SYLLABUS

LIN 837: Advanced Studies in Semantics and Pragmatics

1 The course

This course is two things at once:

- a continuation of the first-semester semantics course, expanding on the framework developed there and introducing more formal tools
- something like a seminar, in which you'll encounter the literature in earnest and do original research

2 Topics

The first chunk of the course aims to:

- provide you with some logical tools and some experience with a slightly different analytical framework
- briefly confront a few new empirical areas

After this, we'll narrow our empirical focus start looking at the literature. The topics we'll focus on this semester:

- crosslinguistic semantics and semantic variation
- definiteness

These overlap massively.

3 Contact Information

Me: Marcin Morzycki Email: morzycki@msu.edu

Office hours: Wednesday 2:30–3:30 and Thursday 2:00–3:00 (or

make an appointment)

Office: B-404 Wells Hall

4 Requirements

The requirements for this course are:

- Doing some small technical exercises.
- Doing a few more open-ended assignments that involve actual linguistic analysis. For one of these assignments, you—along with collaborators—will present your work and lead the ensuing discussion. You will need to have a fairly extensive handout (or slides) and plan to entertain us for most of a class.
- Writing a squib (very short paper) or more fully-developed paper. If you've been around a while, you might want to aim for a paper. If you're taking this class in place of doing a thesis, you should also aim something closer to a proper paper.
- Presenting your work on the squib/paper.
- Presenting one of the readings.
- Participating vigorously in the discussion. This is not syllabus window-dressing. This really is a requirement.

Grading Your final grade will be determined on the basis of your written work and your contributions in class (in presentations and more generally), weighted equally. (So, seriously, talk.)

A word about squibs They don't need to provide a full analysis of a phenomenon, and they do not need to reflect an entirely novel empirical discovery. Reasonable things to do in a squib are:

- make some empirical observations that you haven't seen made before and explain their significance
- attempt to extend an existing analysis of some phenomenon to a new range of data
- point out a disadvantage or difficulty in an existing analysis or discuss some larger issues it presents
- develop your own analysis from scratch of a phenomenon, without looking at the literature, then compare what you invented to what others have proposed

It is *not* sufficient, though, to simply read and summarize a handful of papers.

If you're writing a paper, you'll need an actual analysis.

1

5 Textbooks

Much of what we read will be from the primary literature. But you should also get a copy of:

Gamut, L. T. F. 1990. Logic, Language, and Meaning. University of Chicago Press.

It comes in two volumes. You should get both. This is somewhere between a textbook and a reference work. We'll use it in class a bit. but it's particularly useful as a kind of handbook to have by one's side when reading semantics. It is quite sophisticated formally, which can make it pretty challenging in places.

For purely formal background, you might also be interested in this:

Partee, Barbara, Alice ter Meulen, and Robert Wall. 1990. Mathematical Methods in Linguistics. Kluwer, Dordrecht.

6 Tentative Schedule

We won't follow this exact schedule. It's just a rough roadmap. Adjustments in scheduling and readings will be made along the way.

Aug. 29: logistics & syllabus

indirect interpretation propositional logic

brief chat about coming attractions

for next time: read Gamut (1991c) & do exercises

predicate logic Sept. 10:

articulating the indirect interpretation framework

working with the framework:

generalized conjunction and indirect interpretation

for next time: read Gamut (1991b) and do the purely-technical assignment

if you have time, read ch. 1 of Heim (1982)

working with the framework: Sept 17:

relative clauses & clausal comparatives

Heim on (in)definites, the big picture:

ch. 1 Heim (1982)

for next time: do assignment & read ch. 1-2 of Heim (1982)

Sept. 24 assignment presentation: plurals the familiarity theory of definiteness: ch. 2 Heim (1982) for next time: do assignment & read ch. 3 of Heim (1982) Oct. 1

assignment presentation: degree constructions

File Change Semantics: ch. 3 Heim (1982)

for next time: do assignment & read

Oct. 7: assignment presentation: kinds and genericity

Discourse Representation Theory:

