

Clive Perdue, Sandra Benazzo & Patrizia Giuliano (2002)

**When Finiteness gets marked: the Relation between morpho-syntactic
Development and Use of Scopal Items in Adult Language Acquisition**

In: *Linguistics* 40 (4) pp. 849-890

WHEN FINITENESS GETS MARKED: THE RELATION BETWEEN MORPHO-SYNTACTIC DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF SCOPAL ITEMS IN ADULT LANGUAGE ACQUISITION¹

Clive Perdue, Sandra Benazzo & Patrizia Giuliano,
(Université Paris VIII & UMR 7023, CNRS)

Abstract

This paper investigates the acquisition of scope in L2 English and French, using longitudinal data from five informants from the ESF data base (Feldweg 1993). The scopal items analysed are negation, and additive, restrictive and temporal items. These items are found to be acquired in a fixed order, with negation preceding additive and restrictive particles (*also, only* and equivalents), which in turn precede the temporal items. For these latter, forms marking the iteration of an event (*again*) are used before temporal adverbs of contrast ('TACs': *already, still, no more*).

The learners studied have been independently shown (Klein & Perdue 1992, 1997) to progress from a nominal utterance organisation, through an organisation based on an uninflected verb (the 'Basic Variety') and on to utterances organised around a finite verb, and the placement and scopal properties of the items analysed correspond closely to this development. Items occur first in nominal utterances adjacent to the constituent they affect, then immediately before the VP or at the utterance boundary, then immediately behind the finite verb. It is only at this final stage that an item is both integrated within the utterance-structure while affecting a non-adjacent constituent. Furthermore, it is only at this stage that TACs occur, in the same position.

Two types of explanation can be proposed for this correspondence between the acquisition order of the particles, and the development first of VP then of verbal morphology:

- (i) these particles affect the constituents available at a given point of development. The first (additive and restrictive) particles apply their meaning to NP-referents, the first temporal items to be used quantify over whole events (different tokens of the same TT-Tsit relation: Klein 1994), while TACs affect phases of an event, thus requiring an independent specification of tense, on the finite verb;
- (ii) the development of finiteness-marking is a central feature of the grammaticalisation of utterance organisation. This development strongly constrains the combinatorial possibilities of the particles within the utterance structure.

The paper concludes by retracing the interaction between the development of finiteness-marking, and the overall organisation of learner varieties over time.

1. Introduction

What does an adult need to learn when faced with a new language?

An overly simple answer, but which is relevant for the present purposes, is that she needs new linguistic means to express the concepts she masters by virtue of her knowledge of her first language, including the concepts grammaticalised in that language. One of the most central of these concepts is finiteness. The adult knows that to assertⁱⁱ - or to deny – that a state of affairs is the case, the state of affairs must be linked to a time span, and possibly to other anchor points: entities or places. What she does not know, is the linguistic means of the new language which would allow her to do this. It is true that she may master certain morpho-syntactic operations in her first language, such as verbal morphology, subject-verb agreement, specific word orders, but this language-specific knowledge is of no help at the beginning of the process of acquiring a new languageⁱⁱⁱ. Such is the idea we pursue in this article.

We will attempt to show how the concept of finiteness as described in the previous paragraph, and elaborated in section 2.1, is conveyed from the very beginnings of the acquisition process, that different aspects of this concept come progressively to be expressed over the course of the process, and that the order of acquisition of these aspects is constrained by the internal organisation of the learner's language at a given time. We further hope to show that the acquisition of the TL's morpho-syntactic expression of finiteness is more than aesthetic – aesthetic in the sense of acquiring a fancy accent, for example – but that it opens up hitherto unavailable communicative possibilities.

Such is the general aim of the paper, which will be taken up again in section 5 below. For the specifics, we investigate the acquisition of scope in L2 English and French, in particular negation, and additive, restrictive and temporal items corresponding to English also, only, just, again, already, still, (not) yet, no more. For convenience, we will refer henceforth to this set simply as "particles". The use (and non-use) of these items turns out to be tightly linked to the acquisition of finiteness-marking in the L2s under discussion. These items are structurally not obligatory in an utterance, and have in common that they variably affect other constituents in the utterance in which they occur. Their acquisition represents a complex task for the language learner, as will be seen at the end of section 2.2.

Complex though this task may seem, and (grammatically) optional though these particles may be, they are acquired relatively early by the adult learner. This simple fact indicates that the expression of negation, restriction, addition and (temporal) contrast are important functions to be investigated in the learner's construction of a new language.

In the longitudinal corpus of language production that we analysed (part of the ESF data bank, described below), it emerged that these items are acquired in a fixed order, with negation preceding additive and restrictive particles (also, only and equivalents), which in turn precede the temporal items. For these latter, forms marking the iteration of an event (again) are used before temporal adverbs of contrast ('TACs': already, still, no more). The specific aim of this paper is to propose an explanation for this developmental sequence by relating it to the communicative

potential of the learners' repertoire at a given point, and to the overall path of their morpho-syntactic development, finiteness-marking in particular.

Data base

The learners whose production is analysed here were first studied in the European Science Foundation's project on second language acquisition by adult immigrants (Perdue 1993). Data are taken from the ESF data-base (Feldweg 1993). All informants were followed during approximately thirty months over three « cycles » of data collection with meetings every four to six weeks. The cycle was so organised that a set of activities could be recorded three times with each informant, to enhance longitudinal comparability. As well as spontaneous conversation, the recorded activities consisted of "complex verbal tasks" such as narratives, retellings and descriptions. These tasks were chosen because piloting had shown that they provide ample linguistic material relevant to the project's main research areas: utterance structure, and temporal and spatial reference. For example, personal narratives have a clearly defined temporal structure. In these more constrained tasks, the aim was to obtain stretches of connected texts of different types, with the linguistic context and extra-linguistic checks - the film to be retold^{iv}, the picture to be described - favouring in-depth contextual interpretation of learners' utterances.

The recorded data were transcribed and computerised, allowing exhaustive counts of the scopal items used by the main informants. The data base for this article consists of holophrastic uses of the particles, their use in verbless utterances, and in addition approximately 650 occurrences of clausal negation and 800 occurrences of other particles than negation, used in verbal utterances. The counts try to capture informants' spontaneous production of the items, excluding direct repetitions of an item from native speaker (NS) input, uninterpretable utterances and clear rote forms. Some residual "doubtful" forms are commented on as necessary.

We look at the following longitudinal data:

L1 Italian; L2 English: Lavinia (LA), Andrea (AN), Santo (SA), Vito (VI)

L1 Spanish; L2 French: Bernarda (BE), Alfonso (AL), Palmira (PA), Gloria (GL), Ramon (RA)

The five main informants are given in small capitals, with the initials identifying them in the examples^v. For the longitudinal analysis, we will restrict ourselves to these learners, as putting their results together gives a representative overall picture of these language pairs (see also 2.3). Detailed longitudinal analyses of further informants can be found in Benazzo (2000) and Giuliano (2000). Additional examples come from the other learners listed above, and some further examples are added for comparative purposes, from the Moroccan-French pair (Stoffel and Véronique 1996, Starren 2000), and the Punjabi-English pair (Huebner, Carroll and Perdue 1992):

L1 Punjabi; L2 English: Madan (MA), Ravinder (RA)

L1 (Moroccan) Arabic; L2 French: Zahra (ZA), Abdelmalek (AB), Malika (MA)

2. Background

The acquisition of the scopal items examined here is the subject of a growing body of studies (Bernini 1995, 2000; Becker 1998; Becker and Dietrich 1996; Dietrich and Grommes 1998; Benazzo and Giuliano 1998; Starren and van Hout 1996; Dimroth 1998, this volume; Dimroth and Klein 1996; Dimroth and Watorek 2000; Watorek and Perdue 1999; Perdue 1996; Stoffel and Véronique 1996; Silberstein 2001) whose general aim is to describe the constraints on the behaviour of these items and integrate these constraints with those governing the organisation of utterances, over time, and across language-pairings. The relevant aspects of these items' behaviour are briefly described in 2.2. The 'old' ESF project studied utterance organisation. One important acquisitional development analysed was the passage from a "basic variety", where arguments are organised around the uninflected verb, to a "finite utterance organisation" where the presence of a finitely-inflected verb provokes a radical reorganisation of the utterance. This development is further explored in this paper, with the relevant aspects of finiteness briefly set out in 2.1, and those of utterance organisation, in 2.3.

2.1. Finiteness

Finiteness is traditionally associated with the morphosyntactic categories of person and tense. However, in the first paragraph of this paper we distinguished between the concept of finiteness and the way languages mark it. The European languages examined here typically mark finiteness by verb morphology – one speaks of finite versus non-finite verb forms – but this is not the case for a language like Chinese, for example (see Klein, Li and Hendriks 2000), nor for early learner varieties. Following Lasser (1997: 77), we therefore distinguish between: "the overt form that finiteness takes and the invisible function that finiteness serves" and adopt her terms of M(orphological)-finiteness versus S(ematic)-finiteness for this distinction.

M-finiteness is used to denote finite verbal morphology. S-finiteness is a property of the whole utterance. It centrally involves the speaker's making a claim about a time span. Klein (1994) terms this operation assertion (ASN)^{vi}, and illustrates it with the following example:

- (1) The book WAS on the table.

In this example, WAS is marked by contrastive stress, and the contrast can involve either the time-span ('the book WAS on the table, but isn't any longer'), or the claim ('you said it wasn't, but in fact the book WAS on the table'). Thus the M-finite element WAS "carries (at least) two distinct meaning components: 1. the tense component: it marks past, in contrast to present or future; 2. it marks the 'claim' - the fact that the situation described by the utterance indeed obtains, in contrast to the opposite claim" (Klein 1998:227).

