Workshops

WS 1: Kontraste und Oppositionen bei Genus und Geschlecht im Deutschen

Workshop Coordination

Gabriele Diewald (Universität Hannover)
gabriele.diewald@germanistik.uni-hannover.de
Damaris Nübling (Universität Mainz)
nuebling@uni-mainz.de

Room: GW2 B 3009

Das Deutsche ist bekannt für seine komplexen Interdependenzen zwischen der grammatischen, z. T. flexionsmorphologisch repräsentierten Kategorie Genus und den semantischen Oppositionen in der Domäne "Geschlecht" bei Lebewesen. Diese Interdependenzen drücken sich sowohl im Basiswortschatz wie auch in hochproduktiven Wortbildungsprozessen aus.

Von grundsätzlicher Relevanz ist bei "Geschlecht" die linguistisch vernachlässigte Unterscheidung zwischen Sexus und (sozialem) Gender sowie die Frage nach deren Beziehung(en) zu den drei Genera (Nübling 2017). Hinzu kommen zahlreiche textlinguistische und pragmatische Forschungsfelder, bei denen sich in den letzten Jahren aufgrund gesellschaftlichen Wandels zahlreiche Normverschiebungen und Sprachwandelprozesse abzeichnen (z.B. bei der Movierung und ihrer Verwendung sowie beim "generischen Maskulinum", s. Doleschal 2002).

Das Zusammenwirken und die Bruchstellen sprachstruktureller, semantischer und pragmatischer Mechanismen im Bereich Genus-Sexus-Gender sind wenig erforscht (z.B. Oppositionen und Kontraste im Genussystem des Deutschen, in der Ableitungsmorphologie, bei Personenbezeichnungen und bei Personennamen, bei sozіopragmatischen Funktionen von Genus) bzw. wurden in der germanistischen Linguistik bislang kaum rezipiert (so z.B. kognitionspsychologische Studien zum Einfluss des Sprachgebrauchs auf kognitive Stereotypien wie Genderrollen, s. Gygax u.a. 2008).

Literatur

Diewald, Gabriele/Steinhauer, Anja (2017): *Richtig Gendern. Wie Sie angemessen und verständlich schreiben*. Berlin: Dudenverlag.

Doleschal, Ursula (2002): Das generische Maskulinum im Deutschen. Ein historischer Spaziergang durch die deutsche Grammatikschreibung von der Renaissance bis zur Postmoderne. In: *Linguistik online* 11, 2 .

Gygax, Pascal/Gabriel, Ute/Sarrasin, Oriane/Oakhill, Jane/Garnham, Alan (2008). Generically intended, but specifically interpreted: When beauticians, musicians and mechanics are all men. In: *Language and Cognitive Processes* 23, 464-485.

Irmen, Lisa/Steiger, Vera (2005): Zur Geschichte des Generischen Maskulinums: Sprachwissenschaftliche, sprachphilosophische und psychologische Aspekte im historischen Diskurs. In: *ZGL*, 33, 212-235.

Kusterle, Karin (2011): *Die Macht von Sprachformen. Der Zusammenhang von Sprache, Denken und Genderwahrnehmung*. Frankfurt.

Nübling, Damaris (2017): Funktionen neutraler Genuszuweisung bei Personennamen und Personenbezeichnungen im germanischen Vergleich. In: Helmbrecht, J./Nübling, D./Schlücker, B. (eds.):

Namengrammatik. *LB*, Sonderheft 23. Hamburg, 173-211.
Nübling, Damaris/Hirschauer, Stefan (eds.) (2018): *Namen und Geschlechter – Studien zum onymischen Un/doing Gender*. Berlin/Boston.
Oelkers, Susanne (2003): Naming Gender. Empirische Untersuchungen zur phonologischen Struktur von Vornamen im Deutschen. Frankfurt.
Ott, Christine (2017): *Sprachlich vermittelte Geschlechterkonzepte. Eine diskurslinguistische Untersuchung von Schulbüchern der Wilhelminischen Kaiserzeit bis zur Gegenwart*. Berlin/Boston.

WS 2: Proper names versus common nouns: morphosyntactic contrasts in the languages of the world

Workshop Coordination

Johannes Helmbrecht (Universität Regensburg)
Johannes.Helmbrecht@sprachlit.uni-regensburg.de
Javier Caro Reina (Universität zu Köln)
javier.caroreina@uni-koeln.de

Room: GW2 B 3850

Invited Speakers

Corinna Handschuh (Universität Regensburg)

Recent research has shown that proper names may differ morphosyntactically from common nouns (see Schlücker & Ackermann 2017 for details). These morphological and syntactic differences are so striking that Nübling et al. (2015) speak of a specific "onymic grammar". However, little is known of the morphosyntactic contrasts between proper names and common nouns in less studied European and Non-European languages, or even from a cross-linguistic perspective. The goal of this workshop is to bring together papers that examine the morphological and syntactic patterns of proper names in opposition to common nouns in related and unrelated languages (and language families), from a descriptive, comparative-typological, or diachronic perspective.

Topics to be explored include language-specific and/or cross-linguistic differences between proper names and common nouns regarding:

- verbal agreement (cross-reference) of argument positions;
- word order of argument positions and/or non-arguments (adjuncts);
- topicalization and dislocation;
- differential case marking of arguments and/or non-arguments (adjuncts);
- inflection and word-formation (including allomorphy);
- gender assignment (e.g. Bantu languages);
- definite articles (e.g. Austronesian languages);
- modifiers;
- etc.

Grammatical phenomena that have received more attention in typology and that fall under these possible topics of the workshop are Differential Object Marking (DOM) and changes of alignment types in split ergative languages. In Old Spanish, for instance, DOM was obligatory with personal names while it was optional with human definite common nouns. In Corsican, by contrast, DOM occurs with proper names but not with common nouns. Furthermore, personal names pattern differently with regard to the alignment type in so-called split ergative languages. For example, Meriam Mer (a Papuan language of the Torres Strait region) has a nominative-accusative case marking pattern with personal pronouns and an ergative-absolutive marking pattern with common nouns. Proper names, on the other hand, have a three-way marking pattern with an ergative case for the A argument, absolutive case for the S argument, and an accusative case for the O argument (see Helmbrecht et al. 2018 for further examples and a discussion).

