

LING 571 Syntax 2 (CRN 19699)

MW 11:35 - 12:55
1085 Dr. Penfield Rm 002

Instructor: Junko Shimoyama

E-mail: Email via myCourses

(In case you use junko.shimoyama@mcgill.ca, please make sure to include “LING 571” in the subject line, otherwise I may not be able to respond to your email.)

Office location: 1085 Dr. Penfield Ave., Rm 219

Office hours: Mondays 1:00-2:30 pm & by appointment

Course Description

This course extends and refines the theory of grammar developed in Syntax 1 (LING 371), while introducing primary literature and theoretical developments. Practical emphasis is on development of argumentation and theory construction.

The course also includes activities that are designed for developing skills in: presenting your analysis articulately, providing and receiving constructive feedback among peers, and thinking critically (to be explained below).

Prerequisites

LING 201 and LING 371; or permission of instructor.

Course Requirements and Method of Evaluation

Contributions to class discussions (including in presentations by peers): 15%

Mini reading questions (myCourses): 15% (5 x 3%)

Assignments: 32% (2 x 10%-3%-3%)

Would you publish it (write-up & discussion): 10%

Critical review paper summary (150 words): 3%

Critical review presentation: 25%

Readings

Required readings will be available in online journals through the library website or on myCourses. The class discussions will assume that you have done the required readings. **You are expected to contribute to class discussions by bringing in your own questions and comments on the readings.** The purpose of mini reading questions is to help you with doing the required readings and with digesting materials covered in class, which in turn will help you make contributions to class discussions.

Assignments

In doing the assignments, in addition to providing a linguistic analysis to a given data set, you will practice **presenting the analysis articulately and concisely**. You will also learn how to **provide and receive constructive feedback to/from your peers**.

- Stage a: Submit your analysis (version 1).
- Stage b: Submit revised work reflecting class discussions (version 2).
- Stage c: Evaluate and provide constructive feedback on a classmate's version 2. (Peer review)

- Stage d: Submit revised work reflecting the feedback received (version 3).

In the preparation process for Stage a (and only Stage a), you may discuss problems with **one partner**. However, given the nature of how the assignments are set up for the course, it is very important that your responses reflect your own careful analysis of the problems, written up on your own.

If you choose to work with a partner, **write down the name of your partner**. Make sure you try to solve the problems on your own first, before you meet and discuss them with your partner. Near identical answers will be treated as probable cases of scholastic dishonesty and will be reported to the Office of the Dean of Students.

“Would you publish it?”

As a class we will pick one paper and practice (i) evaluating it critically and (ii) providing constructive feedback to the author(s). We try to follow a model similar to a ‘peer review’ process for actual journal article publication. You will be the ‘reviewers’ who will identify strengths and weaknesses of the paper. There will be a separate handout on this later.

Critical Review

In general, a critical review of a paper contains:

1. A brief summary of the goals and the main issues addressed in the paper.
2. Presentation of the main proposal and crucial data that support the main proposal.
3. **Critical evaluation** of the proposed analysis (Highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the analysis.)
4. Your critical review would go one-step further if it also contained discussions of further predictions made by the analysis you are critiquing and new data that bear on the analysis; discussion of your own questions.

Procedure:

- Sign-up page on myCourses will be set up for meetings to discuss your plans with me for a critical review. You should come to the meeting with potential papers to critically evaluate.
- Submit a summary of the paper (max 150 words): due Wed. March 11th (Your summary will not be accepted if you skip the above step.)
- Presentation: 10 minutes (tentative), Weeks 12 & 13 (You can choose to present in Week 11 instead, if you prefer.)
- Handout to be submitted on myCourses before your presentation (format and page limit to be specified later)

Course Policies

- No late work will be accepted unless you contact me with a legitimate excuse preferably before the due date or within 24 hours of the missed work, followed up with **a valid written document** (e.g., doctor’s notes, notes from IT Services in the case of technical issues on myCourses). There will be no make-up or extra credit work or re-weighting of grades in this course.

- If you have specific questions about the course material, please try to ask them in person whenever you can to avoid unfortunate miscommunication due to the nature of e-mail communication. Limit the use of email to other purposes and trivial questions that can be handled easily. If you have no choice but to ask questions by email, I will try to answer them as quickly as I can, but please note that my response time could be around 24 to 48 hours, barring weekends.
- It is your responsibility to make sure that in each class, you have access to an electronic copy or a printed-out copy of the handout posted on myCourses. Often, one handout covers more than one lecture, so if you use a printed-out copy, remember to bring your copy from a previous class if any materials are left undiscussed.

Copyright: Instructor-generated course materials

Instructor-generated course materials (e.g., slides, handouts, conference materials, assignments, quizzes, exam questions, answer keys, etc.) are protected by law and may not be copied or distributed in any form or in any medium without explicit permission of the instructor. Note that infringements of copyright can be subject to follow up by the University under the Code of Student Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures (see www.mcgill.ca/students/srr/honest/ for more information).

Academic integrity

McGill University values academic integrity. Therefore, all students must understand the meaning and consequences of cheating, plagiarism and other academic offences under the code of student conduct and disciplinary procedures (see www.mcgill.ca/students/srr/honest/ for more information).

L'université McGill attache une haute importance à l'honnêteté académique. Il incombe par conséquent à tous les étudiants de comprendre ce que l'on entend par tricherie, plagiat et autres infractions académiques, ainsi que les conséquences que peuvent avoir de telles actions, selon le Code de conduite de l'étudiant et des procédures disciplinaires (pour de plus amples renseignements, veuillez consulter le site www.mcgill.ca/students/srr/honest/).

Right to submit in French

In accord with McGill University's Charter of Students' Rights, students in this course have the right to submit in English or in French any written work that is to be graded.

