## Week 1-3: THE LANGUAGE FACULTY. A BIOLINGUISTIC APPROACH

**Part 1: Colorless green ideas sleep furiously, The Human Language Series, part 1.**

**Part 2:**
- language as part of our biological endowment
- language as a faculty of the human mind
- I-language vs. E-language
- language specific properties
- other factors which are part of language design

**READINGS**

* Cattell, R. 2000: *Children’s Language*, London/New York: Continuum, Chapters 3 and 5. [R2]


*** Pinker, S., R. Jackendoff 2007 ‘The Faculty of Language: What’s Special about it?’, *Cognition* [oD]

## Week 4 – 5: THE INNATENESS HYPOTHESIS

**Part 1: The Language Game. The Human Language Series, part 2.**

**READINGS**


Part 2:
- from behaviourism to the innateness hypothesis (IH)
- main arguments in favour of the IH

*Jackendoff, R. 1994. Patterns in the mind. Language and Human Nature, BasicBooks. Part I, 1 (pp. 3-7) and 3 (pp. 21-35). [oD]


***The Linguistic Review 2002, 19 (special issue on the poverty of the stimulus argument). [oD]


6 – 7

THE CRITICAL PERIOD HYPOTHESIS

Part 1: The CPH
- Language acquisition and the Critical Period Hypothesis
- evidence in favour of the CPH (feral children, L2 learning, the linguistic development of cochlear-implanted (CI) children, neurolinguistics)

Part 2: Genie, the wild child


Textbook: Chapter 1, pp. 38-41.

8 – 9

BRAIN ORGANIZATION FOR LANGUAGE
- left-hemisphere dominance for language
- the role of the right hemisphere
- on the autonomy of the language module
- the modularity hypothesis
- arguments in favour of modularity: aphasia: Broca’s aphasia, Wernicke’s

*R. Cattell 2000: Children’s Language, London/New York: Continuum, Chapters 9 and 10 The two hemispheres of the brain [R2]


*Fromkin, V. 1997 ‘Some thoughts about the
aphasia//aphasia and age//aphasia and bilingualism.

brain/mind/language interface’, Lingua 100: 3-27. [R1]


**Bellugi, U., S. Marks, A. Bihrlle, H. Sabo 1993 ‘Dissociation between language and cognitive functions in Williams syndrome’. In D. Bishop, K. Mogford (eds.) Language Development in Exceptional Circumstances (pp. 177-189), Hove (UK), Hillsdale (USA): Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. [R1]


**Gopnik, M. 1990. ‘Feature blindness: A case study’, Language Acquisition 1:139-164. [R1]


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>12-13</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE THEORY OF MIND AND LINGUISTIC DEVELOPMENT</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| - towards a definition of the theory of mind (ToM)  
  - ToM and the acquisition of vocabulary  
  - ToM and the acquisition of modality  
  - ToM and pragmatics  
  - Autism and language acquisition  |

- **Papafragou, A.** 2002 ‘Modality and theory of mind: Perspectives from language development and autism’. In S. Barbiers, F. Beukema & W. van der Wurff (eds.) *Modality and its interaction with the verbal system*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins. [R2]
- **Perner, J.** 1999 ‘What is theory of mind?’ Chapter in M. Bennett (ed.) *Developmental psychology: achievements and prospects*. [R2]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14</th>
<th>LANGUAGE AND MIND: CONCLUSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOAM CHOMSKY: LANGUAGE AND MIND, LECTURE AT PRINCETON 1997.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


R1 = READER Language & Mind I Universitatea din Bucureşti 2003 (compiled by Larisa Avram)

R2 = READER Language & Mind II Universitatea din Bucureşti 2007 (compiled by Larisa Avram)

The studies marked with and asterisk (*) are the most accessible ones. At the other end of the scale are the *** - marked studies, which are for the highly motivated student.