

Hans-Heinrich Lieb
(editor)

**Linguistic research in progress:
The Berlin Research Colloquium on Integrational Linguistics
1992 – 2003.
Proceedings (Parts I to XXII).**

**Berliner Forschungskolloquium Integrative Sprachwissenschaft
1992 – 2003.
Protokolle (Teil I bis XXII).**

Part I:

Acknowledgements. Editor's Introduction.

Berlin: Freie Universität Berlin

2017

URL: http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_document_000000026894

DOI: 10.17169/FUDOCS_document_000000026894

Publication date: June 2017

© Hans-Heinrich Lieb

Terms of Use

The items archived on the Institutional Repository of the Freie Universität Berlin may be distributed free of charge by the FU Universitätsbibliothek (university library) and printed out, copied, and cited for study and research purposes, or any other responsible purpose (§53 UrhG, German Copyright Law).

Any use is subject to proper attribution of authorship/right holder. The authors of the works hold the copyright. The sole responsibility for document contents resides with the authors. Any commercial use of the documents, either in whole or in part, is strictly forbidden unless such use is by prior agreement with the author, for example, by means of a [Creative Commons License](#).

The user is responsible for complying with the statutory provisions; in the event of any misuse the user may be held responsible or liable to prosecution.

(Added:) Adaptation and remixing not allowed.

Dedicated
to the memory of
Ágnes Lieb-Dóczy
(1941 – 1999)

Acknowledgements

Editing and publishing a text that comprises more than seventeen-hundred pages, consists of twenty-two parts and was written over a period of more than ten years is a vast undertaking indeed. I owe major thanks to a number of co-workers who have been vital to its success.

First of all, there are my assistants, essential help in taking down and formulating the minutes, or draughts of the minutes, during the years in which the Research Colloquium was active. Names will appear from the Editor's Notes for individual parts of the *Proceedings*.

Thanks are also due to Robin Sackmann, Andreas Nolda, and Sören Philipps for their help in technical matters long after their time at the Freie Universität Berlin ended.

Most prominently, Sören Philipps has been instrumental in the publication of the *Proceedings*; without him, I could not have managed. Not only was my conception for the publication worked out in discussions with him, he also worked tirelessly to solve the considerable technical problems that had to be overcome.

In addition, my thanks go to the staff of the university server at the Freie Universität Berlin for their advice, and for their efficiency in getting this work online and looking after it.

Berlin, June 2017

Hans-Heinrich Lieb
Professor of Linguistics

Editor's Introduction

Hans-Heinrich Lieb
Freie Universität Berlin

Contents

1. General remarks
2. The *Forschungskolloquium Integrative Sprachwissenschaft*
 - 2.1 Origin of the Colloquium
 - 2.2 Period and size of activity
 - 2.3 Membership and language
 - 2.4 Aim
 - 2.5 The topics
3. The documentation: the *Proceedings*
 - 3.1 Size, method, and aims of the documentation
 - 3.2 What is being published
 - 3.3 Arrangement of text
 - 3.4 Production details
 - 3.5 The text and its 22 Parts. Identifiers
4. Background
 - 4.1 The Integrational framework
 - 4.2 On theories
 - 4.3 Three kinds of linguistic theories
5. Current relevance of the *Proceedings*
 - 5.1 Five relevance claims
 - 5.2 Claim 1: conceptual work
 - 5.3 Claim 2: work on the conceptual core of a theory of language
 - 5.4 Claims 3 and 4: choice of topics and semantic approach
 - 5.5 Claim 5: questions of method
6. The *Proceedings* and the *Integrational Linguistics* mini-series

1. General remarks

The *Proceedings*, covering close to 2000 pages (including some 260 pages of editorial text), are being published online as an open-access publication by the Freie Universität Berlin, constituting a series of twenty-two parts, separate but interconnected.

The twenty-two parts are accessible both jointly (technically, as a series, with a single URL) and individually, where each part has its separate URL and DOI; for text identifiers, see § 3.5, below. The terms of use are restrictive: the *Proceedings* and its Parts are free for downloading and personal use, but commercial use and changing of text is not allowed; copyright remains with the editor; and quotation requires indication of source.

The texts presented in the *Proceedings* are written in German. However, explanatory texts by the editor are newly written and are written in English to improve accessibility and to emphasize the claim of continuing relevance of the original texts irrespective of their time of creation (see § 3.5, below), of the language in which they are written (German), and of the background approach (Integrational Linguistics, IL – not to be confused with a similarly named framework developed by Roy Harris).

