

Workshop: **Patterns and Models of Semantic Change**

Organizers: Cleo Condoravdi, Stanford University ([cleoc@stanford.edu](mailto:cleoc@stanford.edu))  
Ashwini Deo, Yale University ([ashwini.deo@yale.edu](mailto:ashwini.deo@yale.edu))

Typological and grammaticalization research has discovered many systematic patterns in the diachronic pairings between form and meaning of functional categories such as tense, aspect, modality, possession, intensification, and negation. The systematicity can be seen in the innovation of new functional expressions through the recruitment of lexical material, as well as in the predictable paths and cycles that such expressions tend to follow once they become overtly encoded in a language. Some examples of such paths are given below:

1. a. Progressive markers generalize to markers of imperfective aspect. (Bybee et al 1994; Comrie 1976).
- b. Resultative markers generalize to markers of perfect aspect and past tense. (Bybee et al 1994; Dahl 1985, 2000).
- c. Expressions encoding location evolve into expressions encoding alienable/inalienable possession. (Clark 1978; Aristar 1996; Heine 1997; Stassen 2009).
- d. Expressions restricted to expressing deontic modality diachronically acquire epistemic uses, but not vice versa. (Traugott 1989; Traugott & Dasher 2002).

Semantic and pragmatic research over the last decade has been increasingly engaging with precisely modeling the interaction between semantic content, utterance context, pragmatic pressures and the interaction between speakers and hearers in situated linguistic interpretation. Innovation in the application of mathematical techniques for modeling communication, inferential reasoning, and language evolution (e.g. Jaeger 2007, van Rooij 2004a,b) has led semanticists and pragmaticists to direct their attention to questions of historical change and to explore how diachronic phenomena can be modeled using formal semantic and pragmatic methods (e.g. Eckardt 2006, Condoravdi and Deo 2014, Deo , to appear).

Specifically, the workshop seeks to address the following questions.

2. a. What is the semantic content of the categories that form the input to or output of a given path?
- b. What logical relation between the meanings of these categories allows the construal of these trajectories as generalizations?
- c. What are the mechanisms that effect trajectorial semantic changes?
- d. What motivates the change in any particular case?

The proposed workshop aims to provide a forum for debate and, ideally, enable joint research on how the robust diachronic observations and insights about meaning change emerging from the typological and grammaticalization paradigm can be modeled using semantic and pragmatic tools and whether attempts at translation between these paradigms can be fruitful for both approaches to meaning.

The first workshop exploring these connections took place at the University of Texas at Austin in April 2013.

<http://linguisticssouthasia.commons.yale.edu/semchangeaustin/>

The second workshop on formal theories of meaning change took place at the University of Goettingen in September 2014, as a special parasession of Sinn und Bedeutung 19, the premier Semantics conference in Europe.

<http://www.uni-goettingen.de/en/call-for-papers-special-session/476294.html>

## Selected references

- Bybee, Joan, Revere Perkins, and William Pagliuca. 1994. *The Evolution of Grammar. Tense, Aspect, and Modality in the Languages of the World*. Chicago: The University of Chicago.
- Dahl, Oesten, ed. 2000. *Tense and Aspect in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dahl, Oesten. 1985. *Tense and Aspect Systems*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Deo, Ashwini. To appear. Grammaticalization paths and diachronic semantics. *Annual Review of Linguistics* 1
- Eckardt, Regine. 2006. *Meaning change in grammaticalization: An enquiry into semantic reanalysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Horn, Laurence. 1984. Towards a new taxonomy of pragmatic inference: Q-based and R-based implicature. In D. Schiffrin, ed., *Meaning, Form, and Use in Context: Linguistic Applications*, pages 11–42. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Jaeger, Gerhard. 2007. Evolutionary game theory and typology: A case study. *Language* 83(1):74–109.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 2012. Grammaticalization as optimization. In D. Jonas, J. Whitman, and A. Garrett, eds., *Grammatical change: Origins, nature, and outcomes*, pages 15–51. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kiparsky, Paul and Cleo Condoravdi. 2006. Tracking Jespersen's cycle. In *Proceedings of the 2nd international conference of Modern Greek dialects and linguistic theory*, pages 172–197.
- Roberts, Craige. 1998. Information structure in discourse: Towards an integrated formal theory of pragmatics. In J. H. Yoon and A. Kathol, eds., *OSUWPL*, 49, pages 91–136. The Ohio State University, Department of Linguistics.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C. and Richard B. Dasher. 2002. *Regularity in Semantic Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- van Rooij, Robert. 2004a. Evolution of conventional meaning and conversational principles. *Synthese* 139(2):331–366.
- van Rooij, Robert. 2004b. Signalling games select Horn strategies. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27(4):493–527.