

Ling 315: On the Syntax-Semantics Interface

WiSe 2010-11

COURSE DESCRIPTION

This advanced seminar explores the division of labor between syntax and semantics in a Generative / Minimalistic framework. Areas of interest are: (i) quantifier scope, (ii) issues concerning scope (integrity, non-locality, weak crossover, intervention effects), (iii) reconstruction and connectivity effects, and (iv) ellipsis. For some phenomena, LF-based approaches and semantic approaches compete against each other to derive the empirical pattern. For some others, the data are derived from the interplay of syntactic and semantic constraints. By examining and evaluating all these approaches, the students will gain a deeper insight into the complex underpinnings of the syntax-semantics interface.

INSTRUCTOR: Prof. Maribel Romero (short for María Isabel Romero Sangüesa)
maribel.romero@uni-konstanz.de
G212
Office hours: Thursdays 12-13h

COURSE PREREQUISITES

Background on syntax at least equivalent to Ling214 and knowledge formal semantics at least equivalent to Ling215.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

- Class presentation of a paper on the syllabus (Referat)
- Term paper (Hausarbeit) due shortly after the end of classes.

Syllabus

I. INTRODUCTION	
The emergence of Logical Form (LF)	May, R. 1985. <i>Logical Form</i> , MIT Press. Sag, I. 1976. <i>Deletion and Logical Form</i> . MIT Diss.

I. QUANTIFIER SCOPE How is quantifier scope computed? How do scopal ambiguities arise?	
Approaches to Quantifier Scope: Quantifier Raising QR / Quantifying-in Flexible types Quantifier Storage Variable-free semantics Continuations Scope in TAG	Montague, R. 1974. English as a Formal Language, in R. H. Thomason (ed.), <i>Formal Philosophy: Selected Papers of Richard Montague</i> . Yale University Press. Montague, R. 1974.. The Proper Treatment of Quantification in Ordinary English (abbreviated PTQ), <i>ibidem</i> . Cooper, R. 1983, <i>Quantification and syntactic theory</i> , Reidel. Jacobson, P. 1992. Flexible Categorical Grammar: Questions and Prospects, in R. Levine (ed.), <i>Formal Grammar: Theory and Implementation</i> , Oxford Univ. Press. Shan, C. 2002. A continuation semantics of interrogatives that accounts for Baker's Ambiguity, <i>SALT XII</i> . Barker, C. 2001. Integrity: a syntactic constraint of quantificational scoping, <i>WCCFL 20</i> . Kallmeyer, L. and M. Romero. 2008. Scope and Situation Binding in LTAG using Semantic Unification, <i>Research on Language and Computation</i> 6, §2, 3, 4.1-4.5.

II. SOME ISSUES CONCERNING SCOPE	
Nested QuNPs: Limitations of QR: integrity Continuations TAG NP scope + E-type pronoun Some exceptions to integrity	Barker, C. 2002. Continuations and the nature of quantification, <i>Natural Language Semantics</i> . Kallmeyer, L. and M. Romero. 2008. Scope and Situation Binding in LTAG using Semantic Unification, <i>Research on Language and Computation</i> 6.1, §4.6. Büring, D. 2001. A situation-semantics for binding out of DP, in <i>SALT XI</i> . Sauerland, U. 2000. Syntactic economy and quantifier raising. Ms.
Non-locality cases	Shimoyama, J. 2001. <i>WH-constructions in Japanese</i> . UMass Ph. D. dissertation. Shan, C. 2004. Binding alongside Hamblin alternatives calls for variable-free semantics, <i>SALT</i> 14. Novel, M. and M. Romero. In press. Movement, Variables and Hamblin Semantics, <i>Sinn und Bedeutung</i> 14.
Weak Crossover	Jacobson, P. 1999. Towards a Variable-Free Semantics, <i>L&P</i> 22. Shan, C. and C. Barker. 2006. Explaining crossover and superiority as left-to-right evaluation, <i>L&P</i> 29. Eilam, A. 2010. Weak Crossover effects and variable binding: the role of information structure. Handout, Univ. Pennsylvania.
Intervention effects	Beck, S. 1996. Quantified Structures as Barriers for LF-movement, <i>NLS</i> 4. Beck, S. 2006. Intervention Effects Follow from Focus Interpretation, <i>NLS</i> 14. Tomioka S. 2007. Pragmatics of LF intervention effects: Japanese and Korean <i>wh</i> -interrogatives, <i>Journal of Pragmatics</i> 39.