The *Proceedings* document the work of a linguistic research group as an ongoing process leading to specific results. They represent a type of text whose publication has become possible only due to individual universities joining the open-access movement. This explains the publication of the *Proceedings* well after termination of the group's work.

The work of the Research Colloquium was documented from the very beginning with eventual public presentation in mind. The resulting text of the *Proceedings* is published now for the following major reasons:

- i. Many results achieved by the Research Colloquium continue to be of general linguistic interest, over and above the importance they have had, and still have, for the framework that was adopted (Integrational Linguistics); indeed, the results may have grown in relevance. (See § 5, below.)
- ii. Since the path leading towards a given result is also documented, decisions that were eventually rejected, possibly wrongly so, are formulated and made available for reconsideration and for consideration in other linguistic frameworks.
- iii. Quotable text is finally provided for further work both within and outside the adopted framework.
- iv. The *Proceedings* are unique in presenting linguistic research not as a sequence of results but as an actual process: a self-organizing process at a university that involves a group of people, does not rely on outside financial support, continues through a large number of years, combines research and teaching, and is directed not towards data processing but towards the conceptual aspects of theory development.

It is hard to imagine how a research group like this one could exist anymore at a German university, or at any university in Europe, after the remodelling of the universities as quasi-industrial input-output institutions organized to serve the economic needs of a society, including, in Germany, a tendency to impose a foreign language (English) as the normal language in which to conduct university teaching and research even in the humanities. In particular, the organization of teaching in fixed modules, repetitive and test-oriented, rules out teaching as part of a long-term research colloquium like the one whose work is being documented. Nor is research and teaching of this kind encouraged by requiring faculty, at all levels, to maximize the number of publications in high-impact-factor journals, write elaborate applications for outside funding, evaluate applications written by others, and devote most of the time that is left to the non-stop marking of tests. Separating research from teaching organizationally is, of course, the end of any undertaking like the one that is being presented here. – The *Proceedings* provide an example of what is lost.

2. The *Forschungskolloquium Integrative Sprachwissenschaft*

2.1 Origin of the Colloquium

Between 1970 and 1990, my own work as a general linguist had been predominantly on developing a theory of formal grammars as axiomatic theories (rather than algorithms of one of the accepted types), and on formulating fragments of a theory of language that could be presupposed in the theory of grammars. Eventually, it became clear to me that working on the theory of language had to take precedence over further developing the theory of grammars. In 1991, I decided to discontinue my work on the theory of grammars for an indefinite period of time and to devote myself completely to further developing the conceptual part of the theory of language, also considering methodological questions as a side-line.

Nor did I want to do this all by myself. I decided to make full use of the means available to me as a full professor of linguistics at the Freie Universität Berlin instead of applying for outside funding, to save time and retain maximal independence. Being a firm believer in blending teaching with research, I settled on the format of a research colloquium, to be repeated each semester over a number of years; for a while, I would devote most of my research time to this colloquium and to its documentation rather than go on producing papers. Eventually, the documentation of the colloquium and its results were to be made generally available, in a suitable form.

This is how the *Forschungskolloquium Integrative Sprachwissenschaft* came into being at the Freie Universität Berlin in the winter of 1991/1992.

2.2 Period and size of activity

The research group was active, with a few interruptions, from the winter of 1991/1992 to the summer of 2003, either in a winter semester (8 semesters, on an average of 15 sessions at 90 minutes each) or in a summer semester (12 semesters, on an average of 12 sessions at 90 minutes each), which yields a total of 20 semesters. There were 269 sessions amounting to 403 hours of time.

2.3 Membership and language

Once the Colloquium got better known, membership settled at 12 to 15 participants at any given time: M.A. and Ph.D. candidates, before and after graduation; assistants, student assistants, advanced students, guest members; all with training in linguistics and representing different linguistic fields. Naturally, there was considerable turnover over the years, not only with respect to students; however, a hard core remained through most of the entire period, mostly consisting of members who had started out as students but then stayed on.

Giving a complete list of members is not feasible here, and such a list may not be of interest. Some names may appear in individual Parts of the *Proceedings*. (Whenever possible, I contacted former members for permission to leave their names unchanged.)

The degree of active involvement was different with different members of the group, but none were entirely passive. Being officially responsible for the Colloquium, and also because of the teaching component, I took a more active part in it myself than most other group members.

The majority of the participants were native speakers of German, but over the years there were also native speakers of English, French, Spanish, Catalan, Russian, Polish, Slovene, Georgian, Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Burmese, mostly with a good to excellent command of German. English was part of the general linguistic background. A number of other languages, such as Yinchia (Mon-Khmer?), two indigenous languages of South America (Tupí: Guaraní and Awetí), Portuguese, and Modern Hebrew were accessible through non-native speakers. Latin, Classical Greek, Hungarian, and Igbo were available as part of the language background of several participants.

