

# **The Interface Between Syntax and Semantics in Complex Sentence Processing**

**By: Asst. Prof. Dr. Hayder Ali Abdulridha ALUBAIDI**

**Hayder.alia@uokut.edu.iq**

**009647717933611**

**College of Education, English department**

**Kut University, Iraq**

## **Abstract**

This announcement seeks to enhance the efficiency and organization of - related communication by assigning a liaison representative from among the students. The appointed representative will serve as the primary point of contact, responsible for receiving, organizing, and communicating all research-related announcements, guidelines, deadlines, and updates to the rest of the group. This system is designed to ensure consistency in information flow, minimize misunderstandings, and support effective coordination between students and academic staff. Ultimately, appointing a liaison representative contributes to a more structured research process and facilitates the timely and successful completion of academic research projects.

## Introduction

Human language is a complex cognitive system that enables individuals to express ideas and understand meaning through structured combinations of words. Sentence comprehension does not rely solely on grammatical structure, nor does it depend only on meaning. Instead, it emerges from the interaction between **syntax** and **semantics**, which together shape how linguistic messages are interpreted.

Modern models of language processing, such as those proposed by Ray Jackendoff and Willem Levelt, suggest that the language system operates through multiple interconnected levels, including syntactic structure and semantic interpretation. During real-time sentence processing, the human brain does not construct grammatical form first and then assign meaning separately. Rather, structural and meaning-based information are processed simultaneously in an interactive manner.

This interaction becomes especially important when individuals encounter complex or syntactically ambiguous sentences. In such cases, semantic information plays a crucial role in guiding interpretation and resolving ambiguity. Even small changes in word order or syntactic arrangement can lead to significant differences in meaning, demonstrating that syntax functions not merely as a formal system, but as a key contributor to semantic interpretation.

Psycholinguistic research further indicates that sentence comprehension depends on the integration of multiple sources of information, including grammatical structure, lexical meaning, contextual cues, and world knowledge. These elements work together dynamically during real-time processing, allowing language users to interpret messages efficiently even in the presence of complexity or ambiguity.

Therefore, this study aims to explore the interactive relationship between syntax and semantics in sentence comprehension, highlighting how structural and meaning-based information jointly contribute to understanding complex linguistic expressions.

## Research Questions

### 1. How does syntactic structure influence semantic interpretation in complex sentences?

This section discusses how syntactic structure interacts with semantic meaning in the processing of complex sentences, including subordinate clauses, long noun phrases, and WH-questions. The syntactic arrangement largely determines how meaning is interpreted. (Source: Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface, pp. 225-226)

#### 1.1. Linking Algorithm:

The linking algorithm connects syntactic elements to their semantic roles.

**Example:** In a sentence, the subject and object positions define who performs the action and who receives it.

Any change in the order of syntactic constituents can alter semantic interpretation. (Source: Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface, pp. 227-233)

#### 1.2. Subordinate and Complex Phrases:

In complex sentences, readers/listeners must identify the relationship between the main and subordinate clauses.

Syntax clarifies whether a subordinate clause expresses circumstance, reason, or purpose, guiding semantic interpretation.

(Source: Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface, pp. 234-245)

#### 1.3. Word Order Effects:

Word order directly affects sentence meaning. **Example:** —The teacher gave the student the book|| versus —The student gave the teacher the book.||

Syntax determines who is the agent and who is the recipient.(Source: Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface, pp. 246-255)

#### **1.4. WH-Question Interpretation:**

WH-words (Who, What, Where) require syntactic linking to determine what is being questioned. Syntax guides the meaning to specify the intended subject or object.(Source: Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface, pp. :256-265) Syntax and semantics operate interactively, not independently. Accurate comprehension of complex sentences depends on the interplay between syntactic structure and meaning. Any disruption in syntactic arrangement can lead to ambiguity or misinterpretation.(Source: Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface, pp. 266-273)

