

19 – 21 December 2011 University of Amsterdam



INSTITUTE FOR LOGIC, LANGUAGE AND COMPUTATION

The 18th Amsterdam Colloquium

The 2011 edition of the Amsterdam Colloquium is the eighteenth in a series which started in 1976. Originally an initiative of the Department of Philosophy, the colloquium is now organised by the Institute for Logic, Language and Computation (ILLC). This booklet provides information about the Colloquium, locations, programme, and short summaries of the presentations.

Programme

The programme of the 18th AC includes four **invited lectures** by renowned experts in the field:

- Irene Heim (MIT)
- Seth Yalcin (University of California, Berkeley)
- Chung-chieh Shan (Cornell University)
- Donka Farkas (University of California, Santa Cruz)

The colloquium also hosts three **thematic workshops**:

Inquisitiveness

- Invited speaker: Manfred Krifka (Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin)
- Organisers: J. Groenendijk, F. Roelofsen and M. Westera

Formal semantic evidence

- Invited speakers: Richard Breheny (University College London) and Bart Geurts (Radboud University Nijmegen)
- Organisers: Katrin Schulz and Galit Weidman Sassoon

Formal semantics and pragmatics of sign languages

- Invited speaker: Philippe Schlenker (Institut Nicod, Paris and NYU)
- Organisers: Vadim Kimmelman, Roland Pfau and Anne Baker

In addition, on Monday 19 December the E.W. Beth Foundation organises an evening lecture given by

• Kevin Kelly (Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh)

The Beth lecture will take place in the Doelenzaal of the UvA (see map).

Programme committee

Abstracts submitted for the general programme have been selected by a programme committee consisting of internal members: Frank Veltman (Chair), Hedde Zeijlstra and Paul Dekker, and external members: Adrian Brasoveanu (University of California Santa Cruz), Angelika Kratzer (University of Massachusetts Amherst), Anna Szabolcsi (New York University), Ariel Cohen (Ben Gurion University), Bart Geurts (Radboud University Nijmegen), Chris Kennedy (University of Chicago), Chris Potts (Stanford University), Chung-chieh Shan (Cornell University), Cleo Condoravdi (Palo Alto Research Center), David Beaver (University of Texas Austin), Donka Farkas (University of California Santa Cruz), Dorit Abusch (Cornell), Ede Zimmermann (Frankfurt University), Emmanuel Chemla (Ecole Normale Superieure Paris), Elena Tribushinina (Utrecht University), Fred Landman (Tel Aviv University), Fritz Hamm (Tuebingen University), Gennaro Chierchia (Harvard), Gerhard Jäger (Tuebingen University), Henriette de Swart (Utrecht University), Irene Heim (MIT), Ivano Caponigro (University of California San Diego), Jakub Dotlačil (University of California Santa Cruz), Jon Gajewski (University of Connecticut), Kjell-Johan Saebo (University of Oslo), Klaus von Heusinger (Stuttgart University), Louise McNally (Pompeu Fabra University) Barcelona), Luis Alonso-Ovalle (McGill University), Martin Hackl (MIT), Martin Stokhof (University of Amsterdam), Paul Portner (Georgetown University), Pauline Jacobson (Brown University), Philippe Schlenker (Institut Jean-Nicod, Paris and NYU), Raquel Fernández Rovira (UvA), Regine Eckardt (Goettingen University), Rick Nouwen (Utrecht University), Robert van Rooij (University of Amsterdam), Roger Schwarzschild (Rutgers University), Sabine Iatridou (MIT), Seth Cable (University of Massachusetts Amherst), Seth Yalcin (Berkeley), Stefan Kaufmann (Northwestern University), Susan Rothstein (Bar-Ilan University), Tim Fernando (Trinity College Dublin), Uli Sauerland (ZAS, Berlin), Yael Sharvit (University of California Los Angeles), Yaron McNabb (University of Chicago), Yoad Winter (Utrecht University).

We thank the members of the programme committee for the very substantial work they did.

Venue

The Colloquium takes place in the EUCLIDES-building of the Faculty of Science of the University of Amsterdam:

EUCLIDES-building Plantage Muidergracht 24 1018 TV Amsterdam

In view of traffic jams, parking problems and parking police, we strongly advice not to get there by car. The easiest way to reach the conference site is by means of public transport, bicycle, or 'shanks' mare' (walking).

Directions To reach the EUCLIDES building by public transport proceed as follows. Take tramline 9 (coming from the Central Station) or line 14 and get off at stop 'Plantage Badlaan' (you can ask the driver to announce that stop). Next turn right and walk through the 'Plantage Lepellaan' (100 meters). The white building at the end of the street is the EUCLIDES building.

Coming from the city center, you can also take tramline 10, and get off at stop Alexanderplein (near the Muiderpoort). Turn left (over the water), and then the first street left is the Plantage Muidergracht. EUCLIDES is the third building on your left.

Social Program

On Monday 19 December after the Beth lecture there will be a **welcome re**ception in Café Kapitein Zeppos (see map). A ticket for a one hour boat trip departing from the city center is included in the conference package.

Registration and Information

All participants are requested to register on Monday morning at the registration desk in room P015B. In order to speed up processing, those who have registered beforehand on the website will be handled first.

During breaks in the academic programme, an AC information desk will be open in room P015B.

Lunches and Dinner

Lunch on Tuesday will be served freely at the EUCLIDES building while other lunches are provided in the nearby student's restaurant 'Agora' (see map). Lunch tickets for Monday and Wednesday are included in the conference package. The following website has dinner suggestions and reviews:

http://www.iens.nl/english/restaurantsIn/Amsterdam/

Dinner in the Netherlands is usually served around 6:00 pm - 8:00 pm; many restaurants might not serve meals after 9:00 pm; also keep in mind that eating out in Amsterdam is relatively expensive. In the following, we give a number of recommendations. The restaurants are roughly ordered by distance from the conference location: the restaurants from (1) to (7) are within 5 minutes walking distance; those from (8) to (10) within 15 minutes, the others within half an hour.

(1). Plancius

Plantage Kerklaan 61

Nice place to sit down opposite the Artis zoo.

(2). Café Koosje

Plantage Middenlaan 37 From sandwiches to more complete meals. Open for lunch and dinner. Reasonably priced.

- (3). Meneer Nilsson
 Plantage Kerklaan 41
 Mediterranean café open for lunch and dinner.
- (4). Mediacafé Plantage Plantage Kerklaan 36 This Large café offers sandwiches and full meals. Open for lunch and dinner.
- (5). **De Groene Olifant** Sarphatistraat 510 Quite a nice pub. Serves pub meals.

(6). **Kerklaan** (Indian / Surinamese), Plantage Muidergracht 69, Phone (020) 421 49 39

Mostly a take-out and delivery place, but has a number of tables and decent food.

- (7). **Taman Sari** (Indonesian), Plantage Kerklaan 32, Phone (020) 623 71 30 Small and very unpretentious Indonesian restaurant.
- (8). Koffiehuis van de Volksbond (International) Kadijksplein 4, Phone (020) 622 12 09, kitchen open 18.00-22.00 Simple and good restaurant without pretence. Warm atmosphere. Reasonbly priced.
- (9). Asmara (African), Jonas Daniël Meijerplein 8, Phone (020) 627 10 02 East African cuisine without cutlery.
- (10). Bird (Thai), Zeedijk 77, Amsterdam, Phone (020) 420 62 89, kitchen open 3.00pm-10.00pm
 Good Thai food on the street parallel to the Red Light District.
- (11). Oriental City (Chinese), Oudezijds Voorburgwal 177-179, Phone (020)
 626 83 52, kitchen open 11.30am-10.30pm Don't let the 'touristy' exterior scare you away. Good for larger groups. If feeling adventurous, ask the waiter/waitress to recommend dishes from the Chinese menu
- (12). Krua Thai Classic (Thai), Staalstraat 22, Phone (020) 622 95 33
- (13). Koh-I-Noor (Indian), Rokin 18, Phone (020) 627 21 18, kitchen open 5.00pm-11.30pm
 Verse nach Indian fand

Very good Indian food.

(14). De Bolhoed (Vegetarian), Prinsengracht 60, Phone (020) 626 18 03, kitchen open noon-10.00pm
 Good vegetarian food in a beautiful neighborhood

Internet information

The short version At the registration desk you have received a login with an SSID and a password. Use this to log on to the wireless network.

The long version Try to connect to the network with the SSID which was given to you using the default options and the password.

(1). If you are using Vista you may get an error message saying that the connection failed. If you are connecting to the network for the first time, tick the box marked 'save this network'. Close the error message and open a web browser; try to load a page. If this fails, wait 30 seconds and try again. The network should work now. The error mesage may persist each time you reboot and reconnect to the network; in that case, wait 30 seconds and the network should work.

- (2). If you are using on your laptop and you are having trouble connecting, go to the registration desk for a more detailed manual.
- (3). If you are using a Mac laptop, connecting using the default options should work; you may have wait 30 seconds after connecting before the network works. If not, try the 'WEP 40/128 bit hex' security option.
- (4). On Linux, use the default WEP options or something resembling 'WEP 40/128 bit key'.

Acknowledgments

For the organisation of the 18th Amsterdam Colloquium financial support is received from the following organisations, which are gratefully acknowledged:

- the Institute for Logic, Language and Computation (ILLC)
- the NWO-funded project 'Indefinites and Beyond: Evolutionary pragmatics and typological semantics' (coordinator: Maria Aloni)
- the NWO-funded project 'Inquisitiveness' (coordinator: Jeroen Groenendijk)
- the Municipality of Amsterdam

Organisation

The Amsterdam Colloquia are organised by the Institute for Logic, Language and Computation (ILLC) of the University of Amsterdam. The organising committee of the 18th Amsterdam Colloquium consists of Maria Aloni, Eric Flaten, Peter van Ormondt, Floris Roelofsen, Galit Weidman Sassoon and Matthijs Westera.