The language used in the research group was German; other languages would not have worked in this group for this kind of research.

2.4 Aim

The general aim of the Research Colloquium was this: further development of the conceptual core of a theory of language conceived as below (§ 4.2); eventually, some work on questions of linguistic method was added. It was *conceptual work* that was required for achieving the general aim, of a type explained below (§§ 4.4 and 4.5). Such work may start from a few languages, and for initial orientation, it may even concentrate on a single one – in this case, German. However, the many different languages available through members of the group provided a natural background and guide for conducting all conceptual work even where it does not show in the published texts, and different languages were introduced explicitly into the discussion to prevent rash conceptual decisions.

2.5 The topics

For each semester a topic was agreed upon by the group, freely chosen as long as it was in agreement with the general aim of the Research Colloquium; it is only in the first semester and in the last two that the general topic was extended beyond work on a theory of language to include questions of linguistic methodology. The following topics were treated (WS = winter semester, SS = summer semester):

- (1) WS 1991/92 Der Begriff der Äußerung
The notion of utterance
- (2) SS 1992 Probleme der Nominalgruppe I
Noun Group problems I
- (3) WS 1992/93 Probleme der Nominalgruppe II
Noun Group problems II
- (4) SS 1993 Probleme der Nominalgruppe III
Noun Group problems III
- (5) SS 1994 Semantik der deutschen Nominale
The semantics of German nominal expressions
- (6) SS 1995 Relativsätze I
Relative clauses I

- (7) WS 1995/96 Relativsätze II
Relative clauses II
- (8) SS 1996 Valenz und Rektion I
Valence and government I
- (9) SS 1997 Valenz und Rektion II
Valence and government II
- (10) WS 1997/98 Kongruenz I
Agreement I
- (11) SS 1998 Kongruenz II / Ellipse I
Agreement II / Ellipsis I
- (12) WS 1998/99 Ellipse bei Koordination (Ellipse II)
Ellipsis in coordination (Ellipsis II)
- (13) SS 1999 Der Sprechaktaspekt der Integrativen Sprachtheorie I
Speech acts: the Integrational account I
- (14) WS 1999/00 Der Sprechaktaspekt II: Satzarten und Sätze
Speech acts, integrational II: sentence types and sentences
- (15) SS 2000 Der Sprechaktaspekt III: Satzarten, Bedeutungsrichtung und Sprechakttypen
Speech acts, integrational III: sentence types, directive part, and speech act types
- (16) SS 2001 Grundprobleme der Integrativen Morphologie I
Integrational Morphology: basic problems I
- (17) WS 2001/02 Grundprobleme der Integrativen Morphologie II
Integrational Morphology: basic problems II
- (18) SS 2002 Grundprobleme der Integrativen Morphologie III
Integrational Morphology: basic problems III
- (19) WS 2002/03 Integrative Methodologie mit besonderem Bezug auf die Syntax I
Syntactic methodology: an Integrational account I
- (20) SS 2003 Integrative Methodologie mit besonderem Bezug auf die Syntax II
Syntactic methodology: an Integrational account II

3. The documentation: the *Proceedings*

3.1 Size, method and aims of the documentation

Written minutes were produced for each session, excepting 8 sessions in the first semester in the winter of 1991/1992, amounting to a total of 261 *documented* sessions, or 391 hours. The overall documentation, written in German, essentially consisted of:

- i. the *minutes* of the sessions,
- ii. *written contributions* by members of the group,
- iii. a *descriptive table of contents* for the minutes of each semester and a *comprehensive index* for the complete body of texts.

The *size* of the minutes plus any written contributions varied between 26 pages for Topic (1), above, and 139 pages for Topic (14), with 80 pages as an average. Disregarding the minutes for Topic (1) and a number of written contributions by group members which could not be reproduced in the *Proceedings* for technical reasons, the over-all size of (i) to (iii) is about 1730 pages. *Documentation* took the following form.

For each session, *Minutes* were produced. They were to document the essential points that had been discussed, the course the discussion had taken, and any results that had been reached. Different styles were tried for formulating the minutes, but eventually a single format and style developed and was adhered to. Production took the following form.

First, a draught of the Minutes was produced for a given session, mostly by a student assistant, as part of his or her official duties, or else by myself. The draught was based on notes taken by whoever was in charge of the write-up, and on any additional material that had been distributed. The draught was then checked and improved upon by myself, sometimes extensively, and a copy of the final version was produced by the student assistant. This version was then copied and distributed at the beginning of the next session, usually in the following week.

