

Ars Grammatica 2018

Theoretical and Empirical Issues in Cross-Linguistic Research: State-of-Affairs/Propositional Arguments

IDS Mannheim

21-22 June 2018

The Ars Grammatica 2018 workshop at the Institute for the German Language (IDS) in Mannheim, Germany, is concerned with cross-linguistic variation in the realization of propositional/ state-of-affairs arguments understood in a broad sense, i.e. arguments that describe events, propositions, situations and are realized as complement clauses, infinitival, gerundive or nominalized complements.

The issues regarding these arguments, abbreviated here as SoA-arguments, have been the subject of many investigations ranging from detailed studies on individual phenomena in single languages or language pairs (e.g. concerning restructuring, control, propositional proforms etc., see the overviews in Wurmbrand 2017; Polinsky 2013; Stiebels 2015; Frey et al. 2016) to typological studies (see e.g. the overviews in Horie 2001; Dixon 2006; Noonan 2007; Cristofaro 2003), and it has also been a centre of attention in functionalist approaches ever since Givón's (1980; 1993) studies on the topic. Apart from the empirical and theoretical discussions, we also find a range of methodologically different approaches to cross-linguistic variation depending on the perspective, empirical scope and theoretical framework (see among others the discussions in Davis et al. 2014, 2015 vs. Dryer 2014; Haspelmath 2014 or Newmeyer 2007 vs. Haspelmath 2010). Yet, there is still a gap between the typological approach and detailed studies about individual languages: whereas language specific studies of a single phenomenon might lack the discussion of typological predictions, typological studies face the challenge not to gloss over the complexity of the phenomena in the individual languages while comparing a large number of languages. Research in the domain of SoA-arguments therefore still needs to find ways to analyse variation in great enough detail in individual languages with the aim of describing the complexity of variation from a cross-linguistic perspective in a theoretically adequate manner. Such work will be a useful source for typological studies, theoretical analyses and contrastive grammars alike.

The main aim of the workshop is to bring together researchers who work on variation within and between languages with respect to the realisation of SoA-arguments and who are concerned with the empirical investigation, theoretical analysis, methodological approaches and/or with the specific challenges of contrastive grammar writing.

We invite the submission of abstracts which can contribute to one or more of the following questions:

1. Empirical description: Which formal means do individual languages/language groups use for realizing SoA-arguments? Which role does the inventory of means to realize

SoA arguments play for the conceptualization of these arguments? Which systematic correlations and differences do we find in cross-linguistic variation?

2. Theoretical approaches: How should the variation be theoretically modelled? What predictions of possible and impossible variation do different analyses of the variation make?
3. Methodological issues: Which empirical methods are best used for cross-linguistic research? What kinds of resources are necessary to make the analysis of individual languages available for cross-linguistic comparison?

Abstracts can for example be concerned with detailed analyses of two or more (un)related languages, comparative studies of universal restrictions, suggestions for possible parameters, and can be phrased in functional, typological or formal terms, such as:

- Which factors influence the preferences for which types of SoA-arguments in languages that allow for more than one formal realization of SoA arguments?
- Which language specific means do we find to conceptualize SoA as integrated/ a single SoA (e.g. coherent infinitives, restructuring, clause union) vs. as two desintegrated/independent SoAs (possibly via extraposition, nominalization, etc.)? Which factors guide whether or not a SoA-arguments is obligatorily integrated or desintegrated, when and how do languages make room for a choice to express a different conceptualization?
- Which role do semantic concepts such as tense, modality, factivity, assertion, etc. have when it comes to the choice of a specific form of SoA-arguments? What role does these concepts play for integration vs. desintegration?
- What kinds of propositional proforms are there in different languages? How can we distinguish between different types that look similar on the surface?
- What is the inventory of possible formal realizations of SoA-arguments? Which cross-linguistic patterns do we find? How does the inventory affect the formal means to express (des)integration of a SoA-argument?
- How do SoA-arguments relate to the realization as complements versus adjuncts in language comparison? How can we distinguish between the two?

With respect to the comparative methods, abstracts can focus on the following questions:

- Which role does the concept of *Tertium Comparationis* play for hypothesis-guided comparative studies? What kinds of concepts are useful as *Tertium Comparationis* with experimental methods in cross-linguistic research? How can psycho-linguistic methods be applied for approaching comparative questions? How do we need to adjust the known methods in order to make them useful for cross-linguistic comparison?
- Which challenges need to be tackled from the perspective of corpus linguistics, in order to use these methods in cross-linguistic research? Which specific requirements arise for building and implementing multi-lingual corpora for comparative studies?
- How can we make research of single or small-scale comparative studies available so that they can be used for writing comparative grammars, and be included in typological studies? Which resources are there already?

