Syntax has uncovered a number of differences between languages which can be understood as differences in the distribution of various types of overt movement. We standardly say, for example, that some languages (like English) have overt wh-movement in ordinary wh-questions, while other languages (like Chinese) do not, and still others (like French) move their wh-phrases optionally, at least in some syntactic contexts. Similarly, English is described as having EPP effects of the classic type, which require the specifier of TP to be filled, typically by the subject, while this is not true, for example, in Italian.

Although we know a great deal about the syntactic properties of movement, syntactic theories generally have little to say about why overt movements are distributed cross-linguistically as they are. In Minimalism, for example, we standardly appeal to diacritic features or properties of features (“strong features” and their theoretical descendants) in order to describe the distribution of overt movement. These features typically have no properties other than triggering overt movement; in effect, they represent a claim that the distribution of overt movement in a given language is arbitrary, unconnected to any other facts about the language.

In this class we will consider a theory, called Contiguity Theory, which makes predictions about the distribution of overt movement. The approach explores the claim that overt movement is driven by considerations imposed on syntax by its interface with the phonological component. In particular, the idea is that there are universal conditions on the mapping of syntactic structures onto phonological structures, and that syntactic movement can sometimes be driven by the need to improve the phonological representation. Cross-linguistic differences in movement, on this account, are the consequence of phonological and morphological parameters, of a kind which can be observed independently.

Class requirements

The only requirement for this class is a squib at the end of around 1,000 words, related to the subject matter of the class (loosely understood), and due on the last day of the Institute.

This theory is still in the early stages of construction, so there are a lot of possible topics! One type of squib would demonstrate how the theory works, or doesn’t, for a language or a type of movement that it hasn’t been tried on yet. But you shouldn’t feel confined to this kind of topic, if you have something else related to prosody and syntax that you would like to write up.

If you’re interested in getting a grade for the class, please send me a one-sentence description of a possible topic by, let’s say, Friday, July 20th—but I encourage everybody who wants to talk with me, in person or by e-mail, about whatever topics interest them, whenever they want to.
Office hours

The Institute is recommending that we meet people in the basement of the William T. Young library. Right now, it looks like I’ll be able to be there regularly on Mondays 1-3, but you can also e-mail me (norvin@mit.edu) to set up a different time.

Rough schedule

Fri 7/7       Affix Support and the EPP.
Tue 7/11      EPP, Continued: Contiguity.
Fri 7/13      Probe-Goal Contiguity: wh-movement.
Tue 7/18      Probe-Goal Contiguity, continued: raising, pied-piping.
Fri 7/20      Selectional Contiguity: the FOFC, more on pied-piping.
Tue 7/25      Selectional Contiguity continued. Infinitives.
Fri 7/27      Head-movement.
Tue 8/1       Overview: deriving Contiguity. Future directions.
Sexual Harassment

The Linguistic Society of America is committed to providing its members with an environment that is free from sexual harassment in any form. To that end, it is the policy of the LSA that no LSA member, interviewer, publisher representative, or participant in any LSA-sponsored event, may engage in sexual harassment.

Sexual harassment consists of unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when:

- submission to such conduct is explicitly or implicitly made a term or condition of a person’s favorable interview report;
- submission to or rejection of such conduct by a person is used as the basis for making favorable or unfavorable decisions affecting the person; or
- such conduct has the purpose of creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive environment.

Sexual harassment can occur between individuals of the same or opposite sex. In addition to the behavior described above, sexual harassment may include, but is not limited to:

- lewd comments about an individual’s sex, sexuality, sexual characteristics, or sexual behavior;
- offensive sexually-oriented jokes or innuendos;
- sexually suggestive comments or obscene gestures;
- leering, pinching, or touching of a sexual nature.
This document is intended to serve as a basic ethical framework for linguists of all subdisciplines. We hope that linguists will find it a useful resource for indicating to local review bodies, funding agencies, potential research consultants, and others that they are professionally committed to carrying out their work in an ethical manner. The document is intentionally written to be highly general; the point is not to provide the sole or final voice on what counts as ethical practice, but to provide linguists with some guidance for making ethical choices. Overlap between this document and other principles and regulations is therefore inevitable. Redundancy—and even conflict—with other principles is welcome to the extent that it serves the broader aims of encouraging linguists to actively engage with the ethical issues that arise in the course of their professional activities and of fostering increased discussion of ethics within the discipline.
1. Introduction.