Additionally, proper names have been traditionally viewed as a homogeneous group. However, there is cross-linguistic evidence that an animacy-based classification of proper names comprised of deity names (theonyms), personal names (anthroponyms), animal names (zoonyms), and place names (toponyms) contributes to a better understanding of the distinct morphosyntactic patterns of proper names.

The workshop will enable us to explore the morphosyntactic differences between proper names and common nouns, and also to strive for semantic and pragmatic explanations of these differences. We invite submissions of abstracts that address the morphosyntactic contrasts between common nouns and proper names in a language or language family, cross-linguistically, or from a diachronic perspective.

References

Helmbrecht, Johannes et al. 2018. Morphosyntactic coding of proper names and its implications for the Animacy Hierarchy. In Sonja Cristofaro & Fernando Zúñiga (eds.), *Typological hierarchies in synchrony and diachrony*, 381–404. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Nübling, Damaris et al. 2015. *Namen: Eine Einführung in die Onomastik*. Tübingen: Narr.

Schlücker, Barbara & Tanja Ackermann. 2017. The morphosyntax of proper names: An overview. *Folia Linguistica* 51(2). 309–339.

WS 3: Cross-linguistic variation in control phenomena

Workshop Coordination

Jutta Hartmann (IDS Mannheim)
hartmann@ids-mannheim.de
Anne Mucha (IDS Mannheim)
mucha@ids-mannheim.de
Beata Trawiski (IDS Mannheim)
trawinski@ids-mannheim.de
Angelika Wöllstein (IDS Mannheim)
woellstein@ids-mannheim.de

Room: SFG 0150

Invited Speakers

Idan Landau (Ben Gurion University)

Across the worlds languages, we find a wide variety of phenomena that can be regarded as instances of control in that they involve a referentially dependent unpronounced subject in an embedded (typically non-finite) clause. Investigation of these control structures has proven fruitful both from a typological and from a theoretical point of view. For instance, differences in the control properties of infinitive-selecting predicates have been shown to correlate with the syntactic structure as well as with the temporal and modal interpretation of the embedded control constituent in interesting ways (see e.g. Landau, 2000; Wurmbrand 2001, 2002; Pearson 2016; Brandt, Trawiski & Wöllstein 2016). While the theoretical literature on control phenomena is extensive and controversial (for an overview see Landau 2013), controversy partly originates from disagreement over the nature of control as a lexical, syntactic or pragmatic phenomenon (Köpcke & Panther 1993; Stiebels 2007) and over what the exact empirical generalizations are (for discussion, see e.g. Polinsky & Potsdam 2006 for the case of backward control, and White & Grano 2014 for partial control).

This workshop aims to address pertinent issues concerning the grammar of control based on novel empirical evidence (from experiments, fieldwork or corpus studies) from a contrastive and cross-linguistic perspective, with a focus on non-canonical control phenomena. Non-canonical control phenomena by our definition include, but are not restricted to, anti(-subject)-control, backward control, split-control, and control shift, as well as cases of non-obligatory and/or non-exhaustive control such as partial control and implicit control (see Stiebels 2007 for a survey of relevant phenomena).

References

Brandt, P., B. Trawiski, & A. Wöllstein (2016). (Anti-)Control in German: evidence from comparative, corpus- and psycholinguistic studies. In: Reich, I. & A. Speyer (eds.). *Co- and subordination in German and other languages*. Sonderheft 21 *Linguistische Berichte*, 77-98.

Landau, I. (1999). *Elements of control*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.

Landau, I. (2013). *Control in generative grammar: a research companion*. Cambridge University Press.

Pearson, H. (2016). The semantics of partial control. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 34, 691-738.

Polinsky, M. & E. Potsdam (2006). Expanding the scope of control and raising. *Syntax* 9, 171-192.

Stiebels, B. (2007). Towards a typology of complement control. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 47, 1- 59.
White, A. S. & T. Grano (2014). An experimental investigation of partial control. *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 18, 469-486.

WS 4: Encoding varieties of topic and focus: the role of contrast and information status

Workshop Coordination

Johannes Mursell (Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main)
j.mursell@lingua.uni-frankfurt.de
Sophie Repp (Universität zu Köln)
sophie.repp@uni-koeln.de

Room: SFG 1010

Invited Speakers

Silvio Cruschina (Universität Helsinki)
Frank Kügler (Goethe Universität Frankfurt)

This workshop aims at gaining a better understanding of the syntax and phonology of different types of topics and foci. The term 'type' here refers to aspects like the information-structural dimensions contrast and information status (given...new), as well as to other semantic/pragmatic differences that have been associated with different varieties of topics and foci. We are particularly interested in syntactic and phonological strategies used to mark these type-relevant aspects, in the sense that certain marking strategies typically result in a specific semantic/pragmatic interpretation of the topical/focused element. For instance, contrastive focus, or identificational focus, has frequently been associated with a left peripheral position in the clause in several languages, occurring in this area together with certain kinds of topics. We would like to address the question if there are further type-relevant characteristics that can be associated with a left-peripheral position, and if so, how exactly these characteristics can be defined (for contrast, e.g. Repp 2016). Similarly, are there type-relevant characteristics that can be associated with a non-left-peripheral position (e.g. newness for foci or givenness for topics), and if so, with what position exactly? Finally, can comparable restrictions be found in the nominal domain?

Besides the different types of information-structural marking, the workshop will also address characteristics that seem to cross-cut the typical divide between topic and focus, for example contrast. In several eastern African languages contrastive topics frequently behave like foci, raising the question of the exact semantic/pragmatic impact that contrast has on these categories.

For prosodic reflexes of different types of topics/foci, similar questions can be asked. For instance, do contrastive topics and contrastive foci share phonetic/phonological characteristics in comparison to their non-contrastive variants? And what exactly makes a contrastive phrase contrastive?

In addition to the issue of varieties of topics/foci, we are also interested in critical evaluations of the terms topic and focus themselves because e.g. especially thematic topics are notoriously difficult to define (Büring 2016). Such evaluations could not only include discussions of synchronic properties but also of the diachronic development of topic and focus in general and with respect to the different types mentioned above.