#### **2. To what extent do semantic cues assist in resolving syntactic ambiguity?**

Semantic cues play a fundamental and measurable role in resolving syntactic ambiguity, as highlighted by various foundational psycholinguistic research (Altmann & Steedman, 1988). When a sentence lets in greater than one feasible syntactic structure, comprehenders do not rely solely on syntax. Instead, they at once integrate semantic data such as thematic roles, verb meaning, and contextual plausibility to guide interpretation even before the full syntactic parsing is complete (Trueswell, Tanenhaus, & Garnsey, 1994). These findings indicate that semantic cues furnish early training in the course of processing, supporting interpreters who prioritize the most coherent and significant interpretation available (Altmann & Steedman, 1988).

One of the clearest demonstrations of the role of semantic cues seems in prepositional-phrase ambiguity. In sentences such as —The detective saw the man with the binoculars, semantic facts help decide whether or not the phrase describes the man or the instrument used through the detective (Altmann & Steedman, 1988). In these cases, comprehenders count on world expertise and semantic plausibility to pick out the most probable interpretation. Furthermore, lexical semantics strongly influences syntactic ambiguity resolution, as positive verbs lift inherent semantic biases that desire specific structural interpretations, enabling faster and greater

accurate sentence processing (MacDonald, Pearlmutter, & Seidenberg, 1994).

Contextual priming further strengthens the contribution of semantic cues to ambiguity resolution. When a sentence is embedded inside a sturdy semantic or discourse context, readers or listeners unexpectedly set off the most fabulous interpretation and suppress syntactically feasible but semantically not going preferences (Spivey-Knowlton & Sedivy, 1995). Together, these insights show that semantic cues are no longer elective or secondary; rather, they function interactively with syntax to guide the parser in actual time, decrease ambiguity, and help environment friendly comprehension of complicated sentences (Tanenhaus & Trueswell, 1995). Thus, semantics performs a decisive function in constraining syntactic possibilities and steering interpretation toward the most coherent and possible meaning.

### **3. What cognitive processes are involved in integrating syntax and semantics during sentence processing?**

According to Friederici (2011), the integration of syntax and semantics throughout sentence processing depends on quite a few coordinated cognitive techniques that function in rapid and overlapping stages. First, the intelligence engages in syntactic structure building, the place it assigns an initial grammatical framework based on word class records processed principally in the left inferior frontal gyrus. Simultaneously, the device prompts semantic retrieval techniques that draw on lexical meaning, thematic roles, and world knowledge saved in temporal Genius regions. As the sentence unfolds, the parser engages in semantic–syntactic mapping, a procedure in which the grammatical structure is aligned with conceptual meaning to ensure coherence. When conflicts arise—such as syntactic ambiguity or semantic implausibility—the talent recruits reanalysis and conflict-monitoring mechanisms, frequently reflected in ERP factors like the N400 (semantic mismatch) and P600 (syntactic reprocessing). These techniques work together to permit comprehenders to assemble a unified interpretation that integrates both structural and meaning-based information correctly and incrementally. (Friederici, 2011).

Building on the framework proposed through Hagoort (2005), the integration of syntax and semantics at some stage in sentence processing entails a complex interplay of a couple of cognitive mechanisms that operate each sequentially and interactively. At the earliest stage of comprehension, the intelligence engages in lexical access, a speedy retrieval of grammatical and semantic records from long-term memory every time a new phrase is encountered. Immediately after this retrieval process, the machine initiates syntactic unification, in which man or woman words are combined into large grammatical structures via operations supported through the left inferior frontal cortex. At the same time, the meaning of every word prompts conceptual networks in temporal brain regions, enabling semantic unification, the system through which thematic roles, match structures, and contextual cues are bound together to create significant representations. Crucially, these syntactic and semantic unification approaches do not show up separately; instead, they interact continuously, permitting the processor to consider whether or not a growing structure is coherent, plausible, and consistent with prior context. When mismatches or ambiguities arise—such as when a sentence temporarily supports more than one viable interpretation—the cognitive machine recruits monitoring and repair mechanisms, attractive additional working- memory resources to reanalyze the structure and get to the bottom of conflicts. This dynamic combination of lexical retrieval, syntactic assembly, semantic mapping, hostilities detection, and structural revision forms the core of the cognitive architecture that helps real-time comprehension of complicated sentences. (Hagoort, 2005).

