Ababa	Tot.	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Initial	5	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	-
Prev	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Interv	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Postv	7	1	2	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-
Final	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Xiao	Tot.	18	17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Initial	13	3	1	2	3	-	1	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Prev	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Postv	6	-	-	1	1	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	-
Final	5	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	1	-

Additive Scope Particles in Advanced Learner and Native Speaker Discourse

Marzena Watorek and Christine Dimroth

1. Introduction

The present study attempts to discover the rules behind the functioning of scope phenomena in advanced learner discourse by considering the interactional relationship between scope particles and the speech construction process. It investigates the interaction between the functioning of additive particles and their distribution in descriptive discourse. The following additive particles will be discussed: *aussi* ('also')/*encore* ('still, another') in French and their equivalents in German (*auch/noch*), in Italian (*anche/ancora*), and in Polish (*też*[1]/*jeszcze*).

In the study presented here, we have adopted the perspective proposed by Dimroth and Klein (1996), whereby scope particles are considered in terms of optional units operating within a preliminary structure (*Ausgangsstruktur*) that is, in principle, independent of the presence of these particles. The relation between the functioning of these particles and the process of discourse construction becomes a central concern, since the discourse within which the particles occur functions as the *Ausgangsstruktur*. Although different theoretical approaches are not always in accord with regard to the description of the functioning and distribution of scope particles, four notions can be considered as basic:

The **basic meaning** of scope particles can be explained in terms of the special relationship their application creates between the elements of a set of alternatives. This can be seen in (1) where the meaning of the additive particle *too* lies in the additive relation between the elements of the relevant set of alternatives[2] {Peter, Paul, Mary}:

(1)   *Peter and Paul live in Paris. Mary lives in Paris, too.*

The **domain of application**[3] refers to the part of the utterance directly affected by the basic meaning of the scope particle, such as Mary in (1). With the application of an additive scope particle, an additive relation between the referent of the domain of application and other elements of the set of alterna-

tives is established.

The relation between the domain of application and the position of the particle is called **scope**[4]. Scope is thus a relational term defined with respect to two criteria: direction (right, left) and distance (+/- adjacency). In (1), the particle is situated in a distant position with respect to its domain of application, and its scope extends to the left. The potential or maximum scope expressed, depending on the position of the scope particle and in some languages (e.g. German) on its stress, is considered to be a syntactic phenomenon in the target language; thus the term "syntactic domain" is often identified as the domain that is c-commanded by the particle (cf. Bayer 1996). Learners have to acquire the adequate syntactic position of the particles with respect to their domain of application. The options they have depend to a large extent on their general development of utterance organisation principles, i.e. target language-like syntactic ways of scope marking might be excluded and replaced by more pragmatic solutions at basic levels of language acquisition.

Our reflections are based on an analysis of the productions of advanced Italian and Polish learners of French and of Polish learners of German. Based on cross-sectional and comparative investigations, we shall propose - unlike the studies presented in the other chapters - a description of scope phenomena occurring within the advanced learner variety. We shall therefore be particularly concerned with identifying the linguistic development that occurs within this learner variety.

The paper is organised as follows. We shall firstly present (section 2), from a developmental perspective, the acquisition path up to the advanced variety. This short description concentrates, of course, on the acquisition of scope phenomena. Secondly, in section 3, we shall present the type of discourse we are dealing with. The fourth and fifth sections contain the results of our descriptive analysis for native speakers and advanced learners respectively. Finally, (section 6), we shall discuss these results, thereby aiming to identify the most important characteristics of scope phenomena in the advanced variety.

2. Background of research: the acquisition of additive scope particles up to advanced learner varieties

Since the focus of this article is on the functioning of additive scope particles in advanced learner varieties, we can only provide a short sketch of the developmental path followed by the learners from the outset of acquisition to the advanced level. The following remarks summarise the results of a number of longitudinal studies[5] investigating the acquisition of scope particles by natural

learners with various source and target languages.

In light of the results presented by these studies, we generally assume that the acquisition of additive scope particles is driven by the interaction of two occasionally competing factors. On the one hand, the need to express more varied but, nonetheless, universal constellations of information seems to **promote** acquisition. On the other hand, the growing need to adapt one's interlanguage to the structural properties of the language to be acquired (in this case, the rules of grammar governing scope marking in the target language) seems to **shape** the acquisition process (cf. Perdue 1999; Perdue and Watorek 1998). Bearing in mind the interaction of these two factors, in what follows we shall briefly describe the following stages of the acquisition process: (a) the basic variety (BV, cf. Klein and Perdue 1997), (b) the linguistic development occurring at a post-basic variety (post-BV) level that then leads to (c) the advanced variety.

