Investigating 'Full Transfer': Preliminary Data From The Adult L2 Acquisition Of Afrikaans[*]

Simone Conradie

Department of General Linguistics, Stellenbosch University,
7600 Stellenbosch, South Africa. E-mail: simone.conradie@mail.mcgill.ca

1.   Introduction

In generative linguistics, many researchers agree that (something like) Universal Grammar (UG) must play some role in second language (L2) acquisition, since the logical problem of first language (L1) acquisition[1] seems to hold for L2 acquisition, as well: in L2 acquisition, as in L1 acquisition, the complex, abstract system of knowledge that the learner ends up acquiring exceeds to a great extent the primary linguistic data that the learner receives as input (see White 1989 for more detailed arguments). However, these researchers are still debating the following two questions as to the exact role of UG in L2 acquisition: (i) what constitutes the initial state of L2 acquisition? and (ii) is parameter resetting possible in situations in which the value of a certain parameter differs for the learner's L1 and the target L2? A number of hypotheses have been proposed in response to either one or both of these questions (see, for example, Clahsen and Muysken 1986, 1989; Epstein, Flynn and Martohardjono 1996; Eubank 1993/1994, 1994, 1996; Hawkins and Chan 1997; Vainikka and Young-Scholten 1994, 1996; also White 2003 for an overview). One such hypothesis is the Full Transfer Full Access hypothesis (FTFA) (e.g. Schwartz and Sprouse 1994, 1996; White 1989, 2003) which proposes the following answers to the above questions: (i) the learner's L1 grammar (including L1 parameter settings) constitutes the initial state of L2 acquisition (= full transfer),

and (ii) the L2 learner has access to UG in its entirety and, hence, parameter resetting is possible in L2 acquisition (= full access).

The study reported in this paper was designed to test the predictions made by the FTFA[2] by investigating the L2 acquisition of two syntactic parameters, the Split-IP parameter (SIP) (Thráinsson 1996) and the V2 parameter, in Afrikaans by native speakers of English and German, respectively. German has the same parameter settings as the L2, Afrikaans (namely, [+SIP] and [+V2]), whereas English differs from these two languages with respect to the settings of both parameters ([-SIP] and [-V2]). Hence, the study compares two learner groups to each other (one whose L1 has the same parameter settings as the L2 and one whose L1 has different parameter settings) in addition to comparing each of these groups to native speakers of the L2. This paper reports preliminary data collected from 9 beginner learners of Afrikaans (5 German-speaking and 4 English-speaking) and will thus only be concerned with the 'full transfer' claim of the FTFA.[3] I will first discuss the two parameters (sections 2.1 and 2.2) and their settings in the three languages under investigation (section 2.3) and will then turn to the study itself (section 3). Section 4 provides a brief conclusion.

2.   Two syntactic parameters[4]

In sections 2.1 and 2.2, I will first illustrate the properties of the four parameter settings ([±SIP] and [±V2]) by means of English and Icelandic examples and will then turn to the other relevant languages (Afrikaans and German) in section 2.3. The reason for this is two-fold. Firstly, although Icelandic is not one of the languages involved in the study reported in this paper, it is the language used to represent [+SIP] languages in the source paper (Bobaljik and Thráinsson 1998). And secondly, headedness and the presence/absence of non-V2 verb movement are established issues for English and Icelandic, but remain controversial in the case of Afrikaans and German.

2.1   The Split-IP parameter

Pursuing the idea that languages might differ as to which functional categories they have in their IP-complex[5] (see, for example, Iatridou 1990), Thráinsson (1996: 262) proposed the Split-IP parameter (SIP), according to which some languages ([-SIP] languages) have a simple, unsplit IP, while other languages ([+SIP] languages) have a more complex IP that is

split up into AgrSP, TP and AgrOP. Bobaljik and Thráinsson (1998) (henceforth: "BandT") assumed the existence of (something like) the SIP and showed how this parameter could be used to account for some cross-linguistic variation in morphology and syntax.

Since [+SIP] languages by definition have more projections in their IP-complex than [-SIP] languages, it follows that [+SIP] languages also have additional specifier positions that are not available in [-SIP] languages. Therefore, constructions that make use of these additional specifier positions are only allowed in [+SIP] languages. Two such constructions are transitive expletive constructions (TECs) and Object Shift constructions (OSCs) (BandT 1998: 53, 55). TECs are constructions that contain both a transitive verb and an expletive. Whereas English allows constructions containing an unaccusative (hence, intransitive) verb and an expletive (1a), it does not allow TECs (1b). Icelandic, on the other hand, does allow TECs (2).

> (1)   (a)   *There appeared a train in the distance.*
>   (b)   **There has a cat eaten the mice.*

> (2)   *Það   hefur einhver   köttur étið   mýsnar.*
>   expletive   has   some   cat   eaten mice-the
>   'A cat has eaten mice.'

The assumption here is that the subject NP of a transitive verb is not allowed to remain VP-internal (see, for example, Bobaljik and Jonas 1996; Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1997; Chomsky 1995). This means that in [-SIP] languages, such as English, the subject NP of a transitive verb must move into Spec,IP, since there is no other specifier position in the IP-complex; but this is exactly the position that an expletive would occupy. Thus, in TECs in [-SIP] languages two elements (the expletive and the subject NP) would have to occupy a single position (Spec,IP), something which is not possible.[6] Thus, TECs are ungrammatical in [-SIP] languages because these languages simply do not have the phrase structure to accommodate TECs. In [+SIP] languages, such as Icelandic, on the other hand, there is more than one specifier position in the IP-complex: if an expletive occupies Spec,AgrSP, the

subject can still raise out of Spec,VP and into Spec,TP. For this reason, TECs are only allowed in [+SIP] languages.

OSCs are constructions in which the direct-object NP has been moved leftward over some element that is taken to mark the left edge of VP, such as a sentence-medial adverb, floating quantifier, or negative element (for the sake of convenience I will refer to these as "left-edge markers"). In the examples in (3) and (4) the direct object NP *three books / þrjár bækur* has been moved from its VP-internal position over the negative element *not / ekki*. As can be seen from these examples, such object shift is allowed in Icelandic (4) but not in English (3).

(3)   **I did three books not read.*

(4)   *Ég   las   þrjár   bækur   ekki.*
       I   read   three   books   not
       'I didn't read three books.'

It is commonly assumed that the landing site of OS is Spec,AgrOP. In [+SIP] languages the subject occupies Spec,AgrSP and the object can be moved into Spec,AgrOP. In [-SIP] languages, on the other hand, the subject occupies Spec,IP and there is no additional position above VP that the object can move to. In this way, only [+SIP] languages have the required phrase structure to accommodate OSCs.

