

Workshops at the 44th Annual Meeting of the Societas Linguistica Europaea

(Logroño, Spain), 8-11 September 2011

WS Evaluative morphology

Convenors: Livia Körvélyessy and Pavol Štekauer (P. J. Šafárik University, Košice, Slovakia)

When Scalise (1984) came up with an idea of evaluative morphology as a third level of morphology, distinct from both derivational morphology and inflectional morphology, he gave an important impetus to research in this field. Contrary to Scalise's view, cross-linguistic research has revealed that the assumption of a "third morphology" is language-specific rather than a universal feature of languages. Thus, for example, Anderson (1992: 80ff.), argues that, while diminutive formation is derivational in many languages, diminutives in Fula (a Niger-Congo language) are integrated into the paradigmatic system of inflection as the marking of number. Brown and Dryer (ms.) give evidence that the category of diminutiveness in Walman, a language of the Torricelli family spoken in Papua New Guinea, is inflectional, too. Similarly, Contini-Morava (pers. com.) shows that diminutives in Swahili are integrated into the inflectional system of paradigmatic classes. As a result, Katamba (1993: 212) aptly notes that one and the same category (e.g. diminutive) may be inflectional in one language but derivational in another." Similar conclusions can also be found in Stump (1993) and Štekauer et al. (in press). In any case, Scalise managed to draw attention of linguists to this field of morphology. While this turn of interest has yielded a number of interesting publications dealing with various aspects of evaluative morphology there are many open questions concerning both language-specific and cross-linguistic issues.

The focus of the proposed session should be on **morphologically expressed diminutives and augmentatives**. Not all languages have morphological devices of this type. Research into typology and universals in word-formation (Štekauer et al., in press) has shown that out of 55 languages of their sample only 37 languages (69%) form morphological diminutives, and only 19 languages of the sample (35%) form morphological augmentatives. The research has also confirmed a former observation (Bakema and Geeraerts, 2000: 106) that the two categories are related by an **implicational universal**: the existence of augmentatives in a language implies the presence of diminutives, but the reverse does not hold. If a language has both categories, diminutives are more frequent and can be formed in more ways than augmentatives. It should be, however, noted that one can find exceptions, such as Hausa and Ilocano.

Semantics of diminutives and augmentatives is another area of evaluative morphology which requires a more profound examination. Like with a number of other linguistic topics there has been much confusion in the definition of the **scope of evaluative morphology**, especially in terms of mixing the system-level and the speech-level semantics. Even one of the fundamental papers on the semantics of diminutives (Jurafsky 1993) suffers partly from this flaw. Jurafsky's model of radial category, based on the core sense of CHILD, has – as some of its extensions – the senses of AFFECTION and SMALL, the former of which is evidently a speech-level sense. Similarly, the basic definition of evaluative morphology by Grandi and Montermini (2005) along two axes, in particular, SMALL – BIG and GOOD – BAD, combines the objective (system-level) and the subjective (speech-level) viewpoints. As observed by Ultan (1978: 547), in several languages (e.g. Amharic, Khasi, Pashto, Russian), the same form may have either hypocoristic or pejorative connotations, depending on context. And Supriyanto (pers. comm.) shows that in Javanese a diminutive adjective may also be interpreted as augmentative depending on the context. For this reason, Nieuwenhuis (1985: 39) distinguishes between objective diminutives expressing smallness, limited size, limited duration, small amount, etc., and subjective diminutives expressing positive or negative emotions. The situation gets even more complicated if one reflects **word-formation processes** employed for the generation of diminutives and augmentatives, because one and the same process may bring contradictory results. As a case in point, Mattes (2006) discusses full reduplication in Bikol, a Philippine language, which can produce both augmentative and diminutive meanings of the same form.

To add to the obscure nature of evaluative morphology, recent research (Štekauer et al., in print, Gregová, Körvélyessy, Zimmermann 2010) has confirmed observations by Ultan 1978, Nieuwenhuis 1985, and Bauer 1996 that the postulate of universal validity of **phonetic iconicity** in evaluative morphology (indication of

diminutiveness by high front vowels and palatal consonants) is one of a number of false assumptions in linguistics.

The previous brief outline indicates that there are still many not yet resolved issues concerning diminutives and augmentatives, including, inter alia, the status of evaluative morphology within the morphological component, the scope of evaluative morphology in terms of semantics, synchronic and diachronic aspects of research, evaluative morphology from the perspective of *langue* and *parole*, the relation between the morphological and the genetic type of language, on one hand, and the way of expressing evaluative categories, on the other, the typology of diminutives and augmentatives and the related cross-linguistic research, evaluative morphology and word-classes, evaluative morphology and recursiveness, phonetic symbolism in relation to the categories of diminutiveness and augmentativeness, homonymy/polysemy of evaluative affixes, productivity of morphological processes (suffixation, prefixation, compounding, reduplication, etc.) used for the formation of diminutives/augmentatives etc. It is these topics that should be discussed within the workshop. The following list of workshop participants, the titles of their topics and brief abstracts guarantee that our knowledge about the field of evaluative morphology can benefit from the proposed workshop.

References:

- Anderson, Stephen R. 1992. *A-Morphous Morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bakema, Peter and Geeraerts, Dirk. 2000. "Diminution and augmentation." In: G.E. Booij, Ch. Lehmann and J. Mugdan (eds.) in collaboration with W. Kesselheim and S. Skopeteas, *Morphologie/Morphology. Ein internationales Handbuch zur Flexion und Wortbildung/An International Handbook on Inflection and Word formation*. Vol. 1. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter; 1045-1052
- Bauer, Laurie. 1996. "No Phonetic Iconicity in Evaluative Morphology?" *Studia Linguistica* 50, 189-206.
- Brown, Lea and Dryer, Matthew S. In press. *Diminutive as an Inflectional Category in Walman*.
- Grandi, Nicola and Fabio Montermini (2005) "Prefix-Suffix Neutrality in Evaluative Morphology." In: G. Booij, E. Guevara, A. Ralli, S. Scalise and S. C. SgROI (eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th Mediterranean Meeting of Morphology. Morphology and Language Typology*. <http://mmm.lingue.unibo.it/mmm-proc/MMM4/143/156/Grandi/Montermini/MMM4.pdf>.
- Gregová, Renata Körtvélyessy, Livia Zimmermann, Július 2010. "Phonetic iconicity in the evaluative morphology of a sample of Indo-European, Niger-Congo and Austronesian languages." *Word Structure* 3, 156-180.
- Jurafsky, Daniel. 1993. "Universals in the semantics of the diminutive". In: J.S. Guenter, B.A. Kaiser and C.C. Zoll (eds.) *Proceedings of the 19th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: Parasession on Semantic Typology and Semantic Universals*; Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Linguistics Society; 423-436.
- Katamba, Francis. 1993. *Morphology*. London: MacMillan.
- Mattes, Veronika. 2006. "One form – opposite meanings? Diminutive and augmentative interpretation of full reduplication in Bikol." Paper presented at 10th international conference on Austronesian linguistics. 17-20 January 2006. Puerto Princesa City, Palawan, Philippines. <http://www.sil.org/asia/philippines/ical/papers.html>.
- Nieuwenhuis, Paul. 1985. *Diminutives*. PhD. Dissertation. University of Edinburgh.
- Scalise, Sergio. 1984. *Generative Morphology*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Ultan, Russell. 1978. "Size-sound symbolism." [in:] J. Greenberg (ed.) *Universals of Human Language* Vol. 2. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 525-568
- Štekauer, P., Valera, S., Körtvélyessy. In press. *Word-Formation in the World's Languages. A Typological Survey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stump, Gregory T. 1993. "How peculiar is Evaluative Morphology?" *Journal of Linguistics* 29: 1-36.

WS Metaphor in social interaction: Culture, genre and discourse communities

Convenor: Rosario Caballero (University of Castilla-La Mancha, Spain)

Claiming that human reasoning is largely metaphorical and imaginative not only involves attempting to determine the role of metaphor in cognition, but also how we use metaphor to communicate with each other. Metaphor is both a conceptual and a socialization tool, and one that is partly acquired and effectively put to work through discourse interaction. Hence, there is a need to incorporate the cognitive, linguistic, and cultural aspects of figurative phenomena in metaphor research aimed at explaining why and how people communicate

through metaphor. This makes it necessary to combine both a cognitive and a discourse perspective on metaphor if reliable insights are to be gained.

Indeed, a core assumption underlying this workshop proposal is that metaphor and its verbal instantiations are sensitive to the context(s) where they appear, which suggests that knowledge of the topics articulated by metaphorical scenarios, the community involved, and the social practices articulating their discourse interaction is needed in order to gain insight into how metaphor is actually used by real people and, more interestingly, how metaphors may be further elaborated and become part of a given community cognitive and interaction tools through repeated use. However, the critical role of discourse interaction and everything this encompasses (genres, language, context, etc.) in exploring conceptual metaphors has been often neglected in Cognitive Metaphor Theory (henceforth, CMT). The present workshop sees culture as encompassing two related notions or constructs: on the one hand, Culture with capital c refers to the shared beliefs, knowledge and world view(s) characterizing national, ethnic, speech, etc. communities; on the other, culture also underlies the ways in which particular discourse communities use metaphor –communities which, in this sense, may be seen as subcultures within a much broader cultural frame, and are characterized by specific knowledge schemas, needs, interests and language –as revealed by their metaphors. Moreover, if as claimed by Silverstein (2004), culture is articulated and manifested through patterned—genred—and interactive negotiation of meanings and values, paying attention to the genres where metaphorical language occurs is unavoidable (see also the discussion in Caballero 2006; Cameron & Deignan 2006; Gibbs 1999, 2009; or MacArthur 2005, among others).

In this context, this workshop is intended to be a forum where scholars working within various fields (Cognitive Linguistics, Discourse Analysis, Sociolinguistics or Pragmatics) can discuss both theoretical and applied issues related to the occurrence and function of metaphor in social interaction. The main goal, then, is to provide a collaborative environment where the CMT bottom-up approach to metaphor and other related phenomena can be combined with the top-down procedures of Discourse Analysis, Pragmatics etc., in an attempt to yield a richer view of metaphor, with special emphasis on how metaphor contributes to the shared cultural and cognitive schemas of discourse communities.

Accordingly, the workshop is particularly concerned with the following theoretical and applied topics: (a) how metaphor occurs and is used in discourse contexts and interaction, (b) the roles of metaphor in the construction of social identities through discourse interaction, (c) how metaphor is used, expanded, negotiated, and interpreted in macro-cultures and their local sub-cultures (e.g. professional communities), which covers discussions of metaphor as both an individual and collective tool for cognition and communication as well as the question of metaphor variation across communities, genres etc., (d) the role of discourse interaction and language in the expansion and ‘health’ of metaphor as well as in metaphor acculturation, (e) the organizational and interpersonal role of metaphorical language in discourse interaction, and (f) discussions on the identification, research and interpretation of metaphorical language in real interaction (oral or written).