### **3. Aims of the Study**

The first intention of this study is to analyze the interaction between syntactic and semantic information in the comprehension of complex sentences. Previous research has shown that sentence processing does no longer remember fully on syntactic structure, but as a substitute on a non-stop interaction between grammatical form and meaning. According to Bates and MacWhinney (1989), language comprehension is guided by way of a couple of cues, including syntactic patterns and semantic plausibility, which work together to guide understanding. This interplay will become

mainly important in complex sentences where syntactic shape alone may additionally now not be sufficient to determine meaning.

The second goal of the study is to become aware of the principal challenges language users face when syntactic and semantic information conflict. Such conflicts frequently occur in sentences that are syntactically correct however semantically unexpected, leading to improved processing difficulty. Garden-path sentences are a clear example of this phenomenon, where readers originally adopt an incorrect syntactic interpretation that ought to later be revised based totally on semantic facts (Ferreira & Clifton, 1986). These challenges highlight the cognitive effort required to reconcile mismatches between structure and meaning in the course of real-time sentence processing.

The 1/3 goal of this study is to evaluate experimental findings from psycholinguistics that provide an explanation for how syntax and semantics are processed together. Psycholinguistic experiments using techniques such as eye-tracking and reaction-time measurements have tested that semantic data can have an effect on syntactic parsing at very early levels of comprehension. These findings aid interactive fashions of sentence processing, which argue that syntactic and semantic statistics are built-in concurrently as a substitute than sequentially. (Trueswell, Tanenhaus, & Garnsey, 1994).

#### **4. Significance of the Study**

Langacker (2008) Understanding the interface between syntax and semantics is integral for advancing research in cognitive linguistics, as it explains how linguistic buildings are connected to conceptual meaning. Cognitive linguistic theories emphasize that grammatical patterns are now not arbitrary, but are closely tied to how audio systems conceptualize activities and relationships. argues that syntax inherently incorporates which means and cannot be separated from semantic interpretation. Therefore, investigating the syntax–semantics interface presents deeper perception into how language reflects human cognition.

According to Trueswell and Tanenhaus (1994) The study is also large for psycholinguistics, particularly in grasping real-time sentence processing. Experimental lookup suggests that readers and listeners do not know syntax and semantics independently; instead, both sorts of statistics are built-in simultaneously throughout comprehension. Semantic cues such as thematic roles and plausibility affect syntactic parsing from early stages. This challenges strictly modular models of language processing and helps interactive approaches.

Ferreira & Henderson, 1991). Another important contribution of this find lies in explaining comprehension difficulties associated with complex and ambiguous sentences. When syntactic shape leads to greater than one viable interpretation, language users often rely on semantic facts to resolve ambiguity. Garden-path sentences show how preliminary syntactic misanalysis can be revised through semantic reinterpretation, Understanding these procedures helps make clear why positive sentence sorts are cognitively demanding.

Ellis (2006) highlights an educational perspective, the value of this learning extends to language teaching, especially in second and foreign language learning. Learners often struggle with complicated sentence structures due to the fact they focal point on floor grammar without totally perception meaning relations. that effective language training ought to combine form and that means instead of teaching grammar in isolation. Insights from the syntax–semantics interface can therefore inform instructing techniques that beautify comprehension and accuracy.

In addition, Baker (2018) notes this study is valuable for translation studies, as translators ought to continuously negotiate between syntactic structure and semantic content. Differences in syntactic constructions across languages frequently require adjustments to hold meaning.) successful translation relies upon appreciation of how syntactic picks shape semantic interpretation. Research on the syntax–semantics interface therefore supports extra accurate and natural translations.