The role of the student assistants was entirely within their official duties, and a single assistant was to be engaged in producing the minutes for all sessions during one or several semesters.

The body of texts created this way grew in size as time went on. To keep the proceedings manageable, Sören Philipps, working as a student assistant at the time (in 2000), developed a *descriptive table of contents*, close to a summary, for each semester and a *comprehensive index of terms*, with cross-references, for all minutes and for some of the written contributions. Philipps and others eventually completed this work for the entire body of texts resulting from the sessions.

The *immediate aim of the minutes* was group-internal: keeping track, for orderly progress, of what had been achieved at any given time, and documenting the results in view of the over-all aim of the Research Colloquium. However, there was an *additional aim* from the very beginning: eventually presenting the work of the research group to a larger linguistic audience, where it might be useful for others, too.

3.2 What is being published

The *non-editorial text* of the *Proceedings* can now be characterized more precisely as follows. It consists of:

- i. the minutes for Topics (2) to (20) (the minutes for Topic (1) have been omitted because of too provisional a form),
- ii. any material contributed to or used for individual sessions unless copyrighted or technically unsuited for reproduction,
- iii. the various Tables of Contents and Subjects and the Comprehensive Index of Terms.

All this is in German. In addition, there is the *explanatory text* written in English by the editor: the present “Editor’s Introduction”, and the “Editor’s Summary and Notes” for individual Parts of the *Proceedings*.

3.3 Arrangement of text

The *Proceedings* are arranged in twenty-two parts: Part I to Part XXII, each one listed below (§ 3.5) with its own URL. Part I is the present Editor’s Introduction. Parts II to XX correspond to the minutes of Topics (2) to (20), above. Part XXI contains the Tables of Contents and Subjects, and Part XII the Comprehensive Index of Terms.

Let **Y** be one of the Parts II to XX. Y begins with the *Editor’s Summary and Notes*, consisting of a Summary, mostly brief, of the minutes of Y, and of Notes that essentially contain:

- i. a *list of other relevant Parts* of the *Proceedings*, including the Tables of Contents and Subjects (Part XXI) and the Comprehensive Index of Terms (Part XXII), together with their identifiers;
- ii. *technical and other information* on the text of the minutes in Y;
- iii. remarks on the *subsequent treatment* of the topic of Y either in other Parts of the *Proceedings* or in later Integrational work – ‘*Continuation*’;
- iv. remarks on subsequent (especially recent) developments in linguistics pertaining to the topic of Y, remarks that show the current relevance of its treatment in the *Proceedings* – ‘*Later developments*’.

The Editor’s Summary and Notes are followed by the *Table of Contents and Subjects for the minutes that Y contains* (this Table is in German).

After this, there are the *Minutes*, in German, of the sessions documented in Y, together with *additional material* if any, inserted either before or after the first relevant session. In a few cases, this is still followed by an *Index* specific to the minutes of Y that has been extracted from the Comprehensive Index of Terms (Part XXII).

Pagination is separate for each Part of the *Proceedings*; it is in Roman numbers for the Editor’s Summary and Notes, and in Arabic numbers in the rest of a given Part. In Part II, pagination is partly missing or is separate for each Session; reference to this Part in Parts XXI (Tables of Contents and Subjects) and XXII (Index of Terms) is therefore not by page numbers but by Session dates. In Parts III to XX, there is only one pagination for the minutes of each Part, which may but need not be extended to added material; usually, added material has its own, independent page numbering. This rather complex pagination system has not been simplified because it is presupposed in Parts XXI and XXII.

In a few cases, page numbers are missing, with no loss of content.

3.4 Production details

Computer files were no longer available for the original German texts of the *Proceedings*, so *print-outs* had to be used for their reproduction. The *editorial texts* in English are, of course, newly written.

Some of the added material discussed in the Sessions was hand-written, including complex diagrams; this has been retyped by Sören Philipps, retaining the text distribution of the *hand-written versions* despite creating a large amount of empty space, in order to allow correct references to the retyped material when the Comprehensive Index of Terms (Part XXII) is used.

Generally, the *original texts* of Parts II to XXII of the *Proceedings* have been left unchanged, except for typographic corrections (some typos will have remained).

Dealing with the Semester print-outs was complicated. Scanning was followed by applying an optimization program, after which a program for digital cleansing was applied to individual pages to remove any stains. Next, an up-to-date OCR program was applied to the resulting pdf file to render the file available to *the search function of the pdf reader*. It is well known that in such a case the search function does not always yield reliable results, due to a limited recognition rate of the OCR program. (In the present case, recognition is generally reliable, though, except for subscripts and superscripts and for text that appears inside – as opposed to below – diagrams.)