As it is, the contributions in the workshop cover the aforementioned issues. Thus, several papers address the role of metaphor in building up social identities in various cultures and languages (Spanish, Russian, African) and/or in one or various genres (narratives, face-to-face interviews, news features, etc.). Another set of papers deals with the same issues, yet the discussion is specifically concerned with the role of metaphor in professional communities (e.g. business or academic communities) or in the discussion of ‘broader’ societal issues (e.g. politics). A final group of papers tackles more analytical questions, and explores the identification and classification of metaphor as well as the difficulties involved in interpreting metaphorical language as illustrated by mono- or pluri-lingual users.

References

- Caballero, R. (2006). *Re-viewing space. Figurative language in architects’ assessment of built space*. Berlin & New York, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Cameron, L. & Deignan A. (2006). The emergence of metaphor in discourse. *Applied Linguistics* 27 (4): 671-690.
- Gibbs, R. (1999). Taking metaphor out of our heads and putting it into the cultural world. In R.W. Gibbs & G. Steen (Eds), *Metaphor in Cognitive Linguistics* (Selected papers from the Fifth International Cognitive Linguistics Conference. Amsterdam, July 1997). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 145-166.

- Gibbs, R.W. & Lonergan J.E. (2009). Commentary. Studying metaphor in discourse: Some lessons, challenges and new data. In: A. Musolff & J. Zinken (Eds.), *Metaphor and Discourse*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 116-134.
- MacArthur, F. (2005). The competent horseman in a horseless world: Observations on a conventional metaphor in Spanish and English. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 20 (1): 71–94.
- Silverstein, M. (2004). “Cultural” concepts and the language-culture nexus. *Current Anthropology* 45: 621–652.

WS The sociolinguistics and pragmatics of borrowing

Convenors: Eline Zenner, University of Leuven (Belgium) & Gitte Kristiansen, Universidad Complutense de Madrid (Spain)

The study of lexical borrowing has for a long time been an important part of (historical) linguistics. Consequently, the issue has been developed from many different angles within a number of linguistic fields (e.g. Whitney 1881, Haugen 1950, Thomason 1998, Field 2002, Haspelmath & Tadmor 2009).

Focusing on corpus-based accounts of borrowing, we see that loanword research has so far predominantly been conducted from a systemic and structural perspective. Attention has mainly been paid to counting and classifying types of loanwords according to the degree of morphological and phonological adaptation to the recipient language (e.g. gender assignment, plural formation ...), to the diachronic evolution in the amount of loanwords or to their lexicographical treatment (see Androutsopolous *in press* and Onysko & Winter-Froemel *forthcoming* for similar claims). Typically, the data collections rely on small corpora or dictionaries, making it hard for researchers to make reliable empirical claims. As a result, variation in the use, form and success of borrowed lexical units is ignored or is only dealt with in the form of qualitative accounts: quantitative corpus-based approaches addressing variation in lexical and phrasal borrowing are relatively scarce (but see Poplack *et al.* 1988). Of course, exceptions exist. In this workshop, we would like to bring some of these together: we aim at variationist approaches to the study of loanwords (like the use of Italian “pesto” in French) and phrasal borrowing (e.g. the use of English “as good as it gets” in Dutch). Both methodological papers presenting results from quantitative, empirical studies and theoretical papers presenting comprehensive models of borrowing and borrowability are represented. Below, we summarize the main points and research questions we wish to address in this workshop.

Methodological Issues

We stress the importance of empirical evidence and reliable methods (compare Geeraerts *et al.* 2010). Specifically, we wish to bring together papers which address the following issues. Firstly, *how can we overcome the existing methodological bottleneck in corpus-based loanword research?* Currently, researchers use small data collections mainly because they extract loanwords manually from dictionaries or corpora. In this workshop, we wish to explore which methods (e.g. from computational linguistics) can be introduced to extract loanwords automatically from corpora (see Alex 2008).

Secondly, we believe that *new methods of measuring the success of loanwords* are required in order to obtain a reliable view on the process of borrowing (compare Van Hout & Muysken 1994). This entails that we focus on studies incorporating:

- *onomasiological variation*: we wish to highlight the importance of a transition from term-based accounts to concept-based accounts of borrowing (see Rohde *et al.* 1999, Speelman *et al.* 2003). The main methodological issue here is how we can take the existence of alternative (native) expressions for borrowed items into account (compare “schaduwschrijver” as Dutch alternative for the French loanword “nègre”)?
- *phrasal borrowing*: another way of opening up the term-based perspective is by introducing a shift to expression-based accounts (e.g. Dogruoz & Backus 2009). The question is then how we can study the borrowability of fixed expressions (the use of Spanish “hasta la vista” in English): how should phrasal borrowing be identified (compared to lexical borrowing and code-switching; Myers-Scotton 1993) and how can we incorporate these items in empirical studies (see Zenner *et al.* 2010)?

Thirdly, the *main aim* of this workshop is to inquire into *variation* in the use, form and success of foreign language elements. Of course, different perspectives can be taken:

- *sociolinguistic approaches*: how can we link variation in the use of loanwords to regional and societal differences? E.g. what differences exist in the use, form and success of loanwords when comparing Portuguese speakers from Portugal and Brazil?
- *sociological approaches*: how can we link variation in the use of loanwords to language planning and attitudes? E.g. how effective are prescriptive and normative accounts on loanwords?
- *pragmatic and stylistic approaches*: what is the importance of discursive function and connotational nuance in accounting for the variation we find?
- *cognitive approaches*: how can we explain the attested variation on the basis of metaphors, entrenchment or other cognitive processes?

Finally, we emphasize the value of multivariate studies, i.e. of looking at the simultaneous effect of several levels of variation. In the workshop, we wish to present papers using *statistical analyses* to find out which of the variables introduced account for most of the attested variation and to determine how these variables interact (see Baayen 2008).

Theoretical Frameworks

The ambition of this workshop is to discuss how we can use the results from the empirical variationist studies to set out the first lines of an overarching theoretical model on the sociolinguistics and pragmatics of borrowing. The final discussion of the workshop will be used to verify in what way the findings presented in the different papers can be brought together within such a theoretical model. However, we would like to highlight that the applicability of several frameworks will also be dealt with in individual papers. The main theoretical frameworks the workshop is based on are:

- usage-based models of cognitive processing in borrowing and borrowability
- theoretical models based on insights from the frameworks of Cultural Models, Ideologies, and Intercultural Pragmatics
- comprehensive models on the introduction of variationist perspectives in research on borrowing and borrowability

Descriptive Demarcation

We invite papers presenting studies on specific contact situations (e.g. the nature of English influence in Germany / France / Europe at large / ...), on the comparison of different contact situations (e.g. the influence of French in Belgium and the Netherlands) and on general theoretical models of the sociolinguistics and pragmatics of borrowings.

References

- Alex, Beatrice. 2008. Comparing corpus-based to web-based lookup techniques for automatic English inclusion detection. In Calzolari, Nicoletta *et al.* (eds.), *Proceedings of the Language Resources and Evaluation Conference (LREC)*, Marrakech (Morocco): 2693-2697.
- Androutsopoulos, Jannis. *in press*. English on top: discourse functions of English resources in German mediascapes. To appear in *Sociolinguistic Studies*.
- Baayen, R Harald. 2008. *Analyzing Linguistic Data. A Practical Introduction to Statistics Using R*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dogruoz, Seza & Ad Backus. 2009. Innovative constructions in Dutch Turkish: An assessment of ongoing contact-induced change. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 12: 41-63.
- Field, Fredric W. 2002. *Linguistic Borrowing in Bilingual Contexts*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Geeraerts, Dirk, Gitte Kristiansen & Yves Peirsman (eds.). 2010. *Advances in Cognitive Sociolinguistics*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haspelmath, Martin & Uri Tadmor (eds.). 2009. *Loanwords in the World's Languages: a Comparative Handbook*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Haugen, Einar. 1950. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language* 26, 2: 210-231.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. Differentiating borrowing and codeswitching. In Ferrara, Kathleen (ed.), *Linguistic Change and Contact: Proceedings of the 16th Annual conference on New Ways of Analyzing Variation*, Texas (USA): 318-325.
- Onysko, Alexander & Esme Winter-Froemel. *forthcoming*. Necessary loans? Luxury loans? Explaining the pragmatic dimension of borrowing.

- Poplack, Shana, David Sankoff & Chris Miller. 1988. The social correlates and linguistic processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation. *Linguistics* 26: 47-104.
- Rohde, Ada, Anatol Stefanowitsch & Suzanne Kemmer. 1999. Loanwords in a usage-based model. *Chicago Linguistics* 35: 265-275.
- Speelman, Dirk, Stef Grondelaers and Dirk Geeraerts. 2003. Profile-based linguistic uniformity as a generic method for comparing language varieties. *Computers and the Humanities* 37, 317-337.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language Contact: an Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Van Hout, Roeland & Pieter Muysken. 1994. Modeling lexical borrowability. *Language Variation and Change* 6: 39-62.
- Whitney, William D. 1881. On mixture in language. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 12: 5-26.
- Zenner, Eline, Dirk Speelman and Dirk Geeraerts. 2010. What makes a catchphrase catchy? Possible determinants in the borrowability of English catchphrases in Dutch. Pre-published paper for the *Laud Symposium on Cognitive Sociolinguistics*, Essen (Germany): 399-427.

WS Construction Grammar beyond English: observational and experimental approaches

Convenors: Jiyoung Yoon (University of North Texas) & Stefan Th. Gries (University of California, Santa Barbara)

Overview

The notion of constructions, understood as learned form-meaning pairings of non-predictable as well as highly frequent predictable linguistic expressions, has introduced a new perspective on language: grammatical knowledge is not viewed as modular, but rather as knowledge of a highly structured and interconnected network of symbolic units, which in turn is viewed as a lexico-semantic continuum, the so-called *constructicon* (Langacker 1987; Goldberg 1995, 2006). While an increasing number of constructional studies have been adopting the usage-based model of constructions in which it is assumed that grammar is shaped by usage (Goldberg 2006) and children learn a language in a bottom-up fashion (Tomasello 2003), the range of existing studies is narrower than it would ideally be. On the one hand, there is the usual predominance of work on English: with the exception of Fried & Östman (2004) and Croft's typological work on Radical Construction Grammar (e.g., Croft 2001), there is as yet unsatisfactorily little construction-grammar work on different languages.

On the other hand, even though Construction Grammarians have been embracing different methodologies and sources of data, there is still a need for more methodologically diverse and comprehensive studies, especially since while all types of data can provide linguistic evidence to a certain degree, there is no single linguistic method that can cover and answer all types of research questions (cf. Arppe et al. 2010).

Objectives and description

This workshop brings together empirically-oriented Construction Grammar approaches with the specific aims to (i) advance promote interaction and cross-fertilization between researchers interested in constructional approaches on languages other than English and (ii) further the growing trend towards empirically rigorous research that takes seriously a commitment not only to usage-based theories, but also to usage-based methodologies that involve more than just intuition-based data of what can or cannot be said.