Following Klein (1994), we will call the time span for which the speaker makes a claim the "topic time" (TT), in contrast to the time of situation (TSit), i.e., the interval occupied on the time axis by the situation talked about. The notional category of tense then expresses the relation of TT to the deictically given time of utterance (TU), and the notional category of grammatical aspect expresses the relation between TT and TSit. Starren (2001) uses the metaphor of the video camera to explain TT - it is the time the camera is 'shooting'. Imagine you are a witness in court, and the judge asks you, "What did you see when you entered the room?" The crucial time span corresponds to your entering the room, and just this time span is filmed by the camera. You

answer, “A man was trying to open the safe. He looked Japanese.” The time span occupied by ‘man try to open safe’, and indeed the time span occupied by ‘man look Japanese’ - the ‘situation times’ - are considerably longer than it took you to enter the room. It would indeed be surprising if the man did not still look Japanese as you speak. But this was not what you were asked. The TT is your entering the room, and your, and the judge’s use of past tense puts this TT (but not necessarily the TSit) before the time of utterance. The time of the action of trying to open the safe, TSit, encompasses the TT: $TT \in TSit$. This aspectual relation is imperfective, and explains the use of the past progressive aspect in your answer. (Imperfective aspect contrasts with perfective aspect, where TSit is within, or coincides with, TT.)

As its name suggests, TT belongs to the topic of an utterance, which may, but need not, also contain a topic entity (in canonical versusthetic sentences, respectively), and a topic place (see also note 6). ASN functions therefore to link the state of affairs or entity denoted by the predicate of the utterance, to its topic.

Different languages use different linguistic (and discourse-based) means to express S-finiteness; whereas possibly all languages use adverbials and discourse organisational principles, more specific morpho-syntactic means such as particle use and verb morphology are confined to specific sub-sets of languages. Moreover, as Lasser points out for German root infinitives (which are S-finite), the fact that a language has specific means to mark S-finiteness does not entail that all S-finite clauses are so marked. She draws the following generalisations as to the relationship between S- and M-finiteness (1997:84):

- a. M-finiteness implies [S-finiteness]
- b. the absence of M-finiteness does not imply the absence of [S-finiteness]

In the light of these considerations, the learning task for the adult learner can be stated in three general questions:

- What are the means that the TL gives me for expressing S-finiteness?
- Are any of these means grammaticalised? i.e. does M-finiteness play a role?
- If so, does this M-finiteness affect other aspects of utterance structure?

2.2 Scopal items

In sections 3 and 4, we trace the acquisition of negation, of additive and restrictive particles, and of some specific temporal adverbs. The main question is whether the development of M-finiteness on the path towards the TLs affects the use and distribution of these items: are there items that can only appear with the acquisition of M-finiteness? But first, we briefly characterise the items in question.

In their classic treatment, Karttunen and Peters (1977, 1979) state that scope particles “focus” on a constituent, and the particle’s “scope” is the open sentence without the particle and with the focussed constituent replaced by a variable. In simple cases such as:

- (2) The girl ran away too

the focus of the additive particle too is the girl, and the sentence implicates that “there are other x besides [the girl] under consideration such that [x ran away]” (1979:25). Negation and the particles share the property of associating with a constituent of what Dimroth and Klein (1996)

later termed the “initial structure” (“Ausgangsstruktur”): their presence in that structure modifies its meaning. This modification is defined in terms of the set of alternatives (Jacobs 1983) the “focussed” (associated) constituent belongs to.

Focus thus represents a choice within a set of alternatives. The « basic meaning » of a scopal item is seen as the relation it creates between the focus and set of alternatives. Additive particles implicate that the open sentence is valid for the focus and (at least) another member of the set; they add the focus to an already existing alternative from the set. Restrictive particles exclude the other members of the set (‘only the girl ran away’), and negation excludes the focus from the set (‘the girl didn’t run away, the boy did’). Karttunen and Peter’s use of the term “focus” can however be at odds with other diagnostics of focus such as WH-questions (and their transposition to text level in Klein and von Stutterheim’s *quaestio*, see note 9), which also open up a set of alternatives. This non-coincidence of “focus” is illustrated in example 3 below. For this reason we use the term “domain of application” (DoA, from “Bezugsausdruck”, Dimroth 1998a) for “focus” in Karttunen and Peter’s sense, and use “focus” as it is defined by the question, or *quaestio* (see section 2.3).

In the following uncontextualised utterance of Bernarda’s from a conversation about her childrens’ schooling:

(3a) SF:BE

le garçon (...) est en classe spéciale aussi
“The boy ... is in a special class too”

aussi potentially associates with the boy (in addition to other people), his being in a special class (in addition to being elsewhere), or both (in addition to other relevant problems: ‘the father is out of work, the girl is in prison’, for example). In order to determine the actual DoA, contextual information is necessary. From a previous utterance of Bernarda’s:

(3b) les filles sont en classe spéciale

“The girls are in a special class”

it becomes clear that the DoA of aussi is, here, the boy. The DoA is therefore to the left of the particle, and non-adjacent, and aussi sets up a relation (here, of addition) between its DoA and the already existing alternatives of the set (the girls). There is however in this conversation a question intervening between 3a and 3b. The interviewer asks:

(3c) et il est où le garçon?

“And where is the boy?”

a WH-question which evokes the set of possible places the boy may be. In answer to this question, the specification – the focus – of 3a is en classe spéciale. 3c is a case of non-coincidence between the utterance’s focus and the DoA of the particle aussi.

The temporal adverbs we look at express iteration (again, encore) and contrast (still/encore, already/déjà). The former typically quantify over different occurrences of the same event type (‘He rang, then he rang again’), whereas the latter associate with different phases of

the same event. Still/encore mark that an action or a state is valid for some TT-span t and for at least one other time span preceding t ('the phone rang at nine and at ten it was still ringing'). Already/déjà are first and foremost aspectual. They create a relationship between the TT of the utterance they occur in and the post-state of the TSit ("I have already phoned John")^{vii}. As the examples indicate, these adverbs create an anaphoric link with a time span in the preceding discourse context.

It follows from all these considerations that learners are faced with a very complex acquisitional task: they need to find out the meaning of the scopal items in question, where they can be placed in the utterance structure, what constituents they can associate with in a given position and which constituent they do associate with in a given informational context. Furthermore, the form-function pairings are rather unpredictable across languages. To give just one example here, French encore has additive, iterative and contrastive functions, respectively: encore une boisson ('one more drink'), il boit encore ('he's drinking again') and il boit encore ('he's still drinking'), and Italian ancora behaves similarly, but as the glosses indicate, English has specific forms for each function. This fact will pose specific problems for the Italian learner of L2 English, as we shall see.

In order to understand how they go about this task, it is perhaps helpful to summarise the structures available for the learners to embed these items, as they emerge from the results of the ESF project, to which we now turn.

2.3. The ESF project

The research aims relevant here were, firstly, to identify the principles underlying the learner's arrangement of words in the utterance (Klein and Perdue 1992), mainly in relation to its obligatory constituents (verb-argument structure), and secondly, to describe how the learner expresses temporal relations, given this utterance structure (Dietrich, Klein and Noyau 1995). Analyses were based on 20 individual 30-month longitudinal studies of learners acquiring Dutch, English, French or German L2, including the learners of the present study.

Utterance structure

It was found that there exists a stage of utterance organisation even before verb-argument structure comes into play, a so-called "noun-based utterance organisation" (NUO), which then develops into an organisation centred around the non-finite verb ("infinite utterance organisation": IUO), and from there to "finite utterance organisation" (FUO). In NUO, utterances are very simple, consisting mainly of two constituents (sometimes three, cf. section 6 below) formed by words corresponding to TL nouns, adverbs, particles, and adjectives. NUO lacks the structuring power of verbs, and could well be called "pre-verbal utterance organisation". Mastering verb-argument structure was found to be a major acquisitional task, but which then allows the learner to make use of the different types of valency which comes with the (non-finite) verb along dimensions such as agentivity, and the assigning of positions according to this ranking. There is however no distinction made at this level between the finite and non-finite component of the verb. Such a distinction, involving M-finiteness, which is of fundamental importance in the TLs studied, only emerges later at the level of FUO, which indeed is not attained by all the learners, one third of whom stabilise at IUO (the "basic variety" of Klein

and Perdue 1997). Transition from one “stage” to the next is not sudden, as we shall see, and the coexistence of different types of utterance organisation is attested in individual data.

Table 1 relates the longitudinal data available from the main informants of the present study to these three main acquisitional stages:

Table 1. Longitudinal development of main informants

SL/TL	Learners	NUO (prebasic v.)	IUO (basic v.)	FUO (postbasic v.)
Ital > English	Santo		+	
	Andrea		+	+
	Lavinia			+
Span > French	Bernarda	+	+	+
	Alfonso			+

For the learners of English, Santo’s and Andrea’s production share characteristics of NUO and IUO at the beginning of data collection. Santo shows very little development over the cycle and a half of available data, remaining essentially at IUO level: some conjugated uses of be and have are attested (see Table 2), but that is all. Lavinia on the other hand comes to master FUO by the end of her first cycle of data collection. Andrea spans the two extremes, passing from IUO to FUO during the second cycle of data collection. For the learners of French, Bernarda was an absolute beginner at the start of data collection, whereas Alfonso’s production during the first cycle of data collection corresponds to Bernarda’s during her final interviews: both are at FUO. Santo’s, Andrea’s and Bernarda’s data thus give us ample illustration of the first stages of development, whereas Alfonso and Lavinia amply illustrate FUO.

NUO can be illustrated by the examples in (4)^{viii} :

- (4) (a) SF: PA les deux + content
 ‘the two (of them) + happy’ (both of them are happy)
- (b) PE: MA daughter’s dad + no job
 (the girl’s father doesn’t have a job)
- (c) MF: ZA lifille + lisalledebains
 ‘the girl + the bathroom’ (the girl is in the bathroom)
- (d) SF: GL aujourd’hui ici + quatre familles
 ‘today here + four families’ (there are four families living here now)
- (e) MF: AD après + avec le policier
 ‘afterwards + with the policeman’ (afterwards there came a policeman)

Such utterances pattern topic-focus in the sense described in section 2.1, very often with a pause between the topic and the focus expression, which comes last. This pragmatic regularity will be referred to for brevity as:

P. Focus last^{ix}

In dialogue, the topic is often supplied by the interlocutor's question, and may be left implicit in the answer. At this stage, learners put nominals into a relationship with a "predicative" nominal, adverbial, adjective or particle (examples 4a-c), or simply introduce a nominal referent with optional contextualisation thanks to a temporal or locative adverbial (examples 4d-e). In other words, examples (4a-c) correspond to:

a. NP - PP
NP
Adj/Part

and examples (4d-e) correspond to:

c. Adv - NP

In achieving IUO, the learners regularly develop three main phrasal patterns, expanding a. to A., B., and c. to C. as follows:

A. NP - V - (NP) (NP)

B. NP - Cop - $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} PP \\ NP \\ Adj \end{array} \right\}$

C. (Adv) - $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} V \\ cop \end{array} \right\}$ - NP

The verbs are uninflected^x: there is no functional verbal morphology and indeed no productive morphology at all at this stage, therefore no tense, aspect, agreement, case, number, gender-marking.

