

Strada Edgar Quinet nr. 5, 010017, București, ROMÂNIA  
tel: 021 313 8875  
e-mail: [decanat@litere.unibuc.ro](mailto:decanat@litere.unibuc.ro)  
web: [litere.ro](http://litere.ro)

**THE 24<sup>th</sup> INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE  
OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS**  
*Approaches to Language: Data, Interpretations, Theories*

**Workshop 3:**  
*Special definites, demonstratives, and pronouns*

**Date:** November 16, 2024  
**Venue:** Faculty of Letters, University of Bucharest, 5-7 Edgar Quinet St., Bucharest, Romania, and online (hybrid)  
**Keynote speaker:** Prof. Stefan Hinterwimmer, University of Hamburg  
**Convenors:** Ion Giurgea ([giurgeaion@yahoo.com](mailto:giurgeaion@yahoo.com)), Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin ([sorin.carmen2@gmail.com](mailto:sorin.carmen2@gmail.com))  
**Registration fee:** 300 RON (60 €) for faculty members; 150 RON (30 €) for PhD students and online participants

The “Iorgu Iordan – Alexandru Rosetti” Institute of Linguistics of the Romanian Academy and the Faculty of Letters of the University of Bucharest organize a workshop on special definites, demonstratives, and pronouns, within the 24<sup>th</sup> *International Conference of the Department of Linguistics of the University of Bucharest*.

We invite submissions for 30 minutes presentations (including 5-10 minutes for discussion) on any topic related to the semantics and syntax of various types of definite expressions, on demonstratives and their relation with the definite article, and on the internal structure and interpretation of definite pronouns (personal and demonstrative pronouns). Topics include:

- distinctions between various types of definite expressions, as reflected in distribution or semantics (e.g. the use of definites in predicative position, see Cheng et al. 2017, the use of definite articles in vocatives and with proper names, or weak definites in the sense of Carlson & Sussman 2005) or the use of special forms (strong vs. weak articles, see Schwarz 2009, 2019, Ortmann 2014, Bernstein et al. 2021); is there evidence for different types of definite articles or different underlying structure, depending on the semantic type of definite, even in languages where there are no formal differences (such as strong vs. weak articles or overt vs. null D)?
- the analysis of demonstratives, in particular, how they differ from definite articles, whether they can be semantically decomposed into a definite article and other pieces of structure (see Simonenko 2014) or rather involve an additional argument (see e.g. King 2001, Elbourne 2008, Ahn 2019, 2022) or just an enriched meaning (see e.g. Roberts 2002, Wolter 2006). How do anaphoric demonstratives differ from anaphoric definites? How do recognitional demonstratives differ from familiar definites? How does the decompositional analysis correlate with syntactic structure across languages, where we find both co-occurrence and complementary distribution between demonstratives and definite articles?

Strada Edgar Quinet nr. 5, 010017, București, ROMÂNIA  
tel: 021 313 8875  
e-mail: decanat@litere.unibuc.ro  
web: litere.ro

- the analysis of definite pronouns (personal pronouns and demonstratives), in particular, the correspondence between pronouns and determiners with overt nouns: should pronouns be analyzed as determiners followed by noun ellipsis (see e.g. Elbourne 2005, 2013, Sauerland 2007, Patel-Grosz & Grosz 2017, a.o.), or are they ambiguous between structures with no N-component and structures with N-ellipsis (Jenks & Konate 2022)? Does the determiner of 3<sup>rd</sup> person pronouns correspond to the definite article (Wolter 2006, Patel-Grosz & Grosz 2017) or is it closer to demonstratives (Ahn 2019, Blumberg 2021)? It is well-known that languages use various series of pronouns (weak, strong, demonstratives) depending on the accessibility or level of activation of the antecedent. How can this be accounted for within analyses which decompose pronouns into a definite D and a null N-constituent which may result from ellipsis?

The abstracts should be anonymous and no longer than **2 pages**, including examples and references, 2,5 cm. margins, font size 12. The language of the workshop is English.