Accordingly, the papers in this workshop comprise a wider range of studies involving non-English data than are typically found, including both mono-lingual studies of data that are not synchronic English and cross-linguistic analyses between English and other languages. The languages studied include Dutch, old English, Finnish, German, Icelandic, Innu, Italian, Russian, and Spanish. A total of thirteen papers will be included in this theme session to fit in a 1.5-day workshop. The topics to be presented include, but are not limited to: Dutch dative alternation; resultative constructions in English and German; word order alternations in Dutch verb clusters; conjunct order (i.e., a distinct set of inflections which all Innu verbs exhibit in subordinate clauses) in Innu, an Algonquian language from North Eastern Québec, Canada; idiomatic expressions called "snowclone" identified as a customizable, instantly recognizable and time-worn phrase or sentence in Spanish; Finnish spatial particle constructions; analytic causatives in Dutch and English; quirky subjects in Icelandic, Italian, and Spanish; the availability/prototypicality in Spanish of constructions of the "English" type and the "Spanish" type in the domain of motion events; Light Verb Constructions in Italian; diachronic development of *that/zero*

complementation alternation with three mental state predicates in English; Russian Universal Concessive-Conditional Construction; and infinitival complement constructions in Spanish.

Methodologically, nearly all of the papers are based on observational data, but they use quite a variety of different sources: language acquisition corpora, diachronic corpora, web data, as well as ‘regular’ synchronic corpora. In addition to this diversity of data, the workshop also features papers from a wider range of statistical sophistication: some papers use more traditional approaches and are concerned with what is attested and what is not, some papers use inferential statistical techniques to explore lexically specific preferences and patterns in constructional slots, and some papers use multifactorial hypothesis-testing techniques or multivariate exploratory tools to discover patterns in corpus data that a mere eye-balling or simple statistical tools would not uncover.

Research questions

The research questions to be addressed in this theme session are the following:

- What do language users of a given language have to know in order to use certain form-meaning pairings (i.e., construction) successfully?
- Why do language users choose one construction over another when both constructions convey more or less the same meaning?
- How do typologically more diverse studies advance our understanding of specific constructions in particular and of the conceptual apparatus of Construction Grammar in general? Put differently, to what degree do phenomena from languages other than English force us to revise or refine existing work, which is largely based on English?

WS The argument/adjunct distinction cross-linguistically

Convenors: Søren Wichmann, Iren Hartmann, Andrej Malchukov, Martin Haspelmath and Bernard Comrie (Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology)

Description

The envisaged workshop is organized by several members of the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, under the auspices of [the Leipzig Valency Classes Project](#), and is devoted to the topic of argument/adjunct distinction, a distinction which is essential to the issue of valency classification.

The distinction between arguments and adjuncts has been hotly debated since the 1970s (e.g., contributions to Vater (ed.) 1977), yet the issue remains largely unresolved. One of the challenges is that some of the most reliable tests (such as verb-anaphoric tests, especially popular in generative approaches), are not applicable to all languages. Another challenge is that the notion of valency is understood both at the levels of semantics and syntax (see, e.g., contributions to Herbst (ed.) 2007 for some complexities involved discussed primarily from lexicographic perspective), with some theories also introducing intermediate levels (e.g., in the work by Apresjan and Mel’čuk; e.g., Mel’čuk 1988). Yet, this topic is of obvious typological relevance, as it has been suggested that the distinction might correlate with other typologically significant parameters (such as the pro-arg hypothesis by Jelinik 1984, Baker 1996 and others predicting that NPs show an adjunct-like behavior in radically head-marking (“polysynthetic”) languages).

For the envisaged workshop we invite contributions dealing with the following topics (where contributions discussing lesser-studied languages are particularly welcome, as the present workshop is intended to explore the degree of convergence and variation in this domain.):

- the distinctions between arguments and adjuncts in individual languages;
- diagnostics for the argument/adjunct distinction in individual languages and across languages;
- cross-linguistic applicability/universality of diagnostics for argumenthood;
- the question of whether the distinction between arguments and adjuncts is dichotomous or rather gradient (as argued by Croft 2001 ch. 7, following Langacker 1987);
- mismatches between semantic and syntactic valency.

From preliminary abstracts already received as well as from a plain consideration of these issues it is clear that a distinction needs to be made between the conceptual dimension, where the argument/adjunct distinction is either categorical or gradient, and the empirical dimension, where the distinction is applied to either individual languages (the language-specific domain), languages belonging to different types (the type-domain) or across different types (the typological domain). A choice made in the conceptual dimension does not carry the same implications in all empirical domains. Thus, a categorical application of the argument-adjunct distinction making reference to specific criteria such as obligatoriness or case-marking may be highly useful for the description of a particular language, whereas the application of the distinction as a gradient may be less meaningful within this domain, raising the question to what extent the distinction then reveals anything interesting about the language in question. Within a given type of language (e.g., a dependent-marking language making case distinctions) similar criteria for argumenthood may apply, and the nature of the gradient obtained may be typologically revealing. Across different types, however, it is possible that the argument-adjunct distinction is so weakly motivated that it ceases to be of any relevance whether interpreted categorically or as a gradient

Viewed in this way, a discussion of the argument-adjunct distinction is part of a larger discussion of how to apply theoretical notions in linguistics and the relationship between description and typology.

References

- Baker, Mark. 1996. *The Polysynthesis Parameter*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Croft, William. 2001. *Radical Construction Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Herbst, Thomas & Katrin Götz-Votteler (eds.). 2007. *Valency: Theoretical, Descriptive and Cognitive Issues*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Jelinek, Eloise. 1984. Empty categories, case, and configurationality. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2:39–76.
- Langacker, Ronald. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Vol. 1: Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Mel'čuk, Igor. A. 1988. *Dependency Syntax: Theory and Practice*. Albany, NY: SUNY
- Vater, Heinz (ed.). 1977. *Valence, Semantic Case and Grammatical Relations*. Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

WS Covert patterns of modality

Convenors: Werner Abraham (Vienna & Munich) & Elisabeth Leiss (Munich)

The main concern of this workshop is covert patterns of modality in a cross-linguistic perspective. We assume that covert, or silent, modality is far more frequent than its overt expression. In this respect, modal categories behave completely different compared with their aspectual and temporal counterparts. The main reasons for this behavior are the far more complex functions of modality and the strategies used to encode these functions in an economical way. Modality uses parasitically less complex categories as building blocks to encode the illocutive functions of a sentence. This might be the very reason why aspect seems, at first sight, to be the most frequent grammatical overt category in a cross-linguistic perspective followed by tense, whereas mood and modality are quite rare.

Patterns of modality may be hidden for two reasons: First, they are formed by intricate patterns yet undiscovered. Second, the functions of modality are not yet well enough defined, and they are additionally blurred by different terminologies due to different descriptive linguistic traditions. Thus, the functional equivalents of modal particles in languages without overtly expressed modal particles are yet to be discovered. Third, modality seems to be the most ubiquitous category of language. For this very reason, it is difficult to perceive and conceive its presence in discourse. The overarching reason for modal expressivity is the existence of, and the expressive reference to, a common ground of knowledge and assumptions shared, or not shared, between Speaker and Hearer. The strategy for the Speaker to fathom out such common knowledge ground on the Hearer's part is *Foreign Conscience Alignment/FCA* (Abraham to appear). *FCA* will be the leading methodological criterion uniting all approaches to the topic of modality as represented by an autonomous type of illocutive force.

We invite contributions to the following topics concerning the intricate patterns of modality:

1. Aspect and tense and their respective features as building blocks of modality.
2. Covert epistemicity in evidentials, and covert evidentiality in epistemic modals.
3. Sources of illocutive force in subordinate clauses.
4. Covert modality in pronouns and applicative datives.
5. Modality in non-finite contexts such as root infinitives and infinitival relatives.

Recent linguistic literature on modality discusses links with aspect, primarily in languages that have a scarcer representation of direct expressions of modality such as modal verbs and, in particular, their systematic epistemic readings (see Kotin 2008 and the volumes edited by W. Abraham & E. Leiss 2008, 2009). We expect a large amount of still undisclosed patterns of modality, where aspect is involved as a trigger of readings related to modality.

Aspectual selectional restrictions are also regularly at the core of studies on evidentials and epistemics. Far better attested are epistemic readings in evidentials, as well as evidential readings in epistemics. Here, the common function of both categories might be blurred by different descriptive traditions.

Another most intriguing phenomenon concerning modality is the fact that, counter to prior convictions, we find dependent clauses that react sensitively to the insertion of epistemic modal elements forcing the conclusion that they have the root property of independent clauses, i.e. an autonomous illocutive function. Subordinate clauses are conventionally taken to carry no illocutive power of their own (e.g., you cannot express imperativity or interrogativity through dependent clause status). But there are three types of dependent clauses that autonomously bear illocutive power: non-factive complement clauses, causal/adversative adverbial clauses, and non-restrictive relative clauses (Kayne 2005, Haegeman 2006, Coniglio 2009, Abraham (submitted), Introductions in Abraham & Leiss (eds.) 2008, 2009). We invite contributions which disclose the patterns of hidden modality in dependent clauses.

Quite a new field of study is the amount of illocutionary force transported by pronouns such as (*ein*) *gewisser* (X), which, in contrast to (*ein*) *bestimmer* (X), refers to the common knowledge ground of both speaker and hearer (Aloni in prep., Alonso-Ovalle & Menendez-Benito 2010, Port 2010, Van der Auwera & Van Alsenoy 2010). Phenomena of this kind give additional support to the hypothesis that modality might ubiquitously found in all sentences and even constituents we produce. Other candidates for covert modality are applicative dative objects in Polish as discussed by Rivero et al. (2010). As appears, Polish human datives are amenable to modal readings under specific contextual circumstances. One might argue that, on a similar line, the German(ic) ethical dative may be regarded as a modal particle leaving undecided, or, more precisely, making assessable to the hearer, the truth value of the proposition. There seem to be islands of modality in sentences yet to be undisclosed. We invite the investigation of such islands of modality.

A classical field of covert modality are embedded infinitives (with or without a preposition): There appears to be a general occurrence of covert modality in root infinitives and infinitival relatives (*this is to be done soon / this has to be so / middle constructions such as this field plays well with the notion “can/may be played upon well”*; see in detail and for examples Bhatt 2006 as well as others). The phenomenon appears to be a cross-linguistic one (shown to also hold for German, French, and Hindi-Urdu). Covert modality is not associated with any lexical item in the structure that is interpreted as above. The main question to solve is: Where does the modal flavor come from? What is its source: Is it syntactic, semantic, or unsystematically pragmatic?

References

- Abraham, Werner (submitted): Fremdbewusstseinsabgleich in Syntax und Semantik. Paper presented at the workshop on modality, University of Hannover, June 2010.
- Abraham, Werner & Leiss, Elisabeth (eds.) 2008. *Modality-aspect interfaces – implications and typological solutions*. [Typological Studies in Language 79]. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Abraham, Werner & Leiss, Elisabeth (eds.) 2009. *Modalität*. [Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 77]. Tübingen: Stauffenburg
- Aloni, Maria (in prep.). Notes on indefinites in comparatives. Manuscript, University of Amsterdam.
- Alonso-Ovalle, Luis & Paula Menendez-Benito 2010. Plural epistemic indefinites. Presentation at the DGfS-Meeting Berlin February 2010.
- Auwera, Johan van der & Lauren Van Alsenoy 2010. Mapping the *any*'s of English, German, and Dutch. Presentation at the DGfS-Meeting Berlin February 2010.

