




Linguistic Inquiry  
Monograph Forty-five

# Interface Strategies

## Optimal and Costly Computations

Tanya Reinhart



---

## Interface Strategies

---

## Linguistic Inquiry Monographs

Samuel Jay Keyser, general editor

6. *Some Concepts and Consequences of the Theory of Government and Binding*, Noam Chomsky
10. *On the Nature of Grammatical Relations*, Alec Marantz
12. *Logical Form: Its Structure and Derivation*, Robert May
13. *Barriers*, Noam Chomsky
15. *Japanese Tone Structure*, Janet Pierrehumbert and Mary Beckman
16. *Relativized Minimality*, Luigi Rizzi
18. *Argument Structure*, Jane Grimshaw
19. *Locality: A Theory and Some of Its Empirical Consequences*, Maria Rita Manzini
20. *Indefinites*, Molly Diesing
21. *Syntax of Scope*, Joseph Aoun and Yen-hui Audrey Li
22. *Morphology by Itself: Stems and Inflectional Classes*, Mark Aronoff
23. *Thematic Structure in Syntax*, Edwin Williams
24. *Indices and Identity*, Robert Fiengo and Robert May
25. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, Richard S. Kayne
26. *Unaccusativity: At the Syntax–Lexical Semantics Interface*, Beth Levin and Malka Rappaport Hovav
27. *Lexico-Logical Form: A Radically Minimalist Theory*, Michael Brody
28. *The Architecture of the Language Faculty*, Ray Jackendoff
29. *Local Economy*, Chris Collins
30. *Surface Structure and Interpretation*, Mark Steedman
31. *Elementary Operations and Optimal Derivations*, Hisatsugu Kitahara
32. *The Syntax of Nonfinite Complementation: An Economy Approach*, Željko Bošković
33. *Prosody, Focus, and Word Order*, Maria Luisa Zubizarreta
34. *The Dependencies of Objects*, Esther Torrego
35. *Economy and Semantic Interpretation*, Danny Fox
36. *What Counts: Focus and Quantification*, Elena Herburger
37. *Phrasal Movement and Its Kin*, David Pesetsky
38. *Dynamic Antisymmetry*, Andrea Moro
39. *Prolegomenon to a Theory of Argument Structure*, Ken Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser
40. *Essays on the Representational and Derivational Nature of Grammar: The Diversity of Wh-Constructions*, Joseph Aoun and Yen-hui Audrey Li
41. *Japanese Morphophonemics: Markedness and Word Structure*, Junko Ito and Armin Mester
42. *Restriction and Saturation*, Sandra Chung and William A. Ladusaw
43. *The Linearization of Chains and Sideward Movement*, Jairo Nunes
44. *The Syntax of (In) Dependence*, Ken Safir
45. *Interface Strategies: Optimal and Costly Computations*, Tanya Reinhart

---

**Interface Strategies**  
**Optimal and Costly**  
**Computations**

Tanya Reinhart

The MIT Press  
Cambridge, Massachusetts  
London, England

© 2006 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means (including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval) without permission in writing from the publisher.

MIT Press books may be purchased at special quantity discounts for business or sales promotional use. For information, please e-mail [special\\_sales@mitpress.mit.edu](mailto:special_sales@mitpress.mit.edu) or write to Special Sales Department, The MIT Press, 55 Hayward Street, Cambridge, MA 02142.

This book was set in Times Roman and was printed and bound in the United States of America.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Reinhart, Tanya.

Interface strategies : optimal and costly computations / Tanya Reinhart.

p. cm.—(Linguistic inquiry monographs ; 45)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-262-18250-5 (alk. paper); 0-262-68156-0 (pbk: alk. paper)

1. Grammar, Comparative and general. I. Title. II. Series.

P151.R45 2006

415—dc22

2005054004

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

---

# Contents

Acknowledgments ix

---

## Introduction: Optimal Design 1

---

### Chapter 1

---

#### Reference-Set Computation 13

- 1.1 The Minimal Link Condition 14
- 1.2 Interpretation-Dependent Reference Sets 25
- 1.3 The Interface Strategy: Repair of Imperfections 37

---

### Chapter 2

---

#### Scope-Shift 47

- 2.1 Quantifier Scope: The State of the Art 48
  - 2.1.1 The Optimistic QR View of the 1970s 48
  - 2.1.2 The Syntactic Freedom of Existential Wide Scope 50
  - 2.1.3 Can the Problem with Existentials Be Explained Away? 53
  - 2.1.4 The “Realistic” QR View of the 1980s 60
  - 2.1.5 Some Problems 61
- 2.2 The Alternative of Wide Scope In Situ 64
  - 2.2.1 *Wh*-In Situ 64
  - 2.2.2 Sluicing 66
- 2.3 The Interpretation Problem of Wide Scope In Situ 68
  - 2.3.1 *Wh*-In Situ 69
  - 2.3.2 Sluicing 71
  - 2.3.3 Existential Wide Scope 73

2.4	The Semantic Problem with Island-Free QR	76
2.5	An Intermediate Summary	79
2.6	Where No QR Is Needed: Choice Functions for Existential Quantifiers	81
2.6.1	Choice Functions and Existential Closure	81
2.6.2	Deriving the Choice-Function Interpretation	85
2.6.3	The Collective-Distributive Distinction	88
2.6.4	Which Indefinites Are Interpretable by Choice Functions?	91
2.6.5	Some Choice-Function Semantics	95
2.7	Scope-Shift: An Interface Repair Strategy	101
2.7.1	Minimize Interpretative Options	101
2.7.2	Applying the Illicit QR as a Repair Strategy	105
2.7.3	Processing Limitations on the Size of Reference Sets—Indefinite Numerals	110

### Chapter 3

---

#### Focus: The PF Interface 125

3.1	Sentence Main Stress	127
3.1.1	Cinque's Main-Stress System	127
3.1.2	Szendrői's Main-Stress System	131
3.2	How Focus Is Coded	134
3.2.1	Main Stress and Focus: The Basic View	134
3.2.2	PF-Coding: The Focus Set	135
3.3	Stress Operations	141
3.3.1	Focus and Anaphora	141
3.3.2	The Operations: Destressing and Main-Stress Shift	148
3.4	Reference-Set Computation	156
3.4.1	Focus Projection	156
3.4.2	Markedness	161

### Chapter 4

---

#### The Anaphora Reference-Set Strategy 165

4.1	Two Procedures of Anaphora Resolution	165
4.1.1	The Current Picture	166
4.1.2	What Is Binding?	169
4.1.3	Covaluation	172

4.2	Anaphora Restrictions	173
4.2.1	Restrictions on Binding	173
4.2.2	Restrictions on Covaluation	178
4.3	The Interface Strategy Governing Covaluation (Rule I)	181
4.3.1	Minimize Interpretative Options	181
4.3.2	Reference-Set Computation	186
4.3.3	Further Details of the Computation	190
4.4	Covaluation in Ellipsis Contexts	192
4.5	The Psychological Reality of Rule I	196

## Chapter 5

---

### The Processing Cost of Reference-Set Computation 199

5.1	Acquisition of the Coreference Rule I	204
5.1.1	An Overview of Binding and Rule I	206
5.1.2	Thornton and Wexler's Arguments against the Processing Account	216
5.1.3	Questions of Learnability	227
5.1.4	Explaining Chance Performance	232
5.2	Acquisition of Main-Stress Shift	238
5.2.1	An Overview of Stress and Focus	238
5.2.2	Preliminaries	246
5.2.3	Switch-Reference Resolution	251
5.2.4	Guess and Default: Focus Identification in the Scope of <i>Only</i>	259
5.2.5	Useful and Arbitrary Defaults	266
5.3	Acquisition of Scalar Implicatures	272

Notes 293

References 315

Author Index 331

Subject Index 335





---

## Acknowledgments

Kriszta Szendrői has made important contributions to this work since 1999, when I presented my ideas on focus and stress in the summer linguistics school in Potsdam, Germany. Her dissertation (Szendrői 2001) has shaped much of my analysis of stress in chapter 3, and her research as a post doc in Utrecht since 2002 has turned the acquisition hypothesis entailed by the focus analysis into reality. It is hard to imagine that chapter 5 would have materialized without her ideas, experiments, and constant feedback. In this area of stress and focus, I also wish to thank Ad Neeleman, who taught me how important PF is, and how to think about it. Many of the arguments in chapter 3 were formed in our joint work (Neeleman and Reinhart 1998).

My views on economy, reference-set computation, and the economy approach to anaphora were formed in intensive interaction with Danny Fox since 1993, when we were both exploring Yael Golan's idea that reference-set comparisons are relative to interpretation. His inspiration goes beyond what is evident in the chapters on these topics.

