A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY OF SEMANTICS-BASED
GENERATIVE GRAMMAR

Having been 'commissioned' to prepare a bibliography of Generative Semantics, we soon discovered that what we called 'Generative Semantics' was in reality at least seven or eight different things with, in many cases, little or no overlap. In the broadest sense, 'Generative Semantics' refers to the assumption that semantic representation provides the input to the transformational rules of a grammar, an idea which was unthinkably radical when Jeffrey Gruber proposed it in his 1965 MIT dissertation, but which now is taken almost for granted by many. However, only a relatively small part of the literature is concerned with elaborating and explicitly motivating this assumption. In another sense, the term 'Generative Semantics' is taken to refer to a theory in which global rules and other derivational constraints play a major role—although as C. Lakoff argued in "Global Rules", this theory is logically quite independent of the role of semantics in a grammar. In still a third sense, 'Generative Semantics' is used to refer to what was for a time called 'abstract syntax', which is not so much a theory or an assumption as a way of doing things: showing how the apparently arbitrary distributions of grammatical constructions and relationships were predictable if one postulated underlying structures that were somewhat more 'abstract' than the surface structures they represented. The abstractness of these structures resided primarily in their containing elements which might not show up in surface structure and category labels that differed from those borne in surface structure, and in their expressing grammatical relationships which did not hold at surface structure. None of these characteristics was by itself a theoretical innovation; yet they resulted in a conception of deep structure that differed appreciably from that of Aspects. Ross' "On declarative sentences", his "Auxiliaries as main verbs", and R. Lakoff's Abstract syntax and Latin complementation are paradigm examples in this tradition.
Clustered around these three concepts, and yet not belonging more to any one than to any other are 1) proposals concerning the representation of reference, definiteness, and quantifiers in underlying structure, 2) attempts to describe the way(s) in which presuppositions, assumptions, and entailments seem to govern various grammatical phenomena, 3) discussions of various phenomena involving expressed and implied negation, 4) proposals concerning lexical structure, lexical insertion in a grammar with a semantic base, and the representation of the meaning of specific lexical items and classes of lexical items, and 5) demonstrations of the relevance of diverse kinds of semantic facts to grammatical and even phonological phenomena. Consequently the bibliography consists of eight sections reflecting these focuses of research. Naturally there are many papers which bear on several issues, and some which only arbitrarily can be put in one of these categories. For the latter, alternative classifications have been given at the end of the entries.

A few words of caution: 1) this bibliography is not exhaustive--it probably could not have been. Case theory for instance has been all but ignored except for work by Fillmore, its main articulator. Many relevant works have no doubt been inadvertently left out, and for this we apologize to their authors, and perhaps more important, to the reader. With the exception of Donnellan's "Reference and definite descriptions" (which was included because it describes an important class of data which linguistic theories purporting to deal with reference have yet to deal with in a natural way), no articles by philosophers have been included. For a suggestive bibliography of philosophical viewpoints on linguistic problems, the reader is referred to "Bibliography: Logic and Language" prepared by B. Partee, S. Sabsay and J. Soper, mimeographed and distributed by the Indiana University Linguistics Club. 2) The authors of some of the papers included here would not consider their work 'generative semantics'; most of these papers have been included because they bear on phenomena or issues crucial to 'generative semanticists' claims.
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Abbreviations


FL   Foundations of language.

GUMSL  Georgetown University. *Monograph series on languages and linguistics*.

HCL  Harvard University Computation Laboratory.


IULL  Indiana University Linguistics Club.

JL   Journal of linguistics.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lg.</td>
<td>Language.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIL</td>
<td>Papers in linguistics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SILS</td>
<td>Studies in the linguistic sciences, (working papers), Department of Linguistics, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SEMANTIC BASE COMPONENT (SBC)**


Lakoff, George, and John R. Ross. ca. 1966. *Is deep structure necessary?* Duplicated, MIT, IULC. [Four unpublished speculative pages beginning "We believe semantics may be generative, for the following reasons..."]


ABSTRACT SYNTAX (AS)


Mimeographed, University of California at Berkeley, Slavic Dept. 
[Presents additional evidence for auxiliary verbs as main verbs.]

Davison, Alice. 1970. Causal adverbs and performative verbs. CLS6 
190-202.

Fillmore, Charles J. 1968. The case for case. BAH 1-88.


To appear in HRK.

CLS6 235-249.

Green, Georgia M. 1970. Review of R. Lakoff, Abstract syntax and 
Latin complementation. Lg. 46:149-167.
1972. How to get people to do things with words. Mimeographed, 
University of Illinois. [Discusses proposals by Sadock, 
Gordon and Lakoff, and others concerning 'questions' with 
imperative' force, and points out a range of facts which 
better proposals will have to account for.]

FL 4:30-57. [An early paper relating tense to time 
adverbs.]

Lakoff, George. 1966. Stative adjectives and verbs in English. 
HCL Report NSF-17 1-16. [Analyzes verbs and adjectives 
as members of the same deep-structure category.]
1968. Instrumental adverbs and the concept of deep structure. 
FL 4:4-29
1970. Irregularity in syntax. New York, Holt, Rinehart and 
Winston. [A version of GL's 1965 Indiana University 
dissertation. Ch. 10 and Appendixes A and F are most 
representative of abstract syntax.]

1971. Passive resistance. CLS7 149-163. [Discusses accounts 
of the passive in English and other languages.]


Peterson, Thomas H. 1969. *A case for the declarative performative verb; dependent and independent conjunction in Mooré and English.* CLS5 411-419.

