

Arbeitsgruppen für die 31. Jahrestagung der DGfS 2009 in Osnabrück
Termin: 4.3. – 6.3. 2009
Rahmenthema: Form und Funktion

- AG 1:** Eva Breindl / Gisella Ferraresi / Anna Volodina,
Formen und Funktionen von Satzverknüpfungen
- AG 2:** Holger Hopp / Rosemary Tracy
Morphological form and syntactic function: the syntax-morphology-interface in child and adult 2nd language acquisition
- AG 3:** Angela Grimm / Anja Müller / Cornelia Hamann / Esther Ruigendijk
Production-comprehension asymmetries in child language
- AG 4:** Diana Apoussidou / Tamas Biro
Learning meets acquisition: the learnability of linguistic frameworks from formal and cognitive perspectives
- AG 5:** Susanne Jekat / Christiane Hohenstein
Formen des Ausdrucks von Höflichkeit/ Respekt im Gespräch
(Kurz-AG, Donnerstag und Freitag)
- AG 6:** Sabine Bartsch / Monica Holtz
Corpus, colligation, register variation
- AG 7:** Stefanie Jannedy / Marzena Zygis
Form and function of insertions and deletions in speech
(Kurz-AG, Mittwoch)
- AG 8:** Ralf Vogel / Ruben Vijver
Rhythm beyond the word
- AG 9:** Andreas Haida / Edgar Onea / Malte Zimmermann
Focus marking strategies and focus interpretation
- AG 10:** Daniel Gutzmann / Hans-Martin Gärtner
Expressives and other kind of non-truth-conditional meaning
- AG 11:** Patrick Brandt / Eric Fuß
Repairs
- AG 12:** Barbara Stiebels / Tonjes Veenstra
Linking und Diathesen bei Satzargumenten
- AG 13:** Carla Umbach / Klaus von Heusinger
Comparison constructions and similarity-based classification

AG 1: Formen und Funktionen von Satzverknüpfungen

Eva Breindl

Institut für Deutsche Sprache

R 5, 6-13

68161 Mannheim

breindl@ids-mannheim.de

Gisella Ferraresi

Institut kognitive Linguistik
Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität

Grüneburgplatz 1

60629 Frankfurt am Main

ferraresi@lingua.uni-frankfurt.de

Anna Volodina

Universität Kassel
Fachbereich 02 - Germanistik

Georg-Forster-Straße 3

34109 Kassel

volodina@uni-kassel.de

Diskursstrukturen lassen sich als multidimensionale Gebilde verstehen, für deren Zustandekommen mehrere Ebenen auf vielfältige Weise interagieren. Eine zentrale Rolle spielen dabei die spezifischen semantischen Relationen zwischen den einzelnen Diskurssegmenten. Hierbei konstituieren formale Mittel wie lexikalische Satzverknüpfungen (Konnektoren und konnektorähnliche Ausdrücke), Prosodie und Syntax Merkmalsbündel, die wiederum mit den informationsstrukturellen Eigenschaften und der Interpretation der Diskursrelation korrelieren (Pasch et al. 2003, Lang/Adamiková 2007). So ist etwa der Faktor (prosodische und syntaktische) Desintegration eines adverbialen Konnektors oder eines sententialen Adverbials meist relevant für die Interpretation der Diskursrelation (vgl. Lohnstein/Trissler (Hg.) 2004), wie bei der Scheidung einer irrelevanzkonditionalen (1a) von einer konditionalen (1b) Lesart.

(1a) Wenn du auch dagegen bist, ich gehe da nicht hin.

(1b) Wenn du auch dagegen bist, gehe ich da nicht hin.

Im Mittelpunkt der AG stehen die Fragen:

- Wie funktioniert die Interaktion zwischen den einzelnen sprachlichen Ebenen und welche „Einwirkungsrichtungen“ und Abhängigkeiten lassen sich dabei erkennen?
- Wie interagieren Informationsstruktur und Diskursrelationen?
- Welche Rolle hat die Prosodie: Wird sie von den topologischen Eigenschaften der Konstruktion gesteuert, oder kann sie selbst die Interpretation steuern?

In der AG sind neben synchronen und sprachvergleichenden auch diachrone empirische Ansätze zur Syntax und Semantik von Satzverknüpfungen willkommen, die historische Erklärungen für die Entwicklungsprozesse bei den Formen sowie Einschränkungen im Gebrauch von Satzverknüpfungen liefern können.

Literatur:

Lang, Ewald/ Adamiková, Marcela (2007): The lexical content of connectors and its interplay with intonation. An interim balance on sentential connection in discourse.

In: Späth, Andreas (Hg.): Interfaces and Interface Conditions. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter. 199-230.

Lohnstein, Horst/ Trissler, Susanne (Hg.) (2004): The Syntax and Semantics of the Left Periphery. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Pasch, Renate/ Brauße, Ursula/ Breindl, Eva/ Waßner, Ulrich Hermann (2003): Handbuch der deutschen Konnektoren. Berlin/ New York: de Gruyter.

