

DISCOURSE STRUCTURE IN CONTRAST

JULY 17 2019, AHRWEILER (NRW)

Programme

Wednesday, July 17 2019

11:00 - 11:10	Begrüßung
11:10 - 12:00	ŁUKASZ JĘDRZEJOWSKI On relative <i>um-zu</i> -clauses in German
12:00 - 12:50	CLÉMENTINE RAFFY ENABLE at the interface
12:50 - 14:15	<i>Mittagspause</i>
14:15 - 15:05	JET HOEK Prominence while you wait? Referents as cues for contrastive coherence relations
15:05 - 15:55	REGINA ZIELEKE On contrast with German <i>dennoch</i> and <i>trotzdem</i>
15:55 - 16:45	FREDERIKE WEEBER The semantics of the indefinite pronouns <i>einer</i> and <i>jemand</i> in German
16:45 - 17:15	<i>Kaffepause</i>
17:15 - 18:05	ELYESA SEIDEL Event types and anaphoric uptake of bare nouns
18:05 - 18:55	SEMRA KIZILKAYA Event structure and accusative case marking in Turkish
19:30	<i>Gemeinsames Abendessen</i>

Abstracts

ŁUKASZ JĘDRZEJOWSKI

On relative *um-zu*-clauses in German

Adverbial infinitive clauses introduced by the complementizer *um* (lit. 'about') are taken to be able to exhibit three different A-bar dependencies. They can give rise to a purpose, a consecutive or a telic interpretation. However, there is in addition another type of dependent clauses headed by *um* that have hitherto escaped attention in the literature:

- (1) Bereit liegt auch [DP **ein Kabel**] **um** einen iPad ans Center **anzuschließen**.
ready lie.3SG also a cable COMP a iPad at:the center to:connect.INF
'There is also a cable available to connect an iPad to the center.'

(DeReKo, *NZZ am Sonntag*, 16/3/2008)

In (1), the subordinate clause is not used as an adverbial clause. Instead it is a relative clause modifying the DP *ein Kabel* ('a cable').

The main aim of this talk is to examine the syntax of relative *um-zu*-clauses in German. I will compare them with adverbial *um-zu*-clauses and conclude that they cannot be brought down to a common denominator, i.e. to an operator movement, as proposed by Haegeman & Ürögdi (2010).

References

Haegeman, Liliane & Barbara Ürögdi. 2010. Referential CPs and DPs. An operator movement account. *Theoretical Linguistics* 36(2-3), 111-152.

CLÉMENTINE RAFFY

ENABLE at the interface

Syntactic causatives appear to be available in all Romance languages. MAKE-causatives of the *faire*-infinitive type as in (1) have been analyzed extensively due to their specificities – notably because the presence of the light verb *faire* triggers the creation of a complex predicate (Guasti 1996, Harley & Folli 2007). This results in constructions like (1) being monoclausal, unlike their English counterparts.

- (1) Jean a fait manger une pomme à Pierre.
Jean make.PF eat an apple to Pierre
'Jean made Pierre eat an apple.'

Less attention has been devoted to LET-causatives. In Spanish and French, the causative verbs *laisser* and *dejar* do not behave like *faire* and display two levels of syntactic complexity and three different constructions. My goal is to show that in order to explain their distinct syntactic realizations, syntactic causative structures in Spanish and French must be analyzed across three different levels of representation: (i) a cognitive representation, encoding the causal tendency expressed by the LET causal verbs (Wolff & Song 2003) which is mapped

onto (ii) the argument structure of the causative verbs. The latter in turn determines (iii) the realization of arguments at the syntax-semantics interface.

References

- Guasti, M. T. 1996. Semantic restrictions in Romance causatives and the incorporation approach. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 294-313.
- Folli, R., & Harley, H. 2007. Causation, obligation, and argument structure: On the nature of little *v*. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 38(2), 197-238.
- Wolff, P., & Song, G. 2003. Models of causation and the semantics of causal verbs. *Cognitive Psychology*, 47(3), 276-332.

JET HOEK

Prominence while you wait? Referents as cues for contrastive coherence relations

A well-established phenomenon within sentences is anti-locality (e.g. Levy & Keller 2013): a longer wait for an expected linguistic element facilitates the processing of that linguistic element. This study aims to investigate whether anti-locality effects can also occur at the discourse level. Setting up a strong expectation for contrasting information about two referents, we measure whether the mention of the second referent is processed faster as the amount of information about the first referent increases:

- (1) John and Mary have very different opinions about kitchen organization.
John thinks ... **Mary** ...

