processing preference fails to outlaw all of the discontinuous structures in language, and where our push-down stack capacities actually reside.

Finally, C&C's Now-or-Never bottleneck theory suggests that details of an utterance cannot be retained in memory when following material overwrites it – only the gist of what was said may persist. But the practice of "other-initiated repair" suggests otherwise – in the following excerpt Sig repeats verbatim what he earlier said, just with extra stress on *shoot* even though three conversational turns intervene (Schegloff 2007, p. 109):

(1) Sig: Conservatives like to shoot people (and liberals don't?)
(2.0)
Dad: Conservatives like wha:t?
(0.8)
Sig: Wha:?
Dad: Whadyu say about conservatives? ((mouth full))
(0.3)
Sig: Conservatives like ta shoot people en (hh) liberals don't?

The fact that we can rerun the phonetics (? = rising intonation, underlining = stress) of utterances shows the existence of other buffers that escape the proposed bottleneck.

Linguistic structure emerges through the interaction of memory constraints and communicative pressures

doi:10.1017/S0140525X15000874, e82

Molly L. Lewis and Michael C. Frank
Department of Psychology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305.
mll@stanford.edu **mcfrank@stanford.edu**
http://web.stanford.edu/~mll/
http://web.stanford.edu/~mcfrank/

Abstract: If memory constraints were the only limitation on language processing, the best possible language would be one with only one word. But to explain the rich structure of language, we need to posit a second constraint: the pressure to communicate informatively. Many aspects of linguistic structure can be accounted for by appealing to equilibria that result from these two pressures.

Christiansen & Chater (C&C) claim that memory limitations force the cognitive system to process the transient linguistic signal by compressing it. They suggest that this processing pressure influences the ultimate structure of language over the course of language evolution. Taken at face value, this proposal would lead to a degenerate linguistic structure, however. If memory constraints were the only pressure on language, languages would evolve to compress meaning into the simplest possible form – a single word (Horn 1984). But, as the authors point out, natural languages are not of this sort; they are richly structured into lexical and phrasal units of varying length. To account for this variability, we highlight the need to consider the communicative function of language. Communication serves as an important counter-pressure against compression in language processing, not just as a caveat.

Interlocutors use language with the goal of communicating information, but they also aim to minimize energetic cost (Zipf 1949). For the speaker, this goal implies minimizing production cost, and for the listener it implies minimizing comprehension cost. Importantly, these processing constraints have opposing cost functions (Horn 1984; Zipf 1949). For a producer, processing is minimized when a form is easy to say, and thus highly compressible. For the comprehender, however, processing is minimized when a form is minimally ambiguous and thus verbose. Compressing information is a useful strategy for a speaker who faces memory constraints, but it is useful only to the extent that the listener can still recover the intended meaning. This view of language use as rational action – minimizing costs while maximizing information transfer – is supported by a rich body of theoretical and empirical work (Clark 1996; Frank & Goodman 2012; Goodman & Stuhlmüller 2013; Grice 1975).

Although C&C argue that compression is the key factor in the emergence of structure, evidence at both the acquisition and evolution timescales suggests language is the product of the interaction between both compression and informativity. At the timescale of acquisition, experimental work suggests the resolution of reference in word learning is the product of communicative inferences (e.g., Baldwin 1991; 1993; Frank et al. 2009; Frank & Goodman 2014). And at the timescale of language evolution, a growing body of work suggests that the forms of words are also equilibria between these two pressures (Lewis & Frank 2014; Mahowald et al. 2012; Piantadosi et al. 2011; Zipf 1936). For example, Piantadosi et al. (2011) found that words that are less predictable in their linguistic context are longer, suggesting that speakers may lengthen words that are surprising in order to increase time for the listener to process.

In addition to linguistic form, these pressures influence the mapping between form and meaning. An equilibrium in the structure of form-meaning mappings is one in which the listener is able to recover the intended meaning, but the speaker does not exert additional effort over-describing. A range of semantic domains reflect this equilibrium (Baddeley & Attewell 2009; Kemp & Regier 2012; Regier et al. 2007), and ambiguity, more generally, has been argued to reflect this communicative tradeoff (Piantadosi et al. 2012). Ambiguity is an equilibrium in cases where the listener can recover the intended meaning from the communicative context. One example is the word "some," which has a literal meaning of "at least one and possibly all" but can be strengthened pragmatically to mean "at least one but not all" (Horn 1972). Because its meaning is determined through communicative context, its literal semantics can overlap those of its competitor, "all."

The key challenge associated with this broader proposal – that processing pressures influence linguistic structure – is providing direct evidence for a causal link between these two timescales. This problem is difficult to study in the laboratory because the proposed mechanism takes place over a long timescale and over multiple individual speakers. Furthermore, the presence of a causal link does not entail that phenomena in processing are directly reflected in linguistic structure – rather, entirely new properties may emerge at higher levels of abstraction from the interactions of more fundamental phenomena (Anderson 1972). It may, therefore, not be possible to directly extrapolate from brief communicative interactions observed in the laboratory to properties of linguistic structure.

Several recent pieces of experimental data begin to address this challenge, however. In one study, Fedzechkina et al. (2012) asked speakers to learn an artificial language that arbitrarily distinguished nouns through case-marking. Over learning sessions, speakers developed a system for marking in contexts where meanings were least predictable – a pattern reflected in the case-marking systems of natural language. Other work has used a similar paradigm to reveal the emergence of typologically prevalent patterns in the domains of word order (Culbertson et al. 2012; Culbertson & Newport 2015) and phonology (Wilson 2008).

A particularly promising approach for exploring this causal link is through transmission chains (Kirby et al. 2008; Reali & Griffiths 2009). In a transmission chain, a participant learns and recalls a language, and then the recalled language becomes the learning input for a new learner. By iterating over learners, we can observe how languages change across transmission of learners over the course of language evolution. Kirby et al. (2015) have compared the emergence of linguistic structure in a regime that iterates over different partners of learners versus a regime where the same two partners repeatedly interact with each other. They find that linguistic structure emerges only by iterating over different partners, demonstrating the unique contribution of cross-generational learning to the emergence of structure. Others have begun to use this paradigm to link the interaction of processing pressures to the emergence of communicative regularities in semantic structure (Carstensen et al. 2015; Lewis & Frank 2015).

In sum, the consequences of memory constraints are likely a critical factor in shaping language structure. But an additional important constraint is the pressure to communicate informatively, and this constraint should not be overlooked in accounting for linguistic structure.

The bottleneck may be the solution, not the problem

doi:10.1017/S0140525X15000886, e83

Arnon Lotem,[a] Oren Kolodny,[b] Joseph Y. Halpern,[c]
Luca Onnis,[d] and Shimon Edelman[e]

[a]*Department of Zoology, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv 6997801, Israel;* [b]*Department of Biology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305;* [c]*Department of Computer Science, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853;* [d]*Division of Linguistics and Multilingual Studies, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore 637332;* [e]*Department of Psychology, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853.*

lotem@post.tau.ac.il okolodny@stanford.edu
halpern@cs.cornell.edu lucao@ntu.edu.sg se37@cornell.edu

Abstract: As a highly consequential biological trait, a memory "bottleneck" cannot escape selection pressures. It must therefore co-evolve with other cognitive mechanisms rather than act as an independent constraint. Recent theory and an implemented model of language acquisition suggest that a limit on working memory may evolve to help learning. Furthermore, it need not hamper the use of language for communication.

The target article by Christiansen & Chater (C&C) makes many useful and valid observations about language that we happily endorse. Indeed, several of C&C's major points appear in our own papers, including the following: (a) the inability of non-chunked, "analog" approaches to language to compete with "digital" combinatorics over chunks (Edelman, 2008b); (b) the centrality of chunking to modeling incremental, memory-constrained language acquisition and generation (Goldstein et al. 2010; Kolodny et al. 2015b) and the possible evolutionary roots of these features of language (Kolodny et al. 2014; 2015a; Lotem & Halpern 2012); (c) the realization that language experience has the form of a graph (Solan et al. 2005; cf. Edelman 2008a, p. 274), corresponding to C&C's "forest tracks" analogy; and (d) a proposed set of general principles for language acquisition and processing (Goldstein et al. 2010), one of which is essentially identical to C&C's "Now-or-Never bottleneck." However, our theory is critically different in its causality structure. Rather than assuming that the memory limit is a fixed constraint to which all other traits must adapt, we view it as an adaptation that evolved to cope with computational challenges. Doing so brings theory in line with standard practice in evolutionary biology, is more consistent with research findings, and raises numerous important research issues. We expand on these points in the following paragraphs.

No biological trait can be simply assumed as a "constraint." Viewing the Now-or-Never bottleneck as an evolutionary constraint to which language adapts – C&C's central idea – is unwarranted. In evolutionary theory, biological constraints – as opposed to constraints imposed by physics and chemistry, which are not subject to biological evolution – cannot simply be assumed; they must be understood in terms of trade-offs among selective pressures. Clearly, birds' wings evolved under aerodynamic constraints rather than vice versa. However, biological traits such as memory are not exempt from evolving. In proposing a bottleneck to which everything else in the system must adapt while the bottleneck itself remains fixed and independent (Fig. 1 in the target article), C&C implicitly assume that it cannot evolve.

To justify this assumption, C&C should have offered evidence of stabilizing selection pressures that act against genetic variants coding for a broader or narrower bottleneck, and thereby affecting cognition and, ultimately, fitness. Alternatively, they might have assumed that the biological mechanisms underlying the memory bottleneck cannot be genetically variable – an odd assumption, which runs counter to substantial evidence in humans of (a) a range of verbal memory decay rates (Mueller & Krawitz 2009), including in particular the longer verbal working memory span in individuals with Asperger's (Cui et al. 2010); (b) heritable variation in language and in word memory (Stromswold 2001; van Soelen et al. 2011) and in working memory (Blokland et al. 2011; Vogler et al. 2014); and (c) variation in perceptual memory across species (Lind et al. 2015; Mery et al. 2007). Given that heritable variation in a trait means that it can respond to selection (e.g., Falconer 1981), it is likely that the bottleneck *can* evolve, and that it is what it is because individuals with longer or shorter verbal working memory had lower biological fitness.[1]

If language is supported by domain-general mechanisms, verbal memory is even less immune to evolution. If the emergence of language constitutes a recent and radical departure from other cognitive phenomena, it is in principle possible that working memory evolved and stabilized prior to and separately from the "increasingly abstract levels of linguistic representation" (sect. 3.2, para. 2) posited by C&C. However, there are good arguments in support of a domain-general view of language (e.g., Chater & Christiansen 2010). In particular, linguistic representations and processes are hardly as modular as C&C assume (Onnis & Spivey 2012). Furthermore, theories of neural reuse (Anderson 2010) point to the massive redeployment of existing mechanisms for new functions, resulting in brain regions coming to be involved in diverse cognitive functions. If circuits that support language continue contributing to nonlinguistic functions (including working memory), a memory bottleneck is not a prior and independent constraint on language, but rather a trait that continues to evolve under multiple selective pressures, which include language.

The bottleneck may be the solution, not the problem. As we have suggested (Goldstein et al. 2010; Lotem & Halpern 2008; 2012; Onnis et al. 2008), a limited working memory may be an adaptation for coping with the computational challenges involved in segmentation and network construction. (Importantly, regardless of whether this specific hypothesis is correct, entertaining such hypotheses is the only way of distinguishing a function from a constraint; cf. Stephens & Krebs 1986, Ch. 10.) A recently implemented model that includes this hypothesis has been tested on tasks involving language, birdsong, and foraging (Kolodny et al. 2014; 2015a; 2015b; Menyhart et al. 2015) The model includes a time window during which natural and meaningful patterns are likely to recur and thus to pass a test for statistical significance, while spurious patterns decay and are forgotten. We stress that rather than acting as a constraint, the duration of the window must co-evolve with the mechanisms influencing the distribution of data so as to increase the effectiveness of memory representations (Lotem & Halpern 2012).

We do agree with C&C regarding some of the consequences of the memory bottleneck, such as the need for online incremental construction of hierarchical representation. Indeed, our model effectively implements what C&C call "Chunk-and-Pass" (Kolodny et al. 2015b).[2] We believe, however, that the ultimate constraint on learning structure (such as that of language) in time and space is not the memory bottleneck in itself, but rather the representational levels (this is Chunk-and-Pass processing). Similarly, it requires specifying the representations involved in producing language just before they are used (this is Just-in-Time production). These proposals themselves have, we suggest, a variety of implications for language structure (e.g., that such structure is typically highly local), for acquisition, and for language change and evolution (e.g., that language changes construction-by-construction both within individuals during learning, and over generations within entire language communities).

The commentaries on our article have raised important issues of clarification (e.g., differentiating the present proposals from bottom-up, syntax-driven models such as the Sausage Machine, Frazier & Fodor 1978); have clarified important links with prior models and empirical results (e.g., the link with "good enough" parsing, **Ferreira & Christianson**); and have outlined supporting evidence (e.g., from the time-course of neural activity involved in language processing, e.g., **Honey et al.**) and pointed out ways in which the approach can be deepened and made more linguistically concrete (**O'Grady**). One commentator fears that our proposals may be unfalsifiable (**Levinson**); others suspect that our approach may actually be falsified by known features of language structure (**Medeiros et al.**), processing (**MacDonald**), acquisition (**Wang & Mintz**), or language change (**Endress & Katzir**). We hope that our target article will persuade readers that memory constraints have substantial implications for understanding many aspects of language, and that our response to commentators makes the case that the many claims flowing from the Now-or-Never bottleneck are compatible with what is known about language (although not always with what is presumed to be the case by prior theories). Most important, we encourage interested readers to continue the work of the many commentators who provide constructive directions to further explore the nature of the Now-or-Never bottleneck, further elaborate and test the Chunk-and-Pass and Just-in-Time perspectives on language processing, and help integrate the study of these performance constraints into our understanding of key aspects of language structure, acquisition, and evolution (for some steps in this direction, see Christiansen & Chater 2016).

NOTES

1. **Chacón et al.** contend that "early observations about speech errors indicated that exchange errors readily cross phrasal and clausal boundaries (Garrett 1980)" (para. 7). A careful reading of Garrett, however, shows that most exchange errors tend to occur *within* phrases, as would be expected from our perspective.

2. **Wang & Mintz** seem to have misunderstood the aim of the modeling by Reali and Christiansen (2005). Their point was not to provide a full-fledged model of so-called auxiliary fronting in complex yes/no questions (such as *Is the dog that is on the chair black?*) but rather to demonstrate that the input to young children provided sufficient statistical information for them to distinguish between grammatical and ungrammatical forms of such sentences. Kam et al. (2008) noted some limitations of the simplest bigram model used by Reali and Christiansen, but failed to address the fact that not only did the model fit the results from the classic study by Crain and Nakayama (1987) but also correctly predicted that children should make fewer errors involving high-frequency word chunks compared to low-frequency chunks in a subsequent question elicitation study (Ambridge et al. 2008; see Reali & Christiansen 2009). For example, higher rates of auxiliary-doubling errors occur for questions where such errors involved high-frequency word category combinations (e.g., more errors such as **Is the boy who is washing the elephant is tired?* than **Are the boys who are washing the elephant are tired?*). Most important for current purposes is the fact that Reali and Christiansen – in line with our account of Chunk-and-Pass processing – do not assume that distributional information is all there is to language acquisition: "Young learners are likely to rely on many additional sources of information (e.g., semantic, phonological, prosodic) to be able to infer different aspects of the structure of the target language" (Reali & Christiansen 2009, p. 1024).

3. **Endress & Katzir** (see also **Wang & Mintz**) raise a common concern relating to usage-based models: that the sparseness of the input will prevent them from being able to process novel word sequences that are grammatical but not predictable (such as *Evil unicorns devour xylophones*). Reali et al. (2005) addressed this challenge head-on, showing in a statistical learning experiment that human participants become sufficiently sensitive to the regularities of training examples to recognize novel sequences whose bigram transitions are absent in training. They subsequently showed that a simple recurrent network (Elman 1990) could correctly process sequences that contain null-probability bigram information by relying on distributional regularities in the training corpus. Thus, in contrast to the claims of **Endress & Katzir**, distributional learning appears to be sufficiently powerful to deal with unpredictable but grammatical sequences such as Chomsky's (1957) famous sentence *Colorless green ideas sleep furiously* (see also Allen & Seidenberg 1999).

References

[The letters "a" and "r" before author's initials stand for target article and response references, respectively]

Acheson, D. J. & MacDonald, M. C. (2011) The rhymes that the reader perused confused the meaning: Phonological effects on on-line sentence comprehension. *Journal of Memory and Language* 65:193–207. [MCM, rNC]

Adams, J. A. (1971) A closed-loop theory of motor learning. *Journal of Motor Behavior* 3:111–50. [AB]

Allen, J. & Seidenberg, M. S. (1999) The emergence of grammaticality in connectionist networks. In: *The emergence of language*, ed. B. MacWhinney, pp. 115–51. Erlbaum. [rNC]

Allopenna, P. D., Magnuson, J. S. & Tanenhaus, M. K. (1998) Tracking the time course of spoken word recognition using eye movements: Evidence for continuous mapping models. *Journal of Memory and Language* 38:419–39. [aMHC]

Altmann, G. T. M. (2002) Learning and development in neural networks: The importance of prior experience. *Cognition* 85:43–50. [aMHC, MLD]

Altmann, G. T. M. (2004) Language-mediated eye movements in the absence of a visual world: The "blank screen paradigm." *Cognition* 93:79–87. [aMHC]

Altmann, G. T. M. & Kamide, Y. (1999) Incremental interpretation at verbs: Restricting the domain of subsequent reference. *Cognition* 73:247–64. [aMHC]

Altmann, G. T. M. & Kamide, Y. (2009) Discourse-mediation of the mapping between language and the visual world: Eye movements and mental representation. *Cognition* 111:55–71. [MLD, aMHC]

Altmann, G. T. M. & Mirkovic, J. (2009) Incrementality and prediction in human sentence processing. *Cognitive Science* 33:583–609. [aMHC]

Altmann, G. T. M. & Steedman, M. J. (1988) Interaction with context during human sentence processing. *Cognition* 30:191–38. [aMHC]

Ambridge, B., Rowland, C. & Pine, J. (2008) Is structure dependence an innate constraint? New experimental evidence from children's complex question production. *Cognitive Science* 32:222–55. [rNC]

Ames, H. & Grossberg, S. (2008) Speaker normalization using cortical strip maps: A neural model for steady state vowel categorization. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 124:3918–36. [SG]

Anderson, J. R. (1990) *The adaptive character of thought*. Erlbaum. [aMHC, KB]

Anderson, J. R. & Milson, R. (1989) Human memory: An adaptive perspective. *Psychological Review* 96:703. [rNC]

Anderson, J. R. & Schooler, L. J. (1991) Reflections of the environment in memory. *Psychological Science* 2:396–408. [rNC]

Anderson, M. L. (2010) Neural reuse: A fundamental organizational principle of the brain. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 34:245–66. [AB, AL]

Anderson, P. W. (1972) More is different. *Science* 177:393–96. [MLL]

Aoshima, S., Phillips, C. & Weinberg, A. (2004) Processing filler-gap dependencies in a head-final language. *Journal of Memory and Language* 51:23–54. [DAC]

Appelt, D., Hobbs, J., Bear, J., Israel, D. & Tyson, M. (1993) FASTUS: A finite-state processor for information extraction from real-world text. *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, Chambery, France, August 1993.* ed. A. Ralescu, pp. 1172–78. [CRH]

Arbib, M. A. (2005) From monkey-like action recognition to human language: An evolutionary framework for neurolinguistics. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 28:105–24. [aMHC]

Arbib, M. A. (2012) *How the brain got language: The mirror system hypothesis*. Oxford University Press. [DPM]

Arnon, I. & Christiansen, M. H. (submitted) The role of multiword building blocks in explaining L1-L2 differences [aMHC, rNC]

Arnon, I. & Clark, E. V. (2011) Why brush your teeth is better than teeth – Children's word production is facilitated in familiar sentence-frames. *Language Learning and Development* 7:107–29. [aMHC]

Arnon, I. & Cohen Priva, U. (2013) More than words: The effect of multi-word frequency and constituency on phonetic duration. *Language and Speech* 56:349–73. [aMHC, rNC]