The range of 'closed-class items' at this stage is small: one observes a few quantifiers and determiners, some overgeneralised conjunctions and prepositions and a rudimentary pronoun system comprising means to refer to speaker, hearer and a third person (functioning deictically and anaphorically). There is also a word for negation, and additive and restrictive particles. The range of possible NP structures varies with NP position in the pattern, which is governed by two types of constraints: semantic and pragmatic (i.e., Focus last). The main semantic constraint

concerns the relationship between the arguments of verbs which associate more than one argument. For some of these verbs a semantic asymmetry is observed in that one NP referent has a 'higher' and the other(s) a 'lower' degree of control over the situation described (Klein and Perdue 1992): that NP-referent which is in control of, or intends to be in control of, the other entities in the situation is placed by learners in pre-verbal position. 'Control' is a relative notion: it applies neither to verbs with one argument, nor to symmetrical relationships and so does not account for why the arguments(s) are arranged in front of, or behind, the verbs in the following examples of Ramon:

(5) SF: RA

- a. [aRiv] *otra* personne
'Arrive other person': V-NP
- b. [el aRiv]
'He arrive': NP - V
- c. le *autor* de le vol [nepa] chaplin
'The author of the theft is not Chaplin': NP - Cop - NP

The patterning of these NPs obey the focus last constraint already operative in NUO. The referent of the pre-verbal NPs is topical information, and that of the post-verbal NPs is in focus, a distribution which explains the internal structural possibilities of these NPs: pronouns and zero anaphor take up already given topics. Referents in focus are, however, never referred to by pronouns.

Temporality

Up to and including IUO, learners' utterances are S-finite, but show no trace of M-finiteness.

The adverbial and discourse-organisational means for expressing temporality are already present in NUO, but are enriched at IUO by the fact that the verb-argument structure allows the consistent expression of inherent lexical aspect (*Aktionsart*)^{x1}. However, a defining characteristic of IUO is that utterances contain uninflected verbs, IUO completely lacks the grammatical means to express tense and aspect central to the languages under discussion. Learners nevertheless manage to produce sophisticated temporal structures in their discourse with the means available, which allow the specification of some time span and certain relations between time spans. What learners do at the beginning of their discourse is establish an initial TT either: - implicitly, by taking over the time proposed by the interlocutor or using TU as a default case, or: - explicitly by means of an utterance-initial adverb as in 4(d). This initial TT serves as a point of departure, and is maintained or shifted, depending on the type of discourse. If it is shifted (as in a narrative, for example), then this shifted time is marked by an initial anaphoric adverb, as in 4(e), or follows on from discourse-organisational principles such as the principle of natural order (PNO, Clark 1971), whereby events are recounted in the order in which they occur. With this organisation, the time of situation is always more or less simultaneous with TT, as there are no linguistic means allowing the learner to dissociate them; events are presented perfectly (see 2.1 above). We return to this expressive restriction on IUO in sections 4 and 5 below: it constrains the productive use of temporal adverbs of contrast.

Development towards FUO

This development was found to be motivated by the fact that the semantic and pragmatic constraints just discussed come into ‘competition’ in specifiable discourse contexts, in the sense that the learner wants to express that TT and TSit do not coincide, or that the inherent temporal properties of an utterance are at variance with its intended temporal relationship to other utterances in the discourse, or where the semantic role of an argument is at variance with its discourse status. It is in these contexts that the morpho-syntactic specifics of the TL emerge (Perdue 1990): pronominal paradigms, focalisation devices, and finiteness marking on the verb, hence grammatical agreement, tense and aspect. As we shall see in section 4, the acquisition of M-finiteness is of significance for the behaviour of the scopal items analysed in this paper.

The passage from IUO to FUI is not sudden. Finiteness-marking emerges gradually, typically first on auxiliaries and later on main verbs, as we shall see. The following table attempts to visualise the emergence of M-finiteness for the five informants whose progress is reported in this article. The columns are to be read from top to bottom (1:1 = cycle 1, recording 1, to 3:3 = cycle 3, recording 3). The columns mark the recording starting from which a particular conjugated verb form first appears spontaneously in declarative affirmative utterances. For example, Bernarda shows no unambiguously conjugated form before the last interview of the first cycle of data collection.

Table 2. First appearance of some conjugated forms in affirmative utterances

Recording	<u>Santo</u>	<u>Andrea</u>	<u>Lavinia</u>	<u>Bernarda</u>	<u>Alfonso</u>
1:1	<u>is</u>	<u>am, is</u>	<u>am, is, are</u>		<u>suis, est</u> Mod + V
1:2	<u>am</u>	<u>are</u>	Past		Passé composé
1:3			Present Perfect		
1:4					XXXXXXXX
1:5	<u>are, have</u>		Mod + V	[a] (‘avoir’?)	
1:6					
1:7					
1:8					
1:9			Past Perfect	<u>suis, est</u>	
2:1	<u>have + V</u>		XXXXXXXX	Passé composé	
2:2		Mod + V			
2:3					
2:4		Present Perfect			
2:5					
2:6		Past			
3:1		Past Perfect		Mod + V	
3:2					
3:3		XXXXXXXX		XXXXXXXX	

'V' in the table indicates a main, lexical verb, and 'Mod', the English defective modals, and French modal pouvoir. For English, use of inflected be, of modals + V, of the present and past perfect, and of the past tense are given, and for French, the use of conjugated être, of modal pouvoir + V, of être/avoir + Vé (the passé composé). FUI can be said to be achieved in both TLs when learners use the auxiliary + V combinations appropriately. The line of crosses in each

column – xxxxx - approximately indicate the interview at which FOU can be said to be mastered, except for Santo, who never reaches this level.

This summary of the descriptive generalisations from the work of the ESF project will, it is hoped, suffice to serve as background for the acquisition of scopal items, to which we now turn. As negation markers are used before other scopal items, we start with negation.

3. The acquisition of negation

Holophrastic negation is expressed in TL-English by no, and in French by non. The sentence negator (Neg) occurs in both languages after the finite verb (M-finiteness), but with associated, language -specific, variants. In English, the negator not cannot occur to the right of the main verb of the sentence; it is carried by the auxiliary do: Peter does not smoke. Furthermore, not is pronounced [nt] in spoken English, unless it is contrastive. The contracted form following the finite form results in a morphologically complex phonological string (didn't, can't, etc.) whose segmentation is not transparent for learners. In French, whereas the negator pas can occur to the right of the M-finite main verb: Pierre fume pas (cf. * Peter smokes not), it is sometimes accompanied in spoken registers by the particle ne (pronounced [nœ] when contrastive) which precedes the M-finite form: Pierre ne doit pas fumer ('Peter mustn't smoke'). In the learners' L1s, Italian and Spanish, holophrastic negation is expressed by no, which has similar phonetic characteristics to the equivalent TL forms. Sentence negation (Sp. no, It. non) occurs before the finite verb (which may make the pre-verbal French ne relatively salient for such learners; Dubois et al. 1981). Other relevant negative items - the indefinites "nobody, no more, never" - occur post-verbally if accompanied by no(n), and otherwise pre-verbally. The acquisition task for these learners of English and French is therefore a priori to place the clause negator to the right of the finite verb, with the further complication of 'do-insertion' for English. But mastery of the finite verb itself represents, as we have seen, a major acquisitional step which not all learners achieve.

At the very beginning of the process, holophrastic (or anaphoric) negation is evidenced. It denies the assertability of a proposition previously mentioned in the discourse. It seems that a word for negation is essential, and we return to this fact in section 5. Here, we concentrate on Neg in combination with other constituents. At NUO-level, the negator is placed immediately adjacent to the negated constituent, either preposed to the focus constituent (see also example 4b):

- (6) a. SF:BE Cycle 1
NS: c'est un peu une imprimerie alors?
'So it's a sort of printing press?'
BE: non non [nepade] primerie + *otra forma*
'No no isanot printing press + other thing'
- b. IE:SA Cycle 1
NS: does she live with her father and mother?
SA: no father + only mother

or postposed to the topic constituent:

- (7) a. SF:BE Cycle 1
 NS: tu conduis pas toi?
 'you don't drive yourself'
 BE: moi non
 'Me no'
- b. IE:SA Cycle 1
 NS: have you got your driving licence now?
 SA: now original copy + no

If X represents the negated constituent – the DoA of Neg - then Neg + X excludes the focus from the set of alternatives it is possible to associate with the topic, and X + Neg excludes the topic from the set of alternatives relative to a contextually given focus. X corresponds to one or the other constituent of patterns a., b. of section 2.3^{xii}.

At IUO, the negator is placed immediately before the verb and the structure Neg + V is added to the informants' repertoire. "Added", as the constituent negation of NUO is still attested, as indeed it is in native production. The acquisition of Neg + V is significant as the negator takes specific forms in this context, some of which are non-target-like, as the unanalysed dont of L2 English, and [nepade] of L2-French. Dont is used with all persons, but only pre-verbally; [nepa(de)] is used in Neg + X and Neg + V, but not in X + Neg contexts, which attest no(n).

- (8) a. SF:BE Cycle 2
 yo [nepa] parle bien le français
 'I no speak well French'
- b. IE:AN Cycle 1
 i *prove* (...) but er no speak english
 'I try but ...'
- c. IE:SA Cycle 1
 i dont have insurance

What is added at this stage is a specifically verbal negation marker whose DoA is to its right, comprising all or part of the verb and its complements.

