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Discontinuous Dependencies and Complex Determiners

PAUL KAY & IVAN A. SAG

4.1 Introduction

Two understudied phenomena of English\(^1\) are intimately intertwined but, insofar as they are studied at all, are not usually related to one another. The discontinuous dependent phenomenon (DD) illustrated in (1) and the complex pre-determination (CPD) phenomenon illustrated in (2)\(^2\) are independent. That is, each of these phenomena may occur independently of the other, as shown in (1)–(2):

(1) a. [[so willing to help out] that they called early]
   b. [[too far] behind on points] to quit]
   c. [[more ready] for what was coming] than I was]
   d. [[as prepared for the worst] as anyone]
   e. [[the same courage in the face of adversity] as yours]

(2) a. [[this delicious] a lasagna]...
   b. [[that friendly] a policeman]...
   c. [[How hard] a problem] (was it)?

\(^1\)For their helpful comments and/or discussion regarding the ideas presented here, we would like to thank Berthold Crysmann, Charles Fillmore, Dan Flickinger, Laura Michaelis, Chris Potts, Stefan Müller, Peter Sells and Frank Van Eynde.

d. [What a fiasco] (it was)!

The oddity (the ‘non-core’ property) of DD examples like those in (1) is that they appear to call for a discontinuous constituent analysis. The oddity of CPD examples like those in (2) is that they present an adjective modifying an NP (or DP), rather than a nominal (a common noun phrase or ‘N’) – specifically an NP determined by the singular indefinite article a.

Although, as we have seen in (1) and (2), DD and CPD may appear independently, they frequently occur intertwined as in (3):

(3) a. [[too heavy] a trunk] (for me) to lift __
   b. [[so lovely] a melody] that some people cried
   c. [[more sincere] an apology] than her critics acknowledged
   d. [[as good] a singer] as many professionals

Unsurprisingly, the initial lexical licenser determines the three-way distributional distinction displayed in (1), (2) and (3).

Licensers of DD but not CPD include those comparative governors listed in (4):

(4) same...as, similar...to, equal...to/with, identical...to/with, ADJ-er...than, rather...than, ...else...than, ...enough...that, ...other...than

Complement-selecting adjectives, verbs, and nouns also participate in DD, as we will see. Licensers of CPD but not DD include:

(5) this, that, how

And licensers of both DD and CPD are listed, exhaustively we believe, in (6):

(6) so, too, more, less, as, such

It is notable that comparative licensers are split between those that do not [(4)] and those that do [(6)] license CPD. There are licensers of CPD but not DD, DD but not CPD, and both DD and CPD.

More than one DD can occur in a clause, as exemplified in (7).

(7) a. so much more satisfied than the last time that he couldn’t stop smiling
   b. [[too many fewer] supporters] than her opponent (for her) to rely on appeals to her base

---

4It should be noted that such is different from the other adjective specifiers in (6). In particular, such, like exclamative what, functions essentially as the portmanteau of a specifier and an adjective.
c. [[[enough bigger] an audience] [than last time] to require standing room only]

In examples such as (7) the multiple DDs form nested dependencies. The corresponding crossed dependencies in (8) are impossible:

(8) a. *so much more satisfied that he couldn’t stop smiling than the last time
b. *too many fewer supporters (for her) to rely on appeals to her base than her opponent
c. *enough bigger an audience to require standing room only than last time

Other DDs may, however, participate with arguments or modifiers in either nested [(9b,d)] or crossed [(9a,c)] dependencies:

(9) a. Kim was [[[more willing] than Pat is] to wash the dishes].
   b. Kim [[[is [more willing] now] to wash the dishes] than Pat is].
   c. I [[[sent out [more books] yesterday] than ever before] that I really liked].
   d. I [[[sent out [more books] yesterday] that I really liked] than ever before].

In general,

(10) All DD licensors except so, too, and enough can participate in crossed dependencies with arguments and other dependents.

We will need to formulate the listemes for the licensors and, critically, the relevant phrasal constructions, in such a way as to account for all the above facts, plus some more to be mentioned.

4.2 Previous Proposals

There are no fully worked out analyses of DD in the syntactic literature, though there are discussions of various aspects of DD. Perhaps the most detailed of these proposals is due to Chae (1992), who extends the GPG analysis of gap-binding by allowing a word like too to transmit its gap-binding potential to a higher node, e.g. to the adjective phrase too hot in examples like (11):

(11) This is [[[AP [too hot] [to touch _]]].

In Chae’s analysis, binding of the gap takes place when a nonempty SLASH specification and its appropriate licensing specification are both passed up to the same point in the tree, i.e. the AP labelled in (11).

Flickinger and Nerbonne (1992) provide an analysis of examples like (12), proposing to allow SUBCAT (VAL) information to be inherited from multiple daughters in structures like (12):
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(12) An \textit{easy man} \textit{to please} \textit{...}

On their proposal, an \textit{N} like \textit{easy man} inherits its subcategorization potential from both \textit{easy} and \textit{man} and hence can select \textit{to please} \textit{...} as a complement.