Arnon, I. & Snider, N. (2010) More than words: Frequency effects for multi-word phrases. *Journal of Memory and Language* 62:67–82. [aMHC]

Aronoff, M., Meir, I. & Sandler, W. (2005) The paradox of sign language morphology. *Language* 81(2):301–44. [KE]

Austin, J. L. (1962) *How to do things with words*. Harvard University Press. [aMHC]

Bach, E., Brown, C. & Marslen-Wilson, W. (1986) Crossed and nested dependencies in German and Dutch: A psycholinguistic study. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 1:249–62. [rNC]

Baddeley, A. (1987) *Working memory*. Oxford University Press. [SCL]

Baddeley, A. (1992) Working memory. *Science* 255:556–59. [rNC]

Baddeley, A. D. & Hitch, G. J. (1974) Working memory. *The Psychology of Learning and Motivation* 8:47–89. [rNC]

Baddeley, R. & Attewell, D. (2009) The relationship between language and the environment: Information theory shows why we have only three lightness terms. *Psychological Science* 20:1100–107. [MLL]

Badets, A., Koch, I. & Philipp, A. M. (2016) A review of ideomotor approaches to perception, cognition, action, and language: Advancing a cultural recycling hypothesis. *Psychological Research* 80:1–15. doi: 10.1007/s00426-014-0643-8. [AB]

Badets, A. & Osiurak, F. (2015) A goal-based mechanism for delayed motor intention: Considerations from motor skills, tool use and action memory. *Psychological Research* 79:345–60. [AB]

Badets, A. & Rensonnet, C. (2015) Une approche idéomotrice de la cognition. *L'Année psychologique* 115:591–635. [AB]

Baker, M. (2001) *The atoms of language*. Basic Books. [aMHC]

Baker, M. C. (2008) *The syntax of agreement and concord*. Cambridge University Press. [DPM]

Baker, M. C. (2013) On agreement and its relationship to case: Some generative ideas and results. *Lingua* 130(June):14–32. [DPM]

Baldwin, D. (1991) Infants' contribution to the achievement of joint reference. *Child Development* 62:874–90. [MLL]

Baldwin, D. A. (1993) Infants' ability to consult the speaker for clues to word reference. *Journal of Child Language* 20:395–18. [MLL]

Bannard, C. & Matthews, D. (2008) Stored word sequences in language learning. *Psychological Science* 19:241–48. [aMHC]

Bar, M. (2004) Visual objects in context. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 5:617–29. [aMHC]

Bar, M. (2007) The proactive brain: Using analogies and associations to generate predictions. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 11:280–89. [aMHC]

Bard, E. G., Shillcock, R. C. & Altmann, G. T. M. (1988) The recognition of words after their acoustic offsets in spontaneous speech: Effects of subsequent context. *Perception and Psychophysics* 44:395–408. [KB]

Barsalou, L. W. (2008) Grounded cognition. *Annual Review of Psychology* 59:617–45. [MLD]

Bates, E. & MacWhinney, B. (1982) Functionalist approaches to grammar. In: *Language acquisition: The state of the art*, ed. E. Wanner & L. Gleitman, pp. 173–218. Cambridge University Press. [DPM]

Baumann, T. & Schlangen, D. (2012) INPRO_iSS: A component for just-in-time incremental speech synthesis. In: *Proceedings of the ACL 2012 System Demonstrations*, pp. 103–108. Association for Computational Linguistics. [aMHC]

Bavelas, J. B. & Gerwing, J. (2007) Conversational hand gestures and facial displays in face-to-face dialogue. In: *Social communication*, ed. K. Fiedler, pp. 283–308. Psychology Press. [PGTH]

Beckner, C., Blythe, R., Bybee, J., Christiansen, M. H., Croft, W., Ellis, N., Holland, J., Ke, J., Larsen- Freeman, D. & Schoenemann, T. (2009) Language is a complex adaptive system: Position paper. *Language Learning* 59 (Suppl. 1):1–27. [aMHC]

Behme, C. (2014a) Assessing direct and indirect evidence in linguistic research. *Topoi* 33:373–83. [CB]

Behme, C. (2014b) *Evaluating Cartesian linguistics: From historic antecedents to computational modeling.* Peter Lang. [CB]

Belletti, A., ed. (2004) *Structures and beyond. The cartography of syntactic structures, vol. 3.* Oxford University Press. [DPM]

Bellugi, U. & Fisher, S. (1972) A comparison of sign language and spoken language. *Cognition* 1:173–200. [aMHC]

Bellugi, U., Klima, E. S. & Siple, P. (1975) Remembering in signs. *Cognition* 3:93–25. [KE]

Bentz, C. & Winter, B. (2013) Languages with more second language learners tend to lose nominal case. *Language Dynamics and Change* 3:1–27. [TB]

Berwick, R. C. (1985) *The acquisition of syntactic knowledge*. MIT Press. [aMHC]

Berwick, R. C., Chomsky, N. & Piattelli-Palmarini, M. (2013) Poverty of the stimulus stands: Why recent challenges fail. In: *Rich languages from poor inputs*, ed. M. Piattelli-Palmarini & R. C. Berwick, pp. 19–42. Oxford University Press. [DPM]

Berwick, R. C., Friederici, A. D., Chomsky, N. & Bolhuis, J. J. (2013) Evolution, brain, and the nature of language. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 17:91–100. [aMHC]

Berwick, R. C. & Weinberg, A. S. (1984) *The grammatical basis of linguistic performance*. MIT Press. [aMHC]

Bever, T. (1970) The cognitive basis for linguistic structures. In: *Cognition and the development of language*, ed. J. R. Hayes, pp. 279–362. Wiley. [aMHC, DPM]

Bever, T. G. (1975) Cerebral asymmetries in humans are due to the differentiation of two incompatible processes: Holistic and analytic. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 263(1):251–62. [DPM]

Bi, G. & Poo, M. (2001) Synaptic modification of correlated activity: Hebb's postulate revisited. *Annual Review of Neuroscience* 24:139–66. [SLF]

Bickel, B., Banjade, G., Gaenszle, M., Lieven, E., Paudyal, N., Rai, I. P., Rai, M., Rai, N. K. & Stoll, S. (2007) Free prefix ordering in Chintang. *Language* 83(1):43–73. [SCL]

Bickerton, D. (1984) The language bioprogram hypothesis. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 7:173–221. [aMHC]

Bicknell, K. & Levy, R. (2010) A rational model of eye movement control in reading. In: *Proceedings of the 48th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, ed. J. Hajič, S. Carberry, S. Clark, & J. Nivre, pp. 1168–78. Association for Computational Linguistics. [KB]

Bicknell, K., Tanenhaus, M. K. & Jaeger, T. F. (2015) Listeners can maintain and rationally update uncertainty about prior words. Manuscript submitted for publication. [KB]

Blackburn, S. & Meyer-Viol, W. (1994) Linguistics, logic and finite trees. *Bulletin of Interest Group in Pure and Applied Logics* 2:3–29. [RK]

Blaubergs, M. S. & Braine, M. D. S. (1974) Short-term memory limitations on decoding self- embedded sentences. *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 102:745–48. [rNC]

Blokland, G. A. M., McMahon, K. L., Thompson, P. M., Martin, N. G., de Zubicaray, G. I. & Wright, M. J. (2011) Heritability of working memory brain activation. *The Journal of Neuroscience* 31:10882–90. [AL]

Boardman, I., Grossberg, S., Myers, C. & Cohen, M. (1999) Neural dynamics of perceptual order and context effects for variable-rate speech syllables. *Perception and Psychophysics* 6:1477–500. [SG]

Bock, J. K. (1982) Toward a cognitive psychology of syntax: Information processing contributions to sentence formulation. *Psychological Review* 89:1–47. [aMHC]

Bock, J. K. (1986) Meaning, sound, and syntax: Lexical priming in sentence production. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 12:575–86. [aMHC]

Bock, J. K. & Loebell, H. (1990) Framing sentences. *Cognition* 35:1–39. [aMHC]

Bock, J. K. & Miller, C. A. (1991) Broken agreement. *Cognitive Psychology* 23:45–93. [aMHC]

Bock, K. (1987) Exploring levels of processing in sentence production. In: *Natural language generation*, ed. G. Kempen, pp. 351–63. Springer. [DAC]

Bock, K. & Cutting, J. C. (1992) Regulating mental energy: Performance units in language production. *Journal of Memory and Language* 31:99–127. [rNC]

Bock, K. & Miller, C. A. (1991) Broken agreement. *Cognitive Psychology* 23:45–93. [DAC]

Bod, R. (2009) From exemplar to grammar: A probabilistic analogy–based model of language learning. *Cognitive Science* 33:752–93. [aMHC]

Boeckx, C. & Leivada, E. (2013) Entangled parametric hierarchies: Problems for an overspecified universal grammar. *PLOS ONE* 8(9):e72357. [aMHC]

Boemio, A., Fromm, S., Braun, A. & Poeppel, D. (2005) Hierarchical and asymmetric temporal sensitivity in human auditory cortices. *Nature Neuroscience* 8(3):389–95. [GB]

Bohnet, B. & Nivre, J. (2012) A transition-based system for joint part-of-speech tagging and labeled non-projective dependency parsing. In: *Proceedings of the 2012 Joint Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and Computational Natural Language Learning, Jeju Island, Korea, July 12–14, 2012*, ed. J. Tsujii, J. Henderson & M. Pasca, pp. 1455–65. Association for Computational Linguistics. [CG-R]

Borovsky, A., Elman, J. L. & Fernald, A. (2012) Knowing a lot for one's age: Vocabulary skill and not age is associated with anticipatory incremental sentence interpretation in children and adults. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology* 112:417–36. [aMHC]

Börschinger, B. & Johnson, M. (2011) A particle filter algorithm for Bayesian word segmentation. In: *Proceedings of the Australasian Language Technology*

Association Workshop, Canberra, Australia, ed. D. Mollá & D. Martinez, pp. 10–18. [ADE]

Bortfeld, H., Morgan, J. L., Golinkoff, R. M. & Rathbun, K. (2005) Mommy and me: Familiar names help launch babies into speech-stream segmentation. *Psychological Science* 16(4):298–304. [RM, rNC]

Botvinick, M. M. (2008) Hierarchical models of behavior and prefrontal function. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 12:201–208. [rNC]

Bouzouita, M. & Chatzikyriakidis, S. (2009) Clitics as calcified processing strategies. In: *Proceedings of LFG09, Cambridge, UK, July 2009*, ed. M. Butt & T. Holloway-King, pp. 189–207. CSLI Press. Available at: http://www.stergioschatzikyriakidis.com/uploads/1/0/3/6/10363759/lfg09bouzouitachatzikyriakidis_2.pdf. [RK]

Boyd, R. & Richerson, P. J. (1987) The evolution of ethnic markers. *Cultural Anthropology* 2:65–79. [aMHC]

Branigan, H., Pickering, M. & Cleland, A. (2000) Syntactic co-ordination in dialogue. *Cognition* 75:13–25. [aMHC]

Bransford, J. D. & Johnson, M. K. (1972) Contextual prerequisites for understanding: Some investigations of comprehension and recall. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 11:717–26. [rNC]

Bregman, A. S. (1990) *Auditory scene analysis: The perceptual organization of sound*. MIT Press. [aMHC, rNC]

Brennan, S. E. & Schober, M. F. (2001) How listeners compensate for disfluencies in spontaneous speech. *Journal of Memory and Language* 44(2):274–96. [PGTH]

Brentari, D. (1998) *A prosodic model of sign language phonology*. The MIT Press. [KE]

Brinton, B., Fujiki, M., Loeb, D. F. & Winkler, E. (1986) Development of conversational repair strategies in response to requests for clarification. *Journal of Speech, Language, and Hearing Research* 29(1):75–81. [GB]

Broadbent, D. (1958) *Perception and communication*. Pergamon Press. [aMHC]

Brodsky, P., Waterfall, H. & Edelman, S. (2007) Characterizing motherese: On the computational structure of child-directed language. In: *Proceedings of the 29th Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society*, August 2007, pp. 833–38, ed. D. S. McNamara & J. G. Trafton. Cognitive Science Society. [rNC]

Brown, G. D. A., Neath, I. & Chater, N. (2007) A temporal ratio model of memory. *Psychological Review* 114:539–76. [aMHC, rNC]

Brown, M., Dilley, L. C. & Tanenhaus, M. K. (2014) Probabilistic prosody: Effects of relative speech rate on perception of (a) word(s) several syllables earlier. In: *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Speech Prosody, Dublin, Ireland, May 20–23, 2014*, ed. N. Campbell, D. Gibbon & D. Hirst. pp. 1154–58. Dublin. [KB]

Brown-Schmidt, S. & Konopka, A. E. (2011) Experimental approaches to referential domains and the on-line processing of referring expressions in unscripted conversation. *Information* 2:302–26. [aMHC]

Brown-Schmidt, S. & Konopka, A. (2015) Processes of incremental message planning during conversation. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review* 22:833–43. [aMHC]

Brown-Schmidt, S. & Tanenhaus, M. K. (2008) Real-time investigation of referential domains in unscripted conversation: A targeted language game approach. *Cognitive Science* 32:643–84. [aMHC]

Bubic, A., von Cramon, D. Y. & Schubotz, R. I. (2010) Prediction, cognition and the brain. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience* 4(25):1–15. [SW]

Buonomano, D. V. & Maass, W. (2009) State-dependent computations: Spatiotemporal processing in cortical networks. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 10:113–25. [SLF]

Burgess, N. & Hitch, G. J. (1999) Memory for serial order: A network model of the phonological loop and its timing. *Psychological Review* 106:551. [rNC]

Burghardt, G. M. (1970) Defining "communication." In: *Communication by chemical signals*, ed. J. W. Johnston Jr., D. G. Moulton & A. Turk, pp. 5–18. Appleton-Century-Crofts. [AL]

Bybee, J. (2002) Word frequency and context of use in the lexical diffusion of phonetically conditioned sound change. *Language Variation and Change* 14:261–90. [aMHC]

Bybee, J. (2006) From usage to grammar: The mind's response to repetition. *Language* 82:711–33. [aMHC]

Bybee, J. (2007) *Frequency of use and the organization of language*. Oxford University Press. [aMHC, DPM]

Bybee, J. (2009) Language universals and usage-based theory. In: *Language universals*, ed. M. H. Christiansen, C. Collins & S. Edelman, pp. 17–39. Oxford University Press. [aMHC]

Bybee, J. & Hopper, P., eds. (2001) *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure*. John Benjamins. [aMHC]

Bybee, J. & McClelland, J. L. (2005) Alternatives to the combinatorial paradigm of linguistic theory based on general principles of human cognition. *The Linguistic Review* 22:381–410. [aMHC]

Bybee, J., Perkins, R. D. & Pagliuca, W. (1994) *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*. University of Chicago Press. [aMHC]

Bybee, J. & Scheibman, J. (1999) The effect of usage on degrees of constituency: The reduction of don't in English. *Linguistics* 37:575–96. [aMHC, rNC]

Bybee, J. L. & Slobin, D. I. (1982) Rules and schemas in the development and use of the English past tense. *Language* 58:265–89. [aMHC]

Campbell, L. (2000) What's wrong with grammaticalization? *Language Sciences* 23:113–61. [aMHC]

Cann, R. & Kempson, R. (2008) Production pressures, syntactic change and the emergence of clitic pronouns. In: *Language in flux: Dialogue coordination, language variation, change and evolution*, ed. R. Cooper & R. Kempson, pp. 221–63. College Publications. [aMHC]

Cann, R., Kempson, R. & Marten, L. (2005) *The dynamics of language: An introduction*. Elsevier (now published by Emerald Insight Publishers). [RK]

Cann, R., Kempson, R. & Wedgwood, D. (2012) Representationalism and linguistic knowledge. In: *Philosophy of linguistics*, ed. R. Kempson, T. Fernando & N. Asher, pp. 357–402. Elsevier. [aMHC]

Cann, R., Purver, M. & Kempson, R. (2007) Context and wellformedness: The dynamics of ellipsis. *Research on Language and Computation* 5:333–58. [RK]

Carey, S. & Bartlett, E. (1978) Acquiring a single word. *Papers and Reports on Child Language Development* 15:17–29. [ADE]

Carney, A. E., Widin, G. P. & Viemeister, N. F. (1977) Noncategorical perception of stop consonants differing in VOT. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 62:961–70. [KB]

Carr, M. F., Jadhav, S. P. & Frank, L. M. (2011) Hippocampal replay in the awake state: A potential substrate for memory consolidation and retrieval. *Nature Neuroscience* 14:147–53. [aMHC]

Carstairs-McCarthy, A. (1992) *Current morphology*. Routledge. [aMHC]

Carstensen, A., Xu, J., Smith, C. & Regier, T. (2015) Language evolution in the lab tends toward informative communication. In: *Proceedings of the 37th Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society, Austin, TX, July 2015*, ed. D. C. Noelle, R. Dale, A. S. Warlaumont, J. Yoshimi, T. Matlock, C. D. Jennings & P. P. Maglio, pp. 303–308. Cognitive Science Society. [MLL]

Catani, M., Jones, D. K. & ffytche, D. H. (2005) Perisylvian language networks of the human brain. *Annals of Neurology* 57(1):8–16. [GB]

Cattell, J. M. (1886) The time it takes to see and name objects. *Mind* 11:63–65. [MCM]

Chacón, D., Imtiaz, M., Dasgupta, S., Murshed, S., Dan, M. & Phillips, C. (submitted) Locality in the processing of filler-gap dependencies in Bangla. [DAC]

Chang, F., Dell, G. S. & Bock, K. (2006) Becoming syntactic. *Psychological Review* 113:234–72. [aMHC]

Chater, N. & Christiansen, M. H. (2010) Language acquisition meets language evolution. *Cognitive Science* 34:1131–57. [AL, rNC]

Chater, N., Crocker, M. J. & Pickering, M. J. (1998) The rational analysis of inquiry: The case of parsing. In: *Rational models of cognition*, ed. M. Oaksford & N. Chater, pp. 441–68. Oxford University Press. [aMHC]

Chater, N., McCauley, S. M. & Christiansen, M. H. (2106) Language as skill: Intertwining comprehension and production. *Journal of Memory and Language* 89:244–54. [aMHC, rNC]

Chater, N., Reali, F. & Christiansen, M. H. (2009) Restrictions on biological adaptation in language evolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 106:1015–20. [rNC]

Chater, N., Tenenbaum, J. B. & Yuille, A. (2006) Probabilistic models of cognition: Conceptual foundations. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 10:287–91. [aMHC]

Chatzikyriakids, S. & Kempson, R. (2011) Standard modern and Pontic Greek person restrictions: Feature-free dynamic account. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 10:127–66. Available at: http://www.kcl.ac.uk/innovation/groups/ds/publications/assets/chatzikyriakidis-kempson-jgl-draft.pdf. [RK]

Chen, D. & Manning, C. D. (2014) A fast and accurate dependency parser using neural networks. In: *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods on Natural Language Processing, Doha, Qatar, October 25–29, 2014*, ed. A. Moschitti, B. Pang & W. Daelemans, pp. 740–50. Association for Computational Linguistics. [CG-R]

Cherry, E. C. (1953) Some experiments on the recognition of speech with one and with two ears. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 25:975–79. [aMHC]

Choi, J. D. & McCallum, A. (2013) Transition-based dependency parsing with selectional branching. In: *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), Sofia, Bulgaria, August 4–9, 2013*, ed. P. Fung & M. Poesio, pp. 1052–62. Association for Computational Linguistics. [CG-R]

Chomsky, N. (1957) *Syntactic structures*. Mouton. [aMHC, rNC]

Chomsky, N. (1965) *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. MIT Press. [aMHC]

Chomsky, N. (1975) *Reflections on language*. Pantheon Books. [CB]

Chomsky, N. (1980) The linguistic approach. In: *Language and learning*, ed. M. Piattelli-Palmerini, pp. 107–30. Harvard University Press. [CB]

Chomsky, N. (1981) *Lectures on government and binding*. Mouton de Gruyter. [aMHC]

Chomsky, N. (1986) *Knowledge of language*. Praeger Publishing. [CB]

Chomsky, N. (2000) *The architecture of language*. Oxford University Press. [CB]

