

AG 6: Microvariation in quantificational structures

(Kurz-AG: 4 Std. Mi)

Sjef BarbiersMeertens Institute
Amsterdam**Ellen Brandner**Universität Konstanz
Fachbereich Sprachwissenschaft
PF 191
Universitätsstr. 10
78457 Konstanz
eleonore.brandner@uni-konstanz.de**Helmut Weiss**

Universität Frankfurt

Standardized (written) languages are known to be rather 'parsimonous' in the overt encoding of functional structure. One of the (probably) most cited examples is what is referred to as the 'Doubly filled Comp Filter'. Whereas in the standardized variant the complementizer is absent, many of the dialects of German(ic) insist on the overt realization of it:

- | | |
|--|-----------------|
| (1) a. ich möchte wissen mit wem du gesprochen hast | Standard German |
| b. i mechtet wissen mit wem dass'd gsprochen hast | Bavarian |
| c. i tät gern wüsse mit wem dass du g'schwätzt hesch | Alemannic |

This kind of explicit encoding is found especially in that part of the grammar that could be subsumed under the name "quantificational structures": Some examples would be NEGATION (negative concord), DETERMINER SYSTEM (different types of definite determiners, e.g. no ambiguity between definite and generic reading), QUANTIFIERS ACCOMPANIED BY DETERMINERS (as in: *a jeder, a so a guets Bier*), QUESTION FORMATION (see above), COMPARATIVES (*grösser als wie...*) among many others.

The investigation of phenomena of this kind seems to be promising under several perspectives:

- (1) The more explicit lexicalization can give us a clue for a finer-grained and more adequate analysis of the respective phenomena (cf. Matthewsons (2001) on quantifiers plus determiners).
- (2) A comparison between various dialects or spoken varieties can give us new insights on the amount of (micro-)variation possible within one language (system).
- (3), Finally, what can we learn about the properties of the items that tend to be omitted in standardized languages. Are they in fact "superfluous"? Is it the case that they are only omitted if the syntactic environment allows recoverability? Do standardized languages show more ambiguities than dialects, resp. spoken variants?

The latter questions raise also issues beside formal (detail)-analysis of the phenomena in question, since they touch also e.g. the difference between written and spoken language and whether (or to which extent) different parsing procedures are involved, or, more generally, to which extent are grammatical coding and parsing principles related to each other?

We invite contributions on the morphosyntax of quantificational structures in dialects (spoken varieties) presented in all kinds of formal frameworks.