

# 4 The acquisition of German

*Wolfgang Klein and Mary Carroll*

## 4.1 Introduction

### 4.1.1 *Presentation of the chapter*

This chapter concentrates on two Italian-speaking learners, Tino and Angelina, and two Turkish-speaking learners, Çevdet and Ayshe. Since it turned out that the two Italian learners represent two very different levels of acquisition, two other learners, Gina and Vito, are included in the analysis so as to give a representative sample of the process of development found for this group. Tino has frequent contact with speakers of German and makes rapid progress over the period studied. Angelina, on the other hand, is the least advanced learner; she has comparatively little opportunity for speaking German, and her utterances, though they show some progress, are even at the end still quite typical of those of a beginner. Gina and Vito, whom we have already considered in chapter 2, are somewhat more advanced in their use of the language. The differences between these learners are palpable, but they appear to be differences in speed rather than structural differences. The group of Turkish learners is far more homogeneous with respect to language contact and other factors; thus, the study is based on the data of two learners as they give a representative picture of the course of development found.

In the remainder of this introduction we shall, to the extent necessary for present purposes, outline some regularities of word order in everyday German, and briefly consider word order in Turkish (for Italian, see chapter 3).

#### 4.1.2 *Word order in German*

In the following, we will focus on obligatory syntactic constraints on word order, i.e. those which can be stated in terms of notions such as NP, V, nominative, in contrast to constraints involving semantic role properties, properties of the entities referred to, or pragmatic factors. We will first deal with the arrangement of major constituents and then have a look at the internal organisation of these major constituents.

There is a running debate on whether SOV or SVO should be regarded as the "basic word order" of German. In fact, neither of these is particularly plausible, since the category V is comprised of two different components which are occasionally realised by a single, fused form but are often expressed by two forms. In German, these two forms obey clear but very distinct positional constraints, and any understanding of the basic utterance organisation in German, be it by the linguist or the learner, crucially hinges on this fact. The first component corresponds to the role of the verb as a carrier of a specific lexical meaning and as a governing category which asks for certain NP or PP complements ("actants", as we have been saying); the second component corresponds to the verb as a carrier of tense, mood, agreement and similar features, most often marked by inflexion. We shall call the latter the "finite" component, and the former, the "infinite" component. These components often correspond to two separate forms, labelled here  $V_f$  and  $V_i$ , respectively; but they may also be fused into one single form, labelled here  $V_{if}$ .  $V_f$  is realised by an auxiliary or a modal,  $V_i$  by an infinitive or a participle, and  $V_{if}$  by an inflected lexical verb. It should be clear that this is a gross oversimplification, among other reasons because a modal clearly has a lexical content, too, because there may be several auxiliaries, only one of which is  $V_f$ , and because  $V_i$  may be complex. But for present purposes, we can ignore these complications, with one exception: In German,  $V_i$  often consists of two parts - the "stem" and a separable prefix (*an-*, *auf-*, *ein-*) which carries the main stress and has special positional properties; we label it PART; it may, but need not have an independent lexical meaning, as exemplified by the two readings of *anziehen* ("to attract", "to put on").

The basic word order properties of German may now be stated by three rules:

- I.  $V_i$  is clause-final.
- II.
  - a.  $V_f$  is preceded by exactly one major constituent in declarative main clauses.
  - b.  $V_f$  is clause-initial in yes-no-questions and imperatives.
  - c.  $V_f$  follows  $V_i$  in subordinate clauses (overruling I).

III. In case of fusion,  $V_f$  and PART keep their position; the rest of V; moves and fuses with  $V_f$  to  $V_{if}$ .

Some examples may illustrate these principles which, incidentally, hold for both literary and everyday spoken language, with the exception that subordinate clauses introduced by *weil* "because" often have main clause order (i.e. IIa instead of IIc) in spoken language.

- (1) *Dann hat Charlie das Mädchen gesehen*  
'Then has Charlie the girl seen'
- (2) *daß Charlie das Mädchen gesehen hat*  
'that Charlie the girl seen has'
- (3) *Dann sah Charlie das Mädchen*  
'Then saw Charlie the girl'
- (4) *Dann ist Charlie weggegangen*  
'Then is Charlie away-gone'
- (5) *Dann ging Charlie weg*  
'Then went Charlie away'

As the examples illustrate, the basic organising principles of German and English are, despite their close genetic relationship and occasional matches, quite different, even in declarative main clauses. In particular, the one major constituent preceding  $V_f$  in main clauses need not be the subject. Adverbials in this position are quite common and by no means marked. It is also possible to have other constituents in this position, such as the direct object; even the  $V_i$ , which is normally clause-final (cf. I) can be put there, but this is clearly felt to be a "marked" structure, with the pragmatic effect of a topicalisation. It is difficult to say (and a subject of much debate) which constituents are "normal" in front position and which ones are "marked". As a rule of thumb, one may say that four types of constituent are "normal" in this position:

1. grammatical subject;
2. adverbials, in particular adverbials of time and space;
3. indirect or direct object for some special verbs, e.g. *Mir ist etwas aufgefallen* "something caught my attention", *Charlie ist ein Unfall passiert* "To Charlie is an accident occurred", i.e. "Charlie had an accident";
4. expletive *es* (roughly English "it" or "there") in many constructions.

It is also possible to have constituents after  $V_i$  ("right extraposition"); this is felt to be marked, except in case of sentential-complements, as in (7):

(6) *Dann hat Charlie ihr etwas gesagt*  
'Then has Charlie (to)her something said'

(7) *Dann hat Charlie ihr gesagt, daß...*  
'Then has Charlie (to)her told, that ...'

Obviously, these indications give only a rough picture. But a learner who obeyed them consistently would sound quite good. It should be noted that the schemes described in (I—III) are also the basis for the placing of smaller constituents; for example, sentence negation is (typically) placed before  $V_i$  (before moving in the case of fusion).

Let us now have a short look at the internal structure of NP and PP, beginning with the latter. German normally has prepositions; it also has a few postpositions, and very occasionally both (e.g. *an der Wand entlang* "along the wall"). Prepositions assign case, mostly accusative or dative; some have both accusative and dative; thus, *in* with dative is locative, *in* with accusative is directional, roughly corresponding to "in" and "into". Prepositions are often fused with the definite article, resulting in forms like *am* (*an dem* "at the") and others, which may constitute a special learning problem.

The NP in German is roughly like the English NP, that is, determiners and adjectives precede the noun, other attributes follow it. There are two differences, however. German has a type of complex attribute which precedes the noun, e.g. *der von seiner Frau seit Jahren geschiedene Mann*, lit. "the from his wife since years divorced man". Secondly, and more importantly, the German NP is marked for case, gender, and plural, and the way in which this is done is generally felt to be a nightmare. There are about twenty inflectional paradigms of nouns, but case is often marked by the determiner rather than by the noun, the adjective may have different inflexion depending on the preceding determiner, etc. One can safely predict that not all learners master this system after the first year.

#### 4.1.3 A quote on word order in Turkish

If there is any agglutinative language, it is Turkish. Both nominal and verbal stems can be modified by a whole series of suffixes (prefixes are rare). It is not unusual to have verb forms with ten suffixes. There are various types of agreement, notably verb-subject agreement. One is not surprised, then, to find that the grammatical subject can be left out, but only if it is clear from mor-

phology alone and not in focus. "Although Turkish has no agreement markers for non-subjects, it is also possible to "drop" such constituents; e.g. *bul+du+m* (find+past+1sg). "I found (it)". Such examples are more restricted, however, than "subject-drop" examples. They can never start a discourse, while "subjectless" finite sentences can (Kornfilt 1987:637). As we shall see later, this is reflected in the learner varieties of Turkish learners.

Turkish is generally considered to be a left-branching language, with postpositions, head before modifier and SOV word order. The latter point is not so clear, however. The most comprehensive study of word order in Turkish, Erguvanhan (1979, reprinted 1984) reveals a complex picture. We have no better way to sketch the basic facts about Turkish word order in simple clauses than by quoting Erguvanhan (p. 7; see also the clear account in von Stutterheim 1986:chapter 4).

The rich morphology, in particular the systematic case marking, suggests that word order in Turkish doesn't have a "primary" grammatical function, such as signalling grammatical relations (as is often the case in languages that don't have a case system) or the syntactic form (i.e. statement, question, embedded sentences, etc.) since the morphological markings signal such necessary grammatical information. This is not to say that there is no such thing as a basic word order for Turkish. Let's consider the following examples:

(1) *Mutluluk huzur getir-ir*  
 'happiness peace=of=mind bring'  
 "Happiness brings peace of mind"  
 \* "Peace of mind brings happiness"

(2) *Huzur mutluluk getir-ir*  
 'peace=of=mind happiness bring'  
 "Peace of mind brings happiness"  
 \* "Happiness brings peace of mind"

A change in the word order of (1) produces (2), which is now a different sentence. This is a crucial case in illustrating that there is a basic word order in Turkish and that it is SOV. However, such sentences are rather infrequent, that is, in most cases, there is either case marking on one of the NPs or the NPs differ in their semantic features, which then distinguishes their grammatical role. Therefore, once the grammatical roles of the NPs are made transparent, there is then grounds for word order variation. It is in this respect, then, that Turkish fits into the Pragmatic Word Order type (Thompson

1978), where the linear ordering of elements and their variation serve pragmatic purposes, like signalling topics, old vs. new information, etc."

The semantic factors which Erguvanhan has in mind have to do with definiteness and with intrinsic properties of the NP-referent, like animacy. Role properties, such as being the controller, do not seem to affect word order, more precisely, Erguvanhan has found no such effect (nor any other author, to our knowledge). Erguvanhan sums up his findings as follows (p. 42):

"we can summarise the constraints on word order in simplex sentences as follows:

- (a) If there is a single indefinite NP in a sentence and it is not a [-animate] subject, it obligatorily occurs in the immediately preverbal position (a [+animate] subject optionally occurs in this position).
- (b) In sentences with more than one indefinite NP, the non-case marked DO (i.e. non-referential or indefinite specific) has priority over the others in occupying the immediately preverbal position.  
Corollary: A DO which is not right before the verb has to be case marked (definite or indefinite specific), in which case oblique NPs or adverbs may come to the immediate left of the verb. If the DO is indefinite, specific and the oblique NP is definite, the unmarked position of the DO is immediately preverbal; any other word order is a marked order.
- (c) An indefinite NP other than [+animate] subjects may not occur sentence initially unless it is the only NP in the sentence.

These constraints, then, center around two syntactic positions; i) sentence initial and ii) immediately preverbal position, which we will label respectively as the *topic* and *focus* position".

This fits well with some observations on the behaviour of Turkish learners, although we feel that, given our learners' aptitudes, this is perhaps not the last word on Turkish word order.

## 4.2 Italian — German: Tino

### 4.2.1 *The informant*

Tino was born in 1963 in Taranto. He went to an elementary school for five years and to the *scuola media* for 3 further years. He had no professional training and was unemployed until, at the suggestion of a friend, he first came to Germany in 1982, where he worked in a pizzeria. After a few months, he returned to Italy, but came back to Heidelberg in February 1983, where he then worked as a kitchen hand and, at the end of the observation period, as a waiter in an Italian restaurant. He had regular and frequent contacts with Germans, including a German partner, with whom he lived for a while. At the time of the first encounter, his knowledge of German was very elementary, but due to his relatively intensive contacts, he made rapid progress. He has some - very basic - knowledge of French and English.

The first retelling took place in June, 1983, the second in December 1983, and the third in June, 1984.

### 4.2.2 *Cycle I*

#### *Repertoire and a sample*

In order to give an idea of his skills at this point, we give the beginning of his first, short retelling, which consisted of about 40 utterances.

- (1) *chariot jetzt arbeite in eine baustelle*  
'Chariot now work in a building site'
- (2) *aber ist nicht gut für arbeiten*  
'but is not good for(at) work'
- (3) *und will noch mal gefängnis gehen*  
'and wants again prison go'
- (4) *aber in der straße seh eine mädchen*  
'but in the street see a girl'
- (5) *das hatte ein brötchen nehmen + ohne geld nehmen*  
that has/had<sup>1</sup> a roll/bread take + without money take'
- (6) *sie fliehen*  
'she run'

As the examples illustrate, Tino's retelling is short, but quite fluent and well-organised, although his repertoire is highly restricted. He uses about twenty **nouns**, all of them in an uninflected base form, and a similar number of **verbs**, again in an uninflected base form; there are a few signs of beginning inflexion, to which we will turn below. He has four **prepositions**, six adjectives, about a dozen **adverbs**, including *dann* "then", *jetzt* "now" and *nochmal* "again", and two **connectors** *und* "and" and *aber* "but". Lexical NPs are introduced by *ein* "a, one" or *de* "the", with variant *die*. His **pronouns** include *ich* "I", *du* "you" and *wir* "we"; *er* "he", *sie* "she, they", which are correctly used, anaphoric *das* "this" and two relative pronouns, *wo* "where" and *wer* "who".

Tino does not inflect, hence does not distinguish between  $V_i$  and  $V_f$  (cf. 4.1.2); there are two exceptions, however, which indicate that he is "working" at this distinction; first, he distinguishes between *ist* "is" and *war* "was" as well as between *will* "wants to" and its plural form *wollen*. And second, he has two analytic verb constructions, both mentioned in the text above: *will ... gehen* (3) and *hat .... nehmen* (5: the appropriate target form would be *hat ... genommen*). One could take these few occurrences to be accidental, but we shall see that he systematically elaborates on them. It is perhaps not accidental, either, that he starts differentiating verbs with irregular forms which are phonologically very distinct. Regular oppositions like *lacht - lachte* or *lacht - lachen* are more systematic and apply to many verbs, but given Tino's phonology, they are both harder to perceive and to produce.

#### *Basic phrasal patterns*

Tino's utterances correspond to one of the following three patterns (where  $V$  is the "base form" of the verb, which does not discriminate between  $V_f$  and  $V_i$ ; in form it corresponds mostly to later  $V_i$ ):

- A.  $NP_1 - V - NP_2$
- B.  $NP_1 - \text{Cop} - \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Adj} \\ \text{PP} \\ \text{NP}_2 \end{array} \right\}$
- E.  $NP_1 - V_f - (NP_2) - V_i$

They all can be preceded by *und* (or *aber*). In addition, many A.- and E.-utterances have PPs (i.e. non-governed "adverbial" PPs), which appear either at the beginning or at the end or before  $V_i$  (E.). There are a few exceptions, to which we will turn below.

