

<b><u>Workshop ID :</u></b>	12
<b><u>Workshop Duration :</u></b>	Workshop - 2 Days
<b><u>Workshop Title :</u></b>	<b>Formal Approaches to Iconicity</b>
<b><u>Workshop Leader :</u></b>	Robert Henderson, University of Arizona

---

There is a growing body of work showing that many iconic phenomena in signed and spoken languages are more grammaticalized than previously thought, and so should be treated within the same formal compositional semantics as more familiar semantic phenomena. The goal of this workshop is to explore ways of compositionally integrating iconic content with truth-conditional content more commonly construed. The workshop will address the following questions, among others:

- Are there always substantive differences between: (i) demonstration-based theories-with either events (Baglini to appear; Davidson 2015; Henderson 2016) or situations (Schlenker to appear[a],[b]); (ii) Icon $\Phi$  approaches (Kuhn & Aristodemo 2015); and (iii) more radical approaches that assume special iconic interpretation functions, or are some merely notational variants?
- Iconicity in sign languages has been argued to constrain interpretation (Meir 2010) - does this extend to instances of spoken language iconicity that have received renewed attention?
- There is increasing research on formal models of gesture as well as visual depiction like movies, signage, comicbooks (e.g., Cohn 2016). Is there truly linguistically(/culturally)- independent iconic meaning or is all iconic meaning at least partially conventionalized?
- Can the various iconic phenomena be treated under a unified approach to iconic meaning or do we need a kind of formal toolbox from which languages can assemble heterogeneous iconic systems?

Hosting a workshop is crucial for addressing these questions. The previous literature surrounding these questions is marked by the fact that not only does it involve a great diversity of languages, but a great variety of constructions, including ideophones, quotation, role shift, classifier predicates, pluractionality, metaphors, etc. Moreover, much of this research involves minority and understudied languages, and some focus on co-speech gesture. This diversity can make it difficult for researchers to understand each other due to differing background assumptions. For this reason, a multiday workshop like the one proposed is the ideal place to make headway to clear up misconceptions and seek common ground.

#### **Selected References:**

- Baglini, Rebekah. to appear. "The semantics of quotative ideophones". In *Semantics and Linguistic Theory*. Ed. by Mary Moroney Carol-Rose Little, Jacob Collard & Dan Burgdorf. Vol. 26.
- Cohn, Neil. 2016. A multimodal parallel architecture: A cognitive framework for multi-modal interactions. *Cognition* (146).304-323.
- Davidson, Kathryn. 2015. Quotation, Demonstration, and Iconicity. *Linguistics and Philosophy* (38). 477-520. DOI: 10.1007/s10988-015-9180-1.

- Henderson, Robert. 2016. "A demonstration-based account of (pluractional) ideophones". In *Semantics and Linguistic Theory*. Ed. by Mary Moroney Carol-Rose Little, Jacob Col-lard & Dan Burgdorf. Vol. 26. 664-683.
- Kuhn, Jeremy & Valentina Aristodemo. 2015. "Iconicity in the grammar: pluractionality in French Sign Language". In *Sinn und Bedeutung*. Vol. 20.
- Meir, Irit. 2010. Iconicity and metaphor: Constraints on metaphorical extension of iconic forms. *Language* 86(4). 865-896.
- Schlenker, Philippe. to appear(a). Super Monsters I: Attitude and Action Role Shift in Sign Language. *Semantics & Pragmatics*.
- Schlenker, Philippe. to appear(b). Super Monsters II: Attitude and Action Role Shift in Sign Language. *Semantics & Pragmatics*.