Choice functions were conceived through endless conversations with Remko Scha in the early 1990s. His patience, knowledge, and wisdom were formative at the stage summarized in Reinhart 1992. At later stages, many of the ideas were developed further through collaboration with Yoad Winter. Eddy Ruys has been a constant source of scrutiny and feedback on all issues of QR, economy, syntax, and interpretation.

An acquisition conference in Trieste in 1998 provided key input for this work. Gennaro Chierchia, Stephen Crain, Maria Teresa Guasti, and Rosalind Thornton presented their early findings on the acquisition of scalar implicatures there. It was the first indication that 50 percent performance (chance) is found in another area of reference-set computation besides coreference. So what was by then just a hypothesis seemed to become an experimental reality. My exchanges since, particularly with

Stephen Crain, have been extremely valuable as I pursued this hypothesis further.

The final shape of this book owes a lot to anonymous reviewers, of this monograph as well as of previous articles that were partially incorporated here. Their thorough and insightful comments gave me even more food for thought than I could incorporate.

---

## Introduction: Optimal Design


A hypothesis that got much attention in the 1990s is that the well-formedness of syntactic derivations is not always determined by absolute conditions, but it may be based on a selection of the optimal competitor out of a set of candidates—a reference set. A restricted version of this was assumed at the early stages of the minimalist program (Chomsky 1992, 1994), and simultaneously, it has been the central notion developed in Optimality Theory (OT) (see Prince and Smolensky 1993 and later work on optimality in syntax, including Grimshaw 1997). The computation of optimality selection is of a different sort than previously assumed in syntax. Typically, it requires that in computing a given derivation, an alternative derivation be constructed, in order to determine whether a given step in the current derivation (or the full output) is permitted. I will refer to this type of computation as *reference-set computation* (following the notation in the early minimalist framework). Naturally, the introduction of this new type of computation ignited a debate on whether the computational system of natural language (syntax) indeed includes such computations. In later developments of the minimalist framework (since Chomsky 1995), it was determined that there is no evidence that reference-set computation applies in core syntax. To establish that such computation is required it would be necessary to show that whatever it derives could not be derived otherwise, with more minimal computations. In fact, all original syntactic arguments in favor of this computation have found a simpler explanation in the minimalist framework.

The line of argument I pursue here is that this computation is nevertheless available to the computational system, as witnessed in some areas of the interface. But it is much more restricted than assumed in OT. It applies only as a “last resort,” when the outputs of core syntax operations are insufficient for the interface. The instances of reference-set computation that I examine in subsequent chapters can be viewed as interface

strategies needed to make up for imperfections in the system. Their operation is severely restricted, and applying them comes with a processing cost.

The concept of the interface that underlies this work can be best illustrated with a thought experiment from Chomsky 2000—an “evolutionary fable.” Imagine a primate that by some mystery of genetic development acquired the full set of the human cognitive abilities, except the language faculty. We can assume, then, that among other cognitive abilities, he has a system of concepts similar to that of humans, and a sensorimotor system that enables the perceiving and coding of information in sounds. Let us assume, further, that he has an innate system of logic, an abstract formal system, which contains an inventory of abstract symbols, connectives, functions, and definitions necessary for inference. What would he be able to do with these systems? Not much. Based on the rich concept system of humans, his inference system should in principle allow him to construct sophisticated theories and communicate them to his fellow primates. However, the inference system operates on propositions, not on concepts, so it is unusable for the primate in our thought experiment. Possibly he could code concepts in sounds, but not the propositions needed for inference.

Pursuing this thought experiment, the goal of linguistic theory can be described as reconstructing the system the primate lacks, which consists of whatever is needed to facilitate the interface of his various cognitive systems. In other words, the goal is to construct the computational system (CS) (syntax in a broad sense) that defines language (L), a state of the faculty-of-language (FL) organ, which makes this interface possible. Correctly capturing the interface is the crucial adequacy criterion of any syntactic theory. This is not to be confused with functional accounts of language. There is ample evidence by now that it is strictly impossible to derive the properties of the computational system from any functional considerations of language use. Systems of inference, use, and communication are consistent with many possible languages, and they cannot explain why the particular human language was selected. On the other hand, it is a crucial fact about human language that it can be used to argue, communicate, think, and so on. If our formal analysis of the computational system turns out to be inconsistent with basic facts of language use—for example, if it can be shown that the representations it generates are unusable for inference or cannot adjust to varying contexts of use—this cannot be the correct analysis, since the actual sentences of human language can be used for such purposes.



**Figure I.1**

Making the interface possible means that the other cognitive systems should be able to access the representations generated by the CS, namely, these representations should be legible to the other systems. Chomsky defines the “interface levels” as sets of representations legible to other systems (external to the faculty of language). He outlines two broad external systems (each consisting of sets of systems): (1) the sensorimotor, articulatory-perceptual systems, and (2) the conceptual-intentional (C/I), or thought systems. But for work on the interface it may be useful to decompose further the components of the C/I interface. I assume three (sets of) such systems, along with the sensorimotor sound system, as schematized in figure I.1.

We may assume that basic information of the concepts system is coded on the lexical items, which are the building blocks of the CS derivations. For this purpose, the information must be coded in a form legible to other systems—for example, as thematic features. The problem of legibility with the concepts system is somewhat different from the problem with the other C/I systems. Some of the information of the concepts systems, like the number of Theta roles of a verb—the verb’s arity—must be legible to the CS (rather than conversely). Similarly, the thematic properties of a selected argument may determine its merging order in the derivation (agents must merge in SpecVP, and so on). Much of the other information coded on lexical items is not legible to the CS itself, but it is transferred through the derivations of the CS to the other C/I systems, and it should be legible to them. (This is the same intuition that underlies the concept of interpretable features in the minimalist framework.) The

inference system is essentially logic and its inventory includes, for example, logical relations, functions, abstract predicates, and variables (but no constants). The outputs of the CS are representations that are legible to the inference system, which can read them as propositions fit for its computations. The hardest to define given our present state of knowledge are the context systems that narrow the information transmitted through the derivation (coded in the relevant representation), and select the information that is useful for the context of use. On this view, then, the C/I systems are the concepts/context/inference systems. Figure I.1 is, of course, an abstraction. It may turn out to be necessary to assume that the context, inference, and sound systems may have direct interfaces, rather than each negotiating only with the CS, as in the figure. (This is related to Chomsky's (2000) question of association.) I will touch occasionally on this question, particularly in chapter 3, on focus and stress, but I do not attempt a comprehensive answer. The specific focus of this book is the interface of the CS with the inference and the context systems. The interface with the concepts system is the topic of research on the relations between the lexicon and the computational system. I discuss the concepts interface in Reinhart 2002.

A central question of linguistic theory, then, is how the interface is guaranteed, or what makes the CS representations legible to the other systems. Put more broadly, the question is how structure and use are related. There is no pretheoretical way to answer this. Suppose we observed, empirically, that a certain derivation *D* is associated with a set *U* of possible uses. In principle, there are several conceivable ways that this could come about. One is that the properties necessary for *U* are directly coded in *D*, through the computational system, as specific features, functional projections, operations, or conditions on derivations. In other instances, it is possible that there is no direct relation between the syntactic properties of *D* and *U*. Rather, the set *U* is determined solely by independent properties and computations of the external systems, which apply to legible CS representations and further modify them. Yet another possibility is that there are some interface strategies associating *D* and *U*, using independent properties of the CS, and of the external systems.

I believe all three solutions to the question of the interface are realized in various areas of the interface, but the one actually favored in syntactic practice is the first—that of syntactic coding. Many of the properties now encoded in the theory of the CS got there in order to guarantee the correct interface with the external systems of use. Quantified (Q), focus (F), and referential (R) features are just a few examples. The features

approach has been found useful in current syntax. The theoretical goal is that syntactic operations—the computational system—should be driven only by purely formal and mechanical considerations, and feature checking is a formal procedure of this nature. Nevertheless, it is far less obvious in advance that the full information necessary for the interface is coded in the CS in the same way. What it would mean, if true, is that features of one cognitive system are fully coded in another. It is easy to see why this is an attractive option. If this is how the human system has developed genetically, it can be viewed as a perfect system, where full matching of the various cognitive systems is guaranteed in advance, and no problem of coordination (or of the interface) can ever arise. Though not impossible conceptually, more evidence that language is perfect in this sense is needed than is currently available. We should also bear in mind that if the properties we encode in the CS (as theoreticians) do not, in fact, belong there, we are unlikely to get very far. As we will see, encoding interface properties in the CS has led to an enormous enrichment of the machinery. In many cases, the result is a highly baroque syntax, which, nevertheless, fares rather poorly in capturing the interface.