Finally,(Jackendoff, 2002) This learning contributes to broader linguistic principles by supporting fashions that view language as a dynamic and interactive system. By inspecting how syntax and semantics work together, the lookup reinforces the concept that sentence comprehension is a lively cognitive method influenced by a couple of sources of information. Such findings have implications no longer only for linguistics but additionally for cognitive science and psychology .

## **literature Review**

Jackendoff (1999, 2002) and Levelt (1999) advocate a tripartite architecture of the human language system, consisting of separate processing tiers for conceptual/semantic information, orthographic/phonological information, and syntactic information. Based on this architecture, most current models of language processing agree that during online sentence comprehension, multiple types of constraints are simultaneously taken into account during speaking, listening, and reading. These constraints include how words can be structurally combined, how word meanings are integrated, how phrases are grouped into phonological phrases, and how they are bound referentially into a discourse model. Together, these constraints help address the "binding problem" of language, i.e., how speakers and listeners integrate single-word information into multi-word utterances and complex messages (Hagoort, Brown, & Osterhout, 1999).

Frazier (1987), O'Seaghdha (1997), Altmann and Steedman (1988), and Trueswell, Tanenhaus, and Garnsey (1994) as well as Trueswell, Tanenhaus, and Kello (1993) discuss the constraints operating during sentence formulation and interpretation, yet the exact mechanism of their implementation in sentence processing remains a subject of debate in psycholinguistics. A central question concerns whether, when, and how syntactic analysis of an incoming string of words interacts with semantic integration of individual word meanings. One perspective argues that syntactic analysis is initially independent and unaffected by semantic variables, with semantic integration occurring only after the syntactic structure is computed. Conversely, other views suggest that semantic information can guide or contribute to syntactic analysis, particularly in the processing of syntactically ambiguous sentences.

Kutas and Hillyard (1980), van Berkum, Hagoort, and Brown (1999), Friederici, Hahne, and Mecklinger (1996), and Hagoort, Wassenaar, and Brown (2003) provide empirical evidence using electrophysiological

measures, especially event-related potentials (ERPs), which has offered insights into the temporal dynamics of syntactic and semantic processing. The N400 component, a negative-going ERP peaking around 400 ms, reflects semantic integration and is modulated by how easily a word's meaning matches the preceding context. Syntax-related ERP components include the Left Anterior Negativity (LAN) and the P600/SPS, which are elicited by morphosyntactic violations, phrase structure violations, and agreement mismatches. These electrophysiological markers allow researchers to examine the interaction between semantic integration and syntactic processing in real-time sentence comprehension

Ainsworth-Darnell, Shulman, and Boland (1998), Friederici, Steinhauer, and Frisch (1999), Gunter, Stowe, and Mulder (1997), and Osterhout and Nicol (1999) examined the spatial specificity of ERP effects, supporting the notion that semantic and syntactic processes are distinct, yet their interplay is not fully understood. Previous studies combining semantic and syntactic violations in a factorial design provide evidence for partial non-additivity, indicating that semantic and syntactic processes may interact under certain conditions. Understanding this interaction is crucial for explaining how humans efficiently integrate multiple sources of linguistic information during comprehension.

The present study aims to shed light on the interface between syntax and semantics in complex sentence processing, specifically when syntactic structures can be fully computed from lexical-syntactic information. By leveraging ERP measures, this study investigates the temporal and functional dynamics of syntactic and semantic processing, contributing to the broader understanding of human language comprehension mechanisms.

## Methodology

This study employs a descriptive and analytical method to study the interface between syntax and semantics in complicated sentence processing. The descriptive method is used to define and provide an explanation for predominant linguistic and psycholinguistic theories that tackle how syntactic structure and semantic meanings have interaction at some stage in sentence comprehension. At the same time, the analytical technique enables an essential examination of how these theoretical views account for real-time language processing. According to Langacker (2008), grammatical buildings are inherently significant and can't be separated from semantic interpretation, which supports the use of an approach that integrates description with analysis. Similarly, Jackendoff (2002) emphasizes that perception language requires analyzing the interplay between multiple cognitive factors alternatively than isolating syntax from meaning.

