

1. Record Nr.	UNINA9910789251403321
Titolo	The evidential basis of linguistic argumentation // edited by Andras Kertesz, Csilla Rakosi
Pubbl/distr/stampa	Amsterdam, Netherlands ; ; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania : , : John Benjamins Publishing Company, , 2014 ©2014
ISBN	90-272-7055-4
Descrizione fisica	1 online resource (326 p.)
Collana	Studies in Language Companion Series, , 0165-7763 ; ; Volume 153
Disciplina	410.1
Soggetti	Linguistic models - Data processing Linguistic analysis (Linguistics) Linguistics - Research - Methodology Corpora (Linguistics) Computational linguistics
Lingua di pubblicazione	Inglese
Formato	Materiale a stampa
Livello bibliografico	Monografia
Note generali	Description based upon print version of record.
Nota di bibliografia	Includes bibliographical references and indexes.
Nota di contenuto	The Evidential Basis of Linguistic Argumentation; Editorial page; Title page; LCC data; Table of contents; Chapter 1.Introduction; 1. The aim of the volume; 2. On the state of the art; 3. On the p-model; 4. The structure of the book; Acknowledgements; References; Part I.The methodological framework; Chapter 2.The p-model of data and evidence in linguistics; 1. The problem; 2. A possible solution to (P)(a): The p-model; 2.1 Introductory remarks; 2.2 The uncertainty of information: Plausible statements; 2.3 Obtaining new information from uncertain information: Plausible inferences 2.4 The p-context and the p-context-dependency of plausible inferences 2.5 Problems, their solution and their resolution; 2.6 The problem solving process; 2.6.1 Plausible argumentation; 2.6.2 Problem-solving strategies; 2.7 The solution to (P)(a); 3. A possible solution to (P)(b): The p-model's concepts of 'data' and 'evidence'; 3.1 Data; 3.2 Evidence; 4. Conclusions; Acknowledgements; References; Part II. Object-theoretical applications; Chapter 3.The plausibility of approaches to syntactic alternation of Hungarian verbs; Chapter 4.

## Methods and argumentation in historical linguistics

1. Introduction  
2. Argumentation in historical linguistics; 2.1 Quantitative and qualitative data in historical research; 2.2 Frequency; 2.3 Analogy; 2.4 Summary; 3. A case study; 3.1 The starting p-context: Three accounts of the morphological development of the Catalan periphrastic perfective past; 3.1.1 Colon (1978a, b); 3.1.2 Detges (2004); 3.1.3 Juge (2006); 3.2 Extension of the starting p-context: The historical present; 3.3 Coordination of the extended p-context; 4. Modification of the p-context and comparison of the rival solutions; 5. Conclusions; Acknowledgements; Historical sources  
References  
Chapter 5. Hungarian verbs of natural phenomena with explicit and implicit subject arguments; 1. Introduction: Aims and the organisation of the chapter; 2. The rivalling approaches in the starting p-context: On the subjectlessness of verbs of natural phenomena in Hungarian; 2.1 Magyar Ertelmezo Keziszotar (Concise Explanatory Dictionary of Hungarian) (Pusztai 2003); 2.2 Magyar Grammatika (Hungarian grammar) (Keszler 2000); 2.3 Lexical-functional grammar (Komlosy 1994); 2.4 A generative syntactic analysis (Toth 2001); 2.5 The evaluation of the starting p-context  
3. Extending the starting p-context with new data  
4. Extending the p-context with results of previous research into implicit arguments in Hungarian; 4.1 Definition of implicit arguments and their occurrence in Hungarian; 4.2 Compatible rivalling proposals; 4.3 Non-compatible rivalling approaches; 5. Modification of the p-context: The occurrence of verbs of natural phenomena with implicit subject arguments in Hungarian; 6. The resolution of the starting p-problem in the modified p-context: The advantages of the analysis of verbs of natural phenomena with implicit and explicit subject arguments  
Acknowledgements

### Sommario/riassunto

This chapter provides a survey about the most frequent methods of inconsistency resolution in Optimality Theory. With the help of the p-model, inconsistencies in OT are divided into two main groups. The first group includes conflicts that are deemed to be fatal and are solved usually by the modification of the theory: namely, clashes between "linguistic data" (acceptability judgements) and applications of the model (results of the evaluation procedure). The second group consists of conflicts that are, in contrast, tolerable in the view of OT theorists: inconsistencies between constraints and t