Linguists work in a variety of settings and approach the study of language from multiple disciplinary perspectives. Each setting presents its own set of potential ethical dilemmas. It is the responsibility of linguists individually and collectively to anticipate ethical dilemmas and to avoid bringing harm to those with whom they work.

Some kinds of linguistic research fall under the purview of formal human subjects regulations. This document is not meant to replace formal ethics oversight; nor is it meant to provide an exhaustive code of conduct. Rather, it is meant to provide linguists working in all subdisciplines with a very general framework for making ethical choices.

2. Responsibility to individual research participants.

Research participants share their knowledge and often aspects of their lives with researchers. Even when a project focuses exclusively on the language and does not require institutional ethics review, linguists should recognize the collegial status of language consultants and respect their rights and wishes. Linguists should do everything in their power to ensure that their research poses no threat to the well-being of research participants.

- Research participants have the right to control whether their actions are recorded in such a way that they can be connected with their personal identity. They also have the right to control who will have access to the resulting data, with full knowledge of the potential consequences.
- Linguists are responsible for obtaining the informed consent of those who provide them with data (regardless of whether and how that consent is documented), for maintaining any expected confidentiality in storing data and reporting findings, and for ensuring that any individual’s participation in their research is completely voluntary at every stage. Anonymous observations of public behavior, which often cannot involve consent, should include no information that could inadvertently identify individuals or,
where sensitive, the community.

- Linguists should carefully consider whether compensation of some kind is appropriate, be it remuneration for time and effort, or use of their knowledge and expertise to benefit participants or their communities.
- Where feasible, linguists should facilitate participants’ access to their research results.

3. Responsibility to communities.

While acknowledging that what constitutes the relevant community is a complex issue, we urge linguists to consider how their research affects not only individual research participants, but also the wider community. In general, linguists should strive to determine what will be constructive for all those involved in a research encounter, taking into account the community’s cultural norms and values.

Ideal frameworks for interaction with outside researchers vary depending on a community’s particular culture and history. In many communities, responsibility for linguistic and cultural knowledge is viewed as corporate, so that individual community members are not in a position to consent to share materials with outsiders, and linguists must try to determine whether there are individuals who can legitimately represent the community in working out the terms of research. Some communities regard language, oral literature, and other forms of cultural knowledge as valuable intellectual property whose ownership should be respected by outsiders; in such cases linguists should comply with community wishes regarding access, archiving, and distribution of results. Other communities are eager to share their knowledge in the context of a long-term relationship of reciprocity and exchange. In all cases where the community has an investment in language research, the aims of an investigation should be clearly discussed with the community and community involvement sought from the earliest stages of project planning.

4. Responsibility to students and colleagues.

Linguists should model and promote ethical behavior in all their professional activities. They should strive to minimize harm to students, colleagues, and others over whom they hold power.

- Linguists should recognize and properly attribute the contributions of
students and colleagues to their research. They should compensate students fairly for their assistance.

- Linguists should strive to evaluate student work in a fair and timely manner.
- Gender, marital status, race, ethnic background, social class, political beliefs, disability, religion, national origin, sexual orientation, age, and other such distinctions should not be used as a basis for discrimination.
- Intimate relations between instructors and students may lead to exploitation and conflicts of interest. Instructors and students should avoid such involvement when an instructor is in any way responsible for a student’s success.
- Linguists should ensure that their students receive instruction in the ethical practices appropriate for their field.

5. Responsibility to scholarship.

Linguists are collectively responsible for the reputation and progress of the discipline and should endeavor to maintain a high degree of professionalism in all aspects of their work.

- Linguists are subject to the standards of conduct found in other disciplines. They should practice honesty (e.g., by not plagiarizing or fabricating data) and carefully cite the original sources of ideas, descriptions, and data.
- Linguists conducting field research should do all they can to preserve opportunities for researchers who may follow them in the future.
- Linguists should make all reasonable efforts to preserve their original irreplaceable data and documentary materials.
- Linguists should strive to follow through on promises made in funded grant proposals and should acknowledge the support of sponsors.

6. Responsibility to the public.

Linguists have a responsibility to consider the social and political implications of their research.

- Linguists should make the results of their research available to the general public, and should endeavor to make the empirical bases and limitations of their research comprehensible to nonprofessionals.
• Linguists should give consideration to likely misinterpretations of their research findings, anticipate the damage they may cause, and make all reasonable effort to prevent this.
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