AG 2: Morphological form and syntactic function: the syntax-morphology-interface in child and adult 2nd language acquisition

Holger Hopp

Anglistische Linguistik
Universität Mannheim
Schloß, EW 266
68131 Mannheim
Tel: +49-621-181-3160
Fax: +49-621-181-2336
hhopp@rumms.uni-mannheim.de

Rosemarie Tracy

Anglistische Linguistik
Universität Mannheim
Schloß, EW 265
68131 Mannheim
Tel: +49-621-181-2337
Fax: +49-621-181-2336
rtracy@rumms.uni-mannheim.de

This workshop aims at a systematic comparison of the syntax-morphology interface in child versus adult second-language (L2) acquisition. The relation between inflectional morphology and syntax in the development of L2 grammars has been at the forefront of research on early and late L2 acquisition. While the available evidence to date suggests that inflectional morphology presents only passing difficulty in child L2 acquisition and may be relatively closely tied to the acquisition of syntax, inflectional morphology is prone to protracted problems in late L2 acquisition, yet, with less clear linkages to syntactic development. This scenario has led to various approaches claiming either that child L2 acquisition differs from adult L2 acquisition in the domain of morphology, yet not in syntax (Schwartz 2003), or that they differ in both morphology and syntax (Blom, Polisenska & Weerman 2006). Against the backdrop of these approaches, this workshop seeks to relate comparative empirical data to three questions:

- 1) What are the effects of age in the acquisition of inflectional morphology and syntax? Do child L2 learners invariably outperform late L2ers, and, if so, is the relation between age and performance at the syntax-morphology interface linear or age-bounded, i.e. indicative of a Critical Period?
- 2) What are the effects of the first language on the acquisition of morphosyntax? Is morphosyntactic development in child L2 acquisition equally affected by L1 properties as adult L2 development?
- 3) What is the nature of problems at the syntax-morphology interface? Some approaches stress representational problems in syntax (e.g. Hawkins 2001) or morphology (e.g. Lardiere 2006), while others point to computational problems (e.g. Prévost & White 2000) or problems at PF (Goad & White 2004). Recent advances in L2 processing and neuroimaging research can help address the question as to whether non-convergent production and comprehension of morphosyntax in L2 development are due to representational deficits or computational problems in L2 acquisition. In addition, they allow us to consider the role of cognitive resources in child and adult L2 processing.

With reference to these three questions, we invite researchers studying early and/or late L2 acquisition of morphosyntax from different perspectives to contribute presentations and to submit abstracts to this workshop. We hope to discuss new findings in order to move closer towards a coherent perspective on age effects in the L2 acquisition of morphosyntax.

References

- Blom, Elma, Polišenskà, Daniela & Fred Weerman (2006). Effects of age on the acquisition of agreement inflection. *Morphology* 16: 313-336.
- Schwartz, Bonnie D. (2003). Child L2 acquisition: Paving the way. In *BUCLD 27: Proceedings of the 27th Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development*, Barbara Beachley & Amanda Brown & Frances Conlin (eds.), 26-50. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla.

AG 3: Production-comprehension asymmetries in child language

Angela Grimm

Universität Frankfurt am Main
 Institut für Deutsche Sprache und Literatur I
 Grüneburgplatz 1
 60629 Frankfurt
 Fon: 069/798-32565, Fax: - 32564
grimm@em.uni-frankfurt.de

Anja Müller

Universität Potsdam
 Institut für Linguistik, Haus 24
 Karl-Liebknecht-Str. 24-25
 14476 Golm
 Fon: 0331-977-2527, Fax: - 2095
anmuelle@rz.uni-potsdam.de

Cornelia Hamann

Seminar für Anglistik/Amerikanistik
 Universität Oldenburg
 26111 Oldenburg
 Tel. 0441 798 2342/Fax: 3771
Cornelia.hamann@uni-oldenburg.de

Esther Ruigendijk

Seminar für Niederlandistik
 Universität Oldenburg
 26111 Oldenburg
 798 4695/Fax:4596
esther.ruigendijk@uni-oldenburg.de

It is a widely held assumption that children develop receptive skills before productive ones. For example, 16 months-old children produce 45 words but understand approximately 180 words (Fenson et al., 1993 for English). Several recent studies, however, provide evidence that preschool children use structures in a target-like way without assigning them an adult-like interpretation (such as focus particles, anaphora, complementizers, or contrast accent). At first glance, these latter findings are surprising, because target-like production requires mastery of the relevant grammatical structure. Taken together, both sets of findings suggest that language is acquired within a circle where comprehension precedes production and production precedes comprehension. Moreover, these results call for a reconsideration of the notions 'comprehension' and 'production' in language acquisition research.

In our workshop, we aim to (re)consider the comprehension-production asymmetries in child language from theoretical and methodological perspectives. We would focus on comprehension because it is central for both comprehension (e.g., true value judgements) and production tasks (e.g., sentence completion). Questions related to the topic of the workshop are for example:

- Is there further evidence for or against a comprehension-production-asymmetry?
- Which theoretical models can account for the empirical findings?
- Could the earlier mastery of comprehension skills be an artefact of research methods?
- How can 'comprehension' and 'production' be redefined to capture the observed asymmetries?

