U.S. Spanish under a morphological approach to discourse

Jose Sequeros-Valle University of Illinois at Chicago

The goal of this project is to explore the implications of a morphological approach to discourse (Author, in progress) for the ongoing discussion on bilingualism at the discourse-syntax interface (e.g. Author et al., accepted-a, accepted-b; Montrul & Polinsky, 2011; Sorace, 2011).

Namely, this study focuses on the discursive restrictions of clitic-doubled left dislocation as an anaphoric construction (CLLD, see example (1b)) and focus fronting as a contrastive construction (FF, see example (2b)). In sum, anaphoricity is correlated to clitic-doubling (as in (1)) and the lack of anaphoricity is correlated to the lack of clitic-doubling (as in (2)).

On a first line of discussion on the acquisition of the above test case by bilinguals, some authors have predicted bilingual divergence at this interface, both at the competence level (e.g. Benmamoun et al., 2013; Sorace & Filiaci, 2006) and the processing level (e.g. Mountrul & Polinksy, 2011; Sorace, 2011). However, these hypotheses have been challenged via acceptability judgment task (Leal Mendez et al., 2015; Slabakova et al., 2012) and via self-paced reading task (Leal et al., 2017). However, Author et al. (accepted-a, accepted-b) have found evidence of bilingual divergence in a production task. This pattern – convergence in an acceptability task, convergence in an online task, and divergence in a production task – is similar to is found in other domain that is purely syntactic: L2 gender (Grüter et al., 2012). Therefore, it looks like the issues at the discourse-syntax interface may be production issues well beyond the interfaces.

On a second line of discussion, I have argued (Author, in progress) that discourse features are morphemes from numeration included in morphosyntax as functional heads. Under my model, a discourse-feature (e.g. [+contrast]) merges to the target constituent (see example (3)). When fronting does take place, which I consider it to be optional, there is an additional step in which an unvalued featured in C leads the now marked constituent to raise to the left periphery (see example (4)). In these two syntactic trees, [+x] would be the [+contrast], [+anaphora], or [+promotion] feature. On a later stage, native speakers externalize [+contrast] as emphatic contrastive stress and [+anaphora] and [+promotion] as clitic-doubling.

Taking these two separate discussions into account, I argue that bilingual divergence at the discourse-syntax interface is due to a production-specific issue (see first discussion) on the externalization of discourse features (see second discussion). For example, English – Spanish bilinguals already create anaphoric relations in their L1 English (see example (5)). However, it is the phonological externalization of the [+anaphora] feature as clitic-doubling in their Spanish that creates divergence performance. My claim aligns with previous research on bilingualism: For example, the Bottleneck Hypothesis (Montrul, 2018; Slabakova, 2014) argues that functional morphology is the source of bilingual divergence, or the Gradient/Categorical Competence Hypothesis (Duffield, 2005; Slabakova et al., 2011) argues that bilinguals tend to produce more categorical output in instances in which controls produce more gradient output. In sum, this new theoretical approach can provide a general explanation of divergence beyond the interfaces.

Examples

- (1) a. ¿Dónde ves [ANTECEDENT a tus amigos]?
 - Where see.2nd DOM your friends
 - 'Where do you see your friends?'
 - b. [ANAPHORIC A Pedro] [CLITIC-DOUBLING lo] veo en el parque, y a María en casa. DOM Pedro Cl. veo.1st in the park and DOM Maria in house
 - 'I see Pedro at the park, and Maria at home.'
- (2) a. Viste [ANTECEDENT a Miguel], ¿no?
 - see.2nd.past DOM Miguel no
 - 'You saw Miguel, didn't you?'
 - b. [NON-ANAPHORIC A PEDRO] [NO LITIC-DOUBLING] vi.
 - DOM Pedro see.1st.past
 - 'I saw Pedro (not Miguel).'
- (3) [utterance ... [(+x)XP[(+x)][XP]]]
- (4) [CP [(+x)XP [[ux] ... [t]]]]
- (5) a. 'Where do you see [ANTECEDENT your friends]?'
 - b. 'I see [ANAPHORIC Pedro] at the park, and [ANAPHORIC Maria] at home.'

References

Author (in progress). A morphological approach to discourse in Spanish: A theoretical and experimental review. Unpublished dissertation. • Author et al. (accepted-a). Clitic-doubled left dislocation in L2 Spanish: The effect of processing load at the syntax-discourse interface. Language Acquisition. • Author et al. (accepted-b). Clitic-doubled left dislocation in heritage Spanish: Judgment vs. speeded production data. Languages. • Benmamoun, E., Montrul, S., & Polinsky, M. (2013). Heritage languages and their speakers: Opportunities and challenges for linguistics. Theoretical Linguistics, 39(3/4), 129–181. • Duffield, N. (2005). Implications of competent gradience. Moderne Sprachen, 48(1), 95-117. · Grüter, T., Lew-Williams, C., & Fernald, A. (2012). Grammatical gender in L2: A production or a real-time processing problem? Second Language Research 28(2), 191-215. · Leal Méndez, T., Rothman, J., & Slabakova, R. (2015). Discourse-sensitive clitic-doubled dislocations in heritage Spanish. Lingua, 155, 85–97. Leal, T., Slabakova, R., & Farmer, T.A. (2017). The fine-tuning of linguistic expectations over the course of L2 learning. Studies in Second Language Acquisition 39(3), 493-525. • Montrul, S. (2018). The Bottleneck Hypothesis extends to heritage language acquisition. Meaning and Structure in Second Language Acquisition: In honor of Roumyana Slabakova, 55, 149-179. Montrul, S. & Polinsky, M. (2011). Why not heritage speakers? Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism, 1(1), 58–62. · Slabakova, R. (2014). The bottleneck of second language acquisition. Foreign Language Teaching and Research, 46(4), 543-559. · Slabakova, R., Rothman, J., & Kempchinsky, P. (2011). Gradient competence at the syntax-discourse interface. EuroSLA Yearbook, 11(1), 218-243. · Slabakova, R., Kempchinsky, P., & Rothman, J. (2012). Cliticdoubled left dislocation and focus fronting in L2 Spanish: A case of successful acquisition at the syntax-discourse interface. Second Language Research 28(3), 319-343. · Sorace, A. (2011). Pinning down the concept of 'interface' in bilingualism. Linguistic Approaches to Bilingualism 1(1), 1-33. · Sorace, A. & Filiaci, F. (2006). Anaphora resolution in near-native speakers of Italian. Second Language Research, 22(3), 339-368.