This book covers four areas of the inference/context interface: quantifier scope, focus, anaphora, and (more briefly) scalar implicatures. The first question in each of the areas is what makes the computational system legible to the other systems at the interface. In other words, how much of the information needed for inference and context is coded in the CS, and how is it coded? Once the CS coding is established, we discover that in each of these areas there are certain aspects of meaning, or the use of derivations at the interface, that cannot be coded in the CS formal language, on both conceptual and empirical grounds. This residue, I argue, is governed by interface strategies that can be viewed as strategies of repair, adjusting the derivation to the needs on the interface. (Not all interface strategies are strategies of repair, but those discussed here are.)

The broader context of this analysis is Chomsky's (2000) hypothesis of optimal design. The term *optimal* as used here should not be confused with its use in Optimality Theory (OT). In OT, optimality is a type of computation—selecting the optimal competitor out of a reference set. Here the question is whether the genetic design of language happens to be optimal.<sup>1</sup> As we saw with the primate thought experiment, the problem that language is a solution to is the interface of the different cognitive systems; to enable this, its representations must be legible to the other systems. Chomsky's working hypothesis, viewed as an ideal to guide inquiry, is that the solution is optimal: "Language is an optimal solution



to legibility conditions” (p. 96). A difficult question, of course, is what would count as an optimal design. A useful way to think about this may be to imagine a spectrum between a perfect and a poor solution, and optimal systems should be closer to the first alternative than to the second. As a first approximation, we may take the earlier view of the minimalist program, which I discuss in chapter 1. The assumption is that in a perfect system, the bare minimum needed for constructing derivations will be sufficient for the full needs of the interface. We may view deviations from the perfect system as imperfections—adjustments needed to enable the output representations to meet interface requirements. The less of these there are, the more optimal the system design is. Though this is not the full story, we may note that in the three interface areas under consideration here, the CS outputs are not sufficient for the interface needs. Some extension or repair of what the CS allows is therefore needed, so these are areas of imperfections. I will argue that the repair strategies involve the application of an illicit operation, which is only motivated by the fact that the output representations of the CS are not sufficient for the interface needs. Applying this operation requires constructing a reference set to check whether this is indeed necessary—that is, that this is the only way to meet the interface requirements. If optimal design has some measurable implications, imperfections should come at some cost.

While capturing the interface is the minimal requirement of the CS, a factor that cannot be ignored in determining which solutions can be viewed as optimal is that the actual use of language is also restricted by questions of “hardware.” There is by now ample evidence that the human processor operates with limited resources of working memory and other limitations. So far we have looked only at the C/I interface. A CS that accommodates this interface would enable thought, but not yet communication. This also requires accommodating the SM (sensorimotor) interface, which, as formulated in Chomsky 2005, enables the externalization of language (sound, communication, processing). But the sensorimotor systems are severely constrained by the hardware available for sound production and perception, or more broadly, for the computations required in parsing sound inputs into linguistic representations. It may be possible to imagine various good solutions to the problem of the C/I interface, perhaps even better than the actual CSs, which require so much computation space that they would not be usable by humans. Suppose, then, that language is optimally designed to accommodate the C/I interface. The next question is how good the accommodation is to the SM interface, or the linking of the optimal design for the C/I interface with the fixed hard-

ware properties of the SM systems. Of the various hardware questions, the one relevant to the problems discussed in this book is how a parser that operates with limited memory resources can access and apply the definitions of the CS.

With this question in mind, we may turn to the fuller specification Chomsky (2000, 96) gives to the hypothesis of optimal design. He says: “Suppose that FL [Faculty of Language] satisfying legibility conditions in an optimal way satisfies all other empirical conditions too: acquisition, processing, neurology. . . . Then the language organ is a perfect solution to minimal design specifications. That is, a system that satisfies a very narrow subset of empirical conditions in an optimal way—those it must satisfy to be usable at all [i.e., the interface conditions]—turns out to satisfy all empirical conditions. Whatever is learned about other matters will not change the conclusions about FL.” Note that what is outlined here is the (unrealistic) perfect solution (rather than the optimal). In the perfect solution, the CS is some kind of genetic development that, while optimally enabling the C/I interface, also happens to fit perfectly for actual use with limited resources (thus satisfying all empirical conditions, not just the subset needed for the C/I interface). Sticking to the question of the parser, along with Chomsky’s reasoning in the paragraph quoted here, it is easy to see intuitively why this would be the ideal situation. The farther apart the CS and the parser are, the more questions arise regarding their coordination. For example, if a change takes place in one system, how does the other adjust? The question, then, is how close language design could be to this idealized perfect match. Phillips (1996) suggests that it is pretty close, arguing that “the parser is the grammar.”

The question of how “transparent” the parser can be—to what extent it can directly apply computations of the CS, rather than its own independent algorithms—has a long history, with roots in Miller and Chomsky 1963. One interpretation of their proposal became known in research on processing as the Derivational Theory of Complexity. According to this theory, there should be a measurably greater processing load depending on the number and complexity of the operations assumed in syntactic theory (the theory even made the assumption that a passive sentence would impose greater processing load than an active sentence). The general contention since the mid-1970s was that this hypothesis did not find empirical support, and it was abandoned. Phillips reexamines this history in detail, and argues, first, that the empirical findings were not as sweepingly nonsupportive as they were said to be, and, more crucially, that this specific interpretation of Miller and Chomsky’s hypothesis was not

necessarily warranted, because it also depends on the question of measurement, or perceptual complexity. It is not obvious that every difference in processing steps, or number of operations applied, should be measurable. Berwick and Weinberg (1984) argued that in a nonserial model of parsing, it is possible that increased complexity does not increase time demands.

Phillips's hypothesis that the parser is the CS adopts the strongest possible version of a transparent parser, which in Berwick and Weinberg's terms is *token-to-token transparency* between the CS and the parser. On this view, then, the fit of the parser and the CS is perfect.

But executing this hypothesis in Phillips's system also requires substantial changes in the CS, to make it usable in linear left-to-right parsing (changes that Phillips attempts to show are independently motivated by syntax-internal considerations, but that are nevertheless not consistent with current views of the CS). It may be realistic to consider the other option as well—that language is optimally designed, though it is not perfect. It has been repeatedly argued that in speech perception (processing) the parser uses specific principles or strategies that find no direct correlate in computations of the CS. The most famous are strategies resolving local ambiguity at a processing stage, which does not even arise in syntax, as in (1).

- (1) a. Max knows Lucie well enough.
- b. Max knows Lucie will laugh.

In response time or eye-tracking experiments, it was found that there is more intense processing activity following the occurrence of *Lucie* in (1b) than in (1a). This indicates that the parser first attaches *Lucie* as a complement of the verb in both derivations, but then reanalysis is required in (1b). Such findings are often taken to suggest that the parser must be a system independent of the CS (other relevant parsing-specific operations will be mentioned shortly). But we may still ask how optimal the correlation between the two systems is.

Let us assume that the parser is some algorithmic device that generates trees. But it can lend itself to any other system for the specifics of the trees generated—that is, it has no internal information about what counts as a legitimate tree. This means that as long as the CS definitions and computations are accessible to parsing algorithms, the parser can construct trees defined by the CS as legitimate outputs. Though the parser can, in principle, parse anything that is formally compatible, it has developed to operate within the hardware of limited human working memory. Hence, there

are parser-specific strategies of how to minimize the load on working memory, while still applying the computations dictated by the system it works with, which in this case is the CS. A parser of this sort can be viewed as transparent, because apart from adjustments to hardware needs, it does not apply rules of its own, but borrows them from the CS—its computations are a function of the CS computations and the input string. (The term *transparent parser* has a long history, but I am using it only as described here.<sup>2</sup>) In practice, it may turn out that the actual human parser requires some parser-specific conditions for the processing of language derivations, but the more transparent the parser is, in this sense, the more optimal language design is. It means that the minimal design necessary to capture the interface also contains all the information needed for the parser; thus, the serious problems of coordinating two independent systems are avoided.

Perhaps the reason the idea of a transparent parser was abandoned was that for years it did not seem possible to define such a parser for the CS. The crucial problem seemed to be that parsing, unlike the CS derivations, proceeds from left to right (top to bottom). However, Pritchett's (1992) parser, which may not have received the attention it deserves, does solve this problem. It is a head-driven parser, which means that inputs are stored until a lexical head (verb) is reached. What distinguishes it from other head-driven parsers is a parsing condition (specific to language processing) stating that any step in the parsing derivation must satisfy a Theta requirement (Pritchett's Theta attachment). Once a parsing step is licensed by Theta attachment, other attachments in this parse follow the CS instructions. When the first verb is encountered, the subject being stored can be attached, by Theta attachment. The derivation proceeds bottom up, and at the same parse, VP, IP, and CP are constructed, the subject moves from SpecVP to SpecIP, and so on. (Let us abstract away from the question of adjuncts here.) In (1b), repeated in (2a), when *Lucie* is encountered, Theta attachment allows only one option—attaching it as the complement of the verb, just as in (1a). Hence, when this attachment is found inconsistent with the subsequent input, reanalysis is required.

