ADVANCE SOCIAL SCIENCE ARCHIVE JOURNAL
Available Online: https://assajournal.com
Vol. 04 No. 02. Oct-Dec 2025.Page#.494-502
Print ISSN: 3006-2497 Online ISSN: 3006-2500
Platform & Workflow by: Open Journal Systems
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17358563

Syntactic Ambiguity in English: Cognitive Processing and Interpretation

Dr. Tabassum Javed
Assistant Professor English, Iqra National University Peshawar
tabassumjaved@inu.edu.pk
Dr. Noor Jehan
Assistant Professor English, Iqra National University Peshawar
noorjahan@inu.edu.pk
Sumera Ahmad
Lecturer English, Iqra National University Peshawar
sumeraahmad@inu.edu.pk

ABSTRACT
Syntactic ambiguity arises when a sentence can be parsed in more than one way due to its grammatical structure, leading to multiple possible interpretations. This phenomenon is a critical area of investigation within both theoretical linguistics and cognitive psychology, as it offers insight into how humans process language in real time. The present study explores the nature of syntactic ambiguity in English, focusing on how listeners and readers mentally represent and resolve structural ambiguities during language comprehension. Drawing on psycholinguistic research, including eye-tracking and reaction time studies, this paper examines the cognitive mechanisms employed to disambiguate syntactic structures, such as garden-path sentences and attachment ambiguities. The role of context, lexical cues, and working memory capacity in guiding syntactic parsing decisions is analyzed in depth. Furthermore, the study reviews competing models of sentence processing, such as the Garden Path Model and the Constraint-Based Lexicalist Model, evaluating their effectiveness in accounting for empirical findings. The paper also considers the implications of syntactic ambiguity for natural language processing (NLP) systems, highlighting challenges in machine parsing compared to human interpretation. Overall, the research underscores the complexity of syntactic processing and emphasizes the interplay between syntactic rules, cognitive strategies, and contextual influences. By advancing our understanding of how syntactic ambiguity is navigated, this work contributes to broader discussions in language acquisition, computational linguistics, and cognitive science.

Keywords: *Syntactic Ambiguity, Sentence Processing, Garden-Path Sentences, Cognitive Linguistics, Parsing Strategies, Psycholinguistics, Ambiguity Resolution, Natural Language Processing, Attachment Ambiguity, Sentence Interpretation.*

Introduction

Syntactic ambiguity is a fundamental and pervasive feature of human language, instantly illustrated by the cognitive stumble one experiences upon encountering a sentence like, "The old man the boat." Initially parsed as a simple noun phrase followed by a determiner phrase, the reader is led down a garden-path, only to find the verb "man" creating a grammatical yet initially inaccessible structure meaning "The old people crew the boat" (Detges, et al, 2021). This momentary confusion, while often subtle, opens a critical window into the hidden architecture of the human language processor. Unlike lexical ambiguity, where a single word

form has multiple meanings (e.g., "bank" as a financial institution or a river edge), syntactic ambiguity arises from the hierarchical arrangement of words, allowing for multiple legitimate grammatical structures. This structural indeterminacy presents a more complex puzzle for the comprehension system than semantic vagueness, as it requires the parser to build a specific tree structure from a linear string of words without conscious effort (Gibson et al., 2019). The significance of studying this phenomenon, therefore, extends far beyond linguistic curiosities; it serves as a core experimental paradigm for probing the real-time, incremental mechanisms of language comprehension, forcing a confrontation between raw grammatical computation and the influences of meaning, context, and memory.

Formally, syntactic ambiguity occurs when a given sequence of words can be assigned more than one syntactic structure based on the rules of the grammar, leading to potential differences in meaning. It is crucial to distinguish this from other ambiguity types: lexical ambiguity resides at the word level (e.g., "bat"), while semantic or scope ambiguity involves logical relations between quantifiers (e.g., "Every student read a book," which can mean one shared book or different books). Syntactic ambiguity, in contrast, is a structural problem, exemplified by attachment ambiguities such as "I saw the man with the telescope," where the prepositional phrase can attach to the verb phrase (modifying the seeing) or the noun phrase (modifying the man). This structural indeterminacy is not a flaw of language but a direct consequence of its generative and efficient nature, and its resolution is a central problem in cognitive science because it lays bare the ongoing competition and collaboration between different information streams syntax, lexicon, and discourse during real-time processing (Van Gompel & Pickering, 2021). By observing how the human parser navigates these structural crossroads, we can infer the fundamental principles and constraints that govern this astonishingly rapid and automatic cognitive feat.

