5 The acquisition of Dutch

Josée Coenen and Wolfgang Klein

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 Presentation of the chapter

This chapter concentrates on two Turkish learners (Mahmut and Ergün) and two Moroccan learners (Fatima and Mohamed) of Dutch. All informants were living in or around Tilburg. At the beginning of data collection, their proficiency in Dutch was almost nil.

As in the other chapters, the main data are retellings of Modern Times (average length about 120 utterances). But unfortunately, no such retellings were available for the first cycle. They were replaced by personal narratives (average length about 45 utterances). There is a second, minor difference from the technique used in other chapters: In the retellings (always to the same TL speaker), photographs of selected scenes of the movie were occasionally used. They were only meant to prompt memory; nevertheless, this technique may have yielded more deictic terms and overall more details compared to retellings without such prompts. Before turning to the data, we shall have a short look at word order in Dutch and in Moroccan Arabic (for Turkish, cf. chapter 4.1.3).

5.1.2 Word order in Dutch

It would not be correct to say that the word order of Dutch and German is identical. But with one clear exception, differences are subtle, and probably beyond the level ever attained by our informants. Therefore, the regularities stated in 4.1.2 for German can be re-stated analoguously for Dutch. The crucial fact is the distinction between a finite and a non-finite component of the verb which can, but need not be fused in one word. If these components correspond

to two single forms, we call these forms V_f and V_i, respectively; if they are fused to one single form, the label V_{if} is used. Just as in German, the Dutch V_i may often consist of two parts - the "stem" and a separable particle (PART), such as *op-, aan-, mee-* (in *opstaan, aantekenen, meenemen*). The only major difference from German concerns the position of V_f in subordinate clauses: it immediately precedes V_i, whereas it follows V_i in German, cf.

(1) *Charlie zei, dat hij het meisje heeft gezien*
    'Charlie said that he the girl   has   seen'

(2) *Charlie sagte, daß er das Mädchen gesehen hat*
    'Charlie said   that he the girl   seen   has'

Hence, the basic word order rules of Dutch may be stated as follows:

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 immediately precedes V_i in subordinate clauses.

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

Note that the single major constituent which according to IIa must precede the finite verb need not be the subject. As in German, it can be an object or an adverbial, for example:

(3) *Dit   meisje heb ik nooit gezien.*
    'This girl   have I never seen'

(4) *Gisteren   heeft Charlie het meisje niet gezien.*
    'Yesterday has   Charlie the girl   not seen'

It seems, however, that Dutch does not tolerate some cases of fronting which are allowed and not uncommon in German, as in

(5) *Häuser gekauft haben soll   er drei.*
    'Houses bought have   should he three'

The learners studied here hardly reach a level of proficiency at which such subtleties would matter. Still, these differences are noteworthy for two reasons. First, the fact that Dutch is slightly less liberal in word order than German may be correlated to the much richer morphological case marking of the latter. And second, the "balance" between phrasal, semantic and pragmatic constraints on word order is therefore somewhat different, although by no means as different as in English or French. One feature of Dutch which is not directly related to word

order but clearly affects the acquisition of syntax is its tendency to use clitics. For example, postponed *hij* "he" often shows up as cliticised *ie,* as in

(6) *toen ging-ie   weg*
    'then went-he away'

Constructions of this type may easily lead the informant to the assumption that the subject can be dropped *(ie* being interpreted as an inflectional ending). We shall see some examples of this construction below. Form and function of noun phrases are essentially the same as in English. There is no case inflexion except for some pronouns, although there are two genders *(het meisje/de man, de vrouw* "the girl/the man, the woman").

5.1.3   Some notes on Moroccan Arabic

   Arabic is often quoted as the paragon of a VSO-language. But the reality is opaque. A first complicating factor is the pervasive diglossia of Arabic. The language acquired in childhood is a local dialect; so-called "Standard Arabic" is only taught in school and then used in formal contexts, in writing, and for communication with speakers from different dialect areas. In a way, the situation is not too different from the case of people in Holland, Sweden and Germany who, having acquired their native language in childhood, learn English in school for specific communicative purposes, except, of course, that spoken Arabic dialects are normally not written languages and are often considered to be of lower value by their speakers, compared to Standard Arabic. This diglossia is important for two reasons. First, it means that the attitude towards languages and their structural differences may be strongly influenced by this diglossia. The learner is already familiar with the existence of specific structural differences: learning Dutch for a Moroccan Arab is tantamount to learning a third or, if he or she knows some French, even fourth language. Second, it is not easy to say what the utterance structure of the "source language" is, since local dialects and Standard Arabic differ to some extent in syntax. Most dialects are supposed to be SVO, whereas Standard Arabic (like Classical Arabic) is supposed to be VSO still - although this is challenged by some authors, and the picture was never really a uniform one.

   It should be clear, therefore, that the following hints are a gross oversimplification. Let us start with some undisputed points. Both verbs and noun phrases are heavily inflected. Personal pronouns are optional; in a way, a 3rd. person sg. verb form should not be rendered as e.g. "loves" but as "he-loves-her", with the

possibility to add explicit pronouns or lexical noun phrases. Bare noun phrases are normally indefinite (except in some special positions); definiteness is marked by an article (the famous *"al")* or some other modifiers. All of this is more or less common to all varieties of Arabic, except that the concrete morphological forms are often very different.

Much less clear are the facts of constituent structure and word order. Ever since the first Arabic grammars (around 790 AC), two types of sentences have been distinguished - nominal and verbal sentences. The former lack a finite verb. In fact, they are predicative constructions in which the copula, if in present tense and not negated, is regularly omitted. In other tenses and also when negated, there are special copula forms whose position is more or less the position of a normal finite verb. Hence, "nominal sentences" are not so exotic as this term may suggest. Verbal sentences come in two main types: the argument(s) either follow the verb (mostly in the order S 0, but the opposing order is possible, too), or S precedes the verb. In the first case, there is no verb agreement (the verb is normally in the singular), in the latter, there is agreement in gender and number. In both cases, the arguments are case-marked. The following simple way to present the various patterns is not really in the tradition of Arabic philology, but it gives a suggestive idea of the facts:

A.   Predicative constructions
A1. (there) is/was/is-not John a fool
A2. John, (he-is)/he-was/he-is-not a fool.

B.   Verb constructions
B1. (there) is-seeing by the children of the parents.
B2. The children, they-are-seeing-them, the parents.

Remarkably enough, an initial NP (A2 or B2) must be definite. This reminds one of the common French constructions *Pierre, c 'est un idiot* or *Les enfants, ils voient les parents* where indefinite NP in initial position is impossible (cf. chapter 6). We will not follow up these similarities (also observed in other languages) but just note that these patterns A2 and B2 are said to be dominant in most local dialects (although Moroccan Arabic might be an exception, cf. Harrell 1962, p. 160), whilst they are said to be exceptional in Classical Arabic. As was said above, their status in Standard Arabic is disputed. It may well be, however, that these differences have to do with the general differences between spoken and written language and their specific topic-focus-conditions, as is also observed for spoken and written French.

5.2   Turkish - Dutch: Mahmut

Here and for all subsequent informants, we shall, after a short profile of the informant, first present one rather extensive analysis of the first **retelling** (i.e., cycle II). This will be followed by an analysis of cycles III and I, in order to trace developmental trends.

5.2.1   The informant

Mahmut was born in a small town about 150 km from Ankara. After primary school, he worked as a car mechanic. At the age of 19, he went to the Netherlands, joining his wife who had been living there for 4 years. After a year of unemployment, he worked for ten months in a meat factory; but his contract was not renewed. He mostly spends his time with friends and relatives. His contacts with the Dutch environment were largely limited to colleagues (during the time of his employment), to hospital staff (he had an operation) and people in second-hand car markets. He is very much aware of his language problems.