- (2) a. Max knew Lucie would laugh.  
       b. Max warned Lucie would laugh. (Garden path)

While (2a) is captured by virtually any of the available parsers without assuming either a head-driven or Theta-based parser, Pritchett's analysis focuses on the difference between (2a) and (2b). Both require reanalysis, but only the second is a garden path. Pritchett draws a crucial distinction

between low-cost and high-cost reanalysis. The difference between (2a) and (2b) is that the verb in the first sentence selects only one Theta role, but in the second it selects two. In Pritchett's initial analysis, the problem with the second reanalysis was assumed to be that *Lucie* is moved from one Theta domain to another. This would be puzzling, because it means another parser-specific condition not familiar from syntax is required. However, later in the same book he shows that the conditions on permissible (low-cost) reanalysis are purely syntactic. Mulders (2004, 2005) and Siloni (2004) develop this second line of argument and maintain that reanalysis obeys a subset of the conditions that apply to movement in the CS. Garden paths, then, are cases where the parsing of a legitimate output of the CS requires a violation of a syntactic principle of the CS during parsing. If a parser-specific restriction on reanalysis is still required (which is a topic of debate between these two authors), it is, in any case, stated in terms defined in the CS.

A central argument against Pritchett's parser has been that, because of its head-driven engine, it cannot be suitable for verb-final languages, like Japanese or, partially, Dutch, because the system predicts that in such languages no commitment is made before the verb is encountered. However, Mulders (2002) shows that this is actually in accordance with the facts, because verb-final languages have fewer garden paths, and those that are still found follow from a Pritchett-based analysis. Mulders offers an in-depth analysis of Japanese parsing, in this system. She shows further that it is possible to formulate a "universal" parser that accounts for garden-path phenomena across languages, with no appeal to language-specific parsers. Pritchett's system, then, is a realistic model of a highly transparent parser, which directly applies conditions of the computational system, with a very restricted set of parser-specific conditions. We may note that even the parser-specific condition of Theta attachment is not precisely an arbitrary parser condition. The current view of the CS is that its derivations proceed bottom up, starting with a verb or a lexical head, and, although this has been debated, certain aspects of the Theta criterion guide the derivation. Theta attachment remains a parser-specific condition, since the CS does not require that no computation can take place unless it also involves Theta attachment. But this parser-specific condition can be viewed as an attempt of the parser to imitate the CS computations as closely as possible—to start each step of the parsing in a position enabling it to proceed bottom up according to CS definitions.

It seems possible to conclude that, with this model of the parser, language may indeed be optimally designed with respect to the "empirical

condition” of use with limited resources. The minimal set necessary for the interface—that is, for language use to be possible at all—is also close to being sufficient for capturing everything else.

Turning now to reference-set computation, my focus in this book is on reference sets of the global sort (which requires holding two or more derivations open). If the parser is transparent, this means it actually carries out the required computation. But this goes against what is known about working-memory limitations. Given these limitations, the parser attempts to compute, close, and discharge chunks of the tree as soon as possible. Global reference-set computation does not allow such closure and discharge, before the full derivation is completed and evaluated against the reference set. So carrying out this computation imposes a serious processing load. As we will see, in frameworks assuming that this type of computation is the driving engine of the CS and is extremely common, it is necessary to assume parser-specific bypassing algorithms, so the parser does not, in fact, carry out the CS computations. Given that in such frameworks, this computation is always at work, this would mean that the parser cannot be transparent, or, in our terms, that language is not optimally designed.

But the hypothesis I develop in this book is that reference-set computation, although available for the CS, is a severely restricted computation. As mentioned earlier, it applies in areas of imperfections, where the CS fails to meet the interface requirements and where an illicit operation must apply. On this view, imperfections have a processing cost. Let us continue to assume that language is optimally designed and that the parser is transparent, with the minimum parser-specific adjustments mentioned above, which means it also carries out reference-set computations when required. We would then expect to find some evidence for the cost involved. The problem of measurement this question entails is different than in the cases examined by the Derivational Theory of Complexity. It is not just a question of degrees of computational complexity, which may not be fully measurable (and it also depends on other considerations not discussed here), but it verges on the question of the upper limit of what can be processed within the limitations of human working memory. In chapter 5, I argue that children, whose working memory is not yet fully developed, simply cannot carry out the required computations, a claim based on extensive acquisition findings. Since their knowledge of the CS is innate, they know what they have to do in the relevant experimental tasks, but failing the execution they resort to bypassing strategies, one of which is guessing. Adults’ working memory is sufficient for the standard

instances of computations with two members in the reference set. (Otherwise we could not have any real way of knowing that such computations are available to the CS, apart from theory-internal considerations.) But in section 2.7.3, I argue that adults also cannot process reference sets with more than three members, which gives us an idea of the upper limit on what can be computed within the resources of human working memory. If accurate, these findings lend support to the hypothesis that the parser is transparent, and indirectly, to the hypothesis of optimal design.

---

## References

- Abusch, Dorit. 1994. The scope of indefinites. *Natural Language Semantics* 2(2):83–135.
- Adams, A.-M., and S. E. Gathercole. 1996. Phonological working memory and spoken language development in young children. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 49A, 216–233.
- Akmajian, A., and R. Jackendoff. 1970. Coreferentiality and stress. *Linguistic Inquiry* 1:124–126.
- Altman, G. T. M., and M. Steedman. 1988. Interaction with context during human sentence processing. *Cognition* 30:191–238.
- Ariel, Mira. 1990. *Accessing Noun Phrase Antecedents*. London: Routledge.
- Avrutin, Sergey. 1994. *Psycholinguistic Investigations in the Theory of Reference*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Baauw, S., E. Ruigendijk, and F. Cuetos. 2003. The interpretation of contrastive stress in Spanish-speaking children. In J. van Kampen and S. Baauw, eds., *Proceedings of GALA 2003*. LOT, Occasional Series 2. Utrecht, The Netherlands.
- Baddeley, A. D. 1986. *Working Memory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baert, J. L. 1987. *Focus, Syntax, and Accent Placements*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: ICG Printing.
- Baker, Carl L. 1970. Notes on the description of English questions: The role of an abstract question morpheme. *Foundations of Language* 6:197–219.
- Barwise, J., and R. Cooper. 1981. Generalized quantifiers and natural language. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 4:159–219.
- Beghelli, Filippo. 1993. A minimalist approach to quantifier scope. In Amy J. Schafer, ed., *Proceedings of NELS 23*, University of Ottawa. Amherst: NELS/University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Beghelli, Filippo. 1995. *The Phrase Structure of Quantifier Scope*. Doctoral dissertation, UCLA.
- Beghelli, Filippo, Dorit Ben-Shalom, and Anna Szabolcsi. 1993. When do subjects and objects exhibit a branching reading? In Erin Duncan, Donka Farkas, and Philip Spaelti, eds., *Proceedings of the Twelfth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.



- Beghelli, Filippo, and Timothy Stowell. 1995. Distributivity and negation: The syntax of each and every. Unpublished manuscript, UCLA.
- Beghelli, Filippo, and T. Stowell. 1997. The syntax of distributivity and negation. In A. Szabolcsi, ed., *Ways of Scope Taking*, 71–108. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Ben-Shalom, Dorit. 1993. Object wide scope and semantic trees. In A. Lahiri, ed., *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) 3*, 19–37. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications/Cornell University.
- Ben-Shalom, Dorit. 1996. Dependent and independent pronouns. In *Semantic Trees*, chap. 2. Doctoral dissertation, UCLA.
- Berwick, Robert, and Amy Weinberg. 1984. *The Grammatical Basis of Linguistic Performance*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- Bochvar, D. A. 1939. On a three-valued logical calculus and its application to the analysis of contradictories. *Matematckeskiy Sbornik* 4:287–308. Quoted in Susan Haack, *Deviant Logic: Some Philosophical Issues*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Bolinger, Dwight. 1972. Accent is predictable (if you're a mind-reader). *Language* 48:633–644.
- Braine, M., and B. Romain. 1981. Children's comprehension of "or": Evidence for a sequence of competencies. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology* 31:46–70.
- Breheny, Richard, Napoleon Katsos, and John Williams. Forthcoming. Are generalised scalar implicatures generated by default? An on-line investigation into the role of context in generating pragmatic inferences. *Cognition*.
- Carston, R. 1998. Informativeness, relevance, and scalar implicatures. In R. Carston and S. Uchida, eds., *Relevance Theory: Applications and Implications*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Chien, Y.-Ch., and K. Wexler. 1990. Children's knowledge of locality conditions in binding as evidence of the modularity of syntax and pragmatics. *Language Acquisition* 1:225–295.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 1993. Questions with quantifiers. *Natural Language Semantics* 1:181–234.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 2004. Scalar implicatures, polarity phenomena, and the syntax/pragmatics interface. In A. Belletti, ed., *Structures and Beyond*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chierchia, G., S. Crain, M. T. Guasti, A. Gualmini, and L. Meroni. 2001. The acquisition of disjunction: Evidence for a grammatical view of scalar implicatures. In A. H.-J. Do, L. Domínguez, and A. Johansen, eds., *Proceedings of the 25th Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development*, 157–168. Somerville, Mass.: Cascadilla Press.
- Chierchia, G., and M. T. Guasti. 2000. Backwards vs. forward anaphora: Reconstruction in child language. *Language Acquisition* 8(2):129–170.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1971. Deep structure, surface structure, and semantic interpretation. In D. D. Steinberg and L. A. Jakobovits, eds., *Semantics: An Interdisci-*