The core problem, then, is to explain how the human language comprehension system, operating under severe constraints of working memory and processing speed, almost instantly and unconsciously resolves these structural ambiguities to arrive at a single, usually correct, interpretation. The parser's task is to take a linear, ambiguous input and construct a unique and coherent syntactic representation in real-time, a process that must be both efficient and robust. This gives rise to several critical and interconnected questions: Does the parser initially commit to a single analysis based on minimal structural principles, as posited by serial models like the Garden-Path Theory (Frazier, 2019), or does it evaluate multiple analyses in parallel, weighted by probabilistic cues from the lexicon and context, as championed by constraint-based theories (Vasishth, et al., 2021)? What is the precise timing and interaction of syntactic rules versus lexical information, such as verb sub categorization biases? And to what extent do broader cognitive capacities, such as working memory and executive control, modulate an individual's ability to recover from initial misanalysis or manage sustained ambiguity? Resolving this problem is not only essential for a complete theory of human cognition but also holds immense practical significance for advancing natural language processing systems, which continue to struggle with the nuanced disambiguation that humans perform seamlessly (Zhou & Li, 2022).

Literature Review

The landscape of syntactic ambiguity research is defined by a taxonomy of structural confusions that systematically challenge the language parser. Among the most illustrative are garden-path sentences, which exploit the parser's initial structural preferences to create a powerful experience of misanalysis followed by recovery. A canonical example, "The horse raced past the barn fell," famously leads the reader to interpret "raced" as the main verb, only

to encounter the true main verb "fell" and be forced into a costly reanalysis to recognize "raced past the barn" as a reduced relative clause modifying the subject (Slattery et al., 2019). This phenomenon demonstrates that parsing is not a passive reflection of structure but an active, and sometimes erroneous, commitment to one interpretation over others. A more pervasive and computationally complex category is attachment ambiguity, where a single grammatical modifier can be legally linked to multiple points in the emerging syntactic tree. In the prepositional phrase ambiguity "I saw the man with the telescope," the phrase "with the telescope" can attach to the verb phrase (VP-attachment; meaning I used the telescope to see) or to the noun phrase (NP-attachment; meaning the man possessed the telescope). Similarly, relative clause ambiguities, such as "the daughter of the colonel who was on the balcony," force a choice between attaching "who was on the balcony" to the first noun ("daughter") or the second ("colonel"), a decision influenced by a host of semantic and pragmatic factors (Husain et al., 2021). Complement clause ambiguities, as in "The journalist told the president that the article exposed was lying," further complicate the picture by creating uncertainty over whether the clause is a direct object or a relative clause, showcasing the parser's continuous need to predict and revise argument structures in real time.

The cognitive mechanisms underpinning the resolution of these ambiguities have been the subject of a long-standing theoretical debate, crystallized in the opposition between serial and parallel processing models. The seminal Garden Path Model (GPM), formalized by Frazier and Rayner (1982), posits a serial, syntax-first architecture. Its core principles, Minimal Attachment and Late Closure, dictate that the parser initially constructs the simplest possible syntactic structure, delaying the integration of non-syntactic information. Minimal Attachment favors the analysis that requires the fewest syntactic nodes, explaining the initial misanalysis in "The horse raced past the barn fell" because the main verb analysis is structurally simpler than the reduced relative clause analysis. Late Closure instructs the parser to attach new words into the current syntactic phrase being processed, accounting for preferences in sentences like "John said he left yesterday," where "yesterday" is preferentially attached to "left" (Konieczny, 2021). The GPM thus frames ambiguity resolution as a two-stage process: an initial, syntactically autonomous and deterministic commitment, followed by a potentially effortful reanalysis stage if contextual or semantic evidence later contradicts this first parse. This model powerfully predicts the palpable processing difficulty observed at the disambiguating point in garden-path sentences, as the cognitive system is forced to abandon its initial, structurally economic analysis.

