University of Cyprus
Department of English Studies

AIT562   <u>**NOMINAL MORPHOLOGY AND SYNTAX**</u>

<u>OBJECTIVE:</u>

Focusing on English and other languages, this course examines

    1. how nominal phrases are structured and

    2. how their features are morphologically expressed.

The following topics on the morphology and syntax of nominal constituents are studied: what are nouns? what is the role and function of gender, number, person, case? Where are demonstratives? What are determiners? What does plural really mean? Why can we sometimes have many articles? Are adjectives for real?

<u>COURSE OUTLINE</u>

LECTURE 1	Introduction: nominal phrases as sentences' poor relatives. The DP hypothesis and an alternative.
LECTURE 2	Determiners and Quantifiers. Are Determiners universal?
LECTURE 3	Analysing demonstratives within DPs: where and why
LECTURE 4	Multi article DPs
LECTURE 5	Person, Number and Gender: where and how
LECTURE 6	Pronouns and problominisation(s)
LECTURE 7	Pronouns of various sizes and forms: *Pro*, ellipsis and Indefinite Argument Drop
LECTURE 8	Empty Nouns (overt and covert)
LECTURE 9	Nominalisations
LECTURE 10	What are nouns? What are *really* NPs?

ASSESSMENT

Long paper:	50%
Presentations:	30%
Class Participation:	20%

Research-led teaching driving the design of the course:

In designing the course, I have followed the "obvious pattern", as aptly described by Dr McLean: I organized each lecture around a research topic which I have either engaged in or which have been interested in.

More specifically, Lectures 3, 4, 7, 8, 9 and 10 all correspond to research areas I have published and extensively presented on. This does not entail using the actual publications and presentations as principal study materials; on the contrary, in each of these lectures I present students with both the empirical issues themselves and the literature on them (and the gaps or problems in it), which prompted me in the first place to look into each of these topics. Then we evaluate the solutions offered in the research I was engaged in, and we examine the ways in which 'my' research was falsified, superseded, or incorporated into our understanding of the said empirical issues.

Lectures 1, 2, 5, 6 are themed after areas I have done intense reading on for the purpose of appropriately framing my research and/or setting the background for it. Here, the teaching style is more exploratory: I actively collaborate with students in outlining the questions that matter and the research paths that look promising. Moreover, students are actually invited and encouraged to come up themselves with criticism and ideas on the way the literature a) interprets empirical evidence and b) generates theoretical insights.

Research-led teaching driving the evaluation of the course:

Students in their presentations are invited to provide criticism on the literature and/or suggest their own solutions. This is achieved either by considering novel empirical data, e.g. from varieties they have a command on and which are under-represented in the literature, or by questioning and re-examing the theoretical accounts and the analyses on offer.

Interestingly, this is where *teaching feeds back into the research*: students come up with genuine matters in need of resolution, rethinking, or – even – a shift in point of view: this is the source of new topic of research on behalf of myself or students themselves.