This means, in particular, that use of the Comprehensive Index of Terms (Part XXII of the *Proceedings*) cannot be simply replaced by applying the search function of the pdf reader, quite independently of the fact that this function is blind with respect to content.

The newly written or retyped texts were not subject to this treatment, and the OCR program was not applied to them, which makes the search function of the pdf reader apply in the usual way.

After pdf files had been obtained for the various types of texts to be included in a given Part, these were combined into a single file by applying a combination program. (All technical steps were taken by Sören Philipps.)

3.5 The text and its 22 Parts. Identifiers

The complete text of the *Proceedings* can be addressed under its series URL:

http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_series_000000000782

The twenty-two Parts of the *Proceedings*, each with its own URL and DOI, are now listed as follows (each Part can be individually addressed under its URL):

- I. Acknowledgements. Editor's introduction

http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_document_000000026894
10.17169/FUDOCS_document_000000026894

- II. SS 1992 Noun Group problems I
Probleme der Nominalgruppe I
- http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_document_000000026891
10.17169/FUDOCS_document_000000026891
- III. WS 1992/93 Noun Group problems II
Probleme der Nominalgruppe II
- http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_document_000000026895
10.17169/FUDOCS_document_000000026895
- IV. SS 1993 Noun Group problems III
Probleme der Nominalgruppe III
- http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_document_000000026896
10.17169/FUDOCS_document_000000026896
- V. SS 1994 The semantics of German nominal expressions
Semantik der deutschen Nominalen
- http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_document_000000026897
10.17169/FUDOCS_document_000000026897
- VI. SS 1995 Relative clauses I
Relativsätze I
- http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_document_000000026898
10.17169/FUDOCS_document_000000026898
- VII. WS 1995/96 Relative clauses II
Relativsätze II
- http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_document_000000026899
10.17169/FUDOCS_document_000000026899
- VIII. SS 1996 Valence and government I
Valenz und Rektion I
- http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_document_000000026900
10.17169/FUDOCS_document_000000026900

- IX. SS 1997 Valence and government II
Valenz und Rektion II
- http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_document_000000026901
10.17169/FUDOCS_document_000000026901
- X. WS 1997/98 Agreement I
Kongruenz I
- http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_document_000000026902
10.17169/FUDOCS_document_000000026902
- XI. SS 1998 Agreement II / Ellipsis I
Kongruenz II / Ellipse I
- http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_document_000000026903
10.17169/FUDOCS_document_000000026903
- XII. WS 1998/99 Ellipsis in coordination (Ellipsis II)
Ellipse bei Koordination (Ellipse II)
- http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_document_000000026904
10.17169/FUDOCS_document_000000026904
- XIII. SS 1999 Speech acts: the Integrational account I
Der Sprechaktaspekt der Integrativen Sprachtheorie I
- http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_document_000000026905
10.17169/FUDOCS_document_000000026905
- XIV. WS 1999/00 Speech acts, integrational II: sentence types and sentences
Der Sprechaktaspekt II: Satzarten und Sätze
- http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_document_000000026906
10.17169/FUDOCS_document_000000026906

- XV. SS 2000 Speech acts, integrational III: sentence types, directive part, and speech act types
Der Sprechaktaspekt III: Satzarten, Bedeutungsrichtung und Sprechakttypen
- http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_document_000000026907
10.17169/FUDOCS_document_000000026907
- XVI. SS 2001 Integrational Morphology: basic problems I
Grundprobleme der Integrativen Morphologie I
- http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_document_000000026908
10.17169/FUDOCS_document_000000026908
- XVII. WS 2001/02 Integrational Morphology: basic problems II
Grundprobleme der Integrativen Morphologie II
- http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_document_000000026909
10.17169/FUDOCS_document_000000026909
- XVIII. SS 2002 Integrational Morphology: basic problems III
Grundprobleme der Integrativen Morphologie III
- http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_document_000000026910
10.17169/FUDOCS_document_000000026910
- XIX. WS 2002/03 Syntactic methodology: an Integrational account I
Integrative Methodologie mit besonderem Bezug auf die Syntax I
- http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_document_000000026911
10.17169/FUDOCS_document_000000026911
- XX. SS 2003 Syntactic methodology: an Integrational account II
Integrative Methodologie mit besonderem Bezug auf die Syntax II
- http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_document_000000026912
10.17169/FUDOCS_document_000000026912