We invite contributions investigating monolingual, bilingual, and impaired language development, and we explicitly welcome research comparing comprehension and production skills in the same subjects. As the workshop aims at bringing together researchers from experimental and theoretical linguistics, we particularly welcome contributions that build a bridge between empirical findings and linguistic theory.

References:

Fenson, Larry, Phillip S. Dale, Steven Reznick, Donna Thal, Elizabeth Bates, Jeffrey P. Hartung, Steven Pethick & Judy S. Reilly (1993). The MacArthur communicative development inventories: User's guide and technical manual. San Diego: Singular.

AG 4: Learning meets acquisition: the learnability of linguistic frameworks from formal and cognitive perspectives

Diana Apoussidou

Universiteit van Amsterdam
Spuistraat 210
1012 VT Amsterdam
Netherlands
Tel.: +31-20-525 21 85
Fax: +31-20-525 30 21
d.apoussidou@uva.nl

Tamas Biró

Eötvös Loránd University
Király utca 1/b
Budapest
Hungary
Tel.: +36-30-212 12 96
birot@nytud.hu

The workshop brings together researchers working on the learnability of linguistic models from a formal point, with those working on the models' cognitive adequacy. In general, studies on the learnability of language account for how grammar and lexicon of a language can be learnt, and by what means. To give an example, considerable progress has been made recently in connectionist-based frameworks such as Optimality Theory (Prince & Smolensky 1993) and Harmonic Grammar (Legendre et al. 1990). Most learnability models within OT deal with the learning of the grammar: learning of constraint hierarchies, and learning of constraints themselves. In most of these approaches, lexical information is already given. Other OT approaches tackle the learning of parts of the lexicon. Differences between approaches include whether lexicon and grammar are learnt in turns (offline) or in parallel (online), or whether the OT grammar to be learnt is traditional or stochastic. Current approaches to learnability within HG include learning constraint weights, by using learning algorithms such as the perceptron algorithm. Yet, formal results have been only seldom tested against empirical data from language acquisition research.

The workshop will not only capture the State-of-the-Art in current approaches to learnability, but also point out future developments in this field, especially those pertaining to cognitive adequacy. Questions to be addressed in the workshop include:

- What are appropriate computational models of the formalizations and why?
- What is the cognitive and psycholinguistic plausibility of these models?
- How does the research on formal models of learnability relate to (psycholinguistic) research on language acquisition? Is there a "missing link"?
- How can the learnability of interfaces (e.g., syntax-phonology, semantics-phonology) be formalized?
- How can learnability account for diachronic aspects of language?

We invite anybody working within any well-established contemporary linguistic framework (including phonology, syntax or semantics, let it be GB, the Minimalist Program, OT, LFG or HPSG among many others), and who tackles its learnability from a theoretical, formal or cognitive perspective. Especially invited are contributions that contrast the learnability of a framework with empirical data (from language acquisition, language change or psycholinguistic experiments).

References:

- Prince, A. & P. Smolensky (1993/2004). Optimality Theory: constraint interaction in generative grammar. RuCCS-TR-2. Rutgers Center for Cognitive Science.
- Legendre, G., Miyata, Y. & P. Smolensky (1990). Harmonic grammar - a formal multi-level theory of linguistic well-formedness: An application. Proceedings of the 12th Annual Cognitive Science Society Conference, Hillsdale, NJ. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

AG 5: Formen des Ausdrucks von Höflichkeit/ Respekt im Gespräch
(Kurz-AG, Donnerstag und Freitag)

Susanne J. Jekat

Zürcher Hochschule für
Angewandte Wissenschaften
Institut für Übersetzen und Dolmetschen
Theaterstr. 15c, Postfach
CH-8401 Winterthur
Schweiz
Fon: +41 58 934 6071
Fax: +41 58 935 6071
jane@zhaw.ch

Christiane Hohenstein

Zürcher Hochschule für
Angewandte Wissenschaften
Zentrum Interkulturelle Kompetenz
Theaterstr. 15c, Postfach
CH-8401 Winterthur
Schweiz
Fon: +41 58 934 6225
Fax: +41 58 935 6071
hohc@zhaw.ch