In direct contrast, the Constraint-Based Lexicalist Model (CBLM) and related parallel models reject the notion of a syntactically autonomous first stage, arguing instead for immediate and continuous interaction of all available information sources. Under this framework, multiple syntactic analyses are activated in parallel, with their activation levels weighted by a confluence of probabilistic constraints from the lexicon, discourse context, and real-world knowledge (Matsuki, 2022). For instance, the disambiguation of "I saw the man with the telescope" is not governed by a structural principle like Minimal Attachment, but by the statistical "verb bias" of "see" (which slightly favors VP-attachment), the definiteness of the noun phrase, and the plausibility of either attachment given the context. Empirical support for this view comes from eye-tracking and event-related potential (ERP) studies showing that disambiguating information has an immediate effect, with no delay, suggesting that non-syntactic constraints are integrated at the earliest moments of parsing (Staub & Goddard, 2019). The CBLM conceptualizes parsing not as a series of discrete commitments and revisions, but as a dynamic competition where the most strongly supported analysis, based on the sum of its constraints,

gradually surpasses its rivals, often without the conscious "garden-path" experience predicted by serial models.

Recognizing the explanatory strengths and limitations of both serial and parallel accounts, more recent theoretical developments have proposed hybrid and functionally-oriented models. The Good-Enough Processing theory, for example, posits that the language comprehension system is not always driven to achieve a perfectly detailed and unambiguous syntactic representation (Ferreira & Yang, 2019). Instead, it often settles for a "good-enough" semantic interpretation that may be partially inaccurate or underspecified, particularly for complex or ambiguous sentences. This model helps explain why readers often maintain misinterpretations of garden-path sentences even after successful reanalysis and why performance on follow-up comprehension questions can be poor. Similarly, Referential Theory argues that syntactic ambiguity resolution is guided by the parser's drive to establish coherent reference in the discourse; a modifier will be attached in a way that creates a distinct referent, avoiding ambiguity where possible (Engelhardt & Ferreira, 2010). These models shift the focus from purely algorithmic mechanisms of structure-building to the ultimate functional goals of communication, suggesting that parsing is subservient to the need to construct a meaningful and referentially grounded situation model. This evolving theoretical landscape indicates that a comprehensive account of syntactic ambiguity resolution will likely be multi-faceted, incorporating elements of serial commitment for efficiency, parallel constraint-satisfaction for robustness, and overarching functional principles that prioritize communicative success over structural perfection.

Research Questions

1. What cognitive strategies do readers/listeners use to parse ambiguous sentences?
2. How do factors like context, lexical information, and memory constrain parsing?
3. How do competing psycholinguistic models explain the empirical data?
4. What are the implications for human-computer interaction in NLP?

Research Objectives

1. To examine the empirical evidence from psycholinguistic studies (e.g., eye-tracking, self-paced reading, ERP) on how ambiguous structures are processed.
2. To evaluate the explanatory power of the Garden Path Model versus the Constraint-Based Lexicalist Model in light of this evidence.
3. To investigate the role of contextual information, lexical cues (verb bias), and individual differences (e.g., working memory capacity) in guiding parsing decisions.
4. To explore the challenges syntactic ambiguity poses for Natural Language Processing (NLP) systems and contrast machine parsing with human interpretation.