The sources for this find consist of scholarly books, peer-reviewed journal articles, and empirical findings from psycholinguistic experiments. These substances supply both theoretical foundations and experimental proof regarding the processing of complicated sentences. Psycholinguistic lookup has proven that sentence comprehension includes speedy interplay between syntactic parsing and semantic interpretation, mainly when sentences incorporate ambiguity or complicated structures (Trueswell & Tanenhaus, 1994). Friederici (2011) further argues that neurocognitive proof demonstrates that syntactic and semantic strategies are intently linked in the brain, reinforcing the significance of relying on experimental research alongside theoretical literature. By drawing on these various educational sources, the present finds out about ensuring a comprehensive and balanced analysis of the syntax–semantics interface.

The system of the find out entails an sizable evaluation of applicable literature on syntactic and semantic processing, accompanied with the aid of a comparative evaluation of influential theoretical and experimental models. Special interest is given to fashions that explain how semantic cues information syntactic parsing during real-time comprehension. For

example, constraint-based fashions propose that more than one sources of information, such as semantic plausibility, are concurrently evaluated at some point of sentence processing (Kintsch, 1998). In addition, Townsend and Bever (2001) advocate that sentence comprehension results from the interplay between realized grammatical policies and semantic knowledge. By synthesizing these models and comparing their findings, they find out about targets to make clear how syntax and semantics jointly make contributions to the appreciation of complicated sentences.

## **Results**

The report is predicted to demonstrate that syntactic and semantic processing are intently interconnected at some point of the comprehension of complex sentences, functioning in an interactive rather than an impartial manner. Psycholinguistic evidence suggests that language customers do not now wait for complete syntactic buildings earlier than assigning meaning; instead, they integrate semantic statistics as quickly as it turns into available. This real-time interplay allows comprehenders to structure expectations about sentence continuation and regulate interpretations dynamically, aiding efficient language processing (MacDonald et al., 1994).

Additionally, the findings are predicted to divulge that semantic information notably contributes to resolving syntactic ambiguity, particularly in sentences that allow a couple of structural interpretations. When syntactic cues by myself are insufficient, semantic plausibility, verb argument structure, and thematic role expectations guide the parser toward the most meaningful interpretation. Empirical studies have proven that readers count on verb semantics and contextual means to disambiguate sentence shape early in processing, which reduces cognitive load and enables comprehension (Trueswell et al., 1994).

Moreover, the file is anticipated to aid interactive and constraint-based models of sentence processing, which advocate that multiple sources of information—such as syntax, semantics, lexical frequency, and world knowledge—jointly have an effect on sentence interpretation. These fashions argue towards strictly modular theories by demonstrating that semantic context can affect syntactic choices at early tiers of comprehension. Research shows that sentence processing is quicker and greater accurate when syntactic structures align with semantic expectations, whereas mismatches between syntax and semantics may also end in processing delays or temporary misinterpretations (Altmann & Steedman, 1988).

Finally, the expected consequences advocate that the interaction between syntax and semantics reflects underlying cognitive mechanisms accountable for environment friendly language comprehension. This interplay lets in language users to construct coherent interpretations even in the presence of complicated embeddings, long-distance dependencies, or decreased relative clauses. From a broader perspective, these findings spotlight the importance of integrating syntactic and semantic statistics in theoretical models of language and make a contribution to a deeper appreciation of how meaning is derived from linguistic structure (Jackendoff, 2002).

## **Discussion**

The findings of this study support the view that sentence comprehension is fundamentally shaped by the dynamic interaction between syntactic structure and semantic interpretation. Rather than operating as independent modules, syntax and semantics function in an integrated and mutually influential manner during real-time language processing.