WS 5: Concessives vs. adversatives: opposing oppositions

Workshop Coordination

Elena Castroviejo (UPV/EHU, Vitorio-Gasteiz)
elena.castroviejo@ehu.eus
Berit Gehrke (Humboldt University of Berlin)
berit.gehrke@hu-berlin.de
Laia Mayol (UPF Barcelona)
laia.mayol@upf.edu

Room: SFG 1040

Invited Speakers

Kaja Jasinskaja (Universität zu Köln)
Mingya Liu (Universität Osnabrück)

Concessive and adversative relations, introduced by adverbs (e.g. *nevertheless*), prepositions (*in spite of*), complementizers (e.g. *while*) and conjunctions (e.g. *but*), express a contrast to the element they are related to and raise different issues in syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. Adversative clauses have been studied in relation to information and discourse structure (and the notion of contrast, e.g. Sœbø 2004, Umbach 2005, Jasinskaja 2012, Jasinskaja & Zeevat 2008, 2009, Zeevat 2012, Winterstein 2012), as well as in terms of argumentation theory (Anscombre & Ducrot 1983). Concessives, on the other hand, have been examined alongside causal and conditional clauses, notably by König (1986, 1994) and König & Siemund (2000), and recently also by Liu (in preparation), in investigating experimentally the connection between connectives and conditionals. However, concessives and adversatives have not been systematically compared and contrasted.

The goals of this AG are the following: (1) to debate formal semantic and pragmatic characterisations of adversative and concessive constructions; (2) to discuss analyses of constructions that include adversative or concessive semantics, such as scalar modifiers (*at least*, as discussed e.g. in Nakanishi & Rullmann 2009 and Biezma 2013); (3) to compare cross-linguistic, diachronic, experimental and theoretical approaches on the topic, and, (4), ultimately, to deepen our understanding of the semantic and pragmatic distinction between coordination and subordination, as well as the notion of opposition that underlies these semantic and pragmatic relations. Further topics of interest include the import of mood marking (e.g. subjunctive vs. indicative, see e.g. Quer 1998), the question as to what is negated, the semantics-pragmatics of the elements involved in the expression of this relation (adverbs, prepositions, complementizers, conjunctions), the acquisition of concessive and adversative expressions (which are generally assumed to be acquired late), the diachronic development of such expressions (for example, many concessive adverbials are grammaticalized expressions, such as Spanish *sin embargo* 'nevertheless, lit. without + seizure', German *trotzdem* 'nevertheless, lit. despite + demonstrative', Catalan *això no obstant* 'nevertheless, lit. this not preventing'), or the number of meaning types conveyed in the expression of adversativity and concession (e.g. Iten 2000).

References

Anscombre, J.C., & Ducrot, O. (1983). *L'argumentation dans la langue*. Brussels: Pierre Mardaga.

Biezma, M. (2013). Only one *at least*: Refining the role of discourse in building alternatives. In U. Penn Working Papers in Linguistics, Volume 19.1.

Iten, C.B. (2000). *'Non-truth-conditional' meaning, relevance and concessives*. PhD Thesis, University College London.

Jasinskaja, K. (2012). Correction by adversative and additive markers. *Lingua* 122: 1899-1918.

Jasinskaja, K., & Zeevat, H. (2008). Explaining additive, adversative and contrast marking in Russian and English. *Revue de Sémantique et Pragmatique* 24:65-91.

Jasinskaja, K., & Zeevat, H. (2009). Contrast in Russian and English. In *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung13*, eds. A. Riester & T. Solstad, Stutgart: OPUS, 231-246.

König, E. (1986). Conditionals, concessive conditionals and concessives: Areas of contrast, overlap and neutralization. In *On Conditionals*, ed. E.C. Traugott, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 229-246.

König, E. (1991). Concessive relations as the dual of causal relations. *Semantic Universals and Universal Semantics*, ed. D. Zaefferer, Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 190-209.

König, E., & Siemund, P. (2000). Causal and concessive clauses: Formal and semantic relations. In *Cause-condition-concession-contrast: Cognitive and discourse perspectives*, ed. E. Couper-Kuhlen, E., & B. Kortmann (Topics in English Linguistics, Vol. 33). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 341-360.

Liu, M. (in preparation). The *wenn/falls* contrast in German: With experimental evidence. Ms. U. Osnabrück.

Nakanishi, K., & Rullmann, H. (2009). Epistemic and Concessive Interpretation of *at least*. Talk presented at the Canadian Linguistic Association (CLA) 2009.

Quer, J. (1998). *Mood at the Interface*. PhD Thesis, LOT.

Sœbø, K. J. (2004). Conversational contrast and conventional parallel: Topic implicatures and additive presuppositions. *Journal of Semantics* 21.2:199-217.

Umbach, C. (2005). Contrast and information structure: A focus-based analysis of 'but'. *Linguistics* 43.1:207-232.

Winterstein, G. (2012). What *but*-sentences argue for: An argumentative analysis of *but*. Lingua 122: 1864-1885.

Zeevat, H. (2012). Objection marking and additivity. *Lingua* 122: 1886-1898.

WS 6: Factors influencing the stability of phonetic contrasts and phonemic oppositions

Workshop Coordination

Stefanie Jannedy (ZAS Berlin)
jannedy@leibniz-zas.de
Melanie Weirich (Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena)
melanie.weirich@uni-jena.de

Room: SFG 1020

Invited Speakers

Anrew B. Wedel (University of Arizona in Tucson (USA))

Three areas research seem be especially promising with regard to exploring the stability of phonetic contrasts and phonemic oppositions:

1. typological deliberations and within-system oppositions;
2. category (in-)stability in speech perception – especially in the context of added/co-presented extra-linguistic information; and
3. intra- and inter-speaker variability in speech production.

From a typological perspective, some phonemic oppositions are undoubtedly rarer than others but the question as to why this is the case remains a recurring topic in the fields of typology and phonetics/phonology. Recent advances in the testing of phonetic explanations for diachronic sound changes that shape a phoneme inventory have identified a link to the misparsing of coarticulation (Kleber et al. 2012).

This is related to the accumulating evidence from speech perception research suggesting that the stability of an opposition of a phonetic contrast is somewhat compromised because perceptual categories are flexible and highly dependent on contextual information (Jannedy and Weirich 2014).

