Chapter 1 : On Functional Linguistics

This two-volume work on syntax views grammar as a non-arbitrary language-processing device, to be understood in terms of the various substantive parameters relevant to language: communicative function, cognitive processing, socio-culture and neuro-biology.

Additional Information In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: This would permit the generalization that a modifier precedes its head when both are part of a word. Nevertheless, a lot of ingenuity is reflected in this book, and any linguist can profit by reading it. In fact, I think a viable theory of linguistic structure must eventually incorporate a number of features that distinguish word grammar from the theoretical approaches currently in favor. Physically, the book is reasonably attractive. Mechanically, there are far too many errors, some with the potential for hindering comprehension. Certain diagrams appear to be faulty, with missing arrowheads 47, , incorrect subscripts 64 , inconsistencies in the direction of dependency 99 , or arrows that are misdrawn Numerous minor errors of spelling etc. Extra lines of text are inserted in a few places; extra spaces are sometimes put between paragraphs; and formatting mistakes can be found. Finally, I noted a fair number of cross-references to page which I have been unable to locate. Arguments for a non-transformational grammar. University of Chicago Press. Current studies in linguistics, 8. Foundations of cognitive grammar, I: A functional-typological introduction, I. Reviewed by Jeffrey Heath, Harvard University This is half of a two-volume work designed to be used as a textbook for a typological survey, or a typologically oriented syntax course p. There is nothing wrong with this kind of compendium from such a prolific and wide-ranging author, but it is somewhat difficult to use such a work as a classroom text unless the instructor is sympathetic REVIEWS to and well-versed in the relevant corpusâ€"in which case the book can be recommended. Factive, implicative, and manipulative verbs are distinguished with attention to the logic of negation. Split ergativity and antipassives are analysed as functions You are not currently authenticated. View freely available titles:

Chapter 2 : Linguistics - The University of Auckland

This new edition of Syntax: A functional-typological introduction is at many points radically revised. In the previous edition () the author deliberately chose to de-emphasize the more formal aspects of syntactic structure, in favor of a more comprehensive treatment of the semantic and pragmatic correlates of syntactic structure.

This is from the outset something of a misnomer, since one of the hallmarks of functionalism is its refusal to recognize strict theoretical or methodological boundaries among syntax and the explanatory realms of semantics, pragmatics, and discourse, or for that matter among synchronic, diachronic, phylo- and ontogenetic analysis and explanation. That is, there is no such thing as "functionalist syntax" in the sense that there is "generative syntax", since a generativist assumes ex hypothesi that there is a distinct syntactic component in Universal Grammar for "syntax" to be the study of. Still, we all recognize that one of the hallmarks of human language is the ability to combine symbolically-meaningful signs into more complex structures. Many clever mammals, and apparently a few birds, are able to learn a substantial number of words, and even use them--but, with the marginal exceptions of chimpanzees in the "ape language" experiments, only one at a time. This uniquely human behavior is what we call morphosyntax, and whether or not it forms a unitary and legitimately discrete theoretical domain, it does form a roughly definable field of inquiry. Morphosyntax is indeed a wonderful, and wonderfully complex, phenomenon. But the true mystery, and the true locus of explanation for most of the fundamental facts of syntax, is in what it is expressing. We lightly debate whether or not language is "primarily" for communication, without touching on exactly what linguistic "communication" entails. Human language is not simply a device for presenting and pointing to interesting objects and events in the world. It is a set of tools for communicating our experience, and its structure is fundamentally informed by the structure of our experience and our cultural models of experience. Languages, for example, tend to afford distinct treatment of some kind to expressions of individual internal experience "experiencer subject" predicates of emotion and cognition, internal states such as hunger, etc. The purpose of this course will be to demonstrate functionalist explanations of some of the phenomena which constitute the subject matter of theories of core syntax. I will present a sequence of interwoven accounts of aspects of clause structure from the inside out, and some illustrations of the issues in clause combining phenomena. Grammaticalization will be a central theme, and the outlines of grammaticalization theory will be presented in Lecture 3. With that as a basis, I will then present an explanatory account of what we know about language, from the ground up. Obviously this is too large a task for the available time, and we will have to limit our scope in both breadth and depth--there are limits to how far up from the ground we can get, and to how many grammatical phenomena we can deal with. But I hope to give you a sense of how much of linguistic structure can be explained without recourse to untestable hypotheses about neural structure. Even within this narrowed application of the term, there is certainly no monolithic "functional theory" shared by all those who would identify themselves as part of or allied with the functional movement. What all functionalists have in common is a rejection of the notion of formalism as explanation. The basic difference between functionalist and formalist linguistic frameworks is in where explanations are lodged, and what counts as an explanation. Most contemporary formal theories, certainly Generative Grammar in all its manifestations, provide ontological grounding for these explanations in a hypothesized, but unexplored and unexplained, biologically-based universal language faculty. Functionalists, in contrast, find explanations in function, and in recurrent diachronic processes which are for the most part function-driven. That is, they see language as a tool, or, better, a set of tools, whose forms are adapted to their functions, and thus can be explained only in terms of those functions. Formal principles can be no more than generalizations over data, so that most Generative "explanation" seems to functionalists to proceed on the dormitive principle. Functionalism in this sense overlaps tremendously with--and in a real sense, subsumes--allied schools such as Cognitive Grammar and the "Constructivist" school in Europe e. Modern functionalism is, in important ways, a return to the conception of