Note that Tino has, at this level, no V-first constructions. The dominant



pattern is A. His utterance organisation is still based on a "non-finite" V - i.e. a form which has lexical meaning and governs one or two NPs (though it does not assign case yet), but which does not include the function of the verb as a carrier of tense, agreement, and similar features. Thus, it corresponds in function and mostly in form to  $V_i$ , and we might call it  $V_i$ , except that such a label would incorrectly suggest a contrast to  $V_f$ , which does not exist at this point: V is the predecessor of both  $V_f$  and  $V_i$ . As pattern E. indicates, Tino is on his way to this differentiation. It is arguable whether one should indeed call  $V_f$  the few occurrences of *hat*, *will*, that there are; obviously, he is in a transitory stage, and his retelling clearly demonstrates that the transition from "infinite" (IUO) to "finite" TL-like utterance organisation (FUO)<sup>2</sup> is a gradual process. Similar considerations apply to the copula which corresponds to an inflected form; but it is arguable whether it should be regarded as such at this point, given that the only contrast is with *war*.<sup>3</sup> The facts are simply that he is on his way.

The transitory status of his organisation principles is also illustrated by a phenomenon not mentioned yet: he is occasionally unsure about the position of NP<sub>2</sub>. A particularly telling case is the following correction:

- (7) *und dann er rufe ein polizei/polizei rufe*  
 'and then he call a police/police call'

Note that non-finite construction would require NP<sub>2</sub> after *rufe* (according to A.), whereas finite construction requires the lexical part of the verb in final position. There are a few more examples of this type, indicating some degree of uncertainty on his part.

#### *Semantic and pragmatic constraints*

Tino always follows the principles S. and P.: "Controller first" and "Focus comes last", and he seems to avoid conflicts, with one possible exception to which we will turn below.

#### *Exceptions and complex cases*

Tino has two subordinate clauses, both of them relative clauses. One of them is (5) above, although one might argue that *das* is not a relative pronoun but a third person personal pronoun (in spoken German, *das* would indeed be more appropriate here as a personal pronoun than *es* "it"). The other example is:

- (8) ... *ein haus + wo leben zusammen*  
 ... 'a home + where (they) live together'

In both cases (and under both interpretations of 5), the basic pattern A. is kept. There is one utterance in which Cop comes first (after one adverb), hence

where B. is violated:

- (9) *und dann is ende*  
'and then is end'

Actually, this construction would be correct in TL (barring the missing article, although one would say: *dann ist Schluß* "and then, there is the end"), since *dann* would count as a major constituent filling the position before  $V_f$ , and thus, an expletive *es* would be superfluous. In Tino's case, two possibilities seem plausible - either he is omitting an  $NP_1$  from pattern B., since  $NP_1$  is empty. Under this assumption, pattern B. is not violated, or (9) is presentational, as with Santo's pattern C. (4.3.5.1).

The first possibility is confirmed - to some extent - by a closer look at two further utterances, both of them quoted speech; we give the whole sequence:

- (10) *und chariot sage*  
'and Chariot say'

- (11) *"war ich die brot nehme + nicht die mädchen"*  
'was I who bread take + not the girl'

- (12) *aber nochmal die dame sage*  
'but again the lady say'

- (13) *"das ist nicht er + aber die mädchen"*  
'that is not he + but the girl'

Two points are remarkable here:

- First, the word order in the (third) relative clause *die brot nehme*, which one might take as a reflex of German subordinate clause order (in contrast to the two other relative clauses quoted above). But this would presuppose that *nehme* has to be interpreted as  $V_f$ , which seems unlikely at this point. One might take this order rather as another instance of his uncertainty in his differentiation process of V, discussed above in connection with utterance (7).
- The other point concerns the two sequences *war ich* and *das ist er* (we are ignoring the negation here). The best way to understand them is to ask what (implicit) questions they ask, and this question is in both cases "Who was it?", or more precisely "Who was it that took the bread?" The focus information is therefore the breadtaker, not the breadtaking, and according to the "focus principle" (P. from chapter 2.5), that constituent which refers to the breadtaker should come last. This is exactly what happens: the focus information is specified by *ich*, *er*, and *die mädchen* (or rather *nicht er* and, in one case, *nicht die mädchen*)<sup>4</sup>; note that both pronouns are not anaphorical

but deictic. This is clear for *ich*, anyway, but also *er* is used deictically here (it is quoted speech, and the lady is meant to point to Charlie). What happens with the rest of the information, the "breadtaking", which belongs to the topic in this case? In principle, it should come before the specification of the breadtaker who is both controller and focus. A possible conflict between the positional constraints of controller, on the one hand, and focus, on the other, is avoided by using a predicative ("x is breadtaker") rather than an agentive ("x takes bread") construction. Thus, the controller principle does not apply, and the "breadtaking" is either expressed anaphorically (*das*, as in 13) or it is encoded, redundantly in this case, in form of a relative clause, as in (11). Note that both ways are quite common devices in many languages to deal with complex topic-focus arrangements.

There is a last, less important point which deserves mention. It is the use of *aber* in (13), which should be *sondern* in TL. The use of *sondern* vs. *aber* in German is extremely difficult to describe; basically, *sondern* immediately precedes a focus constituent whose counterpart has been negated in a preceding parallel clause. As we shall see later, Tino indeed learns this pattern.

#### *Referent introduction and reference maintenance*

Tino has five types of NPs:

- names (only *Chariot*);
- lexical NPs; the noun may be bare or preceded by *ein* or *de* (with variant *die*); complex NPs are rare (*die mädchen mit brot* "the girl with (the) bread", *die camion die polizei* "the van of the police", i.e. "the police car"); all adjectives are used in predicative, rather than in attributive function;
- quantifier NPs, like *alles* (everything);
- personal pronouns; *ich*, *du*, *er*, *sie*, *wir*, and perhaps *das*;
- zero anaphor ( $\emptyset$ ).

They can all appear as NP<sub>1</sub>, but only the first three as NP<sub>2</sub>, with the exception of the pronouns in focus position discussed above (utterances 11 and 13). Their use for referential movement is not entirely consistent. The choice between *de* N and *ein* N depends on whether the entity referred to is familiar or not; bare N, however, can replace either of these. Maintenance, somewhat surprisingly, is mostly expressed by personal pronoun (with occasional confusion of gender). Zero anaphor, rare anyway, is used for maintaining reference to the topic in immediately subsequent utterances. The only difference between zero anaphor

and personal pronoun seems to be that the latter *can* maintain reference over intervening utterances.

#### 4.2.S Cycle II

##### *Repertoire and a sample*

Tino has made considerable progress, as is illustrated by the following sample from his second retelling (which contains altogether about 100 utterances):

- (1) *chariot finde eine arbeit + eine neue arbeit*  
'Chariot find a job + a new job'
- (2) *wo machen die schip*  
'where make the ship'
- (3) *wo die leute machen die schip*  
'where the people make the ship'
- (4) *aber er arbeit nicht gut*  
'but he work not good/well'
- (5) *er nehme eine stuck holz*  
'he take a piece (of) wood'
- (6) *und die (xxx) fur die schip*  
'and that (xxx) for the ship'
- (7) *er bringe*  
'he bring/take'
- (8) *aber die schip geht in die wasser/in der see*  
'but the ship go in the water/in the sea'
- (9) *und dann er sage*  
'and then he say'
- (10) *"ich kann nicht arbeiten"*  
'I can not work'

Tino's vocabulary is much larger. He uses about 35 **nouns**, all of them in an uninflected base form, and almost the same number of **verbs**, some of them inflected (see below). He has 17 **adjectives** (in attributive and predicative function), about a dozen **adverbs**, seven **prepositions** and, in addition to the **coordinators** *und* and *aber*, two **subordinators**, *wenn* (or *wann*) "when" and *daß* "that". His **determiner** system is enriched by *diese* "this", and his **pronoun** system by *mich* "me", *dich* "you" (acc.), and *mein* "my", and *sein* "his".

The most clear development, however, is his progress in **inflecting the verb**, or more accurately, of splitting V into  $V_f$  and  $V_i$ . There are a great number of constructions like *ich kann nicht arbeiten* "I cannot work", *ich bin gewesen* "I have been" (contrasting with *war*, *ist*, *sind*, and even *ist gewesen*), *will gehen* "wants to go", to mention a few. There is even a correct second person singular  $V_{if}$  in a question: *kennst du mich?* "do you know me?". On the other hand, the use of non-finite constructions is still dominant, as the sample above illustrates. Moreover, there are two interesting constraints on his use of inflected forms:

- They concern almost exclusively auxiliaries and modals; the case of *kennst* and of *ich weiß es nicht* "I don't know", which may be a rote form, are the only exceptions.
- Inflexion forms appear mostly in quoted speech (QS); in the narration proper, they are very rare. (Remember that "quoted speech" is not really "quoted" since it is a silent film). As we shall see later, such an asymmetry between QS and narrative utterances is quite typical, and a challenge to any acquisition theory. One clearly gets the impression that the learner entertains two different systems of organising his utterances, or that, for some reason, he limits his full capacities at the given stage of development to one type of utterances.

We shall come back to this point below.

#### *Basic phrasal patterns*

Tino has kept his three patterns, and added two:

- A.             $NP_1-V-NP_2$
- B.             $NP_1-Cop-\left\{ \begin{array}{l} Adj \\ PP \\ NP_2 \end{array} \right\}$
- E.             $NP_1-V_f-(NP_2)-V_i$
- G.             $NP_1-Cop_f-\left\{ \begin{array}{l} PP \\ Adj \\ NP_2 \end{array} \right\}-Cop_i$
- C.             $V-NP_2$

There is also one utterance with three actants, to which we will turn below. The first new pattern is G.; it is the counterpart of B., i.e. he also splits the copula into a finite and an infinite component (...*ist gewesen* "has been"); it is limited to QS. The other new appearance on the scene for this chapter is C.; it is confined to verbs of movement, *gehe* "go" and, mostly, *komme* "come", for example

- (11) *komme die polizei*  
'come the police'

A particularly interesting case is the following correction (we give the whole sequence):

- (12) *er rufe die polizei* (er=the baker)  
'he call the police'

- (13) *komme die mäd/*  
'come the gi/'

- (14) *die mädchen laufen*  
'the girl run (away)'

This really illustrates the contrast of a movement of the girl as "appearance on the scene" and of performing an action. There is one occurrence of *sage* "say" in this position, after the quote (where even English allows such an inversion):

- (15) *"mhm" sage sie*  
'"mhm" (yes) say she'

The *komme*-cases are clear presentationals: the only *gehe*-case will be discussed below. Clearly, the C. pattern fulfills the same function as it did in chapter 3.

To sum up, he has made good progress on his way from IUO to FUO, but he is still in a transitional stage. This is confirmed by a number of inconsistencies in the position of NP<sub>2</sub> - before or after V<sub>i</sub> - already discussed in 4.2.2, although the majority of cases now correspond to the position described in E.

There are even some traces of the separable verb prefix which is so characteristic of TL utterances, for example in the following case:

- (16) ... *toto mach die tür offen*  
... 'toto make the door open'

Standard German would be *Toto macht die tür auf* or, in the perfect, *Toto hat die tür aufgemacht*. Obviously, (16) violates both A. and E.: it looks like a compromise between both. Another possibility, of course, would be to assume that it is an independent "factive" construction. But the evidence is too scarce to decide between these possible accounts. To conclude this section: There is no noticeable change in the position of other major constituents, in particular of adverbial PPs.

#### *Semantic and pragmatic constraints*

The principle "Controller first" applies quite rigidly, i.e. whenever there are two NP-referents differing in the degree of control, that one with higher control comes first.

There is one utterance which patterns as C, but is not a presentational; it continues (16); the sequence is:

(16) *und dann jedesmal daß toto mach die tür offen*  
'and then everytime that Toto make the door open'

(17) *oben seine kopf geht<sup>5</sup> ein stück holz*  
'on-top his head go a piece(of) wood'

What he wants to say is this: Whenever Charlie closed the door, a log dropped on his head. The only actant follows the verb. There are three possible explanations of this order.

- It could be a first reflex of the correct German structure (cf. IIB in section 4.1.2), in which the initial PP occupies the position of the first major constituent before  $V_f$  (or  $V_{if}$ ). But then, we would indeed have to interpret *geht* as a "correct" finite verb ( $V_{if}$ ), a singular forerunner of his development.
- The log has no "control property"; it rather happens to the log to fall down, hence there is no reason to have the NP which refers to it in first position. This would mean that Tino's habit of having one NP before V is actually not a phrasal but a semantic (or pragmatic) principle; if there is no "controller", there is no specific reason to have a NP in this position, and having it there might even suggest that it is a "controller". This is, to some extent at least, contradicted by utterance (8), repeated here.

(8) *aber die schip geht in die wasser*  
'but the ship go in the water'

Clearly, this is something that "happens" to the ship. On the other hand, the lack of the controller property does not necessarily exclude having the NP before V: there is simply no semantic impact on the relative ordering of NP and V, and other factors take over. Note, for example, that in (8), the ship has been introduced before (*die schip*, whereas in (17), the log is first mentioned; one might argue that (8) answers an implicit question "what happens to the ship?", and focus is its going to the water; (17), on the other hand, answers the question "what happens to Charlie, or to his head?", and what happens - the focus - is the dropping of a log on it. Hence, the order of (17) results from two facts: its special focus structure, and the non-application of the controller principle.

- Finally, it might be that the category of presentations is only a special case of a larger set of situations which are marked by V in initial position. It appears, for example, that "unexpected events" are often expressed by that order; we

shall see examples of this kind later, and will postpone the discussion of this possibility for a while.

All of these possible interpretations make sense. They cannot be decided here, but given our general perspective, the second one seems most attractive.

*Exceptions and complex cases*

Tino has some more relative clauses, introduced by *das* "that" or *wo* "where", and some other subordinate clauses, introduced by *wann* (or *wenn*) "when" and by *daß* "that". They have no special organising properties, with one exception - a complex construction involving a kind of passive:

(18) *aber in diese moment komm auch die mädchen*  
 'but in this moment come also the girl'

(19) *das + es ist in andere moment genommen bei polizei*  
 'that + it is in other moment taken at police'

The relative pronoun *das* seems to be repeated here by the anaphoric pronoun *es*; it could be, however, that he is just repeating *das*; all other relative clauses do not include additional anaphoric supports. The remainder corresponds to a TL passive (barring the wrong preposition, which should be *von*); later, Tino corrects the word order to more common *bei polizei genommen*. There is no comparable case.

Normally, V governs one or two NPs. There is one exception, where it governs three. Tino is quite uncertain about their relative order, except for the initial controller:

(20) *ich will ein etwas dich mach sehen*  
 'I want-to a something you(acc) make see'

(21) *dir mach sehen ein etwas*  
 'you (dat.) make see a something'

The "complex verb" *mach sehen* is, in a short metalinguistic sequence, corrected to *zeigen* "show". Apparently, he has not made his mind up about three-actant-constructions; but the passage shows beginning awareness of case marking.