Kamp (1981) (or chapter 2 of Kadmon (2001))

for next time: do assignment & read

Oct. 15: assignment presentation: events

universals in semantics:

von Fintel & Matthewson (2008) for next time: from now on, read

Oct. 22: variation and degrees: Beck et al. (2009)

are degrees universal?: Bochnak (2013)

Oct. 29: projecting degree arguments in Navajo:

Bogal-Allbritten (2013)

scale segments:

Schwarzschild (2012)

Nov. 5: evidentials as modals: Matthewson et al. (2007)

evidentials and surprise: Rett & Murray (2013)

modals as indefinites: Rullmann et al. (2008) Nov. 12:

definiteness in Warlpiri: Bittner & Hale (1995)

Nov. 19: kinds across languages: Chierchia (1998)

spillover, no doubt

Nov. 26: tense, aspect, & modality across languages:

Rullmann & Matthewson (2018)

spillover, no doubt

Dec. 3: squib presentations

Finals week: squib presentations

Loads of other readings are reasonable options under either of the broad rubrics of definiteness and variation. I'm open to suggestions about other possibilities.

References

- Beck, Sigrid, Polina Berezovskaya, & Katja Pflugfelder. 2009. 'The use of *again* in 19th-century English versus present-day English'. *Syntax* **12**(3), 193–214.
- Bittner, Maria & Ken Hale. 1995. 'Remarks on definiteness in Warlpiri'. In Emmon Bach, Eloise Jelinek, Angelika Kratzer, & Barbara Partee (eds.), *Quantification in Natural Languages, Vol. 1*, pp. 81–105. Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht.
- Bochnak, M. Ryan. 2013. 'The non-universal status of degrees: Evidence from Washo'. In Stefan Keine & Shayne Slogget (eds.), *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS)* 42, pp. 79–92. GLSA Publications, Amherst.
- Bogal-Allbritten, Elizabeth. 2013. 'Decomposing notions of adjectival transitivity in navajo'. *Natural Language Semantics* **21**(3), 277–314.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 1998. 'Reference to kinds across languages'. *Natural Language Semantics* **6**(4), 339–405.
- von Fintel, Kai & Lisa Matthewson. 2008. 'Universals in semantics'. *The Linguistic Review* **25**(1-2), 139–201.
- Gamut, L.T.F. 1991a. Logic, Language and Meaning. University of Chicago Press.
- Gamut, L.T.F. 1991b. 'Predicate logic'. In Gamut (1991a), chap. 3.
- Gamut, L.T.F. 1991c. 'Propositional logic'. In Gamut (1991a), chap. 2.
 Heim, Irene. 1982. The Semantics of Definite and Indefinite Noun Phrases. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Kadmon, Nirit. 2001. Formal Pragmatics. Blackwell Publishing, Malden, Massachusetts.
- Kamp, Hans. 1981. 'A theory of truth and semantic representation'. In Jeroen Groenendijk, Theo Janssen, & Martin Stokhof (eds.), Formal Methods in the Study of Language, Part 1, vol. 135, pp. 277–322. Mathematical Centre Tracts, Amsterdam. Reprinted in Jeroen Groenendijk, Theo Janssen and Martin Stokhof (eds), 1984, Truth, Interpretation, and Information; Selected Papers from the Third Amsterdam Colloquium, Foris, Dordrecht, pp. 1–41.
- Matthewson, Lisa, Henry Davis, & Hotze Rullmann. 2007. 'Evidentials as epistemic modals: Evidence from St'a ÌĄt'imcets'. In J. van Craenenbroeck (ed.), *guistic Variation Yearbook*, vol. 7, pp. 201–254. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- Rett, Jessica & Sarah E. Murray. 2013. 'A semantic account of mirative evidentials'. In *Proceedings of Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) 23*, pp. 453–472. CLC Publications, Ithaca, NY.
- Rullmann, Hotze & Lisa Matthewson. 2018. 'Towards a theory of modal-temporal interaction'. *Language* **94**(2), 281–331.

- Rullmann, Hotze, Lisa Matthewson, & Henry Davis. 2008. 'Modals as distributive indefinites'. *Natural Language Semantics* **16**(4), 317–357.
- Schwarzschild, Roger. 2012. 'Directed scale segments'. In Anca Chereches (ed.), *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT)* 22. eLanguage.

3