Programme

	18-th Amsterdam Colloquium	Monday, 19 December 2011	
9.00 - 9.50	Registration & coffee (room P0.15B)		
9.50 - 10.00	Opening by Frank Veltman (room 2.27)		
	Chair: Frank Vel	ltman (room 2.27)	
	Irono	Heim	
10.00 - 11.00	Interpreting reconstruction	on in interrorative clauses	
brook	interpreting reconstruction	on in interrogative elauses	
oreak	Chair: Frank Veltman (room 0.20)	Chair: Remko Scha (room 0.14)	
	Michael Franke	India Houston	
11.15 - 11.45	Scales, Salience and Referential	Nour A Discourse Reged Theory	
	Safety: The Benefit of the Extreme	Now: A Discourse-Dased Theory	
		Reinhard Muskens	
11.45 - 12.15	Sveta Krasikova	A Theory of Names and True	
	Definite Theory of Superlatives	Intensionality	
	Anna Chernilovskava and	U U	
	Rick Nouven	Tim Fernando	
12.15 - 12.45	On wheevelamatives and	Steedman's Temporality Proposal	
	noteworthiness	and Finite Automata	
lunch	notewortminess		
Variotiv	Workshop: Inquisitiveness		
	Chain: Floric Poolofoon (noom 0.00)	Chain: Hadda Zaiilatna (naam 0.11)	
	Debin General and Leasthan Ginsham	Chair: Heade Zeifistra (100m 0.14)	
19 45 14 15	Norotius in quisitium and	Concelizing Manatonicity Information	
13.40 - 14.10	alternatives based poration	to Opposition Informas	
	alternatives-based negation	to opposition interences	
	Martin Aher	Ryan Waldre	
14.15 - 14.45	Free Choice in Deontic Inquisitive	Nuu-chah-nulth Evidentials and the	
	Semantics (DIS)	Origo	
break			
	Markus Steinbach and Edgar Onea	Vincent Homer	
15.00 - 15.30	Where Question, Conditionals and	As Simple as It Seems	
	Topics Converge		
	$Wataru \ Uegaki$	Lucas Champollion	
15.30 - 16.00	Inquisitive knowledge attribution and	Each vs. jeweils: A cover-based view	
	the Gettier problem	on distance-distributivity	
break			
	Chair: Floris Roe	clofsen (room 2.27)	
	Manfre	d Krifka	
10.15 - 17.15	Questions and	d question acts	
17.15 - 17.30	Launch of the Festsch	rift for Martin Stokhof	
20.00 - 21.00	Beth/Vienna Circle Lecture (Doelenzaal)		
	An Enotatio Theorem of E	n Kelly	
	An Erotetic Theory of Empirical Simplicity and its Connection with Truth		
21.15	Welcome Reception	a at Kapitein Zeppos	

	18-th Amsterdam Colloquium	Tuesday, 20 December 2011		
	Chair: Martin S	tokhof (room 2.27)		
0.00 10.00	Seth Yalcin			
9.00 - 10.00	Context H	Context Probabilism		
break				
	Chair: Henk Zeevat (room 0.20)	Chair: Henriette de Swart (room 0.14)		
	Arno Bastenhof	I-Ta Chris Hsieh		
10.15 - 10.45	Polarities in logic and semantics	On the Non-Licensing of NPIs in the		
	i ofarities in logic and semanties	Only-Focus		
	Chris Blom, Philippe de Groote,			
	Yoad Winter and Joost Zwarts	Natalia Ivlieva		
10.45 - 11.15	Implicit Arguments: Event	Obligatory implicatures and		
	Modification or Option Type	grammaticality		
	Categories?			
	Udo Klein	Todor Koev		
11.15 - 11.45	Scope underspecification by	On the Grounding Status of		
	expansion	Appositive Relative Clauses		
break				
	Chair: Galit W. Sassoon (room 2.27)			
12.00 - 12.50	Poster talks			
12.50 - 14.00	Poster session $+$ lunch			
break _				
	Chair: Robert van Rooij (room 2.27)			
14.15 - 15.15	Bart Geurts Superlative quantifiers: a dynamic approach			
1 1				
Urean	Workshop: Semantic evidence			
	Chair: Katrin Schulz (room 0.20)	Chair: Robert van Rooij (room 0.14)		
	Janina Radó and Oliver Bott	Simon Charlow		
15.30 - 16.00	Underspecified representations of	Cross-categorial donkeys		
	scope ambiguity?			
10.00 10.90	Sonja Tiemann and Florian Schwarz	Daniel Hardt, Line Mikkelsen and \mathbf{p}		
10.00 - 16.30	Presupposition Processing – The	Bjarne Ørsnes		
	Case of German wieder	Sameness, Empsis and Anaphora		
		Jonathan Ginzburg,		
	Agata Maria Renans	Raquel Fernández and		
16.30 - 17.00	Projective behaviour of Nur –	David Schlangen		
	quantitative experimental research	On the Semantics and Pragmatics of		
1. 1		Dysnuency		
oreak	Chaim Katain O	abula (man 2 27)		
	Dich and	(10011 2.21) Brohomy		
17 15 - 18 15	Kichara Ask not (only) what experimental	s Dieneny psychology can do for you. Ask what		
1,.10 10.10	you can do for experimental psychology			
	you can do for experimental psychology			

	18-th Amsterdam Colloquium	Wednesday, 21 December 2011		
Chair: Vadim Kimmelman (room 2.27)				
0.00 10.00	Philippe Schlenker			
9.00 - 10.00	The Semantics of Pronouns: Insight	s and Problems from Sign Language		
break				
	Workshop: Sign Language			
	Chair: A. Baker and R. Pfau (room 0.20)	Chair: Michael Franke (room 0.14)		
	Gemma Barberà Altimira	Jacaves Javez and Bob van Tiel		
10.15 - 10.45	When wide scope is not enough:	Only 'only' An experimental window		
10.10 10.10	scope and topicality of discourse	on exclusiveness		
	referents	on exclusiveness		
	Josep Quer	David Beaver and Elizabeth Coppock		
10.45 - 11.15	Quantificational strategies across	Exclusive Updates! Brought to you		
	language modalities	by your local QUD		
break				
	Kathryn Davidson	Noor van Leusen		
11.30 - 12.00	When Disjunction looks like	The accommodation potential of		
	Conjunction: Pragmatic	implicative verbs		
	Consequences in ASL	-		
	Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and	Tina Xu		
12.00 - 12.30	Robin Shay	You again: How is its ambiguity		
	Degree modification and	derived?		
1 1	intensification in ASL adjectives			
lunch	Chaim: Baul Da	then (mean 0 07)		
	Chains al	high Shan		
14.00 - 15.00	Shadows of	of meaning		
hreak	Shadows e	, meaning		
orean	Chair: Paul Dekker (room 0.20)	Chair: Jeroen Groenendijk (room 0.14)		
	Friederike Moltmann			
15.15 - 15.45	Tropes, Intensional Relative Clauses	Marta Abrusan		
	and the Notion of a Variable Object	Focus, Evidentiality and Soft triggers		
	Louise McNally and			
	Henriette de Swart	Andreas Walker		
15.45 - 16.15	Inflection and derivation: how	Focus, Uniqueness and Soft		
	adjectives and nouns refer to abstract	Presupposition Triggers		
	objects			
	Gianluca Giorgolo and			
	Stephanie Needham	Tohru Seraku		
16.15 - 16.45	Pragmatic constraints on gesture use:	Multiple Foci in Japanese Clefts and		
	the effect of downward entailing	the Growth of Semantic		
	contorta on gosturo processing	Representation		
	contexts on gesture processing			
break				
break	Chair: Jeroen Groe	nendijk (room 2.27)		
break	Chair: Jeroen Groe Donka	nendijk (room 2.27) Farkas		

	18-th Amsterdam Colloquium Poster Talks, Tuesday, 20 December 2011	
	Chair: Galit W. Sassoon (room 2.27)	
12.00 - 12.05	Márta Abrusán and Kriszta Szendröi Experimenting with the king of France	
12.05 - 12.10	Emmanuel Chemla and Lewis Bott Processing: Free choice at no cost	
12.10 - 12.15	Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox Variation of Presupposition Projection in Quantified Sentences	
12.15 - 12.20	Alex Djalali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts Corpus evidence for preference-driven interpretation	
break		
12.30 - 12.35	Adrian Brasoveanu and Jakub Dotlačil Licensing Sentence-internal Readings in English: An Experimental Study	
12.35 - 12.40	Lisa Bylinina and Stas Zadorozhny Evaluative adjectives, scale structure, and ways of being polite	
12.40 - 12.45	Francesca Panzeri and Francesca Foppolo Can children tell us something about the semantics of adjectives?	
12.45 - 12.50	Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally Adjectives as saturators vs. modifiers: Statistical evidence	

Abstracts

Invited Speakers

Polarity particles in English and beyond

Donka Farkas

This talk reports on work done in collaboration with Floris Roelofsen from ILLC, Amsterdam. It proposes an account of the distribution and interpretation of 'polarity particles', i.e., morphemes exemplified by *yes* and *no* in English. The goal is to explain why utterances of the type *Yes, she is/No, she isn't* can only occur in responses to assertions (*She is home*) or polar questions (*Is she home?/Is she not home?*) but not in 'out of the blue' contexts or in reactions to constituent questions or certain type of alternative questions. We approach the issue from an inquisitive semantics perspective by first refining semantic distinctions so as to allow us to capture the similarities and differences between assertions and polar questions, as well as the differences between questions such as *Is the door open?/Is the door closed?* so as to be able to account for the different interpretations *yes* and *no* reactions to these questions receive. After giving a detailed analysis of the data in English and formulating predictions concerning cross linguistic patterns we turn to checking them by looking at the facts in Romanian, a language whose polarity particle system contrasts with that of English along several parameters.

Interpreting reconstruction in interrogative clauses

Irene Heim

Building on Rullmann & Beck (1998), I will explore some consequences of interpreting the restrictor of 'which' as a definite description inside the question nucleus. Issues discussed will include functional readings, $de \ re/de \ dicto$ ambiguity, and question-answer congruence.