Subsequent development to FUO is, as we said, gradual. The exception is Lavinia, who had achieved FUO at the end of the first cycle of data collection. The following tables give an exhaustive account for all informants of the negative utterances containing verbs. For Lavinia, only her first cycle is presented, in which it is noticeable that she already uses conjugated do, does with negation.

- Tables 3 and 4 about here -

The top three lines (a-c) of each sub-table place the negative utterances in respect to Tables 1 (development from NUO to FUO) and 2 (first appearances of inflected verb forms). The following lines give the occurrences of the negator preceding the non-finite verb: no/not + V, dont + V (Table 3, lines d, e), and [nepade] + V (Table 4, line d). Underneath these are given the occurrences of Neg to the right of the conjugated copula (Table 3, line f; Table 4, line e), and of the conjugated French main verb (Table 4, line f). Line g of both tables give occurrences of

complex verbal groups consisting of conjugated auxiliaries or modals, Neg, and the main verb. The "transition" from IUO (Table 3, lines d, e; Table 4, line d), to FUO (lines g) can thus be traced in the intervening lines.

Table 3. Negative utterances containing verbs: English L2 learners all stages

a	Santo	NUO to IUO		
b	rec.	11-13	15-17	18-24
c	verb morph.	is am	are, have	have +V
d	no/not + V _{nonfin}	13	30	59
e	dont + V _{nonfin}	3	4	46
f	cop/have not	-	1	46
g	aux/mod + not + V _{lex}	-	-	-

a	Andrea	NUO to IUO			FUO	
b	rec.	11-12	13-17	18-23	24-29	31-35
c	verb morph.	cop		mod	PresPerf/past	PastP
d	no/not + V _{nonfin}	6	5	2	-	-
e	dont + V _{nonfin}	-	9	4	2	9
f	cop/have not	1	2	6	4	12
g	aux/mod + not + V _{lex}	-	-	1	-	9

a	Lavinia	IUO		to	FUO		
b	rec.	11-13	14-18		21-23	24-27	31-36
c	verb morph.	cop		past, PresPrf, Mod	Past Perf		
d	no/not + V _{nonfin}	6	-	-	-	-	-
e	dont + V _{nonfin} *	5	-	-	-	-	-
f	cop/have not	14	22	35	+	+	
g	aux/mod + not*+ V _{lex}	-	44*	41**	+	+	

*44 = mod n't (1), haven't + PP (1), isn't + Ving (1), doesn't (4), don't + V (37)

**41 = mod n't (5), doesn't (2), didn't (9), don't (25)

Table 4. Negative utterances containing verbs: French L2 learners all stages

a	Bernarda	NUO			IUO			FUO	
b	recordings	11-13	14-15	16-18	19-21	22-23	24-26	31-33	34-36
c	verb morph.	(avoir)			cop	PC	Mod		
d	nepasde +V _{nonfin}	-	-	4	3	11	3	10	17
e	ne cop pas	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	6
f	ne V _{fin} pas	-	-	-	-	-	-	10	47
g	ne aux/mod pas V _{lex}	-	-	-	-	-	-	5	5

a	Alfonso	FUO		
b	recordings	11-19	21-26	31-36
c	verb morph.	cop, pc, mod.		
d	nepasde +V _{nonfin}	38	27	38
e	ne cop pas	5	12	12
f	ne V _{fin} pas	7	9	20
g	ne aux/mod pas V _{lex}	-	5	14

For more detailed discussion of Table 3, we start by examining Andrea's data. We can see that unanalysed dont is still present in Andrea's 3rd cycle as a remnant of IUO. No(t) + V disappears however from the middle of cycle 2. Parallel to the use of dont, we see the first developments of post-verbal negation with use of the (finite) copula and have forms, and only in the third cycle do verbal lexemes occur with finite auxiliaries and modals. For all these developments we can see, by comparison with lines b-c, that the negative forms are a contemporaneous or subsequent development to their affirmative counterparts. This is not logically necessary. However, it appears that finite forms are attested independently, before being associated with negation. Negation tends to lag behind, and a possible explanation would be that negative utterances are more complex to process^{xiii}.

Santo's data gives us more detail on the early part of the acquisition process. Of the 102 occurrences of no/not and the 53 occurrences of dont, the proportion of the former becomes smaller over time^{xiv}. His progress is also marked by the use of Neg behind conjugated have, be, but the $Aux_{fin} + Neg + V_{lex}$ pattern is never acquired. Lavinia's first cycle gives us more detail on the final part of this development. As with Andrea, pre-verbal Neg disappears, but unlike Andrea, Lavinia ends up using analysed, finite forms of pre-verbal do, as well as the other auxiliaries and modals. By the end of the first cycle she has mastered the target system.

For Bernarda (Table 4), IUO structures are not evidenced at all before the 5th recording, and the first negated verbal form occurs in 1:6. Clear conjugated verbal forms are evidenced more and more in her second cycle of recordings, but (as with Andrea), her negative uses of conjugated verbs do not precede affirmative uses, occurring only in cycle 3. Bernarda still has traces of IUO (line d) at the end of data collection (Andrea likewise was still producing dont + V). But the number of finite forms increases progressively, with the full pattern $Aux_{fin} + Neg + V_{nonfin}$ being the last to develop. Even Alfonso never loses the $Neg + V_{nonfin}$ pattern, but we see in his data how the relative frequency of use of this pattern decreases over the three cycles in relation to use of finite forms: from 38:12 in cycle 1, to 27:26 in cycle 2, to 38:46 in cycle 3. Thus for all learners, the full pattern is the last to develop.

In sum, although the numbers are not large, the tendency for each language is remarkably clear, and concordant. For French L2, the (TL-ungrammatical) placement of Neg before the verb never completely disappears. Bernarda uses the passé composé productively, and starts using modals in affirmative utterances, before Neg starts moving behind conjugated être, avoir, modals and lexical verbs. In hers, and in Alfonso's data one sees furthermore that the complex $Aux/Mod + Neg + V$ is a very late development. In English L2, the (TL-ungrammatical) placement of no(t) before the verb disappears only in Andrea's 3rd cycle, and never from Santo's production. Unanalysed dont + V is used throughout data collection by Andrea and Santo: only Lavinia uses conjugated do correctly. Neg placement behind be, have for Santo is a relatively timid development occurring, as for Bernarda, after the spontaneous use of these forms in affirmative utterances. Andrea's data also show that the complex $Aux/Mod + Neg + V$ is a very late development in English, too. Acquisition of this last construction affects the scope possibilities for Neg, which can have its DoA to the left (capitals indicate that the word is stressed) and non-adjacent, contrary to the simple constituent negation.

(9) PE: MA

SHE didn't steal any bread + I steal it

We note in conclusion the following acquisition sequence for both target languages^{xv} :

(10)

NUO	>	IUO	>	FUO
Neg + X		Neg + V _{nonfin}		Aux _{fin} + Neg + V _{nonfin}
X + Neg				

The sequence will be completed and commented at the end of the following section. In particular, there remains one late development of negation to be discussed, namely, the use of temporal not anymore/(ne)...plus, but we postpone the discussion to the following section. Note that there is no sudden jump between stages. In particular, the "transition" mentioned above between IUO and FUO is marked in both languages by the first occurrences of Cop_{fin} + Neg, and in French, V_{fin} + Neg. These developments interact with the development of other scopal items as part of a major reorganisation of the learner variety. In section 5 and 6 we return in more detail to this "transitional phase" and its significance. But first we turn to the acquisition of scope particles.

4. The acquisition of scope particles

Development of the scopal repertoire

Tables 5 and 6 give an exhaustive account of the use of additive, restrictive and temporal particles for the five informants. There are correspondences between the acquisitional stage and the type of particle used by learners, hence the acquisitional stages are again given on the top line of the Tables. At NUO, mainly additive and restrictive particles are used. These are joined at IUO by iterative items, while the TACs - yet, already, still, déjà and (continuative) encore, and their very infrequent negative counterparts, are not used until FUO is established.

- Tables 5 and 6 about here-

Table 5 Repertoire of scopal items: learners of English

Santo	NUO to IUO		
	11-13	15-17	18-24
rec.			
only / just	13	18	39
again		9*	9*
too/also			2
just (T)			
already			
still			

Andrea	NUO to IUO			FUO	
	11-12	13-17	18-23	24-29	31-35
rec.					
only / just	9	5	10	11	6
again	3	1	-	6*	1
also / too			1	-	-
just (T)				1	-
still ?					2*

Lavinia	IUO		FUO		
	11-13	14-18	21-23	24-27	31-36
rec.					
only / just	16	11	15	6	4
again	1	7	5	7	9
also/too/as well		3	8	8	6
just (T)			2	-	-
already			3	1	2
still				3	1

Table 6 Repertoire of scopal items: learners of French

Bernarda	NUO			IUO			FUO	
	11-13	14-15	16-18	19-21	22-23	24-26	31-33	34-36
recordings								
seulement		1	12	22	34	7	43	37
aussi / encore (A)				7	6	1	35	30
encore/autre fois (I)				1	-	1	2	1
déjà							4	6
encore (C)							1	-

Alfonso	FUO		
	11-19	21-26	31-36
recordings			
seulement	41	12	21
aussi / encore (A)	16	43	64
autre fois/encore (I)	4	16	3
déjà	34	24	25
encore (C)	-	-	-

Letters used in the left-hand column indicate the semantic values of *encore*: A = additive, C = continuative, I = iterative, and of *just*: R = restrictive, T = temporal.

*Idiosyncratic uses in Table 5: some occurrences of Santo's *again* seem to have an additive value equivalent to *also, more* (see example 11); Andrea's *again* is produced in contexts of continuity (12), requiring TL *still*; Andrea's *still* functions as a sort of aspect marker (13).

The Tables show a general development from use of restrictive/additive, to temporal items with one form marking the iteration of an event (TL again, encore); later, only at FUI, TACs such as 'still' are used which mark different phases of an event. This implies a development in the functions of encore, which is used first with additive function, then with iterative function, and only later with continuative function. This development incites us to return, briefly, to negation, and the very late appearance of expressions such as 'not anymore' mentioned at the end of the previous section. These expressions are the negative counterparts of the TACs, and it is logical that they should only appear when use of these TACs is established. Only at the end of Lavinia's data are there occurrences of not..anymore (1x) and not yet (5x); in Alfonso's data we find pas encore (= 'not yet': 3x), and two occurrences of ne...plus (= 'not anymore') in the last cycle of Bernarda.