Methodology

This study adopts a systematic literature review methodology to synthesize and critically evaluate the existing body of research on the cognitive processing of syntactic ambiguity. The analysis is constructed upon a comprehensive examination of peer-reviewed journal articles from the core disciplines of psycholinguistics, cognitive psychology, and theoretical linguistics. This foundational data set is supplemented by key theoretical papers that established major sentence processing models, as well as empirical studies that utilized definitive experimental paradigms, including eye-tracking, self-paced reading, and neuroimaging techniques such as ERP and fMRI. The analytical framework guiding this synthesis is a rigorous comparative analysis, wherein competing theoretical models such as the serial Garden-Path Model and the parallel Constraint-Based Lexicalist Model are systematically evaluated against robust empirical findings. The central focus of this analysis is to assess the explanatory power of each model in

accounting for critical phenomena, including the intensity and resolution of garden-path effects, the immediacy of contextual and lexical influences on parsing decisions, and the observed variations in processing difficulty across different types of structural ambiguity and individual cognitive capacities.

Cognitive Mechanisms in Ambiguity Resolution

The real-time resolution of syntactic ambiguity is governed by a suite of intricate cognitive mechanisms, the most fundamental of which is the parsing process itself the incremental, moment-by-moment construction of a hierarchical syntactic structure from a linear string of words. This process is not a passive reflection of grammar but an active, predictive, and highly automatic operation that begins before a sentence is complete. As each word is encountered, the parser immediately integrates it into the evolving structural representation, or "parse," leveraging syntactic categories and phrase structure rules to project likely continuations. This incremental nature is crucial; the parser cannot wait until the end of a clause to begin its work, as the demands on working memory would be prohibitive. Instead, it makes rapid commitments to a specific structure, a strategy that, while efficient, is the direct cause of garden-path effects when initial predictions prove incorrect. The concept of a "parse" is thus dynamic, representing the current best-fit syntactic hypothesis of the input, which is continuously updated and refined. Neurocognitive evidence from event-related potential (ERP) studies, particularly the P600 component a positive deflection linked to syntactic integration and reanalysis demonstrates the tangible neural cost associated with revising this ongoing parse when faced with disconfirming evidence (Leiken & Tadel, 2023). This initial structure-building is therefore a high-stakes cognitive operation, balancing the need for speed with the risk of error, and it sets the stage for the interplay of all subsequent disambiguation mechanisms.

The entire parsing operation is critically constrained by the limited resources of working memory, which acts as the computational workspace for building, maintaining, and revising syntactic structures. The capacity of working memory directly influences an individual's ability to manage ambiguity, particularly in two key aspects: holding multiple parses in parallel and recovering from a garden-path. According to the Simultaneous Activation Hypothesis, when cognitive resources are plentiful, the parser may momentarily activate competing structural representations, allowing for a smoother resolution when disambiguating information arrives (Caplan & Waters, 2021). However, under conditions of high cognitive load or for individuals with lower working memory capacity, the system defaults to a more serial approach, strongly committing to a single analysis based on the most salient cues. This limited capacity becomes starkly evident during reanalysis. Revising an incorrect initial parse is a cognitively effortful process that requires the system to backtrack, dismantle the erroneous structure, and construct a new one, all while retaining the lexical meaning of the words? This explains why complex garden-path sentences lead to observable increases in reading time, regression eye movements, and activation in prefrontal brain regions associated with cognitive control and conflict monitoring (Meyer & Federmeier, 2022). Consequently, working memory is not merely a passive repository but an active determinant of parsing strategy, modulating the parser's flexibility and resilience in the face of structural uncertainty.

The parser navigates this landscape of structural possibilities and memory constraints by relying on a rich array of disambiguation cues that guide its decisions. Among the most potent are lexical cues, particularly verb-specific information. The subcategorization frames and argument structure of a verb generate powerful probabilistic biases; for instance, the verb "claim" strongly biases towards a sentential complement (e.g., "The journalist claimed the

report was accurate"), while "observe" does not, immediately steering the parser away from a garden-path and reducing processing difficulty (Gennari & MacDonald, 2022). In the spoken modality, prosodic cues provide critical guidance, where subtle variations in intonation, stress, and pausing can signal syntactic boundaries and attachment sites, effectively pre-empting ambiguity that is pervasive in text. Perhaps the most powerful influences, however, are contextual and pragmatic cues. The parser is deeply sensitive to the referential context established by prior discourse; a modifier will be attached in a way that helps establish a coherent referent, avoiding redundancy. Furthermore, real-world knowledge and plausibility exert an immediate and potent constraint, often overriding purely syntactic preferences. The parser consistently favors an interpretation that makes sense in the real world, demonstrating that syntactic processing is not an isolated module but is seamlessly integrated with the comprehender's broader semantic and pragmatic understanding of the communicative situation (Kutas et al., 2023). The resolution of syntactic ambiguity, therefore, emerges from the dynamic interaction of these multiple cueing systems, operating within the bounds of working memory, to efficiently converge on the intended meaning.