Shadows of meaning

Chung-chieh Shan

Context Probabilism

Seth Yalcin

I investigate the idea of equipping the common ground of a conversation with probabilistic and utility-theoretic structure, analogous to the kind of structure typically assumed in Bayesian decision theory. I offer some suggestions for how best to interpret such a model of the common ground, and I explore some options for giving a dynamic semantics for modals and conditionals which exploits the added structure. I close with some discussion of the question in virtue of what the semantics developed might be considered 'essentially dynamic'.

Beth/Vienna Circle Lecture

An Erotetic Theory of Empirical Simplicity and its Connection with Truth

Kevin T. Kelly (joint work with Hanti Lin)

In keeping with the Vienna Circle theme, we revisit the problem of justifying induction, as described by Rudolf Carnap in his paper "On Inductive Logic". According to Carnap, "the decisive justification of an inductive procedure does not consist in its plausibility... but must refer to its success in some sense." Carnap approves of Hans Reichenbach's appeal to convergence to the truth as a partial answer, but remarks that convergence allows for infinite variety among methods in the short run – something more is required to explain characteristic scientific biases such as Ockham's razor. The nature of simplicity and its relationship to truth are persistent problems. First, we propose an axiomatic theory of empirical simplicity that recovers a unique simplicity order in typical empirical problems, which are assumed to consist of a theory choice question (modeled as a partition over possible worlds) and a specification of possible information states (modeled as a topological basis). Simplicity emerges from topological relations that arise at the boundaries of the theories in the information space, so simplicity essentially involves both the question and the information space. Next, we pursue Carnap's challenge by considering methods that converge to the truth in the most *deductive* way possible, where deductiveness is characterized in terms of losses that measure departures from standard features of deductive inference. Charging for retractions of prior beliefs minimizes violations of monotonicity. Charging for *impatience* – ruling out possibilities that nature would have ruled out if your belief were true - approximates the fact that deduction never rules out possibilities until nature does. We discuss the extent to which convergent Ockham strategies coincide with strategies that converge to the truth in an optimally deductive way.

Workshop on Inquisitiveness

Questions and question acts

Manfred Krifka (invited speaker)

I will argue for a distinction between questions as semantic objects (to be modelled, e.g., as sets of propositions) and questions as pragmatic objects or speech acts (to be modelled, e.g., as transitions between obligations). I will consider both embedded questions (e.g., embedding under know vs. wonder) and root questions (e.g., the expression of bias in questions).

Free Choice in Deontic Inquisitive Semantics (DIS)

Martin Aher

We will propose a novel solution to the free choice puzzle that is driven by empirical data from legal discourse and does not suffer from the same problems as implicature-based accounts. We will argue against implicature based accounts and provide an entailment-based solution. Following Andersons violation-based deontic logic, we will demonstrate that a support based radical inquisitive semantics will correctly model both the free choice effect and the boolean standard entailment relations in downward entailing contexts. An inquisitive semantics is especially suited to model sluicing effects where the continuation "but I do not know which" coerces an ignorance reading. It also demonstrates that the counterarguments to Anderson failed to take into account the effects of inquisitiveness. Furthermore, we will argue that the problem of strengthening the antecedent that is used as a counterargument against entailment based accounts fails to capture the complexity of the data and will outline conditions for a solution to this issue.

Negative inquisitiveness and alternatives-based negation

Robin Cooper & Jonathan Ginzburg

We propose some fundamental requirements for the treatment of negative particles, positive/negative polar questions, and negative propositions, as they occur in dialogue with questions. We offer a view of negation that combines aspects of alternative semantics, intuitionist negation, and situation semantics. We formalize the account in TTR (a version of type theory with records). We develop an account of the coherence of negative utterances in the dialogue framework KoS.

Where Question, Conditionals and Topics Converge

Edgar Onea & Markus Steinbach

In this paper we show that using traditional partition semantics for questions and the idea of highlighted alternatives from inquisitive semantics opens the way to a predictive and comprehensive account for the fairly complicated and puzzling distribution of V1-conditionals and irrelevance conditionals in German. Our analysis does not only correctly predict a number of puzzling distributional facts about V1 and wh-conditionals in German, it also clarifies the relation between conditionals and questions in general. If yes/no questions highlight exactly one alternative and are topical, they can be interpreted as conditionals.

Inquisitive knowledge attribution and the Gettier problem *Wataru Uegaki*

This paper addresses one of the unresolved questions in Inquisitive Semantics. Namely, given that the inquisitive-semantic denotation of the clausal complement is a set of possibilities, how an attitude verb, such as *believe* and *know*, semantically operates on its complement. The conclusion will be that know operates on the set of possibilities denoted by the complement 'as a whole', in contrast to *believe*, which operates on the union of the possibilities. The argument is twofold. First, Inquisitive Semantics combined with the claim that know operates on the inquisitive denotation of the complement provides a new solution to (the linguistic counterpart of) the Gettier problem (Gettier 1963). Second, the proposed treatment provides an elegant account of the entailments of attitude verbs combining with certain 'propositional' DPs (e.g., *the rumor that p*).

Workshop on Formal Semantic Evidence

Ask not (only) what experimental psychology can do for you. Ask what you can do for experimental psychology *Bishard Brohomy (invited speaker)*

Richard Breheny (invited speaker)

I take the goal of contemporary semantics-pragmatics to be to provide at least a framework for a theory of cognition that explains how meaning is ascribed in the production and comprehension of utterances. It follows then that engagement with the methods of the experimental psychologist should be a two-way street. In this talk, I consider some notable examples of how the use of experimental methods has contributed to purely theoretical debates in a way introspective methods could not; but I also highlight some clear limitations for the use of experiments to settle theoretical issues. I argue that the best way to use experiments to progress theory is to show how a theory can illuminate research in psychology generally. Here I present some work on negation and on the use speaker perspective from our lab as well as some developmental work that are examples of this direction of fit.

Superlative quantifiers: a dynamic approach

Bart Geurts (invited speaker)

Although, prima facie, "at least n" and "at most n" would appear to be synonymous with "more than n - 1" and "fewer than n + 1", respectively, Geurts and Nouwen (2007) show that there is ample evidence to suggest that they are quite different. Geurts and Nouwen propose to capture the differences between superlative ("at least/most n") and comparative ("more/fewer than n") quantifiers by assuming that, whereas the standard semantics of the latter is correct, the former have modal meanings: "At least n A are B" means that the speaker is certain that there are n A that are B and considers it possible that more than n A are B (the meaning of "at most" is similar). This account makes predictions about the relative complexity of comparative and superlative quantifiers, which have been confirmed experimentally (Geurts et al. 2010). Unfortunately, the modal account of superlative quantifiers has its problems, too. In particular, it has a hard time explaining some embedded occurrences of superlative quantifiers. In this talk, I show how the differences between superlative and comparative quantifiers can be captured by supposing that they change the context in quite different ways. In truth-conditional terms, this means that I revert to the standard view, but I can still account for the fact that superlative quantifiers are more complex than comparative ones, as shown by Geurts et al.'s data (2010) on acquisition and online processing. Furthermore, the various quantity implicatures associated with superlative quantifiers follow straightforwardly from the proposed analysis.

Geurts, B. and R. Nouwen 2007: "At least" et al.: the semantics of scalar modifiers. Language 83: 533-559. Geurts, B., N. Katsos, C. Cummins, J. Moons, and L. Noordman 2010: Scalar quantifiers: logic, acquisition, and processing.Language and cognitive processes 25: 130-148.

Relating ERP-Effects to Theories of Belief Update and Combining Systems

Ralf Naumann (cancelled)

The significance of empirical neurophysiological data, like ERPs, for formal semantic theory has increasingly been acknowledged in recent years. Despite this rapprochement, there still remain important unsolved foundational questions like 'How can ERP-effects be related to particular semantic phenomena?' or 'How can these assignments be empirically tested?' Using the results of well-designed ERP-studies, Baggio et al. (2008, 2010) have shown how a correlation between two known ERP-effects, the N400 and the SAN, and semantic phenomena like the progressive can be established. In this talk we will present an alternative to the formal theory used by Baggio et al. which is based on the technique of combining systems and in which the dynamics of information change is separated from the more static aspects of knowledge representation. Using this two-layered architecture, we hypothesize that the SAN is related to the process of updating a discourse model in the light of new information about changes in the world and therefore with the relation between the two layers, whereas the N400 concerns the more static aspects of discourse models, e.g. the relation between events and persistent objects (swimming is more expected for ducks than for humans). Finally, we will present some test cases for our hypothesis.

Underspecified representations of scope ambiguity?

Janina Radó & Oliver Bott

The paper presents an online experiment investigating when readers start to compute quantifier scope. In the critical trials participants first had to read a doubly quantified sentence and then incrementally uncover a picture that disambiguated the reading. The reading times show indication of scope conflict well before participants encountered the disambiguation. We discuss implications for semantic underspecification accounts.

Projective behaviour of *Nur* – **quantitative experimental research** *Agata Maria Renans*

The talk presents the fieldwork manual on formal semantics QUISsem (Renans et al. 2011) and the results of an experiment obtained with the use of QUISsem. The exemplary experiment concerns the projective meaning of *only*. The data from German shows that the prejacent of nur ('only') projects easily out of counterfactual if-clauses, whereas its projective behaviour changes while embedding under indicative if-clauses. The obtained results classify projection out of counterfactuals as a reliable test for projective meanings in the cross linguistic perspective, on the one hand, while shedding more light on the semantics of nur and conditionals, on the other.

Presupposition Processing - The Case of German wieder

Florian Schwarz & Sonja Tiemann

Presuppositions are vital for language comprehension, but little remains known about their processing. Using eye tracking in reading, we investigated two issues based on *wieder* ('again'). First, we looked at the time course of presupposition processing by testing for processing costs of unsupported presuppositions. Secondly, we tested whether embedding *wieder* under negation affected this mismatch effect. Presupposition-induced effects showed up immediately after *wieder*, but only in the unembedded context, suggesting that embedding interferes (at least) with the immediate detection of the mismatch. A follow-up rating study confirmed that there indeed is a mis-match for the embedded context. Detection of the mis-match under embedding thus seems to be delayed in processing.