(a) The Basic Variety

In spite of the diversity of the source and target languages of the learners investigated, a picture of the BV is quite uniform in many respects. Important features shared by early basic varieties can be summarised as follows: firstly, additive scope particles tend to occur in incomplete utterances (Benazzo and Giuliano 1998:49). Secondly, the entities to which these particles are applied are predominantly nominal in nature (Giacomi et al. 1994:8). However, with regard to the position of scope particles in the utterance, the longitudinal studies mentioned report some variation even at the outset of acquisition (cf. Dimroth and Watorek 2000, for an overview). This variation not only affects the absolute positions attested for additive scope particles in basic variety utterances, but also their positions with respect to their domains of application.

Whilst Dimroth (1998a) reports that Polish learners of German first produce the basic order "NP/PP[6]+ particle", Becker and Dietrich (1996) find that, for Italian learners of German, "particle + NP/PP" is the basic pattern with "NP/PP + particle" appearing only later. The picture becomes even more diverse if we look at the integration of particles in more complex utterances, namely utterances of a typical Basic Variety type which contain (mostly uninflected) verbal elements and show the canonical order NP1 - V - NP2 (cf. Klein and Perdue 1997).

While the two groups of learners of German referred to earlier continue to show some variation with respect to scope direction, the principle of adjacency seems to be valid at this stage, irrespective of the source language involved, and also irrespective of the constituents affected by the particle.

Learners of French, however, are reported to follow a different developmental route when attempting to integrate additive scope particles into their utterances. In their case, it is not adjacency to the domain of application which counts. Rather, they manifest a general tendency to place particles at the periphery of utterances (in the case of additive particles at the very end) before a stepwise integration into the core structure takes place (cf. Benazzo and Giuliano 1998: 35).

In the following developmental stage, learners begin to place particles in a postverbal position (which is target-like in most of the languages investigated), from where they seem to potentially include the whole utterance in their scope. The particles' domain of application can be located to the right or to the left, adjacency and distance are both possible, and the particles can refer to domains of application of different size and location. The identification of the actual domain of application of the particle then depends to a large extent on contextual information. This is particularly true when additive particles have scope to the left and affect a distant domain of application, a phenomenon which occurs only occasionally at the BV level, but which becomes more frequent when finite utterance organisation comes into play.

(b) The Post-Basic Variety level

Many of the longitudinal studies referred to in this section (cf. Becker and Dietrich 1996; Benazzo and Giuliano 1998; Dimroth and Watorek 2000), have observed a close relationship between the increasing extent to which the structural integration of additive particles and the means of flexible scope marking grammaticalise, on the one hand, and the development of verbal morphology (finiteness marking) at the Post-BV level on the other. In what follows, we shall briefly illustrate this relationship with the help of an example from the acquisition of German additive particles at a post-BV stage.

If the initial constituent of a declarative sentence is to be affected by an additive particle, German allows, in principle, two positions for that particle:

(A)   Particle - <u>Constituent 1</u> - V - ... (e.g. *Auch <u>da</u> steht ein Haus.* 'Also there is a house'.)

(B)   <u>Constituent 1</u> - V - Particle - ... (e.g. *<u>Da</u> steht auch ein Haus.* 'There is also a house'.)

The rarity of type (A) in colloquial native German speech is due to the fact that it is used only if the affected constituent in initial position is the focus of the utterance in question (cf. Dimroth 1998b; Krifka 1999). In the majority of

cases, however, the first constituent is a topic constituent. If such a topic constituent is contrasted with others, it fulfils the requirements for the application of additive particles. Indeed, such contrasting topic elements frequently function as the domain of application of additive particles. In this case, structure (B) must be chosen.

Learners could be shown (cf. Dimroth 1999) to be sensitive to the underlying difference in information structure from early on. In structure (B), however, the particle has distant scope to the left and - as with other target languages investigated (cf. Benazzo 2000 for French) - this structure is only possible with a more hierarchical syntax that hinges on the acquisition of finiteness.

