In my talk, I will focus on two types of non-prototypical contrastive connectives in German: dagegen (‘in contrast’) and wiederum (‘in turn’) compared to dennoch (‘however’) and trotzdem (‘nevertheless’).

This comparison emanates from three observations: (i), dagegen and wiederum are limited to contexts with a parallel information structure as in (2a), in contrast to (1) (cf. Søbø 2004, Umbach 2005, Breindl et al. 2014). (ii), dennoch and trotzdem are eligible in both contexts, but invoke a change in meaning in (2b) that is analyzed as an incausal implicature (cf. König 1991, Malchukov 2004). (iii), when both types of connectives are combined, they keep their original functions and criteria of use, as shown in (3).

(1)  Das Wetter ist schön. Wir gehen #dagegen/#wiederum/dennoch/trotzdem nicht spazieren.
(The weather is fine. We go CONN not for a walk.)

(2a)  Peter ist groß. Fritz ist dagegen/wiederum klein.
(Peter is tall. Fritz is CONN small.)

(2b)  Peter ist groß. Fritz ist dennoch/trotzdem klein.

(3)  Peter ist groß. Fritz dagegen/wiederum ist dennoch/trotzdem klein.

I will present three experimental studies that address the observations in (1) to (3) and suggest an analysis of contrast on dimensions: a structural dimension of contrast for dagegen/wiederum and a propositional dimension for dennoch/trotzdem. The first study addresses the structural limitations of dagegen/wiederum as shown in (1) and indicates that these connectives rely on a parallel information structure. The second study shows that participants retrieve an implicature of an incausal relation between the conjuncts with the connectives dennoch/trotzdem, regardless of the structure in the two conjuncts. The third study investigated the combinability of dagegen/wiederum with dennoch/trotzdem shown in (3). The results indicate that dagegen/wiederum rely on criteria on the structural dimension, while dennoch/trotzdem involve criteria licensed by the propositional dimension of contrast.
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