Chomsky, N. (2002) *On nature and language*. Cambridge University Press. [CB]

Chomsky, N. (2010) Some simple evo-devo theses: How true might they be for language? In: *Approaches to the evolution of language*, ed. R. K. Larson, V. M. Deprez & H. Yamakido. Cambridge University Press. [rNC]

Chomsky, N. (2012) *Noam Chomsky, the science of language – interviews with James McGilvray*. Cambridge University Press. [CB]

Christiansen, M. H. & Chater, N. (1999) Toward a connectionist model of recursion in human linguistic performance. *Cognitive Science* 23:157–205. [aMHC, SLF]

Christiansen, M. H. & Chater, N. (2008) Language as shaped by the brain. *Behavioral & Brain Sciences* 31(05):489–58. [aMHC, ADE, DPM, rNC]

Christiansen, M. H. & Chater, N. (2015) The language faculty that wasn't: A usage-based account of natural language recursion. *Frontiers in Psychology* 6:1182. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01182. [rNC]

Christiansen, M. H. & Chater, N. (2016) *Creating language: Integrating evolution, acquisition, and processing*. MIT Press. [rNC]

Christiansen, M. H. & MacDonald, M. C. (2009) A usage-based approach to recursion in sentence processing. *Language Learning* 59(Suppl. 1):126–61. [aMHC, rNC]

Christianson, K. & Ferreira, F. (2005) Conceptual accessibility and sentence production in a free word order language (Odawa). *Cognition* 98:105–35. [DAC]

Christianson, K., Hollingworth, A., Halliwell, J. F. & Ferreira, F. (2001) Thematic-roles assigned along the garden path linger. *Cognitive Psychology* 42:368–407. [FF, rNC]

Christianson, K. & Luke, S. G. (2011) Context strengthens initial misinterpretations of text. *Scientific Studies of Reading* 15:136–66. [FF]

Christianson, K., Williams, C. C., Zacks, R. T. & Ferreira, F. (2006) Misinterpretations of garden-path sentences by older and younger adults. *Discourse Processes* 42:205–38. [FF]

Chun, M. M. & Potter, M. C. (1995) A two-stage model for multiple target detection in rapid serial visual presentation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance* 21:109–27. [MCP]

Cinque, G. (1996) The 'antisymmetric' program: Theoretical and typological implications. *Journal of Linguistics* 32(2):447–64. [DPM]

Cinque, G. (1999) *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford University Press. [DPM]

Cinque, G. (2005) Deriving Greenberg's universal 20 and its exceptions. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36(3):315–32. [DPM]

Cinque, G. (2013) Cognition, universal grammar, and typological generalizations. *Lingua* 130:50–65. doi: 10.1016/j.lingua.2012.10.007. [DPM]

Cisek, P. & Kalaska, J. F. (2001) Common codes for situated interaction. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 24:883–84. [AB]

Clark, A. (2013) Whatever next? Predictive brains, situated agents, and the future of cognitive science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 36(3):181–253. [aMHC, SW]

Clark, H. H. (1975) Bridging. In: *Proceedings of the 1975 Workshop on Theoretical Issues in Natural Language Processing, Cambridge, MA, June 1975*, ed. B. L. Nash-Webber & R. Shank, pp. 169–74. Association for Computational Linguistics. [rNC]

Clark, H. H. (1996) *Using language*. Cambridge University Press. [aMHC, GB, MLL]

Clark, J., Yallop, C. & Fletcher, J. (2007) *An introduction to phonetics and phonology, third edition*. Wiley-Blackwell. [aMHC]

Clément, S., Demany, L. & Semal, C. (1999) Memory for pitch versus memory for loudness. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 106:2805–11. [aMHC]

Cohen, M. A. & Grossberg, S. (1986) Neural dynamics of speech and language coding: Developmental programs, perceptual grouping, and competition for short-term memory. *Human Neurobiology* 5:1–22. [SG]

Colman, M. & Healey, P. G. T. (2011) The distribution of repair in dialogue. In: *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society, Boston, MA, July 2011*, ed. L. Carlson & T. F. Shipley, pp. 1563–68. [PGTH]

Coltheart, M. (1980) Iconic memory and visible persistence. *Perception & Psychophysics* 27:183–228. [aMHC]

Connine, C. M., Blasko, D. G. & Hall, M. (1991) Effects of subsequent sentence context in auditory word recognition: Temporal and linguistic constraints. *Journal of Memory and Language* 30:234–50. [KB, rNC]

Conway, C. & Christiansen, M. H. (2005) Modality constrained statistical learning of tactile, visual, and auditory sequences. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 31:24–39. [rNC]

Conway, C. M. & Christiansen, M. H. (2009) Seeing and hearing in space and time: Effects of modality and presentation rate on implicit statistical learning. *European Journal of Cognitive Psychology* 21:561–80. [rNC]

Cooper, R. P. & Shallice, T. (2006) Hierarchical schemas and goals in the control of sequential behavior. *Psychological Review* 113:887–916. [aMHC]

Corballis, M. C. (2009) Mental time travel and the shaping of language. *Experimental Brain Research* 192:553–60. [AB]

Courtney, E. H. & Saville-Troike, M. (2002) Learning to construct verbs in Navajo and Quechua. *Journal of Child Language* 29:623–54. [UL]

Cover, T. M. & Thomas, J. A. (2006) *Elements of information theory, second edition*. Wiley. [rNC]

Cowan, N. (2000) The magical number 4 in short-term memory: A reconsideration of mental storage capacity. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 24:87–185. [aMHC, KE, rNC]

Crain, S. (1991) Language acquisition in the absence of experience. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 14:597–50. [DPM]

Crain, S. & Nakayama, M. (1987) Structure dependence in grammar formation. *Language* 63:522–43. [rNC]

Crain, S., Thornton, R. & Khlentzos, D. (2009) The case of the missing generalizations. *Cognitive Linguistics* 20(1):145–55. [DPM]

Crick, F. & Mitchison, G. (1983) The function of dream sleep. *Nature* 304:111–14. [aMHC]

Croft, W. (2001) *Radical construction grammar*. Oxford University Press. [aMHC]

Crowder, R. G. (1993) Systems and principles in memory theory: Another critique of pure memory. In: *Theories of memory*, ed. A. Collins, S. Gathercole, M. Conway & P. Morris. Erlbaum. [rNC]

Crowder, R. G. & Neath, I. (1991) The microscope metaphor in human memory. In: *Relating theory and data: Essays on human memory in honour of Bennet B. Murdock, Jr.*, ed. W. E. Hockley & S. Lewandowsky. Erlbaum. [aMHC]

Cui, J., Gao, D., Chen, Y., Zou, X. & Wang, Y. (2010) Working memory in early-school-age children with Asperger's syndrome. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders* 40:958–67. [AL]

Culbertson, J. & Adger, D. (2014) Language learners privilege structured meaning over surface frequency. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111 (16):5842–47. [DPM]

Culbertson, J. & Newport, E. L. (2015) Harmonic biases in child learners: In support of language universals. *Cognition* 139:71–82. [MLL]

Culbertson, J., Smolensky, P. & Legendre, G. (2012) Learning biases predict a word order universal. *Cognition* 122(3):306–29. [MLL, DPM]

Culicover, P. W. (1999) *Syntactic nuts: Hard cases, syntactic theory, and language acquisition*. Oxford University Press. [aMHC]

Culicover, P. W. (2013) The role of linear order in the computation of referential dependencies. *Lingua* 136:125–44. [aMHC]

Curtiss, S. (1977) *Genie: A psycholinguistic study of a modern-day "wild child."* Academic Press. [RM]

Cutler, A., ed. (1982) *Slips of the tongue and language production*. De Gruyter Mouton. [aMHC]

Cutler, A., Hawkins, J. A. & Gilligan, G. (1985) The suffixing preference: A processing explanation. *Linguistics* 23:723–58. [KE]

Dahan, D. (2010) The time course of interpretation in speech comprehension. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 19:121–26. [aMHC]

Dahl, Ö. (2004) *The growth and maintenance of linguistic complexity*. Benjamins. [TB]

Dale, R. & Lupyan, G. (2012) Understanding the origins of morphological diversity: The linguistic niche hypothesis. *Advances in Complex Systems* 15(3–4):1–16. Available at: http://doi.org/10.1142/S0219525911500172. [TB]

Darwin, C. (1871) *The descent of man, and selection in relation to sex, vol. 1*. John Murray. [rNC]

Davenport, J. L. & Potter, M. C. (2004) Scene consistency in object and background perception. *Psychological Science* 15:559–64. [MCP]

Davenport, J. L. & Potter, M. C. (2005) The locus of semantic priming in RSVP target search. *Memory and Cognition* 33:241–48. [MCP]

Dawkins, R. (1986) *The blind watchmaker: Why the evidence of evolution reveals a universe without design*. Norton. [rNC]

de Vries, M. H., Christiansen, M. H. & Petersson, K. M. (2011) Learning recursion: Multiple nested and crossed dependencies. *Biolinguistics* 5:10–35. [aMHC]

de Vries, M. H., Geukes, S., Zwitserlood, P., Petersson, K. M. & Christiansen, M. H. (2012) Processing multiple non-adjacent dependencies: Evidence from sequence learning. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 367:2065–76. [rNC]

Dediu, D., Cysouw, M., Levinson, S. C., Baronchelli, A., Christiansen, M. H., Croft, W., Evans, N., Garrod, S., Gray, R., Kandler, A. & Lieven, E. (2013) Cultural evolution of language. In: *Cultural evolution: Society, technology, language and religion*, ed. P. J. Richerson & M. H. Christiansen, pp. 303–32. MIT Press. [aMHC]

Dehaene, S. (2009) *Reading in the brain: The new science of how we read*. Viking. [GB]

Dehaene-Lambertz, G., Dehaene, S., Anton, J. L., Campagne, A., Ciuciu, P., Dehaene, G. P., Denghien, I., Jobert, A., Lebihan, D., Sigman, M., Pallier, C. & Poline, J.-P. (2006a) Functional segregation of cortical language areas by sentence repetition. *Human Brain Mapping* 27:360–71. [aMHC]

Dehaene-Lambertz, G., Hertz-Pannier, L., Dubois, J., Meriaux, S., Roche, A., Sigman, M. & Dehaene, S. (2006b) Functional organization of perisylvian activation during presentation of sentences in preverbal infants. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 103:14240–45. [aMHC]

Dell, G. S., Burger, L. K. & Svec, W. R. (1997) Language production and serial order: A functional analysis and a model. *Psychological Review* 104:123–47. [aMHC]

Dell, G. S. & Chang, F. (2014) The P-chain: Relating sentence production and its disorders to comprehension and acquisition. *Philosophical Transactions* *of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 369(1634):20120394. [aMHC]

DeLong, K. A., Urbach, T. P. & Kutas, M. (2005) Probabilistic word pre-activation during language comprehension inferred from electrical brain activity. *Nature Neuroscience* 8:1117–21. [aMHC]

Dikker, S., Rabagliati, H., Farmer, T. A. & Pylkkänen, L. (2010) Early occipital sensitivity to syntactic category is based on form typicality. *Psychological Science* 21:629–34. [aMHC]

Dillon, B., Mishler, A., Sloggett, S. & Phillips, C. (2013) Contrasting intrusion profiles for agreement and anaphora: Experimental and modeling evidence. *Journal of Memory and Language* 69:85–103. [DAC]

Ding, N., Melloni, L., Zhang, H., Tian, X. & Poeppel, D. (2016) Cortical tracking of hierarchical linguistic structures in connected speech. *Nature Neuroscience* 19:159–64. [GB]

Dixon, R. & Aikhenvald, A. (2002) Word: A typological framework. In: *Word: A cross-linguistic typology*, ed. R. M. W. Dixon & A. Y. Aikhenvald, pp. 1–41. Cambridge University Press. [SCL]

Dominey, P. F., Hoen, M., Blanc, J.-M. & Lelekov-Boissard, T. (2003) Neurological basis of language and sequential cognition: Evidence from simulation, aphasia and ERP studies. *Brain and Language* 86:207–25. [SLF]

Dumitru, M. L. (2014) Moving stimuli guide retrieval and (in)validation of coordination simulations. *Cognitive Processing* 15(3):397–403. [MLD]

Dumitru, M. L., Joergensen, G. H., Cruickshank, A. G. & Altmann, G. T. M. (2013) Language-guided visual processing affects reasoning: The role of referential and spatial anchoring. *Consciousness and Cognition* 22(2):562–71. [MLD]

Dumitru, M. L. & Taylor, A. J. (2014) *Or* cues knowledge of alternatives: Evidence from priming. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology* 55(2):97–101. [MLD]

Dunn, M., Greenhill, S. J., Levinson, S. C. & Gray, R. D. (2011) Evolved structure of language shows lineage-specific trends in word-order universals. *Nature* 473:79–82. [aMHC]

Durrant, P. (2013) Formulaicity in an agglutinating language: The case of Turkish. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* 9:1–38. [aMHC]

Dryer, M. (1992) The Greenbergian word order correlations. *Language* 68:81–138. [DPM]

Dryer, M. S. (2009) The branching direction theory of word order correlations revisited. In: *Universals of language today*, ed. S. Scalise, E. Magni & A. Bisetto, pp. 185–207. Springer Netherlands. [DPM]

Dyer, C., Ballesteros, M., Ling, W., Matthews, A. & Smith, N. (2015) Transition-based dependency parsing with stack long short-term memory. In: *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), Beijing, China, July 26–31, 2015*, ed. C. Zong & M. Strube, pp. 334–43. Association for Computational Linguistics. [CG-R]

Edelman, S. (2008a) *Computing the mind: How the mind really works*. Oxford University Press. [AL]

Edelman, S. (2008b) On the nature of minds, or: Truth and consequences. *Journal of Experimental and Theoretical AI* 20:181–96. [AL]

Edelman, S. (2015) The minority report: Some common assumptions to reconsider in the modeling of the brain and behavior. *Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Artificial Intelligence* 27, doi 10.1080/0952813X.2015.1042534. [AL]

Eggermont, J. (2001) Between sound and perception: Reviewing the search for a neural code. *Hearing Research* 157(1): 1–42. [CRH]

Eldredge, N. & S. J. Gould (1972) Punctuated equilibria: An alternative to phyletic gradualism. In: *Models in paleobiology*, ed. T. J. M. Schopf, pp. 82–115. Freeman Cooper. [rNC]

Elliott, L. L. (1962) Backward and forward masking of probe tones of different frequencies. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 34:1116–17. [aMHC, CJH]

Ellis, N. C. (2002) Frequency effects in language processing. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 24:143–88. [aMHC]

Elman, J. L. (1990) Finding structure in time. *Cognitive Science* 14(2):179–211. [aMHC, ADE, rNC]

Emmorey, K. (1995) Processing the dynamic visual-spatial morphology of signed languages. In: *Morphological aspects of language processing: Cross-linguistic perspectives*, ed. L. M. Feldman, pp. 29–54. Erlbaum. [KE]

Emmorey, K., Bosworth, R. & Kraljic, T. (2009) Visual feedback and self-monitoring of sign language. *Journal of Memory and Language* 61:398–11. [KE]

Endress, A. D. & Potter, M. C. (2014a) Large capacity temporary visual memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*. 143(1):548–65. doi: 10.1037/a0033934. [MCP, rNC]

Endress, A. D. & Potter, M. C. (2014b) Something from (almost) nothing: Buildup of object memory from forgettable single fixations. *Attention, Perception, and Psychophysics* 76:2413–23. [ADE]

Enfield, N. J. (2013) *Relationship thinking: Enchrony, agency, and human sociality*. Oxford University Press. [aMHC]

Engelmann, F. & Vasishth, S. (2009) Processing grammatical and ungrammatical center embeddings in English and German: A computational model. In: *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Cognitive Modeling, Manchester, UK, July 2009*, pp. 240–45. ed. A. Howes, D. Peebles & R. Cooper. [rNC]

Erickson, T. A. & Matteson, M. E. (1981) From words to meaning: A semantic illusion. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 20:540–52. [aMHC]

Ericsson, K. A., Chase, W. G. & Faloon, S. (1980) Acquisition of a memory skill. *Science* 208:1181–82. [aMHC, MLD, rNC]

Eshghi, A., Hough, J. & Purver, M. (2013) Incremental grammar induction from child-directed dialogue utterances. In: *Proceedings of the 4th Annual ACL Workshop on Cognitive Modeling and Computational Linguistics (CMCL)*, Sofia, Bulgaria, August 8 2013, pp. 94–103, ed. V. Demberg & R. Levy. Association for Computational Linguistics. [PGTH]

Eshghi, A., Howes, C., Gregoromichelaki, E., Hough, J. & Purver, M. (2015) Feedback in conversation as incremental semantic update. In: *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Computational Semantics (IWCS)*, London, UK, April 15–17 2015, pp. 261–71, ed. M. Purver, M. Sadrzadeh & M. Stone. Association for Computational Linguistics. [PGTH]

Evans, N. & Levinson, S. (2009) The myth of language universals: Language diversity and its importance for cognitive science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 32:429–92. [aMHC, ADE, rNC]

Falconer, D. S. (1981) *Introduction to quantitative genetics*. Longman. [AL]

Farmer, T. A., Christiansen, M. H. & Monaghan, P. (2006) Phonological typicality influences on-line sentence comprehension. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 103:12203–208. [aMHC]

Farmer, T. A., Monaghan, P., Misyak, J. B. & Christiansen, M. H. (2011) Phonological typicality influences sentence processing in predictive contexts: A reply to Staub et al. (2009) *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 37:1318–25. [aMHC]

Federmeier, K. D. (2007) Thinking ahead: The role and roots of prediction in language comprehension. *Psychophysiology* 44:491–505. [aMHC]

Fedzechkina, M., Jaeger, T. F. & Newport, E. L. (2012) Language learners restructure their input to facilitate efficient communication. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 109:17897–17902. [MLL]

Feldman, N. H., Griffiths, T. L. & Morgan, J. L. (2009) The influence of categories on perception: Explaining the perceptual magnet effect as optimal statistical inference. *Psychological Review* 116:752–82. [KB]

Ferreira, F. (1993) Creation of prosody during sentence production. *Psychological Review* 100:233. [rNC]

Ferreira, F. (2003) The misinterpretation of noncanonical sentences. *Cognitive Psychology* 47(2):164–203. [FF, rNC]

Ferreira, F., Bailey, K. G. & Ferraro, V. (2002) Good-enough representations in language comprehension. *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 11(1):11–15. [aMHC, FF, rNC]

Ferreira, F. & Swets, B. (2002) How incremental is language production? Evidence from the production of utterances requiring the computation of arithmetic sums. *Journal of Memory and Language* 46(1):57–84. [DAC, FF, MCM, rNC]

Ferreira, V. (2008) Ambiguity, accessibility, and a division of labor for communicative success. *Psychology of Learning and Motivation* 49:209–46. [aMHC]

Ferrer i Cancho, R. (2004) The Euclidean distance between syntactically linked words. *Physical Review E* 70:056135. [aMHC]

Ferrer i Cancho, R. & Liu, H. (2014) The risks of mixing dependency lengths from sequences of different length. *Glottotheory* 5:143–55. [aMHC]

Fine, A. B., Jaeger, T. F., Farmer, T. A. & Qian, T. (2013) Rapid expectation adaptation during syntactic comprehension. *PLOS ONE* 8(10):e77661. [aMHC]

Fiske, S. T. & Taylor, S. E. (1984) *Social cognition*. Addison-Wesley. [aMHC]

Fitneva, S. A., Christiansen, M. H. & Monaghan, P. (2009) From sound to syntax: Phonological constraints on children's lexical categorization of new words. *Journal of Child Language* 36:967–97. [aMHC]

Fitz, H. (2011) A liquid-state model of variability effects in learning nonadjacent dependencies. In: *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society, Boston, MA, July 2011*, ed. L. Carlson, C. Hölscher & T. Shipley, pp. 897–902. Cognitive Science Society. [SLF, rNC]

Flanagan, J. R. & Wing, A. M. (1997) The role of internal models in motor planning and control: Evidence from grip force adjustments during movements of hand-held loads. *Journal of Neuroscience* 17:1519–28. [aMHC]

Fleischman, S. (1982) *The future in thought and language: Diachronic evidence from Romance*. Cambridge University Press. [aMHC]