POSTER SESSION

Experimenting with the king of France

Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi

Existential presuppositions seem not to appear equally strongly in every sentence (cf. Strawson 1969, Reinhart 1981, von Fintel 2004, etc.). Strawson (1969) (cf. also Reinhart 1981) proposed that definite descriptions trigger an existential presupposition only in topic position. Lasersohn (1993) and von Fintel (2004) dismissed the importance of topichood and argued instead that what is important is verifiability: If a sentence contains an independent NP such that the sentence could be verified based on the properties of this NP, speakers might have enough grounds to accept or reject the sentence whether or not the presupposition of the definite description is satisfied. All the data in the above papers are based on the intuitions of the authors. We designed an experiment to verify the alleged differences between the various (local) linguistic contexts and to test the predictions of the theories. We found that the situation is more complex than appears from any of the above papers. Both topicality and verifiability is a factor in its own right.

Adjectives as saturators vs. modifiers: Statistical evidence

Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally

The paper employs a large-scale, statistical corpus data analysis to support the analysis of ethnic adjectives (EAs, e.g. 'French') as modifiers (Arsenijević et al., to appear) over the standard analysis in the syntax literature, on which they can saturate the arguments of nominals (e.g. in 'French agreement'; Kayne, 1981, among others). We exploited the fact that the two accounts make different predictions about the distribution of EAs vs. the corresponding PPs (e.g. 'agreement by France') and constructed a linear regression model to test these predictions using the British National Corpus without doing any semantic tagging. The results support the modifier analysis and illustrate the usefulness of statistical analysis for testing theoretical hypotheses in semantics.

Licensing Sentence-internal Readings in English: An Experimental Study

Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil

Adjectives of comparison (AOCs) like *same*, *different* and *similar* can compare two elements sentence-internally, i.e., without referring to any previously introduced element. This reading can only be licensed if some semantically plural NP is present. In contrast to almost all previous literature, we argue in this paper that it is incorrect to describe a particular NP as either licensing or not licensing the sentence-internal reading of a specific AOC. Licensing is more fine-grained. We use experimental methods to establish which NPs license which AOCs and to what extent. Furthermore, we show the advantage of using Bayesian statistics for analyzing data over the traditional, frequentist approach.

Evaluative adjectives, scale structure, and ways of being polite

Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny

We investigate gradable properties of evaluative adjectives (EAs), both negative ('lazy', 'ugly' etc.) and positive ('charming', 'industrious' etc.). This is a pilot quantitative study limited to several degree modifiers: low-degree modifiers 'a bit', 'a little bit', 'slightly', 'somewhat', and a standard-boosting modifier 'very'. We take distribution of degree modifiers as a diagnostics for scale structure of EAs: low-degree modification is applicable to lower-bound scales, while 'very' is commonly taken to be characteristic of totally open scales with relative standards. Our study reveals that negative EAs show properties of both lower-bound and totally open scales at the same time, while positive EAs are canonically open-scale. We try to make sense of this assuming that for negative EAs a 'polite lower-bound interpretation is systematically available along with the default relative one. This systematic ambiguity is unavailable for positive EAs.

Processing: Free choice at no cost

Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott

A disjunctive sentence such as (1) standardly carries the conjunctive inference that (2)a and (2)b are true. (1) John is allowed to eat an apple or a banana. (2) a. John is allowed to eat an apple. b. John is allowed to eat a banana. This phenomenon is known as Free Choice (FC) permission (Kamp 1973). Current formal models tend to treat FC inferences as a special type of scalar implicature (mostly building on Kratzer & Shimoyama's 2002 insights, see, e.g., Schulz 2005, Klinedinst 2006, Fox 2007, Chemla 2008, Franke 2011). We present the first processing study of FC. Our results go against the expectations of recent formal analyses, and show that, unlike scalar implicatures, FC inferences come at no processing cost.

Corpus evidence for preference-driven interpretation

Alex Djalali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts

We present a novel corpus of 799 task-oriented dialogues and use it to explore models of discourse in which production and interpretation are driven by the goals and preferences of the discourse participants. We look in particular at the interpretation of question–answer pairs, showing how the corpus's extensive metadata can be used to pinpoint the effects of domain restriction and to elucidate the forces driving the mention-some/mention-all distinction.

Can children tell us something about the semantics of adjectives? Francesca Panzeri & Francesca Foppolo

We present two experiments in which Relative Gradable Adjectives were tested with objects that did not evoke any normative class, and were presented in isolation. In Exp. 1, we found that children overwhelmingly accepted "This is Rel-Adj", while most of the adults opted for the answer-option "I don't know". In Exp.2, we tested adults with a similar material but we trained them to be "charitable" and only give them a binary choice (yes/no). Surprisingly, adults turned into children, overwhelmingly accepting a Rel-GA even in the absence of contextual/normative/perceptual cues. We claim that children's behaviour cannot be easily integrated under a degree-based semantics for GAs (a.o. Kennedy, 2007) in which Rel-GAs are irreducibly comparative. One possibility is that children start by interpreting Rel-GAs as total functions and only later refine their analysis of GAs as partial functions, as assumed under Klein's analysis.

Variation of Presupposition Projection in Quantified Sentences

Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox

Presupposition projection in quantified sentences is at the center of debates in the presupposition literature. This paper reports on a survey revealing inter-speaker variation regarding which quantifier yields universal inferences. In particular, we observe an implication that if 'some' yields a universal inference for a speaker, 'no', and a polar question with 'any' do too for the same speaker. We propose an account of this implication based on trivalent theories of presupposition projection together with auxiliary assumptions.

Workshop on Sign Language

The Semantics of Pronouns: Insights and Problems from Sign Language

Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)

It is often thought that sign language indexes are sometimes the overt realization of formal indices (Lillo-Martin and Klima 1990). Some studies of Binding Theory confirm this point, as versions of Condition A, Condition B, as well as Strong and possibly Weak Crossover constraints appear to hold in ASL, among others. The Overtness hypothesis has made it possible to use sign language to bring new insights into some classic questions in semantics, pertaining for instance to donkey anaphora and to temporal and modal anaphora. Still, in other cases there are modality-determined *differences* between sign and spoken language pronouns, involving in particular iconicity. We will attempt to provide a framework that does justice both to the similarities and to some of the differences.

When wide scope is not enough: scope and topicality of discourse referents

Gemma Barberà

This paper aims at determining the semantic properties that discourse referents may have, which lead to the establishment of a location in sign space. It is argued that prominence of the discourse referent interacts with the actual establishment of the spatial location: both wide and narrow scope variables correlate with a location as long as the narrow scope variable denotes the d-topic. Narrow scope variables are introduced with an eyegaze which functions as an operator denoting a de dicto mode. In such contexts, the link with the discourse topic is required. A representational semantic level which integrates a theory of discourse structure with special focus on the d-topic is offered. Data taken from a small-scale Catalan Sign Language corpus is used to argue for the proposed integrated theory.

When Disjunction looks like Conjunction: Pragmatic Consequences in ASL

Kathryn Davidson

In this paper I present the first discussion of disjunction (English "or") in American Sign Language (ASL) by describing the various devices ASL makes use of for disjunction, including two that look identical to conjunction ("and")(terminology used here is from Haspelmath 2006). I also present experimental evidence highlighting a different rate of scalar implicature calculation in ASL based on these disjunctions/conjunction scales compared to other scales in ASL and compared to the disjunction/conjunction scale in English. Results support the view that separate lexical instantiation of contrasting scalar items is a crucial component of scalar implicature calculation.

Quantificational strategies across language modalities

Josep Quer

In this paper I discuss the three varieties of quantificational strategies attested in two signed languages (ASL and LSC (Catalan SL)) and argue that even the apparent instances of pure D-quantification in those languages actually make use of the more "constructional" way of encoding quantificational meanings, i.e. Aquantification. Further, lexical quantification is addressed from the domain of quantifier binding structures.

Degree modification and intensification in ASL adjectives

Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay

The Event Visibility Hypothesis (EVH) was formulated for SLs based on the observation that telic verb signs are distinguished from atelics by end-marking reflecting the final state of telic events. Given the mapping of event structure to scalar structure in adjectives (McNally/Kennedy), and the EVH, it is predicted that closed scalar structure adjectives are end-marked. It will be shown that some categories take modification by SO/VERY whereas others permit only intensification by [+delayed release]; that lower-closed scalar adjectives lacking closed upper boundaries (like 'far') can be coerced to have a closed upper boundary reading when combined with a measure phrase providing the limit in 'too far to walk'; and that the adjective receives a similar nonmanual to telic verbs, indicating that, like the visibility of event structure in verbs, scalar structure is also visible in ASL.

General Programme

Focus, Evidentiality and Soft triggers

Márta Abrusán

Soft triggers are fairly easily suspendable in context (cf. Karttunen 1971, Stalnaker 1974, Simons 2001, Abbott 2006, Abusch 2010, Romoli 2011, Tonhauser 2011, etc.). Two main environments in which this happens have been identified: (1) The presupposition of soft triggers can be suspended by focus (cf. Beaver 2004). In some languages even verbs such as know are sensitive to focus: (2) Simons (2007) has observed that many soft triggers such as *hear, see, believe*, *discover, know*, etc. have semantically parenthetical uses which are not presuppositional. This paper offers a way of predicting these facts.

Polarities in logic and semantics

Arno Bastenhof

We ask to what extent a satisfactory analysis of non-local scope construal can already be realized without compromising on context-freeness, nor on the association of a unique reading to each syntactic derivation. We show that a variety of data on the topic can be dealt with through an adaptation of classical non-associative Lambek calculus (CNL), taking into account Girard's concept of polarity. The latter has found application in the constructivization of classical logic, recognizable by computer scientists as the definition of continuation-passing style (CPS) translations. Crucially, we make no appeal to non-context-free mechanisms, nor on the relaxation of compositionality to a mapping of derivations into non-singleton sets of readings.