Some learners of German develop an intermediate solution as a means of indicating that a contrasting topic constituent in utterance initial position is to be affected by an additive particle: they put the particle directly behind constituent 1, in preverbal position (e.g. *Da auch steht ein Haus.* 'There also is a house'). The fact that this ungrammatical position quickly disappears is connected with the development of target adequate verbal morphology. With the acquisition of finiteness marking, learners increasingly adhere to the German V2 rule that precludes such a position.

(c) The advanced variety: between scope grammar and discourse

The advanced learners investigated in this analysis master the target language (henceforth TL) in a way which is, in many respects, similar to the level of proficiency demonstrated by the native speaker. Bartning (1997) proposes both a definition and a linguistic portrait of the advanced learner. She notes that the advanced variety "shows areas of fragility in the domain of functional morphology but also (...) in the [domains] of discourse, dialogue, and sociolinguistics" (our translation).

For the purpose of this study, we presume that, on the level of utterance structure, our learners master the TL grammar rules (including the scope grammar) relatively well. In fact, we have found only a very limited number of examples of incorrect placement of scope particles. Nonetheless, as stated by Carroll and von Stutterheim (1997), we concur that, "in order to attain a competence equal to that of the native speakers", learners must continue to acquire so as "to organise information, in a given text, as a coherent whole and to express it with a certain grammatical form rather than another".

Advanced learners have attained a high level of proficiency in the TL. This renders them comparable to the native speaker, and, as a consequence, it is necessary that learners and native speakers undergo the same data elicitation

techniques. We will therefore present (section 4) the functioning of additive particles in static spatial descriptions produced by native speakers of French and German (the target languages of our learners) and native speakers of Italian and Polish (the source languages of our learners). Section 5 is devoted to an analysis of the same type of texts in the learner data. Before we do so, however, we shall present the type of text on which our arguments are based.

3. The text type investigated (static spatial description)

Our data[7] were collected by means of oral descriptions of a poster portraying a town. The speaker describes the poster to someone who is not familiar with it, specifying what is found in the space represented within the poster. This task results in a particular type of discourse - the *static spatial description* (cf. Watorek 1996a, 1998a), the characteristics of which constitute, in this case, what Dimroth and Klein (1996) term the *Ausgangsstruktur* for the insertion of the particles. In the type of text in question, the speaker must establish a relation between two referents: the relatum and the theme, the former (Rel) serving as a point of reference allowing the latter (Th) to be located. Thus, the foreground of the text corresponds to the expression of the spatial static relation and the background of the text refers to other information (cf. Klein and von Stutterheim 1991).

In this kind of discourse, we generally observe two types of information structure depending on how information becomes available as the task[8] proceeds. The two types of information structure are as follows:

- maintenance of reference to the relatum-entities and change in the domain of reference to the theme-entities;
- maintenance of reference to the theme-entities and change of reference to the relatum-entities.

The syntactic encoding of these two information structures is generally characterised by the following pattern: PP/Adv + finiteV + NP, where the PP/Adv corresponds to the locative expression encoding the spatial interval, irrespective of the speaker's language. The locative expression sometimes corresponds to constructions different from PP/Adv (for instance, it may correspond to a gerund *En se déplaçant vers le feuillet central* 'By going to the middle of the poster'). We shall therefore use the more neutral symbol *LOC* (LOC + finiteV + NP) for the different expressions encoding the relatum.

This sentence pattern is dominant in the native speaker texts of the four

languages concerned, even though, depending on the information context, permutations of the constituents are possible, as shown in table 1. Otherwise, as far as German is concerned, the phenomenon of verbal parentheses (*Verbklammer*) involves some specific variation from the basic syntactic pattern. In the German data, we often find variants such as LOC + FinAux + NP + V, in which the verb is at the end, whereas a (finite) auxiliary occupies the second position.