- Bhatt, Rajesh 2006. *Covert modality in non-finite contexts*. [Interface Explorations 8]. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Coniglio, Marco 2009. Deutsche Modalpartikeln in Haupt- und Nebensätzen. In: Ab-raham, Werner & Leiss, Elisabeth (eds.) 2009.
- Haegeman, Liliane 2006. Conditionals, factives, and the left periphery. *Lingua* 116: 1651-1669.
- Kayne, Richard 2005. *Silent syntax*. Oxford: OUP.
- Kotin, Michail 2008. Zu den Affinitäten zwischen Modalität und Aspekt: Eine germa-nisch-slavisches Fallstudie. *Die Welt der Slaven* 53: 116-140.
- Port, Angelika 2010. Epistemic specificity and knowledge. Presentation at the DGfS-Meeting Berlin February 2010.
- Rivero, María Luisa; Ana Arregui & Ewelina Frąckowiak 2010. Variation in circumstantial modality: Polish vs. St’át’imcets. *Squib Linguistic Inquiry* 41.4 .

WS Advances in Biolinguistics

Convenors: Cedric Boeckx (ICREA, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona) and Kleantes K. Grohmann (University of Cyprus)

Biolinguistics is concerned with exploring the basic properties of the language faculty, how it matures in the individual, how it is put to use in thought and action (including communication), what brain circuits may implement it, and how it emerged in the human species. In asking these questions, biolinguists try to determine which components of the brain are unique to language, as opposed to shared with other cognitive domains such as music and mathematics, and especially those that also seem unique to humans. If, as seems reasonable to suppose, our linguistic capacity is both uniquely human and, in part, uniquely comprised of language-specific mechanisms, significant conceptual and empirical issues arise concerning its evolution, form, maturation, and function.

Today, in light of advances in theoretical linguistics (under the rubric of ‘linguistic minimalism’), genetics (FOXP2 and its interactome), developmental and comparative psychology, the evo-devo program in biology, and systems neuroscience, novel, more testable hypotheses are being formulated. The kind of convergence envisaged by mavericks like Eric Lenneberg (in his 1967 *Biological Foundations of Language*) is again being actively sought by a variety of researchers working across traditional disciplines, making biolinguistics an interdisciplinary science par excellence.

The *Advances in Biolinguistics* workshop is aimed at showcasing this kind of renewed appreciation for interdisciplinarity, and highlighting advances and directions in biolinguistics, by inviting contributions articulating how some insights can only be gathered by synthesizing work in two or more areas of research. We propose to structure contributions thematically across the one-and-a-half day workshop:

language development, language evolution, and attempts to establish precise connections between ‘mind, brain, and behavior’ (contributions from psycholinguistics, neurolinguistics, and theoretical linguistics). Presentations in both language development and language evolution will focus on how humans get/got to the mature state of the language faculty, while the third part on ‘mind, brain, behavior’ would focus on more ‘synchronic’ issues pertaining to the language faculty.

Boeckx and Grohmann (2007), in the inaugural issue of the open-access journal *Biolinguistics*, point out that there is both a weak and a strong sense to the term ‘biolinguistics’. The weak sense of the term refers to ‘business as usual’ for theoretical linguists, so to speak, to the extent that they are seriously engaged in discovering the properties of grammar from a mentalist stance, in effect carrying out the research program Chomsky (1957) initiated in *Syntactic Structures*. The strong sense of the term ‘biolinguistics’ refers to attempts to provide explicit answers to questions that necessarily require the combination of linguistic insights and insights from related disciplines (evolutionary biology, genetics, neurology, psychology, etc.), such as:

- (1) Which aspects of the language faculty are unique to language?
- (2) Which are unique to human cognition?

- (3) What are the factors that influence language development and the ways language is put to use?
(4) What are the neural substrates of linguistic concepts; what are the origins of this or that aspect of the language faculty?

All presenters at the workshop will be asked to demonstrate the viability and advantages of the biolinguistic approach in the strong sense.

We feel that it has certainly become more common to see theoretical linguists speculate at some of the biolinguistic (in the strong sense) implications of their proposals, or even motivate their premises on biolinguistic grounds (again in the strong sense). Thus it is more and more common to find introductory statements such as this (taken from a recent article by Charles Yang):

How much should we ask of Universal Grammar? Not too little, for there must be a place for our unique ability to acquire a language along with its intricacies and curiosities. But asking for too much won't do either. A theory of Universal Grammar is a statement of human biology, and one needs to be mindful of the limited structural modification that would have been plausible under the extremely brief history of *Homo sapiens* evolution. (Yang 2010: 1160)

References:

- Boeckx, C. and K.K. Grohmann. 2007. The Biolinguistics Manifesto. *Biolinguistics* 1: 1–8.
Chomsky, N. 1957. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton.
Lenneberg, E.H. 1967. *Biological Foundations of Language*. New York: Wiley.
Yang, C. 2010. Three Factors in Language Variation. *Lingua* 120: 1160–1177.

WS Meaning construction at the crossroads of grammar, cognition and communication

Convenor: Francisco J. Cortés-Rodríguez (Universidad de La Laguna, Spain)

This workshop is intended to be a forum for the discussion of the different factors that play a role in the construction of the meaning of linguistic expressions. Providing an account of meaning is still one of the most controversial topics both within and outside the realm of Linguistics, given the disparate as well as wide range of factors at play in meaning construction, which may go beyond language and involve the interaction of neuroscience, psychology and other disciplines.

Even if we confine ourselves to the purely linguistic domain, the construction and interpretation of semantic structures encompasses many problematic issues, among which the following should be mentioned: the (non-)compositionality of meaning (construction); the interaction of lexis and syntax; the (lack of) boundaries between different areas of grammar, semantics and pragmatics; the role of constructions *vis-à-vis* the lexicon; the contribution of metaphor and metonymy to non-lexical levels of linguistic description; semantic and grammatical coercion; the role of implicature and illocution as descriptive levels, etc.

With this scenario in mind, this workshop seeks to host recent work on such problematic topics; it also has the purpose of promoting the collaboration of researchers from different theoretical standpoints, including functional, cognitivist and/or constructionist approaches to language.

Some of the topics that this workshop includes are listed below. The presentations should place emphasis on the value of addressing these topics from a perspective that integrates different approaches and/or dimensions of analysis:

- The architecture of the lexicon: proposals for lexical organization (lexematics, lexical classes and domains, frames, scripts, etc).

- Meaning construction below and above word level: the role of constructions in Morphology in general, with special focus on word formation processes, the interaction of constructions and affixes, the relation between word internal and word external syntax, etc. Meaning construction above the word level: from phrasal syntax to texts.
- The nature of semantic representations: Cognitive modeling, primes, logical and/or event structures, qualia, etc.
- The interaction between lexical units and constructions: the (non-) existence and nature of a lexicon-grammar continuum, lexical-constructional fusion, semantic and grammatical coercion, etc.
- Layers of meaning and layers of grammar: layering proposals in functional models vs. form-meaning pairings.
- Whether linguistic processes attested in one domain of linguistic inquiry are active –and, if so, to what extent– in other domains (cf. the equipollence hypothesis in the Lexical Constructional Model).
- The explanatory value of postulating semantic and/or pragmatic dimensions of meaning, with special emphasis on the communicative function(s) of lexical items and the constructions with which they fuse.
- Principles and constraints in meaning construction and interpretation: e.g. conceptual compatibility between lexical and constructional structure, metaphor and metonymy as possible constraining factors on grammar.

The workshop will have an introductory session by Professor Mairal Usón, from the Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia (Madrid-Spain), who will address the central issues concerning the crucial notion of “meaning construction”. There will also be a final discussion session on the topics addressed in the workshop papers. Dr. Christopher Butler (Hon. Professor-Swansea University) will act as a discussant in this final session.

WS Referential Hierarchies in Alignment Typology

Convenors: Balthasar Bickel (University of Leipzig), Anna Siewierska (Lancaster University) & Alena Witzlack-Makarevich (University of Leipzig)

Since the first comprehensive descriptions of languages with ergative patterns in the 70s (Dixon 1972, Comrie 1978), alignment figures as a prominent typological feature both in cross-linguistic investigations and in the descriptions of individual languages. The term ‘alignment’ refers to the way argument roles S, A, and P—and T and G, if one extends the analysis to ditransitives—are organized relative to each other in the morphosyntax, that is, which arguments are marked identically or exhibit identical syntactic behavior.

The taxonomy of all logical possibilities of grouping the three argument roles yields five alignment types: neutral, accusative, ergative, tripartite, and horizontal. These basic alignment types are still common in characterizing whole languages or language systems (e.g. case marking or agreement, syntactic behavior) and serve as a basis for typological investigations (Greenberg 1963; Nichols 1992; Siewierska 1996; Dryer 2002; Bickel and Nichols 2008). However, as not all systems of morphological marking or syntactic behavior fit neatly into one of the basic alignment patterns, this resulted in the modification of the basic taxonomy and introduction of additional types.

Particularly challenging for alignment typology are the patterns of argument identification found in languages in which the morphosyntactic properties of arguments are affected by referential hierarchies (e.g. in which speech-act participants rank higher than third persons, animate entities higher than inanimate ones, and known entities higher than unknown ones). Basically, three different types of effects of referential hierarchies can be distinguished. First, the hierarchical ranking of nominal referents can directly affect the marking of a particular argument resulting in what is known as differential object and differential subject marking. This phenomenon is frequently treated as a split in the alignment of a language system, such that arguments on

different positions of a referential hierarchy exhibit different alignment types (e.g. 1st and 2nd person is neutral, whereas 3rd person is ergative). Another type of effects is represented by so-called “direct/inverse” systems, as found e.g. in Algonquian languages. Here, morphological markers on transitive verbs indicate whether the agent is higher or lower in the referential hierarchy than the patient, i.e., whether the action goes in the expected direction (“direct”) or against it (“inverse”). Usually, such patterns are not discussed in terms of alignment. Finally, the referential hierarchy may determine the choice and/or order of person indices on the verb, a system often characterized as “hierarchical agreement” (e.g. in Tupi- Guaranian languages): when there is only one affixal person-marking slot on the verb, it is the higher-ranking person that is indexed, regardless of its role. A similar kind of effect is observed in many Austronesian languages, such as Tagalog, where the constituent highest on an information-structural hierarchy (an argument or an adjunct) is marked in a special way and gains certain syntactic privileges. At the same time, the voice marking on the verbs indicates the semantic roles of this privileged constituent (cf. Schachter & Otanes 1972; Schachter 1976). One way to accommodate such systems into the alignment typology is to introduce additional alignment types called hierarchical alignment (Nichols 1992; Siewierska 1998, 2005) or Philippine-type alignment (Mallinson & Blake 1981). Such additional types are, however, problematic because they are based on other principles than the basic alignment types, namely, not on semantic roles (agent/patient), but on referential properties of event participants (Zúñiga 2007, Creissels 2009). Moreover, the introduction of the special alignment types conceals the fact that hierarchical systems contain traces of the basic alignment types (cf. Nichols 1992; Bickel 1995; Bickel and Nichols 2008).