Fodor, J. D. (1998) Unambiguous triggers. *Linguistic Inquiry* 29:1–36. [aMHC]

Ford, M., Bresnan, J. W. & Kaplan, R. M. (1982) A competence-based theory of syntactic closure. In: *The mental representation of grammatical relations*, ed. J. W. Bresnan, pp. 727–96. MIT Press. [aMHC]

Forster, K. I. (1970) Visual perception of rapidly presented word sequences of varying complexity. *Perception & Psychophysics* 8:215–21. [MCP]

Forster, K. I. & Davis, C. (1984) Repetition priming and frequency attenuation in lexical access. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 10:680–698. [MCP]

Franck, J., Soare, G., Frauenfelder, U. H. & Rizzi, L. (2010) Object interference: The role of intermediate traces of movement. *Journal of Memory and Language* 62:166–82. [DAC]

Frank, M., Goldwater, S., Griffiths, T. & Tenenbaum, J. (2010) Modeling human performance in statistical word segmentation. *Cognition* 117:107–25. [ADE]

Frank, M. C. & Goodman, N. (2012) Predicting pragmatic reasoning in language games. *Science* 336:998–98. [MLL]

Frank, M. C. & Goodman, N. D. (2014) Inferring word meanings by assuming that speakers are informative. *Cognitive Psychology* 75:90–96. [MLL]

Frank, M. C., Goodman, N. D. & Tenenbaum, J. B. (2009) Using speakers' referential intentions to model early cross-situational word learning. *Psychological Science* 20:579–85. [MLL]

Frank, S. L. & Bod, R. (2011) Insensitivity of the human sentence-processing system to hierarchical structure. *Psychological Science* 22:829–34. [SLF, rNC]

Frank, S. L., Bod, R. & Christiansen, M. H. (2012) How hierarchical is language use? *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 279:4522–31. [aMHC]

Frank, S. L., Trompenaars, T. & Vasishth, S. (2016) Cross-linguistic differences in processing double-embedded relative clauses: Working-memory constraints or language statistics? *Cognitive Science*. 40:554–78. [rNC]

Frazier, L. & Fodor, J. D. (1978) The sausage machine: A new two-stage parsing model. *Cognition* 6:291–25. [aMHC, DAC, rNC]

Frazier, L. & Rayner, K. (1982) Making and correcting errors during sentence comprehension: Eye movements in the analysis of structurally ambiguous sentences. *Cognitive Psychology* 14(2):178–10. [FF]

French, R. M. (1999) Catastrophic forgetting in connectionist networks. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 3:128–35. [aMHC, rNC]

Frost, R., Armstrong, B. C., Siegelman, N. & Christiansen, M. H. (2015) Domain generality versus modality specificity: The paradox of statistical learning. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 19:117–25. [rNC]

Fuster, J. & Alexander, G. (1971) Neuron activity related to short-term memory. *Science* 173:652–54. [CRH]

Fuster, J. M. (1995) Temporal processing. *Annals of the New York Academy of Science* 769:173–82. [GB]

Fuster, J. M. (1997) Network memory. *Trends in Neuroscience* 20:451–59. [CJH]

Gahl, S. & Garnsey, S. M. (2004) Knowledge of grammar, knowledge of usage: Syntactic probabilities affect pronunciation variation. *Language* 80:748–75. [aMHC]

Gallace, A., Tan, H. Z. & Spence, C. (2006) The failure to detect tactile change: A tactile analogue of visual change blindness. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review* 13:300–303. [aMHC]

Gärdenfors, P. (2004) Cooperation and the evolution of symbolic communication. In: *Evolution of communication systems*, ed. D. K. Oller & U. Griebel, pp. 237–56. MIT Press. [AB]

Gärdenfors, P. & Rott, H. (1995) Belief revision. In: *Handbook of logic in artificial intelligence and logic programming, vol. 4*, ed. D. Gabbay, pp. 35–132. Oxford University Press. [rNC]

Garnham, A. & Oakhill, J. (1985) On-line resolution of anaphoric pronouns: Effects of inference making and verb semantics. *British Journal of Psychology* 76:385–93. [rNC]

Garrett, M. F. (1980) Levels of processing in sentence production. In: *Language production: Vol. 1. Speech and talk*, ed. B. Butterworth. pp. 177–221. Academic Press. [DAC, rNC]

Gee, J. & Grosjean, F. (1983) Performance structures: A psycholinguistics and linguistic appraisal. *Cognitive Psychology* 15:411–58. [MLD]

Gerstner, W., Kistler, W. M., Naud, R. & Paninski, L. (2014) *Neuronal dynamics: From single neurons to networks and models of cognition*. Cambridge University Press. [SLF]

Gertner, Y. & Fisher, C. (2012) Predicted errors in children's early sentence comprehension. *Cognition* 124:85–94. [rNC]

Gibson, E. (1998) Linguistic complexity: Locality of syntactic dependencies. *Cognition* 68:1–76. [aMHC]

Gibson, E., Bergen, L. & Piantadosi, S. T. (2013) Rational integration of noisy evidence and prior semantic expectations in sentence interpretation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110:8051–56. [aMHC]

Gibson, E. & Thomas, J. (1999) Memory limitations and structural forgetting: The perception of complex ungrammatical sentences as grammatical. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 14:225–48. [rNC]

Gibson, E. & Wexler, K. (1994) Triggers. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25:407–54. [aMHC, rNC]

Gil, D. (2009) How much grammar does it take to sail a boat? In: Language complexity as an evolving variable, ed. G. Sampson, D. Gil & P. Trudgill, pp. 19–33. Oxford University Press. [CB]

Gilbreth, F. B. & Gilbreth, L. M. (1919) *Applied motion study*. Macmillan. [RM]

Gildea, D. & Temperley, D. (2010) Do grammars minimize dependency length? *Cognitive Science* 34:286–310. [aMHC]

Gimenes, M., Rigalleau, F. & Gaonac'h, D. (2009) When a missing verb makes a French sentence more acceptable. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 24:440–49. [rNC]

Giraud, A. L., Kleinschmidt, A., Poeppel, D., Lund, T. E., Frackowiak, R. S. J. & Laufs, H. (2007) Endogenous cortical rhythms determine cerebral specialization for speech perception and production. *Neuron* 56(6):1127–34. [GB]

Giraud, A. L. & Poeppel, D. (2012) Cortical oscillations and speech processing: Emerging computational principles and operations. *Nature Neuroscience* 15(4):511–17. [GB]

Givón, T. (1971) Historical syntax and synchronic morphology: An archaeologist's field trip. *Chicago Linguistic Society* 7:394–415. [aMHC]

Givón, T. (1979) *On understanding grammar*. Academic Press. [aMHC]

Gobet, F., Lane, P. C. R., Croker, S., Cheng, P. C. H., Jones, G., Oliver, I. & Pine, J. M. (2001) Chunking mechanisms in human learning. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 5:236–43. [aMHC]

Gold, E. M. (1967) Language identification in the limit. *Information and Control* 10:447–74. [aMHC]

Goldberg, A. (2006) *Constructions at work*. Oxford University Press. [aMHC, rNC]

Goldinger, S. D. (1998) Echoes of echoes? An episodic theory of lexical access. *Psychological Review* 105:251–79. [aMHC]

Goldstein, M. H., Waterfall, H. R., Lotem, A., Halpern, J., Schwade, J., Onnis, L. & Edelman, S. (2010) General cognitive principles for learning structure in time and space. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 14:249–58. [AL]

Golinkoff, R. M. (1986) "I beg your pardon?": The preverbal negotiation of failed messages. *Journal of Child Language* 13(3):455–76. [GB]

Golinkoff, R. M., Hirsh-Pasek, K., Bloom, L., Smith, L., Woodward, A., Akhtar, N., Tomasello, M. & Hollich, G., eds. (2000) *Becoming a word learner: A debate on lexical acquisition*. Oxford University Press. [aMHC]

Gómez, R. L. (2002) Variability and detection of invariant structure. *Psychological Science* 13:431–36. [rNC]

Gómez-Rodríguez, C. & Nivre, J. (2013) Divisible transition systems and multiplanar dependency parsing. *Computational Linguistics* 39(4):799–45. [CG-R]

Gómez-Rodríguez, C., Sartorio, F. & Satta, G. (2014) A polynomial-time dynamic oracle for non-projective dependency parsing. In: *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods on Natural Language Processing, Doha, Qatar, October 25–29, 2014*, ed. A. Moschitti, B. Pang & W. Daelemans, pp. 917–27. Association for Computational Linguistics. [CG-R]

Goodman, N. D. & Stuhlmüller, A. (2013) Knowledge and implicature: Modeling language understanding as social cognition. *Topics in Cognitive Science* 5:173–84. [MLL]

Goodwin, C. (1979) The interactive construction of a sentence in natural conversation. In: *Everyday language: Studies in ethnomethodology*, ed. G. Psathas, pp. 97–121. Irvington Publishers. [PGTH]

Gordon, R. G. (2005) *Ethnologue: Languages of the world, 15th edition*. SIL International. [TB]

Gorrell, P. (1995) *Syntax and parsing*. Cambridge University Press. [aMHC]

Goswami, U. (2015) Sensory theories of developmental dyslexia: Three challenges for research. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 16:43–54. [GB]

Gould, S. J. & Vrba, E. S. (1982) Exaptation: A missing term in the science of form. *Paleobiology* 8:4–15. [AB]

Graesser, A. C., Singer, M. & Trabasso, T. (1994) Constructing inferences during narrative text comprehension. *Psychological Review* 101(3):371–95. [GB]

Grandin, T. (2005) *Animals in translation*. Scribner. [CB]

Graybiel, A. M. (1998) The basal ganglia and chunking of action repertoires. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory* 70:119–36. [aMHC]

Green, S. & Marler, P. (1979) The analysis of animal communication. In: *Handbook of behavioral neurobiology: Vol. 3. Social behavior and communication*, ed. P. Marler & J. G. Vandenbergh, pp. 73–158. Plenum Press. [AL]

Greenberg, J. (1963) Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In: *Universals of language*, ed. J. Greenberg, pp. 73–113. MIT Press. [DPM]

Greenwald, A. G. (1970) Sensory feedback mechanisms in performance control: With special reference to the ideo-motor mechanism. *Psychological Review* 77:73–99. [AB]

Greenwald, A. G. (1972) On doing two things at once: Time sharing as a function of ideomotor compatibility. *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 94:52–57. [AB]

Gregoromichelaki, E., Kempson, R., Howes, C. & Eshghi, A. (2013) On making syntax dynamic: The challenge of compound utterances and the architecture of the grammar. In: *Alignment in communication: Towards a new theory of communication*, ed. I. Wachsmuth, J. de Ruiter, P. Jaecks & S. Kopp, pp. 57–86. John Benjamins. [RK]

Gregoromichelaki, E., Kempson, R., Purver, M., Mills, G., Cann, R., Meyer-Viol, W. & Healey, P. (2011) Incrementality and intention-recognition in utterance processing. *Dialogue and Discourse* 2:199–33. Available at: http://dad.uni-bielefeld.de/index.php/dad/article/view/363/1460. [RK]

Gregory, R. L. (2005) The Medawar lecture 2001 knowledge for vision: Vision for knowledge. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 360:1231–51. [rNC]

Grice, H. P. (1967) *Logic and conversation*. William James Lectures. Manuscript, Harvard University. [aMHC]

Grice, H. P. (1975) Logic and conversation. In: *Syntax and Semantics*, ed. P. Cole & J. Morgan, pp. 41–58. Academic Press. [MLL]

Griffin, Z. M. & Bock, K. (2000) What the eyes say about speaking. *Psychological Science* 4:274–79. [SCL]

Griffiths, T. L. & Tenenbaum, J. B. (2009) Theory-based causal induction. *Psychological Review* 116:661–716. [aMHC]

Grosjean, F. (1985) The recognition of words after their acoustic offset: Evidence and implications. *Perception and Psychophysics* 38:299–10. [KB]

Grossberg, S. (1973) Contour enhancement, short-term memory, and constancies in reverberating neural networks. *Studies in Applied Mathematics* 52:213–57. [SG]

Grossberg, S. (1978a) A theory of human memory: Self-organization and performance of sensory- motor codes, maps, and plans. In: *Progress in theoretical biology, volume* 5, ed. R. Rosen & F. Snell, pp. 233–74. Academic Press. [SG]

Grossberg, S. (1978b) Behavioral contrast in short-term memory: Serial binary memory models or parallel continuous memory models? *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* 3:199–19. [SG]

Grossberg, S. (1986) The adaptive self-organization of serial order in behavior: Speech, language, and motor control. In: *Pattern recognition by humans and machines, vol. 1: Speech perception*, ed. E. C. Schwab & H. C. Nusbaum, pp. 187–94. Academic Press. [SG]

Grossberg, S. (2003) Resonant neural dynamics of speech perception. *Journal of Phonetics* 31:423–45. [SG]

Grossberg, S. (2013) Adaptive resonance theory: How a brain learns to consciously attend, learn, and recognize a changing world. *Neural Networks* 37:1–47. [SG]

Grossberg, S., Boardman, I. & Cohen, C. (1997) Neural dynamics of variable-rate speech categorization. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance* 23:418–503. [SG]

Grossberg, S. & Kazerounian, S. (2011) Laminar cortical dynamics of conscious speech perception: A neural model of phonemic restoration using subsequent context in noise. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 130:440–60. [SG]

Grossberg, S. & Myers, C. W. (2000) The resonant dynamics of speech perception: Interword integration and duration-dependent backward effects. *Psychological Review* 107:735–67. [SG]

Grossberg, S. & Pearson, L. (2008) Laminar cortical dynamics of cognitive and motor working memory, sequence learning and performance: Toward a unified theory of how the cerebral cortex works. *Psychological Review* 115:677–32. [SG]

Gualmini, A. & Crain, S. (2005) The structure of children's linguistic knowledge. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36(3):463–74. [DPM]

Gurevich, O., Johnson, M. A. & Goldberg, A. E. (2010) Incidental verbatim memory for language. *Language and Cognition* 2:45–78. [aMHC]

Haber, R. N. (1983) The impending demise of the icon: The role of iconic processes in information processing theories of perception. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 6:1–11. [aMHC]

Hagoort, P. (2009) Reflections on the neurobiology of syntax. In: *Biological foundations and origin of syntax. Strüngmann Forum Reports, volume 3*, ed. D. Bickerton & E. Szathmáry, pp. 279–96. MIT Press. [aMHC]

Hagstrom, P. & Rhee, R. (1997) The dependency locality theory in Korean. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 26:189–206. [rNC]

Hahn, U. & Nakisa, R. C. (2000) German inflection: Single route or dual route? *Cognitive Psychology* 41:313–60. [aMHC]

Hakes, D. T., Evans, J. S. & Brannon, L. L (1976) Understanding sentences with relative clauses. *Memory and Cognition* 4:283–90. [rNC]

Hale, J. (2001) A probabilistic Earley parser as a psycholinguistic model. *Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics, Pittsburgh, PA, June 2–7, 2001*, pp. 159–66. Association for Computational Linguistics. [aMHC]

Hale, J. (2006) Uncertainty about the rest of the sentence. *Cognitive Science* 30:609–42. [aMHC]

Hall, M. & Bavelier, D. (2009) Short-term memory stages in sign versus speech: The source of the serial span discrepancy. *Cognition* 120:54–66. [KE]

Hamilton, H. W. & Deese, J. (1971) Comprehensibility and subject-verb relations in complex sentences. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 10:163–70. [rNC]

Haspelmath, M. (1999) Why is grammaticalization irreversible? *Linguistics* 37:1043–68. [aMHC]

Hasson, U., Chen, J. & Honey, C. J. (2015) Hierarchical process memory: Memory as an integral component of information processing. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 19(6):304–13. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2015.04.006. [CJH, rNC]

Hasson, U., Yang, E., Vallines, I., Heeger, D. J. & Rubin, N. (2008) A hierarchy of temporal receptive windows in human cortex. *The Journal of Neuroscience* 28 (10):2539–50. [aMHC, CJH]

Hatori, J., Matsuzaki, T., Miyao, Y. & Tsujii, J. (2012) Incremental joint approach to word segmentation, POS tagging, and dependency parsing in Chinese. In: *Proceedings of the 50th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers), Jeju Island, Korea, July 8–14, 2012*, ed. H. Li, C-Y. Lin, M. Osborne, G. G. Lee & J. C. Park, pp. 1216–24. Association for Computational Linguistics. [CG-R]

Hauser, M. D., Chomsky, N. & Fitch, W. T. (2002) The faculty of language: What is it, who has it, and how did it evolve? *Science* 298:1569–79. [aMHC]

Hauser, M. D., Yang, C., Berwick, R. C., Tattersall, I., Ryan, M., Watumull, J., Chomsky, N. & Lewontin, R. (2014) The mystery of language evolution. *Frontiers of Psychology* 5:401. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00401. [CB]

Hawkins, J. A. (1983) *Word order universals.* Academic Press. [DPM]

Hawkins, J. A. (1990) A parsing theory of word order universals. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21:223–61. [DPM]

Hawkins, J. A. (2004) *Efficiency and complexity in grammars*. Oxford University Press. [aMHC, DPM, WO]

Hawkins, J. A. (2009) Language universals and the performance-grammar correspondence hypothesis. In: *Language universals*, ed. M. H. Christiansen, C. Collins & S. Edelman, pp. 54–78. Oxford University Press. [aMHC]

Hawkins, J. A. (2014) *Cross-linguistic variation and efficiency*. Oxford University Press. [WO]

Hay, J. (2000) Morphological adjacency constraints: A synthesis. *Proceedings of Student Conference in Linguistics 9. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 36:17–29. [aMHC]

Healey, P. G. T., Eshghi, A., Howes, C. & Purver, M. (2011) Making a contribution: Processing clarification requests in dialogue. In: *Proceedings of the 21st Annual Meeting of the Society for Text and Discourse*. Poitiers, France, July 11–13 2011, [PGTH]

Healey, P. G. T., Purver, M. & Howes, C. (2014) Divergence in dialogue. *PLOS ONE* 9(6):e98598. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0098598. [PGTH]

Heathcote, A., Brown, S. & Mewhort, D. J. K. (2000) The power law repealed: The case for an exponential law of practice. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review* 7:185–207. [aMHC]

Hebb, D. (1949) *The organization of behavior*. Wiley. [CRH]

Heider, P., Dery, J. & Roland, D. (2014) The processing of *it* object relative clauses: Evidence against a fine-grained frequency account. *Journal of Memory and Language* 75:58–76. [aMHC]

Heine, B. & Kuteva, T. (2002) *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge University Press. [aMHC]

Heine, B. & Kuteva, T. (2007) *The genesis of grammar*. Oxford University Press. [aMHC]

Hickok, G. & Poeppel, D. (2000) Towards a functional anatomy of speech perception. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 4:131–38. [SCL]

Hinaut, X. & Dominey, P. F. (2013) Real-time parallel processing of grammatical structure in the fronto-striatal system: A recurrent network simulation study using reservoir computing. *PLOS ONE* 8(2):e52946. [SLF]

Hinojosa, J. A., Moreno, E. M., Casado, P., Munõz, F. & Pozo, M. A. (2005) Syntactic expectancy: An event-related potentials study. *Neuroscience Letters* 378:34–39. [aMHC]

Hintzman, D. L. (1988) Judgments of frequency and recognition memory in a multiple-trace memory model. *Psychological Review* 95:528–51. [aMHC, rNC]

Hinton, G. E. & Sejnowski, T. J. (1986) *Learning and relearning in Boltzmann machines*. In: *Graphical models: Foundations of neural computation*, ed. M. J. Irwin & T. J. Sejnowski, pp. 45–76. MIT Press. [aMHC]

Hoey, M. (2005) *Lexical priming: A new theory of words and language*. Psychology Press. [aMHC]

Hofmeister, P. & Sag, I. A. (2010) Cognitive constraints and island effects. *Language* 86:366–415. [aMHC]

Holmes, V. M. (1988) Hesitations and sentence planning. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 3:323–61. [rNC]

Hommel, B., Müsseler, J., Aschersleben, G. & Prinz, W. (2001) The theory of event coding (TEC): A framework for perception and action planning. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 24:849–78. [AB]