Kiss (2005; see also Wittenburg 1987) treats German relative clause extraposition as an anaphoric dependency, rather than a syntactic one, introducing a feature \textit{ANCHORS} to pass up a set of indices from NPs within a given phrase, each of which can be associated with an extraposed relative clause at a higher level of structure. See Müller 2004 and Crystmann to appear for assessments of this and other alternative approaches.

CPD has been discussed by many researchers in the transformational literature, culminating perhaps in the work of Kennedy and Merchant (2000), who provide a useful review and a comprehensive proposal that even addresses complex pre-determiners with \textit{of} (e.g. \textit{how much of a difference}), which we will not discuss here. However, their proposal is stated in terms of complex structures, a rich array of empty categories, and movement operations that make appeal to a constraint on phonetic form (see their footnote 28) in order to account for the most basic facts of CPD, i.e. the contrasts given in (13) below. However, Kennedy and Merchant do not include a formulation of this essential piece of their analysis.

The most successful treatment of CPD to date, in our view, is that of Van Eynde (2007).\footnote{This is an outgrowth of earlier work by Van Eynde (1998), further developing the ideas of Allegranza (1998). See also Van Eynde 2006 and Allegranza 2007.} A key aspect of this analysis, which we follow here in the main, is the replacement of Pollard and Sag’s (1994) features \textit{MOD} and \textit{SPEC} by the single feature \textit{SELECT} (\textit{SEL}). The \textit{SELECT} analysis allows Pollard and Sag’s \textit{SPR} feature to be eliminated, as well.

None of the proposals just mentioned provides a treatment of the interaction of DD and CPD. It turns out, however, that this interaction will follow straightforwardly from the analysis we propose here.

4.3 Analysis

We develop an analysis of DD, CPD, and their interaction in terms of \textit{Sign-Based Construction Grammar} (\textit{SBCG}). For a more detailed exposition of \textit{SBCG}, the reader is referred to Sag this volume and the references cited there.

In the introduction, we sketched a few of the more salient distributional
facts about DDs. We begin the more analytical discussion with CPD structures, as illustrated in (2) and (3). As already noted, the interesting property of these structures is that they contain adjective phrases modifying determined NPs, rather than the usual adjectival modification of undetermined common nominal expressions (CNPs):

(13) a. a [rotten pear] (cf. *rotten a pear)
    b. a [mere bagatelle] (cf. *mere a bagatelle)
    c. the [old book]
    d. her [seven [lonely nights]]

The SBCG representation of the bracketed expression in (13a), a feature structure of type head-functor-construct, is given in Figure 1. Beginning with the first daughter (specified as [FORM ⟨rotten⟩]) we note that the SYN value has three attributes: CATEGORY, MARKING and EXTRA. As indicated,  

Constructs may be thought of as local trees whose nodes are fully resolved feature structures. (Formally, they are functions from the domain (MTR, DTRS), where MTR (MOTHER) is sign-valued and the value of DTRS (DAUGHTERS) is a list of signs.) Constructs are the local structures associated with phrases like [red ball], [the [red ball]], or [put Fido out]. They are represented as boxed local trees whose nodes are AVMS. Combinatory constructions are (partial) descriptions of constructs, that is, constraints that characterize a class of constructs. They are represented as AVMS with a MTR and a DTRS feature, not as trees. Since constructions are descriptions, not feature structures, they are never boxed.
the CATEGORY(CAT) value is a feature structure of type *adj(ective)*. This feature structure includes a specification for the feature SELECT, whose value is represented by the tag [H], indicating that this value has been equated with another feature structure in the same diagram, which is also ‘tagged’ by [H]. The SELECT-based analysis provides a unified treatment of modifiers, specifiers, determiners and other ‘markers’ in terms of lexically varying specifications for the SELECT feature. These in turn correspond to the varying possibilities for the second daughter (in this construction). This SELECT-based treatment of nominal modifiers is fundamental to our analysis of extraposed relative clauses, presented in (27) below. The MARKING (MKG) value of the first daughter, *unmarked* (*unmkd*), reflects the fact that adjectives are so specified lexically. And following Van Eynde (2007), the mother’s MKG value is identified with that of the functor daughter.7

The EXTRA feature plays a central role in the present discussion. It is a nonlocal, list-valued feature that provides the mechanism for a wide range of extrapositions (in line with the arguments offered by Keller, Van Eynde, and Bouma), including those illustrated in (14):8

(14) a. *It seems that your hair is burning.*  
    (extraposition from subject)

    b. They regret *it* very much that *we could not hire Mosconi.*  
    (extraposition from object)

    c. I am *unwilling* when sober to *sign any such petition.*  
    (extraposition of VP complement)

    d. He lowered the nitro bottle gently onto the floor.  
    (extraposition of PP complement)

    e. An article appeared yesterday about the situation in Kazakhstan.  
    (extraposition of PP modifier)

    f. A man walked in who was wearing striped suspenders.  
    (extraposition of relative clause)

The EXTRA feature thus works much like SLASH (GAP): A lexical entry or lexical construction requires an item on the EXTRA list of a sign. For example, the comparative listeme *more* specifies a *than*-phrase on its EXTRA list. When this sign serves as the daughter of some phrasal construct, its non-empty EXTRA specification becomes part of the mother’s EXTRA list and this continues until a higher structure (a head-extra-construct) realizes the item as a constituent sign whose mother’s EXTRA list is free of the now realized

7Note that the features HEAD, LOCAL, and NONLOCAL are not just being suppressed in our displays. They have in fact been eliminated from the grammar. The feature HD-DTR, however, plays an important role in SBCG.

