

## LING 571 Syntax 2

MW 10:05 am - 11:25 am  
PE1085 002

Last updated on January 6, 2024

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: MW 1-2 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)<sup>1</sup>: 10%

Mini reading questions (myCourses): 8% (4 x 2%)

Assignments: 36% (2 x 12%-3%-3%)

*Would you publish it* (write-up 8% & discussion 4%): 12%

Critical review paper summary (150 words): 4%

Critical review presentation: 30%

### *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**. Here are the four stages involved in each of the two assignments:

---

<sup>1</sup> You can make contributions to class discussions by doing the reading assignment to be prepared to raise questions in class, by posting questions, data points, *etc.* on the Discussion board on myCourses, and also (indirectly) by asking questions and engaging in discussions with the instructor during the office hours.

- 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 for Stage a**. 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.

If you miss the deadline of Stage a, only partial credit could be given as we discuss the assignment in class immediately after the deadline.

### ***“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. **Main part: Critical evaluation of the proposed 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:

- The paper(s) that you are going to critically evaluate must be related to the topics covered in the course.
- A sign-up page on myCourses will be set up for meetings ([weeks 7, 8, 9](#)) to discuss your plans with me for a critical review. You should come to the meeting with potential papers to critically evaluate.
- In the meeting, we will discuss which one of your potential papers would be the most interesting, appropriate and doable given the time allotted. In order for you to leave the meeting with an interesting topic, it is crucial that you come prepared.
- Submit a summary of the paper (max. 150 words): due [Monday, March 18](#) (Your summary will not be accepted if you skip the above step.)

- Presentation: **12 minutes + 3 minutes for questions (tentative)**, Weeks 11 - 14 (You could choose to present on Monday in Week 11, 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 within 72 hours, barring weekends.
- **It is your responsibility to make sure that in each class, you have access to an electronic or 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/](http://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/](http://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/](http://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 Student Accessibility and Achievement (<https://www.mcgill.ca/access-achieve/>)

### **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.

### **Land acknowledgement**

McGill University is on land which long served as a site of meeting and exchange amongst Indigenous peoples, including the Haudenosaunee and Anishinabeg nations. We acknowledge and thank the diverse Indigenous people whose footsteps have marked this territory on which peoples of the world now gather.

**Schedule**  
(subject to change)

Wk: Date	Topic	Required readings	Other readings	Due
1: 1/8,10	<b>-Intro: Discovering structure</b> <b>-Why structure?</b> (Non-)Configurationality	Saito (1985) Ch. 2 pp. 20-54	Ko (2007); Hale (1983) Kathol and Rhodes (1999) LeSourd (2006) Russell and Reinholtz (1995) Tomlin and Rhodes (1992)	
2: 1/15, 17	<i>continued</i>			
3: 1/22,24	<b>-Structure inside VP</b> Layered VP projections	Larson (1988)	Beck and Johnson (2004) Bruening (2001); Marantz (1993) Pylkkänen (2008); Staub et al. (2006)	
4: 1/29,31	<b>-Functional projections</b> Head movt in head-final lgs	Han et al. (2007)	Kishimoto (2008)	1a (Mon) 1b (Wed)
5: 2/5,7	<i>continued</i>			1c (Mon)
	<b>-Nominalization</b>	Collins (1994)	Tamba (2014); Tamba et al. (2012)	1d (Wed)
6: 2/12,14	<i>continued</i>			
	<b>Binding Phenomena</b>	Charnavel (2020)		2a (Wed)
7: 2/19, 21	<i>continued</i>			2b (Mon)
	<b>mtg week</b>			2c (Wed)
8: 2/26,28	catch-up WYPI session (Wed)			WYPI prep sheet (Mon)
	<b>mtg week</b>			
	Winter Reading Break			
9: 3/11,13	<b>-Subject positions</b>	Bobaljik (2003)	McCloskey (1997); Kratzer (1996) Bošković (2004)	A2d (Mon)
10: 3/18,20	<i>continued</i>			
	<b>-Main clause phenomena</b>	McCloskey (2006)	Heycock (2017); Wood (2013)	paper summary (Wed)
11: 3/25, 27	<i>continued</i>			
	Presentations			
12: 4/3 (Wed)	Presentations			
13: 4/8,10	Presentations			
14: 4/11 (Th)	Presentations			