the field of those linguists who founded the linguistic approach to synchronic, as well as diachronic, phenomena in the late 19th century see Whitney , von der Gabelentz , Paul , inter alia. These scholars understood that linguistic structure must be explained in terms of functional, cognitive, "psychological" imperatives: Language, then, signifies rather certain instrumentalities whereby men consciously and with intention represent their thought, to the end, chiefly, of making it known to other men; it is expression for the sake of communication. They looked to functional motivation for the basis of linguistic structure, and to motivation and recurrent patterns of diachronic change for explanations of cross-linguistic similarities of structure. The roots of contemporary mainstream linguistics, in contrast, go back only to the Structuralists who, in keeping with the intellectual tenor of an era noteworthy for the ascendancy of behaviorism in psychology and of Logical Positivism in philosophy, banished all notion of explanation from the field, letting the structure simply be. See, for example, the resolute empiricism of Hockett This left them without any avenue for explaining cross-linguistic similarities, but this was an endeavor which most American Structuralists had little interest in. The "Generative Revolution" which began with Syntactic Structures is generally presented as a reaction to this Structuralist agnosticism, a re-introduction of the notion of explanation in the science of language. Unfortunately, the Generativists inherited from their Structuralist forbears a deep distrust of "external" explanation. They resolved the problem by positing language-internal "explanations" for linguistic consistency. And to all appearances many contemporary theoreticians continue to believe that they can have their cake and eat it too, to have an autonomous theory of linguistics which explains structure without itself needing explanation. Functionalism in this respect is the true revolution--or, better, counter-revolution, as it constitutes a return to a concept of explanation which has been ignored since the Bloomfieldian Ascendancy. For Functional linguistics, like Generative linguistics, or Minimalist syntax, or what have you, refers both to a set of intellectual positions which define the school, and to a group of scholars who adhere to whatever degree to it. Although they represent two different, though overlapping, social groups, there is no sharp break in theory or practice between the Functional and Cognitive movements in contemporary linguistics. I do not intend to present this course in the format of "the Functionalist alternative to mainstream syntax". Usually, though, the terminological differences are the key to fundamental differences in the theoretical framework within which the analysis is placed. We will return to this in more detail in the next lecture; here I simply want to introduce one of the basic aspects of Functional analysis. Consider the concept Noun. Start with the traditional notional definition: The basic problem with this is that it is not operationalizable. It cannot reliably tell us whether a given concept will be a noun or a verb, since many concepts can occur as both: English honesty, for example, is clearly a noun. It does not refer to a person or place, so it must qualify as a noun by referring to a thing. We are left chasing a circle: We will have occasion to deal further with this sort of circularity, which is more apparent than real. The perceived circularity inheres in the folk-theoretic conception of language as an autonomous system into which meanings can be put. On this view, either "Nounness" or "thingness" must be basic, and the other then must be defined in terms of it. A better conception of what we are looking at here starts from the premise that language is simply the overt expression of cognitive structure. So Structuralists insist rigorously structural definitions. A noun is a word which fits into noun slots, pure and simple. This is operationalizable--to decide whether a word is a noun or not, try and make it the subject of a clause, and see what happens. But this is unsatisfactory in three crucial respects. First, as the Structuralists were well aware, it makes it impossible to equate word classes across languages. And more critically, it offers no explanation for why there should be such a thing as a "noun slot", and why any particular word should fit into that slot rather than some other. However much it might outrage the positivistic assumptions of the likes of Bloch, there is no evading the clear intuition that we all--linguists and non-linguists alike--have that there is some notional basis at least to major categories like noun, verb, adjective, and adposition. One kind of account "explains" this fact by saying that there is a syntactic position in underlying structure at the beginning of a sentence. If a constituent is to be moved, it can only be moved to a syntactic position, so there it goes. This is a formal explanation: But this is, once again, explanation by the