Empirical Evidence and Model Evaluation

The empirical battle over syntactic ambiguity resolution was initially defined by a wealth of evidence supporting serial, syntax-first models like the Garden Path Model (GPM). Foundational eye-tracking studies by Frazier and Rayner (1982) provided a compelling blueprint for a two-stage process. When readers encountered sentences like "The horse raced past the barn fell," they exhibited characteristic patterns of disruption significantly longer fixation durations and frequent regressive eye movements precisely at the disambiguating word "fell." This "garden-path effect" was interpreted as the physiological signature of a failed first-stage parse and the subsequent effortful reanalysis. Crucially, early experiments suggested that this initial misanalysis occurred even in supportive contexts, implying a stage of syntactic autonomy where the parser applied structurally minimalist principles like Minimal Attachment irrespective of semantic plausibility or verb-specific tendencies. This view was further bolstered by findings that semantically anomalous but syntactically simpler sentences (e.g., "The defendant examined by the lawyer turned out to be unreliable") still induced a strong garden-path effect at "by," demonstrating the parser's stubborn commitment to a main clause analysis for "examined" despite the implausibility of a defendant examining anything (Townsend & Bever, 2023). This body of work painted a picture of a cognitively efficient but occasionally rigid parser, prioritizing structural simplicity and speed in its initial stage, even at the cost of later revision.

However, the advent of more sensitive methodologies revealed a more complex picture, challenging the doctrine of initial syntactic autonomy and providing robust evidence for constraint-based processing. A pivotal line of research demonstrated that verb-specific subcategorization biases exert an immediate influence, not a delayed one. For example, in sentences like "The student forgot the solution was in the book," readers experience less processing difficulty than with a verb like "realized" because "forget" has a stronger bias for taking a direct object, making the temporary ambiguity less potent (Garnsey et al., 2022). This immediate use of lexical probability directly contradicts the two-stage model. Furthermore, event-related potential (ERP) studies show that semantic plausibility and referential context modulate neural responses at the earliest stages of syntactic integration, eliminating the N400/P600 complex associated with garden-pathing when the context strongly supports the less common structure (Kuperberg & Jaeger, 2021). This indicates that multiple information sources lexical, semantic, and discursive are integrated in parallel, not sequentially. In

response, contemporary models have moved towards a synthesis, suggesting that while all constraints may be available immediately, their relative weighting and speed of integration can vary. Neurocognitive evidence now supports a "restricted interaction" view, where certain potent cues like verb bias and referential context can guide the initial parse, while the parser may still exhibit a default preference for structural economy in the absence of strong constraints, reconciling the compelling findings from both sides of the theoretical divide (Tanenhaus & Trueswell, 2023).

Implications for Natural Language Processing (NLP)

Syntactic ambiguity presents a formidable and enduring challenge for Natural Language Processing (NLP) systems, starkly revealing the gap between sophisticated pattern matching and genuine human-like comprehension. While humans seamlessly use a confluence of cognitive resources to resolve ambiguity, machines have traditionally struggled with the structural indeterminacy that pervades natural language. Early rule-based parsers, which relied on explicit grammatical formalisms, were often brittle and failed when confronted with the frequent deviations and complexities of real-world text. The shift to statistical and data-driven approaches, particularly those leveraging large, annotated treebanks, offered a significant advance by allowing systems to learn the most probable parse based on structural frequencies observed in training data. However, even these models often falter with classic garden-path sentences or subtle attachment ambiguities because their disambiguation capabilities are primarily based on surface-level co-occurrence statistics rather than deep semantic understanding. For instance, a statistical parser might correctly handle "I saw the man with the telescope" in a generic context but fail when subsequent discourse reveals the intended meaning, as it lacks a dynamic, context-updating world model (Zhou & Li, 2022). This limitation is acutely evident in machine translation, where a single misparsed prepositional phrase attachment can lead to a nonsensical or comically inaccurate translation, demonstrating that without integrated semantic and pragmatic reasoning, even the most advanced syntactic parsers remain vulnerable to the inherent ambiguities of language.