Honey, C. J., Thesen, T., Donner, T. H., Silbert, L. J., Carlson, C. E., Devinsky, O., Doyle, W. K., Rubin, N., Heeger, D. J. & Hasson, U. (2012) Slow cortical dynamics and the accumulation of information over long timescales. *Neuron* 76(2):423–34. [aMHC, CJH]

Hoover, M. L. (1992) Sentence processing strategies in Spanish and English. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 21:275–99. [rNC]

Hopper, P. J. & Traugott, E. C. (1993) *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge University Press. [aMHC, rNC]

Horn, L. (1984) Toward a new taxonomy for pragmatic inference: Q-based and R-based implicature. In: *Meaning, form, and use in context*, ed. D. Schiffrin, pp. 11–42. Georgetown University Press. [MLL]

Horn, L. R. (1972) On the semantic properties of logical operators in English. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, UCLA. [MLL]

Horst, J. S. & Samuelson, L. K. (2008) Fast mapping but poor retention in 24-month-old infants. *Infancy* 13:128–57. [rNC]

Hough, J. & Purver, M. (2012) Processing self-repairs in an incremental type-theoretic dialogue system. In: *Proceedings of the 16th SemDial Workshop on the Semantics and Pragmatics of Dialogue (SeineDial),* Paris, France, September 19–21, 2012, pp. 136–44, ed. S. Brown-Schmidt, J. Ginzburg & S. Larsson. SemDial [PGTH]

Hough, J. & Purver, M. (2013) Modelling expectation in the self-repair processing of annotat-, um, listeners. In: *Proceedings of the 17th SemDial Workshop on the Semantics and Pragmatics of Dialogue (DialDam)*, Amsterdam, Netherlands, December 16–18, 2013, pp. 92–101, ed. R. Fernández & A. Isard. SemDial. [PGTH]

Howes, A., Lewis, R. L. & Vera, A. (2009) Rational adaptation under task and processing constraints: Implications for testing theories of cognition and action. *Psychological Review* 116:717–51. [KB]

Howes, C., Purver, M., McCabe, R., Healey, P. G. & Lavelle, M. (2012) Helping the medicine go down: Repair and adherence in patient-clinician dialogues. In: *Proceedings of the 16th SemDial Workshop on the Semantics and Pragmatics of Dialogue (SeineDial)*, Paris, France, September 19–21 2012, pp. 155–56, ed. S. Brown-Schmidt, J. Ginzburg & S. Larsson. SemDial. [PGTH]

Hruschka, D., Christiansen, M. H., Blythe, R. A., Croft, W., Heggarty, P., Mufwene, S. S., Pierrehumbert, J. H. & Poplack, S. (2009) Building social cognitive models of language change. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 13:464–69. [aMHC]

Hsiao, Y., Gao, Y. & MacDonald, M. C. (2014) Agent-patient similarity affects sentence structure in language production: Evidence from subject omissions in Mandarin. *Frontiers in Psychology* 5:1015. [MCM]

Hsu, A., Chater, N. & Vitányi, P. (2011) The probabilistic analysis of language acquisition: Theoretical, computational, and experimental analysis. *Cognition* 120:380–90. [aMHC]

Huang, C.-T. J. (1982) Logical relations in Chinese and the theory of grammar. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Departments of Linguistics and Philosophy, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. [ADE]

Hudson Kam, C. L. & Newport, E. L. (2005) Regularizing unpredictable variation: The roles of adult and child learners in language formation and change. *Language Learning and Development* 1:151–95. [aMHC]

Hurford, J. (1999) The evolution of language and languages. In: *The evolution of culture*, ed. R. Dunbar, C. Knight & C. Power, pp. 173–93. Edinburgh University Press. [aMHC]

Huyck, C. (2009) A psycholinguistic model of natural language parsing implemented in simulated neurons. *Cognitive Neurodynamics* 3(4):316–30. [CRH]

Indefrey, P. & Levelt, W. J. M. (2004) The spatial and temporal signatures of word production components. *Cognition* 92(1–2):101–44. [SCL]

Intraub, H. (1981) Rapid conceptual identification of sequentially presented pictures. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance* 7:604–10. [MCP]

Ito, Y. (2005) A psycholinguistic approach to *wanna* contraction in second language acquisition. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Hawaii at Manoa. Department of Second Language Studies. [WO]

Jackendoff, R. (2002) *Foundations of language*. Oxford. [SCL]

Jackendoff, R. (2007) A parallel architecture perspective on language processing. *Brain Research* 1146:2–22. [aMHC, MLD]

Jacoby, L. L., Baker, J. G. & Brooks, L. R. (1989) The priority of the specific: Episodic effects in picture identification. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 15:275–81. [aMHC]

Jaeger, H. & Haas, H. (2004) Harnessing nonlinearity: Predicting chaotic systems and saving energy in wireless communication. *Science* 304:78–80. [SLF]

Jaeger, T. (2010) Redundancy and reduction: Speakers manage syntactic information density. *Cognitive Psychology* 61:23–62. [aMHC]

Jaeger, T. F. & Tily, H. (2011) On language "utility": Processing complexity and communicative efficiency. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science* 2:323–35. [aMHC]

Jaeggli, O. (1980) Remarks on *to*-contraction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11:239–45. [WO]

Jensen, M. S., Yao, R., Street, W. N. & Simons, D. J. (2011) Change blindness and inattentional blindness. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Cognitive Science* 2:529–46. [aMHC]

Johnson, J. S. & Newport, E. L. (1989) Critical period effects in second language learning: The influence of maturational state on the acquisition of English as a second language. *Cognitive Psychology*. http://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285(89)90003-0. [RM]

Johnson-Laird, P. N. (1983) *Mental models: Towards a cognitive science of language, inference, and consciousness*. Harvard University Press. [aMHC]

Jolsvai, H., McCauley, S. M. & Christiansen, M. H. (2013) Meaning overrides frequency in idiomatic and compositional multiword chunks. In: *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society, ,Berlin, Germany, July 31–August 3, 2013,*, ed. M. Knauff, M. Pauen, N. Sebanz & I. Wachsmuth, pp. 692–97. Cognitive Science Society. [aMHC]

Jones, G. (2012) Why chunking should be considered as an explanation for developmental change before short-term memory capacity and processing speed. *Frontiers in Psychology* 3:167. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2012.00167. [aMHC, rNC]

Jurafsky, D. (1996) A probabilistic model of lexical and syntactic access and disambiguation. *Cognitive Science* 20:137–94. [aMHC]

Jurafsky, D., Bell, A., Gregory, M. L. & Raymond, W. D. (2001) Probabilistic relations between words: Evidence from reduction in lexical production. In: *Frequency and the emergence of linguistic structure*, ed. J. L. Bybee & P. Hopper, pp. 229–54. John Benjamins. [aMHC]

Jurafsky, D., Martin, J. H., Kehler, A., Vander Linden, K. & Ward, N. (2000) *Speech and language processing: An introduction to natural language processing, computational linguistics, and speech recognition*. Prentice Hall. [aMHC]

Just, M. & Carpenter, P. (1980) A theory of reading: From eye fixations to comprehension. *Psychological Review* 87(4):123–54. [CRH]

Just, M. A. & Carpenter, P. A. (1992) A capacity theory of comprehension: Individual differences in working memory. *Psychological Review* 99:122. [rNC]

Kam, X.-N. C. & Fodor, J. D. (2013) Children's acquisition of syntax: Simple models are too simple. In: *Rich languages from poor inputs*, ed. M. Piattelli-Palmarini & R. C. Berwick, pp. 43–60. Oxford University Press. [DPM]

Kam, X. N. C., Stoyneshka, I., Tornyova, L., Fodor, J. D. & Sakas, W. G. (2008) Bigrams and the richness of the stimulus. *Cognitive Science* 32(4):771–87. [FHW, rNC]

Kamide, Y. (2008) Anticipatory processes in sentence processing. *Language and Linguistic Compass* 2:647–70. [aMHC]

Kamide, Y., Altmann, G. T. M. & Haywood, S. L. (2003) The time-course of prediction in incremental sentence processing: Evidence from anticipatory eye movements. *Journal of Memory and Language* 49:133–56. [MLD]

Kamin, L. J. (1969) Predictability, surprise, attention and conditioning. In: *Punishment and aversive behavior*, ed. B. A. Campbell, R. M. Church, pp. 279–96. Appleton-Century-Crofts. [aMHC]

Karlsson, F. (2007) Constraints on multiple center-embedding of clauses. *Journal of Linguistics* 43:365–92. [aMHC, rNC]

Kashima, Y., Bekkering, H. & Kashima, E. S. (2013) Communicative intentions can modulate the linguistic perception-action link. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 36:33–34. [AB]

Katz, J. J. (1984) An outline of Platonist grammar. In: *Talking minds: The study of language in cognitive science*, ed. T. G. Bever, J. M. Carroll & L. A. Miller, pp. 17–48. MIT Press. [CB]

Katz, J. J. (1996) The unfinished Chomskyan revolution. *Mind and Language* 11:270–94. [CB]

Katz, J. J. (1998) *Realistic rationalism*. MIT Press. [CB]

Katz, J. J. (2004) *Sense, reference, and philosophy*. Oxford University Press. [CB]

Katz, J. J. & Postal, P. M. (1991) Realism vs. conceptualism in linguistics. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 14:515–54. [CB]

Kazerounian, S. & Grossberg, S. (2014) Real-time learning of predictive recognition categories that chunk sequences of items stored in working memory. *Frontiers in Psychology: Language Sciences.* doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.01053. [SG]

Kelly, B., Wigglesworth, G., Nordlinger, R. & Blythe, J. (2014) The acquisition of polysynthetic languages. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 8(2):51–64. [UL, rNC]

Kemp, C. & Regier, T. (2012) Kinship categories across languages reflect general communicative principles. *Science* 336:1049–54. [MLL]

Kempson, R., Gregoromichelaki, E. & Howes, C. (2011) *The dynamics of lexical interfaces*. CSLI Press. [RK]

Kempson, R. & Kiaer, J. (2010) Multiple long-distance scrambling: Syntax as reflections of processing. *Journal of Linguistics* 6:127–92. [RK]

Kempson, R., Meyer-Viol W. & Gabbay, D. (2001) *Dynamic syntax: The flow of language understanding*. Blackwell. [aMHC, RK]

Kendrick, K. H. & Torreira, F. (2015) The timing and construction of preference: A quantitative study. *Discourse Processes* 52(4):255–89. [SCL]

Kimball, J. (1973) Seven principles of surface structure parsing in natural language. *Cognition* 2:15–47. [aMHC]

Kirby, S., Cornish, H. & Smith, K. (2008) Cumulative cultural evolution in the laboratory: An experimental approach to the origins of structure in human language. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 105:10681–85. [aMHC, MLL, rNC]

Kirby, S., Tamariz, M., Cornish, H. & Smith, K. (2015) Compression and communication drive the evolution of language. *Cognition* 141:87–102. [MLL]

Kleinschmidt, D. F. & Jaeger, T. F. (2015) Robust speech perception: Recognize the familiar, generalize to the similar, and adapt to the novel. *Psychological Review* 122:148–203. [KB]

Kluender, R. & Kutas, M. (1993) Subjacency as a processing phenomenon. *Language & Cognitive Processes* 8:573–633. [aMHC, DAC]

Koelsch, S. (2005) Neural substrates of processing syntax and semantics in music. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology* 15(2):207–12. [UL]

Kolers, P. A. & Roediger, H. L. (1984) Procedures of mind. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 23:425–49. [rNC]

Kolodner, J. (1993) *Case-based reasoning*. Morgan Kaufmann. [rNC]

Kolodny, O., Edelman, S. & Lotem, A. (2014) The evolution of continuous learning of the structure of the environment. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface* 11:20131091. [AL, rNC]

Kolodny, O., Edelman, S. & Lotem, A. (2015a) Evolution of protolinguistic abilities as a by-product of learning to forage in structured environments. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B* 282(1811):20150353. [AL, rNC]

Kolodny, O., Lotem, A. & Edelman, S. (2015b) Learning a generative probabilistic grammar of experience: A process-level model of language acquisition. *Cognitive Science* 39:227–67. [AL, rNC]

Konopka, A. E. (2012) Planning ahead: How recent experience with structures and words changes the scope of linguistic planning. *Journal of Memory and Language* 66:143–62. [aMHC]

Kraljic, T. & Brennan, S. (2005) Prosodic disambiguation of syntactic structure: For the speaker or for the addressee? *Cognitive Psychology* 50:194–231. [aMHC]

Kuhl, P. K. (2004) Early language acquisition: Cracking the speech code. *Nature Reviews. Neuroscience* 5(11):831–43. http://doi.org/10.1038/nrn1533. [RM]

Kuperberg, G. & Jaeger, T. F. (2016) What do we mean by prediction in language comprehension? *Language, Cognition, and Neuroscience* 31:32–59. [KB]

Kutas, M., Federmeier, K. D. & Urbach, T. P. (2014) The "negatives" and "positives" of prediction in language. In: *The Cognitive Neurosciences V*, ed. M. S. Gazzaniga & G. R. Mangun, pp. 649–56. MIT Press. [aMHC]

Kutas, M. & Hillyard, S. A. (1980) Reading senseless sentences: Brain potentials reflect semantic incongruity. *Science* 207:203–205. [MCP]

Lachmann, M., Számadó, S. & Bergstrom, C. T. (2001) Cost and conflict in animal signals and human language. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* 98:13189–94. [AL]

Lake, J. K., Humphreys, K. R. & Cardy, S. (2011) Listener vs. speaker-oriented aspects of speech: Studying the disfluencies of individuals with autism spectrum disorders. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review* 18(1):135–40. [PGTH]

Lakshmanan, U. (2000) The acquisition of relative clauses by Tamil children. *Journal of Child Language* 21:587–17. [UL]

Lakshmanan, U. (2006) Assessing linguistic competence: Verbal inflection in child Tamil. *Language Assessment Quarterly* 3(2):171–205. [UL]

Lashley, K. S. (1951) The problem of serial order in behavior. In: *Cerebral mechanisms in behavior: The Hixon Symposium*, ed. L. A. Jeffress, pp. 112–46. Wiley. [aMHC, MCM]

Lawrence, D. H. (1971a) Temporal numerosity estimates for word lists. *Perception and Psychophysics* 10:75–78. [MCP]

Lawrence, D. H. (1971b) Two studies of visual search for word targets with controlled rates of presentation. *Perception and Psychophysics* 10:85–89. [MCP]

Lee, E. K., Brown-Schmidt, S. & Watson, D. G. (2013) Ways of looking ahead: Hierarchical planning in language production. *Cognition* 129:544–62. [DAC, rNC]

Leger, D. W. (1993) Contextual sources of information and responses to animal communication signals. *Psychological Bulletin* 113:295–304. [AL]

Legge, G. E., Pelli, D. G., Rubin, G. S. & Schleske, M. M. (1985) Psychophysics of reading – I. Normal vision. *Vision Research* 25:239–52. [rNC]

Lenneberg, E. H. (1964) A biological perspective of language. In: *New directions in the study of language*, ed. E. Lenneberg, pp. 65–88. MIT Press. [RM]

Lerdahl, F. & Jackendoff, R. (1983) *A generative theory of tonal music*. MIT Press. [aMHC]

Lerner, Y., Honey, C. J., Silbert, L. J. & Hasson, U. (2011) Topographic mapping of a hierarchy of temporal receptive windows using a narrated story. *Journal of Neuroscience* 31:2906–15. [aMHC, CJH]

Levelt, W. (2012) *A history of psycholinguistics: The pre-Chomskyan era*. Oxford University Press. [DAC]

Levelt, W. J. (1993) *Speaking: From intention to articulation, vol. 1*. MIT Press. [PGTH]

Levelt, W. J. M. (2001) Spoken word production: A theory of lexical access. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 98:13464–71. [aMHC]

Levinson, S. C. (2000) *Presumptive meanings: The theory of generalized conversational implicature*. MIT Press. [aMHC, rNC]

Levinson, S. C. (2013) Recursion in pragmatics. *Language* 89:149–62. [aMHC]

Levinson, S. C. & Torreira, F. (2015) Timing in turn-taking and its implications for processing models of language. *Frontiers in Psychology* 6:731. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2015.00731. [SCL]

Levy, R. (2008) Expectation-based syntactic comprehension. *Cognition* 106:1126–77. [aMHC, ADE]

Levy, R. (2011) Integrating surprisal and uncertain-input models in online sentence comprehension: formal techniques and empirical results. In: *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, Portland, OR, June 19–24, 2011*, pp. 1055–65, ed. Y. Matsumoto & R. Mihalcea.. Association for Computational Linguistics. [KB]

Levy, R., Bicknell, K., Slattery, T. & Rayner, K. (2009) Eye movement evidence that readers maintain and act on uncertainty about past linguistic input. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 106:21086–90. [aMHC, KB, MCM]

Lewis, M. & Frank, M. C. (2015) Conceptual complexity and the evolution of the lexicon. In: *Proceedings of the 37th Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society, Austin, TX, July 2015*, ed. D. C. Noelle, R. Dale, A. S. Warlaumont, J. Yoshimi, T. Matlock, C. D. Jennings & P. P. Magli, pp. 1138–343. Cognitive Science Society. [MLL]

Lewis, M., Sugarman, E. & Frank, M. C. (2014) The structure of the lexicon reflects principles of communication. In: *Proceedings of the 36th Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society, Austin, TX, July 2014*, pp. 845–50, Cognitive Science Society. [MLL]

Lewis, R. & Vasishth, S. (2005) An activation-based model of sentence processing as skilled memory retrieval. *Cognitive Science* 29(3):375–419. [CRH]

Lewis, R. L., Shvartsman, M. & Singh, S. (2013) The adaptive nature of eye movements in linguistic tasks: How payoff and architecture shape speed-accuracy trade-offs. *Topics in Cognitive Science* 5:1–30. [KB]

Lewis, R. L., Vasishth, S. & Van Dyke, J. A. (2006) Computational principles of working memory in sentence comprehension. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 10:447–54. [DAC]

Liberman, A. M., Harris, K. S., Hoffman, H. S. & Griffith, B. C. (1957) The discrimination of speech sounds within and across phoneme boundaries. *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 54:358–68. [KB]

Lightfoot, D. (1989) The child's trigger experience: Degree-0 learnability. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 12:321–34. [aMHC]

Lightfoot, D. (1991) *How to set parameters: Arguments from language change*. MIT Press. [rNC]

Lim, J.-H. & Christianson, K. (2015) L2 Sensitivity to agreement errors: Evidence from eye movements during comprehension and translation. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 36:1283–315. [FF]

Lind, J., Enquist, M. & Ghirlanda, S. (2015) Animal memory: A review of delayed matching-to-sample data. *Behavioural Processes* 117:52–58. [AL]

Loftus, G. R. (1983) Eye fixations on text and scenes. In: *Eye movements in reading: Perceptual and language processes*, ed. K. Rayner, pp. 359–76. Academic Press. [MCP]

Logan, G. D. (1988) Toward an instance theory of automatization. *Psychological Review* 95:492–527. [aMHC]

Lombardi, L. & Potter, M. C. (1992) The regeneration of syntax in short term memory. *Journal of Memory and Language* 31:713–33. [MCP]

Lotem, A. & Halpern, J. Y. (2008) A data-acquisition model for learning and cognitive development and its implications for autism. Computing and information science technical reports, Cornell University. Available at: http://hdl.handle.net/1813/10178. [AL]

Lotem, A. & Halpern, J. Y. (2012) Coevolution of learning and data-acquisition mechanisms: A model for cognitive evolution. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* 367:2686–94. [AL]

Louwerse, M. M., Dale, R., Bard, E. G. & Jeuniaux, P. (2012) Behavior matching in multimodal communication is synchronized. *Cognitive Science* 36:1404–26. [aMHC]

Luck, S. J. & Vogel, E. K. (1997) The capacity of visual working memory for features and conjunctions. *Nature* 390:279–81. [rNC]

Luck, S. J., Vogel, E. K. & Shapiro, K. L. (1996) Word meanings can be accessed but not reported during the attentional blink. *Nature* 383:616–18. [MCP]

Lukoševičius, M. & Jaeger, H. (2009) Reservoir computing approaches to recurrent neural network training. *Computer Science Review* 3:127–49. [SLF]

Lupyan, G. & Christiansen, M. H. (2002) Case, word order, and language learnability: Insights from connectionist modeling. In: *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society, Fairfax, VA, August 2002*, pp. 596–601, ed. W. D. Gray & C. Schunn. Erlbaum. [aMHC]

Lupyan, G. & Dale, R. (2010) Language structure is partly determined by social structure. *PLOS ONE* 5(1):1–10. http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0008559. [TB]

Lupyan, G. & Dale, R. A. (2015) The role of adaptation in understanding linguistic diversity. In: *Language structure and environment: Social, cultural, and natural factors*, ed. R. de Busser & R. J. LaPolla, pp. 287–16. John Benjamins. [TB]

Maass, W., Natschläger, T. & Markram, H. (2002) Real-time computing without stable states: A new framework for neural computation based on perturbations. *Neural Computation* 14:2531–60. [SLF]

MacDonald, M. C. (1994) Probabilistic constraints and syntactic ambiguity resolution. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 9:157–201. [aMHC, MCM]

MacDonald, M. C. (2013) How language production shapes language form and comprehension. *Frontiers in Psychology* 4:226. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00226. [aMHC, MCM]

MacDonald, M. C. & Christiansen, M. H. (2002) Reassessing working memory: A comment on Just & Carpenter (1992) and Waters & Caplan (1996). *Psychological Review* 109:35–54. [aMHC, rNC]

MacDonald, M. C., Pearlmutter, M. & Seidenberg, M. (1994) The lexical nature of ambiguity resolution. *Psychological Review* 101:676–703. [aMHC]

MacKay, D. G. (1987) *The organization of perception and action: A theory for language and other cognitive skills*. Springer. [rNC]

MacKay, D. J. (2003) *Information theory, inference and learning algorithms*. Cambridge University Press. [aMHC]

Magyari, L. & de Ruiter, J. P. (2012) Prediction of turn-ends based on anticipation of upcoming words. *Frontiers in Psychology* 3:376. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2012.00376 [aMHC]

Mahowald, K., Fedorenko, E., Piantadosi, S. & Gibson, E. (2012) Info/information theory: Speakers actively choose shorter words in predictable contexts. *Cognition* 126:313–18.