5.2.2   Cycle II: First retelling

Repertoire and a sample

Mahmut's linguistic repertoire is rather limited. He uses mainly non-finite verb forms like infinitives and participles. There is hardly any trace of inflexion. Function words are rare. His pronominal system consists of *ik* "I", *jij* "you", *hij* "he" - the latter being strongly overgeneralised - and *mijn* "my". Instead of articles, he uses the emphatic numeral *een* "one" and the demonstratives *die* "that" and *deze* "this". The full retelling contains 142 analysable utterances; the following selection is taken from the "bread-stealing scene":

(1) *die   ander vrouw   gezien*
      'that other woman seen'   (= the other woman saw it)

(2) *die broodbaas zegt*
      'that breadboss says' (= she told the baker)

(3) *ja +   die   meisje brood weggooien*
      'yes + that girl   bread away-throw'

(4) *ja +   baas politie vragen*
     'yes + boss police ask'

(5) *en   dan politie komen*
     'and then police come'

(6) *meisje roepen*
     'girl   call' (= he called the girl)

(7) *meisje weg*
     'girl   away'

(8) *en   dan andere vrouw   komen baas/broodbaas*
     'and then other   woman come   boss/breadboss' (= and then the other
                                              woman went to the baker)

Basic phrasal patterns

In what follows, simple V is the 'base form' of the verb which does not
discriminate between V_i and V_f (as in chapter 4); mostly, but not always, the
form of V corresponds to V, in the target language; but there are also some
V_f-like forms, as *zegt* in example (2) above.

Mahmut's utterances are organised differently from those of other beginners
we have seen. A one-actant verb patterns NP-V, and a two-actant verb regularly
patterns NP-NP-V, so the basic organisation is V-final. Recall that with Madan,
for example, NP-NP-V (Pattern D.) was exceptional and NP-V-NP the rule;
here, the opposite is the case. For ease of reference, we will also refer to Mahmut's
basic pattern as D.:

D. $\mathbf{NP_1 \text{-} (NP_4) \text{-} V}$

Mahmut also frequently uses the following pattern:

B. $\mathbf{NP_1 \text{-}} \begin{Bmatrix} \mathbf{Adj} \\ \mathbf{Adv} \\ \mathbf{NP_2} \end{Bmatrix}$

Both patterns can be preceded by temporal, locative or modal adverbials, such
as *en dan* "and then", including bare nouns in such a function. Pattern B. is
a predicative construction, although there is never an explicit copula. So, we
cannot decide whether this "copula" follows or precedes the predication (which
can be realised as adjective, adverbial or noun phrase). The V-final pattern is
extremely consistent: There are a couple of exceptions: example 8 and *(dan) hij
zegt tegen haar* "then he says to her ...". For completeness sake, we list this as
pattern A.:

A.   **N P $_1$ - V - N P $_2$**

But it would be misleading to consider A. to be on a par with D. or B.

Semantic   and pragmatic   constraints

   The semantic constraint "Controller first" is never violated. There is one utterance which looks like such a violation:

   (9) *fout   gedaan + hij*
       'Mistake made   he'

But both the context and a pause before *hij* indicate that *hij* is a postponed clarification. By contrast, there are a few clear violations of the "Focus last"-constraint. This is particularly clear in the accusation-scene after the bread-stealing:

   (10) (Charlie says) *ik weggooien +   niet meisje weggooien*
                       'I away-throw + not girl   away-throw' (= it was me
                       who took it, not the girl)

The fact that the referent is in focus is marked by intonation. There are several similar examples. They leave open whether it is the phrasal constraint (V in final position) or the semantic constraint (Controller first) which enforces this violation. There is another example of "Focus last" which shows that the phrasal constraint as such is not so strong. After Charlie and the girl escape, they wander through the streets and end up in front of a middle-class house. This is described as follows:

   (11) *een huis   voor   zitten/zitten twee + meisje en   man*
         'one house in-front-of sit/sit   two + girl   and man'

The construction is clearly presentational.' "In front of the house are sitting two people, a girl and a man" (note the postposition of the preposition *voor)*. This shows that the "Verb last"-constraint can indeed be overruled by "Focus last", provided the semantic constraint is not violated.

Form   and function   of NP

   The typical NP in either position is a bare noun which can introduce or maintain its referent. N can be preceded by the numeral *een* "one" (only introduction) or the determiners *die* "that", *deze* "this" (only maintenance). NP can also be empty in both positions if it is maintained from the immediately preceding utterance, although this is rare for NP$_4$ (in Turkish, both subject and object can be left implicit in any position). There are three personal pronouns which are confined to NP$_1$ - *ik* "I", *jij* "you" and *hij* "he". The latter is also used for "she" and "they". A fourth pronoun *mijn* "my" is used only with following N. NP can

be preceded or followed by a "preposition" (see example 11 above); this latter position seems a clear reflex of Turkish postpositions. Most often, though, bare NPs are used as PPs.

Exceptions   and   additional   observations

In general, Mahmut avoids conflicts between the various constraints; exceptions have been noted already. As was mentioned above, there are hardly any traces of inflexion. It is interesting to see again that the few possible exceptions are typically tied to quoted speech, as in

(12) (policeman says) *jij   komt*
                            'you come'

(13) (policeman says) *jij   moet   *hapis*   gaan*
                            'you must (to) hapis (Turk. jail) go'

It is arguable, however, whether forms such as *komt* or *moet* - which are finite in Dutch - should indeed be considered as finite in the learner's language. But the few occurrences again point to the role of quoted speech as a germ of development.

5.2.3   Cycle III: Second retelling

Repertoire   and   a   sample

There is a distinct increase in Mahmut's lexical repertoire, both for open class words and function words. He now differentiates between *hij* "he" and *zij* "she/they", and he uses the oblique pronoun *mij* "me". There are some occurrences of the article *de* "the (masculine/feminine)", although the normal determiners are still *die* and *deze* (besides *een).* Most verbs still show up as infinitives. But four have distinct finite counterparts. The copula *is* "is" shows up only in formulaic expressions.

We again give a selection from the bread-stealing scene:

(1) *even zij gezien die   brood*
    'just she seen   that bread'

(2) *die   baas winkel binnen*
    'that boss shop   inside'

(3) *die/zij   die   brood een/die   pakken*
    'that/she that bread one/that grab'

(4) *en   dan   weglopen*
    'and then away-run'

(5) *en   dan   andere vrouw   gezien*
    'and then other   woman seen'

(6) *die   baas zegt*
    'that boss says' (= she told it to the baker)

(7) *"die   meisje brood stelen" zegt*
    '"that girl   bread stead" says'

(8) *die   meisje weggaan*
    'that girl   away-go'

(9) *weggaan die   andere meneer*
    'away-go that other   mister' (possibly = came along the other man,
                        or: ran into the other man)

(10) *en   tussen   die   vallen*
    'and between that/those fall'   (= they fell over each other)

(11) *die   meisje daar grond   zitten*
    'that girl   there ground sit'

Basic   phrasal   patterns

There is no new pattern, unless we count the appearances of imperatives with bare verb in initial position as such. But apart from that there are two clear developments. First, the exceptional pattern A. from the first cycle with V between the two NPs now shows up in a number of cases, as illustrated by (1) above. In some of these cases, V corresponds to a finite Dutch form. But this is also true for V in pattern D., where it is in final position (still by far the dominant pattern), as for example in:

(12) *en   politie   handen   vat*
    'and police (her) hands   grabs'

So, one cannot argue that the acquisition of the V_i/V_f-distinction enforces this positional change, plausible as this may sound. Apparently, Mahmut is just on the verge of discovering the finite-nonfinite distinction; but he is not fully aware of what it means in terms of word order, as stated in Rules I—III above. The second development concerns separable particles. Normally, Mahmut never separates them - except in imperatives, such as *kom mee* "come with me". It may be, however, that this not infrequent construction is a rote form.