The proposed workshop is intended to bring together scholars interested in the effects of referential hierarchies on the morphosyntactic properties of arguments and in the position of such systems in the typology of alignment or grammatical relations more generally. The main topics of the workshop will include, but are not limited to, the following:

- The theoretical status of systems exhibiting referential hierarchy effects in alignment typology.
- The diachronic development of referential hierarchy effects in individual languages, language families or linguistic areas from any part of the world.
- Case studies of hierarchical systems in less documented languages. Authors working on individual languages are encouraged to situate their findings in a broader theoretical/typological perspective.

References

- Bickel, Balthasar. 1995. In the vestibule of meaning: transitivity inversion as a morphological phenomenon. *Studies in Language* 19:73–127.
- Bickel, Balthasar, and Johanna Nichols. 2008b. The geography of case. In *The Oxford Handbook of Case*, ed. Andrej Malchukov and Andrew Spencer, 479–493. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Comrie, Bernard. Ergativity. In W.P. Lehmann (ed.), *Syntactic Typology. Studies in the Phenomenology of Language*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 329–394.
- Creissels, Denis. 2009a. Ergativity/Accusativity Revisited. Presented at ALT VIII, Berkeley (www.deniscreissels.fr/public/Creissels-ergativity.pdf), 24–28 August 2009.
- Dixon, R.M.W. (1972). *The Dyirbal Language of North Queensland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2002. Case distinctions, rich verb agreement, and word order type (comments on Hawkins’ paper). *Theoretical Linguistics* 28:151–157.
- Greenberg, Joseph H. 1963. Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In *Universals of Language*, ed. Joseph Greenberg, 73–113. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Mallinson, Graham, and Barry Blake. 1981. *Language typology. Cross- linguistic Studies in Syntax*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1992. *Linguistic Diversity in Space and Time*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Schachter, Paul. 1976. The subject in Philippine languages: topic, actor, actor-topic, or none of the above. In *Subject and Topic*, ed. Charles N. Li, 492–518. New York: Academic Press.
- Schachter, Paul, and Fe T. Otanes. 1972. *Tagalog reference grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Siewierska, Anna. 1996. Word order type and alignment. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 49:149–176.
- Siewierska, Anna. 1998. On nominal and verbal person marking. *Linguistic Typology* 2:1–56.
- Siewierska, Anna. 2005. Alignment of verbal person marking. In *The World Atlas of Language Structures*, ed. Martin Haspelmath, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil, and Bernard Comrie, 406–409. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zúñiga, Fernando. 2007. From the typology of inversion to the typology of alignment. In *New Challenges in Typology*, ed. Matti Miestamo and Bernhard Wälchli, 199–220. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

WS Indefinites in diachronic and comparative perspective

Convenors: Johan van der Auwera (Antwerp) & Volker Gast (Jena)

The category of indefinite pronouns comprises a broad range of expressions such as existential, universal and negative pronominal quantifiers (*someone, everyone, no one*), free choice items (e.g. *whoever* [+ VP]) and generic or impersonal pronouns (*one* as in *one should not do this*), to name just the most prominent English representatives of this class. It constitutes a notoriously difficult topic of linguistic investigation for several reasons. Most importantly perhaps, the interpretation of indefinite pronouns is often heavily context dependent, and it is not clear how much meaning should be assigned to the pronouns themselves, and how much should be attributed to the context. For instance, existential pronouns such as *anyone* are often (apparently) interpreted as universal quantifiers (e.g. in conditionals, cf. [1]), negative polarity items turn into free choice items under specific circumstances (i.e. they assume a universal reading, cf. [2]), and negative pronouns may be negative all by themselves or may step into a concord structure. The question arises, thus, where negation is *encoded*, and where it is *reflected*. For example, in multiple negation structures as in French *ne ... personne* (cf. [3]), the negative force can be attributed to either *ne*, or *personne*, or both items.

(1) If anyone even looks at the king, he will get into trouble.

(~ 'For all x, if x looks at ...')

(2) ANYBODY can understand this.

(3) a. Je n'ai vu personne.

b. Personne ne m'a vu.

The fact that the 'division of labour' within such structures is subject to historical change, often rather rapid and with variation showing up within historical corpora, adds an additional layer of complexity to the problem. Given the proneness of indefinite pronouns to undergo diachronic changes, through which they sometimes leave the indefinite domain altogether (e.g. via a 'Jespersen' path to sentential negation), their exact meaning and distribution is often difficult to pin down from a purely synchronic point of view. Moreover, historical changes appear to spread through the lexicon, rather than applying generally. For example, in episodic contexts Engl. *one* is used as an impersonal pronoun in combination with specific verbs such as *suspect, feel, or hope* (cf. [4]), but not with *say* or *believe* (cf. [5]):

(4) Sometimes the discussion of rebirth sounds like Shirley Maclean's writings on 'channelling', though one suspects it is not meant to. (BNC A36 90)

(5) * ... though one says it is not meant to.

As a consequence of these difficulties, many contemporary linguists have investigated the occurrence of indefinite pronouns in specific sets of contexts rather than determining a single reading for any given pronoun, e.g. with the help of semantic maps as proposed by Haspelmath (1997). This, however, raises the question of how the contexts for indefinite pronouns can be characterized or defined independently, and the question remains how much meaning is to be attributed to the pronouns themselves, and how much is contributed by the context. For instance, Haspelmath's (1997) map is based on categories such as 'free choice', which seems to concern the interpretation of an indefinite pronoun as a universal quantifier, but also contains 'purely contextual' categories such as 'conditional'. An obvious solution is to separate the quantificational force of a pronoun (e.g. existential) from the context (e.g. conditional clause), and to regard the resultant meaning as a function of an interplay between these factors. However, as relevant research has shown, such a clear separation between 'lexical content' and 'contextual embedding' is mostly an idealization at best. Moreover, it cannot account for the lexical idiosyncrasies that are often observed in the domain of indefinite pronouns.

Finally, the relationships between major sub-classes of indefinite pronouns, as well as their relations to other types of (non-indefinite) pronouns and grammatical categories, provide an interesting field of investigation that has not so far received much attention. For example, the study of 'impersonal' indefinites such as *one* is typically separated from that of 'personal' indefinites such as *someone, anyone* and *no one*, even though there are obvious formal and semantic relationships between these elements. The impersonal

indefinites are furthermore linked up with personal definites such as *you* or *we* as well as with non-pronominal strategies of impersonal indefiniteness such as the passive (see e.g. Malchukov & Siewierska forthcoming). For instance, as is well known, the French impersonal pronoun *on* is regularly used as a first person plural form, and English *you* is in fact the most common impersonal pronoun of contemporary English, ousting *one* in contexts of the type illustrated in (6):

(6) You shouldn't try to work when you are drunk or tired.

In our workshop we aim to bring together semantically oriented scholars working on indefinite pronouns from a diachronic and/or comparative point of view in order to discuss questions like the following:

- How can the contexts licensing specific types of pronouns be characterized?
- What is the relationship between (licensing) contexts and the lexical content of the relevant pronouns?
- What factors (in addition to semantic and pragmatic ones) determine the distribution of indefinite pronouns (e.g. register, politeness)? Can any relevant crosslinguistic generalizations be made?
- How can the meaning and distribution of indefinite pronouns be modeled in contemporary semantic and pragmatic theories?
- What types of patterns of polysemy are attested, and with what frequencies?
- Can semantic maps be derived directly from textual sources such as parallel corpora?
- What types of historical development can be observed? Which of them are restricted by universal principles and which ones seem to be more or less random?
- Can diachronic developments be traced in historical corpora? To what extent are such changes lexically specific?
- How can language change in the domain of indefinites best be modeled, esp. with respect to the high degree of 'dynamicity' typical of this class of expressions?
- What relation holds between (specific types of) negative pronouns and (specific types of) sentential negators?
- How do impersonal and personal indefinites relate to one another?
- How do indefinite pronouns relate to question words?
- What role do 'Boolean' expressions such as 'and' and 'or' play in the formation of indefinite pronouns, and how do they interact with quantificational components?
- In what ways does (in)definiteness interact with other nominal categories such as number or the mass/count distinction?

Some fifteen years have passed since Haspelmath (1997) and the field shows no signs of waning. It is time to take stock and explore new avenues.

WS Come and go off the beaten grammaticalisation path

Convenors: Maud Devos & Jenneke van der Wal (GRAMIS project, Royal Museum for Central Africa, Tervuren, Belgium)

It is often presented as a well-known fact that the deictic motion verbs 'come' and 'go' develop into tense-aspect markers, expressing e.g. anterior, andative or future. However, the lexical semantics and pragmatics of verbs like 'come' and 'go' are not identical cross-linguistically, as remarked by Wilkins and Hill (1995). Moreover, recent studies show that the grammatical functions to which they develop are much more diverse than just tense-aspect markers. The Bantu language Shangaci exemplifies both the lexical diversity of 'go' and its development to a function other than tense-aspect. In Shangaci, there are two verbs that can be translated as 'to go'. For one verb the motion is inherently salient, whereas the other focuses on the goal. Only the latter has grammaticalised to become an inflectional prefix that expresses verb focus (Devos and Van der Wal 2010). This shows that the lexical semantics of 'come' and 'go' cannot be taken for granted and that the grammaticalisation paths can be fairly unusual.

We intend to organise a workshop focussing on the lesser known targets of ‘come’ and ‘go’ verbs, taking into account the lexical semantics that form the input to grammaticalisation. The questions we would like to discuss include, but are not limited to, the following:

1. Which different uses do ‘come’ and ‘go’ verbs have? What is the range of targets in grammaticalisation that have ‘come’ and ‘go’ verbs as their source? Apart from tense-aspect markers (see e.g. Bybee et al. 1994, Bybee and Dahl 1989, Heine and Kuteva 2002), ‘come’ and ‘go’ verbs can also develop functions as discourse connectors (Ebert 2003), textual connectivity (Bourdin 2008), and subjectivity and social deixis (Nicolle 2002).
2. How do the discourse-related uses of grammaticalised ‘come’ and ‘go’ verbs fit into the cline propositional > textual > expressive, which is usually associated with discourse markers (Traugott 1995, Brinton 1996)?
3. In how far is the grammaticalisation path, and hence the target, determined and/or constrained by the original meaning of ‘come’ or ‘go’? That is, can we account for the various developments by reference to their persistent original lexical semantics (Hopper 1991)?
4. In which respects do various expressions for ‘come’ and for ‘go’ differ, within a language as well as cross-linguistically? Factors associated with motion verbs include SOURCE, GOAL, PATH, and MANNER (Talmy 1975), but further research can show whether these are the only relevant properties and also whether there are properties related to all ‘come’ and ‘go’ verbs. Botne (2005) shows for Ndali that the relative saliency of these components should also be taken into account, and Wilkins and Hill (1995) demonstrate that ‘come’ and ‘go’ verbs are not universally deictic.