Implicit Arguments: Event Modification or Option Type Categories? Chris Blom, Philippe de Groote, Yoad Winter and Joost Zwarts

We propose a unified syntactic-semantic account of passive sentences and sentences with an unspecified object ('John read'). For both constructions, we employ option types for introducing implicit arguments into the syntactic-semantic categorial mechanism. We show the advantages of this approach over previous proposals in the domains of scope and unaccusatives. Unlike pure syntactic treatments, option types immediately derive the obligatory narrow scope of existential quantification over an implicit arguments slot. Unlike purely semantic, event-based treatments, our proposal naturally accounts for syntactic contrasts between passives and unaccusatives, as in 'the door *(was) opened by John'. After the main system is introduced, some of its further predictions in the domain of optional arguments and event modification are analyzed.

Each vs. jeweils: A cover-based view on distance-distributivity Lucas Champollion

Zimmermann (2002) identifies two classes of distance-distributive items (DD) across languages. The first class is restricted to distribution over individuals; the second class can also be interpreted as distributing over occasions/events. I explain this behavior by formally relating this split to the two distributivity operators proposed in the work of Link (atomic D operator) and Schwarzschild (cover-based operator).

Cross-categorial donkeys

Simon Charlow

Ellipsis constructions with unexpected sloppy interpretations are used to argue against situation-based analyses of donkey anaphora. Situation-based accounts

founder because the descriptive content of E-type pronouns causes trouble for both syntactic and semantic ways of ensuring identity between antecedent and ellipsis VPs/clauses. An account of the phenomena is advocated on which the surprising sloppy items are dynamically-bound donkey pronouns. The analysis integrates de Groote's (2006) variable-free dynamic semantics with Rooth's (1993) two-stage process for ellipsis resolution. The cross-categorial nature of the relevant phenomena (explored in greater detail in the paper) provide an important argument that donkey anaphora is itself a cross-categorial phenomenon.

On wh-exclamatives and noteworthiness

Anna Chernilovskaya & Rick Nouwen

There are two dominating approaches to the semantics of wh-exclamatives. One approach claims that wh-exclamatives are degree constructions involving degree intensification of a possibly implicit degree property (see, especially, Rett (2011)). The opposing account, mainly due to Zanuttini and Portner (2003), has it that wh-exclamatives involve a mechanism of domain widening. In this paper we show that the mechanisms behind the two competing approaches are basically indistinguishable. Moreover, we point out that there is a kind of wh-exclamatives for which these approaches do not provide the expected semantics. Finally, we put forward a distinctive and crucially much simpler proposal: exclamatives directly express a noteworthiness evaluation, either of the referent associated to the wh-phrase or of the open proposition underlying the exclamative. Crucially, this means we do not consider exclamatives to be a degree phenomenon, nor do we need to assume a widening mechanism.

Generalizing Monotonicity Inferences to Opposition Inferences Ka-fat Chow

This paper generalizes the definitions of monotonicities to opposition properties (OPs) of determiners and focuses on 4 OPs that are related to the classical contrary, subcontrary and contradictory relations. These OPs are analogous to the monotonicity properties that are related to the superordinate and subordinate relations. Some theorems that will enable us to determine the OPs of determiners will be proposed. Moreover, we will formulate the concept of OP-chain and propose a principle that will enable us to determine the OPs of an iterated quantifier in its arguments based on the OPs of its constituent determiners. By virtue of these results, we can then derive valid opposition inferences of both monadic determiners and iterated quantifiers involving the contrary, subcontrary and contradictory relations.

Exclusive Updates! Brought to you by your local QUD

Elizabeth Coppock & David Beaver

We propose a dynamic semantics within a variant of standard type theory (Ty3; Beaver 2001) in which contexts include not only a common set of beliefs, but also a

question under discussion (QUD) whose answers are information states consisting of world-assignment pairs, along with a strength ranking over such answers. The proposed framework satisfies several desiderata arising from the behavior of exclusives (e.g. only, just, mere and sole), including: (i) the possibility of presupposing a question; (ii) quantificational binding into such presupposed questions; (iii) the expressibility of presuppositional constraints regarding the strength ranking over the answers to the question under discussion; (iv) compositional derivation of logical forms for sentences. Along with a grammar fragment and a new, dynamic notion of Strawson Downward Entailment, we use this framework to capture similarities and differences between exclusives manifest in data from paraphrasability, entailments, and NPI licensing.

Steedman's Temporality Proposal and Finite Automata

Tim Fernando

In a wide-ranging study, Steedman (2005) proposes that "the so-called temporal semantics of natural language is not primarily to do with time at all" (as given say, by the real line) but that "the formal devices we need are those related to representation of causality and goal-directed action." The present paper explains why Steedman's proposal is interesting, and what is added to the proposal by finite automata, implicit in which are notions of causality (labelled transitions) and goal-directed action (final/accepting states). Three strands in theories of aspect isolated in Binnick 2006 are examined: temporal relations, phases, and boundedness. The commonly recognized dichotomy between states and events is linked to that between programs and their runs, as strings representing events are extended to automata.

Scales, Salience and Referential Safety: The Benefit of the Extreme Michael Franke

This paper argues that signaling games fail to account plausibly for a general preference to use gradable adjectives to communicate *extreme values*. The reason is that these models focus too narrowly on *descriptive language use*. Numerical simulations show that the choice of extreme values is pragmatically beneficial in situations of *referential language use* under possible noise. A preference for extreme values also offers an explanation for Kennedy's (2007) observation that the topology of the scale a gradable adjective is associated with influences its contextual use conditions. Yet, unlike previous explanations of this observation in terms of *psychological salience* (Kennedy, 2007; Potts, 2008), this paper contributes a truly *functional* explanation for this association.

On the Semantics and Pragmatics of Dysfluency

Jonathan Ginzburg, Raquel Fernández and David Schlangen

Although dysfluent speech is pervasive in spoken conversation, dysfluencies have received little attention within formal theories of dialogue. The majority of work

on dysfluent language has come from psycholinguistic models of speech production and comprehension and from structural approaches designed to improve performance in speech applications. In this paper, we present a detailed formal account which: (a) unifies dysfluencies (self-repair) with Clarification Requests (CRs), without conflating them, (b) offers a precise explication of the roles of all key components of a dysfluency, including editing phrases and filled pauses, (c) accounts for the possibility of self-addressed questions in a dysfluency.

Pragmatic constraints on gesture use: the effect of downward entailing contexts on gesture processing

Gianluca Giorgolo & Stephanie Needham

Giorgolo (2010) introduces a theory of the joint interpretation of verbal language and co-verbal spontaneous gestures that assumes a tight connection between gesture meaning and the semantic structures of the co-occurring linguistic expression. In this abstract we extend this theory by considering additional pragmatic restrictions that we assume control the use of gestures and that effect the interpretability of a multimodal utterance. This leads to a number of predictions that we are in the process of testing experimentally. We report on some preliminary results obtained in a pilot study. Our goal is to provide support for the hypothesis that gesture and speech are part of a single communicative process which is constructed around the systematic constraints imposed by language. In particular, we believe that our analysis and our experimental results suggest that the interpretation of a gesture is dependent at a very precise level on the logical/semantical structure of the verbal expression it accompanies.

Sameness, Ellipsis and Anaphora

Daniel Hardt, Line Mikkelsen and Bjarne Ørsnes

It is a truism that elliptical and anaphoric expressions are in some sense interpreted the same as the antecedent – in this paper we examine expressions involving explicit assertions of sameness, and we find that they differ in surprising ways from analogous elliptical and anaphoric expressions. We examine "do the same" and compare it to the related forms, VP ellipsis and "do so/it/that", and we also examine "same" in ordinary NP's like "the same book". We conclude that "same" quite generally functions as an additive particle, giving rise to a presupposition similar to "too"; we are not aware that this has been observed previously. Furthermore, we show that "same" must take scope over the minimal containing VP, by covert movement or some other mechanism.

As Simple as It Seems

Vincent Homer

English presents a well-known case of syntax-semantics mismatch known as the "can't seem to construction" (Langendoen 1970, Jacobson 2006). It consists in

the reversal of the relative scope of "seem" and ability "can". Only ability "can" lends itself to the scope reversal (SR); the two verbs have to be relatively close to each other; the reversal only occurs in the presence of an expression which denotes a downward-entailing function; "seem" achieves wide scope both over the trigger and can (in that order); contrary to what normally happens in (non-generic) present sentences, the predicate embedded under "seem" need not be stative. We show that SR is not illusive (contra Jacobson 2006) and is due to the covert movement of "seem", a positive polarity item.

On the Non-Licensing of NPIs in the Only-Focus

I-Ta Chris Hsieh

While the grammaticality of NPIs in the scope of 'only' receives great attention (e.g., (1a); Klima 1964; Ladusaw 1979; von Fintel 1999; Giannakidou 2006; a.o.), the non-licensing of these items in the only-focus is rarely discussed (e.g., (1b); Wagner 2006; Horn 1996; a.o.).

(1) a. Only $[John]_F$ at any vegetables b. *Only [any student]_F at vegetables.

This paper focuses on the non-licensing of NPIs in the only-focus; first I show that with the SDE condition of NPI licensing (von Fintel 1999), the non-licensing of NPIs in the only-focus is predicted by a Fox-style semantics of 'only' (Fox 2007), which appeals to innocent exclusion, but not a Horn-style one. The proposed analysis suggests that assuming a (Fauconnier-Ladusaw-von Fintel) DE-based approach, a revision of the SDE condition that is context-independent and refers to assignment functions is called for.