dormitive principle: To a functionalist, such an account cannot, in principle, be an explanation. It is simply a statement of the data. The choice of vocabulary in which such a statement is made cannot constitute an explanation. Moreover, it fails to explain the apparent correlation between left-dislocation on the one hand and topicality and contrastiveness on the other. We do not, for example, find languages where contrastive constituents are moved to sentence-second position, though this is also a syntactically-defined position cf. A legitimate explanation for the typological facts here must offer an account which provides a principled reason for the association of topic function with initial position--otherwise it is not an explanation, merely a description. And at least the basis of such an explanation is not far to seek. It is a well-known and long established fact in psychology that the first in a series--any kind of series, in any modality--has a perceptually privileged position Gernsbacher and Hargreaves , This fact by itself is obviously not an explanation for any syntactic facts, but combined with an adequate understanding of topicality and of sentence construction and interpretation see e. Gernsbacher ; we will return to this question in later lectures it offers the possibility of a truly explanatory account. For another example, consider the so-called "Unaccusative Hypothesis". In a significant number of languages the single arguments of monovalent verbs fall into two classes in terms of some morphosyntactic behavior by which some of them act like transitive subjects, others like transitive objects see Mithun ; we will discuss some of these data more fully in a later lecture. In a fair number of languages, indeed, they are explicitly coded like transitive subjects or objects by surface case marking or indexation in the verb; a well-known example is Lakhota: So what explanation does the Unaccusative "Hypothesis" offer? Why, that some arguments of intransitives are subjects, and some are "underlyingly" objects: Alternatively, in argument structure terms, an unergative verb has an external argument but no direct internal argument, whereas an unaccusative verb has a direct internal argument but no external argument. Levin and Rappaport Hovav In order for it to even make sense, we have to first believe that there simply are subjects and objects. Then the claim that "there are two classes of intransitive verbs" is not a hypothesis at all, but an empirical fact--it may or may not be true or have any morphosyntactic repercussions in English or Chinese, but in Lakhota, Pomo, Guarani, Acehnese, Lhasa Tibetan, Italian, Dutch, etc. Now, "each associated with a different underlying syntactic configuration" is already a theory-bound formulation; it is meaningful only in terms of some interpretation of the phrase "underlying syntactic configuration". L and R-H give us some possible interpretations of this: But these formulations are meaningless without a framework within which notions like "D-structure subject" and "external argument" are defined. From a functionalist perspective, notions like these cannot have any explanatory value. An explanatory account must explain why they should be alike--why is a jumper more like a killer than a killee, why is a dier more like a killee than a killer? Put otherwise, we need some story about how you get to be an unaccusative or an unergative verb in this world. Thus stated, part of the answer is obvious. Well, because they both die, obviously. And, similarly, how is a jumper like a killer? Well, they both do something, cause something to happen in the world. Now, this begins to sound explanatory. If you want to develop an explanatory theory, this is what needs to be developed. If you want a formalized system, this is what you need to try and formalize. Relational Grammar accounts for these patterns in terms of a priori categories, and thus says nothing concrete beyond that the argument of some intransitive verbs is more subject-like, and of others more object-like--in other words, is nothing more than a restatement of the empirical facts--unless we buy the idea that "1", "2", "3", and the associated theory of clause structure are wired into the cortex, or in some other way determined by the structure of the human organism. But even that is only a preliminary "explanation"--somebody has to come up with a hypothesis as to how and why such a thing could have gotten wired in. But the theory does make an explicit prediction that this typological tendency is universal and exceptionless.