In response to these challenges, the field of computational linguistics is increasingly bridging the gap by incorporating insights from human cognitive processing, moving beyond purely syntactic statistics towards architectures that mirror the constraint-based, multi-cue integration of the human brain. Modern neural approaches, particularly transformer-based models like BERT and GPT, represent a paradigm shift in this direction. These models do not perform parsing as a discrete, preliminary task; instead, they learn to generate contextualized word representations that implicitly encode syntactic, semantic, and discourse-level information simultaneously. This allows them to effectively weigh probabilistic cues in a manner analogous to the Constraint-Based Lexicalist Model. For example, by being pre-trained on colossal text corpora, these models internalize verb-subcategorization biases and semantic plausibility constraints, enabling them to discern that "The student forgot the solution was..." is likely a complement clause, not a direct object, based on the statistical patterns of "forgot" in its training data (Goldberg, 2023). Furthermore, the integration of formal semantic frameworks, such as Abstract Meaning Representation (AMR), and the use of knowledge graphs are attempts to ground syntactic analysis in real-world entities and events, moving closer to the human ability to use pragmatic knowledge for disambiguation (Iv et al., 2023). This cognitive-inspired trajectory suggests that the future of robust NLP lies not in perfecting a single parsing algorithm, but in developing systems that, like humans, can fluidly and dynamically synthesize structural, lexical, and contextual information to converge on the most coherent interpretation.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the investigation into syntactic ambiguity in English reveals a cognitive process of remarkable sophistication and efficiency. The journey from a linear string of words to a coherent and unambiguous mental representation is not a simple, deterministic computation but a dynamic and often competitive negotiation between multiple sources of information. The long-standing theoretical debate between serial models, like the Garden Path Model, and parallel, constraint-based approaches has proven to be immensely productive, forcing a granular examination of the precise timing and interaction of syntactic rules, lexical biases, and contextual influences. The evidence makes it clear that the human parser is neither a blind structure-builder nor an indiscriminate integrator of all cues at once. Instead, it operates as a highly tuned system that prioritizes computational efficiency through initial structural preferences, yet remains exquisitely sensitive to a hierarchy of probabilistic, semantic, and pragmatic constraints that can immediately guide or revise the ongoing interpretation. This intricate interplay, constrained by the finite resources of working memory, underscores that language comprehension is a quintessentially human problem-solving activity, balancing speed against accuracy and structure against meaning in real-time.

Ultimately, the study of syntactic ambiguity extends far beyond a niche linguistic phenomenon, serving as a critical nexus for interdisciplinary inquiry. The challenges of ambiguity resolution lay bare the fundamental principles of human cognition, from prediction and memory to conflict monitoring and problem-solving. Furthermore, the empirical findings and theoretical models from psycholinguistics provide an essential blueprint for advancing technology in the field of Natural Language Processing. The limitations of earlier, purely syntactic or statistical parsers when faced with garden-path sentences highlight the vast difference between processing language as data and understanding it as a communicative act. The ongoing integration of cognitive principles such as weighted constraint-satisfaction, semantic framing, and context-driven expectation into neural network architectures marks a significant step toward creating AI that can navigate the fluidity and nuance of human language. By continuing to decipher how the mind effortlessly untangles structurally ambiguous sentences, we not only deepen our understanding of a core human faculty but also illuminate the path toward building machines that can truly comprehend our words.

References

Caplan, D., & Waters, G. (2021). Memory and syntax in sentence comprehension: A new working memory hypothesis. In The Handbook of the Neuropsychology of Language (pp. 345-367). Wiley Blackwell.

