I. Administrative

A. Enrollment issues?
B. Books?
C. Assignments: read the book through Ch. 2
D. Honors Option
E. Questions?

II. Language and its Relation to Arguments

A. Our authors say, “…arguing is something we can only do with words or other meaningful symbols” (17). Are they right about this?

B. Whether or not they are, language can certainly be used to represent arguments, and in this role, there is the presumption that the structure of language corresponds to the structure of the argument, which is itself a representation of the structure of reasoning.

C. So, that implies that it is useful to examine the structure of language so as to make sense out of the structure of reasoning. (What does this argument look like?)

D. Three Examples from the Hewitt piece

1. Local Argument

   P1. If the Iran deal moves forward “without a vocal bipartisan objection to having to vote without full disclosure”, then the deal is “a disaster too awful in its particulars to allow full disclosure and debate”

   P2. The Iran deal is moving forward without “vocal bipartisan objection”
C. The Iran deal is a “a disaster too awful in its particulars to allow full disclosure and debate”

2. Local Argument

P1. Iran shows zero signs of moderating its state support of terror (¶4)

P2. Iran shows zero signs of moderating its mayhem-creating proxies in Syria, Lebanon, Yemen and around the globe (¶4)

P3. Iran shows zero signs of moderating its most public "death to America and Israel" rhetoric at home (¶4)

P4. If P1 – P3, then most US citizens will oppose the Iran deal

C. In fact, most US citizens oppose the Iran deal (¶4)

3. Global Argument

P1. The Iran deal is inconsistent with the US Constitution’s “express direction that significant undertakings with foreign powers would be of no lasting, binding effect on future Congresses unless two-thirds of the then-sitting senators ratified the treaty proposed by a president” (¶1, ¶2)

P2. The Iran deal is “a disaster too awful in its particulars to allow full disclosure and debate” (¶3)

P3. Most US citizens oppose the Iran deal (¶4)

* C. The Iran deal should be rejected

E. What can we say about the language used in these arguments? What are the various levels of language use at work here? Close attention to this can give us three different levels at which to seek linguistic insight:

1. The “conversational” level

2. The “speaker” level

3. The “language” level
III. Language and Its Meaning

A. As the authors note, language is conventional. What does this amount to? (2.1)

B. Language is clearly structured in a variety of ways, but what matters for us is its meaning. How does language mean?

C. Semantics is the discipline that focuses on this question, and there are a variety of cross-cutting suggestions forthcoming from semantics:

1. Social / Individual:
   a. Social: focus on conventional patterns as they arise in the context of speech communities
   b. Speaker-centric: focus on (say) the intentions of the speaker (e.g., Humpty Dumpty, Grice)
   c. Hybrid: combine elements of both (e.g., Searle)

2. Abstract / Concrete
   a. Abstract: meaning is something that language has independently of speakers or speech communities
   b. Concrete: meaning is a part of the lives of speakers (e.g., take language use to be an action and to have meaning in the context of lives)
   c. They can be served up in response to “Why?” questions, and also “How?” questions.

D. We’ll adopt for the purposes of our work in this chapter a hybrid, concrete approach

IV. Linguistic Acts

A. Morphological structure: root word, affixes, part of speech, stresses, etc.

B. Syntactic / grammatical rules – Is a linguistic item grammatical?
1. These focus on the \textit{structure} of the linguistic items (although they have implications for meaning)

2. Words can be put in different orders and be inflected in different ways and still be grammatical:
   a. “John introduced Mary to Steve”, “Steve introduced John to Mary”, etc.
   b. “Bill is here”, “Bill was here”, “Bill and Ted are here”

3. Constitutive vs. stylistic rules

C. Semantic rules – \textit{What does the linguistic item mean?}
   1. These focus on the content or meaning of the linguistic items (although they have implications for structure)
   2. Word combinations have different interpretations, but these are typically constrained by the meanings of the words and the semantic character of the constructions in which those words are put
   3. Semantics can focus on word meaning (\textit{lexical} semantics) or on the meanings of larger units (\textit{compositional} semantics)

D. When these are put together in the production of a sentence, we have a \textit{linguistic act} – to perform a linguistic act, you must say “something meaningful in a language” (21)

E. Ch. 2, Ex. 1 (2.2&3&4)