Semantic   and   pragmatic   constraints

Again, there is no violation of the "Controller first"-principle. But if there is a conflict between "Verb last" and "Focus last", this conflict can be resolved

in either way. In (9) above, the verb comes first. This is plausibly analysed as a presentational construction, roughly "there came along the other man"; alternatively, we can analyse (9) as pattern A. with zero NP_1. But just as in the first cycle, we also find stressed NP_1 in initial position when it is focussed and when having it in final position would violate the "Controller first"-principle. So, the relative weight of the various constraints has not changed.

Form   and function   of NP

Apart from the changes mentioned under "Repertoire", there is one interesting development: This is the disappearance of postpositions. Furthermore, there is one case in which *hij* "he" is used as NP_2, meaning "to him":

   (13) *ja,   hij - die politie bureau   hij brief   geven*
        'yes, he - that police office (person) he letter give'

In general, however, a maintained referent is either simply repeated by a lexical noun or not explicitly marked at all; this is the most common case.

Exceptions   and   additional   observations

Example (13) is also interesting for a different reason: It contains three ac¬ tants governed by the verb, and whilst the position of *politie   bureau* - the police bureaucrat - is correctly predicted by the Controller constraint, there is no clear rule so far which would fix the relative position of the remaining two actants ("direct object" and "indirect object"). Standard Dutch - like German - allows both orders. It may well be that only the Focus constraint is operative here - it is more plausible to say that *brief* belongs to the focus than *hij;* but more and clearer examples would be necessary to decide this. It may also be that a somewhat refined "Controller principle" is operative in these cases. Three-actant verbs like *geven* "to give" are typically "two-state verbs", i.e., their lexical content involves a source state and a target state. In this case, the two states can be very roughly characterised as follows (a, b, c are variables for actants):

source state	target state
a has b	a does not have b
c does not have b	c has b
a is active in bringing about	
the target state	

This analysis allows us to apply the "Controller constraint" independently to the two states: a is controller in the source state, c is controller in the target

state. We then can refine the "Controller principle", if necessary, by the following ranking:

(S2) Controller of source state comes before controller of target state

At this point, we shall leave open whether it is (S2) or just the focus constraint which leads to the order in (13). But in principle, it is by no means excluded that semantic constraints, as well, play a role in constructions with more than two actants.

5.2.4   Cycle I: Personal narrative

Repertoire   and   a   sample

As was mentioned in the beginning, no Chaplin-retelling is available for the first cycle. Personal narratives were used instead. Since Mahmut's repertoire was extremely restricted at that time, it is not to be assumed that a retelling would reveal a very different picture. With one exception (*komt*), there is no trace of inflexion. Three deictic pronouns are used, *ik* "I" (overgeneralised to "me"), *jij* "you" (overgeneralised in various ways), and *mijn* "my". There is no anaphoric personal pronoun. Maintenance is expressed by *die* "that", *deze* "this" (with or without following noun). The indefinite article is replaced by *een* "one". The following selection from a story - his mother and brother had each bought him a new leather jacket - shows how restricted his language is:

(1) *die   gisteren   jaar turkije*
    'that yesterday year Turkey' (= that one I got last year from Turkey)

(2) *deze   mijn   moeder   halen*
    'this my   mother get'

(3) *en   andere   mijn   broeder   halen*
    'and (the) other one my   brother get'

(4) *mijn   broeder   kadootje   zak   in*
    'my   brother present   bag in (= put it in a bag)

(5) *mijn   buurman   halen*
    'my   neighbour get' (= my neighbour brought it)

Basic   phrasal   patterns

Most of his utterances lack an explicit verb. But wherever a verb surfaces, it is in final position, i.e., the pattern is D. In example (4) above, the *in* "in" is

probably not to be seen as a postposition but as the separable particle of a verb (functioning indeed as a verb). Predicative constructions never have a copula, just as in pattern B. of cycle II.

Semantic   and   pragmatic   constraints

In remarkable contrast to his more advanced stages, Mahmut indeed violates the "Controller first"-constraint, but not the "Focus last"-constraint nor the "Verb last"-constraint. This is exemplified by both (2) and (3). Clearly, mother and brother are the agents, and what he wants to say is: "this one was bought by my mother, and that one was bought by my brother" (both jackets had been introduced before). There are other examples which confirm that he indeed displays a different balance between phrasal, semantic and pragmatic constraints in this cycle, compared to the later ones.

Form   and   function   of   NP

The dominant type is bare N, which is used both for introduction and maintenance. As was mentioned above, it can be preceded by *een, mijn, die, deze,* with the obvious functions.

5.2.5   A   short   summary

The overall picture of Mahmut's language is quite clear. The three crucial points are:

1. In the first cycle, his utterances show mainly a "nominal organisation". Where they have a verb, no distinction is made between V_i and V_f, and the neutral V always shows up in final position. No copula is used. The "Focus last"-constraint can overrule the "Controller first"-constraint.
2. In the second cycle, most utterances have a V, again normally in final position. "Focus last" cannot overrule "Controller first".
3. In the third cycle, V is occasionally split into V_f and V_i. Parallel to this distinction, verb forms show up between NPs; but they can be V_f and V_i in any position. The balance between the various constraints is as in cycle II.

5.3   Turkish - Dutch: Ergün

5.3.1   The   informant

Ergün was born in Ankara. Like Mahmut, he worked as a car mechanic after primary school. At the age of 17, he left Turkey and joined his parents, who had been living there for some years. After five months, he got a first job as a factory worker, which was followed by interchanging periods of employment and unemployment. Being a youngster and living at home with his parents, he enjoyed life very much: visiting friends, going to discotheques, playing soccer in a mixed Dutch/Turkish team and meeting Turkish and Dutch friends. So, his contacts with the host society were much more intensive than Mahmut's.

5.3.2   Cycle II: First retelling

Repertoire and a sample

Although Ergün had hardly been any longer in Holland at the time of the first retelling than Mahmut, his language is far more elaborate. His vocabulary is richer (both open and closed class items), and in about half of the utterances, he uses finite constructions; similarly, he uses the copula (although not without exceptions) and several modal verbs. Purely nominal constructions are rare. He uses both deictic and anaphoric pronouns, in both nominative and oblique (accusative, sometimes with overgeneralisations). Gender differentiation is in its beginnings. The definite article *de* "the" (masculine and feminine) is interchangeably used with *die* 'that" and *deze* "this", whereas the indefinite article is - if at all - expressed by the numeral *een* "one". He also starts to differentiate between present tense and perfect, although no real systematicity is observed in the use of these forms.

(1) *hij is/zij is   weggelopen*
    'he is/she is away-run   (correct for "she ran away")

(2) *dan   hier is*
    'then here is' (refers to photo used as prompt)

(3) *hij   is honger*
    'he is hunger' (meaning "she")

(4) *hij is daar ook brood weggehaald*
    'he is there also bread away-taken'

(5) *daar   vrouw   gezien*
    'there woman seen'

(6) *dan   moet zeggen of   is dief*
    'then must say   whether is thief'

(7) *dan   hij is + kijken*
    'then he is + look'

(8) *helemaal   snel   rijen/lopen*
    'very   fast drive/run'

(9) *daar   ook die   man*
    'there also that man'

(10) *ongeluk   gehad*
    'accident had'

(11) *alle   twee zo staan*
    'all   two so stand'

(12) *dan   moet die   afgelopen*
    'then must that be-over'   (meaning not fully clear)

(13) *hij   wilt   naar + terug + gevangenis*
    'he wants to +   back 4- prison

(14) *nou   hij moet zeggen "ik heb ..."*
    'now he must say   "I have ..."