Let us finally consider the counterpart of utterances (11) and (13) in the first cycle, which we discussed at length in 4.2.2. The two relevant utterances, both of them quoted speech, are:

(22) *ich war + ich war + ich bin gewesen und nicht mädchen*  
 'I was + I was + I have been and not girl'



(23) *ist die mädchen gewesen und nicht diese mann*  
 'has the girl been and not this man'

We ignore the negation and the (interesting) correction from *ich war* to *ich bin gewesen*. Again, the focus is the person to be specified. In the first utterance, Tino clearly violates the usual focus constraint ("Focus comes last"); in addition, he does not specify the topic information at all, even not by an anaphoric *es* or *das*. This also holds in the second case, although here, he has the focal NP after the finite V. It is not easy to say what the reason of this inconsistency is, but it may have to do with the development towards normal TL utterance structure which requires - for structural reasons and independently of the focus principle - having the infinite part of the verb at the end. The asymmetry of (22) and (23) corresponds indeed to an asymmetry in Standard German, which in itself is hard to explain: It would be appropriate to say *Es ist das Mädchen gewesen* "It was the girl", but impossible to say *Es bin ich gewesen* "it was me".

#### *Referent introduction and reference maintenance*

There is no dramatic change, but noticeable progress in the structure of Tino's NP. In particular, his lexical NPs are often quite complex, including adjectives and various attributes, like *in eine haus mit garten* "in a house with garden" or *eine kleine und sehr alte haus* "a small and very old house". Bare Ns are very rare now, but he still has compounds by simple juxtaposition, like *die chef die geschäft*.

There is no noticeable change in the use of *ein* vs. *die* (the variant *de* is rare); for re-introduction of referents, he now also uses *diese* N, but there are not enough examples to discriminate the use of *die* and *diese*, except that the latter presupposes introduction and not just familiarity.

Maintenance is expressed by personal pronouns normally according to TL rules; there are only very few occurrences of zero anaphora, when a NP<sub>1</sub> in its function as topic and controller, is maintained. All in all, his system of introducing and maintaining referents has stabilised along the lines sketched in the previous paragraph.

#### 4.2.4 Cycle III

##### *Repertoire and a sample*

Tino is now quite fluent, and although there are still non-finite constructions, the normal TL patterns are dominant. We give a short sample where he retells

the early fate of the girl; the whole story consists of about 110 utterances:

- (1) *und dann kommt seine tochter*  
'and then comes his daughter'
- (2) *sie hat gesehen*  
'she has seen'
- (3) *daß sein vater war tot*  
'that his (her) father was dead'
- (4) *und sie war traurig*  
'and she was sad'
- (5) *und sie hat gedacht*  
'and she has thought'
- (6) *wie ich muß jetzt machen*  
'how I must now do'
- (7) *sie hat kein geld für so einkaufen von essen*  
'she has no money for sort-of buying of food'
- (8) *und sie hat auch noch zwei kleine bruder*  
'and she has also still two little brother' (very idiomatic!)
- (9) *und dann sie sehe eine bäckerei*  
'and then she see a bakery'
- (10) *und sie kriege so zwei stück brot [...]*  
'and she get (herself) sort-of two piece(of) bread'
- (11) *und eine alte dame seht das*  
'and an old lady sees that'
- (12) *daß sie kriegt die brot*  
'that she gets the bread'

Tino's repertoire is quite elaborate now. He uses approximately fifty **nouns**, more than forty verbs, including many verbs with **separate prefix** like *einkaufen* "to shop/to buy" *weglaufen* "to run away" etc., about 15 **adjectives** and a similar number of **adverbs**. His **pronominal system** is complete for the nominative, he has another subordinating **conjunction**, *weil* "because", and he even has the peculiar adversative *sondern* "but", which we will discuss below (cf. also 4.2.2 above).

The greatest progress, however, concerns the acquisition of **finite verb forms**; the process is still not completed, but has carried him very far. It seems remarkable, given this degree of elaboration of the verb, that he has virtually no nominal

inflexion - not even for plural, let alone case.

*Basic phrasal patterns*

He has exactly the patterns as before, or at least, it looks like that. There is a difference, however, in that V in pattern A. and Cop in pattern C. are occasionally, though not always, inflected; examples (9) and (11), (10) and (12) highlight this; it would seem appropriate to analyse the verbs in (9) and (10) as V, and the verbs in (11) and (12) as  $V_{if}$ . This difference does not affect the relative order of major constituents; but it marks a clear step ahead in his acquisition of the TL regularities.

Another indication of this progress is his beginning mastery of the separable particle. There are, first, two forms with the correct marking of the past participle, the prefix *ge-* between separable particle and stem: *weggemacht* "done away", *zugemacht* "closed". And second, there are at least two clear instances of fusion of  $V_i$  with  $V_f$ , where the separable particle is left behind:

(13) *du kommst mit*  
'you come with' (from: *mitkommen*)

(14) *die beide gehen weg*  
'they both go off/away'

This represents the beginnings of another development from A.: fusion of V, with  $V_f$ , and with the separable particle - PART - in utterance-final position:

F.  $NP_1 - V_{if} - (NP_2) - (PART)$

Still, his language deviates in two crucial respects from the TL rules I—III, stated in section 4.1.2. First, he does not master IIc, i.e. he does not place  $V_f$  in final position in subordinate clauses; in other words, he does not discriminate between (declarative) main clauses and subordinate clauses. Second, IIb requires exactly one major constituent before  $V_f$ ; Tino regularly has one NP there, but he often has other constituents before  $V_f$ , too. This is illustrated by utterances like (9) in the sample above, where IIb would require (in combination with III, in this case) *und dann sieht sie eine bäckerei* or, less elegant but correct, *und sie sieht dann eine bäckerei*. It is interesting to note, however, that he seems to have this "inversion" of NP, when the other major constituent is a subordinate clause, as is illustrated by (16):

(15) *wenn chariot hat die tür zugemacht*  
'when Chariot has the door closed'

(16) *ist unten sein kopf eine stück holz untegefallen*  
'is down his head a piece(of) wood down fallen'

Now, this case is problematic for other reasons, because there might be other factors involved (cf. the discussion in 4.2.3, which applies analogously here). One other example is blurred by the occurrence of a third constituent (all other occurrences of subordinate clauses follow the main clause):

(17) *wann er so gemacht*  
'when he so [knocks on chair] made'

(18) *unten noch war alles kaputt*  
'down still was everything broken'

The TL would require the main clause (18) to begin with *war*. Tino violates both this rule and his own normal pattern B. The reasons are unclear, since there seems to be no particular focus organisation which would explain this order.

#### *Semantic and pragmatic constraints*

Tino obeys the principles S. and P.: "Controller first" and "Focus last" quite rigidly, and he seems to avoid possible conflicts. There are only two irregular cases. In the first one, the initial NP is clearly "patient":

(19) *und eine person ist tot geworden mit/von ein schuß von eine pistole*  
'and a person is dead become with/by a shot of a gun'

There is no real "controller" in this utterance, unless one would consider the extraposed PP as such - something that is hardly possible. Hence, the pattern is G., and the controller principle is not violated - it is just not operative. Note also that the *quaestio* here seems not to presuppose a protagonist - as in "what happened next?", and that it can be "answered" by a copula-utterance.

The other case is the third version of the self-accusation, and the subsequent correction by the lady. The relevant passages are (we give some context to illustrate Tino's increasing skills):

(20) *aber chariot hat gesagt*  
'but Chariot has said'

(21) *"nä, das stimmt nicht*  
'"no, that is-correct not'

(22) *ich war es, und nicht die mädchen"*  
'I was it, and not the girl''

(and then the old lady says again):

(23) *"das stimmt nicht*  
'"that is-correct not'

(24) *war sie und nicht die mann"*  
'was her and not the man''

He still is torn between the requirements of TL which here, due to the fact that NP is a (deictic) pronoun, does not allow the focal NP after the copula, and his normal focus rule. In (22), he follows the German pattern, with a correct anaphoric *es* for the predicative complement. In (24), he follows his focus rule, omitting the redundant topical *es*.

*Exceptions and complex cases*

Essentially, we have dealt with his exceptions already. Just as in the previous cycles, he is sometimes unclear about the positioning of NP<sub>2</sub> - before or after V<sub>i</sub>, but his language is clearly stabilising in favour of NP<sub>2</sub>-V<sub>i</sub>.

There is one construction which highlights his progress. It is his mastery of the adversative *sondern*, as in

- (25) *die haus ist neben eine - nicht see sondern wie neckar - \*fiume\**  
 'the house is next-to a - not lake but like Neckar - flume'

The sequence, in which he uses *sondern* here is metalinguistic, and although metalinguistic sequences are somewhat rare, and we have not included them systematically, they often show an even more advanced level of acquisition than narrative sequences proper.

*Referent introduction and reference maintenance*

There are again no major changes, but gradual progress. His lexical NPs tend to become very complex, like *kein geld für einkaufen von essen* "no money for buying of food" and similar ones. Compound noun phrases by juxtaposition are gone - he now says *die chef von die bäckerei* - and so are, with very few exceptions, bare nouns. His use of *der/ein* N and of personal pronouns is extremely systematic. He shows clear awareness of gender distinction, although he is often wrong; but there is still no case marking, except occasionally for pronouns. Two points are striking with respect to his system of introducing and maintaining referents. First, his usage of zero anaphora is now down to three or four occurrences (or rather: non-occurrences) in the whole text, and second, he almost never uses the "secondary system" of pronominalisation in German by means of *der, die, das*, which is completely dominant in the local vernacular (and in everyday spoken German everywhere). There are some traces of *das* in this function, but in general, he uses quite rigidly *er, sie, es*.

#### 4.2.5 *Short summary*

We will not recapitulate Tino's progress in detail here. The data illustrate quite clearly how he struggles with the split of a "non-finite" verb form, labelled V, into a "finite" and an "infinite" form,  $V_f$  and  $V_i$ , respectively, and their possible fusion into a joint form,  $V_{if}$ . This process is a slow one, and even at the end, he has not fully mastered it, but he is very close to the TL system, as described in section 4.1.2. Principles such as "Controller first" and "Focus last" apply throughout, and they are hardly ever in conflict. If such a conflict arises, he has no uniform solution.

A particularly interesting point is the fact that his linguistic behaviour is not uniform. This is not only apparent in the co-existence of "finite" and "infinite" organisation of utterances (FUO and IUO), but also in the fact that his quoted speech is structurally more advanced than narrative utterances proper.

### 4.3 Italian — German: Angelina

#### 4.3.1 *The informant*

Angelina was in her early twenties when she married and moved to Germany in 1981. She comes from a town near Naples, where she attended primary school and three years of secondary school. Before her marriage she helped out in her father's ironmonger's shop.

In Germany Angelina lived in a small village outside Heidelberg with her Italian husband. She was virtually isolated from the local community as there were no shops or facilities in the village. Contact with the language was confined to visits to the doctor and watching television. Her husband, who had worked as a bricklayer for a number of years, had acquired some knowledge of the language. He, therefore, dealt with the local authorities, did the shopping and so on.

At the beginning of the study in 1982 Angelina had little or no knowledge of the language. The monthly encounters provided the main opportunity for speaking German.

Angelina was very conscious at the outset of the shortcomings of her knowledge of German and the way in which this affects self-expression. Although this diminished somewhat as her use of language became more routinised, she never felt at ease with her level of proficiency and frequently switched to Italian - within utterances - to fill in missing constituents. This occurred regardless of

whether the interlocutor understood Italian or not, and led to occasional meta-linguistic statements such as that she had trouble learning "correct" verb forms and that it was wrong to use them otherwise.

The first retelling took place in May 1983, the second in December 1983 and the third in June 1984.

#### 4.3.2 Cycle I

##### *Repertoire and a sample*

Compared to Tino's, Angelina's utterances give a much less organised impression. There are three reasons. First, her repertoire is extremely limited, in particular with respect to verbs; second, she has a strong tendency to include Italian words in her utterances, in particular verbs - clearly as a result of her restricted repertoire; and third, she appears much more concerned about her language - she has very many false starts, repetitions, hesitations and corrections; she also often interrupts her retelling and asks for something. The following sample, though edited with respect to repetitions and hesitations, gives an idea:

- (1) *und de große mädchen \*s'e nescappato\**  
'and the big girl (escapes)'
- (2) *wann zu fuß in de straß*  
'when by foot in the street'
- (3) *\*camina\* in de straß*  
'(walks) in the street'
- (4) *kucke de mann mit brot*  
'look the man with bread'
- (5) *und die mädchen aber wolle essen*  
'and the girl however want-to eat'
- (6) *und \*prende\* eine brot*  
'and (takes) a bread'
- (7) *und \*scappa\**  
'and (runs away)'
- (8) *die frau kuck*  
'the woman look'
- (9) *und sprechen mit de mann*  
'and speak with the man'

(10) *de mann \*corre\* später*  
'the man (runs) later' <=after>

(11) *und die mädchen \*s'incontra\* mit de mann* <followed by relative  
'and the girl (meets) with the man' clause in Italian>

The whole retelling consists of 80 utterances.

Since her repertoire is quite limited, we give it in full. It consists of

- approximately ten different verbs: *kommen* "move", *fliehen* "run", *ausgang* "go out?", *arbeite* "work", *guck* "look", *sagen* "say", *habe* "have", *ist* "is", *bring* "cause to move from source", *zu fuß* "walk, on foot", the modal form *wolle* "want";
- a dozen nouns: *frau* "woman", *mädch* "girl", *kinder* "children", *mann* "man", *mann de brot* "man the bread", *polizei* "police/policeman", *gasthaus* "restaurant", *brot* "bread", *kopf* "head", *zigaretten* "cigarettes", *straße* "street", *Schokolade* "chocolate";
- two determiner-like forms: *de* with variant *die* "the", and *eine* "one/a";
- three adjectives: *groß* "big", *schön* "nice", *andere* "other";
- the adverbs: *später* "later", *vielleicht* "perhaps";
- the prepositions: *in* "in", *mit* "with", *für* "for";
- the one connector: *und* "and";
- one conjunction: *wann* "when".
- the personal pronouns *ich* "I" and *du* "you" (quoted speech only); there is also one occurrence of *er* "he".

There is no inflexion whatsoever: although some of her verbs look inflected, there is no opposition of, say, *gehe* to *geht*.

#### *Basic phrasal patterns*

It has been said already that Angelina's utterances seem much less principle-governed than Tino's. Still, there are three distinct patterns, which correspond exactly to Tino's A., B., and C.

- A.            **NP<sub>1</sub>-V-(NP<sub>2</sub>)**
- B.            **NP<sub>1</sub>-COP- $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Adj} \\ \text{PP} \end{array} \right\}$**
- C.            **V-NP<sub>2</sub>**

Pattern C. occurs only once, however, with *komme* being the verb. There is no real counterpart to Tino's pattern E., i.e. NP<sub>1</sub> V<sub>f</sub>(NP<sub>2</sub>) V<sub>i</sub>, although there are three occurrences of a modal *wolle* "want to", as in *wolle essen*. But this



form never contrasts with any other form of this verb, so it is more plausible to take this construction as a compound V, rather than as a combination of  $V_f$  and  $V_i$ . In other words: There is still no trace of an incipient differentiation of V into  $V_f$  and  $V_i$ , not even in quoted speech. It should be noted that the analysis of many utterances as patterns A. and B. is based on a rather liberal understanding of what should be counted as a verb; for example, we included *zu fuß* (which she repeats as *\*camina\**, hence she means "walks") as well as the not infrequent Italian inserts. This seems justifiable because they clearly indicate that she "has" a verb in this position although she is still lacking the appropriate lexical item in German. It is remarkable in this respect that all her Italian forms are appropriately inflected. One might interpret this as an indication that she is planning her utterances in Italian. Other constituents, like PPs and adverbs, normally appear at the beginning or at the end, with directionals confined to the end.