Now: A Discourse-Based Theory

Julie Hunter

This paper offers an account of examples in which "now" refers to a time in the past of the utterance event. Contrary to existing theories of "now", e.g., Kamp & Reyle (1993) and Lee & Choi (2009), I argue that the interpretation of "now" in such examples is determined by the rhetorical structure of the discourse in which the example figures. A full theory of rhetorical structure is needed to account for these examples.

Obligatory implicatures and grammaticality

Natalia Ivlieva

In this paper we address the question whether scalar implicatures of a sentence could prevent it from being grammatical. In many theories of scalar implicatures it is predicted to be impossible. We argue, however, that the answer is yes, but that happens in a limited number of cases, namely when a scalar implicature of a given single sentence has to be calculated but potentially leads to a contradiction if conjoined with another scalar implicature of the sentence (is not innocently excludable, Fox 2006). This is illustrated by a puzzling data on agreement with disjunctions in Russian.

Only 'only'. An experimental window on exclusiveness

Jacques Jayez & Bob van Tiel

The 'standard theory' (Horn 1967) for 'only' claims that 'only P' presupposes that P (the so-called 'prejacent') and asserts that alternatives to P are false. This approach has been challenged in a number of ways. We focus here on Beaver and Clarke's (2008) recent proposal (B&C), which entails in particular that 'only P' does NOT presuppose P, partly on the basis of experimental data. We review their experiment and show that it is not conclusive and that their theory is problematic. We present the results of a large-scale experiment on several triggers in English, Dutch and French. Whereas the English data support B&C's claim on 'only', the Dutch ('alleen') and French ('seulement') counterparts are quite standard and seemingly presuppose their prejacent. Given the fact that (i) verbs like 'manage' behave like 'only', and (ii) the French 'seulement' behaves exactly like 'only' in every other respect, we conclude that the observed differences are not due to a special status of the prejacent but are better explained by postulating that presupposed propositions can be affected by truth-conditional operators like negation to various degrees, depending on the language and the lexical trigger under consideration.

Scope underspecification by expansion

Udo Klein

In this paper I will propose a theory of quantification and scope underspecification, where contrary to the standard view (i) the denotation of the underspecified representation does indeed capture what the possible readings all have in common, and (ii) the specification of an underspecified denotation amounts to adding information, so that there is a clear sense in which the underspecified denotation is part of every specified reading.

On the Grounding Status of Appositive Relative Clauses

Todor Koev

It is usually assumed in the literature that appositive relative clauses (ARCs) (i) project, i.e. are not affected by truth-conditional operators in the main clause and (ii) are backgrounded, i.e. are not part of the main point of the utterance (see Chierchia & McConnell-Ginet 1990, Potts 2005, Simons et al. 2010). In this paper I focus on the latter property and demonstrate that ARCs are not inherently backgrounded but rather their grounding status depends on their surface position. Roughly, clause-medial ARCs are backgrounded whereas clause-final ARCs are (or can be) foregrounded. I provide a uniform account of ARCs according to

which appositive content is backgrounded only if it updates the context before the main clause content is accepted. Building on AnderBois et al. (2010), I implement the proposal in Dynamic Predicate Logic with propositional variables. I also demonstrate that only clause-final ARCs can advance the reference time in narrative discourses and propose a structurally similar account.

Definite Theory of Superlatives

Sveta Krasikova

We develop a new analysis of the superlative that successfully handles some longstanding problems in resolving the absolute/comparative ambiguity. The analysis follows the spirit of Stateva's dissertation, in treating the superlative as an anaphoric expression depending on a measure function salient in the context. The main advantage of our proposal over existing analyses is that the definite article is not ignored but contributes to creating the superlative degree description.

The accommodation potential of implicative verbs

Noor van Leusen

We present an analysis of implicative verbs, a class of complement-taking verbs known for their specific projection behaviour since Karttunen (1971). Implicative verbs induce polarity sensitive entailments (Nairn et al. 2006), but are also claimed to trigger presuppositions. What is presupposed, however, is much more diffuse and variable than with e.g. factive verbs. We provide a formal treatment in Logical Description Grammar (van Leusen and Muskens 2003) and consider the implications of handling this class of verbs for the theory of accommodation, cf. Beaver and Zeevat (2006). It is argued that what is accommodated need not be precisely the linguistically presupposed material but can be any background information that explains the presupposition or makes it more likely, in support of models of interpretation which integrate linguistic and pragmatic presupposition.

Inflection and derivation: how adjectives and nouns refer to abstract objects

Louise McNally & Henriette de Swart

The study of nominalization raises foundational questions about the relation between adjectives and nouns in the way they refer to abstract objects. We analyze the three-way distinction in Dutch between expressions that refer to color/taste (e.g. 'het rood/het rode/de roodheid van de aardbeien' 'the red/the red+e/the redness of the strawberries'). We assume that noun and adjective 'rood' derive from an uncategorized root. We treat 'rood' in 'het rood' as a noun, referring to a shade of color. Derivational '-heid' turns adjective 'rood' into a noun; thus 'roodheid' denotes instantiations (bits) of redness in individual objects. We take 'rode' to be an adjective; the inflectional suffix '-e' enriches the valence of the adjective, creating a relation such that 'het rode van de aardbeien' is interpreted as 'the red aspect of the strawberries', where 'het' denotes Chierchia's (1984) nominalizer cap, embedding the AP directly under DP.

Tropes, Intensional Relative Clauses and the Notion of a Variable Object

Friederike Moltmann

It is a common view that NPs like 'the originality of the book' or 'the length of the paper' refer to tropes or particularized properties. This view faces a serious challenge from NPs of the sort 'the originality of the book he plans to write' or 'the length of the paper he needs to write'. I propose an account of such NPs based on a notion of a variable object and argue that it is superior to an account that would make use of individual concepts, not only conceptually, but also empirically.

A Theory of Names and True Intensionality

Reinhard Muskens

Standard approaches to proper names, such as Kripke's, hold that (a) intensions of expressions are functions from possible worlds to extensions and (b) names are rigid designators, i.e. their intensions are constant functions from worlds to entities. The difficulties with these approaches are well-known and in this paper we develop an alternative. Based on earlier work on a higher order logic that is truly intensional in the sense that it does not validate the axiom schema of Extensionality, we develop a simple theory of names in which Kripke's intuitions are accounted for, but the unpalatable consequences of the traditional theory are avoided.

Multiple Foci in Japanese Clefts and the Growth of Semantic Representation

Tohru Seraku

Japanese clefts are divided into two types, depending on whether a focus item has a case particle: "clefts+P" (i.e. clefts with a particle) and "cleftsP" (i.e. clefts without a particle).

(2) [Tom-ga nagu-tta no]-wa Mary(-o) da. [T.-NOM hit-PAST NO]-TOP M.(-ACC) COP 'It is Mary that Tom hit.'

It is well known that multiple foci are possible only in clefts+P (Koizumi 2000).

(3) [Tom-ga age-ta no]-wa [T.-NOM give-PAST NO]-TOP Mary*(-ni) purezento*(-o) da. M.(-DAT) present(-ACC) COP Lit. 'It is Mary_i a present_j that Tom gave $\phi_i \ \phi_j$.' In the literature, the asymmetry concerning multiple foci in Japanese has been treated syntactically (Hiraiwa and Ishihara to appear). This paper proposes that such syntactic issues can be handled as an outcome of semantic-structure building: a parser builds up semantic structure of clefts incrementally, with the machinery of "structural underspecification and subsequent resolution". More specifically, each node for a focus item is unfixed in semantic structure and needs to be fixed by a case particle before a next focus is parsed. Thus, multiple foci are licit only if each focus has a case particle to resolve underspecification; hence, multiple foci are possible only in clefts+P.

A Modal Analysis of the Perfective in Slavic

Sergei Tatevosov (cancelled)

The perfective has never been among those aspectual operators that are believed to deserve a modal analysis (e.g., Dowty 1979, Landman 1992, Portner 1998, a.o. for the perfective and Katz 2003, Portner 2003 for the perfect). However, I argue that properties of the perfective in Slavic languages are best accounted for if its semantics is endowed with a modal component, too. Evidence for the proposal comes from aspectual composition in Slavic. Specifically, I propose that the contribution of the Slavic perfective to the interpretation is two-fold. First, it introduces an operator in Klein's (1994) style mapping predicates of events to predicates of times. Secondly and crucially, to say that the perfective sentence is true in our world we need to make sure that the event does not continue in accessible worlds as long as it falls under the same event description. This idea is implemented within Kratzer's (1977, 1981 and elsewhere) double relative theory of modality.

Nuu-chah-nulth Evidentials and the Origo

Ryan Waldie

This paper investigates the nature of the origo-the person from whose perspective a proposition is evaluated-using data from Nuu-chah-nulth. The origo is also the receiver of information indicated by evidentials, and I look at the interactions between the two systems. I present three ways an origo can be assigned, and show how this results in the shifted indexical behaviour of evidentials in complement clauses. I also argue that the pragmatics of assertion and the origo argument together conspire to yield the effect of a direct evidential.

Focus, Uniqueness and Soft Presupposition Triggers

Andreas Walker

This paper investigates the behaviour of the definite article in the context of the sentence (1) 'John only saw the $[GERman]_F$ professor'. As von Heusinger (2007) observed, its uniqueness presuppositions are not copied in the alternative set. Instead of assuming a special lexical entry for the definite article, we provide data

showing that it behaves as a soft presupposition trigger with respect to its uniqueness presupposition, and suggest that the presuppositions of soft presupposition triggers need not be copied in the context of a sentence like (1).

You again: How is its ambiguity derived?

Ting Xu

It is well-known that a sentence with a complex predicate modified by *again* displays a repetitive vs. restitutive ambiguity. The former presupposes that the subject has previously performed the action denoted by the VP. The latter presupposes that the result state has held before. It either held from the very beginning or came into being as a result of someone else performing the action. Like English *again*, Chinese *you* 'again' modifying a resultative verb compound also exhibits a repetitive vs. restitutive ambiguity. However, Chinese differs from English in that the position of *you* 'again' is relatively fixed: it can only occur preverbally but not postverbally. This study examines how the ambiguity of Chinese you is derived. Investigating the scope interaction between *you* 'again' and an indefinite object, I argue that the ambiguity of *you* 'again' is structural but not lexical. I further propose that *you* 'again' moves overtly as a last resort to satisfy a PF requirement specific to Chinese.

