

Grammatical theory

From transformational grammar to
constraint-based approaches

Stefan Müller

DRAFT
of September 1, 2016, 14:39

■ Textbooks in Language Sciences 1



Textbooks in Language Sciences

Editors: Stefan Müller, Martin Haspelmath

Editorial Board: Claude Hagège, Marianne Mithun, Anatol Stefanowitsch, Foong Ha Yap

In this series:

1. Müller, Stefan. Grammatical theory: From transformational grammar to constraint-based approaches.
2. Schäfer, Roland. Einführung in die grammatische Beschreibung des Deutschen.

Grammatical theory

From transformational grammar to
constraint-based approaches

Stefan Müller

DRAFT
of September 1, 2016, 14:39

Stefan Müller. 2016. *Grammatical theory: From transformational grammar to constraint-based approaches* (Textbooks in Language Sciences 1). Berlin: Language Science Press.

This title can be downloaded at:

<http://langsci-press.org/catalog/book/25>

© 2016, Stefan Müller

Published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Licence (CC BY 4.0):

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

ISBN: Digital, complete work: 978-3-944675-21-3 ;
Hardcover: vol1: 978-3-946234-29-6; vol. 2 978-3-946234-40-1
Softcover: vol1: 978-3-946234-30-2; vol. 2 978-3-946234-41-8
Softcover US: vol1: 978-1-530465-62-0; vol. 2 978-1-523743-82-7

ISSN: 2364-6209

Cover and concept of design: Ulrike Harbort

Translators: Andrew Murphy, Stefan Müller

Typesetting: Stefan Müller

Proofreading: Viola Auermann, Armin Buch, Andreea Calude, Rong Chen, Matthew Czuba, Leonel de Alencar, Christian Döhler, Joseph T. Farquharson, Andreas Hölzl, Gianina Iordăchioaia, Paul Kay, Anne Kilgus, Sandra Kübler, Timm Lichte, Antonio Machicao y Priemer, Michelle Natolo, Stephanie Natolo, Sebastian Nordhoff, Parviz Parsafar, Conor Pyle, Daniela Schröder, Eva Schultze-Berndt, Alec Shaw, Benedikt Singpiel, Anelia Stefanova, Neal Whitman, Viola Wiegand

Open reviewing: Armin Buch, Leonel de Alencar, Andreas Hölzl, Gianina Iordăchioaia, Paul Kay, Dick Hudson, Paul Kay, Timm Lichte, Antonio Machicao y Priemer, Andrew McIntyre, Arne Nymos, Sebastian Nordhoff, Neal Whitman

Fonts: Linux Libertine, Arimo, DejaVu Sans Mono

Typesetting software: \LaTeX

Language Science Press

Habelschwerdter Allee 45

14195 Berlin, Germany

langsci-press.org

Storage and cataloguing done by FU Berlin

Freie Universität



Berlin

Language Science Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party Internet websites referred to in this publication, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

For Max

目 录

前言	xv
II 研究背景与语法理论	1
1 导言与术语	3
1.1 为什么要研究句法?	3
1.2 为什么要形式化?	5
1.3 构成成分	6
1.3.1 组成成分测试	7
1.3.2 关于成分测试法的一些看法	10
1.4 词类	16
1.5 中心语	26
1.6 论元成分与说明语	28
1.7 语法功能	32
1.7.1 主语	32
1.7.2 状语	37
1.7.3 谓语	38
1.7.4 配价类型	39
1.8 德语小句的空间位置模型	40
1.8.1 动词的位置	40
1.8.2 句子的框架结构、前场、中场及后场	41
1.8.3 场内元素的排列	41
1.8.4 递归	45
2 短语结构语法	49
2.1 符号和重写规则	49
2.2 短语结构语法中特征的运用	54
2.3 语义	55
2.4 部分德语句法的短语结构规则	58
2.4.1 名词短语	58
2.4.2 介词短语	67

目 录

2.5	\bar{X} 理论	69
3	转换语法-管辖与约束理论	77
3.1	关于表示形式的一般说明	78
3.1.1	转换	78
3.1.2	有关语言习得的假说: 原则与参数理论	80
3.1.3	T 模型	81
3.1.4	\bar{X} 理论	86
3.1.5	英语中的 CP 和 IP	89
3.1.6	德语小句的结构	91
3.2	动词位置	93
3.3	长距离依存	97
3.4	被动	99
3.4.1	结构格与词汇格	99
3.4.2	格指派与格过滤	101
3.5	域内重新排序	104
3.6	小结	107
3.6.1	有关语言习得的解释	107
3.6.2	形式化	108
4	Transformational Grammar – Minimalism	115
4.1	General remarks on the representational format	115
4.1.1	Basic architecture	116
4.1.2	Valence, feature checking, and agreement	117
4.1.3	Phrase structure and \bar{X} theory	118
4.1.4	Little v	120
4.1.5	CP, TP, v P, VP	122
4.1.6	Adjuncts	126
4.2	Verb position	126
4.3	Long-distance dependencies	127
4.4	Passive	127
4.5	Local reordering	130
4.6	New developments and theoretical variants	131
4.6.1	Move, Merge, feature-driven movement and functional projections	132
4.6.2	Labeling	142
4.6.3	Specifiers, complements, and the remains of \bar{X} theory	148
4.6.4	Minimalism, Categorical Grammar, and HPSG	152
4.6.5	Selection of atomic features vs. selection of complex categories	160
4.6.6	Summary	162
4.7	Summary and classification	162
4.7.1	Explaining language acquisition	162
4.7.2	Formalization	163

5	Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar	169
5.1	General remarks on the representational format	169
5.1.1	Complex categories, the Head Feature Convention, and \bar{X} rules	170
5.1.2	Local reordering	172
5.1.3	Metarules	174
5.1.4	Semantics	176
5.1.5	Adjuncts	178
5.2	Passive as a metarule	179
5.3	Verb position	182
5.4	Long-distance dependencies as the result of local dependencies	183
5.5	Summary and classification	186
5.5.1	Valence and morphology	187
5.5.2	Valence and partial verb phrase fronting	188
5.5.3	Generative capacity	189
6	Feature descriptions	191
6.1	Feature descriptions	191
6.2	Types	194
6.3	Disjunction	197
6.4	Structure sharing	197
6.5	Cyclic structures	199
6.6	Unification	200
6.7	Phenomena, models and formal theories	201
7	Lexical Functional Grammar	207
7.1	General remarks on the representational format	210
7.1.1	Functional structure	210
7.1.2	Completeness	213
7.1.3	Coherence	213
7.1.4	Restrictions on the c-structure/f-structure relation	214
7.1.5	Semantics	215
7.1.6	Adjuncts	217
7.2	Passive	218
7.3	Verb position	221
7.4	Local reordering	222
7.5	Long-distance dependencies and functional uncertainty	224
7.6	Summary and classification	228
8	Categorial Grammar	231
8.1	General remarks on the representational format	232
8.1.1	Representation of valence information	232
8.1.2	Semantics	234
8.1.3	Adjuncts	235
8.2	Passive	236

目 录

8.3	Verb position	237
8.4	Local reordering	239
8.5	Long-distance dependencies	240
8.5.1	Type Raising	240
8.5.2	Forward and backward composition	241
8.5.3	Analysis of long-distance dependencies	241
8.6	Summary and classification	243
9	Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar	249
9.1	General remarks on the representational format	252
9.1.1	Representation of valence information	253
9.1.2	Representation of constituent structure	255
9.1.3	Linearization rules	259
9.1.4	Projection of head properties	260
9.1.5	Inheritance hierarchies and generalizations	262
9.1.6	Semantics	264
9.1.7	Adjuncts	267
9.2	Passive	270
9.2.1	Valence information and the Case Principle	273
9.3	Verb position	275
9.4	Local reordering	280
9.5	Long-distance dependencies	283
9.6	New developments and theoretical variants	288
9.6.1	Specifier, complements and argument structure	288
9.6.2	Linearization-based HPSG	291
9.7	Summary and classification	292
10	Construction Grammar	297
10.1	General remarks on the representational format	299
10.1.1	The head-complement construction	300
10.1.2	Representation of valence information	301
10.1.3	Semantics	301
10.1.4	Adjuncts	301
10.2	Passive	301
10.3	Verb position	306
10.4	Local reordering	308
10.5	Long-distance dependencies	309
10.6	New developments and theoretical variants	309
10.6.1	Berkeley Construction Grammar	309
10.6.2	Sign-Based Construction Grammar	313
10.6.3	Embodied Construction Grammar	325
10.6.4	Fluid Construction Grammar	329
10.6.5	Coordination	337
10.6.6	Discontinuous constituents and performance models	338

10.6.7	Discontinuity vs. Subject-Head and Head-Filler Schema	339
10.6.8	Restricting discontinuity	339
10.7	Summary and classification	349
11	Dependency Grammar	351
11.1	General remarks on the representational format	355
11.1.1	Valence information, nucleus and satellites	355
11.1.2	Adjuncts	358
11.1.3	Linearization	358
11.1.4	Semantics	360
11.2	Passive	361
11.3	Verb position	362
11.4	Local reordering	364
11.5	Long-distance dependencies	365
11.6	New developments and theoretical variants	371
11.6.1	Tesnière's part of speech classification	371
11.6.2	Connection, junction, and transfer	372
11.6.3	Scope	378
11.7	Summary and classification	378
11.7.1	Linearization	379
11.7.2	Dependency Grammar vs. phrase structure grammar	387
12	Tree Adjoining Grammar	399
12.1	General remarks on representational format	400
12.1.1	Representation of valence information	400
12.1.2	Substitution	400
12.1.3	Adjunction	401
12.1.4	Semantics	402
12.2	Local reordering	404
12.3	Verb position	407
12.4	Passive	409
12.5	Long-distance dependencies	410
12.6	New developments and theoretical variants	410
12.6.1	FTAG	411
12.6.2	V-TAG	414
12.6.3	The competence-performance distinction and the generative capacity of tree-local MC-LTAG	416
12.7	Summary and classification	422

III 讨论

425■

13 The innateness of linguistic knowledge	427
13.1 Syntactic universals	429
13.1.1 Head Directionality Parameter	430
13.1.2 \bar{X} structures	431
13.1.3 Grammatical functions such as subject and object	434
13.1.4 Binding principles	436
13.1.5 Properties of long-distance dependencies	438
13.1.6 Grammatical morphemes for tense, mood and aspect	446
13.1.7 Parts of speech	446
13.1.8 Recursion and infinitude	447
13.1.9 Summary	453
13.2 Speed of language acquisition	454
13.3 Critical period for acquisition	454
13.4 Lack of acquisition among non-human primates	456
13.5 Creole and sign languages	456
13.6 Localization in special parts of the brain	458
13.7 Differences between language and general cognition	459
13.7.1 Williams Syndrome	459
13.7.2 KE family with FoxP2 mutation	459
13.8 Poverty of the Stimulus	460
13.8.1 Gold's Theorem	461
13.8.2 Four case studies	465
13.8.3 Unsupervised Data-Oriented Parsing (U-DOP)	475
13.8.4 Negative evidence	481
13.9 Summary	483
14 Generative-enumerative vs. model-theoretic approaches	485
14.1 Graded acceptability	487
14.2 Utterance fragments	488
14.3 A problem for model-theoretic approaches?	490
15 The competence/performance distinction	495
15.1 The derivational theory of complexity	497
15.2 Incremental processing	500
16 Language acquisition	507
16.1 Principles & Parameters	507
16.2 Principles and the lexicon	515
16.3 Pattern-based approaches	515
16.4 Selection-based approaches	522
16.5 Summary	523

17	Generative capacity and grammar formalisms	525
18	Binary branching, locality, and recursion	531
18.1	Binary branching	531
18.2	Locality	534
18.3	Recursion	543
19	Empty elements	545
19.1	Views on empty elements	545
19.2	Eliminating empty elements from grammars	547
19.3	Empty elements and semantic interpretation	552
19.4	Evidence for empty elements	559
19.5	Transformations, lexical rules, and empty elements	559
20	Extraction, scrambling, and passive: one or several descriptive devices?	565
21	Phrasal vs. lexical analyses	575
21.1	Some putative advantages of phrasal models	576
21.1.1	Usage-based theories	576
21.1.2	Coercion	578
21.1.3	Aspect as a clause level phenomenon	580
21.1.4	Simplicity and polysemy	581
21.2	Evidence for lexical approaches	583
21.2.1	Valence and coordination	583
21.2.2	Valence and derivational morphology	588
21.3	Radical underspecification: the end of argument structure?	594
21.3.1	Neo-Davidsonianism	594
21.3.2	Little <i>v</i> and idiom asymmetries	596
21.3.3	Deverbal nominals	598
21.3.4	Idiosyncratic syntactic selections	601
21.3.5	Expletives	603
21.3.6	An exoskeletal approach	604
21.3.7	Is there an alternative to lexical valence structure?	608
21.3.8	Summary	609
21.4	Relations between constructions	609
21.4.1	Inheritance hierarchies for constructions	610
21.4.2	Mappings between different levels of representations	614
21.4.3	Is there an alternative to lexical rules?	617
21.5	Further problems for phrasal approaches	617
21.5.1	Particle verbs and commitment to phrase structure configurations	617
21.6	Arguments from language acquisition	618
21.6.1	Recognizability of constructions	618
21.6.2	Coordination and discontinuousness	620

目 录

21.7	Arguments from psycho- and neurolinguistics	625
21.7.1	Lexical rules vs. phrasal constructions	625
21.7.2	Light verbs	627
21.7.3	Arguments from neurolinguistics	628
21.8	Arguments from statistical distribution	632
21.8.1	Unsupervised Data-Oriented Parsing	632
21.8.2	Collostructions	635
21.9	Conclusion	635
21.10	Why (phrasal) constructions?	636
21.10.1	Verbless directives	636
21.10.2	Serial verbs	643
21.10.3	Relative and interrogative clauses	644
21.10.4	The N-P-N construction	647
22	Universal Grammar and comparative linguistics without UG	651
22.1	Formal tools for capturing generalizations	651
22.2	How to develop linguistic theories that capture cross-linguistic general- izations	655
23	Conclusion	665
24	Solutions to the exercises	669
24.1	Introduction and basic terms	669
24.2	Phrase structure grammars	670
24.3	Transformational Grammar – Government & Binding	674
24.4	Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar	676
24.5	Feature descriptions	679
24.6	Lexical Functional Grammar	680
24.7	Categorial Grammar	682
24.8	Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar	683
24.9	Construction Grammar	684
24.10	Dependency Grammar	685
24.11	Tree Adjoining Grammar	686
	参考文献	689
	Index	778
	Name index	778
	Language index	778
	Subject index	778

前言

This book is an extended and revised version of my German book *Grammatiktheorie* (Müller 2013b). It introduces various grammatical theories that play a role in current theorizing or have made contributions in the past which are still relevant today. I explain some foundational assumptions and then apply the respective theories to what can be called the “core grammar” of German. I have decided to stick to the object language that I used in the German version of this book since many of the phenomena that will be dealt with cannot be explained with English as the object language. Furthermore, many theories have been developed by researchers with English as their native language and it is illuminative to see these theories applied to another language. I show how the theories under consideration deal with arguments and adjuncts, active/passive alternations, local reorderings (so-called scrambling), verb position, and fronting of phrases over larger distances (the verb second property of the Germanic languages without English).

The second part deals with foundational questions that are important for developing theories. This includes a discussion of the question of whether we have innate domain specific knowledge of language (UG), the discussion of psycholinguistic evidence concerning the processing of language by humans, a discussion of the status of empty elements and of the question whether we construct and perceive utterances holistically or rather compositionally, that is, whether we use phrasal or lexical constructions.

Unfortunately, linguistics is a scientific field with a considerable amount of terminological chaos. I therefore wrote an introductory chapter that introduces terminology in the way it is used later on in the book. The second chapter introduces phrase structure grammars, which plays a role for many of the theories that are covered in this book. I use these two chapters (excluding the Section 2.3 on interleaving phrase structure grammars and semantics) in introductory courses of our BA curriculum for German studies. Advanced readers may skip these introductory chapters. The following chapters are structured in a way that should make it possible to understand the introduction of the theories without any prior knowledge. The sections regarding new developments and classification are more ambitious: they refer to chapters still to come and also point to other publications that are relevant in the current theoretical discussion but cannot be repeated or summarized in this book. These parts of the book address advanced students and researchers. I use this book for teaching the syntactic aspects of the theories in a seminar for advanced students in our BA. The slides are available on my web page. The second part of the book, the general discussion, is more ambitious and contains the

discussion of advanced topics and current research literature.

This book only deals with relatively recent developments. For a historical overview, see for instance Robins (1997); Jungen & Lohnstein (2006). I am aware of the fact that chapters on Integrational Linguistics (Lieb 1983; Eisenberg 2004; Nolda 2007), Optimality Theory (Prince & Smolensky 1993; Grimshaw 1997; G. Müller 2000), Role and Reference Grammar (Van Valin 1993) and Relational Grammar (Perlmutter 1983, 1984) are missing. I will leave these theories for later editions.

The original German book was planned to have 400 pages, but it finally was much bigger: the first German edition has 525 pages and the second German edition has 564 pages. I added a chapter on Dependency Grammar and one on Minimalism to the English version and now the book has 777 pages. I tried to represent the chosen theories appropriately and to cite all important work. Although the list of references is over 85 pages long, I was probably not successful. I apologize for this and any other shortcomings.

Available versions of this book

The canonical version of this book is the PDF document available from the Language Science Press webpage of this book¹. This page also links to a Print on Demand version. Since the book is very long, we decided to split the book into two volumes. The first volume contains the description of all theories and the second volume contains the general discussion. Both volumes contain the complete list of references and the indices. The second volume starts with page 427. The printed volumes are therefore identical to the parts of the PDF document.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank David Adger, Jason Baldridge, Felix Bildhauer, Emily M. Bender, Stefan Evert, Gisbert Fanselow, Sandiway Fong, Hans-Martin Gärtner, Kim Gerdes, Adele Goldberg, Bob Levine, Paul Kay, Jakob Maché, Guido Mensching, Laura Michaelis, Geoffrey Pullum, Uli Sauerland, Roland Schäfer, Jan Strunk, Remi van Trijp, Shravan Vasishth, Tom Wasow, and Stephen Wechsler for discussion and Monika Budde, Philippa Cook, Laura Kallmeyer, Tibor Kiss, Gisela Klann-Delius, Jonas Kuhn, Timm Lichte, Anke Lüdeling, Jens Michaelis, Bjarne Ørsnes, Andreas Pankau, Christian Pietsch, Frank Richter, Ivan Sag, and Eva Wittenberg for comments on earlier versions of the German edition of this book and Thomas Groß, Dick Hudson, Sylvain Kahane, Paul Kay, Haitao Liu (刘海涛), Andrew McIntyre, Sebastian Nordhoff, Tim Osborne, Andreas Pankau, and Christoph Schwarze for comments on earlier versions of this book. Thanks to Leonardo Boiko and Sven Verdoolaege for pointing out typos. Special thanks go to Martin Haspelmath for very detailed comments on an earlier version of the English book.

我要感谢在此书的中文译本中给予我帮助的学者们，他们是刘海涛、刘晓、冯秋香。

¹ <http://langsci-press.org/catalog/book/25>

This book was the first Language Science Press book that had an open review phase (see below). I thank Dick Hudson, Paul Kay, Antonio Machicao y Priemer, Andrew McIntyre, Sebastian Nordhoff, and one anonymous open reviewer for their comments. These comments are documented at the download page of this book. In addition the book went through a stage of community proofreading (see also below). Some of the proofreaders did much more than proofreading, their comments are highly appreciated and I decided to publish these comments as additional open reviews. Armin Buch, Leonel de Alencar, Andreas Hölzl, Gianina Iordăchioaia, Timm Lichte, Antonio Machicao y Priemer, and Neal Whitman deserve special mention here.

I thank Wolfgang Sternefeld and Frank Richter, who wrote a detailed review of the German version of this book (Sternefeld & Richter 2012). They pointed out some mistakes and omissions that were corrected in the second edition of the German book and which are of course not present in the English version.

Thanks to all the students who commented on the book and whose questions lead to improvements. Lisa Deringer, Aleksandra Gabryszak, Simon Lohmiller, Theresa Kallenbach, Steffen Neuschulz, Reka Meszaros-Segner, Lena Terhart and Elodie Winckel deserve special mention.

Since this book is built upon all my experience in the area of grammatical theory, I want to thank all those with whom I ever discussed linguistics during and after talks at conferences, workshops, summer schools or via email. Werner Abraham, John Bateman, Dorothee Beermann, Rens Bod, Miriam Butt, Manfred Bierwisch, Ann Copestake, Holger Diessel, Kerstin Fischer, Dan Flickinger, Peter Gallmann, Petter Haugereid, Lars Hellan, Tibor Kiss, Wolfgang Klein, Hans-Ulrich Krieger, Andrew McIntyre, Detmar Meurers, Gereon Müller, Martin Neef, Manfred Sailer, Anatol Stefanowitsch, Peter Svenonius, Michael Tomasello, Hans Uszkoreit, Gert Webelhuth, Daniel Wiechmann and Arne Zeschel deserve special mention.

I thank Sebastian Nordhoff for a comment regarding the completion of the subject index entry for *recursion*.

Andrew Murphy translated part of Chapter 1 and the Chapters 2–3, 5–10, and 12–23. Many thanks for this!

I also want to thank the 27 community proofreaders (Viola Auermann, Armin Buch, Andreea Calude, Rong Chen, Matthew Czuba, Leonel de Alencar, Christian Döhler, Joseph T. Farquharson, Andreas Hölzl, Gianina Iordăchioaia, Paul Kay, Anne Kilgus, Sandra Kübler, Timm Lichte, Antonio Machicao y Priemer, Michelle Natolo, Stephanie Natolo, Sebastian Nordhoff, Parviz Parsafar, Conor Pyle, Daniela Schröder, Eva Schultze-Berndt, Alec Shaw, Benedikt Singpiel, Anelia Stefanova, Neal Whitman, Viola Wiegand) that each worked on one or more chapters and really improved this book. I got more comments from every one of them than I ever got for a book done with a commercial publisher. Some comments were on content rather than on typos and layout issues. No proofreader employed by a commercial publisher would have spotted these mistakes and inconsistencies since commercial publishers do not have staff that knows all the grammatical theories that are covered in this book.

During the past years, a number of workshops on theory comparison have taken

place. I was invited to three of them. I thank Helge Dyvik and Torbjørn Nordgård for inviting me to the fall school for Norwegian PhD students *Languages and Theories in Contrast*, which took place 2005 in Bergen. Guido Mensching and Elisabeth Stark invited me to the workshop *Comparing Languages and Comparing Theories: Generative Grammar and Construction Grammar*, which took place in 2007 at the Freie Universität Berlin and Andreas Pankau invited me to the workshop *Comparing Frameworks* in 2009 in Utrecht. I really enjoyed the discussion with all participants of these events and this book benefited enormously from the interchange.

I thank Peter Gallmann for the discussion of his lecture notes on GB during my time in Jena. The Sections 3.1.3–3.4 have a structure that is similar to the one of his script and take over a lot. Thanks to David Reitter for the \LaTeX macros for Combinatorial Categorical Grammar, to Mary Dalrymple and Jonas Kuhn for the LFG macros and example structures, and to Laura Kallmeyer for the \LaTeX sources of most of the TAG analyses. Most of the trees have been adapted to the forest package because of compatibility issues with \XeLaTeX , but the original trees and texts were a great source of inspiration and without them the figures in the respective chapters would not be half as pretty as they are now.

I thank Sašo Živanović for implementing the \LaTeX package forest. It really simplifies typesetting of trees, dependency graphs, and type hierarchies. I also thank him for individual help via email and on stackexchange. In general, those active on stackexchange could not be thanked enough: most of my questions regarding specific details of the typesetting of this book or the implementation of the \LaTeX classes that are used by Language Science Press now have been answered within several minutes. Thank you! Since this book is a true open access book under the CC-BY license, it can also be an open source book. The interested reader finds a copy of the source code at <https://github.com/langsci/25>. By making the book open source I pass on the knowledge provided by the \LaTeX gurus and hope that others benefit from this and learn to typeset their linguistics papers in nicer and/or more efficient ways.

Viola Auermann and Antje Bahlke, Sarah Dietzfelbinger, Lea Helmers, and Chiara Jancke cannot be thanked enough for their work at the copy machines. Viola also helped a lot with proof reading prefinal stages of the translation. I also want to thank my (former) lab members Felix Bildhauer, Philippa Cook, Janna Lipenkova, Jakob Maché, Bjarne Ørsnes and Roland Schäfer, which were mentioned above already for other reasons, for their help with teaching. During the years from 2007 until the publication of the first German edition of this book two of the three tenured positions in German Linguistics were unfilled and I would have not been able to maintain the teaching requirements without their help and would have never finished the *Grammatiktheorie* book.

I thank Tibor Kiss for advice in questions of style. His diplomatic way always was a shining example for me and I hope that this is also reflected in this book.

On the way this book is published

I started to work on my dissertation in 1994 and defended it in 1997. During the whole time the manuscript was available on my web page. After the defense, I had to look for a publisher. I was quite happy to be accepted to the series *Linguistische Arbeiten* by Niemeyer, but at the same time I was shocked about the price, which was 186.00 DM for a paperback book that was written and typeset by me without any help by the publisher (twenty times the price of a paperback novel).² This basically meant that my book was depublished: until 1998 it was available from my web page and after this it was available in libraries only. My Habilitationsschrift was published by CSLI Publications for a much more reasonable price. When I started writing textbooks, I was looking for alternative distribution channels and started to negotiate with no-name print on demand publishers. Brigitte Narr, who runs the Stauffenburg publishing house, convinced me to publish my HPSG textbook with her. The copyrights for the German version of the book remained with me so that I could publish it on my web page. The collaboration was successful so that I also published my second textbook about grammatical theory with Stauffenburg. I think that this book has a broader relevance and should be accessible for non-German-speaking readers as well. I therefore decided to have it translated into English. Since Stauffenburg is focused on books in German, I had to look for another publisher. Fortunately the situation in the publishing sector changed quite dramatically in comparison to 1997: we now have high profile publishers with strict peer review that are entirely open access. I am very glad about the fact that Brigitte Narr sold the rights of my book back to me and that I can now publish the English version with Language Science Press under a CC-BY license.

Language Science Press: scholar-owned high quality linguistic books

In 2012 a group of people found the situation in the publishing business so unbearable that they agreed that it would be worthwhile to start a bigger initiative for publishing linguistics books in platinum open access, that is, free for both readers and authors. I set up a web page and collected supporters, very prominent linguists from all over the world and all subdisciplines and Martin Haspelmath and I then founded Language Science Press. At about the same time the DFG had announced a program for open access monographs and we applied (Müller & Haspelmath 2013) and got funded (two out of 18 applications got funding). The money is used for a coordinator (Dr. Sebastian Nordhoff) and an economist (Debora Siller), two programmers (Carola Fanselow and Dr. Mathias Schenner), who work on the publishing platform Open Monograph Press (OMP) and on conversion software that produces various formats (ePub, XML, HTML) from our \LaTeX code. Svantje Lilienthal works on the documentation of OMP, produces screencasts and does user support for authors, readers and series editors.

OMP is extended by open review facilities and community-building gamification

² As a side remark: in the meantime Niemeyer was bought by de Gruyter and closed down. The price of the book is now 139.95 €/ \$ 196.00. The price in Euro corresponds to 273.72 DM.

前言

tools (Müller 2012b; Müller & Haspelmath 2013). All Language Science Press books are reviewed by at least two external reviewers. Reviewers and authors may agree to publish these reviews and thereby make the whole process more transparent (see also Pulum (1984) for the suggestion of open reviewing of journal articles). In addition there is an optional second review phase: the open review. This review is completely open to everybody. The whole community may comment on the document that is published by Language Science Press. After this second review phase, which usually lasts for two months, authors may revise their publication and an improved version will be published. This book was the first book to go through this open review phase. The annotated open review version of this book is still available via the web page of this book.

Currently, Language Science Press has 17 series on various subfields of linguistics with high profile series editors from all continents. We have 18 published and 17 forthcoming books and 146 expressions of interest. Series editors and authors are responsible for delivering manuscripts that are typeset in \LaTeX , but they are supported by a web-based typesetting infrastructure that was set up by Language Science Press and by volunteer typesetters from the community. Proofreading is also community-based. Until now 53 people helped improving our books. Their work is documented in the Hall of Fame: <http://langsci-press.org/about/hallOfFame>.

If you think that textbooks like this one should be freely available to whoever wants to read them and that publishing scientific results should not be left to profit-oriented publishers, then you can join the Language Science Press community and support us in various ways: you can register with Language Science Press and have your name listed on our supporter page with almost 600 other enthusiasts, you may devote your time and help with proofreading and/or typesetting, or you may donate money for specific books or for Language Science Press in general. We are also looking for institutional supporters like foundations, societies, linguistics departments or university libraries. Detailed information on how to support us is provided at the following webpage: <http://langsci-press.org/about/support>. In case of questions, please contact me or the Language Science Press coordinator at contact@langsci-press.org.

Berlin, September 1, 2016

Stefan Müller

第零部分 研究背景与语法理论

第一章 导言与术语

本章旨在探讨两个问题：一是为什么要研究句法（第1.1节），二是为什么说形式化的表述是非常重要的（第1.2节）。我们将在第1.3节到第1.8节的内容中介绍基本概念：第1.3节讲解将语流切分成一个个小单位的准则。第1.4节展示了词汇聚类的规律，其中我将重点介绍动词或形容词的分类标准。第1.5节介绍中心语的概念，而有关论元和说明语的区别将在第1.6节中展开。第1.7节界定了语法功能。第1.8节利用空间位置理论来分析德语这类语言中小句的空间位置。

需要说明的是，语言学领域里术语纷杂，难以统一。造成这一现象的部分原因是，这些术语最早来源于对某些语言（如拉丁语，英语）的分析，而后又被用于描述其他语言现象。然而，这样做并不合适，因为有些语言与其他语言区别很大，而且语言本身也在不断地发展变化。基于以上原因，有些术语的用法发生了变化或者是有新的术语被创造出来。

本书在介绍新术语时，会援引相关的术语或者区分出每一条术语的不同用法，这样可以方便读者将这些术语与其他文献的术语联系起来。

1.1 为什么要研究句法？

所有的语言表达式都有意义。据此，我们研究形式与意义的结合体 (de Saussure 1916b)。例如，*tree*（树）这个词的字形与其相应的语音形式被赋予了 *tree'*（树）的含义。相对大的语音单位可以由相对小的单位构成：词与词可以一起构成词组并且这些词组可以继而构成句子。

接下来的问题是：我们是否需要一个形式化的系统来表述这些句子的结构呢？就像上面，我们将 *tree*（树）这个词的形式与意义对儿形式化地表述出来对于完成这些句子来说是不是不够的呢？

理论上来说，这只适用于那些由有限词语序列构成的语言。如果我们假设句子的最大长度是有限的，词长是有限的，词语的数量也是有限的，那么句子的数量也应该是有限的。但是，即使我们能限制句子的长度，可以构成的句子数量也是无限的。由此，我们真正需要回答的问题是：句子的最大长度是多少呢？举例来说，我们可以把下面的句子（1）进行扩展：

- (1) a. This sentence goes on and on and on and on ...
这 句子 长 PREP 和 PREP 和 PREP 和 PREP ...
b. [A sentence is a sentence] is a sentence.
一 句子 COP 一 句子 COP 一 句子

- c. that Max thinks that Julius knows that Otto claims that Karl suspects
 CONJ Max 认为 CONJ Julius 知道 CONJ Otto 声称 CONJ Carl 怀疑
 that Richard confirms that Friederike is laughing
 CONJ Richard 承认 CONJ Friederike AUX 笑

例 (1b) 是对 “a sentence is a sentence” 这组词的说明，即它是一个句子。我们也可以按照 (1b) 的方式来扩展句子，将这一整句话也看作是一句话。(1c) 是将 “Friederike is laughing” 和 “Richard confirms” 组合起来构成了一个新句子 “Richard confirms, that Friederike is laughing”。按照同样的方式，我们还可以将 “Karl suspects” 扩展进来。由此，我们就可以将一个不太复杂的句子嵌套进来构成一个非常复杂的句子。这样就可以一句句地嵌套下去。(1c) 这类句子类似于俄罗斯套娃 (matryoshka)：每个娃娃都由一个套一个的不同颜色的更小的娃娃构成。(1c) 中的句子也是以同样的方式构成的，即他们都由更小的成分，而且是不同的名词和动词组成。我们可以用方括号很清楚地表示出来，如下所示：

- (2) that Max thinks [that Julius knows [that Otto claims [that Karl suspects [that Richard confirms [that Friederike is laughing]]]]]

我们可以像例 (1) 一样通过扩展的方式构建出又长又复杂的句子。¹

对于这些组合来说，我们很难轻易地说截止到哪里是我们的语言可以接受的。(Harris 1957: 208; Chomsky 1957: 23)。同样，如果认为这些复杂的句子被当作一个复杂的单位储存在大脑中，这样的观点也是难以令人信服的。虽然神经语言学的实验显示，高频词语或固定搭配往往以复杂单位的形式储存在大脑中，但是这与例 (1) 所示的情况是不同的。再者，我们能够造出我们从未听过、说过或者写下的话语。这些话语一定是有结构的，一定会有可以一遍一遍重复的模式。作为人类，我们有能力将简单的成分构成复杂的句子，也可以将复杂的话语分解出他们的构成成分。目前，也有神经科学相关的研究可以证明，人类具有利用规则将词构成更大单位的能力。(Pulvermüller 2010: 170)

这些规则被违反时，反而更能证明我们是按照规则来组织语言材料的。儿童是通过他们能够接触到的语言输入来习得语言的。在这样做的时候，他们可以说出他们以前从没听过的话语：

- (3) Ich festhalte die.
 我 紧-握 他们(Friederike, 2;6)
 想说：“我紧紧地握住了。”

Friederike 说这句话的时候，正在习得德语句中定式动词 (finite verb) 位置的规则，即定式动词位于第二位。但是，她在这句话中将整个动词放在了第二位，其中就包括可分前缀 *fest* (紧)。正确的用法应该是将这个可分前缀放在句子的末尾。

¹ 也有学者认为我们有能力构建出无限长的句子 (Nowak, Komarova & Niyogi 2001: 117; Kim & Sells 2008: 3; Dan Everett in O'Neill & Wood (2012)), 乔姆斯基也这样认为 (Leiss 2003: 341)。但这是不正确的，因为每个句子必然要在某个节点结束。即使是在乔姆斯基传统下发展起来的形式语言也没有无限长的句子。不过，有些形式语法可以描述出一系列无限地包含着有限句子的情况。(Chomsky 1957: 13) 也可以参看 Pullum & Scholz (2010) 和第13.1.8 节中关于语法的递归性和与语言无限论的观点。

如果我们并不希望语言仅仅是由一个个形式意义对儿构成的，那么必然需要将话语中小的意义成分构成复杂话语的意义的过程。句法就是用来揭示词汇组合的方式和话语的结构。比如说，主谓一致（subject-verb agreement）的知识有助于我们解释下面的德语句子：

- (4) a. Die Frau schläft.
DET 女人睡觉.3SG
‘这个女人睡着了。’
- b. Die Mädchen schlafen.
DET 女孩儿.3PL 睡觉.3PL
‘这些女孩儿睡着了。’
- c. Die Frau kennt die Mädchen.
DET 女人认识.3SG 这 女孩儿.3PL
‘这个女人认识这些女孩儿。’
- d. Die Frau kennen die Mädchen.
DET 女人.3PL 认识.3PL 这个女孩儿.3PL
‘这些女人认识这些女孩儿。’

例句（4a,b）显示，主语的单数或复数形式需要由相应的动词屈折形式来搭配。在（4c,d）中，动词带两个论元成分，而“die Frau”（这个女人）和“die Mädchen”（这些女孩儿）在德语中可以出现在任意一个论元位置上。这些句子可以理解为这个女人认识某人或者某人认识这个女人。不过，按照动词的屈折变化以及德语的句法规则，听话人知道对于（4c）和（4d）来说都只有一种解读。

所以说，句法就是用来发现、描写和解释这些规则、范式和结构的。

1.2 为什么要形式化？

为什么要对语言进行形式化（formalization）的描述呢？我们先来看两条经典的论述：

在发现语言结构的过程中，对语言结构的精确建模，不管是正面的、还是负面的，都起到十分重要的作用。通过对一条不可接受的结论进行精确但是是不充分的建模过程，可以暴露出这种不充分的确切来源，并最终对语言数据有更深层次的理解。乐观来看，一个形式化的理论可以为许多问题自动提供解决方案，而不是像其他那些被精细设计的理论那样。那些晦涩的，凭直觉判定的理念既不能得到荒谬的结论，也不能得到新的、正确的结论。所以说，他们在这两个方面都没有实际的用处。我认为那些质疑过语言学理论的发展在精确和技术层面上的价值的学者们都无法认识到这种方法的巨大潜力，即严密地论证观点以及严格地将之应用在语言事实上，而不是为了避免由特设的调整以及模糊的组成方式造成的不合格的结论。(Chomsky 1957: 5)

正如我们经常指出，但是不能过度强调的是，语言形式化的一个重要的目的就是可以使得研究者们看到一种观点的缺点的同时也看到它的优点。只有这样，我们才能使研究变得有效率。(Dowty 1979: 322)

如果我们将语言的描写形式化，就会易于我们认识某一特定分析所表示的确切含义。我们可以构建起该分析下可预测的内容，并排除其他的分析。另一个优势在于，精确的形式化理论可以用计算机程序能够理解的方式记录下来。这样，一个理论分析就可以作为计算过程中的语法部分来实现，如有不一致的地方就会更快地显现出来。这种语法可以用来分析大规模的数据，也叫做语料库，而且他们可以构建出语法尚无法分析的句子或者组配错误的结果。更多的在语言学中应用计算机实现方面的研究可以参看Bierwisch (1963: 163), Müller (1999a: Chapter 22) 和Bender (2008b) 这几篇文献，也可参看第3.6.2节的内容。

1.3 构成成分

拿例（5）来说，我们可以凭直觉判断出句中有些词构成了一个单位。

- (5) Alle Studenten lesen während dieser Zeit Bücher.
所有学生 读 在 这 时间书
‘在这个时候，所有的学生都在读书。’

例如，alle（所有）和 Studenten（学生）这两个词组成了一个单位，说的是有人在读书的意思。während（在……时候），dieser（这）和 Zeit（时间）这三个词也组成了一个单位，意思是读这个动作发生的这段时间，而 Bücher（书）是指读的对象。第一个单位本身由两部分组成，即 alle（所有）和 Studenten（学生）。“während dieser Zeit”（在这个时候）这个单位也可以分成两个小部分：während（在……时候）和 “dieser Zeit”（这个时候）。“dieser Zeit”（这个时候）也由两部分组成，跟 “alle Studenten”（所有的学生）是一样的。

在前面的例（1c）中，我们用俄罗斯套娃（matryoshkas）来比喻语言中的嵌套现象。这里，我们也可以将（5）分成更小的单位，从而组成更大的单位。但是，与俄罗斯套娃的隐喻不同的是，我们不能只将小的单位放在大的单位里，而是我们可以将几个单位组成更大的单位。最好的方法就是把它想象成一套盒子系统：一个大盒子装着整个句子。在这个盒子里，还有四个小盒子，每个盒子分别装着 “alle Studenten”（所有的学生），“lesen”（读），“während dieser Zeit”（在这个时候）和 “Bücher”（书）。如图 1.1 所示。




图 1.1: 盒子中的词与短语

在下一节，我会介绍几种不同的测验方法来判断出哪些词与其他词相比是“在一起的”。每当我说到一个词语序列的时候，通常是指一个任意的线性词语序列，它并不必须具有句法或语义上的联系，比如说例（5）中 “students read during”（学生们读在）。而由一组词组成的结构单位通常叫做短语（phrase）。短语由词构成，

如“this time”（这个时候），或者由词与短语组成，如“during this time”（在这个时候）。短语内的部分和短语本身叫做构成成分（constitutnes）。所以说，在图 1.1 中，盒子中的所有元素都是句子的构成成分。

基于上述的基本说明，我现在将介绍一些可以帮助我们判断出一个词串是否是构成成分的测试方法。

1.3.1 组成成分测试

有许多方法可以用来测试词汇序列的构成成分。在下面的章节中，我会介绍其中一些方法。在第 1.3.2 节，我们还将看到简单地盲目测试只会得到一些无用的结果。

1.3.1.1 替换

如果可以将一个句子内的词语序列替换（substitution）为另一套不同的词语序列，而且句子的可接受程度不变，那么就可以证明这些词语序列是一个构成成分。在例（6）中，“der Mann”（男人）可以被替换为“eine Frau”（一个女人）。这就表明了这些词语序列都是组成成分。

- (6) a. Er kennt [den Mann].
他认识 那 男人
‘他认识那个男人。’
b. Er kennt [eine Frau].
他认识 一 女人
‘他认识一个女人。’

与（7a）类似的是，字符串“das Buch zu lesen”可以被替换为“der Frau das Buch zu geben”。

- (7) a. Er versucht, [das Buch zu lesen].
他试图 这 书 AUX 读
‘他试着读这本书。’
b. Er versucht, [der Frau das Buch zu geben].
他试图 这 女人这 书 AUX 给
‘他试着把这本书给这位女士。’

这类测验叫做替换测试（substitution test）。

1.3.1.2 代词化

凡是能够由代词所替代的也构成一个成分。在例（8）中，我们可以用代词 er（他）替代“der Mann”（这个男人）：

1 导言与术语

- (8) a. [Der Mann] schläft.
这 男人 睡觉
‘这个男人在睡觉。’
b. Er schläft.
他 睡觉
‘他在睡觉。’

我们也可以用一个代词来指代诸如 “das Buch zu lesen ” 这样的成分，如下面的例 (9) 所示：

- (9) a. Peter versucht, [das Buch zu lesen].
Peter 试图 这 书 AUX 读
‘Peter 试着读这本书。’
b. Klaus versucht das auch.
Klaus 试图 这 也
‘Klaus 也试着这么做。’

代词化测试 (pronominalization test) 是替换测试的另一种形式。

1.3.1.3 疑问结构

如果一个词语序列能够用问句来提问，那么它就构成一个成分：

- (10) a. [Der Mann] arbeitet.
这 男人 工作
‘这个男人在工作。’
b. Wer arbeitet?
谁 工作
‘谁在工作？’

疑问结构属于一种特殊的代词化。我们可以用一种特殊类型的代词来指代词语序列。像 (7a) “das Buch zu lesen” 这类成分就可以用疑问词来提问，如例 (11) 所示：

- (11) Was versucht er?
什么 试图 他
‘他想试什么？’

1.3.1.4 变换测试

如有一组词语序列可以移动，而不会影响到其所在句子的合格性，那么这就意味着这个词语序列组成了一个成分。在例 (12) 中，keiner (没有人) 和 diese Frau (这个女人) 可以有不同的语序排列方式，这就意味着 diese (这) 和 Frau (女人) 是一个成分。

- (12) a. dass keiner [diese Frau] kennt
CONJ 没有 这 女人 认识
b. dass [diese Frau] keiner kennt
CONJ 这 女人 没有 认识
‘没有人认识这个女人’

从另一个角度来看, *keiner diese* (没有这) 在例 (12a) 中是无法构成一个成分的。如我们将 *keiner diese* (没有这) 整体移动的话, 我们会得到不合格的句子:²

- (13) a. *dass Frau keiner diese kennt
CONJ 女人 没有 这 认识
b. *dass Frau kennt keiner diese
CONJ 女人 认识 没有 这

再者, 诸如例 (7a) 中 “the das Buch zu lesen” 这一组成成分是可以移动的:

- (14) a. Er hat noch nicht [das Buch zu lesen] versucht.
他 AUX PART 不 DET 书 AUX 读 试图
‘他还没有试着读这本书。’
b. Er hat [das Buch zu lesen] noch nicht versucht.
他 AUX DET 书 AUX 读 PART 不 试图
c. Er hat noch nicht versucht, [das Buch zu lesen].
他 AUX PART 不 试图 DET 书 AUX 读

1.3.1.5 前置

前置 (fronting) 是更深层次的移位测试。在德语的陈述句中, 只有一个成分能够前置到定式动词的前面:

- (15) a. [Alle Studenten] lesen während der vorlesungsfreien Zeit Bücher.
所有学生 读.3PL 在 DET 课程. 空闲 时间书
‘所有的学生都在学期放假的时候看书。’
b. [Bücher] lesen alle Studenten während der vorlesungsfreien Zeit.
书 读 所有学生 在 DET 课程. 空闲 时间
c. * [Alle Studenten] [Bücher] lesen während der vorlesungsfreien Zeit.
所有学生 书 读 在 DET 课程. 空闲 时间
d. * [Bücher] [alle Studenten] lesen während der vorlesungsfreien Zeit.
书 所有学生 读 在 DET 课程. 空闲 时间

一个词语序列能否前置, 即出现在定式动词的前面, 是确定其为一个成分的重要依据。

² 我在所有的例句中都使用如下的符号: ‘*’表示句子是不合乎语法的, ‘#’表示句子有着不同于常规用法的解读, 最后 ‘\$’ 是指那些因语义或信息结构等方面的原因可以被解读的句子, 比如说, 主语必须是生有, 但是实际上我们提问的是非生有的主语, 或者由于代词的使用, 成分序列和已知信息的标记之间存在矛盾。

1 导言与术语

1.3.1.6 并列

如有两组词语序列可以连在一起，那么每一组词都是一个构成成分。

在例（16）中，*der Mann*（这个男人）和 *die Frau*（这个女人）连在一起使用，整个短语作动词 *arbeiten*（工作）的主语。这个事实可以证明 *der Mann*（这个男人）和 *die Frau*（这个女人）构成一个成分。

- (16) [*Der Mann*] und [*die Frau*] *arbeiten*.
这 男人 和 这 女人 工作.3PL
‘这个男人和这个女人都工作。’

例（17）说明了带 *zu* 不定式的短语可以并列：

- (17) *Er hat versucht, [das Buch zu lesen] und [es dann unauffällig verschwinden*
他 AUX 试图 这 书 CONJ 读 和 它然后 悄悄地 消失
zu lassen].
CONJ 让
‘他试着读这本书，然后让它悄悄地消失。’

1.3.2 关于成分测试法的一些看法

如果上述测试法可以对每一种情况给出明确的结果，那就太理想了，正如基于经验主义的句法理论也会变得更加明确一样。然而，实际情况并不是这样。成分测试法实际上存在一些问题，我将在下面具体讨论。

1.3.2.1 虚位成分

在代词中有一类特殊的词，叫做虚位成分（*expletives*），它们并不指称人或者事物，即它们是无指的。例（18）中的 *es*（它）就是一个例子。

- (18) a. *Es regnet.*
它 下雨
‘下雨了。’
b. *Regnet es?*
下雨 它
‘下雨了吗？’
c. *dass es jetzt regnet*
CONJ 它 现在 下雨
‘现在在下雨’

如例（18）所示，*es*（它）可以用在动词前面，也可以用在动词后面。有副词的时候，它也可以与动词分开，这就意味着 *es*（它）可以被看作是一个独立的成分。无论如何，我们观察到上述测试存在一些问题。首先，在例（19a）和（20b）中，*es*（它）在移位方面有限制。

- (19) a. *dass jetzt es regnet
CONJ 现在它下雨
想说：“现在正在下雨”
b. dass jetzt keiner klatscht
CONJ 现在没有人鼓掌
‘现在没有人在鼓掌’
- (20) a. Er sah es regnen.
他看见它.ACC 下雨
‘他看见在下雨。’
b. *Es sah er regnen.
它.ACC 看见他下雨
想说：“他看见下雨了。’
c. Er sah einen Mann klatschen.
他看见一.ACC 男人 鼓掌
‘他看见一个男人在鼓掌。’
d. Einen Mann sah er klatschen.
一.ACC 人 看见他鼓掌
‘一个男人，他看见在鼓掌。’

与(20c,d)中的宾格宾语 *einen Mann* (一个男人)不同的是,(20b)中的形式代词不能前置。第二,替换和疑问测试法也不适用:

- (21) a. *Der Mann / er regnet.
DET 男人 他下雨
b. *Wer / was regnet?
谁 什么下雨

类似地,并列测试法也不适用:

- (22) *Es und der Mann regnet / regnen.
它和 DET 男人 下雨.3SG 下雨.3PL

这些测试方法不适用的原因是:弱重音的代词 *es* (它)倾向于位于其他成分的前面,连词的后面(18c中的 *dass*),以及定式动词的后面(20a)(参考Abraham 1995: 570)。如果一个成分位于虚位成分的前面,如(19a)所示,那么,整个句子就是不合乎语法的。例(20b)不合乎语法的原因在于宾格 *es* (它)不能位于小句句首的位置。尽管有这样的情况,只有当 *es* 是有指(referential)的时候才是成立的(Lenerz 1994: 162; Gärtner & Steinbach 1997: 4)。

事实是,我们不能在上例中应用替换和疑问测试的方法的原因是,这些例子中的 *es* 是无指的。我们可以将 *es* 替换为另一个虚位成分,比如说 *das*。如果将虚位成分替换为一个有指的表达式,我们可以得到一个不同的语义解释。而语义上的空位概念或者用代词来指代都是没有意义的。

这样看来并不是所有的测试法都会将词语序列区分出不同的成分，也就是说，这些测试法并不是检验组成成分的必要条件。

1.3.2.2 移位

对于具有相对自由语序的语言来说，移位测试（movement test）是有问题的，因为我们不可能总是能够准确地判断出移位的成分。例如，字符串“gestern dem Mann”就有着不同的排列顺序。

- (23) a. weil keiner gestern dem Mann geholfen hat
因为没有人昨天 DET 男人 帮助 AUX
‘因为昨天没有人帮助了那个男人’
b. weil gestern dem Mann keiner geholfen hat
因为昨天 DET 男人 没有人帮助 AUX
‘因为昨天没有人帮助了那个男人’

我们可以推断出，gestern（昨天）和 dem Mann（那个男人）虽是一起移位的，但是它们并不能构成一个成分。对于（23）中语序变化的另一个解释是副词可以在小句的不同位置出现，而且只有（23b）中的 dem Mann（那个男人）移到了 keiner（没有）的前面。不管在什么情况下，gestern（昨天）和 dem Mann（那个男人）都没有语义关系，而且不可能用一个代词来指称他们。尽管看上去是，这个部分是以一个单位来移动的，可实际上我们知道 gestern dem Mann（昨天那个男人）并不能构成一个成分。

1.3.2.3 前置

正如我们在（15）中前置这一部分所讨论的，定式动词前的位置一般由一个成分充当。在定式动词前能否放置一组词被用来作为判断成分状态的明确标记，这种方法还用在了 Satzglied 这个术语的定义中。（Satzglied 在德语语法中是指小句层面的句子成分）（Eisenberg et al. 2005: 783）。Bußmann (1983)提出了一个例子，而这个例子在Bußmann (1990)中已经找不到了：³

句子成分测试是一个应用话题化的方式来对复杂成分进行分析的过程。由于话题化只允许一个单独的成分移到句子的开头，复杂的成分序列，比如说副词短语，实际上包括一个或多个组成成分。在“Ein Taxi quält sich im Schrittempo durch den Verkehr（出租车正在以步行的速度顽强地前进）”这个例子中，im Schrittempo（以步行的速度）和 durch den Verkehr（通过交通）都是句子成分，因为他们都可以各自独立地前置。（Bußmann 1983: 446）

上面这段话可以得到如下的推论：

- 如果某一个语言片段中的某一部分断片可以各自独立地前置，那么该语言片段不构成一个成分。

³ 句子成分测试，也写作 Konstituententest。

- 如果某一个语言片段可以整体前置，那么该语言片段构成一个成分。

接下来我们要指出的是，这两种说法都是有问题的。第一个观点在（24）中就站不住脚：

- (24) a. Keine Einigung erreichten Schröder und Chirac über den Abbau der
 不 一致 达成 Schröder 和 Chirac 关于 DET 减少 PREP.DET
 Agrarsubventionen.⁴
 农业. 补贴
 ‘Schröder 和 Chirac 不能就农业补贴的减少达成一致。’
- b. [Über den Abbau der Agrarsubventionen] erreichten Schröder
 关于 DET 减少 DET 农业. 补贴 达成 Schröder 和 Chirac
 und Chirac keine Einigung.
 不 一致

尽管“keine Einigung über den Abbau der Agrarsubventionen”这个名词短语的一部分可以独立地前置，在例（25）中我们仍可将没有前置的整个词串分析为一个名词短语。

- (25) Schröder und Chirac erreichten [keine Einigung über den Abbau der Agrarsubventionen].
 Schröder 和 Chirac 达成 不 一致 关于 DET 减少 DET 农业. 补贴

“über den Abbau der Agrarsubventionen”（关于缩减农业补贴）这个介词短语在语义上依存于 Einigung（一致），如例（26）所示：

- (26) Sie einigen sich über die Agrarsubventionen.
 他们同意 REFL 关于 DET 农业. 补贴
 ‘他们在农业补贴方面达成了一致。’

这个词语序列也可以整体前置：

- (27) [Keine Einigung über den Abbau der Agrarsubventionen] erreichten Schröder
 不 一致 关于 DET 减少 DET 农业. 补贴 达成 Schröder
 und Chirac.
 和 Chirac

在理论文献中，人们普遍认为“keine Einigung über den Abbau der Agrarsubventionen”构成了一个成分，并且它可以在一定的情况下进行“分裂”。

⁴ 《每日新闻》，2002 年 10 月 15 日，晚八点。

在这种情况下，如我们在例（25）中看到的，次级组成成分是可以各自独立移位的。(De Kuthy 2002)

第二条推论也是有问题的，如例（28）所示：

- (28) a. [Trocken] [durch die Stadt] kommt man am Wochenende auch mit
变干的 通过 DET 城市 来 一 PREP.DET 周末 也 PREP
der BVG.⁵
DET BVG

‘搭乘 BVG，你就可以在周末确保风雨无阻地穿越这个城市。’

- b. [Wenig] [mit Sprachgeschichte] hat der dritte Beitrag in dieser
少 PREP 语言. 历史 AUX DET 第三 文章 PREP
Rubrik zu tun, [...] ⁶
DET 章节 AUX 做

‘这一节中的第三篇文章与语言历史没有太多的关系。’

在例（28）中，定式动词前有多个组成成分，而且这些成分之间没有明显的句法或语义上的联系。在下面的章节中，我们会详细解释什么叫做“句法或语义关系”。在这一点上，我仅指出（28a）中的形容词 trocken（干燥）的主语是 man（人），并且是该主语进一步说明了有关“穿越城市旅行”的动作行为，这是因为它指称了动词所指的动作。如（29b）所示，durch die Stadt（穿过城市）不能与形容词 trocken（干燥）相组合。

- (29) a. Man ist / bleibt trocken.
人 是 保持 干燥
‘有人是干的。’
b. *Man ist / bleibt trocken durch die Stadt.
人 是 保持 干燥 通过 DET 城市

所以说，形容词 trocken（干燥）与介词短语 durch die Stadt（穿越城市）之间不具有句法或语义上的联系。这些短语的共性在于他们都指向动词并且与它有依存关系。

有学者认为应该把例（28）看作是例外。不过，正如我在相关的经验主义的研究中所指出的，这种方法也是有问题的 (Müller 2003a)。

如果我们根据是否能够通过前置测试而将 durch die Stadt（通过这个城市）看作是一个成分，那么我们必须承认例（30）中的 durch die Stadt（通过这个城市）也是一个成分。这么做的结果是，我们会低估组成成分这个术语，因为组成成分测试的目的就是为了找到词串间的语义与语法联系。⁷

⁵ taz berlin, 1998 年 7 月 10 日, p. 22.

⁶ Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik, LXIX, 3/2002, p. 339.

⁷ 这些数据可以这样来解释，即假设一个空动词的中心语位于定式动词的前面，继而保证了在定式动词前只有一个成分位于首位的要求。(Müller 2005c, 2015b)无论如何，这类数据对于组成成分测试来说都是有问题的，因为这些测试是专门用来区分例（30）中的 trocken（变干），durch die Stadt（通过这个城市），以及 mit Sprachgeschichte（与语言历史）这类字符串是否是组成成分的。

- (30) a. Man kommt am Wochenende auch mit der BVG trocken durch
人 来 PREP.DET 周末 也 PREP DET BVG 干燥 通过
die Stadt.
DET 城市
‘搭乘 BVG, 你就可以在周末确保风雨无阻地穿越这个城市。’
- b. Der dritte Beitrag in dieser Rubrik hat wenig mit Sprachgeschichte zu
DET 第三 文章 在 DET 章节 AUX 少 PREP 语言. 历史 AUX
tun.
做
‘这一节中的第三篇文章与语言历史没有太多的关系。’

所以说, 一个给定词语序列是否能够前置并不足以用来判断组成成分的性质。

再有, 虚位成分也被看作是组成成分, 尽管事实上宾格的虚位成分并不能前置 (cf. (20a)):

- (31) a. Er bringt es bis zum Professor.
他 拿 EXPL 直到 PREP.DET 教授
‘他把它拿给教授。’
- b. # Es bringt er bis zum Professor.
它 拿 他 直到 PREP.DET 教授

还有其他成分也不能前置。隐含的虚位成分 就是一个很好的例子:

- (32) a. Karl hat sich nicht erholt.
Karl AUX REFL 不 恢复
‘Karl 还没有恢复。’
- b. *Sich hat Karl nicht erholt.
REFL AUX Karl 不 恢复

由此可见, 前置并不是成分测试的必要条件。这样的话, 一个给定词串能否前置对于判断组成成分的性质来说既不是充分也不是必要的条件了。

1.3.2.4 并列

例 (33) 中的并列结构 (coordination) 也被证明是有问题的:

- (33) Deshalb kaufte der Mann einen Esel und die Frau ein Pferd.
所以 买 DET 男人 一 驴子和 DET 女人 一 马
‘所以说, 这个男人买了一头驴, 这个女人买了一匹马。’

乍看上去, *der Mann einen Esel* (这个男人一头驴) 和 *die Frau ein Pferd* (这个女人一匹马) 在例 (33) 中是并列的。这是不是说 *der Mann einen Esel* (这个男人一头驴) 和 *die Frau ein Pferd* (这个女人一匹马) 分别构成一个组成成分呢?

正如利用其他成分测试方法所证明的那样，这个观点并不是像它看上去那样的。这组词不能作为一个单位来整体移动：⁸

- (34) *Der Mann einen Esel kaufte deshalb.
DET 男人 一 驴子买 所以

我们也不能替换这个组成成分，除非有省略的情况。

- (35) a. #Deshalb kaufte er.
所以 买 他
b. *Deshalb kaufte ihn.
所以 买 他

代词不能填充到 kaufen（买）的两个逻辑论元的位置上，而是由（33）中的 der Mann（这个男人）和（33）中 einen Esel（一头驴子）来填充的，只不过是每个位置有一个成分。对于（33）这类例子的分析也有不同的看法，即这里有两个动词 kauft（买），其中只有一个是显性的 (Crysmann 2008)。这样，例（33）应该是：

- (36) Deshalb kaufte der Mann einen Esel und kaufte die Frau ein Pferd.
所以 买 DET 男人 一 驴子和 买 DET 女人 一 马

这就意味着，即使 der Mann einen Esel（这个男人一头驴）和 die Frau ein Pferd（这个女人一匹马）看上去是并列结构，实际上并列的成分是 kauft der Mann einen Esel（买这个男人一头驴）和 (kauft) die Frau ein Pferd。（买这个女人一匹马）

通过上面的讨论，我们得到的结论是：即使一个给定的词语序列通过了某种成分测试法，这并不意味着我们能够自动从这个测试中推导出它是一个组成成分，也就是说，上面的测试并不是判断组成成分性质的充分条件。

综上所述，这些测试方法对于判断一组词的组成成分来说既不是充分条件也不是必要条件。但是，只要我们对有争议的地方保持清醒的认识，我们就会大概知道如何来判断组成成分了。

1.4 词类

例（37）中的词不仅意义不同，其他方面也有所不同。

- (37) Der dicke Mann lacht jetzt.
DET 胖 男人 笑 现在
‘那个胖男人在笑。’

⁸ 定式动词前的位置也叫作前场 (Vorfeld)（参看 1.8 节）。德语中，显性的多项成分前置在某些情况下是可能的。例如前面章节中，尤其是第 14 页的例（28）。例（34）也是一个例子，对于 kaufen（买）这类动词来说，主语在前场的位置上是比较少见的，因为这种前置的结构与信息结构有关。我们也可以比较 De Kuthy & Meurers 2003b 有关前置动词短语的主语的研究，以及 Bildhauer & Cook 2010: 72 有关显性多重前置的主语前置方面的研究。

句中的每一个词都受到某种限制。常见的练习就是将具有共同属性的词归为一类。比如说，*der*（那）是一个冠词，*Mann*（男人）是一个名词，*lacht*（笑）是一个动词，*jetzt*（现在）是一个副词。如例（38）所示，我们可以将例（37）中的词替换为相同词类的词。

- (38) *Die dünne Frau lächelt immer.*
 DET 瘦 女人笑 一直
 ‘那个瘦女人一直在笑。’

但是，并不是所有的词都能替换。比如说，我们不能用反身动词 *erholt*（恢复）或者例（38）中第二人称的动词 *lächelst*（笑）来替换。把词归入相应的词类并不是这样简单的。我们还要考虑给定词的属性。在这一节，我们会讨论不同的词类，并在下一节详细描述一个给定词类的若干属性。

词类中最为重要的有动词、名词、形容词、介词和副词。很多年前，研究德语的学者通常会区分动作类词，描述类词和命名类词（参看第 11.6.1 节有关 *Tesnière's* 的范畴系统）。但是这些说法都被证明是有问题的，如下所示：

- (39) a. *die Idee*
 DET 主意
 b. *die Stunde*
 DET 小时
 c. *das laute Sprechen*
 DET 大 说话
 ‘大声地说话（动作）’
 d. *Die Erörterung der Lage dauerte mehrere Stunden.*
 DET 讨论 DET 情形持续 几个 小时
 ‘有关这个情形的讨论已经持续了几个小时。’

(39a) 并不能描述一个实体，(39b) 描述的是一段时期，(39c) 和 (39d) 描述动作。显然，*Idee*、*Stunde*、*Sprechen* 和 *Erörterung* 在意义上有很大的区别。无论如何，这些词仍在很多方面与 *Mann* 和 *Frau* 有相同之处，所以它们被归为名词。

“动作类词”这个术语不能在科学的语法体系中用来指称动词了，因为动词并不一定指称动作：

- (40) a. *Ihm gefällt das Buch.*
 他 喜欢 DET 书
 ‘他喜欢这本书。’
 b. *Das Eis schmilzt.*
 DET 冰 融化
 ‘冰融化了。’
 c. *Es regnet.*
 它 下雨
 ‘下雨了。’

我们也可以将 *Erörterung* (讨论) 归入动作类动词。形容词并不总是描述事物的属性。在下面的例子中, 相反的情况是真实存在的, 即将一个杀人犯的特质表示为一种可能或者猜测, 而不是被修饰名词的真实属性。

- (41) a. *der mutmaßliche Mörder*
DET 被怀疑的 杀人犯
b. *Soldaten sind potenzielle Mörder.*
士兵 是 潜在的 杀人犯

例 (41) 中的形容词实际上并没有提供所描述实体的特征信息。我们也希望将例 (42) 中的 *lachende* (笑) 看作是一个形容词。

- (42) *der lachende Mann*
DET 笑 男人

不过, 如果我们将属性和行为作为分类的标准, 那么 *lachend* (笑) 在技术层面上来说应该属于动作类词。

与语义标准不同的是, 决定词类的标准通常是形式上的标准。词的不同形式也要纳入考察的范围。所以, 举例来说 *lacht* (笑) 在例 (43) 中有如下几种形式。

- (43) a. *Ich lache.*
我 笑
b. *Du lachst.*
你.SG 笑
c. *Er lacht.*
他 笑
d. *Wir lachen.*
我们笑
e. *Ihr lacht.*
你们.PL 笑
f. *Sie lachen.*
他们笑

德语也有过去式、命令式、虚拟语气和不定式 (助词和带 *zu* 与不带 *zu* 的不定式) 的形态变化。这些形式就构成了动词的屈折范式 (*inflectional paradigm*)。时态 (现在式、过去式、将来式), 情态 (陈述语气、虚拟语气、命令语气), 人称 (第 1, 2, 3 人称) 和数 (单数、复数) 都在屈折范式中有所体现。在有些范式中这些形式有所重合, 如例 (43c), 例 (43e), 例 (43d) 和例 (43f) 所示。

与动词相似的是, 名词也有屈折范式:

- (44) a. *der Mann*
DEF.NOM 男人
b. *des Mannes*
DEF.GEN 男人.GEN

- c. dem Mann
DEF.DAT 男人
- d. den Mann
DEF.ACC 男人
- e. die Männer
DEF.NOM 男人
- f. der Männer
DEF.GEN 男人
- g. den Männern
DEF.DAT 男人.DAT
- h. die Männer
DEF.ACC 男人

我们根据性（阴性、阳性和中性）来区分名词。性一般是纯形式上的性质，只是部分地受到生物性别或者我们描述特定物体事实的影响。

- (45) a. die Tüte
DEF.F 包 (F)
‘包’
- b. der Krampf
DEF.M 夹子 (M)
‘夹子’
- c. das Kind
DEF.N 孩子 (N)
‘孩子’

与性相似的是，格（主格、属格、与格、宾格）与数对名词性范式来说也是同样重要的。

与名词相似的是，形容词也有性、数和格的屈折变化。不过，这些变化与名词不同，因为性的标示是可变的。形容词则可以与这三种性一同使用。

- (46) a. eine kluge Frau
一.F 聪明.F 女人
- b. ein kluger Mann
一 聪明.M 男人
- c. ein kluges Kind
一 聪明.N 孩子

除了性数格之外，我们还可以区分其他几种屈折类型。传统上来说，我们区分形容词的强、中和弱变化。这些屈折类与定冠词的形式或者有无是密切相关的：

- (47) a. ein alter Wein
一 老 酒

1 导言与术语

- b. der alte Wein
DET 老 酒
- c. alter Wein
老 酒

另外，形容词也有比较级和最高级：

- (48)
- a. klug
聪明
 - b. klüg-er
聪明-PTCP
 - c. am klüg-sten
PERP.DET 聪明-PTCP

并不是所有的形容词都有比较级。对于那些指称终结点的形容词来说只能用在肯定式中，如果有一个最优解，那么就没有更好的了。所以说，我们不能说一个“更好的最优”方案。相似的是，也不能比死“更死”的了。

特殊情况是德语中一些以 a 结尾的颜色形容词，如 lila（紫色）和 rosa（粉色）。这些词的屈折形式是可选的（49a），没有屈折变化的形式也是可行的：

- (49)
- a. eine lilan-e Blume
一 紫色-F 花
 - b. eine lila Blume
一 紫色花

上述例子中，lila（紫色）可以归入形容词。这是因为他们与其他形容词处于同样的位置上，并且在屈折变化上与形容词的变化是一致的。

迄今我们所讨论的词类与屈折变化属性的概念是不同的。对于那些没有屈折变化的词而言，我们需要用到额外的标准。比如说，我们可以通过他们出现的句法环境来判别词类（正如我们对上面有屈折变化的形容词所做的那样）。我们可以区分出介词、副词、连词、感叹词，有时也可以区分出助词。介词是指那些与名词共现，并决定这些名词的格属性的一类词：

- (50)
- a. in diesen Raum
在DEF.ACC 房间
 - b. in diesem Raum
在DEF.DAT 房间

wegen（因为）通常被看作是前置词，尽管它也会出现在名词后，后者在技术层面上被处理为后置词：

- (51) des Geldes wegen
DET 钱.GEN 因为
“因为钱”

如果希望对词的位置的说明保持中立的话，那么你也可以将之称为 *adpositions*（介词）。

与介词不同的是，副词不需要带名词短语。

- (52) a. Er schläft in diesem Raum.
他睡觉 PREP 这 房间
b. Er schläft dort.
他睡觉 那儿

有时，副词仅是简单地被看作是前置词的一种特殊形式（参看第 87 页）。对于这个观点的解释是，前置词短语如 *in diesem Raum*（在这间房间里）与相应的副词的表现是完全一致的。与 *dort*（那儿）不同的是，它需要带一个额外的名词短语。我们也可以在其他词类中找到类似的区别。例如，动词 *schlafen*（睡觉）需要带一个名词短语，而 *erkennen*（认识）需要带两个。

- (53) a. Er schläft.
他睡觉
b. Peter erkennt ihn.
Peter 认识 他

连词（*conjunction*）分为从属连词和并列连词。并列连词包括 *und*（和）与 *oder*（或者）。在并列结构中，两组具有同样句法属性的词被组合起来。他们在形式上是彼此有联系的。*dass*（这个）与 *weil*（因为）这两个连词是从属连词，因为他们引导的小句从属于一个更大的句子。

- (54) a. Klaus glaubt, dass er lügt.
Klaus 认为 CONJ 他说谎
‘Klaus 认为他在说谎。’
b. Klaus glaubt ihm nicht, weil er lügt.
Klaus 相信 他 不 因为他说谎
‘Klaus 不相信他，因为他在说谎。’

叹词（*interjection*）类似于小句表达式。如“Ja！（是的！）”“Bitte！（请！）”“Hallo！（你好！）”“Hurra！（好耶！）”“Bravo！（太棒啦！）”“Pst！（嘘！）”“Plumps！（扑通！）”。

如果副词和介词不能归入某个特定的类别，那么副词就通常被看作是一种没有屈折变化的“剩余”类，其他的介词，连词或者感叹词都不能归入副词。有时这种“剩余”类是需要进一步划分的：只有那些出现在定式动词前的用作一个成分的词可以被看作是副词。这些不能前置的词被称为助词。这些助词可以根据他们不同的功能而归入不同的类别中，如程度助词和言外助词。由于这些基于功能的分类标准也包括了介词，但是我不作这种区分，只是将之归为副词。

我们已经将一些具有屈折变化的词归入不同的词类中了。如果需要划分词类，我们可以利用图 1.2 on the next page 来判断，该图摘自德语杜登语法 (Eisenberg et al. 2005: 133)。⁹

⁹ 《杜登语法》是德语正字法的官方文件。杜登语法虽然没有取得官方的地位，但是它也非常具有影响力，并且较多用于教学之中。在导言这部分内容中，我会经常引用这一重要文献。




图 1.2: Eisenberg et al. (2005: 133)提出的词类决策树

如果一个词会随着时态发生变化，那么它就是动词。如果它有不同的变化式，那么就需要看它是否有固定的性。如果是这样的，那么就需要知道我们是不是在分析一个名词。具有不同性的词需要检查他们是否有比较级。如果是，那它可能是形容词。其他的词就归入剩余的类别中，杜登语法将之称为代词或冠词。对于没有屈折变化的元素来说，这个剩余类别中的元素可以根据他们的句法行为来进一步划分。杜登语法对代词和冠词进行了区分。基于这个分类标准，代词是那些可以替代诸如 *der Mann*（男人）的名词短语的词。而冠词通常与名词相组合。在拉丁语法中，代词包括上面所说的代词和冠词，因为它们带不带名词在形式上是一样的。在过去的几百年间，形式发生了分裂变化，在当代罗曼语族的语言中需要区分那些可以替代名词短语的词与必须与名词短语共现的词。后一种类别的词也叫做限定词（*determiner*）。

如果我们按照图 1.2 的决策树来分析代词（*pronoun*）的话，人称代词 *ich*（我），*du*（你），*er*（他），*sie*（她），*es*（它），*wir*（我们），*ihr*（你们）和 *sie*（他们）都可以跟属格代词 *mein*（我的），*dein*（你的），*sein*（他/它的），*ihr*（她的/他们的）和 *unser*（我们的）归为一类。相应的反身代词 *mich*（我自己），*dich*（你自己），*sich*（他/她/它/他们自己），*uns*（我们自己），*euch*（你们自己）和交互代词 *einander*（互相）在德语中是特殊的一类，因为他们没有不同的性的格式。交互代词没有格的形态变化。我们用交互代词替代属格、与格和宾格代词，无法看到 *einander*（交互）的格的变化形式，因为他们的格式是一样的：

- (55) a. Sie gedenken seiner / einander.
 他们想 他.GEN 互相

- b. Sie helfen ihm / einander.
他们帮助 他.DAT 互相
- c. Sie lieben ihn / einander.
他们爱 他.ACC 互相

所谓的代副词 *darauf* (在那儿), *darin* (在这儿), *worauf* (在哪儿), *worin* (在哪儿) 也是有问题的。这些形式都包括一个介词, 如 *auf* (在……上), *da* (那儿), 以及 *wo* (哪儿)。正如其名称所示的, 代副词包括代词性成分, 而这个成分只能是 *da* (那儿) 和 *wo* (哪儿)。但是, *da* (那儿) 和 *wo* (哪儿) 并不具有屈折变化, 所以说按照决策树的划分, 应该将之归为代词。

例 (56) 中的相对代词也是类似的:

- (56) a. Ich komme eben aus der Stadt, wo ich Zeuge eines Unglücks gewesen
我 来 PART 自 DET 城市 CONJ 我 见证 PERP.ART 事故 AUX
bin.¹⁰
COP
‘我来自的那个城市里, 我亲眼目睹了一个事故。’
- b. Studien haben gezeigt, daß mehr Unfälle in Städten passieren, wo die
研究 AUX 表明 CONJ 更多 事故 在城市 发生 DET 斑马线
Zebrastreifen abgebaut werden, weil die Autofahrer unaufmerksam werden.¹¹
去除 CONJ 因为 DET 司机疏忽 AUX
‘研究表明, 城市中事故更多发生在没有斑马线的地方, 因为司机们更易疏忽。’
- c. Zufällig war ich in dem Augenblick zugegen, wo der Steppenwolf zum
恰巧地 AUX 我 在DET 时候 出现 CONJ DET 荒原狼 PREP.DET
erstmals unser Haus betrat und bei meiner Tante sich einmietete.¹²
第一次 我们的房子 进入 和 在 我的 姑姑 REFL 租房
‘我恰好亲眼看见了荒原狼第一次闯进了我们的房子, 并在我姑姑那里租了一间房间。’

根据上面的决策树, 如果他们没有屈折变化, 则不能归入代词。Eisenberg (2004: 277) 指出 *wo* 是一种没有屈折变化的关系代词, 并且指明这种描述与名词性的用法是不同的, 因为名词是有屈折变化的元素。由此, 他用关系副词 (relative adverb) 来指称他们 (参见 Eisenberg et al. (2005: §856, §857))。

同样也有与名词相联系的关系词 *dessen* (他们) 和 *wessen* (他们) 的用法。

- (57) a. der Mann, dessen Schwester ich kenne
DET 男人 CONJ 姐妹 我 认识

¹⁰ Drosdowski (1984: 672).

¹¹ taz berlin, 03.11.1997, p. 23.

¹² Herman Hesse, *Der Steppenwolf* (《荒原狼》). Berlin und Weimar: Aufbau-Verlag. 1986, p. 6.

b. Ich möchte wissen, wessen Schwester du kennst.

我 想 知道 CONJ 姐妹 你 认识

‘我想知道你认识谁的姐妹。’

根据杜登的分类标准，这些词被看作是“关系冠词”和“疑问冠词”。他们通常被看作是关系代词和疑问代词的一部分（参看Eisenberg (2004: 229)）。如果按照Eisenberg 提出的术语来看，这些词的归类问题是不具有争议的，因为他没有对冠词、代词和名词进行区分，而是将它们都归为名词类。但是对于那些提出需要区分出冠词和代词的学者来说，疑问代词也是一个经常探讨的问题，即他们可以作为冠词使用，也可以替代一个名词短语。

我们应须知，“代词”这个术语通常只是指那些能够指代其他实体的词，这点是非常重要的，这里所指的指代不是指像“书”和“约翰”等名词那样的指代，而是指依赖于语境的指代关系。例如，人称代词 *er*（他）既可以指桌子也可以指人。“代词”的这种用法与图 1.2 中的决策树是不同的，而且它还包括那些没有屈折变化的词，如 *da*（那儿）和 *wo*（哪儿）。

虚指代词（expletive pronouns），如 *es*（它），*das*（这个）及 *sich*（自己）这类反身动词，并不指代实际的物体。由于形式上的相似性，我们将之看作是代词。即使我们假定要对代词采用狭义的界定，我们也只会得到错误的结论，因为虚指词的形式并没有根据性、数和格而发生变化。如果我们按照教材中的分类标准，虚指成分可以归入无屈折变化的类型中。如果我们假定 *es*（它）与人称代词一定具有相同的主格和宾格形式，那么就可以将它们归入名词。这样我们就需要认为 *es* 是有性的，但是这样是讲不通的。这样，我们就将 *es* 看作是与人称代词相似的中性名词。

我们还没有讨论例（58）中斜体的词：

(58) a. das *geliebte* Spielzeug

DET 喜欢 玩具

b. das *schlafende* Kind

DET 睡着的 孩子

c. die Frage des *Sprechens* und *Schreibens* über Gefühle

DET 问题 DET 谈论 和 书写 关于感情

‘有关谈论和书写感情的问题’

d. Auf dem Europa-Parteitag fordern die *Grünen* einen ökosozialen Politikwechsel.

在 DET 欧洲-党会 要求 DET 绿党 ART 生态-社会 政治变革

‘在欧洲党会中，绿党要求生态社会性的政治变革。’

e. Max lacht *laut*.

Max 笑 大声

f. Max würde *wahrscheinlich* lachen.

Max AUX 可能地 笑

geliebte（被爱）和 *schlafende*（睡着的）是 *lieben*（爱）和 *schlafen*（睡觉）的分词形式。这些形式传统上被看作是动词范式的一部分。从这个角度来看，*geliebte* 和

schlafende 是动词。这些形式可以归入词汇词的类别，即术语 *lexeme*（词位）。屈折范式的所有形式都属于相应的词位。传统意义上来看，这个术语还囊括了规则变化的屈折形式。也就是说，助词和名词化不定式也属于动词性词位。不过，不是所有的语言学家都持这一观点。问题在于我们将动词性范式与名词性和形容词性范式的概念混在一起了。比如说，*Sprechens*（谈论）是属格，并且形容词助词也有性、数和格的屈折变化。进而，我们并不清楚为什么 *schlafende*（睡着的）应该归入动词词位，以及名词 *Störung*（混乱）单属于一个词位，而不是 *stören*（打扰）这个词位。我倾向于现代语法的解释，即随着词类发生变化，新的词位被创造出来。最终，*schlafende*（睡着的）不属于词位 *schlafen*（睡觉），而是词位 *schlafend* 在形式上的变化。这个词位属于形容词类并且有相应的屈折变化。

正如我们所看到，至今仍然难以区分屈折（*inflection*）与派生（*derivation*）（产生新的词位）。Sag, Wasow & Bender (2003: 263–264) 认为，英语中的现在分词与过去分词属于派生形式，而在法语中则随着性数而发生屈折变化。

例（58d）*Grünen*（绿色的）是名词化的形容词，在德语中，当文中没有其他名词时，它就与其他名词一样将首字母大写。

(59) A: Willst du den roten Ball haben?

要 你 DET 红色的球 有

“你想要这个红色的球吗？”

B: Nein, gib mir bitte den grünen.

不 给我 请 DET 绿色的

“不，请给我那个绿色的，谢谢。”

在例（59）的答句中，名词 *ball*（球）被省略了。在例（58d）中则没有这种省略形式。我们也可以认为这里是词类发生了变化。如果一个词的词类发生了变化，但是并没有加上可见的词缀，那么，我们可以把这类现象叫做词类活用。有些语言学家认为转化是词汇派生的一个次级类型。但是，问题是 *Grüne*（绿色）就像形容词一样有屈折变化，并且会随着宾语的所指的性的不同而有所变化。

(60) a. Ein Grüner hat vorgeschlagen, ...

ART 绿党成员.M AUX 提出建议

‘绿党的一位（男性）成员提出了建议 ...’

b. Eine Grüne hat vorgeschlagen, ...

ART 绿党成员.F AUX 提出建议

‘绿党的一位（女性）成员提出了建议 ...’

我们也会遇到一个词兼有两种属性的情况。我们可以将之称为名词化的形容词。*Grüne*（绿色）的词汇范畴（*lexical category*）是形容词，而它的句法范畴（*syntactic category*）是名词。

在例（58e）中的词可以像形容词一样屈折变化，所以它在我们的测试中被归为形容词。有时，一些形容词也被叫做是副词。这是因为这些形容词的非屈折形式与副词很像：

- (61) Max lacht immer / oft / laut.
Max 笑 总是 经常 大声
'Max (总是 / 经常) (大声地) 笑。'

为了描述这些词的双重特征，一些研究者认为有必要区分他们的词汇范畴与句法范畴。loud (ly) 在词汇范畴上属于形容词，而句法范畴上则属于副词。但是对于例 (61) 中 loud (ly) 的这种分类方法并不被所有的学者所认可。相反，有些人认为这是形容词的副词性用法，也就是说，他们认为这些词的句法范畴仍是形容词，但是它们的用法可以不同，这样就像一个副词（参看Eisenberg 2004: Section 7.3）。这和介词的情况很像，介词也可以出现在不同的句法语境中：

- (62) a. Peter schläft im Büro.
Peter 睡觉 PERP.DET 办公室
'Peter 在办公室里睡觉。'
b. der Tisch im Büro
DET 桌子 PERP.DET 办公室
'办公室里的桌子'

在例 (62) 中，我们有两个介词短语的例子；但是，例 (62a) 中的 im Büro（在办公室里）像副词一样，因为它修饰的是动词 schläft（睡觉），而在例 (62b) 中的 im Büro（在办公室里）修饰是名词 Tisch（桌子）。同样，可以修饰名词 (63) 或动词 (61)。

- (63) die laute Musik
DET 大声 音乐

1.5 中心语

一个构成成分或短语的中心语 (head) 决定了这个构成成分或短语的最重要的属性。同时，中心语也决定了这个短语的构成，即中心语要求在短语中有其他要素的共现。如下例所示（中心语用斜体表示）：

- (64) a. *Träumt* dieser Mann?
做梦 这.NOM 人
'这个人做梦吗？'
b. *Erwartet* er diesen Mann?
等 他.NOM 这.ACC 人
'他在等这个人吗？'
c. *Hilft* er diesem Mann?
帮助他.NOM 这.DAT 人
'他在帮助这个人吗？'
d. *in* diesem Haus
在这.DAT 房间

- e. ein Mann
一.NOM 人

动词决定它们的论元的格属性。在例（64d）中，介词决定名词短语（这个房子）的格属性（与格），也决定这个短语的语义（它描述了一个位置）。例（64e）是有争议的：有学者认为限定语是中心语（???: 90; Vennemann & Harlow 1977; Hellan 1986; Abney 1987; Netter 1994, 1998），而其他学者认为名词是中心语（Van Langendonck 1994; Pollard & Sag 1994: 49; Demske 2001; Müller 2007b: Section 6.6.1; Hudson 2004; Bruening 2009）。

中心语与其他成分的组合叫做中心语的投射（projection）。保证短语合法性所需的所有要素的投射叫做最大投射。一个句子就是定式动词的最大投射。

图 1.3 以方框的形式显示了例（65）的结构。

- (65) Der Mann liest einen Aufsatz.
DET 人 读 ART 论文
‘这个人在读一篇论文。’

与图 1.1 不同的是，这些盒子都有标记。




图 1.3: 有标记的盒子中的词与短语

这些标记包含了盒子中最重要的要素范畴。VP 表示动词短语，NP 表示名词短语。VP 和 NP 是他们各自中心语的最大投射。

试想你在自己姐妹的婚礼上被安排了找照片的任务，当那么多杂乱的、未分类的照片摆在你面前的时候，你一定会想说这些照片如果按照所含不同类型的照片标记的相册该有多好。对于上面的盒子来说，也是一样，如果能按照内容将它们分类将是一个好主意。

一个有趣的现象是如果装有语言素材的盒子放进更大的盒子中去时，这些盒子里的具体内容就不重要了。比如说，我们可以将名词短语 *der Mann*（男人）用 *er*（他）代替，或者用更为负责的形式“*der Mann aus Stuttgart, der das Seminar zur Entwicklung der Zebrafinken besucht*”（从斯图加特来的那个参加斑马发展讨论班的男人）代替。但是，我们不能用 *die Männer*（男人们）来代替，也不能用 *des Mannes*（男人的）来代替：

- (66) a. *Die Männer liest einen Aufsatz.
DET 男人 读 ART 论文

- b. *Des Mannes liest einen Aufsatz.
DET 男人.GEN 读 ART 论文

原因在于 **die Männer**（男人们）是复数，而 **liest**（读）是单数。带有属格的名词短语也不能出现，只有主格的名词才可以。所以说，我们有必要将那些对构成更大盒子的有用的信息标记出来。在下图中，我们加入了更多详细的标注信息。




图 1.4: 在有标记盒子中的词与词串

那些决定中心语能带什么成分的特征叫做中心语特征（**head features**）。这些特征被认为是由中心语投射出来的。

1.6 论元成分与说明语

小句中的各成分与中心语具有不同的关系。最为典型的是区分论元成分和说明语。中心语的句法论元在很大程度上对应于其逻辑论元。我们可以用（67b）中的谓词逻辑，来表示句子（67a）的意义。

- (67) a. Peter 帮助了 Maria。
b. *help'(peter', maria')*

（67b）中的逻辑表达式与例（67a）所表示的十分相似；但是，它没有语序和屈折变化的信息。**Peter** 和 **Maria** 是动词（帮助）的句法论元，而它们各自的意义（*Peter'* 和 *Maria'*）是由（帮助）所表示的逻辑关系的论元。我们也可以说 **help**（帮助）指派给它的论元的语义角色（**semantic roles**）。语义角色包括施事（发出动作的人），受事（受到影响的人或物），受益者（得到东西或经验的人），经事（经历某种心理状态的人）。**help**（帮助）的主语是事实，直接宾语是受益者。充当语义角色的论元也叫做行动元（**actant**）。这个术语用来指称无生的物体。

中心语和论元的这种关系叫做选择（**selection**）和价（**valence**）。价这个术语是从化学借来的。原子与原子组合成分子具有不同程度的稳定性。电子层的排列方式对这种稳定性起到了重要的作用。如果一个原子与其他原子相组合，这样它的电子层就被占满了，那么这就可以得到一个稳定的连接。价告诉我们要构成一个元素需要多少个氢原子。在构成水（ H_2O ）的时候，氧原子是二价。我们可以把元素按照价进行分类。按照 **Mendeleev** 的方法，带有一个特定价的元素被安排在元素周期表的同一个栏中。

价的概念被泰尼埃Tessnière (1959)用于语言学：一个中心语需要一定的论元以构成一个稳定的组合。具有相同价的词，即需要同样数目与种类的论元的词，被分成不同的类别。图 1.5 分别展示了化学与语言学的例子。



图 1.5: 氢原子和氧原子的组合与动词和其论元的组合

我们用 (67) 来解释逻辑价。不过，逻辑价有时与句法价不同。对于动词 **rain** (下雨) 来说，它需要一个虚指代词 (**expletive pronoun**) 作为论元。德语中的自反身动词也是一样的，如 **sich erholen** (复元)。

- (68) a. Es regnet.
它 下雨
‘下雨了。’
b. Klaus erholt sich.
Klaus 恢复 REFL
‘Klaus 正在恢复健康。’

虚指的 **es** (它) 与表示天气的动词以及带 **erholen** (恢复) 这类带 **sich** 的内在反身动词都需要在句子里出现。日耳曼语言有虚指成分用来放在定式动词前的位置上。这些虚指成分并不能用在德语的嵌套句中，因为嵌套句与常规的非嵌套的陈述句的结构不同，即陈述句要求变位动词位于第二位。例 (69a) 说明了 **es** (它) 在 **dass** 引导的从句中不能省略。

- (69) a. *Ich glaube, dass regnet.
我 想 CONJ 下雨
想说：“我想是下雨了。”
b. *Ich glaube, dass Klaus erholt.
我 想 CONJ Klaus 恢复
想说：“我相信 Klaus 在恢复之中。”

不管是虚指成分还是反身代词都对句子的语义没有贡献。但是，为了构成一个完整的、合乎语法的句子，它们必须出现。所以说，它们也是动词的价的一部分。

那些对中心语对核心意义没有贡献的成分叫做说明语，这些成分提供的是一些额外的信息。比如说例 (70) 中的副词“深深”：

- (70) John 深深地爱着 Mary.

这里的副词说明了动词所描述的程度。此外，还有属性形容词 (71a) 和关系从句 (71b) 的例子：

1 引言与术语

- (71) a. 一位漂亮的女人
b. the man who Mary loves
DET 男人 CONJ Mary 爱
'Mary 爱着的那个男人'

说明语 (adjunct) 具有如下的句法和语义属性:

- (72) a. 说明语不构成语义角色。
b. 说明语是可选的。
c. 说明语可以重复。

例 (71a) 的短语可以通过增加说明语得到扩展:

- (73) 一位漂亮的聪明女人

如果我们先不考虑语言处理的问题, 这种通过增加说明语的方式可以无限扩展下去 (参看38) on page 60的讨论)。另一方面, 论元是不能多次实现的。

- (74) *The man the boy sleeps.
DET 男人 DET 男孩 睡觉

如果发出睡觉这个动作的实体已经被提及了, 那么就无法再用另一个名词短语来指称睡觉的个体。如果想要表达不只有一个个体在睡觉的话, 就必须采用例 (75) 中的并列式。

- (75) The man and the boy are sleeping.
DET 男人和 DET 男孩 COP 睡觉
'这个男人和这个男孩在睡觉。'

我们需要指出的是, 在72中提出的辨认说明语的标准并不充分, 因为还有句法论元不能充当语义角色。比如说68a中的 es (它), 68b中的 sich (自己), 以及例 (76) 中的可选成分, 如“比萨饼”。

- (76) Tony 正在吃 (比萨饼)。

中心语通常以一种相对固定的方式决定其所带论元的句法属性。动词负责其所带动词的格属性。

- (77) a. Er gedenkt des Opfers.
他记得 DET.GEN 受害人.GEN
'他记得受害人。'
b. *Er gedenkt dem Opfer.
他记得 DET.DAT 受害人
c. Er hilft dem Opfer.
他帮助 DET.DAT 受害人
'他帮助了受害人。'

- d. * Er hilft des Opfers.
他 帮助DET.GEN 受害人.GEN

动词管辖论元的格属性。介词短语中的介词和名词短语的格都由动词决定的：¹³

- (78) a. Er denkt an seine Modelleisenbahn.
他 想 PERP 他的.ACC 火车模型
'他在想他的火车模型。'
- b. # Er denkt an seiner Modelleisenbahn.
他 想 PREP 他的.DAT 火车模型
- c. Er hängt an seiner Modelleisenbahn.
他 附着 PREP 他的.DAT 火车模型
'他紧贴着他的火车模型。'
- d. * Er hängt an seine Modelleisenbahn.
他 附着 PREP 他的.ACC 火车模型

另一方面，修饰介词短语的名词的格与他们的意义有关系。在德语中，例（79a）中表示趋向的介词短语通常要求其名词短语是第四格（宾格），而例（79b）中表示地点的介词短语则需要是第三格（与格）。

- (79) a. Er geht in die Schule / auf den Weihnachtsmarkt / unter die
他去 在DET.ACC 学校 在 DET.ACC 圣诞市场 在..... 下DET.ACC
Brücke.
桥
'他去学校 / 圣诞市场 / 桥下面。'
- b. Er schläft in der Schule / auf dem Weihnachtsmarkt / unter
他 睡觉 在 DET.DAT 学校 在 DET.DAT 圣诞市场 在..... 下
der Brücke.
DET.DAT 桥
'他在学校 / 圣诞市场 / 桥下面睡觉。'

一个有趣的现象是，动词（位于）表示地点的信息。它不能单独使用，即无法在没有地点信息的情况下使用。

- (80) * Wir befinden uns.
我们处于 REFL

这个信息的形式是不固定的，句法范畴或介词短语内的介词都不是限定的：

- (81) Wir befinden uns hier / unter der Brücke / neben dem Eingang / im
我们处于 REFL 这儿 在..... 下DET 桥 在..... 附近DET 入口 在
Bett.
床
'我们在这儿 / 桥下面 / 入口旁 / 床上。'

¹³ 相关例子参看 Eisenberg (1994b: 78).

地点修饰词如 *hier*（这儿）或 *unter der Brücke*（桥下面）都可以看作是其他动词 *schlafen*（睡觉）的说明语。对于 *sich befinden*（位于）这类动词来说，我们更倾向于认为表示地点信息的格式说动词的句法论元的必有成分。动词选择表示地点信息的短语，但是并没有对其有任何句法上的限制。这种地点限制很像我们前面讲的说明语通过语义进行限制的方式。如果我只考虑中心语和说明语组合的语义层面，那么我也会将附加语看作是修饰语¹⁴。那些需要区分处所论元的动词，如 *sich befinden*（位于），也被看作是修饰语。修饰语通常是指说明语，所以说它也是可选的，然而在 *sich befinden*（位于）这个例子中，他们看起来是（必有）论元。

综上所述，我们可以说那些需要与中心语共现的句法成分是论元。并且，那些能够充当中心语的语义角色的句法成分也是论元。然而，这两类论元有时是可选的。

论元通常可以划分为主语和补足语。¹⁵ 不是所有的中心语都需要主语（参看 see Müller 2007b: Section 3.2）。由此，中心语所带论元的数量可以与中心语所带补足语的数量具有相关性。

1.7 语法功能

在有些理论中，诸如主语和宾语的语法功能构成了语言的形式化描述的一部分（如参考第 7 章有关词汇功能语法的内容）。但是本书中所讨论的主要理论并不这样看，这些术语被用来指称特定现象的非正式的描述。基于上述原因，我在下面的内容中进行简要的说明。

1.7.1 主语

尽管我认为读者对主语（subject）已经有了清晰的认识，但是给主语下一个跨语言的定义绝不是一件小事（？）。对于德语来说，Reis (1982) 提出下面的句法属性作为对主语对界定：

- 与变位动词构成主谓一致的关系
- 非名词性从句中的主格
- 在不定式中被省略（控制）
- 在祈使句中是可选的

我已经在例（4）中讨论过主谓一致的问题。Reis (1982) 认为第二个要点适用于德语。她构建了非名词性从句的限制条件，因为名词作谓语的句子中可以有不止有一个名词性的论元成分，如例（82）所示：

- (82) a. Er ist ein Lügner.
他.NOM COP 一 骗子.NOM
‘他是一个骗子。’

¹⁴ 参看第 1.7.2 节中更多有关状语的句法功能的内容。状语这个术语通常指与动词相关的成分。而修饰语是一个更为普遍的术语，通常还包括定语。

¹⁵ 有些学派认为补足语包括主语，即补足语的概念等同于论元（参看 Groß 2003: 342）。有些学者将变位动词的主语看作是补足语（Pollard 1996b; Eisenberg 1994a: 376）

- b. Er wurde ein Lügner genannt.
 他.NOM COP 一 骗子.NOM 叫做
 ‘他被人叫做骗子。’

按照这一标准，德语中，诸如 den Männern（男人们）的与格论元不能作主语：

- (83) a. Er hilft den Männern.
 他 帮助DET.DAT 男人.DAT
 ‘他在帮助那个男人。’
 b. Den Männern wurde geholfen.
 DET.DAT 男人.DAT COP.3SG 帮助
 ‘那个男人被人帮助了。’

根据其他标准，与格也不应该被看作是主语（如Reis (1982)的观点）。在例（83b）中，wurde（想要）是一个第三人称单数的形式，不与 den Männern（男人们）搭配。前述指出的第三条标准有关不定式结构，如下例（mex1）所示：

- (84) a. Klaus behauptet, den Männern zu helfen.
 Klaus 声称 DET.DAT 男人.DAT AUX 帮助
 ‘Klaus 声称要帮助那个男人。’
 b. Klaus behauptet, dass er den Männern hilft.
 Klaus 声称 CONJ 他DET.DAT 男人.DAT 帮助
 ‘Klaus 声称他在帮助那个男人。’
 c. *Die Männer behaupten, geholfen zu werden.
 DET 男人 声称 帮助 AUX COP
 想说：“那个男生声称得到了帮助。”
 d. *Die Männer behaupten, elegant getanzt zu werden.
 DET 男人 声称 优雅地 跳舞 AUX COP
 想说：“那个男人声称在优雅地跳舞。”

在第一句中，动词 helfen（帮助）的论元被省略了。如果有人希望表达这个论元，那么久应该用例（84b）中 dass 引导的从句。例（84c,d）显示了不需要名词性论元的不定式不能嵌套在动词下，如 behaupten（声称）。如果与格名词短语（男人们）是（83b）的主语，我们应该回看到一个合乎语法的控制结构（84c）。但是，事实并非如此。与例（84c）不同的是，有必要用例（85）：

- (85) Die Männer behaupten, dass ihnen geholfen wird.
 DET 男人.NOM 声称 CONJ 他们.DAT 帮助 COP
 ‘这些男人们声称他们被帮助了。’

同理，祈使句也不能由不需要名词性成分的动词充当。例（86）列出了Reis (1982: 186)提出的一些例子。

- (86) a. Fürchte dich nicht!
 害怕 REFL 不
 ‘不要害怕!’
- b. *Graue nicht!
 恐惧 不
 想说: “不要感到恐惧!”
- c. Werd einmal unterstützt und ...
 COP 一次 支持 和
 ‘让人支持你一次, 并且...’
- d. *Werd einmal geholfen und ...
 COP 一次 帮助 和
 想说: “让人帮助你一次, 并且...”

例(86a)中的动词(害怕)必须要带一个名词性的论元做主语(87a)。例(86b)中的与之类似的动词(怕)需要带一个与格论元(87b)。

- (87) a. Ich fürchte mich vor Spinnen.
 我.NOM 害怕 REFL PERP 蜘蛛
 ‘我害怕蜘蛛。’
- b. Mir graut vor Spinnen.
 我.DAT 害怕 PERP 蜘蛛
 ‘我怕蜘蛛。’

有趣的是, 冰岛语中的与格论元表现不同。Zaenen et al. (1985) 讨论了冰岛语中主语的各种特征, 并且可以在被动句中将与格论元看作是主语, 即使变位动词与他们没有构成主谓一致的关系(第3.1节), 或者他们并不必是主格。例如, 下面就是带有被省略的与格论元的不定式结构(第457页):

- (88) a. Ég vonast til að verða hjálpað.
 我希望 PERP AUX COP 帮助
 ‘我希望我能得到帮助。’
- b. Að vera hjálpað í prófinu er óleyfilegt.
 AUX COP 帮助 PERP 考试 COP 不允许
 ‘在考试中是不允许被帮助的。’

在一些语法现象中, 例(89)中的小句论元被看作是主语, 因为它们能被主格的名词短语(90)所代替(参考 e.g., Eisenberg 2004: 63, 289)。

- (89) a. Dass er schon um sieben kommen wollte, stimmt nicht.
 CONJ 他已经 在 七点 来 想 确定 不
 ‘他想尽可能在七点赶来, 这不是真的。’

- b. Dass er Maria geheiratet hat, gefällt mir.
 CONJ 他Maria 娶 AUX 高兴 我
 ‘我很高兴他娶了 Maria。’
- (90) a. Das stimmt nicht.
 DEM 确定 不
 ‘那不是真的。’
- b. Das gefällt mir.
 DEM 喜欢 我
 ‘我喜欢那个。’

需要指出的是，对于小句论元能否做主语这个问题上有不同的看法。最近发表的文献表明，在词汇功能语法中仍有相当多的讨论（参考第7章）（Dalrymple & Lødrup 2000; Berman 2003b, 2007; Alsina, Mohanan & Mohanan 2005; Forst 2006）。)

如果我们知道如何界定主语，那么宾语的界定就不再困难了：宾语就是由给定中心语决定其形式的所有其他论元。以小句宾语为例，德语有属格、与格、宾格和介词宾语：

- (91) a. Sie gedenken des Mannes.
 他们记得 DEF.GEN 人.GEN
 ‘他们记得这个人。’
- b. Sie helfen dem Mann.
 他们帮助 DEF.DAT 人.DAT
 ‘他们在帮助这个人。’
- c. Sie kennen den Mann.
 他们认识 DEF.ACC 人.ACC
 ‘他们认识这个人。’
- d. Sie denken an den Mann.
 他们想 PERP DET 人
 ‘他们正想起这个人。’

在对宾语按照格进行分类的同时，更为普遍的做法是区分直接宾语和间接宾语。顾名思义，直接宾语与间接宾语不同，直接宾语的所指直接受到动词指定的动作的影响。带双宾语的动词，如德语的 *geben*（给），宾格宾语就是直接宾语，而与格宾语就是间接宾语。

- (92) dass er dem Mann den Aufsatz gibt
 CONJ 他.NOM DEF.DAT 人.DAT DEF.ACC 论文.ACC 给
 ‘他给那个人这篇论文’

对于三价动词（带有三个论元的动词）来说，我们可以看到动词要么可以带一个属格宾语（93a），要么对于带宾格的直接宾语来说，再带一个宾格宾语（93b）：

1 导言与术语

- (93) a. dass er den Mann des Mordes bezichtigte
CONJ 他DEF.ACC 人.ACC DEF.GEN 谋杀.GEN 控告
‘他控告了杀人的人’
b. dass er den Mann den Vers lehrte
CONJ he DEF.ACC 人.ACC DEF.ACC 诗.ACC 教
‘他教那个人读诗了’

这类宾语有时也叫做间接宾语。通常，只有那些由 *werden* 引导的被动句中能够上升到主语位置上的成分才被看作是直接宾语。这对有些理论（如词汇功能语法，看第 7 章）来说非常重要，因为被动态被定义为语法功能。对于二元的动词性谓语来说，与格通常不被看作是直接宾语（(Cook 2006)）。

- (94) dass er dem Mann hilft
CONJ 他DEF.DAT 人.DAT 帮助
‘他帮助那个人’

在很多理论中，语法功能并不是构成理论多原始成分，而是与树结构中的位置密切相关的。所以说，德语中的直接宾语在句法配置中首先与动词组合这个特点被认为是德语句子的底层结构。间接宾语是与动词组合的第二个宾语。按照这一观点，*helfen*（帮助）的与格宾语需要被看作是直接宾语。

下面，我就只用宾语的格属性来指称，而避免使用直接宾语（direct object）和间接宾语（indirect object）的术语。我们对主语也采用相同的策略，有特定格属性的宾语小句能够分别对应于直接宾语或者间接宾语的语法功能。如果在例（95b）中，我们认为“*dass du sprichst*”（你在说话）这个小句是主语，那么从句就必然是直接宾语：

- (95) a. Dass du sprichst, wird erwähnt.
CONJ 你 说话 COP 提到
‘你在说话的事实被提及了。’
b. Er erwähnt, dass du sprichst.
他提到 CONJ 你 说话
‘他提到你在说话。’

这种情况下，我们不能真的将从句看作是宾格宾语，因为它没有格属性。但是，我们用带有宾格标记的名词短语来替换这个句子：

- (96) Er erwähnt diesen Sachverhalt.
他提到 这.ACC 事情
‘他提到这个事情。’

如果我们不想讨论这一问题，就可以简单地把这些论元称为小句宾语。

1.7.2 状语

状语与主语和宾语在语义上有很大的不同。它们告诉我们有关动作或过程发生地方的信息，或者是按照何种状态进行的方式。在大部分情况下，状语是说明语，但是，正如我们已经看到的，有些中心语也要有状语。这些动词的例子有 *to be located*（位于）或者 *to make one's way*（让路）。以 *to be located*（位于）为例，有必要明确一个地点，还需要一个前进的方向。由此，这类状语被看作是动词的论元。

状语这个术语的来源是因为大部分状语都是副词。但是，还有其他情况。介词、助词、介词短语、名词短语，甚至是句子都可以充当状语：

- (97) a. Er arbeitet sorgfältig.
他工作 认真
b. Er arbeitet vergleichend.
他工作 比较
‘他做比较的工作。’
c. Er arbeitet in der Universität.
他工作 在DET 大学
‘他在大学工作。’
d. Er arbeitet den ganzen Tag.
他工作 DET 整 天.ACC
‘他整天工作。’
e. Er arbeitet, weil es ihm Spaß macht.
他工作 因为它他.DAT 乐趣 作
‘他工作因为他喜欢工作。’

尽管例（97d）中的名词短语带有宾格，它并不是宾格宾格。*den ganzen Tag*（整天）号称是时间宾格。这种情况下宾格的出现与名词短语的句法和语义功能有关，它不是由动词决定的。这类宾格可以跟许多动词共现，甚至是那些通常不需要宾格宾语的动词：

- (98) a. Er schläft den ganzen Tag.
他睡觉 DET 整 天
‘他睡了一整天。’
b. Er liest den ganzen Tag diesen schwierigen Aufsatz.
他读 DEF.ACC 整.ACC 天 这.ACC 难的.ACC 论文
‘他花了一整天读这篇难懂的论文。’
c. Er gibt den Armen den ganzen Tag Suppe.
他给 DEF.DAT 穷人.DAT DEF.ACC 整天.ACC 天 汤
‘他花了一整天给穷人汤喝。’

被动态中状语的格不发生变化：The case of adverbials does not change under passivization:

- (99) a. weil den ganzen Tag gearbeitet wurde
 因为DEF.ACC 整.ACC 天 工作 AUX
 ‘因为有人整天工作’
 b. *weil der ganze Tag gearbeitet wurde
 因为DEF.NOM whole.NOM 天 工作 AUX

1.7.3 谓语

例（100a,b）中的形容词与例（100c）中的名词短语被看作是谓语。

- (100) a. Klaus ist *klug*.
 Klaus COP 聪明
 b. Er isst den Fisch *roh*.
 他吃 DET 鱼 生的
 c. Er ist *ein Lügner*.
 他 COP 一 骗子

在例（100a,c）的系词结构中，形容词 *klug*（聪明）与名词短语 *ein Lügner*（一个骗子）都是系词 *sein*（是）的论元，而例（100b）中的描述性形容词则作 *isst*（吃）的状态。

对于名词性谓语来说，格不是由中心语决定的，而是由其他成分决定的。¹⁶
 例如，例（101a）中的宾格在例（101b）的被动句中变成了主格。

¹⁶ 不同方言区的系词结构有所不同：在标准德语中系词 *sein*（是）所带的名词短语总是主格，即使是嵌套在 *lassen*（让）的下面也不发生变化。根据Drosdowski (1995: § 1259)，瑞士地区则经常能发现例（ii.a）中用作宾格的情况。

- (i) a. Ich bin dein Tanzpartner.
 I COP 你的.NOM 舞伴
 b. Der wüste Kerl ist ihr Komplize.
 DET 疯狂的家伙COP 她的.NOM 从犯
 c. Laß den wüsten Kerl [...] meinerwegen ihr Komplize sein.
 让 DEF.ACC 疯狂的.ACC 家伙 我所关心的 她的.NOM 从犯 COP
 ‘我所关心的是，让我们来假定那个疯狂的家伙是她的从犯。’ (Grebe & Gipper 1966: § 6925)
 d. Baby, laß mich dein Tanzpartner sein.
 宝贝 让 我.ACC 你的.NOM 舞伴 COP
 ‘宝贝，让我当你的舞伴吧！’ (Funny van Dannen, Benno-Ohnesorg-Theater, Berlin, Volksbühne, 11.10.1995)
- (ii) a. Er läßt den lieben Gott ‘n frommen Mann sein.
 他让 DEF.ACC 亲爱的.ACC 上帝一虔诚的.ACC 人 COP
 ‘他全是不走心（漠不关心）啊。’
 b. *Er läßt den lieben Gott ‘n frommer Mann sein.
 他让 DEF.ACC 亲爱的.ACC 上帝一虔诚的.NOM 人 COP

- (101) a. Sie nannte ihn einen Lügner.
 她 叫 他.ACC 一.ACC 骗子
 “她把他叫做骗子。”
- b. Er wurde ein Lügner genannt.
 他.NOM AUX 一.NOM 骗子 叫做
 “他被人叫做骗子。”

例(101a)中,只有ihn(他)被描述成宾语。在例(101b)中,ihn(他)变成了主语,也就成为了主格。在例(101a)中,einen Lügner(一个骗子)指代ihn(他),例(101b)中的er(他)需要与作谓语的名词的格保持一致。这也叫做格的一致关系。

其他的谓词性结构可以参看Eisenberg et al. (2005: § 1206)、Müller (2002a: Chapter 4, Chapter 5), 以及Müller (2008a)。

1.7.4 配价类型

我们可以按照动词所带论元成分的数量与属性来对动词进行分类。一方面,那些可以带宾语且其宾语能变换为被动式的主语多动词叫做及物动词(transitive),如love(爱)或beat(击打)这类动词。另一方面,不及物动词不能带宾语,或者其在被动式中不能变成主语,如schlafen(睡觉),helfen(帮忙)或gedenken(纪念)。及物动词还包括双及物动词,如geben(给)和zeigen(展示)。

不过,这一术语的使用并不完全一致。有时,带与格和属格宾语的二位动词也被看作是及物动词。在这个命名系统中,不及物动词、及物动词以及双及物动词的术语与一位动词、二位动词和三位动词的术语在含义上是相同的。

这种术语混淆的情况导致对乔姆斯基的评论的误解,即使他们是由一些知名的语言学家(Culicover and Jackendoff's (2005: 59))提出来的。乔姆斯基指出,英语助动词“be”带动词的被动态只能用在及物动词上。Culicover和Jackendoff则认为这是不对的,因为还有及物动词不能变换为被动式,如weigh(称重)和cost(花费)。

- (102) a. This book weighs ten pounds / costs ten dollars.
 这 书 重 十 磅 / 花费 十 美元
 ‘这本书重十磅/卖十美元。’
- b. *Ten pounds are weighed / ten dollar are cost by this book.
 十 磅 AUX 重 / 十 美元 AUX 花费PREP 这 书

Culicover和Jackendoff这里说的及物动词是指带两个论元的动词。如果我们只把那些动词宾语可以变换为被动式主语动词看作是及物动词,那么weigh(称重)和cost(花费)都不能算是及物动词,这样Culicover和Jackendoff的观点就站不脚了。¹⁷诸如例(102)中的名词短语不是普通宾语,因为它们不能被代词替代。所以说它们的格属性无法确定,因为英语中只有代词有格的区分。如果我们将英语的例子翻译成德语,我们会发现它们是宾格宾语:

¹⁷ 即使我们将及物动词看作是二位谓词的话,他们的评论也是站不住的。如果我们认为动词至少带两个论元成分才能变换成被动式的话,那么我们也必须要认定所有带两个或两个以上论元的动词都可以变换成被动式。实际上,带多个论元这个属性只是一个充分条件,并不是唯一条件。

- (103) a. Das Buch kostete einen Dollar.
DET 书 值 一.ACC 美元
'这本书值一美元。'
b. Das Buch wiegt einen Zentner.
DET 书 重 一.ACC 公担
'这本书重五十公斤。'

在下面，我会采用及物的前一个概念，即那些能在被动式中将宾语变换为主语的动词。对于 *helfen*（帮助）类动词，它们带一个主格和一个与格论元；而 *schlagen*（击打）类动词带有一个主格和一个宾格论元。我会用二位动词或二价动词（bivalent verb）动词来指称它们。

1.8 德语小句的空间位置模型

在这一节，我会介绍所谓的空间位置的概念。这一概念会在后续的章节中被经常用来讨论德语小句中的不同部分。此外，也可以在Reis (1980), Höhle (1986) and Askedal (1986)的文献中找到更多有关空间位置的知识。Wöllstein (2010)是一本有关空间位置模型的教科书。

1.8.1 动词的位置

最常见的是按照变位动词的位置将德语的句子分成三类：

- 动词位于末位的小句
- 动词位于首位的小句
- 动词位于第二位（V2）的小句

下面的例子说明了这些可能性：

- (104) a. (Peter hat erzählt,) dass er das Eis gegessen hat.
Peter AUX 告诉 CONJ 他DET 雪糕吃 AUX
'Peter 说他把雪糕吃完了。'
b. Hat Peter das Eis gegessen?
AUX Peter DET 雪糕吃
'Peter 吃完雪糕了吗？'
c. Peter hat das Eis gegessen.
Peter AUX DET 雪糕吃
'Peter 吃完雪糕了。'

1.8.2 句子的框架结构、前场、中场及后场

我们观察到，在例（104a）中，变位动词 *hat* 只跟它的补足语 *gegessen*（吃完）挨着。在例（104b）和例（104c）中，动词跟它的补足语是分开的，也就是非连续的。这样，我们可以基于这些区别将德语小句分成不同的小类。在例（104b）和例（104c）中，动词和祝词构成小句的一个基本框架。基于这个原因，我们称之为框型结构。例（104b）和例（104c）中的变位动词构成框架的左边界，非变位动词构成右边界。以动词为末位的小句通常由连词引入，如 *weil*（因为）、*dass*（这个），以及 *ob*（是否）。不管是在动词占首位，还是动词占末尾到小句中，这些连词占据了与变位动词一样的位置。由此，我们认为这些连词也构成了这些句子的左边界。应用句子框架的概念，使得我们有可能将德语小句划分成前场、中场和后场这三个部分。前场指位于左边界之前的成分，中场是指位于左边界与右边界之间的成分，后场指右边界之后的成分。如图 1.1 on the following page 所示：右边界可以包括多个动词，通常被看作是动词性复合词或动词词组。下一节，我们将讨论疑问词和关系代词在前场的排列。

1.8.3 场内元素的排列

如图中的例子所示，并不是所有的位置都需要有成分来充当。如果想在例（105）中省略系词（copula）的话，即使是左边界，也可以是空的：

- (105) a. [...] *egal, was noch passiert, der Norddeutsche Rundfunk steht schon*
 无论如何什么仍然 发生 DET 北德 广播公司 存在 已经
*jetzt als Gewinner fest.*¹⁸
 现在PREP 赢家 PART
 ‘不管将要发生什么，北德广播公司早就已经是赢家了。’
- b. *Interessant, zu erwähnen, daß ihre Seele völlig in Ordnung war.*¹⁹
 有趣 AUX 提到 CONJ 她的灵魂 完整地PREP 顺序 COP
 ‘值得注意的是，她的灵魂完好无损。’
- c. *Ein Treppenwitz der Musikgeschichte, daß die Kollegen von Rammstein*
 一 讽刺 DET 音乐历史 CONJ DET 成员 PREP Rammstein
*vor fünf Jahren noch im Vorprogramm von Sandow spielten.*²⁰
 PREP 五 年 仍然 PREP.DET 开场 PREP Sandow 表演
 ‘音乐历史上具有讽刺意味的一件事是，五年前 Rammstein 的成员仍然为 Sandow 作开场演出。’

例（105）中的例子与例（106）中的系词具有相关性：

- (106) a. *Egal ist, was noch passiert, ...*
 不管COP 什么仍然 发生
 ‘今后将发生什么并不重要 ...’

¹⁸ 《明镜周刊》（*Spiegel*），1999 年 12 月，p. 258.

¹⁹ Michail Bulgakow, *Der Meister und Margarita*. München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag. 1997, p. 422.

²⁰ Flüstern & Schweigen, taz, 12.07.1999, p. 14.

表 1.1: 空间位置分布例示

前场	左边界	中场	右边界	后场
Karl	schläft.			
Karl	hat		geschlafen.	
Karl	erkennt	Maria.		
Karl	färbt	den Mantel		den Maria kennt.
Karl	hat	Maria	um	
Karl	hat	Maria als sie aus dem Zug stieg sofort	erkannt.	
Karl	hat	Maria sofort	erkannt.	als sie aus dem Zug stieg.
Karl	hat	Maria zu erkennen	behauptet.	
Karl	hat		behauptet	Maria zu erkennen.
	Schläft	Karl?		
	Schlaf!			
	Iss	jetzt dein Eis	auf!	
	Hat	er doch das ganze Eis alleine	gegessen.	
	weil	er das ganze Eis alleine	gegessen hat	ohne mit der Wimper zu zucken.
wer	weil	er das ganze Eis alleine	essen können will	ohne gestört zu werden.
der		das ganze Eis alleine	gegessen hat	
mit wem		das ganze Eis alleine	gegessen hat	
mit dem		du	geredet hast	
		du	geredet hast	

- b. Interessant ist zu erwähnen, dass ihre Seele völlig in Ordnung
有趣 COP AUX 提到 CONJ 她的灵魂 完整地PREP 顺序
war.
COP

‘值得注意的是，她的灵魂完好无损。’

- c. Ein Treppenwitz der Musikgeschichte ist, dass die Kollegen von
一 讽刺 DET 音乐历史 COP CONJ DET 成员 PREP
Rammstein vor fünf Jahren noch im Vorprogramm von Sandow
Rammstein PREP 五 年 仍然 PREP.DET 开场 PREP Sandow
spielten.
表演

‘五年前，Rammstein 的成员仍为 Sandow 作开场演出是音乐史上的一件具有讽刺意义的事件。’

当某些位置为空时，就不太容易判断句中成分占据了哪些位置。如例（105）所示，我们需要将系词插入来确保哪个成分位于前场，以及其他成分所处的位置。

在下面Paul (1919: 13)引用的例子中，插入系词则得到了不同的结果：

- (107) a. Niemand da?
没有人 那儿
b. Ist niemand da?
COP 没有人 那儿
‘没有人在那儿吗？’

这里，我们要分析的是一个问句，所以 niemand（没有人）不能分析为位于前场，而应是位于中场。

例（108）中，前场、左边界和中场都有成分充当，而右边界是空的。²¹

- (108) Er gibt der Frau das Buch, die er kennt.
他.M 给 DET 女人 (F) DET 书.(N) CONJ.F 他认识
‘他把书交给了他认识的那个女人。’

我们应该怎么分析诸如“die er kennt”（他认识的吗？）这样的关系从句呢？它们构成了中场还是后场呢？我们可以应用开发到测试法来进行测试：首先，我们把例（108）改成完成时。由于非变位动词位于右边界，我们可以清楚地看出中场与后场的边界。例（109）中的例子显示了，关系从句不能位于中场，除非它是与中心语 Frau（女人）一起构成的一个复杂成分的一部分。

- (109) a. Er hat [der Frau] das Buch gegeben, [die er kennt].
他 AUX DET 女人 DET 书 给 CONJ 他认识
‘他把书交给了他认识的那个女人。’

²¹ 这个句子需要对 der（这个）进行强调。der Frau, die er kennt（他认识的这个女人）与另一个或其他女人进行区分。

- b. *Er hat [der Frau] das Buch, [die er kennt,] gegeben.
 他 AUX DET 女人 DET 书 CONJ 他认识 给
- c. Er hat [der Frau, die er kennt,] das Buch gegeben.
 他 AUX DET 女人 CONJ 他认识 DET 书 给

如果修饰中心语名词的关系从句像例(110)这种位于句末的话,这个测试也没有用了。

- (110) Er gibt das Buch der Frau, die er kennt.
 他给 DET 书 DET 女人 CONJ 他认识
 ‘他把书交给了他认识的那个女人。’

如果我们把例(110)的句子变成完成时,那么我们可以发现,动词可以出现在关系小句的前面或者后面:

- (111) a. Er hat das Buch [der Frau] gegeben, [die er kennt].
 他 AUX DET 书 DET 女人 给 CONJ 他认识
 ‘他把书交给了他认识的那个女人。’
- b. Er hat das Buch [der Frau, die er kennt,] gegeben.
 他 AUX DET 书 DET 女人 CONJ 他认识 给

在例(111a)中,关系小句被提前了。在(111b)中,它构成了名词短语 *der Frau, die er kennt* (他认识的那个女人)的一部分,并位于中场的名词短语内部。这样,上面的测试方法也不适用于例(110)了。我们认为例(110)中的关系小句也术语名词短语,因为这样是最简单的结构。如果关系小句位于后场,我们则需要假定它从名词短语内部上升到这个位置上了。也就是说,我们需要假设其是一个名词短语结构,并且还涉及了移外变形。对于疑问词和冠词代词来说也有同样的问题。不同作者看法不同,有的认为它们位于左边界,有的认为是前场,也有的认为是中场。在标准德语中,疑问句和关系小句中的所有成分从来没有占全的时候。这就导致,无法直观地分清楚某个元素所在的位置。尽管如此,我们可以结合主句来判断:疑问句和关系小句中的代词可以包含在复杂短语中:

- (112) a. der Mann, [mit dem] du gesprochen hast
 DET 人 PREP 谁 你说话 AUX
 ‘你跟他说话的那个人’
- b. Ich möchte wissen, [mit wem] du gesprochen hast.
 我 想 知道 PREP 谁 你说话 AUX
 ‘我想知道你在跟谁说话。’

通常,只有个别词语(连词或动词)能够占据左边界,²²而词和短语可以出现在前

²² 并列结构是一个例外:

- (i) Er [kennt und liebt] diese Schallplatte.
 他 知道 和 热爱 这 专辑
 ‘他了解并且热爱这张专辑。’

场中。由此可以推断，疑问词和关系代词（及其包含的短语）也能在这个位置上出现。

进而，我们观察到，在陈述句的前场位置的成分与句中其他成分的依存关系跟包括关系代词的短语与句中其他成分之间的依存关系是一样的。比如说，例（113a）中 *about this topic*（关于这个话题）依存于深深地嵌套在句中的 *Vortrag*（演讲）：*einen Vortrag*（一个演讲）是 *zu halten*（发布）的一个论元成分，也是 *gebeten*（要求）的一个论元成分。

- (113) a. *Über dieses Thema habe ich ihn gebeten, einen Vortrag zu halten.*

关于这 题目 AUX 我 他 请求 ART 演讲 AUX hold

‘我请他做个有关这个题目的演讲。’

- b. *das Thema, über das ich ihn gebeten habe, einen Vortrag zu halten*

DET 题目 关于我 他 请求AUX ART 演讲 AUX 作

‘这是那个我让他做一个演讲的题目’

例（113b）的情景是类似的：关系短语 *über das*（关于这个）是 *Vortrag*（演讲）的一个与之关系较远的依存成分。所以说，如果关系短语被放在前场，我们可以推断出，远距离的前置总是指向前场。

最后来看一下《杜登大辞典》(Eisenberg et al. 2005: §1347) 中应用的标准德语（大部分是南方方言）中的一些例子：

- (114) a. *Kommt drauf an, mit wem dass sie zu tun haben.*

来 PREP PART PREP 谁 CONJ 你 AUX 做 AUX

‘这要取决于是谁在处理。’

- (115) a. *Lotti, die wo eine tolle Sekretärin ist, hat ein paar merkwürdige Herren*

Lotti 谁 哪儿一 伟大秘书 COP 有 一些 奇怪 绅士

empfangen.

欢迎

‘Lotti 作为一名伟大的秘书，受到了一些奇怪的绅士的欢迎。’

- b. *Du bist der beste Sänger, den wo ich kenn.*

你 COP DET 最棒 歌手 谁 哪儿我 知道

‘你是我知道的最棒的歌手。’

这些有关疑问句和关系从句的例子说明句子的左边界在不同方言中分别由连词 *dass*（这个）和 *wo*（哪儿）充当。所以说，如果我们希望得到一个能够统一分析标准德语与方言的模型的话，就应该认为关系短语和疑问短语位于前场。

1.8.4 递归

正如Reis (1980: 82)已经指出的，当前场由一个复杂成分充当的时候，可以将其进一步细化。例如，(116b)中的 *für lange lange Zeit*（很长很长时间）和(116d)中的 *daß du kommst*（你要进来）都位于前场，但是出现在右边界 *gewußt*（知道）的右边，也就是说他们出现在前场内的后场。

1 导言与术语

- (116) a. Die Möglichkeit, etwas zu verändern, ist damit verschüttet für lange
DET 机会 东西 AUX 变化 COP 在那儿消失 PREP 长
lange Zeit.
长 时间
‘变革的机会将要消失很长很长时间了。’
- b. [Verschüttet für lange lange Zeit] ist damit die Möglichkeit, etwas
消失 PREP 长 长 时间 COP 在那儿DET 机会 东西
zu verändern.
AUX 变化
- c. Wir haben schon seit langem gewußt, daß du kommst.
我们AUX PART CONJ 长 知道 CONJ 你 来
‘我们早就知道你要来了。’
- d. [Gewußt, daß du kommst,] haben wir schon seit langem.
知道 CONJ 你 来 AUX 我们PART PREP 长

正如在前场的成分一样，中场和后场的成分也能有内部的结构，并且可以相应地划分到不同的次级结构中。如例（116c）中，daß（这个）是从句 daß du kommst（他知道）的左边界，而 du（你）占据了中场，kommst（来）是右边界。

思考题

1. 短语中的中心语与其他成分相比有何不同？
2. 请找出例（117）中的中心语：
(117) a. 他
b. 走！
c. 快
3. 论元与附加语有什么区别？
4. 请指出例（118）所示的整句及其小句中的中心语、论元和附加语：
(118) Er hilft den kleinen Kindern in der Schule.
他 帮助DET 小 孩子 在DET 学校
‘他在学校帮助小孩子。’
5. 如何界定前场、中场、后场、左边界与右边界？

练习题

1. 请指出下列句子及其嵌套对小句的框架结构、前场、中场，以及后场。

- (119) a. Karl isst.
Karl 吃
‘Karl 正在吃。’
- b. Der Mann liebt eine Frau, den Peter kennt.
DET 男人 爱 一 女人 谁 Peter 认识
‘Peter 认识的那个男人爱着这个女人。’
- c. Der Mann liebt eine Frau, die Peter kennt.
DET 男人 爱 一 女人 CONJ Peter 认识
‘这个男人爱着那个彼得认识的女人。’
- d. Die Studenten haben behauptet, nur wegen der Hitze einzuschlafen.
DET 学生们 AUX 声称 只 因为 DET 热
睡着了
‘学生们声称他们是因为热才睡着了。’
- e. Dass Peter nicht kommt, ärgert Klaus.
CONJ Peter 不 来 惹恼 Klaus
‘Peter 不能来的事实惹恼了 Klaus。’
- f. Einen Mann küssen, der ihr nicht gefällt, würde sie nie.
一 男人 亲 CONJ 她 不 喜欢 AUX 她 从不
‘她绝不会亲一个她不喜欢的男人。’

延伸阅读

Reis (1980)解释了为什么空间位置理论对描述德语中成分之间关系如此重要。Höhle (1986)讨论了前场左边的位置由左移位结构充当，如例 (120) der Mittwoch (星期三)，例 (121a) 的 aber (但是)，以及例 (121b) 的 denn (那么)。

- (120) Der Mittwoch, der passt mir gut.
DET 星期三 CONJ 适合 我 好
‘周三，我有空。’
- (121) a. Aber würde denn jemand den Hund füttern morgen Abend?
但是 AUX PART 有人 DET 狗 喂 明天 晚上
‘但是明天晚上会有人喂狗吗？’
- b. Denn dass es regnet, damit rechnet keiner.
因为 CONJ 它下雨 对此 想到 没有人
‘因为没人想到会下雨。’

1 引言与术语

Höhle 还讨论了空间位置理论的历史发展。

第二章 短语结构语法

本章讨论短语结构语法，该语法在我们接下来要讲解的理论中起到了至关重要的作用。

2.1 符号和重写规则

根据词的屈折形态和句法分布，我们可以判断出它们的词性。由此，例（1）中的 **weil**（因为）是一个连词，而 **das**（这）和 **dem**（这）是冠词，后两者也叫做限定词。进而，**Buch**（书）和 **Mann**（人）是名词，而 **gibt**（给）是动词。

- (1) **weil er das Buch dem Mann gibt**
因为他DET 书 DET 人 给
‘因为他给人这本书’

在第 1.3 节，我们介绍了组成成分测试的若干方法。采用这些方法，我们可以判断出 **das Buch**（这本书）和 **dem Mann**（这个人）这两组字符串分别构成了组成成分。那么这些成分需要特定的符号来指称他们。因为在这些短语中，名词起到了重要的作用，它们就叫做名词短语（**noun phrase**）或简称为 **NPs**。因为代词 **er**（他）也可以出现在完整的名词短语所在的位置中，所以代词也应归入 **NP** 这一类别中。

短语结构语法用规则来说明符号是如何指派到某类词中，并且这些词是如何构成更复杂的单位的。如（2）所示，这是用来分析例句（1）的一个简单的短语结构语法：^{1,2}

- | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| (2) | $NP \rightarrow Det\ N$ | $NP \rightarrow er$ | $N \rightarrow Buch$ |
| | $S \rightarrow NP\ NP\ NP\ V$ | $Det \rightarrow das$ | $N \rightarrow Mann$ |
| | | $Det \rightarrow dem$ | $V \rightarrow gibt$ |

由此，我们将 $NP \rightarrow Det\ N$ 这一规则解读为一个名词短语，这个名词短语被赋予了 **NP** 这个符号，并且包括一个限定词（**D**）和一个名词（**N**）。

¹ 我们暂不分析 **weil**（因为）。因为对于德语的动词位于第一位和动词位于第二位的小句的确切分析来说，我们还需要一些额外的假设，所以在这一章只讨论动词位于句末的小句。

² $NP \rightarrow er$ 这条规则看起来有些奇怪。我们本可以用 $PersPron \rightarrow er$ 这条规则来说明，但是这就需要另一条规则来说明能够代替整个 **NP** 的人称代词 $NP \rightarrow PersPron$ 。（2）将前面两条规则整合成一条，并且说明 **er**（他）出现在名词短语可以出现的位置上。

2 短语结构语法

对于例（1）这个句子，我们可以应用（2）中的文法并按照如下的方式来分析：首先，我们选取句中的第一个词，然后看是否有规则来说明该词出现在规则的右边。如果有，那么我们就用规则左边的符号来替换它。这一过程可以参考（3）中的第 2-4，6-7 和 9 行的推导过程。比如说，第二行中 er 被 NP 代替。如果在规则的右边有两个以上的符号，那么这些符号都被左边的符号所代替。这一过程可以参考第 5、8 和 10 行。例如，在第 5 行和第 8 行中，Det 和 N 被重写为 NP。

(3)	words and symbols						rules that are applied
1	er	das	Buch	dem	Mann	gibt	
2	NP	das	Buch	dem	Mann	gibt	NP → er
3	NP	Det	Buch	dem	Mann	gibt	Det → das
4	NP	Det	N	dem	Mann	gibt	N → Buch
5	NP		NP	dem	Mann	gibt	NP → Det N
6	NP		NP	Det	Mann	gibt	Det → dem
7	NP		NP	Det	N	gibt	N → Mann
8	NP		NP		NP	gibt	NP → Det N
9	NP		NP		NP	V	V → gibt
10						S	S → NP NP NP V

如例（3）所示，我们从一串词开始，然后按照给定的短语结构文法，我们可以推导出句子的结构。我们也可以按照相反的方向来分析：从句子标号 S 开始，我们可以应用第 9-1 步，最后到词串。如要从文法中选择重写符号的不同规则，我们可以用（2）中的文法来从 S 分析到字符串“er dem Mann das Buch gibt”（他男人书给）。我们可以说，这个文法生成了一组句子。

例（3）中的推导过程可以表示为一棵树，如图 2.1所示。




图 2.1: “er das Buch dem Mann gibt”（他这本书这个人给）的分析

树中的符号叫做节点（node）。S 直接统制 NP 节点和 V 节点。树中的其他节点也被统制，只不过不是受到 S 的直接统制。如果我们想讨论节点之间的关系，我们通常会用亲属词来表示。在图 2.1中，S 是三个 NP 节点和 V 节点的母节点（mother node）。NP 节点和 V 节点是姊妹节点，因为他们有共同的母节点。如果一个节点有两个子节点，那么我们会得到一个二叉树结构。如果只有一个子节点，则会得到一个单叉树结构。如果有两个成分是直接相连的，我们就说它们具有邻接关系（adjacent）。

语言学著作中通常会省略短语结构规则。相反，作者们倾向于使用树图或者紧缩的框式结构，如（4）所示。

- (4) $[_S [_{NP} \text{er}] [_{NP} [_{Det} \text{das}] [_N \text{Buch}]] [_{NP} [_{Det} \text{dem}] [_N \text{Mann}]] [_V \text{gibt}]]$
 he the book the man gives

无论采取哪种形式，文法规则是最重要的，因为这些规则表示了语法知识，而这是与具体的结构没有太多关系的。这样，我们可以利用（2）中的文法来剖析或生成例（5），该句中的宾语顺序与前面例（1）的不同：

- (5) [weil] er dem Mann das Buch gibt
 因为 他.NOM DET.DAT 人 DET.ACC 书 给
 ‘因为他给这个人这本书’

与例（1）相比，这句话中用来替代限定词和名词的规则采用了不同的顺序。具体来说，这里并不是用 *das*（这）来替代第一个 *Det*，也不是用 *Buch*（书）来替代第一个 *noun*，而是用 *dem*（这）来替代第一个 *Det*，并用 *Mann*（人）替代第一个 *noun*。

在此，我需要指出的是，（2）中的文法并不是针对（1）中的例句的唯一一套文法。实际上，对于这类句子（参看练习1）而言，还有无限多可能的文法。另一套文法如例（6）所示：

- (6) $NP \rightarrow Det\ N$ $NP \rightarrow er$ $N \rightarrow Buch$
 $V \rightarrow NP\ V$ $Det \rightarrow das$ $N \rightarrow Mann$
 $Det \rightarrow dem$ $V \rightarrow gibt$

该文法允许了如图 2.2 所示的二叉树结构。




图 2.2: “er das Buch dem Mann gibt”（他这本书这个人给）的二叉树结构分析

2 短语结构语法

实际上，(6) 和 (2) 中的文法都不够精确。如果我们在文法中加入额外的词条，如 *ich* (我) 和 *den* (DET 的宾格形式)，那么就会生成不合乎语法的句子，如例 (7b-d) 所示：³

- (7) a. *er das Buch dem Mann gibt*
他.NOM DET.ACC 书 DET.DAT 人 给
‘他把书给这个人。’
b. **ich das Buch dem Mann gibt*
我.NOM DET.ACC 书 DET.DAT 人 给
c. **er das Buch den Mann gibt*
他.NOM DET.ACC 书 DET.ACC 人 给
d. **er den Buch dem Mann gibt*
他.NOM DET.M 书(N) DET 人 给

例 (7b) 违反了主谓一致原则，具体来说：*ich* (我) 和 *gibt* (给) 并不搭配。例 (7c) 是不合乎语法的，因为没有满足动词对格的约束条件。最后，例 (7d) 也是不合乎语法的，因为在限定词和名词之间缺少一致关系。我们不能将 *den* (这) 这个阳性的宾格成分与 *Buch* (书) 这个中性词搭配。基于上述原因，这两个成分的性质不同，所以说，二者不能搭配。

在下面的内容中，我们将来考虑如何让我们的语法可以杜绝生成例 (7b-d) 中的句子。如果我们想说明主谓一致关系，那么我们就需要说明德语中的六种格，并且动词必须与主语在人称 (1、2、3) 和数 (sg、pl) 上保持一致：

- (8) a. *Ich schlafe.* (1, sg)
我 睡觉
b. *Du schläfst.* (2, sg)
你 睡觉
c. *Er schläft.* (3, sg)
他 睡觉
d. *Wir schlafen.* (1, pl)
我们睡觉
e. *Ihr schlaft.* (2, pl)
你们睡觉

³ 应用 (6) 中的文法，我们还会遇到别的问题，即我们无法确定什么时候话语是完整的，因为符号 *V* 被用来表示 *V* 和 *NP* 的所有组合。由此，我们也可以这个文法来分析 (i) 中的句子：

- (i) a. **der Mann erwartet*
DET 人 希望
b. **des Mannes er das Buch dem Mann gibt*
DET.GEN 人.GEN 他.NOM DET.ACC 书 DET.DAT 人 给

动词所带的论元数量应该在文法中显示出来。在下面的章节中，我们将介绍动词对论元的选择 (valence) 是如何在不同的语法理论中进行表述的。

- f. Sie schlafen. (3, pl)
他们睡觉

我们可以通过增加符号的数量来用语法规则描述这些关系。我们用下面的符号来替换 $S \rightarrow NP\ NP\ NP\ V$:

- (9) $S \rightarrow NP_1_sg\ NP\ NP\ V_1_sg$
 $S \rightarrow NP_2_sg\ NP\ NP\ V_2_sg$
 $S \rightarrow NP_3_sg\ NP\ NP\ V_3_sg$
 $S \rightarrow NP_1_pl\ NP\ NP\ V_1_pl$
 $S \rightarrow NP_2_pl\ NP\ NP\ V_2_pl$
 $S \rightarrow NP_3_pl\ NP\ NP\ V_3_pl$

这样就意味着，我们需要六种不同的符号来分别表示名词短语和动词，还需要六条规则，而不是一条。

为了说明动词的格指派关系，我们可以按照类似的方式将格信息整合到符号中。这样，我们可以得到如下的规则：

- (10) $S \rightarrow NP_1_sg_nom\ NP_dat\ NP_acc\ V_1_sg_nom_dat_acc$
 $S \rightarrow NP_2_sg_nom\ NP_dat\ NP_acc\ V_2_sg_nom_dat_acc$
 $S \rightarrow NP_3_sg_nom\ NP_dat\ NP_acc\ V_3_sg_nom_dat_acc$
 $S \rightarrow NP_1_pl_nom\ NP_dat\ NP_acc\ V_1_pl_nom_dat_acc$
 $S \rightarrow NP_2_pl_nom\ NP_dat\ NP_acc\ V_2_pl_nom_dat_acc$
 $S \rightarrow NP_3_pl_nom\ NP_dat\ NP_acc\ V_3_pl_nom_dat_acc$

考虑到名词需要区分四种不同的格，我们给主格 NP 设置了六种符号，其他格的 NP 需要三种符号。由于动词需要与 NP 相搭配，我们还需要区分 (11) 中带三个论元，或者只带一个或两个论元的动词，所以说，我们需要增加表示动词的符号数量。

- (11) a. Er schläft.
他睡觉
‘他正在睡觉。’
 b. *Er schläft das Buch.
他睡觉 DET 书
 c. Er kennt das Buch.
他认识 DET 书
‘他认识这本书。’
 d. *Er kennt.
他认识

在上面的规则中，有关动词所需论元数量的信息在 “nom_dat_acc” 这个标记中有所说明。

2 短语结构语法

为了说明例(12)中的限定词与名词的一致关系,我们需要整合性(阴性、阳性、中性)、数(单数、复数)、格(主格、属格、与格、宾格),以及屈折类型(强、弱)的信息⁴。

- (12) a. der Mann, die Frau, das Buch (性)
DET.M 人(M) DET.F 女人(F) DET.N 书(N)
b. das Buch, die Bücher (数)
DET 书.SG DET 书.PL
c. des Buches, dem Buch (格)
DET.GEN 书.GEN DET.DAT 书
d. ein Beamter, der Beamte (屈折类型)
一 公务员 DET 公务员

我们不用 $NP \rightarrow Det\ N$ 这条规则,我们将要用到下面这些规则,如例(13)所示:⁵

- (13) $NP_3_sg_nom \rightarrow Det_fem_sg_nom\ N_fem_sg_nom$
 $NP_3_sg_nom \rightarrow Det_mas_sg_nom\ N_mas_sg_nom$
 $NP_3_sg_nom \rightarrow Det_neu_sg_nom\ N_neu_sg_nom$
 $NP_3_pl_nom \rightarrow Det_fem_pl_nom\ N_fem_pl_nom$
 $NP_3_pl_nom \rightarrow Det_mas_pl_nom\ N_mas_pl_nom$
 $NP_3_pl_nom \rightarrow Det_neu_pl_nom\ N_neu_pl_nom$

 $NP_3_sg_nom \rightarrow Det_fem_sg_nom\ N_fem_sg_nom$
 $NP_3_sg_nom \rightarrow Det_mas_sg_nom\ N_mas_sg_nom$
 $NP_3_sg_nom \rightarrow Det_neu_sg_nom\ N_neu_sg_nom$
 $NP_3_pl_nom \rightarrow Det_fem_pl_nom\ N_fem_pl_nom$
 $NP_3_pl_nom \rightarrow Det_mas_pl_nom\ N_mas_pl_nom$
 $NP_3_pl_nom \rightarrow Det_neu_pl_nom\ N_neu_pl_nom$

例(13)说明了主格名词短语的规则。我们还需要针对属格、与格和宾格的类似规则。这样,我们就需要24个符号来说明限定词($3 \times 2 \times 4$),24个符号说明名词,以及24条规则,而不是一条规则。如果要考虑屈折类型的话,符号的数量和规则的数量都要翻倍。

2.2 短语结构语法中特征的运用

短语结构语法如果只用原子式的符号是有问题的,因为他们无法描写一些特定的扩展形式。语言学家能够辨识出 $NP_3_sg_nom$ 指的是名词短语,因为这里面包括字母NP。但是,在形式化的术语中,这个符号与文法中的其他任意一个符号是一样的。我们并不能找到可以用来指代NP的所有符号的共同特征。进而,非结

⁴ 这些是形容词的屈折变化类型,它们也同样适用于某些名词,如 Beamter (公务员)、Verwandter (亲戚)和 Gesandter (公使)。有关形容词类型的更多信息请参考第19页。

⁵ 为了方便,这些规则没有包括屈折类型相关的信息。

构化的符号无法捕捉到这样的事实，即例（13）中的规则是有共同点的。在形式化的术语中，规则之间的唯一共性在于规则左边有一个符号，而右边有两个。

我们可以引进特征来解决这一问题。我们给范畴符号指派一些特征，并且允许我们的规则将这些特征的值包含进来。举例来说，我们可以假设范畴符号 NP 具有人称、数和格的特征。对于限定词和名词来说，我们可以采用一条附加的特征来表示性，另一条特征来表示屈折类型。例（14）给出了两条规则，并用括号分别表示出特征值：⁶

- (14) NP(3,sg,nom) → Det(fem,sg,nom) N(fem,sg,nom)
 NP(3,sg,nom) → Det(mas,sg,nom) N(mas,sg,nom)

如果我们在例（14）中要用到变量而不是值，那么我们会得到例（15）中的规则格式：

- (15) NP(3,Num,Case) → Det(Gen,Num,Case) N(Gen,Num,Case)

这里变量的值并不重要，重要的是他们是搭配的。为了保证规则的有效性，这些值要按照顺序排列是非常重要的；也就是说，在限定词的范畴中，性永远排在第一位，数第二，其他往后排。人称特征的值在 NP (3, Num, Case) 的第一个位置，这是由规则决定的，并且是固定的，即第三人称。当然，值的这种限制也可以由词汇来决定：

- (16) NP(3,sg,nom) → es
 Det(mas,sg,nom) → des

(10) 中的规则可以如例（17）所示，归并到一条范式中：

- (17) S → NP(Per1,Num1,nom)
 NP(Per2,Num2,det)
 NP(Per3,Num3,acc)
 V(Per1,Num1,ditransitive)

Per1 和 Num1 在动词和主语中的实现保证了主谓一致。对于其他 NP 来说，这些特征的值是无关的。这些 NP 的格也是明确的。

2.3 语义

在引言和前面几个章节，我们主要分析了语言的句法方面，而且这本书后面的部分也主要探讨句法问题。但是，有必要提醒大家的是，我们是为了交流而使用语言的，也就是说，针对某些场景、话题或者观点来交换信息。如果我们想准确地解释我们的语言能力，那么我们还要解释我们所说的话的意义。为了达到这一目标，我们就有必要理解句法结构，但是单是这样是不够的。进而，有关语言习得的理论只是关注句法结构的习得也是不全面的。由此，句法语义接口 (syntax-

⁶ 第 6 章介绍了属性值结构。这些结构总是包括一对属性名称和属性值。在这样的情况下，值的顺序就不重要了，因为每个值都是独一无二的，并由相应的特征名称来指定。因为我们在 (13) 这样的格式中没有属性名称，所以值的顺序是重要的。

2 短语结构语法

semantics interface) 问题的重要性尤为突出, 每个语法理论都要说明句法和语义是如何互动的。在下面, 我将讲解我们是如何将短语结构规则与语义信息相结合的。为了表示意义, 我会用一阶谓词逻辑和 λ 演算。不过遗憾的是, 我们无法介绍基础逻辑知识的详细信息, 以帮助没有相关经验的读者来理解下面的内容, 但是我们这里举的这些简单的例子应该可以为句法和语义的互动关系提供一些基本的认识, 进而得到一个能够对它进行解释的语言学理论。

为了显示句子的意义是如何从它的组成部分推导出来的, 我们来看一下例 (18a)。我们将例 (18b) 中的意义指派给例 (18a) 这个句子。

- (18) a. Max schläft.
Max 睡觉
‘Max 正在睡觉。’
b. *schlafen'*(max')

这里, 我们假定 *schlafen'* 表示了 *schläft* (睡觉) 的含义。我们用初始符号来表示我们处理的是词义而不是实在的词。乍看上去, 我们用 *schlafen'* 来表示 (19a) 的意义并没有太大的变化, 因为它只不过是动词 *schläft* (睡觉) 的另一种形式。但是, 我们有必要集中在一个单一的动词形式上, 因为屈折变化与意义是无关的。我们可以通过比较例 (19a) 和 (19b) 中的句子来看:

- (19) a. Jeder Junge schläft.
每个 男孩 睡觉
‘每个男孩都在睡觉。’
b. Alle Jungen schlafen.
所有男孩 睡觉
‘所有的男孩都在睡觉。’

为了提高可读性, 我从现在开始在语义表示中使用谓词的英语释义。⁷ 所以说, (18a) 的意义表示为 (20), 而不是 (18b):

- (20) *sleep'*(max')

当我们分析 (20) 的意义时, 我们可以看出每个词都表示了哪部分含义。凭直觉来看, *max'* 来自 Max。但是棘手的问题是 *schläft* 贡献了哪些含义。如果我们考虑一个“睡觉”事件的特征的话, 那么我们就知道典型的情况是有一个人在睡觉。这个信息属于动词 *schlafen* 的含义的一部分。但是, 动词的含义并不包括睡觉的个体, 因为这个动词可以跟不同的主语搭配:

- (21) a. Paul schläft.
Paul 睡觉
‘Paul 正在睡觉。’

⁷ 需要注意的是, 我并不是说英语适合表示语言的语义关系与概念, 其实它们也可以用其他语言来表示。

- b. Mio schläft.
Mio 睡觉
'Mio 正在睡觉。'
- c. Xaver schläft.
Xaver 睡觉
'Xaver 正在睡觉。'

所以说，我们可以抽象出 *sleep'* 的任意一种具体的用法。相反，我们用变量（如 x ）来表示，如 (19b) 中的 *max'*。这个 x 可以在指定的句子中被替换为 *paul'*, *mio'* 或 *xaver'*。为了保证我们能在给定的含义中接触到这些变量，我们在它们前面写上 λ 。这样，*schläft* 的含义可以表示如下：

(22) $\lambda x \text{ sleep}'(x)$

从 (20) 到 (22) 的步骤被叫做 lambda 抽象 (lambda abstraction)。(22) 这个表达式与它的论元的意义整合过程是按照下面的方式进行的：我们去除 λ 和相应的变量，然后将变量的所有实例替换为论元的意义。如果我们将 (22) 和 (23) 中的 *max'* 整合在一起，我们就会得到 (18b) 中的含义。

(23) $\lambda x \text{ sleep}'(x) \text{ max}'$

这一过程叫做 β 还原 (β -reduction) 或 λ 变换 (λ -conversion)。为了深入说明这一概念，我们用及物动词的例子来分析。例 (24a) 中的句子具有 (24b) 所表示的含义：

- (24) a. Max mag Lotte.
Max 喜欢Lotte
'Max 喜欢 Lotte.'
- b. *like'*(*max'*, *lotte'*)

mag (喜欢) 的 λ 抽象如例 (25) 所示：

(25) $\lambda y \lambda x \text{ like}'(x, y)$

需要注意的是，第一个 λ 总是需要用在第一位的。变量 y 对应于 *mögen* 的宾语。对于英语这种语言来说，宾语和动词一起构成动词短语 (VP)，并且这个 VP 是与主语相搭配的。德语与英语不同的地方在于，德语在语序方面允许更大的自由度。造成形式意义匹配的问题在不同的理论中有不同的解决方案。我们将在下面的章节中来说明具体的解决方案。

如果我们将 (25) 中的表达式与其宾语 *Lotte* 整合在一起，我们会得到 (26a)，然后通过 β -reduction 得到 (26b)：

- (26) a. $\lambda y \lambda x \text{ like}'(x, y) \text{ lotte}'$
b. $\lambda x \text{ like}'(x, \text{lotte}')$

这一意义可以反过来与主语相整合，进而我们得到 (27a)，以及通过 β 还原后的 (27b)：

2 短语结构语法

- (27) a. $\lambda x \text{ like}'(x, \text{lotte}') \text{max}'$
b. $\text{like}'(\text{max}', \text{lotte}')$

在介绍完 lambda 演算后，我们将组合性语义整合进我们的短语结构中就比较简单了。动词跟主语组合的规则需要进一步扩展，以囊括进动词的语义贡献、主语的语义贡献，以及二者组合（整个句子）后的语义所占据的位置。完整的语义是按照正确顺序排列的个体语义的组合。由此，我们可以将（28a）中的简单规则转化为（28b）：（28b）：

- (28) a. $S \rightarrow \text{NP}(\text{nom}) V$
b. $S(V' \text{ NP}') \rightarrow \text{NP}(\text{nom}, \text{NP}') V(V')$

V' 表示 V 的意义， NP' 表示 $\text{NP}(\text{nom})$ 的意义。 $V' \text{ NP}'$ 表示 V' 和 NP' 的组合性意义。当我们分析（18a）时， V' 的意义是 $\lambda x \text{ sleep}'(x)$ ，而 NP' 的意义是 max' 。 $V' \text{ NP}'$ 的组合对应于（29a），或者在 β -reduction 后对应于（18b）—这里重复表示为（29b）：

- (29) a. $\lambda x \text{ sleep}'(x) \text{max}'$
b. $\text{sleep}'(\text{max}')$

我们可以提出（30）中的规则来处理例（24a）中的及物动词：

- (30) $S(V' \text{ NP2}' \text{ NP1}') \rightarrow \text{NP}(\text{nom}, \text{NP1}') V(V') \text{NP}(\text{acc}, \text{NP2}')$

动词（ V' ）的意义首先与宾语（ $\text{NP2}'$ ）的意义相组合，然后跟主语（ $\text{NP1}'$ ）的意义想组合。

在这一点，我们可以看到上述的短语结构规则有几条不同的语义规则。按照这一方式来分析语言的理论假说叫做基于规则的假说（rule-to-rule hypothesis）(Bach 1976: 184)。针对语言表达式的意义的推导过程将在第 5.1.4 节详细展开。

2.4 部分德语句法的短语结构规则

因为德语中相对自由的语序允许我们通过移位测试来判断句中的直接成分，所以说对句中直接成分的判断是相对容易的。相较而言，名词短语内各部分的分析则比较困难的。我们在这一节就来集中解决这一问题。为了对第 2.5 节中有关 \bar{X} 句法理论的讲解做准备，我们还会讲到介词短语。

2.4.1 名词短语

到目前为止，我们提出了名词短语的一个相对简单的结构：我们的规则规定了一个名词短语包括一个限定词和一个名词。名词短语可以是像例（31a）那样较为复杂的结构，如例（31）所示：

- (31) a. eine Frau
ART 女人
b. eine Frau, die wir kennen
ART 女人 CONJ 我们认识

- c. eine Frau aus Stuttgart
ART 女人 PREP 斯图加特
- d. eine kluge Frau
ART 聪明 女人
- e. eine Frau aus Stuttgart, die wir kennen
ART 女人 PREP 斯图加特 CONJ 我们认识
- f. eine kluge Frau aus Stuttgart
ART 聪明 女人 PREP 斯图加特
- g. eine kluge Frau, die wir kennen
ART 聪明 女人 CONJ 我们认识
- h. eine kluge Frau aus Stuttgart, die wir kennen
ART 聪明 女人 PREP 斯图加特 CONJ 我们认识

与限定词和名词一样的是，名词短语也可以包括形容词、介词短语和关系从句。例(31)中附加的成分是说明语。它们限制了名词短语所指称的物体的集合。而(31a)是指具有女人的属性的某个实体，(31b)中的所指也必须具有为我们所知的属性。

前面的名词短语规则只是简单地将名词和限定词组合在一起，这样只能用来分析例(31a)。我们现在面临的问题是如何修改这条规则，以适应于分析例(31)中的其他名词短语。除了规则(32a)之外，我们可以提出跟(32b)一样的一条规则。^{8,9}

- (32) a. $NP \rightarrow Det\ N$
b. $NP \rightarrow Det\ A\ N$

但是，这条规则并不能用来分析诸如(33)的名词短语：

- (33) alle weiteren schlagkräftigen Argumente
所有进一步 强有力 论证
‘所有其他的强有力的论证’

为了分析(33)，我们需要例(34)中的规则：

- (34) $NP \rightarrow Det\ A\ A\ N$

在名词短语中，总是有可能增加形容词的数量。而给这些形容词制定一个上限是相当武断的。即使我们选择如下的简称，仍是有问题的：

- (35) $NP \rightarrow Det\ A^*\ N$

例(35)中的星号表示任意的迭代次数。所以说，(35)包括了没有形容词，有一个、两个，或更多个形容词的规则。

问题是，根据(35)中的规则，形容词和名词并不组成一个成分，这样我们就可以不解释为什么例(36)中的并列结构仍是可能的：

⁸ 参看Eisenberg (2004: 238)中有关名词短语中平铺结构的假说。

⁹ 当然，还有诸如性和数的其他特征也应该在这一节里讨论。但是，为了降低解释的难度，我们暂不考虑这些问题。

2 短语结构语法

- (36) alle [[geschickten Kinder] und [klugen Frauen]]
所有 有能力 孩子 和 聪明 女人
‘所有有能力的孩子和聪明的女人’

如果我们假设并列涉及到具有相同句法属性的两个或两个以上的字符串的组合的话，那么我们就需要认为形容词和名词构成了一个单位。

下面的规则说明了截至目前所讨论的带形容词的名词短语：

- (37) a. $NP \rightarrow Det \bar{N}$
b. $\bar{N} \rightarrow A \bar{N}$
c. $\bar{N} \rightarrow N$

这些规则说明了：一个名词短语包括一个限定词和一个名词性成分 (\bar{N})。这个名词性成分包括一个形容词和一个名词性成分 (37b)，或者只包括一个名词 (37c)。因为 \bar{N} 也位于 (37b) 中规则的右边，所以我们可以多次应用这一规则，并且用它来说明诸如 (33) 的带有多个形容词的名词短语。图 2.3 on the following page 给出了不带形容词的名词短语、带一个形容词的名词短语和带两个形容词的名词短语的结构。形容词 *klug* (聪明) 限定了名词短语所指的集合。如果我们假设另一个形容词，如 *glücklich* (开心)，那么它只是指那些既开心又聪明的女人。这种名词短语可以用在如下的语境中：

- (38) A: Alle klugen Frauen sind unglücklich.
所有聪明 女人 COP 不开心
B: Nein, ich kenne eine glückliche kluge Frau.
不 我 认识 ART 开心 聪明 女人

我们观察到，这段话可以加上 “Aber alle glücklichen klugen Frauen sind schön” (但是所有开心和聪明的女人都是漂亮的)，以及一个相应的回答。在我们的规则系统中，(37) 也允许了在名词短语中增加更多形容词的情况，如 “eine glückliche kluge Frau” (一个开心的、聪明的女人)。在规则 (37b) 中， \bar{N} 既出现在规则的左右，也出现在规则的右边。这类规则被看作是递归的 (recursive)。

我们现在构建了一套精巧的语法，可以用它来分析带有形容词性修饰语的名词短语。结果是，形容词和名词的组合构成一个组成成分。我们也可以想到这个问题，即限定词和形容词是否能够构成一个成分，如下类名词短语：

- (39) diese schlaun und diese neugierigen Frauen
这些 聪明 和 这些 好奇 女人

这里，我们分析一个不同的结构。虽然有两个完整的 NP 并列在一起，但是第一个并列成分的一部分被删除了。

- (40) diese schlaun ~~Frauen~~ und diese neugierigen Frauen
这些 聪明 女人 和 这些 好奇 女人

我们也可以在句子，甚至是词层面发现类似的现象：




图 2.3: 带有不同数量的形容词的名词短语

- (41) a. dass Peter dem Mann das Buch ~~gibt~~ und Maria der Frau die Schallplatte
 CONJ Peter DET 人 DET 书 给 和 Maria DET 女人 DET 唱片
 gibt
 给
 ‘Peters 给这个人这本书, 并且 Maria 给这个女人这张唱片’
- b. be- und ent-laden
 PRT 和 PRT-装载
 ‘装载和卸载’

到目前为止, 我们讨论了如何能够将形容词整合进我们的有关名词短语的规则当中。其他说明语, 如介词短语或关系小句, 也可以按照类似的方式将形容词加入N̄之中。

- (42) a. $\bar{N} \rightarrow \bar{N} PP$

2 短语结构语法

b. $\bar{N} \rightarrow \bar{N}$ relative clause

有了这些规则和 (37) 的那些规则，我们就可以设想 PP 和关系小句的规则，并用它们来分析 (31) 中的例子。

(37c) 说明了 \bar{N} 有可能只带一个名词。但我们还没有讨论更为重要的规则：我们需要另一个规则来整合名词与它们所带的论元成分。如例 (43a-b) 所示，这些名词有 Vater (爸爸)、Sohn (儿子) 和 Bild (照片) 这类关系名词 (relational nouns)。例 (43c) 说明了动词与其所带论元的名词化过程：

- (43) a. der Vater von Peter
DET 爸爸 PREP Peter
‘Peter 的爸爸’
- b. das Bild vom Gleimtunnel
DET 照片 PREP.DET 格莱姆隧道
‘格莱姆隧道的照片’
- c. das Kommen des Installateurs
DET 来 DET 水管工
‘水管工的检查’

下面是用来分析 (43a,b) 的规则，如 (44) 所示：(44):

(44) $\bar{N} \rightarrow N PP$

图 2.4 说明了带 PP 论元的两种结构。右边的树形图还包括一个额外的 PP 说明语，并由 (42a) 中的规则来允准。




图 2.4: 名词与位于右侧的作为说明语的 PP 补足语 “vom Gleimtunnel” 的组合

除了上述讨论的 NP 结构，还有限定语或名词缺失的其他结构。名词可以通过省略而被删除。(45) 给出了名词短语的一个例子，这里不需要补足语的名词被省略了。例 (46) 说明了名词只有一个限定语，而且其补足语被实现了，而不是名词本身。下划线表明了名词正常应该出现的位置。

- (45) a. eine kluge _
ART 聪明
‘一个聪明的’

- b. eine kluge große _
ART 聪明 高
‘一个聪明的高的’
- c. eine kluge _ aus Hamburg
ART 聪明 PREP 汉堡
‘一位从汉堡来的聪明的’
- d. eine kluge _, die alle kennen
ART 聪明 CONJ 所有人知道
‘一个大家都知道的聪明的’
- (46) a. (Nein, nicht der Vater von Klaus), der _ von Peter war gemeint.
不 不 DET 爸爸 PREP Klaus DET PREP Peter AUX 指的是
‘不, 指的不是 Klaus 的爸爸, 而是 Peter 的爸爸。’
- b. (Nein, nicht das Bild von der Stadtautobahn), das _ vom Gleimtunnel
不 不 DET 图片 PREP DET 公路 DET PREP DET 格莱姆隧道
war beeindruckend.
AUX 印象深刻
‘不, 不是公路的照片让人印象深刻, 而是格莱姆隧道的照片。’
- c. (Nein, nicht das Kommen des Tischlers), das _ des Installateurs ist
不 不 DET 来 DET 木匠 DET DET 水管工 COP
wichtig.
重要
‘不, 木匠来不重要, 而是水管工来很重要。’

在英语中, 代词 *one* 必须用在相应的位置上,¹⁰ 但是德语中, 名词 就被简单地省略了。在短语结构语法中, 这就叫做 ϵ 生成式 (epsilon production)。例 ((47a) 中, 这些规则被一个空成分所替代。例 (47b) 中的规则是与术语 ϵ 生成式 (epsilon production) 相关的变量:

- (47) a. $N \rightarrow$
b. $N \rightarrow \epsilon$

相应的树形图如图 2.5 on the next page 所示。回到盒子的比喻, 例 (47) 中的规则像是贴有同样标签的空盒子, 就好像是普通名词的盒子一样。正如我们在前面所强调的, 当我们思考的是将这些盒子放在哪里的问题时, 装在盒子里的内容就不重要了。由此, 例 (31) 中的名词短语可以在同样的句子中出现。空名词盒子也可以像一个真正名词那样。如果我们不打开这个空盒子, 我们就不会知道它与装满东西的盒子有什么不同。

我们不仅可以在名词短语中省略名词, 在某些语境中, 限定词也可以不出现。例 (48) 显示了复数的名词短语:

¹⁰ 参看 Fillmore et al. (2012: Section 4.12), 在英语中这些例子没有代词 *one*。

2 短语结构语法




图 2.5: 没有明显中心语的名词短语

- (48) a. Frauen
 女人
 b. Frauen, die wir kennen
 女人 CONJ 我们认识
 c. kluge Frauen
 聪明 女人
 d. kluge Frauen, die wir kennen
 聪明 女人 CONJ 我们认识

如果名词是集合名词的话，限定词在单数时可以被省略：

- (49) a. Getreide
 庄稼
 b. Getreide, das gerade gemahlen wurde
 粮食 CONJ 刚 种 AUX
 ‘刚种的庄稼’
 c. frisches Getreide
 新鲜 庄稼
 d. frisches Getreide, das gerade gemahlen wurde
 新鲜 粮食 CONJ 刚刚 种 AUX
 ‘刚种的新鲜的庄稼’

最后，限定词和名词都可以被省略：

- (50) a. Ich helfe klugen.
 我 帮助 聪明
 ‘我帮助聪明人。’

- b. Dort drüben steht frisches, das gerade gemahlen wurde.
那儿那边 有 新鲜 CONJ 刚 种 AUX
‘在那边有一些刚种的新鲜的（庄稼）。’

图 2.6显示了相应的树形图。




图 2.6: 没有明显限定词的名词短语

针对我们目前提出的规则，有两点需要说明：截至目前，我一直在说形容词。但是，在名词前的位置上可以有非常复杂的形容词短语。这些可以是带补足语（51a,b）的形容词或者是形容词性助词（51c,d）：

- (51) a. der seiner Frau treue Mann
DET 他的.DAT 妻子忠诚 男人
‘忠于妻子的男人’
b. der auf seinen Sohn stolze Mann
DET PREP 他的.ACC 儿子 骄傲 男人
‘以儿子为骄傲的男人’
c. der seine Frau liebende Mann
DET 他的.ACC 女人爱 男人
‘爱妻子的男人’
d. der von seiner Frau geliebte Mann
DET PREP 他的.DAT 妻子爱 男人
‘被妻子爱的男人’

把这点考虑进来的话，我们需要将规则（37b）按照如下的方式来修改：

- (52) $\bar{N} \rightarrow AP \bar{N}$

一个形容词短语（AP）可以包括一个 NP 和一个形容词，一个 PP 和一个形容词或者仅仅是一个形容词：

2 短语结构语法

- (53) a. $AP \rightarrow NP A$
b. $AP \rightarrow PP A$
c. $AP \rightarrow A$

就目前我们提出的规则而言，还有两点不如意的结果。就是例（53c）和例（37c）中不带补足语的形容词或名词的规则，这里重复显示为例（54）：

- (54) $\bar{N} \rightarrow N$

如果我们应用这些规则，那么我们会生成一元的子树，即只有一个母节点只有一个子节点的树。如图 2.6 所示。如果我们援引盒子的比喻，这就意味着一个盒子中只装有一个盒子。

原则上来说，没有人能阻止我们将这一信息放进更大的盒子中。我们不用（55）的规则，只是简单应用（56）中的规则：

- (55) a. $A \rightarrow kluge$
b. $N \rightarrow Mann$
- (56) a. $AP \rightarrow kluge$
b. $\bar{N} \rightarrow Mann$

例（56a）说明了 *kluge*（聪明）与完整的形容词短语具有相同的属性。特别是，它不能带补足语。这与（2）和（6）的语法中，代词 *er*（他）作为一个 NP 的范畴类型是一致的。

将 \bar{N} 指派给不需要补足语的名词是有优势的，我们不需要解释为什么（57b）和（57a）中的分析是可能的，尽管二者在意义上没有什么分别。

- (57) a. $[_{NP} \text{ einige } [_{\bar{N}} \text{ kluge } [_{\bar{N}} [_{N} \text{ Frauen }] \text{ und } [_{\bar{N}} [_{N} \text{ Männer }]]]]]]$
一些 聪明 女人 和 男人
- b. $[_{NP} \text{ einige } [_{\bar{N}} \text{ kluge } [_{\bar{N}} [_{N} [_{N} \text{ Frauen }] \text{ und } [_{N} \text{ Männer }]]]]]]$
一些 聪明 女人 和 男人

例（57a）中，两个名词被投射到 \bar{N} ，并且随后并列起来。属于同一范畴的两个成分并列的结果一定会是属于该范畴的一个新成分。在（57a）的例子中，这也是 \bar{N} 。这个成分随后与形容词和限定词相组合。在（57b）中，名词本身是一个并列结构。并列的结果一定是跟其组成成分具有一样的范畴。在这个例子中，这个范畴是 N 。这个 N 变成 \bar{N} ，然后与形容词相组合。如果不带补足语的名词被看作是 \bar{N} ，而不是 N ，我们就会遇到假歧义（*spurious ambiguities*）问题。例（58）中的结构是唯一可能的分析结果。

- (58) $[_{NP} \text{ einige } [_{\bar{N}} \text{ kluge } [_{\bar{N}} [_{\bar{N}} \text{ Frauen }] \text{ und } [_{\bar{N}} \text{ Männer }]]]]]]$
一些 聪明 女人 和 男人

2.4.2 介词短语

与名词短语的句法相比，介词短语（PPs）的句法相对来说就比较简单了。PPs 通常包括一个介词和一个名词短语，这个名词短语的格属性由介词决定。我们可以用下面的规则来表示：

(59) $PP \rightarrow P NP$

当然，这个规则也必须包括 NP 的格信息。为了方便，我在上面的 NP-规则和 AP-规则中省略了格信息。

下面（60）中的语法选自《杜登语法》(Eisenberg et al. 2005: §1300)，这里的介词短语进一步界定了介词所述方式的语义，如下所示：

- (60) a. [[Einen Schritt] vor dem Abgrund] blieb er stehen.
 ART 步 PREP DET 深渊 保留 他站
 ‘他在离深渊一步之遥的地方站住了。’
- b. [[Kurz] nach dem Start] fiel die Klimaanlage aus.
 短暂 PREP DET 起飞 坏 DET 空调 PTCP
 ‘起飞后不久，空调就停止工作了。’
- c. [[Schräg] hinter der Scheune] ist ein Weiher.
 斜 PREP DET 谷仓 COP ART 池塘
 ‘在谷仓的斜对面有一个池塘。’
- d. [[Mitten] im Urwald] stießen die Forscher auf einen alten Tempel.
 中间 PREP.DET 丛林 碰到 DET 研究人员PREP ART 古老 寺庙
 ‘在丛林当中，研究者碰到了一栋古老的寺庙。’

为了分析例（60a,b）中的句子，我们可以提出下面这些规则，如（61）所示：

- (61) a. $PP \rightarrow NP PP$
 b. $PP \rightarrow AP PP$

这些规则利用 PP 来表示动作的方式。最后得到的成分是另一个 PP。我们有必要在（60a,b）中利用这些规则来分析介词短语，但是我们无法应用这些规则来分析（62）中的句子：

- (62) a. * $[_{PP} \text{einen Schritt } [_{PP} \text{kurz } [_{PP} \text{vor dem Abgrund}]]]$
 ART 步 短 PREP DET 深渊
- b. * $[_{PP} \text{kurz } [_{PP} \text{einen Schritt } [_{PP} \text{vor dem Abgrund}]]]$
 短 ART 步 PREP DET 深渊

（61）中的所有规则被用来分析（62）中的例子。由于在规则的左边和右边都有 PP，我们可以按照我们所希望的任意顺序和次数来应用这些规则。

为了避免这些不需要的副作用的产生，我们可以修改前面提出的规则：

- (63) a. $PP \rightarrow NP \bar{P}$

2 短语结构语法

- b. $PP \rightarrow AP \bar{P}$
- c. $PP \rightarrow \bar{P}$
- d. $\bar{P} \rightarrow P NP$

规则 (59) 变成了 (63d))。 (63c) 中的规则证明了 PP 可以包括 \bar{P} 。图 2.7 显示了应用 (63c) 和 (63d) 对 (64) 的分析，以及在规则 (63b) 和 (63d) 的约束下形容词位于首位的例子：

(64) vor dem Abgrund
PREP DET 深渊
‘在深渊前’




图 2.7: 带和不带方式的介词短语

有读者可能对图 2.7 有疑问，为什么左图中没有表示空方式的短语？这与图 2.6 中所示的空限定语是相似的。图 2.6 中的空限定词是指没有限定词的名词短语与有限定词的名词短语表示的意义是一样的。通常由可见的限定词表示的意义以某种方式整合进名词短语的结构之中了。如果我们在空限定语中没有表示这层意思的话，将会导致有关语义整合的更为复杂的问题：我们只是需要了解第 2.3 节表示的机制，而且这些信息是比较普遍的。意义是由这些词本身决定的，而不是由规则决定的。如果我们假设在图 2.7 中左边的那棵树那样有一条一元的规则，而不是空限定词的话，那么这个一元规则就应该提供限定词的语义。有些学者提出了这种分析。更多的有关空语类的内容参看第 19 章。

与没有限定词的 NP 不同的是，不带有关程度或方式的介词短语并不缺少任何意义的组成部分。所以说，我们没有必要假设有一个表示方式的空语类，并对整个 PP 有语义贡献。由此，(63c) 中的规则说明了介词短语包括 \bar{P} ，即由 P 和 NP 构成。

2.5 \bar{X} 理论

如果我们回顾前面章节中介绍的规则，我们会发现中心语永远和他们的补足语相组合，以构成一个新的成分 (65a,b)，然后再与其它成分 (65c,d) 相组合：

- (65) a. $\bar{N} \rightarrow N PP$
 b. $\bar{P} \rightarrow P NP$
 c. $NP \rightarrow Det \bar{N}$
 d. $PP \rightarrow NP \bar{P}$

研究英语的语法学家发现平行结构可以用来表示那些以形容词或动词作为中心语的短语。在这里，我先讨论形容词短语，之后在第 3 章讨论动词短语。与德语一样的是，英语中可以带补足语的形容词是有严格限制的，即这些带补足语的形容词短语在英语中不能出现在名词性成分之前。如下例 (66) 所示：

- (66) a. He is proud.
 他 COP 骄傲
 ‘他感到很骄傲。’
 b. He is very proud.
 他 COP 非常骄傲
 ‘他感到非常骄傲。’
 c. He is proud of his son.
 他 COP 骄傲 PREP 他的儿子
 ‘他为他的儿子感到骄傲。’
 d. He is very proud of his son.
 他 COP 非常骄傲 PREP 他的儿子
 ‘他为他的儿子感到非常骄傲。’

与介词短语不同的是，带补足语的形容词通常是可选的。proud (骄傲) 可以带或不带 PP。表达程度的 very (很) 也是可以选择的。

(67) 中有针对这一分析的规则，在图 2.8 on the following page 中显示了相应的结构。

- (67) a. $AP \rightarrow \bar{A}$
 b. $AP \rightarrow AdvP \bar{A}$
 c. $\bar{A} \rightarrow A PP$
 d. $\bar{A} \rightarrow A$




图 2.8: 英语的形容词短语

正如在第 2.2 节所显示的，我们可以对具体的短语结构规则进行扩展，并最终得到更具有普遍性的规则。按照这一方式，诸如人称、数和性这些属性不再按照范畴符号来进行编码，而是采用更为简单的符号，如 NP、Det 和 N。我们只需要明确那些在给定规则的语境中相关的特征的值。我们可以进一步抽象为：与其采用明确的范畴符号，如词范畴的 N、V、P 和 A，以及短语范畴的 NP、VP、PP 和 AP，不如简单地采用词类的变量，并用 X 和 XP 来表示。

这种抽象的方式就叫做 \bar{X} theory（或者 X-bar 理论，*bar* 这个术语是指在符号上面的线）。该理论由 Chomsky (1970) 提出，并由 Jackendoff (1977) 完善。这种形式的抽象规则在很多不同的理论中发挥了重要的作用。比如说：管辖与约束理论（第 3 章）、扩展的短语结构语法（第 5 章）和词汇功能语法（第 7 章）。在中心语驱动的短语结构语法（第 9 章）中， \bar{X} 理论也起到了重要的作用，但是并没有采纳 \bar{X} 范式的所有限制条件。

例 (68) 说明了应用 \bar{X} 规则的可能的实例，X 范畴被放在了 N 的位置上，就好像这些词串的例子都是由这些规则生成的：

(68) \bar{X} rule	with specific categories	example strings
$\bar{X} \rightarrow \overline{\text{specifier}} \bar{X}$	$\bar{N} \rightarrow \overline{\text{DET}} \bar{N}$	the [picture of Paris]
$\bar{X} \rightarrow \bar{X} \overline{\text{adjunct}}$	$\bar{N} \rightarrow \bar{N} \overline{\text{REL_CLAUSE}}$	[picture of Paris] [that everybody knows]
$\bar{X} \rightarrow \overline{\text{adjunct}} \bar{X}$	$\bar{N} \rightarrow \bar{A} \bar{N}$	beautiful [picture of Paris]
$\bar{X} \rightarrow \bar{X} \overline{\text{complement}^*}$	$\bar{N} \rightarrow \bar{N} \bar{P}$	picture [of Paris]

任何一个词类都可以替代 X（如 V，A 或 P）。在上面的规则中，没有横杠的 X 表示一个词汇项。如果想把横杠明确地显示出来，就需要写成 X^0 。正如 (15) 中的规则所示，我们并没有明确指定限定词或名词的格的值，而是简单地要求在规则右边的值与之相符，(68) 中的规则要求规则右边（X 或 \bar{X} ）的元素的词类与规则左边（ \bar{X} 或 \bar{X} ）的元素的词类是一致的。

一个词汇项能跟它的补足语相组合。最后一条规则中的 “*” 表示它后面的符号可以不受限制地重复。一个特殊的情况是补足语的缺失。在 *das Bild* 中，Bild 没有 PP 担当补足语，由此变成了 \bar{N} 。词汇项及其补足语结合的结果是 X 的一个新的投射层：投射层 1，并由一个横杠来表示。之后， \bar{X} 可以跟说明语相组合。这一过程

发生在 \bar{X} 的左边或右边。这一组合过程的结果仍然是一个 \bar{X} ，也就是说，将一个说明语组合进来并没有改变投射层。最大投射由两个横杠表示。我们也可以将XP写成带有两个横杠的X。一个XP包括一个指定语和 \bar{X} 。在有些理论中，句子中的主语和NP中的限定词都是指定语。进而，形容词短语中的程度修饰词和介词短语中的方式指示词也被算作是指定语。

非中心语的位置只能满足最大投射，所以补足语、说明语和指定语总是有两个横杠。图2.9显示了短语结构的最小结构和最大结构。




图 2.9: 短语的最小和最大结构

有些范畴没有指定语或者只有一个。说明语也是可选的，所以，并不是所有结构都包括带有说明语子节点的 \bar{X} 。除了右边图上的分支所示的，带说明语的XP和中心语-说明语有时也是成立的。在(68)中，只有一条规则是针对中心语在补足语之前的情况，当然，补足语在中心语之前的顺序也是可能的，如图2.9所示。

图2.10 on the following page 显示了对NP结构“das Bild”(这张图片)和“das schöne Bild von Paris”(这张巴黎的美丽图片)的分析。图2.10中的NP结构和图2.8中的树形图都是最小产出结构的例子。图2.10中左边的属性图也是没有说明语的结构的一个例子。图2.10中的右手结构是最大产出结构的一个例子：指定语、说明语和补足语都是齐全的。

图2.10中的分析说明了规则中的所有非中心语都是短语。这样，我们就需要认为这是一个限定短语，即使限定词没有跟其他元素相组合。限定词的一元结构并不好看，但是它是自足的。¹¹在图2.10中，Paris(巴黎)这个NP的一元分支看起来也有点奇怪，但是如果我们把它放进更为复杂的名词短语之中，他们就不那么奇怪了：

- (69) a. das Paris der dreißiger Jahre
 DET 巴黎 DET 三十 年
 ‘30年代的巴黎’
 b. die Maria aus Hamburg
 DET Maria PREP 汉堡
 ‘来自汉堡的 Maria’

¹¹ 有的 \bar{X} 理论并不认为限定词有复杂的结构，请看Muysken (1982)。




图 2.10: “das Bild”（这张图片）和 “das schöne Bild von Paris”（这张巴黎的美丽图片）的 \bar{X} 分析

虽然一元投射有些不够优雅，但是我们不用过于担心，因为在（56）有关词汇项的讨论中，大部分情况下一元分支节点都是可以避免的，或者说我们争取避免这样的结构。如果不这样做的话，我们会得到假歧义结构。在下面的章节中，我们将讨论范畴语法和中心语驱动的短语结构语法，这些语法理论没有针对限定词、形容词和名词的一元规则。

再者，其他的 \bar{X} 理论与本书所讨论的理论也有不同的看法。特别是，我们将不予理会非中心语永远作为最大投射这一条假设。Pullum (1985) 和 Kornai & Pullum (1990) 认为，有些理论并不一定没有严格的 \bar{X} 理论的限制多。也可以参考第 13.1.2 节中的讨论。

思考题

1. 为什么只用原子式范畴的短语结构语法不足以描写自然语言呢？
2. 让我们来看一下（6）中的文法，为了分析到例（70）中的符号 V，我们应该采取哪些（替换符号的）步骤？

- (70) er das Buch dem Mann gibt
 他DET 书 DET 人 给
 ‘他给这个人这本书。’

你的回答应该与（3）中的分析保持一致。

3. 请应用谓词逻辑来表示例（71）的意义：

- (71) a. Ulrike kennt Hans.
 Ulrike 认识 Hans
 b. Joshi freut sich.
 Joshi 高兴 REFL
 ‘Joshi 很高兴。’

练习题

1. 在第 51 页，我认为句子（1）的分析可以有无限多种可能的文法。为什么这种说法是正确的？
2. 请说明哪个文法或哪些文法是最好的？
3. 在第 2.4.1 节，我们给出了名词短语的一部分句法。为什么说例（72）中的规则是有问题的？

- (72) a. $NP \rightarrow Det \bar{N}$
 b. $\bar{N} \rightarrow N$
 c. $Det \rightarrow \epsilon$
 d. $N \rightarrow \epsilon$

4. 为什么在词典中把 books 标记为 NP 是不合适的？
5. 为什么对于 books 这类名词来说，下面的规则并不适用？

- (73) $NP \rightarrow Modifier^* \text{books} Modifier^*$

（73）中的规则说明了有无限数量的修饰语与名词 books 相组合，并且其后也有无限数量的修饰语。我们可以应用这个规则来生成例（74）中的短语：

- (74) a. books
 书
 ‘书’
 b. interesting books
 有趣 书
 ‘有趣的书’

2 短语结构语法

- c. interesting books from Stuttgart
有趣 书 PREP 斯图加特
‘斯图加特的有趣的书’

请在你的回答中考虑到并列的语料。请假设对称的并列结构要求其并列的短语或词具有相同的句法属性。

6. Fillmore et al. (2012)提出, 对于例(75)中的无名词结构, 应该将其看作是由限定词 the 和形容词相组合的短语结构。

- (75) a. Examine the plight of the very poor.
检查 DET 困境 PREP DET 非常穷
‘了解穷人的困境’
b. Their outfits range from the flamboyant to the functional.
他们的套装 范围 PREP DET 华丽 PREP DET 功能性
‘他们套装从华丽的到功能性的都有。’
c. The unimaginable happened.
DET 不可想象的 发生
‘不可思议的事情发生了。’

例(76)说明了对应于其结构的短语结构规则:

- (76) NP → the Adj

Adj 表示 poor 这样的单词或者 very poor 这样的复合体。

再来看(45)和(46)中的德语语料, 并说明为什么这么分析, 而且为什么例(77)中的更为普遍的分析不能扩展到德语的应用之中。

- (77) NP → Det Adj

7. 为什么 \bar{X} 理论不能说明没有额外假设的德语形容词短语呢?(这一问题只适合于操德语(为母语)者。)
8. 请写出能够分析例(78)中的句子, 并且能排除例(79)的句子的短语结构文法。

- (78) a. Der Mann hilft der Frau.
DET.NOM 男人 帮助DET.DAT 女人
‘这个男人帮助这个女人。’
b. Er gibt ihr das Buch.
他.NOM 给 她.DAT DET 书
‘他给她这本书。’

- c. Er wartet auf ein Wunder.
 他.NOM 等 PREP ART 奇迹
 ‘他在等奇迹发生。’

- (79) a. *Der Mann hilft er.
 DET.NOM 人 帮助他.NOM
 b. *Er gibt ihr den Buch.
 他.NOM 给 她.DAT DET.M 书.N

9. 为了分析下述句子，你应该对上述习题中完成的文法做哪些修改？

- (80) a. Der Mann hilft der Frau jetzt.
 DET.NOM 男人 帮助DET.DAT 女人现在
 ‘这个男人在帮助这个女人。’
 b. Der Mann hilft der Frau neben dem Bushäuschen.
 DET.NOM 男人 帮助DET.DAT 女人PREP DET 公交车候车亭
 ‘这个男人帮助公交车候车亭旁边的那个女人。’
 c. Er gibt ihr das Buch jetzt.
 他.NOM 给 她.DAT DET.ACC 书 现在
 ‘他现在给她这本书。’
 d. Er gibt ihr das Buch neben dem Bushäuschen.
 他.NOM 给 她.DAT DET.ACC 书 PREP DET 公交车候车亭
 ‘他给她公交车候车亭旁的那本书。’
 e. Er wartet jetzt auf ein Wunder.
 他.NOM 等 现在PREP ART 奇迹
 ‘他在等奇迹发生。’
 f. Er wartet neben dem Bushäuschen auf ein Wunder.
 他.NOM 等 PREP DET.DAT 公交车候车亭PREP ART 奇迹
 ‘他在等公交车候车亭旁的奇迹发生。’

10. 请安装 Prolog 系统（如 SWI-Prolog¹²）并测试你的语法。详细的使用说明可以在对应手册中定子句文法（Definite Clause Grammar, DCG）的关键词下面找到。

延伸阅读

在短语结构语法中加入特征的扩展最早是由Harman (1963)在 1963 年提出的。

¹² <http://www.swi-prolog.org>

2 短语结构语法

本章所讨论的有关名词短语的短语结构语法覆盖了名词短语句法的大部分内容，但是仍不能解释某些特定的 NP 结构。而且，练习（3）也说明了目前文法的一些问题。Netter (1998)和Kiss (2005)在 HPSG 理论框架下讨论了这一问题，并提出了解决方案。

针对语义信息整合进短语结构语法中的讨论是比较少的。有关谓词逻辑的讨论以及它如何整合进短语结构语法中，还有量词辖域的讨论，可以参考 Blackburn & Bos (2005)。

第三章 转换语法-管辖与约束理论

转换语法 (Transformational Grammar) 和它的后续理论 (如管辖与约束理论、最简方案) 是由乔姆斯基在波士顿的麻省理工大学提出来的 (Chomsky 1957, 1965, 1975, 1981a, 1986a, 1995b)。Manfred Bierwisch (1963) 最早将乔姆斯基的想法应用到德语的分析中。在六十年代, 最有代表性的组织是德意志民主共和国 (GDR) 科学研究所的结构语法研究小组 (Arbeitsstelle Strukturelle Grammatik)。相关历史可以参考 Bierwisch 1992 和 Vater 2010。除了 Bierwisch 所做的工作, 下面这些专注于研究德语或者乔姆斯基的著作也是值得关注的: Fanselow (1987)、Fanselow & Felix (1987)、von Stechow & Sternefeld (1988)、Grewendorf (1988)、Haider (1993)、Sternefeld (2006)。

针对乔姆斯基理论的不同应用通常被归入到生成语法 (Generative Grammar) 的名头下面。这一术语来源于这样的事实, 乔姆斯基提出的短语结构语法和其扩充的理论框架可以生成合乎语法的表达式 (请看第50页)。正是这一组句子在形式上构成了一种语言, 我们可以通过检查一个特定的句子是否是由给定的文法生成的句子集合中的一部分来判断该句子是否属于该语言。从这个意义来看, 简单的短语结构语法与相应的形式化理论, GPSG、LFG、HPSG 和构式语法 (Construction Grammar, CxG) 都属于生成理论。近年来, 以形式化为基础的理论不断涌现, 如 LFG、HPSG 和 CxG, 前述的语法理论现在被称为模型理论 (model theoretic), 而不是生成组配的¹。(请看第 14 章的讨论)。在 1965 年, 乔姆斯基按照如下这种方式来界定生成语法 (Generative Grammar) 这一概念 (也可以参考 Chomsky 1995b: 162):

一种语言的语法应该是对理想的听者-说者的内在能力的描写。进而, 如果这种语法能够完美地表示出来-按照另一种说法, 如果它不依赖于读者的智力, 而只是针对他的贡献给出一个明确的分析的话-我们就可以将之称为生成语法 (generative grammar)。(Chomsky 1965: 4)

按照这一定义, 这本书所讨论的所有语法理论都应该被看作是生成语法。为了进一步区分, 有时会用主流的生成语法 (Mainstream Generative Grammar, MGG) 这一概念 (Culicover & Jackendoff 2005: 3) 来表示乔姆斯基式模型。在这一章, 我将阐述一个发展全面且影响深远的乔姆斯基式语法, 即管辖和约束理论。最近的有关乔姆斯基的最简方案的内容将在第 4 章具体说明。

¹ 模型理论的方法总是基于约束的, 所以说模型理论 (model theoretic) 和基于约束的理论 (constraint-based) 有时是同义的。

3.1 关于表示形式的一般说明

这一节说明本章的主要内容。在第 3.1.1 节, 我将介绍转换的概念。第 3.1.2 节介绍了有关语言习得的假设的背景信息, 这些信息在一定程度上构成了理论。第 3.1.3 节介绍了所谓的 T 模型, 即管辖和约束理论的基本模型。第 3.1.4 节介绍了管辖和约束中用到的 \bar{X} 理论的特殊形式, 第 3.1.5 节展示了 \bar{X} 理论的这个版本是如何应用在英语中的。有关英语句子的分析的讨论是理解对德语的分析的前提条件, 因为在管辖和约束理论框架下的许多分析都是按照英语的分析来模拟的。第 3.1.6 节介绍了针对德语小句的分析, 这些分析方法参考了第 3.1.5 节中对英语的分析。

3.1.1 转换

在前一章, 我介绍了简单的短语结构语法。Chomsky (1957: Chapter 5) 批判了这种重写文法, 因为 – 按照他的说法 – 我们无法捕捉到主动句和被动句之间的关系, 也无法说明句中成分排序的不同可能性。当然, 我们可以在短语结构语法中给主动句和被动句不同的规则。例如, 一对规则给不及物动词 (1), 一条规则给及物动词 (2), 再有一条规则给双及物动词 (3)。但是这样仍然无法充分地说明同样的现象会发生在例 (1) – (3) 的句对儿中:

- (1) a. weil dort noch jemand arbeitet
因为那儿仍 有人 工作
‘因为有人还在那儿工作’
b. weil dort noch gearbeitet wurde
因为那儿仍 工作 AUX
‘因为那儿还有需要做的工作’
- (2) a. weil er den Weltmeister schlägt
因为他DET 世界冠军 击败
‘因为他击败了世界冠军’
b. weil der Weltmeister geschlagen wurde
因为DET 世界冠军 击败 AUX
‘因为世界冠军被击败了’
- (3) a. weil der Mann der Frau den Schlüssel stiehlt
因为DET 男人 DET 女人DET 钥匙 偷
‘因为这个男人正在从这个女人这儿偷钥匙’
b. weil der Frau der Schlüssel gestohlen wurde
因为DET 女人DET 钥匙 偷 AUX
‘因为这把钥匙从这个女人这里被偷走了’

Chomsky (1957: 43) 提出了一个转换过程, 以在主动句和被动句之间创建联系。他认为, 英语的被动式变换有着下面的形式, 如 (4) 所示:

- (4) $NP\ V\ NP \rightarrow 3\ [_{AUX}\ be]\ 2en\ [_{PP}\ [_P\ by]\ 1]$
 1 2 3

这个转换规则可以看成是带有规则左手边的符号的一棵树匹配到带有规则右手边的符号的另一棵树上。相应地，规则右边的 1、2 和 3 也对应于规则左手边的数字对应的符号。*en* 表示构成助词（seen、been，还有 loved）的语素。例（5a,b）的树形图如图 3.1 所示。

- (5) a. John loves Mary.
 John 爱 Mary
 ‘John 爱着 Mary。’
 b. Mary is loved by John.
 Mary AUX 爱 PREP John
 ‘Mary 正被 John 爱着。’

~>




图 3.1: 被动式变换的应用

在转换规则左边的符号并不必是受限于域内的，也就是说它们可以是不同母节点的子节点，如图 3.1 所示。

重写文法按照他们的属性被分成四个复杂的类别。最简单的文法被分到第 3 类，最复杂的叫做 0 型。所谓的上下文无关文法（context-free grammar）is context-free grammar 叫做 2 型文法。转换文法运训符号被任意其他符号所替换，叫做 0 型文法 (Peters & Ritchie 1973)。在对自然语言的复杂度进行研究的基础上，我们发现最复杂的 0 型文法对于自然语言来说太复杂了。按照这一观点，假设我们需要针对语言知识进行受限的形式化演算 (Chomsky 1965: 62)，我们需要限制转换的形式

3 转换语法-管辖与约束理论

与潜在力量。² 针对转换语法的早期版本的另一个争论是，由于缺乏限制，转换进行互动的方式是不够清楚的。而且，针对省略的材料而言，转换也是有问题的（请看Klenk 2003: Section 3.1.4）。基于上述原因，新的理论被提出来，如管辖与约束理论 (Chomsky 1981a)。在这个模型下，语法规则的形式受到严格的限制（请看第 3.1.4 节）。通过转换而移动定元素仍然在他们原始的位置上，这样就使得原始位置是可获得的，也就为语义解读提供了可能。也有更具有普遍性的原则来限制转换过程。

在了解了管辖与约束理论中有关语言习得模型的一些最初的看法之后，我们来仔细看一下短语结构语法、转换和限制。

3.1.2 有关语言习得的假说：原则与参数理论

Chomsky (1965: Section I.8) 认为，语言知识一定是内置的，因为语言系统就是如此。所以说，我们不可能仅凭一般的认知规律依靠有限的输入而学会语言（也可以看第 13.8 节）。如果我们不能仅仅通过与环境的互动而学会语言的话，那么至少我们的部分语言能力是内置的。问题是到底有多少是内置的，还有人类是否真有一套语言的内在机制也是充满争议的，再有在过去的几十年中，对于这一问题的看法也发生了很多的变化。有关这一议题的代表性著作有 citewPinker94a、Tomasello (1995)、Wunderlich (2004)、Hauser, Chomsky & Fitch (2002) 和 Chomsky (2007)。更多的内容可以参看第 13 章。

Chomsky (1981a) 还指出，还有一些普遍的、内在的原则是语法结构所不能违反的。这些原则是许多参数，即不只有一个选项。参数设置在不同语言中是不同的。如下面的例（6）中的参数化原则：

(6) 原则：中心语是在补足语的前面或者后面，这取决于参数的值 POSITION。

原则与参数模型 (P&P 模型) 认为，语言习得中的一个重要部分在于从语言输入中提取足够的信息来设置参数。Chomsky (2000: 8) 用开关的开和关来比喻参数的设置。操英语者必须要学习的是，他们的语言中中心语出现在补足语的前面，而操日语者必须要学会的是，中心语位于补足语的后面，如下面的例（7）所示：

- (7) a. be showing pictures of himself
AUX 展示 图片 PREP 他自己
b. zibun -no syasin-o mise-te iru
REFL PREP 图片 展示 PTCP

可见，日语动词、名词和形容词短语是对应的英语句子的镜像结构。（8）中的表格做了一个简单的总结，并且给出语序参数的参数值：

- (8) 语言 事实 参数：中心语位于前面
英语 中心语位于补足语之前 +
日语 中心语位于补足语之后 -

² 有关形式语言的力量的更多内容，请看第 17 章。

在过去的几十年中，根据特定的参数来研究语言之间的差异已经成为研究的一个重要方向，并且在跨语言的比较研究中取得了丰厚的成果。

在介绍完有关语言习得的内容之后，下面我们将讨论管辖与约束理论的基本观点。

3.1.3 T 模型

Chomsky指出，简单的短语结构语法不足以分析一些特定的关系。比如说，主动句和被动句之间的关系就是如此。在短语结构语法中，我们需要给不及物动词、及物动词和双及物动词创建主动和被动规则，请看上面（1）-（3）的讨论。事实上，短语结构语法无法描述被动式中主要的论元受到了抑制。所以，Chomsky 提出还有一个潜在的结构，叫做深层结构（Deep Structure），其他结构都是由它生成的。在下面的章节中，我们将讨论 T 模型的构造。

3.1.3.1 深层结构与表层结构

在生成新结构的时候，深层结构的一部分可以被删除或者移动。按照这一方式，我们可以解释主动句和被动句之间的关系。对结构的这种操作结果也叫做转换。我们可以从原始的深层结构生成一个新的结构，即表层结构（Surface Structure）。在理论的有些版本中，表层结构并不是句中词语的实际使用情况的镜像，所以有时采用 S-结构这一术语来避免误解。

- (9) *Surface Structure* = S-structure
Deep Structure = D-structure

图 3.2给出了管辖与约束理论的整体框架：短语结构规则和词汇允准了 D-结构转换为 S-结构。S-结构包括语音形式（Phonetic Form, PF）和逻辑形式（Logical Form, LF）。




图 3.2: T 模型

LF)。这一模型被称为 T 模型 (T-model), 或 Y 模型 (or Y-model), 因为 D-结构、S-结构、PF 和 LF 从上倒下构成 T (或 Y)。我们会详细讲解这些具体的成分。

应用短语结构规则, 我们可以描述具体元素之间的关系 (比如说词和短语, 有时也可以是词的一部分)。这些规则的形式是 \bar{X} 句法 (请看第 2.5 节)。词汇与 \bar{X} 句法允准的结构一起构成了 D-结构的基础。那么, D-结构就是由词库中的具体词形成的选择栅 (= 配价类型) 的句法表征。

词库包括每个人的词汇项, 每个词汇项包含有关形态结构、句法特征和选择属性等信息。我们将在第 3.1.3.4 节详细解释这些内容。根据确切的理论假说, 形态也被当作是词的一部分。但是, 屈折形态更多是与句法有关的。词库是针对具体词的形式语义解释的一个接口。

成分在表层结构的位置并不一定是它们在深层结构中的位置。比如说, 带有双及物动词的句子就有如下几种变换式:

- (10) a. [dass] der Mann der Frau das Buch gibt
 CONJ DET.NOM 男人 DET.DAT 女人 DET.ACC 书 给
 ‘这个男人给这个女人这本书’
- b. Gibt der Mann der Frau das Buch?
 给 DET.NOM 男人 DET.DAT 女人 DET.ACC 书
 ‘这个男人给这个女人这本书了吗?’
- c. Der Mann gibt der Frau das Buch.
 DET.NOM 男人 给 DET.DAT 女人 DET.ACC 书
 ‘这个男人给这个女人这本书。’

针对上述移位过程, 我们提出下列转换规则: (10b) 是通过将 (10a) 中的动词前置得出来的, 而且 (10c) 是通过将主格对名词短语提前而得到的 (10b)。在管辖与约束理论中, 只有一种非常普遍的转换: 移动 α = “在任何地方移动任何东西”。而到底什么是可以移动的, 以及移到哪里, 和出于何种原因都是由原则所决定的。这类原则有题元准则 (Theta-Criterion) 和格过滤条件 (Case Filter), 详见下面。

谓词及其论元之间的关系是由词汇项决定的, 这点在语义解读的所有表征层面上都是可及的。基于这一原因, 位移元素的原本位置被标记为踪迹 (trace)。这就意味着, 前置的 gibt (给) 的原始位置在例 (11b) 中有所标示。相应的标记叫做踪迹 (trace) 或 (gap)。这类空范畴乍看起来难以理解, 但是我们早在第 2.4.1 节 (第 63 页) 就介绍了名词结构中的空语类。

- (11) a. [dass] der Mann der Frau das Buch gibt
 CONJ DET 男人 DET 女人 DET 书 给
 ‘这个男人给这个女人这本书’
- b. Gibt_i der Mann der Frau das Buch _{-i}?
 给 DET 男人 DET 女人 DET 书
 ‘这个男人给这个女人这本书了吗?’
- c. [Der Mann]_j gibt_i _{-j} der Frau das Buch _{-i}.
 DET 男人 给 DET 女人 DET 书
 ‘这个男人给这个女人这本书。’

例 (11c) 是由 (11a) 经过两步移位构成的, 这也就是为什么 (11c) 中有两个空语迹。这些踪迹用下标来表示, 进而来区分所移动的成分。下标与所移动成分具有对应关系。有时, *e* (表示空) or *t* (表示痕迹) 也用来表示踪迹。

由 D-结构推导而来的 S-结构像表层的结构, 但是它们与实际话语的结构并不完全相同。

3.1.3.2 语音形式

音位操作是在语音形式 (Phonetic Form, PF) 这一层来表示的。PF 负责实际发声的形式。比如说, *wanna* 这个简称就发生在 PF 层 (Chomsky 1981a: 20–21)。

- (12) a. The students want to visit Paris.

DET 学生 想要 INF 访问巴黎

‘这些学生想要访问巴黎。’

- b. The students wanna visit Paris.

DET 学生 想要 访问巴黎

‘这些学生想要访问巴黎。’

例 (12) 中的简称是由 (13) 中可选的规则所决定的:

- (13) want + to → wanna

3.1.3.3 逻辑形式

逻辑形式 (Logical Form, LF) 是介于 S-结构的句法层和句子的语义解释之间的。与 LF 有关的现象有代词的复指、量化和统制问题。

在解决复指依存的问题中, 语义因素起到了重要的作用。管辖与约束理论的一个重要部分是约束理论 (Binding Theory), 该理论用来解释代词能够或必须指称的对象, 以及什么时候能用或者必须用反身代词。(14) 中是人称代词和反身代词的例子:

- (14) a. Peter kauft einen Tisch. Er gefällt ihm.

Peter 买 一 桌子.M 他 喜欢 它

‘Peter 在买一个桌子。他喜欢它。’

- b. Peter kauft eine Tasche. Er gefällt ihm.

Peter 买 一 包.F 他 喜欢 它

‘Peter 在买一个包。他喜欢它。’

- c. Peter kauft eine Tasche. Er gefällt sich.

