

# Causes of linguistics-induced insomnia

Matthew Gotham

University of Oslo

CAS SynSem planning meeting, Lysebu  
6–8 February 2017



# Some things I work on

(or am planning to)

Two (possibly) related issues:

1 (Un)semanticity

2 Individuation and quantification

# (Un)semanticality

Are there truly semantic constraints on well-formedness, such that failure to meet them is separate from being that of ungrammatical, a presupposition failure, or pragmatically unlikely/impossible?

# (Un)semanticality

Are there truly semantic constraints on well-formedness, such that failure to meet them is separate from being that of ungrammatical, a presupposition failure, or pragmatically unlikely/impossible?

- (1) #John amazed the injustice of that decision. (Chomsky 1965: p. 95)
- (2) #The theory of relativity is eating breakfast. (Magidor 2013: p. 1)
- (3) #Fred attended three heavy books. (Gotham 2014: p. 132)

# (Un)semanticality

Are there truly semantic constraints on well-formedness, such that failure to meet them is separate from being that of ungrammatical, a presupposition failure, or pragmatically unlikely/impossible?

- (1) #John amazed the injustice of that decision. (Chomsky 1965: p. 95)
- (2) #The theory of relativity is eating breakfast. (Magidor 2013: p. 1)
- (3) #Fred attended three heavy books. (Gotham 2014: p. 132)

If so,

- what are those criteria

# (Un)semanticality

Are there truly semantic constraints on well-formedness, such that failure to meet them is separate from being that of ungrammatical, a presupposition failure, or pragmatically unlikely/impossible?

- (1) #John amazed the injustice of that decision. (Chomsky 1965: p. 95)
- (2) #The theory of relativity is eating breakfast. (Magidor 2013: p. 1)
- (3) #Fred attended three heavy books. (Gotham 2014: p. 132)

If so,

- what are those criteria,
- how can we detect them

# (Un)semanticality

Are there truly semantic constraints on well-formedness, such that failure to meet them is separate from being that of ungrammatical, a presupposition failure, or pragmatically unlikely/impossible?

- (1) #John amazed the injustice of that decision. (Chomsky 1965: p. 95)
- (2) #The theory of relativity is eating breakfast. (Magidor 2013: p. 1)
- (3) #Fred attended three heavy books. (Gotham 2014: p. 132)

If so,

- what are those criteria,
- how can we detect them, and
- what work do they do?

## One recent proposal

Anomaly is implicated in restriction on the domain of quantification:

*Bob owns a house with a large yard. In the yard there are six trees and six beautiful hand-carved Scandinavian planks, but nothing else—no bushes, brush, grass or anything of the sort: just dirt. Bob wants to build a fire to keep warm in the winter but is loathe to use those wooden planks. Consequently Bob uproots the six trees and uses them as firewood.*

(Shaw 2015: p. 148)

- (4) a. Bob uprooted everything in his yard and burned it.
- b. Bob burned everything in his yard.



## One recent proposal

Anomaly is implicated in restriction on the domain of quantification:

*Bob owns a house with a large yard. In the yard there are six trees and six beautiful hand-carved Scandinavian planks, but nothing else—no bushes, brush, grass or anything of the sort: just dirt. Bob wants to build a fire to keep warm in the winter but is loathe to use those wooden planks. Consequently Bob uproots the six trees and uses them as firewood.*

(Shaw 2015: p. 148)

- (4)
- a. Bob uprooted everything in his yard and burned it.
  - b. Bob burned everything in his yard.
  - c. #Bob uprooted a plank.

# Individuation and quantification

- What we count and how we count it in speech.

# Individuation and quantification

- **What** we count and **how** we count it in speech.

# Individuation and quantification

- **What** we count and **how** we count it in speech.
- An example of what I mean:

Context: in a music store

- (5)
- a. How many albums do you have? (type/token)
  - b. How many **Metallica** albums do you have? (type favoured)
  - c. How many albums do you have **on that shelf**? (token favoured)

# Individuation and quantification

- **What** we count and **how** we count it in speech.
- An example of what I mean:

Context: in a music store

- (5) a. How many albums do you have? (type/token)
- b. How many **Metallica** albums do you have? (type favoured)
- c. How many albums do you have **on that shelf**? (token favoured)

(Asher 2011, Cooper 2011, Chatzikyriakidis & Luo 2015, Gotham 2016)

# Questions

- How to represent the lexical semantics of ‘album’ in such a way as to make these readings possible?
- (Gotham (2014, 2016): overspecification)

# Questions

- How to represent the lexical semantics of ‘album’ in such a way as to make these readings possible?
- (Gotham (2014, 2016): overspecification)
- What is the compositional semantic contribution of e.g. ‘Metallica album on the shelf’ to individuation?

↑

(type)

↑

(token)

- (Gotham (2014, 2016): different equivalence relations)

# Questions

- How to represent the lexical semantics of ‘album’ in such a way as to make these readings possible?
- (Gotham (2014, 2016): overspecification)
- What is the compositional semantic contribution of e.g. ‘Metallica album on the shelf’ to individuation?



(type)



(token)

- (Gotham (2014, 2016): different equivalence relations)
- How can it be integrated with pragmatic and discourse contributions?



## Another example

- (6) a. Tesco served 50 million people last week. (per individual/visit)

## Another example

- (6) a. Tesco served 50 million people last week. (per individual/visit)  
b. Tesco served 50 million different people last week.  
(per individual favoured)

## Another example

- (6) a. Tesco served 50 million people last week. (per individual/visit)  
b. Tesco served 50 million different people last week.  
(per individual favoured)  
c. Tesco served 50 million customers last week. (per visit favoured)

(Krifka 1990, Doetjes & Honcoop 1997, Barker 1999, 2010, Luo 2012, Cooper 2016)



# Questions

- How to represent the different readings of (6-a)? (And what are they?)

# Questions

- How to represent the different readings of (6-a)? (And what are they?)
- What is the lexical semantics of (e.g.) ‘customer’? Is it *inherently* eventive?

# Questions

- How to represent the different readings of (6-a)? (And what are they?)
- What is the lexical semantics of (e.g.) ‘customer’? Is it *inherently* eventive?
- If so, does that mean we need polymorphism in the lexical semantics of the selecting verb (‘serve’)?

## Another example

- (7) a. We should all drive the same car.<sup>1</sup> (type)  
b. My wife and I drive the same car. (token)

(Barker 2007, Lasersohn 2000)

---

<sup>1</sup><http://www.gearboxmagazine.com/5-reasons-we-should-all-drive-the-same-car/>



# Questions

- How to represent the different readings of (7-a)–(7-b)? (And what are they?)

# Questions

- How to represent the different readings of (7-a)–(7-b)? (And what are they?)
- What is the lexical semantics of ‘same’ (and ‘different’)?

# Questions

- How to represent the different readings of (7-a)–(7-b)? (And what are they?)
- What is the lexical semantics of ‘same’ (and ‘different’)?

And:

- Is there anything that unifies these examples?
- Does it have something to do with (un)semanticity?

# References I

- Asher, Nicholas. 2011. *Lexical meaning in context: A web of words*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Barker, Chris. 1999. Individuation and quantification. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30. 683–691.
- Barker, Chris. 2007. Parasitic scope. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 30. 407–444. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10988-007-9021-y>.
- Barker, Chris. 2010. Nominals don't provide criteria of identity. In Artemis Alexiadou & Monika Rathert (eds.), *The semantics of nominalizations across languages and frameworks* (Interface Explorations), 9–24. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

## References II

- Chatzikyriakidis, Stergios & Zhaohui Luo. 2015. Individuation criteria, dot-types and copredication: A view from modern type theories. In *Proceedings of the 14th meeting on the mathematics of language (MoL 2015)*, 39–50. Chicago, USA: Association for Computational Linguistics.  
<http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/W15-2304>.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cooper, Robin. 2011. Copredication, quantification and frames. In Sylvain Pogodalla & Jean-Philippe Prost (eds.), *Logical aspects of computational linguistics* (Lecture Notes in Computer Science 6736), 64–79. Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer.

## References III

- Cooper, Robin. 2016. Frames as records. In Annie Foret, Glyn Morrill, Reinhard Muskens, Rainer Osswald & Sylvain Pogodalla (eds.), *Formal grammar, 20th and 21st international conferences: FG 2015, Barcelona, Spain, August 2015, revised selected papers. FG 2016, Bozen, Italy, August 2016, proceedings* (Lecture Notes in Computer Science 9804), 3–18. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer. <http://dx.doi.org/10/f3t3tn>.
- Doetjes, Jenny & Martin Honcoop. 1997. The semantics of event-related readings: A case for pair-quantification. In Anna Szabolcsi (ed.), *Ways of scope taking*, 263–310. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Gotham, Matthew. 2014. *Copredication, quantification and individuation*. University College London dissertation.
- Gotham, Matthew. 2016. Composing criteria of individuation in copredication. *Journal of Semantics*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jos/ffw008>.

## References IV

- Krifka, Manfred. 1990. Four thousand ships passed through the lock: Object-induced measure functions on events. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 13. 487–520.
- Lasersohn, Peter. 2000. Same, models and representation. In Brendan Jackson & Tanya Matthews (eds.), *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory*, vol. 10, 83–97.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.3765/salt.v10i0.3104>.
- Luo, Zhaohui. 2012. Common nouns as types. In D. Bechet & A. Dikovsky (eds.), *Logical aspects of computational linguistics* (Lecture Notes in Computer Science 7351), 173–185. Berlin/Heidelberg: Springer.
- Magidor, Ofra. 2013. *Category mistakes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shaw, James R. 2015. Anomaly and quantification. *Noûs* 49(1). 147–176.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/nous.12014>.