Contents

Programme7Abstracts12Invited Speakers13Donka Farkas13Chung-chich Shan13Chung-chich Shan13Seth Yalcin13Beth/Vienna Circle Lecture14Kevin T. Kelly (joint work with Hanti Lin)14Workshop on Inquisitiveness14Manfred Krifka (invited speaker)14Martin Aher15Robin Cooper & Jonathan Ginzburg15Edgar Onea & Markus Steinbach15Wataru Uegaki15Workshop on Formal Semantic Evidence16Richard Breheny (invited speaker)16Batt Geurts (invited speaker)16Ralf Naumann (cancelled)17Janina Radó & Oliver Bott17Janina Radó & Viriszt Szendröi18Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi18Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi18Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally19Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil19Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny19Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott20Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Vorkshop on Sign Language21Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)21Stas Zadorozhny21Stas Zadorozhny22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22General Programme22Márta Abrusán22Márta Abrusán22Anine Bastenhof23	General Information
Abstracts 12 Invited Speakers 13 Donka Farkas 13 Irene Heim 13 Chung-chieh Shan 13 Seth Yalcin 13 Beth/Vienna Circle Lecture 14 Kevin T. Kelly (joint work with Hanti Lin) 14 Workshop on Inquisitiveness 14 Martin Aher 15 Robin Cooper & Jonathan Ginzburg 15 Edgar Onea & Markus Steinbach 15 Workshop on Formal Semantic Evidence 16 Richard Breheny (invited speaker) 16 Bart Geurts (invited speaker) 16 Bart Geurts (invited speaker) 16 Ralf Naumann (cancelled) 17 Janina Radó & Oliver Bott 17 Agata Maria Renans 18 Florian Schwarz & Sonja Tiemann 18 Poster session 18 Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi 18 Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally 19 Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny 19 Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny 20 Vasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox<	Programme
Invited Speakers 13 Donka Farkas 13 Irene Heim 13 Chung-chich Shan 13 Seth Yalcin 13 Beth/Vienna Circle Lecture 14 Kevin T. Kelly (joint work with Hanti Lin) 14 Workshop on Inquisitiveness 14 Martin Aher 15 Robin Cooper & Jonathan Ginzburg 15 Edgar Onea & Markus Steinbach 15 Wataru Uegaki 15 Workshop on Formal Semantic Evidence 16 Richard Breheny (invited speaker) 16 Bart Geurts (invited speaker) 16 Ralf Naumann (cancelled) 17 Janina Radó & Oliver Bott 17 Janina Radó & Oliver Bott 17 Agata Maria Renans 18 Florian Schwarz & Sonja Tiemann 18 Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi 18 Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally 19 Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil 19 Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorzhny 19 Pianesca Panzeri & Francesca Foppolo 20 Varskhop on Sign Lauguage	Abstracts
Donka Farkas 13 Irene Heim 13 Chung-chieh Shan 13 Seth Yalcin 13 Beth/Vienna Circle Lecture 14 Kevin T. Kelly (joint work with Hanti Lin) 14 Workshop on Inquisitiveness 14 Martin Aher 15 Robin Cooper & Jonathan Ginzburg 15 Edgar Onea & Markus Steinbach 15 Wataru Uegaki 15 Workshop on Formal Semantic Evidence 16 Richard Breheny (invited speaker) 16 Bart Geurts (invited speaker) 16 Bart Geurts (invited speaker) 16 Raf Naumann (cancelled) 17 Janina Radó & Oliver Bott 17 Agata Maria Renans 18 Florian Schwarz & Sonja Tiemann 18 Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi 18 Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi 19 Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny 19 Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil 19 Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny 19 Alex Djalali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts 20 Varskhop on Sign Language	Invited Speakers 13
Irene Heim 13 Chung-chieh Shan 13 Seth Yalcin 13 Beth/Vienna Circle Lecture 14 Kevin T. Kelly (joint work with Hanti Lin) 14 Workshop on Inquisitiveness 14 Manfred Krifka (invited speaker) 14 Martin Aher 15 Robin Cooper & Jonathan Ginzburg 15 Edgar Onea & Markus Steinbach 15 Wataru Uegaki 15 Workshop on Formal Semantic Evidence 16 Richard Breheny (invited speaker) 16 Bart Geurts (invited speaker) 16 Bart Geurts (invited speaker) 16 Ralf Naumann (cancelled) 17 Janina Radó & Oliver Bott 17 Agata Maria Renans 18 Poster session 18 Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi 18 Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally 19 Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil 19 Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil 20 Francesca Panzeri & Francesca Foppolo 20 Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox 20	Donka Farkas
Chung-chieh Shan 13 Seth Yalcin 13 Beth/Vienna Circle Lecture 14 Kevin T. Kelly (joint work with Hanti Lin) 14 Workshop on Inquisitiveness 14 Manfred Krifka (invited speaker) 14 Martin Aher 15 Robin Cooper & Jonathan Ginzburg 15 Edgar Onea & Markus Steinbach 15 Wataru Uegaki 15 Workshop on Formal Semantic Evidence 16 Richard Breheny (invited speaker) 16 Bart Geurts (invited speaker) 16 Bart Geurts (invited speaker) 16 Ralf Naumann (cancelled) 17 Janina Radó & Oliver Bott 17 Janina Radó & Sonja Tiemann 18 Plorian Schwarz & Sonja Tiemann 18 Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi 18 Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally 19 Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil 19 Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny 19 Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny 20 Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox 20 Varkshop on Sign Language </td <td>Irene Heim</td>	Irene Heim
Seth Yalcin13Beth/Vienna Circle Lecture14Kevin T. Kelly (joint work with Hanti Lin)14Workshop on Inquisitiveness14Manfred Krifka (invited speaker)14Martin Aher15Robin Cooper & Jonathan Ginzburg15Edgar Onea & Markus Steinbach15Wataru Uegaki15Workshop on Formal Semantic Evidence16Richard Breheny (invited speaker)16Bart Geurts (invited speaker)16Ralf Naumann (cancelled)17Janina Radó & Oliver Bott17Agata Maria Renans18Florian Schwarz & Sonja Tiemann18Poster session18Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi19Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil19Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny19Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott20Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Vasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Vorkshop on Sign Language21Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)21Gemma Barberà21Kathryn Davidson21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22General Programme22Márta Abrusán22Arno Bastenhof23	Chung-chieh Shan
Beth/Vienna Circle Lecture 14 Kevin T. Kelly (joint work with Hanti Lin) 14 Workshop on Inquisitiveness 14 Manfred Krifka (invited speaker) 14 Martin Aher 15 Robin Cooper & Jonathan Ginzburg 15 Edgar Onea & Markus Steinbach 15 Wataru Uegaki 15 Workshop on Formal Semantic Evidence 16 Richard Breheny (invited speaker) 16 Bart Geurts (invited speaker) 16 Bart Geurts (invited speaker) 16 Ralf Naumann (cancelled) 17 Janina Radó & Oliver Bott 17 Janina Radó & Oliver Bott 17 Agata Maria Renans 18 Florian Schwarz & Sonja Tiemann 18 Poster session 18 Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi 18 Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally 19 Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil 19 Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny 19 Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott 20 Francesca Panzeri & Francesca Foppolo 20 Vasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and	Seth Yalcin
Kevin T. Kelly (joint work with Hanti Lin)14Workshop on Inquisitiveness14Manfred Krifka (invited speaker)14Martin Aher15Robin Cooper & Jonathan Ginzburg15Edgar Onea & Markus Steinbach15Wataru Uegaki15Wataru Uegaki15Workshop on Formal Semantic Evidence16Richard Breheny (invited speaker)16Bart Geurts (invited speaker)16Ralf Naumann (cancelled)17Janina Radó & Oliver Bott17Agata Maria Renans18Florian Schwarz & Sonja Tiemann18Poster session18Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi18Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally19Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil19Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny19Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott20Francesca Panzeri & Francesca Foppolo20Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Workshop on Sign Language21Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22Márta Abrusán22Márta Abrusán22	Beth/Vienna Circle Lecture
Workshop on Inquisitiveness 14 Manfred Krifka (invited speaker) 14 Martin Aher 15 Robin Cooper & Jonathan Ginzburg 15 Edgar Onea & Markus Steinbach 15 Wataru Uegaki 15 Workshop on Formal Semantic Evidence 16 Richard Breheny (invited speaker) 16 Bart Geurts (invited speaker) 16 Ralf Naumann (cancelled) 17 Janina Radó & Oliver Bott 17 Agata Maria Renans 18 Florian Schwarz & Sonja Tiemann 18 Poster session 18 Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi 18 Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally 19 Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil 19 Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny 19 Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott 20 Alex Djalali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts 20 Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox 20 Vorkshop on Sign Language 21 Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker) 21 Gemma Barberà 21 Kathryn Davidson <	Kevin T. Kelly (joint work with Hanti Lin)
Manfred Krifka (invited speaker)14Martin Aher15Robin Cooper & Jonathan Ginzburg15Edgar Onea & Markus Steinbach15Wataru Uegaki15Workshop on Formal Semantic Evidence16Richard Breheny (invited speaker)16Bart Geurts (invited speaker)16Ralf Naumann (cancelled)17Janina Radó & Oliver Bott17Agata Maria Renans18Florian Schwarz & Sonja Tiemann18Poster session18Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi19Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny19Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny19Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott20Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Vasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Vasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox21Genma Barberà21Kathryn Davidson21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22Márta Abrusán22Arno Bastenhof23	Workshop on Inquisitiveness
Martin Aher15Robin Cooper & Jonathan Ginzburg15Edgar Onea & Markus Steinbach15Wataru Uegaki15Wataru Uegaki15Workshop on Formal Semantic Evidence16Richard Breheny (invited speaker)16Bart Geurts (invited speaker)16Ralf Naumann (cancelled)17Janina Radó & Oliver Bott17Agata Maria Renans18Florian Schwarz & Sonja Tiemann18Poster session18Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi18Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally19Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil19Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny19Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott20Alex Djalali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts20Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Workshop on Sign Language21Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)21Gemma Barberà21Kathryn Davidson21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22Márta Abrusán22Arno Bastenhof23	Manfred Krifka (invited speaker)
Robin Cooper & Jonathan Ginzburg15Edgar Onea & Markus Steinbach15Wataru Uegaki15Workshop on Formal Semantic Evidence16Richard Breheny (invited speaker)16Bart Geurts (invited speaker)16Ralf Naumann (cancelled)17Janina Radó & Oliver Bott17Agata Maria Renans18Florian Schwarz & Sonja Tiemann18Poster session18Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally19Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil19Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny19Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott20Alex Djalali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts20Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Workshop on Sign Language21Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)21Gemma Barberà21Kathryn Davidson21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22Márta Abrusán22Arno Bastenhof23	Martin Aher
Edgar Onea & Markus Steinbach15Wataru Uegaki15Workshop on Formal Semantic Evidence16Richard Breheny (invited speaker)16Bart Geurts (invited speaker)16Ralf Naumann (cancelled)17Janina Radó & Oliver Bott17Janina Radó & Oliver Bott17Agata Maria Renans18Florian Schwarz & Sonja Tiemann18Poster session18Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi18Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally19Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil19Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny19Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott20Alex Djalali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts20Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Workshop on Sign Language21Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22General Programme22Arno Bastenhof22Arno Bastenhof22	Robin Cooper & Jonathan Ginzburg
Wataru Uegaki15Workshop on Formal Semantic Evidence16Richard Breheny (invited speaker)16Bart Geurts (invited speaker)16Ralf Naumann (cancelled)17Janina Radó & Oliver Bott17Agata Maria Renans18Florian Schwarz & Sonja Tiemann18Poster session18Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi18Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally19Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil19Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny19Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott20Alex Djalali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts20Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Workshop on Sign Language21Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22General Programme22Márta Abrusán22Arno Bastenhof22	Edgar Onea & Markus Steinbach
Workshop on Formal Semantic Evidence16Richard Breheny (invited speaker)16Bart Geurts (invited speaker)16Ralf Naumann (cancelled)17Janina Radó & Oliver Bott17Agata Maria Renans18Florian Schwarz & Sonja Tiemann18Poster session18Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi18Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally19Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil19Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny19Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott20Alex Djalali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts20Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Workshop on Sign Language21Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22General Programme22Márta Abrusán22Anno Bastenhof23	Wataru Uegaki
Richard Breheny (invited speaker)16Bart Geurts (invited speaker)16Ralf Naumann (cancelled)17Janina Radó & Oliver Bott17Agata Maria Renans18Florian Schwarz & Sonja Tiemann18Poster session18Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi18Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally19Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil19Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny19Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott20Alex Djalali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts20Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Workshop on Sign Language21Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)21Gemma Barberà21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22Márta Abrusán22Arno Bastenhof23	Workshop on Formal Semantic Evidence
Bart Geurts (invited speaker)16Ralf Naumann (cancelled)17Janina Radó & Oliver Bott17Agata Maria Renans18Florian Schwarz & Sonja Tiemann18Poster session18Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi18Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally19Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil19Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny19Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott20Alex Djalali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts20Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Workshop on Sign Language21Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22Márta Abrusán22Arno Bastenhof22	Richard Breheny (invited speaker)
Ralf Naumann (cancelled)17Janina Radó & Oliver Bott17Agata Maria Renans18Florian Schwarz & Sonja Tiemann18Poster session18Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi18Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally19Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil19Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny19Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott20Alex Djalali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts20Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Workshop on Sign Language21Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)21Gemma Barberà21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22General Programme22Márta Abrusán22Arno Bastenhof23	Bart Geurts (invited speaker)
Janina Radó & Oliver Bott17Agata Maria Renans18Florian Schwarz & Sonja Tiemann18Poster session18Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi18Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally19Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil19Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny19Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott20Alex Djalali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts20Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Workshop on Sign Language21Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)21Gemma Barberà21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22Márta Abrusán22Márta Abrusán22Arno Bastenhof23	Ralf Naumann (cancelled)
Agata Maria Renans18Florian Schwarz & Sonja Tiemann18Poster session18Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi18Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally19Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil19Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny19Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott20Alex Djalali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts20Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Workshop on Sign Language21Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)21Gemma Barberà21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22Márta Abrusán22Arno Bastenhof23	Janina Radó & Oliver Bott
Florian Schwarz & Sonja Tiemann18Poster session18Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi18Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally19Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil19Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny19Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott20Alex Djalali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts20Francesca Panzeri & Francesca Foppolo20Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Workshop on Sign Language21Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)21Josep Quer21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22Márta Abrusán22Arno Bastenhof22Arno Bastenhof23	Agata Maria Renans
Poster session18Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi18Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally19Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil19Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny19Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott20Alex Djalali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts20Francesca Panzeri & Francesca Foppolo20Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Workshop on Sign Language21Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)21Gemma Barberà21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22Márta Abrusán22Arno Bastenhof23	Florian Schwarz & Sonja Tiemann
Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi18Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally19Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil19Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny19Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott20Alex Djalali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts20Francesca Panzeri & Francesca Foppolo20Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Workshop on Sign Language21Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)21Gemma Barberà21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22Márta Abrusán22Arno Bastenhof23	Poster session
Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally19Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil19Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny19Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott20Alex Djalali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts20Francesca Panzeri & Francesca Foppolo20Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Workshop on Sign Language21Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)21Gemma Barberà21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22Márta Abrusán22Arno Bastenhof23	Márta Abrusán & Kriszta Szendröi
Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil19Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny19Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott20Alex Djalali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts20Francesca Panzeri & Francesca Foppolo20Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Workshop on Sign Language21Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)21Gemma Barberà21Josep Quer21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22Márta Abrusán22Arno Bastenhof23	Gemma Boleda, Stefan Evert, Berit Gehrke and Louise McNally . 19
Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny19Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott20Alex Djalali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts20Francesca Panzeri & Francesca Foppolo20Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Workshop on Sign Language21Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)21Gemma Barberà21Kathryn Davidson21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22Márta Abrusán22Arno Bastenhof23	Adrian Brasoveanu & Jakub Dotlačil
Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott20Alex Djalali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts20Francesca Panzeri & Francesca Foppolo20Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Workshop on Sign Language21Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)21Gemma Barberà21Josep Quer21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22Márta Abrusán22Arno Bastenhof23	Lisa Bylinina & Stas Zadorozhny
Alex Djalali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts20Francesca Panzeri & Francesca Foppolo20Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Workshop on Sign Language21Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)21Gemma Barberà21Kathryn Davidson21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22Márta Abrusán22Arno Bastenhof23	Emmanuel Chemla & Lewis Bott
Francesca Panzeri & Francesca Foppolo20Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Workshop on Sign Language21Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)21Gemma Barberà21Kathryn Davidson21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22Márta Abrusán22Arno Bastenhof23	Alex Dialali, Sven Lauer and Christopher Potts
Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox20Workshop on Sign Language21Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)21Gemma Barberà21Kathryn Davidson21Josep Quer21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22Márta Abrusán22Arno Bastenhof23	Francesca Panzeri & Francesca Foppolo
Workshop on Sign Language21Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)21Gemma Barberà21Kathryn Davidson21Josep Quer21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22General Programme22Márta Abrusán22Arno Bastenhof23	Yasutada Sudo, Jacopo Romoli, Martin Hackl and Danny Fox 20
Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker) 21 Gemma Barberà 21 Kathryn Davidson 21 Josep Quer 21 Josep Quer 22 Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay 22 General Programme 22 Márta Abrusán 22 Arno Bastenhof 23	Workshop on Sign Language
Gemma Barberà 21 Kathryn Davidson 21 Josep Quer 21 Josep Quer 22 Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay 22 General Programme 22 Márta Abrusán 22 Arno Bastenhof 23	Philippe Schlenker (invited speaker)
Kathryn Davidson21Josep Quer22Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay22General Programme22Márta Abrusán22Arno Bastenhof23	Gemma Barberà
Josep Quer 22 Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay 22 General Programme 22 Márta Abrusán 22 Arno Bastenhof 23	Kathryn Davidson
Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shay 22 General Programme 22 Márta Abrusán 22 Arno Bastenhof 23	Josep Quer
General Programme 22 Márta Abrusán 22 Arno Bastenhof 23	Ronnie Wilbur, Evie Malaia and Robin Shav
Márta Abrusán 22 Arno Bastenhof 23	General Programme
Arno Bastenhof	Márta Abrusán
	Arno Bastenhof