The results align with interactive models of language comprehension proposed by scholars such as Ray Jackendoff, which emphasize that linguistic processing involves the coordination of multiple representational levels rather than a strictly sequential procedure. The analysis suggests that comprehenders do not rely exclusively on syntactic structure when interpreting complex sentences. Instead, semantic cues such as plausibility, thematic roles, and contextual knowledge actively guide interpretation from the earliest stages of processing.

One important observation emerging from this study is that syntactic structure significantly constrains meaning interpretation. Elements such as word order, clause hierarchy, and WH-dependencies play a central role in determining how participants assign roles within a sentence. For example, the distinction between agent and recipient is often determined by syntactic positioning, which directly shapes semantic understanding. This confirms that syntax provides the structural framework within which meaning is constructed.

At the same time, the study demonstrates that semantic information assists in resolving syntactic ambiguity. When sentences allow multiple structural interpretations, comprehenders draw upon semantic plausibility and lexical knowledge to select the most coherent meaning. This supports constraint-based approaches to sentence processing, which argue that multiple sources of information are evaluated simultaneously rather than sequentially.

Furthermore, the discussion highlights the cognitive mechanisms involved in integrating syntax and semantics. Processes such as lexical access, syntactic structuring, semantic mapping, and conflict monitoring work together to ensure coherent interpretation. When mismatches occur between structure and meaning, the language processing system engages

in reanalysis and revision. Such processes reflect the flexible and adaptive nature of human language comprehension.

The findings also provide insights into the processing of complex sentences, particularly those involving subordination, long dependencies, or temporary ambiguity. In such cases, reliance on either syntax or semantics alone proves insufficient. Efficient comprehension depends on the continuous interaction between structural constraints and meaning-based expectations.

From a broader perspective, these results challenge strictly modular theories that assume a separation between syntactic and semantic processing. Instead, they lend support to interactive frameworks in which linguistic interpretation emerges from the coordination of grammatical form and conceptual meaning.

Overall, this study reinforces the view that understanding complex sentences is not a purely structural task nor solely a semantic one. Rather, it is a cognitive process that depends on the ongoing integration of syntactic and semantic information, allowing language users to construct meaningful interpretations even in the presence of ambiguity or structural complexity.

## **Conclusion**

Paste your text here and click on "Next" to watch this article rewriter do it is thing. In conclusion, this learn about highlights that sentence comprehension seriously relies upon on the dynamic and interactive relationship between syntax and semantics. Syntax affords the structural framework that organizes words into grammatical patterns, whilst semantics contributes that means that guides interpretation. The integration of these two elements lets language customers assemble coherent interpretations in real time, particularly when processing complicated or ambiguous sentences. Psycholinguistic research has verified that semantic cues, such as verb meaning, thematic roles, and contextual plausibility, can impact syntactic parsing from the earliest stages of sentence comprehension, reducing ambiguity and facilitating understanding

## Reference

- Ainsworth-Darnell, K., Shulman, H., & Boland, J. (1998). Interaction between syntactic and semantic processes in sentence comprehension: Evidence from ERP studies. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 27(4), 443–463.
- Altmann, G. T. M., & Steedman, M. J. (1988). Interaction with context during human sentence processing. *Cognition*, 30(3), 191–238. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277\(88\)90020-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(88)90020-0)
- Baker, M. (2018). In other words: A coursebook on translation (3rd ed.). Routledge.
- Bates, E., & MacWhinney, B. (1989). Functionalism and the competition model. In B. MacWhinney & E. Bates (Eds.), *The crosslinguistic study of sentence processing* (pp. 3–73). Cambridge University Press.
- Ellis, R. (2006). *Language acquisition and use*. Oxford University Press.
- Ferreira, F., & Clifton, C. (1986). The independence of syntactic processing. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 25(3), 348–368. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-596X\(86\)90006-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-596X(86)90006-9)
- Ferreira, F., & Henderson, J. M. (1991). Recovery from misanalyses of garden-path sentences. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 30(6), 725–745. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-596X\(91\)90034-H](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-596X(91)90034-H)
- Frazier, L. (1987). Sentence processing: A tutorial review. In M. Coltheart (Ed.), *Attention and performance XII* (pp. 559–586). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Friederici, A. D. (2011). The brain basis of language processing: From structure to function. *Physiological Reviews*, 91(4), 1357–1392. <https://doi.org/10.1152/physrev.00006.2011>
- Friederici, A. D., Hahne, A., & Mecklinger, A. (1996). Temporal structure of syntactic processing: Early and late event-related brain potential effects. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 22(5), 1219–1238.
- Friederici, A. D., Steinhauer, K., & Frisch, S. (1999). Lexical integration and syntactic structure: ERP studies on the processing of German sentence structure. *Cognitive Brain Research*, 7(3), 245–257.
- Gunter, T. C., Stowe, L. A., & Mulder, G. (1997). When syntax meets semantics. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 26(3), 309–339.