(15) *dan   moet hij terug naar [gevangenis]*
    'then must he back to   [prison]

(16) *hij wil   terug naar gevangenis*
    'he wants back to   prison'

(17) *hij zegt: "ja +   ik heb   gedaan"*
    'he says: "yes + I have done"'

(18) *"ik heb   brood weggehaald"*
    '"I have bread away-taken"'

(19) *en   dan hij is teruggelopen*
    'and then he is back-run'

(20) *die   vrouw   komt*
    'that woman comes'

(21) "*ne,   hij/hij/hij niet weggehaald*
     '"no, he/he/he not away-taken"'

(22) *"zij is die weggehaald die brood"*
     '"she is who away-taken that bread"'

Basic phrasal patterns

We have given a relatively long extract in order to show the wealth of his structural patterns, compared to Mahmut's:

A. $NP_1–V–(NP_2)$

$A_{fin.}$ $NP_1–V_{if}–(NP_2)$

B. $NP_1–\!-\begin{Bmatrix} \mathbf{Adj} \\ \mathbf{PP} \\ \mathbf{NP_2} \end{Bmatrix}$

$B_{fin.}$ $NP_1–Cop_f–\begin{Bmatrix} \mathbf{Adj} \\ \mathbf{PP} \\ \mathbf{NP_2} \end{Bmatrix}$

$C_{fin.}$ $V_{if}–NP_2$

D. $NP_1–(NP_2)–V$

$D_{fin.}$ $NP_1–(NP_2)–V_{if}$

E. $NP_1–V_f–(NP_2)–V_i$

This picture looks more complex than it is. He has all patterns of Mahmut (A., B., D.) as well as their finite counterparts (note that A_{fin}. and D_{fin}. collapse if there is only one actant). No principled reason is visible why he sometimes uses one and sometimes the other. In fact, there are passages where "finite" is quite consistent, and then there is a sequence of non-finite constructions. In other words: He is, a few remnants aside, beyond the level of "nominal utterance organisation" and on his way from "non-finite" (IUO) to "finite utterance organisation" (FUO). But appropriate positions are not stable yet. If V_f and V_i are distributed over two forms, then he always has pattern E. Pattern C. is rare and reserved for special topic-focus constructions. There are a few subordinate clauses, but they show no different word order pattern, as would be required in Standard Dutch. All patterns can be preceded or followed by an adverbial (simple adverb or PP). This makes clear that Ergün is still far from the Dutch rule IIa, according to which only one major constituent can precede V_f (or V_{if}). We shall return to this point below.

Semantic and pragmatic constraints

Here, the situation is straightforward: "Controller first" is never violated, "Focus last" can be violated, as is illustrated by (17)-(18) and (21)-(22). In these cases, focus is normally indicated by intonation. But in (22) he also uses a special cleft-construction to mark focus: "She was it who took away the bread". As pattern $C_{fin.}$ shows, the Focus-principle can also lead to initial position of the verb. Most of these utterances are presentationals, but there are also some different cases, for example:

   (23) *ja + moet betalen politie*

What is meant here, is something like: "Eventually, it was the policeman who had to pay".

Form and function of the NP

The dominant NP pattern is still bare N; it can both maintain and introduce its referent. But Ergün has a wealth of other possibilities: *deze* (N), *die* (N), *de* (N) for maintenance, *een* N for introduction. His system of anaphoric and deictic pronouns is almost complete for the singular (with some uncertainties, cf. the oscillation between *hij* "he" and *zij* "she" in the sample text above). Accusative forms are also used, although the standard device here is simply omission. It is not easy to decide whether he also has plural pronouns: There is only one such case, *ze* "(destressed) they". But this scarcity may simply be due to the fact that there are no appropriate situations. Prepositional phrases are expressed either as bare NP or with a preposition - but not with a postposition, as in Mahmut's case. There is only one NP with an adjective attribute, *die grote dinges* "the big thing". Remarkably enough, he uses the correct inflexion (the lexicon form of the adjective would be *groot).* Again, the lack of more attributes and complex NPs in general may be due to the fact that such constructions are not needed for the retelling.

Exceptions and additional remarks

As was said under "Basic phrasal patterns", an adverbial may precede all patterns. In Dutch, an initial adverbial would shuffle NP_1 behind V_f (according to rule IIa). There are three instances in which Ergün does indeed do this inversion, for example in (15) above, where *hij* is placed after the finite verb. This inversion is not confined to personal pronouns (as is typically the case at the onset of this construction for the Turkish learners of German, cf. Chapter 4). An example is

(24) *ja +   dan moet die dinges   ook +   gevangenis*
        'yes + then must that suchandsuch also + prison

But these inversions are still exceptional.

Another much more salient phenomenon is Ergün's strange use of the word *is* in many utterances. In Standard Dutch, *is* is the present tense copula (singular); it also functions as an auxiliary for some verbs, for example *weglopen* "to run away". Ergün uses it very often in these two functions. But there are a large number of occurrences which escape this analysis. Here are some examples:

(25) *jij   is hier weglopen*
        'you is here away-run'

(26) *hij is misschien gaan naar werk*
        'he is perhaps   go   to   work'

(27) *hij is komt   huis*
        'he is comes home'

At first glance, (25) looks like a morphologically somewhat deviant but otherwise correct Dutch perfect tense construction *(jij bent hier weggelopen.)*. But the utterance relates to the scene in which Charlie asks the girl to run away from here; so, (25) means something like "you must (from) here run away". Similarly, (26) looks like a good approximation to Dutch "he is perhaps gone to work". But in fact, Ergün is describing the "good-bye scene" of the bourgeois couple; so, (26) means something like "maybe he was going to work". Only (27) could indeed be a normal perfect; but it is odd here that he combines two finite forms, given that he normally has the participle *gekomen*. There are a number of similar cases in which *is* cannot have its standard Dutch meaning. What is common to all of these cases, is the position of *is*. With one exception it always appears where V_f would be in Standard Dutch declarative clauses. Roeland van Hout (p.c.) has pointed out that in other data of Ergün's, *moet* "must", *niet* "not" and some adverbs, also occupy this V_f position before he masters FUO. We assume, therefore, that in his transition from IUO to FUO, he can plug in a semantically empty element *is* which just marks finiteness, roughly like English "does" in negated clauses. In other words: Ergün is aware of the necessity of distinguishing the finite from the non-finite component of the verb, and he is also aware of the fact that the former has to be in second position. But he has not yet worked out the morphosyntactical details, as described by rules I-III - although he is working on these details. This analysis cannot be proven. But it makes perfect sense in virtually all occurrences of *is*.

There is a functional alternative to this structural explanation of *is*. It may well be that *is* marks the end of the topic component (or the beginning of the

focus component) of the utterance.

This alternative is consistent with the "focussing" and "existential" (Huebner, 1989:126-7) uses of "English" is by Ravinder (see also chapter 3), and with a very salient aspect of the early utterance organisation of Huebner's (1983) Hmong learner of English - the particle *isa* - which Huebner called at the time a "topic-comment boundary marker".

Again, all occurrences are compatible with such a functional analysis. Which of these two explanations really applies (if any), must be left open at this point.

