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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **1** | *"We should begin by saying what this course is about...". According to what she says next, what is syntactic theory? [00:00 - 01:00]* |
| (a) ‘the kinds of rules that determine how words in a language are put together into larger units that have meaning and how speakers of a language are able to determine what are possible and impossible order of words in their language’ .  also (b): what speakers know when they know the syntax of their language.  NB: this is what a descriptivist answers the question ‘what is syntactic theory’ …. and for this course at least you are a DESCRIPTIVIST! |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **2** | *How does the prescriptivist grammarian answer this?* |
| The **PRESCRIPTIVIST** says: a spealer who knows the syntax of their language knows what rules they should follow in order to produce good sentences. i.e., they know the rules of good grammar. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **3** | She claims that prescriptive rules describe exceptions in the knowledge that speakers have about their languages. What is the argument she give to back that up? [02:00 - 03:00] |
| Prescriptive rules are rules that speakers consciously follow and that were taught to them (or that they learned) explicitly, often in an academic setting. But most of what a speaker knows about their language was learned/acquired unconsciously and without any kind of explicit and/or formal teaching.  So prescriptive rules are the exception rather than the general case of the kind of knowledge that speakers have of their language. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **4** | Explain briefly how prescriptive grammar rules are like laws of a country and descriptive grammar rules are like laws of nature. 'observations about regularities in the universe'[03:00 - 9:00] |
| Descriptive rules are like laws of nature. They are observations about how what actually happens. The physicist looks at how matter, space and time behave. The chemist observes the structure of matter. The biologist observes living organisms. The (experimental) psychologist observes behaviour of living organisms. The descriptive grammarian/linguist is interested in observing the regularities of linguistic behaviour.  Prescriptive rules are like laws of a country. They describe what should or shouldn’t be done and they include punishment for disobedience. The punishment for disobeying prescriptive rules would be some kind of social prejudice (for example, in Portuguese, people who say ‘menas cadeiras’, ‘conje’ etc are regarded as uneducated). |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **5** | She mentions that some countries have an authority that 'gets to codify what is considered correct or incorrect in linguistic behaviour'.  Is Brazil one of those? If so, what is/are those authorities? Are the UK, USA, Australia amongst those? |
| Yes Brazil is one of those. In Brazil Academia Brasileira de Letras and Congresso Nacional (acordo ortgráfico is a law, for example) codify what is considered correct. No UK, US and A and Australia are not among those countries which have an authority to codify for language. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **6** | "Societal laws are a good guide to what people actually do." Explain. Is the same true for prescriptive language rules? Think of 3 examples in Portuguese.[05:00 - 06:00] |
| Prescriptive rules, like societal laws are a good guide to how people actually behave/speak. Laws/rules are only made to keep people from behaving in undesirable ways. We pass laws against theft, because people steal things. So the existence of a rule is a good guide to actual behavior. And that is also true with respect to prescriptive grammar rules. prescriptive grammarians make rules against ways of speaking that they find undesirable.  Examples could be:  - you shouldn’t use the subject pronoun ele/ela as complements of verbs (vi ele/a, encontrei ele/a etc) … of course people do it all the time.  - never start a clause with pronome oblíquo átono, for example : Me disseram is wrong … of course people do it all the time too (who the hell says disseram-me???)  - pronome oblíquo tónico can never be subject of an infinitival verb (‘não é *para mim fazer* é *para eu fazer* … *mim não faz nada*’) …. of course people do that all the time as well |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **7** | She mentions one way in which prescriptive rules of language often arise. Summarise it. Are efforts to keep language in its 'original form' frequently successful. [6:00 - 7:00] |
| Frequently it is when there is more than one way of saying the same thing and one of those ways becomes more prestigious than the other (for example, because it is more common in a dominant societal group). |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **8** | What is a descriptive grammarian/linguist interested in doing? [08:00 - 09:00] |
| The descriptive grammarian/linguist is interested in observing the regularities of linguistic behaviour. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **9** | She mentions two kinds of source of data for observation linguistic behaviour(a.k.a., use of language). What are they? Describe each one briefly. [9:00 - 10:00] |
| Look at corpora of speech/writing (collections of texts) to observe what kind of linguistic structures are actually used in language.  Look at grammaticality judgments of possible strings of words. Not only those that occur in a corpora or real life but also some that never do. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **10** | *Why is it relevant for a linguist to observe that \*Which book did Anna read and a newspaper? is an ungrammatical sentence? [10:00 - 12:00]* |
| Because it reflects linguistic knowledge that English speakers have about English which was not thought to them explicitly. Every speaker of English knows it is ungrammatical but nobody actually teaches that to anyone (in an academic setting or in day to day life) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **11** | *What does the '\*' that precedes 'Which book did Anna read and a newspaper?' mean? [10:00 - 12:00]* |
| That the clause is ungrammatical. |