- Hagoort, P. (2005). On Broca, brain, and binding: A new framework. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 9(9), 416–423.
- Hagoort, P., Brown, C. M., & Osterhout, L. (1999). The neurocognition of syntactic processing. In C. M. Brown & P. Hagoort (Eds.), *The neurocognition of language* (pp. 273–316). Oxford University Press.
- Hagoort, P., Wassenaar, M., & Brown, C. M. (2003). Syntax-related ERP components in sentence processing. *Cognitive Brain Research*, 17(1), 1– 12.
- Jackendoff, R. (1990). *Exploring the syntax–semantics interface*. MIT Press.
- Jackendoff, R. (1999). The view from the periphery: The English comparative correlative. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 30(4), 543–571.
- Jackendoff, R. (2002). *Foundations of language: Brain, meaning, grammar, evolution*. Oxford University Press.
- Kintsch, W. (1998). *Comprehension: A paradigm for cognition*. Cambridge University Press.
- Kutas, M., & Hillyard, S. A. (1980). Reading senseless sentences: Brain potentials reflect semantic incongruity. *Science*, 207(4427), 203–205.
- Langacker, R. W. (2008). *Cognitive grammar: A basic introduction*. Oxford University Press.
- Levelt, W. J. M. (1999). Models of word production. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 3(6), 223–232.
- MacDonald, M. C., Pearlmutter, N. J., & Seidenberg, M. S. (1994). The lexical nature of syntactic ambiguity resolution. *Psychological Review*, 101(4), 676–703. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.101.4.676>
- O’Seaghdha, P. G. (1997). Parsing and the syntax-semantics interface. *Linguistics*, 35(2), 321–352.
- Osterhout, L., & Nicol, J. (1999). On the distinctiveness, independence, and time-course of the brain responses to syntactic and semantic anomalies. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 14(3), 283–348.
- Spivey-Knowlton, M. J., & Sedivy, J. C. (1995). Resolving attachment ambiguities with multiple constraints. *Cognition*, 55(3), 227–267.
- Tanenhaus, M. K., & Trueswell, J. C. (1995). Sentence comprehension. In J. L. Miller & P. D. Eimas (Eds.), *Speech, language, and communication* (pp. 217–262). Academic Press.

- Townsend, D. J., & Bever, T. G. (2001). *Sentence comprehension: The integration of habits and rules*. MIT Press.
- Trueswell, J. C., & Tanenhaus, M. K. (1994). Toward a lexicalist framework of constraint-based syntactic ambiguity resolution. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 23(3), 217–250. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02139002>.
- Trueswell, J. C., Tanenhaus, M. K., & Garnsey, S. M. (1994). Semantic influences on parsing: Use of thematic role information in syntactic ambiguity resolution. *Journal of Memory and Language*, 33(3), 285–318. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jmla.1994.1014>
- Trueswell, J. C., Tanenhaus, M. K., & Kello, C. T. (1993). Verb-specific constraints in sentence processing: Separating effects of lexical preference from garden paths. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, 19(3), 528–553.
- van Berkum, J. J. A., Hagoort, P., & Brown, C. M. (1999). Semantic integration in sentences and discourse: Evidence from the N400. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 11(6), 657–671.