8We will not attempt to establish this broad claim in the present paper, but we intend the EXTRA feature and the constructions that mention it eventually to cover all the data in (14).
('extraposed') item. We will see how this works in detail below. For the moment we note that in a \textit{hd-func-cxt} like the one shown in Figure 1, the mother inherits the \textit{EXTRA} value from the non-head (functor) daughter.

The second daughter ([\textsc{form} \textit{\langle pear\rangle}]) is the head daughter, as indicated by the boxed \textit{H} preceding the outer brackets.\footnote{Representing the tag with capital \textit{H} instances the standard \textit{SBG} abbreviation according to which a sign thus tagged is the value of the \textit{HD-DTR} (Head Daughter) feature, correspondingly not shown.} Its \textsc{cat} value, as indicated, is a feature structure of type \textit{noun} and its \textsc{valence} (\textsc{val}) value is the empty list. The mother sign ([\textsc{form} \textit{\langle rotten, pear\rangle}]) of this construct, following \textsc{Van Eynde}, inherits its \textsc{cat} and \textsc{val} specifications from the head daughter and its \textsc{mkg} and \textsc{extra} values from the functor (non-head) daughter. The construction that licenses this construct is the Head-Functor Construction, shown in Figure 2.\footnote{\textit{Discussion of the semantics employed in our analysis is postponed until section 4.4.}}\footnote{\textsc{Van Eynde} (2006, 2007) couches his proposal in terms of phrasal types, using the framework of \textsc{Ginzburg} and \textsc{Sag} (2000). For convenience, we refer to his phrasal type constraints as \textit{SBG} constructions. The reader should also be aware that \textsc{Van Eynde} posits multiple subtypes of his head-functor phrasal type, a complication we do not investigate here.}

This construction specifies the inheritance by the mother of the \textsc{mkg} and \textsc{extra} values from the functor daughter we observed in the \textit{rotten pear} construct in Figure 1.\footnote{Capital letter tags (e.g. \textit{Y}) denote feature structure variables; \textit{L}_i tags denote variables ranging over (possibly empty) lists of feature structures.} It also specifies the inheritance by the mother of the \textsc{val} value from the head daughter. Explicit identification of the mother and head-daughter’s \textsc{cat} values is absent from Figure 2, since head-functor constructs are a subtype of \textit{headed-construct} (\textit{hd-cxt}), which in turn is constrained by the Head Feature Principle, which guarantees that (in any headed construct) the head daughter’s \textsc{cat} value is identical to the \textsc{cat} value of its mother:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{FIGURE 2} & \text{ Head-Functor Construction} \\
\text{hd-func-cxt} & \Rightarrow \\
\text{hd-cxt} & \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{VAL} \ L_1 \\
\text{MTR} & \text{SYN} & \text{MKG} \ Y \\
\text{EXTRA} & \ L_2 \\
\text{DTRS} & \text{SYN} & \text{MKG} \ Y \\
\text{EXTRA} & \ L_2 \\
\text{HD-DTR} & \ H \\
\end{array} \right], \ H : \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{SYN} [\text{VAL} L_1] \\
\end{array} \right] \\
\end{align*}
\]
The Head Feature Principle:

\[ hd-cxt \Rightarrow [ MTR \ [ \text{SYN} \ [ \text{CAT} \ X ]] ] \]

\[ HD-DTR \ [ \text{SYN} \ [ \text{CAT} \ X ]] \]

The Head Functor Construction thus licenses adjectivally modified nominals and determined noun phrases, among other local structures.

We now turn our attention to the CPD phenomenon we illustrated in (2)–(3) above. We cannot use the Head-Functor Construction to license CPD noun phrases like [[so big] [a mess]], because (1) ordinary adjectives, like big or rotten, select only undetermined nominals, as illustrated in (13a,b), and (2) since SELECT is a CAT feature, the Head-Functor Construction would incorrectly require that the mother’s SELECT value be the same as that of the head daughter.

Van Eynde (2007) has proposed a constructional HPSG solution at the level of the NP. That is, to license a noun phrase like [[so big] [a mess]] Van Eynde proposes a construction whose mother is a noun phrase and whose first daughter is an adjective phrase marked ‘degree’, which necessitates that it contain a degree modifier from the list given in (6), excluding such (which is lexically specified to select a singular, indefinite NP). In Van Eynde’s (2007) ‘Big Mess’ construction, which is distinct from his Head-Functor construction, the adjectival daughter does not select the nominal head; rather the Big Mess construction specifies merely that the indices of the two daughters are identified.