*Semantic and pragmatic constraints*

Angelina regularly observes the principles S. and P.: "Controller first" and "Focus last". Normally, possible conflicts are avoided. But there is one interesting exception:

(12) *und de mann \*dice\**  
'and the man (says)'

(13) *"de brot ich nehme"*  
'"the bread I take"'

Hence, she not only violates pattern A. by having two NPs before V; she also has the controller in second position. The reason is apparently the specific focus structure: *ich* is focus, the taking of the bread is topic. Thus, the focus principle outweighs the controller principle when there is competition; note, however, that this does not fully explain the order of (13), since we would expect *ich* in final position. The counterpart of Chaplin's self-accusation, the lady's account, is rendered as:

(14) *niks/kein de mann + is de mädchen*  
'not the man + is the girl'

(We ignore the negations). The first part has no copula at all, something she rarely does; so, there is no way to determine a position of V or Cop. The second part has Cop in first position, clearly because of the specific focus structure; a clash with the controller principle is avoided as there is none; the topic - which one would assume in first position, expressed by an anaphoric or deictic NP like *es* or *das* - is omitted.

The following case shows a particular interesting conflict between phrasal patterns and focus principle (the girl is informing Charlie that she, too, has found a house):

(15) *und de mädchen sagen de mann*  
'and the girl say the man'

(16) *habe auch ich + nee*  
'have also I + no'

(17) *auch ich habe eine haus sehr schön*<sup>6</sup>  
'also I have a house very beautiful'

Here, phrasal pattern and controller principle win over the focus principle, but this is due to an explicit correction on her part: her first thought clearly favours the focus principle.

#### *Exceptions and complex cases*

The interesting exceptions have been dealt with already. Angelina has four subordinate clauses, three of them introduced by *wann* "when", one by the Italian relative pronoun *che* "who"; they do not differ in word order from declarative main clauses. There are also two imperatives, but they are probably rote forms.

There is one complex construction which looks like an infinitival sentence complement:

(18) *de mann wolle mache de polizei bezahle*  
'the man want-to make the police pay'

Assuming that NP<sub>2</sub> may be an actant both of *wolle mache* and of *bezahle*, utterance (18) matches pattern A. both in the matrix clause and the embedded clause - it is reminiscent of Santo's "chaining" patterns (see 3.5.1). Note that the order in the corresponding Italian complementiser clause would be different: *il uomo vuole far pagare la polizia*, i.e. the agent would follow the verb by which it is governed. This illustrates that Angelina's language, though heavily inspired by Italian, is not just a "relexification" of Italian patterns.

A final observation on exceptions concerns "verbless" constructions. There are a number of utterances where there is no explicit verb at all, not even in Italian, but the content, though of course not the position, of a verb is inferrable. It appears that omission is typical of utterances which do not push forward the plotline but provide background information. Foreground utterances, on the other hand always contain a verb, even if this means switching to the source language to supply it, as is often the case with Angelina. It is significant in this context that utterances which do not answer the question "what happened (with p) next?" have no verb. Such utterances show the structure NP<sub>1</sub>-NP<sub>2</sub> or

NP<sub>1</sub>-PP. This contrast is systematic since the learner could also switch to the source language in the latter case to supply the verbs required. The systematic use of verbs in utterances which belong to the foreground is characteristic of the discourse type narrative retelling. In such a context, the action carried out or experienced by the entities mentioned usually cannot be inferred simply by naming the entities involved, although we noticed one implicit relation - "move" - in chapter 3.

In tasks where the learner was required to instruct a person to move objects from one position to another (see ch. 7.6.1), reference is optionally be made to the source and path of the motion, and necessarily to the position at goal. However, reference to the type of action required, e.g. take, lift up, put, etc. do not occur in the early phases of acquisition. This information is inferrable from the context once the objects and goal position have been defined.

In background utterances which give descriptions of, or ascribe properties to entities, the information encoded by the verb is relatively redundant, as for example in (19).

(19) *später de mädchen küche*  
'later the girl kitchen'

(20) *und \*prepara\* de stühle*  
'and fix up the chairs'

Interpreting (19) in relation to (20), it is sufficient to know that the girl was in the kitchen, but not necessarily how she got there: (19) provides a spatio-temporal frame for (20).

#### *Referent introduction and reference maintenance*

Angelina's NPs have the form *de* N, *ein* N or bare N; in all cases, N may be preceded by an adjective or followed by a PP. The dominant form is *de* N (with variant *die* N); it is used for introduction, re-introduction and maintenance of referents, hence does not presuppose familiarity with the referent on the part of the hearer; *ein* N mainly occurs when *ein* is used as a quantifier (e.g. *ein brot* - "one loaf of bread", rather than "a loaf of bread"); bare N mainly appears in locative phrases, e.g. *in gefängnis* "in prison".

Maintenance of reference is also possible with zero anaphora, if the following two conditions are met:

- the referent was "controller" in the previous utterance and is maintained in this function;

- the referent is the only one of its kind mentioned in the previous utterance (in particular there may be only one human referent).

It is most remarkable that Angelina does not use anaphoric pronouns. There is only one occurrence of anaphoric *er*, in a position where she normally has zero anaphora, and, of course, there are the deictic pronouns in quoted speech.

#### 4.3.S Cycle II

##### *Repertoire*

Angelina's language has not changed very much; we will not give a sample here. Her repertoire has increased, though. Although her retelling is much shorter (less than 60 utterances), she now uses about 25 different nouns and about 15 verbs. The insertion of Italian verbs is less frequent, though still a salient feature of her production. There is also a slight quantitative increase for the other word classes, including occasional use of the personal pronouns *er* and *sie* (we will turn to this below).

##### *Basic phrasal patterns*

Angelina continues operating with A. and B. There are only 3 cases of V-initial utterances (C), one of them probably an afterthought, since the whole utterance is somewhat hesitant:

- (1) *und die große mädchen \*fugge\**  
'and the big girl (escapes)'
- (2) *und später gucke*  
'and later look'
- (3) *später habe/will essen + essen + de mädchen*  
'later has/wants-to eat + eat + the girl'

The topic - the girl - is maintained, and there is no real reason why she is explicitly reintroduced; it is also preceded by a hesitation. The other case of V-first will be dealt with below.

There is also one utterance in which NP is placed after the copula, but this is immediately corrected:

- (4) *und in eine moment ist frei alles zwei*  
'and in one moment is free all two (both of them)'
- (5) *alles zwei ist frei*  
'all two is free'

So, (4) rather constitutes counterevidence to a presentational use of the copula than an argument in favour.

*Semantic and pragmatic constraints*

The two principles "Controller first" and "Focus last" are applied throughout. The first two possible cases of competition are literally the same:

(6) *un sage*  
'and say'

(7) *"de brot ich brau<sup>7</sup>"*  
""the bread I take""

and, in the lady's subsequent correction:

(8) *"is de mädchen"*  
""is the girl""

There is another deviation from the usual phrasal pattern - a V-first construction which is clearly not presentational in the usual sense of the word but apparently due to the semantic role of NP.

(9) *mit auto passiert Unfall*  
'with car happens accident'

Clearly, the NP *unfall* is not a "controller" in any sense; actually, it would be hard to assign it any of the case roles suggested in published work. Corresponding constructions in German would normally not have the "subject", i.e. *unfall*, in first position, either: *ein Unfall ist mir passiert* sounds marked compared to *mir ist ein unfall passiert* (cf. section 4.1.2). In a sense, constructions of this type denote the "coming up" of a new situation, and in this sense one might consider them to be presentationals. Moreover, *unfall* is a crucial part of the focus information, and hence should come last. Whatever the explanation may be - the particular order of (9) does not seem accidental, as in (3) above; as we shall see, it is also repeated in the third cycle.

*Exceptions and complex cases*

There are no exceptions and complex cases beyond these mentioned already. Interestingly enough, she has no subordinate clauses at all in this retelling.

*Referent introduction and reference maintenance*

There is no major development in form but some progress in function: referents are now introduced in the domain of discourse as in the target language by means of the indefinite article *ein* N; the use of *de* N presupposes familiarity; it is mostly used for re-introduction. There is, however, at least one exception,

and bare nouns can appear anywhere.

As in the first cycle, Angelina normally does not use personal pronouns. There is an interesting exception, however. After the retelling, the interviewer showed her some pictures of important scenes, and there, out of the narrative flow, she uses *er* and *sie*. This clearly indicates that she knows these forms, and this non-use is a consequence of her special referential movement in narrative discourse, rather than absence of forms from her repertoire.

#### 4.3.4 Cycle III

##### *Repertoire and a sample*

In the third retelling, Angelina shows limited but distinct progress. There are still a large number of false starts, interruptions and corrections, which makes it difficult to analyse her language. Some of her struggles with the language are quite telling, however. We give a short sample (her complete retelling is about 70 utterances long):

- (1) *jetzt charlie komme in eine restaurant*  
'now Charlie come in a restaurant'
- (2) *und essen*  
'and eat'
- (3) *und wann is fertig + \*chiama\**  
'and when is ready + \*(calls)'
- (4) *eine polizei komme*  
'a police come'
- (5) *und charlie sage*  
'and Charlie say'
- (6) *"bezahle"*  
"'pay'"
- (7) *charlie sage de polizei*  
'Charlie say the police'
- (8) *"bezahle was alles ich esse* [this is repeated, with slight variants]  
"'pay what all I eat'"
- (9) *und die polizei jetzt bezahle*  
'and the police now pay'

- (10) *nicht charlie + die polizei*  
'not Charlie + the police'
- (11) *und fort brauchen die charlie*  
'and away bring the Charlie'
- (12) *und jetzt komme eine auto*  
'and now come a car'
- (13) *und charlie \*sale\**  
'and Charlie (leaves)'

There is a slight increase in her vocabulary. In particular, she uses more verbs, and Italian verbs are now down to three occurrences. She has two "relative" pronouns, *wo* "where" and *was* "what", and, as in the first cycle, the subordinating conjunction *wann* "when".

There are some very first traces of inflexion; she hesitates between singular *ist* and plural *sind* when talking about *die mädchen und Charlie*, and she has the compound verb form *ist passiert* "has happened".

#### *Basic phrasal patterns*

Angelina now regularly applies one of three patterns, the third one being Tino's C:

- A.  $NP_1-V-(NP_2)$
- B.  $NP_1-Comp-\left\{ \begin{array}{l} PP \\ Adj \end{array} \right\}$
- C.  $V-NP_2$

Some of the verb-initial constructions have *is* as a verb; we have not counted these as a separate pattern, different from cases with *komme* (which is the most frequent case). It has already been mentioned that she shows the beginning split of V into  $V_f$  and  $V_i$ ; there are two occurrences of *is passiert ein unfall* - clearly not enough to postulate the existence of a pattern like Tino's E.; but she is moving in this direction.

#### *Semantic and pragmatic constraints*

Things are as before, i.e. "Controller first" and "Focus last" are operative in most cases, and the cases of competition are almost the same ones as before. They often result in corrections, like in the falling of the log:

- (14) *und charlie eingang*  
'and Charlie entrance' (enters)

- (15) *und die holz/ habe die holz in kopf*  
 'and the log/ has the log in head'

Having the log in initial position would give it - perhaps - an inappropriate "controller" status; in fact, something happens to the log, rather than it is doing something. So, Angelina describes the resultant state - the new position of the log.

*Exceptions and complex cases*

Angelina now has some subordinate clauses, introduced by *wann* "when" or by *wo* "where", with the latter being an intermediate case between spatial adverbial clause and relative clause. An example is

- (16) *charlie chaplin arbeite wo ist eine/die schiff*  
 'Charlie Chaplin work where is a/the ship'

The word order is often V-NP, but usually, these cases have no presentational character.

There is one case of V-NP, which is less easily accounted for.

- (17) *wann is eine auto + is passiert ein Unfall*  
 'when is a car + has happened an accident'

- (18) *und dann sitzen die charlie und die madchen in straÙe*  
 'and then sit the Charlie and the girl in street'

Whereas the two V-NP-patterns in (17) might be accounted for by "appearance on the scene" and by the peculiar role of *Unfall* in connection with *passieren*, this does not apply in (18). A first explanation would be to assume that she has an exceptionally early case of TL rule IIb, i.e. just one constituent (*dann*) before V. But this is totally implausible, first, because she has no  $V_f$  yet, but only V, and second, in all other cases of *dann*, there is no such inversion. In fact, (18) looks very much like the "log"-case (15): what is described is not an action itself, the falling from the car, but the resultant state: the new position of the protagonist. In terms of the background-foreground distinction, the utterance clearly contributes to the plot line, without referring to the event itself. We do not want to overstretch the concept "appearance on the scene", but it appears that utterances like (15) or (18) indeed express such an appearance, no less than presentationals. They do not answer an implicit question like

"What happens next (to p)?"

which is constitutive of foreground utterances of a narrative but a question like

"What is next on stage?"

They involve a change of state. But this change is not fully included in the



utterance. It is expressed as a change with respect to some previous state - given in the context or expressed in preceding utterances. In (18) (and similarly in 15), the change of state is a new position: Charlie and the girl, who have been in the car, are now in the street. Note that "in the street" is still focus information in this case, and hence the corresponding constituent is final.

We will have to come back to this point - to the question whether there is a uniform reason behind V-first constructions, which we have conveniently called here "presentationals" and "appearance on the scene".

*Referent introduction and reference maintenance*

There is no salient development here, except that bare nouns are almost entirely gone. The use of *ein* N (or *de* N) has stabilised along the lines sketched in 4.3.3; it is interesting, though, that she often has corrections of *die* to *ein* and vice versa; it almost seems as if she only now becomes aware of the possible problems involved.

She still uses no anaphoric pronouns.

4.3.5 *Summary*

Angelina's language is noticeably different from Tino's. But with one possible exception, it appears that the differences only reflect different degrees of achievement. In her third retelling, she has approximately reached the level of Tino in his first, with three patterns of Tino's five, and a beginning differentiation of V. All in all, her utterances are still "non-finite", as most of Tino's in cycle I. The possible exception concerns hers and Tino's use of personal pronouns, which are virtually non-existent for her outside quoted speech, and abundant in Tino's case. At this point, it must be left open whether this indeed reflects a real interindividual difference in the structure of the acquisition process, or whether Tino also went through a similar phase.

At this stage, Angelina is working on form-function relations of full NPs, lacks anaphoric pronouns, and has a regular contrastive use of patterns A., B. and C. - all of which is highly reminiscent of Santo (2.5), and in contrast to Andrea (2.4).