Last class for MW pattern = Thursday, April 11  
<https://www.mcgill.ca/importantdates/key-dates>

## References

- Beck, Sigrid, and Kyle Johnson. 2004. Double objects again. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35:97–123.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan. 2003. Floating quantifiers: Handle with care. In *The second Glot International state-of-the-article book*, ed. Lisa L.-S. Cheng and Rint Sybesma, 107–148. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bošković, Željko. 2004. Be careful where you float your quantifiers. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22:681–742.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2001. QR obeys superiority: frozen scope and ACD. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32:233–273.
- Charnavel, Isabelle. 2020. Logophoricity and locality: A view from french anaphors. *Linguistic Inquiry* 51:671–723.
- Collins, Chris. 1994. The factive construction in Kwa. In *Travaux de recherche sur le Créol Haïtien*, volume 23, 31–65.
- Hale, Ken. 1983. Warlpiri and the grammar of non-configurational languages. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 1:5–48.
- 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.
- Heycock, Caroline. 2017. Embedded root phenomena. *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Syntax, Second Edition* 1–37.
- Kathol, Andreas, and Richard A. Rhodes. 1999. Constituency and linearization of Ojibwe nominals. *Proceedings of WSCLA* 4:75–91.
- Kishimoto, Hideki. 2008. Ditransitive idioms and argument structure. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 17:141–179.
- Ko, Heejeong. 2007. Asymmetries in scrambling and cyclic linearization. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38:49–83.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1996. Severing the external argument from its verb. In *Phrase structure and the lexicon*, ed. Johan Rooryck and Laurie Zaring, 109–137. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Larson, Richard. 1988. On the double object construction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19:335–392.
- LeSourd, Philip S. 2006. Problems for the pronominal argument hypothesis in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy. *Language* 83:486–514.
- Marantz, Alec. 1993. Implications of asymmetries in double object constructions. In *Theoretical aspects of Bantu grammar I*, ed. Sam A. Mchombo, 113–151. Stanford University: CSLI Publications.
- McCloskey, James. 1997. Subjecthood and subject positions. In *Elements of grammar*, ed. Liliane Haegeman, 197–235. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- McCloskey, James. 2006. Questions and questioning in a local English. In *Crosslinguistic research in syntax and semantics: negation, tense, and clausal architecture*, ed. Raffaella Zanuttini, Héctor Campos, Elena Herburger, and Paul H. Portner, 87–126. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

- Pylkkänen, Liina. 2008. *Introducing arguments*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Russell, Kevin, and Charlotte Reinholtz. 1995. Hierarchical structure in a non-configurational language: Asymmetries in Swampy Cree. In *Proceedings of the West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. José Camacho, Lina Choueiri, and Maki Watanabe, volume 14, 431–445. Stanford: CSLI.
- Saito, Mamoru. 1985. Some asymmetries in Japanese and their theoretical implications. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Staub, Adrian, Charles Clifton Jr, and Lyn Frazier. 2006. Heavy np shift is the parser's last resort: Evidence from eye movements. *Journal of memory and language* 54:389–406.
- Tamba, Khady. 2014. Clausal nominalization in wolof. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Kansas.
- Tamba, Khady, Harold Torrence, and Malta Zimmermann. 2012. Wolof quantifiers. In *Handbook of quantifiers in natural language*, ed. E. L. Keenan and D. Paperno, 891–939. Springer.
- Tomlin, Russell S., and Richard A. Rhodes. 1992. Information distribution in ojibwa. In *Pragmatics of word order flexibility*, ed. Doris L. Payne, 117–135. John Benjamins.
- Wood, Jim. 2013. Inversion in embedded questions (Yale Grammatical Diversity Project: English in North America). Available online at <http://ygdp.yale.edu/phenomena/inversion-embedded-questions>. Accessed on 2021-09-20). Updated by Tom McCoy (2015) and Katie Martin (2018).