Eine durch Höflichkeit bzw. den Ausdruck von Respekt gegenüber Dritten motivierte unterschiedliche Versprachlichung von Sachverhalten findet sich in vielen Sprachen: In japanischen und koreanischen Gesprächen wird z.B. eine Hierarchie zwischen den Entitäten etabliert, die den Gesprächspartnern zugeordnet sind, wobei der "rangniedere" Gesprächspartner die ihm zugeordneten Entitäten gegenüber denjenigen des ranghöheren Gesprächspartners abwertet (z.B. jap. "mein blöder Vater" vs. „Ihr ehrenwerter Herr Vater“, vgl. Haase, 1994). Das Deutsche dagegen differenziert zwischen proximalem „Du“ und distalem „Sie“, ohne dies auf die jeweils zugehörigen Familien-/ Gruppenmitglieder sowie deren Besitz auszudehnen. In den Schweizer dialektalen Varietäten des Deutschen finden sich allerdings höflichkeitsbedingte, respektbezogene Formen des Redens über Dritte (in der Sprechsituation nicht anwesende Personen), z.B. "er hät kai Freud gha" als Ausdruck dafür, dass die mit „er“ bezeichnete Person sehr ungehalten war. Da diesbezüglich Beschreibungen der gesprochenen Sprache nur begrenzt vorliegen (s. Ender et al. 2007) und im Bereich der Höflichkeitsforschung die sprecher- und hörerbefugte Höflichkeit im Mittelpunkt steht (s. Hickey/Stewart eds. 2005), sollen in der vorgeschlagenen AG solche nicht-anredebezogene Höflichkeitsfunktionen sprachlicher Darstellungsformen eines Sachverhaltes in verschiedenen Sprachen und (ihren) Varietäten kontrastiert werden. Dabei sollen Sprachen und Varietäten, die in einem mehrsprachigen Kontext mit Standard- oder Amtssprachen konkurrieren (z.B. Schweizer Dialekte, Luxemburgisch), besonders berücksichtigt werden. Die AG wendet sich an Kolleg/inn/en mit den Arbeitsbereichen Formen und Funktionen der gesprochenen Sprache/Gesprächs- und Diskursanalyse, Dialektologie/ kleine Sprachen/ Varietätenlinguistik, kontrastive Linguistik/ Sprachvergleich.

Literatur:

- Ender, Andrea, Li, Wei & Katharina Strassl (2007). "Das Projekt `Deutsch als Zweitsprache in Dialektumgebung`", Linguistik online 32,3.
Haase, Martin (1994). Respekt. Die Grammatikalisierung von Höflichkeit. München: Lincom.
Hickey, Leo/ Stewart, Miranda (eds.) (2005). Politeness in Europe. Clevedon : Multilingual Matters.

Interessentenkreis/Themenbereiche:

Formen und Funktionen in der gesprochenen Sprache
Dialektologie/ kleine Sprachen
Kontrastive Linguistik/Sprachvergleich

AG 6: Corpus, colligation, register variation**Sabine Bartsch**

Technische Universität Darmstadt
 Institut für Sprach- und Literaturwissen-
 schaft
 Hochschulstraße 1
 64289 Darmstadt
 Bartsch@linglit.tu-darmstadt.de

Monica Holtz

Technische Universität Darmstadt
 Institut für Sprach- und Literaturwissen-
 schaft
 Hochschulstraße 1
 64289 Darmstadt
 Holtz@linglit.tu-darmstadt.de

Register variation, i.e. functional linguistic variation according to situational context, has been the subject of numerous studies addressing a wide spectrum of features deemed to be characteristic of specific registers (cf. e.g. on the expression of stance in scientific registers (Hunston, Thompson 2000), the self-construal of the scientist (Hyland 1998, 2002), changes in the course of the historical development of scientific registers (e.g. Halliday 1988); register profiling (Biber 1995)).

Many register studies focus on single or relative small sets of texts instead of being based on studies of larger corpora. This limits the possibilities of systematically evaluating register features in larger and more diverse sets of registers and, thus, the wider applicability of the results. Furthermore, most registers are not reliably characterized by features that are exclusively found in a single register, but rather by sets of lexical and grammatical features that are principally found in any text, albeit to varying extent. It has been shown that methodologies based on qualitative as well as quantitative corpus studies are well suited to the study of registers from different perspectives (e.g. synchronic, diachronic, comparative, cross-linguistic etc.). Advances in corpus-based methodology in combination with the increasing availability of corpora and tools for their annotation and analysis at different levels of linguistic organization make more extensive and systematic register studies feasible. In particular, they enable the investigation of a more diverse set of types and combinations of register features that require qualitative and quantitative corpus analyses.

The main interest of this workshop is the exploration of the methodological possibilities and limitations of present-day corpus-based register studies with a focus on lexico-grammatical and grammatical register features. Central issues are lexical co-occurrence patterns such as collocations and other types of multiword expressions and lexico-grammatical patterns such as colligations which are postulated to characteristically co-occur in individual registers. Research invited for presentation at this workshop includes lexical, grammatical and semantic analyses of colligation and collocation in registerially diverse synchronic and diachronic corpora and new methods in exploring register features. The focus of this workshop is going to be on methodology in corpus-based register studies, yet contributions on theoretical issues are also welcome.

References:

- Biber, D. (1995). *Dimensions of Register Variation: A Cross-Linguistic Comparison*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Halliday, MAK. (1988). 'On the language of physical science'. In Ghadessy, H. ed. *Registers of Written English*. London: Pinter Publishers, 162-178.
- Hunston, S., G. Thompson. eds. (2000). *Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse*. Oxford et al.: OUP.
- Hyland, K. (1998). *Hedging in Scientific Research Articles*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins Publishers Ltd.

Hyland, K. (2002). 'Options of identity in academic writing'. *ELT Journal* 2002
56(4):351-358.