Two types of exception to the general developmental trend must however be noted. Firstly, the number of occurrences of French iterative encore is tiny. This may chiefly be explained by learners' use of idiosyncratic *otra* fois ('one more time'). Table 6 sums over both forms.

Secondly, not all particles are immediately used with standard meaning. Some overgeneralisations of the use of particles can be observed, marked by an asterisk in the tables:
- the English L2 use of again for both 'also' and 'still':

- (11) IE:SA Cycle 1 (metalinguistic exchange over yesterday)
 SA the court last +++ last night
 NS uh right it was ↓last night okay
 SA last day + [for]
 NS [mhm]
 SA last morning
 NS ↓yesterday yesterday
 SA + yesterday
 NS yesterday morning
 SA *eh be* possible again ?last morning? *?no?* (again = also)
 NS no yesterday morning

- (12) IE:AN Cycle 2
 NS: and now all the woods have gone?
 AN: no there are again but no like before (again = still)

- and the English L2 use of still (perhaps by analogy to Italian stare) as a first marker of imperfectivity when describing a man putting some apples into a bag:

- (13) IE:AN Cycle 3
 this man still to take some apples into his bag

(12-13) and others are of significance for the overall structure of the acquisition process as they occur at the end of the transition between IUO and FUO. Similarly, Alfonso uses déjà ('already') as a temporal adverb of position - not contrast - to clear up a misunderstanding as to whether he will go or did go to the employment office:

- (14) IE:AL Cycle 1
 [∞e ire]/ non [∞e] déjà [∞e ale] là-bas
 'I'll go/ no I already I went there'

These and other similar examples function as precursors to the productive, TL-like use of the particles. Examples (11-13) represent plausible evaluations of semantic relatedness on the learners' part, but this will not be pursued here (see Benazzo 2000 for further discussion). As the vast majority of particles produced at NUO and IUO level are additive and restrictive, we will deal with this class first.

The distribution of additive and restrictive particles

We discuss the English restrictive particles only and just, and additive too, as well, and the French restrictive seulement and additive aussi, in relation to their Italian and Spanish 'equivalents' solo, anche, and sólo, también^{XVI}. The discussion is limited to simple (M-)finite declarative sentences of the type:

the girl takes the loaf of bread
 __NP__ V_{fin} __NP__

(and equivalents in the other languages) whose major constituents form the particles' DoA. The particles are either adjacent to, or distant from their DoA, to its left, or to its right.

When the DoA of the particle is adjacent, the rule is that it is found to the right of restrictive particles, and to the left of additive particles. But there are exceptions:

- the SL additive particles: the DoA of Italian anche is to its right, so that anche in sentence-final position is unacceptable to most speakers of Italian:

la ragazza prende il pane *anche

The DoA of Spanish también also occurs to its right, but not systematically.

- English too, as well are on the other hand almost exclusively found in sentence-final position (Taglicht 1984).

- Italian solo, and French seulement, are not found immediately to the left of the lexical verb:

la fille *seulement prend le pain
 la ragazza *solo prende il pan

When the DoA of the particle is non-adjacent, the particle is found either at the sentence periphery, or next to the finite verb. Also, only, just immediately to the left of the finite verb, or aussi, anche immediately to its right, have other possible DoA than simply the verb. Likewise, the DoA of sentence-final too, as well is not limited to the final NP.

If the finite verb is an auxiliary, other possibilities open up:

the girl has ___ taken the loaf of bread

English only, just^{xvii} may be placed to the right of has, as may, in equivalent sentences, Italian solo and French seulement. Their DoA may then be the verb, its object, or both. The same possibilities also exist in this position for also^{xviii}, aussi, anche, but these additive particles may in addition have as their DoA the subject of the sentence. This position is however not attested for Spanish sólo, también, which occur before the finite auxiliary.

This simplified contrast would predict greater acquisitional difficulties for Italian learners of English for the placement of additive than restrictive particles, difficulties which are compounded by a form-function misfit whereby four frequent English particles: also, as well, too, but also even (see note 15), correspond to different uses of anche. The position to the left of the finite lexical verb may also present difficulties, as it is not shared in either of the SL-TL pairs. The 'medial' position next to the finite verb is that which is shared by most particles (and, anticipating, by the TACs as well), and where their scope properties are greatest. As with negation, there is a close interplay between these particles and M-finiteness. These are the contrastive predictions; we will now look at the actual acquisition order.

At NUO, the particle's domain is an adjacent constituent X (the same 'X' as we saw for negation). There is a tendency for additive particles to be placed to the right of this X, and restrictive only, just, seulement to the left.

At IUO, the same configurations are observed as at NUO, but particles can also have as their DoA, the verb and its complements. Some cross-linguistic variation is observed: restrictive and additive particles are generally placed at the periphery of the utterance, with the exception of only, which occurs between V and the following NP, with this NP as its DoA (15a. The DoA is italicised in the English examples, and in the gloss of the French examples). Seulement is placed at the beginning of the utterance (15b), and the additive particles aussi/too occur exclusively at the end of the utterance. In this position, their domain of application is no longer necessarily adjacent (15c, see also example 3a of section 2.2).

- (15) a. IE:AN Cycle 1
 I see only one
- b. SF:BE Cycle 2
 NS: ils sont en train de sortir du bateau?
 'they're getting out of the boat?'
 BE: non + seulement [son tombe] *al sol* de bateau
 'no + only have fell to floor of boat'
- c. IE:LA Cycle 1

you have a mortgage too?

In the transition to FUO, the post-verbal position is more and more exploited, with the particle's DoA (italicised in the gloss) being the post-verbal NP:

- (16) a. IE:AL Cycle 1
il y a aussi des grands casinos
'There are also big casinos'
b. SF:BE Cycle 3
là-bas il y a seulement une pause
'there there is only a break'

Mastery of IUO is of course a pre-requisite for the possibility of integrating a particle in post-verbal position: NP - V - Part - NP. This position remains predominant for the French particles and English only even in FUO; Lavinia never produces TL: Aux + only + V, for example, although she develops Aux_{fin} + V. We have no explanation for this, and treat it henceforth as an exception to the main tendencies. What does change at FUO are the possible DoA for the post-verbal particles, which continue to affect the verb's complement, but also for aussi, constituents to the left of the verb:

- (17) SF:AL Cycle 2
en argentine se parle aussi espagnol
'In Argentina is spoken also Spanish'

This is a second indication that the possibility of a particle's having a non-adjacent DoA when integrated within the utterance is related to the acquisition of finiteness-marking. This possibility was first encountered during the discussion of Neg-placement at FUO. The relevant example is repeated here:

- (9) PE:MA
SHE didn't steal any bread + I steal it

The distribution of temporal particles

As mentioned before, the first temporal adverbs to appear are iterative, at IUO level. The central forms are again, encore, but others - particularly *otra* fois - can also convey iteration. These adverbs indicate that the state of affairs denoted in the predicate of the utterance containing them is of the same type as that of a previous utterance. They quantify over states of affairs; their DoA is the predicate of the utterance they occur in, and they occur adjacent to it^{xix}: in other words, they occupy the already available positions where either negative, or additive and restrictive particles are found.

- (18) a. SF:AL Cycle 2
el ... [ale] à la prison *otra* fois

- ‘he .. go to prison once more’
- b. IE:AN Cycle 3
after ten days they meet again
- c. IE:SA Cycle 1
me again no see the traffic light

The other temporal adverbs (TACs) do not appear until FUO is mastered. They function to contrast the TT of the utterance they occur in to another time. As by now the verb group is acquired, they - and their negative counterparts not yet/pas encore, not anymore/(ne)..plus - are integrated into the group, appearing behind the finite verb:

- (19) a. IE:LA Cycle 2
he is already in the nursery
- b. IE:LA Cycle 2
the car is still there
- c. IE:LA Cycle 2
really i didn't decide yet
- d. SF:BE Cycle 3
je ne me rappelle plus
‘i don't remember any more’

5. Discussion

To summarise the descriptions of sections 3 and 4, the original developmental pattern from NUO to FUO established through analysis of an utterance's obligatory constituents has proved useful in describing the developmental path of the expression of negation, additive and restrictive particles, and some temporal particles: the efficient functioning of each organisational stage turned out to be a pre-requisite for the spontaneous use of the relevant items: the verb-complement structure is acquired before adverbs occur between V and the post-verbal NP; finite verb forms tend to occur independently before being associated with Neg. But the original developmental pattern does not account in particular for what we have termed the "transition" from IUO to FUO, and we will return to this.

For both languages examined here^{xx}, the acquisition of these optional items has shown remarkable commonalities in the order of acquisition, but some cross-linguistic discrepancy in the distribution of the items at different stages of development, a fact which also needs to be accounted for. The acquisition order can be summed up as follows (the abbreviations used are: Neg = negator; X represents a major constituent of patterns a., b. of section 2.3; V = lexical verb; Aux = be/have and modal verb; Cop = be/have (and equivalents); Part = additive, restrictive and iterative particles, and temporal adverbs of contrast. The underlined NPs in the table indicate the different DoAs of the particle through the "transition" to the FUO stage)

(20)

Holoph r.	NUO	IUO	transition	FUO	advanced
non no	Neg ₁ + X X + Neg ₂ Neg ₁ = nepade, no Neg ₂ = non, no	NP neg V + NP neg = nepade no dont	NP + V <u> </u> NP ↓ pas NP + cop <u> </u> NP/ADJ ↓ pas not	NP + aux _{fm} + Neg + V + NP aux = do (eng), avoir / have, être / be, pouvoir /devoir & modals neg = pas, n't	NP + aux <u> </u> V + NP ↓ plus notanymore not yet
	Part ₁ + X X + Part ₂ Part ₁ = seulement, only Part ₂ = aussi, too	Part ₁ NP + V + NP Part ₂ Part ₁ = seulmt, otra fois Part ₂ = aussi, otra fois, too, again	NP + V <u> </u> <u>NP</u> ↓ seulement aussi only (compensatory déjà)	<u>NP</u> + V <u> </u> NP ↓ aussi	NP + aux + part + V + NP part = (target-like) déjà, already, still

In proposing an explanation for the descriptive generalisation (20), both structural and communicative factors have to be taken into account. We will start with structural considerations, and look at the distributional discrepancies for additive and restrictive particles at IUO. A learner who has such particles in her repertoire must also learn where to place them in the utterance in relation to their DoA. In the absence of this knowledge, two pragmatic solutions offer themselves: (a) adjacency (b) at the periphery of the already-established utterance structure^{xxi}. Adjacency was the solution adopted at NUO, and this fact, although perhaps not surprising, is also not inevitable. In relation to an utterance such as (4a) of section 2.3, repeated here:

- (4) a. les deux + content
 'the two (of them) + happy'

it turns out that learners do not place a particle such as aussi in utterance final position when its DoA would be les deux, although they do so at IUO.