Chapter 3 : Syntax: An Introduction - Talmy GivÃ³n - Google Books

(a)Syntax should be analysed in complete isolation from discourse, dis- course properties being used neither in the statement of syntactic regularities nor as a methodological crutch in gaining insight into syntactic regularities.

Connectionism and the study of change by Elizabeth A. Elman - Brain Development and Cognition: A Reader , " Developmental psychology and developmental neuropsychology have traditionally focused on the study of children. But these two fields are also supposed to be about the study of change, i. Ironically, there has been relatively little interest in the mechanisms responsible for change in the last 15â€"20 years of developmental research. The reasons for this de-emphasis on change have a great deal to do with a metaphor for mind and brain that has influenced most of experimental psychology, cognitive science and neuropsychology for the last few decades, i. We will refer to this particu- Show Context Citation Context It seems to us that we n The English dative alternation: We challenge the predominant view of the English dative alternation, which takes all alternating verbs to have two meanings: Instead, we argue that verbs like give and sell only Instead, we argue that verbs like give and sell only have a caused possession meaning, while verbs like throw and send have both caused motion and caused possession meanings. We show that the caused possession meaning may be realized by both variants. We reassess evidence for alternative approaches adduced from inference patterns and verbâ€"argument combinations and demonstrate how our verb-sensitive analysis, when combined with an account of variant choice, provides a more insightful explanation of this data, while having wider coverage. To conclude, we consider the crosslinguistic implications of our study, attempting to explain why so Lexical Semantics of Adjectives: This work belongs to a family of research efforts, called microtheories and aimed at describing the static meaning of all lexical categories in several languages in the framework of the MikroKosmos project on computational semantics. The latter also involves other static microtheories describin The latter also involves other static microtheories describing world knowledge and syntax-semantics mapping as well as dynamic microtheories connected with the actual process of text analysis. This paper describes our approach to determining and representing adjectival meaning, compares it with the body of knowledge on adjectives in literature and presents a detailed, practically tested methodology and heuristics for the acquisition of lexical entries for adjectives. The work was based on the set of over 6, English and about 1, Spanish adjectives obtained from task-oriented corpora. Introduction The topic of this paper is the information about adjectival meaning which should be included in a computational lexicon. Thus, we concentrate on Verb retrieval in brain-damaged subjects: Verb retrieval for action naming was assessed in 53 brain-damaged subjects by administering a standardized test with items. The goal of the study was to gain further insight into the nature of verb processing impairments by investigating the influence of several kinds of stimulus, lexical, and c For both groups of subjects, verb retrieval was significantly Show Context Citation Context This led to 28 verbs being classified as having homophonous nouns and the remaining 72 verbs being classified as not having homophonous nouns. It 5 Throughout this paper, the designati

Chapter 4 : Syntax: An Introduction. Volume I | T. Givón

Get Textbooks on Google Play. Rent and save from the world's largest eBookstore. Read, highlight, and take notes, across web, tablet, and phone.