III. RECONSTRUCTION AND CONNECTIVITY EFFECTS

Do Connectivity Effects (e.g. Binding Theory) obtain through syntactic LF reconstruction or by purely semantic means?

<p>A'-movement:</p> <p>Binding Theory in <i>wh</i>-mov't Chomsky's possible LF account Correlation between scope and connectivity Syntactic & semantic accounts of correlation Fox's necessary LF account?</p>	<p>Lebeaux, D. 1994. "Where does Binding Theory Apply?", ms. U. Maryland. Chomsky, N. <i>The Minimalist Program</i>. MIT Press. Chapter 3. Cresti, D. 1995. Extraction and reconstruction, <i>NLS</i> 3. Rullmann, H., 1995. <i>Maximality in the semantics of wh-constructions</i>. UMass Ph.D. diss. Heycock, C. 1995. Asymmetries in reconstruction, <i>Linguistic Inquiry</i> 16. Romero, M. 1997. "The correlation between Scope Reconstruction and Connectivity Effects". <i>WCCFL</i> 16. Fox, D. 2000. <i>Economy and Semantic Interpretation</i>. MIT Press. Sharvit, Y. 1999. Functional Relative Clauses, <i>Linguistics & Philosophy</i>, 22. Chiechia, G. 1995. <i>Dynamics of meaning: Anaphora, Presupposition, and the Theory of Grammar</i>. Univ. Chicago Press. Fox, D. 1995. "Condition C Effects in ACD", <i>MITWPL</i> 27, pp.105-119. Fox, D. 2003. On Logical Form, in Randall Hendrick's <i>Minimalist Syntax</i>, Blackwell.</p>
<p>Specificational copular sentences:</p> <p>Syntactic conversion approach Semantic approach Syntactic question+ellipsis approach</p>	<p>Higgins, R. 1976. <i>The Pseudo-cleft construction in English</i>. Indiana Univ. Heycock, C. & A. Kroch. 1999. Pseudocleft Connectivity: Implications for the LF Interface. <i>Linguistic Inquiry</i> 30.3: 365 – 397. Jacobson, P. 1994. Binding connectivity in copular sentences, <i>SALT</i> 4. Sharvit, Y. 1999. Connectivity in Specificational Sentences, <i>NLS</i>, 7.3. Ross, H. 2000. The Frozenness of Pseudoclefts – Towards an Inequality-based Syntax. Ms. University of North Texas. Schlenker, P. 2003. Clausal Equations (A Note on the Connectivity Problem), <i>NLLT</i> 21 Romero, M. 2005. Concealed Questions and Specificational Subjects, <i>L&P</i> 28.</p>

IV. ELLIPSIS What identity relation is required between the ellipsis site and its antecedent: syntactic identity at LF or semantic anaphora?	
Syntactic identity at LF: Antecedent-Contained Deletion resolution Sloppy readings of pronouns Vehicle change	Fiengo-May 1994, <i>Indices and Identity</i> , MIT Press. Dahl, Ö. 1973. On So-called ‘Sloppy Identity’, <i>Synthese</i> 26. Rooth, M. 1992a. A Theory of focus Interpretation, <i>Natural Language Semantics</i> 1: 75-116.
Semantic anaphora: ACD resolution Sloppy readings of Verb Phrases Person, gender and number features	Jacobson, P. 1992. Antecedent-Contained Deletion in a Variable Free Semantics. In: <i>Proceedings of SALT 2</i> . Hardt, D. 1999. Dynamic Interpretation of VP Ellipsis. <i>Linguistics and Philosophy</i> 22.2. Heim, I. 2001. Semantics and morphology of person and logophoricity. Tuebingen talk.
Semantic identity on LF material	Merchant, J. 2001, <i>The Syntax of Silence</i> . Oxford University Press.