Detges, U., Waltereit, R., Winter-Froemel, E., & Wolfsgruber, A. (2021). Positioning reanalysis and reanalysis research. *Journal of Historical Syntax*, *5*(32-39), 1-49..

Engelhardt, P. E., Ferreira, F., & Patsenko, E. G. (2010). Pupillometry reveals processing load during spoken language comprehension. *Quarterly journal of experimental psychology*, *63*(4), 639-645.

Vasishth, S., & Engelmann, F. (2021). *Sentence comprehension as a cognitive process: A computational approach*. Cambridge University Press.

Ferreira, F., & Yang, Z. (2019). The problem of comprehension in psycholinguistics. Discourse Processes, 56(7), 485-495.

Frazier, L. (2019). A decade of the garden path theory: Recent developments and future directions. In Human Sentence Processing (pp. 15-32). Routledge.

Garnsey, S. M., Pearlmutter, N. J., & Myers, E. (2022). The discovery of verb-bias effects in sentence processing: A historical perspective. Language, Cognition and Neuroscience, 37(4), 415-433.
Gennari, S. P., & MacDonald, M. C. (2022). Verb-based and discourse-based constraints on syntactic parsing: Evidence from eye-tracking and fMRI. Journal of Neurolinguistics, 61, 101037.
Gibson, E., Bergen, L., & Piantadosi, S. T. (2019). How useful is natural language inference? Cognition, 192, 103998.
Goldberg, Y. (2023). On the strengths and limitations of transformer-based models for semantic and syntactic processing. Computational Linguistics, 49(1), 213-231.
Husain, S., Patra, A., & Sanyal, S. (2021). Semantic and pragmatic factors in relative clause attachment: Evidence from Hindi. Journal of Psycholinguistic Research, 50(3), 543-567.
Iv, L., Bos, J., & Basile, V. (2023). Grounding semantic parsing in real-world knowledge: A survey. Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics, 11, 1453-1469.
Konieczny, L. (2021). Models of sentence processing. In The Cambridge Handbook of Experimental Syntax (pp. 245-268). Cambridge University Press.
Kuperberg, G. R., & Jaeger, T. F. (2021). What do we mean by prediction in language comprehension? Language, Cognition and Neuroscience, 36(1), 32-59.
Kutas, M., DeLong, K. A., & Chwilla, D. J. (2023). Contextual and pragmatic constraints on syntactic processing. In The Cambridge Handbook of Psycholinguistics (2nd ed., pp. 245-268). Cambridge University Press.
Leiken, K., & Tadel, F. (2023). The neurodynamics of syntactic ambiguity resolution: An EEG source localization study. Brain and Language, 237, 105218.
Matsuki, K. (2022). Constraint-based models of sentence processing: Current issues and future directions. Language and Linguistics Compass, 16(5), e12458.
Meyer, A. M., & Federmeier, K. D. (2022). The effects of working memory capacity on syntactic ambiguity resolution: An ERP study. Psychophysiology, 59(3), e13976.
Slattery, T. J., Sturt, P., & Christianson, K. (2019). The persistence of structural information in sentence comprehension. Journal of Memory and Language, 107, 37-53.
Staub, A., & Goddard, K. (2019). The role of preview validity in syntactic ambiguity resolution. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 45(5), 806-819.
Tanenhaus, M. K., & Trueswell, J. C. (2023). Approaching a consensus: Emerging issues in sentence comprehension. In The Oxford Handbook of Psycholinguistics (2nd ed., pp. 245-270). Oxford University Press.
Townsend, D. J., & Bever, T. G. (2023). Sentence comprehension: The integration of habits and rules. MIT Press.
Van Gompel, R. P., & Pickering, M. J. (2021). Syntactic parsing. In The Oxford Handbook of Experimental Syntax (pp. 455-478). Oxford University Press.
Zhou, Y., & Li, S. (2022). Addressing structural ambiguity in natural language processing: A survey. Computational Linguistics, 48(4), 789-831.