#### 4.4 Italian — German: Comparative data

As has been said in the introduction to this chapter, Tino and Angelina are our main Italian informants. To complete the picture, we will now have a shorter look on two other informants, Gina and Vito, focussing on the first cycle and then adding some remarks on their further development.

##### 4.4.1 *Gina*

Gina came to live in Germany in 1982 at the age of 17. Her parents had emigrated to Mannheim in 1972. Not being married, Gina had no choice but to join them on finishing her schooling, even though she had found secretarial work in Italy and would have liked to stay there. Her hopes of using her secretarial skills in Germany diminished as time went on.

At the beginning of the period of data collection Gina was attending a language course provided by the Centro Italiano in Mannheim (2 hours/week). On her own account, this mainly gave her the opportunity of meeting other Italians without having to be in the company of her parents.

Contact with Germans was not encouraged at home, and her engagement in 1983 to an Italian living in Italy did little to help her progress in German.

In 1983 Gina found work as a cleaner. Practically all her colleagues were Italians so that the opportunities for learning German were relatively limited. After her engagement, her interests centred on the prospect of setting up a home and future in Italy.

Although Gina attended a language course for a certain period, she shows little active interest in extending her knowledge of the language in exchanges with native speakers. If problems arise either in making herself understood, or understanding the interlocutor, these are generally glossed over. Requests for information on the language are rarely made, Gina is quite content to "manage" with the means available, and where these are insufficient, to either drop or avoid the message.

Data collection began in October 1982. The first retelling was recorded in June 1983; the second in January 1984 and the last retelling in September 1984.

## 44.2 Cycle I

*Repertoire and a sample*

Gina's first retelling consists of about 120 utterances; the following sequence gives an impression:

- (1) *und er geh weg*  
'and he go off/away'
- 2) *und in straÙe ist eine/der/eine mädchen*  
'and in street is a/the/a girl'
- 3) *gucken in eine bäckerei*  
'look in a bakery'
- 4) *dann habe gesehen eine \*camion\* mit der brot*  
'then have seen a (van) with the bread'
- 5) *und dann habe eine brot gebringen*  
'and then have a bread brought'
- 6) *and so ist weggegangen*  
'and so is away-gone'
- 7) *so ist weg + + sie*  
'so is off/away + + she'
- 8) *und eine frau hat gesehen die mädchen*  
'and a woman has seen the girl'
- 9) *und sprechen mit ein mann*  
'and talk with a man'
- 10) *und sagen*  
'and say'
- (11) *"diese mädchen hat deine brot gebringt"*  
'this girl has your bread brought'

As these examples illustrate, her language is comparatively rich and varied. She uses about 30 different **nouns** in the complete retelling, all of them in a base form, the **determiners** *ein* und *die* plus *dies*, which is used both deictically and anaphorically: she has about 20 **verbs**, a dozen **adverbials**, six **adjectives**, two **prepositions**, the **conjunctions** *und* "and", *aber* "but", and the **subordinators** *wenn* (or *wann*) "when" and *weil* "because". Her pronouns include the deictic **pronouns** *ich*, *du*, *mir*, anaphoric *er*, *sie*, *das* "this", the possessives *mein* "my", *sein* "his/her", and indefinite *eins* "one";

Her verb inflexion is in development, but still confined to the auxiliaries *haben* "to have" and *sein* "to be", which is also used and inflected as a copula; a great deal of her  $V_i$  are participles, correctly marked as such, including the complex insertion of prefix *ge-* between separable particle and stem (like in *weggegangen*, cf. 6 above). She is apparently aware of the separability of particles like *weg* or *mit*. There is no convincing evidence of  $V_{if}$ , although some of her Vs look like inflected lexical verbs, e.g. *gibt* "gives"; but there are apparently no systematic oppositions.

*Basic phrasal patterns*

Gina comes close to Tino in his last cycle, except that she does not have a split of the copula (*ist gewesen*).

- A.  $NP_1-V-NP_2$
- B.  $NP_1-Cop-\left\{ \begin{array}{l} PP \\ Adj \\ NP_2 \end{array} \right\}$
- C.  $V-NP_2$
- E.  $NP_1-V_f-(NP_2)-V_i$

In addition, however, she has three-actant verbs:

- A'.  $NP_1-V-NP_2-NP_3$

As in Tino's case, we subsume Cop and V under V in pattern C. (we will return to this pattern below). Pattern A', on the other hand, has been listed separately although it could be integrated into A., for ease of comparison.

Two additional remarks are in order here. It is arguable whether Cop in pattern B. should be considered as finite or infinite. She has some inflexion, but clearly not the full range: in other words, she is on her way, and it is somewhat arbitrary to say that she has  $Cop_f$  or she does not. This uncertainty also applies to the positioning of  $NP_2$  in pattern E., which often comes after V., as the examples illustrate. There is no apparent reason why she prefers sometimes the one, sometimes the other (cf. our discussion of this uncertainty in connection with Tino, section 4.2.2).

It should be noted, finally, that she sometimes (though rarely) omits  $V_f$  in pattern E.

There is one open question with regard to the relative order of the NPs in A'. The controller principle solves this for the first NP, but the relative order of the other two varies; in TL terms, the direct object may follow or precede the

indirect object, and there are not enough examples to justify any argument on whether this variation is random or principle-governed.

*Exceptions and complex cases*

Gina has a number of subordinate clauses, introduced by *wo*, *weil* and *wenn*; they have no special word order, in particular no  $V_f$  at the end.

There are two clear violations of her phrasal patterns; these are

(12) *und dann haben gegessen alle beide*  
'and then have eaten all both (both of them)'

(13) *und sie sagen*  
'and she say'

(14) *"moment ein/kein haben nicht"*  
"moment one/no one have not"

The first case is clearly non-presentational, and the re-interpretation of "appearance on the scene" from section 4.3.3 does not cover this case, either. In (14), Gina wants to express, in quoted speech, something like: "Right now, we (or I) don't have one (i.e. a house)". The order is completely wrong; maybe her construction breaks down because of the complicated negation; thus, having *nicht* before *ein*, with the latter in normal NP<sub>2</sub> position, might be read as constituent negation. But this is totally speculative.

A final point which deserves mention is her beginning awareness of the separable verb prefix. It has been mentioned already that she has correct participles like *weggegangen* (from *weg-gehen*, cf. 6). She also has first signs of moving  $V_i$ , with the separable particle left behind; an example is (1). Clearly, this cannot be taken as full evidence that she has rule III of Standard German, but it documents that she is working on this problem.

*Referent introduction and reference maintenance*

Gina has four types of NP (she does not use the name Chaplin):

1. lexical NP; they consist of a noun preceded by
  - a. *ein*;
  - b. *de*, with some variants indicating awareness of gender distinction (*die*, *der*);
  - c. possessive pronoun;
  - d. quantifier, like *viel* "much" or numeral;
  - e. *dies* "this".

Complex lexical NPs are almost non-existent, and bare nouns very rare.

2. Quantifier NP, like *alles* "everything", *eins* "one" (as in "can I have one?"), *alle beide* "all both, i.e. both of them".
3. Both deictic and anaphoric pronouns, confined to TL-nominative forms, with one exceptional occurrence of *mir* "to me".
4. Zero anaphora.

*Ein* N is generally used to introduce non-familiar referents, whereas *de* N normally introduces or re-introduces familiar ones; there are some exceptions, though, where *de* N is generalised to the function of *ein* N. Maintenance can also be expressed by zero, anaphoric pronoun and *diese* N, (the latter sometimes being used without N). Their precise use is not entirely clear; while zero is confined to cases where some referent (usually, but not always in initial position) is maintained from the immediately preceding utterance, personal pronouns can also appear in this function. But they allow a referent to "jump" over intervening utterances. The difference between personal pronoun and *de* N in this respect is possibly only gradual. *Diese* N is typically used where the referent is maintained from NP<sub>2</sub> in the preceding utterance; it then may appear as NP<sub>1</sub> or as NP<sub>2</sub> in the new utterance. Remarkably enough, personal pronouns can also appear as NP<sub>2</sub> in V-initial constructions (but in this case associated with a right-dislocated NP). The following sequence illustrates her free use of pronouns:

- (15) *und dann nacht, sie schlafen*  
'and then night, they sleep'
- (16) *sie in ein zimmer*  
'she in one room'
- (17) *und er in/in die andre*  
'and he in/in the other'
- (18) *morgen haben + + sie hat die brot gemacht*  
'morning have + + she has the bread prepared'
- (19) *und dann kommt er + der mann*  
'and then comes he + the man'
- (20) *und dann sitze in der stuhl*  
'and then sit in the chair'

Clearly, (16) and (17) are cases of regular gapping; in this case, the pronouns must be repeated to ascertain unambiguous reference.

#### 4.4.3 *Changes in the second and third cycle*

We can be very brief here. Although almost eight months passed between each retelling, there is almost no development. Her repertoire remains entirely stable, and the only possible indication of a development is the appearance of the  $V_f$ - $V_i$  distinction with three-actant verbs (*hat-gegeben*). There is also no frequency shift from IUO to FUI, as we observed for Tino. The only possible indication of progress surfaces in the use of some clearly inflected verb forms in quoted speech, like *wo wohnst du?* "where do you live?" If these are not rote forms (there are only a few occurrences), quoted speech is acting again as a forerunner of development. But otherwise, Gina's language is fossilised at this point.

#### 4.4.4 *A note on Vito*

Vito's language has been extensively analysed in section 2, and we will not go into detail here again. His participation in the project ended after about one year, since he returned to Italy. Within this time, his language did not show any significant development beyond the level of the first cycle, analysed in chapter 2. In particular, he never developed any inflexion and no split of V into  $V_f$  and  $V_i$ . To sum up in brief: His utterances follow phrasal pattern A., B. and C, and the principles "Controller first" and "Focus last" apply throughout. Thus, his language is in accordance with the development observed in this chapter; but he does not get very far.

### 4.5 **Summary of Italian learners**

The Italian learners are not a homogeneous group. But it appears that their utterance organisation follows essentially the same patterns, and their performance reflects different degrees of achievement in an essentially similar acquisition process. The major transition is between "non-finite" organisation of utterances (IUO) and "finite" organisation (FUI)<sup>8</sup>. The former is characterised by the use of a base form of the verb (sometimes a compound of two non-inflected forms), which expresses the lexical content and government relations, requiring one, two or occasionally three nominal actants with different semantic roles. The latter is characterised by a split between "finite" and "non-finite" component of

the verb; the infinite part  $V_i$  corresponds to the previous  $V$ , the finite part carries agreement, tense, and perhaps other features. In both cases, the positioning is constrained by different phrasal patterns which, together with S. ("Controller first") and P. ("Focus last") fix the word order. Constructions with  $V$  in initial position are constrained by special conditions ("appearance on the scene") which might in turn reflect a specific focus structure imposed on the utterance by the implicit question which it is meant to answer within the text ("What is now on stage, compared to what was on stage before?"). The transition, in particular the  $V_f$ — $V_i$  distinction, is a gradual process, and no learner attains full control of the TL rules I—III; in particular, III (fusion of  $V_f$  and  $V_i$  to  $V_{if}$ , where separable prefix is left behind) is hardly ever attested. There is often a clear structural difference between narrative sequences and quoted speech (invented quoted speech, of course), in that the latter shows more advanced structures.

Form and function of NPs clearly show the same development, although there is considerable variation with regard to the use of personal pronouns, on the one hand, and zero anaphora on the other.

#### 4.6 Turkish - German: Çevdet

##### 4.6.1 *The informant*

Çevdet was born in 1966 in a village in the province of Yozgat. He went to primary and secondary school for almost six years. In October 1981, he went to Germany to look for work. From summer 1982 to summer 1983, he took part in the MBSE programme of the German government ("measures of social and professional integration"), which included having three months' language teaching. From September 1983, he worked for a firm which cleans and refurbishes furniture; the language at this work place was German; he also belonged to a mixed sports team; therefore, his linguistic contacts were comparatively intensive.

The first retelling took place in June 1983, the second in January 1984, and the third in August 1984.

##### 4.6.2 *Cycle I*

###### *Repertoire and a sample*

Çevdet is more advanced than Tino, the best Italian speaker, in the third



cycle. In particular, he has inflected verbs. This often results in TL-like, but very repetitive patterns. We give a sample (the whole retelling consists of 70 utterances):

- (1) *ein mann hat ein brief bekommen für arbeit*  
'a man has a letter got for work'
- (2) *dann er ist nach fabrik gegangen*  
'then he has to factory gone'
- (3) *dann er hat mit chef gesprochen*  
'then he has with boss talked'
- (4) *dann er hat arbeit bekommt*  
'then he has work got'
- (5) *dann noch ein ander chef hat gesagt*  
'then still another boss has said'
- (6) *"wann du so wie ein holz gefunden hast*  
"when you such (like) a log found have
- (7) *dann bringst du mir*  
then bring you (to) me"
- (8) *dann er hat gesucht*  
'then he has looked-for'
- (9) *aber er hat nicht gefunden*  
'but he has not found'

Essentially, Çevdet has no lexical problems: he has all the nouns and verbs to give a coherent account of the story. His system of personal pronouns is fairly complete; it also includes case-marked forms. He does not use many adjectives, adverbs or intensifiers, though. This corresponds to the overall impression of his language being quite correct but somewhat monotonous.

#### *Basic phrasal patterns*

Çevdet's utterances follow one of three basic patterns:

- E.             $NP_1-V_f-(NP_2)-V,$   
 F.             $NP_1-V_{i,f}-(NP_2)-(PART)$   
 B<sub>fin</sub>.         $NP_1-Cop_f-\left\{ \begin{array}{l} NP_2 \\ PP \\ Adj \end{array} \right\}$

They all may be preceded by *und* and/or a temporal adverb or PP. Other adverbials, in particular local and directional PPs, are before "V,-position", i.e. before V, and, in pattern F., at the end. There are a few cases of "right dislocation", i.e. cases where NP<sub>2</sub> or PP follows V, (only once for NP, though).

Just listing the three patterns gives a wrong picture, however: pattern E. is absolutely dominant (about 90% of all utterances), and pattern F. is rare, but this may be simply due to the fact that he tells the story in the past, and apparently, the present perfect, which is compound, is his only past tense.

F. represents a very advanced step which Tino, a few first traces aside, never achieves. It is not entirely clear, on the other hand, whether Çevdet indeed fully masters TL rule III, i.e. fusion of V<sub>f</sub> and V<sub>i</sub>, leaving a possible separable prefix behind: he clearly masters the inflexion of V<sub>i</sub> with separable prefix (e.g. *weggegangen* "away-gone", *hingefallen* "down-fallen"). But there is only one case of fusion resulting in a V<sub>if</sub> with separable prefix, and this is quoted speech.

- (10) *"wart mal + ich komme auch mit"*  
 "wait a moment + I come also with" (from "mit-kommen")

Çevdet's patterns indeed give the impression that he masters the TL rules for main declarative clauses. This is not so, however. He always has NP<sub>1</sub> before V<sub>f</sub>; but he may also have two constituents there, as utterances (2-5) or (8) in the sample clearly illustrate; German would require the NP after V<sub>f</sub> in these cases. He does seem to have, on the other hand, the correct order of V<sub>f</sub> in subordinate clauses, as utterance (6) shows; but there is only one instance of a subordinate clause, and it is in quoted speech.