1970. *Imperatives and purpose and reason adverbials as complements of abstract verbs in Mooré.* Duplicated, University of California at Santa Barbara.


[Argues for abstract performative clauses.]

Sadock, Jerrold M. 1970. Whimperatives. PBL 223-238. [Treats sentences with question form and imperative force.]


DERIVATIONAL CONSTRAINTS (DC)


Gordon, David, and George Lakoff. 1971. Conversational postulates. CLS7 63-84. [Proposes that certain syntactic and semantic phenomena are determined by entailments of underlying structures.] (AS, P).


1971. The global nature of the nuclear stress rule: a rejoinder. Duplicated, University of Michigan. [A reply to Bresnan's claim in 'On sentence stress and syntactic transformation' (Lg. 47:257-281) that the nuclear stress rule is ordered in the syntactic cycle.]


1972. Doubl-ing. LI 3:61-86. [Discusses constraints against two successive forms in -ing in English.]


DEFINITENESS, REFERENCE, AND QUANTIFICATION (DRO)


1970. The deep structure of both. CLS6 178-190.


Grinder, John, and Paul M. Postal. 1971. Missing antecedents. LI 2:269-312. [Shows that interpretive theories have no uniform way of accounting for a variety of cases of identity of sense anaphora which 'generative semantic' theories would treat as subcases of the same phenomenon.]


1970. Repartee, or a reply to [Partee's] 'Negation, conjunction, and quantifiers'. FL 6 389-422.


LEXICAL STRUCTURE AND LEXICAL INSERTION (L)


DeRijk, Rudolph. 1968. A note on pre-lexical predicate raising. Dittoed, MIT.


1970. Where have all the ajectives gone? An essay in universal semantics. Duplicated, Australian National University, Canberra. (S).

1971. A method of semantic description. SJ 436-471. [A synthesis of componential and definitional approaches in describing the verbs of an Australian language, with discussion of their relationships to the syntax.]


1967. Look and see. Lg. 43:937-947.

1967. Functions of the lexicon in formal descriptive grammars. System Development Corporation, Santa Monica, Calif. [More detailed proposals concerning pre-lexical semantic structures and lexical insertion.]


McCawley, James D. 1968. Lexical insertion in a transformational grammar without deep structure. CLS4 71-80. (SBC).


Morgan, Jerry L. 1968. Remarks on the notion 'possible lexical item'. Dittoed, University of Chicago.


1971. The source of derived nominals in English. Lg. 47:786-796.


To appear. The derivation of surface nouns.

Quang Phuc Dong. 1971. The applicability of transformations to
idioms. CLS7 198-206.

Rice, Lester. 1968. Do trees have leaves? Ms. [On the representation
of fetch as deriving from a conjoined structure.]


Steffensen, Margaret. 1971. A deverbal analysis of adverbials in

Ohio State Working Papers in Linguistics 8 174-185. To
appear in HRK.

NEGERATION AND POLARITY (NP)

published in 1970, LI 1:169-186. [Syntax and semantics of
positive- and negative-polarity environments].


Horn, Laurence R. 1969. Polarity, or some more reasons why there
can't be any some-any rule. Paper presented at the 1969
winter meeting of the LSA.

(S, L).

CLS5 140-148. (AS).

Lindholm, James M. 1969. Negative-raising and sentence-pronominali-
ization. CLS5 148-159. (DRQ).

McCawley, James D. 1969. A note on multiple negations, or why you
can't not say no sentences like these. Mimeographed,
University of Chicago.

1971. The deep structure of negative clauses. Eigo Kyoııiku
Rivero, Mario-Luisa. 1970. A surface-structure constraint on
genation in Spanish. Lg. 46:640-666.

Schmerling, Susan F. 1971. A note on negative polarity. PIL
4:200-206.

See also entries under Presuppositions.

PRESUPPOSITIONS (P)

RBL 1-16. (NP).

Duplicated, University of Göteborg.

description. PIL 1:91-117; SLS 272-289. (L).

Fraser, Bruce. 1969. An analysis of concessive conditionals.
CLS5 66-76. (L).

LI 2:561-566.

Givon, Talmy. 1970. Existential presuppositions with ego problems,
or who sez? Duplicated, UCLA.

1971. Forward implication, backward presupposition, and the time
axis of complement-taking verbs. Dittoed, UCLA.

Horn, Laurence. 1969. A presuppositional analysis of only and
even. CLS5 98-108. (L).

of adverbs, and quantifiers, suspension of presupposition,
and negative polarity items.] (NP).

Hutchinson, Larry G. 1970. On what (possibly) to believe about
presuppositions. Non-publication #14 of the 1970 MSSB
mathematical linguistics seminar. Duplicated, Ohio
State University.

CLS6 328-340.

MSSB mathematical linguistics seminar. Dittoed, Ohio State
University.


Lakoff, Robin. 1969. Some reasons why there can't be any some-any rule. Lg. 45:608-615. (NP).


1970. The question of 'order' in semantic structure. Duplicated, Syracuse University. [Argues against meaning postulates and entailment rules. This and the above deal exclusively with semantic representation.] (S).


See also entries under 'Negation and polarity' and 'Definiteness, reference and quantification'.

SEMANTICS, GENERAL OR UNCLASSIFIABLE (S)

Binnick, Robert I. 1971. Will and be going to. CLS7 40-53.


Green, Georgia M. 1970. How abstract is surface structure? CLS6 270-281. [Treats identical surface structures which encode diverse grammatical-semantic relationships.]


Lakoff, Robin. 1971. If's, and's and but's about conjunction. SLS 114-149.