The third area of relevance is the intra-and inter-speaker variability among others connected to different speech registers (i.e. formal vs. informal), addressees (i.e. child vs. adult directed speech), and speaker characteristics such as gender, age, dialect, ethnic background etc. (Weirich and Simpson 2017).

This workshop addresses the challenge of investigating the realization and loss of contrast and opposition in speech and the various conditioning factors of what makes oppositions and contrasts stable or instable. It will provide a forum for all linguists (phonetics/phonology, typology, computational modeling, psycholinguistics, dialectology, historical linguistics) interested in the causes (system-internal and extra-linguistic factors) leading to phonemic stability or instability consequently influencing the linguistic system.

WS 7: Language change at the interfaces. On the interaction between syntax, prosody and information structure

Workshop Coordination

Marco Coniglio (Georg-August-Universität Göttingen)
marco.coniglio@phil.uni-goettingen.de
Chiara De Bastiani (Universität Göttingen)
chiara.debastiani@unive.it
Nicholas Catasso (Bergische Universität Wuppertal)
catasso@uni-wuppertal.de

Room: SFG 1020

Invited Speakers

George Walkden (Universität Konstanz)

In recent years, a lively scientific debate has uncovered a (relative) interdependency between the encoding of different information-structural (IS) categories and syntactic reordering in the diachrony of Germanic and Romance, thereby laying the ground for a novel approach to language change at least in part based on language-internal mechanisms at the interface with syntax and prosody. Diachronic change can, indeed, be described as a change in the way IS categories are displayed in the grammar, e.g. through LF or PF conditions. Cf. for instance the loss of V2 in Middle English (van Kemenade & Westergaard 2012) and Old Italian (Poletto 2014), the loss of IS-triggered leftward movements in Old Spanish and Old Portuguese (Eide & Sitaridou 2014) or the impact of IS on the OV/VO alternation in Old High German (Petrova 2009, Hinterhölzl & Petrova 2018) or in Old Icelandic (Hróarsdóttir 2009), the alternation between V2 and V3 in older West Germanic (Walkden 2015).

The aim of this workshop is to bring together linguists of different theoretical persuasions with original contributions on the intricate relation between syntax, prosody and IS from a diachronic and synchronic perspective. Specifically, the topics we would like to address include (but are not limited to) the following questions:

- In what way does the encoding of IS categories such as Topic and Focus, referential givenness/newness, contrast etc. contribute to parametric resetting in diachronic syntax? What factors determine this change and how can we model it in a (non-)cartographic framework?
- What is the role of discourse-structural strategies (such as discourse particles or the anaphoric properties of demonstratives) in IS-induced syntactic change?
- From a broader cross-linguistic perspective, what kind of insights do other languages provide in which a diachronic switch from information-structurally to syntactically triggered configurations is observed (in the spirit of van Kemenade & Westergaard 2012)?
- How can we improve the methodology in order to effectively ascertain IS and prosodic phenomena? Can paratextual elements constitute reliable evidence for the individuation of intonational patterns?

WS 8: Who cares? Contrast and opposition in „free“ phenomena

Workshop Coordination

Volker Struckmeier (Universität Bochum)
volker.struckmeier@ruhr-uni-bochum.de

Room: SFG 1030

Invited Speakers

Klaus Abels (UCL London)

Syntactic theories have taken different routes to the question of optionality. With move-alpha, movement, e.g., was free (everybody move anywhere!). In early minimalism, movement was feature-driven (check to feed your Greed!), and given internal/external merge, it may be free again (depending on your definitions). Similarly, the output of movement operations can be handled in the mapping to PF through the deletion of the copies created by movement, making the pertinent word order options "free", at least from the point of view of syntax (/semantics). Thus, theories differ with regard to the question, which operations are "free" – and "free" for which component(s) of the grammar.

Empirically, we find that some phenomena seem to display "optional" variations – which grammars then have to be equipped to handle. Verb-second languages, e.g., allow more or less any constituent to occupy the pre-verbal position, resulting in an optionality as to which element of the clause is fronted. But if movement is feature-driven, either some interpretative impact has to be connected to this movement (singling out a particular XP for every case) or the set of XPs that have the potential to be fronted need to receive a treatment that makes them all equally likely for fronting, depending on theoretical implementations. As another example, consider scrambling. Whereas scrambling was treated as "free", possibly up until Lenerz 1977, it was later considered free but coupled to semantic effects (Frey 1993). In yet other treatments, scrambling is analyzed as triggered by information structural properties (Frey 2004) – and thus not optional at all. Still other analyses deny that scrambling involves triggered movements (Fanselow 2006) or else propose different solutions for triggers and moved materials (Struckmeier 2017).

Our questions include but (are not restricted to) ones like:

- Do truly '"free" oppositions exist at all in syntax and morphology, or are they "optical illusions", observer effects, or theory-induced artifacts?
- When we talk about "free" and optional phenomena, which language subsystems do indeed regard them as "free"? (Can phenomena be truly "free" across all subsystems?)
- Do seemingly "unrestricted" formal contrasts reflect underlying functional oppositions?
- Do performance restrictions or pragmatic principles bar "true" optionality from ever arising (in all cases)?
- Are there formal oppositions hitherto regarded as "free" that in fact involve subtle functional contrasts and should thus be taken off the list of "optional" phenomena after all?

WS 9: Koloniale und post-koloniale Toponomastik

Workshop Coordination

Matthias Schulz (Universität Würzburg)
matth.schulz@uni-wuerzburg.de
Doris Stolberg (IDS Mannheim)
stolberg@ids-mannheim.de

Room: SFG 1030

Toponymische (Um-)Benennungen waren Teil des Sprachhandelns der Kolonisatoren sowohl im kolonisierten Raum als auch in den sog. kolonialen Metropolen. Diese sprachlichen Praktiken werden seit einigen Jahren in koloniallinguistischer und onomastischer Perspektive eingehend erforscht. Dazu wurden in Fallstudien zur Produktion kolonial motivierter Toponyme und zu (historischen) Benennungs- und Umbenennungspraktiken Nameninventare erhoben, analysiert und verglichen. In solchen Zusammenhängen wurden auch Fragen zu strukturellen und funktionalen Besonderheiten (oder Übereinstimmungen) zwischen Benennungspraktiken im kolonisierten Raum und Benennungspraktiken in den sog. koloniale Metropolen sowie nach dem Vorhandensein übergreifender sprachlicher Strukturen bei Benennungs- und Umbenennungspraktiken unterschiedlicher europäischer Kolonialmächte aufgeworfen. Der erreichte Forschungsstand soll skizziert werden. Ein Teil der Vorträge der AG schließt unmittelbar daran an und kann ihn erweitern.

