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Workshop description
The workshop aims at assessing the cognitive reality of (grammatical) paradigms throughout various linguistic domains, thereby testing this notion for its ability to allow for “graceful integration” (Jackendoff 2011), meaning that it should be able to account for empirical findings and general cognitive mechanisms. Paradigms are seen as part of speaker knowledge and important generalizations that enable speakers to deal with previously unencountered elements. Moreover, grammatical paradigms are an important tool in describing the target structure of grammaticalization. It is assumed that grammatical categories are structured paradigmatically in this sense. The theoretical and conceptual foundations of the workshop are grammaticalization theory, implicational morphology, usage-based constructional approaches, cognitive semantics, as well as corpus-based and experimental approaches to grammatical structures in diachronic and synchronic phenomena.

Background and aims
The notion of paradigms is primarily discussed in morphological theories, where it plays a central role as a tool for describing the structures in which inflectional forms are organized. Each member of a paradigm corresponds to a cell, which can be either filled by a form or by a form-feature pair (Lieb 2005, Werner 1994, Wurzel 1984). Lately, work on relational structures in morphological paradigms (Ackerman et al. 2009, Blevins 2015, Blevins 2016) has shown that this purely instrumental conception of paradigms as nothing but a useful descriptive convention clearly underestimates its cognitive foundation and functional importance. Current morphological theory defines paradigms as “cohesive wholes” (Blevins 2015: 94) that consist of relations and associations between its cells. As such, they are part of speaker knowledge, because they are necessary generalizations that allow speakers to infer previously unencountered forms of lexical items (Ackerman et al. 2009: 54). Knowing the overall organizational structure of the forms allows for inferring forms and their functions from one another.

This inferential nature of paradigms is what can be generalized as a structuring principle to other areas of grammar. (Nørgård-Sørensen et al. 2011: XI). In addition to their prominence in morphological approaches, paradigms are an important notion in grammaticalization as well (Diewald 2017, [in preparation]), where grammatical paradigms are the target structure of grammaticalization processes. They are not just accumulations of inflectional forms but holistic semiotic structures, consisting of ordered bundles of oppositions between all members of the category in question (which in grammaticalization are modified in various ways). Take
the grammatical category tense as an example: The members of the tense paradigm share a common categorical function, namely situating events relatively to the speech time. The unmarked zero in tense is the present. The specific function of all other members of the category – like past and future forms – can be described relatively to that unmarked zero, i.e. in opposition to it and of course also in opposition to one another. In short: The oppositions between the members of a grammatical paradigm are the very essence of grammatical structures that “cannot be described without reference to the paradigmatic organisation that lies behind the syntagmatic realisations” (Nørgård-Sørensen et al. 2011: 71).

During grammaticalization processes, elements acquire a place in this structure or change their place within it. Elements form oppositional pairs with other grammatical elements that are members of the same superordinate category, e.g. “tense” (Diewald and Smirnova 2010: 4). By developing this opposition, the newly grammaticalized item becomes a member of a grammatical paradigm (Bybee et al. 1994, Lehmann 1982[1982]).

While it is undisputed that “grammar” is the target domain of grammaticalization processes, and that “paradigms” play a role in the development of Indo-European languages, the exact extend of the notion of paradigm and grammatical paradigm and its usefulness for languages with little or no inflectional morphology has been under dispute for some time by now. For once, there is fundamental criticism concerning the lack of an exact definition of “grammar”, as put forth by Himmelmann: “[w]ork in grammaticalization also hardly ever makes explicit the concept of grammar underlying a given investigation” (Himmelmann 1992: 2). Furthermore, there is a lively discussion about (i.) whether the notion of paradigm should be extended to syntagmatic linguistic structures beyond bound morphology and periphrastic forms, as for example in Construction Morphology (Booij 2010, 2016), and include, for example, grammatical oppositions on the level of the whole clause, like the opposition between sentences particles and modal particles. Another hotly disputed issue is (ii.) what the benefit of such an extension might be (cf. (Haspelmath 2000: 663, Wiemer & Bisang 2004, Bisang 2014, Diewald 2017, [in preparation]).

This discussion, which arose in typological research and grammaticalization studies, meets with current questions and challenges in construction grammar. In constructional approaches, paradigms are often “marginalized or even lost” (Diewald, [in preparation]). However, construction grammar aims at describing grammatical structures in their entirety. It is therefore necessary to find an integrative approach that combines both construction grammar and paradigms as organizational structures of grammar (Diewald 2009, Diewald and Smirnova 2010, Diewald 2015). In such an approach, paradigms are, as in morphology (Blevins 2016), necessary generalizations of associative structures and can be seen as constructions “whose function and meaning is defined by the specific number and constellation of its components”, which “mutually define each other’s values” through their inherent indexical structure (Diewald [in preparation]).

The basic assumptions derived from this background are

1. paradigms are necessary generalizations of grammatical structures,
2. paradigms are part of the grammatical knowledge of speakers, and
3. paradigms are what makes grammaticalization processes structured processes.
This workshop intends to investigate and test these assumptions, and thus raises the following questions:

- Can research from different linguistic subdisciplines underpin the importance of the notion of paradigms?
- What are the advantages (and limitations) of such an integrative approach of describing grammatical structures as paradigmatic, i.e. as consisting of oppositions and relations?
- Is there independent evidence from neighbouring disciplines supporting the assumption of paradigms as cognitive entities?

**Call for Papers**

We invite contributions from various areas of linguistics focusing on where evidence for – or against – an integrated approach of grammatical paradigms as cognitively relevant factors can be found: cognitive linguistics, psycholinguistics, morphology, general linguistics, semantics, syntax, historical linguistics, and others. Possible research topics and research questions to be covered include

- paradigmatic structures in implicational and constructional morphology,
- paradigms between bound inflectional and non-bound constructional structures,
- the diachronic development of paradigmatic oppositions in grammatical categories,
- investigating oppositions between closely related constructions in a grammatical category,
- typological views on paradigms of various shapes,
- empirical and/or experimental evidence for paradigms as cognitive entities.

Abstracts should not exceed 500 words (excluding references). Please submit abstracts via the EasyChair link on the SLE website (sle2019.eu) until January 15, 2019. Details about the submission process and the abstract guidelines can be found at http://sle2019.eu/call-for-papers.
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