But an appeal to such pragmatic principles on their own is circular: why should only follow principle (a), whereas seulement follows principle (b)? If, however, these principles are put into correspondence with the predominant distribution of the particles in the TL-input - where aussi, too/as well often or always occur in the salient utterance-final position, seulement in the salient utterance-initial position, the distribution makes more sense. Note that it is unlikely that these learners initially rely on SL knowledge. Spanish tambien and sólo can be placed adjacent to their DoA, or in pre-verbal position with wide scope, as we saw, but these positions characterise more the final stages of acquisition of aussi and seulement. The Italian learners place English additive particles at the right periphery of the utterance, where anche is excluded; on the other hand, the wide-scope position of solo, between auxiliary and verb, is possible for only, but never attained

The subsequent placing of aussi/seulement post-verbally is only attested when verb-complement structure is acquired, i.e., when IUO is already functional. With the availability of this post-verbal position, the relation between the position and DoA of these two particles becomes

progressively more TL-like: aussi occupies the post-verbal and utterance-final positions, seulement is uniquely left-adjacent to its DoA.

It seems, then, that in the transition from IUO to FUO, the learners choose first to solve the structural problem: first of all they find out where to place the particles, and only then, what the scope possibilities of the position are. This reasoning can also be applied at FUO, where a further position opens up, namely, the post- V_{fin} which is possible for all the particles under consideration in both target languages, including negation, but with the exception of too/as well. When there is only one verb form, this position is the "same" as at IUO, but the verb is M-finite. With $Aux_{fin} _ V$ constructions, however, the position was hitherto unavailable. The availability of this position opens up more TL-like scope possibilities, to the left and right of the (additive) particles, and negation. We have seen a progression from a (T/F) utterance organisation, where adjacency is the only possible way of signalling a particle's DoA, to a "basic" utterance structure (IUO) where the particles are on the periphery of the utterance and have scope over its entirety. Then the particles are integrated within the utterance and, finally, there is an interaction with M-finiteness, with the particles affecting^{xxii} non-adjacent constituents.

Why, though, do not all particles exploit all available positions as soon as they become available? Why are iterative particles not attested before IUO? Nor TACs before FUO? The link between the structural characteristics of a given learner variety and a learner's production of scopal items, illustrated in (20), has shown that:

- learners of the same L2 use the same particles in the same way at each stage examined;
- at a given stage of utterance organisation, learners of both L2s show similar behaviour.

This is in itself a remarkable correspondence, and it is linked, as we have seen, with the development of morphological finiteness-marking. The correspondence has to do with the nature of the constituents that at each stage of development constitute the DoA of a particle. Additive and restrictive particles characteristically quantify over entities, referred to by NPs. They can therefore be used independently of any verbal inflexion, and indeed of any verb, and their use is observed from NUO onwards. Iterative particles characteristically express the repetition of an event, which happens again, at a later time interval. They quantify over events, characteristically referred to by V and its complements. To be repeated, an event has to be bounded (perfectly presented), and the expressive means for temporality of IUO allow this. But TACs relate two different time intervals (phases) of the same event. These time intervals have to be signalled, and for this, M-finiteness has to have been acquired.

This last remark is important. Starren (2000) has shown that a major communicative limitation of IUO is that the available linguistic means do not suffice to dissociate TT and TSit (see section 2.1). Learners thus cannot focus on the pre-state of an event (prospective: $TT < TSit$) or the post state of an event (perfect: $TT > TSit$). It is this latter configuration which is crucial to the use of already/déjà. In the English TL sentence:

John has (already) read this book

$TT=Tu > TSit$, TSit is accomplished before TT, which refers to the post-state of the situation, and the finite has is necessary to specify the TT. The situation is different with still and temporal

encore, which contrast two temporal reference points: a state or event remains valid from one TT to a subsequent TT. In the sentence:

John is (still) reading this book

TSit δ TT = TU, i.e., the event is presented imperfectively. The use of still associates this TT with a previous TT within the same TSit, and one needs the finite is to specify the TT. This is why these TACs are only used appropriately at FUO.

Which allows us to return to the phase marked “transition”. Here, learners are building up a finite verbal morphology, pushed by the 'need' to express aspectual distinctions. Both L2s evidence this verbal morphology (Table 1) on what Parodi (1998:40) terms “non-thematic verbs”, i.e., have, be and equivalents: “At an early stage in acquisition, second language learners deal with syntactic and lexical information separately. At this early stage, non-thematic verbs act as carriers of syntactic information while thematic verbs deal mainly with lexical information”.

Our data point however to a more nuanced conclusion, as the lexical verb, too, is involved in the 'transition' phase of L2 French. The structural problem associated with the development of M-finiteness is the relation of the particles to a simple verb form: what goes in front, and what behind, the simple finite verb form? As learners are working with simple verb forms, their repertoire is not yet rich enough to express progressive and perfect aspect in English, perfect aspect and past tense in French. These need the more complex pattern $Aux_{fin} + V_{lex}$ to be productive. This is also true for the negative forms of the English present and past simple. Hence it is no surprise to find that the initial use of TACs “compensate” for the not yet fully functional morphology at this stage: déjà is used to express past time reference, and still, again, imperfectivity, as we have seen with examples 11-14.

There is one last remark to be made in this section: it is not the conceptual complexity of the particles that determine their order of acquisition. Precocious holophrastic use, or direct repetitions of TACs would not run counter to the picture drawn in this paper. We have observed the behaviour of the particles within a functioning system, and have seen that it is the overall functioning of the system that allows different particles to integrate into it at different stages.

6. Expressing the concept of finiteness

Having established the relatively early acquisition and use of negation, restrictive, additive and iterative relations, we return to the role of the corresponding particles in the construction of utterances in context. We place these functions within the wider context of the “fit” between informational and linguistic structure, and in particular in relation to the question of the development of finiteness in an L2. The important development retraced in this section is found within what we will term "Column B" below. Here we will see in particular the "transition" from IUO to FUO.

As we said in the introduction, the adult learner (as opposed to the child) understands the concepts involved in appropriately embedding an utterance in context, and expressing the relation between this context-embedding and the state of affairs expressed in the utterance: the learning problem is to acquire the L2 linguistic means to assert^{xxiii} that a state of affairs is or is

not the case in relation to a context. There are many aspects to "context". What concerns us here is the utterance's (spatio-)temporal and personal co-ordinates (topic times, places and entities), whether they be established directly in relation to the origo, or to a previously mentioned time/person/space.

The utterances at NUO and IUO showed a simple topic-focus organisation where the focus expression comes last, whereas the structures of FUU are much less transparent in this respect. We adopt this T-F organisation in the following tables^{xxiv}: topic items are in the first column ('A') and focus items in the last column ('C'). We concentrate on the development of column B. Column B includes the expression of the two functions of finiteness - (temporal) anchoring, and assertion - discussed in section 2.1.

Table 7. NUO utterances

Learner	A Topic items	B	C Focus items
(1) SF: GL (ex 4d)	aujourd'hui ici 'today here'		quatre familles 'four families'
(2) MF:AB	après 'then'		avec la police 'with the police' (='then the policeman arrived')
(3) MF: ZA	moi quatre mois 'me four months'		toujours fatiguée 'always tired'
(4) SF: PA (4c)	les deux 'the two (of them)'		content 'happy'
(5) IE: SA		no only	father mother
(6) MF: MA	toi 'you'	[jãna] 'isa'	li café 'the café'
(7) SF: PA	à côté del restaurant 'next to the restaurant'	[se] 'isa'	un kiosk 'a kiosk'
(8)) PE:RA	then	[iz]	police (='then the policeman arrived')

As we see in (1) - (5), the assertion is left implicit. However, an assertion marker is developed by some informants, as illustrated in (6-8)^{xxv}. In (6) Malika is reporting speech: her employer said that he would look after the kitchen, and Malika (= 'toi') must look after the café; (7) is the introduction of the referent 'kiosk' from a known spatial context - the restaurant. (8) marks the 'arrival on the scene' of a policeman. Temporal adverbs in A allow the TT to be set (1-3, 8), otherwise it is derivable from context. (3) is directly contextualised in relation to the origo ('me'), and shows a combination of adverbs: the adverb in column A ('four months') gives the TT of the utterance, and that in column C ('always tired'), the TSit, allowing preliminary aspectual distinctions which become systematic at IUO. We leave their discussion until then.

(1,2, 8) serve to introduce referents, whereas the referents in (4-5) are derivable from the immediately preceding discourse: in (5), recall that Santo answers the NS’s question “Does she live with her father and mother”, denying the “father” alternative and restricting the validity of the assertion to “mother”.

At this stage it is therefore possible to deny the assertability of the A-C relation. Here are some more examples.