Additional Information In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: French contrast in infinitives follows. This analysis, however suggestive , raises quite a few problems. The approach does not explain why non-theta assigners can still move to null Agr in French infinitives. It does not provide a common account of the identical lexical restrictions on V to T to Agr in French infinitives and on V to T to Agr in English tensed clauses. University of Chicago Press. Verb positions; NP positions: Some notes on the economy of derivations and representations. The Linguistic Review 8. Notes on English agreement. Italian negative imperatives and clitic climbing. City University of New York, ms. Verb movement, universal grammar and the structure of IP. Agreement parameters and the development of English modal auxiliaries. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 3. Verbs and diachronic syntax. The syntax of words. A theory of floating quantifiers and its corollaries for constituent structure. Syntactic properties of sentential negation: A comparative study of Romance negation. University of Pennsylvania dissertation. A functional-typological introduction, vol. Reviewed by Jeffrey Heath, University of Michigan The second and final volume of this work appears six years after Vol. Pagination is consecu6 N. This would incorrectly predict optional verb movement in French tensed clauses as well as infinitives. In the interval, the classroom value of the first volume has been limited by its incompleteness. The two-volume organization seems to be dictated as much by sheer size as by a natural breaking point though multiclause syntax tends to occur after the division ; topics such as NPs, subordinated clauses, and voice were deferred to the second volume. The question facing classroom instructors, now that the set is complete, is whether some portions of the first volume have become dated. Fortunately, while G acknowledges some changes in his thinking, the time lapse is not fatal. A functional-typological analysis is interpretive and low on notational trappings ; a mature theory in this mold will not change radically in a six-year period. One might consider, in contrast, how a two-volume textbook on formal syntax would have fared under similar publication circumstances—one pictures an author prefacing Vol. The present volume has ten chapters, Chs. You are not currently authenticated. View freely available titles:

Chapter 5 : Typology - Linguistics - Oxford Bibliographies

Ethical Issues for Applying Linguistics to Clinical Contexts: The Case of Speech-Language Pathology.

Typology in the second sense, which is what dominates the modern typological literature, grows out of work by Joseph H. Greenberg on word order correlations or universals. For this reason typology has played an important part in linguistic theory, which aims to explain the range of possible human languages and why human languages are the way they are. Given its theoretical importance and the fact that almost any aspect of human language can be studied typologically, typology is a broad discipline that is of importance to every subfield of linguistics. Reference Works All broad linguistic encyclopedias include entries on typology as well as typological studies of individual languages and language families. The best of these are Brown and Frawley , which are lengthy and comprehensive. In addition, there are a few encyclopedias and handbooks dedicated to typology. The first volume is dedicated to historical and methodological concerns. Although it is not exactly a reference work, because it contains original research, the coverage is encyclopedic and represents a large swath of early modern typological research. Song is a series of critical overviews. It treats the empirical results of typological study, while also covering the history of typology and issues in typological theory, as well as the connection between typology and related disciplines. Encyclopedia of language and linguistics. A huge fourteen-volume reference work. It contains a section of short articles devoted to typology and universals, as well as typological descriptions of languages and language areas. International encyclopedia of linguistics. Universals of human language. Though older than the other works in this section, this book is still relevant and covers syntactic, morphological, and phonological typology, as well as the history of typology and typological methodology. Language typology and language universals: This two-volume set is huge, containing more than a hundred articles on both empirical and theoretical aspects of typology. It is a great first stop when starting a research project on any linguistic phenomena. It also has an extensive bibliography. Song, Jae Jung, ed. The Oxford handbook of linguistic typology. It also has a section on the relationship between typology and other areas of linguistic investigation. Users without a subscription are not able to see the full content on this page. Please subscribe or login. How to Subscribe Oxford Bibliographies Online is available by subscription and perpetual access to institutions. For more information or to contact an Oxford Sales Representative click here.

Chapter 6 : Syntax: a functional-typological introduction - Talmy Givón - Google Books

The long-awaited second volume of the two-volume work on syntax from a functional-typological perspective. Grammar is viewed as a non-arbitrary language-processing device, to be understood in terms of the various substantive parameters relevant to language: Communicative function, cognitive processing, socio-culture and neuro-biology.

Chapter 7 : CiteSeerX â€" Citation Query Syntax. A functional-typological introduction

We use cookies to distinguish you from other users and to provide you with a better experience on our websites. Close this message to accept cookies or find out how to manage your cookie settings.

Chapter 8 : Syntax: A functional-typological introduction. Volume II | T. Givón

This two-volume work on syntax views grammar as a non-arbitrary language-processing device, to be understood in terms of the various substantive parameters relevant to language: communicative.

Chapter 9 : Syntax: A Functional-Typological Introduction. Volume I by Talmy Givón

DOWNLOAD PDF SYNTAX A FUNCTIONAL-TYPOLOGICAL INTRODUCTION

A functional-typological analysis is interpretive and low on notational trap- pings; a mature theory in this mold will not change radically in asix-yearperiod. (One might consider, in contrast, how a two-volume textbook on formal syntax.