- XXI. Tables of Contents and Subjects
Inhalts- und Themenverzeichnisse

http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_document_000000026913
10.17169/FUDOCS_document_000000026913

- XXII. Comprehensive Index of Terms
Stichwort-Gesamtverzeichnis

http://edocs.fu-berlin.de/docs/receive/FUDOCS_document_000000026914
10.17169/FUDOCS_document_000000026914

4. Background

4.1 The Integrational framework

The background for work in the research group was provided by Integrational Linguistics (IL); for a general characterization of IL, see Sackmann (2006), (2008):

Sackman, Robin. 2006. "Integrational Linguistics (IL)". In: Keith Brown (ed.-in-chief). Encyclopedia of language and linguistics. 2nd edition. Oxford: Elsevier. Vol. 5. 704–713.

Sackmann, Robin. 2008. "An introduction to Integrational Linguistics". In: Robin Sackmann (ed.) Explorations in Integrational Linguistics: four essays on German, French, and Guaraní. (Studies in Integrational Linguistics, 1). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: Benjamins. (= Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 285). 1–20. [Reprint of Sackmann, R. (2006), slightly updated].

For those who would like to know more about Integrational Linguistics (IL), here is its *internet address*, which will take you to its Homepage (also providing access to the Homepage of Hans-Heinrich Lieb; both Homepages are currently – as of June 2017 – under revision):

www.integrational-linguistics.science

The relevance of the work done by the Research Colloquium is neither restricted to, nor restricted by, the background that was adopted. This is partly due to a distinction made in Integrational Linguistics between linguistic theories of three different kinds, a distinction that has general application in linguistics. As the relevance claims to be made partly depend on it, the distinction must be briefly characterized, after a few remarks on theories in general.

4.2 On theories

The conception of theories underlying the work documented in the *Proceedings* is developed and explained in detail in Lieb (1983) and Lieb (*to appear*):

Lieb, Hans-Heinrich. 1983. Integrational Linguistics. Vol. I.: General Outline. (Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 17). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Lieb, Hans-Heinrich (to appear). “Describing linguistic objects in a realist way”. In: Behme, Christina, and Martin Neef (eds.), *Essays on Linguistic Realism*. Amsterdam: Benjamins,

On this conception, any theory contains sentences formulating assumptions, and may contain definitions of terms. The *conceptual core of an empirical theory* consists of those definitions and assumptions that are considered to be exempt from change when the theory is applied (the core may eventually be changed, too, giving rise to a different theory). The adequacy of a theory very much depends on the adequacy of its conceptual core.

4.3 Three kinds of linguistic theories

Theories of language are taken to be empirical theories of arbitrary ‘historical languages’ and their varieties, in particular, their periods and stages; they deal not only with linguistic systems but also with language use. Languages and their varieties are construed as abstract objects understood in a ‘realist’ way, which excludes construing versions of ‘Universal Grammar’, however understood, as theories of language.

Grammars are conceived as empirical theories (descriptions) of individual idiolects, language varieties, or languages. A *theory of grammars* is a theory whose domain consists of grammars, which may be grammars of a specific type. Such a theory is empirical, too (a prescriptive framework for grammars is not conceived as a theory).

Theories of language are basic to grammars because both grammars of individual languages and comparative grammars are formulated – either explicitly or implicitly – ‘in terms of’ a theory of language: it is a theory of language that supplies most of the terminology to be used in formulating grammars of a given type, and supplies the general assumptions on a grammar’s object that are presupposed by the grammar. On an Integrational view, a theory of language contains functional or relational constants such as “(is an) adjective of” – defined or primitive in the theory – that are relativized to the idiolect systems of arbitrary languages and may be used in grammars that presuppose the theory of language, as follows. A grammar of a language or language variety L contains a name of L. In describing L, we formulate general statements on the systems of all idiolects in L, restricting terms from the theory of language to such systems as in: “For any system S of any idiolect in L, adjective-of-S has P”, where adjective-of-S is the set of lexical words that stand to S in the relation ‘(is an) adjective of’ to S, and P is a property of sets of lexical words.

Now suppose that we have two grammars of two different languages L_1 and L_2 that presuppose the same theory of language. In statements of the above form, the expression “adjective-of-S” is then restricted to systems of idiolects in L_1 in one grammar and to systems of idiolects in L_2 in the other. However, the term “adjective” does not change its meaning; it is used as introduced in the presupposed theory of language, to denote the relation ‘(is an) adjective of’, for idiolect systems in arbitrary languages. This makes the two statements strictly comparable with respect to their denotation; analogously, for other grammatical terms.