Conformément à la Charte des droits de l'étudiant de l'Université McGill, chaque étudiant a le droit de soumettre en français ou en anglais tout travail écrit devant être noté (sauf dans le cas des cours dont l'un des objets est la maîtrise d'une langue).

Inclusive learning environment

As the instructor of this course I endeavour to provide an inclusive learning environment. However, if you experience barriers to learning in this course, do not hesitate to discuss them with me and the Office for Students with Disabilities, 514-398-6009.

Sustainability

McGill has policies on sustainability, paper use and other initiatives to promote a culture of sustainability at McGill. (See the Office of Sustainability website.)

Extraordinary circumstances

In the event of extraordinary circumstances beyond the University's control, the content and/or evaluation scheme in this course is subject to change.

Schedule
(tentative & subject to change)
Last update: January 6, 2020

Wk: Date	Topic	Required readings	Other readings	Due
1: Jan. 6, 8	Introduction Sentence structure Configurationality	Saito 1985 Ch. 2 pp. 20-54	Ko 2007, Hale 1983 Kathol/Rhodes 1999, LeSourd 2006	
2: Jan. 13, 15	continued		Russell/Reinholtz 1995 Tomlin & Rhodes 1992	
3: Jan. 20, 22	Structure inside VP Layered VP projections	Larson 1988	Beck/Johnson 2004, Bruening 2001 Marantz 1993, Pylkkänen 2008	A1a
4: Jan. 27, 29	Subject positions	Bobaljik 2003	McCloskey 1997, Kratzer 1996 Boskovic 2004	A1b A1c
5: Feb. 3, 5	Functional projections Head movt in head-final lgs	Han et al. 2007	Kishimoto 2008	A1d
6: Feb. 10, 12 mtg week	Movement & Ellipsis	Ott & de Vries 2015	Tanaka 2001, Merchant 2004	A2a
7: Feb. 17, 19 mtg week	Unexpected Case-marking Subj-to-Obj Raising	Horn 2008 (selection TBA)	Takano 2003	A2b A2c
8: Feb. 24, 26 mtg week	<i>Catch-up</i> WYPI session (Feb.26) Study break			WYPI prep sheet A2d
9: Mar. 9, 11	Main clause phenomena	TBA		paper summary
10: Mar. 16 18	continued			
11: Mar. 23, 25	<i>Catch-up week</i>			
12: Mar.30, Apr.1	Presentations			
13: Apr. 6, 8	Presentations			

Last class for MW pattern = Wed. April 8
<https://www.mcgill.ca/importantdates/key-dates>

References

- Bobaljik, Jonathan. 2003. Floating quantifiers: handle with care. In *The Second Glot International State-of-the-Article Book: The Latest in Linguistics*, ed. by Lisa Cheng and Rint Sybesma, 107-148. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Boskovic, Z. 2004. Be careful where you float your quantifiers. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22: 681-742.

- Beck, Sigrid and Kyle Johnson. 2004. Double objects again. *LI* 35: 97-124.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2001. QR obeys superiority: frozen scope and ACD. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 233-273.
- Hale, Ken. 1983. Warlpiri and the grammar of non-configurational languages. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 1: 5-47.
- Han, Chung-hye, Jeffrey Lidz and Julien Musolino. 2007. Verb-raising and Grammar Competition in Korean: Evidence from Negation and Quantifier Scope. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38:1-47.
- Horn, Stephen Wright 2008. Syntax, semantics, and pragmatics of accusative-quotative constructions in Japanese (Order No. 3300147). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (193742611). Retrieved from <https://proxy.library.mcgill.ca/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/193742611?accountid=12339>
- Kathol, Andreas and Richard Alan Rhodes. 1999. Constituency and linearization of Ojibwe nominals, in *Proceedings of WSCLA 4 - Workshop on structure and constituency in Native American Languages*, 75-91.
- Kishimoto, Hideki. 2008. On verb raising, in Shigeru Miyagawa and Mamoru Saito (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of Japanese Linguistics*, 107-140. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Ko, Heejeong. 2007. Asymmetries in scrambling and cyclic linearization. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38(1): 49-83.
- Kratzer, A. 1996. Severing the external argument from its verb, in *Phrase structure and the lexicon*, ed. by Johan Rooryck and Laurie Zaring, 109-137. Kluwer.
- Larson, Richard. 1988. On the double object construction. *LI* 19: 335-392.
- LeSourd, Philip. 2006. Problems for the pronominal argument hypothesis in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy. *Language* 82(3): 486-514.
- Marantz, Alec. 1993. Implications of asymmetries in double object constructions, in Sam Mchombo (ed.) *Theoretical Aspects of Bantu Grammar*, 113-150.
- McCloskey, James. 1997. Subjecthood and subject positions, in Liliane Haegeman (ed.) *Elements of Grammar: A Handbook of Generative Syntax*, Dordrecht: Kluwer. 197-236.
- Merchant, Jason. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics and philosophy* 27:661-738.
- Ott, Dennis, and Mark de Vries. 2015. Right-dislocation as deletion. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*.
- Pylkkänen, Liina. 2008. *Introducing Arguments*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Russell, Kevin and Charlotte Reinholtz. 1995. Hierarchical Structure in a Non-Configurational Language: Asymmetries in Swampy Cree. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, 431-445.
- Saito, Mamoru. 1985. *Some Asymmetries in Japanese and Their Theoretical Consequence*, PhD dissertation, MIT. (pp. 20-54)
- Tanaka, Hidekazu. 2001. Right-dislocation as scrambling. *Journal of Linguistics* 37:551-579.
- Tomlin, Russell. and Richard Rhodes. 1992. Information distribution in Ojibwa. *Pragmatics of Word Order flexibility*, ed. Doris Payne, 117-135. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.