The aim of the workshop is thus to bring together linguists working on typologically different languages to broaden our view on the semantics as well as the formal and functional developments of these motion verbs; aspects that are too often assumed to be known or standard.

WS New Forays into Root Phenomena

Convenors: Cécile De Cat (University of Leeds, U.K.) Karen Lahousse (University of Leuven, Belgium)

Root phenomena (or main clause phenomena) typically occur in matrix clauses and in a restricted set of embedded (“root-like”) clauses (Heycock 2005). Classic examples for English include subject auxiliary inversion (including negative inversion), argument fronting (both topicalisation and focalisation), VP preposing, preposing around *be*, locative inversion, left dislocation, tag formation, subject omission and imperatives.

Since Emonds (1970), many have attempted to capture root phenomena as a syntactic property of clauses. Recent instantiations of the syntactic approach include the Cartographic analysis (Haegeman 2006), in which root properties are entirely dependent on the presence of a dedicated functional projection in the CP field, and the Movement analysis (Haegeman 2010, to appear), in which root phenomena are allowed by default, but blocked in clauses derived by movement to the CP field of an epistemic operator, over which further movement is impossible because of intervention effects.

In their influential paper, Hooper & Thompson (1973) put forward a pragmatic analysis and argue that root phenomena are possible in clauses that are asserted, but not those that are presupposed. Peripheral adverbial clauses (such as *because* clauses) display a surprising behaviour in that respect. When sentence-initial (1), they are presupposed, and hence unable to host root phenomena. When sentence-final (2), they are asserted, and hence able to host such phenomena.

(1) *Because her son, he owns stocks in Xerox, Mildred drives a Mercedes.

(2) Mildred drives a Mercedes because her son, he owns stocks in Xerox.

(Examples from Larson & Sawada 2010.)

As recently pointed out by Larson & Sawada (2010), this contrast is particularly challenging for strictly syntactic approaches: can we postulate different structures depending on the position of the adverbial clause? Larson & Sawada propose to capture the contrast in (1-2) as a consequence of event quantification. This suggests that the interpretive component is involved in the licensing of Root Phenomena, at least in adverbial clauses.

The aim of this workshop is double.

First, we would like to investigate the extent to which Root Phenomena require the involvement of the interpretive component, and its nature: is it Pragmatics, Semantics, Information Structure? A combination of these?

Questions to be addressed under this theme include the following:

- What is the division of labour between syntax and the interpretive component in capturing root phenomena?
- Which root phenomena display information structural or semantic effects?
- Can a semantic characterisation of clauses account for the restrictions on all Root Phenomena?

Second, we would like to extend the field of investigation to include not only 'standard' Root Phenomena (i.e. those that are strictly (?) impossible in non-root contexts, such as VP preposing, locative inversion, exclamatory inversion, etc. in English) but also phenomena that are not excluded from non-root contexts but nonetheless sensitive to the +/- root distinction. In French, these include verb-subject inversion (Lahousse 2010) and Clitic Left Dislocation (De Cat 2007, 2010). These have been shown to be subject to different constraints depending on the host clause: CLLD is fully acceptable in main clauses and 'embedded roots' such as peripheral adverbial clauses, but much degraded in central adverbial clauses, which have been shown not to allow root phenomena (see e.g. Haegeman 2006, 2009, 2010); verb-subject inversion in French is limited by heavy constraints in main clauses and peripheral adverbial clauses, but not in central adverbial clauses.

Questions to be addressed under this theme include the following:

- Which phenomena are sensitive to the +/- root distinction, across languages?
- What can these phenomena tell us about the properties of the clauses hosting them?
- Is their sensitivity to the +/- root distinction of a similar nature to that operating in 'standard' Root Phenomena?

WS Functionally motivated computational approaches to models of language and grammar

Convenors: Brian Nolan (Institute of Technology Blanchardstown Dublin Ireland) & Carlos Perriñán Pascual (Universidad Católica de San Antonio, Murcia Spain)

The **purpose** of the workshop is to examine and discuss recent and current work in the use of functional, cognitive and constructional approaches to the computational modelling of language and grammars.

The workshop will address the following main **topics and research issues**:

- The deployment of functional models in parse and generation
- The architecture of the lexicon
- Motivating the linking system between semantics, lexicon and morphosyntax
- Interpretation of the linguistic model into an algorithm specification
- Issues for the layered structure of the clause, NP and word
- Complexity issues
- Concept formation
- Linguistically motivated computational approaches to gesture in language

While recognising that in recent times much work has concentrated on statistical models, we wish to examine in particular computational models that are linguistically motivated and that deal with problems at the interfaces between concept, semantics, lexicon, syntax and morphology. Many functionally oriented models of grammar, including Functional Grammar, Functional Discourse Grammar and Role and reference Grammar have lent themselves to work as diverse as lexically motivated machine translation from Arabic to English (Nolan and Salem 2009, Salem and Nolan 2009a and 2009b) to the conceptual ontological work on FunGramKB (Perriñán-Pascual & Arcas-Túnez 2005, 2007, 2010a, 2010b; Perriñán-Pascual & Mairal Usón 2009) plus recent work undertaken within the Lexical-Constructional Model (Mairal Usón, R. & Francisco Ruiz de Mendoza. 2008

and 2009, Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez, Francisco José and Mairal, Ricardo. 2008, Guest, Nolan & Mairal-Uson. 2009) and Role and Reference Grammar (Van Valin 2005, Van Valin & LaPolla 1997).

Indeed, similar work has been ongoing quietly within the domain of Sign Linguistics where various initiatives based upon variations of the original Mental Spaces Model (Fauconnier 1994) have been productively used in the creation of digital intelligent avatars to translate spoken/written languages into several Sign Languages (Morrissey & Way 2006, Cassell et al 2000, Prendinger & Ishizuka 2010). Sign Languages, as visual gestural languages, pose interesting problems for functional models of grammar (Leeson & Nolan 2008, Leeson et al 2006).

The organisers of this workshop are a European group of linguists, computational linguists and computer scientists who, since the 2004 Role and Reference Grammar International Conference in Dublin, have formulated computational proposals in different areas concerned with the lexicon and concept ontologies, and the computational processing of the syntax, morphology and semantics of a variety of languages. Thus far, these actual computational projects have encompassed 1) rule-based lexicalist interlingua bridge machine translation, 2) ontological engineering of concepts that enhance and enrich logical structures in a machine tractable way, 3) the implementation of a unified lexical meta-language in software, and 4) the parsing of complex sentences. The languages that have undergone a computation treatment in RRG have included English, Arabic and Spanish, and others.

A consequence of this computational work has been the enrichment of the theoretical elements of the RRG theory, especially in its semantics and lexical underpinnings where they connect with concepts, and the building of frame based applications in software that demonstrate its viability in natural language processing. Furthermore, this computational work provides compelling evidence that functional approaches to grammar have a positive and crucial role to play in natural language processing. We claim that a functional approach to grammar delivers a credible and realistic linguistic model to underpin these kinds of NLP applications.

We would like to present a forum for a functional and cognitive linguistic, computational research agenda, based around an inclusive model consisting of the various cognitive and functional approaches to grammar. In sum, the aim of this workshop is to offer a forum for discussion and critical evaluation of the full gamut of research projects concerned with a broadly functional computational linguistics and that also contributes to our understanding of languages in a functionally oriented way.

WS Ethical Datives and Related Constructions

Convenors: Mirjam Fried (Czech Academy of Sciences, Prague) & Francesca Masini (University of Bologna)

Description

The label Ethical Dative appears frequently in the literature on dative marking and on argument structure, as well as in traditional grammars of various European languages. It refers to a dative-marked personal pronoun that is not required by the valence of the verb and tends to be interpreted, broadly, as an expression of the referent's interest in the described event. Current understanding of the topic is rather sketchy and impressionistic, and Ethical Dative is far from being a well-defined grammatical category. A comprehensive crosslinguistic overview of the phenomenon is still missing and its contours, including its relationship to other dative constructions, are still to be traced. The goal of this workshop is to start filling this gap by bringing together scholars whose research concentrates on the issues surrounding certain pronominal datives in various languages and whose contributions can advance our understanding of this topic.

1. Data

In (1), there is an example from Latin, in which the pronoun *mihi* 'to me' is described as an Ethical Dative; similarly in (2) from Old Czech:

(1) *Quid mihi facis?*

what 1.SG.DAT make.2.SG.PRS

'What are you doing "on me"?'

(2) *Kak mi nevesele vzhledaš!*
how 1.SG.DAT not.merrily look. 2.SG.PRS
'How out of spirits you look, I [see].'

The Latin usage seems to have passed into Romance languages as well, as shown by the examples from French (3) and Italian (4):

(3) *Jean lui a mange tout le fromage*
Jean 3.SG.DAT has eaten all the cheese
'Jean ate all the cheese "on him/her"' (adapted from Shibatani 1994: 469)
(4) *Luca mi mangia troppo*
Luca 1.SG.DAT eat.3.SG.PRES too_much
'Luca eats too much "on me"' (Masini In press)

Ethical Datives are quite widespread also in present-day Slavic languages (especially West and South), exemplified by Bulgarian (5) and Polish (6):

(5) *Toj si pijva*
3.SG.M self.DAT drink.3SG.SMLF
'He likes to take a drop' (adapted from Scatton 1993: 204)
(6) *Ona ci mu wtedy nagadala*
she 2.SG.DAT 3.SG.DAT then tell_off.SG.PAST
'And then she gave him a piece of her mind' (adapted from Franks & King 2000: 157)

The situation is less clear in the Germanic family. German has been said to have a kind of Ethical Dative (7), and although it is not commonly found in contemporary English, certain usages suggest a relationship to Ethical Datives as well. They are attested both in diachronic material (8a) and in present-day English (8b-8c): (8c) illustrates the "Southern Double Object Construction", typical of Southern American English (Webelhuth & Dannenberg 2006: 38), whereas (8d) exemplifies the use of the preposition *on* with a pseudo-ethical reading (Konig & Haspelmath 1988: 560).

(7) *Mir ist meine Mutter gestorben*
1.SG.DAT is my mother dead
'I had my mother die on me' (adapted from Shibatani 1994: 472)

(8) a. *Come, knock me at that door!* (Shakespeare, *Romeo and Juliet*)
b. *Stepped outside and I smoked myself a J* (Paul Simon's song)
c. *Hei bought himi a car*
d. *The rest of the children died on me*

Candidates for the status of Ethical Datives can be found in non-Indo-European languages as well, e.g. Chechen (Molochieva 2006), Modern Hebrew (9), or in the Japanese adversative passive (10), which Shibatani (1994) proposes to regard as semantically related to Ethical Datives.