If the prominence of an expected referent indeed increases as the distance between its first and second mention becomes larger, this effect would be in stark contrast to the finding that having recently been mentioned strongly contributes to a referent's accessibility in a discourse.

REGINA ZIELEKE

On contrast with German *dennoch* and *trotzdem*

Contrast with the German discourse connectives *dennoch* ('however/still') and *trotzdem* ('however/nevertheless') is characterized by a rejected implicature of a generic rule. In (1), the connectives implicate a generic rule that can be formulated as 'if it rains, one doesn't go for a walk'. Via the assertion of the two conjuncts, this rule is rejected:

- (1) Es regnet. Wir gehen **dennoch/trotzdem** spazieren. (= $P_1 \wedge Q_1$)
(It's raining. We go CONN for a walk.)
(i) implicature: *Wenn es regnet, geht man nicht spazieren.* (= $P_n \rightarrow \neg Q_n$)
(ii) assertion: $\neg(P_1 \rightarrow \neg Q_1)$; $P_1 \subseteq P_n, Q_1 \subseteq Q_n$

As I will argue in my talk, this contrast on the propositional level of discourse involves certain constraints and conditions of use for connexions with *dennoch* and *trotzdem* concerning the connectives' scope, contextual constraints, and discourse structural aspects.

FREDERIKE WEEBER

The semantics of the indefinite pronouns *einer* and *jemand* in German

Crosslinguistically, indefinite pronouns show a wide variety of functions: for example, they can introduce new discourse referents, signal the epistemic state of the speaker or express free choice. In one language, different functions are often expressed by morphologically distinct series of indefinite pronouns (Haspelmath 1997). The talk will focus on two indefinite pronouns in German that refer to human referents, *einer* and *jemand*, and ask whether these pronouns fulfill the same functions and can therefore be used in the same contexts.

So far, the literature indeed suggests that *einer* and *jemand* fulfill the same functions (Zifonun 1997, Fobbe 2004). However, I will argue that they differ in that only *jemand* can be used in specific contexts. I will propose an experimental investigation of this hypothesis and further discuss the combinability of *einer* and *jemand* with the epistemic marker *irgend-* (Kratzer & Shimoyama 2002).

References

- Kratzer, Angelika & Junko Shimoyama. 2002. Indeterminate pronouns: The view from Japanese. In Paper presented at the 3rd Tokyo Conference on Psycholinguistics March 2002.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1997. Indefinite pronouns. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fobbe, Eilika. 2004. Die Indefinitpronomina des Deutschen. Aspekte ihrer Verwendung und ihrer historischen Entwicklung. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter.
- Zifonun, Gisela. 2007. Grammatik des Deutschen im europäischen Vergleich. Das Pronomen. Teil IV: Indefinita im weiteren Sinne. amades. Arbeitspapiere und Materialien zur deutschen Sprache.

ELYESA SEIDEL

Event types and anaphoric uptake of bare nouns

The talk investigates the anaphoric uptake of Turkish determinerless and caseless nouns (henceforth bare nouns) in object position. Turkish bare nouns are argued to be number neutral and anaphorically difficult to access. In the present talk I will show that (i) number neutrality is dependent on the aspectual specification of the predicate and that (ii) the anaphoric potential of bare nouns is sensitive to different event types. I will present preliminary results from a forced choice study which show that anaphoric uptake correlates with the event type.

SEMRA KIZILKAYA

Event structure and accusative case marking in Turkish

Turkish exhibits Differential Object Marking, i.e. indefinite direct objects occur both with and without overt accusative case morphology, depending on the topicality and referentiality of the direct object (von Stechow & Kornfilt 2005). In my presentation, I argue that case is also associated with the event structure of the verb. Focusing on dynamic

predicates (verbs entailing change through time), I will make use of the notion of affectedness to account for the semantic differences associated with overt case marking of indefinite direct objects. The Turkish data will be analyzed within the constructional system of Ramchand (2008) which integrates event structure into syntax. Within this system, morphologically accusative marked direct objects in Turkish will be associated with a designated structural position inside the vP.

References

- von Stechow, Klaus & Jaklin Kornfilt. 2005. The case of the direct object in Turkish: Semantics, syntax and morphology. *Turkic Languages* 9, 3-44.
- Ramchand, Gillian C. 2008. *Verb meaning and the lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.