Peter 买 一 包.F he 喜欢 他自己

‘Peter 在买一个包。他喜欢他自己。’

在第一个例子中, *er* (他) 可以指代 Peter、桌子或者上文中提及的其他东西或其他人。*ihm* (它/他) 可以指代 Peter 或者上下文中的某人。根据世界知识, 这里限于指代桌子。在第二个例子中, *er* (他) 不能指代 Tasche (包), 因为 Tasche 是阴

3 转换语法-管辖与约束理论

性的，而 *er* 是阳性的。只有当 *ihm*（他）不指向 *Peter* 的时候，*er*（他）才可以指 *Peter*。否则，*ihm* 只能在更大范围的上下文内指称一个人。这与例（14c）是不同的。在（14c）中，*er*（他）和 *sich*（他自己）必须指向同一个目标。这是因为像 *sich* 这样的反身代词的所指受限於局部域之内。管约论主要负责描述这些限制条件。

LF 对于量词辖域来说也是重要的，比如说（15a）有两种解释，如（15b）和（15c）所示。

- (15) a. 每个男人都爱着一个女人。
b. $\forall x \exists y (\Box(x) \rightarrow (\Box(y) \wedge \Box(x, y)))$
c. $\exists y \forall x (\Box(x) \rightarrow (\Box(y) \wedge \Box(x, y)))$

符号 \forall 表示全称量词 (universal quantifier)，而 \exists 表示存在量词 (existential quantifier)。第一个公式是指对于每一个男人来说，都有一个他爱的女人，当然可以是不同的女人。第二种含义可以是有这样一个女人，所有男人都爱她。什么时候会造成这种歧义以及哪种意思是可能的，取决于给定话语的句法属性。LF 这一层次对于像 *a* 和 *every* 这样的限定词的意义来说是较为重要的。

控制理论 (Control Theory) 也跟 LF 密切相关。控制理论主要分析例（16）中的不定式主语的语义角色是如何实现的。

- (16) a. Der Professor schlägt dem Studenten vor, die Klausur noch mal zu
DET 教授 建议 DET 学生 PRT DET 考试 一次再 INF
schreiben.
写
‘教授建议学生再参加一次考试。’
b. Der Professor schlägt dem Studenten vor, die Klausur nicht zu bewerten.
DET 教授 建议 DET 学生 PRT DET 考试 不 INF 打分
‘教授建议学生这次考试不打分。’
c. Der Professor schlägt dem Studenten vor, gemeinsam ins Kino zu gehen.
DET 教授 建议 DET 学生 PRT 一起 进入电影院 INF 去
‘教授建议学生一起去电影院。’

3.1.3.4 词库

为了创建更为复杂的短语，词的意义告诉我们他们需要跟一定的角色，如“发出动作的人”或“受到影响的事物”，相组合。例如，动词 *beat* 在语义上实际需要两个论元。（17a）中动词 *beat* 的语义表征表示为（17b）中的形式：

- (17) a. Judit 打了大师。
b. 打'(x,y)

将中心语按照配价类型进行分类的过程也叫做次范畴化 (subcategorization)：beat 可以次范畴化为一个主语和一个宾语。这一术语来自于这样的事实，中心语已经按照它的词类（动词、名词、形容词等）进行分类，并进一步根据配价信息分成小

类（如不及物动词或及物动词）。有时会用“X subcategorizes for Y”（X 次范畴化 Y）这个短语，它表示“X selects Y”（X 选择 Y）。beat 被看作是谓词，因为 *beat* 是逻辑谓词。主语和宾语都是谓词的论元。有很多术语用来描述这些选择性的必有元素的集合，如论元结构（argument structure）、配价框架（valence frame）、次范畴化框架（subcategorization frame）、题元栅（thematic grid），以及西塔-栅或 θ -栅。

说明语修饰语义上的谓词，并且当语义部分被强调的时候，他们叫做修饰语（modifier）。在谓词的论元结构中没有说明语。

按照 GB 的理论假说，论元出现在小句的特定位置中，即所谓的论元位置，如一个 X^0 元素的子节点（请看第 2.5 节）。题元准则（Theta-准则）声称论元位置中的元素必须被赋予一个语义角色（semantic role），也叫做西塔角色（theta-role）。而且，每一个角色都只能被指派一次（Chomsky 1981a: 36）：

Principle 1 (题元准则)

- 每个题元角色只指派给一个论元位置。
- 一个论元位置内的任何短语只能充当一个题元角色。

中心语的论元成分是有主次之分的，也就是说，我们可以区分出高阶论元和低阶论元。动词和形容词的最高阶论元占有特殊的地位。因为 GB 理论认为，在有些语法中，这些高阶论元通常在动词或形容词短语之外的位置实现，通常叫做外部论元（external argument）。剩下的论元出现在动词和形容词短语内部的位置上。这类论元叫做内部论元（internal argument）或补足语（complements）。对于简单句来说，这通常意味着主语是外部论元。

当我们讨论论元类型的时候，我们可以指认出三种题元角色：

- 第一类：施事（发出动作的个体）、行动或感受的触发者（刺激），以及具有某种属性的个体
- 第二类：感事（感受的个体）、从某方面获益的人（受益者）（或者相反：受到某种伤害的人），以及领有者（所有者，或者即将拥有某物的人，或者相反的情况：失去或者缺少某物的人）
- 第三类：受事（受到影响的人或物）、客体

如果一个动词需要指派这些题元角色，那么第一类通常具有最高级别，而第三类是最低的。不过令人遗憾的是，现有文献中对动词论元所指派的语义角色的分析非常不一致。Dowty (1991) 针对这一问题作出了讨论，并提出应该应用原型角色。如果一个论元具有足够多的 Dowty 所定义的施事的原型特征（如有生的），那么该论元就被指派给原型施事。

心理词库应该包括这样的词条，即该词条具有这个词在合乎语法的使用中特定句法词的属性。比如说下列的一些属性：

- 形式
- 意义（语义）
- 语法属性：句法词类 + 形态特征

3 转换语法-管辖与约束理论

- theta-栅

(18) 给出了一个词条的例子：

(18)

形式	<i>hilft</i> ‘helps’
语义	<i>helfen</i> ’
语法特征	动词, 第三人称单数表示现在时
theta-栅	
theta-角色	<u>施事</u> 受益格
语法特性	与格

将语义角色指派给特殊的句法要求（受益者 = 与格）也叫做联接（linking）。

按照论元的主次顺序可以对论元进行排序：最高阶论元位于左边最远的位置上。以 *helfen* 为例，最高阶论元就是外部论元（external argument），所以施事下面用下划线表示。对于所谓的非宾格动词而言，³ 最高阶论元并不是外部论元。所以在相应的词条中没有用下划线表示。

3.1.4 \bar{X} 理论

在 GB 理论中，所有由核心语法⁴ 允准的句法结构都适用于 \bar{X} 范式（请看第 2.5 节）。⁵ 在下面的章节中，我将对其提出的句法范畴和有关语法规则的解释方面的基本论断进行评价。

3.1.4.1 句法范畴

在 \bar{X} 范式中，能用变量 X 表示的范畴可以分为词汇范畴 和功能范畴。这与开放和封闭的词汇类型是大致相关的。下面是词汇范畴：

- V = 动词
- N = 名词
- A = 形容词
- P = 介词/postposition
- Adv = 副词

³ 有关非宾格动词的讨论请看 Perlmutter (1978)。作格动词（ergative verb）也是常见的术语，尽管用词不够准确。有关乔姆斯基框架下非宾格动词的早期研究请看 Burzio (1981, 1986)，有关德语的相关研究请看 Grewendorf (1989)。同样，有关这些术语的用法以及历史上的评介请看 Pullum (1988)。

⁴ Chomsky (1981a: 7–8) 将语言区分成常规区域和边缘区域，常规区域是指那些由语法决定的，基于基因自然习得的那部分固定的语言知识，而边缘区域是指语言中不规则的部分，如熟语 “to pull the wool over sb.’s eyes”（掩人耳目）。请看第 16.3 节。

⁵ Chomsky (1970: 210) 允许从 \bar{X} 范式中推导出语法规则。但是，更为普遍的看法是语言完全应用 \bar{X} 的结构。

词汇范畴可以用二元特征和交叉分类来表示：⁶

表 3.1: 应用二元特征的四种词汇范畴表征

	-V	+V
-N	P = [-N, -V]	V = [-N, +V]
+N	N = [+N, -V]	A = [+N, +V]

因为副词被看作是不及物介词，所以就在上面的表格中显示出来了。

应用这一交叉分类，我们就有可能构成普遍的规律。比如说，我们可以这样简单地指称形容词和动词：所有带有 [+V] 的词汇范畴要么是形容词，要么就是动词。进而，我们也可以说带有 [+N] 范畴（名词和形容词）的都可以有格属性。

除此之外，有些作者尝试将表 3.1 中的中心语位置与特征值联系起来（如 Grewendorf 1988: 52、Haftka 1996: 124 和 G. Müller 2011a: 238）。在德语中，带有介词和名词的结构，中心语位于补足语之前：

- (19) a. *für* Marie
给 Marie
b. *Bild* von Maria
图片PREP Maria

带有形容词和动词的结构，中心语位于后面：

- (20) a. *dem* König *treu*
DET 国王 忠诚
‘对国王忠诚’
b. *der* [*dem* Kind *helfende*] Mann
DET DET 孩子 帮助 男人
‘帮助这个孩子的男人’
c. *dem* Mann *helfen*
DET 男人 帮助
‘帮助这个男人’

以上数据说明中心语带 [+V] 的位于后面，而带 [-V] 范畴的位于前面。不过，这条规律是有问题的，因为德语还有后置介词。这些成分跟前置词很像，不是动词性的，但是它们出现在所搭配的 NP 的后面：

⁶ 有关 N、A 和 V 的交叉分类，请看 Chomsky (1970: 199)，有关额外包含 P，但是具有不同的特征分布的内容请看 Jackendoff (1977: Section 3.2)。

3 转换语法-管辖与约束理论

- (21) a. des Geldes wegen
DET 钱 因为
‘因为钱’
b. die Nacht über
DET 晚上 PREP
‘在晚上’

所以说, 我们要么必须发明一个新范畴, 要么我们放弃用二元范畴特征来描述排序方面的限制。如果我们要把后置介词看作是一个新范畴, 我们就必须假定还有一个二元特征。⁷ 因为这一属性可以是否定的或者是肯定的, 这样就构成了另外四个范畴。一共有八个可能的特征组合, 其中有一些不属于任何貌似合理的范畴。

对于功能范畴来说, GB 理论并没有提出交叉分类的方法。通常, 我们会提出下列几种范畴:

- C 补足语 (小句连接成分, 如 dass)
- I 定式 (也就是时态和情态);
早期文献中也写作 Infl (屈折变化),
近期文献中写作的 T (时态)
- D 限定词 (冠词、指示代词)

3.1.4.2 假设与规则

GB 理论认为, 所有的规则都应该采用第 2.5 节中讨论的 \bar{X} 这种形式。在其他理论中, 与 \bar{X} 形式相关的规则是这样应用的, 但是其他的规则并不相同。如果按照严格的 \bar{X} 理论, 就会得到短语的向心性特征 (endocentricity) 假设: 每个短语都有一个中心语, 而且每个中心语都是短语的一部分 (用更为技术化的语言来说: 每个中心语都投射到一个短语)。

进而, 正如短语结构语法所指出的, 树结构的分支之间不能交叉 (Non-Tangling Condition)。这个观点在本书中的很多理论中都有所涉及。但是, 在树邻接语法 (TAG) 和中心语驱动的短语结构语法 (HPSG)、构式语法 (Construction Grammar) 和依存语法 (Dependency Grammar) 中, 允许分支间交叉, 由此构成非连续成分 (Becker, Joshi & Rambow 1991; Reape 1994; Bergen & Chang 2005; Heringer 1996: 261; Eroms 2000: Section 9.6.2)。

⁷ Martin Haspelmath 指出, 我们可以提出这样一条规则, 将中心语后的论元成分放在中心语前的位置上 (请看 Riemsdijk 1978: 89 有关转换方法的讨论)。这与德语形容词的前置论元的情况是一致的:

- (i) a. auf seinen Sohn stolz
PREP 他 儿子 骄傲
‘为他的儿子而骄傲’
b. stolz auf seinen Sohn
骄傲 PREP 他的 儿子

但是需要注意的是, 这里的情况与后置词并不相同, 所有带前置宾语的形容词允许两种语序, 而介词不是这样的。大部分的介词不允许它们的宾语出现在它们前面。对于后置词来说, 它们的论元位于左边是一种特异性的特征。

在 \bar{X} 理论中，通常认为有两个投射层（ X' and X'' ）。但是，在主流的生成语法和其他理论中允许三层甚至是更多层 (Jackendoff 1977; Uszkoreit 1987)。在这一章，我会按照标准说法的两个投射层，这样，短语就至少有三个层次：

- X^0 = 中心语
- X' = 中间投射 (\bar{X} ，读作：X bar)
- XP = 最高投射 ($= X'' = \bar{\bar{X}}$)，也叫做最大投射 (maximal projection)

3.1.5 英语中的 CP 和 IP

主流的生成语法的大部分著作都深受之前分析英语的文献的影响。如果想真正理解德语和其他语言的 GB 分析，我们需要首先理解其对英语的分析，并基于这个原因，本节重在介绍这部分内容。在英语的词汇功能语法中，也有 CP/IP 系统。由此，下一节也介绍了第 7 章有关词汇功能语法的一些基础理论的理解。

在早期作品中，(22a) 和 (22b) 中的规则被用来分析英语句子 (Chomsky 1981a: 19)。

- (22) a. $S \rightarrow NP VP$
b. $S \rightarrow NP Infl VP$

Infl 表示屈折变化 (Inflection)，就像插入结构中的屈折词缀一样。在早期文献中，符号 AUX 也用来指代 Infl，因为助动词跟屈折词汇一样。图 3.3 展示了应用 (22b) 中的规则对带有助词的句子的样本分析。




图 3.3: Chomsky (1981a: 19) 提出的带有助动词的句子




图 3.4: 在 CP/IP 系统中带有助动词的句子

动词跟它的补足语一起构成一个结构单元：VP。VP 的成分地位受到很多成分测试的支持，也受到主语和宾语在位置上的限制的支持。

(23) 中的句子分析为补足语短语 (CPs)，补足语是中心语：

- (23) a. that Ann will read the newspaper
CONJ Ann 将 读 DET 报纸
b. that Ann reads the newspaper
CONJ Ann 读 DET 报纸

在像 (23) 的句子中，CPs 没有指定语。图 3.5 显示了 (23a) 的分析。




图 3.5: 补足语短语




图 3.6: 极性问题

如 (24) 中的那些英语中的肯定与否定问题是通过将助动词前移到主语前而构成的。

- (24) Will Ann read the newspaper?
AUX Ann 读 DET 报纸

让我们来假设，问句的结构与带有补足语的句子结构是一致的。这就意味着问句也像 CPs。但是，与 (23) 中的句子不同，并没有从属连词。在问句的 D-结构中，C⁰ 位置是空的，而且助动词之后被移到这个位置上。图 3.6 表示了对 (24) 的分析。助动词的原始位置被标记为语迹 _{-k}，这与移动的助词的索引是相同的。

wh-问句是由助动词前的成分的额外移位构成的；也就是移到 CP 的说明语的位置上。图 3.7 on the following page 显示了 (25) 的分析：



图 3.7: *wh*-question

图 3.8: 没有助动词的句子

- (25) What will Ann read?
什么 AUX Ann 读

如前所述，**read** 的宾语的移位由语迹来说明。当我们构建句子的意思的时候，这是非常重要的。动词指派给它的宾语位置上的元素以语义角色。这样，我们就需要“重建”**what**（什么）在这个位置上的来源。这一点可以由 **what**（什么）的语迹的索引重合而得到保证。

直到现在，我们还没有讨论没有助动词的句子，如例（23b）。为了分析这类句子，我们必须假定屈折词缀在 I^0 位置上，如图 3.8 所示。因为屈折词缀出现在动词前，所以也需要一些移位操作。由于理论内部的原因，我们不需要移位到树的靠下的位置上，所示动词必须移到词缀处，而不是反过来。

按照这些针对英语句子的分析方法，我们来看德语。

3.1.6 德语小句的结构

很多学者都采用了 CP/IP 模型来分析德语。⁸ 范畴 C、I 和 V，与他们的特定位置一起，可以联接到空间位置的分布中，如图 3.9 on the next page 所示。

⁸ 对于没有 IP 的 GB 分析，请看 Bayer & Kornfilt (1989)、Höhle (1991a: 157)、Haider (1993, 1997a) 和 Sternefeld (2006: Section IV.3)。Haider 认为 I 的功能被整合进动词中。在 LFG 中，英语有 IP (Bresnan 2001: Section 6.2、Dalrymple 2001: Section 3.2.1)，而德语没有 (Berman 2003a: Section 3.2.3.2)。而在 HPSG 中，根本就没有 IP。




图 3.9: CP、IP 和 VP 以及德语的空间位置模型

需要注意的是，SpecCP 和 SpecIP 并不是范畴符号。它们在语法中不与重写规则一同出现，它们仅是用来描述树上的某个位置的。

如图 3.9 所示，动词的最高论元（简单句的主语）具有特殊的地位。理所当然地，我们认为主语总是出现在 VP 的外面，并且指向外围论元。VP 本身没有指定语。但是，近期的一些文献认为主语由 VP 的指定语位置生成 (Fukui & Speas 1986; Koopman & Sportiche 1991)。在一些语言中，它被认为是移到了 VP 之外的位置上。在其他语言中，比如说德语，至少要在一定的条件下才是这样的（如有定性，请看 Diesing 1992）。这里，我将采用经典的 GB 分析，主语位于 VP 之外。所有不是主语的论元都是 V 的补足语，它们在 VP 内部实现，也就是说，它们是内部论元。如果动词只需要一个补足语，那么按照 \bar{X} 范式，这就是中心语 V^0 的姐妹节点和 V' 的子节点。非宾格宾语是原型补足语。

按照 \bar{X} 模版，说明语是 V' 的补足语之上的分支。带有一个说明语的 VP 的分析请见图 3.10 on the following page。

- (26) weil der Mann morgen den Jungen trifft
因为 DET 男人 明天 DET 男孩 见面
‘因为这个男人明天要见这个男孩’




图 3.10: GB 理论中说明语的分析

3.2 动词位置

在德语中，VP 和 IP 的中心语位置位于它们的补足语的右边， V^0 和 I^0 属于句子的右边界。主语和其他成分（补足语和说明语）都出现在 V^0 和 I^0 的左边，并且构成中场。有人认为，德语—至少从 D-结构来看—是一个 SOV 类型的语言（= 这种语言的基本语序是主语-宾语-动词）。有关德语作为一种 SOV 型语言的研究几乎跟转换语法一样古老。最早是由 Bierwisch (1963: 34) 提出的。⁹ 与德语不同的，其他日耳曼语言，如丹麦语、英语，以及罗曼语中的法语都是 SVO 型语言，而威尔士语、阿拉伯语是 VSO 型的语言。大概 40% 的语言都属于 SOV 型的语言，35% 是 SVO 型的 (Dryer 2013c)。

有关动词位于后面的观点是受到下面的数据的启发：¹⁰

1. 助词与动词构成一个封闭的单位。

- (27) a. weil er morgen an-fängt
 因为他明天 PRT-开始
 ‘因为他明天开始’
 b. Er fängt morgen an.
 他开始 明天 PRT
 ‘他明天开始。’

⁹ Bierwisch 针对 Fourquet (1957) 的文献，提出了一个隐含的以动词为后的语序。我们可以在 Fourquet (1970: 117–135) 中找到由 Bierwisch 援引的法语手稿的德语译文。对于其他观点，请看 Bach (1962)、Reis (1974)、Koster (1975) 和 Thiersch (1978: Chapter 1)。有关德语具有隐含的 SOV 模式的观点也在 GPSG (Jacobs 1986: 110)、LFG (Berman 1996: Section 2.1.4) 和 HPSG (Kiss & Wesche 1991、Oliva 1992、Netter 1992、Kiss 1993、Frank 1994、Kiss 1995、Feldhaus 1997、Meurers 2000、Müller 2005b, 2015b) 中有所提及。

¹⁰ 针对第 1 点和第 2 点，请看 Bierwisch (1963: 34–36)。针对 4，请看 Netter (1992: Section 2.3)。

3 转换语法-管辖与约束理论

这一单位只能用在动词末位的结构中，这也说明了这一结构反映了基本语序的事实。

通过后-构成由名词推导出的动词（如 *uraufführen*，表示第一次做某事）通常不能分出他们的组成部分，这样就无法构成动词二位的小句（Höhle (1991b) 在未发表的工作中首次提出这一观点。Haider (1993: 62) 在出版物中首次提出。）：

- (28) a. weil sie das Stück heute ur-auf-führen
 因为他们DET 演出 今天 PREF-PART-引导
 ‘因为他们今天首次演出’
 b. * Sie ur-auf-führen heute das Stück.
 他们PREF-PART-引导今天 DET 演出
 c. * Sie führen heute das Stück ur-auf.
 他们引导 今天 DET 演出 PREF-PART

以上例子说明对于这类动词来说，只有一个合适的位置。这个语序就被认为是基本语序。

2. 在非定式小句和定式从句中带连词的动词都处于动词末位（我不考虑移位的可能性）：

- (29) a. Der Clown versucht, Kurt-Martin die Ware zu geben.
 DET 小丑 尝试 Kurt-Martin DET 物品 PCTP 给
 ‘小丑正在试着给 Kurt-Martin 这些物品。’
 b. dass der Clown Kurt-Martin die Ware gibt
 CONJ DET 小丑 Kurt-Martin DET 物品 给
 ‘小丑给 Kurt-Martin 这些物品’

3. 如果我们将德语中的动词位置与丹麦语（丹麦语跟英语一样是 SVO 型的语言）中的动词位置相比较的话，我们可以清楚看到德语动词聚集在句子的末尾，而丹麦语中它们出现在宾语的前面 (Ørsnes 2009a: 146)：

- (30) a. dass er ihn gesehen₃ haben₂ muss₁
 CONJ 他他 看见 AUX 必须
 b. at han må₁ have₂ set₃ ham
 CONJ 他 必须AUX 看见他
 ‘他必须看见他’

4. 在 (31) 中, 副词的辖域决定于他们的语序: 位于最左边的副词辖域囊括后面的两个元素。¹¹ 这点可以在下面提出的结构中进行解释:

- (31) a. weil er [absichtlich [nicht lacht]]
 因为他 本想 不 笑
 ‘因为他本来想不笑’
 b. weil er [nicht [absichtlich lacht]]
 因为他 不 本想 笑
 ‘因为他本来不想笑’

值得一提的是, 辖域关系并不受到动词位置的影响。如果我们假设动词二位的句子具有如 (31) 中的结构, 那么这一事实就不需要再深入解释了。(32) 显示了 (31) 推导出的 S-结构:

- (32) a. Er lacht_i [absichtlich [nicht _{-i}]].
 他 笑 本想 不
 ‘他本来想不笑。’

¹¹ 在这里, 我们需要指出的是, 左边的修饰语的辖域包括其右边的这条规则也是有例外的。Kasper (1994: 47) 讨论了 (i) 中的这些例子, 也可以参考 Bartsch & Vennemann (1972: 137)。

- (i) a. Peter liest gut wegen der Nachhilfestunden.
 Peter 阅读好 因为 DET 补习课
 b. Peter liest wegen der Nachhilfestunden gut.
 Peter 阅读因为 DEF 补习课 好
 ‘Peter 的阅读好, 多亏上了补习班。’

正如 Koster (1975: Section 6) 和 Reis (1980: 67) 指出的, 这些并不是特别可信的反例, 因为这些例子中右边句子的边界没有被填满。所以, 这些例子就不必是对中场内部重新排序的例子, 而相反地是包括前置的 PP。正如 Koster 和 Reis 所指出的, 如果我们能够把右边界填上, 并且不把致使的说明语前置的话, 这些例子是不合乎语法的:

- (ii) a. *Hans hat gut wegen der Nachhilfestunden gelesen.
 Hans AUX 好 因为 DET 补习课 阅读
 b. Hans hat gut gelesen wegen der Nachhilfestunden.
 Hans AUX 好 阅读 因为 DET 辅导
 ‘Hans 因为辅导而读得好。’

但是, 下面的例子选自 Crysmann (2004: 383), 即使右边界被填充了, 我们还是可以得到这样的语序, 位于右边的说明语的辖域囊括了左边的成分:

- (iii) Da muß es schon erhebliche Probleme mit der Ausrüstung gegeben haben, da wegen
 这儿 必须 它 已经 严重 问题 PREP DET 设备 有 AUX 因为 由于
 schlechten Wetters ein Reinhold Messmer niemals aufgab.
 坏 天气 ART Reinhold Messmer 从不 放弃
 ‘一定是设备出现了严重的问题, 因为像 Reinhold Messmer 这样的人不会仅仅因为天气不好就放弃了。’

尽管如此, 这并不能改变任何事。不管动词的位置在哪儿, (31) 和 (32) 中的相关例子具有同样的含义。语义组合的方式可以在 Crysmann 的分析中按照同样的方式来实现。

- b. Er lacht_i [nicht [absichtlich _{-i}]].
 他笑 不 本想
 ‘他本来没想笑。’

在简单介绍了动词末位语序的分析之后，我将详细说明德语的 CP/IP 分析。 C^0 对应于句子的左边界，并且可以按照两个不同的方式来填充：英语中，在由连词引导的从句中，从句连词（补足语）占据了 C^0 的位置。动词还是位于句子的右边界，如例（33）所示。

- (33) dass jeder diesen Mann kennt
 CONJ 每个人这 人 认识
 ‘每个人都认知这个人’

(33) 的分析如图 3.11 所示。在动词首位和动词二位的小句中，定式动词通过 I^0 位




图 3.11: 在 C^0 中带有补足语的句子

置移动到了 C^0 : $V^0 \rightarrow I^0 \rightarrow C^0$ 。图显示了例（3.12 on the following page）的分析：

- (34) Kennt jeder diesen Mann?
 认识 每个人这 人
 ‘所有人都认知这个人吗？’

在例（34）的 D-结构中， C^0 位置是空的。因为这个位置不能由补足语充当，动词可以移到这里。




图 3.12: GB 中的动词位置

3.3 长距离依存

在德语的陈述句中，SpecCP 位置 对应于前场，并可以由任何 XP 成分来充当。这样，我们可以通过将成分移到动词前面这种方式，来从例 (35) 中推导出例 (36) 的句子：

- (35) Gibt der Mann dem Kind jetzt den Mantel?
 给 DET.NOM 人 DET.DAT 孩子 现在 DET.ACC 大衣
 ‘这个人现在要把大衣给孩子了吗？’

- (36) a. Der Mann gibt dem Kind jetzt den Mantel.
 DET.NOM 人 给 DET.DAT 孩子 现在 DET.ACC 大衣
 ‘这个人正在给孩子这件大衣。’
 b. Dem Kind gibt der Mann jetzt den Mantel.
 DET.DAT 孩子 给 DET.NOM 人 现在 DET.ACC 大衣
 c. Den Mantel gibt der Mann dem Kind jetzt.
 DET.ACC 大衣 给 DET.NOM 人 DET.DAT 孩子 现在
 d. Jetzt gibt der Mann dem Kind den Mantel.
 现在 给 DET.NOM 人 DET.DAT 孩子 DET.ACC 大衣

由于任何成分都可以移到定式动词的前面，德语在类型学上被看作是一种动词位于第二位的语言（V2）。所以说，这是一种带有 SOV 基本语序的动词位于第二位的语言。另一方面，英语则是不具有 V2 属性的 SVO 语言，而丹麦语则是以 SOV 为基本语序的动词位于第二位的语言（请看Ørsnes 2009a有关丹麦语的研究）。

图 3.13 显示了由图 3.12推导出来的结构。决定短语移动的关键因素是句子的




图 3.13: GB 理论中的前置

信息结构（information structure）。具体来说，与前述和其他已知信息相联系的材料放在最左端（最好在前场），而新信息一般出现在右边。在陈述句中前置到前场的过程一般叫做话题化（topicalization）。但是，这一术语不够准确，因为焦点 isfocus（非正式定义：所要表达的成分）也可以出现在前场。进一步说，虚指代词 ispronoun!expletive 可以出现在那里，而这些成分是无指的，所以它们并不能联系到前面和已知的信息。据此，虚指成分永远不能作话题。

基于转换的分析也可以用在所谓的长距离依存中。所谓长距离依存，是指跨域几个短语边界的依存关系：

- (37) a. [Um zwei Millionen Mark]_i soll er versucht haben, [eine Versicherung _{-i}
 大约两 千百万 德国马克应该他试图 AUX ART 保险公司
 zu betrügen].¹²
 INF 欺骗
 ‘他显然试图从保险公司那里骗取两千百万德国马克。’

¹² taz, 2001 年 5 月 4 日, p. 20.

- b. „Wer_i, glaubt er, daß er _i ist?“ erregte sich ein Politiker vom Nil.¹³
 谁 相信 他 CONJ 他 AUX 反驳 REFL ART 政客 PREP 尼罗河
 ‘他认为他是谁呀？’, 一个来自尼罗河来的政客这样反驳道。’
- c. Wen_i glaubst du, daß ich _i gesehen habe?¹⁴
 谁 认为 你 CONJ 我 看见 AUX
 ‘你认为我看见谁了？’
- d. [Gegen ihn]_i falle es den Republikanern hingegen schwerer,
 反对 他 陷阱它 DET 共和党人们 但是 更难
 [[Angriffe _i] zu lancieren].¹⁵
 攻击 INF 发起
 ‘但是, 共和党人们很难对他发起攻击。’

在(37)的例子中, 前场中的元素都是来自于嵌套更深的短语。在 GB 理论中, 跨越句子界限的长距离依存是按照 (Grewendorf 1988: 75-79) 的步骤生成的, 也就是说, 在(37c)的分析中, 疑问代词被移动到 dass 引导的从句的限定语位置, 并且从那里移到主句的限定语位置上。这是因为移位受到的限制必须在局部进行核查。

3.4 被动

在介绍第 3.4.2 节的被动之前, 第一小节将详细说明结构格与词汇格的区别。

3.4.1 结构格与词汇格

带有格标记的论元的格属性有赖于论元的中心语所实现的句法环境。这些论元被叫做是具有结构格的论元。而不具有结构格的带有格标记的论元叫做词汇格。¹⁶

下面是结构格的例子:¹⁷

- (38) a. Der Installateur kommt.
 DET.NOM 水管工 来
 ‘水管工要来。’

¹³ Spiegel, 1999 年 8 月, p. 18.

¹⁴ Scherpenisse (1986: 84).

¹⁵ taz, 2008 年 2 月 8 日, p. 9.

¹⁶ 另外, 它们也叫做一致格 (agreeing case) (请看第 ?? 页) 和语义格 (semantic case)。一致格一般在谓词中。这个格属性也随着相应的结构发生变化, 但是这个变化一般发生在前面的元素中。语义格与某些短语的功能具有相关性 (如时间宾格副词性结构)。进而, 与宾语的词汇格类似的是, 语义格并不受到句法环境的影响而发生变化。对于这一小节将讨论到的被动的分析而言, 只有结构格和词汇格是相关的。

¹⁷ 我们来比较 Heinz & Matiassek (1994: 200)。

例 (38b) 也叫做 AcI 结构。AcI 是 “Accusativus cum infinitivo” 的缩写, 它表示 “无限的宾格”。所嵌套动词 (kommen, 这里表示 “来”) 的逻辑主语变成了主动词 (lassen, “让”) 的宾格宾语。AcI-动词一般是感官动词, 如 hören (听)、sehen (看) 和 lassen (让)。

3 转换语法-管辖与约束理论

- b. Der Mann lässt den Installateur kommen.
DET 人 让 DET.ACC 水管工 来
‘这个人让水管工来。’
- c. das Kommen des Installateurs
DET 来 PREP.DET 水管工
‘水管工的拜访’

在第一个例子中，主语是主格，而在第二个例子中，*Installateur*（水管工）是宾格，在第三个例子中，它则是紧跟主格后面的属格。宾语的宾格通常是结构格。这个格在被动化后变成了主格：

- (39) a. Karl schlägt den Weltmeister.
Karl 打败 DET.ACC 世界冠军
‘Karl 打败了世界冠军。’
- b. Der Weltmeister wird geschlagen.
DET.NOM 世界冠军 AUX 打败
‘世界冠军被打败了。’

与宾格不同的是，由动词管辖的属格是一个词汇格。当动词被动化之后，具有属格的宾语的格是不变的。

- (40) a. Wir gedenken der Opfer.
我们记得 DET.GEN 受害者
- b. Der Opfer wird gedacht.
DET.GEN 受害者AUX 被记住
‘受害者被记住了。’

例（40b）是所谓 *impersonal passive*（人称被动）的一个例子。与例（39b）不同的是，宾格宾语变成了主语，而（40b）中没有主语。请看第 1.7.1 节。

同样，与格宾语也没有变化：

- (41) a. Der Mann hat ihm geholfen.
DET 人 AUX 他.DAT 帮助
‘这个人帮助了他。’
- b. Ihm wird geholfen.
他.DAT AUX 帮助
‘他被帮助了。’

对于与格来说，它应该被看作是词汇格，还是说在动词结构环境中的一些或者所有与格都应该被看作是结构格还是存在争论的。限于篇幅，我不在这里展开讨论，有兴趣的读者可以参考 Müller (2007b) 中第 14 章的内容。在后面的内容中，我将按照 Haider (1986a: 20) 的假设，认为与格实际上是一个词汇格。

3.4.2 格指派与格过滤

在 GB 理论中, 主语从 (定式的) I 位置得到格, 而其他论元的格来自于 V (Chomsky 1981a: 50; Haider 1984: 26; Fanselow & Felix 1987: 71–73)。

Principle 2 (格指派原则)

- V 将宾格 (*accusative*) 指派给它的补足语, 如果这个宾格是结构格的话。
- 当动词为定式动词时, *INFL* 将格指派给主语。

格过滤 过滤掉那些没有将格指派到 NP 的结构。

图 3.14 on the following page 说明了例 (42a) 中的格指派原则。¹⁸

- (42) a. [dass] der Mann der Frau den Jungen zeigt
 CONJ DET 男人 DET.DAT 女人 DET.ACC 男孩 展示
 ‘这个男人将这个男孩展示给这个女人’
- b. [dass] der Junge der Frau gezeigt wird
 CONJ DET 男孩.NOM DET.DAT 女人 展示 AUX
 ‘这个男孩被展示给这个女人’

被动在形态上要求主语不出现, 并且吸收了结构化的宾格。在主动句中的宾语在被动式中会变成宾格, 而且其语义角色与其原有位置保持一致, 但是它不能得到吸收的格。所以, 它就必须移动到可以指派格的位置上 (Chomsky 1981a: 124)。图 3.15 on page 103 说明了对于例 (42b) 而言, 这一过程是如何进行的。

这种基于移位的分析适合于英语, 因为隐含的宾语总是要移动的:

- (43) a. The mother gave [the girl] [a cookie].
 DET 妈妈 给 DET 女孩 ART 饼干
 ‘妈妈给这个女孩饼干。’
- b. [The girl] was given [a cookie] (by the mother).
 DET 女孩 AUX 给 ART 饼干 PREP DET 妈妈
 ‘这个女孩从妈妈那里得到了饼干。’
- c. *It was given [the girl] [a cookie].
 它 AUX 给 DET 女孩 ART 饼干

例 (43c) 说明了在主语位置上填上虚指代词是不可行的, 所以宾语必须要移位。但是 Lenerz (1977: Section 4.4.3) 指出, 这类移位在德语中并不是必需的:

- (44) a. weil das Mädchen dem Jungen den Ball schenkte
 因为 DET.NOM 女孩 DET.DAT 男孩 DET.ACC 球 给
 ‘因为这个女孩将球给了这个男孩儿’

¹⁸ 上图并不符合 X 理论的标准范式, 因为 *der Frau* (这个女人) 是一个与 *V'* 相组合的补足语。在标准的 X 理论中, 所有的补足语都与 *V⁰* 相组合。这对于双及物动词结构来说是有问题的, 因为我们要将这些结构处理为二分的 (参看 Larson (1988) 有关双宾语结构的分析)。进而, 在下面的图中, 出于明晰性的原因, 动词被置于 *V⁰* 的位置上。为了创造出合格的 S-结构, 动词必须要移动到 *I⁰* 位置的前缀处。




图 3.14: 主动句中的格与题元角色指派

- b. weil dem Jungen der Ball geschenkt wurde
因为DET.DAT 男孩 DET.NOM 球 给 AUX
‘因为这个球被送给了这个男孩’
- c. weil der Ball dem Jungen geschenkt wurde
因为DET.NOM 球 DET.DAT 男孩 给 AUX

与例(44c)相比,例(44b)是没有标记的顺序。例(44b)中的 der Ball (球)与例(44a)中的 den Ball 出现在相同的位置上。也就是说,移位并不是必需的。只有格是不同的。但是,例(44c)相对于(44b)而言,在某种程度上是有标记的。我们提出的诸如(44b)的分析中包括了抽象的移位过程:元素在他们的位置上,但是连接到主语的位置上,并从那里接收到他们的格信息。Grewendorf (1993: 1311)认为在诸如例(44b)的主语位置上有一个空的虚指代词,而且在诸如例(45)的句子主语位置上包含了人称被动的过程:¹⁹

- (45) weil heute nicht gearbeitet wird
因为今天 不 工作 AUX
‘因为今天没有完成的工作’

¹⁹ 请看Koster (1986: 11-12)有关荷兰语的平行分析,还有Lohnstein (2014)基于移位的分析,即对于人称被动而言,也包括一个空的虚指代词。




图 3.15: 被动句中的格与题元角色指派

空的虚指代词是指我们看不到也听不到的成分。对于这类空成分的讨论，可以参考第 13.1.3 节和第 19 章。

在下面的章节中，我将介绍被动的另一种分析方法，这种方法没有联系到论元位置的空范畴，并且试图按照一种更为普遍和一致的具有跨语言共性的方式（如对于最主要论元的压制）来分析被动。

进而，我们需要回答的问题是为什么宾格宾语没有从动词那里得到格指派。对于这一问题的解释可追溯到 Burzio (1986: 178–185) 提出的 Burzio 概说 (Burzio's

Generalization)。²⁰

(46) Burzio 概说 (修订版):

如果 V 没有外部论元, 那么它并不指派 (结构) 宾格。

Koster (1986: 12)指出, 英语中的被动不能由格理论推导出来, 因为如果我们在英语中, 像德语和荷兰语那样允许空的虚指主语的话, 我们就可以分析下面的例子 (47), 这里 np 是一个空的虚指成分:

(47) np was read the book.

np AUX 读 DET 书

相反, Koster 提出, 英语中的主语要么受制于其他成分 (即非虚指成分), 要么在词汇上被填充, 即由可见的材料填充。这样, 例 (47) 的结构就被排除了, 并且我们可以保证 the book 需要被位于定式动词的前面, 以使得主语位置被填充上。

3.5 域内重新排序

位于中场的论元在原则上几乎可以按照任意的顺序排列, 如例 (48) 所示:

(48) a. [weil] der Mann der Frau das Buch gibt

因为 DET 男人 DET 女人 DET 书 给

‘因为这个男人给这个女人这本书’

b. [weil] der Mann das Buch der Frau gibt

因为 DET 男人 DET 书 DET 女人 给

c. [weil] das Buch der Mann der Frau gibt

因为 DET 书 DET 男人 DET 女人 给

d. [weil] das Buch der Frau der Mann gibt

因为 DET 书 DET 女人 DET 男人 给

e. [weil] der Frau der Mann das Buch gibt

因为 DET 女人 DET 男人 DET 书 给

²⁰ Burzio 提出的早期公式对应于下面: 一个动词指派宾格, 当且仅当它指派给它的主语一个语义角色。这个概念在以下两个方面来看都是有问题的。(i), 动词并没有指派给主语语义角色, 而是不管怎样都是宾格:

(i) Mich friert.

我.ACC 冻

‘我冻极了。’

我们必须区分结构宾格和词汇宾格, 并相应地修改 Burzio 概说。诸如 begegnen (遇见) 的存在动词从隐含的另一个方面来看也是有问题的。begegnen 有主语, 但是仍然不能指派宾格, 而是与格:

(ii) Peter begegnete einem Mann.

Peter 遇见 ART.DAT 人

‘Peter 遇见了个人。’

请看Haider (1999)和Webelhuth (1995: 89), 以及这里针对 Burzio 概说的问题的参考文献。

- f. [weil] der Frau das Buch der Mann gibt
 因为 DET 女人 DET 书 DET 男人 给

在例 (48b-f) 中, 组成成分具有不同的重音, 而且跟例 (48a) 相比, 每个能说的句子的语境的数量是受到限制的 (Höhle 1982)。由此, 例 (48a) 中的语序被看作是中性语序 (neutral order) 或没有标记的语序 (unmarked order)。

为了分析这些语序, 我们提出了两条建议: 第一条建议是假定 (48b-f) 中的五种语序是通过 Move- α (Frey 1993) 将一个隐含的语序推导出来的。举例来说, 对 (48c) 的分析如图 3.16 所示。宾语 das Buch (书) 被移到了左边, 并且连接到最高




图 3.16: 作为 IP 附加语的域内重新排序分析

点的 IP。

一个通常用来支撑这一分析观点的论断是, 实际上在重新排序的句子中存在的辖域歧义在基本语序的句子中是不存在的。对于这种歧义的解释是基于这样的假设, 即限定词的辖域可以在表层结构的位置上推导出来, 也可以在深层结构的位置上推导出来。如果在表层结构和深层结构中的位置是一致的, 也就说没有任何的移位, 那么就只有一种解读的可能性。但是, 如果发生了移位, 那么就有两种可能的解释 (Frey 1993):

- (49) a. Es ist nicht der Fall, daß er mindestens einem Verleger fast jedes Gedicht
 它 COP 不 DET 事实 CONJ 他至少 ART 出版社 几乎每 诗

3 转换语法-管辖与约束理论

anbot.

提供

‘事实并不是他给至少一家出版社提供了几乎每一首诗。’

- b. Es ist nicht der Fall, daß er fast jedes Gedicht_i mindestens einem
它 COP 不 DET 事实 CONJ 他 几乎 每 诗 至少 ART

Verleger _{-i} anbot.

出版社 提供

‘事实并不是他给至少一家出版社提供了几乎每一首诗。’

有些观点认为语迹会带来诸如对于句子有不同解读的问题，事实上，这些问题是不存在的（请看Kiss 2001: 146 和Fanselow 2001: Section 2.6）。以（50）的例子来说，可以将“mindestens einem Verleger”（at least one publisher）这句话在_{-i}位置上进行解释，这样就可以得到后面的解释，即“fast jedes Gedicht”（almost every poem）涵盖了“mindestens einem Verleger”（at least one publisher）。但是，这样的解释是不存在的。

- (50) Ich glaube, dass mindestens einem Verleger_i fast jedes Gedicht_j nur dieser
我 相信 CONJ 至少 ART 出版社 几乎 每 诗 只有这
Dichter _{-i -j} angeboten hat.
诗人 提供 AUX

‘我想，只有这位诗人给至少一家出版社提供了几乎每一首诗。’

Sauerland & Elbourne (2002: 308) 讨论了日语中的相关例子，他们将之归功于Kazuko Yatsushiro。他们提出了这样一个分析，其中第一步是将宾格宾语提到主语的前面。然后，与格宾语放在它的前面，然后，第三步移位是，宾语再次移动。最后一步既可以构成表层结构²¹也可以构成音位形式。对于后者来说，这种移位没有任何语义效应。但是，这种分析可以预测正确的有可能性的解读，它并不需要带有中间步骤的格外的移位操作。

移位分析的另一种说法叫做基础生成（base generation）：由短语结构规则允准生成的最初结构叫做基础结构（base）。基础生成的一个变体认为动词一次与一个论元相组合，而且每个 θ -角色被指派给相应的中心语-论元配置。其中，与动词相组合的论元的顺序不是固定的，这就意味着（48）中所有的顺序可以不通过任何转换而直接生成。²²这类观点由Fanselow (2001)提出来分析 GB 理论。²³有关组成成分的位置的不同观点，请看Fanselow (1993)。

²¹ 这些作者是在最简方案下提出这些理论的。这就意味着没有严格意义上的表层结构。我只是简单地将他们的分析翻译为这里所使用的术语。

²² 我们将这个与第 51 页（6）中的语法相比较。这个语法包括一个 V 和一个 NP 来构成一个新的 V。由于在短语结构规则中没有提及论元的格，NPs 可以按照任意顺序来与动词相组合。

²³ 基础生成分析在 HPSG 框架下是一种自然分析。它是由 Gunji 在 1986 年提出来分析日语的，我们会在第 9.4 节来详细讨论这一方法。Sauerland & Elbourne (2002: 313–314) 声称他们认为句法是派生的，即有一系列句法树需要被推导出来。我认为事实上这是不大可能的。比如说，Kiss (2001) 提出的分析就说明了辖域问题可以在基于约束的理论中得到很好的解释。

3.6 总结

GB 理论和最简方案（参看第 4 章）中的一些重要文献在语言的共性与个性方面都有一些新的发现。下面，我将重点分析德语句法。

在转换语法下有关动词移位的分析是由 Bierwisch (1963: 34) 提出的。Reis (1974)、Koster (1975)、Thiersch (1978: Chapter 1) 和 den Besten (1983) 几乎在所有语法模型（除了构式语法和依存语法）中都已经成为标准的分析了。

Lenerz (1977) 有关成分顺序的分析影响到其他框架下的分析（GPSG 和 HPSG 中的线性规则可以追溯到 Lenerz 的分析）。Haider 有关成分序列、格和被动的研究 (1984; 1985b; 1985a; 1986a; 1990b; 1993) 对德语的 LFG 和 HPSG 分析产生了重要的影响。

句法配置方面的整个讨论都是非常重要的，比如说我们假定德语中定式动词的主语是在 VP 内部好一些，还是外部好一些（例如 Haider 1982; Grewendorf 1983; Kratzer 1984, 1996; Webelhuth 1985; Sternefeld 1985b; Scherpenisse 1986; Fanselow 1987; Grewendorf 1988; Dürscheid 1989; Webelhuth 1990; Oppenrieder 1991; Wilder 1991; Haider 1993; Grewendorf 1993; Frey 1993; Lenerz 1994; Meinunger 2000），以及德语的宾格动词第一次在 GB 中得到了详细的讨论 (Grewendorf 1989; Fanselow 1992a)。Fanselow 和 Frey 有关成分序列的工作，特别是有关信息结构的研究，在相当程度上提高了德语句法的研究水平 (Fanselow 1988, 1990, 1993, 2000a, 2001, 2003b,c, 2004a; Frey 2000, 2001, 2004a, 2005)。不定式结构、复杂谓词结构和部分前置都在 GB/MP 框架下得到了详细讨论与成功的分析 (Bierwisch 1963; Evers 1975; Haider 1982, 1986b, 1990a, 1991, 1993; Grewendorf 1983, 1987, 1988; den Besten 1985; Sternefeld 1985b; Fanselow 1987, 2002; von Stechow & Sternefeld 1988; Bayer & Kornfilt 1989; G. Müller 1996a, 1998; Vogel & Steinbach 1998)。在第二谓词方面，特别值得指出的是 Winkler (1997) 的工作。

以上有关语法的不同理论方面的著作并不全面（与我个人的研究兴趣密切相关），而且大部分是关于德语的。当然，对于其他语言和现象来说，肯定还有其他有价值的文献，只不过我们在这里不一一列出了。

在这一节剩下的部分，我将重点讨论两点：原则与参数理论下语言习得的模型与乔姆斯基式语言学内形式化的程度（特别是近几十年的研究成果）其中有些内容还会在第 III 部分再次提及。

3.6.1 有关语言习得的解释

乔姆斯基式研究语法的一个重要目标就是解释语言习得。在 GB 理论中，我们假定一套非常简单的规则，它可以适用于所有的语言（ \bar{X} theory），也就是适用于所有语言的普遍原则，但是对于个别语言和语言类别来说还需要一些参数来调整。这样，一个参数被认为与某些现象相联系。原则与参数模型特别丰富，它在解释语言之间的共性与差异的时候得到了一些有趣的研究成果。在语言习得方面，参数是由输入所决定的这一观点倍受争议，因为它不能在观察到的现象中得到解释：在设定参数后，学习者应该立刻掌握语言的某些方面。citet[146]Chomsky86 应用开关的比喻来进行说明，要么开启，要么关闭。正如他们所想的，语言中的很多方面都由参数锁定，设定一个参数会对给定学习者的语法的剩下的部分产生重要的

影响。但是，儿童的语言行为并不像我们所期待的那样会根据参数而突然发生改变 (citealp[731]Bloom93a; Haider 1993: 6; Abney 1996: 3; Ackerman & Webelhuth 1998: Section 9.1; Tomasello 2000, 2003; Newmeyer 2005)。进而，我们无法证明在某个参数语不同的语法现象之间存在联系。更多的内容，请参考第 16 章。

无论如何，原则与参数模型对于跨语言的研究都保有极大的兴趣。每一个理论都必须解释为什么英语中动词在宾语前面，而日语中则在宾语后面。我们可以将这个不同看作是一个参数，并将语言进行相应的分类，但是这是否真正地 with 语言认知是有关系的还是存在很大的疑问的。

3.6.2 形式化

Bierwisch 在他发表于 1963 年的有关转换语法的那篇文章中指出：²⁴

很有可能的是，由我们构造的规则所生成的句子出乎意料地是不合乎语法的，也就是说，它们由于某些属性而违反了合格性，而这些属性是在我们的检验中要特别排除的。这就意味着，语法是对一种语言的结构假说。对于自然语言的语法的合格性的系统诊断显然不能再由人工来解决。这一任务可以由计算机按照计算任务来进行实现，这样就可以对所描述语言派生出的结果进行检验。(Bierwisch 1963: 163)

Bierwisch 所说的这些观点在过去几十年经验主义的研究中更为正确。比如说，Ross (1967) 指明了移位和长距离依存所需的限制条件，Perlmutter (1978) 在 70 年代发现了非宾格动词。德语的情况请看 Grewendorf (1989) 和 Fanselow (1992a)。除了对于这些现象的分析，(Lenerz 1977) 提出了可能的短语成分位置的限制条件，还有格指派分析 (Yip, Maling & Jackendoff 1987; Meurers 1999c; Przepiórkowski 1999b)，动词性复杂结构的理论和短语中成分的前置问题 (Evers 1975; Grewendorf 1988; Hinrichs & Nakazawa 1994; Kiss 1995; G. Müller 1998; Meurers 1999b; Müller 1999a, 2002a; De Kuthy 2002)。所有这些现象都是彼此联系的！

再来看其他内容：

早期语言学研究的目标，也是计算语言学中语言学部分的核心目标，是开发出一种语法能够针对英语中的每一句话都指派给一个合理的句法结构。在理论语言学中，这一目标并不重要。特别是在管辖约束理论中，为了追求语法的深层原则早就抛弃了大规模的语法片段。问题在于，对于正确剖析的确认不能通过检查小片段的为而决定，但是它们是在深层分析的。大的片段不仅仅是小片段的倍数 - 当我们开始研究大片段的时候，就已经有质的变化

²⁴ Es ist also sehr wohl möglich, daß mit den formulierten Regeln Sätze erzeugt werden können, die auch in einer nicht vorausgesehenen Weise aus der Menge der grammatisch richtigen Sätze herausfallen, die also durch Eigenschaften gegen die Grammatikalität verstoßen, die wir nicht wissentlich aus der Untersuchung ausgeschlossen haben. Das ist der Sinn der Feststellung, daß eine Grammatik eine Hypothese über die Struktur einer Sprache ist. Eine systematische Überprüfung der Implikationen einer für natürliche Sprachen angemessenen Grammatik ist sicherlich eine mit Hand nicht mehr zu bewältigende Aufgabe. Sie könnte vorgenommen werden, indem die Grammatik als Rechenprogramm in einem Elektronenrechner realisiert wird, so daß überprüft werden kann, in welchem Maße das Resultat von der zu beschreibenden Sprache abweicht.

了。当语法能够适应的结构增加，不需要的句子的剖析结构也显著地增加。(Abney 1996: 20)

所以，正如 Bierwisch 和 Abney 所指出的，开发一个人类语言的绝大部分的好用的理论是非常艰巨的任务。但是理论语言学家所要实现的则更多：他们的目标是构建出能够完美地解释所有语言的限制条件，或者至少对某些语言类型来说是这样的。这样的话，我们就需要对不仅仅是一种语言，而是许多语言的交互关系有一个整体的认识。这个任务太难了，以至于个体的研究者不能胜任。在这点上，计算机可以提供帮助，因为他们可以立即指出理论中的不一致。在去掉这些不一致之后，计算机实现程序可以用来系统地测试数据或者语料库，进而检查理论在经验上是否是自足的 (Müller, 1999a: Chapter 22; 2015a; 2014d; Oepen & Flickinger 1998; Bender 2008b, see Section 1.2)。

在乔姆斯基第一篇重要著作发表的 50 多年后，很显然目前并没有基于转换语法分析的大规模语法片段。毫无疑问，乔姆斯基对语言的形式化作出了重要的贡献，并且他开发出了重要的形式基础理论，这些方面与计算机科学和理论计算语言学中有关形式语言的理论仍是密切相关的 (Chomsky 1959)。但是，在 1981 年，他已经反对严格的形式化了：

我想我们实际上开始得到语法的一些基本原则，这些原则也许处于合适的抽象层面上。同时，我们有必要对它们进行检验，并且通过开发十分具体的机制来测试他们在事实方面的充分性。然后，我们应该尽量区分开具有前瞻性的思想的讨论与选取了具体实现形式的讨论。(Chomsky 1981a: 2-3)

上面这段话在写给 *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* (《自然语言与语言学理论》) 的一封信中进行了更为清晰的阐述：

即使在数学中，我们所谓的形式化的概念直到一个世纪之前尚未提出来，这一概念对提高研究和理解的水平都至关重要。毫无疑问，语言学已经比 19 世纪的数学和支持 Pullum 的禁令有用的当代分子物理学更为先进了，只要这是可以展示出来的，自然是好的。目前，据我所示，我们有着生动的互动与令人激动的进展，但是没有没有任何迹象表明目前所进行的工作中有关于形式化层面的问题。(Chomsky 1990: 146)

这种与严格意义上的形式化的背离导致在主流的生成语法下相当多的文献有时会得到不一致的观点，这些观点导致我们无法清晰地将不同文献的观点整合起来。比如说核心概念管辖就有几种不同的界定 (概述请看 Aoun & Sportiche 1983²⁵)。

这种情况从 80 年代开始就不断受到争议，而且有时 GPSG 的支持者提出的意见更为尖锐 (Gazdar, Klein, Pullum & Sag 1985: 6、Pullum 1985, 1989a、Pullum 1991: 48、Kornai & Pullum 1990)。

主流的生成语法内部这种缺乏精确的和细节的研究²⁶，以及对基本假设的不断修订²⁷导致他们的研究成果极少能够应用到计算实现中。有一些基于转换语

²⁵ 进一步的定义可在 Aoun & Lightfoot (1984)中找到。不过，这与 Postal & Pullum (1986: 104-106)中的早期版本是一致的。

²⁶ 请看 e.g., Kuhns (1986: 550)、Crocker & Lewin (1992: 508)、Kolb & Thiersch (1991: 262)、Kolb (1997: 3)、Freidin (1997: 580)，以及针对后者的 Veenstra (1998: 25, 47)、Lappin et al. (2000a: 888)和 Stabler (2011a: 397, 399, 400)。

²⁷ 参考 e.g., Kolb (1997: 4)、Fanselow (2009) 和第 159页引用 Stabler 的话。

法、GB 理论或 MP 模型，以及借鉴了主流的生成语法思想的一些实现系统 (Petrick 1965; Zwicky, Friedman, Hall & Walker 1965; Kay 1967; Friedman 1969; Friedman, Bredt, Doran, Pollack & Martner 1971; Morin 1973; Marcus 1980; Abney & Cole 1986; Kuhns 1986; Correa 1987; Stabler 1987, 1992, 2001; Kolb & Thiersch 1991; Fong 1991; Crocker & Lewin 1992; Lohnstein 1993; Fordham & Crocker 1994; Nordgård 1994; Veenstra 1998; Fong & Ginsburg 2012),²⁸。但是，这些实现系统通常不用转换或者很大程度上与出版提出的理论假设不一致。例如，Marcus (1980: 102–104) and Stabler (1987: 5) 应用特别的规则来描述助词置换的问题。²⁹ 为了分析例 (51a) 这个句子，这些规则将 John 和 has 的顺序颠倒，这样就得到了例 (51b) 中的顺序，这句话就可以应用非转换结构的原则来剖析。

- (51) a. Has John scheduled the meeting for Wednesday?
AUX John 安排 DET 会议 PREP 星期三
'John 安排了星期三的会了吗？'
b. John has scheduled the meeting for Wednesday?
John AUX 安排 DET 会议 PREP 星期三
'John 安排了星期三的会了吗？'

这些针对助动词置换的规则非常明确，而且清晰地指称助动词的范畴。然而，这些规则与 GB 理论下提出的分析没有丝毫关系。正如我们在第 3.1.5 节看到的，我们并没有针对助动词置换提出特别的转换规则。助动词置换是由更为普遍的转换 Move- α 和相关的限制原则而实现的。规则的构成指向助动词的类别并不是没有问题的，正如 Stabler 受到 GB 启发提出的短语结构语法：

- (52) a. $s \rightarrow \text{switch}(\text{aux_verb}, \text{np}), \text{vp}$.
b. $s([\text{First}|\text{L0}], \text{L}, \text{X0}, \text{X}) :- \text{aux_verb}(\text{First}),$
 $\text{np}(\text{L0}, \text{L1}, \text{X0}, \text{X1}),$
 $\text{vp}([\text{First}|\text{L1}], \text{L}, \text{X1}, \text{X})$.

我们将例 (52a) 转换为 (52b) 中的 Prolog 谓词表达式。s 后的表达式 [First|L0] 对应的字符串需要被处理。‘|’-操作符将列表分为开头和其他剩余部分。“First” 是最先处理的词，L0 则包含其他词。在例 (51a) 的分析中，第一个词是 “has”，L0 是 “John scheduled the meeting for Wednesday”。在 Prolog 子句中，随后测试了 First 是否是助动词 (aux_verb(First))，而且如果是的话，那么就需要证明 L0 序列由一个名词短语开头。因为 “John” 是一个 NP，这样就是成功的。L1 是分析所剩下的 L0 的子集，也就是 “scheduled the meeting for Wednesday”。这组词随后跟助动词 (First) 相组合，现在就需要检查剩下的这组词 “has scheduled the meeting for Wednesday” 是否由 VP 开头。事实是这样的，而且剩下的列表 L 是空的。最后，这个句子被成功地处理了。

²⁸ 请看 Fordham & Crocker (1994) 将统计方法整合进 GB 理论中的研究。

²⁹ Nozohoor-Farshi (1986, 1987) 指出，Marcus 的剖析器只能剖析上下文无关语言。由于自然语言更为复杂（看第 17 章），而且相应复杂度的语法可以在目前的转换语法的框架内被允准，Marcus 的剖析器既不是乔姆斯基理论下的充分的实现，也不是分析自然语言整体的一个软件。

这一分析的问题在于每个词都在词典中进行了核查。诸如 (53) 这样的句子³⁰就无法分析了：³¹

- (53) Could or should we pool our capital with that of other co-ops to
AUX 或 AUX 我们合作我们的资本 PREP CONJ PREP 其他的合作者 INF
address the needs of a regional “neighborhood”?
应对 DET 需求 PREP ART 区域的 邻居
‘我们是可以还是应该将我们的资金与其他合作者的资金一起用来解决区域性的“邻居”的需求?’

在这类句子中，两个情态动词并列在一起。二者构成了一个 X^0 ，且在 GB 理论下，二者可以一起移动。如果我们想将这些案例按照 Stabler 那样简单地处理，那我们就需要将这些词处理为两个无限的子集，并且检查第一组词是否包含一个助动词或者几个并列的助动词。我们需要一个递归的谓词性助动词，它们可以在一定程度上检查 *could or should* 这个词语序列是否是合格的助动词序列。这并不能通过指定一个特殊的谓词来实现，而是需要通过表示助动词并列的句法规则来实现。与 (52a) 类似的另一条规则可以是 (54)，这条规则用在像 GPSG (Gazdar et al. 1985: 62)、LFG (Falk 1984: 491)、一些 HPSG 的分析 (Ginzburg & Sag 2000: 36) 和构式语法中 (Fillmore 1999):

- (54) $s \rightarrow v(\text{aux+}), \text{np}, \text{vp}$.

这条规则对于例 (53) 这类并列语料来说是没有问题的，因为多个助动词的并列可以构成 $v(\text{aux+})$ 这个范畴的对象（更多有关并列的研究请看第 21.6.2 节）。如果置换需要一个像 (52a) 的特殊的规则来操作，那么就不清楚为什么我们不能简单地应用 (54) 的有更少转换的规则。

在 MITRE 系统 (Zwicky et al. 1965) 中，有针对表层结构的具体语法，这一表层结构是从深层结构通过将转换的应用反过来推导出来的，也就是说，不用一个文法来创造深层结构，然后转换为其他结构，我们需要两个文法。由剖析器决定的深层结构被用来当作转换成分的输入，因为这是真正确保表层结构是由基本结构推导出来的 (Kay 2011: 10)。

这章还讨论了其他与基于转换的分析不同的应用实现。比如说，Kolb & Thiersch (1991: 265, Section 4) 得到这样的结论，一个陈述的、基于约束的方法对于 GB 来说比一个推导的方法更为有效。Johnson (1989) 提出了推导式剖析方法，该方法重建了 GB 的子理论 (\bar{X} 理论、Theta-理论、格语法) 作为逻辑表达式。³² 这些方法可以在逻辑的基础上各自独立地应用。在 Johnson 的分析中，GB 理论被看作是基于约束的系统。更多普遍性的约束条件从 S-结构和 D-结构中限制条件抽取出来，这样就可以随后直接用于剖析了。这就意味着转换并不是直接由剖析器实现的。如 Johnson 所指出的，他所模拟的语言片段是非常小的。比如说，它没有针对 *wh*-移位的描述 (第 114 页)。

³⁰ <http://www.cooperativegrocer.coop/articles/index.php?id=595>. 2010 年 3 月 28 日。

³¹ 有关词素并列是语言学理论的一种观点的讨论，请看 Abeillé (2006)。

³² 请看 Crocker & Lewin (1992: 511) 和 Fordham & Crocker (1994: 38) 有关其他的基于约束的推导式的剖析方法。

3 转换语法-管辖与约束理论

在 GB 和语障 (GB 之后的理论, 请看 Chomsky 1986a) 传统下的最详细的应用实现可能就是 Stabler 的 Prolog 实现了 (1992)。Stabler 的成就自然是十分显著的, 但是他在书里也这样声称: Stabler 必须简化语障 (Barriers) 理论中没有明确说明的很多事情 (比如说在对 \bar{X} 理论形式化的时候, 应用特征-值对儿, 这是借鉴了 GPSG 理论), 而且有些假设不能有效地形式化, 并被简单地忽略了 (更多细节请看 Briscoe 1997)。

满足一定要求的 GB 分析可以被重建, 这样他们就不再应用转换条件了。这些不用转换的方法也叫做表征 (representational), 而基于转换的方法叫做推导 (derivational)。对于表征分析来说, 只有表层结构有语迹, 但是这些结构都没有通过转换与深层结构联系起来 (请看 e.g., Koster 1978; 1987: 235; Kolb & Thiersch 1991; Haider 1993: Section 1.4; Frey 1993: 14; Lohnstein 1993: 87–88, 177–178; Fordham & Crocker 1994: 38; Veenstra 1998: 58)。这些分析可以按照相应的 HPSG 分析来进行计算处理的实现 (请看第 9 章), 实际上我们有对德语动词位置的例子。³³ 但是, 这类应用分析与 GB 分析在基本框架和一些小且重要的方面 (比如说如何处理长距离依存和并列 (Gazdar 1981b)) 是不同的。有关内容和转换语法内的移位分析的分类, 请看 Borsley (2012)。

在上面富有争议的概述内容之后, 我要加一条评论以避免可能的误解: 我不是要求所有的语言学的工作都应该是形式化的。比如说, 对于一篇三十页的文章来说, 这是不可能的。而且, 我并不认为所有的语言学家都应该做形式化的工作, 并且将他们的分析应用于计算模型之中。不过, 总要有有人做形式化的细节工作, 而且这些基础的理论假设也应该在我们共同的研究领域内在相当充分的时间被接受和认可。

思考题

1. 请举例说明功能范畴与词汇范畴。
2. 如何用二元特征来表示词汇范畴? 这样做有什么好处?

练习题

1. 请画出下列句子的句法树:

- (55) a. dass die Frau den Mann liebt
CONJ DET.NOM 女人 DET.ACC 男人 爱
'这个女人爱这个男人'
- b. dass der Mann geliebt wird
CONJ DET.NOM 男人 爱 AUX
'这个男人被人爱'

³³ 这说明了 ten Hacken 将 HPSG、GB 和 LFG 相比较的不同的地方, 而且这些不同研究范式下的框架的类型完全是错误的。在他的分类中, ten Hacken 主要是指 HPSG 认定的理论模型的形式化方法。但是, LFG 也是一个理论模型的形式化理论 (Kaplan 1995)。而且, GB 也有一个理论模型的变体 (Rogers 1998)。更多的内容, 请看第 14 章。

- c. Der Mann wird geliebt.
DET.NOM 男人 AUX 爱
‘这个男人被人爱。’
- d. dass der Mann der Frau hilft
CONJ DET.NOM 男人 DET.DAT 女人 帮助
‘这个男人帮助这个女人’
- e. Der Mann hilft der Frau.
DET 男人.NOM 帮助DET.DAT 女人
‘这个男人正在帮助这个女人。’

请这样分析被动句：位于主语的名词短语是从宾语的位置移动而来的，也就是说，主语并不是一个空的虚指代词。

延伸阅读

在第 3.1 节到第 3.5 节，我参考了 Peter Gallmann 2003 年以来的文献材料。但是，我在很多地方做了一些调整。对于其中的任何错误与不足，我个人负全部责任。有关 Peter Gallmann 的材料，请看 <http://www.syntax-theorie.de>。

在《句法分析视点》(*Syntaktische Analyseperspektiven*) 这本书中，Lohnstein (2014) 展示了 GB 理论的一个变体，这与本章所讨论的问题多少有些相关性 (CP/IP 和被动的基于移位的分析)。这本书里的不同章节是由主张不同理论的学者针对同一篇新闻报道的分析而写的。这对于希望对不同理论进行比较的读者来说是特别有意思的研究。

Haegeman (1994) 是对 GB 理论的综合性导论。对于可以阅读德语的读者来说，可以看看 Fanselow & Felix (1987)、von Stechow & Sternefeld (1988) 和 Grewendorf (1988) 所著的教科书，因为他们也提到了本书所提及的一些现象。

在乔姆斯基的很多著作中，他将没有转换的方法叫做“显著变体”。这是不合适的，因为没有转换的分析可以对基于转换的方法做出不同的预测（比如说，与并列和提取相关的方面，可以参考第 5.5 节有关 GPSG 的讨论）。在 Gazdar (1981a) 中，我们可以找到有关 GB 和 GPSG 相比较的内容，以及将 GPSG 的类型作为转换语法的一个显著变体，这方面的代表有 Noam Chomsky、Gerald Gazdar 和 Henry Thompson。

Borsley (1999) 和 Kim & Sells (2008) 出版了英语的 GB 和 HPSG 教材。对于转换语法和 LFG 的比较，请看 Bresnan & Kaplan (1982)。Kuhn (2007) 将现代推导分析与基于约束的 LFG 和 HPSG 进行了比较分析。Borsley (2012) 比较了 HPSG 理论下的长距离依存和 GB 与最简方案下的基于移位的分析。Borsley 讨论了四种对于基于移位的方法而言有问题的数据：没有填充的提取、多重空位的提取（请看本书第 154 页的脚注 57 和第 187 页的脚注 55）、填充与空位不匹配的提取以及没有空位的提取。

第四章 转换语法-最简方案

跟上一章介绍的管辖与约束理论一样，最简方案是由乔姆斯基在波士顿的麻省理工学院提出来的。Chomsky (1993, 1995b)提出，我们应该严肃地看待语言演化的问题，而且我们应该能够回答出语言知识是如何成为我们普遍认识的问题。为了回答这些问题，他认为我们应该重新关注那些语言学分析所需的最少假设的模型的理论发展上，并最终导向那些具有更少的针对个别语言内在知识的模型。

与 GB 理论一样，最简方案也广为流传：全世界的理论家都在这一框架下工作，由此下面列出的研究者与研究机构一定是不够全面的。*Linguistic Inquiry*（《语言探索》）与 *Syntax*（《句法》）这两本期刊几乎只刊登最简方案的工作，而且读者可以从这些期刊中知道在该领域较为活跃的人物。德语方面最为著名的学者有 Artemis Alexiadou（柏林洪堡大学）、Günther Grewendorf (2002)（缅因的法兰克福）、Joseph Bayer（康斯坦斯）、和 Gereon Müller（莱比锡）。

尽管 \bar{X} 理论具有极大的创新性，而且 GB 理论下对小句的分析具有非常重要的影响，并且可以在本书中讨论的大部分学说中找到这些内容，但是在最简方案下的技术层面的工作却非常的少。无论如何，技术层面的工作是十分有用的，因为最简方案这个框架下已经做了很多研究，而且理解该理论的基本机制可以有效地获知该理论下对语言事实的一些有趣的研究成果。

尽管 1980 年代和 1990 年代的 GB 文献有很多相同的假设，最简方案则爆发了许多不同的方法，使得我们难以掌握。下面的内容主要参考了 David Adger 编著的教材之中的内容 (Adger 2003)。

4.1 表示形式的一般说明

最简方案框架下的理论假说基于 GB 框架下的已经完成的工作。所以，在上一章解释的很多内容可以在这一章继续讨论。但是，在基础假设方面有一些改动。该理论摒弃了最为普遍的参数原则，而是将相关区别放在特征之中。语言间的差异表现在某些特征的值上面，而且，这些特征可以是强特征，也可以是弱特征，而且特征强度也是区分不同语言的一个属性。强特征使得句法对象移向更高的位置上。读者应该对这种特征驱动的移位方法较为熟悉了，因为它是第 3.4 节中基于移位的被动分析的一部分。在被动的 GB 分析中，宾语为了获得格，必须要移到 IP 的限定语位置上。这类由于特征值的缺失而导致的移位是最简方案中的核心部分。

4.1.1 基本框架

乔姆斯基提出，只有两条操作（规则）用来整合语言对象：外部合并与内部合并。外部合并是指将 *the* 和 *book* 这两类元素组合起来，从而得到一个复杂的短语。内部合并被用来指称组成成分的移位。它应用于一个语言对象，并且从这个语言对象中取出一部分，并将之链接到对应对象的左边。外部合并与内部合并的应用可以按照任意顺序来实现。比如说，两个对象可以按照外部合并组合起来，然后一个合并项通过应用内部合并而移动到左边。得到的对象可以再与其他对象进行外部的合并，并且继续合并。如例（1）所示：

- (1) the man who we know
DET 男人 CONJ 我们认识
‘我们认识的那个男人’

为了得到这个 NP，动词 *know*（认识）与它的宾语 *who*（谁）通过外部合并在一起。在下面讨论的几个中间过程的合并之后，*know who* 将与 *we* 合并，最后 *who* 通过内部合并移到左边，得到了 *who we know*。这个关系小句还可以通过外部合并与 *man* 组合在一起，并且继续进行下去。

所以，最简方案与 GB 理论是不同的，它没有假定一个通过某个 \bar{X} 语法生成的深层结构以及通过 *Move- α* 从深层结构生成的表层结构。相反，它假定短语是由外部合并和内部合并（组合与移位）按照任意顺序生成一个结构，然后就被拼写出来。结构被发送到表层：一方面是发声—感知系统（AP），另在一方面是感知—意念系统（CI）。AP 对应于 GB 理论中的音位形式（PF）层，CI 对英语逻辑形式（LF）层。图 4.1 描述了这种新的架构。显性句法代表通畅具有可见效应的句法操作。在




图 4.1: 最简方案理论在短语模型之前提出的架构

显性句法之后，句法对象被发送到表层，这里在这个拼写点之后有一些转换操作。音位这类转换并不会影响发音，这部分句法被叫做隐性句法。就像 GB 理论中的 LF，隐性句法被用来推导出某些辖域决定的意义。

这一架构后来修改成在推导过程中的很多点都允许拼写。现在是这样假定的，在推导过程中包括很多阶段，一旦一个完整的短语被用在与中心语的组合中

(Chomsky 2008), 它就被拼写出来。比如说, 像例 (2) 中的从句 *that Peter comes* 是一个短语, 它在整个句子完成之前被送到表层。¹

- (2) *He believes that Peter comes.*
 他 认为 CONJ Peter 来
 ‘他认为 Peter 会来。’

对于到哪个范畴构成完整的短语这一问题有许多不同的看法。因为阶段这个概念对于下面的内容并不重要, 我会在下面忽略这一概念。请看第 15.1 节中有关阶段的心理语言学可能性与普遍意义上的最简结构的讨论。

4.1.2 配价、特征核查与一致关系

最简方案的基本机制是特征核查。例如, 名词 *letters* (信) 有一个 P 特征, 这个特征是指它要与一个 PP 相结合以构成一个完整的短语。

- (3) *letters to Peter*
 信 PREP Peter
 ‘给 Peter 的信’

一般认为, 既有可预测的特征, 也有不可预测的特征。不可预测的特征的例子是名词的数的特征。单数和复数的区别在语义上是具有相关性的。有关词类的范畴特征纯粹是句法的, 并由此不能在语义上被解读。最简发难认为所有不可预测的特征需要在负责的语言对象的推导过程中被用到。这种用尽特征的过程被叫做核查 (*checking*)。比如说, 我们再来看名词 *letters* 的例子。例 (3) 的分析如图 4.2 所示。*letters* 的 P 特征是不可预测的, 这点由 P 前面的小 u 表示。*letters* 的 P 特征的




图 4.2: 不可预测特征的配价表征

不可预测性可以通过 *to Peter* 的 P 特征来进行核查。所有被核查的特征被看作是自动删除。在图中, 删除通过将特征突显而得到表示。像例 (4) 的字符串被作为完整的推导被排除出来, 因为 P 的 N 特征没有被核查。这一情况在图 4.3 on the next page 中显示出来。

¹ Andreas Pankau (p.c. 2015) 跟我指出, 这种阶段的概念有一个基本的问题, 因为如果是这样的话, 那么只有与中心语有关系的元素被送到表层, 然后推导中的最顶层短语就再也不能被送到表层了, 因为它没有任何可供依存的中心语。

- (4) * letters to
信 PREP




图 4.3: 由于不可预测特征的不合法的句法对象

如果这个结构能够用在被排除的更大的结构中，那么这个推导就会崩溃了，因为概念系统不允许 N 特征还出现在 P 节点上。

选择性特征是原子式的，这就是说，在 GB 和本书中介绍的其他理论中，介词不能选择 NP[acc]，除非这个 NP[acc] 是原子式的。这样，一个附加的机制就在选择特征之外来核查其他特征。这个机制叫做一致关系 (Agree)。

- (5) a. * letters to he
信 PREP 他
b. letters to him
信 PREP 他
'给他的信'

例 (5b) 的分析如图 4.4 所示。在选择性特征核查与一致关系核查之间有着有趣的




图 4.4: 一致关系的特征核查

区别。一致关系所核查的特征不需要是与中心语组合的对象的最高节点。这在后面被动和局部重新排序的分析中发挥着一定的作用。

4.1.3 短语结构与 \bar{X} 理论

在第 71 页的图 2.9 中给出了 \bar{X} 结构的投射。按照 \bar{X} 理论的早期版本，可以有任意多的补足语与 X^0 组合以构成 \bar{X} 。也可以有任意多的附加语附加到 \bar{X} 上，嗯后至多一个限定语可以组合到 \bar{X} 中，以构成一个 XP。最简方案理论是二元的，所以至多只有一个补足语，它是第一个合并到项目。进而，它并没有指定一个特殊的限定语的位置。Chomsky 倾向于这样的认识，所有不是补足语的项目是限定语。也就

是说，他讲第一次合并（补足语）与后期合并的项目（限定语）区分开来。图 4.5 显示了带有两个限定语的例子。也可以只有一个补足语且没有限定语，或者有一个




图 4.5: 最简方案下的补足语与限定语

或三个限定语。最终允准那种结构在于参与到合并操作中的项目的特征。短语投射是 \bar{X} 还是 XP 取决于这个短语是否被用作另一个中心语的补足语还是限定语，或者它是否用作进一步合并操作的中心语。如果一个短语被用为限定语或补足语，它的状态就固定为一个短语 (XP)，否则得到的短语的投射状态被看作是未被限定的。在合并操作中的词汇中心语的子节点具有范畴 X ，而合并操作中的复杂中心语的子节点们具有范畴 \bar{X} 。这就解决了标准的 \bar{X} 理论方法具有代词和专有名词时的问题：必须假定出许多的一元结构（看 2.9 中的左图）。这在最简方案理论中就不是问题了。²

4.1.4 小 v

在第 3.4 节，我用 \bar{X} 结构来表示双及物动词，该动词带上宾格宾语构成一个 \bar{V} ，然后跟与格宾格构成有一个 \bar{V} 。这种所有的宾语与动词构成 \bar{V} 的二元结构以及平层结构的分析被大部分 GB 理论和最简方案的学者所反对，因为这些分支并不是反身代词与否定极项的约束现象所需的分支结构。在例 (6a) 中，Benjamin 与 himself 具有约束关系是不可能的：

- (6) a. *Emily showed himself Benjamin in the mirror.
 Emily 展示 他自己 Benjamin PREP DET 镜子
 b. Peter showed himself Benjamin in the mirror.
 Peter 展示 他自己 Benjamin PREP DET 镜子
 ‘Peter 在镜子中给他自己看 Benjamin。’

约束关系所需要的分析，以及按照树的构造分析这些现象的这些理论中的 NPI 现象是，反身代词在树中比专有名词 Benjamin 的位置高。更准确地说，反身代词 himself 必须 c-统制 Benjamin。c-统制的定义如下所示 (Adger 2003: 117):³

² 有关这一问题的问题请看 Brosziewski (2003: Chapter 2.1)

³ c-统制在 GB 理论中也发挥着重要的作用。实际上，管辖与约束理论的一部分是约束理论，我们在前面的章节中没有讨论这一现象，因为本书中并不涉及管辖现象。

4 转换语法-最简方案

- (7) 节点 A c-统制 B，当且仅当 A 的子节点满足以下条件之一：
- 是 B，或者
 - 包括 B

在图 4.6 左边和中部的树中，并没有所期待的 c-统制：在最左边的树中，所有的 NPs 互相 c-统制，在中部的树中，Benjamin c-统制 himself，而不是其他成分。所以说，




图 4.6: 双及物动词可能分析

在左边和中间的结构是不合适的，而且还有一些附加的结构包括范畴 v ，它被叫做小 v (Adger 2003: Section 4.4)。himself 的子节点是 \bar{V} ，而且 \bar{V} 包括 Benjamin，所以 himself c-统制 Benjamin。由于 Benjamin 的子节点是 V，而且 V 既不是 himself，也不包括 himself，Benjamin 并没有 c-统制 himself。

关于双及物动词，早期的分析认为包括一个附加的动词性中心语 Larson (1988)。Hale & Keyser (1993a: 70) 认为，这个动词性中心语具有致使的语义。图 4.7 中结构的生成被认为是动词 show 始于 V 位置，然后移动到 v 的位置上。show 被认为具有 see 的意义，而且在小 v 的位置上，它具有致使含义，这样就得到了致使-看见的含义 (Adger 2003: 133)。




图 4.7: 移动到小 v 的双及物分析

尽管带有空动词中心语的动词壳分析最初是由Larson (1988)提出来分析双及物动词的, 现在它还被用来分析严格的及物动词, 甚至是不及物动词。

Adger (2003: Section 4.5)认为, 在具体的树的配置中, 语义角色的配置是不一致的。

- (8) a. vP 的 NP 子节点 \rightarrow 被分析为施事
- b. VP 的 NP 子节点 \rightarrow 被分析为主事
- c. \bar{v} 的 PP 子节点 \rightarrow 被分析为目标

Adger 认为, 这种语义角色指派的不一致有助于语言认知的过程, 而且从此, 按照这一点, 小 v 在严格的及物和不及物动词动分析中也发挥了重要的作用。图 4.8和图 4.9显示了分别包括动词 *burn* 和 *laugh* 的句子的分析。⁴




图 4.8: 包括小 v 的严格及物动词的分析




图 4.9: 包括小 v 的不及物动词分析

Adger (2003: 164)认为, 不及物和及物动词从 V 移动到小 v 的位置上。这点在下面的图中有所显示。

4.1.5 CP、TP、 vP 和 VP

第 3.1.5 节分析 GB 理论中的 CP/IP 系统。在最简方案的发展过程中, 屈折短语被分成几个功能性投射 (Chomsky 1989), 其中只有时态短语在目前的最简方案的

⁴ 如果这一类型的所有不及物动词都被认为是具有作主语的主事, 那么就需要更为宽泛的主事的界定, 以包括 *sleep* 这类动词的主语。通常, *sleeping* 不是一个有意为之的活动。

分子中有所涉及。所以，最简方案的 TP 对应于 GB 分析中的 IP。除了这一变化，CP/IP 分析的核心思想被转化为英语的最简方案分析。这一小节将先讨论触发移位的特殊特征（第 4.1.5.1 小节），然后是格指派（第 4.1.5.2 小节）。

4.1.5.1 特征作为移位的触发语：T 的 EPP 特征

在 GB 理论中，情态动词和助词被分析为范畴 I 的成员，主语是 IP 的限定语。在上一节，我说明了主语是如何被分析为 *vP* 的限定语。现在，如果我们假设有一个情态动词，包括这样一个 *vP*，且主语在情态动词后面，这一语序与观察到的英语的语序要求是不一致的。要解决这一问题，可以假定在 T 上有一个强势的不可解释的 D 特征。因为特征很强，一个合适的 D 必须要移动到 T 的限定语的位置上，然后在域内核查 D。图 4.10 显示了在例（9）的分析中 TP 所发挥的作用：

- (9) Anna will read the book.
 Anna 将 读 DET 书
 ‘Anna 将要读书。’




图 4.10: 包括情态词和从 *v* 到 T 的主语移位的“Anna will read the book”的句子分析

DP “the book” 是 read 的宾语，然后核查 read 的 D 特征。小 *v* 选择了主语 Anna。因为 T 有着强势的 D 特征（由星号“*”标记），Anna 一定不能在 *vP* 内部，但是会移动到 TP 的限定语位置。

完整的句子是 CPs。针对例（9）的分析，空 C 的中心语被认为是与 TP 组合在一起。空 C 贡献了从句的类型特征 Decl。例（9）的完整分析如图 4.11 所示。




图 4.11: 带有空 C 和小句类型特征 Decl 的 CP 的 “Anna will read the book” 的句子分析

例 (10) 中间句的分析包括对于问句 (question) 的句子类型的未指派值的 T 的小句类型特征。

- (10) What will Anna read?
 什么 将 Anna 读
 ‘Anna 要读什么?’

空补足语 C 具有 Q 特征，它可以给 T 的小句类型特征赋值。由于 T 的小句类型特征具有强势的 Q 值，T 元素必须移到 C 来局部核查。另外，wh 元素被移位了。这个移位是由 C 上的强 wh 特征决定的。例 (10) 的分析如图 4.12 on the following page 所示。

4.1.5.2 格指派

在第 3 章介绍的 GB 分析中，主格是由 (定式) I 所指派的，而且其他格是由动词指派的 (请看第 3.4.2 节)。主格的指派由最简方案接管，所以一般认为主格由 (定式) T 所指派。但是，在我们考虑的最简方案中，没有一个单一的动词投射，但是有两个动词性投射：vP 和 VP。现在，我们可以认为 V 指派给它的补足语宾格，或者 v 将宾格指派给它所统制的动词的补足语。Adger (2003: Section 6.3.2, Section 6.4) 认同后一种方法，因为它与所谓的非宾格动词和被动的分析是一致的。图 4.13 on page 125 显示了例 (11) 中的 TP:




图 4.12: 带有空 C 和强 wh 特征的 “What will Anna read?” 的句子分析

- (11) Anna reads the book.
 Anna 读 DET 书
 ‘Anna 读这本书。’


“Anna” 和 “the book” 这两个 NP 开始是没有赋值的不可解读的格特征: [u 格:]。这些特征被赋值为 T 和 v 。一般认为, 只有一个特征通过合并得到核查, 所以这可以是 T 上的 D 特征, 并为其他可能的核查机制留下格特征: 一致关系。一致关系可以用来核查子节点的特征, 也可是树上较远距离的特征。第一个节点需要 c-统制跟它具有一致关系的节点。c-统制大概是指: 一个节点在上, 然后任意多节点在下。所以 v c-统制 VP、V 和 DP “the book”, 以及所有该 DP 内部的节点。由于一致关系可以给 c-统制的节点赋值, v 上的宾格可以给 DP “the book” 的格特征赋值。

一致关系内部的非局部性带来一个问题: 为什么例 (12) 是不合乎语法的?

- (12) *Him likes she.
 他 喜欢她

v 的宾格可以通过它的主语得到核查, 而 T 的主格可以通过 likes 的宾语得到核查。所有的 DP 都与 T 和 v 具有必需的 c-关系。这一问题就通过要求所有的一致关系都包括最近的可能的元素而得到解决。Adger (2003: 218) 构建了如下的限制条件:

- (13) 一致关系的局部性: 在特征 F 和在 Y 上匹配的特征 F 具有一致关系, 当且仅当没有介于中间的 Z[F]。

图 4.13: T 的格指派和 “Anna reads the book” 这句的 TP 中的 v

这种介于关系在例 (14) 中被界定为:

- (14) 介于关系: 在结构 $[X \dots Z \dots Y]$ 中, Z 介于 X and Y 中间, 当且仅当 X c-统制 Y 。

所以说, 因为 T 可能与 *Anna* 具有一致关系, 它一定不能与 *the book* 具有一致关系。由此, (12) 中指派给 *she* 的主格是不可能的, 而且 (12) 也被准确地排除了。

4.1.6 说明语

Adger (2003: Section 4.2.3) 认为说明语附加在 XP 上, 并构成了一个新的 XP 。他把这一操作叫做邻接 (Adjoin)。由于这一操作并不消耗任何特征, 它与外部合并是不同的, 所以说这是介绍到理论中的一个新的操作, 这与 Chomsky 所主张的人类语言只使用合并作为结构构建操作是相互矛盾的。也有人提议将说明语看作是带有空中心语的特殊的副词性短语 (请看第 4.6.1 节), 并将其看作是功能性投射层级中的一部分。我个人更倾向于 Adger 在许多其他的框架下提出的解决办法: 我们用一条特殊的规则和操作来解决说明语和中心语的组合问题 (请看第 9.1.7 节有关 HPSG 框架下针对中心语说明语的组合问题)。

4.2 动词位置

根据前一节所介绍的机制, 德语动词位于首位的句子的分析是比较直接的。基本观点与 GB 理论中的是一致的: 定式动词从 V 移到 v , 再移到 T , 然后到 C 。移

到 T 的移位是由 T 上的强势时态特征所控制的，由 T 复杂式到 C 的移位由 T 上的小句类型特征得到加强，该特征通过 C 被赋值为强势的 Decl。例（15）的分析由图 4.14所示。

- (15) Kennt jeder diesen Mann?
认识 每人 这 男人
‘每个人都认识这个男人吗？’




图 4.14: 在Adger (2003)的分析下有关 “Kennt jeder diesen Mann?”（每个人都认识这个男人吗？）的分析

4.3 长距离依存

在对动词位于句首的句子解释完之后，动词位于第二位的句子的分析就不稀奇了：Adger (2003: 331) 认为有一个特征触发了成分向 C 的限定语的位置上的移位。Adger 称这个特征为向上，但是这个术语是不恰当的，因为德语陈述句的首位并不限制为话题。图 4.15 on the following page显示了例（16）的分析：

- (16) Diesen Mann kennt jeder.
这 男人 认识 每人
‘每个人都认识这个男人。’




图 4.15: 在 Adger (2003: 331) 的分析下有关 “Diesen Mann kennt jeder.” (这个男人, 每个人都认识。) 的分析

4.4 被动

Adger (2003) 针对英语被动式提出了相关的分析, 这里我将其应用于德语。就像第 3.4 节讨论的 GB 中的分析中, 一般认为动词并没有将宾格指派给 *shalagen* (打) 的宾语。在最简方案的术语中, 这意味着小 *v* 不具有需要被核查的宾格特征。小 *v* 的这一特殊版本在所谓的非宾格动词的句子的分析中发挥了重要作用 (Perlmutter 1978)。非宾格动词是具有许多有趣特征的不及物动词的小类。比如说, 他们可以被用在形容词分词 *isparticiple!adjectival* 中, 尽管这在不及物动词中并不常见。

- (17) a. *der getanzte Mann
DET 跳舞 人
b. der gestorbene Mann
DET 死 人
'这个死人'

对于这一区别的解释是形容词分词说明了主动句中的宾语:

4 转换语法-最简方案

- (18) a. dass der Mann das Buch gelesen hat
 CONJ DET 人 DET 书 读 AUX
 ‘这个人读这本书’
 b. das gelesene Buch
 DET 读 书

现在的设想是 gestorben (死) 的论元看上去像宾语, 而 getanzt (跳舞) 的论元像主语。如果形容词性被动式可以说明宾语, 这就解释了为什么例 (17b) 是可能的, 而例 (17a) 是不可能的。

Adger (2003: 140)提出了图 4.16中带非宾格动词的 vPs 的结构。一般认为, 这个




图 4.16: 在Adger (2003: 140)下, 带 fall、collapse 和 wilt 这类非宾格动词的 vP 结构

小 v 的非宾格变量在被动的分析中起到重要的作用。非宾格动词与被动动词相似, 因为他们都有一个主语, 这些主语在某种程度上也有宾语的特征。小 v 的特别版本由被动式中心语 werden 所选择, 这就构成了一个被动短语 (缩写为 PassP)。请看图 4.17中有关例 (19) 中例子的分析:

- (19) dass er geschlagen wurde
 CONJ 他打 AUX
 ‘他被打了’




图 4.17: 无移位且根据一致关系带有非域内格指派的最简方案分析

被动中心语要求小 v 的 Infl 特征具有 Pass 的值, 这就导致了输出层面的分词形态变化。所以所用的形式是 geschlagen (打)。助词移动到 T, 来核查 T 的 Infl 的强

势特征，并且由于 Infl 特征是过去式，werden 的过去式形式是 wurde，该形式用于输出表层。T 有一个主格特征尚需被核查。有趣的是，最简方案并不要求 schlagen 的宾语移动到 T 的限定语位置上来指派格，因为格指派是通过一致关系而达成的。所以说原则上，schlagen 的凸显论元可以在它的宾语位置上，并且无论如何都会从 T 上得到主格。这就可以解决 Lenerz (1977: Section 4.4.3) 指出的 GB 分析中的问题。请看第 101 页有关 Lenerz 的例子和问题的讨论。但是，Adger (2003: 332) 认为德语在 T 上具有强 EPP 特征。如果这一假设得到支持，那么 GB 理论下所有的问题都会延伸到最简方案的分析中：所有的宾语都需要移到 T 上，即使没有重新排序发生。进而，例 (20) 这类人称被动式就会有问题，因为没有名词短语能够为了核查 EPP 特征而移到 T 上：

- (20) weil getanzt wurde
 因为跳舞 AUX
 ‘因为那儿有人跳舞’

4.5 域内重新排序

Adger (2003) 并没有分析域内重新排序。但是文献中有一些其他的建议。因为最简方案中所有的重新排序都是特征驱动的，所以就必须有一个特征可以触发例 (21b) 中的重新排序：

- (21) a. [weil] jeder diesen Mann kennt
 因为 每人 这 人 认识
 ‘因为每个人都认识这个人’
 b. [weil] diesen Mann jeder kennt
 因为 这 人 每人 认识

像话题短语 (Laenzlinger 2004: 222) 或提供可移动位置的 AgrS 和 AgrO (Meinunger 2000: Chapter 4) 这类功能性投射有着许多不同的看法。G. Müller (2014a: Section 3.5) 给出了一个简洁的解决方案。在他的方法中，宾语简单地移到小 v 的第二个限定语位置上。这一分析在图 4.18 on the next page 中有所描述。⁵

Laenzlinger (2004: 229–230) 提出了一个观点来假定宾语的几个宾语短语可以按照任意次序排列。宾语移到这些投射的限定语位置上，而且因为宾语短语的语序没有限制，例 (22) 中的所有顺序都是可分析的：

- (22) a. dass Hans diesen Brief meinem Onkel gibt
 CONJ Hans 这 信 我的 舅舅 给
 ‘Hans 把这封信给我的舅舅’
 b. dass Hans meinem Onkel diesen Brief gibt
 CONJ Hans 我的 舅舅 这 信 给
 ‘Hans 给我的舅舅这封信’

⁵ G. Müller 提出了 v 的可选特征和触发域内重新排序的 V (第 48 页)。这些在图中没有显示。




图 4.18: “dass diesen Mann jeder kennt” (每个人都认识这个人) 句中宾语移到 v 的限定语位置上的分析

4.6 新的发展与理论变体

在 90 年代初期, 乔姆斯基对 GB 理论的基本假设进行了重新思考, 并只保留了那些绝对必要的部分。在最简方案 (Minimalist Program) 中, 乔姆斯基说明了对 GB 理论进行修正的核心动因 (Chomsky 1993, 1995b)。直到 90 年代早期, 格理论、Theta-标准、 \bar{X} 理论、邻接理论、约束理论、控制理论等都属于语言的内在机制 (Richards 2015: 804)。当然, 这就涉及到了非常具体的语言知识是如何进入我们的基因组的问题。最简方案沿着这一思路, 并且试图解释更为普遍的认知原则下的语言属性, 以及减少具体的内在语言知识的数量。比如说, 表、深层结构和表层结构, 之间的区别就被取消了。移位仍是一种操作, 但是只直接用来构建子结构, 而不是在一个完整的 D-结构之后完成。语言之间的差别在于这种移位是可见的还是不可见的。

尽管乔姆斯基的最简方案应该被看作是 GB 理论的后续理论, 最简方案的支持者经常强调这样一个事实, 即最简方案并不是一种理论, 而是一个研究项目 (乔姆斯基 2007: 4、2013: 6)。在 Chomsky (1995b) 介绍这一研究项目时, 乔姆斯基提出的实际分析被理论家们热烈地评论, 并且有时会引发严重的质疑 (Kolb 1997; Johnson & Lappin 1997, 1999; Lappin, Levine & Johnson 2000a,b, 2001; Seuren 2004; Pinker & Jackendoff 2005)。不过, 我们应该承认有些评论偏离了问题的关键。

最简方案有很多分支。在下面的内容中, 我将讨论一些核心的观点, 并解释哪些部分被认为是有关问题的。

4.6.1 移位、合并、特征驱动的移位与功能投射

Johnson、Lappin 和 Kolb 曾质疑过乔姆斯基系统的计算方面。乔姆斯基将经济原则引入了理论。在某些条件下，语法系统可以创造出一个任意数量的结构，但是只能是最经济的，也就是说，那些需要最少力气来产生的结构被认为是合乎语法的，也叫做 (transderivational economy)。这一假设并不需要被过于重视，实际上，它在最简方案框架下的很多研究中没有发挥重要的作用（尽管 Richards (2015) 在最新的有关生成的方法中用经济性进行了比较）。无论如何，乔姆斯基的理论的其他方面可以在很多近期的研究中有发现。比如说，乔姆斯基提出将基本结构的构建允准规则的数量减少到两个：移位和合并（即内部和外部合并）。移位对应于 Move- α 操作，这点已经在第 3 章有所讨论，合并是将（两个）语言对象进行组合。

我们普遍认为，两个对象可以被组合起来 (Chomsky 1995b: 226)。对于移位来说，一个给定的移位操作一定会有一个原因。这个移位的原因被认为是可以核查它要移到的位置上的某些特征。这一观点早在第 3.4 节有关被动的分析中有所说明：宾格宾语在被动句中不能带格，进而必须移到能够接收格的位置上。这类方法也可以用在一系列其他现象中。例如，有的短语的中心语是焦点和话题范畴。德语和英语中相应的功能中心语永远是空的。尽管如此，提出这些中心语是受到别的语言中有表示话题和焦点的形态变化的启发。这一论断是合理的，只能是建立在所有其他的语言中都有同样的范畴的假设上。不过，这一具有普遍性的共享部分（普遍语法，Universal Grammar, UG）跟具体的语言知识这种假设是冲突的，并且在乔姆斯基传统外的学者们所认可。即使再乔姆斯基语言学下工作的学者而言，仍有很多问题被提出，是否这样讨论问题是合适的，因为这只是创造循环结构的能力，这一能力负责人类应用语言的具体能力（狭义的语言的功用）——正如 Hauser, Chomsky & Fitch (2002) 所认为的——然后个别的句法范畴不属于普遍语法，其他语言的数据也不能用来解释另一种语言不可见的范畴。

4.6.1.1 功能投射与语言知识的分子化

移位必须由特征核查所允准这一思想导致了（静态）功能中心语数量的膨胀。

⁶ Rizzi (1997: 297) 提出了图 4.19 on the following page（也可以参考 Grewendorf 2002: 85, 240、2009）中的结构。

⁶ 这类中心语的假设并不是必要的，因为特征可以被集中，然后他们能被一起核查。在这一点，HPSG 理论中在本质上是类似的，请看 Sternefeld (2006: Section II.3.3.4, Section II.4.2)。

在所谓的 cartographic 方法中，每个形态句法特征都对英语一个独立的句法中心语 (Cinque & Rizzi 2010: 54, 61)。对于一个明显形式化的方法来说，在一个组合操作中有一个特征被利用了（请看 Stabler (2001: 335)）。Stabler 的最简方案语法 (Minimalist Grammars) 在第 4.6.4 节中有更为详细的讨论。




图 4.19: 在Rizzi (1997: 297)下句子的句法结构

功能范畴 Force、Top、Foc 和 Fin 对应于小句类型、话题、焦点和定式。一般认为移位总是锚定限定语位置。话题和焦点元素总是移动相应短语的限定语位置。话题可以在焦点元素的前面或后面，这就是为什么会有两个话题投射：一个在 FocP 上面、一个在 FocP 下面。话题短语是可循环的，也就是说，任意数目的 TopP 可以出现在图中的 TopP 位置上。根据 Grewendorf (2002: 70)，话题和焦点短语只能在有特殊的信息结构的需要而实现，比如说移位。⁷ Chomsky (1995b: 147) 采纳了 Pollock (1989) 的观点，并认为所有语言都有主宾一致关系 isagreement!object 和否定 (AgrS、AgrO、Neg) 的功能投射。⁸ Sternefeld (1995: 78)、von Stechow (1996:

⁷ 对于功能投射是不是可选的具有不同的看法。有些作者认为功能投射的完整层级总是存在的，但是功能中心语可以是空的（如 Cinque 1999: 106 和 Cinque & Rizzi 2010: 55）。

⁸ 请看 Chomsky (1995b: Section 4.10.1)。

103)和Meinunger (2000: 100–101, 124)区分了直接宾语和间接宾语 (AgrO、AgrIO) 的两个一致关系的位置。同样对于 AgrS、AgrO和 Neg, Beghelli & Stowell (1997) 认为功能中心语分享和分发, 以解释英语在 LF 层特征驱动的辖域现象。对于没有空元素或移动的辖域现象的分析, 请看第 19.3 节。Błaszczak & Gärtner (2005: 13)提出了 –PolP、+PolP和%PolP范畴来讨论极性问题。

Webelhuth (1995: 76)对功能投射进行了概述, 并在 1995 年提出以下范畴的定义, 包括 AgrA AgrN、AgrV、Aux、Clitic 态、Gender、Honorific、μ、Number、Person、Predicate、Tense和 Z。

除了 AdvP、NegP、AgrP、FinP、TopP 和 ForceP, Wiklund, Hrafnbjargarson, Bentzen & Hróarsdóttir (2007) 提出了外围 TopP。Poletto (2000: 31)针对意大利语中 clitics 的位置, 提出了 HearerP 和 SpeakerP。

Cinque (1999: 106)在他的研究中采用了 32 个功能中心语, 如图 4.1所示。他认

表 4.1: Cinque (1999: 106)的功能中心语

1. Mood _{Speech Act}	2. Mood _{Evaluative}	3. Mood _{Evidential}	4. Mood _{Epistemic}
5. T(Past)	6. T(Future)	7. Mood _{Irrealis}	8. Mod _{Necessity}
9. Mod _{Possibility}	10. Mod _{Volitional}	11. Mod _{Obligation}	12. Mod _{Ability/permission}
13. Asp _{Habitual}	14. Asp _{Repetitive(I)}	15. Asp _{Frequentative(I)}	16. Asp _{Celerative(I)}
17. T(Anterior)	18. Asp _{Terminative}	19. Asp _{Continuative}	20. Asp _{Perfect(?)}
21. Asp _{Retrospective}	22. Asp _{Proximative}	23. Asp _{Durative}	24. Asp _{Generic/progressive}
25. Asp _{Prospective}	26. Asp _{SgCompletive(I)}	27. Asp _{PlCompletive}	28. Asp _{Voice}
29. Asp _{Celerative(II)}	30. Asp _{SgCompletive(II)}	31. Asp _{Repetitive(II)}	32. Asp _{Frequentative(II)}

为所有句子都包括一个具有所有这些功能中心语的结构。这些中心语的限定语位置可以由副词充当或者保持空位。Cinque 认为这些功能中心语和相应的结构构成了普遍语法中的一部分, 即这些结构的知识是内在的 (第 107 页)。⁹

Laenzlinger (2004)在 Cinque 的思想下, 提出德语的功能中心语语序。他还采用了 Kayne (1994)的思想, 他认为所有的句法结构都有跨语言的具体语序的中心语补足语, 即使表层语序看起来是与之矛盾的。

组成成分序列最终是可见的是由左向移位推导而立的。¹⁰ 图 4.20 on page 135

⁹ 图 4.1显示了小句域内的功能中心语。Cinque (1994: 96, 99) 也说明了带有投射的形容词的顺序: 质量、大小、形状、颜色和国籍。这些范畴和他们的语序被认为与普遍语法是有关系的 (第 100 页)。

Cinque (1994: 96) 认为最有可能有七个属性形容词, 并解释了这样的事实, 在名词域中有着有限数量的功能投射。如第60, 页所示的, 在合适的语境中, 有可能有这七种形容词, 这就是为什么 Cinque 的功能投射需要重复的原因。

¹⁰ 这也适用于外置, 即德语中将成分移到后场。通常这会被分析为向右移位, Kayne (1994: Chapter 9)将它分析为把所有其他成分向左移动。Kayne 认为 (i.b) 是通过移动 NP 的部分从 (i.a) 推导而来的:

(i) a. just walked into the room [NP someone who we don't know].
刚 走 进 DET 房间 NP 某人 谁 我们 不 认识
'刚走进房间 [NP 我们不认识的某人]'

显示了动词位于末位的小句的分析, 这里功能副词中心语被省略了。¹¹ 主语和宾语分别作为 vP 和 VP 内部的论元而生成。主语移到了主语短语的限定语位置, 而宾语移到了宾语短语的限定语位置。动词性投射 (VP_k) 移到了助词前, 并移到了包括助词的短语的限定语位置。SubjP 和 ObjP 的唯一功能在于给各自移位提供落地点。对于宾语在主语前的句子而言, Laenzlinger 认为宾语移到了话题短语的限定语位置。图 4.20 只包含一个 ModP 和一个 AspP, 尽管 Laenzlinger 认为 Cinque 提出的所有的中心语在所有德语小聚的结构中都是存在的。Zwart (1994) 针对荷兰语提出了一个类似的分析, 宾语和主语从动词位于末位的 VP 移到了 Agr 位置。

针对 Kayne 模型的争论, 请看 Haider (2000)。Haider 指出, Kayne 类的理论对德语作出了不正确的判断 (比如说对于选择的副词和第二谓词的位置, 以及动词的复杂构成), 由此就无法证明该理论可以解释所有的语言的论断。Haider (1997a: Section 4) 指出, 由 Pollock (1989)、Haegeman (1995) 和其他人提出的空否定中心语的论断是有问题的。请看 Bobaljik (1999) 关于 Cinque 的副词投射的论断的讨论。

进而, 还需要指出 SubjP 和 ObjP, TraP (及物短语) 和 IntraP (不及物短语) (Karimi-Doostan 2005: 1745) 和 TopP (话题短语), DistP (数量短语), AspP (情态短语) (Kiss 2003: 22、Karimi 2005: 35), PathP 和 PlaceP (Svenonius 2004: 246) 这些范畴符号都包含了语法功能、配价、信息结构和语义的信息。¹² 某种程度上, 这是对范畴符号的误用, 但是这种对信息结构和语义范畴的误用是必要的, 因为句法、语义和信息结构是紧密相连的, 而且, 语义解读句法信息, 即语义在句法之后进行 (看图 3.2 和图 4.1)。通过在句法中运用语义和语用相关的范畴, 在形态、句法、语义和语用层面上已经没有清晰的界限了: 每个元素都被“句法化”了。Felix Bildhauer (p.c. 2012) 向我指出, 意义的单个方面由节点表示的一系列功能投射的假设实际上与构式语法中的短语方法非常接近了 (Adger 2013: 470 也持这一观点)。我们只是简单地列出这些句法配置, 并且这些配置被赋予某种意义 (或在句法后被解读的特征, 比如说, 请看 Cinque & Rizzi (2010: 62) 有关 TopP 的分析)。

b. Someone_i just walked into the room [_{NP} _{-i} who we don't know].

某人_i 刚 走 进 DET 房间 _{NP} _{-i} 谁 我们 不 认识

‘某人刚走进房间 [_{NP} _{-i} 我们不认识的]’

(i.a) 一定是某种推导出的中间表示, 否则英语就不会是 SV(O), 而是 V(O)S。由此, (i.a) 是通过将 VP “just walked into the room” 前置由 (ii) 推导出来的。

(ii) Someone who we don't know just walked into the room

某人 谁 我们 不 认识 刚 走 进 DET 房间

‘我们不认识的某个人刚走进房间’

这类分析需要承认的是他们不能轻易地与行为模型相组合 (请看第 15 章)。

¹¹ 这些结构并不对应于第 2.5 节介绍的 \bar{X} 理论。在某些情况下, 中心语与补足语相组合以构成 XP 而不是 X' 。更多有关最简方案中 \bar{X} 理论的内容, 请看第 4.6.3 节。

¹² 更多例子和参考资料请看 Newmeyer (2004a: 194、2005: 82) Newmeyer 也研究了规定每个语义角色 (如施事、受益格、工具、致事、随伴格和逆行格短语) 投射的条件。




图 4.20: 在Laenzlinger (2004: 224)下的左向剩余移位和功能中心语的句子结构分析

4.6.1.2 限定语位置的特征核查

如果认可特征核查理论关于限定语-中心语关系与逻辑结论的关系, 那么就可以得到诸如Radford (1997: 452)提出的分析结果。Radford 认为, 介词嵌套在附加于例 (23) 中的结构的一致关系短语中, 通常认为, 介词邻接于一致关系短语的中心语, 并且介词的论元移到了一致关系短语的限定语位置上。

(23) [PP P DP]

这里的问题是宾语在介词之前。为了校正这一点, Radford 提出了带有空中心语的功能投射 p (读作小 p), 这一中心语是介词连接的对象。这一分析如图 4.21所示。这一机制只在保证特征核查发生于限定语-中心语关系这一假设中是必需的。如果




图 4.21: Radford 理论下有关限定语位置和小 p 的格指派分析

想允许介词决定它所带的宾语的格, 那么所有这些理论上的演算就没有必要了, 而且可以保证 (23) 中的结构是完好的。

Sternefeld (2006: 549–550)对这一分析提出质疑, 并将之比喻为瑞士奶酪 (充满了空洞)。这个瑞士奶酪的比喻也许太贴切了, 因为, 与瑞士奶酪不同的, 这一分析中空洞的比率非常大 (两个词与五个空元素)。我们已经看过第 65页有关名词短语的分析了, 这里 NP 的结构, 只包括一个形容词 *klugen* (聪明), 它所包含动空元素比显性的词还多。与这里所讨论的 PP 的分析不同的是, 空成分只出现在显性的限定词和名词实际出现的位置上。另一方面, 小 p 投射是全部由理论内部推导的。对于图 4.21的分析没有任何一条附加的假设是由理论外推导而成的 (请看Sternefeld 2006: 549–550)。

这一分析的变体由Hornstein, Nunes & Grohmann (2005: 124)提出。这些作者没有利用小 p , 而是不那么复杂的结构。他们提出了例 (24) 中的结构, 对应于图 4.21中的 AgrOP-子树。

(24) [_{AgrP} DP_k [_{Agr'} P_i+Agr [_{PP} t_i t_k]]]

作者认为 DP 向 SpecAgrP 的移动是不可见的，即隐性的。这就解决了 Radford 的难题，并使得 pP 的假设多余了。

这些作者通过匈牙利语中的一致现象来推动这一分析：匈牙利语的名词短语后的后介词与其在人称和数上保持一致关系。也就是说，他们认为英语的前介词与匈牙利语的后介词短语具有同样由移位生成的结果，尽管英语中这一移位是隐性的。

按照这一思路，我们有可能减少基本操作的数量，并降低其复杂度，这一分析可以说是最简的。但是，这些结构仍然是非常复杂的。本书中所介绍的其他理论没有一种是需要用如此膨胀的结构来分析介词和名词短语的组合的。例(24)中的结果不能由英语数据来说明，由此无法从语言输入而获得。提出这类结构的理论需要提出一个特征只能在（特定的）限定语位置上核查的普遍语法（看第13章和第16章有关普遍语法和语言习得的内容）。更多有关（隐性）移位的讨论请看Haider (2014: Section 2.3)。

4.6.1.3 域内选择与功能投射

应用功能中心语来表示语序会带来另一个问题。在经典的 CP/IP-系统和这里讨论的所有其他理论中，一个范畴代表带有同样分布的一类宾语，即 NP（或 DP）表示代词和复杂名词短语。中心语选择哪些带有一定范畴的短语。在 CP/IP-系统中，I 选择了一个 VP 和一个 NP，而 C 选择了一个 IP。在较新的分析中，这类选择机制并不能简单地奏效。因为例(25)中已经有移位了，我们需要在“das Buch dem Mann zu geben”（这个人要给的这本书）这句话中处理 TopP 或 FocP。由此，um 不能简单地选择非定式 IP，而是分别选择 TopP、FocP 或 IP。需要确定的是，TopPs 和 FocPs 标记了包含其中的动词的形式，因为 um 只能与 zu-不定式相搭配。

- (25) a. um dem Mann das Buch zu geben
 PREP DET 人 DET 书 INF 给
 ‘给那个人这本书’
 b. um das Buch dem Mann zu geben
 PREP DET 书 DET 人 INF 给
 ‘把这本书给那个人’

由此，范畴系统、选择机制和特征投射就需要被处理得更为复杂，尤其是将他们与简单基础生成的系统相比，这些系统生成语序或者成分从 IP 移出，构成一个新的 IP。

支持Cinque (1999)理论的观点是有问题的，原因是：Cinque 认为范畴 AdverbP 用来组合副词和 VP。这是一个空的功能中心语，它将动词性投射作为它的补足语，而且，副词表面上位于该投射的限定语位置。在这些系统中，副词短语需要传递动词的屈折属性，因为具有特定的屈折属性的动词（定式的、带 zu 的不定式、不带 zu 的不定式、助词）需要由更高位置的中心语来选择（请看第171页和第9.1.4节）。当然也有应用一致关系来表示的，但是这样的话，所有的选择关系就是非域内的，而且所有的选择关系都不是一致的。进而，这个分析的更为严重的问题有由副词修饰副词的结构，这与英语中的部分前置和位于动词前的副词性的非短语结构有关，请看Haider (1997a: Section 5)。

副词问题的一个特殊情况是否定问题: Ernst (1992)更为细致地研究了否定的句法,并指出否定不能附加在几个不同的动词投射 (26a,b)、形容词 (26c) 和副词 (26d) 上。

- (26) a. Ken could not have heard the news.
Ken AUX 不 AUX 听 DET 新闻
‘Ken 不可能通过这个新闻。’
- b. Ken could have not heard the news.
Ken AUX AUX 不 听 DET 新闻
Ken 可能没听过这个新闻。‘
- c. a [not unapproachable] figure
ART 不 不可接触 人物
‘一位不可接触的人物’
- d. [Not always] has she seasoned the meat.
AUX 总是 AUX 她 DET 肉
‘她并不总是把肉调味。’

如果所有这些投射只是没有更多属性 (有关动词形式、形容词词性、副词词性) 的 NegP, 这就无法说明他们不同的句法分布。否定很明显只是更多普遍性问题的一个特殊的情况, 因为副词在传统意义上可以附加在形容词上构成形容词短语, 而不是 Chinque 意义上的副词短语。比如说, 例 (27) 中的副词 oft (经常) 修饰 lachender (笑) 构成了形容词短语 oft lachender, 这就像未被修饰的形容词助词 lachender: 它修饰 Mann (人), 并位于它前面。

- (27) a. ein lachender Mann
ART 笑 人
‘一位大笑的人’
- b. ein oft lachender Mann
ART 经常大笑 人
‘一位经常大笑的人’

当然我们可以想出针对上述三个问题的解决方案, 并且应用一致关系来加强域外的选择限制, 但是这样就会破坏选择的域内限制 (请看 Ernst 1992: 110 和本书第 18.2 节的讨论), 而且这比依存关系的直接选择来说要复杂得多。

与前述我们讨论的域内问题相关的是安放附着词的特殊功能投射的假设: 如果用 SpeakerP, 那么第一人称单数的附着词就可以移到正确的限定语位置, 而对于 HearerP 来说, 第二人称附着词就可以移到正确的位置上 (Poletto 2000: 31), 然后我们需要的用来编码所有与小句有关的特征的特殊投射 (另外, 我们当然可以假定有非域内的一致关系来表示分配事实)。在这些特征之外, 范畴标签包括允许更高的中心语选择包括附着词的小句的信息。在其他方法和转换语法早期变体中, 选择被认为是严格的域内限制, 这样更高的中心语只能接触到所嵌套范畴的属性, 这些范畴直接与选择相关 (citealp[223]Abraham2005a、Sag 2007), 而不是有关小句内中心语的论元是否是说话者还是听话者, 或者小句中的一些论元是否被实现为附着词。域内限制将在第 18.2 节讨论。

4.6.1.4 特征驱动的移位

最后,对于特征驱动的移位来说有一个概念上的问题,这一问题由 Gisbert Fanselow 指出: Frey (2004a: 27)提出了 KontrP (对比短语),并且Frey (2004b)提出了 TopP (话题短语)(请看Rizzi (1997)提出意大利语中的 TopP 和 FocP (焦点短语)、Haftka (1995)、Grewendorf (2002: 85, 240)、2009、Abraham (2003: 19)、Laenzlinger (2004: 224)以及Hinterhölzel (2004: 18)有关德语中带 TopP 和 / 或 FocP 的分析)。构成成分根据信息结构的状态移到这些功能中心语的限定语位置上。Fanselow (2003a)指出这种基于移位的理论对于中场的元素排序来说与最简方案的假设是不一致的。这一现象的原因是,有时移动的发生是为了给其他元素创造出位置(利他移位)。如果句子的信息结构要求离动词最近的宾语既不是焦点,也不是焦点的一部分,那么离动词最近的宾语不应在小句子得到最重音。这可以通过去重音化而得到,即通过将重音移到另一个成分上,或者进而,如例(28b)所示,通过将宾语从接受结构重音的位置上移到不同的位置上。

- (28) a. dass die Polizei gestern Linguisten verhaftete
 CONJ DET 经常 昨天 语言学家 逮捕
 ‘昨天警察逮捕了语言学家’
 b. dass die Polizei Linguisten gestern verhaftete
 CONJ DET 警察 语言学家 昨天 逮捕
 ‘昨天警察逮捕了语言学家’

在西班牙语中,部分焦点可以不通过特殊的语调就能实现,但是只能通过利他移位来将宾语移出焦点位置。请看德语中有关利他的多重前置的讨论。

为了核查由信息结构的属性驱动的一些特征,就不可能认为成分移到了树中的特殊位置上。因为特征核查是现今最简方案中移位的前提条件,我们就不得不假定有一个特殊的属性,该属性只有触发利他移位的功能。Fanselow (2003a: Section 4、2006: 8)还指出,话题、焦点和句子副词的语序限制可以被一种理论来合理地描述,其中,论元首先跟他们的中心语一个接一个地组合(最简方案中的术语是合并),然后状语可以在附加在任意投射层上。在句中焦点位置前的句子副词有这样的语义解释:由于句子副词像焦点敏感算子,他们不得不直接位于他们所指的元素之前。这样,话语(话题)中不属于焦点的元素需要在句子副词之前。这样就必须假定一个话题位置来解释中场的域内重新排序。这一分析在 LFG 和 HPSG 中也有所涉及。相应的分析在后面的章节中有更为详细的讨论。

4.6.2 标记

在最简方案中,乔姆斯基尝试将组合操作及其基础简化到越简单越好。为了支撑这一假设,他认为带有较少具体语言知识的普遍语法比带有较多具体语言支持的普遍语法而言在演化的角度来看更为可行(Chomsky 2008: 135)。

基于此,他取消了X理论中的投射层、语迹、index 和“相似的描述技术”(Chomsky 2008: 138)。剩下只有合并和移位,即内部和外部合并。内部和外部合并将两个句法对象 α 和 β 合并进一个表示为集合 $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ 的更大的句法对象中。 α 和 β 要么是词汇项,要么是内部复杂的句法对象。内部合并将宾语的一部分移到了它的边缘。

¹³内部合并元素的结果是集合 $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ ，其中， α 是 β 的一部分。外部合并也得到有两个元素的集合。但是，两个独立的对象被合并了。通过合并创造出的对象有一定的范畴（一套特征）。例如，如果我们将元素 α 和 β 相组合，那么我们会得到 $\{1, \{\alpha, \beta\}\}$ ，其中，1是结果对象的范畴。这一范畴也叫做标记（label）。因为我们认为所有成分都有中心语，指派到 $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ 到范畴要么是范畴 α ，要么是范畴 β 。Chomsky (2008: 145)分析了决定集合的标记的两条规则。

- (29) a. 在 $\{H, \alpha\}$ 中，H和LI，H是标记。
b. 如果 α 在内部合并到 β 上，构成了 $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ ，然后 β 到标记是 $\{\alpha, \beta\}$ 的标记。

正如Chomsky指出的，这些规则不是没有问题的，因为在所有的情况中，标记并不是单一决定的。一个例子是两个词汇元素的组合。如果例(29a)中的H和 α 都是词汇项（LI），那么H和 α 可以是结果结构的标记。Chomsky意识到，这可以导致推导结构，但是他指出这一点是没有问题的，并且将之忽视了。Chomsky在他的2013这篇论文中给出了两个词汇项到组合的分析。解决这一问题的方法是界定所有的词汇项的组合都拗口一个功能元素和一个根元素 (Marantz 1997; Borer 2005)。根在定义上不是标记¹⁴而且功能元素范畴决定了组合的范畴 (Chomsky 2013: 47)。这样的分析只能被反对：最简方案的目标是简化理论设想，使得语言习得和语言演化的模型变为可行的，但是为了简化基本概念，它就要设计名词不仅仅是一个名词，而是需要一个功能元素来说明名词所在的范畴。Chomsky的光杆短语结构 (Chomsky 1995a)的所有设想是在 \bar{X} 理论中去除一元分支结构，我们不清楚他们为什么在现在通过后门来被重新介绍出来，带有一个额外的空元素就更为复杂了。¹⁵诸如范畴语法和HPSG的理论可以将词汇项直接组合，无须假定任何助词投射或空元素。请看Rauh (2013)有关早期的转换语法、HPSG、构式语法、角色参数语法 isRole and Reference Grammar 和Chomsky (2013)提出的基于根的新构建主义理论中句法范畴的处置的比较分析。Rauh总结道，句法和语义信息的直接连接是需要的，而且Marantz和Borer的新构建主义需要被反对。更多有关新构建主义的评论请看Wechsler (2008a)和Müller & Wechsler (2014a: Sections 6.1 and 7)。

代词与动词投射相组合带来的问题与上面讲的问题有关。在He left的分析中，代词he是一个词汇元素，所以需要为He left的标记负责，因为left是最简方案中的一个内在复杂动词投射。结果可以是一个名词标记，而不是动词的。为了解决这一问题，Chomsky (2013: 46)指出he有一个复杂的内部结构：‘也许是D-pro’，即he（可能）是在一个可见的限定词和一个名词之外构成的。

¹³ 更为具体来说，句法对象的一部分被拷贝，然后该拷贝成分被放到整个对象的边缘位置。该拷贝的原型不再与发音有关（移位的拷贝理论）。

¹⁴ 另一个通过定义被排除为标记的范畴是 Conj，它表示并列 (Chomsky 2013: 45–46)。这是需要并列可用的操作。请看下面。

¹⁵ (i.a) 中旧的 \bar{X} 规则对应于 (i.b) 中的二元组合。

- (i) a. $N' \rightarrow N$
b. $N \rightarrow N\text{-func root}$

在 (i.a) 中，一个词汇名词投射到 N' 中，而且在 (i.b) 中，一个根元素与功能名词中心语相组合为一个名词范畴。

两个非词汇项外部合并的情况(如一个名词短语和动词短语)并没有在Chomsky (2008)中有所讨论。Chomsky (2013: 43–44)指出, 短语 XP 与 { XP, YP } 的标记无关, 如果 XP 进一步被移位的话(或者是在移位的拷贝理论中被拷贝)。Chomsky 认为在 { XP, YP } 组合中的两个短语中的一个要被移位, 因为不然的话就无法标记了(第 12 页)。¹⁶ 我们用下面并列的例子来进行说明。Chomsky 认为, “Z and W” 这个表达式可以这样进行分析: 首先, Z 和 W 合并。这一表达式再与 Conj 相组合 (30a), 然后再下一步 Z 被提升 (30b)。

- (30) a. [$_{\alpha}$ Conj [$_{\beta}$ Z W]]
b. [$_{\gamma}$ Z [$_{\alpha}$ Conj [$_{\beta}$ Z W]]

由于 β 中的 Z 只是一个拷贝, 它并不能表示标记, 而且 β 可以获得 W 这个标记。并且要求 Z 和 α 相组合, Conj 不能是标记, 所以完整结构的标记是 Z。¹⁷

Chomsky 讨论的另一特殊情况是 LI α 非 LI β 的内部合并。按照规则 (29a), 标记应该是 α 。按照 (29b), 标记应为 β (也请看Donati (2006)) Chomsky 讨论了代词 what 与 you wrote 相组合的例子。

- (31) what [C [you wrote t]]
什么 C 你写 t
‘你写了什么’

如果标记是由 (29b) 决定的, 那么在 GB 框架下就有一个被叫做 CP 的句法对象; 由于这个 CP 是疑问句, 它可以在 (32a) 中被用作 wonder 的补足语。如果标记是由 (29a) 来决定的, 我们就可以在 (32b) 中得到被用为 read 的宾格宾语的宾语, 即在 GB 术语中与 DP 相关的成分。

- (32) a. I wonder what you wrote.
我想知道 什么 你 写
‘我想知道你写了什么’

¹⁶ 他的解释是自相矛盾的: 在第 11 页, Chomsky 认为两个具有相同范畴的实体的组合的标记就是这个范畴。但是在他对并列的操作中, 他认为其中一个并列项需要被移动, 否则完整的结构就不能得到标记了。

¹⁷ 正如 Bob Borsley (p.c. 2013) 向我指出的, 这种方法对于两个用 and 连接的单一名词短语的并列情况会得出错误的结论, 因为并列的结果是一个复数 NP, 而不是像第一个并列成分的单一个体。HPSG 之类的理论可以通过将特征集中起来表示这一特点, 这些特征在并列结构共享(句法特征和非域内特征, 请看Pollard & Sag (1994: 202))。

进而, 整个分析并不能解释为什么 (i.b) 被规则排除出去了。

- (i) a. both Kim and Lee
二者 Kim 和 Lee
‘Kim 和 Lee 两个人’
b. *both Kim or Lee
二者 Kim 或 Lee

并列的信息必须是 “or Lee” 这个表达式的一部分, 这样可以用来与 “and Lee” 进行对比。

另一个问题是 α 这个标记应该是 W 的标记, 因为 Conj 并不能决定是哪个标记。这就导致, 我们需要在 Z 和 W 之间进行选择, 来决定 γ 的标记。按照 Chomsky 的逻辑, 要么是 Z, 要么是 W 必须要移位来使得标记 γ 是可行的。Chomsky (2013) 在脚注 40 中提到了这一问题, 但是并没有给出解决办法。

- b. I read what you wrote.
我读 什么 你 写
‘我读了你写的东西。’

例 (32b) 中的 “what you wrote” 被叫做自由关系从句。

Chomsky 关于自由的关系从句的方法是有兴趣的，但是不能在全维度上来描述这一现象。问题是包括关系代词的短语可以是复杂的（与 Donati 的观点相比，请看 Citko (2008: 930–932)）。¹⁸ (33) 是从 Bresnan & Grimshaw (1978: 333) 中选出的英语例子。Bausewein (1990: 155) 和 Müller (1999b: 78) 中的德语例子在例 (34) 中。

- (33) I'll read [whichever book] you give me.
我-将读 任何一个 书 你 给 我
‘我会读你给我的任何一本书。’

- (34) a. Ihr könnt beginnen, [mit wem] ihr wollt.¹⁹
你 可以 开始 PREP 谁 你 想要
‘你想跟你想要的任何一个人开始。’
b. [Wessen Birne] noch halbwegs in der Fassung steckt, pflegt solcherlei
谁的 灯泡/头也 半路 PREP DET 插座 AUX 使用 这样
Erloschene zu meiden;²⁰
消逝 INF 避免
‘那些还有一半智慧的人想要避免这类空字符；’
c. [Wessen Schuhe] „danach“ besprenkelt sind, hat keinen Baum gefunden und
谁的 鞋 此后 有斑点的 AUX AUX 不 树 找到 和
war nicht zu einem Bogen in der Lage.²¹
AUX 不 INF ART 弓 PREP DET 位置
‘那些鞋上有斑点的人找不到树也不能按照弧形来小便。’

由于 “wessen Schuhe” (谁的鞋) 并不是一个词汇项，我们就需要应用规则 (29b)，而且对于这种情况没有额外的规则。这就意味着整个自由关系从句 “wessen Schuhe danach besprenkelt sind” 被标记为 CP。对于标记为 CP 的 (33) 和 (34) 中的自由关系从句并不是期望得到的记过，因为他们作为主谓词的主语或宾语，并由此被标记为 DP。但是，因为 “wessen Schuhe” 是一个复杂短语，而不是一个词汇项，(29a) 并不适用，所以就没有作为 DP 的自由关系小句的分析。所以说，看起来我们必须回到 Groos & van Riemsdijk (1981) 提出的 GB 分析，至少是针对德语的例子。Gross 和 van Riemsdijk 认为自由关系从句包括一个空名词，它像正常名词一样被关系小

¹⁸ Chomsky (2013: 47) 承认，目前关于自由关系小句中的标记还有很多问题，所以他承认这类标记相关的问题还有很多。

¹⁹ Bausewein (1990: 155).

²⁰ Thomas Gsella, taz, 1997 年 2 月 12 日，第 20 页。

²¹ taz, taz mag, 08./09.08.1998，第 XII 页。

句来修饰。在这一方法中, 关系短语的复杂度是无关的。只有空中心语是跟整个短语的标记是有关的。²²

但是, 一旦空中心语在分析中被批准, (29a) 到 (31) 的应用就是不需要的了, 因为应用可以导致针对 (32b) 的两个分析: 一个是空名词性中心语, 一个是最经济的取胜, 但是转移派生限制的假设导致不想要的后果 (Pullum 2013: Section 5)。

Chomsky (2013) 放弃了 (29b) 中的标记条件, 而是将它替换为普遍的标记规则, 该规则约束两个短语的内部和外部合并。他区分这种情况。在第一中情况中, 标记是可能的, 因为集合 {XP, YP} 中的两个短语中的一个被移走了。这一情况早在上面就有所讨论。Chomsky 还写了另一种情况: “X 和 Y 在相关方面是相同的, 并可具有相同的标记, 可以被看作是 SO 的标记” (第 11 页)。他草拟了第 13 页的疑问小聚的分析, 这里疑问短语具有一个 Q 特征, 提取出 Q 短语的剩余的句子也具有 Q 特征。这类标记也许也可以被用作正常句子的标记, 它们包括主语和动词短语的在人称和数上的一致关系。这些特征可以对句子的标记负责。确切的细节还没有制定出来, 但是可以肯定的是一定比 (29b) 更为复杂。

在 Chomsky (2005) 和 Chomsky (2013) 中较为一致的属性是标记由合并的宾语中的一个外在地决定。正如 Bob Borsley 跟我指出的, 这对 (35) 这类疑问/关系短语是有问题的。

- (35) with whom
PREP 谁
‘跟谁’

(35) 中的短语既是一个介词短语 (因为第一词是介词), 也是一个疑问/关系短语 (因为第二个词是一个疑问/关系词)。所以, 我们需要的是 PPs 的正确标记啊, 像

²² 假设空中心语是有问题的, 因为它职能在那些由状语修饰的情况下用作论元, 叫做关系小句 (Müller 1999b: 97)。对于后期重新发现这一问题的也可以看 Ott (2011: 187)。这一问题可以在 HPSG 理论下得到解决, 通过假定一个一元投射, 投射到关系小句的合适的范畴。我也应用一元投射来分析所谓的非匹配的自由关系小句 (Müller 1999b)。在非匹配的自由关系小句的结构中, 关系小句填充了论元槽的位置上, 该位置并不对应于关系短语的属性 (Bausewein 1990)。Bausewein 讨论了下面的例子, 这里关系短语是一个 PP, 但是自由关系代词填充了 kocht (做饭) 的宾格槽。

- (i) Sie kocht, worauf sie Appetit hat.
她 做饭 是什么她 胃口 AUX
‘她想吃的时候就做饭。’

请看 Müller (1999b: 60–62) 关于语料库的例子。

最简方案不能应用一元投射。Ott (2011) 提出了关系短语的范畴被投射的分析, 但是他没有为非匹配自由关系小句提供解决方案 (第 187 页)。这 Citko 的分析是一样的, 其中内部合并的 XP 可以提供标记。

还有许多其他有标记, 或者更多没有标记的研究。比如说, 一些最简方案研究者想要标记删除, 进一步提出没有标记的句法。如 Osborne, Putnam & Groß (2011) 所指出的, 这类分析使得最简方案更像依存语法了。不清楚的是这些模型中的哪些能够处理非匹配的自由关系小句。Groß & Osborne (2009: Section 5.3.3) 在他们的依存语法中给出了自由关系小句的分析, 但是否认了非匹配部分的存在 (第 78 页)。他们提出, 关系短语是自由关系小聚的根或标记, 所以他们具有与最简方中非匹配自由小句相同的问题。正如 Groß & Osborne (2009: 73) 和 Osborne et al. (2011: 327) 所声称的: 在 (他们所谓的) 依存语法中通常没有所谓的空中心语。也没有一元分支投射。这看起来使得带有关系短语 YP 的自由关系小句可以作为 XP, 使得 XP 是一个在 Keenan & Comrie (1977) 的旁格层级中更高的范畴, Bausewein (1990) 发现的一般特征 (也可以看 Müller 1999b: 60–62 和 Vogel 2001: 4)。为了能够表示相关事实, 需要有一个与 (i) 中的 worauf 标记不同的元素或者标记。

(35) 中那种是覆盖了从子节点到母节点的不同属性的界定良好的形式。²³

更多有关最近合并的构成的标记和大范围的过度分析请看 Fabregas et al. (2016)。

总之, 我们可以说, 用来简化理论和减少具体语言内在知识所提出的标记, 只能用在一定数量的规定中。例如, 需要空功能词假设的词汇元素的组合, 他们的唯一目的在于决定特定词汇元素的句法范畴。如果这与语言实体相关, 有关标记的知识、各自的功能范畴, 以及有关需要忽视标记的范畴可以称为具体语言内在知识的一部分, 而且什么都得不到。剩下的只是没有在最简方案的方向下取得进展的特别复杂的怪异分析。进而, 还有很多以观察和实验为依据的问题以及大量未能解决的问题。

结论是, 二元组合的标记不应该由 Chomsky (2008, 2013) 提出的方式来决定。另一种用来计算标记的选择是用功能论元结构中的功能函子作为标记 (Berwick & Epstein 1995: 145)。这是范畴语法 (Ajdukiewicz 1935; Steedman 2000) 和 Stabler 的最简方案 (2011b) 中所采用的方法。²⁴ Stabler 有关合并的形式化的内容将在第 4.6.4 节进行讨论。

4.6.3 限定语、补足语和 \bar{X} 理论的剩余部分

Chomsky (2008: 146) 认为, 每个中心语都只有一个补足语, 但是有任意数量的限定语。在标准 \bar{X} 理论中, 限制在普遍的 \bar{X} 模式中最多只有一个补足语, 而且假定这样的结构至多是二元分支的: 在标准 \bar{X} 理论中, 一个词汇中心语与所有它的补足语相组合以构成一个 X' 。如果在一个短语中最多有两个子节点, 只能有一个补足语 (双及物动词动句子被分析为一个空中心语允准一个额外的论元; 请看 Larson (1988) 有关空动词中心语的研究以及 Müller & Wechsler (2014a: Sections 6.1 and 7) 对包括小 *v* 方法的严格评论)。在标准的 \bar{X} 理论中, 只有一个限定语。这一限制现在被废黜了。Chomsky 写道, 限定语和补足语的区别现在可以从哪些元素与他们的中心语相合并的顺序来推导出来: 首先合并的元素是补足语, 其他所有的 (即后期合并的) 是限定语。

这一方法对单价动词的句子来说是有问题的: 根据 Chomsky 的观点, 单价动词的主语不能是限定语, 而是补足语。²⁵ 有关这一问题的更多细节将在第 4.6.4 节

²³ HPSG 通过区分包括言语信息的中心语特征和包括提取和疑问/关系元素的信息的非域内特征来解决这一问题。中心语特征从中心语投射, 母节点的非域内特征是子节点的非域内特征减去那些特定中心语或者在特定句法配置中没有约束的特征。

Citko (2008: 926) 提出了一个分析, 其中所有的子节点都可以贡献力量给母节点。结果是像 $\{P, \{D, N\}\}$ 的复杂标记。这是一个高度复杂的数据结构, 而且 Citko 并没有给出任何信息, 它所包含的相关信息是如何被接触到的。带有标记 $\{P, \{D, N\}\}$ 的宾语是 *P*、*D*, 还是 *N* 呢? 我们可以说 *P* 有限性, 因为它在嵌套最少的集合中, 但是 *D* 和 *N* 在一个结合中。突出的特征怎么样呢? 介词如何选择 *DP* 决定了 $\{D, N\}$ 是 *D*, 还是 *N*? 任何情况下, 很清楚的是形式化会包括循环的关系, 它们为了接触到他们的特征能够发掘出子集的元素。这增加了整体的复杂度, 而且在 HPSG 中不受推崇, 因为它对于应用了每个语言对象的词性值。

²⁴ 为了范畴语法的方法奏效, 有必要将范畴 x/x 指派给状语, 这里 *x* 表示状语所附加的中心语的范畴。例如, 形容词与名词对象组合成一个名词对象。这里它的范畴是 *n/n*, 而不是 *adj*。

同样, Stabler 的方法并不适用于状语, 除非他想将名词范畴指派给定语形容词。解决这一问题的一个方法是假定对状语和他们的中心语有一个特殊的组合操作 (请看 Frey & Gärtner 2002: Section 3.2)。这一组合操作与 HPSG 理论中的中心语-状语范式是等效的。

²⁵ Pauline Jacobson (p.c. 2013) 指出, 不及物动词动问题可以这样来解决, 即假定最后合并的元素是限定语, 而所有非最后合并的元素是补足语。这就可以解决非及物动词的问题以及 (36) 中动词的并列

详细讨论。

除此之外，认为与词组相合并的句法对象是限定语的分析不允许两个词汇动词直接并列，如 (36) 所示：²⁶

(36) He [knows and loves] this record.

他知道 和 喜爱 这 专辑

‘他知道并喜爱这张专辑。’

例如，在 Steedman (1991: 264) 提出的分析中，and（作为中心语）首先与 love 合并，然后得到的结果与 knows 合并。这一组合的结果是具有所组合部分相同句法属性的复杂对象：结果是一个复杂动词，该动词需要一个主语和一个宾语。在与两个动词并列的结合之后，结果需要与 this record 和 he 组合。this record 在所有相关方面都像补足语。但是，按照 Chomsky 的定义，它应该是一个限定语，因为它与合并的第三次应用所组合。得到的结果是不清楚的。Chomsky 认为合并不能说明成分序列。按照他的观点，线性化发生在音位形式（Phonological Form, PF）层。其中的限制在他近期的文章中并没有提及。但是，如果作为补足语或限定语的范畴在 Kayne 的工作中对线性化起到了作用，而且在 Stabler 的观点中（请看第 4.6.4 节），this record 需要在 knows and loves 之前线性化，这是与事实相反的。这就意味着类似于范畴语法的有关并列的分析是不可行的，而且剩下的唯一选择看起来就是假定 knows 与宾语相组合，然后两个 VPs 并列在一起。Kayne (1994: 61, 67) 追随 Wexler & Culicover (1980: 303) 的观点，提出这一观点，并认为第一个 VP 中的宾语被删除了。但是，Borsley (2005: 471) 指出这一分析作出了错误的预测，因为 (37a) 可以从 (37b) 推导出来，尽管这些句子在意义上是不同的。²⁷

(37) a. Hobbs whistled and hummed the same tune.

Hobbs 吹口哨 和 哼 DET 相同 调子

‘Hobbs 吹着口哨，并哼着相同的曲调。’

b. Hobbs whistled the same tune and hummed the same tune.

Hobbs 吹口哨 DET 相同 调子和 哼 DET 相同 调子

‘Hobbs 吹着相同的调子，并且哼着相同的调子。’

问题。但是，它不能解决 (39) 中中心语后置语言的并列问题。进而，现金的最简方案允许多重限定语，这就与 Jacobson 式的思想不一致了，除非希望对非首先合并元素的状态施以更为复杂的限制。

²⁶ Chomsky (2013: 46) 在 (30) 中提出了并列分析：按照这一分析，动词可以直接合并，而且其中一个动词可以在生成的较后步骤中在连词前后移动。正如在上一节所指出的，这样的分析并不有利于达到关于具体语言的内在知识进行最小化的假设的目的，因为它完全无法清楚地解释这样的并列分析是如何由语言学习者习得的。所以说，我在这里不考虑并列分析。

Chomsky 2013 年的这篇文章的另一个创新之处在于，他取消了限定语的概念。他在第 43 页的脚注 27 写道：“关于限定语的问题有非常多有启发性的文献，但是如果这里的推理是正确的，它们就不存在，而且这些问题不能用公式来表示。”这么说是对的，但是这就意味着在最简方案框架下关于限定语概念的解释到目前为止不再有意义了。如果我们按照 Chomsky 的说法，过去几十年大部分的语文学研究都没有价值了，而且需要重新做。

Chomsky 在他早期的研究中没有严格遵守线性化的思路，但是某种程度上我们要确认那些叫做限定语的实体在被叫做限定语的成分所在的位置上实现的。这就意味着下面的评论即使在 Chomsky 式的假设中也是相关的。

²⁷ 也可以看 Bartsch & Vennemann (1972: 102)、Jackendoff (1977: 192–193)、Dowty (1979: 143)、den Besten (1983: 104–105)、Klein (1985: 8–9) 和 Eisenberg (1994b) 关于转换语法的早期版本中相似观察与相似观点的评论。

因为语义解读不能在音位形式层面看到像删除这样的处理 (Chomsky 1995b: Chapter 3), 语义之间的区别不能通过删除材料的分析而得到解释。

在另一个 VP 并列结构的分析中, 有一个语迹与 *this record* 相关。这可以是一个右节点提升 (Right-Node-Raising) 分析。Borsley (2005) 指出这样的分析是有问题的。下面的例子选自他讨论的几个有问题的例子 (也可以看 Bresnan 1974: 615)。

- (38) a. He tried to persuade and convince him.
 他 尝试 INF 劝说 和 说服 他
 ‘他试着劝说并说服他。’
 b. *He tried to persuade, but couldn't convince, him.
 他 尝试 INF 劝说 但是 AUX-NEG 说服 他

如果 *him* 没有重读的话, 第二个例子是不合乎语法的。相较而言, (38a) 是合格的, 即使带有不重读的 *him*。所以, 如果 (38a) 是右节点提升的一个例子, 对比就是出乎意料的。由此, Borsley 派出了右节点提升分析。

针对 (36) 这类句子的分析的第三个可能性提出了非连续的成分概念, 并应用了材料两次: 两个 VP *knows this record* 和 *loves this record* 与第一个 VP 的并列是非连续的。(请看 Crysmann (2001) 和 Beavers & Sag (2004) 在 HPSG 理论框架下提出的分析。) 但是, 非连续的成分通常不在最简方案框架下进行应用 (比如说 Kayne (1994: 67))。而且, Abeillé (2006) 指出, 有证据表明词汇元素直接并列的结构。这就意味着我们需要上面讨论的 CG 分析, 这就会导致刚刚讨论的限定语/补足语状态的问题。

进而, Abeillé 指出, 在中心语后置的语言中, 如韩语和日语中, NP 并列在基于合并的分析中是有困难的。(39) 是一个日语的例子。

- (39) Robin-to Kim
 Robin-和 Kim
 ‘Kim 和 Robin’

在第一步中, Robin 与 *to* 合并。在第二步, Kim 被合并。因为 Kim 是限定语, 我们可以认为 Kim 位于中心语之前, 因为在中心语后置的语言中, 限定语就是这样排列的。

Chomsky 试图去除标准 \bar{X} 理论的一元分支结构, 该结构用来将代词和限定词等词汇项投射到完整的短语中, 相关工作由 Muysken (1982) 完成。Muysken 应用二元特征 MIN 和 MAX 将句法对象区分为最小 (词或者类词的复杂对象) 或最大 (代表完整短语的句法对象)。这样的特征系统可以用来将代词和限定词描述为 [+MIN, +MAX]。但是, 像 *give* 一类的动词被归类为 [+MIN, -MAX]。它们必须为了达到 [+MAX]-层而投射。如果限定语和补足语需要是 [+MAX] 的, 那么限定词和代词满足了这一要求, 而不需要从 X^0 通过 X' 投射到 XP-层。

在 Chomsky 的系统里, MIN/MAX 的区别表现在中心语的完整性 (完整=短语), 以及作为词汇项的属性。但是, 在 Muysken 和 Chomsky 的观点中有一个小但是很重要的区别: 关于上面讨论的并列数据的认识问题。在 \bar{X} 理论的范畴系统中, 可以将两个 X^0 s 相组合以得到一个新的、复杂的 X^0 。这一新对象基本上具有简单的 X^0 s 具有的相同的句法属性 (请看 Jackendoff 1977: 51 和 Gazdar, Klein, Pullum & Sag

1985)。在 Muysken 的系统里, 可以构成这样的并列规则(或连词的词汇项)来将两个 +MIN 并列为一个 +MIN 项。在 Chomsky 的系统里, 无法定义一个相似的规则, 因为两个词汇项的并列不再是一个词汇项了。

正如 Chomsky 最近提出的最简方案, 范畴语法 (Ajdukiewicz 1935) 和 HPSG 理论 (Pollard and Sag 1987, 1994: 39–40) 并不(严格)遵循 \bar{X} 理论。所有的理论都将符号 NP 指派给代词(有关 CG 请看 Steedman & Baldridge (2006: p. 615), 有关为了量化来加入词汇类型的提升请看 Steedman (2000: Section 4.4))。短语 likes Mary 和词 sleeps 在范畴语法 (s\NP) 中具有相同的范畴。在所有的理论中, 没有必要为了将像 tree 的名词与限定词或状语相组合而从 N^0 投射到 \bar{N} 。在受限不定式中的限定词和单价动词在许多 HPSG 理论的分析中没有从 X^0 层投射到 XP 层, 因为每个语言对象(一个空的 SUBCAT 或 COMPS list) 的价的属性足够决定他们的组合潜力以及句法分布 (Müller 1996d, Müller 1999a)。如果最简的属性对于现象的描述是必要的, 那么在 HPSG 理论中就应用了二元特征 LEX (Pollard and Sag 1987: 172, 1994: 22)。但是, 这个特征对于区分限定语和补足语来说不是必要的。这一区分将由论元结构列表 (ARG-ST) 的元素匹配到限定语与补足语的特征(分别缩写为 SPR 和 COMPS) 的配价列表的原则所决定。²⁸ 严格来说, 动词投射中的限定语是英语类结构定型语言中动词的最间接论元。由于论元结构列表是由 Keenan & Comrie (1977) 提出的间接层级所决定的, 该列表中的第一个元素是动词的最间接论元, 而且该论元匹配到 SPR list 上。SPR list 中的元素实现为英语等 SVO 语言的动词左边的成分。COMPS list 中的元素实现为他们的中心语右边的成分。Ginzburg & Sag (2000: 34, 364) 提出的方法认为中心语-补足语短语将动词及其论元组合起来, 这与 (36) 这类并列具有相同的问题, 因为 VP 的中心语不是一个词。²⁹ 但是, 中心语的这一限制可以由指称 LEX 的特征所替代, 而不是词或词项的属性。

Pollard & Sag 和 Sag & Ginzburg 提出了英语的平层结构。由于其中一个子节点被标记为词汇的, 它自然得到的规则就不会将中心语与它的补足语的子集相结合, 然后第二次将结果与其他补足语组合起来。所以说, 像 (40a) 的结构就被排除了, 因为 gave John 不是一个词, 所以不能用作规则中的中心语节点。

- (40) a. [[gave John] a book]
给 John ART 书
‘给 John 一本书’
b. [gave John a book]
给 John ART 书
‘给 John 一本书’

与 (40a) 不同的是, 只有像 (40b) 的分析是被允许的; 也就是说, 中心语与它所有的论元相组合。另一方面是假定二元分支结构 (Müller 2015c, Müller & Ørsnes 2015: Section 1.2.2)。在这一方法中, 中心语补足语模式不能限制中心语节点的词短语状态。HPSG 理论中的二元分支结构对应于 MP 的外部合并。

²⁸ 一些作者提出了主语、限定语和补足语的三分法。

²⁹ 正如上面提到的, 对于非连续成分的多领域方法对于 (36) 的分析而言是可行的(请看 Crysmann 2001 和 Beavers & Sag 2004)。但是, 正如 Abeillé (2006) 强调的, 词汇项的合并需要在原则是可行的。还需要注意的是, 并列的 HPSG 方法不能代替 MP。原因是 HPSG 方法包括并列的特殊语法规则, 而 MP 则只有合并。所以说, 组合型规则的额外介入并不是 MP 的一个选项。


在前面两节中，我们讨论了 Chomsky 有关标记的界定问题以及词汇项的并列问题。在下面一节中，我将探讨 Stabler 对最简方案的合并的界定，他的界定是与标记相关的，而且其中一个版本没有涉及到上面讨论的问题。我将指出他的形式化方法与 HPSG 的表示非常一致。

4.6.4 最简方案、范畴语法和 HPSG 理论

在这一小节，我将最简方案、范畴语法和 HPSG 理论联系起来。对范畴语法和 HPSG 理论不太熟悉的读者可以略过这一节，或者在看完第 6 章、第 8 章、和第 9 章之后再回来。

在第 4.6.2 节，我们指出 Chomsky 的论文在未确定的标记上留下了许多重要的细节尚未讨论。Stabler 的工作相对而言接近于近期的最简方案方法，但是在实现方面更为准确（也请看 Stabler (2011a: 397, 399, 400) 关于后 GB 方法的形式化）。Stabler (2001) 说明了 Kayne 的剩余移位理论时如何形式化和实现的。Stabler 将他对最简方案理论的形式化的方式叫做最简语法 (Minimalist Grammars, MG)。关于最简方案和其变体 (Michaelis 2001) 的能力不足有许多有趣的结论。比如说，可以用 MGs 创造的语言也可以用树邻接语法（请看第 12 章）来创造。这就意味着，可以将更多的词串指派到 MGs 的结构中，但是，由 MGs 推导出来的结构并不一定必须与 TAGs 创造的结构相同。更多有关语法的生成能力的内容，请看第 17 章。

尽管 Stabler 的工作可以看作是 Chomsky 的最简方案思想的形式化，Stabler 采用的方法与 Chomsky 的方法在某些细节方面是不同的。Stabler 认为两个合并操作的结果不是集合，而是对儿。对儿的中心语由指针（‘<’或‘>’）来标记。像（第 4.6.2 节讨论的）括号表达式 $\{\alpha, \{\alpha, \beta\}\}$ 替换为 (41) 中的树的表达形式。



在 (41) 中，1 是中心语，2 是补足语，3 是限定语。指针指向包括中心语的结构的那个部分。树中的子节点是按照顺序排列的，即 3 在 1 之前，1 在 2 之前。

Stabler (2011a: 402) 对外部合并的界定如下所示：

$$(42) \quad em(t_1[=f], t_2[f]) = \begin{cases} \begin{array}{c} < \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ t_1 \quad t_2 \end{array} & \text{if } t_1 \text{ has exactly 1 node} \\ \\ \begin{array}{c} > \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ t_2 \quad t_1 \end{array} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

=f 是一个选择特征, f 是对应的范畴。当 $t_1[=f]$ 和 $t_2[f]$ 组合时, 结果是一棵树, 其中 t_1 的选择特征和 t_2 的个别范畴特征被删除了。(42) 中的上层树表示一个 (词汇) 中心语与其补足语相组合。 t_1 位于 t_2 之前。只能由一个节点的条件与的设想是一致的, 即第一个合并是与补足语的合并, 其他合并操作是与限定语的合并 (Chomsky 2008: 146)。

Stabler 将内部合并界定为:³⁰

$$(43) \text{ im}(t_1[+f]) = \begin{array}{c} > \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ t_2^> \quad t_1\{t_2[-f]^> \mapsto \epsilon\} \end{array}$$

t_1 是一棵带有 t_2 子树的树, 它的特征 f 的值是 ‘-’。这一子树被删除了 ($t_2[-f]^> \mapsto \epsilon$), 然后没有特征 $-f(t_2^>)$ 的被删除子树的拷贝位于限定语的位置。在限定语位置上的元素必须是最大投射。这一要求由提升的 ‘>’ 来表示。

Stabler 为 (44) 中的句子提供了一个推导的例子。

- (44) who Marie praises
 谁 Marie 表扬
 ‘Marie 表扬的人’

praises 是一个带有两个 =D 特征的二元动词。这就意味着有两个限定短语的选择。who 和 Marie 是两个 Ds, 而且它们填充到动词的宾语和主语位置上。得到的动词投射 Marie praises who 嵌套在空的补足语下面, 它被限定为 +WH, 这样就为 who 的移位提供了位置, 它被放在内部合并的操作下 CP 的限定语位置上。who 的 -WH 特征被删除了, 应用内部合并得到的结果是 Marie praises who。

这一分析的问题由 Stabler 他自己在未发表的著作 Veenstra (1998: 124): 中提出: 它对单价动词的处理是不正确的。如果动词与 NP 组合, 按照 (42) 中有关外部合并的定义, 就会将 NP 看作是补足语³¹, 并将其排到中心语的右边。与 (45a) 中的句子的分析相反, 我们会得到、(45b) 中的字符串的分析。

- (45) a. Max sleeps.
 Max 睡觉
 ‘Max 睡觉。’
 b. *Sleeps Max.
 睡觉 Max

为了解决这一问题, Stabler 提出, 单价动词与非显性宾语相组合 (请看 Veenstra (1998: 61, 124), 他引用了 Stabler 尚未发表的工作, 而且也采用了这一解决方法)。有了这一空宾语, 得到的结构和 Max 是限定语, 并由此被排列在 (46) 中动词的左边。

³⁰ 除了 (43) 所示的情况, Stabler 的定义包括最短移位限制 (Shortest Move Constraint, SMC) 的变体, 这与目前所讨论的问题是无关的, 所以我们在这里就不说明了。

³¹ 再与第 4.6.3 节中 Chomsky 关于限定语和补足语的定义相比较。


(46) Max sleeps _.

Max 睡觉

‘Max 睡觉。’

当然，任何一种这类分析都是规定的，而且完全是特设的。而且，它恰巧可以佐证 Culicover & Jackendoff (2005: Section 2.1.2) 讨论的转换生成语法在方法论上的缺陷：过度地追求统一。

另一种方法是，假定有一个空的动词中心语，它带有补足语 *sleeps* 和主语 *Max*。这种分析经常被用来说明最简方案中 Larson 式的动词壳 (Larson 1988) 理论下的双及物动词。Larson 式的分析一般认为有一个叫做小 *v* 的空的动词中心语，该中心语具有致使的含义。正如我们在第 4.1.4 节讨论的，Adger (2003) 采用了基于小 *v* 的分析来讨论不及物动词。不考虑 TP 投射，图 4.22 显示了他的分析。Adger 认为带

图 4.22: Max sleeps (Max 睡觉) 的基于小 *v* 的分析

有非作格动词的句子的分析包括选择了施事的小 *v*，而带有非宾格动词的分析包括小 *v*，但是它并不选择 N 中心语。对于非宾格动词而言，他认为动词选择了主题。他证明了小 *v* 不必具有致使的含义，但是要能引入施事。不过需要注意的是手头这个例子中，*sleep* 的主语既没有引发事件，也不必故意做某事。所以，它实际上是遭受者，而不是施事。这意味着关于空 *v* 中心语的假设纯粹是基于理论的假设，而不是针对不及物动词的语义所驱动的。如果假定了双及物构式中小 *v* 的致使贡献，这就意味着我们需要两个小 *vs*，一个具有致使含义，另一个不具有致使含义。小 *v* 除了缺乏理论外的驱动力，这类分析仍有一些基于经验上的一些问题（比如说并列）。更多细节可以参考 citew[Sections 6.1 and 7]MWArgSt。

除了 (42) 和 (43) 中界定的两个操作，MG 中没有其他操作了。³² 除了 单价动词的问题，它还会导致第 4.6.3 节讨论的问题是有点问题的：对于例 (36) – 这里重复显示为 (47) – 的动词，还没有对其直接组合的分析。

(47) He [knows and loves] this record.

他知道 和 喜爱 这 专辑

‘他知道并喜爱这张专辑。’

原因是 *know*、*and* 和 *loves* 的组合包括三个节点，而且 *knows and loves* 与 *this record* 的合并会让 *this record* 变成结构的限定语。由此 *this record* 就会排列在 *knows and loves* 的前面，这是与事实相反的。由于可以由 MGs 生成的语言包括那些可以由

³² 扩展内容请看 Frey & Gärtner (2002: Section 3.2)

TAGs 和组合性范畴语法 (Michaelis 2001), 生成的语言, 范畴语法分析的存在暗示了并列例子可以由 MGs 推导出来。但是对于语言学家而言, 事实是无法生成不太重要的所有的字符串 (语法的能力较弱)。由语法所允准的实际结构大多是重要的 (重要性能力)。

4.6.4.1 导向性的最简语法与范畴语法

除了重新界定 X^0 范畴, 并列问题海可以通过改变合并的定义来解决, 改变后的定义允许中心语确定与之组合的论元的方向: Stabler (2011b: p. 635) 指出, 决定论元的位置与选择特征一起重新定义了外部合并。

$$(48) \quad \text{em}(t_1[\alpha], t_2[x]) = \begin{cases} \begin{array}{c} < \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ t_1 \quad t_2 \end{array} & \text{if } \alpha \text{ is } =x \\ \\ \begin{array}{c} > \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ t_2 \quad t_1 \end{array} & \text{if } \alpha \text{ is } x= \end{cases}$$

等号的位置决定了论元需要实现在中心语的哪一边。这对应于范畴语法的前向与后向应用 (请看第 8.1.1 节)。Stabler 将这一形式叫做导向性的 MG (DMG)。这一 MG 的变体避免了单价动词的问题, 而且如果我们假设连词是带有变量范畴的中心语, 这些变量范畴选择与它左边或右边具有同样范畴的元素, 这样并列数据也没有问题了。know 和 love 都会讲宾语选在右边, 主语选在左边, 而且这一要求可以被传递到 knows and loves。³³ Stabler 针对 DMGs 提出的有关 CG 的更多细节请看 Steedman (1991: 264)。

4.6.4.2 最简语法与中心语驱动的短语结构语法

用 ‘>’ 和 ‘<’ 标记结构的中心语直接对应于中心语的 HPSG 表示。由于 HPSG 是一个基于符号的理论, 所有相关的语言学层面都表示为描述 (音位、形态、句法、语义、信息结构)。(49) 给出了一个例子: 词 grammar 的词汇项。

³³ 不过, 需要注意的是, 这一传递使得选择复杂范畴变成了可能, 这是我在 Müller (2013c) 忽略的事实。简单特征还是复杂他正的选择问题将在第 4.6.5 节讨论。

$$(49) \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{word} \\ \text{PHON} \\ \\ \text{SYNSEM|LOC} \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{c} \langle 'gramər \rangle \\ \text{loc} \\ \text{CAT} \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{cat} \\ \text{HEAD } \textit{noun} \\ \text{SPR } \langle \text{DET} \rangle \end{array} \right] \\ \text{CONT } \dots \left[\begin{array}{c} \textit{grammar} \\ \text{INST } X \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \right]$$

grammar 的词类是名词。为了构成一个完整的短语，它需要一个限定词。这由值为 $\langle \text{DET} \rangle$ 的 *SPR* 特征来表示。语义信息列于 *CONT* 下。更多细节请看第 9 章。

由于我们穷尽地处理句法方面，只有使用过特征的子集是相关的：配价信息和词类信息以及与短语的外在分布有关的某些形态句法属性表现为 *SYNSEM|LOC|CAT* 路径下的特征描述。这里特别有趣的特征是所谓的中心语特征。在词汇中心语和它的最大投射之间共享中心语特征。复杂的层级结构也被模拟为特征值对儿。复杂语言对象的组成成分通常表现为复杂对象的表示的部分。比如说，特征 *HEAD-DAUGHTER* 的值是一个特征结构，该特征结构模拟了包括短语中心语的语言学对象。中心语特征原则 (50) 指向这个子节点，并且保证中心语与完整对象的中心语特征是相同的。

$$(50) \textit{headed-phrase} \Rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT|HEAD } \boxed{1} \\ \text{HEAD-DTR|SYNSEM|LOC|CAT|HEAD } \boxed{1} \end{array} \right]$$

指称是由具有相同数字的盒子表示的。

Ginzburg & Sag (2000: 30) 在给出了子节点属性的值的列表中表示了语言对象的所有子节点。特征 *HEAD-DAUGHTER* 的值与子节点列表中的一个元素相同：

$$(51) \begin{array}{ll} \text{a.} & \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{HEAD-DTR } \boxed{1} \\ \text{DTRS } \langle \boxed{1} \alpha, \beta \rangle \end{array} \right] \\ \text{b.} & \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{HEAD-DTR } \boxed{1} \\ \text{DTRS } \langle \alpha, \boxed{1} \beta \rangle \end{array} \right] \end{array}$$

α 和 β 是对语言学对象的描述的简称。(51) 中的两个描述的要点在于中心语子节点与两个子节点的一个是相同的，这分别由 α 和 β 前的 $\boxed{1}$ 决定。在第一个特征描述中，第一个子节点是中心语，而在第二个描述中，第二个子节点是中心语。由于中心语特征原则，整个短语的句法属性由中心语子节点决定。也就是说，中心语子节点的句法属性对应于 Chomsky 界定的标注。这一说法直接与 Stabler 使用的术语有关：(51a) 等同于 (52a)，而且 (51b) 等同于 (52b)。

$$(52) \begin{array}{ll} \text{a.} & \begin{array}{c} < \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \alpha \quad \beta \end{array} & \text{b.} & \begin{array}{c} > \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ \alpha \quad \beta \end{array} \end{array}$$

由Pollard & Sag (1994: Chapter 9)讨论的, 基本信息的另一种结构应用了 HEAD-DAUGHTER 和 NON-HEAD-DAUGHTERS 这两个特征, 而不是 HEAD-DAUGHTER 和 DAUGHTERS。这给出了像 (53a) 的特征描述, 它直接对应于 Chomsky 的基于集合的表示, 并在第节进行了讨论, 而且这里重复为 (53b)。

- (53) a.
$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{HEAD-DTR} & \alpha \\ \text{NON-HEAD-DTRS} & \langle \beta \rangle \end{bmatrix}$$

 b. $\{\alpha, \{\alpha, \beta\}\}$

例 (53a) 中的表示并不包括 α 和 β 的线性排列顺序。组成成分的线性排列顺序受到排列规则的限制, 这些规则是受到 (直接) 统制之外的独立的限制。

在 (43) 中有关内部合并的定义对应于 HPSG 中的中心语-填充语范式 (Pollard & Sag 1994: 164)。Stabler 的派生规则删除了 $t_2[-f]^>$ 子树。HPSG 是单调的, 即在语法允准的结构中是没有什么成分被删除的。与在更大的结构中删除 t_2 相反的是, 包括空元素 (NB, 不是树) 的结构是被直接允准的。³⁴ 在 Stabler 的定义和 HPSG 范式中, t_2 被实现为结构中的填充语。在 Stabler 关于内部合并的界定中, 没有提及中心语子节点的范畴, 但是 Pollard & Sag (1994: 164) 将中心语子节点限制为一个定式的动词投射。Chomsky (2007: 17) 认为, 所有的操作, 除了外部合并操作, 都是短语层面的。Chomsky 认为 CP 和 v^*P 是短语。如果这一限制被合并到 (43) 的定义中, 标记 t_1 的限制也会相应地得到扩展。在 HPSG 中, 像 (54) 的句子被看作是 VPs, 而不是 CPs。所以 Pollard & Sag 要求中心语填充语范式中的中心语子节点应该是动词性的, 以对应于 Chomsky 提出的限制。

- (54) Bagels, I like.
 百吉饼我喜欢
 ‘百吉饼, 我喜欢。’

所以说, 除了较小的表现上的差异, 我们可以得到这样的结论, 内部合并与中心语-填充语模式的形式化是非常相似的。

在 HPSG 和 Stabler 的定义之间一个重要的区别是移位。在 HPSG 中不是特征驱动的。这是一个重要的优势, 音位特征驱动的移位不能处理所谓的排他移位 (Fanselow 2003a) 的例子, 也就是说, 组成成分移位的发生是为了在某个位置上的其他成分让地方 (请看第 4.6.1.4 节)。

在一般的 \bar{X} 理论和 Stabler 在内部合并上的形式化一方面与 HPSG 中的另一方面的差别是, 后者中病没有有关填充语子节点的完整性 (或配价饱和度) 的限制。填充语子节点是否是最大投射或者不是, 这一问题受到域内强加的限制, 当语迹是与它的中心语相组合的时候。这就使得我们有可能分析 (55) 这类没有剩余移位的句子。³⁵

- (55) Gelesen_i hat_j das Buch keiner _{-i} _{-j}.
 读 AUX DET 书 没有人

³⁴ 请看 Bouma, Malouf & Sag (2001a) 在 HPSG 模式中有关无语迹的研究, 以及本书中的第 Müller (2015b: Chapter 7) 章和第 19 章有关空元素的讨论。

³⁵ 也可以参考 Müller & Ørsnes (2013b) 有关丹麦语中宾语转换的分析, 这种现象与没有剩余移位的动词前置是有关的。这一分析没有剩余分析所具有的任何问题。

相反, Stabler 被迫要假定 (56b) 中这样的分析 (请看 G. Müller (1998) 有关剩余移位的分析)。第一步, *das Buch* 被移出了 VP (56a), 而且在第二部, 空置的 VP 被提前, 如 (56b) 所示。

- (56) a. *Hat* [*das Buch*]_j [*keiner* [_{VP} _{-j} *gelesen*]].
 b. [_{VP} _{-j} *Gelesen*]_i *hat* [*das Buch*]_j [*keiner* _{-i}].

Haider (1993: 281), De Kuthy & Meurers (2001: Section 2) 和 Fanselow (2002) 指出, 这类剩余移位分析对于德语是有问题的。Fanselow 所指的需要剩余移位分析的唯一现象的问题是多重前置 (请看 Müller (2003a) 针对更多相关数据的讨论)。Müller (2005b,c, 2015b) 针对这些多重前置提出了另一种分析方法, 他提出了前场中的空动词中心语概念, 但是并没有假定例 (56b) 中 *das Buch* 这类附加语和论元是从前场成分中提取出来的。与剩余移位分析相反的事, 范畴语法 (Geach 1970; Hinrichs & Nakazawa 1994) 中的论元组成的机制被来确保句中论元的合理实现。Chomsky (2007: 20) 已经将论元组成作为他的 TPs 和 CPs 的一部分。所以说, 这两个剩余移位和论元组合被看作是最近的最简方案的理论。但是, HPSG 看起来不需要太多的理论演算, 并由此在简约的推理方面更为可取。

最后, 需要指出的是, 所有的转换方法在跨域提取方面都是有问题的, 就像 (57a) 和 (57) 中, 一个元素对应于几个空位。

- (57) a. *Bagels, I like and Ellison hates.*³⁶
 b. *The man who*_i [*Mary loves* _{-i}] and [*Sally hates* _{-i}] *computed my tax.*
 DET 男人 CONJ_i Mary 爱 _{-i} 和 Sally 恨 _{-i} 计算 我的税
 ‘Mary 喜爱但是 Sally 憎恨的这个男人计算了我的税。’

Gazdar (1981b) 针对 GPSG 解决了这一问题, 而且该解决方案也被用在了 HPSG 中。最简方案社团试着通过引进侧边移位来解决这些问题 (Nunes 2004), 其中组成成分可以被插入子树中。所以 (57a) 的例子中, *Bagels* 从 *hates* 的宾语位置拷贝到 *like* 的宾语位置, 然后两个拷贝都与前置的元素相关。Kobele 批评这些方法, 音位他们过度生成, 而且需要复杂的过滤。相反, 他提出将 GPSG 式的 SLASH 机制引入到最简方案的理论中 (Kobele 2008)。

进而, 移位矛盾 (Bresnan 2001: Chapter 2) 可以通过不在填充语和空位之间分享所有的信息来避免, 这一方法在转换框架下是不可能的, 它通常会假定填充语和空位具有同一性 – 正如在移位的拷贝理论下 – 认为一个推导过程包括一个宾语的多重拷贝, 其中只有一个是被拼写出来的。也可以参考 Borsley (2012) 跟多有关基于移位的方法的问题与困惑。

MG 和 HPSG 更深一层的区分在于中心语-填充语不是分析长距离议论的唯一模式。正如在第 133 页的脚注 10 所指出的, 右侧 (外置) 和前置都有错位的情况。尽管这些问题一定会分析为长距离依存, 他们与其他长距离依存在很多方面都有不同之处 (请看第 13.1.5 节)。在 HPSG 框架下的有关外置的分析, 请看 Keller (1995)、Bouma (1996) 和 Müller (1999a)。

除了长距离依存, 在 HPSG 中当然还有其他不在 MG 和最简方案下的现象。这些模式包括描述那些没有中心语的结构或者需要捕捉结构内部的分布属性, 这些

³⁶ Pollard & Sag (1994: 205).

不能轻易地在词汇分析中有所表示（比如说 *wh-* 和关系代词的分布情况）。请看第 21.10 节。

Chomsky (2010) 比较过助词转换的基于合并的分析与 HPSG 式的分析，并且评论道 HPSG 应用了十个模式，而不是一个（合并）。Ginzburg & Sag (2000) 区分了三类带有移位的助词的结构：带有前置副词和 *wh-* 问句 (58a,b) 的倒置句、倒置的感叹句 (58c)，以及极疑问句 (58d)：

- (58) a. Under no circumstances *did she think they would do that.*
 PREP 没有条件 AUX 她想他们 AUX 做那
 ‘在没有任何条件下，她想他们会那样做。’
- b. Whose book *are you reading?*
 谁的 书 AUX 你读
 ‘你在读谁的书？’
- c. Am I tired!
 AUX 我累
 ‘我累了！’
- d. Did Kim leave?
 AUX Kim 离开
 ‘Kim 离开了吗？’

Fillmore (1999) 在他的构式语法框架下分析助词倒装捕捉了几个不同的应用语境，并指出在不同的语境下有语义和语用的不同。每个理论都需要说明这些。进而，我们不需要十个模式。正如范畴语法那样，我们有可能在词汇项中来决定助词或空的中心语（请看第 21 章更多有关词汇和短语分析的讨论）。除此之外，每个理论都要在某种程度上解释这十种不同。如果有人认为这与句法无关，那么这就需要在语义组成上进行模拟。这就意味着在这一点上没有理由倾向于一种理论。

4.6.5 原子特征的选择与复杂范畴的选择

Berwick & Epstein (1995) 指出最简方案与范畴语法非常相似，而且我已经在 Müller (2013c) 和前面几节中讨论了最简方案和 HPSG 的相似之处。但是，我忽略了最简方案和范畴语法、依存语法、LFG、HPSG、TAG 和构式语法中关于选择的一个重要区别：在理论的前一版本中选择的是一个单一特征，而后面的理论选择的是特征束。这一区别看起来很小，但是后果很严重。在第 148 页给出的 Stabler 关于外部合并的定义移除了选择特征 (=f)，以及被选择的元素 (f) 的相应特征。在一些文献和本书的导言部分，选择特征被左脚不可预测的特征，并被标记为 *u*。不可预测的特征需要被核查，然后从 Stabler 界定的语言对象中移除。他们被核查的事实通过挑选被表示出来。所有不可预测的特征都需要在句法对象被送到表层（语义和语音）之前核查。如果不可预测的特征没有被核查，推导就失败了。Adger (2003: Section 3.6) 明确地讨论了这些假说的后果：一个选择的中心语核查被选择宾语的特征。我们不可能去检查与中心语相组合的包含在宾语中的元素的特征。只有在最高点的特征，所谓的根节点，可以由外在合并核查。在复杂对象内部的特征被核查的唯一途径是通过移位。这就意味着中心语可以不与部分

饱和的语言对象相组合，即带有一个未核查选择特征的语言对象。我会讨论Adger (2003: 95)提供的例子所指的决策设计。名词 *letters* 选择了一个 P，而且 Ps 选了一个 N。例 (59a) 的分析如图 4.23 所示。

- (59) a. *letters to Peter*
 信 PREP Peter
 ‘给 Peter 的信’
 b. **letters to*
 信 PREP




图 4.23: 根据Adger (2003: 95)，对 “letters to Peter” 的分析

例 (59b) 对字符串被规则排除了，因为介词 *to* 的不可预测的 N 特征没有被核查。所以这就整合了这样的限制，所有的依存元素必须在核心机制中是最大的。这就使得 (60) 这类例子在最直接的方式上来分析是不可能的，即包括一个复杂的介词和缺少限定词的名词：

- (60) *vom Bus*
 PREP.DET 公交车

在复杂描述可以用来描述依存关系的理论中，被依存的对象可以部分满足。所以比如说 HPSG 中，像 *vom* (*from.the*) 的复合介词可以选择一个 \bar{N} ，它是一个缺少限定语的名词性投射：

- (61) $N[\text{SPR} \langle \text{DET} \rangle]$

例 (61) 中的描述是一个内部饱和了的特征值对儿的缩写（请看第 9.6.1 节）。这里的例子只针对于差异的基石，因为有很多方法用来解释单一特征合并系统的情况。例如，我们可以假设一个 DP 分析，并且让复杂介词选择一个完整的 NP（没有不可预测特征的范畴 N）。另外，我们可以假设确实有一个完整的 PP，带有通畅所假定的所有结构，而且介词和限定词的组合在发音阶段形成。第一种方法省略了假定 NP 分析的选项，正如 Bruening (2009) 在最简方案框架下所提出的。

除了符合介词这个例子，还有其他想要将未饱和的语言对象相组合的例子。我已经讨论了上面的并列例子。另一个例子是像德语、荷兰语和日语这样的语言中的动词复杂形式。当然，还有一些看法并不认同动词复杂式 (G. Müller 1998; Wurmbrand 2003a)，但是他们也不是没有问题的。有些问题在前一节中也有所讨论。

简单总结这一小节的内容，需要说明的是构建进合并概念的特征核查机制必范畴语法、词汇功能语法、HPSG、构式语法和 TAG 中运用的选择来说更为严格。依我看，它有些太严格了。

4.6.6 小结

总之，我们可以说最简方案约束的计算机制与特征驱动的移位理论是有问题的，而且空功能范畴的假设有时是特异的。如果我们不希望假定这些范畴在所有的语言中都存在的话，那么提出两种机制（合并与移位）并不能表示出语法的简化，因为每个必须约定的功能范畴都构成了整个系统的复杂度的一部分。

标记机制在细节上也没有完全实现，它并不能描述它所生成可以描述的现象，由此它应该被替换为范畴语法和 HPSG 中基于中心语/函项的标记。

4.7 总结

这一节与第节相似。我首先评论语言习得，然后是形式化。

4.7.1 关于语言习得的解释

Chomsky (2008: 135)将 MP 中的理论归纳为原则 & 参数分析，并将 MP 参数确定在词汇中。也可以参考Hornstein (2013: 396)。UG 被界定为可能包括非具体语言的成分，他们是由基因决定的 (Chomsky 2007: 7)。UG 包括非绑定的合并，而且由语法生成的表达式的条件必须满足由音位和概念-意愿接口赋予的限制。另外，特征的具体集合被看作是 UG 的一部分 (Chomsky 2007: 6-7)。这些特征的具体本质没有被详细地解释，而且结果是，UG 的力量有时是模糊的。但是，在不同的语言学阵营里有达成一致的地方，就像 Chomsky 并不认为我们在第 4.6.1 节介绍的功能投射的部分也构成 UG 的一部分（但是，像Cinque & Rizzi (2010)这类作者认为功能投射的层级是 UG 的一部分）。由于参数的存在，第 3.6.1节用来反对 GB 理论关于语言习得的论断与最简方案中语言习得的论断具有相关性。请看第 16 章有关语言习得和原则 & 参数模型，以及基于输入的方法的深入讨论。

Chomsky 在最简方案中的主要目标是简化语言的形式属性的理论假说，以及用来使得他们和相关部分是我们的基因天赋的一部分的计算机制。但是，如果我们总结一下本章的主要内容，我们很难相信最简方案可以达到这一目标。为了得到一个不及物动词的简单句，我们需要几个空的中心语和移位。特征可以是强的或者弱的，一致操作跨越了几个短语界限的句法树。而且为了得到正确的结果，必须要确保一致只能看到最近的元素 (13) - (14)。这与范畴语法相比是一个巨大的工程，范畴语法只组合临近的成分。范畴语法可以从输入获得（请看第 13.8.3节），而它很难想象当输入很强时，特征驱动移位，而在输入很弱时就没有驱动这样的事实应用单独从数据获得。

4.7.2 形式化

第 3.6.2 节评论了转换语法直到上世纪九十年代都缺少形式化的研究内容。在最简方案中对形式化的态度没有变化，所以只有很少的最简方案理论的形式化与应用实现。

Stabler (2001) 说明了如何对 Kayne 的剩余移位理论进行形式化与实现。在 Stabler 的实现中³⁷，并没有转换生成限制，也没有计数³⁸，他不提倡一致等关系（请看 see Fong 2014: 132）。下述也是 Stabler 对于最简方案和 GB 理论的应用：没有大量的语法。Stabler 的语法是小型的，作为概念和句法的证据。没有形态变化³⁹，没有对多重一致关系的处理 (Stabler 2011b: Section 27.4.3)，尤其是没有语义。PF 和 LF 的过程也没有被模拟。⁴⁰ 由 Sandiway Fong 开发的语法和计算系统与理论的大小和相似度基本一致 (Fong & Ginsburg 2012; Fong 2014)：语法片段较小，句法编码，如直接在短语结构中标注 (Fong & Ginsburg 2012: Section 4)，而且远远位于 X 理论的后面。进而，他们不包括形态变化。没有实现拼写输出，所以最终无法剖析和生成任何话语。⁴¹ 这里的标准由基于约束的理论中语法的应用所决定；比如说，在上世纪九十年代开发的德语、英语和日语的 HPSG 语法作为 *Verbmobil* (Wahlster 2000a) 的一部分，用来对口语和大范围的 LFG 或 CCG 系统的分析。这些语法可以分析口

³⁷ 他的系统可以在以下网址找到：<http://www.linguistics.ucla.edu/people/stabler/coding.html>. 05.03.2016.

³⁸ 在 Veenstra (1998: Chapter 9) 中有一个计数的词汇项。这个词汇项包括一个计数的集合，它包括功能中心语，可以用在某类句子中。比如说，Veenstra 认为计数可以用在带有二价动词的句子和主语位于首位的句子、带有单价动词的嵌套句、带有单价动词的 *wh*-疑问句，以及带有单价动词的极性疑问句。这一计数集合的一个元素对应于一个特别的句法配置以及在构式语法思想下的短语构式。Veenstra 的分析并不是在最简方案下找到的计数的概念的形式化。通常，它被认为是包含所有句子生成所需词汇项的计数。如 (i) 所示，复杂句可以报考带有不同句子类型的句子的组合：

- (i) Der Mann, der behauptet hat, dass Maria gelacht hat, steht neben der Palme, die im
 DET 男人 CONJ 声称 AUX CONJ Maria 大笑 AUX 站 PREP DET 棕榈树 CONJ PREP
 letzten Jahr gepflanzt wurde.
 上次 年 种植 AUX
 ‘声称 Maria 大笑的男人站在去年种下的棕榈树旁。’

在 (i) 中，有两个带有不同价的动词的关系小句，一个带有单价动词的嵌套句和主句。在传统上对计数的理解中，Veenstra 需要假定有无限数量的词汇包含所有可能的句子类型的组合。

³⁹ 测试句具有 (i) 中的形式。

- (i) a. the king will -s eat
 b. the king have -s eat -en
 c. the king be -s eat -ing
 d. the king -s will -s have been eat -ing the pie

⁴⁰ 请看 Sauerland & Elbourne (2002) 有关 PF 和 LF-移位以及拷贝部分删除的建议（第 285 页）。对于这一点的应用并不是微不足道的。

⁴¹ Berwick, Pietroski, Yankama & Chomsky (2011: 1221) 关于 Fong 的研究的评论是错误的：“但是因为我们有时转而考虑计算机处理的问题，正如可以‘核查’中心语或标签的特征的能力一样，这就指出了一个合理的疑问，我们的框架是否是可计算的。所以我们值得指出移位的拷贝理论，与上述描述的‘搜索与标注’过程的域内导向，可以作为有效的剖析器来计算应用；更多细节内容请看 Fong (2011)。”如果一个软件不能剖析一个简单句，那么我们就不能说它是有效的，因为我们不知道程序所缺少的部分会不会使得它失效。进而，我们将这个软件与其他程序进行比较。正如上面已经讨论的，Fong 没有用 Chomsky 所谓的标签，但是相反他应用了第 2 章所描述的短语结构语法。

语 (Verbmobil 涉及到日程安排和旅行计划领域) 或书面语中 83% 的话语。语言知识被用来生成和分析语言结构。在一个方向上, 我们会得到词串的语义表示, 而另一个方向上, 可以创造出给定语义表征的词串。形态分析在分析有精细的形态标记的语言中自然发生的数据上是不可缺少的。在本书的其他部分, 我们会在每章的开头讨论其他理论开发的语法和计算系统。

在 GB/MP 内部缺少大规模的语法片段的原因有可能跟最简方案参团的基本假设的变化相对较快有关系:

在最简方案中, 驱动的中心语通常被叫做探针 (probe), 移动的元素叫做目标 (goal), 而且对于激活句法效应的特征之间的关系有许多不同的看法。Chomsky (1995b: p. 229) 首先提出, 当要求被满足, 特征表示核查与删除的特征。第一个设想几乎立即被修饰, 这样只有特征的一部分子集, 即“形式化”、“不可预测”的特征在成功的生成过程中被核查操作所删除 (Collins, 1997、Chomsky 1995b: §4.5)。另一个想法是一些特征, 特别是某些功能范畴的特征, 也许受限是未被估值的, 通过与其他元素进入合适的句法配置而被估值 (Chomsky 2008、Hiraiwa, 2005)。而且近期的工作采取了这样的观点, 特征从未被删除 (Chomsky 2007: p. 11)。这些问题都没有得到解决。 (Stabler 2011a: 397)

为了开发全部的语法片段, 一般需要至少三年时间, 我们可以计算一下 Barriers (1986) 发表的文章和 Stabler 的应用 (1992) 发表的时间间隔。特别是大量的语法需要几个研究者在几年甚至是几十年间开展国际合作。如果基本假设在短期内重复变化, 这一过程就会被打断。

延伸阅读

这一章主要参考了 Adger (2003) 的内容。关于最简方案的其他教科书有 Radford (1997)、Grewendorf (2002) 和 Hornstein, Nunes & Grohmann (2005)。

Kuhn (2007) 对比了基于约束的 LFG 和 HPSG 的现代生成分析。Borsley (2012) 对比了 HPSG 中的长距离依存分析和 GB/最简方案中的基于移位的分析。Borsley 讨论了基于移位的方法的四种数据: 没有填充语的抽取、带有多个空位的抽取、填充语和空位不匹配的抽取, 以及没有空位的抽取。

有关标注、 \bar{X} 理论的弃用, 以及第 4.6.2–4.6.4 节 Stabler 的最简语法和 HPSG 的比较内容可以在 Müller (2013c) 找到。

Błaszczak & Gärtner (2005) 所著的《韵律短语、非连续及否定的辖域》 (Intonational Phrasing, Discontinuity, and the Scope of Negation) 推荐给想深入了解的读者。该作者将否定量词的分析与最简方案 (在 Kayne 的影响下) 和范畴语法 (在 Steedman 的影响下) 中的宽域进行了比较。

Sternefeld (2006) 是对开发了德语转换语法分析的句法 (839 页) 进行了详细的介绍, 这些语法 (以转换为模) 几乎与 HPSG 理论下的语法完全一致 (按照层级体系在配价列表中的论元的特征描述)。Sternefeld 的结构是最小的, 因为他没有假定任何功能投射, 如果他们不能在所研究的语言中有驱动力的话。Sternefeld 对于其他研究中理所当然的某些方面特别严格。Sternefeld 把他的书看作是教科书, 通过这本书, 学生可以学到在提出理论时如何做到论述的一致性。基于此, 这本书不仅仅推荐给学生和博士生。

Sternefeld & Richter (2012)讨论了理论语言学中尤其注重描述这一章和前面章节中的内容。我非常能够理解作者们在面对分析的模糊性、论述的方式、研究的经验基础、修辞的套路、免疫但尝试以及科学标准的一般方面时感到的挫折：现成的例子就是Chomsky (2013)的文章《投射的问题》(*Problems of Projection*)。⁴²

但是，我并不认同这篇文章的普遍的、悲观的观点。依我看来，病人的情况是很危险，但是他还没有死。Sternefeld 和 Richter 所著文章一篇评论指出，语言学领域的变化太快了，以后拥有 MIT 毕业的头衔已经不能保证能找到工作了（脚注 16）。可见，一些科学家在某些经验性的问题是在重新寻找方向，以合适的方式来处理数据并在不同理论阵营中提高交流水平可以是走出这场危机的一个途径。

自从上世纪九十年代以来，可以看见的是更多的注意力放在基于经验的研究上（特别是在德国），比如说，在语言合作研究中心（linguistic Collaborative Research Centers, SFBs）或年度语言事实（Linguistic Evidence）大会上进行的工作就是如此。正如上面引用的评论者所说的，在未来，只关注 Chomsky 决定的句法范畴已经是不够的，如“He left”这个句子（请看第 4.6.2 节）。语言学博士论文需要有经验的事实，这些事实能够证明作者真正理解语言。进而，博士论文以及其他出版作品应该能够说明作者不仅仅了解一种框架，而是了解较大范围的相关描述性与理论性文献。

正如我在第 4.6.4 节和Müller (2013c)中所讨论的，我也将在下面的章节和特别讨论的内容中来说明，在不同分析之间有很多相似性，而且他们在某些方面是一致的。走出当前的危机的方式就在于基于经验的原则、多理论的背景教育以及对于后代的培养。

简言之：所有的老师和学生都应该阅读 Sternefeld 和 Richter 所著的医疗报告。我恳求学生们不要在读完之后直接放弃阅读他们的研究，而是至少在阅读完本书的其他章节之后再做出这一决定。

⁴² 模糊性：在这篇文章中，perhaps 出现了 19 次，may 出现了 17 次，还有许多 if。一致性：结论并不一致。请看本书第 141 页的脚注 16。论证方式：术语限定语被弃用了，并声称与该术语有关的问题不存在了。由此，他们不属于这个世界。请看本书第 145 页的脚注 26。免疫性：Chomsky 这样论述空范畴原则：“明显的例外不能解释放弃一般性所到达的程度，而是探求能够解释在哪儿和为什么这样的深层原因”（第 9 页）。这一说法显然不是正确的，但是人们会想为了驳斥一个现有的分析需要多少整整。特别是在《投射的问题》(*Problems of Projection*)这篇文章中，我们必须要知道为什么这篇文章在《关于短语》(*On phrases*)发表之后的五年就发表了。反对最初设想的证据是强有力的，而且好几个点都是Chomsky (2013)自己提出来的。如果 Chomsky 想要应用他自己的标准（1957 年他的引用，请看第 5 页），以及普遍的科学方法（奥卡姆的剪刀），结果自然是回到基于中心语的标注的分析。

有关这篇文章的更多评论，请看第 4.6.2 节和第 4.6.3 节。

第五章 Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar

Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar (GPSG) was developed as an answer to Transformational Grammar at the end of the 1970s. The book by Gazdar, Klein, Pullum & Sag (1985) is the main publication in this framework. Hans Uszkoreit has developed a largish GPSG fragment for German (1987). Analyses in GPSG were so precise that it was possible to use them as the basis for computational implementations. The following is a possibly incomplete list of languages with implemented GPSG fragments:

- German (Weisweber 1987; Weisweber & Preuss 1992; Naumann 1987, 1988; Volk 1988)
- English (Evans 1985; Phillips & Thompson 1985; Phillips 1992; Grover, Carroll & Briscoe 1993)
- French (Emirkanian, Da Sylva & Bouchard 1996)
- Persian (Bahrani, Sameti & Manshadi 2011)

As was discussed in Section 3.1.1, Chomsky (1957) argued that simple phrase structure grammars are not well-suited to describe relations between linguistic structures and claimed that one needs transformations to explain them. These assumptions remained unchallenged for two decades (with the exception of publications by Harman (1963) and Freidin (1975)) until alternative theories such as LFG and GPSG emerged, which addressed Chomsky's criticisms and developed non-transformational explanations of phenomena for which there were previously only transformational analyses or simply none at all. The analysis of local reordering of arguments, passives and long-distance dependencies are some of the most important phenomena that have been discussed in this framework. Following some introductory remarks on the representational format of GPSG in Section 5.1, I will present the GPSG analyses of these phenomena in some more detail.

5.1 General remarks on the representational format

This section has three parts. The general assumptions regarding features and the representation of complex categories is explained in Section 5.1.1, the assumptions re-

garding the linearization of daughters in a phrase structure rule is explained in Section 5.1.2. Section 5.1.3 introduces metarules, Section 5.1.4 deals with semantics, and Section 5.1.5 with adjuncts.

5.1.1 Complex categories, the Head Feature Convention, and \bar{X} rules

In Section 2.2, we augmented our phrase structure grammars with features. GPSG goes one step further and describes categories as sets of feature-value pairs. The category in (1a) can be represented as in (1b):

- (1) a. NP(3,sg,nom)
 b. { CAT n, BAR 2, PER 3, NUM sg, CASE nom }

It is clear that (1b) corresponds to (1a). (1a) differs from (1b) with regard to the fact that the information about part of speech and the \bar{X} level (in the symbol NP) are prominent, whereas in (1b) these are treated just like the information about case, number or person.

Lexical entries have a feature SUBCAT. The value is a number which says something about the kind of grammatical rules in which the word can be used. (2) shows examples for grammatical rules and lists some verbs which can occur in these rules.¹

- | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| (2) | V2 → H[5] | (kommen ‘come’, schlafen ‘sleep’) |
| | V2 → H[6], N2[CASE acc] | (kennen ‘know’, suchen ‘search’) |
| | V2 → H[7], N2[CASE dat] | (helfen ‘help’, vertrauen ‘trust’) |
| | V2 → H[8], N2[CASE dat], N2[CASE acc] | (geben ‘give’, zeigen ‘show’) |
| | V2 → H[9], V3[+dass] | (wissen ‘know’, glauben ‘believe’) |

These rules license VPs, that is, the combination of a verb with its complements, but not with its subject. The numbers following the category symbols (V or N) indicate the \bar{X} projection level. For Uszkoreit, the maximum number of projections of a verbal projection is three rather than two as is often assumed.

The H on the right side of the rule stands for *head*. The *Head Feature Convention* (HFC) ensures that certain features of the mother node are also present on the node marked with H (for details see Gazdar, Klein, Pullum & Sag 1985: Section 5.4 and Uszkoreit 1987: 67):

Principle 1 (Head Feature Convention)

The mother node and the head daughter must bear the same head features unless indicated otherwise.

In (2), examples for verbs which can be used in the rules are given in brackets. As with ordinary phrase structure grammars, one also requires corresponding lexical entries for verbs in GPSG. Two examples are provided in (3):

- (3) V[5, VFORM inf] → einzuschlafen
 V[6, VFORM inf] → aufzuessen

¹ The analyses discussed in the following are taken from Uszkoreit (1987).

The first rule states that *einzuschlafen* ‘to fall asleep’ has a SUBCAT value of 5 and the second indicates that *aufzuessen* ‘to finish eating’ has a SUBCAT value of 6. It follows, then, that *einzuschlafen* can only be used in the first rule (2) and *aufzuessen* can only be used in the second. Furthermore, (3) contains information about the form of the verb (*inf* stands for infinitives with *zu* ‘to’).

If we analyze the sentence in (4) with the second rule in (2) and the second rule in (3), then we arrive at the structure in Figure 5.1.

- (4) Karl hat versucht, [den Kuchen aufzuessen].
 Karl has tried the cake to.eat.up
 ‘Karl tried to finish eating the cake.’




图 5.1: Projection of head features in GPSG

The rules in (2) say nothing about the order of the daughters which is why the verb (H[6]) can also be in final position. This aspect will be discussed in more detail in Section 5.1.2. With regard to the HFC, it is important to bear in mind that information about the infinitive verb form is also present on the mother node. Unlike simple phrase structure rules such as those discussed in Chapter 2, this follows automatically from the Head Feature Convention in GPSG. In (3), the value of *vFORM* is given and the HFC ensures that the corresponding information is represented on the mother node when the rules in (2) are applied. For the phrase in (4), we arrive at the category $V2[vFORM\ inf]$ and this ensures that this phrase only occurs in the contexts it is supposed to:

- (5) a. [Den Kuchen aufzuessen] hat er nicht gewagt.
 the cake to.eat.up has he not dared
 ‘He did not dare to finish eating the cake.’
 b. * [Den Kuchen aufzuessen] darf er nicht.
 the cake to.eat.up be.allowed.to he not
 Intended: ‘He is not allowed to finish eating the cake.’
 c. * [Den Kuchen aufessen] hat er nicht gewagt.
 the cake eat.up has he not dared
 Intended: ‘He did not dare to finish eating the cake.’
 d. [Den Kuchen aufessen] darf er nicht.
 the cake eaten.up be.allowed.to he not
 ‘He is not allowed to finish eating the cake.’

gewagt ‘dared’ selects for a verb or verb phrase with an infinitive with *zu* ‘to’ but not a bare infinitive, while *darf* ‘be allowed to’ takes a bare infinitive.

This works in an analogous way for noun phrases: there are rules for nouns which do not take an argument as well as for nouns with certain arguments. Examples of rules for nouns which either require no argument or two PPs are given in (6) (Gazdar, Klein, Pullum & Sag 1985: 127):

- (6) $N1 \rightarrow H[30]$ (Haus ‘house’, Blume ‘flower’)
 $N1 \rightarrow H[31], PP[mit], PP[über]$ (Gespräch ‘talk’, Streit ‘argument’)

The rule for the combination of \bar{N} and a determiner is as follows:

- (7) $N2 \rightarrow Det, H1$

$N2$ stands for NP, that is, for a projection of a noun phrase on bar level two, whereas $H1$ stands for a projection of the head daughter on the bar level one. The Head Feature Convention ensures that the head daughter is also a nominal projection, since all features on the head daughter apart from the \bar{X} level are identified with those of the whole NP. When analyzing (8), the second rule in (6) licenses the \bar{N} *Gesprächs mit Maria über Klaus*. The fact that *Gesprächs* ‘conversation’ is in the genitive is represented in the lexical item of *Gesprächs* and since *Gesprächs* is the head, it is also present at \bar{N} , following the Head Feature Convention.

- (8) des Gespräch-s mit Maria über Klaus
the.GEN conversation-GEN with Maria about Klaus
‘the conversation with Maria about Klaus’

For the combination of \bar{N} with the determiner, we apply the rule in (7). The category of the head determines the word class of the element on the left-hand side of the rule, which is why the rule in (7) corresponds to the classical \bar{X} rules that we encountered in (65c) on page 69. Since *Gesprächs mit Maria über Klaus* is the head daughter, the information about the genitive of \bar{N} is also present at the NP node.

5.1.2 Local reordering

The first phenomenon to be discussed is local reordering of arguments. As was already discussed in Section 3.5, arguments in the middle field can occur in an almost arbitrary order. (9) gives some examples:

- (9) a. [weil] der Mann der Frau das Buch gibt
because the.NOM man the.DAT woman the.ACC book gives
‘because the man gives the book to the woman’
b. [weil] der Mann das Buch der Frau gibt
because the.NOM man the.ACC book the.DAT woman gives
c. [weil] das Buch der Mann der Frau gibt
because the.ACC book the.NOM man the.DAT woman gives

- d. [weil] das Buch der Frau der Mann gibt
because the.ACC book the.DAT woman the.NOM man gives
- e. [weil] der Frau der Mann das Buch gibt
because the.DAT woman the.NOM man the.ACC book gives
- f. [weil] der Frau das Buch der Mann gibt
because the.DAT woman the.ACC book the.NOM man gives

In the phrase structure grammars in Chapter 2, we used features to ensure that verbs occur with the correct number of arguments. The following rule in (10) was used for the sentence in (9a):

- (10) $S \rightarrow NP[nom] NP[dat] NP[acc] V_nom_dat_acc$

If one wishes to analyze the other orders in (9), then one requires an additional five rules, that is, six in total:

- (11) $S \rightarrow NP[nom] NP[dat] NP[acc] V_nom_dat_acc$
 $S \rightarrow NP[nom] NP[acc] NP[dat] V_nom_dat_acc$
 $S \rightarrow NP[acc] NP[nom] NP[dat] V_nom_dat_acc$
 $S \rightarrow NP[acc] NP[dat] NP[nom] V_nom_dat_acc$
 $S \rightarrow NP[dat] NP[nom] NP[acc] V_nom_dat_acc$
 $S \rightarrow NP[dat] NP[acc] NP[nom] V_nom_dat_acc$

In addition, it is necessary to postulate another six rules for the orders with verb-initial order:

- (12) $S \rightarrow V_nom_dat_acc NP[nom] NP[dat] NP[acc]$
 $S \rightarrow V_nom_dat_acc NP[nom] NP[acc] NP[dat]$
 $S \rightarrow V_nom_dat_acc NP[acc] NP[nom] NP[dat]$
 $S \rightarrow V_nom_dat_acc NP[acc] NP[dat] NP[nom]$
 $S \rightarrow V_nom_dat_acc NP[dat] NP[nom] NP[acc]$
 $S \rightarrow V_nom_dat_acc NP[dat] NP[acc] NP[nom]$

Furthermore, one would also need parallel rules for transitive and intransitive verbs with all possible valences. Obviously, the commonalities of these rules and the generalizations regarding them are not captured. The point is that we have the same number of arguments, they can be realized in any order and the verb can be placed in initial or final position. As linguists, we find it desirable to capture this property of the German language and represent it beyond phrase structure rules. In Transformational Grammar, the relationship between the orders is captured by means of movement: the Deep Structure corresponds to verb-final order with a certain order of arguments and the surface order is derived by means of Move- α . Since GPSG is a non-transformational theory, this kind of explanation is not possible. Instead, GPSG imposes restrictions on *immediate dominance* (ID), which differ from those which refer to *linear precedence* (LP): rules such as (13) are to be understood as dominance rules, which do not have anything to say about the order of the daughters (Pullum 1982).

(13) $S \rightarrow V, NP[nom], NP[acc], NP[dat]$

The rule in (13) simply states that *S* dominates all other nodes. Due to the abandonment of ordering restrictions for the right-hand side of the rule, we only need one rule rather than twelve.

Nevertheless, without any kind of restrictions on the right-hand side of the rule, there would be far too much freedom. For example, the following order would be permissible:

(14) *Der Frau der Mann gibt ein Buch.
 the woman.DAT the.NOM man gives the.ACC book

Such orders are ruled out by so-called *Linear Precedence Rules* or LP-rules. LP-constraints are restrictions on local trees, that is, trees with a depth of one. It is, for example, possible to state something about the order of *V*, *NP[nom]*, *NP[acc]* and *NP[dat]* in Figure 5.2 using linearization rules.




图 5.2: Example of a local tree

The following linearization rules serve to exclude orders such as those in (14):

(15) $V[+MC] < X$
 $X < V[-MC]$

MC stands for *main clause*. The LP-rules ensure that in main clauses (+*MC*), the verb precedes all other constituents and follows them in subordinate clauses (−*MC*). There is a restriction that says that all verbs with the *MC*-value ‘+’ also have to be (+*FIN*). This will rule out infinitive forms in initial position.

These LP rules do not permit orders with an occupied prefield or postfield in a local tree. This is intended. We will see how fronting can be accounted for in Section 5.4.

5.1.3 Metarules

We have previously encountered linearization rules for sentences with subjects, however our rules have the form in (16), that is, they do not include subjects:

(16) $V2 \rightarrow H[7], N2[CASE\ dat]$
 $V2 \rightarrow H[8], N2[CASE\ dat], N2[CASE\ acc]$

These rules can be used to analyze the verb phrases *dem Mann das Buch zu geben* ‘to give the man the book’ and *das Buch dem Mann zu geben* ‘to give the book to the man’ as they appear in (17), but we cannot analyze sentences like (9), since the subject does not occur on the right-hand side of the rules in (16).

- (17) a. Er verspricht, [dem Mann das Buch zu geben].
 he promises the.DAT man the.ACC book to give
 ‘He promises to give the man the book.’
 b. Er verspricht, [das Buch dem Mann zu geben].
 he promises the.ACC book the.DAT man to give
 ‘He promises to give the book to the man.’

A rule with the format of (18) does not make much sense for a GPSG analysis of German since it cannot derive all the orders in (9) as the subject can occur between the elements of the VP as in (9c).

- (18) $S \rightarrow N2\ V2$

With the rule in (18), it is possible to analyze (9a) as in Figure 5.3 and it would also be possible to analyze (9b) with a different ordering of the NPs inside the VP. The remaining examples in (9) cannot be captured by the rule in (18), however. This has to do with the




图 5.3: VP analysis for German (not appropriate in the GPSG framework)

fact that only elements in the same local tree, that is, elements which occur on the right-hand side of a rule, can be reordered. While we can reorder the parts of the VP and thereby derive (9b), it is not possible to place the subject at a lower position between the objects. Instead, a metarule can be used to analyze sentences where the subject occurs between other arguments of the verb. This rule relates phrase structure rules to other phrase structure rules. A metarule can be understood as a kind of instruction that creates another rule for each rule with a certain form and these newly created rules will in turn license local trees.

For the example at hand, we can formulate a metarule which says the following: if there is a rule with the form “V2 consists of something” in the grammar, then there also has to be another rule “V3 consists of whatever V2 consists + an NP in the nominative”. In formal terms, this looks as follows:

- (19) $V2 \rightarrow W \mapsto$
 $V3 \rightarrow W, N2[\text{CASE nom}]$

W is a variable which stands for an arbitrary number of categories ($W = \textit{whatever}$). The metarule creates the following rule in (20) from the rules in (16):

- (20) $V3 \rightarrow H[7], N2[\text{CASE dat}], N2[\text{CASE nom}]$
 $V3 \rightarrow H[8], N2[\text{CASE dat}], N2[\text{CASE acc}], N2[\text{CASE nom}]$

Now, the subject and other arguments both occur in the right-hand side of the rule and can therefore be freely ordered as long as no LP rules are violated.

5.1.4 Semantics

The semantics adopted by Gazdar, Klein, Pullum & Sag (1985: Chapter 9–10) goes back to Richard Montague (1974). Unlike a semantic theory which stipulates the combinatorial possibilities for each rule (see Section 2.3), GPSG uses more general rules. This is possible due to the fact that the expressions to be combined each have a semantic type. It is customary to distinguish between entities (e) and truth values (t). Entities refer to an object in the world (or in a possible world), whereas entire sentences are either true or false, that is, they have a truth value. It is possible to create more complex types from the types e and t . Generally, the following holds: if a and b are types, then $\langle a, b \rangle$ is also a type. Examples of complex types are $\langle e, t \rangle$ and $\langle e, \langle e, t \rangle \rangle$. We can define the following combinatorial rule for this kind of typed expressions:

- (21) If α is of type $\langle b, a \rangle$ and β of type b , then $\alpha(\beta)$ is of type a .

This type of combination is also called *functional application*. With the rule in (21), it is possible that the type $\langle e, \langle e, t \rangle \rangle$ corresponds to an expression which still has to be combined with two expressions of type e in order to result in an expression of type t . The first combination step with e will yield $\langle e, t \rangle$ and the second step of combination with a further e will give us t . This is similar to what we saw with λ -expressions on page 57: $\lambda y \lambda x \textit{like}'(x, y)$ has to combine with a y and an x . The result in this example was $\textit{mögen}'(\textit{max}', \textit{lotte}')$, that is, an expression that is either true or false in the relevant world.

In Gazdar et al. (1985), an additional type is assumed for worlds in which an expression is true or false. For reasons of simplicity, I will omit this here. The types that we need for sentences, NPs and N' 's, determiners and VPs are given in (22):

- (22) a. $\text{TYP}(S) = t$
 b. $\text{TYP}(\text{NP}) = \langle \langle e, t \rangle, t \rangle$
 c. $\text{TYP}(N') = \langle e, t \rangle$
 d. $\text{TYP}(\text{Det}) = \langle \text{TYP}(N'), \text{TYP}(\text{NP}) \rangle$
 e. $\text{TYP}(\text{VP}) = \langle e, t \rangle$

A sentence is of type t since it is either true or false. A VP needs an expression of type e to yield a sentence of type t . The type of the NP may seem strange at first glance, however, it is possible to understand it if one considers the meaning of NPs with quantifiers. For sentences such as (23a), a representation such as (23b) is normally assumed:

- (23) a. All children laugh.
b. $\forall x \text{ child}'(x) \rightarrow \text{laugh}'(x)$

The symbol \forall stands for the universal quantifier. The formula can be read as follows. For every object, for which it is the case that it has the property of being a child, it is also the case that it is laughing. If we consider the contribution made by the NP, then we see that the universal quantifier, the restriction to children and the logical implication come from the NP:

- (24) $\forall x \text{ child}'(x) \rightarrow P(x)$

This means that an NP is something that must be combined with an expression which has exactly one open slot corresponding to the x in (24). This is formulated in (22b): an NP corresponds to a semantic expression which needs something of type $\langle e, t \rangle$ to form an expression which is either true or false (that is, of type t).

An N' stands for a nominal expression for the kind $\lambda x \text{ child}(x)$. This means if there is a specific individual which one can insert in place of the x , then we arrive at an expression that is either true or false. For a given situation, it is the case that either John has the property of being a child or he does not. An N' has the same type as a VP.

$\text{TYP}(N')$ and $\text{TYP}(\text{NP})$ in (22d) stand for the types given in (22c) and (22b), that is, a determiner is semantically something which has to be combined with the meaning of N' to give the meaning of an NP.

Gazdar, Klein, Pullum & Sag (1985: 209) point out a redundancy in the semantic specification of grammars which follow the rule-to-rule hypothesis (see Section 2.3) since, instead of giving rule-by-rule instructions with regard to combinations, it suffices in many cases simply to say that the functor is applied to the argument. If we use types such as those in (22), it is also clear which constituent is the functor and which is the argument. In this way, a noun cannot be applied to a determiner, but rather only the reverse is possible. The combination in (25a) yields a well-formed result, whereas (25b) is ruled out.

- (25) a. $\text{Det}'(N')$
b. $N'(\text{Det}')$

The general combinatorial principle is then as follows:

- (26) Use functional application for the combination of the semantic contribution of the daughters to yield a well-formed expression corresponding to the type of the mother node.

The authors of the GPSG book assume that this principle can be applied to the vast majority of GPSG rules so that only a few special cases have to be dealt with by explicit rules.

5.1.5 Adjuncts

For nominal structures in English, Gazdar et al. (1985: 126) assume the \bar{X} analysis and, as we have seen in Section 2.4.1, this analysis is applicable to nominal structures in German. Nevertheless, there is a problem regarding the treatment of adjuncts in the verbal domain if one assumes flat branching structures, since adjuncts can freely occur between arguments:

- (27) a. weil der Mann der Frau das Buch *gestern* gab
 because the man the woman the book yesterday gave
 ‘because the man gave the book to the woman yesterday’
 b. weil der Mann der Frau *gestern* das Buch gab
 because the man the woman yesterday the book gave
 c. weil der Mann *gestern* der Frau das Buch gab
 because the man yesterday the woman the book gave
 d. weil *gestern* der Mann der Frau das Buch gab
 because yesterday the man the woman the book gave

For (27), one requires the following rule:

- (28) $V3 \rightarrow H[8], N2[CASE\ dat], N2[CASE\ acc], N2[CASE\ nom], AdvP$

Of course, adjuncts can also occur between the arguments of verbs from other valence classes:

- (29) weil (oft) die Frau (oft) dem Mann (oft) hilft
 because often the woman often the man often helps
 ‘because the woman often helps the man’

Furthermore, adjuncts can occur between the arguments of a VP:

- (30) Der Mann hat versucht, der Frau heimlich das Buch zu geben.
 the man has tried the woman secretly the book to give
 ‘The man tried to secretly give the book to the woman.’

In order to analyze these sentences, we can use a metarule which adds an adjunct to the right-hand side of a V2 (Uszkoreit 1987: 146).

- (31) $V2 \rightarrow W \mapsto$
 $V2 \rightarrow W, AdvP$

By means of the subject introducing metarule in (19), the V3-rule in (28) is derived from a V2-rule. Since there can be several adjuncts in one sentence, a metarule such as (31) must be allowed to apply multiple times. The recursive application of metarules is often ruled out in the literature due to reasons of generative capacity (see Chapter 17) (Thompson 1982; Uszkoreit 1987: 146). If one uses the Kleene star, then it is possible to formulate the adjunct metarule in such a way that it does not have to apply recursively (Uszkoreit 1987: 146):

- (32) $V2 \rightarrow W \mapsto$
 $V2 \rightarrow W, AdvP^*$

If one adopts the rule in (32), then it is not immediately clear how the semantic contribution of the adjuncts can be determined.² For the rule in (31), one can combine the semantic contribution of the AdvP with the semantic contribution of the V2 in the input rule. This is of course also possible if the metarule is applied multiple times. If this metarule is applied to (33a), for example, the V2-node in (33a) contains the semantic contribution of the first adverb.

- (33) a. $V2 \rightarrow V, NP, AdvP$
 b. $V2 \rightarrow V, NP, AdvP, AdvP$

The V2-node in (33b) receives the semantic representation of the adverb applied to the V2-node in (33a).

Weisweber & Preuss (1992) have shown that it is possible to use metarules such as (31) if one does not use metarules to compute a set of phrase structure rules, but rather directly applies the metarules during the analysis of a sentence. Since sentences are always of finite length and the metarule introduces an additional AdvP to the right-hand side of the newly licensed rule, the metarule can only be applied a finite number of times.

5.2 Passive as a metarule

The German passive can be described in an entirely theory-neutral way as follows:³

- The subject is suppressed.
- If there is an accusative object, this becomes the subject.

This is true for all verb classes which can form the passive. It does not make a difference whether the verbs takes one, two or three arguments:

- (34) a. weil er noch gearbeitet hat
 because he.NOM still worked has
 'because he has still worked'

² In LFG, an adjunct is entered into a set in the functional structure (see Section 7.1.6). This also works with the use of the Kleene Star notation. From the f-structure, it is possible to compute the semantic denotation with corresponding scope by making reference to the c-structure. In HPSG, Kasper (1994) has made a proposal which corresponds to the GPSG proposal with regard to flat branching structures and an arbitrary number of adjuncts. In HPSG, however, one can make use of so-called relational constraints. These are similar to small programs which can create relations between values inside complex structures. Using such relational constraints, it is then possible to compute the meaning of an unrestricted number of adjuncts in a flat branching structure.

³ This characterization does not hold for other languages. For instance, Icelandic allows for dative subjects. See Zaenen, Maling & Thráinsson (1985).

- b. weil noch gearbeitet wurde
because still worked was
'because there was still working there'
- (35) a. weil er an Maria gedacht hat
because he.NOM on Maria thought has
'because he thought of Maria'
- b. weil an Maria gedacht wurde
because on Maria thought was
'because Maria was thought of'
- (36) a. weil sie ihn geschlagen hat
because she.NOM him.ACC beaten has
'because she has beaten him'
- b. weil er geschlagen wurde
because he.NOM beaten was
'because he was beaten'
- (37) a. weil er ihm den Aufsatz gegeben hat
because he.NOM him.DAT the.ACC essay given has
'because he has given him the essay'
- b. weil ihm der Aufsatz gegeben wurde
because him.DAT the.NOM essay given was
'because he was given the essay'

In a simple phrase structure grammar, we would have to list two separate rules for each pair of sentences making reference to the valence class of the verb in question. The characteristics of the passive discussed above would therefore not be explicitly stated in the set of rules. In GPSG, it is possible to explain the relation between active and passive rules using a metarule: for each active rule, a corresponding passive rule with suppressed subject is licensed. The link between active and passive clauses can therefore be captured in this way.

An important difference to Transformational Grammar/GB is that we are not creating a relation between two trees, but rather between active and passive rules. The two rules license two unrelated structures, that is, the structure of (38b) is not derived from the structure of (38a).

- (38) a. weil sie ihn geschlagen hat
because she.NOM him.ACC beaten has
'because she has beaten him'
- b. weil er geschlagen wurde
because he.NOM beaten was
'because he was beaten'

The generalization with regard to active/passive is captured nevertheless.

In what follows, I will discuss the analysis of the passive given in Gazdar, Klein, Pullum & Sag (1985) in some more detail. The authors suggest the following metarule for English (p. 59):⁴

- (39) $VP \rightarrow W, NP \mapsto$
 $VP_{[PAS]} \rightarrow W, (PP[by])$

This rule states that verbs which take an object can occur in a passive VP without this object. Furthermore, a *by*-PP can be added. If we apply this metarule to the rules in (40), then this will yield the rules listed in (41):

- (40) $VP \rightarrow H[2], NP$
 $VP \rightarrow H[3], NP, PP[to]$
- (41) $VP_{[PAS]} \rightarrow H[2], (PP[by])$
 $VP_{[PAS]} \rightarrow H[3], PP[to], (PP[by])$

It is possible to use the rules in (40) to analyze verb phrases in active sentences:

- (42) a. [_S The man [_{VP} devoured the carcass]].
 b. [_S The man [_{VP} handed the sword to Tracy]].

The combination of a VP with the subject is licensed by an additional rule ($S \rightarrow NP, VP$).

With the rules in (41), one can analyze the VPs in the corresponding passive sentences in (43):

- (43) a. [_S The carcass was [_{VP[PAS]} devoured (by the man)]].
 b. [_S The sword was [_{VP[PAS]} handed to Tracy (by the man)]].

At first glance, this analysis may seem odd as an object is replaced inside the VP by a PP which would be the subject in an active clause. Although this analysis makes correct predictions with regard to the syntactic well-formedness of structures, it seems unclear how one can account for the semantic relations. It is possible, however, to use a lexical rule that licenses the passive participle and manipulates the semantics of the output lexical item in such a way that the *by*-PP is correctly integrated semantically (Gazdar et al. 1985: 219).

We arrive at a problem, however, if we try to apply this analysis to German since the impersonal passive cannot be derived by simply suppressing an object. The V2-rules for verbs such as *arbeiten* ‘work’ and *denken* ‘think’ as used for the analysis of (34a) and (35a) have the following form:

- (44) $V2 \rightarrow H[5]$
 $V2 \rightarrow H[13], PP[an]$

⁴ See Weisweiler & Preuss (1992: 1114) for a parallel rule for German which refers to accusative case on the left-hand side of the metarule.

There is no NP on the right-hand side of these rules which could be turned into a *von*-PP. If the passive is to be analyzed as suppressing an NP argument in a rule, then it should follow from the existence of the impersonal passive that the passive metarule has to be applied to rules which license finite clauses, since information about whether there is a subject or not is only present in rules for finite clauses.⁵ In this kind of system, the rules for finite sentences (V3) are the basic rules and the rules for V2 would be derived from these.

It would only make sense to have a metarule which applies to V3 for German since English does not have V3 rules which contain both the subject and its object on the right-hand side of the rule.⁶ For English, it is assumed that a sentence consists of a subject and a VP (see Gazdar et al. 1985: 139). This means that we arrive at two very different analyses for the passive in English and German, which do not capture the descriptive insight that the passive is the suppression of the subject and the subsequent promotion of the object in the same way. The central difference between German and English seems to be that English obligatorily requires a subject,⁷ which is why English does not have an impersonal passive. This is a property independent of passives, which affects the possibility of having a passive structure, however.

The problem with the GPSG analysis is the fact that valence is encoded in phrase structure rules and that subjects are not present in the rules for verb phrases. In the following chapters, we will encounter approaches from LFG, Categorical Grammar, HPSG, Construction Grammar, and Dependency Grammar which encode valence separately from phrase structure rules and therefore do not have a principled problem with impersonal passive.

See Jacobson (1987b: 394–396) for more problematic aspects of the passive analysis in GPSG and for the insight that a lexical representation of valence – as assumed in Categorical Grammar, GB, LFG and HPSG – allows for a lexical analysis of the phenomenon, which is however unformulable in GPSG for principled reasons having to do with the fundamental assumptions regarding valence representations.

5.3 Verb position

Uszkoreit (1987) analyzed verb-initial and verb-final order as linearization variants of a flat tree. The details of this analysis have already been discussed in Section 5.1.2.

An alternative suggestion in a version of GPSG comes from Jacobs (1986: 110): Jacobs's analysis is a rendering of the verb movement analysis in GB. He assumes that

⁵ GPSG differs from GB in that infinitive verbal projections do not contain nodes for empty subjects. This is also true for all other theories discussed in this book with the exception of Tree-Adjoining Grammar.

⁶ Gazdar et al. (1985: 62) suggest a metarule similar to our subject introduction metarule on page 175. The rule that is licensed by their metarule is used to analyze the position of auxiliaries in English and only licenses sequences of the form AUX NP VP. In such structures, subjects and objects are not in the same local tree either.

⁷ Under certain conditions, the subject can also be omitted in English. For more on imperatives and other subject-less examples, see page 512.

there is an empty verb in final position and links this to the verb in initial position using technical means which we will see in more detail in the following section.

5.4 Long-distance dependencies as the result of local dependencies

One of the main innovations of GPSG is its treatment of long-distance dependencies as a sequence of local dependencies (Gazdar 1981b). This approach will be explained taking constituent fronting to the prefield in German as an example. Until now, we have only seen the GPSG analysis for verb-initial and verb-final position: the sequences in (45) are simply linearization variants.

- (45) a. [dass] der Mann der Frau das Buch gibt
 that the man the woman the book gives
 ‘that the man gives the book to the woman’
 b. Gibt der Mann der Frau das Buch?
 gives the man the woman the book
 ‘Does the man give the book to the woman?’

What we want is to derive the verb-second order in the examples in (46) from V1 order in (45b).

- (46) a. Der Mann gibt der Frau das Buch.
 the man gives the woman the book
 ‘The man gives the woman the book.’
 b. Der Frau gibt der Mann das Buch.
 the woman gives the man the book
 ‘The man gives the woman the book.’

For this, the metarule in (47) has to be used. This metarule removes an arbitrary category X from the set of categories on the right-hand side of the rule and represents it on the left-hand side with a slash ($/$):⁸

- (47) $V3 \rightarrow W, X \mapsto$
 $V3/X \rightarrow W$

This rule creates the rules in (49) from (48):

- (48) $V3 \rightarrow H[8], N2[CASE\ dat], N2[CASE\ acc], N2[CASE\ nom]$
 (49) $V3/N2[CASE\ nom] \rightarrow H[8], N2[CASE\ dat], N2[CASE\ acc]$
 $V3/N2[CASE\ dat] \rightarrow H[8], N2[CASE\ acc], N2[CASE\ nom]$
 $V3/N2[CASE\ acc] \rightarrow H[8], N2[CASE\ dat], N2[CASE\ nom]$

⁸ An alternative to Uszkoreit’s trace-less analysis (1987: 77), which is explained here, consists of using a trace for the extracted element as in GB.

The rule in (50) connects a sentence with verb-initial order with a constituent which is missing in the sentence:

$$(50) \quad V3[+FIN] \rightarrow X[+TOP], V3[+MC]/X$$

In (50), X stands for an arbitrary category which is marked as missing in V3 by the '/'. X is referred to as a *filler*.

The interesting cases of values for X with regard to our examples are given in (51):

$$(51) \quad \begin{aligned} V3[+FIN] &\rightarrow N2[+TOP, CASE \text{ nom}], V3[+MC]/N2[CASE \text{ nom}] \\ V3[+FIN] &\rightarrow N2[+TOP, CASE \text{ dat}], V3[+MC]/N2[CASE \text{ dat}] \\ V3[+FIN] &\rightarrow N2[+TOP, CASE \text{ acc}], V3[+MC]/N2[CASE \text{ acc}] \end{aligned}$$

(51) does not show actual rules. Instead, (51) shows examples for insertions of specific categories into the X-position, that is, different instantiations of the rule.

The following linearization rule ensures that a constituent marked by [+TOP] in (50) precedes the rest of the sentence:

$$(52) \quad [+TOP] < X$$

TOP stands for *topicalized*. As was mentioned on page 98, the prefield is not restricted to topics. Focused elements and expletives can also occur in the prefield, which is why the feature name is not ideal. However, it is possible to replace it with something else, for instance *prefield*. This would not affect the analysis. X in (52) stands for an arbitrary category. This is a new X and it is independent from the one in (50).

Figure 5.4 shows the interaction of the rules for the analysis of (53).⁹

- (53) Dem Mann gibt er das Buch.
the.DAT man gives he,NOM the.ACC book
‘He gives the man the book.’




图 5.4: Analysis of fronting in GPSG

⁹ The FIN feature has been omitted on some of the nodes since it is redundant: +MC-verbs always require the FIN value '+’.

The metarule in (47) licenses a rule which adds a dative object into slash. This rule now licenses the subtree for *gibt er das Buch* ‘gives he the book’. The linearization rule $V[+MC] < X$ orders the verb to the very left inside of the local tree for V3. In the next step, the constituent following the slash is bound off. Following the LP-rule $[+TOP] < X$, the bound constituent must be ordered to the left of the V3 node.

The analysis given in Figure 5.4 may seem too complex since the noun phrases in (53) all depend on the same verb. It is possible to invent a system of linearization rules which would allow one to analyze (53) with an entirely flat structure. One would nevertheless still need an analysis for sentences such as those in (37) on page 98 – repeated here as (54) for convenience:

- (54) a. [Um zwei Millionen Mark]_i soll er versucht haben, [eine
around two million Deutsche.Marks should he tried have an
Versicherung _i zu betrügen].¹⁰
insurance.company to deceive
‘He apparently tried to cheat an insurance company out of two million Deutsche Marks.’
- b. „Wer_i, glaubt er, daß er _i ist?“ erregte sich ein Politiker vom Nil.¹¹
who believes he that he is retort REFL a politician from.the Nile
‘“Who does he think he is?”, a politician from the Nile exclaimed.’
- c. Wen_i glaubst du, daß ich _i gesehen habe?¹²
who believe you that I seen have
‘Who do you think I saw?’
- d. [Gegen ihn]_i falle es den Republikanern hingegen schwerer,
against him fall it the Republicans however more.difficult
[[Angriffe _i] zu lancieren].¹³
attacks to launch
‘It is, however, more difficult for the Republicans to launch attacks against him.’

The sentences in (54) cannot be explained by local reordering as the elements in the prefield are not dependent on the highest verb, but instead originate in the lower clause. Since only elements from the same local tree can be reordered, the sentences in (54) cannot be analyzed without postulating some kind of additional mechanism for long-distance dependencies.¹⁴

¹⁰ taz, 04.05.2001, p. 20.

¹¹ Spiegel, 8/1999, p. 18.

¹² Scherpenisse (1986: 84).

¹³ taz, 08.02.2008, p. 9.

¹⁴ One could imagine analyses that assume the special mechanism for nonlocal dependencies only for sentences that really involve dependencies that are nonlocal. This was done in HPSG by Kathol (1995) and Wetta (2011) and by Groß & Osborne (2009) in Dependency Grammar. I discuss the Dependency Grammar analyses in detail in Section 11.7.1 and show that analyses that treat simple V2 sentences as ordering vari-

Before I conclude this chapter, I will discuss yet another example of fronting, namely one of the more complex examples in (54). The analysis of (54c) consists of several steps: the introduction, percolation and finally binding off of information about the long-distance dependency. This is shown in Figure 5.5. Simplifying somewhat, I assume that




图 5.5: Analysis of long-distance dependencies in GPSG

gesehen habe ‘have seen’ behaves like a normal transitive verb.¹⁵ A phrase structure rule licensed by the metarule in (47) licenses the combination of *ich* ‘I’ and *gesehen habe* ‘has seen’ and represents the missing accusative object on the V3 node. The complementizer *dass* ‘that’ is combined with *ich gesehen habe* ‘I have seen’ and the information about the fact that an accusative NP is missing is percolated up the tree. This percolation is controlled by the so-called *Foot Feature Principle*, which states that all foot features of all the daughters are also present on the mother node. Since the SLASH feature is a foot feature, the categories following the ‘/’ percolate up the tree if they are not bound off in the local tree. In the final step, the V3/N2[acc] is combined with the missing N2[acc]. The result is a complete finite declarative clause of the highest projection level.

5.5 Summary and classification

Some twenty years after Chomsky’s criticism of phrase structure grammars, the first large grammar fragment in the GPSG framework appeared and offered analyses of phenomena which could not be described by simple phrase structure rules. Although works in GPSG essentially build on Harman’s 1963 idea of a transformation-less gram-

ants of non-V2 sentences have problems with the scope of fronted adjuncts, with coordination of simple sentences and sentences with nonlocal dependencies and with so-called multiple frontings.

¹⁵ See Nerbonne (1986a) and Johnson (1986), for analyses of verbal complexes in GPSG.

mar, they also go far beyond this. A special achievement of GPSG is, in particular, the treatment of long-distance dependencies as worked out by Gazdar (1981b). By using the SLASH-mechanism, it was possible to explain the simultaneous extraction of elements from conjuncts (Across the Board Extraction, Ross 1967). The following examples from Gazdar (1981b: 173) show that gaps in conjuncts must be identical, that is, a filler of a certain category must correspond to a gap in every conjunct:

- (55) a. The kennel which Mary made and Fido sleeps in has been stolen.
(= S/NP & S/NP)
- b. The kennel in which Mary keeps drugs and Fido sleeps has been stolen.
(= S/PP & S/PP)
- c. * The kennel (in) which Mary made and Fido sleeps has been stolen.
(= S/NP & S/PP)

GPSG can plausibly handle this with mechanisms for the transmission of information about gaps. In symmetric coordination, the SLASH elements in each conjunct have to be identical. On the one hand, a transformational approach is not straightforwardly possible since one normally assumes in such analyses that there is a tree and something is moved to another position in the tree thereby leaving a trace. However, in coordinate structures, the filler would correspond to two or more traces and it cannot be explained how the filler could originate in more than one place.

While the analysis of Across the Board extraction is a true highlight of GPSG, there are some problematic aspects that I want to address in the following: the interaction between valence and morphology, the representation of valence and partial verb phrase fronting, and the expressive power of the GPSG formalism.

5.5.1 Valence and morphology

The encoding of valence in GPSG is problematic for several reasons. For example, morphological processes take into account the valence properties of words. Adjectival derivation with the suffix *-bar* ‘-able’ is only productive with transitive verbs, that is, with verbs with an accusative object which can undergo passivization:

- (56) a. lös-bar (nominative, accusative)
solv-able
- b. vergleich-bar (nominative, accusative, PP[mit])
compar-able
- c. * schlaf-bar (nominative)
sleep-able
- d. * helf-bar (nominative, dative)
help-able

A rule for derivations with *-bar* ‘-able’ must therefore make reference to valence information. This is not possible in GPSG grammars since every lexical entry is only assigned

a number which says something about the rules in which this entry can be used. For *-bar*-derivations, one would have to list in the derivational rule all the numbers which correspond to rules with accusative objects, which of course does not adequately describe the phenomenon. Furthermore, the valence of the resulting adjective also depends on the valence of the verb. For example, a verb such as *vergleichen* ‘compare’ requires a *mit* (with)-PP and *vergleichbar* ‘comparable’ does too (Riehemann 1993: 7, 54; 1998: 68). In the following chapters, we will encounter models which assume that lexical entries contain information as to whether a verb selects for an accusative object or not. In such models, morphological rules which need to access the valence properties of linguistic objects can be adequately formulated.

The issue of interaction of valence and derivational morphology will be taken up in Section 21.2.2 again, where approaches in LFG and Construction Grammar are discussed that share assumptions about the encoding of valence with GPSG.

5.5.2 Valence and partial verb phrase fronting

Nerbonne (1986a) and Johnson (1986) investigate fronting of partial VPs in the GPSG framework. (57) gives some examples: in (57a) the bare verb is fronted and its arguments are realized in the middle field, in (57b) one of the objects is fronted together with the verb and in (57c) both objects are fronted with the verb.

- (57) a. Erzählen wird er seiner Tochter ein Märchen können.
 tell will he his daughter a fairy.tale can
 b. Ein Märchen erzählen wird er seiner Tochter können.
 a fairy.tale tell will he his daughter can
 c. Seiner Tochter ein Märchen erzählen wird er können.
 his daughter a fairy.tale tell will he can
 ‘He will be able to tell his daughter a fairy tale.’

The problem with sentences such as those in (57) is that the valence requirements of the verb *erzählen* ‘to tell’ are realized in various positions in the sentence. For fronted constituents, one requires a rule which allows a ditransitive to be realized without its arguments or with one or two objects. Furthermore, it has to be ensured that the arguments that are missing in the prefield are realized in the remainder of the clause. It is not legitimate to omit obligatory arguments or realize arguments with other properties like a different case, as the examples in (58) show:

- (58) a. Verschlungen hat er es nicht.
 devoured has he.NOM it.ACC not
 ‘He did not devour it.’
 b. *Verschlungen hat er nicht.
 devoured has he.NOM not
 c. *Verschlungen hat er ihm nicht.
 devoured has he.NOM him.DAT not

The obvious generalization is that the fronted and unfronted arguments must add up to the total set belonging to the verb. This is scarcely possible with the rule-based valence representation in GPSG. In theories such as Categorical Grammar (see Chapter 8), it is possible to formulate elegant analyses of (58) (Geach 1970). Nerbonne and Johnson both suggest analyses for sentences such as (58) which ultimately amount to changing the representation of valence information in the direction of Categorical Grammar.

Before I turn to the expressive power of the GPSG formalism, I want to note that the problems that we discussed in the previous subsections are both related to the representation of valence in GPSG. We already run into valence-related problems when discussing the passive in Section 5.2: since subjects and objects are introduced in phrase structure rules and since there are some languages in which subject and object are not in the same local tree, there seems to be no way to describe the passive as the suppression of the subject in GPSG.

5.5.3 Generative capacity

In GPSG, the system of linearization, dominance and metarules is normally restricted by conditions we will not discuss here in such a way that one could create a phrase structure grammar of the kind we saw in Chapter 2 from the specification of a GPSG grammar. Such grammars are also called context-free grammars. In the mid-80s, it was shown that context-free grammars are not able to describe natural language in general, that is it could be shown that there are languages that need more powerful grammar formalisms than context-free grammars (Shieber 1985; Culy 1985; see Pullum (1986) for a historical overview). The so-called *generative capacity* of grammar formalisms is discussed in Chapter 17.

Following the emergence of constraint-based models such as HPSG (see Chapter 9) and unification-based variants of Categorical Grammar (see Chapter 8 and Uszkoreit 1986a), most authors previously working in GPSG turned to other frameworks. The GPSG analysis of long-distance dependencies and the distinction between immediate dominance and linear precedence are still used in HPSG and variants of Construction Grammar to this day. See also Section 12.2 for a Tree Adjoining Grammar variant that separates dominance from precedence.

Comprehension questions

1. What does it mean for a grammar to be in an ID/LP format?
2. How are linear variants of constituents in the middle field handled by GPSG?
3. Think of some phenomena which have been described by transformations and consider how GPSG has analyzed these data using other means.

Exercises

1. Write a small GPSG grammar which can analyze the following sentences:

- (59) a. [dass] der Mann ihn liest
that the.NOM man him.ACC reads
'that the man reads it'
- b. [dass] ihn der Mann liest
that him.ACC the.NOM man reads
'that the man reads it'
- c. Der Mann liest ihn.
the.NOM man reads him.ACC
'The man reads it.'

Include all arguments in a single rule without using the metarule for introducing subjects.

Further reading

The main publication in GPSG is Gazdar, Klein, Pullum & Sag (1985). This book has been critically discussed by Jacobson (1987b). Some problematic analyses are contrasted with alternatives from Categorical Grammar and reference is made to the heavily Categorical Grammar influenced work of Pollard (1984), which counts as one of the predecessors of HPSG. Some of Jacobson's suggestions can be found in later works in HPSG.

Grammars of German can be found in Uszkoreit (1987) and Busemann (1992). Gazdar (1981b) developed an analysis of long-distance dependencies, which is still used today in theories such as HPSG.

A history of the genesis of GPSG can be found in Pullum (1989b).

第六章 Feature descriptions

In the previous chapter, we talked about sets of feature-value pairs, which can be used to describe linguistic objects. In this chapter, we will introduce feature descriptions which play a role in theories such as LFG, HPSG, Construction Grammar, versions of Categorical Grammar and TAG (and even some formalizations of Minimalist theories (Veenstra 1998)). This chapter will therefore lay some of the groundwork for the chapters to follow.

Feature structures are complex entities which can model properties of a linguistic object. Linguists mostly work with feature descriptions which describe only parts of a given feature structure. The difference between models and descriptions will be explained in more detail in Section 6.7.

Alternative terms for feature structures are:

- feature-value structure
- attribute-value structure

Other terms for feature description are the following:

- *attribute-value matrix* (AVM)
- *feature matrix*

In what follows, I will restrict the discussion to the absolutely necessary details in order to keep the formal part of the book as short as possible. I refer the interested reader to Shieber (1986), Pollard & Sag (1987: Chapter 2), Johnson (1988), Carpenter (1992), King (1994) and Richter (2004). Shieber's book is an accessible introduction to Unification Grammars. The works by King and Richter, which introduce important foundations for HPSG, would most probably not be accessible for those without a good grounding in mathematics. However, it is important to know that these works exist and that the corresponding linguistic theory is built on a solid foundation.

6.1 Feature descriptions

When describing linguistic signs, we have to say something about their properties. For a noun, we can say that it has case, gender, number and person features. For a word

6 Feature descriptions

such as *Mannes* ‘man’, we can say that these features have the values *genitive*, *masculine*, *singular* and 3. If we were to write these as a list of feature-value pairs, we would arrive at the following feature description:

- (1) Feature-value pair for *Mannes*:
- $$\begin{bmatrix} \text{CASE} & \textit{genitive} \\ \text{GENDER} & \textit{masculine} \\ \text{NUMBER} & \textit{singular} \\ \text{PERSON} & 3 \end{bmatrix}$$

It is possible to describe a variety of different things using feature descriptions. For example, we can describe a person as in (2):

- (2)
$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{FIRSTNAME} & \textit{max} \\ \text{LASTNAME} & \textit{meier} \\ \text{DATE-OF-BIRTH} & \textit{10.10.1985} \end{bmatrix}$$

People are related to other people – a fact that can also be expressed in feature-value pairs. For example, the fact that Max Meier has a father called Peter Meier can be captured by expanding (2) as follows:

- (3)
$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{FIRSTNAME} & \textit{max} \\ \text{LASTNAME} & \textit{meier} \\ \text{DATE-OF-BIRTH} & \textit{10.10.1985} \\ \text{FATHER} & \begin{bmatrix} \text{FIRSTNAME} & \textit{peter} \\ \text{LASTNAME} & \textit{meier} \\ \text{DATE-OF-BIRTH} & \textit{10.05.1960} \\ \text{FATHER} & \dots \\ \text{MOTHER} & \dots \end{bmatrix} \\ \text{MOTHER} & \dots \end{bmatrix}$$

The value of the `FATHER` feature is another feature description containing the same features as (2).

In feature descriptions, a *path* is a sequence of features which immediately follow each other. The *value of a path* is the feature description at the end of the path. Therefore, the value of `FATHER|DATE-OF-BIRTH` is *10.05.1960*.

One can think of many different features that could be included in representations such as (3). One may wonder how to integrate information about offspring into (3).

An obvious solution would be to add features for `DAUGHTER` und `SON`:

- (4)
$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{FIRSTNAME} & \textit{max} \\ \text{LASTNAME} & \textit{meier} \\ \text{DATE-OF-BIRTH} & \textit{10.10.1985} \\ \text{FATHER} & \dots \\ \text{MOTHER} & \dots \\ \text{DAUGHTER} & \dots \end{bmatrix}$$

This solution is not satisfactory as it is not immediately clear how one could describe a person with several daughters. Should one really introduce features such as DAUGHTER-1 or DAUGHTER-3?

(5)

FIRSTNAME	max
LASTNAME	meier
DATE-OF-BIRTH	10.10.1985
FATHER	...
MOTHER	...
DAUGHTER-1	...
DAUGHTER-2	...
DAUGHTER-3	...

How many features do we want to assume? Where is the limit? What would the value of DAUGHTER-32 be?

For this case, it makes much more sense to use a list. Lists are indicated with angle brackets. Any number of elements can occur between these brackets. A special case is when no element occurs between the brackets. A list with no elements is also called *empty list*. In the following example, Max Meier has a daughter called Clara, who herself has no daughter.

(6)

FIRSTNAME	max												
LASTNAME	meier												
DATE-OF-BIRTH	10.10.1985												
FATHER	...												
MOTHER	...												
DAUGHTER	<table> <tr><td>FIRSTNAME</td><td>clara</td></tr> <tr><td>LASTNAME</td><td>meier</td></tr> <tr><td>DATE-OF-BIRTH</td><td>10.10.2004</td></tr> <tr><td>FATHER</td><td>...</td></tr> <tr><td>MOTHER</td><td>...</td></tr> <tr><td>DAUGHTER</td><td><></td></tr> </table>	FIRSTNAME	clara	LASTNAME	meier	DATE-OF-BIRTH	10.10.2004	FATHER	...	MOTHER	...	DAUGHTER	<>
FIRSTNAME	clara												
LASTNAME	meier												
DATE-OF-BIRTH	10.10.2004												
FATHER	...												
MOTHER	...												
DAUGHTER	<>												

Now, we are left with the question of sons. Should we add another list for sons? Do we want to differentiate between sons and daughters? It is certainly the case that the gender of the children is an important property, but these are properties of the objects themselves, since every person has a gender. The description in (7) therefore offers a more adequate representation.

At this point, one could ask why the parents are not included in a list as well. In fact, we find similar questions also in linguistic works: how is information best organized for the job at hand? One could argue for the representation of descriptions of the parents under separate features, by pointing out that with such a representation it is possible to make certain claims about a mother or father without having to necessarily search for the respective descriptions in a list.

$$(7) \left[\begin{array}{ll} \text{FIRSTNAME} & \textit{max} \\ \text{LASTNAME} & \textit{meier} \\ \text{DATE-OF-BIRTH} & \textit{10.10.1985} \\ \text{GENDER} & \textit{male} \\ \text{FATHER} & \dots \\ \text{MOTHER} & \dots \\ \text{CHILDREN} & \left\langle \begin{array}{ll} \text{FIRSTNAME} & \textit{clara} \\ \text{LASTNAME} & \textit{meier} \\ \text{DATE-OF-BIRTH} & \textit{10.10.2004} \\ \text{GENDER} & \textit{female} \\ \text{FATHER} & \dots \\ \text{MOTHER} & \dots \\ \text{CHILDREN} & \langle \rangle \end{array} \right\rangle \end{array} \right]$$

If the order of the elements is irrelevant, then we could use sets rather than lists. Sets are written inside curly brackets.¹

6.2 Types

In the previous section, we introduced feature descriptions consisting of feature-value pairs and showed that it makes sense to allow for complex values for features. In this section, feature descriptions will be augmented to include types. Feature descriptions which are assigned a type are also called *typed feature descriptions*. Types say something about which features can or must belong to a particular structure. The description previously discussed describes an object of the type *person*.

$$(8) \left[\begin{array}{ll} \textit{person} & \\ \text{FIRSTNAME} & \textit{max} \\ \text{LASTNAME} & \textit{meier} \\ \text{DATE-OF-BIRTH} & \textit{10.10.1985} \\ \text{GENDER} & \textit{male} \\ \text{FATHER} & \dots \\ \text{MOTHER} & \dots \\ \text{CHILDREN} & \langle \dots, \dots \rangle \end{array} \right]$$

Types are written in *italics*.

The specification of a type determines which properties a modelled object has. It is then only possible for a theory to say something about these properties. Properties such as OPERATING VOLTAGE are not relevant for objects of the type *person*. If we know the

¹ The definition of a set requires many technicalities. In this book, I would use sets only for collecting semantic information. This can be done equally well using lists, which is why I do not introduce sets here and instead use lists.

type of a given object, then we also know that this object must have certain properties even if we do not yet know their exact values. In this way, (9) is still a description of Max Meier even though it does not contain any information about Max' date of birth:

$$(9) \left[\begin{array}{ll} \textit{person} & \\ \text{FIRSTNAME} & \textit{max} \\ \text{LASTNAME} & \textit{meier} \\ \text{GENDER} & \textit{male} \end{array} \right]$$

We know, however, that Max Meier must have been born on some day since this is a description of the type *person*. The question *What is Max' date of birth?* makes sense for a structure such as (9) in a way that the question *Which operating voltage does Max have?* does not. If we know that an object is of the type *person*, then we have the following basic structure:

$$(10) \left[\begin{array}{ll} \textit{person} & \\ \text{FIRSTNAME} & \textit{firstname} \\ \text{LASTNAME} & \textit{lastname} \\ \text{DATE-OF-BIRTH} & \textit{date} \\ \text{GENDER} & \textit{gender} \\ \text{FATHER} & \textit{person} \\ \text{MOTHER} & \textit{person} \\ \text{CHILDREN} & \textit{list of person} \end{array} \right]$$

In (10) and (9), the values of features such as FIRSTNAME are in italics. These values are also types. They are different from types such as *person*, however, as no features belong to them. These kinds of types are called *atomic*.

Types are organized into hierarchies. It is possible to define the subtypes *woman* and *man* for *person*. These would determine the gender of a given object. (11) shows the feature structure for the type *woman*, which is analogous to that of *man*.

$$(11) \left[\begin{array}{ll} \textit{female person} & \\ \text{FIRSTNAME} & \textit{firstname} \\ \text{LASTNAME} & \textit{lastname} \\ \text{DATE-OF-BIRTH} & \textit{date} \\ \text{GENDER} & \textit{female} \\ \text{FATHER} & \textit{person} \\ \text{MOTHER} & \textit{person} \\ \text{CHILDREN} & \textit{list of person} \end{array} \right]$$

At this point, we could ask ourselves if we really need the feature GENDER. The necessary information is already represented in the type *woman*. The question if specific information is represented by special features or whether it is stored in a type without a corresponding individual feature will surface again in the discussion of linguistic analyses. Both alternatives differ mostly in the fact that the information which is modelled by types is not immediately accessible for structure sharing, which is discussed in Section 6.4.

Type hierarchies play an important role in capturing linguistic generalizations, which is why type hierarchies and the inheritance of constraints and information will be explained with reference to a further example in what follows. One can think of type hierarchies as an effective way of organizing information. In an encyclopedia, the individual entries are linked in such a way that the entries for monkey and mouse will each contain a pointer to mammal. The description found under mammal does therefore not have to be repeated for the subordinate concepts. In the same way, if one wishes to describe various electric appliances, one can use the hierarchy in Figure 6.1. The most




图 6.1: Non-linguistic example of multiple inheritance

general type *electrical device* is the highest in Figure 6.1. Electrical devices have certain properties, e.g., a power supply with a certain power consumption. All subtypes of *electrical device* “inherit” this property. In this way, *printing device* and *scanning device* also have a power supply with a specific power consumption. A *printing device* can produce information and a *scanning device* can read in information. A *photocopier* can both produce information and read it. Photocopiers have both the properties of scanning and printing devices. This is expressed by the connection between the two superordinate types and *photocopier* in Figure 6.1. If a type is at the same time the subtype of several superordinate types, then we speak of *multiple inheritance*. If devices can print, but not scan, they are of type *printer*. This type can have further more specific subtypes, which in turn may have particular properties, e.g., *laser printer*. New features can be added to subtypes, but it is also possible to make values of inherited features more specific. For example, the material that can be scanned with a *negative scanner* is far more restricted than that of the supertype *scanner*, since negative scanners can only scan negatives.

The objects that are modeled always have a maximally specific type. In the example above, this means that we can have objects of the type *laser printer* and *negative scanner* but not of the type *printing device*. This is due to the fact that *printing device* is not maximally specific since this type has two subtypes.

Type hierarchies with multiple inheritance are an important means for expressing linguistic generalizations (Flickinger, Pollard & Wasow 1985; Flickinger 1987; Sag 1997).

Types of words or phrases which occur at the very top of these hierarchies correspond to constraints on linguistic objects, which are valid for linguistic objects in all languages. Subtypes of such general types can be specific to certain languages or language classes.

6.3 Disjunction

Disjunctions can be used if one wishes to express the fact that a particular object can have various different properties. If one were to organize a class reunion twenty years after leaving school and could not recall the exact names of some former classmates, it would be possible to search the web for “Julia (Warbanow or Barbanow)”. In feature descriptions, this “or” is expressed by a ‘ \vee ’.

$$(12) \left[\begin{array}{l} \textit{person} \\ \textit{FIRSTNAME } \textit{julia} \\ \textit{LASTNAME } \textit{warbanow} \vee \textit{barbanow} \end{array} \right]$$

Some internet search engines do not allow for searches with ‘or’. In these cases, one has to carry out two distinct search operations: one for “Julia Warbanow” and then another for “Julia Barbanow”. This corresponds to the two following disjunctively connected descriptions:

$$(13) \left[\begin{array}{l} \textit{person} \\ \textit{FIRSTNAME } \textit{julia} \\ \textit{LASTNAME } \textit{warbanow} \end{array} \right] \vee \left[\begin{array}{l} \textit{person} \\ \textit{FIRSTNAME } \textit{julia} \\ \textit{LASTNAME } \textit{barbanow} \end{array} \right]$$

Since we have type hierarchies as a means of expression, we can sometimes do without disjunctive specification of values and instead state the supertype: for *printer* \vee *photocopier*, one can simply write *printing device* if one assumes the type hierarchy in Figure 6.1 on the preceding page.

6.4 Structure sharing

Structure sharing is an important part of the formalism. It serves to express the notion that certain parts of a structure are identical. A linguistic example for the identity of values is agreement. In sentences such as (14), the number value of the noun phrase has to be identical to that of the verb:

- (14) a. Der Mann schläft.
 the man sleeps
 ‘The man is sleeping.’
 b. Die Männer schlafen.
 the men sleep
 ‘The men are sleeping.’

6 Feature descriptions

- c. * Der Mann schlafen.
 the man sleep
 Intended: ‘The man are sleeping.’

The identity of values is indicated by boxes containing numbers. The boxes can also be viewed as variables.

When describing objects we can make claims about equal values or claims about identical values. A claim about the identity of values is stronger. Let us take the following feature description containing information about the children that Max’s father and mother have as an example:

$$(15) \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{person} \\ \text{FIRSTNAME} \quad \text{max} \\ \text{LASTNAME} \quad \text{meier} \\ \text{DATE-OF-BIRTH} \quad 10.10.1985 \\ \text{FATHER} \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{person} \\ \text{FIRSTNAME} \quad \text{peter} \\ \text{LASTNAME} \quad \text{meier} \\ \text{CHILDREN} \quad \left\langle \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{person} \\ \text{FIRSTNAME} \quad \text{klaus} \end{array} \right], \dots \right\rangle \end{array} \right] \\ \text{MOTHER} \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{person} \\ \text{FIRSTNAME} \quad \text{anna} \\ \text{LASTNAME} \quad \text{meier} \\ \text{CHILDREN} \quad \left\langle \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{person} \\ \text{FIRSTNAME} \quad \text{klaus} \end{array} \right], \dots \right\rangle \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

Notice that under the paths FATHER|CHILDREN and MOTHER|CHILDREN, we find a list containing a description of a person with the first name Klaus. The question of whether the feature description is of one or two children of Peter and Anna cannot be answered. It is certainly possible that we are dealing with two different children from previous partnerships who both happen to be called Klaus.

By using structure sharing, it is possible to specify the identity of the two values as in (16). In (16), Klaus is a single child that belongs to both parents. Everything inside the brackets which immediately follow $\boxed{1}$ is equally present in both positions. One can think of $\boxed{1}$ as a pointer or reference to a structure which has only been described once. One question still remains open: what about Max? Max is also a child of his parents and should therefore also occur in a list of the children of his parents. There are two points in (16) where there are three dots. These ellipsis marks stand for information about the other children of Peter and Anna Meier. Our world knowledge tells us that both of them must have the same child namely Max Meier himself. In the following section, we will see how this can be expressed in formal terms.

$$(16) \left[\begin{array}{l} \textit{person} \\ \text{FIRSTNAME} \quad \textit{max} \\ \text{LASTNAME} \quad \textit{meier} \\ \text{DATE-OF-BIRTH} \quad \textit{10.10.1985} \\ \text{FATHER} \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} \textit{person} \\ \text{FIRSTNAME} \quad \textit{peter} \\ \text{LASTNAME} \quad \textit{meier} \\ \text{CHILDREN} \quad \left\langle \left[\begin{array}{l} \textit{person} \\ \text{FIRSTNAME} \quad \textit{klaus} \end{array} \right], \dots \right\rangle \end{array} \right] \\ \text{MOTHER} \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} \textit{person} \\ \text{FIRSTNAME} \quad \textit{anna} \\ \text{LASTNAME} \quad \textit{meier} \\ \text{CHILDREN} \quad \langle \left[\begin{array}{l} \textit{person} \\ \text{FIRSTNAME} \quad \textit{klaus} \end{array} \right], \dots \rangle \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

6.5 Cyclic structures

We have introduced structure sharing in order to be able to express the fact that Max's parents both have a son Klaus together. It would not be enough to list Max in the child-lists of his parents separately. We want to capture the fact that it is the same Max which appears in each of these lists and furthermore, we have to ensure that the child being described is identical to the entire object being described. Otherwise, the description would permit a situation where Max's parents could have a second child also called Max. The description given in (17) can capture all facts correctly. Structures

$$(17) \left[\begin{array}{l} \textit{person} \\ \text{FIRSTNAME} \quad \textit{max} \\ \text{LASTNAME} \quad \textit{meier} \\ \text{DATE-OF-BIRTH} \quad \textit{10.10.1985} \\ \text{FATHER} \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} \textit{person} \\ \text{FIRSTNAME} \quad \textit{peter} \\ \text{LASTNAME} \quad \textit{meier} \\ \text{CHILDREN} \quad \left\langle \left[\begin{array}{l} \textit{person} \\ \text{FIRSTNAME} \quad \textit{klaus} \end{array} \right], \left[\begin{array}{l} \textit{person} \\ \text{FIRSTNAME} \quad \textit{klaus} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \\ \text{MOTHER} \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} \textit{person} \\ \text{FIRSTNAME} \quad \textit{anna} \\ \text{LASTNAME} \quad \textit{meier} \\ \text{CHILDREN} \quad \langle \left[\begin{array}{l} \textit{person} \\ \text{FIRSTNAME} \quad \textit{klaus} \end{array} \right], \left[\begin{array}{l} \textit{person} \\ \text{FIRSTNAME} \quad \textit{klaus} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \rangle \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

such as those described in (17) are called cyclic because one ends up going in a circle if

one follows a particular path: e.g., the path `FATHER|CHILDREN|...|FATHER|CHILDREN|...`² can be potentially repeated an infinite number of times.

6.6 Unification

Grammatical rules are written exactly like lexical entries in HPSG and Construction Grammar and are done so with the help of feature descriptions. For a word or a larger phrasal entity to be usable as daughter in a phrase licensed by some grammatical rule, the word or phrase must have properties which are compatible with the description of the daughters in the grammatical rule. If this kind of compatibility exists, then we can say that the respective items are *unifiable*.³ If one unifies two descriptions, the result is a description which contains information from both descriptions but no additional information.

The way unification works can be demonstrated with feature descriptions describing people. One can imagine that Bettina Kant goes to the private detective Max Müller and wants to find a specific person. Normally, those who go to a detective's office only come with a partial description of the person they are looking for, e.g., the gender, hair color or date of birth. Perhaps even the registration number of the car belonging to the person is known.

It is then expected of the detective that he or she provides information fitting the description. If we are looking for a blonde female named Meier (18a), then we do not want to get descriptions of a male red-head (18b). The descriptions in (18) are incompatible and cannot be unified:

- (18) a.
$$\left[\begin{array}{ll} \textit{person} & \\ \textit{LASTNAME} & \textit{meier} \\ \textit{GENDER} & \textit{female} \\ \textit{HAIRCOLOR} & \textit{blonde} \end{array} \right]$$
- b.
$$\left[\begin{array}{ll} \textit{person} & \\ \textit{LASTNAME} & \textit{meier} \\ \textit{GENDER} & \textit{male} \\ \textit{HAIRCOLOR} & \textit{red} \end{array} \right]$$

The description in (19) would be a possible result for a search for a blonde, female individual called Meier:

² The dots here stand for the path to $\boxed{?}$ in the list which is the value of `CHILDREN`. See Exercise 3.

³ The term *unification* should be used with care. It is only appropriate if certain assumptions with regard to the formal basis of linguistic theories are made. Informally, the term is often used in formalisms where unification is not technically defined. In HPSG, it mostly means that the constraints of two descriptions lead to a single description. What one wants to say here, intuitively, is that the objects described have to satisfy the constraints of both descriptions at the same time (*constraint satisfaction*). Since the term *unification* is so broadly-used, it will also be used in this section. The term will not play a role in the remaining discussions of theories with the exception of explicitly unification-based approaches. In contrast, the concept of constraint satisfaction presented here is very important for the comprehension of the following chapters.

(19)

<i>person</i>	
FIRSTNAME	<i>katharina</i>
LASTNAME	<i>meier</i>
GENDER	<i>female</i>
DATE-OF-BIRTH	<i>15.10.1965</i>
HAIRCOLOR	<i>blonde</i>

Katharina Meier could also have other properties unknown to the detective. The important thing is that the properties known to the detective match those that the client is looking for. Furthermore, it is important that the detective uses reliable information and does not make up any information about the sought object. The unification of the search in (18a) and the information accessible to the detective in (19) is in fact (19) and not (20), for example:

(20)

<i>person</i>	
FIRSTNAME	<i>katharina</i>
LASTNAME	<i>meier</i>
GENDER	<i>female</i>
DATE-OF-BIRTH	<i>15.10.1965</i>
HAIRCOLOR	<i>blond</i>
CHILDREN	$\langle \rangle$

(20) contains information about children, which is neither contained in (18a) nor in (19). It could indeed be the case that Katharina Meier has no children, but there are perhaps several people called Katharina Meier with otherwise identical properties. With this invented information, we might exclude one or more possible candidates.

It is possible that our detective Max Müller does not have any information about hair color in his files. His files could contain the following information:

(21)

<i>person</i>	
FIRSTNAME	<i>katharina</i>
LASTNAME	<i>meier</i>
GENDER	<i>female</i>
DATE-OF-BIRTH	<i>15.10.1965</i>

These data are compatible with the search criteria. If we were to unify the descriptions in (18a) and (21), we would get (19). If we assume that the detective has done a good job, then Bettina Kant now knows that the person she is looking for has the properties of her original search plus the newly discovered properties.

6.7 Phenomena, models and formal theories

In the previous sections, we introduced feature descriptions with types. These feature descriptions describe typed feature structures, which are models of observable linguistic structures. In the definitions of types, one determines which properties of lin-

guistic objects should be described. The type hierarchy together with type definitions is also referred to as a *signature*. As a grammarian, one typically uses types in feature descriptions. These descriptions contain constraints which must hold for linguistic objects. If no constraints are given, all values that are compatible with the specification in the signature are possible values. For example, one can omit the case description of a linguistic object such as *Frau* ‘woman’ since *Frau* can – as shown in (22) – appear in all four cases:

- (22) a. Die Frau schläft. (nominative)
 the.NOM woman sleeps
 b. Wir gedenken der Frau. (genitive)
 we commemorate the.GEN woman
 c. Er hilft der Frau. (dative)
 he helps the.DAT woman
 d. Er liebt die Frau. (accusative)
 he loves the.ACC woman



In a given model, there are only fully specified representations, that is, the model contains four forms of *Frau*, each with a different case. For masculine nouns such as *Mann* ‘man’, one would have to say something about case in the description since the genitive-singular form *Mann-es* differs from other singular forms, which can be seen by adding *Mann* into the examples in (22). (23) shows the feature descriptions for *Frau* ‘woman’ and *Mann* ‘man’:

- (23) a. Frau ‘woman’:
 [GENDER *fem*]
 b. Mann ‘man’:
 [GENDER *mas*
 CASE *nominative* \vee *dative* \vee *accusative*]

Unlike (23b), (23a) does not contain a case feature since we do not need to say anything special about case in the description of *Frau*. Since all nominal objects require a case feature, it becomes clear that the structures for *Frau* must actually also have a case feature. The value of the case feature is of the type *case*. *case* is a general type which subsumes the subtypes *nominative*, *genitive*, *dative* and *accusative*. Concrete linguistic objects always have exactly one of these maximally specified types as their case value. The feature structures belonging to (23) are given in Figure 6.2 and Figure 6.3.

In these representations, each node has a certain type (*noun*, *fem*, *nominative*, ...) and the types in feature structures are always maximally specific, that is, they do not have any further subtypes. There is always an entry node (*noun* in the example above) and the other nodes are connected with arrows that are annotated with the feature labels (GENDER, CASE).

If we return to the example with people from the previous sections, we can capture the difference between a model and a description as follows: if we have a model of

图 6.2: Feature structures for the description of *Frau* 'woman' in (23a)图 6.3: Feature structures for the description of *Mann* 'man' in (23b)

people that includes first name, last name, date of birth, gender and hair color, then it follows that every object we model also has a birthday. We can, however, decide to omit these details from our descriptions if they do not play a role for stating constraints or formulating searches.

The connection between linguistic phenomena, the model and the formal theory is shown in Figure 6.4. The model is designed to model linguistic phenomena. Further-




图 6.4: Phenomenon, model and formal theory

more, it must be licensed by our theory. The theory determines the model and makes

predictions with regard to possible phenomena.

Comprehension questions

1. What are the reasons for using types?
2. What is inheritance? What is special about multiple inheritance?
3. Are the following structures compatible, that is, can they be used to describe the same object?

$$(24) \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{FIRSTNAME } max \\ \text{LASTNAME } meier \\ \text{FATHER } \left[\begin{array}{l} person \\ \text{FIRSTNAME } peter \\ \text{LASTNAME } meier \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{FIRSTNAME } max \\ \text{LASTNAME } meier \\ \text{FATHER } \left[\begin{array}{l} person \\ \text{FIRSTNAME } peter \\ \text{LASTNAME } müller \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

$$(25) \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{FIRSTNAME } max \\ \text{LASTNAME } meier \\ \text{FATHER } \left[\begin{array}{l} person \\ \text{FIRSTNAME } peter \\ \text{LASTNAME } meier \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{FIRSTNAME } max \\ \text{LASTNAME } meier \\ \text{MOTHER } \left[\begin{array}{l} person \\ \text{FIRSTNAME } ursula \\ \text{LASTNAME } müller \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

Exercises

1. Think about how one could describe musical instruments using feature descriptions.
2. Come up with a type hierarchy for the word classes (*det*, *comp*, *noun*, *verb*, *adj*, *prep*). Think about the ways in which one can organize the type hierarchy so that one can express the generalizations that were captured by the binary features in Table 3.1 on page 87.
3. In this chapter, we introduced lists. This may look like an extension of the formalism, but it is not as it is possible to convert the list notation into a notation which only requires feature-value pairs. Think about how one could do this.
4. (Additional exercise) The relation *append* will play a role in Chapter 9. This relation serves to combine two lists to form a third. Relational constraints such as *append* do in fact constitute an expansion of the formalism. Using relational constraints, it is possible to relate any number of feature values to other values, that is, one can write programs which compute a particular value depending on other values. This

poses the question as to whether one needs such powerful descriptive tools in a linguistic theory and if we do allow them, what kind of complexity we afford them. A theory which can do without relational constraints should be preferred over one that uses relational constraints (see Müller 2007b: Chapter 20 for a comparison of theories).

For the concatenation of lists, there is a possible implementation in feature structures without recourse to relational constraints. Find out how this can be done. Give your sources and document how you went about finding the solution.

Further reading

This chapter was designed to give the reader an easy-to-follow introduction to typed feature structures. The mathematical properties of the structures, type hierarchies and the combinatorial possibilities of such structures could not be discussed in detail here, but knowledge of at least part of these properties is important for work in computational linguistics and in developing one's own analyses. For more information, I refer the interested reader to the following publications: Shieber (1986) is a short introduction to the theory of Unification Grammar. It offers a relatively general overview followed by the discussion of important grammar types such as DCG, LFG, GPSG, HPSG, PATR-II. Johnson (1988) describes the formalism of untyped feature structures in a mathematically precise way. Carpenter (1992) goes into the detail about the mathematical aspects of typed feature structures. The formalism developed by King (1999) for HPSG-grammars forms the basis for the formalism by Richter (2004), which currently counts as the standard formalism for HPSG.

第七章 Lexical Functional Grammar

Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG) was developed in the 80s by Joan Bresnan and Ron Kaplan (Bresnan & Kaplan 1982). LFG forms part of so-called West-Coast linguistics: unlike MIT, where Chomsky works and teaches, the institutes of researchers such as Joan Bresnan and Ron Kaplan are on the west coast of the USA (Joan Bresnan in Stanford and Ron Kaplan at Xerox in Palo Alto and now at the language technology firm Nuance Communications in the Bay Area in California).

Bresnan & Kaplan (1982) view LFG explicitly as a psycholinguistically plausible alternative to transformation-based approaches. For a discussion of the requirements regarding the psycholinguistic plausibility of linguistics theories, see Chapter 15.

The more in-depth works on German are Berman (1996, 2003a) and Cook (2001).

LFG has well-designed formal foundations (Kaplan & Bresnan 1982; Kaplan 1995), and hence first implementations were available rather quickly (Frey & Reyle 1983a,b; Yasukawa 1984; Block & Hunze 1986; Eisele & Dorre 1986; Wada & Asher 1986; Delmonte 1990; Her, Higinbotham & Pentheroudakis 1991; Kohl 1992; Kohl, Gardent, Plainfossé, Reape & Momma 1992; Kaplan & Maxwell III 1996; Mayo 1997, 1999; Boullier & Sagot 2005a,b; Clément 2009; Clément & Kinyon 2001).

The following is a list of languages with implemented LFG fragments, probably incomplete:

- Arabic (Attia 2008),
- Arrernte (Dras, Lareau, Börschinger, Dale, Motazedi, Rambow, Turpin & Ulinski 2012),
- Bengali (Sengupta & Chaudhuri 1997),
- Danish (Ørsnes 2002; Ørsnes & Wedekind 2003, 2004),
- English (Her, Higinbotham & Pentheroudakis 1991; Butt, Dipper, Frank & King 1999a; Riezler, King, Kaplan, Crouch, Maxwell III & Johnson 2002; King & Maxwell III 2007),
- French (Zweigenbaum 1991; Frank 1996; Frank & Zaenen 2002; Butt, Dipper, Frank & King 1999a; Clément & Kinyon 2001; Boullier, Sagot & Clément 2005; Schwarze & de Alencar 2016),

- Georgian (Meurer 2009),
- German (Rohrer 1996; Berman 1996; Kuhn & Rohrer 1997; Butt et al. 1999a; Dipper 2003; Rohrer & Forst 2006; Forst 2006; Frank 2006; Forst & Rohrer 2009),
- Hungarian (Laczkó et al. 2010),
- Indonesian (Arka, Andrews, Dalrymple, Mistica & Simpson 2009),
- Italian (Delmonte 1990; Mayo 1999; Quaglia 2014),
- Irish (Sulger 2009, 2010),
- Japanese (Her, Higinbotham & Pentheroudakis 1991; Masuichi & Ohkuma 2003; Umemoto 2006),
- Korean (Her, Higinbotham & Pentheroudakis 1991),
- Malagasy (Randriamasimanana 2006; Dalrymple, Liakata & Mackie 2006),
- Mandarin Chinese (Her, Higinbotham & Pentheroudakis 1991; Fang & King 2007),
- Murrinh-Patha (Seiss & Nordlinger 2012),
- Norwegian (Dyvik, Meurer & Rosén 2005),
- Polish (Patejuk & Przepiórkowski 2012),
- Portuguese (de Alencar 2004, 2013),
- Spanish (Mayo 1999),
- Tigrinya (Kifle 2012),
- Turkish (Çetinoğlu & Oflazer 2006),
- Hungarian (Laczkó, Rákosi & Tóth 2010; Rákosi, Laczkó & Csernyi 2011),
- Urdu/Hindi (Butt, King & Roth 2007; Bögel, Butt & Sulger 2008),
- Welsh (Mittendorf & Sadler 2005) and
- Wolof (Dione 2014, 2013).

Many of these grammars were developed in the ParGram consortium¹ (Butt, King, Niño & Segond 1999b; Butt, Dyvik, King, Masuichi & Rohrer 2002). Apart from these grammars there is a small fragment of Northern Sotho, which is currently being expanded (Faaß 2010).

¹ <http://pargram.b.uib.no/research-groups/>. 01.10.2015.

Many of the LFG systems combine linguistically motivated grammars with a statistical component. Such a component can help to find preferred readings of a sentence first, it can increase the efficiency of processing and make the complete processing robust (for instance Kaplan et al. 2004; Riezler et al. 2002). Josef van Genabith's group in Dublin is working on the induction of LFG grammars from corpora (e.g., Johnson et al. 1999; O'Donovan et al. 2005; Cahill et al. 2005; Chrupala & van Genabith 2006; Guo et al. 2007; Cahill et al. 2008; Schluter & van Genabith 2009).

Some of the systems can be tested online:

- <http://iness.uib.no/xle-web/xle-web>
- <http://lfg-demo.computing.dcu.ie/lfgparser.html>
- <http://www.xlfg.org/>

7.1 General remarks on the representational format

LFG assumes multiple levels of representation.² The most important are c-structure and f-structure. c-structure is the constituent structure and it is licensed by a phrase structure grammar. This phrase structure grammar uses \bar{X} structures for languages for which this is appropriate. f-structure stands for functional structure. Functional structure contains information about the predicates involved and about the grammatical functions (subject, object, ...) which occur in a constituent. Mappings mediate between these representational levels.

7.1.1 Functional structure

In LFG, grammatical functions such as subject and object play a very important role. Unlike in most other theories discussed in this book, they are primitives of the theory. A sentence such as (1a) will be assigned a functional structure as in (1b):

- (1) a. David devoured a sandwich.

$$b. \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{PRED} \text{ 'DEVOUR(SUBJ, OBJ)'} \\ \text{SUBJ} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{PRED} \text{ 'DAVID'} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{OBJ} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{SPEC} \text{ A} \\ \text{PRED} \text{ 'SANDWICH'} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

All lexical items that have a meaning (e.g., nouns, verbs, adjectives) contribute a PRED feature with a corresponding value. The grammatical functions governed by a head (government = subcategorization) are determined in the specification of PRED.³ Corresponding functions are called *governable grammatical functions*. Examples of this are shown in Table 7.1 on the following page (Dalrymple 2006). The PRED specification corresponds to the theta grid in GB theory. The valence of a head is specified by the PRED value.

The non-governable grammatical functions are given in Table 7.2 on the following page. Topic and focus are information-structural terms. There are a number of works on

² The English examples and their analyses discussed in this section are taken from Dalrymple (2001) and Dalrymple (2006).

³ In the structure in (1b), the SUBJ and OBJ in the list following *devour* are identical to the values of SUBJ and OBJ in the structure. For reasons of presentation, this will not be explicitly indicated in this structure and following structures.

表 7.1: Governable grammatical functions

SUBJ:	subject
OBJ:	object
COMP:	sentential complement or closed (non-predicative) infinitival complement
XCOMP:	open (predicative) complement, often infinitival, the SUBJ function is externally controlled
OBJ _θ :	secondary OBJ functions that are related to a special, language specific set of grammatical roles; English has OBJ _{THEME} only.
OBL _θ :	a group of thematically restricted oblique functions, as for instance OBL _{GOAL} or OBL _{AGENT} . These often correspond to adpositional phrases in c-structure.

表 7.2: Non-governable grammatical functions

ADJ:	adjuncts
TOPIC:	the topic of an utterance
FOCUS:	the focus of an utterance

their exact definition, which differ to varying degrees (Kruijff-Korbayová & Steedman 2003: 253–254), but broadly speaking, one can say that the focus of an utterance constitutes new information and that the topic is old or given information. Bresnan (2001: 97) uses the following question tests in order to determine topic and focus:

- (2) Q: What did you name your cat?
A: Rosie I named her. (*Rosie* = FOCUS)
- (3) Q: What did you name your pets?
A: My dog, I named Harold. My cat, I named Rosie. (*my dog, my cat* = TOPIC)

f-structures are characterized using functional descriptions, for example, one can refer to a value of the feature TENSE in the functional structure f using the following expression:

- (4) (f TENSE)

It is possible to say something about the value which this feature should have in the feature description. The following descriptions express the fact that in the structure f , the feature TENSE must have the value PAST.

- (5) (f TENSE) = PAST

The value of a feature may also be a specific f-structure. The expression in (6) ensures that the SUBJ feature in f is the f-structure g :

$$(6) \quad (f \text{ SUBJ}) = g$$

For the analysis of (7a), we get the constraints in (7b):


- (7) a. David sneezed.
 b. $(f \text{ PRED}) = \text{'SNEEZE(SUBJ)'}'$
 $(f \text{ TENSE}) = \text{PAST}$
 $(f \text{ SUBJ}) = g$
 $(g \text{ PRED}) = \text{'DAVID'}$

The description in (7b) describes the following structure:

$$(8) \quad f: \begin{bmatrix} \text{PRED} & \text{'SNEEZE(SUBJ)'} \\ \text{TENSE} & \text{PAST} \\ \text{SUBJ} & g: \begin{bmatrix} \text{PRED} & \text{'DAVID'} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$


But (7b) also describes many other structures which contain further features. We are only interested in minimal structures that contain the information provided in the description.

(9) shows how a node in the c-structure can be connected to the f-structure for the entire sentence:




The function ϕ from the NP-node to the f-structure corresponding to the NP is depicted with an arrow marked ϕ .

A phrase and its head always correspond to the same f-structure:



In LFG grammars of English, the CP/IP system is assumed as in GB theory (see Section 3.1.5). IP, I' and I (and also VP) are mapped onto the same f-structure.

- (11) a. David is yawning.



f-structures have to fulfill two well-formedness conditions: they have to be both *complete* and *coherent*. Both these conditions will be discussed in the following sections.

7.1.2 Completeness

Every head adds a constraint of the PRED value of the corresponding f-structure. In determining completeness, one has to check that the elements required in the PRED value are actually realized. In (12b), OBJ is missing a value, which is why (12a) is ruled out by the theory.

- (12) a. * David devoured.
- b.
$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{PRED 'DEVOUR<SUBJ,OBJ>} \\ \text{SUBJ } \left[\text{PRED 'DAVID'} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

7.1.3 Coherence

The Coherence Condition requires that all argument functions in a given f-structure have to be selected in the value of the local PRED attribute. (13a) is ruled out because COMP does not appear under the arguments of *devour*.

- (13) a. * David devoured a sandwich that Peter sleeps.
- b.
$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{PRED 'DEVOUR<SUBJ,OBJ>} \\ \text{SUBJ } \left[\text{PRED 'DAVID'} \right] \\ \text{OBJ } \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{SPEC A} \\ \text{PRED 'SANDWICH'} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{COMP } \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{PRED 'SLEEP<SUBJ>} \\ \text{SUBJ } \left[\text{PRED 'PETER'} \right] \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

The constraints on completeness and coherence together ensure that all and only those arguments required in the PRED specification are actually realized. Both of those constraints taken together correspond to the Theta-Criterion in GB theory (see page 85).⁴

⁴ For the differences between predicate-argument structures in LFG and the Deep Structure oriented Theta

7.1.4 Restrictions on the c-structure/f-structure relation

Symbols in c-structures are assigned restrictions for f-structures. The following symbols are used: ‘ \uparrow ’ refers to the f-structure of the immediately dominating node and ‘ \downarrow ’ refers to the f-structure of the c-structure node bearing the annotation. A common annotation is ‘ $\uparrow = \downarrow$ ’. This constraint states that the f-structure of the mother node is identical to that of the annotated category:

$$(14) \quad V' \rightarrow \begin{array}{c} V \\ \uparrow = \downarrow \\ \text{f-structure of the mother} = \text{own f-structure} \end{array}$$

The annotation ‘ $\uparrow = \downarrow$ ’ is below the head of a structure.

Phrases which are licensed by the annotated c-structure in (14) can be visualized as follows:

$$(15) \quad \begin{array}{c} V' \longrightarrow [] \\ | \\ V \end{array}$$

(16) shows a V' rule with an object:

$$(16) \quad V' \rightarrow \begin{array}{cc} V & NP \\ \uparrow = \downarrow & (\uparrow \text{OBJ}) = \downarrow \end{array}$$

The annotation on the NP signals that the OBJ value in the f-structure of the mother ($\uparrow \text{OBJ}$) is identical to the f-structure of the NP node, that is, to everything that is contributed from the material below the NP node (\downarrow). This is shown in the figure in (17):

$$(17) \quad \begin{array}{c} V' \longrightarrow [\text{OBJ} \longrightarrow []] \\ \swarrow \quad \searrow \\ V \quad \quad NP \end{array}$$

In the equation $(\uparrow \text{OBJ}) = \downarrow$, the arrows ‘ \uparrow ’ and ‘ \downarrow ’ correspond to feature structures. ‘ \uparrow ’ and ‘ \downarrow ’ stand for the f and g in equations such as (6).

(18) is an example with an intransitive verb and (19) is the corresponding visualization:

$$(18) \quad \text{sneezed} \quad V \quad \begin{array}{l} (\uparrow \text{PRED}) = \text{'SNEEZE<SUBJ>'} \\ (\uparrow \text{TENSE}) = \text{PAST} \end{array}$$

$$(19) \quad \begin{array}{c} V \longrightarrow \left[\begin{array}{cc} \text{PRED} & \text{'SNEEZE<SUBJ>'} \\ \text{TENSE} & \text{PAST} \end{array} \right] \\ | \\ \text{sneezed} \end{array}$$

Criterion, see Bresnan & Kaplan (1982: xxvi–xxviii).

7.1.5 Semantics


Following Dalrymple (2006: 90–92), *glue semantics* is the dominant approach to semantic interpretation in LFG (Dalrymple, Lamping & Saraswat 1993; Dalrymple 2001: Chapter 8). There are, however, other variants where Kamp’s discourse representation structures (Kamp & Reyle 1993) are used (Frey & Reyle 1983a,b).

In the following, glue semantics will be presented in more detail.⁵ Under a glue-based approach, it is assumed that f-structure is the level of syntactic representation which is crucial for the semantic interpretation of a phrase, that is, unlike GB theory, it is not the position of arguments in the tree which play a role in the composition of meaning, but rather functional relations such as SUBJ and OBJ. Glue semantics assumes that each substructure of the f-structure corresponds to a semantic resource connected to a meaning and furthermore, that the meaning of a given f-structure comes from the sum of these parts. The way the meaning is assembled is regulated by certain instructions for the combination of semantic resources. These instructions are given as a set of logic premises written in linear logic as *glue language*. The computation of the meaning of an utterance corresponds to a logical conclusion.

This conclusion is reached on the basis of logical premises contributed by the words in an expression or possibly even by a syntactic construction itself. The requirements on how the meaning of the parts can be combined to yield the full meaning are expressed in linear logic, a resource-based logic. Linear logic is different from classic logic in that it does not allow that premises of conclusions are not used at all or more than once in a derivation. Hence, in linear logic, premises are resources which have to be used. This corresponds directly to the use of words in an expression: words contribute to the entire meaning exactly once. It is not possible to ignore them or to use their meaning more than once. A sentence such as *Peter knocked twice*, does not mean the same as *Peter knocked*. The meaning of *twice* must be included in the full meaning of the sentences. Similarly, the sentence cannot mean the same as *Peter knocked twice twice*, since the semantic contribution of a given word cannot be used twice.

The syntactic structure for the sentence in (20a) together with its semantic representation is given in (20b):

(20) a. David yawned.



The semantic structure of this sentence is connected to the f-structure via the correspon-

⁵ The following discussion heavily draws from the corresponding section of Dalrymple (2006). (It is a translation of my translation of the original material into German.)

dence function σ (depicted here as a dashed line). The semantic representation is derived from the lexical information for the verb *yawned*, which is given in (21).

$$(21) \quad \lambda x. \text{yawn}'(x) : (\uparrow \text{SUBJ})_\sigma \multimap \uparrow_\sigma$$

This formula is referred to as the *meaning constructor*. Its job is to combine the meaning of *yawned* – a one place predicate $\lambda x. \text{yawn}'(x)$ – with the formula $(\uparrow \text{SUBJ})_\sigma \multimap \uparrow_\sigma$ in linear logic. Here, the connective \multimap is the *linear implication* symbol of linear logic. The symbol contains the meaning that *if* a semantic resource $(\uparrow \text{SUBJ})_\sigma$ for the meaning of the subject is available, *then* a semantic resource for \uparrow_σ must be created which will stand for the entire meaning of the sentence. Unlike the implication operator of classic logic, the linear implication must consume and produce semantic resources: the formula $(\uparrow \text{SUBJ})_\sigma \multimap \uparrow_\sigma$ states that if a semantic resource $(\uparrow \text{SUBJ})_\sigma$ is found, it is consumed and the semantic resource \uparrow_σ is produced.

Furthermore, it is assumed that a proper name such as *David* contributes its own semantic structure as a semantic resource. In an utterance such as *David yawned*, this resource is consumed by the verb *yawned*, which requires a resource for its SUBJ in order to produce the resource for the entire sentence. This corresponds to the intuition that a verb in any given sentence requires the meaning of its arguments in order for the entire sentence to be understood.

The f-structure of *David yawned* with the instantiated meaning construction contributed by *David* and *yawned* is given in (22):

$$(22) \quad y : \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{PRED} \quad \text{'YAWN'(\text{SUBJ})'} \\ \text{SUBJ} \quad d : \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{PRED} \quad \text{'DAVID'} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

$$\begin{array}{ll} [\text{David}] & \text{david}' : d_\sigma \\ [\text{yawn}] & \lambda x. \text{yawn}'(x) : d_\sigma \multimap y_\sigma \end{array}$$

The left side of the meaning constructor marked by **[David]** is the meaning of the proper name *David*, *david'* to be precise. The left-hand side of the meaning constructor **[yawn]** is the meaning of the intransitive verb – a one-place predicate $\lambda x. \text{yawn}'(x)$.

Furthermore, one must still postulate further rules to determine the exact relation between the right-hand side (the glue) of the meaning constructors in (22) and the left-hand side (the meaning). For simple, non-implicational meaning constructors such as **[David]** in (22), the meaning on the left is the same as the meaning of the semantic structure on the right. Meaning constructors such as **[yawn]** have a λ -expression on the left, which has to be combined with another expression via functional application (see Section 2.3). The linear implication on the right-hand side must be applied in parallel. This combined process is shown in (23).

$$(23) \quad \frac{x : f_\sigma \quad P : f_\sigma \multimap g_\sigma}{P(x) : g_\sigma}$$

The right-hand side of the rule corresponds to a logical conclusion following the *modus ponens* rule. With these correspondences between expressions in linear logic and the meanings themselves, we can proceed as shown in (24), which is based on Dalrymple (2006: 92). After combining the respective meanings of *yawned* and *David* and then

(24)	$david' : d_\sigma$	The meaning <i>david'</i> is associated with the semantic structure of SUBJ d_σ .
	$\lambda x.yawn'(x) : d_\sigma \multimap y_\sigma$	If we find the semantic resource for the SUBJ d_σ on the glue side, this resource is consumed and the semantic resource for the entire sentence y_σ is produced. On the meaning side, we apply the function $\lambda x.yawn'(x)$ to the meaning associated with d_σ .
<hr/>		
	$yawn'(david') : y_\sigma$	We have created the semantic structure y_σ for the entire sentence, associated with the meaning of $yawn'(david')$.

carrying out β -reduction, we arrive at the desired result of $yawn'(david')$ as the meaning of *David yawned*.

Glue analyses of quantification, modification and other phenomena have been investigated in a volume on glue semantics (Dalrymple 1999). Particularly problematic for these approaches are cases where there appear to be too many or too few resources for the production of utterances. These kinds of cases have been discussed by Asudeh (2004).

7.1.6 Adjuncts

Adjuncts are not selected by their head. The grammatical function ADJ is a non-governable grammatical function. Unlike arguments, where every grammatical function can only be realized once, a sentence can contain multiple adjuncts. The value of ADJ in the f-structure is therefore not a simple structure as with the other grammatical functions, but rather a set. For example, the f structure for the sentence in (25a) contains an ADJ set with two elements: one for *yesterday* and one for *at noon*.

- (25) a. David devoured a sandwich at noon yesterday.

b.	PRED	'DEVOUR(SUBJ,OBJ)'
	SUBJ	$\left[\begin{array}{c} \text{PRED 'DAVID'} \end{array} \right]$
	OBJ	$\left[\begin{array}{c} \text{SPEC A} \\ \text{PRED 'SANDWICH'} \end{array} \right]$
	ADJ	$\left\{ \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{PRED 'YESTERDAY'} \end{array} \right], \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{PRED 'AT(OBJ)'} \\ \text{OBJ} \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{PRED 'NOON'} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \right\}$

The annotation on the c-structure rule for adjuncts requires that the f-structure of the adjuncts be part of the ADJ set of the mother's f-structure:

$$(26) \quad V' \rightarrow V' \quad PP \\ \uparrow = \downarrow \quad \downarrow \in (\uparrow \text{ ADJ})$$

The representation of adjuncts in a set is not sufficient to characterize the meaning of an utterance containing scope-bearing adjuncts (as for instance the negation in sentences like (31) on page 95). In order to determine scopal relations, one has to refer to the linear order of the adjuncts, that is, the c-structure. For linearization restrictions in LFG, see Zaenen & Kaplan (1995).

7.2 Passive

Bresnan & Mchombo (1995) argue that one should view words as “atoms” of which syntactic structure is comprised (*lexical integrity*⁶).

Syntactic rules cannot create new words or make reference to the internal structure of words. Every terminal node (each “leaf” of the tree) is a word. It follows from this that analyses such as the GB analysis of Pollock (1989) in Figure 7.1 on the following page for the French example in (27) are ruled out (the figure is taken from Kuhn 2007: 617):

- (27) Marie ne parlerait pas
 Marie NEG speak.COND.3SG NEG
 ‘Marie would not speak.’

In Pollock's analysis, the various morphemes are in specific positions in the tree and are combined only after certain movements have been carried out.

The assumption of lexical integrity is made by all theories discussed in this book with the exception of GB and Minimalism. However, formally, this is not a must as it is also possible to connect morphemes to complex syntactic structures in theories such as Categorical Grammar, GPSG, HPSG, CxG, DG and TAG. As far as I know, this kind of analysis has never been proposed.

Bresnan noticed that, as well as passivized verbs, there are passivized adjectives which show the same morphological idiosyncrasies as the corresponding participles (Bresnan 1982c: 21; Bresnan 2001: 31). Some examples are given in (28):

- (28) a. a well-written novel (write – written)
 b. a recently given talk (give – given)
 c. my broken heart (break – broken)
 d. an uninhabited island (inhabit – inhabited)
 e. split wood (split – split)

⁶ See Anderson (1992: 84) for more on lexical integrity.




图 7.1: Pollock's analysis of *Marie ne parlerait pas* 'Marie would not speak.' according to Kuhn (2007: 617)

If one assumes lexical integrity, then adjectives would have to be derived in the lexicon. If the verbal passive were not a lexical process, but rather a phrase-structural one, then the form identity would remain unexplained.

In LFG, grammatical functions are primitives, that is, they are not derived from a position in the tree (e.g., Subject = SpecIP). Words (fully inflected word-forms) determine the grammatical function of their arguments. Furthermore, there is a hierarchy of grammatical functions. During participle formation in morphology, the highest verbal argument is suppressed. The next highest argument moves up and is not realized as the OBJECT but rather as the SUBJECT. This was explicitly encoded in earlier work (Bresnan 1982c: 8):

- (29) Passivization rule:
 (SUBJ) $\mapsto \emptyset / (\text{OBL})$
 (OBJ) $\mapsto (\text{SUBJ})$

The first rule states that the subject is either not realized (\emptyset) or it is realized as an oblique element (the *by*-PP in English). The second rule states that if there is an accusative object, this becomes the subject.

In later work, the assignment of grammatical functions was taken over by Lexical Mapping Theory (Bresnan & Kanerva 1989). It is assumed that thematic roles are ordered in a universally valid hierarchy (Bresnan & Kanerva 1989; Bresnan 2001: 307): agent > beneficiary > experiencer/goal > instrument > patient/theme > locative. Patient-like roles are marked as unrestricted ($[-r]$) in a corresponding representation, the so-called a-structure. Secondary patient-like roles are marked as *objective* ($[+o]$) and all other roles are marked as non-objective ($[-o]$). For the transitive verb *schlagen* ‘to beat’, we have the following:

- (30)
- | | | | |
|-------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | Agent | Patient |
| a-structure | <i>schlagen</i> ‘beat’ | $\langle x$ | $y \rangle$ |
| | | $[-o]$ | $[-r]$ |

The mapping of a-structure to f-structure is governed by the following restrictions:

- (31)
- a. Subject-Mapping-Principle: The most prominent role marked with $[-o]$ is mapped to SUBJ if it is initial in the a-structure. Otherwise, the role marked with $[-r]$ is mapped to SUBJ.
 - b. The argument roles are connected to grammatical functions as shown in the following table. Non-specified values for o and r are to be understood as ‘+’:
- | | | |
|--------|--------|-----------------|
| | $[-r]$ | $[+r]$ |
| $[-o]$ | SUBJ | OBL $_{\theta}$ |
| $[+o]$ | OBJ | OBJ $_{\theta}$ |
- c. Function-Argument Biuniqueness: Every a-structure role must be associated to exactly one function and vice versa.

For the argument structure in (30), the principle in (31a) ensures that the agent x receives the grammatical function SUBJ. (31b) adds an o-feature with the value ‘+’ so that the patient y is associated with OBJ:

- (32)
- | | | | |
|-------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | Agent | Patient |
| a-structure | <i>schlagen</i> ‘beat’ | $\langle x$ | $y \rangle$ |
| | | $[-o]$ | $[-r]$ |
| | | SUBJ | OBJ |

Under passivization, the most prominent role is suppressed so that only the $[-r]$ marked patient role remains. Following (31a), this role will then be mapped to the subject.

- (33)
- | | | | |
|-------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | Agent | Patient |
| a-structure | <i>schlagen</i> ‘beat’ | $\langle x$ | $y \rangle$ |
| | | $[-o]$ | $[-r]$ |
| | | \emptyset | SUBJ |

Unlike the objects of transitive verbs, the objects of verbs such as *helfen* ‘help’ are marked as [+o] (Berman 1999). The lexical case of the objects is given in the a-structure, since this case (dative) is linked to a semantic role (Zaenen, Maling & Thráinsson 1985: 465). The corresponding semantic roles are obligatorily mapped to the grammatical function OBJ_θ .

(34)	a-structure	<i>helfen</i> ‘help’	Agent	Beneficiary
			⟨ x	y ⟩
			[−o]	[+o]/DAT
			SUBJ	OBJ_θ

Passivization will yield the following:

(35)	a-structure	<i>helfen</i> ‘help’	Agent	Beneficiary
			⟨ x	y ⟩
			[−o]	[+o]/DAT
			∅	OBJ_θ

Since there is neither a [−o] nor a [−r] argument, no argument is connected to the subject function. The result is an association of arguments and grammatical functions that corresponds to the one found in impersonal passives.

These mapping principles may seem complex at first glance, but they play a role in analyzing an entire range of phenomena, e.g., the analysis of unaccusative verbs (Bresnan & Zaenen 1990). For the analysis of the passive, we can now say that the passive suppresses the highest [−o] role. Mentioning an eventual object in the passive rule is no longer necessary.

7.3 Verb position

There are two possibilities for the analysis of verb placement in German.

- a trace in verb-final position (as in GB) (see Choi 1999, Berman 1996: Section 2.1.4) and
- so-called *extended head domains* (see Berman 2003a).

In the analysis of extended head domains, the verb is simply omitted from the verb phrase. The following preliminary variant of the VP rule is used:⁷

(36)	$\text{VP} \rightarrow (\text{NP}) (\text{NP}) (\text{NP}) (\text{V})$
------	--

All components of the VP are optional as indicated by the brackets. As in GB analyses, the verb in verb-first clauses is in C. No I projection is assumed – as in a number of GB works (Haider 1993, 1995, 1997a; Sternefeld 2006: Section IV.3), since it is difficult to motivate its existence for German (Berman 2003a: Section 3.2.2). The verb contributes




图 7.2: Analysis of verb placement following Berman (2003a: 41)

its f-structure information from the C position. Figure 7.2 contains a simplified version of the analysis proposed by Berman (2003a: 41).

After what we learned about phrase structure rules in Chapters 2 and 5, it may seem strange to allow VPs without V. This is not a problem in LFG, however, since for the analysis of a given sentence, it only has to be ensured that all the necessary parts (and only these) are present. This is ensured by the constraints on completeness and coherence. Where exactly the information comes from is not important. In Figure 7.2, the verb information does not come from the VP, but rather from the C node. C' is licensed by a special rule:

$$(37) \quad C' \rightarrow \begin{array}{cc} C & VP \\ \uparrow = \downarrow & \uparrow = \downarrow \end{array}$$

In LFG rules, there is normally only one element annotated with ' $\uparrow = \downarrow$ ', namely the head. In (37), there are two such elements, which is why both equally contribute to the f-structure of the mother. The head domain of V has been extended to C. The information about SUBJ and OBJ comes from the VP and the information about PRED from C.

7.4 Local reordering

Two possibilities for treating local reordering have been discussed in the literature:⁸

⁷ See Bresnan (2001: 110) and Dalrymple (2006: Section 2.2) for a corresponding rule with optional constituents on the right-hand side of the rule.

⁸ Kaplan (1995: 20–21) shows how one can write grammars in the ID/LP format in LFG. A GPSG-like analysis of German constituent order has not been proposed in the LFG framework.

- movement of arguments from a base configuration as in GB (see Choi 1999)
- direct licensing by phrase structure rules (see Berman 1996: Section 2.1.3.1; 2003a)

If one assumes that traces are relevant for the semantic interpretation of a given structure, then the first option has the same problems as movement-based GB analyses. These have already been discussed in Section 3.5.

In what follows, I will present the analysis proposed by Berman (1996: Section 2.1.3) in a somewhat simplified form. Case and grammatical functions of verbal arguments are determined in the lexicon (Berman 1996: 22). (38) shows the lexical entry for the verb *verschlingen* ‘devour’.^{9,10}

- (38) *verschlingt* V (↑ PRED) = ‘VERSCHLINGEN(SUBJ, OBJ)’
 (↑ SUBJ AGR CAS) = NOM
 (↑ OBJ AGR CAS) = ACC
 (↑ TENSE) = PRES

⁹ The four cases in German can be represented using two binary features (GOV, OBL) (Berman 1996: 22). Nominative corresponds to GOV– and OBL– and accusative to GOV+ and OBL–. This kind of encoding allows one to leave case partially underspecified. If one does not provide a value for GOV, then an element with OBL– is compatible with both nominative and accusative. Since this underspecification is not needed in the following discussion, I will omit this feature decomposition and insert the case values directly.

¹⁰ Alternative analyses derive the grammatical function of an NP from its case (Berman 2003a: 37 for German; Bresnan 2001: 187, 201 for German and Russian).

- (i) (↓ CASE) = ACC ⇒ (↑ OBJ) = ↓

Karttunen (1989: Section 2.1) makes a similar suggestion for Finnish in the framework of Categorical Grammar. Such analyses are not entirely unproblematic as case cannot always be reliably paired with grammatical functions. In German, as well as temporal accusatives (ii.a), there are also verbs with two accusative objects (ii.b–c) and predicative accusatives (ii.d).

- (ii) a. Er arbeitete den ganzen Tag.
 he worked the.ACC whole.ACC day
 b. Er lehrte ihn den Ententanz.
 he taught him.ACC the.ACC duck.dance
 c. Das kostet ihn einen Taler.
 that costs him.ACC a.ACC taler
 d. Sie nannte ihn einen Lügner.
 she called him.ACC a.ACC liar

All of these accusatives can occur in long-distance dependencies (see Section 7.5):

- (iii) Wen glaubst du, dass ich getroffen habe.
 who believe you that I met have
 ‘Who do you think I met?’

wen is not the object of *glauben* ‘believe’ and as such cannot be included in the f-structure of *glauben* ‘believe’. One would have to reformulate the implication in (i) as a disjunction of all possible grammatical functions of the accusative and in addition account for the fact that accusatives can come from a more deeply embedded f-structure.

Berman proposes an analysis that does not combine the verb with all its arguments and adjuncts at the same time, as was the case in GPSG. Instead, she chooses the other extreme and assumes that the verb is not combined with an adjunct or an argument, but rather forms a VP directly. The rule for this is shown in (39):

$$(39) \quad \text{VP} \rightarrow (\text{V})$$

$$\uparrow = \downarrow$$

At first sight, this may seem odd since a V such as *verschlingen* ‘devour’ does not have the same distribution as a verb with its arguments. However, one should recall that the constraints pertaining to coherence and completeness of f-structures play an important role so that the theory does not make incorrect predictions.

Since the verb can occur in initial position, it is marked as optional in the rule in (39) (see Section 7.3).

The following rule can be used additionally to combine the verb with its subject or object.

$$(40) \quad \text{VP} \rightarrow \begin{array}{cc} \text{NP} & \text{VP} \\ (\uparrow \text{SUBJ} \mid \text{OBJ} \mid \text{OBJ}_\theta) = \downarrow & \uparrow = \downarrow \end{array}$$

The ‘|’ here stands for a disjunction, that is, the NP can either be the subject or the object of the superordinate f-structure. Since VP occurs both on the left and right-hand side of the rule in (40), it can be applied multiple times. The rule is not complete, however. For instance, one has to account for prepositional objects, for clausal arguments, for adjectival arguments and for adjuncts. See footnote 12 on page 228.

Figure 7.3 on the following page shows the analysis for (41a).

- (41) a. [dass] David den Apfel verschlingt
 that David the apple devours
 ‘that David is devouring the apple’
 b. [dass] den Apfel David verschlingt
 that the apple David devours

The analysis of (41b) is shown in Figure 7.4 on the following page. The analysis of (41b) differs from the one of (41a) only in the order of the replacement of the NP node by the subject or object.

One further fact must be discussed: in the rule (39), the verb is optional. If it is omitted, the VP is empty. In this way, the VP rule in (40) can have an empty VP on the right-hand side of the rule. This VP is also simply omitted even though the VP symbol in the right-hand side of rule (40) is not marked as optional. That is, the corresponding symbol then also becomes optional as a result of taking the rest of the grammar into consideration as well as possible interactions with other rules.

7.5 Long-distance dependencies and functional uncertainty

We have seen that LFG can explain phenomena such as passivization, local reordering as well as verb placement without transformations. In Chapter 5 on GPSG, we already




图 7.3: Analysis of SOV order following Berman (1996)




图 7.4: Analysis of OSV order following Berman (1996)

saw that the development of a transformation-less analysis for long-distance dependencies constitutes a real achievement. In LFG, Kaplan & Zaenen (1989) proposed another transformation-less analysis of long-distance dependencies, which we will consider in further detail in what follows.


In example (42), the displaced constituent *Chris* is characterized by two functions:

(42) Chris, we think that David saw.

For one, it has an argument function which is normally realized in a different position (the OBJ function of *saw* in the above example) and additionally it has a discourse function: a certain emphasis of the information-structural status in this construction (TOPIC in the matrix clause). In LFG, TOPIC and FOCUS are assumed to be grammaticalized discourse functions (furthermore, SUBJ is classified as the default discourse function). Only

grammaticalized discourse functions are represented on the level of f-structure, that is, those that are created by a fixed syntactic mechanism and that interact with the rest of the syntax.

Unlike argument functions, the discourse functions TOPIC and FOCUS are not lexically subcategorized and are therefore not subject to the completeness and coherence conditions. The values of discourse function features like TOPIC and FOCUS are identified with an f-structure that bears an argument function. (43) gives the f-structure for the sentence in (42):




The connecting line means that the value of TOPIC is identical to the value of COMP|OBJ. In Chapter 6 on feature descriptions, I used boxes for structure sharing rather than connecting lines, since boxes are more common across frameworks. It is possible to formulate the structure sharing in (43) as an f-structure constraint as in (44):

$$(44) \quad (\uparrow \text{TOPIC}) = (\uparrow \text{COMP OBJ})$$

Fronting operations such as (42) are possible from various levels of embedding: for instance, (45a) shows an example with less embedding. The object is located in the same f-structure as the topic. However, the object in (42) comes from a clause embedded under *think*.

The f-structure corresponding to (45a) is given in (45b):




The identity restriction for TOPIC and object can be formulated in this case as in (46):

$$(46) \quad (\uparrow \text{TOPIC}) = (\uparrow \text{OBJ})$$

Example (47a) shows a case of even deeper embedding than in (42) and (47b,c) show the corresponding f-structure and the respective restriction.

(47) a. Chris, we think Anna claims that David saw.



c. $(\uparrow \text{TOPIC}) = (\uparrow \text{COMP COMP OBJ})$

The restrictions in (44), (46) and (47c) are c-structure constraints. The combination of a c-structure with (44) is given in (48):

(48) CP \rightarrow XP C'

$(\uparrow \text{TOPIC}) = \downarrow$ $\uparrow = \downarrow$

$(\uparrow \text{TOPIC}) = (\uparrow \text{COMP OBJ})$

(48) states that the first constituent contributes to the TOPIC value in the f-structure of the mother and furthermore that this topic value has to be identical to that of the object in the complement clause. We have also seen examples of other embeddings of various depths. We therefore need restrictions of the following kind as in (49):

- (49) a. $(\uparrow \text{TOPIC}) = (\uparrow \text{OBJ})$
 b. $(\uparrow \text{TOPIC}) = (\uparrow \text{COMP OBJ})$
 c. $(\uparrow \text{TOPIC}) = (\uparrow \text{COMP COMP OBJ})$
 d. ...

The generalization emerging from these equations is given in (50):

(50) $(\uparrow \text{TOPIC}) = (\uparrow \text{COMP}^* \text{OBJ})$

Here, ‘*’ stands for an unrestricted number of occurrences of COMP. This means of leaving the possible identification of discourse and grammatical function open is known as *functional uncertainty*, see Kaplan & Zaenen (1989).

As was shown in the discussion of examples (2) and (3) on page 211, it is not the case that only a TOPIC can be placed in the specifier position of CP in English as FOCUS can occur there too. One can use disjunctions in LFG equations and express the corresponding condition as follows:

$$(51) \quad (\uparrow \text{TOPIC|FOCUS}) = (\uparrow \text{COMP}^* \text{OBJ})$$

One can introduce a special symbol for TOPIC|FOCUS, which stands for a disjunction of discourse functions: DF. (51) can then be abbreviated as in (52):

$$(52) \quad (\uparrow \text{DF}) = (\uparrow \text{COMP}^* \text{OBJ})$$

The final version of the c-structure rule for fronting in English will therefore have the form of (53):¹¹

$$(53) \quad \text{CP} \rightarrow \begin{array}{cc} \text{XP} & \text{C}' \\ (\uparrow \text{DF}) = \downarrow & \uparrow = \downarrow \\ (\uparrow \text{DF}) = (\uparrow \text{COMP}^* \text{OBJ}) & \end{array}$$

In German, as well as objects, nearly any other constituent (e.g., subjects, sentential complements, adjuncts) can be fronted. The c-structure rule for this is shown in (54):¹²

$$(54) \quad \text{CP} \rightarrow \begin{array}{cc} \text{XP} & \text{C}' \\ (\uparrow \text{DF}) = \downarrow & \uparrow = \downarrow \\ (\uparrow \text{DF}) = (\uparrow \text{COMP}^* \text{GF}) & \end{array}$$

Here, GF is an abbreviation for a disjunction of grammatical functions which can occur in the prefield.

7.6 Summary and classification

LFG is a constraint-based theory and utilizes feature descriptions and PSG rules. Grammatical functions are treated as primitives of the theory, which sets LFG apart from most of the other theories covered in this book. They are not defined structurally (as in GB). LFG is a lexicalist theory. Like GPSG, LFG can do without transformations. Processes affecting argument structure such as passivization are analyzed by means of lexical rules. Whereas GPSG treated long-distance dependencies using the percolation of information in trees, LFG uses functional uncertainty: a part of the f-structure is identified with another f-structure that can be embedded to an arbitrary depth. Coherence and completeness ensure that the long-distance dependency can be correctly resolved, that is, it ensures that a fronted object is not assigned to an f-structure which already contains an object or one in which no object may occur.

While LFG does contain a phrase-structural component, this plays a significantly less important role compared to other models of grammar. There are rules in which all

¹¹ Note that the two disjunctions that are abbreviated by the respective occurrences of DF are independent in principle. This is unwanted. We want to talk about either a topic or a focus not about a topic and a focus in the mother f-structure. So additional machinery is needed to ensure that both occurrences of DF refer to the same discourse function.

¹² Berman (1996) uses the symbol ZP for symbols in the prefield rather than XP in (54). She formulates various phrase structure rules for ZPs, which replace ZP with NP, PP, AP and various adjuncts. Following Berman, ZPs can also be combined with the verb in the middle field. For reasons of exposition, I refrained from using ZP symbols in the formulation of the VP rule (40) in Section 7.4 and instead used NP directly.

constituents are optional and it has even been proposed for some languages that there are rules where the part of speech of the constituents is not specified (see Section 13.1.2). In these kinds of grammars, f-structure, coherence and completeness work together to ensure that the grammar only allows well-formed structures.

LFG differs from other theories such as HPSG and variants of Construction Grammar in that feature structures are untyped. Generalizations can therefore not be represented in type hierarchies. Until a few years ago, the hierarchical organization of knowledge in inheritance hierarchies did not form part of theoretical analyses. In computer implementations, there were macros but these were viewed as abbreviations without any theoretical status. It is possible to organize macros into hierarchies and macros were discussed explicitly in Dalrymple, Kaplan & King (2004) with reference to capturing linguistic generalizations. Asudeh, Dalrymple & Toivonen (2008) suggest using macros not only for the organization of lexical items but also for capturing generalizations regarding c-structure annotations. Because of these developments, there was a greater convergence between LFG and other theories such as HPSG and CxG.

Williams (1984) compares analyses in LFG with GB. He shows that many analyses are in fact transferable: the function that f-structure has in LFG is handled by the Theta-Criterion and Case Theory in GB. LFG can explicitly differentiate between subjects and non-subjects. In GB, on the other hand, a clear distinction is made between external and internal arguments (see Williams 1984: Section 1.2). In some variants of GB, as well as in HPSG and CxG, the argument with subject properties (if there is one) is marked explicitly (Haider 1986a; Heinz & Matiassek 1994; Müller 2003b; Michaelis & Ruppenhofer 2001). This special argument is referred to as the *designated argument*. In infinitival constructions, subjects are often not expressed inside the infinitival phrase. Nevertheless, the unexpressed subject is usually coreferential with an argument of the matrix verb:

- (55) a. Er versucht, [das Buch zu lesen].
 he tries the book to read
 ‘He is trying to read the book.’
 b. Er zwingt ihn, [das Buch zu lesen].
 he forces him the book to read
 ‘He is forcing him to read the book.’

This is a fact that every theory needs to be able to capture, that is, every theory must be able to differentiate between subjects and non-subjects.

For a comparison of GB/Minimalism and LFG/HPSG, see Kuhn (2007).

Comprehension questions

1. What do the terms *coherence* and *completeness* mean?
2. What are extended head domains?
3. What does lexical integrity mean?

Exercises

1. Give the lexical entry for *kannte* ‘knew’.
2. How could one analyze the following sentence?

(56) Den Apfel verschlingt David.
the apple devours David
‘David devours the apple.’

Provide the necessary c-structure rules. What kind of f-structure is licensed? Draw a syntactic tree with corresponding references to the f-structure. For fronted constituents, simply write NP rather than expanding the XP node. The c-structure rule for the NP can also be omitted and a triangle can be drawn in the tree.

Further reading

Section 7.1 was based extensively on the textbook and introductory article of Dalrymple (2001, 2006). Additionally, I have drawn from teaching materials of Jonas Kuhn from 2007. Bresnan (2001) is a comprehensive textbook in English for the advanced reader. Some of the more in-depth analyses of German in LFG are Berman (1996, 2003a). Schwarze & de Alencar (2016) is an introduction to LFG that uses French examples. The authors demonstrate how the XLE system can be used for the development of a French LFG grammar. The textbook also discusses the Finite State Morphology component that comes with the XLE system.

Levelt (1989) developed a model of language production based on LFG. Pinker (1984) – one of the best-known researchers on language acquisition – used LFG as the model for his theory of acquisition. For another theory on first and second language acquisition that uses LFG, see Pienemann (2005).

第八章 **Categorial Grammar**

Categorial Grammar is the second oldest of the approaches discussed in this book. It was developed in the 30s by the Polish logician Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz (Ajdukiewicz 1935). Since syntactic and semantic descriptions are tightly connected and all syntactic combinations correspond to semantic ones, Categorial Grammar is popular amongst logicians and semanticists. Some stellar works in the field of semantics making use of Categorial Grammar are those of Richard Montague (1974). Other important works come from David Dowty in Columbus, Ohio (1979), Michael Moortgat in Utrecht (1989), Glyn Morrill in Barcelona (1994), Bob Carpenter in New York (1998) and Mark Steedman in Edinburgh (1991; 1997; 2000). A large fragment for German using Montague Grammar has been developed by von Stechow (1979). The 2569-page grammar of the *Institut für Deutsche Sprache* in Mannheim (Eroms, Stickel & Zifonun 1997) contains Categorial Grammar analyses in the relevant chapters. Fanselow (1981) worked on morphology in the framework of Montague Grammar. Uszkoreit (1986a), Karttunen (1986, 1989) and Calder, Klein & Zeevat (1988) developed combinations of unification-based approaches and Categorial Grammar.

The basic operations for combining linguistic objects are rather simple and well-understood so that it is no surprise that there are many systems for the development and processing of Categorial Grammars (Yampol & Karttunen 1990; Carpenter 1994; Bouma & van Noord 1994; Lloré 1995; König 1999; Moot 2002; White & Baldridge 2003; Baldridge, Chatterjee, Palmer & Wing 2007; Morrill 2012). An important contribution has been made by Mark Steedman's group (see for instance Clark, Hockenmaier & Steedman 2002; Clark & Curran 2007).

Implemented fragments exist for the following languages:

- German (Uszkoreit 1986a; König 1999; Vierhuff, Hildebrandt & Eikmeyer 2003; Vancoppenolle, Tabbert, Bouma & Stede 2011)
- English (Villavicencio 2002; Baldridge 2002; Beavers 2003, 2004)
- Finish (Karttunen 1989)
- French (Baschung, Bes, Corluy & Guillotin 1987)
- Dutch (Bouma & van Noord 1994; Baldridge 2002)

- Tagalog (Baldridge 2002)
- Turkish (Hoffman 1995; Baldridge 2002)

In addition, Baldridge, Chatterjee, Palmer & Wing (2007: 15) mention an implementation for Classical Arabic.

Some of the systems for the processing of Categorial Grammars have been augmented by probabilistic components so that the processing is robust (Osborne & Briscoe 1997; Clark, Hockenmaier & Steedman 2002). Some systems can derive lexical items from corpora, and Briscoe (2000) and Villavicencio (2002) use statistical information in their UG-based language acquisition models.

8.1 General remarks on the representational format

In what follows I introduce some basic assumptions of Categorial Grammar. After these introductory remarks, I will discuss specific analyses that were developed by Steedman (1997) in the framework of Combinatory Categorial Grammar. There are other variants of Categorial Grammar as for instance type-logical CG, the variety espoused by Morrill (1994), Dowty (1997), Moortgat (2011), and others, which cannot be discussed here.

8.1.1 Representation of valence information

In Categorial Grammar, complex categories replace the SUBCAT feature that is used in GPSG to ensure that a head can only be used with suitable grammatical rules. Simple phrase structure rules can be replaced with complex categories as follows:

(1) Rule	Category in the lexicon
$vp \rightarrow v(\text{ditrans})\ np\ np$	$(vp/np)/np$
$vp \rightarrow v(\text{trans})\ np$	vp/np
$vp \rightarrow v(np_and_pp)\ np\ pp(\text{to})$	$(vp/pp)/np$

vp/np stands for something that needs an np in order for it to form a vp .

In Categorial Grammar, there are only a few very abstract rules. One of these is forward application, also referred to as the multiplication rule:

- (2) forward application:
 $X/Y * Y = X$

This rule combines an X looking for a Y with a Y and requires that Y occurs to the right of X/Y . The result of this combination is an X that no longer requires a Y . X/Y is called the *functor* and Y is the *argument* of the functor.

As in GB theory, valence is encoded only once in Categorial Grammar, in the lexicon. In GPSG, valence information was present in grammatical rules and in the SUBCAT feature of the lexical entry.

$$\frac{\frac{\text{chased}}{vp/np} \quad \frac{\text{Mary}}{np}}{vp} \rightarrow$$

图 8.1: Combination of a verb and its object (preliminary)

Figure 8.1 shows how a lexical entry for a transitive verb is combined with its object. A derivation in CG is basically a binary branching tree; it is, however, mostly represented as follows: an arrow under a pair of categories indicates that these have been combined via a combinatorial rule. The direction of this arrow indicates the direction of this combination. The result is given beneath the arrow. Figure 8.2 shows the tree corresponding to Figure 8.1.




图 8.2: Derivation in Figure 8.1 as a tree diagram

One usually assumes left associativity for ‘/’; that is, $(vp/pp)/np = vp/pp/np$.

If we look at the lexical entries in (1), it becomes apparent that the category v does not appear. The lexicon only determines what the product of combination of a lexical entry with its arguments is. The symbol for vp can also be eliminated: an (English) vp is something that requires an NP to its left in order to form a complete sentence. This can be represented as $s \backslash np$. Using the rule for backward application, it is possible to compute derivations such as the one in Figure 8.3.

(3) Backward application:

$$Y * X \backslash Y = X$$

$$\frac{\frac{\frac{\text{the}}{np/n} \quad \frac{\text{cat}}{n}}{np} \rightarrow \quad \frac{\frac{\text{chased}}{(s \backslash np)/np} \quad \frac{\text{Mary}}{np}}{s \backslash np} \rightarrow}{s} <$$

图 8.3: Analysis of a sentence with a transitive verb

In Categorical Grammar, there is no explicit difference made between phrases and words: an intransitive verb is described in the same way as a verb phrase with an object: $s \backslash np$. Equally, proper nouns are complete noun phrases, which are assigned the symbol np .

8.1.2 **Semantics**

As already mentioned, Categorial Grammar is particularly popular among semanticists as syntactic combinations always result in parallel semantic combinations and even for complex combinations such as those we will discuss in more detail in the following sections, there is a precise definition of meaning composition. In the following, we will take a closer look at the representational format discussed in Steedman (1997: Section 2.1.2).

Steedman proposes the following lexical entry for the verb *eats*:¹

$$(4) \text{ eats} := (s: \text{eat}'(x, y) \backslash np_{3S}:x) / np:y$$

In (4), the meaning of each category is given after the colon. Since nothing is known about the meaning of the arguments in the lexical entry of *eat*, the meaning is represented by the variables x and y . When the verb combines with an NP, the denotation of the NP is inserted. An example is given in (5):²

$$(5) \frac{(s: \text{eat}'(x, y) \backslash np_{3S}:x) / np:y \quad np: \text{apples}'}{s: \text{eat}'(x, \text{apples}') \backslash np_{3S}:x} \rightarrow$$

When combining a functor with an argument, it must be ensured that the argument fits the functor, that is, it must be unifiable with it (for more on unification see Section 6.6). The unification of $np:y$ with $np: \text{apples}'$ results in $np: \text{apples}'$ since *apples'* is more specific than the variable y . Apart from its occurrence in the term $np:y$, y occurs in the description of the verb in another position ($s: \text{eat}'(x, y) \backslash np_{3S}:x$) and therefore also receives the value *apples'* there. Thus, the result of this combination is $s: \text{eat}'(x, \text{apples}') \backslash np_{3S}:x$ as shown in (5).

Steedman notes that this notation becomes less readable with more complex derivations and instead uses the more standard λ -notation:

$$(6) \text{ eats} := (s \backslash np_{3S}) / np: \lambda y. \lambda x. \text{eat}'(x, y)$$

Lambdas are used to allow access to open positions in complex semantic representations (see Section 2.3). A semantic representation such as $\lambda y. \lambda x. \text{eat}'(x, y)$ can be combined with the representation of *apples* by removing the first lambda expression and inserting the denotation of *apples* in all the positions where the corresponding variable (in this case, y) appears (see Section 2.3 for more on this point):

$$(7) \frac{\lambda y. \lambda x. \text{eat}'(x, y) \quad \text{apples}'}{\lambda x. \text{eat}'(x, \text{apples}')}$$

This removal of lambda expressions is called β -reduction.

If we use the notation in (6), the combinatorial rules must be modified as follows:

¹ I have adapted his notation to correspond to the one used in this book.

² The assumption that *apples* means *apples'* and not *apples'(z)* minus the quantifier contribution is a simplification here.

- (8) $X/Y:f * Y:a = X: f a$
 $Y:a * X\backslash Y:f = X: f a$

In such rules, the semantic contribution of the argument (a) is written after the semantic denotation of the functor (f). The open positions in the denotation of the functor are represented using lambdas. The argument can be combined with the first lambda expression using β -reduction.

Figure 8.4 shows the derivation of a simple sentence with a transitive verb. After forward and backward application, β -reduction is immediately applied.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \frac{Jacob}{np : jacob'} \quad \frac{eats}{(s \backslash np) / np : \lambda y. \lambda x. eat'(x, y)} \quad \frac{apples}{np : apples'} \\
 \hline
 \frac{s \backslash np : \lambda y. \lambda x. eat'(x, y) \quad apples'}{s \backslash np : \lambda y. \lambda x. eat'(x, y) apples'} > \\
 \hline
 \frac{s : \lambda x. eat'(x, apples') \quad jacob'}{s : \lambda x. eat'(x, apples') jacob'} < \\
 \hline
 = eat'(jacob', apples')
 \end{array}$$

图 8.4: Meaning composition in Categorical Grammar

8.1.3 Adjuncts

As noted in Section 1.6, adjuncts are optional. In phrase structure grammars, this can be captured, for example, by rules that have a certain element (for instance a VP) on the left-hand side of the rule and the same element and an adjunct on the right-hand side of the rule. Since the symbol on the left is the same as the one on the right, this rule can be applied arbitrarily many times. (9) shows some examples of this:

- (9) a. $VP \rightarrow VP PP$
 b. $Noun \rightarrow Noun PP$

One can analyze an arbitrary amount of PPs following a VP or noun using these rules.

In Categorical Grammar, adjuncts have the following general form: $X \backslash X$ or X/X . Adjectives are modifiers, which must occur before the noun. They have the category n/n . Modifiers occurring after nouns (prepositional phrases and relative clauses) have the category $n \backslash n$ instead.³ For VP-modifiers, X is replaced by the symbol for the VP ($s \backslash np$) and this yields the relatively complex expression $(s \backslash np) \backslash (s \backslash np)$. Adverbials in English are VP-modifiers and have this category. Prepositions that can be used in a PP modifying a verb require an NP in order to form a complete PP and therefore have the category $((s \backslash np) \backslash (s \backslash np)) / np$. Figure 8.5 on the next page gives an example of an adverb (*quickly*) and a preposition (*round*). Note that the result of the combination of *round* and *the*

³ In Categorical Grammar, there is no category symbol like \overline{X} for intermediate projections of \overline{X} theory. So rather than assuming $\overline{N} / \overline{N}$, CG uses n/n . See Exercise 2.




图 8.5: Example of an analysis with adjuncts in Categorical Grammar

garden corresponds to the category of the adverb ((\np)(\s\np)). In GB theory, adverbs and prepositions were also placed into a single class (see page 87). This overarching class was then divided into subclasses based on the valence of the elements in question.

8.2 Passive

In Categorical Grammar, the passive is analyzed by means of lexical rule (Dowty 1978: 412; Dowty 2003: Section 3.4). (10) shows the rule in Dowty (2003: 49).

- (10) Syntax: $\alpha \in (s \backslash np) / np \rightarrow \text{PST-PART}(\alpha) \in \text{PstP} / np_{by}$
 Semantics: $\alpha' \rightarrow \lambda y \lambda x \alpha'(y)(x)$

Here, PstP stands for past participle and np_{by} is an abbreviation for a verb phrase modifier of the form $vp \backslash vp$ or rather $(s \backslash np) \backslash (s \backslash np)$. The rule says the following: if a word belongs to the set of words with the category $(s \backslash np) \backslash np$, then the word with past participle morphology also belongs in the set of words with the category $PstP / np_{by}$.

(11a) shows the lexical entry for the transitive verb *touch* and (11b) the result of rule application:

- (11) a. touch: (s\np)/np
b. touched: PstP/np_{bu}

The auxiliary *was* has the category $(s\backslash np)/PstP$ and the preposition *by* has the category np_{by}/np , or its unabbreviated form $((s\backslash np)\backslash (s\backslash np))/np$. In this way, (12) can be analyzed as in Figure 8.6 on the following page.

- (12) John was touched by Mary.

The question as to how to analyze the pair of sentences in (13) still remains unanswered.⁴

- (13) a. He gave the book to Mary.
b. The book was given to Mary.

⁴ Thanks to Roland Schäfer (p. m., 2009) for pointing out these data to me.




图 8.6: Analysis of the passive using a lexical rule

gave has the category $((s \backslash np) / pp) / np$, that is, the verb must first combine with an NP (*the book*) and a PP (*to Mary*) before it can be combined with the subject. The problem is that the rule in (10) cannot be applied to *gave* with a *to*-PP since the pp argument is sandwiched between both np arguments in $((s \backslash np) / pp) / np$. One would have to generalize the rule in (10) somehow by introducing new technical means⁵ or assume additional rules for cases such as (13b).

8.3 Verb position

Steedman (2000: 159) proposed an analysis with variable branching for Dutch, that is, there are two lexical entries for *at* 'eat': an initial one with its arguments to the right, and another occupying final position with its arguments to its left.

- (14) a. *at* 'eat' in verb-final position: $(s_{+SUB} \backslash np) \backslash np$
 b. *at* 'eat' in verb-initial position: $(s_{-SUB} / np) / np$

Steedman uses the feature SUB to differentiate between subordinate and non-subordinate sentences. Both lexical items are related via lexical rules.

One should note here that the NPs are combined with the verb in different orders. The normal order is:

- (15) a. in verb-final position: $(s_{+SUB} \backslash np[nom]) \backslash np[acc]$
 b. in verb-initial position: $(s_{-SUB} / np[acc]) / np[nom]$

The corresponding derivations for German sentences with a bivalent verb are shown in Figures 8.7 and 8.8.

In Figure 8.7, the verb is first combined with an accusative object, whereas in Figure 8.8, the verb is first combined with the subject. For criticism of these kinds of analyses with variable branching, see Netter (1992) and Müller (2005b, 2015b).

Jacobs (1991) developed an analysis which corresponds to the verb movement analysis in GB. He assumes verb-final structures, that is, there is a lexical entry for verbs where arguments are selected to the left of the verb. A transitive verb would therefore have the

⁵ Baldridge (p. M. 2010) suggests using regular expressions in a general lexical rule for passive.




图 8.7: Analysis of verb-final sentences following Steedman




图 8.8: Analysis of verb-initial sentences following Steedman

entry in (16a). Additionally, there is a trace in verb-final position that requires the arguments of the verb and the verb itself in initial position. (16b) shows what the verb trace looks like for a transitive verb in initial position:

- (16) a. Verb in final position:
 $(s \backslash np[nom]) \backslash np[acc]$
 b. Verb trace for the analysis of verb-first:
 $((s \backslash ((s \backslash np[nom]) \backslash np[acc])) \backslash np[nom]) \backslash np[acc]$

The entry for the verb trace is very complex. It is probably simpler to examine the analysis in Figure 8.9.




图 8.9: Analysis of verb-initial sentences following Jacobs (1991)

The trace is the head in the entire analysis: it is first combined with the accusative object and then with the subject. In a final step, it is combined with the transitive verb in initial-position.⁶ A problem with this kind of analysis is that the verb *isst* ‘eats’, as well as *er* ‘he’ and *ihn* ‘him’/‘it’, are arguments of the verb trace in (17).

- (17) Morgen [isst [er [ihn _]]]
 tomorrow eats he him
 ‘He will eat it/him tomorrow.’

⁶ See Netter (1992) for a similar analysis in HPSG.

Since adjuncts can occur before, after or between arguments of the verb in German, one would expect that *morgen* ‘tomorrow’ can occur before the verb *isst*, since *isst* is just a normal argument of the verbal trace in final position. As adjuncts do not change the categorial status of a projection, the phrase *morgen isst er ihn* ‘tomorrow he eats him’ should be able to occur in the same positions as *isst er ihn*. This is not the case, however. If we replace *isst er ihn* by *morgen isst er ihn* in (18a), the result is (18b), which is ungrammatical.

- (18) a. Deshalb isst er ihn.
 therefore eats he him
 ‘Therefore he eats it/him.’
 b. *Deshalb morgen isst er ihn.
 therefore tomorrow eats he him

An approach which avoids this problem comes from Kiss & Wesche (1991) (see Section 9.3). Here, the authors assume that there is a verb in initial position which selects a projection of the verb trace. If adverbials are only combined with verbs in final-position, then a direct combination of *morgen* ‘tomorrow’ and *isst er ihn* ‘eats he it’ is ruled out. If one assumes that the verb in first-position is the functor, then it is possible to capture the parallels between complementizers and verbs in initial position (Höhle 1997): finite verbs in initial position differ from complementizers only in requiring a projection of a verb trace, whereas complementizers require projections of overt verbs:

- (19) a. dass [er ihn isst]
 that he it eats
 b. Isst [er ihn _]
 eats he it

This description of verb position in German captures the central insights of the GB analysis in Section 3.2.

8.4 Local reordering

Up to now, we have seen combinations of functors and arguments where the arguments were either to the left or to the right of the functor. The saturation of arguments always took place in a fixed order: the argument furthest to the right was combined first with the functor, e.g., (s\NP)/PP first combined with the PP, and the result of this combination was combined with the NP.

There are a number of possibilities to analyze ordering variants in German: Uszko-reit (1986b) suggests accounting for possible orders lexically; that is, that each possible order corresponds to a lexical item. One would therefore have at least six lexical items for a ditransitive verb. Briscoe (2000: 257) and Villavicencio (2002: 96–98) propose a variant of this analysis where the order of arguments is modified in the syntax: a syntactic rule can, for example, change the order (S/PRT)/NP into (S/NP)/PRT.

A different approach is suggested by Steedman & Baldridge (2006). They discuss various options for ordering arguments attested in the languages of the world. This includes languages in which the order of combination is free, as well as languages where the direction of combination is free. Steedman and Baldridge introduce the following convention for representing categories: elements in curly brackets can be discharged in any order. ‘|’ in place of ‘\’ or ‘/’ serves to indicate that the direction of combination is free. Some prototypical examples are shown in (20):

(20)	English	$(S \backslash NP) / NP$	$S(VO)$
	Latin	$S\{ NP[nom], NP[acc]\}$	free order
	Tagalog	$S\{/NP[nom], /NP[acc]\}$	free order, verb-initial
	Japanese	$S\{\backslash NP[nom], \backslash NP[acc]\}$	free order, verb-final

Hoffman (1995: Section 3.1) has proposed an analysis analogous to that of Japanese for Turkish and this could also be used in conjunction with an analysis of verb position for German. This would correspond to the GB/MP analysis of Fanselow (2001) or the HPSG analysis presented in Section 9.4.

8.5 Long-distance dependencies

Steedman (1989: Section 1.2.4) proposes an analysis of long-distance dependencies without movement or empty elements. For examples such as (21), he assumes that the category of *Harry must have been eating* or *Harry devours* is s/np .

- (21) a. These apples, Harry must have been eating.
 b. apples which Harry devours

The fronted NP *these apples* and the relative pronoun *which* are both functors in the analysis of (21) which take s/np as their argument. Using the machinery introduced up to now, we cannot assign the category s/np to the strings *Harry must have been eating* and *Harry devours* in (21) although it is intuitively the case that *Harry devours* is a sentence missing an NP. We still require two further extensions of Categorial Grammar: type raising and forward and backward composition. Both of these operations will be introduced in the following sections.

8.5.1 Type Raising

The category np can be transformed into the category $(s/(s/np))$ by *type raising*. If we combine this category with (s/np) , then we get the same result as if we had combined np and (s/np) with the forward application rule in (2). (22a) shows the combination of an NP with a VP (a sentence missing an NP to its left). The combination of the type-raised NP with the VP is given in (22b).

- (22) a. $np * s/np = s$
 b. $s/(s/np) * s/np = s$

In (22a), a verb or verb phrase selects an NP to its left ($s\backslash np$). In (22b), an NP having undergone type raising selects a verb or verb phrase to its right which requires an NP to its left ($s\backslash np$).

Type raising simply reverses the direction of selection: the VP in (22a) is the functor and the NP is the argument, whereas in (22b), it is the type raised NP which acts as the functor, and the VP is the argument. In each case, the result of the combination is the same. This change of selectional direction may just seem like a trick at first glance, but as we will see, this trick can be extremely useful. First, however, we will introduce forward and backward composition.

8.5.2 Forward and backward composition

(23) shows the rules for forward and backward composition.

- (23) a. Forward composition ($>B$)
 $X/Y * Y/Z = X/Z$
 b. Backward composition ($<B$)
 $Y/Z * X\backslash Y = X\backslash Z$

These rules will be explained using forward composition as an example. (23a) can be understood as follows: X/Y more or less means; if I find a Y , then I am a complete X . In the combinatorial rule, X/Y is combined with Y/Z . Y/Z stands for a Y that is not yet complete and is still missing a Z . The requirement that Y must find a Z in order to be complete is postponed: we pretend that Y is complete and use it anyway, but we still bear in mind that something is actually still missing. Hence, if we combine X/Y with Y/Z , we get something which becomes an X when combined with a Z .

8.5.3 Analysis of long-distance dependencies

By using forward composition, we can assign *Harry must have been eating* the category $s\backslash np$. Figure 8.10 shows how this works. *must* is a verb which requires an unmarked




图 8.10: Application of forward composition to VP-chains

infinitive form, *have* requires a participle and *been* must combine with a gerund. In the above figure, the arrow with a small ‘T’ stands for type raising, whereas the arrows with

a ‘B’ indicate composition. The direction of composition is shown by the direction of the arrow.

For the analysis of (21a), we are still missing one small detail, a rule that turns the NP at the beginning of the sentence into a functor which can be combined with s/np . Normal type raising cannot handle this because it would produce $s/(s\backslash np)$ when $s/(s/np)$ is required.

Steedman (1989: 217) suggests the rule in (24):

- (24) Topicalization (\uparrow):
 $X \Rightarrow st/(s/X)$
 where $X \in \{ np, pp, vp, ap, s' \}$

st stands for a particular type of sentence (s), namely one with topicalization (t). The \Rightarrow expresses that one can type raise any X into an $st/(s/X)$.

If we replace X with np , we can turn *these apples* into $st/(s/np)$ and complete the analysis of (21a) as shown in Figure 8.11.




图 8.11: Analysis of long-distance dependencies in Categorical Grammar

The mechanism presented here will of course also work for dependencies that cross sentence boundaries. Figure 8.12 shows the analysis for (25):

- (25) Apples, I believe that Harry eats.




图 8.12: Analysis of long-distance dependencies across sentence boundaries

Using the previously described tools, it is, however, only possible to describe extractions where the fronted element in the sentence would have occurred at the right edge of the

phrase without fronting. This means it is not possible to analyze sentences where the middle argument of a ditransitive verb has been extracted (Steedman 1985: 532). Pollard (1988: 406) provides the derivation in Figure 8.13 for (26).

(26) Fido we put downstairs.




图 8.13: Analysis of long-distance dependencies across sentence boundaries

In this analysis, it is not possible to combine *we* and *put* using the rule in (23a) since $(s\backslash np)$ is not directly accessible: breaking down $((s\backslash np)/pp)/np$ into functor and argument gives us $((s\backslash np)/pp)$ and np . In order to deal with such cases, we need another variant of composition:

(27) Forward composition for $n=2$ ($> BB$)
 $X/Y * (Y/Z1)/Z2 = (X/Z1)/Z2$

With this addition, it is now possible to combine the type-raised *we* with *put*. The result is $(s/pp)/np$. The topicalization rule in (24), however, requires an element to the right of *st* with the form (s/X) . This is not the case in Figure 8.13. For the NP *Fido*, we need a functor category which allows that the argument itself is complex. The rule which is needed for the case in (26) is given in (28).

(28) Topicalization for $n=2$ ($\uparrow\uparrow$):
 $X2 \Rightarrow (st/X1)/((s/X1)/X2)$
 where $X1$ and $X2 \in \{ NP, PP, VP, AP, S' \}$

If we assume that verbs can have up to four arguments (z. B. *buy*: buyer, seller, goods, price), then it would be necessary to assume a further rule for composition as well as another topicalization rule. Furthermore, one requires a topicalization rule for subject extraction (Pollard 1988: 405). Steedman has developed a notation which provides a compact notation of the previously discussed rules, but if one considers what exactly these representations stand for, one still arrives at the same number of rules that have been discussed here.

8.6 Summary and classification

The operations of Combinatory Categorical Grammar, which go beyond those of standard Categorical Grammar, allow for so much flexibility that it is even possible to

assign a category to sequences of words that would not normally be treated as a constituent. This is an advantage for the analysis of coordination (see Section 21.6.2) and furthermore, Steedman (1991) has argued that intonation data support the constituent status of these strings. See also Section 15.2 for a direct model of incremental language processing in Categorical Grammar. In phrase structure grammars, it is possible to use GPSG mechanisms to pass information about relative pronouns contained in a phrase up the tree. These techniques are not used in CG and this leads to a large number of recategorization rules for topicalization and furthermore leads to inadequate analyses of pied-piping constructions in relative clauses. As the topicalization analysis was already discussed in Section 8.5, I will briefly elaborate on relative clauses here.

Steedman & Baldridge (2006: 614) present an analysis of long-distance dependencies using the following relative clause in (29):

(29) the man that Manny says Anna married

The relative pronoun is the object of *married* but occurs outside the clause *Anna married*.

Steedman assumes the lexical entry in (30) for relative pronouns:

(30) $(n \backslash n) / (s / np)$

This means the following: if there is a sentence missing an NP to the right of a relative pronoun, then the relative pronoun can form an N-modifier $(n \backslash n)$ with this sentence. The relative pronoun is the head (functor) in this analysis.

Utilizing both additional operations of type raising and composition, the examples with relative clauses can be analyzed as shown in Figure 8.14. The lexical entry for the

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \text{that} & \text{Manny} & \text{says} & \text{Anna} & \text{married} & & \\
 \hline
 (n \backslash n) / (s / np) & s / (s \backslash np) & (s \backslash np) / s & s / (s \backslash np) & (s \backslash np) / np & & \\
 & \xrightarrow{>T} & \xrightarrow{>B} & \xrightarrow{>T} & \xrightarrow{>B} & & \\
 & s / s & & s / np & & & \\
 & \xrightarrow{>B} & & \xrightarrow{>B} & & & \\
 & s / np & & & & & \\
 & \xrightarrow{>B} & & & & & \\
 & n \backslash n & & & & &
 \end{array}$$

图 8.14: Categorical Grammar analysis of a relative clause with long-distance dependency

verbs corresponds to what was discussed in the preceding sections: *married* is a normal transitive verb and *says* is a verb that requires a sentential complement and forms a VP $(s \backslash np)$ with it. This VP yields a sentence when combined with an NP. The noun phrases in Figure 8.14 have been type raised. Using forward composition, it is possible to combine *Anna* and *married* to yield s / np . This is the desired result: a sentence missing an NP to its right. *Manny* and *says* and then *Manny says* and *Anna married* can also be combined via forward composition and we then have the category s / np for *Manny says Anna married*. This category can be combined with the relative pronoun using forward application and we then arrive at $n \backslash n$, which is exactly the category for postnominal modifiers.

However, the assumption that the relative pronoun constitutes the head is problematic since one has to then go to some lengths to explain pied-piping constructions such as those in (31).

- (31) a. Here's the minister [[in [the middle [of [whose sermon]]]]] the dog barked].⁷
 b. Reports [the height of the lettering on the covers of which] the government prescribes should be abolished.⁸

In (31), the relative pronoun is embedded in a phrase that has been extracted from the rest of the relative clause. The relative pronoun in (31a) is the determiner of *sermon*. Depending on the analysis, *whose* is the head of the phrase *whose sermon*. The NP is embedded under *of* and the phrase *of whose sermon* depends on *middle*. The entire NP *the middle of the sermon* is a complement of the preposition *in*. It would be quite a stretch to claim that *whose* is the head of the relative clause in (31a). The relative pronoun in (31b) is even more deeply embedded. Steedman (1997: 50) gives the following lexical entries for *who*, *whom* and *which*:

- (32) a. $((n \backslash n) / (s \backslash np)) \backslash (np / np)$ (complex subject-relative phrase)
 b. $((n \backslash n) / (s \backslash pp)) \backslash (pp / np)$ (complex extracted PP-relative phrase)
 c. $((n \backslash n) / (s \backslash np)) \backslash (np / np)$ (complex extracted NP-relative phrase)

Using (32b) and (32c), it is possible to analyze (33a) and (33b):

- (33) a. a report the cover of which Keats (expects that Chapman) will design
 b. a subject on which Keats (expects that Chapman) will speak

In the analysis of (33b), *which* requires a preposition to its left (pp / np) so it can form the category $(n \backslash n) / (s \backslash pp)$. This category needs a sentence lacking a PP to its right in order to form a post-nominal modifier $(n \backslash n)$. In the analysis of (33a), *the cover of* becomes np / np by means of composition and *which* with the lexical entry (32c) can combine with *the cover of* to its left. The result is the category $(n \backslash n) / (s \backslash np)$, that is, something that requires a sentence missing an NP.

Ross' examples (31b) can also be analyzed as follows (32c):

- (34) reports [the height of the lettering on the covers of] _{np / np} which] _{$(n \backslash n) / (s \backslash np)$} the government prescribes

The complex expression *the height of the lettering on the covers of* becomes np / np after composition and the rest of the analysis proceeds as that of (33a).

In addition to entries such as those in (32), we also need further entries to analyze sentences such as (35), where the relative phrase has been extracted from the middle of the clause (see Pollard 1988: 410):

- (35) Fido is the dog which we put downstairs.

⁷ Pollard & Sag (1994: 212).

⁸ Ross (1967: 109).

The problem here is similar to what we saw with topicalization: *we put* does not have the category s/np but rather $(s/pp)/np$ and as such, cannot be directly combined with the relative pronoun in (30).

Morrill (1995: 204) discusses the lexical entry in (32b) for the relative pronoun in (36):

(36) about which John talked

In the lexical entry (32b), *which* requires something to the left of it, which requires a noun phrase in order to form a complete prepositional phrase; that is, *which* selects a preposition. Morrill noted that there is a need to postulate further lexical items for cases like (37) in which the relative pronoun occurs in the middle of the fronted phrase.

(37) the contract [the loss of which after so much wrangling] John would finally have to pay for

These and other cases could be handled by additional lexical stipulations. Morrill instead proposes additional types of the combination of functors and arguments, which allow a functor $B \uparrow A$ to enclose its argument A and produce B , or a functor $A \downarrow B$ to enclose its argument to then yield B (p. 190). Even with these additional operations, he still needs the two lexical items in (38) for the derivation of a pied-piping construction with an argument NP or a PP:

- (38) a. $(NP \uparrow NP) \downarrow (N \backslash N)/(S/NP)$
 b. $(PP \uparrow NP) \downarrow (N \backslash N)/(S/PP)$

These lexical items are still not enough, however, as (38b) contains a PP but this PP corresponds to an argument PP, which is required for (36). To analyze (31a), which involves a PP adjunct, we need to assume the category $(s \backslash np)/(s \backslash np)$ for the prepositional phrase *in the middle of whose sermon*. We, therefore, also require at least three additional items for relative pronouns.

By introducing new operations, Morrill manages to reduce the number of lexical entries for *which*; however, the fact remains that he has to mention the categories which can occur in pied-piping constructions in the lexical entry of the relative pronoun.

Furthermore, the observation that relative clauses consist of a phrase with a relative pronoun plus a sentence missing a relative phrase is lost. This insight can be kept if one assumes a GPSG-style analysis where information about whether there is a relative pronoun in the relative phrase can be passed up to the highest node of the relative phrase. The relative clause can then be analyzed as the combination of a sentence with a gap and an appropriately marked relative phrase. For the discussion of such analyses in the framework of GB theory and HPSG/CxG, see Section 21.10.3.

Comprehension questions

1. Identify the functors and arguments in Figures 8.1 and 8.3.
2. Which combination operations do you know?
3. What is composition used for?

Exercises

1. Analyze the following sentence:

(39) The children in the room laugh loudly.

2. Analyze the noun phrase in (40):

(40) the picture of Mary

Compare the resulting analysis with the structure given in Figure 2.4 on page 62 and think about which categories of \bar{X} syntax the categories in Categorial Grammar correspond to.

Further reading

Mark Steedman discusses a variant of Categorial Grammar, *Combinatory Categorial Grammar*, in a series of books and articles: Steedman (1991, 2000); Steedman & Baldridge (2006).

Lobin (2003) compares Categorial Grammar with Dependency Grammar and Pickering & Barry (1993) suggest a combination of Dependency Grammar and Categorial Grammar, which they call Dependency Categorial Grammar.

Briscoe (2000) and Villavicencio (2002) discuss UG-based acquisition models in the framework of Categorial Grammar.

第九章 **Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar**

Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (HPSG) was developed by Carl Pollard and Ivan Sag in the mid-80's in Stanford and in the Hewlett-Packard research laboratories in Palo Alto (Pollard & Sag 1987, 1994). Like LFG, HPSG is part of so-called West Coast linguistics. Another similarity to LFG is that HPSG aims to provide a theory of competence which is compatible with performance (Sag & Wasow 2011, 2015, see also Chapter 15).

The formal properties of the description language for HPSG grammars are well-understood and there are many systems for processing such grammars (Dörre & Seiffert 1991; Dörre & Dorna 1993; Popowich & Vogel 1991; Uszkoreit, Backofen, Busemann, Diagne, Hinkelman, Kasper, Kiefer, Krieger, Netter, Neumann, Oepen & Spackman 1994; Erbach 1995; Schütz 1996; Schmidt, Theofilidis, Rieder & Declerck 1996b; Schmidt, Rieder & Theofilidis 1996a; Uszkoreit, Backofen, Calder, Capstick, Dini, Dörre, Erbach, Estival, Manandhar, Mineur & Oepen 1996; Müller 1996c, 2004c; Carpenter & Penn 1996; Penn & Carpenter 1999; Götz, Meurers & Gerdemann 1997; Copestake 2002; Callmeier 2000; Dahllöf 2003; Meurers, Penn & Richter 2002; Penn 2004; Müller 2007a; Sato 2008; Kaufmann 2009).¹ Currently, the LKB system by Ann Copestake and the TRALE system, that was developed by Gerald Penn (Meurers, Penn & Richter 2002; Penn 2004), have the most users. The DELPH-IN consortium – whose grammar fragments are based on the LKB – and various TRALE users have developed many small and some large grammar fragments of various languages. The following is a list of implementations in different systems:

- Arabic (Haddar, Boukedi & Zalila 2010; Hahn 2011; Masum, Islam, Rahman & Ahmed 2012; Boukedi & Haddar 2014; Loukam, Balla & Laskri 2015; Arad Greshler, Herzig Sheinfux, Melnik & Wintner 2015),
- Bengali (Paul 2004; Islam, Hasan & Rahman 2012),
- Bulgarian (Simov, Osenova, Simov & Kouylekov 2004; Osenova 2010a,b, 2011),
- Cantonese (Fan, Song & Bond 2015),
- Danish (Ørsnes 1995, 2009b; Neville & Paggio 2004; Müller 2009c; Müller & Ørsnes 2011; Müller 2012a; Müller & Ørsnes 2015),

¹ Uszkoreit et al. (1996) and Bolc et al. (1996) compare systems that were available or were developed at the beginnings of the 1990s. Melnik (2007) compares LKB and TRALE. See also Müller (2015a: Section 5.1).

- German (Kiss 1991; Netter 1993, 1996; Meurers 1994; Hinrichs et al. 1997; Kordoni 1999a; Tseng 2000; Geißler & Kiss 1994; Keller 1994; Müller 1996c, 1999a; Müller & Kasper 2000; Crysmann 2003, 2005b,c; Müller 2007b; Kaufmann & Pfister 2007, 2008; Kaufmann 2009; Fokkens 2011),
- English (Copestake & Flickinger 2000; Flickinger, Copestake & Sag 2000; Flickinger 2000; Dahllöf 2002, 2003; De Kuthy & Meurers 2003a; Meurers, De Kuthy & Metcalf 2003; De Kuthy, Metcalf & Meurers 2004),
- Esperanto (Li 1996),
- French (Tseng 2003),
- Ga (Kropp Dakubu, Hellan & Beermann 2007; Hellan 2007),
- Georgian (Abzianidze 2011),
- Greek (Kordoni & Neu 2005),
- Hausa (Crysmann 2005a, 2009, 2011, 2012; ?),
- Hebrew (Melnik 2007; Haugereid, Melnik & Wintner 2013; Arad Greshler, Herzig Sheinflux, Melnik & Wintner 2015),
- Indonesian (?),
- Japanese (Siegel 2000; Siegel & Bender 2002; Bender & Siegel 2005),
- Korean (Kim & Yang 2003, 2004, 2006, 2009; Kim, Sells & Yang 2007; Song, Kim, Bond & Yang 2010; Kim, Yang, Song & Bond 2011),
- Maltese (Müller 2009b),
- Mandarin Chinese (Liu 1997; Ng 1997; Müller & Lipenkova 2009, 2013; Fan, Song & Bond 2015),
- Dutch (van Noord & Bouma 1994; Bouma, van Noord & Malouf 2001b; Fokkens 2011),
- Norwegian (Hellan & Haugereid 2003; Beermann & Hellan 2004; Hellan & Beermann 2006),
- Persian (Müller 2010b; Müller & Ghayoomi 2010),
- Polish (Przepiórkowski, Kupść, Marciniak & Mykowiecka 2002; Mykowiecka, Marciniak, Przepiórkowski & Kupść 2003),
- Portuguese (Branco & Costa 2008a,b; Costa & Branco 2010),
- Russian (Avgustinova & Zhang 2009),

- Sahaptin (Drellishak 2009),
- Spanish (Pineda & Meza 2005a,b; Bildhauer 2008; Marimon 2013),
- Sign Language (German, French, British, Greek!) (Sáfár & Marshall 2002; Marshall & Sáfár 2004; Sáfár & Glauert 2010),
- South African Sign Language (Bungeroth 2002),
- Turkish (Fokkens, Poulson & Bender 2009),
- Wambaya (Bender 2008a,c, 2010).
- Yiddish (Müller & Ørsnes 2011),

The first implemented HPSG grammar was a grammar of English developed in the Hewlett-Packard labs in Palo Alto (Flickinger, Pollard & Wasow 1985; Flickinger 1987). Grammars for German were developed in Heidelberg, Stuttgart and Saarbrücken in the LILOG project. Subsequently, grammars for German, English and Japanese were developed in Heidelberg, Saarbrücken and Stanford in the *Verbmobil* project. *Verbmobil* was the largest ever AI project in Germany. It was a machine translation project for spoken language in the domains of trip planning and appointment scheduling (Wahlster 2000a).

Currently there are two larger groups that are working on the development of grammars: the DELPH-IN consortium (Deep Linguistic Processing with HPSG)² and the network CoGETI (Constraintbasierte Grammatik: Empirie, Theorie und Implementierung)³. Many of the grammar fragments that are listed above were developed by members of DELPH-IN and some were derived from the Grammar Matrix which was developed for the LKB to provide grammar writers with a typologically motivated initial grammar that corresponds to the properties of the language under development (Bender, Flickinger & Oepen 2002). The CoreGram project⁴ is a similar project that is being run at the Freie Universität Berlin. It is developing grammars for German, Danish, Persian, Maltese, Mandarin Chinese, Spanish, French and Yiddish that share a common core. Constraints that hold for all languages are represented in one place and used by all grammars. Furthermore there are constraints that hold for certain language classes and again they are represented together and used by the respective grammars. So while the Grammar Matrix is used to derive grammars that individual grammar writers can use, adapt and modify to suit their needs, CoreGram really develops grammars for various languages that are used simultaneously and have to stay in sync. A description of the CoreGram can be found in Müller (2013a, 2015a).

There are systems that combine linguistically motivated analyses with statistics components (Brew 1995; Miyao et al. 2005; Miyao & Tsujii 2008) or learn grammars or lexica from corpora (Fouvry 2003; Cramer & Zhang 2009).

The following URLs point to pages on which grammars can be tested:

² <http://www.delph-in.net/>. 13.11.2015.

³ <http://wwwuser.gwdg.de/~cogeti/>. 13.11.2015. Supported by the DFG under the grant number HO3279/3-1.


⁴ <http://hpsg.fu-berlin.de/Projects/CoreGram.html>. 01.09.2016.

- <http://www.delph-in.net/erg/>
- <http://hpsg.fu-berlin.de/Demos/>

9.1 General remarks on the representational format

HPSG has the following characteristics: it is a lexicon-based theory, that is, the majority of linguistic constraints are situated in the descriptions of words or roots. HPSG is sign-based in the sense of Saussure (1916a): the form and meaning of linguistic signs are always represented together. Typed feature structures are used to model all relevant information.⁵ These structures can be described with feature descriptions such as in (1). Lexical entries, phrases and principles are always modeled and described with the same formal means. Generalizations about word classes or rule schemata are captured with inheritance hierarchies (see Section 6.2). Phonology, syntax and semantics are represented in a single structure. There are no separate levels of representation such as PF or LF in Government & Binding Theory. (1) shows an excerpt from the representation of a word such as *Grammatik* ‘grammar’.

- (1) Lexical item for the word *Grammatik* ‘grammar’:



One can see that this feature description contains information about the phonology, syntactic category and semantic content of the word *Grammatik*. To keep things simple, the value of PHONOLOGY (PHON) is mostly given as an orthographic representation. In fully fleshed-out theories, the PHON value is a complex structure that contains information about metrical grids and weak or strong accents. See Bird & Klein (1994), Orgun (1996), Höhle (1999), Walther (1999), Crysmann (2002: Chapter 6), and Bildhauer (2008) for phonology in the framework of HPSG. The details of the description in (1) will be explained in the following sections.

HPSG has adopted various insights from other theories and newer analyses have been influenced by developments in other theoretical frameworks. Functor-argument

⁵ Readers who read this book non-sequentially and who are unfamiliar with typed feature descriptions and typed feature structures should consult Chapter 6 first.

structures, the treatment of valence information and function composition have been adopted from Categorical Grammar. Function composition plays an important role in the analysis of verbal complexes in languages like German and Korean. The Immediate Dominance/Linear Precedence format (ID/LP format, see Section 5.1.2) as well as the Slash mechanism for long-distance dependencies (see Section 5.4) both come from GPSG. The analysis assumed here for verb position in German is inspired by the one that was developed in the framework of Government & Binding (see Section 3.2).

9.1.1 Representation of valence information

The phrase structure grammars discussed in Chapter 2 have the disadvantage that one requires a great number of different rules for the various valence types. (2) shows some examples of this kind of rules and the corresponding verbs.

- | | | |
|-----|--|--|
| (2) | $S \rightarrow \text{NP}[\textit{nom}], V$ | $X \textit{schläft}$ ‘X is sleeping’ |
| | $S \rightarrow \text{NP}[\textit{nom}], \text{NP}[\textit{acc}], V$ | $X Y \textit{erwartet}$ ‘X expects Y’ |
| | $S \rightarrow \text{NP}[\textit{nom}], \text{PP}[\textit{über}], V$ | $X \textit{über } Y \textit{ spricht}$ ‘X talks about Y’ |
| | $S \rightarrow \text{NP}[\textit{nom}], \text{NP}[\textit{dat}], \text{NP}[\textit{acc}], V$ | $X Y Z \textit{ gibt}$ ‘X gives Z to Y’ |
| | $S \rightarrow \text{NP}[\textit{nom}], \text{NP}[\textit{dat}], \text{PP}[\textit{mit}], V$ | $X Y \textit{ mit } Z \textit{ dient}$ ‘X serves Y with Z’ |

In order for the grammar not to create any incorrect sentences, one has to ensure that verbs are only used with appropriate rules.

- (3)
- a. * dass Peter das Buch schläft
that Peter the book sleeps
 - b. * dass Peter erwartet
that Peter expects
 - c. * dass Peter über den Mann erwartet
that Peter about the man expects

Therefore, verbs (and heads in general) have to be divided into valence classes. These valence classes have to then be assigned to grammatical rules. One must therefore further specify the rule for transitive verbs in (2) as follows:

- (4) $S \rightarrow \text{NP}[\textit{nom}], \text{NP}[\textit{acc}], V[\textit{nom_acc}]$

Here, valence has been encoded twice. First, we have said something in the rules about what kind of elements can or must occur, and then we have stated in the lexicon which valence class the verb belongs to. In Section 5.5, it was pointed out that morphological processes need to refer to valence information. Hence, it is desirable to remove redundant valence information from grammatical rules. For this reason, HPSG – like Categorical Grammar – includes descriptions of the arguments of a head in the lexical entry of that head. There is a feature with a list-value, the SUBCAT feature, which contains descriptions of the objects that must combine with a head in order to yield a complete phrase. (5) gives some examples for the verbs in (2):

(5)	Verb	SUBCAT
	<i>schlafen</i> ‘to sleep’	$\langle \text{NP}[\textit{nom}] \rangle$
	<i>erwarten</i> ‘to expect’	$\langle \text{NP}[\textit{nom}], \text{NP}[\textit{acc}] \rangle$
	<i>sprechen</i> ‘to speak’	$\langle \text{NP}[\textit{nom}], \text{PP}[\textit{über}] \rangle$
	<i>geben</i> ‘to give’	$\langle \text{NP}[\textit{nom}], \text{NP}[\textit{dat}], \text{NP}[\textit{acc}] \rangle$
	<i>dienen</i> ‘to serve’	$\langle \text{NP}[\textit{nom}], \text{NP}[\textit{dat}], \text{PP}[\textit{mit}] \rangle$

SUBCAT is an abbreviation for subcategorization. It is often said that a head subcategorizes for certain arguments. See page 84 for more on the term *subcategorization*.

Figure 9.1 shows the analysis for (6a) and the analysis for (6b) is in Figure 9.2 on the following page:

- (6) a. [dass] Peter schläft
 that Peter sleeps
 b. [dass] Peter Maria erwartet
 that Peter Maria expects
 ‘that Peter expects Maria’





图 9.1: Analysis of *Peter schläft* ‘Peter sleeps’ in *dass Peter schläft* ‘that Peter sleeps’


In Figures 9.1 and 9.2, one element of the SUBCAT list is combined with its head in each local tree. The elements that are combined with the selecting head are then no longer present in the SUBCAT list of the mother node. $V[\text{SUBCAT } \langle \rangle]$ corresponds to a complete phrase (VP or S). The boxes with numbers show the structure sharing (see Section 6.4). Structure sharing is the most important means of expression in HPSG. It plays a central role for phenomena such as valence, agreement and long-distance dependencies. In the examples above, 1 indicates that the description in the SUBCAT list is identical to another daughter in the tree. The descriptions contained in valence lists are usually partial descriptions, that is, not all properties of the argument are exhaustively described. Therefore, it is possible that a verb such as *schläft* ‘sleeps’ can be combined with various kinds of linguistic objects: the subject can be a pronoun, a proper name or a complex noun phrase, it only matters that the linguistic object in question has an empty SUBCAT list and bears the correct case.⁶

⁶ Furthermore, it must agree with the verb. This is not shown here.


 图 9.2: Analysis of *Peter Maria erwartet* ‘Peter expects Maria.’

9.1.2 Representation of constituent structure

As already noted, feature descriptions in HPSG serve as the sole descriptive inventory of morphological rules, lexical entries and syntactic rules. The trees we have seen thus far are only visualizations of the constituent structure and do not have any theoretical status. There are also no rewrite rules in HPSG.⁷ The job of phrase structure rules is handled by feature descriptions. Information about dominance is represented using DTR features (head daughter and non-head daughter), information about precedence is implicitly contained in PHON. (7) shows the representation of PHON values in a feature description corresponding to the tree in Figure 9.3.


 图 9.3: Analysis of *dem Mann* ‘the man’


$$(7) \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{PHON} \\ \text{HEAD-DTR} \\ \text{NON-HEAD-DTRS} \end{array} \left[\begin{array}{l} \langle \text{dem Mann} \rangle \\ \left[\text{PHON} \langle \text{Mann} \rangle \right] \\ \left\langle \left[\text{PHON} \langle \text{dem} \rangle \right] \right\rangle \end{array} \right] \right]$$

In (7), there is exactly one head daughter (HEAD-DTR). The head daughter is always the daughter containing the head. In a structure with the daughters *das* ‘the’ and *Bild von*

⁷ However, phrase structure rules are used in some computer implementations of HPSG in order to improve the efficiency of processing.

Maria ‘picture of *Maria*’, the latter would be the head daughter. In principle, there can be multiple non-head daughters. If we were to assume a flat structure for a sentence with a ditransitive verb, as in Figure 2.1 on page 50, we would have three non-head daughters. It also makes sense to assume binary branching structures without heads (see Müller 2007b: Chapter 11 for an analysis of relative clauses). In such structures we would also have more than one non-head daughter, namely exactly two.

Before it is shown how it is ensured that only those head-argument structures are licensed in which the argument matches the requirements of the head, I will present the general structure of feature descriptions in HPSG. The structure presented at the start of this chapter is repeated in (8) with all the details relevant to the present discussion:



In the outer layer, there are the features PHON and SYNSEM. As previously mentioned, PHON contains the phonological representation of a linguistic object. The value of SYNSEM is a feature structure which contains syntactic and semantic information that can be selected by other heads. The daughters of phrasal signs are represented outside of SYNSEM. This ensures that there is a certain degree of locality involved in selection: a head cannot access the internal structure of the elements which it selects (Pollard und Sag 1987: 143–145; 1994: 23). See also Sections 10.6.2.1 and 18.2 for a discussion of locality. Inside SYNSEM, there is information relevant in local contexts (LOCAL, abbreviated to LOC) as well as information important for long-distance dependencies (NONLOCAL or NONLOC for short). Locally relevant information includes syntactic (CATEGORY or CAT), and semantic (CONTENT or CONT) information. Syntactic information encompasses information that determines the central characteristics of a phrase, that is, the head information. This is represented under HEAD. Further details of this will be discussed in Section 9.1.4.

Among other things, the part of speech of a linguistic object belongs to the head properties of a phrase. As well as HEAD, SUBCAT belongs to the information contained inside CAT. The semantic content of a sign is present under CONT. The type of the CONT value is *mrs*, which stands for *Minimal Recursion Semantics* (Copestake, Flickinger, Pollard & Sag 2005). An MRS structure is comprised of an index and a list of relations which restrict this index. Of the NONLOCAL features, only SLASH is given here. There are further features for dealing with relative and interrogative clauses (Pollard & Sag 1994; Sag 1997; Ginzburg & Sag 2000; Holler 2005), which will not be discussed here.

As can be seen, the description of the word *Grammatik* ‘grammar’ becomes relatively complicated. In theory, it would be possible to list all properties of a given object directly in a single list of feature-value pairs. This would, however, have the disadvantage that the identity of groups of feature-value pairs could not be expressed as easily. Using the feature geometry in (8), one can express the fact that the CAT values of both conjuncts in symmetric coordinations such as those in (9) are identical.

- (9) a. [der Mann] und [die Frau]
 the man and the woman
 b. Er [kennt] und [liebt] diese Schallplatte.
 he.NOM knows and loves this.ACC record
 c. Er ist [dumm] und [arrogant].
 he is dumb and arrogant

(9b) should be compared with the examples in (10). In (10a), the verbs select for an accusative and a dative object, respectively and in (10b), the verbs select for an accusative and a prepositional object:

- (10) a. *Er kennt und hilft dieser Frau / diese Frau.
 he.NOM knows and helps this.DAT woman this.ACC woman
 Intended: ‘He knows and helps this woman.’
 b. *weil er auf Maria kennt und wartet
 because he for Maria knows and waits
 Intended: ‘because he knows Maria and waits for her’

While the English translation of (10a) is fine, since both *knows* and *helps* take an accusative, (10a) is out, since *kennt* ‘knows’ takes an accusative and *hilft* ‘helps’ a dative object. Similarly, (10b) is out since *kennt* ‘knows’ selects an accusative object and *wartet* ‘waits’ selects for a prepositional phrase containing the preposition *auf* ‘for’.

If valence and the part of speech information were not represented in one common sub-structure, we would have to state separately that utterances such as (9) require that both conjuncts have the same valence and part of speech.

After this general introduction of the feature geometry that is assumed here, we can now turn to the head-argument schema:

Schema 1 (Head-Argument Schema (binary branching, preliminary version))

$$\text{head-argument-phrase} \Rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT|SUBCAT } [1] \\ \text{HEAD-DTR|SYNSEM|LOC|CAT|SUBCAT } [1] \oplus \langle [2] \rangle \\ \text{NON-HEAD-DTRS } \langle [\text{SYNSEM } [2]] \rangle \end{array} \right]$$

Schema 1 states the properties a linguistic object of the type *head-argument-phrase* must have. The arrow in Schema 1 stands for a logical implication and not for the arrow of

rewrite rules as we know it from phrase structure grammars. ‘ \oplus ’ (*append*) is a relation which combines two lists. (11) shows possible splits of a list that contains two elements:

$$(11) \quad \langle x, y \rangle = \langle x \rangle \oplus \langle y \rangle \text{ or } \\ \langle \rangle \oplus \langle x, y \rangle \text{ or } \\ \langle x, y \rangle \oplus \langle \rangle$$

The list $\langle x, y \rangle$ can be subdivided into two lists each containing one element, or alternatively into the empty list and $\langle x, y \rangle$.

Schema 1 can be read as follows: if an object is of the type *head-argument-phrase* then it must have the properties on the right-hand side of the implication. In concrete terms, this means that these objects always have a valence list which corresponds to [1], that they have a head daughter with a valence list that can be divided into two sublists [1] and $\langle 2 \rangle$ and also that they have a non-head daughter whose syntactic and semantic properties (SYNSEM value) are compatible with the last element of the SUBCAT list of the head daughter ([2]). (12) provides the corresponding feature description for the example in (6a).

$$(12) \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{head-argument-phrase} \\ \text{PHON} \langle \text{Peter schläft} \rangle \\ \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT|SUBCAT} \langle \rangle \\ \text{HEAD-DTR} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{PHON} \langle \text{schläft} \rangle \\ \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT|SUBCAT} \langle [1] \text{ NP[nom]} \rangle \end{array} \right] \\ \text{NON-HEAD-DTRS} \left\langle \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{PHON} \langle \text{Peter} \rangle \\ \text{SYNSEM} [1] \end{array} \right] \right\rangle \end{array} \right]$$

NP[nom] is an abbreviation for a complex feature description. Schema 1 divides the SUBCAT list of the head daughter into a single-element list and what is left. Since *schläft* ‘sleeps’ only has one element in its SUBCAT list, what remains is the empty list. This remainder is also the SUBCAT value of the mother.

9.1.3 Linearization rules

Dominance schemata do not say anything about the order of the daughters. As in GPSG, linearization rules are specified separately. Linearization rules can make reference to the properties of daughters, their function in a schema (head, argument, adjunct, ...) or both. If we assume a feature INITIAL for all heads, then heads which precede their arguments would have the INITIAL value ‘+’ and heads following their arguments would have the value ‘-’. The linearization rules in (13) ensure that ungrammatical orders such as (14b,d) are ruled out.⁸

⁸ Noun phrases pose a problem for (13): determiners have been treated as argument until now and were included in the SUBCAT list of the head noun. Determiners occur to the left of noun, whereas all other arguments of the noun are to the right. This problem can be solved either by refining linearization rules (Müller 1999a: 164–165) or by introducing a special valence feature for determiners (Pollard & Sag 1994: Section 9.4). For an approach using such a feature, see Section 9.6.1.

- (13) a. Head[INITIAL +] < Argument
b. Argument < Head[INITIAL-]

Prepositions have an INITIAL value ‘+’ and therefore have to precede arguments. Verbs in final position bear the value ‘-’ and have to follow their arguments.

- (14) a. [in [den Schrank]]
in the cupboard
b. * [[den Schrank] in]
the cupboard in
c. dass [er [ihn umfüllt]]
that he it decants
d. * dass [er [umfüllt ihn]]
that he decants it

9.1.4 Projection of head properties

As was explained in Section 1.5 certain properties of heads are important for the distribution of the whole phrase. For instance, the verb form belongs to the features that are important for the distribution of verbal projections. Certain verbs require a verbal argument with a particular form:

- (15) a. [Dem Mann helfen] will er nicht.
the man help wants he not
‘He doesn’t want to help the man.’
b. [Dem Mann geholfen] hat er nicht.
the man helped has he not
‘He hasn’t helped the man.’
c. * [Dem Mann geholfen] will er nicht.
the man helped wants he not
d. * [Dem Mann helfen] hat er nicht.
the man help has he not

wollen ‘to want’ always requires an infinitive without *zu* ‘to’, while *haben* ‘have’ on the other hand requires a verb in participle form. *glauben* ‘believe’ can occur with a finite clause, but not with an infinitive without *zu*:

- (16) a. Ich glaube, Peter kommt morgen.
I believe Peter comes tomorrow
‘I think Peter is coming tomorrow.’
b. * Ich glaube, Peter morgen kommen.
I believe Peter tomorrow come

- c. * Ich glaube, morgen kommen.
 I believe tomorrow come

This shows that projections of verbs must not only contain information about the part of speech but also information about the verb form. Figure 9.4 shows this on the basis of the finite verb *gibt* ‘gives’.




图 9.4: Projection of the head features of the verb

GPSG has the Head Feature Convention that ensures that head features on the mother node are identical to those on the node of the head daughter. In HPSG, there is a similar principle. Unlike GPSG, head features are explicitly contained as a group of features in the feature structures. They are listed under the path `SYNSEM|LOC|CAT|HEAD`. (17) shows the lexical item for *gibt* ‘gives’:

- (17) *gibt* ‘gives’:
- $$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{word} \\ \text{PHON} \langle \text{gibt} \rangle \\ \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{verb} \\ \text{VFORM } \textit{fin} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{SUBCAT} \langle \text{NP}[\textit{nom}], \text{NP}[\textit{dat}], \text{NP}[\textit{acc}] \rangle \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

The *Head Feature Principle* takes the following form:

Principle 1 (*Head Feature Principle*)

The *HEAD* value of any headed phrase is structure-shared with the *HEAD* value of the head daughter.




图 9.5: Projection of head features of a verb with structure sharing

Figure 9.5 is a variant of Figure 9.4 with the structure sharing made explicit.

The following section will deal with how this principle is formalized as well as how it can be integrated into the architecture of HPSG.

9.1.5 Inheritance hierarchies and generalizations

Up to now, we have seen one example of a dominance schema and more will follow in the coming sections, e.g., schemata for head-adjunct structures as well as for the binding off of long-distance dependencies. The Head Feature Principle is a general principle which must be met by all structures licensed by these schemata. As mentioned above, it must be met by all structures with a head. Formally, this can be captured by categorizing syntactic structures into those with and those without heads and assigning the type *headed-phrase* to those with a head. The type *head-argument-phrase* – the type which the description in Schema 1 on page 258 has – is a subtype of *headed-phrase*. Objects of a certain type x always have all properties that objects have that are supertypes of x . Recall the example from Section 6.2: an object of the type *female person* has all the properties of the type *person*. Furthermore, objects of type *female person* have additional, more specific properties not shared by other subtypes of *person*.

If one formulates a restriction on a supertype, this automatically affects all of its subtypes. The Head Feature Principle hence can be formalized as follows:

$$(18) \text{ headed-phrase} \Rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT|HEAD } \boxed{1} \\ \text{HEAD-DTR|SYNSEM|LOC|CAT|HEAD } \boxed{1} \end{array} \right]$$

The arrow corresponds to a logical implication, as mentioned above. Therefore, (18) can be read as follows: if a structure is of type *headed-phrase*, then it must hold that the value of *SYNSEM|LOC|CAT|HEAD* is identical to the value of *HEAD-DTR|SYNSEM|LOC|CAT|HEAD*.

An extract from the type hierarchy under *sign* is given in Figure 9.6.




图 9.6: Type hierarchy for *sign*: all subtypes of *headed-phrase* inherit constraints

word and *phrase* are subclasses of linguistic signs. Phrases can be divided into phrases with heads (*headed-phrase*) and those without (*non-headed-phrase*). There are also subtypes for phrases of type *non-headed-phrase* and *headed-phrase*. We have already discussed *head-argument-phrase*, and other subtypes of *headed-phrase* will be discussed in the later sections. As well as *word* and *phrase*, there are the types *root* and *stem*, which play an important role for the structure of the lexicon and the morphological component. Due to space considerations, it is not possible to further discuss these types here, but see Chapter 22.

The description in (19) shows the Head-Argument Schema from page 258 together with the restrictions that the type *head-argument-phrase* inherits from *headed-phrase*.

(19) Head-Argument Schema + Head Feature Principle:

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{head-argument-phrase} \\ \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD } \boxed{1} \\ \text{SUBCAT } \boxed{2} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{HEAD-DTR|SYNSEM|LOC|CAT} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD } \boxed{1} \\ \text{SUBCAT } \boxed{2} \oplus \langle \boxed{3} \rangle \end{array} \right] \\ \text{NON-HEAD-DTRS} \langle [\text{SYNSEM } \boxed{3}] \rangle \end{array} \right]$$

(20) gives a description of a structure licensed by Schema 1. As well as valence information, the head information is specified in (20) and it is also apparent how the Head Feature Principle ensures the projection of features: the head value of the entire structure ($\boxed{1}$) corresponds to the head value of the verb *gibt* ‘gives’.

$$(20) \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{head-argument-phrase} \\ \text{PHON } \langle \text{das Buch gibt} \rangle \\ \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT } \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD } [1] \\ \text{SUBCAT } [2] \langle \text{NP}[\text{nom}], \text{NP}[\text{dat}] \rangle \end{array} \right] \\ \text{HEAD-DTR } \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{word} \\ \text{PHON } \langle \text{gibt} \rangle \\ \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT } \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD } [1] \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{verb} \\ \text{VFORM } \text{fin} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{SUBCAT } [2] \oplus \langle [3] \rangle \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \\ \text{NON-HEAD-DTRS } \left\langle \begin{array}{l} \text{PHON } \langle \text{das Buch} \rangle \\ \text{SYNSEM } [3] \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{LOC|CAT } \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD } \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{noun} \\ \text{CAS } \text{acc} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{SUBCAT } \langle \rangle \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right\rangle \\ \text{HEAD-DTR } \dots \\ \text{NON-HEAD-DTRS } \dots \end{array} \right]$$

For the entire sentence *er das Buch dem Mann gibt* ‘he the book to the man gives’, we arrive at a structure (already shown in Figure 9.5) described by (21):

$$(21) \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT } \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD } \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{verb} \\ \text{VFORM } \text{fin} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{SUBCAT } \langle \rangle \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

This description corresponds to the sentence symbol S in the phrase structure grammar on page 49, however (21) additionally contains information about the form of the verb.

Using dominance schemata as an example, we have shown how generalizations about linguistic objects can be captured, however, we also want to be able to capture generalizations in other areas of the theory: like Categorical Grammar, the HPSG lexicon contains a very large amount of information. Lexical entries (roots and words) can also be divided into classes, which can then be assigned types. In this way, it is possible to capture what all verbs, intransitive verbs and transitive verbs, have in common. See Figure 22.1 on page 654.

Now that some fundamental concepts of HPSG have been introduced, the following section will show how the semantic contribution of words is represented and how the meaning of a phrase can be determined compositionally.

9.1.6 Semantics

An important difference between theories such as GB, LFG and TAG, on the one hand, and HPSG and CxG on the other is that the semantic content of a linguistic object is

modeled in a feature structure just like all its other properties. As previously mentioned, semantic information is found under the path SYNSEM|LOC|CONT . (22) gives an example of the CONT value for *Buch* ‘book’. The representation is based on Minimal Recursion Semantics (MRS):⁹

$$(22) \left[\begin{array}{l} mrs \\ \text{IND } \boxed{1} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{PER } 3 \\ \text{NUM } sg \\ \text{GEN } neu \end{array} \right] \\ \text{RELS } \left\langle \left[\begin{array}{l} buch \\ \text{INST } \boxed{1} \end{array} \right] \right\rangle \end{array} \right]$$

IND stands for index and RELS is a list of relations. Features such as person, number and gender are part of a nominal index. These are important in determining reference or coreference. For example, *sie* ‘she’ in (23) can refer to *Frau* ‘woman’ but not to *Buch* ‘book’. On the other hand, *es* ‘it’ cannot refer to *Frau* ‘woman’.

- (23) Die Frau_i kauft ein Buch_j. Sie_i liest es_j.
the woman buys a book she reads it
‘The woman buys a book. She reads it.’

In general, pronouns have to agree in person, number and gender with the element they refer to. Indices are then identified accordingly. In HPSG, this is done by means of structure sharing. It is also common to speak of *coindexation*. (24) provides some examples of coindexation of reflexive pronouns:

- (24) a. Ich_i sehe mich_i.
I see myself
b. Du_i siehst dich_i.
you see yourself
c. Er_i sieht sich_i.
he sees himself
d. Wir_i sehen uns_i.
we see ourselves
e. Ihr_i seht euch_i.
you see yourselves
f. Sie_i sehen sich_i.
they see themselves

⁹ Pollard & Sag (1994) and Ginzburg & Sag (2000) make use of Situation Semantics (Barwise & Perry 1983; Cooper, Mukai & Perry 1990; Devlin 1992). An alternative approach which has already been used in HPSG is Lexical Resource Semantics (Richter & Sailer 2004). For an early underspecification analysis in HPSG, see Nerbonne (1993).

The question of which instances of coindexation are possible and which are necessary is determined by Binding Theory. Pollard & Sag (1992, 1994) have shown that Binding Theory in HPSG does not have many of the problems that arise when implementing binding in GB with reference to tree configurations. There are, however, a number of open questions for Binding Theory in HPSG (Müller 1999a: Section 20.4).

(25) shows the CONT value for the verb *geben* ‘give’:

$$(25) \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{mrs} \\ \text{IND } \boxed{1} \text{ event} \\ \text{RELS } \left\langle \begin{array}{l} \text{geben} \\ \text{EVENT } \boxed{1} \\ \text{AGENT index} \\ \text{GOAL index} \\ \text{THEME index} \end{array} \right\rangle \end{array} \right]$$

It is assumed that verbs have an event variable of the type *event*, which is represented under IND just as with indices for nominal objects. Until now, we did not assign elements in the valence list to argument roles in the semantic representation. This connection is referred to as *linking*. (26) shows how linking works in HPSG. The referential indices of the argument noun phrases are structure-shared with one of the semantic roles of the relation contributed by the head.

(26) *gibt* ‘gives’:

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{CAT} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD } \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{verb} \\ \text{VFORM fin} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{SUBCAT } \left\langle \text{NP[nom]}_{\boxed{1}}, \text{NP[dat]}_{\boxed{2}}, \text{NP[acc]}_{\boxed{3}} \right\rangle \end{array} \right] \\ \text{CONT} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{mrs} \\ \text{IND } \boxed{4} \text{ event} \\ \text{RELS } \left\langle \begin{array}{l} \text{geben} \\ \text{EVENT } \boxed{4} \\ \text{AGENT } \boxed{1} \\ \text{GOAL } \boxed{2} \\ \text{THEME } \boxed{3} \end{array} \right\rangle \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

Since we use general terms such as AGENT and PATIENT for argument roles, it is possible to state generalizations about valence classes and the realization of argument roles. For example, one can divide verbs into verbs taking an agent, verbs with an agent and theme, verbs with agent and patient etc. These various valence/linking patterns can be represented in type hierarchies and these classes can be assigned to the specific lexical entries, that is, one can have them inherit constraints from the respective types. A type constraint for verbs with agent, theme and goal takes the form of (27):

$$(27) \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{CAT|SUBCAT} \left\langle \boxed{}_1, \boxed{}_2, \boxed{}_3 \right\rangle \\ \text{CONT} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{mrs} \\ \text{IND} \quad \boxed{4} \text{ event} \\ \text{RELS} \left\langle \begin{array}{l} \text{agent-goal-theme-rel} \\ \text{EVENT} \quad \boxed{4} \\ \text{AGENT} \quad \boxed{1} \\ \text{GOAL} \quad \boxed{2} \\ \text{THEME} \quad \boxed{3} \end{array} \right\rangle \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

$\boxed{}_1$ stands for an object of unspecified syntactic category with the index 1. The type for the relation *geben'* is a subtype of *agent-goal-theme-rel*. The lexical entry for the word *geben* 'give' or rather the root *geb-* has the linking pattern in (27). For more on theories of linking in HPSG, see Davis (1996), Wechsler (1991) und Davis & Koenig (2000).

Up to now, we have only seen how the meaning of lexical entries can be represented. The Semantics Principle determines the computation of the semantic contribution of phrases: the index of the entire expression corresponds to the index of the head daughter, and the RELS value of the entire sign corresponds to the concatenation of the RELS values of the daughters plus any relations introduced by the dominance schema. The last point is important because the assumption that schemata can add something to meaning can capture the fact that there are some cases where the entire meaning of a phrase is more than simply the sum of its parts. Pertinent examples are often discussed as part of Construction Grammar. Semantic composition in HPSG is organized such that meaning components that are due to certain patterns can be integrated into the complete meaning of an utterance. For examples, see Section 21.10.

The connection between the semantic contribution of the verb and its arguments is established in the lexical entry. As such, we ensure that the argument roles of the verb are assigned to the correct argument in the sentence. This is, however, not the only thing that the semantics is responsible for. It has to be able to generate the various readings associated with quantifier scope ambiguities (see page 84) as well as deal with semantic embedding of predicates under other predicates. All these requirements are fulfilled by MRS. Due to space considerations, we cannot go into detail here. The reader is referred to the article by Copestake, Flickinger, Pollard & Sag (2005) and to Section 19.3 in the discussion chapter.

9.1.7 Adjuncts

Analogous to the selection of arguments by heads via SUBCAT, adjuncts can also select their heads using a feature (MODIFIED). Adjectives, prepositional phrases that modify nouns, and relative clauses select an almost complete nominal projection, that is, a noun that only still needs to be combined with a determiner to yield a complete NP. (28) shows a description of the respective *synsem* object. The symbol \bar{N} , which is familiar from \bar{X} theory (see Section 2.5), is used as abbreviation for this feature description.

(28) AVM that is abbreviated as \bar{N} :

$$\left[\text{CAT} \left[\begin{array}{ll} \text{HEAD} & \text{noun} \\ \text{SUBCAT} & \langle \text{DET} \rangle \end{array} \right] \right]$$

(29) shows part of the lexical item for *interessantes* ‘interesting’:

(29) CAT value for *interessantes* ‘interesting’:

$$\left[\begin{array}{ll} \text{HEAD} & \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{adj} \\ \text{MOD } \bar{N} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{SUBCAT} & \langle \rangle \end{array} \right]$$

interessantes is an adjective that does not take any arguments and therefore has an empty SUBCAT list. Adjectives such as *treu* ‘loyal’ would have a dative NP in their SUBCAT list.

(30) ein dem König treues Mädchen
a the.DAT king loyal girl
‘a girl loyal to the king’

The CAT value is given in (31):

(31) CAT value for *treues* ‘loyal’:

$$\left[\begin{array}{ll} \text{HEAD} & \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{adj} \\ \text{MOD } \bar{N} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{SUBCAT} & \langle \text{NP}[\text{dat}] \rangle \end{array} \right]$$

dem König treues ‘loyal to the king’ forms an adjective phrase, which modifies *Mädchen*.

Unlike the selectional feature SUBCAT that belongs to the features under CAT, MOD is a head feature. The reason for this is that the feature that selects the modifying head has to be present on the maximal projection of the adjunct. The \bar{N} -modifying property of the adjective phrase *dem König treues* ‘loyal to the king’ has to be included in the representation of the entire AP just as it is present in the lexical entry for adjectives in (29) at the lexical level. The adjectival phrase *dem König treues* has the same syntactic properties as the basic adjective *interessantes* ‘interesting’:

(32) CAT value für *dem König treues*:

$$\left[\begin{array}{ll} \text{HEAD} & \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{adj} \\ \text{MOD } \bar{N} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{SUBCAT} & \langle \rangle \end{array} \right]$$

Since MOD is a head feature, the Head Feature Principle (see page 261) ensures that the MOD value of the entire projection is identical to the MOD value of the lexical entry for *treues* ‘loyal’.

As an alternative to the selection of the head by the modifier, one could assume a description of all possible adjuncts on the head itself. This was suggested by Pollard & Sag (1987: 161). Pollard & Sag (1994: Section 1.9) revised the earlier analysis since the semantics of modification could not be captured.¹⁰

Figure 9.7 demonstrates selection in head-adjunct structures.




图 9.7: Head-adjunct structure (selection)

Head-adjunct structures are licensed by the Schema 2.

Schema 2 (Head-Adjunct Schema (preliminary version))

head-adjunct-phrase \Rightarrow

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD-DTR}|\text{SYNSEM } [1] \\ \text{NON-HEAD-DTRS} \left\langle \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{SYNSEM}|\text{LOC}|\text{CAT} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD}|\text{MOD } [1] \\ \text{SUBCAT} \quad \langle \rangle \end{array} \right] \right] \right\rangle \end{array} \right]$$

The value of the selectional feature on the adjunct ($[1]$) is identified with the *SYNSEM* value of the head daughter, thereby ensuring that the head daughter has the properties specified by the adjunct. The *SUBCAT* value of the non-head daughter is the empty list, which is why only completely saturated adjuncts are allowed in head-adjunct structures. Phrases such as (33b) are therefore correctly ruled out:

- (33) a. die Wurst in der Speisekammer
the sausage in the pantry
b. * die Wurst in
the sausage in

Example (33a) requires some further explanation. The preposition *in* (as used in (33a)) has the following *CAT* value:

¹⁰ See Bouma, Malouf & Sag (2001a), however. Bouma, Malouf & Sag (2001a) pursue a hybrid analysis where there are adjuncts which select heads and also adjuncts that are selected by a head. Minimal Recursion Semantics is the semantic theory underlying this analysis. Using this semantics, the problems arising for Pollard & Sag (1987) with regard to the semantics of modifiers are avoided.

$$(34) \text{ CAT value of } in: \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD} \left[\begin{array}{l} prep \\ \text{MOD } \overline{N} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{SUBCAT } \langle NP[dat] \rangle \end{array} \right]$$

After combining *in* with the nominal phrase *der Speisekammer* ‘the pantry’ one gets:

$$(35) \text{ CAT value for } in \text{ der Speisekammer ‘in the pantry’}: \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD} \left[\begin{array}{l} prep \\ \text{MOD } \overline{N} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{SUBCAT } \langle \rangle \end{array} \right]$$

This representation corresponds to that of the adjective *interessantes* ‘interesting’ and can – ignoring the position of the PP – also be used in the same way: the PP modifies a \overline{N} .

Heads that can only be used as arguments but do not modify anything have a MOD value of *none*. They can therefore not occur in the position of the non-head daughter in head-adjunct structures since the MOD value of the non-head daughter has to be compatible with the SYNSEM value of the head daughter.

9.2 Passive

HPSG follows Bresnan’s argumentation (see Section 7.2) and takes care of the passive in the lexicon.¹¹ A lexical rule takes the verb stem as its input and licenses the participle form and the most prominent argument (the so-called designated argument) is suppressed.¹² Since grammatical functions are not part of theory in HPSG, we do not require any mapping principles that map objects to subjects. Nevertheless, one still has to explain the change of case under passivization. If one fully specifies the case of a particular argument in the lexical entries, one has to ensure that the accusative argument of a transitive verb is realized as nominative in the passive. (36) shows what the respective lexical rule would look like:

¹¹ Some exceptions to this are analyses influenced by Construction Grammar such as Tseng (2007) and Haugereid (2007). These approaches are problematic, however, as they cannot account for Bresnan’s adjectival passives. For other problems with Haugereid’s analysis, see Müller (2007c) and Section 21.3.6.

¹² For more on the designated argument, see Haider (1986a). HPSG analyses of the passive in German have been considerably influenced by Haider. Haider uses the designated argument to model the difference between so-called unaccusative and unergative verbs (Perlmutter 1978): unaccusative verbs differ from unergatives and transitives in that they do not have a designated argument. We cannot go into the literature on unaccusativity here. The reader is referred to the original works by Haider and the chapter on the passive in Müller (2007b).

(36) Lexical rule for personal passives adapted from Kiss (1992):

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{stem} \\ \text{PHON } \boxed{1} \\ \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT } \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD } \textit{verb} \\ \text{SUBCAT } \langle \text{NP}[\textit{nom}], \text{NP}[\textit{acc}]_{\boxed{2}} \rangle \oplus \boxed{3} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \mapsto \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{word} \\ \text{PHON } f(\boxed{1}) \\ \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT } \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD } \left[\text{VFORM } \textit{passive-part} \right] \\ \text{SUBCAT } \langle \text{NP}[\textit{nom}]_{\boxed{2}} \rangle \oplus \boxed{3} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

This lexical rule takes a verb stem¹³ as its input, which requires a nominative argument, an accusative argument and possibly further arguments (if $\boxed{3}$ is not the empty list) and licenses a lexical entry that requires a nominative argument and possibly the arguments in $\boxed{3}$.¹⁴ The output of the lexical rule specifies the *VFORM* value of the output word. This is important as the auxiliary and the main verb must go together. For example, it is not possible to use the perfect participle instead of the passive participle since these differ in their valence in Kiss' approach:

- (37) a. Der Mann hat den Weltmeister geschlagen.
 the man has the world.champion beaten
 'The man has beaten the world champion.'
- b. * Der Mann wird den Weltmeister geschlagen.
 the man is the world.champion beaten
- c. Der Weltmeister wird geschlagen.
 the world.champion is beaten
 'The world champion is (being) beaten.'

¹³ The term *stem* includes roots (*help-* 'help-'), products of derivation (*besing-* 'to sing about') and compounds. The lexical rule can therefore also be applied to stems like *help-* and derived forms such as *besing-*.

¹⁴ This rule assumes that arguments of ditransitive verbs are in the order nominative, accusative, dative. Throughout this chapter, I assume a nominative, dative, accusative order, which corresponds to the unmarked order of arguments in the German clause. Kiss (2001) argued that a representation of the unmarked order is needed to account for scope facts in German. Furthermore, the order of the arguments corresponds to the order one would assume for English, which has the advantage that cross-linguistic generalizations can be captured. In earlier work I assumed that the order is nominative, accusative, dative since this order encodes a prominence hierarchy that is relevant in a lot of areas in German grammar. Examples are: ellipsis (Klein 1985), Topic Drop (Fries 1988), free relatives (Bausewein 1990; Pittner 1995; Müller 1999b), depictive secondary predicates (Müller 2004d, 2002a, 2008a), Binding Theory (Grewendorf 1985; Pollard und Sag: 1992; 1994: Chapter 6). This order also corresponds to the Obliqueness Hierarchy suggested by Keenan & Comrie (1977) and Pullum (1977). In order to capture this hierarchy, a special list with nominative, accusative, dative order would have to be assumed.

The version of the passive lexical rule that will be suggested below is compatible with both orders of arguments.

There are a few conventions for the interpretation of lexical rules: all information that is not mentioned in the output sign is taken over from the input sign. Thus, the meaning of the verb is not mentioned in the passive rule, which makes sense as the passive rule is a meaning preserving rule. The CONT values of the input and output are not mentioned in the rule and hence are identical. It is important here that the linking information is retained. As an example consider the application of the rule to the verb stem *schlag-* ‘beat’:

(38) a. Input *schlag-* ‘beat’ :

PHON $\langle \textit{schlag} \rangle$	
SYNSEM LOC	CAT $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD } \textit{verb} \\ \text{SUBCAT } \langle \text{NP}[\textit{nom}]_{[1]}, \text{NP}[\textit{acc}]_{[2]} \rangle \end{array} \right]$
	CONT $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{IND } [3] \textit{event} \\ \text{RELS } \left\langle \begin{array}{l} \textit{schlagen} \\ \text{EVENT } [3] \\ \text{AGENT } [1] \\ \text{PATIENT } [2] \end{array} \right\rangle \end{array} \right]$

b. Output *geschlagen* ‘beaten’:

PHON $\langle \textit{geschlagen} \rangle$	
SYNSEM LOC	CAT $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD } \left[\begin{array}{l} \textit{verb} \\ \text{VFORM } \textit{passive-part} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{SUBCAT } \langle \text{NP}[\textit{nom}]_{[2]} \rangle \end{array} \right]$
	CONT $\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{IND } [3] \textit{event} \\ \text{RELS } \left\langle \begin{array}{l} \textit{schlagen} \\ \text{EVENT } [3] \\ \text{AGENT } [1] \\ \text{PATIENT } [2] \end{array} \right\rangle \end{array} \right]$

The agent role is connected to the subject of *schlag-*. After passivization, the subject is suppressed and the argument connected to the patient role of *schlag-* becomes the subject of the participle. Argument linking is not affected by this and thus the nominative argument is correctly assigned to the patient role.

As Meurers (2001) has shown, lexical rules can also be captured with feature descriptions. (39) shows the feature description representation of (36). What is on the left-hand side of the rule in (36), is contained in the value of LEX-DTR in (39). Since this kind of lexical rule is fully integrated into the formalism, feature structures corresponding to these lexical rules also have their own type. If the result of the application of a given rule is an inflected word, then the type of the lexical rule (*acc-passive-lexical-rule* in our example) is a subtype of *word*. Since lexical rules have a type, it is possible to state

$$(39) \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{acc-passive-lexical-rule} \\ \text{PHON } f(\boxed{1}) \\ \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD} \quad [\text{VFORM } \textit{passive-part}] \\ \text{SUBCAT} \quad \langle \text{NP}[\textit{nom}]_{\boxed{2}} \rangle \oplus \boxed{3} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{LEX-DTR} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{stem} \\ \text{PHON } \boxed{1} \\ \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD} \quad \textit{verb} \\ \text{SUBCAT} \quad \langle \text{NP}[\textit{nom}], \text{NP}[\textit{acc}]_{\boxed{2}} \rangle \oplus \boxed{3} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

generalizations over lexical rules.

The lexical rules discussed thus far work well for the personal passive. For the impersonal passive, however, we would require a second lexical rule. Furthermore, we would have two different lexical items for the passive and the perfect, although the forms are always identical in German. In the following, I will discuss the basic assumptions that are needed for a theory of the passive that can sufficiently explain both personal and impersonal passives and thereby only require one lexical item for the participle form.

9.2.1 Valence information and the Case Principle

In Section 3.4.1, the difference between structural and lexical case was motivated. In the HPSG literature, it is assumed following Haider (1986a) that the dative is a lexical case. For arguments marked with a lexical case, their case value is directly specified in the description of the argument. Arguments with structural case are also specified in the lexicon as taking structural case, but the actual case value is not provided. In order for the grammar not to make any false predictions, it has to be ensured that the structural cases receive a unique value dependent on their environment. This is handled by the Case Principle:¹⁵

Principle 2 (Case Principle)

- *In a list containing the subject as well as complements of a verbal head, the first element with structural case receives nominative.*
- *All other elements in the list with structural case receive accusative.*
- *In nominal environments, elements with structural case are assigned genitive.*

(40) shows prototypical valence lists for finite verbs:

¹⁵ The Case Principle has been simplified here. Cases of so-called ‘raising’ require special treatment. For more details, see Meurers (1999c), Przepiórkowski (1999a) and Müller (2007b: Chapter 14, Chapter 17). The Case Principle given in these publications is very similar to the one proposed by Yip, Maling & Jackendoff (1987) and can therefore also explain the case systems of the languages discussed in their work, notably the complicated case system of Icelandic.

- (40) a. *schläft* ‘sleeps’: SUBCAT $\langle \text{NP}[\text{str}]_j \rangle$
 b. *unterstützt* ‘supports’: SUBCAT $\langle \text{NP}[\text{str}]_j, \text{NP}[\text{str}]_k \rangle$
 c. *hilft* ‘helps’: SUBCAT $\langle \text{NP}[\text{str}]_j, \text{NP}[\text{ldat}]_k \rangle$
 d. *schenkt* ‘gives’: SUBCAT $\langle \text{NP}[\text{str}]_j, \text{NP}[\text{ldat}]_k, \text{NP}[\text{str}]_l \rangle$

str stands for *structural* and *ldat* for lexical dative. The Case Principle ensures that the subjects of the verbs listed above have to be realized in the nominative and also that objects with structural case are assigned accusative.

With the difference between structural and lexical case, it is possible to formulate a passive-lexical rule that can account for both the personal and the impersonal passive:

- (41) Lexical rule for personal and impersonal passive (simplified):

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{stem} \\ \text{PHON } \boxed{1} \\ \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT } \left[\begin{array}{ll} \text{HEAD} & \text{verb} \\ \text{SUBCAT} & \langle \text{NP}[\text{str}] \rangle \oplus \boxed{2} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \mapsto \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{word} \\ \text{PHON } f(\boxed{1}) \\ \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT } \left[\begin{array}{ll} \text{HEAD} & \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{VFORM } \textit{ppp} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{SUBCAT} & \boxed{2} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

This lexical rule does exactly what we expect it to do from a pretheoretical perspective on the passive: it suppresses the most prominent argument with structural case, that is, the argument that corresponds to the subject in the active clause. The standard analysis of verb auxiliary constructions assumes that the main verb and the auxiliary forms a verbal complex (Hinrichs & Nakazawa 1994; Pollard 1994; Müller 1999a, 2002a; Meurers 2000; Kathol 2000). The arguments of the embedded verb are taken over by the auxiliary. After combining the participle with the passive auxiliary, we arrive at the following SUBCAT lists:

- (42) a. *geschlafen wird* ‘slept is’: SUBCAT $\langle \rangle$
 b. *unterstützt wird* ‘supported is’: SUBCAT $\langle \text{NP}[\text{str}]_k \rangle$
 c. *geholfen wird*: ‘helped is’ SUBCAT $\langle \text{NP}[\text{ldat}]_k \rangle$
 d. *geschenkt wird*: ‘given is’ SUBCAT $\langle \text{NP}[\text{ldat}]_k, \text{NP}[\text{str}]_l \rangle$

(42) differs from (40) in that a different NP is in first position. If this NP has structural case, it will receive nominative case. If there is no NP with structural case, as in (42c), the case remains as it was, that is, lexically specified.

We cannot go into the analysis of the perfect here. It should be noted, however, that the same lexical item for the participle is used for (43).

- (43) a. Er hat den Weltmeister geschlagen.
 he has the world.champion beaten
 ‘He has beaten the world champion.’
 b. Der Weltmeister wurde geschlagen.
 the world.champion was beaten
 ‘The world champion was beaten.’

It is the auxiliary that determines which arguments are realized (Haider 1986a; Müller 2007b: Chapter 17). The lexical rule in (41) licenses a form that can be used both in passive and perfect. Therefore, the *VFORM* value is of *ppp*, which stands for *participle perfect passive*.

One should note that this analysis of the passive works without movement of constituents. The problems with the GB analysis do not arise here. Reordering of arguments (see Section 9.4) is independent of passivization. The accusative object is not mentioned at all unlike in GPSG, Categorical Grammar or Bresnan’s LFG analysis from before the introduction of Lexical Mapping Theory (see page 220). The passive can be analyzed directly as the suppression of the subject. Everything else follows from interaction with other principles of grammar.

9.3 Verb position

The analysis of verb position that I will present here is based on the GB-analysis. In HPSG, there are a number of different approaches to describe the verb position, however in my opinion, the HPSG variant of the GB analysis is the only adequate one (Müller 2005b,c, 2015b). The analysis of (44) can be summarized as follows: in the verb-initial clauses, there is a trace in verb-final position. There is a special form of the verb in initial position that selects a projection of the verb trace. This special lexical item is licensed by a lexical rule. The connection between the verb and the trace is treated like long-distance dependencies in GPSG via identification of information in the tree or feature structure (structure sharing).

- (44) Kennt_k jeder diesen Mann _{-k}?
 knows everyone this man
 ‘Does everyone know this man?’

Figure 9.8 on the following page gives an overview of this. The verb trace in final position behaves just like the verb both syntactically and semantically. The information about the missing word is represented as the value of the feature *DOUBLE SLASH* (abbreviated: *DSL*). This is a head feature and is therefore passed up to the maximal projection (VP). The verb in initial position has a VP in its *SUBCAT* list which is missing a verb (VP//V). This is the same verb that was the input for the lexical rule and that would normally occur in final position. In Figure 9.8, there are two maximal verb projections: *jeder diesen Mann _{-k}* with the trace as the head and *kennt jeder diesen Mann _{-k}* with *kennt* as the head.




图 9.8: Analysis of verb position in HPSG

This analysis will be explained in more detail in what follows. For the trace in Figure 9.8, one could assume the lexical entry in (45).

(45) Verb trace for *kennt* ‘knows’:

SYNSEM LOC	PHON	<>	
	CAT	HEAD	$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{verb} \\ \text{VFORM } \textit{fin} \end{array} \right]$
		SUBCAT	$\langle \text{NP}[\textit{nom}]_{[1]}, \text{NP}[\textit{acc}]_{[2]} \rangle$
	CONT	IND	[3]
		RELS	$\left\langle \begin{array}{l} \textit{kennen} \\ \text{EVENT} \quad [3] \\ \text{EXPERIENCER} \quad [1] \\ \text{THEME} \quad [2] \end{array} \right\rangle$

This lexical entry differs from the normal verb *kennt* only in its PHON value. The syntactic aspects of an analysis with this trace are represented in Figure 9.9 on the following page.

The combination of the trace with *diesen Mann* ‘this man’ and *jeder* ‘everybody’ follows the rules and principles that we have encountered thus far. This begs the immediate question as to what licenses the verb *kennt* in Figure 9.9 and what status it has.

If we want to capture the fact that the finite verb in initial position behaves like a complementizer (Höhle 1997), then it makes sense to give head status to *kennt* in Figure 9.9 and have *kennt* select a saturated, verb-final verbal projection. Finite verbs in initial position differ from complementizers in that they require a projection of a verb trace, whereas complementizers need projections of overt verbs:




图 9.9: Analysis of *Kennt jeder diesen Mann?* ‘Does everyone know this man?’

- (46) a. dass [jeder diesen Mann kennt]
 that everybody this man knows
 ‘that everybody knows this man’
 b. Kennt [jeder diesen Mann _]
 knows everybody this man
 ‘Does everybody know this man?’


It is normally not the case that *kennen* ‘know’ selects a complete sentence and nothing else as would be necessary for the analysis of *kennt* as the head in (46b). Furthermore, we must ensure that the verbal projection with which *kennt* is combined contains the verb trace belonging to *kennt*. If it could contain a trace belonging to *gibt* ‘gives’, for example, we would be able to analyze sentences such as (47b):

- (47) a. Gibt [der Mann der Frau das Buch _{–gibt}]?
 gives the man the woman the book
 ‘Does the man give the woman the book?’
 b. * Kennt [der Mann der Frau das Buch _{–gibt}]?
 knows the man the woman the book

In the preceding discussion, the dependency between the fronted verb and the verb trace was expressed by coindexation. In HPSG, identity is always enforced by structure sharing. The verb in initial position must therefore require that the trace has exactly those properties of the verb that the verb would have had, were it in final position. The information that must be shared is therefore all locally relevant syntactic and semantic information, that is, all information under *LOCAL*. Since *PHON* is not part of the *LOCAL* features, it is not shared and this is why the *PHON* values of the trace and verb can differ. Up to now, one crucial detail has been missing in the analysis: the *LOCAL* value of the trace cannot be directly structure-shared with a requirement of the initial verb since the verb *kennt* can only select the properties of the projection of the trace and the *SUBCAT* list

of the selected projection is the empty list. This leads us to the problem that was pointed out in the discussion of (47b). It must therefore be ensured that all information about the verb trace is available on the highest node of its projection. This can be achieved by introducing a head feature whose value is identical to the *LOCAL* value of the trace. This feature is referred to as *DSL*. As was already mentioned above, *DSL* stands for *double slash*. It is called so because it has a similar function to the *SLASH* feature, which we will encounter in the following section.¹⁶ (48) shows the modified entry for the verb trace:

(48) Verb trace of *kennt* (preliminary version):



Through sharing of the *LOCAL* value and the *DSL* value in (48), the syntactic and semantic information of the verb trace is present at its maximal projection, and the verb in initial position can check whether the projection of the trace is compatible.¹⁷

The special lexical item for verb-initial position is licensed by the following lexical rule:¹⁸

¹⁶ The feature *DSL* was proposed by Jacobson (1987a) in the framework of Categorical Grammar to describe head movement in English inversions. Borsley (1989) adopted this idea and translated it into HPSG terms, thereby showing how head movement in a HPSG variant of the CP/IP system can be modeled using *DSL*. The introduction of the *DSL* feature to describe head movement processes in HPSG is motivated by the fact that, unlike long-distance dependencies as will be discussed in Section 9.5, this kind of movement is local.

The suggestion to percolate information about the verb trace as part of the head information comes from Oliva (1992).

¹⁷ Note that the description in (48) is cyclic since the tag $\boxed{1}$ is used inside itself. See Section 6.5 on cyclic feature descriptions. This cyclic description is the most direct way to express that a linguistic object with certain local properties is missing and to pass this information on along the head path as the value of the *DSL* feature. This will be even clearer when we look at the final version of the verb trace in (50) on page 280.

¹⁸ The lexical rule analysis cannot explain sentences such as (i):

- (i) Karl kennt und liebt diese Schallplatte.
Karl knows and loves this record

This has to do with the fact that the lexical rule cannot be applied to the result of coordination, which constitutes a complex syntactic object. If we apply the lexical rule individually to each verb, then we arrive at variants of the verbs which would each select verb traces for *kennen* ‘to know’ and *lieben* ‘to love’. Since the *CAT* values of the conjuncts are identified with each other in coordinations, coordinations involving the V1 variants of *kennt* and *liebt* would be ruled out since the *DSL* values of the selected VPs contain the

(49) Lexical rule for verbs in initial position:

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} \text{SYNSEM|LOC } [1] \\ \text{CAT|HEAD} \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{verb} \\ \text{VFORM } \textit{fin} \\ \text{INITIAL } - \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \mapsto \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT} \\ \text{HEAD} \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{verb} \\ \text{VFORM } \textit{fin} \\ \text{INITIAL } + \\ \text{DSL } \textit{none} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{SUBCAT } \left\langle \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{LOC|CAT} \\ \text{HEAD} \left[\begin{array}{c} \text{verb} \\ \text{DSL } [1] \end{array} \right] \\ \text{SUBCAT } \langle \rangle \end{array} \right] \right\rangle \end{array} \right]$$

The verb licensed by this lexical rule selects a maximal projection of the verb trace which has the same local properties as the input verb. This is achieved by the coindexation of the LOCAL values of the input verb and the DSL values of the selected verb projection. Only finite verbs in final position (INITIAL−) can be the input for this rule. The output is a verb in initial-position (INITIAL+). The corresponding extended analysis is given in Figure 9.10. V1-LR stands for the verb-initial lexical rule.




图 9.10: Visualization of the analysis of *Kennt jeder diesen Mann?* ‘Does everyone know this man?’

meaning of the respective verbs and are hence not compatible (Müller 2005b: 13). Instead of a lexical rule, one must assume a unary syntactic rule that applies to the phrase *kennt und liebt* ‘knows and loves’. As we have seen, lexical rules in the HPSG formalization assumed here correspond to unary rules such that the difference between (49) and a corresponding syntactic rule is mostly a difference in representation.

The lexical rule in (49) licenses a verb that selects a VP ([1] in Figure 9.10). The DSL value of this VP corresponds to the LOCAL value of the verb that is the input of the lexical rule. Part of the DSL value is also the valence information represented in Figure 9.10 ([2]). Since DSL is a head feature, the DSL value of the VP is identical to that of the verb trace and since the LOCAL value of the verb trace is identified with the DSL value, the SUBCAT information of the verb *kennen* is also available at the trace. The combination of the trace with its arguments proceeds exactly as with an ordinary verb.

It would be unsatisfactory if we had to assume a special trace for every verb. Fortunately, this is not necessary as a general trace as in (50) will suffice for the analysis of sentences with verb movement.

(50) General verb trace following Meurers (2000: 206–208):

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{PHON } \langle \rangle \\ \text{SYNSEM|LOC } [1] \left[\text{CAT|HEAD|DSL } [1] \right] \end{array} \right]$$

This may seem surprising at first glance, but if we look closer at the interaction of the lexical rule (49) and the percolation of the DSL feature in the tree, then it becomes clear that the DSL value of the verb projection and therefore the LOCAL value of the verb trace is determined by the LOCAL value of the input verb. In Figure 9.10, *kennt* is the input for the verb movement lexical rule. The relevant structure sharing ensures that, in the analysis of (44), the LOCAL value of the verb trace corresponds exactly to what is given in (48).

The most important points of the analysis of verb position are summarized below:

- A lexical rule licenses a special lexical item for each finite verb.
- This lexical item occupies the initial position and requires as its argument a complete projection of a verb trace.
- The projection of the verb trace must have a DSL value corresponding to the LOCAL value of the input verb of the lexical rule.
- Since DSL is a head feature, the selected DSL value is also present on the trace.
- As the DSL value of the trace is identical to its LOCAL value, the LOCAL value of the trace is identical to the LOCAL value of the input verb in the lexical rule.

After discussing the analysis of verb-first sentences, we will now turn to local reordering.

9.4 Local reordering

There are several possibilities for the analysis of constituent order in the middle field: one can assume completely flat structures as in GPSG (Kasper 1994), or instead assume binary branching structures and allow for arguments to be saturated in any order. A compromise was proposed by Kathol (2001) and Müller (1999a, 2002a, 2004c):

binary branching structures with a special list that contains the arguments and adjuncts belonging to one head. The arguments and adjuncts are allowed to be freely ordered inside such lists. See Reape (1994) and Section 11.7.2.2 of this book for the formal details of these approaches. Both the completely flat analysis and the compromise have proved to be on the wrong track (see Müller 2005b, 2014c and Müller 2007b: Section 9.5.1) and therefore, I will only discuss the analysis with binary branching structures.

Figure 9.11 shows the analysis of (51a).

- (51) a. [weil] jeder diesen Mann kennt
 because everyone this man knows
 b. [weil] diesen Mann jeder kennt
 because this man everyone knows
 ‘because everyone knows this man’




图 9.11: Analysis of constituent order in HPSG: unmarked order

The arguments of the verb are combined with the verb starting with the last element of the SUBCAT list, as explained in Section 9.1.2. The analysis of the marked order is shown in Figure 9.12. Both trees differ only in the order in which the elements are taken off




图 9.12: Analysis of constituent order in HPSG: marked order

from the SUBCAT list: in Figure 9.11, the last element of the SUBCAT list is discharged first and in Figure 9.12 the first one is.

The following schema is a revised version of the Head-Argument Schema:

Schema 3 (Head-Argument Schema (binary branching))

head-argument-phrase \Rightarrow

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT|SUBCAT } [1] \oplus [3] \\ \text{HEAD-DTR|SYNSEM|LOC|CAT|SUBCAT } [1] \oplus \langle [2] \rangle \oplus [3] \\ \text{NON-HEAD-DTRS } \left\langle [\text{SYNSEM } [2]] \right\rangle \end{array} \right]$$

Whereas in the first version of the Head-Argument Schema it was always the last element from the SUBCAT list that was combined with the head, the SUBCAT list is divided into three parts using *append*: a list of arbitrary length ($[1]$), a list consisting of exactly one element ($\langle [2] \rangle$) and a further list of arbitrary length ($[3]$). The lists $[1]$ and $[3]$ are combined and the result is the SUBCAT value of the mother node.

Languages with fixed constituent order (such as English) differ from languages such as German in that they discharge the arguments starting from one side (for more on the subject in English, see Section 9.6.1), whereas languages with free constituent order can combine arguments with the verb in any order. In languages with fixed constituent order, either $[1]$ or $[3]$ is always the empty list. Since German structures are not restricted with regard to $[1]$ or $[3]$, that is $[1]$ and $[3]$ can either be the empty list or contain elements, the intuition is captured that there are less restrictions in languages with free constituent order than in languages with fixed order. We can compare this to the Kayneian analysis from Section 4.6.1, where it was assumed that all languages are derived from the base order [specifier [head complement]] (see Figure 4.20 on page 135 for Laenzlinger’s analysis of German as an SVO-language (Laenzlinger 2004)). In these kinds of analyses, languages such as English constitute the most basic case and languages with free ordering require some considerable theoretical effort to get the order right. In comparison to that, the analysis proposed here requires more theoretical restrictions if the language has more restrictions on permutations of its constituents. The complexity of the licensed structures does not differ considerably from language to language under an HPSG approach. Languages differ only in the type of branching they have.^{19, 20}

The analysis presented here utilizing the combination of arguments in any order is similar to that of Fanselow (2001) in the framework of GB/MP as well as the Categorical Grammar analyses of Hoffman (1995: Section 3.1) and Steedman & Baldrige (2006). Gunji proposed similar HPSG analyses for Japanese as early as 1986.

¹⁹ This does not exclude that the structures in question have different properties as far as their processability by humans is concerned. See Gibson (1998); Hawkins (1999) and Chapter 15.

²⁰ Haider (1997b: 18) has pointed out that the branching type of VX languages differs from those of XV languages in analyses of the kind that is proposed here. This affects the c-command relations and therefore has implications for Binding Theory in GB/MP. However, the direction of branching is irrelevant for HPSG analyses as Binding Principles are defined using o-command (Pollard & Sag 1994: Chapter 6) and o-command makes reference to the Obliqueness Hierarchy, that is, the order of elements in the SUBCAT list rather than the order in which these elements are combined with the head.

9.5 Long-distance dependencies

The analysis of long-distance dependencies utilizes techniques that were originally developed in GPSG: information about missing constituents is passed up the tree (or feature structure).²¹ There is a trace at the position where the fronted element would normally occur. Figure 9.13 shows the analysis of (52).

- (52) [Diesen Mann]_j kennt_i _{-j} jeder _{-i}.
 this man knows everyone
 ‘Everyone knows this man.’




图 9.13: Analysis of long-distance dependencies in HPSG

In principle, one could also assume that the object is extracted from its unmarked position (see Section 3.5 on the unmarked position). The extraction trace would then follow the subject:

- (53) [Diesen Mann]_j kennt_i jeder _{-j} _{-i}.
 this man knows everyone
 ‘Everyone knows this man.’

²¹ In HPSG, nothing is actually ‘passed up’ in a literal sense in feature structures or trees. This could be seen as one of the most important differences between deterministic (e.g., HPSG) and derivational theories like transformational grammars (see Section 15.1). Nevertheless, it makes sense for expository purposes to explain the analysis as if the structure were built bottom-up, but linguistic knowledge is independent of the direction of processing. In recent computer implementations, structure building is mostly carried out bottom-up but there were other systems which worked top-down. The only thing that is important in the analysis of nonlocal dependencies is that the information about the missing element on all intermediate nodes is identical to the information in the filler and the gap.

Fanselow (2004c) argues that certain phrases can be placed in the *Vorfeld* without having a special pragmatic function. For instance, (expletive) subjects in active sentences (54a), temporal adverbials (54b), sentence adverbials (54c), dative objects of psychological verbs (54d) and objects in passives (54e) can be placed in the *Vorfeld*, even though they are neither topic nor focus.

- (54) a. Es regnet.
it rains
'It rains.'
- b. Am Sonntag hat ein Eisbär einen Mann gefressen.
on Sunday has a polar.bear a man eaten
'On Sunday, a polar bear ate a man.'
- c. Vielleicht hat der Schauspieler seinen Text vergessen.
perhaps has the actor his text forgotten
'Perhaps, the actor has forgotton his text.'
- d. Einem Schauspieler ist der Text entfallen.
a.DAT actor is the.NOM text forgotten
'An actor forgot the text.'
- e. Einem Kind wurde das Fahrrad gestohlen.
a.DAT child was the.NOM bike stolen
'A bike was stolen from a child.'

Fanselow argues that information structural effects can be due to reordering in the *Mittelfeld*. So by ordering the accusative object as in (55), one can reach certain effects:

- (55) Kennt diesen Mann jeder?
knows this man everybody
'Does everybody know this man?'

If one assumes that there are frontings to the *Vorfeld* that do not have information structural constraints attached to them and that information structural constraints are associated with reorderings in the *Mittelfeld*, then the assumption that the initial element in the *Mittelfeld* is fronted explains why the examples in (54) are not information structurally marked. The elements in the *Vorfeld* are unmarked in the initial position in the *Mittelfeld* as well:

- (56) a. Regnet es?
rains it
'Does it rains?'
- b. Hat am Sonntag ein Eisbär einen Mann gefressen?
has on Sunday a polar.bear a man eaten
'Did a polar bear eat a man on Sunday?'

- c. Hat vielleicht der Schauspieler seinen Text vergessen?
has perhaps the actor his text forgotten
'Has the actor perhaps forgotten his text?'
- d. Ist einem Schauspieler der Text entfallen?
is a.DAT actor the.NOM text forgotten
'Did an actor forget the text?'
- e. Wurde einem Kind das Fahrrad gestohlen?
was a.DAT child the.NOM bike stolen
'Was a bike stolen from a child?'

So, I assume that the trace of a fronted argument that would not be Mittelfeld-initial in the unmarked order is combined with the head last, as described in Section 9.4. Of course, the same applies to all extracted arguments that would be Mittelfeld-initial in the unmarked order anyway: the traces are combined last with the head as for instance in (57):

- (57) [Jeder]_j kennt_i _{-j} diesen Mann _{-i}.
everybody knows this man
'Everyone knows this man.'

After this rough characterization of the basic idea, we now turn to the technical details: unlike verb movement, which was discussed in Section 9.3, constituent movement is nonlocal, which is why the two movement types are modeled with different features (SLASH vs. DSL). DSL is a head feature and, like all other head features, projects to the highest node of a projection (for more on the Head Feature Principle, see page 261). SLASH, on the other hand, is a feature that belongs to the NONLOC features represented under SYNSEM|NONLOC. The value of the NONLOC feature is a structure with the features INHERITED (or INHER for short) and TO-BIND. The value of INHER is a structure containing information about elements involved in a long-distance dependency. (58) gives the structure assumed by Pollard & Sag (1994: 163):²²

- (58)
$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{nonloc} \\ \text{QUE} \quad \text{list of } n\text{pros} \\ \text{REL} \quad \text{list of indices} \\ \text{SLASH} \quad \text{list of local structures} \end{array} \right]$$

QUE is important for the analysis of interrogative clauses as is REL for the analysis of relative clauses. Since these will not feature in this book, they will be omitted in what follows. The value of SLASH is a list of *local* objects.


As with the analysis of verb movement, it is assumed that there is a trace in the position where the accusative object would normally occur and that this trace shares the properties of that object. The verb can therefore satisfy its valence requirements

²² Pollard & Sag assume that the values of QUE, REL, and SLASH are sets rather than lists. The math behind sets is rather complicated, which is why I assume lists here.

locally. Information about whether there has been combination with a trace and not with a genuine argument is represented inside the complex sign and passed upward in the tree. The long-distance dependency can then be resolved by an element in the prefield higher in the tree.

Long-distance dependencies are introduced by the trace, which has a feature corresponding to the *LOCAL* value of the required argument in its *SLASH* list. (59) shows the description of the trace as is required for the analysis of (52):

(59) Trace of the accusative object of *kennen* (preliminary):



Since traces do not have internal structure (no daughters), they are of type *word*. The trace has the same properties as the accusative object. The fact that the accusative object is not present at the position occupied by the trace is represented by the value of *SLASH*.

The following principle is responsible for ensuring that *NONLOC* information is passed up the tree.

Principle 3 (Nonlocal Feature Principle)

In a headed phrase, for each nonlocal feature, the INHERITED value of the mother is a list that is the concatenation of the INHERITED values of the daughters minus the elements in the TO-BIND list of the head daughter.

The Head-Filler Schema (Schema 4) licenses the highest node in Figure 9.14 on the following page. The schema combines a finite, verb-initial clause (*INITIAL+*) that has an element in *SLASH* with a non-head daughter whose *LOCAL* value is identical to the *SLASH* element. In this structure, no arguments are saturated. Nothing can be extracted from the filler daughter itself, which is ensured by the specification of the *SLASH* value of the non-head daughter. Figure 9.14 shows a more detailed variant of the analysis of fronting to the prefield. The verb movement trace for *kennt* ‘knows’ is combined with a nominative NP and an extraction trace. The extraction trace stands for the accusative object in our example. The accusative object is described in the *SUBCAT* list of the verb ([4]). Following the mechanism for verb movement, the valence information that was originally contained in the entry for *kennt* ($\langle [3], [4] \rangle$) is present on the verb trace. The combination of the projection of the verb trace with the extraction trace works in exactly the same way as for non-fronted arguments. The *SLASH* value of the extraction trace is passed up the tree and bound off by the Head-Filler Schema.

Schema 4 (Head-Filler Schema)

head-fillerphrase \Rightarrow

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD-DTR|SYNSEM} \\ \text{NON-HEAD-DTRS} \left\langle \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{SYNSEM} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{LOC } \boxed{1} \\ \text{NONLOC|INHER|SLASH } \langle \rangle \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \right\rangle \end{array} \right. \left. \begin{array}{l} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{LOC|CAT} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{verb} \\ \text{VFORM } fin \\ \text{INITIAL } + \end{array} \right] \\ \text{SUBCAT } \langle \rangle \end{array} \right] \\ \text{NONLOC} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{INHER|SLASH } \langle \boxed{1} \rangle \\ \text{TO-BIND|SLASH } \langle \boxed{1} \rangle \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \right]$$




图 9.14: Analysis of *Diesen Mann kennt jeder*. ‘Everyone knows this man.’ combined with the verb movement analysis for verb-initial order

(59) provides the lexical entry for a trace that can function as the accusative object of *kennen* ‘to know’. As with the analysis of verb movement, it is not necessary to have numerous extraction traces with differing properties listed in the lexicon. A more general entry such as the one in (60) will suffice:

(60) Extraction trace:

$$\left[\begin{array}{cc} \text{word} & \\ \text{PHON} & \langle \rangle \\ \text{SYNSEM} & \left[\begin{array}{cc} \text{LOC} & \boxed{1} \\ \text{NONLOC} & \left[\begin{array}{cc} \text{INHER|SLASH} & \langle \boxed{1} \rangle \\ \text{TO-BIND|SLASH} & \langle \rangle \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

This has to do with the fact that the head can satisfactorily determine the *LOCAL* properties of its arguments and therefore also the local properties of the traces that it combines with. The identification of the object in the *SUBCAT* list of the head with the *SYNSEM* value of the trace coupled with the identification of the information in *SLASH* with information about the fronted element serves to ensure that the only elements that can be realized in the prefield are those that fit the description in the *SUBCAT* list of the head. The same holds for fronted adjuncts: since the *LOCAL* value of the constituent in the prefield is identified with the *LOCAL* value of the trace via the *SLASH* feature, there is then sufficient information available about the properties of the trace.

The central points of the preceding analysis can be summarized as follows: information about the local properties of a trace is contained in the trace itself and then present on all nodes dominating it until one reaches the filler. This analysis can offer an explanation for so-called extraction path marking languages where certain elements show inflection depending on whether they are combined with a constituent out of which something has been extracted in a long-distance dependency. Bouma, Malouf & Sag (2001a) cite Irish, Chamorro, Palauan, Icelandic, Kikuyu, Ewe, Thompson Salish, Moore, French, Spanish, and Yiddish as examples of such languages and provide corresponding references. Since information is passed on step-by-step in HPSG analyses, all nodes intervening in a long-distance dependency can access the elements in that dependency.

9.6 New developments and theoretical variants

This section discusses refinements of the representation of valence information in Subsection 9.6.1 and briefly mentions an important variant of HPSG, namely Linearization-based HPSG in Subsection 9.6.2.

9.6.1 Specifier, complements and argument structure

In this chapter, *SUBCAT* was assumed as the only valence feature. This corresponds to the state of theory in Pollard & Sag (1994: Chapter 1–8). It has turned out to be desirable

to assume at least one additional valence feature and a corresponding schema for the combination of constituents. This additional feature is called SPECIFIER (SPR) and is used in grammars of English (Pollard & Sag 1994: Chapter 9) and German (Müller 2007b: Section 9.3) for the combination of a determiner with a noun. It is assumed that the noun selects its determiner. For the noun *Zerstörung* ‘destruction’, we have the following CAT value:

$$(61) \left[\begin{array}{ll} \text{HEAD} & \left[\begin{array}{l} \textit{noun} \\ \text{INITIAL } + \end{array} \right] \\ \text{SPR} & \langle \text{DET} \rangle \\ \text{SUBCAT} & \langle \text{NP}[\text{GEN}], \text{PP}[\textit{durch}] \rangle \end{array} \right]$$

Schema 5 can be used just like the Head-Argument Schema for the combination of noun and determiner.

Schema 5 (Specifier-Head Schema)

$$\text{head-specifier-phrase} \Rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT|SPR } [1] \\ \text{HEAD-DTR|SYNSEM|LOC|CAT } \left[\begin{array}{ll} \text{SPR} & [1] \oplus \langle [2] \rangle \\ \text{SUBCAT} & \langle \rangle \end{array} \right] \\ \text{NON-HEAD-DTRS } \langle [\text{SYNSEM } [2]] \rangle \end{array} \right]$$

The analysis of the NP in (62) with the Specifier Schema is shown in Figure 9.15 on the following page.

- (62) die Zerstörung der Stadt durch die Soldaten
the destruction of.the city by the soldiers

Following the linearization rules discussed in Section 9.1.3, it is ensured that the noun occurs before the complements as the INITIAL value of the noun is ‘+’. The LP-rule in (63) leads to the determiner being ordered to the left of the noun.

- (63) specifier < head

In grammars of English, the SPR feature is also used for the selection of the subject of verbs (Sag, Wasow & Bender 2003: Section 4.3). In a sentence such as (64), the verb is first combined with all its complements (the elements in the SUBCAT or COMPS in newer works) and is then combined with the subject in a second step by applying Schema 5.

- (64) Max likes ice cream.

As we have seen in Section 9.4, it makes sense to represent subjects and arguments in the same valence list for the analysis of finite sentences. In this way, the fact can be captured that the order in which a verb is combined with its arguments is not fixed. While the different orders could also be captured by assuming that the subject is selected via





图 9.15: NP analysis with valence features SPR

SPR, the fact that scrambling is a phenomenon that affects all arguments in the same way would not be covered in a SPR-based analysis. Furthermore, the extraction out of subjects is impossible in languages like English, but it is possible in German (for references and attested examples see p. 526). This difference can be captured by assuming that subjects are selected via SPR in English and that extraction out of elements in the SPR list is prohibited. Since subjects in German are represented on the COMPS list, the fact that they pattern with the objects in terms of possible extractions is captured.

A further expansion from Pollard & Sag (1994: Chapter 9) is the introduction of an additional list that is called ARG-ST in newer works. ARG-ST stands for Argument Structure. The ARG-ST list corresponds to what we encountered as SUBCAT list in this chapter. It contains the arguments of a head in an order corresponding to the Obliqueness Hierarchy. The elements of the list are linked to argument roles in the semantic content of the head (see Section 9.1.6). Binding Theory operates on the ARG-ST list. This level of representation is probably the same for most languages: in every language there are semantic predicates and semantic arguments. Most languages make use of syntactic categories that play a role in selection, so there is both syntactic and semantic selection.²³ Languages differ with regard to how these arguments are realized. In English, the first element in the valence list is mapped to the SPR list and the remaining arguments to the SUBCAT (or COMPS list in more recent work). In German, the SPR list of verbs remains empty. (65) shows some relevant examples for German and English.

²³ Koenig & Michelson (2012) argue for an analysis of Oneida (a Northern Iroquoian language) that does not include a representation of syntactic valence. If this analysis is correct, syntactic argument structure would not be universal, but would be characteristic for a large number of languages.



One can view the ARG-ST list as the equivalent to Deep Structure in GB theory: semantic roles are assigned with reference to this list. The difference is that there is no ordered tree that undergoes transformations. The question of whether all languages can be derived from either VO or OV order therefore becomes irrelevant.

9.6.2 Linearization-based HPSG

The schemata that were presented in this chapter combine adjacent constituents. The assumption of adjacency can be dropped and discontinuous constituents maybe permitted. Variants of HPSG that allow for discontinuous constituents are usually referred to as *Linearization-based HPSG*. The first formalization was developed by Mike Reape (1991, 1992, 1994). Proponents of linearization approaches are for instance Kathol (1995, 2000); Donohue & Sag (1999); Richter & Sailer (1999b); Crysmann (2008); Beavers & Sag (2004); Sato (2006); Wetta (2011). I also suggested linearization-based analyses (Müller 1999a, 2002a) and implemented a large-scale grammar fragment based on Reape's ideas (Müller 1996c). Linearization-based approaches to the German sentence structure are similar to the GPSG approach in that it is assumed that verb and arguments and adjuncts

are members of the same linearization domain and hence may be realized in any order. For instance, the verb may precede arguments and adjuncts or follow them. Hence, no empty element for the verb in final position is necessary. While this allows for grammars without empty elements for the analysis of the verb position, it is unclear how examples with apparent multiple frontings can be accounted for, while such data can be captured directly in the proposal suggested in this chapter. The whole issue is discussed in more detail in Müller (2015b). I will not explain Reape's formalization here, but defer its discussion until Section 11.7.2.2, where the discontinuous, non-projective structures of some Dependency Grammars are compared to linearization-based HPSG approaches. Apparent multiple frontings and the problems they pose for simple linearization-based approaches are discussed in Section 11.7.1.

9.7 Summary and classification

In HPSG, feature descriptions are used to model all properties of linguistic objects: roots, words, lexical rules and dominance schemata are all described using the same formal tools. Unlike GPSG and LFG, there are no separate phrase structure rules. Thus, although HPSG stands for Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, it is not a phrase structure grammar. In HPSG implementations, a phrase structure backbone is often used to increase the efficiency of processing. However, this is not part of the theory and linguistically not necessary.

HPSG differs from Categorical Grammar in that it assumes considerably more features and also in that the way in which features are grouped plays an important role for the theory.

Long-distance dependencies are not analyzed using function composition as in Categorical Grammar, but instead as in GPSG by appealing to the percolation of information in the tree. In this way, it is possible to analyze pied-piping constructions such as those discussed in Section 8.6 with just one lexical item per relative pronoun, whose relevant local properties are identical to those of the demonstrative pronoun. The relative clause in (66) would be analyzed as a finite clause from which a PP has been extracted:

- (66) der Mann, [_{RS} [_{PP} an den] [_{S/PP} wir gedacht haben]]
 the man on who we thought have
 ‘the man we thought of’

For relative clauses, it is required that the first daughter contains a relative pronoun. This can, as shown in the English examples on page 245, be in fact very deeply embedded. Information about the fact that *an den* ‘of whom’ contains a relative pronoun is provided in the lexical entry for the relative pronoun *den* by specifying the value of NONLOC|INHER|REL. The Nonlocal Feature Principle passes this information on upwards so that the information about the relative pronoun is contained in the representation of the phrase *an den*. This information is bound off when the relative clause is put together (Pollard & Sag 1994: Chapter 5; Sag 1997). It is possible to use the same lexical entry for

den in the analyses of both (66) and (67) as – unlike in Categorical Grammar – the relative pronoun does not have to know anything about the contexts in which it can be used.

- (67) der Mann, [_{RS} [_{NP} den] [_{S/NP} wir kennen]]
 the man that we know
 ‘the man that we know’

Any theory that wants to maintain the analysis sketched here will have to have some mechanism to make information available about the relative pronoun in a complex phrase. If we have such a mechanism in our theory – as is the case in LFG and HPSG – then we can also use it for the analysis of long-distance dependencies. Theories such as LFG and HPSG are therefore more parsimonious with their descriptive tools than other theories when it comes to the analysis of relative phrases.

In the first decade of HPSG history (Pollard & Sag 1987, 1994; Nerbonne, Netter & Pollard 1994a), despite the differences already mentioned here, HPSG was still very similar to Categorical Grammar in that it was a strongly lexicalized theory. The syntactic make-up and semantic content of a phrase was determined by the head (hence the term *head-driven*). In cases where head-driven analyses were not straight-forwardly possible, because no head could be identified in the phrase in question, then it was commonplace to assume empty heads. An example of this is the analysis of relative clauses in Pollard & Sag (1994: Chapter 5). Since an empty head can be assigned any syntactic valence and an arbitrary semantics (for discussion of this point, see Chapter 19), one has not really explained anything as one needs very good reasons for assuming an empty head, for example that this empty position can be realized in other contexts. This is, however, not the case for empty heads that are only proposed in order to save theoretical assumptions. Therefore, Sag (1997) developed an analysis of relative clauses without any empty elements. As in the analyses sketched for (66) and (67), the relative phrases are combined directly with the partial clause in order to form the relative clause. For the various observable types of relative clauses in English, Sag proposes different dominance rules. His analysis constitutes a departure from strong lexicalism: in Pollard & Sag (1994), there are six dominance schemata, whereas there are 23 in Ginzburg & Sag (2000).

The tendency to a differentiation of phrasal schemata can also be observed in the proceedings of recent conferences. The proposals range from the elimination of empty elements to radically phrasal analyses (Haugereid 2007, 2009).²⁴

Even if this tendency towards phrasal analyses may result in some problematic analyses, it is indeed the case that there are areas of grammar where phrasal analyses are required (see Section 21.10). For HPSG, this means that it is no longer entirely head-driven and is therefore neither Head-Driven nor Phrase Structure Grammar.

HPSG makes use of typed feature descriptions to describe linguistic objects. Generalizations can be expressed by means of hierarchies with multiple inheritance. Inheritance also plays an important role in Construction Grammar. In theories such as GPSG, Categorical Grammar and TAG, it does not form part of theoretical explanations. In implementations, macros (abbreviations) are often used for co-occurring feature-value pairs

²⁴ For discussion, see Müller (2007c) and Section 21.3.6.

(Dalrymple, Kaplan & King 2004). Depending on the architecture assumed, such macros are not suitable for the description of phrases since, in theories such as GPSG and LFG, phrase structure rules are represented differently from other feature-value pairs (however, see Asudeh, Dalrymple & Toivonen (2008, 2013) for macros and inheritance used for c-structure annotations). Furthermore, there are further differences between types and macros, which are of a more formal nature: in a typed system, it is possible under certain conditions to infer the type of a particular structure from the presence of certain features and of certain values. With macros, this is not the case as they are only abbreviations. The consequences for linguistic analyses made by this differences are, however, minimal.

HPSG differs from GB theory and later variants in that it does not assume transformations. In the 80s, representational variants of GB were proposed, that is, it was assumed that there was no D-structure from which an S-structure is created by simultaneous marking of the original position of moved elements. Instead, one assumed the S-structure with traces straight away and the assumption that there were further movements in the mapping of S-structure to Logical Form was also abandoned (Koster 1978; Haider 1993: Section 1.4; Frey 1993: 14). This view corresponds to the view in HPSG and many of the analyses in one framework can be translated into the other.

In GB theory, the terms subject and object do not play a direct role: one can use these terms descriptively, but subjects and objects are not marked by features or similar devices. Nevertheless it is possible to make the distinction since subjects and objects are usually realized in different positions in the trees (the subject in specifier position of IP and the object as the complement of the verb). In HPSG, subject and object are also not primitives of the theory. Since valence lists (or ARG-ST lists) are ordered, however, this means that it is possible to associate the ARG-ST elements to grammatical functions: if there is a subject, this occurs in the first position of the valence list and objects follow.²⁵ For the analysis of (68b) in a transformation-based grammar, the aim is to connect the base order in (68a) and the derived order in (68b). Once one has recreated the base order, then it is clear what is the subject and what is the object. Therefore, transformations applied to the base structure in (68a) have to be reversed.

- (68) a. [weil] jeder diesen Mann kennt
 because everyone this man knows
 ‘because everyone knows this man’
 b. [weil] diesen Mann jeder kennt
 because this man everyone knows

In HPSG and also in other transformation-less models, the aim is to assign arguments in the order in (68b) to descriptions in the valence list. The valence list (or ARG-ST in newer approaches) corresponds in a sense to Deep Structure in GB. The difference is that the

²⁵ When forming complex predicates, an object can occur in first position. See Müller (2002a: 157) for the long passive with verbs such as *erlauben* ‘allow’. In general, the following holds: the subject is the first argument with structural case.

head itself is not included in the argument structure, whereas this is the case with D-structure.

Bender (2008c) has shown how one can analyze phenomena from non-configurational languages such as Wambaya by referring to the argument structure of a head. In Wambaya, words that would normally be counted as constituents in English or German can occur discontinuously, that is an adjective that semantically belongs to a noun phrase and shares the same case, number and gender values with other parts of the noun phrase can occur in a position in the sentence that is not adjacent to the remaining noun phrase. Nordlinger (1998) has analyzed the relevant data in LFG. In her analysis, the various parts of the constituent refer to the f-structure of the sentence and thus indirectly ensure that all parts of the noun phrase have the same case. Bender adopts a variant of HPSG where valence information is not removed from the valence list after an argument has been combined with its head, but rather this information remains in the valence list and is passed up towards the maximal projection of the head (Meurers 1999c; Przepiórkowski 1999b; Müller 2007b: Section 17.4). Similar proposals were made in GB by Higginbotham (1985: 560) and Winkler (1997). By projecting the complete valence information, it remains accessible in the entire sentence and discontinuous constituents can refer to it (e.g., via MOD) and the respective constraints can be formulated.²⁶ In this analysis, the argument structure in HPSG corresponds to f-structure in LFG. The extended head domains of LFG, where multiple heads can share the same f-structure, can also be modeled in HPSG. To this end, one can utilize function composition as it was presented in the chapter on Categorical Grammar (see Chapter 8.5.2). The exact way in which this is translated into HPSG cannot be explained here due to space restrictions. The reader is referred to the original works by Hinrichs & Nakazawa (1994) and the explanation in Müller (2007b: Chapter 15).

Valence information plays an important role in HPSG. The lexical item of a verb in principle predetermines the set of structures in which the item can occur. Using lexical rules, it is possible to relate one lexical item to other lexical items. These can be used in other sets of structures. So one can see the functionality of lexical rules in establishing a relation between sets of possible structures. Lexical rules correspond to transformations in Transformational Grammar. This point is discussed in more detail in Section 19.5. The effect of lexical rules can also be achieved with empty elements. This will also be the matter of discussion in Section 19.5.

In GPSG, metarules were used to license rules that created additional valence patterns for lexical heads. In principle, metarules could also be applied to rules without a lexical head. This is explicitly ruled out by Flickinger (1983) and Gazdar et al. (1985: 59) using a special constraint. Flickinger, Pollard & Wasow (1985: 265) pointed out that this kind of constraint is unnecessary if one uses lexical rules rather than metarules since the former can only be applied to lexical heads.

For a comparison of HPSG and Stabler's Minimalist Grammars, see Section 4.6.4.

²⁶ See also Müller (2008a) for an analysis of depictive predicates in German and English that makes reference to the list of realized or unrealized arguments of a head, respectively. This analysis is also explained in Section 18.2.

Comprehension questions

1. What status do syntactic trees have in HPSG?
2. How does case assignment take place in the analysis of example (69)?

(69) Dem Mann wurde ein Buch geschenkt.
the.DAT man was a.NOM book given
'The man was given a book.'

3. What is *linking* and how is it accounted for in HPSG?

Exercises

1. Give a feature description for (70) ignoring *dass*.

(70) [dass] Max lacht
that Max laughs

2. The analysis of the combination of a noun with a modifying adjective in Section 9.1.7 was just a sketch of an analysis. It is, for example, not explained how one can ensure that the adjective and noun agree in case. Consider how it would be possible to expand such an analysis so that the adjective-noun combination in (71a) can be analyzed, but not the one in (71b):

- (71) a. eines interessanten Mannes
an.GEN interesting.GEN man.GEN
b. *eines interessanter Mannes
an.GEN interesting.NOM man.GEN

Further reading

Here, the presentation of the individual parts of the theory was – as with other theories – kept relatively short. For a more comprehensive introduction to HPSG, including motivation of the feature geometry, see Müller (2007b). In particular, the analysis of the passive was sketched in brief here. The entire story including the analysis of unaccusative verbs, adjectival participles, modal infinitives as well as diverse passive variants and the long passive can be found in Müller (2002a: Chapter 3) and Müller (2007b: Chapter 17).

Overviews of HPSG can be found in Levine & Meurers (2006), Przepiórkowski & Kupść (2006), Bildhauer (2014) and Müller (2015c).

第十章 Construction Grammar

Like LFG and HPSG, *Construction Grammar* (CxG) forms part of West Coast linguistics. It has been influenced considerably by Charles Fillmore, Paul Kay and George Lakoff (all three at Berkeley) and Adele Goldberg (who completed her PhD in Berkeley and is now in Princeton) (Fillmore 1988; Fillmore, Kay & O'Connor 1988; Kay & Fillmore 1999; Kay 2002, 2005; Goldberg 1995, 2006).

Fillmore, Kay, Jackendoff and others have pointed out the fact that, to a large extent, languages consist of complex units that cannot straightforwardly be described with the tools that we have seen thus far. In frameworks such as GB, an explicit distinction is made between core grammar and the periphery (Chomsky 1981a: 8), whereby the periphery is mostly disregarded as uninteresting when formulating a theory of Universal Grammar. The criticism leveled at such practices by CxG is justified since what counts as the 'periphery' sometimes seems completely arbitrary (Müller 2014d) and no progress is made by excluding large parts of the language from the theory just because they are irregular to a certain extent.

In Construction Grammar, idiomatic expressions are often discussed with regard to their interaction with regular areas of grammar. Kay & Fillmore (1999) studied the *What's X doing Y?*-construction in their classic essay. (1) contains some examples of this construction:

- (1) a. What is this scratch doing on the table?
- b. What do you think your name is doing in my book?

The examples show that we are clearly not dealing with the normal meaning of the verb *do*. As well as the semantic bleaching here, there are particular morphosyntactic properties that have to be satisfied in this construction. The verb *do* must always be present and also in the form of the present participle. Kay and Fillmore develop an analysis explaining this construction and also capturing some of the similarities between the WXDY-construction and the rest of the grammar.

There are a number of variants of Construction Grammar:

- Berkeley Construction Grammar (Fillmore 1988; Kay & Fillmore 1999; Fried 2015)
- Goldbergian/Lakovian Construction Grammar (Lakoff 1987; Goldberg 1995, 2006)
- Cognitive Grammar (Langacker 1987, 2000, 2008; Dąbrowska 2004)

- Radical Construction Grammar (Croft 2001)
- Embodied Construction Grammar (Bergen & Chang 2005)
- Fluid Construction Grammar (Steels & De Beule 2006; Steels 2011a)
- Sign-Based Construction Grammar (Sag 2010, 2012)

The aim of Construction Grammar is to both describe and theoretically explore language in its entirety. In practice, however, irregularities in language are often given far more importance than the phenomena described as ‘core grammar’ in GB. Construction Grammar analyses usually analyze phenomena as phrasal patterns. These phrasal patterns are represented in inheritance hierarchies (e.g., Croft 2001; Goldberg 2003b). An example for the assumption of a phrasal construction is Goldberg’s analysis of resultative constructions. Goldberg (1995) and Goldberg & Jackendoff (2004) argue for the construction status of resultatives. In their view, there is no head in (2) that determines the number of arguments.

(2) Willy watered the plants flat.

The number of arguments is determined by the construction instead, that is, by a rule or schema saying that the subject, verb, object and a predicative element must occur together and that the entire complex has a particular meaning. This view is fundamentally different from analyses in GB, Categorical Grammar, LFG¹ and HPSG. In the aforementioned theories, it is commonly assumed that arguments are always selected by lexical heads and not independently licensed by phrasal rules. See Simpson (1983), Neeleman (1994), Wunderlich (1997), Wechsler (1997), and Müller (2002a) for corresponding work in LFG, GB, Wunderlich’s Lexical Decomposition Grammar and HPSG.

Like the theories discussed in Chapters 5–9, CxG is also a non-transformational theory. Furthermore, no empty elements are assumed in most variants of the theory and the assumption of lexical integrity is maintained as in LFG and HPSG. It can be shown that these assumptions are incompatible with phrasal analyses of resultative constructions (see Section 21.2.2 and Müller 2006, 2007c). This point will not be explained further here. Instead, I will discuss the work of Fillmore and Kay to prepare the reader to be able to read the original articles and subsequent publications. Although the literature on Construction Grammar is now relatively vast, there is very little work on the basic formal assumptions or analyses that have been formalized precisely. Examples of more formal works are Kay & Fillmore (1999), Kay (2002), Michaelis & Ruppenhofer (2001), and Goldberg (2003b). Another formal proposal was developed by Jean-Pierre Koenig (1999) (formerly Berkeley). This work is coached in the framework of HPSG, but it has been heavily influenced by CxG. Fillmore and Kay’s revisions of their earlier work took place in close collaboration with Ivan Sag. The result was a variant of HPSG known as Sign-Based Construction Grammar (SBCG) (Sag 2010, 2012). See Section 10.6.2 for further discussion.


¹ See Alsina (1996) and Asudeh, Dalrymple & Toivonen (2008, 2013), however. For more discussion of this point, see Sections 21.1.3 and 21.2.2.

John Bryant, Nancy Chang, Eva Mok have developed a system for the implementation of Embodied Construction Grammar². Luc Steels is working on the simulation of language evolution and language acquisition (Steels 2003). Steels works experimentally modeling virtual communities of interacting agents. Apart from this he uses robots that interact in language games (Steels 2015). In personal communication (p.c. 2007) Steels stated that it is a long way to go until robots finally will be able to learn to speak but the current state of the art is already impressive. Steels can use robots that have a visual system (camera and image processing) and use visual information paired with audio information in simulations of language acquisition. The implementation of Fluid Construction Grammar is documented in Steels (2011a) and Steels (2012). The second book contains parts about German, in which the implementation of German declarative clauses and *w* interrogative clauses is explained with respect to topological fields (Micelli 2012). The FCG system, various publications and example analyses are available at: <http://www.fcg-net.org/>. Jurafsky (1996) developed a Construction Grammar for English that was paired with a probabilistic component. He showed that many performance phenomena discussed in the literature (see Chapter 15 on the Competence/Performance Distinction) can be explained with recourse to probabilities of phrasal constructions and valence properties of words. Bannard, Lieven & Tomasello (2009) use a probabilistic context-free grammar to model grammatical knowledge of two and three year old children.

10.1 General remarks on the representational format

In this section, I will discuss the mechanisms of Berkeley Construction Grammar (BCG). As I pointed out in Müller (2006), there are fundamental problems with the formalization of BCG. The details will be given in Section 10.6.1. While the framework was developed further into Sign-Based Construction Grammar (see Section 10.6.2) by its creators Kay and Fillmore, there are still authors working in the original framework (for instance Fried 2013). I will therefore present the basic mechanisms here to make it possible to understand the original ideas and put them into a broader context.

As we saw in Section 9.1.2, dominance relations in HPSG are modeled like other properties of linguistic objects using feature-value pairs. In general, CxG uses feature-value pairs to describe linguistic objects, but dominance relations are represented by boxes (Kay & Fillmore 1999; Goldberg 2003b):



The structure can be written using feature-value pairs as follows:

(4)


$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{PHON} \langle \text{the man} \rangle \\ \text{DTRS} \langle [\text{PHON} \langle \text{the} \rangle], [\text{PHON} \langle \text{man} \rangle] \rangle \end{array} \right]$$

² See <http://www.icsi.berkeley.edu/~jbryant/old-analyzer.html> and Bryant (2003).

10.1.1 The head-complement construction

Kay & Fillmore (1999) assume the following construction for the combination of heads with their complements:


(5) Head plus Complements Construction (HC)



A head is combined with at least one complement (the '+' following the box stands for at least one sign that fits the description in that box). LOC+ means that this element must be realized locally. The value of ROLE tells us something about the role that a particular element plays in a construction. Unfortunately, here the term *filler* is used somewhat differently than in GPSG and HPSG. Fillers are not necessarily elements that stand in a long-distance dependency to a gap. Instead, a *filler* is a term for a constituent that fills the argument slot of a head.

The verb phrase construction is a sub-construction of the head-complement construction:


(6) Verb phrase Construction:



The syntactic category of the entire construction is V. Its complements cannot have the grammatical function subject.

The VP construction is a particular type of head-complement construction. The fact that it has much in common with the more general head-complement construction is represented as follows:

(7) Verb phrase Construction with inheritance statement:



This representation differs from the one in HPSG, aside from the box notation, only in the fact that feature descriptions are not typed and as such it must be explicitly stated in the representation from which superordinate construction inheritance takes place. HPSG – in addition to the schemata – has separate type hierarchies specifying the inheritance relation between types.

10.1.2 Representation of valence information

In Kay and Fillmore, valence information is represented in a set (VAL). The Valence Principle states that local filler-daughters have to be identified with an element in the valence set of the mother.³ The Subset Principle states that the set values of the head-daughter are subsets of the corresponding sets of the mother. This is the exact opposite approach to the one taken in Categorical Grammar and HPSG. In HPSG grammars, valence lists at the mother nodes are shorter, whereas in Berkeley CxG at least as many elements are present on the mother node as on the head-daughter.

10.1.3 Semantics

Semantics in CxG is handled exactly the same way as in HPSG: semantic information is contained in the same feature structure as syntactic information. The relation between syntax and semantics is captured by using the same variable in the syntactic and semantic description. (8) contains a feature description for the verb *arrive*:

(8) Lexical entry for *arrive* following Kay & Fillmore (1999: 11):

cat	v
sem	$\left\{ \left[\begin{array}{cc} \text{FRAME} & \text{ARRIVE} \\ \text{ARGS} & \{ A \} \end{array} \right] \right\}$
val	$\{ [\text{SEM } \{ A \}] \}$

Kay & Fillmore (1999: 9) refer to their semantic representations as a notational variant of the Minimal Recursion Semantics of Copestake, Flickinger, Pollard & Sag (2005). In later works, Kay (2005) explicitly uses MRS. As the fundamentals of MRS have already been discussed in Section 9.1.6, I will not repeat them here. For more on MRS, see Section 19.3.

10.1.4 Adjuncts

For the combination of heads and modifiers, Kay and Fillmore assume further phrasal constructions that are similar to the verb phrase constructions discussed above and create a relation between a head and a modifier. Kay and Fillmore assume that adjuncts also contribute something to the VAL value of the mother node. In principle, VAL is nothing more than the set of all non-head daughters in a tree.

10.2 Passive

The passive has been described in CxG by means of so-called linking constructions, which are combined with lexical entries in inheritance hierarchies. In the base lexicon, it is only listed which semantic roles a verb fulfils and the way in which these are realized is determined by the respective linking constructions with which the basic lexical entry is combined. Figure 10.1 on the next page gives an example of a relevant inheritance hierarchy. There is a linking construction for both active and passive as well as lexical

³ Sets in BCG work differently from those used in HPSG. A discussion of this is deferred to Section 10.6.1.




图 10.1: Passive and linking constructions

entries for *read* and *eat*. There is then a cross-classification resulting in an active and a passive variant of each verb.

The idea behind this analysis goes back to work by Fillmore and Kay between 1995 and 1997⁴, but variants of this analysis were first published in Koenig (1999: Chapter 3) and Michaelis & Ruppenhofer (2001: Chapter 4). Parallel proposals have been made in TAG (Candito 1996; Clément & Kinyon 2003: 188; Kallmeyer & Osswald 2012: 171–172) and HPSG (Koenig 1999; Davis & Koenig 2000; Kordoni 2001).

Michaelis & Ruppenhofer (2001: 55–57) provide the following linking constructions:⁵

- (9) a. *Transitive Construction:*

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{SYN} \left[\begin{array}{ll} \text{CAT} & v \\ \text{VOICE} & \text{active} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{VAL} \left\{ \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{ROLE} \left[\begin{array}{ll} \text{GF} & \text{obj} \\ \text{DA} & - \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \right\} \end{array} \right]$$

- b. *the Subject Construction:*

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{SYN} \left[\begin{array}{ll} \text{CAT} & v \end{array} \right] \\ \text{VAL} \left\{ \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{ROLE} \left[\begin{array}{ll} \text{GF} & \text{subj} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \right\} \end{array} \right]$$

- c. *the Passive Construction:*

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{SYN} \left[\begin{array}{ll} \text{CAT} & v \\ \text{FORM} & \text{PastPart} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{VAL} \left\{ \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{ROLE} \left[\begin{array}{ll} \text{GF} & \text{obl} \\ \text{DA} & + \end{array} \right] \\ \text{SYN} & \text{P[von]/zero} \end{array} \right] \right\} \end{array} \right]$$

⁴ <http://www.icsi.berkeley.edu/~kay/bcg/ConGram.html>. 03.05.2010.

⁵ In the original version of the transitive construction in (9a), there is a feature θ that has the value DA–, however, DA is a feature itself and – is the value. I have corrected this in (9a) accordingly.

In the following structures, GF stands for *grammatical function* and DA for *distinguished argument*. The distinguished argument usually corresponds to the subject in an active clause.

The structure in (9a) says that the valence set of a linguistic object that is described by the transitive construction has to contain an element that has the grammatical function *object* and whose DA value is ‘-’. The DA value of the argument that would be the subject in an active clause is ‘+’ and ‘-’ for all other arguments. The subject construction states that an element of the valence set must have the grammatical function *subject*. In the passive construction, there has to be an element with the grammatical function *oblique* that also has the DA value ‘+’. In the passive construction the element with the DA value ‘+’ is realized either as a *by*-PP or not at all (*zero*).

The interaction of the constructions in (9) will be explained on the basis of the verb *schlagen* ‘to beat’:

- (10) Lexical entry for *schlag-* ‘beat’:

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{SYN} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{CAT } v \\ \text{VOICE } \text{active} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{VAL} \left\{ \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{ROLE} \left[\begin{array}{l} \theta \text{ agent} \\ \text{DA } + \end{array} \right] \right], \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{ROLE} \left[\begin{array}{l} \theta \text{ patient} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \right\} \end{array} \right]$$

If we combine this lexical entry with the transitive and subject constructions, we arrive at (11a) following Fillmore, Kay, Michaelis, and Ruppenhofer, whereas combining it with the subject and passive construction yields (11b):⁶

- (11) a. *schlag-* + Subject and Transitive Construction:

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{SYN} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{CAT } v \\ \text{VOICE } \text{active} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{VAL} \left\{ \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{ROLE} \left[\begin{array}{l} \theta \text{ agent} \\ \text{GF } \text{subj} \\ \text{DA } + \end{array} \right] \right], \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{ROLE} \left[\begin{array}{l} \theta \text{ patient} \\ \text{GF } \text{obj} \\ \text{DA } - \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \right\} \end{array} \right]$$

- b. *schlag-* + Subject and Passive Construction:

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{SYN} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{CAT } v \\ \text{FORM } \text{PastPart} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{VAL} \left\{ \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{ROLE} \left[\begin{array}{l} \theta \text{ agent} \\ \text{GF } \text{obl} \\ \text{DA } + \end{array} \right] \right], \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{ROLE} \left[\begin{array}{l} \theta \text{ patient} \\ \text{GF } \text{subj} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \right\} \\ \text{SYN } \text{P[von]/zero} \end{array} \right]$$

Using the entries in (11), it is possible to analyze the sentences in (12):

- (12) a. Er schlägt den Weltmeister.
 he beats the world.champion
 ‘He is beating the world champion.’

⁶ This assumes a particular understanding of set unification. For criticism of this, see Section 10.6.1.

- b. Der Weltmeister wird (von ihm) geschlagen.
 the world.champion is by him beaten
 ‘The world champion is being beaten (by him).’

This analysis is formally inconsistent as set unification cannot be formalized in such a way that the aforementioned constructions can be unified (Müller 2006; Müller 2007b: Section 7.5.2, see also Section 10.6.1 below). It is, however, possible to fix this analysis by using the HPSG formalization of sets (Pollard & Sag 1987; Pollard & Moshier 1990). The Subject, Transitive and Passive Constructions must then be modified such that they can say something about what an element in *VAL* looks like, rather than specifying the *VAL* value of a singleton set.

- (13) The *Subject Construction* with Pollard & Moschier’s definition of sets:

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} \text{SYN} | \text{CAT } v \\ \text{VAL } \boxed{1} \end{array} \right] \wedge \left\{ \left[\text{ROLE } \left[\text{GF } \textit{subj} \right] \right] \right\} \subset \boxed{1}$$

The restriction in (13) states that the valence set of a head has to contain an element that has the grammatical function *subj*. By these means, it is possible to suppress arguments (by specifying *SYN* as *zero*), but it is not possible to add any additional arguments to the fixed set of arguments of *schlagen* ‘to beat’.⁷ For the analysis of Middle Constructions such as (14), inheritance-based approaches do not work as there is no satisfactory way to add the reflexive pronoun to the valence set:⁸

- (14) Das Buch liest sich gut.
 the book reads REFL good
 ‘The book reads well / is easy to read.’

If we want to introduce additional arguments, we require auxiliary features. An analysis using auxiliary features has been suggested by Koenig (1999). Since there are many argument structure changing processes that interact in various ways and are linked to particular semantic side-effects, it is inevitable that one ends up assuming a large number of syntactic and semantic auxiliary features. The interaction between the various linking constructions becomes so complex that this analysis also becomes cognitively implausible and has to be viewed as technically unusable. For a more detailed discussion of this point, see Müller (2007b: Section 7.5.2).

⁷ Rather than requiring that *schlagen* ‘to beat’ has exactly two arguments as in HPSG, one could also assume that the constraint on the main lexical item would be of the kind in (11a). One would then require that *schlagen* has at least the two members in its valence set. This would complicate everything considerably and furthermore it would not be clear that the subject referred to in (13) would be one of the arguments that are referred to in the description of the lexical item for *schlagen* in (11a).

⁸ One technically possible solution would be the following: one could assume that verbs that occur in middle constructions always have a description of a reflexive pronoun in their valence set. The Transitive Construction would then have to specify the *SYN* value of the reflexive pronoun as *zero* so that the additional reflexive pronoun is not realized in the Transitive Construction. The middle construction would suppress the subject, but realizes the object and the reflexive.

This solution cannot be applied to the recursive processes we will encounter in a moment such as causativization in Turkish, unless one wishes to assume infinite valence sets.

The following empirical problem is much more serious: some processes like passivization, impersonalization and causativization can be applied in combination or even allow for multiple application, but if the grammatical function of a particular argument is determined once and for all by unification, additional unifications cannot change the initial assignment. We will first look at languages which allow for a combination of passivization and impersonalization, such as Lithuanian (Timberlake 1982: Section 5), Irish (Noonan 1994), and Turkish (Özkaragöz 1986; Knecht 1985: Section 2.3.3). I will use Özkaragöz's Turkish examples in (15) for illustration (1986: 77):

- (15) a. Bu şato-da boğ-ul-un-ur.
 this château-LOC strangle-PASS-PASS-AOR
 'One is strangled (by one) in this château.'
- b. Bu oda-da döv-ül-ün-ür.
 this room-LOC hit-PASS-PASS-AOR
 'One is beaten (by one) in this room.'
- c. Harp-te vur-ul-un-ur.
 war-LOC shoot-PASS-PASS-AOR
 'One is shot (by one) in war.'

-In, *-n*, and *-Il* are allomorphs of the passive/impersonal morpheme.⁹

Approaches that assume that the personal passive is the unification of some general structure with some passive-specific structure will not be able to capture double passivization or passivization + impersonalization since they have committed themselves to a certain structure too early. The problem for nontransformational approaches that state syntactic structure for the passive is that such a structure, once stated, cannot be modified. That is, we said that the underlying object is the subject in the passive sentence. But in order to get the double passivization/passivization + impersonalization, we have to suppress this argument as well. What is needed is some sort of process (or description) that takes a representation and relates it to another representation with a suppressed subject. This representation is related to a third representation which again suppresses the subject resulting in an impersonal sentence. In order to do this one needs different strata as in Relational Grammar (Timberlake 1982; Özkaragöz 1986), metarules (Gazdar, Klein, Pullum & Sag 1985), lexical rules (Dowty, 1978: 412; 2003: Section 3.4; Bresnan 1982c; Pollard & Sag 1987; Blevins 2003; Müller 2003b), transformations (Chomsky 1957), or just a morpheme-based morphological analysis that results in items with different valence properties when the passivization morpheme is combined with a head (Chomsky 1981a).

The second set of problematic data that will be discussed comes from causativization in Turkish (Lewis 1967: 146):

⁹ According to Özkaragöz, the data is best captured by an analysis that assumes that the passive applies to a passivized transitive verb and hence results in an impersonal passive. The cited authors discussed their data as instances of double passivization, but it was argued by Blevins (2003) that these and similar examples from other languages are impersonal constructions that can be combined with personal passives.

(16) öl-dür-t-tür-t-

‘to cause someone to cause someone to cause someone to kill someone’
 (kill = cause someone to die)

The causative morpheme *-t* is combined four times with the verb (*tür* is an allomorph of the causative morpheme). This argument structure-changing process cannot be modeled in an inheritance hierarchy since if we were to say that a word can inherit from the causative construction three times, we would still not have anything different to what we would have if the inheritance via the causative construction had applied only once. For this kind of phenomenon, we would require rules that relate a linguistic object to another, more complex object, that is, lexical rules (unary branching rules which change the phonology of a linguistic sign) or binary rules that combine a particular sign with a derivational morpheme. These rules can semantically embed the original sign (that is, add *cause* to *kill*).

The problem of repeated combination with causativization affixes is an instance of a more general problem: derivational morphology cannot be handled by inheritance as was already pointed out by Krieger & Nerbonne (1993) with respect to cases like *preprepreversion*.

If we assume that argument alternations such as passive, causativization and the Middle Construction should be described with the same means across languages, then evidence from Lithuanian and Turkish form an argument against inheritance-based analyses of the passive (Müller 2006, 2007c; Müller & Wechsler 2014a). See also Section 21.2.2 for the discussion of an inheritance-based approach to passive in LFG and Section 21.4.2 for the discussion of an inheritance-based approach in Simpler Syntax.

10.3 Verb position

At present, I only know of one article in the framework of CxG that has dealt with the sentence structure in German. This is the article by Vanessa Micelli (2012), where she describes a computer implementation of a German grammar in Fluid Construction Grammar. This fragment is restricted to declarative V2-clauses and *wh*-questions. In her analysis, the middle field forms a constituent comprising exactly two constituents (the direct and indirect object).¹⁰ The right sentence bracket and the postfield are empty. Long-distance dependencies are not discussed. It is only possible for arguments of the verb in the left sentence bracket to occur in the prefield. Micelli’s work is an interesting starting point but one has to wait and see how the analysis will be modified when the grammar fragment is expanded.

In the following, I will not discuss Micelli’s analysis further, but instead explore some of the possibilities for analyzing German sentence structure that are at least possible in principle in a CxG framework. Since there are neither empty elements nor transformations, the GB and HPSG analyses as well as their variants in Categorical Grammar are ruled out. The following options remain:

¹⁰ Note that none of the constituent tests that were discussed in Section 1.3 justifies such an analysis and that no other theory in this book assumes the *Mittelfeld* to be a constituent.

- an analysis similar to LFG with an optional verb
- an entirely flat analysis as proposed in GPSG
- an analysis with binary branching but variable verb position like that of Steedman (2000: 159)

Different variants of CxG make different assumptions about how abstract constructions can be. In Categorical Grammar, we have very general combinatorial rules which combine possibly complex signs without adding any meaning of their own (see rule (2) on page 232 for example). (17) shows an example in which the abstract rule of forward application was used:

- (17) [[[[Gibt] der Mann] der Frau] das Buch]
 give the man the woman the book
 'Does the man give the woman the book?'

If we do not want these kinds of abstract combinatorial rules, then this analysis must be excluded.

The LFG analysis in Section 7.3 is probably also unacceptable on a CxG view as it is assumed in this analysis that *der Mann der Frau das Buch* forms a VP although only three NPs have been combined. CxG has nothing like the theory of extended head domains that was presented in Section 7.3.

Thus, both variants with binary-branching structures are ruled out and only the analysis with flat branching structures remains. Sign-based CxG, which is a variant of HPSG (Sag 2010: 486), as well as Embodied Construction Grammar (Bergen & Chang 2005: 156) allow for a separation of immediate dominance and linear order so that it would be possible to formulate a construction which would correspond to the dominance rule in (18) for transitive verbs:¹¹

- (18) $S \rightarrow V, NP, NP$

Here, we have the problem that adjuncts in German can occur between any of the arguments. In GPSG, adjuncts are introduced by metarules. In formal variants of CxG, lexical rules, but not metarules, are used.¹² If one does not wish to expand the formalism to include metarules, then there are three options remaining:

- Adjuncts are introduced in the lexicon (van Noord & Bouma 1994; Bouma, Malouf & Sag 2001a) and treated as arguments in the syntax,
- Constructions always have slots available for an arbitrary number of adjuncts, or

¹¹ In principle, this is also Micelli's analysis, but she assumed that the middle field forms a separate constituent.

¹² Goldberg (2014: 116) mentions metarule-like devices and refers to Cappelle (2006). The difference between metarules and their CxG variant as envisioned by Cappelle and Goldberg is that in CxG two constructions are related without one construction being basic and the other one derived. Rather there exists a mutual relation between two constructions.

- Constructions can be discontinuous

Kasper (1994) has proposed an analysis of the first type in HPSG: adjuncts and arguments are combined with the head in a flat structure. This corresponds to the dominance rule in (19), where the position of adjuncts is not stated by the dominance rule.

(19) $S \rightarrow V, NP, NP, Adj^*$

If we want to say something about the meaning of the entire construction, then one has to combine the original construction (transitive, in the above example) with the semantics contributed by each of the adjuncts. These computations are not trivial and require relational constraints (small computer programs), which should be avoided if there are conceptually simpler solutions for describing a particular phenomenon.

The alternative would be to use discontinuous constructions. Analyses with discontinuous constituents have been proposed in both HPSG (Reape 1994) and Embodied Construction Grammar (Bergen & Chang 2005). If we apply Bergen and Chang's analysis to German, the italicized words in (20) would be part of a ditransitive construction.

(20) *Gibt der Mann morgen der Frau unter der Brücke das Geld?*
 gives the man tomorrow the woman under the bridge the money
 'Is the man going to give the woman the money under the bridge tomorrow?'

The construction has been realized discontinuously and the adjuncts are inserted into the gaps. In this kind of approach, one still has to explain how the scope of quantifiers and adjuncts is determined. While this may be possible, the solution is not obvious and has not been worked out in any of the CxG approaches to date. For further discussions of approaches that allow for discontinuous constituents see Section 11.7.2.2.

10.4 Local reordering

If we assume flat branching structures, then it is possible to use the GPSG analysis for the order of arguments. However, Kay (2002) assumes a phrasal construction for so-called Heavy-NP-Shift in English, which means that there is a new rule for the reordering of heavy NPs in English rather than one rule and two different ways to linearize the daughters.

In CxG, it is often argued that the usage contexts of certain orders differ and we therefore must be dealing with different constructions. Accordingly, one would have to assume six constructions to capture the ordering variants of sentences with ditransitive verbs in final position (see also page 173). An alternative would be to assume that the ordering variants all have a similar structure and that the information-structural properties are dependent on the position of constituents in the respective structure (see De Kuthy 2000 for German and Bildhauer 2008 for Spanish).

10.5 Long-distance dependencies

Kay & Fillmore (1999: Section 3.10) discuss long-distance dependencies in their article. Since the number of arguments is not specified in the verb phrase construction, it is possible that an argument of the verb is not locally present. Like the LFG and GPSG analyses in previous chapters, there are no empty elements assumed for the analysis of long-distance dependencies. In the *Left Isolation Construction* that licenses the entire sentence, there is a left daughter and a right daughter. The left daughter corresponds to whatever was extracted from the right daughter. The connection between the fronted element and the position where it is missing is achieved by the operator VAL. VAL provides all elements of the valence set of a linguistic object as well as all elements in the valence set of these elements and so on. It is thereby possible to have unrestricted access to an argument or adjunct daughter of any depth of embedding, and then identify the fronted constituent with an open valence slot.¹³ This approach corresponds to the LFG analysis of Kaplan & Zaenen (1989) based on functional uncertainty.

10.6 New developments and theoretical variants

Berkeley Construction Grammar was already discussed in the main part of this chapter. The discussion of the formal underpinnings was deferred until the theoretical variants section, since it is more advanced. I made some comments on set unification in Müller (2006: 858), but the longer discussion is only available in Müller (2007b: Section 7.5.2), which is in German. Therefore, I include Section 10.6.1 here, which discusses the formal underpinnings of Berkeley Construction Grammar in more detail and shows that they are not suited for what they were intended to do.

Section 10.6.2 discusses Sign-Based Construction Grammar, which was developed in joint work by Charles Fillmore, Paul Kay and Ivan Sag. It embodies ideas from BCG without having its formal flaws. Section 10.6.3 deals with Embodied Construction Grammar, which is based on work by Charles Fillmore, Paul Kay and George Lakoff. Section 10.6.4 deals with Fluid Construction Grammar.

10.6.1 Berkeley Construction Grammar

Section 10.2 discussed the valence representation in BCG and linking constructions for active and passive. Kay & Fillmore (1999) represent valence information in sets and I deferred the discussion of the formal properties of sets in BCG to this section. Fillmore and Kay's assumptions regarding set unification differ fundamentally from those that are made in HPSG. Kay and Fillmore assume that the unification of the set { a } with the set { b }, where a and b do not unify, results in the union of the two sets, that is

¹³ Note again, that there are problems with the formalization of this proposal in Kay & Fillmore's paper. The formalization of VAL, which was provided by Andreas Kathol, seems to presuppose a formalization of sets as the one that is used in HPSG, but the rest of Fillmore & Kay's paper assumes a different formalization, which is inconsistent. See Section 10.6.1.

$\{a, b\}$. Due to this special understanding of sets it is possible to increase the number of elements in a set by means of unification. The unification of two sets that contain compatible elements is the disjunction of sets that contain the respective unifications of the compatible elements. This sounds complicated, but we are only interested in a specific case: the unification of an arbitrary set with a singleton set:

$$(21) \quad \{NP[nom], NP[acc]\} \wedge \{NP[nom]\} = \{NP[nom], NP[acc]\}$$

According to Fillmore & Kay the unification of a set with another set that contains a compatible element does not result in an increase of the number of list elements.

(22) illustrates another possible case:

$$(22) \quad \{ \text{NP}, \text{NP}[\text{acc}] \} \wedge \{ \text{NP}[\text{nom}] \} = \{ \text{NP}[\text{nom}], \text{NP}[\text{acc}] \}$$

The first NP in (22) is underspecified with respect to its case. The case of the NP in the second set is specified as nominative. $\text{NP}[\text{nom}]$ does not unify with $\text{NP}[\text{acc}]$ but with NP.

This particular conception of unification has consequences. Unification is usually defined as follows:

- (23) The unification of two structures FS_1 and FS_2 is the structure FS_3 that is subsumed by both FS_1 and FS_2 where there is no other structure that subsumes FS_1 and FS_2 and is subsumed by FS_3 .

A structure FS_1 is said to subsume FS_3 iff FS_3 contains all feature value pairs and structure sharings from FS_1 . FS_3 may contain additional feature value pairs or structure sharings. The consequence is that the subsumption relations in (24b,c) have to hold if unification of valence sets works as in (24a):

- (24) Properties of the set unification according to Kay & Fillmore (1999):
 a. $\{ \text{NP}[\text{nom}] \} \wedge \{ \text{NP}[\text{acc}] \} = \{ \text{NP}[\text{nom}], \text{NP}[\text{acc}] \}$
 b. $\{ \text{NP}[\text{nom}] \} \geq \{ \text{NP}[\text{nom}], \text{NP}[\text{acc}] \}$
 c. $\{ \text{NP}[\text{acc}] \} \geq \{ \text{NP}[\text{nom}], \text{NP}[\text{acc}] \}$

(24b) means that a feature structure with a valence set that contains just one $\text{NP}[\text{nom}]$ is more general than a feature structure that contains both an $\text{NP}[\text{nom}]$ and an $\text{NP}[\text{acc}]$. Therefore the set of transitive verbs is a subset of the intransitive verbs. This is rather unintuitive, but compatible with Fillmore & Kay's system for the licensing of arguments. However, there are problems with the interaction of valence specifications and linking constructions, which we turn to now.

We have seen the result of combining lexical items with linking constructions in (11a) and (11b), but the question of how these results are derived has not been addressed so far. Kay (2002) suggests an automatic computation of all compatible combinations of maximally specific constructions. Such a procedure could be used to compute the lexical representations we saw in Section 10.2 and these could be then used to analyze the well-formed sentences in (12).

However, problems would result for ungrammatical sentences like (25b). *grauen* 'to dread' is a subjectless verb. If one would simply combine all compatible linking constructions with *grauen*, the Kay & Fillmoreian conception of set unification would cause the introduction of a subject into the valence set of *grauen*. (25b) would be licensed by the grammar:

- (25) a. Dem Student graut vor der Prüfung.
 the.DAT student dreads before the exam
 'The student dreads the exam.'
 b. *Ich graue dem Student vor der Prüfung.
 I dread the.DAT student before the exam

One could solve this problem by specifying an element with the grammatical function *subject* in the lexical entry of *grauen* ‘to dread’. In addition, it would have to be stipulated that this subject can only be realized as an overt or covert expletive (The covert expletive would be *syn zero*). For the covert expletive, this means it has neither a form nor a meaning. Such expletive pronouns without phonological realization are usually frowned upon in Construction Grammar and analyses that can do without such abstract entities are to be preferred.

Kay & Fillmore (1999) represent the semantic contribution of signs as sets as well. This excludes the possibility of preventing the unwanted unification of linking constructions by referring to semantic constraints since we have the same effect as we have with valence sets: if the semantic descriptions are incompatible, the set is extended. This means that in an automatic unification computation all verbs are compatible with the Transitive Construction in (9a) and this would license analyses for (26) in addition to those of (25b).

- (26) a. * Der Mann schläft das Buch.
 the man sleeps the book
 b. * Der Mann denkt an die Frau das Buch.
 the man thinks at the woman the book

An intransitive verb was unified with the Transitive Construction in the analysis of (26a) and in (26b) a verb that takes a prepositional object was combined with the Transitive Construction. This means that representations like (11) cannot be computed automatically as was intended by Kay (2002). Therefore one would have to specify subconstructions for all argument structure possibilities for every verb (active, passive, middle, ...). This does not capture the fact that speakers can form passives after acquiring new verbs without having to learn about the fact that the newly learned verb forms one.

Michaelis & Ruppenhofer (2001) do not use sets for the representation of semantic information. Therefore they could use constraints regarding the meaning of verbs in the Transitive Construction. To this end, one needs to represent semantic relations with feature descriptions as it was done in Section 9.1.6. Adopting such a representation, it is possible to talk about two-place relations in an abstract way. See for instance the discussion of (27) on page 266. However, the unification with the Subject Construction cannot be blocked with reference to semantics since there exist so-called raising verbs that take a subject without assigning a semantic role to it. As is evidenced by subject verb agreement, *du* ‘you’ is the subject in (27), but the subject does not get a semantic role. The referent of *du* is not the one who *seems*.

- (27) Du scheinst gleich einzuschlafen.
 you seem.2SG soon in.to.sleep
 ‘You seem like you will fall asleep soon.’

This means that one is forced to either assume an empty expletive subject for verbs like *grauen* or to specify explicitly which verbs may inherit from the subject construction and which may not.

In addition to (27), there exist object raising constructions with accusative objects that can be promoted to subject in passives. The subject in the passive construction does not get a semantic role from the finite verb:

- (28) a. Richard lacht ihn an.
 Richard laughs him towards
 ‘Richard smiles at him.’
 b. Richard fischt den Teich leer.
 Richard fishes the pond empty

The objects in (28) are semantic arguments of *an* ‘towards’ and *leer* ‘empty’, respectively, but not semantic arguments of the verbs *lacht* ‘laughs’ and *fischt* ‘fishes’, respectively. If one wants to explain these active forms and the corresponding passive forms via the linking constructions in (9), one cannot refer to semantic properties of the verb. Therefore, one is forced to postulate specific lexical entries for all possible verb forms in active and passive sentences.

10.6.2 Sign-Based Construction Grammar

In more recent work by Fillmore, Kay, Michaelis and Sag, the Kay & Fillmore formalization of the description of valence using the Kay & Fillmore version of sets was abandoned in favor of the HPSG formalization (Kay 2005; Michaelis 2006; Sag 2012; Sag, Boas & Kay 2012: 10–11). Sign-Based Construction Grammar was developed from the Berkeley variant of CxG. Sign-Based Construction Grammar is a variant of HPSG (Sag 2010: 486) and as such uses the formal apparatus of HPSG (typed feature structures). Valence and saturation are treated in exactly the same way as in standard HPSG. Changes in valence are also analyzed as in HPSG using lexical rules (Sag, Boas & Kay 2012: Section 2.3). The analysis of long-distance dependencies was adopted from HPSG (or rather GPSG). Minimal Recursion Semantics (MRS; Copestake, Flickinger, Pollard & Sag 2005) is used for the description of semantic content. The only difference to works in standard HPSG is the organization of the features in feature structures. A new feature geometry was introduced to rule out constructions that describe daughters of daughters and therefore have a much larger locality domain in contrast to rules in phrase structure grammars, LFG, and GPSG. I do not view this new feature geometry as particularly sensible as it can be easily circumvented and serves to complicate the theory. This will be discussed in Section 10.6.2.1. Other changes regard the omission of the *LOCAL* feature and the omission of valence features. These changes are discussed in Section 10.6.2.2 and 10.6.2.4, respectively.

10.6.2.1 Locality and *MOTHER*

Sag, Wasow & Bender (2003: 475–489) and Sag (2007, 2012) suggest using a *MOTHER* feature in addition to daughter features. The Head-Complement Construction would then have the form in (29):

(29) Head-Complement Construction following Sag, Wasow & Bender (2003: 481):

$$\text{head-comp-cx} \rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{MOTHER|SYN|VAL|COMPS } \langle \rangle \\ \text{HEAD-DTR } \boxed{0} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{word} \\ \text{SYN|VAL|COMPS } \boxed{A} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{DTRS } \langle \boxed{0} \rangle \oplus \boxed{A} \text{ nelist} \end{array} \right]$$

The value of COMPS is then a list of the complements of a head (see Section 9.6.1). Unlike in standard HPSG, it is not *synsem* objects that are selected with valence lists, but rather signs. The analysis of the phrase *ate a pizza* takes the form in (30).¹⁴

$$(30) \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{head-comp-cx} \\ \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{phrase} \\ \text{FORM } \langle \text{ate, a, pizza} \rangle \\ \text{SYN} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD } \text{verb} \\ \text{SPR } \langle \text{NP[nom]} \rangle \\ \text{COMPS } \langle \rangle \end{array} \right] \\ \text{SEM } \dots \end{array} \right] \\ \text{MOTHER} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{word} \\ \text{FORM } \langle \text{ate} \rangle \\ \text{SYN} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD } \text{verb} \\ \text{SPR } \langle \text{NP[nom]} \rangle \\ \text{COMPS } \langle \boxed{2} \text{ NP[acc]} \rangle \end{array} \right] \\ \text{SEM } \dots \end{array} \right] \\ \text{HEAD-DTR } \boxed{1} \\ \text{DTRS } \langle \boxed{1}, \boxed{2} \rangle \end{array} \right]$$


The difference to HPSG in the version of Pollard & Sag (1994) is that for Sag, Wasow & Bender, signs do not have daughters and this makes the selection of daughters impossible. As a result, the SYNSEM feature becomes superfluous (selection of the PHON value and of the value of the newly introduced FORM feature is allowed in Sag, Wasow & Bender (2003) and Sag (2012)). The information about the linguistic objects that contribute to a complex sign is only represented in the very outside of the structure. The sign represented under MOTHER is of the type *phrase* but does not contain any information about the daughters. The object described in (30) is of course also of another type than the phrasal or lexical signs that can occur as its daughters. We therefore need the following extension so that the grammar will work (Sag, Wasow & Bender 2003: 478):¹⁵

¹⁴ SBCG uses a FORM feature in addition to the PHON feature, which is used for phonological information as in earlier versions of HPSG (Sag 2012: Section 3.1, Section 3.6). The FORM feature is usually provided in example analyses.

¹⁵ A less formal version of this constraint is given as the Sign Principle by Sag (2012: 105): “Every sign must be listemically or constructionally licensed, where: a sign is listemically licensed only if it satisfies some listeme, and a sign is constructionally licensed if it is the mother of some well-formed construct.”

- (31) Φ is a Well-Formed Structure according to a grammar G if and only if:
1. there is a construction C in G , and
 2. there is a feature structure I that is an instantiation of C , such that Φ is the value of the MOTHER feature of I .

For comparison, a description is given in (32) with the feature geometry that was assumed in Section 9.6.1.



In (32), the features HEAD-DTR and NON-HEAD-DTRS belong to those features that phrases of type *head-complement-phrase* have. In (30), however, the phrase corresponds only to the value of the MOTHER feature and therefore has no daughters represented in the sign itself. Using the feature geometry in (32), it is in principle possible to formulate restrictions on the daughters of the object in the NON-HEAD-DTRS list, which would be completely ruled out under the assumption of the feature geometry in (30) and the restriction in (31).

There are several arguments against this feature geometry, which will be discussed in the following subsections. The first one is an empirical one: there may be idioms that span clauses. The second argument concerns the status of the meta statement in (31) and the third one computational complexity.

10.6.2.1.1 Idioms that cross constituent boundaries

In Müller (2007b: Chapter 12) I conjectured that the locality restrictions may be too strong since there may be idioms that require one to make reference to daughters of daughters for their description. Richter & Sailer (2009) discuss the following idioms as examples:

- (33) a. nicht wissen, wo X_Dat der Kopf steht
 not know where X the head stands
 ‘to not know where x’s head is at’

- b. glauben, X_Acc tritt ein Pferd
believe X kicks a horse
'be utterly surprised'
- c. aussehen, als hätten X_Dat die Hühner das Brot weggefressen
look as.if had X the chicken the bread away.eaten
'to look confused/puzzled'
- d. look as if butter wouldn't melt [in X's mouth]
'to look absolutely innocent'

In sentences containing the idioms in (33a–c), the X-constituent has to be a pronoun that refers to the subject of the matrix clause. If this is not the case, the sentences become ungrammatical or lose their idiomatic meaning.

- (34) a. Ich glaube, mich / # dich tritt ein Pferd.
I believe me.ACC you.ACC kicks a horse
- b. Jonas glaubt, ihn tritt ein Pferd.¹⁶
Jonas believes him kicks a horse
'Jonas is utterly surprised.'
- c. # Jonas glaubt, dich tritt ein Pferd.
Jonas believes you kicks a horse
'Jonas believes that a horse kicks you.'

In order to enforce this co-reference, a restriction has to be able to refer to both the subject of *glauben* 'believe' and the object of *treten* 'kick' at the same time. In SBCG, there is the possibility of referring to the subject since the relevant information is also available on maximal projections (the value of a special feature (XARG) is identical to the subject of a head). In (33a–c), we are dealing with accusative and dative objects. Instead of only making information about one argument accessible, one could represent the complete argument structure on the maximal projection (as is done in some versions of HPSG, see page 295 and pages 540–542). This would remove locality of selection, however, since if all heads project their argument structure, then it is possible to determine the properties of arguments of arguments by looking at the elements present in the argument structure. Thus, the argument structure of *wissen* 'to know' in (35) would contain the description of a *dass* clause.

- (35) Peter weiß, dass Klaus kommt.
Peter knows that Klaus comes
'Peter knows that Klaus is coming.'

Since the description of the *dass* clause contains the argument structure of *dass*, it is possible to access the argument of *dass*. *wissen* 'to know' can therefore access *Klaus kommt*. As such, *wissen* also has access to the argument structure of *kommt* 'to come',

¹⁶ <http://www.machandel-verlag.de/der-katzenschatz.html>, 06.07.2015.

which is why *Klaus* is also accessible to *wissen*. However, the purpose of the new, more restrictive feature geometry was to rule out such nonlocal access to arguments.

An alternative to projecting the complete argument structure was suggested by Kay et al. (2015: Section 6): instead of assuming that the subject is the XARG in idiomatic constructions like those in (33), they assume that the accusative or dative argument is the XARG. This is an interesting proposal that could be used to fix the cases under discussion, but the question is whether it scales up if interaction with other phenomena are considered. For instance, Bender & Flickinger (1999) use XARG in their account of question tags in English. So, if English idioms can be found that require a non-subject XARG in embedded sentences while also admitting the idiom parts in the embedded sentence to occur as full clause with question tag, we would have conflicting demands and would have to assume different XARGS for root and embedded clauses, which would make this version of the lexical theory rather unattractive, since we would need two lexical items for the respective verb.

(33d) is especially interesting, since here the X that refers to material outside the idiom is in an adjunct. If such cases existed, the XARG mechanism would be clearly insufficient since XARG is not projected from adjuncts. However, as Kay et al. (2015) point out the X does not necessarily have to be a pronoun that is coreferent with an element in a matrix clause. They provide the following example:

- (36) Justin Bieber—Once upon a time \emptyset butter wouldn't melt in little Justin's mouth.
Now internationally famous for being a weapons-grade petulant brat ...


So, whether examples of the respective kind can be found is an open question.

Returning to our *horse* examples, Richter & Sailer (2009: 313) argue that the idiomatic reading is only available if the accusative pronouns is fronted and the embedded clause is V2. The examples in (37) do not have the idiomatic reading:

- (37) a. Ich glaube, dass mich ein Pferd tritt.
I believe that me a horse kicks
'I believe that a horse kicks me.'
b. Ich glaube, ein Pferd tritt mich.
I believe a horse kicks me
'I believe that a horse kicks me.'

Richter & Sailer assume a structure for *X_Acc tritt ein Pferd* in (33b) that contains, among others, the constraints in (38).

The feature geometry in (38) differs somewhat from what was presented in Chapter 9 but that is not of interest here. It is only of importance that the semantic contribution of the entire phrase is *surprised'*($x_{[2]}$). The following is said about the internal structure of the phrase: it consists of a filler-daughter (an extracted element) and also of a head daughter corresponding to a sentence from which something has been extracted. The head daughter means 'a horse kicks $x_{[2]}$ ' and has an internal head somewhere whose argument structure list contains an indefinite NP with the word *Pferd* 'horse' as its head.



The second element in the argument structure is a pronominal NP in the accusative whose LOCAL value is identical to that of the filler ([1]). The entire meaning of this part of the sentence is *surprised'*($x_{[2]}$), whereby [2] is identical to the referential index of the pronoun. In addition to the constraints in (38), there are additional ones that ensure that the partial clause appears with the relevant form of *glauben* 'to believe' or *denken* 'to think'. The exact details are not that important here. What is important is that one can specify constraints on complex syntactic elements, that is, it must be possible to refer to daughters of daughters. This is possible with the classical HPSG feature geometry, but not with the feature geometry of SBCG. For a more general discussion of locality, see Section 18.2.

The restrictions on *Pferd* clauses in (38) are too strict, however, since there are variants of the idiom that do not have the accusative pronoun in the *Vorfeld*:

- (39) a. ich glaub es tritt mich ein Pferd wenn ich einen derartigen Unsinn
 I believe EXPL kicks me a horse when I a such nonsense
 lese.¹⁷
 read
 'I am utterly surprised when I read such nonsense.'

¹⁷ <http://www.welt.de/wirtschaft/article116297208/Die-verlogene-Kritik-an-den-Steuerparadiesen.html>, commentary section, 10.12.2015.

- b. omg dieser xBluuR der nn ist wieder da ey nein ich glaub es tritt
 omg this XBluuR he is again there no I believe EXPL kicks
 mich ein Pferd!!¹⁸
 me a horse
 ‘OMG, this xBluuR, the nn, he is here again, no, I am utterly surprised.’
- c. ich glaub jetzt tritt mich ein pferd¹⁹
 I believe now kicks me a horse
 ‘I am utterly surprised now.’

In (40a–b) the *Vorfeld* is filled by an expletive and in (40c) an adverb fills the *Vorfeld* position. While these forms of the idiom are really rare, they do exist and should be allowed for by the description of the idiom. So, one would have to make sure that *ein Pferd* ‘a horse’ is not fronted, but this can be done in the lexical item of *tritt* ‘kicks’. This shows that the cases at hand cannot be used to argue for models that allow for the representation of (underspecified) trees of depth greater one, but I still believe that such idioms can be found. Of course this is an open empirical question.

What is not an open empirical question though is whether humans store chunks with complex internal structure or not. It is clear that we do and much Construction Grammar literature emphasizes this. Constructional HPSG can represent such chunks, but SBCG cannot since linguistic signs do not have daughters. So here Constructional HPSG and TAG are the theories that can represent complex chunks of linguistic material with its internal structure, while other theories like GB, Minimalism, CG, LFG and DG can not.

10.6.2.1.2 Complicated licensing of constructions

In addition to these empirical problems, there is a conceptual problem with (31): (31) is not part of the formalism of typed feature structures but rather a meta-statement. Therefore, grammars which use (31) cannot be described with the normal formalism. The formalization given in Richter (2004) cannot be directly applied to SBCG, which means that the formal foundations of SBCG still have to be worked out.²⁰ Furthermore, the original problem that (31) was designed to solve is not solved by introducing the new feature geometry and the meta statement. Instead, the problem is just moved to another level since we now need a theory about what is a permissible meta-statement and what is not. As such, a grammarian could add a further clause to the meta statement stating that Φ is only a well-formed structure if it is true of the daughters of a relevant construction C that they are the MOTHER value of a construction C' . It would be possible to formulate

¹⁸ <http://forum.gta-life.de/index.php?user/3501-malcolm/>, 10.12.2015.

¹⁹ <http://www.castingshow-news.de/menowin-frhlich-soll-er-zum-islam-konvertieren-7228/>, 10.12.2015.

²⁰ A note of caution is necessary since there were misunderstandings in the past regarding the degree of formalizations of SBCG: in comparison to most other theories discussed in this book, SBCG is well-formalized. For instance it is easy to come up with a computer implementation of SBCG fragments. I implemented one in the TRALE system myself. The reader is referred to Richter (2004) to get an idea what kind of deeper formalization is talked about here.

constraints in the meta-statement about the construction C' or individual values inside the corresponding feature structures. In this way, locality would have been abandoned since it is possible to refer to daughters of daughters. By assuming (31), the theoretical inventory has been increased without any explanatory gain.

10.6.2.1.3 Computational complexity

One motivation behind restrictions on locality was to reduce the computational complexity of the formalism (Ivan Sag, p. c. 2011, See Chapter 17 on computational complexity and generative power). However, the locality restrictions of SBCG can be circumvented easily by structure sharing (Müller 2013b: Section 9.6.1). To see this consider a construction with the following form:

$$(40) \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{MOTHER} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{sign} \\ \text{PHON} \quad \textit{phonological-object} \\ \text{FORM} \quad \textit{morphological-object} \\ \text{SYN} \quad \textit{syntactic information} \\ \text{SEM} \quad \textit{semantic information} \\ \text{NASTY} \quad \boxed{1} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{DTRS} \quad \boxed{1} \textit{ list of signs} \end{array} \right]$$

The feature `NASTY` in the `MOTHER sign` refers to the value of `DTRS` and hence all the internal structure of the sign that is licensed by the constructional schema in (40) is available. Of course one could rule out such things by stipulation – if one considered it to be empirically adequate, but then one could as well continue to use the feature geometry of Constructional HPSG (Sag 1997) and stipulate constraints like “Do not look into the daughters.” An example of such a constraint given in prose is the Locality Principle of Pollard & Sag (1987: 143–144).

10.6.2.2 Lexical extraction and the `LOCAL` feature

A main theme in Ivan Sag’s work was to eliminate empty elements from grammar. He co-developed a lexical analysis of extraction that did not use empty elements (van Noord & Bouma 1994; Bouma, Malouf & Sag 2001a). Rather than assuming a trace as in earlier versions of HPSG (see Section 9.5) a lexical rule (lexical construction) or a special mapping between list-valued features (for instance `ARG-ST` and `VALENCE`) is assumed so that a lexical item is licensed that has an element in the `GAP` list (`SLASH` in earlier versions of HPSG). The `LOCAL` feature in Standard HPSG is used to bundle all those information that is shared between a filler and the gap. The lexical entry for the trace was given as (60) on page 288 and is repeated as (41) for convenience. For the trace-based analysis of extraction it is crucial that only information under `CATEGORY` and `CONT` is shared between filler and gap. This information is bundled under `LOCAL`. Information about daughters and phonology of the filler is not shared. Since traces are not pronounced, their `PHONOLOGY` value would be incompatible with any `PHONOLOGY` value of a filler.

(41) Extraction trace:

word									
PHON	⟨ ⟩								
SYNSEM	<table> <tr> <td>LOC</td><td>[1]</td></tr> <tr> <td>NONLOC</td><td> <table> <tr> <td>INHER SLASH</td><td>⟨ [1] ⟩</td></tr> <tr> <td>TO-BIND SLASH</td><td>⟨ ⟩</td></tr> </table> </td></tr> </table>	LOC	[1]	NONLOC	<table> <tr> <td>INHER SLASH</td><td>⟨ [1] ⟩</td></tr> <tr> <td>TO-BIND SLASH</td><td>⟨ ⟩</td></tr> </table>	INHER SLASH	⟨ [1] ⟩	TO-BIND SLASH	⟨ ⟩
LOC	[1]								
NONLOC	<table> <tr> <td>INHER SLASH</td><td>⟨ [1] ⟩</td></tr> <tr> <td>TO-BIND SLASH</td><td>⟨ ⟩</td></tr> </table>	INHER SLASH	⟨ [1] ⟩	TO-BIND SLASH	⟨ ⟩				
INHER SLASH	⟨ [1] ⟩								
TO-BIND SLASH	⟨ ⟩								

In a lexical approach, one would assume an additional lexical item with an element in SLASH or GAP.

(42) Lexical introduction of nonlocal dependencies according to Sag (2012: 163):

FORM	⟨ like ⟩												
ARG-ST	<table> <tr> <td>[1]</td><td> <table> <tr> <td>NP</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>GAP</td><td>⟨ ⟩</td></tr> </table> </td></tr> <tr> <td>[2]</td><td> <table> <tr> <td>NP</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>GAP</td><td>⟨ ⟩</td></tr> </table> </td></tr> </table>	[1]	<table> <tr> <td>NP</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>GAP</td><td>⟨ ⟩</td></tr> </table>	NP		GAP	⟨ ⟩	[2]	<table> <tr> <td>NP</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>GAP</td><td>⟨ ⟩</td></tr> </table>	NP		GAP	⟨ ⟩
[1]	<table> <tr> <td>NP</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>GAP</td><td>⟨ ⟩</td></tr> </table>	NP		GAP	⟨ ⟩								
NP													
GAP	⟨ ⟩												
[2]	<table> <tr> <td>NP</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>GAP</td><td>⟨ ⟩</td></tr> </table>	NP		GAP	⟨ ⟩								
NP													
GAP	⟨ ⟩												
SYN	<table> <tr> <td>VAL</td><td>⟨ [1] ⟩</td></tr> <tr> <td>GAP</td><td>⟨ [2] ⟩</td></tr> </table>	VAL	⟨ [1] ⟩	GAP	⟨ [2] ⟩								
VAL	⟨ [1] ⟩												
GAP	⟨ [2] ⟩												

The analysis of (43) then results in a linguistic object in which the second element of the ARG-ST list of *like* has the FORM value ⟨ *bagels* ⟩.

(43) Bagels, I like.

In a trace-based account, the FORM value of the extracted element would be the empty list.

Now, the problem is that not everybody agrees with the traceless analysis of unbounded dependencies. For instance, Levine & Hukari (2006) wrote a monograph discussing various versions of traceless accounts of extraction and argue against them. Chaves (2009) suggested solutions to some of the puzzles, but does not solve them entirely. While feature geometries that include a LOCAL feature allow researchers to assume trace-based analyses, the SBCG geometry makes this impossible. So those who use traces in their theories will never adopt the SBCG geometry. See Section 19 for more on empty elements.

A further advantage of having a package of information that is shared in nonlocal dependencies is that some information can be excluded from sharing by specifying it outside of such a package. This was used by Höhle (1994), Müller (1996d, 2002a), and Meurers (1999a) to account for partial verb phrase fronting in German. The generalization about partial verb phrase fronting in German is that verbs can be fronted together with some or all of their objects even though the verb does not form a VP in other contexts. For instance, *erzählen* ‘tell’ and *wird* ‘will’ in (44a) usually form a complex that may not be separated by scrambling a projection of *erzählen* to the left.

- (44) a. dass er seiner Tochter ein Märchen erzählen wird
 that he his daughter a fairy.tale tell will
 ‘that he will tell his daughter a fairy tale’

- b. * dass er seiner Tochter ein Märchen erzählen nie wird
 that he his daughter a fairy.tale tell never will

Hinrichs & Nakazawa (1994) account for this by assuming a special schema for verbal complexes and by assuming that such verbal complexes are marked in a certain way (later this was encoded with the LEX feature with the value ‘+’) and that heads that form a verbal complex select for appropriately marked elements. So in the analysis of (44a) *wird* ‘will’ selects a LEX + element and the word *erzählen* ‘tell’ satisfies this requirement.

The problem for many accounts of nonlocal dependencies is that the fronted material is not necessarily a single verb:

- (45) a. Erzählen wird er seiner Tochter ein Märchen.
 tell will he.NOM his.DAT daughter a.ACC fairytale
 ‘He will tell his daughter a fairytale.’
 b. Ein Märchen erzählen wird er seiner Tochter.
 a fairytale.ACC tell will he.NOM his.DAT daughter
 c. Seiner Tochter erzählen wird er das Märchen.
 his.DAT daughter tell will he.NOM the.ACC fairytale
 d. Seiner Tochter ein Märchen erzählen wird er.
 his.DAT daughter a.ACC fairytale tell will he.NOM

If the local requirement of *wird* would be shared between filler and gap, the sentences in (45b)–(45d) would be ruled out, since the projections in the *Vorfeld* are not lexical elements but complex phrasal projections that are LEX –. Now, as pointed out by the authors mentioned above, this turns into a non-issue if not all information is shared between filler and gap. If LEX is outside LOCAL, the filler maybe LEX –, while the local constraints on the extracted element require the LEX value +. If all information is shared as in SBCG, no such solution is possible. Of course one could stick to the SBCG feature geometry and say that not the entire ARG-ST element is shared with the GAP element, but then one would end up with single structure sharings of all the features at the outermost level of a sign, that is, PHON, FORM, SYN, SEM, and CNTXT (see Sag 2012: 98 for these features)²¹ and the whole point of grouping features is to avoid such multiple individual structure sharings in situations in which there is a systematic relation between feature values.

10.6.2.3 Selection of PHON and FORM values

The feature geometry of constructional HPSG has the PHON value outside of SYNSEM. Therefore verbs can select for syntactic and semantic properties of their arguments but not for their phonology. For example, they can require that an object has accusative

²¹ Note that these structure sharings are necessary. It is not an option to leave the values of these features unspecified in the argument structure list. Since we have a model-theoretic view on things, an unspecified value would make the respective structures infinitely ambiguous, since infinitely many instantiation of these features are possible.

case but not that it starts with a vowel. SBCG allows for the selection of phonological information (the feature is called `FORM` here) and one example of such a selection is the indefinite article in English, which has to be either *a* or *an* depending on whether the noun or nominal projection it is combined with starts with a vowel or not (Flickinger, Mail to the HPSG mailing list, 01.03.2016):

- (46) a. an institute
b. a house

The distinction can be modeled by assuming a selection feature for determiners.²² An alternative would be of course to capture all phonological phenomena by formulating constraints on phonology on the phrasal level (see Bird & Klein 1994 and Walther 1999 for phonology in HPSG).

Note also that the treatment of raising and nonlocal dependencies in SBCG admits nonlocal selection of phonology values, since the `FORM` value of the filler is present at the `ARG-ST` list of the head from which the argument is extracted. In earlier HPSG versions only `LOCAL` information is shared and elements in valence lists do not have a `PHON` feature. In principle, SBCG could be used to model languages in which the phonology of a filler is relevant for a head from which it is extracted. So for instance *likes* can see the phonology of *bagels* in (47):

- (47) Bagels, I think that Peter likes.

It would be possible to state constraints saying that the filler has to contain a vowel or two vowels or that it ends with a consonant. In addition all elements on the extraction path (*that* and *think*) can see the phonology of the filler as well. While there are languages that mark the extraction path, I doubt that there are languages that have phonological effects across long distances.

Similarly, the analysis of raising in SBCG assumes that the element on the valence list of the embedded verb is identical to an element in the `ARG-ST` list of the matrix verb (Sag 2012: 159). Hence, both verbs in (48) can see the phonology of the subject:

- (48) Kim can eat apples.

In principle there could be languages in which the form of the downstairs verb depends on the presence of an initial consonant in phonology of the subject. English allows for long chains of raising verbs and one could imagine languages in which all the verbs on the way are sensitive to the phonology of the subject. Such languages probably do not exist.

Now, is this a problem? Not for me, but if one develops a general setup in a way to exclude everything that is not attested in the languages of the world (as for instance the selection of arguments of arguments of arguments), then it is a problem that heads can see the phonology of elements that are far away.

²² In Standard HPSG there is mutual selection between the determiner and the noun. The noun selects the determiner via `SPR` and the determiner selects the noun via a feature called `SPECIFIED`. This feature is similar to the `MOD` feature, which was explained in Section 9.1.7.

There are two possible conclusions for practitioners of SBCG: either the *MOTHER* feature could be given up since one agrees that theories that do not make wrong predictions are sufficiently constraint and one does not have to explicitly state what cannot occur in languages or one would have to react to the problem with nonlocally selected phonology values and therefore assume a *SYNSEM* or *LOCAL* feature that bundles information that is relevant in raising and nonlocal dependencies and does not include the phonology.²³ This supports the arguments I made on *MOTHER* and *LOCAL* in the previous subsections.

10.6.2.4 The *VALENCE* list

Another change from Constructional HPSG to SBCG involves the use of a single valence feature rather than three features *SPR*, *SUBJ* and *COMPS* that were suggested by Borsley (1987) to solve problems in earlier HPSG versions that used a single valence feature (*SUBCAT*). Borseley's suggestion was taken up by Pollard & Sag (1994: Chapter 9) and has been used in some version or other in other HPSG versions since then.

Sag (2012: 85) assumes that VPs are described by the following feature description:

$$(49) \left[\text{SYN} \left[\text{VAL} \langle \text{NP} \rangle \right] \right]$$

The problem with such an approach is that VPs differ from other phrasal projections in having an element on their *VALENCE* list. APs, NPs, and (some) PPs have an empty *VALENCE* list. In other versions of HPSG the complements are represented on the *COMPS* list and generalizations about phrases with fully saturated *COMPS* lists can be expressed directly. One such generalization is that projections with an empty *COMPS* list (NPs, PPs, VPs, adverbs, CPs) can be extraposed in German (Müller 1999a: Section 13.1.2).

10.6.2.5 Conclusion

Due to the conceptual problems with meta-statements and the relatively simple ways of getting around locality restrictions, the reorganization of features (*MOTHER* vs. *SYNSEM*) does not bring with it any advantages. Since the grammar becomes more complex due to the meta-constraint, we should reject this change.²⁴ Other changes in the

²³ If *SYNSEM* is reintroduced, the elements in the valence lists could be of type *synsem*. Information about phonology would not be part of the description of the selected elements. This would not solve the problem of partial verb phrase fronting though, since the *LEX* feature is selected for (hence part of the information under *SYNSEM*) but not shared with the filler. One would need a *LOCAL* feature in addition to *SYNSEM*. See Section 10.6.2.2.

²⁴ In Müller (2013b: 253) I claimed that SBCG uses a higher number of features in comparison to other variants of HPSG because of the assumption of the *MOTHER* feature. As Van Eynde (2015) points out this is not true for more recent variants of HPSG since they have the *SYNSEM* feature, which is not needed if *MOTHER* is assumed. (Van Eynde refers to the *LOCAL* feature, but the *LOCAL* feature was eliminated because it was considered superfluous because of the lexical analysis of extraction, see Section 10.6.2.2). If one simply omits the *MOTHER* feature from SBCG one is back to the 1987 version of HPSG (Pollard & Sag 1987), which also used a *SYN* and a *SEM* feature. What would be missing would be the locality of selection (Sag 2012: 149) that was enforced to some extent by the *SYNSEM* feature. Note that the locality of selection that is enforced

feature geometry (elimination of the `LOCAL` feature and use of a single valence feature) are problematic as well. However, if we do reject the revised feature geometry and revert to the feature geometry that was used before, then Sign-Based Construction Grammar and Constructional HPSG (Sag 1997) are (almost) indistinguishable.

10.6.3 Embodied Construction Grammar

Embodied Construction Grammar was developed by Bergen & Chang (2005) and there are some implementations of fragments of German that use this format (Porzel et al. 2006). In the following, I will briefly present the formalism using an example construction. (50) gives the `DetNoun` construction:²⁵


(50)	Construction <code>DetNoun</code> subcase of <code>RefExp</code> constructional <code>d:Determiner</code> <code>c:CommonNoun</code> <code>self.case</code> ↔ <code>d.case</code> <code>self.number</code> ↔ <code>c.number</code> <code>d.gender</code> ↔ <code>c.gender</code> <code>d.case</code> ↔ <code>c.case</code> <code>d.number</code> ↔ <code>c.number</code> form <code>d.f before c.f</code> meaning <code>self.m</code> ↔ <code>c.m</code>
------	---

This representational form is reminiscent of PATR-II grammars (Shieber, Uszkoreit, Pereira, Robinson & Tyson 1983): as in PATR-II, the daughters of a construction are given names. As such, (50) contains the daughters `c` and `d`. `d` is a determiner and `c` is a common noun. It is possible to refer to the construction itself via the object `self`. Constructions (and also their daughters) are feature-value descriptions. Structure sharing is represented by path equations. For example, `d.gender` ↔ `c.gender` states that the value of the gender feature of the determiner is identical to the gender feature of the noun. As well as restrictions on features, there are restrictions on the form. `d.f before c.f` states that the form contribution of the determiner must occur before that of the noun. Bergen & Chang (2005) differentiate between immediate (**meets**) and non-immediate precedence (**before**). Part of the information represented under `f` is the orthographic form (`f.orth`). The inheritance relation is given explicitly in the construction as in Kay & Fillmore (1999).

by `SYNSEM` can be circumvented by the use of relational constraints as well (see Frank Richter and Manfred Sailer's work on collocations (Richter & Sailer 1999a; Soehn & Sailer 2008)). So in principle, we end up with style guides in this area of grammar as well.

²⁵ For a similar construction, see Bergen & Chang (2005: 162).

The construction in (50) can be represented in a similar way to the format used in Chapter 6: (51) shows how this is done. The structure in (51) corresponds to a construction



where the determiner directly precedes the noun because the form contribution of the determiner has been combined with that of the noun. This strict adjacency constraint makes sense as the claim that the determiner must precede the noun is not restrictive enough since sequences such as (52b) would be allowed:

- (52) a. [dass] die Frauen Türen öffnen
 that the women doors open
 ‘that the woman open doors’
 b. *die Türen öffnen
 Frauen

If discontinuous phrases are permitted, *die Türen* ‘the doors’ can be analyzed with the DetNoun Construction although another noun phrase intervenes between the determiner and the noun (Müller 1999a: 424; 1999c). The order in (52b) can be ruled out by linearization constraints or constraints on the continuity of arguments. If we want the construction to require that the determiner and noun be adjacent, then we would simply use **meets** instead of **before** in the specification of the construction.

This discussion has shown that (51) is more restrictive than (50). There are, however, contexts in which one could imagine using discontinuous constituents such as the deviant one in (52b). For example, discontinuous constituents have been proposed for verbal complexes, particle verbs and certain coordination data (Wells 1947). Examples for analyses with discontinuous constituents in the framework of HPSG are Reape (1994), Kathol (1995), Kathol (2000), Crysmann (2008), and Beavers & Sag (2004).²⁶ These analyses, which are discussed in Section 11.7.2.2 in more detail, differ from those previously presented in that they use a feature **DOMAIN** instead of or in addition to the daughters features. The value of the **DOMAIN** feature is a list containing the head and the elements

²⁶ Crysmann, Beaver and Sag deal with coordination phenomena. For an analysis of coordination in TAG that also makes use of discontinuous constituents, see Sarkar & Joshi (1996) and Section 21.6.2.

dependent on it. The elements do not have to necessarily be adjacent in the utterance, that is, discontinuous constituents are permitted. Which elements are entered into this list in which way is governed by the constraints that are part of the linguistic theory. This differs from the simple **before** statement in ECG in that it is much more flexible and in that one can also restrict the area in which a given element can be ordered since elements can be freely ordered inside their domain only.

There is a further difference between the representation in (50) and the general HPSG schemata: in the ECG variant, linearization requirements are linked to constructions. In HPSG and GPSG, it is assumed that linearization rules hold generally, that is, if we were to assume the rules in (53), we would not have to state for each rule explicitly that shorter NPs tend to precede longer ones and that animate nouns tend to occur before inanimate ones.

- (53) a. $S \rightarrow \text{NP}[\text{nom}], \text{NP}[\text{acc}], V$
 b. $S \rightarrow \text{NP}[\text{nom}], \text{NP}[\text{dat}], V$
 c. $S \rightarrow \text{NP}[\text{nom}], \text{NP}[\text{dat}], \text{NP}[\text{acc}], V$
 d. $S \rightarrow \text{NP}[\text{nom}], \text{NP}[\text{acc}], \text{PP}, V$

It is possible to capture these generalizations in ECG if one specifies linearization constraints for more general constructions and more specific constructions inherit them from these. As an example, consider the Active-Ditransitive Construction discussed by Bergen & Chang (2005: 170):

- (54) **Construction** Active-Ditransitive
 subcase of Pred-Expr
 constructional
 agent:Ref-Expr
 action:Verb
 recipient:Ref-Expr
 theme:Ref-Expr
 ...
 form
 agent.f **before** action.f
 action.f **meets** recipient.f
 recipient.f **meets** theme.f
 meaning
 ...

These restrictions allow the sentences in (55a,b) and rule out those in (55c):

- (55) a. Mary tossed me a drink.
 b. Mary happily tossed me a drink.
 c. * Mary tossed happily me a drink.

The restriction *agent.f before action.f* forces an order where the subject occurs before the verb but also allows for adverbs to occur between the subject and the verb. The other constraints on form determine the order of the verb and its object: the recipient must be adjacent to the verb and the theme must be adjacent to the recipient. The requirement that an agent in the active must occur before the verb is not specific to ditransitive constructions. This restriction could therefore be factored out as follows:

- (56)

Construction Active-Agent-Verb subcase of Pred-Expr constructional agent:Ref-Expr action:Verb form agent.f before action.f
--

The Active-Ditransitive Construction in (54) would then inherit the relevant information from (56).

In addition to the descriptive means used in (50), there is the evokes operator (Bergen & Chang 2005: 151–152). An interesting example is the representation of the term *hypotenuse*: this concept can only be explained by making reference to a right-angled triangle (Langacker 1987: Chapter 5). Chang (2008: 67) gives the following formalization:

- (57)

Schema hypotenuse subcase of line-segment evokes right-triangle as rt constraints self ↔ rt.long-side

This states that a hypotenuse is a particular line segment, namely the longest side of a right-angled triangle. The concept of a right-angled triangle is activated by means of the evokes operator. Evokes creates an instance of an object of a certain type (in the example, *rt* of type *right-triangle*). It is then possible to refer to the properties of this object in a schema or in a construction.

The feature description in (58) is provided in the notation from Chapter 6. It is the equivalent to (57).

- (58)
$$\boxed{1} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{hypotenuse} \\ \text{EVOKES} \left\langle \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{right-triangle} \\ \text{LONG-SIDE } \boxed{1} \end{array} \right] \right\rangle \end{array} \right]$$

The type *hypotenuse* is a subtype of *line-segment*. The value of EVOKES is a list since a schema or construction can evoke more than one concept. The only element in this list in (58) is an object of type *right-triangle*. The value of the feature LONG-SIDE is identified

with the entire structure. This essentially means the following: I, as a hypotenuse, am the long side of a right-angled triangle.

Before turning to FCG in the next subsection, we can conclude that ECG and HPSG are notational variants.

10.6.4 Fluid Construction Grammar

Van Trijp (2013, 2014) claims that SBCG and HPSG are fundamentally different from Fluid Construction Grammar (FCG). He claims that the former approaches are generative ones while the latter is a cognitive-functional one. I think that it is not legitimate to draw these distinctions on the basis of what is done in FCG.²⁷ I will comment on this at various places in this section. I first deal with the representations that are used in FCG, talk about argument structure constructions, the combination operations fusion and merging that are used in FCG and then provide a detailed comparison of FCG and SBCG/HPSG.

10.6.4.1 General remarks on the representational format


Fluid Construction Grammar (FCG, Steels 2011a) is similar to HPSG in that it uses attribute value matrices to represent linguistic objects. However, these AVMs are untyped as in LFG. Since there are no types, there are no inheritance hierarchies that can be used to capture generalizations, but one can use macros to reach similar effects. Constructions can refer to more general constructions (van Trijp 2013: 105). Every AVM comes with a name and can be depicted as follows:

$$(59) \quad \boxed{\begin{array}{l} \textit{unit-name} \\ \left[\begin{array}{ll} \text{FEATURE}_1 & \textit{value}_1 \\ \dots & \\ \text{FEATURE}_n & \textit{value}_n \end{array} \right] \end{array}}$$

Linguistic objects have a form and a meaning pole. The two poles could be organized into a single feature description by using a SYN and a SEM feature, but in FCG papers the two poles are presented separately and connected via a double arrow. (60) is an example:

(60) The name *Kim* according to van Trijp (2013: 99):

²⁷ Steels (2013: 153) emphasizes the point that FCG is a technical tool for implementing constructionist ideas rather than a theoretical framework of its own. However, authors working with the FCG system publish linguistic papers that share a certain formal background and certain linguistic assumptions. So this section addresses some of the key assumptions made and some of the mechanisms used.



Depending on the mode in which the lexical items are used, the syntactic pole or the semantic pole is used first. The first processing step is a matching phase in which it is checked whether the semantic pole (for generation) or the syntactic pole (for parsing) matches the structure that was build so far. After this test for unification, the actual unification, which is called merging, is carried out. After this step, the respective other pole (syntax for generation and semantics for parsing) is merged. This is illustrated in Figure 10.2.




图 10.2: Generation and parsing in FCG (van Trijp 2013: 99)

10.6.4.2 Argument Structure Constructions

Fluid Construction Grammar assumes a phrasal approach to argument structure, that is, it is assumed that lexical items enter into phrasal configurations that contribute independent meaning (van Trijp 2011). The FCG approach is one version of implementing Goldberg's plugging approach to argument structure constructions (Goldberg 1995). Van Trijp suggests that every lexical item comes with a representation of potential argument roles like Agent, Patient, Recipient, and Goal. Phrasal argument structure constructions are combined with the respective lexical items and realize a subset of the argument roles, that is they assign them to grammatical functions. Figure 10.3 on the next page shows an example: the verb *sent* has the semantic roles Agent, Patient, Recipient, and Goal (upper left of the figure). Depending on the argument structure construction that is chosen, a subset of these roles is selected for realization.²⁸ The figures show the relation between sender, sent, and sendee and more the more abstract semantic roles and the relation between these roles and grammatical functions for the sentences in (61):

- (61) a. He sent her the letter.
 b. He sent the letter.
 c. The letter was sent to her.

While in (61a) the agent, the patient and the recipient are mapped to grammatical functions, only the agent and the patient are mapped to grammatical functions in (61b). The recipient is left out. (61c) shows an argument realization in which the sendee is realized as a *to* phrase. According to van Trijp this semantic role is not a recipient but a goal.

Note that under such an approach, it is necessary to have a passive variant of every active construction. For languages that allow for the combination of passive and impersonal constructions, one would be forced to assume a transitive-passive-impersonal construction. As was argued in Müller (2006: Section 2.6) free datives (*commodi/incommodi*) in German can be added to almost any construction. They interact with the dative passive and hence should be treated as arguments. So, for the resultative construction one would need an active variant, a passive variant, a variant with dative argument, a variant with dative argument and dative passive, and a middle variant. While it is technically possible to list all these patterns and it is imaginable that we store all this information in our brains, the question is whether such listings really reflect our linguistic knowledge. If a new construction comes into existence, lets say an active sentence pattern with a nominative and two datives in German, wouldn't we expect that this pattern can be used in the passive? While proposals that establish relations between active and passive con-

²⁸ It is interesting to note here that van Trijp (2011: 141) actually suggests a lexical account since every lexical item is connected to various phrasal constructions via coapplication links. So every such pair of a lexical item and a phrasal construction corresponds to a lexical item in Lexicalized Tree Adjoining Grammar (LTAG). See also Müller & Wechsler (2014a: 25) on Goldberg's assumption that every lexical item is associated with phrasal constructions.

Note that such coapplication links are needed since without them the approach cannot account for cases in which two or more argument roles can only be realized together but not in isolation or in any other combination with other listed roles.




图 10.3: Lexical items and phrasal constructions. Figure from van Trijp (2011: 122)

structions would predict this, alternative proposals that just list the attested possibilities do not.

The issue of how such generalizations should be captured was discussed in connection with the organization of the lexicon in HPSG (Flickinger 1987; Meurers 2001). In the lexical world, one could simply categorize all verbs according to their valence and say that *loves* is a transitive verb and the passive variant *loved* is an intransitive verb. Similarly *gives* would be categorized as a ditransitive verb and *given* as a strictly transitive one. Obviously this misses the point that *loved* and *given* share something: they both are related to their active form in a systematic way. This kind of generalization is captured by lexical rules that relate two lexical items. The respective generalizations that are captured by lexical rules are called a horizontal generalizations as compared to vertical generalizations, which describe relations between subtypes and supertypes in an inheritance hierarchy.

The issue is independent of the lexical organization of knowledge, it can be applied to phrasal representations as well. Phrasal constructions can be organized in hierarchies (vertical), but the relation between certain variants is not covered by this. The analog to the lexical rules in a lexical approach are GPSG-like metarules in a phrasal approach. So what seems to be missing in FCG is something that relates phrasal patterns, e.g., allo-constructions (Cappelle 2006; Goldberg 2014: 116, see also footnote 12).

10.6.4.3 Fusion, matching and merging

As was pointed out by Dowty (1989: 89–90), checking for semantic compatibility is not sufficient when deciding whether a verb may enter (or be fused with) a certain con-

struction. The example is the contrast between *dine*, *eat*, and *devour*. While the thing that is eaten may not be realized with *dine*, its realization is optional with *eat* and obligatory with *devour*. So the lexical items have to come with some information about this.

Van Trijp (2011) and Steels & van Trijp (2011) make an interesting suggestion that could help here: every verb comes with a list of potential roles and argument structure constructions can pick subsets of these roles (see Figure 10.3). This is called *matching*: introducing new argument roles is not allowed. This would make it possible to account for *dine*: one could say that there is something that is eaten, but that no Theme role is made available for linking to the grammatical functions. This would be a misuse of thematic roles for syntactic purposes though since *dine* is semantically a two-place predicate. To account for the extension of argument roles as it is observed in the Caused-Motion Construction (Goldberg 1995: Chapter 7), Steels & van Trijp (2011) suggest a process called *merging*. Merging is seen as a repair strategy: if an utterance involves an intransitive verb and some other material, the utterance cannot be processed with matching alone. For example, when processing Goldberg's example in (62), *he sneezed* could be parsed, but *the foam* and *off the cappuccino* would be unintegrated (see Chapter 21 for an extended discussion of such constructions).

(62) He sneezed the foam off the cappuccino.²⁹

So, Steels & van Trijp (2011: 319–320) suggest that only if regular constructions cannot apply, merging is allowed. The problem with this is that human language is highly ambiguous and in the case at hand this could result in situations in which there is a reading for an utterance, so that the repair strategy would never kick in. Consider (63):³⁰

(63) Schlag den Mann tot!
beat the man dead
'Beat the man to death!' or 'Beat the dead man!'

(63) has two readings: the resultative reading in which *tot* 'dead' expresses the result of the beating and another reading in which *tot* is a depictive predicate. The second reading is dispreferred, since the activity of beating dead people is uncommon, but the structure is parallel to other sentences with depictive predicates:

(64) Iss den Fisch roh!
eat the fish raw

The depictive reading can be forced by coordinating *tot* with a predicate that is not a plausible result predicate:

(65) Schlag ihn tot oder lebendig!
beat him dead or alive
'Beat him when he is dead or while he is alive!'

²⁹ Goldberg (2006: 42).

³⁰ I apologize for these examples ...

So, the problem is that (63) has a reading which does not require the invocation of the repair mechanism: *schlug* ‘beat’ is used with the transitive construction and *tot* is an adjunct (see Winkler 1997). However, the more likely analysis of (63) is the one with the resultative analysis, in which the valence frame is extended by an oblique element. So this means that one has to allow the application of merging independent of other analyses that might be possible. As Steels & van Trijp (2011: 320) note, if merging is allowed to apply freely, utterances like (66a) will be allowed and of course (66b) as well.

- (66) a. * She sneezed her boyfriend.
b. * She dined a steak.

In (66) *sneeze* and *dined* are used in the transitive construction.

The way out of this dilemma is to establish information in lexical items that specifies in which syntactic environments a verb can be used. This information can be weighted and for instance the probability of *dine* to be used transitively would be extremely low. Steels and van Trijp would connect their lexical items to phrasal constructions via so-called coapplication links and the strength of the respective link would be very low for *dine* and the transitive construction and reasonably high for *sneeze* and the Caused-Motion Construction. This would explain the phenomena (and in a usage-based way), but it would be a lexical approach, as it is common in CG, HPSG, SBCG, and DG.

10.6.4.4 Long-distance dependencies

Van Trijp (2014) compares the SLASH-based approaches that are used in GPSG, HPSG, and SBCG with the approach that he suggests within the framework of FCG. He claims that there are fundamental differences between SBCG and FCG and assigns SBCG to the class of generative grammars, while placing FCG in the class of cognitive-functional approaches. He claims that his cognitive-functional approach is superior in terms of completeness, explanatory adequacy, and theoretical parsimony (p. 2). What van Trijp (2014) suggests is basically an analysis that was suggested by Reape (2000) in unpublished work (see Reape (1994) for a published version of an linearization-based approach and Kathol (2000); Müller (1996c, 1999a, 2002a) for linearization-based approaches that despite of being linearization-based assume the SLASH approach for nonlocal dependencies). Van Trijp develops a model of grammar that allows for discontinuous constituents and just treats the serialization of the object in sentences like (67) as an alternative linearization option.

- (67) a. This book, I read.
b. What did the boy hit?

Van Trijp’s analysis involves several units that do not normally exist in phrase structure grammars, but can be modeled via adjacency constraints or represent relations between items which are part of lexical representations in HPSG/SBCG anyway. An example is the subject-verb anchor that connects the subject and the verb to represent the fact that these two items play an important functional role. Figure 10.4 on the following page shows the analysis of (68).

(68) What did the boy hit?




图 10.4: The analysis of *What did the boy hit?* according to van Trijp (2014: 265)

As can be seen in the figure, van Trijp also refers to information structural terms like topic and focus. It should be noted here that the analysis of information structure has quite some history in the framework of HPSG (Engdahl & Vallduví 1996; Kuhn 1995, 1996; Günther et al. 1999; Wilcock 2001; De Kuthy 2002; Paggio 2005; Bildhauer 2008; Bildhauer & Cook 2010). The fact that information structure is not talked about in syntax papers like Sag (2012) does not entail that information structure is ignored or should be ignored in theories like HPSG and SBCG. So much for completeness. The same holds of course for explanatory adequacy. This leaves us with theoretical parsimony, but before I comment on this, I want to discuss van Trijp's analysis in a little bit more detail in order to show that many of his claims are empirically problematic and that his theory therefore cannot be explanatory since empirical correctness is a precondition for explanatory adequacy.

Van Trijp claims that sentences with nonlocal dependency constructions in English start with a topic.³¹ Bresnan's sentences in (2) and (3) were discussed on page 211 (Bresnan 2001: 97) and are repeated below for convenience:

(69) Q: What did you name your cat?
A: Rosie I named her. (*Rosie* = FOCUS)

(70) Q: What did you name your pets?
A: My dog, I named Harold. My cat, I named Rosie. (*my dog, my cat* = TOPIC)

These sentences show that the pre-subject position is not unambiguously a topic or a focus position. So, a statement saying that the fronted element is a topic is empirically

³¹ Van Trijp (2014: 256) uses the following definitions for topic and focus: "Topicality is defined in terms of aboutness: the topic of an utterance is what the utterance is 'about'. Focality is defined in terms of salience: focus is used for highlighting the most important information given the current communicative setting."

not correct. If this position is to be associated with an information structural function, this association has to be a disjunction admitting both topics and focused constituents.

A further problematic aspect of van Trijp's analysis is that he assumes that the auxiliary *do* is an object marker (p. 10, 22) or a non-subject marker (p. 23). It is true that *do* support is not necessary in subject questions like (71a), but only in (71b), but this does not imply that all items that are followed by *do* are objects.

- (71) a. Who saw the man?
b. Who did John see?

First, *do* can be used to emphasize the verb:

- (72) Who *did* see the man?

Second, all types of other grammatical functions can precede the verb:

- (73) a. Where did you see the man? (adverbial)
b. How tall is the man? (predicative)
c. What did John consider Peter? (predicative)
d. What does this book cost? (adverbial)
e. About what did you talk? (prepositional object)

And finally, even a subject can appear in front of *do* if it is extracted from another clause:

- (74) Who does he think saw this man? (subject)

There is a further empirical problem: approaches that assume that a filler is related to its origin can explain scope ambiguities that only arise when an element is extracted. Compare for instance the sentence in (75a) with the sentences in (75b, c): although the order of *oft* 'often' and *nicht* 'not' in (75a) and (75c) is the same, (75a) is ambiguous but (75c) is not.

- (75) a. Oft liest er das Buch nicht.
often reads he the book not
'It is often that he does not read the book.' or 'It is not the case that he reads the book often.'
b. dass er das Buch nicht oft liest
that he the book not often reads
'that it is not the case that he reads the book often'
c. dass er das Buch oft nicht liest
that he the book often not reads
'that it is often that he does not read the book'

(75a) has the two readings that correspond to (75b) and (75c). A purely linearization-based approach probably has difficulties to explain this. A SLASH-based approach can assume that (75a) has a gap (or some similar means for the introduction of nonlocal

dependencies) at the position of *oft* in (75b) or (75c). The gap information is taken into account in the semantic composition at the site of the gap. This automatically accounts for the observed readings.

Another empirical problem that has to be solved is the existence of extraction path marking languages. Bouma, Malouf & Sag (2001a) list a number of languages in which elements vary depending on the existence or absence of a gap in a constituent they attach to. For instance, Irish has complementizers that have one form if the clause they attach to has an element extracted and another form if it does not. SLASH-based proposals can account for this in a straight-forward way: the fact that a constituent is missing in a phrase is represented in the SLASH value of the trace and this information is percolated up the tree. So even complex structures contain the information that there is a constituent missing inside them. Complementizers that are combined with sentences therefore can select sentences with SLASH values that correspond to their inflection. Van Trijp's answer to this challenge is that all languages are different (van Trijp 2014: 263) and that the evidence from one language does not necessarily mean that the analysis for that language is also appropriate for another language. While I agree with this view in principle (see Section 13.1), I do think that extraction is a rather fundamental property of languages and that nonlocal dependencies should be analyzed in parallel for those languages that have it.

10.6.5 Coordination

One of the success stories of non-transformational grammar is the SLASH-based analysis of nonlocal dependencies by Gazdar (1981b). This analysis made it possible for the first time to explain Ross's Across the Board Extraction (Ross 1967). The examples were already discussed on page 187 and are repeated here for convenience:

- (76) a. The kennel which Mary made and Fido sleeps in has been stolen.
(= S/NP & S/NP)
- b. The kennel in which Mary keeps drugs and Fido sleeps has been stolen.
(= S/PP & S/PP)
- c. * The kennel (in) which Mary made and Fido sleeps has been stolen.
(= S/NP & S/PP)

The generalization is that two (or more) constituents can be coordinated if they have identical syntactic categories and identical SLASH values. This explains why *which* and *in which* in (76a,b) can fill two positions in the respective clauses. Now, theories that do not use a SLASH feature for the percolation of information about missing elements have to find different ways to make sure that all argument slots are filled and that the correct correspondence between extracted elements and the respective argument role is established. Note that this is not straightforward in models like the one suggested by van Trijp, since he has to allow the preposition *in* to be combined with some material to the left of it that is simultaneously also the object of *made*. Usually an NP cannot simply be used by two different heads as their argument. As an example consider (77a):

- (77) a. * John said about the cheese that I like.
 b. John said about the cheese that I like it.

If it would be possible to use material several times, a structure for (77a) would be possible in which *the cheese* is the object of the preposition *about* and of the verb *like*. This sentence, however, is totally out: the pronoun *it* has to be used to fill the object slot.

10.6.6 Discontinuous constituents and performance models

Van Trijp points out that SBCG does not have a performance model and contrasts this with FCG. On page 252 he states:

So parsing starts by segmenting the utterance into discrete forms, which are then categorized into words by morphological and lexical constructions, and which can then be grouped together as phrases (see Steels, 2011b, for a detailed account of lexico-phasal processing in FCG). So the parser will find similar constituents for all four utterances, as shown in examples (21–24). Since auxiliary-*do* in example (24) falls outside the immediate domain of the VP, it is not yet recognized as a member of the VP.

All of these phrases are disconnected, which means that the grammar still has to identify the relations between the phrases. (van Trijp 2014: 252)

In his (21)–(24), van Trijp provides several tree fragments that contain NPs for subject and object and states that these have to be combined in order to analyze the sentences he discusses. This is empirically inadequate: if FCG does not make the competence/performance distinction, then the way utterances are analyzed should reflect the way humans process language (and this is what is usually claimed about FCG). However, all we know about human language processing points towards an incremental processing, that is, we process information as soon as it is available. We start to process the first word taking into account all of the relevant aspects (phonology, stress, part of speech, semantics, information structure) and come up with an hypothesis about how the utterance could proceed. As soon as we have two words processed (in fact even earlier: integration already happens during the processing of words) we integrate the second word into what we know already and continue to follow our hypothesis, or revise it, or simply fail. See Section 15.2 for details on processing and the discussion of experiments that show that processing is incremental. So, we have to say that van Trijp's analysis fails on empirical grounds: his modeling of performance aspects is not adequate.

The parsing scheme that van Trijp describes is pretty much similar to those of computational HPSG parsers, but these usually come without any claims about human performance. Modeling human performance is rather complex since a lot of factors play a role. It is therefore reasonable to separate competence and performance and continue to work the way it is done in HPSG and FCG. This does not mean that performance aspects should not be modeled, in fact psycholinguistic models using HPSG have been developed in the past (Konieczny 1996), but developing both a grammar with large coverage and the performance model that combines with it demands a lot of resources.

10.6.7 Discontinuity vs. Subject-Head and Head-Filler Schema

I now turn to parsimony: van Trijp uses a subject-verb anchor construction that combines the subject and the main verb. Because of examples like (78) it must be possible to have discontinuous subject-verb constructions:³²

(78) Peter often reads books.

But if such constructions can be discontinuous one has to make sure that (79b) cannot be an instantiation of the subject-verb construction:

- (79) a. The boy I think left.
b. *I the boy think left.

Here it is required to have some adjacency between the subject and the verb it belongs to, modulo some intervening adverbials. This is modelled quite nicely in phrase structure grammars that have a VP node. Whatever the internal structure of such a VP node may be, it has to be adjacent to the subject in sentences like (78) and (79a) above. The dislocated element has to be adjacent to the complex consisting of subject and VP. This is what the Filler-Head Schema does in HPSG and SBCG. Van Trijp criticizes SBCG for having to stipulate such a schema, but I cannot see how his grammar can be complete without a statement that ensures the right order of elements in sentences with fronted elements.

Van Trijp stated that FCG differs from what he calls generative approaches in that it does not want to characterize only the well-formed utterances of a language. According to him, the parsing direction is much more liberal in accepting input than other theories. So it could well be that he is happy to find a structure for (79b). Note though that this is incompatible with other claims made by van Trijp: he argued that FCG is superior to other theories in that it comes with a performance model (or rather in not separating competence from performance at all). But then (79b) should be rejected both on competence and performance grounds. It is just unacceptable and speakers reject it for whatever reasons. Any sufficiently worked out theory of language has to account for this.

10.6.8 Restricting discontinuity

There is a further problem related to discontinuity. If one does not restrict continuity, then constituent orders like (80b) are admitted by the grammar:

- (80) a. Deshalb klärt, dass Peter kommt, ob Klaus spielt.
therefore resolves that Peter comes whether Klaus plays
‘Therefore that Peter comes resolves whether Klaus will play.’

³² Unless modals and tense auxiliaries are treated as main verbs (which they should not in English), constructions with modals seem to be another case where the subject and the main verb are not adjacent:

- (i) a. Peter will read the book.
b. Peter has read the book.

- b. *Deshalb klärt dass ob Peter Klaus kommt spielt.
therefore resolves that whether Peter Klaus comes plays

The interesting thing about the word salad in (80b) is that the constituent order within the *dass* clause and within the *ob* clause is correct. That is, the complementizer precedes the subject, which in turn precedes the verb. The problem is that the constituents of the two clauses are mixed.

In a model that permits discontinuous constituents, one cannot require that all parts of an argument have to be arranged after all parts that belong to another argument since discontinuity is used to account for nonlocal dependencies. So, it must be possible to have *Klaus* before other arguments (or parts of other arguments) since *Klaus* can be extracted. An example of mixing parts of phrases is given in (81):

- (81) Dieses Buch hat der Mann mir versprochen, seiner Frau zu geben, der gestern
this book has the man me promised his wife to give who yesterday
hier aufgetreten ist.
here performed is
'The man who performed here yesterday promised me to give this book to his wife.'

We see that material that refers to *der Mann* 'the man', namely the relative clause *der gestern hier aufgetreten ist* 'who performed here yesterday', appears to the right. And the object of *geben* 'to give', which would normally be part of the phrase *dieses Buch seiner Frau zu geben* 'this book his wife to give' appears to the left. So, in general it is possible to mix parts of phrases, but this is possible in a very restricted way only. Some dependencies extend all the way to the left of certain units (fronting) and others all the way to the right (extraposition). Extraposition is clause-bound, while extraction is not. In approaches like GPSG, HPSG and SBCG, the facts are covered by assuming that constituents for a complete clause are continuous apart from constituents that are fronted or extraposed. The fronted and extraposed constituents are represented in SLASH and EXTRA (Keller 1995; Müller 1999a), respectively, rather than in valence features, so that it is possible to require of constituents that have all their valents saturated to be continuous.

Summing up the discussion of parsimony, it has to be said that van Trijp has to provide the details on how continuity is ensured. The formalization of this is not trivial and only after this is done can FCG be compared with the SLASH-based approach.

In addition to all the points discussed so far, there is a logical flaw in van Trijp's argumentation. He states that:

whereas the filler-gap analysis cannot explain WHY *do*-support does not occur in *wh*-questions where the subject is assigned questioning focus, this follows naturally from the interaction of different linguistic perspectives in this paper's approach. (van Trijp 2014: 263)

The issue here is whether a filler-gap analysis or an analysis with discontinuous constituents is suited better for explaining the data. A correct argumentation against the

filler-gap analysis would require a proof that information structural or other functional constraints cannot be combined with this analysis. This proof was not provided and in fact I think it cannot be provided since there are approaches that integrate information structure. Simply pointing out that a theory is incomplete does not falsify a theory. This point was already made in my review of Boas (2003) and in a reply to Boas (2014). See Müller (2005a: 655–656), Müller (2007b: Chapter 20), and Müller & Wechsler (2014b: Footnote 15).

The conclusion about the FCG analysis of nonlocal dependencies is that there are some empirical flaws that can be easily fixed or assumptions that can simply be dropped (role of *do* as object marker, claim that the initial position in English fronting construction is the topic), some empirical shortcomings (coordination, admittance of illformed utterances with discontinuous constituents), some empirical problems when the analysis is extended to other languages (scope of adjuncts in German), and the parsimony of the analyses is not really comparable since the restrictions on continuity are not really worked out (or at least not published). If the formalization of restrictions on continuity in FCG turns out to be even half as complex as the formalization that is necessary for accounts of nonlocal dependencies (extraction and extraposition) in linearization-based HPSG that Reape (2000) suggested,³³ the SLASH-based analysis would be favorable.

In any case, I do not see how nonlocal dependencies could be used to drive a wedge between SBCG and FCG. If there are functional considerations that have to be taken into account, they should be modeled in both frameworks. In general, FCG should be more restrictive than SBCG since FCG claims to integrate a performance model, so both competence and performance constraints should be operative. I will come back to the competence/performance distinction in the following section, which is a more general comparison of SBCG and FCG.

10.6.8.1 Comparison to Sign-Based Construction Grammar/HPSG

According to van Trijp (2013), there are the differences shown in Table 10.1 on the next page. These differences will be discussed in the following subsections.

10.6.8.1.1 Competence/performance distinction

As for the linguistic approach, the use of the term *generative* is confusing. What van Trijp means – and also explains in the paper – is the idea that one should separate competence and performance. We will deal with both the generative-enumerative vs. constraint-based view and with the competence/performance distinction in more detail in the Chapters 14 and 15, respectively. Concerning the cognitive-functional approach, van Trijp writes:

³³ See Kathol & Pollard (1995) for a linearization-based account of extraposition. This account is implemented in the Babel System (Müller 1996c). See (Müller 1999d) on restricting discontinuity. Linearization-based approaches were argued to not be able to account for apparent multiple frontings in German (Müller 2005c, 2015b) and hence linearization-based approaches were replaced by more traditional variants that allow for continuous constituents only.

表 10.1: Differences between SBCG and FCG according to van Trijp (2013: 112)

Scientific model	Theoretical physics (abstract calculus)	Evolutionary theory (complex adaptive system)
Linguistic approach	Generative (competence model)	Cognitive-functional (parsing and production)
Formalization	Mathematical (amenable for implementation)	Computational (implemented)
Constructions	Static type constraints	Dynamic mappings
Constructicon	Signature and grammar	Open-ended inventory
Processing	Assumption of processing- independence	Bidirectional processing model

The goal of a cognitive-functional grammar, on the other hand, is to explain how speakers express their conceptualizations of the world through language (= *production*) and how listeners analyze utterances into meanings (= *parsing*). Cognitive-functional grammars therefore implement both a competence and a processing model. (van Trijp 2013: 90)

It is true that HPSG and SBCG make a competence/performance distinction (Sag & Wasow 2011). HPSG theories are theories about the structure of utterances that are motivated by distributional evidence. These theories do not contain any hypothesis regarding brain activation, planning of utterances, processing of utterances (garden path effects) and similar things. In fact, none of the theories that are discussed in this book contains an explicit theory that explains all these things. I think that it is perfectly legitimate to work in this way: it is legitimate to study the structure of words without studying their semantics and pragmatics, it is legitimate to study phonology without caring about syntax, it is legitimate to deal with specific semantic problems without caring about phonology and so on, provided there are ways to integrate the results of such research into a bigger picture. In comparison, it is wrong to develop models like those developed in current versions of Minimalism (called Biolinguistics), where it is assumed that utterances are derived in phases (NPs, CPs, depending on the variant of the theory) and then shipped to the interfaces (spell out and semantic interpretation). This is not what humans do (see Chapter 15).³⁴ But if we are neutral with respect towards such issues, we are fine. In fact, there is psycholinguistic work that couples HPSG grammars to performance models (Konieczny 1996) and similar work exists for TAG (Shieber & Johnson 1993; Demberg & Keller 2008).

Finally, there is also work in Construction Grammar that abstracts away from performance considerations. For instance, Adele Goldberg's book from 1995 does not contain a worked out theory of performance facts. It contains boxes in which grammatical functions are related to semantic roles. So this basically is a competence theory as well.

³⁴ Attempts to integrate current Minimalist theories with psycholinguistic findings (Phillips 2003) are incompatible with core principles of Minimalism like the *No Tampering Condition* of Chomsky (2008).

Of course there are statements about how this is connected to psycholinguistic findings, but this is also true for theories like HPSG, SBCG and Simpler Syntax (Jackendoff 2011: 600) that explicitly make the competence/performance distinction.

10.6.8.1.2 Mathematical formalization vs. implementation

The difference between mathematical and computational formalization is a rather strange distinction to make. I think that a formal and precise description is a prerequisite for implementation (see the discussion in Section 3.6.2 and Section 4.7.2). Apart from this, a computer implementation of SBCG is trivial, given the systems that we have for processing HPSG grammars. In order to show this, I want to address one issue that van Trijp discusses. He claims that SBCG cannot be directly implemented. On issues of complexity of constraint solving systems he quotes (Levine & Meurers 2006: Section 4.2.2):

Actual implementations of HPSG typically handle the problem by guiding the linguistic processor using a (rule-based) phrase structure backbone, but the disadvantage of this approach is that the “organization and formulation of the grammar is different from that of the linguistic theory” (Levine & Meurers 2006: Section 4.2.2). (van Trijp 2013: 108)

He concludes:

Applying all these observations to the operationalization of SBCG, we can conclude that an SBCG grammar is certainly amenable for computational implementation because of its formal explicitness. There are at least two computational platforms available, mostly used for implementing HPSG-based grammars, whose basic tenets are compatible with the foundations of SBCG: LKB (Copestake 2002) and TRALE (Richter 2006). However, none of these platforms supports a ‘direct’ implementation of an SBCG grammar as a general constraint system, so SBCG’s performance-independence hypothesis remains conjecture until proven otherwise.

There are two issues that should be kept apart here: efficiency and faithfulness to the theory. First, as Levine and Meurers point out, there were many constraint solving systems at the beginning of the 90’s. So there are computer systems that can and have been used to implement and process HPSG grammars. This is very valuable since they can be used for direct verification of specific theoretical proposals. As was discussed by Levine and Meurers, trying to solve constraints without any guidance is not the most efficient way to deal with the parsing/generation problem. Therefore, additional control-structure was added. This control structure is used for instance in a parser to determine the syntactic structure of a phrase and other constraints will apply as soon as there is sufficient information available for them to apply. For instance, the assignment of structural case happens once the arguments of a head are realized. Now, is it bad to have a phrase structure backbone? One can write down phrase structure grammars that use phrase structure rules that have nothing to do with what HPSG grammars usually do. The systems TRALE (Meurers, Penn & Richter 2002; Penn 2004) and LKB will process them. But

one is not forced to do this. For instance, the grammars that I developed for the Core-Gram project (Müller 2013a, 2015a) are very close to the linguistic theory. To see that this is really the case, let us look at the Head-Argument Schema. The Head-Argument Schema is basically the type *head-argument-phrase* with certain type constraints that are partly inherited from its supertypes. The type with all the constraints was given on page 263 and is repeated here as (82):

(82) (syntactic) constraints on *head-argument-phrase*:

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{head-argument-phrase} \\ \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD} \quad [1] \\ \text{SUBCAT} \quad [2] \end{array} \right] \\ \text{HEAD-DTR|SYNSEM|LOC|CAT} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD} \quad [1] \\ \text{SUBCAT} \quad [2] \oplus \langle [3] \rangle \end{array} \right] \\ \text{NON-HEAD-DTRS} \langle [\text{SYNSEM} [3]] \rangle \end{array} \right]$$

This can be translated into a phrase structure grammar in a straight-forward way:

$$(83) \quad \begin{array}{ll} \text{a.} & \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{head-argument-phrase} \\ \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD} \quad [1] \\ \text{SUBCAT} \quad [2] \end{array} \right] \\ \text{HEAD-DTR} [4] \mid \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD} \quad [1] \\ \text{SUBCAT} \quad [2] \oplus \langle [3] \rangle \end{array} \right] \\ \text{NON-HEAD-DTRS} \langle [5] [\text{SYNSEM} [3]] \rangle \end{array} \right] \rightarrow [4], [5] \\ \\ \text{b.} & \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{head-argument-phrase} \\ \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD} \quad [1] \\ \text{SUBCAT} \quad [2] \end{array} \right] \\ \text{HEAD-DTR} [4] \mid \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD} \quad [1] \\ \text{SUBCAT} \quad [2] \oplus \langle [3] \rangle \end{array} \right] \\ \text{NON-HEAD-DTRS} \langle [5] [\text{SYNSEM} [3]] \rangle \end{array} \right] \rightarrow [5], [4] \end{array}$$

The left hand side of the rule is the mother node of the tree, that is, the sign that is licensed by the schema provided that the daughters are present. The right hand side in (83a) consists of the head daughter [4] followed by the non-head daughter [5]. We have the opposite order in (83b), that is, the head daughter follows the non-head daughter. The two orders correspond to the two orders that are permitted by LP-rules: the head precedes its argument if it is marked INITIAL+ and it follows it if it is marked INITIAL−.

The following code shows how (83b) is implemented in TRALE:

```
arg_h rule (head_argument_phrase,
            synsem:loc:cat:head:initial:minus,
            head_dtr:HeadDtr,
            non_head_dtrs:[NonHeadDtr]
```

```

)
==>
cat> NonHeadDtr,
cat> HeadDtr.

```

A rule starts with an identifier that is needed for technical reasons like displaying intermediate structures in the parsing process in debugging tools. A description of the mother node follows and after the arrow we find a list of daughters, each introduced by the operator `cat>`.³⁵ Structure sharing is indicated by values with capital letters. The above TRALE rule is a computer-readable variant of (83b), but includes the explicit specification of the value of `INITIAL`.

Now, the translation of a parallel schema using a `MOTHER` feature like (84a) into a phrase structure rule is almost as simple:

$$\begin{array}{l}
 (84) \quad \text{a.} \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{head-argument-cx} \\ \text{MOTHER} | \text{SYNSEM} | \text{LOC} | \text{CAT} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD} \quad [1] \\ \text{SUBCAT} \quad [2] \end{array} \right] \\ \text{HEAD-DTR} [4] | \text{SYNSEM} | \text{LOC} | \text{CAT} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD} \quad [1] \\ \text{SUBCAT} \quad [2] \oplus \langle [3] \rangle \end{array} \right] \\ \text{NON-HEAD-DTRS} \langle [5] [\text{SYNSEM} [3]] \rangle \end{array} \right] \\
 \\
 \text{b.} \quad [6] \rightarrow [4], [5] \text{ where} \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{head-argument-cx} \\ \text{MOTHER} [6] | \text{SYNSEM} | \text{LOC} | \text{CAT} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD} \quad [1] \\ \text{SUBCAT} \quad [2] \end{array} \right] \\ \text{HEAD-DTR} [4] | \text{SYNSEM} | \text{LOC} | \text{CAT} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD} \quad [1] \\ \text{SUBCAT} \quad [2] \oplus \langle [3] \rangle \end{array} \right] \\ \text{NON-HEAD-DTRS} \langle [5] [\text{SYNSEM} [3]] \rangle \end{array} \right]
 \end{array}$$

(84b) is only one of the two phrase structure rules that correspond to (84a), but since the other one only differs from (84b) in the ordering of [4] and [5], it is not given here.

For grammars in which the order of the elements corresponds to the observable order of the daughters in a `DTRS` list, the connection to phrase structure rules is even simpler:

$$(85) \quad [1] \rightarrow [2] \text{ where} \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{construction} \\ \text{MOTHER} [1] \\ \text{DTRS} \quad [2] \end{array} \right]$$

The value of `DTRS` is a list and hence [2] stands for the list of daughters on the right hand side of the phrase structure rule as well. The type *construction* is a supertype of all

³⁵ Other operators are possible in TRALE. For instance, `sem_head` can be used to guide the generator. This is control information that has nothing to do with linguistic theory and not necessarily with the way humans process natural language. There is also a `cats` operator, which precedes lists of daughters. This can be used to implement phrase structures with more than one non-head daughter.

constructions and hence (85) can be used to analyze all phrases that are licensed by the grammar. In fact, (85) is one way to put the meta constraint in (31).

So, this shows that the version of SBCG that has been developed by Sag (2012) has a straightforward implementation in TRALE.³⁶ The question remains whether *SBCG's performance-independence hypothesis remains conjecture until proven otherwise* as van Trijp sees it. The answer is: it is not a conjecture since any of the old constraint-solving systems of the nineties could be used to process SBCG. The question of whether this is efficient is an engineering problem that is entirely irrelevant for theoretical linguistics. Theoretical linguistics is concerned with human languages and how they are processed by humans. So whether some processing system that does not make any claims about human language processing is efficient or not is absolutely irrelevant. Phrase structure-based backbones are therefore irrelevant as well, provided they refer to the grammar as described in theoretical work.

Now, this begs the question whether there is a contradiction in my claims. On page 319 I pointed out that SBCG is lacking a formalization in Richter's framework (Richter 2004). Richter and also Levine & Meurers (2006) pointed out that there are problems with certain theoretically possible expressions and it is these expressions that mathematical linguists care about. So the goal is to be sure that any HPSG grammar has a meaning and that it is clear what it is. Therefore, this goal is much more foundational than writing a single grammar for a particular fragment of a language. There is no such foundational work for FCG since FCG is a specific toolkit that has been used to implement a set of grammars.

10.6.8.1.3 Static constraints vs. dynamic mappings and signature + grammar vs. open-endedness

One very interesting feature of Fluid Construction Grammar is its fluidity, that is there are certain constraints that can be adapted if there is pressure, the inventory of the theory is open-ended, so categories and features can be added if need be.

Again, this is not a fundamental difference between HPSG/SBCG and FCG. An HPSG grammar fragment of a specific language is a declarative representation of linguistic knowledge and as such it of course just represents a certain fragment and does not contain any information how this set of constraints evolved or how it is acquired by speakers. For this we need specific theories about language evolution/language change/ll-language acquisition. This is parallel to what we said about the competence/performance distinction, in order to account for language evolution we would have to have several HPSG grammars and say something about how one developed from the other. This will involve weighted constraints, it will involve recategorization of linguistic items and lots more.³⁷ So basically HPSG has to be extended, has to be paired with a model about

³⁶ A toy fragment of English using a MOTHER feature and phrase structure rules with specifications of the kind given above can be downloaded at <http://hpsg.fu-berlin.de/Fragments/SBCG-TRALE/>.

³⁷ There are systems that use weighted constraints. We had a simple version of this in the German HPSG grammar that was developed in *Verbmobil* project (Müller & Kasper 2000) already. Further theoretical approaches to integrate weighted constraints are Brew (1995) and more recently Guzmán Naranjo (2015).

language evolution in the very same way as FCG is.

10.6.8.1.4 Theoretical physics vs. Darwinian evolutionary theory

Van Trijp compares SBCG and FCG and claims that SBCG follows the model of theoretical physics – like Chomsky does –, while FCG adopts a Darwinian model of science – like Croft does –, the difference being that SBCG makes certain assumptions that are true of all languages, while FCG does not make any a priori assumptions. The fundamental assumptions made in both theories are that the objects that we model are best described by feature value pairs (a triviality). FCG assumes that there is always a syntactic and a semantic pole (fundamental assumption in the system) and researchers working in HPSG/SBCG assume that if languages have certain phenomena, they will be analyzed in similar ways. For instance, if a language has nonlocal dependencies, these will be analyzed via the SLASH mechanism. However, this does not entail that one believes that grammars of all languages have a SLASH feature. And in fact, there may even be languages that do not have valence features (Koenig & Michelson 2010), which may be a problem for FCG since it relies on the SYN-pole for the matching phase. So as far as SBCG is concerned, there is considerable freedom to choose features that are relevant in an analysis, and of course additional features and types can be assumed in case a language is found that provides evidence for this. The only example of a constraint provided by van Trijp that is possibly too strong is the locality constraint imposed by the MOTHER feature. The idea about this feature is that everything that is of relevance in a more nonlocal context has to be passed up explicitly. This is done for nonlocal dependencies (via SLASH) and for instance also for information concerning the form of a preposition inside of a PP (via PFORM or more recently via FORM). Certain verbs require prepositional objects and restrict the form of the preposition. For instance, *wait* has to make sure that its prepositional object has the preposition *for* in it. Since this information is usually available only at the preposition, it has to be passed up to the PP level in order to be directly selectable by the governing verb.

(86) I am waiting for my man.

So, assuming strict locality of selection requires that all phenomena that cannot be treated locally have to be analyzed by passing information up. Assuming strict locality is a design decision that does not have any empirical consequences, as far as it does not rule out any language or construction in principle. It just requires that information has to be passed up that needs to be accessed at higher nodes. As I have shown in Section 10.6.2, the locality constraint is easily circumvented even within SBCG and it makes the analysis of idioms unnecessarily complicated and unintuitive, so I suggest dropping the MOTHER feature. But even if MOTHER is kept, it is not justified to draw a distinction between SBCG and FCG along the lines suggested by van Trijp.

Independent of the MOTHER issue, the work done in the CoreGram project (Müller 2013a, 2015a) shows that one can derive generalizations in a bottom-up fashion rather

Usually such weighted constraints are not part of theoretical papers, but there are exceptions as for instance the paper by Briscoe and Copestake about lexical rules (Briscoe & Copestake 1999).

than imposing constraints on grammars in a top-down way. The latter paper discusses Croft's methodological considerations and shows how methodological pitfalls are circumvented in the project. HPSG/SBCG research differs from work in Chomskyan frameworks in not trying to show that all languages are like English or Romance or German or whatever, rather languages are treated on their own as it is common in the Construction Grammar community. This does not imply that there is no interest in generalizations and universals or near universals or tendencies, but again the style of working and the rhetoric in HPSG/SBCG is usually different from the ones in Mainstream Generative Grammar. Therefore, I think that the purported difference between SBCG and FCG does not exist.

10.6.8.1.5 Permissiveness of the theories

Van Trijp claims that HPSG/SBCG is a “generative grammar” since its aim is to account for and admit only grammatical sentences. FCG on the other hand is more permissive and tries to get the most out of the input even if it is fragmentary or ungrammatical (see also Steels 2013: 166). While it is an engineering decision to be able to parse ungrammatical input – and there are most certainly systems for the robust processing of HPSG grammars (Kiefer, Krieger & Nederhof 2000; Copestake 2007), it is also clear that humans cannot parse everything. There are strong constraints whose violations cause measurable effects in the brain. This is something that a model of language (that includes competence and performance factors or does not make the difference at all) has to explain. The question is what the cause of deviance is: is it processing complexity? Is it a category mismatch? A clash in information structure? So, if FCG permits structures that are not accepted by human native speakers and that do not make any sense whatsoever, additional constraints have to be added. If they are not added, the respective FCG theory is not an adequate theory of the language under consideration. Again, there is no difference between HPSG/SBCG and FCG.

10.6.8.1.6 A note on engineering

A problematic property of work done in FCG is that linguistic and engineering aspects are mixed.³⁸ Certain bookkeeping features that are needed only for technical reasons appear in linguistic papers, technical assumptions that are made to get a parser running are mixed with linguistic constraints. Bit vector encodings that are used to represent case information are part of papers about interesting case systems. There is certainly nothing wrong with bit vector encodings. They are used in HPSG implementations as well (Reape 1991: 55; Müller 1996c: 269), but this is not mixed into the theoretical papers.

³⁸ This is not a problem if all FCG papers are read as papers documenting the FCG-system (see Footnote 27 on page 329) since then it would be necessary to include these technical details. If the FCG papers are to be read as theoretical linguistics papers that document a certain Construction Grammar analysis, the Lisp statements and the implementational details are simply an obstacle.

It was a big breakthrough in the 80's when theoretical linguists and computational linguists started working together and developed declarative formalisms that were independent of specific parsers and processing systems. This made it possible to take over insights from a lot of linguists who were not concerned with the actual implementation but took care of finding linguistic generalizations and specifying constraints. Since this separation is given up in FCG, it will remain an engineering project without much appeal to the general linguist.

10.7 Summary and classification

There are currently three formalized variants of Construction Grammar: Sign-Based Construction Grammar, Embodied Construction Grammar, and Fluid Construction Grammar. The first two variants can be viewed as notational variants of (Constructional) HPSG (for SBCG with regard to this point, see Sag (2007: 411) and Sag (2010: 486)), or put differently, sister theories of HPSG. This is also true to a large extent for FCG, although van Trijp (2013) spends 25 pages working out the alleged differences. As I have shown in Section 10.6.4, HPSG and FCG are rather similar and I would say that these theories are sister theories as well.

Due to the origins of all three theories, respective analyses can differ quite considerably: HPSG is a strongly lexicalized theory, where phrasal dominance schemata have only been increasingly more used in the last ten years under the influence of Ivan Sag. The phrasal dominance schemata that Ivan Sag uses in his work are basically refinements of schemata that were present in earlier versions of HPSG. Crucially, all phenomena that interact with valence receive a lexical analysis (Sag, Boas & Kay 2012: Section 2.3). In CxG, on the other hand, predominantly phrasal analyses are adopted due to the influence of Adele Goldberg.

As already emphasized in Chapter 9, these are only tendencies that do not apply to all researchers working in the theories in question.

Exercises

1. Find three examples of utterances whose meaning cannot be derived from the meaning of the individual words. Consider how one could analyze these examples in Categorical Grammar (yes, Categorical Grammar).

Further reading

There are two volumes on Construction Grammar in German: Fischer & Stefanowitsch (2006) and Stefanowitsch & Fischer (2008). Deppermann (2006) discusses Construction Grammar from the point of view of conversational analysis. The 37(3) volume of the *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* from 2009 was also devoted to Construction Grammar. Goldberg (2003a) and Michaelis (2006) are overview articles in English. Goldberg's books constitute important contributions to Construction Grammar (1995;

2006; 2009). Goldberg (1995) has argued against lexical analyses such as those common in GB, LFG, CG, HPSG, and DG. These arguments can be invalidated, however, as will be shown in Section 21.7.1. Sag (1997), Borsley (2006), Jacobs (2008) and Müller & Lipenkova (2009) give examples of constructions that require a phrasal analysis if one wishes to avoid postulating empty elements. Jackendoff (2008) discusses the noun-preposition-noun construction that can only be properly analyzed as a phrasal construction (see Section 21.10). The discussion on whether argument structure constructions should be analyzed phrasally or lexically (Goldberg 1995, 2006; Müller 2006) culminated in a series of papers (Goldberg 2013a) and a target article by Müller & Wechsler (2014a) with several responses in the same volume.

Tomasello's publications on language acquisition (Tomasello 2000, 2003, 2005, 2006c) constitute a Construction Grammar alternative to the Principle & Parameters theory of acquisition as it does not have many of the problems that P&P analyses have (for more on language acquisition, see Chapter 16). For more on language acquisition and Construction Grammar, see Behrens (2009).

Dąbrowska (2004) looks at psycholinguistic constraints for possible grammatical theories.

第十一章 Dependency Grammar

Dependency Grammar is the oldest framework described in this book. Its modern version was developed by the French linguist Lucien Tesnière (1893–1954). His foundational work *Éléments de syntaxe structurale* ‘Elements of structural syntax’ was basically finished in 1938 only three years after Ajdukiewicz’s paper on Categorical Grammar (1935), but the publication was delayed until 1959, five years after his death. Since valence is central in Dependency Grammar, it is sometimes also referred to as Valence Grammar. Tesnière’s ideas are wide-spread nowadays. The conceptions of valence and dependency are present in almost all of the current theories (Ágel & Fischer 2010: 262–263, 284).

Although there is some work on English (Anderson 1971; Hudson 1984), Dependency Grammar is most popular in central Europe and especially so in Germany (Engel 1996: 56–57). Ágel & Fischer (2010: 250) identified a possible reason for this: Tesnière’s original work was not available in English until very recently (Tesnière 2015), but there has been a German translation for more than 35 years now (Tesnière 1980). Since Dependency Grammar focuses on dependency relations rather than linearization of constituents, it is often felt to be more appropriate for languages with freer constituent order, which is one reason for its popularity among researchers working on Slavic languages: the New Prague School represented by Sgall, Hajičová and Panevova developed Dependency Grammar further, beginning in the 1960s (see Hajičová & Sgall 2003 for an overview). Igor A. Mel’čuk and A. K. Žolkovskij started in the 1960s in the Soviet Union to work on a model called Meaning–Text Theory, which was also used in machine translation projects (Mel’čuk 1964, 1981, 1988; Kahane 2003). Mel’čuk left the Soviet Union towards Canada in the 1970s and now works in Montréal.

Dependency Grammar is very wide-spread in Germany and among scholars of German linguistics worldwide. It is used very successfully for teaching German as a foreign language (Helbig & Buscha 1969, 1998). Helbig and Buscha, who worked in Leipzig, East Germany, started to compile valence dictionaries (Helbig & Schenkel 1969) and later researchers working at the Institut für Deutsche Sprache (Institute for German Language) in Mannheim began similar lexicographic projects (Schumacher et al. 2004).

The following enumeration is a probably incomplete list of linguists who are/were based in Germany: Vilmos Ágel (2000), Kassel; Klaus Baumgärtner (1965, 1970), Leipzig later Stuttgart; Ulrich Engel (1977, 2014), IDS Mannheim; Hans-Werner Eroms (1985, 1987, 2000), Passau; Heinz Happ, Tübingen; Peter Hellwig (1978, 2003), Heidelberg; Jürgen Heringer (1996), Augsburg; Jürgen Kunze (1968, 1975), Berlin; Henning Lobin (1993),

Gießen; Klaus Schubert (1987), Hildesheim; Heinz Josef Weber (1997), Trier; Klaus Welke (1988, 2011), Humboldt University Berlin; Edeltraud Werner (1993), Halle-Wittenberg.

Although work has been done in many countries and continuously over the decades since 1959, a periodical international conference was established as late as 2011.^{1, 2}

From early on, Dependency Grammar was used in computational projects. Meřčuk worked on machine translation in the Soviet Union (Meřčuk 1964) and David G. Hays worked on machine translation in the United States (Hays & Ziehe 1960). Jürgen Kunze, based in East Berlin at the German Academy of Sciences, where he had a chair for computational linguistics, also started to work on machine translation in the 1960s. A book that describes the formal background of the linguistic work was published as Kunze (1975). Various researchers worked in the Collaborative Research Center 100 *Electronic linguistic research* (SFB 100, Elektronische Sprachforschung) from 1973–1986 in Saarbrücken. The main topic of this SFB was machine translation as well. There were projects on Russian to German, French to German, English to German, and Esperanto to German translation. For work from Saarbrücken in this context see Klein (1971), Rothkegel (1976), and Weissgerber (1983). Muraki et al. (1985) used Dependency Grammar in a project that analyzed Japanese and generated English. Richard Hudson started to work in a dependency grammar-based framework called Word Grammar in the 1980s (Hudson 1984, 2007) and Sleator and Temperley have been working on Link Grammar since the 1990s (Sleator & Temperley 1991; Grinberg et al. 1995). Fred Karlsson’s Constraint Grammars (1990) are developed for many languages (bigger fragments are available for Danish, Portuguese, Spanish, English, Swedish, Norwegian, French, German, Esperanto, Italian, and Dutch) and are used for school teaching, corpus annotation and machine translation. An online demo is available at the project website.³

In recent years, Dependency Grammar became more and more popular among computational linguists. The reason for this is that there are many annotated corpora (tree banks) that contain dependency information.⁴ Statistical parsers are trained on such tree banks (Yamada & Matsumoto 2003; Attardi 2006; Nivre 2003; Kübler et al. 2009; Bohnet 2010). Many of the parsers work for multiple languages since the general approach is language independent. It is easier to annotate dependencies consistently since there are fewer possibilities to do so. While syntacticians working in constituency-based models may assume binary branching or flat models, high or low attachment of adjuncts, empty elements or no empty elements and argue fiercely about this, it is fairly clear what the dependencies in an utterance are. Therefore it is easy to annotate consistently and train statistical parsers on such annotated data.

Apart from statistical modeling, there are also so-called deep processing systems, that is, systems that rely on a hand-crafted, linguistically motivated grammar. I already mentioned Meřčuk’s work in the context of machine translation; Hays & Ziehe (1960) had a parser for Russian; Starosta & Nomura (1986) developed a parser that was used with an English grammar, Jäppinen, Lehtola & Valkonen (1986) developed a parser that was demoed with Finnish, Hellwig (1986, 2003, 2006) implemented grammars of German in

¹ <http://depling.org/>. 10.04.2015.

² A conference on Meaning–Text Theory has taken place biannually since 2003.

³ http://beta.visl.sdu.dk/constraint_grammar. 24.07.2015.

⁴ According to Kay (2000), the first treebank ever was developed by Hays and did annotate dependencies.

the framework of Dependency Unification Grammar, Hudson (1989) developed a Word Grammar for English, Covington (1990) developed a parser for Russian and Latin, which can parse discontinuous constituents, and Menzel (1998) implemented a robust parser of a Dependency Grammar of German. Other work on computational parsing to be mentioned is Kettunen (1986); Lehtola (1986); Menzel & Schröder (1998b). The following is a list of languages for which Dependency Grammar fragments exist:

- Danish (Bick 2001; Bick & Nygaard 2007)
- English (Muraki et al. 1985; Starosta & Nomura 1986; Lavoie & Rambow 1997; Hudson 1989; Sleator & Temperley 1991; Voutilainen et al. 1992; Iordanskaja et al. 1992; Coch 1996)
- Esperanto (Bick 2009)
- Estonian (Müürisep 1999; Müürisep, Puolakainen, Muischnek, Koit, Roosmaa & Uibo 2003)
- Faroese (Trosterud 2009)
- Finnish (Nelimarkka, Jäppinen & Lehtola 1984; Jäppinen, Lehtola & Valkonen 1986)
- French (Iordanskaja et al. 1992; Coch 1996; Bick 2010)
- German (Hellwig 1986; Coch 1996; Heinecke et al. 1998; Menzel & Schröder 1998a; Hellwig 2003, 2006; Gerdes & Kahane 2001)
- Irish (Dhonnchadha & van Genabith 2006)
- Japanese (Muraki, Ichiyama & Fukumochi 1985)
- Latin (Covington 1990)
- Mandarin Chinese (Liu & Huang 2006; Liu 2009)
- Norwegian (Hagen, Johannessen & Nøklestad 2000),
- Old Icelandic (Maas 1977)
- Portuguese (Bick 2003)
- Russian (Hays & Ziehe 1960; Mel'čuk 1964; Covington 1990)
- Spanish (Coch 1996; Bick 2006)
- Swahili (Hurskainen 2006)

The Constraint Grammar webpage⁵ additionally lists grammars for Basque, Catalan, English, Finnish, German, Italian, Sami, and Swedish.

⁵ http://beta.visl.sdu.dk/constraint_grammar_languages.html

11.1 General remarks on the representational format

11.1.1 Valence information, nucleus and satellites

The central concept of Dependency Grammar is valence (see Section 1.6). The central metaphor for this is the formation of stable molecules, which is explained in chemistry with reference to layers of electrons. A difference between chemical compounds and linguistic structures is that the chemical compounding is not directed, that is, it would not make sense to claim that oxygen is more important than hydrogen in forming water. In contrast to this, the verb is more important than the nominal phrases it combines with to form a complete clause. In languages like English and German, the verb determines the form of its dependents, for instance their case.

One way to depict dependencies is shown in Figure 11.1. The highest node is the verb *reads*. Its valence is a nominative NP (the subject) and an accusative NP (an object). This is




图 11.1: Analysis of *The child reads a book*.

depicted by the dependency links between the node representing the verb and the nodes representing the respective nouns. The nouns themselves require a determiner, which again is shown by the dependency links to *the* and *a* respectively. Note that the analysis presented here corresponds to the NP analysis that is assumed in HPSG for instance, that is, the noun selects its specifier (see Section 9.6.1). It should be noted, though, that the discussion whether an NP or a DP analysis is appropriate also took place within the Dependency Grammar community (Hudson 1984: 90; Van Langendonck 1994; Hudson 2004). See Engel (1977) for an analysis with the N as head and Welke (2011: 31) for an analysis with the determiner as head.

The verb is the head of the clause and the nouns are called *dependents*. Alternative terms for head and dependent are *nucleus* and *satellite*, respectively.

An alternative way to depict the dependencies, which is used in the Dependency Grammar variant Word Grammar (Hudson 2007), is provided in Figure 11.2 on the next page. This graph displays the grammatical functions rather than information about part of speech, but apart from this it is equivalent to the representation in Figure 11.1. The highest node in Figure 11.1 is labeled with the ROOT arrow in Figure 11.2. Downward links are indicated by the direction of the arrows.




图 11.2: Alternative presentation of the analysis of *The child reads a book.*

A third form of representing the same dependencies provided in Figure 11.3 has the tree format again. This tree results if we pull the root node in Figure 11.2 upwards. Since we have a clear visualization of the dependency relation that represents the nu-




图 11.3: Alternative presentation of the analysis of *The child reads a book.*

cleus above the dependents, we do not need to use arrows to encode this information. However, some variants of Dependency Grammar – for instance Word Grammar – use mutual dependencies. So for instance, some theories assume that *his* depends on *child* and *child* depends on *his* in the analysis of *his child*. If mutual dependencies have to be depicted, either arrows have to be used for all dependencies or some dependencies are represented by downward lines in hierarchical trees and other dependencies by arrows.

Of course part of speech information can be added to the Figures 11.2 and 11.3, grammatical function labels could be added to Figure 11.1, and word order can be added to Figure 11.3.

The above figures depict the dependency relation that holds between a head and the respective dependents. This can be written down more formally as an n -ary rule that is similar to phrase structure rules that were discussed in Chapter 2 (Gaifman 1965: 305; Hays 1964: 513; Baumgärtner 1970: 61; Heringer 1996: Section 4.1). For instance Baumgärtner suggests the rule in (1):

$$(1) \quad \chi \rightarrow \varphi_1 \dots \varphi_i * \varphi_{i+2} \dots \varphi_n, \text{ where } 0 < i \leq n$$

The asterisk in (1) corresponds to the word of the category χ . In our example, χ would be V, the position of the '*' would be taken by *reads*, and φ_1 and φ_3 would be N. Together with the rule in (2b) for the determiner-noun combination, the rule in (2a) would license the dependency tree in Figure 11.1.

$$(2) \quad \text{a. } V \rightarrow N * N$$

11.1 General remarks on the representational format

b. $N \rightarrow D *$

Alternatively, several binary rules can be assumed that combine a head with its subject, direct object, or indirect object (Kahane 2009). Dependency rules will be discussed in more detail in Section 11.7.2, where dependency grammars are compared with phrase structure grammars.

11.1.2 Adjuncts

Another metaphor that was used by Tesnière is the drama metaphor. The core participants of an event are the *actants* and apart from this there is the background, the stage, the general setting. The actants are the arguments in other theories and the stage-describing entities are called *circumstants*. These circumstants are modifiers and usually analyzed as adjuncts in the other theories described in this book. As far as the representation of dependencies is concerned, there is not much of a difference between arguments and adjuncts in Dependency Grammar. Figure 11.4 shows the analysis of (3):

- (3) The child often reads the book slowly.




图 11.4: Analysis of *The child often reads the book slowly.*

The dependency annotation uses a technical device suggested by Engel (1977) to depict different dependency relations: adjuncts are marked with an additional line upwards from the adjunct node (see also Eroms 2000). An alternative way to specify the argument/adjunct, or rather the actant/circumstant distinction, is of course an explicit specification of the status as argument or adjunct. So one can use explicit labels for adjuncts and arguments as it was done for grammatical functions in the preceding. German grammars and valence dictionaries often use the labels E and A for *Ergänzung* and *Angabe*, respectively.

11.1.3 Linearization

So far we have seen dependency graphs that had connections to words that were linearized in a certain order. The order of the dependents, however, is in principle not

determined by the dependency and therefore a Dependency Grammar has to contain additional statements that take care of the proper linearization of linguistic objects (stems, morphemes, words). Engel (2014: 50) assumes the dependency graph in Figure 11.5 for the sentences in (4).⁶

- (4) a. Gestern war ich bei Tom.
yesterday was I with Tom
'I was with Tom yesterday.'
- b. Ich war gestern bei Tom.
I was yesterday with Tom
- c. Bei Tom war ich gestern.
with Tom was I yesterday
- d. Ich war bei Tom gestern.
I was with Tom yesterday




图 11.5: Dependency graph for several orders of *ich*, *war*, *bei Tom*, and *gestern* 'I was with Tom yesterday.' according to Engel (2014: 50)

According to Engel (2014: 50), the correct order is enforced by surface syntactic rules as for instance the rules that states that there is always exactly one element in the *Vorfeld* in declarative main clauses and that the finite verb is in second position.^{7,8} Furthermore, there are linearization rules that concern pragmatic properties, as for instance given information before new information. Another rule ensures that weak pronouns are placed into the *Vorfeld* or at the beginning of the *Mittelfeld*. This conception of linear order is problematic both for empirical and conceptual reasons and we will turn to it again in Section 11.7.1. It should be noted here that approaches that deal with dependency alone admit discontinuous realizations of heads and their dependents. Without any further constraints, Dependency Grammars would share a problem that was already discussed on page 326 in Section 10.6.3 on Embodied Construction Grammar and in Section 10.6.4.4

⁶ Engel uses E_{sub} for the subject and E_{acc} , E_{dat} , and E_{gen} for the objects with respective cases.

⁷ "Die korrekte Stellung ergibt sich dann zum Teil aus oberflächensyntaktischen Regeln (zum Beispiel: im *Vorfeld* des Konstativsatzes steht immer genau ein Element; das finite Verb steht an zweiter Stelle) [...]"

⁸ Engel (1970: 81) provides counterexamples to the claim that there is exactly one element in the *Vorfeld*. Related examples will be discussed in Section 11.7.1.

with respect to Fluid Construction Grammar: one argument could interrupt another argument as in Figure 11.6. In order to exclude such linearizations in languages in which




图 11.6: Unwanted analysis of *dass die Frauen Türen öffnen* ‘that the women open doors’

they are impossible, it is sometimes assumed that analyses have to be projective, that is crossing branches like those in Figure 11.6 are not allowed. This basically reintroduces the concept of constituency into the framework, since this means that all dependents of a head have to be realized close to the head unless special mechanisms for liberation are used (see for instance Section 11.5 on nonlocal dependencies).⁹ Some authors explicitly use a phrase structure component to be able to formulate restrictions on serializations of constituents (Gerdes & Kahane 2001; Hellwig 2003).

11.1.4 Semantics

Tesnière already distinguished the participants of a verb in a way that was later common in theories of semantic roles. He suggested that the first actant is the agent, the second one a patient and the third a benefactive (Tesnière 2015: Chapter 106). Given that Dependency Grammar is a lexical framework, all lexical approaches to argument linking can be adopted. However, argument linking and semantic role assignment are just a small part of the problem that has to be solved when natural language expressions have to be assigned a meaning. Issues regarding the scope of adjuncts and quantifiers have to be solved and it is clear that dependency graphs representing dependencies without taking into account linear order are not sufficient. An unordered dependency graph assigns grammatical functions to a dependent of a head and hence it is similar in many respects to an LFG f-structure.¹⁰ For a sentence like (25a) on page 217, repeated here as (5),

⁹ While this results in units that are also assumed in phrase structure grammars, there is a difference: the units have category labels in phrase structure grammars (for instance NP), which is not the case in Dependency Grammars. In Dependency Grammars, one just refers to the label of the head (for instance the N that belongs to *child* in Figure 11.4) or one refers to the head word directly (for instance, the word *child* in Figure 11.3). So there are fewer nodes in Dependency Grammar representations (but see the discussion in Section 11.7.2.3).

¹⁰ Tim Osborne (p. c. 2015) reminds me that this is not true in all cases: for instance non-predicative prepositions are not reflected in f-structures, but of course they are present in dependency graphs.

one gets the f-structure in (25b) on page 217. This f-structure contains a subject (*David*), an object (*a sandwich*), and an adjunct set with two elements (*at noon* and *yesterday*).

- (5) David devoured a sandwich at noon yesterday.

This is exactly what is encoded in an unordered dependency graph. Because of this parallel it comes as no surprise that Bröker (2003: 308) suggested to use glue semantics (Dalrymple, Lamping & Saraswat 1993; Dalrymple 2001: Chapter 8) for Dependency Grammar as well. Glue semantics was already introduced in Section 7.1.5.

There are some variants of Dependency Grammar that have explicit treatments of semantics. One example is Meaning–Text Theory (Mel’čuk 1988). Word Grammar is another one (Hudson 1991: Chapter 7; 2007: Chapter 5). The notations of these theories cannot be introduced here. It should be noted though that theories like Hudson’s Word Grammar are rather rigid about linear order and do not assume that all the sentences in (4) have the same dependency structure (see Section 11.5). Word Grammar is closer to phrase structure grammar and therefore can have a semantics that interacts with constituent order in the way it is known from constituent-based theories.

11.2 Passive

Dependency Grammar is a lexical theory and valence is the central concept. For this reason, it is not surprising that the analysis of the passive is a lexical one. That is, it is assumed that there is a passive participle that has a different valence requirement than the active verb (Hudson 1990: Chapter 12; Eroms 2000: Section 10.3; Engel 2014: 53–54).

Our standard example in (6) is analyzed as shown in Figure 11.7 on the following page.

- (6) [dass] der Weltmeister geschlagen wird
 that the world.champion beaten is
 ‘that the world champion is (being) beaten’

This figure is an intuitive depiction of what is going on in passive constructions. A formalization would probably amount to a lexical rule for the personal passive. See Hellwig (2003: 629–630) for an explicit suggestion of a lexical rule for the analysis of the passive in English.

Note that *der Weltmeister* ‘the world champion’ is not an argument of the passive auxiliary *wird* ‘is’ in Engel’s analysis. This means that subject–verb agreement cannot be determined locally and some elaborated mechanism has to be developed for ensuring agreement.¹¹ Hudson (1990), Eroms (2000: Section 5.3) and Groß & Osborne (2009) assume that subjects depend on auxiliaries rather than on the main verb. This requires

¹¹ This problem would get even more pressing for cases of the so-called remote passive:

- (i) a. weil der Wagen zu reparieren versucht wurde
 because the.SG.NOM car to repair tried was
 ‘because it was tried to repair the car’




图 11.7: Analysis of [*dass*] *der Weltmeister geschlagen wird* ‘that the world champion is (being) beaten’ parallel to the analyses provided by Engel (2014: 53–54)

some argument transfer as it is common in Categorical Grammar (see Section 8.5.2) and HPSG (Hinrichs & Nakazawa 1994). The adapted analysis that treats the subject of the participle as a subject of the auxiliary is given in Figure 11.8 on the following page.

11.3 Verb position

In many Dependency Grammar publications on German, linearization issues are not dealt with and authors just focus on the dependency relations. The dependency

-
- b. weil die Wagen zu reparieren versucht wurden
 because the.PL.NOM cars to repair tried were
 ‘because it was tried to repair the cars’

Here the object of *zu reparieren*, which is the object of a verb which is embedded two levels deep, agrees with the auxiliaries *wurde* ‘was’ and *wurden* ‘were’. However, the question how to analyze these remote passives is open in Engel’s system anyway and the solution of this problem would probably involve the mechanism applied in HPSG: the arguments of *zu reparieren* are raised to the governing verb *versucht*, passive applies to this verb and turns the object into a subject which is then raised by the auxiliary. This explains the agreement between the underlying object of *zu reparieren* ‘to repair’ and *wurde* ‘was’. Hudson (1997), working in the framework of Word Grammar, suggests an analysis of verbal complementation in German that involves what he calls *generalized raising*. He assumes that both subjects and complements may be raised to the governing head. Note that such an analysis involving generalized raising would make an analysis of sentences like (i) straightforward, since the object would depend on the same head as the subject, namely on *hat* ‘has’ and hence can be placed before the subject.

- (ii) Gestern hat sich der Spieler verletzt.
 yesterday has self the player injured
 ‘The player injured himself yesterday.’

For a discussion of Groß & Osborne’s account of (ii) see page 572.




图 11.8: Analysis of [*dass*] *der Weltmeister geschlagen wird* ‘that the world champion is (being) beaten’ with the subject as dependent of the auxiliary

relations between a verb and its arguments are basically the same in verb-initial and verb-final sentences. If we compare the dependency graphs of the sentences in (7) given in the Figures 11.9 and 11.10, we see that only the position of the verb is different, but the

dependency relations are the same, as it should be.¹²

- (7) a. [dass] jeder diesen Mann kennt
that everybody this man knows
'that everybody knows this man'
- b. Kennt jeder diesen Mann?
knows everybody this man
'Does everybody know this man?'




图 11.9: Analysis of [*dass*] *jeder diesen Mann kennt* ‘that everybody knows this man’

The correct ordering of the verb with respect to its arguments and adjuncts is ensured by linearization constraints that refer to the respective topological fields. See Section 11.1.3 and Section 11.7.1 for further details on linearization.

11.4 Local reordering

The situation regarding local reordering is the same. The dependency relations of the sentence in (8b) are shown in Figure 11.11 on the following page. The analysis of the sentence with normal order in (8a) has already been given in Figure 11.9.

¹² Eroms (2000) uses the part of speech Pron for pronouns like *jeder* 'everybody'. If information about part of speech plays a role in selection, this makes necessary a disjunctive specification of all valence frames of heads that govern nominal expressions, since they can either combine with an NP with internal structure or with a pronoun. By assigning pronouns the category N, such a disjunctive specification is avoided. A pronoun differs from a noun in its valence (it is fully saturated, while a noun needs a determiner), but not in its part of speech. Eroms & Heringer (2003: 259) use the symbol N_pro for pronouns. If the pro-part is to be understood as a special property of items with the part of speech N, this is compatible with what I have said above: heads could then select for Ns. If N_pro and N are assumed to be distinct, atomic symbols, the problem remains.

Using N rather than Pron as part of speech for pronouns is standard in other versions of Dependency Grammar, as for instance Word Grammar (Hudson 1990: 167; Hudson 2007: 190). See also footnote 2 on page 49 on the distinction of pronouns and NPs in phrase structure grammars.




图 11.10: Analysis of *Kennt jeder diesen Mann?* ‘Does everybody know this man?’

- (8) a. [dass] jeder diesen Mann kennt
 that everybody this man knows
 ‘that everybody knows this man’
 b. [dass] diesen Mann jeder kennt
 that this man everybody knows
 ‘that everybody knows this man’




图 11.11: Analysis of *[dass] diesen Mann jeder kennt* ‘that everybody knows this man’

11.5 Long-distance dependencies

There are several possibilities to analyze nonlocal dependencies in Dependency Grammar. The easiest one is the one we have already seen in the previous sections. Many analyses just focus on the dependency relations and assume that the order with the verb in second position is just one of the possible linearization variants (Ermons 2000: Section 9.6.2; Groß & Osborne 2009). Figure 11.12 on the next page shows the analysis of (9):

- (9) [Diesen Mann] kennt jeder.
 this man knows everybody
 ‘Everyone knows this man.’




图 11.12: Analysis of *Diesen Mann kennt jeder.* ‘This man, everybody knows.’ without special treatment of fronting

Now, this is the simplest case, so let us look at the example in (10), which really involves a *nonlocal* dependency:

- (10) Wen_i glaubst du, daß ich _{-i} gesehen habe?¹³
 who.ACC believe.2SG you.NOM that I.NOM seen have
 ‘Who do you think I saw?’

The dependency relations are depicted in Figure 11.13 on the following page. This graph differs from most graphs we have seen before in not being projective. This means that there are crossing lines: the connection between V_{prt} and the N for *wen* ‘who’ crosses the lines connecting *glaubst* ‘believe’ and *du* ‘you’ with their category symbols. Depending on the version of Dependency Grammar assumed, this is seen as a problem or it is not. Let us explore the two options: if discontinuity of the type shown in Figure 11.13 is allowed for as in Heringer’s and Eroms’ grammars (Heringer 1996: 261; Eroms 2000: Section 9.6.2),¹⁴ there has to be something in the grammar that excludes discontinuities that are ungrammatical. For instance, an analysis of (11) as in Figure 11.14 on the following page should be excluded.

- (11) *Wen glaubst ich du, dass gesehen habe?
 who.ACC believe.2SG I.NOM you.NOM that seen have
 Intended: ‘Who do you think I saw?’

Note that the order of elements in (11) is compatible with statements that refer to topological fields as suggested by Engel (2014: 50): there is a *Vorfeld* filled by *wen* ‘who’, there is a left sentence bracket filled by *glaubst* ‘believe’, and there is a *Mittelfeld* filled by *ich*

¹³ Scherpenisse (1986: 84).

¹⁴ However, the authors mention the possibility of raising an extracted element to a higher node. See for instance Eroms & Heringer (2003: 260).




图 11.13: Non-projective analysis of *Wen glaubst du, dass ich gesehen habe?* ‘Who do you think I saw?’




图 11.14: Unwanted dependency graph of * *Wen glaubst ich du, dass gesehen habe?* ‘Who do you think I saw?’

‘I’, *du* ‘you’ and the clausal argument. Having pronouns like *ich* and *du* in the *Mittelfeld* is perfectly normal. The problem is that these two pronouns come from different clauses: *du* belongs to the matrix verb *glaubst* ‘believe’ while *ich* ‘I’ depends on (*gesehen* ‘seen’) *habe* ‘have’. What has to be covered by a theory is the fact that fronting and extraposition target the left-most and right-most positions of a clause, respectively. This can be modeled in constituency-based approaches in a straightforward way, as has been shown in the previous chapters.

As an alternative to discontinuous constituents, one could assume additional mechanisms that promote the dependency of an embedded head to a higher head in the structure. Such an analysis was suggested by Kunze (1968), Hudson (1997, 2000), Kahane (1997), Kahane et al. (1998), and Groß & Osborne (2009). In what follows, I use the analysis by Groß & Osborne (2009) as an example for such analyses. Groß & Osborne depict the reorganized dependencies with a dashed line as in Figure 11.15.^{15,16} The origin of the




图 11.15: Projective analysis of *Wen glaubst du, dass ich gesehen habe?* ‘Who do you think I saw?’ involving rising

dependency (V_{prt}) is marked with a *g* and the dependent is connected to the node to which it has risen (the topmost V) by a dashed line. Instead of realizing the accusative dependent of *gesehen* ‘seen’ locally, information about the missing element is transferred to a higher node and realized there.

The analysis of Groß & Osborne (2009) is not very precise. There is a *g* and there is a dashed line, but sentences may involve multiple nonlocal dependencies. In (12) for instance, there is a nonlocal dependency in the relative clauses *den wir alle begrüßt haben* ‘who we all greeted have’ and *die noch niemand hier gesehen hat* ‘who yet nobody here seen has’: the relative pronouns are fronted inside the relative clauses. The phrase *dem*

¹⁵ Eroms & Heringer (2003: 260) make a similar suggestion but do not provide any formal details.

¹⁶ Note that Groß & Osborne (2009) do not assume a uniform analysis of simple and complex V2 sentences. That is, for cases that can be explained as local reordering they assume an analysis without rising. Their analysis of (9) is the one depicted in Figure 11.12. This leads to problems which will be discussed in Section 11.7.1.

Mann, den wir alle kennen ‘the man who we all know’ is the fronted dative object of *gegeben* ‘given’ and *die noch niemand hier gesehen hat* ‘who yet nobody here seen has’ is extraposed from the NP headed by *Frau* ‘woman’.

- (12) Dem Mann, den wir alle begrüßt haben, hat die Frau das Buch gegeben, die noch niemand hier gesehen hat.
 the man who we all greeted have has the woman the book given who
 yet nobody here seen has
 ‘The woman who nobody ever saw here gave the book to the man, who all of us greeted.’

So this means that the connections (dependencies) between the head and the dislocated element have to be made explicit. This is what Hudson (1997, 2000) does in his Word Grammar analysis of nonlocal dependencies: in addition to dependencies that relate a word to its subject, object and so on, he assumes further dependencies for extracted elements. For example, *wen* ‘who’ in (10) – repeated here as (13) for convenience – is the object of *gesehen* ‘seen’ and the extractee of *glaubst* ‘believe’ and *dass* ‘that’:

- (13) Wen glaubst du, dass ich gesehen habe?
 who believe you that I seen have
 ‘Who do you believe that I saw?’

Hudson states that the use of multiple dependencies in Word Grammar corresponds to structure sharing in HPSG (Hudson 1997: 15). Nonlocal dependencies are modeled as a series of local dependencies as it is done in GPSG and HPSG. This is important since it allows one to capture extraction path marking effects (Bouma, Malouf & Sag 2001a: 1–2, Section 3.2): for instance, there are languages that use a special form of the complementizer for sentences from which an element is extracted. Figure 11.16 shows the analysis of (13) in Word Grammar. The links above the words are the usual dependency




图 11.16: Projective analysis of *Wen glaubst du, dass ich gesehen habe?* ‘Who do you think I saw?’ in Word Grammar involving multiple dependencies

links for subjects (s) and objects (o) and other arguments (r is an abbreviation for *sharer*, which refers to verbal complements, l stands for *clausal complement*) and the links below the words are links for extractees (x<). The link from *gesehen* ‘seen’ to *wen* ‘who’ is special since it is both an object link and an extraction link (x<o). This link is an explicit statement which corresponds to both the little *g* and the N that is marked by the dashed line in Figure 11.15. In addition to what is there in Figure 11.15, Figure 11.16 also has an extraction link from *dass* ‘that’ to *wen* ‘who’. One could use the graphic representation of Engel, Eroms, and Gross & Osborne to display the Word Grammar dependencies: one would simply add dashed lines from the V_{prt} node and from the Subjunction node to the N node dominating *wen* ‘who’.

While this looks simple, I want to add that Word Grammar employs further principles that have to be fulfilled by well-formed structures. In the following I explain the *No-tangling Principle*, the *No-dangling Principle* and the *Sentence-root Principle*.

Principle 1 (The No-tangling Principle) *Dependency arrows must not tangle.*

Principle 2 (The No-dangling Principle) *Every word must have a parent.*

Principle 3 (The Sentence-root Principle) *In every non-compound sentence there is just one word whose parent is not a word but a contextual element.*

The No-tangling Principle ensures that there are no crossing dependency lines, that is, it ensures that structures are projective (Hudson 2000: 23). Since non-local dependency relations are established via the specific dependency mechanism, one wants to rule out the non-projective analysis. This principle also rules out (14b), where *green* depends on *peas* but is not adjacent to *peas*. Since *on* selects *peas* the arrow from *on* to *peas* would cross the one from *peas* to *green*.

- (14) a. He lives on green peas.
b. * He lives green on peas.

The No-dangling Principle makes sure that there are no isolated word groups that are not connected to the main part of the structure. Without this principle (14b) could be analyzed with the isolated word *green* (Hudson 2000: 23).

The Sentence-root Principle is needed to rule out structures with more than one highest element. *glaubst* ‘believe’ is the root in Figure 11.16. There is no other word that dominates it and selects for it. The principle makes sure that there is no other root. So the principle rules out situations in which all elements in a phrase are roots, since otherwise the No-dangling Principle would lose its force as it could be fulfilled trivially (Hudson 2000: 25).

I added this rather complicated set of principles here in order to get a fair comparison with phrase structure-based proposals. If continuity is assumed for phrases in general, the three principles do not have to be stipulated. So, for example, LFG and HPSG do not need these three principles.

Note that Hudson (1997: 16) assumes that the element in the *Vorfeld* is extracted even for simple sentences like (9). I will show in Section 11.7.1 why I think that this

analysis has to be preferred over analyses assuming that simple sentences like (9) are just order variants of corresponding verb-initial or verb-final sentences.

11.6 New developments and theoretical variants

This section mainly deals with Tesnière's variant of Dependency Grammar. Section 11.6.1 deals with Tesnière's part of speech system and Section 11.6.2 describes the modes of combinations of linguistics objects assumed by Tesnière.

11.6.1 Tesnière's part of speech classification

As mentioned in the introduction, Tesnière is a central figure in the history of Dependency Grammar as it was him who developed the first formal model (Tesnière 1959, 1980, 2015). There are many versions of Dependency Grammar today and most of them use the part of speech labels that are used in other theories as well (N, P, A, V, Adv, Conj, ...). Tesnière had a system of four major categories: noun, verb, adjective, and adverb. The labels for these categories were derived from the endings that are used in Esperanto, that is, they are O, I, A, and E, respectively. These categories were defined semantically as specified in Table 11.1.¹⁷ Tesnière assumed these categories to be universal and suggested

表 11.1: Semantically motivated part of speech classification by Tesnière

	substance	process
concrete	noun	verb
abstract	adjective	adverb

that there are constraints in which way these categories may depend on others.

According to Tesnière, nouns and adverbs may depend on verbs, adjectives may depend on nouns, and adverbs may depend on adjectives or adverbs. This situation is depicted in the general dependency graph in Figure 11.17 on the following page. The “**” means that there can be an arbitrary number of dependencies between Es. It is of course easy to find examples in which adjectives depend on verbs and sentences (verbs) depend on nouns. Such cases are handled via so-called *transfers* in Tesnière's system. Furthermore, conjunctions, determiners, and prepositions are missing from this set of categories. For the combination of these elements with their dependents Tesnière used special combinatoric relations: junction and transfer. We will deal with these in the following subsection.

¹⁷ As Weber (1997: 77) points out this categorization is not without problems: in what sense is *Angst* ‘fear’ a substance? Why should *glauben* ‘believe’ be a concrete process? See also Klein (1971: Section 3.4) for the discussion of *schlagen* ‘to beat’ and *Schlag* ‘the beat’ and similar cases. Even if one assumes that *Schlag* is derived from the concrete process *schlag-* by a transfer into the category O, the assumption that such Os stand for concrete substances is questionable.




图 11.17: Universal configuration for dependencies according to Tesnière
(I = verb, O = noun, A = adjective, E = adverb)

11.6.2 Connection, junction, and transfer

Tesnière (1959) suggested three basic relations between nodes: connection, junction, and transfer. Connection is the simple relation between a head and its dependents that we have already covered in the previous sections. Junction is a special relation that plays a role in the analysis of coordination and transfer is a tool that allows one to change the category of a lexical item or a phrase.

11.6.2.1 Junction

Figure 11.18 illustrates the junction relation: the two conjuncts *John* and *Mary* are connected with the conjunction *and*. It is interesting to note that both of the conjuncts are connected to the head *laugh*.




图 11.18: Analysis of coordination using the special relation *junction*

In the case of two coordinated nouns we get dependency graphs like the one in Figure 11.19 on the following page. Both nouns are connected to the dominating verb and both nouns dominate the same determiner.

An alternative to such a special treatment of coordination would be to treat the conjunction as the head and the conjuncts as its dependents.¹⁸ The only problem of such a

¹⁸ I did not use Tesnière's category labels here to spare the reader the work of translating I to V and O to N.




图 11.19: Analysis of coordination using the special relation *junction*

proposal would be the category of the conjunction. It cannot be *Conj* since the governing verb does not select a *Conj*, but an *N*. The trick that could be applied here is basically the same trick as in *Categorial Grammar* (see Section 21.6.2): the category of the conjunction in *Categorial Grammar* is $(X \backslash X) / X$. We have a functor that takes two arguments of the same category and the result of the combination is an object that has the same category as the two arguments. Translating this approach to *Dependency Grammar*, one would get an analysis as the one depicted in Figure 11.20 rather than the ones in Figure 11.18 and Figure 11.19. The figure for *all girls and boys* looks rather strange since both the




图 11.20: Analysis of coordination without *junction* and the conjunction as head

determiner and the two conjuncts depend on the conjunction, but since the two *Ns* are selecting a *Det*, the same is true for the result of the coordination. In *Categorial Grammar* notation, the category of the conjunction would be $((NP \backslash Det) \backslash (NP \backslash Det)) / (NP \backslash Det)$ since *X* is instantiated by the nouns which would have the category $(NP \backslash Det)$ in an analysis in which the noun is the head and the determiner is the dependent.

Note that both approaches have to come up with an explanation of subject-verb agreement. Tesnière's original analysis assumes two dependencies between the verb and the individual conjuncts.¹⁹ As the conjuncts are singular and the verb is plural, agree-

¹⁹ Eroms (2000: 467) notes the agreement problem and describes the facts. In his analysis, he connects the

ment cannot be modeled in tandem with dependency relations in this approach. If the second analysis finds ways of specifying the agreement properties of the coordination in the conjunction, the agreement facts can be accounted for without problems.

The alternative to a headed approach as depicted in Figure 11.20 is an unheaded one. Several authors working in phrase structure-based frameworks suggested analyses of coordination without a head. Such analyses are also assumed in Dependency Grammar (Hudson 1988; Kahane 1997). Hudson (1988) and others who make similar assumptions assume a phrase structure component for coordination: the two nouns and the conjunction are combined to form a larger object which has properties which do not correspond to the properties of any of the combined words.

Similarly, the junction-based analysis of coordination poses problems for the interpretation of the representations. If semantic role assignment happens in parallel to dependency relations, there would be a problem with graphs like the one in Figure 11.18, since the semantic role of *laugh* cannot be filled by *John* and *Mary* simultaneously. Rather it is filled by one entity, namely the one that refers to the set containing John and Mary. This semantic representation would belong to the phrase *John and Mary* and the natural candidate for being the topmost entity in this coordination is *and*, as it embeds the meaning of *John* and the meaning of *Mary*: *and'* (*John'*, *Mary'*).

Such junctions are also assumed for the coordination of verbs. This is, however, not without problems, since adjuncts can have scope over the conjunct that is closest to them or over the whole coordination. An example is the following sentence from Levine (2003: 217):

- (15) Robin came in, found a chair, sat down, and whipped off her logging boots in exactly thirty seconds flat.

The adjunct *in exactly thirty seconds flat* can refer either to *whipped off her logging boots* as in (16a) or scope over all three conjuncts together as in (16b):

- (16) a. Robin came in, found a chair, sat down, and [[pulled off her logging boots] in exactly thirty seconds flat].
b. Robin [[came in, found a chair, sat down, and pulled off her logging boots] in exactly thirty seconds flat].

The Tesnièreian analysis in Figure 11.21 on the following page corresponds to (17), while an analysis that treats the conjunction as the head as in Figure 11.22 on the following page corresponds to (16b).

- (17) Robin came in in exactly thirty seconds flat and Robin found a chair in exactly thirty seconds flat and Robin pulled off her logging boots in exactly thirty seconds flat.

The reading in (17) results when an adjunct refers to each conjunct individually rather than referring to a cumulative event that is expressed by a verb phrase as in (16b).

first conjunct to the governing head, although it seems to be more appropriate to assume an internally structured coordination structure and then connect the highest conjunction.




图 11.21: Analysis of verb coordination involving the junction relation




图 11.22: Analysis of verb coordination involving the connection relation

Levine (2003: 217) discusses these sentences in connection to the HPSG analysis of extraction by Bouma, Malouf & Sag (2001a). Bouma, Malouf & Sag suggest an analysis in which adjuncts are introduced lexically as dependents of a certain head. Since adjuncts are introduced lexically, the coordination structures basically have the same structure as the ones assumed in a Tesnièreian analysis. It may be possible to come up with a way to get the semantic composition right even though the syntax does not correspond to the semantic dependencies (see Chaves 2009 for suggestions), but it is clear that it is simpler to derive the semantics from a syntactic structure which corresponds to what is going on in semantics.

11.6.2.2 Transfer

Transfers are used in Tesnière's system for the combination of words or phrases with a head of one of the major categories (for instance nouns) with words in minor categories (for instance prepositions). In addition, transfers can transfer a word or phrase into another category without any other word participating.

Figure 11.23 shows an example of a transfer. The preposition *in* causes a category




图 11.23: Transfer with an example adapted from Weber (1997: 83)

change: while *Traumboot* 'dream boat' is an O (noun), the combination of the preposition and the noun is an E. The example shows that Tesnière used the grammatical category to encode grammatical functions. In theories like HPSG there is a clear distinction: there is information about part of speech on the one hand and the function of elements as modifiers and predicates on the other hand. The modifier function is encoded by the selectional feature *MOD*, which is independent of the part of speech. It is therefore possible to have modifying and non-modifying adjectives, modifying and non-modifying prepositional phrases, modifying and non-modifying noun phrases and so on. For the example at hand, one would assume a preposition with directional semantics that selects for an NP. The preposition is the head of a PP with a filled *MOD* value.

Another area in which transfer is used is morphology. For instance, the derivation of French *frappant* 'striking' by suffixation of *-ant* to the verb stem *frapp* is shown in Figure 11.24 on the following page. Such transfers can be subsumed under the general connection relation if the affix is treated as the head. Morphologists working in realizational morphology and construction morphology argue against such morpheme-based analyses since they involve a lot of empty elements for conversions as for instance the conversion of the verb *play* into the noun *play* (see Figure 11.25 on the following page).




图 11.24: Transfer in morphology and its reconceptualization as normal dependency

Consequently, lexical rules are assumed for derivations and conversions in theories like



图 11.25: Conversion as transfer from I (verb) to O (substantive) and as dependency with an empty element of the category N as head

HPSG. HPSG lexical rules are basically equivalent to unary branching rules (see the discussion of (39) on page 273 and Section 19.5). The affixes are integrated into the lexical rules or into realization functions that specify the morphological form of the item that is licensed by the lexical rule.

Concluding it can be said that transfer corresponds to

- binary-branching phrase structure rules, if a word or phrase is combined with another word,
- unary phrase structure rules or binary branching phrase structure rules together with an empty head if a phrase is converted to another category without any additional element present or
- a (unary) lexical rule if a word or stem is mapped to a word or a stem.

For further discussion of the relation between Tesnière's transfer rules and constituency rules see Osborne & Kahane (2015: Section 4.9.1–4.9.2). Osborne & Kahane point out that transfer rules can be used to model exocentric constructions, that is, constructions in which there is no single part that could be identified as the head. For more on headless constructions see Section 11.7.2.4.

11.6.3 Scope

As Osborne & Kahane (2015: lix) point out, Tesnière uses so-called polygraphs to represent scopal relations. So, since *that you saw yesterday* in (18) refers to *red cars* rather than *cars* alone, this is represented by a line that starts at the connection between *red* and *cars* rather than on one of the individual elements (Tesnière 2015: 150, Stemma 149).

(18) red cars that you saw yesterday

Tesnière's analysis is depicted in the left representation in Figure 11.26. It is worth noting that this representation corresponds to the phrase structure tree on the right of Figure 11.26. The combination B between *red* and *cars* corresponds to the B node in the




图 11.26: Tesnière's way of representing scope and the comparison with phrase structure-based analyses by Osborne & Kahane (2015: lix)

right-hand figure and the combination A of *red cars* and *that you saw yesterday* corresponds to the A node. So, what is made explicit and is assigned a name in phrase structure grammars remains nameless in Tesnière's analysis, but due to the assumption of polygraphs, it is possible to refer to the combinations. See also the discussion of Figure ??, which shows additional nodes that Hudson assumes in order to model semantic relations.

11.7 Summary and classification

Proponents of Dependency Grammar emphasize the point that Dependency Grammar is much simpler than phrase structure grammars, since there are fewer nodes and the general concept is more easy to grasp (see for instance Osborne 2014: Section 3.2, Section 7). This is indeed true: Dependency Grammar is well-suited for teaching grammar in introductory classes. However, as Sternefeld & Richter (2012: 285) point out in a rather general discussion, simple syntax has the price of complex semantics and vice versa. So, in addition to the dependency structure that is described in Dependency Syntax, one needs other levels. One level is the level of semantics and another one is linearization. As far as linearization is concerned, Dependency Grammar has two options: assuming continuous constituents, that is, projective structures, or allowing for discontinuous constituents. These options will be discussed in the following subsections. Section 11.7.2 compares dependency grammars with phrase structure grammars and shows that projective Dependency Grammars can be translated into phrase structure grammars. It also

shows that non-projective structures can be modeled in theories like HPSG. The integration of semantics is discussed in Section 11.7.2.3 and it will become clear that once other levels are taken into account, Dependency Grammars are not necessarily simpler than phrase structure grammars.

11.7.1 Linearization

We have seen several approaches to linearization in this chapter. Many just assume a dependency graph and some linearization according to the topological fields model. As has been argued in Section 11.5, allowing discontinuous serialization of a head and its dependents opens up Pandora's box. I have discussed the analysis of nonlocal dependencies by Kunze (1968), Hudson (1997, 2000), Kahane, Nasr & Rambow (1998), and Groß & Osborne (2009). With the exception of Hudson those authors assume that dependents of a head rise to a dominating head only in those cases in which a discontinuity would arise otherwise. However, there seems to be a reason to assume that fronting should be treated by special mechanisms even in cases that allow for continuous serialization. For instance, the ambiguity or lack of ambiguity of the examples in (19) cannot be explained in a straightforward way:

- (19) a. Oft liest er das Buch nicht.
 often reads he the book not
 'It is often that he does not read the book.' or
 'It is not the case that he reads the book often.'
- b. dass er das Buch nicht oft liest
 that he the book not often reads
 'It is not the case that he reads the book often.'
- c. dass er das Buch oft nicht liest
 that he the book often not reads
 'It is often that he does not read the book.'

The point about the three examples is that only (19a) is ambiguous. Even though (19c) has the same order as far as *oft* 'often' and *nicht* 'not' are concerned, the sentence is not ambiguous. So it is the fronting of an adjunct that is the reason for the ambiguity. The dependency graph for (19a) is shown in Figure 11.27 on the next page. Of course the dependencies for (19b) and (19c) do not differ. The graphs would be the same, only differing in serialization. Therefore, differences in scope could not be derived from the dependencies and complicated statements like (20) would be necessary:

- (20) If a dependent is linearized in the *Vorfeld* it can both scope over and under all other adjuncts of the head it is a dependent of.

Eroms (1985: 320) proposes an analysis of negation in which the negation is treated as the head; that is, the sentence in (21) has the structure in Figure 11.28 on the following page.²⁰

²⁰ But see Eroms (2000: Section 11.2.3).




图 11.27: Dependency graph for *Oft liest er das Buch nicht.* 'He does not read the book often.'

- (21) Er kommt nicht.
 he comes not
 'He does not come.'




图 11.28: Analysis of negation according to Eroms (1985: 320)

This analysis is equivalent to analyses in the Minimalist Program assuming a NegP and it has the same problem: the category of the whole object is Adv, but it should be V. This is a problem since higher predicates may select for a V rather than an Adv.²¹

The same is true for constituent negation or other scope bearing elements. For example, the analysis of (22) would have to be the one in Figure 11.29 on the following page.

- (22) der angebliche Mörder
 the alleged murderer

²¹ See for instance the analysis of embedded sentences like (23) below.




图 11.29: Analysis that would result if one considered all scope-bearing adjuncts to be heads

This structure would have the additional problem of being non-projective. Eroms does treat the determiner differently from what is assumed here, so this type of non-projectivity may not be a problem for him. However, the head analysis of negation would result in non-projectivity in so-called coherent constructions in German. The sentence in (23) has two readings: in the first reading, the negation scopes over *singen* ‘sing’ and in the second one over *singen darf* ‘sing may’.

- (23) *dass er nicht singen darf*
 that he not sing may
 ‘that he is not allowed to sing’ or ‘that he is allowed not to sing’

The reading in which *nicht* ‘not’ scopes over the whole verbal complex would result in the non-projective structure that is given in Figure 11.30. Eroms also considers an




图 11.30: Analysis that results if one assumes the negation to be a head

analysis in which the negation is a word part (‘Wortteiläquivalent’). This does, however,

not help here since first the negation and the verb are not adjacent in V2 contexts like (19a) and even in verb-final contexts like (23). Eroms would have to assume that the object to which the negation attaches is the whole verbal complex *singen darf* ‘sing may’, that is, a complex object consisting of two words.

This leaves us with the analysis provided in Figure 11.27 and hence with a problem since we have one structure with two possible adjunct realizations that correspond to different readings. This is not predicted by an analysis that treats the two possible linearizations simply as alternative orderings.

Thomas Groß (p. c. 2013) suggested an analysis in which *oft* does not depend on the verb but on the negation. This corresponds to constituent negation in phrase structure approaches. The dependency graph is shown on the left-hand side in Figure 11.31. The




图 11.31: Dependency graph for *Oft liest er das Buch nicht*. ‘He does not read the book often.’ according to Groß and verb-final variant

figure on the right-hand side shows the graph for the corresponding verb-final sentence. The reading corresponding to constituent negation can be illustrated with contrastive expressions. While in (24a) it is only *oft* ‘often’ which is negated, it is *oft gelesen* ‘often read’ that is in the scope of negation in (24b).

- (24) a. Er hat das Buch nicht oft gelesen, sondern selten.
 he has the book not often read but seldom
 ‘He did not read the book often, but seldom.’
 b. Er hat das Buch nicht oft gelesen, sondern selten gekauft.
 he has the book not often read but seldom bought
 ‘He did not read the book often but rather bought it seldom.’

These two readings correspond to the two phrase structure trees in Figure 11.32 on the following page. Note that in an HPSG analysis, the adverb *oft* would be the head of the phrase *nicht oft* ‘not often’. This is different from the Dependency Grammar analysis suggested by Groß. Furthermore, the Dependency Grammar analysis has two structures: a flat one with all adverbs depending on the same verb and one in which *oft* depends on the negation. The phrase structure-based analysis has three structures: one with




图 11.32: Possible syntactic analyses for *er das Buch nicht oft liest* 'he does not read the book often'

the order *oft* before *nicht*, one with the order *nicht* before *oft* and the one with direct combination of *nicht* and *oft*. The point about the example in (19a) is that one of the first two structures is missing in the Dependency Grammar representations. This probably does not make it impossible to derive the semantics, but it is more difficult than it is in constituent-based approaches.

Furthermore, note that models that directly relate dependency graphs to topological fields will not be able to account for sentences like (25).

- (25) Dem Saft eine kräftige Farbe geben Blutorangen.²²
 the juice a strong color give blood.oranges
 ‘Blood oranges give a strong color to the juice.’

The dependency graph of this sentence is given in Figure 11.33.




图 11.33: Dependency graph for *Dem Saft eine kräftige Farbe geben Blutorangen*. ‘Blood oranges give the juice a strong color.’

Such apparent multiple frontings are not restricted to NPs. Various types of dependents can be placed in the *Vorfeld*. An extensive discussion of the data is provided in Müller (2003a). Additional data have been collected in a research project on multiple frontings and information structure (Bildhauer 2011). Any theory based on dependencies alone and not allowing for empty elements is forced to give up the restriction commonly assumed in the analysis of V2 languages, namely that the verb is in second position. In comparison, analyses like GB and those HPSG variants that assume an empty verbal head can assume that a projection of such a verbal head occupies the *Vorfeld*. This explains why the material in the *Vorfeld* behaves like a verbal projection containing a visible verb: such *Vorfelds* are internally structured topologically. They may have a filled *Nachfeld* and even a particle that fills the right sentence bracket. See Müller (2005c, 2015b) for further data, discussion, and a detailed analysis. The equivalent of the analysis in Gross & Osborne’s framework (2009) would be something like the graph that is shown in Figure 11.34 on the following page, but note that Groß & Osborne (2009: 73) explicitly reject empty elements, and in any case an empty element which is stipulated

²² Bildhauer & Cook (2010) found this example in the *Deutsches Referenzkorpus* (DeReKo), hosted at Institut für Deutsche Sprache, Mannheim: <http://www.ids-mannheim.de/kl/projekte/korpora>

just to get the multiple fronting cases right would be entirely ad hoc.²³ It is important




图 11.34: Dependency graph for *Dem Saft eine kräftige Farbe geben Blutorangen*. ‘Blood oranges give the juice a strong color.’ with an empty verbal head for the *Vorfeld*

to note that the issue is not solved by simply dropping the V2 constraint and allowing dependents of the finite verb to be realized to its left, since the fronted constituents do not necessarily depend on the finite verb as the examples in (26) show:

²³ I stipulated such an empty element in a linearization-based variant of HPSG allowing for discontinuous constituents (Müller 2002b), but later modified this analysis so that only continuous constituents are allowed, verb position is treated as head-movement and multiple frontings involve the same empty verbal head as is used in the verb movement analysis (Müller 2005c, 2015b).

- (26) a. [Gezielt] [Mitglieder] [im Seniorenbereich] wollen die Kendoka
specifically members in.the senior.citizens.sector want.to the Kendoka
allerdings nicht werben.²⁴
however not recruit
‘However, the Kendoka do not intend to target the senior citizens sector with
their member recruitment strategy.’
- b. [Kurz] [die Bestzeit] hatte der Berliner Andreas Klöden [...] gehalten.²⁵
briefly the best.time had the Berliner Andreas Klöden held
‘Andreas Klöden from Berlin had briefly held the record time.’

And although the respective structures are marked, such multiple frontings can even cross clause boundaries:

- (27) Der Maria einen Ring glaube ich nicht, daß er je schenken wird.²⁶
the.DAT Maria a.ACC ring believe I not that he ever give will
‘I don’t think that he would ever give Maria a ring.’

If such dependencies are permitted it is really difficult to constrain them. The details cannot be discussed here, but the reader is referred to Müller (2005c, 2015b).

Note also that Engel’s statement regarding the linear order in German sentences (2014: 50) referring to one element in front of the finite verb (see footnote 7) is very imprecise. One can only guess what is intended by the word *element*. One interpretation is that it is a continuous constituent in the classical sense of constituency-based grammars. An alternative would be that there is a continuous realization of a head and some but not necessarily all of its dependents. This alternative would allow an analysis of extraposition with discontinuous constituents of (28) as it is depicted in Figure 11.35.

- (28) Ein junger Kerl stand da, mit langen blonden Haaren, die sein Gesicht
a young guy stood there with long blond hair that his face
einrahmten, [...] ²⁷
framed
‘A young guy was standing there with long blond hair that framed his face’

A formalization of such an analysis is not trivial, since one has to be precise about what exactly can be realized discontinuously and which parts of a dependency must be realized continuously. Kathol & Pollard (1995) developed such an analysis of extraposition in the framework of HPSG. See also Müller (1999a: Section 13.3). I discuss the basic mechanisms for such linearization analyses in HPSG in the following section.

²⁴ taz, 07.07.1999, p. 18. Quoted from Müller (2002b).

²⁵ Märkische Oderzeitung, 28./29.07.2001, p. 28.

²⁶ Fanselow (1993: 67).

²⁷ Charles Bukowski, *Der Mann mit der Ledertasche*. München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1994, p. 201, translation by Hans Hermann.




图 11.35: Dependency graph for *Ein junger Kerl stand da, mit langen blonden Haaren*. ‘A young guy was standing there with long blond hair.’ with a discontinuous constituent in the *Vorfeld*

11.7.2 Dependency Grammar vs. phrase structure grammar

This section deals with the relation between Dependency Grammars and phrase structure grammars. I first show that projective Dependency Grammars can be translated into phrase structure grammars (Section 11.7.2.1). I will then deal with non-projective DGs and show how they can be captured in linearization-based HPSG (Section 11.7.2.2). Section 11.7.2.3 argues for the additional nodes that are assumed in phrase structure-based theories and Section 11.7.2.4 discusses headless constructions, which pose a problem for all Dependency Grammar accounts.


11.7.2.1 Translating projective Dependency Grammars into phrase structure grammars

As noted by Gaifman (1965), Covington (1990: 234), Oliva (2003) and Hellwig (2006: 1093), certain projective headed phrase structure grammars can be turned into Dependency Grammars by moving the head one level up to replace the dominating node. So in an NP structure, the N is shifted into the position of the NP and all other connections remain the same. Figure 11.36 illustrates. Of course this procedure cannot be applied to all phrase structure grammars directly since some involve more elaborate structure. For instance, the rule $S \rightarrow NP, VP$ cannot be translated into a dependency rule, since NP and VP are both complex categories.

In what follows, I want to show how the dependency graph in Figure 11.1 on page 355 can be recast as headed phrase structure rules that license a similar tree, namely the one

图 11.36: *a book* in a phrase structure and a Dependency Grammar analysis

in Figure 11.37 on the following page. I did not use the labels NP and VP to keep the two

图 11.37: Analysis of *The child reads a book.* in a phrase structure with flat rules

figures maximally similar. The P part of NP and VP refers to the saturation of a projection and is often ignored in figures. See Chapter 9 on HPSG, for example. The grammar that licenses the tree is given in (29), again ignoring valence information.

- (29) $N \rightarrow D N$ $N \rightarrow \text{child}$ $D \rightarrow \text{the}$ $D \rightarrow a$
 $V \rightarrow N V N$ $N \rightarrow \text{book}$ $V \rightarrow \text{reads}$

If one replaces the N and V in the right-hand side of the two left-most rules in (29) with the respective lexical items and then removes the rules that license the words, one arrives at the lexicalized variant of the grammar given in (30):

- (30) $N \rightarrow D \text{ book}$ $D \rightarrow \text{the}$
 $N \rightarrow D \text{ child}$ $D \rightarrow a$
 $V \rightarrow N \text{ reads } N$

Lexicalized means that every partial tree licensed by a grammar rule contains a lexical element. The grammar in (30) licenses exactly the tree in Figure 11.1.²⁸

²⁸ As mentioned on page 356, Gaifman (1965: 305), Hays (1964: 513), Baumgärtner (1970: 57) and Heringer (1996: 37) suggest a general rule format for dependency rules that has a special marker ('*' and '~', respectively) in place of the lexical words in (30). Heringer's rules have the form in (31):

One important difference between classical phrase structure grammars and Dependency Grammars is that the phrase structure rules impose a certain order on the daughters. That is, the V rule in (30) implies that the first nominal projection, the verb, and the second nominal projection have to appear in the order stated in the rule. Of course this ordering constraint can be relaxed as it is done in GPSG. This would basically permit any order of the daughters at the right hand side of rules. This leaves us with the integration of adjuncts. Since adjuncts depend on the head as well (see Figure 11.4 on page 358), a rule could be assumed that allows arbitrarily many adjuncts in addition to the arguments. So the V rule in (30) would be changed to the one in (31):²⁹

(31) $V \rightarrow N \text{ reads } N \text{ Adv}^*$

Such generalized phrase structures would give us the equivalent of projective Dependency Grammars.³⁰ However, as we have seen, some researchers allow for crossing edges, that is, for discontinuous constituents. In what follows, I show how such Dependency Grammars can be formalized in HPSG.

11.7.2.2 Non-projective Dependency Grammars and phrase structure grammars with discontinuous constituents

The equivalent to non-projective dependency graphs are discontinuous constituents in phrase structure grammars. In what follows I want to provide one example of a phrase structure-based theory that permits discontinuous structures. Since, as I will show, discontinuities can be modeled as well, the difference between phrase structure grammars and Dependency Grammars boils down to the question of whether units of words are given a label (for instance NP) or not.

The technique that is used to model discontinuous constituents in frameworks like HPSG goes back to Mike Reape's work on German (1991; 1992; 1994). Reape uses a list called `DOMAIN` to represent the daughters of a sign in the order in which they appear at the surface of an utterance. (32) shows an example in which the `DOM` value of a headed-phrase is computed from the `DOM` value of the head and the list of non-head daughters.

$$(32) \text{ headed-phrase} \Rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD-DTR} | \text{DOM} \quad \boxed{1} \\ \text{NON-HEAD-DTRS} \quad \boxed{2} \\ \text{DOM} \quad \boxed{1} \circ \boxed{2} \end{array} \right]$$

(i) $X[Y_1, Y_2, \sim, Y_3]$

X is the category of the head, Y₁, Y₂, and Y₃ are dependents of the head and ' \sim ' is the position into which the head is inserted.

²⁹ See page 179 for a similar rule in GPSG and see Kasper (1994) for an HPSG analysis of German that assumes entirely flat structures and integrates an arbitrary number of adjuncts.

³⁰ Sylvain Kahane (p. c. 2015) states that binarity is important for Dependency Grammars, since there is one rule for the subject, one for the object and so on (as for instance in Kahane 2009, which is an implementation of Dependency Grammar in the HPSG formalism). However, I do not see any reason to disallow for flat structures. For instance, Ginzburg & Sag (2000: 364) assumed a flat rule for subject auxiliary inversion in HPSG. In such a flat rule the specifier/subject and the other complements are combined with the verb in one go. This would also work for more than two valence features that correspond to grammatical functions like subject, direct object, indirect object. See also Footnote 28 on flat rules.

The symbol ‘ \circ ’ stands for the *shuffle* relation. *shuffle* relates three lists A, B and C iff C contains all elements from A and B and the order of the elements in A and the order of the elements of B is preserved in C. (33) shows the combination of two sets with two elements each:

$$(33) \quad \langle a, b \rangle \circ \langle c, d \rangle = \langle a, b, c, d \rangle \vee \\ \langle a, c, b, d \rangle \vee \\ \langle a, c, d, b \rangle \vee \\ \langle c, a, b, d \rangle \vee \\ \langle c, a, d, b \rangle \vee \\ \langle c, d, a, b \rangle$$

The result is a disjunction of six lists. *a* is ordered before *b* and *c* before *d* in all of these lists, since this is also the case in the two lists $\langle a, b \rangle$ and $\langle c, d \rangle$ that have been combined. But apart from this, *b* can be placed before, between or after *c* and *d*. Every word comes with a domain value that is a list that contains the word itself:

$$(34) \quad \text{Domain contribution of single words, here } gibt \text{ ‘gives’}: \\ \boxed{1} \begin{bmatrix} \text{PHON} & \langle gibt \rangle \\ \text{SYNSEM} & \dots \\ \text{DOM} & \langle \boxed{1} \rangle \end{bmatrix}$$

The description in (34) may seem strange at first glance, since it is cyclic, but it can be understood as a statement saying that *gibt* contributes itself to the items that occur in linearization domains.

The constraint in (35) is responsible for the determination of the PHON values of phrases:

$$(35) \quad phrase \Rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} \text{PHON} & \boxed{1} \oplus \dots \oplus \boxed{n} \\ \text{DOM} & \left\langle \begin{bmatrix} sign \\ \text{PHON} \ \boxed{1} \end{bmatrix}, \dots, \begin{bmatrix} sign \\ \text{PHON} \ \boxed{n} \end{bmatrix} \right\rangle \end{bmatrix}$$

It states that the PHON value of a sign is the concatenation of the PHON values of its DOMAIN elements. Since the order of the DOMAIN elements corresponds to their surface order, this is the obvious way to determine the PHON value of the whole linguistic object.

Figure 11.38 shows how this machinery can be used to license binary branching structures with discontinuous constituents. Words or word sequences that are separated by commas stand for separate domain objects, that is, $\langle das, Buch \rangle$ contains the two objects *das* and *Buch* and $\langle das\ Buch, gibt \rangle$ contains the two objects *das Buch* and *gibt*. The important point to note here is that the arguments are combined with the head in the order accusative, dative, nominative, although the elements in the constituent order domain are realized in the order dative, nominative, accusative rather than nominative, dative, accusative, as one would expect. This is possible since the formulation of




图 11.38: Analysis of *dass der Frau ein Mann das Buch gibt* ‘that a man gives the woman the book’ with binary branching structures and discontinuous constituents

the computation of the DOM value using the shuffle operator allows for discontinuous constituents. The node for *der Frau das Buch gibt* ‘the woman the book gives’ is discontinuous: *ein Mann* ‘a man’ is inserted into the domain between *der Frau* ‘the woman’ and *das Buch* ‘the book’. This is more obvious in Figure ?? on page ??, which has a serialization of NPs that corresponds to their order. Such binary branching structures were assumed for the analysis of German by Kathol (1995, 2000) and Müller (1995, 1996c, 1999a, 2002a), but as we have seen throughout this chapter, Dependency Grammar assumes flat representations (but see Footnote 30 on page 388). Schema 1 licenses structures in which all arguments of a head are realized in one go.³¹

Schema 1 (Head-Argument Schema (flat structure))

head-argument-phrase \Rightarrow

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{SYNSEM|LOC|CAT|SUBCAT } \langle \rangle \\ \text{HEAD-DTR|SYNSEM|LOC|CAT|SUBCAT } \boxed{1} \\ \text{NON-HEAD-DTRS } \boxed{1} \end{array} \right]$$

To keep the presentation simple, I assume that the SUBCAT list contains descriptions of complete signs. Therefore the whole list can be identified with the list of non-head daughters.³² The computation of the DOM value can be constrained in the following way:

³¹ I assume here that all arguments are contained in the SUBCAT list of a lexical head, but nothing hinges on that. One could also assume several valence features and nevertheless get a flat structure. For instance, Borsley (1989: 339) suggests a schema for auxiliary inversion in English and verb-initial sentences in Welsh that refers to both the valence feature for subjects and for complements and realizes all elements in a flat structure.

³² Without this assumption one would need a relational constraint that maps a list with descriptions of type *synsem* onto a list with descriptions of type *sign*. See Meurers (1999c: 198) for details.

$$(36) \text{ headed-phrase} \Rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{ll} \text{HEAD-DTR} & \boxed{1} \\ \text{NON-HEAD-DTRS} & \langle \boxed{2}, \dots, \boxed{n} \rangle \\ \text{DOM} & \langle \boxed{1} \rangle \circ \langle \boxed{2} \rangle \circ \dots \circ \langle \boxed{n} \rangle \end{array} \right]$$

This constraint says that the value of DOM is a list which is the result of shuffling singleton lists each containing one daughter as elements. The result of such a shuffle operation is a disjunction of all possible permutations of the daughters. This seems to be overkill for something that GPSG already gained by abstracting away from the order of the elements on the right hand side of a phrase structure rule. Note, however, that this machinery can be used to reach even freer orders: by referring to the DOM values of the daughters rather than the daughters themselves, it is possible to insert individual words into the DOM list.

$$(37) \text{ headed-phrase} \Rightarrow \left[\begin{array}{ll} \text{HEAD-DTR|DOM} & \boxed{1} \\ \text{NON-HEAD-DTRS} & \langle [\text{DOM } \boxed{2}] \dots [\text{DOM } \boxed{n}] \rangle \\ \text{DOM} & \langle \boxed{1} \rangle \circ \langle \boxed{2} \rangle \circ \dots \circ \langle \boxed{n} \rangle \end{array} \right]$$

Using this constraint we have DOM values that basically contain all the words in an utterance in any permutation. What we are left with is a pure Dependency Grammar without any constraints on projectivity. With such a grammar we could analyze the non-projecting structure of Figure 11.6 on page 360 and much more. The analysis in terms of domain union is shown in Figure ?? on page ?. There is some dispute going on about the question of whether constituency/dependency is primary/necessary to analyze natural language: while Hudson (1980) and Engel (1996) claim that dependency is sufficient, a claim that is shared by dependency grammarians (according to Engel 1996), Leiss (2003) claims that it is not. In order to settle the issue, let us take a look at some examples:

- (38) Dass Peter kommt, klärt nicht, ob Klaus spielt.
 that Peter comes resolves not whether Klaus plays
 ‘That Peter comes does not resolve the question of whether Klaus will play.’

If we know the meaning of the utterance, we can assign a dependency graph to it. Let us assume that the meaning of (38) is something like (39):

$$(39) \neg \text{resolve}'(\text{that}'(\text{come}'(\text{Peter}')), \text{whether}'(\text{play}'(\text{Klaus}'))))$$

With this semantic information, we can of course construct a dependency graph for (38). The reason is that the dependency relation is reflected in a bi-unique way in the semantic representation in (39). The respective graph is given in Figure 11.39. But note that this does not hold in the general case. Take for instance the example in (40):

- (40) Dass Peter kommt, klärt nicht, ob Klaus kommt.
 that Peter comes resolves not whether Klaus plays
 ‘That Peter comes does not resolve the question of whether Klaus comes.’

Here the word *kommt* appears twice. Without any notion of constituency or restrictions regarding adjacency, linear order and continuity, we cannot assign a dependency graph




图 11.39: The dependency graph of *Dass Peter kommt, klärt nicht, ob Klaus spielt*. ‘That Peter comes does not resolve the question of whether Klaus plays.’ can be derived from the semantic representation.

unambiguously. For instance, the graph in Figure ?? on page ?? is perfectly compatible with the meaning of this sentence: *dass* dominates *kommt* and *kommt* dominates *Peter*, while *ob* dominates *kommt* and *kommt* dominates *Klaus*.

- (41) a. Deshalb klärt, dass Peter kommt, ob Klaus spielt.
therefore resolves that Peter comes whether Klaus plays
- b. *Deshalb klärt dass ob Peter Klaus kommt spielt.
therefore resolves that whether Peter Klaus comes plays

(41b) is a variant of (41a) in which the elements of the two clausal arguments are in correct order with respect to each other, but both clauses are discontinuous in such a way that the elements of each clause alternate. The dependency graph is shown in Figure ?? on page ??.

11.7.2.3 Features that are not identical between heads and projections

As Oliva (2003) points out, the equivalence of Dependency Grammar and HPSG only holds up as far as HEAD values are concerned. That is, the node labels in dependency graphs correspond to the HEAD values in an HPSG. There are, however, additional features like CONT for the semantics and SLASH for nonlocal dependencies. These values usually differ between a lexical head and its phrasal projections. For illustration, let us have a look at the phrase *a book*. The semantics of the lexical material and the complete phrase is given in (42):³³

- (42) a. $a: \lambda P \lambda Q \exists x (P(x) \wedge Q(x))$

³³ For lambda expressions see Section 2.3.

- b. *book*: $\lambda y (book'(y))$
 c. *a book*: $\lambda Q \exists x (book'(x) \wedge Q(x))$

Now, the problem for the Dependency Grammar notation is that there is no NP node that could be associated with the semantics of *a book* (see Figure 11.36 on page 387), the only thing present in the tree is a node for the lexical N: the node for *book*.³⁴ This is not a big problem, however: the lexical properties can be represented as part of the highest node as the value of a separate feature. The N node in a dependency graph would then have a CONT value that corresponds to the semantic contribution of the complete phrase and a LEX-CONT value that corresponds to the contribution of the lexical head of the phrase. So for *a book* we would get the following representation:

$$(43) \begin{bmatrix} \text{CONT} & \lambda Q \exists x (book'(x) \wedge Q(x)) \\ \text{LEXICAL-CONT} & \lambda y (book'(y)) \end{bmatrix}$$

With this kind of representation one could maintain analyses in which the semantic contribution of a head together with its dependents is a function of the semantic contribution of the parts. Now, there are probably further features in which lexical heads differ from their projections. One such feature would be SLASH, which is used for nonlocal dependencies in HPSG and could be used to establish the relation between the risen element and the head in an approach à la Groß & Osborne (2009). Of course we can apply the same trick again. We would then have a feature LEXICAL-SLASH. But this could be improved and the features of the lexical item could be grouped under one path. The general skeleton would then be (44):

$$(44) \begin{bmatrix} \text{CONT} \\ \text{SLASH} \\ \text{LEXICAL} \begin{bmatrix} \text{CONT} \\ \text{SLASH} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix}$$

But if we rename LEXICAL to HEAD-DTR, we basically get the HPSG representation. Hellwig (2003: 602) states that his special version of Dependency Grammar, which he calls Dependency Unification Grammar, assumes that governing heads select complete nodes with all their daughters. These nodes may differ in their properties from their head (p. 604). They are in fact constituents. So this very explicit and formalized variant of Dependency Grammar is very close to HPSG, as Hellwig states himself (p. 603). Hudson's Word Grammar (2015) is also explicitly worked out and, as will be shown, it is rather similar to HPSG. The representation in Figure ?? on page ?? is a detailed description of

³⁴ Hudson (2003: 391–392) is explicit about this: “In dependency analysis, the dependents modify the head word’s meaning, so the latter carries the meaning of the whole phrase. For example, in *long books about linguistics*, the word *books* means ‘long books about linguistics’ thanks to the modifying effect of the dependents.” For a concrete implementation of this idea see Figure ?? on page ?. An alternative is to assume different representational levels as in Meaning–Text Theory (Mel’čuk 1981). In fact the CONT value in HPSG is also a different representational level. However, this representational level is in sync with the other structure that is build.

what the abbreviated version in Figure ?? on page ?? stands for. What is shown in the first diagram is that a combination of two nodes results in a new node. For instance, the combination of *playing* and *outside* yields *playing'*, the combination of *small* and *children* yields *children'*, and the combination of *children'* and *playing'* yields *playing''*. The combination of *were* and *playing''* results in *were'* and the combination of *children''* and *were'* yields *were''*. The only thing left to explain is why there is a node for *children* that is not the result of the combination of two nodes, namely *children''*. The line with the roof at the bottom stands for default inheritance. That is, the upper node inherits all properties from the lower node by default. Defaults can be overridden, that is, information at the upper node may differ from information at the dominated node. This makes it possible to handle semantics compositionally: nodes that are the result of the combination of two nodes have a semantics that is the combination of the meaning of the two combined nodes. Turning to *children* again, *children'* has the property that it must be adjacent to *playing*, but since the structure is a raising structure in which *children* is raised to the subject of *were*, this property is overwritten in a new instance of *children*, namely *children''*. The interesting point now is that we get almost a normal phrase structure tree if we replace the words in the diagram in Figure ?? by syntactic categories. The result of the replacement is shown in Figure ?? on page ?. The only thing unusual in this graph (marked by dashed lines) is that N' is combined with $V[ing]'$ and the mother of N' , namely N'' , is combined with $V[fin]'$. As explained above, this is due to the analysis of raising in Word Grammar, which involves multiple dependencies between a raised item and its heads. There are two N nodes (N' and N'') in Figure ?? and two instances of *children* in Figure ?. Apart from this, the structure corresponds to what an HPSG grammar would license. The nodes in Hudson's diagram which are connected with lines with roofs at the bottom are related to their children using default inheritance. This too is rather similar to those versions of HPSG that use default inheritance. For instance, Ginzburg & Sag (2000: 33) use a Generalized Head Feature Principle that projects all properties of the head daughter to the mother by default. The conclusion of this section is that the only principled difference between phrase structure grammars and Dependency Grammar is the question of how much intermediate structure is assumed: is there a VP without the subject? Are there intermediate nodes for adjunct attachment? It is difficult to decide these questions in the absence of fully worked out proposals that include semantic representations. Those proposals that are worked out – like Hudson's and Hellwig's – assume intermediate representations, which makes these approaches rather similar to phrase structure-based approaches. If one compares the structures of these fully worked out variants of Dependency Grammar with phrase structure grammars, it becomes clear that the claim that Dependency Grammars are simpler is unwarranted. This claim holds for compacted schematic representations like Figure ?? but it does not hold for fully worked out analyses.

11.7.2.4 Non-headed constructions

Hudson (1980: Section 4.E) discusses headless constructions like those in (45):

- (45) a. the rich
 b. the biggest
 c. the longer the stem
 d. (with) his hat over his eyes

He argues that the terms *adjective* and *noun* should be accompanied by the term *substantive*, which subsumes both terms. Then he suggests that *if a rule needs to cover the constructions traditionally referred to as noun-phrases, with or without heads, it just refers to 'nouns', and this will automatically allow the constructions to have either substantives or adjectives as heads.* (p. 195) The question that has to be asked here, however, is what the internal dependency structure of substantive phrases like *the rich* would be. The only way to connect the items seems to be to assume that the determiner is dependent on the adjective. But this would allow for two structures of phrases like *the rich man*: one in which the determiner depends on the adjective and one in which it depends on the noun. So underspecification of part of speech does not seem to solve the problem. Of course all problems with non-headed constructions can be solved by assuming empty elements.³⁵ This has been done in HPSG in the analysis of relative clauses (Pollard & Sag 1994: Chapter 5). English and German relative clauses consist of a phrase that contains a relative word and a sentence in which the relative phrase is missing. Pollard & Sag assume an empty relativizer that selects for the relative phrase and the clause with a gap (Pollard & Sag 1994: 216–217). Similar analyses can be found in Dependency Grammar (Eroms 2000: 291).³⁶ Now, the alternative to empty elements are phrasal constructions.³⁷ Sag (1997) working on relative clauses in English suggested a phrasal analysis of relative clauses in which the relative phrase and the clause from which it is extracted form a new phrase. A similar analysis was assumed by Müller (1996c) and is documented in Müller (1999a: Chapter 10). As was discussed in Section 8.6 it is neither plausible to assume the relative pronoun or some other element in the relative phrase to be the head of the entire relative clause, nor is it plausible to assume the verb to be the head of the entire relative clause (pace Sag), since relative clauses modify \bar{N} s, something that projections of (finite)

³⁵ See Section 2.4.1 for the assumption of an empty head in a phrase structure grammar for noun phrases.

³⁶ The Dependency Grammar representations usually have a *d-* element as the head of the relative clause. However, since the relative pronoun is also present in the clause and since the *d-* is not pronounced twice, assuming an additional *d-* head is basically assuming an empty head. Another option is to assume that words may have multiple functions: so, a relative pronoun may be both a head and a dependent simultaneously (Tesnière 2015: Chapter 246, §8–11; Osborne & Kahane 2015: xlv; Kahane 2009: 129–130). At least the analysis of Kahane is an instance of the Categorical Grammar analysis that was discussed in Section 8.6 and it suffers from the same problems: if the relative pronoun is a head that selects for a clause that is missing the relative pronoun, it is not easy to see how this analysis extends to cases of pied-piping like (i) in which the extracted element is a complete phrase containing the relative pronoun rather than just the pronoun itself.

(i) die Frau, von deren Schwester ich ein Bild gesehen habe
 the woman of whose sister I a picture seen have
 'the woman of whose sister I saw a picture'

³⁷ See Chapter 19 on empty elements in general and Subsection 21.10.3 on relative clauses in particular.

verbs usually do not do. So assuming an empty head or a phrasal schema seems to be the only option. Chapter 21 is devoted to the discussion of whether certain phenomena should be analyzed as involving phrase structural configurations or whether lexical analyses are better suited in general or for modeling some phenomena. I argue there that all phenomena interacting with valence should be treated lexically. But there are other phenomena as well and Dependency Grammar is forced to assume lexical analyses for all linguistic phenomena. There always has to be some element on which others depend. It has been argued by Jackendoff (2008) that it does not make sense to assume that one of the elements in N-P-N constructions like those in (46) is the head.

- (46) a. day by day, paragraph by paragraph, country by country
 b. dollar for dollar, student for student, point for point
 c. face to face, bumper to bumper
 d. term paper after term paper, picture after picture
 e. book upon book, argument upon argument

Of course there is a way to model all the phenomena that would be modeled by a phrasal construction in frameworks like GPSG, CxG, HPSG, or Simpler Syntax: an empty head. Figure ?? on page ?? shows the analysis of *student after student*. The lexical item for the empty N would be very special, since there are no similar non-empty lexical nouns, that is, there is no noun that selects for two bare Ns and a P. Bragmann (2015) pointed out an additional aspect of the N-P-N construction, which makes things more complicated. The pattern is not restricted to two nouns. There can be arbitrarily many of them:

- (47) Day after day after day went by, but I never found the courage to talk to her.

So rather than an N-P-N pattern Bragmann suggests the pattern in (48), where ‘+’ stands for at least one repetition of a sequence.

- (48) N (P N)+

Now, such patterns would be really difficult to model in selection-based approaches, since one would have to assume that an empty head or a noun selects for an arbitrary number of pairs of the same preposition and noun or nominal phrase. Of course one could assume that P and N form some sort of constituent, but still one would have to make sure that the right preposition is used and that the noun or nominal projection has the right phonology. Another possibility would be to assume that the second N in N-P-N can be an N-P-N and thereby allow recursion in the pattern. But if one follows this approach it is getting really difficult to check the constraint that the involved Ns should have the same or at least similar phonologies. One way out of these problems would of course be to assume that there are special combinatorial mechanisms that assign a new category to one or several elements. This would basically be an unheaded phrase structure rule and this is what Tesnière suggested: transfer rules (see Section 11.6.2.2). But this is of course an extension of pure Dependency Grammar towards a mixed model. See Section 21.10 for the discussion of further cases which are probably problematic for purely selection-based grammars.

Exercises

Provide the dependency graphs for the following three sentences:

- (49) a. Ich habe einen Mann getroffen, der blonde Haare hat.
 I have a man met who blond hair has
 'I have met a man who has blond hair.'
- b. Einen Mann getroffen, der blonde Haare hat, habe ich noch nie.
 a man met who blond hair has have I yet never
 'I have never met a man who has blond hair.'
- c. Dass er morgen kommen wird, freut uns.
 that he tomorrow come will pleases us
 'That he will come tomorrow pleases us.'

You may use non-projective dependencies. For the analysis of relative clauses authors usually propose an abstract entity that functions as a dependent of the modified noun and as a head of the verb in the relative clause.

Further reading

In the section on further reading in Chapter 3, I referred to the book called *Syntaktische Analyseperspektiven* 'Syntactic perspectives on analyses'. The chapters in this book have been written by proponents of various theories and all analyze the same newspaper article. The book also contains a chapter by Engel (2014), assuming his version of Dependency Grammar, namely *Dependent Verb Grammar*. Ágel, Eichinger, Eroms, Hellwig, Heringer & Lobin (2003a, 2006) published a handbook on dependency and valence that discusses all aspects related to Dependency Grammar in any imaginable way. Many of the papers have been cited in this chapter. Papers comparing Dependency Grammar with other theories are especially relevant in the context of this book: Lobin (2003) compares Dependency Grammar and Categorical Grammar, Oliva (2003) deals with the representation of valence and dependency in HPSG, and Bangalore, Joshi & Rambow (2003) describe how valence and dependency are covered in TAG. Hellwig (2006) compares rule-based grammars with Dependency Grammars with special consideration given to parsing by computer programs. Osborne & Groß (2012) compare Dependency Grammar with Construction Grammar and Osborne, Putnam & Groß (2011) argue that certain variants of Minimalism are in fact reinventions of dependency-based analyses. The original work on Dependency Grammar by Tesnière (1959) is also available in parts in German (Tesnière 1980) and in full in English (Tesnière 2015).

第十二章 Tree Adjoining Grammar

Tree Adjoining Grammar (TAG) was developed by Aravind Joshi at the University of Pennsylvania in the USA (Joshi, Levy & Takahashi 1975). Several important dissertations in TAG have been supervised by Aravind Joshi and Anthony Kroch at the University of Pennsylvania (e.g., Rambow 1994). Other research centers with a focus on TAG are Paris 7 (Anne Abeillé), Columbia University in the USA (Owen Rambow) and Düsseldorf, Germany (Laura Kallmeyer). Rambow (1994) and Gerdes (2002b) are more detailed studies of German.¹

TAG and its variants with relevant extensions are of interest because it is assumed that this grammatical formalism can – with regard to its expressive power – relatively accurately represent what humans do when they produce or comprehend natural language. The expressive power of Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar was deliberately constrained so that it corresponds to context-free phrase structure grammars (Type-2 languages) and it has in fact been demonstrated that this is not enough (Shieber 1985; Culy 1985).² Grammatical theories such as HPSG and CxG can generate/describe so-called Type-0 languages and are thereby far above the level of complexity presently assumed for natural languages. The assumption is that this complexity lies somewhere between context-free and context-sensitive (Type-1) languages. This class is thus referred to as *mildly context sensitive*. Certain TAG-variants are inside of this language class and it is assumed that they can produce exactly those structures that occur in natural languages. For more on complexity, see Section 12.6.3 and Chapter 17.

There are various systems for the processing of TAG grammars (Doran, Hockey, Sarkar, Srinivas & Xia 2000; Parmentier, Kallmeyer, Maier, Lichte & Dellert 2008; Kallmeyer, Lichte, Maier, Parmentier, Dellert & Evang 2008). Smaller and larger TAG fragments have been developed for the following languages:

- Arabic (Fraj, Zribi & Ahmed 2008),
- German (Rambow 1994; Gerdes 2002a; Kallmeyer & Yoon 2004; Lichte 2007),

¹ Since my knowledge of French leaves something to be desired, I just refer to the literature in French here without being able to comment on the content.

² See Pullum (1986) for a historical overview of the complexity debate and G. Müller (2011a) for argumentation for the non-context-free nature of German, which follows parallel to Culy with regard to the N-P-N construction (see Section 21.10.4).

- English (XTAG Research Group 2001; Frank 2002; Kroch & Joshi 1987),
- French (Abeillé 1988; Candito 1996, 1998, 1999; Crabbé 2005),
- Italian (Candito 1998, 1999),
- Korean (Han, Yoon, Kim & Palmer 2000; Kallmeyer & Yoon 2004),
- Vietnamese (Le, Nguyen & Roussanaly 2008)

Candito (1996) has developed a system for the representation of meta grammars which allows the uniform specification of crosslinguistic generalizations. This system was used by some of the projects mentioned above for the derivation of grammars for specific languages. For instance Kinyon, Rambow, Scheffler, Yoon & Joshi (2006) derive the verb second languages from a common meta grammar. Among those grammars for verb second languages is a grammar of Yiddish for which there was no TAG grammar until 2006.

Resnik (1992) combines TAG with a statistics component.

12.1 General remarks on representational format

12.1.1 Representation of valence information

Figure 12.1 shows so-called elementary trees. These are present in the lexicon and can be combined to create larger trees. Nodes for the insertion of arguments are specially




图 12.1: Elementary trees

marked (NP↓ in the tree for *laughs*). Nodes for the insertion of adjuncts into a tree are also marked (VP* in the tree for *always*). Grammars where elementary trees always contain at least one word are referred to as *Lexicalized Tree Adjoining Grammar* (LTAG).

12.1.2 Substitution

Figure 12.2 on the following page shows the substitution of nodes. Other subtrees have to be inserted into substitution nodes such as the NP node in the tree for *laughs*. The tree for *John* is inserted there in the example derivation.




图 12.2: Substitution

12.1.3 Adjunction

Figure 12.3 shows an example of how the adjunction tree for *always* can be used.




图 12.3: Adjunction

Adjunction trees can be inserted into other trees. Upon insertion, the target node (bearing the same category as the node marked with “*”) is replaced by the adjunction tree.

TAG differs considerably from the simple phrase structure grammars we encountered in Chapter 2 in that the trees extend over a larger domain: for example, there is an NP node in the tree for *laughs* that is not a sister of the verb. In a phrase structure grammar (and of course in GB and GPSG since these theories are more or less directly built on phrase structure grammars), it is only ever possible to describe subtrees with a depth of one level. For the tree for *laughs*, the relevant rules would be those in (1):

- (1) $S \rightarrow NP VP$
 $VP \rightarrow V$
 $V \rightarrow laughs$

In this context, it is common to speak of *locality domains*. The extension of the locality domain is of particular importance for the analysis of idioms (see Section 18.2).

TAG differs from other grammatical theories in that it is possible for structures to be broken up again. In this way, it is possible to use adjunction to insert any amount of material into a given tree and thereby cause originally adjacent constituents to end up being arbitrarily far away from each other in the final tree. As we will see in Section 12.5, this property is important for the analysis of long-distance dependencies without movement.

12.1.4 Semantics

There are different approaches to the syntax-semantics interface in TAG. One possibility is to assign a semantic representation to every node in the tree. The alternative is to assign each elementary tree exactly one semantic representation. The semantics construction does not make reference to syntactic structure but rather the way the structure is combined. This kind of approach has been proposed by Candito & Kahane (1998) and then by Kallmeyer & Joshi (2003), who build on it. The basic mechanisms will be briefly presented in what follows.

In the literature on TAG, a distinction is made between derived trees and derivation trees. Derived trees correspond to constituent structure (the trees for *John laughs* and *John always laughs* in Figures 12.2 and 12.3). The derivation tree contains the derivational history, that is, information about how the elementary trees were combined. The elements in a derivation tree represent predicate-argument dependencies, which is why it is possible to derive a semantic derivation tree from them. This will be shown on the basis of the sentence in (2):

- (2) Max likes Anouk.

The elementary tree for (2) and the derived tree are given in Figure 12.4 on the following page. The nodes in trees are numbered from top to bottom and from left to right. The result of this numbering of nodes for *likes* is shown in Figure 12.5 on the following page. The topmost node in the tree for *likes* is S and has the position 0. Beneath S, there is an NP and a VP node. These nodes are again numbered starting at 0. NP has the position 0 and VP the position 1. The VP node has in turn two daughters: V and the object NP. V receives number 0 and the object NP 1. This makes it possible to combine these numbers and then it is possible to unambiguously access individual elements in the tree. The position for the subject NP is 00 since this is a daughter of S and occurs in first position. The object NP has the numeric sequence 011 since it is below S (0), in the VP (the second daughter of S = 1) and occurs in second position (the second daughter of VP = 1).

With these tree positions, the derivation tree for (2) can be represented as in Figure 12.6. The derivation tree expresses the fact that the elementary tree for *likes* was combined with two arguments that were inserted into the substitution positions 00 and 011. The derivation tree also contains information about what exactly was placed into these nodes.




图 12.4: Elementary trees and derived tree for *Max likes Anouk*.




图 12.5: Node positions in the elementary tree for *likes*




图 12.6: Derivation tree for *Max likes Anouk*.

Kallmeyer & Joshi (2003) use a variant of *Minimal Recursion Semantics* as their semantic representational formalism (Copestake, Flickinger, Pollard & Sag 2005). I will use a considerably simplified representation here, as I did in Section 9.1.6 on semantics in HPSG. For the elementary trees *Max*, *likes* and *Anouk*, we can assume the semantic representations in (3).

- (3) Semantic representations for elementary trees:

max(x)	like(x ₁ , x ₂)	anouk(y)
arg: –	arg: ⟨ x ₁ , 1 ⟩, ⟨ x ₂ , 2.2 ⟩	arg: –

In a substitution operation, a variable is assigned a value. If, for example, the elementary tree for *Max* is inserted into the subject position of the tree for *likes*, then x_1 is identified with x . In the same way, x_2 is identified with y if the tree for *Anouk* is inserted into the object position. The result of these combinations is the representation in (4):

- (4) Combination of the meaning of elementary trees:

like(x, y)
max(x)
anouk(y)
arg: –

Kallmeyer & Joshi (2003) show how an extension of TAG, Multi-Component LTAG, can handle quantifier scope and discuss complex cases with embedded verbs. Interested readers are referred to the original article.

12.2 Local reordering

In TAG, there is a family of trees for each word. In order to account for ordering variants, one can assume that there are six trees corresponding to a ditransitive verb and that each of these corresponds to a different ordering of the arguments. Trees are connected to one another via lexical rules. This lexical rule-based analysis is parallel to the one developed by Uszkoreit (1986b) in Categorical Grammar.

Alternatively, one could assume a format for TAG structures similar to what we referred to as the ID/LP format in the chapter on GPSG. Joshi (1987b) defines an elementary structure as a pair that consists of a dominance structure and linearization constraints. Unlike GPSG, linearization rules do not hold for all dominance rules but rather for a particular dominance structure. This is parallel to what we saw in Section 10.6.3 on Embodied-CxG. Figure 12.7 on the following page shows a dominance tree with numbered nodes. If we combine this dominance structure with the linearization rules in (5), we arrive at the exact order that we would get with ordinary phrase structure rules, namely $NP_1 V NP_2$.

- (5) $LP_1^\alpha = \{ 1 < 2, 2.1 < 2.2 \}$




图 12.7: Dominance structure with numbered nodes

If one specifies the linearization restrictions as in (6), all the orders in (7) are permitted, since the empty set means that we do not state any restrictions at all.

$$(6) \quad LP_2^\alpha = \{ \}$$

- (7)
- a. $NP_1 \ V \ NP_2$
 - b. $NP_2 \ V \ NP_1$
 - c. $NP_1 \ NP_2 \ V$
 - d. $NP_2 \ NP_1 \ V$
 - e. $V \ NP_1 \ NP_2$
 - f. $V \ NP_2 \ NP_1$

This means that it is possible to derive all orders that were derived in GPSG with flat sentence rules despite the fact that there is a constituent in the tree that consists of NP and VP. Since the dominance rules include a larger locality domain, such grammars are called LD/LP grammars (local dominance/linear precedence) rather than ID/LP grammars (immediate dominance/linear precedence) (Joshi, Shanker & Weir 1990).

Simple variants of TAG such as those presented in Section 12.1 cannot deal with reordering if the arguments of different verbs are scrambled as in (8).

- (8) weil ihm das Buch jemand zu lesen versprochen hat³
 because him.DAT the.ACC book somebody.NOM to read promised has
 ‘because somebody promised him to read the book’

In (8), *das Buch* ‘the book’ is the object of *zu lesen* ‘to read’, and *ihm* ‘him’ and *jemand* ‘somebody’ are dependent on *versprochen* and *hat*, respectively. These cases can be analyzed by LD/LP-TAG developed by Joshi (1987b) and Free Order TAG (FO-TAG) (Becker, Joshi & Rambow 1991: 21) since both of these TAG variants allow for crossing edges.

Since certain restrictions cannot be expressed in FO-TAG (Rambow 1994: 48–50), so-called Multi-Component TAG was developed. Joshi, Becker & Rambow (2000) illustrate the problem that simple LTAG grammars have with sentences such as (8) using examples such as (9):⁴

³ For more on this kind of examples, see Bech (1955).

⁴ The authors use *versprochen hat* ‘has promised’ rather than *versprach* ‘promised’, which sounds better but does not correspond to the trees they use.

- (9) a. ... daß der Detektiv dem Klienten [den Verdächtigen des
 that the.NOM detective the.DAT client the.ACC suspect the.GEN
 Verbrechens zu überführen] versprach
 crime to indict promised
 ‘that the detective promised the client to indict the suspect of the crime’
- b. ... daß des Verbrechens_k der Detektiv den Verdächtigen_j
 that the.GEN crime the.NOM detective the.ACC suspect
 dem Klienten [_{-j} _{-k} zu überführen] versprach
 the.DAT client to indict promised

In LTAG, the elementary trees for the relevant verbs look as shown in Figure 12.8. The




图 12.8: Elementary trees of an infinitive and a control verb

verbs are numbered according to their level of embedding. The NP arguments of a verb bear the same index as that verb and each has a superscript number that distinguishes it from the other arguments. The trees are very similar to those in GB. In particular, it is assumed that the subject occurs outside the VP. For non-finite verbs, it is assumed that the subject is realized by PRO. PRO is, like *e*, a phonologically empty pronominal category that also comes from GB. The left tree in Figure 12.8 contains traces in the normal position of the arguments and the relevant NP slots in higher trees positions. An interesting difference to other theories is that these traces only exist in the tree. They are not represented as individual entries in the lexicon as the lexicon only contains words and the corresponding trees.

The tree for *versprach* ‘promised’ can be inserted into any S node in the tree for *zu überführen* ‘to indict’ and results in trees such as those in the Figures 12.9 and 12.10. In Figure 12.9, the tree for *versprach* is inserted directly above the PRO NP and in Figure 12.10 above NP_2^1 .




图 12.9: Analysis of the order $NP_2^2 NP_2^1 NP_1^1 NP_1^2 V_2 V_1$: adjunction to the lowest S node

It is clear that it is not possible to derive a tree in this way where an argument of *überführen* ‘to indict’ occurs between the arguments of *versprach* ‘promised’. Joshi, Becker & Rambow (2000) therefore suggest an extension of the LTAG formalism. In MC-TAG, the grammar does not consist of elementary trees but rather finite sets of elementary trees. In every derivational step, a set is selected and the elements of that set are simultaneously added to the tree. Figure 12.11 on the following page shows an elementary tree for *versprach* ‘promised’ consisting of multiple components. This tree contains a trace of NP_1^1 that was moved to the left. The bottom-left S node and the top-right S node are connected by a dashed line that indicates the dominance relation. However, immediate dominance is not required. Therefore, it is possible to insert the two subtrees into another tree separately from each other and thereby analyze the order in Figure 12.12 on page 409, for example.

Other variants of TAG that allow for other constituent orders are V-TAG (Rambow 1994) and TT-MC-TAG (Lichte 2007).

12.3 Verb position

The position of the verb can be analyzed in a parallel way to the GPSG analysis: the verb can be realized in initial or in final position in a given linearization domain.




图 12.10: Analysis of the order $NP_2^2 NP_1^1 NP_1^2 NP_2^1 V_2 V_1$: adjunction to the S node between NP_2^2 and NP_2^1




图 12.11: Elementary tree set for *versprach* consisting of multiple components




图 12.12: Analysis of the order $NP_1^1 NP_2^2 NP_1^2 NP_2^1 V_2 V_1$: adjunction to the S node between NP_2^2 and NP_2^1

Since the verb position has an effect on the clause type and hence on semantics, a lexical rule-based analysis would be also viable: a tree with the finite verb in initial position is licensed by a lexical rule that takes a tree with the verb in final position as input. This would be similar to the analyses in GB, Minimalism, and HPSG.

12.4 Passive

There is a possible analysis for the passive that is analogous to the transformations in Transformational Grammar: one assumes lexical rules that create a lexical item with a passive tree for every lexical item with an active tree (Kroch & Joshi 1985: 50–51).

Kroch & Joshi (1985: 55) propose an alternative to this transformation-like approach that more adequately handles so-called raising constructions. Their analysis assumes that arguments of verbs are represented in subcategorization lists. Verbs are entered into trees that match their subcategorization list. Kroch and Joshi formulate a lexical rule that corresponds to the HPSG lexical rule that was discussed on page 270, that is, an accusative object is explicitly mentioned in the input of the lexical rule. Kroch and Joshi

then suggest a complex analysis of the impersonal passive which uses a semantic null role for a non-realized object of intransitive verbs (p. 56). Such an analysis with abstract auxiliary entities can be avoided easily: one can instead use the HPSG analysis going back to Haider (1986a), which was presented in Section 9.2.

There are also proposals in TAG that use inheritance to deal with valence changing processes in general and the passive in particular (Candito 1996 and Kinyon, Rambow, Scheffler, Yoon & Joshi 2006 following Candito). As we saw in Section 10.2 of the Chapter on Construction Grammar, inheritance is not a suitable descriptive tool for valence changing processes. This is because these kinds of processes interact syntactically and semantically in a number of ways and can also be applied multiple times (Müller 2006, 2007c; 2007b: Section 7.5.2; 2013c; 2014a). See also Section 21.4 of this book.

12.5 Long-distance dependencies

The analysis of long-distance dependencies in TAG is handled with the standard apparatus: simple trees are inserted into the middle of other trees. Figure 12.13 on the following page shows an example of the analysis of (10):

(10) Who_i did John tell Sam that Bill likes _{-i}?

The tree for *WH COMP NP likes* _{-i} belongs to the tree family of *likes* and is therefore present in the lexicon. The tree for *tell* is adjoined to this tree, that is, this tree is inserted in the middle of the tree for *who that Bill likes* _{-i}. Such an insertion operation can be applied multiple times so that sentences such as (11) where *who* is moved across multiple sentence boundaries can be analyzed:

(11) Who_i did John tell Sam that Mary said that Bill likes _{-i}?

There is another important detail: although the tree for (12) has the category S, (12) is not a grammatical sentence of English.

(12) * who that Bill likes

This has to be captured somehow. In TAG, the marking OA ensures that a tree counts as incomplete. If a tree contains a node with marking OA, then an obligatory adjunction operation must take place at the relevant position.

12.6 New developments and theoretical variants

In Section 12.2, we introduced Multi-Component-TAG. There are a large number of TAG variants with different formal properties. Rambow (1994) gives an overview of the variants existing in 1994. In the following, I will discuss two interesting variants of TAG: Feature Structure-Based TAG (FTAG, Vijay-Shanker & Joshi 1988) and Vector-TAG (V-TAG, Rambow 1994).




图 12.13: Analysis of long-distance dependencies in TAG

12.6.1 FTAG

In FTAG, nodes are not atomic (N, NP, VP or S), but instead consist of feature descriptions. With the exception of substitution nodes, each node has a top structure and a bottom structure. The top structure says something about what kind of properties a given tree has inside a larger structure, and the bottom structure says something about the properties of the structure below the node. Substitution nodes only have a top structure. Figure 12.14 on the next page shows an example tree for *laughs*. A noun phrase can be combined with the tree for *laughs* in Figure 12.14. Its top structure is identified with the NP node in the tree for *laughs*. The result of this combination is shown in Figure 12.15 on the following page.

In a complete tree, all top structures are identified with the corresponding bottom




图 12.14: Elementary trees for *John* and *laughs* in FTAG




图 12.15: Combination of the trees for *John* and *laughs* in FTAG

structures. This way, only sentences where the subject is in third person singular can be analyzed with the given tree for *laughs*, that is, those in which the verb's agreement features match those of the subject.

For adjunction, the top structure of the tree that is being inserted must be unifiable with the top structure of the adjunction site, and the bottom structure of the node marked “*” in the inserted tree (the so-called foot node) must be unifiable with the adjunction site.

The elementary trees discussed so far only consisted of nodes where the top part matched the bottom part. FTAG allows for an interesting variant of specifying nodes that makes adjunction obligatory in order for the entire derivation to be well-formed. Figure 12.16 shows a tree for *laughing* that contains two VP nodes with incompatible MODE values. In order for this subtree to be used in a complete structure, another tree has




图 12.16: Obligatory adjunction in FTAG

to be added so that the two parts of the VP node are separated. This happens by means of an auxiliary tree as shown in Figure 12.16. The highest VP node of the auxiliary tree is unified with the upper VP node of *laughing*. The node of the auxiliary tree marked with “*” is unified with the lower VP node of *laughing*. The result of this is given in Figure 12.17 on the following page.

If a tree is used as a final derivation, the top structures are identified with the bottom structures. Thus, the AGR value of the highest VP node is identified with that of the lower




图 12.17: Result of obligatory adjunction in FTAG

one in the tree in Figure 12.17. As such, only NPs that have the same AGR value as the auxiliary can be inserted into the NP slot.

This example shows that, instead of the marking for obligatory adjunction that we saw in the section on long-distance dependencies, the same effect can be achieved by using incompatible feature specifications on the top and bottom structures. If there are incompatible top and bottom structures in a tree, then it cannot be a final derivation tree and therefore this means that at least one adjunction operation must still take place in order to yield a well-formed tree.

12.6.2 V-TAG

V-TAG is a variant of TAG proposed by Owen Rambow (1994) that also assumes feature structures on nodes. In addition, like MC-TAG, it assumes that elementary trees consist of multiple components. Figure 12.18 on the following page shows the elementary

lexical set for the ditransitive verb *geben* ‘give’. The lexicon set consists of a tree for the




图 12.18: Lexicon set for *geben* ‘to give’ in V-TAG according to Rambow (1994: 6)

verb, an empty element of the category VP and three trees where a VP has been combined with an NP. As in MC-TAG, dominance relations are also indicated. The dominance constraints in Figure 12.18 ensure that all lower VP nodes dominate the highest VP node of the tree further to the right. The order of the arguments of the verb as well as the position of the verb is not given. The only thing required is that lower VP in the NP trees and lower VP in the *geben* tree dominate the empty VP node. With this lexicon set, it is possible to derive all permutations of the arguments. Rambow also shows how such lexical entries can be used to analyze sentences with verbal complexes. Figure 12.19 shows a verbal complex formed from *zu reparieren* ‘to repair’ and *versprochen* ‘promised’ and the relevant dominance constraints. Both of the first NP trees have to dominate




图 12.19: Analysis of the verbal complex *zu reparieren versprochen* in V-TAG

versprochen and the third and fourth NP tree have to dominate *zu reparieren*. The order of the NP trees is not restricted and thus all permutations of NPs can be derived.

The interesting thing here is that this approach is similar to the one proposed by Berman (1996: Section 2.1.3) in LFG (see Section 7.4): in Berman's analysis, the verb projects directly to form a VP and the arguments are then adjoined.

A difference to other analyses discussed in this book is that there is always an empty element in the derived trees regardless of verb position.

12.6.3 The competence–performance distinction and the generative capacity of tree-local MC-LTAG

In many of the theories discussed in this book, a distinction is made between competence and performance (Chomsky 1965: Section I.1). Competence theories are supposed to describe linguistic knowledge, whereas a performance theory should explain how linguistic knowledge is used and why we make mistakes during speech production and comprehension, etc. See Chapter 15 for further discussion.

Joshi, Becker & Rambow (2000) discuss examples of center self embedding of relative clauses as those in (13b), and follow Chomsky & Miller (1963: 286) in the assumption that the fact that this kind of embedding is only possible up to three levels should not be described by grammar, but is rather due to processing problems with the hearer independent of their principle abilities with regard to grammar.

- (13) a. dass der Hund bellt, der die Katze jagt, die die Maus gefangen hat
 that the dog barks that the cat chases that the mouse caught has
 ‘that the dog that chases the cat that caught the mouse barks’
 b. dass der Hund, [₁ der die Katze, [₂ die die Maus gefangen hat, ₂] jagt ₁]
 that the dog that the cat that the mouse caught has chases
 bellt
 barks

What is interesting in this context is that it is possible to construct examples of center embedding so that they are easier to process for the hearer. In this way, it is possible to increase the number of center embeddings possible to process by one and therefore to show that all grammars that formulate a restriction that there may be at most two center-embedded relative clauses are incorrect. The following example from Hans Uszkoreit is easier to process since all embedded relative clauses are isolated and the verbs are separated by material from the higher clause.

- (14) Die Bänke, [₁ auf denen damals die Alten des Dorfes, [₂ die allen
 the benches on which back.then the old.people of.the village that all
 Kindern, [₃ die vorbeikamen ₃], freundliche Blicke zuwarfen ₂], lange Stunden
 children that came.by friendly glances gave long hours
 schweigend nebeneinander saßen ₁], mussten im letzten Jahr einem
 silent next.to.each.other sat must in.the last year a

Parkplatz weichen.
car.park give.way.to

‘The benches on which the older residents of the village, who used to give friendly glances to all the children who came by, used to sit silently next to one another had to give way to a car park last year.’

For other factors that play a role in processing, see Gibson (1998).

Joshi et al. (2000) discuss verbal complexes with reordered arguments. The general pattern that they discuss has the form shown in (15):

(15) $\sigma(NP_1 NP_2 \dots NP_n) V_n V_{n-1} \dots V_1$

Here, σ stands for any permutation of noun phrases and V_1 is the finite verb. The authors investigate the properties of Lexicalized Tree Adjoining Grammar (LTAG) with regard to this pattern and notice that LTAG cannot analyze the order in (16) if the semantics is supposed to come out correctly.

(16) $NP_2 NP_3 NP_1 V_3 V_2 V_1$

Since (17) is possible in German, LTAG is not sufficient to analyze all languages.

(17) dass ihm₂ das Buch₃ niemand₁ zu lesen₃ versprechen₂ darf₁
that him the book nobody to read promise be.allowed.to
‘that nobody is allowed to promise him to read the book’

Therefore, they propose the extension of TAG discussed in Section 12.2; so-called *tree-local multi-component LTAG* (Tree-local MC-LTAG or TL-MCTAG). They show that TL-MCTAG can analyze (17) but not (18) with the correct semantics. They claim that these orders are not possible in German and argue that in this case, unlike the relative clause examples, one has both options, that is, the unavailability of such patterns can be explained as a performance phenomenon or as a competence phenomenon.

(18) $NP_2 NP_4 NP_3 NP_1 V_4 V_3 V_2 V_1$

If we treat this as a performance phenomenon, then we are making reference to the complexity of the construction and the resulting processing problems for the hearer. The fact that these orders do not occur in corpora can be explained with reference to the principle of cooperativeness. Speakers normally want to be understood and therefore formulate their sentences in such a way that the hearer can understand them. Verbal complexes in German with more than four verbs are hardly ever found since it is possible to simplify very complex sentences with multiple verbs in the right sentence bracket by extraposing material and therefore avoiding ambiguity (see Netter 1991: 5 and Müller 2007b: 262).

The alternative to a performance explanation would involve using a grammatical formalism which is just powerful enough to allow embedding of two verbs and reordering of their arguments, but rules out embedding of three verbs and reordering of the

arguments. Joshi et al. (2000) opt for this solution and therefore attribute the impossibility of the order of arguments in (18) to competence.

In HPSG (and also in Categorical Grammar and in some GB analyses), verbal complexes are analyzed by means of argument composition (Hinrichs & Nakazawa 1989b, 1994). Under this approach, a verbal complex behaves exactly like a simplex verb and the arguments of the verbs involved can be placed in any order. The grammar does not contain any restriction on the number of verbs that can be combined, nor any constraints that ban embedding below a certain level. In the following, I will show that many reorderings are ruled out by communication rules that apply even with cases of simple two-place verbs. The conclusion is that the impossibility of embedding four or more verbs should in fact be explained as a performance issue.

Before I present arguments against a competence-based exclusion of (18), I will make a more general comment: corpora cannot help us here since one does not find any instances of verbs with four or more embeddings. Bech (1955) provides an extensive collection of material, but had to construct the examples with four embedded verbs. Meurers (1999b: 94–95) gives constructed examples with five verbs that contain multiple auxiliaries or modal verbs. These examples are barely processable and are not relevant for the discussion here since the verbs in (18) have to select their own arguments. There are therefore not that many verbs left when constructing examples. It is possible to only use subject control verbs with an additional object (e.g., *versprechen* ‘to promise’), object control verbs (e.g., *zwingen* ‘to force’) or AcI verbs (e.g., *sehen* ‘to see’ or *lassen* ‘to let’) to construct examples. When constructing examples, it is important make sure that all the nouns involved differ as much as possible with regard to their case and their selectional restrictions (e.g., animate/inanimate) since these are features that a hearer/reader could use to possibly assign reordered arguments to their heads. If we want to have patterns such as (18) with four NPs each with a different case, then we have to choose a verb that governs the genitive. There are only a very small number of such verbs in German. Although the example constructed by Joshi et al. (2000) in (9b) fulfills these requirements, it is still very marked. It therefore becomes clear that the possibility of finding a corresponding example in a newspaper article is extremely small. This is due to the fact that there are very few situations in which such an utterance would be imaginable. Additionally, all control verbs (with the exception of *helfen* ‘to help’) require an infinitive with *zu* ‘to’ and can also be realized incoherently, that is, with an extraposed infinitival complement without verbal complex formation. As mentioned above, a cooperative speaker/author would use a less complex construction and this reduces the probability that these kinds of sentences arise even further.

Notice that tree-local MC-LTAG does not constrain the number of verbs in a sentence. The formalism allows for an arbitrary number of verbs. It is therefore necessary to assume, as in other grammatical theories, that performance constraints are responsible for the fact that we never find examples of verbal complexes with five or more verbs. Tree-local MC-LAG makes predictions about the possibility of arguments to be reordered. I consider it wrong to make constraints regarding mobility of arguments dependent on the power of the grammatical formalism since the restrictions that one finds

are independent of verbal complexes and can be found with simplex verbs taking just two arguments. The problem with reordering is that it still has to be possible to assign the noun phrases to the verbs they belong to. If this assignment leads to ambiguity that cannot be resolved by case, selectional restrictions, contextual knowledge or intonation, then the unmarked constituent order is chosen. Hoberg (1981: 68) shows this very nicely with examples similar to the following:⁵

- (19) a. Hanna hat immer schon gewußt, daß das Kind sie verlassen will.
 Hanna has always already known that the child she leave wants
 ‘Hanna has always known that the child wants to leave her.’
- b. # Hanna hat immer schon gewußt, daß sie das Kind verlassen will.
 Hanna has always already known that she the child leave wants
 Preferred reading: ‘Hanna has always known that she wants to leave the child.’
- c. Hanna hat immer schon gewußt, daß sie der Mann verlassen will.
 Hanna has always already known that she the.NOM man leave
 will.
 wants.to
 ‘Hanna has always known that the man wants to leave her.’

⁵ Instead of *das* ‘the’, Hoberg uses the possessive pronoun *ihr* ‘her’. This makes the sentences more semantically plausible, but one then gets interference from the linearization requirements for bound pronouns. I have therefore replaced the pronouns with the definite article.

It is not possible to reorder (19a) to (19b) without creating a strong preference for another reading. This is due to the fact that neither *sie* ‘she’ nor *das Kind* ‘the child’ are unambiguously marked as nominative or accusative. (19b) therefore has to be interpreted as Hanna being the one that wants something, namely to leave the child. This reordering is possible, however, if at least one of the arguments is unambiguously marked for case as in (19c).

For noun phrases with feminine count nouns, the forms for nominative and accusative as well as genitive and dative are the same. For mass nouns, it is even worse. If they are used without an article, all cases are the same for feminine nouns (e.g., *Milch* ‘milk’) and also for masculines and neuters with exception of the genitive. In the following example from Wegener (1985: 45) it is hardly possible to switch the dative and accusative object, whereas this is possible if the nouns are used with articles as in (20c,d):

- (20) a. Sie mischt Wein Wasser bei.
 she mixes wine water into
 ‘She mixes water into the wine.’
 b. Sie mischt Wasser Wein bei.
 she mixes water wine into
 ‘She mixes wine into the water.’
 c. Sie mischt dem Wein das Wasser bei.
 she mixes the.DAT wine the.ACC water into
 ‘She mixes the water into the wine.’
 d. Sie mischt das Wasser dem Wein bei.
 she mixes the.ACC water the.DAT wine into
 ‘She mixes the water into the wine.’

The two nouns can only be switched if the meaning of the sentence is clear from the context (e.g., through explicit negation of the opposite) and if the sentence carries a certain intonation.

The problem with verbal complexes is now that with four noun phrases, two of them almost always have the same case if one does not wish to resort to the few verbs governing the genitive. A not particularly nice-sounding example of morphologically unambiguously marked case is (21):

- (21) weil er den Mann dem Jungen des Freundes gedenken
 because he.NOM the.ACC man the.DAT boy of.the.GEN friend remember
 helfen lassen will
 help let wants
 ‘because he wants to let the man help the boy remember his friend’

Another strategy is to choose verbs that select animate and inanimate objects so that animacy of the arguments can aid interpretation. I have constructed such an example where the most deeply embedded predicate is not a verb but rather an adjective. The

predicate *leer fischen* ‘to fish empty’ is a resultative construction that should be analyzed parallel to verbal complexes (Müller 2002a: Chapter 5).

- (22) weil niemand₁ [den Mann]₂ [der Frau]₃ [diesen Teich]₄ leer₄
 because nobody.NOM the.ACC man the.DAT woman this.ACC pond empty
 fischen₃ helfen₂ sah₁
 fish help saw
 ‘because nobody saw the man help the woman fish the pond empty’

If one reads the sentences with the relevant pauses, it is comprehensible. Case is unambiguously marked on the animate noun phrases and our word knowledge helps us to interpret *diesen Teich* ‘this pond’ as the argument of *leer* ‘empty’.

The sentence in (22) would correctly be analyzed by an appropriately written tree-local MC-LTAG and also by argument composition analyses for verbal complexes and resultative constructions. The sentence in (23) is a variant of (22) that corresponds exactly to the pattern of (18):

- (23) weil [der Frau]₂ [diesen Teich]₄ [den Mann]₃ niemand₁ leer₄
 because the.DAT woman this.ACC pond the.ACC man nobody.NOM empty
 fischen₃ helfen₂ sah₁
 fish help saw
 ‘because nobody saw the man help the woman fish the pond empty’

(23) is more marked than (22), but this is always the case with local reordering (Gisbert Fanselow, p. c. 2006). This sentence should not be ruled out by the grammar. Its markedness is more due to the same factors that were responsible for the markedness of reordering of arguments of simplex verbs. Tree-local MC-LTAG can not correctly analyze sentences such as (23), which shows that this TAG variant is not sufficient for analyzing natural language.

There are varying opinions among TAG researchers as to what should be counted as competence and what should be counted as performance. For instance, Rambow (1994: 15) argues that one should not exclude reorderings that cannot be processed by means of competence grammar or the grammatical formalism. In Chapter 6, he presents a theory of performance that can explain why the reordering of arguments of various verbs in the middle field is harder to process. One should therefore opt for TAG variants such as V-TAG or TT-MC-TAG (Lichte 2007) that are powerful enough to analyze the diverse reorderings and then also use a performance model that makes it possible to explain the gradual differences in acceptability.

An alternative to looking for a grammatical formalism with minimal expressive power is to not restrict the grammatical formalism at all with regard to its expressive power and instead develop as restrictive linguistic theories as possible. For further discussion of this point, see Chapter 17.

12.7 Summary and classification

In sum, we have seen the following: LTAG is lexicalized, that is, there is at least one lexical element in every tree. There are not any trees that correspond to the rule $S \rightarrow NP VP$ since no words are mentioned in this rule. Instead, there are always complex trees that contain the subject NP and the VP. Inside the VP, there can be as much structure as is necessary to ensure that the verb is contained in the tree. As well as the head, elementary trees in LTAG always contain the arguments of the head. For transitive verbs, this means that both the subject and the object have to be components of the elementary tree. This is also true of the trees used to analyze long-distance dependencies. As shown in Figure 12.13, the object must be part of the tree. The fact that the object can be separated from the verb by multiple sentence boundaries is not represented in the elementary tree, that is, recursive parts of grammar are not contained in elementary trees. The relevant effects are achieved by adjunction, that is, by insertion of material into elementary trees. The elementary tree for extraction in Figure 12.13 differs from the elementary tree for *likes* given in Figure 12.4 for the use in normal SVO clauses. Every minimal construction, in which *likes* can occur (subject extraction, topicalization, subject relative clauses, object relative clauses, passive, ...) needs its own elementary tree (Kallmeyer & Joshi 2003: 10). The different elementary trees can be connected using lexical rules. These lexical rules map a particular tree treated as underlying to other trees. In this way, it is possible to derive a passive tree from an active tree. These lexical rules are parallel to transformations in Transformational Grammar, however, one should bear in mind that there is always a lexical element in the tree, which makes the entire grammar more restrictive than grammars with free transformations.

An interesting difference to GB and variants of LFG, CG, and HPSG that assume empty elements is that the variants of TAG presented here⁶ do not contain empty elements in the lexicon. They can be used in trees but trees are listed as a whole in the lexicon.

Elementary trees can be of any size, which makes TAG interesting for the analysis of idioms (see Section 18.2). Since recursion is factored out, trees can contain elements that appear very far away from each other in the derived tree (extended domains of locality).

Kasper, Kiefer, Netter & Shanker (1995) show that it is possible to transfer HPSG grammars that fulfill certain requirements into TAG grammars. This is interesting as in this way one arrives at a grammar whose complexity behavior is known. Whereas HPSG grammars are generally in the Type-0 area, TAG grammars can, depending on the variant, fall into the realm of Type-2 languages (context-free) or even in the larger set of the mildly context-sensitive grammars (Joshi 1985). Yoshinaga, Miyao, Torisawa & Tsujii (2001) have developed a procedure for translating FB-LTAG grammars into HPSG grammars.

⁶ See Rambow (1994) and Kallmeyer (2005: 194), however, for TAG analyses with an empty element in the lexicon.

Comprehension questions

1. How are long-distance dependencies analyzed in TAG? Does one need empty elements for this?
2. Is it possible to analyze the reordering of arguments of multiple verbs using standard TAG processes?

Exercises

1. Analyze the following string in LTAG:

(24) der dem König treue Diener
 the the.DAT king loyal servant
 ‘the servant loyal to the king’

Further reading

Some important articles are Joshi, Levy & Takahashi (1975), Joshi (1987a), and Joshi & Schabes (1997). Many works discuss formal properties of TAG and are therefore not particularly accessible for linguistically interested readers. Kroch & Joshi (1985) give a good overview of linguistic analyses. An overview of linguistic and computational linguistic works in TAG can be found in the volume edited by Abeillé and Rambow from 2000. Rambow (1994) compares his TAG variant (V-TAG) to Karttunen’s *Radical Lexicalism* approach, Uszkoreit’s GPSG, Combinatorial Categorical Grammar, HPSG and Dependency Grammar.

Shieber & Johnson (1993) discuss psycholinguistically plausible processing models and show that it is possible to do incremental parsing with TAG. They also present a further variant of TAG: synchronous TAG. In this TAG variant, there is a syntactic tree and a semantic tree connected to it. When building syntactic structure, the semantic structure is always built in parallel. This structure built in parallel corresponds to the level of Logical Form derived from S-Structure using transformations in GB.

Rambow (1994: Chapter 6) presents an automaton-based performance theory. He applies it to German and shows that the processing difficulties that arise when reordering arguments of multiple verbs can be explained.

Kallmeyer & Romero (2008) show how it is possible to derive MRS representations directly via a derivation tree using FTAG. In each top node, there is a reference to the semantic content of the entire structure and each bottom node makes reference to the semantic content below the node. In this way, it becomes possible to insert an adjective (e.g., *mutmaßlichen* ‘suspected’) into an NP tree *alle Mörder* ‘all murderers’ so that the adjective has scope over the nominal part of the NP (*Mörder* ‘murderers’): for adjunction of the adjective to the N node, the adjective can access the semantic content of the noun. The top node of *mutmaßlichen* is then the top node of the combination

mutmaßlichen Mörder ‘suspected murderers’ and this ensures that the meaning of *mutmaßlichen Mörder* is correctly embedded under the universal quantifier.

第零部分 讨论

第十三章 The innateness of linguistic knowledge

If we try and compare the theories presented in this book, we notice that there are a number of similarities.¹ In all of the frameworks, there are variants of theories that use feature-value pairs to describe linguistic objects. The syntactic structures assumed are sometimes similar. Nevertheless, there are some differences that have often led to fierce debates between members of the various schools. Theories differ with regard to whether they assume transformations, empty elements, phrasal or lexical analyses, binary branching or flat structures.

Every theory has to not only describe natural language, but also explain it. It is possible to formulate an infinite number of grammars that license structures for a given language (see Exercise 1 on page 73). These grammars are *observationally adequate*. A grammar achieves *descriptive adequacy* if it corresponds to observations and the intuitions of native speakers.² A linguistic theory is descriptively adequate if it can be used to formulate a descriptively adequate grammar for every natural language. However, grammars achieving descriptive adequacy do not always necessarily reach *explanatory adequacy*. Grammars that achieve explanatory adequacy are those that are compatible with acquisition data, that is, grammars that could plausibly be acquired by human speakers (Chomsky 1965: 24–25).

Chomsky (1965: 25) assumes that children already have domain-specific knowledge about what grammars could, in principle, look like and then extract information about

¹ The terms *theory* and *framework* may require clarification. A framework is a common set of assumptions and tools that is used when theories are formulated. In this book, I discussed theories of German. These theories were developed in certain frameworks (GB, GPSG, HPSG, LFG, ...) and of course there are other theories of other languages that share the same fundamental assumptions. These theories differ from the theories of German presented here but are formulated in the same framework. Haspelmath (2010b) argues for framework-free grammatical theory. If grammatical theories used incompatible tools, it would be difficult to compare languages. So assuming transformations for English nonlocal dependencies and a SLASH mechanism for German would make comparison impossible. I agree with Haspelmath that the availability of formal tools may lead to biases, but in the end the facts have to be described somehow. If nothing is shared between theories, we end up with isolated theories formulated in one man frameworks. If there is shared vocabulary and if there are standards for doing framework-free grammatical theory, then the framework is framework-free grammatical theory. See Müller (2015a) and Chapter 22 of this book for further discussion.

² This term is not particularly useful as subjective factors play a role. Not everybody finds grammatical theories intuitively correct where it is assumed that every observed order in the languages of the world has to be derived from a common Specifier-Head-Complement configuration, and also only by movement to the left (see Section 4.6.1 for the discussion of such proposals).

what a given grammar actually looks like from the linguistic input. The most prominent variant of acquisition theory in Mainstream Generative Grammar (MGG) is the Principles & Parameters theory, which claims that parametrized principles restrict the grammatical structures possible and children just have to set parameters during language acquisition (see Section 3.1.2).

Over the years, the innateness hypothesis, also known as nativism, has undergone a number of modifications. In particular, assumptions about exactly what forms part of the innate linguistic knowledge, so-called Universal Grammar (UG), have often been subject to change.

Nativism is often rejected by proponents of Construction Grammar, Cognitive Grammar and by many other researchers working in other theories. Other explanations are offered for the facts normally used to argue for the innateness of grammatical categories, syntactic structures or relations between linguistic objects in syntactic structures. Another point of criticism is that the actual complexity of analyses is blurred by the fact that many of the stipulations are simply assumed to be part of UG. The following is a caricature of a certain kind of argumentation in GB/Minimalism analyses:

1. I have developed an analysis for the phenomenon P in the language S.
2. The analysis is elegant/conceptually simple/mine³.
3. There is no possibility to learn the relevant structures or principles.
4. Therefore, the assumptions A_1 through A_n that are made in this analysis must be part of the innate knowledge of speakers.

By attributing arbitrary assumptions to UG, it is possible to keep the rest of the analysis very simple.

The following section will briefly review some of the arguments for language-specific innate knowledge. We will see that none of these arguments are uncontroversial. In the following chapters, I will discuss fundamental questions about the architecture of grammar, the distinction between competence and performance and how to model performance phenomena, the theory of language acquisition as well as other controversial questions, e.g., whether it is desirable to postulate empty elements in linguistic representations and whether language should be explained primarily based on the properties of words or rather phrasal patterns.

Before we turn to these hotly debated topics, I want to discuss the one that is most fiercely debated, namely the question of innate linguistic knowledge. In the literature, one finds the following arguments for innate knowledge:

- the existence of syntactic universals,
- the speed of acquisition,
- the fact that there is a ‘critical period’ for language acquisition,

³ Also, see <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cAYDiPizDI8>. 01.12.2015.

- the fact that all children learn a language, but primates do not,
- the fact that children spontaneously regularize pidgin languages,
- the localization of language processing in particular parts of the brain,
- the alleged dissociation of language and general cognition:
 - Williams Syndrome,
 - the KE family with FoxP2 mutation and
- the Poverty of the Stimulus Argument.

Pinker (1994) offers a nice overview of these arguments. Tomasello (1995) provides a critical review of this book. The individual points will be discussed in what follows.

13.1 Syntactic universals

The existence of syntactic universals has been taken as an argument for the innateness of linguistic knowledge (e.g., Chomsky 1998: 33; Pinker 1994: 237–238). There are varying claims in the literature with regard to what is universal and language-specific. The most prominent candidates for universals are:⁴

- the Head Directionality Parameter
- \bar{X} structures
- grammatical functions such as subject or object
- binding principles
- properties of long-distance dependencies
- grammatical morphemes for tense, mood and aspect
- parts of speech
- recursion or self-embedding

These supposed universals will each be discussed briefly in what follows. One should emphasize that there is by no means a consensus that these are universal and that the observed properties actually require postulating innate linguistic knowledge.

⁴ Frans Plank has an archive of universals in Konstanz (Plank & Filimonova 2000): <http://typo.uni-konstanz.de/archive/intro/>. On 23.12.2015, it contained 2029 entries. The entries are annotated with regard to their quality, and it turns out that many of the universals are statistical universals, that is, they hold for the overwhelming majority of languages, but there are some exceptions. Some of the universals are marked as almost absolute, that is, very few exceptions are known. 1153 were marked as absolute or absolute with a question mark. 1021 of these are marked as absolute without a question mark. Many of the universals captured are implicational universals, that is, they have the form: if a language has the property X, then it also has the property Y. The universals listed in the archive are, in part, very specific and refer to the diachronic development of particular grammatical properties. For example, the fourth entry states that: *If the exponent of vocative is a prefix, then this prefix has arisen from 1st person possessor or a 2nd person subject.*

13.1.1 Head Directionality Parameter

The Head Directionality Parameter was already introduced in Section 3.1.2. The examples in (7) on page 80, repeated below as (1), show that the structures in Japanese are the mirror image of the English structures:

- (1) a. be showing pictures of himself
 b. zibun -no syasin-o mise-te iru
 himself of picture showing be

In order to capture these facts, a parameter was proposed that is responsible for the position of the head relative to its arguments (e.g., Chomsky 1986b: 146; 1988: 70).

By assuming a Head Directionality Parameter, Radford (1990: 60–61; 1997: 19–22), Pinker (1994: 234, 238), Baker (2003: 350) and other authors claim, either explicitly or implicitly, that there is a correlation between the direction of government of verbs and that of adpositions, that is, languages with verb-final order have postpositions and languages with VO order have prepositions. This claim can be illustrated with the language pair English/Japanese and the examples in (1): the *no* occurs after the pronoun in the prepositional phrase, the noun *syasin-o* ‘picture’ follows the PP belonging to it, the main verb follows its object and the auxiliary *iru* occurs after the main verb *mise-te*. The individual phrases are the exact mirror image of the respective phrases in English.

A single counterexample is enough to disprove a universal claim and in fact, it is possible to find a language that has verb-final order but nevertheless has prepositions. Persian is such a language. An example is given in (2):

- (2) man ketâb-â-ro be Sepide dâd-am.
 I book-PL-RÂ to Sepide gave-1SG
 ‘I gave the books to Sepide.’

In Section 3.1.4, it was shown that German cannot be easily described with this parameter: German is a verb-final language but has both prepositions and postpositions. The World Atlas of Language Structures lists 41 languages with VO order and postpositions and 14 languages with OV order and prepositions (Dryer 2013b,a).⁵ An earlier study by Dryer (1992) done with a smaller sample of languages also points out that there are exceptions to what the Head Directionality Parameter would predict.

Furthermore, Gibson & Wexler (1994: 422) point out that a single parameter for the position of heads would not be enough since complementizers in both English and German/Dutch occur before their complements; however, English is a VO language, whereas German and Dutch count as OV languages.

If one wishes to determine the direction of government based on syntactic categories (Gibson & Wexler 1994: 422, Chomsky 2005: 15), then one has to assume that the syntactic categories in question belong to the inventory of Universal Grammar (see Section 13.1.7, for more on this). Difficulties with prepositions and postpositions also arise for this kind of assumption as these are normally assigned to the same category

⁵ http://wals.info/combinations/83A_85A#2/15.0/153.0, 23.12.2015.

(P). If we were to introduce special categories for both prepositions and postpositions, then a four-way division of parts of speech like the one on page 87 would no longer be possible. One would instead require an additional binary feature and one would thereby automatically predict eight categories although only five (the four commonly assumed plus an extra one) are actually needed.

One can see that the relation between direction of government that Pinker formulated as a universal claim is in fact correct but rather as a tendency than as a strict rule, that is, there are many languages where there is a correlation between the use of prepositions or postpositions and the position the verb (Dryer 1992: 83).⁶

In many languages, adpositions have evolved from verbs. In Chinese grammar, it is commonplace to refer to a particular class of words as coverbs. These are words that can be used both as prepositions and as verbs. If we view languages historically, then we can find explanations for these tendencies that do not have to make reference to innate linguistic knowledge (see Evans & Levinson 2009a: 445).

Furthermore, it is possible to explain the correlations with reference to processing preferences: in languages with the same direction of government, the distance between the verb and the pre-/postposition is less (Figure 13.1a–b) than in languages with differing directions of government (Figure 13.1c–d). From the point of view of processing, languages with the same direction of government should be preferred since they allow the hearer to better identify the parts of the verb phrase (Newmeyer (2004a: 219–221) cites Hawkins (2004: 32) with a relevant general processing preference, see also Dryer (1992: 131)). This tendency can thus be explained as the grammaticalization of a performance preference (see Chapter 15 for the distinction between competence and performance) and recourse to innate language-specific knowledge is not necessary.

13.1.2 \bar{X} structures

It is often assumed that all languages have syntactic structures that correspond to the \bar{X} schema (see Section 2.5) (Pinker 1994: 238; Meisel 1995: 11, 14; Pinker & Jackendoff 2005: 216). There are, however, languages such as Dyirbal (Australia) where it does not seem to make sense to assume hierarchical structure for sentences. Thus, Bresnan (2001: 110) assumes that Tagalog, Hungarian, Malayalam, Warlpiri, Jiwari, Wambaya, Jakaltek and other corresponding languages do not have a VP node, but rather a rule taking the form of (3):

$$(3) \quad S \rightarrow C^*$$

Here, C^* stands for an arbitrary number of constituents and there is no head in the structure. Other examples for structures without heads will be discussed in Section 21.10.

⁶ Pinker (1994: 234) uses the word *usually* in his formulation. He thereby implies that there are exceptions and that the correlation between the ordering of adpositions and the direction of government of verbs is actually a tendency rather than a universally applicable rule. However, in the pages that follow, he argues that the Head Directionality Parameter forms part of innate linguistic knowledge. Travis (1984: 55) discusses data from Mandarin Chinese that do not correspond to the correlations she assumes. She then proposes treating the Head Directionality Parameter as a kind of Default Parameter that can be overridden by other constraints in the language.




图 13.1: Distance between verb and preposition for various head orders according to Newmeyer (2004a: 221)

\bar{X} structure was introduced to restrict the form of possible rules. The assumption was that these restrictions reduce the class of grammars one can formulate and thus – according to the assumption – make the grammars easier to acquire. But as Kornai & Pullum (1990) have shown, the assumption of \bar{X} structures does not lead to a restriction with regard to the number of possible grammars if one allows for empty heads. In GB, a number of null heads were used and in the Minimalist Program, there has been a significant increase of these. For example, the rule in (3) can be reformulated as follows:

$$(4) \quad V' \rightarrow V^0 C^*$$

Here, V^0 is an empty head. Since specifiers are optional, V' can be projected to VP and we arrive at a structure corresponding to the \bar{X} schema.

Apart from the problem with languages with very free constituent order, there are further problems with adjunction structures: Chomsky's analysis of adjective structure in \bar{X} theory (Chomsky 1970: 210; see also Section 2.5 of this book, in particular Figure 2.8 on page 70) is not straightforwardly applicable to German since, unlike English, adjective phrases in German are head-final and degree modifiers must directly precede the adjective:

- (5) a. der auf seinen Sohn sehr stolze Mann
 the of his son very proud man
 ‘the man very proud of his son’
 b. * der sehr auf seinen Sohn stolze Mann
 the very of his son proud man
 c. * der auf seinen Sohn stolze sehr Mann
 the of his son proud very man

Following the \bar{X} schema, *auf seinen Sohn* has to be combined with *stolze* and only then can the resulting \bar{A} projection be combined with its specifier (see Figure 2.8 on page 70 for the structure of adjective phrases in English). It is therefore only possible to derive orders such as (5b) or (5c). Neither of these is possible in German. It is only possible to rescue the \bar{X} schema if one assumes that German is exactly like English and, for some reason, the complements of adjectives must be moved to the left. If we allow this kind of repair approaches, then of course any language can be described using the \bar{X} schema. The result would be that one would have to postulate a vast number of movement rules for many languages and this would be extremely complex and difficult to motivate from a psycholinguistic perspective. See Chapter 15 for grammars compatible with performance.

A further problem for \bar{X} theory in its strictest form as presented in Section 2.5 is posed by so-called hydra clauses (Perlmutter & Ross 1970; Link 1984; Kiss 2005):

- (6) a. [[der Kater] und [die Katze]], die einander lieben
 the tomcat and the cat that each other love
 ‘the tomcat and the (female) cat that love each other’
 b. [[The boy] and [the girl]] who dated each other are friends of mine.

Since the relative clauses in (6) refer to a group of referents, they can only attach to the result of the coordination. The entire coordination is an NP, however, and adjuncts should actually be attached at the \bar{X} level. The reverse case of relative clauses in German and English is posed by adjectives in Persian: Samvelian (2007) argues for an analysis where adjectives are combined with nouns directly, and only the combination of nouns and adjectives is then combined with a PP argument.

The discussion of German and English shows that the introduction of specifiers and adjuncts cannot be restricted to particular projection levels, and the preceding discussion of non-configurational languages has shown that the assumption of intermediate levels does not make sense for every language.

It should also be noted that Chomsky himself assumed in 1970 that languages can deviate from the \bar{X} schema (1970: 210).

If one is willing to encode all information about combination in the lexicon, then one could get by with very abstract combinatorial rules that would hold universally. An example of this kind of combinatorial rules is the multiplication rules of Categorical Grammar (see Chapter 8) as well as Merge in the Minimalist Program (see Section 4). The rules in question simply state that two linguistic objects are combined. These kinds of

combination of course exist in every language. With completely lexicalized grammars, however, it is only possible to describe languages if one allows for null heads and makes certain ad hoc assumptions. This will be discussed in Section 21.10.

13.1.3 Grammatical functions such as subject and object

Bresnan & Kaplan (1982: xxv), Pinker (1994: 236–237), Baker (2003: 349) and others assume that all languages have subjects and objects. In order to determine what exactly this claim means, we have to explore the terms themselves. For most European languages, it is easy to say what a subject and an object is (see Section 1.7); however, it has been argued that it is not possible for all languages or that it does not make sense to use these terms at all (Croft 2001: Chapter 4; Evans & Levinson 2009a: Section 4).

In theories such as LFG – the one in which Pinker worked – grammatical functions play a primary role. The fact that it is still controversial whether one should view sentences as subjects, objects or as specially defined sentential arguments (xCOMP) (Dalrymple & Lødrup 2000; Berman 2003b, 2007; Alsina, Mohanan & Mohanan 2005; Forst 2006) serves to show that there is at least some leeway for argumentation when it comes to assigning grammatical functions to arguments. It is therefore likely that one can find an assignment of grammatical functions to the arguments of a functor in all languages.

Unlike LFG, grammatical functions are irrelevant in GB (see Williams 1984; Sternefeld 1985a) and Categorical Grammar. In GB, grammatical functions can only be determined indirectly by making reference to tree positions. Thus, in the approach discussed in Chapter 3, the subject is the phrase in the specifier position of IP.

In later versions of Chomskyan linguistics, there are functional nodes that seem to correspond to grammatical functions (AgrS, AgrO, AgrIO, see page 132). However, Chomsky (1995b: Section 4.10.1) remarks that these functional categories were only assumed for theory internal reasons and should be removed from the inventory of categories that are assumed to be part of UG. See Haider (1997a) and Sternefeld (2006: 509–510) for a description of German that does without functional projections that cannot be motivated in the language in question.

The position taken by HPSG is somewhere in the middle: a special valence feature is used for subjects (in grammars of German, there is a head feature that contains a representation of the subject for non-finite verb forms). However, the value of the SUBJ feature is derived from more general theoretical considerations: in German, the least oblique element with structural case is the subject (Müller 2002a: 153; 2007b: 311).

In GB theory (Extended Projection Principle, EPP, Chomsky (1982: 10)) and also in LFG (Subject Condition), there are principles ensuring that every sentence must have a subject. It is usually assumed that these principles hold universally.⁷

As previously mentioned, there are no grammatical functions in GB, but there are structural positions that correspond to grammatical functions. The position correspond-

⁷ However, Chomsky (1981a: 27) allows for languages not to have a subject. He assumes that this is handled by a parameter. Bresnan (2001: 311) formulates the Subject Condition, but mentions in a footnote that it might be necessary to parameterize this condition so that it only holds for certain languages.

ing to the subject is the specifier of IP. The EPP states that there must be an element in SpecIP. If we assume universality of this principle, then every language must have an element in this position. As we have already seen, there is a counterexample to this universal claim: German. German has an impersonal passive (7a) and there are also subjectless verbs (7b,c) and adjectives (7d–f).⁸

- (7) a. dass noch gearbeitet wird
that still worked is
'that people are still working'
- b. Ihm graut vor der Prüfung.
him.DAT dreads before the exam
'He dreads the exam.'
- c. Mich friert.
me.ACC freezes
'I am freezing.'
- d. weil schulfrei ist
because school.free is
'because there is no school today'
- e. weil ihm schlecht ist
because him.DAT ill is
'because he is not feeling well'
- f. Für dich ist immer offen.⁹
for you is always open
'We are always open for you.'

Most of the predicates that can be used without subjects can also be used with an expletive subject. An example is given in (8):

- (8) dass es ihm vor der Prüfung graut
that EXPL him before the exam dreads
'He dreads the exam.'

However, there are verbs such as *liegen* 'lie' in example (9a) from Reis (1982: 185) that cannot occur with an *es* 'it'.

- (9) a. Mir liegt an diesem Plan.
me.DAT lies on this plan
'This plan matters a lot to me.'
- b. *Mir liegt es an diesem Plan.
me.DAT lies it on this plan

⁸ For further discussion of subjectless verbs in German, see Haider (1993: Sections 6.2.1, 6.5), Fanselow (2000b), Nerbonne (1986b: 912) and Müller (2007b: Section 3.2).

⁹ Haider (1986a: 18).

Nevertheless, the applicability of the EPP and the Subject Condition is sometimes also assumed for German. Grewendorf (1993: 1311) assumes that there is an empty expletive that fills the subject position of subjectless constructions.

Berman (1999: 11; 2003a: Chapter 4), working in LFG, assumes that verbal morphology can fulfill the subject role in German and therefore even in sentences where no subject is overtly present, the position for the subject is filled in the f-structure. A constraint stating that all f-structures without a PRED value must be third person singular applies to the f-structure of the unexpressed subject. The agreement information in the finite verb has to match the information in the f-structure of the unexpressed subject and hence the verbal inflection in subjectless constructions is restricted to be 3rd person singular (Berman 1999).

As we saw on page 149, some researchers working in the Minimalist Program even assume that there is an object in every sentence (Stabler quoted in Veenstra (1998: 61, 124)). Objects of monovalent verbs are assumed to be empty elements.

If we allow these kinds of tools, then it is of course easy to maintain the existence of many universals: we claim that a language X has the property Y and then assume that the structural items are invisible and have no meaning. These analyses can only be justified theory-internally with the goal of uniformity (see Culicover & Jackendoff 2005: Section 2.1.2).¹⁰

13.1.4 Binding principles

The principles governing the binding of pronouns are also assumed to be part of UG (Chomsky 1998: 33; Crain, Thornton & Khlentzos 2009: 146; Rizzi 2009a: 468). Binding Theory in GB theory has three principles: principle A states that reflexives such as *sich* or *himself* refer to an element (antecedent) inside of a certain local domain (binding domain). Simplyfying a bit, one could say that a reflexive has to refer to a co-argument.

- (10) Klaus_i sagt, dass Peter_j sich_{*i/j} rasiert hat.
Klaus says that Peter himself shaved has

Principle B holds for personal pronouns and states that these cannot refer to elements inside of their binding domain.

- (11) Klaus_i sagt, dass Peter_j ihn_{i/*j} rasiert hat.
Klaus says that Peter him shaved has

Principle C determines what referential expressions can refer to. According to Principle C, an expression A₁ cannot refer to another expression A₂ if A₂ c-commands A₁. c-command is defined with reference to the structure of the utterance. There are various definitions of c-command; a simple version states that A c-commands B if there is a path in the constituent structure that goes upwards from A to the next branching node and then only downwards to B.

For the example in (12a), this means that *Max* and *er* ‘he’ cannot refer to the same individual since *er* c-commands *Max*.

¹⁰ For arguments from language acquisition, see Chapter 16.

- (12) a. Er sagt, dass Max Brause getrunken hat.
 he says that Max soda drunk has
 ‘He said that Max drank soda.’
 b. Max sagt, dass er Brause getrunken hat.
 Max said that he soda drunk has
 ‘Max said that he drank soda.’
 c. Als er hereinkam, trank Max Brause.
 as he came.in drank Max soda
 ‘As he came in, Max was drinking soda.’

This is possible in (12b), however, as there is no such c-command relation. For *er* ‘he’, it must only be the case that it does not refer to another argument of the verb *getrunken* ‘drunk’ and this is indeed the case in (12b). Similarly, there is no c-command relation between *er* ‘he’ and *Max* in (12c) since the pronoun *er* is inside a complex structure. *er* ‘he’ and *Max* can therefore refer to the the same or different individuals in (12b) and (12c).

Crain, Thornton & Khlentzos (2009: 147) point out that (12b,c) and the corresponding English examples are ambiguous, whereas (12a) is not, due to Principle C. This means that one reading is not available. In order to acquire the correct binding principles, the learner would need information about which meanings expressions do not have. The authors note that children already master Principle C at age three and they conclude from this that Principle C is a plausible candidate for innate linguistic knowledge. (This is a classic kind of argumentation. For Poverty of the Stimulus arguments, see Section 13.8 and for more on negative evidence, see Section 13.8.4).

Evans & Levinson (2009b: 483) note that Principle C is a strong cross-linguistic tendency but it nevertheless has some exceptions. As an example, they mention both reciprocal expressions in Abaza, where affixes that correspond to *each other* occur in subject position rather than object position as well as Guugu Yimidhirr, where pronouns in a superordinate clause can be coreferent with full NPs in a subordinate clause.

Furthermore, Fanselow (1992b: 351) refers to the examples in (13) that show that Principle C is a poor candidate for a syntactic principle.

- (13) a. Mord ist ein Verbrechen.
 murder is a crime
 b. Ein gutes Gespräch hilft Probleme überwinden.
 a good conversation helps problems overcome
 ‘A good conversation helps to overcome problems.’

(13a) expresses that it is a crime when somebody kills someone else, and (13b) refers to conversations with another person rather than talking to oneself. In these sentences, the nominalizations *Mord* ‘murder’ and *Gespräch* ‘conversation’ are used without any arguments of the original verbs. So there aren’t any arguments that stand in a syntactic command relation to one another. Nevertheless the arguments of the nominalized verbs

cannot be coreferential. Therefore it seems that there is a principle at work that says that the argument slots of a predicate must be interpreted as non-coreferential as long as the identity of the arguments is not explicitly expressed by linguistic means.

In sum, one can say that there are still a number of unsolved problems with Binding Theory. The HPSG variants of Principles A–C in English cannot even be applied to German (Müller 1999a: Chapter 20). Working in LFG, Dalrymple (1993) proposes a variant of Binding Theory where the binding properties of pronominal expressions are determined in the lexicon. In this way, the language-specific properties of pronouns can be accounted for.

13.1.5 Properties of long-distance dependencies

The long-distance dependencies discussed in the preceding chapters are subject to some kind of restrictions. For example, nothing can be extracted out of sentences that are part of a noun phrase in English. Ross (1967: 70) calls the relevant constraint the *Complex NP Constraint*. In later work, the attempt was made to group this, and other constraints such as the *Right Roof Constraint* also formulated by Ross (1967: Section 5.1.2), into a single, more general constraint, namely the Subjacency Principle (Chomsky 1973: 271; 1986a: 40; Baltin 1981, 2006). Subjacency was assumed to hold universally. The Subjacency Constraint states that movement operations can cross at most one bounding node, whereby what exactly counts as a bounding node depends on the language in question (Baltin 1981: 262; 2006; Rizzi 1982: 57; Chomsky 1986a: 38–40).¹¹

Currently, there are varying opinions in the GB/Minimalism tradition with regard to the question of whether subjacency should be considered as part of innate linguistic knowledge. Hauser, Chomsky & Fitch (2002) assume that subjacency does not form part of language-specific abilities, at least not in the strictest sense, but rather is a linguistically relevant constraint in the broader sense that the constraints in question can be derived from more general cognitive ones (see p. 445). Since subjacency still plays a role as a UG principle in other contemporary works (Newmeyer 2005: 15, 74–75; 2004a: 184; Baltin 2006¹²; Baker 2009; Freidin 2009; Rizzi 2009a,b), the Subjacency Principle will be discussed here in some further detail.

It is possible to distinguish two types of movement: movement to the left (normally called extraction) and movement to the right (normally referred to as extraposition). Both movement types constitute long-distance dependencies. In the following section,

¹¹ Newmeyer (2004b: 539–540) points out a conceptual problem following from the language-specific determination of bounding nodes: it is argued that subjacency is an innate language-specific principle since it is so abstract that it is impossible for speakers to learn it. However, if parameterization requires that a speaker chooses from a set of categories in the linguistic input, then the corresponding constraints must be derivable from the input at least to the degree that it is possible to determine the categories involved. This raises the question as to whether the original claim of the impossibility of acquisition is actually justified. See Section 13.8 on the *Poverty of the Stimulus* and Section 16.1 on parameter-based theories of language acquisition.

Note also that a parameter that has as the value a part of speech requires the respective part of speech values to be part of UG.

¹² However, see Baltin (2004: 552).

I will discuss some of the restrictions on extraposition. Extraction will be discussed in Section 13.1.5.2 following it.

13.1.5.1 Extraposition

Baltin (1981) and Chomsky (1986a: 40) claim that the extraposed relative clauses in (14) have to be interpreted with reference to the embedding NP, that is, the sentences are not equivalent to those where the relative clause would occur in the position marked with *t*, but rather they correspond to examples where it would occur in the position of the *t'*.

- (14) a. [_{NP} Many books [_{PP} with [stories *t*]] *t'*] were sold [that I wanted to read].
 b. [_{NP} Many proofs [_{PP} of [the theorem *t*]] *t'*] appeared
 [that I wanted to think about].

Here, it is assumed that NP, PP, VP and AP are bounding nodes for rightward movement (at least in English) and the interpretation in question here is thereby ruled out by the Subjacency Principle (Baltin 1981: 262).

If we construct a German example parallel to (14a) and replace the embedding noun so that it is ruled out or dispreferred as a referent, then we arrive at (15):

- (15) weil viele Schallplatten mit Geschichten verkauft wurden, die ich noch
 because many records with stories sold were that I still
 lesen wollte
 read wanted
 'because many records with stories were sold that I wanted to read'

This sentence can be uttered in a situation where somebody in a record store sees particular records and remembers that he had wanted to read the fairy tales on those records. Since one does not read records, adjunction to the superordinate noun is implausible and thus adjunction to *Geschichten* 'stories' is preferred. By carefully choosing the nouns, it is possible to construct examples such as (16) that show that extraposition can take place across multiple NP nodes:¹³

- (16) a. Karl hat mir [ein Bild [einer Frau _{-i}]] gegeben, [die schon lange tot
 Karl has me a picture a woman given that PRT long dead
 ist]_i.
 is
 'Karl gave me a picture of a woman that has been dead some time.'

¹³ See Müller (1999a: 211) and Müller (2004b; 2007e: Section 3). For parallel examples from Dutch, see Koster (1978: 52).

- b. Karl hat mir [eine Fälschung [des Bildes [einer Frau $_{-i}$]]] gegeben, [die Karl has me a forgery of.the picture of.a woman given that schon lange tot ist]_i.
PRT long dead is
'Karl gave me a forgery of the picture of a woman that has been dead for some time.'
- c. Karl hat mir [eine Kopie [einer Fälschung [des Bildes [einer Frau $_{-i}$]]]] gegeben, [die schon lange tot ist]_i.
given that PRT long dead is
'Karl gave me a copy of a forgery of the picture of a woman that has been dead for some time.'

This kind of embedding could continue further if one were to not eventually run out of nouns that allow for semantically plausible embedding. NP is viewed as a bounding node in German (Grewendorf 1988: 81; 2002: 17–18; Haider 2001: 285). These examples show that it is possible for rightward extraposed relative clauses to cross any number of bounding nodes.

Koster (1978: 52–54) discusses some possible explanations for the data in (16), where it is assumed that relative clauses move to the NP/PP border and are then moved on further from there (this movement requires so-called escape hatches or escape routes). He argues that these approaches will also work for the very sentences that should be ruled out by subadjacency, that is, for examples such as (14). This means that either data such as (14) can be explained by subadjacency and the sentences in (16) are counterexamples, or there are escape hatches and the examples in (14) are irrelevant, deviant sentences that cannot be explained by subadjacency.

In the examples in (16), a relative clause was extraposed in each case. These relative clauses are treated as adjuncts and there are analyses that assume that extraposed adjuncts are not moved but rather base-generated in their position, and coreference/coindexation is achieved by special mechanisms (Kiss 2005). For proponents of these kinds of analyses, the examples in (16) would be irrelevant to the subadjacency discussion as the Subadjacency Principle only constrains movement. However, extraposition across phrase boundaries is not limited to relative clauses; sentential complements can also be extraposed:

- (17) a. Ich habe [von [der Vermutung $_{-i}$]] gehört, [dass es Zahlen gibt, die I have from the conjecture heard that EXPL numbers gives that die folgenden Bedingungen erfüllen]_i.
the following requirements fulfill
'I have heard of the conjecture that there are numbers that fulfill the following requirements.'

- b. Ich habe [von [einem Beweis [der Vermutung $_{-i}$]]] gehört, [dass es
I have from a proof of.the conjecture heard that EXPL
Zahlen gibt, die die folgenden Bedingungen erfüllen]_i.
numbers give that the following requirements fulfill
'I have heard of the proof of the conjecture that there are numbers that fulfill
the following requirements.'
- c. Ich habe [von [dem Versuch [eines Beweises [der Vermutung $_{-i}$]]]] gehört,
I have from the attempt of.a proof of.the conjecture heard
[dass es Zahlen gibt, die die folgenden Bedingungen erfüllen]_i.
that EXPL numbers gives that the following requirements fulfill
'I have heard of the attempt to prove the conjecture that there are numbers
that fulfill the following requirements.'

Since there are nouns that select *zu* infinitives or prepositional phrases and since these can be extraposed like the sentences above, it must be ensured that the syntactic category of the postposed element corresponds to the category required by the noun. This means that there has to be some kind of relation between the governing noun and the extraposed element. For this reason, the examples in (17) have to be analyzed as instances of extraposition and provide counter evidence to the claims discussed above.

If one wishes to discuss the possibility of recursive embedding, then one is forced to refer to constructed examples as the likelihood of stumbling across groups of sentences such as those in (16) and (17) is very remote. It is, however, possible to find some individual cases of deep embedding: (18) gives some examples of relative clause extraposition and complement extraposition taken from the Tiger corpus¹⁴ (Müller 2007e: 78–79; Meurers & Müller 2009: Section 2.1).

- (18) a. Der 43jährige will nach eigener Darstellung damit [NP den Weg [PP für
the 43.year.old wants after own depiction there.with the way for
[NP eine Diskussion [PP über [NP den künftigen Kurs [NP der stärksten
a discussion about the future course of.the strongest
Oppositionsgruppierung]]]]]] freimachen, [die aber mit 10,4 Prozent
opposition.group free.make that however with 10.4 percent
der Stimmen bei der Wahl im Oktober weit hinter den Erwartungen
of.the votes at the election in October far behind the expectations
zurückgeblieben war]. (s27639)
stayed.back was
'In his own words, the 43-year old wanted to clear the way for a discussion
about the future course of the strongest opposition group that had, however,
performed well below expectations gaining only 10.4 percent of the votes at
the election in October.'
- b. [...] die Erfindung der Guillotine könnte [NP die Folge [NP eines
the invention of.the guillotine could the result of.a

¹⁴ See Brants et al. (2004) for more information on the Tiger corpus.

verzweifelten Versuches des gleichnamigen Doktors] gewesen sein, [seine desperate attempt the same.name doctor have been his Patienten ein für allemal von Kopfschmerzen infolge schlechter Kissen patients once for all.time of headaches because.of bad pillows zu befreien]. (s16977)
to free

‘The invention of the guillotine could have been the result of a desperate attempt of the eponymous doctor to rid his patients once and for all of headaches from bad pillows.’

It is also possible to construct sentences for English that violate the Subjacency Condition. Uszkoreit (1990: 2333) provides the following example:

- (19) [_{NP} Only letters [_{PP} from [_{NP} those people _{-i}]]] remained unanswered [that had received our earlier reply]_i.

Jan Strunk (p. c. 2008) has found examples for extraposition of both restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses across multiple phrase boundaries:

- (20) a. For example, we understand that Ariva buses have won [_{NP} a number [_{PP} of [_{NP} contracts [_{PP} for [_{NP} routes in London _{-i}]]]]] recently, [which will not be run by low floor accessible buses]_i.¹⁵
b. I picked up [_{NP} a copy of [_{NP} a book _{-i}]] today, by a law professor, about law, [that is not assigned or in any way required to read]_i.¹⁶
c. We drafted [_{NP} a list of [_{NP} basic demands _{-i}]] that night [that had to be unconditionally met or we would stop making and delivering pizza and go on strike]_i.¹⁷

(20a) is also published in Strunk & Snider (2013: 111). Further attested examples from German and English can be found in this paper.

The preceding discussion has shown that subjacency constraints on rightward movement do not hold for English or German and thus cannot be viewed as universal. One could simply claim that NP and PP are not bounding nodes in English or German. Then, these extraposition data would no longer be problematic for theories assuming subjacency. However, subjacency constraints are also assumed for leftward movement. This is discussed in more detail in the following section.

13.1.5.2 Extraction

Under certain conditions, leftward movement is not possible from certain constituents (Ross 1967). These constituents are referred to as islands for extraction. Ross (1967: Section 4.1) formulated the *Complex NP Constraint* (CNPC) that states that extraction is not

¹⁵ <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm199899/cmselect/cmenvtra/32ii/32115.htm>, 24.02.2007.

¹⁶ <http://greyhame.org/archives/date/2005/09/>, 27.09.2008.

¹⁷ <http://portland.indymedia.org/en/2005/07/321809.shtml>, 27.09.2008.

possible from complex noun phrases. An example of extraction from a relative clause inside a noun phrase is the following:

- (21) *Who_i did he just read [_{NP} the report [_S that was about _{-i}]]?

Although (21) would be a semantically plausible question, the sentence is still ungrammatical. This is explained by the fact that the question pronoun has been extracted across the sentence boundary of a relative clause and then across the NP boundary and has therefore crossed two bounding nodes. It is assumed that the CNPC holds for all languages. This is not the case, however, as the corresponding structures are possible in Danish (Erteschik-Shir & Lappin 1979: 55), Norwegian, Swedish, Japanese, Korean, Tamil and Akan (see Hawkins (1999: 245, 262) and references therein). Since the restrictions of the CNPC are integrated into the Subjacency Principle, it follows that the Subjacency Principle cannot be universally applicable unless one claims that NP is not a bounding node in the problematic languages. However, it seems indeed to be the case that the majority of languages do not allow extraction from complex noun phrases. Hawkins explains this on the basis of the processing difficulties associated with the structures in question (Section 4.1). He explains the difference between languages that allow this kind of extraction and languages that do not with reference to the differing processing load for structures that stem from the interaction of extraction with other grammatical properties such as verb position and other conventionalized grammatical structures in the respective languages (Section 4.2).

Unlike extraction from complex noun phrases, extraction across a single sentence boundary (22) is not ruled out by the Subjacency Principle.

- (22) Who_i did she think that he saw _{-i}?

Movement across multiple sentence boundaries, as discussed in previous chapters, is explained by so-called cyclic movement in transformational theories: a question pronoun is moved to a specifier position and can then be moved further to the next highest specifier. Each of these movement steps is subject to the Subjacency Principle. The Subjacency Principle rules out long-distance movement in one fell swoop.

The Subjacency Principle cannot explain why extraction from sentences embedded under verbs that specify the kind of utterance (23a) or factive verbs (23b) is deviant (Erteschik-Shir & Lappin 1979: 68–69).

- (23) a. ?? Who_i did she mumble that he saw _{-i}?
b. ?? Who_i did she realize that he saw _{-i}?

The structure of these sentences seems to be the same as (22). In entirely syntactic approaches, it was also attempted to explain these differences as subjacency violations or as a violation of Ross' constraints. It has therefore been assumed (Stowell 1981: 401–402) that the sentences in (23) have a structure different from those in (22). Stowell treats these sentential arguments of manner of speaking verbs as adjuncts. Since adjunct clauses are islands for extraction by assumption, this would explain why (23a) is marked. The adjunct analysis is compatible with the fact that these sentential arguments can be omitted:

- (24) a. She shouted that he left.
b. She shouted.

Ambridge & Goldberg (2008: 352) have pointed out that treating such clauses as adjuncts is not justified as they are only possible with a very restricted class of verbs, namely verbs of saying and thinking. This property is a property of arguments and not of adjuncts. Adjuncts such as place modifiers are possible with a wide number of verb classes. Furthermore, the meaning changes if the sentential argument is omitted as in (24b): whereas (24a) requires that some information is communicated, this does not have to be the case with (24b). It is also possible to replace the sentential argument with an NP as in (25), which one would certainly not want to treat as an adjunct.

- (25) She shouted the remark/the question/something I could not understand.

The possibility of classifying sentential arguments as adjuncts cannot be extended to factive verbs as their sentential argument is not optional (Ambridge & Goldberg 2008: 352):

- (26) a. She realized that he left.
b. ?? She realized.

Kiparsky & Kiparsky (1970) suggest an analysis of factive verbs that assumes a complex noun phrase with a nominal head. An optional *fact* Deletion-Transformation removes the head noun and the determiner of the NP in sentences such as (27a) to derive sentences such as (27b) (page 159).

- (27) a. She realized [_{NP} the fact [_S that he left]].
b. She realized [_{NP} [_S that he left]].

The impossibility of extraction out of such sentences can be explained by assuming that two boundary nodes were crossed, which was assumed to be impossible (on the island status of this construction, see Kiparsky & Kiparsky 1970: Section 4). This analysis predicts that extraction from complement clauses of factive verbs should be just as bad as extraction from overt NP arguments since the structure for both is the same. According to Ambridge & Goldberg (2008: 353), this is, however, not the case:

- (28) a. * Who did she realize the fact that he saw _i?
b. ?? Who did she realize that he saw _i?

Together with Erteschik-Shir (1981), Erteschik-Shir & Lappin (1979), Takami (1988) and Van Valin (1998), Goldberg (2006: Section 7.2) assumes that the gap must be in a part of the utterance that can potentially form the focus of an utterance (see Cook (2001), De Kuthy (2002) and Fanselow (2003c) for German). This means that this part must not be presupposed.¹⁸ If one considers what this means for the data from the subadjacency discussion, then one notices that in each case extraction has taken place out of presupposed material:

¹⁸ Information is presupposed if it is true regardless of whether the utterance is negated or not. Thus, it follows from both (i.a) and (i.b) that there is a king of France.

- (29) a. Complex NP
 She didn't see the report that was about him. → The report was about him.
 b. Complement of a verb of thinking or saying
 She didn't whisper that he left. → He left.
 c. Factive verb
 She didn't realize that he left. → He left.

Goldberg assumes that constituents that belong to backgrounded information are islands (*Backgrounded constructions are islands* (BCI)). Ambridge & Goldberg (2008) have tested this semantic/pragmatic analysis experimentally and compared it to a purely syntactic approach. They were able to confirm that information structural properties play a significant role for the extractability of elements. Along with Erteschik-Shir (1973: Section 3.H), Ambridge & Goldberg (2008: 375) assume that languages differ with regard to how much constituents have to belong to background knowledge in order to rule out extraction. In any case we should not rule out extraction from adjuncts for all languages as there are languages such as Danish where it is possible to extract from relative clauses.¹⁹ Erteschik-Shir (1973: 61) provides the following examples, among others:

- (30) a. Det_i er der mange [der kan lide _{-i}].
 that are there many that can like
 'There are many who like that.' (lit.: 'That, there are many who like.')
- b. Det hus_i kender jeg en mand [som har købt _{-i}].
 that house know I a man that has bought
 'I know a man that has bought that house.' (lit.: 'This house, I know a man that has bought.')

Rizzi's parameterization of the subjacency restriction has been abandoned in many works, and the relevant effects have been ascribed to differences in other areas of grammar (Adams 1984; Chung & McCloskey 1983; Grimshaw 1986; Kluender 1992).

We have seen in this subsection that there are reasons other than syntactic properties of structure as to why leftward movement might be blocked. In addition to information structural properties, processing considerations also play a role (Grosu 1973; Ellefson & Christiansen 2000; Gibson 1998; Kluender & Kutas 1993; Hawkins 1999; Sag, Hofmeister & Snider 2007). The length of constituents involved, the distance between filler and gap, definiteness, complexity of syntactic structure and interference effects

-
- (i) a. The King of France is bald.
 b. The King of France is not bald.

¹⁹ Discussing the question of whether UG-based approaches are falsifiable, Crain, Khlentzos & Thornton (2010: 2669) claim that it is not possible to extract from relative clauses and the existence of such languages would call into question the very concept of UG. ('If a child acquiring any language could learn to extract linguistic expressions from a relative clause, then this would seriously cast doubt on one of the basic tenets of UG.') They thereby contradict Evans and Levinson as well as Tomasello, who claim that UG approaches are not falsifiable. If the argumentation of Crain, Khlentzos and Thornton were correct, then (30) would falsify UG and that would be the end of the discussion.

between similar discourse referents in the space between the filler and gap are all important factors for the acceptability of utterances. Since languages differ with regard to their syntactic structure, varying effects of performance, such as the ones found for extraposition and extraction, are to be expected.

In sum, we can say that subadjacency constraints do not hold for extraposition in either German or English and furthermore that one can better explain constraints on extraction with reference to information structure and processing phenomena than with the Subadjacency Principle. Assuming subadjacency as a syntactic constraint in a universal competence grammar is therefore unnecessary to explain the facts.

13.1.6 Grammatical morphemes for tense, mood and aspect

Pinker (1994: 238) is correct in claiming that there are morphemes for tense, mood, aspect, case and negation in many languages. However, there is a great deal of variation with regard to which of these grammatical properties a language has and how they are expressed.

For examples of differences in the tense system see Dahl & Velupillai (2013b,a). Mandarin Chinese is a clear case: it has next to no morphology. The fact that the same morphemes occur in one form or another in almost every language can be attributed to the fact that certain things need to be expressed repeatedly and then things which are constantly repeated become grammaticalized.

13.1.7 Parts of speech

In Section 4.6, so-called cartographic approaches were mentioned, some of which assume over thirty functional categories (see Table 4.1 on page 133 for Cinque's functional heads) and assume that these categories form part of UG together with corresponding fixed syntactic structures. Cinque & Rizzi (2010: 55, 57) even assume over 400 functional categories that are claimed to play a role in the grammars of all languages.²⁰ Also, specific parts of speech such as Infl (inflection) and Comp (complementizer) are referred to when formulating principles that are assumed to be universal (Baltin 1981: 262; 2006; Rizzi 1982; Chomsky 1986a: 38; Hornstein 2013: 397).

Chomsky (1988: 68; 1991; 1995b: 131), Pinker (1994: 284, 286), Briscoe (2000: 270) and Wunderlich (2004: 621) make comparatively fewer assumptions about the innate inventory of parts of speech: Chomsky assumes that all lexical categories (verbs, nouns, adjectives and adpositions) belong to UG and languages have these at their disposal. Pinker, Briscoe and Wunderlich assume that all languages have nouns and verbs. Again critics of UG raised the question as to whether these syntactic categories can be found in other languages in the form known to us from languages such as German and English.

Braine (1987: 72) argues that parts of speech such as verb and noun should be viewed as derived from fundamental concepts like argument and predicate (see also Wunderlich

²⁰ The question of whether these categories form part of UG is left open.

(2008: 257)). This means that there is an independent explanation for the presence of these categories that is not based on innate language-specific knowledge.

Evans & Levinson (2009a: Section 2.2.4) discuss the typological literature and give examples of languages which lack adverbs and adjectives. The authors cite Straits Salish as a language in which there may be no difference between verbs and nouns (see also Evans & Levinson 2009b: 481). They remark that it does make sense to assume the additional word classes ideophone, positional, coverb, classifier for the analysis of non Indo-European languages on top of the four or five normally used.²¹ This situation is not a problem for UG-based theories if one assumes that languages can choose from an inventory of possibilities (a toolkit) but do not have to exhaust it (Jackendoff 2002: 263; Newmeyer 2005: 11; Fitch, Hauser & Chomsky 2005: 204; Chomsky 2007: 6–7; Cinque & Rizzi 2010: 55, 58, 65). However, if we condone this view, then there is a certain arbitrariness. It is possible to assume any parts of speech that one requires for the analysis of at least one language, attribute them to UG and then claim that most (or maybe even all) languages do not make use of the entire set of parts of speech. This is what is suggested by Villavicencio (2002: 157), working in the framework of Categorical Grammar, for the categories S, NP, N, PP and PRT. This kind of assumption is not falsifiable (see Evans & Levinson 2009a: 436; Tomasello 2009: 471 for a discussion of similar cases and a more general discussion).

Whereas Evans and Levinson assume that one needs additional categories, Haspelmath (2009: 458) and Croft (2009: 453) go so far as to deny the existence of cross-linguistic parts of speech. I consider this to be too extreme and believe that a better research strategy is to try and find commonalities between languages.²² One should, however, expect to find languages that do not fit into our Indo-European-biased conceptions of grammar.

13.1.8 Recursion and infinitude

In an article in *Science*, Hauser, Chomsky & Fitch (2002) put forward the hypothesis that the only domain-specific universal is recursion, “providing the capacity to generate an infinite range of expressions from a finite set of elements” (see (37b) on page 60 for an example of a recursive phrase structure rule).²³ This assumption is controversial and there have been both formal and empirical objections to it.

²¹ For the opposite view, see Jackendoff & Pinker (2009: 465).

²² Compare Chomsky (1999: 2): “In the absence of compelling evidence to the contrary, assume languages to be uniform, with variety restricted to easily detectable properties of utterances.”

²³ In a discussion article in *Cognition*, Fitch, Hauser & Chomsky (2005) clarify that their claim that recursion is the only language-specific and human-specific property is a hypothesis and it could be the case that are not any language-specific/species-specific properties at all. Then, a particular combination of abilities and properties would be specific to humans (p. 182–201). An alternative they consider is that innate language-specific knowledge has a complexity corresponding to what was assumed in earlier versions of Mainstream Generative Grammar (p. 182). Chomsky (2007: 7) notes that Merge could be a non language-specific operation but still attributes it to UG.

13.1.8.1 Formal problems

The claim that our linguistic capabilities are infinite is widespread and can already be found in Humboldt's work:²⁴

Das Verfahren der Sprache ist aber nicht bloß ein solches, wodurch eine einzelne Erscheinung zustande kommt; es muss derselben zugleich die Möglichkeit eröffnen, eine unbestimmbare Menge solcher Erscheinungen und unter allen, ihr von dem Gedanken gestellten Bedingungen hervorzubringen. Denn sie steht ganz eigentlich einem unendlichen und wahrhaft grenzenlosen Gebiete, dem Inbegriff alles Denkbaren gegenüber. Sie muss daher von endlichen Mitteln einen unendlichen Gebrauch machen, und vermag dies durch die Identität der gedanken- und spracheerzeugenden Kraft. (Humboldt 1988: 108)

If we just look at the data, we can see that there is an upper bound for the length of utterances. This has to do with the fact that extremely long instances cannot be processed and that speakers have to sleep or will eventually die at some point. If we set a generous maximal sentence length at 100,000 morphemes and then assume a morpheme inventory of X then one can form less than $X^{100,000}$ utterances. We arrive at the number $X^{100,000}$ if we use each of the morphemes at each of the 100,000 positions. Since not all of these sequences will be well-formed, then there are actually less than $X^{100,000}$ possible utterances (see also Weydt 1972 for a similar but more elaborate argument). This number is incredibly large, but still finite. The same is true of thought: we do not have infinitely many possible thoughts (if *infinitely* is used in the mathematical sense of the word), despite claims by Humboldt and Chomsky (2008: 137) to the contrary.²⁵

²⁴ The process of language is not simply one where an individual instantiation is created; at the same time it must allow for an indefinite set of such instantiations and must above all allow the expression of the conditions imposed by thought. Language faces an infinite and truly unbounded subject matter, the epitome of everything one can think of. Therefore, it must make infinite use of finite means and this is possible through the identity of the power that is responsible for the production of thought and language.

²⁵ Weydt (1972) discusses Chomsky's statements regarding the existence of infinitely many sentences and whether it is legitimate for Chomsky to refer to Humboldt. Chomsky's quote in *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory* (Chomsky 1964a: 17) leaves out the sentence *Denn sie steht ganz eigentlich einem unendlichen und wahrhaft grenzenlosen Gebiete, dem Inbegriff alles Denkbaren gegenüber*. Weydt (1972: 266) argues that Humboldt, Bühler and Martinet claimed that there are infinitely many thoughts that can be expressed. Weydt claims that it does not follow that sentences may be arbitrarily long. Instead he suggests that there is no upper bound on the length of texts. This claim is interesting, but I guess texts are just the next bigger unit and the argument that Weydt put forward against languages without an upper bound for sentence length also applies to texts. A text can be generated by the rather simplified rule in (i) that combines an utterance U with a text T resulting in a larger text T :

(i) $T \rightarrow T U$

U can be a sentence or another phrase that can be part of a text. If one is ready to admit that there is no upper bound on the length of texts, it follows that there cannot be an upper bound on the length of sentences either, since one can construct long sentences by joining all phrases of a text with *and*. Such long sentences that are the product of conjoining short sentences are different in nature from very long sentences that are admitted under the Chomskyan view in that they do not include center-self embeddings of an arbitrary depth (see Section 15), but nevertheless the number of sentences that can be produced from arbitrarily long texts is infinite.

In the literature, one sometimes finds the claim that it is possible to produce infinitely long sentences (see for instance Nowak, Komarova & Niyogi (2001: 117) and Kim & Sells (2008: 3) and Dan Everett in O'Neill & Wood (2012) at 25:19). This is most certainly not the case. It is also not the case that the rewrite grammars we encountered in Chapter 2 allow for the creation of infinite sentences as the set of symbols of the right-hand side of the rule has to be finite by definition. While it is possible to derive an infinite number of sentences, the sentences themselves cannot be infinite, since it is always one symbol that is replaced by finitely many other symbols and hence no infinite symbol sequence may result.

Chomsky (1965: Section I.1) follows de Saussure (1916b) and draws a distinction between competence and performance: competence is the knowledge about what kind of linguistic structures are well-formed, and performance is the application of this knowledge (see Section 12.6.3 and Chapter 15). Our restricted brain capacity as well as other constraints are responsible for the fact that we cannot deal with an arbitrary amount of embedding and that we cannot produce utterances longer than 100,000 morphemes. The separation between competence and performance makes sense and allows us to formulate rules for the analysis of sentences such as (31):

- (31) a. Richard is sleeping.
 b. Karl suspects that Richard is sleeping.
 c. Otto claims that Karl suspects that Richard is sleeping.
 d. Julius believes that Otto claims that Karl suspects that Richard is sleeping.
 e. Max knows that Julius believes that Otto claims that Karl suspects that Richard is sleeping.

The rule takes the following form: combine a noun phrase with a verb of a certain class and a clause. By applying this rule successively, it is possible to form strings of arbitrary length. Pullum & Scholz (2010) point out that one has to keep two things apart: the question of whether language is a recursive system and whether it is just the case that the best models that we can devise for a particular language happen to be recursive. For more on this point and on processing in the brain, see Luuk & Luuk (2011). When constructing strings of words using the system above, it cannot be shown that (a particular) language is infinite, even if this is often claimed to be the case (Bierwisch 1966: 105–106; Pinker 1994: 86; Hauser, Chomsky & Fitch 2002: 1571; Müller 2007b: 1; Hornstein, Nunes & Grohmann 2005: 7; Kim & Sells 2008: 3).

The “proof” of this infinitude of language is led as an indirect proof parallel to the proof that shows that there is no largest natural number (Bierwisch 1966: 105–106; Pinker

As for arbitrarily long texts there is an interesting problem: Let us assume that a person produces sentences and keeps adding them to an existing text. This enterprise will be interrupted when the human being dies. One could say that another person could take up the text extension until this one dies and so on. Again the question is whether one can understand the meaning and the structure of a text that is several million pages long. 42. If this is not enough of a problem, one may ask oneself whether the language of the person who keeps adding to the text in the year 2731 is still the same that the person who started the text spoke in 2015. If the answer to this question is no, then the text is not a document containing sentences from one language *L* but a mix from several languages and hence irrelevant for the debate.

1994: 86). In the domain of natural numbers, this works as follows: assume x is the largest natural number. Then form $x + 1$ and, since this is by definition a natural number, we have now found a natural number that is greater than x . We have therefore shown that the assumption that x is the highest number leads to a contradiction and thus that there cannot be such a thing as the largest natural number.

When transferring this proof into the domain of natural language, the question arises as to whether one would still want to class a string of 1,000,000,000 words as part of the language we want to describe. If we do not want this, then this proof will not work.

If we view language as a biological construct, then one has to accept the fact that it is finite. Otherwise, one is forced to assume that it is infinite, but that an infinitely large part of the biologically real object is not biologically real (Postal 2009: 111). Luuk & Luuk (2011) refer to languages as physically uncountable but finite sets of strings. They point out that a distinction must be made between the ability to imagine extending a sentence indefinitely and the ability to take a sentence from a non-countable set of strings and really extend it. We possess the first ability but not the second.

One possibility to provide arguments for the infinitude of languages is to claim that only generative grammars, which create sets of well-formed utterances, are suited to modeling language and that we need recursive rules to capture the data, which is why mental representations have a recursive procedure that generates infinite numbers of expressions (Chomsky, 1956: 115; 2002: 86–87), which then implies that languages consist of infinitely many expressions. There are two mistakes in this argument that have been pointed out by Pullum & Scholz (2010): even if one assumes generative grammars, it can still be the case that a context-sensitive grammar can still only generate a finite set even with recursive rules. Pullum & Scholz (2010: 120–121) give an interesting example from András Kornai.

The more important mistake is that it is not necessary to assume that grammars generate sets. There are three explicitly formalized alternatives of which only the third is mentioned here, namely the model-theoretic and therefore constraint-based approaches (see Chapter 14). Johnson & Postal's Arc Pair Grammar (1980), LFG in the formalization of Kaplan (1995), GPSG in the reformalization of Rogers (1997) and HPSG with the assumptions of King (1999), Pollard (1999) and Richter (2007) are examples of model-theoretic approaches. In constraint-based theories, one would analyze an example like (31) saying that certain attitude verbs select a nominative NP and a *that* clause and that these can only occur in a certain local configuration where a particular relation holds between the elements involved. One of these relations is subject-verb agreement. In this way, one can represent expressions such as (31) and does not have to say anything about how many sentences can be embedded. This means that constraint-based theories are compatible with both answers to the question of whether there is a finite or infinite number of structures. Using competence grammars formulated in the relevant way, it is possible to develop performance models that explain why certain strings – for instance very long ones – are unacceptable (see Chapter 15).

13.1.8.2 Empirical problems

It is sometimes claimed that all natural languages are recursive and that sentences of an arbitrary length are possible in all languages (Hornstein, Nunes & Grohmann 2005: 7 for an overview, and see Pullum & Scholz (2010: Section 2) for further references). When one speaks of recursion, what is often meant are structures with self-embedding as we saw in the analysis of (31) (Fitch 2010). However, it is possible that there are languages that do not allow self-embedding. Everett (2005) claims that Pirahã is such a language (however, see Nevins, Pesetsky & Rodrigues (2009) and Everett (2009)). A further example of a language without recursion, which is sometimes cited with reference to Hale (1976), is Warlpiri. Hale's rules for the combination of a sentence with a relative clause are recursive, however (page 85). This recursion is made explicit on page 98.²⁶ Pullum & Scholz (2010: 131) discuss Hixkaryana, an Amazonian language from the Caribbean language family that is not related to Pirahã. This language does have embedding, but the embedded material has a different form to that of the matrix clause. It could be the case that these embeddings cannot be carried out indefinitely. In Hixkaryana, there is also no possibility to coordinate phrases or clauses (Derbyshire (1979: 45) cited by Pullum & Scholz (2010: 131)), which is why this possibility of forming recursive sentence embedding does not exist in this language either. Other languages without self-embedding seem to be Akkadian, Dyirbal and Proto-Uralic.

There is of course a trivial sense in which all languages are recursive: they follow a rule that says that a particular number of symbols can be combined to form another symbol.²⁷

(32) $X \rightarrow X \dots X$

In this sense, all natural languages are recursive and the combination of simple symbols to more complex ones is a basic property of language (Hockett 1960: 6). The fact that the debate about Pirahã is so fierce could go to show that this is not the kind of recursion that is meant. Also, see Fitch (2010).

It is also assumed that the combinatorial rules of Categorical Grammar hold universally. It is possible to use these rules to combine a functor with its arguments ($X/Y * Y = X$). These rules are almost as abstract as the rules in (32). The difference is that one of the elements has to be the functor. There are also corresponding constraints in the Minimalist Program such as selectional features (see Section 4.6.4) and restrictions on the assignment of semantic roles. However, whether or not a Categorical Grammar licenses

²⁶ However, he does note on page 78 that relative clauses are separated from the sentence containing the head noun by a pause. Relative clauses in Warlpiri are always peripheral, that is, they occur to the left or right of a sentence with the noun they refer to. Similar constructions can be found in German:

(i) Es war einmal ein Mann. Der hatte sieben Söhne.
 there was once a man he had seven sons
 'There once was a man. He had seven sons.'

It could be the case that we are dealing with linking of sentences at text level and not recursion at sentence level.

²⁷ Chomsky (2005: 11) assumes that Merge combines n objects. A special instance of this is binary Merge.

recursive structures does not depend on the very general combinatorial schemata, but rather on the lexical entries. Using the lexical entries in (33), it is only possible to analyze two sentences and certainly not to build recursive structures.

- (33) a. the: np/n
 b. woman: n
 c. cat: n
 d. sees: (s\np)/np

If we expand the lexicon to include modifiers of the category n/n or conjunctions of the category (X\X)/X, then we arrive at a recursive grammar.

Fitch, Hauser & Chomsky (2005: 203) note that the existence of languages that do not license recursive structures is not a problem for UG-based theories as not all the possibilities in UG have to be utilized by an individual language. With this view, we have actually the same situation as with parts of speech (see Section 13.1.7) that you can posit any number of properties belonging to UG and then decide on a language by language basis whether they play a role or not. An extreme variant of this approach would be that grammars of all languages become part of UG (perhaps with different symbols such as NP_{Spanish}, NP_{German}). This variant of a UG-based theory of the human capacity for language would be truly unfalsifiable (Evans & Levinson 2009a: 436, 443; Tomasello 2009: 471).

13.1.8.3 Recursion in other areas of cognition

There are also phenomena in domains outside of language that can be described with recursive rules: Hauser, Chomsky & Fitch (2002: 1571) mention navigation, family relations and counting systems.²⁸ One could perhaps argue that the relevant abilities are acquired late and that higher mathematics is a matter of individual accomplishments that do not have anything to do with the cognitive capacities of the majority, but even children at the age of 3 years and 9 months are already able to produce recursive structures: In 2008, there were newspaper reports about an indigenous Brazilian tribe that was photographed from a plane. I showed this picture to my son and told him that Native Americans shot at the plane with a bow and arrow. He then asked me what kind of plane it was. I told him that you cannot see that because the people who took the photograph were sitting in the plane. He then answered that you would then need another plane if you wanted to take a photo that contained both the plane and the Native Americans. He was pleased with his idea and said “And then another one. And then another

²⁸ Pinker & Jackendoff (2005: 230) note, however, that navigation differs from the kind of recursive system described by Chomsky and that recursion is not part of counting systems in all cultures. They assume that those cultures that have developed infinite counting systems could do this because of their linguistic capabilities. This is also assumed by Fitch, Hauser & Chomsky (2005: 203). The latter authors claim that all forms of recursion in other domains depend on language. For more on this point, see Chomsky (2007: 7–8). Luuk & Luuk (2011) note that natural numbers are defined recursively, but the mathematical definition does not necessarily play a role for the kinds of arithmetic operations carried out by humans.

one. One after the other”. He was therefore very much able to imagine the consequence of embeddings.

Culicover & Jackendoff (2005: 113–114) discuss visual perception and music as recursive systems that are independent of language. Jackendoff (2011) extends the discussion of visual perception and music and adds the domains of planning (with the example of making coffee) and wordless comic strips. Chomsky (2007: 7–8) claims that examples from visual perception are irrelevant but then admits that the ability to build up recursive structures could belong to general cognitive abilities (p. 8). He still attributes this ability to UG. He views UG as a subset of the Faculty of Language, that is, as a subset of non domain-specific abilities (Faculty of Language in the Broad Sense = FLB) and the domain-specific abilities (Faculty of Language in the Narrow Sense = FLN) required for language.

13.1.9 Summary

In sum, we can say that there are no linguistic universals for which there is a consensus that one has to assume domain-specific innate knowledge to explain them. At the 2008 meeting of the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Sprachwissenschaft*, Wolfgang Klein promised €100 to anyone who could name a non-trivial property that all languages share (see Klein 2009). This begs the question of what is meant by ‘trivial’. It seems clear that all languages share predicate-argument structures and dependency relations in some sense (Hudson 2010a; Longobardi & Roberts 2010: 2701) and, all languages have complex expressions whose meaning can be determined compositionally (Manfred Krifka was promised 20 € for coming up with compositionality). However, as has been noted at various points, universality by no means implies innateness (Bates 1984: 189; Newmeyer 2005: 205): Newmeyer gives the example that words for sun and moon probably exist in all languages. This has to do with the fact that these celestial bodies play an important role in everyone’s lives and thus one needs words to refer to them. It cannot be concluded from this that the corresponding concepts have to be innate. Similarly, a word that is used to express a relation between two objects (e.g., *catch*) has to be connected to the words describing both of these objects (*I, elephant*) in a transparent way. However, this does not necessarily entail that this property of language is innate.

Even if we can find structural properties shared by all languages, this is still not proof of innate linguistic knowledge, as these similarities could be traced back to other factors. It is argued that all languages must be made in such a way as to be acquirable with the paucity of resource available to small children (Hurford 2002: Section 10.7.2; Behrens 2009: 433). It follows from this that, in the relevant phases of its development, our brain is a constraining factor. Languages have to fit into our brains and since our brains are similar, languages are also similar in certain respects (see Kluender 1992: 251).

13.2 Speed of language acquisition

It is often argued that children learn language extraordinarily quickly and this can only be explained by assuming that they already possess knowledge about language that does not have to be acquired (e.g., Chomsky 1976b: 144; Hornstein 2013: 395). In order for this argument to hold up to closer scrutiny, it must be demonstrated that other areas of knowledge with a comparable degree of complexity require longer to acquire (Sampson 1989: 214–218). This has not yet been shown. Language acquisition spans several years and it is not possible to simply state that language is acquired following *brief exposure*. Chomsky compares languages to physics and points out that it is considerably more difficult for us to acquire knowledge about physics. Sampson (1989: 215) notes, however, that the knowledge about physics one acquires at school or university is not a basis for comparison and one should instead consider the acquisition of everyday knowledge about the physical world around us. For example, the kind of knowledge we need when we want to pour liquids into a container, skip with a skipping rope or the knowledge we have about the ballistic properties of objects. The complexity in comparing these domains of knowledge in order to be able to make claims about language acquisition may turn out to be far from trivial. For an in-depth discussion of this aspect, see Sampson (1989: 214–218). Müller & Riemer (1998: 1) point out that children at the age of six can understand 23,700 words and use over 5000. It follows from this that, in the space of four and a half years, they learn on average 14 new words every day. This is indeed an impressive feat, but cannot be used as an argument for innate linguistic knowledge as all theories of acquisition assume that words have to be learned from data rather than being predetermined by a genetically-determined Universal Grammar. In any case the assumption of genetic encoding would be highly implausible for newly created words such as *fax*, *iPod*, *e-mail*, *Tamagotchi*.

Furthermore, the claim that first language acquisition is effortless and rapid when compared to second language acquisition is a myth as has been shown by estimations by Klein (1986: 9): if we assume that children hear linguistic utterances for five hours a day (as a conservative estimate), then in the first five years of their lives, they have 9100 hours of linguistic training. But at the age of five, they have still not acquired all complex constructions. In comparison, second-language learners, assuming the necessary motivation, can learn the grammar of a language rather well in a six-week crash course with twelve hours a day (500 hours in total).

13.3 Critical period for acquisition

Among ducks, there is a critical phase in which their behavior towards parent figures is influenced significantly. Normally, baby ducks follow their mother. If, however, a human is present rather than the mother during a particular time span, the ducks will follow the human. After the critical period, this influence on their behavior can no longer be identified (Lorenz 1970). This kind of critical period can also be identified in other animals and in other areas of cognition, for example the acquisition of visual abil-

ities among primates. Certain abilities are acquired in a given time frame, whereby the presence of the relevant input is important for determining the start of this time frame.

Lenneberg (1964) claims that language acquisition is only possible up to the age of twelve and concludes from the fact that children can learn language much better than adults that this is also due to a critical period and that language acquisition must have similar properties to the behavior of ducks and hence, the predisposition for language acquisition must be innate (Lenneberg 1967: Chapter 4).

The assumptions about the length of the critical period for language acquisition vary considerably. It is possible to find suggestions for 5, 6, 12 and even 15 years (Hakuta et al. 2003: 31). An alternative assumption to a critical period would be to assume that the ability to acquire languages decreases continuously over time. Johnson & Newport (1989) tried to determine a critical period for second-language acquisition and they claim that a second language is learned significantly worse from the age of 15. Elman, Bates, Johnson, Karmiloff-Smith, Parisi & Plunkett (1996) have, however, pointed out that there is a different curve for Johnson and Newport's data that fits the individual data better. The alternative curve shows no abrupt change but rather a steady decrease in the ability to learn language and therefore offers no proof of an effect created by a critical period.

Hakuta, Bialystok & Wiley (2003) evaluate data from a questionnaire of 2,016,317 Spanish speakers and 324,444 speakers of Mandarin Chinese that immigrated to the United States. They investigated which correlations there were between age, the point at immigration, the general level of education of the speakers and the level of English they acquired. They could not identify a critical point in time after which language acquisition was severely restricted. Instead, there is a steady decline in the ability to learn as age increases. This can also be observed in other domains: for example, learning to drive at an older age is much harder.

Summing up, it seems to be relatively clear that a critical period cannot be proven to exist for second-language acquisition. Sometimes, it is assumed anyway that second-language acquisition is not driven by an innate UG, but is in fact a learning process that accesses knowledge already acquired during the critical period (Lenneberg 1967: 176). One would therefore have to show that there is a critical period for first-language acquisition. This is, however, not straightforward as, for ethical reasons, one cannot experimentally manipulate the point at which the input is available. We cannot, say, take 20 children and let them grow up without linguistic input to the age of 3, 4, 5, 6, ... or 15 and then compare the results. This kind of research is dependent on thankfully very rare cases of neglect. For example, Curtiss (1977) studied a girl called Genie. At the time, Genie was 13 years old and had grown up in isolation. She is a so-called feral child. As Curtiss showed, she was no longer able to learn certain linguistic rules. For an objective comparison, one would need other test subjects that had not grown up in complete isolation and in inhumane conditions. The only possibility of gaining relevant experimental data is to study deaf subjects that did not receive any input from a sign language up to a certain age. Johnson & Newport (1989: 63) carried out relevant experiments with learners of American Sign Language. It was also shown here that there is a linear decline in the ability to learn, however nothing like a sudden drop after a certain age or even a

complete loss of the ability to acquire language.

13.4 Lack of acquisition among non-human primates

The fact that non-human primates cannot learn natural language is viewed as evidence for the genetic determination of our linguistic ability. All scientists agree on the fact that there are genetically-determined differences between humans and primates and that these are relevant for linguistic ability. Friederici (2009) offers an overview of the literature that claims that in chimpanzees and macaques (and small children), the connections between parts of the brain are not as developed as in adult humans. The connected regions of the brain are together responsible for the processing of lexical-semantic knowledge and could constitute an important prerequisite for the development of language (p. 179).

The question is, however, whether we differ from other primates in having special cognitive capabilities that are specific to language or whether our capability to acquire languages is due to domain-general differences in cognition. Fanselow (1992b: Section 2) speaks of a human-specific formal competence that does not necessarily have to be specific to language, however. Similarly, Chomsky (2007: 7–8) has considered whether Merge (the only structure-building operation, in his opinion), does not belong to language-specific innate abilities, but rather to general human-specific competence (see, however, Section 13.1.8, in particular footnote 28).

One can ascertain that non-human primates do not understand particular pointing gestures. Humans like to imitate things. Other primates also imitate, however, not for social reasons (Tomasello 2006b: 9–10). According to Tomasello et al. (2005: 676), only humans have the ability and motivation to carry out coordinated activities with common goals and socially-coordinated action plans. Primates do understand intentional actions, however, only humans act with a common goal in mind (*shared intentionality*). Only humans use and understand hand gestures (Tomasello et al. 2005: 685, 724, 726). Language is collaborative to a high degree: symbols are used to refer to objects and sometimes also to the speaker or hearer. In order to be able to use this kind of communication system, one has to be able to put oneself in the shoes of the interlocutor and develop common expectations and goals (Tomasello et al. 2005: 683). Non-human primates could thus lack the social and cognitive prerequisites for language, that is, the difference between humans and other primates does not have to be explained by innate linguistic knowledge (Tomasello 2003: Section 8.1.2; Tomasello et al. 2005).

13.5 Creole and sign languages

When speakers that do not share a common language wish to communicate with each other, they develop so-called pidgin languages. These are languages that use parts of the vocabularies of the languages involved but have a very rudimentary grammar. It has been noted that children of pidgin speakers regularize these languages. The next

generation of speakers creates a new language with an independent grammar. These languages are referred to as *creole languages*. One hypothesis is that the form of languages that develop from creolization is restricted by an innate UG (Bickerton 1984b). It is assumed that the parameter setting of creole languages corresponds to the default values of parameters (Bickerton 1984a: 217; 1984b: 178), that is, parameters already have values at birth and these correspond to the values that creole languages have. These default values would have to be modified when learning other languages.²⁹ Bickerton claims that creole languages contain elements that language learners could not have acquired from the input, that is from the pidgin languages. His argumentation is a variant of the classic Poverty of the Stimulus Argument that will be discussed in more detail in Section 13.8.

Bickerton's claims have been criticized as it cannot be verified whether children had input in the individual languages of the adults (Samarin 1984: 207; Seuren 1984: 209). All that can be said considering this lack of evidence is that there are a number of demographic facts that suggest that this was the case for at least some creole languages (Arends 2008). This means that children did not only have the strings from the pidgin languages as an input but also sentences from the individual languages spoken by parents and others around them. Many creolists assume that adults contribute specific grammatical forms to the emerging language. For example, in the case of Hawaiian Creole English one can observe that there are influences from the mother tongues of the speakers involved: Japanese speakers use SOV order as well as SVO and Philipinos use VOS order as well as SVO order. In total, there is quite a lot of variation in the language that can be traced back to the various native languages of the individual speakers.

It is also possible to explain the effects observed for creolization without the assumption of innate language-specific knowledge: the fact that children regularize language can be attributed to a phenomenon independent of language. In experiments, participants were shown two light bulbs and the test subjects had to predict which of the light bulbs would be turned on next. If one of the bulbs was switched on 70% of the time, the participants also picked this one 70% of the time (although they would have actually had a higher success rate if they had always chosen the bulb turned on with 70% probability). This behavior is known as *Probability Matching*. If we add another light bulb to this scenario and then turn this lamp on in 70% of cases and the other two each 15% of the time, then participants choose the more frequently lit one 80–90% of the time, that is, they regularize in the direction of the most frequent occurrence (Gardner 1957; Weir 1964).

Children regularize more than adults (Hudson & Newport 1999; Hudson Kam & Newport 2005), a fact that can be traced back to their limited brain capacity ("less is more"-hypothesis, Newport 1990; Elman 1993).

Like creolization, a similar situation can be found in certain social contexts with the acquisition of sign language: Singleton & Newport (2004) have shown that a child (Simon) that learned American Sign Language (ASL) makes considerably less mistakes than his parents. The parents first learned ASL at the age of 15 or 16 and performed

²⁹ For problems that can arise from the assumption of defaults values, see Meisel (1995: 17). Bickerton (1997: 56, fn. 13) distances himself from the claim that creole languages have the default values of parameters.

particular obligatory movements only 70% of the time. Simon made these movements 90% of the time. He regularized the input from his parents, whereby the consistent use of form-meaning pairs plays an important role, that is, he does not simply use Probability Matching, but learns selectively. Singleton & Newport (2004: 401) suspect that these kinds of regularizations also play a role for the emergence of creole and sign languages. However, the relevant statistical data that one would need to confirm this hypothesis are not available.

13.6 Localization in special parts of the brain

By measuring brain activity during speech production/processing and also by investigating patients with brain damage, one can identify special parts of the brain (Broca's area and Wernicke's area) that play an important role for language production and processing (see Friederici (2009) for a current overview). Chomsky talks about there being a center of language and even calls this (metaphorically) an *organ* (Chomsky 1977: 164; Chomsky 2005: 1; Chomsky 2008: 133). This localization was seen as evidence for the innate basis for our linguistic knowledge (see also Pinker 1994: 297–314).

However, it is the case that if these parts are damaged, other areas of the brain can take over the relevant functions. If the damage occurs in early childhood, language can also be learned without these special areas of the brain (for sources, see Dąbrowska 2004: Section 4.1).

Apart from that, it can also be observed that a particular area of the brain is activated when reading. If the conclusion about the localization of processing in a particular part of the brain leading to the innateness of linguistic knowledge were valid, then the activation of certain areas of the brain during reading should also lead us to conclude that the ability to read is innate (Elman et al. 1996; Bishop 2002: 57). This is, however, not assumed (see also Fitch, Hauser & Chomsky 2005: 196).

It should also be noted that language processing affects several areas of the brain and not just Broca's and Wernicke's areas (Fisher & Marcus 2005: 11; Friederici 2009). On the other hand, Broca's and Wernicke's areas are also active during non-linguistic tasks such as imitation, motoric coordination and processing of music (Maess et al. 2001). For an overview and further sources, see Fisher & Marcus (2005).

Musso et al. (2003) investigated brain activity during second-language acquisition. They gave German native speakers data from Italian and Japanese and noticed that there was activation in Broca's area. They then compared this to artificial languages that used Italian and Japanese words but did not correspond to the principles of Universal Grammar as assumed by the authors. An example of the processes assumed in their artificial language is the formation of questions by reversing of word order as shown in (34).

- (34) a. This is a statement.
b. Statement a is this?

The authors then observed that different areas of the brain were activated when learning this artificial language. This is an interesting result, but does not show that we have

innate linguistic knowledge. It only shows that the areas that are active when processing our native languages are also active when we learn other languages and that playing around with words such as reversing the order of words in a sentence affects other areas of the brain.

A detailed discussion of localization of languages in particular parts of the brain can be found in Dąbrowska (2004: Chapter 4).

13.7 Differences between language and general cognition

Researchers who believe that there is no such thing as innate linguistic knowledge assume that language can be acquired with general cognitive means. If it can be shown that humans with severely impaired cognition can still acquire normal linguistic abilities or that there are people of normal intelligence whose linguistic ability is restricted, then one can show that language and general cognition are independent.

13.7.1 Williams Syndrome

There are people with a relatively low IQ, who can nevertheless produce grammatical utterances. Among these are people with Williams Syndrome (see Bellugi, Lichtenberger, Jones, Lai & George (2000) for a discussion of the abilities of people with Williams Syndrome). Yamada (1981) takes the existence of such cases as evidence for a separate module of grammar, independent of the remaining intelligence.

IQ is determined by dividing a score in an intelligence test (the mental age) by chronological age. The teenagers that were studied all had a mental age corresponding to that of a four to six year-old child. Yet children at this age already boast impressive linguistic ability that comes close to that of adults in many respects. Gosch, Ståding & Pankau (1994: 295) have shown that children with Williams Syndrome do show a linguistic deficit and that their language ability corresponds to what would be expected from their mental age. For problems of sufferers of Williams Syndrome in the area of morphosyntax, see Karmiloff-Smith et al. (1997). The discussion about Williams Syndrome is summarized nicely in Karmiloff-Smith (1998).

13.7.2 KE family with FoxP2 mutation

There is a British family – the so-called KE family – that has problems with language. The members of this family who suffer from these linguistic problems have a genetic defect. Fisher et al. (1998) and Lai et al. (2001) discovered that this is due to a mutation of the FoxP2 gene (FoxP2 stands for *Forkhead-Box P2*). Gopnik & Cargo (1991) conclude from the fact that deficits in the realm of morphology are inherited with genetic defects that there must be a gene that is responsible for a particular module of grammar (morphology). Vargha-Khadem et al. (1995: 930) have demonstrated, however, that the KE family did not just have problems with morphosyntax: the affected family members have intellectual and linguistic problems together with motoric problems with facial muscles. Due to the considerably restricted motion in their facial muscles, it would make sense to assume that their linguistic difficulties also stem from motory problems

(Tomasello 2003: 285). The linguistic problems in the KE family are not just limited to production problems, however, but also comprehension problems (Bishop 2002: 58). Nevertheless, one cannot associate linguistic deficiencies directly with FoxP2 as there are a number of other abilities that are affected by the FoxP2 mutation: as well as hindering pronunciation, morphology and syntax, it also has an effect on non-verbal IQ and motory problems with the facial muscles, dealing with non-linguistic tasks, too (Vargha-Khadem et al. 1995).

Furthermore, FoxP2 also occurs in other body tissues: it is also responsible for the development of the lungs, the heart, the intestine and various regions of the brain (Marcus & Fisher 2003). Marcus & Fisher (2003: 260–261) point out that FoxP2 is probably not directly responsible for the development of organs or areas of organs but rather regulates a cascade of different genes. FoxP2 can therefore not be referred to as the language gene, it is just a gene that interacts with other genes in complex ways. It is, among other things, important for our language ability, however, in the same way that it does not make sense to call FoxP2 a language gene, nobody would connect a hereditary muscle disorder with a ‘walking gene’ just because this myopathy prevents upright walking (Bishop 2002: 58). A similar argument can be found in Karmiloff-Smith (1998: 392): there is a genetic defect that leads some people to begin to lose their hearing from the age of ten and become completely deaf by age thirty. This genetic defect causes changes in the hairs inside the ear that one requires for hearing. In this case, one would also not want to talk about a ‘hearing gene’.

Fitch, Hauser & Chomsky (2005: 190) are also of the opinion that FoxP2 cannot be responsible for linguistic knowledge. For an overview of this topic, see Bishop (2002) and Dąbrowska (2004: Section 6.4.2.2) and for genetic questions in general, see Fisher & Marcus (2005).

13.8 Poverty of the Stimulus

An important argument for the innateness of the linguistic knowledge is the so-called Poverty of the Stimulus Argument (PSA) (Chomsky 1980: 34). Different versions of it can be found in the literature and have been carefully discussed by Pullum & Scholz (2002). After discussing these variants, they summarize the logical structure of the argument as follows (p. 18):

- (35) a. Human children learn their first language either by data-driven learning or by learning supported by innate knowledge (a disjunctive premise by assumption)
- b. If children learn their first language by data-driven learning, then they could not acquire anything for which they did not have the necessary evidence (the definition of data-driven learning)
- c. However, children do in fact learn things that they do not seem to have decisive evidence for (empirical prerequisite)
- d. Therefore, children do not learn their first language by data-driven learning. (*modus tollens* of b and c)

- e. Conclusion: children learn language through a learning process supported by innate knowledge. (disjunctive syllogism of a and d)

Pullum and Scholz then discuss four phenomena that have been claimed to constitute evidence for there being innate linguistic knowledge. These are plurals as initial parts of compounds in English (Gordon 1986), sequences of auxiliaries in English (Kimball 1973), anaphoric *one* in English (Baker 1978) and the position of auxiliaries in English (Chomsky 1971: 29–33). Before I turn to these cases in Section 13.8.2, I will discuss a variant of the PSA that refers to the formal properties of phrase structure grammars.

13.8.1 Gold's Theorem

In theories of formal languages, a language is viewed as a set containing all the expressions belonging to a particular language. This kind of set can be captured using various complex rewrite grammars. A kind of rewrite grammar – so-called context-free grammars – was presented in Chapter 2. In context-free grammars, there is always exactly one symbol on the left-hand side of the rule (a so-called non-terminal symbol) and there can be more of these on the right-hand side of the rule. On the right side there can be symbols (so-called non-terminal symbols) or words/morphemes of the language in question (so-called terminal symbols). The words in a grammar are also referred to as vocabulary (*V*). Part of a formal grammar is a start symbol, which is usually *S*. In the literature, this has been criticized since not all expressions are sentences (see Deppermann 2006: 44). It is, however, not necessary to assume this. It is possible to use Utterance as the start symbol and define rules that derive *S*, *NP*, *VP* or whatever else one wishes to class as an utterance from Utterance.³⁰

Beginning with the start symbol, one can keep applying phrase structure rules in a grammar until one arrives at sequences that only contain words (terminal symbols). The set of all sequences that one can generate are the expressions that belong to the language that is licensed by the grammar. This set is a subset of all sequences of words or morphemes that can be created by arbitrary combination. The set that contains all possible sequences is referred to as V^* .

Gold (1967) has shown that in an environment *E*, it is not possible to solve the identification problem for any language from particular languages classes, given a finite amount of linguistic input, without additional knowledge. Gold is concerned with the identification of a language from a given class of languages. A language *L* counts as identified if at a given point in time t_n , a learner can determine that *L* is the language in question and does not change this hypothesis. This point in time is not determined in advance, however, identification has to take place at some point. Gold calls this *identification in the limit*. The environments are arbitrary infinite sequences of sentences $\langle a_1, a_2, a_3, \dots \rangle$, whereby each sentence in the language must occur at least once in this sequence. In order to show that the identification problem cannot be solved for even

³⁰ On page 264, I discussed a description that corresponds to the *S* symbol in phrase structure grammars. If one omits the specification of head features in this description, then one gets a description of all complete phrases, that is, also *the man* or *now*.

very simple language classes, Gold considers the class of languages that contain all possible sequences of words from the vocabulary V except for one sequence: let V be the vocabulary and x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots the sequences of words from this vocabulary. The set of all strings from this vocabulary is V^* . For the class of languages in (36), which consist of all possible sequences of elements in V with the exception of one sequence, it is possible to state a process of how one could learn these languages from a text.

$$(36) \quad L_1 = V^* - x_1, L_2 = V^* - x_2, L_3 = V^* - x_3, \dots$$

After every input, one can guess that the language is $V^* - \sigma$, where σ stands for the alphabetically first sequence with the shortest length that has not yet been seen. If the sequence in question occurs later, then this hypothesis is revised accordingly. In this way, one will eventually arrive at the correct language.

If we expand the set of languages from which we have to choose by V^* , then our learning process will no longer work since, if V^* is the target language, then the guessing will perpetually yield incorrect results. If there were a procedure capable of learning this language class, then it would have to correctly identify V^* after a certain number of inputs. Let us assume that this input is x_k . How can the learning procedure tell us at this point that the language we are looking for is not $V^* - x_j$ for $j \neq k$? If x_k causes one to guess the wrong grammar V^* , then every input that comes after that will be compatible with both the correct ($V^* - x_j$) and incorrect (V^*) result. Since we only have positive data, no input allows us to distinguish between either of the hypotheses and provide the information that we have found a superset of the language we are looking for. Gold has shown that none of the classes of grammars assumed in the theory of formal languages (for example, regular, context-free and context-sensitive languages) can be identified after a finite amount of steps given the input of a text with example utterances. This is true for all classes of languages that contain all finite languages and at least one infinite language. The situation is different if positive and negative data are used for learning instead of text.

The conclusion that has been drawn from Gold's results is that, for language acquisition, one requires knowledge that helps to avoid particular hypotheses from the start. Pullum (2003) criticizes the use of Gold's findings as evidence for the fact that linguistic knowledge must be innate. He lists a number of assumptions that have to be made in order for Gold's results to be relevant for the acquisition of natural languages. He then shows that each of these is not uncontroversial.

1. Natural languages could belong to the class of text-learnable languages as opposed to the class of context-free grammars mentioned above.
2. Learners could have information about which sequences of words are not grammatical (see p. 453–454 of Gold's essay for a similar conjecture). As has been shown since then, children do have direct negative evidence and there is also indirect negative evidence (see Section 13.8.4).
3. It is not clear whether learners really restrict themselves to exactly one grammar. Feldman (1972) has developed a learning procedure that eliminates all incorrect

grammars at some point and is infinitely many times correct but it does not have to always choose one correct grammar and stick to the corresponding hypothesis. Using this procedure, it is possible to learn all recursively enumerable languages, that is, all languages for which there is a generative grammar. Pullum notes that even Feldman's learning procedure could prove to be too restrictive. It could take an entire lifetime for a learner to reach the correct grammar and they could have incorrect yet increasingly better hypotheses along the way.

4. Learners could work in terms of improvements. If one allows for a certain degree of tolerance, then acquisition is easier and it even becomes possible to learn the class of recursively enumerable languages (Wharton 1974).
5. Language acquisition does not necessarily constitute the acquisition of knowledge about a particular set of sequences, that is, the acquisition of a generative grammar capable of creating this set. The situation is completely different if grammars are viewed as a set of constraints that partially describe linguistic structures, but not necessarily a unique set of linguistic structures (for more on this point, see Section 6.7 and Chapter 14).

Furthermore, Pullum notes that it is also possible to learn the class of context-sensitive grammars with Gold's procedure with positive input only in a finite number of steps if there is an upper bound k for the number of rules, where k is an arbitrary number. It is possible to make k so big that the cognitive abilities of the human brain would not be able to use a grammar with more rules than this. Since it is normally assumed that natural languages can be described by context-sensitive grammars, it can therefore be shown that the syntax of natural languages in Gold's sense can be learned from texts (see also Scholz & Pullum 2002: 195–196).

Johnson (2004) adds that there is another important point that has been overlooked in the discussion about language acquisition. Gold's problem of identifiability is different from the problem of language acquisition that has played an important role in the nativism debate. In order to make the difference clear, Johnson differentiates between identifiability (in the Goldian sense) and learnability in the sense of language acquisition. Identifiability for a language class C means that there must be a function f that for each environment E for each language L in C permanently converges on hypothesis L as the target language in a finite amount of time.

Johnson proposes the following as the definition of *learnability* (p. 585): *A class C of natural languages is learnable iff, given almost any normal human child and almost any normal linguistic environment for any language L in C , the child will acquire L (or something sufficiently similar to L) as a native language between the ages of one and five.* Johnson adds the caveat that this definition does not correspond to any theory of learnability in psycholinguistics, but rather it is a hint in the direction of a realistic conception of acquisition.

Johnson notes that in most interpretations of Gold's theorem, identifiability and learnability are viewed as one and the same and shows that this is not logically correct:

the main difference between the two depends on the use of two quantifiers. Identifiability of *one* language L from a class C requires that the learner converges on L in *every* environment after a finite amount of time. This time can differ greatly from environment to environment. There is not even an upper bound for the time in question. It is straightforward to construct a sequence of environments E_1, E_2, \dots for L , so that a learner in the environment E_i will not guess L earlier than the time t_i . Unlike identifiability, learnability means that there is a point in time after which in every normal environment, *every* normal child has converged on the correct language. This means that children acquire their language after a particular time span. Johnson quotes Morgan (1989: 352) claiming that children learn their native language after they have heard approximately 4,280,000 sentences. If we assume that the concept of learnability has a finite upper-bound for available time, then very few language classes can be identified in the limit. Johnson has shown this as follows: let C be a class of languages containing L and L' , where L and L' have some elements in common. It is possible to construct a text such that the first n sentences are contained both in L and in L' . If the learner has L as its working hypothesis then continue the text with sentences from L' , if he has L' as his hypothesis, then continue with sentences from L . In each case, the learner has entertained a false hypothesis after n steps. This means that identifiability is not a plausible model for language acquisition.

Aside from the fact that identifiability is psychologically unrealistic, it is not compatible with learnability (Johnson 2004: 586). For identifiability, only one learner has to be found (the function f mentioned above), learnability, however, quantifies over (almost) all normal children. If one keeps all factors constant, then it is easier to show the identifiability of a language class rather than its learnability. On the one hand, identifiability quantifies universally over all environments, regardless of whether these may seem odd or of how many repetitions these may contain. Learnability, on the other hand, has (almost) universal quantification exclusively over normal environments. Therefore, learnability refers to fewer environments than identifiability, such that there are less possibilities for problematic texts that could occur as an input and render a language unlearnable. Furthermore, learnability is defined in such a way that the learner does not have to learn L exactly, but rather learn something sufficiently similar to L . With respect to this aspect, learnability is a weaker property of a language class than identifiability. Therefore, learnability does not follow from identifiability nor the reverse.

Finally, Gold is dealing with the acquisition of syntactic knowledge without taking semantic knowledge into consideration. However, children possess a vast amount of information from the context that they employ when acquiring a language (Tomasello et al. 2005). As pointed out by Klein (1986: 44), humans do not learn anything if they are placed in a room and sentences in Mandarin Chinese are played to them. Language is acquired in a social and cultural context.

In sum, one should note that the existence of innate linguistic knowledge cannot be derived from mathematical findings about the learnability of languages.

13.8.2 Four case studies

Pullum & Scholz (2002) have investigated four prominent instances of the Poverty of the Stimulus Argument in more detail. These will be discussed in what follows. Pullum and Scholz's article appeared in a discussion volume. Arguments against their article are addressed by Scholz & Pullum (2002) in the same volume. Further PoS arguments from Chomsky (1986b) and from literature in German have been disproved by Eisenberg (1992).

13.8.2.1 Plurals in noun-noun compounding

Gordon (1986) claims that compounds in English only allow irregular plurals in compounds, that is, *mice-eater* but ostensibly not **rats-eater*. Gordon claims that compounds with irregular plurals as first element are so rare that children could not have learned the fact that such compounds are possible purely from data.

On pages 25–26, Pullum and Scholz discuss data from English that show that regular plurals can indeed occur as the first element of a compound (*chemicals-maker*, *forms-reader*, *generics-maker*, *securities-dealer*, *drinks trolley*, *rules committee*, *publications catalogue*).³¹ This shows that what could have allegedly not been learned from data is in fact not linguistically adequate and one therefore does not have to explain its acquisition.

13.8.2.2 Position of auxiliaries

The second study deals with the position of modal and auxiliary verbs. Kimball (1973: 73–75) discusses the data in (37) and the rule in (38) that is similar to one of the rules suggested by Chomsky (1957: 39) and is designed to capture the following data:

- (37) a. It rains.
 b. It may rain.
 c. It may have rained.
 d. It may be raining.
 e. It has rained.
 f. It has been raining.
 g. It is raining.
 h. It may have been raining.
- (38) $\text{Aux} \rightarrow \text{T}(\text{M})(\text{have}+\text{en})(\text{be}+\text{ing})$

T stands for tense, M for a modal verb and *en* stands for the participle morpheme (*-en* in *been/seen/...* and *-ed* in *rained*). The brackets here indicate the optionality of the expressions. Kimball notes that it is only possible to formulate this rule if (37h) is well-formed. If this were not the case, then one would have to reorganize the material in rules such that the three cases (M)(have+en), (M)(be+ing) and (have+en)(be+ing) would be covered.

³¹ Also, see Abney (1996: 7) for examples from the Wall Street Journal.

Kimball assumes that children master the complex rule since they know that sentences such as (37h) are well-formed and since they know the order in which modal and auxiliary verbs must occur. Kimball assumes that children do not have positive evidence for the order in (37h) and concludes from this that the knowledge about the rule in (38) must be innate.

Pullum and Scholz note two problems with this Poverty of the Stimulus Argument: first, they have found hundreds of examples, among them some from children's stories, so that the Kimball's claim that sentences such as (37h) are "vanishingly rare" should be called into question. For PSA arguments, one should at least specify how many occurrences there are allowed to be if one still wants to claim that nothing can be learned from them (Pullum & Scholz 2002: 29).

The second problem is that it does not make sense to assume that the rule in (37h) plays a role in our linguistic knowledge. Empirical findings have shown that this rule is not descriptively adequate. If the rule in (38) is not descriptively adequate, then it cannot achieve explanatory adequacy and therefore, one no longer has to explain how it can be acquired.

Instead of a rule such as (38), all theories discussed here currently assume that auxiliary or modal verbs embed a phrase, that is, one does not have an Aux node containing all auxiliary and modal verbs, but rather a structure for (37h) that looks as follows:

(39) It [may [have [been raining]]].

Here, the auxiliary or modal verb always selects the embedded phrase. The acquisition problem now looks completely different: a speaker has to learn the form of the head verb in the verbal projection selected by the auxiliary or modal verb. If this information has been learned, then it is irrelevant how complex the embedded verbal projections are: *may* can be combined with a non-finite lexical verb (37b) or a non-finite auxiliary (37c,d).

13.8.2.3 Reference of *one*

The third case study investigated by Pullum and Scholz deals with the pronoun *one* in English. Baker (1978: 413–425, 327–340) claims that children cannot learn that *one* can refer to constituents larger than a single word as in (40).

- (40) a. I would like to tell you another funny story, but I've already told you the only *one* I know.
b. The old man from France was more erudite than the young *one*.

Baker (416–417) claims that *one* can never refer to single nouns inside of NPs and supports this with examples such as (41):

- (41) * The student of chemistry was more thoroughly prepared than the one of physics.

According to Baker, learners would require negative data in order to acquire this knowledge about ungrammaticality. Since learners – following his argumentation – never have access to negative evidence, they cannot possibly have learned the relevant knowledge and must therefore already possess it.

Pullum & Scholz (2002: 33) point out that there are acceptable examples with the same structure as the examples in (41):

- (42) a. I'd rather teach linguistics to a student of mathematics than to one of any discipline in the humanities.
 b. An advocate of Linux got into a heated discussion with one of Windows NT and the rest of the evening was nerd talk.

This means that there is nothing to learn with regard to the well-formedness of the structure in (41). Furthermore, the available data for acquiring the fact that *one* can refer to larger constituents is not as hopeless as Baker (p. 416) claims: there are examples that only allow an interpretation where *one* refers to a larger string of words. Pullum and Scholz offer examples from various corpora. They also provide examples from the CHILDES corpus, a corpus that contains communication with children (MacWhinney 1995). The following example is from a daytime TV show:

- (43) A: "Do you think you will ever remarry again? I don't."
 B: "Maybe I will, someday. But he'd have to be somebody very special. Sensitive and supportive, giving. Hey, wait a minute, where do they make guys like this?"
 A: "I don't know. I've never seen one up close."

Here, it is clear that *one* cannot refer to *guys* since A has certainly already seen *guys*. Instead, it refers to *guys like this*, that is, men who are sensitive and supportive.

Once again, the question arises here as to how many instances a learner has to hear for it to count as evidence in the eyes of proponents of the PSA.

13.8.2.4 Position of auxiliaries in polar questions

The fourth PoS argument discussed by Pullum and Scholz comes from Chomsky and pertains to the position of the auxiliary in polar interrogatives in English. As shown on page 90, it was assumed in GB theory that a polar question is derived by movement of the auxiliary from the I position to the initial position C of the sentence. In early versions of Transformational Grammar, the exact analyses were different, but the main point was that the highest auxiliary is moved to the beginning of the clause. Chomsky (1971: 29–33) discusses the sentences in (44) and claims that children know that they have to move the highest auxiliary verb even without having positive evidence for this.³² If, for example, they entertained the hypothesis that one simply places the first auxiliary at the beginning of the sentence, then this hypothesis would deliver the correct result (44b) for (44a), but not for (44c) since the polar question should be (44d) and not (44e).

- (44) a. The dog in the corner is hungry.
 b. Is the dog in the corner hungry?

³² Examples with auxiliary inversion are used in more recent PoS arguments too, for example in Berwick, Pietroski, Yankama & Chomsky (2011) and Chomsky (2013: 39). Work by Bod (2009b) is not discussed by the authors. For more on Bod's approach, see Section 13.8.3.

- c. The dog that is in the corner is hungry.
- d. Is the dog that is in the corner hungry?
- e. * Is the dog that in the corner is hungry?

Chomsky claims that children do not have any evidence for the fact that the hypothesis that one simply fronts the linearly first auxiliary is wrong, which is why they could pursue this hypothesis in a data-driven learning process. He even goes so far as to claim that speakers of English only rarely or even never produce examples such as (44d) (Chomsky in Piattelli-Palmarini (1980: 114–115)). With the help of corpus data and plausibly constructed examples, Pullum (1996) has shown that this claim is clearly wrong. Pullum (1996) provides examples from the Wall Street Journal and Pullum & Scholz (2002) discuss the relevant examples in more detail and add to them with examples from the CHILDES corpus showing that adult speakers cannot only produce the relevant kinds of sentences, but also that these occur in the child's input.³³ Examples from CHILDES that disprove the hypothesis that the first auxiliary has to be fronted are given in (45):³⁴

- (45) a. Is the ball you were speaking of in the box with the bowling pin?
- b. Where's this little boy who's full of smiles?
- c. While you're sleeping, shall I make the breakfast?

Pullum and Scholz point out that *wh*-questions such as (45b) are also relevant if one assumes that these are derived from polar questions (see page 90 in this book) and if one wishes to show how the child can learn the structure-dependent hypothesis. This can be explained with the examples in (46): the base form from which (46a) is derived is (46b). If we were to front the first auxiliary in (46b), we would produce (46c).

- (46) a. Where's the application Mark promised to fill out?³⁵
- b. the application Mark [_{AUX} PAST] promised to fill out [_{AUX} is] there
- c. * Where did the application Mark promised to fill out is?

Evidence for the fact that (46c) is not correct can, however, also be found in language addressed to children. Pullum and Scholz provide the examples in (47):³⁶

- (47) a. Where's the little blue crib that was in the house before?
- b. Where's the other dolly that was in here?
- c. Where's the other doll that goes in there?

³³ For more on this point, see Sampson (1989: 223). Sampson cites part of a poem by William Blake, that is studied in English schools, as well as a children's encyclopedia. These examples surely do not play a role in acquisition of auxiliary position since this order is learned at the age of 3;2, that is, it has already been learned by the time children reach school age.

³⁴ See Lewis & Elman (2001). Researchers on language acquisition agree that the frequency of this kind of examples in communication with children is in fact very low. See Ambridge et al. (2008: 223).

³⁵ From the transcription of a TV program in the CHILDES corpus.

³⁶ These sentences are taken from NINA05.CHA in DATABASE/ENG/SUPPES/.

These questions have the form *Where's NP?*, where NP contains a relative clause.

In (45c), there is another clause preceding the actual interrogative, an adjunct clause containing an auxiliary as well. This sentence therefore provides evidence for falsehood of the hypothesis that the linearly first auxiliary must be fronted (Sampson 1989: 223).

In total, there are a number of attested sentence types in the input of children that would allow them to choose between the two hypotheses. Once again, the question arises as to how much evidence should be viewed as sufficient.

Pullum und Scholz's article has been criticized by Lasnik & Uriagereka (2002) and Legate & Yang (2002). Lasnik and Uriagereka argue that the acquisition problem is much bigger than presented by Pullum and Scholz since a learner without any knowledge about the language he was going to acquire could not just have the hypothesis in (48) that were discussed already but also the additional hypotheses in (49):

- (48) a. Place the first auxiliary at the front of the clause.
b. Place the first auxiliary in matrix-Infl at the front of the clause.
- (49) a. Place any auxiliary at the front of the clause.
b. Place any finite auxiliary at the front of the clause.

Both hypotheses in (49) would be permitted by the sentences in (50):

- (50) a. Is the dog in the corner hungry?
b. Is the dog that is in the corner hungry?

They would, however, also allow sentences such as (51):

- (51) * Is the dog that in the corner is hungry?

The question that must now be addressed is why all hypotheses that allow (51) should be discarded since the learners do not have any information in their natural-linguistic input about the fact that (51) is not possible. They are lacking negative evidence. If (50b) is present as positive evidence, then this by no means implies that the hypothesis in (48b) has to be the correct one. Lasnik and Uriagereka present the following hypotheses that would also be compatible with (50b):

- (52) a. Place the first auxiliary in initial position (that follows a change in intonation).
b. Place the first auxiliary in initial position (that follows the first complete constituent).
c. Place the first auxiliary in initial position (that follows the first parsed semantic unit).

These hypotheses do not hold for sentences such as (53) that contain a conjunction:

- (53) Will those who are coming and those who are not coming raise their hands?

The hypotheses in (52) would also allow for sentences such as (54):

- (54) * Are those who are coming and those who not coming will raise their hands?

Speakers hearing sentences such as (53) can reject the hypotheses (52) and thereby rule out (54), however, it is still possible to think of analogous implausible hypotheses that are compatible with all data previously discussed.

Legate & Yang (2002) take up the challenge of Pullum and Scholz and explicitly state how many occurrences one needs to acquire a particular phenomenon. They write the following:

Suppose we have two independent problems of acquisition, P_1 and P_2 , each of which involves a binary decision. For P_1 , let F_1 be the frequency of the data that can settle P_1 one way or another, and for P_2 , F_2 . Suppose further that children successfully acquire P_1 and P_2 at roughly the same developmental stage. Then, under any theory that makes quantitative predictions of language development, we expect F_1 and F_2 to be roughly the same. Conversely, if F_1 and F_2 turn out significantly different, then P_1 and P_2 must represent qualitatively different learning problems.

Now let P_1 be the auxiliary inversion problem. The two choices are the structure-dependent hypothesis (3b-i) and the first auxiliary hypothesis (3a-i). (Legate & Yang 2002: 155)

The position of auxiliaries in English is learned by children at the age of 3;2. According to Legate and Yang, another acquisition phenomenon that is learned at the age of 3;2 is needed for comparison. The authors focus on subject drop³⁷, that is learned at 36 months (two months earlier than auxiliary inversion). According to the authors, acquisition problems involve a binary decision: in the first case, one has to choose between the two hypotheses in (48). In the second case, the learner has to determine whether a language uses overt subjects. The authors assume that the use of expletives such as *there* serves as evidence for learners that the language they are learning is not one with optional subjects. They then count the sentences in the CHILDES corpus that contain *there*-subjects and estimate F_2 at 1.2 % of the sentences heard by the learner. Since, in their opinion, we are dealing with equally difficult phenomena here, sentences such as (44d) and (47) should constitute 1.2 % of the input in order for auxiliary inversion to be learnable.

The authors then searched in the Nina and Adam corpora (both part of CHILDES) and note that 0.068 to 0.045 % of utterances have the form of (47) and none have the form of (44d). They conclude that this number is not sufficient as positive evidence.

Legate and Yang are right in pointing out that Pullum and Scholz's data from the Wall Street Journal are not necessarily relevant for language acquisition and also in pointing out that examples with complex subject noun phrases do not occur in the data or at least to a negligible degree. There are, however, three serious problems with their argumentation: first, there is no correlation between the occurrence of expletive subjects and the property of being a pro-drop language: Galician (Raposo & Uriagereka 1990: Section 2.5) is a pro-drop language with subject expletive pronouns, in Italian there is

³⁷ This phenomenon is also called *pro-drop*. For a detailed discussion of the pro-drop parameter see Section 16.1.

an existential expletive *ci*,³⁸ even though Italian counts as a pro-drop language, Franks (1995) lists Upper and Lower Sorbian as pro-drop languages that have expletives in subject position. Since therefore expletive pronouns have nothing to do with the pro-drop parameter, their frequency is irrelevant for the acquisition of a parameter value. If there were a correlation between the possibility of omitting subjects and the occurrence of subject expletives, then Norwegian and Danish children should learn that there has to be a subject in their languages earlier than children learning English since expletives occur a higher percentage of the time in Danish and Norwegian (Scholz & Pullum 2002: 220). In Danish, the constructions corresponding to *there*-constructions in English are twice as frequent. It is still unclear whether there are actually differences in rate of acquisition (Pullum 2009: 246).

Second, in constructing their Poverty of the Stimulus argument, Legate and Yang assume that there is innate linguistic knowledge (the pro-drop parameter). Therefore their argument is circular since it is supposed to show that the assumption of innate linguistic knowledge is indispensable (Scholz & Pullum 2002: 220).

The third problem in Legate and Yang's argumentation is that they assume that a transformational analysis is the only possibility. This becomes clear from the following citation (Legate & Yang 2002: 153):

The correct operation for question formation is, of course, structure dependent: it involves parsing the sentence into structurally organized phrases, and fronting the auxiliary that follows the subject NP, which can be arbitrarily long:

- (4) a. Is [the woman who is singing] e happy?
- b. Has [the man that is reading a book] e eaten supper?

The analysis put forward by Chomsky (see page 90) is a transformation-based one, that is, a learner has to learn exactly what Legate and Yang describe: the auxiliary must move in front of the subject noun phrase. There are, however, alternative analyses that do not require transformations or equivalent mechanisms. If our linguistic knowledge does not contain any information about transformations, then their claim about what has to be learned is wrong. For example, one can assume, as in Categorical Grammar, that auxiliaries form a word class with particular distributional properties. One possible placement for them is initial positions as observed in questions, the alternative is after the subject (Villavicencio 2002: 104). There would then be the need to acquire information about whether the subject is realized to the left or to the right of its head. As an alternative to this lexicon-based analysis, one could pursue a Construction Grammar (Fillmore 1988: 44; 1999; Kay & Fillmore 1999: 18), Cognitive Grammar (Dąbrowska 2004: Chapter 9), or HPSG (Ginzburg & Sag 2000) approach. In these frameworks, there are simply two³⁹ schemata for the two sequences that assign different meanings according to the order of verb and subject. The acquisition problem is then that the learners have

³⁸ However, *ci* is not treated as an expletive by all authors. See Remberger (2009) for an overview.

³⁹ Fillmore (1999) assumes subtypes of the Subject Auxiliary Inversion Construction since this kind of inversion does not only occur in questions.

to identify the corresponding phrasal patterns in the input. They have to realize that Aux NP VP is a well-formed structure in English that has interrogative semantics. The relevant theories of acquisition in the Construction Grammar-oriented literature have been very well worked out (see Section 16.3 and 16.4). Construction-based theories of acquisition are also supported by the fact that one can see that there are frequency effects, that is, auxiliary inversion is first produced by children for just a few auxiliaries and only in later phases of development is it then extended to all auxiliaries. If speakers have learned that auxiliary constructions have the pattern Aux NP VP, then the coordination data provided by Lasnik and Uriagereka in (53) no longer pose a problem since, if we only assign the first conjunct to the NP in the pattern Aux NP VP, then the rest of the coordinate structure (*and those who are not coming*) remains unanalyzed and cannot be incorporated into the entire sentence. The hearer is thereby forced to revise his assumption that *will those who are coming* corresponds to the sequence Aux NP in Aux NP VP and instead to use the entire NP *those who are coming and those who are not coming*. For acquisition, it is therefore enough to simply learn the pattern Aux NP VP first for some and then eventually for all auxiliaries in English. This has also been shown by Lewis & Elman (2001), who trained a neural network exclusively with data that did not contain NPs with relative clauses in auxiliary constructions. Relative clauses were, however, present in other structures. The complexity of the training material was increased bit by bit just as is the case for the linguistic input that children receive (Elman 1993).⁴⁰ The neural network can predict the next symbol after a sequence of words. For sentences with interrogative word order, the predictions are correct. Even the relative pronoun in (55) is predicted despite the sequence Aux Det N Relp never occurring in the training material.

(55) Is the boy who is smoking crazy?

Furthermore, the system signals an error if the network is presented with the ungrammatical sentence (56):

(56) * Is the boy who smoking is crazy?

A gerund is not expected after the relative pronoun, but rather a finite verb. The constructed neural network is of course not yet an adequate model of what is going on in our heads during acquisition and speech production.⁴¹ The experiment shows, however, that the input that the learner receives contains rich statistical information that can be used when acquiring language. Lewis and Elman point out that the statistical information about the distribution of words in the input is not the only information that speakers have. In addition to information about distribution, they are also exposed to information about the context and can make use of phonological similarities in words.

⁴⁰ There are cultural differences. In some cultures, adults do not talk to children that have not attained full linguistic competence (Ochs 1982; Ochs & Schieffelin 1985) (also see Section 13.8.4). Children have to therefore learn the language from their environment, that is, the sentences that they hear reflect the full complexity of the language.

⁴¹ See Hurford (2002: 324) and Jackendoff (2007: Section 6.2) for problems that arise for certain kinds of neural networks and Pulvermüller (2003, 2010) for an alternative architecture that does not have these problems.

In connection to the ungrammatical sentences in (56), it has been claimed that the fact that such sentences can never be produced shows that children already know that grammatical operations are structure-dependent and this is why they do not entertain the hypothesis that it is simply the linearly first verb that is moved (Crain & Nakayama 1987). The claim simply cannot be verified since children do not normally form the relevant complex utterances. It is therefore only possible to experimentally illicit utterances where they could make the relevant mistakes. Crain & Nakayama (1987) have carried out such experiments. Their study has been criticized by Ambridge, Rowland & Pine (2008) since these authors could show that children do really make mistakes when fronting auxiliaries. The authors put the difference to the results of the first study by Crain and Nakayama down to unfortunate choice of auxiliary in Crain and Nakayama's study. Due to the use of the auxiliary *is*, the ungrammatical examples had pairs of words that never or only very rarely occur next to each other (*who running* in (57a)).

- (57) a. The boy who is running fast can jump high. →
 * Is the boy who running fast can jump high?
 b. The boy who can run fast can jump high. →
 * Can the boy who run fast can jump high?

If one uses the auxiliary *can*, this problem disappears since *who* and *run* certainly do appear together. This then leads to the children actually making mistakes that they should not have, as the incorrect utterances actually violate a constraint that is supposed to be part of innate linguistic knowledge.

Estigarribia (2009) investigated English polar questions in particular. He shows that not even half of the polar questions in children's input have the form Aux NP VP (p. 74). Instead, parents communicated with their children in a simplified form and used sentences such as:

- (58) a. That your tablet?
 b. He talking?
 c. That taste pretty good?

Estigarribia divides the various patterns into complexity classes of the following kind: FRAG (*fragmentary*), SPRED (*subject predicate*) and AUX-IN (*auxiliary inversion*). (59) shows corresponding examples:

- (59) a. coming tomorrow? (FRAG)
 b. you coming tomorrow? (SPRED)
 c. Are you coming tomorrow? (AUX-IN)

What we see is that the complexity increases from class to class. Estigarribia suggests a system of language acquisition where simpler classes are acquired before more complex ones and the latter ones develop from peripheral modifications of more simple classes (p. 76). He assumes that question forms are learned from right to left (*right to left elaboration*), that is, (59a) is learned first, then the pattern in (59b) containing a subject in

addition to the material in (59a), and then in a third step, the pattern (59c) in which an additional auxiliary occurs (p. 82). In this kind of learning procedure, no auxiliary inversion is involved. This view is compatible with constraint-based analyses such as that of Ginzburg & Sag (2000). A similar approach to acquisition by Freudenthal, Pine, Aguado-Orea & Gobet (2007) will be discussed in Section 16.3.

A further interesting study has been carried out by Bod (2009b). He shows that it is possible to learn auxiliary inversion assuming trees with any kind of branching even if there is no auxiliary inversion with complex noun phrases present in the input. The procedure he uses as well as the results he gains are very interesting and will be discussed in Section 13.8.3 in more detail.

In conclusion, we can say that children do make mistakes with regard to the position of auxiliaries that they probably should not make if the relevant knowledge were innate. Information about the statistical distribution of words in the input is enough to learn the structures of complex sentences without actually having this kind of complex sentences in the input.

13.8.2.5 Summary

Pullum & Scholz (2002: 19) show what an Argument from Poverty of the Stimulus (APS) would have to look like if it were constructed correctly:

(60) APS specification schema:

- a. ACQUIRENDUM CHARACTERIZATION: describe in detail what is alleged to be known.
- b. LACUNA SPECIFICATION: identify a set of sentences such that if the learner had access to them, the claim of data-driven learning of the acquirendum would be supported.
- c. INDISPENSABILITY ARGUMENT: give reason to think that if learning were data-driven, then the acquirendum could not be learned without access to sentences in the lacuna.
- d. INACCESSIBILITY EVIDENCE: support the claim that tokens of sentences in the lacuna were not available to the learner during the acquisition process.
- e. ACQUISITION EVIDENCE: give reason to believe that the acquirendum does in fact become known to learners during childhood.

As the four case studies have shown, there can be reasons for rejecting the acquirendum. If the acquirendum does not have to be acquired, then there is no longer any evidence for innate linguistic knowledge. The acquirendum must at least be descriptively adequate. This is an empirical question that can be answered by linguists. In three of the four PoS arguments discussed by Pullum and Scholz, there were parts which were not descriptively adequate. In previous sections, we already encountered other PoS arguments that involve claims regarding linguistic data that cannot be upheld empirically (for example, the Subacency Principle). For the remaining points in (60), interdisciplinary work is required: the specification of the lacuna falls into the theory of formal language (the specification of a set of utterances), the argument of indispensability is a mathematical

task from the realm of learning theory, the evidence for inaccessibility is an empirical question that can be approached by using corpora, and finally the evidence for acquisition is a question for experimental developmental psychologists (Pullum & Scholz 2002: 19–20).

Pullum & Scholz (2002: 46) point out an interesting paradox with regard to (60c): without results from mathematical theories of learning, one cannot achieve (60c). If one wishes to provide a valid Poverty of the Stimulus Argument, then this should automatically lead to improvements in theories of learning, that is, it is possible to learn more than was previously assumed.

13.8.3 Unsupervised Data-Oriented Parsing (U-DOP)

Bod (2009b) has developed a procedure that does not require any information about word classes or relations between words contained in utterances. The only assumption that one has to make is that there is some kind of structure. The procedure consists of three steps:

1. Compute all possible (binary-branching) trees (without category symbols) for a set of given sentences.
2. Divide these trees into sub-trees.
3. Compute the ideal tree for each sentence.

This process will be explained using the sentences in (61):

- (61) a. Watch the dog.
b. The dog barks.

The trees that are assigned to these utterances only use the category symbol X since the categories for the relevant phrases are not (yet) known. In order to keep the example readable, the words themselves will not be given the category X, although one can of course do this. Figure 13.2 on the next page shows the trees for (61). In the next step, the trees are divided into subtrees. The trees in Figure 13.2 have the subtrees that can be seen in Figure 13.3 on page 477. In the third step, we now have to compute the best tree for each utterance. For *The dog barks.*, there are two trees in the set of the subtrees that correspond exactly to this utterance. But it is also possible to build structures out of subtrees. There are therefore multiple derivations possible for *The dog barks.* all of which use the trees in Figure 13.3: one the one hand, trivial derivations that use the entire tree, and on the other, derivations that build trees from smaller subtrees. Figure 13.4 gives an impression of how this construction of subtrees happens. If we now want to decide which of the analyses in (62) is the best, then we have to compute the probability of each tree.

- (62) a. [[the dog] barks]
b. [the [dog barks]]




图 13.2: Possible binary-branching structures for *Watch the dog* and *The dog barks*.

The probability of a tree is the sum of the probabilities of all its analyses. There are two analyses for (62b), which can be found in Figure 13.4. The probability of the first analysis of (62b) corresponds to the probability of choosing exactly the complete tree for [the [dog barks]] from the set of all subtrees. Since there are twelve subtrees, the probability of choosing that one is $1/12$. The probability of the second analysis is the product of the probabilities of the subtrees that are combined and is therefore $1/12 \times 1/12 = 1/144$. The probability of the analysis in (62b) is therefore $1/12 + (1/12 \times 1/12) = 13/144$. One can then calculate the probability of the tree in (62a) in the same way. The only difference here is that the tree for [the dog] occurs twice in the set of subtrees. Its probability is therefore $2/12$. The probability of the tree [[the dog] barks] is therefore: $1/12 + (1/12 \times 2/12) = 14/144$. We have thus extracted knowledge about plausible structures from the corpus. This knowledge can also be applied whenever one hears a new utterance for which there is no complete tree. It is then possible to use already known subtrees to calculate the probabilities of possible analyses of the new utterance. Bod's model can also be combined with weights: those sentences that were heard longer ago by the speaker, will receive a lower weight. One can thereby also account for the fact that children do not have all sentences that they have ever heard available simultaneously. This extension makes the UDOP model more plausible for language acquisition.

In the example above, we did not assign categories to the words. If we were to do this, then we would get the tree in Figure 13.5 on page 478 as a possible subtree. These kinds of discontinuous subtrees are important if one wants to capture dependencies between elements that occur in different subtrees of a given tree. Some examples are the following sentences:

- (63) a. BA carried *more* people *than* cargo in 2005.
 b. *What's* this scratch *doing* on the table?




图 13.3: Subtrees for the trees in Figure 13.2




图 13.4: Analysis of *The dog barks* using subtrees from Figure 13.3




图 13.5: Discontinuous partial tree

c. Most software *companies* in Vietnam *are* small sized.

It is then also possible to learn auxiliary inversion in English with these kinds of discontinuous trees. All one needs are tree structures for the two sentences in (64) in order to prefer the correct sentence (65a) over the incorrect one (65b).

(64) a. The man who is eating is hungry.
b. Is the boy hungry?

(65) a. Is the man who is eating hungry?
b. * Is the man who eating is hungry?

U-DOP can learn the structures for (64) in Figure 13.6 on the following page from the sentences in (66):

- (66) a. The man who is eating mumbled.
 b. The man is hungry.
 c. The man mumbled.
 d. The boy is eating.

Note that these sentences do not contain any instance of the structure in (65a). With




图 13.6: Structures that U-DOP learned from the examples in (64) and (66)

the structures learned here, it is possible to show that the shortest possible derivation for the position of the auxiliary is also the correct one: the correct order *Is the man who is eating hungry?* only requires that the fragments in Figure 13.7 on the next page are combined, whereas the structure for **Is the man who eating is hungry?* requires at least four subtrees from Figure 13.6 to be combined with each other. This is shown by Figure 13.8 on the following page.

The motivation for always taking the derivation that consists of the least subparts is that one maximizes similarity to already known material.

The tree for (67) containing one auxiliary too many can also be created from Figure 13.6 with just two subtrees (with the tree $[_X \text{ is}_X X]$ and the entire tree for *The man who is eating is hungry*).

- (67) **Is the man who is eating is hungry?*

Interestingly, children do produce this kind of incorrect sentences (Crain & Nakayama 1987: 530; Ambridge, Rowland & Pine 2008). However, if we consider the probabilities of the subtrees in addition to the the number of combined subparts, we get the correct result, namely (65a) and not (67). This is due to the fact that *the man who is eating* occurs in the corpus twice, in (65a) and in (66a). Thus, the probability of *the man who is eating* is just as high as the probability of *the man who is eating is hungry* and thus




图 13.7: Derivation of the correct structure for combination with an auxiliary using two subtrees from Figure 13.6




图 13.8: Derivation of the incorrect structure for the combination with an auxiliary using two subtrees from Figure 13.6

derivation in Figure 13.7 is preferred over the one for (67). This works for the constructed examples here, however one can imagine that in a realistic corpus, sequences of the form *the man who is eating* are more frequent than sequences with further words since *the man who is eating* can also occur in other contexts. Bod has applied this process to corpora of adult language (English, German and Chinese) as well as applying it to the Eve corpus from the CHILDES database in order to see whether analogy formation constitutes a plausible model for human acquisition of language. He was able to show that what we demonstrated for the sentences above also works for a larger corpus of naturally occurring language: although there were no examples for movement of an auxiliary across a complex NP in the Eve corpus, it is possible to learn by analogy that the auxiliary from a complex NP cannot be fronted.

It is therefore possible to learn syntactic structures from a corpus without any prior knowledge about parts of speech or abstract properties of language. The only assumption that Bod makes is that there are (binary-branching) structures. The assumption of

binarity is not really necessary. But if one includes flat branching structures into the computation, the set of trees will become considerably bigger. Therefore, Bod only used binary-branching structures in his experiments. In his trees, *X* consists of two other *X*'s or a word. We are therefore dealing with recursive structures. Therefore, Bod's work proposes a theory of the acquisition of syntactic structures that only requires recursion, something that is viewed by Hauser, Chomsky & Fitch (2002) as a basic property of language.

As shown in Section 13.1.8, there is evidence that recursion is not restricted to language and thus one can conclude that it is not necessary to assume innate linguistic knowledge in order to be able to learn syntactic structures from the given input.

Nevertheless, it is important to point out something here: what Bod shows is that syntactic structures can be learned. The information about the parts of speech of each word involved which are not yet included in his structures can also be derived using statistical methods (Redington et al. 1998; Clark 2000).⁴² In all probability, the structures that can be learned correspond to structures that surface-oriented linguistic theories would also assume. However, not all aspects of the linguistic analysis are acquired. In Bod's model, only occurrences of words in structures are evaluated. Nothing is said about whether words stand in a particular regular relationship to one another or not (for example, a lexical rule connecting a passive participle and perfect participle). Furthermore, nothing is said about how the meaning of expressions arise (are they rather holistic in the sense of Construction Grammar or projected from the lexicon?). These are questions that still concern theoretical linguists (see Chapter 21) and cannot straightforwardly be derived from the statistic distribution of words and the structures computed from them (see Section 21.8.1 for more on this point).

A second comment is also needed: we have seen that statistical information can be used to derive the structure of complex linguistic expressions. This now begs the question of how this relates to Chomsky's earlier argumentation against statistical approaches (Chomsky 1957: 16). Abney (1996: Section 4.2) discusses this in detail. The problem with his earlier argumentation is that Chomsky referred to Markov models. These are statistical versions of finite automata. Finite automata can only describe type 3 languages and are therefore not appropriate for analyzing natural language. However, Chomsky's criticism cannot be applied to statistical methods in general.

13.8.4 Negative evidence

In a number of works that assume innate linguistic knowledge, it is claimed that children do not have access to negative evidence, that is, nobody tells them that sentences such as (44e) – repeated here as (68) – are ungrammatical (Brown & Hanlon 1970: 42–52; Marcus 1993).

(68) *Is the dog that in the corner is hungry?

⁴² Computational linguistic algorithms for determining parts of speech often look at an entire corpus. But children are always dealing with just a particular part of it. The corresponding learning process must then also include a curve of forgetting. See Braine (1987: 67).

It is indeed correct that adults do not wake up their children with the ungrammatical sentence of the day, however, children do in fact have access to negative evidence of various sorts. For example, Chouinard & Clark (2003) have shown that English and French speaking parents correct the utterances of their children that are not well-formed. For example, they repeat utterances where the verb was inflected incorrectly. Children can deduce from the fact that the utterance was repeated and from what was changed in the repetition that they made a mistake and Chouinard and Clark also showed that they actually do this. The authors looked at data from five children whose parents all had an academic qualification. They discuss the parent-child relationship in other cultures, too (see Ochs (1982); Ochs & Schieffelin (1985) and Marcus (1993: 71) for an overview) and refer to studies of America families with lower socio-economic status (page 660).

A further form of negative evidence is indirect negative evidence, which Chomsky (1981a: 9) also assumes could play a role in acquisition. Goldberg (1995: Section 5.2) gives the utterance in (69a) as an example:⁴³

- (69) a. Look! The magician made the bird disappear.
b. * The magician disappeared the bird.

The child can conclude from the fact that adults use a more involved causative construction with *make* that the verb *disappear*, unlike other verbs such as *melt*, cannot be used transitively. An immediately instructive example for the role played by indirect negative evidence comes from morphology. There are certain productive rules that can however still not be applied if there is a word that blocks the application of the rule. An example is the *-er* nominalization suffix in German. By adding an *-er* to a verb stem, one can derive a noun that refers to someone who carries out a particular action (often habitually) (*Raucher* ‘smoker’, *Maler* ‘painter’, *Sänger* ‘singer’, *Tänzer* ‘dancer’). However, *Stehler* ‘stealer’ is very unusual. The formation of *Stehler* is blocked by the existence of *Dieb* ‘thief’. Language learners therefore have to infer from the non-existence of *Stehler* that the nominalization rule does not apply to *stehlen* ‘to steal’.

Similarly, a speaker with a grammar of English that does not have any restrictions on the position of manner adverbs would expect that both orders in (70) are possible (Scholz & Pullum 2002: 206):

- (70) a. call the police immediately
b. * call immediately the police

Learners can conclude indirectly from the fact that verb phrases such as (70b) (almost) never occur in the input that these are probably not part of the language. This can be modeled using the relevant statistical learning algorithms.

The examples for the existence of negative evidence provided so far are more arguments from plausibility. Stefanowitsch (2008) has combined corpus linguistic studies on the statistical distribution with acceptability experiments and has shown that negative evidence gained from expected frequencies correlates with acceptability judgments of

⁴³ Also, see Tomasello (2006a: 277).

speakers. This process will be discussed now briefly: Stefanowitsch assumes the following principle:

- (71) Form expectations about the frequency of co-occurrence of linguistic features or elements on the basis of their individual frequency of occurrence and check these expectations against the actual frequency of co-occurrence. (Stefanowitsch 2008: 518)

Stefanowitsch works with the part of the *International Corpus of English* that contains British English (ICE-GB). In this corpus, the verb *say* occurs 3,333 times and sentences with ditransitive verbs (Subj Verb Obj Obj) occur 1,824 times. The entire total of verbs in the corpus is 136,551. If all verbs occurred in all kinds of sentences with the same frequencies, then we would expect *say* to occur 44.52 times ($X / 1,824 = 3,333 / 136,551$ and hence $X = 1,824 \times 3,333 / 136,551$) in the ditransitive construction. But the number of actual occurrences is actually 0 since, unlike (72b), sentences such as (72a) are not used by speakers of English.

- (72) a. *Dad said Sue something nice.
b. Dad said something nice to Sue.

Stefanowitsch shows that the non-occurrence of *say* in the ditransitive sentence pattern is significant. Furthermore, he investigated how acceptability judgments compare to the frequent occurrence or non-occurrence of verbs in certain constructions. In a first experiment, he was able to show that the frequent non-occurrence of elements in particular constructions correlates with the acceptability judgments of speakers, whereas this is not the case for the frequent occurrence of a verb in a construction.

In sum, we can say that indirect negative evidence can be derived from linguistic input and that it seems to play an important role in language acquisition.

13.9 Summary

It follows from all this that not a single one of the arguments in favor of innate linguistic knowledge remains uncontroversial. This of course does not rule out there still being innate linguistic knowledge but those who wish to incorporate this assumption into their theories have to take more care than was previously the case to prove that what they assume to be innate is actually part of our linguistic knowledge and that it cannot be learned from the linguistic input alone.

Comprehension questions

1. Which arguments are there for the assumption of innate linguistic knowledge?

Further reading

Pinker's book (1994) is the best written book arguing for nativist models of language.

Elman, Bates, Johnson, Karmiloff-Smith, Parisi & Plunkett (1996) discuss all the arguments that have been proposed in favor of innate linguistic knowledge and show that the relevant phenomena can be explained differently. The authors adopt a connectionist view. They work with neuronal networks, which are assumed to model what is happening in our brains relatively accurately. The book also contains chapters about the basics of genetics and the structure of the brain, going into detail about why a direct encoding of linguistic knowledge in our genome is implausible.

Certain approaches using neuronal networks have been criticized because they cannot capture certain aspects of human abilities such as recursion or the multiple usage of the same words in an utterance. Pulvermüller (2010) discusses an architecture that has memory and uses this to analyze recursive structures. In his overview article, certain works are cited that show that the existence of more abstract rules or schemata of the kind theoretical linguists take for granted can be demonstrated on the neuronal level. Pulvermüller does not, however, assume that linguistic knowledge is innate (p. 173).

Pullum and Scholz have dealt with the Poverty-of-the-Stimulus argument in detail (Pullum & Scholz 2002; Scholz & Pullum 2002).

Goldberg (2006) and Tomasello (2003) are the most prominent proponents of Construction Grammar, a theory that explicitly tries to do without the assumption of innate linguistic knowledge.

第十四章 **Generative-enumerative vs. model-theoretic approaches**

Generative-enumerative approaches assume that a grammar generates a set of sequences of symbols (strings of words). This is where the term Generative Grammar comes from. Thus, it is possible to use the grammar on page 49, repeated here as (1), to derive the string *er das Buch dem Mann gibt* ‘he the book the man gives’.

(1)	$NP \rightarrow D, N$	$NP \rightarrow er$	$N \rightarrow Buch$
	$S \rightarrow NP, NP, NP, V$	$D \rightarrow das$	$N \rightarrow Mann$
		$D \rightarrow dem$	$V \rightarrow gibt$


Beginning with the start symbol (S), symbols are replaced until one reaches a sequence of symbols only containing words. The set of all strings derived in this way is the language described by the grammar.

The following are classed as generative-enumerative approaches:

- all phrase structure grammars
- Transformational Grammars in almost all variants
- GPSG in the formalism of Gazdar, Klein, Pullum & Sag (1985)
- many variants of Categorical Grammar
- many variants of TAG
- Chomsky’s Minimalist Grammars

LFG was also originally designed to be a generative grammar.

The opposite of such theories of grammar are model-theoretic or constraint-based approaches (MTA). MTAs formulate well-formedness conditions on the expressions that the grammar describes. In Section 6.7, we already discussed a model-theoretic approach for theories that use feature structures to model phenomena. To illustrate this point, I will discuss another HPSG example: (2) shows the lexical item for *kennst* ‘know’. In the description of (2), it is ensured that the PHON value of the relevant linguistic sign is $\langle kennst \rangle$, that is, this value of PHON is constrained. There are parallel restrictions for

(2) Lexical item for *kennst*:

the features given in (2): the SYNSEM value is given. In SYNSEM, there are restrictions on the LOC and NONLOC value. In CAT, there are individual restrictions for HEAD and SUBCAT. The value of SUBCAT is a list with descriptions of dependent elements. The descriptions are given as abbreviations here, which actually stand for complex feature descriptions that also consist of feature-value pairs. For the first argument of *kennst*, a HEAD value of type *noun* is required, the PER value in the semantic index has to be *second* and the NUM value has to be *sg*. The structure sharings in (2) are a special kind of constraint. Values that are not specified in the descriptions of lexical entries can vary in accordance with the feature geometry given by the type system. In (2), neither the SLASH value of the nominative NP nor the one of the accusative NP is fixed. This means that SLASH can either be an empty or non-empty list.

The constraints in lexical items such as (2) interact with further constraints that hold for the signs of type *phrase*. For instance, in head-argument structures, the non-head daughter must correspond to an element from the SUBCAT list of the head daughter.

Generative-enumerative and model-theoretic approaches view the same problem from different sides: the generative side only allows what can be generated by a given set of rules, whereas the model-theoretic approach allows everything that is not ruled out by constraints.¹

Pullum & Scholz (2001: 19–20) and Pullum (2007) list the following model-theoretic approaches:²

- the non-procedural variant of Transformational Grammar of Lakoff, that formu-

¹ Compare this to an old joke: in dictatorships, everything that is not allowed is banned, in democracies, everything that is not banned is allowed and in France, everything that is banned is allowed. Generative-enumerative approaches correspond to the dictatorships, model-theoretic approaches are the democracies and France is something that has no correlate in linguistics.

² See Pullum (2007) for a historical overview of Model Theoretic Syntax (MTS) and for further references.

lates constraints on potential tree sequences,

- Johnson and Postal’s formalization of Relational Grammar (1980),
- GPSG in the variants developed by Gazdar et al. (1988), Blackburn et al. (1993) and Rogers (1997),
- LFG in the formalization of Kaplan (1995)³ and
- HPSG in the formalization of King (1999).

Categorial Grammars (Bouma & van Noord 1994), TAG (Rogers 1994) and Minimalist approaches (Veenstra 1998) can be formulated in model-theoretic terms.

Pullum & Scholz (2001) point out various differences between these points of view. In the following sections, I will focus on two of these differences.⁴ Section 14.3 deals with ten Hacken’s objection to the model-theoretic view.

14.1 Graded acceptability

Generative-enumerative approaches differ from model-theoretic approaches in how they deal with the varying degrees of acceptability of utterances. In generative-enumerative approaches, a particular string is either included in the set of well-formed expressions or it is not. This means that it is not straightforwardly possible to say something about the degree of deviance: the first sentence in (3) is judged grammatical and the following three are equally ungrammatical.

- (3) a. Du kennst diesen Aufsatz.
you know.2SG this.ACC essay
- b. *Du kennen diesen Aufsatz.
you know.3PL this.ACC essay
- c. *Du kennen dieser Aufsatz.
you know.3PL this.NOM essay
- d. *Du kennen Aufsatz dieser.
you know.3PL essay this.NOM

At this point, critics of this view raise the objection that it is in fact possible to determine degrees of acceptability in (3b–d): in (3b), there is no agreement between the subject and the verb, in (3c), *dieser Aufsatz* ‘this essay’ has the wrong case in addition, and in (3d), *Aufsatz* ‘essay’ and *dieser* ‘this’ occur in the wrong order. Furthermore, the sentence in (4) violates grammatical rules of German, but is nevertheless still interpretable.

³ According to Pullum (2013: Section 3.2), there seems to be a problem for model-theoretic formalizations of so-called *constraining equations*.

⁴ The reader should take note here: there are differing views with regard to how generative-enumerative and MTS models are best formalized and not all of the assumptions discussed here are compatible with every formalism. The following sections mirror the important points in the general discussion.

- (4) Studenten stürmen mit Flugblättern und Megafon die Mensa und rufen alle
 students storm with flyers and megaphone the canteen and call all
 auf zur Vollversammlung in der Glashalle zum kommen. Vielen bleibt das
 up to plenary.meeting in the glass.hall to.the come many.DAT stays the
 Essen im Mund stecken und kommen sofort mit.⁵
 food in.the mouth stick and come immediately with
 ‘Students stormed into the university canteen with flyers and a megaphone calling
 for everyone to come to a plenary meeting in the glass hall. For many, the food
 stuck in their throats and they immediately joined them.’

Chomsky (1975: Chapter 5; 1964b) tried to use a string distance function to determine the relative acceptability of utterances. This function compares the string of an ungrammatical expression with that of a grammatical expression and assigns an ungrammaticality score of 1, 2 or 3 according to certain criteria. This treatment is not adequate, however, as there are much more fine-grained differences in acceptability and the string distance function also makes incorrect predictions. For examples of this and technical problems with calculating the function, see Pullum & Scholz (2001: 29).

In model-theoretic approaches, grammar is understood as a system of well-formedness conditions. An expression becomes worse, the more well-formedness conditions it violates (Pullum & Scholz 2001: 26–27). In (3b), the person and number requirements of the lexical item for the verb *kennst* are violated. In addition, the case requirements for the object have not been fulfilled in (3c). There is a further violation of a linearization rule for the noun phrase in (3d).

Well-formedness conditions can be weighted in such a way as to explain why certain violations lead to more severe deviations than others. Furthermore, performance factors also play a role when judging sentences (for more on the distinction between performance and competence, see Chapter 15). As we will see in Chapter 15, constraint-based approaches work very well as performance-compatible grammar models. If we combine the relevant grammatical theory with performance models, we will arrive at explanations for graded acceptability differences owing to performance factors.

14.2 Utterance fragments

Pullum & Scholz (2001: Section 3.2) point out that generative-enumerative theories do not assign structure to fragments. For instance, neither the string *and of the* nor the string *the of and* would receive a structure since none of these sequences is well-formed as an utterance and they are therefore not elements of the set of sequences generated by the grammar. However, *and of the* can occur as part of the coordination of PPs in sentences such as (5) and would therefore have some structure in these cases, for example the one given in Figure 14.1 on the following page.

- (5) That cat is afraid of the dog and of the parrot.

⁵ Streikzeitung der Universität Bremen, 04.12.2003, p. 2. The emphasis is mine.




图 14.1: Structure of the fragment *and of the* following Pullum & Scholz (2001: 32)

As a result of the interaction of various constraints in a constraint-based grammar, it emerges that *the* is part of an NP and this NP is an argument of *of* and furthermore *and* is combined with the relevant *of*-PP. In symmetric coordination, the first conjunct has the same syntactic properties as the second, which is why the partial structure of *and of the* allows one to draw conclusions about the category of the conjunct despite it not being part of the string.

Ewan Klein noted that Categorical Grammar and Minimalist Grammars, which build up more complex expressions from simpler ones, can sometimes create this kind of fragments (Pullum 2013: 507). This is certainly the case for Categorical Grammars with composition rules, which allow one to combine any sequence of words to form a constituent. If one views derivations as logical proofs, as is common in some variants of Categorical Grammar, then the actual derivation is irrelevant. What matters is whether a proof can be found or not. However, if one is interested in the derived structures, then the argument brought forward by Pullum and Scholz is still valid. For some variants of Categorical Grammar that motivate the combination of constituents based on their prosodic and information-structural properties (Steedman 1991: Section 3), the problem persists since fragments have a structure independent of the structure of the entire utterance and independent of their information-structural properties within this complete structure. This structure of the fragment can be such that it is not possible to analyze it with type-raising rules and composition rules.

In any case, this argument holds for Minimalist theories since it is not possible to have a combination of *the* with a nominal constituent if this constituent was not already built up from lexical material by Merge.

14.3 A problem for model-theoretic approaches?

Ten Hacken (2007: 237–238) discusses the formal assumptions of HPSG. In HPSG, feature descriptions are used to describe feature structures. Feature structures must contain all the features belonging to a structure of a certain type. Additionally, the features have to have a maximally-specific value (see Section 6.7). Ten Hacken discusses gender properties of the English noun *cousin*. In English, gender is important in order to ensure the correct binding of pronouns (see page 265 for German):

- (6) a. The man_i sleeps. He_i snores.
- b. The woman_i sleeps. He_{*i} snores.

While *he* in (6a) can refer to *man*, *woman* is not a possible antecedent. Ten Hacken's problem is that *cousin* is not marked with respect to gender. Thus, it is possible to use it to refer to both male and female relatives. As was explained in the discussion of the case value of *Frau* 'woman' in Section 6.7, it is possible for a value in a description to remain unspecified. Thus, in the relevant feature structures, any appropriate and maximally specific value is possible. The case of *Frau* can therefore be nominative, genitive, dative or accusative in an actual feature structure. Similarly, there are two possible genders for *cousin* corresponding to the usages in (7).

- (7) a. I have a cousin_i. He_i is very smart.
- b. I have a cousin_i. She_i is very smart.

Ten Hacken refers to examples such as (8) and claims that these are problematic:

- (8) a. Niels has two cousins.
- b. How many cousins does Niels have?

In plural usage, it is not possible to assume that *cousins* is feminine or masculine since the set of relatives can contain either women or men. It is interesting to note that (9a) is possible in English, whereas German is forced to use (9b) to express the same meaning.

- (9) a. Niels and Odette are cousins.
- b. Niels und Odette sind Cousin und Cousine.
 Niels and Odette are cousin.M and cousin.F

Ten Hacken concludes that the gender value has to remain unspecified and this shows, in his opinion, that model-theoretic analyses are unsuited to describing language.

If we consider what exactly ten Hacken noticed, then it becomes apparent how one can account for this in a model-theoretic approach: Ten Hacken claims that it does not make sense to specify a gender value for the plural form of *cousin*. In a model-theoretic approach, this can be captured in two ways. One can either assume that there are no gender features for referential indices in the plural, or that one can add a gender value that plural nouns can have.

The first approach is supported by the fact that there are no inflectional differences between the plural forms of pronouns with regard to gender. There is therefore no reason to distinguish genders in the plural.

- (10) a. Niels and Odette are cousins. They are very smart.
 b. The cousins/brothers/sisters are standing over there. They are very smart.

No distinctions are found in plural when it comes to nominal inflection (*brothers, sisters, books*). In German, this is different. There are differences with both nominal inflection and the reference of (some) noun phrases with regard to the sexus of the referent. Examples of this are the previously mentioned examples *Cousin* ‘male cousin’ and *Cousine* ‘female cousin’ as well as forms with the suffix *-in* as in *Kindergärtnerin* ‘female nursery teacher’. However, gender is normally a grammatical notion that has nothing to do with sexus. An example is the neuter noun *Mitglied* ‘member’, which can refer to both female and male persons.

The question that one has to ask when discussing Ten Hacken’s problem is the following: does gender play a role for pronominal binding in German? If this is not the case, then the gender feature is only relevant within the morphology component, and here the gender value is determined for each noun in the lexicon. For the binding of personal pronouns, there is no gender difference in German.

- (11) Die Schwestern / Brüder / Vereinsmitglieder / Geschwister stehen dort.
 the sisters.F brothers.M club.members.N siblings stand there
 Sie lächeln.
 they smile.

‘The sisters/brothers/club members/siblings are standing there. They are smiling.’

Nevertheless, there are adverbials in German that agree in gender with the noun to which they refer (Höhle 1983: Chapter 6):

- (12) a. Die Fenster wurden eins nach dem anderen geschlossen.
 the windows.N were one.N after the other closed
 ‘The windows were closed one after the other.’
 b. Die Türen wurden eine nach der anderen geschlossen.
 the doors.F were one.F after the other closed
 ‘The doors were closed one after the other.’
 c. Die Riegel wurden einer nach dem anderen zugeschoben.
 the bolts.M were one.M after the other closed
 ‘The bolts were closed one after the other.’

For animate nouns, it is possible to diverge from the gender of the noun in question and use a form of the adverbial that corresponds to the biological sex:

- (13) a. Die Mitglieder des Politbüros wurden eines / einer nach dem anderen
 the members.N of.the politburo were one.N one.M after the other
 aus dem Saal getragen.
 out.of the hall carried
 ‘The members of the politburo were carried out of the hall one after the other.’

- b. Die Mitglieder des Frauentanzklubs verließen eines / eine nach dem
 the members.N of.the women's.dance.club left one.N one.F after the.N
 / der anderen im Schutze der Dunkelheit den Keller.
 the.F other in.the protection of.the dark the basement
 'The members of the women's dance club left the basement one after the other
 under cover of darkness.'

This deviation from gender in favor of sexus can also be seen with binding of personal and relative pronouns with nouns such as *Weib* 'woman' (pej.) and *Mädchen* 'girl':

- (14) a. „Farbe bringt die meiste Knete!“ verriet ein 14jähriges türkisches *Mädchen*,
 color brings the most money revealed a 14-year.old Turkish girl.N
 die die Mauerstückchen am Nachmittag am Checkpoint Charlie an
 who.F the wall.pieces in.the afternoon at Checkpoint Charlie at
 Japaner und US-Bürger verkauft.⁶
 Japanese and US-citizens sells
 '“Color gets the most money” said a 14-year old Turkish girl who sells pieces
 of the wall to Japanese and American citizens at Checkpoint Charlie.'
 b. Es ist ein junges *Mädchen*, die auf der Suche nach CDs bei Bolzes
 it is a young girl.N who.F on the search for CDs at Bolzes
 reinschaut.⁷
 stops.by
 'It is a young girl looking for CDs that stops by Bolzes.'

For examples from Goethe, Kafka and Thomas Mann, see Müller (1999a: 417–418).

For inanimate nouns such as those in (12), agreement is obligatory. For the analysis of German, one therefore does in fact require a gender feature in the plural. In English, this is not the case since there are no parallel examples with pronouns inflecting for gender. One can therefore either assume that plural indices do not have a gender feature or that the gender value is *none*. In the latter case, the feature would have a value and hence fulfill the formal requirements. (15) shows the first solution: plural indices are modeled by feature structures of type *pl-ind* and the GENDER feature is just not appropriate for such objects.

- (15) a. singular index: b. plural index:
- | | |
|--|---|
| $\left[\begin{array}{l} sg-ind \\ PER \text{ } per \\ NUM \text{ } sg \\ GEN \text{ } gender \end{array} \right]$ | $\left[\begin{array}{l} pl-ind \\ PER \text{ } per \\ NUM \text{ } pl \end{array} \right]$ |
|--|---|

The second solution requires the type hierarchy in Figure 14.2 on the following page for the subtypes of *gender*. With such a type hierarchy *none* is a possible value of the GEN feature and no problem will arise.

⁶ taz, 14.06.1990, p. 6.

⁷ taz, 13.03.1996, p. 11.




图 14.2: Type hierarchy for one of the solutions of ten Hacken's problem

In general, it is clear that cases such as the one constructed by ten Hacken will never be a problem since there are either values that make sense, or there are contexts for which there is no value that makes sense and one therefore does not require the features.

So, while ten Hacken's problem is a non-issue, there are certain problems of a more technical nature. I have pointed out one such technical problem in Müller (1999a: Section 14.4). I show that spurious ambiguities arise for a particular analysis of verbal complexes in German when one resolves the values of a binary feature (FLIP). I also show how this problem can be avoided by the complicated stipulation of a value in certain contexts.

第十五章 The competence/performance distinction

The distinction between competence and performance (Chomsky 1965: Section 1.1), which is assumed by several theories of grammar, was already discussed in Section 12.6.3 about the analysis of scrambling and verbal complexes in TAG. Theories of competence are intended to describe linguistic knowledge and performance theories are assigned the task of explaining how linguistic knowledge is used as well as why mistakes are made in speech production and comprehension. A classic example in the competence/performance discussion are cases of center self-embedding. Chomsky & Miller (1963: 286) discuss the following example with recursively embedded relative clauses:

- (1) (the rat (the cat (the dog chased) killed) ate the malt)

(2b) is a corresponding example in German:

- (2) a. dass der Hund bellt, der die Katze jagt, die die Maus kennt, die
that the dog.M barks that.M the cat chases that.F the mouse knows who
im Keller lebt
in.the basement lives
'that the dog that chases the cat that knows the mouse who is living in the
basement is barking'
b. dass er Hund, [₁ der die Katze, [₂ die die Maus, [₃ die im Keller
that the dog that the cat that the mouse who in.the basement
lebt, ₃] kennt, ₂] jagt ₁] bellt
lives knows chases barks

The examples in (1) and (2b) are entirely incomprehensible for most people. If one rearranges the material somewhat, it is possible to process the sentences and assign a meaning to them.¹ For sentences such as (2b), it is often assumed that they fall within

¹ The sentence in (2a) can be continued following the pattern that was used to create the sentence. For instance by adding *die unter der Treppe lebte, die meine Freunde repariert haben* 'who lived under the staircase which my friends repaired'. This shows that a restriction of the number of elements that depend on one head to seven (Leiss 2003: 322) does not restrict the set of the sentences that are generated or licensed by a grammar to be finite. There are at most two dependents of each head in (2a). The extraposition of the relative clauses allows the hearer to group material into processable and reducible chunks, which reduces the cognitive burden during processing.

This means that the restriction to seven dependents does not cause a finitization of recursion ("Ver-

our grammatical competence, that is, we possess the knowledge required to assign a structure to the sentence, although the processing of utterances such as (2b) exceeds language-independent abilities of our brain. In order to successfully process (2b), we would have to retain the first five noun phrases and corresponding hypotheses about the further progression of the sentence in our heads and could only begin to combine syntactic material when the verbs appear. Our brains become overwhelmed by this task. These problems do not arise when analyzing (2a) as it is possible to immediately begin to integrate the noun phrases into a larger unit.

Nevertheless, center self-embedding of relative clauses can also be constructed in such a way that our brains can handle them. Hans Uszkoreit (p. c. 2009) gives the following example:

- (3) Die Bänke, [₁ auf denen damals die Alten des Dorfes, [₂ die allen the benches on which back.then the old.people of.the village that all Kindern, [₃ die vorbeikamen ₃], freundliche Blicke zuwarfen ₂], lange Stunden children that came.by friendly glances gave long hours schweigend nebeneinander saßen ₁], mussten im letzten Jahr einem silent next.to.each.other sat must in.the last year a Parkplatz weichen.
car.park give.way.to

‘The benches on which the older residents of the village, who used to give friendly glances to all the children who came by, used to sit silently next to one another for hours had to give way to a car park last year.’

Therefore, one does not wish to include in the description of our grammatical knowledge that relative clauses are not allowed to be included inside each other as in (2b) as this would also rule out (3).

We can easily accept the fact that our brains are not able to process structures past a certain degree of complexity and also that corresponding utterances then become unacceptable. The contrast in the following examples is far more fascinating:²

- (4) a. # The patient [who the nurse [who the clinic had hired] admitted] met Jack.
b. * The patient who the nurse who the clinic had hired met Jack.

Although (4a) is syntactically well-formed and (4b) is not, Gibson & Thomas (1999) were able to show that (4b) is rated better by speakers than (4a). It does not occur to some people that an entire VP is missing. There are a number of explanations for this fact, all of which in some way make the claim that previously heard words are forgotten as soon as new words are heard and a particular degree of complexity is exceeded (Frazier 1985: 178; Gibson & Thomas 1999).

endlichung von Rekursivität“) as was claimed by Leiss (2003: 322). Leiss argued that Miller could not use his insights regarding short term memory, since he worked within Transformational Grammar rather than in Dependency Grammar. The discussion shows that dependency plays an important role, but that linear order is also important for processing.

² See Gibson & Thomas (1999: 227). Frazier (1985: 178) attributes the discovery of this kind of sentences to Janet Fodor.

Instead of developing grammatical theories that treat (2b) and (4a) as unacceptable and (3) and (4b) as acceptable, descriptions have been developed that equally allow (2b), (3), and (4a) (competence models) and then additionally investigate the way utterances are processed in order to find out what kinds of structures our brains can handle and what kinds of structures it cannot. The result of this research is then a performance model (see Gibson (1998), for example). This does not rule out that there are language-specific differences affecting language processing. For example, Vasisht, Suckow, Lewis & Kern (2010) have shown that the effects that arise in center self-embedding structures in German are different from those that arise in the corresponding English cases such as (4): due to the frequent occurrence of verb-final structures in German, speakers of German were able to better store predictions about the anticipated verbs into their working memory (p. 558).

Theories in the framework of Categorical Grammar, GB, LFG, GPSG and HPSG are theories about our linguistic competence.³ If we want to develop a grammatical theory that directly reflects our cognitive abilities, then there should also be a corresponding performance model to go with a particular competence model. In the following two sections, I will recount some arguments from Sag & Wasow (2011) in favor of constraint-based theories such as GPSG, LFG and HPSG.

15.1 The derivational theory of complexity

The first point discussed by Sag & Wasow (2011) is the Derivational Theory of Complexity. In the early days of Transformational Grammar, it was assumed that transformations were cognitively real, that is, it is possible to measure the consumption of resources that transformations have. A sentence that requires more transformations than the analysis of another sentence should therefore also be more difficult for humans to process. The corresponding theory was dubbed the *Derivational Theory of Complexity* (DTC) and initial experiments seemed to confirm it (Miller & McKean 1964; Savin & Perchonock 1965; Clifton & Odom 1966), so that in 1968 Chomsky still assumed that the Derivational Theory of Complexity was in fact correct (Chomsky 1976a: 249–250).⁴ Some

³ For an approach where the parser is equated with UG, see Abney & Cole (1986: Section 3.4). For a performance-oriented variant of Minimalism, see Phillips (2003).

In Construction Grammar, the question of whether a distinction between competence and performance would be justified at all is controversially discussed (see Section 10.6.8.1.1). Fanselow, Schlesewsky, Cavar & Kliegl (1999) also suggest a model – albeit for different reasons – where grammatical properties considerably affect processing properties. The aforementioned authors work in the framework of Optimality Theory and show that the OT constraints that they assume can explain parsing preferences. OT is not a grammatical theory on its own but rather a meta theory. It is assumed that there is a component GEN that creates a set of candidates. A further component EVAL then chooses the most optimal candidate from this set of candidates. GEN contains a generative grammar of the kind that we have seen in this book. Normally, a GP/MP variant or also LFG is assumed as the base grammar. If one assumes a transformational theory, then one automatically has a problem with the Derivational Theory of Complexity that we will encounter in the following section. If one wishes to develop OT parsing models, then one has to make reference to representational variants of GB as the aforementioned authors seem to.

years later, however, most psycholinguists rejected the DTC. For discussion of several experiments that testify against the DTC, see Fodor, Bever & Garrett (1974: 320–328). One set of phenomena where the DTC makes incorrect predictions for respective analyses is that of elliptical constructions, for example (Fodor, Bever & Garrett 1974: 324): in elliptical constructions, particular parts of the utterance are left out or replaced by auxiliaries. In transformation-based approaches, it was assumed that (5b) is derived from (5a) by means of deletion of *swims* and (5c) is derived from (5b) by inserting *do*.

- (5) a. John swims faster than Bob swims.
- b. John swims faster than Bob.
- c. John swims faster than Bob does.

The DTC predicts that (5b) should require more time to process than (5a), since the analysis of (5b) first requires to build up the structure in (5a) and then delete *swims*. This prediction was not confirmed.

Similarly, no difference could be identified for the pairs in (6) and (7) even though one of the sentences, given the relevant theoretical assumptions, requires more transformations for the derivation from a base structure (Fodor, Bever & Garrett 1974: 324).

- (6) a. John phoned up the girl.
- b. John phoned the girl up.
- (7) a. The bus driver was nervous after the wreck.
- b. The bus driver was fired after the wreck.

In (6), we are dealing with local reordering of the particle and the object. (7b) contains a passive clause that should be derived from an active clause under Transformational Grammar assumptions. If we compare this sentence with an equally long sentence with an adjective, like (7a), the passive clause should be more difficult to process. This is, however, not the case.

It is necessary to add two qualifications to Sag & Wasow's claims: if one has experimental data that show that the DTC makes incorrect predictions for a particular analysis, this does not necessarily mean that the DTC has been disproved. One could also try to find a different analysis for the phenomenon in question. For example, instead of a transformation that deletes material, one could assume empty elements for the analysis

⁴ In the Transformational Grammar literature, transformations were later viewed as a metaphor (Lohnstein 2014: 170, also in Chomsky 2001: Footnote 4), that is, it was no longer assumed to have psycholinguistic reality. In *Derivation by phase* and *On phases*, Chomsky refers once again to processing aspects such as computational and memory load (Chomsky 2001: 11, 12, 15; 2007: 3, 12; 2008: 138, 145, 146, 155). See also Marantz (2005: 440) and Richards (2015).

A structure building operation that begins with words and is followed by transformations, as recently assumed by theories in the Minimalist Program, is psycholinguistically implausible for sentence parsing. See Labelle (2007) and Section 15.2 for more on incremental processing.

Chomsky (2007: 6) (written later than *On phases*) seems to adopt a constraint-based view. He writes that “a Merge-based system involves parallel operations” and compares the analysis of an utterance with a proof and explicitly mentions the competence/performance distinction.

of elliptical structures that are inserted directly into the structure without deleting any material (see page 63 for the assumption of an empty nominal head in structures with noun ellipsis in German). Data such as (5) would then be irrelevant to the discussion.⁵ However, reordering such as (6b) and the passive in (7b) are the kinds of phenomena that are typically explained using transformations.

The second qualification pertains to analyses for which there is a representational variant: it is often said that transformations are simply metaphors (Jackendoff 2000: 22–23; 2007: 5, 20): for example, we have seen that extractions with a transformational grammar yield structures that are similar to those assumed in HPSG. Figure 15.1 shows cyclic movement in GB theory compared to the corresponding HPSG analysis.




图 15.1: Cyclic movement vs. feature percolation

In GB, an element is moved to the specifier position of CP (SpecCP) and can then be moved from there to the next higher SpecCP position.

- (8) a. Chris_i , we think [$_{\text{CP } -i}$ Anna claims [$_{\text{CP } -i}$ that David saw $_{-i}$]]. (GB)
 b. Chris_i , we think [$_{\text{CP/NP}}$ Anna claims [$_{\text{CP/NP}}$ that David saw $_{-i}$]]. (HPSG)

In HPSG, the same effect is achieved by structure sharing. Information about a long-distance dependency is not located in the specifier node but rather in the mother node of the projection itself. In Section 19.2, I will discuss various ways of eliminating empty elements from grammars. If we apply these techniques to structures such as the GB structure in Figure 15.1, then we arrive at structures where information about missing elements is integrated into the mother node (CP) and the position in SpecCP is unfilled. This roughly corresponds to the HPSG structure in Figure 15.1.⁶ It follows from this that

⁵ Culicover & Jackendoff (2005: Chapters 1 and 7) argue in favor of analyzing ellipsis as a semantic or pragmatic phenomenon rather than a syntactic one anyway.

⁶ In Figure 15.1, additionally the unary branching of C' to CP was omitted in the tree on the right so that C combines directly with VP/NP to form CP/NP.

there are classes of phenomena that can be spoken about in terms of transformations without expecting empirical differences with regard to performance when compared to transformation-less approaches. However, it is important to note that we are dealing with an S-structure in the left-hand tree in Figure 15.1. As soon as one assumes that this is derived by moving constituents out of other structures, this equivalence of approaches disappears.

15.2 Incremental processing

The next important point mentioned by Sag & Wasow (2011) is the fact that both comprehension and production of language take places incrementally. As soon as we hear or read even the beginning of a word, we begin to assign meaning and to create structure. In the same way, we sometimes start talking before we have finished planning the entire utterance. This is shown by interruptions and self-correction in spontaneous speech (Clark & Wasow 1998; Clark & Fox Tree 2002). When it comes to processing spoken speech, Tanenhaus et al. (1996) have shown that we access a word as soon as we have heard a part of it (see also Marslen-Wilson 1975). The authors of the study carried out an experiment where participants were instructed to pick up particular objects on a grid and reorganize them. Using eye-tracking measurements, Tanenhaus and colleagues could then show that the participants could identify the object in question earlier if the sound sequence at the beginning of the word was unambiguous than in cases where the initial sounds occurred in multiple words. An example for this is a configuration with a candle and candy: *candy* and *candle* both begin with *can* such that speakers could not yet decide upon hearing this sequence which lexical entry should be accessed. Therefore, there was a slight delay in accessing the lexical entry when compared to words where the objects in question did not contain the same segment at the start of the word (Tanenhaus et al. 1995: 1633).

If complex noun phrases were used in the instructions (*Touch the starred yellow square*), the participants' gaze fell on the object in question 250ms after it was unambiguously identifiable. This means that if there was only a single object with stars on it, then they looked at it after they heard *starred*. In cases where there were starred yellow blocks as well as squares, they looked at the square only after they had processed the word *square* (Tanenhaus et al. 1995: 1632). The planning and execution of a gaze lasts 200ms. From this, one can conclude that hearers combine words directly and as soon as enough information is available, they create sufficient structure in order to capture the (potential) meaning of an expression and react accordingly. This finding is incompatible with models that assume that one must have heard a complete noun phrase or even a complete utterance of even more complexity before it is possible to conclude anything about the meaning of a phrase/utterance. In particular, analyses in the Minimalist Program which assume that only entire phrases or so-called phases⁷ are interpreted (see Chomsky 1999 and also Marantz 2005: 441, who explicitly contrasts the MP to Catego-

⁷ Usually, only CP and vP are assumed to be phases.

rial Grammar) must therefore be rejected as inadequate from a psycholinguistic perspective.^{8,9}

With contrastive emphasis of individual adjectives in complex noun phrases (e.g., *the BIG blue triangle*), hearers assumed that there must be a corresponding counterpart to the reference object, e.g., a small blue triangle. The eye-tracking studies carried out by Tanenhaus et al. (1996) have shown that taking this kind of information into account results in objects being identified more quickly.

Similarly, Arnold et al. (2004) have shown, also using eye-tracking studies, that hearers tend to direct their gaze to previously unmentioned objects if the interlocutor interrupts their speech with *um* or *uh*. This can be traced back to the assumption that hearers assume that describing previously unmentioned objects is more complex than referring to objects already under discussion. The speaker can create more time for himself by using *um* or *uh*.

Examples such as those above constitute evidence for approaches that assume that when processing language, information from all available channels is used and that this information is also used as soon as it is available and not only after the structure of the entire utterance or complete phrase has been constructed. The results of experimental research therefore show that the hypothesis of a strictly modular organization of linguistic knowledge must be rejected. Proponents of this hypothesis assume that the output of one module constitutes the input of another without a given module having access to the inner states of another module or the processes taking place inside it. For example, the morphology module could provide the input for syntax and then this would be processed later by the semantic module. One kind of evidence for this kind of organization of linguistic knowledge that is often cited are so-called *garden path sentences* such as (9):

- (9) a. The horse raced past the barn fell.
- b. The boat floated down the river sank.

The vast majority of English speakers struggle to process these sentences since their parser is led down a garden path as it builds up a complete structure for (10a) or (10b) only then to realize that there is another verb that cannot be integrated into this structure.

- (10) a. The horse raced past the barn.
- b. The boat floated down the river.

⁸ Sternefeld (2006: 729–730) points out that in theories in the Minimalist Program, the common assumption of uninterpretable features is entirely unjustified. Chomsky assumes that there are features that have to be deleted in the course of a derivation since they are only relevant for syntax. If they are not checked, the derivation crashes at the interface to semantics. It follows from this that NPs should not be interpretable under the assumptions of these theories since they contain a number of features that are irrelevant for the semantics and have to therefore be deleted (see Section 4.1.2 of this book and Richards 2015). As we have seen, these kinds of theories are incompatible with the facts.

⁹ It is sometimes claimed that current Minimalist theories are better suited to explain production (generation) than perception (parsing). But these models are as implausible for generation as they are for parsing. The reason is that it is assumed that there is a syntax component that generates structures that are then shipped to the interfaces. This is not what happens in generation though. Usually speakers know what they want to say (at least partly), that is, they start with semantics.

However, the actual structure of (9) contains a reduced relative clause (*raced past the barn* or *floated down the river*). That is the sentences in (9a) are semantically equivalent to the sentences in (11):

- (11) a. The horse that was raced past the barn fell.
b. The boat that was floated down the river sank.

The failure of the parser in these cases was explained by assuming that syntactic processing such as constructing a sentence from NP and VP take place independently of the processing of other constraints. As Crain & Steedman (1985) and others have shown, yet there are data that make this explanation seem less plausible: if (9a) is uttered in a relevant context, the parser is not misled. In (12), there are multiple horses under discussion and each NP is clearly identified by a relative clause. The hearer is therefore prepared for a relative clause and can process the reduced relative clause without being led down the garden path, so to speak.

- (12) The horse that they raced around the track held up fine. The horse that was raced down the road faltered a bit. And the horse raced past the barn fell.

By exchanging lexical material, it is also possible to modify (9a) in such way as to ensure that processing is unproblematic without having to add additional context. It is necessary to choose the material so that the interpretation of the noun as the subject of verb in the reduced relative clause is ruled out. Accordingly, *evidence* in (13) refers to an inanimate noun. It is therefore not a possible agent of *examined*. A hypothesis with *evidence* as the agent of *examined* is therefore never created when processing this sentence (Sag & Wasow 2011).

- (13) The evidence examined by the judge turned out to be unreliable.

Since processing proceeds incrementally, it is sometimes assumed that realistic grammars should be obliged to immediately assign a constituent structure to previously heard material (Ades & Steedman 1982; Hausser 1992). Proponents of this view would assume a structure for the following sentence where every word forms a constituent with the preceding material:

- (14) [Das britische Finanzministerium stellt dem angeschlagenen the British treasury provides the crippled Bankensystem des Landes mindestens 200 Milliarden Pfund zur banking.system of.the country at.least 200 billion pounds to Verfügung].
use
'The British Treasury is making at least 200 billion pounds available to the crippled banking system.'

Pulman (1985), Stabler (1991) and Shieber & Johnson (1993: 301–308) have shown, however, that it is possible to build semantic structures incrementally, using the kind of

phrase structure grammars we encountered in Chapter 2. This means that a partial semantic representation for the string *das britische* ‘the British’ can be computed without having to assume that the two words form a constituent in (14). Therefore, one does not necessarily need a grammar that licenses the immediate combination of words directly. Furthermore, Shieber & Johnson (1993) point out that from a purely technical point of view, synchronous processing is more costly than asynchronous processing since synchronous processing requires additional mechanisms for synchronization whereas asynchronous processing processes information as soon as it becomes available (p. 297–298). Shieber and Johnson do not clarify whether this also applies to synchronous/asynchronous processing of syntactic and semantic information. See Shieber & Johnson (1993) for incremental processing and for a comparison of Steedman’s Categorical Grammar and TAG.

What kind of conclusions can we draw from the data we have previously discussed? Are there further data that can help to determine the kinds of properties a theory of grammar should have in order to count as psycholinguistically plausible? Sag, Wasow & Bender (2003) and Sag & Wasow (2011, 2015) list the following properties that a performance-compatible competence grammar should have:¹⁰

- surface-oriented
- model-theoretic and therefore constraint-based
- sign-based organization
- strictly lexicalist
- representational underspecification of semantic information

Approaches such as CG, GPSG, LFG, HPSG, CxG and TAG are surface-oriented since they do not assume a base structure from which other structures are derived via transformations. Transformational approaches, however, require additional assumptions.¹¹ This will be briefly illustrated in what follows. In Section 3.1.5, we encountered the following analysis of English interrogatives:

¹⁰ Also, see Jackendoff (2007) for reflections on a performance model for a constraint-based, surface-oriented linguistic theory.

¹¹ An exception among transformational approaches is Phillips (2003). Phillips assumes that structures relevant for phenomena such as ellipsis, coordination and fronting are built up incrementally. These constituents are then reordered in later steps by transformations. For example, in the analysis of (i), the string *Wallace saw Gromit in* forms a constituent where *in* is dominated by a node with the label P(P). This node is then turned into a PP in a subsequent step (p. 43–44).

(i) Wallace saw Gromit in the kitchen.

While this approach is a transformation-based approach, the kind of transformation here is very idiosyncratic and incompatible with other variants of the theory. In particular, the modification of constituents contradicts the assumption of Structure Preservation when applying transformations as well as the *No Tampering Condition* of Chomsky (2008). Furthermore, the conditions under which an incomplete string such as *Wallace saw Gromit in* forms a constituent are not entirely clear.

(15) [_{CP} What_i [_{C'} will_k [_{IP} Ann [_{I'} _{-k} [_{VP} read _{-i}]]]]].

This structure is derived from (16a) by two transformations (two applications of Move- α):

- (16) a. Ann will read what?
b. * Will Ann read what

The first transformation creates the order in (16b) from (16a), and the second creates (15) from (16b).

When a hearer processes the sentence in (15), he begins to build structure as soon as he hears the first word. Transformations can, however, only be carried out when the entire utterance has been heard. One can, of course, assume that hearers process surface structures. However, since – as we have seen – they begin to access semantic knowledge early into an utterance, this begs the question of what we need a deep structure for at all.

In analyses such as those of (15), deep structure is superfluous since the relevant information can be reconstructed from the traces. Corresponding variants of GB have been proposed in the literature (see page 112). They are compatible with the requirement of being surface-oriented. Chomsky (1981a: 181; 1986a: 49) and Lasnik & Saito (1992: 59–60) propose analyses where traces can be deleted. In these analyses, the deep structure cannot be directly reconstructed from the surface structure and one requires transformations in order to relate the two. If we assume that transformations are applied ‘online’ during the analysis of utterances, then this would mean that the hearer would have to keep a structure derived from previously heard material as well as a list of possible transformations during processing in his working memory. In constraint-based grammars, entertaining hypotheses about potential upcoming transformation steps is not necessary since there is only a single surface structure that is processed directly. At present, it is still unclear whether it is actually possible to distinguish between these models empirically. But for Minimalist models with a large number of movements (see Figure 4.20 on page 135, for example), it should be clear that they are unrealistic since storage space is required to manage the hypotheses regarding such movements and we know that such short-term memory is very limited in humans.

Frazier & Clifton (1996: 27) assume that a transformation-based competence grammar yields a grammar with pre-compiled rules or rather templates that is then used for parsing. Therefore, theorems derived from UG are used for parsing and not axioms of UG directly. Johnson (1989) also suggests a parsing system that applies constraints from different sub-theories of GB as early as possible. This means that while he does assume the levels of representation D-Structure, S-Structure, LF and PF, he specifies the relevant constraints (\bar{X} theory, Theta-Theory, Case Theory, ...) as logical conditions that can be reorganized, then be evaluated in a different but logically equivalent order and be used for structure building.¹² Chomsky (2007: 6) also compares human parsing to working through a proof, where each step of the proof can be carried out in different orders.

¹² Stabler (1992: Section 15.7) also considers a constraint-based view, but arrives at the conclusion that parsing and other linguistic tasks should use the structural levels of the competence theory. This would again pose problems for the DTC.

This view does not assume the psychological reality of levels of grammatical representation when processing language, but simply assumes that principles and structures play a role when it comes to language acquisition. As we have seen, the question of whether we need UG to explain language acquisition was not yet decided in favor of UG-based approaches. Instead, all available evidence seems to point in the opposite direction. However, even if innate linguistic knowledge does exist, the question arises as to why one would want to represent this as several structures linked via transformations when it is clear that these do not play a role for humans (especially language learners) when processing language. Approaches that can represent this knowledge using fewer technical means, e.g., without transformations, are therefore preferable. For more on this point, see Kuhn (2007: 615).

The requirement for constraint-based grammars is supported by incremental processing and also by the ability to deduce what will follow from previously heard material. Stabler (1991) has pointed out that Steedman's argumentation with regard to incrementally processable grammars is incorrect, and instead argues for maintaining a modular view of grammar. Stabler has developed a constraint-based grammar where syntactic and semantic knowledge can be accessed at any time. He formulates both syntactic structures and the semantic representations attached to them as conjoined constraints and then presents a processing system that processes structures based on the availability of parts of syntactic and semantic knowledge. Stabler rejects models of performance that assume that one must first apply all syntactic constraints before the semantic ones can be applied. If one abandons this strict view of modularity, then we arrive at something like (17):

$$(17) \quad (\text{Syn}_1 \wedge \text{Syn}_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \text{Syn}_n) \wedge (\text{Sem}_1 \wedge \text{Sem}_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \text{Sem}_n)$$

Syn_1 – Syn_n stand for syntactic rules or constraints and Sem_1 – Sem_n stand for semantic rules or constraints. If one so desires, the expressions in brackets can be referred to as modules. Since it is possible to randomly reorder conjoined expressions, one can imagine performance models that first apply some rules from the syntax module and then, when enough information is present, respective rules from the semantic module. The order of processing could therefore be as in (18), for example:

$$(18) \quad \text{Syn}_2 \wedge \text{Sem}_1 \wedge \text{Syn}_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \text{Syn}_n \wedge \text{Sem}_2 \wedge \dots \wedge \text{Sem}_n$$

If one subscribes to this view of modularity, then theories such as HPSG or CxG also have a modular structure. In the representation assumed in the HPSG variant of Pollard & Sag (1987) and Sign-Based CxG (see Section 10.6.2), the value of *SYN* would correspond to the syntax module, the value of *SEM* to the semantic module and the value of *PHON* to the phonology module. If one were to remove the respective other parts of the lexical entries/dominance schemata, then one would be left with the part of the theory corresponding exactly to the level of representation in question.¹³ Jackendoff (2000) argues

¹³ In current theories in the Minimalist Program, an increasing amount of morphological, syntactic, semantic and information-structural information is being included in analyses (see Section 4.6.1). While there are

for this form of modularity with the relevant interfaces between the modules for phonology, syntax, semantics and further modules from other areas of cognition. Exactly what there is to be gained from assuming these modules and how these could be proved empirically remains somewhat unclear to me. For skepticism with regard to the very concept of modules, see Jackendoff (2000: 22,27). For more on interfaces and modularization in theories such as LFG and HPSG, see Kuhn (2007).

Furthermore, Sag & Wasow (2015: 53–54) argue that listeners often leave semantic interpretation underspecified until enough information is present either in the utterance itself or the context. They do not commit to a certain reading early and run into garden paths or backtrack to other readings. This is modeled appropriately by theories that use a variant of underspecified semantics. For a concrete example of underspecification in semantics see Section 19.3.

In conclusion, we can say that surface-oriented, model-theoretic and strongly lexicalist grammatical theories such as CG, LFG, GPSG, HPSG, CxG and the corresponding GB/MP variants (paired with appropriate semantic representations) can plausibly be combined with processing models, while this is not the case for the overwhelming majority of GB/MP theories.

suggestions for using feature-value pairs (Sauerland & Elbourne 2002: 290–291), a strict structuring of information as in GPSG, LFG, HPSG, CxG and variants of CG and TAG is not present. This means that there are the levels for syntax, Phonological Form and Logical Form, but the information relevant for these levels is an unstructured part of syntax, smeared all over syntactic trees.

第十六章 Language acquisition

Linguists and philosophers are fascinated by the human ability to acquire language. Assuming the relevant input during childhood, language acquisition normally takes place completely effortlessly. Chomsky (1965: 24–25) put forward the requirement that a grammatical theory must provide a plausible model of language acquisition. Only then could it actually explain anything and would otherwise remain descriptive at best. In this section, we will discuss theories of acquisition from a number of theoretical standpoints.

16.1 Principles & Parameters

A very influential explanation of language acquisition is Chomsky's Principles & Parameters model (1981a). Chomsky assumes that there is an innate Universal Grammar that contains knowledge that is equally relevant for all languages. Languages can then vary in particular ways. For every difference between languages in the area of core grammar, there is a feature with a specific value. Normally, the value of a parameter is binary, that is, the value is either '+' or '-'. Depending on the setting of a parameter, a language will have certain properties, that is, setting a parameter determines whether a language belongs to a particular class of languages. Parameters are assumed to influence multiple properties of a grammar simultaneously (Chomsky 1981a: 6). For example, Rizzi (1986) claims that the pro-drop parameter affects whether referential subjects can be omitted, the absence of expletives, subject extraction from clauses with complementizers (*that*-t contexts) and interrogatives and finally the possibility of realizing the subject postverbally in VO-languages (see Chomsky 1981a: Section 4.3; Meisel 1995: 12). It has been noted that there are counter-examples to all the correlations assumed.¹ Another example of a parameter is the Head Directionality Parameter discussed in Section 13.1.1. As was shown, there are languages where heads govern in different directions. In his overview article, Haider (2001) still mentions the parametrized Subjacency Principle but

¹ See Haider (1994) and Haider (2001: Section 2.2) for an overview. Haider assumes that there is at least a correlation between the absence of expletive subjects and pro-drop. However, Galician is a pro-drop language with expletive subject pronouns (Raposo & Uriagereka 1990: Section 2.5). Franks (1995: 314) cites Upper and Lower Sorbian as pro-drop languages with expletive subjects. Scholz & Pullum (2002: 218) point out that there is an expletive pronoun *ci* in modern Italian although Italian is classed as a pro-drop language.

notes that subadjacency is no longer assumed as a principle in newer versions of the theory (see Section 13.1.5.2 for more on subadjacency).

Snyder (2001) discovered a correlation of various phenomena with productive root compounding as it is manifested for instance in compounding of two nouns. He argues that the acquisition of complex predicate formation is connected to the acquisition of compound structures and that there is a parameter that is responsible for this type of compounding and simultaneously for the following set of phenomena:

- | | |
|--|---------------------------|
| (1) a. John painted the house red. | (resultative) |
| b. Mary picked the book up/picked up the book. | (verb-particle) |
| c. Fred made Jeff leave. | (<i>make</i> -causative) |
| d. Fred saw Jeff leave. | (perceptual report) |
| e. Bob put the book on the table. | (<i>put</i> -locative) |
| f. Alice sent the letter to Sue. | (<i>to</i> -dative) |
| g. Alice sent Sue the letter. | (double-object dative) |

Snyder examined languages from various language groups: Afroasiatic, Austroasiatic, Austronesian, Finno-Ugric, Indo-European (Germanic, Romance, Slavic), Japanese-Korean, Niger-Kordofanian (Bantu), and Sino-Tibetan, as well as American Sign Language and the language isolate Basque. The languages that were examined either had all of these phenomena or none. This was tested with native speakers of the respective languages. In addition the claim that these phenomena are acquired once noun-noun compounds are used productively was tested for English using CHILDES data. The result was positive with the exception of the double object construction, for which an explanation was provided. The correlation of the phenomena in (1) is interesting and was interpreted as proof of the existence of a parameter that correlates several phenomena in a language. However, Son (2007) and Son & Svenonius (2008) showed that Snyder's claims for Japanese were wrong and that there are further languages like Korean, Hebrew, Czech, Malayalam, Javanese in which some of the phenomena show no correlations.

Gibson & Wexler (1994) discuss the acquisition of constituent order and assume three parameters that concern the position of the verb relative to the subject (SV vs. VS) and relative to the object (VO vs. OV) as well as the V2-property. There is no consensus in the literature about which parameters determine the make-up of languages (see Newmeyer 2005: Section 3.2 and Haspelmath 2008 for an overview and critical discussion). Fodor (1998a: 346–347) assumes that there are 20 to 30 parameters, Gibson & Wexler (1994: 408) mention the number 40, Baker (2003: 349) talks of 10 to 20 and Roberts & Holmberg (2005: 541) of 50 to 100. There is no consensus in the literature as to which parameters one should assume, how they interact and what they predict. However, it is nevertheless possible to contemplate how a grammar of an individual language could be derived from a UG with parameters that need to be set. Chomsky's original idea (1986b: Section 3.5.1) was that the child sets the value of a parameter based on the language input as soon as the relevant evidence is present from the input (see also Gibson & Wexler 1994; Nowak, Komarova & Niyogi 2001). At a given point in time, the learner has a grammar with certain parameter settings that correspond to the input seen so far.

In order to fully acquire a grammar, all parameters must be assigned a value. In theory, thirty utterances should be enough to acquire a grammar with thirty parameters if these utterances provide unambiguous evidence for a particular parameter value.

This approach has often been criticized. If setting a parameter leads to a learner using a different grammar, one would expect sudden changes in linguistic behavior. This is, however, not the case (Bloom 1993: 731). Fodor (1998a: 343–344) also notes the following three problems: 1) Parameters can affect things that are not visible from the perceptible constituent order. 2) Many sentences are ambiguous with regard to the setting of a particular parameter, that is, there are sometimes multiple combinations of parameters compatible with one utterance. Therefore, the respective utterances cannot be used to set any parameters (Berwick & Niyogi 1996; Fodor 1998b). 3) There is a problem with the interaction of parameters. Normally multiple parameters play a role in an utterance such that it can be difficult to determine which parameter contributes what and thus how the values should be determined.

Points 1) and 2) can be explained using the constituent order parameters of Gibson & Wexler: imagine a child hears sentences such as the English and the German examples in (2):

- (2) a. Daddy drinks juice.
 b. Papa trinkt Saft.
 daddy drinks juice

These sentences look exactly the same, even though radically different structures are assumed for each. According to the theories under discussion, the English sentence has the structure shown in Figure 3.8 on page 91 given in abbreviated form in (3a). The German sentence, on the other hand, has the structure in Figure 3.13 on page 98 corresponding to (3b):

- (3) a. [_{IP} [Daddy [_{I'} _{-k} [_{VP} drinks_k juice]]]].
 b. [_{CP} Papa_i [_{C'} trinkt_k [_{IP} _{-i} [_{I'} [_{VP} Saft _{-k}] _{-k}]]]].

English has the basic constituent order SVO. The verb forms a constituent with the object (VP) and this is combined with the subject. The parameter setting must therefore be SV, VO and –V2. German, on the other hand, is analyzed as a verb-final and verb-second language and the parameter values would therefore have to be SV, OV and +V2. If we consider the sentences in (2), we see that both sentences do not differ from one another with regard to the order of the verb and its arguments.

Fodor (1998a,b) concludes from this that one first has to build a structure in order to see what grammatical class the grammar licensing the structure belongs to since one first needs the structure in (3b) in order to be able to see that the verb in the partial constituent occurs after its argument in the VP (Saft _{-k}). The question is now how one achieves this structure. A UG with 30 parameters corresponds to $2^{30} = 1,073,741,824$ fully instantiated grammars. It is an unrealistic assumption that children try out these grammars successively or simultaneously.

Gibson & Wexler (1994) discuss a number of solutions for this problem: parameters have a default value and the learner can only change a parameter value if a sentence that could previously not be analyzed can then be analyzed with the new parameter

setting (*Greediness Constraint*). In this kind of procedure, only one parameter can be changed at a time (*Single Value Constraint*), which aims at ruling out great leaps leading to extremely different grammars (see Berwick & Niyogi 1996: 612–613, however). This reduces the processing demands, however with 40 parameters, the worst case could still be that one has to test 40 parameter values separately, that is, try to parse a sentence with 40 different grammars. This processing feat is still unrealistic, which is why Gibson & Wexler (1994: 442) additionally assume that one hypothesis is tested per input sentence. A further modification of the model is the assumption that certain parameters only begin to play a role during the maturation of the child. At a given point in time, there could be only a few accessible parameters that also need to be set. After setting these parameters, new parameters could become available.

In their article, Gibson & Wexler show that the interaction between input and parameter setting is in no way trivial. In their example scenario with three parameters, a situation can arise in which a learner sets a parameter in order to analyze a new sentence, however setting this parameter leads to the fact that the target grammar cannot be acquired because only one value can be changed at a time and changes can only be made if more sentences can be analyzed than before. The learner reaches a so-called local maximum in these problematic cases.² Gibson & Wexler then suggest assigning a default value to particular parameters, whereby the default value is the one that will cause the learner to avoid problematic situations. For the V2 parameter, they assume ‘–’ as the default value.

Berwick & Niyogi (1996) show that Gibson & Wexler calculated the problematic conditions incorrectly and that, if one shares their assumptions, it is even more frequently possible to arrive at parameter combinations from which it is not possible to reach the target grammar by changing individual parameter values. They show that one of the problematic cases not addressed by Gibson & Wexler is –V2 (p. 609) and that the assumption of a default value for a parameter does not solve the problem as both ‘+’ and ‘–’ can lead to problematic combinations of parameters.³ In their article, Berwick and Niyogi show that learners in the example scenario above (with three parameters) learn the target grammar faster if one abandons the Greediness or else the Single Value Constraint. They suggest a process that simply randomly changes one parameter if a sentence cannot be analyzed (*Random Step*, p. 615–616). The authors note that this approach does not share the problems with the local maxima that Gibson & Wexler had in their example and that it also reaches its goal faster than theirs. However, the fact that *Random Step* converges more quickly has to do with the quality of the parameter space (p. 618). Since there is no consensus about parameters in the literature, it is not possible to assess how the entire system works.

Yang (2004: 453) has criticized the classic Principles & Parameters model since abrupt switching between grammars after setting a parameter cannot be observed. In-

² If one imagines the acquisition process as climbing a hill, then the Greediness Constraint ensures that one can only go uphill. It could be the case, however, that one begins to climb the wrong hill and can no longer get back down.

³ Kohl (1999, 2000) has investigated this acquisition model in a case with twelve parameters. Of the 4096 possible grammars, 2336 (57%) are unlearnable if one assumes the best initial values for the parameters.

stead, he proposes the following learning mechanism:

- (4) For an input sentence, s , the child: (i) with probability P_i selects a grammar G_i , (ii) analyzes s with G_i , (iii) if successful, reward G_i by increasing P_i , otherwise punish G_i by decreasing P_i .

Yang discusses the example of the pro-drop and topic drop parameters. In pro-drop languages (e.g., Italian), it is possible to omit the subject and in topic drop languages (e.g., Mandarin Chinese), it is possible to omit both the subject and the object if it is a topic. Yang compares English-speaking and Chinese-speaking children noting that English children omit both subjects and objects in an early linguistic stage. He claims that the reason for this is that English-speaking children start off using the Chinese grammar.

The pro-drop parameter is one of the most widely discussed parameters in the context of Principles & Parameters theory and it will therefore be discussed in more detail here. It is assumed that speakers of English have to learn that all sentences in English require a subject, whereas speakers of Italian learn that subjects can be omitted. One can observe that children learning both English and Italian omit subjects (German children too in fact). Objects are also omitted notably more often than subjects. There are two possible explanations for this: a competence-based one and a performance-based one. In competence-based approaches, it is assumed that children use a grammar that allows them to omit subjects and then only later acquire the correct grammar (by setting parameters or increasing the rule apparatus). In performance-based approaches, by contrast, the omission of subjects is traced back to the fact that children are not yet capable of planning and producing long utterances due to their limited brain capacity. Since the cognitive demands are greatest at the beginning of an utterance, this leads to subjects being increasingly left out. Valian (1991) investigated these various hypotheses and showed that the frequency with which children learning English and Italian respectively omit subjects is not the same. Subjects are omitted more often than objects. She therefore concludes that competence-based explanations are not empirically adequate. The omission of subjects should then be viewed more as a performance phenomenon (see also Bloom 1993). Another argument for the influence of performance factors is the fact that articles of subjects are left out more often than articles of objects (31% vs. 18%, see Gerken 1991: 440). As Bloom notes, no subject article-drop parameter has been proposed so far. If we explain this phenomenon as a performance phenomenon, then it is also plausible to assume that the omission of complete subjects is due to performance issues.

Gerken (1991) shows that the metrical properties of utterances also play a role: in experiments where children had to repeat sentences, they omitted the subject/article of the subject more often than the object/article of the object. Here, it made a difference whether the intonation pattern was iambic (weak-strong) or trochaic (strong-weak). It can even be observed with individual words that children leave out weak syllables at the beginning of words more often than at the end of the word. Thus, it is more probable that “giRAFFE” is reduced to “RAFFE” than “MONkey” to “MON”. Gerken assumes the following for the metrical structure of utterances:

1. A metrical foot contains one and only one strong syllable.
2. Create maximally binary left-to-right feet.
3. Metrical structure is independent of syntactic structure.

Subject pronouns in English are sentence-initial and form a iambic foot with the following strongly emphasized verb as in (5a). Object pronouns, however, can form the weak syllable of a trochaic foot as in (5b).

- (5) a. she KISSED + the DOG
 b. the DOG + KISSED her
 c. PETE + KISSED the + DOG

Furthermore, articles in iambic feet as in the object of (5a) and the subject of (5b) are omitted more often than in trochaic feet such as with the object of (5c).

It follows from this that there are multiple factors that influence the omission of elements and that one cannot simply take the behavior of children as evidence for switching between two grammars.

Apart from what has been discussed so far, the pro-drop parameter is of interest for another reason: there is a problem when it comes to setting parameters. The standard explanation is that learners identify that a subject must occur in all English sentences, which is suggested by the appearance of expletive pronouns in the input.

As discussed on page 507, there is no relation between the pro-drop property and the presence of expletives in a language. Since the pro-drop property does not correlate with any of the other putative properties either, only the existence of subject-less sentences in the input constitutes decisive evidence for setting a parameter. The problem is that there are grammatical utterances where there is no visible subject. Examples of this are imperatives such as (6), declaratives with a dropped subject as in (7a) and even declarative sentences without an expletive such as the example in (7b) found by Valian (1991: 32) in the New York Times.

- (6) a. Give me the teddy bear!
 b. Show me your toy!
- (7) a. She'll be a big hit. Sings like a dream.
 b. Seems like she always has something twin-related perking.

The following title of a Nirvana song also comes from the same year as Valian's article:

- (8) Smells like Teen Spirit.

Teen Spirit refers to a deodorant and *smell* is a verb that, both in German and English, requires a referential subject but can also be used with an expletive *it* as subject. The usage that Kurt Cobain had in mind cannot be reconstructed⁴, independent of the intended

⁴ See http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Smells_Like_Teen_Spirit. 06.03.2016.

meaning, however, the subject in (8) is missing. Imperatives do occur in the input children have and are therefore relevant for acquisition. Valian (1991: 33) says the following about them:

What is acceptable in the adult community forms part of the child's input, and is also part of what children must master. The utterances that I have termed "acceptable" are not grammatical in English (since English does not have pro subjects, and also cannot be characterized as a simple VP). They lack subjects and therefore violate the extended projection principle (Chomsky 1981a), which we are assuming.

Children are exposed to fully grammatical utterances without subjects, in the form of imperatives. They are also exposed to acceptable utterances which are not fully grammatical, such as [(7a)], as well as forms like, "Want lunch now?" The American child must grow into an adult who not only knows that overt subjects are grammatically required, but also knows when subjects can acceptably be omitted. The child must not only acquire the correct grammar, but also master the discourse conditions that allow relaxation of the grammar. (Valian 1991: 33)

This passage turns the relations on their head: we cannot conclude from the fact that a particular grammatical theory is not compatible with certain data, that these data should not be described by this theory, instead we should modify the incompatible grammar or, if this is not possible, we should reject it. Since utterances with imperatives are entirely regular, there is no reason to categorize them as utterances that do not follow grammatical rules. The quotation above represents a situation where a learner has to acquire two grammars: one that corresponds to the innate grammar and a second that partially suppresses the rules of innate grammar and also adds some additional rules.

The question we can pose at this point is: how does a child distinguish which of the data it hears are relevant for which of the two grammars?

Fodor (1998a: 347) pursues a different analysis that does not suffer from many of the aforementioned problems. Rather than assuming that learners try to find a correct grammar among a billion others, she instead assumes that children work with a single grammar that contains all possibilities. She suggests using parts of trees (*treelets*) rather than parameters. These treelets can also be underspecified and in extreme cases, a treelet can consist of a single feature (Fodor 1998b: 6). A language learner can deduce whether a language has a given property from the usage of a particular treelet. As an example, she provides a VP treelet consisting of a verb and a prepositional phrase. This treelet must be used for the analysis of the VP occurring in *Look at the frog*. Similarly, the analysis of an interrogative clause with a fronted *who* would make use of a treelet with a *wh*-NP in the specifier of a complementizer phrase (see Figure 3.7 on page 91). In Fodor's version of Principles and Parameters Theory, this treelet would be the parameter that licenses *wh*-movement in (overt) syntax. Fodor assumes that there are defaults that allow a learner to parse a sentence even when no or very few parameters have been set. This allows one to learn from utterances that one would have not otherwise been able to use since there would have been multiple possible analyses for them. Assuming a default can lead to misanalyses, however: due to a default value, a second parameter could be set

because an utterance was analyzed with a treelet t_1 and t_3 , for example, but t_1 was not suited to the particular language in question and the utterance should have instead been analyzed with the non-default treelet t_2 and the treelet t_{17} . In this acquisition model, there must therefore be the possibility to correct wrong decisions in the parameter setting process. Fodor therefore assumes that there is a frequency-based degree of activation for parameters (p. 365): treelets that are often used in analyses have a high degree of activation, whereas those used less often have a lower degree of activation. In this way, it is not necessary to assume a particular parameter value while excluding others.

Furthermore, Fodor proposes that parameters should be structured hierarchically, that is, only if a parameter has a particular value does it then make sense to think about specific other parameter values.

Fodor's analysis is – as she herself notes (Fodor 2001: 385) – compatible with theories such as HPSG and TAG. Pollard & Sag (1987: 147) characterize UG as the conjunction of all universally applicable principles:

$$(9) \quad \text{UG} = P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge \dots \wedge P_n$$

As well as principles that hold universally, there are other principles that are specific to a particular language or a class of languages. Pollard & Sag give the example of the constituent ordering principle that only holds for English. English can be characterized as follows if one assumes that P_{n+1} – P_m are language-specific principles, L_1 – L_p a complete list of lexical entries and R_1 – R_q a list of dominance schemata relevant for English.

$$(10) \quad \text{English} = P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge \dots \wedge P_m \wedge (L_1 \vee \dots \vee L_p \vee R_1 \vee \dots \vee R_q)$$

In Pollard & Sag's conception, only those properties of language that equally hold for all languages are part of UG. Pollard & Sag do not count the dominance schemata as part of this. However, one can indeed also describe UG as follows:

$$(11) \quad \text{UG} = P_1 \wedge P_2 \wedge \dots \wedge P_n \wedge (R_{\text{en-1}} \vee \dots \vee R_{\text{en-q}} \vee R_{\text{de-1}} \vee \dots \vee R_{\text{de-r}} \vee \dots)$$

P_1 – P_n are, as before, universally applicable principles and $R_{\text{en-1}}$ – $R_{\text{en-q}}$ are the (core) dominance schemata of English and $R_{\text{de-1}}$ – $R_{\text{de-r}}$ are the dominance schemata in German. The dominance schemata in (11) are combined by means of disjunctions, that is, not every disjunct needs to have a realization in a specific language. Principles can make reference to particular properties of lexical entries and rule out certain phrasal configurations. If a language only contains heads that are marked for final-position in the lexicon, then grammatical rules that require a head in initial position as their daughter can never be combined with these heads or their projections. Furthermore, theories with a type system are compatible with Fodor's approach to language acquisition because constraints can easily be underspecified. As such, constraints in UG do not have to make reference to all properties of grammatical rules: principles can refer to feature values, the language-specific values themselves do not have to already be contained in UG. Similarly, a supertype describing multiple dominance schemata that have similar but language-specific instantiations can also be part of UG, however the language-specific details remain open and are then deduced by the learner upon parsing (see Ackerman & Webelhuth 1998: Section 9.2). The differences in activation assumed by Fodor can be captured by

weighting the constraints: the dominance schemata R_{en-1} – R_{en-q} etc. are sets of feature-value pairs as well as path equations. As explained in Chapter 15, weights can be added to such constraints and also to sets of constraints. In Fodor’s acquisition model, given a German input, the weights for the rules of English would be reduced and those for the German rules would be increased. Note that in Pollard & Sag’s acquisition scenario, there are no triggers for parameter setting unlike in Fodor’s model. Furthermore, properties that were previously disjunctively specified as part of UG will now be acquired directly. Using the treelet t_{17} (or rather a possibly underspecified dominance schema), it is not the case that the value ‘+’ is set for a parameter P_5 but rather the activation potential of t_{17} is increased such that t_{17} will be prioritized for future analyses.

16.2 Principles and the lexicon

A variant of the UG-driven theory of language acquisition would be to assume that principles are so general that they hold for all languages and individual languages simply differ with regard to their lexicon. Principles then refer to properties of combined entities. Parameters therefore migrate from principles into the lexicon (Chomsky 1999: 2). See Mensching & Remberger (2011) for a study of Romance languages in this model and Son & Svenonius (2008: 395) for an analysis of Snyder’s examples that were discussed in the previous subsection.

At this point, one can observe an interesting convergence in these approaches: most of the theories discussed here assume a very general structure for the combination of heads with their arguments. For example, in Categorical Grammar and the Minimalist Program, these are always binary functor-argument combinations. The way in which constituents can be ordered in a particular language depends on the lexical properties of the combined elements.

The question that is being discussed controversially at present is whether the spectrum of lexical properties is determined by UG (Chomsky 2007: 6–7) and whether all areas of the language can be described with the same general combinatorial possibilities (see Section 21.10 on phrasal constructions).

In Section 16.1, I have shown what theories of acquisition assuming innate language specific knowledge can look like and also that variants of such acquisition theories are compatible with all the theories of grammar we have discussed. During this discussion, one should bear in mind the question of whether it makes sense at all to assume that English children use parts of a Chinese grammar during some stages of their acquisition process (as suggested by Yang 2004: 453), or whether the relevant phenomena can be explained in different ways. In the following, I will present some alternative approaches that do not presuppose innate language specific knowledge, but instead assume that language can simply be acquired from the input. The following section will deal with pattern-based approaches and Section 16.4 will discuss the lexically-oriented variant of input-based language acquisition.

16.3 Pattern-based approaches

Chomsky (1981a: 7–8) proposed that languages can be divided into a core area and a periphery. The core contains all regular aspects of language. The core grammar of a language is seen as an instantiation of UG. Idioms and other irregular parts of language are then part of the periphery. Critics of the Principles & Parameters model have pointed out that idiomatic and irregular constructions constitute a relatively large part of our language and that the distinction, both fluid and somewhat arbitrary, is only motivated theory-internally (Jackendoff 1997: Chapter 7; Culicover 1999; Ginzburg & Sag 2000: 5; Newmeyer 2005: 48; Kuhn 2007: 619). For example, it is possible to note that there are interactions between various idioms and syntax (Nunberg, Sag & Wasow 1994). Most idioms in German with a verbal component allow the verb to be moved to initial position (12b), some allow that parts of idioms can be fronted (12c) and some can undergo passivization (12d).

- (12) a. dass er ihm den Garaus macht
that he him the GARAUS makes
'that he finishes him off (kills him)'
- b. Er macht ihm den Garaus.
he makes him the GARAUS
'He finishes him off.'
- c. In Amerika sagte man der Kamera nach, die größte Kleinbildkamera der Welt zu sein. Sie war laut Schleiffer am Ende der Sargnagel der Mühlheimer Kam-
eraproduktion.
Den Garaus machte ihr die Diskussion um die Standardisierung des
the GARAUS made her the discussion around the standardization of the
16-Millimeter-Filmformats, an dessen Ende die DIN-Norm 19022 (Patrone
16-millimeter-film.format at whose end the DIN-norm 19022 cartridge
mit Spule für 16-Millimeter-Film) stand, die im März 1963 zur Norm
with coil for 16-millimeter-film stood that in March 1963 to the norm
wurde.⁵
became
'In America, one says that this camera was the biggest compact camera in the
world. According to Schleiffer, it was the last nail in the coffin for camera pro-
duction in Mühlheim. What finished it off was the discussion about standardiz-
ing the 16 millimeter format, which resulted in the DIN-Norm 19022 (cartridge
with coil for 16 millimeter film) that became the norm in March 1963.'
- d. in Heidelberg wird „parasitären Elementen“ unter den Professoren *der*
in Heidelberg are parasitic elements among the professors the
*Garaus gemacht*⁶
GARAUS made
'In Heidelberg, "parasitic elements" among professors are being killed off.'

⁵ Frankfurter Rundschau, 28.06.1997, p. 2.

⁶ Mannheimer Morgen, 28.06.1999, Sport; Schrauben allein genügen nicht.

It is assumed that the periphery and lexicon are not components of UG (Chomsky 1986b: 150–151; Fodor 1998a: 343) but rather are acquired using other learning methods – namely inductively directly from the input. The question posed by critics is now why these methods should not work for regular aspects of the language as well (Abney 1996: 20; Goldberg 2003a: 222; Newmeyer 2005: 100; Tomasello 2006c: 36; 2006b: 20): the areas of the so-called ‘core’ are by definition more regular than components of the periphery, which is why they should be easier to learn.

Tomasello (2000, 2003) has pointed out that a Principles & Parameters model of language acquisition is not compatible with the observable facts. The Principles and Parameters Theory predicts that children should no longer make mistakes in a particular area of grammar once they have set a particular parameter correctly (see Chomsky 1986b: 146, Radford 1990: 21–22 and Lightfoot 1997: 175). Furthermore, it is assumed that a parameter is responsible for very different areas of grammar (see the discussion of the pro-drop parameter in Section 16.1). When a parameter value is set, then there should be sudden developments with regard to a number of phenomena (Lightfoot 1997: 174). This is, however, not the case. Instead, children acquire language from utterances in their input and begin to generalize from a certain age. Depending on the input, they can reorder certain auxiliaries and not others, although movement of auxiliaries is obligatory in English.⁷ One argument put forward against these kinds of input-based theories is that children produce utterances that cannot be observed to a significant frequency in the input. One much discussed phenomenon of this kind are so called *root infinitives* (RI) or *optional infinitives* (OI) (Wexler 1998). These are infinitive forms that can be used in non-embedded clauses (*root sentences*) instead of a finite verb. Optional infinitives are those where children use both a finite (13a) and non-finite (13b) form (Wexler 1998: 59):

- (13) a. Mary likes ice cream.
b. Mary like ice cream.

Wijnen, Kempen & Gillis (2001: 656) showed that Dutch children use the order object infinitive 90 % of the time during the two-word phase although these orders occur in less than 10 % of their mother’s utterances that contained a verb. Compound verb forms, e.g., with a modal in initial position as in (14) that contain another instance of this pattern only occurred in 30 % of the input containing a verb (Wijnen, Kempen & Gillis 2001: 647).

- (14) Willst du Brei essen?
want you porridge eat
‘Do you want to eat porridge?’

At first glance, there seems to be a discrepancy between the input and the child’s utterances. However, this deviation could also be explained by an utterance-final bias in learning (Wijnen et al. 2001; Freudenthal, Pine & Gobet 2006). A number of factors can be made responsible for the salience of verbs at the end of an utterance: 1) restrictions of the infant brain. It has been shown that humans (both children and adults) forget words

⁷ Here, Yang’s suggestion to combine grammars with a particular probability does not help since one would have to assume that the child uses different grammars for different auxiliaries, which is highly unlikely.

during the course of an utterance, that is, the activation potential decreases. Since the cognitive capabilities of small children are restricted, it is clear why elements at the end of an utterance have an important status. 2) Easier segmentation at the end of an utterance. At the end of an utterance, part of the segmentation problem for hearers disappears: the hearer first has to divide a sequence of phonemes into individual words before he can understand them and combine them to create larger syntactic entities. This segmentation is easier at the end of an utterance since the word boundary is already given by the end of the utterance. Furthermore according to Wijnen, Kempen & Gillis (2001: 637), utterance-final words have an above average length and do bear a pitch accent. This effect occurs more often in language directed at children.

Freudenthal, Pine, Aguado-Orea & Gobet (2007) have modeled language acquisition for English, German, Dutch, and Spanish. The computer model could reproduce differences between these languages based on input. At first glance, it is surprising that there are even differences between German and Dutch and between English and Spanish with regard to the use of infinitives as German and Dutch have a very similar syntax (SOV+V2). Similarly, English and Spanish are both languages with SVO order. Nevertheless, children learning English make OI mistakes, whereas this is hardly ever the case for children learning Spanish.

Freudenthal, Pine, Aguado-Orea & Gobet (2007) trace the differences in error frequencies back to the distributional differences in each language: the authors note that 75 % of verb-final utterances⁸ in English consist of compound verbs (finite verb + dependent verb, e.g., *Can he go?*), whereas this is only the case 30 % of the time in Dutch.

German also differs from Dutch with regard to the number of utterance-final infinitives. Dutch has a progressive form that does not exist in Standard German:

- (15) Wat ben je aan het doen?
 what are you on it do.INF
 ‘What are you doing?’

Furthermore, verbs such as *zitten* ‘to sit’, *lopen* ‘to run’ and *staan* ‘to stand’ can be used in conjunction with the infinitive to describe events happening in that moment:

- (16) Zit je te spelen?
 sit you to play
 ‘Are you sitting and playing?’

Furthermore, there is a future form in Dutch that is formed with *ga* ‘go’. These factors contribute to the fact that Dutch has 20 % more utterance-final infinitives than German.

Spanish differs from English in that it has object clitics:

- (17) (Yo) Lo quiero.
 I it want
 ‘I want it.’

⁸ For English, the authors only count utterances with a subject in third person singular since it is only in these cases that a morphological difference between the finite and infinitive form becomes clear.

Short pronouns such as *lo* in (17) are realized in front of the finite verb so that the verb appears in final position. In English, the object follows the verb, however. Furthermore, there are a greater number of compound verb forms in the English input (70 %) than in Spanish (25 %). This is due to the higher frequency of the progressive in English and the presence of *do*-support in question formation.

The relevant differences in the distribution of infinitives are captured correctly by the proposed acquisition model, whereas alternative approaches that assume that children possess an adult grammar but use infinitives instead of the finite forms cannot explain the gradual nature of this phenomenon.

Freudenthal, Pine & Gobet (2009) could even show that input-based learning is superior to other explanations for the distribution of NPs and infinitives. They can explain why this order is often used with a modal meaning (e.g., *to want*) in German and Dutch (Ingram & Thompson 1996). In these languages, infinitives occur with modal verbs in the corresponding interrogative clauses. Alternative approaches that assume that the linguistic structures in question correspond to those of adults and only differ from them in that a modal verb is not pronounced cannot explain why not all utterances of object and verb done by children learning German and Dutch do have a modal meaning. Furthermore, the main difference to English cannot be accounted for: in English, the number of modal meanings is considerably less. Input-based models predict this exactly since English can use the dummy verb *do* to form questions:

- (18) a. Did he help you?
b. Can he help you?

If larger entities are acquired from the end of an utterance, then there would be both a modal and non-modal context for *he help you*. Since German and Dutch normally do not use the auxiliary *tun* 'do', the relevant endings of utterances are always associated with modals contexts. One can thereby explain why infinitival expressions have a modal meaning significantly more often in German and Dutch than in English.

Following this discussion of the arguments against input-based theories of acquisition, I will turn to Tomasello's pattern-based approach. According to Tomasello (2003: Section 4.2.1), a child hears a sentence such as (19) and realizes that particular slots can be filled freely (see also Dąbrowska (2001) for analogous suggestions in the framework of Cognitive Grammar).

- (19) a. Do you want more juice/milk?
b. Mommy is gone.

From these utterances, it is possible to derive so-called pivot schemata such as those in (20) into which words can then be inserted:

- (20) a. more ____ → more juice/milk
b. ____ gone → mommy/juice gone

In this stage of development (22 months), children do not generalize using these schemata, these schemata are instead construction islands and do not yet have any syntax

(Tomasello et al. 1997). The ability to use previously unknown verbs with a subject and an object in an SVO order is acquired slowly between the age of three and four (Tomasello 2003: 128–129). More abstract syntactic and semantic relations only emerge with time: when confronted with multiple instantiations of the transitive construction, the child is then able to generalize:

- (21) a. [_S [_{NP} The man/the woman] sees [_{NP} the dog/the rabbit/it]].
 b. [_S [_{NP} The man/the woman] likes [_{NP} the dog/the rabbit/it]].
 c. [_S [_{NP} The man/the woman] kicks [_{NP} the dog/the rabbit/it]].

According to Tomasello (2003: 107), this abstraction takes the form [Sbj TrVerb Obj]. Tomasello's approach is immediately plausible since one can recognize how abstraction works: it is a generalization about reoccurring patterns. Each pattern is then assigned a semantic contribution. These generalizations can be captured in inheritance hierarchies (see page 196) (Croft 2001: 26). The problem with this kind of approach, however, is that it cannot explain the interaction between different areas of phenomena in the language: it is possible to represent simple patterns such as the use of transitive verbs in (21), but transitive verbs interact with other areas of the grammar such as negation. If one wishes to connect the construction one assumes for the negation of transitive verbs with the transitive construction, then one arrives at a problem since this is not possible in inheritance hierarchies.

- (22) The woman did not kick the dog.

The problem is that the transitive construction has a particular semantic contribution but that negated transitive construction has the opposite meaning. The values of SEM features would therefore be contradictory. There are technical tricks to avoid this problem, however, since there are a vast number of these kinds of interactions between syntax and semantics, this kind of technical solution will result in something highly implausible from a cognitive perspective (Müller 2006, 2007c,b, 2010b; Müller & Wechsler 2014a). For discussion of Croft's analysis, see Section 21.4.1.

At this point, proponents of pattern-based analyses might try and argue that these kinds of problems are only the result of a poor/inadequate formalization and would rather do without a formalization (Goldberg 2009: Section 5). However, this does not help here as the problem is not the formalization itself, rather the formalization allows one to see the problem more clearly.

An alternative to an approach built entirely on inheritance is a TAG-like approach that allows one to insert syntactic material into phrasal constructions. Such a proposal was discussed in Section 10.6.3. Bergen & Chang (2005: 170) working in Embodied Construction Grammar suggest an Active-Ditransitive Construction with the form [RefExpr Verb RefExpr RefExpr], where RefExpr stands for a referential expression and the first RefExpr and the verb may be non-adjacent. In this way, it is possible to analyze (23a,b), while ruling out (23c):

- (23) a. Mary tossed me a drink.

- b. Mary happily tossed me a drink.
- c. * Mary tossed happily me a drink.

While the compulsory adjacency of the verb and the object correctly predicts that (23c) is ruled out, the respective constraint also rules out coordinate structures such as (24):

(24) Mary tossed me a juice and Peter a water.

Part of the meaning of this sentence corresponds to what the ditransitive construction contributes to *Mary tossed Peter a water*. There is, however, a gap between *tossed* and *Peter*. Similarly, one can create examples where there is a gap between both objects of a ditransitive construction:

(25) He showed me and bought for Mary the book that was recommended in the Guardian last week.

In (25), *me* is not adjacent to *the book* It is not my aim here to request a coordination analysis. Coordination is a very complex phenomenon for which most theories do not have a straightforward analysis (see Section 21.6.2). Instead, I would simply like to point out that the fact that constructions can be realized discontinuously poses a problem for approaches that claim that language acquisition is exclusively pattern-based. The point is the following: in order to understand coordination data in a language, a speaker must learn that a verb which has its arguments somewhere in the sentence has a particular meaning together with these arguments. The actual pattern [Sbj V Obj1 Obj2] can, however, be interrupted in all positions. In addition to the coordination examples, there is also the possibility of moving elements out of the pattern either to the left or the right. In sum, we can say that language learners have to learn that there is a relation between functors and their arguments. This is all that is left of pattern-based approaches but this insight is also covered by the selection-based approaches that we will discuss in the following section.

A defender of pattern-based approaches could perhaps object that there is a relevant construction for (25) that combines all material. This means that one would have a construction with the form [Sbj V Obj1 Conj V PP Obj2]. It would then have to be determined experimentally or with corpus studies whether this actually makes sense. The generalization that linguists have found is that categories with the same syntactic properties can be coordinated (N, \bar{N} , NP, V, \bar{V} , VP, ...). For the coordination of verbs or verbal projections, it must hold that the coordinated phrases require the same arguments:

- (26)
- a. Er [arbeitet] und [liest viele Bücher].
he works and reads many books
 - b. Er [kennt und liebt] diese Schallplatte.
he knows and loves this record
 - c. Er [zeigt dem Jungen] und [gibt der Frau] die Punk-Rock-CD.
he shows the boy and gives the woman the punk rock CD
 - d. Er [liebt diese Schallplatte] und [schenkt ihr ein Buch].
he loves this record and gives her a book

In an approach containing only patterns, one would have to assume an incredibly large number of constructions and so far we are only considering coordinations that consist of exactly two conjuncts. However, the phenomenon discussed above is not only restricted to coordination of two elements. If we do not wish to abandon the distinction between competence and performance (see Chapter 15), then the number of conjuncts is not constrained at all (by the competence grammar):

- (27) Er [kennt, liebt und verborgt] diese Schallplatte.
 he knows loves and lends.out this record

It is therefore extremely unlikely that learners have patterns for all possible cases in their input. It is much more likely that they draw the same kind of generalizations as linguists from the data occurring in their input: words and phrases with the same syntactic properties can be coordinated. If this turns out to be true, then all that is left for pattern-based approaches is the assumption of discontinuously realized constructions and thus a dependency between parts of constructions that states that they do not have to be immediately adjacent to one another. The acquisition problem is then the same as for selection-based approaches that will be the topic of the following section: what ultimately has to be learned are dependencies between elements or valences (see Behrens (2009: 439), the author reaches the same conclusion following different considerations).

16.4 Selection-based approaches

I will call the alternative to pattern-based approaches *selection-based*. A selection-based approach has been proposed by Green (2011).

The generalizations about the pattern in (21) pertain to the valence class of the verb. In Categorical Grammar, the pattern [Sbj TrVerb Obj] corresponds to the lexical entry (s/np)/np (for the derivation of a sentence with this kind of lexical entry, see Figure 8.3 on page 233). A TAG tree for *likes* was given on page 403. Here, one can see quite clearly that lexical entries determine the structure of sentences in these models. Unlike pattern-based approaches, these analyses allow enough room for semantic embedding: the lexical entries in Categorical Grammar can be combined with adjuncts, and elementary trees in TAG also allow for adjunction to the relevant nodes.

Now, we face the question of how the jump from a pivot schema to a lexical entry with an argument structure takes place. In Tomasello's approach, there is no break between them. Pivot schemata are phrasal patterns and [Sbj TrVerb Obj] is also a phrasal pattern. Both schemata have open slots into which certain elements can be inserted. In selection-based approaches, the situation is similar: the elements that are fixed in the pivot schema are functors in the selection-based approach. Green (2011) proposes a theory of acquisition in HPSG that can do without UG. For the two-word phase, she assumes that *where's* is the head of an utterance such as (28) and that *where's* selects *Robin* as its argument.

- (28) Where's Robin?

This means that, rather than assuming that there is a phrasal pattern *Where's X?* with an empty slot X for a person or thing, she assumes that there is a lexical entry *where's*, which contains the information that it needs to be combined with another constituent. What needs to be acquired is the same in each case: there is particular material that has to be combined with other material in order to yield a complete utterance.

In her article, Green shows how long-distance dependencies and the position of English auxiliaries can be acquired in later stages of development. The acquisition of grammar proceeds in a monotone fashion, that is, knowledge is added – for example, knowledge about the fact that material can be realized outside of the local context – and previous knowledge does not have to be revised. In her model, mistakes in the acquisition process are in fact mistakes in the assignment of lexical entries to valence classes. These mistakes have to be correctable.

In sum, one can say that all of Tomasello's insights can be applied directly to selection-based approaches and the problems with pattern-based approaches do not surface with selection-based approaches. It is important to point out explicitly once again here that the selection-based approach discussed here also is a construction-based approach. Constructions are just lexical and not phrasal. The important point is that, in both approaches, words and also more complex phrases are pairs of form and meaning and can be acquired as such.

In Chapter 21, we will discuss pattern-based approaches further and we will also explore areas of the grammar where phrasal patterns should be assumed.

16.5 Summary

We should take from the preceding discussion that models of language acquisition that assume that a grammar is chosen from a large set of grammars by setting binary parameters are in fact inadequate. All theories that make reference to parameters have in common that they are purely hypothetical since there is no non-trivial set of parameters that all proponents of the model equally agree on. In fact there is not even a trivial one.

In a number of experiments, Tomasello and his colleagues have shown that, in its original form, the Principles & Parameters model makes incorrect predictions and that language acquisition is much more pattern-based than assumed by proponents of P&P analyses. Syntactic competence develops starting from verb islands. Depending on the frequency of the input, certain verbal constructions can be mastered even though the same construction has not yet been acquired with less frequent verbs.

The interaction with other areas of grammar still remains problematic for pattern-based approaches: in a number of publications, it has been shown that the interaction of phenomena that one can observe in complex utterances can in fact not be explained with phrasal patterns since embedding cannot be captured in an inheritance hierarchy. This problem is not shared by selection-based approaches. All experimental results and insights of Tomasello can, however, be successfully extended to selection-based approaches.

Further reading

Meisel (1995) gives a very good overview of theories of acquisition in the Principles & Parameters model.

Adele Goldberg and Michael Tomasello are the most prominent proponents of Construction Grammar, a theory that explicitly tries to do without the assumption of innate linguistic knowledge. They published many papers and books about topics related to Construction Grammar and acquisition. The most important books probably are Goldberg (2006) and Tomasello (2003).

An overview of different theories of acquisition in German can be found in Klann-Delius (2008) an English overview is Ambridge & Lieven (2011).

第十七章 Generative capacity and grammar formalisms

In several of the preceding chapters, the complexity hierarchy for formal languages was mentioned. The simplest languages are so-called regular languages (Type-3), they are followed by those described as context-free grammars (Type-2), then those grammars which are context-sensitive (Type-1) and finally we have unrestricted grammars (Type-0) that create recursively enumerable languages, which are the most complicated class. In creating theories, a conscious effort was made to use formal means that correspond to what one can actually observe in natural language. This led to the abandonment of unrestricted Transformational Grammar since this has generative power of Type-0 (see page 79). GPSG was deliberately designed in such a way as to be able to analyze just the context-free languages and not more. In the mid-80s, it was shown that natural languages have a higher complexity than context-free languages (Shieber 1985; Culy 1985). It is now assumed that so-called *mildly context sensitive* grammars are sufficient for analyzing natural languages. Researchers working on TAG are working on developing variants of TAG that fall into exactly this category. Similarly, it was shown for different variants of Stabler's *Minimalist Grammars* (see Section 4.6.4 and Stabler 2001, 2011b) that they have a mildly context-sensitive capacity (Michaelis 2001). Peter Hellwig's Dependency Unification Grammar is also mildly context-sensitive (Hellwig 2003: 595). LFG and HPSG, as well as Chomsky's theory in *Aspects*, fall into the class of Type-0 languages (Berwick 1982; Johnson 1988). The question at this point is whether it is an ideal goal to find a descriptive language that has exactly the same power as the object it describes. Carl Pollard (1996a) once said that it would be odd to claim that certain theories in physics were not adequate simply because they make use of tools from mathematics that are too powerful.¹ It is not the descriptive language that should constrain the theory but rather the theory contains the restrictions that must hold for the objects in question. This is the view that Chomsky (1981b: 277, 280) takes. Also, see Berwick (1982:

¹ If physicists required the formalism to constrain the theory:

Editor: Professor Einstein, I'm afraid we can't accept this manuscript of yours on general relativity.

Einstein: Why? Are the equations wrong?

Editor: No, but we noticed that your differential equations are expressed in the first-order language of set theory. This is a totally unconstrained formalism! Why, you could have written down ANY set of differential equations! (Pollard 1996a)

Section 4), Kaplan & Bresnan (1982: Section 8) on LFG and Johnson (1988: Section 3.5) on the *Off-Line Parsability Constraint* in LFG and attribute-value grammars in general.

There is of course a technical reason to look for a grammar with the lowest level of complexity possible: we know that it is easier for computers to process grammars with lower complexity than more complex grammars. To get an idea about the complexity of a task, the so-called ‘worst case’ for the relevant computations is determined, that is, it is determined how long a program needs for an input of a certain length in the least favorable case to get a result for a grammar from a certain class. This begs the question if the worst case is actually relevant. For example, some grammars that allow discontinuous constituents perform less favorably in the worst case than normal phrase structure grammars that only allow for combinations of continuous strings (Reape 1991: Section 8). As I have shown in Müller (2004c), a parser that builds up larger units starting from words (a bottom-up parser) is far less efficient when processing a grammar assuming a verb movement analysis than is the case for a bottom-up parser that allows for discontinuous constituents. This has to do with the fact that verb traces do not contribute any phonological material and a parser cannot locate them without further machinery. It is therefore assumed that a verb trace exists in every position in the string and in most cases these traces do not contribute to an analysis of the complete input. Since the verb trace is not specified with regard to its valence information, it can be combined with any material in the sentence, which results in an enormous computational load. On the other hand, if one allows discontinuous constituents, then one can do without verb traces and the computational load is thereby reduced. In the end, the analysis using discontinuous constituents was eventually discarded for linguistic reasons (Müller 2005b,c, 2007b, 2015b), however, the investigation of the parsing behavior of both grammars is still interesting as it shows that worst case properties are not always informative.

I will discuss another example of the fact that language-specific restrictions can restrict the complexity of a grammar: Gärtner & Michaelis (2007: Section 3.2) assume that Stabler’s Minimalist Grammars (see Section 4.6.4) with extensions for late adjunction and extraposition are actually more powerful than mildly context-sensitive. If one bans extraction from adjuncts (Frey & Gärtner 2002: 46) and also assumes the Shortest Move Constraint (see footnote 30 on page 149), then one arrives at a grammar that is mildly-context sensitive (Gärtner & Michaelis 2007: 178). The same is true of grammars with the Shortest Move Constraint and a constraint for extraction from specifiers.

Whether extraction takes place from a specifier or not depends on the organization of the particular grammar in question. In some grammars, all arguments are specifiers (Kratzer 1996: 120–123, also see Figure 18.4 on page 537). A ban on extraction from specifiers would imply that extraction out of arguments would be impossible. This is, of course, not true in general. Normally, subjects are treated as specifiers (also by Frey & Gärtner 2002: 44). It is often claimed that subjects are islands for extraction (see Grewendorf 1989: 35, 41; G. Müller 1996b: 220; 1998: 32, 163; Sabel 1999: 98; Fanselow 2001: 422). Several authors have noted, however, that extraction from subjects is possible in German (see Dürscheid 1989: 25; Haider 1993: 173; Pafel 1993; Fortmann 1996: 27; Suchsland 1997: 320; Vogel & Steinbach 1998: 87; Ballweg 1997: 2066; Müller 1999a: 100–

101; De Kuthy 2002: 7). The following data are attested examples:

- (1) a. [Von den übrigbleibenden Elementen]_i scheinen [die Determinantien _{-i}] die
of the left.over elements seem the determinants the
wenigsten Klassifizierungsprobleme aufzuwerfen.²
fewest classification.problems to.throw.up
'Of the remaining elements, the determinants seem to pose the fewest problems for classification.'
- b. [Von den Gefangenen]_i hatte eigentlich [keine _{-i}] die Nacht der Bomben
of the prisoners had actually none the night of.the bombs
überleben sollen.³
survive should
'None of the prisoners should have actually survived the night of the bombings.'
- c. [Von der HVA]_i hielten sich [etwa 120 Leute _{-i}] dort in ihren Gebäuden
of the HVA held REFL around 120 people there in their buildings
auf.⁴
PRT
'Around 120 people from the HVA stayed there inside their buildings.'
- d. [Aus dem „Englischen Theater“]_i stehen [zwei Modelle _{-i}] in den Vitrinen.⁵
from the English theater stand two models in the cabinets
'Two models from the 'English Theater' are in the cabinets.'
- e. [Aus der Fraktion]_i stimmten ihm [viele _{-i}] zu darin, dass die
from the faction agreed him many PRT there.in that the
Kaufkraft der Bürger gepöppelt werden müsse, nicht die gute Laune
buying.power.of.the citizens boosted become must not the good mood
der Wirtschaft.⁶
of.the economy
'Many of the fraction agreed with him that it is the buying power of citizens that needed to be increased, not the good spirits of the economy.'
- f. [Vom Erzbischof Carl Theodor Freiherr von Dalberg]_i gibt es
from archbishop Carl Theodor Freiherr from Dalberg gives it
beispielsweise [ein Bild _{-i}] im Stadtarchiv.⁷
for.example a picture in.the city.archives
'For example, there is a picture of archbishop Carl Theodor Freiherr of Dalberg

² In the main text of Engel (1970: 102).

³ Bernhard Schlink, *Der Vorleser*, Diogenes Taschenbuch 22953, Zürich: Diogenes Verlag, 1997, p. 102.

⁴ Spiegel, 3/1999, p. 42.

⁵ Frankfurter Rundschau, quoted from De Kuthy (2001: 52).

⁶ taz, 16.10.2003, p. 5.

⁷ Frankfurter Rundschau, quoted from De Kuthy (2002: 7).

in the city archives.'

- g. [Gegen die wegen Ehebruchs zum Tod durch Steinigen verurteilte
against the because.of adultery to.the death by stoning sentenced
Amina Lawal]_i hat gestern in Nigeria [der zweite Berufungsprozess _{-i}]
Amina Lawal has yesterday in Nigeria the second appeal.process
begonnen.⁸
begun

'The second appeal process began yesterday against Amina Lawal, who was sentenced to death by stoning for adultery.'

- h. [Gegen diese Kahlschlagspolitik]_i finden derzeit bundesweit
against this clear.cutting.politics happen at.the.moment statewide
[Proteste und Streiks _{-i}] statt.⁹
protests and strikes PRT

'At the moment, there are state-wide protests and strikes against this destructive politics.'

- i. [Von den beiden, die hinzugestoßen sind], hat [einer _{-i}] eine Hacke, der
of the both that joined are has one a pickaxe the
andere einen Handkarren.¹⁰
other a handcart

'Of the two that joined, one had a pickaxe and the other a handcart.'

- j. ein Plan, [gegen den]_i sich nun [ein Proteststurm _{-i}] erhebt¹¹
a plan against which REFL now a storm.of.protests rises
'a plan against which a storm of protests has now risen'

- k. Dagegen_i jedoch regt sich jetzt [Widerstand _{-i}]: [...]¹²
against however rises REFL now resistance
'Resistance to this is now rising, however.'

- l. [Aus der Radprofiszene]_i kennt ihn [keiner _{-i}] mehr.¹³
from the cycling.professional.scene knows him nobody anymore
'Nobody from the professional cycling scene acts like they know him anymore.'

- m. [Über das chinesische Programm der Deutschen Welle] tobt dieser Tage
about the Chinese program of.the Deutsche Welle rages these days
[ein heftiger Streit _{-i}].¹⁴
a hefty controversy

'Recently, there has been considerable controversy about the Chinese program

⁸ taz, 28.08.2003, p. 2.

⁹ Streikaufruf, Universität Bremen, 03.12.2003, p. 1.

¹⁰ Haruki Murakami, *Hard-boiled Wonderland und das Ende der Welt*, suhrkamp taschenbuch, 3197, 2000, Translation by Annelie Ortmanns and Jürgen Stalph, p. 414.

¹¹ taz, 30.12.2004, p. 6.

¹² taz, 02.09.2005, p. 18.

¹³ taz, 04.07.2005, p. 5.

¹⁴ taz, 21.10.2008, p. 12.

by the Deutsche Welle.’

This means that a ban on extraction from specifiers cannot hold for German. As such, it cannot be true for all languages.

We have a situation that is similar to the one with discontinuous constituents: since it is not possible to integrate the ban on extraction discussed here into the grammar formalism, it is more powerful than what is required for describing natural language. However, the restrictions in actual grammars – in this case, the restrictions on extraction from specifiers in the relevant languages – ensure that the respective language-specific grammars have a mildly context-sensitive capacity.

第十八章 Binary branching, locality, and recursion

This chapter discusses three points: section 18.1 deals with the question of whether all linguistic structures should be binary branching or not. Section 18.2 discusses the question what information should be available for selection, that is, whether governing heads can access the internal structure of selected elements or whether everything should be restricted to local selection. Finally, Section 18.3 discusses recursion and how/whether it is captured in the different grammar theories that are discussed in this book.

18.1 Binary branching

We have seen that the question of the kind of branching structures assumed has received differing treatments in various theories. Classical \bar{X} theory assumes that a verb is combined with all its complements. In later variants of GB, all structures are strictly binary branching. Other frameworks do not treat the question of branching in a uniform way: there are proposals that assume binary branching structures and others that opt for flat structures.

Haegeman (1994: Section 2.5) uses learnability arguments (rate of acquisition, see Section 13.2 on this point). She discusses the example in (1) and claims that language learners have to choose one of eight structures if flat-branching structures can occur in natural language. If, on the other hand, there are only binary-branching structures, then the sentence in (1) cannot have the structures in Figure 18.1 to start with, and therefore a learner would not have to rule out the corresponding hypotheses.

- (1) Mummy must leave now.

图 18.1: Structures with partial flat-branching

However, Haegeman (1994: 88) provides evidence for the fact that (1) has the structure in (2):

- (2) [Mummy [must [leave now]]]

The relevant tests showing this include elliptical constructions, that is, the fact that it is possible to refer to the constituents in (2) with pronouns. This means that there is actually evidence for the structure of (1) that is assumed by linguists and we therefore do not have to assume that it is just hard-wired in our brains that only binary-branching structures are allowed. Haegeman (1994: 143) mentions a consequence of the binary branching hypothesis: if all structures are binary-branching, then it is not possible to straightforwardly account for sentences with ditransitive verbs in \bar{X} theory. In \bar{X} theory, it is assumed that a head is combined with all its complements at once (see Section 2.5). So in order to account for ditransitive verbs in \bar{X} theory, an empty element (little *v*) has to be assumed (see Section 4.1.4).

It should have become clear in the discussion of the arguments for the Poverty of the Stimulus in Section 13.8 that the assumption that only binary-branching structures are possible is part of our innate linguistic knowledge is nothing more than pure speculation. Haegeman offers no kind of evidence for this assumption. As shown in the discussions of the various theories we have seen, it is possible to capture the data with flat structures. For example, it is possible to assume that, in English, the verb is combined with its complements in a flat structure (Pollard & Sag 1994: 39). There are sometimes theory-internal reasons for deciding for one kind of branching or another, but these are not always applicable to other theories. For example, Binding Theory in GB theory is formulated with reference to dominance relations in trees (Chomsky 1981a: 188). If one assumes that syntactic structure plays a crucial role for the binding of pronouns (see page 83), then it is possible to make assumptions about syntactic structure based on the observable binding relations (so also Section 4.1.4). Binding data have, however, received a very different treatment in various theories. In LFG, constraints on f-structure are used for Binding Theory (Dalrymple 1993), whereas Binding Theory in HPSG operates on argument structure lists (valence information that are ordered in a particular way, see Section 9.6.1).

The opposite of Haegeman's position is the argumentation for flat structures put forward by Croft (2001: Section 1.6.2). In his *Radical Construction Grammar FAQ*, Croft observes that a phrasal construction such as the one in (3a) can be translated into a Categorical Grammar lexical entry like (3b).

- (3) a. [_{VP} V NP]
b. VP/NP

He claims that a disadvantage of Categorical Grammar is that it only allows for binary-branching structures and yet there exist constructions with more than two parts (p. 49). The exact reason why this is a problem is not explained, however. He even acknowledges himself that it is possible to represent constructions with more than two arguments in Categorical Grammar. For a ditransitive verb, the entry in Categorical Grammar of English would take the form of (4):

- (4) ((s\NP)/NP)/NP

If we consider the elementary trees for TAG in Figure 18.2 on the following page, it becomes clear that it is equally possible to incorporate semantic information into a flat

tree and a binary-branching tree. The binary-branching tree corresponds to a Categorical




图 18.2: Flat and binary-branching elementary trees

Grammar derivation. In both analyses in Figure 18.2, a meaning is assigned to a head that occurs with a certain number of arguments. Ultimately, the exact structure required depends on the kinds of restrictions on structures that one wishes to formulate. In this book, such restrictions are not discussed, but as explained above some theories model binding relations with reference to tree structures. Reflexive pronouns must be bound within a particular local domain inside the tree. In theories such as LFG and HPSG, these binding restrictions are formulated without any reference to trees. This means that evidence from binding data for one of the structures in Figure 18.2 (or for other tree structures) constitutes nothing more than theory-internal evidence.

Another reason to assume trees with more structure is the possibility to insert adjuncts on any node. In Chapter 9, an HPSG analysis for German that assumes binary-branching structures was proposed. With this analysis, it is possible to attach an adjunct to any node and thereby explain the free ordering of adjuncts in the middle field:

- (5) a. [weil] der Mann der Frau das Buch *gestern* gab
because the man the woman the book yesterday gave
'because the man gave the woman the book yesterday'
- b. [weil] der Mann der Frau *gestern* das Buch gab
because the man the woman yesterday the book gave
- c. [weil] der Mann *gestern* der Frau das Buch gab
because the man yesterday the woman the book gave
- d. [weil] *gestern* der Mann der Frau das Buch gab
because yesterday the man the woman the book gave

This analysis is not the only one possible, however. One could also assume an entirely flat structure where arguments and adjuncts are dominated by one node. Kasper (1994) suggests this kind of analysis in HPSG (see also Section 5.1.5 for GPSG analyses that make

use of metarules for the introduction of adjuncts). Kasper requires complex relational constraints that create syntactic relations between elements in the tree and also compute the semantic contribution of the entire constituent using the meaning of both the verb and the adjuncts. The analysis with binary-branching structures is simpler than those with complex relational constraints and – in the absence of theory-external evidence for flat structures – should be preferred to the analysis with flat structures. At this point, one could object that adjuncts in English cannot occur in all positions between arguments and therefore the binary-branching Categorical Grammar analysis and the TAG analysis in Figure 18.2 are wrong. This is not correct, however, as it is the specification of adjuncts with regard to the adjunction site that is crucial in Categorical Grammar. An adverb has the category $(s\backslash np)\backslash(s\backslash np)$ or $(s\backslash np)/(s\backslash np)$ and can therefore only be combined with constituents that correspond to the VP node in Figure 18.2. In the same way, an elementary tree for an adverb in TAG can only attach to the VP node (see Figure 12.3 on page 401). For the treatment of adjuncts in English, binary-branching structures therefore do not make any incorrect predictions.

18.2 Locality

The question of local accessibility of information has been treated in various ways by the theories discussed in this book. In the majority of theories, one tries to make information about the inner workings of phrases inaccessible for adjacent or higher heads, that is, *glaubt* ‘believe’ in (6) selects a sentential argument but it cannot “look inside” this sentential argument.

- (6) a. Karl glaubt, dass morgen seine Schwester kommt.
 Karl believes that tomorrow his sister comes
 ‘Karl believes that his sister is coming tomorrow.’
 b. Karl glaubt, dass seine Schwester morgen kommt.
 Karl believes that his sister tomorrow comes


Thus for example, *glauben* cannot enforce that the subject of the verb has to begin with a consonant or that the complementizer has to be combined with a verbal projection starting with an adjunct. In Section 1.5, we saw that it is a good idea to classify constituents in terms of their distribution and independent of their internal structure. If we are talking about an NP box, then it is not important what this NP box actually contains. It is only of importance that a given head wants to be combined with an NP with a particular case marking. This is called *locality of selection*.

Various linguistic theories have tried to implement locality of selection. The simplest form of this implementation is shown by phrase structure grammars of the kind discussed in Chapter 2. The rule in (17) on page 55, repeated here as (7), states that a ditransitive verb can occur with three noun phrases, each with the relevant case:

- (7) $S \rightarrow NP(\text{Per1,Num1,nom})$
 $NP(\text{Per2,Num2,dat})$
 $NP(\text{Per3,Num3,acc})$
 $V(\text{Per1,Num1,ditransitive})$

Since the symbols for NPs do not have any further internal structure, the verb cannot require that there has to be a relative clause in an NP, for example. The internal properties of the NP are not visible to the outside. We have already seen in the discussion in Chapter 2, however, that certain properties of phrases have to be outwardly visible. This was the information that was written on the boxes themselves. For noun phrases, at least information about person, number and case are required in order to correctly capture their relation to a head. The gender value is important in German as well, since adverbial phrases such as *einer nach dem anderen* ‘one after the other’ have to agree in gender with the noun they refer to (see example (12) on page 491). Apart from that, information about the length of the noun phrases is required, in order to determine their order in a clause. Heavy constituents are normally ordered after lighter ones, and are also often extraposed (cf. Behaghel’s *Gesetz der wachsenden Glieder* ‘Law of increasing constituents’ (1909: 139; 1930: 86)).

Theories that strive to be as restrictive as possible with respect to locality therefore have to develop mechanisms that allow one to only access information that is required to explain the distribution of constituents. This is often achieved by projecting certain properties to the mother node of a phrase. In \bar{X} theory, the part of speech a head belongs to is passed up to the maximal projection: if the head is an N, for example, then the maximal projection is an NP. In GPSG, HPSG and variants of CxG, there are Head Feature Principles responsible for the projection of features. Head Feature Principles ensure that an entire group of features, so-called head features, are present on the maximal projection of a head. Furthermore, every theory has to be capable of representing the fact that a constituent can lack one of its parts and this part is then realized via a long-distance dependency in another position in the clause. As previously discussed on page 288, there are languages in which complementizers inflect depending on whether their complement is missing a constituent or not. This means that this property must be somehow accessible. In GPSG, HPSG and variants of CxG, there are additional groups of features that are present at every node between a filler and a gap in a long-distance dependency. In LFG, there is f-structure instead. Using Functional Uncertainty, one can look for the position in the f-structure where a particular constituent is missing. In GB theory, movement proceeds cyclically, that is, an element is moved into the specifier of CP and can be moved from there into the next highest CP. It is assumed in GB theory that heads can look inside their arguments, at least they can see the elements in the specifier position. If complementizers can access the relevant specifier positions, then they can determine whether something is missing from an embedded phrase or not. In GB theory, there was also an analysis of case assignment in infinitive constructions in which the case-assigning verb governs into the embedded phrase and assigns case to the element in SpecIP. Figure 18.3 shows the relevant structure taken from Haegeman (1994: 170). Since the Case Principle is formulated in such a way that only finite I can assign

图 18.3: Analysis of the AcI construction with *Exceptional Case Marking*

case to the subject (cf. page 101), *him* does not receive case from I. Instead, it is assumed that the verb *believe* assigns case to the subject of the embedded infinitive.

Verbs that can assign case across phrase boundaries are referred to as ECM verbs, where ECM stands for *Exceptional Case Marking*. As the name suggests, this instance of case assignment into a phrase was viewed as an exception. In newer versions of the theory (e.g., Kratzer 1996: 120–123), all case assignment is to specifier positions. For example, the Voice head in Figure 18.4 on the following page assigns accusative to the DP in the specifier of VP. Since the Voice head governs into the VP, case assignment to a run-of-the-mill object in this theory is an instance of exceptional case assignment as well. The same is true in Adger’s version of Minimalism, which was discussed in Chapter 4: Adger (2010) argues that his theory is more restrictive than LFG or HPSG since it is only one feature that can be selected by a head, whereas in LFG and HPSG complex feature bundles are selected. However, the strength of this kind of locality constraint is weakened by the operation Agree, which allows for nonlocal feature checking. As in Kratzer’s proposal, case is assigned nonlocally by little *v* to the object inside the VP (see Section 4.1.5.2).




图 18.4: Analysis of structures with a transitive verb following Kratzer

Adger discusses PP arguments of verbs like *depend* and notes that these verbs need specific PPs, that is, the form of the preposition in the PP has to be selectable. While this is trivial in Dependency Grammar, where the preposition is selected right away, the respective information is projected in theories like HPSG and is then selectable at the PP node. However, this requires that the governing verb can determine at least two properties of the selected element: its part of speech and the form of the preposition. This is not possible in Adger's system and he left this for further research. Of course it would be possible to assume an onP (a phrasal projection of *on* that has the category 'on'). Similar solutions have been proposed in Minimalist theories (see Section 4.6.1 on functional projections), but such a solution would obviously miss the generalization that all prepositional phrases have something in common, which would not be covered in a system with atomic categories that are word specific.

In theories such as LFG and HPSG, case assignment takes place locally in constructions such as those in (8):

- (8) a. John believes him to be a liar.
 b. Ich halte ihn für einen Lügner.
 I hold him for a.ACC liar
 'I take him to be a liar.'
 c. Er scheint ein Lügner zu sein.
 he seems a.NOM liar to be
 'He seems to be a liar.'
 d. Er fischt den Teich leer.
 he fishes the.ACC pond empty
 'He fishes (in) the pond (until it is) empty.'

Although *him*, *ihn* ‘him’, *er* ‘he’ and *den Teich* ‘the pond’ are not semantic arguments of the finite verbs, they are syntactic arguments (they are raised) and can therefore be assigned case locally. See Bresnan (1982a: 348–349 and Section 8.2) and Pollard & Sag (1994: Section 3.5) for an analysis of raising in LFG and HPSG respectively. See Meurers (1999c), Przepiórkowski (1999b), and Müller (2007b: Section 17.4) for case assignment in HPSG and for its interaction with raising.

There are various phenomena that are incompatible with strict locality and require the projection of at least some information. For example, there are question tags in English that must match the subject of the clause with which they are combined:

- (9) a. She is very smart, isn’t she / * he?
b. They are very smart, aren’t they?

Bender & Flickinger (1999), Flickinger & Bender (2003) therefore propose making information about agreement or the referential index of the subject available on the sentence node.¹ In Sag (2007), all information about phonology, syntax and semantics of the subject is represented as the value of a feature *XARG* (EXTERNAL ARGUMENT). Here, *external argument* does not stand for what it does in GB theory, but should be understood in a more general sense. For example, it makes the possessive pronoun accessible on the node of the entire NP. Sag (2007) argues that this is needed to force coreference in English idioms:

- (10) a. He_i lost [his_i / *her_j marbles].
b. They_i kept/lost [their_i / *our_j cool].

The use of the *XARG* feature looks like an exact parallel to accessing the specifier position as we saw in the discussion of GB. However, Sag proposes that complements of prepositions in Polish are also made accessible by *XARG* since there are data suggesting that higher heads can access elements inside PPs (Przepiórkowski 1999a: Section 5.4.1.2).

In Section 10.6.2 about Sign-based Construction Grammar, we already saw that a theory that only makes the reference to one argument available on the highest node of a projection cannot provide an analysis for idioms of the kind given in (11). This is because the subject is made available with verbal heads, however, it is the object that needs to be accessed in sentences such as (11). This means that one has to be able to formulate constraints affecting larger portions of syntactic structure.

- (11) a. Ich glaube, mich / # dich tritt ein Pferd.²
I believes me you kicks a horse
‘I am utterly surprised.’
b. Jonas glaubt, ihn tritt ein Pferd.³
Jonas believes him kicks a horse
‘Jonas is utterly surprised.’

¹ See also Sag & Pollard (1991: 89).

² Richter & Sailer (2009: 311).

³ <http://www.machandel-verlag.de/der-katzenschatz.html>, 06.07.2015.

- c. #Jonas glaubt, dich tritt ein Pferd.
 Jonas believes you kicks a horse
 'Jonas believes that a horse kicks you.'

Theories of grammar with extended locality domains do not have any problems with this kind of data.⁴ An example for this kind of theory is TAG. In TAG, one can specify trees of exactly the right size (Abeillé 1988; Abeillé & Schabes 1989). All the material that is fixed in an idiom is simply determined in the elementary tree. Figure 18.5 shows the tree for *kick the bucket* as it is used in (12a).

- (12) a. The cowboys kicked the bucket.
 b. Cowboys often kick the bucket.
 c. He kicked the proverbial bucket.




图 18.5: Elementary tree for *kick the bucket*

Since TAG trees can be split up by adjunction, it is possible to insert elements between the parts of an idiom as in (12b,c) and thus explain the flexibility of idioms with regard to adjunction and embedding.⁵ Depending on whether the lexical rules for the passive and long-distance dependencies can be applied, the idiom can occur in the relevant variants.

⁴ Or more carefully put: they do not have any serious problems since the treatment of idioms in all their many aspects is by no means trivial (Sailer 2000).

⁵ Interestingly, variants of Embodied CxG are strikingly similar to TAG. The Ditransitive Construction that was discussed on page 327 allows for additional material to occur between the subject and the verb.

The problems that arise for the semantics construction are also similar. Abeillé & Schabes (1989: 9) assume that the semantics of *John kicked the proverbial bucket* is computed from the parts *John'*, *kick-the-bucket'* and *proverbial'*, that is, the added modifiers always have scope over the entire idiom. This is not adequate for all idioms (Fischer & Keil 1996):

- (i) Er band ihr einen großen Bären auf.
 he tied her a big bear on
 'He pulled (a lot of) wool over her eyes.'

In the idiom in (i), *Bär* 'bear' actually means 'lie' and the adjective has to be interpreted accordingly. The

In cases where the entire idiom or parts of the idiom are fixed, it is possible to rule out adjunction to the nodes of the idiom tree. Figure 18.6 shows a pertinent example from Abeillé & Schabes (1989: 7). The ban on adjunction is marked by a subscript NA.




图 18.6: Elementary tree for *take into account*

The question that also arises for other theories is whether the efforts that have been made to enforce locality should be abandoned altogether. In our box model in Section 1.5, this would mean that all boxes were transparent. Since plastic boxes do not allow all of the light through, objects contained in multiple boxes cannot be seen as clearly as those in the topmost box (the path of Functional Uncertainty is longer). This is parallel to a suggestion made by Kay & Fillmore (1999) in CxG. Kay and Fillmore explicitly represent all the information about the internal structure of a phrase on the mother node and therefore have no locality restrictions at all in their theory. In principle, one can motivate this kind of theory in parallel to the argumentation in Chapter 17. The argument there made reference to the complexity of the grammatical formalism: the kind of complexity that the language of description has is unimportant, it is only important what one does with it. In the same way, one can say that regardless of what kind of information is in principle accessible, it is not accessed if this is not permitted. This was the approach taken by Pollard & Sag (1987: 143–145).

It is also possible to assume a world in which all the boxes contain transparent areas where it is possible to see parts of their contents. This is more or less the LFG world: the information about all levels of embedding contained in the f-structure is visible to both the inside and the outside. We have already discussed Nordlinger's (1998) LFG analysis

relevant tree should therefore contain nodes that contribute semantic information and also say something about the composition of these features.

In the same way, when computing the semantics of noun phrases in TAG and Embodied Construction Grammar, one should bear in mind that the adjective that is combined with a discontinuous NP Construction (see page 325) or an NP tree can have narrow scope over the noun (*all alleged murderers*).

of Wambaya on page 295. In Wambaya, words that form part of a noun phrase can be distributed throughout the clause. For example, an adjective that refers to a noun can occur in a separate position from it. Nordlinger models this by assuming that an adjective can make reference to an argument in the f-structure and then agrees with it in terms of case, number and gender. Bender (2008c) has shown that this analysis can be transferred to HPSG: instead of no longer representing an argument on the mother node after it has been combined with a head, simply marking the argument as realized allows us to keep it in the representation (Meurers 1999c; Przepiórkowski 1999b; Müller 2007b: Section 17.4). Detmar Meurers compares both of these HPSG approaches to different ways of working through a shopping list: in the standard approach taken by Pollard & Sag (1994), one tears away parts of the shopping list once the relevant item has been found. In the other case, the relevant item on the list is crossed out. At the end of the shopping trip, one ends up with a list of what has been bought as well as the items themselves.

I have proposed the crossing-out analysis for depictive predicates in German and English (Müller 2004a, 2008a). Depictive predicates say something about the state of a person or object during the event expressed by a verb:

- (13) a. Er sah sie nackt.⁶
 he saw her naked
 b. He saw her naked.

In (13), the depictive adjective can either refer to the subject or the object. However, there is a strong preference for readings where the antecedent noun precedes the depictive predicate (Lötscher 1985: 208). Figure 18.7 on the next page shows analyses for the sentences in (14):

- (14) a. dass er_i die Äpfel_j ungewaschen_{i/j} isst
 that he the apples unwashed eats
 ‘that he eats the apples unwashed’
 b. dass er_i ungewaschen_{i/*j} die Äpfel_j isst
 that he unwashed the apples eats
 ‘that he eats the apples (while he is) unwashed’

Arguments that have been realized are still represented on the upper nodes, however, they are crossed-out and thereby marked as “realized”. In German, this preference for the antecedent noun can be captured by assuming a restriction that states that the antecedent noun must not yet have been realized.

It is commonly assumed for English that adjuncts are combined with a VP.

- (15) a. John [[_{VP} ate the apples_i] unwashed_i].
 b. You can’t [[_{VP} give them_i injections] unconscious_i].⁷

⁶ Haider (1985a: 94).

⁷ Simpson (2005a: 17).




图 18.7: Analysis of *dass er die Äpfel ungewaschen isst* ‘that he the apples unwashed eats’ and *dass er ungewaschen die Äpfel isst* ‘that he unwashed the apples eat’

In approaches where the arguments of the verb are accessible at the VP node, it is possible to establish a relation between the depictive predicate and an argument although the antecedent noun is inside the VP. English differs from German in that depictives can refer to both realized (*them* in (15b)) and unrealized (*you* in (15b)) arguments.

Higginbotham (1985: 560) and Winkler (1997) have proposed corresponding non-cancellation approaches in GB theory. There are also parallel suggestions in Minimalist theories: checked features are not deleted, but instead marked as already checked (Stabler 2011b: 14). However, these features are still viewed as inaccessible.

Depending on how detailed the projected information is, it can be possible to see adjuncts and argument in embedded structures as well as their phonological, syntactic and semantic properties. In the CxG variant proposed by Kay and Fillmore, all information is available. In LFG, information about grammatical function, case and similar properties is accessible. However, the part of speech is not contained in the f-structure. If the part of speech does not stand in a one-to-one relation to grammatical function, it cannot be restricted using selection via f-structure. Nor is phonological information represented completely in the f-structure. If the analysis of idioms requires nonlocal access to phonological information or part of speech, then this has to be explicitly encoded in the f-structure (see Bresnan (1982c: 46–50) for more on idioms).

In the HPSG variant that I adopt, only information about arguments is projected. Since arguments are always represented by descriptions of type *synsem*, no information about their phonological realization is present. However, there are daughters in the structure so that it is still possible to formulate restrictions for idioms as in TAG or Construction Grammar (see Richter & Sailer (2009) for an analysis of the ‘horse’ example in (11a)). This may seem somewhat like overkill: although we already have the tree structure, we are still projecting information about arguments that have already been

realized (unfortunately these also contain information about their arguments and so on). At this point, one could be inclined to prefer TAG or LFG since these theories only make use of one extension of locality: TAG uses trees of arbitrary or rather exactly the necessary size and LFG makes reference to a complete f-structure. However, things are not quite that simple: if one wants to create a relation to an argument when adjoining a depictive predicate in TAG, then one requires a list of possible antecedents. Syntactic factors (e.g., reference to dative vs. accusative noun phrases, to argument vs. adjuncts, coordination of verbs vs. nouns) play a role in determining the referent noun, this cannot be reduced to semantic relations. Similarly, there are considerably different restrictions for different kinds of idioms and these cannot all be formulated in terms of restrictions on f-structure since f-structure does not contain information about parts of speech.

One should bear in mind that some phenomena require reference to larger portions of structure. The majority of phenomena can be treated in terms of head domains and extended head domains, however, there are idioms that go beyond the sentence level. Every theory has to account for this somehow.

18.3 Recursion

Every theory in this book can deal with self-embedding in language as it was discussed on page 4. The example (2) is repeated here as (16):

- (16) that Max thinks [that Julia knows [that Otto claims [that Karl suspects [that Richard confirms [that Friederike is laughing]]]]]

Most theories capture this directly with recursive phrase structure rules or dominance schemata. TAG is special with regard to recursion since recursion is factored out of the trees. The corresponding effects are created by an adjunction operation that allows any amount of material to be inserted into trees. It is sometimes claimed that Construction Grammar cannot capture the existence of recursive structure in natural language (e.g., Leiss 2009: 269). This impression is understandable since many analyses are extremely surface-oriented. For example, one often talks of a [Sbj TrVerb Obj] construction. However, the grammars in question also become recursive as soon as they contain a sentence embedding or relative clause construction. A sentence embedding construction could have the form [Sbj that-Verb that-S], where a that-Verb is one that can take a sentential complement and that-S stands for the respective complement. A *that*-clause can then be inserted into the that-S slot. Since this *that*-clause can also be the result of the application of this construction, the grammar is able to produce recursive structures such as those in (17):

- (17) Otto claims [_{that-S} that Karl suspects [_{that-S} that Richard sleeps]].

In (17), both *Karl suspects that Richard sleeps* and the entire clause are instances of the [Sbj that-Verb that-S] construction. The entire clause therefore contains an embedded subpart that is licensed by the same construction as the clause itself. (17) also contains a

constituent of the category *that*-S that is embedded inside of *that*-S. For more on recursion and self-embedding in Construction Grammar, see Verhagen (2010).

Similarly, every Construction Grammar that allows a noun to combine with a genitive noun phrase also allows for recursive structures. The construction in question could have the form [Det N NP[gen]] or [N NP[gen]]. The [Det N NP[gen]] construction licenses structures such as (18):

- (18) [_{NP} des Kragens [_{NP} des Mantels [_{NP} der Vorsitzenden]]]
 the collar of.the coat of.the chairwoman
 ‘the collar of the coat of the chairwoman’

Jurafsky (1996) and Bannard, Lieven & Tomasello (2009) use probabilistic context-free grammars (PCFG) for a Construction Grammar parser with a focus on psycholinguistic plausibility and modeling of acquisition. Context-free grammars have no problems with self-embedding structures like those in (18) and thus this kind of Construction Grammar itself does not encounter any problems with self-embedding.

Goldberg (1995: 192) assumes that the resultative construction for English has the following form:

- (19) [SUBJ [V OBJ OBL]]

This corresponds to a complex structure as assumed for elementary trees in TAG. LTAG differs from Goldberg’s approach in that every structure requires a lexical anchor, that is, for example (19), the verb would have to be fixed in LTAG. But in Goldberg’s analysis, verbs can be inserted into independently existing constructions (see Section 21.1). In TAG publications, it is often emphasized that elementary trees do not contain any recursion. The entire grammar is recursive however, since additional elements can be added to the tree using adjunction and – as (17) and (18) show – insertion into substitution nodes can also create recursive structures.

第十九章 Empty elements

This chapter deals with empty elements, I first discuss the general attitude of various research traditions towards empty elements and then show how they can be eliminated from grammars (Section 19.2). Section 19.3 discusses empty elements that have been suggested in order to facilitate semantic interpretation. Section 19.4 discusses possible motivation for empty elements with a special focus on cross-linguistic comparison and the final Section 19.5 shows that certain accounts with transformations, lexical rules, and empty elements can be translated into each other.

19.1 Views on empty elements

One point that is particularly controversial among proponents of the theories discussed in this book is the question of whether one should assume empty elements or not. The discussion of empty elements is quite old: there was already some investigation in 1961 with reference to phrase structure grammars (Bar-Hillel, Perles & Shamir 1961). The discussion of the status of empty elements has carried on ever since (see Löbner 1986; Wunderlich 1987, 1989; von Stechow 1989; Haider 1997a; Sag 2000; Bouma, Malouf & Sag 2001a; Levine & Hukari 2006; Müller 2014c; Arnold & Spencer 2015, for example). There are sometimes empirical differences between analyses that assume empty elements and those that do not (Arnold & Spencer 2015), but often this is not the case. Since empty elements often feature prominently in the argumentation for or against particular theories, I will discuss how they have been used in somewhat more detail here.

In GB theory, empty elements were assumed for traces of movement (verb movement and fronting of phrases) as well as for deleted elements in elliptical constructions. Starting with the analysis of Larson (1988), more and more empty heads have been introduced to ensure uniformity of structures and certain semantic interpretations (binding and scope, see Section 4.1.4 on little *v*). Other examples of an empty element that was introduced in order to maintain particular generalizations are the empty expletives of Coopmans (1989: 734) and Postal (2004: Chapter 1). These fill the subject position in inversion structures in English, where the position preceding the verb is occupied by a PP and not by an overt subject NP. Similarly, Grewendorf (1993: 1311) assumes that the subject position in impersonal passives and passives without subject movement is in fact occupied by an empty expletive. Also, see Newmeyer (2005: 91) and Lohnstein

(2014: 180) for this assumption with regard to the passive in German. Sternefeld (2006: Section II.3.3.3) assumes that there is an empty expletive subject in impersonal passives and subjectless sentences such as (1).

- (1) a. Mir graut.
 me.DAT scares
 ‘I am scared.’
 b. Mich düstet.
 me.ACC is.thirsty
 ‘I am thirsty.’

On page 150, we discussed Stabler’s proposal for the analysis of sentences with intransitive verbs. Since, following Chomsky (2008: 146), the element that first merges with a head is the complement, intransitive verbs pose a problem for the theory. This problem is solved by Stabler by assuming that intransitive verbs are combined with an empty object (Veenstra 1998: 61, 124). Since these silent elements do not contribute to the meaning of an expression, we are also dealing with empty expletive pronouns.

In other theories, there are researchers that reject empty elements as well as those who assume them. In *Categorial Grammar*, Steedman suggests an analysis of nonlocal dependencies that does without empty elements (see Section 8.5), but as Pollard (1988) has shown, Steedman’s analysis requires various kinds of type raising for NPs or a correspondingly high number of complex lexical items for relative pronouns (see Section 8.5.3). On the other hand, König (1999) uses traces. In *GPSG*, there is the traceless analysis of extraction by Uszkoreit (1987: 76–77) that we discussed in Section 5.4, but there is also the analysis of Gazdar, Klein, Pullum & Sag (1985: 143) that uses traces. In *LFG*, there are both analyses with traces (Bresnan 2001: 67) and those without (see Section 7.3 and Section 7.5). Many of the phrasal analyses in *HPSG* are born out of the wish to avoid empty elements (see Section 21.10). An example for this is the relative clause analysis by Sag (1997) that replaces the empty relativizer in Pollard & Sag (1994) with a corresponding phrasal rule. On the other hand we have Bender (2000) and Sag, Wasow & Bender (2003: 464), who assume a silent copula. Another attempt to eliminate empty elements from *HPSG* was to handle long-distance dependencies not by traces but rather in the lexicon (Bouma, Malouf & Sag 2001a). As Levine & Hukari (2006) could show, however, theories of extraction that introduce long-distance dependencies lexically have problems with the semantic interpretation of coordinate structures. For a suggestion of how to solve these problems, see Chaves (2009). There are many TAG analyses without silent elements in the lexicon (see Section 12.5 and Kroch (1987), for example), however there are variants of TAG such as that of Kallmeyer (2005: 194), where a trace is assumed for the reordering of constituents in sentences with a verbal complex. Rambow (1994: 10–11) assumes an empty head in every verb phrase (see Section 12.6.2 on V-TAG).¹ In *Dependency Grammar*, Mel’čuk (1988: 303; 2003: 219), Starosta (1988: 253),

¹ Note that empty elements in TAG are slightly different from empty elements in other theories. In TAG the empty elements are usually part of elementary trees, that is, they are not lexical items that are combined with other material.

Eroms (2000: 471–472), Hudson (2007: Section 3.7; 2010b: 166) and Engel (2014) assume empty elements for determiners, nouns, ellipsis, imperatives, controlled infinitives, and for coordinate structures, but Groß & Osborne (2009: 73) reject empty elements (with the exception of ellipsis, Osborne 2016).

No empty elements are assumed in Construction Grammar (Michaelis & Ruppenhofer 2001: 49–50; Goldberg 2003a: 219; Goldberg 2006: 10), the related Simpler Syntax (Culicover & Jackendoff 2005) as well as in Cognitive Grammar.² The argumentation against empty elements runs along the following lines:

1. There is no evidence for invisible objects.
2. There is no innate linguistic knowledge.
3. Therefore, knowledge about empty elements cannot be learned, which is why they cannot be assumed as part of our grammar.

This begs the question of whether all the premises on which the conclusion is based actually hold. If we consider an elliptical construction such as (2), then it is clear that a noun has been omitted:

- (2) Ich nehme den roten Ball und du den blauen.
 I take the.ACC red.ACC ball and you the.ACC blue.ACC
 'I'll take the red ball and you take the blue one.'

Despite there being no noun in *den blauen* 'the blue', this group of words behaves both syntactically and semantically just like a noun phrase. (2) is of course not necessarily evidence for there being empty elements, because one could simply say that *den blauen* is a noun phrase consisting only of an article and an adjective (Wunderlich 1987).

Similar to the fact that it is understood that a noun is missing in (2), speakers of English know that something is missing after *like*:

- (3) Bagels, I like.

Every theory of grammar has to somehow account for these facts. It must be represented in some way that *like* in (3) behaves just like a verb phrase that is missing something. One possibility is to use traces. Bar-Hillel, Perles & Shamir (1961: 153, Lemma 4.1) have shown that it is possible to turn phrase structure grammars with empty elements into those without any. In many cases, the same techniques can be applied to the theories presented here and we will therefore discuss the point in more detail in the following section.

19.2 Eliminating empty elements from grammars

It is possible to turn a grammar with empty elements (also called *epsilon*) into a grammar without these by removing all categories that can be rewritten by an epsilon

² However, Fillmore (1988: 51) did not rule them out.

in every rule that uses such categories and then add the respective rules without the empty elements to the grammar. The following example has an epsilon rule for np. One therefore has to replace all rules containing the symbol np with new rules without this np symbol. (5) shows the result of this conversion of the grammar in (4):

- (4) $\bar{v} \rightarrow np, v$
 $\bar{v} \rightarrow np, pp, v$
 $np \rightarrow \epsilon$
- (5) $\bar{v} \rightarrow np, v$
 $\bar{v} \rightarrow v$
 $\bar{v} \rightarrow np, pp, v$
 $\bar{v} \rightarrow pp, v$

This can also lead to cases where all elements on the right-hand side of a rule are removed. Thus, what one has done is actually create a new empty category and then one has to apply the respective replacement processes again. We will see an example of this in a moment. Looking at the pair of grammars in (4)–(5), it is clear that the number of rules has increased in (5) compared to (4) despite the grammars licensing the same sequences of symbols. The fact that an NP argument can be omitted is not expressed directly in (5) but instead is implicitly contained in two rules.

If one applies this procedure to the HPSG grammar in Chapter 9, then the trace does not have a specific category such as NP. The trace simply has to be compatible with a non-head daughter. As the examples in (6) show, adjuncts, arguments and parts of verbal complexes can be extracted.

- (6) a. Er_i liest t_i die Berichte.
 he reads the reports
- b. Oft_i liest er die Berichte t_i nicht.
 often reads he the reports not
 ‘Often, he does not read the reports.’
- c. $Lesen_i$ wird er die Berichte t_i müssen.
 read will he the reports must
 ‘He will have to read the reports.’

The relevant elements are combined with their head in a specific schema (Head-Argument Schema, Head-Adjunct Schema, Predicate Complex Schema). See Chapter 9 for the first two schemata; the Predicate Complex Schema is motivated in detail in Müller (2002a: Chapter 2; 2007b: Chapter 15). If one wishes to do without traces, then one needs further additional schemata for the fronting of adjuncts, of arguments and of parts of predicate complexes. The combination of a head with a trace is given in Figure 19.1 on the following page. The trace-less analysis is shown in Figure 19.2 on the following page. In Figure 19.1, the element in the SUBCAT list of *kennen* is identified with the SYNSEM value of the trace [4]. The lexical entry of the trace prescribes that the LOCAL value of the trace should be identical to the element in the INHER|SLASH list.




图 19.1: Introduction of information about long-distance dependencies with a trace

The Non-Local Feature Principle (page 286) ensures that the SLASH information is present on the mother node. Since an argument position gets saturated in Head-Argument structures, the accusative object is no longer contained in the SUBCAT list of the mother node.

Figure 19.2 shows the parallel trace-less structure. The effect that one gets by com-




图 19.2: Introduction of information about long-distance dependencies using a unary projection

binning a trace in argument position in Head-Argument structures is represented directly on the mother node in Figure 19.2: the LOCAL value of the accusative object was identified with the element in INHER|SLASH on the mother node and the accusative object does not occur in the valence list any more.

The grammar presented in Chapter 9 contains another empty element: a verb trace. This would then also have to be eliminated.

- (7) a. Er_i liest_j t_i die Berichte t_j .
 he reads the reports
 b. Oft_i liest_j er die Berichte t_i nicht t_j .
 often reads he the reports not
 ‘Often, he does not read the reports.’
 c. Lesen_i wird_j er die Berichte t_i müssen t_j .
 read will he the reports must
 ‘He will have to read the reports.’

Figure 19.3 shows the combination of a verb trace with an accusative object. The verb




图 19.3: Analysis of verb position with verb trace

trace is specified such that the DSL value is identical to the LOCAL value of the trace (see p. 280). Since DSL is a head feature, the corresponding value is also present on the mother node. Figure 19.4 shows the structures that we get by omitting the empty node. This structure may look odd at first sight since a noun phrase is projected to a verb




图 19.4: Analysis of verb position using a unary projection

(see page 222 for similar verb-less structures in LFG). The information about the fact that a verb is missing in the structure is equally contained in this structure as in the structure with the verb trace. It is the DSL value that is decisive for the contexts in which the structure in Figure 19.4 can appear. This is identical to the value in Figure 19.3 and contains the information that a verb that requires an accusative object is missing in the structure in question. Until now, we have seen that extraction traces can be removed from the grammar by stipulating three additional rules. Similarly, three new rules are needed for the verb trace. Unfortunately, it does not stop here as the traces for extraction and head movement can also interact. For example, the NP in the tree in Figure 19.4 could be an extraction trace. Therefore, the combination of traces can result in more empty elements that then also have to be eliminated. Since we have three schemata, we will have three new empty elements if we combine the non-head daughter with an extraction trace and the head daughter with a verb trace. (8) shows these cases:

- (8) a. Er_i [schläft_j t_i t_j]. (Extraction trace (argument) + verb trace)
he sleeps
‘He is sleeping.’
- b. Jetzt_i [schlaf_j t_i t_j]! (Extraction trace (adjunct) + verb trace)
now sleep
‘Go to sleep now!’
- c. Geschlafen_i [wird_j t_i t_j]! (Extraction trace (complex) + verb trace)
slept is
‘Now is time to sleep!’

These three new traces can occur as non-head daughters in the Head-Argument Schema and thus one would require three new schemata for Head-Argument structures. Using these schemata, it then becomes possible to analyze the sentences in (8).

Six further schemata are required for the examples in (9) and (10) since the three new traces can each occur as heads in Head-Argument structures (9) and Head-Adjunct structures (10):

- (9) a. Den Aufsatz_i liest_j [er t_i t_j].
the essay reads he
‘He is reading the essay.’
- b. Oft_i liest_j er [ihn t_i t_j].
often reads he it
‘He often reads it.’
- c. Lesen_i wird_j er [ihn t_i t_j].
read will he it
‘He will read it.’
- (10) a. Den Aufsatz_i liest_j er [nicht t_i t_j].
the essay reads he not
‘He isn’t reading the essay.’
- b. Oft_i liest_j er ihn [nicht t_i t_j].
often reads he it not
‘He often doesn’t read it’
- c. Lesen_i wird_j er ihn [nicht t_i t_j].
reads will he it not
‘He won’t read it.’

Eliminating two empty elements therefore comes at the price of twelve new rules. These rules are not particularly transparent and it is not immediately obvious why the mother node describes a linguistic object that follows general grammatical laws. For example, there are no heads in the structures following the pattern in Figure 19.4. Since there is no empirical difference between the theoretical variant with twelve additional schemata

and the variant with two empty elements, one should prefer the theory that makes fewer assumptions (Occam's Razor) and that is the theory with two empty elements.

One might think that the problem discussed here is just a problem specific to HPSG not shared by trace-less analyses such as the LFG approach that was discussed in Section 7.5. If we take a closer look at the rule proposed by Dalrymple (2006: Section 2.2), we see that the situation in LFG grammars is entirely parallel. The brackets around the category symbols mark their optionality. The asterisk following the PP means that any number of PPs (zero or more) can occur in this position.

$$(11) \quad V' \rightarrow (V) (NP) PP^*$$

This means that (11) is a shorthand for rules such as those in (12):

- $$(12) \quad \begin{array}{ll} \text{a. } V' \rightarrow V \\ \text{b. } V' \rightarrow V NP \\ \text{c. } V' \rightarrow V NP PP \\ \text{d. } V' \rightarrow V NP PP PP \\ \text{e. } \dots \\ \text{f. } V' \rightarrow NP \\ \text{g. } V' \rightarrow NP PP \\ \text{h. } V' \rightarrow NP PP PP \\ \text{i. } \dots \end{array}$$

Since all the elements on the right-hand side of the rule are optional, the rule in (11) also stands for (13):

$$(13) \quad V' \rightarrow \epsilon$$

Thus, one does in fact have an empty element in the grammar although the empty element is not explicitly listed in the lexicon. This follows from the optionality of all elements on the right-hand side of a rule. The rule in (12f) corresponds to the schema licensed by the structure in Figure 19.4. In the licensed LFG structure, there is also no head present. Furthermore, one has a large number of rules that correspond to exactly the schemata that we get when we eliminate empty elements from an HPSG grammar. This fact is, however, hidden in the representational format of the LFG rules. The rule schemata of LFG allow for handy abbreviations of sometimes huge sets of rules (even infinite sets when using ‘*’).

Pollard (1988) has shown that Steedman's trace-less analysis of long-distance dependencies is not without its problems. As discussed in Section 8.5.3, a vast number of recategorization rules or lexical entries for relative pronouns are required.

19.3 Empty elements and semantic interpretation

In this section, I discuss an analysis that assumes empty elements in order to allow for different readings of particular sentences. I then show how one can use so-called underspecification approaches to do without empty elements.

Sentences such as (14) are interesting since they have multiple readings (see Dowty 1979: Section 5.6) and it is not obvious how these can be derived.

- (14) dass Max alle Fenster wieder öffnete
 that Max all windows again opened
 ‘that Max opened all the windows again’

There is a difference between a repetitive and a restitutive reading: for the repetitive reading of (14), Max has to have opened every window at least once before, whereas the restitutive reading only requires that all windows were open at some point, that is, they could have been opened by someone else.

These different readings are explained by decomposing the predicate *open'* into at least two sub-predicates. Egg (1999) suggests the decomposition into CAUSE and *open'*:

- (15) CAUSE(*x*, *open'*(*y*))

This means that there is a CAUSE operator that has scope over the relation *open'*. Using this kind of decomposition, it is possible to capture the varying scope of *wieder* ‘again’: in one of the readings, *wieder* scopes over CAUSE and it scopes over *open'* but below CAUSE in the other. If we assume that *öffnen* has the meaning in (15), then we still have to explain how the adverb can modify elements of a word’s meaning, that is, how *wieder* ‘again’ can refer to *open'*. Von Stechow (1996: 93) developed the analysis in Figure 19.5 on the following page. AgrS and AgrO are functional heads proposed for subject and object agreement in languages like Basque and have been adopted for German (see Section 4.6). Noun phrases have to be moved from the VoiceP into the specifier position of the AgrS and AgrO heads in order to receive case. T stands for Tense and corresponds to Infl in the GB theory (see Section 3.1.5 and Section 4.1.5). What is important is that there is the Voice head and the separate representation of *offen* ‘open’ as the head of its own phrase. In the figure, everything below Voice' corresponds to the verb *öffnen*. By assuming a separate Voice head that contributes causative meaning, it becomes possible to derive both readings in syntax: in the reading with narrow scope of *wieder* ‘again’, the adverb is adjoined to the XP and has scope over *open*(*x*). In the reading with wide scope, the adverb attaches to VoiceP or some higher phrase and therefore has scope over CAUSE(BECOME(*open*(*x*))).

Jäger & Blutner (2003) point out that this analysis predicts that sentences such as (16) only have the repetitive reading, that is, the reading where *wieder* ‘again’ has scope over CAUSE.

- (16) dass Max wieder alle Fenster öffnete
 that Max again all windows opened

This is because *wieder* precedes *alle Fenster* and therefore all heads that are inside VoiceP. Thus, *wieder* can only be combined with AgrOP or higher phrases and therefore has (too) wide scope. (16) does permit a restitutive reading, however: all windows were open at an earlier point in time and Max reestablishes this state.




图 19.5: Decomposition in syntactic structures

Egg (1999) develops an analysis for these *wieder* cases using Constraint Language for Lambda-Structures (CLLS). CLLS is an underspecification formalism, that is, no logical formulae are given but instead expressions that describe logical formulae. Using this kind of expressions, it is possible to leave scope relations underspecified. I have already mentioned Minimal Recursion Semantics (MRS) (Copestake, Flickinger, Pollard & Sag 2005) in several chapters of this book. As well as CLLS, MRS together with Underspecified Discourse Representation Theory (Reyle 1993; Frank & Reyle 1995) and Hole Semantics (Bos 1996; Blackburn & Bos 2005) all belong to the class of underspecification formalisms. See Baldridge & Kruijff (2002) for an underspecification analysis in Categorical Grammar and Nerbonne (1993) for an early underspecification analysis in HPSG. In the following, I will reproduce Egg's analysis in an MRS-like notation.

Before we turn to (14) and (16), let us consider the simpler sentence in (17):

- (17) dass Max alle Fenster öffnete
that Max all windows opened
‘that Max opened all the windows’

This sentence can mean that in a particular situation, it is true of all windows that Max opened them. A less readily accessible reading is the one in which Max causes all of the windows to be open. It is possible to force this reading if one rules out the first reading through contextual information (Egg 1999):

- (18) Erst war nur die Hälfte der Fenster im Bus auf, aber dann öffnete Max
first was only the half of.the windows in.the bus open but then opened Max
alle Fenster.
all windows
‘At first, only half of the windows in the bus were open, but then Max opened all of the windows.’

Both readings under discussion here differ with regard to the scope of the universal quantifier. The reading where Max opens all the windows himself corresponds to wide scope in (19a). The reading where some windows could have already been open corresponds to (19b):

- (19) a. $\forall x \text{ window}'(x) \rightarrow \text{CAUSE}(\text{max}', \text{open}'(x))$
b. $\text{CAUSE}(\text{max}', \forall x \text{ window}'(x) \rightarrow \text{open}'(x))$

Using underspecification, both of these readings can be represented in one dominance graph such as the one given in Figure 19.6. Each relation in Figure 19.6 has a name that




图 19.6: Dominance graph for *Max alle Fenster öffnete*

one can use to refer to the relation or “grasp” it. These names are referred to as *handle*. The dominance graph states that h_0 dominates both h_1 and h_6 and that h_2 dominates h_4 , h_3 dominates h_5 , and h_7 dominates h_5 . The exact scopal relations are underspecified:

the universal quantifier can have scope over CAUSE or CAUSE can have scope over the universal quantifier. Figures 19.7 and 19.8 show the variants of the graph with resolved scope. The underspecified graph in Figure 19.6 does not say anything about the relation




图 19.7: Dominance graph for the reading $\forall x \text{ window}(x) \rightarrow \text{CAUSE}(\text{max}, \text{open}(x))$.




图 19.8: Graph for the reading $\text{CAUSE}(\text{max}, \forall x \text{ window}(x) \rightarrow \text{open}(x))$.

between $h3$ and $h6$. The only thing it says is that $h3$ somehow has to dominate $h5$. In Figure 19.7 every ($h3$) dominates CAUSE ($h6$) and CAUSE dominates open ($h5$). So, *every'* dominates *open'* indirectly. In Figure 19.8, CAUSE dominates *every'* and *every'* dominates *open'*. Again the constraints of Figure 19.6 are fulfilled, but $h7$ dominates $h5$ only indirectly.

The fact that the quantifier dominates $h4$ is determined by the lexical entry of the quantifier. The fact that the quantifier dominates $h5$ does not have to be made explicit in the analysis since the quantifier binds a variable in the relation belonging to $h5$, namely

x. The dominance relation between $h7$ and $h5$ is always determined in the lexicon since CAUSE and *open'* both belong to the semantic contribution of a single lexical entry.

The exact syntactic theory that one adopts for this analysis is, in the end, not of great importance. I have chosen HPSG here. As Figure 19.9 shows, the analysis of *alle Fenster öffnet* contains a simple structure with a verb and an object. This structure does not differ




图 19.9: MRS analysis of *alle Fenster öffnet*

from the one that would be assumed for *alle Kinder kennt* ‘all children know’, involving the semantically simplex verb *kennen* ‘to know’. The only difference comes from the meaning of the individual words involved. As shown in Section 9.1.6, relations between individual words are passed on upwards. The same happens with scopal restrictions. These are also represented in lists. HCONS stands for *handle constraints*. $=_q$ in $h0 =_q h6$ stand for the equality *modulo* quantifier scope.

Egg lists the following readings for the sentence in (16) – repeated here as (20):

- (20) dass Max wieder alle Fenster öffnete
 that Max again all windows opened
 ‘that Max opened all the windows again’

1. Max opened every window and he had already done that at least once for each window (*again'*(\forall (CAUSE(open))); repetitive)
2. Max caused every window to be open and he had done that at least once before (*again'*(CAUSE(\forall (open))); repetitive)
3. At some earlier point in time, all windows were simultaneously open and Max re-established this state (CAUSE(*again'*(\forall (open))); restitutive)

These readings correspond to the dominance graph in Figure 19.10 on the next page. Figure 19.11 on the following page shows the graph for (14) – repeated here as (21):




图 19.10: Dominance graph for *Max wieder alle Fenster öffnete* ‘that Max opened all the windows again’

- (21) dass Max alle Fenster wieder öffnete
that Max all windows again opened




图 19.11: Dominance graph for *Max alle Fenster wieder öffnete* ‘that Max opened all the windows again’

To derive these dominance graphs from the ones without *wieder* ‘again’, all one has to do is add the expression $h8:again(h9)$ and the dominance requirements that demand that $h9$ dominates quantifiers occurring to the right of *wieder* and that it is dominated by quantifiers to the left of *wieder*.

It is therefore unproblematic to derive the relevant readings for modification by *wieder* without empty elements for CAUSE and BECOME. The meaning of the word *öffnen* is decomposed in a similar way but the decomposed meaning is assigned to a single element, the verb. By underspecification of the scopal relations in the lexicon, the relevant readings can then be derived.

19.4 Evidence for empty elements

As previously discussed, grammarians agree that both linguists and speakers notice when there is a constituent missing from a string of words. For cases where it can be shown that analyses with or without traces are indistinguishable empirically, then one can assume empty elements. Nevertheless, the learnability argument put forward by Construction Grammarians has some validity: if one assumes that there is no or little innate linguistic knowledge, then it is not possible to motivate empty elements with data from other languages. This means that just because Basque shows object agreement, this does not mean that one can assume an empty head for object agreement (AgrO) in a grammar of German as for instance von Stechow (1996) and Meinunger (2000) do. Since there is no object agreement in German, there would be no way for the child to learn the fact that there is an AgrO head. Knowledge about AgrO must therefore be innate. Since the assumption of innate linguistic knowledge is controversial (see Chapter 13), any theory that uses cross-linguistic data to motivate the use of empty elements is on shaky ground.

Cross-linguistic considerations can only be drawn upon if there are no empirical differences between multiple alternative analyses compatible and motivated by the language under consideration. In this case, one should follow Occam's Razor and choose the analysis which is compatible with analyses of other languages (see Müller 2015a and Chapter 22.2).

19.5 Transformations, lexical rules, and empty elements

In the discussion of the passive in the framework of TAG, it became clear that lexical rules correspond to particular transformations, namely those which have some relation to a lexical item (lexically governed transformations, Dowty 1978; for the discussion of transformations and lexical rules, see Bresnan (1978) and Bresnan & Kaplan (1982)). In the respective variants of TAG, lexical rules establish a relation between a lexical item for an active tree with a lexical item of a passive tree. Both the active and passive tree can be extended by adjunction.

In theories such as Categorical Grammar, the situation is similar: since the direction in which a functor expects to find its argument is fixed for languages such as English, the lexical item stands for an entire tree. Only the attachment of adjuncts is not yet specified in lexical items. The positions in the tree where the adjuncts can occur depend on the properties of the adjuncts. In Section 8.4, we have seen suggestions for treatments of languages with free constituent order. If the direction of combination is not fixed in the

lexicon, then the lexical item can occur in a number of trees. If we compare lexical rules that can be applied to this kind of lexical items with transformations, we see that lexical rules create relations between different sets of trees.

In HPSG analyses, this works in a similar way: lexical rules relate lexical items with differing valence properties to each other. In HPSG grammars of English, there is normally a schema that licenses a VP containing the verb and all its complements as well as a schema that connects the subject to the VP (Pollard & Sag 1994: 39). In the lexical items for finite verbs, it is already determined what the tree will look like in the end. As in Categorical Grammar, adjuncts in HPSG can be combined with various intermediate projections. Depending on the dominance schemata used in a particular grammar, the lexical item will determine the constituent structure in which it can occur or allow for multiple structures. In the grammar of German proposed in Chapter 9, it is possible to analyze six different sequences with a lexical item for a ditransitive verb, that is, the lexical item can – putting adjuncts aside – occur in six different structures with verb-final order. Two sequences can be analyzed with the passive lexical item, which only has two arguments. As in Categorical Grammar, sets of licensed structures are related to other sets of licensed structures. In HPSG theorizing and also in Construction Grammar, there have been attempts to replace lexical rules with other mechanisms since their “status is dubious and their interaction with other analyses is controversial” (Bouma, Malouf & Sag 2001a: 19). Bouma et al. (2001a) propose an analysis for extraction that, rather than connecting lexical items with differing valence lists, establishes a relation between a subset of a particular list in a lexical item and another list in the same lexical item. The results of the two alternative analyses are shown in (22) and (23), respectively:

- (22) a.
$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{SUBCAT} \langle \text{NP}[\textit{nom}], \text{NP}[\textit{acc}] \rangle \\ \text{SLASH} \langle \rangle \end{array} \right]$$
- b.
$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{SUBCAT} \langle \text{NP}[\textit{nom}] \rangle \\ \text{SLASH} \langle \text{NP}[\textit{acc}] \rangle \end{array} \right]$$

In (22), (22a) is the basic entry and (22b) is related to (22a) via a lexical rule. The alternative analysis would only involve specifying the appropriate value of the ARG-ST feature³ and the SUBCAT and SLASH value is then derived from the ARG-ST value using the relevant constraints. (23) shows two of the licensed lexical items.

- (23) a.
$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{ARG-ST} \langle \text{NP}[\textit{nom}], \text{NP}[\textit{acc}] \rangle \\ \text{SUBCAT} \langle \text{NP}[\textit{nom}], \text{NP}[\textit{acc}] \rangle \\ \text{SLASH} \langle \rangle \end{array} \right]$$
- b.
$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{ARG-ST} \langle \text{NP}[\textit{nom}], \text{NP}[\textit{acc}] \rangle \\ \text{SUBCAT} \langle \text{NP}[\textit{nom}] \rangle \\ \text{SLASH} \langle \text{NP}[\textit{acc}] \rangle \end{array} \right]$$

³ ARG-ST stands for *Argument Structure*. The value of ARG-ST is a list containing all the arguments of a head. For more on ARG-ST, see Section 9.6.1.

If we want to eliminate lexical rules entirely in this way, then we would require an additional feature for each change.⁴ Since there are many interacting valence-changing processes, things only work out with the stipulation of a large number of auxiliary features. The consequences of assuming such analyses have been discussed in detail in Müller (2007b: Section 7.5.2.2). The problems that arise are parallel for inheritance-based approaches for argument structure-changing processes: they also require auxiliary features since it is not possible to model embedding and multiple changes of valence information with inheritance. See Section 10.2.

Furthermore, the claim that the status of lexical rules is dubious must be rejected: there are worked-out formalizations of lexical rules (Meurers 2001; Copestake & Briscoe 1992; Lascarides & Copestake 1999) and their interaction with other analyses is not controversial. Most HPSG implementations make use of lexical rules and the interaction of a number of rules and constraints can be easily verified by experiments with implemented fragments.

Jackendoff (1975) presents two possible conceptions of lexical rules: in one variant, the lexicon contains all words in a given language and there are just redundancy rules saying something about how certain properties of lexical entries behave with regard to properties of other lexical entries. For example, *les-* ‘read-’ and *lesbar* ‘readable’ would both have equal status in the lexicon. In the other way of thinking of lexical rules, there are a few basic lexical entries and the others are derived from these using lexical rules. The stem *les-* ‘read-’ would be the basic entry and *lesbar* would be derived from it. In HPSG, the second of the two variants is more often assumed. This is equivalent to the assumption of unary rules. In Figure 9.8 on page 276, this has been shown accordingly: the verb *kennt* ‘knows’ is mapped by a lexical rule to a verb that selects the projection of an empty verbal head. With this conception of lexical rules, it is possible to remove lexical rules from the grammar by assuming binary-branching structures with an empty head rather than unary rules. For example, in HPSG analyses of resultative constructions such as (24), lexical rules have been proposed (Verspoor 1997; Wechsler 1997; Wechsler & Noh 2001; Müller 2002a: Chapter 5).

- (24) [dass] Peter den Teich leer fischt
 that Peter the pond empty fishes
 ‘that Peter fishes the pond empty’

In my own analysis, a lexical rule connects a verb used intransitively to a verb that selects an accusative object and a predicate. Figure 19.12 on the next page shows the corresponding tree. If we consider what (24) means, then we notice that the fishing act causes the pond to become empty. This causation is not contained in any of the basic lexical items for the words in (24). In order for this information to be present in the semantic representation of the entire expression, it has to be added by means of a lexical

⁴ Alternatively, one could assume a very complex relation that connects ARG-ST and SUBCAT. But this would then have to deliver the result of an interaction of a number of phenomena and the interaction of these phenomena would not be captured in a transparent way.




图 19.12: Analysis of the resultative construction with a lexical rule

rule. The lexical rule says: if a verb is used with an additional predicate and accusative object, then the entire construction has a causative meaning.

Figure 19.13 on the following page shows how a lexical rule can be replaced by an empty head. The empty head requires the intransitive verb and additionally an adjective, an accusative object and a subject. The subject of *fischt* ‘fishes’ must of course be identical to the subject that is selected by the combination of *fischt* and the empty head. This is not shown in the figure. It is possible, however, to establish this identity (see Hinrichs & Nakazawa 1994). The causative semantics is contributed by the empty head in this analysis. The trick that is being implemented here is exactly what was done in Section 19.2, just in the opposite direction: in the previous section, binary-branching structures with an empty daughter were replaced by unary-branching structures. In this section, we have replaced unary-branching structures with binary-branching structures with an empty daughter.⁵

We have therefore seen that certain transformations can be replaced by lexical rules and also that lexical rules can be replaced by empty heads. The following chapter deals with the question of whether phenomena like extraction, scrambling, and passive should be described with the same tool as in GB/Minimalism or with different tools as in LFG

⁵ Here, we are discussing lexical rules, but this transformation trick can also be applied to other unary rules. Semanticists often use such rules for type shifting. For example, a rule that turns a referential NP such as *a trickster* in (i.a) into a predicative one (i.b) (Partee 1987).

- (i) a. A trickster laughs.
- b. He is a trickster.

These changes can be achieved by a unary rule that is applied to an NP or with a special empty head that takes an NP as its argument. In current Minimalist approaches, empty heads are used (Ramchand 2005: 370), in Categorical Grammar and HPSG unary-branching rules are more common (Flickinger 2008: 91–92; Müller 2009c, 2012a).




图 19.13: Analysis of the resultative construction with an empty head

19 Empty elements

and HPSG.

第二十章 **Extraction, scrambling, and passive: one or several descriptive devices?**

An anonymous reviewer suggested discussing one issue in which transformational theories differ from theories like LFG and HPSG. The reviewer claimed that Transformational Grammars use just one tool for the description of active/passive alternations, scrambling, and extraction, while theories like LFG and HPSG use different techniques for all three phenomena. If this claim were correct and if the analyses made correct predictions, the respective GB/Minimalism theories would be better than their competitors, since the general aim in science is to develop theories that need a minimal set of assumptions. I already commented on the analysis of passive in GB in Section 3.4, but I want to extend this discussion here and include a Minimalist analysis and one from Dependency Grammar.

The task of any passive analysis is to explain the difference in argument realization in examples like (1):

- (1) a. She beats him.
- b. He was beaten.

In these examples about chess, the accusative object of *beat* is realized as the nominative in (1b). In addition, it can be observed that the position of the elements is different: while *him* is realized postverbally in object position in (1a), it is realized preverbally in (1b). In GB this is explained by a movement analysis. It is assumed that the object does not get case in passive constructions and hence has to move into the subject position where case is assigned by the finite verb. This analysis is also assumed in Minimalist work as in David Adger's textbook (2003), for instance. Figure 20.1 on the next page shows his analysis of (2):

- (2) Jason was killed.

TP stands for Tense Phrase and corresponds to the IP that was discussed in Chapter 3. PassP is a functional head for passives. *v*P is a special category for the analysis of verb phrases that was originally introduced for the analysis of ditransitives (Larson 1988) and VP is the normal VP that consists of verb and object. In Adger's analysis, the verb *kill* moves from the verb position in VP to the head position of *v*, the passive auxiliary *be* moves from the head position of PassP to the head position of the Tense Phrase. Features




图 20.1: Adger's Minimalist movement-based analysis of the passive (p. 231)

like Infl are 'checked' in combination with such movements. The exact implementation of these checking and valuing operations does not matter here. What is important is that *Jason* moves from the object position to a position that was formerly known as the specifier position of T (see Footnote 26 on page 145 on the notion of specifier). All these analyses assume that the participle cannot assign accusative to its object and that the object has to move to another position to get case or check features. How exactly one can formally represent the fact that the participle cannot assign case is hardly ever made explicit in the GB literature. The following is a list of statements that can be found in the literature:

- (3) a. We shall assume that a passivized verb loses the ability to assign structural ACCUSATIVE case to its complement. (Haegeman 1994: 183)
- b. das Objekt des Aktivsatzes wird zum Subjekt des Passivsatzes, weil die passivische Verbform keinen Akkusativ-Kasus regieren kann (Akk-Kasus-Absorption). (Lohnstein 2014: 172)

In addition, it is sometimes said that the external theta-role is absorbed by the verb morphology (Jaeggli 1986; Haegeman 1994: 183). Now, what would it entail if we made this explicit? There is some lexical item for verbs like *beat*. The active form has the ability to assign accusative to its object, but the passive form does not. Since this is a property that is shared by all transitive verbs (by definition of the term transitive verb), this is some regularity that has to be captured. One way to capture this is the assumption of a special passive morpheme that suppresses the agent and changes something in the case specification of the stem it attaches too. How this works in detail was never made explicit. Let us compare this morpheme-based analysis with lexical rule-based analyses: as was explained in Section 19.5, empty heads can be used instead of lexical rules in those cases in which the phonological form of the input and the output do not differ. So for ex-

ample, lexical rules that license additional arguments as in resultative constructions, for instance, can be replaced by an empty head. However, as was explained in Section 9.2, lexical rules are also used to model morphology. This is also true for Construction Grammar (see Gert Booij's work on Construction Morphology (2010), which is in many ways similar to Riehemann's work in HPSG (1993; 1998)). In the case of the passive lexical rule, the participle morphology is combined with the stem and the subject is suppressed in the corresponding valence list. This is exactly what is described in the GB/MP literature. The respective lexical rule for the analysis of *ge-lieb-t* 'loved' is depicted in Figure 20.2 to the left. The morpheme-based analysis is shown to the right. To keep things simple, I




图 20.2: Lexical rule-based/constructionist vs. morpheme-based analysis

assume a flat analysis, but those who insist on binary branching structures would have to come up with a way of deciding whether the *ge-* or the *-t* is combined first with the stem and in which way selection and percolation of features takes place. Independent of how morphology is done, the fact that the inflected form (the top node in both figures) has different properties than the verb stem has to be represented somehow. In the morpheme-based world, the morpheme is responsible for suppressing the agent and changing the case assignment properties, in the lexical rule/construction world this is done by the respective lexical rule. There is no difference in terms of needed tools and necessary stipulations.

The situation in Minimalist theories is a little bit different. For instance, (Adger 2003: 229, 231) writes the following:

Passives are akin to unaccusatives, in that they do not assign accusative case to their object, and they do not appear to have a thematic subject. [...] Moreover, the idea that the function of this auxiliary is to select an unaccusative little *vP* simultaneously explains the lack of accusative case and the lack of a thematic subject. (Adger 2003: 229, 231)

So this is an explicit statement. The relation between a stem and a passive participle form that was assumed in GB analyses is now a verb stem that is combined with two different versions of little *v*. Which *v* is chosen is determined by the governing head, a functional Perf head or a Pass head. This can be depicted as in Figure 20.3 on the next page. When *kill* is used in the perfect or the passive, it is spelled out as *killed*. If it is used in the active with a 3rd person singular subject it is spelled out as *kills*. This can be compared with a lexical analysis, for instance the one assumed in HPSG. The analysis is shown in




Figure 20.3: Analysis of the passive and the perfect and the passive in a Minimalist theory involving two different versions of little *v*

Figure 20.4. The left figure shows a lexical item that is licensed by a lexical rule that is




图 20.4: Lexical rule-based analysis of the perfect and the passive in HPSG

applied to the stem *kill-*. The stem has two elements in its argument structure list and for the active forms the complete argument structure list is shared between the licensed lexical item and the stem. The first element of the ARG-ST list is mapped to SPR and the other elements to COMPS (in English). Passive is depicted in the right figure: the first element of the ARG-ST with structural case is suppressed and since the element that was the second element in the ARG-ST list of the stem (2) is now the first element, this item is mapped to SPR. See Section 9.2 for passive in HPSG and Section 9.6.1 for comments on ARG-ST and the differences between German and English.

The discussion of Figures 20.3 and 20.4 are a further illustration of a point made in Section 19.5: lexical rules can be replaced by empty heads and vice versa. While HPSG says there are stems that are related to inflected forms and corresponding to the inflection the arguments are realized in a certain way, Minimalist theories assume two variants of little *v* that differ in their selection of arguments. Now, the question is: are there empirical differences between the two approaches? I think there are differences if one considers the question of language acquisition. What children can acquire from data is that there are various inflected forms and that they are related somehow. What remains questionable is whether they really would be able to detect empty little *vs*. One could claim of course that children operate with chunks of structures such as the ones in Figure 20.3. But then a verb would be just a chunk consisting of little *v* and *V* and

having some open slots. This would be indistinguishable from what the HPSG analysis assumes.

As far as the “lexical rules as additional tool” aspect is concerned, the discussion is closed, but note that the standard GB/Minimalism analyses differ in another way from LFG and HPSG analyses, since they assume that passive has something to do with movement, that is, they assume that the same mechanisms are used that are used for nonlocal dependencies.¹ This works for languages like English in which the object has to be realized in postverbal position in the active and in preverbal position in the passive, but it fails for languages like German in which the order of constituents is more free. Lenerz (1977: Section 4.4.3) discussed the examples in (44) on page 101 – which are repeated here as (4) for convenience:

- (4) a. weil das Mädchen dem Jungen den Ball schenkt
 because the girl the.DAT boy the.ACC Ball gives
 ‘because the girl gives the ball to the boy’
 b. weil dem Jungen der Ball geschenkt wurde
 because the.DAT boy the.NOM ball given was
 c. weil der Ball dem Jungen geschenkt wurde
 because the.NOM ball the.DAT boy given was
 ‘because the ball was given to the boy’

While both orders in (4b) and (4c) are possible, the one with dative–nominative order in (4b) is the unmarked one. There is a strong linearization preference in German demanding that animate NPs be serialized before inanimate ones (Hoberg 1981: 46). This linearization rule is unaffected by passivization. Theories that assume that passive is movement either have to assume that the passive of (4a) is (4c) and (4b) is derived from (4c) by a further reordering operation (which would be implausible since usually one assumes that more marked constructions require more transformations), or they would have to come up with other explanations for the fact that the subject of the passive sentence has the same position as the object in active sentences. As was already explained in Section 3.4, one such explanation is to assume an empty expletive subject that is placed in the position where nominative is assigned and to somehow connect this expletive element to the subject in object position. While this somehow works, it should be clear that the price for rescuing a movement-based analysis of passive is rather high: one has to assume an empty expletive element, that is, something that neither has a form nor a meaning. The existence of such an object could not be inferred from the input unless it is assumed that the structures in which it is assumed are given. Thus, a rather rich UG would have to be assumed.

¹ There is another option in Minimalist theories. Since Agree can check features nonlocally, T can assign nominative to an embedded element. So, in principle the object may get nominative in the VP without moving to T. However, Adger (2003: 368) assumes that German has a strong EPP feature on T, so that the underlying object has to move to the specifier of T. This is basically the old GB analysis of passive in German with all its conceptual problems and disadvantages.

The question one needs to ask here is: why does the movement-based analysis have these problems and why does the valence-based analysis not have them? The cause of the problem is that the analysis of the passive mixes two things: the fact that SVO languages like English encode subjecthood positionally, and the fact that the subject is suppressed in passives. If these two things are separated the problem disappears. The fact that the object of the active sentence in (1a) is realized as the subject in (1b) is explained by the assumption that the first NP on the argument structure list with structural case is realized as subject and mapped to the respective valence feature: *SPR* in English. Such mappings can be language specific (see Section 9.6.1 and Müller (2016a) where I discuss Icelandic, which is an SVO language with subjects with lexical case).

In what follows, I discuss another set of examples that are sometimes seen as evidence for a movement-based analysis. The examples in (5) are instances of the so-called remote passive (Höhle 1978: 175–176).²

- (5) a. daß er auch von mir zu überreden versucht wurde³
 that he.NOM also from me to persuade tried got
 ‘that an attempt to persuade him was also made by me’
 b. weil der Wagen oft zu reparieren versucht wurde
 because the car.NOM often to repair tried was
 ‘because many attempts were made to repair the car’

What is interesting about these examples is that the subject is the underlying object of a deeply embedded verb. This seems to suggest that the object is extracted out of the verb phrase. So the analysis of (5b) would be (6):

- (6) weil [_{IP} der Wagen_i [_{VP} oft [_{VP} [_{VP} _{-i} zu reparieren] versucht] wurde]
 because the car.NOM often to repair tried was

While this is a straight-forward explanation of the fact that (5b) is grammatical, another explanation is possible as well. In the HPSG analysis of German (and Dutch) it is assumed that verbs like those in (5b) form a verbal complex, that is, *zu reparieren versucht wurde* ‘to repair tried was’ forms one unit. When two or more verbs form a complex, the highest verb attracts the arguments from the verb it embeds (Hinrichs & Nakazawa 1989c, 1994; Bouma & van Noord 1998). A verb like *versuchen* ‘to try’ selects a subject, an infinitive with *zu* ‘to’ and all complements that are selected by this infinitive. In the analysis of (7), *versuchen* ‘to try’ selects for its subject, the object of *reparieren* ‘to repair’ and for the verb *zu reparieren* ‘to repair’.

- (7) weil er den Wagen zu reparieren versuchen will
 because he.NOM the.ACC car to repair try wants
 ‘because he wants to try to repair the car’

² See Müller (2002a: Section 3.1.4.1) and Wurmbrand (2003b) for corpus examples.

³ Oppenrieder (1991: 212).

Now if the passive lexical rule applies to *versuch-*, it suppresses the first argument of *versuch-* with structural case, which is the subject of *versuch-*. The next argument of *versuch-* is the object of *zu reparieren*. Since this element is the first NP with structural case, it gets nominative as in (5b). So, this shows that there is an analysis of the remote passive that does not rely on movement. Since movement-based analyses were shown to be problematic and since there are no data that cannot be explained without movement, analyses without movement have to be preferred.

This leaves us with movement-based accounts of local reordering (scrambling). The reviewer suggested that scrambling, passive, and nonlocal extraction may be analyzed with the same mechanism. It was long thought that scope facts made the assumption of movement-based analyses of scrambling necessary, but it was pointed out by Kiss (2001: 146) and Fanselow (2001: Section 2.6) that the reverse is true: movement-based accounts of scrambling make wrong predictions with regard to available quantifier scopings. I discussed the respective examples in Section 3.5 already and will not repeat the discussion here. The conclusion that has to be drawn from this is that passive, scrambling, and long distance extraction are three different phenomena that should be treated differently. The solution for the analysis of the passive that is adopted in HPSG is based on an analysis by Haider (1986a), who worked within the GB framework. The “scrambling-as-base generation” approach to local reordering that was used in HPSG right from the beginning (Gunji 1986) is also adopted by some practitioners of GB/Minimalism, e.g., Fanselow (2001).

Having discussed the analyses in GB/Minimalism, I now turn to Dependency Grammar. Groß & Osborne (2009) suggest that w-fronting, topicalization, scrambling, extraposition, splitting, and also the remote passive should be analyzed by what they call *rising*. The concept was already explained in Section 11.5. The Figures 20.5 and 20.6 show examples for the fronting and the scrambling of an object. Groß and Osborne assume




图 20.5: Analysis of *Die Idee wird jeder verstehen*. ‘Everybody will understand the idea.’ involving rising

that the object depends on the main verb in sentences with auxiliary verbs, while the subject depends on the auxiliary. Therefore, the object *die Idee* ‘the idea’ and the object *sich* ‘himself’ have to rise to the next higher verb in order to keep the structures projec-




图 20.6: Analysis of *Gestern hat sich der Spieler verletzt*. ‘Yesterday, the player injured himself.’ involving rising of the object of the main verb *verletzt* ‘injured’

tive. Figure 20.7 shows the analysis of the remote passive. The object of *zu reparieren* ‘to




图 20.7: Analysis of the remote passive *dass der Wagen zu reparieren versucht wurde* ‘that it was tried to repair the car’ involving rising

repair’ rises to the auxiliary *wurde* ‘was’.

Groß and Osborne use the same mechanism for all these phenomena, but it should be clear that there have to be differences in the exact implementation. Groß and Osborne say that English does not have scrambling, while German does. If this is to be captured, there must be a way to distinguish the two phenomena, since if this were not possible, one would predict that English has scrambling as well, since both German and English allow long distance fronting. Groß & Osborne (2009: 58) assume that object nouns that rise must take the nominative. But if the kind of rising that they assume for remote passives is identical to the one that they assume for scrambling, they would predict that *den Wagen* gets nominative in (8) as well:

- (8) dass den Wagen niemand repariert hat
 that the.ACC car nobody.NOM repaired has
 ‘that nobody repaired the car’

Since *den Wagen* ‘the car’ and *repariert* ‘repaired’ are not adjacent, *den Wagen* has to rise to the next higher head in order to allow for a projective realization of elements. So in order to assign case properly, one has to take into account the arguments that are governed by the head to which a certain element rises. Since the auxiliary *hat* ‘has’ already governs a nominative, the NP *den Wagen* has to be realized in the accusative. An analysis that assumes that both the accusative and nominative depend on *hat* ‘has’ in (8) is basically the verbal complex analysis assumed in HPSG and some GB variants.

Note, however, that this does not extend to nonlocal dependencies. Case is assigned locally by verbs or verbal complexes, but not to elements that come from far away. The long distance extraction of NPs is more common in southern variants of German and there are only a few verbs that do not take a nominative argument themselves. The examples below involve *dünken* ‘to think’, which governs an accusative and a sentential object and *scheinen* ‘to seem’, which governs a dative and a sentential object. If (9a) is analyzed with *den Wagen* rising to *dünkt*, one might expect that *den Wagen* ‘the car’ gets nominative since there is no other element in the nominative. However, (8b) is entirely out.

- (9) a. Den Wagen dünkt mich, dass er repariert.
 the.ACC car thinks me.ACC that he.NOM repairs
 ‘I think that he repairs the car’
 b. *Der Wagen dünkt mich, dass er repariert.
 the.NOM car thinks me.ACC that he.NOM repairs

Similarly there is no agreement between the fronted element and the verb to which it attaches:

- (10) a. Mir scheint, dass die Wagen ihm gefallen.
 me.DAT.1PL seems.3SG that the cars.3PL him please.3PL
 ‘He seems to me to like the cars.’
 b. Die Wagen scheint mir, dass ihm gefallen.
 the cars.3PL seem.3SG me.DAT that him please.3PL
 ‘The cars, he seems to me to like.’
 c. *Die Wagen scheinen mir, dass ihm gefällt.
 the cars.3PL seem.3PL me.DAT that him pleases.3SG
 d. *Die Wagen scheinen mir, dass ihm gefallen.
 the cars.3PL seem.3PL me.DAT that him please.3PL

This shows that scrambling/remote passive and extraction should not be dealt with by the same mechanism or if they are dealt with by the same mechanism one has to make sure that there are specialized variants of the mechanism that take the differences into

account. I think what Groß and Osborne did is simply recode the attachment relations of phrase structure grammars. *die Idee* ‘the idea’ has some relation to *wird jeder verstehen* ‘will everybody understand’ in Figure 20.5, as it does in GB, LFG, GPSG, HPSG, and other similar frameworks. In HPSG, *die Idee* ‘the idea’ is the filler in a filler-head configuration. The remote passive and local reorderings of arguments of auxiliaries, modal verbs, and other verbs that behave similarly are explained by verbal complex formation where all non-verbal arguments depend on the highest verb (Hinrichs & Nakazawa 1994).

Concluding this chapter, it can be said that local reorderings and long-distance dependencies are two different things that should be described with different tools (or there should be further constraints that differ for the respective phenomena when the same tool is used). Similarly, movement-based analyses of the passive are problematic since passive does not necessarily imply reordering.

第二十一章 Phrasal vs. lexical analyses

coauthored with Stephen Wechsler

This section deals with a rather crucial aspect when it comes to the comparison of the theories described in this book: valence and the question whether sentence structure, or rather syntactic structure in general, is determined by lexical information or whether syntactic structures have an independent existence (and meaning) and lexical items are just inserted into them. Roughly speaking, frameworks like GB/Minimalism, LFG, CG, HPSG, and DG are lexical, while GPSG and Construction Grammar (Goldberg 1995, 2003a; Tomasello 2003, 2006b; Croft 2001) are phrasal approaches. This categorization reflects tendencies, but there are non-lexical approaches in Minimalism (Borer's exoskeletal approach, 2003) and LFG (Alsina 1996; Asudeh et al. 2008, 2013) and there are lexical approaches in Construction Grammar (Sign-Based Construction Grammar, see Section 10.6.2). The phrasal approach is wide-spread also in frameworks like Cognitive Grammar (Dąbrowska 2001; Langacker 2009: 169) and Simpler Syntax (Culicover & Jackendoff 2005; Jackendoff 2008) that could not be discussed in this book.

The question is whether the meaning of an utterance like (1a) is contributed by the verb *give* and the structure needed for the NPs occurring together with the verb does not contribute any meaning or whether there is a phrasal pattern [X Verb Y Z] that contributes some "ditransitive meaning" whatever this may be.¹

- (1) a. Peter gives Mary the book.
b. Peter fishes the pond empty.

¹ Note that the prototypical meaning is a transfer of possession in which Y receives Z from X, but the reverse holds in (i.b):

- (i) a. Er gibt ihr den Ball.
he.NOM gives her.DAT the.ACC ball
b. Er stiehlt ihr den Ball.
he.NOM steals her.DAT the.ACC ball
'He steals the ball from her.'

Similarly, there is the question of how the constituents in (1b) are licensed. This sentence is interesting since it has a resultative meaning that is not part of the meaning of the verb *fish*: Peter’s fishing causes the pond to become empty. Nor is this additional meaning part of the meaning of any other item in the sentence. On the lexical account, there is a lexical rule that licenses a lexical item that selects for *Peter*, *the pond*, and *empty*. This lexical item also contributes the resultative meaning. On the phrasal approach, it is assumed that there is a pattern [Subj V Obj Obl]. This pattern contributes the resultative meaning, while the verb that is inserted into this pattern just contributes its prototypical meaning, e.g., the meaning that *fish* would have in an intransitive construction. I call such phrasal approaches *plugging approaches*, since lexical items are plugged into ready-made structures that do most of the work.

In what follows I will examine these proposals in more detail and argue that the lexical approaches to valence are the correct ones. The discussion will be based on earlier work of mine (Müller 2006, 2007c, 2010b) and work that I did together with Steve Wechsler (Müller & Wechsler 2014a,b). Some of the sections in Müller & Wechsler (2014a) started out as translations of Müller (2013b), but the material was reorganized and refocused due to intensive discussion with Steve Wechsler. So rather than using a translation of Section 11.11 of Müller (2013b), I use parts of Müller & Wechsler (2014a) here and add some subsections that had to be left out of the article due to space restrictions (Subsections 21.3.6 and 21.7.3). Because there have been misunderstandings in the past (e.g., Boas (2014), see Müller & Wechsler (2014b)), a disclaimer is necessary here: this section is not an argument against Construction Grammar. As was mentioned above Sign-Based Construction Grammar is a lexical variant of Construction Grammar and hence compatible with what I believe to be correct. This section is also not against phrasal constructions in general, since there are phenomena that seem to be best captured with phrasal constructions. These are discussed in detail in Subsection 21.10. What I will argue against in the following subsections is a special kind of phrasal construction, namely phrasal argument structure constructions (phrasal ASCs). I believe that all phenomena that have to do with valence and valence alternations should be treated lexically.

21.1 Some putative advantages of phrasal models

In this section we examine certain claims to purported advantages of phrasal versions of Construction Grammar over lexical rules. Then in the following section, we will turn to positive arguments for lexical rules.

21.1.1 Usage-based theories

For many practitioners of Construction Grammar, their approach to syntax is deeply rooted in the ontological strictures of *usage-based* theories of language (Langacker 1987; Goldberg 1995; Croft 2001; Tomasello 2003). Usage-based theorists oppose the notion of “linguistic rules conceived of as algebraic procedures for combining symbols that do not themselves contribute to meaning” (Tomasello 2003: 99). All linguistic entities are

symbolic of things in the realm of denotations; “all have communicative significance because they all derive directly from language use” (*ibid*). Although the formatives of language may be rather abstract, they can never be divorced from their functional origin as a tool of communication. The usage-based view of constructions is summed up well in the following quote:

The most important point is that constructions are nothing more or less than patterns of usage, which may therefore become relatively abstract if these patterns include many different kinds of specific linguistic symbols. But never are they empty rules devoid of semantic content or communicative function. (Tomasello 2003: 100)

Thus constructions are said to differ from grammatical rules in two ways: they must carry meaning; and they reflect the actual “patterns of usage” fairly directly.

Consider first the constraint that every element of the grammar must carry meaning, which we call the *semiotic dictum*. Do lexical or phrasal theories hew the most closely to this dictum? Categorical Grammar, the paradigm of a lexical theory (see Chapter 8), is a strong contender: it consists of meaningful words, with only a few very general combinatorial rules such as $X/Y * Y = X$. Given the rule-to-rule assumption, those combinatorial rules specify the meaning of the whole as a function of the parts. Whether such a rule counts as meaningful in itself in Tomasello’s sense is not clear.

What does seem clear is that the combinatorial rules of Construction Grammar, such as Goldberg’s Correspondence Principle for combining a verb with a construction (1995: 50), have the same status as those combinatorial rules:

- (2) The Correspondence Principle: each participant that is lexically profiled and expressed must be fused with a profiled argument role of the construction. If a verb has three profiled participant roles, then one of them may be fused with a non-profiled argument role of a construction. (Goldberg 1995: 50)

Both verbs and constructions are specified for participant roles, some of which are *profiled*. Argument profiling for verbs is “lexically determined and highly conventionalized” (Goldberg 1995: 46). Profiled argument roles of a construction are mapped to direct grammatical functions, i. e., SUBJ, OBJ, or OBJ2. By the Correspondence Principle the lexically profiled argument roles must be direct, unless there are three of them, in which case one may be indirect.² With respect to the semiotic dictum, the Correspondence Principle has the same status as the Categorical Grammar combinatorial rules: a meaningless algebraic rule that specifies the way to combine meaningful items.

Turning now to the lexicalist syntax we favor, some elements abide by the semiotic dictum while others do not. Phrase structure rules for intransitive and transitive VPs (or the respective HPSG ID schema) do not. Lexical valence structures clearly carry meaning since they are associated with particular verbs. In an English ditransitive, the first object expresses the role of “intended recipient” of the referent of the second object.

² We assume that the second sentence of (2) provides for exceptions to the first sentence.

Hence *He carved her a toy* entails that he carved a toy with the intention that she receive it. So the lexical rule that adds a benefactive recipient argument to a verb adds meaning. Alternatively, a phrasal ditransitive construction might contribute that “recipient” meaning.³ Which structures have meaning is an empirical question for us.

In Construction Grammar, however, meaning is assumed for all constructions *a priori*. But while the ditransitive construction plausibly contributes meaning, no truth-conditional meaning has yet been discovered for either the intransitive or bivalent transitive constructions. Clearly the constructionist’s evidence for the meaningfulness of *certain* constructions such as the ditransitive does not constitute evidence that *all* phrasal constructions have meaning. So the lexical and phrasal approaches seem to come out the same, as far as the semiotic dictum is concerned.

Now consider the second usage-based dictum, that the elements of the grammar directly reflect patterns of usage, which we call *the transparency dictum*. The Construction Grammar literature often presents their constructions informally in ways that suggest that they represent surface constituent order patterns: the transitive construction is “[X VERB Y]” (Tomasello) or “[Subj V Obj]” (Goldberg 1995, 2006)⁴; the passive construction is “X was VERBed by Y” (Tomasello 2003: 100) or “Subj aux Vpp (PPby)” (Goldberg 2006: 5). But a theory in which constructions consist of surface patterns was considered in detail and rejected by Müller (2006: Section 2), and does not accurately reflect Goldberg’s actual theory.⁵ The more detailed discussions present *argument structure constructions*, which are more abstract and rather like the lexicalists’ grammatical elements (or perhaps an LFG f-structure): the transitive construction resembles a transitive valence structure (minus the verb itself); the passive construction resembles the passive lexical rule.

With respect to fulfilling the desiderata of usage-based theorists, we do not find any significant difference between the non-lexical and lexical approaches.

21.1.2 Coercion

Researchers working with plugging proposals usually take coercion as an indication of the usefulness of phrasal constructions. For instance, Anatol Stefanowitsch (Lecture in the lecture series *Algorithmen und Muster – Strukturen in der Sprache*, 2009) discussed the example in (3):

- (3) Das Tor zur Welt Hrnglb öffnete sich ohne Vorwarnung und verschlang [sie] ... die Welt Hrnglb wird von Magiern erschaffen, die Träume zu Realität formen können,

³ In Section 21.2.1 we argue that the recipient should be added in the lexical argument structure, not through a phrasal construction. See Wechsler (1991: 111–113; 1995: 88–89) for an analysis of English ditransitives with elements of both constructional and lexical approaches. It is based on Kiparsky’s notion of a *thematically restricted positional linker* (1987; 1988).

⁴ Goldberg et al. (2004: 300) report about a language acquisition experiment that involves an SOV pattern. The SOV order is mentioned explicitly and seen as part of the construction.

⁵ This applies to argument structure constructions only. In some of her papers Goldberg assumes that very specific phrase structural configurations are part of the constructions. For instance in her paper on complex predicates in Persian (Goldberg 2003b) she assigns V^0 and \bar{V} categories. See Müller (2010b: Section 4.9) for a critique of that analysis.

aber nicht in der Lage sind zu träumen. Haltet aus, Freunde. Und ihr da draußen, bitte träumt ihnen ein Tor.⁶

The crucial part is *bitte träumt ihnen ein Tor* ‘Dream a gate for them’. In this fantasy context the word *träumen*, which is intransitive, is forced into the ditransitive construction and therefore gets a certain meaning. This forcing of a verb corresponds to overwriting or rather extending properties of the verb by the phrasal construction.

In cases in which the plugging proposals assume that information is overwritten or extended, lexical approaches assume mediating lexical rules. Briscoe & Copestake (1999: Section 4) have worked out a lexical approach in detail.⁷ They discuss the ditransitive sentences in (4), which either correspond to the prototypical ditransitive construction (4a) or deviate from it in various ways.

- (4) a. Mary gave Joe a present.
- b. Joe painted Sally a picture.
- c. Mary promised Joe a new car.
- d. He tipped Bill two pounds.
- e. The medicine brought him relief.
- f. The music lent the party a festive air.
- g. Jo gave Bob a punch.
- h. He blew his wife a kiss.
- i. She smiled herself an upgrade.

For the non-canonical examples they assume lexical rules that relate transitive (*paint*) and intransitive (*smile*) verbs to ditransitive ones and contribute the respective semantic information or the respective metaphorical extension. The example in (4i) is rather similar to the *träumen* example discussed above and is also analyzed with a lexical rule (page 509). Briscoe and Copestake note that this lexical rule is much more restricted in its productivity than the other lexical rules they suggest. They take this as motivation for developing a representational format in which lexical items (including those that are derived by lexical rules) are associated with probabilities, so that differences in productivity of various patterns can be captured.

Looking narrowly at such cases, it is hard to see any rational grounds for choosing between the phrasal analysis and the lexical rule. But if we broaden our view, the lexical rule approach can be seen to have a much wider application. Coercion is a very general pragmatic process, occurring in many contexts where no construction seems to be responsible (Nunberg 1995). Nunberg cites many cases such as the restaurant waiter asking *Who is the ham sandwich?* (Nunberg 1995: 115). Copestake & Briscoe (1992: 116)

⁶ http://www.elbenwaldforum.de/showflat.php?Cat=&Board=Tolkiens_Werke&Number=1457418&page=3&view=collapsed&sb=5&o=&fpart=16, 27.02.2010.

‘The gate to the world Hrnglb opened without warning and swallowed them. The world Hrnglb is created by magicians that can form reality from dreams but cannot dream themselves. Hold out, friends! And you out there, please, dream a gate for them.’

⁷ Kay (2005), working in the framework of CxG, also suggests unary constructions.

discuss the conversion of terms for animals to mass nouns (see also Copestake & Briscoe (1995: 36–43)). Example (5) is about a substance, not about a cute bunny.

- (5) After several lorries had run over the body, there was rabbit splattered all over the road.

The authors suggest a lexical rule that maps a count noun onto a mass noun. This analysis is also assumed by Fillmore (1999: 114–115). Such coercion can occur without any syntactic context: one can answer the question *What's that stuff on the road?* or *What are you eating?* with the one-word utterance *Rabbit*. Some coercion happens to affect the complement structure of a verb, but this is simply a special case of a more general phenomenon that has been analyzed by rules of systematic polysemy.

21.1.3 Aspect as a clause level phenomenon

Alsina (1996), working in the framework of LFG, argues for a phrasal analysis of resultative constructions based on the aspectual properties of sentences, since aspect is normally viewed as a property that is determined by the sentence syntax. Intransitive verbs such as *bark* refer to activities, a resultative construction with the same verb, however, stands for an accomplishment (an extended change of state). Alsina supports this with the following data:

- (6) a. (*) The dog barked in five minutes.
b. The dog barked the neighbors awake in five minutes.

The latter sentence means that the *barking* event was completed after five minutes. A reading referring to the time span of the event is not available for (6a). If (6a) is grammatical at all, then a claim is being made about the time frame in which the event begun.

If we now consider examples such as (7c), however, we see that Alsina's argumentation is not cogent since the resultative meaning is already present at the word-level in nominalizations. As the examples in (7) show, this contrast can be observed in nominal constructions and is therefore independent of the sentence syntax:

- (7) a. weil sie die Nordsee in fünf Jahren leer fischten
because they the North.Sea in five years empty fished
'because they fished the North Sea (until it was) empty in five years'
b. # weil sie in fünf Jahren fischten
because they in five years fished
c. das Leerfischen der Nordsee in fünf Jahren
the empty.fishing of.the North.Sea in five years
d. # das Fischen in fünf Jahren
the fishing in five years

In a lexical approach there is a verb stem selecting for two NPs and a resultative predicate. This stem has the appropriate meaning and can be inflected or undergo derivation

und successive inflection. In both cases we get words that contain the resultative semantics and hence are compatible with respective adverbials.

21.1.4 Simplicity and polysemy

Much of the intuitive appeal of the plugging approach stems from its apparent simplicity relative to the use of lexical rules. But the claim to greater simplicity for Construction Grammar is based on misunderstandings of both lexical rules and Construction Grammar (specifically of Goldberg's (1995; 2006) version). It draws the distinction in the wrong place and misses the real differences between these approaches. This argument from simplicity is often repeated and so it is important to understand why it is incorrect.

Tomasello (2003) presents the argument as follows. Discussing first the lexical rules approach, Tomasello (2003: 160) writes that

One implication of this view is that a verb must have listed in the lexicon a different meaning for virtually every different construction in which it participates [...]. For example, while the prototypical meaning of *cough* involves only one participant, the cougher, we may say such things as *He coughed her his cold*, in which there are three core participants. In the lexical rules approach, in order to produce this utterance the child's lexicon must have as an entry a ditransitive meaning for the verb *cough*. (Tomasello 2003: 160)

Tomasello (2003: 160) then contrasts a Construction Grammar approach, citing Fillmore et al. (1988), Goldberg (1995), and Croft (2001). He concludes as follows:

The main point is that if we grant that constructions may have meaning of their own, in relative independence of the lexical items involved, then we do not need to populate the lexicon with all kinds of implausible meanings for each of the verbs we use in everyday life. The construction grammar approach in which constructions have meanings is therefore both much simpler and much more plausible than the lexical rules approach. (Tomasello 2003: 161)

This reflects a misunderstanding of lexical rules, as they are normally understood. There is no implausible sense populating the lexicon. The lexical rule approach to *He coughed her his cold* states that when the word *coughed* appears with two objects, the whole complex has a certain meaning (see Müller 2006: 876). Furthermore we explicitly distinguish between listed elements (lexical entries) and derived ones. The general term subsuming both is *lexical item*.

The simplicity argument also relies on a misunderstanding of a theory Tomasello advocates, namely the theory due to Goldberg (1995, 2006). For his argument to go through, Tomasello must tacitly assume that verbs can combine freely with constructions, that is, that the grammar does not place extrinsic constraints on such combinations. If it is necessary to also stipulate which verbs can appear in which constructions, then the claim to greater simplicity collapses: each variant lexical item with its "implausible meaning"

under the lexical rule approach corresponds to a verb-plus-construction combination under the phrasal approach.

Passages such as the following may suggest that verbs and constructions are assumed to combine freely:⁸

Constructions are combined freely to form actual expressions as long as they can be construed as not being in conflict (invoking the notion of construal is intended to allow for processes of accommodation or coercion). [...] Allowing constructions to combine freely as long as there are no conflicts, allows for the infinitely creative potential of language. [...] That is, a speaker is free to creatively combine constructions as long as constructions exist in the language that can be combined suitably to categorize the target message, given that there is no conflict among the constructions. (Goldberg 2006: 22)

But in fact Goldberg does not assume free combination, but rather that a verb is “conventionally associated with a construction” (Goldberg 1995: 50): verbs specify their participant roles and which of those are obligatory direct arguments (*profiled*, in Goldberg’s terminology). In fact, Goldberg herself (2006: 211) argues against Borer’s putative assumption of free combination (2003) on the grounds that Borer is unable to account for the difference between *dine* (intransitive), *eat* (optionally transitive), and *devour* (obligatorily transitive).⁹ Despite Tomasello’s comment above, Construction Grammar is no simpler than the lexical rules.

The resultative construction is often used to illustrate the simplicity argument. For example, Goldberg (1995: Chapter 7) assumes that the same lexical item for the verb *sneeze* is used in (8a) and (8b). It is simply inserted into different constructions:

- (8) a. He sneezed.
- b. He sneezed the napkin off the table.

The meaning of (8a) corresponds more or less to the verb meaning, since the verb is used in the Intransitive Construction. But the Caused-Motion Construction in (8b) contributes additional semantic information concerning the causation and movement: his sneezing caused the napkin to move off the table. *sneeze* is plugged into the Caused-Motion Construction, which licenses the subject of *sneeze* and additionally provides two slots: one for the theme (*napkin*) and one for the goal (*off the table*). The lexical approach is essentially parallel, except that the lexical rule can feed further lexical processes like passivization (*The napkin was sneezed off the table*), and conversion to nouns or adjectives (see Sections 21.2.2 and 21.6).

In a nuanced comparison of the two approaches, Goldberg (1995: 139–140) considers again the added recipient argument in *Mary kicked Joe the ball*, where *kick* is lexically

⁸ The context of these quotes makes clear that the verb and the argument structure construction are considered constructions. See Goldberg (2006: 21, ex. (2)).

⁹ Goldberg’s critique cites a 2001 presentation by Borer with the same title as Borer (2003). See Section 21.3.4 for more discussion of this issue. As far as we know, the *dine* / *eat* / *devour* minimal triplet originally came from Dowty (1989: 89–90).

a 2-place verb. She notes that on the constructional view, “the composite fused structure involving both verb and construction is stored in memory”. The verb itself retains its original meaning as a 2-place verb, so that “we avoid implausible verb senses such as ‘to cause to receive by kicking’”. The idea seems to be that the lexical approach, in contrast, must countenance such implausible verb senses since a lexical rule adds a third argument.

But the lexical and constructional approaches are actually indistinguishable on this point. The lexical rule does not produce a verb with the “implausible sense” in (9a). Instead it produces the sense in (9b):

- (9) a. cause-to-receive-by-kicking(x, y, z)
b. cause(kick(x, y), receive(z, y))

The same sort of “composite fused structure” is assumed under either view. With respect to the semantic structure, the number and plausibility of senses, and the polyadicity of the semantic relations, the two theories are identical. They mainly differ in the way this representation fits into the larger theory of syntax. They also differ in another respect: on the lexical view, the derived three-argument valence structure is associated with the phonological string *kicked*. Next, we present evidence for this claim.

21.2 Evidence for lexical approaches

21.2.1 Valence and coordination

On the lexical account, the verb *paint* in (4b), for example, is lexically a 2-argument verb, while the unary branching node immediately dominating it is effectively a 3-argument verb. On the constructional view there is no such predicate seeking three arguments that dominates only the verb. Coordination provides evidence for the lexical account.

A generalization about coordination is that two constituents which have compatible syntactic properties can be coordinated and that the result of the coordination is an object that has the syntactic properties of each of the conjuncts. This is reflected by the Categorical Grammar analysis which assumes the category $(X \setminus X)/X$ for the conjunction: the conjunction takes an X to the right, an X to the left and the result is an X .

For example, in (10a) we have a case of the coordination of two lexical verbs. The coordination *know and like* behaves like the coordinated simplex verbs: it takes a subject and an object. Similarly, two sentences with a missing object are coordinated in (10b) and the result is a sentence with a missing object.

- (10) a. I know and like this record.
b. Bagels, I like and Ellison hates.

The German examples in (11) show that the case requirement of the involved verbs has to be respected. In (11b,c) the coordinated verbs require accusative and dative respectively and since the case requirements are incompatible with unambiguously case marked nouns both of these examples are out.

- (11) a. Ich kenne und unterstütze diesen Mann.
 I know and support this.ACC man
 b. *Ich kenne und helfe diesen Mann.
 I know and help this.ACC man
 c. *Ich kenne und helfe diesem Mann.
 I know and help this.DAT man

Interestingly, it is possible to coordinate basic ditransitive verbs with verbs that have additional arguments licensed by the lexical rule. (12) provides examples in English and German ((12b) is quoted from Müller (2013b: 420)):

- (12) a. She then offered and made me a wonderful espresso – nice.¹⁰
 b. ich hab ihr jetzt diese Ladung Muffins mit den Herzchen drauf
 I have her now this load Muffins with the little.heart there.on
 gebacken und gegeben.¹¹
 baked and given
 ‘I have now baked and given her this load of muffins with the little heart on top.’

These sentences show that both verbs are 3-argument verbs at the V^0 level, since they involve V^0 coordination:

- (13) [V^0 offered and made] [_{NP} me] [_{NP} a wonderful espresso]

This is expected under the lexical rule analysis but not the non-lexical constructional one.¹²

Summarizing the coordination argument: coordinated verbs generally must have compatible syntactic properties like valence properties. This means that in (12b), for example, *gebacken* ‘baked’ and *gegeben* ‘given’ have the same valence properties. On the lexical approach the creation verb *gebacken*, together with a lexical rule, licenses a ditransitive verb. It can therefore be coordinated with *gegeben*. On the phrasal approach however, the verb *gebacken* has two argument roles and is not compatible with the verb *gegeben*, which has three argument roles. In the phrasal model, *gebacken* can only realize three arguments when it enters the ditransitive phrasal construction or argument

¹⁰ <http://www.thespinroom.com.au/?p=102> 07.07.2012

¹¹ <http://www.musiker-board.de/diverses-ot/35977-die-liebe-637-print.html>. 08.06.2012

¹² One might wonder whether these sentences could be instances of Right Node Raising (RNR) out of coordinated VPs (Bresnan 1974; Abbott 1976):

- (i) She [offered ____] and [made me ____] a wonderful espresso.

But this cannot be correct. Under such an analysis the first verb has been used without a benefactive or recipient object. But *me* is interpreted as the recipient of both the offering and making. Secondly, the second object can be an unstressed pronoun (*She offered and made me it*), which is not possible in RNR. Note that *offered and made* cannot be a pseudo-coordination meaning ‘offered to make’. This is possible only with stem forms of certain verbs such as *try*.

structure construction. But in sentences like (12) it is not *gebacken* alone that enters the phrasal syntax, but rather the combination of *gebacken* and *gegeben*. On this view, the verbs are incompatible as far as the semantic roles are concerned.

To fix this under the phrasal approach, one could posit a mechanism such that the semantic roles that are required for the coordinate phrase *baked and given* are shared by each of its conjunct verbs and that they are therefore compatible. But this would amount to saying that there are several verb senses for *baked*, something that the anti-lexicalists claim to avoid, as discussed in the next section.

A reviewer of Theoretical Linguistics correctly observes that a version of the (phrasal) ASC approach could work in the exactly same way as our lexical analysis. Our ditransitive lexical rule would simply be rechristened as a “ditransitive ASC”. This construction would combine with *baked*, thus adding the third argument, prior to its coordination with *gave*. As long as the ASC approach is a non-distinct notational variant of the lexical rule approach then of course it works in exactly the same way. But the literature on the ASC approach represents it as a radical alternative to lexical rules, in which constructions are combined through inheritance hierarchies, instead of allowing lexical rules to alter the argument structure of a verb prior to its syntactic combination with the other words and phrases.

The reviewer also remarked that examples like (14) show that the benefactive argument has to be introduced on the phrasal level.

(14) I designed and built him a house.

Both *designed* and *built* are bivalent verbs and *him* is the benefactive that extends both *designed* and *built*. However, we assume that sentences like (14) can be analyzed as coordination of two verbal items that are licensed by the lexical rule that introduces the benefactive argument. That is, the benefactive is introduced before the coordination.

The coordination facts illustrate a more general point. The output of a lexical rule such as the one that would apply in the analysis of *gebacken* in (12b) is just a word (an X^0), so it has the same syntactic distribution as an underived word with the same category and valence feature. This important generalization follows from the lexical account while on the phrasal view, it is mysterious at best. The point can be shown with any of the lexical rules that the anti-lexicalists are so keen to eliminate in favor of phrasal constructions. For example, active and passive verbs can be coordinated, as long as they have the same valence properties, as in this Swedish example:

(15) Golfklubben begärde och beviljade-s marklov för banbygget efter
 golf.club.DEF requested and granted-PASS ground.permit for track.build.DEF after
 en hel del förhandlingar och kompromisser med Länsstyrelsen och
 a whole part negotiations and compromises with county.board.DEF and
 Naturvårdsverket.¹³
 nature.protection.agency.DEF

‘The golf club requested and was granted a ground permit for fairlane construc-

¹³ <http://www.lyckselegolf.se/index.asp?Sida=82>

tion after a lot of negotiations and compromises with the County Board and the Environmental Protection Agency.’

(English works the same way, as shown by the grammatical translation line.) The passive of the ditransitive verb *bevilja* ‘grant’ retains one object, so it is effectively transitive and can be coordinated with the active transitive *begära* ‘request’.

Moreover, the English passive verb form, being a participle, can feed a second lexical rule deriving adjectives from verbs. All categories of English participles can be converted to adjectives (Bresnan, 1982c, 2001: Chapter 3):

- (16) a. active present participles (cf. The leaf is falling): *the falling leaf*
 b. active past participles (cf. The leaf has fallen): *the fallen leaf*
 c. passive participles (cf. The toy is being broken (by the child).): *the broken toy*

That the derived forms are adjectives, not verbs, is shown by a host of properties, including negative *un-* prefixation: *unbroken* means ‘not broken’, just as *unkind* means ‘not kind’, while the *un-* appearing on verbs indicates, not negation, but action reversal, as in *untie* (Bresnan, 1982c: 21, 2001: Chapter 3). Predicate adjectives preserve the subject of predication of the verb and for prenominal adjectives the rule is simply that the role that would be assigned to the subject goes to the modified noun instead (*The toy remained (un-)broken.*; *the broken toy*). Being an A^0 , such a form can be coordinated with another A^0 , as in the following:

- (17) a. The suspect should be considered [armed and dangerous].
 b. any [old, rotting, or broken] toys

In (17b), three adjectives are coordinated, one underived (*old*), one derived from a present participle (*rotting*), and one from a passive participle (*broken*). Such coordination is completely mundane on a lexical theory. Each A^0 conjunct has a valence feature (in HPSG it would be the *SPR* feature for predicates or the *MOD* feature for the prenominal modifiers), which is shared with the mother node of the coordinate structure. But the point of the phrasal (or ASC) theory is to deny that words have such valence features.

The claim that lexical derivation of valence structure is distinct from phrasal combination is further supported with evidence from deverbal nominalization (Wechsler 2008a). To derive nouns from verbs, *-ing* suffixation productively applies to all inflectable verbs (*the shooting of the prisoner*), while morphological productivity is severely limited for various other suffixes such as *-(a)tion* (**the shootation of the prisoner*). So forms such as *destruction* and *distribution* must be retrieved from memory while *-ing* nouns such as *looting* or *growing* could be (and in the case of rare verbs or neologisms, must be) derived from the verb or the root through the application of a rule (Zucchi 1993). This difference explains why *-ing* nominals always retain the argument structure of the cognate verb, while other forms show some variation. A famous example is the lack of the agent argument for the noun *growth* versus its retention by the noun *growing*: **John’s growth of tomatoes* versus *John’s growing of tomatoes* (Chomsky 1970).¹⁴

¹⁴ See Section 21.3.3 for further discussion.

But what sort of rule derives the *-ing* nouns, a lexical rule or a phrasal one? In Marantz's (1997) phrasal analysis, a phrasal construction (notated as *vP*) is responsible for assigning the agent role of *-ing* nouns such as *growing*. For him, none of the words directly selects an agent via its argument structure. The *-ing* forms are permitted to appear in the *vP* construction, which licenses the possessive agent. Non-*-ing* nouns such as *destruction* and *growth* do not appear in *vP*. Whether they allow expression of the agent depends on semantic and pragmatic properties of the word: *destruction* involves external causation so it does allow an agent, while *growth* involves internal causation so it does not allow an agent.

However, a problem for Marantz is that these two types of nouns can coordinate and share dependents (example (18a) is from Wechsler (2008a: Section 7)):

- (18) a. With nothing left after the soldier's [destruction and looting] of their home, they reboarded their coach and set out for the port of Calais.¹⁵
 b. The [cultivation, growing or distribution] of medical marijuana within the County shall at all times occur within a secure, locked, and fully enclosed structure, including a ceiling, roof or top, and shall meet the following requirements.¹⁶

On the phrasal analysis, the nouns *looting* and *growing* occur in one type of syntactic environment (namely *vP*), while forms *destruction*, *cultivation*, and *distribution* occur in a different syntactic environment. This places contradictory demands on the structure of coordinations like those in (18). As far as we know, neither this problem nor the others raised by Wechsler (2008a) have even been addressed by advocates of the phrasal theory of argument structure.

Consider one last example. In an influential phrasal analysis, Hale and Keyser (1993a) derived denominal verbs like *to saddle* through noun incorporation out of a structure akin to [PUT a saddle ON x]. Again, verbs with this putative derivation routinely coordinate and share dependents with verbs of other types:

- (19) Realizing the dire results of such a capture and that he was the only one to prevent it, he quickly [saddled and mounted] his trusted horse and with a grim determination began a journey that would become legendary.¹⁷

As in all of these X^0 coordination cases, under the phrasal analysis the two verbs place contradictory demands on a single phrase structure.

A lexical valence structure is an abstraction or generalization over various occurrences of the verb in syntactic contexts. To be sure, one key use of that valence structure is simply to indicate what sort of phrases the verb must (or can) combine with, and the result of semantic composition; if that were the whole story then the phrasal theory would be viable. But it is not. As it turns out, this lexical valence structure, once abstracted,

¹⁵ <http://www.amazon.com/review/R3IG4M3Q6YYNFT>, 21.07.2012

¹⁶ <http://www.scribd.com/doc/64013640/Tulare-County-medical-cannabis-cultivation-ordinance>, 05.03.2016

¹⁷ http://www.jouethouse.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=56&Itemid=63, 21.07.2012

can alternatively be used in other ways: among other possibilities, the verb (crucially including its valence structure) can be coordinated with other verbs that have similar valence structures; or it can serve as the input to lexical rules specifying a new word bearing a systematic relation to the input word. The coordination and lexical derivation facts follow from the lexical view, while the phrasal theory at best leaves these facts as mysterious and at worst leads to irreconcilable contradictions for the phrase structure.

21.2.2 Valence and derivational morphology

Goldberg & Jackendoff (2004), Alsina (1996), and Asudeh, Dalrymple & Toivonen (2008, 2013) suggest analyzing resultative constructions and/or caused-motion constructions as phrasal constructions.¹⁸ As was argued in Müller (2006) this is incompatible with the assumption of lexical integrity. Lexical integrity means that word formation happens before syntax and that the morphological structure is inaccessible to syntactic processes (Bresnan & Mchombo 1995).¹⁹ Let us consider a concrete example, such as (20):

- (20) a. Er tanzt die Schuhe blutig / in Stücke.
 he dances the shoes bloody into pieces
 b. die in Stücke / blutig getanzten Schuhe
 the into pieces bloody danced shoes
 c. * die getanzten Schuhe
 the danced shoes

The shoes are not a semantic argument of *tanzt*. Nevertheless the referent of the NP that is realized as accusative NP in (20a) is the element the adjectival participle in (20b) predicates over. Adjectival participles like the one in (20b) are derived from a passive participle of a verb that governs an accusative object. If the accusative object is licensed phrasally by configurations like the one in (20a), then it is not possible to explain why the participle *getanzten* can be formed despite the absence of an accusative object in the valence specification of the verb. See Müller (2006: Section 5) for further examples of the interaction of resultatives and morphology. The conclusion drawn by Dowty (1978: 412) and Bresnan (1982c: 21) in the late 70s and early 80s is that phenomena which feed morphology should be treated lexically. The natural analysis in frameworks like HPSG, CG, CxG, and LFG is therefore one that assumes a lexical rule for the licensing of resultative

¹⁸ Asudeh & Toivonen (2014: Section 2.3) argue that their account is not constructional. If a construction is a form-meaning pair, their account is constructional, since a certain c-structure is paired with a semantic contribution. Asudeh & Toivonen (2014: Section 2.2) compare their approach with approaches in Constructional HPSG (Sag 1997) and Sign-Based Construction Grammar (see Section 10.6.2), which they term constructional. The only difference between these approaches and the approach by Asudeh, Dalrymple & Toivonen is that the constructions in the HPSG-based theories are modeled using types and hence have a name.

¹⁹ Asudeh et al. (2013: 14) claim that the Swedish Directed Motion Construction does not interact with derivational morphology. However, the parallel German construction does interact with derivational morphology. The absence of this interaction in Swedish can be explained by other factors of Swedish grammar and given this I believe it to be more appropriate to assume an analysis that captures both the German and the Swedish data in the same way.

constructions. See Verspoor (1997), Wechsler (1997), Wechsler & Noh (2001), Wunderlich (1992: 45; 1997: 120–126), Kaufmann & Wunderlich (1998), Müller (2002a: Chapter 5), Kay (2005), and Simpson (1983) for lexical proposals in some of these frameworks.

This argument is similar to the one that was discussed in connection with the GPSG representation of valence in Section 5.5: morphological processes have to be able to see the valence of the element they apply to. This is not the case if arguments are introduced by phrasal configurations after the level of morphology.

Asudeh, Dalrymple & Toivonen's papers are about the concept of lexical integrity and about constructions. Asudeh & Toivonen (2014) replied to our target article and pointed out (again) that their template approach makes it possible to specify the functional structure of words and phrases alike. In the original paper they discussed the Swedish word *vägen*, which is the definite form of *väg* 'way'. They showed that the f-structure is parallel to the f-structure for the English phrase *the way*. In our reply (2014b), we gave in too early, I believe. Since the point is not about being able to provide the f-structure of words, the point is about morphology, that is – in LFG terms – about deriving the f-structure by a morphological analysis. More generally speaking, one wants to derive all properties of the involved words, that is, their valence, their meaning, and the linking of this meaning to their dependents. What we used in our argument based on the sentences in (20) was parallel to what Bresnan (1982c: 21; 2001: 31) used in her classical argument for a lexical treatment of the passive. So either Bresnan's argument (and ours) is invalid or both arguments are valid and there is a problem for Asudeh, Dalrymple & Toivonen's approach and for phrasal approaches in general. I want to give another example that was already discussed in Müller (2006: 869) but was omitted in Müller & Wechsler (2014a) due to space limitations. I will first point out why this example is problematic for phrasal approaches and then explain why it is not sufficient to be able to assign certain f-structures to words: in (21a), we are dealing with a resultative construction. According to the plugging approach, the resultative meaning is contributed by a phrasal construction into which the verb *fischt* is inserted. There is no lexical item that requires a resultative predicate as its argument. If no such lexical item exists, then it is unclear how the relation between (21a) and (21b) can be established:

- (21) a. [dass] jemand die Nordsee leer fischt
 that somebody the North.Sea empty fishes
 'that somebody fishes the North Sea empty'
 b. wegen der Leerfischung der Nordsee²⁰
 because of.the empty.fishing of.the North.Sea
 'because of the fishing that resulted in the North Sea being empty'

As Figure 21.1 on the following page shows, both the arguments selected by the heads and the structures are completely different. In (21b), the element that is the subject of the related construction in (21a) is not realized. As is normally the case in nominalizations, it is possible to realize it in a PP with the preposition *durch* 'by':

²⁰ taz, 20.06.1996, p. 6.

- (22) wegen der Leerfischung der Nordsee durch die Anrainerstaaten
 because of.the empty.fishing of.the North.Sea by the neighboring.states
 ‘because of the fishing by the neighboring states that resulted in the North Sea
 being empty’




图 21.1: Resultative construction and nominalization

If one assumes that the resultative meaning comes from a particular configuration in which a verb is realized, there would be no explanation for (21b) since no verb is involved in the analysis of this example. One could of course assume that a verb stem is inserted into a construction both in (21a) and (21b). The inflectional morpheme *-t* and the derivational morpheme *-ung* as well as an empty nominal inflectional morpheme would then be independent syntactic components of the analysis. However, since Goldberg (2003b: 119) and Asudeh et al. (2013) assume lexical integrity, only entire words can be inserted into syntactic constructions and hence the analysis of the nominalization of resultative constructions sketched here is not an option for them.

One might be tempted to try and account for the similarities between the phrases in (21) using inheritance. One would specify a general resultative construction standing in an inheritance relation to the resultative construction with a verbal head and the nominalization construction. I have discussed this proposal in more detail in Müller (2006: Section 5.3). It does not work as one needs embedding for derivational morphology and this cannot be modeled in inheritance hierarchies (Krieger & Nerbonne (1993), see also Müller (2006) for a detailed discussion).

It would also be possible to assume that both constructions in (23), for which struc-

tures such as those in Figure 21.1 would have to be assumed, are connected via metarules.^{21, 22} ■

- (23) a. [SbJ Obj Obl V]
 b. [Det [[Adj V -ung]] NP[*gen*]]

The construction in (23b) corresponds to Figure 21.2.²³ The genitive NP is an argument




图 21.2: Resultative construction and nominalization

of the adjective. It has to be linked semantically to the subject slot of the adjective. Alternatively, one could assume that the construction only has the form [Adj V -ung], that is, that it does not include the genitive NP. But then one could also assume that the verbal variant of the resultative construction has the form [OBL V] and that SbJ and Obj are only represented in the valence lists. This would almost be a lexical analysis, however.

Turning to lexical integrity again, I want to point out that all that Asudeh & Toivonen can do is assign some f-structure to the N in Figure 21.2. What is needed, however, is a principled account of how this f-structure comes about and how it is related to the resultative construction on the sentence level.

Before I turn to approaches with radical underspecification of argument structure in the next section, I want to comment on a more recent paper by Asudeh, Giorgolo & Toivonen (2014). The authors discuss the phrasal introduction of cognate objects and benefactives. (24a) is an example of the latter construction.

²¹ Goldberg (p. c. 2007, 2009) suggests connecting certain constructions using GPSG-like metarules. Deppermann (2006: 51), who has a more Croftian view of CxG, rules this out. He argues for active/passive alternations that the passive construction has other information structural properties. Note also that GPSG metarules relate phrase structure rules, that is, local trees. The structure in Figure 21.2, however, is highly complex.

²² The structure in (23b) violates a strict interpretation of lexical integrity as is commonly assumed in LFG. Booij (2005, 2009), working in Construction Grammar, subscribes to a somewhat weaker version, however.

²³ I do not assume zero affixes for inflection. The respective affix in Figure 21.2 is there to show that there is structure. Alternatively one could assume a unary branching rule/construction as is common in HPSG/Construction Morphology.

- (24) a. The performer sang the children a song.
 b. The children were sung a song.

According to the authors, the noun phrase *the children* is not an argument of *sing* but contributed by the c-structure rule that optionally licenses a benefactive.

- (25) $V' \rightarrow \begin{array}{ccc} V & DP & DP \\ \uparrow = \downarrow & (\uparrow \text{OBJ}) = \downarrow & (\uparrow \text{OBJ}_\theta) = \downarrow \\ (@\text{BENEFACTIVE}) \end{array}$

Whenever this rule is evoked, the template BENEFACTIVE can add a benefactive role and the respective semantics of this is compatible with the verb that is inserted into the structure. The authors show how the mappings for the passive example in (24b) work, but they do not provide the c-structure that licenses such examples. In order to analyze these examples one would need a c-structure rule for passive VPs and this rule has to license a benefactive as well. So it would be:

- (26) $V' \rightarrow \begin{array}{ccc} V[\text{pass}] & DP \\ \uparrow = \downarrow & (\uparrow \text{OBJ}_\theta) = \downarrow \\ (@\text{BENEFACTIVE}) \end{array}$

Note that a benefactive cannot be added to any verb: adding a benefactive to an intransitive verb as in (27a) is out and the passive that would correspond to (27a) is ungrammatical as well, as (27b) shows:

- (27) a. *He laughed the children.
 b. *The children were laughed.

So one could not just claim that all c-structure rules optionally introduce a benefactive argument. Therefore there is something special about the two rules in (25) and (26). The problem is that there is no relation between these rules. They are independent statements saying that there can be a benefactive in the active and that there can be one in the passive. This is what Chomsky (1957: 43) criticized in 1957 and this was the reason for the introduction of transformations (see Section 3.1.1 of this book). Bresnan-style LFG captured the generalizations by lexical rules and later by Lexical Mapping Theory. But if elements are added outside the lexical representations, the representations where these elements are added have to be related too. One could say that our knowledge about formal tools has changed since 1957. We now can use inheritance hierarchies to capture generalizations. So one can assume a type (or a template) that is the supertype of all those c-structure rules that introduce a benefactive. But since not all rules allow for the introduction of a benefactive element, this basically amounts to saying: c-structure rule A, B, and C allow for the introduction of a benefactive. In comparison, lexical rule-based approaches have one statement introducing the benefactive. The lexical rule states what verbs are appropriate for adding a benefactive and syntactic rules are not affected.

In Müller & Wechsler (2014a) we argued that the approach to Swedish Caused-Motion Constructions in Asudeh et al. (2008, 2013) would not carry over to German since

the German construction interacts with derivational morphology. Asudeh & Toivonen (2014) argued that Swedish is different from German and hence there would not be a problem. However, the situation is different with the benefactive constructions. Although English and German do differ in many respects, both languages have similar dative constructions:

- (28) a. He baked her a cake.
 b. Er buk ihr einen Kuchen.
 he baked her.DAT a.ACC cake

Now, the analysis of the free constituent order was explained by assuming binary branching structures in which a VP node is combined with one of its arguments or adjuncts (see Section 7.4). The c-structure rule is repeated in (29):

- (29) $VP \rightarrow \begin{matrix} NP & VP \\ (\uparrow \text{SUBJ} \mid \text{OBJ} \mid \text{OBJ}_{\theta}) = \downarrow & \uparrow = \downarrow \end{matrix}$

The dependent elements contribute to the f-structure of the verb and coherence/completeness ensure that all arguments of the verb are present. One could add the introduction of the benefactive argument to the VP node of the right-hand side of the rule. However, since the verb-final variant of (28b) would have the structure in (30), one would get spurious ambiguities, since the benefactive could be introduced at every node:

- (30) weil $[_{VP} \text{er } [_{VP} \text{ihr } [_{VP} \text{einen Kuchen } [_{VP} [_V \text{buk}]]]]]$
 because he her a cake baked

So the only option seems to be to introduce the benefactive at the rule that got the recursion going, namely the rule that projected the lexical verb to the VP level. The rule (39) from page 224 is repeated as (31) for convenience.

- (31) $VP \rightarrow (V)$
 $\uparrow = \downarrow$

Note also that benefactive datives appear in adjectival environments as in (32):

- (32) a. der seiner Frau einen Kuchen backende Mann
 the his.DAT wife a.ACC cake baking man
 ‘the man who is baking a cake for her’
 b. der einen Kuchen seiner Frau backende Mann
 the a.ACC cake his.DAT wife baking man
 ‘the man who is baking a cake for her’

In order to account for these datives one would have to assume that the adjective-to-AP rule that would be parallel to (31) introduces the dative. The semantics of the benefactive template would have to somehow make sure that the benefactive argument is not added to intransitive verbs like *lachen* ‘to laugh’ or participles like *lachende* ‘laughing’. While this may be possible, I find the overall approach unattractive. First it does not

have anything to do with the original constructional proposal but just states that the benefactive may be introduced at several places in syntax, second the unary branching syntactic rule is applying to a lexical item and hence is very similar to a lexical rule and third the analysis does not capture cross-linguistic commonalities of the construction. In a lexical rule-based approach as the one that was suggested by Briscoe & Copestake (1999: Section 5), a benefactive argument is added to certain verbs and the lexical rule is parallel in all languages that have this phenomenon. The respective languages differ simply in the way the arguments are realized with respect to their heads. In languages that have adjectival participles, these are derived from the respective verbal stems. The morphological rule is the same independent of benefactive arguments and the syntactic rules for adjectival phrases do not have to mention benefactive arguments.

21.3 Radical underspecification: the end of argument structure?

21.3.1 Neo-Davidsonianism

In the last section we examined proposals that assume that verbs come with certain argument roles and are inserted into prespecified structures that may contribute additional arguments. While we showed that this is not without problems, there are even more radical proposals that the construction adds all agent arguments, or even all arguments. The notion that the agent argument should be severed from its verbs is put forth by Marantz (1984, 1997), Kratzer (1996), Embick (2004) and others. Others suggest that no arguments are selected by the verb. Borer (2003) calls such proposals *exoskeletal* since the structure of the clause is not determined by the predicate, that is, the verb does not project an inner “skeleton” of the clause. Counter to such proposals are *endoskeletal* approaches, in which the structure of the clause is determined by the predicate, that is, lexical proposals. The radical exoskeletal approaches are mainly proposed in Mainstream Generative Grammar (Borer 1994, 2003, 2005; Schein 1993; Hale & Keyser 1997; Lohndal 2012) but can also be found in HPSG (Haugereid 2009). We will not discuss these proposals in detail here, but we review the main issues insofar as they relate to the question of lexical argument structure.²⁴ We conclude that the available empirical evidence favors the lexical argument structure approach over such alternatives.

Exoskeletal approaches usually assume some version of Neo-Davidsonianism. Davidson (1967) argued for an event variable in the logical form of action sentences (33a). Dowty (1989) coined the term *neo-Davidsonian* for the variant in (33b), in which the verb translates to a property of events, and the subject and complement dependents are translated as arguments of secondary predicates such as *agent* and *theme*.²⁵ Kratzer (1996) further noted the possibility of mixed accounts such as (33c), in which the agent (subject) argument is severed from the *kill'* relation, but the theme (object) remains an argument of the *kill'* relation.²⁶

²⁴ See Müller (2010a: Section 11.11.3) for a detailed discussion of Haugereid's approach.

²⁵ Dowty (1989) called the system in (33a) an *ordered argument system*.

²⁶ The event variable is shown as existentially bound, as in Davidson's original account. As discussed below, in Kratzer's version it must be bound by a lambda operator instead.

- (33) a. *kill*: $\lambda y \lambda x \exists e [\textit{kill}(e, x, y)]$ (Davidsonian)
 b. *kill*: $\lambda y \lambda x \exists e [\textit{kill}(e) \wedge \textit{agent}(e, x) \wedge \textit{theme}(e, y)]$ (neo-Davidsonian)
 c. *kill*: $\lambda y \lambda x \exists e [\textit{kill}(e, y) \wedge \textit{agent}(e, x)]$ (mixed)

Kratzer (1996) observed that a distinction between Davidsonian, neo-Davidsonian and mixed can be made either “in the syntax” or “in the conceptual structure” (Kratzer 1996: 110–111). For example, on a lexical approach of the sort we advocate here, any of the three alternatives in (33) could be posited as the semantic content of the verb *kill*. A lexical entry for *kill* in the mixed model is given in (34).

- (34)
$$\left[\begin{array}{ll} \text{PHON} & \langle \textit{kill} \rangle \\ \text{ARG-ST} & \langle \text{NP}_x, \text{NP}_y \rangle \\ \text{CONTENT} & \textit{kill}(e, y) \wedge \textit{agent}(e, x) \end{array} \right]$$

In other words, the lexical approach is neutral on the question of the “conceptual structure” of eventualities, as noted already in a different connection in Section 21.1.4. For this reason, certain semantic arguments for the neo-Davidsonian approach, such as those put forth by Schein (1993: Chapter 4) and Lohndal (2012), do not directly bear upon the issue of lexicalism, as far as we can tell.

But Kratzer (1996), among others, has gone further and argued for an account that is neo-Davidsonian (or rather, mixed) “in the syntax”. Kratzer’s claim is that the verb specifies only the internal argument(s), as in (35a) or (35b), while the agent (external argument) role is assigned by the phrasal structure. On the “neo-Davidsonian in the syntax” view, the lexical representation of the verb has no arguments at all, except the event variable, as shown in (35c).

- (35) a. *kill*: $\lambda y \lambda e [\textit{kill}(e, y)]$ (agent is severed)
 b. *kill*: $\lambda y \lambda e [\textit{kill}(e) \wedge \textit{theme}(e, y)]$ (agent is severed)
 c. *kill*: $\lambda e [\textit{kill}(e)]$ (all arguments severed)

On such accounts, the remaining dependents of the verb receive their semantic roles from silent secondary predicates, which are usually assumed to occupy the positions of functional heads in the phrase structure. An Event Identification rule identifies the event variables of the verb and the silent light verb (Kratzer 1996: 22); this is why the existential quantifiers in (33) have been replaced with lambda operators in (35). A standard term for the agent-assigning silent predicate is “little *v*” (see Section 4.1.4 on little *v*). These extra-lexical dependents are the analogs of the ones contributed by the constructions in Construction Grammar.

In the following subsections we address arguments that have been put forth in favor of the little *v* hypothesis, from idiom asymmetries (Section 21.3.2) and deverbal nominals (Section 21.3.3). We argue that the evidence actually favors the lexical view. Then we turn to problems for exoskeletal approaches, from idiosyncratic syntactic selection (Section 21.3.4) and expletives (Section 21.3.5). We conclude with a look at the treatment

of idiosyncratic syntactic selection under Borer's exoskeletal theory (Section 21.3.7), and a summary (Section 21.3.8).

21.3.2 Little *v* and idiom asymmetries

Marantz (1984) and Kratzer (1996) argued for severing the agent from the argument structure as in (35a), on the basis of putative idiom asymmetries. Marantz (1984) observed that while English has many idioms and specialized meanings for verbs in which the internal argument is the fixed part of the idiom and the external argument is free, the reverse situation is considerably rarer. To put it differently, the nature of the role played by the subject argument often depends on the filler of the object position, but not vice versa. To take Kratzer's examples (Kratzer 1996: 114):

- (36) a. kill a cockroach
 b. kill a conversation
 c. kill an evening watching TV
 d. kill a bottle (i.e. empty it)
 e. kill an audience (i.e., wow them)

On the other hand, one does not often find special meanings of a verb associated with the choice of subject, leaving the object position open (examples from Marantz (1984: 26)):

- (37) a. Harry killed NP.
 b. Everyone is always killing NP.
 c. The drunk refused to kill NP.
 d. Silence certainly can kill NP.

Kratzer observes that a mixed representation of *kill* as in (38a) allows us to specify varying meanings that depend upon its sole NP argument.

- (38) a. *kill*: $\lambda y \lambda e [\textit{kill}(e, y)]$
 b. If *a* is a time interval, then $\textit{kill}(e, a) = \textit{truth}$ if *e* is an event of wasting *a*
 If *a* is animate, then $\textit{kill}(e, a) = \textit{truth}$ if *e* is an event in which *a* dies
 ... etc.

On the polyadic (Davidsonian) theory, the meaning could similarly be made to depend upon the filler of the agent role. On the polyadic view, "there is no technical obstacle" (Kratzer 1996: 116) to conditions like those in (38b), except reversed, so that it is the filler of the agent role instead of the theme role that affects the meaning. But, she writes, this could not be done if the agent is not an argument of the verb. According to Kratzer, the agent-severed representation (such as (38a)) disallows similar constraints on the meaning that depend upon the agent, thereby capturing the idiom asymmetry.

But as noted by Wechsler (2005), “there is no technical obstacle” to specifying agent-dependent meanings even if the Agent has been severed from the verb as Kratzer proposes. It is true that there is no variable for the agent in (38a). But there is an event variable e , and the language user must be able to identify the agent of e in order to interpret the sentence. So one could replace the variable a with “the agent of e ” in the expressions in (38b), and thereby create verbs that violate the idiom asymmetry.

While this may seem to be a narrow technical or even pedantic point, it is nonetheless crucial. Suppose we try to repair Kratzer’s argument with an additional assumption: that modulations in the meaning of a polysemous verb can only depend upon arguments of the *relation* denoted by that verb, and not on other participants in the event. Under that additional assumption, it makes no difference whether the agent is severed from the lexical entry or not. For example, consider the following (mixed) neo-Davidsonian representation of the semantic content in the lexical entry of *kill*:

(39) *kill*: $\lambda y \lambda x \lambda e [kill(e, y) \wedge agent(e, x)]$

Assuming that sense modulations can only be affected by arguments of the *kill*(e, y) relation, we derive the idiom asymmetry, even if (39) is the lexical entry for *kill*. So suppose that we try to fix Kratzer’s argument with a different assumption: that modulations in the meaning of a polysemous verb can only depend upon an argument of the lexically denoted function. Kratzer’s “neo-Davidsonian in the syntax” lexical entry in (35a) lacks the agent argument, while the lexical entry in (39) clearly has one. But Kratzer’s entry still fails to predict the asymmetry because, as noted above, it has the e argument and so the sense modulation can be conditioned on the “agent of e ”. As noted above, that event argument cannot be eliminated (for example through existential quantification) because it is needed in order to undergo event identification with the event argument of the silent light verb that introduces the agent (Kratzer 1996: 22).

Moreover, recasting Kratzer’s account in lexicalist terms allows for verbs to vary. This is an important advantage, because the putative asymmetry is only a tendency. The following are examples in which the subject is a fixed part of the idiom and there are open slots for non-subjects:²⁷

- (40) a. A little bird told X that S.
 ‘X heard the rumor that S.’
 b. The cat’s got X’s tongue.
 ‘X cannot speak.’
 c. What’s eating X?
 ‘Why is X so galled?’

Further data and discussion of subject idioms in English and German can be found in Müller (2007b: Section 3.2.1).

²⁷ (40a) is from Nunberg, Sag & Wasow (1994: 526), (40b) from Bresnan (1982a: 349–350), and (40c) from Bresnan (1982a: 349–350).

The tendency towards a subject-object asymmetry plausibly has an independent explanation. Nunberg, Sag & Wasow (1994) argue that the subject-object asymmetry is a side-effect of an animacy asymmetry. The open positions of idioms tend to be animate while the fixed positions tend to be inanimate. Nunberg et al. (1994) derive these animacy generalizations from the figurative and proverbial nature of the metaphorical transfers that give rise to idioms. If there is an independent explanation for this tendency, then a lexicalist grammar successfully encodes those patterns, perhaps with a mixed neo-Davidsonian lexical decomposition, as explained above (see Wechsler (2005) for such a lexical account of the verbs *buy* and *sell*). But the little *v* hypothesis rigidly predicts this asymmetry for all agentive verbs, and that prediction is not borne out.

21.3.3 Deverbal nominals

An influential argument against lexical argument structure involves English deverbal nominals and the causative alternation. It originates from a mention in Chomsky (1970), and is developed in detail by Marantz (1997); see also Pesetsky (1996) and Harley & Noyer (2000). The argument is often repeated, but it turns out that the empirical basis of the argument is incorrect, and the actual facts point in the opposite direction, in favor of lexical argument structure (Wechsler 2008b,a).

Certain English causative alternation verbs allow optional omission of the agent argument (41), while the cognate nominal disallows expression of the agent (42):

- (41) a. that John grows tomatoes
b. that tomatoes grow
- (42) a. *John's growth of tomatoes
b. the tomatoes' growth, the growth of the tomatoes

In contrast, nominals derived from obligatorily transitive verbs such as *destroy* allow expression of the agent, as shown in (44a):

- (43) a. that the army destroyed the city
b. *that the city destroyed
- (44) a. the army's destruction of the city
b. the city's destruction

Following a suggestion by Chomsky (1970), Marantz (1997) argued on the basis of these data that the agent role is lacking from lexical entries. In verbal projections like (41) and (43) the agent role is assigned in the syntax by little *v*. Nominal projections like (42) and (44) lack little *v*. Instead, pragmatics takes over to determine which agents can be expressed by the possessive phrase: the possessive can express “the sort of agent implied by an event with an external rather than an internal cause” because only the former can “easily be reconstructed” (quoted from Marantz (1997: 218)). The destruction of a city has a cause external to the city, while the growth of tomatoes is internally caused

by the tomatoes themselves (Smith 1970). Marantz points out that this explanation is unavailable if the noun is derived from a verb with an argument structure specifying its agent, since the deverbal nominal would inherit the agent of a causative alternation verb.

The empirical basis for this argument is the putative mismatch between the allowability of agent arguments, across some verb-noun cognate pairs: e.g., *grow* allows the agent but *growth* does not. But it turns out that the *grow/growth* pattern is rare. Most deverbal nominals precisely parallel the cognate verb: if the verb has an agent, so does the noun. Moreover, there is a ready explanation for the exceptional cases that exhibit the *grow/growth* pattern (Wechsler 2008a). First consider non-alternating theme-only intransitives (unaccusatives), as in (45) and non-alternating transitives as in (46). The pattern is clear: if the verb is agentless, then so is the noun:

- (45) *arriv(al)*, *disappear(ance)*, *fall* etc.:
- a. A letter arrived.
 - b. the arrival of the letter
 - c. * The mailman arrived a letter.
 - d. * the mailman's arrival of the letter
- (46) *destroy/destruction*, *construct(ion)*, *creat(ion)*, *assign(ment)* etc.:
- a. The army is destroying the city.
 - b. the army's destruction of the city

This favors the view that the noun inherits the lexical argument structure of the verb. For the anti-lexicalist, the badness of (45c) and (45d), respectively, would have to receive independent explanations. For example, on Harley and Noyer's 2000 proposal, (45c) is disallowed because a feature of the root ARRIVE prevents it from appearing in the context of *v*, but (45d) is instead ruled out because the cause of an event of arrival cannot be easily reconstructed from world knowledge. This exact duplication in two separate components of the linguistic system would have to be replicated across all non-alternating intransitive and transitive verbs, a situation that is highly implausible.

Turning to causative alternation verbs, Marantz's argument is based on the implicit generalization that noun cognates of causative alternation verbs (typically) lack the agent argument. But apart from the one example of *grow/growth*, there do not seem to be any clear cases of this pattern. Besides *grow(th)*, Chomsky (1970: examples (7c) and (8c)) cited two experienter predicates, *amuse* and *interest*: *John amused (interested) the children with his stories* versus **John's amusement (interest) of the children with his stories*. But this was later shown by Rappaport (1983) and Dowty (1989) to have an independent aspectual explanation. Deverbal experienter nouns like *amusement* and *interest* typically denote a mental state, where the corresponding verb denotes an event in which such a mental state comes about or is caused. These result nominals lack not only the agent but all the eventive arguments of the verb, because they do not refer to events. Exactly to the extent that such nouns can be construed as representing events, expression of the agent becomes acceptable.

In a response to Chomsky (1970), Carlota Smith (1972) surveyed Webster's dictionary and found no support for Chomsky's claim that deverbal nominals do not inherit agent arguments from causative alternation verbs. She listed many counterexamples, including "*explode, divide, accelerate, expand, repeat, neutralize, conclude, unify*, and so on at length." (Smith 1972: 137). Harley and Noyer (2000) also noted many so-called "exceptions": *explode, accumulate, separate, unify, disperse, transform, dissolve/dissolution, detach(ment), disengage-(ment)*, and so on. The simple fact is that these are not exceptions because there is no generalization to which they can be exceptions. These long lists of verbs represent the norm, especially for suffix-derived nominals (in *-tion, -ment*, etc.). Many zero-derived nominals from alternating verbs also allow the agent, such as *change, release*, and *use*: *my constant change of mentors from 1992–1997; the frequent release of the prisoners by the governor; the frequent use of sharp tools by underage children* (examples from Borer (2003: fn. 13)).²⁸

Like the experiencer nouns mentioned above, many zero-derived nominals lack event readings. Some reject all the arguments of the corresponding eventive verb, not just the agent: **the freeze of the water, *the break of the window*, and so on. According to Stephen Wechsler, *his drop of the ball* is slightly odd, but *the drop of the ball* has exactly the same degree of oddness. The locution *a drop in temperature* matches the verbal one *The temperature dropped*, and both verbal and nominal forms disallow the agent: **The storm dropped the temperature. *the storm's drop of the temperature*. In short, the facts seem to point in exactly the opposite direction from what has been assumed in this oft-repeated argument against lexical valence. Apart from the one isolated case of *grow/growth*, event-denoting deverbal nominals match their cognate verbs in their argument patterns.

Turning to *grow/growth* itself, we find a simple explanation for its unusual behavior (Wechsler 2008a). When the noun *growth* entered the English language, causative (transitive) *grow* did not exist. The OED provides these dates of the earliest attestations of *grow* and *growth*:

- (47) a. intransitive *grow*: c725 'be verdant' ... 'increase' (intransitive)
 b. the noun *growth*: 1587 'increase' (intransitive)
 c. transitive *grow*: 1774 'cultivate (crops)'

Thus *growth* entered the language at a time when transitive *grow* did not exist. The argument structure and meaning were inherited by the noun from its source verb, and then preserved into present-day English. This makes perfect sense if, as we claim, words have predicate argument structures. Nominalization by *-th* suffixation is not productive in English, so *growth* is listed in the lexicon. To explain why *growth* lacks the agent we need only assume that a lexical entry's predicate argument structure dictates whether it takes an agent argument or not. So even this one word provides evidence for lexical argument structure.

²⁸ Pesetsky (1996: 79, ex. (231)) assigns a star to *the thief's return of the money*, but it is acceptable to many speakers. The *Oxford English Dictionary* lists a transitive sense for the noun *return* (definition 11a), and corpus examples like *her return of the spoils* are not hard to find.

21.3.4 Idiosyncratic syntactic selections

The notion of lexical valence structure immediately explains why the argument realization patterns are strongly correlated with the particular lexical heads selecting those arguments. It is not sufficient to have general lexical items without valence information and let the syntax and world knowledge decide about argument realizations, because not all realizational patterns are determined by the meaning. The form of the preposition of a prepositional object is sometimes loosely semantically motivated but in other cases arbitrary. For example, the valence structure of the English verb *depend* captures the fact that it selects an *on*-PP to express one of its semantic arguments:

(48) a. John depends on Mary. (*counts, relies, etc.*)

b. John trusts (*on) Mary.

c.
$$\left[\begin{array}{ll} \text{PHON} & \langle \textit{depend} \rangle \\ \text{ARG-ST} & \langle \text{NP}_x, \text{PP}[\textit{on}]_y \rangle \\ \text{CONTENT} & \textit{depend}(x,y) \end{array} \right]$$

Such idiosyncratic lexical selection is utterly pervasive in human language. The verb or other predicator often determines the choice between direct and oblique morphology, and for obliques, it determines the choice of adposition or oblique case. In some languages such as Icelandic even the subject case can be selected by the verb (Zaenen, Maling & Thráinsson 1985).

Selection is language-specific. English *wait* selects *for* (German *für*) while German *warten* selects *auf* ‘on’ with an accusative object:

(49) a. I am waiting for my man.

b. Ich warte auf meinen Mann.

I wait on my man.ACC

It is often impossible to find semantic motivation for case. In German there is a tendency to replace genitive (50a) with dative (50b) with no apparent semantic motivation:

(50) a. dass der Opfer gedacht werde

that the victims.GEN remembered is

‘that the victims would be remembered’

b. daß auch hier den Opfern des Faschismus gedacht werde [...] ²⁹

that also here the victims.DAT of.the fascism remembered is

‘that the victims of fascism would be remembered here too’

The synonyms *treffen* and *begegnen* ‘to meet’ govern different cases (example from Polard & Sag (1987: 126)).

²⁹ Frankfurter Rundschau, 07.11.1997, p. 6.

- (51) a. Er traf den Mann.
he.NOM met the.ACC man
b. Er begegnete dem Mann.
he.NOM met the.DAT man

One has to specify the case that the respective verbs require in the lexical items of the verbs.³⁰

A radical variant of the plugging approach is suggested by Haugereid (2009).³¹ Haugereid (pages 12–13) assumes that the syntax combines a verb with an arbitrary combination of a subset of five different argument roles. Which arguments can be combined with a verb is not restricted by the lexical item of the verb.³² A problem for such views is that the meaning of an ambiguous verb sometimes depends on which of its arguments are expressed. The German verb *borgen* has the two translations ‘borrow’ and ‘lend’, which basically are two different perspectives on the same event (see Kunze (1991, 1993) for an extensive discussion of verbs of exchange of possession). Interestingly, the dative object is obligatory only with the ‘lend’ reading (Müller 2010a: 403):

- (52) a. Ich borge ihm das Eichhörnchen.
I lend him the squirrel
‘I lend the squirrel to him.’
b. Ich borge (mir) das Eichhörnchen.
I borrow me the squirrel
‘I borrow the squirrel.’

If we omit it, we get only the ‘borrow’ reading. So the grammar must specify for specific verbs that certain arguments are necessary for a certain verb meaning or a certain perspective on an event.

Synonyms with differing valence specifications include the minimal triplet mentioned earlier: *dine* is obligatorily intransitive (or takes an *on*-PP), *devour* is transitive, and *eat* can be used either intransitively or transitively (Dowty 1989: 89–90). Many other examples are given in Levin (1993) and Levin & Rappaport Hovav (2005).

In a phrasal constructionist approach one would have to assume phrasal patterns with the preposition or case, into which the verb is inserted. For (49b), the pattern includes a prepositional object with *auf* and an accusative NP, plus an entry for *warten* specifying that it can be inserted into such a structure (see Kroch & Joshi (1985: Section 5.2) for such a proposal in the framework of TAG). Since there are generalizations regarding verbs with such valence representations, one would be forced to have two inheritance hierarchies: one for lexical entries with their valence properties and another

³⁰ Or at least mark the fact that *treffen* takes an object with the default case for objects and *begegnen* takes a dative object in German. See Haider (1985a), Heinz & Matiassek (1994), and Müller (2001) on structural and lexical case.

³¹ Technical aspects of Haugereid’s approach are discussed in Section 21.3.6.

³² Haugereid has the possibility to impose valence restrictions on verbs, but he claims that he uses this possibility just in order to get a more efficient processing of his computer implementation (p. 13).

one for specific phrasal patterns that are needed for the specific constructions in which these lexical items can be used.

More often, proponents of neo-constructionist approaches either make proposals that are difficult to distinguish from lexical valence structures (see Section 21.3.7 below) or simply decline to address the problem. For instance, Lohndal (2012) writes:

An unanswered question on this story is how we ensure that the functional heads occur together with the relevant lexical items or roots. This is a general problem for the view that Case is assigned by functional heads, and I do not have anything to say about this issue here. (Lohndal 2012)

We think that getting case assignment right in simple sentences, without vast overgeneration of ill-formed word sequences, is a minimal requirement for a linguistic theory.

21.3.5 Expletives

A final example for the irreducibility of valence to semantics are verbs that select for expletives and reflexive arguments of inherently reflexive verbs in German:

- (53) a. weil es regnet
because it rains
- b. weil (es) mir (vor der Prüfung) graut
because EXPL me.DAT before the exam dreads
'because I am dreading the exam'
- c. weil er es bis zum Professor bringt
because he EXPL until to.the professor brings
'because he made it to professor'
- d. weil es sich um den Montag handelt
because EXPL REFL around the Monday trades
'because it is about the Monday'
- e. weil ich mich (jetzt) erhole
because I myself now recreate
'because I am relaxing now'

The lexical heads in (53) need to contain information about the expletive subjects/objects and/or reflexive pronouns that do not fill semantic roles. Note that German allows for subjectless predicates and hence the presence of expletive subjects cannot be claimed to follow from general principles. (53c) is an example with an expletive object. Explanations referring to the obligatory presence of a subject would fail on such examples in any case. Furthermore it has to be ensured that *erholen* is not realized in the [Sbj IntrVerb] construction for intransitive verbs or respective functional categories in a Minimalist setting although the relation *erholen* ('*relax*') is a one-place predicate and hence *erholen* is semantically compatible with the construction.

21.3.6 An exoskeletal approach

In what follows I discuss Haugereid's proposal (2007) in more detail. His analysis has all the high-level problems that were mentioned in the previous subsections, but since it is worked out in detail it is interesting to see its predictions.

Haugereid (2007), working in the framework of HPSG, suggests an analysis along the lines of Borer (2005) where the meaning of an expression is defined as depending on the arguments that are present. He assumes that there are five argument slots that are assigned to semantic roles as follows:

- Arg1: agent or source
- Arg2: patient
- Arg3: benefactive or recipient
- Arg4: goal
- Arg5: antecedent

Here, antecedent is a more general role that stands for instrument, comitative, manner and source. The roles Arg1–Arg3 correspond to subject and objects. Arg4 is a resultative predicate of the end of a path. Arg4 can be realized by a PP, an AP or an NP. (54) gives examples for the realization of Arg4:

- (54) a. John smashed the ball *out of the room*.
 b. John hammered the metal *flat*.
 c. He painted the car *a brilliant red*.

Whereas Arg4 follows the other participants in the causal chain of events, the antecedent precedes the patient in the order of events. It is realized as a PP. (55) is an example of the realization of Arg5:

- (55) John punctured the balloon *with a needle*.

Haugereid now assumes that argument frames consist of these roles. He provides the examples in (56):

- | | | |
|------|---|----------------|
| (56) | a. John smiles. | (arg1-frame) |
| | b. John smashed the ball. | (arg12-frame) |
| | c. The boat arrived. | (arg2-frame) |
| | d. John gave Mary a book. | (arg123-frame) |
| | e. John gave a book to Mary. | (arg124-frame) |
| | f. John punctured the ball with a needle. | (arg125-frame) |

Haugereid points out that multiple verbs can occur in multiple argument frames. He provides the variants in (57) for the verb *drip*:

- (57)
- | | |
|---|------------------|
| a. The roof drips. | (arg1-frame) |
| b. The doctor drips into the eyes. | (arg14-frame) |
| c. The doctor drips with water. | (arg15-frame) |
| d. The doctor drips into the eyes with water. | (arg145-frame) |
| e. The roof drips water. | (arg12-frame) |
| f. The roof drips water into the bucket. | (arg124-frame) |
| g. The doctor dripped the eyes with water. | (arg125-frame) |
| h. The doctor dripped into the eyes with water. | (arg145-frame) |
| i. John dripped himself two drops of water. | (arg123-frame) |
| j. John dripped himself two drops of water into his eyes. | (arg1234-frame) |
| k. John dripped himself two drops of water into his eyes with a drop counter. | (arg12345-frame) |
| l. Water dripped. | (arg2-frame) |
| m. It drips. | (arg0-frame) |

He proposes the inheritance hierarchy in Figure 21.3 in order to represent all possible argument combinations. The Arg5 role is omitted due to space considerations.




图 21.3: Hierarchy of argument frames following Haugereid (2007)

Haugereid assumes binary-branching structures where arguments can be combined with a head in any order. There is a dominance schema for each argument role. The schema realizing the argument role 3 provides a link value *arg3+*. If the argument role 2 is provided by another schema, we arrive at the frame *arg23*. For unergative intransitive verbs, it is possible to determine that it has an argument frame of *arg1*. This frame is only compatible with the types *arg1+*, *arg2-*, *arg3-* and *arg4-*. Verbs that have an optional object are assigned to *arg1-12* according to Haugereid. This type allows for the following combinations: *arg1+*, *arg2-*, *arg3-* and *arg4-* such as *arg1+*, *arg2+*, *arg3-* and *arg4-*.

This approach comes very close to an idea by Goldberg: verbs are underspecified with regard to the sentence structures in which they occur and it is only the actual realization of arguments in the sentence that decides which combinations of arguments are realized. One should bear in mind that the hierarchy in Figure 21.3 corresponds to a considerable disjunction: it lists all possible realizations of arguments. If we say that *essen* ‘to eat’ has the type *arg1-12*, then this corresponds to the disjunction *arg1* \vee *arg12*. In addition to the information in the hierarchy above, one also requires information about the syntactic properties of the arguments (case, the form of prepositions, verb forms in verbal complements). Since this information is in part specific to each verb (see Section 21.1), it cannot be present in the dominance schemata and must instead be listed in each individual lexical entry. For the lexical entry for *warten auf* ‘wait for’, there must be information about the fact that the subject has to be an NP and that the prepositional object is an *auf*-PP with accusative. The use of a type hierarchy then allows one to elegantly encode the fact that the prepositional object is optional. The difference to a disjunctively specified SUBCAT list with the form of (58) is just a matter of formalization.

(58) SUBCAT $\langle \text{NP}[\textit{str}] \rangle \vee \langle \text{NP}[\textit{str}], \text{PP}[\textit{auf}, \textit{acc}] \rangle$

Since Haugereid’s structures are binary-branching, it is possible to derive all permutations of arguments (59a–b), and adjuncts can be attached to every branching node (59c–d).

- (59) a. dass [_{arg1} keiner [_{arg2} Pizza isst]]
 that nobody pizza eats
 ‘that nobody eats pizza’
 b. dass [_{arg2} Pizza [_{arg1} keiner isst]]
 that pizza nobody eats
 c. dass [_{arg1} keiner [_{gerne} [_{arg2} Pizza isst]]]
 that nobody gladly pizza eats
 ‘that nobody eats pizza gladly’
 d. dass [[hier [_{arg1} keiner [_{arg2} Pizza isst]]]
 that here nobody pizza eats
 ‘that nobody eats pizza here’

Haugereid has therefore found solutions for some of the problems in Goldberg’s analysis that were pointed out in Müller (2006). Nevertheless, there are a number of other problems, which I will discuss in what follows. In Haugereid’s approach, nothing is said about the composition of meaning. He follows the so-called Neo-Davidsonian approach. In this kind of semantic representation, arguments of the verb are not directly represented on the verb. Instead, the verb normally has an event argument and the argument roles belonging to the event in question are determined in a separate predication. (60) shows two alternative representations, where *e* stands for the event variable.

- (60) a. Der Mann isst eine Pizza.
 the man eats a pizza
 ‘The man is eating a pizza’
 b. $eat'(e, x, y) \wedge man'(x) \wedge pizza'(y)$
 c. $eat'(e) \wedge agent(e, x) \wedge theme(e, y) \wedge man'(x) \wedge pizza'(y)$

Haugereid adopts Minimal Recursion Semantics (MRS) as his semantic formalism (see also Section 9.1.6 and 19.3). The fact that arguments belong to a particular predicate is represented by the fact that the relevant predicates have the same handle. The representation in (60c) corresponds to (61):

- (61) $h1:essen'(e), h1:arg1(x), h1:arg2(y), h2:mann'(x), h3:pizza'(y)$

This analysis captures Goldberg’s main idea: meaning arises from particular constituents being realized together with a head.

For the sentence in (62a), Haugereid (2007, p. c.) assumes the semantic representation in (62b):³³

- (62) a. der Mann den Teich leer fischt
 the man the pond empty fishes
 b. $h1:mann'(x), h2:teich'(y), h3:leer'(e),$
 $h4:fischen'(e2), h4:arg1(x), h4:arg2(y), h4:arg4(h3)$

In (62b), the *arg1*, *arg2* and *arg4* relations have the same handle as *fischen'*. Following Haugereid’s definitions, this means that *arg2* is the patient of the event. In the case of (62a), this makes incorrect predictions since the accusative element is not a semantic argument of the main verb. It is a semantic argument of the secondary predicate *leer* ‘empty’ and has been raised to the object of the resultative construction. Depending on the exact analysis assumed, the accusative object is either a syntactic argument of the verb or of the adjective, however, it is never a semantic argument of the verb. In addition to this problem, the representation in (62b) does not capture the fact that *leer* ‘empty’ predicates over the object. Haugereid (2007, p.c.) suggests that this is implicit in the representation and follows from the fact that all *arg4s* predicate over all *arg2s*. Unlike Haugereid’s analysis, analyses using lexical rules that relate a lexical item of a verb to another verbal item with a resultative meaning allow for a precise specification of the semantic representation that then captures the semantic relation between the predicates involved. In addition, the lexical rule-based analysis makes it possible to license lexical items that do not establish a semantic relation between the accusative object and the verb (Wechsler 1997; Wechsler & Noh 2001; Müller 2002a: Chapter 5).

³³ See Haugereid (2009: 165) for an analysis of the Norwegian examples in (i).

(i) Jon maler veggen rød.
 Jon paints wall.DEF red
 ‘Jon paints the wall red.’

Haugereid sketches an analysis of the syntax of the German clause and tackles active/passive alternations. However, certain aspects of the grammar are not elaborated on. In particular, it remains unclear how complex clauses containing Acl verbs such as *sehen* ‘to see’ and *lassen* ‘to let’ should be analyzed. Arguments of embedded and embedding verbs can be permuted in these constructions. Haugereid (2007, p. c.) assumes special rules that allow to saturate arguments of more deeply embedded verbs, for example, a special rule that combines an *arg2* argument of an argument with a verb. In order to combine *das Nilpferd* and *nicht füttern helfen lässt* in sentences such as (63), he is forced to assume a special grammatical rule that combines an argument of a doubly embedded verb with another verb:

- (63) weil Hans Cecilia John das Nilpferd nicht füttern helfen lässt
 because Hans Cecilia John the hippo not feed help let
 ‘because Hans is not letting Cecilia help John feed the hippo.’

In Müller (2004c: 220), I have argued that embedding under complex-forming predicates is only constrained by performance factors (see also Section 12.6.3). In German, verbal complexes with more than four verbs are barely acceptable. Evers (1975: 58–59) has pointed out, however, that the situation in Dutch is different since Dutch verbal complexes have a different branching: in Dutch, verbal complexes with up to five verbs are possible. Evers attributes this difference to a greater processing load for German verbal complexes (see also Gibson 1998: Section 3.7). Haugereid would have to assume that there are more rules for Dutch than for German. In this way, he would give up the distinction between competence and performance and incorporate performance restrictions directly into the grammar. If he wanted to maintain a distinction between the two, then Haugereid would be forced to assume an infinite number of schemata or a schema with functional uncertainty since depth of embedding is only constrained by performance factors. Existing HPSG approaches to the analysis of verbal complexes do without functional uncertainty (Hinrichs & Nakazawa 1994). Since such raising analyses are required for object raising anyway (as discussed above), they should be given preference.

Summing up, it must be said that Haugereid’s exoskeletal approach does account for different orderings of arguments, but it neither derives the correct semantic representations nor does it offer a solution for the problem of idiosyncratic selection of arguments and the selection of expletives.

21.3.7 Is there an alternative to lexical valence structure?

The question for theories denying the existence of valence structure is what replaces it to explain idiosyncratic lexical selection. In her exoskeletal approach, Borer (2005) explicitly rejects lexical valence structures. But she posits post-syntactic interpretive rules that are difficult to distinguish from them. To explain the correlation of *depend* with an *on*-PP, she posits the following interpretive rule (Borer 2005: Vol. II, p. 29):

- (64) MEANING $\Leftrightarrow \pi_9 + [\langle e^{on} \rangle]$

Borer refers to all such cases of idiosyncratic selection as idioms. In a rule such as (64), “MEANING is whatever the relevant idiom means” (Borer 2005: Vol. II, p. 27). In (64), π_9 is the “phonological index” of the verb *depend* and e^{on} “corresponds to an open value that must be assigned range by the f-morph *on*” (Borer 2005: Vol. II, p. 29), where f-morphs are function words or morphemes. Hence this rule brings together much the same information as the lexical valence structure in (48c). Discussing such “idiom” rules, Borer writes

Although by assumption a listeme cannot be associated with any grammatical properties, one device used in this work has allowed us to get around the formidable restrictions placed on the grammar by such a constraint – the formation of idioms. [...] Such idiomatic specification could be utilized, potentially, not just for *arrive* and *depend on*, but also for obligatorily transitive verbs [...], for verbs such as *put*, with their obligatory locative, and for verbs which require a sentential complement.

The reader may object that subcategorization, of sorts, is introduced here through the back door, with the introduction, in lieu of lexical syntactic annotation, of an articulated listed structure, called an *idiom*, which accomplishes, de facto, the same task. The objection of course has some validity, and at the present state of the art, the introduction of idioms may represent somewhat of a concession. (Borer 2005: Vol. II, p. 354–355)

Borer goes on to pose various questions for future research, related to constraining the class of possible idioms. With regard to that research program it should be noted that a major focus of lexicalist research has been narrowing the class of subcategorization and extricating derivable properties from idiosyncratic subcategorization. Those are the functions of HPSG lexical hierarchies, for example.

21.3.8 Summary

In Sections 21.3.2–21.3.5 we showed that the question of which arguments must be realized in a sentence cannot be reduced to semantics and world knowledge or to general facts about subjects. The consequence is that valence information has to be connected to lexical items. One therefore must either assume a connection between a lexical item and a certain phrasal configuration as in Croft’s approach (2003) and in LTAG or assume our lexical variant. In a Minimalist setting the right set of features must be specified lexically to ensure the presence of the right case assigning functional heads. This is basically similar to the lexical valence structures we are proposing here, except that it needlessly introduces various problems discussed above, such as the problem of coordination raised in Section 21.2.1.

21.4 Relations between constructions

On the lexical rules approach, word forms are related by lexical rules: a verb stem can be related to a verb with finite inflection and to a passive verb form; verbs can be

converted to adjectives or nouns; and so on. The lexical argument structure accompanies the word and can be manipulated by the lexical rule. In this section we consider what can replace such rules within a phrasal or ASC approach.

21.4.1 Inheritance hierarchies for constructions

For each valence structure that the lexicalist associates with a root lexeme (transitive, ditransitive, etc.), the phrasal approach requires multiple phrasal constructions, one to replace each lexical rule or combination of lexical rules that can apply to the word. Taking ditransitives, for example, the phrasal approach requires an active-ditransitive construction, a passive-ditransitive construction, and so on, to replace the output of every lexical rule or combination of lexical rules applied to a ditransitive verb. (Thus Bergen & Chang (2005: 169–170) assume an active-ditransitive and a passive-ditransitive construction and Kallmeyer & Osswald (2012: 171–172) assume active and passive variants of the transitive construction.) On that view some of the active voice constructions for German would be:

- (65) a. Nom V
- b. Nom Acc V
- c. Nom Dat V
- d. Nom Dat Acc V

The passive voice constructions corresponding to (65) would be:

- (66) a. V V-Aux
- b. Nom V V-Aux
- c. Dat V V-Aux
- d. Dat Nom V V-Aux

Merely listing all these constructions is not only uneconomical but fails to capture the obvious systematic relation between active and passive constructions. Since phrasalists reject both lexical rules and transformations, they need an alternative way to relate phrasal configurations and thereby explain the regular relation between active and passive. The only proposals to date involve the use of inheritance hierarchies, so let us examine them.

Researchers working in various frameworks, both with lexical and phrasal orientation, have tried to develop inheritance-based analyses that could capture the relation between valence patterns such as those in (65) and (66) (see for instance Kay & Fillmore 1999: 12; Michaelis & Ruppenhofer 2001: Chapter 4; Candito 1996; Clément & Kinyon 2003: 188; Kallmeyer & Osswald 2012: 171–172; Koenig 1999: Chapter 3; Davis & Koenig 2000; Kordoni 2001 for proposals in CxG, TAG, and HPSG). The idea is that a single representation (lexical or phrasal, depending on the theory) can inherit properties from multiple constructions. In a phrasal approach the description of the pattern in (65b) inherits from the transitive and the active construction and the description of (66b) inherits

from both the transitive and the passive constructions. Figure 21.4 illustrates the inheritance-based lexical approach: a lexical entry for a verb such as *read* or *eat* is combined with either an active or passive representation. The respective representations for the active and passive are responsible for the expression of the arguments.




图 21.4: Inheritance Hierarchy for active and passive

As was already discussed in Section 10.2, inheritance-based analyses cannot account for multiple changes in valence as for instance the combination of passive and impersonal construction that can be observed in languages like Lithuanian (Timberlake 1982: Section 5), Irish (Noonan 1994), and Turkish (Özkaragöz 1986). Özkaragöz's Turkish examples are repeated here with the original glossing as (67) for convenience:

- (67) a. Bu şato-da boğ-ul-un-ur. (Turkish)
 this château-LOC strangle-PASS-PASS-AOR
 'One is strangled (by one) in this château.'
- b. Bu oda-da döv-ül-ün-ür.
 this room-LOC hit-PASS-PASS-AOR
 'One is beaten (by one) in this room.'
- c. Harp-te vur-ul-un-ur.
 war-LOC shoot-PASS-PASS-AOR
 'One is shot (by one) in war.'

Another example from Section 10.2 that cannot be handled with inheritance is multiple causativization in Turkish. Turkish allows double and even triple causativization (Lewis 1967: 146):

- (68) Öl-dür-t-tür-t- (Turkish)
 'to cause somebody to cause somebody to kill somebody'

An inheritance-based analysis would not work, since inheriting the same information several times does not add anything new. Krieger & Nerbonne (1993) make the same point with respect to derivational morphology in cases like *preprepreversion*: inheriting information about the prefix *pre-* twice or more often, does not add anything.

So assuming phrasal models, the only way to capture the generalization with regard to (65) and (66) seems to be to assume GPSG-like metarules that relate the constructions

in (65) to the ones in (66). If the constructions are lexically linked as in LTAG, the respective mapping rules would be lexical rules. For approaches that combine LTAG with the Goldbergian plugging idea such as the one by Kallmeyer & Osswald (2012) one would have to have extended families of trees that reflect the possibility of having additional arguments and would have to make sure that the right morphological form is inserted into the respective trees. The morphological rules would be independent of the syntactic structures in which the derived verbal lexemes could be used. One would have to assume two independent types of rules: GPSG-like metarules that operate on trees and morphological rules that operate on stems and words. We believe that this is an unnecessary complication and apart from being complicated the morphological rules would not be acceptable as form-meaning pairs in the CxG sense since one aspect of the form namely that additional arguments are required is not captured in these morphological rules. If such morphological rules were accepted as proper constructions then there would not be any reason left to require that the arguments have to be present in a construction in order for it to be recognizable, and hence, the lexical approach would be accepted.³⁴

Inheritance hierarchies are the main explanatory device in Croft's Radical Construction Grammar (Croft 2001). He also assumes phrasal constructions and suggests representing these in a taxonomic network (an inheritance hierarchy). He assumes that every idiosyncrasy of a linguistic expression is represented on its own node in this kind of network. Figure 21.5 shows part of the hierarchy he assumes for sentences. There are




图 21.5: Classification of phrasal patterns in Croft (2001: 26)

sentences with intransitive verbs and sentences with transitive verbs. Sentences with the form [Sbj kiss Obj] are special instances of the construction [Sbj TrVerb Obj]. The [Sbj kick Obj] construction also has further sub-constructions, namely the constructions [Sbj kick the bucket] and [Subj kick the habit]. Since constructions are always pairs of form and meaning, this gives rise to a problem: in a normal sentence with *kick*, there is a kicking relation between the subject and the object of *kick*. This is not the case for the

³⁴ Compare the discussion of *Totschießen* 'shoot dead' in example (81) below.

idiomatic use of *kick* in (69):

(69) He kicked the bucket.

This means that there cannot be a normal inheritance relation between the [Sbj kick Obj] and the [Sbj kick the bucket] construction. Instead, only parts of the information may be inherited from the [Sbj kick Obj] construction. The other parts are redefined by the sub-construction. This kind of inheritance is referred to as *default inheritance*.

kick the bucket is a rather fixed expression, that is, it is not possible to passivize it or front parts of it without losing the idiomatic reading (Nunberg, Sag & Wasow 1994: 508). However, this is not true for all idioms. As Nunberg, Sag & Wasow (1994: 510) have shown, there are idioms that can be passivized (70a) as well as realizations of idioms where parts of idioms occur outside of the clause (70b).

- (70) a. The beans were spilled by Pat.
b. The strings [that Pat pulled] got Chris the job.

The problem is now that one would have to assume two nodes in the inheritance hierarchy for idioms that can undergo passivization since the realization of the constituents is different in active and passive variants but the meaning is nevertheless idiosyncratic. The relation between the active and passive form would not be captured. Kay (2002) has proposed an algorithm for computing objects (Construction-like objects = CLOs) from hierarchies that then license active and passive variants. As I have shown in Müller (2006: Section 3), this algorithm does not deliver the desired results and it is far from straightforward to improve it to the point that it actually works. Even if one were to adopt the changes I proposed, there are still phenomena that cannot be described using inheritance hierarchies (see Section 10.2 in this book).

A further interesting point is that the verbs have to be explicitly listed in the constructions. This begs the question of how constructions should be represented where the verbs are used differently. If a new node in the taxonomic network is assumed for cases like (71), then Goldberg's criticism of lexical analyses that assume several lexical entries for a verb that can appear in various constructions³⁵ will be applicable here: one would have to assume constructions for every verb and every possible usage of that verb.

- (71) He kicked the bucket into the corner.

For sentences with negation, Croft assumes the hierarchy with multiple inheritance given in Figure 21.6 on the following page. The problem with this kind of representation is that it remains unclear as to how the semantic embedding of the verb meaning under negation can be represented. If all constructions are pairs of form and meaning, then there would have to be a semantic representation for [Sbj IntrVerb] (CONT value or SEM value). Similarly, there would have to be a meaning for [Sbj Aux-n't Verb]. The

³⁵ Note the terminology: I used the word *lexical entry* rather than *lexical item*. The HPSG analysis uses lexical rules that correspond to Goldberg's templates. What Goldberg criticizes is lexical rules that relate lexical entries, not lexical rules that license new lexical items, which may be stored or not. HPSG takes the latter approach to lexical rules. See Section 9.2.




图 21.6: Interaction of phrasal patterns following Croft (2001: 26)

problem now arises that the meaning of [Sbj IntrVerb] has to be embedded under the meaning of the negation and this cannot be achieved directly using inheritance since X and not(X) are incompatible. There is a technical solution to this problem using auxiliary features. Since there are a number of interactions in grammars of natural languages, this kind of analysis is highly implausible if one claims that features are a direct reflection of observable properties of linguistic objects. For a more detailed discussion of approaches with classifications of phrasal patterns, see Müller (2010b) as well as Müller (2007b: Section 18.3.2.2) and for the use of auxiliary features in inheritance-based analyses of the lexicon, see Müller (2007b: Section 7.5.2.2).

21.4.2 Mappings between different levels of representations

Culicover & Jackendoff (2005: Chapter 6.3) suggest that passive should be analyzed as one of several possible mappings from the Grammatical Function tier to the surface realization of arguments. Surface realizations of referential arguments can be NPs in a certain case, with certain agreement properties, or in a certain position. While such analyses that work by mapping elements with different properties onto different representations are common in theories like LFG and HPSG (Koenig 1999; Bouma, Malouf & Sag 2001a), a general property of these analyses is that one needs one level of representation per interaction of phenomena (ARG-ST, SEM-ARG, ADD-ARG in Koenig's proposal, ARG-ST, DEPS, SPR, COMPS in Bouma, Malouf and Sag's proposal). This was discussed extensively in Müller (2007b: Section 7.5.2.2) with respect to extensions that would be needed for Koenig's analysis.

Since Culicover and Jackendoff argue for a phrasal model, we will discuss their proposal here. Culicover and Jackendoff assume a multilayered model in which semantic representations are linked to grammatical functions, which are linked to tree positions. Figure 21.7 shows an example for an active sentence. GF stands for Grammatical Function. Culicover & Jackendoff (2005: 204) explicitly avoid names like Subject and Object since this is crucial for their analysis of the passive to work. They assume that the first GF following a bracket is the subject of the clause the bracket corresponds to (p. 195–196) and hence has to be mapped to an appropriate tree position in English. Note that this view of grammatical functions and obliqueness does not account for subjectless sentences that are possible in some languages, for instance in German.³⁶

³⁶ Of course one could assume empty expletive subjects, as was suggested by Grewendorf (1993: 1311), but empty elements and especially those without meaning are generally avoided in the constructionist literature. See Müller (2010a: Section 3.4, Section 11.1.1.3) for further discussion.




图 21.7: Linking grammatical functions to tree positions: active

Regarding the passive, the authors write:

we wish to formulate the passive not as an operation that deletes or alters part of the argument structure, but rather as a piece of structure in its own right that can be unified with the other independent pieces of the sentence. The result of the unification is an alternative licensing relation between syntax and semantics. (Culicover & Jackendoff 2005: 203)

They suggest the following representation of the passive:

$$(72) \quad [GF_i > [GF \dots]]_k \Leftrightarrow [\dots V_k + \text{pass } \dots (\text{by } NP_i) \dots]_k$$

The italicized parts are the normal structure of the sentence and the non-italicized parts are an overlay on the normal structure, that is, additional constraints that have to hold in passive sentences. Figure 21.8 shows the mapping of the example discussed above that corresponds to the passive.




图 21.8: Linking grammatical functions to tree positions: passive

Although Culicover and Jackendoff emphasize the similarity between their approach and Relational Grammar (Perlmutter 1983), there is an important difference: in Relational Grammar additional levels (strata) can be stipulated if additional remappings are needed. In Culicover and Jackendoff's proposal there is no additional level. This causes problems

for the analysis of languages which allow for multiple argument alternations. Examples from Turkish were provided in (67). Approaches that assume that the personal passive is the unification of a general structure with a passive-specific structure will not be able to capture this, since they committed to a certain structure too early. The problem for approaches that state syntactic structure for the passive is that such a structure, once stated, cannot be modified. Culicover and Jackendoff's proposal works in this respect since there are no strong constraints in the right-hand side of their constraint in (72). But there is a different problem: when passivization is applied the second time, it has to apply to the innermost bracket, that is, the result of applying (72) should be:

$$(73) \quad [GF_i > [GF_j \dots]]_k \Leftrightarrow [\dots V_k + \text{pass } \dots (\text{by } NP_i) \dots (\text{by } NP_j) \dots]_k$$

This cannot be done with unification, since unification checks for compatibility and since the first application of passive was possible it would be possible for the second time as well. Dots in representations are always dangerous and in the example at hand one would have to make sure that NP_i and NP_j are distinct, since the statement in (72) just says there has to be a *by*-PP somewhere. What is needed instead of unification would be something that takes a GF representation and searches for the outermost bracket and then places a bracket to the left of the next GF. But this is basically a rule that maps one representation onto another one, just like lexical rules do.

If Culicover and Jackendoff want to stick to a mapping analysis, the only option to analyze the data seems to be to assume an additional level for impersonal passives from which the mapping to phrase structure is done. In the case of Turkish sentences like (74), which is a personal passive, the mapping to this level would be the identity function.

- (74) Arkadaş-ım bu oda-da döv-ül-dü.
 friend-my this room-LOC hit-PASS-AOR
 'My friend is beaten (by one) in this room.'

In the case of passivization + impersonal construction, the correct mappings would be implemented by two mappings between the three levels that finally result in a mapping as the one that is seen in (67b), repeated here as (75) for convenience.

- (75) Bu oda-da döv-ül-ün-ür.
 this room-LOC hit-PASS-PASS-AOR
 'One is beaten (by one) in this room.'

Note that passivization + impersonal construction is also problematic for purely inheritance based approaches. What all these approaches can suggest though is that they just stipulate four different relations between argument structure and phrase structure: active, passive, impersonal construction, passive + impersonal construction. But this misses the fact that (75) is an impersonal variant of the passive in (74).

In contrast, the lexical rule-based approach suggested by Müller (2003b) does not have any problems with such multiple alternations: the application of the passivization lexical rule suppresses the least oblique argument and provides a lexical item with the argument structure of a personal passive. Then the impersonal lexical rule applies and

suppresses the now least oblique argument (the object of the active clause). The result is impersonal constructions without any arguments as the one in (75).

21.4.3 Is there an alternative to lexical rules?

In this section we have reviewed the attempts to replace lexical rules with methods of relating constructions. These attempts have not been successful, in our assessment. We believe that the essential problem with them is that they fail to capture the derivational character of the relationship between certain word forms. Alternations signaled by passive voice and causative morphology are relatively simple and regular when formulated as operations on lexical valence structures that have been abstracted from their phrasal context. But non-transformational rules or systems formulated on the phrasal structures encounter serious problems that have not yet been solved.

21.5 Further problems for phrasal approaches

Müller (2006) discussed the problems shared by proposals that assume phrasal constructions to be a fixed configuration of adjacent material as for instance the one by Goldberg & Jackendoff (2004). I showed that many argument structure constructions allow great flexibility as far as the order of their parts is concerned. Back then I discussed resultative constructions in their interaction with free datives, passive and other valence changing phenomena and showed that for all these constructions licensed by such interactions the construction parts can be scrambled, the verb can appear in different positions, arguments can be extracted and so on. The following subsection discusses particle verbs, which pose similar problems for theories that assume a phrasal construction with fixed order of verb and particle.

21.5.1 Particle verbs and commitment to phrase structure configurations

A general problem of approaches that assume phrase structure configurations paired with meaning is that the construction may appear in different contexts: the construction parts may be involved in derivational morphology (as discussed in the previous subsection) or the construction parts may be involved in dislocations. A clear example of the latter type is the phrasal analysis of particle verbs that was suggested by Booij (2002: Section 2; 2012) and Blom (2005), working in the frameworks of Construction Grammar and LFG, respectively. The authors working on Dutch and German assume that particle verbs are licensed by phrasal constructions (pieces of phrase structure) in which the first slot is occupied by the particle.

(76) $[X []_V]_{V'}$ where $X = P, Adv, A,$ or N

Examples for specific Dutch constructions are:

(77) a. $[af []_V]_{V'}$

- b. [door []_V]_{V'}
- c. [op []_V]_{V'}

This suggestion comes with the claim that particles cannot be fronted. This claim is made frequently in the literature, but it is based on introspection and wrong for languages like Dutch and German. On Dutch see Hoeksema (1991: 19), on German, Müller (2002a,c, 2003d, 2007e).³⁷ A German example is given in (78); several pages of attested examples can be found in the cited references and some more complex examples will also be discussed in Section 21.7.3 on page 630.

- (78) *Los damit geht es schon am 15. April.*³⁸
 PART there.with goes it already at.the 15 April
 'It already starts on April the 15th.'

Particle verbs are mini-idioms. So the conclusion is that idiomatic expressions that allow for a certain flexibility in order should not be represented as phrasal configurations describing adjacent elements. For some idioms, a lexical analysis along the lines of Sag (2007) seems to be required.³⁹ The issue of particle verbs will be taken up in Section 21.7.3 again, where we discuss evidence for/against phrasal analyses from neuroscience.

21.6 Arguments from language acquisition

The question whether language acquisition is pattern-based and hence can be seen as evidence for the phrasal approach has already been touched upon in the Sections 16.3 and 16.4. It was argued that constructions can be realized discontinuously in coordinations and hence it is the notion of dependency that has to be acquired; acquiring simple continuous patterns is not sufficient.

Since the present discussion about phrasal and lexical approaches deals with specific proposals, I would like to add two more special subsections: Section 21.6.1 deals with the recognizability of constructions and Section 21.6.2 discusses specific approaches to coordination in order to demonstrate how frameworks deal with the discontinuous realization of constructions.

21.6.1 Recognizability of constructions

I think that a purely pattern-based approach is weakened by the existence of examples like (79):

³⁷ Some more fundamental remarks on introspection and corpus data with relation to particle verbs can also be found in Müller (2007e) and Meurers & Müller (2009).

³⁸ *taz*, 01.03.2002, p. 8, see also Müller (2005c: 313).

³⁹ Note also that the German example is best described as a clause with a complex internally structured constituent in front of the finite verb and it is doubtful whether linearization-based proposals like the ones in Kathol (1995: 244–248) or Wetta (2011) can capture this. See also the discussion of multiple frontings in connection to Dependency Grammar in Section 11.7.1.

- (79) a. John tried to sleep.
b. John tried to be loved.

Although no argument of *sleep* is present in the phrase *to sleep* and neither a subject nor an object is realized in the phrase *to be loved*, both phrases are recognized as phrases containing an intransitive and a transitive verb, respectively.⁴⁰

The same applies to arguments that are supposed to be introduced/licensed by a phrasal construction: in (80) the resultative construction is passivized and then embedded under a control verb, resulting in a situation in which only the result predicate (*tot* ‘dead’) and the matrix verb (*geschossen* ‘shot’) are realized overtly within the local clause, bracketed here:

- (80) Der kranke Mann wünschte sich, [totgeschossen zu werden].⁴¹
the sick man wished SELF dead.shot to be
‘The sick man wanted to be shot dead.’

Of course passivization and control are responsible for these occurrences, but the important point here is that arguments can remain unexpressed or implicit and nevertheless a meaning usually connected to some overt realization of arguments is present (Müller 2007c: Section 4). So, what has to be acquired by the language learner is that when a result predicate and a main verb are realized together, they contribute the resultative meaning. To take another example, NP arguments that are usually realized in active resultative constructions may remain implicit in nominalizations like the ones in (81):

- (81) a. dann scheint uns das Totschießen mindestens ebensoviel Spaß zu machen⁴²
then seems us the dead-shooting at.least as.much fun to make
‘then the shooting dead seems to us to be as least as much fun’
b. Wir lassen heut das Totgeschieße,
we let today the annoying.repeated.shooting.dead
Weil man sowas heut nicht tut.
since one such.thing today not does
Und wer einen Tag sich ausruht,
and who a day SELF rests
Der schießt morgen doppelt gut.⁴³
this shoots tomorrow twice good
‘We do not shoot anybody today, since one does not do this today, and those who rest a day shoot twice as well tomorrow.’

⁴⁰ Constructionist theories do not assume empty elements. Of course, in the GB framework the subject would be realized by an empty element. So it would be in the structure, although inaudible.

⁴¹ Müller (2007c: 387).

⁴² <https://www.elitepartner.de/forum/wie-gehen-die-maenner-mit-den-veraenderten-anspruechen-der-frauen-um-26421-6.html>. 26.03.2012.

⁴³ Gedicht für den Frieden, Oliver Kalkofe, <http://www.golyr.de/oliver-kalkofe/songtext-gedicht-fuer-den-frieden-417329.html>. 04.03.2016.

The argument corresponding to the patient of the verb (the one who is shot) can remain unrealized, because of the syntax of nominalizations. The resultative meaning is still understood, which shows that it does not depend upon the presence of a resultative construction involving Subj V Obj and Obl.

21.6.2 Coordination and discontinuousness

The following subsection deals with analyses of coordination in some of the frameworks that were introduced in this book. The purpose of the section is to show that simple phrasal patterns have to be broken up in coordination structures. This was already mentioned in Section 16.3, but I think it is illuminative to have a look at concrete proposals.

In Categorical Grammar, there is a very elegant treatment of coordination (see Steedman 1991). A generalization with regard to so-called symmetric coordination is that two objects with the same syntactic properties are combined to an object with those properties. We have already encountered the relevant data in the discussion of the motivation for feature geometry in HPSG on page 258. Their English versions are repeated below as (82):

- (82) a. the man and the woman
 b. He knows and loves this record.
 c. He is dumb and arrogant.

Steedman (1991) analyzes examples such as those in (82) with a single rule:

- (83) $X \text{ conj } X \Rightarrow X$

This rule combines two categories of the same kind with a conjunction in between to form a category that has the same category as the conjuncts.⁴⁴ Figure 21.9 shows the analysis of (82a) and Figure 21.10 on the following page gives an analysis of the corresponding English example of (82b).




图 21.9: Coordination of two NPs in Categorical Grammar

⁴⁴ Alternatively, one could analyze all three examples using a single lexical entry for the conjunction *and*: *and* is a functor that takes a word or phrase of any category to its right and after this combination then needs to be combined with an element of the same category to its left in order to form the relevant category after combining with this second element. This means that the category for *und* would have the form $(X \backslash X) / X$. This analysis does not require any coordination rules. If one wants to assume, as is common in GB/MP, that every structure has a head, then a headless analysis that assumes a special rule for coordination like the one in (83) would be ruled out.




图 21.10: Coordination of two transitive verbs in Categorical Grammar

If we compare this analysis to the one that would have to be assumed in traditional phrase structure grammars, it becomes apparent what the advantages are: one rule was required for the analysis of NP coordination where two NPs are coordinated to form an NP and another was required for the analysis of V coordination. This is not only undesirable from a technical point of view, neither does it capture the basic property of symmetric coordination: two symbols with the same syntactic category are combined with each other.

It is interesting to note that it is possible to analyze phrases such as (84) in this way:

(84) give George a book and Martha a record

In Section 1.3.2.4, we have seen that this kind of sentences is problematic for constituent tests. However, in Categorical Grammar, it is possible to analyze them without any problems if one adopts rules for type raising and composition as Dowty (1988) and Steedman (1991) do. In Section 8.5, we have already seen forward type raising as well as forward and backward composition. In order to analyze (84), one would require backward type raising repeated in (85) and backward composition repeated in (86):

(85) Backward type raising ($< T$)
 $X \Rightarrow T \setminus (T/X)$

(86) Backward composition (< B)
 $Y \setminus Z * X \setminus Y = X \setminus Z$

Dowty's analysis of (84) is given in Figure 21.11. vp stands for s\np.




图 21.11: Gapping in Categorical Grammar

This kind of type-raising analysis was often criticized because raising categories leads to many different analytical possibilities for simple sentences. For example, one

could first combine a type-raised subject with the verb and then combine the resulting constituent with the object. This would mean that we would have a $[[S\ V]\ O]$ in addition to the standard $[S\ [V\ O]]$ analysis. Steedman (1991) argues that both analyses differ in terms of information structure and it is therefore valid to assume different structures for the sentences in question.

I will not go into these points further here. However, I would like to compare Steedman's lexical approach to phrasal analyses: all approaches that assume that the ditransitive construction represents a continuous pattern encounter a serious problem with the examples discussed above. This can be best understood by considering the TAG analysis of coordination proposed by Sarkar & Joshi (1996). If one assumes that $[Sb\ TransVerb\ Obj]$ or $[S\ [V\ O]]$ constitutes a fixed unit, then the trees in Figure 21.12 form the starting point for the analysis of coordination.




图 21.12: Elementary trees for *knows* and *loves*

If one wants to use these trees/constructions for the analysis of (87), there are in principle two possibilities: one assumes that two complete sentences are coordinated or alternatively, one assumes that some nodes are shared in a coordinated structure.

(87) He knows and loves this record.

Abeillé (2006) has shown that it is not possible to capture all the data if one assumes that cases of coordination such as those in (87) always involve the coordination of two complete clauses. It is also necessary to allow for lexical coordination of the kind we saw in Steedman's analysis (see also Section 4.6.3). Sarkar & Joshi (1996) develop a TAG analysis in which nodes are shared in coordinate structures. The analysis of (87) can be seen in Figure 21.13 on the following page. The subject and object nodes are only present once in this figure. The S nodes of both elementary trees both dominate the *he* NP. In the same way, the object NP node belongs to both VPs. The conjunction connects two verbs indicated by the thick lines. Sarkar and Joshi provide an algorithm that determines which nodes are to be shared. The structure may look strange at first, but for TAG purposes, it is not the derived tree but rather the derivation tree that is important, since this is the one that is used to compute the semantic interpretation. The authors show that the derivation trees for the example under discussion and even more complex examples can be constructed correctly.




图 21.13: TAG analysis of *He knows and loves this record.*

In theories such as HPSG and LFG where structure building is, as in Categorical Grammar, driven by valence, the above sentence is unproblematic: both verbs are conjoined and then the combination behaves like a simple verb. The analysis of this is given in Figure 21.14. This analysis is similar to the Categorical Grammar analysis in Figure 21.10.⁴⁵ With Goldberg's plugging analysis one could also adopt this approach to




图 21.14: Selection-based analysis of *He knows and loves this record.* in tree notation

coordination: here, *knows* and *loves* would first be plugged into a coordination construction and the result would then be plugged into the transitive construction. Exactly how the semantics of *knows and loves* is combined with that of the transitive construction is unclear since the meaning of this phrase is something like $and'(know'(x, y), love'(x, y))$, that is, a complex event with at least two open argument slots x and y (and possibly ad-

⁴⁵ A parallel analysis in Dependency Grammar is possible as well. Tesnière's original analysis was different though. See Section 11.6.2.1 for discussion.

ditionally an event and a world variable depending on the semantic theory that is used). Goldberg would probably have to adopt an analysis such as the one in Figure 21.13 in order to maintain the plugging analysis.

Croft would definitely have to adopt the TAG analysis since the verb is already present in his constructions. For the example in (84), both Goldberg and Croft would have to draw from the TAG analysis in Figure 21.15.




图 21.15: TAG analysis of *He gave George a book and Martha a record.*

The consequence of this is that one requires discontinuous constituents. Since coordination allows a considerable number of variants, there can be gaps between all arguments of constructions. An example with a ditransitive verb is given in (88):

(88) He gave George and sent Martha a record.

See Crysmann (2008) and Beavers & Sag (2004) for HPSG analyses that assume discontinuous constituents for particular coordination structures.

The result of these considerations is that the argument that particular elements occur next to each other and that this occurrence is associated with a particular meaning is considerably weakened. What competent speakers do acquire is the knowledge that heads must occur with their arguments somewhere in the utterance and that all the requirements of the heads involved have to somehow be satisfied (θ -Criterion, coherence/completeness, empty SUBCAT list). The heads themselves need not necessarily occur directly adjacent to their arguments. See the discussion in Section 16.3 about pattern-based models of language acquisition.

The computation of the semantic contribution of complex structures such as those in Figure 21.15 is by no means trivial. In TAG, there is the derivation tree in addition to the derived tree that can then be used to compute the semantic contribution of a linguistic object. Construction Grammar does not have this separate level of representation. The question of how the meaning of the sentences discussed here is derived from their component parts still remains open for phrasal approaches.

Concluding the section on language acquisition, we assume that a valence representation is the result of language acquisition, since this is necessary for establishing the dependency relations in various possible configurations in an utterance. See also Behrens (2009: 439) for a similar conclusion.

21.7 Arguments from psycho- and neurolinguistics

This section has three parts: in the first part we compare approaches which assume that valence alternations are modeled by lexical rules, underspecification, or disjunctions with phrasal approaches. In Subsection 21.7.2 part we discuss approaches to light verb constructions and Subsection 21.7.3 is devoted to neurolinguistic findings.

21.7.1 Lexical rules vs. phrasal constructions

Goldberg (1995: Section 1.4.5) uses evidence from psycholinguistic experiments to argue against lexical approaches that use lexical rules to account for argument structure alternations: Carlson & Tanenhaus (1988) showed that sentences with true lexical ambiguity like those in (89) and sentences with two verbs with the same core meaning have different processing times.

- (89) a. Bill set the alarm clock onto the shelf.
b. Bill set the alarm clock for six.
- (90) a. Bill loaded the truck onto the ship.
b. Bill loaded the truck with bricks.

Errors due to lexical ambiguity cause a bigger increase in processing time than errors in the use of the same verb. Experiments showed that there was a bigger difference in processing times for the sentences in (89) than for the sentences in (90). The difference in processing times between (90a) and (90b) would be explained by different preferences for phrasal constructions. In a lexicon-based approach one could explain the difference by assuming that one lexical item is more basic, that is, stored in the mental dictionary and the other is derived from the stored one. The application of lexical rules would be time consuming, but since the lexical items are related, the overall time consumption is smaller than the time needed to process two unrelated items (Müller 2002a: 405).

Alternatively one could assume that the lexical items for both valence patterns are the result of lexical rule applications. As with the phrasal constructions, the lexical rules would have different preferences. This shows that the lexical approach can explain the experimental results as well, so that they do not force us to prefer phrasal approaches.

Goldberg (1995: 18) claims that lexical approaches have to assume two variants of *load* with different meaning and that this would predict that *load* alternations would behave like two verbs that really have absolutely different meanings. The experiments discussed above show that such predictions are wrong and hence lexical analyses would

be falsified. However, as was shown in Müller (2010a: Section 11.11.8.2), the argumentation contains two flaws: let's assume that the construction meaning of the construction that licenses (90a) is C_1 and the construction meaning of the construction that licenses (90b) is C_2 . Under such assumptions the semantic contribution of the two lexical items in the lexical analysis would be (91). *load*(...) is the contribution of the verb that would be assumed in phrasal analyses.

- (91) a. *load* (onto): $C_1 \wedge \text{load}(\dots)$
 b. *load* (with): $C_2 \wedge \text{load}(\dots)$

(91) shows that the lexical items partly share their semantic contribution. We hence predict that the processing of the dispreferred argument realization of *load* is simpler than the dispreferred meaning of *set*: in the latter case a completely new verb has to be activated while in the first case parts of the meaning are activated already.⁴⁶

Goldberg (1995: 107) argues against lexical rule-based approaches for locative alternations like (92), since according to her such approaches have to assume that one of the verb forms has to be the more basic form.

- (92) a. He loaded hay onto the wagon.
 b. He loaded the wagon with hay.

She remarks that this is problematic since we do not have clear intuitions about what the basic and what the derived forms are. She argues that the advantage of phrasal approaches is that various constructions can be related to each other without requiring the assumption that one of the constructions is more basic than the other. There are two phrasal patterns and the verb is used in one of the two patterns. This criticism can be addressed in two ways: first one could introduce two lexical types (for instance *onto-verb* and *with-verb*) into a type hierarchy. The two types correspond to two valence frames that are needed for the analysis of (92a) and (92b). These types can have a common supertype (*onto-with-verb*) which is relevant for all *spray/load* verbs. One of the subtypes or the respective lexical item of the verb is the preferred one. This corresponds to a disjunction in the lexicon, while the phrasal approach assumes a disjunction in the set of phrasal constructions.

A variant of this approach is to assume that the lexical description of *load* just contains the supertype describing all *spray/load* verbs. Since model theoretic approaches assume that all structures that are models of utterances contain only maximally specific types (see for instance King (1999) and Pollard & Sag (1994: 21)), it is sufficient to say about verbs like *load* that they are of type *onto-with-verb*. As this type has exactly two subtypes, *load* has to be either *onto-verb* or *with-verb* in an actual model.⁴⁷

A second option is to stick with lexical rules and to assume a single representation for the root of a verb that is listed in the lexicon. In addition, one assumes two lexical

⁴⁶ See also Croft (2003: 64–65) for a brief rejection of Goldberg's interpretation of the experiment that corresponds to what is said here.

⁴⁷ This analysis does not allow the specification of verb specific preferences for one of the realization patterns since the lexicon contains the general type only.

rules that map this basic lexical item onto other items that can be used in syntax after being inflected. The two lexical rules can be described by types that are part of a type hierarchy and that have a common supertype. This would capture commonalities between the lexical rules. We therefore have the same situation as with phrasal constructions (two lexical rules vs. two phrasal constructions). The only difference is that the action is one level deeper in the lexical approach, namely in the lexicon (Müller 2002a: 405–406).

The argumentation with regard to the processing of resultative constructions like (93c) is parallel:

- (93) a. He drinks.
 b. He drinks the milk.
 c. He drinks the pub empty.

When humans parse a sentence they build up structure incrementally. If one hears a word that is incompatible with the current hypothesis, the parsing process breaks down or the current hypothesis is revised. In (93c) *the pub* does not correspond to the normal transitive use of *drink*, so the respective hypothesis has to be revised. In the phrasal approach the resultative construction would have to be used instead of the transitive construction. In the lexical analysis the lexical item that is licensed by the resultative lexical rule would have to be used rather than the bivalent one. Building syntactic structure and lexicon access in general place different demands on our processing capacities. However, when (93c) is parsed, the lexical items for *drink* are active already, we only have to use a different one. It is currently unclear to us whether psycholinguistic experiments can differentiate between the two approaches, but it seems to be unlikely.

21.7.2 Light verbs

Wittenberg, Jackendoff, Kuperberg, Paczynski, Snedeker & Wiese (2014) report on a number of experiments that test predictions made by various approaches to light verb constructions. (94a) shows a typical light verb construction: *take* is a light verb that is combined with the nominal that provides the main predication.

- (94) a. take a walk to the park
 b. walk to the park

Wittenberg & Piñango (2011) examined two psychologically plausible theories of light verb constructions. The phrasal approach assumes that light verb constructions are stored objects associated with semantics (Goldberg 2003b). The alternative compositional view assumes that the semantics is computed as a fusion of the semantics of the event noun and the semantics of the light verb (Grimshaw 1997; Butt 2003; Jackendoff 2002; Culicover & Jackendoff 2005; Müller 2010b; Beavers et al. 2008). Since light verb constructions are extremely frequent (Piñango, Mack & Jackendoff 2006; Wittenberg & Piñango 2011: 399), the phrasal approaches assuming that light verb constructions are stored items with the object and verb fixed predict that light verb constructions should

be retrievable faster than non-light verb constructions like (95) (Wittenberg & Piñango 2011: 396).

(95) take a frisbee to the park

This is not the case. As Wittenberg and Piñango found, there is no difference in processing at the licensing condition (the noun in VO languages like English and the verb in OV languages like German).

However, Wittenberg & Piñango (2011) found an increased processing load 300ms *after* the light verb construction is processed. The authors explain this by assuming that semantic integration of the noun with the verbal meaning takes place after the syntactic combination. While the syntactic combination is rather fast, the semantic computation takes additional resources and this is measurable at 300ms. The verb contributes aspectual information and integrates the meaning of the nominal element. The semantic roles are fused. The resource consumption effect would not be expected if the complete light verb construction were a stored item that is retrieved together with the complete meaning (p. 404). We can conclude that Wittenberg and Piñango's results are compatible with the lexical proposal, but are incompatible with the phrasal view.

21.7.3 Arguments from neurolinguistics

Pulvermüller, Cappelle & Shtyrov (2013) discuss neurolinguistic facts and relate them to the CxG view of grammar theory. One important finding is that deviant words (lexical items) cause brain responses that differ in polarity from brain responses on incorrect strings of words, that is, syntactic combinations. This suggests that there is indeed an empirical basis for deciding the issue.

Concerning the standard example of the Caused-Motion Construction in (96) the authors write the following:

(96) She sneezed the foam off the cappuccino.⁴⁸

this constellation of brain activities may initially lead to the co-activation of the verb *sneeze* with the DCNAs for *blow* and thus to the sentence mentioned. Ultimately, such co-activation of a one-place verb and DCNAs associated with other verbs may result in the former one-place verb being subsumed into a three-place verb category and DCNA set, a process which arguably has been accomplished for the verb *laugh* as used in the sequence *laugh NP off the stage*. (Pulvermüller, Cappelle & Shtyrov 2013)

A DCNA is a discrete combinatorial neuronal assembly. Regarding the specifics of DCNAs the authors write that

Apart from linking categories together, typical DCNAs establish a temporal order between the category members they bind to. DCNAs that do not impose temporal

⁴⁸ Goldberg (2006: 42).

order (thus acting, in principle, as AND units for two constituents) are thought to join together constituents whose sequential order is free or allow for scrambling. (Pulvermüller, Cappelle & Shtyrov 2013: 404)

I believe that this view is entirely compatible with the lexical view outlined above: the lexical item or DCNA requires certain arguments to be present. A lexical rule that relates an intransitive verb to one that can be used in the Caused-Motion Construction is an explicit representation of what it means to activate the valence frame of *blow*.

The authors cite earlier work (Cappelle, Shtyrov & Pulvermüller 2010) and argue that particle verbs are lexical objects, admitting for a discontinuous realization despite their lexical status (p. 21). They restrict their claim to frequently occurring particle verbs. This claim is of course compatible with our assumptions here, but the differences in brain behavior are interesting when it comes to fully productive uses of particle verbs. For instance any semantically appropriate monovalent verb in German can be combined with the aspectual particle *los*: *lostanzen* ‘start to dance’, *loslachen* ‘start to laugh’, *lossingen* ‘start to sing’, Similarly, the combination of monovalent verbs with the particle *an* with the reading *directed-towards* is also productive: *anfahren* ‘drive towards’, *anlachen* ‘laugh in the direction of’, *ansegeln* ‘sail towards’, ... (see Stiebels (1996) on various productive patterns). The interesting question is how particle verbs behave that follow these patterns but occur with low frequency. This is still an open question as far as the experimental evidence is concerned, but as I argue below lexical proposals to particle verbs as the one suggested by Müller (2003d) are compatible with both possible outcomes.

Summarizing the discussion so far, lexical approaches are compatible with the accumulated neurobiological evidence and as far as particle verbs are concerned they seem to be better suited than the phrasal proposals by Booij (2002: Section 2) and Blom (2005) (See Section 21.5.1 for discussion). However, in general, it remains an open question what it means to be a discontinuous lexical item. The idea of discontinuous words is pretty old (Wells 1947), but there have not been many formal accounts of this idea. Nunberg, Sag & Wasow (1994) suggest a representation in a linearization-based framework of the kind that was proposed by Reape (1994) and Kathol (1995: 244–248) and Crysmann (2002) worked out such analyses in detail. Kathol’s lexical item for *aufwachen* ‘to wake up’ is given in (97):

(97) *aufwachen* (following Kathol 1995: 246):

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \dots | \text{HEAD } [1] \text{ verb} \\ \dots | \text{VCOMP } \langle \rangle \\ \text{DOM } \left\langle \left\langle \begin{array}{l} \langle \text{wachen} \rangle \\ \dots | \text{HEAD } [1] \\ \dots | \text{VCOMP } \langle [2] \rangle \end{array} \right\rangle \right\rangle \circ \left\langle \begin{array}{l} \text{vc} \\ \langle \text{auf} \rangle \\ \text{SYNSEM } [2] \left[\dots | \text{HEAD } \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{sepref} \\ \text{FLIP } - \end{array} \right] \right] \end{array} \right\rangle \end{array} \right]$$

The lexical representation contains the list-valued feature *DOM* that contains a description of the main verb and the particle (see Section 11.7.2.2 for details). The *DOM* list is a

list that contains the dependents of a head. The dependents can be ordered in any order provided no linearization rule is violated (Reape 1994). The dependency between the particle and the main verb was characterized by the value of the *vcomp* feature, which is a valence feature for the selection of arguments that form a complex predicate with their head. The shuffle operator \circ concatenates two lists without specifying an order between the elements of the two lists, that is, both *wachen, auf* and *auf, wachen* are possible. The little marking *vc* is an assignment to a topological field in the clause.

I criticized such linearization-based proposals since it is unclear how analyses that claim that the particle is just linearized in the domain of its verb can account for sentences like (98), in which complex syntactic structures are involved (Müller 2007c). German is a V2 language and the fronting of a constituent into the position before the finite verb is usually described as some sort of nonlocal dependency; that is, even authors who favor linearization-based analyses do not assume that the initial position is filled by simple reordering of material (Kathol 2000; Müller 1999a, 2002a; Bjerre 2006).⁴⁹

- (98) a. [_{vf} [_{mf} Den Atem] [_{vc} an]] hielt die ganze Judenheit.⁵⁰
 the breath PART held the whole Jewish.community
 ‘The whole Jewish community held their breath.’
 b. [_{vf} [_{mf} Wieder] [_{vc} an]] treten auch die beiden Sozialdemokraten.⁵¹
 again PART kick also the two Social.Democrats
 ‘The two Social Democrats are also running for office again.’
 c. [_{vf} [_{vc} Los] [_{nf} damit]] geht es schon am 15. April.⁵²
 PART there.with went it already at.the 15 April
 ‘It already starts on April the 15th.’

The conclusion that has to be drawn from examples like (98) is that particles interact in complex ways with the syntax of sentences. This is captured by the lexical treatment that was suggested in Müller (2002a: Chapter 6) and Müller (2003d): the main verb selects for the verbal particle. By assuming that *wachen* selects for *auf*, the tight connection between verb and particle is represented.⁵³ Such a lexical analysis provides an easy way

⁴⁹ Kathol (1995: Section 6.3) working in HPSG suggested such an analysis for simple sentences, but later changed his view. Wetta (2011) also working in HPSG assumes a purely linearization-based approach. Similarly Groß & Osborne (2009) working in Dependency Grammar assume that there is a simple dependency structure in simple sentences while there are special mechanisms to account for extraction out of embedded clauses. I argue against such proposals in Müller (2015b) referring to the scope of adjuncts, coordination of simple with complex sentences and Across the Board Extraction and apparent multiple frontings. See also Section 11.7.1.

⁵⁰ Lion Feuchtwanger, *Jud Süß*, p. 276, quoted from Grubačić (1965: 56).

⁵¹ taz, bremen, 24.05.2004, p. 21.

⁵² taz, 01.03.2002, p. 8.

⁵³ Cappelle et al. (2010: 197) write: “the results provide neurophysiological evidence that phrasal verbs are lexical items. Indeed, the increased activation that we found for existing phrasal verbs, as compared to infelicitous combinations, suggests that a verb and its particle together form one single lexical representation, i. e. a single lexeme, and that a unified cortical memory circuit exists for it, similar to that encoding a single word”. I believe that my analysis is compatible with this statement.

to account for fully nontransparent particle verbs like *an-fangen* ‘to begin’. However, I also argued for a lexical treatment of transparent particle verbs like *losfahren* ‘to start to drive’ and *jemanden/etwas anfahren* ‘drive directed towards somebody/something’. The analysis involves a lexical rule that licenses a verbal item selecting for an adjunct particle. The particles *an* and *los* can modify verbs and contribute arguments (in the case of *an*) and the particle semantics. This analysis can be shown to be compatible with the neuro-mechanical findings: if it is the case that even transparent particle verb combinations with low frequency are stored, then the rather general lexical rule that I suggested in the works cited above is the generalization of the relation between a large amount of lexical particle verb items and their respective main verb. The individual particle verbs would be special instantiations that have the form of the particle specified as it is also the case for non-transparent particle verbs like *anfangen*. If it should turn out that productive combinations with particle verbs of low frequency cause syntactic reflexes in the brain, this could be explained as well: the lexical rule licenses an item that selects for an adverbial element. This selection would then be seen as parallel to the relation between the determiner and the noun in the NP *der Mut* ‘the courage’, which Cappelle et al. (2010: 191) discuss as an example of a syntactic combination. Note that this analysis is also compatible with another observation made by Shtyrov, Pihko & Pulvermüller (2005): morphological affixes also cause the lexical reflexes. In my analysis the stem of the main verb is related to another stem that selects for a particle. This stem can be combined with (derivational and inflectional) morphological affixes causing the lexical activation pattern in the brain. After this combination the verb is combined with the particle and the dependency can be either a lexical or a syntactic one, depending on the results of the experiments to be carried out. The analysis is compatible with both results.

Note that my analysis allows the principle of lexical integrity to be maintained. I therefore do not follow Cappelle, Shtyrov & Pulvermüller (2010: 198), who claim that they “provide proof that potentially separable multi-word items can nonetheless be word-like themselves, and thus against the validity of a once well-established linguistic principle, the Lexical Integrity Principle”. I agree that non-transparent particle verbs are multi-word lexemes, but the existence of multi-word lexemes does not show that syntax has access to the word-internal morphological structure. The parallel between particle verbs and clearly phrasal idioms was discussed in Müller (2002a,c) and it was concluded that idiom-status is irrelevant for the question of wordhood. Since the interaction of clearly phrasal idioms with derivational morphology as evidenced by examples like (99) did not force grammarians to give up on lexical integrity, it can be argued that particle verbs are not convincing evidence for giving up the Lexical Integrity Principle either.⁵⁴

- (99) a. Er hat ins Gras gebissen.
 he has in.the grass bit
 ‘He bit the dust.’

⁵⁴ However, see Booij (2009) for some challenges to lexical integrity.

- b. „Heath Ledger“ kann ich nicht einmal schreiben, ohne dass mir sein ins
 Heath Ledger can I not even write without that me his in.the
 Gras-Gebeiß wieder so wahnsinnig leid tut⁵⁵
 grass.biting again so crazy sorrow does
 ‘I cannot even write “Heath Ledger” without being sad again about his biting
 the dust.’

The example in (99b) involves the discontinuous derivation with the circumfix *Ge- -e* (Lüdeling 2001: Section 3.4.3; Müller 2002a: 324–327, 372–377; Müller 2003d: Section 2.2.1, Section 5.2.1). Still the parts of the idiom *ins Gras beiß-* ‘bite the dust’ are present and with them the idiomatic reading. See Sag (2007) for a lexical analysis of idioms that can explain examples like (99).

So, while I think that it is impossible to distinguish phrasal and lexical approaches for phenomena where heads are used with different valence patterns (Section 21.7.1), there seem to be ways to test whether patterns with high frequency and strong collocations should be analyzed as one fixed chunk of material with a fixed form and a fixed meaning or whether they should be analyzed compositionally.

21.8 Arguments from statistical distribution

In this section, we want to look at arguments from statistics that have been claimed to support a phrasal view. We first look at data-oriented parsing, a technique that was successfully used by Bod (2009b) to model language acquisition and then we turn to the collostructional analysis by Stefanowitsch & Gries (2009). Lastly, we argue that these distributional analyses cannot decide the question whether argument structure constructions are phrasal or lexical.

21.8.1 Unsupervised Data-Oriented Parsing

In Section 13.8.3, we saw Bod’s approach to the structuring of natural language utterances (2009b). If one assumes that language is acquired from the input without innate knowledge, the structures that Bod extracts from the distribution of words would have to be the ones that children also learn (parts of speech, meaning, and context would also have to be included). These structures would then also have to be the ones assumed in linguistic theories. Since Bod does not have enough data, he carried out experiments under the assumption of binary-branching trees and, for this reason, it is not possible to draw any conclusions from his work about whether rules license flat or binary-branching structures. There will almost certainly be interesting answers to this question in the future. What can certainly not be determined in a distribution-based analysis is the exact node in the tree where meaning is introduced. Bod (2009a: 132) claims that his approach constitutes “a testable realization of CxG” in the Goldbergian sense, but the trees that he can construct do not help us to decide between phrasal or lexical analyses or analyses

⁵⁵ <http://www.coffee2watch.at/egala>. 23.03.2012

with empty heads. These alternative analyses are represented in Figure 21.16.⁵⁶ The first





图 21.16: Three possible analyses for resultative construction: holistic construction, lexical rule, empty head

figure stands for a complex construction that contributes the meaning as a whole. The second figure corresponds to the analysis with a lexical rule and the third corresponds to the analysis with an empty head. A distributional analysis cannot decide between these theoretical proposals. Distribution is computed with reference to words; what the words actually mean is not taken into account. As such, it is only possible to say that the word *fischt* 'fishes' occurs in a particular utterance, however it is not possible to see if this word contains resultative semantics or not. Similarly, a distributional analysis does not help to distinguish between theoretical analyses with or without a lexical head. The

⁵⁶ The discussion is perhaps easier to follow if one assumes flat structures rather than binary-branching ones.



The first figure corresponds to the Goldbergian view of phrasal constructions where the verb is inserted into the construction and the meaning is present at the topmost node. In the second figure, there is a lexical rule that provides the resultative semantics and the corresponding valence information. In the third analysis, there is an empty head that combines with the verb and has ultimately the same effect as the lexical rule.

empty head is not perceptible in the signal. It is a theoretical construct and, as we have seen in Section 19.5, it is possible to translate an analysis using an empty head into one with a lexical rule. For the present example, any argumentation for a particular analysis will be purely theory-internal.

Although Unsupervised Data-Oriented Parsing (U-DOP) cannot help us to decide between analyses, there are areas of grammar for which these structures are of interest: under the assumption of binary-branching structures, there are different branching possibilities depending on whether one assumes an analysis with verb movement or not. This means that although one does not see an empty element in the input, there is a reflex in statistically-derived trees. The left tree in Figure 21.17 shows a structure that one would expect from an analysis following Steedman (2000: 159), see Section 8.3. The tree on the right shows a structure that would be expected from a GB-type verb movement analysis (see Section 3.2). But at present, there is no clear finding in this regard (Bod, p. c.




图 21.17: Structures corresponding to analyses with or without verb movement

2009). There is a great deal of variance in the U-DOP trees. The structure assigned to an utterance depends on the verb (Bod, referring to the Wall Street Journal). Here, it would be interesting to see if this changes with a larger data sample. In any case, it would be interesting to look at how all verbs as well as particular verb classes behave. The U-DOP procedure applies to trees containing at least one word each. If one makes use of parts of speech in addition, this results in structures that correspond to the ones we have seen in the preceding chapters. Sub-trees would then not have two Xs as their daughters but rather NP and V, for example. It is also possible to do statistic work with this kind of subtrees and use the part of speech symbols of words (the preterminal symbols) rather than the words themselves in the computation. For example, one would get trees for the symbol V instead of many trees for specific verbs. So instead of having three different trees for *küssen* ‘kiss’, *kennen* ‘know’ and *sehen* ‘see’, one would have three identical trees for the part of speech “verb” that corresponds to the trees that are needed for transitive verbs. The probability of the V tree is therefore higher than the probabilities of the trees for the individual verbs. Hence one would have a better set of data to compute structures for utterances such as those in Figure 21.17. I believe that there are further results in this area to be found in the years to come.

Concluding this subsection, we contend that Bod's paper is a milestone in the Poverty of the Stimulus debate, but it does not and cannot show that a particular version of constructionist theories, namely the phrasal one, is correct.

21.8.2 Collostructions

Stefanowitsch & Gries (2009: Section 5) assume a plugging analysis: "words occur in (slots provided by) a given construction if their meaning matches that of the construction". The authors claim that their *collostructional analysis has confirmed [the plugging analysis] from various perspectives*. Stefanowitsch and Gries are able to show that certain verbs occur more often than not in particular constructions, while other verbs never occur in the respective constructions. For instance, *give*, *tell*, *send*, *offer* and *show* are attracted by the Ditransitive Construction, while *make* and *do* are repelled by this construction, that is they occur significantly less often in this construction than what would be expected given the overall frequency of verbs in the corpus. Regarding this distribution the authors write:

These results are typical for collexeme analysis in that they show two things. First, there are indeed significant associations between lexical items and grammatical structures. Second, these associations provide clear evidence for semantic coherence: the strongly attracted collexemes all involve a notion of 'transfer', either literally or metaphorically, which is the meaning typically posited for the ditransitive. This kind of result is typical enough to warrant a general claim that collostructional analysis can in fact be used to identify the meaning of a grammatical construction in the first place. (Stefanowitsch & Gries 2009: 943)

We hope that the preceding discussion has made clear that the distribution of words in a corpus cannot be seen as evidence for a phrasal analysis. The corpus study shows that *give* usually is used with three arguments in a certain pattern that is typical for English (Subject Verb Object1 Object2) and that this verb forms a cluster with other verbs that have a transfer component in their meaning. The corpus data do not show whether this meaning is contributed by a phrasal pattern or by lexical entries that are used in a certain configuration.

21.9 Conclusion

The essence of the lexical view is that a verb is stored with a valence structure indicating how it combines semantically and syntactically with its dependents. Crucially, that structure is abstracted from the actual syntactic context of particular tokens of the verb. Once abstracted, that valence structure can meet other fates besides licensing the phrasal structure that it most directly encodes: it can undergo lexical rules that manipulate that structure in systematic ways; it can be composed with the valence structure of another predicate; it can be coordinated with similar verbs; and so on. Such an abstraction allows for simple explanations of a wide range of robust, complex linguistic

phenomena. We have surveyed the arguments against the lexical valence approach and in favor of a phrasal representation instead. We find the case for a phrasal representation of argument structure to be unconvincing: there are no compelling arguments in favor of such approaches, and they introduce a number of problems:

- They offer no account for the interaction of valence changing processes and derivational morphology.
- They offer no account for the interaction of valence changing processes and coordination of words.
- They offer no account for the iteration of valence changing processes.
- They overgenerate, unless a link between lexical items and phrasal constructions is assumed.
- They offer no account for distribution of arguments in partial fronting examples.

Assuming a lexical valence structure allows us to solve all the problems that arise with phrasal approaches.

21.10 Why (phrasal) constructions?

In previous sections, I have argued against assuming too much phrasality in grammatical descriptions. If one wishes to avoid transformations in order to derive alternative patterns from a single base structure, while still maintaining lexical integrity, then phrasal analyses become untenable for analyzing all those phenomena where changes in valence and derivational morphology interact. There are, however, some areas in which these two do not interact. In these cases, there is mostly a choice between analyses with silent heads and those with phrasal constructions. In this section, I will discuss some of these cases.

21.10.1 Verbless directives

Jacobs (2008) showed that there are linguistic phenomena where it does not make sense to assume that there is a head in a particular group of words. These configurations are best described as phrasal constructions, in which the adjacency of particular constituents leads to a complete meaning that goes beyond the sum of its parts. Examples of the phenomena that are discussed by Jacobs are phrasal templates such as those in (100) and verbless directives as in (105):

- (100) Pro_{+w,caus/purp} NP
 a. Wozu Konstruktionen?
 why constructions
 ‘Why constructions?’

- b. Warum ich?
 why I
 ‘Why me?’

- (101) NP_{acc} Y_{PP/A/Adv}
 Den Hut in der Hand (kam er ins Zimmer).
 the hat in the hand came he into.the room
 ‘(He came into the room) hat in hand.’

In (100), we are dealing with abbreviated questions:

- (102) a. Wozu braucht man Konstruktionen? / Wozu sollte man Konstruktionen
 to.what needs one constructions to.what should one constructions
 annehmen?
 assume
 ‘Why do we need constructions?’ / ‘Why should we assume constructions?’
 b. Warum soll ich das machen? / Warum wurde ich ausgewählt? / Warum
 why should I that do why was I chosen why
 passiert mir sowas?
 happens me something.like.that
 ‘Why should I do that?’ / ‘Why was I chosen?’ / ‘Why do things like that
 happen to me?’

In (101), a participle has been omitted:

- (103) Den Hut in der Hand haltend kam er ins Zimmer.
 the hat.ACC in the hand holding came he in.the room
 ‘He came into the room hat in hand.’

Cases such as (101) can be analyzed with an empty head that corresponds to *haltend* ‘holding’. For (100), on the other hand, one would require either a syntactic structure with multiple empty elements, or an empty head that selects both parts of the construction and contributes the components of meaning that are present in (102). If one adopts the first approach with multiple silent elements, then one would have to explain why these elements cannot occur in other constructions. For example, it would be necessary to assume an empty element corresponding to *man* ‘one’/‘you’. But such an empty element could never occur in embedded clauses since subjects cannot simply be omitted there:

- (104) * weil dieses Buch gerne liest
 because this book gladly reads
 Intended: ‘because he/she/it likes to read this book’

If one were to follow the second approach, one would be forced to assume an empty head with particularly odd semantics.

The directives in (105) and (106) are similarly problematic (see also Jackendoff & Pinker (2005: 220) for parallel examples in English):

- (105) a. Her mit dem Geld / dem gestohlenen Geld!
 here with the money the stolen money
 'Hand over the (stolen) money!'
- b. Weg mit dem Krempel / dem alten Krempel!
 away with the junk the old junk
 'Get rid of this (old) junk!'
- c. Nieder mit den Studiengebühren / den sozialfeindlichen Studiengebühren!
 down with the tuition.fees the antisocial tuition.fees
 'Down with (antisocial) tuition fees!'
- (106) a. In den Müll mit diesen Klamotten!
 in the trash with these clothes
 'Throw these clothes into the trash!'
- b. Zur Hölle mit dieser Regierung!
 to.the hell with this government
 'To hell with this government!'

Here, it is also not possible to simply identify an elided verb. It is, of course, possible to assume an empty head that selects an adverb or a *mit*-PP, but this would be *ad hoc*. Alternatively, it would be possible to assume that adverbs in (105) select the *mit*-PP. Here, one would have to disregard the fact that adverbs do not normally take any arguments. The same is true of Jacobs's examples in (106). For these, one would have to assume that *in* and *zur* 'to the' are the respective heads. Each of the prepositions would then have to select a noun phrase and a *mit*-PP. While this is technically possible, it is as unattractive as the multiple lexical entries that Categorical Grammar has to assume for pied-piping constructions (see Section 8.6).

A considerably more complicated analysis has been proposed by G. Müller (2009a). Müller treats verbless directives as antipassive constructions. Antipassive constructions involve either the complete suppression of the direct object or its realization as an oblique element (PP). There can also be morphological marking on the verb. The subject is normally not affected by the antipassive but can, however, receive a different case in ergative case systems due to changes in the realization of the object. According to G. Müller, there is a relation between (107a) and (107b) that is similar to active-passive pairs:

- (107) a. [dass] jemand diese Klamotten in den Müll schmeißt
 that somebody these clothes in the trash throws
 'that somebody throws these clothes into the trash'
- b. In den Müll mit diesen Klamotten!
 in the trash with these clothes
 'Throw these clothes into the trash!'

that the prefield can only be filled if the C position is filled.


One major advantage of this analysis is that it derives the different sentence types that are possible with this kind of construction: the V1-variants correspond to polar questions and imperatives, and the V2-variants with a question word correspond to *wh*-questions. A further consequence of the approach pointed out by G. Müller is that no further explanation is required for other interactions with the grammar. For example, the way in which the constructions interact with adverbs follows from the analysis:

- (109) a. Schmeiß den Krempel weg!
 throw the junk away
 b. Schmeiß den Krempel schnell weg!
 throw the junk quickly away
 c. ?* Schmeiß den Krempel sorgfältig weg!
 throw the junk carefully away
- (110) a. Weg mit dem Krempel!
 away with the junk
 b. Schnell weg mit dem Krempel!
 quickly away with the junk
 c. ?* Sorgfältig weg mit dem Krempel!
 carefully away with the junk

Nevertheless one should still bear the price of this analysis in mind: it assumes an empty antipassive morpheme that is otherwise not needed in German. It would only be used in constructions of the kind discussed here. This morpheme is not compatible with any verb and it also triggers obligatory verb movement, which is something that is not known from any other morpheme used to form verb diatheses.

The costs of this analysis are, of course, less severe if one assumes that humans already have this antipassive morpheme anyway, that is, this morpheme is part of our innate Universal Grammar. But if one follows the argumentation from the earlier sections of this chapter, then one should only assume innate linguistic knowledge if there is no alternative explanation.

G. Müller's analysis can be translated into HPSG. The result is given in (111):




(111) contains a lexical entry for an empty verb in verb-initial position. *directive'* is a placeholder for a more general relation that should be viewed as a supertype of all possible meanings of this construction. These subsume both *schmeißen* 'to throw' and cases such as (112) that were pointed out to me by Monika Budde:

- (112) Und mit dem Klavier ganz langsam durch die Tür!
 and with the piano very slowly through the door
 'Carry the piano very slowly through the door!'

Since only verb-initial and verb-second orders are possible in this construction, the application of the lexical rule for verb-initial position (see page 279) is obligatory. This can be achieved by writing the result of the application of this lexical rule into the lexicon, without having the object to which the rule should have applied actually being present in the lexicon itself. Koenig (1999: Section 3.4.2, 5.3) proposed something similar for English *rumored* 'it is rumored that ...' and *aggressive*. There is no active variant of the verb *rumored*, a fact that can be captured by the assumption that only the result of applying a passive lexical rule is present in the lexicon. The actual verb or verb stem from which the participle form has been derived exists only as the daughter of a lexical rule but not as an independent linguistic object. Similarly, the verb **aggress* only exists as the daughter of a (non-productive) adjective rule that licenses *aggressive* and a nominalization rule licensing *aggression*.

The optionality of the *mit*-PP is signaled by the brackets in (111). If one adds the information inherited from the type *verb-initial-lr* under *SYNSEM*, then the result is (113).



The valence properties of the empty verb in (113) are to a large extent determined by the lexical rule for verb-initial order: the V1-LR licenses a verbal head that requires a VP to its right that is missing a verb with the local properties of the LEX-DTR ($\boxed{3}$).

Semantic information dependent on sentence type (assertion, imperative or question) is determined inside the V1-LR depending on the morphological make-up of the verb and the SLASH value of the selected VP (see Müller 2007b: Section 10.3; 2016b; 2015b). Setting the semantics to *imperative-or-interrogative* rules out *assertion* as it occurs in V2-clauses. Whether this type is resolved in the direction of *imperative* or *interrogative* is ultimately decided by further properties of the utterance such as intonation or the use of interrogative pronouns.

The valence of the lexical daughters in (113) as well as the connection to the semantic role (the linking to the patient role) are simply stipulated. Every approach has to stipulate that an argument of the verb has to be expressed as a *mit*-PP. Since there is no antipassive in German, the effect that could be otherwise achieved by an antipassive lexical rule in (113) is simply written into the LEX-DTR of the verb movement rule.

The SUBCAT list of LEX-DTR contains a modifier (adverb, directional PP) and the *mit*-PP. This *mit*-PP is co-indexed with the patient of *directive'* and the modifier refers to the referent of the *mit*-PP. The agent of *directive'* is unspecified since it depends on the context (speaker, hearer, third person).

This analysis is shown in Figure 21.19 on the following page. Here, V[LOC $\boxed{2}$] corre-




图 21.19: HPSG variant of the analysis of *In den Müll mit diesen Klamotten!/?*

sponds to the LEX-DTR in (113). The V1-LR licenses an element that requires a maximal verb projection with that exact DSL value [2]. Since DSL is a head feature, the information is present along the head path. The DSL value is identified with the LOCAL value [2] in Figure 21.19) in the verb movement trace (see page 280). This ensures that the empty element at the end of sentence has exactly the same local properties that the LEX-DTR in (113) has. Thus, both the correct syntactic and semantic information is present on the verb trace and structure building involving the verb trace follows the usual principles. The structures correspond to the structures that were assumed for German sentences in Chapter 9. Therefore, there are the usual possibilities for integrating adjuncts. The correct derivation of the semantics, in particular embedding under imperative or interrogative semantics, follows automatically (for the semantics of adjuncts in conjunction with verb position, see Müller (2007b: Section 9.4)). Also, the ordering variants with the *mit*-PP preceding the direction (112) and direction preceding the *mit*-PP (107b) follow from the usual mechanisms.

If one rejects the analyses discussed up to this point, then one is only really left with phrasal constructions or dominance schemata that connect parts of the construction and contribute the relevant semantics. Exactly how one can integrate adjuncts into the phrasal construction in a non-stipulative way remains an open question; however, there are already some initial results by Jakob Maché (2010) suggesting that directives can still be sensibly integrated into the entire grammar provided an appropriate phrasal schema is assumed.

21.10.2 Serial verbs

There are languages with so-called serial verbs. For example, it is possible to form sentences in Mandarin Chinese where there is only one subject and several verb phrases (Li & Thompson 1981: Chapter 21). There are multiple readings depending on the distri-

bution of aspect marking inside the VP:⁵⁷ if the first VP contains a perfect marker, then we have the meaning ‘VP1 in order to do/achieve VP2’ (114a). If the second VP contains a perfect marker, then the entire construction means ‘VP2 because VP1’ (114b), and if the first VP contains a durative marker and the verb *hold* or *use*, then the entire construction means ‘VP2 using VP1’ (114c).

- (114) a. Ta1 qu3 le qian2 qu4 guang1jie1.
 he withdraw PRF money go shop
 ‘He withdrew money to go shopping.’
 b. Ta1 zhu4 Zhong1guo2 xue2 le Han4yu3.
 he live China learn PRF Chinese
 ‘He learned Chinese because he lived in China.’
 c. Ta1 na2 zhe kuai4zi chi1 fan4.
 he take DUR chopsticks eat food
 ‘He eats with chopsticks.’

If we consider the sentences, we only see two adjacent VPs. The meanings of the entire sentences, however, contain parts of meaning that go beyond the meaning of the verb phrases. Depending on the kind of aspect marking, we arrive at different interpretations with regard to the semantic combination of verb phrases. As can be seen in the translations, English sometimes uses conjunctions in order to express relations between clauses or verb phrases.

There are three possible ways to capture these data:

1. One could claim that speakers of Chinese simply deduce the relation between the VPs from the context,
2. one could assume that there are empty heads in Chinese corresponding to *because* or *to*, or
3. one could assume a phrasal construction for serial verbs that contributes the correct semantics for the complete meaning depending on the aspect marking inside the VPs.

The first approach is unsatisfactory because the meaning does not vary arbitrarily. There are grammaticalized conventions that should be captured by a theory. The second solution has a stipulative character and thus, if one wishes to avoid empty elements, only the third solution remains. Müller & Lipenkova (2009) have presented a corresponding analysis.

21.10.3 Relative and interrogative clauses

Sag (1997) develops a phrasal analysis of English relative clauses as have Ginzburg & Sag (2000) for interrogative clauses. Relative and interrogative clauses consist of a

⁵⁷ See Müller & Lipenkova (2009) for a detailed discussion and further references.

fronted phrase and a clause or a verb phrase missing the fronted phrase. The fronted phrase contains a relative or interrogative pronoun.

- (115) a. the man [who] sleeps
 b. the man [who] we know
 c. the man [whose mother] visited Kim
 d. a house [in which] to live
- (116) a. I wonder [who] you know.
 b. I want to know [why] you did this.

The GB analysis of relative clauses is given in Figure 21.20. In this analysis, an empty head is in the C position and an element from the IP is moved to the specifier position.




图 21.20: Analysis of relative clauses in GB theory

The alternative analysis shown in Figure 21.21 involves combining the subparts directly in order to form a relative clause. Borsley (2006) has shown that one would require




图 21.21: Analysis of relative clauses in HPSG following Sag (1997)

six empty heads in order to capture the various types of relative clauses possible in English if one wanted to analyze them lexically. These heads can be avoided and replaced by corresponding schemata (see Chapter 19 on empty elements). A parallel argument

can also be found in Webelhuth (2011) for German: grammars of German would also have to assume six empty heads for the relevant types of relative clause.

Unlike the resultative constructions that were already discussed, there is no variability among interrogative and relative clauses with regard to the order of their parts. There are no changes in valence and no interaction with derivational morphology. Thus, nothing speaks against a phrasal analysis. If one wishes to avoid the assumption of empty heads, then one should opt for the analysis of relative clauses by Sag, or the variant in Müller (1999a: Chapter 10; 2007b: Chapter 11). The latter analysis does without a special schema for noun-relative clause combinations since the semantic content of the relative clause is provided by the relative clause schema.

Sag (2010) discusses long-distance dependencies in English that are subsumed under the term *wh*-movement in GB theory and the Minimalist Program. He shows that this is by no means a uniform phenomenon. He investigates *wh*-questions (117), *wh*-exclamatives (118), topicalization (119), *wh*-relative clauses (120) and *the*-clauses (121):

- (117) a. How foolish is he?
b. I wonder *how foolish he is*.
- (118) a. What a fool he is!
b. It's amazing *how odd it is*.
- (119) The bagels, I like.
- (120) a. I met the person *who they nominated*.
b. I'm looking for a bank *in which to place my trust*.
- (121) a. The more people I met, *the happier I became*.
b. *The more people I met*, the happier I became.

These individual constructions vary in many respects. Sag lists the following questions that have to be answered for each construction:

- Is there a special *wh*-element in the filler daughter and, if so, what kind of element is it?
- Which syntactic categories can the filler daughters have?
- Can the head-daughter be inverted or finite? Is this obligatory?
- What is the semantic and/or syntactic category of the mother node?
- What is the semantic and/or syntactic category of the head-daughter?
- Is the sentence an island? Does it have to be an independent clause?

The variation that exists in this domain has to be captured somehow by a theory of grammar. Sag develops an analysis with multiple schemata that ensure that the category and semantic contribution of the mother node correspond to the properties of both daughters. The constraints for both classes of constructions and specific constructions are represented in an inheritance hierarchy so that the similarities between the constructions can be accounted for. The analysis can of course also be formulated in a GB-style using empty heads. One would then have to find some way of capturing the generalizations pertaining to the construction. This is possible if one represents the constraints on empty heads in an inheritance hierarchy. Then, the approaches would simply be notational variants of one another. If one wishes to avoid empty elements in the grammar, then the phrasal approach would be preferable.

21.10.4 The N-P-N construction

Jackendoff (2008) discusses the English N-P-N construction. Examples of this construction are given in (122):

- (122) a. day by day, paragraph by paragraph, country by country
 b. dollar for dollar, student for student, point for point
 c. face to face, bumper to bumper
 d. term paper after term paper, picture after picture
 e. book upon book, argument upon argument

This construction is relatively restricted: articles and plural nouns are not allowed. The phonological content of the first noun has to correspond to that of the second. There are also similar constructions in German:

- (123) a. Er hat Buch um Buch verschlungen.
 he has book around book swallowed
 'He binge-read book after book.'
 b. Zeile für Zeile⁵⁸
 line for line
 'line by line'

Determining the meaning contribution of this kind of N-P-N construction is by no means trivial. Jackendoff suggests the meaning *many Xs in succession* as an approximation.

Jackendoff points out that this construction is problematic from a syntactic perspective since it is not possible to determine a head in a straightforward way. It is also not clear what the structure of the remaining material is if one is working under assumptions of \bar{X} theory. If the preposition *um* were the head in (123a), then one would expect that it is combined with an NP, however this is not possible:

- (124) a. *Er hat dieses Buch um jenes Buch verschlungen.
 he has this book around this book swallowed

⁵⁸ *Zwölf Städte*. Einstürzende Neubauten. Fünf auf der nach oben offenen Richterskala, 1987.

- b. * Er hat ein Buch um ein Buch verschlungen.
 he has a book around a book swallowed

For this kind of structures, it would be necessary to assume that a preposition selects a noun to its right and, if it finds this, it then requires a second noun of this exact form to its left. For N-*um*-N and N-*für*-N, it is not entirely clear what the entire construction has to do with the individual prepositions. One could also try to develop a lexical analysis for this phenomenon, but the facts are different to those for resultative constructions: in resultative constructions, the semantics of simplex verbs clearly plays a role. Furthermore, unlike with the resultative construction, the order of the component parts of the construction is fixed in the N-P-N construction. It is not possible to extract a noun or place the preposition in front of both nouns. Syntactically, the N-P-N combination with some prepositions behaves like an NP (Jackendoff 2008: 9):

- (125) Student after/upon/*by student flunked.

This is also strange if one wishes to view the preposition as the head of the construction.

Instead of a lexical analysis, Jackendoff proposes the following phrasal construction for N-*after*-N combinations:

- (126) Meaning: MANY X_i s IN SUCCESSION [or however it is encoded]
 Syntax: $[_{NP} N_i P_j N_i]$
 Phonology: Wd_i after_j Wd_i

The entire meaning as well as the fact that the N-P-N has the syntactic properties of an NP would be captured on the construction level.

I already discussed examples by Bragmann (2015) in Section 11.7.2.4 that show that N-P-N constructions may be extended by further P-N combinations:

- (127) Day after day after day went by, but I never found the courage to talk to her.

So rather than an N-P-N pattern Bragmann suggests the pattern in (128), where ‘+’ stands for at least one repetition of a sequence.

- (128) N (P N)+

As was pointed out on page 397 this pattern is not easy to cover in selection-based approaches. One could assume that an N takes arbitrarily many P-N combinations, which would be very unusual for heads. Alternatively, one could assume recursion, so N would be combined with a P and with an N-P-N to yield N-P-N-P-N. But such an analysis would make it really difficult to enforce the restrictions regarding the identity of the nouns in the complete construction. In order to enforce such an identity the N that is combined with N-P-N would have to impose constraints regarding deeply embedded nouns inside the embedded N-P-N object (see also Section 18.2).

G. Müller (2011a) proposes a lexical analysis of the N-P-N construction. He assumes that prepositions can have a feature REDUP. In the analysis of *Buch um Buch* ‘book after book’, the preposition is combined with the right noun *um Buch*. In the phonological component, reduplication of *Buch* is triggered by the REDUP feature, thereby yielding

Buch um Buch. This analysis also suffers from the problems pointed out by Jackendoff: in order to derive the semantics of the construction, the semantics would have to be present in the lexical entry of the reduplicating preposition (or in a relevant subsequent component that interprets the syntax). Furthermore it is unclear how a reduplication analysis would deal with the Bragmann data.

第二十二章 Universal Grammar and doing comparative linguistics without an a priori assumption of a (strong) UG

The following two sections deal with the tools that I believe to be necessary to capture generalizations and the way one can derive such generalizations.

22.1 Formal tools for capturing generalizations

In Chapter 13, it was shown that all the evidence that has previously been brought forward in favor of innate linguistic knowledge is in fact controversial. In some cases, the facts are irrelevant to the discussion and in other cases, they could be explained in other ways. Sometimes, the chains of argumentation are not logically sound or the premises are not supported. In other cases, the argumentation is circular. As a result, the question of whether there is innate linguistic knowledge still remains unanswered. All theories that presuppose the existence of this kind of knowledge are making very strong assumptions. If one assumes, as Kayne (1994) for example, that all languages have the underlying structure [specifier [head complement]] and that movement is exclusively to the left, then these two basic assumptions must be part of innate linguistic knowledge since there is no evidence for the assumption that utterances in all natural languages have the structure that Kayne suggests. As an example, the reader may check Laenzlinger's proposal for German (2004: 224), which is depicted in Figure 4.20 on page 135. According to Laenzlinger, (1a) is derived from the underlying structure in (1b):

- (1) a. weil der Mann wahrscheinlich diese Sonate nicht oft gut gespielt hat
because the man probably this sonata not often well played has
'because the man probably had not played this sonata well often'
- b. * weil der Mann wahrscheinlich nicht oft gut hat gespielt diese Sonate
because the man probably not often well has played this sonata

(1b) is entirely unacceptable, so the respective structure cannot be acquired from input and hence the principles and rules that license it would have to be innate.

As we have seen, there are a number of alternative theories that are much more surface-oriented than most variants of Transformational Grammar. These alternative theories often differ with regard to particular assumptions that have been discussed in

the preceding sections. For example, there are differences in the treatment of long-distance dependencies that have led to a proliferation of lexical items in Categorical Grammar (see Section 8.6). As has been shown by Jacobs (2008), Jackendoff (2008) and others, approaches such as Categorical Grammar that assume that every phrase must have a functor/head cannot explain certain constructions in a plausible way. Inheritance-based phrasal analyses that only list heads with a core meaning in the lexicon and have the constructions in which the heads occur determine the meaning of a complex expression turn out to have difficulties with derivational morphology and with accounting for alternative ways of argument realization (see Section 21.2.2, 21.4.1, and 21.4.2). We therefore need a theory that handles argument structure changing processes in the lexicon and still has some kind of phrase structure or relevant schemata. Some variants of GB/MP as well as LFG, HPSG, TAG and variants of CxG are examples of this kind of theory. Of these theories, only HPSG and some variants of CxG make use of the same descriptive tools ((typed) feature descriptions) for roots, stems, words, lexical rules and phrases. By using a uniform description for all these objects, it is possible to formulate generalizations over the relevant objects. It is therefore possible to capture what particular words have in common with lexical rules or phrases. For example, the *-bar* ‘able’ derivation corresponds to a complex passive construction with a modal verb. (2) illustrates.

- (2) a. Das Rätsel ist lösbar.
 the puzzle is solvable
 b. Das Rätsel kann gelöst werden.
 the puzzle can solved be
 ‘The puzzle can be solved.’

By using the same descriptive inventory for syntax and morphology, it is possible to capture cross-linguistic generalizations: something that is inflection/derivation in one language can be syntax in another.

It is possible to formulate principles that hold for both words and phrases and furthermore, it is possible to capture cross-linguistic generalizations or generalizations that hold for certain groups of languages. For example, languages can be divided into those with fixed constituent order and those with more flexible or completely free constituent order. The corresponding types can be represented with their constraints in a type hierarchy. Different languages can use a particular part of the hierarchy and also formulate different constraints for each of the types (see Ackerman & Webelhuth 1998: Section 9.2). HPSG differs from theories such as LFG and TAG in that phrases are not ontologically different from words. This means that there are no special c-structures or tree structures. Descriptions of complex phrases simply have additional features that say something about their daughters. In this way, it is possible to formulate cross-linguistic generalizations about dominance schemata. In LFG, the c-structure rules are normally specified separately for each language. Another advantage of consistent description is that one can capture similarities between words and lexical rules, as well as between words and phrases. For example, a complementizer such as *dass* ‘that’ shares a number of properties with a simple verb or with coordinated verbs in initial position:

- (3) a. [dass] Maria die Platte kennt und liebt
 that Maria the record knows and loves
 ‘that Maria knows and loves the record’
 b. [Kennt und liebt] Maria die Platte?
 knows and loves Maria the record
 ‘Does Mary know and love the record?’

The difference between the two linguistic objects mainly lies in the kind of phrase they select: the complementizer requires a sentence with a visible finite verb, whereas the verb in initial position requires a sentence without a visible finite verb.

In Section 9.1.5, a small part of an inheritance hierarchy was presented. This part contains types that probably play a role in the grammars of all natural languages: there are head-argument combinations in every language. Without this kind of combinatorial operation, it would not be possible to establish a relation between two concepts. The ability to create relations, however, is one of the basic properties of language.

In addition to more general types, the type hierarchy of a particular language contains language-specific types or those specific to a particular class of languages. All languages presumably have one and two-place predicates and for most languages (if not all), it makes sense to talk about verbs. It is then possible to talk about one and two-place verbs. Depending on the language, these can then be subdivided into intransitive and transitive. Constraints are formulated for the various types that can either hold generally or be language-specific. In English, verbs have to occur before their complements and therefore have the INITIAL value +, whereas verbs in German have the INITIAL value – and it is the lexical rule for initial position that licenses a verb with an INITIAL value +.

The differing settings of the INITIAL value for German and English is reminiscent of parameters from GB-Theory. There is one crucial difference, however: it is not assumed that a language learner sets the INITIAL value for all heads once and for all. The use of an INITIAL value is compatible with models of acquisition that assume that learners learn individual words with their positional properties. It is certainly possible for the respective words to exhibit different values for a particular feature. Generalizations about the position of entire word classes are only learned at a later point in the acquisition process.

A hierarchy analogous to the one proposed by Croft (see Section 21.4.1) is given in Figure 22.1 on the following page. For inflected words, the relevant roots are in the lexicon. Examples of this are *schlaf-* ‘sleep’, *lieb-* ‘love’ and *geb-* ‘give’. In Figure 22.1, there are different subtypes of *root*, the general type for roots: e.g., *intrans-verb* for intransitive verbs and *trans-verb* for transitive verbs. Transitive verbs can be further subdivided into strictly transitive verbs (those with nominative and accusative arguments) and ditransitive verbs (those with nominative and both accusative and dative arguments). The hierarchy above would of course have to be refined considerably as there are even further sub-classes for both transitive and intransitive verbs. For example, one can divide intransitive verbs into unaccusative and unergative verbs and even strictly transitive verbs would have to be divided into further sub-classes (see Welke 2009: Section 2).




图 22.1: Section of an inheritance hierarchy with lexical entries and dominance schemata

In addition to a type for roots, the above figure contains types for stems and words. Complex stems are complex objects that are derived from simple roots but still have to be inflected (*lesbar*- ‘readable’, *besing*- ‘to sing about’). Words are objects that do not inflect. Examples of these are the pronouns *er* ‘he’, *sie* ‘she’ etc. as well as prepositions. An inflected form can be formed from a verbal stem (*geliebt* ‘loved’, *besingt* ‘sings about’). Relations between inflected words and (complex) stems can be formed again using derivation rules. In this way, *geliebt* ‘loved’ can be recategorized as an adjective stem that must then be combined with adjectival endings (*geliebt-e*). The relevant descriptions of complex stems/words are subtypes of *complex-stem* or *word*. These subtypes describe the form that complex words such as *geliebte* must have. For a technical implementation of this, see Müller (2002a: Section 3.2.7). Using dominance schemata, all words can be combined to form phrases. The hierarchy given here is of course by no means complete. There are a number of additional valence classes and one could also assume more general types that simply describe one, two and three-place predicates. Such types are probably plausible for the description of other languages. Here, we are only dealing with a small part of the type hierarchy in order to have a comparison to the Croftian hierarchy: in Figure 22.1, there are no types for sentence patterns with the form [Sbj IntrVerb], but rather types for lexical objects with a particular valence ($V[\text{SUBCAT} \langle \text{NP}[\textit{str}] \rangle]$). Lexical rules can then be applied to the relevant lexical objects that license objects with another valence or introduce information about inflection. Complete words can be combined in the syntax with relatively general rules, for example in head-argument structures. The problems from which purely phrasal approaches suffer are thereby avoided. Nevertheless generalizations about lexeme classes and the utterances that can be formed can be captured in the hierarchy.

There are also principles in addition to inheritance hierarchies: the Semantics Principle presented in Section 9.1.6 holds for all languages. The Case Principle that we also saw is a constraint that only applies to a particular class of languages, namely nominative-accusative languages. Other languages have an ergative-absolutive system.

The assumption of innate linguistic knowledge is not necessary for the theory of language sketched here. As the discussion in Section 13 has shown, the question of whether this kind of knowledge exists has still not been answered conclusively. Should it turn out that this knowledge actually exists, the question arises of what exactly is innate. It would be a plausible assumption that the part of the inheritance hierarchy that is relevant for all languages is innate together with the relevant principles (e.g., the constraints on Head-Argument structures and the Semantics Principle). It could, however, also be the case that only a part of the more generally valid types and principles is innate since something being innate does not follow from the fact that it is present in all languages (see also Section 13.1.9).

In sum, one can say that theories that describe linguistic objects using a consistent descriptive inventory and make use of inheritance hierarchies to capture generalizations are the ones best suited to represent similarities between languages. Furthermore, this kind of theory is compatible with both a positive and a negative answer to the question of whether there is innate linguistic knowledge.

22.2 How to develop linguistic theories that capture cross-linguistic generalizations

In the previous section I argued for a uniform representation of linguistic knowledge at all descriptive levels and for type hierarchies as a good tool for representing generalizations. This section explores a way to develop grammars that are motivated by facts from several languages.

If one looks at the current practice in various linguistic schools one finds two extreme ways of approaching language. On the one hand, we have the Mainstream Generative Grammar (MGG) camp and, on the other hand, we have the Construction Grammar/Cognitive Grammar camp. I hasten to say that what I state here does not hold for all members of these groups, but for the extreme cases. The caricature of the MGG scientist is that he is looking for underlying structures. Since these have to be the same for all languages (poverty of the stimulus), it is sufficient to look at one language, say English. The result of this research strategy is that one ends up with models that were suggested by the most influential linguist for English and that others then try to find ways to accommodate other languages. Since English has an NP VP structure, all languages have to have it. Since English reorders constituents in passive sentences, passive is movement and all languages have to work this way. I discussed the respective analyses of German in more detail in Section 3.4.2 and in Chapter 20 and showed that the assumption that passive is movement makes unwanted predictions for German, since the subject of passives stays in the object position in German. Furthermore, this analysis requires the assumption of invisible expletives, that is, entities that cannot be seen and do not have any meaning.

On the other extreme of the spectrum we find people working in Construction Grammar or without any framework at all (see footnote 1 on page 1 for discussion) who claim that all languages are so different that we cannot even use the same vocabulary

to analyze them. Moreover, within languages, we have so many different objects that it is impossible (or too early) to state any generalizations. Again, what I describe here are extreme positions and clichés.

In what follows, I sketch the procedure that we apply in the CoreGram project¹ (Müller 2013a, 2015a). In the CoreGram project we work on a set of typologically diverse languages in parallel:

- German (Müller 2007b, 2009c, 2012a; Müller & Ørsnes 2011, 2013a; Müller 2014b, 2015b)
- Danish (Ørsnes 2009b; Müller 2009c, 2012a; Müller & Ørsnes 2011, 2013a,b, 2015)
- Persian (Müller 2010b; Müller & Ghayoomi 2010)
- Maltese (Müller 2009b)
- Mandarin Chinese (Lipenkova 2009; Müller & Lipenkova 2009, 2013, 2016)
- Yiddish (Müller & Ørsnes 2011)
- English (Müller 2009c, 2012a; Müller & Ørsnes 2013a)
- Hindi
- Spanish (Machicao y Priemer 2015)
- French

These languages belong to diverse language families (Indo-European, Afro-Asiatic, Sino-Tibetan) and among the Indo-European languages the languages belong to different groups (Germanic, Romance, Indo-Iranian). Figure 22.2 provides an overview. We work out fully formalized, computer-processable grammar fragments in the framework of HPSG that have a semantics component. The details will not be discussed here, but the interested reader is referred to Müller (2015a).




图 22.2: Language families and groups of the languages covered in the CoreGram project

As was argued in previous sections, the assumption of innate language-specific knowledge should be kept to a minimum. This is also what Chomsky suggested in his

¹ <http://hpsg.fu-berlin.de/Projects/CoreGram.html>, September 1, 2016.

Minimalist Program. There may even be no language-specific innate knowledge at all, a view taken in Construction Grammar/Cognitive Grammar. So, instead of imposing constraints from one language onto other languages, a bottom-up approach seems to be more appropriate: grammars for individual languages should be motivated language-internally. Grammars that share certain properties can be grouped in classes. This makes it possible to capture generalizations about groups of languages and natural language as such. Let us consider a few example languages: German, Dutch, Danish, English and French. If we start developing grammars for German and Dutch, we find that they share a lot of properties: for instance, both are SOV and V2 languages and both have a verbal complex. One main difference is the order of elements in the verbal complex. The situation can be depicted as in Figure 22.3. There are some properties that are shared




图 22.3: Shared properties of German and Dutch

between German and Dutch (Set 3). For instance, the argument structure of lexical items, a list containing descriptions of syntactic and semantic properties of arguments and the linking of these arguments to the meaning of the lexical items, is contained in Set 3. In addition to the constraints for SOV languages, the verb position and the fronting of a constituent in V2 clauses are contained in Set 3. The respective constraints are shared between the two grammars. Although these sets are arranged in a hierarchy in Figure 22.3 and the following figures this has nothing to do with the type hierarchies that have been discussed in the previous subsection. These type hierarchies are part of our linguistic theories and various parts of such hierarchies can be in different sets: those parts of the type hierarchy that concern more general aspects can be in Set 3 in Figure 22.3 and those that are specific to Dutch or German are in the respective other sets. When we add another language, say Danish, we get further differences. While German and Dutch are SOV, Danish is an SVO language. Figure 22.4 on the following page shows the resulting situation: the topmost node represents constraints that hold for all the languages considered so far (for instance the argument structure constraints, linking and V2) and the node below it (Set 4) contains constraints that hold for German and Dutch only.² For instance, Set 4 contains constraints regarding verbal complexes

² In principle, there could be constraints that hold for Dutch and Danish, but not for German or for German

and SOV order. The union of Set 4 and Set 5 is Set 3 of Figure 22.3.




图 22.4: Shared properties of German, Dutch, and Danish

If we add further languages, further constraint sets will be distinguished. Figure 22.5 on the following page shows the situation that results when we add English and French. Again, the picture is not complete since there are constraints that are shared by Danish and English but not by French, but the general idea should be clear: by systematically working this way, we should arrive at constraint sets that directly correspond to those that have been established in the typological literature.

The interesting question is what will be the topmost set if we consider enough languages. At first glance, one would expect that all languages have valence representations and linkings between these and the semantics of lexical items (argument structure lists in the HPSG framework). However, Koenig & Michelson (2012) argue for an analysis of Oneida (a Northern Iroquoian language) that does not include a representation of syntactic valence. If this analysis is correct, syntactic argument structure would not be universal. It would, of course, be characteristic of a large number of languages, but it would not be part of the topmost set. So this leaves us with just one candidate for the topmost set from the area of syntax: the constraints that license the combination of two or more linguistic objects. This is basically Chomsky's External Merge without the binarity restriction³. In addition, the topmost set would, of course, contain the basic machinery for representing phonology and semantics.

It should be clear from what has been said so far that the goal of every scientist who works this way is to find generalizations and to describe a new language in a way that

and Danish, but not for Dutch. These constraints would be removed from Set 1 and Set 2, respectively, and inserted into another constraint set higher up in the hierarchy. These sets are not illustrated in the figure and I keep the names Set 1 and Set 2 from Figure 22.3 for the constraint sets for German and Dutch.

³ Note that binarity is more restrictive than flat structures: there is an additional constraint that there have to be exactly two daughters. As was argued in Section 21.10.4 one needs phrasal constructions with more than two constituents.




图 22.5: Languages and language classes

reuses theoretical constructs that have been found useful for a language that is already covered. However, as was explained above, the resulting grammars should be motivated by data of the respective languages and not by facts from other languages. In situations where more than one analysis would be compatible with a given dataset for language X, the evidence from language Y with similar constructs is most welcome and can be used as evidence in favor of one of the two analyses for language X. I call this approach the *bottom-up approach with cheating*: unless there is contradicting evidence, we can reuse analyses that have been developed for other languages.

Note that this approach is compatible with the rather agnostic view advocated by Haspelmath (2010a), Dryer (1997), Croft (2001: Section 1.4.2–1.4.3), and others, who argue that descriptive categories should be language-specific, that is, the notion of *subject* for Tagalog is different from the one for English, the category *noun* in English is different from the category *noun* in Persian and so on. Even if one follows such extreme positions, one can still derive generalizations regarding constituent structure, head-argument relations and so on. However, I believe that some categories can fruitfully be used cross-linguistically; if not universally, then at least for language classes. As Newmeyer (2010: 692) notes with regard to the notion of *subject*: calling two items *subject* in one language does not entail that they have identical properties. The same is true for two linguistic items from different languages: calling a Persian linguistic item *subject* does not entail that it has exactly the same properties as an English linguistic item that is called *subject*. The same is, of course, true for all other categories and relations, for instance, parts

of speech: Persian nouns do not share all properties with English nouns.⁴ Haspelmath (2010c: 697) writes: “Generative linguists try to use as many crosslinguistic categories in the description of individual languages as possible, and this often leads to insurmountable problems.” If the assumption of a category results in problems, they have to be solved. If this is not possible with the given set of categories/features, new ones have to be assumed. This is not a drawback of the methodology, quite the opposite is true: if we have found something that does not integrate nicely into what we already have, this is a sign that we have discovered something new and exciting. If we stick to language-particular categories and features, it is much harder to notice that a special phenomenon is involved, since all categories and features are specific to one language anyway. Note also that not all speakers of a language community have exactly the same categories. If one were to take the idea of language-particular category symbols to an extreme, one would end up with person specific category symbols like *Klaus-English-noun*.

After my talk at the MIT in 2013, members of the linguistics department objected to the approach taken in the CoreGram project and claimed that it would not make any predictions as far as possible/impossible languages are concerned. Regarding predictions two things must be said: firstly, predictions are being made on a language particular basis. As an example consider the following sentences from Netter (1991):

- (4) a. [Versucht, zu lesen], hat er das Buch nicht.
 tried to read has he.NOM the.ACC book not
 ‘He did not try to read the book.’
 b. [Versucht, einen Freund vorzustellen], hat er ihr noch nie.
 tried a.ACC friend to.introduce has he.NOM her.DAT yet never
 ‘He never before tried to introduce a friend to her.’

When I first read these sentences I had no idea about their structure. I switched on my computer and typed them in and within milliseconds I got an analysis of the sentences and by inspecting the result I realized that these sentences are combinations of partial verb phrase fronting and the so-called third construction (Müller 1999a: 439). I had previously implemented analyses of both phenomena but had never thought about the interaction of the two. The grammar predicted that examples like (4) are grammatical. Similarly the constraints of the grammar can interact to rule out certain structures. So predictions about ungrammaticality/impossible structures are in fact made as well.

⁴ Note that using labels like *Persian Noun* and *English Noun* (see for instance Haspelmath 2010a: Section 2 for such a suggestion regarding case, e.g., Russian Dative, Korean Dative, ...) is somehow strange since it implies that both Persian nouns and English nouns are somehow nouns. Instead of using the category *Persian Noun* one could assign objects of the respective class to the class *noun* and add a feature *LANGUAGE* with the value *persian*. This simple trick allows one to assign both objects of the type *Persian Noun* and objects of the type *English Noun* to the class *noun* and still maintain the fact that there are differences. Of course, no theoretical linguist would introduce the *LANGUAGE* feature to differentiate between Persian and English nouns, but nouns in the respective languages have other features that make them differ. So the part of speech classification as noun is a generalization over nouns in various languages and the categories *Persian Noun* and *English Noun* are feature bundles that contain further, language-specific information.

Secondly, the topmost constraint set holds for all languages seen so far. It can be regarded as a hypothesis about properties that are shared by all languages. This constraint set contains constraints about the connection between syntax and information structure and such constraints allow for V2 languages but rule out languages with the verb in penultimate position (see Kayne 1994: 50 for the claim that such languages do not exist. Kayne develops a complicated syntactic system that predicts this). Of course, if a language is found that places the verb in penultimate position for the encoding of sentence types or some other communicative effect, a more general topmost set has to be defined. But this is parallel for Minimalist theories: if languages are found that are incompatible with basic assumptions, the basic assumptions have to be revised. As with the language particular constraints, the constraints in the topmost set make certain predictions about what can be and what cannot be found in languages.

Frequently discussed examples such as those languages that form questions by reversing the order of the words in a string (Musso et al. 2003) need not be ruled out by the grammar, since they are ruled out by language external constraints: we simply lack the working memory to do such complex computations.

A variant of this argument comes from David Pesetsky and was raised in Facebook discussions of an article by Paul Ibbotson and Michael Tomasello published in *The Guardian*⁵. Pesetsky claimed that Tomasello's theory of language acquisition could not explain why we find V2 languages but no V3 languages. First, I do not know of anything that blocks V3 languages in current Minimalist theories. So per se the fact that V3 languages may not exist cannot be used to support any of the competing approaches. Of course, the question could be asked whether the V3 pattern would be useful for reaching our communicative goals and whether it can be easily acquired. Now, with V2 as a pattern it is clear that we have exactly one position that can be used for special purposes in the V2 sentence (topic or focus). For monovalent and bivalent verbs we have an argument that can be placed in initial position. The situation is different for the hypothetical V3 languages, though: If we have monovalent verbs like *sleep*, there is nothing for the second position. As Pesetsky pointed out in the answer to my comment on a blog post, languages solve such problems by using expletives. For instance some languages insert an expletive to mark subject extraction in embedded interrogative sentences, since otherwise the fact that the subject is extracted would not be recognizable by the hearer. So the expletive helps to make the structure transparent. V2 languages also use expletives to fill the initial position if speakers want to avoid something in the special, designated position:

- (5) Es kamen drei Männer zum Tor hinein.
EXPL came three man to.the gate in
'Three man came through the gate.'

In order to do the same in V3 languages one would have to put two expletives in front of the verb. So there seem to be many disadvantages of a V3 system that V2 systems do not

⁵ *The roots of language: What makes us different from other animals?* Published 05.11.2015. <http://www.theguardian.com/science/head-quarters/2015/nov/05/roots-language-what-makes-us-different-animals>

have and hence one would expect that V3 systems are less likely to come into existence. If they existed, they would be expected to be subject to change in the course of time; e.g., omission of the expletive with intransitives, optional V2 with transitives and finally V2 in general. With the new modeling techniques for language acquisition and agent-based community simulation one can actually simulate such processes and I guess in the years to come, we will see exciting work in this area.

Cinque (1999: 106) suggested a cascade of functional projections to account for re-occurring orderings in the languages of the world. He assumes elaborate tree structures to play a role in the analysis of all sentences in all languages even if there is no evidence for respective morphosyntactic distinctions in a particular language (see also Cinque & Rizzi 2010: 55). In the latter case, Cinque assumes that the respective tree nodes are empty. Cinque's results could be incorporated in the model advocated here. We would define part of speech categories and morpho-syntactic features in the topmost set and state linearization constraints that enforce the order that Cinque encoded directly in his tree structure. In languages in which such categories are not manifested by lexical material, the constraints would never apply. Neither empty elements nor elaborate tree structures would be needed. Thus Cinque's data could be covered in a better way in an HPSG with a rich UG but I, nevertheless, refrain from introducing 400 categories (or features) into the theories of all languages and, again, I point out that such a rich and language-specific UG is implausible from a genetic point of view. Therefore, I wait for other, probably functional, explanations of the Cinque data.

Note also that implicational universals can be derived from hierarchically organized constraint sets as the ones proposed here. For instance, one can derive from Figure 22.5 the implicational statement that all SVO languages are V2 languages, since there is no language that has constraints from Set 4 that does not also have the constraints of Set 7. Of course, this implicational statement is wrong, since there are lots and lots of SOV languages and just exceptionally few V2 languages. So, as soon as we add other languages as for instance Persian or Japanese, the picture will change.

The methodology suggested here differs from what is done in MGG, since MGG stipulates the general constraints that are supposed to hold for all languages on the basis of general speculations about language. In the best case, these general assumptions are fed by a lot of experience with different languages and grammars, in the worst case they are derived from insights gathered from one or more Indo-European languages. Quite often impressionistic data is used to motivate rather far-reaching fundamental design decisions (Fanselow 2009; Sternefeld & Richter 2012; Haider 2014). It is interesting to note that this is exactly what members of the MGG camp reproach typologists for. Evans & Levinson (2009a) pointed out that counterexamples can be found for many alleged universals. A frequent response to this is that unanalyzed data cannot refute grammatical hypotheses (see, for instance, Freidin 2009: 454). In the very same way it has to be said that unanalyzed data should not be used to build theories on (Fanselow 2009). In the CoreGram project, we aim to develop broad-coverage grammars of several languages, so those constraints that make it to the top node are motivated and not stipulated on the basis of intuitive implicit knowledge about language.

22.2 How to develop linguistic theories that capture cross-linguistic generalizations

Since it is data-oriented and does not presuppose innate language-specific knowledge, this research strategy is compatible with work carried out in Construction Grammar (see Goldberg 2013b: 481 for an explicit statement to this end) and in any case it should also be compatible with the Minimalist world.

第二十三章 Conclusion

The analyses discussed in this book show a number of similarities. All frameworks use complex categories to describe linguistic objects. This is most obvious for GPSG, LFG, HPSG, CxG and FTAG, however, GB/Minimalism and Categorical Grammar also talk about NPs in third person singular and the relevant features for part of speech, person and number form part of a complex category. In GB, there are the feature N and V with binary values (Chomsky 1970: 199), Stabler (1992: 119) formalizes *Barriers* with feature-value pairs and Sauerland & Elbourne (2002: 290–291) argue for the use of feature-value pairs in a Minimalist theory. Also, see Veenstra (1998) for a constraint-based formalization of a Minimalist analysis using typed feature descriptions. Dependency Grammar dialects like Hellwig's Dependency Unification Grammar also use feature-value pairs (Hellwig 2003: 612).

Furthermore, there is a consensus in all current frameworks (with the exception of Construction Grammar and Dependency Grammar) about how the sentence structure of German should be analyzed: German is an SOV and V2 language. Clauses with verb-initial order resemble verb-final ones in terms of structure. The finite verb is either moved (GB) or stands in a relation to an element in verb-final position (HPSG). Verb-second clauses consist of verb-initial clauses out of which one constituent has been extracted. It is also possible to see some convergence with regard to the analysis of the passive: some ideas originally formulated by Haider (1984, 1985a, 1986a) in the framework of GB have been adopted by HPSG. Some variants of Construction Grammar also make use of a specially marked 'designated argument' (Michaelis & Ruppenhofer 2001: 55–57).

If we consider new developments in the individual frameworks, it becomes clear that the nature of the proposed analyses can sometimes differ drastically. Whereas CG, LFG, HPSG and CxG are surface-oriented, sometimes very abstract structures are assumed in Minimalism and in some cases, one tries to trace all languages back to a common base structure (Universal Base Hypothesis).¹ This kind of approach only makes sense if one assumes that there is innate linguistic knowledge about this base structure common to all languages as well as about the operations necessary to derive the surface structures. As was shown in Chapter 13, all arguments for the assumption of innate linguistic knowledge are either not tenable or controversial at the very least. The acquisition of linguistic abilities can to a large extent receive an input-based explanation

¹ It should be noted that there are currently many subvariants and individual opinions in the Minimalist community so that it is only possible – as with CxG – to talk about tendencies.

(Section 13.8.3, Section 16.3 and Section 16.4). Not all questions about acquisition have been settled once and for all, but input-based approaches are at least plausible enough for one to be very cautious about any assumption of innate linguistic knowledge.

Models such as LFG, CG, HPSG, CxG and TAG are compatible with performance data, something that is not true of certain transformation-based approaches, which are viewed as theories of competence that do not make any claims about performance. In MGG, it is assumed that there are other mechanisms for working with linguistic knowledge, for example, mechanisms that combine ‘chunks’ (fragments of linguistic material). If one wishes to make these assumptions, then it is necessary to explain how chunks and the processing of chunks are acquired and not how a complex system of transformations and transformation-comparing constraints is acquired. This means that the problem of language acquisition would be a very different one. If one assumes a chunk-based approach, then the innate knowledge about a universal transformational base would only be used to derive a surface-oriented grammar. This then poses the question of what exactly the evidence for transformations in a competence grammar is and if it would not be preferable to simply assume that the competence grammar is of the kind assumed by LFG, CG, HPSG, CxG or TAG. One can therefore conclude that constraint-based analyses and the kind of transformational approaches that allow a constraint-based reformulation are the only approaches that are compatible with the current facts, whereas all other analyses require additional assumptions.

A number of works in Minimalism differ from those in other frameworks in that they assume structures (sometimes also invisible structures) that can only be motivated by evidence from other languages. This can streamline the entire apparatus for deriving different structures, but the overall costs of the approach are not reduced: some amount of the cost is just transferred to the UG component. The abstract grammars that result cannot be learned from the input.

One can take from this discussion that only constraint-based, surface-oriented models are adequate and explanatory: they are also compatible with psycholinguistic facts and plausible from the point of view of acquisition.

If we now compare these approaches, we see that a number of analyses can be translated into one another. LFG (and some variants of CxG and DG) differ from all other theories in that grammatical functions such as subject and object are primitives of the theory. If one does not want this, then it is possible to replace these labels with Argument1, Argument2, etc. The numbering of arguments would correspond to their relative obliqueness. LFG would then move closer to HPSG. Alternatively, one could mark arguments in HPSG and CxG with regard to their grammatical function additionally. This is what is done for the analysis of the passive (DESIGNATED ARGUMENT).

LFG, HPSG, CxG and variants of Categorical Grammar (Moens et al. 1989; Briscoe 2000; Villavicencio 2002) possess means for the hierarchical organization of knowledge, which is important for capturing generalizations. It is, of course, possible to expand any other framework in this way, but this has never been done explicitly, except in computer implementations and inheritance hierarchies do not play an active role in theorizing in the other frameworks.

In HPSG and CxG, roots, stems, words, morphological and syntactic rules are all objects that can be described with the same means. This then allows one to make generalizations that affect very different objects (see Chapter 22). In LFG, c-structures are viewed as something fundamentally different, which is why this kind of generalization is not possible. In cross-linguistic work, there is an attempt to capture similarities in the f-structure, the c-structure is less important and is not even discussed in a number of works. Furthermore, its implementation from language to language can differ enormously. For this reason, my personal preference is for frameworks that describe all linguistic objects using the same means, that is, HPSG and CxG. Formally, nothing stands in the way of a description of the c-structure of an LFG grammar using feature-value pairs so that in years to come there could be even more convergence between the theories. For hybrid forms of HPSG and LFG, see Ackerman & Webelhuth (1998) and Hellan & Haugereid (2003), for example.

If one compares CxG and HPSG, it becomes apparent that the degree of formalization in CxG works is relatively low and a number of questions remain unanswered. The more formal approaches in CxG (with the exception of Fluid Construction Grammar) are variants of HPSG. There are relatively few precisely worked-out analyses in Construction Grammar and no description of German that would be comparable to the other approaches presented in this book. To be fair, it must be said that Construction Grammar is the youngest of the theories discussed here. Its most important contributions to linguistic theory have been integrated into frameworks such as HPSG and LFG.

The theories of the future will be a fusion of surface-oriented, constraint-based and model-theoretic approaches like CG, LFG, HPSG, Construction Grammar, equivalent variants of TAG and GB/Minimalist approaches that will be reformulated as constraint-based. (Variants of) Minimalism and (variants of) Construction Grammar are the most widely adopted approaches at present. I actually suspect the truth to lie somewhere in the middle. The linguistics of the future will be data-oriented. Introspection as the sole method of data collection has proven unreliable (Müller 2007e; Meurers & Müller 2009) and is being increasingly complemented by experimental and corpus-based analyses.

Statistical information and statistical processes play a very important role in machine translation and are becoming more important for linguistics in the narrow sense (Abney 1996). We have seen that statistical information is important in the acquisition process and Abney discusses cases of other areas of language such as language change, parsing preferences and gradience with grammaticality judgments. Following a heavy focus on statistical procedures, there is now a transition to hybrid forms in computational linguistics,² since it has been noticed that it is not possible to exceed certain levels of quality with statistical methods alone (Steedman 2011; Church 2011; Kay 2011). The same holds here as above: the truth is somewhere in between, that is, in combined systems. In order to have something to combine, the relevant linguistic theories first need to be developed. As Manfred Pinkal said: “It is not possible to build systems that understand language without understanding language.”

² See Kaufmann & Pfister (2007) and Kaufmann (2009) for the combination of a speech recognizer with a HPSG grammar.

第二十四章 Solutions to the exercises

24.1 Introduction and basic terms

- (1) a. $\underbrace{\text{Karl}}_{\text{VF}} \underbrace{\text{isst}}_{\text{LS}} .$
- b. $\underbrace{\text{Der Mann}}_{\text{VF}} \underbrace{\text{liebt}}_{\text{LS}} \underbrace{\text{eine Frau,}}_{\text{MF}} \underbrace{\underbrace{\text{den}}_{\text{VF}} \underbrace{\text{Peter}}_{\text{MF}} \underbrace{\text{kennt.}}_{\text{RS}}}_{\text{NF}}$
- c. $\underbrace{\text{Der Mann}}_{\text{VF}} \underbrace{\text{liebt}}_{\text{LS}} \underbrace{\text{eine Frau,}}_{\text{MF}} \underbrace{\underbrace{\text{die}}_{\text{VF}} \underbrace{\text{Peter}}_{\text{MF}} \underbrace{\text{kennt.}}_{\text{RS}}}_{\text{NF}}$
- d. $\underbrace{\text{Die Studenten}}_{\text{VF}} \underbrace{\text{haben}}_{\text{LS}} \underbrace{\text{behauptet,}}_{\text{RS}} \underbrace{\underbrace{\text{nur wegen der Hitze}}_{\text{MF}} \underbrace{\text{einzuschlafen.}}_{\text{RS}}}_{\text{NF}}$
- e. $\underbrace{\underbrace{\text{Dass}}_{\text{LS}} \underbrace{\text{Peter nicht kommt,}}_{\text{MF}} \underbrace{\text{ärgert}}_{\text{RS}}}_{\text{VF}} \underbrace{\underbrace{\text{Klaus.}}_{\text{MF}}}_{\text{LS}}$
- f. $\underbrace{\underbrace{\underbrace{\text{Einen Mann küssen,}}_{\text{MF}} \underbrace{\text{der}}_{\text{VF}} \underbrace{\text{ihr nicht gefällt,}}_{\text{MF}} \underbrace{\text{würde sie nie.}}_{\text{RS}}}_{\text{NF}} \underbrace{\text{LS}}_{\text{MF}}$

On (1c): theoretically, this could also be a case of extraposition of the relative clause to the postfield. Since *eine Frau, die Peter kennt* is a constituent, however, it is assumed that no reordering of the relative clause has taken place. Instead, we have a simpler structure with *eine Frau, die Peter kennt* as a complete NP in the middle field.

24.2 Phrase structure grammars

1. For any grammar, it is possible to assume additional symbols and rules that create unnecessary structure or are simply never used because there are no words or phrases that could be used on the right-hand side of the rule. If we were to add the following rule to our grammar, for example, we would have a more complex grammar that can still analyze the same fragment of the language.

(2) Tralala \rightarrow Trulla Trololo

2. In general, it is assumed that the grammar with the fewest rules is the best one. Therefore, we can reject grammars that contain unnecessary rules such as (2).

One should bear in mind what the aim of a theory of grammar is. If our goal is to describe the human language capacity, then a grammar with more rules could be better than other grammars with less rules. This is because psycholinguistic research has shown that highly-frequent units are simply stored in our brains and not built up from their individual parts each time, although we would of course be able to do this.

3. The problem here is the fact that it is possible to derive a completely empty noun phrase (see Figure 24.1). This noun phrase could be inserted in all positions where




图 24.1: Noun phrases without a visible determiner and noun

an otherwise filled NP would have to stay. Then, we would be able to analyze sequences of words such as (3), where the subject of *schläft* ‘sleeps’ is realized by an empty NP:

- (3) *Ich glaube, dass schläft.
I believe that sleeps

This problem can be solved using a feature that determines whether the left periphery of the \bar{N} is empty. Visible Ns and \bar{N} with at least an adjective would have the value ‘-’ and all others ‘+’. Empty determiners could then only be combined with \bar{N} s that have the value ‘-’. See Netter (1994).

4. If *Bücher* ‘books’ were an NP in the lexicon, then adjectives such as *interessant* ‘interesting’ would have to modify NPs in order for phrases such as (4) to be analyzed.

- (4) interessante Bücher
interesting books

If adjectives are combined with NPs, however, it still has to be explained why (5) is ungrammatical.

- (5) * interessante die Bücher
interesting the books

For a detailed discussions of this topic, see Müller (2007b: Section 6.6.2).

5. This kind of rule cannot analyze noun phrases such as those in (6):

- (6) a. interessante [Aufsätze und Bücher]
interesting essays and books
b. interessante [Aufsätze und Bücher aus Stuttgart]
interesting essays and books from Stuttgart

Since adjectives can only be combined directly with nouns, these phrases cannot be analyzed. *Bücher* ‘books’ or *Bücher aus Stuttgart* ‘books from Stuttgart’ would be complete NPs. Since it is assumed that coordinated elements always have the same syntactic category, then *Aufsätze* ‘essays’ would have to be an NP. *Aufsätze und Bücher* and *Aufsätze und Bücher aus Stuttgart* would then also be NPs and it remains unexplained how an adjective can be combined with this NP. Because of (5), we must rule out analyses that assume that full NPs combine with adjectives. See Chapter 19 for a general discussion of empty elements.

6. If a specific determiner or just any determiner were to be combined with an adjective to form a complete NP, there would be no room for the integration of postnominal modifiers like modifying genitives, PPs and relative clauses. For PPs and relative clauses, analyses have been suggested in which these postnominal modifiers attach to complete NPs (Kiss 2005), but modifying genitives usually attach to smaller units. But even if one admits postnominal modifiers to attach to complete NPs, one cannot account for the iteration of adjectives and for arguments that depend on the elided noun.

So, the simplest way to cope with the German data is the assumption of an empty noun. Alternatively one could assume that an adjective is directly projected to an \bar{N} . This \bar{N} then can be modified by further adjectives or postnominal modifiers. The \bar{N} is combined with a determiner to form a full NP. For phrases that involve elided relational nouns, one would have to assume the projection of an argument like *vom Gleimtunnel* ‘of the Gleimtunnel’ to \bar{N} . The \bar{N} could be further modified or combined with a determiner directly.

7. Adjective phrases such as those in (7) cannot be analyzed since the degree modifier occurs between the complement and the adjective:

- (7) der auf seinen Sohn sehr stolze Vater
 the on his son very proud father
 ‘the father very proud of his son’

One would either have to allow for specifiers to be combined with their heads before complements or allow crossing lines in trees. Another assumption could be that German is like English, however then adjectival complements would have to be obligatorily reordered before their specifier. For a description of this kind of reordering, see Chapter 3. See Section 13.1.2 for a discussion of \bar{X} -Theory.

8. Write a phrase structure grammar that can analyze the sentences in (8), but does not allow the strings of words in (9).



- (8) a. Der Mann hilft der Frau.
 the.NOM man helps the.DAT woman
 ‘The man helps the woman.’
 b. Er gibt ihr das Buch.
 he.NOM gives her.DAT the.ACC book
 ‘He gives her the book.’
 c. Er wartet auf ein Wunder.
 he.NOM waits on a miracle.ACC
 ‘He is waiting for a miracle.’
 (9) a. *Der Mann hilft er.
 the.NOM man helps he.NOM
 b. *Er gibt ihr den Buch.
 he.NOM gives her.DAT the.ACC book



In order to rule out the last two sentences, the grammar has to contain information about case. The following grammar will do the job:


- (10) a. $s \rightarrow np(nom) v(nom_dat), np(dat)$
 b. $s \rightarrow np(nom), v(nom_dat_acc), np(dat), np(acc)$
 c. $s \rightarrow np(nom), v(nom_pp_auf), pp(auf,acc)$
 d. $pp(Pform,Case) \rightarrow p(Pform,Case), np(Case)$
 e. $np(Case) \rightarrow d(Case), n(Case)$
 f. $v(nom_dat) \rightarrow hilft$
 g. $v(nom_dat_acc) \rightarrow gibt$

- h. $v(\text{nom_pp_auf}) \rightarrow \text{wartet}$
- i. $np(\text{nom}) \rightarrow \text{er}$
- j. $np(\text{dat}) \rightarrow \text{ihr}$
- k. $d(\text{nom}) \rightarrow \text{der}$
- l. $d(\text{dat}) \rightarrow \text{der}$
- m. $d(\text{acc}) \rightarrow \text{das}$
- n. $d(\text{acc}) \rightarrow \text{ein}$
- o. $n(\text{nom}) \rightarrow \text{Mann}$
- p. $n(\text{dat}) \rightarrow \text{Frau}$
- q. $n(\text{acc}) \rightarrow \text{Buch}$
- r. $n(\text{acc}) \rightarrow \text{Wunder}$
- s. $p(\text{auf,acc}) \rightarrow \text{auf}$

24.3 Transformational Grammar – Government & Binding







24.4 Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar

In order to analyze the sentences in (11), one requires a rule for transitive verbs and a metarule for the extraction of an element. Furthermore, rules for the combination of elements in the noun phrase are required.

- (11) a. [dass] der Mann ihn liest
 that the man it reads
 ‘that the man reads it’
 b. [dass] ihn der Mann liest
 that it the man reads
 ‘that the man reads it’
 c. Der Mann liest ihn.
 the man reads it
 ‘The man reads it.’

It is possible to analyze the sentences in (11a,b) using the rules in (12) and the lexical entries in (13).

- (12) a. $V3 \rightarrow H[6], N2[\text{CASE nom}], N2[\text{CASE acc}]$
 b. $N2 \rightarrow \text{Det}[\text{CASE CAS}], H1[\text{CASE CAS}]$
 c. $N1 \rightarrow H[27]$

- (13) a. $\text{Det}[\text{CASE nom}] \rightarrow \text{der}$
 b. $\text{N}[27] \rightarrow \text{Mann}$
 c. $\text{V}[6, +\text{FIN}] \rightarrow \text{liest}$
 d. $\text{N2}[\text{CASE acc}] \rightarrow \text{ihn}$

The rules (12b,c) correspond to \bar{X} -rules that we encountered in Section 2.4.1. They only differ from these rules in that the part of speech of the head is not given on the right-hand side of the rule. The part of speech is determined by the Head Feature Convention. The part of speech of the head is identical to that on the left-hand side of the rule, that is, it must be N in (12b,c). It also follows from the Head Feature Convention that the whole NP has the same case as the head and therefore does not have to be mentioned additionally in the rule above. 27 is the SUBCAT value. This number is arbitrary.

In order for the verb to appear in the correction position, we need linearization rules:

- (14) $\text{V}[+\text{MC}] < \text{X}$
 $\text{X} < \text{V}[-\text{MC}]$

The fact that the determiner precedes the noun is ensured by the following LP-rule:

- (15) $\text{Det} < \text{X}$

The Extraction Metarule in (16) is required in order to analyze (11c):

- (16) $V3 \rightarrow W, X \mapsto$
 $V3/X \rightarrow W$

Among others, this metarule licenses the rule in (17) for (12a):

- (17) $V3/N2[CASE\ nom] \rightarrow H[6], N2[CASE\ acc]$

The rule in (18) is used to bind off long-distance dependencies.

- (18) $V3[+FIN] \rightarrow X[+TOP], V3[+MC]/X$

The following linearization rule ensures that the +TOP-constituent precedes the sentence in which it is missing:

- (19) $[+TOP] < X$

Figure 24.2 shows the structure licensed by the grammar. In sum, one can say that the




图 24.2: Analysis of *Der Mann liest ihn*. ‘The man reads it.’

grammar that licenses the sentences in (11) should have (at least) the following parts:

1. ID rules:

- (20) a. $V3 \rightarrow H[6], N2[CASE\ nom], N2[CASE\ acc]$
 b. $N2 \rightarrow Det[CASE\ CAS], H1[CASE\ CAS]$
 c. $N1 \rightarrow H[27]$

2. LP rules:

- (21) $V[+MC] < X$
 $X < V[-MC]$
 $Det < X$
 $[+TOP] < X$

3. Metarules:


$$(22) \quad V3 \rightarrow W, X \mapsto \\ V3/X \rightarrow W$$

4. Lexical entries

- (23) a. Det[CASE nom] \rightarrow der
 b. N[27] \rightarrow Mann
 c. V[6, +FIN] \rightarrow liest
 d. N2[CASE acc] \rightarrow ihn

24.5 Feature descriptions

1. For the class [+V], the type *verbal* is assumed with the subtypes *adjective* and *verb*. For the class [-V] there is the type *non-verbal* and its subtypes *noun* and *preposition*. This is analogous for the N values. The corresponding hierarchy is given in the following figure:



2. Lists can be described using recursive structures that consist of both a list beginning and a rest. The rest can either be a non-empty list (*ne_list*) or the empty list (*e_list*). The list $\langle a, b, c \rangle$ can be represented as follows:

$$(24) \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} ne_list \\ FIRST \ a \\ REST \ \left[\begin{array}{l} ne_list \\ FIRST \ b \\ REST \ \left[\begin{array}{l} ne_list \\ FIRST \ c \\ REST \ e_list \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right]$$

3. If we extend the data structure in (24) by two additional features, it is possible to do without *append*. The keyword is *difference list*. A difference list consists of a list and a pointer to the end of the list.

$$(25) \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{diff-list} \\ \text{LIST} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{ne_list} \\ \text{FIRST } a \\ \text{REST} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{ne_list} \\ \text{FIRST } b \\ \text{REST } [1] \text{ list} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \\ \text{LAST } [1] \end{array} \right]$$

Unlike the list representation in (24), the REST value of the end of the list is not *e_list*, but rather simply *list*. It is then possible to extend a list by adding another list to the point where it ends. The concatenation of (25) and (26a) is (26b).

$$(26) \quad \text{a.} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{diff-list} \\ \text{LIST} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{ne_list} \\ \text{FIRST } c \\ \text{REST } [2] \text{ list} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{LAST } [2] \end{array} \right]$$

$$\text{b.} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{diff-list} \\ \text{LIST} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{ne_list} \\ \text{FIRST } a \\ \text{REST} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{ne_list} \\ \text{FIRST } b \\ \text{REST} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{ne_list} \\ \text{FIRST } c \\ \text{REST } [2] \text{ list} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right] \\ \text{LAST } [2] \end{array} \right]$$

In order to combine the lists, the LIST value of the second list has to be identified with the LAST value of the first list. The LAST value of the resulting list then corresponds to the LAST value of the second list ([2] in the example.)

Information about the encoding of difference lists can be found by searching for the keywords *list*, *append*, and *feature structure*. In the search results, one can find pages on developing grammars that explain difference lists.

24.6 Lexical Functional Grammar

1. *kannte* ‘knew’ is a transitive verb:

- (27) *kannte* V (↑ PRED) = 'KENNEN(SUBJ, OBJ)'
 (↑ SUBJ AGR CAS = NOM)
 (↑ OBJ AGR CAS = ACC)
 (↑ TENSE) = PAST

2. In the sentence (28), the object of *verschlingen* 'devour' is in the prefield.

- (28) Den Apfel verschlingt David.
 the.ACC apple devours David.NOM
 'David is devouring the apple.'

The analysis is a combination of the analysis in Figure 7.2 on page 222 and the analysis of long-distance dependencies that was presented in Section 7.5. The object is not realized inside the VP, but rather in the prefield.

The necessary c-structure rules are given in (29):

- (29) a. VP → NP VP
 (↑SUBJ | OBJ) = ↓ ↑ = ↓
 b. VP → (V)
 ↑ = ↓
 c. C' → C VP
 ↑ = ↓ ↑ = ↓
 d. CP → XP C'
 (↑DF) = ↓ ↑ = ↓
 (↑DF) = (↑COMP* GF)

These rules allow two f-structures for the example in question: one in which the NP *den Apfel* 'the apple' is the topic and another in which this NP is the focus. Figure 24.3 shows the analysis with a topicalized constituent in the prefield.




图 24.3: Analysis of verb second

24.7 Categorical Grammar

1. The analysis of *The children in the room laugh loudly.* is given in Figure 24.4.






图 24.4: Categorical Grammar analysis of *The children in the room laugh loudly*.

2. The analysis of *the picture of Mary* is given in Figure 24.5. n/pp corresponds to N^0 , n corresponds to \bar{N} and np corresponds to NP.

图 24.5: Categorical Grammar analysis of *the picture of Mary*

24.8 Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar

1. The solution is:



2. An analysis of the difference in (30) has to capture the fact that the case of the adjective has to agree with that of the noun. In (30a), the genitive form of *interessant* ‘interesting’ is used, whereas (30b) contains a form that is incompatible with the genitive singular.

- (30) a. eines interessanten Mannes
 one.GEN interesting.GEN man.GEN
 b. *eines interessanter Mannes
 one.GEN interesting.NOM man.GEN

(31) shows the CAT value of *interessanten*.

(31) CAT value of *interessanten* ‘interesting’ with case information:

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \text{HEAD} \quad \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{adj} \\ \text{MOD } \bar{N} [\text{CASE } 1] \\ \text{CASE } 1 \text{ gen} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{SUBCAT } \langle \rangle \end{array} \right]$$

The structure sharing of the case value of the adjective with the case value of the \bar{N} under MOD identifies the case values of the noun and the adjective. *interessanten* can therefore be combined with *Mannes*, but not with *Mann*. Similarly, *interessanter* can only be combined with the nominative *Mann*, but not with the genitive *Mannes*.



For a refinement of the analysis of agreement inside the noun phrase, see Müller (2007b: Abschnitt 13.2).


24.9 Construction Grammar

Idioms can be found by reading the newspaper carefully. The less exciting method is to look them up a dictionary of idioms such as the Free Dictionary of Idioms and Phrases¹.

¹ <http://idioms.thefreedictionary.com/>, 04.03.2015.

24.10 Dependency Grammar





24.11 Tree Adjoining Grammar

The elementary trees in Figure 24.6 are needed for the analysis of (32).

- (32) der dem König treue Diener
 the.NOM the.DAT king loyal servant
 ‘the servant loyal to the king’




图 24.6: Elementary trees for *der dem König treue Diener*

By substituting the tree for *dem* ‘the’ in the substitution node of *König* ‘king’, one then arrives at a full NP. This can then be inserted into the substitution node of *treue* ‘loyal’.

Similarly, the tree for *der* ‘the’ can be combined with the one for *Diener*. One then has both of the trees in Figure 24.7.




图 24.7: Trees for *der dem König treue* and *der Diener* after substitution

The adjective tree can then be adjoined to the N' -node of *der Diener*, which yields the structure in Figure 24.8 on the following page.




图 24.8: Result of adjunction of the AP to the N'-node

参考文献

- Abbott, Barbara. 1976. Right node raising as a test for constituenthood. *Linguistic Inquiry* 7(4). 639–642.
- Abeillé, Anne. 1988. Parsing French with Tree Adjoining Grammar: Some linguistic accounts. In Vargha (1988) 7–12. <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/C/C88/C88-1002.pdf>.
- Abeillé, Anne. 2006. In defense of lexical coordination. In Olivier Bonami & Patricia Cabredo Hofherr (eds.), *Empirical issues in formal syntax and semantics*, vol. 6, 7–36. Paris: CNRS. <http://www.cssp.cnrs.fr/eiss6/>.
- Abeillé, Anne & Owen Rambow (eds.). 2000a. *Tree Adjoining Grammars: Formalisms, linguistic analysis and processing* (CSLI Lecture Notes 156). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Abeillé, Anne & Owen Rambow (eds.). 2000b. *Tree Adjoining Grammars: Formalisms, linguistic analysis and processing* (CSLI Lecture Notes 156). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Abeillé, Anne & Yves Schabes. 1989. Parsing idioms in Lexicalized TAG. In Somers & Wood (1989) 1–9.
- Abney, Steven P. 1987. *The English noun phrase in its sentential aspect*. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation. <http://www.vinartus.net/spa/87a.pdf>.
- Abney, Steven P. 1996. Statistical methods and linguistics. In Judith L. Klavans & Philip Resnik (eds.), *The balancing act: Combining symbolic and statistical approaches to language* (Language, Speech, and Communication), 1–26. London, England/Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Abney, Steven P. & Jennifer Cole. 1986. A Government-Binding parser. In S. Berman, J-W. Choe & J. McDonough (eds.), *Proceedings of NELS 16*, 1–17. University of Massachusetts, Amherst: GLSA.
- Abney, Steven P. & Erhard W. Hinrichs (eds.). 1995. *Proceedings of the Seventh Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Dublin: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Abraham, Werner (ed.). 1982. *Satzglieder im Deutschen – Vorschläge zur syntaktischen, semantischen und pragmatischen Fundierung* (Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 15). Tübingen: originally Gunter Narr Verlag now Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Abraham, Werner (ed.). 1985. *Erklärende Syntax des Deutschen* (Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 25). Tübingen: originally Gunter Narr Verlag now Stauffenburg Verlag.

- Abraham, Werner. 1995. *Deutsche Syntax im Sprachenvergleich: Grundlegung einer typologischen Syntax des Deutschen* (Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 41). Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Abraham, Werner. 2003. The syntactic link between thema and rhema: The syntax-discourse interface. *Folia Linguistica* 37(1–2). 13–34.
- Abraham, Werner. 2005. *Deutsche Syntax im Sprachenvergleich: Grundlegung einer typologischen Syntax des Deutschen* (Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 41). Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag 2nd edn.
- Abzianidze, Lasha. 2011. *An HPSG-based formal grammar of a core fragment of Georgian implemented in TRALE*. Charles University in Prague MA thesis.
- Ackerman, Farrell & Gert Webelhuth. 1998. *A theory of predicates* (CSLI Lecture Notes 76). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Adams, Marianne. 1984. Multiple interrogation in Italian. *The Linguistic Review* 4(1). 1–27.
- Ades, Anthony E. & Mark J. Steedman. 1982. On the order of words. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 4(4). 517–558.
- Adger, David. 2003. *Core syntax: A Minimalist approach* (Oxford Core Linguistics 1). Oxford: Oxford University Press Oxford.
- Adger, David. 2010. A Minimalist theory of feature structure. In Anna Kibort & Greville G. Corbett (eds.), *Features: Perspectives on a key notion in linguistics* (Oxford Linguistics), 185–218. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Adger, David. 2013. Constructions and grammatical explanation: Comments on Goldberg. *Mind and Language* 28(4). 466–478.
- Ágel, Vilmos. 2000. *Valenztheorie* (Narr Studienbücher). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Ágel, Vilmos, Ludwig M. Eichinger, Hans Werner Eroms, Peter Hellwig, Hans Jürgen Heringer & Henning Lobin (eds.). 2003a. *Dependenz und Valenz / Dependency and valency: Ein internationales Handbuch der zeitgenössischen Forschung / An international handbook of contemporary research*, vol. 25.1 (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Ágel, Vilmos, Ludwig M. Eichinger, Hans Werner Eroms, Peter Hellwig, Hans Jürgen Heringer & Henning Lobin (eds.). 2003b. *Dependenz und Valenz / Dependency and valency: Ein internationales Handbuch der zeitgenössischen Forschung / An international handbook of contemporary research*, vol. 25.1 (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Ágel, Vilmos, Ludwig M. Eichinger, Hans Werner Eroms, Peter Hellwig, Hans Jürgen Heringer & Henning Lobin (eds.). 2006. *Dependenz und Valenz / Dependency and valency: Ein internationales Handbuch der zeitgenössischen Forschung / An international handbook of contemporary research*, vol. 25.2 (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Ágel, Vilmos & Klaus Fischer. 2010. 50 Jahre Valenztheorie und Dependenzgrammatik. *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 38(2). 249–290.
- Ajdukiewicz, Kasimir. 1935. Die syntaktische Konnexität. *Studia Philosophica* 1. 1–27.

- de Alencar, Leonel. 2004. Complementos verbais oracionais – uma análise léxicofuncional. *Lingua(gem)* 1(1). 173–218.
- de Alencar, Leonel. 2013. BrGram: uma gramática computacional de um fragmento do português brasileiro no formalismo da LFG. In *Proceedings of the 9th Brazilian Symposium in Information and Human Language Technology. Fortaleza, Ceará, Brazil, October 20–24*, 183–188. Fortaleza, Ceará: Sociedade Brasileira de Computação. <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W13-4823>.
- Alsina, Alex. 1996. Resultatives: A joint operation of semantic and syntactic structures. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG '96 conference, Rank Xerox, Grenoble*, Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/1/>.
- Alsina, Alex, KP Mohanan & Tara Mohanan. 2005. How to get rid of the COMP. In Butt & King (2005). <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/10/lfg05amm.pdf>.
- Ambridge, Ben & Adele E. Goldberg. 2008. The island status of clausal complements: Evidence in favor of an information structure explanation. *Cognitive Linguistics* 19. 349–381.
- Ambridge, Ben & Elena V. M. Lieven. 2011. *Child language acquisition: Contrasting theoretical approaches*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Ambridge, Ben, Caroline F. Rowland & Julian M. Pine. 2008. Is structure dependence an innate constraint? New experimental evidence from children's complex-question production. *Cognitive Science: A Multidisciplinary Journal* 32(1). 222–255.
- Anderson, John M. 1971. *The grammar of case: Towards a localistic theory*, vol. 4 (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Anderson, Stephen R. 1992. *A-morphous morphology* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 62). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Aoun, Joseph & David W. Lightfoot. 1984. Government and contraction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15(3). 465–473.
- Aoun, Joseph & Dominique Sportiche. 1983. On the formal theory of government. *The Linguistic Review* 2(3). 211–236.
- Arad Greshler, Tali, Livnat Herzig Sheinflux, Nurit Melnik & Shuly Wintner. 2015. Development of maximally reusable grammars: Parallel development of Hebrew and Arabic grammars. In Müller (2015d) 27–40. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2015/ahmw.pdf>.
- Arends, Jacques. 2008. A demographic perspective on Creole formation. In Silvia Kouwenberg & John Victor Singler (eds.), *The handbook of pidgin and creole studies*, 309–331. Oxford/Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Arka, I Wayan, Avery Andrews, Mary Dalrymple, Meladel Mistica & Jane Simpson. 2009. A linguistic and computational morphosyntactic analysis for the applicative *-i* in Indonesian. In Butt & King (2009) 85–105. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/14/>.
- Arnold, Doug & Andrew Spencer. 2015. A constructional analysis for the skeptical. In Müller (2015d) 41–60. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2015/arnold-spencer.pdf>.

- Arnold, Jennifer E., Michael K. Tanenhaus, Rebecca J. Altmann & Maria Fagnano. 2004. The old and thee, uh, new. *Psychological Science* 15(9). 578–582.
- Askedal, John Ole. 1986. Zur vergleichenden Stellungsfelderanalyse von Verbalsätzen und nichtverbalen Satzgliedern. *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* 23. 269–273 and 342–348.
- Asudeh, Ash. 2004. *Resumption as resource management*: Stanford University dissertation.
- Asudeh, Ash, Mary Dalrymple & Ida Toivonen. 2008. Constructions with lexical integrity: Templates as the lexicon-syntax interface. In Butt & King (2008). <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/13/>.
- Asudeh, Ash, Mary Dalrymple & Ida Toivonen. 2013. Constructions with lexical integrity. *Journal of Language Modelling* 1(1). 1–54.
- Asudeh, Ash, Gianluca Giorgolo & Ida Toivonen. 2014. Meaning and valency. In Butt & King (2014) 68–88.
- Asudeh, Ash & Ida Toivonen. 2014. With lexical integrity. *Theoretical Linguistics* 40(1–2). 175–186.
- Attardi, Giuseppe. 2006. Experiments with a multilanguage non-projective dependency parser. In *Proceedings of the 10th Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL-X)*, 166–170. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Attia, Mohammed A. 2008. *Handling Arabic morphological and syntactic ambiguity within the LFG framework with a view to machine translation*: School of Languages, Linguistics and Cultures, University of Manchester dissertation.
- Avgustinova, Tania & Yi Zhang. 2009. Exploiting the Russian national corpus in the development of a Russian Resource Grammar. In Núria Bel, Erhard Hinrichs, Kiril Simov & Petya Osenova (eds.), *Adaptation of language resources and technology to new domains at the RANLP 2009 Conference, Borovets, Bulgaria*, 1–11. Shoumen, Bulgaria: INCOMA Ltd.
- Bach, Emmon. 1962. The order of elements in a Transformational Grammar of German. *Language* 8(3). 263–269.
- Bach, Emmon. 1976. An extension of classical Transformation Grammar. In *Problems in linguistic metatheory, Proceedings of the 1976 Conference at the Michigan State University*, 183–224.
- Bahrani, Mohammad, Hossein Sameti & Mehdi Hafezi Manshadi. 2011. A computational grammar for Persian based on GPSG. *Language Resources and Evaluation* 45(4). 387–408.
- Baker, Carl Lee. 1978. *Introduction to Generative-Transformational Syntax*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Baker, Mark C. 2003. Linguistic differences and language design. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 7(8). 349–353.
- Baker, Mark C. 2009. Language universals: Abstract but not mythological. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 32(5). 448–449.
- Baldrige, Jason. 2002. *Lexically specified derivational control in Combinatory Categorical Grammar*: University of Edinburgh dissertation.

- Baldrige, Jason, Sudipta Chatterjee, Alexis Palmer & Ben Wing. 2007. DotCCG and VisCCG: Wiki and programming paradigms for improved grammar engineering with OpenCCG. In King & Bender (2007) 5–25. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/GEAF/2007/>.
- Baldrige, Jason & Geert-Jan M. Kruijff. 2002. Coupling CCG and Hybrid Logic Dependency Semantics. In Isabelle (2002) 319–326. <http://aclanthology.info/events/acl-2002>.
- Ballweg, Joachim. 1997. Stellungsregularitäten in der Nominalphrase. In Hans-Werner Eroms, Gerhard Stickel & Gisela Zifonun (eds.), *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*, vol. 7.3 (Schriften des Instituts für deutsche Sprache), 2062–2072. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Baltin, Mark. 1981. Strict bounding. In Carl Lee Baker & John J. McCarthy (eds.), *The logical problem of language acquisition*, 257–295. Cambridge, MA/London, England: MIT Press.
- Baltin, Mark. 2004. Remarks on the relation between language typology and Universal Grammar: Commentary on Newmeyer. *Studies in Language* 28(3). 549–553.
- Baltin, Mark. 2006. Extraposition. In Martin Everaert, Henk van Riemsdijk, Rob Goedemans & Bart Hollebrandse (eds.), *The Blackwell companion to syntax* (Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics), 237–271. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Baltin, Mark R. & Anthony S. Kroch (eds.). 1989. *Alternative conceptions of phrase structure*. Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bangalore, Srinivas, Aravind K. Joshi & Owen Rambow. 2003. Dependency and valency in other theories: Tree Adjoining Grammar. In Ágel et al. (2003b) 669–678.
- Bannard, Colin, Elena Lieven & Michael Tomasello. 2009. Modeling children's early grammatical knowledge. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 106(41). 17284–17289.
- Bar-Hillel, Yehoshua, Micha A. Perles & Eliahu Shamir. 1961. On formal properties of simple phrase-structure grammars. *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* 14(2). 143–172.
- Bartsch, Renate & Theo Vennemann. 1972. *Semantic structures: A study in the relation between semantics and syntax* (Athenäum-Skripten Linguistik 9). Frankfurt/Main: Athenäum.
- Barwise, Jon & John Perry. 1983. *Situations and attitudes*. Cambridge, MA/London, England: MIT Press.
- Barwise, Jon & John Perry. 1987. *Situationen und Einstellungen – Grundlagen der Situationssemantik*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
- Baschung, K., G. G. Bes, A. Corluy & T. Guillotin. 1987. Auxiliaries and clitics in French UCG grammar. In Bente Maegaard (ed.), *Proceedings of the Third Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 173–178. Copenhagen, Denmark: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bates, Elizabeth A. 1984. Bioprograms and the innateness hypothesis. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 7(2). 188–190.
- Baumgärtner, Klaus. 1965. Spracherklärung mit den Mitteln der Abhängigkeitsstruktur. *Beiträge zur Sprachkunde und Informationsverarbeitung* 5. 31–53.

参考文献

- Baumgärtner, Klaus. 1970. Konstituenz und Dependenz: Zur Integration beider grammatischer Prinzipien. In Hugo Steger (ed.), *Vorschläge für eine strukturelle Grammatik des Deutschen* (Wege der Forschung 144), 52–77. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Bausewein, Karin. 1990. Haben kopflose Relativsätze tatsächlich keine Köpfe? In Fanselow & Felix (1990) 144–158.
- Bayer, Josef & Jaklin Kornfilt. 1989. Restructuring effects in German. DYANA Report University of Edinburgh.
- Beavers, John. 2003. A CCG implementation for the LKB. LinGO Working Paper 2002-08 CSLI Stanford Stanford, CA. <http://lingo.stanford.edu/pubs/WP-2002-08.ps.gz>.
- Beavers, John. 2004. Type-inheritance Combinatory Categorical Grammar. In *Proceedings of COLING 2004*, 57–63. Geneva, Switzerland: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Beavers, John, Elias Ponvert & Stephen Mark Wechsler. 2008. Possession of a controlled substantive. In T. Friedman & S. Ito (eds.), *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) XVIII*, 108–125. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.
- Beavers, John & Ivan A. Sag. 2004. Coordinate ellipsis and apparent non-constituent coordination. In Müller (2004e) 48–69. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2004/>.
- Bech, Gunnar. 1955. *Studien über das deutsche Verbum infinitum* (Linguistische Arbeiten 139). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. 2nd unchanged edition 1983.
- Becker, Tilman, Aravind K. Joshi & Owen Rambow. 1991. Long-distance scrambling and Tree Adjoining Grammars. In *Fifth Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics. Proceedings of the conference*, 21–26. Berlin: Association for Computational Linguistics. <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/E91-1005.pdf>.
- Beermann, Dorothee & Lars Hellan. 2004. A treatment of directionals in two implemented HPSG grammars. In Müller (2004e) 357–377. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2004/>.
- Beghelli, Filippo & Timothy Stowell. 1997. Distributivity and negation: The syntax of *each* and *every*. In Anna Szabolcsi (ed.), *Ways of scope taking*, 71–107. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Behaghel, Otto. 1909. Beziehung zwischen Umfang und Reihenfolge von Satzgliedern. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 25. 110–142.
- Behaghel, Otto. 1930. Von deutscher Wortstellung. *Zeitschrift für Deutschkunde* 44. 81–89.
- Behrens, Heike. 2009. Konstruktionen im Spracherwerb. *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 37(3). 427–444.
- Bellugi, Ursula, Liz Lichtenberger, Wendy Jones, Zona Lai & Marie St. George. 2000. The neurocognitive profile of Williams Syndrome: A complex pattern of strengths and weaknesses. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 12. 7–29.
- Bender, Emily & Daniel P. Flickinger. 1999. Peripheral constructions and core phenomena: Agreement in tag questions. In Webelhuth et al. (1999) 199–214.

- Bender, Emily M. 2000. *Syntactic variation and linguistic competence: The case of AAVE copula absence*. Stanford University dissertation. <http://faculty.washington.edu/ebender/dissertation/>.
- Bender, Emily M. 2008a. Evaluating a crosslinguistic grammar resource: A case study of Wambaya. In Moore et al. (2008) 977–985. <http://aclweb.org/anthology-new/P/P08/P08-1111.pdf>.
- Bender, Emily M. 2008b. Grammar engineering for linguistic hypothesis testing. In Nicholas Gaylord, Alexis Palmer & Elias Ponvert (eds.), *Proceedings of the Texas Linguistics Society X Conference: Computational linguistics for less-studied languages*, 16–36. Stanford CA: CSLI Publications ONLINE.
- Bender, Emily M. 2008c. Radical non-configurationality without shuffle operators: An analysis of Wambaya. In Müller (2008b) 6–24. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2008/>.
- Bender, Emily M. 2010. Reweaving a grammar for Wambaya: A case study in grammar engineering for linguistic hypothesis testing. *Linguistic Issues in Language Technology – LiLT* 3(3). 1–34. <http://journals.linguisticsociety.org/ellanguage/lilt/article/view/662/523.html>.
- Bender, Emily M., Daniel P. Flickinger, Frederik Fouvry & Melanie Siegel (eds.). 2003. *Proceedings of the ESSLLI 2003 Workshop “Ideas and Strategies for Multilingual Grammar Development”*. Vienna, Austria.
- Bender, Emily M., Daniel P. Flickinger & Stephan Oepen. 2002. The Grammar Matrix: An open-source starter-kit for the rapid development of cross-linguistically consistent broad-coverage precision grammars. In John Carroll, Nelleke Oostdijk & Richard Sutcliffe (eds.), *Proceedings of the Workshop on Grammar Engineering and Evaluation at the 19th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, 8–14. Taipei, Taiwan.
- Bender, Emily M. & Melanie Siegel. 2005. Implementing the syntax of Japanese numeral classifiers. In Su et al. (2005) 626–635.
- Bergen, Benjamin K. & Nancy Chang. 2005. Embodied Construction Grammar in simulation-based language understanding. In Jan-Ola Östman & Mirjam Fried (eds.), *Construction Grammars: Cognitive grounding and theoretical extensions*, 147–190. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Berman, Judith. 1996. Eine LFG-Grammatik des Deutschen. In Berman & Frank (1996) 11–96.
- Berman, Judith. 1999. Does German satisfy the Subject Condition? In Butt & King (1999). <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/4/>.
- Berman, Judith. 2003a. *Clausal syntax of German* (Studies in Constraint-Based Lexicalism). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Berman, Judith. 2003b. Zum Einfluss der strukturellen Position auf die syntaktische Funktion der Komplementsätze. *Deutsche Sprache* 3. 263–286.
- Berman, Judith. 2007. Functional identification of complement clauses in German and the specification of COMP. In Annie Zaenen, Jane Simpson, Tracy Holloway King, Jane Grimshaw, Joan Maling & Chris Manning (eds.), *Architectures, rules, and preferences: Variations on themes by Joan W. Bresnan*, 69–83. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

- Berman, Judith & Anette Frank. 1996. *Deutsche und französische Syntax im Formalismus der LFG* (Linguistische Arbeiten 344). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Berwick, Robert C. 1982. Computational complexity and Lexical-Functional Grammar. *American Journal of Computational Linguistics* 8(3–4). 97–109.
- Berwick, Robert C. & Samuel David Epstein. 1995. On the convergence of the ‘Minimalist’ Syntax and Categorical Grammar. In Anton Nijholt, Giuseppe Scollo & Rene Steetskamp (eds.), *Algebraic methods in language processing*, 143–148. Enschede: University of Twente. <http://eprints.eemcs.utwente.nl/9555/01/twlt10.pdf>.
- Berwick, Robert C. & Partha Niyogi. 1996. Learning from triggers. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27. 605–622.
- Berwick, Robert C., Paul Pietroski, Beracah Yankama & Noam Chomsky. 2011. Poverty of the Stimulus revisited. *Cognitive Science* 35(7). 1207–1242.
- Bick, Eckhard. 2001. En Constraint Grammar parser for dansk. In Peter Widell & Mette Kunøe (eds.), *8. Møde om Udforskningen af Dansk Sprog, 12.–13. October 2000*, vol. 8, 40–50. Århus: Århus University.
- Bick, Eckhard. 2003. A Constraint Grammar-based question answering system for Portuguese. In Fernando Moura Pires & Salvador Abreu (eds.), *Progress in artificial intelligence: 11th Portuguese Conference on Artificial Intelligence, EPIA 2003, Beja, Portugal, December 4–7, 2003, proceedings* (Lecture Notes in Computer Science 2902), 414–418. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Bick, Eckhard. 2006. A Constraint Grammar parser for Spanish. In *Proceedings of TIL 2006 – 4th Workshop on Information and Human Language Technology (Ribeirão Preto, October 27–28, 2006)*, 3–10. <http://www.nilc.icmc.usp.br/til/til2006/>.
- Bick, Eckhard. 2009. A Dependency Constraint Grammar for Esperanto. In Bick et al. (2009) 8–12.
- Bick, Eckhard. 2010. FrAG: A hybrid Constraint Grammar parser for French. In Nicoletta Calzolari, Khalid Choukri, Bente Maegaard, Joseph Mariani, Jan Odijk, Stelios Piperidis, Mike Rosner & Daniel Tapias (eds.), *Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC’10)*, 794–798. Valletta, Malta: European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Bick, Eckhard, Kristin Hagen, Kaili Müürisep & Trond Trosterud (eds.). 2009. *Constraint Grammar and robust parsing: Proceedings of the NODALIDA 2009 workshop* (NEALT Proceedings Series 8) Northern European Association for Language Technology Tartu: Tartu University Library.
- Bick, Eckhard & Lars Nygaard. 2007. Using Danish as a CG interlingua: A wide-coverage Norwegian-English machine translation system. In Joakim Nivre, Heiki-Jaan Kaalep, Kadri Muischnek & Mare Koit (eds.), *Proceedings of the 16th Nordic Conference of Computational Linguistics*, 21–28. Forlag uden navn.
- Bickerton, Derek. 1984a. Creol is still king. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 7(2). 212–218.
- Bickerton, Derek. 1984b. The Language Bioprogram Hypothesis. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 7(2). 173–188.

- Bickerton, Derek. 1997. How to acquire language without positive evidence: What acquisitionists can learn from Creoles. In Michel DeGraff (ed.), *Language creation and language change: Creolization, diachrony, and development* (Learning, Development, and Conceptual Change), 49–74. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bierwisch, Manfred. 1963. *Grammatik des deutschen Verbs* (studia grammatica 2). Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Bierwisch, Manfred. 1966. Strukturalismus: Geschichte, Probleme und Methoden. *Kursbuch* 5. 77–152.
- Bierwisch, Manfred. 1992. Grammatikforschung in der DDR: Auch ein Rückblick. *Linguistische Berichte* 139. 169–181.
- Bildhauer, Felix. 2008. *Representing information structure in an HPSG grammar of Spanish*: Universität Bremen Dissertation.
- Bildhauer, Felix. 2011. Mehrfache Vorfeldbesetzung und Informationsstruktur: Eine Bestandsaufnahme. *Deutsche Sprache* 39(4). 362–379.
- Bildhauer, Felix. 2014. Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar. In Carnie et al. (2014) 526–555.
- Bildhauer, Felix & Philippa Helen Cook. 2010. German multiple fronting and expected topic-hood. In Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, Université Paris Diderot*, 68–79. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Bird, Steven & Ewan Klein. 1994. Phonological analysis in typed feature systems. *Computational Linguistics* 20(3). 455–491.
- Bishop, Dorothy V. M. 2002. Putting language genes in perspective. *TRENDS in Genetics* 18(2). 57–59.
- Bjerre, Tavs. 2006. Object positions in a topological sentence model for Danish: A linearization-based HPSG approach. Presentation at Ph.D.-Course at Sandbjerg, Denmark. <http://www.hum.au.dk/engelsk/engsv/objectpositions/workshop/Bjerre.pdf>.
- Blackburn, Patrick & Johan Bos. 2005. *Representation and inference for natural language: A first course in computational semantics*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Blackburn, Patrick, Claire Gardent & Wilfried Meyer-Viol. 1993. Talking about trees. In Krauwer et al. (1993) 21–29.
- Błaszczak, Joanna & Hans-Martin Gärtner. 2005. Intonational phrasing, discontinuity, and the scope of negation. *Syntax* 8(1). 1–22.
- Blevins, James P. 2003. Passives and impersonals. *Journal of Linguistics* 39(3). 473–520.
- Block, Hans-Ulrich & Rudolf Hunze. 1986. Incremental construction of c- and f-structure in a LFG-parser. In Nagao (1986) 490–493.
- Blom, Corrien. 2005. *Complex predicates in Dutch: Synchrony and diachrony* (LOT Dissertation Series 111). Utrecht: Utrecht University.
- Bloom, Paul. 1993. Grammatical continuity in language development: The case of subjectless sentences. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24(4). 721–734.
- Boas, Hans C. 2003. *A Constructional approach to resultatives* (Stanford Monographs in Linguistics). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

- Boas, Hans C. 2014. Lexical approaches to argument structure: Two sides of the same coin. *Theoretical Linguistics* 40(1–2). 89–112.
- Boas, Hans C. & Ivan A. Sag (eds.). 2012. *Sign-based Construction Grammar* (CSLI Lecture Notes 193). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan. 1999. Adverbs: The hierarchy paradox. *Glott International* 4(9/10). 27–28.
- Bod, Rens. 2009a. Constructions at work or at rest? *Cognitive Linguistics* 20(1). 129–134.
- Bod, Rens. 2009b. From exemplar to grammar: Integrating analogy and probability in language learning. *Cognitive Science* 33(4). 752–793.
- Bögel, Tina, Miriam Butt & Sebastian Sulger. 2008. Urdu ezafe and the morphology-syntax interface. In Butt & King (2008) 129–149. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/13/>.
- Bohnet, Bernd. 2010. Very high accuracy and fast Dependency Parsing is not a contradiction. In Chu-Ren Huang & Dan Jurafsky (eds.), *Proceedings of the 23rd International Conference on Computational Linguistics*, 89–97. Stroudsburg, PA, USA: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bolc, Leonard, Krzysztof Czuba, Anna Kupść, Małgorzata Marciniak, Agnieszka Mykowiecka & Adam Przepiórkowski. 1996. A survey of systems for implementing HPSG grammars. Tech. Rep. 814 Institute of Computer Science, Polish Academy of Sciences Warsaw, Poland. <http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~kczuba/systems-wide.ps.gz>.
- Booij, Geert E. 2002. Separable complex verbs in Dutch: A case of periphrastic word formation. In Dehé et al. (2002) 21–41.
- Booij, Geert E. 2005. Construction-Dependent Morphology. *Lingue e linguaggio* 4. 31–46.
- Booij, Geert E. 2009. Lexical integrity as a formal universal: A Constructionist view. In Sergio Scalise, Elisabetta Magni & Antonietta Bisetto (eds.), *Universals of language today* (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 76), 83–100. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Booij, Geert E. 2010. Construction morphology. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 4(7). 543–555. DOI:10.1111/j.1749-818X.2010.00213.x.
- Booij, Geert E. 2012. Construction morphology. Ms. Leiden University.
- Borer, Hagit. 1994. The projection of arguments. In E. Benedicto & J. Runner (eds.), *Functional projections* (UMass Occasional Papers in Linguistics (UMOP) 17), 19–47. Massachusetts: University of Massachusetts Graduate Linguistic Student Association.
- Borer, Hagit. 2003. Exo-skeletal vs. endo-skeletal explanations: Syntactic projections and the lexicon. In John Moore & Maria Polinsky (eds.), *The nature of explanation in linguistic theory*, 31–67. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Borer, Hagit. 2005. *Structuring sense: In name only*, vol. 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Borsley, Robert D. 1987. Subjects and complements in HPSG. Report No. CSLI-87-107 Center for the Study of Language and Information Stanford, CA.
- Borsley, Robert D. 1989. Phrase-Structure Grammar and the Barriers conception of clause structure. *Linguistics* 27(5). 843–863.
- Borsley, Robert D. 1991. *Syntactic theory: A unified approach*. London: Edward Arnold.

- Borsley, Robert D. 1999. *Syntactic theory: A unified approach*. London: Edward Arnold 2nd edn.
- Borsley, Robert D. 2005. Against ConjP. *Lingua* 115(4), 461–482.
- Borsley, Robert D. 2006. Syntactic and lexical approaches to unbounded dependencies. Essex Research Reports in Linguistics 49 University of Essex. <http://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/4187949.pdf#page=35>.
- Borsley, Robert D. 2007. Hang on again! Are we ‘on the right track’? In Andrew Radford (ed.), *Martin Atkinson – the Minimalist muse* (Essex Research Reports in Linguistics 53), 43–69. Essex: Department of Language and Linguistics, University of Essex.
- Borsley, Robert D. 2012. Don’t move! *Iberia: An International Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 4(1), 110–139.
- Borsley, Robert D. & Kersti Börjars (eds.). 2011. *Non-transformational syntax: Formal and explicit models of grammar: A guide to current models*. Oxford, UK/Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Bos, Johan. 1996. Predicate logic unplugged. In Paul J. E. Dekker & M. Stokhof (eds.), *Proceedings of the Tenth Amsterdam Colloquium*, 133–143. Amsterdam: ILLC/Department of Philosophy, University of Amsterdam.
- Boukedi, Sirine & Kais Haddar. 2014. HPSG grammar treating of different forms of Arabic coordination. *Research in Computing Science* 86: Advances in Computational Linguistics and Intelligent Decision Making, 25–41.
- Boullier, Pierre & Benoît Sagot. 2005a. Analyse syntaxique profonde à grande échelle: SxLFG. *Traitement Automatique des Langues (T.A.L.)* 46(2), 65–89.
- Boullier, Pierre & Benoît Sagot. 2005b. Efficient and robust LFG parsing: SxLFG. In *Proceedings of IWPT 2005*, 1–10. Vancouver, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Boullier, Pierre, Benoît Sagot & Lionel Clément. 2005. Un analyseur LFG efficace pour le français: SxLfg. In *Actes de TALN 05*, 403–408. Dourdan, France.
- Bouma, Gosse. 1996. Extraposition as a nonlocal dependency. In Geert-Jan Kruijff, Glynn V. Morrill & Dick Oehrle (eds.), *Proceedings of Formal Grammar 96*, 1–14. Prag. <http://www.let.rug.nl/gosse/papers.html>.
- Bouma, Gosse, Robert Malouf & Ivan A. Sag. 2001a. Satisfying constraints on extraction and adjunction. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19(1), 1–65.
- Bouma, Gosse & Gertjan van Noord. 1994. Constraint-based Categorical Grammar. In James Pustejovsky (ed.), *32th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. Proceedings of the conference*, 147–154. Las Cruces: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Bouma, Gosse & Gertjan van Noord. 1998. Word order constraints on verb clusters in German and Dutch. In Erhard W. Hinrichs, Andreas Kathol & Tsuneko Nakazawa (eds.), *Complex predicates in nonderivational syntax* (Syntax and Semantics 30), 43–72. San Diego: Academic Press. <http://www.let.rug.nl/~vannoord/papers/>.
- Bouma, Gosse, Gertjan van Noord & Robert Malouf. 2001b. Alpino: Wide-coverage computational analysis of Dutch. In Walter Daelemans, Khalil Sima’an, Jorn Veenstra & Jakub Zavrel (eds.), *Computational linguistics in the Netherlands 2000: Selected papers*

- from the Eleventh CLIN Meeting (Language and Computers 37), Amsterdam/New York, NY: Rodopi.
- Bragmann, Sascha. 2015. Syntactically flexible VP-idioms and the N-after-N Construction. Poster presentation at the 5th General Meeting of PARSEME, Iasi, 23–24 September 2015.
- Braine, Martin D. S. 1987. What is learned in acquiring word classes—A step toward an acquisition theory. In Brian MacWhinny (ed.), *Mechanisms of language acquisition*, 65–87. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Branco, António & Francisco Costa. 2008a. A computational grammar for deep linguistic processing of Portuguese: LXGram, version A.4.1. Tech. Rep. TR-2008-17 Universidade de Lisboa, Faculdade de Ciências, Departamento de Informática.
- Branco, António & Francisco Costa. 2008b. LXGram in the shared task ‘comparing semantic representations’ of STEP 2008. In Johan Bos & Rodolfo Delmonte (eds.), *Semantics in text processing: STEP 2008 conference proceedings*, vol. 1 (Research in Computational Semantics), 299–314. London: College Publications. <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W08-2224>.
- Brants, Sabine, Stefanie Dipper, Peter Eisenberg, Silvia Hansen-Schirra, Esther König, Wolfgang Lezius, Christian Rohrer, George Smith & Hans Uszkoreit. 2004. TIGER: Linguistic interpretation of a German corpus. *Research on Language and Computation* 2(4). 597–620.
- Bresnan, Joan. 1974. The position of certain clause-particles in phrase structure. *Linguistic Inquiry* 5(4). 614–619.
- Bresnan, Joan. 1978. A realistic Transformational Grammar. In M. Halle, J. Bresnan & G. A. Miller (eds.), *Linguistic theory and psychological reality*, 1–59. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bresnan, Joan. 1982a. Control and complementation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13(3). 343–434.
- Bresnan, Joan (ed.). 1982b. *The mental representation of grammatical relations* (MIT Press Series on Cognitive Theory and Mental Representation). Cambridge, MA/London: MIT Press.
- Bresnan, Joan. 1982c. The passive in lexical theory. In Bresnan (1982b) 3–86.
- Bresnan, Joan. 2001. *Lexical-Functional Syntax*. Oxford, UK/Cambridge, USA: Blackwell.
- Bresnan, Joan & Jane Grimshaw. 1978. The syntax of free relatives in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9. 331–392.
- Bresnan, Joan & Jonni M. Kanerva. 1989. Locative inversion in Chichewa: A case study of factorization in grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20(1). 1–50.
- Bresnan, Joan & Ronald M. Kaplan. 1982. Introduction: Grammars as mental representations of language. In Bresnan (1982b) xvii–lii.
- Bresnan, Joan & Sam A. Mchombo. 1995. The Lexical Integrity Principle: Evidence from Bantu. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 13. 181–254.
- Bresnan, Joan & Annie Zaenen. 1990. Deep unaccusativity in LFG. In Katarzyna Dziwirek, Patrick Farrell & Errapel Mejías-Bikandi (eds.), *Grammatical relations: A cross-theoretical perspective*, 45–57. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Brew, Chris. 1995. Stochastic HPSG. In Abney & Hinrichs (1995) 83–89.

- Briscoe, Ted J. 1997. Review of Edward P. Stabler, Jr., *The logical approach to syntax: Foundations, specifications, and implementations of theories of Government and Binding*. *Journal of Linguistics* 33(1). 223–225.
- Briscoe, Ted J. 2000. Grammatical acquisition: Inductive bias and coevolution of language and the language acquisition device. *Language* 76(2). 245–296.
- Briscoe, Ted J. & Ann Copestake. 1999. Lexical rules in constraint-based grammar. *Computational Linguistics* 25(4). 487–526.
- Bröker, Norbert. 2003. Formal foundations of Dependency Grammar. In Ágel et al. (2003b) 294–310.
- Brosziewski, Ulf. 2003. *Syntactic derivations: A nontransformational view* (Linguistische Arbeiten 470). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Brown, Keith (ed.). 2006. *The encyclopedia of language and linguistics*. Oxford: Elsevier Science Publisher B.V. (North-Holland) 2nd edn.
- Brown, Roger & Camille Hanlon. 1970. Derivational complexity and order of acquisition in child speech. In John R. Hayes (ed.), *Cognition and the development of language*, 11–53. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2009. Selectional asymmetries between CP and DP suggest that the DP hypothesis is wrong. In Laurel MacKenzie (ed.), *Proceedings of the 32th Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium* (Penn Working Papers in Linguistics 15.1), 26–35. Philadelphia.
- Bryant, John. 2003. *Constructional analysis*. University of California at Berkeley MA thesis. <http://www.icsi.berkeley.edu/~jbryant/old-analyzer.html>.
- Budde, Monika. 2010. Konstruktionen integrativ: Topik-Konstruktionen als rein-syntaktisches Pendant zu den lexikalisch verankerten Komplement-Konstruktionen. Vortrag auf der Tagung Konstruktionsgrammatik: Neue Perspektiven zur Untersuchung des Deutschen und Englischen. Internationale Fachtagung an der Christian-Albrechts-Universität zu Kiel vom 18. bis 20. Februar 2010.
- Bungeroth, Jan. 2002. *A formal description of Sign Language using HPSG*. Karlsruhe Department of Computer Science, University of Stellenbosch, Lehrstuhl Informatik für Ingenieure und Naturwissenschaftler, Universität Karlsruhe (TH) Diploma thesis. <http://www-i6.informatik.rwth-aachen.de/~bungeroth/diplarb.pdf>.
- Burzio, Luigi. 1981. *Intransitive verbs and Italian auxiliaries*: MIT dissertation.
- Burzio, Luigi. 1986. *Italian syntax: A Government-Binding approach* (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 1). Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Busemann, Stephan. 1992. *Generierung natürlicher Sprache mit generalisierten Phrasenstrukturgrammatiken*, vol. 313 (Informatik-Fachberichte). Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Bußmann, Hadumod (ed.). 1983. *Lexikon der Sprachwissenschaft* (Kröners Taschenausgabe 452). Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag.
- Bußmann, Hadumod (ed.). 1990. *Lexikon der Sprachwissenschaft* (Kröners Taschenausgabe 452). Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag 2nd edn.
- Butt, Miriam. 2003. The light verb jungle. In C. Quinn, C. Bowerman & G. Aygen (eds.), *Papers from the Harvard/Dudley House light verb workshop* (Harvard Working Papers in Linguistics 9), 1–49. Harvard University, Department of Linguistics.

- Butt, Miriam, Stefanie Dipper, Anette Frank & Tracy Holloway King. 1999a. Writing large-scale parallel grammars for English, French and German. In Butt & King (1999). <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/4/>.
- Butt, Miriam, Helge Dyvik, Tracy Holloway King, Hiroshi Masuichi & Christian Rohrer. 2002. The Parallel Grammar Project. In *Proceedings of COLING-2002 Workshop on Grammar Engineering and Evaluation*, 1–7.
- Butt, Miriam & Tracy Holloway King (eds.). 1999. *Proceedings of the LFG '99 conference, University of Manchester*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/4/>.
- Butt, Miriam & Tracy Holloway King (eds.). 2005. *Proceedings of the LFG 2005 conference*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/10/>.
- Butt, Miriam & Tracy Holloway King (eds.). 2008. *Proceedings of the LFG 2008 conference*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/13/>.
- Butt, Miriam & Tracy Holloway King (eds.). 2009. *Proceedings of the LFG 2009 conference*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/14/>.
- Butt, Miriam & Tracy Holloway King (eds.). 2014. *Proceedings of the LFG 2014 conference*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Butt, Miriam, Tracy Holloway King, María-Eugenia Niño & Frédérique Segond. 1999b. *A grammar writer's cookbook* (CSLI Lecture Notes 95). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Butt, Miriam, Tracy Holloway King & Sebastian Roth. 2007. Urdu correlatives: Theoretical and implementational issues. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG 2007 conference*, 107–127. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/12/>.
- Cahill, Aoife, Michael Burke, Martin Forst, Ruth O'Donovan, Christian Rohrer, Josef van Genabith & Andy Way. 2005. Treebank-based acquisition of multilingual unification grammar resources. *Research on Language and Computation* 3(2). 247–279.
- Cahill, Aoife, Michael Burke, Ruth O'Donovan, Stefan Riezler, Josef van Genabith & Andy Way. 2008. Wide-coverage deep statistical parsing using automatic dependency structure annotation. *Computational Linguistics* 34(1). 81–124.
- Calder, Jonathan, Ewan Klein & Henk Zeevat. 1988. Unification Categorical Grammar: A concise, extendable grammar for natural language processing. In Vargha (1988) 83–86.
- Callmeier, Ulrich. 2000. PET—A platform for experimentation with efficient HPSG processing techniques. *Journal of Natural Language Engineering* 1(6). 99–108. (Special Issue on Efficient Processing with HPSG: Methods, Systems, Evaluation).
- Calzolari, Nicoletta, Claire Cardie & Pierre Isabelle (eds.). 2006. *Proceedings of the 21st International Conference on Computational Linguistics and 44th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Sydney, Australia: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Candito, Marie-Hélène. 1996. A principle-based hierarchical representation of LTAGs. In Tsuji (1996) 194–199.
- Candito, Marie-Hélène. 1998. Building parallel LTAG for French and Italian. In *Proceedings of the 36th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and*

- 17th International Conference on Computational Linguistics, 211–217. Montreal, Quebec, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Candito, Marie-Hélène. 1999. *Organisation modulaire et paramétrable de grammaires électroniques lexicalisées. Application au français et à l'italien*: Université Paris 7 dissertation.
- Candito, Marie-Hélène & Sylvain Kahane. 1998. Can the TAG derivation tree represent a semantic graph? An answer in the light of Meaning-Text Theory. In *TAG+4*, 25–28.
- Cappelle, Bert. 2006. Particle placement and the case for “allostructions”. *Constructions online* 1(7). 1–28.
- Cappelle, Bert, Yuri Shtyrov & Friedemann Pulvermüller. 2010. *Heating up or cooling up the brain?* MEG evidence that phrasal verbs are lexical units. *Brain and Language* 115. 189–201.
- Carlson, Gregory N. & Michael K. Tanenhaus. 1988. Thematic roles and language comprehension. In Wendy Wilkins (ed.), *Thematic relations* (Syntax and Semantics 21), 263–289. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Carnie, Andrew, Yosuke Sato & Dan Siddiqi (eds.). 2014. *The Routledge handbook of syntax*. Oxford: Routledge.
- Carpenter, Bob. 1992. *The logic of typed feature structures* (Tracts in Theoretical Computer Science). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Carpenter, Bob. 1994. A natural deduction theorem prover for type-theoretic Categorical Grammars. Tech. rep. Carnegie Mellon Laboratory for Computational Linguistics. http://www.essex.ac.uk/linguistics/external/clmt/papers/cg/carp_cgparser_doc.ps.
- Carpenter, Bob. 1998. *Type-logical semantics*. Cambridge, MA/London, England: MIT Press.
- Carpenter, Bob & Gerald Penn. 1996. Efficient parsing of compiled typed attribute value logic grammars. In Harry Bunt & Masaru Tomita (eds.), *Recent advances in parsing technology* (Text, Speech and Language Technology 1), 145–168. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Çetinoğlu, Özlem & Kemal Oflazer. 2006. Morphology-syntax interface for Turkish LFG. In Calzolari et al. (2006) 153–160.
- Chang, Nancy Chih-Lin. 2008. Constructing grammar: A computational model of the emergence of early constructions. Technical Report UCB/EECS-2009-24 Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences, University of California at Berkeley.
- Chaves, Rui P. 2009. Construction-based cumulation and adjunct extraction. In Müller (2009d) 47–67.
- Choi, Hye-Won. 1999. *Optimizing structure in scrambling: Scrambling and information structure* (Dissertations in Linguistics). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1956. Three models for the description of language. *IRE Transactions on Information Theory* 2. 113–124.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1957. *Syntactic structures* (Janua Linguarum / Series Minor 4). The Hague/Paris: Mouton.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1959. On certain formal properties of grammars. *Information and Control* 2(2). 137–167.

参考文献

- Chomsky, Noam. 1964a. *Current issues in linguistic theory* (Janua Linguarum / Series Minor 38). The Hague/Paris: Mouton.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1964b. Degrees of grammaticalness. In Fodor & Katz (1964) 384–389.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1968. Language and the mind. *Psychology Today* 1(9). 48–68. Reprint as: Chomsky (1976a).
- Chomsky, Noam. 1970. Remarks on nominalization. In Roderick A. Jacobs & Peter S. Rosenbaum (eds.), *Readings in English Transformational Grammar*, chap. 12, 184–221. Waltham, MA/Toronto/London: Ginn and Company.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1971. *Problems of knowledge and freedom*. London: Fontana.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1973. Conditions on transformations. In Stephen R. Anderson & Paul Kiparski (eds.), *A festschrift for Morris Halle*, 232–286. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1975. *The logical structure of linguistic theory*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1976a. Language and the mind. In Diane D. Borstein (ed.), *Readings in the theory of grammar: From the 17th to the 20th century*, 241–251. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop. Reprint from: Chomsky (1968).
- Chomsky, Noam. 1976b. *Reflections on language*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1977. *Essays on form and interpretation*. New York: North Holland.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1980. *Rules and representations*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981a. *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981b. Reply to comments of Thompson. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences* 295(1077). 277–281.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1982. *Some concepts and consequences of the theory of Government and Binding* (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 5). Cambridge, MA/London, England: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1986a. *Barriers* (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 13). Cambridge, MA/London, England: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1986b. *Knowledge of language: Its nature, origin, and use* (Convergence). New York/Westport, Connecticut/London: Praeger.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1988. *Language and problems of knowledge: The Managua lectures* (Current Studies in Linguistics 16). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1989. Some notes on economy of derivation and representation. In I. Laka & Anoop Mahajan (eds.), *Functional heads and clause structure* (MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 10), 43–74. Cambridge, MA: Department of Linguistics and Philosophy.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1990. On formalization and formal linguistics. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 8(1). 143–147.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1991. Some notes on economy of derivation and representation. In Robert Freidin (ed.), *Principles and parameters in Generative Grammar*, 417–454. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Reprint as: Chomsky (1995b: 129–166).

- Chomsky, Noam. 1993. A Minimalist Program for linguistic theory. In Hale & Keyser (1993b) 1–52.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995a. Bare phrase structure. In Hector Campos & Paula Kempchinsky (eds.), *Evolution and revolution in linguistic theory: Essays in honor of Carlos Otero*, 51–109. Washington, DC: Georgetown U Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995b. *The Minimalist Program* (Current Studies in Linguistics 28). Cambridge, MA/London, England: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1998. Noam Chomsky's Minimalist Program and the philosophy of mind: An interview [with] Camilo J. Cela-Conde and Gisde Marty. *Syntax* 1(1). 19–36.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1999. Derivation by phase. MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics 18 MIT. Reprint in: Michael Kenstowicz, ed. 2001. Ken Hale. A Life in Language. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1–52.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. *New horizons in the study of language and mind*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A life in language*, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2002. *On nature and language*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2005. Three factors in language design. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36(1). 1–22.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2007. Approaching UG from below. In Sauerland & Gärtner (2007) 1–29.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2008. On phases. In Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero & Maria Luisa Zubizarreta (eds.), *Foundational issues in linguistic theory: Essays in honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, 133–166. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2010. Restricting stipulations: Consequences and challenges. Talk given in Stuttgart.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2013. Problems of projection. *Lingua* 130. 33–49.
- Chomsky, Noam & George A. Miller. 1963. Introduction to the formal analysis of natural languages. In R. Duncan Luce, Robert R. Bush & Eugene Galanter (eds.), *Handbook of mathematical psychology*, vol. 2, 269–321. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Chouinard, Michelle M. & Eve V. Clark. 2003. Adult reformulations of child errors as negative evidence. *Journal of Child Language* 30. 637–669.
- Chrupala, Grzegorz & Josef van Genabith. 2006. Using machine-learning to assign function labels to parser output for Spanish. In Calzolari et al. (2006) 136–143.
- Chung, Sandra & James McCloskey. 1983. On the interpretation of certain island facts in GPSG. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14. 704–713.
- Church, Kenneth. 2011. A pendulum swung too far. *Linguistic Issues in Language Technology* 6(5). 1–27. <http://journals.linguisticsociety.org/elanguage/lilt/article/view/2581.html>. Special Issue on Interaction of Linguistics and Computational Linguistics.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1994. On the evidence for partial N movement in the Romance DP. In Guglielmo Cinque, Jan Koster, Jean-Yves Pollock, Luigi Rizzi & Raffaella Zanuttini (eds.), *Paths towards Universal Grammar: Studies in honor of Richard S. Kayne*, 85–110. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo & Luigi Rizzi. 2010. The cartography of syntactic structures. In Bernd Heine & Heiko Narrog (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of linguistic analysis*, 51–65. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Citko, Barbara. 2008. Missing labels. *Lingua* 118(7). 907–944.
- Clark, Alexander. 2000. Inducing syntactic categories by context distribution clustering. In *Proceedings CoNLL 2000*, 91–94. Stroudsburg, PA: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Clark, Herbert H. & Jean E. Fox Tree. 2002. Using *uh* and *um* in spontaneous speaking. *Cognition* 84(1). 73–111.
- Clark, Herbert H. & Thomas Wasow. 1998. Repeating words in spontaneous speech. *Cognitive Psychology* 37(3). 201–242.
- Clark, Stephen & James Curran. 2007. Wide-coverage efficient statistical parsing with CCG and log-linear models. *Computational Linguistics* 33(4). 493–552.
- Clark, Stephen, Julia Hockenmaier & Mark J. Steedman. 2002. Building deep dependency structures with a wide-coverage CCG parser. In Isabelle (2002) 327–334. <http://aclanthology.info/events/acl-2002>.
- Clément, Lionel. 2009. XLFG5 documentation. Translated from French by Olivier Bonami. <http://www.xlfg.org/>.
- Clément, Lionel & Alexandra Kinyon. 2001. XLFG—An LFG parsing scheme for French. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG 2001 conference*, Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/6/>.
- Clément, Lionel & Alexandra Kinyon. 2003. Generating parallel multilingual LFG-TAG grammars from a MetaGrammar. In Erhard Hinrichs & Dan Roth (eds.), *Proceedings of the 41st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 184–191. Sapporo, Japan: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Clifton, Charles Jr. & Penelope Odom. 1966. Similarity relations among certain English sentence constructions. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied* 80(5). 1–35.
- Coch, Jose. 1996. Overview of AlethGen. In *Demonstrations and posters of the Eighth International Natural Language Generation Workshop (INLG'96)*, 25–28.
- Cook, Philippa Helen. 2001. *Coherence in German: An information structure approach*: Departments of Linguistics and German, University of Manchester dissertation.
- Cook, Philippa Helen. 2006. The datives that aren't born equal: Beneficiaries and the dative passive. In Daniel Hole, André Meinunger & Werner Abraham (eds.), *Datives and similar cases: Between argument structure and event structure*, 141–184. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Cooper, Robin, Kuniaki Mukai & John Perry (eds.). 1990. *Situation Theory and its applications*, vol. 1 (CSLI Lecture Notes 22). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Coopmans, Peter. 1989. Where stylistic and syntactic processes meet: Locative inversion in English. *Language* 65(4). 728–751.
- Copetake, Ann. 2002. *Implementing typed feature structure grammars* (CSLI Lecture Notes 110). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

- Copestake, Ann. 2007. Applying robust semantics. In *Proceedings of the 10th Conference of the Pacific Association for Computational Linguistics (PACLING)*, 1–12.
- Copestake, Ann & Ted Briscoe. 1995. Semi-productive polysemy and sense extension. *Journal of Semantics* 12(1). 15–67.
- Copestake, Ann & Ted J. Briscoe. 1992. Lexical operations in a unification based framework. In James Pustejovsky & Sabine Bergler (eds.), *Lexical semantics and knowledge representation* (Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence 627), 101–119. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Copestake, Ann & Daniel P. Flickinger. 2000. An open-source grammar development environment and broad-coverage English grammar using HPSG. In *Proceedings of the second Linguistic Resources and Evaluation Conference*, 591–600. Athens, Greece.
- Copestake, Ann, Daniel P. Flickinger, Carl J. Pollard & Ivan A. Sag. 2005. Minimal Recursion Semantics: An introduction. *Research on Language and Computation* 4(3). 281–332.
- Correa, Nelson. 1987. An Attribute-Grammar implementation of Government-Binding Theory. In Sidner (1987) 45–51.
- Costa, Francisco & António Branco. 2010. LXGram: A deep linguistic processing grammar for Portuguese. In Thiago A.S. Pardo (ed.), *Computational processing of the Portuguese language: 9th International Conference, PROPOR 2010, Porto Alegre, RS, Brazil, April 27–30, 2010. Proceedings* (Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence 6001), 86–89. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Covington, Michael A. 1990. Parsing discontinuous constituents in Dependency Grammar. *Computational Linguistics* 16(4). 234–236.
- Crabbé, Benoit. 2005. *Représentation informatique de grammaires d’arbres fortement lexicalisées: le cas de la grammaire d’arbres adjoints*: Université Nancy 2 dissertation.
- Crain, Stephen, Drew Khlentzos & Rosalind Thornton. 2010. Universal Grammar versus language diversity. *Lingua* 120(12). 2668–2672.
- Crain, Stephen & Mineharu Nakayama. 1987. Structure dependence in grammar formation. *Language* 63(3). 522–543.
- Crain, Stephen & Mark J. Steedman. 1985. On not being led up the garden path: The use of context by the psychological syntax processor. In Dowty et al. (1985) 320–358.
- Crain, Stephen, Rosalind Thornton & Drew Khlentzos. 2009. The case of the missing generalizations. *Cognitive Linguistics* 20(1). 145–155.
- Cramer, Bart & Yi Zhang. 2009. Construction of a German HPSG grammar from a detailed treebank. In King & Santaholma (2009) 37–45. <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W/W09/#2600>.
- Crocker, Matthew Walter & Ian Lewin. 1992. Parsing as deduction: Rules versus principles. In Bernd Neumann (ed.), *ECAI 92. 10th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 508–512. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Croft, William. 2001. *Radical Construction Grammar: Syntactic theory in typological perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Croft, William. 2003. Lexical rules vs. constructions: A false dichotomy. In Hubert Cuyckens, Thomas Berg, René Dirven & Klaus-Uwe Panther (eds.), *Motivation in language:*

- Studies in honour of Günter Radden*, 49–68. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Croft, William. 2009. Syntax is more diverse, and evolutionary linguistics is already here. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 32(5). 457–458.
- Crysmann, Berthold. 2001. Clitics and coordination in linear structure. In Birgit Gerlach & Janet Grijzenhout (eds.), *Clitics in phonology, morphology and syntax* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 36), 121–159. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Crysmann, Berthold. 2002. *Constraint-based co-analysis: Portuguese cliticisation and morphology-syntax interaction in HPSG* (Saarbrücken Dissertations in Computational Linguistics and Language Technology 15). Saarbrücken: Deutsches Forschungszentrum für Künstliche Intelligenz und Universität des Saarlandes.
- Crysmann, Berthold. 2003. On the efficient implementation of German verb placement in HPSG. In *Proceedings of RANLP 2003*, 112–116. Borovets, Bulgaria.
- Crysmann, Berthold. 2004. Underspecification of intersective modifier attachment: Some arguments from German. In Müller (2004e) 378–392. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2004/>.
- Crysmann, Berthold. 2005a. An inflectional approach to Hausa final vowel shortening. In Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of morphology 2004*, 73–112. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Crysmann, Berthold. 2005b. Relative clause extraposition in German: An efficient and portable implementation. *Research on Language and Computation* 1(3). 61–82.
- Crysmann, Berthold. 2005c. Syncretism in German: A unified approach to underspecification, indeterminacy, and likeness of case. In Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, Department of Informatics, University of Lisbon*, 91–107. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2005/>.
- Crysmann, Berthold. 2008. An asymmetric theory of peripheral sharing in HPSG: Conjunction reduction and coordination of unlikes. In Jäger et al. (2008) 47–62.
- Crysmann, Berthold. 2009. Autosegmental representations in an HPSG of Hausa. In King & Santaholma (2009) 28–36. <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W/W09/#2600>.
- Crysmann, Berthold. 2011. A unified account of Hausa genitive constructions. In Philippe de Groote, Markus Egg & Laura Kallmeyer (eds.), *Formal Grammar: 14th International Conference, FG 2009, Bordeaux, France, July 25–26, 2009, revised selected papers* (Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence 5591), 102–117. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Crysmann, Berthold. 2012. HaG: A computational grammar of Hausa. In Michael R. Marlo, Nikki B. Adams, Christopher R. Green, Michelle Morrison & Tristan M. Purvis (eds.), *Selected proceedings of the 42nd Annual Conference on African Linguistics (ACAL 42)*, 321–337. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press. <http://www.lingref.com/cpp/acal/42/paper2780.pdf>.
- Culicover, Peter W. 1999. *Syntactic nuts: Hard cases, syntactic theory, and language acquisition*, vol. 1 (Foundations of Syntax). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Culicover, Peter W. & Ray S. Jackendoff. 2005. *Simpler Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Culy, Christopher. 1985. The complexity of the vocabulary of Bambara. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 8. 345–351.
- Curtiss, Susan. 1977. *Genie: A psycholinguistic study of a modern-day “wild child”*. New York: Academic Press.
- Dąbrowska, Ewa. 2001. From formula to schema: The acquisition of English questions. *Cognitive Linguistics* 11(1–2). 83–102.
- Dąbrowska, Ewa. 2004. *Language, mind and brain: Some psychological and neurological constraints on theories of grammar*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Dahl, Östen & Viveka Velupillai. 2013a. The past tense. In Dryer & Hespelmeth (2013). <http://wals.info/chapter/66>.
- Dahl, Östen & Viveka Velupillai. 2013b. Perfective/imperfective aspect. In Dryer & Hespelmeth (2013). <http://wals.info/chapter/65>.
- Dahlöf, Mats. 2002. Token dependency semantics and the paratactic analysis of intensional constructions. *Journal of Semantics* 19(4). 333–368.
- Dahlöf, Mats. 2003. Two reports on computational syntax and semantics. Reports from Uppsala University (RUUL) 36 Department of Linguistics. <http://stp.ling.uu.se/~matsd/pub/ruul36.pdf>.
- Dalrymple, Mary. 1993. *The syntax of anaphoric binding* (CSLI Lecture Notes 36). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Dalrymple, Mary (ed.). 1999. *Semantics and syntax in Lexical Functional Grammar: The Resource Logic approach*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Dalrymple, Mary. 2001. *Lexical Functional Grammar* (Syntax and Semantics 34). New York: Academic Press.
- Dalrymple, Mary. 2006. Lexical Functional Grammar. In Brown (2006) 82–94.
- Dalrymple, Mary, Ronald M. Kaplan & Tracy Holloway King. 2004. Linguistic generalizations over descriptions. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG 2004 conference*, 199–208. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/9/>.
- Dalrymple, Mary, Ronald M. Kaplan, John T. Maxwell III & Annie Zaenen (eds.). 1995. *Formal issues in Lexical-Functional Grammar* (CSLI Lecture Notes 47). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Dalrymple, Mary, John Lamping & Vijay Saraswat. 1993. LFG semantics via constraints. In Krauwer et al. (1993) 97–105. DOI:10.3115/976744.976757.
- Dalrymple, Mary, Maria Liakata & Lisa Mackie. 2006. Tokenization and morphological analysis for Malagasy. *Computational Linguistics and Chinese Language Processing* 11(4). 315–332.
- Dalrymple, Mary & Helge Lødrup. 2000. The grammatical functions of complement clauses. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG 2000 conference*, Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/5/lfg00dalrympl-lodrup.pdf>.
- Davidson, Donald. 1967. The logical form of action sentences. In Nicholas Rescher (ed.), *The logic of decision and action*, 81–95. Pittsburg: Pittsburg University Press.

