plethora of new research. Chomsky himself: only gnomic utterances on the importance of the lexicon. (ha)

Do children have F-categories?


This relies too heavily on the absence of the data. Evidence of absence is ambiguous as almost anything can be absent: “the number of things that are not true vastly exceeds the number of things that are” — Sartre.

A discontinuity model or a continuity model? Or intermediaries. Gm children with V2 but no CP: (278) da faehrt die Caroline. Kaput is der. (?) stages of development: IP, then CP.

Neg + nucleus: No the sun shining. No a boy bed. Later they learn the necessity for subject movement across Neg. Cf. French: Pas la poupee dormir.

and Elle a pas la bouche. Note the movement in the latter, finite V (280).

Key, according to Deprez and Pierce: they allow subj NP to remain in VP. There must be some FCats, as at the earliest level the movement is felt to be different. Cf. when V is finite, it moves: Est pas morte. Vs. Pas manger la poupee.

Evidence also from German: children do not move Verbs when it is nonfinite. The T node = gaining inflections, vs. not gaining them.

This is ambiguous in English as the V form itself is the same:

Pig go in (218), Here’s Teddy. Maybe the first is nonfinite. Want have drink (to is missed out).

German L2 learners: Korean and Turkish: early on, they retain their L1 order, namely OV:

Oya Zigarette trinken. [why is anyone saying this and what does it mean??]

Late: Ich sehen Schleier.

‘stagiation’: VP > IP > AGRP.
Lexical parameters belong to the functional cat’s. Eg. whether AGRP is opaque or not, whether CP is +/- wh-. The word give is always s-selected for agent, theme, recipient in the universal lexicon.

More on the null-subj sentence.

children begin with pro-drop. Licensed by a lexical AGR which can govern it, as in Italian. non-lexical AGR cannot govern pro, so yields a non-pro-drop language. See diagram p. 285.

Yet early speakers have a number of real pro subjects. Also have null objects: me have (!). cf. mommy, you wiping.

Chinese has no inflections, yet is a pro-drop lang. See table 287. Spanish has a full conj; Engl on 3rd sg; Irish labh-rann for all (pres tense), Chinese shuo. Pro-drop lang’s must be uniform (all or none of the forms are morphologically complex), but not mixed, as Eng, with only 3rd sg. “Null subjects are permitted in all and only lang’s with morphologically uniform paradigms.” [but cf. Russian and Czech, Polish!! – past tense is decisive here]

Discourse must disambiguate in Irish, Chinese (!!!)

German is uniformly complex but no pro-drop

This problem is far from decided. Cf. Moroccan Arabic, which is pro-drop although not all forms are complex (290).

Chinese has no inflections, yet is a pro-drop lang. See table 287. Spanish has a full conj; Engl on 3rd sg; Irish labh-rann for all (pres tense), Chinese shuo. Pro-drop lang’s must be uniform (all or none of the forms are morphologically complex), but not mixed, as Eng, with only 3rd sg. “Null subjects are permitted in all and only lang’s with morphologically uniform paradigms.” [but cf. Russian and Czech, Polish!! – past tense is decisive here]

Discourse must disambiguate in Irish, Chinese (!!!)

German is uniformly complex but no pro-drop

This problem is far from decided. Cf. Moroccan Arabic, which is pro-drop although not all forms are complex (290).

Perhaps it’s a question of where the affixes are generated, lexicon or syntax. If AGR is already attached to the V, no pro-drop possibility.

Access to UG in L2 learners.

Three possibilities: direct access to UG; indirect; none at all. See 292. The poverty-of-the-stimulus argument. Learners reject *Is Sam is the cat that brown?

Indirect: tied to L1. But there are striking differences betw languages with same setting: Spanish L2’s dropped it a lot, vs. Japanese. Yet 39% of J. teachers accepted the sentence Is French. (ha)

No access. SVO order assumed for German, and masses of ad hoc rules to generate the exceptions. Also poor subjacency: *What did Sam believe the claim that Mary bought? evidence cited: L2 never complete, or fossilized, or vary.

Can parameters be reset? Tsimpli and Roussou: principles can be reset, but parameters are harder, eg. null pro drop reanalyze subj and AGR heads, but, say, that-trace, a
parameter, is much harder. [What is hardest in an L2? aspect, topicalization (word order), D- indef, morphologization…. Valences of N,V – inherent lexical… But also parameters]

translation model: implies indirect access, refers constantly to L1
communicative: direct access, rely on target
grammatical explanation: no access, exploit other faculties (296) [seems to me that the translation model refers also to no-access stuff]

Perhaps it is the wrong metaphor. Perhaps transferable principles and non-resettable parameters. Reifies three objects: learning, UG, and competence, none of which has any independent existence (good).

Maturation and UG – process that stretches over years? Gradual acquisition of lang. Continuity hypothesis. Certain principles emerge at particular times. v. a discontinuity hypothesis, where it metamorphoses into itself.

Borer and Wexler. Passives: e opened the door by the butler. But many quasi-passives, e.g. he was given this puppy by a farmer; ppp’s as adjectives [Russ open, closed, certain]

He was very interested in X [cf. ego ochen’ interesovalo…] Claim the adj forms are learned before the passives.

Tree is broken. lamp got kicked. (no agent). Maybe they can’t yet form A-chains, moving NP’s up the nodes yet.

Eg maybe at 20 months, lexical structures, VP, th-government. lexical-thematic stage 24 months: IP, CP, DP – the functional non-thematic stage (300) GOOD

Lenneberg’s Critical Period Hypothesis. specialization of brain functions, cognitive devel, etc. Note ASL – the final knowledge of the manual lang. is predictable from the age of the learner at first exposure, indep. of the number of years he subsequently used it (!!) Hence direct access is not available. Two sub-q’s: does L1 prevent it, or is it age? Seems to be all aspecs of learning, not just UG violations. [eg intonation, lexicon, syntax…]

Difference in Binding Theory

Variation in size of local domain – can be the whole matrix clause [cf. many good Russian examples. u nego est’ svoi problemy… pl reflexivization blocks in svoj; cf. –sja and sebja, sam, svoj]
*Bill read Mary’s novel about himself. Very small gov cat. NP possessive acts as ‘subj’.
Norwegian lets it go out of infin. clause, Japanese ranges widely (304).
Thus child must learn the value of the governing category parameter! Child tries most
restrictive option first, then, with positive evidence, expands it.
Child does better early with anaphora than with pronominals. Pragmatic evidence needed.
(Very deictic, too).
Not just poverty-of-stimulus argument alone, now, as we have a wealth of factual data.