Neben sprachstrukturellen Fragestellungen geraten aktuell auch solche zur Repräsentation, zur Verwendung und zu den semantischen Strukturen kolonialer Mikro- und Makrotoponyme in Texten und Diskursen in den Blick. Neben Benennungen werden dabei erstmals
auch Umbenennungen als musterhafte, system- und diskursanalytisch zu untersuchende onymische Einheiten erfasst. Analysen von sprachlichen Benennungs- wie auch Umbenennungsprodukten werfen dabei auch Fragen nach sprachlicher Wahrnehmung und
sprachlichen Einstellungen auf. Gesprächsanalytische Verfahren erweitern das Spektrum koloniallinguistischer Untersuchungsmethoden. Sie können Befunde zur Identifizierbarkeit und zur sprachlichen Bewertung onomastischer Einheiten als koloniale Toponyme aus zeitlicher Distanz heraus erbringen, usuelle Argumentationsmuster aufdecken und womöglich
auch strukturelle Hinweise zur Wahrnehmung und Bewertung endonymischer und exonymischer Einheiten und der Priorisierung bestimmter Typen von Modifikatoren und Klassifikatoren
liefern. An diese Forschungsbereiche schließen weitere Beiträge der AG an.

Die aktuelle Kolonialtoponomastik kann sich in der erreichten Vielfalt methodischer Zugriffe damit der Frage nähern, welche Rolle koloniale Toponyme (als Benennungen und Umbenennungen) bei sprachlicher Kolonisierung, aber womöglich auch bei angestrebten sprachlichen Dekolonisierungsprozessen einnehmen. Die AG soll diese Fragestellungen datenbasiert und einzelsprachübergreifend erörtern.

WS 10: Prosody from a cross-domain perspective: how language speaks to music (and vice versa)

Workshop Coordination

Mathias Scharinger (Universität Marburg)
mathias.scharinger@staff.uni-marburg.de
Natalie Boll-Avetisyan (Universität Potsdam)
nboll@uni-potsdam.de

Room: GW2 B 1400

Invited Speakers

Daniela Sammler (MPI for Human Cognitive and Brain Sciences)
Paul Kiparsky (Stanford University)

Relations between language and music have been discussed for centuries. The antique perspective suggested a close affinity of the two domains, with poets considered singers, and poems equated with songs. Generative linguistic approaches, on the other hand, assume a separate language module.

Recent research contributed substantially to the language-music debate, and we have now some evidence for shared as well as separate processing areas in the human brain. Surprisingly, despite the fact that both domains consider prosody as organizational principle of at least rhythm and intonation, and despite a possible joint origin, shared prosodic accounts of language and music are rare.

Can linguistic theory entirely ignore shared prosodic principles in the two domains? Or can the new insights prove beneficial for advancing linguistic theories on prosody? This workshop intends to bring together interdisciplinary researchers in order to sparkle discussions how mutual exchange between language and music can be fruitful. We invite contributions focusing on general mechanisms and representations underlying the prosody of language and music, addressing questions such as: What are the key units of prosody? What do they share between language and music, what is specific to either domain? What cognitive and neural networks support linguistic and musical prosody? Moreover, we invite contributions that explore evolutionary and developmental aspects of linguistic and musical prosody, addressing questions such as: Did linguistic and musical prosody co-evolve? Is language and musical acquisition supported by transfer/interactions between the two domains? Welcome are, furthermore, contributions studying the immediate link between the two domains in poetry or text-setting, particularly if they address the role of underlying language-specific principles. The workshop also aims at incorporating a wide range of methodologies, reaching from generative accounts of prosody to brain imaging techniques establishing prosodic networks, in order to seek for a best-possible approach to a timely and very interesting cross-domain research topic.

WS 11: Iconicity in Language

Workshop Coordination

Aleksandra wiek (ZAS Berlin)
cwiek@leibniz-zas.de
Cornelia Ebert (ZAS Berlin)
ebert@leibniz-zas.de
Susanne Fuchs (ZAS Berlin)
fuchs@leibniz-zas.de

Room: SFG 0140

Invited Speakers

Pamela Perniss (University of Cologne)

It has long been a general assumption that natural languages exhibit an arbitrary pairing of form and meaning. The arbitrary mapping of form to meaning has even been formulated as a defining property for natural languages (Hockett 1960). In recent years, however, there is increasing empirical evidence that iconicity in language is more pervasive than often thought.

For example, Blasi et al. (2016) show in their study about the 100 most important vocabularies in over 4000 languages strikingly similar non-arbitrary sound-meaning relations, which cannot be explained as language contact phenomena. Other examples for iconicity in spoken language are ideophones, i.e. words which evoke sensory imagery, like English splish-splash or German holterdipolter. Furthermore, there are iconic prosodic modulations (Perniss & Vigliocco 2014). Here, prosodic features such as duration and fundamental frequency are modulated to express additional meaning components such as size and speed as in looooooooong (in written or spoken language) to iconically express extreme length/size/duration/... of the item under consideration. In sign languages, there is a long tradition for the investigation of the iconic aspects of these languages. Recently, also gestures in spoken languages and their iconic contributions have been investigated more systematically under formal semantic and pragmatic aspects (Ebert & Ebert 2014, Schlenker 2017).

In our workshop, we want to deal with all these different aspects of iconicity and pursue the following questions among others: in which contexts and why do we use iconic means in communication? Which pragmatic meaning and function do they have? What are language universals and what are language specific iconic means? Which prosodic, gestural, or written means are used to express iconicity? In this introduction session, we will introduce the main issues and questions that we are after and that will become relevant in the different contributions to this workshop.

References

Blasi, D. E., S. Wichmann, H. Hammarström, P. F. Stadler & M. H. Christiansen. 2016. Sound–meaning association biases evidenced across thousands of languages. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113(39). 10818–10823.