We present here a related analysis that operates inside the adjective phrase, rather than at the NP level. This choice encodes a different intuition, namely that the special property of the CPD phenomenon is the apparent divergence of the selectional potential of an AP from that of its lexical head. On this view, big selects an undetermined nominal, but so big selects a singular, indefinite NP. The selectional process is the same as in normal adjectival modification: once the special AP so big is constructed to select an NP rather than a CNP, the AP and the NP are combined by the familiar Head-Functor Construction. The need for a special construction arises only in building the AP.13

The CPD construct so big is shown in Figure 3. Starting with the first

13Our account, unlike Van Eynde’s, provides a uniform treatment of Big Mess APs (so big) and lexical expressions, e.g. what, such, and many, which may appear in pre-determiner position (what/such/many a fool!). That is, what, such, and many can bear exactly the same SELECT value as the phrases licensed by the CPD Construction. Although these words select bare plurals (Such fools!), which Big Mess APs do not, all these facts could presumably be accommodated in a lexicon with multiple constraint inheritance. However, there is considerable lexical idiosyncrasy in this domain, as Van Eynde observes, and the additional generalization captured by our approach is arguably unimpressive in the light of it. We are not aware of further data that would distinguish on empirical grounds between our analysis and an appropriate extension of Van Eynde’s.
daughter ([FORM ⟨so⟩]), we note that its category is adverb and that it selects its right sister, indicated by the tag 1. The so-constituent is specified as [MKG deg'], which is a lexical property of all and only the lexical items listed in (6), other than such. The EXTRA list contains a single item, which is a that-marked clause. The second daughter ([FORM ⟨big⟩]) is of category adjective and selects an unmarked nominal head. The mother of this construct ([FORM ⟨so, big⟩]) inherits its MKG and EXTRA values from the first daughter, as in a hd-func-cxt. Another similarity with a hd-func-cxt is the identification of the type of mother’s CAT value (adj) with that of the second daughter. But here the parallelism with the Head-Functor Construction breaks down; we note that the second daughter is not the head daughter and the SELECT values of the mother and second daughter differ. In particular, since the second daughter reflects the selection restriction of the lexical item big – [MKG unmkd], it must be an undetermined nominal. By contrast, the mother’s SELECT value is a nominal sign specified as [MKG a], i.e. an NP determined by the article a.

The CPD Construction is sketched in Figure 4. A construct licensed by this construction is not a headed construct, as we have just seen. Although the category type of the mother (adj) matches that of the second daughter, the SELECT values do not match: the mother selects an NP specified as [MKG a], but the second daughter selects a common noun, an NP specified as [MKG unmkd]. As in the construct it licenses that we have just considered
(Figure 3), the MKG and EXTRA values of the first daughter and the mother are identified. The first daughter is specified as [MKG deg'], identifying it as one of the lexical licensors of the CPD phenomenon.

A noun phrase like *so big a mess* is licensed as follows. The Complex Pre-Determiner Construction in Figure 4 licenses the construct *so big* shown in Figure 3. Because this construct is well-formed, its mother, the phrase shown in (16), is licensed by the grammar:

(16)  

The NP *a mess* is assembled by the Head-Functor Construction (Figure 2 above), with the determiner *a* passing up its [MKG a] specification to the constructed NP:
Therefore, the Head-Functor Construction allows the combination of so big and a mess, with the former selecting the latter. The resulting construct is shown in (18):

And the mother of the construct in (18) has the properties shown in (19).\footnote{Following Müller (2009), predicative NPs are created via a unary (‘pumping’) construction whose daughter is a nonpredicative NP. This provides a straightforward account of predicative uses, e.g., examples like She is so big a fan that she bought season tickets, Kim is too honest a guy to do that, etc.}

Having illustrated the analysis of constructs like so big a mess, we now need to account for an extraposed that-clause, extraposed in the sense that while its introduction is dependent on the presence of so, it is linearized after the noun mess. Moreover, it need not appear immediately after mess, as shown in (20):

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{(17)}
  \item \textbf{(18)}
  \item \textbf{(19)}
  \item \textbf{(20)}
\end{itemize}
they can be realized will occupy much of our attention in the remainder of this paper.

We noted that in both the Head-Functor Construction and the Complex Pre-Determiner Construction the mother inherits its EXTRA value from the first daughter. Because of this, the listeme for so, sketched in (21) is an essential ingredient in the so-that dependency:

\[
(21) \begin{bmatrix}
\text{FORM} & \langle \text{so} \rangle \\
\text{SYN} & \text{CAT} [\text{SELECT} [\text{SYN} [\text{EXTRA} L_1]]] \\
& \text{EXTRA} L_1 \oplus \langle S[\text{that}] \rangle
\end{bmatrix}
\]

The listeme for so stipulates that its EXTRA list includes a that-clause appended to (⊕) the EXTRA list of the element that so selects. That is, so says in effect: ‘my EXTRA list consists of the EXTRA list of the element I select followed by a that-clause’. Various constructions, including the Complex Pre-Determiner Construction, specify the EXTRA value of the mother in terms of the EXTRA values of the daughters. In the case of the constructions we have seen so far – and also the Subject-Predicate Construction, presented below – the mother’s EXTRA value is identified with the EXTRA value of the first daughter. Often the EXTRA list of the selected element will be empty, as in the case of big. The result is that when so and big are combined, the EXTRA value of the mother (so big) is just the singleton list containing S[that], as in Figure 3 and (16) above. The EXTRA values of both a and mess are the empty list, so the EXTRA value of a mess is also the empty list. Hence, the EXTRA value of so big a mess will consist of the single item S[that], which originated on the EXTRA list of the listeme for so, got ‘passed up’ to so big by the Complex Pre-Determiner Construction, and then again to so big a mess by the Head-Functor Construction.

How do extraposed elements get off the EXTRA list and realized in the sentence? The extraposition analysis we are proposing follows previous GPSG/HPSS treatments of nonlocal dependencies.\(^{15}\) At the site of introduction, lexical or constructional constraints ensure that the unrealized element corresponds to an element of the list serving as the value of the nonlocal feature F (SLASH aka GAP) or, in this case, EXTRA. The nonempty specification for F is introduced (lexically, as we have seen) at a given point in an analysis tree. General principles then require that the F-specifications must be inherited by the mothers of successively larger constructs – these phrases form the middle of the nonlocal dependency. Certain constructions then license the presence of a daughter that has a nonempty F-specification, typically introducing a new phrase (the filler in the case of filler-gap depen-

dependencies) that is identified with a member of its sister’s $F$-value (at the top of the nonlocal dependency). The construction realizing extraposed elements, the Head-Extraposition Construction,\footnote{See Pollard and Sag 1994, Keller 1995, Van Eynde 1996, Bouma 1996, Kim and Sag 2005 and Crysmann to appear.} is formulated in (22):

\[(22)\text{ Head-Extraposition Construction:}\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{hd-extra-cxt} \Rightarrow \\
\text{MTR} \begin{cases}
\text{SYN} & \left[\text{VAL} \begin{cases}
\text{EXTRA} & L_1 \\
L_2 & \\
\end{cases} \right]
\end{cases} \\
\text{DTRS} \begin{cases}
H: \begin{cases}
\text{SYN} & \left[\text{VAL} \begin{cases}
\text{EXTRA} & L_1 \\
(X) \oplus L_2 & \\
\end{cases} \right], X
\end{cases}
\end{cases}
\end{array}
\]

The Head-Extraposition Construction in (22) realizes the initial element of the EXTRA list of the head (first) daughter as the second daughter. The EXTRA list of the mother is the EXTRA list of the head daughter minus the element realized as the second daughter. This means that the order of elements on a non-singleton EXTRA list corresponds to the linear order of those elements in a binary-branching head-extraposition derivation.

The combination of the three lexical and constructional processes is exemplified by the analysis tree in Figure 5.\footnote{Note that an analysis tree like this is not a structure licensed directly by the grammar. Rather, each local tree it contains is directly licensed. For this reason, there is no box around the tree as a whole, which is simply a sketch of a ‘proof’ one might give to illustrate that the grammar licenses the particular sign at the root of the analysis tree.} Starting at the lower left, we see that *more*, in combining with *boys*, records on its EXTRA list the requirement for a *than*-phrase, represented by the tag $1$, adding this element to the empty EXTRA list of its selected sister *boys*. The Head-Functor Construction identifies the EXTRA list of its functor daughter *more* with that of the mother of the construct it licenses (*more boys*). When *more boys* and *left* combine in accordance with the Subject-Predicate Construction, the EXTRA list of the first (non-head) daughter *more boys* also becomes the EXTRA list of the mother *more boys left* (because the EXTRA list of the head daughter must be empty) – see below. The construct combining *more boys left* and *than girls* is licensed by the Head-Extraposition Construction [(22)], which realizes the sole member of the head daughter’s EXTRA list (the XP[*than]*) as the second daughter *than girls* of the highest construct in Figure 5. The EXTRA list of this construct’s mother is the empty list.

Extraposed elements obey certain ordering restrictions, as we saw in examples (7)–(9) above. In order to specify where extraposed elements can be
FIGURE 5 A Head-Extraposition Analysis Tree
realized we need to consider further constructions. First, we note that some extraposed complements, either arising within the VP or extraposed from the subject, can be permuted with arguments of predicates (as in (23)) and also with other extraposed elements, such as relative clauses (as in (24)):

(23) a. Kim was more willing than Pat to wash the dishes.
    b. Kim was more willing to wash the dishes than Pat.
    c. I sent out more books yesterday that I really liked than ever before.
    d. I sent out more books yesterday than ever before that I really liked.

(24) a. More books arrived that I actually liked than I expected.
    b. More books arrived than I expected that I actually LIKED.

As noted earlier, not all extraposed elements have this property. In particular, as summarized in (10) above, complements of too, so and enough do not permute with arguments or other extraposed dependents, as shown again by the examples in (25):

(25) a. The boys are so proud now of their achievements that they’ve become unbearable.
    b.*The boys are so proud now that they’ve become unbearable of their achievements.
    c. Nichelle is so much taller now than Beavis that people think she’s in middle school.
    d.*Nichelle is so much taller now that people think she’s in middle school than Beavis.

Two things need to be explained about the data of (23)–(25): (1) the fact just mentioned, that comparative complements permute while so, too and enough complements don’t, and (2) the prior fact that some extraposed complements permute with elements that are patently extraposed. We account for the latter fact – the possibility of crossed dependencies like (23a) and (24b) – by postulating two unary lexical constructions. The first ‘moves’ arguments from the VAL list to the EXTRA list; the second allows nouns to be constructed that have a relative clause on their EXTRA list.\(^{18}\)

An initial sketch of these constructions is given in (26) and (27):\(^{19}\)

---

\(^{18}\)A relative clause otherwise functions as a nominal modifier selecting the nominal it modifies via SELECT; see Sag 2010.