(9) *be' emca haseret hem nixnasim li*
in-the-middle the-movie they enter 1.SG.DAT
'They enter in the middle of the movie (aggravating me)' (adapted from Borer & Grodzinsky 1983: 179)

(10) *Taroowa Hanakoni sinareta*
Taroo-TOP Hanako-DAT die-PASS-PST
'Taro had Hanako die on him' (adapted from Shibatani 1994: 467)

2. Issues to address

It is clear that the phenomena usually gathered under the label Ethical Dative are possibly widespread in the languages of the world, although linguists' attention has been so far focused mostly on their manifestations in Indo-European languages. This notwithstanding, thorough descriptions are scarce. Moreover, the label tends to be applied very broadly. This poses both

(i) theoretical and (ii) empirical problems:

(i) It is crucial to identify (clusters of) features that can help delimit the category in the first place and set it apart from other, albeit related, uses of pronominal datives. No such understanding exists, and it may easily turn out that not all of the usages that have been called Ethical Datives should be included in this category. Some of the examples above may well be regarded as instances of other constructions, some of which are relatively well understood at this point and have been established as distinct categories, such as External Possessors (e.g. (3), (7); cf. König & Haspelmath 1998, Payne & Barshi 1999, McGregor 2009) and Middles or Indirect Reflexives, e.g. (5) (cf. Kemmer 1993, Kazenin 2001).

(ii) It is often difficult to evaluate the meaning and/or pragmatic function of the dative pronoun, given that the relevant data mostly consist of isolated examples without any context. Reliable sources of material, better methodology for its analysis, and more fine-grained approaches are thus needed (a corpus-based approach, with the aid of conversation analysis, has been introduced in Fried 2010 and In press, as a viable route toward greater empirical grounding).

The workshop is expected to shed light on Ethical Datives by providing more accurate and informative linguistic descriptions of relevant empirical material, thereby also leading toward a well-grounded characterization of Ethical Datives as a distinct linguistic category. In particular, the workshop aims at getting:

- a) a clearer idea about the spread of Ethical Datives and related constructions in the languages of the world;
- b) a better understanding of their “form”, such as the role of the case (e.g., why dative?), the clitic status of the form, the interaction with voice (reflexives, middles, etc.);
- c) a better understanding of the “meaning” or “function” pole of these constructions, e.g. the semantic roles involved (benefactive, malefactive, affectee, etc.), the interaction with argument structure and verb classes, pragmatic function(s) in discourse, possible textual restrictions;
- d) a better definition of the domain that properly delimits Ethical Datives with respect to related constructions, such as External Possessors, Middles, Ditransitives, Applicatives, Miratives;
- e) suitable theoretical proposals that would account for the attested patterns.

References

- Borer, Hagit & Josef Grodzinsky (1986), *Syntactic Cliticization and Lexical Cliticization: The Case of Hebrew Dative Clitics*, in Borer, Hagit (ed.), *The Syntax of Pronominal Clitics (=Syntax and Semantics 19)*, New York, Academic Press, 175-217.
- Fried, Mirjam (2010), *Between verb semantics and interpersonal meanings in participant realization: A constructional analysis of ‘ethical’ datives*, paper given at the Workshop on “Variation and Change in Argument Realization”, Naples/Capri, May 27-30, 2010.
- Fried, Mirjam (In press), *The notion of affectedness in expressing interpersonal functions*, in Grygiel, Marcin & Laura A. Janda (eds.), *Slavic Linguistics in a Cognitive Framework*, Frankfurt/New York, Peter Lang Publishing Company.
- Franks, Stephen & Tracy Holloway King (2000), *A Handbook of Slavic Clitics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Kazenin, Konstantin I. (2001), *Verbal reflexives and the middle voice*, in Haspelmath, Martin, Ekkehard König, Wulf Oesterreich & Wolfgang Raible (eds.), *Language Typology and Language Universale. An International Handbook*, Volume 2, Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 916-927.
- Kemmer, Suzanne (1993), *The Middle Voice*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.
- König, Ekkehard & Martin Haspelmath (1998), *Le constructions a possesseur eterne dans les langues d’Europe*, in Feuillet, Jack (ed.), *Actance et valence dans les langue de l’Europe*, Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter, 525-606.
- Masini, Francesca (In press), *Costruzioni verbopronominali “intensive” in italiano*, in Bertinetto, Pier Marco et al. (eds.), *Linguaggio e cervello / Semantica*, Proceedings of the “XLII Convegno della Societa di Linguistica Italiana”, Vol. 2 (CD ROM), Roma, Bulzoni.
- McGregor, William (ed.) (2009), *Expression of possession*, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter.
- Molochieva, Zarina (2006), *Mirativity in Chechen*, Handout of a presentation at the Leipzig Typology Colloquium, June 1, 2006.
- Payne, Doris L. & Immanuel Barshi (eds.) (1999), *External Possession*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.
- Scatton, Ernest A. (1993), *Bulgarian*, in Comrie, Bernard & Greville Corbett (eds.), *The Slavonic Languages*, London/New York, Routledge Press, 188-248.

- Shibatani, Masayoshi (1994), *An integrational approach to possessor raising, ethical datives, and adversative passives*, in *Proceedings of the 20th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (=BLS 20), Berkeley, Berkeley Linguistics Society, 461-486.
- Webelhuth, Gert & Clare J. Dannenberg (2006), *Southern American English personal datives: the theoretical significance of dialectal variation*, in "American Speech" 81 (1), 31-55.

WS Doubling in Syntax, Semantics and Morphology

Convenors: Lobke Aelbrecht, Anne Breitbarth, Karen De Clercq, Liliane Haegeman, Will Harwood, Rachel Nye, Amélie Rocquet and Reiko Vermeulen (GIST, University of Ghent)

Doubling is manifested on different levels, including syntax, semantics, morphology and phonology (in the latter two domains it is also known as 'reduplication'). This workshop aims to investigate the nature of syntactic, semantic and morphological doubling and the interaction between them, from both formal and functional perspectives. We begin by exemplifying doubling phenomena in the domains listed above, identifying specific issues related to doubling. This leads to a series of questions which we hope to address.

Syntactic doubling is crosslinguistically very common. One example is *wh*-doubling in German and Dutch, where the *wh*-element occurs both in the matrix and embedded clause (Barbiers et al. 2009, (1)). Another example is subject doubling, where in main clauses the subject can occur once preceding and once following the finite verb ((2)), in this instance with no added meaning (Haegeman 2004; van Craenenbroeck & van Koppen 2002,2008; De Vogelaer&Devos 2008).

1. **Wie** denk je **wie** ik gezien heb? (Drenthe Dutch)
who think you who I seen have
 'Who do you think I have seen?'
2. **Zij** heeft **zij** daar niks mee te maken. (Flemish Brabant Dutch)
she has she there nothing with to make
 'She doesn't have anything to do with it.'

Doubling also occurs in morphology. For instance in the word formation process which derives the deverbal agent noun *picker-upper* from the particle verb *pick up*, the affix *-er* is realised on both verb and particle. Another example is the formation of certain adjectives in Tz'utujil, spoken in Guatemala: the first consonant of an adjective is repeated before suffix $-o\chi$ (Dayley 1985), resulting in an approximative reading:

3. a. [kaq] 'red' → [kaqkoχ] 'reddish'
- b. [jaʔ] 'water' → [jaʔjoχ] 'watery'

In child language too words are frequently formed by repeating the first syllable of an existing word: in French *un dodo* 'a nap' is formed from *dormir* 'to sleep' by reduplication. Although in some instances doubling is clearly syntactic or morphological, quite often the line between the two domains is unclear. One such case is found in Ilocano (spoken in the Philippines), where doubling of the word stem expresses plurality:

4. a. pingan 'dish' → pingpingan 'dishes'
- b. talon 'field' → taltalon 'fields'

One could argue that doubling here is not part of morphology, but involves a syntactic plurality head in the structure of the noun phrase (see Borer 2005). A similar account could be given for adjective doubling in Italian, e.g. *forte forte* 'very strong', which arguably involves a syntactic degree head. Another example is Japanese verb reduplication, which results in an expression that behaves more like an adverb, syntactically and semantically (Poser 1990):

5. a. nak 'cry' → naki-naki 'while crying'
- b. tab 'eat' → tabe-tabe 'while eating'

Semantic doubling can be illustrated by French and Dutch verbs that receive an iterative meaning when a certain infix is added. Similarly, verbs in Chechen receive an iterative meaning when the stem vowel is altered:

6. a. saut-er 'jump' → saut-**ill**-er 'skip along, jump up and down' (French)
- b. hupp-en 'jump, hop' → hupp-**el**-en 'skip' (Dutch)
- c. *saca* 'stop once' → *sieca* 'stop many times' (Chechen; Yu 2003)

Postma (1995) identifies another semantic doubling effect. He discusses NP-P-NP constructions such as (7), where the distributive universal quantification reading is the result of NP doubling: one NP yields the lexical meaning 'raam' ('window') whilst the other NP is in so-called "zero semantics", i.e. it has no lexical meaning and gives a quantificational interpretation to the entire construction.

7. In de rosse buurt zit **raam aan raam** een meisje. (Dutch)
in the red-light district sits window to window a girl.
'In the red-light district there is a girl at every window.'

Another issue related to doubling involves iconicity (Haiman 1980). While doubling with semantic effects involving greater quantity or quality (such as plurality or intensity) is traditionally seen as iconic, the double formal expression of one single meaning violates the principle of iconicity. Negative concord, where two (or more) negative elements express one logical negation, is arguably a case of semantically vacuous, and therefore non-iconic, doubling:

8. **Non vedo niente.** (Italian)
not I.see nothing
'I don't see anything.'

Finally, there are phenomena which look like doubling, but have been argued not to involve doubling at all, e.g. perfective doubling in Dutch dialects (Barbiers et al 2010):

9. Ik heb het **gezegd gehad.**
I have it said had
'I have said it.'

Taking into account the discussion and illustrations above, questions that we would like to see addressed in our workshop include, but are not limited to:

- Given recent developments in Distributed Morphology (Halle&Marantz 1993,1994; Harley&Noyer 1998), can morphological doubling be considered a syntactic phenomenon?
- If the hypothesis that the structure of lexical items is similar to that of clauses holds (Cardinaletti&Starke 1999, Hale&Keyser 1993), we would expect that morphological and syntactic doubling have similar semantic/pragmatic effects (plurality, emphasis, contrast...). Are there indeed common points between doubling in syntax and in morphology? And are there effects that are the consequences of either syntactic or morphological doubling alone?
- Do the semantic/pragmatic effects caused by syntactic and morphological doubling argue for additional covert syntactic structure (e.g. a Number head in case doubling expresses plurality) or do these effects result from inferential reasoning?
- By what formal means is semantic doubling realized? How general is the mapping between formal doubling (of a morpheme, lexical item or phrase) and semantic doubling?
- Formally similar types of doubling sometimes have different semantic effects. For instance, in the Italian *forte forte* and doubling in Tz'utujil ((3)), the same formal means expresses what seems to be the opposite meaning. Can this observation find a theoretical explanation?
- Are there distributional and syntactic differences between doubling phenomena that affect the interpretation of a lexical item/clause and those that do not? How can these be captured?
- Are concord and agreement particular types of doubling phenomena? If so, how can they be reconciled with the principle of iconicity?
- Is what appears to be a doubling phenomenon always a real instance of doubling?