In the general pattern (PP/Adv+finiteV+NP), the verb is always finite but we find cross-linguistic variants concerning its form. In French and Italian, the verb corresponds to the existential form in over 50% of occurrences (cf. Watorek 1996a). On the contrary, in German, the existential form *es gibt* is not commonly used in this context; in Polish, the equivalent of the French *il y a* does not exist and its function is replaced by the verb *be* (*być*) (cf.Skibińska 1996). This explains why in both German and Polish other types of verbs are attested, such as those verbal forms expressing an existential meaning: *sein* 'to be', *wir sehen* 'to see', and *man sieht* 'you see' in German, and *być* 'to be', and *widać* 'we/you see' in Polish; the locative verb *sich befinden* 'to find oneself' in German and *znajdować się* 'to be present/to find oneself' in Polish. The existential form also integrates the manner of existing, such as *stehen* 'to stay' in German which corresponds to *stać* in Polish, and lexical verbs like *to flow*: *fließen* (German), *płynać* (Polish).

To summarise, we find, in this discourse type, an information structure which is widely shared by the speakers, irrespective of the language concerned: the foreground refers to the spatial localisation (the relationship between a theme and a relatum), where either the information concerning the relatum or the information concerning the theme is maintained. On the contrary, the encoding of the information structure is subject to cross-linguistic variation.

In the descriptive discourse under investigation, speakers must express a certain number of additive relations that hold between different themes or different relata respectively. These contexts are of course conducive to the production of additive scope particles. Due to the relatively well-known informational properties of the *static spatial description* at hand, we have a high degree of control over the underlying information structures of the relevant utterances, and this allows us to identify the particle's domain of application even if no other member of a set of alternatives is explicitly mentioned (cf. introduction). For each information structure and for each language, we shall firstly show which particles are chosen by native speakers and advanced learners. We shall then analyse the way in which the actual scope of the particle is marked by the speaker, i.e. the particle's position in the syntactic struc-

4. Additive particles in native speaker discourse: their integration in different information structures

In this section we shall present and discuss our findings concerning the functioning of additive particles in German, Italian, French, and Polish, based on our analysis of the native speaker data in each language. Thus, our comparison of the learner data with those of the native speakers is not based on what is theoretically possible in the TL but rather on what the native speakers of the TL actually do when performing the same task. In the preceding section we have identified two main information structures which speakers must verbalise in the spatial description task. In principle, both of them can serve as an *Ausgangsstruktur* for additive particles but since their different information distribution has consequences for their domains of applications, we shall address them separately in the following sections.

4.1. Maintenance of relatum

The first basic pattern can be schematised as follows:

Rel 1 - Th aRel 1 - Th b

To encode this information structure, the speakers of the four languages concerned use the particle *aussi* and its equivalents (*anche,* in Italian, *auch,* in German, and *też,* in Polish). We shall demonstrate the use of these particles with examples from French and German, since their functioning is common in the four languages (for the equivalents in Polish and Italian, cf. examples (a) and (b) in the appendix).

(2) French native speaker

1: *ensuite   juste à côté,   il y a   une   rue.*
    then   just   beside   there is   a   street

2: *où   on   voit   un marché* [...].
    where one   sees   a   market [...]

3: *dans la   rue   on   voit* **aussi** *une   pharmacie*[9].
    in   the   street one   sees   also   a   chemist's shop

'Then, just beside there is a street where you see a market [...] In the street you also see a chemist's shop'.

(3) German speaker

1: *in der   mitte   des   bildes   ist ein platz   zu sehen*
    in the   centre   of the poster is a   square to see

2: *auf   diesem   platz   befinden sich fünf   bäume*
    on   this   square there are   five   trees

3: *auf   diesem   platz   befinden sich* **auch** *menschen*
    on   this   square there are   also   people.

'In the centre of the poster you see a square. In this square there are five trees. In this square there are also (some) people'.

In these examples, the relatum is maintained. In utterance 3 of example 2, the relatum is maintained with respect to utterance 2 (the expressions *où* and *dans la rue* refer to the same place, delimited by the same relatum). We observe the same phenomenon in German (example 3, utterance 3), where the relatum (*dieser platz*) is kept constant. When the relatum is maintained, the range of alternatives is indicated by a set of themes which may be located in relation to the maintained relatum. As such, the domain of application of the particle corresponds to the theme expressed by the NP. As far as the marking of scope is concerned, no cross-linguistic differences are noted. The four particles are placed in postverbal position. Their domain of application extends to the right and affects the NP referring to the theme. In this case, the domain of application can be defined as adjacent and rightward.

Unlike Italian and French, in Polish and German we find *noch* and *jeszcze* in the same information structure: the relatum is maintained and there is a change of theme. The following examples demonstrate such use. In example (4), *jeszcze* occurs immediately before its domain of application, i.e. the NP that refers to the theme-entity. The relatum maintained is *kamieniczka z wykuszem* ('building with oriel window').