Ebert, C. & C. Ebert. 2014. Gestures, demonstratives, and the attributive/referential distinction. *Semantics and Philosophy in Europe* 7, ZAS, Berlin.

Hockett, C. S. 1960. The origin of speech. *Scientific American* 203. 88–106.

Perniss, P. & G. Vigliocco. 2014. The bridge of iconicity: from a world of experience to the experience of language. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* B 369. 20130300.
Schlenker, P. 2018. Gesture projection and cosuppositions. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 41(3). 295–365.

WS 12: Sorting out the concepts behind definiteness

Workshop Coordination

Carla Bombi (Universität Potsdam)
carla.bombi.ferrer@uni-potsdam.de
Radek Šimik (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin)
radek.simik@hu-berlin.de

Room: GW2 B 2890

Invited Speakers

Elizabeth Coppock (Boston University)
Peter Jenks (UC Berkeley)

There is no agreement in the literature as to which and how many concepts are needed to capture the meaning of definite descriptions, whether intra- or cross-linguistically. A continuing controversy surrounds even the most agreed-upon notions like uniqueness and familiarity, while novel evidence has been put forth to support the relevance of various other notions (established or new), such as **(in)determinacy** (Coppock & Beaver 2015), **salience** (von Heusinger 1997; Barlew 2014) and **maximal informativeness** (von Fintel et al. 2014).

From a theoretical perspective, the question arises whether any of these notions can be dispensed with. Much work in the tradition of formal semantics, for instance, maintains that familiarity is either theoretically unappealing (Elbourne 2013) or that it can be derived from uniqueness (Beaver & Coppock 2015). Despite these and other reductionist attempts, theories of definiteness must ultimately face the complexity of the empirical landscape—both intra- and cross-linguistic: definite expressions come in different forms (weak and strong articles, demonstratives, bare NPs, pronouns) as well as flavors (referential vs attributive, situation-based vs anaphoric, weak, affective, etc.). Important steps towards the understanding of this complexity have been made (Chierchia 1998; Dayal 2004; Schwarz 2009), but many issues remain open (such as the precise division of labor between semantics and pragmatics) and new ones keep arising (such as the problem of the co-existence of definite bare NPs and non-demonstrative definite descriptions within a single language; Jiang 2018).

The goal of this workshop is to shed new light on these and related issues. We welcome abstracts dealing with the semantics of definiteness from fresh angles, whether grammatically (less explored construction or phrase types), language-wise (cross-linguistic semantics, less studied languages), or methodologically (quantitative approaches– experimental or corpus-based). The core question of the workshop ''Which concepts are needed to capture the meaning of definiteness?'' Other relevant subquestions include:

- What are the notions behind different types of definite descriptions (weak vs strong articles, articles vs demonstratives, definite descriptions vs bare NPs)? Can the claim that uniqueness is part of expresssions such as weak definites (Aguilar-Guevara 2014) or demonstrative descriptions (Elbourne 2008) be maintained (cf. Šimík 2016)?
- What semantics do demonstrative descriptions contribute in contrast to definite descriptions? Notions such as anti-uniqueness (Simonenko 2014), contrast (Löbner 1985), affectivity (Davis & Potts 2010) have been proposed, but their status/cross-linguistic availability remains to be explored.

- Bare NPs in articleless languages are widely believed to be able to be semantically definite (Dayal 2004; Geist 2010), but some recent work shows that this stance might need to be reconsidered (Heim 2011; Borik 2018; Šimík & Demian in prep).
- What is the status of the implications carried by definite descriptions? Concepts such as uniqueness are believed to be presupposed, at least among linguists (Elbourne 2013), but recent experimental findings suggest a more pragmatic source of uniqueness/maximality (De Veaugh-Geiss et al. 2018).
- There are a number of approaches analyzing definite expressions in terms of the "cognitive activation" of their referent in discourse (Gundel et al. 2001). Can their generalizations also be captured by formal semantic analyses? If so, how are the two types of approaches to be reconciled?

WS 13: Post-truth: the semantics and pragmatics of saying „what you believe to be false“

Workshop Coordination

Daniel Gutzmann (Universität zu Köln)
mail@danielgutzmann.com
Emar Maier (Rijksuniversiteit Groningen)
emar.maier@gmail.com
Katharina Turgay (Universität Landau)
turgay@uni-landau.de

Room: GW2 B 2880

Invited Speakers

Regine Eckardt (Universität Konstanz)
Jörg Meibauer (Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz)

Grice's first maxim of quality says "do not say what you believe to be false", but we often do. We tell lies ("I did not have sexual relations with that woman"), we deceive (e.g. by lying by implicature), we bullshit ("Trade wars are easy to win"), we make up stories ("When Harry Potter first came to Hogwarts …"), we pretend (Kids playing: "You were Batgirl and I was Wonder Woman"), or we use irony ("Losing the key was very smart!"). In all such speech acts there is a clear sense in which we're not, or at least not literally, speaking the truth. Clinton did have a sexual affair, trade wars are probably not easy to win, there is no Hogwarts, the kids are no superheroes, losing keys is not smart. On the other hand, except in (typical cases of) lying, these speech acts also convey something true: Harry did go to Hogwarts in the well-known series of novels, the kids are superheroes in their play, and the attitude which speakers intend to communicate with their bullshit or irony may be true as well.

Semantics has typically focused on idealized cooperative conversation, where every assertion contributes to a lofty shared truth-seeking endeavor in order to establish a common ground of shared beliefs between speaker and hearer. However, since the phenomena like the above all run counter to this idea, their explanation is usually left to pragmatics, philosophy, or literary theory. And while Grice's other maxims have gained a lot of attention and sparked entire research traditions (quantity implicatures, relevance theory, Horn's division of pragmatic labor and Levinson's M-principle), the role of the quality maxim remained a bit underexplored in linguistic semantics and pragmatics.

In this workshop we want to discuss the challenges that these and other deviations from the Gricean norm of quality pose for semantics and pragmatics and see if we can incorporate ideas from philosophy, literary theory, cognitive science and other related fields to extend the coverage of our theories of meaning and our understanding of the dynamics and logic of (non-)cooperative conversation.