- plinary Reader in Philosophy, Linguistics, and Psychology*, 183–216. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1973. Conditions on transformations. In Stephen Anderson and Paul Kiparsky, eds., *A Festschrift for Morris Halle*, 232–286. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1975. Questions of form and interpretation. *Linguistic Analysis* 1:75–109.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1976. Conditions on rules of grammar. *Linguistic Analysis* 2:303–351. Reprinted in Noam Chomsky, *Essays on Form and Interpretation*. New York: North Holland, 1977.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Foris.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Barriers*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1992. *A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1994. A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser, eds., *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, 1–52. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. (Reprinted as chap. 3 in Noam Chomsky, *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1995.)
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka, eds., *Step by Step*, 89–156. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In M. Kenstowicz, ed., *A Life in Language*, 1–52. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2005. Three factors in language design. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36(1):1–22.
- Chomsky, Noam, and Morris Halle. 1968. *The Sound Pattern of English*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Chomsky, Noam, and Howard Lasnik. 1993. The theory of principles and parameters. In Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld, and Theo Vennemann, eds., *Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, vol. 1, 506–569. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. (Reprinted in Noam Chomsky, *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1995.)
- Chung, S., W. Ladusaw, and J. McCloskey. 1994. Sluicing and logical form. *Natural Language Semantics* 3(3):239–282.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1993. A null theory of phrase and compound stress. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24(2):239–298.
- Collins, Chris. 1994. Economy of derivation and the generalized proper binding condition. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25(1):45–61.
- Collins, Chris. 1997. *Local Economy*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

- Cooper, R. 1979. Variable binding and relative clauses. In Franz Guenther and S. J. Schmidt, eds., *Formal Semantics and Pragmatics for Natural Languages*, 131–170. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Reidel.
- Cooper, R. 1983. *Quantification and Syntactic Theory*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Reidel.
- Crain, S. 1991. Language acquisition in the absence of experience. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 14:597–611.
- Crain, S., and H. Hamburger. 1992. Semantic knowledge and NP modification. In R. Levine, ed., *Formal Grammar: Theory and Interpretation*, vol. 2, 372–401. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Crain, S., and D. Lillo-Martin. 1999. *An Introduction to Linguistic Theory and Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Crain, S., and Cecile McKee. 1986. Acquisition of structural restrictions on anaphora. In S. Berman, J.-W. Choe, and J. McDonough, eds., *Proceedings of the North Eastern Linguistic Society 16, GLSA*, 94–110. Amherst, Mass.: GLSA.
- Crain, S., W. Ni, and L. Conway. 1994. Learning, parsing, and modularity. In C. Clifton, L. Frazier, and K. Rayner, eds., *Perspectives on Sentence Processing*, 443–467. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- Crain, S., and M. Steedman. 1985. On not being led up the garden path: The use of context by the psychological parser. In D. Dowty, L. Karttunen, and A. Zwicky, eds., *Natural Language Parsing: Psychological, Computational and Theoretical Perspectives*, 320–358. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crain, S., and R. Thornton. 1998. *Investigations in Universal Grammar: A Guide to Experiments on the Acquisition of Syntax and Semantics*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Crain, S., R. Thornton, C. Boster, L. Conway, D. Lillo-Martin, and E. Woodams. 1996. Quantification without qualification. *Language Acquisition* 5:83–153.
- Crain, S., and K. Wexler. 1999. A modular approach to methodology. In William Ritchie and Tej Bhatia, eds., *Handbook of Child Language Acquisition*, 327–426. New York: Academic Press.
- Cutler, A., and D. Swinney. 1987. Prosody and the development of comprehension. *Journal of Child Language* 14(1):145–167.
- Danon, G. 1996. *The Syntax of Determiners in Hebrew*. MA thesis, Tel Aviv University. Available at <http://faculty.biu.ac.il/~danong1/papers/thesis.pdf>.
- Diesing, M. 1992. *Indefinites*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- van der Does, J. 1992. *Applied Quantifier Logics*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.
- Dowty, D. 1980. Comments on the paper by Bach and Partee. In K. J. Kreiman, and A. E. Ojeda, eds., *Papers from the Parasession on Pronouns and Anaphora*, 29–40. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Dowty, D. 1986. A note on collective predicates, distributive predicates and “all.” In F. Marshall, A. Miller, and Z. Zhang, eds., *Proceedings of the Third Eastern State Conference on Linguistics*. Columbus: Ohio State University.

- Engdahl, Elisabet. 1980. *The Syntax and Semantics of Questions in Swedish*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Engdahl, Elisabet. 1986. *Constituent Questions: The Syntax and Semantics of Questions with Special Reference to Swedish*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Reidel.
- Epstein, Samuel David. 1992. Derivational constraints on A-Chain formation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23(2):235–259.
- Evans, Gareth. 1980. Pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11(2):337–362.
- Everaert, M., and Eric Reuland, eds. 2000. *Interface Strategies*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences.
- Farkas, D. 1981. Quantifier scope and syntactic islands. In G. N. Carlson, ed., *Papers from the Seventeenth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 59–66. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Farkas, Donka, and Anastasia Giannakidou. 1996. How clause bounded is the scope of universals? In Teresa Galloway and Justin Spence, eds., *Proceedings of SALT VI*, 35–52.
- Fiengo, Robert, and Robert May. 1994. *Indices and Indentity*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Fodor, Janet Dean, and Ivan A. Sag. 1982. Referential and quantificational indefinites. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 5(3):355–398.
- Fodor, Jerry. 1979. In defense of the truth gap. In C. K. Oh and D. A. Dinneen, eds., *Presuppositions, Syntax, and Semantics 11*. New York: Academic Press.
- Fodor, Jerry A., Thomas G. Bever, and Merrill F. Garrett. 1974. *The Psychology of Language: An Introduction to Psycholinguistics and Generative Grammar*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fox, Danny. 1993. *Chain and Binding: A modification of Reinhart and Reuland's reflexivity*. Unpublished manuscript, MIT.
- Fox, Danny. 1995. Economy and scope. *Natural Language Semantics* 3:283–341.
- Fox, Danny. 1998. Locality in variable binding. In Pilar Barbosa, Danny Fox, Paul Hagstrom, Martha McGinnis, and David Pesetsky, eds., *Is the Best Good Enough? Optimality and Competition in Syntax*, 129–155. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Fox, Danny. 2000. *Economy and Semantic Interpretation*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Gathercole, S. E., and A. Adams. 1993. Phonological working memory in very young children. *Developmental Psychology* 29:770–778.
- Gathercole, S. E., and Alan D. Baddeley. 1993. *Working Memory and Language: Essays in Cognitive Psychology*. Hove, UK: Erlbaum.
- Gathercole, S. E., and G. J. Hitch. 1993. Developmental changes in short-term memory: A revised working memory perspective. In A. F. Collins, S. E. Gathercole, M. A. Conway, and P. E. Morris, eds., *Theories of Memory*, 189–209. Hove, UK: Erlbaum.