AG 7: Form and function of insertions and deletions in speech
(Kurz-AG, Mittwoch)

Stefanie Jannedy

ZAS
Schützenstr. 18
10117 Berlin
Tel. 030 20192435,
Fax. 030 20192402
jannedy@ling.ohio-state.edu

Marzena Zygis

ZAS
Schützenstr. 18
10117 Berlin
Tel. 030 20192441
Fax. 030 20192402
marzena@zas.gwz-berlin.de

Phonetics as well as phonology has treated insertions and deletions differently: while for phonetics, insertions and deletions mark the endpoints of gradual processes, for phonology, both processes are categorical and fulfill different functions.

Insertions have been phonologically interpreted as a syllable structure repair mechanism (insertion of /t/ as onset in Axinica Campa), prosodic boundary markers (glottal stop insertion in German and English) or as hiatus preservation (Skerre). Other types of insertions such as /t/-epenthesis in nasal-fricative sequences in US-English (/prins/ is pronounced as [prints]) do not seem to have a specific function; in fact, in South African English, these insertions are unattested (Fourakis & Port, 1986). The epenthesis process can be easily explained as a phonetic by-product of the phasing of articulatory gestures. However, it remains unclear why only selected consonants /h ʔ t w j l r r ɾ/ are the most frequently inserted segments across languages.

Phonologically, deletions, too, are claimed to serve the purpose of optimizing the syllable structure (cluster simplification in Polish) or adjusting prosodic requirements (/s/ is deleted word-finally but not utterance-finally in Castilian Spanish). However, we can also find the opposite effect, whereby the syllable onset is being made less optimal by deleting the unstressed syllable nucleus. In German, we found vowel deletions in unstressed syllables causing complex onsets and, moreover, confusion between competing forms (i.e. *geleiten* 'to accompany' can be pronounced as *gleiten* 'to slide') in faster rates of speech. Thus, the altered form poses a question about the undesired products of deletions.

This workshop will provide a forum for phonologists, phoneticians, and morphologists to discuss the forms and functions of deletions and insertions found cross-linguistically, their dependence on prosodic structure, accent, phonotactics, frequency as well as their consequences for phonological systems.

AG 8: Rhythm beyond the word**Ralf Vogel**

Universität Bielefeld
 Fakultät für Linguistik und Literaturwissenschaft
 Postfach 10 01 31
 33501 Bielefeld
 Tel.: 0521-1063673
 ralf.vogel@uni-bielefeld.de

Ruben van de Vijver

Universität Potsdam
 Institut für Linguistik
 Karl-Liebknecht-Str. 24/25
 14476 Potsdam-Golm
 Tel.: 0331-9772926
 ruben@ling.uni-potsdam.de

As a well-formedness condition on outputs, rhythm plays an important role in language acquisition, psycholinguistics, language change, phraseology, and, of course, in morphology and phonology. More recent research by a number of authors includes the following findings: rhythm affects the morphological process of truncations; rhythmic constraints affected the morpho-syntactic development of Early Modern English and Early Modern German; rhythm has an impact on word order in sentence production; the rhythmic characteristics of a language are learned extremely early in language acquisition; rhythm helps children acquire knowledge of the word order regularities in their language; in neurolinguistics, “syntactic” effects observed at the basal ganglia have been reinterpreted as emerging from the basal ganglia’s role as organising the rhythmic sequencing of cognitive and motor activities.

Such effects are unexpected in many current syntactic and psycholinguistic theories in which phonology only interprets syntactic structure. The impact of rhythm on the various subdomains of linguistics, as illustrated by the effects mentioned above, is not integrated in linguistic theory yet. To achieve this goal an exchange of data and ideas across the various linguistic subdomains is needed.

The goal of this workshop is therefore to bring together researchers who focus on the role of rhythm in various subdomains of linguistics. We invite contributions from scholars working in morphology, phonology and syntax, psycho- and neurolinguistics, aphasiology and language acquisition. Contributions should address one or more of the following questions – or any other question pertinent to the theme of the workshop:

- What is the role of rhythm in phonology above the word level?
- How is rhythm above the word level acquired?
- What is the role of rhythm in syntax and morphology, both synchronically and diachronically?
- What is the role of rhythm in psycho- and neurolinguistics?
- Which role does rhythm play in aphasic speech?
- How does rhythm affect speech perception?
- How can linguistic rhythm be detected and defined?
- Is rhythm really as fundamental for language as recent findings suggest?

AG 9: Focus marking strategies and focus interpretation

Andreas Haida

Inst. für deutsche Sprache
und Linguistik,
Humboldt-Universität
Mohrenstr. 40-41
10117 Berlin
Tel.: (030) 2093-4728
Fax.: (030) 2093-9729
andreas.haida@rz.hu-berlin.de

Edgar Onea-Gáspár

Inst. für Linguistik (Germ.)

Universität Stuttgart
Heilbronner Str. 7
70174 Stuttgart
Tel.: (0711) 685-83133
Fax.: (0711) 685-8-3141
edgar.onea@ling.uni-stuttgart.de

Malte Zimmermann

Inst. für Linguistik

Universität Potsdam
Karl-Liebknecht-Str. 24-25
14476 Golm
Tel.: (0331) 977-2319
Fax.: (0331) 977-2087
malte@ling.uni-potsdam.de

The necessity of a strict distinction between focus as a category of information structure related to the presence of alternatives in the interpretation context and focus marking as the grammatical coding of focus has been widely discussed in the literature (Krifka 2007). Different focus marking strategies may, however, have some effect on focus interpretation.