Another property that BandT (1998) link to the setting of the SIP is whether or not the verb raises out of VP in non-V2 environments. This follows from their particular theory of checking (BandT 1998: 39-45), which can be summarized as follows. The crucial assumptions that they make are that (i) "the features of a projection are those of its head", (ii) "movement occurs solely for the purposes of feature checking" and (iii) "features are checked in all and only local relations to a head" (where the "local relations" are specifier-head, head-complement and head-head) (BandT 1998: 39). This means that in [-SIP] languages verb raising will not be required in non-V2 environments: if V and I have features that need to be checked against each other (as is assumed to be the case), then this checking will simply occur between I and VP, since they are in a head-complement (hence, local) relation to each other (see assumption (iii) above) and the features of VP are those of V (see assumption (i) above).

Because verb raising is not required for the purposes of feature checking, it is prohibited (see assumption (ii) above). This means that in [-SIP] languages verb raising is prohibited in non-V2 environments. In [+SIP] languages, on the other hand, if V and AgrS have features that need to be checked against each other (as is assumed to be the case), then this checking cannot occur with the verb in its original VP-internal position, since neither V nor VP is in a local relation with AgrS. For this reason, the verb must raise out of VP and into a position that is in a local relation with AgrS, so that the relevant features of these two heads (V and AgrS) can be checked against each other. This means that in [+SIP] languages verb raising out of VP is obligatory in non-V2 environments.

Consequently, to determine the setting of the SIP in a language, one simply has to determine whether or not the verb raises out of VP in non-V2 environments. If the verb has raised out of VP, then it will *precede* left-edge markers, and this will in turn indicate that the language is [+SIP]. If the verb has not raised out of VP, then it will *follow* left-edge markers, and this will in turn indicate that the language is [-SIP]. This is illustrated by the examples in (5) and (6) below: in the [-SIP] language English, the verb *read* follows the adverb *often*, whereas in the [+SIP] language Icelandic, the verb *las* precedes the adverb *oft*.

(5)   *Helgi often read books.*
         *Helgi read often books.

(6)   *Ég spurði af hverju   Helgi las   oft   bækur.*
         I   asked   why   Helgi read   often   books
         'I asked why Helgi often read books.'

These differences between [+SIP] and [-SIP] languages are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Consequences of the setting of the SIP

	[+SIP]	[-SIP]
transitive expletive constructions	possible	impossible
full NP object shift constructions	possible	impossible
verb raising in non-V2 environments	obligatory	prohibited

2.2   The V2 parameter

In Table 1, it is stated explicitly that the position of the verb relative to left-edge markers is only indicative of the setting of the SIP in *non-V2 environments*. This is because it is commonly assumed that in *V2 environments* the head C (the head of the complementizer phrase) has some feature that requires the verb to raise into C, regardless of whether the language is [+SIP] or [-SIP]. Therefore, the position of the verb in V2 environments is linked to the setting of the V2 parameter, and not the SIP.

The relevant feature in C that is linked to the V2 parameter is said to be present in V2 languages (forcing verb raising into C) and absent in non-V2 languages (prohibiting verb raising into C). The consequences of the setting of the V2 parameter are visible in non-subject initial main clauses (NSIMCs). In V2 languages, a sentence-initial adverbial phrase or topicalized object is in Spec,CP and is immediately followed by the verb (which is in *second position*, in C). In non-V2 languages, a sentence-initial adverbial phrase or topicalized object is adjoined to IP and is immediately followed by the subject (in Spec,IP), and the verb appears in *third position* (inside VP).[7] Consequently, V2 languages, such as Icelandic, have V2-NSIMCs (i.e., NSIMCs in which the verb appears in second position – see (7)), whereas non-V2 languages, such as English, have V3-NSIMCs (i.e., NSIMCs in which the verb appears in third position – see (8)).

> (7)   *Refinn   skaut   Olafur   með   þessari byssu.*
>   the-fox (ACC)   shot   Olaf (NOM)   with   this   shotgun
>   'The fox Olaf shot with this shotgun.'

> (8)   *The fox Olaf shot with this shotgun.*

2.3   Parameter settings in Afrikaans, German and English

In **Afrikaans,** NSIMCs are V2-constructions (9). This means that the language is **[+V2]**. In subject-initial main clauses (SIMCs), the verb precedes left-edge markers (10).[8] Afrikaans also allows TECs (11) and OSCs (12). This indicates that the language is **[+SIP]**.

(9)   (a)   *Vandag   eet   die   kinders   brood.*

today   eat   the   children   bread

'Today the children eat bread.'

(b)   **Vandag   die   kinders   eet   brood.*

today   the   children   eat   bread

(10)   (a)   *Hulle   verloor   [selde]   'n   wedstryd.*

they   lose   seldom   a   game

'They seldom lose a game.'

(b)   **Hulle [selde]   verloor   'n   wedstryd.*

they   seldom   lose   a   game

(11)   *Daar   het   drie   vrouens   koek   verkoop   by   die*

there   have   three   women   cake   sold   at   the

fees.

festival

'Three women sold cake at the festival.'

(12)   (a)   *Ek   het   nie   [daardie   man]   geken   nie.*

I   have   not   that   man   know   final-neg[9]

(b)   *Ek   het   [daardie   man]   nie   geken   nie.*

I   have   that   man   not   know   final-neg

'I did not know that man.'

German is identical to Afrikaans with respect to the syntactic properties mentioned above. In German, NSIMCs are V2-constructions (13). Therefore, German is **[+V2]**. In German SIMCs, the verb precedes left-edge markers (14). German allows TECs (15) and OSCs (16). All of this indicates that the language is **[+SIP]**.

(13)   (a)   *Heute essen   die   Kinder   Brot.*
today   eat   the   children   bread
'Today the children eat bread.'

(b)   **Heute die   Kinder   essen   Brot.*
today   the   children   eat   bread

(14)   (a)   *Sie   verlieren   [selten]   einen   Wettkampf.*
they   lose   seldom   a   game
'They seldom lose a game.'

(b)   **Sie   [selten]   verlieren   einen   Wettkampf.*
they   seldom   lose   a   game

(15)   *Es   haben drei   Frauen   auf   dem   Fest   Kuchen*
expletive   have   three   women   at   the   festivalcake
verkauft.
sold
'Three women sold cake at the festival.'