- Gazdar, G. A. 1979. *Pragmatics: Implicatures, Presupposition and Logical Form*. New York: Academic Press.
- Gennari, S., A. Gualmini, S. Crain, L. Meroni, and S. Maciukaite. 2001. How adults and children manage stress in ambiguous contexts. In *Proceedings of the 1st Workshop on Cognitive Models of Semantic Processing*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh.
- Gil, David. 1982. Quantifier scope, linguistic variation and natural language semantics. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 5:421–472.
- Golan, Yael. 1993. Node crossing economy, superiority and D-linking. Unpublished manuscript, Tel Aviv University.
- Goldsmith, John A. 1976. *Autosegmental Phonology*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Grice, P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In P. Cole and J. Morgan, eds., *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press. Also in Paul Grice, *Studies in the Way of Words*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1989.
- Grimshaw, Jane. 1997. Projections, heads and optimality. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28:373–422.
- Grimshaw, J., and S. Rosen. 1990. Knowledge and obedience: The developmental status of the binding theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21:187–222.
- Grodzinsky, Y., T. Reinhart, and K. Wexler. 1990. The Development of Principles Governing Pronouns in Grammar and Discourse—Binding Theory and Pragmatic Implicatures of Quantity. Grant proposal, U.S.–Israel Binational Science Foundation. (Ms. Tel Aviv University and MIT, available at <http://www.let.uu.nl/~tanya.reinhart/personal/>.)
- Grodzinsky, Yoseph, and Tanya Reinhart. 1993. The innateness of binding and coreference. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24:69–101.
- Groenendijk, Jeroen, and Martin Stokhof. 1982. Semantic analysis of *wh*-complements. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 52:175–234.
- Groenendijk, Jeroen, and Martin Stokhof. 1984. *Studies on the Semantics of Questions and the Pragmatics of Answers*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.
- Gualmini, A., S. Crain, L. Meroni, G. Chierchia, and M. T. Guasti. 2001. At the semantics/pragmatics interface in child language. In Rachel Hastings, Brendan Jackson, and Zsófia Zvolenszky, eds., *Proceedings from Semantics and Linguistic Theory 11*, 231–247. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University.
- Gualmini, Andrea, Simona Maciukaite, and Stephen Crain. 2003. Children's insensitivity to contrastive stress in sentences with *only*. In Sudha Arunachalam, Elsi Kaiser, and Alexander Williams, eds., *Proceedings of the 25th Penn Linguistics Colloquium*, 87–100. Philadelphia: Department of Linguistics, University of Pennsylvania.
- Guenther, F., and S. Schmidt, eds. 1979. *Formal Semantics and Pragmatics for Natural Languages*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Reidel.

- Gussenhoven, Carlos. 1984. *On the Grammar and Semantics of Sentence Accents in Dutch*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Foris.
- Halbert, A., S. Crain, D. Shankweiler, and E. Woodams. 1995. Children's interpretive use of emphatic stress. Paper presented at the Eighth Annual CUNY Conference on Human Sentence Processing, Tucson, Ariz.
- Halle, M., and J.-R. Vergnaud. 1987. *An Essay on Stress*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1967. Notes on transitivity and theme in English, Part 2. *Journal of Linguistics* 3:199–244.
- Hamblin, Charles Leonard. 1976. Questions in Montague English. In B. Partee, ed., *Montague Grammar*. New York: Academic Press. (Originally appeared in *Foundations of Language* 10/1(1973):41–53.)
- Heim, Irene. 1982. *The Semantics of Definite and Indefinite Noun Phrases*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. (Published in 1989 by Garland, New York.)
- Heim, Irene. 1986. Notes on comparatives and related matters. Unpublished manuscript, University of Texas, Austin.
- Heim, Irene. 1998. Anaphora and semantic interpretation: A reinterpretation of Reinhart's approach. In U. Sauerland and O. Percus, eds., *The Interpretative Tract*. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 25. Cambridge, MA: MITWPL, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT.
- Heim, Irene, and Angelika Kratzer. 1998. *Semantics in Generative Grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hendriks, H. 1993. *Studied Flexibility*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Amsterdam.
- Higginbotham, James. 1983. Logical form, binding, and nominals. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14(3):395–420.
- Higginbotham, James. 1985. On semantics. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16(4):547–593.
- Higginbotham, James. 1987. Indefinites and predication. In E. Reuland and A. G. B. ter Meulen, eds., *The Representation of (In)definiteness*, 41–80. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Higginbotham, James. 1992. Interrogatives. Unpublished manuscript, MIT.
- Higginbotham, James, and Robert May. 1981. Questions, quantifiers, and crossing. *Linguistic Review* 1:41–79.
- Hilbert, D., and P. Bernays. [1939] 1970. *Die Grundlagen der Mathematik II*. 2nd ed. Berlin: Springer.
- Hirschbühler, P. 1982. VP Deletion and across-the-board quantifier scope. In James Pustejovsky and Peter Sells, eds., *NELS 12*, 132–139. GLSA, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- de Hoop, H. 1992. *Case Configuration and NP Interpretation*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Groningen, The Netherlands.

- Horn, Larry. 1972. *On the Semantic Properties of Logical Operators in English*. PhD dissertation, UCLA, distributed by Indiana University Linguistics Club.
- Horn, Larry. 1984. Toward a new taxonomy for pragmatic inference. In D. Schiffrin, ed., *Meaning, Form, and Use in Context: Linguistic Applications (GURT '84)* (p. 1142). Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Horn, Larry. 1989. *A Natural History of Negation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hornby, P. A., and W. A. Hass. 1970. Use of contrastive stress by preschool children. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research* 13:395–399.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1995. *LF: The Grammar of Logical Form: From GB to Minimalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hornstein, N., and A. Weinberg. 1990. The necessity of LF. *Linguistic Review* 7:129–167.
- Huang, C. T. James. 1982. *Logical Relations in Chinese and the Theory of Grammar*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Ingram, D., and C. Shaw. 1981. The comprehension of pronominal reference in children. Unpublished manuscript, University of British Columbia, Vancouver.
- Inhelder, B., and J. Piaget. 1964. *The Early Growth of Logic in the Child*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Ioup, G. L. 1975. *The Treatment of Quantifier Scope in a Transformational Grammar*. Doctoral dissertation, City University of New York.
- Jackendoff, Ray S. 1972. *Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Jackendoff, Ray S. 1997. The architecture of the language faculty. Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 28. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Jacobson, Pauline. 1999. Towards a variable-free semantics. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 22:117–184.
- Kamp, H., and U. Reyle. 1993. *From Discourse to Logic: Introduction to Model Theoretic Semantics of Natural Language, Formal Logic and Discourse Representation Theory*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Karttunen, L. 1977. The syntax and semantics of questions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1:1–44.
- Katsos, N., R. Breheny, and N. Williams. 2005. Interaction of structural and contextual constraints during the on-line generation of scalar inferences. Paper presented at CogSci2005—27th Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society.
- Kayne, Richard. 1984. *Connectedness and Binary Branching*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Foris.
- Keenan, Edward. 1971. Names, quantifiers and a solution to the sloppy identity problem. *Papers in Linguistics* 4(2).
- Keenan, Edward. 1987. A semantic definition of indefinite NP. In E. Reuland and A. ter Meulen, eds., *The Representation of (In)definiteness*, 109–150. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

- Keenan, Edward, and Leonard M. Faltz. 1978. Logical types for natural language. In *UCLA Occasional Papers in Linguistics 3*. Los Angeles: Department of Linguistics, UCLA.
- Kehler, Andy. 1993. A discourse copying algorithm for ellipsis and anaphora. *Proceedings of EACL*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Morristown, N.J.
- Kempson, R., and A. Cormack. 1981. Ambiguity and quantification. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 4:259–309.
- Kennedy, Christopher. 1997. Antecedent-contained deletion and the syntax of quantification. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28:662–688.
- Krämer, I. 2001. *Interpreting Indefinites*. Doctoral dissertation, Max Planck Institute, Nijmegen.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1995. Stage-level and individual-level predicates. In G. N. Carlson and F. J. Pelletier, eds., *The Generic Book*, 125–175. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1998. Scope or pseudo scope? Are there wide scope indefinites? In S. Rothstein, ed., *Events in Grammar*, 163–196. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Krifka, Manfred. 1995. The semantics and pragmatics of polarity items. *Linguistic Analysis* 25:209–257.
- Ladd, D. Robert. 1980. *The Structure of Intonational Meaning: Evidence from English*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Landman, Fred. 2000. *Events and Plurality*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Langacker, R. 1969. On pronominalization and the chain of command. In W. Reibel and S. Schane, eds., *Modern Studies in English*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall.
- Lappin, S., and T. Reinhart. 1989. Presuppositional effects of strong determiners. *Linguistics* 26:1021–1037.
- Lasnik, Howard. 1976. Remarks on coreference. *Linguistic Analysis* 2(1):1–22.
- Lasnik, Howard, and Mamoru Saito. 1992. *Move alpha: Conditions on its applications and output*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Levinson, Stephen C. 1987. *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinson, S. 1987. Pragmatics and the grammar of anaphora. *Journal of Linguistics* 23:379–434.
- Levinson, S. 2000. *Presumptive Meanings*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Lewis, David. 1975. Adverbs of quantification. In Edward Keenan, ed., *Formal Semantics of Natural Language*, 3–15. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liberman, Mark. 1979. *The Intonational System of English*. New York: Garland Press. (Originally a doctoral dissertation, MIT, 1975.)
- Lidz, J., and J. Musolino. 2002. Children's command of quantification. *Cognition* 84(2):113–154.