#### *Semantic and pragmatic constraints*

As a rule, the first NP denotes that entity which ranks highest in control, and since almost all utterances contribute to the plot line, hence report activities of the controller, the focus principle is generally met. But if there is a possible conflict, or if these principles do not apply, then Çevdet sticks to his phrasal pattern; a good example is utterance (1) above, where the first NP is low in control. In fact, he never deviates from his three patterns: they appear like a set frame, into which he fills the appropriate lexical item, without taking much notice of other principles.

#### *Exceptions and complex cases*

There is hardly any exception, apart from the fact that he occasionally omits the auxiliary (both *hat* and *ist*).

*Referent introduction and reference maintenance*

Like Gina, Çevdet uses five types of NPs:

- Lexical NP; they are mostly simple, consisting of *ein*, *der* or quantifiers and N; very rarely, he uses bare N. He has clear signs of case marking and gender differentiation, although he is far from being systematic here.
- Quantifier NPs, like *etwas* "something", etc.
- Personal pronouns: they are regularly, although sometimes wrongly, case-marked. He sometimes uses the *der/die/das*-systems of pronouns, but there is no apparent functional difference to the *er/sie/ es*-system.
- Zero anaphor, confined to immediately adjacent utterances.

Their function is clear in principle: *ein* N and quantifier NPs may introduce referents, *die* N presupposes familiarity, personal pronoun and zero anaphor maintain reference; for maintenance, the usual gradual distinctions apply. So far, this looks like a slightly advanced stage of Tino's or Gina's. There is a salient difference, however: Çevdet uses *all* NPs in *all* positions; in particular, zero anaphor is not crucial to maintenance of topic or controller. Utterances (7) and (9) are cases in question, where the log (*holz*) to be brought and not found is just never referred to again. This is not found with Italian learners.

4.6.3 *Cycle II**Repertoire and a sample*

Çevdet's utterance structures exhibits a small, but distinct development; we give a short passage (from altogether 130 utterances):

- (1) *der chef hat zu charlie gesagt*  
'the boss has to Charlie said'
- (2) *"dann bringst du mir so wie diese holz"*  
'then bring you me such like this log'
- (3) *dann er hat gesucht*  
'then he has looked-for'
- (4) *dann net gefunden*  
'then not found'
- (5) *später hat er eins gefunden*  
'later has he one found'

- (6) *und dann schiff* + +  
'and then ship'
- (7) *die/die/die firma bauen eine schiff*  
'the/the/the factory build a ship'
- (8) *und er wollte der/den holz abnehmen*  
'and he wanted-to the/the(acc) log away-take'
- (9) *und charlie wollte den holz nehmen*  
'and Charlie wanted-to the(acc) log take'
- (10) *dann er konnte nicht einfach wegnehmen*  
'then he was-able not simply take'
- (11) *und dann er hat eine hammer genommen*  
'and then he has a hammer taken'
- (12) *dann er hat geschlagen*  
'then he has hit'
- (13) *dann hat er den holz genommen*  
'then has he the log taken'
- (14) *dann der schiff weggegangen*  
'then the ship away-gone'

There is no significant development in Çevdet's repertoire. **Nouns** and **verbs** show an increase in number, and so do **adjectives** and **adverbs**. There is also a perceivable progress in case marking of lexical NPs.

#### *Basic phrasal patterns*

The three patterns of cycle I are still prevalent, with F. even less frequent and E. dominating. There is one important development, however. Çevdet now begins to place NP behind  $V_{\beta}$  if there is another constituent in initial position. As the sample text shows, this rule is optional, utterances like (12) (*dann er hat ...*) and (13) (*dann hat er ...*) immediately follow each other; the ratio is about 50:50. There is one important constraint, however, the "inversion" only takes place with personal pronouns, never with lexical NP. The first constituent in these cases is typically a temporal, sometimes a locative adverb, and in one case both:

- (15) *dann da haben sie einen mann und eine frau gesehen*  
'then there have they a man and a woman seen'

This again shows that the idea of "precisely one constituent" is still maturing. There is also one case where he "preposes" an object:

- (16) *und den hat er auch net bezahlt*  
 'and that has he also not paid'

This construction is quite normal in TL, but it violates the usual semantic and perhaps pragmatic constraints. There is no observable progress as regards the "fusion" of  $V_f$  and  $V_i$  for  $V_{if}$ , but this may be due to the fact that there are only a few instances of this anyhow, neither of them involving separable particles.

Similarly, it is hard to decide whether he has advanced with respect to TL rule (IIa), i.e. the placing of  $V_f$  at the end of subordinate clauses. There is one clear case where he does, another where he omits the auxiliary altogether, and several attempts to construct relative clauses, which are doubtful. We will consider them below.

#### *Semantic and pragmatic constraints*

The usual principles normally apply, but as in the first cycle, this may be incidental. There are three clear violations of the controller principle. One of them is (16), mentioned above. It is hard to see why he deviates here from the controller first principle, since there is no straightforward pragmatic reason to do so; *den* which refers to the chocolate mentioned in the preceding utterance, is no more typical or focal than *er*; but the order he has chosen sounds much better in German than the reverse, "nominal" order with the subject in initial position. This utterance perhaps does not answer the *quaestio*, but is a background comment: It gives the impression of a "contrasting topic" - contrasting to the cigar he hasn't paid before. So, it may well be that there are more subtle principles of topic-focus-organisation at work in this case than predicted by the elementary principle "Focus last". We cannot pursue this issue here, but it seems to indicate that Çevdet is very sensitive, indeed, to topic-focus requirements, whereas he does not care so much for possible semantic influences on word order.

The second exceptional case is (18):

- (17) *dann hat er gesagt*  
 'then has he said'

- (18) *das ICH mit brot war*  
 'that I with bread was'

Here, the question to be answered is clearly "Who was it with the bread?", and therefore, the focus is clearly the person, specified by *ich*. In (18), he violates not only the focus principle but also his normal phrasal patterns. Standard German would allow here both *Das mit dem brot war ich* and *Ich war das mit dem brot<sup>p</sup>*, where the former sounds contextually better integrated; in both cases, *ich* would be stressed. There is no straightforward explanation of this twofold violation

of his normal utterance organisation. The clause-final copula may be due to Turkish influence; but then, why are there no other cases of this particular TL transfer?

The third case involves only one NP which is clearly no controller:

(19) *dann die charhe hat ihn über den kopf geschlagen*  
'then the Charlie has him over the head hit'

(20) *dann die polizei ist wieder geschlagen*  
'then the police is again hit'

There are two possible explanations of (20): (a) either it is the first, and only, occurrence of a passive (with the wrong auxiliary), and he simply sticks to his normal pattern  $B_f$ . Or, more trivially, it would be a speech error, and he means *gefallen* rather than *geschlagen*, because it is this what happens in the film. Given that he never has a trace of passive anywhere else, this seems more likely.

#### *Exceptions and complex cases*

Some exceptions have been mentioned already. He still has an inclination to omit the auxiliary once in a while. And there is one construction where he has problems - the relative clause. Consider, first, the following two instances:

(21) *und dann der chef wollte etwas zeigen*  
'and then the boss wanted something show'

(22) *was er machen kann*  
'what he make can'

(23) *dann ein holz wo genommen der chef ...*  
'then a log where taken the boss ...'

In (22), he not only masters the subordinate clause order of TL, he even manages the jump over  $V_i$  *zeigen* from the head *etwas* to the (appropriate) relative pronoun. In (23), on the other hand, he omits  $V_f$  altogether, puts the only NP, a clear controller, after V, and applies a wrong relative pronoun. We have no reasonable account for these phenomena, in particular not for the positioning of NP, unless we take it as a result of his general uncertainty about the relative. There are two occurrences where he merges complementiser clause and relative clause; one of them is

(24) *vorher hat er eine mädchen gesehen*  
'before has he a girl seen'

(25) *daß sie eine brot geklaut hatte*  
'that she a bread stolen had'

The subordinate clause seems to be a composition between "... he has seen that she ..." and "... he has seen a girl who ...". But it could also be that he treats *daß* as a kind of particle indicating "relative clause", as many languages do.

*Referent introduction and reference maintenance*

There is no observable development here. In particular, his zero anaphora is still not confined to topic or controller in initial position.

4.6.4 *Cycle III*

*Repertoire and a sample*

Çevdet's third retelling is much longer (about 210 utterances) and sounds very different from the two preceding ones. We give a sample:

- (1) *und nachher der chef sagt*  
'and afterwards the boss says'
- (2) *"bring mir solche keil + ne, so'n holzstück"*  
'"bring me such wedge + yea, such a log!'"
- (3) *und er hatte gesucht + aber net gefunden*  
'and he had looked-for + but not found'
- (4) *und er ist etwas weggegangen*  
'and he is a bit away-gone'
- (5) *er sucht weiter*  
'he looks-for further' (i.e. goes on looking)
- (6) *und unter dem schiff hat er eins gesehen + eine keil*  
'and under the ship has he one seen + a wedge'
- (7) *er sollte den keil net rausziehen*  
'he should the wedge not out-pull'
- (8) *und wenn er rauszieht*  
'and when he out-pulls'
- (9) *dann schiff geht ins wasser*  
'then ship goes into-the water'

There is some increase in his lexical repertoire, including rather unusual (in learner varieties) **modals** like *sollte* (cf. 7 above). Far more interesting, however, are the many salient traces of spoken language: he has many interactive particles

like *ne* (roughly "isn't it"), words like *also* (roughly "well"), vernacular pronunciation like *net* instead of *nicht* or even dialectal forms like *gefunne* instead of *gefunden* (in 3, he actually says *gefunne*). His quoted speech in particular sounds extremely idiomatic, with forms like *alles in ordnung, kannstde bei uns arbeiten*, which violate the TL rules, as we have stated them in 4.1.2, but which are quite common.

#### *Basic phrasal patterns*

There are three salient developments:

- The "inversion", i.e. the placing of NP<sub>1</sub> after VP, if there is another major constituent in initial position, is now predominant, although not fully established. It is still confined, however, to personal pronouns (contrast utterances 1 and 6 in the sample above). Moreover, he tends to overgeneralise it to *und*, i.e. Çevdet treats *und* on a par with *dann* or other major constituents.
- He masters TL rule III, i.e. fusion of V<sub>f</sub> and V<sub>i</sub>, where a possible separable prefix is left behind.
- He now has a number of presentationals, which are regularly introduced by *dort* "there" or more often by a form *do*, derived from the dialect form of *da* (roughly "there"). So, we should add another pattern to his repertoire.

C<sub>f</sub>.            *do* V<sub>if</sub> NP<sub>2</sub>, where V<sub>if</sub> also includes Cop<sub>f</sub>

It is one of the most striking features of Çevdet's language - and actually of all Turkish learners - that he never uses verb-initial constructions (except in imperatives and questions). He seems to avoid presentationals in the first two cycles altogether, perhaps in connection with his heavy concentration on the plot-line, and where they show up, they are not introduced by V or Cop. This is one of the most salient differences from Italian learners, and there is a ready explanation - the tendency of Turkish to have something else before the verb.

#### *Semantic and pragmatic constraints*

The general pattern - controller first, focus last - is confirmed, but there are a number of interesting violations. Two of them concern the anaphoric pronoun *der/das* - in contrast to *ihn/es*; we give one of the two examples:

(10) *und sie hatte ein brot gestohlen + von eine wagen*  
       'and she had a bread stolen + from a van'

(11) *und das hatte eine andere frau gesehen*  
       'and that had another woman seen'



In German, there is a small, but distinct difference between the order of NPs in (11), the reverse order *eine frau hat das gesehen*, and this latter order with *es* instead of *das* (the fourth order *es hatte eine andere frau gesehen*, with anaphoric *es* is impossible, no one knows why). This difference has to do with a slightly different focussing of the various entities involved. It would go far beyond the elementary framework developed here to account for these nuances; actually, no linguistic theory has so far been able to provide a satisfactory account; but doubtlessly, (11) is the most fluent and elegant continuation of (10). This illustrates that Çevdet has made much more progress since the first cycle than a simple comparison of phrasal patterns would lead us to suppose. He largely retains his patterns, with some subtle extensions; but he has developed an amazing sensitivity for the subtle coalitions of grammatical structures and pragmatic components in German utterance organisation. A number of other examples confirm this point.

#### *Exceptions and complex cases*

He still occasionally omits the auxiliary, although this is rare now. His relative clauses are now largely correct.

#### *Referent introduction and reference maintenance*

The only interesting change here is the increasing use of *der/die/das* pronouns. It is remarkable that among the about twenty zero anaphora, one third do not apply to topic and controller: he keeps his "zero object", although neither Standard German nor the local dialect tolerates this, idiomatic expressions aside.

#### 4.6.5 *Summary*

Çevdet's learner varieties are not totally different from the ones of the Italian learners, but they are markedly distinct in at least three respects:

1. He does not start with a relatively free interaction of phrasal, semantic and pragmatic constraints. He rather has three rigid phrasal patterns from which, in the initial state, he hardly deviates. These patterns are neither Turkish nor German, but they are in one crucial respect close to the latter: they involve the distinction between  $V_f$  and  $V_i$  which is so important for German utterance organisation and whose acquisition is *the* major step in the developing Italian learner varieties. He then elaborates these rigid patterns in two directions; first, he extends them to cover the full range of phrasal

TL regularities I-III. Second, he learns to "play" with these patterns, for example with the possibility of having essentially any constituent, not just the subject, in initial position.

2. He never chooses the option of having the verb in initial position - a possibility used by all Italian learners. It seems likely that this difference is due to SL influence.
3. While introduction and maintenance of referents are essentially similar, there is one major difference: Çevdet has all types of NP in all positions; in particular, he also has zero anaphora in all positions and functions.

It is surely not implausible to assume that the early differentiation of  $V_f$  and  $V_i$  is due to the teaching he has obtained. Since teaching was limited and had already ended before the first retelling, it cannot have guided his further development. It may well be, however, that this experience in the classroom set him on a certain track which he then followed when working on his language by interacting with his environment.

#### 4.7 Turkish - German: Ayshe

Ayshe's varieties resemble Çevdet's in all crucial respects. In the following, we will consider her first retelling in some detail and then concentrate on changes in the second and third cycle.

##### 4.7.1 *The informant*

Ayshe was born in 1966 in Bafra (Trabzon). She attended primary and secondary school for five years and a half. At the age of fifteen, she went to Germany to join her father and her two brothers. From autumn 1982 to summer 1983, she attended an MBSE course (the vocational training that Çevdet also followed). She then worked in a laundry. Her contacts with the German speaking environment were quite limited in this time and during the participation in the project. The first retelling was recorded in November 1983, the second in May 1984, the third in November 1984.