A well known example is Hungarian in which in-situ and ex-situ focus differ with regard to exhaustivity and contrast (É.Kiss 1998). Similar findings have been reported on Finnish, Turkish etc. Such findings support the hypothesis that at least in languages in which several strategies of focus marking are possible focus interpretation depends on the marking strategy.

However, analyses on other languages suggested that the hypothesis may not hold universally. For instance in Hausa (Chadic, Afro-Asiatic) any interpretation available for ex-situ focus is also available for in-situ focus. Moreover, it has recently been argued that even in Hungarian the interpretation difference between in-situ and ex-situ focus is related to a specific syntactic position at the left periphery which may actually be independent of focus.

Given such observations the question arises whether cross linguistically

- i) a general notion of focus as a widely underspecified information structural category (often associated with prosodic prominence) with a unified semantic interpretation mechanism in terms of alternatives (e.g. Rooth 1992) can be maintained by deriving meaning differences related to different strategies of focus marking from the different grammatical structure of the respective sentences plus pragmatic principles or
- ii) more specific notions of information structure, such as e.g. *contrast*, *exhaustivity*, *newness* are required that fall into subclasses of a more general notion of focus such that languages would be expected to use different marking strategies for them?

The workshop invites syntactic, semantic and typological work on different strategies of focus marking and focus interpretation. In addition, we would also encourage the presentation of diachronic data related to the evolution of different strategies of focus marking.

References

É. Kiss, K. 1998. Identificational focus versus information focus, *Language* 74(2), 245-273.

- Krifka, M. 2007. Basic notions of information structure. In Féry, C, Fanselow, G. & Krifka, M. (Eds.), *Working Papers of the SFB632, Interdisciplinary Studies on Information Structure (ISIS) 6*. Potsdam: Universitätsverlag, 13-56.
- Rooth, M. 1992. A Theory of Focus Interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1,75-116.

AG 10: Expressives and other kind of non-truth-conditional meaning**Daniel Gutzmann**

Deutsches Institut
 c/o Lehrstuhl für deskriptive Sprachwissenschaft
 Johannes Gutenberg-Universität
 55099 Mainz
 Tel. 06131 837 48 25
 danielgutzmann@gmail.com

Hans-Martin Gärtner

ZAS
 Schützenstr. 18
 10117 Berlin
 Tel. 030 20192504
 Fax. 030 20192402
 gaertner@zas.gwz-berlin.de

Expressives and other expressions and constructions that – although having conventional rather than conversational meaning – do not contribute to truth conditions and which therefore fall outside the simple picture that the distinction between semantics and pragmatics is solely drawn by the notion of truth, recently gain more and more attention in both semantic and pragmatic research. The focus of this recent development lies in extending the formal tools of semantic analysis to cover such non-truth-conditional though conventional aspects of meaning as well.

Especially expressives attract a lot of interest (e.g. Kaplan 1999; Kratzer 2004; and Potts 2007 and the comments in the same volume). Beside expressives, another important class of non-truth conditional meaning that is recently addressed with different formal tools are particles (Gutzmann 2007; Karagjosova 2004; Zeevat 2005). However, there are still many unsolved questions about both their meaning and their form. For instance, it remains unclear how ordinary truth-conditional content and rather ‘use-conditional’ expressions can be integrated into a single compositional approach. Furthermore, there is the question what non-truth-conditional expressions do contribute, e.g., whether they contribute felicity conditions on utterances, or whether they affect the context of utterance. How do they help to shape the overall form of the discourse and how do they relate to other pragmatic phenomena like conversational implicatures, presuppositions, and speech acts? How is their special semantic status and their particular pragmatic function reflected in their phonetical, morphological, and syntactic structure?

This workshop provides a forum for researchers of all subfields of linguistics to address these closely connected questions. Although the main focus of the workshop lies on formal approaches to the semantics, pragmatics, and syntax of non-truth-conditional aspects of meaning, morphological and phonological research may shed some light on these questions, too. Furthermore, typological and experimental approaches may provide empirical evidence that can help to decide between competing theoretical approaches.

References

- Gutzmann, D. (2007): Eine Implikatur konventioneller Art. *Der Dativus Ethicus*. In: *Linguistische Berichte* 211:277–308.
- Kaplan, D. (1999): The meaning of ouch and oops. Explorations in the theory of meaning as use. Unpubl. ms. Los Angeles: University of California.
- Karagjosova, E. (2004): The meaning and function of German modal particles. PhD thesis. Saarbrücken: Saarland University.
- Kratzer, A. (2004): Interpreting focus: Presupposed or expressive meanings? A comment on Geurt and van der Sandt. In: *Theoretical Linguistics* 30. 123–136.
- Potts, C. (2007): The expressive dimension. In: *Theoretical Linguistics* 33.2. 165–197.