(16)   *Ich   kenne [diesen   Mann] nicht.*
I   know   this   man   not
'I do not know this man.'

In **English,** NSIMCs are V3-constructions (see (8) above). It follows that English is **[-V2]**. In English SIMCs, the verb follows left-edge markers (see (5) above), and English does not allow TECs (see (1b) above) or OSCs (see (3) above), which indicates that the language is **[-SIP]**.

To summarize: Afrikaans and German are [+V2] [+SIP], whereas English is [-V2] [-SIP].

3.   The study: Ongoing research on the L2 acquisition of the SIP and the V2 parameter in Afrikaans

3.1   Hypothesis and predictions

As was mentioned in Section 1, the study reported here was designed to test the predictions made by the FTFA with respect to the L2 acquisition of the SIP and the V2 parameter,[10] by comparing English-speaking learners of Afrikaans to German-speaking learners of Afrikaans. The FTFA predicts that the learners will start out with the L1 settings of the SIP and the V2 parameter, and that the English-speaking learners will be able to reset these parameters so that both groups of learners will end up with the correct settings for Afrikaans (see Table 2).

Table 2. Predictions made by FTFA

L1	L2	initial settings in IL grammar	eventual settings in IL grammar
English	Afrikaans	[-V2] [-SIP]	[+V2] [+SIP]
German	Afrikaans	[+V2] [+SIP]	[+V2] [+SIP]

3.2   Tasks

To determine the setting of the SIP and the V2 parameter in the L2 learners' interlanguage (IL) grammars, they were asked to complete three tasks (in this order): a sentence manipulation task, a grammaticality judgment task, and a short truth-value judgment task. (Examples of the test items on the sentence manipulation task and the grammaticality judgment task are provided in the Appendix.)

In the **sentence manipulation task** (based on that in White 1991), the subject was handed a set of randomly shuffled Afrikaans word cards and asked to form a sentence that (s)he found acceptable, using all of the cards. Once the subject had formed a sentence, this was recorded and the subject was asked whether (s)he could form another sentence using the same cards. This continued until the subject could not form another sentence. The subject was then presented with the next set of cards and the steps repeated. There are 18 sets of word cards that the subject had to manipulate: 6 SIMC sets (3 x adverb and 3 x negative element), 6

NSIMC sets (3 x sentence-initial adverb and 3 x topicalized object) and 6 OSC sets (3 x adverb and 3 x negative element).[11] An illustrative example is given in (17). In this example, the 'cards' (indicated by square brackets) are arranged in such a way that they form the targeted sentence.

(17) *[die   supermodel] [wen] [dikwels]   [skoonheidskompetisies].*
       the   supermodel   wins   often   beauty.pageants
       'The supermodel often wins beauty pageants.'

In the **grammaticality judgment task** (based on the written preference task in White 1991), the subject was presented with pairs of Afrikaans sentences and asked to circle one of the options below each pair: "Only (a) is possible", "Only (b) is possible", "Both possible", "Both impossible" or "Don't know". The subject was presented with 55 pairs of sentences to be judged: 5 distracter pairs, 15 SIMC pairs (5 x sentence-medial adverb, 5 x negative element and 5 x floating quantifier), 10 NSIMC pairs (5 x topicalized object and 5 x sentence-initial adverb), 20 OSC pairs (5 x adverb, 5 x negative element, 5 x floating quantifier and 5 x indefinite NP) and 5 TEC pairs.[12] An example of a test pair is given in (18). (English glosses and the correct answer were not included in the actual task.)

(18) a. *Dirk kyk   soms   sport   op   televisie.*
              Dirk   watches   sometimes   sports   on   television
       b. *Dirk soms   kyk   sport   op   televisie.*
              Dirk   sometimes   watches   sports   on   television
              'Dirk sometimes watches sports on television.'   **(SIMC-adv)**

<u>Only (a) is possible</u>   Only (b) is possible   Both possible   Both impossible   Don't know

Note that this task includes 5 OS pairs that involve shifting an *indefinite* object (the OSC-indef pairs). At issue here are the semantic constraints on OS that determine which objects are allowed to undergo OS in a [+SIP] language. The semantic distinction between VP-external (i.e. shifted) and VP-internal (i.e. unshifted) objects seems to involve the distinction between "old information" and "new information" but, as Thráinsson (2001: 193) notes, "various terms

have been used about the relevant semantic distinctions involved in OS and Scrambling [which – SC] reflects the fact that the nature of these is not entirely clear". (The reader is referred to Thráinsson 2001 for some discussion of this.) The most accurate generalization seems to be that "the weak/existential reading is incompatible with OS and Scrambling but objects having the strong/quantificational/specific reading do not necessarily have to shift or scramble" (Thráinsson 2001: 193). Furthermore, the semantic constraints on OS differ cross-linguistically, as is illustrated by the sentences in (12) and (16) above: whereas both the OS and the No-OS sentences in (12) are allowed in Afrikaans, German allows only the OS in (16); the German translation of the No-OSC in (12a) is highly marked. Given this difference between the two languages with respect to the semantic constraints on OS, it was predicted that the Afrikaans Controls would form both OSCs and their non-OSC counterparts on the sentence manipulation task and that they would accept both OSCs and their non-OSC counterparts on the grammaticality judgment task, whereas German-speaking learners of Afrikaans would form and accept only OSCs (and not their non-OSC counterparts) on the relevant items in the two tasks. The OSC-indef items on the grammaticality judgment task were included to establish that the German-speaking learners would accept non-OSCs under certain circumstances, namely when the object has the semantic properties of an "unshiftable" object. Under the assumption that the indefinite objects in the OSC-indef pairs on the grammaticality judgment task are "unshiftable", the prediction was that the Afrikaans Controls, the beginner German participants and the beginner English participants would all (correctly) reject these items: the Afrikaans Controls and the German participants because an indefinite object is "unshiftable", and the English participants because their L1 does not allow OS in the first place (regardless of the semantic properties of the object-NP). However, it should be noted that this assumption (that the objects in the OSC-indef pairs are "unshiftable") turned out to be incorrect, as will be discussed in section 3.4 below.

The **truth-value judgment task** (based on that in Dekydtspotter, Sprouse and Thyre 1999) was designed to determine whether the learners had knowledge of one of the semantic effects of OS in Afrikaans (especially the English participants, since their L1 does not allow OS).

At issue is the following: In Afrikaans, if a direct object NP is modified by a number (e.g. *drie boeke* 'three books') and this NP remains VP-internal in a negative clause, then the negative

element takes scope over the direct object and the number modifying it. However, if this NP is shifted out of the VP and across the negative element, then the direct object and the number modifying it take scope over the negative element. This results in a clear interpretive difference, which is illustrated by the sentences in (19) and (20).

(19)   *Sven   het   <u>nie</u>   [drie   boeke]   gelees   nie.*   **(No OS: neg>#DO)**
Sven   has   not   three   books   read   final neg
'It is not true that Sven has read three books.'

(20)   *Sven   het   [drie   boeke]   <u>nie</u>   gelees   nie.*   **(OS: #DO>neg)**
Sven   has   three   books   not   read   final neg
'There are three books that Sven hasn't read.'

Keeping the sentences in (19) and (20) in mind, consider the context in (21):

(21)   Sven is taking a course in English literature at the university. For this week's class he had to read 4 books but he only read 2. Fortunately, the class got cancelled and now Sven has another weekend to try and get the reading done.

Given the context in (21), the non-OS sentence in (19) meaning "It is not true that Sven has read three books" is *true* (since Sven has only read two books, not three), while the OS sentence in (20) meaning "There are three books that Sven hasn't read" is *false* (since there are only two books that Sven hasn't read, not three).

In the truth-value judgment task the participants were presented with contexts such as that in (21) (which were provided in their L1)[13] and these contexts were followed by an Afrikaans OS sentence or non-OS sentence, which the participants had to judge as true or false, given the preceding context. There were 10 sentences to be judged, each with its own context: 2 distracter items, 4 OS items and 4 non-OS items.

3.3   Participants

In the study reported in Conradie (2002) (see also Conradie, to appear), the three tasks described above were used to test 15 advanced English-speaking learners of Afrikaans[14] and I concluded that the results provided evidence for the 'full access' part of the FTFA because these results indicated that the learners had managed to reset the SIP and the V2 parameter from their L1 (English) settings to their L2 (Afrikaans) settings. However, although the participants had grown up in homes where only English was spoken, they had all been born and raised in South Africa, so that they would have been exposed to Afrikaans from birth. Thus, proponents of No Parameter Resetting hypotheses (see, for example, Clahsen and Muysken 1989 and Hawkins and Chan 1997) might argue that these learners acquired Afrikaans before the end of some critical period for L2 acquisition, and that, therefore, it is not surprising that they managed to reset the relevant parameters. The suggestion is that, if these learners had started acquiring Afrikaans *after* the end of this critical period, as adults, they would not have been able to reset the parameters. Consequently, it would be interesting to compare child L2 learners of Afrikaans with adult L2 learners of Afrikaans.[15]

With this goal in mind, I am now employing the three tasks mentioned in Section 3.2 to investigate the L2 acquisition of the SIP and the V2 parameter in Afrikaans by native speakers of English and German, respectively, who were *not* born in South Africa and who only started learning Afrikaans when they came to stay in South Africa (either temporarily or permanently) as adults. As this study is part of ongoing research, Section 3.4 below only offers preliminary results from 20 Afrikaans native speaker controls and 9 beginner adult learners of Afrikaans, which bear on the 'full transfer' part of the FTFA.

The 9 L2 learners are non-South-African students who were taking an Afrikaans Beginner's course through Stellenbosch University. These students had only arrived in South Africa a few months earlier and had never been exposed to Afrikaans before. There were 5 German-speaking learners and 4 English-speaking learners. They were tested after 30 hours of instruction, but at this stage both groups still had trouble with the simple Afrikaans vocabulary items used in the tasks, although they had received a vocabulary list with all of the words translated into English and German a few days before the testing and they were allowed to refer to this list during testing. In fact, most of the participants (English as well as German),

had to refer to the list constantly during testing and sometimes translated sentences on the grammaticality judgment task word-for-word with the help of the list before deciding whether they found the sentences acceptable or unacceptable in Afrikaans. Consequently, one cannot really conclude anything on the basis of the results obtained during this testing session. The exact same students were then tested again at the end of their Afrikaans course, when they had received 60 hours of instruction. These results are discussed directly below and, although no statistical tests have been performed on these data yet because of the very small learner groups, the tendencies within the two groups are clear enough to justify some discussion.

3.4   Results

Recall that, following the FTFA, I predicted that the German participants would perform much better on the tasks than the English participants, because both groups were still beginner learners and, therefore, they were presumably still operating with the parameter settings that they had transferred from their L1s.

The results of the **sentence manipulation task** are presented in Table 3 as the **mean** number of sentences formed for each sentence type by each of the groups. The italicized numbers in square brackets in each cell are the **total number** of sentences formed by the group for each sentence type. (For example, the total number of V2-NSIMCs formed by the German-speaking learners is 52 (mean number of V2-NSIMCs per participant = 10.4) and the total number of V3-NSIMCs formed by this group is 10 (mean number of V3-NSIMCs per participant = 2).)

Table 3. Results: Sentence Manipulation Task

(*Number of sentences formed for each sentence type:* Mean [total])

	√VAdv	*AdvV	√VNeg	*NegV	√V2-NSIMC	*V3-NSIMC	√OSC
Afr Controls (n=20)	2.95 [59]	0 [0]	3 [60]	0 [0]	14.95 [299]	0.1 [2]	2.35 [47]
L1 Ger (n=5)	2.4 [12]	0.6 [3]	2 [10]	2.2 [11]	10.4 [52]	2 [10]	4.2 [21]
L1 Eng (n=4)	0.25 [1]	1.25 [5]	0 [0]	3 [12]	0.25 [1]	5 [20]	0 [0]

Note: VAdv = verb preceding adverb, AdvV = verb following adverb, VNeg = verb preceding negation, NegV = verb following negation, V2-NSIMC = non-subject initial main clause with the verb in second position, V3-NSIMC = non-subject initial main clause with the verb in third position, OSC = object shift construction, * = ungrammatical, √ = grammatical

The Afrikaans Controls only formed SIMCs in which the verb *precedes* the adverb and in which the verb *precedes* negation. They formed 299 V2-NSIMCs and only 2 V3-NSIMCs. The mean number of OSCs formed per participant was 2.35. As predicted by the FTFA, the German participants show a strong tendency towards raising the verb past an adverb, and a strong preference for V2-NSIMCs, and their mean number of OSCs formed per participant is 4.2 (almost double that of the Afrikaans Controls). The only surprising results, in view of the FTFA, involve the SIMC-negation items, in that verb raising past a negative element seems to be optional for the German participants: they formed 10 SIMCs in which the verb precedes the negative element and 11 in which the verb follows the negative element. And this optionality is not a result of grouping the individual results together; it is found for each of the German participants individually. This might have something to do with the learners being unsure about which of the two negative elements in Afrikaans has semantic content (since German, like English, does not have negative concord). As predicted by the FTFA, the English participants exhibit exactly the opposite of the tendencies exhibited by the other two

groups: they show a strong preference for SIMCs in which the verb follows an adverb or a negative element, and for V3-NSIMCs, and they did not form any OSCs.

The results of the **grammaticality judgement task** are given in Table 4 as percentage of accurate judgments for each of the sentence types.[16]

Table 4. Results: Grammaticality Judgment Task

(% Accurate Judgments)

	SIMC			NSIMC		OSC				TEC	dis	TOTAL
	adv (5)	fq (5)	neg (5)	adv (5)	top.obj. (5)	adv (5)	fq (5)	neg (5)	indef (5)	(5)	(5)	(55)
Afr Controls n=20	99	92	100	96	94	100	84	99	40	93	94	90
L1 Ger n=5	72	84	44	80	100	52	32	36	36	84	100	65
L1 Eng n=4	33	11	0	11	6	44	6	37	70	14	40	25

Note: SIMC = subject-initial main clause, NSIMC = non-subject initial main clause, OSC = object shift construction, TEC = transitive expletive construction, dis = distracter, adv = adverb, fq = floating quantifier, neg = negation, top.obj. = topicalized object, indef = indefinite (object)

The Afrikaans Controls have near-perfect scores for all of the categories except the OS pairs involving an indefinite object, where they only score 40%. The OSCs in these pairs were predicted to be ungrammatical under the assumption that an indefinite object does not have the semantic properties of an object that can be shifted. Contrary to this prediction, the

Afrikaans Controls accepted these OSCs as grammatical. Recall that the participants were asked to judge these isolated sentences without any context (see example 18), so that it is very likely that (as native speakers) they were simply able to imagine a context in which the object *does* have the semantic properties of an object that can be shifted, and the sentence is, therefore, grammatical. As was mentioned earlier (section 3.2), the semantic distinction between "shiftable" and "unshiftable" objects is not at all clear-cut and can indeed not be reduced to the distinction between definite and indefinite objects.

Furthermore, the semantic constraints on OS differ cross-linguistically in subtle ways. I would like to propose that this accounts for the German participants' low scores on the OS items: these participants are, as beginner learners, still unsure as to how exactly the semantic constraints on Afrikaans OS differ from the semantic constraints on German OS. Regardless of whether this account is valid, the English participants fare even worse on the OS items than the German participants. They do score 70% for the OS items involving an indefinite object, but recall that they were expected to do well on this category. The English participants were correct in rejecting the indefinite OS-items, but they (presumably) rejected them for the wrong reason. They did not reject them because the object had the wrong semantic properties; rather, they rejected them for the same reason that they rejected the other OS-items, namely, because their L1 does not allow OS, regardless of the semantic properties of the object.[17]

On all of the other categories in the grammaticality judgment task, the predictions of the FTFA are borne out in that the German participants' scores are much higher than the Eng participants' scores. This is also true of the SIMC items involving a negative element, even though here the German participants' score is not quite as high as their other scores. This is due to the optionality also witnessed in the sentence manipulation task. If one considers the total scores of the three groups, the predictions of the FTFA are again borne out in that the German participants fare much better than the English participants. In fact, overall, the English participants are performing exactly at the level of chance (which is 25% on this task, since, for every sentence pair, there are four possible responses to choose from). Once more data have been collected, statistical tests will be performed in order to determine whether the differences between the two learner groups are statistically significant, but at this stage the

tendencies within the two groups on the sentence manipulation task and the grammaticality judgement task fit well with the predictions made by the 'full transfer' claim of the FTFA.

The results of the **truth-value judgment task** are given in Table 5 as the percentage of accurate judgments on the different categories of this task.

Table 5. Results: Truth-Value Judgment Task

(% Accurate Judgments)

	OS (4)	No-OS (4)	dis (2)	TOTAL (10)
Afr Controls **n=20**	98	96	98	97
L1 Ger **n=5**	85	80	90	84
L1 Eng **n=4**	88	50	75	70

Note: OS = object shift, No-OS = no object shift, dis = distracter

The Afrikaans Controls' performance is once again near-perfect on all of the categories and, as predicted by the FTFA, the German participants' scores are high as well. The English participants' scores, on the other hand, are completely unexpected. The FTFA predicts that these learners should do well on the No-OS items and poorly on the OS items, since their L1 does not allow OS and, for this reason, they should not have knowledge of the semantic effects of OS. However, they do exactly the opposite: on the No-OS items they perform at chance (i.e. 50%, since there are only two possible responses on this task)[18] and on the OS items they perform even better than the German participants, at 88%. How does one explain this? Since these are still beginner learners, I would like to propose that they have simply not yet reset the SIP (as confirmed by their performance on the other two tasks), which means

that, at this stage, their IL grammars for Afrikaans would be unable to interpret OSCs. When they are then *forced* to try and interpret these constructions in a task, they resort to a strategy involving a kind of logical calculation in the following way.

The two example sentences from the truth-value judgment task are repeated here as (22) and (23).

(22)   *Sven   het   <u>nie</u>   [drie   boeke] gelees   nie.*   **(No OS: neg>#DO)**
        Sven   has   not   three   books   read   final neg
        'It is not true that Sven has read three books.'

(23)   *Sven   het   [drie   boeke] <u>nie</u>   gelees   nie.*   **(OS: #DO>neg)**
        Sven   has   three   books   not   read   final neg
        'There are three books that Sven hasn't read.'

As a consequence of Afrikaans word order properties, the lexical verb is always surrounded by the two negative elements in OSCs (for example, *nie gelees nie* in (23)). It might be that the learners have noticed that if the verb is surrounded by the two negative elements, it is the *verb* that is being negated, and the sentence is about "how many things were not V-ed" (for example, how many books were not read). This calculation happens to lead them to the correct interpretation and gives them a high score on the OS items. In Non-OSCs, on the other hand, as one can see in (22), there is no single element (such as the verb or the object) that is surrounded by the two negative elements. In these cases, the participants don't know whether it is the verb or the number that is being negated and they have to resort to guessing, which would explain why they perform at chance level on the No-OS items.

4.   Conclusion

To summarize, the study reported in this paper was designed to test the predictions made by the FTFA with respect to the L2 acquisition of the SIP and the V2 parameter in Afrikaans. As this study forms part of ongoing research (see note 3), only preliminary results are reported in this paper, namely those obtained from 9 beginner learners of Afrikaans who are native speakers of German and English, respectively. The German participants fared much better on

the sentence manipulation task and the grammaticality judgment task than the English participants, and since all of these learners received the same instruction over the same period of time from the same instructor, we can conclude that the differences between these two groups are attributable to the grammars that they started out with. Furthermore, the tendencies observed within the two groups on all three of the tasks can easily be accounted for by the FTFA. In this way, these preliminary results provide some support for the 'full transfer' part of the FTFA. Currently, more beginner adult L2 learners of Afrikaans as well as a number of advanced adult L2 learners of Afrikaans are being tested. As soon as more data have been collected, (i) statistical tests will be performed in order to determine whether the observations made with respect to the beginner learner groups discussed in this paper, hold for a larger beginner learner group as well, and (ii) the data from the advanced learners will be used to test the predictions made by the 'full access' part of the FTFA. Finally, these initial data suggest that a larger database might offer some insight into the semantic constraints on OS and how these differ cross-linguistically, an area that deserves attention given that these constraints are not yet well understood. (See note 3 for a reference to work on the complete data set.)

Notes

*   I would like to thank, firstly, the Department of Afrikaans and Dutch as well as the International Office at Stellenbosch University, for their help in recruiting participants for this research and, secondly, two anonymous SPIL-reviewers for their comments on a previous draft of this paper. Of course, all errors are my own.

1.   The assumption that there is a logical problem of L1 acquisition, is not undisputed. However, see Baker and McCarthy 1981 and Hornstein and Lightfoot 1981 for some convincing arguments for a logical problem of L1 acquisition.

2.   Note that, of course, a number of alternative hypotheses exist. However, it is impossible to design an experiment that will test all of these hypotheses at once. Consequently, as is stated explicitly here, the study reported in this paper focuses on testing the predictions made by a single hypothesis, the FTFA. See note 3 below for a reference to work that discusses alternative L2 acquisition hypotheses and their success/failure in accounting for the data reported here (as well as additional data).

3.   It should be noted that additional data have subsequently been collected from 24 beginner (4 English-speaking and 20 German-speaking) and 15 advanced (5 English-speaking and 10 German-speaking) adult L2 learners of Afrikaans. These data are not included in the present paper, which (as is indicated by the title) is meant to present the preliminary data available at the time of initial submission to SPIL. For an analysis of the complete data set as well as more in-depth discussions of the issues raised in the present paper, the reader is referred to my Ph.D. dissertation, submitted to McGill University in March 2005, entitled *Verb movement parameters in Afrikaans: investigating the Full Transfer Full Access hypothesis*. In this dissertation I argue that the additional data from the beginner learners support the conclusions reached on the basis of the smaller data set in the present paper (i.e., the data are consistent with 'full transfer') and that the data from the advanced learners support the 'full access' claim of the FTFA. The dissertation also includes data from the L2 acquisition of the SIP and the V2 parameter in French by adult native speakers of Afrikaans.

4.   This section provides a brief (and therefore incomplete) discussion of the relevant syntactic parameters. The reader is referred to Conradie (2002) and Conradie (to

appear) as well as the source paper (Bobaljik and Thráinsson 1998) for more detailed discussions.

5.   The term 'IP-complex' is taken from Bobaljik and Thráinsson (1998: 38) and refers to "the collection of inflectional heads and their phrases that together make up the articulated IP".

6.   In constructions such as (1a), on the other hand, which contain an **unaccusative** verb and an expletive, the expletive occurs in Spec,IP and the subject-NP (*a train* in (1a)) remains in the complement position of VP (where it is base-generated - see, for example, Perlmutter and Postal's (1984) Unaccusative Hypothesis).

7.   This is true for non-V2 languages that are [-SIP]. I will not consider non-V2 languages that are [+SIP] (such as French) in this paper.

8.   The assumption here is that SIMCs are non-V2 environments (i.e. IPs/AgrSPs, and not CPs) in V2 languages such as Afrikaans. This assumption is actually untenable under BandT's framework and it is made here purely to simplify the presentation of the results of the study in this paper. See Conradie (to appear) for some discussion about the syntactic status of SIMCs.

9.   In Afrikaans, the second (final-neg) *nie* has no semantic content and always appears in clause-final position. Its syntactic status need not concern us here as it is the first (clause-medial) *nie* that serves as a left-edge marker and corresponds to English *not* and German *nicht*. See Oosthuizen 1998 for a proposal as to the syntactic status of clause-final *nie*.

10.   This study is set in the framework proposed by Bobaljik and Thráinsson 1998. See note 3 for reference to work that includes some justification for this framework over current alternatives.

11.   The reason that no distracters are included in this task, is that the construction types under investigation are diverse - there are only 18 items on this task and they are divided between 6 different construction types – and it is thus highly unlikely that participants would be able to determine what was being tested. Furthermore, given participants' comments on this task in previous studies (a pilot study and the study reported in Conradie 2002), I believe that this task would become tiring if more items are included.

12.   The reasons for the small number of distracter pairs on this task are identical to those mentioned in note 11 with respect to the sentence manipulation task: because there are a large number of items on this task (110 sentences to be judged) and the construction types under investigation (n=10) are diverse, it is highly unlikely that participants would be able to determine what was being tested. Furthermore, adding more items to this (already long) task would doubtlessly make it tiring for the participants.

13.   Following Dekydtspotter et al., contexts were provided in the participants' L1s to ensure that they would understand the contexts, something which is, of course, necessary for them to accurately judge the test sentences as true or false.

14.   The tasks employed in the study reported in Conradie (2002) differ slightly from those employed in the study reported here and described in Section 3.2, as some revisions were made after the earlier testing sessions (e.g. the inclusion of OS test pairs involving an indefinite object in the grammaticality judgment task).

15.   See Schwartz 2003 on potential insights to be gained by comparing child L2 acquisition to adult L2 acquisition. Also, Unsworth 2003, 2004 conducted a study on the L2 acquisition of Dutch by native speakers of English (some child L2ers and some adult L2ers), investigating whether these learners could acquire some semantic and syntactic aspects of OS, a phenomenon not allowed in their L1 grammar. She employed a truth-value judgment task and an elicited production task and argues that the results of her study show that both the child and the adult L2ers were able to acquire the relevant properties of the L2.

16.   See note 3 for reference to work that includes an analysis of individual participants' performance as well as an investigation into the FTFA's prediction that performance on related construction types (e.g., performance on OSCs and performance on TECs – both linked to the setting of the SIP) should cluster.

17.   Two anonymous SPIL-reviewers suggested that, contrary to what I claim, the English-speaking learners might actually have IL grammars that allow OS but that they simply did not form any OSCs on the sentence manipulation task or accept (most of the) OSCs on the grammaticality judgment task because they could not imagine contexts in which the objects would have the semantic properties that would make them "shiftable" – see again the brief discussion in section 3.2 on the semantic constraints on OS. However, this potentially confounding non-grammatical factor (participants'

(in)ability to imagine the required context) should affect all three groups, or at least the two learner groups, equally (precisely because it is a non-grammatical factor). The conclusions reached here are thus supported by a comparison of the two learner groups to each other instead of an analysis of each groups' performance separately. Furthermore, the analysis of the two learner groups' scores on the OSC pairs in the grammaticality judgement task is supported by an error analysis performed on the larger data set examined in my Ph.D. dissertation (see note 3). At first sight, the German-speaking learners and the English-speaking learners perform similarly on the OSC-categories, both achieving low scores overall. However, an error analysis shows that the two L1-groups make different types of errors on these categories: most of the errors that the German-speaking learners make involve them accepting only the OSC, whereas most of the errors that the English-speaking learners make involve them accepting only the Non-OSC.

18.   The fact that the English-speaking learners' group performance on the Non-OSCs in this task is at chance level, is not the result of a bimodal distribution (i.e., some learners performing very well and other learners performing very poorly); individual results show that all of these learners performed at chance level.

References

Alexiadou, A. and E. Anagnostopoulou. 1997. Postverbal subjects. Ms. Tilburg and MIT.

Baker, C. L. and J. McCarthy (eds.). 1981. *The logical problem of language acquisition.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bobaljik, J. D. and D. Jonas. 1996. Subject positions and the roles of TP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27 (2): 195-236.

Bobaljik, J. D. and H. Thráinsson. 1998. Two heads aren't always better than one. *Syntax* 1 (1): 37-71.

Chomsky, N. 1995. *The minimalist program.* Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Clahsen, H. and P. Muysken. 1986. The availability of Universal Grammar to adult and child learners: A study of the acquisition of German word order. *Second Language Research* 2: 93-119.

Clahsen, H. and P. Muysken. 1989. The UG paradox in L2 acquisition. *Second Language Research* 5: 1-29.

Conradie, S. 2002. Parameter resetting in the second language acquisition of Afrikaans: The SIP and the V2 parameter. *McGill Working Papers in Linguistics* 17:1, 1-23.

Conradie, S. To appear in *Second Language Research* in late 2005. Investigating the acquisition of the Split-IP parameter and the V2 parameter in L2 Afrikaans.

Dekydtspotter, L., R. A. Sprouse and R. Thyre. 1999. The interpretation of quantification at a distance in English-French interlanguage: Domain specificity and second-language acquisition. *Language Acquisition* 8(4): 265-320.

Epstein, S. D., S. Flynn and G. Martohardjono. 1996. Second language acquisition: Theoretical and experimental issues in contemporary research. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 19: 677-714.

Eubank, L. 1993/1994. On the transfer of parametric values in L2 development. *Language Acquisition* 3: 183-208.

Eubank, L. 1994. Optionality and the initial state in L2 development. In T. Hoekstra and B. D. Schwartz (eds.), *Language acquisition studies in generative grammar* (p369-388). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Eubank, L. 1996. Negation in early German-English interlanguage: More valueless features in the L2 initial state. *Second Language Research* 12: 73-106.

Hawkins, R. and Y. Chan. 1997. The partial availability of Universal Grammar in second language acquisition: the 'failed functional features hypothesis'. *Second Language Research* 13 (3): 187-226.

Hornstein, N. and D. Lightfoot (eds.). 1981. *Explanation in linguistics: the logical problem of language acquisition.* London: Longman.

Iatridou, S. 1990. About Agr(P). *Linguistic Inquiry* 21: 551-577.

Oosthuizen, J. 1998. The final *nie* in Afrikaans negative sentences. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics* 31: 61-93.

Perlmutter, D. and P. Postal. 1984. The 1-Advancement exclusiveness law. In D. Perlmutter and C. Rosen (eds.), *Studies in Relational Grammar 2* (p81-125). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Schwartz, B. D. 2003. Child L2 acquisition: Paving the way. In *Proceedings of the 27ᵗʰ Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development*, B. Beachley, A. Brown and F. Conlin (eds.) (pp. 26-50). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Schwartz, B. D. and R. A. Spouse. 1994. Word order and nominative case in nonnative language acquisition: a longitudinal study of (L1 Turkish) German interlanguage. In T. Hoekstra and B. D. Schwartz (eds.) *Language acquisition studies in generative grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Schwartz, B. D. and R. A. Sprouse. 1996. L2 cognitive states and the Full Transfer/Full Access model. *Second Language Research* 12: 40-72.

Thráinsson, H. 1996. On the (non-)universality of functional categories. In W. Abraham, S.D. Epstein, H. Thráinsson and C. J.-W. Zwart (eds.) *Minimal Ideas*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Thráinsson, H. 2001. Object Shift and Scrambling. In M. Baltin and C. Collins (eds.) *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Unsworth, S. 2003. Direct object scrambling in adult and child L2 Dutch. In Y. Otsu (ed.), *Proceedings of the Fourth Tokyo Conference on Psycholinguistics* (p265-289). Tokyo: Hituzi Syobo.

Unsworth, S. 2004. On the syntax-semantics interface in Dutch: adult and child L2 acquisition compared. *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* 42 (2): 173-187.

Vainikka, A. and M. Young-Scholten. 1994. Direct access to X'-theory: Evidence from Korean and Turkish adults learning German. In T. Hoekstra and B. D. Schwartz (eds.) *Language acquisition studies in generative grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Vainikka, A. and M. Young-Scholten. 1996. Gradual development of L2 phrase structure. *Second Language Research* 12: 7-39.

White, L. 1989. *Universal Grammar and second language acquisition.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

White, L. 1991. Adverb placement in second language acquisition: some effects of positive and negative evidence in the classroom. *Second Language Research* 7: 133-161.

White, L. 2003. *Second language acquisition and Universal Grammar.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Appendix

Sentence Manipulation Task: Examples of test items

In each case, words that were on a single card in the sentence manipulation task are enclosed in square brackets and the "cards" are arranged in such a way that they form the sentence that was targeted.

(1) *[Nico] [het] [die vrou] [dikwels] [besoek].*
  Nico has the woman often visited
  'Nico often visited the woman.'   **(OSC-adv)**

(2) *[Jaco] [het] ["Star Wars"] [nie] [gesien] [nie].*
  Jaco has "Star Wars" not seen final-neg
  'Jaco did not see "Star Wars".'   **(OSC-neg)**

(3) *[die supermodel] [wen] [dikwels] [skoonheidskompetisies].*
  the supermodel wins often beauty.pageants
  'The supermodel often wins beauty pageants.' **(SIMC-adv)**

(4) *[Friedl] [rook] [nie] [sigare] [nie].*
  Friedl smokes not cigars final-neg
  'Friedl does not smoke cigars.'   **(SIMC-neg)**

(5) *[die belangrikste wedstryd] [het] [hulle] [verloor].*
  the most important game have they lost
  'The most important game they lost.' (= 'They lost the most important game.')
           (NSIMC-top. obj.)

(6) *[môre]*   *[ontmoet]*   *[ek]*   *[die   nuwe   huurders].*

     tomorrow   meet   I   the   new   tenants

     'Tomorrow I meet the new tenants.' (= 'I am meeting the new tenants tomorrow.')

                                                            (NSIMC-adv)

Grammaticality Judgment Task: Examples of test items

<u>SIMCs</u>

(7) (a) *Daardie*   *krieketspan*   *[verloor]*   <u>*selde*</u> *'n*   *wedstryd.*

         that   cricket.team   loses   seldom a   game

     (b) *Daardie*   *krieketspan*   <u>*selde*</u> *[verloor]*   *'n*   *wedstryd.*

         that   cricket.team   seldom loses   a   game

         'That cricket team seldom loses a game.'   **(SIMC-adv)**

<u>**Only (a) is possible**</u>   **Only (b) is possible**   **Both possible**   **Both impossible**   **Don't know**

(8) (a) *Die*   *nuwe*   *sekretaresse*   <u>*nie*</u>   *[eet]*   *vleis*   *nie.*

         the   new   secretary   not   eats   meat   final-neg

     (b) *Die*   *nuwe*   *sekretaresse*   *[eet]*   <u>*nie*</u>   *vleis*   *nie.*

         the   new   secretary   eats   not   meat   final-neg

         'The new secretary does not eat meat.'   **(SIMC-neg)**

Only (a) is possible   <u>**Only (b) is possible**</u>   **Both possible**   **Both impossible**   **Don't know**

(9) (a) *Die*   *atlete*   *van*   *die Olimpiese Span*   <u>*almal*</u>   *[hardloop]*   *vinnig.*

         the   athletes of   the Olympic Team   all   run   fast

     (b) *Die*   *atlete*   *van*   *die Olimpiese Span*   *[hardloop]*   <u>*almal*</u>   *vinnig.*

         the   athletes of   the Olympic Team   run   all   fast

         'The athletes of the Olympic Team all run fast.'   **(SIMC-fq)**

Only (a) is possible   <u>**Only (b) is possible**</u>   **Both possible**   **Both impossible**   **Don't know**

NSIMCs

(10) (a) *Daardie* *dag* *[ek]* <u>*onthou*</u> *soos* *gister.*

that day I remember like yesterday

    (b) *Daardie* *dag* <u>*onthou*</u> *[ek]* *soos* *gister.*

that day remember I like yesterday

'That day I remember like yesterday.' (= 'I remember that day like yesterday.')

(NSIMC-top.

obj.)

Only (a) is possible <u>**Only (b) is possible**</u> **Both possible** **Both impossible** **Don't know**

(11) (a) *Op* *25* *Desember* <u>*vier*</u> *[baie* *mense]* *Kersfees.*

on 25 December celebrate many people Christmas

    (b) *Op* *25* *Desember* *[baie* *mense]* <u>*vier*</u> *Kersfees.*

on 25 December many people celebrate Christmas

'On the 25th of December many people celebrate Christmas.' (= 'Many people celebrate Christmas on the 25th of December.') **(NSIMC-adv)**

<u>**Only (a) is possible**</u> **Only (b) is possible** **Both possible** **Both impossible** **Don't know**

OSCs

(12) (a) *Pieter* *het* <u>*altyd*</u> *[sy* *huiswerk]* *in* *die* *middag* *gedoen.*

Pieter has always his homework in the afternoon done

    (b) *Pieter* *het* *[sy* *huiswerk]* <u>*altyd*</u> *in* *die* *middag* *gedoen.*

Pieter has his homework always in the afternoon done

'Pieter always did his homework in the afternoon.' **(OSC-adv)**

Only (a) is possible **Only (b) is possible** <u>**Both possible**</u> **Both impossible** **Don't know**

(13) (a) *Sy*   *het*   *[haar* *oupa]*   <u>*nie*</u>   *geken* *nie.*

she   has   her   grandfather   not   known final-neg

(b) *Sy*   *het*   <u>*nie*</u>   *[haar* *oupa]*   *geken* *nie.*

she   has   not   her   grandfather   known final-neg

'She did not know her grandfather.'   **(OSC-neg)**

Only (a) is possible   Only (b) is possible   <u>Both possible</u>   Both impossible   Don't know

(14) (a) *Rudie* *het*   *[sy*   *beste* *vriende]*   <u>*almal*</u> *genooi.*

Rudie   has   his   best   friends   all   invited

(b) *Rudie* *het*   <u>*al*</u>   *[sy*   *beste* *vriende]*   *genooi.*

Rudie   has   all   his   best   friends   invited

'Rudie invited all of his best friends.'   **(OSC-fq)**

Only (a) is possible   Only (b) is possible   <u>Both possible</u>   Both impossible   Don't know

(15) (a) *Freek* *het*   <u>*nie*</u>   *[motors]*   *verkoop*   *nie.*

Freek   has   not   cars   sold   final-neg

(b) *Freek* *het*   *[motors]*   *nie*   *verkoop*   *nie.*

Freek   has   cars   not   sold   final-neg

'Freek didn't sell cars.'   **(OSC-indef)**

<u>Only (a) is possible</u>   Only (b) is possible   Both possible   Both impossible   Don't know

TECs

(16) (a) *Baie   mense   het   vis   geëet   by   die   troue.*
       many people have   fish   eaten   at   the   wedding

   (b) *Daar't   baie   mense   vis   geëet   by   die   troue.*
       there+have   many   people fish   eaten   at   the   wedding
       'Many people ate fish at the wedding.'   **(TEC)**

Only (a) is possible   Only (b) is possible   <u>Both possible</u>   Both impossible   Don't know