Theories of language are also basic to theories of grammars, be it only for the fact that any theory of grammars must be able to specify the relationship between a grammar and its object, which requires having access to a theory specifying the nature of such objects.

Given these distinctions, the relevance claims for the *Proceedings* can now be formulated.

5. Current relevance of the *Proceedings*

5.1 Five relevance claims

The *Proceedings* can claim current relevance in at least five respects (more specific relevance claims will be made in the Editor's Notes for individual Parts of the *Proceedings*):

1. What is represented, is **conceptual work**. Vast amounts of linguistic data have become readily available to an extent that until recently would have been unimaginable. This increases rather than decreases the importance of conceptual work, not only in linguistic methodology where the need for conceptual work is obvious and undisputed, but also in general linguistics, where theories of language are developed: ultimately, it is such theories by which the relevance of linguistic data – outside a purely technological context – must be judged.
2. Most of the work represented here attempts to develop the **conceptual core of a theory of language**. As just explained, such a theory supplies a framework for the description – either individually or comparatively – of arbitrary languages. Concentrating on the conceptual core of a theory to be used in this way provides a much needed corrective to current theories of grammars that try to do without a theory of language in dealing with grammars.
3. The **topics** chosen in the *Colloquium* for actual consideration are key topics that any theory of language must consider in its system-related part, topics that are of continuing interest in grammar writing.
4. **Semantic problems** that are discussed in the *Proceedings* concern a theory of language whose semantic part, though formal, is not model-theoretic but combines three traditions: the realist, the mentalist, and the meaning-as-use tradition, in agreement with a more liberal view of linguistic meaning that has been developing in recent semantics.
5. Questions of **method** that are considered concern, in particular, methods for evaluating the results of linguistic analyses that apply statistical methods to large corpora of language data.

The five claims will now be explained and justified.

5.2 Claim 1: conceptual work

The actual and potential availability of large linguistic corpora and the availability of new types of data (e.g., from brain imaging) has created an urgent need for two types of work: development of adequate methods for dealing with vast amounts of data, possibly of new types, and sharpening, or newly developing, theoretical tools and methods for evaluating the relevance of results. Much effort is currently spent on the first type of work but comparatively little on the second; available linguistic frameworks simply tend to be used in practical work. It is especially in this second area of theoretical tools and evaluation methods that the *Proceedings* make their contribution through painstaking conceptual work.

Sharpening or developing theoretical tools requires both conceptual work and data-driven studies; it is a mistake to try and create an either-or opposition between the two. However, while the grasp of a theoretical tool must be adequate for dealing with the data, developing it will hardly ever be an automatic result of applying methods to ever more data (despite recent progress in deep machine learning). Conceptual work requires talent, knowledge, patience, and luck, and may well be considered an art.

Several stages of *theory-related conceptual work* may be distinguished, roughly as follows. At a *first stage*, we may start from a few languages to develop our theoretical conceptions; for initial orientation, we may even concentrate on data from a single language, as long as this is done in a context in which data from other languages are at any time available. At a *second stage*, the conceptions developed at the first stage are confronted with data from a larger number of typologically different languages. At a *third stage*, the theoretical conceptions developed at the first stage are modified, and added to, by the results obtained at the second stage. The three stages may of course interlink, and may be repeated cyclically, covering ever larger numbers of languages.

The work represented in the *Proceedings* is predominantly stage-one conceptual work on a theory of language, but some stage-two and stage-three steps are also taken.

5.3 Claim 2: work on the conceptual core of a theory of language

In the case of a theory of language, understood as above, the conceptual core must be such that the *theory supplies a framework, especially a terminology, for the description of arbitrary languages*, as outlined above (§ 4.3). It is exactly to such a core that the *Proceedings* make contributions. This makes the results obtained in the *Proceedings* immediately relevant to a major problem in current linguistics.

A situation has developed where informal grammar writing, formal grammar writing (mostly, in the context of language technology), comparative studies and work in general linguistics coexist without being properly related. It is argued in Lieb (*to appear*) that the missing link between all of these is theories of language: they are informally presupposed in informal grammars; should be explicitly introduced into the frameworks for formal grammars from which they are currently absent, thus providing formal grammars, too, with the language-overarching grammatical terminology that is typical of informal grammars; should be seen as supplying comparative linguistics with most of the terminology used in language comparison; and should be conceived, in general linguistics, as establishing the general properties of natural human languages, in a fairly traditional sense. (Basically the same position is already taken in Lieb 1983.)

Lieb, Hans-Heinrich. 1983. Integrational Linguistics. Vol. I: General Outline. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: Benjamins. (= Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 17).