Zeevat, H. (2005): A dynamic approach to discourse particles. In: Fischer, K., ed. (2005): Discourse particles. (Studies in Pragmatics 1). Amsterdam: Elsevier. 133–147.

AG 11: Repairs**Patrick Brandt**

Universität zu Köln
 Institut für deutsche Sprache und Literatur I
 Albertus-Magnus-Platz
 50923 Köln
 Tel. +49 (0) 221 470 5225
 Fax.: +49 (0) 221 470 5107
 pbrandt@uni-koeln.de

Eric Fuß

Johann Wolfgang Goethe Universität
 Institut für Kognitive Linguistik
 Grüneburgplatz 1
 60629 Frankfurt
 Tel. + 49 (0) 69 798 32401
 Fax. + 49 (0) 69 798 32399
 fuss@lingua.uni-frankfurt.de

A leading hypothesis in recent work on linguistic interfaces is that grammar is an optimal solution to conditions imposed by other cognitive systems (Chomsky 1995, 2001). It is assumed that the operations performed by the computational system of language reduce to the bare minimum required to interpret hierarchical syntactic structures in terms of sound and meaning. At the same time, it is well-known that syntactic structures may be unfit for straightforward interpretation. For example, elements often seem to be semantically interpreted in positions different from their surface position (e.g., scope of quantifiers (QR) and negation). At the sound end, hierarchical syntactic structures must be converted into linearly ordered phonological exponents in order to be interpretable at the serial interface to the articulatory-perceptual system. This process may modify the constituent structure derived in syntax, cf. analyses of ‘affix-hopping’/‘do-support’ in English, or, more generally, clitic placement (see Chomsky 1957, Bobaljik 1995, Lasnik 2000 on the former, and Wackernagel 1892, Bonet 1991, Halpern 1992, Embick & Noyer 2001 on the latter). While such ‘repairs’ of the syntactic output are usually viewed as imperfections of the grammar, the workshop wants to turn around the perspective and look at repairs as a device that is routinely and virtuously employed by the grammar to economically code interpretations the transparent expression of which would be tedious, unfeasible or even impossible. Adopting, e.g., ideas of C.S. Peirce (cf. also Horn 1989: chapter 5), unexpected modal or generic interpretations might be repairs of logical conflicts (specifically, circumventing the law of contradiction and the law of the excluded middle, respectively); in Antecedent-Contained-Deletion (Sag 1976, May 1985), QR (at LF) and Ellipsis (at PF) seem to furnish interpretations that could not at all be transparently expressed. Specific questions include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Where do repair mechanisms appear to provide ‘shortcuts’ – or even necessary conditions – to particular interpretations?
- Where exactly do specific repairs happen – e.g., is there true repair in the semantics, or can pragmatics do all the required work?
- Are there grammaticalization paths that involve a ‘repair stage’ which gets hard-wired?

The workshop is of interest for researchers working on linguistic interfaces. We are looking forward to applications that provide formally explicit analyses of particular interface phenomena in terms of repair.

AG 12: Linking und Diathesen bei Satzargumenten

Barbara Stiebels/

Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissen-
schaft
Schützenstr. 18
10117 Berlin
Tel. 030/20192-412
Fax -402
stiebels@zas.gwz-berlin.de

Tonjes Veenstra

Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissen-
schaft
Schützenstr. 18
10117 Berlin
Tel. 030/20192-567
Fax -402
veenstra@zas.gwz-berlin.de

Während es zu Linking und Diathesen bei Individuenargumenten eine reiche typologische und theoretische Literatur gibt, sind Satzargumente, d. h. Argumente von satzeinbettenden Prädikaten wie *sagen*, *versprechen*, *drohen*, *fragen* etc., bislang kaum berücksichtigt worden. Dies hängt u. a. damit zusammen, dass abhängig vom Subordinationstyp Satzargumente nicht immer direkt kasus-markiert werden. Bei finiten Satzkomplementen wird häufig der Kasus allenfalls stellvertretend an einem pronominalen Korrelat o. ä. realisiert (z. B. *dar-auf hoffen*, *sich dessen bewusst sein*, etc.). Nominalisierte Satzkomplemente sind dagegen in der Regel kasusmarkiert. Dort, wo sich Kasus manifestiert, kann das Satzargument kanonischen oder nichtkanonischen Kasus aufweisen (z. B. Akkusativ vs. Genitiv bei Satzkomplementen in der Position des direkten Objekts). **F1:** Inwieweit folgt die Kasusmarkierung von Satzargumenten üblichen Mechanismen/Bedingungen des Argumentlinkings? Wie werden Satzargumente in anderen Linkingsystemen (z. B. Aktivsprachen, Inverssprachen etc.) realisiert?

In Sprachen mit Subjekt-/Objektkongruenz können Satzargumente ebenfalls mit pronominalen Affixen indiziert werden, allerdings unter Einschränkungen. So ist – analog zu Individuenargumenten – Kongruenz mit einem Satzargument in der Regel nur möglich, wenn dieses nicht oblik markiert ist. **F2:** Welche Beschränkungen zur Indizierung von Satzargumenten gibt es?