5.3.3   *Cycle III: Second retelling*

Since the developmental trend is very clear, we skip the details and only present the main findings and then discuss some exceptional cases. Ergün's lexical repertoire has considerably grown, in particular for closed-class items. The most salient progress, though, is in inflexion. He tries regularly, though with mixed success, to apply case marking for pronoun forms. About 80% of all utterances have a finite verb, including some past tense forms (which are rare, anyway, in spoken Dutch). He regularly varies between present-tense-like forms and perfect-tense-like forms, although it is not clear which factors determine the choice. As for the basic phrasal patterns, the development is only quantitative but salient: The "non-finite" forms A., B., D. are rare now, and the finite form in wrong position, as in $D_{fin.}$ is almost gone (only one clear example). The dominant patterns are therefore:

$A_{fin.}$ $\quad\quad$ $NP_1–V_{if}–(NP_2)$

$B_{fin.}$ $\quad\quad$ $NP_1–Cop_f–\left\{\begin{array}{c} Adj \\ PP \\ NP_2 \end{array}\right\}$

$C_{fin.}$ $\quad\quad$ $V_{if}–NP_2$

E. $\quad\quad$ $NP_1–V_f–(NP_2)–V_i$

This looks almost like Standard Dutch. But he can still have two constituents before the finite verb (Adv before NP_1), as in

(1) en   *dan die man zegt tegen politie*
    'and then that man says to   police'

He shows no correct analysis of the particle separation (as required by IIa), as in

(2) *ik wil   niet gaan buiten*
    'I want not go   out'

And he has the same word order in main and subordinate clauses (these latter are more frequent by now), as in

   (3) *omdat   die   brood is van hem*
       'because that bread is of him'

There is no change in the relative impact of the pragmatic and semantic constraints: The latter is never violated (with the exception of one doubtful case, in which he repeats a word of the interviewer), the former is occasionally violated. Noun phrases tend to be more complex. In particular, he tries to enrich them by case marking prepositions like *van* "of", *tegen, aan* "to", as well as other prepositions. His attempts in this direction lead to interesting constructions, for example

   (4) en   *die   van vader is dood geschieten*
       'and that of   father is dead shot'

What he wants to say, is: "The one whose father was shot", in Standard Dutch *die van wie de vader is doodgeschoten.* Since he now has oblique pronouns, zero pronoun in NP2-position has become rare.

   By far the most interesting phenomenon in his learner variety at this time is the use of *is.* About 35 (one fourth) of his utterances in the retelling contain an *is,* sometimes even two, and only ten of them are easily analysed as either normal copula constructions or auxiliaries (there are three or four doubtful cases). We give some examples from the remaining cases:

   (5) *en dan is gewoon   zo lopen komt*
       'en then is (dummy) so run   comes'

   (6) *dan   is die   man ook zegt: ...*
       'then is that man also says: ...'

   (7) *nou   is die   tafel is kapot*
       'now is that table is broken'

   (8) en   is *die   meisje ook hier slapen*
       'and is that girl   also here sleep'

   (9) *dan   die   meisje is eten   klaar maken*
       'then that girl   is eating ready make

   (10) *dan   is krant   kijken*
       'then is newspaper look'

   The typical pattern is this: First, there is an introductory element, usually an adverbial like *dan* "then" or *nou* "now" or NP$_1$ (never focussed), sometimes a combination of these. This is followed by *is,* and this in turn is followed by the remainder of the utterance which can include a (finite or non-finite) verb. This

pattern does not directly match the idea that *is* marks the position of the finite element (in main clauses), although it is very often in second position. Suppose now that the (implicit) question which underlies an utterance in a narrative and thus fixes its topic-focus-structure is

What happens then (to some protagonist)? or, for background clauses
What is now the case (with someone)?

then it makes almost perfect sense to say that *is* marks the end of the topic component, or conversely, it marks the beginning of the focus component. The "*is*-construction" means something like

And then/now, there is this (with someone):......

This analysis seems to match virtually all cases. Still, one cannot exclude the "finiteness-explanation", and in fact, it may well be that both ways of analysing this construction are not mutually exclusive.

5.3.4   Cycle I: Personal narrative

Repertoire   and   a   sample

   In this encounter, Ergün's repertoire is very elementary compared to the first retelling. The few nouns and verbs show no trace of inflexion. The copula *is* occurs only in quotations. He has few prepositions and adverbs, but no articles or determiners except a few occurrences of *die* N "that N". Only the deictic pronouns *ik* "I", *jij* "you (sg.)" and *jullie* "you (pl.)". We give a selection from a personal narrative about a quarrel he had with his boss in the factory:

   (1) *die   fabriek   hier   kist*
       'that factory hier box'

   (2) *en   dan   altijd   ruzie   maken*
       'and then always quarrel make'

   (3) *en   dan   een keer   over twee per dag*
       'and then one time over two per day'

   (4) *en   dan   +   "jij   huis   gaan naar"*
       'and then +   "you home go   to"'

   (5) *en   dan   die fabriek   automatiek koffie drink*
       'and then the factory automatic   coffee drink'

(6) *die   kapot*
   'that broken'

(7) *en   dan   half tien pauze*
   'and then half ten break'

(8) *en   dan   klaar*
   'and then ready'

(9) *en   dan   pomp halen*
   'and then pump get'

It is remarkable that all foreground utterances - in which an action is reported - are introduced by *en dan*. Only background information need not have this introduction.

Basic phrasal patterns

Most of his utterances show a purely nominal utterance organisation - they do not contain any verb. If there is a verb, it is non-finite and always utterance-final (i.e., pattern D. from his second cycle).

Pragmatic and semantic constraints

Given the paucity of these constructions, it is difficult to argue here. But there is at least no clear violation of either "Focus last" nor "Controller first".

Form and function of noun phrases

As was said already, the dominant pattern is bare N, which can be used both for introduction and for maintenance. For introduction, there is no other possibility, whereas maintenance is occasionally expressed by *die* N "that N" or - this is the normal case - by nothing.

5.3.5   A short summary

Again, the developmental picture is quite clear:

1. In the first cycle, Ergün's utterance organisation is largely nominal. Only a few verb constructions show up, always non-finite and always in final position.

2. In the second cycle, he is on the verge of moving from IUO to FUO. In principle, he has captured the important distinction between V_f and V_i,

but he does not manage its morphosyntactical implementation. This leads to finite and to non-finite forms in various positions- There is a special construction - *is* - which marks either the position of the finite element or the topic-focus-boundary. "Controller first" is never violated, "Focus last" is, though not often.

3. In the third cycle, FUO is dominant. V_f does not appear in wrong positions. Main clauses and subordinate clauses show the same word order. Neither the rule for "particle separation" nor the rule "exactly one constituent in front of V_f" are systematically applied, although the latter has considerably increased in comparison to cycle II. The "*is*-construction" is very salient by now, and it tends to be rather a boundary-marker for topic-focus than a marker of the finiteness position. Again, "Controller first" is systematically obeyed, but not "Focus last", if there is a conflict between the various requirements.

All in all, Ergün's development is not really different from Mahmut's - except that he makes much more progress in the course of the study. There are only two real differences. First, Mahmut indeed violates "Controller first" in the first cycle. And second, Ergün develops a special construction - the "is construction" - which is not seen in Mahmut's data. But it may well be that Mahmut simply did not reach that stage during the study.

5.4   Moroccan - Dutch: Fatima

5.4.1   The informant

Fatima was born in a small town in Western Morocco. After two years of primary school, she learned needlework and knitting. By the end of her 18th year, she was a qualified needlewoman and had opened her own shop. When she was 25, she married a Moroccan who had already been living in the Netherlands for 12 years, and joined him in Tilburg. At the time of the first recording - one year after her arrival -, her Dutch was almost nonexistent. At that time, she had a part-time job as a cleaning woman. Most of her contacts with native speakers were at work.

5.4.2   Cycle II: First retelling

Repertoire and a sample

Although the first retelling took place after she had been in the Netherlands for more than two years, her lexical repertoire is still extremely limited. Her verbs show up in only one form. This is either the infinitive (rare), a stem-like form (more frequent) or mostly a form which corresponds to the third person singular of Dutch verbs. There is little reason, though, to assume that she indeed distinguishes between V_f and V_i, since these forms do not vary, and no attempt is made to combine them (for example in a modal or perfect construction). It is remarkable, though, that in complete contrast to the Turkish learners, she seems to pick up inflected forms right from the beginning. The copula is usually omitted, though there is one occurrence of *is* "is".

