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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 [De ein Kabel] um einen iPad ans Center anzuschließen.

‘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).
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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 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.
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**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.  
   (‘It’s raining. We go CONN for a walk.’)
(i) implicature: *Wenn es regnet, geht man nicht spazieren.*  
   ( = P₁ → Q₁)
(ii) assertion:  
   ¬(P₁ → ¬Q₁); P₁ ⊆ P_n, Q₁ ⊆ 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.
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 & Shimoyerama 2002).
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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.

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 Heusinger & 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.
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