## 4.7.2 Cycle I

*Repertoire and a sample*

The following selection (from about 100 utterances) shows almost all of her patterns:

- (1) *da war ein mädchen*  
'there was a girl'
- (2) *sie ist hunger*  
'she is hunger'
- (3) *sie hat auf fenster geguckt*  
'she has on window looked'
- (4) *dann da gibts ein auto*  
'then there is a car'
- (5) *da den brot, französische brot + so groß*  
'there the (acc.) bread, french bread + that big'
- (6) *dann die hat diese brote geklaut*  
'then that/she has this bread stolen'
- (7) *dann eine frau hat gesehen*  
'then a woman has seen'
- (8) *diese frau hat gesagt der chef*  
'this woman has said (to) the boss'
- (9) *"diese mädchen hat ihr brot genommen"*  
'this girl has your bread taken'
- (10) *dann der chef geht auch*  
'then the boss goes also'
- (11) *wenn sie schneller laufen*  
'when she faster run'
- (12) *dann kommt charlie chaplin*  
'then comes Charlie Chaplin'
- (13) *dann sie machen hingefallen*  
'then they make down-fallen'
- (14) *dann diese brot nimmt charlie chaplin*  
'then this bread takes Charlie Chaplin'
- (15) *dann wenn polizei kommt*  
'then when police comes'

(16) *dann polizei hat gesagt*  
 'then police has said'

(17) *"wir gehen gefängnis"*  
 "'we go prison'"

Like Çevdet, Ayshe has no problems with open class words, although in fact, she does not use many adjectives; occasionally, she asks for a word. She has about ten spatial and temporal **adverbs**; several **particles** like *auch* "too", *noch* "still" and about seven **prepositions** are present. She has four connectors, *und*, *oder*, *aber* and the complicated *sondern*, all of them used appropriately. There is only one **subordinate** construction, *wann-dann* "when-then"; in particular, there is no relative pronoun. Personal **pronouns** are fully present, including case-marked forms, whereas she has no case-marking for lexical noun phrases; there are a few occurrences of *der/die/das* pronouns, all of them in initial position.

The most salient feature is clearly the full - though sometimes wrong - inflectional marking of the verb. Like Çevdet, she has the differentiation of V into  $V_f$  and  $V_i$ .

#### Basic phrasal patterns

With a few exceptions to be discussed below, she uses four phrasal patterns, which correspond to Çevdet's four in his last cycle:

E.  $NP_1 - V_f - (NP_2) - V_i$

F.  $NP_1 - V_{if} - (NP_2) - (PART)$

$B_f$ .  $NP_1 - Cop_f - \left\{ \begin{array}{l} NP_2 \\ PP \\ Adj \end{array} \right\}$

$C_f$ . *do*  $V_{if}$   $NP_2$ , *where*  $V_{if}$  *includes*  $Cop_f$

Both  $V_{if}$  and  $Cop_f$  are occasionally omitted. There are two cases (one of them 13), where a presentational is introduced by *dann* rather than *da*. (All patterns can be preceded by *und*, *aber* and/or a temporal adverbial *dann* or a PP.) This clearly illustrates that she does not have the TL main clause order. With one exception (to be discussed below), she never inverts  $NP_1$  and  $V_f$ , as utterances like (10) illustrate. There is one case in which she starts such an "inversion" but then immediately corrects it:

(18) *dann später ha/ der hat gewußt*  
 'then later ha/ he has known'

Like Çevdet, Ayshe has some clear "moulds", into which lexical items are fed,

without taking too much care of other possible features. There is some variation, however, as regards the position of PPs, in particular directionals, and even NP<sub>2</sub>. Normally, they precede V<sub>i</sub> (before possible fusion); but sometimes, they are "right dislocated", i.e. put after V<sub>i</sub>. This variation does not appear to correlate with any special focus condition, hence it reflects some indeterminateness of the syntactic pattern itself.

Ayshe masters, like Çevdet in his first retelling, the formation of V, with separate particle (like *raus genommen* "out-taken", *angezogen* "on-put", etc.), but there is only one (correct) application of V<sub>i</sub>-formation with the particle left behind. So, it is hard to say whether she is in full control of TL rule III. In a word, Ayshe's patterns correspond exactly to Çevdet's in his first cycle, except the early presence of presentationals; but this may be due to the relative scarcity of background clauses in Çevdet's first, somewhat dry and monotonous retelling.

#### *Semantic and phrasal patterns*

The findings are like in Çevdet's case. Violations of "Controller first" and "Focus last" are avoided. There is one interesting exception, however. It concerns the scene in which the girl who first stole the bread runs into Charlie. Ayshe then goes on:

- (14) *dann diese brot nimmt charlie chaplin*  
'then this bread takes Charlie Chaplin'

A normal foreground utterance answers a question like "What happened then (to p)?" In this respect, although (14) is in concordance with Ayshe's phrasal patterns, F. in this case, it violates the controller principle (the breadtaker is clearly higher in the control hierarchy than the bread), and it violates the "focus principle", since focus is the next action, and not the person. Now, in the film, Charlie does not really "take" the bread; the girl bumps into him, and he ends up with having the bread; the action is *not* under his control, and it may be that (14) does not describe the action but the resulting state, i.e. the new position of the bread. In this case, the controller principle would not be violated. Moreover, it is plausible that (14) does not answer a question "what happened then" but a question like "Who was then in possession of the bread?". In this case, Charlie Chaplin is focus, and the order of (14) matches the focus principle. Clearly, this interpretation cannot be proven, since there is no explicit question, but it would make perfect sense, and it would account for an otherwise mysterious deviation from Ayshe's normal word order.

*Exceptions and complex cases*

There are no noteworthy exceptions beyond those mentioned already. It seems remarkable, given her general advancement, that she has no subordinate clauses except three *wann-dann* constructions, which show main clause order.

*Referent introduction and reference maintenance*

Ayshe has the same NP-patterns as Çevdet; in addition, she also has a name, Charlie Chaplin. And like Çevdet, she can have all NPs in all positions, except *der/die/das* pronouns, which are restricted to initial position. Whilst the use of *ein* N vs. *der* N corresponds to the familiarity dichotomy, there are quite a few "wrong" applications which are not so frequent as to falsify the general picture but which reveal at least some uncertainty on her part.

4.7.S *Cycle II*

Ayshe's second retelling is much more complex, dynamic and elegant (it consists of about 240 utterances). Her repertoire has increased, but interestingly enough, her utterance organisation is basically unchanged. Therefore, we concentrate here on those aspects which show some change, or which are interesting because they do not change.

1. The most salient development concerns pattern  $C_f$ , which tends to become very frequent. In addition, she varies this construction by varying between *es* and *da*, sometimes *dann*.
2. Pronominal *er* (with gender variants) is regularly replaced by *der* in initial position (there are a few exceptions, though).

There is no real progress otherwise. Actually, there is even some regression, as it appears: She now has no subordinate clause at all, despite the length of her story, and there is no instance of a separable prefix left behind according to TL rule III. This does not prove that she does not have this rule, but if so, she gives no evidence of it. There is no case of "inversion", but there are two cases in which the normal order of NPs, according to the controller principle, does not apply. The first one is this:

(1) *der hat von gefängnis ein brief gekriegt*  
 'he (Charlie) has from prison a letter got'

Neither Charlie nor the letter are high in the control hierarchy; but (1) is in accordance with the focus principle, and no phrasal pattern is violated. The other

case concerns the "breadpassing" from the girl to Charlie, which we discussed in 4.9.2. Actually, this scene is rendered twice, first in the following form:

(2) *und charlie chaplin hat das brot in der hand gehabt*

'and Charlie Chaplin has the bread in his hand had'

Here, Ayshe explicitly describes the resulting state, rather than the event, although not precisely in the form which we had assumed to underly her account in the previous retelling. If the focus principle applies, then the new position is in focus, and it indeed would make sense to assume that, in this situation, (2) is used to answer a question like "Where was the bread then?" An even better answer to such a question would be to put the bread, which in such a question would be clearly marked as topic, into initial position. This is exactly what Ayshe does in her second rendering of the scene, a few utterances later:

(3) *aber das brot hatte charlie chaplin ihnen hand*

'but the bread had Charlie Chaplin in the hand'

We mentioned already in 4.9.2 that explanations of this kind cannot be proven, since there are no explicit questions, and neither can we look into the speaker's mind, nor do we know what her focus rules really are. But they make sense, they are compatible with the facts, and there is no other, better justifiable explanation in sight.

#### 4.7.4 Cycle III

##### *Repertoire*

In her last, extremely long retelling (about 280 utterances), Ayshe shows distinct progress in several crucial respects. She skilfully applies a number of idiomatic constructions, like *aber der wollte unbedingt ins gefängnis* (roughly: "but he wanted by all means into jail"), or the "quoted thought" *ich muß sofort hier verschwinden* "I must get out of here fast". Her quoted speech in particular is full of distinct traces of everyday spoken German, and indeed dialect pronunciation. There are one or two cases where she asks for a word (like the kennel in which Charlie spends the night at the end of the story); but in principle, she has no repertoire problems at all.

##### *Basic phrasal patterns*

She now has Tino's pattern G., i.e. compound copula construction; for completeness' sake, we list it here:

$$G. \quad \text{NP}_1\text{-Cop}_f\text{-}\left\{ \begin{array}{c} \text{Adj} \\ \text{PP} \\ \text{NP}_2 \end{array} \right\}\text{-Cop}_i$$

But the really interesting developments are the following:

- She now has TL rule III, i.e. she often fuses  $V_f$  and  $V_i$ , leaving a separable particle behind when required.
- She has a number of subordinate clauses, introduced by *wenn* "when", *als* "while, when" and *dass* "that"; their word order corresponds to TL rule IIc, i.e. has  $V_f$  in final position, where it may fuse with  $V_i$  to  $V_{if}$ . Interestingly enough, she still has no relative clauses.
- She also masters IIc, i.e. she has exactly one major constituent before  $V_f$  in declarative main clauses (there are two exceptions, where she combines *dann* and a NP before  $V_f$ ).

The latter change, clearly a big step ahead, needs qualification, however. She clearly has this rule, with minimal uncertainty, but first, it is still confined to personal pronouns, and second, she rarely applies it (12 cases among about 280 utterances). She mostly avoids having any other constituent (except *und*) in initial position, hence the need rarely arises to invert  $\text{NP}_1$  and  $V_f$ . The cases in which she "inverts" are highly idiomatic, and they give fluency and elegance to her narration. We give some examples:

(1) *sie ham kein problem +*  
'they have no problem +'

(2) *essen + wohnung + ham se alles*  
'food + home + have they everything'

(This might be approximately translated by "food, place to live - just got everything".) In this case, the "topicalised" constituent is picked up by *alles*. This, and some other examples, violates the controller principle; but the reverse order would sound rather clumsy in this context. This is probably due to a sophisticated topic-focus distribution which we will not try to account for here. Another case with two inversions is this:

(3) *und als der reinkam + hat sie eier gemacht*  
'and when he in-came + has she eggs made'

(4) *und den tee hat sie gemacht*  
'and the tea has she made'

In (3), the TL rules require "inversion" - which she obeys, still keeping the principle "Controller first". She also violates this principle in (4), again observing the correct pattern; in this case, there is no need to violate it, but as in the



examples above, the "normal" order *und sie hat den tee gemacht*, sounds much heavier and less fluent. There are a number of similar examples which demonstrate her increasing security to the special topic-focus differentiation which the relatively free German word order offers.

*Referent introduction and reference maintenance*

There are many small developments and one interesting one: the use of *der* has now almost entirely replaced the use of *er*- except "inversion", where *der* never occurs: it is confined to the first position. Now, the local vernacular - and actually most spoken German - is clearly dominated by the use of *der*, compared to *er* (cf. Klein and Rieck 1982). So, it seems justified to consider this as another step towards the language of her social environment. Unfortunately enough, this plausible idea is plainly contradicted by the fact that Ayshe does not do this for the corresponding (singular) form *sie*: she hardly ever uses *die*, no matter in which position. She uses *die*, however, for plural *sie*. It still seems plausible to assume that there is an influence of the local vernacular; but as is often the case: the contribution of this factor to her language is not as simple as we would like to have it.

4.7.5 *Summary of Turkish informants*

We can be short here. Basically, we found exactly the same development as in the case of Çevdet (cf. 4.8.5). The only noteworthy difference is Çevdet's non-early use of presentationals which is possibly due more to his rather arid style of retelling than to his lacking mastery of this construction. Both, however, share their avoidance of verb-initial constructions.

## 4.8 Summary of German learners

Anyone who has ever tried to read Immanuel Kant or Marcel Proust will be inclined to agree that utterances can be quite ramified. This does not mean, however, that the principles on which these constructions are based are similarly complex. It is our assumption that the principles underlying utterance organisation in elementary learner varieties as well as in highly sophisticated "full" languages are essentially the same, that they are simple, and that complexity arises from their repeated application, on the one hand, and from their mutual

and varying interaction, on the other. The utterances studied here are extremely simple in the beginning, and even at the very end of the observation period, their complexity is not particularly high. Still, there is clear developmental progress, most visible in the growing repertoire: new lexical items are learned, and more and more inflectional devices are added. This is not just a quantitative change, it also leads to a different interplay of phrasal, semantic and pragmatic principles and, consequently, to an utterance organisation which is more complex and closer to that of the target language.

In this summary, we will be mainly concerned with the order of major constituents. There is also a noticeable development in form and function of the NP, but the essential lines of this development correspond to what has been said in chapters 2 and 3, and we add here only a few points which have to do with inter-individual variation. Clearly, we cannot deal with all of the observations made in the preceding analysis of individual learners. In particular, we will skip over most of the exceptions which have been discussed above, although it is often these exceptions which shed most light on the workings of the learner varieties considered here. We will rather try to bring our observations in line with the general picture of the acquisition process just alluded to.

#### 4.8.1 *Principles*

In chapter 2, we distinguished three types of principles which co-determine the ways in which learners put their words together. These are:

- Phrasal principles, i.e. those which can be stated in terms such as NP, V, Adj etc. Such a principle would be: "V always follows a NP".

It has been said in 4.1.2 that in order to describe the regularities of German, a category such as V is too crude: It is crucial to distinguish between  $V_f$  and  $V_{,}$ , which may merge into  $V_{if}$ . The acquisition of this distinction turned out to be a major step in the developmental process; we will come back to this point.

- Semantic principles; the one which proved to be sufficient for the data of the pilot study was S.: "Controller first" - i.e. if there are two NPs, that one comes first whose referent exerts, or intends to exert, most control over the situation.
- Pragmatic principles, the most important candidate being P.: "Focus last". Focus constituent (or constituents, as the case may be) is that constituent

which "answers the question" (cf. chapter 2.4). Such a question need not be explicitly asked. It may be entirely implicit, or it may follow from the "text question" which the text - the film retelling, in this case - is designed to answer.