Major, G. & Tank, D. (2004) Persistent neural activity: Prevalence and mechanisms. *Current Opinion in Neurobiology* 14(6):675–84. [ADE, rNC]

Mandel, D. R., Jusczyk, P. W. & Pisoni, D. B. (1995) Infants' recognition of the sound patterns of their own names. *Psychological Science* 6(5):314–17. [RM]

Mani, N. & Huettig, F. (2012) Prediction during language processing is a piece of cake – but only for skilled producers. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance* 38:843–47. [aMHC]

Manning, C. D. & Schütze, H. (1999) *Foundations of statistical natural language processing*. MIT press. [aMHC]

Marchman, V. A. & Fernald, A. (2008) Speed of word recognition and vocabulary knowledge in infancy predict cognitive and language outcomes in later childhood. *Developmental Science* 11:F9–16. [aMHC]

Marcus, M. P. (1980) *Theory of syntactic recognition for natural languages*. MIT Press. [aMHC]

Markson, L. & Bloom, P. (1997) Evidence against a dedicated system for word learning in children. *Nature* 385:813–15. [ADE]

Marr, D. (1976) Early processing of visual information. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, B: Biological Sciences* 275:483–519. [aMHC]

Marr, D. (1982) *Vision*. W. H. Freeman. [aMHC]

Marslen-Wilson, W. (1987) Functional parallelism in spoken word recognition. *Cognition* 25:71–102. [rNC]

Marslen-Wilson, W. D. (1975) Sentence perception as an interactive parallel process. *Science* 189:226–28. [aMHC]

Marslen-Wilson, W. D., Tyler, L. K. & Koster, C. (1993) Integrative processes in utterance resolution. *Journal of Memory and Language* 32:647–66. [aMHC]

Martin, R. C. & He, T. (2004) Semantic STM and its role in sentence processing: A replication. *Brain and Language* 89:76–82. [aMHC]

Martin, R. C., Shelton, J. R. & Yaffee, L. S. (1994) Language processing and working memory: Neuropsychological evidence for separate phonological and semantic capacities. *Journal of Memory and Language* 33:83–111. [aMHC]

Maye, J., Werker, J. F. & Gerken, L. (2002) Infant sensitivity to distributional information can affect phonetic discrimination. *Cognition* 82:101–111. [RM]

McCauley, S. M. & Christiansen, M. H. (2011) Learning simple statistics for language comprehension and production: The CAPPUCCINO model. In: *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society, Boston, MA, July 2011*. pp. 1619–24, ed. L. A. Carlson, C. Hölscher & T. F. Shipley. Cognitive Science Society. [aMHC, ADE]

McCauley, S. M. & Christiansen, M. H. (2013) Toward a unified account of comprehension and production in language development. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 36:366–67. [rNC]

McCauley, S. M. & Christiansen, M. H. (2014a) Acquiring formulaic language: A computational model. *Mental Lexicon* 9:419–36. [rNC]

McCauley, S. M. & Christiansen, M. H. (2014b) Reappraising lexical specificity in children's early syntactic combinations. In: *Proceedings of the 36th Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society*. pp. 1000–1005. ed. P. Bello, M. Guarini, M. McShane, & B. Scassellati. Cognitive Science Society. [aMHC]

McCauley, S. M. & Christiansen, M. H. (2015a) *Computational investigations of multiword chunks in language learning*. Submitted. [rNC]

McCauley, S. M. & Christiansen, M. H. (2015b) Individual differences in chunking ability predict on-line sentence processing. In: *Proceedings of the 37th Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society, Pasadena, CA, July 2015*, pp. 1553–58, ed. D. C. Noelle & R. Dale. Cognitive Science Society. [rNC]

McCauley, S. M. & Christiansen, M. H. (2015c) *Language learning as language use: A cross-linguistic model of child language development*. Manuscript in preparation. [rNC]

McCauley, S. M., Monaghan, P. & Christiansen, M. H. (2015) Language emergence in development: A computational perspective. In: *The handbook of language emergence*, ed. B. MacWhinney & W. O'Grady, pp. 415–36. Wiley-Blackwell. [rNC]

McClelland, J. L. (1987) The case for interactionism in language processing. In: *Attention & performance XII: The psychology of reading*, ed. M. Coltheart, pp. 3–35. Erlbaum. [UL]

McClelland, J. L. & Elman, J. L. (1986) The TRACE model of speech perception. *Cognitive Psychology* 18(1):1–86. [rNC]

McCloskey, M. & Cohen, N. J. (1989) Catastrophic interference in connectionist networks: The sequential learning problem. *Psychology of Learning and Motivation* 24:109–65. [aMHC]

McElree, B., Foraker, S. & Dyer, L. (2003) Memory structures that subserve sentence comprehension. *Journal of Memory and Language* 48:67–91. [DAC]

McMurray, B., Horst, J. S. & Samuelson, L. K. (2012) Word learning emerges from the interaction of online referent selection and slow associative learning. *Psychological Review* 119:831–77. [rNC]

McMurray, B., Tanenhaus, M. K. & Aslin, R. N. (2009) Within-category VOT affects recovery from "lexical" garden-paths: Evidence against phoneme-level inhibition. *Journal of Memory and Language* 60:65–91. [KB]

McWhorter, J. (2001) The world's simplest grammars are creole grammars. *Linguistic Typology* 5(2):125–66. Available at: http://doi.org/10.1515/lity.2001.001. [TB]

Meng, M. & Potter, M. C. (2008) Detecting and remembering pictures with and without visual noise. *Journal of Vision* 8(9):7. Available at: http://journalofvision.org/8/9/7/ [MCP]

Meng, M. & Potter, M. C. (2011) An attentional blink for nontargets? *Attention, Perception, and Psychophysics* 73:440–46. [MCP]

Menyhart, O., Kolodny, O., Goldstein, M. H., Devoogd, T. & Edelman, S. (2015) Juvenile zebra finches learn the underlying statistical regularities in their father's song. *Frontiers in Psychology* 6:571. [AL]

Mermillod, M., Bugaïska, A. & Bonin, P. (2013) The stability-plasticity dilemma: Investigating the continuum from catastrophic forgetting to age-limited learning effects. *Frontiers in Psychology* 4:504. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2013.00504. [aMHC]

Mery, F., Belay, A. T., So, A. K., Sokolowski, M. B. & Kawecki, T. J. (2007) Natural polymorphism affecting learning and memory in Drosophila. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* 104:13051–55. [AL]

Mesulam, M. M. (1998) From sensation to cognition. *Brain* 121(6):1013–52. [GB]

Meyer, D. E. & Schvaneveldt, R. W. (1971) Facilitation in recognizing pairs of words: evidence of a dependence between retrieval operations. *Journal of Experimental Psychology* 90:227–34. [aMHC]

Meyer, A. S. (1996) Lexical access in phrase and sentence production: Results from picture-word interference experiments. *Journal of Memory and Language* 35:477–96. [aMHC, DAC]

Miller, G. A. (1956) The magical number seven, plus or minus two: Some limits on our capacity for processing information. *Psychological Review* 63(2):81–97. [aMHC, SCL, rNC]

Miller, G. A., Galanter, E. & Pribram, K. H. (1960) *Plans and the structure of behavior*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston. [aMHC]

Miller, G. A. & Taylor, W. G. (1948) The perception of repeated bursts of noise. *Journal of the Acoustic Society of America* 20:171–82. [aMHC]

Mintz, T. H., Wang, F. H. & Li, J. (2014) Word categorization from distributional information: Frames confer more than the sum of their (Bigram) parts. *Cognitive Psychology* 75:1–27. [FHW]

Misyak, J. B. & Christiansen, M. H. (2010) When "more" in statistical learning means "less" in language: Individual differences in predictive processing of adjacent dependencies. In: *Proceedings of the 32nd Annual Cognitive Science Society Conference, Portland, OR, August 11–14, 2010*, ed. R. Catrambone & S. Ohlsson, pp. 2686–91. Cognitive Science Society. [aMHC]

Momma, S., Slevc, L. R. & Phillips, C. (2015) The timing of verb planning in active and passive sentence production. *Poster presented at the 28th annual CUNY Conference on Human Sentence Processing, Los Angeles, CA, March 19–21, 2015.* [DAC]

Momma, S., Slevc, L. R. & Phillips, C. (in press) The timing of verb planning in Japanese sentence production. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*. [DAC]

Monaghan, P. & Christiansen, M. H. (2008) Integration of multiple probabilistic cues in syntax acquisition. In: *Trends in corpus research: Finding structure in data* (TILAR Series), ed. H. Behrens, pp. 139–63. John Benjamins. [aMHC]

Monaghan, P. & Christiansen, M. H. (2010) Words in puddles of sound: Modelling psycholinguistic effects in speech segmentation. *Journal of Child Language* 37:545–64. [rNC]

Mongillo, G., Barak, O. & Tsodyks, M. (2008) Synaptic theory of working memory. *Science* 319:1543–46. [SLF]

Morgan, J. L. & Demuth, K. (1996) *Signal to syntax: Bootstrapping from speech to grammar in early acquisition*. Erlbaum. [aMHC]

Morillon, B., Lehongre, K., Frackowiak, R. S. J., Ducorps, A., Kleinschmidt, A., Poeppel, D. & Giraud, A. L. (2010) Neurophysiological origin of human brain asymmetry for speech and language. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107(43):18688–93. [GB]

Morrill, G. (2010) *Categorial grammar: Logical syntax, semantics, and processing*. Oxford University Press. [aMHC]

Morrill, T. H., Dilley, L. C., McAuley, J. D. & Pitt, M. A. (2014) Distal rhythm influences whether or not listeners hear a word in continuous speech: Support for a perceptual grouping hypothesis. *Cognition* 131:69–74. [MCM]

Mueller, S. T. & Krawitz, A. (2009) Reconsidering the two-second decay hypothesis in verbal working memory. *Journal of Mathematical Psychology* 53:14–25. [AL]

Mufwene, S. (2008) *Language evolution: Contact, competition and change*. Continuum International Publishing Group. [aMHC]

Murdock B. B., Jr. (1968) Serial order effects in short-term memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology Monograph Supplement* 1–15. [aMHC]

Murdock, B. B. (1983) A distributed memory model for serial-order information. *Psychological Review* 90:316–38. [rNC]

Nadig, A. S. & Sedivy, J. C. (2002) Evidence of perspective-taking constraints in children's on-line reference resolution. *Psychological Science* 13:329–36. [aMHC]

Navon, D. & Miller, J. O. (2002) Queuing or sharing? A critical evaluation of the single-bottleneck notion. *Cognitive Psychology* 44:193–251. [aMHC]

Neal, R. M. & Hinton, G. E. (1998) A view of the EM algorithm that justifies incremental, sparse, and other variants. In: *Learning in graphical models*, ed. M. I. Jordan, pp. 355–68. Kluwer. [aMHC]

Neef, M. (2014) Das nächste Paradigma: Realistische Linguistik. Eine Ergänzung zum Beitrag Wo stehen wir in der Grammatiktheorie? von Wolfgang Sternefeld und Frank Richter. *Muttersprache* 124:105–20. [CB]

Neely, J. H. (1991) Semantic priming effects in visual word recognition: A selective review of current findings and theories. In: *Basic processes in reading: Visual word recognition*, ed. D. Besner & G. W. Humphreys, pp. 264–36. Erlbaum. [MCP]

Neumann, R., Rafferty, A. N. & Griffiths, T. L. (2014) A bounded rationality account of wishful thinking. In: *Proceedings of the 36th Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society, Quebec City, Canada, July 2014, Quebec City, Quebec, Canada,* pp. 1210–15, ed. P. Bello, M. Guarini, M. McShane, & B. Scassellati. Cognitive Science Society. [KB]

Nevins, A. (2010) *Locality in vowel harmony*. MIT Press. [aMHC]

Newell, A. & Rosenbloom, P. S. (1981) Mechanisms of skill acquisition and the law of practice. In: *Cognitive skills and their acquisition*, ed. J. R. Anderson, pp. 1–55. Erlbaum. [aMHC]

Newport, E. L. (1990) Maturational constraints on language learning. *Cognitive Science* 14:11–28. [RM]

Nicol, J. L., Forster, K. I. & Veres, C. (1997) Subject-verb agreement processes in comprehension. *Journal of Memory and Language* 36:569–87. [aMHC]

Nieuwland, M. S. & Van Berkum, J. J. (2006) When peanuts fall in love: N400 evidence for the power of discourse. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 18(7):1098–11. [CJH]

Nivre, J. (2003) An efficient algorithm for projective dependency parsing. In: *Proceedings of the 8th International Workshop on Parsing Technologies (IWPT 03), Nancy, France, April 23–25, 2003*, ed. H. Bunt & G. van Noord, pp. 149–60. Association for Computational Linguistics. [CG-R]

Nivre, J. (2004) Incrementality in deterministic dependency parsing. In: *Proceedings of the Workshop on Incremental Parsing: Bringing Engineering and Cognition Together*, ed. F. Keller, S. Clark, M. Crocker & M. Steedman, pp. 50–57. Association for Computational Linguistics. [CG-R]

Nivre, J. (2008) Algorithms for deterministic incremental dependency parsing. *Computational Linguistics* 34(4):513–53. [CG-R]

Nivre, J., Hall, J., Nilsson, J., Chanev, A., Eryigit, G., Kübler, S., Marinov, S. & Marsi, E. (2007) MaltParser: A language-independent system for data-driven dependency parsing. *Natural Language Engineering* 13(2):95–35. [CG-R]

Niyogi, P. & Berwick, R. C. (1996) A language learning model for finite parameter spaces. *Cognition* 61:161–93. [aMHC]

Niyogi, P. & Berwick, R. C. (2009) The proper treatment of language acquisition and change in a population setting. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 106:10124–29. [ADE]

Norman, D. A. & Shallice, T. (1986) Attention to action: Willed and automatic control of behavior. In: *Consciousness and self-regulation*, ed. R. J. Davidson, G. E. Schwartz & D. Shapiro, pp. 1–18. Plenum Press. [aMHC]

Norris, D., McQueen, J. M., Cutler, A. & Butterfield, S. (1997) The possible word constraint in the segmentation of continuous speech. *Cognitive Psychology* 34:191–43. [KE]

Nosofsky, R. M. (1986) Attention, similarity, and the identification–categorization relationship. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 115:39. [aMHC]

Noveck, I. A. & Reboul, A. (2008) Experimental pragmatics: A Gricean turn in the study of language. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 12:425–31. [aMHC]

Nygaard, L. C., Sommers, M. S. & Pisoni, D. B. (1994) Speech perception as a talker-contingent process. *Psychological Science* 5:42–46. [aMHC]

O'Grady, W. (2005) *Syntactic carpentry: An emergentist approach to syntax*. Erlbaum. [aMHC, WO]

O'Grady, W. (2013) The illusion of language acquisition. *Approaches to Bilingualism* 3:253–85. [aMHC, WO, rNC]

O'Grady, W. (2015a) Anaphora and the case for emergentism. In: *The handbook of language emergence*, ed. B. MacWhinney & W. O'Grady, pp. 100–22. Wiley-Blackwell. [aMHC, WO, rNC]

O'Grady, W. (2015b) Processing determinism. *Language Learning* 65:6–32. [WO]

Oaksford, M. & Chater, N., eds. (1998) *Rational models of cognition.*. Oxford University Press. [aMHC]

Oaksford, M. & Chater, N. (2007) *Bayesian rationality*. Oxford University Press. [aMHC]

Odling-Smee, F. J., Laland, K. N. & Feldman, M. W. (2003) *Niche construction: The neglected process in evolution, vol. MPB 37*. Princeton University Press. [AL]

Ohno, T. & Mito, S. (1988) *Just-in-time for today and tomorrow*. Productivity Press. [aMHC]

Omaki, A., Davidson-White, I., Goro, T., Lidz, J. & Phillips, C. (2014) No fear of commitment: Children's incremental interpretation in English and Japanese. *Language Learning and Development* 10:206–33. [DAC]

Onnis, L. & Spivey, M. J. (2012) Toward a new scientific visualization for the language sciences. *Information* 3:124–50. [AL]

Onnis, L., Waterfall, H. R. & Edelman, S. (2008) Learn locally, act globally: Learning language from variation set cues. *Cognition* 109:423–30. [AL]

Orfanidou, E., Morgan, G., Adam, R. & McQueen, J. (2010) Recognition of signed and spoken language: Different sensory inputs, the same segmentation procedure. *Journal of Memory and Language* 62:272–83. [KE]

Orr, D. B., Friedman, H. L. & Williams, J. C. C. (1965) Trainability of listening comprehension of speeded discourse. *Journal of Educational Psychology* 56:148–56. [aMHC]

Orwin, M., Howes, C. & Kempson, R. (2013) *Language, music and interaction*. College Publications. [aMHC]

Padó, U., Crocker, M. W. & Keller, F. (2009) A probabilistic model of semantic plausibility in sentence processing. *Cognitive Science* 33:794–838. [aMHC]

Pallier, C., Devauchelle, A. D. & Dehaene, S. (2011) Cortical representation of the constituent structure of sentences. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108(6):2522–27. [GB]

Pallier, C., Sebastian-Gallés, N., Dupoux, E., Christophe, A. & Mehler, J. (1998) Perceptual adjustment to time-compressed speech: A cross-linguistic study. *Memory and Cognition* 26(4):844–51. [rNC]

Pani, J. R. (2000) Cognitive description and change blindness. *Visual Cognition* 7:107–26. [aMHC]

Pashler, H. (1988) Familiarity and visual change detection. *Perception and Psychophysics* 44:369–78. [aMHC]

Pashler, H. (1998) *The psychology of attention*. MIT Press. [rNC]

Patson, N. D., Darowski, E. S., Moon, N. & Ferreira, F. (2009) Lingering misinterpretations in garden-path sentences: Evidence from a paraphrasing task. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 35:280–85. [FF]

Pavani, F. & Turatto, M. (2008) Change perception in complex auditory scenes. *Perception and Psychophysics* 70:619–29. [aMHC]

Payne, B. R., Grison, S., Gao, X., Christianson, K., Morrow, D. G. & Stine-Morrow, E. A. (2014) Aging and individual differences in binding during sentence understanding: Evidence from temporary and global syntactic attachment ambiguities. *Cognition* 130:157–73. [FF]