\(^{19}\)In (26), ⊕ denotes the ‘shuffle’ relation, as opposed to the ‘append’ relation (⊕) used in (27) and in (21) and (22) above. For example, if \(L_1 = \langle a, b \rangle\) and \(L_2 = \langle c \rangle\), then any of the following
(26) **Complement Extraposition Construction:**

\[
\text{comp-extra-cxt} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} 
\text{MTR} \begin{array}{c} \text{word} \\
\text{SYN} \begin{array}{c} \text{VAL} (\text{NP}) \oplus L_1 \\
\text{EXTRA} L_2 \oplus \{X\} \end{array} \\
\end{array} \\
\end{cases} \\
\text{DTRS} \begin{cases} 
\text{SYN} \begin{array}{c} \text{VAL} (\text{NP}) \oplus (L_1 \bigcirc \{X\}) \\
\text{EXTRA} L_2 \end{array} \\
\end{cases}
\]

(27) **Nominal Modifier Extraposition Construction:**

\[
\text{nm-extra-cxt} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} 
\text{MTR} \begin{array}{c} \text{word} \\
\text{SYN} \begin{array}{c} \text{FORM} \{Y\} \\
\text{CAT} \text{ noun} \\
\text{VAL} L_1 \\
\text{EXTRA} L_2 \oplus \{\text{SELECT } Z\} \end{array} \\
\end{array} \\
\end{cases} \\
\text{DTRS} \begin{cases} 
Z: \begin{array}{c} \text{SYN} \begin{array}{c} \text{CAT} \text{ noun} \\
\text{VAL} L_1 \\
\text{EXTRA} L_2 \end{array} \\
\end{array} \\
\end{cases}
\]

The Complement Extraposition Construction 'pumps' a daughter (one that is a 'predicator') with a nonsubject valent \(X\) to a predicator (the mother) where \(X\) appears as the last element of the \(\text{EXTRA}\) list and is absent from the \(\text{VAL}\) list. As the final element on the \(\text{EXTRA}\) list, \(X\) is the last element on the list to be realized by the Head Extraposition Construction [(22) above] and hence appears in the sentence after any other elements realized from this list. Similarly, the Nominal Modifier Extraposition Construction in (27) pumps a nominal to lists satisfies the description \(L_1 \bigcirc L_2\), while only the list in (ii) satisfies \(L_1 \oplus L_2\):

(i) \((c, a, b), (a, c, b)\)
(ii) \((a, b, c)\)

In addition, the following lists satisfy neither description, as they fail to respect the original ordering of elements in \(L_1\):

(iii) \((c, b, a), (b, c, a), (b, a, c)\)

For further discussion and motivation, see Reape 1994.
a nominal whose EXTRA list ends with a [SELECT Z] element – that is, an expression modifying Z, which this construction identifies with its daughter, i.e. the nominal whose EXTRA list is unaugmented by the modifier. As illustrated in section 4.4 below, this ensures that the extraposed element functions exactly as it would if it were directly adjoined to the noun in question as a modifier.

Because the Head-Extraposition Construction is binary, only one extraposed element is introduced at each level of structure. Hence, multiple extrapositions involve a nested, left-branching tree structure. Multiple extraposition dependencies typically arise when one of these dependencies interact with an extraposition dependency induced lexically (by so, more, etc.). A comp-extra-ctx (a post-lexical construct in the terminology of Sag this volume) is illustrated in Figure 6, where the daughter’s VAL list contains a PP[of], and its EXTRA list is empty. The mother’s VAL list contains only the subject of proud – the PP[of] appears on the EXTRA list.

Let us now return to the fact that, unlike other extraposed modifier complements (such as than- or as-phrases), so, to and enough complements never participate in crossed dependencies. We account for this via the listemes shown in (28):

(28) a. \[
\begin{align*}
\text{FORM} & \langle \text{so} \rangle \\
\text{SYN} & \left[\begin{array}{c}
\text{CAT} \left[\text{SELECT} \left[\text{SYN} \left[\text{EXTRA} L_1 \right] \right] \right] \\
\text{EXTRA} L_1 \oplus \langle S[that] \rangle \\
\end{array}\right]
\end{align*}
\]
b. \[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{FORM}\langle \text{more}\rangle \\
\text{SYN} \\
\text{CAT} \left[ \text{SELECT} \left[ \text{SYN} \left[ \text{EXTRA} L_1 \right] \right] \right] \\
\text{EXTRA} L_1 \oplus \langle \text{XP[than]} \rangle \\
\end{array} \]

We have already seen that so adds its S[that] complement at the right end of the EXTRA list, ensuring that it will be realized highest (hence latest, right-most) in the structure of any element realized from the same list. Note that the entry for more is partially similar, but with the important difference that the XP[than] complement is added not at the end, but at an arbitrary position within the selected element’s EXTRA list (as specified by the use of \(\oplus\), rather than \(\oplus\)). This arrangement allows complements of comparative modifiers to be realized either earlier (hence lower, to the left) or later (hence higher, to the right) than other elements realized from their list, as illustrated in Figures 7 and 8. So/too/enough complements cannot similarly precede other extraposed elements because of lexical constraints like the SELECT and EXTRA specifications shown in (28a).