Lieb, Hans-Heinrich. To appear. “Describing linguistic objects in a realist way”. In: Behme, Christina, and Martin Neef (eds), *Essays in Linguistic Realism*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

In particular, a theory of language like the one partially developed in the *Proceedings* may help to settle the current debate concerning ‘comparative concepts’ vs. ‘descriptive categories’ in language description (a debate prominent in typology since Haspelmath 2010 but also beginning to make its appearance in computational linguistics, compare Müller 2016: Ch. 22; for details, see Lieb *to appear*). ‘Comparative concepts’, to be used in language compari-

son, can be construed as constants of a theory of language that are relativized to the idiolect systems of many or all languages; and the ‘descriptive categories’ of individual grammars can be identified with the complex grammatical terms (see § 4.3, above) to which these constants give rise in the grammars of individual languages.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2010. “Comparative concepts and descriptive categories in crosslinguistic studies”. *Language* 86(3): 663-687.

Müller, Stefan. 2016. Grammatical theory: From transformational grammar to constraint-based approaches (Textbooks in Language Sciences 1). Berlin: Language Science Press.

It is part of the relevance of the *Proceedings* that it contains significant contributions to a general theory of language that may be equally useful for grammar writing, comparative studies, and work in general linguistics.

5.4 Claims 3 and 4: choice of topics and semantic approach

The specific *Topics* chosen for work in the Colloquium (see § 2.5, above) are obviously of continued importance in linguistics; it will appear from the various Parts of the *Proceedings* that this is also true of their treatment and of the results that are obtained.

The theory of language under development in the *Proceedings* embodies a *semantic approach* that is even more topical than it was at the time of the Colloquium, due to the following features. In *lexical semantics*, the approach is psychological, identifying lexical meanings with concepts in a psychological sense, but concept intensions and extensions follow a classical ‘realist’ tradition. In *sentence semantics*, the approach is in the meaning-as-use tradition.

The semantic part of the theory of language is unique in combining all three major traditions in semantics: psychological or mentalist, realist, and meaning-as-use (in the speech-act tradition). This is superior to model-theoretic semantics, dominant for several decades in formal semantics but representing only one tradition, the realist; superior to traditional ‘concept’ versions of lexical meanings, following only the psychological approach; and to semantic conceptions that are just in the speech-act tradition or are narrowly utterance-based (currently represented by ‘distributional semantics’).

Currently, the walls between these three major traditions are beginning to crumble, as demonstrated by some recent conferences devoted to semantics. The semantic approach taken in the *Proceedings*, being truly integrational, is directly relevant to this development and may help to strengthen it.

5.5 Claim 5: questions of method

Dealing with big data requires an adequate methodology also in linguistics. Corresponding methods have been under development for some time; to mention but one relevant publication:

Schäfer, Roland, and Felix Bildhauer. 2013. Web corpus construction. San Francisco, CA: Morgan and Claypool.

However, such methods do not exhaust what must be available to the linguist. For suppose we apply statistical methods to a large linguistic corpus to clarify a certain linguistic problem. The results must still be *evaluated* not only with respect to the original problem but also in regard of generalizability; in addition, we may have to establish how the results relate to a larger problem set to which the original problem belongs. For evaluation of this kind, adequate methods should also be available, which appears to be rarely recognized.

Parts XIX and XX of the *Proceedings* provide an example of the need for such methods and how it may be satisfied in a specific case; thus, they complement the work – on the conceptual core of a theory of language – that is represented in the preceding Parts II to XVIII.

6. *The Proceedings and the Integrational Linguistics mini-series*

In recent years, I have once again taken up work on the mini-series on Integrational Linguistics, “Integrational Linguistics: Foundations and Development”, to be published by Benjamins and currently planned to comprise the following eight volumes:

- Volume I: General Outline
- Volume II: Conceiving Linguistics
- Volume III: Integrational Phonology
- Volume IV: Morphology and Syntax
- Volume V: Semantics
- Volume VI: Word Formation and Inflection
- Volume VII: Coordination. With special reference to German
- Volume VIII: Speech Acts and the Imperative Sentence Type. With special reference to German

Volume I was published in 1983. Volumes II to V will mostly contain material that has been published over the years, up to and including the present. Work on Volumes VI to VIII is in progress; the volumes will consist of new material. I hope to finish this undertaking over the next few years.

The Berlin Research Group on Integrational Linguistics, whose work is represented in the *Proceedings*, was, among other things, a vast laboratory providing a basis for the eight volumes: counting the hours spent by each member of the group separately, it turns out that there are thousands of hours of work – not just by myself – behind them.