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Our workshop focusses on two word classes, ideophones and interjections, that have been faced, throughout their history, with definitional problems of a rather different nature than other word classes, in part because they are situated at the boundary of arbitrary vs. iconic language. In this workshop we would like to bring together scholars who study the semantics, morphology, syntax and pragmatics of ideophones and interjections from a typological, diachronic, areal and/or multimodal perspective.

Interjections, invented by Latin scholars to fill a gap in the 8-part word classific after the dismissal of articles (which existed in Greek but not in Latin), are on the whole defined, throughout history, in negative terms on account of their phonological marginality, their nonparticipation in morphological processes and their syntactic autonomy. Ideophones are also difficult to define notionally, on account of the great variety of ideophonic lexemes in the world’s languages, and many definitions, as with interjections, highlight the non-standard phonology found with this word class. We have decided to consider these two word classes in the same workshop with the hope that setting them up in opposition to each other will make us more efficient in searching for consistent (and contrasting) definitions and in discussing issues of data collection, methodology and analysis that are common to both. Considering that in many languages, ideophones and interjections do not participate in morphological processes, it is reasonable to question whether they should, or even can be, topics in grammatical descriptions, and if so, how they can be described (and not only listed). They express emotions or reactions (interjections) and sensory imagery (ideophones), in other words subjective notions with great cultural variability. The difficulty in translating them and accurately capturing their meaning makes describing them difficult (for non-native linguists), marginalizing them even more compared to other word classes. An important question to be discussed in our workshop is that of the type of data which is needed to study these word classes: interjections and ideophones are more frequent in corpora of spontaneous speech, most often interactive, in other words types of linguistic production that are significantly different from those commonly used for research into nominal or verbal morphology. Additionally, they will often only be interpretable to the fieldworker after a relatively long period in the field, adding to the complexity of their description.

Ideophones have been given cross-linguistic consideration, through work on sound symbolism (Hinton et al. 1994), and in typology and descriptive work (see especially Voeltz and Kilian-Hatz 2001, Dingemanse 2011 and Reiter 2011). This work on ideophones has resulted in the following implicational hierarchy: sound < movement < visual patterns < other sensory perceptions < inner feelings and cognitive states (languages with ideophones covering a semantic field to the right will also have ideophones in semantic domains to the left of that point). In contrast, work on interjections has tended to be situated within the field of
The workshop will address the following questions from the perspective of language-specific and cross-linguistic analysis.

- **TYPOLOGY**: How can one proceed from language-specific to cross-linguistic definitions of “interjection” and “ideophone”? What formal, semantic and pragmatic criteria can be used to compare interjections and ideophones across languages?
- **CATEGORIZATION**: Where are the boundaries between ideophones and adverbs, interjections and ideophones, interjections and fixed expressions, interjections and “imperativa tanta” etc.?
- **MORPHOLOGY**: In which languages do we find productive processes for the formation of ideophones on the basis of elements from other word classes? What derivational processes can interjections and ideophones be the input for?
- **PROSODY**: What are characteristic features of the word prosody and the prosodic integration of ideophones and interjections in individual languages and cross-linguistically?
- **SEMANTICS**: What are the semantic domains expressed by interjections and ideophones? When interjections and ideophones occur in grammars, it is often in the form of lists, divided into semantic sub-classes: are other configurations for their description possible?
- **DIACHRONY**: What are the lexical or syntagmatic origins of interjections across languages? What are possible origins of ideophones (onomatopoeia, loans etc.)?
- **AREALITY**: How do interjections and ideophones spread across language boundaries or within a linguistic area? Are there phono-symbolic patterns that are characteristic of specific linguistic areas? In which linguistic areas do we find similarly elaborated systems of interjections (e.g. interjections for different types of work, domestic animals)?
- **MULTIMODALITY**: Which co-verbal gestures are associated with ideophones and interjections?
- **METHODOLOGY / TOOLS FOR DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS**: What types of linguistic data most frequently yield interjections and ideophones? Are there differences in frequency between certain linguistic genres (narratives, poetry, prayers, eulogies…) and everyday language? Which (non-)verbal stimuli can be used to trigger the use of interjections and ideophones and to help us capture their meaning?
- **HISTORIOGRAPHY**: How have interjections and ideophones typically been defined and described in research traditions of certain areas, language branches, families?
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