Pearlmutter, N. J., Garnsey, S. M. & Bock, K. (1999) Agreement processes in sentence comprehension. *Journal of Memory and Language* 41:427–56. [aMHC]

Pellegrino, F., Coupé, C. & Marsico, E. (2011) A cross-language perspective on speech information rate. *Language* 87:539–58. [aMHC]

Pelucchi, B., Hay, J. F. & Saffran, J. R. (2009) Learning in reverse: Eight-month-old infants track backward transitional probabilities. *Cognition* 113:244–47. [rNC]

Pereira, P. & Schabes, Y. (1992) Inside–outside reestimation from partially bracketed corpora. *Proceedings of the 30th Annual Meeting on Association for Computational Linguistics, Newark, DE, June 28–July 2, 1992*, pp. 128–35, ed. H. S. Thompson. Association for Computational Linguistics. [aMHC]

Perfors, A., Tenenbaum, J. B. & Regier, T. (2011) The learnability of abstract syntactic principles. *Cognition* 118(3):306–38. doi: 10.1016/j.cognition.2010.11.001. [DPM]

Peterfalvi, J. M. & Locatelli, F (1971) L'acceptabilité des phrases [The acceptability of sentences]. *L'Année Psychologique* 71(2):417–27. [rNC]

Petersson, K. M. & Hagoort, P. (2012) The neurobiology of syntax: Beyond string sets. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* 367:1971–83. [SLF]

Petkov, C. I., O'Connor, K. N. & Sutter, M. L. (2007) Encoding of illusory continuity in primary auditory cortex. *Neuron* 54(1):153–65. [GB]

Phillips, B. S. (2006) *Word frequency and lexical diffusion*. Palgrave Macmillan. [aMHC]

Phillips, C. (1996) Merge right: An approach to constituency conflicts. In: *Proceedings of the Fourteenth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics, volume 15, Los Angeles, CA, March 1994*, pp. 381–95, ed. J. Camacho, L. Choueiri & M. Watanabe. University of Chicago Press. [aMHC]

Phillips, C. (2003) Linear order and constituency. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34:37–90. [aMHC]

Phillips, C. (2013) Some arguments and nonarguments for reductionist accounts of syntactic phenomena. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 28:156–87. [DAC]

Piantadosi, S., Tily, H. & Gibson, E. (2011) Word lengths are optimized for efficient communication. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108:3526–29. [aMHC, MLL]

Piantadosi, S., Tily, H. & Gibson, E. (2012) The communicative function of ambiguity in language. *Cognition* 122:280–91. [aMHC]

Piattelli-Palmarini, M., Hancock, R. & Bever, T. (2008) Language as ergonomic perfection [Peer Commentary] *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 31(5):530–31. [DPM]

Pickering, M. J. & Branigan, H. P. (1998) The representation of verbs: Evidence from syntactic priming in language production. *Journal of Memory and Language* 39:633–51. [aMHC]

Pickering, M. J. & Garrod, S. (2004) Toward a mechanistic psychology of dialogue. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 27:169–226. [aMHC, rNC]

Pickering, M. J. & Garrod, S. (2007) Do people use language production to make predictions during comprehension? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 11:105–10. [aMHC, rNC]

Pickering, M. J. & Garrod, S. (2013a) An integrated theory of language production and comprehension. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 36: 329–47. [aMHC, AB, rNC]

Pickering, M. J. & Garrod, S. (2013b) How tightly are production and comprehension interwoven? *Frontiers in Psychology* 4:377–92. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3636456/. [RK]

Pierrehumbert, J. (2002) *Word-specific phonetics*. Laboratory Phonology VII. Mouton de Gruyter. [aMHC]

Pietroski, P. (2008) Minimalist meaning, internalist interpretation. *Biolinguistics* 2(4):317–41. [DPM]

Pine, J. M., Freudenthal, D., Krajewski, G. & Gobet, F. (2013) Do young children have adult-like syntactic categories? Zipf's law and the case of the determiner. *Cognition* 127:345–60. [aMHC]

Pinker, S. (1984) *Language learnability and language development*. Harvard University Press. [aMHC]

Pinker, S. (1994) *The language instinct: How the mind creates language*. William Morrow. [aMHC]

Pinker, S. & Bloom, P. (1990) Natural language and natural selection. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 13:707–27. [aMHC]

Pinker, S. & Prince, A. (1988) On language and connectionism: Analysis of a parallel distributed processing model of language acquisition. *Cognition* 28:73–193. [aMHC]

Pinkster, H. (2005) The language of Pliny the Elder. In: *The language of Latin Prose*, ed. T. Reinhardt, M. Lapidge & J. N. Adams, pp. 239–56. Oxford University Press. [SCL]

Pisoni, D. B. & Lazarus, J. H. (1974) Categorical and noncategorical modes of speech perception along the voicing continuum. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 55:328–33. [KB]

Pisoni, D. B. & Tash, J. (1974) Reaction times to comparisons within and across phonetic categories. *Perception & Psychophysics* 15:285–90. [KB]

Poesio, M & Rieser, H. (2011) An incremental model of anaphora and reference resolution based on resource situations. *Dialogue and Discourse* 2:235–77. http://dad.uni-bielefeld.de/index.php/dad/article/view/373/1461. [RK]

Poggio, T. & Edelman, S. (1990) A network that learns to recognize 3D objects. *Nature* 343:263–66. [rNC]

Postal, P. M. (2003) Remarks on the foundations of linguistics. *The Philosophical Forum* 34:233–51. [CB]

Postal, P. M. (2009) The incoherence of Chomsky's "Biolinguistic" ontology. *Biolinguistics* 3:104–23. [CB]

Potter, M. C. (1976) Short-term conceptual memory for pictures. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Learning and Memory* 2:509–22. [MCP]

Potter, M. C. (1984) Rapid serial visual presentation (RSVP): A method for studying language processing. In: *New methods in reading comprehension research*, ed. D. Kieras & M. Just, pp. 91–18. Erlbaum. [MCP]

Potter, M. C. (1993) Very short-term conceptual memory. *Memory and Cognition* 21:156–61. [MCP]

Potter, M. C. (2009) Conceptual short term memory. *Scholarpedia* 5(2):3334. [MCP]

Potter, M. C. (2012) Conceptual short term memory in perception and thought. *Frontiers in Psychology* 3:113. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2012.00113. [MCP, rNC]

Potter, M. C. & Faulconer, B. A. (1975) Time to understand pictures and words. *Nature* 253:437–38. [MCP]

Potter, M. C. & Lombardi, L. (1990) Regeneration in the short-term recall of sentences. *Journal of Memory and Language* 29:633–54. [MCP]

Potter, M. C. & Lombardi, L. (1998) Syntactic priming in immediate recall of sentences. *Journal of Memory and Language* 38:265–82. [aMHC, MCP]

Potter, M. C., Kroll, J. F. & Harris, C. (1980) Comprehension and memory in rapid sequential reading. In: *Attention and Performance VIII*, ed. R. Nickerson, pp. 395–18. Erlbaum. [MCP]

Potter, M. C., Kroll, J. F., Yachzel, B., Carpenter, E. & Sherman, J. (1986) Pictures in sentences: Understanding without words. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 115:281–94. [MCP]

Potter, M. C., Moryadas, A., Abrams, I. & Noel, A. (1993) Word perception and misperception in context. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 19:3–22. [MCP]

Potter, M. C., Staub, A. & O'Connor, D. H. (2002) The time course of competition for attention: Attention is initially labile. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance* 28:1149–62. [MCP]

Potter, M. C., Stiefbold, D. & Moryadas, A. (1998) Word selection in reading sentences: Preceding versus following contexts. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 24:68–100. [MCP]

Potter, M. C., Valian, V. V. & Faulconer, B. A. (1977) Representation of a sentence and its pragmatic implications: Verbal, imagistic, or abstract? *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 16:1–12. [MCP]

Potter, M. C., Wyble, B., Hagmann, C. E. & McCourt, E. S. (2014) Detecting meaning in RSVP at 13 ms per picture. *Attention, Perception, and Performance* 76(2):270–79. doi: 10.3758/s13414-013-0605-z. [MCP]

Potter, M. C., Wyble, B., Pandav, R. & Olejarczyk, J. (2010) Picture detection in RSVP: Features or identity? *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance* 36:1486–94. [MCP]

Poulet, J. F. A. & Hedwig, B. (2006) New insights into corollary discharges mediated by identified neural pathways. *Trends in Neurosciences* 30:14–21. [aMHC]

Princeton, N. J. & Stromswold, K. (2001) The heritability of language: A review and metaanalysis of twin, adoption, and linkage studies. *Language* 77:647–23. [AL]

Pulman, S. G. (1985) A parser that doesn't. *Proceedings of the Second European Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, Geneva, Switzerland, March 1985*, pp. 128–35, Association for Computational Linguistics. [aMHC, rNC]

Pulman, S. G. (1986) Grammars, parsers, and memory limitations. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 1(3):197–225. [ADE]

Purver, M., Cann, R. & Kempson, R. (2006) Grammars as parsers: Meeting the dialogue challenge. *Research in Language and Computation* 4(2–3):289–326. [PGTH]

Purver, M., Eshghi, A. & Hough, J. (2011) Incremental semantic construction in a dialogue system. *Proceedings of the Ninth International Conference on Computational Semantics (IWCS)*,, Oxford, UK, January 12–14, 2011, pp. 365–69, ed. J. Box & S. Pulman. Association for Computational Linguistics. [PGTH]

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. N. & Svartvik, J. (1972) *A grammar of contemporary English*. Longman. [DAC]

Rabinovich, M., Huerta, R. & Laurent, G. (2008) Transient dynamics for neural processing. *Science* 321:48–50. [SLF]

Ratcliff, R. (1990) Connectionist models of recognition memory: Constraints imposed by learning and forgetting functions. *Psychological Review* 97:285–308. [aMHC]

Rayner, K., ed. (1983) *Eye movements in reading: Perceptual and language processes*. Academic Press. [MCP]

Rayner, K., ed. (1992) *Eye movements and visual cognition: Scene perception and reading*. Springer. [MCP]

Reali, F. & Christiansen, M. H. (2005) Uncovering the richness of the stimulus: Structure dependence and indirect statistical evidence. *Cognitive Science* 29(6):1007–28. [DPM, FHW, rNC]

Reali, F. & Christiansen, M. H. (2007a) Processing of relative clauses is made easier by frequency of occurrence. *Journal of Memory and Language* 57:1–23. [aMHC]

Reali, F. & Christiansen, M. H. (2007b) Word-chunk frequencies affect the processing of pronominal object-relative clauses. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 60:161–70. [aMHC]

Reali, F. & Christiansen, M. H. (2009) On the necessity of an interdisciplinary approach to language universals. In: *Language universals*, ed. M. H. Christiansen, C. Collins & S. Edelman, pp. 266–77. Oxford University Press. [rNC]

Reali, F., Dale, R. & Christiansen, M. H. (2005) *Colorless green ideas sleep furiously* revisited: A statistical perspective. In: *Proceedings of the 27th Annual Meeting of the Cognitive Science Society, Stresa, Italy, July 2005*, pp. 1821–26, ed. B. G. Bara, L. W. Barsalou & M. Bucciarelli. Erlbaum. [rNC]

Reali, F. & Griffiths, T. (2009) The evolution of frequency distributions: Relating regularization to inductive biases through iterated learning. *Cognition* 111:317–28. [MLL, rNC]

Redington, M., Chater, N. & Finch, S. (1998) Distributional information: A powerful cue for acquiring syntactic categories. *Cognitive Science* 22:425–469. [aMHC]

Regier, T., Kay, P. & Khetarpal, N. (2007) Color naming reflects optimal partitions of color space. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 104:1436–41. [MLL]

Remez, R. E., Fellowes, J. M. & Rubin, P. E. (1997) Talker identification based on phonetic information. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance* 23:651–66. [aMHC]

Remez, R. E., Ferro, D. F., Dubowski, K. R., Meer, J., Broder, R. S. & Davids, M. L. (2010) Is desynchrony tolerance adaptable in the perceptual organization of speech? *Attention, Perception, and Psychophysics* 72:2054–58. [aMHC]

Richerson, P. J. & Christiansen, M. H., eds. (2013) *Cultural evolution: Society, technology, language and religion.* MIT Press. [aMHC]

Rigotti, M., Barak, O., Warden, M. R., Wang, X. -J., Daw, N. D., Miller, E. K. & Fusi, S. (2013) The importance of mixed selectivity in complex cognitive tasks. *Nature* 497:585–90. [SLF]

Rizzi, L. (1990) *Relativized minimality*. MIT Press. [ADE]

Rizzolatti, G. & Arbib, M. A. (1998) Language within our grasp. [Viewpoint] *Trends in Neurosciences* 21(5):188–94. [DPM]

Roland, D., Elman, J. & Ferreira, V. (2006) Why is that? Structural prediction and ambiguity resolution in a very large corpus of English sentences. *Cognition* 98:245–72. [aMHC]

Rose, Y. & Brittain, J. (2011) Grammar matters: Evidence from phonological and morphological development in Northern East Cree. In: *Selected proceedings of the 4th Conference on Generative Approaches to Language Acquisition North America (GALANA 2010), Somerville, MA*, pp. 193–208, ed. M. Pirvulescu, M. C. Cuervo, A. T. Pérez-Leroux, J. Steele & N. Strik. Cascadilla Proceedings Project. Available at: www.lingref.com, document #2596. [UL]

Ross, J. R. (1967) Constraints on variables in syntax. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Department of Linguistics, MIT. [ADE]

Rumelhart, D. E. & McClelland, J. L. (1986) On learning the past tenses of English verbs. In: *Parallel distributed processing: Explorations in the microstructure of cognition. Volume 2: Psychological and biological models*, ed. J. L. McClelland, D. E. Rumelhart & the PDP Research Group, pp. 216–71. MIT Press. [aMHC]

Rumelhart, D. E., McClelland, J. L. & the PDP Research Group (1986a) *Parallel distributed processing: Explorations in the microstructure of cognition, volumes 1 and 2*. MIT Press. [aMHC]

Rumelhart, D. E., McClelland, J. L. & the PDP Research Group (1988) *Parallel distributed processing, vol. 1*, pp. 354–62. IEEE. [DPM]

Rumelhart, D. E., Smolensky, P., McClelland, J. L. & Hinton, G. (1986b) Sequential thought processes in PDP models. In: *Parallel distributed processing: explorations in the microstructures of cognition, vol. 2*, ed, J. L. McClelland & D. E. Rumelhart, pp. 3–57. MIT Press. [rNC]

Saad, D., ed. (1998) *On-line learning in neural networks.* Cambridge University Press. [aMHC]

Sacks, H., Schegloff, E. & Jefferson, G. (1974) Simplest systematics for organization of turn-taking for conversation. *Language* 50(4):696–35. [SCL]

Sagarra, N. & Herschensohn, J. (2010) The role of proficiency and working memory in gender and number processing in L1 and L2 Spanish. *Lingua* 120:2022–39. [aMHC]

Sahin, N. T., Pinker, S., Cash, S. S., Schomer, D. & Halgren, E. (2009) Sequential processing of lexical, grammatical, and articulatory information within Broca's area. *Science* 326:445. [aMHC]

Sandler, W. (1986) The spreading hand autosegment of American Sign Language. *Sign Language Studies* 50:1–28. [KE]

Sandler, W. (2012) Dedicated gestures and the emergence of sign language. *Gesture* 12:265–307. [rNC]

Sandler, W., Aronoff, M., Meir, I. & Padden, C. (2011) The gradual emergence of phonological form in a new language. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 29:503–43. [KE]

Sandler, W., Meir, I., Padden, C. & Aronoff, M. (2005) The emergence of grammar: Systematic structure in a new language. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 102:2661–65. [aMHC]

Sanford, A. J. & Sturt, P. (2002) Depth of processing in language comprehension: Not noticing the evidence. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 6:382–86. [rNC]

Sarma, V. (2003) Noncanonical word order: Topic and focus in adult and child Tamil. In: *Word order and scrambling*, ed. S. Karimi, pp. 238–72. Blackwell. [UL]

Saxton, M., Houston-Price, C. & Dawson, N. (2005) The prompt hypothesis: Clarification requests as corrective input for grammatical errors. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 26(3):393–14. [GB]

Schegloff, E. (2007) *Sequence organization in interaction*. Cambridge University Press. [SCL]

Schegloff, E. A., Jefferson, G. & Sacks, H. (1977) The preference for self-correction in the organization of repair in conversation. *Language* 53(2):361–82. [PGTH]

Schlenker, P. (2010) A phonological condition that targets discontinuous syntactic units: Ma/mon suppletion in French. *Snippets* 22:11–13. [SCL]

Schlesinger, I. M. (1975) Why a sentence in which a sentence in which a sentence is embedded is embedded is difficult. *Linguistics* 153:53–66. [rNC]

Schmidt, R. A. & Wrisberg, C. A. (2004) *Motor learning and performance, third edition*. Human Kinetics. [aMHC]

Schultz, W., Dayan, P. & Montague, P. R. (1997) A neural substrate of prediction and reward. *Science* 275:1593–99. [aMHC]

Schwab, E. C., Nusbaum, H. C. & Pisoni, D. B. (1985) Some effects of training on the perception of synthetic speech. *Human Factors* 27:395–408. [ADE]

Seidenberg, M. S. (1997) Language acquisition and use: Learning and applying probabilistic constraints. *Science* 275:1599–603. [aMHC]

Seidenberg, M. S. & McClelland, J. L. (1989) A distributed, developmental model of word recognition and naming. *Psychological Review* 96:523–68. [aMHC]

Seitz, A. R. & Watanabe, T. (2003) Psychophysics: Is subliminal learning really passive? *Nature* 422:36. [ADE]

Senghas, A., Kita, S. & Özyürek, A. (2004) Children creating core properties of language: Evidence from an emerging sign language in Nicaragua. *Science* 305:1779–82. [rNC]

Shanks, D. R. & St. John, M. F. (1994) Characteristics of dissociable human learning systems. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 17:367–95. [rNC]

Shannon, C. (1948) A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal* 27:623–56. [aMHC]

Shin, Y. K., Proctor, R. W. & Capaldi, E. J. (2010) A review of contemporary ideomotor theory. *Psychological Bulletin* 136:943–74. [AB]

Siegel, D. (1978) The adjacency constraint and the theory of morphology. *North East Linguistics Society* 8:189–97. [aMHC]

Sigman, M. & Dehaene, S. (2005) Parsing a cognitive task: A characterization of the mind's bottleneck. *PLOS Biology* 3(2):e37. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0030037. [aMHC]

Silbert, L. J., Honey, C. J., Simony, E., Poeppel, D. & Hasson, U. (2014) Coupled neural systems underlie the production and comprehension of naturalistic narrative speech. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 111:E4687–96. [aMHC]

Silver, M. R., Grossberg, S., Bullock, D., Histed, M. H. & Miller, E. K. (2011) A neural model of sequential movement planning and control of eye movements: Item-order-rank working memory and saccade selection by the supplementary eye fields. *Neural Networks* 26:29–58. [SG]

Simon, H. A. (1956) Rational choice and the structure of the environment. *Psychological Review* 63:129–38. [aMHC]

Simon, H. A. (1982) *Models of bounded rationality: Empirically grounded economic reason*. MIT Press. [aMHC, KB]

Simon, H. A. & Chase, W. G. (1973) Skill in chess. *American Scientist* 61:393–403. [rNC]

Simons, D. J. & Levin, D. T. (1998) Failure to detect changes to people during a real-world interaction. *Psychonomic Bulletin and Review* 5:644–49. [aMHC]

Singer, W. (2013) Cortical dynamics revisited. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 17:616–26. [SLF]

Singleton, J. L. & Newport, E. L. (2004) When learners surpass their models: The acquisition of American Sign Language from inconsistent input. *Cognitive Psychology* 49:370–407. [rNC]

Siyanova-Chanturia, A., Conklin, K. & Van Heuven, W. J. B. (2011) Seeing a phrase "time and again" matters: The role of phrasal frequency in the processing of multiword sequences. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 37:776–784. [aMHC]