Given this overall picture, her NPs can be remarkably complex. She tends to mark case by prepositions (*tegen, van,* etc.), and she also has genitive attributes *(die kant van muur komt kapot* 'the edge of wall comes broken'). Altogether, she uses six prepositions quite regularly; they never appear after N. Bare N also occurs but is comparatively rare; most Ns are preceded by *die* "that", *deze* "this" or *een* "one" (meaning 'a'). There is one occurrence of the regular Dutch article *de* "the". Her system of deictic pronouns is quite complete, including oblique forms; but there is only one occurrence of an anaphoric pronoun, *hij* "he".

    (1) *die   meisje honger*
       'that girl   hunger'

    (2) *die   brood comme ci comme ça*
       'that bread comme ci comme ça' (TL vernacular for 'steal')

    (3) *stelen die stuk   brood*
       'steal that piece-of bread

    (4) *die   ander vrouw kijk*
       'that other woman look'

    (5) *praat met   bakkerman*
       'talk with bakerman'

    (6) *die   man pakt   die meisje*
       'that man grasps that girl'

    (7) *politie komt*
       'police comes'

(8) *die   vrouw   zeg met   bakkerman*
     'that woman say with bakerman'

(9) *die   bakkerman loop met   die   meisje*
     'that bakerman run   with that girl'

(10) *dit   meisje en   charlie peng*
      'this girl   and Charlie peng'

(11) *die   charlo   zeg   "ik doen"*
      'that Charlie say "I   do"'

(12) *politie pakt   die   meisje*
      'police grasps that girl'

(13) *die   charlo   zeg   "ik doen"*
      'that Charlie say "I   do'"

(14) *maar die   vrouw   zeg   "niet"*
      'but   that woman say "not"'

(15) *"die   meisje zelf   doen"*
      '"that girl   herself do"'

Basic   phrasal   patterns

Apart from purely nominal constructions, her retelling displays essentially
three patterns:

A. $$\text{NP}_1\text{--V--(NP}_2)$$

B. $$\text{NP}_1\text{--(Cop)--} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \textbf{Adj} \\ \textbf{PP} \\ \textbf{NP}_2 \end{array} \right\}$$

C. $$\text{V--NP}_2$$

As was mentioned above, V can show up in various forms among which the
"third person singular present tense" of Standard Dutch is most typical. But as
there is no evidence that she indeed distinguishes between V_f and V_i, the verb
is simply labelled as V. This V is occasionally omitted, in particular if "have" is
meant. By contrast, the copula is mostly absent (there is only one occurrence of
is which is actually a presentational, see below (16)). The third pattern is used
when NP_2 is in focus. It seems that all patterns can be preceded or followed
by an adverbial, although there is no example for some of these possibilities. In
fact, she only rarely uses adverbials, compared to the Turkish learners (note, for
example, that the common *en dan* is virtually absent in the text sample above).

Pragmatic   and   semantic   constraints

Here, the observations are straightforward. The "Controller first"-principle is never violated; in fact, Fatima seems to avoid possible conflict cases. As pattern C. indicates, the pragmatic principle "Focus last" seems to be strong: if some NP is in focus, it is easily put behind the verb. Most of these cases are static or dynamic presentationals, as in

(16) *is   een mooi   huis*
     'is a   beautiful house'

(17) *komt   ook die   balk*
     'comes also that plank' (= moreover, the plank drops on his head)

But on occasion, the phrasal constraint wins, i.e. a focussed NP remains in first position. The standard example is again the thief-argument, see (11), (13) and (15) above. In the first two cases, focus is marked by intonation. The last case is particularly interesting, because she uses a special construction - *zelf* "(her)self" which in Standard Dutch - like in English - functions to highlight some NP. It seems, then, there are competitions in which "Focus last" wins, as well as cases in which "Verb second" wins. Note that the "control asymmetry" cannot be the criterion here because in (11), (13) and (15), there is only one actant - unless one assumes that there is indeed an implicit second NP: "I did IT" or "the girl herself did IT". Under this assumption, the "Controller first"-principle would indeed force the NP (and hence the focus) into initial position. Such an assumption is not implausible but cannot be proven, of course.

Form   and function   of NP

Most relevant points have already been mentioned. It should be added, however, that there are no really convincing cases of zero pronouns in NP_2-position - much in contrast to the Turkish learners. And second, she uses *die* N not only for maintenance but also for introduction. Examples (2) and (4) are striking illustrations.

Exceptions   and   additional   observations

The most striking difference with respect to the Turkish learners is clearly the position of V: The latter have it typically in final position, Fatima has it in second position. There is one exception in the entire retelling

(18) *hij krant   lees*
     'he newspaper read'

We have no convincing explanation for this case: Possibly, a particularly close semantic association makes *krant* a sort of detachable verb complement (cf. Ger-

man *radfahren* "cycle-riding": see Klein, 1986:107, for the effect such a close association can have on negation). There is one clear example of a subordinate construction - actually a double subordination:

   (19) *naar beetje praten die   meisje weet   wanneer bots-tegen*
         'after a-bit talk   that girl   knows when   bump-against'

What this means, is "After they had talked a bit (after some talking), the girl remembered when/that they had bumped into each other". Clearly, there is no structural difference to the main clause patterns (if we assume that the actants are left implicit).

5.4.3   Cycle III: Second retelling

We can be very short here. Although Fatima's lexical repertoire is somewhat richer, there is no substantial development. Utterance structures are the same. There are two occurrences of a past participle, but again, they seem to be simply a variant of V, as in

   (1) *die   ander vrouw gezien die   meisje*
        'that other woman seen   that girl'.

There is again one NP_1-NP_2-V-pattern. The balance between pragmatic, semantic and phrasal constraints is unchanged.

5.4.4   Cycle I: Personal narrative

In this cycle, a longer personal narrative was analysed. At this stage, almost all of her utterances show purely nominal organisation, and it is almost impossible to detect any pattern beyond the NP-level. The only noteworthy fact is her already quite regular use of prepositions at this elementary level.

5.4.5   A short summary

Fatima did not get very far in her acquisition of Dutch. In fact, her language seems fossilised at a very elementary level, the one reached in cycle II. It is remarkable, though, that this variety is distinctly different from the language of the Turkish learners at the level of non-finite utterance organisation (IUO): Whereas the Turks place V almost invariably in final position, Fatima tends to

have if after the first NP. This demonstrates that the position of V and, as a consequence, the shape of of the first phrasal patterns is neither universal nor determined by the underlying pattern of the language to be learned: in scanning the TL-input, learners first identify verbs in positions most in accordance with their SL expectations.

5.5   Moroccan - Dutch: Mohamed

5.5.1   The informant

Mohamed was born in Casablanca. After primary school and two years of secondary school, he was trained as a car mechanic. At the age of 19, he (and most of his family) joined his father who had been living in the Netherlands for almost 14 years. He soon found a job in a factory, in a village near Tilburg with few immigrants. He had close contacts with the native environment. After one year and a half, he moved with his Dutch girlfriend to her parents' home. At the end of the data collection period, he was living with another Dutch girl.

5.5.2   Cycle II: First retelling

Repertoire and a sample

As one might expect from his biography, Mohamed's repertoire is quite elaborate at this point. It contains auxiliaries, copulas, particles and infinitives. Most of his verb forms show present tense inflexion, and there are even some past tense forms (only for irregular verbs, though). He uses all necessary deictic and anaphoric pronouns, both nominative and oblique. Like Fatima, he is strong on prepositions. In particular, he tries to mark case by prepositions like *van, tegen,* etc.

