Ellipsis with garden-path antecedents in French

Dario Paape¹, Barbara Hemforth², Shravan Vasishth¹ ¹University of Potsdam ²Université Paris Diderot paape@uni-potsdam.de



The reactivation hypothesis

- Paape (2016) found a reduction in reading times at a sluicing site if the antecedent had been syntactically reanalyzed
- In cue-based retrieval parsing (e.g., Lewis & Vasishth, 2005), syntactic phrases are stored in memory as chunks
- Observed speedup is hypothesized to be the result of reactivation of the antecedent's memory trace during reanalysis

Garden-path sentence:

Anna forgot the baby $act=100 \leftarrow base activation$ Anna forgot the baby $_{act=90} \leftarrow _{decay}$ had spit up Attachment = Activation boost Anna forgot the baby had spit $up_{act=120}$

Chunk created

Reanalysis trigger

Results

- **Reduced relative clauses:** Garden-path effect visible in the disambiguating region (go-past times & total reading times*)
- Subject-object inversion: Garden-path effect on the auxiliary (go-past times & total reading times^{*}; continues into the following regions)
- **Triple trouble**': Garden-path effect on the adjective (go-past times, see below); reversed on the verb

* <u>Pre</u>-ellipsis fixations only

Antecedent (Go-past times), 'Triple trouble'



Control sentence:

Anna forgot that the baby

Anna forgot that the baby had spit $up_{act=100} \leftarrow base activation$ Chunk created

Retrieval speed \propto Activation but I don't know why _____.

Issues

- Evidence comes from a late spillover region in a self-paced reading study
- Result has failed to replicate (Paape, 2015)
- Previous studies were limited to German

A new eye-tracking study

- Three types of potential garden-path sentences were identified in French: Reduced relative clauses, sentences featuring subject-object inversion and clauses involving triple lexical ambiguity ('triple trouble'):
- Shorter regression path durations for ellipsis versus control sentences across sentence types
- In 'triple trouble' sentences only, longer total reading times in the ellipsis region with ambiguous antecedents (not in control sentences)

Ellipsis site (Total reading times), 'Triple trouble'



The market is known for its large sides of beef Context which are delivered during the night.

tranche₃, Ambiguous sale boucher les₂ Le filthy butcher them the cuts Unambiguous bouchers tranchent, sales les Les butchers filthy.pl the them cut

demandent Ellipsis clients quand, mais les se the clients self when but ask technique, Control mais les clients demandent la en the clients of.it ask the technique but

marinée viande est vendue déjà la que VU that the meat sold already marinated is seen début matinée. de en beginning of morning at

Garden-path reading tranches Le boucher sale les (impossible with *sales*) the butcher salts₁the₂slices₃

Reduced relative clause

se demandent Incredulemen quano, vu que la viande la technique en demandent Region

- In 'triple trouble' and subject-object inversion sentences, longer re-reading times for the antecedent region in the ambiguous conditions*
- In 'triple trouble' sentences, more refixations on the initial noun and the adjective in the ambiguous/ellipsis condition*

* Post-ellipsis fixations only

Post-ellipsis antecedent refixations, 'Triple trouble'



Discussion

Garden-path effects were observed in all three sentence types

Le(s) héros dans cette histoire a/ont bête. décrit(s) vaincu une the hero(es) described in this story has/have defeated a beast

Subject-object inversion

Quelles journalistes de la chaîne president? a/ont soudoyé le which journalists of the channel has/have bribed the president

- Pretest (Internet-based, n = 56): 'Triple trouble' and subject-object inversion sentences received lower ratings in their ambiguous/dispreferred versions
- In the main study, 41 native speakers of French read 20/16/20 sentences of each type, plus 24 unrelated fillers
- Comprehension was probed after each trial (80% mean accuracy) Accuracy was highest for reduced relative clauses (86%), intermediate for 'triple trouble' sentences (80%) and lowest for subject-object inversion (74%)*

* Higher proportion of questions targeting argument structure

- Only in 'triple trouble' sentences, additional ellipsis processing difficulty (elevated reading times at the ellipsis site + antecedent re-reading) was observed with temporarily ambiguous antecedents
- Results do not support the reactivation hypothesis, but are compatible with accounts in which ellipsis acts as a memory pointer (Frazier & Clifton, 2001/2005; Martin & McElree, 2008)
- Results for 'triple trouble' sentences suggest that subjects fail to resolve the garden-path before reaching the ellipsis site \rightarrow implies 'good enough' processing (e.g., Ferreira & Patson, 2007) Why is this visible only in 'triple trouble' sentences? Were the other \rightarrow garden-paths easier to resolve?

References. Ferreira & Patson (2007). Lang Linguist Compass, 1(1-2), 71-83. Frazier & Clifton (2001). Syntax, 4(1), 1-22. - (2005). Syntax, 8(2), 121–174. Lewis & Vasishth (2005). Cognitive Sci, 29, 375–419. Martin & McElree (2008). J Mem Lang, 58(3), 879–906. Paape (2015). Poster presented at AMLaP 2015. — (2016). Front. Psychol., 27(7), doi 10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00027.