Table 8. NUO negatives

Learner	A Topic items	B	C Focus items
(1) IE: SA	in london	no	<u>very sun</u>
(2) SF:PA	il 'he'	pas 'no'	<u>l'école</u> 'school'
(3) SF: BE		[nepade] 'isanot'	<u>voiture</u> 'car'
(4) IE :SA		no	<u>chef</u>
(5) IE:SA	<u>original copy</u>	no	
(6) MF:ZA	<u>couture</u> 'sewing'	non 'no'	

In (1), Santo states that the information in focus ('very sun') does not belong to the set of properties that are valid for the topic 'in London', and in (2) Palmira states that the T-F relation 'he' (her son) and 'school' is not valid. In (3) Bernarda, who has a car, answers a question whether she made a particular journey by car ('we did not go by car'), and in (4) Santo replies to the suggestion that he is a 'real' chef (rather than a simple kitchen hand).

The assertion can be left implicit, but not the negation marker, so an adult beginner may acquire an assertion marker (in addition to the holophrastic 'yes'), but has to acquire a negation marker. As we said, the negation marker seems to be essential.

In examples (5-6) of Table 8, the negation functions to exclude the topic from the alternatives valid for a (contextually given, implicit) focus. The T-F relation can also be asserted of another known referent (a procedure sometime called “contrastive topic”), in which case B can have an additive value (examples 2 and 3 below). Example 1 below contrasts the validity of two relevant members of the set of alternatives:

Table 9. 'Contrastive topic'

Informant	A Topic items	B	C Focus
(1) IE:SA	for me for manager the restaurant	yes no	
(2) SF: BE	moi 'me'	aussi 'too'	

In (1), Santo replies to a comment that it must be very pleasant when the restaurant is empty. In (2) NS has just said that supermarket shopping gets on her nerves. There are then a limited number of variants in NUO marking the relation between A and C: These come to be expanded at IUO.

We have called the utterances in the tables (8-10) “nominal structures”: in particular, there is little or no structure within the column C. Progress from NUO to IUO is generally speaking pushed by communicative needs, as the learner at the initial stage requires constant scaffolding (not merely for vocabulary, cf. how to retell *Modern Times* with the help of the interlocutor, Perdue 1987). IUO (the basic variety) is an autonomous system, and a level of potential stabilisation, where the learner has managed to differentiate parts of speech, and develop an argument structure. For the main constituents, the crucial development is the emergence of recognisable verbs and their arguments. This development has consequences for negation and other scopal items, as we have seen in the previous sections. We deal first with negation:

Table 10. IUO: Negatives

Learner	A Topic items	B Neg	C Verb + complement
(1) IE:SA	i	dont	<u>have insurance</u>
(2) IE :AN	i (...)	no	<u>speak english</u>
(3) MF :ZA	charlot 'chaplin'	[jānapa]	[don] [lepeje] 'give the money' (='pay')
(4) SF:BE	moi 'me'	[nepa]	[parle] <u>bien le</u> <u>français</u> 'speak good french'

As we said in section 3, the negator now occurs before the (non-finite) verb, and a specific pre-verbal negator (dont) appears in L2 English. In NUO and IUO, the situation is very similar to that described by Silberstein (2001) for L2 German, and Bernini for L2 Italian. Bernini states:

pre-basic varieties are characterized by the common strategy of integrating the expression of negation into the T/F structure of the utterances, yielding two structural results: the negator is

either pre-posed to the topic constituent, or postposed to a topicalized constituent. As soon as verbal utterances emerge, the expression of negation is integrated into the utterance in pre-verbal position. (Bernini 2000:404).

Table 11. IUO: Particles

Informant	Particle	A	B	C	Particle
(1) SF: PA	seulement 'only	[Ze] I		[fe] un stage <u>do a course'</u>	
(2) SF: BE		la maison 'at home	[se] isa	[parle] français <u>speak French</u>	seulement only'
(3) IE: LA		<u>you</u>		have a mortgage	too
(4) IE: AND		after 10 days they		<u>meet</u>	again
(5) SF: PA	*otra* fois 'once more	[le] on-him		[tumbe] le table <u>fall the table'</u>	

Additive and restrictive particles (1-3) are placed at the utterance boundary, with the context determining the DoA (underlined). Iterative particles share the distribution of additive and restrictive particles (4-5).

In IUO, the assertion marker is still optional, and other carriers of illocutionary force appear.

Table 12. IUO: Column B

Informant	A Topic	B	C Focus
(1) SF: Bernarda	après 'then	[se] isa	[lemar e] à pied the walk on foot'
(2) PE: Ravinder	girl	[iz]	pinch bread
(3) IE: Andrea		no possible	open door (=he couldn't open the door)

(1) is a presentational: the focus 'walk on foot' is introduced. This could be glossed as 'then they had to continue on foot', (2-3) are narrative utterances. (3) shows a modal value in column B, the topic 'he' is recoverable from the discourse context. Coenen and van Hout (1988) analyse the Dutch modal moet ('must') at IUO as an adverb, which has complementary distribution in

column B to the negator niet, and to the emphatic assertion marker wel (app. ‘indeed’). There are then at this stage a larger, but still limited number of items appearing in column B, whose function is to express assertion, or some (modalised) variant of assertion, or the additive/restrictive relation as in NUO^{xxvi}.

The interplay of temporal adverbs within columns A and C becomes more systematic. Starren (2000) analyses many examples of the following kind:

Table 13. IUO: Temporal adverbs

Informant	A Topic	B	C Focus
(1) MF: Zahra	toujours moi 'always me		[fè] la cuisine ce soir do the cooking the evening'
(2) MF: Abdel	hier le capitaine bateau 'yesterday the captain boat		toujours [regarde] always watch'

pointing out that at this stage, certain aspectual contrasts are possible, but with the limitation that the utterance’s TT and its TSit coincide. Thus (1) expresses habituality (‘for all the sub-intervals of always I cook in the evening), and (2) continuity (‘the time span yesterday is filled by the activity of supervising’). What is relevant for our purposes is that TT is still specified adverbially, in column A, with no reflex in B.

It is only from the “transition” stage on that temporal specification in the form of M-finiteness appears in column B. We will restrict the remainder of the discussion to the auxiliaries, as the A-B-C analysis breaks down in the case of inflected lexical verbs.

Table 14. Beyond IUO

Informant	A Topic	B	C Focus
(1) IE: VI		are	come too much english (= there are too many english tourists)
(2) SF: BE	je 'i'	suis 'have'	[ale] 'gone'
(3) IE: LA	i	was just	going to the park
(4) IE: LA	he	is still	working
(5) IE: LA (cf. 19c)	i	didn't	decide yet
(6) SF: AL	tous les gens [ke] j' 'all the people that i'	ai déjà 'have already'	dit 'said'
(7) SF: BE	le coupable 'the guilty one'	est seulement 'is only'	<u>la femme</u> 'the woman'
(8) SF: AL (cf. 16a)		il y a aussi 'there are also'	<u>des grands casinos</u> 'big casinos'
(9) SF: AL	<u>ma femme</u> 'my wife'	a aussi 'has also'	téléphoné 'called'
(10) SF: PA	<u>la fille</u> 'the girl'	a PAS 'has not'	volé le pain 'stolen the bread'

The internal organisation of column B complexifies, with a verbal element carrying the assertion, and temporal and personal information (1-2). Negation and temporal adverbs of contrast can combine with this verbal element (3-6). Furthermore, French additive and restrictive particles are integrated into the utterance, with seulement placed in the TL-post-verbal position with NP2 as its DoA (7), and aussi combining with the complex assertion marker in column B (8-9). Negation (10) and (French) additive particles (8-9) can now have a non-adjacent DoA to their left.

Summing up, we see from the development in column B that the expression of assertion grammaticalises over time, in parallel to the development described in the other sections (and illustrated in the other columns). In NUO, the only possibilities are: yes/no, a qualified yes (additive particles) and a qualified no (restrictive particles). Some primitive modal expressions (Dittmar??). These possibilities are expanded with the development of verb-argument structure at IUO: again (and equivalents) interacts with the verb and its complement. When FUO has developed, these possibilities become fully functional: the finite verb carries assertion, and can be modalised (can(not), etc.) as well as specifying TT, and this for the expression of different phases of the situation: just, already, still and their negative counterparts.

7. Conclusion

In conclusion, we have examined step by step the communicative possibilities and limitations of each successive functioning learner variety, and how learners overcome its communicative limitations. We have also seen how a particular type of organisation has to function productively before new items can be integrated. In section 5, we summarised the structural complexification of the utterance from NUO to FUO. We also examined the semantic compatibility between the meaning of a particle (or different meaning values of the same form in the case of just and encore) and the type of constituent available as its DoA. And we noticed a remarkable developmental correspondence between each level.

In doing so, we have witnessed a grammatical category “finiteness” building up over time, from the initial assertion and negation markers. The development of M-finiteness allows the two functions of assertion and temporal specification to be expressed in one and the same form. Not only the functions of temporal adverbs, but also the scope properties of negation and additive particles are affected by this development. We have uncovered some quite novel interactions between the acquisition of verbal morphology expressing agreement, tense and aspect and the behaviour of these items. “Novel” not in the sense of “totally unexpected”, but in relation to published work on the acquisition of finiteness in a second language.

ⁱ Address for correspondence, Clive Perdue, Sciences du Langage, Université Paris VIII. 2 rue de la Liberté, F-93526 Saint Denis Cedex. email: clive@univ-paris8.fr.

Previous versions of this paper have been presented to the “dynamics of learner varieties” group in Heidelberg, October 1999, and at The “Finiteness” workshop, at the DGfS-Tagung in Marburg, March 2000. The authors are very grateful for the discussions the presentations provoked, and remain of course responsible for the idiosyncrasies and possible errors. We are especially grateful to Christine Dimroth, Petra Gretsche, Peter Jordens and Marianne Starren for long discussions and detailed comments. The first author has a special debt to the MPI for Psycholinguistics for providing an ideal working environment.

ⁱⁱ We limit the discussion in this paper to assertion, leaving aside questions and requests.

ⁱⁱⁱ It is true that learners of a typologically closely related language – for example, a Spanish-speaker learning French – has a less arduous learning task. But this facilitation has much to do with the lexicon, and much less to do with the phenomena under discussion in this paper.

^{iv} One much-analysed activity was to ask the learner to retell part of the Charlie Chaplin film “Modern Times”, which explains why Chaplin’s name occurs in some of the examples given in this paper.