Da Satzargumente auf unbelebte Entitäten referieren, können keine Effekte der differentiellen Objektmarkierung beobachtet werden, die mit sortalen Merkmalen korreliert sind (z. B. an Belebtheit gekoppelte Akkusativmarkierung). Vorstellbar sind jedoch Effekte, die an referentielle Merkmale gebunden sind (z. B. Spezifität im Zusammenhang mit desiderativen Matrixprädikaten wie *wünschen/wollen*) oder an die Polarität des Matrixprädikats (z. B. Akkusativ-Genitiv-Alternation bei Negation). **F3:** Gibt es Phänomene der differentiellen Subjekt-/Objektmarkierung bei Satzargumenten?

Ebenfalls unsystematisch sind Beschreibungen zu Effekten von Diathesen auf die Einführung oder Wegbindung von Satzargumenten. So werden Applikative in der Regel nur mit Individuenargumenten diskutiert. **F4:** Gibt es spezifische Diathesen zur Einführung oder Wegbindung von Satzargumenten bzw. inwieweit werden Satzargumente von den gegebenen Diathesen affiziert?

Schließlich kann die konkrete Realisierung von Satzargumenten Konsequenzen für bestimmte syntaktische Prozesse haben. So ist Restrukturierung/*Clause Union* in der Regel an die kanonische Realisierung des Satzarguments gebunden (s. Sabel 1996). **F5:** Inwieweit werden syntaktische Strukturen/Prozesse von der jeweiligen Realisierung des Satzarguments affiziert?

Wir sind an theoretischen, typologischen oder konkret einzelsprachlichen Analysen/Beschreibungen zu den genannten Phänomenen interessiert, wobei wir in der AG ein möglichst weites Spektrum bzgl. theoretischer Ansätze, Linkingsysteme und Subordinationstypen bieten wollen.

Literatur:

Sabel, Joachim (1996). Restrukturierung und Lokalität. Universelle Beschränkungen für Wortstellungsvarianten. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

AG 13: Comparison constructions and similarity-based classification

Carla Umbach

Institut für Kognitionswissenschaft
 Universität Osnabrück
 Albrechtstrasse 28
 49076 Osnabrück
cumbach@uos.de

Klaus von Heusinger

Institut für Germanistik/ Linguistik
 Universität Stuttgart
 Keplerstr. 17
 70174 Stuttgart
Klaus.vonHeusinger@ling.uni-stuttgart.de

Classification of objects and situations can be expressed linguistically in two basic ways, either by ascribing a (nominal or verbal etc.) predicate to the object/situation, or by comparing the object/ situation to some entity known to the addressee. When ascribing a predicate classification is performed according to the meaning of the predicate. In (1a), for example, we are told that Anna's height is 1,80m. But when using a comparison construction the classifying property has to be inferred from a similarity relation between the compared entities and the relevant respect of similarity. Thus, in (1b) we only learn that Anna and Marie are similar with respect to height and we have to infer Anna's height from what we know about Marie. Likewise, in (2a) the property of the student in question is explicitly mentioned while (2b) it has to be inferred from what we know about Marie. Finally, in (3a) we are told that Anna went to Vienna via Prague, while in (3b) we only learn that there is some respect with respect to which Anna's trip to Vienna was similar to Marie's trip.

- | | |
|--|---|
| (1) a. Anna ist 1,80m groß. | 'Anna is 1,80 tall' |
| b. Anna ist so groß wie Marie. | 'Anna is as tall as Marie' |
| (2) a. Uns fehlt eine kluge Mathestudentin im Seminar. | 'We need a clever Math student in the seminar.' |
| b. Uns fehlt eine Studentin wie Marie im Seminar. | 'We need a student like Marie in the seminar.' |
| (3) a. Anna ist über Prag nach Wien gefahren. | 'Anna went to Vienna via Prague.' |
| b. Anna ist genau so nach Wien gefahren wie Marie. | 'Anna took the same route to Vienna as Marie.' |

While the meaning of comparison constructions based on gradable adjectives has been discussed in detail (e.g., Bierwisch 1986, Kennedy 1999), there are few approaches addressing comparison constructions beyond the adjectival domain and there is no general account of how similarity is exploited in natural language. On the other hand, in Cognitive Psychology similarity-based classification is regarded as a basic cognitive ability of human agents and has been studied at length (cf. Hahn & Chater 1998). In the workshop, we would like to address the question of what strategies there are in natural languages to express comparison, how these strategies can be modeled, and how these strategies relate to the findings from Cognitive Psychology. We are interested in semantic/pragmatic approaches as well as contrastive/typological studies and, in particular, contributions from Cognitive Psychology.

References

Bierwisch, M. (1989) The semantics of gradation. In M. Bierwisch & E. Lang (eds) Dimensional adjectives. Springer, Berlin, 71–262.

- Kennedy, Chr. (1999) *Projecting the adjective: The syntax and semantics of gradability and comparison*. Garland Press, New York.
- Hahn, U. & Chater, N. (1998). Similarity and Rules: Distinct? Exhaustive? Empirically Distinguishable? *Cognition*, 65:197–230.
- Stassen, Leon (1985) *Comparison and Universal Grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell.