DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS
Spring Colloquium 2019

Saturday, April 6th
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Frank Porter Graham Student Union Building, Room 3411

9:15 Breakfast

9:45 “An analysis of the Cherokee ‘syllabary’ over time”
Melissa Klein, UNC-CH

10:15 “Intradimensional bias in a variable-free model of phonotactics”
Brandon Prickett, University of Massachusetts Amherst

10:45 “Linguistic and pragmatic data may aid the decoding of speech from the brain”
Leon Li, Duke University & Serban Negoita, University of Maryland School of Medicine

11:15 Break

11:30 “Lexico-semantic stability of the anatomical domain in the Mayan language family”
David Mora-Marín, Meg Fletcher, Elizabeth Gorman, Kimberly Mathison, Matthew Winz, & Yining Zhu, UNC-CH

12:00 “Grammaticalization of the verb ‘take’ in Twi and aspeccual construalization: Functional implications”
Taegyeong Lee, University of New Mexico

Invited speaker: Dr. Paul T. Roberge, UNC-CH
“Rethinking Proto-Germanic”

1:00 Catered Lunch

1:45 “Coasting the intertidal: ‘Performing’ Gullah for extracommunity consumption and intracommunity alignment”
John McCullough, University of South Carolina

2:15 “Markedness’ is an epiphenomenon of random phonetically grounded sound change”
Ollie Sayeed & Andrea Ceolin, University of Pennsylvania

2:45 “Comfortably white or uncomfortably Black: The racialization of Black students in undergraduate classrooms”
Peter Andrews, NC State University

3:15 “A plurilingual approach to borrowing: Numbers in French-Kabiye bilingual speech”
Natasha Derezinski-Choo, Duke University

Coffee Break & Poster Session

4:45 Keynote speaker: Dr. Barbara Partee, University of Massachusetts Amherst
“The history of formal semantics:
Evolving ideas about logical form, linguistic form, and the nature of semantics”

6:00 Social Hour at Tru Deli & Bar (114 Henderson St.)
Barbara Partee • There have been centuries of study of logic and of language. Many philosophers and logicians have argued that natural language is logically deficient, or even that “natural language has no logic”. And before the birth of formal semantics in the late 1960’s, both linguists and philosophers were mostly agreed, for very different reasons, that what logicians meant by “semantics” had no relevance for the study of natural language. The logician and philosopher Richard Montague argued that natural languages do have a very systematic semantic structure, and that uncovering it requires a rich enough logic to mirror the rich syntactic structure of natural languages. So, changing views of the relation between language and logic have often involved changing views of logic itself, and of linguistic structure.

In this talk I’ll reflect on these developments and the growth of formal semantics and formal pragmatics. I’ll touch in passing on innovations and “big ideas” that have shaped the development of formal semantics and its relation to syntax and to pragmatics over the decades. And I’ll describe some of the ways that advances and debates in formal semantics and pragmatics have been and are connected with foundational issues in linguistic theory, philosophy, and cognitive science.

Paul T. Roberge • The standard conception of Proto-Germanic imputes to prehistory a single, unified speech community largely free of dialect variation. Lehmann (1977: 285) claimed that one of the most notable characteristics of the Germanic branch is its lack of dialect differences at the time of Proto-Germanic: “The unity of Germanic is striking when compared for example with the diversity of Greek.” This uniformity is best accounted for by assuming “a stable cohesive community, presumably that located around the Baltic for a millennium or more.” Major innovations—such as the fixation of accent, the Germanic consonant shift—diffused across the entire speech community. Dialect differences arose in Germanic at a late period.

The standard view presupposes a specific setting in which certain geographic and social conditions are present, namely, when speech communities break away from one another without ever getting into contact again. But Germanic prehistory is actually more complex, and progress in its reconstruction requires the appeal to new heuristic metaphors. In the present research program, the object of reconstruction is not a unitary Proto-Germanic but a chain of interconnected dialects (this, the legacy of the Indo-European language spread) having no absolute internal boundaries and evincing a great deal of variability alongside certain idiosyncrasies, with contiguous segments along the chain being mutually intelligible. The prehistoric linguistic situation is more plausibly characterized in terms of a communication network model, which unlike the family-tree model, does not treat contact between dialects and with other “languages” as perturbations in the neat growth of sub-branches. A network model incorporates contact between its members as a basic tenet in theory and allows for convergent as well as divergent processes. Linguistic features are selected and grouped together according to their social functions. Evidence for these functions is slight, but vernacular versus “high” usages may be embedded in inflectional discontinuities.