It is clear that there is some variation and some development as regards the possible phrasal patterns. We have already mentioned the distinction between  $V_f$  and  $V_i$ , which presupposes at least some inflectional morphology: so long as there is only one "base form" of a verb, this distinction does not make too much sense in the description of a learner variety. Other changes go along with an increase in the lexical repertoire, e.g. the introduction of three-actant verbs, or verbs which govern sentential complements, etc. It is less clear whether there are similar changes concerning semantic or pragmatic principles. There is good reason to assume that "Controller first" and "Focus last" do not suffice, as soon as we consider more complex phrasal patterns. But our data apparently do not reach this degree of complexity, if we neglect some interesting exceptions (in particular for the more advanced Turkish learners). It may also be that a principle like "Focus last" has to be completed by another "focus principle" which makes crucial use of intonation - something we have not systematically studied here. Note that all of these changes would not falsify the general account given here: they would enrich it by other principles which join the game.

#### 4.8.2 *Finite and infinite utterance organisation*

Given the nature of the data, questions and imperatives are very rare, and most of our informants did not reach a level at which they would regularly use subordinate clauses. There are a number of such instances, but these do not differ in structure from declarative main clauses. Therefore, we can confine our considerations in this summary to the latter. This leaves us essentially with four major pieces of German phrasal structure which the learners had to grapple with:

- they have to acquire the crucial distinction between  $V_f$  and  $V_i$ ; this is clearly a major problem, given the complexity of German verb morphology, but it is an indispensable step;
- they must learn that  $V_i$  is (normally) clause-final (rule I from 4.1.2);
- they must learn that  $V_f$  is preceded by exactly one major constituent (rule II a from 4.1.2);
- they must learn to "fuse"  $V_f$  and  $V_i$  into  $V_{if}$ , where  $V_f$  defines the position and a separable particle (PART) is left behind (rule III from 4.1.2).

It is easy to see that these four ingredients play a crucial role in the acquisition process of the learners considered here, and that there are some clear differences in the ways in which the learners deal with them. There are also differences in the ways in which the phrasal factors interact with "Controller first" and "Focus last", and both differences go along with the distinction between Italian and Turkish learners.

Depending whether an utterance uses the categories  $V_f$  and  $V_i$ , or whether it only uses  $V$ , we will speak of "finite utterance organisation" (FUO) and of "infinite utterance organisation" (IUO). Both are "verbal" in that they use some of the potential of the verb; in particular, they can both build on the "valency" of the verb (government relations). As we know from many other sources, and is occasionally evidenced by our present data, this is not always the case. At the elementary stages of the acquisition process, utterances often consist of single or apparently unconnected words, mostly nouns, occasionally adjectives or even (uninflected) verbs; where the latter appear, they express a lexical content, just as nouns or adjectives, but they do not seem to have any clear valency: they do not "govern" some other constituent. We may call this way of expressing oneself "nominal utterance organisation" (NUO). Some might dispute whether the word "organisation" is appropriate here at all; but after all, such a common device of fully developed languages as word formation (more precisely: compounds) is an instance of purely "nominal organisation".

There is a clear development from NUO over IUO to FUO in learner varieties; but it is important to keep in mind that transitions are slow and gradual, and the three ways regularly coexist. Having said this, we may state that in the present study, both Turkish and Italian learners are essentially beyond NUO. They both make crucial use of verbs, but they differ with respect to "finiteness".

Our Italian learners are on the verge of transition from IUO to FUO. It appears that their road is essentially the same, although they proceed at a different pace, with Tino being ahead. The general picture is as follows:

1. In IUO, all utterances have either a  $V$  or a Cop. In the former case,  $V$  is either initial or after a NP; a second - and, though exceptionally, third - NP may follow. Cop is between a NP and a "predicative" constituent (PP, Adj, second NP); it may also be initial and is then followed by a NP; in this case, it functions like a lexical verb denoting existence, and we shall consider it on a par with  $V$ -NP. Thus we have the following "infinite" patterns (subscripts are used for ease of reference):

- A.  $\text{NP}_1\text{-V-NP}_2$
- B.  $\text{NP}_1\text{-Cop-}\left\{\begin{array}{l} \text{NP}_2 \\ \text{Adj} \\ \text{PP} \end{array}\right\}$
- C.  $\text{V-NP}_2$

A. and C. may be followed or preceded by an adverbial. This leaves us with three problems:

- (a) Which are the NPs figuring as  $\text{NP}_1$  or  $\text{NP}_2$ ?
- (b) What leads to V-initial constructions, as in C?
- (c) What determines the relative order of NPs in A. (if there are two), and in B.?

The answer to the first question is relatively straightforward: as  $\text{NP}_1$ , we may have nouns, lexical NP, personal pronouns, and  $\emptyset$ ;  $\text{NP}_2$  allows the same except  $\emptyset$ ; it should be noted, though, that pronoun use in  $\text{NP}_2$  is restricted, and that speakers show more or less inclination to use  $\emptyset$ . The other questions will be taken up below.

2. In F.U.O., we are essentially faced with two patterns

- E.  $\text{NP}_1\text{-V}_f \quad \text{-(NP}_2\text{)-V}_i$
- F.  $\text{NP}_1\text{-V}_{if} \quad \text{-(NP}_2\text{)-(PART)}$

where the latter shows up later and is much rarer. Both E. and F. may be followed or preceded by an adverbial. The "finite counterpart" of the copula construction is less frequent, although the transition is hard to pin down: it is often not easy to decide whether *ist* should be considered to be a non-productive, infinite form or a finite form.<sup>10</sup> In other words, it may well be that some occurrences of B. should, at later stages, be regarded as F.U.O. patterns -  $\text{B}_f$  . - although their form has not really changed. Finally, there are no really clear cases of  $\text{V}_f$  or  $\text{V}_{if}$  in initial position; this construction is apparently not maintained in F.U.O. - Question (c) remains open.

3. The transition from I.U.O. to F.U.O. is slow and gradual; both types of utterance organisation co-exist for a long time. It should be noted that no Italian learner ever achieves (Ha), i.e. the correct pattern of main declarative clauses, although their utterances often happen to be correct, if  $\text{NP}_1$  is the only constituent before  $\text{V}_f$  or  $\text{V}_{if}$ . But there is often an initial adverbial, and

then, Standard German would require  $NP_1$  to move behind  $V_f$  or  $V_{if}$ . The Italian learners do not do this.

The picture is quite different for the Turkish learners, despite some apparent similarities:

4. All utterances are based on F<sub>UO</sub>. There are three major patterns:

- E.  $NP_1 - V_f - (NP_2) - V_i$   
 F.  $NP_1 - V_{if} - (NP_2) - (PART)$   
 B<sub>f</sub>.  $NP_1 - Cop_f - \left\{ \begin{array}{l} NP_2 \\ Adj \\ PP \end{array} \right\}$

Furthermore, Ayshe develops G. in the third cycle:

- G.  $NP_1 - Cop_f - \left\{ \begin{array}{l} NP_2 \\ Adj \\ PP \end{array} \right\} - Cop_i$

Pattern E. is clearly dominant, the complete "plot-line" is based on it, and background clauses are comparatively rare, at least in the first retellings. All patterns can be preceded or followed by an adverbial; hence, they do not really reflect the TL rule (Ha), since they allow two major constituents before  $V_f$  or  $V_{if}$  or  $Cop_f$ .

5. There are two major developments. First, rule IIa is applied indeed, but only when  $NP_1$  is a personal pronoun. In other words, we get a coexistence of patterns like

*Dann Charlie hat das Mädchen gesehen.*

*Dann hat er das Mädchen gesehen.*

The reasons for this differentiation are unclear; maybe the personal pronoun is felt to have a clitic status. Standard German does not make such a distinction, i.e. rule Ha applies equally to lexical NPs, nouns and personal pronouns.

Second, we find a kind of expletive, mostly realised as *do* or *dann* which precedes the finite component. The arising pattern C<sub>f</sub> corresponds in function to the V-initial constructions of the Italian learners:

- C<sub>f</sub>.  $Do - V_{if} - NP_2$

We also find  $\text{Cop}_f$  instead of  $\text{V}_{if}$ .  $\text{V}_f$  is rare. Note that the Turkish learners *never* have any verb in initial position.

It seems plausible that both developments are connected the one to the other. The learners start with the notion that (i)  $\text{V}_f$  cannot be initial, and (ii) that NP must be before  $\text{V}_f$ . With the growth of Ha, they give up the second requirement, but stick to the first.

This, again, leaves us with the three questions similar to these raised above, namely (a) which NPs can appear where, (b) what are the conditions of use of post-posed NP - in this case with expletive *do* - and (c) what decides on the order of the NPs if there are two. Again, question (a) is easily answered in principle. All types of NP can appear in any position, except that in  $\text{C}_f$ , pronouns are restricted, and there is no distributional justification for 0. The two other questions will be discussed in the following section.

#### 4-8.3 *Semantic and pragmatic constraints*

So far, we have only dealt with purely phrasal constraints. They cannot answer the questions just mentioned. Here, semantic and pragmatic principles come in. The general picture is this:

6. "Controller first" and "Focus last" apply throughout. This answers question (c), i.e. they determine the relative order of constituents, so long as there is no conflict (to this possibility we turn in a moment).

It also partly answers the other problem: What leads to  $\text{V-NP}_2$  and *do-V-NP*<sub>2</sub>? As we have seen, their conditions of use are not fully uniform. The dominant cases are clearly presentationals or "appearances on the scene", which may be stative or dynamic ("there was a man - there came a man"). But we also noted examples where even the most liberal interpretation of this concept does not work, and we need a more general notion, which comes from the focus-sensitivity of word order.

The crucial point here is: What should be considered as focus? This is in general defined by the - implicit or explicit - question which the utterance is meant to answer. The standard question of a narrative plot line utterance is, as we assumed: "What happened next with the protagonist?" Such a question assigns the protagonist (as well as the time span of the reported event) to the topic component, and the event without the protagonist to the focus. If the question is "What was next on stage?" or "What appeared next?", then the object or

person referred to by NP is in focus, rather than whatever is expressed by V, and hence, NP should come last; this gives us the structure of presentationals. It may also be that both the protagonist and the event (to the extent to which it is expressed by V or V-NP2) belongs to the focus; or the speaker wants to mark it as such. Such a situation would correspond to a question like Labov's (1972:370) "Then what happened?" rather than "What happened next to the protagonist?". In this case, NP must not appear in initial position, because it would then get topic status. All that is topical is the time span, which is actually most often left implicit anyway (given by the sequential order). Such a constellation obtains when everything, including the protagonist, is new, hence, when the whole event, including the participation of the protagonist in it, is unexpected (in contrast to the normal plot line, where the protagonist or protagonists "run through") - in other words, when we get a major referential discontinuity from the preceding utterance. This "major referential break" was crucial in the English learners' early use of episode boundaries, as we saw.

Under this interpretation, Turkish and Italian learners only differ in the way in which they treat the remaining topic element, the time span at which the event to be reported happened. Turks mark it by *do* or *dann*, sometimes even *dort*, whereas Italians mostly leave it implicit, since it is clear anyway.

This explanation seems general, straightforward, and compatible with all our observations. It should be clear, though, that it cannot be taken to be sufficiently confirmed; there are simply not enough possibilities to falsify it in our data.

7. Most often, controller principle and focus principle pull in the same direction. But there are some conflicting cases, which we have discussed at length, such as the "breadtaking" scene. Learners have no ready solution in this case. They try various possibilities, including the use of additional devices like intonation which we have not considered here. We will not repeat this discussion. But there seems to be at least one general observation concerning the difference between Turks and Italians. In the case of the Turkish learners, the focus principle clearly dominates the controller principle, and if they cannot avoid a clash, they are inclined to sacrifice the latter. This is not the case with the Italians; if they sacrifice anything, it is rather the focus principle, although this is less clear. In any event, the semantic principle is at least as strong as the focus principle. The attention which Turkish learners pay to focus also shows up, at the end of the acquisition process studied here, in their high sensitivity towards complex topic-focus-constellations - as reflected, for example, in the choice between *der* and *er* (cf. 4.8.2 and 4.9.4).



4.8.4 *Conclusion*

There are a number of additional observations which might be the reflex of some general principle or some specific factor, such as, for example, the fact that Turkish learners, even at an advanced stage, often omit an auxiliary ( $V_f$ ), when it is clear from the context, whereas Italian learners - at a stage where this applies - never do so. We shall not go into this and related observations but rather deal with the clearer distinction between Turks and Italians.

Part of the observed differences are surely due to the short but probably intensive schooling of the Turkish learners, which led to a rapid acquisition of verb inflexion and hence finite utterance organisation (no learner ever went beyond the very first steps of noun inflexion). They did not need to derive the intricacies of "finiteness" from a heterogenous input, as offered by everyday communication, but obtained essential parts of it "home-delivered". This led to a relatively advanced, but somewhat impoverished and monotonous type of utterance organisation. Still, we can see at many points how the more genuine principles of utterance organisation, as the learners themselves apply them with their given SL bias, show up. They are reflected in the existence of zero objects, in the preponderance of "Focus first" over "Controller first", in the avoidance of V-initial constructions, to mention the most salient differences. This illustrates a more general point: We hardly ever get a "pure" influence of the source language in question, but an interaction of SL bias with other factors that, for one reason or the other, intervene in the acquisitional process.

## Notes

1. It is unclear whether this form corresponds to TL *hat* "has" or *hatte* "had"; but since he never uses pluperfect elsewhere, it is more plausible to regard it as a phonological variant of the former.
2. For a detailed discussion of this transition, cf. Klein (1986:chapter 6.2).
3. In one case, he omits the copula altogether.
4. These examples, incidentally, illustrate the fact that topic and focus need not go hand in hand with "given" and "new".
5. Tino uses the correctly inflected form here, rather than *gehe*; but there is no systematic opposition; it seems more like a phonological variant.

- 6 This is, incidentally, the only case where an Italian informant puts an adjective behind the noun - possibly a hint how much she is under the influence of Italian patterns.
- 7 Many Italian learners use *bringe* "bring" instead of *nehme* "take", sometimes interchangeably. Angelina seems to turn this into a form which sounds *braut* or, later, *brauche* perhaps from the preterite *brachte*. It appears throughout in the second and third cycle.
- 8 There are many traces of an even earlier stage - a substage of "non-finite" - where utterances consist simply of NPs and PPs, there are no verbs, hence no government relations at all, and possible constraints are only semantic or pragmatic. Our learners are essentially beyond that stage, however.
- 9 Note that there is a clear difference between *das* and *es* in this case first, *es* could not be in first position here, and second, it would not allow prepositional attributes like *mit dem brot*, although *es* is clearly referential, referring back to the contextually given topic, and not just a "dummy subject".
- 10 This, obviously, is a general problem. The mere appearance of a form which looks like an inflected TL form does not guarantee that it functions as a "finite form" in the learner's system (cf. note 5 in section 4.2.3). It is clear, however, that Tino develops

the finite-infinite distinction with G.:  $\text{NP}_1\text{-Cop}_f\text{-}\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{NP}_2 \\ \text{Adj} \\ \text{PP} \end{array} \right\}\text{-Cop}_i$