

#### המחלקה ל ספרויות זרות ובלשנות, תש"פ

Name of the course: Methodological Principles in Linguistics

Lecturer name: Idan Landau

Course number:
Office hours:

#### Short course description (5-10 lines) with key words at the end of the paragraph

Learning to construct a valid argument and identify a flawed one are fundamental skills in any scientific inquiry, including generative linguistics. In this course we attempt to enhance and refine this skill by reading through a series of linguistic debates: areas of disagreement among linguists, which have produced a rich array of arguments and counter-arguments. We will evaluate these arguments, focusing on their methodological aspects rather than their specific analytical claims.

### **Course requirements:**

Attendance required yes
Participation 10%
Presentation 20%
Final paper 70%

## סילבוס מפורט של הקורס (נושאים, לוח זמנים, ספרות חובה/בחירה וכדומה)

Larson, Richard K. 2010. Grammar as Science. MIT Press, "Constructing Arguments", p. 169-193.

#### **Philosophical foundations**

Quine, W. V. 1969. Reply to Chomsky. In *Words and Objections*, ed. by Donald Davidson and Jaakko Hintikka, 302-311. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.

Quine, W. V. 1970. Methodological Reflections on Current Linguistic Theory. Synthese 21, 386-398.

Schwartz, Robert. 1969. On Knowing a Grammar. In *Language and Philosophy*, ed. by Sidney Hook, 183-190. NY, New York: NYU Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1975. Reflections on Language, p. 166-204. New York: Pantheon Books.

#### Raising to Object / ECM

Postal, Paul M. 1974. On Raising (chapter 4). Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Bresnan, Joan. 1976. Nonarguments for Raising. Linguistic Inquiry 7, 485-501.

#### **Double object constructions / Dative shift**

Larson, Richard. 1988. On the Double Object Construction. Linguistic Inquiry 19, 335-391.

Jackendoff, Ray. 1990. On Larson's Treatment of the Double Object Construction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21, 427-456.

Larson, Richard K. 1990. Double Objects Revisited: Reply to Jackendoff. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21, 589-632.

## Middles and implicit agents

- [1]/3 Stroik, Thomas. 1992. Middles and Movement. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23, 127-137.
- []/3 Zribi-Hertz, Anne. 1993. On Stroik's Analysis of English Middle Constructions. Linguistic Inquiry 24, 583-589.
- 1/3 Stroik, Thomas. 1995. On Middle Formation: A Reply to Zribi-Hertz.

Linguistic Inquiry 26, 165-171.

## Broad subjects and left dislocation in Hebrew

Doron, Edit, and Caroline Heycock. 1999. Filling and Licensing Multiple Specifiers. In *Specifiers: Minimalist Approaches*, ed. by David Adger, Susan Pintzuk, Bernadette Plunkett and George Tsoulas, 69-89. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Landau, Idan. 2009. Against Broad Subjects in Hebrew. Lingua 119, 89-101.

Doron, Edit, and Caroline Heycock. 2010. In Support of Broad Subjects in Hebrew. *Lingua* 120, 1764-1776. Landau, Idan. 2010. Alleged Broad Subjects in Hebrew: A Rejoinder to Doron & Heycock 2010. To appear

# Fragments and ellipsis

in *Lingua*.

Merchant, Jason. 2005. Fragments and Ellipsis. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 27, 661-738.

Valmala, Vidal. 2017. The Syntax of Little Things. In *Proceedings of IATL 23*, Jerusalem: The Hebrew University. W

Weir, Andrew. 2015. Fragment Answers and 'Exceptional Movement Under Ellipsis': A PF-movement Account. In *Proceedings of NELS 45*, ed. by Thuy Bui and Deniz Özyıldız, 175-188. Amherst: GLSA Publications.