- Link, G. 1983. The logical analysis of plural and mass terms: A lattice theoretical approach. In R. Bäuerle, C. Schwarze, and A. von Stechow, eds., *Meaning, Use and Interpretation of Language*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Lust, B., and T. Clifford. 1982. The 3D study: Effects of depth, distance, and directionality on children's acquisition of Mandarin Chinese. In J. Pustejovsky and P. Sells, eds., *NELS 12*. GLSA, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Lust, B., K. Loveland, and R. Kornet. 1980. The development of anaphora in first language: Syntactic and pragmatic constraints. *Linguistic Analysis* 6(4):359–391.
- Maratsos, M. P. 1973. The effects of stress on the understanding of pronominal reference in children. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 2(1):1–8.
- May, Robert. 1977. *The Grammar of Quantification*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT. (Distributed by Indiana University Linguistics Club.)
- May, Robert. 1985. *Logical Form: Its Structure and Derivation*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Mazuka, R. 1996. Can a grammatical parameter be set before the first words? In J. L. Morgan and K. Demuth, eds., *Signal to Syntax*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- McCawley, J. 1979. Presuppositions and discourse structure. In C. K. Oh and D. A. Dinneen, eds., *Presuppositions, Syntax and Semantics*, 11. New York: Academic Press.
- McDaniel, Dana, and Thomas L. Maxfield. 1992. Principle B and contrastive stress. *Language Acquisition* 2(4):337–358.
- Merchant, Jason. 2001. *The Syntax of Silence: Sluicing, Islands, and the Theory of Ellipsis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Miller, George, and Noam Chomsky. 1963. Finitary models of language users. In R. D. Luce, R. R. Bush, and E. Galanter, eds., *Handbook of Mathematical Psychology*, vol. 2. New York: Wiley.
- Milsark, Gary. 1974. *Existential Sentences in English*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Libraries.
- Moltmann, F., and A. Szabolcsi. 1994. Scope interactions with pair-list readings. In M. González, ed., *NELS 24*, 381–395. Amherst: GLSA, University of Massachusetts.
- Mulders, Iris. 2002. *Transparent Parsing: Head-Driven Processing of Verb-Final Structures*. Doctoral dissertation, Utrecht University. LOT Dissertation Series 56. Available at <http://www.library.uu.nl/digiarchief/dip/diss/2002-1029-094527/inhoud.htm>.
- Mulders, Iris. 2004. Phase theory in sentence processing. Paper presented at the Tools in Linguistic Theory conference, May 16–18, Budapest, Hungary. Unpublished manuscript, Utrecht University.
- Mulders, Iris. 2005. Transparent parsing: Phases in sentence processing. In M. McGinnis and N. Richards, eds., *Perspectives on Phases*, 237–264. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 49. Cambridge, Mass.: MITWPL, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MIT.

- Musolino, J., and Lidz, J. Forthcoming. The scope of isomorphism: Turning adults into children. *Language Acquisition*.
- Neeleman, Ad. 1994. *Complex Predicates*. Doctoral dissertation, Utrecht University. OTS Dissertation Series.
- Neeleman, Ad, and T. Reinhart. 1998. Scrambling and the PF interface. In W. Geuder and M. Butt, eds., *Projecting from the Lexicon*. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.
- Neeleman, Ad, and Kriszta Szendrői. 2004. Superman sentences. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35(1):149–159.
- Neeleman, Ad, and Fred Weerman. 1996. Case and arguments in a flexible syntax. Unpublished manuscript, OTS, Utrecht University.
- Neeleman, Ad, and Fred Weerman. 1999. *Flexible Syntax: A Theory of Case and Arguments*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Nespor, M., T. Guasti, and A. Christophe. 1996. Selecting word order: The rhythmic activation principle. In U. Kleinhenz, ed., *Interfaces in Phonology*, 1–26. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Nespor, Marina, and Irene Vogel. 1986. *Prosodic Phonology*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Foris.
- Nishigauchi, Taisuke. 1986. The syntax of wh-questions in Japanese and English. *Shoin Literary Review* 20:67–85.
- Nooteboom, S. G., and J. G. Kruyt. 1987. Accents, focus distribution, and the perceived distribution of given and new information: An experiment. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 82:1512–1524.
- Noveck, I. 2001. When children are more logical than adults. *Cognition* 86:253–282.
- Noveck, I., and A. Posada. 2003. Characterising the time course of an implicature. *Brain and Language* 85:203–210.
- Papafragou, A., and J. Musolino. 2002. The pragmatics of number. *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- Papafragou, A., and J. Musolino. 2003. Scalar implicatures: Experiments at the semantic-pragmatics interface. *Cognition* 80:253–282.
- Pesetsky, David. 1982. *Paths and Categories*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Pesetsky, David. 1987. *Wh*-in situ: Movement and unselective binding. In E. Reuland and A. ter Meulen, eds., *The Representation of (In)definiteness*, 98–129. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Philip, William. 1995. *Event Quantification in the Acquisition of Universal Quantification*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Phillips, Colin. 1996. *Order and Structure*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT. (Distributed by MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.)
- Pollard, Carl, and Ivan Sag. 1992. Anaphors in English and the scope of the binding theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23:261–305.

- Prince, Alan, and Paul Smolensky. 1993. *Optimality Theory: Constraint Interaction in Generative Grammar*. Technical Report 2. New Brunswick, N.J.: Center for Cognitive Science, Rutgers University.
- Prince, Ellen F. 1981. Towards a taxonomy of given-new information. In P. Cole, ed., *Radical Pragmatics*, 233–255. New York: Academic Press.
- Pritchett, Bradley L. 1992. *Grammatical Competence and Parsing Performance*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pulleyblank, Douglas, and William J. Turkel. 1998. The logical problem of language acquisition in optimality theory. In Pilar Barbosa, Danny Fox, Paul Hagstrom, Martha McGinnis, and David Pesetsky, eds., *Is the Best Good Enough? Optimality and Competition in Syntax*, 399–420. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press and MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 1976. *The Syntactic Domain of Anaphora*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT. (Distributed by MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.)
- Reinhart, Tanya. 1981a. Pragmatics and linguistics: An analysis of sentence topics. *Philosophica* 27(1):53–93.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 1981b. A second COMP position. In A. Belletti, L. Brandi, and L. Rizzi, eds., *Theory of Markedness in Generative Grammar*, 517–557. Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 1983a. *Anaphora and Semantic Interpretation*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 1983b. Coreference and bound anaphora: A restatement of the anaphora questions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 6(1):47–88.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 1986. On the interpretation of donkey sentences. In E. C. Traugott, A. ter Meulen, J. S. Reilly, and C. A. Ferguson, eds., *On Conditionals*, 103–122. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 1987. Specifiers and operator binding. In E. Reuland and A. ter Meulen, eds., *The Representation of (In)definiteness*, 130–167. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 1991. Elliptic conjunctions: Nonquantificational LF. In A. Kasher, ed., *The Chomskyan Turn*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Reinhart, T. 1992. *Wh*-in situ: An apparent paradox. In P. Dekker and M. Stokhof, eds., *Proceedings of the Eighth Amsterdam Colloquium*, 483–492. Amsterdam: ILLC/Department of Philosophy, University of Amsterdam.
- Reinhart, T. [1994] 1998. *Wh*-in situ in the framework of the minimalist program. *OTS Working Papers in Linguistics*, TL-94-003. (Appeared with slight revisions in *Natural Language Semantics* 6(1998):29–56.)
- Reinhart, T. 1995. Interface Strategies. *OTS Working Papers in Linguistics*, TL-95-002. Utrecht: Utrecht University.
- Reinhart, T. 1997. Quantifier scope: How labor is divided between QR and Choice functions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 20:335–397.

- Reinhart, T. 1998. Interface economy: Focus and markedness. In Chris Wilder, Hans-Martin Gaertner, and Manfred Bierwisch, eds., *The Role of Economy Principles in Linguistic Theory*, 146–170. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 1999a. Binding theory. In Robert A. Wilson and Frank C. Keil, eds., *The MIT Encyclopedia of the Cognitive Sciences*, 86–88. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 1999b. The processing cost of reference-set computation: Guess patterns in acquisition. *OTS Working Papers in Linguistics*, 99001-CL/TL, Utrecht University.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 2000. Strategies of anaphora resolution. In Hans Bennis, M. Everaert, and E. Reuland, eds., *Interface Strategies*, 295–324. Amsterdam: Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 2002. The Theta system—an overview. Target Article. *Theoretical Linguistics* 28(3):229–290.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 2004. Topics and the conceptual interface. In H. Kamp and B. Partee, eds., *Context Dependence in the Analysis of Linguistic Meaning*, 275–305. Amsterdam: Elsevier Press.
- Reinhart, Tanya, and Eric Reuland. 1991. Anaphors and logophors: An argument structure perspective. In Jan Koster and E. Reuland, eds., *Long Distance Anaphora*, 283–321. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reinhart, Tanya, and Eric Reuland. 1993. Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24:657–720.
- Reinhart, Tanya, and Kriszta Szendrői. 2003. Optimal Design in Language. NWO grant proposal. Available at <http://www.let.uu.nl/~tanya.reinhart/personal/>.
- Reuland, Eric. 2001. Primitives of Binding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32(3):439–492.
- Reuland, Eric, and A. ter Meulen, eds. 1987. *The Representation of (In)definiteness*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Ristad, Eric. 1992. *Computational Structure of Natural Language*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT. (Distributed by MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.)
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1990. *Relativized Minimality*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Roberts, Craig. 1987. *Modal Subordination, Anaphora, and Distributivity*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Rodman, R. 1976. Scope phenomena, movement transformations, and relative clauses. In B. Partee, ed., *Montague Grammar*. New York: Academic Press.
- Rooth, Mats E. 1985. *Association with Focus*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Rooth, Mats E. 1992. A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1:75–116.
- Ross, J. R. 1969. Guess who. In R. I. Binnick, A. Davidson, G. M. Green, and J. L. Morgan, eds., *CLS 5, Proceedings of the Fifth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 252–286. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Ruys, E. G. 1992. *The Scope of Indefinites*. Doctoral dissertation, Utrecht University, The Netherlands. OTS Dissertation Series.
- Ruys, E. G. 1996. Some notes on economy conditions in Chapter 4. Unpublished manuscript, Utrecht University.
- Ruys, E. G. 2000. Weak crossover as a scope phenomenon. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31(3):513–539.
- Sag, I. 1976. *Deletion and Logical Form*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Scha, R. 1981. Distributive, collective, and cumulative predication. In J. Groenendijk, T. Janssen, and M. Stokhof, eds., *Formal Methods in the Study of Language*, 485–512. Amsterdam: Mathematical Center.
- Schmerling, Susan. 1976. *Aspects of English Sentence Stress*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Schwarzschild, Roger. 1999. Givenness, AvoidF and other constraints on the placement of accents. *Natural Language Semantics* 7(1):41–177.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth O. 1984. *Phonology and Syntax: The Relation between Sound and Structure*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth O. 1996. Sentence prosody: Intonation, stress and phrasing. In John A. Goldsmith, ed., *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Siloni, Tal. 2004. Garden path: Illicit movement. Paper presented at Tools in Linguistic Theory conference, May 16–18, Budapest, Hungary. Unpublished manuscript, Tel Aviv University.
- Smith, Carol L. 1980. Quantifiers and question answering in young children. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology* 30:191–205.
- Smith, Edward E. 1999. Working memory. In Robert A. Wilson and Frank C. Keil, eds., *The MIT Encyclopedia of the Cognitive Sciences*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Solan, Lawrence. 1978. *Anaphora in Child Language*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Solan, Lawrence. 1983. *Pronominal Reference: Child Language and the Theory of Grammar*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Reidel.
- Sperber, D., and D. Wilson. [1986] 1995. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Strawson, P. 1964. Identifying reference and truth values. *Theoria* 30:96–118. (Reprinted in P. Strawson, *Logico Linguistic Papers*. London: Methuen, 1974. Also reprinted in D. Steinberg and L. Jakobovits, eds., *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.)
- Swinney, D. 1979. Lexical access during sentence comprehension: Reconsideration of context effects. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 18:645–659.
- Swinney, D., J. Nicol, and E. B. Zurif. 1989. The effects of focal brain damage on sentence processing: An examination of the neurological organization of a mental module. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 1:25–37.

- Swinney, D., and P. Prather. 1989. On the comprehension of lexical ambiguity by young children: Investigations into the development of mental modularity. In D. S. Gorfein, ed., *Resolving Semantic Ambiguity*, 225–238. New York: Springer Verlag.
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 1995. On modes of operation. In Paul Dekker and M. Stokhof, eds., *Proceedings of the Tenth Amsterdam Colloquium*. Amsterdam: ILLC/ Department of Philosophy, University of Amsterdam.
- Szabolcsi, Anna. 1997. Strategies for scope taking. In A. Szabolcsi, ed., *Ways of Scope Taking*, 109–154. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.
- Szabolcsi, Anna, and Franz Zwarts. 1990. Semantic properties of composed functions and the distribution of *wh*-phrases. In Martin Stockhof and Leen Torenvliet, eds., *Proceedings of the Seventh Amsterdam Colloquium*, 529–555. Amsterdam: Institute for Language, Logic, and Information.
- Szendrői, Kriszta. 2001. *Focus and the Syntax-Phonology Interface*. Doctoral dissertation, University College London.
- Szendrői, Kriszta. 2003. Acquisition evidence for an interface theory of focus. In J. van Kampen and S. Baauw, eds., *Proceedings of GALA 2003*. LOT, Occasional Series 2. Utrecht, The Netherlands.
- Tancredi, Christopher Damian. 1992. *Deletion, Deaccenting, and Presupposition*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Tavakolian, Susan L. 1974. Contrastive stress pattern in four year olds. Unpublished manuscript, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Tavakolian, Susan L. 1977. *Structural Principles in the Acquisition of Complex Sentences*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Taylor-Browne, K. 1983. Acquiring restrictions on forwards anaphora: A pilot study. In *Calgary Working Papers in Linguistics*, 75–99. Calgary, Alberta: Department of Linguistics, University of Calgary.
- Terken, J., and S. G. Noteboom. 1988. Opposite effects of accentuation and deaccentuation on verification latencies for given and new information. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 2(3/4):145–163.
- Tesar, Bruce. 1998. Error-driven learning in optimality theory via the efficient computation of optimal forms. In Pilar Barbosa, Danny Fox, Paul Hagstrom, Martha McGinnis, and David Pesetsky, eds., *Is the Best Good Enough? Optimality and Competition in Syntax*, 421–435. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press and MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.
- Thornton, Rosalind. 1990. *Adventures in Long-Distance Moving: The Acquisition of Complex Wh-Questions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, Storrs.
- Thornton, Rosalind. 1998. Children's interpretation of pronouns. Paper presented at the Trieste Conference on Acquisition, September 1998.
- Thornton, Rosalind, and Kenneth Wexler. 1999. *Principle B, VP Ellipsis, and Interpretation in Child Grammars*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

- Tsai, Wei-Tien. 1994. *On Economizing the Theory of A-Bar Dependencies*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Vallduvi, E. 1990. *The Informational Component*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Verkuyl, Henk J. 1988. Aspectual asymmetry and quantification. In V. Ehrlich and H. Vater, eds., *Temporalsemantik: Beiträge zur Linguistik der Zeitreferenz*, 220–259. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- von Stechow, Kai. 1999. NPI licensing, Strawson entailment, and context dependency. *Journal of Semantics* 16:97–148.
- Wexler, K., and Y.-C. Chien. 1985. The development of lexical anaphors and pronouns. In *Papers and Reports on Child Language Development*, 24:138–149. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University.
- Williams, Edwin S. 1977. Discourse and logical form. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8(1):101–139.
- Williams, Edwin S. 1986. A reassignment of the functions of LF. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17:265–299.
- Williams, Edwin S. 1997. Blocking and anaphora. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28(4):577–628.
- Winter, Yoad. 1997. Choice functions and the scopal semantics of indefinites. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 20(4):399–467.
- Zubizarreta, María Luisa. 1994. Word order, prosody, and focus. Unpublished manuscript, University of Southern California.
- Zubizarreta, María Luisa. 1998. *Prosody, Focus, and Word Order*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Zuckerman, S., N. Vasić, and S. Avrutin. 2001. The syntax-discourse interface and the interpretation of pronominals by Dutch-speaking children. In B. Skarabela, S. Fish, and A. H.-J. Do, eds., *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development, BUCLD 26*, 781–792. Somerville, Mass.: Cascadilla Press.
- Zuckerman, S., N. Vasić, and S. Avrutin. 2005. Pronominal reference in child language. Unpublished manuscript, UiL OTS, Utrecht University.