Slattery, T. J., Sturt, P., Christianson, K., Yoshida, M. & Ferreira, F. (2013) Lingering misinterpretations of garden path sentences arise from flawed semantic processing. *Journal of Memory and Language* 69:104–20. [FF, rNC]

Smith, K. & Kirby, S. (2008) Cultural evolution: Implications for understanding the human language faculty and its evolution. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* 363:3591–603. [aMHC]

Smith, K. & Wonnacott, E. (2010) Eliminating unpredictable variation through iterated learning. *Cognition* 116:444–49. [aMHC]

Smith, M. & Wheeldon, L. (1999) High level processing scope in spoken sentence production. *Cognition* 73:205–46. [aMHC, DAC, rNC]

Smith, M. & Wheeldon, L. (2004) Horizontal information flow in spoken sentence production. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 30:675–686. [MCM, rNC]

Snedeker, J. & Trueswell, J. (2003) Using prosody to avoid ambiguity: Effects of speaker awareness and referential context. *Journal of Memory and Language* 48:103–30. [aMHC]

Snijders, L. (2012) Issues concerning constraints on discontinuous NPs in Latin. In: *Proceedings of the LFG12 Conference, Bali, Indonesia, June 28–July 1, 2012*, pp. 565–81, ed. M. Butt & T. H. King. CSLI Publications. Available at: http://web.stanford.edu/group/cslipublications/cslipublications/LFG/17/lfg12.html [SCL]

Solan, Z., Horn, D., Ruppin, E. & Edelman, S. (2005) Unsupervised learning of natural languages. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* 102:11629–34. [AL]

Sperling, G. (1960) The information available in brief visual presentations. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied* 74:1–29. [aMHC, KB]

Sperling, G., Budiansky, J. Spivak, J. G. & Johnson, M. C. (1971) Extremely rapid visual search: The maximum rate of scanning letters for the presence of a numeral. *Science* 174:307–11. [MCP]

Staub, A. & Clifton, C., Jr. (2006) Syntactic prediction in language comprehension: Evidence from either … or. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 32:425–36. [aMHC]

Steedman, M. (1987) Combinatory grammars and parasitic gaps. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 5:403–39. [aMHC]

Steedman, M. (2000) *The syntactic process*. MIT Press. [aMHC]

Stephens, D. W. & Krebs, J. R. (1986) *Foraging theory*. Princeton University Press. [AL]

Stephens, G. J., Honey, C. J. & Hasson, U. (2013) A place for time: The spatiotemporal structure of neural dynamics during natural audition. *Journal of Neurophysiology* 110(9):2019–26. [aMHC, CJH]

Stephens, G. J., Silbert, L. J. & Hasson, U. (2010) Speaker–listener neural coupling underlies successful communication. *PNAS* 107:14425–30. [aMHC]

Stivers, T., Enfield, N. J., Brown, P., Englert, C., Hayashi, M., Heinemann, T., Hoymann, G., Rossano, F., de Ruiter, J. P., Yoon, K.-Y. & Levinson, S. C. (2009) Universals and cultural variation in turn-taking in conversation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 106:10587–92. [aMHC, rNC]

Studdert-Kennedy, M. (1986) Some developments in research on language behavior. In: *Behavioral and social science: Fifty years of discovery: In commemoration of the fiftieth anniversary of the "Ogburn Report," recent social trends in the United States*, ed. N. J. Smelser & D. R. Gerstein, pp. 208–48. National Academy Press. [aMHC]

Sturt, P. & Crocker, M. W. (1996) Monotonic syntactic processing: A cross-linguistic study of attachment and reanalysis. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 11:449–94. [aMHC]

Supalla, S. (1991) Manually coded English: The modality question in signed language development. In: *Theoretical issues in sign language research*, ed. P. Siple & S. D. Fischer, pp. 85–109. University of Chicago Press. [KE]

Supalla, S. & McKee, C. (2002) The role of manually coded English in language development of deaf children. In: *Modality and structure in signed and spoken languages*, ed. R. P. Meier, K. Cormier & D. Quinto-Pozos, pp. 143–65. Cambridge University Press. [KE]

Swaab, T., Brown, C. M. & Hagoort, P. (2003) Understanding words in sentence contexts: The time course of ambiguity resolution. *Brain and Language* 86:326–43. [aMHC]

Swets, B., Desmet, T., Clifton, C. & Ferreira, F. (2008) Underspecification of syntactic ambiguities: Evidence from self-paced reading. *Memory and Cognition* 36:201–16. [rNC]

Swinney, D. A. & Osterhout, L. (1990) Inference generation during auditory language comprehension. *Psychology of Learning and Motivation* 25:17–33. [GB]

Szostak, C. M. & Pitt, M. A. (2013) The prolonged influence of subsequent context on spoken word recognition. *Attention, Perception, and Psychophysics* 75:1533–1546. [KB]

Talmy, L. (2000) *Toward a cognitive semantics.* MIT Press. [RM]

Tanenhaus, M. K., Spivey-Knowlton, M. J., Eberhard, K. M. & Sedivy, J. C. (1995) Integration of visual and linguistic information in spoken language comprehension. *Science* 268:1632–34. [aMHC]

Tenenbaum, J. B., Kemp, C., Griffiths, T. L. & Goodman, N. D. (2011) How to grow a mind: Statistics, structure, and abstraction. *Science* 331:1279–85. [aMHC]

Thornton, R., MacDonald, M. C. & Gil, M. (1999) Pragmatic constraint on the interpretation of complex noun phrases in Spanish and English. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 25:1347–65. [aMHC]

Tincoff, R. & Jusczyk, P. W. (1999) Some beginnings of word comprehension in 6-month-olds. *Psychological Science* 10(2):172–75. Available at: http://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.00127. [RM]

Tincoff, R. & Jusczyk, P. W. (2012) Six-month-olds comprehend words that refer to parts of the body. *Infancy* 17(4):432–44. Available at: http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7078.2011.00084.x. [RM]

Tomasello, M. (1992) *First verbs: A case study of early grammatical development*. Cambridge University Press. [aMHC]

Tomasello, M. (2003) *Constructing a language: A usage-based theory of language acquisition.* Harvard University Press. [aMHC, DPM, rNC]

Tomasello, M. (2006) Acquiring linguistic constructions. In: *Handbook of child psychology. 2. Cognition, perception, and language*, ed. W. Damon, R. Lerner, D. Kuhn & R. Siegler, pp. 255–98. Wiley. [DPM]

Tomasello, M., Conti-Ramsden, G. & Ewert, B. (1990) Young children's conversations with their mothers and fathers: Differences in breakdown and repair. *Journal of Child Language* 17(1):115–30. [GB]

Townsend, D. J. & Bever, T. G. (2001) *Sentence comprehension: The integration of habits and rules*. MIT Press. [aMHC]

Treisman, A. (1964) Selective attention in man. *British Medical Bulletin* 20:12–16. [aMHC]

Treisman, A. & Schmidt, H. (1982) Illusory conjunctions in the perception of objects. *Cognitive Psychology* 14:107–41. [aMHC]

Tremblay, A. & Baayen, H. (2010) Holistic processing of regular four-word sequences: A behavioral and ERP study of the effects of structure, frequency, and probability on immediate free recall. In: *Perspectives on formulaic language*, ed. D. Wood, pp. 151–67. Continuum International Publishing. [aMHC]

Tremblay, A., Derwing, B., Libben, G. & Westbury, C. (2011) Processing advantages of lexical bundles: Evidence from self-paced reading and sentence recall tasks. *Language Learning* 61:569–613. [aMHC]

Trotzke, A., Bader, M. & Frazier, L. (2013) Third factors and the performance interface in language design. *Biolinguistics* 7:1–34. [rNC]

Trudgill, P. (2011) *Sociolinguistic typology: Social determinants of linguistic complexity*. Oxford University Press. [aMHC, TB]

Trueswell, J. C. & Tanenhaus, M. K. (1994) Towards a lexicalist framework of constraint-based syntactic ambiguity resolution. In: *Perspectives on sentence processing*, ed. C. Clifton, L. Frazier & K. Rayner, pp. 155–79. Erlbaum. [aMHC]

Trueswell, J. C., Medina, T. N., Hafri, A. & Gleitman, L. R. (2013) Propose but verify: Fast mapping meets cross-situational word learning. *Cognitive Psychology* 66(1):126–56. [FHW]

Trueswell, J. C., Sekerina, I., Hill, N. M. & Logrip, M. L. (1999) The kindergarten-path effect: Studying on-line sentence processing in young children. *Cognition* 73:89–134. [aMHC]

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* 33:285–318. [aMHC]

Trueswell, J. C., Tanenhaus, M. K. & Kello, C. (1993) Verb-specific constraints in sentence processing: Separating effects of lexical preference from garden-paths. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 19:528–53. [aMHC]

Tylén, K., Christensen, P., Roepstorff, A., Lund, T., Østergaard, S. & Donald, M. (2015) Brains striving for coherence: Long-term cumulative plot formation in the default mode network. *NeuroImage* 121:106–14. [rNC]

Tyler, L. K. & Warren, P. (1987) Local and global structure in spoken language comprehension. *Journal of Memory and Language* 26(6):638–57. [FF]

Uehara, K. & Bradley, D. (1996) The effect of *-ga* sequences on processing Japanese multiply center-embedded sentences. In: *11th Pacific-Asia conference on language, information, and computation,* pp. 187–196. Seoul: Kyung Hee University. [rNC]

Ullman, M. T. (2001) The declarative/procedural model of lexicon and grammar. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research* 30:37–69. [DPM]

Valian, V., Solt, S. & Stewart, J. (2009) Abstract categories or limited-scope formulae? The case of children's determiners. *Journal of Child Language* 36:743–78. [aMHC]

Van Berkum, J. J., Brown, C. M., Zwitserlood, P., Kooijman, V. & Hagoort, P. (2005) Anticipating upcoming words in discourse: Evidence from ERPs and reading times. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 31:443–67. [aMHC]

van den Brink, D., Brown, C. M. & Hagoort, P. (2001) Electrophysiological evidence for early contextual influences during spoken-word recognition: N200 versus N400 effects. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 13:967–85. [aMHC]

Van Dyke, J. A. & Johns, C. L. (2012) Memory Interference as a determinant of language comprehension. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 6:193–11. [MCM, rNC]

Van Everbroeck, E. (1999) Language type frequency and learnability: A connectionist appraisal. In: *Proceedings of the 21st Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, August 1999*, pp. 755–60, ed. M. Hahn & S. C. Stoness. Erlbaum. [aMHC]

van Gompel, R. P. & Liversedge, S. P. (2003) The influence of morphological information on cataphoric pronoun assignment. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 29:128–39. [aMHC]

van Gompel, R. P. G., Pickering, M. J., Pearson, J. & Jacob, G. (2006) The activation of inappropriate analyses in garden-path sentences: Evidence from structural priming. *Journal of Memory and Language* 55:335–62. [FF]

van Soelen, I. L. C., Brouwer, R. M., van Leeuwen, M., Kahn, R. S., Hulshoff Pol, H. E. & Boomsma, D. I. (2011) Heritability of verbal and performance intelligence in a pediatric longitudinal sample. *Twin Research and Human Genetics* 14:119–28. [AL]

Vasishth, S., Suckow, K., Lewis, R. L. & Kern, S. (2010) Short-term forgetting in sentence comprehension: Crosslinguistic evidence from verb-final structures. *Language and Cognitive Processes* 25:533–67. [rNC]

Vicario, C. M., Martino, D. & Koch, G. (2013) Temporal accuracy and variability in the left and right posterior parietal cortex. *Neuroscience* 245:121–28. [GB]

Vogler, C., Gschwind, L., Coyne, D., Freytag, V., Milnik, A., Egli, T., Heck, A., de Quervain, D. J. & Papassotiropoulos, A. (2014) Substantial SNP-based heritability estimates for working memory performance. *Translational Psychiatry* 4: e438. [AL]

Vouloumanos, A. & Werker, J. F. (2007) Listening to language at birth: Evidence for a bias for speech in neonates. *Developmental Science* 10(2):159–64. Available at: http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7687.2007.00549.x. [RM]

Vroomen, J. & de Gelder, B. (1999) Lexical access of resyllabified words: Evidence from phoneme monitoring. *Memory and Cognition* 27(3):413–21. [SCL]

Wagemans, J., Elder, J. H., Kubovy, M., Palmer, S. E., Peterson, M. A., Singh, M. & von der Heydt, R. (2012) A century of Gestalt psychology in visual perception: I. Perceptual grouping and figure–ground organization. *Psychological Bulletin* 138:1172–217. [rNC]

Wagers, M., Lau, E. & Phillips, C. (2009) Agreement attraction in comprehension: Representations and processes. *Journal of Memory and Language* 61:206–37. [DAC]

Wagner, V., Jescheniak, J. D. & Schriefers, H. (2010) On the flexibility of grammatical advance planning during sentence production: Effects of cognitive load on multiple lexical access. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition* 36:423–40. [MCM]

Wallace, R. S. (2005) *Be your own botmaster, second edition*, ALICE A.I. Foundation. [rNC]

Wang, F. H. & Mintz, T. H. (under revision) The limits of associative learning in cross-situational word learning. [FHW]

Wang, M. D. (1970) The role of syntactic complexity as a determiner of comprehensibility. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior* 9:398–404. [rNC]

Wang, W. S.-Y. (1969) Competing changes as a cause of residue. *Language* 45:9–25. [aMHC]

Wang, W. S.-Y., ed. (1977) *The lexicon in phonological change*. Mouton. [aMHC, rNC]

Wang, W. S.-Y. & Cheng, C.-C. (1977) Implementation of phonological change: The Shaung-feng Chinese case. In: *The lexicon in phonological change*, ed. W. S.-Y. Wang, pp. 86–100. Mouton. [aMHC]

Warren, P. & Marslen-Wilson, W. (1987) Continuous uptake of acoustic cues in spoken word recognition. *Perception & Psychophysics* 41:262–75. [aMHC]

Warren, P., Speer, S. & Schafer, A. (2003) *Wanna*-contraction and prosodic disambiguation in US and NZ English. *Wellington Working Papers in Linguistics* 15:31–49. [WO]

Warren, R. M. (1970) Perceptual restoration of missing speech sounds. *Science* 167 (3917):392–93. [GB, MCM]

Warren, R. M., Obusek, C. J., Farmer, R. M. & Warren, R. P. (1969) Auditory sequence: Confusion of patterns other than speech or music. *Science* 164:586–87. [aMHC, CJH, rNC]

Warren, R. M. & Sherman, G. L. (1974) Phonemic restorations based on subsequent context. *Perception and Psychophysics* 16:150–56. [MCM]

Wasow, T. & Arnold, J. (2003) Post-verbal constituent ordering in English. In: *Determinants of grammatical variation in English*, ed. G. Rohdenburg & B. Mondorf, pp. 119–54. Mouton de Gruyter. [aMHC]

Watanabe, T., Náñez, J. E. & Sasaki, Y. (2001) Perceptual learning without perception. *Nature* 413:844–48. [ADE]

Waters, A. J., Gobet, F. & Leyden, G. (2002) Visuospatial abilities of chess players. *British Journal of Psychology* 93(4):557–65. [rNC]

Waxman, S. R. & Gelman, S. A. (2009) Early word-learning entails reference, not merely associations. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 13(6):258–63. [FHW]

Weber-Fox, C. M. & Neville, H. J. (1996) Maturational constraints on functional specializations for language processing: ERP and behavioral evidence in bilingual speakers. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 8(3):231–56. [RM]

Weissenborn, J. & Höhle, B., eds. (2001) *Approaches to bootstrapping: Phonological, lexical, syntactic and neurophysiological aspects of early language acquisition*. John Benjamins. [aMHC]

Werker, J. F., Yeung, H. H. & Yoshida, K. A. (2012) How do infants become experts at native-speech perception? *Current Directions in Psychological Science* 21(4):221–26. Available at: http://doi.org/10.1177/0963721412449459. [RM, rNC]

Wexler, K. (2002) Lenneberg's dream: Learning, normal language development and specific language impairment. In: *Language competence across populations: Towards a definition of specific language impairment*, ed. J. Schaffer & Y. Levy, pp. 11–60. Erlbaum. [DPM]

Wicha, N. Y. Y., Moreno, E. M. & Kutas, M. (2004) Anticipating words and their gender: An event-related brain potential study of semantic integration, gender expectancy, and gender agreement in Spanish sentence reading. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience* 16:1272–88. [aMHC]

Wiener, M., Turkeltaub, P. & Coslett, H. B. (2010) The image of time: A voxel-wise meta-analysis. *NeuroImage* 49(2):1728–40. [GB]

Wilbur, R. B. & Nolkn, S. B. (1986) The duration of syllables in American Sign Language. *Language and Speech* 29:263–80. [aMHC]

Wilson, C. (2006) Learning phonology with substantive bias: An experimental and computational study of velar palatalization. *Cognitive Science* 30:945–82. [MLL]

Wilson, M. & Emmorey, K. (1997) A visual-spatial "phonological loop" in working memory: Evidence from American Sign Language. *Memory and Cognition* 25(3):313–20. [KE]

Wilson, M. & Emmorey, K. (1998) A "word length effect" for sign language: Further evidence on the role of language in structuring working memory. *Memory and Cognition* 26(3):584–90. [KE]

Wilson, M. & Emmorey, K. (2006) Comparing sign language and speech reveals a universal limit on short-term memory capacity. *Psychological Science* 17:682–83. [aMHC]

Winograd, T. (1972) Understanding natural language. *Cognitive Psychology* 3:1–191. [aMHC]

Wolpert, D. M., Diedrichsen, J. & Flanagan, J. R. (2011) Principles of sensorimotor learning. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* 12:739–51. [aMHC, AB]

Wolpert, D. M., Ghahramani, Z. & Flanagan, J. R. (2001) Perspectives and problems in motor learning. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* 5:487–94. [AB]

Wundt, W. (1904) The psychology of the sentence. In: *Language and psychology: Historical aspects of psycholinguistics*, ed. A. L. Blumenthal, pp. 9–32. Wiley. [DAC]

Xanthos, A., Lahaa, S., Gillis, S., Stefany, U., Aksu-Koc, A., Christofidou, A., Gagarina, N., Hrzica, G., Nihan Ketrez, F., Kilani-Schoch, M., Korecky-Kroll, K., Kovacevic, M., Laalo, K., Palmovic, M., Pfeiler, B., Voeikova, M. D. & Dressler, W. U. (2012) On the role of morphological richness in the early development of noun and verb inflection. *First Language* 31:461–79. [rNC]

Yang, C. (2002) *Knowledge and learning in natural language*. Oxford University Press. [aMHC]

Yang, C. (2013) Ontogeny and phylogeny of language. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 110:6324–27. [aMHC]

Yates, F. (1966) *The art of memory.* Routledge & Kegan Paul. [MLD]

Yonata, L. (1999) Early metalinguistic competence: Speech monitoring and repair behavior. *Developmental Psychology* 35(3):822–34. [GB]

Yoshida, K. A., Pons, F., Maye, J. & Werker, J. F. (2010) Distributional phonetic learning at 10 months of age. *Infancy* 15(4):420–33. Available at: http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7078.2009.00024.x. [RM]

Yu, C. & Smith, L. B. (2007) Rapid word learning under uncertainty via cross-situational statistics. *Psychological Science* 18(5):414–20. [FHW]

Yu, C., Smith, L. B., Klein, K. & Shiffrin, R. M. (2007) Hypothesis testing and associative learning in cross-situational word learning: Are they one and the same? In: *Proceedings of the 29th Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society, Nashville, TN, August 2007*, pp. 737–42, ed. D. S. McNamara & J. G. Trafton. Cognitive Science Society. [FHW]

Zhang, Y. & Clark, S. (2011) Syntactic processing using the generalized perceptron and beam search. *Computational Linguistics* 37(1):105–51. [CG-R]

Zhu, L., Chen, Y., Torrable, A., Freeman, W. & Yuille, A. L. (2010) Part and appearance sharing: Recursive compositional models for multi-view multi-object detection. In: *IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPRW 2010), San Francisco, CA, June 2010*, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE). [aMHC]

Zipf, G. (1936) *The psychobiology of language*. Routledge. [MLL]

Zipf, G. K. (1949) *Human behavior and the principle of least effort*. Addison-Wesley. [aMHC, MLL]