(1) *toen   een meisje heefi brood gepakt*
    'then a   girl   has   bread grabbed'

(2) *toen   gaat snel lopen*
    'then goes fast run'

(3) *maar zij kijkt   achteruit*
    'but   she looks backwards'

(4) *toen zij tegen die man*
   'then she to   this man'

(5) *maar de/een vrouw heeft die meisje gezien*
   'but the/one woman has   this girl   seen

   toen   zij die brood gepakt
   then/as she this bread grabbed'

(6) *toen gaat tegen die meneer van die   winkel*
   'then goes to   this mister of   that shop'

(7) *"die   meisje heeft jouw brood gepakt"*
   '"this girl   has   your bread grabbed"'

(8) *maar kwam politie*
   'but   came police'

(9) *maar toen   zij tegen die man + die brood was   vallen*
   'but then/as she against this man + this bread was/has fallen'

(10) *heeft die man gepakt*
    'has this man grabbed'

(10) *die   man heeft tegen politie*
    'this man has   to   police'

(11) *"die   meisje heeft mijn brood gepakt"*
    '"this girl   has   my   bread grabbed"'

(12) *maar zij was bang*
    'but   she was scared'

(13) *maar die charlie hij zegt*
    'but   this Charlie he says'

(14) (unclear)

(15) *toen   die politie pakken charlie*
    'then this police grab   Charlie'

(16) *die   meisje nou is vrij*
    'this girl   now is free'

(17) *maar die vrouw tegen die man*
    'but   this woman to   that man'

(18) *"die   man heeft niks   gedaan"*
    '"this man has   nothing done"'

(19) *"die   meisje zelf   heeft die brood [gepakt]"*
     '"this girl   her(self) has   that bread [grabbed]"'

As this extract shows, his narration is very fluent, and individual utterances can be very complex, including subordination (cf. (5)). He also likes to mark utterances by adverbials or by *maar* "but" (which in fact is overused). Sometimes, the verb is omitted, in particular if it is a verb of saying or movement. But most of these utterances rather reflect vivid narration than peculiarities of learner language, just as in an English narration, it would not be inappropriate to say "and then he to her: ...". Therefore, we subsume these cases under normal verbal patterns, rather than nominal ones.

Basic phrasal patterns

There are essentially four patterns:

$A_{fin.}$ $NP_1–V_{if}–(NP_2)$

$B_{fin.}$ $NP_1–Cop_f–\left\{ \begin{array}{c} Adj \\ PP \\ NP_2 \end{array} \right\}$

$C_{fin.}$ $V_{if}–(NP_2)$

E. $NP_1–V_f–(NP_2)–V_i$

Patterns $A_{fin.}$-$C_{fin.}$ exactly correspond to Fatima's A.-C. But it is quite clear that Mohammed indeed displays different forms of one and the same verb. (There are two occurrences, though, in which the verb in pattern $A_{fin.}$ shows the form of a Dutch infinitive). The copula is sometimes missing. All patterns can, as usual, be preceded or followed by adverbials. In fact, all occurrences but one of $C_{fin.}$ (always presentationals) are preceded by an adverb, and the only exception has an introductory *maar,* which is possibly interpreted as an adverb. Therefore, $C_{fin.}$ is perhaps not really verb-initial but a reflex of the correct Dutch rule IIa. We shall take up this point below, in connection with some other exceptional patterns. There are some occurrences of verbs (verbs of saying and *geven* 'to give') with three actants. The pattern is:

$$NP_1-V_{if}-NP_2-NP_3$$

Since this is basically a variant of $A_{fin.}$, we do not list it as a special case. The only problem here is the relative order of the postverbal actants, a point to which we return in a moment.

Pragmatic and semantic constraints

The picture is simple: If there is a competition, "Controller first" is strongest. Focus can also be in first position, in which case it is marked by intonation or by emphatic *zelf* "(him/her)self", cf. example (19) above. As has already been said, presentationals are always preceded by an adverb; so, this construction could be the normal Dutch rule. Let us turn now to the three-actant cases. What determines the relative order of NPs? In section 5.2.3, we said that three-actant verbs are normally two-state verbs, and the "Control asymmetry" can be applied both to the source and to the target state. The example discussed there was "give". A similar point can be made for verbs of saying (a, b, c are actants):

source state	target state
a knows b	a knows b
c does not know b	c knows b
a is active in bringing about target state	

This is the common structure of all verbs of saying, ignoring the specific properties of telling vs. saying vs. instructing, etc. The control asymmetry would then predict that a comes before b (control asymmetry in source and target state), that c comes before b (control asymmetry in target state), and finally, that a comes before c (rule (S2) from 5.2.3). And this is exactly what we observe:

(20) *charlie   hij geeft hem een klap*
     'Charlie he gives him one hit'

(21) *toen   hij geeft aan hem chocolaat en   dropjes*
     'then he gives to   him chocolate and candies'

(22) *toen   hij vertelt   aan haar alles*
     'then he narrates to   her   everything.

Note that the "extended Controller principle" again could be overruled by other constraints, notably focus principles. But there is no such case in the data.

Form and function of noun phrases

Mohamed has almost all deictic and anaphoric pronouns he needs for the retelling. Lexical NPs can still be bare N. But normally, they are preceded by either *die, deze, de,* or - in the indefinite case - by *een* or en, or finally by a possessive. His strategy of referential movement is described by three rules (with very few exceptions):

  (i) New referents are introduced by means of een N, en N or bare N.
 (ii) The controller, if maintained from the immediately preceding utterance, is
      left implicit. Otherwise, anaphoric pronouns are used.
(iii) Re-introduction is marked by *de/die/deze* N or name. If this re-introduc-
      tion involves topic shift, then NP is often followed by a personal pronoun.

This latter case - a sort of left dislocation - requires some comment. It is
illustrated by sequences such as

   (23) *hij brengt al hout*
        'he brings all log' (= the whole log)

        maar die   baas hij tegen hem: "..."
        'but   that boss he to   him: "..."

As we shall see in chapter 6, such a "pronoun-copy" construction is quite common
for the learners of French, but Mohamed is the only one to use it among the
learners of Dutch.

Exceptions and additional remarks

    There is one construction which has not been mentioned so far: It is a variant
of E., where V_f is a modal verb. In this case, V_f can come first. Examples are:

   (24) *kan jij   met die   brief werk zoeken*
        'can you with that letter work look-for'

   (25) *moet jij   niet die   hout halen*
        'must you not that log   fetch'

   (26) *moet jij   praten met die politie*
        'must you talk   with this police'

This preposing of V_f seems somewhat bizarre at first. But such constructions are
not uncommon in everyday spoken Dutch where they probably best analysed as
topic deletion: In all such cases, the utterance could be preceded by an adverbial
like *nou* "now" or *dan* "then". Such an introductory adverbial would make
them perfectly target-like (cf. rule IIa). Remarkably enough, Mohamed uses this
construction only in quoted speech. So, he seems sensitive to the peculiarities of
spoken language at this point. As was mentioned under "Basic phrasal patterns",
Mohamed regularly has an initial adverbial in pattern C. (i.e., presentationals).
This, as well as the construction just discussed, seems to suggest that he indeed
has rule IIa: V_f is preceded by exactly one major constituent. Unfortunately
enough, this is not quite true: We find both Adv-NP_1-V_f ... as well as Adv-
V_f-NP_1.., for example in the following two utterances (which are adjacent in
the retelling, too):

(27) *toen   hij moet werken*
     'then he must work'

(28) *toen   moet hij hout halen*
     'then must hij log   fetch'

Standard Dutch only allows the second pattern. Mohamed does not really master the rule - but he is very close to it.

5.5.S   Cycle III: Second retelling

   Since the developmental trends are clear and straightforward, we will not present the findings in detail but sum up the essentials in five points.

1. Occasional mistakes aside, he now masters verb inflexion (to the extent needed for the retelling). In particular, he also uses past tense forms.