We have seen that so/too/enough complements must follow comparative complements if they reside on the same EXTRA list. However, if the comparative element is within the subject NP and the so/too/enough licensor is within the VP of a subject-predicate clause, then the so/too/enough dependent must linearly precede the than-phrase (extraposition is bounded by the VP):

(29) a. **More** girls were **so** happy that they cheered **than** boys.

b.* **More** girls were **so** happy **than** boys that they cheered.

We account for this interaction by formulating the Subject-Predicate Construction as shown in (30):

(30) **Subject-Predicate Construction:**

The Subject-Predicate Construction licenses headed constructs with a mother and two daughters. The mother is required to be non-inverted and finite, with an empty VAL list and, crucially in the present context, to have an
FIGURE 7 A Multiple Extraposition Analysis Tree
FIGURE 8 Another Multiple Extraposition Analysis Tree
EXTRA list that is identified with that of the first (subject) daughter. In addition, the subject daughter satisfies the subject valence requirement (Y) of the head VP daughter and the EXTRA list of the latter must be empty, ensuring that any extraposed elements that arise within the VP of a Subject-Predicate construct are realized within that VP, via a lower application of the Head Extraposition Construction.

Finally, we note that it is not just subject-predicate clauses that inherit the extraposition potential of their first daughter. This is also true of filler-gap constructions (see Sag 2010):

(31) a. [[[How many more talents] did she have] than the other candidate]?
   b. [[[Which candidate] did he support] who had signed the legislation]?
   c. [[[How many soups] he had sampled] that he didn’t like]!
   d. [[[So eager] was he to see the comet] that he stayed up all night].

4.4 Semantics

Thus far, we have neglected the matter of semantics. In fact, the semantics of DD and CPD are relatively straightforward in SBCG. Note first that a complement is lexically assigned a semantic role in any given verbal lexeme. Since the Complement Extraposition Construction (see (26) above) simply ‘moves’ the complement from the verb’s VAL list to its EXTRA list, it leaves all the semantic connections intact. Thus the semantics of both (32a) and (32b) is that shown in (33), which is rendered in a Davidsonian predicate logic with generalized quantifiers in (34):

(32) a. Kim [affirms [that Pak left] [to Judge Lee]].
   b. Kim [[affirms [to Judge Lee]] [that Pak left]].

20See Sag this volume for explanation of the Minimal Recursion Semantics (MRS) used here, which is based on Copestake et al. 2005.

21This is not quite true, as the frames of the extraposed clause appear later on the FRAMES list than they do in the analogous non-extraposed sentence. But order of elements on FRAMES lists (better thought of as multisets) has no semantic significance. Hence the meanings assigned to (32a) and (32b) are identical.

22Note that ‘s’-variables range over situations (essentially Davidsonian events) and ‘l’-variables range over feature structure labels. For explanation of the treatment of tense in terms of situation arguments, see Sag this volume. Present-tense situation variables are left unbound here, though nothing hinges on this choice.
(33) \[ \begin{array}{c}
LTOP \quad l_0 \\
FRAMES
\begin{array}{c}
affirming-fr \\
LBL \quad l_0 \\
SIT \quad s_0 \\
SPEAKER \quad Kim \\
ADDRESSEE \quad Judge-Lee \\
MESSAGE \quad l_1 \\
past-fr \\
LBL \quad l_2 \\
ARG \quad s_1 \\
leaving-fr \\
LBL \quad l_3 \\
SIT \quad s_1 \\
THEME \quad Pak
\end{array}
\right] \left[ \begin{array}{c}
exist-fr \\
LBL \quad l_1 \\
BV \quad s_1 \\
RESTR \quad l_2 \\
SCOPE \quad l_3
\end{array} \right].
\]

(34) \( \text{affirm}(s_0, \text{Kim}, \text{Judge-Lee}, \text{exist}(s_1, \text{past}(s_1), \text{leave}(s_1, \text{Pak}))) \)

Sentences containing extraposed nominal modifiers, allowed in virtue of the Nominal Modifier Extraposition Construction in (27) above, are also assigned a semantics that is identical to that of their unextraposed counterparts, where the relative clause combines with the NP via the Head-Functor Construction, as in (35a):

(35) a. [[the food that Pat loves] arrived.

   b. [[the food arrived] that Pat loves].

This follows because the Head-Functor Construction, which attaches the relative clause to the head noun, applies lower in the analysis tree than the constructions licensing extraposition of the relative clause. The modification relation thus established is unaffected by the extraposition process. Hence, when the modifier is in extraposed position (as in (35b)), its SELECT value is identified with the same NP (the food) that the modifier’s SELECT value is identified with in the head-functor construct (as in (35a)). This guarantees that both (35a) and (35b) have the semantics shown in (36) (again, modulo order of elements on the FRAMES list):
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(37) shows the equivalent expression in Davidsonian predicate logic:

\[ \text{the}(x, \text{food}(x) \& \text{love}(s_3, Pat, x), \text{exist}(s_1, \text{past}(s_1), \text{arrive}(s_1, x))) \]

The equivalence of extraposed and nonextraposed counterparts holds for all the examples of DD discussed in this paper, by similar reasoning: extraposition being in all cases represented higher in the analysis tree than the construct that provides the semantic relation between the extraposed element and its governor. The examples with \textit{so}, \textit{such}, \textit{too}, and the like may be treated in terms of a generalized quantifier, e.g. \textit{so-fr}, that binds the degree variable associated with the expression \textit{so} modifies, whose restriction is the semantics of that modified expression, and whose scope (the \textit{ENABLED-SITUATION} in FrameNet terms) is determined by the broader sentential context.

The meaning of a \textit{so}-sentence can thus be represented as in (38):

\[ \text{(38) Max is so clean that he squeaks.} \]

\[ \text{(39) so}(\delta, \text{clean}(s_0, Max, \delta), \text{squeak}(s_1, he)) \]

We assume the \textit{so-fr}-quantifier is existential in nature. Thus (39) is to be understood roughly as follows:

\[ \text{(40) There is a degree } \delta \text{ such that the fact that Max is } \delta \text{ clean has as a consequence that he squeaks.} \]

The listeme for \textit{so} can now be formulated as in (41):

\[ \text{(41) \ldots} \]

\[ \text{\ldots} \]

Of course some of the constraints in (41) may not be particular to \textit{so}, but rather to a lexical class to which it belongs. In this case, the listeme for \textit{so} could be simplified, moving a share of the work to a lexical class construction.

\[ \text{23} \]
This listeme fixes the degree argument of the LID of the selected phrase as the bound variable (BV value) of the so-frame, the LTOP of the selected phrase as its restriction (RESTR value), and the LTOP of the extraposed that-clause as its SCOPE value. These identities thus establish the basic connections essential to the meaning of a so-sentence and do so in a manner that is independent of the order in which these elements are realized. In particular, sentences like (42a-b) will be assigned identical meanings, modulo order of elements on the FRAMES list:

(42)  a. Bo [[was [so tired] that he fainted] yesterday].
    b. Bo [[was [so tired] yesterday] that he fainted].

The semantic composition of the relevant analysis trees are sketched in Figures 9 and 10.

In the case of multiple extraposed clauses, there is also no effect on the semantics. Pairs like (9c-d) above, repeated here as (44a-b), receive identical semantic treatment (modulo order of frames):

(43)  a. I [[[sent out [more books] yesterday] than ever before] that I really liked].
    b. I [[[sent out [more books] yesterday] that I really liked] than ever before].

The treatment of of comparatives is similar to that of so-sentences, though these introduce further issues of binding and ellipsis that are beyond the scope of this paper.
FIGURE 9 Semantic Analysis Tree: Adjunction Over Extraposition
FIGURE 10 Semantic Analysis Tree: Extrapolation Over Adjunction
Finally, the variation in linear order introduced by the Complex Pre-Determiner Construction also has no semantic effect. For example, (44) is assigned the semantics in (45):

(44) [[[so tall] [a man]] arrived] that Lee laughed].

(45) $\text{exist}(x, \text{man}(x) \& \text{so}(\delta, \text{tall}(x, \delta), \text{exist}(s_1, \text{past}(s_1), \text{laugh}(s_1, \text{Lee}))),$
\hspace{1cm} $\text{exist}(s_2, \text{past}(s_2), \text{arrive}(s_2, x)))$

4.5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have seen that the complex pre-determination (‘Big Mess’) phenomenon and the discontinuous dependency phenomenon are independent – either may occur in a sentence without the other. Nevertheless we find them frequently intertwined because there are seven listemes (so, too, more, less, as, such, and how) that contain features which play key roles in both constructions. The CPD phenomenon requires a special construction (in our analysis or the alternative suggested in Van Eynde 2007); the DD phenomenon follows from the properties of certain lexical licensors and the grammatical mechanisms that govern extraposition in general. The details of the distribution of DD complements derive from the interaction of (1) a general construction for realizing elements of the EXTRA list, (2) specifications on phrasal constructions determining the contents of the mother’s EXTRA list as a function of the EXTRA lists of the daughters, and (3) various lexical specifications for relevant lexical licensors.

The subtleties of DD, CPD and their interaction have led us to an analysis that embodies one of the fundamental tenets of Berkeley Construction Grammar:

One cannot analyze an idiomatic construction without simultaneously discovering and setting aside all the aspects of the data that are NOT licensed by the construction one is studying. To know what is idiomatic about a phrase one has to know what is nongeneral and to identify something as nongeneral one has to be able to identify the general. In grammar, the investigation of the idiomatic and of the general are the same: the study of the periphery is the study of the core-and vice versa. The picture that emerges from the consideration of special constructions... is of a grammar in which the particular and the general are knit together seamlessly (Kay and Fillmore 1999).

We believe that the general approach we have adopted here has allowed us to develop a precise analysis of these phenomena that abstracts the significant generalizations they present, to elucidate their interactions with other aspects of grammar, and to thereby explicate the interaction of the idiosyncratic, the general, and the extensive and finely graded area in between.
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