The abstracts should be sent to [colocviu.lingvistica.2024@gmail.com](mailto:colocviu.lingvistica.2024@gmail.com), specifying in the body of the message or in the title “workshop definites”.

Deadline for abstract submission: **25 September 2024**

Notification of acceptance: **10 October 2024**

#### References

- Ahn, Dorothy. 2019. *The Determinacy Scale: A competition Mechanism for Anaphoric Expressions*. PhD dissertation, Harvard University.
- Ahn, Dorothy. 2022. Indirectly direct: An account of demonstratives and pointing. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 45:1345–1393.
- Bernstein, J., F. Ordóñez, F. Roca, 2021, “Emphatic elements and the development of definite articles: evidence for a layered DP in Early Romance”, *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 5, Article 22: 1-32, <https://doi.org/10.18148/hs/2021.v5i16-25.63>.
- Blumberg, Kyle. 2021. Pronouns as Demonstratives. *Philosophers' Imprint* 21 (35).
- Carlson, Gregory & Rachel Sussman, 2005, “Seemingly indefinite definites”, in Stephan Kepser & Marga Reis (eds.), *Linguistic Evidence*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 26-30.
- Cheng, Lisa L.-S., Heycock, Caroline & Zamparelli, Roberto. 2017. Two levels for definiteness. In Erlewine, Michael Yoshitaka (ed.), *Proceedings of GLOW in Asia XI: MIT working papers in linguistics* 1. 79–93.
- Diessel, Holger. 1999. *Demonstratives: form, function and grammaticalization*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Elbourne, Paul. 2005. *Situations and Individuals*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Elbourne, Paul. 2008. Demonstratives as individual concepts. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 31, 409–466.
- Elbourne, Paul. 2013. *Definite descriptions*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jenks, Peter and Rasidatou Konate. 2022. Indexed definiteness. *Glossa* 7(1): 1–44.
- King, Jeffrey. 2001. *Complex demonstratives: A quantificational account*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Ortmann, Albert. 2014. Definite article asymmetries and concept types: Semantic and pragmatic uniqueness. In Thomas Gamerschlag, Doris Gerland, Rainer Osswald & Wiebke Petersen (eds.), *Frames and concept types: Applications in linguistics and philosophy* (Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy 94), 293–321. Berlin: Springer.
- Patel-Grosz, Pritty & Patrick Grosz. 2017. “Revisiting pronominal typology”. *Linguistic Inquiry* 48(2), 259–297.

---

Strada Edgar Quinet nr. 5, 010017, București, ROMÂNIA  
tel: 021 313 8875  
e-mail: [decanat@litere.unibuc.ro](mailto:decanat@litere.unibuc.ro)  
web: [litere.ro](http://litere.ro)

- Roberts, Craige. 2002. Demonstratives as definites. In K. von Stechow & R. Kibble (eds.), *Information sharing: Reference and presupposition in language generation and interpretation*, 89–196. Stanford, CA: CSLI Press.
- Sauerland, Uli. 2007. Flat Binding: Binding without Sequences. In Uli Sauerland and Hans-Martin Gärtner (eds.): *Interfaces + Recursion = Language? Chomsky's Minimalism and the View from Syntax-Semantics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 197-253.
- Schwarz, Florian. 2009. *Two types of definites in natural language*. PhD dissertation, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Schwarz, Florian. 2019. "Weak vs. strong definite articles: Meaning and form across languages". In A. Aguilar-Guevara, J. Pozas Loyo, V. Vázquez-Rojas Maldonado (eds.), *Definiteness across languages*, Berlin, Language Science Press, 1–37.
- Simonenko, Alexandra. 2014. *Grammatical ingredients of definiteness*. PhD dissertation, McGill University, Montreal.
- Wolter, Lynsey Kay. 2006. *That's that: The Semantics and Pragmatics of Demonstrative Noun Phrases*. PhD dissertation, University of California – Santa Cruz.