2. There is only one new pattern, the "split variant" of C_{fin}., and this variant has to be preceded by an adverbial:

       C_{fin}.   **Adv-V$_f$-NP$_2$-V$_i$**

   This presentational, with a finite verb before the NP, is used frequently in his retelling.

3. The "left-dislocation" (cf. example (23) in section 5.5.2) is very rarely used. Instead, he has another "doubling" of the pronoun, right after the verb:

   (1) *toen   politie gaat-ie politiebureau bellen*
        'then police goes-he police office   call

   This is a construction which is quite common in the local vernacular of Tilburg, and he has simply adopted it. In contrast to his previous left-dislocation, it does not seem to have a particular function.

4. Two constituents in front of V_f are now exceptional: he has almost achieved rule IIa.

5. There are an increasing number of subordinate clauses. They exhibit the same patterns as main clauses - including verb-initial constructions, but **never** with V_f in penultimate position (as would be required in Dutch).

5.5.4   Cycle I: Personal narrative

Repertoire and a sample

The contrast in Mohamed's repertoire is remarkable. In this cycle, his vocabulary is still extremely limited. He has almost no trace of inflexion; all verb forms resemble Dutch infinitives or bare stems, except the form *zegt* "says" - which he uses very regularly to introduce quotations - and is "is". He does have deictic pronouns (in different cases) and one anaphoric pronoun *hij* "he". The following utterances are the beginning of a long and in fact quite fluent story about a pub-crawl in which he did not do honour to his name (for a detailed analysis of this narrative, see Bhardwaj *et al.,* 1988, chapter 5):

(1) en   *dan wij alles gaan naar tilburg*
    'and then we all   go   to   tilburg'

(2) *een   vrouw   werk in winkel*
    'one woman work in shop'

(3) *en   dan   die   jongens een blijf met mij*
    'and then (of) those boys   one stay with me'

(4) *dan   ik ga naar auto*
    'then I   go to   car'

(5) *die   jongen hij zegt: ...*
    'this boy   he says:...'

A great many of his utterances lack a verb, and apparently, this is not due to narrative style. It is quite telling, in fact, that he hardly ever omits the form *zegt* "says", whereas, as we have seen, this is regularly done in his more advanced retellings. So, it is surely correct to say that he is in the transitional stage from nominal utterance organisation (NUO) to non-finite utterance organisation (IUO).

Basic phrasal patterns

We only consider constructions with some verbal element (including copula constructions; the copula is sometimes missing). The patterns are like Fatima's in her second cycle (cf. section 5.3.2 above), that is, V after the first NP, predicative construction with copula, or finally V in initial position (presentationals). In contrast to Fatima, V does not always correspond to a finite Dutch form (except *zegt* and is). Just as with Fatima, there are also some cases of V after two NPs, i.e. in final position. But they are exceptional.

Pragmatic and semantic constraints

Since in a narrative - in contrast to a film-retelling -, we have less control over what he intends to say, it is sometimes open whether "Focus last" and "Controller first" are regularly obeyed. But there is no clear case in which they are violated or even at variance.

Form and function of the noun phrase

Most of his NPs consist of bare nouns, used both for introduction and maintenance. For the former, he also has *een* N "one N", and for the latter *die* N, *deze* N and the pronoun *hij;* most common for immediate maintenance is zero, both for NP_1 and NP_2. He also shows some special constructions, for example (cf. (3) and (5) above) the partitive-like *die jongens een* "these boys one" (= one of the boys) and the structurally parallel, but functionally different left dislocation *die jongen hij* "the boy he". Note the early use of prepositions (as with Fatima), in particular but not only if they serve to mark a case (cf. example (3)).

Exceptions and additional remarks

Much more than in the advanced film-retellings, there are constructions which escape any systematic analysis. Again, this is what normally happens at the stage of NUO and its transition to IUO.

5.5.5   A short summary

The developmental pattern is quite clear. In his first cycle, he displays the same regularities as Fatima on her second cycle, with V normally in second position or first position with presentationals. In the second cycle, he replaces V by V_f or V_{if}, with V_f either after the first NP or after some adverbial (depending on the focus situation). At this stage, he is already very close to the Dutch rule IIa ("one major constituent before finite element"), and this rule is mastered - with few exceptions - in the third cycle. The same patterns show up in subordinate clauses. (We have not mentioned so far the leaving behind of a separable particle, cf. rule III, because there are almost no examples of particle verbs).

5.6   Summary of learners of Dutch

It is evident that all learners share a number of characteristics, notably in the form and function of the noun phrase. But there are also a number of differences. These differences concern the speed of acquisition as well as some selected aspects of its structure. We can sum up similarities and differences in five points:

1. All learners go though a first type of utterance organisation which is largely characterised by nominal structures: There are no lexical verbs which would govern the various noun phrases (nominal utterance organisation, NUO). If there are any word order constraints, they are based on pragmatic principles. But even that is hard to decide because utterances are often not very clear and allow for various analyses.

2. Clear patterns show up when lexical verbs are present. These are initially non-finite forms, although they sometimes look like inflected forms of the target language. But there is no systematic morphology. This "non-finite utterance organisation" (IUO) gradually replaces NUO. All learners reach that transitory stage. At this point, there are some clear differences between Turkish and Moroccan learners: for Turkish learners, V is regularly V-final, for Moroccan learners, V is after the first NP. There are some exceptions in both directions, but overall, the difference is striking.

3. As the process goes on, the distinction between "finite component" and "infinite component" of the verb, which underlies Dutch utterance structure, is slowly learned. Some learners stop at this level, and only traces of this distinction are exhibited in their language (Mahmut, Fatima). Others try to organise their utterance according to this distinction (finite utterance organisation, FUO). This is clearly illustrated in cycles II and III of Ergün and Mohamed. The exact way in which they proceed here differs to some extent, and both of them exhibit some particular strategies. The most striking example is Ergün's *"is*-construction", extensively discussed in section 5.3.3. We will not repeat the details here. Both learners come very close to the Dutch rule IIa, according to which one major constituent can and must precede the finite component in declarative main clauses. They also use subordination, but with the same phrasal patterns. The "fusion" of V_f and V_i to one form V_{if} (rule III) is learned, but without fully mastering its PART-component which requires a separable particle to be left at the end.

4. As for "Controller first" and "Focus last", all learners tend to obey them, and conflict cases are rare. If there is such a competition, "Controller first" is usually observed, whereas "Focus last" is often sacrificed. In this case, intonation or some special construction is used to marked the focussed NP. So far, there is no difference between Turkish and Moroccan learners. But Mohamed in cycle III is much more willing to use constructions with the finite verb before the first NP that Ergün on his cycle III (although he also shows this pattern). So, it appears that the advanced Moroccan learner cares less for the position of the finite verb than Ergün does, if the topic-focus-structure requires having NP later. This possibly correlates with Ergün's strategy of marking the topic-focus-boundary by a special construction (if our analysis of the use of *is* is correct).

5. Form and function of NPs are quite similar across learners. They all start with bare nouns and deictic pronouns. As development goes on, nouns are preceded by the demonstratives *die* "this" and *deze* "this", which function like a definite article, or by the numeral *een* "one", which has the function of an indefinite article. Correct articles come very late, if at all. There are indications from the personal narratives that deictic pronouns develop before anaphors. Anaphoric pronouns start with *hij* "he" which is overgeneralised both for case and gender; only Mohamed learns the full system of anaphoric pronouns (to the extent to which one can tell from the data). All informants use empty elements in case of maintenance in all NP-positions, especially if the referent has the same function in the immediately preceding utterance. But the Moroccan learners are more inclined to replace them by full anaphoric pronouns. They also have a stronger tendency to use prepositions, especially (but not only) for case-marking. Both Turkish learners initially use prepositions as postpositions, something never observed for the Moroccans. But this usage is not maintained for long.