- Davis, Anthony R. 1996. *Lexical semantics and linking in the hierarchical lexicon*: Stanford University dissertation.
- Davis, Anthony R. & Jean-Pierre Koenig. 2000. Linking as constraints on word classes in a hierarchical lexicon. *Language* 76(1). 56–91.
- De Kuthy, Kordula. 2000. *Discontinuous NPs in German — A case study of the interaction of syntax, semantics and pragmatics*. Saarbrücken: Universität des Saarlandes dissertation.
- De Kuthy, Kordula. 2001. Splitting PPs from NPs. In Meurers & Kiss (2001) 31–76.
- De Kuthy, Kordula. 2002. *Discontinuous NPs in German* (Studies in Constraint-Based Lexicalism 14). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- De Kuthy, Kordula, Vanessa Metcalf & Walt Detmar Meurers. 2004. Documentation of the implementation of the Milca English Resource Grammar in the Trale system. Ohio State University, ms.
- De Kuthy, Kordula & Walt Detmar Meurers. 2001. On partial constituent fronting in German. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 3(3). 143–205.
- De Kuthy, Kordula & Walt Detmar Meurers. 2003a. Dealing with optional complements in HPSG-based grammar implementations. In Müller (2003c) 88–96. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2003/>.
- De Kuthy, Kordula & Walt Detmar Meurers. 2003b. The secret life of focus exponents, and what it tells us about fronted verbal projections. In Müller (2003c) 97–110. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2003/>.
- de Saussure, Ferdinand. 1916a. *Cours de linguistique générale* (Bibliothèque Scientifique Payot). Paris: Payot. Edited by Charles Bally and Albert Sechehaye.
- de Saussure, Ferdinand. 1916b. *Grundfragen der allgemeinen Sprachwissenschaft*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co. 2nd edition 1967.
- Dehé, Nicole, Ray S. Jackendoff, Andrew McIntyre & Silke Urban (eds.). 2002. *Verb-particle explorations* (Interface Explorations 1). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Delmonte, Rodolfo. 1990. Semantic parsing with an LFG-based lexicon and conceptual representations. *Computers and the Humanities* 24(5–6). 461–488.
- Demberg, Vera & Frank Keller. 2008. A psycholinguistically motivated version of TAG. In *Proceedings of the 9th International Workshop on Tree Adjoining Grammars and Related Formalisms TAG+9*, 25–32. Tübingen.
- Demske, Ulrike. 2001. *Merkmale und Relationen: Diachrone Studien zur Nominalphrase des Deutschen* (Studia Linguistica Germanica 56). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter Verlag.
- den Besten, Hans. 1983. On the interaction of root transformations and lexical deletive rules. In Werner Abraham (ed.), *On the formal syntax of the Westgermania: Papers from the 3rd Groningen Grammar Talks, Groningen, January 1981* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 3), 47–131. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- den Besten, Hans. 1985. Some remarks on the Ergative Hypothesis. In Abraham (1985) 53–74.
- Deppermann, Arnulf. 2006. Construction Grammar – eine Grammatik für die Interaktion? In Arnulf Deppermann, Reinhard Fiehler & Thomas Spranz-Fogasy (eds.), *Grammatik und Interaktion*, 43–65. Radolfzell: Verlag für Gesprächsforschung.

- Derbyshire, Desmond C. 1979. *Hixkaryana* (Lingua Descriptive Series 1). Amsterdam: North Holland.
- Devlin, Keith. 1992. *Logic and information*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dhonnchadha, E. Uí & Josef van Genabith. 2006. A part-of-speech tagger for Irish using finite-state morphology and Constraint Grammar disambiguation. In *Proceedings of Irec'06*, 2241–2244.
- Diesing, Molly. 1992. *Indefinites*. Cambridge, MA/London, England: MIT Press.
- Dione, Cheikh Mouhamadou Bamba. 2013. Handling Wolof Clitics in LFG. In Christine Meklenborg Salvesen & Hans Petter Helland (eds.), *Challenging clitics* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 206), 87–118. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Dione, Cheikh Mouhamadou Bamba. 2014. An LFG approach to Wolof cleft constructions. In Butt & King (2014) 157–176.
- Dipper, Stefanie. 2003. *Implementing and documenting large-scale grammars – German LFG*: IMS, University of Stuttgart dissertation. Arbeitspapiere des Instituts für Maschinelle Sprachverarbeitung (AIMS), Volume 9, Number 1.
- Donati, C. 2006. On *wh*-head-movement. In Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng & Norbert Corver (eds.), *Wh-movement: Moving on* (Current Studies in Linguistics 42), 21–46. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Donohue, Cathryn & Ivan A. Sag. 1999. Domains in Warlpiri. In *Sixth International Conference on HPSG–Abstracts. 04–06 August 1999*, 101–106. Edinburgh.
- Doran, Christine, Beth Ann Hockey, Anoop Sarkar, Bangalore Srinivas & Fei Xia. 2000. Evolution of the XTAG system. In Abeillé & Rambow (2000b) 371–403.
- Dörre, Jochen & Michael Dorna. 1993. CUF: A formalism for linguistic knowledge representation. DYANA 2 deliverable R.1.2A IMS Stuttgart, Germany.
- Dörre, Jochen & Roland Seiffert. 1991. A formalism for natural language – STUF. In Herzog & Rollinger (1991) 29–38.
- Dowty, David. 1997. Non-constituent coordination, wrapping, and Multimodal Categorical Grammars: Syntactic form as logical form. In Maria Luisa Dalla Chiara, Kees Doets, Daniele Mundici & Johan Van Benthem (eds.), *Structures and norms in science* (Synthese Library 260), 347–368. Springer.
- Dowty, David R. 1978. Governed transformations as lexical rules in a Montague Grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9(3). 393–426.
- Dowty, David R. 1979. *Word meaning and Montague Grammar* (Synthese Language Library 7). Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Dowty, David R. 1988. Type raising, functional composition, and nonconstituent coordination. In Oehrle et al. (1988) 153–198.
- Dowty, David R. 1989. On the semantic content of the notion ‘thematic role’. In Gennaro Chierchia, Barbara H. Partee & Raymond Turner (eds.), *Properties, types and meaning*, vol. 2 (Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy), 69–130. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Dowty, David R. 1991. Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language* 67(3). 547–619.

参考文献

- Dowty, David R. 2003. The dual analysis of adjuncts and complements in Categorical Grammar. In Lang et al. (2003) 33–66.
- Dowty, David R., Lauri Karttunen & Arnold M. Zwicky (eds.). 1985. *Natural language processing*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Dras, Mark, François Lareau, Benjamin Börschinger, Robert Dale, Yasaman Motazedi, Owen Rambow, Myfany Turpin & Morgan Ulinski. 2012. Complex predicates in Arernte. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG 2012 conference*, 177–197. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Drellishak, Scott. 2009. *Widespread but not universal: Improving the typological coverage of the Grammar Matrix*. University of Washington Doctoral dissertation.
- Drosdowski, Günther. 1984. *Duden: Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*, vol. 4. Mannheim, Wien, Zürich: Dudenverlag 4th edn.
- Drosdowski, Günther. 1995. *Duden: Die Grammatik*, vol. 4. Mannheim, Leipzig, Wien, Zürich: Dudenverlag 5th edn.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 1992. The Greenbergian word order correlations. *Language* 68(1). 81–138.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 1997. Are grammatical relations universal? In Joan Bybee, John Haiman & Sandra Thompson (eds.), *Essays on language function and language type: Dedicated to T. Givon*, 115–143. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2013a. Order of adposition and noun phrase. In Dryer & Haspelmath (2013). <http://wals.info/chapter/85>.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2013b. Order of object and verb. In Dryer & Haspelmath (2013). <http://wals.info/chapter/83>.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2013c. Order of subject, object and verb. In Dryer & Haspelmath (2013). <http://wals.info/chapter/81>.
- Dryer, Matthew S. & Martin Haspelmath (eds.). 2013. *The world atlas of language structures online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. <http://wals.info/>.
- Dürscheid, Christa. 1989. *Zur Vorfelddbesetzung in deutschen Verbzweit-Strukturen* (FOKUS 1). Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag.
- Dyvik, Helge, Paul Meurer & Victoria Rosén. 2005. LFG, Minimal Recursion Semantics and translation. Paper presented at the LFG conference 2005.
- Egg, Markus. 1999. Derivation and resolution of ambiguities in *wieder*-sentences. In Paul J. E. Dekker (ed.), *Proceedings of the 12th Amsterdam Colloquium*, 109–114.
- Eisele, Andreas & Jochen Dorre. 1986. A Lexical Functional Grammar system in Prolog. In Nagao (1986) 551–553.
- Eisenberg, Peter. 1992. Platos Problem und die Lernbarkeit der Syntax. In Suchsland (1992) 371–378.
- Eisenberg, Peter. 1994a. German. In Ekkehard König & Johan van der Auwera (eds.), *The Germanic languages* (Routledge Language Family Descriptions), 349–387. London / New York: Routledge.
- Eisenberg, Peter. 1994b. *Grundriß der deutschen Grammatik*. Stuttgart, Weimar: Verlag J. B. Metzler 3rd edn.

- Eisenberg, Peter. 2004. *Grundriß der deutschen Grammatik*, vol. 2. Der Satz. Stuttgart, Weimar: Verlag J. B. Metzler 2nd edn.
- Eisenberg, Peter, Jörg Peters, Peter Gallmann, Cathrine Fabricius-Hansen, Damaris Nübling, Irmhild Barz, Thomas A. Fritz & Reinhard Fiehler. 2005. *Duden: Die Grammatik*, vol. 4. Mannheim, Leipzig, Wien, Zürich: Dudenverlag 7th edn.
- Ellefson, Michelle R. & Morten Christiansen. 2000. Subjacency constraints without Universal Grammar: Evidence from artificial language learning and connectionist modeling. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*, 645–650. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Elman, Jeffrey L. 1993. Learning and development in neural networks: The importance of starting small. *Cognition* 48(1). 71–99.
- Elman, Jeffrey L., Elizabeth A. Bates, Mark H. Johnson, Annette Karmiloff-Smith, Domenico Parisi & Kim Plunkett. 1996. *Rethinking innateness: A connectionist perspective on development*. Cambridge, MA: Bradford Books/MIT Press.
- Embick, David. 2004. On the structure of resultative participles in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35(3). 355–392.
- Emirkanian, Louisette, Lyne Da Sylva & Lorne H. Bouchard. 1996. The implementation of a computational grammar of French using the Grammar Development Environment. In Tsuji (1996) 1024–1027.
- Engdahl, Elisabet & Enric Vallduví. 1996. Information packaging in HPSG. In Claire Grover & Enric Vallduví (eds.), *Edinburgh Working Papers in Cognitive Science*, vol. 12: *Studies in HPSG*, chap. 1, 1–32. Scotland: Centre for Cognitive Science, University of Edinburgh. <ftp://ftp.cogsci.ed.ac.uk/pub/CCS-WPs/wp-12.ps.gz>.
- Engel, Ulrich. 1970. Regeln zur Wortstellung. Forschungsberichte des Instituts für deutsche Sprache 5 Institut für deutsche Sprache Mannheim.
- Engel, Ulrich. 1977. *Syntax der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*, vol. 22 (Grundlagen der Germanistik). Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag.
- Engel, Ulrich. 1996. Tesnière mißverstanden. In Gertrud Gréciano & Helmut Schumacher (eds.), *Lucien Tesnière – Syntaxe Structurale et Opérations Mentales. Akten des deutsch-französischen Kolloquiums anlässlich der 100. Wiederkehr seines Geburtstages. Strasbourg 1993* (Linguistische Arbeiten 348), 53–61. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Engel, Ulrich. 2014. Die dependenzielle Verbgrammatik (DVG). In Hagemann & Staffeldt (2014) 43–62.
- Engelberg, Stefan, Anke Holler & Kristel Proost (eds.). 2011. *Sprachliches Wissen zwischen Lexikon und Grammatik* (Institut für Deutsche Sprache, Jahrbuch 2010). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Erbach, Gregor. 1995. ProFIT: Prolog with features, inheritance and templates. In Abney & Hinrichs (1995) 180–187.
- Ernst, Thomas. 1992. The phrase structure of English negation. *The Linguistic Review* 9(2). 109–144.
- Eroms, Hans-Werner. 1985. Eine reine Dependenzgrammatik für das Deutsche. *Deutsche Sprache* 13. 306–326.

参考文献

- Eroms, Hans-Werner. 1987. Passiv und Passivfunktionen im Rahmen einer Dependenzgrammatik. In Centre de Recherche en Linguistique Germanique (Nice) (ed.), *Das Passiv im Deutschen* (Linguistische Arbeiten 183), 73–95. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Eroms, Hans-Werner. 2000. *Syntax der deutschen Sprache* (de Gruyter Studienbuch). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter Verlag.
- Eroms, Hans-Werner & Hans Jürgen Heringer. 2003. Dependenz und lineare Ordnung. In Ágel et al. (2003b) 247–263.
- Eroms, Hans-Werner, Gerhard Stickel & Gisela Zifonun (eds.). 1997. *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*, vol. 7 (Schriften des Instituts für deutsche Sprache). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 1973. *On the nature of island constraints*. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation.
- Erteschik-Shir, Nomi. 1981. More on extractability from quasi-NPs. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12(4). 665–670.
- Erteschik-Shir, Nomi & Shalom Lappin. 1979. Dominance and the functional explanation of island phenomena. *Theoretical Linguistics* 6(1–3). 41–86.
- Estigarribia, Bruno. 2009. Facilitation by variation: Right-to-left learning of English yes/no questions. *Cognitive Science* 34(1). 68–93.
- Evans, Nicholas & Stephen C. Levinson. 2009a. The myth of language universals: Language diversity and its importance for cognitive science. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 32(5). 429–448.
- Evans, Nicholas & Stephen C. Levinson. 2009b. With diversity in mind: Freeing the language sciences from Universal Grammar. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 32(5). 472–492.
- Evans, Roger. 1985. ProGram: A development tool for GPSG grammars. *Linguistics* 23(2). 213–244.
- Everett, Daniel L. 2005. Cultural constraints on grammar and cognition in Pirahã. *Current Anthropology* 46(4). 621–646.
- Everett, Daniel L. 2009. Pirahã culture and grammar: A response to some criticisms. *Language* 85(2). 405–442.
- Evers, Arnold. 1975. *The transformational cycle in Dutch and German*: University of Utrecht dissertation.
- Faaß, Gertrud. 2010. *A morphosyntactic description of Northern Sotho as a basis for an automated translation from Northern Sotho into English*. Pretoria, South Africa: University of Pretoria dissertation. <http://hdl.handle.net/2263/28569>.
- Fabregas, Antonio, Tom Stroik & Michael Putnam. 2016. Is simplest merge too simple? Ms. Penn State University.
- Falk, Yehuda N. 1984. The English auxiliary system: A Lexical-Functional analysis. *Language* 60(3). 483–509.
- Fan, Zhenzhen, Sanghoun Song & Francis Bond. 2015. An HPSG-based shared-grammar for the Chinese languages: ZHONG []. In Emily M. Bender, Lori Levin, Stefan Müller, Yannick Parmentier & Aarne Ranta (eds.), *Proceedings of the Grammar Engineering*

- Across Frameworks (GEAF) Workshop*, 17–24. The Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fang, Ji & Tracy Holloway King. 2007. An LFG Chinese grammar for machine use. In King & Bender (2007) 144–160. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/GEAF/2007/>.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 1981. *Zur Syntax und Semantik der Nominalkomposition* (Linguistische Arbeiten 107). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 1987. *Konfiguralität* (Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 29). Tübingen: originally Gunter Narr Verlag now Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 1988. Aufspaltung von NPn und das Problem der ‚freien‘ Wortstellung. *Linguistische Berichte* 114. 91–113.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 1990. Scrambling as NP-movement. In Grewendorf & Sternefeld (1990) 113–140.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 1992a. „Ergative“ Verben und die Struktur des deutschen Mittelfelds. In Ludger Hoffmann (ed.), *Deutsche Syntax: Ansichten und Aussichten* (Institut für deutsche Sprache, Jahrbuch 1991), 276–303. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 1992b. Zur biologischen Autonomie der Grammatik. In Suchsland (1992) 335–356.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 1993. Die Rückkehr der Basisgenerierer. *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik* 36. 1–74.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 2000a. Does constituent length predict German word order in the Middle Field? In Josef Bayer & Christine Römer (eds.), *Von der Philologie zur Grammatiktheorie: Peter Suchsland zum 65. Geburtstag*, 63–77. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 2000b. Optimal exceptions. In Barbara Stiebels & Dieter Wunderlich (eds.), *The lexicon in focus* (studia grammatica 45), 173–209. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 2001. Features, θ -roles, and free constituent order. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32(3). 405–437.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 2002. Against remnant VP-movement. In Artemis Alexiadou, Elena Anagnostopoulou, Sjef Barbiers & Hans-Martin Gärtner (eds.), *Dimensions of movement: From features to remnants* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 48), 91–127. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 2003a. Free constituent order: A Minimalist interface account. *Folia Linguistica* 37(1–2). 191–231.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 2003b. Münchhausen-style head movement and the analysis of verb second. In Anoop Mahajan (ed.), *Proceedings of the workshop on head movement* (UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics 10), Los Angeles: UCLA, Linguistics Department.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 2003c. Zur Generierung der Abfolge der Satzglieder im Deutschen. *Neue Beiträge zur Germanistik* 112. 3–47.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 2004a. Cyclic phonology-syntax-interaction: PPT Movement in German (and other languages). In Shinichiro Ishihara, Michaela Schmitz & Anne Schwarz (eds.), *Interdisciplinary studies on information structure* (Working Papers of the SFB 632 1), 1–42. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 2004b. Fakten, Fakten, Fakten! *Linguistische Berichte* 200. 481–493.

- Fanselow, Gisbert. 2004c. Münchhausen-style head movement and the analysis of verb second. In Ralf Vogel (ed.), *Three papers on German verb movement* (Linguistics in Potsdam 22), 9–49. Universität Potsdam.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 2006. On pure syntax (uncontaminated by information structure). In Patrick Brandt & Eric Fuss (eds.), *Form, structure and grammar: A festschrift presented to Günther Grewendorf on occasion of his 60th birthday* (Studia grammatica 63), 137–157. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Fanselow, Gisbert. 2009. Die (generative) Syntax in den Zeiten der Empiriediskussion. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 28(1). 133–139.
- Fanselow, Gisbert & Sascha W. Felix. 1987. *Sprachtheorie 2. Die Rektions- und Bindungstheorie* (UTB für Wissenschaft: Uni-Taschenbücher 1442). Tübingen: A. Francke Verlag GmbH.
- Fanselow, Gisbert & Sascha W. Felix (eds.). 1990. *Strukturen und Merkmale syntaktischer Kategorien* (Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 39). Tübingen: originally Gunter Narr Verlag now Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Fanselow, Gisbert, Matthias Schlesewsky, Damir Cavar & Reinhold Kliegl. 1999. Optimal parsing, syntactic parsing preferences, and Optimality Theory. Rutgers Optimality Archive (ROA) 367 Universität Potsdam. <http://roa.rutgers.edu/view.php3?roa=367>.
- Feldhaus, Anke. 1997. Eine HPSG-Analyse ausgewählter Phänomene des deutschen *w*-Fragesatzes. Working Papers of the Institute for Logic and Linguistics 27 Institute for Logic and Linguistics IBM Scientific Center Heidelberg.
- Feldman, Jerome. 1972. Some decidability results on grammatical inference and complexity. *Information and Control* 20(3). 244–262.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1968. The case for case. In Emmon Bach & Robert T. Harms (eds.), *Universals of linguistic theory*, 1–88. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1971. Plädoyer für Kasus. In Werner Abraham (ed.), *Kasustheorie* (Schwerpunkte Linguistik und Kommunikationswissenschaft 2), 1–118. Frankfurt/Main: Athenäum.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1988. The mechanisms of “Construction Grammar”. In Shelley Axmaker, Annie Jaissner & Helen Singmaster (eds.), *Proceedings of the 14th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 35–55. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1999. Inversion and Constructional inheritance. In Webelhuth et al. (1999) 113–128.
- Fillmore, Charles J., Paul Kay & Mary Catherine O’Connor. 1988. Regularity and idiomatcity in grammatical constructions: The case of *let alone*. *Language* 64(3). 501–538.
- Fillmore, Charles J., Russell R. Lee-Goldmann & Russell Rhomieux. 2012. The FrameNet constructicon. In Boas & Sag (2012) 309–372.
- Fischer, Ingrid & Martina Keil. 1996. Parsing decomposable idioms. In Tsuji (1996) 388–393.
- Fischer, Kerstin & Anatol Stefanowitsch (eds.). 2006. *Konstruktionsgrammatik: Von der Anwendung zur Theorie* (Stauffenburg Linguistik 40). Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.

- Fisher, Simon E. & Gary F. Marcus. 2005. The eloquent ape: Genes, brains and the evolution of language. *Nature Reviews Genetics* 7(1). 9–20.
- Fisher, Simon E., Faraneh Vargha-Khadem, Kate E. Watkins, Anthony P. Monaco & Marcus E. Pembrey. 1998. Localisation of a gene implicated in a severe speech and language disorder. *Nature Genetics* 18(2). 168–170.
- Fitch, W. Tecumseh. 2010. Three meanings of “recursion”: Key distinctions for biolinguistics. In Richard K. Larson, Viviane Déprez & Hiroko Yamakido (eds.), *The evolution of human language: Biolinguistic perspectives* (Approaches to the Evolution of Language 2), 73–90. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Fitch, W. Tecumseh, Marc D. Hauser & Noam Chomsky. 2005. The evolution of the language faculty: Clarifications and implications. *Cognition* 97(2). 179–210.
- Flickinger, Daniel P. 1983. Lexical heads and phrasal gaps. In *Proceedings of the West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, vol. 2, Stanford University Linguistics Dept.
- Flickinger, Daniel P. 1987. *Lexical rules in the hierarchical lexicon*: Stanford University dissertation.
- Flickinger, Daniel P. 2000. On building a more efficient grammar by exploiting types. *Natural Language Engineering* 6(1). 15–28.
- Flickinger, Daniel P. 2008. Transparent heads. In Müller (2008b) 87–94. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2008/abstr-flickinger.shtml>.
- Flickinger, Daniel P. & Emily M. Bender. 2003. Compositional semantics in a multilingual grammar resource. In Bender et al. (2003) 33–42.
- Flickinger, Daniel P., Ann Copestake & Ivan A. Sag. 2000. HPSG analysis of English. In Wahlster (2000b) 254–263.
- Flickinger, Daniel P., Carl J. Pollard & Thomas Wasow. 1985. Structure-sharing in lexical representation. In William C. Mann (ed.), *Proceedings of the Twenty-Third Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 262–267. Chicago, IL: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Fodor, Janet Dean. 1998a. Parsing to learn. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 27(3). 339–374.
- Fodor, Janet Dean. 1998b. Unambiguous triggers. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29(1). 1–36.
- Fodor, Janet Dean. 2001. Parameters and the periphery: Reflections on syntactic nuts. *Journal of Linguistics* 37. 367–392.
- Fodor, Jerry A., Thomas G. Bever & Merrill F. Garrett. 1974. *The psychology of language: An introduction to psycholinguistics and Generative Grammar*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Fodor, Jerry A. & Jerrold J. Katz (eds.). 1964. *The structure of language*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Fokkens, Antske. 2011. Metagrammar engineering: Towards systematic exploration of implemented grammars. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, 1066–1076. Portland, Oregon, USA: Association for Computational Linguistics. <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P11-1107>.

- Fokkens, Antske, Laurie Poulson & Emily M. Bender. 2009. Inflectional morphology in Turkish VP coordination. In Müller (2009d) 110–130.
- Fong, Sandiway. 1991. *Computational properties of principle-based grammatical theories*: MIT Artificial Intelligence Lab dissertation.
- Fong, Sandiway. 2014. Unification and efficient computation in the Minimalist Program. In L. Francis & L. Laurent (eds.), *Language and recursion*, 129–138. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Fong, Sandiway & Jason Ginsburg. 2012. Computation with doubling constituents: Pronouns and antecedents in Phase Theory. In Anna Maria Di Sciullo (ed.), *Towards a Biolinguistic understanding of grammar: Essays on interfaces* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 194), 303–338. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Fordham, Andrew & Matthew Walter Crocker. 1994. Parsing with principles and probabilities. In Judith L. Klavans Philip Resnik (ed.), *The balancing act: Combining symbolic and statistical approaches to language*, Las Cruces, New Mexico, USA: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Forst, Martin. 2006. COMP in (parallel) grammar writing. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG 2006 conference*, Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/11/lfg06forst.pdf>.
- Forst, Martin & Christian Rohrer. 2009. Problems of German VP coordination. In Butt & King (2009) 297–316. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/14/>.
- Fortmann, Christian. 1996. *Konstituentenbewegung in der DP-Struktur: Zur funktionalen Analyse der Nominalphrase im Deutschen* (Linguistische Arbeiten 347). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Fourquet, Jean. 1957. Review of: Heinz Anstock: Deutsche Syntax – Lehr- und Übungsbuch. *Wirkendes Wort* 8. 120–122.
- Fourquet, Jean. 1970. *Prolegomena zu einer deutschen Grammatik* (Sprache der Gegenwart – Schriften des Instituts für deutsche Sprache in Mannheim 7). Düsseldorf: Pädagogischer Verlag Schwann.
- Fouvry, Frederik. 2003. Lexicon acquisition with a large-coverage unification-based grammar. In *Proceedings of EACL 03, 10th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics, research notes and demos, April 12–17, 2003, Budapest, Hungary*, 87–90.
- Fraj, Fériel Ben, Chiraz Zribi & Mohamed Ben Ahmed. 2008. ArabTAG: A Tree Adjoining Grammar for Arabic syntactic structures. In *Proceedings of the International Arab Conference on Information Technology*, Sfax, Tunisia.
- Francis, Elaine J. & Laura A. Michaelis (eds.). 2003. *Mismatch: Form-function incongruity and the architecture of grammar* (CSLI Lecture Notes 163). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Frank, Anette. 1994. Verb second by lexical rule or by underspecification. Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340 No. 43 IBM Deutschland GmbH Heidelberg. <ftp://ftp.ims.uni-stuttgart.de/pub/papers/anette/v2-usp.ps.gz>.
- Frank, Anette. 1996. Eine LFG-Grammatik des Französischen. In Berman & Frank (1996) 97–244.

- Frank, Anette. 2006. (Discourse-) functional analysis of asymmetric coordination. In Miriam Butt, Mary Dalrymple & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Intelligent linguistic architectures: Variations on themes by Ronald M. Kaplan*, 259–285. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Frank, Anette & Uwe Reyle. 1995. Principle based semantics for HPSG. In Abney & Hinrichs (1995) 9–16.
- Frank, Anette & Annie Zaenen. 2002. Tense in LFG: Syntax and morphology. In Hans Kamp & Uwe Reyle (eds.), *How we say when it happens: Contributions to the theory of temporal reference in natural language*, 17–52. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. Reprint as: Frank & Zaenen (2004).
- Frank, Anette & Annie Zaenen. 2004. Tense in LFG: Syntax and morphology. In Louisa Sadler & Andrew Spencer (eds.), *Projecting morphology*, 23–66. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Frank, Robert. 2002. *Phrase structure composition and syntactic dependencies* (Current Studies in Linguistics 38). Cambridge, MA/London: MIT Press.
- Franks, Steven. 1995. *Parameters in Slavic morphosyntax*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Frazier, Lyn. 1985. Syntactic complexity. In Dowty et al. (1985) 129–189.
- Frazier, Lyn & Charles Clifton. 1996. *Construal*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Freidin, Robert. 1975. The analysis of passives. *Language* 51(2). 384–405.
- Freidin, Robert. 1997. Review article: The Minimalist Program. *Language* 73(3). 571–582.
- Freidin, Robert. 2009. A note on methodology in linguistics. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 32(5). 454–455.
- Freudenthal, Daniel, Julian M. Pine, Javier Aguado-Orea & Fernand Gobet. 2007. Modeling the developmental patterning of finiteness marking in English, Dutch, German, and Spanish using MOSAIC. *Cognitive Science* 31(2). 311–341.
- Freudenthal, Daniel, Julian M. Pine & Fernand Gobet. 2006. Modeling the development of children’s use of optional infinitives in Dutch and English using MOSAIC. *Cognitive Science* 30(2). 277–310.
- Freudenthal, Daniel, Julian M. Pine & Fernand Gobet. 2009. Simulating the referential properties of Dutch, German, and English root infinitives in MOSAIC. *Language Learning and Development* 5(1). 1–29.
- Frey, Werner. 1993. *Syntaktische Bedingungen für die semantische Interpretation: Über Bindung, implizite Argumente und Skopus* (studia grammatica 35). Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Frey, Werner. 2000. Über die syntaktische Position der Satztopiks im Deutschen. In Ewald Lang, Marzena Rochon, Kerstin Schwabe & Oliver Teuber (eds.), *Issues on topics* (ZAS Papers in Linguistics 20), 137–172. Berlin: ZAS, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.
- Frey, Werner. 2001. About the whereabouts of indefinites. *Theoretical Linguistics* 27(2/3). 137–161. DOI:10.1515/thli.2001.27.2-3.137. Special Issue: NP Interpretation and Information Structure, Edited by Klaus von Heusinger and Kerstin Schwabe.

参考文献

- Frey, Werner. 2004a. The grammar-pragmatics interface and the German prefield. *Forschungsprogramm Sprache und Pragmatik* 52 Germanistisches Institut der Universität Lund.
- Frey, Werner. 2004b. A medial topic position for German. *Linguistische Berichte* 198. 153–190.
- Frey, Werner. 2005. Pragmatic properties of certain German and English left peripheral constructions. *Linguistics* 43(1). 89–129.
- Frey, Werner & Hans-Martin Gärtner. 2002. On the treatment of scrambling and adjunction in Minimalist Grammars. In Jäger et al. (2002) 41–52.
- Frey, Werner & Uwe Reyle. 1983a. Lexical Functional Grammar und Diskursrepräsentationstheorie als Grundlagen eines sprachverarbeitenden Systems. *Linguistische Berichte* 88. 79–100.
- Frey, Werner & Uwe Reyle. 1983b. A Prolog implementation of Lexical Functional Grammar as a base for a natural language processing system. In Antonio Zampolli (ed.), *First Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Proceedings of the conference*, 52–57. Pisa, Italy: Association for Computational Linguistics. <http://aclweb.org/anthology/E/E83/>.
- Fried, Mirjam. 2013. Principles of constructional change. In Hoffmann & Trousdale (2013) 419–437.
- Fried, Mirjam. 2015. Construction Grammar. In Kiss & Alexiadou (2015) 974–1003.
- Friederici, Angela D. 2009. Pathways to language: Fiber tracts in the human brain. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 13(4). 175–181.
- Friedman, Joyce. 1969. Applications of a computer system for Transformational Grammar. In Research Group for Quantitative Linguistics (ed.), *Proceedings of COLING 69*, 1–27.
- Friedman, Joyce, Thomas H. Bredt, Robert W. Doran, Bary W. Pollack & Theodore S. Martner. 1971. *A computer model of Transformational Grammar* (Mathematical Linguistics and Automatic Language Processing 9). New York: Elsevier.
- Fries, Norbert. 1988. Über das Null-Topik im Deutschen. *Forschungsprogramm Sprache und Pragmatik* 3 Germanistisches Institut der Universität Lund.
- Fukui, Naoki & Margaret Speas. 1986. Specifiers and projection. In N. Fukui, T. R. Rapoport & E. Sagey (eds.), *Papers in theoretical linguistics* (MIT Working Papers 8), 128–172. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Gaifman, Haim. 1965. Dependency systems and phrase-structure systems. *Information and Control* 8. 304–397.
- Gardner, R. Allen. 1957. Probability-learning with two and three choices. *The American Journal of Psychology* 70(2). 174–185.
- Gärtner, Hans-Martin & Jens Michaelis. 2007. Some remarks on locality conditions and Minimalist Grammars. In Sauerland & Gärtner (2007) 161–195.
- Gärtner, Hans-Martin & Markus Steinbach. 1997. Anmerkungen zur Vorfeldphobie pronominaler Elemente. In Franz-Josef d’Avis & Uli Lutz (eds.), *Zur Satzstruktur im Deutschen* (Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340 No. 90), 1–30. Tübingen: Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen.

- Gazdar, Gerald. 1981a. On syntactic categories. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences* 295(1077). 267–283.
- Gazdar, Gerald. 1981b. 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*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Gazdar, Gerald, Geoffrey K. Pullum, Bob Carpenter, Ewan Klein, Thomas E. Hukari & Robert D. Levine. 1988. Category structures. *Computational Linguistics* 14(1). 1–19.
- Geach, Peter Thomas. 1970. A program for syntax. *Synthese* 22. 3–17.
- Geißler, Stefan & Tibor Kiss. 1994. Erläuterungen zur Umsetzung einer HPSG im Basis-formalismus STUF III. Tech. Rep. 19 IBM Informationssysteme GmbH – Institut für Logik und Linguistik (Verbundvorhaben Verbmobil) Heidelberg.
- Gerdes, Kim. 2002a. DTAG? In *Proceedings of the Sixth International Workshop on Tree Adjoining Grammar and Related Frameworks (TAG+6)*, 242–251. Università di Venezia.
- Gerdes, Kim. 2002b. *Topologie et grammaires formelles de l'allemand*: Ecole doctorale Science du langage, UFR de linguistique, Université Paris 7 dissertation.
- Gerdes, Kim & Sylvain Kahane. 2001. Word order in German: A formal Dependency Grammar using a topological hierarchy. In *Proceedings of the 39th Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics*, 220–227. Stroudsburg, PA, USA: Association for Computational Linguistics. DOI:10.3115/1073012.1073041.
- Gerken, LouAnn. 1991. The metrical basis for children's subjectless sentences. *Journal of Memory and Language* 30. 431–451.
- Gibson, Edward. 1998. Linguistic complexity: Locality of syntactic dependencies. *Cognition* 68(1). 1–76.
- Gibson, Edward & James Thomas. 1999. Memory limitations and structural forgetting: The perception of complex ungrammatical sentences as grammatical. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 14(3). 225–248.
- Gibson, Edward & Kenneth Wexler. 1994. Triggers. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25(3). 407–454.
- Ginzburg, Jonathan & Ivan A. Sag. 2000. *Interrogative investigations: The form, meaning, and use of English interrogatives* (CSLI Lecture Notes 123). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Gold, Mark E. 1967. Language identification in the limit. *Information and Control* 10(5). 447–474.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar approach to argument structure* (Cognitive Theory of Language and Culture). Chicago/London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 2003a. Constructions: A new theoretical approach to language. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 7(5). 219–224.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 2003b. Words by default: The Persian Complex Predicate Construction. In Francis & Michaelis (2003) 117–146.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 2006. *Constructions at work: The nature of generalization in language* (Oxford Linguistics). Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press.

- Goldberg, Adele E. 2009. Constructions work. [response]. *Cognitive Linguistics* 20(1). 201–224.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 2013a. Argument structure Constructions vs. lexical rules or derivational verb templates. *Mind and Language* 28(4). 435–465.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 2013b. Explanation and Constructions: Response to Adger. *Mind and Language* 28(4). 479–491.
- Goldberg, Adele E. 2014. Fitting a slim dime between the verb template and argument structure construction approaches. *Theoretical Linguistics* 40(1–2). 113–135.
- Goldberg, Adele E., Devin Casenhiser & Nitya Sethuraman. 2004. Learning argument structure generalizations. *Cognitive Linguistics* 15(3). 289–316.
- Goldberg, Adele E. & Ray S. Jackendoff. 2004. The English resultative as a family of Constructions. *Language* 80(3). 532–568.
- Gopnik, Myrna & Martha B. Cargo. 1991. Familial aggregation of a developmental language disorder. *Cognition* 39(1). 1–50.
- Gordon, Peter. 1986. Level ordering in lexical development. *Cognition* 21(2). 73–93.
- Gosch, Angela, Gabriele Ståding & Rainer Pankau. 1994. Linguistic abilities in children with Williams-Beuren Syndrome. *American Journal of Medical Genetics* 52(3). 291–296.
- Götz, Thilo, Walt Detmar Meurers & Dale Gerdemann. 1997. The ConTroll manual: (ConTroll v.1.0 beta, XTroll v.5.0 beta). User's manual Seminar für Sprachwissenschaft Universität Tübingen. <http://www.sfs.uni-tuebingen.de/control/code.html>.
- Grebe, Paul & Helmut Gipper. 1966. *Duden: Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*, vol. 4. Mannheim, Wien, Zürich: Dudenverlag 2nd edn.
- Green, Georgia M. 2011. Modelling grammar growth: Universal Grammar without innate principles or parameters. In Borsley & Börjars (2011) 378–403.
- Grewendorf, Günther. 1983. Reflexivierungen in deutschen A.c.I.-Konstruktionen – kein transformationsgrammatisches Dilemma mehr. *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik* 23. 120–196.
- Grewendorf, Günther. 1985. Anaphern bei Objekt-Koreferenz im Deutschen: Ein Problem für die Rektions-Bindungs-Theorie. In Abraham (1985) 137–171.
- Grewendorf, Günther. 1987. Kohärenz und Restrukturierung: Zu verbalen Komplexen im Deutschen. In Brigitte Asbach-Schnitker & Johannes Roggenhofer (eds.), *Neuere Forschungen zur Wortbildung und Historiographie: Festgabe für Herbert E. Brekle zum 50. Geburtstag* (Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik 284), 123–144. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Grewendorf, Günther. 1988. *Aspekte der deutschen Syntax: Eine Rektions-Bindungs-Analyse* (Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 33). Tübingen: originally Gunter Narr Verlag now Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Grewendorf, Günther. 1989. *Ergativity in German* (Studies in Generative Grammar 35). Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Grewendorf, Günther. 1993. German: A grammatical sketch. In Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld & Theo Vennemann (eds.), *Syntax – Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung*, vol. 9.2 (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft), 1288–1319. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter Verlag.

- Grewendorf, Günther. 2002. *Minimalistische Syntax* (UTB für Wissenschaft: Uni-Taschenbücher 2313). Tübingen, Basel: A. Francke Verlag GmbH.
- Grewendorf, Günther & Wolfgang Sternefeld (eds.). 1990. *Scrambling and barriers* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 5). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Grewendorf, Günther. 2009. The left clausal periphery: Clitic left dislocation in Italian and left dislocation in German. In Benjamin Shear, Philippa Helen Cook, Werner Frey & Claudia Maienborn (eds.), *Dislocated elements in discourse: Syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic perspectives* (Routledge Studies in Germanic Linguistics), 49–94. New York: Routledge.
- Grimshaw, Jane. 1986. Subadjacency and the S/S' Parameter. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17(2). 364–369.
- Grimshaw, Jane. 1997. Projections, heads, and optimality. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28. 373–422.
- Grinberg, Dennis, John D. Lafferty & Daniel Dominic Sleator. 1995. A robust parsing algorithm for Link Grammars. In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Workshop on Parsing Technologies*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/cmp-lg/9508003>. Also as Carnegie Mellon University Computer Science Technical Report CMU-CS-95-125.
- Groos, Anneke & Henk van Riemsdijk. 1981. Matching effects in free relatives: A parameter of core grammar. In A. Belletti, L. Brandi & L. Rizzi (eds.), *Theory of markedness in Generative Grammar*, 171–216. Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore.
- Groß, Thomas M. & Timothy Osborne. 2009. Toward a practical Dependency Grammar theory of discontinuities. *SKY Journal of Linguistics* 22. 43–90.
- Groß, Thomas Michael. 2003. Dependency Grammar's limits – and ways of extending them. In Ägel et al. (2003b) 331–351.
- Grosu, Alexander. 1973. On the status of the so-called Right Roof Constraint. *Language* 49(2). 294–311.
- Grover, Claire, John Carroll & Ted J. Briscoe. 1993. The Alvey Natural Language Tools grammar (4th release). Technical Report 284 Computer Laboratory, Cambridge University, UK.
- Grubačić, Emilija. 1965. *Untersuchungen zur Frage der Wortstellung in der deutschen Prosadichtung der letzten Jahrzehnte*. Zagreb: Philosophische Fakultät dissertation.
- Gruber, Jeffrey. 1965. *Studies in lexical relations*: MIT dissertation.
- Gunji, Takao. 1986. Subcategorization and word order. In William J. Poser (ed.), *Papers from the Second International Workshop on Japanese Syntax*, 1–21. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Günther, Carsten, Claudia Maienborn & Andrea Schopp. 1999. The processing of information structure. In Peter Bosch & Rob van der Sandt (eds.), *Focus: Linguistic, cognitive, and computational perspectives* (Studies in Natural Language Processing), 18–42. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Rev. papers orig. presented at a conference held 1994, Schloss Wolfsbrunnen, Germany.
- Guo, Yuqing, Haifeng Wang & Josef van Genabith. 2007. Recovering non-local dependencies for Chinese. In *Proceedings of the Joint Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and Natural Language Learning, (EMNLP-CoNLL 2007)*, 257–266. Prague, Czech Republic: Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Guzmán Naranjo, Matías. 2015. Unifying everything: Integrating quantitative effects into formal models of grammar. In *Proceedings of the 6th Conference on Quantitative Investigations in Theoretical Linguistics*, DOI:10.15496/publikation-8636.
- Haddar, Kais, Sirine Boukedi & Ines Zalila. 2010. Construction of an HPSG grammar for the Arabic language and its specification in TDL. *International Journal on Information and Communication Technologies* 3(3). 52–64.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 1994. *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory* (Blackwell Textbooks in Linguistics 1). Oxford, UK/Cambridge, USA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd 2nd edn.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 1995. *The syntax of negation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Haftka, Brigitta. 1995. Syntactic positions for topic and contrastive focus in the German middlefield. In Inga Kohlhof, Susanne Winkler & Hans-Bernhard Drubig (eds.), *Proceedings of the Göttingen Focus Workshop, 17 DGfS, March 1–3* (Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340 No. 69), 137–157. Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen.
- Haftka, Brigitta. 1996. Deutsch ist eine V/2-Sprache mit Verbendstellung und freier Wortfolge. In Ewald Lang & Gisela Zifonun (eds.), *Deutsch – typologisch* (Institut für deutsche Sprache, Jahrbuch 1995), 121–141. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hagemann, Jörg & Sven Staffeldt (eds.). 2014. *Syntaxtheorien: Analysen im Vergleich* (Stauffenburg Einführungen 28). Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Hagen, Kristin, Janne Bondi Johannessen & Anders Nøklestad. 2000. A constraint-based tagger for Norwegian. In C.-E. Lindberg & S. N. Lund (eds.), *17th Scandinavian Conference of Linguistic, Odense*, vol. I (Odense Working Papers in Language and Communication 19), 1–15.
- Hahn, Michael. 2011. Null conjuncts and bound pronouns in Arabic. In Müller (2011b) 60–80. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2011/>.
- Haider, Hubert. 1982. Abhängigkeiten und Konfigurationen: Zur deutschen V-Projektion. *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik* 21. 1–60.
- Haider, Hubert. 1984. Was zu haben ist und was zu sein hat – Bemerkungen zum Infinitiv. *Papiere zur Linguistik* 30(1). 23–36.
- Haider, Hubert. 1985a. The case of German. In Toman (1985) 23–64.
- Haider, Hubert. 1985b. Über *sein* oder nicht *sein*: Zur Grammatik des Pronomens *sich*. In Abraham (1985) 223–254.
- Haider, Hubert. 1986a. Fehlende Argumente: Vom Passiv zu kohärenten Infinitiven. *Linguistische Berichte* 101. 3–33.
- Haider, Hubert. 1986b. Nicht-sententiale Infinitive. *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik* 28. 73–114.
- Haider, Hubert. 1990a. Pro-bleme? In Fanselow & Felix (1990) 121–143.
- Haider, Hubert. 1990b. Topicalization and other puzzles of German syntax. In Grewendorf & Sternefeld (1990) 93–112.
- Haider, Hubert. 1991. Fakultativ kohärente Infinitivkonstruktionen im Deutschen. Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340 No. 17 IBM Deutschland GmbH Heidelberg.

- Haider, Hubert. 1993. *Deutsche Syntax – generativ: Vorstudien zur Theorie einer projektiven Grammatik* (Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik 325). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Haider, Hubert. 1994. (Un-)heimliche Subjekte: Anmerkungen zur Pro-drop Causa, im Anschluß an die Lektüre von Osvaldo Jaeggli & Kenneth J. Safir, eds., *The Null Subject Parameter*. *Linguistische Berichte* 153. 372–385.
- Haider, Hubert. 1995. Studies on phrase structure and economy. Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340 No. 70 Universität Stuttgart Stuttgart.
- Haider, Hubert. 1997a. Projective economy: On the minimal functional structure of the German clause. In Werner Abraham & Elly van Gelderen (eds.), *German: Syntactic problems—Problematic syntax* (Linguistische Arbeiten 374), 83–103. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Haider, Hubert. 1997b. Typological implications of a directionality constraint on projections. In Artemis Alexiadou & T. Alan Hall (eds.), *Studies on Universal Grammar and typological variation* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 13), 17–33. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Haider, Hubert. 1999. The license to license: Structural case plus economy yields Burzio's Generalization. In Eric Reuland (ed.), *Arguments and case: Explaining Burzio's Generalization* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 34), 31–55. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Haider, Hubert. 2000. OV is more basic than VO. In Peter Svenonius (ed.), *The derivation of VO and OV*, 45–67. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Haider, Hubert. 2001. Parametrisierung in der Generativen Grammatik. In Martin Haspelmath, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreicher & Wolfgang Raible (eds.), *Sprachtypologie und sprachliche Universalien – Language typology and language universals: Ein internationales Handbuch – An international handbook*, 283–294. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haider, Hubert. 2014. Scientific ideology in grammar theory. Ms. Universität Salzburg, Dept. of Linguistics and Centre for Cognitive Neuroscience.
- Haider, Hubert & Klaus Netter (eds.). 1991. *Representation and derivation in the theory of grammar* (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 22). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Hajičová, Eva & Petr Sgall. 2003. Dependency Syntax in Functional Generative Description. In Ágel et al. (2003b) 570–592.
- Hakuta, Kenji, Ellen Bialystok & Edward Wiley. 2003. Critical evidence: A test of the Critical-Period Hypothesis for second-language acquisition. *Psychological Science* 14(1). 31–38.
- Hale, Kenneth. 1976. The adjoined relative clause in Australia. In R.M.W. Dixon (ed.), *Grammatical categories of Australian languages* (Linguistic Series 22), 78–105. New Jersey: Humanities Press.
- Hale, Kenneth & Samuel Jay Keyser. 1993a. On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations. In Hale & Keyser (1993b) 53–109.

- Hale, Kenneth & Samuel Jay Keyser (eds.). 1993b. *The view from building 20: essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger* (Current Studies in Linguistics 24). Cambridge, MA/London: MIT Press.
- Hale, Kenneth & Samuel Jay Keyser. 1997. On the complex nature of simple predicators. In Alex Alsina, Joan Bresnan & Peter Sells (eds.), *Complex predicates* (CSLI Lecture Notes 64), 29–65. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Han, Chung-hye, Juntae Yoon, Nari Kim & Martha Palmer. 2000. A feature-based Lexicalized Tree Adjoining Grammar for Korean. Technical Report IRCS-00-04 University of Pennsylvania Institute for Research in Cognitive Science. http://repository.upenn.edu/ircs_reports/35/.
- Harbour, Daniel. 2011. Mythomania? Methods and morals from ‘The myth of language universals’. *Lingua* 121(12). 1820–1830.
- Harley, Heidi & Rolf Noyer. 2000. Formal versus encyclopedic properties of vocabulary: Evidence from nominalizations. In Peeters (2000) 349–374.
- Harman, Gilbert. 1963. Generative grammars without transformation rules: A defence of phrase structure. *Language* 39. 597–616.
- Harris, Zellig S. 1957. Co-occurrence and transformation in linguistic structure. *Language* 33(3). 283–340.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2008. Parametric versus functional explanations of syntactic universals. In T. Biberauer (ed.), *The limits of syntactic variation*, 75–107. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2009. The best-supported language universals refer to scalar patterns deriving from processing costs. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 32(5). 457–458.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2010a. Comparative concepts and descriptive categories in crosslinguistic studies. *Language* 86(3). 663–687.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2010b. Framework-free grammatical theory. In Bernd Heine & Heiko Narrog (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of grammatical analysis*, 341–365. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2010c. The interplay between comparative concepts and descriptive categories (reply to Newmeyer). *Language* 86(3). 696–699.
- Haugereid, Petter. 2007. Decomposed phrasal constructions. In Müller (2007d) 120–129. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2007/>.
- Haugereid, Petter. 2009. *Phrasal subconstructions: A Constructionalist grammar design, exemplified with Norwegian and English*: Norwegian University of Science and Technology dissertation.
- Haugereid, Petter, Nurit Melnik & Shuly Wintner. 2013. Nonverbal predicates in Modern Hebrew. In Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, Freie Universität Berlin*, 69–89. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2013/hmw.pdf>.
- Hauser, Marc D., Noam Chomsky & W. Tecumseh Fitch. 2002. The faculty of language: What is it, who has it, and how did it evolve? *Science* 298. 1569–1579. DOI:10.1126/science.298.5598.1569.

- Hausser, Roland. 1992. Complexity in left-associative grammar. *Theoretical Computer Science* 106(2). 283–308.
- Hawkins, John A. 1999. Processing complexity and filler-gap dependencies across grammars. *Language* 75(2). 244–285.
- Hawkins, John A. 2004. *Efficiency and complexity in grammars*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hays, David G. 1964. Dependency Theory: A formalism and some observations. *Language* 40(4). 511–525.
- Hays, David G. & T. W. Ziehe. 1960. Studies in machine translation: 10–Russian sentence-structure determination. Tech. rep. Rand Corporation.
- Hedeland, Hanna, Thomas Schmidt & Kai Wörner (eds.). 2011. *Multilingual resources and multilingual applications: Proceedings of the Conference of the German Society for Computational Linguistics and Language Technology (GSCL) 2011* (Arbeiten zur Mehrsprachigkeit/Working Papers in Multilingualism, Folge B/Series B 96). Hamburg: Universität Hamburg.
- Heinecke, Johannes, Jürgen Kunze, Wolfgang Menzel & Ingo Schröder. 1998. Eliminative parsing with graded constraints. In Isabelle (1998) 526–530. DOI:10.3115/980845.980953.
- Heinz, Wolfgang & Johannes Matiassek. 1994. Argument structure and case assignment in German. In Nerbonne et al. (1994b) 199–236.
- Helbig, Gerhard & Joachim Buscha. 1969. *Deutsche Grammatik: Ein Handbuch für den Ausländerunterricht*. Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie.
- Helbig, Gerhard & Joachim Buscha. 1998. *Deutsche Grammatik: Ein Handbuch für den Ausländerunterricht*. Leipzig Berlin München: Langenscheidt Verlag Enzyklopädie 18th edn.
- Helbig, Gerhard & Wolfgang Schenkel. 1969. *Wörterbuch zur Valenz und Distribution deutscher Verben*. Leipzig: VEB Bibliographisches Institut Leipzig.
- Hellan, Lars. 1986. The headedness of NPs in Norwegian. In Peter Muysken & Henk van Riemsdijk (eds.), *Features and projections*, 89–122. Dordrecht/Cinnaminson, U.S.A.: Foris Publications.
- Hellan, Lars. 2007. On ‘deep evaluation’ for individual computational grammars and for cross-framework comparison. In King & Bender (2007) 161–181. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/GEAF/2007/>.
- Hellan, Lars & Dorothee Beermann. 2006. The ‘specifier’ in an HPSG grammar implementation of Norwegian. In S. Werner (ed.), *Proceedings of the 15th NODALIDA Conference, Joensuu 2005* (Ling@JoY: University of Joensuu electronic publications in linguistics and language technology 1), 57–64. Joensuu: University of Joensuu.
- Hellan, Lars & Petter Haugereid. 2003. Norsource – An exercise in the Matrix Grammar building design. In Bender et al. (2003).
- Hellwig, Peter. 1978. PLAIN – Ein Programmsystem zur Sprachbeschreibung und maschinellen Sprachbearbeitung. *Sprache und Datenverarbeitung* 1(2). 16–31.
- Hellwig, Peter. 1986. Dependency Unification Grammar. In Nagao (1986) 195–198.
- Hellwig, Peter. 2003. Dependency Unification Grammar. In Ägel et al. (2003b) 593–635.

- Hellwig, Peter. 2006. Parsing with Dependency Grammars. In Vilmos Ágel, Ludwig M. Eichinger, Hans Werner Eroms, Peter Hellwig, Hans Jürgen Heringer & Henning Lobin (eds.), *Dependenz und Valenz / Dependency and valency: Ein internationales Handbuch der zeitgenössischen Forschung / An international handbook of contemporary research*, vol. 25.2 (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft), 1081–1109. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Her, One-Soon, Dan Higinbotham & Joseph Pentheroudakis. 1991. An LFG-based machine translation system. *Computer Processing of Chinese and Oriental Languages* 5(3–4). 285–297.
- Heringer, Hans-Jürgen. 1996. *Deutsche Syntax dependentiell* (Stauffenburg Linguistik). Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Herzog, Otthein & Claus-Rainer Rollinger (eds.). 1991. *Text understanding in LILOG* (Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence 546). Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Higinbotham, James. 1985. On semantics. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16(4). 547–593.
- Hinrichs, Erhard W., Walt Detmar Meurers, Frank Richter, Manfred Sailer & Heike Winhart (eds.). 1997. *Ein HPSG-Fragment des Deutschen. Teil 1: Theorie*, vol. No. 95 (Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340). Tübingen: Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen.
- Hinrichs, Erhard W. & Tsuneko Nakazawa. 1989a. *Aspects of German VP structure* (SfS-Report-01-93). Tübingen: Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen.
- Hinrichs, Erhard W. & Tsuneko Nakazawa. 1989b. Flipped out: AUX in German. In Hinrichs & Nakazawa (1989a).
- Hinrichs, Erhard W. & Tsuneko Nakazawa. 1989c. Subcategorization and VP structure in German. In Hinrichs & Nakazawa (1989a).
- Hinrichs, Erhard W. & Tsuneko Nakazawa. 1994. Linearizing AUXs in German verbal complexes. In Nerbonne et al. (1994b) 11–38.
- Hinterhölzel, Roland. 2004. Language change versus grammar change: What diachronic data reveal about the interaction between core grammar and periphery. In Carola Trips & Eric Fuß (eds.), *Diachronic clues to synchronic grammar*, 131–160. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Hoberg, Ursula. 1981. *Die Wortstellung in der geschriebenen deutschen Gegenwartssprache* (Heutiges Deutsch. Linguistische Grundlagen. Forschungen des Instituts für deutsche Sprache 10). München: Max Hueber Verlag.
- Hockett, Charles F. 1960. The origin of speech. *Scientific American* 203. 88–96.
- Hoeksema, Jack. 1991. Theoretische Aspekten van Partikelvooropplaatsing. *TABU Bulletin voor Taalwetenschap* 21(1). 18–26.
- Hoffman, Beryl Ann. 1995. *The computational analysis of the syntax and interpretation of “free” word order in Turkish*: University of Pennsylvania dissertation.
- Hoffmann, Thomas & Graeme Trousdale (eds.). 2013. *The Oxford handbook of Construction Grammar* (Oxford Handbooks). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Höhle, Tilman N. 1978. *Lexikalische Syntax: Die Aktiv-Passiv-Relation und andere Infinitkonstruktionen im Deutschen* (Linguistische Arbeiten 67). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

- Höhle, Tilman N. 1982. Explikationen für „normale Betonung“ und „normale Wortstellung“. In Abraham (1982) 75–153. Republished as Höhle (2016d).
- Höhle, Tilman N. 1983. Topologische Felder. Köln, ms, Published as Höhle (2016h).
- Höhle, Tilman N. 1986. Der Begriff „Mittelfeld“, Anmerkungen über die Theorie der topologischen Felder. In Walter Weiss, Herbert Ernst Wiegand & Marga Reis (eds.), *Akten des VII. Kongresses der Internationalen Vereinigung für germanische Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft. Göttingen 1985. Band 3. Textlinguistik contra Stilistik? – Wortschatz und Wörterbuch – Grammatische oder pragmatische Organisation von Rede?* (Kontroversen, alte und neue 4), 329–340. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. Republished as Höhle (2016c).
- Höhle, Tilman N. 1988. Verum-Fokus. Netzwerk Sprache und Pragmatik 5 Universität Lund, Germananistisches Institut Lund. Republished as Höhle (2016i).
- Höhle, Tilman N. 1991a. On reconstruction and coordination. In Haider & Netter (1991) 139–197. Republished as Höhle (2016e).
- Höhle, Tilman N. 1991b. Projektionsstufen bei V-Projektionen: Bemerkungen zu F/T. Ms. Published as Höhle (2016f).
- Höhle, Tilman N. 1994. Spuren in HPSG. Vortrag auf der GGS-Tagung in Tübingen am 14. Mai 1994, published as Höhle (2016g).
- Höhle, Tilman N. 1997. Vorangestellte Verben und Komplementierer sind eine natürliche Klasse. In Christa Dürscheid, Karl Heinz Ramers & Monika Schwarz (eds.), *Sprache im Fokus: Festschrift für Heinz Vater zum 65. Geburtstag*, 107–120. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. Republished as Höhle (2016j).
- Höhle, Tilman N. 1999. An architecture for phonology. In Robert D. Borsley & Adam Przepiórkowski (eds.), *Slavic in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*, 61–90. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. Republished as Höhle (2016a).
- Höhle, Tilman N. 2016a. An architecture for phonology. In Höhle (2016b). Originally published as Höhle (1999).
- Höhle, Tilman N. 2016b. *Beiträge zur Grammatik des Deutschen* (Classics in Linguistics). Berlin: Language Science Press. In Preparation.
- Höhle, Tilman N. 2016c. Der Begriff „Mittelfeld“, Anmerkungen über die Theorie der topologischen Felder. In Höhle (2016b). First published as Höhle (1986).
- Höhle, Tilman N. 2016d. Explikationen für „normale Betonung“ und „normale Wortstellung“. In Höhle (2016b). In Preparation.
- Höhle, Tilman N. 2016e. On reconstruction and coordination. In Höhle (2016b). In Preparation.
- Höhle, Tilman N. 2016f. Projektionsstufen bei V-Projektionen: Bemerkungen zu F/T. In Höhle (2016b). First circulated in 1991.
- Höhle, Tilman N. 2016g. Spuren in HPSG. In Höhle (2016b). Vortrag auf der GGS-Tagung in Tübingen am 14. Mai 1994.
- Höhle, Tilman N. 2016h. Topologische Felder. In Höhle (2016b). First circulated as draft in 1983.
- Höhle, Tilman N. 2016i. Verum-Fokus. In Höhle (2016b). Originally published as Höhle (1988).

- Höhle, Tilman N. 2016j. Vorangestellte Verben und Komplementierer sind eine natürliche Klasse. In Höhle (2016b). First published as Höhle (1997).
- Holler, Anke. 2005. *Weiterführende Relativsätze: Empirische und theoretische Aspekte* (studia grammatica 60). Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 2013. Three grades of grammatical involvement: Syntax from a Minimalist perspective. *Mind and Language* 28(4). 392–420.
- Hornstein, Norbert, Jairo Nunes & Kleantes K. Grohmann. 2005. *Understanding Minimalism* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Huck, Geoffrey J. & Almerindo E. Ojeda (eds.). 1987. *Discontinuous constituency* (Syntax and Semantics 20). New York: Academic Press.
- Hudson, Carla L. & Elissa L. Newport. 1999. Creolization: Could adults really have done it all? In Annabel Greenhill, Heather Littlefield & Cheryl Tano (eds.), *Proceedings of the Boston University Conference on Language Development*, vol. 23, 265–276. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Hudson, Richard. 1980. Constituency and dependency. *Linguistics* 18. 179–198.
- Hudson, Richard. 1984. *Word grammar*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Hudson, Richard. 1989. Towards a computer-testable Word Grammar of English. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 1. 321–339.
- Hudson, Richard. 1990. *English Word Grammar*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Hudson, Richard. 1991. *English Word Grammar*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Hudson, Richard. 2003. Mismatches in default inheritance. In Francis & Michaelis (2003) 355–402.
- Hudson, Richard. 2004. Are determiners heads? *Functions of Language* 11(1). 7–42.
- Hudson, Richard. 2010a. Reaction to: “The myth of language universals and cognitive science”: On the choice between phrase structure and dependency structure. *Lingua* 120(12). 2676–2679.
- Hudson, Richard. 2015. Pied piping in cognition. Ms. London. <http://dickhudson.com/papers/>.
- Hudson, Richard A. 1988. Coordination and grammatical relations. *Journal of Linguistics* 24(2). 303–342.
- Hudson, Richard A. 1997. German partial VP fronting. Ms. University College London. <http://dickhudson.com/papers/>.
- Hudson, Richard A. 2000. Discontinuity. *Dependency Grammars, TAL* 41(1). 15–56.
- Hudson, Richard A. 2007. *Language networks: The new Word Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hudson, Richard A. 2010b. *An introduction to Word Grammar* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hudson Kam, Carla L. & Elissa L. Newport. 2005. Regularizing unpredictable variation: The roles of adult and child learners in language formation and change. *Language Learning and Development* 1. 151–195.
- Humboldt, Wilhelm von. 1988. *Gesammelte Werke*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

- Hurford, James R. 2002. Expression/induction models of language evolution: Dimensions and issues. In Ted J. Briscoe (ed.), *Linguistic evolution through language acquisition*, 301–344. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Hurskainen, Arvi. 2006. Constraint Grammar in unconventional use: Handling complex Swahili idioms and proverbs. *Suominen, Mickael et.al.: A Man of Measure: Festschrift in Honour of Fred Karlsson on his 60th Birthday. Special Supplement to SKY Journal of Linguistics* 19. 397–406.
- Ingram, David & William Thompson. 1996. Early syntactic acquisition in German: Evidence for the modal hypothesis. *Language* 72(1). 97–120.
- Iordanskaja, L., M. Kim, R. Kittredge, B. Lavoie & A. Polguère. 1992. Generation of extended bilingual statistical reports. In Zampolli (1992) 1019–1023.
- Isabelle, Pierre (ed.). 1998. *Proceedings of the 36th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and 17th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*. Montreal, Quebec, Canada: Association for Computational Linguistics. DOI:10.3115/980845.980953.
- Isabelle, Pierre (ed.). 2002. *40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Proceedings of the conference*. University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia: Association for Computational Linguistics. <http://aclanthology.info/events/acl-2002>.
- Islam, Md. Asfaqul, K. M. Azharul Hasan & Md. Mizanur Rahman. 2012. Basic HPSG structure for Bangla grammar. In *15th International Conference on Computer and Information Technology (ICCIT)*, 185–189. Curran Associates. DOI:10.1109/ICCITech.2012.6509749.
- Jackendoff, Ray S. 1972. *Semantic interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, MA/London, England: MIT Press.
- Jackendoff, Ray S. 1975. Morphological and semantic regularities in the lexikon. *Language* 51(3). 639–671.
- Jackendoff, Ray S. 1977. *\bar{X} syntax: A study of phrase structure*. Cambridge, MA/London, England: MIT Press.
- Jackendoff, Ray S. 1997. *The architecture of the language faculty* (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 28). Cambridge, MA/London: MIT Press.
- Jackendoff, Ray S. 2000. Fodorian modularity and representational modularity. In Yosef Grodzinsky, Lewis P. Shapiro & David Swinney (eds.), *Language and the brain: Representation and processing* (Foundations of Neuropsychology), 3–30. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Jackendoff, Ray S. 2002. *Foundations of language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jackendoff, Ray S. 2007. A parallel architecture perspective on language processing. *Brain Research* 1146. 2–22.
- Jackendoff, Ray S. 2008. Construction after Construction and its theoretical challenges. *Language* 84(1). 8–28.
- Jackendoff, Ray S. 2011. What is the human language faculty? Two views. *Language* 87(3). 586–624.

- Jackendoff, Ray S. & Steven Pinker. 2005. The nature of the language faculty and its implications for evolution of language (reply to Fitch, Hauser, and Chomsky). *Cognition* 97(2). 211–225.
- Jackendoff, Ray S. & Steven Pinker. 2009. The reality of a universal language faculty. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 32(5). 465–466.
- Jacobs, Joachim. 1986. The syntax of focus and adverbials in German. In Werner Abraham & S. de Meij (eds.), *Topic, focus, and configurationality: Papers from the 6th Groningen Grammar Talks, Groningen, 1984* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 4), 103–127. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Jacobs, Joachim. 1991. Bewegung als Valenztransfer. SFB 282: Theorie des Lexikons 1 Heinrich Heine Uni/BUGH Düsseldorf/Wuppertal.
- Jacobs, Joachim. 2008. Wozu Konstruktionen? *Linguistische Berichte* 213. 3–44.
- Jacobson, Pauline. 1987a. Phrase structure, grammatical relations, and discontinuous constituents. In Huck & Ojeda (1987) 27–69.
- Jacobson, Pauline. 1987b. Review of generalized phrase structure grammar. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 10(3). 389–426.
- Jaeggli, Osvaldo A. 1986. Passive. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17(4). 587–622.
- Jäger, Gerhard & Reinhard Blutner. 2003. Competition and interpretation: The German adverb *wieder* ‘again’. In Lang et al. (2003) 393–416.
- Jäger, Gerhard, Paola Monachesi, Gerald Penn & Shuly Wintner (eds.). 2002. *Proceedings of Formal Grammar 2002*. Trento.
- Jäger, Gerhard, Paola Monachesi, Gerald Penn & Shuly Wintner (eds.). 2008. *Proceedings of Formal Grammar 2003, Vienna, Austria*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Jäppinen, H., A. Lehtola & K. Valkonen. 1986. Functional structures for parsing dependency constraints. In Nagao (1986) 461–463. DOI:10.3115/991365.991501.
- Johnson, David E. & Shalom Lappin. 1997. A critique of the Minimalist Programm. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 20(3). 273–333.
- Johnson, David E. & Shalom Lappin. 1999. *Local constraints vs. economy* (Stanford Monographs in Linguistics). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Johnson, David E. & Paul M. Postal. 1980. *Arc Pair Grammar*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Johnson, Jacqueline S. & Elissa L. Newport. 1989. Critical period effects in second language learning: The influence of maturational state on the acquisition of English as a second language. *Cognitive Psychology* 21(1). 60–99.
- Johnson, Kent. 2004. Gold’s theorem and cognitive science. *Philosophy of Science* 71(4). 571–592.
- Johnson, Mark. 1986. A GPSG account of VP structure in German. *Linguistics* 24(5). 871–882.
- Johnson, Mark. 1988. *Attribute-value logic and the theory of grammar* (CSLI Lecture Notes 14). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Johnson, Mark. 1989. Parsing as deduction: The use of knowledge of language. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 18(1). 105–128.

- Johnson, Mark, Stuart Geman, Stephen Canon, Zhiyi Chi & Stefan Riezler. 1999. Estimators for stochastic “unification-based” grammars. In Robert Dale & Ken Church (eds.), *Proceedings of the Thirty-Seventh Annual Meeting of the ACL*, 535–541. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Joshi, Aravind K. 1985. Tree Adjoining Grammars: How much context-sensitivity is required to provide reasonable structural descriptions? In David Dowty, Lauri Karttunen & Arnold Zwicky (eds.), *Natural language parsing*, 206–250. Cambridge University Press.
- Joshi, Aravind K. 1987a. Introduction to Tree Adjoining Grammar. In Alexis Manaster-Ramer (ed.), *The mathematics of language*, 87–114. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Joshi, Aravind K. 1987b. Word-order variation in natural language generation. In *AAAI 87, Sixth National Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 550–555. Seattle.
- Joshi, Aravind K., Tilman Becker & Owen Rambow. 2000. Complexity of scrambling: A new twist to the competence-performance distinction. In Abeillé & Rambow (2000b) 167–181.
- Joshi, Aravind K., Leon S. Levy & Masako Takahashi. 1975. Tree Adjunct Grammar. *Journal of Computer and System Science* 10(2). 136–163.
- Joshi, Aravind K. & Yves Schabes. 1997. Tree-Adjoining Grammars. In G. Rozenberg & A. Salomaa (eds.), *Handbook of formal languages*, 69–123. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Joshi, Aravind K., K. Vijay Shanker & David Weir. 1990. The convergence of mildly context-sensitive grammar formalisms. Tech. Rep. MS-CIS-90-01 Department of Computer and Information Science, University of Pennsylvania. http://repository.upenn.edu/cis_reports/539/.
- Jungen, Oliver & Horst Lohnstein. 2006. *Einführung in die Grammatiktheorie* (UTB 2676). München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
- Jurafsky, Daniel. 1996. A probabilistic model of lexical and syntactic access and disambiguation. *Cognitive Science* 20(2). 137–194.
- Kahane, Sylvain. 1997. Bubble trees and syntactic representations. In Tilman Becker & Hans-Ulrich Krieger (eds.), *Proceedings of Mathematics of Language (MOL5) Meeting*, 70–76. Saarbrücken: DFKI.
- Kahane, Sylvain. 2003. The Meaning-Text Theory. In Ágel et al. (2003b) 546–570.
- Kahane, Sylvain. 2009. On the status of phrases in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar: Illustration by a fully lexical treatment of extraction. In Alain Polguère & Igor A. Mel’čuk (eds.), *Dependency in linguistic description* (Studies in Language Companion Series 111), 111–150. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Kahane, Sylvain, Alexis Nasr & Owen Rambow. 1998. Pseudo-projectivity: A polynomially parsable non-projective Dependency Grammar. In Isabelle (1998) 646–652. DOI:10.3115/980845.980953. <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P98-1106>.
- Kallmeyer, Laura. 2005. Tree-local Multicomponent Tree Adjoining Grammars with shared nodes. *Computational Linguistics* 31(2). 187–225.

- Kallmeyer, Laura & Aravind K. Joshi. 2003. Factoring predicate argument and scope semantics: Underspecified semantics with LTAG. *Research on Language and Computation* 1(1-2). 3–58. DOI:10.1023/A:1024564228892.
- Kallmeyer, Laura, Timm Lichte, Wolfgang Maier, Yannick Parmentier, Johannes Dellert & Kilian Evang. 2008. TuLiPA: Towards a multi-formalism parsing environment for grammar engineering. In Stephen Clark & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Coling 2008: Proceedings of the Workshop on Grammar Engineering Across Frameworks*, 1–8. Manchester, England: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kallmeyer, Laura & Rainer Osswald. 2012. A frame-based semantics of the dative alternation in Lexicalized Tree Adjoining Grammars. In Piñón (2012) 167–184.
- Kallmeyer, Laura & Maribel Romero. 2008. Scope and situation binding in LTAG using semantic unification. *Research on Language and Computation* 6(1). 3–52.
- Kallmeyer, Laura & Sinwon Yoon. 2004. Tree-local MCTAG with shared nodes: An analysis of word order variation in German and Korean. *Traitement automatique des langues TAL* 45(3). 49–69.
- Kamp, Hans & Uwe Reyle. 1993. *From discourse to logic: Introduction to modeltheoretic semantics of natural language, formal logic and Discourse Representation Theory* (Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy 42). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Kaplan, Ronald M. 1995. The formal architecture of Lexical-Functional Grammar. In Dalrymple et al. (1995) 7–27.
- Kaplan, Ronald M. & Joan Bresnan. 1982. Lexical-Functional Grammar: A formal system for grammatical representation. In Bresnan (1982b) 173–281. Reprint in: Dalrymple et al. (1995: 29–130).
- Kaplan, Ronald M. & John T. Maxwell III. 1996. LFG grammar writer’s workbench. Tech. rep. Xerox PARC.
- Kaplan, Ronald M., Stefan Riezler, Tracy Holloway King, John T. Maxwell III, Alexander Vasserman & Richard Crouch. 2004. Speed and accuracy in shallow and deep stochastic parsing. In *Proceedings of the Human Language Technology Conference and the 4th Annual Meeting of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics (HLT-NAACL’04)*, Boston, MA: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kaplan, Ronald M. & Annie Zaenen. 1989. Long-distance dependencies, constituent structure and functional uncertainty. In Baltin & Kroch (1989) 17–42.
- Karimi, Simin. 2005. *A Minimalist approach to scrambling: Evidence from Persian* (Studies in Generative Grammar 76). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Karimi-Doostan, Gholamhossein. 2005. Light verbs and structural case. *Lingua* 115(12). 1737–1756.
- Karlgren, Hans (ed.). 1990. *COLING-90: Papers presented to the 13th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*. Helsinki: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Karlsson, Fred (ed.). 1986. *Papers from the Fifth Scandinavian Conference of Computational Linguistics*. Helsinki.
- Karlsson, Fred. 1990. Constraint Grammar as a framework for parsing running text. In Karlgren (1990) 168–173.

- Karmiloff-Smith, Annette. 1998. Development itself is the key to understanding developmental disorders. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 2(10). 389–398.
- Karmiloff-Smith, Annette, Julia Grant, Ioanna Berthoud, Mark Davies, Patricia Howlin & Orlee Udwin. 1997. Language in Williams Syndrome: How intact is ‘intact’? *Child Development* 68(2). 246–262.
- Karttunen, Lauri. 1986. Radical lexicalism. Report No. CSLI-86-68 Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Karttunen, Lauri. 1989. Radical lexicalism. In Baltin & Kroch (1989) 43–65.
- Kasper, Robert T. 1994. Adjuncts in the Mittelfeld. In Nerbonne et al. (1994b) 39–70.
- Kasper, Robert T., Bernd Kiefer, Klaus Netter & Vijay K. Shanker. 1995. Compilation of HPSG to TAG. In Uszkoreit (1995) 92–99.
- Kathol, Andreas. 1995. *Linearization-based German syntax*: Ohio State University dissertation.
- Kathol, Andreas. 2000. *Linear syntax*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kathol, Andreas. 2001. Positional effects in a monostratal grammar of German. *Journal of Linguistics* 37(1). 35–66.
- Kathol, Andreas & Carl J. Pollard. 1995. Extraposition via complex domain formation. In Uszkoreit (1995) 174–180.
- Kaufmann, Ingrid & Dieter Wunderlich. 1998. Cross-linguistic patterns of resultatives. SFB 282: Theorie des Lexikons 109 Heinrich Heine Uni/BUGH Düsseldorf.
- Kaufmann, Tobias. 2009. *A rule-based language model for speech recognition*: Computer Engineering and Networks Laboratory, ETH Zürich dissertation.
- Kaufmann, Tobias & Beat Pfister. 2007. Applying licenser rules to a grammar with continuous constituents. In Müller (2007d) 150–162. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2007/>.
- Kaufmann, Tobias & Beat Pfister. 2008. Applying a grammar-based language model to a broadcast-news transcription task. In Moore et al. (2008) 106–113. <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P/P08/P08-1013.pdf>.
- Kay, Martin. 1967. Experiments with a powerful parser. In *Proceedings of Conference Internationale Sur Le Traitement Automatique Des Langues (COLING 1967)*, Grenoble. <http://aclweb.org/anthology/C/C67/C67-1009.pdf>.
- Kay, Martin. 2000. David G. Hays. In William J. Hutchins (ed.), *Early years in machine translation* (Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistics Science Series 3), 165–170. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Kay, Martin. 2011. Zipf’s law and *L’Arbitraire du Signe*. *Linguistic Issues in Language Technology* 6(8). 1–25. <http://journals.linguisticsociety.org/elanguage/lilt/article/view/2584.html>. Special Issue on Interaction of Linguistics and Computational Linguistics.
- Kay, Paul. 2002. An informal sketch of a formal architecture for Construction Grammar. *Grammars* 5(1). 1–19.
- Kay, Paul. 2005. Argument structure constructions and the argument-adjunct distinction. In Mirjam Fried & Hans C. Boas (eds.), *Grammatical constructions: Back to the roots* (Constructional Approaches to Language 4), 71–98. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

- Kay, Paul & Charles J. Fillmore. 1999. Grammatical Constructions and linguistic generalizations: The What's X Doing Y? Construction. *Language* 75(1). 1–33.
- Kay, Paul, Ivan A. Sag & Daniel P. Flickinger. 2015. A lexical theory of phrasal idioms. Ms. CSLI Stanford.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1994. *The antisymmetry of syntax* (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 25). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kayne, Richard S. 2011. Why are there no directionality parameters? In Mary Byram Washburn, Katherine McKinney-Bock, Erika Varis, Ann Sawyer & Barbara Tomaszewicz (eds.), *Proceedings of the 28th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 1–23. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- Keenan, Edward L. & Bernard Comrie. 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and Universal Grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8(1). 63–99.
- Keller, Frank. 1994. German functional HPSG – An experimental CUF encoding. Tech. rep. Institut für Maschinelle Sprachverarbeitung Stuttgart.
- Keller, Frank. 1995. Towards an account of extraposition in HPSG. In Abney & Hinrichs (1995).
- Kettunen, Kimmo. 1986. On modelling dependency-oriented parsing. In Karlsson (1986) 113–120.
- Kiefer, Bernd, Hans-Ulrich Krieger & Mark-Jan Nederhof. 2000. Efficient and robust parsing of word hypotheses graphs. In Wahlster (2000b) 280–295.
- Kifle, Nazareth Amlesom. 2012. *Tigrinya applicatives in Lexical-Functional Grammar*: University of Bergen dissertation. <http://hdl.handle.net/1956/5730>.
- Kim, Jong-Bok & Peter Sells. 2008. *English syntax: An introduction* (CSLI Lecture Notes 185). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Kim, Jong-Bok, Peter Sells & Jaehyung Yang. 2007. Parsing two types of multiple nominative constructions: A Constructional approach. *Language and Information* 11(1). 25–37.
- Kim, Jong-Bok & Jaehyung Yang. 2003. Korean phrase structure grammar and its implementations into the LKB system. In Dong Hong Ji & Kim Teng Lua (eds.), *Proceedings of the 17th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation*, 88–97. National University of Singapore: COLIPS Publications.
- Kim, Jong-Bok & Jaehyung Yang. 2004. Projections from morphology to syntax in the Korean Resource Grammar: Implementing typed feature structures. In Alexander Gelbukh (ed.), *Computational linguistics and intelligent text processing: 5th International Conference, CICLing 2004, Seoul, Korea, February 15-21, 2004, Proceedings* (Lecture Notes in Computer Science 2945), 13–24. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Kim, Jong-Bok & Jaehyung Yang. 2006. Coordination structures in a typed feature structure grammar: Formalization and implementation. In Tapio Salakoski, Filip Ginter, Sampo Pyysalo & Tapio Pahikkala (eds.), *Advances in natural language processing: 5th International Conference, FinTAL 2006 Turku, Finland, August 23-25, 2006 proceedings* (Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence 4139), 194–205. Berlin: Springer Verlag.

- Kim, Jong-Bok & Jaehyung Yang. 2009. Processing three types of Korean cleft constructions in a typed feature structure grammar. *Korean Journal of Cognitive Science* 20(1). 1–28.
- Kim, Jong-Bok, Jaehyung Yang, Sanghoun Song & Francis Bond. 2011. Deep processing of Korean and the development of the Korean Resource Grammar. *Linguistic Research* 28(3). 635–672.
- Kimball, John P. 1973. *The formal theory of grammar* (Foundations of Modern Linguistics). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- King, Maghi (ed.). 1985. *Proceedings of the 2nd European Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Geneva: Association for Computational Linguistics. <http://aclweb.org/anthology/E/E85/>.
- King, Paul. 1994. An expanded logical formalism for Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar. Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340 No. 59 Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen. <http://www.sfs.uni-tuebingen.de/sfb/reports/berichte/59/59abs.html>.
- King, Paul. 1999. Towards truth in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar. In Valia Kordoni (ed.), *Tübingen studies in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar* (Arbeitsberichte des SFB 340 No. 132), 301–352. Tübingen: Universität Tübingen. <http://www.sfs.uni-tuebingen.de/sfb/reports/berichte/132/132abs.html>.
- King, Tracy Holloway & Emily M. Bender (eds.). 2007. *Grammar Engineering across Frameworks 2007*. (Studies in Computational Linguistics ONLINE) Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/GEAF/2007/>.
- King, Tracy Holloway & John T. Maxwell III. 2007. Overlay mechanisms for multi-level deep processing applications. In King & Bender (2007) 182–202. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/GEAF/2007/>.
- King, Tracy Holloway & Marianne Santaholma (eds.). 2009. *Proceedings of the 2009 Workshop on Grammar Engineering Across Frameworks (GEAF 2009)*. Suntec, Singapore: Association for Computational Linguistics. <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W/W09/#2600>.
- Kinyon, Alexandra, Owen Rambow, Tatjana Scheffler, SinWon Yoon & Aravind K. Joshi. 2006. The Metagrammar goes multilingual: A cross-linguistic look at the V2-phenomenon. In Laura Kallmeyer & Tilman Becker (eds.), *TAG+8: The Eighth International Workshop on Tree Adjoining Grammar and Related Formalisms: Proceedings of the workshop*, 17–24. Sydney, Australia: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1987. Morphology and grammatical relations. Unpublished paper, Stanford University, Stanford.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1988. Agreement and linking theory. Unpublished paper, Stanford University, Stanford.
- Kiparsky, Paul & Carol Kiparsky. 1970. Fact. In Manfred Bierwisch & Karl Erich Heidolph (eds.), *Progress in linguistics*, 143–173. The Hague/Paris: Mouton.
- Kiss, Katalin E. 2003. Argument scrambling, focus movement and topic movement in Hungarian. In Simin Karimi (ed.), *Word order and scrambling*, 22–43. London: Blackwell.
- Kiss, Tibor. 1991. The grammars of LILOG. In Herzog & Rollinger (1991) 183–199.

- Kiss, Tibor. 1992. Variable Subkategorisierung: Eine Theorie unpersönlicher Einbettungen im Deutschen. *Linguistische Berichte* 140. 256–293.
- Kiss, Tibor. 1993. Infinite Komplementation – Neue Studien zum deutschen Verbum infinitum. Arbeiten des SFB 282 No. 42 Bergische Universität Gesamthochschule Wuppertal.
- Kiss, Tibor. 1995. *Infinite Komplementation: Neue Studien zum deutschen Verbum infinitum* (Linguistische Arbeiten 333). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Kiss, Tibor. 2001. Configurational and relational scope determination in German. In Meurers & Kiss (2001) 141–175.
- Kiss, Tibor. 2005. Semantic constraints on relative clause extraposition. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23(2). 281–334.
- Kiss, Tibor & Artemis Alexiadou (eds.). 2015. *Syntax – theory and analysis: An international handbook*, vol. 42 (Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter 2nd edn.
- Kiss, Tibor & Birgit Wesche. 1991. Verb order and head movement. In Herzog & Rollinger (1991) 216–242.
- Klann-Delius, Gisela. 2008. *Spracherwerb*. Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler-Verlag 2nd edn.
- Klein, Wolfgang. 1971. *Parsing: Studien zur maschinellen Satzanalyse mit Abhängigkeitsgrammatiken und Transformationsgrammatiken*, vol. 2. Frankfurt a. M.: Athenäum Verlag.
- Klein, Wolfgang. 1985. Ellipse, Fokusgliederung und thematischer Stand. In Reinhard Meyer-Hermann & Hannes Rieser (eds.), *Ellipsen und fragmentarische Ausdrücke*, 1–24. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Klein, Wolfgang. 1986. *Second language acquisition* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Klein, Wolfgang. 2009. Finiteness, Universal Grammar and the language faculty. In Jiansheng Guo, Elena Lieven, Nancy Budwig, Susan Ervin-Tripp, Keiko Nakamura & Seyda Ozcaliskan (eds.), *Cross-linguistic approaches to the study of language: Research in the tradition of Dan Isaac Slobin* (Psychology Press Festschrift Series), 333–344. New York: Psychology Press.
- Klenk, Ursula. 2003. *Generative Syntax* (Narr Studienbücher). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Kluender, Robert. 1992. Deriving island constraints from principles of predication. In Helen Goodluck & Michael Rochemont (eds.), *Island constraints: Theory, acquisition, and processing*, 223–258. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Kluender, Robert & Marta Kutas. 1993. Subjacency as a processing phenomenon. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 8(4). 573–633.
- Knecht, Laura. 1985. *Subject and object in Turkish*. M.I.T. dissertation.
- Kobelev, Gregory M. 2008. Across-the-board extraction in Minimalist Grammars. In *Proceedings of the Ninth International Workshop on Tree Adjoining Grammar and Related Formalisms (TAG+9)*, 113–128.
- Koenig, Jean-Pierre. 1999. *Lexical relations* (Stanford Monographs in Linguistics). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

- Koenig, Jean-Pierre & Karin Michelson. 2010. Argument structure of Oneida kinship terms. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 76(2). 169–205.
- Koenig, Jean-Pierre & Karin Michelson. 2012. The (non)universality of syntactic selection and functional application. In Piñón (2012) 185–205.
- Kohl, Dieter. 1992. Generation from under- and overspecified structures. In Zampolli (1992) 686–692.
- Kohl, Dieter, Claire Gardent, Agnes Plainfossé, Mike Reape & Stefan Momma. 1992. Text generation from semantic representation. In Gabriel G. Bes & Thierry Guillotin (eds.), *The construction of a natural language and graphic interface: Results and perspectives from the ACORD project*, 94–161. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Kohl, Karen T. 1999. *An analysis of finite parameter learning in linguistic spaces*. Massachusetts Institute of Technology MA thesis. <http://karentkohl.org/papers/SM.pdf>.
- Kohl, Karen T. 2000. Language learning in large parameter spaces. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth National Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Twelfth Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, 1080. AAAI Press / The MIT Press.
- Kolb, Hans-Peter. 1997. GB blues: Two essays on procedures and structures in Generative Syntax. Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340 No. 110 Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen.
- Kolb, Hans-Peter & Craig L. Thiersch. 1991. Levels and empty categories in a Principles and Parameters based approach to parsing. In Haider & Netter (1991) 251–301.
- Konieczny, Lars. 1996. *Human sentence processing: A semantics-oriented parsing approach*: Universität Freiburg Dissertation. IIG-Berichte 3/96.
- König, Esther. 1999. LexGram: A practical Categorical Grammar formalism. *Journal of Language and Computation* 1(1). 33–52.
- Koopman, Hilda & Dominique Sportiche. 1991. The position of subjects. *Lingua* 85(2–3). 211–258.
- Kordoni, Valia (ed.). 1999a. *Tübingen studies in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar* (Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340, No. 132, Volume 1). Tübingen: Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen.
- Kordoni, Valia (ed.). 1999b. *Tübingen studies in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar* (Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340, No. 132, Volume 1). Tübingen: Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen.
- Kordoni, Valia. 2001. Linking experiencer-subject psych verb constructions in Modern Greek. In Daniel P. Flickinger & Andreas Kathol (eds.), *Proceedings of the HPSG-2000 Conference, University of California, Berkeley*, 198–213. CSLI Publications. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/1/>.
- Kordoni, Valia & Julia Neu. 2005. Deep analysis of Modern Greek. In Su et al. (2005) 674–683.
- Kornai, András & Geoffrey K. Pullum. 1990. The X-bar Theory of phrase structure. *Language* 66(1). 24–50.
- Koster, Jan. 1975. Dutch as an SOV language. *Linguistic Analysis* 1(2). 111–136.
- Koster, Jan. 1978. *Locality principles in syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Koster, Jan. 1986. The relation between pro-drop, scrambling, and verb movements. *Groningen Papers in Theoretical and Applied Linguistics* 1. 1–43.

- Koster, Jan. 1987. *Domains and dynasties: The radical autonomy of syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1984. On deriving syntactic differences between German and English. TU Berlin, ms.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1996. Severing the external argument from its verb. In Johan Rooryck & Laurie Zaring (eds.), *Phrase structure and the lexicon*, 109–137. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Krauwert, Steven, Michael Moortgat & Louis des Tombe (eds.). 1993. *Sixth Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics. Proceedings of the conference*. Utrecht: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Krieger, Hans-Ulrich & John Nerbonne. 1993. Feature-based inheritance networks for computational lexicons. In Ted Briscoe, Ann Copestake & Valeria de Paiva (eds.), *Inheritance, defaults, and the lexicon*, 90–136. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. A version of this paper is available as DFKI Research Report RR-91-31. Also published in: Proceedings of the ACQUILEX Workshop on Default Inheritance in the Lexicon, Technical Report No. 238, University of Cambridge, Computer Laboratory, October 1991.
- Kroch, Anthony S. 1987. Unbounded dependencies and subjacency in a Tree Adjoining Grammar. In Alexis Manaster-Ramer (ed.), *Mathematics of language*, 143–172. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Kroch, Anthony S. & Aravind K. Joshi. 1985. The linguistic relevance of Tree Adjoining Grammar. Tech. Rep. MS-CIS-85-16 University of Pennsylvania. http://repository.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1706&context=cis_reports.
- Kroch, Anthony S. & Aravind K. Joshi. 1987. Analyzing extraposition in a Tree Adjoining Grammar. In Huck & Ojeda (1987) 107–149.
- Kropp Dakubu, Mary Esther, Lars Hellan & Dorothee Beermann. 2007. Verb sequencing constraints in Ga: Serial verb constructions and the extended verb complex. In Müller (2007d) 99–119. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2007/>.
- Kruijff-Korbayová, Ivana & Mark J. Steedman. 2003. Discourse and information structure. *Journal of Logic, Language and Information: Special Issue on Discourse and Information Structure* 12(3). 249–259.
- Kübler, Sandra, Ryan McDonald & Joakim Nivre. 2009. *Dependency Parsing* (Synthesis Lectures on Human Language Technologies 2). San Rafael, U.S.A: Morgan & Claypool Publishers.
- Kuhn, Jonas. 1995. Information packaging in German: Some motivation from HPSG-based translation. Universität Stuttgart, ms. <ftp://ftp.ims.uni-stuttgart.de/pub/papers/kuhn/Info-Pack.pdf>.
- Kuhn, Jonas. 1996. An underspecified HPSG representation for information structure. In Tsuji (1996) 670–675.
- Kuhn, Jonas. 2007. Interfaces in constraint-based theories of grammar. In Gillian Ramchand & Charles Reiss (eds.), *The Oxford handbook of linguistic interfaces*, 613–650. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Kuhn, Jonas & Christian Rohrer. 1997. Approaching ambiguity in real-life sentences: The application of an Optimality Theory-inspired constraint ranking in a large-scale LFG grammar. In *Proceedings of DGfS/CL 97*, Heidelberg.
- Kuhns, Robert J. 1986. A PROLOG implementation of Government-Binding Theory. In Alan W. Biermann (ed.), *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fourth Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 546–550. Columbia University, New York: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Kunze, Jürgen. 1968. The treatment of non-projective structures in the syntactic analysis and synthesis of English and German. *Computational Linguistics* 7. 67–77.
- Kunze, Jürgen. 1975. *Abhängigkeitsgrammatik* (studia grammatica 12). Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Kunze, Jürgen. 1991. *Kasusrelationen und semantische Emphase* (studia grammatica XXXII). Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Kunze, Jürgen. 1993. *Sememstrukturen und Feldstrukturen* (studia grammatica 36). Berlin: Akademie Verlag. Unter Mitarbeit von Beate Firzlaff.
- Labelle, Marie. 2007. Biolinguistics, the Minimalist Program, and psycholinguistic reality. *Snippets* 14. 6–7. <http://www.ledonline.it/snippets/>.
- Laczkó, Tibor, György Rákosi & Ágoston Tóth. 2010. HunGram vs. EngGram in ParGram: On the comparison of Hungarian and English in an international computational linguistics project. In Irén Hegedűs & Sándor Martsa (eds.), *Selected papers in linguistics from the 9th HUSSE Conference*, vol. 1, 81–95. Pécs: Institute of English Studies, Faculty of Humanities, University of Pécs.
- Laenzlinger, Christoph. 2004. A feature-based theory of adverb syntax. In Jennifer R. Austin, Stefan Engelberg & Gisa Rauh (eds.), *Adverbials: The interplay between meaning, context, and syntactic structure* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 70), 205–252. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Lai, Cecilia S. L., Simon E. Fisher, Jane A. Hurst, Faraneh Vargha-Khadem & Anthony P. Monaco. 2001. A forkhead-domain gene is mutated in a severe speech and language disorder. *Nature* 413(6855). 519–523. DOI:10.1038/35097076.
- Lakoff, George. 1987. *Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lang, Ewald, Claudia Maienborn & Cathrine Fabricius-Hansen (eds.). 2003. *Modifying adjuncts* (Interface Explorations 4). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*, vol. 1. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 2000. A dynamic usage-based model. In Michael Barlow & Suzanne Kemmer (eds.), *Usage-based models of language*, 1–63. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 2008. *Cognitive Grammar: A basic introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 2009. Cognitive (Construction) Grammar. *Cognitive Linguistics* 20(1). 167–176.

- Lappin, Shalom, Robert D. Levine & David E. Johnson. 2000a. The revolution confused: A response to our critics. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18(4). 873–890.
- Lappin, Shalom, Robert D. Levine & David E. Johnson. 2000b. The structure of unscientific revolutions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 18(3). 665–671.
- Lappin, Shalom, Robert D. Levine & David E. Johnson. 2001. The revolution maximally confused. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 19(4). 901–919.
- Larson, Richard K. 1988. On the double object construction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19(3). 335–391.
- Lascarides, Alex & Ann Copestake. 1999. Default representation in constraint-based frameworks. *Computational Linguistics* 25(1). 55–105.
- Lasnik, Howard & Mamoru Saito. 1992. *Move α : Conditions on its application and output* (Current Studies in Linguistics 22). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lasnik, Howard & Juan Uriagereka. 2002. On the poverty of the challenge. *The Linguistic Review* 19(1–2). 147–150.
- Lavoie, Benoit & Owen Rambow. 1997. RealPro—A fast, portable sentence realizer. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Applied Natural Language Processing (ANLP'97)*.
- Le, Hong Phuong, Thi Minh Huyen Nguyen & Azim Roussanally. 2008. Metagrammar for Vietnamese LTAG. In *Proceedings of the Ninth International Workshop on Tree Adjoining Grammars and Related Formalisms (TAG+9)*, 129–132. Tübingen.
- Legate, Julie & Charles D. Yang. 2002. Empirical re-assessment of stimulus poverty arguments. *The Linguistic Review* 19(1–2). 151–162.
- Lehtola, Aarno. 1986. DPL: A computational method for describing grammars and modelling parsers. In Karlsson (1986) 151–159.
- Leiss, Elisabeth. 2003. Empirische Argumente für Dependenz. In Ágel et al. (2003b) 311–324.
- Leiss, Elisabeth. 2009. *Sprachphilosophie* (de Gruyter Studienbuch). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Lenerz, Jürgen. 1977. *Zur Abfolge nominaler Satzglieder im Deutschen* (Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 5). Tübingen: originally Gunter Narr Verlag now Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Lenerz, Jürgen. 1994. Pronomenprobleme. In Brigitta Haftka (ed.), *Was determiniert Wortstellungsvariation? Studien zu einem Interaktionsfeld von Grammatik, Pragmatik und Sprachtypologie*, 161–174. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Lenneberg, Eric H. 1964. The capacity for language acquisition. In Fodor & Katz (1964) 579–603.
- Lenneberg, Eric H. 1967. *Biological foundations of language*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Levelt, Willem J. M. 1989. *Speaking: From intonation to articulation* (ACL-MIT Press Series in Natural Language Processing). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Levin, Beth. 1993. *English verb classes and alternations: A preliminary investigation*. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Levin, Beth & Malka Rappaport Hovav. 2005. *Argument realization*. Cambridge University Press.

- Levin, Lori S., Malka Rappaport & Annie Zaenen (eds.). 1983. *Papers in Lexical Functional Grammar*. Indiana: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Levine, Robert D. 2003. Adjunct valents, cumulative scopings and impossible descriptions. In Jongbok Kim & Stephen Mark Wechsler (eds.), *The proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*, 209–232. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/3/>.
- Levine, Robert D. & Thomas E. Hukari. 2006. *The unity of unbounded dependency constructions* (CSLI Lecture Notes 166). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Levine, Robert D. & Walt Detmar Meurers. 2006. Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar: Linguistic approach, formal foundations, and computational realization. In Brown (2006) 237–252.
- Lewis, Geoffrey L. 1967. *Turkish grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lewis, John D. & Jeffrey L. Elman. 2001. Learnability and the statistical structure of language: Poverty of Stimulus arguments revisited. In Barbora Skarabela, Sarah Fish & Anna H.-J. Do (eds.), *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development*, 359–370. <http://crl.ucsd.edu/~elman/Papers/BU2001.pdf>.
- Li, Charles N. & Sandra A. Thompson. 1981. *Mandarin Chinese: A functional reference grammar*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Li, Wei. 1996. Esperanto inflection and its interface in HPSG. Working papers of the linguistics circle University of Victoria.
- Lichte, Timm. 2007. An MCTAG with tuples for coherent constructions in German. In Laura Kallmeyer, Paola Monachesi, Gerald Penn & Giorgio Satta (eds.), *Proceedings of the 12th Conference on Formal Grammar 2007*, Dublin, Ireland.
- Lieb, Hans-Heinrich. 1983. *Integrational linguistics: Vol. I.: General outline* (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 17). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Lightfoot, David W. 1997. Catastrophic change and learning theory. *Lingua* 100(1). 171–192.
- Link, Godehard. 1984. Hydras: On the logic of relative constructions with multiple heads. In Fred Landmann & Frank Veltman (eds.), *Varieties of formal semantics*, 245–257. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Lipenkova, Janna. 2009. *Serienverbkonstruktionen im Chinesischen und ihre Analyse im Rahmen von HPSG*. Institut für Sinologie, Freie Universität Berlin MA thesis.
- Liu, Gang. 1997. *Eine unifikations-basierte Grammatik für das moderne Chinesisch – dargestellt in der HPSG*: FG Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Konstanz dissertation. <http://www.ub.uni-konstanz.de/kops/volltexte/1999/191/>.
- Liu, Haitao. 2009. *Dependency Grammar: From theory to practice*. Beijing: Science Press.
- Liu, Haitao & Wei Huang. 2006. Chinese Dependency Syntax for treebanking. In *Proceedings of the Twentieth Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation*, 126–133. Beijing: Tsinghua University Press.
- Lloré, F. Xavier. 1995. *Un Método de ‘Parsing’ para Gramáticas Catoriales Multimodales*: I.C.E. de la Universidad Politécnica de Catalunya dissertation.
- Lobin, Henning. 1993. *Koordinationssyntax als strukturelles Phänomen* (Studien zur Grammatik 46). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

- Lobin, Henning. 2003. Dependenzgrammatik und Kategorialgrammatik. In Ägel et al. (2003b) 325–330.
- Löbner, Sebastian. 1986. In Sachen Nullartikel. *Linguistische Berichte* 101. 64–65. <http://user.phil-fak.uni-duesseldorf.de/~loebner/publ/Nullartikel.html>.
- Lohndal, Terje. 2012. Toward the end of argument structure. In María Cristina Cuervo & Yves Roberge (eds.), *The end of argument structure?*, vol. 38 (Syntax and Semantics), 155–184. Bingley, UK: Emerald Group Publishing.
- Lohnstein, Horst. 1993. *Projektion und Linking: Ein prinzipienbasierter Parser fürs Deutsche* (Linguistische Arbeiten 287). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Lohnstein, Horst. 2014. Artenvielfalt in freier Wildbahn: Generative Grammatik. In Hagemann & Staffeldt (2014) 165–185.
- Longobardi, Giuseppe & Ian Roberts. 2010. Universals, diversity and change in the science of language: Reaction to “The myth of language universals and cognitive science”. *Lingua* 120(12). 2699–2703.
- Lorenz, Konrad. 1970. *Studies in human and animal behavior*, vol. I. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Lötscher, Andreas. 1985. Syntaktische Bedingungen der Topikalisierung. *Deutsche Sprache* 13(3). 207–229.
- Loukam, Mourad, Amar Balla & Mohamed Tayeb Laskri. 2015. Towards an open platform based on HPSG formalism for the Standard Arabic language. *International Journal of Speech Technology* DOI:10.1007/s10772-015-9314-4.
- Lüdeling, Anke. 2001. *On particle verbs and similar constructions in German* (Dissertations in Linguistics). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Lüdeling, Anke & Merja Kytö (eds.). 2009. *Corpus linguistics: An international handbook*, vol. 29 (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Luuk, Erkki & Hendrik Luuk. 2011. The redundancy of recursion and infinity for natural language. *Cognitive Processing* 12(1). 1–11.
- Maas, Heinz Dieter. 1977. The Saarbrücken Automatic Translation System (SUSY). In Eric James Coates (ed.), *Proceedings of the Third European Congress on Information Systems and Networks: Overcoming the Language Barrier*, vol. 1, 585–592. München: Verlag Dokumentation.
- Maché, Jakob. 2010. Towards a compositional analysis of verbless directives in German. Paper presented at the HPSG 2010 Conference.
- Machicao y Priemer, Antonio. 2015. SpaGram: An implemented grammar fragment of Spanish. Ms. Humboldt Universität zu Berlin. In Preparation.
- MacWhinney, Brian. 1995. *The CHILDES project: Tools for analyzing talk*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum 2nd edn.
- Maess, Burkhard, Stefan Koelsch, Thomas C. Gunter & Angela D. Friederici. 2001. Musical syntax is processed in Broca’s area: An MEG study. *Nature Neuroscience* 4(5). 540–545.
- Marantz, Alec. 1984. *On the nature of grammatical relations* (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 10). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Marantz, Alec. 1997. No escape from syntax: Don't try morphological analysis in the privacy of your own lexicon. *U. Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 4(2). 201–225. <http://www.ling.upenn.edu/papers/v4.2-contents.html>.
- Marantz, Alec. 2005. Generative linguistics within the cognitive neuroscience of language. *The Linguistic Review* 22(2–4). 429–445.
- Marcus, Gary F. 1993. Negative evidence in language acquisition. *Cognition* 46(1). 53–85.
- Marcus, Gary F. & Simon E. Fisher. 2003. FOXP2 in focus: What can genes tell us about speech and language? *TRENDS in Cognitive Sciences* 7(6). 257–262.
- Marcus, Mitchell P. 1980. *A theory of syntactic recognition for natural language*. London, England/Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Marimon, Montserrat. 2013. The Spanish DELPH-IN grammar. *Language Resources and Evaluation* 47(2). 371–397. DOI:10.1007/s10579-012-9199-7.
- Marshall, Ian & Éva Sáfar. 2004. Sign Language generation in an ALE HPSG. In Müller (2004e) 189–201. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2004/>.
- Marslen-Wilson, William. 1975. Sentence perception as an interactive parallel process. *Science* 189(4198). 226–228.
- Masuichi, Hiroshi & Tomoko Ohkuma. 2003. Constructing a practical Japanese parser based on Lexical-Functional Grammar. *Journal of Natural Language Processing* 10. 79–109. In Japanese.
- Masum, Mahmudul Hasan, Muhammad Sadiqul Islam, M. Sohel Rahman & Reaz Ahmed. 2012. HPSG analysis of type-based Arabic nominal declension. In *The 13th International Arab Conference*, 272–279.
- Mayo, Bruce. 1997. Die Konstanzer LFG-Umgebung. Arbeitspapier 82 des Fachbereichs Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Konstanz Universität Konstanz.
- Mayo, Bruce. 1999. *A computational model of derivational morphology*: Universität Hamburg dissertation. <http://www.sub.uni-hamburg.de/opus/volltexte/1999/386/>.
- Meinunger, André. 2000. *Syntactic aspects of topic and comment* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 38). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Meisel, Jürgen. 1995. Parameters in acquisition. In Paul Fletcher & Brian MacWhinny (eds.), *The handbook of child language*, 10–35. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Mel'čuk, Igor A. 1964. *Avtomatičeskij sintaksičeskij analiz*, vol. 1. Novosibirsk: Izdatel'stvo SO AN SSSR.
- Mel'čuk, Igor A. 1981. Meaning-Text Models: A recent trend in Soviet linguistics. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 10. 27–62.
- Mel'čuk, Igor A. 1988. *Dependency Syntax: Theory and practice* (SUNY Series in Linguistics). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Mel'čuk, Igor A. 2003. Levels of dependency description: Concepts and problems. In Ágel et al. (2003b) 188–230.
- Melnik, Nurit. 2007. From “hand-written” to computationally implemented HPSG theories. *Research on Language and Computation* 5(2). 199–236.
- Mensching, Guido & Eva-Maria Remberger. 2011. Syntactic variation and change in Romance: A Minimalist approach. In Peter Siemund (ed.), *Linguistic universals and lan-*

- guage variation* (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 231), 361–403. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Menzel, Wolfgang. 1998. Constraint satisfaction for robust parsing of spoken language. *Journal of Experimental & Theoretical Artificial Intelligence* 10(1). 77–89.
- Menzel, Wolfgang & Ingo Schröder. 1998a. Constraint-based diagnosis for intelligent language tutoring systems. In *Proceedings of the ITF & KNOWS Conference at the IFIP '98 Congress*, Wien/Budapest.
- Menzel, Wolfgang & Ingo Schröder. 1998b. Decision procedures for Dependency Parsing using graded constraints. In Alain Polguère & Sylvain Kahane (eds.), *Processing of dependency-based grammars: Proceedings of the workshop at COLING-ACL '98*, 78–87. Association for Computational Linguistics. <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W/W98/#0500>.
- Meurer, Paul. 2009. A computational grammar for Georgian. In Peter Bosch, David Gabelaia & Jérôme Lang (eds.), *Logic, language, and computation: 7th International Tbilisi Symposium on Logic, Language, and Computation, TbiLLC 2007, Tbilisi, Georgia, October 2007, revised selected papers* (Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence 5422), 1–15. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Meurers, Walt Detmar. 1994. On implementing an HPSG theory. In Erhard W. Hinrichs, Walt Detmar Meurers & Tsuneko Nakazawa (eds.), *Partial-VP and split-NP topicalization in German – An HPSG analysis and its implementation* (Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340 No. 58), 47–155. Tübingen: Eberhard-Karls-Universität. <http://www.sfs.uni-tuebingen.de/~dm/papers/on-implementing.html>.
- Meurers, Walt Detmar. 1999a. German partial-VP fronting revisited. In Webelhuth et al. (1999) 129–144.
- Meurers, Walt Detmar. 1999b. *Lexical generalizations in the syntax of German non-finite constructions*. Tübingen: Eberhard-Karls-Universität dissertation.
- Meurers, Walt Detmar. 1999c. Raising spirits (and assigning them case). *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik (GAGL)* 43. 173–226. <http://www.sfs.uni-tuebingen.de/~dm/papers/gagl99.html>.
- Meurers, Walt Detmar. 2000. Lexical generalizations in the syntax of German non-finite constructions. Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340 No. 145 Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen. <http://www.sfs.uni-tuebingen.de/~dm/papers/diss.html>.
- Meurers, Walt Detmar. 2001. On expressing lexical generalizations in HPSG. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 24(2). 161–217.
- Meurers, Walt Detmar, Kordula De Kuthy & Vanessa Metcalf. 2003. Modularity of grammatical constraints in HPSG-based grammar implementations. In Bender et al. (2003) 83–90. <http://www.sfs.uni-tuebingen.de/~dm/papers/meurers-dekuthy-metcalf-03.html>.
- Meurers, Walt Detmar & Tibor Kiss (eds.). 2001. *Constraint-based approaches to Germanic syntax* (Studies in Constraint-Based Lexicalism 7). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Meurers, Walt Detmar & Stefan Müller. 2009. Corpora and syntax. In Lüdeling & Kytö (2009) chap. 42, 920–933.

- Meurers, Walt Detmar, Gerald Penn & Frank Richter. 2002. A web-based instructional platform for constraint-based grammar formalisms and parsing. In Dragomir Radev & Chris Brew (eds.), *Effective tools and methodologies for teaching NLP and CL*, 18–25. Association for Computational Linguistics. Proceedings of the Workshop held at 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. Philadelphia, PA.
- Micelli, Vanessa. 2012. Field topology and information structure: A case study for German constituent order. In Luc Steels (ed.), *Computational issues in Fluid Construction Grammar* (Lecture Notes in Computer Science 7249), 178–211. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Michaelis, Jens. 2001. *On formal properties of Minimalist Grammars*: Universität Potsdam dissertation.
- Michaelis, Laura A. 2006. Construction Grammar. In Brown (2006) 73–84.
- Michaelis, Laura A. & Josef Ruppenhofer. 2001. *Beyond alternations: A Constructional model of the German applicative pattern* (Stanford Monographs in Linguistics). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Miller, George A. & Kathryn Ojemann McKean. 1964. A chronometric study of some relations between sentences. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 16(4). 297–308.
- Mittendorf, Ingo & Louisa Sadler. 2005. Numerals, nouns and number in Welsh NPs. In Butt & King (2005) 294–312. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/10/>.
- Miyao, Yusuke, Takashi Ninomiya & Jun'ichi Tsujii. 2005. Corpus-oriented grammar development for acquiring a Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar from the Penn Treebank. In Su et al. (2005) 684–693.
- Miyao, Yusuke & Jun'ichi Tsujii. 2008. Feature forest models for probabilistic HPSG parsing. *Computational Linguistics* 34(1). 35–80.
- Moens, Marc, Jo Calder, Ewan Klein, Mike Reape & Henk Zeevat. 1989. Expressing generalizations in unification-based grammar formalisms. In Somers & Wood (1989) 174–181.
- Montague, Richard. 1974. *Formal philosophy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Moore, Johanna D., Simone Teufel, James Allan & Sadaoki Furui (eds.). 2008. *Proceedings of the 46th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*. Columbus, Ohio: Association for Computational Linguistics. <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P/P08/>.
- Moortgat, Michael. 1989. *Categorical investigations: Logical and linguistic aspects of the Lambek Calculus* (Groningen Amsterdam Studies in Semantics 9). Dordrecht/Cinnaminson, U.S.A.: Foris Publications.
- Moortgat, Michael. 2011. Categorical type logics. In van Benthem & ter Meulen (2011) 95–179.
- Moot, Richard. 2002. *Proof nets for linguistic analysis*: University of Utrecht dissertation.
- Morgan, James L. 1989. Learnability considerations and the nature of trigger experiences in language acquisition. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 12(2). 352–353.
- Morin, Yves Ch. 1973. A computer tested Transformational Grammar of French. *Linguistics* 116(11). 49–114.

参考文献

- Morrill, Glyn V. 1994. *Type Logical Grammars: Categorical logic of signs*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Morrill, Glyn V. 1995. Discontinuity in Categorical Grammar. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 18(2). 175–219.
- Morrill, Glyn V. 2012. CatLog: A Categorical parser/theorem-prover. In *Logical aspects of computational linguistics: System demonstrations*, 13–16. Nantes, France: University of Nantes.
- Müller, Gereon. 1996a. A constraint on remnant movement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14(2). 355–407.
- Müller, Gereon. 1996b. On extraposition and successive cyclicity. In Uli Lutz & Jürgen Pafel (eds.), *On extraction and extraposition in German* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 11), 213–243. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Müller, Gereon. 1998. *Incomplete category fronting: A derivational approach to remnant movement in German* (Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 42). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Müller, Gereon. 2000. *Elemente der optimalitätstheoretischen Syntax* (Stauffenburg Linguistik 20). Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Müller, Gereon. 2009a. There are no Constructions. Handout Ringvorlesung: *Algorithmen und Muster: Strukturen in der Sprache*. Freie Universität Berlin, 20. Mai.
- Müller, Gereon. 2011a. Regeln oder Konstruktionen? Von verblosen Direktiven zur sequentiellen Nominalreduplikation. In Engelberg et al. (2011) 211–249.
- Müller, Gereon. 2014a. Syntactic buffers. Linguistische Arbeitsberichte 91 Institut für Linguistic Universität Leipzig. <http://www.uni-leipzig.de/~muellerg/mu765.pdf>.
- Müller, Natascha & Beate Riemer. 1998. *Generative Syntax der romanischen Sprachen: Französisch, Italienisch, Portugiesisch, Spanisch* (Stauffenburg Einführungen 17). Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Müller, Stefan. 1995. Scrambling in German – Extraction into the *Mittelfeld*. In Benjamin K. T'sou & Tom Bong Yeung Lai (eds.), *Proceedings of the Tenth Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation*, 79–83. City University of Hong Kong.
- Müller, Stefan. 1996c. The Babel-System—An HPSG fragment for German, a parser, and a dialogue component. In *Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on the Practical Application of Prolog*, 263–277. London.
- Müller, Stefan. 1996d. Yet another paper about partial verb phrase fronting in German. In Jun-ichi Tsuji (ed.), *Proceedings of COLING-96: 16th International Conference on Computational Linguistics (COLING96). Copenhagen, Denmark, August 5–9, 1996*, 800–805. Copenhagen, Denmark: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Müller, Stefan. 1999a. *Deutsche Syntax deklarativ: Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar für das Deutsche* (Linguistische Arbeiten 394). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Müller, Stefan. 1999b. An HPSG-analysis for free relative clauses in German. *Grammars* 2(1). 53–105.
- Müller, Stefan. 1999c. Restricting discontinuity. In *Proceedings of the 5th Natural Language Processing Pacific Rim Symposium 1999 (NLPRS'99)*, 85–90. Peking.

- Müller, Stefan. 1999d. Restricting discontinuity. Verbmobil Report 237 Deutsches Forschungszentrum für Künstliche Intelligenz Saarbrücken. This report is also published in the Proceedings of GLDV 99 (Frankfurt/Main). The initial part is contained in the proceedings of the 5th Natural Language Processing Pacific Rim Symposium 1999 (NLPRS'99).
- Müller, Stefan. 2001. Case in German – towards an HPSG analysis. In Walt Detmar Meurers & Tibor Kiss (eds.), *Constraint-based approaches to Germanic syntax* (Studies in Constraint-Based Lexicalism 7), 217–255. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Müller, Stefan. 2002a. *Complex predicates: Verbal complexes, resultative constructions, and particle verbs in German* (Studies in Constraint-Based Lexicalism 13). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Müller, Stefan. 2002b. Multiple frontings in German. In Jäger et al. (2002) 113–124.
- Müller, Stefan. 2002c. Syntax or morphology: German particle verbs revisited. In Dehé et al. (2002) 119–139.
- Müller, Stefan. 2003a. Mehrfache Vorfeldbesetzung. *Deutsche Sprache* 31(1). 29–62.
- Müller, Stefan. 2003b. Object-to-subject-raising and lexical rule: An analysis of the German passive. In Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, Michigan State University, East Lansing*, 278–297. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Müller, Stefan (ed.). 2003c. *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, Michigan State University, East Lansing*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2003/>.
- Müller, Stefan. 2003d. Solving the bracketing paradox: An analysis of the morphology of German particle verbs. *Journal of Linguistics* 39(2). 275–325.
- Müller, Stefan. 2004a. An analysis of depictive secondary predicates in German without discontinuous constituents. In Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, Center for Computational Linguistics, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven*, 202–222. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Müller, Stefan. 2004b. Complex NPs, subadjacency, and extraposition. *Snippets* 8. 10–11.
- Müller, Stefan. 2004c. Continuous or discontinuous constituents? A comparison between syntactic analyses for constituent order and their processing systems. *Research on Language and Computation, Special Issue on Linguistic Theory and Grammar Implementation* 2(2). 209–257.
- Müller, Stefan. 2004d. An HPSG analysis of German depictive secondary predicates. In Lawrence S. Moss & Richard T. Oehrle (eds.), *Proceedings of the joint meeting of the 6th Conference on Formal Grammar and the 7th Conference on Mathematics of Language* (Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science 53), 233–245. Helsinki: Elsevier Science Publisher B.V. (North-Holland). DOI:10.1016/S1571-0661(05)82585-X.
- Müller, Stefan (ed.). 2004e. *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, Center for Computational Linguistics, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2004/>.

- Müller, Stefan. 2005a. Resultative Constructions: Syntax, world knowledge, and collocational restrictions: Review of Hans C. Boas: A Constructional approach to resultatives. *Studies in Language* 29(3). 651–681.
- Müller, Stefan. 2005b. Zur Analyse der deutschen Satzstruktur. *Linguistische Berichte* 201. 3–39.
- Müller, Stefan. 2005c. Zur Analyse der scheinbar mehrfachen Vorfeldbesetzung. *Linguistische Berichte* 203. 297–330.
- Müller, Stefan. 2006. Phrasal or lexical Constructions? *Language* 82(4). 850–883.
- Müller, Stefan. 2007a. The Grammix CD Rom: A software collection for developing typed feature structure grammars. In King & Bender (2007) 259–266. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/GEAF/2007/>.
- Müller, Stefan. 2007b. *Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar: Eine Einführung* (Stauffenburg Einführungen 17). Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag 1st edn.
- Müller, Stefan. 2007c. Phrasal or lexical Constructions: Some comments on underspecification of constituent order, compositionality, and control. In Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*, 373–393. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Müller, Stefan (ed.). 2007d. *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2007/>.
- Müller, Stefan. 2007e. Qualitative Korpusanalyse für die Grammatiktheorie: Introspektion vs. Korpus. In Gisela Zifonun & Werner Kallmeyer (eds.), *Sprachkorpora – Datenmengen und Erkenntnisfortschritt* (Institut für Deutsche Sprache Jahrbuch 2006), 70–90. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Müller, Stefan. 2008a. Depictive secondary predicates in German and English. In Christoph Schroeder, Gerd Hentschel & Winfried Boeder (eds.), *Secondary predicates in Eastern European languages and beyond* (Studia Slavica Oldenburgensia 16), 255–273. Oldenburg: BIS-Verlag.
- Müller, Stefan (ed.). 2008b. *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2008/>.
- Müller, Stefan. 2009b. A Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar for Maltese. In Bernard Comrie, Ray Fabri, Beth Hume, Manwel Mifsud, Thomas Stolz & Martine Vanhove (eds.), *Introducing Maltese linguistics: Papers from the 1st International Conference on Maltese Linguistics (Bremen/Germany, 18–20 October, 2007)* (Studies in Language Companion Series 113), 83–112. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Müller, Stefan. 2009c. On predication. In Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, University of Göttingen, Germany*, 213–233. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Müller, Stefan (ed.). 2009d. *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, University of Göttingen, Germany*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

- Müller, Stefan. 2010a. *Grammatiktheorie* (Stauffenburg Einführungen 20). Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Müller, Stefan. 2010b. Persian complex predicates and the limits of inheritance-based analyses. *Journal of Linguistics* 46(3). 601–655.
- Müller, Stefan (ed.). 2011b. *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, University of Washington*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2011/>.
- Müller, Stefan. 2012a. On the copula, specificational constructions and type shifting. Ms. Freie Universität Berlin.
- Müller, Stefan. 2012b. A personal note on open access in linguistics. *Journal of Language Modelling* 0(1). 9–39.
- Müller, Stefan. 2013a. The CoreGram project: A brief overview and motivation. In Denys Duchier & Yannick Parmentier (eds.), *Proceedings of the workshop on high-level methodologies for grammar engineering (HMGE 2013), Düsseldorf*, 93–104.
- Müller, Stefan. 2013b. *Grammatiktheorie* (Stauffenburg Einführungen 20). Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag 2nd edn.
- Müller, Stefan. 2013c. Unifying everything: Some remarks on Simpler Syntax, Construction Grammar, Minimalism and HPSG. *Language* 89(4). 920–950.
- Müller, Stefan. 2014b. Artenvielfalt und Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar. In Jörg Hagemann & Sven Staffeldt (eds.), *Syntaxtheorien: Analysen im Vergleich* (Stauffenburg Einführungen 28), 187–233. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Müller, Stefan. 2014c. Elliptical constructions, multiple frontings, and surface-based syntax. In Paola Monachesi, Gerhard Jäger, Gerald Penn & Shuly Wintner (eds.), *Proceedings of Formal Grammar 2004, Nancy*, 91–109. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Müller, Stefan. 2014d. Kernigkeit: Anmerkungen zur Kern-Peripherie-Unterscheidung. In Antonio Machicao y Priemer, Andreas Nolda & Athina Sioupi (eds.), *Zwischen Kern und Peripherie* (studia grammatica 76), 25–39. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Müller, Stefan. 2015a. The CoreGram project: Theoretical linguistics, theory development and verification. *Journal of Language Modelling* 3(1). 21–86. DOI:10.15398/jlm.v3i1.91.
- Müller, Stefan. 2015b. *German sentence structure: An analysis with special consideration of so-called multiple fronting* (Empirically Oriented Theoretical Morphology and Syntax). Berlin: Language Science Press. Submitted.
- Müller, Stefan. 2015c. HPSG – A synopsis. In Tibor Kiss & Artemis Alexiadou (eds.), *Syntax – Theory and analysis: An international handbook* (Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 42.2), 937–973. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter 2nd edn.
- Müller, Stefan (ed.). 2015d. *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, Nanyang Technological University (NTU), Singapore*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2015/>.
- Müller, Stefan. 2016a. *Germanic syntax* (Textbooks in Language Sciences). Berlin: Language Science Press. In Preparation.
- Müller, Stefan. 2016b. Satztypen: Lexikalisch oder/und phrasal. In Rita Finkbeiner & Jörg Meibauer (eds.), *Satztypen und Konstruktionen im Deutschen* (Linguistik – Impulse und Tendenzen 65), 72–105. Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter.

- Müller, Stefan & Masood Ghayoomi. 2010. PerGram: A TRALE implementation of an HPSG fragment of Persian. In *Proceedings of 2010 IEEE International Multiconference on Computer Science and Information Technology – Computational Linguistics Applications (CLA'10)*. Wisła, Poland, 18–20 October 2010, vol. 5, 461–467. Polish Information Processing Society.
- Müller, Stefan & Martin Haspelmath. 2013. Language Science Press: A publication model for open-access books in linguistics. Grant Proposal to the DFG.
- Müller, Stefan & Walter Kasper. 2000. HPSG analysis of German. In Wolfgang Wahlster (ed.), *Verbmobil: Foundations of speech-to-speech translation* (Artificial Intelligence), 238–253. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Müller, Stefan & Janna Lipenkova. 2009. Serial verb constructions in Chinese: An HPSG account. In Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, University of Göttingen, Germany*, 234–254. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Müller, Stefan & Janna Lipenkova. 2013. ChinGram: A TRALE implementation of an HPSG fragment of Mandarin Chinese. In Huei ling Lai & Kawai Chui (eds.), *Proceedings of the 27th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information, and Computation (PACLIC 27)*, 240–249. Taipei, Taiwan: Department of English, National Chengchi University.
- Müller, Stefan & Janna Lipenkova. 2016. *Mandarin Chinese in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar* (Empirically Oriented Theoretical Morphology and Syntax). Berlin: Language Science Press. In Preparation.
- Müller, Stefan & Bjarne Ørsnes. 2011. Positional expletives in Danish, German, and Yiddish. In Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, University of Washington, U.S.A.*, 167–187. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Müller, Stefan & Bjarne Ørsnes. 2013a. Passive in Danish, English, and German. In Stefan Müller (ed.), *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, Freie Universität Berlin*, 140–160. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Müller, Stefan & Bjarne Ørsnes. 2013b. Towards an HPSG analysis of object shift in Danish. In Glyn Morrill & Mark-Jan Nederhof (eds.), *Formal Grammar: 17th and 18th International Conferences, FG 2012, Opole, Poland, August 2012, revised selected papers, FG 2013, Düsseldorf, Germany, August 2013: Proceedings* (Lecture Notes in Computer Science 8036), 69–89. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Müller, Stefan & Bjarne Ørsnes. 2015. *Danish in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar* (Empirically Oriented Theoretical Morphology and Syntax). Berlin: Language Science Press. In Preparation.
- Müller, Stefan & Stephen Mark Wechsler. 2014a. Lexical approaches to argument structure. *Theoretical Linguistics* 40(1–2). 1–76.
- Müller, Stefan & Stephen Mark Wechsler. 2014b. Two sides of the same slim Boojum: Further arguments for a lexical approach to argument structure. *Theoretical Linguistics* 40(1–2). 187–224.

- Muraki, Kazunori, Shunji Ichiyama & Yasutomo Fukumochi. 1985. Augmented Dependency Grammar: A simple interface between the grammar rule and the knowledge. In King (1985) 198–204. <http://aclweb.org/anthology/E/E85/>.
- Musso, Mariacristina, Andrea Moro, Volkmar Glauche, Michel Rijntjes, Jürgen Reichenbach, Christian Büchel & Cornelius Weiller. 2003. Broca's area and the language instinct. *Nature Neuroscience* 6(7). 774–781.
- Müürisep, Kaili. 1999. Determination of syntactic functions in Estonian Constraint Grammar. In Henry S. Thompson & Alex Lascarides (eds.), *Ninth conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 291–292. Bergen, Norway.
- Müürisep, Kaili, Tiina Puolakainen, Kadri Muischnek, Mare Koit, Tiit Roosmaa & Heli Uiibo. 2003. A new language for Constraint Grammar: Estonian. In *International Conference Recent Advances in Natural Language Processing*, 304–310.
- Muysken, Peter. 1982. Parameterizing the notion of “head”. *Journal of Linguistic Research* 2. 57–75.
- Mykowiecka, Agnieszka, Małgorzata Marciniak, Adam Przepiórkowski & Anna Kupść. 2003. An implementation of a Generative Grammar of Polish. In Peter Kosta, Joanna Błaszczak, Jens Frasek, Ljudmila Geist & Marzena Żygis (eds.), *Investigations into formal Slavic linguistics: Contributions of the Fourth European Conference on Formal Description of Slavic Languages – FDSL IV held at Potsdam University, November 28–30, 2001*, 271–285. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Nagao, Makoto (ed.). 1986. *Proceedings of COLING 86*. University of Bonn: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Nagao, Makoto (ed.). 1994. *Proceedings of COLING 94*. Kyoto, Japan: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Naumann, Sven. 1987. Ein einfacher Parser für generalisierte Phrasenstrukturgrammatiken. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 6(2). 206–226.
- Naumann, Sven. 1988. *Generalisierte Phrasenstrukturgrammatik: Parsingstrategien, Regelorganisation und Unifikation* (Linguistische Arbeiten 212). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Neeleman, Ad. 1994. *Complex predicates*. Utrecht: Onderzoeksinstituut voor Taal en Spraak (OTS) dissertation.
- Nelimarkka, Esa, Harri Jäppinen & Aarno Lehtola. 1984. Two-way finite automata and Dependency Grammar: A parsing method for inflectional free word order languages. In Wilks (1984) 389–392.
- Nerbonne, John. 1986a. ‘Phantoms’ and German fronting: Poltergeist constituents? *Linguistics* 24(5). 857–870.
- Nerbonne, John. 1986b. A phrase-structure grammar for German passives. *Linguistics* 24(5). 907–938.
- Nerbonne, John. 1993. A feature-based syntax/semantics interface. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence* 8(1–2). 107–132. Special issue on Mathematics of Language edited by Alexis Manaster-Ramer and Wlodek Zadrozny, selected from the 2nd Conference on Mathematics of Language. Also published as DFKI Research Report RR-92-42.

- Nerbonne, John, Klaus Netter & Carl J. Pollard (eds.). 1994a. *German in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar* (CSLI Lecture Notes 46). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Nerbonne, John, Klaus Netter & Carl J. Pollard (eds.). 1994b. *German in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar* (CSLI Lecture Notes 46). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Netter, Klaus. 1991. Clause union phenomena and complex predicates in German. DYANA Report, Deliverable R1.1.B University of Edinburgh.
- Netter, Klaus. 1992. On non-head non-movement: An HPSG treatment of finite verb position in German. In Günther Görz (ed.), *Konvens 92. 1. Konferenz „Verarbeitung natürlicher Sprache“*. Nürnberg 7.–9. Oktober 1992 (Informatik aktuell), 218–227. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Netter, Klaus. 1993. Architecture and coverage of the DISCO Grammar. In Stephan Busemann & Karin Harbusch (eds.), *DFKI Workshop on Natural Language Systems: Re-Usability and Modularity, October 23* (DFKI Document D-93-03), 1–10. Saarbrücken, Germany: DFKI.
- Netter, Klaus. 1994. Towards a theory of functional heads: German nominal phrases. In Nerbonne et al. (1994b) 297–340.
- Netter, Klaus. 1996. *Functional categories in an HPSG for German*. Saarbrücken: Universität des Saarlandes Dissertation.
- Netter, Klaus. 1998. *Functional categories in an HPSG for German* (Saarbrücken Dissertations in Computational Linguistics and Language Technology 3). Saarbrücken: Deutsches Forschungszentrum für Künstliche Intelligenz Universität des Saarlandes.
- Neville, Anne & Patrizia Paggio. 2004. Developing a Danish grammar in the GRASP project: A construction-based approach to topology and extraction in Danish. In Lawrence S. Moss & Richard T. Oehrle (eds.), *Proceedings of the joint meeting of the 6th Conference on Formal Grammar and the 7th Conference on Mathematics of Language* (Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science 53), 246–259. Helsinki: Elsevier Science Publisher B.V. (North-Holland).
- Nevins, Andrew Ira, David Pesetsky & Cilene Rodrigues. 2009. Pirahã exceptionality: A reassessment. *Language* 85(2). 355–404.
- Newmeyer, Frederick J. 2004a. Against a parameter-setting approach to language variation. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 4. 181–234.
- Newmeyer, Frederick J. 2004b. Typological evidence and Universal Grammar. *Studies in Language* 28(3). 527–548.
- Newmeyer, Frederick J. 2005. *Possible and probable languages: A Generative perspective on linguistic typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Newmeyer, Frederick J. 2010. On comparative concepts and descriptive categories: A reply to Haspelmath. *Language* 86(3). 688–695.
- Newport, Elissa L. 1990. Maturational constraints on language learning. *Cognitive Science* 14(1). 11–28.
- Ng, Say Kiat. 1997. *A double-specifier account of Chinese NPs using Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*. University of Edinburgh, Department of Linguistics MSc speech and language processing.

- Nivre, Joakim. 2003. An efficient algorithm for projective dependency parsing. In van Noord (2003).
- Nolda, Andreas. 2007. *Die Thema-Integration: Syntax und Semantik der gespaltenen Topikalisation im Deutschen* (Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 72). Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Noonan, Michael. 1994. A tale of two passives in Irish. In Barbara Fox & Paul J. Hopper (eds.), *Voice: Form and function* (Typological Studies in Language 27), 279–311. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- van Noord, Gertjan (ed.). 2003. *Proceedings of the 8th International Workshop on Parsing Technologies (IWPT 03)*. Nancy.
- van Noord, Gertjan & Gosse Bouma. 1994. The scope of adjuncts and the processing of lexical rules. In Nagao (1994) 250–256.
- Nordgård, Torbjørn. 1994. E-Parser: An implementation of a deterministic GB-related parsing system. *Computers and the Humanities* 28(4–5). 259–272.
- Nordlinger, Rachel. 1998. *Constructive case: Evidence from Australia* (Dissertations in Linguistics). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Nowak, Martin A., Natalia L. Komarova & Partha Niyogi. 2001. Evolution of Universal Grammar. *Science* 291(5501). 114–118.
- Nozohoor-Farshi, R. 1986. On formalizations of Marcus' parser. In Nagao (1986) 533–535.
- Nozohoor-Farshi, R. 1987. Context-freeness of the language accepted by Marcus' parser. In Sidner (1987) 117–122.
- Nunberg, Geoffrey. 1995. Transfers of meaning. *Journal of Semantics* 12(2). 109–132.
- Nunberg, Geoffrey, Ivan A. Sag & Thomas Wasow. 1994. Idioms. *Language* 70(3). 491–538.
- Nunes, Jairo. 2004. *Linearization of chains and Sideward Movement* (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 43). Cambridge, MA/London, England: MIT Press.
- Ochs, Elinor. 1982. Talking to children in Western Samoa. *Language and Society* 11(1). 77–104.
- Ochs, Elinor & Bambi B. Schieffelin. 1985. Language acquisition and socialization: Three developmental stories. In Richard A. Shweder & Robert A. LeVine (eds.), *Culture theory: Essays in mind, self and emotion*, 276–320. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Donovan, Ruth, Michael Burke, Aoife Cahill, Josef van Genabith & Andy Way. 2005. Large-scale induction and evaluation of lexical resources from the Penn-II and Penn-III Treebanks. *Computational Linguistics* 31(3). 328–365.
- Oehrle, Richard, Emmon Bach & Deirdre Wheeler (eds.). 1988. *Categorical Grammars and natural language structures*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Oepen, Stephan & Daniel P. Flickinger. 1998. Towards systematic grammar profiling: Test suite technology ten years after. *Journal of Computer Speech and Language* 12(4). 411–436. <http://www.delph-in.net/itsdb/publications/profiling.ps.gz>. (Special Issue on Evaluation).
- Özkaragöz, İnci. 1986. Monoclausal double passives in Turkish. In Dan I. Slobin & Karl Zimmer (eds.), *Studies in Turkish linguistics* (Typological Studies in Language 8), 77–91. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

- Oliva, Karel. 1992. Word order constraints in binary branching syntactic structures. CLAUS-Report 20 Universität des Saarlandes Saarbrücken.
- Oliva, Karel. 2003. Dependency, valency and Head-Driven Phrase-Structure Grammar. In Ágel et al. (2003b) 660–668.
- O'Neill, Michael & Randall Wood. 2012. The grammar of happiness. Essential Media & Entertainment / Smithsonian Networks. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=er2Vak4uXUs#t=1519>.
- Oppenrieder, Wilhelm. 1991. *Von Subjekten, Sätzen und Subjektsätzen* (Linguistische Arbeiten 241). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Orgun, Cemil Orhan. 1996. *Sign-based morphology and phonology*: University of California, Berkeley dissertation.
- Osborne, Miles & Ted J. Briscoe. 1997. Learning Stochastic Categorical Grammars. In T. Mark Ellison (ed.), *CoNLL97: Computational Natural Language Learning: Proceedings of the 1997 meeting of the ACL Special Interest Group in Natural Language Learning*, 80–87. Madrid: Association for Computational Linguistics. <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology-new/signll.html#1997-0>.
- Osborne, Timothy. 2014. Dependency Grammar. In Carnie et al. (2014) 604–626.
- Osborne, Timothy. 2016. Ellipsis in Dependency Grammar. In Jeroen van Craenenbroek (ed.), *Oxford handbook of ellipsis*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. To appear.
- Osborne, Timothy & Thomas M. Groß. 2012. Constructions are catenae: Construction Grammar meets Dependency Grammar. *Cognitive Linguistics* 23(1). 165–216.
- Osborne, Timothy & Sylvain Kahane. 2015. Translators' introduction. In *Elements of structural syntax*, xxix–lxxiii. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co. Translated by Timothy Osborne and Sylvain Kahane.
- Osborne, Timothy, Michael Putnam & Thomas M. Groß. 2011. Bare Phrase Structure, label-less trees, and specifier-less syntax: Is Minimalism becoming a Dependency Grammar? *The Linguistic Review* 28(3). 315–364.
- Osenova, Petya. 2010a. Bulgarian Resource Grammar – efficient and realistic (BURGER). Tech. rep. LingoLab, CSLI Stanford. <http://www.bultreebank.org/BURGER/BURGER3.pdf>.
- Osenova, Petya. 2010b. *Bulgarian Resource Grammar: Modeling Bulgarian in HPSG*. Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag Dr. Müller.
- Osenova, Petya. 2011. Localizing a core HPSG-based grammar for Bulgarian. In Hedeland et al. (2011) 175–182.
- Ott, Dennis. 2011. A note on free relative clauses in the theory of Phases. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42(1). 183–192.
- Ørsnes, Bjarne. 1995. *The derivation and compounding of complex event nominals in Modern Danish: An HPSG approach with an implementation in Prolog*: University of Copenhagen dissertation.
- Ørsnes, Bjarne. 2002. Case marking and subject extraction in Danish. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Proceedings of the LFG 2002 conference*, 333–353. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/7/>.

- Ørsnes, Bjarne. 2009a. Das Verbalfeldmodell: Ein Stellungsfeldermodell für den kontrastiven DaF-Unterricht. *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* 46(3). 143–149.
- Ørsnes, Bjarne. 2009b. Preposed negation in Danish. In Müller (2009d) 255–275.
- Ørsnes, Bjarne & Jürgen Wedekind. 2003. Parallele datamatiske grammatikker for Norsk og Dansk [parallel computational grammars for Norwegian and Danish]. In Henrik Holmboe (ed.), *Årbog for nordisk sprogteknologisk forskningsprogram 2000–2004*, 113–130. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanums Forlag.
- Ørsnes, Bjarne & Jürgen Wedekind. 2004. Parallele datamatiske grammatikker for Norsk og Dansk: Analyse og disambiguering af modalverber [parallel computational grammars for Norwegian and Danish: Analysis and disambiguation of modal verbs]. In Henrik Holmboe (ed.), *Årbog for Nordisk Sprogteknologisk forskningsprogram 2000–2004*, 165–182. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanums Forlag.
- Pafel, Jürgen. 1993. Ein Überblick über die Extraktion aus Nominalphrasen im Deutschen. In Franz-Josef d’Avis, Sigrid Beck, Uli Lutz, Jürgen Pafel & Susanne Trissler (eds.), *Extraktion im Deutschen I* (Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340 No. 34), 191–245. Tübingen: Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen.
- Paggio, Patrizia. 2005. Representing information structure in a formal grammar of Danish. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop on Logic and Engineering of Natural Language Semantics (LENLS2005)*. Kitakyushu, Japan. June 13–14, .
- Parmentier, Yannick, Laura Kallmeyer, Wolfgang Maier, Timm Lichte & Johannes Dellert. 2008. TuLiPA: A syntax-semantics parsing environment for mildly context-sensitive formalisms. In *Proceedings of the Ninth International Workshop on Tree Adjoining Grammars and Related Formalisms (TAG+9)*, 121–128. Tübingen. <http://www.sfs.uni-tuebingen.de/~lk/papers/tag+9-parmentier-et-al.pdf>.
- Partee, Barbara H. 1987. Noun phrase interpretation and type-shifting principles. In Jeroen A. G. Groenendijk, Dick de Jongh & Martin J. B. Stokhof (eds.), *Studies in Discourse Representation Theory and the theory of generalized quantifiers*, 115–143. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Patejuk, Agnieszka & Adam Przepiórkowski. 2012. Towards an LFG parser for Polish: An exercise in parasitic grammar development. In *Proceedings of the Eighth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation, LREC 2012*, 3849–3852. Istanbul, Turkey: ELRA.
- Paul, Hermann. 1919. *Deutsche Grammatik. Teil IV: Syntax*, vol. 3. Halle an der Saale: Max Niemeyer Verlag. 2nd unchanged edition 1968, Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Paul, Soma. 2004. *An HPSG account of Bangla compound verbs with LKB implementation*. Hyderabad, India: CALTS, University of Hyderabad, India dissertation.
- Peeters, Bert (ed.). 2000. *The lexicon–encyclopedia interface*. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Penn, Gerald. 2004. Balancing clarity and efficiency in typed feature logic through delaying. In Donia Scott (ed.), *Proceedings of the 42nd Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL’04), main volume*, 239–246. Barcelona, Spain.
- Penn, Gerald & Bob Carpenter. 1999. ALE for speech: A translation prototype. In Géza Gordos (ed.), *Proceedings of the 6th Conference on Speech Communication and Technology (EUROSPEECH)*, Budapest, Hungary.

- Perlmutter, David M. 1978. Impersonal passives and the Unaccusative Hypothesis. In *Proceedings of the 4th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 157–189. Berkeley Linguistic Society.
- Perlmutter, David M. (ed.). 1983. *Studies in relational grammar*, vol. 1. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Perlmutter, David M. (ed.). 1984. *Studies in relational grammar*, vol. 2. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Perlmutter, David M. & John Robert Ross. 1970. Relative clauses with split antecedents. *Linguistic Inquiry* 1(3). 350.
- Pesetsky, David. 1996. *Zero syntax: Experiencers and cascades*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Peters, Stanley & R. W. Ritchie. 1973. On the generative power of Transformational Grammar. *Information Sciences* 6(C). 49–83.
- Petrick, Stanley Roy. 1965. *A recognition procedure for Transformational Grammars*: Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Dept. of Modern Languages dissertation. <http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/13013>.
- Phillips, Colin. 2003. Linear order and constituency. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34(1). 37–90.
- Phillips, John D. 1992. A computational representation for Generalised Phrase Structure Grammars. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 15(3). 255–287.
- Phillips, John D. & Henry S. Thompson. 1985. GPSGP – A parser for Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar. *Linguistics* 23(2). 245–261.
- Piattelli-Palmarini, Massimo (ed.). 1980. *Language and learning: The debate between Jean Piaget and Noam Chomsky*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Pickering, Martin & Guy Barry. 1993. Dependency Categorical Grammar and coordination. *Linguistics* 31(5). 855–902.
- Pienemann, Manfred. 2005. An introduction to Processability Theory. In Manfred Pienemann (ed.), *Cross-linguistic aspects of processability theory*, 1–60. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Piñango, Maria Mercedes, Jennifer Mack & Ray S. Jackendoff. 2006. Semantic combinatorial processes in argument structure: Evidence from light-verbs. In *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: Theoretical approaches to argument structure*, vol. 32, Berkeley, CA: BLS.
- Pineda, Luis Alberto & Iván V. Meza. 2005a. A computational model of the Spanish clitic system. In Alexander Gelbukh (ed.), *Computational linguistics and intelligent language processing*, 73–82. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Pineda, Luis Alberto & Iván V. Meza. 2005b. The Spanish pronominal clitic system. *Procesamiento del Lenguaje Natural* 34. 67–103.
- Pinker, Steven. 1984. *Learnability and cognition: The acquisition of argument structure*. London/Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Pinker, Steven. 1994. *The language instinct: How the mind creates language*. New York: William Morrow.
- Pinker, Steven & Ray S. Jackendoff. 2005. The faculty of language: What’s special about it? *Cognition* 95(2). 201–236.

- Piñón, Christopher (ed.). 2012. *Empirical issues in syntax and semantics*, vol. 9. Paris: CNRS.
- Pittner, Karin. 1995. Regeln für die Bildung von freien Relativsätzen: Eine Antwort an Oddleif Leirbukt. *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* 32(4). 195–200.
- Plank, Frans & Elena Filimonova. 2000. The universals archive: A brief introduction for prospective users. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 53(1). 109–123.
- Poletto, Cecilia. 2000. *The higher functional field: Evidence from Northern Italian Dialects*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pollard, Carl J. 1984. *Generalized Phrase Structure Grammars, Head Grammars, and natural language*: Stanford University dissertation.
- Pollard, Carl J. 1988. Categorical Grammar and Phrase Structure Grammar: An excursion on the syntax-semantics frontier. In Oehrle et al. (1988) 391–415.
- Pollard, Carl J. 1994. Toward a unified account of passive in German. In Nerbonne et al. (1994b) 273–296.
- Pollard, Carl J. 1996a. The nature of constraint-based grammar. Paper presented at the Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information, and Computation, Kyung Hee University, Seoul, Korea. <http://lingo.stanford.edu/sag/L221a/pollard-96.txt>.
- Pollard, Carl J. 1996b. On head non-movement. In Harry Bunt & Arthur van Horck (eds.), *Discontinuous constituency* (Natural Language Processing 6), 279–305. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. Published version of a Ms. dated January 1990.
- Pollard, Carl J. 1999. Strong generative capacity in HPSG. In Webelhuth et al. (1999) 281–298.
- Pollard, Carl J. & Andrew M. Moshier. 1990. Unifying partial descriptions of sets. In Philip P. Hanson (ed.), *Information, language and cognition* (Vancouver Studies in Cognitive Science 1), 285–322. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Pollard, Carl J. & Ivan A. Sag. 1987. *Information-based syntax and semantics* (CSLI Lecture Notes 13). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Pollard, Carl J. & Ivan A. Sag. 1992. Anaphors in English and the scope of Binding Theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23(2). 261–303.
- Pollard, Carl J. & Ivan A. Sag. 1994. *Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar* (Studies in Contemporary Linguistics). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Pollock, Jean-Yves. 1989. Verb movement, Universal Grammar and the structure of IP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20(3). 365–424.
- Popowich, Fred & Carl Vogel. 1991. A logic based implementation of Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar. In Charles Grant Brown & Gregers Koch (eds.), *Natural Language Understanding and Logic Programming, III. The 3rd International Workshop, Stockholm, Sweden, 23–25 Jan., 1991*, 227–246. Amsterdam: Elsevier, North-Holland.
- Porzel, Robert, Vanessa Micelli, Hidir Aras & Hans-Peter Zorn. 2006. Tying the knot: Ground entities, descriptions and information objects for Construction-based information extraction. In *Proceedings of the OntoLex Workshop at LREC, May 2006. Genoa, Italy*, 35–40.
- Postal, Paul M. 2004. *Skeptical linguistic essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Postal, Paul M. 2009. The incoherence of Chomsky's 'Biolinguistic' ontology. *Biolinguistics* 3(1). 104–123.
- Postal, Paul M. & Geoffrey K. Pullum. 1986. Misgovernment. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17(1). 104–110.
- Prince, Alan & Paul Smolensky. 1993. Optimality Theory: Constraint interaction in Generative Grammar. RuCCS Technical Report 2 Center for Cognitive Science, Rutgers University, Piscataway, N.J., and Computer Science Department, University of Colorado, Boulder. <http://roa.rutgers.edu/files/537-0802/537-0802-PRINCE-0-0.PDF>.
- Przepiórkowski, Adam. 1999a. *Case assignment and the complement-adjunct dichotomy: A non-configurational constraint-based approach*: Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen dissertation. <https://publikationen.uni-tuebingen.de/xmlui/handle/10900/46147>.
- Przepiórkowski, Adam. 1999b. On case assignment and “adjuncts as complements”. In Webelhuth et al. (1999) 231–245.
- Przepiórkowski, Adam & Anna Kupść. 2006. HPSG for Slavicists. *Glossos* 8. 1–68.
- Przepiórkowski, Adam, Anna Kupść, Małgorzata Marciniak & Agnieszka Mykowiecka. 2002. *Formalny opis języka polskiego: Teoria i implementacja*. Warsaw: Akademicka Oficyna Wydawnicza EXIT.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. 1977. Word order universals and grammatical relations. In Peter Cole & Jerrold M. Sadock (eds.), *Grammatical relations* (Syntax and Semantics 8), 249–277. New York, San Francisco, London: Academic Press.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. 1982. Free word order and phrase structure rules. In James Pustejovsky & Peter Sells (eds.), *Proceedings of the 12th Annual Meeting of the Northeast Linguistic Society*, 209–220. Amherst: Graduate Linguistics Student Association.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. 1983. How many possible human languages are there? *Linguistic Inquiry* 14(3). 447–467.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. 1984. Stalking the perfect journal. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2(2). 261–267.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. 1985. Assuming some version of X-bar Theory. In *Papers from the 21st Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 323–353.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. 1986. Footloose and context-free. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 4(3). 409–414.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. 1988. Citation etiquette beyond thunderdome. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6(4). 579–588.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. 1989a. Formal linguistics meets the Boojum. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 7(1). 137–143. DOI:10.1007/BF00141350.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. 1989b. The incident of the node vortex problem. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 7(3). 473–479.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. 1991. *The great Eskimo vocabulary hoax and other irreverent essays on the study of language*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. 1996. Learnability, hyperlearning, and the Poverty of the Stimulus. In J. Johnson, M. L. Juge & J. L. Moxley (eds.), *Proceedings of the 22nd Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: General session and parasession on the role of learnability in*

- grammatical theory*, 498–513. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Linguistic Society. <http://users.ecs.soton.ac.uk/harnad/Papers/Py104/pullum.learn.html>.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. 2003. Learnability: Mathematical aspects. In William J. Frawley (ed.), *Oxford international encyclopedia of linguistics*, 431–434. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2nd edn.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. 2007. The evolution of model-theoretic frameworks in linguistics. In Rogers & Kepser (2007) 1–10.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. 2009. Response to Anderson. *Language* 85(2). 245–247.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. 2013. The central question in comparative syntactic metatheory. *Mind and Language* 28(4). 492–521.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. & Barbara C. Scholz. 2001. On the distinction between Generative-Enumerative and Model-Theoretic syntactic frameworks. In Philippe de Groote, Glyn Morrill & Christian Retor (eds.), *Logical Aspects of Computational Linguistics: 4th International Conference* (Lecture Notes in Computer Science 2099), 17–43. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. & Barbara C. Scholz. 2002. Empirical assessment of stimulus poverty arguments. *The Linguistic Review* 19(1–2). 9–50.
- Pullum, Geoffrey K. & Barbara C. Scholz. 2010. Recursion and the infinitude claim. In van der Hulst (2010) 113–138.
- Pulman, Stephen G. 1985. A parser that doesn't. In King (1985) 128–135. <http://aclweb.org/anthology/E/E85/>.
- Pulvermüller, Friedemann. 2003. *The neuroscience of language: On brain circuits of words and serial order*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Pulvermüller, Friedemann. 2010. Brain embodiment of syntax and grammar: Discrete combinatorial mechanisms spelt out in neuronal circuits. *Brain & Language* 112(3). 167–179.
- Pulvermüller, Friedemann, Bert Cappelle & Yury Shtyrov. 2013. Brain basis of meaning, words, constructions, and grammar. In Hoffmann & Trousdale (2013) 397–416.
- Quaglia, Stefano. 2014. On the syntax of some apparent spatial particles in Italian. In Butt & King (2014) 503–523.
- Radford, Andrew. 1990. *Syntactic theory and the acquisition of English syntax*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Radford, Andrew. 1997. *Syntactic theory and the structure of English: A Minimalist approach* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Rákosi, György, Tibor Laczkó & Gábor Csernyi. 2011. On English phrasal verbs and their Hungarian counterparts: From the perspective of a computational linguistic project. *Argumentum* 7. 80–89.
- Rambow, Owen. 1994. *Formal and computational aspects of natural language syntax*: University of Pennsylvania dissertation.
- Ramchand, Gillian. 2005. Post-Davidsonianism. *Theoretical Linguistics* 31(3). 359–373.
- Randriamasimanana, Charles. 2006. Simple sentences in Malagasy. In Henry Y. Chang, Lillian M. Huang & Dah ah Ho (eds.), *Streams converging into an ocean: Festschrift in*

- honor of Professor Paul Jen-kuei Li on his 70th birthday*, 71–96. Taipei, Taiwan: Institute of Linguistics, Academia Sinica.
- Raposo, Eduardo & Juan Uriagereka. 1990. Long-distance case assignment. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21(4). 505–537.
- Rappaport, Malka. 1983. On the nature of derived nominals. In Levin et al. (1983) 113–42.
- Rauh, Gisa. 2013. Linguistic categories and the syntax-semantics interface: Evaluating competing approaches. Ms. Universität Wuppertal.
- Reape, Mike. 1991. Word order variation in Germanic and parsing. DYANA Report Deliverable R1.1.C University of Edinburgh.
- Reape, Mike. 1992. *A formal theory of word order: A case study in West Germanic*: University of Edinburgh dissertation.
- Reape, Mike. 1994. Domain union and word order variation in German. In Nerbonne et al. (1994b) 151–198.
- Reape, Mike. 2000. Formalisation and abstraction in linguistic theory II: Toward a radical Linearisation Theory of German. unpublished paper.
- Redington, Martin, Nick Chater & Steven Finch. 1998. Distributional information: A powerful cue for acquiring syntactic categories. *Cognitive Science* 22(4). 425–469.
- Reis, Marga. 1974. Syntaktische Hauptsatzprivilegien und das Problem der deutschen Wortstellung. *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 2(3). 299–327.
- Reis, Marga. 1980. On justifying topological frames: ‘Positional field’ and the order of nonverbal constituents in German. *Documentation et Recherche en Linguistique Allemande Contemporaine* 22/23. 59–85.
- Reis, Marga. 1982. Zum Subjektbegriff im Deutschen. In Abraham (1982) 171–211.
- Remberger, Eva-Maria. 2009. Null subjects, expletives and locatives in Sardinian. In Georg A. Kaiser & Eva-Maria Remberger (eds.), *Proceedings of the workshop Null-Subjects, Expletives, and Locatives in Romance* (Arbeitspapier 123), 231–261. Konstanz: Fachbereich Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Konstanz.
- Resnik, Philip. 1992. Probabilistic Tree-Adjoining Grammar as a framework for statistical natural language processing. In Zampolli (1992) 418–424.
- Reyle, Uwe. 1993. Dealing with ambiguities by underspecification: Construction, representation and deduction. *Journal of Semantics* 10(2). 123–179.
- Richards, Marc. 2015. Minimalism. In Kiss & Alexiadou (2015) 803–839.
- Richter, Frank. 2004. *A mathematical formalism for linguistic theories with an application in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*: Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen Phil. Dissertation (2000). <https://publikationen.uni-tuebingen.de/xmlui/handle/10900/46230>.
- Richter, Frank. 2007. Closer to the truth: A new model theory for HPSG. In Rogers & Kepsner (2007) 101–110.
- Richter, Frank & Manfred Sailer. 1999a. A lexicalist collocation analysis of sentential negation in French. In Kordoni (1999b) 231–300.
- Richter, Frank & Manfred Sailer. 1999b. Lexicalizing the left periphery of German finite sentences. In Kordoni (1999b) 116–154.

- Richter, Frank & Manfred Sailer. 2004. Basic concepts of lexical resource semantics. In Arnold Beckmann & Norbert Preining (eds.), *ESSLLI 2003 – Course material I* (Collegium Logicum 5), 87–143. Wien: Kurt Gödel Society.
- Richter, Frank & Manfred Sailer. 2009. Phraseological clauses as Constructions in HPSG. In Müller (2009d) 297–317.
- Riehemann, Susanne. 1993. *Word formation in lexical type hierarchies: A case study of bar-adjectives in German*. Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen MA thesis. Also published as SfS-Report-02-93, Seminar für Sprachwissenschaft, University of Tübingen.
- Riehemann, Susanne Z. 1998. Type-based derivational morphology. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 2(1). 49–77.
- Riemsdijk, Henk van. 1978. *A case study in syntactic markedness: The binding nature of prepositional phrases*. Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press.
- Riezler, Stefan, Tracy Holloway King, Ronald M. Kaplan, Richard Crouch, John T. Maxwell III & Mark Johnson. 2002. Parsing the Wall Street Journal using a Lexical-Functional Grammar and discriminative estimation techniques. In Isabelle (2002) 271–278. <http://aclanthology.info/events/acl-2002>.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1982. Violations of the *wh* island constraint and the Subjacency Condition. In Luigi Rizzi (ed.), *Issues in Italian syntax* (Studies in Generative Grammar 11), 49–76. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1986. Null objects in Italian and the theory of *pro*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17(3). 501–577.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of grammar*, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2009a. The discovery of language invariance and variation, and its relevance for the cognitive sciences. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 32(5). 467–468.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2009b. Language variation and universals: Some notes on N. Evans and S. C. Levinson (2009) “The myth of language universals: Language diversity and its importance for cognitive science”. In Paola Cotticelli-Kurras & Alessandra Tomaselli (eds.), *La Grammatica tra storia e teoria. Studi in onore di Giorgio Graffi*, 153–162. Alessandra: Edizioni dell’Orso.
- Roberts, Ian F. & Anders Holmberg. 2005. On the role of parameters in Universal Grammar: A reply to Newmeyer. In Hans Broekhuis, N. Corver, Riny Huybregts, Ursula Kleinhenz & Jan Koster (eds.), *Organizing grammar: Linguistic studies in honor of Henk van Riemsdijk* (Studies in Generative Grammar 86), 538–553. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Robins, Robert Henry. 1997. *A short history of linguistics* (Longman Linguistics Library). London: Routledge 4th edn.
- Rogers, James. 1994. Obtaining trees from their descriptions: An application to Tree-Adjoining Grammars. *Computational Intelligence* 10(4). 401–421.
- Rogers, James. 1997. “Grammarless” Phrase Structure Grammar. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 20. 721–746.
- Rogers, James. 1998. *A descriptive approach to language-theoretic complexity* (Studies in Logic, Language and Information). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

- Rogers, James & Stephan Kepser (eds.). 2007. *Model-theoretic syntax at 10 – Proceedings of the ESSLLI 2007 MTS@10 Workshop, August 13–17*. Dublin: Trinity College Dublin.
- Rohrer, Christian. 1996. Fakultativ kohärente Infinitkonstruktionen im Deutschen und deren Behandlung in der Lexikalisch Funktionalen Grammatik. In Gisela Harras & Manfred Bierwisch (eds.), *Wenn die Semantik arbeitet: Klaus Baumgärtner zum 65. Geburtstag*, 89–108. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Rohrer, Christian & Martin Forst. 2006. Improving coverage and parsing quality of a large-scale LFG for German. In *Proceedings of the Language Resources and Evaluation Conference (LREC-2006)*, Genoa, Italy.
- Ross, John Robert. 1967. *Constraints on variables in syntax*: MIT dissertation. <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED016965.pdf>. Reproduced by the Indiana University Linguistics Club and later published as Ross (1986).
- Ross, John Robert. 1986. *Infinite syntax!* Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- Rothkegel, Annely. 1976. *Valenzgrammatik* (Linguistische Arbeiten 19). Saarbrücken, Germany: Sonderforschungsbereich Elektronische Sprachforschung, Universität des Saarlandes.
- Sabel, Joachim. 1999. Das Passiv im Deutschen: Derivationale Ökonomie vs. optionale Bewegung. *Linguistische Berichte* 177, 87–112.
- Sáfár, Éva & John Glauert. 2010. Sign Language HPSG. In *Proceedings of the 4th Workshop on the Representation and Processing of Sign Languages: Corpora and Sign Language Technologies, LREC 2010, 22–23 May 2010, Malta*, 204–207.
- Sáfár, Éva & Ian Marshall. 2002. Sign language translation via DRT and HPSG. In Alexander Gelbukh (ed.), *Computational linguistics and intelligent text processing: Third International Conference, CICLing 2002 Mexico City, Mexico, February 17–23, 2002 Proceedings* (Lecture Notes in Computer Science 2276), 58–68. Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Sag, Ivan A. 1997. English relative clause constructions. *Journal of Linguistics* 33(2), 431–484.
- Sag, Ivan A. 2000. Another argument against *Wh*-trace. Jorge Hankamer Webfest. <http://ling.ucsc.edu/Jorge/sag.html>.
- Sag, Ivan A. 2007. Remarks on locality. In Müller (2007d) 394–414. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2007/>.
- Sag, Ivan A. 2010. English filler-gap constructions. *Language* 86(3), 486–545.
- Sag, Ivan A. 2012. Sign-Based Construction Grammar: An informal synopsis. In Boas & Sag (2012) 69–202.
- Sag, Ivan A., Hans C. Boas & Paul Kay. 2012. Introducing Sign-Based Construction Grammar. In Boas & Sag (2012) 1–29.
- Sag, Ivan A., Philip Hofmeister & Neal Snider. 2007. Processing complexity in subadjacency violations: The Complex Noun Phrase Constraint. In Malcolm Elliott, James Kirby, Osamu Sawada, Eleni Staraki & Suwon Yoon (eds.), *Proceedings of the 43rd Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 215–229. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Sag, Ivan A. & Carl J. Pollard. 1991. An integrated theory of complement control. *Language* 67(1), 63–113.

- Sag, Ivan A. & Thomas Wasow. 2011. Performance-compatible competence grammar. In Borsley & Börjars (2011) 359–377.
- Sag, Ivan A., Thomas Wasow & Emily M. Bender. 2003. *Syntactic theory: A formal introduction* (CSLI Lecture Notes 152). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications 2nd edn.
- Sag, Ivan A. & Tom Wasow. 2015. Flexible processing and the design of grammar. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 44(1). 47–63.
- Sailer, Manfred. 2000. *Combinatorial semantics and idiomatic expressions in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar*: Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen Dissertation. <https://publikationen.uni-tuebingen.de/xmlui/handle/10900/46191>.
- Samarin, William J. 1984. Socioprogrammed linguistics. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 7(2). 206–207.
- Sampson, Geoffrey. 1989. Language acquisition: Growth or learning? *Philosophical Papers* 18(3). 203–240.
- Samvelian, Pollet. 2007. A (phrasal) affix analysis of the Persian Ezafe. *Journal of Linguistics* 43. 605–645.
- Sarkar, Anoop & Aravind K. Joshi. 1996. Coordination in Tree Adjoining Grammars: Formalization and implementation. In Tsuji (1996) 610–615.
- Sato, Yo. 2006. Constrained free word order parsing with Lexicalised Linearisation Grammar. In *Proceedings of 9th Annual CLUK Research Colloquium*, Open University, UK.
- Sato, Yo. 2008. *Implementing Head-Driven Linearisation Grammar*: King's College London dissertation.
- Sauerland, Uli & Paul Elbourne. 2002. Total reconstruction, PF movement, and derivational order. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33(2). 283–319.
- Sauerland, Uli & Hans-Martin Gärtner (eds.). 2007. *Interfaces + recursion = language? Chomsky's Minimalism and the view from syntax-semantics* (Studies in Generative Grammar 89). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Savin, Harris B. & Ellen Perchonock. 1965. Grammatical structure and the immediate recall of English sentences. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 4(5). 348–353.
- Schein, Barry. 1993. *Plurals and events* (Current Studies in Linguistics 23). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Scherpenisse, Wim. 1986. *The connection between base structure and linearization restrictions in German and Dutch* (Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe XXI, Linguistik 47). Frankfurt/M.: Peter Lang.
- Schluter, Natalie & Josef van Genabith. 2009. Dependency parsing resources for French: Converting acquired Lexical Functional Grammar f-structure annotations and parsing f-structures directly. In Kristiina Jokinen & Eckhard Bick (eds.), *Nodalida 2009 conference proceedings*, 166–173.
- Schmidt, Paul, Sibylle Rieder & Axel Theofilidis. 1996a. Final documentation of the German LS-GRAM lingware. Deliverable DC-WP6e (German) IAI Saarbrücken.
- Schmidt, Paul, Axel Theofilidis, Sibylle Rieder & Thierry Declerck. 1996b. Lean formalisms, linguistic theory, and applications: Grammar development in ALEP. In Tsuji (1996) 286–291. DOI:10.3115/992628.992679.

- Scholz, Barbara C. & Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. Searching for arguments to support linguistic nativism. *The Linguistic Review* 19(1–2). 185–223.
- Schubert, K. 1987. *Metataxis: Contrastive Dependency Syntax for machine translation*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Schumacher, Helmut, Jacqueline Kubczak, Renate Schmidt & Vera de Ruiter. 2004. *VALBU – Valenzwörterbuch deutscher Verben*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Schütz, Jörg. 1996. The ALEP formalism in a nutshell. Tech. rep. IAI Saarbrücken. <http://www.iai-sb.de/docs/alep-nutshell.pdf>.
- Schwarze, Christoph & Leonel de Alencar. 2016. *Lexikalisch-funktionale Grammatik: Eine Einführung am Beispiel des Französischen, mit computerlinguistischer Implementierung* (Stauffenburg Einführungen 30). Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Seiss, Melanie & Rachel Nordlinger. 2012. An electronic dictionary and translation system for Murrinh-Patha. *The EUROCALL Review: Proceedings of the EUROCALL 2011 Conference* 20(1). 135–138.
- Sengupta, Probal & B. B. Chaudhuri. 1997. A delayed syntactic-encoding-based LFG parsing strategy for an Indian language—Bangla. *Computational Linguistics* 23(2). 345–351.
- Seuren, Pieter A. M. 1984. The Bioprogram Hypothesis: Facts and fancy. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 7(2). 208–209.
- Seuren, Pieter A. M. 2004. *Chomsky’s Minimalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shieber, Stuart M. 1985. Evidence against the context-freeness of natural language. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 8(3). 333–343.
- Shieber, Stuart M. 1986. *An introduction to unification-based approaches to grammar* (CSLI Lecture Notes 4). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Shieber, Stuart M. & Mark Johnson. 1993. Variations on incremental interpretation. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 22(2). 287–318.
- Shieber, Stuart M., Hans Uszkoreit, Fernando Pereira, Jane Robinson & Mabry Tyson. 1983. The formalism and implementation of PATR-II. In *Research on interactive acquisition and use of knowledge*, 39–79. Menlo Park, CA: Artificial Intelligence Center, SRI International.
- Shtyrov, Y., E. Pihko & F. Pulvermüller. 2005. Determinants of dominance: Is language laterality explained by physical or linguistic features of speech? *Neuroimage* 27(1). 37–47.
- Sidner, Candy (ed.). 1987. *25th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Stanford, CA: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Siegel, Melanie. 2000. HPSG analysis of Japanese. In Wahlster (2000b) 264–279.
- Siegel, Melanie & Emily M. Bender. 2002. Efficient deep processing of Japanese. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Asian Language Resources and International Standardization at the 19th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*. Taipei, Taiwan, <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology-new/W/W02/W02-1210.pdf>.
- Simov, Kiril, Petya Osenova, Alexander Simov & Milen Kouylekov. 2004. Design and implementation of the Bulgarian HPSG-based treebank. *Research on Language and Computation* 2(4). 495–522.
- Simpson, Jane. 1983. Resultatives. In Levin et al. (1983) 143–157. Reprint: Simpson (2005b).

- Simpson, Jane. 2005a. Depictives in English and Warlpiri. In Nikolaus P. Himmelmann & Eva Schultze-Berndt (eds.), *Secondary predication and adverbial modification: The typology of depictives*, 69–106. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Simpson, Jane. 2005b. Resultatives. In Miriam Butt & Tracy Holloway King (eds.), *Lexical semantics in LFG*, 149–161. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Singleton, Jenny L. & Elissa L. Newport. 2004. When learners surpass their models: The acquisition of American Sign Language from inconsistent input. *Cognitive Psychology* 49(4). 370–407.
- Sleator, Daniel D. K. & Davy Temperley. 1991. Parsing English with a Link Grammar. CMU-CS-TR-91-126 School of Computer Science, Carnegie Mellon University.
- Smith, Carlota S. 1970. Jespersen's "move and change" class and causative verbs in English. In Peeters (2000) 101–109.
- Smith, Carlota S. 1972. On causative verbs and derived nominals in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 3(1). 136–138.
- Snyder, William. 2001. On the nature of syntactic variation: Evidence from complex predicates and complex word-formation. *Language* 77(2). 324–342.
- Soehn, Jan-Philipp & Manfred Sailer. 2008. At first blush on tenterhooks: About selectional restrictions imposed by nonheads. In Jäger et al. (2008) 149–161. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/FG/2003/soehn.pdf>.
- Somers, Harold & Mary McGee Wood (eds.). 1989. *Proceedings of the Fourth Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Manchester, England: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Son, Minjeong. 2007. Directionality and resultativity: The cross-linguistic correlation revisited. *Tromsø University Working Papers on Language & Linguistics* 34. 126–164. <http://hdl.handle.net/10037/3191>.
- Son, Minjeong & Peter Svenonius. 2008. Microparameters of cross-linguistic variation: Directed motion and resultatives. In Natasha Abner & Jason Bishop (eds.), *Proceedings of the 27th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 388–396. Somerville, MA: Cascadia Proceedings Project.
- Song, Sanghoun, Jong-Bok Kim, Francis Bond & Jaehyung Yang. 2010. Development of the Korean Resource Grammar: Towards grammar customization. In *Proceedings of the 8th Workshop on Asian Language Resources, Beijing, China, 21–22 August 2010*, 144–152. Asian Federation for Natural Language Processing.
- Sorace, Antonella. 2003. Near-nativeness. In Catherine J. Doughty & Michael H. Long (eds.), *The handbook of second language acquisition* (Blackwell Handbooks in Linguistics), 130–151. Oxford, UK/Cambridge, USA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Stabler, Edward P. 1987. Restricting logic grammars with Government-Binding Theory. *Computational Linguistics* 13(1–2). 1–10.
- Stabler, Edward P. 1991. Avoid the pedestrian's paradox. In Robert C. Berwick, Steven P. Abney & Carol Tenny (eds.), *Principle-based parsing: Computation and psycholinguistics*, 199–237. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

- Stabler, Edward P. 1992. *The logical approach to syntax: Foundations, specifications, and implementations of theories of Government and Binding* (ACL-MIT Press Series in Natural Language Processing). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Stabler, Edward P. 2001. Minimalist Grammars and recognition. In Christian Rohrer, Antje Rossdeutscher & Hans Kamp (eds.), *Linguistic form and its computation* (Studies in Computational Linguistics 1), 327–352. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Stabler, Edward P. 2011a. After Government and Binding Theory. In van Benthem & ter Meulen (2011) 395–414.
- Stabler, Edward P. 2011b. Computational perspectives on Minimalism. In Cedric Boeckx (ed.), *The Oxford handbook of linguistic Minimalism* (Oxford Handbooks in Linguistics), chap. 27, 616–641. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Starosta, Stanley. 1988. *The case for Lexicase* (Open Linguistics Series). London: Pinter Publishers.
- Starosta, Stanley & Hirosato Nomura. 1986. Lexicase parsing: A lexicon-driven approach to syntactic analysis. In Nagao (1986) 127–132. DOI:10.3115/991365.991400.
- von Stechow, Arnim. 1979. Deutsche Wortstellung und Montague-Grammatik. In Jürgen M. Meisel & Martin D. Pam (eds.), *Linear order and Generative theory*, 317–490. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- von Stechow, Arnim. 1989. Distinguo: Eine Antwort auf Dieter Wunderlich. *Linguistische Berichte* 122. 330–339.
- von Stechow, Arnim. 1996. The different readings of *wieder* ‘again’: A structural account. *Journal of Semantics* 13(2). 87–138.
- von Stechow, Arnim & Wolfgang Sternefeld. 1988. *Bausteine syntaktischen Wissens: Ein Lehrbuch der Generativen Grammatik*. Opladen/Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Steedman, Mark J. 1985. Dependency and coordination in the grammar of Dutch and English. *Language* 61(3). 523–568.
- Steedman, Mark J. 1989. Constituency and coordination in a Combinatory Grammar. In Baltin & Kroch (1989) 201–231.
- Steedman, Mark J. 1991. Structure and intonation. *Language* 67(2). 260–296.
- Steedman, Mark J. 1997. *Surface structure and interpretation* (Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 30). Cambridge, MA/London, England: MIT Press.
- Steedman, Mark J. 2000. *The syntactic process* (Language, Speech, and Communication). Cambridge, MA/London, England: MIT Press.
- Steedman, Mark J. 2011. Romantics and revolutionaries. *Linguistic Issues in Language Technology* 6(11). 1–20. <http://journals.linguisticsociety.org/ellanguage/lilt/article/view/2587.html>. Special Issue on Interaction of Linguistics and Computational Linguistics.
- Steedman, Mark J. & Jason Baldridge. 2006. Combinatory Categorical Grammar. In Brown (2006) 610–621.
- Steels, Luc. 2003. Evolving grounded communication for robots. *Trends in Cognitive Science* 7(7). 308–312.
- Steels, Luc (ed.). 2011a. *Design patterns in Fluid Construction Grammar* (Constructional Approaches to Language 11). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

- Steels, Luc (ed.). 2011b. *Design patterns in Fluid Construction Grammar* (Constructional Approaches to Language 11). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Steels, Luc (ed.). 2012. *Computational issues in Fluid Construction Grammar* (Lecture Notes in Computer Science 7249). Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Steels, Luc. 2013. Fluid Construction Grammar. In Hoffmann & Trousdale (2013) 153–167.
- Steels, Luc. 2015. *The Talking Heads experiment: Origins of words and meanings* (Computational Models of Language Evolution 1). Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Steels, Luc & Joachim De Beule. 2006. A (very) brief introduction to Fluid Construction Grammar. Paper presented at the Third International Workshop on Scalable Natural Language Understanding (ScaNaLU 2006) June 8, 2006, following HLT/NAACL, New York City.
- Steels, Luc & Remi van Trijp. 2011. How to make Construction Grammars fluid and robust. In Steels (2011b) 301–330.
- Stefanowitsch, Anatol. 2008. Negative entrenchment: A usage-based approach to negative evidence. *Cognitive Linguistics* 19(3). 513–531.
- Stefanowitsch, Anatol & Kerstin Fischer (eds.). 2008. *Konstruktionsgrammatik II: Von der Konstruktion zur Grammatik* (Stauffenburg Linguistik 47). Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Stefanowitsch, Anatol & Stephan Th. Gries. 2009. Corpora and grammar. In Lüdeling & Kytö (2009) chap. 43, 933–952.
- Sternefeld, Wolfgang. 1985a. Deutsch ohne grammatische Funktionen: Ein Beitrag zur Rektions- und Bindungstheorie. *Linguistische Berichte* 99. 394–439.
- Sternefeld, Wolfgang. 1985b. On case and binding theory. In Toman (1985) 231–285.
- Sternefeld, Wolfgang. 1995. Voice phrases and their specifiers. *FAS Papers in Linguistics* 3. 48–85.
- Sternefeld, Wolfgang. 2006. *Syntax: Eine morphologisch motivierte generative Beschreibung des Deutschen* (Stauffenburg Linguistik 31). Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Sternefeld, Wolfgang & Frank Richter. 2012. Wo stehen wir in der Grammatiktheorie? – Bemerkungen anlässlich eines Buchs von Stefan Müller. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 31(2). 263–291.
- Stiebels, Barbara. 1996. *Lexikalische Argumente und Adjunkte: Zum semantischen Beitrag verbaler Präfixe und Partikeln* (studia grammatica 39). Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Stowell, Timothy. 1981. *Origins of phrase structure*: MIT dissertation. <http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/15626>.
- Strunk, Jan & Nil Snider. 2013. Subclausal locality constraints on relative clause extraposition. In Gert Webelhuth, Manfred Sailer & Heike Walker (eds.), *Rightward movement in a comparative perspective* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 200), 99–143. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Su, Keh-Yih, Oi Yee Kwong, Jn'ichi Tsujii & Jong-Hyeok Lee (eds.). 2005. *Natural language processing IJCNLP 2004* (Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence 3248) Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Suchsland, Peter (ed.). 1992. *Biologische und soziale Grundlagen der Sprache* (Linguistische Arbeiten 280). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.

- Suchsland, Peter. 1997. *Syntax-Theorie: Ein zusammengefaßter Zugang* (Konzepte der Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaft 55). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. Deutsche Bearbeitung von Borsley (1991) durch Peter Suchsland.
- Sulger, Sebastian. 2009. Irish clefting and information-structure. In Butt & King (2009) 562–582. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/14/>.
- Sulger, Sebastian. 2010. Analytic and synthetic verb forms in Irish – An agreement-based implementation in LFG. In Manfred Pinkal, Ines Rehbein, Sabine Schulte im Walde & Angelika Storrer (eds.), *Semantic approaches in natural language processing: Proceedings of the Conference on Natural Language Processing 2010*, 169–173. Saarbrücken: Saarland University Press (universaar).
- Svenononius, Peter. 2004. Slavic prefixes inside and outside VP. *Nordlyd. Special Issue on Slavic Prefixes* 32(2). 205–253.
- Takami, Ken-ichi. 1988. Preposition stranding: Arguments against syntactic analyses and an alternative functional explanation. *Lingua* 76(4). 299–335.
- Tanenhaus, Michael K., Michael J. Spivey-Knowlton, Kathleen M. Eberhard & Julie C. Sedivy. 1995. Integration of visual and linguistic information in spoken language comprehension. *Science* 268(5217). 1632–1634.
- Tanenhaus, Michael K., Michael J. Spivey-Knowlton, Kathleen M. Eberhard & Julie C. Sedivy. 1996. Using eye movements to study spoken language comprehension: Evidence for visually mediated incremental interpretation. In Toshio Inui & James L. McClelland (eds.), *Information integration in perception and communication* (Attention and Performance XVI), 457–478. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- ten Hacken, Pius. 2007. *Chomskyan linguistics and its competitors*. London: Equinox Publishing Ltd.
- Tesnière, Lucien. 1959. *Eléments de syntaxe structurale*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Tesnière, Lucien. 1980. *Grundzüge der strukturalen Syntax*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta. Translated by Ulrich Engel.
- Tesnière, Lucien. 2015. *Elements of structural syntax*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co. Translated by Timothy Osborne and Sylvain Kahane.
- Thiersch, Craig L. 1978. *Topics in German syntax*: M.I.T. Dissertation.
- Thompson, Henry S. 1982. Handling metarules in a parser for GPSG. D.A.I. Research 175 University of Edinburgh.
- Timberlake, Alan. 1982. The impersonal passive in Lithuanian. In Monica Macaulay, Orin D. Gensler, Claudia Brugmann, Inese Čivkulis, Amy Dahlstrom, Katherine Krile & Rob Sturm (eds.), *Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 508–524. Berkeley: University of California.
- Toman, Jindřich (ed.). 1985. *Studies in German grammar* (Studies in Generative Grammar 21). Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Tomasello, Michael. 1995. Language is not an instinct. *Cognitive Development* 10(1). 131–156.
- Tomasello, Michael. 2000. Do young children have adult syntactic competence? *Cognition* 74(3). 209–253.

- Tomasello, Michael. 2003. *Constructing a language: A usage-based theory of language acquisition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Tomasello, Michael. 2005. Beyond formalities: The case of language acquisition. *The Linguistic Review* 22(2–4). 183–197.
- Tomasello, Michael. 2006a. Acquiring linguistic constructions. In Deanna Kuhn & Robert Siegler (eds.), *Handbook of child psychology*, vol. 2, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc. 6th edn.
- Tomasello, Michael. 2006b. Construction Grammar for kids. *Constructions Special Volume 1*. <http://www.constructions-journal.com/>.
- Tomasello, Michael. 2006c. Konstruktionsgrammatik und früher Erstspracherwerb. In Kerstin Fischer & Anatol Stefanowitsch (eds.), *Konstruktionsgrammatik: Von der Anwendung zur Theorie* (Stauffenburg Linguistik 40), 19–37. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Tomasello, Michael. 2009. Universal Grammar is dead. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 32(5). 470–471.
- Tomasello, Michael, Nameera Akhtar, Kelly Dodson & Laura Rekau. 1997. Differential productivity in young children's use of nouns and verbs. *Journal of Child Language* 24(2). 373–387.
- Tomasello, Michael, Malinda Carpenter, Josep Call, Tanya Behne & Henrike Moll. 2005. Understanding and sharing intentions: The origins of cultural cognition. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 28(5). 675–735.
- Travis, Lisa. 1984. *Parameters and effects of word order variation*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Dissertation.
- Trosterud, Trond. 2009. A Constraint Grammar for Faroese. In Bick et al. (2009) 1–7.
- Tseng, Jesse (ed.). 2000. *Aspekte eines HPSG-Fragments des Deutschen* (Arbeitspapiere des SFB 340 No. 156). Tübingen: Eberhard-Karls-Universität Tübingen. <http://www.sfs.uni-tuebingen.de/sfb/reports/berichte/156/156abs.html>.
- Tseng, Jesse L. 2003. LKB grammar implementation: French and beyond. In Bender et al. (2003) 91–97. <http://w3.erss.univ-tlse2.fr/textes/pagespersos/tseng/Pubs/mgd03.pdf>.
- Tseng, Jesse L. 2007. English prepositional passive constructions. In Müller (2007d) 271–286. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2007/>.
- Tsuji, Jun-ichi (ed.). 1996. *Proceedings of COLING-96. 16th International Conference on Computational Linguistics (COLING96). Copenhagen, Denmark, August 5–9, 1996*. Copenhagen, Denmark: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Umemoto, Hiroshi. 2006. Implementing a Japanese semantic parser based on glue approach. In *Proceedings of The 20th Pacific Asia Conference on Language, Information and Computation*, 418–425. <http://dspace.wul.waseda.ac.jp/dspace/handle/2065/29076>.
- Uszkoreit, Hans. 1986a. Categorical Unification Grammars. In Nagao (1986) 187–194. <http://aclweb.org/anthology-new/C/C86/C86-1045.pdf>.
- Uszkoreit, Hans. 1986b. Linear precedence in discontinuous constituents: Complex fronting in German. Report No. CSLI-86-47 Center for the Study of Language and Information Stanford, CA.

- Uszkoreit, Hans. 1987. *Word order and constituent structure in German* (CSLI Lecture Notes 8). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Uszkoreit, Hans. 1990. Extraposition and adjunct attachment in Categorical Unification Grammar. In Werner Bahner, Joachim Schildt & Dieter Viehweger (eds.), *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Congress of Linguists, Berlin/GDR, August 10–15, 1987*, vol. 3, 2331–2336. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Uszkoreit, Hans (ed.). 1995. *33rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics. Proceedings of the conference*. Cambridge, MA: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Uszkoreit, Hans, Rolf Backofen, Stephan Busemann, Abdel Kader Diagne, Elizabeth A. Hinkelman, Walter Kasper, Bernd Kiefer, Hans-Ulrich Krieger, Klaus Netter, Günter Neumann, Stephan Oepen & Stephen P. Spackman. 1994. DISCO—An HPSG-based NLP system and its application for appointment scheduling. In Nagao (1994) 436–440.
- Uszkoreit, Hans, Rolf Backofen, Jo Calder, Joanne Capstick, Luca Dini, Jochen Dörre, Gregor Erbach, Dominique Estival, Suresh Manandhar, Anne-Marie Mineur & Stephan Oepen. 1996. The EAGLES formalisms working group: Final report Expert Advisory Group on Language Engineering Standards. Technical Report LRE 61–100. <http://www.coli.uni-sb.de/publikationen/softcopies/Uszkoreit:1996:EFW.pdf>.
- Valian, Virginia. 1991. Syntactic subjects in the early speech of American and Italian children. *Cognition* 40(1–2). 21–81.
- van Benthem, Johan F. A. K. & G. B. Alice ter Meulen (eds.). 2011. *Handbook of logic and language*. Amsterdam: Elsevier 2nd edn.
- van der Hulst, Harry (ed.). 2010. *Recursion in human language* (Studies in Generative Grammar 104). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Van Eynde, Frank. 2015. Sign-Based Construction Grammar: A guided tour. *Journal of Linguistics* DOI:10.1017/S0022226715000341.
- Van Langendonck, Willy. 1994. Determiners as heads? *Cognitive Linguistics* 5. 243–259.
- van Trijp, Remi. 2011. A design pattern for argument structure constructions. In Steels (2011b) 115–145.
- van Trijp, Remi. 2013. A comparison between Fluid Construction Grammar and Sign-Based Construction Grammar. *Constructions and Frames* 5(1). 88–116.
- van Trijp, Remi. 2014. Long-distance dependencies without filler–gaps: A cognitive-functional alternative in Fluid Construction Grammar. *Language and Cognition* 6(2). 242–270.
- Van Valin, Robert D. Jr. (ed.). 1993. *Advances in Role and Reference Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Van Valin, Robert D. Jr. 1998. The acquisition of *wh*-questions and the mechanisms of language acquisition. In Michael Tomasello (ed.), *The new psychology of language: Cognitive and functional approaches to language structure*, 221–249. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Vancoppenolle, Jean, Eric Tabbert, Gerlof Bouma & Manfred Stede. 2011. A German grammar for generation in Open CCG. In Hedeland et al. (2011) 145–150.

- Vargha, Dénes (ed.). 1988. *Proceedings of COLING 88*. University of Budapest: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Vargha-Khadem, Faraneh, Kate E. Watkins, Katie Alcock, Paul Fletcher & Richard Passingham. 1995. Praxic and nonverbal cognitive deficits in a large family with a genetically transmitted speech and language disorder. In *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, vol. 92, 930–933.
- Vasishth, Shravan & Richard L. Lewis. 2006. Human language processing: Symbolic models. In Brown (2006) 410–419.
- Vasishth, Shravan, Katja Suckow, Richard L. Lewis & Sabine Kern. 2010. Short-term forgetting in sentence comprehension: Crosslinguistic evidence from verb-final structures. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 25(4). 533–567.
- Vater, Heinz. 2010. Strukturalismus und generative Grammatik in Deutschland. In Hans-Harald Müller, Marcel Lepper & Andreas Gardt (eds.), *Strukturalismus in Deutschland: Literatur- und Sprachwissenschaft 1910–1975* (Marbacher Schriften. Neue Folge 5), 125–160. Göttingen: Wallstein Verlag.
- Veenstra, Mettina Jolanda Arnoldina. 1998. *Formalizing the Minimalist Program*: Rijksuniversiteit Groningen Ph.d. thesis.
- Vennemann, Theo & Ray Harlow. 1977. Categorical Grammar and consistent basic VX serialization. *Theoretical Linguistics* 4(1–3). 227–254.
- Verhagen, Arie. 2010. What do you think is the proper place of recursion? Conceptual and empirical issues. In van der Hulst (2010) 93–110.
- Verspoor, Cornelia Maria. 1997. *Contextually-dependent lexical semantics*: University of Edinburgh dissertation. [ftp://ftp.cogsci.ed.ac.uk/pub/kversp/thesis.ps.gz](http://ftp.cogsci.ed.ac.uk/pub/kversp/thesis.ps.gz).
- Vierhuff, Tilman, Bernd Hildebrandt & Hans-Jürgen Eikmeyer. 2003. Effiziente Verarbeitung deutscher Konstituentenstellung mit der Combinatorial Categorical Grammar. *Linguistische Berichte* 194. 213–237.
- Vijay-Shanker, K. & Aravind K. Joshi. 1988. Feature structures based Tree Adjoining Grammars. In Vargha (1988) 714–719. <http://www.aclweb.org/anthology-new/C/C88/C88-2147.pdf>.
- Villavicencio, Aline. 2002. The acquisition of a unification-based Generalised Categorical Grammar. UCAM-CL-TR-533 University of Cambridge Computer Laboratory.
- Vogel, Ralf. 2001. Case conflict in German free relative constructions: An Optimality Theoretic treatment. In Gereon Müller & Wolfgang Sternefeld (eds.), *Competition in syntax*, 341–375. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Vogel, Ralf & Markus Steinbach. 1998. The dative – An oblique case. *Linguistische Berichte* 173. 65–91.
- Volk, Martin. 1988. *Parsing German with GPSG: The problem of separable-prefix verbs*. University of Georgia MA thesis.
- Voutilainen, Atro, Juha Heikkilä & Arto Anttila. 1992. *Constraint Grammar of English: A performance-oriented introduction* (Publications of the Department of General Linguistics 21). Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Wada, Hajime & Nicholas Asher. 1986. BUILDERS: An implementation of DR Theory and LFG. In Nagao (1986) 540–545.

- Wahlster, Wolfgang (ed.). 2000a. *Verbmobil: Foundations of speech-to-speech translation* (Artificial Intelligence). Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Wahlster, Wolfgang (ed.). 2000b. *Verbmobil: Foundations of speech-to-speech translation* (Artificial Intelligence). Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Walther, Markus. 1999. *Deklarative prosodische Morphologie: Constraint-basierte Analysen und Computermodelle zum Finnischen und Tigrinya* (Linguistische Arbeiten 399). Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Webelhuth, Gert. 1985. German is configurational. *The Linguistic Review* 4(3). 203–246.
- Webelhuth, Gert. 1990. Diagnostics for structure. In Grewendorf & Sternefeld (1990) 41–75.
- Webelhuth, Gert. 1995. X-bar Theory and Case Theory. In Gert Webelhuth (ed.), *Government and Binding Theory and the Minimalist Program: Principles and Parameters in syntactic theory* (Generative Syntax), 15–95. Oxford, UK & Cambridge, USA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Webelhuth, Gert. 2011. Paradigmenwechsel rückwärts: Die Renaissance der grammatischen Konstruktion. In Engelberg et al. (2011) 149–180.
- Webelhuth, Gert, Jean-Pierre Koenig & Andreas Kathol (eds.). 1999. *Lexical and Constructional aspects of linguistic explanation* (Studies in Constraint-Based Lexicalism 1). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Weber, Heinz J. 1997. *Dependenzgrammatik: Ein interaktives Arbeitsbuch* (Narr Studienbücher). Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag 2nd edn.
- Wechsler, Stephen Mark. 1991. *Argument structure and linking*: Stanford University dissertation.
- Wechsler, Stephen Mark. 1995. *The semantic basis of argument structure* (Dissertations in Linguistics). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Wechsler, Stephen Mark. 1997. Resultative predicates and control. In Ralph C. Blight & Michelle J. Moosally (eds.), *Texas Linguistic Forum 38: The syntax and semantics of predication: Proceedings of the 1997 Texas Linguistics Society Conference*, 307–321. Austin, Texas: University of Texas, Department of Linguistics.
- Wechsler, Stephen Mark. 2005. What is right and wrong about little v. In *Grammar and beyond—Essays in honour of Lars Hellan*, 179–195. Oslo, Norway: Novus Press.
- Wechsler, Stephen Mark. 2008a. A diachronic account of English deverbal nominals. In Charles B. Chang & Hannah J. Haynie (eds.), *Proceedings of the 26th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 498–506. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Wechsler, Stephen Mark. 2008b. Dualist syntax. In Müller (2008b) 294–304. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2008/>.
- Wechsler, Stephen Mark & Bokyoung Noh. 2001. On resultative predicates and clauses: Parallels between Korean and English. *Language Sciences* 23(4). 391–423.
- Wegener, Heide. 1985. *Der Dativ im heutigen Deutsch* (Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 28). Tübingen: originally Gunter Narr Verlag now Stauffenburg Verlag.
- Weir, Morton W. 1964. Developmental changes in problem-solving strategies. *Psychological Review* 71(6). 473–490.

- Weissgerber, Monika. 1983. *Valenz und Kongruenzbeziehungen: Ein Modell zur Vereindeutigung von Verben in der maschinellen Analyse und Übersetzung*. Frankfurt a. M.: Peter Lang.
- Weisweber, Wilhelm. 1987. Ein Dominanz-Chart-Parser für generalisierte Phrasenstrukturgrammatiken. KIT-Report 45 Technische Universität Berlin Berlin.
- Weisweber, Wilhelm & Susanne Preuss. 1992. Direct parsing with metarules. In Zampolli (1992) 1111–1115.
- Welke, Klaus. 1988. *Einführung in die Valenz- und Kasus-theorie*. Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut.
- Welke, Klaus. 2009. Konstruktionsvererbung, Valenzvererbung und die Reichweite von Konstruktionen. *Zeitschrift für Germanistische Linguistik* 37(3). 514–543.
- Welke, Klaus. 2011. *Valenzgrammatik des Deutschen: Eine Einführung* (De Gruyter Studium). Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Wells, Rulon S. 1947. Immediate constituents. *Language* 23(2). 81–117.
- Werner, Edeltraud. 1993. *Translationstheorie und Dependenzmodell: Kritik und Reinterpretation des Ansatzes von Lucien Tesnière* (Kultur und Erkenntnis: Schriften der Philosophischen Fakultät der Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf 10). Tübingen: Francke Verlag.
- Wetta, Andrew C. 2011. A Construction-based cross-linguistic analysis of V2 word order. In Müller (2011b) 248–268. <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/HPSG/2011/>.
- Wexler, Kenneth. 1998. Very early parameter setting and the unique checking constraint: A new explanation of the optional infinitive stage. *Lingua* 106(1–4). 23–79.
- Wexler, Kenneth & Peter W. Culicover. 1980. *Formal principles of language acquisition*. Cambridge, MA/London: MIT Press.
- Weydt, Harald. 1972. „Unendlicher Gebrauch von endlichen Mitteln“: Mißverständnisse um ein linguistisches Theorem. *Poetica* 5(3/4). 249–267.
- Wharton, R. M. 1974. Approximate language identification. *Information and Control* 26(3). 236–255.
- White, Mike & Jason Baldridge. 2003. Adapting chart realization to CCG. In Ehud Reiter, Helmut Horacek & Kees van Deemter (eds.), *Proceedings of the 9th European Workshop on Natural Language Generation (ENLG-2003) at EACL 2003*, 119–126.
- Wijnen, Frank, Masja Kempen & Steven Gillis. 2001. Root infinitives in Dutch early child language: An effect of input? *Journal of Child Language* 28(3). 629–660.
- Wiklund, Anna-Lena, Gunnar Hrafn Hrafnbjargarson, Kristine Bentzen & Þorbjörg Hróarsdóttir. 2007. Rethinking Scandinavian verb movement. *Journal of Comparative Germanic Linguistics* 10(3). 203–233.
- Wilcock, Graham. 2001. Towards a discourse-oriented representation of information structure in HPSG. In *13th Nordic Conference on Computational Linguistics, Uppsala, Sweden*, <http://www.ling.helsinki.fi/~gwilcock/Pubs/2001/Nodalida-01.pdf>.
- Wilder, Chris. 1991. Small clauses and related objects. *Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik* 34. 215–236.


- Wilks, Yorick (ed.). 1984. *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Computational Linguistics and 22nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*. Stanford University, California: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Williams, Edwin. 1984. Grammatical relations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15(4). 639–673.
- Winkler, Susanne. 1997. *Focus and secondary predication* (Studies in Generative Grammar 43). Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wittenberg, Eva, Ray S. Jackendoff, Gina Kuperberg, Martin Paczynski, Jesse Snedeker & Heike Wiese. 2014. The processing and representation of light verb constructions. In Asaf Bachrach, Isabelle Roy & Linnaea Stockall (eds.), *Structuring the argument* (Language Faculty and Beyond 10), 61–80. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.
- Wittenberg, Eva & Maria Mercedes Piñango. 2011. Processing light verb constructions. *The Mental Lexicon* 6(3). 393–413.
- Wöllstein, Angelika. 2010. *Topologisches Satzmodell* (Kurze Einführungen in die Germanistische Linguistik 8). Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Wunderlich, Dieter. 1987. Vermeide Pronomen – Vermeide leere Kategorien. *Studium Linguistik* 21. 36–44.
- Wunderlich, Dieter. 1989. Arnim von Stechow, das Nichts und die Lexikalistin. *Linguistische Berichte* 122. 321–333.
- Wunderlich, Dieter. 1992. CAUSE and the structure of verbs. Arbeiten des SFB 282 No. 36 Heinrich Heine Uni/BUGH Düsseldorf/Wuppertal.
- Wunderlich, Dieter. 1997. Argument extension by lexical adjunction. *Journal of Semantics* 14(2). 95–142.
- Wunderlich, Dieter. 2004. Why assume UG? *Studies in Language* 28(3). 615–641.
- Wunderlich, Dieter. 2008. Spekulationen zum Anfang von Sprache. *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 27(2). 229–265.
- Wurmbrand, Susanne. 2003a. *Infinitives: Restructuring and clause structure* (Studies in Generative Grammar 55). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Wurmbrand, Susanne. 2003b. Long passive (corpus search results).
- XTAG Research Group. 2001. A lexicalized Tree Adjoining Grammar for English. Tech. rep. Institute for Research in Cognitive Science Philadelphia. <ftp://ftp.cis.upenn.edu/pub/xtag/release-2.24.2001/tech-report.pdf>.
- Yamada, Hiroyasu & Yuji Matsumoto. 2003. Statistical dependency analysis with support vector machines. In van Noord (2003).
- Yamada, Jeni. 1981. Evidence for the independence of language and cognition: Case study of a “hyperlinguistic” adolescent. UCLA Working Papers in Cognitive Linguistics 3 University of California, Los Angeles.
- Yampol, Todd & Lauri Karttunen. 1990. An efficient implementation of PATR for Categorical Unification Grammar. In Karlgren (1990) 419–424.
- Yang, Charles D. 2004. Universal Grammar, statistics or both? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 8(10). 451–456. DOI:10.1016/j.tics.2004.08.006.
- Yasukawa, Hideki. 1984. LFG System in Prolog. In Wilks (1984) 358–361.
- Yip, Moira, Joan Maling & Ray S. Jackendoff. 1987. Case in tiers. *Language* 63(2). 217–250.

- Yoshinaga, Naoki, Yusuke Miyao, Kentaro Torisawa & Jun'ichi Tsujii. 2001. Resource sharing amongst HPSG and LTAG communities by a method of grammar conversion between FB-LTAG and HPSG. In *Proceedings of ACL/EACL workshop on Sharing Tools and Resources for Research and Education*, 39–46. Toulouse, France.
- Zaenen, Annie & Ronald M. Kaplan. 1995. Formal devices for linguistic generalizations: West Germanic word order in LFG. In Dalrymple et al. (1995) 215–239.
- Zaenen, Annie, Joan Maling & Höskuldur Thráinsson. 1985. Case and grammatical functions: The Icelandic passive. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 3(4). 441–483.
- Zampolli, Antonio (ed.). 1992. *14th International Conference on Computational Linguistics (COLING '92), August 23–28*. Nantes, France: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zappa, Frank. 1986. Does humor belong in music? EMI Music Germany GmbH & Co.KG.
- Zucchi, Alessandro. 1993. *The language of propositions and events: Issues in the syntax and the semantics of nominalization* (Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy 51). Berlin: Springer Verlag.
- Zwart, C. Jan-Wouter. 1994. Dutch is head-initial. *The Linguistic Review* 11(3–4). 377–406.
- Zweigenbaum, Pierre. 1991. Un analyseur pour grammaires lexicales-fonctionnelles. *TA Informations* 32(2). 19–34.
- Zwicky, Arnold M., Joyce Friedman, Barbara C. Hall & Donald E. Walker. 1965. The MITRE syntactic analysis procedure for Transformational Grammars. In *Proceedings – FALL Joint Computer Conference*, 317–326. DOI:10.1109/AFIPS.1965.108.

Did you like this book?

This book was brought to you for free

Please help us in providing free access to linguistic research worldwide. Visit <http://www.langsci-press.org/donate> to provide financial support or register as a community proofreader or typesetter at <http://www.langsci-press.org/register>.



Grammatical theory

This book introduces formal grammar theories that play a role in current linguistic theorizing (Phrase Structure Grammar, Transformational Grammar/Government & Binding, Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar, Lexical Functional Grammar, Categorical Grammar, Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar, Construction Grammar, Tree Adjoining Grammar). The key assumptions are explained and it is shown how the respective theory treats arguments and adjuncts, the active/passive alternation, local reorderings, verb placement, and fronting of constituents over long distances. The analyses are explained with German as the object language.

The second part of the book compares these approaches with respect to their predictions regarding language acquisition and psycholinguistic plausibility. The nativism hypothesis, which assumes that humans possess genetically determined innate language-specific knowledge, is critically examined and alternative models of language acquisition are discussed. The second part then addresses controversial issues of current theory building such as the question of flat or binary branching structures being more appropriate, the question whether constructions should be treated on the phrasal or the lexical level, and the question whether abstract, non-visible entities should play a role in syntactic analyses. It is shown that the analyses suggested in the respective frameworks are often translatable into each other. The book closes with a chapter showing how properties common to all languages or to certain classes of languages can be captured.

"With this critical yet fair reflection on various grammatical theories, Müller fills what has been a major gap in the literature." Karen Lehmann, *Zeitschrift für Rezensionen zur germanistischen Sprachwissenschaft*, 2012

"Stefan Müller's recent introductory textbook, 'Grammatiktheorie', is an astonishingly comprehensive and insightful survey of the present state of syntactic theory for beginning students." Wolfgang Sternefeld und Frank Richter, *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft*, 2012

"This is the kind of work that has been sought after for a while. [...] The impartial and objective discussion offered by the author is particularly refreshing." Werner Abraham, *Germanistik*, 2012