Topics of interest include:

- truth in fiction, literature, narration
- analyses of lying, bullshitting, pretending, story-telling, irony etc.
- the relation of non-truthful language to notions like common ground, discourse updates, and commitments

- the role of lying and deception and other non-cooperative language for conversations, discourse structure and the common ground
- approaches to non-cooperative discourse
- psycho- and neurolinguistic studies of these phenomena and their acquisition and their relations to Theory of Mind and other cognitive capacities

WS 14: Variation in der Argumentstruktur des Deutschen. Empirische und theoretische Perspektiven im Spannungsfeld von Valenz und Konstruktion

Workshop Coordination

Robert Külpmann (Universität Bonn)
kuelpmann@uni-bonn.de
Laura Neuhaus (Universität Bonn)
laura.neuhaus@uni-bonn.de
Vilma Symanczyk Joppe (Bergische-Universität Wuppertal)
symanczyk@uni-wuppertal.de

Room: GW2 B 2880

Invited Speakers

Stefan Müller (Humboldt Universität Berlin)

Die grammatiktheoretische Modellierung der Argumentstruktur im Deutschen ist dann besonders problematisch, wenn Variation erklärt werden soll. In jüngerer Zeit wurden neben rein projektionistischen Analysen auch immer wieder ergänzend konstruktionistische Perspektiven herangezogen (z. B. Herbst 2014; Müller & Wechsler 2014). Dabei stehen beide Modelle oftmals nur als unabhängige Erklärungsvarianten nebeneinander. Ziel der AG ist es, die Grenzen zwischen Valenz und Konstruktion im Deutschen zu konkretisieren, empirisch zu überprüfen und Möglichkeiten zur Integration beider Modelle zu diskutieren. Mögliche Phänomenbereiche sind u.a.:

- Komplementweglassungen (z. B. bei direktivem Infinitiv sofort ausmachen)
- Komplementmodifikation (z. B. Lokativalternation *Eva belud den Wagen mit Heu* vs.*Eva lud Heu auf den Wagen*)
- Komplementerweiterungen (z. B. Caused-Motion-Construction Eva niest die Serviette vom Tisch).

Unsere Kernfragen lauten:

1. Wo zeigt sich Variation in der Argumentstruktur des Deutschen?
2. Wie ist sie grammatiktheoretisch zu modellieren?
3. Wie kann eine empirisch fundierte Antwort auf 1) und 2) aussehen?

Ein möglicher Ansatzpunkt sind die von Jacobs (2009) vorgeschlagenen Kriterien zur Valenz- bzw. Konstruktionsbindung. Neben theoretischen Ansätzen sind empirische Arbeiten, z. B. neuro-, psycho- und korpuslinguistische Studien, willkommen.

WS 15: Encoding emotive attitudes in non-truth-conditional meaning

Workshop Coordination

Curt Anderson (Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf)
andersc@hhu.de
Katherine Fraser (UPV/EHU)
fraserk4@gmail.com

Room: GW2 B 2900

Invited Speakers

Jessica Rett (UCLA)
Patrick D. Elliott (Leibniz-Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft)

The work of Kaplan (1999) spurred broad interest in non-asserted, non-truth conditional meaning, especially in what has recently been termed expressive or use-conditional meaning (Potts, 2005; Gutzmann, 2015). Much has been accomplished in different frameworks in understanding how expressive meaning interacts with truth-conditional meaning. However, many questions remain in characterizing the types of expressive meaning predicates available, exploring which linguistic constructions encode expressive meaning, and formalizing expressive meaning. In this workshop we narrow our focus to properties, particularly emotive attitudes, of the expressive content itself. Questions we hope to address in this workshop include (but are not limited to):

- What is the range of emotive attitudes that can be expressed (e.g., GOOD, BAD, SURPRISE) in non-truth-conditional meaning and what do they encompass?
- Can an expression encode multiple attitudes simultaneously? Do their availability vary cross-linguistically? Can (and how do) different syntactic configurations encode particular emotive attitudes?
- What linguistic mechanisms encode non-truth-conditional attitudinal content?
- Are there particular grammatical means for encoding the content? How do certain expressions, such as exclamatives, make use of expressive meaning (i.e., Castroviejo, 2008)?
- Does intonation, either in spoken and sign (=non-manual markers), mark or otherwise influence the expression of attitudinal content, and in what way?
- How can we formalize attitudinal content? Is a multi-dimensional semantics, a dynamic semantics with context updates (AnderBois et al., 2013), or a combination of both best?
- What is the range of emotive attitudes that can be expressed (e.g., Good, Bad, Surprise) in non-truth-conditional meaning and what do they encompass?
- Can an expression encode multiple attitudes simultaneously? Do their availability vary cross-linguistically? Can (and how do) different syntactic configurations encode particular emotive attitudes?
- What linguistic mechanisms encode non-truth-conditional attitudinal content?
- Are there particular grammatical means for encoding the content? How do certain expressions, such as exclamatives, make use of expressive meaning (i.e., Castroviejo, 2008)?
- Does intonation, either in spoken and sign (=non-manual markers), mark or otherwise influence the expression of attitudinal content, and in what way?
- How can we formalize attitudinal content? Is a multi-dimensional semantics, a dynamic semantics with context updates (AnderBois et al., 2013), or a combination of both best?

We intend to address the above questions or related questions in this workshop.

References

AnderBois, Scott, Adrian Brasoveanu & Robert Henderson. 2013. At-issue proposals and appositive impositions in discourse. *Journal of Semantics* 32(1). 93–138.

Castroviejo, Elena. 2008. An expressive answer: Some considerations on the semantics and pragmatics of wh-exclamatives. In *Proceedings from the 44th Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 3–17.

Gutzmann, Daniel. 2015. *Use-conditional meaning: Studies in multidimensional semantics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kaplan, David. 1999. The meaning of *ouch* and *oops*: Explorations in the theory of meaning as use. Ms. University of California, Los Angeles.

