

## Fédération « Typologie et Universaux Linguistiques »

### « Expression des comparaisons d'égalité et de similitude »

Resp. Yvonne Treis & Claudine Chamoreau

Atelier des 3 & 4 décembre 2014

Salle de Conférence

Villejuif

#### Mercredi 3 décembre

- 10h00 - 12h30 Birgit Hellwig (U. Cologne)  
« Semantic fieldwork: stimuli-based elicitation » (ci-après le résumé et ci-joint des articles pour préparer l'atelier)
- 12h30 - 14h00 Déjeuner - Buffet offert par le programme
- 14h00 - 17h00 Birgit Hellwig (U. Cologne)  
Discussion à partir de la présentation de différents types de stimuli  
Présentation et discussion des premiers stimuli créés pour l'expression de la comparaison d'égalité (avec Céline Ferlita, UPS Cultures, Langues, Textes)

#### Jeudi 4 décembre

- 10h00 - 12h30 Comparaison d'égalité et similarité : Différences et ressemblances ...  
Peut-on toujours les distinguer ?  
Présentation et discussion animées par Yvonne Treis et Claudine Chamoreau
- 12h30 - 14h00 Déjeuner - Buffet offert par le programme
- 14h00 - 17h00 Martine Vanhove (LLACAN) : Comparaison d'égalité et similarité en bedja  
Discussion du questionnaire « Expression des comparaisons d'égalité et de similitude 2014-2018 »

#### Résumé Birgit Hellwig

When collecting, interpreting and describing semantic data, we are faced with considerable methodological challenges – as Koptjevskaja-Tamm et al. (2007: 176) put it, “[this] enterprise is far from obvious even for the researcher’s native tongue; for other languages it easily gets insurmountable.” These difficulties exist already for native-speaker linguists, as they need to find ways of tapping into their own intuitions as well as into their fellow speakers’s intuitions. And it is even less clear how these challenges can be met by the many field linguists who are not native speakers of the languages they study. In fact, semantic text books often show considerable skepticism about the possibilities of semantic analyses under such conditions, arguing that we cannot fully rely on our established fieldwork methods.

Over the past few decades, we have gained considerable experience in addressing some of the methodological challenges involved, with many researchers assigning an important role to stimuli-based elicitation. This workshop focuses on such stimuli, covering especially the following points:

- The role of stimuli within semantic fieldwork: their advantages and disadvantages, and their uses in fieldwork alongside other types of data (elicited data, natural data).
- Different types of stimuli: an overview of different types of existing stimuli, their purposes and fieldworker’s experiences with them.

The workshop draws on the growing body of literature on this topic and on my own experience with semantic fieldwork in Nigeria, Sudan and Papua New Guinea. There will be ample time for discussions of the methods in general, and of possible transfers to the topic of comparisons of equality and similarity.

**Suggested readings for this workshop:**

- Du Bois, John W. 1980. Introduction: The search for a cultural niche: Showing the pear film in a Mayan community. In Wallace L. Chafe (ed.). *The pear stories: Cognitive, cultural, and linguistic aspects of narrative production*. Norwood, NJ: ABLEX Publishing Corporation. 1-7.
- Foley, William A. 2003. Genre, register and language documentation in literate and preliterate communities. In Peter K. Austin (ed.). *Language documentation and description* (Vol. 1). London: SOAS. 85-98.
- Hellwig, Birgit. 2010. Meaning and translation in linguistic fieldwork. *Studies in Language* 34.4: 802-831.
- Koptjevskaja-Tamm, Maria, Martine Vanhove & Peter Koch. 2007. Typological approaches to lexical semantics. *Linguistic Typology* 11: 159-185.
- Lüpke, Friederike. 2010. Research methods in language documentation. In Peter K. Austin (ed.). *Language Documentation and Description* (Vol. 7). London: SOAS. 55-104.
- Majid, Asifa. 2012. A guide to stimulus-based elicitation for semantic categories. In Nick Thieberger (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Fieldwork*. New York: Oxford University Press. 54-71.