Chris Blom, Philippe de Groote, Yoad Winter and Joost Zwarts . 23
Lucas Champollion
Simon Charlow
Anna Chernilovskaya & Rick Nouwen
Ka-fat Chow
Elizabeth Coppock & David Beaver
Tim Fernando
Michael Franke
Jonathan Ginzburg, Raquel Fernández and David Schlangen 25
Gianluca Giorgolo & Stephanie Needham
Daniel Hardt, Line Mikkelsen and Bjarne Ørsnes
Vincent Homer
I-Ta Chris Hsieh
Julie Hunter
Natalia Ivlieva
Jacques Jayez & Bob van Tiel
Udo Klein
Todor Koev
Sveta Krasikova
Noor van Leusen
Louise McNally & Henriette de Swart
Friederike Moltmann
Reinhard Muskens
Tohru Seraku
Sergei Tatevosov
Ryan Waldie
Andreas Walker
Ting Xu

Map



- A. Euclides building (conference venue) Plantage Muidergracht 24, Amsterdam
- B. Restaurant Agora (lunch) Roetersstraat 11, Amsterdam
- C. Doelenzaal (Beth lecture) Singel 421, Amsterdam
- D. Café Restaurant Kapitein Zeppos (welcome reception) Gebed Zonder End 5, Amsterdam