1. RC ATTACHMENT ASYMMETRIES

Variation in Relative Clause (RC) attachment across languages (a,b) and structures (b1-b4) [1,4] a.n.:

- **LOW ATTACHMENT, LA**
  a. Someone shot the maid, of the actress, that, was standing on the balcony
  b. The lamp near the painting, of the house, that, was damaged by the flood

- **HIGH ATTACHMENT, HA**
  a. Low Attachment
  b. High Attachment

2. THE PR CONFOUNDED

Grillo & Costa [2012] [2]: In some languages and structures, apparent RCs can also be interpreted as Passive Relative Small Clauses (PRs).

a. Ho visto [a] que Gianni che correva (b) / I saw [a] that Gianni ran
b. *I saw [a] that ran / I saw [a] John running

PRs and RCs are strong identical, but have very distinct structural and interpretative properties.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>RCs</th>
<th>PRs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Available w. objects</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available w. Rel. Pronouns</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP modifier</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available w. Proper Names</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available in SC environments</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP modifier</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspectual restrictions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refers to propositions</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. VARIABLE SYNTAX, UNIFORM PARSING

(Grillo & Costa 2012) Everything else being equal (e.g. lexical, contextual and prosodic factors): A. Low Attachment preference with genuine restrictive RCs, i.e. PRs not available, across languages and structures. B. High Attachment preference is observed in languages and structures which allow PR.

4. PRESENT EXPERIMENT

To test the role of PR in attachment preferences we manipulated:

- i. PR availability in object position through verb type: event-introducing (PR ok) vs. state-introducing (PR) Verbs (e.g. see vs. live only)
- ii. PR availability in subject position through noun type: event-introducing (PR ok) vs. state-introducing (PR) Nouns

**EXPERIMENT**: Ing-form attachment.


MATERIALS AND DESIGN: 2x2 crossing type (PR and noPR) and position (obj. vs. subject); 24 sets of target sentences (4 versions each), 48 fillers; Counterbalanced materials and questions.

**Results**:

- **A. PR, object**
  - Jim shares the house with the son of the doctor having dinner
  - RC only
- **B. PR, subject**
  - The car of the son of the doctor having dinner is old
  - RC only

5. RESULTS & ANALYSIS

**Table 1**: Results of linear mixed model fit for experiment 1. Items and participants were crossed random factors.

| contrast coefficient | SE  | z-value | Pr(>|z|) |
|----------------------|-----|---------|----------|
| PR vs. RC            | 0.75 | 0.25    | 3.01     |

**Table 2**: Results of linear mixed model fit for experiment 1. Items and participants were crossed random factors.

**Table 3**: Items at Comp

**Table 4**: RTs at inf, one word downstream from disambiguation point

6. DISCUSSION

As predicted, the experiment reveals a very strong effect of PR:

- LA is observed when PRs are not available
- HA is observed whenever PRs are available
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