WS Cognition in Context. Empirical approaches to social cognition and emergent language structure

Convenors: Dylan Glynn (Lund University) & Karolina Krawczak (A. Mickiewicz University, Poznan)

This workshop focuses on empirical methodology for the description of emergent language structure. More specifically, it seeks to bring together cognitive and functional linguists applying such methodology to the analysis of situated language use, emergent language structure and socio-cognitive processes conditioning communication.

Social Cognition and emergent grammar have enjoyed a great deal of attention in recent years. Pioneering work such as Langacker (1990, 2001), Stein & Wright (1995), Nuyts (2000), Kärkkäinen (2003), Givón (2005), Verhagen (2005), Athanasiadou & al. (2006), Cornillie (2007), Zlatev & al. (2008), Holšánová (2008), Ekberg & Paradis (2009), and Pishwa (2009) belongs to a diverse and growing field of research that crosses the traditional boundaries of language science, psychology, and sociology. This workshop endeavours to advance the state of the art by developing the methods used in the field.

The term social cognition refers to the speaker's sensitivity to and competence in communication. An emergent understanding of linguistic structure places situated usage events at the heart of linguistic research. It follows that the study of usage events necessarily entails the study of interaction and variation. In this light, contextualised communicative behaviour patterns are seen as clues to language structure, which, in turn, is taken as an index of cognition. As the implications of this theoretical and analytical move are becoming better understood, we need to develop descriptive techniques that can capture such structure.

Since this workshop focuses on empirical methods for the description of emergent language structure, authors will be invited to stress the strengths and weaknesses of each method employed. It is assumed that different questions warrant different methods. Three methods are employed in the workshop:

- corpus analysis
- psycholinguistic experimentation
- elicitation and attitudinal studies

The notions of emergent grammar and social cognition are relevant to a wide range of linguistic phenomena. The above methods are applied to the following areas of research:

- conceptual construal
- epistemic stance
- intersubjectivity
- social cognition
- subjectification
- language variation and change

Lastly, the authors will be asked to interpret their results in terms of certain overarching theoretical questions:

- How does language use reflect socio-cognitive organisation?
- How does language use reflect language structure?
- How does socio-cultural context condition inter- and intra-lingual variation?
- How can we investigate social cognition empirically?

References

- Athanasiadou, A., Canakis, C. & Cornillie, B. (eds.). 2006. *Subjectification: Various paths to Subjectivity*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Cornillie, Bert. 2007. *Evidentiality and Epistemic Modality in Spanish (Semi-)Auxiliaries. A cognitive-functional approach*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Ekberg, L. & Paradis, C. 2009. *Evidentiality in language and cognition* (Special ed. *Functions of Language* 16), Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Givón, T. 2005. *Context as Other Minds. The pragmatics of sociality, cognition and communication*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Holšánová, J. 2008. *Discourse, Vision, and Cognition*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- Kärkkäinen, E. 2003. *Epistemic Stance in English Conversation A description of its interactional functions, with a focus on I think*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Langacker, R. 1990. Subjectification, *Cognitive Linguistics* 1: 5–38.
- Langacker, R. 2001. Discourse in cognitive grammar, *Cognitive Linguistics* 12: 143–188.
- Nuyts, J. 2000. *Epistemic Modality, Language, and Conceptualization. A cognitive-pragmatic perspective*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Pishwa, H. (ed.). 2009. *Language and Social Cognition: Expression of the social mind*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Stein, D. & Wright, S. (eds). 1995. *Subjectivity and subjectivisation: Linguistic perspectives*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Verhagen, A. 2005. *Constructions of Intersubjectivity. Discourse, syntax, and cognition*. Oxford: OUP.
- Zlatev, J. T. Racine, C. Sinha & E. Itkonen (eds). 2008. *The Shared Mind: Perspectives on intersubjectivity*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

WS Diachronic Construction Grammar

Convenors: Jóhanna Barðdal (University of Bergen) & Spike Gildea (University of Oregon)

The theoretical framework of Construction Grammar has by now become an established framework in the international linguistic community, and a viable alternative to more formal approaches to language and linguistic structure. So far, constructional analyses have mostly been focused on synchronic, comparative and typological data, while the emergence of a diachronic construction grammar is a more recent development.

The beginning of diachronic construction grammar was marked by Israel's (1996) influential paper on the development of the *way* construction in the history of English. Since then, work has been done on the development of case in Germanic (Barðdal 2001, 2009), changes in periphrastic causatives in English (Hollmann 2003), future constructions in Germanic (Hilpert 2008), raising constructions in English and Dutch (Noël & Colleman 2010), the development of pragmatic particles in Czech (Fried 2007, 2009), possessive constructions in the history of Russian (Eckhoff 2009), historical variation in case marking (Berg-Olsen 2009, Barðdal 2011), as well as the rise of the *there* construction from Old to Early Modern English (Jenset 2010), to mention a few. Work within diachronic construction grammar has also been tuned in on how insights from the grammaticalization approach can be incorporated into the constructional framework (Traugott 2007, 2008a–b, Noël 2007, Trousdale 2008a–b, Bisang 2010) and how construction grammar aids in historical-comparative reconstruction (Gildea 1997, 1998, 2000, Haig 2008, Barðdal & Eythórsson 2009, Barðdal 2010). At the moment, the community is experiencing a boom in the amount of research being carried out within diachronic construction grammar.

More generally, a constructional approach to diachronic linguistics and language change may be focused on how new constructions arise, how competition in diachronic variation should be accounted for, how constructions fall into disuse, as well as how constructions change in general, formally and/or semantically, and the implications for the language system as a whole. Another area of focus is the value of a constructional approach to the reconstruction of morphosyntax. Further, the role of corpus data, frequency, language contact, and the interaction between item-specific and more general abstract constructions may also be important ingredients in any diachronic constructional analysis, claiming to do justice to language development and change.

This workshop is particularly focused on research where the notion of construction as a form-function pairing is needed to account for the diachronic data and development. We welcome contributions where a comparison between models is facilitated, both with regard to reconstructing grammatical change and to explaining attested grammatical change. The workshop's aim is to promote construction grammar as a viable diachronic framework alongside other linguistic frameworks dealing with language change.

WS Representations in phonology: hierarchical vs. linear models

Convenors: Björn Köhnlein & Emilie Caratini

The issue. Prosodic structure, prosodic representations and prosodic relations in phonology are far from consensual. There is no agreement regarding which different prosodic units should be assumed in phonological theory or how such units should be organised in the prosodic hierarchy. The prosodic tree argued for in Nespor & Vogel [2007 (1986)] may be the most widespread one, yet it certainly does not find unanimous support in the literature – not even concerning its lowest tiers (i.e. mora, syllable, foot, prosodic word). Whereas the existence of these units is acknowledged in a number of approaches (e.g. certain versions of Optimality Theory, cf. Downing 2006, van Oostendorp 2002, Prince & Smolensky 2002 (1993) among others), there is a variety of frameworks that dispense with some of these constituents – or even with all of them – (e.g. Kaye et al. 1990, Kaye 1990, Lowenstamm 1996, Scheer 2004, Neeleman & van de Koot 2006, Samuels 2009). The more hierarchical structure is dismissed from phonological representations, the more lateral relations come into play.

Hierarchical models. Among the defendants of a hierarchical prosodic structure, we find different concepts that are largely incompatible with each other. Consider the notion of the syllable as an example. Despite the enormous amount of literature that has been published on the subject over the years (as was already noted by Pulgram 1968), there is no solid agreement what concerns the internal organization of the syllable. Whereas early views on the subject assumed a direct relation between segments and the syllable along the lines sonority principles (see e.g. Whitney 1874, Kahn 1976, de Saussure 1995), more recent developments added structural units below the syllable (cf. Cairns & Feinstein [1982]).

We find approaches that postulate subsyllabic constituents such as rhymes, onsets, nuclei, codas – or a subset thereof – and make use of timing units (x-slots – cf. Cairns & Feinstein 1982 – or C_s and V_s – cf. Clements & Keyser 1983). The skeleton (i.e. x- or C/V-tier) can thus be seen as a *timing* tier, i.e. as the tier where phonological *linearity* is achieved.

Moras are regarded as units that determine syllable weight. Moraic theory has been proposed as a concept replacing skeletal positions and subsyllabic constituency (e.g. Hyman 1985). It has been claimed to have advantages in relation to processes as for instance compensatory lengthening (e.g. Hayes 1989) or the representation of geminates (e.g. Davis 1994). On the other hand, skeletal positions and/or subsyllabic constituents are able to do the job as well (van Oostendorp 1995, Kaye et al. 1990 among others).

Similar discussions can be found concerning the foot level (cf. Hayes 1995, Kager 1993, 1999 among others).

Linear models. Next to these competing hierarchical approaches, a rising number of alternative theories reduce prosodic hierarchy to a minimum. In frameworks like Government Phonology (cf. Kaye & Pöchtrager 2009, Lowenstamm 1996, Pöchtrager 2006, Scheer 2004, Szigetvári 1999 among others), the existence of prosodic units like moras, syllables, and feet is dismissed. That is, instead of a strict hierarchical order, linearity is assumed. The effects of prosodic structure on the phonological string are achieved by other means: for instance, so-called Strict-CV Phonology (Lowenstamm 1996, Scheer 2004) replaces hierarchical structures by postulating lateral relations (government and licensing). These relations regulate, among other things, the occurrence of long and short vowels (e.g. when these are distributed as a function of syllable structure) and vowel-zero alternations. The absence of hierarchical structure does not prevent Strict-CV to account for the different stress patterns found across languages (cf. Scheer & Szigetvári 2005).

Goals of the workshop. This workshop aims at confronting the existing approaches to (low-level) prosodic representations and to their effects on the phonological string. We thus welcome contributions couched in any theoretical framework which address topics related to low-level prosodic representations and prosodic relations (non-restrictive list):

- Are there (morpho)phonological mechanisms which may be accounted for in a more restrictive way by assuming the existence of a prosodic hierarchy and which cannot be accounted for without the help of such prosodic units (e.g. stress assignment, tonal mechanisms etc.) [or vice versa]?
- Are there (morpho)phonological mechanisms which may be accounted for in a more restrictive way by assuming lateral relations rather than a hierarchical prosodic structure, or vice versa? Or are there

processes that can only be accounted for in one of these competing approaches (e.g. stress assignment, tonal mechanisms, etc.)?

- Can the non-consensus and the increasing variety of incompatible competing proposals concerning the internal structure of the prosodic hierarchy (e.g. at the syllable level, the foot level) be regarded as an indication that we should aim at abolishing any hierarchical prosodic structure in phonology?
- Are there (as yet untreated) phonological phenomena that may be accounted for using moras but not using subsyllabic constituents / skeletal positions [or vice-versa]?
- May there be ways of combining insights from different hierarchical frameworks to develop a more consensual model of the prosodic hierarchy?