^v Criteria for informant selection, and a short socio-biographical sketch of the informants can be found in volume 1 of Perdue 1993. For reasons of space we give only minimal details here.

^{vi} “[B]eing the carrier of [assertion] is the main function of finiteness.” (Klein 1998:225). This idea is standard in enunciative approaches. Culioli (1995[1983]: 106, English translation of Michel Liddle), for example, states: “In an assertion, we can see that this [predicative relation]... will be located with respect to Sit ([the enunciative situation]), with respect to ... a system of spatio-temporal co-ordinates, as well as the subject of the utterance. This will enable me to say that such and such a relation is validated for a specific moment...”. We will however stick with Klein’s formulation, although Culioli’s usual terms “validation of”, or “taking charge of” an utterance are perhaps better suited to an operation which is neutral in relation to mood (declarative, interrogative, imperative) and modality.

^{vii} In traditional terms, the situation has been accomplished and is presently relevant.

^{viii} Transcription conventions are as follows: + represents a short pause; (...) represents an irrelevant, omitted passage; [] enclose broad phonetic transcription in cases where orthography leads to over-interpretation of the data; * * enclose borrowings from another language (often the learner’s source language). Subjects are identified first by

language pairing: SF = Spanish-French, MF = Moroccan Arabic-French; IE = Italian-English, PE = Punjabi-English, and then by the first two letters of their name: BE = Bernarda, etc. NS denotes native speaker. English glosses are enclosed in single quotes and should in no way be taken as a grammatical analysis.

^{ix} In this paper, « focus » and « topic » are used in relation to the « quaestio » model, an elaboration of the question-answer test for focus to account for discourse structure. This perspective for discourse analysis, proposed in 1987 by Klein and von Stutterheim, accounts for the overall structure of a coherent text (such as the complex verbal tasks our informants performed) in terms of the quaestio - the implicit or explicit question - that the whole text answers. The quaestio defines the main structure of the text, and for main structure utterances, which information belongs to the topic or to the focus component. For a narrative text, for example, the quaestio that the main structure answers can be formulated as follows:

What happened (to p) at t_{i+1} ?

This determines that the topic of each main structure utterance optionally involves the protagonist (p) and necessarily a time interval (i) in a chronological chain (i + 1), whereas the focus specifies a singular event falling within that time span (and therefore perfectly presented).

^x More precisely, produced in a base form, or a form resembling the TL's infinitive or participial forms. The important point however is that there are no morphological oppositions.

^{xi} The adjectives and (Germanic) particles can already be interpreted at NUO as having an Aktionsart. I am grateful to Petra Gretsche for this observation.

^{xii} X + Neg is also used as a variant of the holophrastic negation, with simple repetition of the topic, as in this example of Palmira's, who replies to a yes/no question: non + Ze non "no + me no"

^{xiii} For extensive discussion, see Giuliano (2000). Bernini de la soutenance de PatriziaA similar explanation is proposed for learners' use of German additive auch by Dimroth (this volume). She observes that during the transition to FUD, the finite verb and auch are in complementary distribution.

^{xiv} Silberstein (2000:42) gives the following percentages by cycle for Santo: Cycle 1: no(t) V = 72%, dont V = 28%; Cycle 2: no(t) V = 56%, dont V = 44%.

^{xvi} We ignore the "rare" Italian solamente (Ricca 1999), and comment further on the fact that anche also has a scalar reading ('even'); nor do we consider the French discontinuous restrictive ne...que, which is not attested in the data.

^{xvii} just, here, is preferentially interpreted in its temporal reading.

^{xviii} As the present sentence attests.

^{xix} In utterance-final position, the DoA may either be the utterance, or the VP.

^{xx} Space precludes the demonstration, but the situation is almost exactly the same for German L2. See Benazzo 2000 for an analysis of scope particles, Silberstein (in press) for analysis of negation, and Becker and Dietrich 1996 for both.

^{xxi} These two pragmatic solutions were captured long ago in two of Slobin's "operating principles": "avoid interruption ... of linguistic units", "underlying semantic relations should be marked overtly and clearly", respectively principles D and E of Slobin (1973); or (b) the periphery of an utterance (another interpretation of principle D: "there is a tendency to preserve the structure of a sentence as a closed entity, reflected in a development from sentence external placement of various linguistic forms to their movement within the sentence" Slobin 1973:200)

^{xxii} Following Bayer (1999), we may consider particles in this position to be head of a PRT-phrase with VP as its complement, its scope properties being accounted for by c-command (and various movements). However, it is the informational context which specifies the particle's actual DoA within the c-command domain. The same argument

holds potentially for constituent negation versus sentence negation (*ibid.*, p78, note 8). This point is elaborated in Nesterstigt 2002.

^{xxiii} Cf note two

^{xxiv} At the price of some simplification, however. In particular we ignore the presence of 'background' information and complications due to 'old focus'.

^{xxv} These uses are very reminiscent of the focus markers *iz*, *isa* discussed by Huebner (1983, 1989). The hypothesis examined is that a particle initially marking the T/F boundary is a precursor for finiteness marking, "opening up" a position for finiteness marking. See also Véronique (1983) and Starren (2000) in this respect.

^{xxvi} For a discussion of this question in child language acquisition, see Jordens (this volume).

REFERENCES

- Bayer, Josef (1999). Bound focus. In *The Grammar of Focus*. Georges Rebuschi and Laurice Tuller (eds.), 55-82. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Becker, Angelika and Dietrich, Rainer (1996). The acquisition of scope in L2 German. *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 104, 115-140.
- Benazzo, Sandra (2000). *L'Acquisition de Particules de Portée en Français, Anglais et Allemand L2: Etudes Longitudinales Comparées*. Unpublished thesis, Université Paris VIII.
- Clark, Eve (1971). On the acquisition of the meaning of 'before' and 'after'. *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behaviour* 10, 266-275.
- Coenen, Josée and van Hout, Roeland (1988). Word order phenomena in second language acquisition of Dutch. *Linguistics in the Netherlands*
- Dietrich, Rainer, Klein, Wolfgang and Noyau, Colette (eds.) (1995). *The Acquisition of Temporality in Second Language Acquisition*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Dimroth, Christine (1998). Indiquer la portée en allemand L2: une étude longitudinale de l'acquisition des particules de portée. *Acquisition et Interaction en Langue Etrangère* 11, 11-34.
- Dimroth, Christine (this volume)
- Feldweg, Helmut (1993). Transcription and storage of data. In Clive Perdue (ed.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Guliano, Patrizia (2000). *L'Acquisition et l'Expression des Fonctions Négatives en Français et en Anglais comme Langues Secondes*. Unpublished thesis, Université Paris VIII.
- Huebner, Thom (1983). *The Acquisition of English*. Karoma
- Huebner, Thom (1989). Establishing point of view: the development of coding mechanisms in a second language for the expression of cognitive and perceptual organisation. *Linguistics* 27, 111-143.
- Huebner, Thom, Carroll, Mary and Perdue, Clive (1992). The acquisition of English. In *Utterance Structure: Developing Grammars Again*, Wolfgang Klein and Clive Perdue (eds.), 61-122. Amsterdam: Benjamins
- Klein, Wolfgang (1994). *Time in Language*. London: Routledge and Kegan.
- Klein, Wolfgang and von Stutterheim, Christiane (1987). Quaestio und referentielle Bewegung. *Linguistische Berichte* 109, 163-183.

-
- Klein, Wolfgang and Perdue, Clive (1992). *Utterance Structure: Developing Grammars Again*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Klein, Wolfgang and Clive Perdue (1997). The basic variety (or: Couldn't natural languages be much simpler?) *Second Language Research* 13(4), 301-348.
- Parodi, Theresa (1998). Finiteness and verb movement in L2A: a correlation revisited. Ms, University of Cambridge.
- Penner, Zvi, Tracy, Rosemary and Wymann, Karin (1999). Die Rolle des Focuspartikel auch im frühen kindlichen lexikon. In *Das Lexikon im Spracherwerb*. J Meibauer and Monika Rottweiler (eds.), 229-251. Tübingen and Basel: UTB-Frank.
- Perdue, Clive (1987). Real beginners. Real Questions. In *S'Approprier une Langue Etrangère*, Henriette Blanc, Michel Le Douaron and Daniel Véronique (eds.), 196-210. Paris: Didier Erudition.
- Perdue, Clive (1990). Complexification of the simple clause in the narrative discourse of adult language learners. *Linguistics* 28, 983-1009.
- Perdue, Clive (ed.) (1993). *Adult Language Acquisition: Crosslinguistic Perspectives. Volume 1, Field Methods*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Perdue, Clive and Klein, Wolfgang (1992). Why does the production of some learners not grammaticalize? *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 14, 259-272.
- Ricca, D (1999). Osservazioni preliminari sui focalizzatori in italiano. In *Grammatik und Diskurs: Studien zum Erwerb des Deutschen und des Italienischen*, Norbert Dittmar and Anna Giacalone Ramat (eds.), 145-163. Tübingen: Stauffenburg Linguistik.
- Silberstein, Dagmar (in press). Facteurs interlingues, spécifiques et idiosyncrasiques déterminant l'acquisition spontanée de la négation en anglais L2. *Acquisition et Interaction en Langue Etrangère* 13.
- Slobin, Dan (1973). Cognitive prerequisites for the development of grammar. In *Studies of Child Language Development*, Charles Ferguson and Dan Slobin (eds.), 175-208. New York:: Holt Rinehart and Winston.
- Starren, Marianne (2000). Morphosyntactic doorways for expressing tense and aspect in Dutch and French L2. Paper presented at the EURESCO conference, Sant Feliu de Guixols, October.
- Stoffel, Henriette and Véronique, Daniel (1996). L'Acquisition de la négation en français par des adultes arabophones", Paper presented at the European Research Conference "The Structure of Learner Language. Utterance and discourse structure in language acquisition", Espinho, Portugal, September 1996.
- Taglicht, J (1984). *Message and Emphasis. On Focus and Scope in English*. London: Longman.
- Véronique, Daniel (1983). Observations préliminaires sur li dans l'interlangue d'Abdelmalek. *GRAL-Papiers de Travail* 1, 155-180.