Invited speakers:

- Manfred Krifka (ZAS Berlin / HU Berlin)
- Christiane von Steutterheim (Universität Heidelberg)
- Susi Wurmbrand (UConn / Universität Wien)

Submission guidelines

Abstracts for single- or multi-authored proposals (25 min presentation + 15 min discussion) should be submitted electronically as .pdf sent by email to arsgrammatica@ids-mannheim.de. Abstracts should not exceed one A4 page of text (font size 12pt) with an additional page for references, graphs, tables; please send an anonymous version of your abstract, and include in the body of your email: Author name(s), title of abstract, contact details of corresponding author.

Call Deadline: **extended April 15, 2018**

Conference languages are German and English.

Organizers:

Jutta M. Hartmann

Angelika Wöllstein

(Projekt GDE-V am IDS Mannheim)

Summary for *Ars Grammatica* 2018

Title: *Ars Grammatica* 2018: Theoretical and Empirical Issues in Cross-linguistic Research

Venue: IDS Mannheim, Deutschland

Date: 21-June – 22-June 2018

Contact: arsgrammatica@ids-mannheim.de

Homepage: <http://arsgrammatica.ids-mannheim.de/>

Main Organizers: J. M. Hartmann, A. Wöllstein (Projekt GDE-V am IDS Mannheim)

References

Cristofaro, Sonia. 2003. *Subordination* Oxford studies in typology and linguistic theory. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press 1st edn. <http://www.loc.gov/catdir/enhancements/fy0620/2004268354-d.html>.

Davis, Henry, Carrie Gillon & Lisa Matthewson. 2014. How to investigate linguistic diversity: Lessons from the Pacific Northwest. *Language* 90(4). e180–e226. doi:10.1353/lan.2014.0076.

- Davis, Henry, Carrie Gillon & Lisa Matthewson. 2015. Diversity driven but cognitively constrained: Boas meets Chomsky (Response to commentators). *Language* 91(3). e127–e143. doi:10.1353/lan.2015.0039.
- Dixon, Robert M. W. 2006. Complement Clauses and Complementation Strategies in Typological Perspective. In Robert M. W. Dixon & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), *Complementation*, 1–48. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Dryer, Matthew S. 2014. Competing methods for uncovering linguistic diversity: The case of definite and indefinite articles (Commentary on Davis, Gillon, and Matthewson). *Language* 90(4). e232–e249. doi:10.1353/lan.2014.0070.
- Frey, Werner, André Meinunger & Kerstin Schwabe (eds.). 2016. *Inner-sentential Propositional Pro-forms: Syntactic properties and interpretative effects*, vol. 232 *Linguistik aktuell/Linguistics today*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Givón, Talmy. 1980. The Binding Hierarchy and the Typology of Complements. *Studies in Language* 4. 334–377.
- Givón, Talmy. 1993. *English Grammar: A Function-based Introduction*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2010. Comparative concepts and descriptive categories in crosslinguistic studies. *Language* 86(3). 663–687.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2014. Descriptive hypothesis testing is distinct from comparative hypothesis testing: Commentary on Davis, Gillon, and Matthewson. *Language* 90(4). 250–257. doi:10.1353/lan.2014.0071.
- Horie, Kaoru. 2001. Complement Clauses. In Martin Haspelmath (ed.), *Language typology and language universals* *Handbooks of linguistics and communication science*, Berlin and New York: W. de Gruyter.
- Newmeyer, Frederick J. 2007. Linguistic typology requires crosslinguistic formal categories. *Linguistic Typology* 11(1). 133–157.
- Noonan, Michael. 2007. Complementation. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, 52–151. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Polinsky, Maria. 2013. Raising and Control. In Marcel den Dikken (ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of generative syntax* *Cambridge handbooks in language and linguistics*, 577–606. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Stiebels, Barbara. 2015. Control. In Artemis Alexiadou & Tibor Kiss (eds.), *Syntax - theory and analysis* *Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft*, 412–446. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. doi:10.1016/B978-0-08-013517-5.50006-8.
- Wurmbrand, Susanne. 2017. Verb clusters, verb raising, and restructuring. In Martin Everaert & Henk C. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell companion to syntax* *The Wiley Blackwell Companions to Linguistics*, Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.