Potts, Christopher. 2005. *The logic of conventional implicatures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

WS 16: New horizons in the study of nominal phrases

Workshop Coordination

Andreas Blümel (Georg-August-Universität Göttingen)
andreas.bluemel@phil.uni-goettingen.de
Anke Holler (Georg-August-Universität Göttingen)
anke.holler@phil.uni-goettingen.de

Room: GW2 B 2900

Invited Speakers

Giuliana Giusti (Università Ca' Foscari Venezia)
Frank van Eynde (KU Leuven)

Does the DP-projection dominate the NP or does the latter dominate the determiner system? As of yet this simple question has not received a conclusive answer. While nominal phrases figure prominently in the theory of syntax, the DP- vs. NP-debate remains unresolved, despite the decades-long success of the DP-hypothesis across theoretical frameworks (Szabolcsi 1983, Fukui 1986, Abney 1987 *et seq*).

Empirically, early arguments in favor of the DP-hypothesis include possessor agreement in Hungarian as well as the possessor *–s* that can attach to XPs, and gerunds in English. Conceptually, researchers have highlighted parallelisms between sentences and the noun phrase, concluding that like the former, the latter must be introduced and dominated by functional material. Moreover, it has been suggested that noun phrases obtain argument status by virtue of the D-head (Longobardi 1994). Boškovi (2008) proposes that the typological split between article-less languages and such with article systems is captured by means of a parameter, correlating with other syntactic properties of the respective languages.

The NP-hypothesis is arguably a minority position in the field as evidenced by the fact that many syntax text books introduce the DP-hypothesis as a standard (e.g. Radford 2004; Adger 2003, Carnie 2013, Koneman & Zeijlstra 2017; Sag, Wasow & Bender 2003 being a notable exception). Several arguments speak in its favor nonetheless and tacit endorsements have recently been expressed from prominent side, based mainly on conceptual grounds (Chomsky 2007: 25-26 and Chomsky, Gallego and Ott 2017).

There is no shortage of data and observations surrounding the debate. We believe that the time is ripe to carefully evaluate the strength of the arguments advanced to buttress one or the other position. Numerous questions require addressing and scrutiny:

- To what extent are noun phrase internal functional categories such as Num, Quant, and indeed D theoretically justified? Can phenomena which have led to their invocation be subsumed under traditional categories like Nouns, pronominals and Adjectives (cf. Jackendoff 1977; van Eynde 2006; Leu 2008, 2015)?
- Are determiners phrasal (Sag, Wasow & Bender 2003; Chomsky 2007: 25-26; Leu 2008)? And what evidence can be advanced for or against the idea? How are they introduced into the structure, by substitution (or descendants thereof) or adjunction (or descendants thereof, cf. Oishi 2015)?
- Since its inception in the 1980s, the DP-hypothesis has contributed to expanding the cross-linguistic descriptive basis and yielded many novel intricate and detailed facts of the structure of nominal phrases (cf. e.g. Alexiadou, Haegeman & Stavrou 2007). So while the hypothesis has doubtlessly helped to deliver insights and unearth many facts, it has been pointed out that "[t]he postulation of Det

[… obfuscated] the manifold differences between adjectival and pronominal determiners, and it […complicated] the treatment of the many properties which the adjectival determiners share with adjectives and which the pronominal determiners share with pronouns"? (van Eynde 2006: 155-156) So categorization of elements within the noun phrase has become more and more fine-grained over the years. And yet: To what extent might theoretically relevant distinctions have been missed?

- Which hypothesis is better equipped to come to terms with properties of "extraction from NP"-phenomena (Bach & Horn 1976: 280; Cattell 1976; Chomsky 1977: 113 ff.; de Kuthy 2002; Davies & Dubinsky 2003; Müller 1995, 2010: 47 ff.; Oishi 2015; Huang 2018)?
- Interestingly, the split between defendants of the NP-hypothesis on the one hand and the DP-hypothesis on the other cross-cuts representatives of different theoretical persuasion. Thus the DP-hypothesis was endorsed within Word Grammar (Hudson 1990), LFG (Bresnan 2001), GB/Minimalism (Chomsky 1986; Alexiadou, Haegeman & Stavrou 2007). At the same time, proponents of the NP-hypothesis, some of who criticized various aspects of the DP-hypothesis, also stem from differing theoretical currents (Sadler & Arnold 1991: 202f., Pollard & Sag 1994: 363–371; Van Langendonck 1994, Chomsky 2007, Bruening 2009, Boeckx 2014). What notions and technical mechanisms are necessary to capture the functional sequence of elements commonly and cross-linguistically preceding the noun if we pursue either the DP-hypothesis or the NP-hypothesis? Which mechanisms are unique to the theoretical setup used? What are the theoretical prices to pay?
- It has been argued that asymmetries between selection of subordinate clauses/C-heads and the ways in which embedding verbs select types of nouns (but not D-heads) call into question a core motivation for the DP-hypothesis (sentence/noun phrase-parallelisms) and thus suggest that the NP-hypothesis – or descendants thereof – is correct, cf. Bruening 2009. Reactions to the argument stress that the argument is inconclusive in that evidence is lacking that verbs **syntactically**select types (i.e. formal features) of nouns (cf. Salzmann 2018: 23). So while serious damage has been done to the view that verbs select DPs, it has not been shown that they syntactically select NPs (provided syntactic selection is real, cf. Pesetsky 1982 for one opposing view). New pieces of evidence and/or arguments are called for.
- What is the right treatment of classifiers in the languages that have it, e.g. Mandarin Chinese, Japanese, German Sign Language, etc.? And can classifier phenomena inform the DP- vs. NP-debate?
- What is the right treatment of "determiner spread" phenomena, as e.g. Greek, (cf. Alexiadou, Haegeman & Stavrou 2007, Leu 2008)?
- Do the DP- and the NP-hypothesis make different prediction with respect to N(P)-ellipsis phenomena (Corver & van Koppen 2011, Merchant 2014, Murphy to appear)?
- How does the phenomenon of noun incorporation as e.g. in Mohawk (cf. Baker 1988) square with either the NP- or the DP-hypothesis?

As expected with such intricate problems, the issue is both empirical and conceptual. The aim of this workshop is to gather work that speaks to the issue of DP vs. NP, to address questions like – but not limited to – the ones above, to assess the state of the art and to inspire further research. We invite contributions from any formal theoretical framework that advances empirical arguments, be they syntactic, semantic, morphological or phonological. Cross-linguistic aspects are as welcome as evidence from the diachrony of noun phrases. We likewise call for experimental work or language acquisition research that sheds light on the matter.