(4) Polish speaker

1: *następnie obok tej   kamienicy   z   wykuszem   na*
    further   near this   building   with oriel window   at
    poziomie tej   kamienicy jest   jeszcze jedna kamieniczka.
    level   of this   building   is   still   one   building

2: *I   widać* **jeszcze** *fragment dalszego   domu*
    and we see still   fragment of more distant house
    za   tą   kamieniczką z   wykuszem
    behind   this   building   with oriel window

'Then, further beside this building with the oriel window ath the level

of this building there is another building. And we see a fragment of yet another house behind this building with the oriel window.'

Example (5) illustrates a similar structure for German: *noch* is placed before the NP corresponding to its domain of application. The relatum that is implicitly maintained in the second utterance is *auf dem platz* ('in the square').

(5) German speaker

1: *auf   dem   platz   steht   ein   mann mit   einer   zeitung*
   on   the   square   stands   a   man with   a   newspaper

2: *und   **noch**   **ein**   **älterer**   **mann**   **mit**   **bart***
   and   still/yet   a/one   elderly   man   with   moustache
   'In the square stands a man with a newspaper. And yet another elderly man with a moustache'.

In these contexts, it seems that *jeszcze* and *noch* are replaceable by *też* and *auch*, without involving any apparent change in the meaning of the sentence.

4.2. Maintenance of (type of) theme

The second pattern of information distribution can be schematised as follows:

Rel 1- Th a
Rel 1/2 - Th a'

This information pattern is characterised by the maintenance of the type of occurrence in the theme-entities domain (Tha, Tha'). The type of theme can be maintained either in relation to an entity which has already been mentioned as another theme to be located, or as an entity that serves as relatum, or as an entity belonging to the background. In other words, whenever an entity of the same type has already been mentioned in the near context[10], the second mention of an entity of that type is somehow marked as being, at the same time, not new with respect to the first occurrence, but not identical with it either. In the four languages concerned, this information structure involves the use of the particle *encore* ('still') and its equivalents, *noch* in German, *ancora* in Italian, and *jeszcze* in Polish. The examples below demonstrate the functioning of this particle. The items in italics indicate the subsequent occurrences of entities of the same type.

(6) French speaker

1: *il y a   **des   immeubles**   en   arrière-plan*
   there are some blocks of flats   in   the background

2: *un peu   plus   à droite   il y a   une autre   rue*
   a little   more   to the right there is another   street

3: *où   il y a   **ENCORE un   immeuble***
   where there is still/yet a   block of flats
   'There are some blocks of flats in the background. A little further to the right there is another street where there is yet another block of flats'.

(7) Italian speaker

1: *a   sinistra   di questa piazza   allora ci   sono   **degli stabilimenti***
   to   the left   of this   square   then there are   some buildings

2: *poi   ci   sono ANCORA **degli stabilimenti***
   then   there are   still   some buildings

3: *e   poi   ANCORA **degli stabilimenti***
   And then   still   some buildings
   'To the left of this square then there are some buildings. Then there are still some more buildings. And then still some more buildings'.

(8) Polish speaker

1: *w głębi   jeden **człowiek**   **jedzie**   **na**   **rowerze**.*
   in background   a   man   is riding at   bike

2: *tą   ulicą   jedzie   JESZCZE **jeden**   **rowerzysta**.*
   On this   street   is riding still   one   cyclist
   'In the background, a man is riding his bike. On this street yet another cyclist is riding'.

(9) German speaker

1: *wenn man   über   die   häuser   hinwegblickt*
   if   one   over   the   houses   deict. part away look
   *sieht   man   **berggipfel***
   sees   one   mountains

2: *hinter   dem   fachwerkhaus   kann   man   dann NOCH*
   Behind   the   half-timbered house   can   one   then   still/yet
   ***weitere   berggipfel** sehen*
   more   mountains   see
   'If you look over the houses you see (some) mountains. Behind the half-timbered house you can see still / yet more mountains'.

With regard to French and Italian, Watorek and Perdue (1999) show that *encore/ancora* actually affect the quantifier. The same way of functioning is similarly observed for *noch* in German and *jeszcze* in Polish. However, the use of the Polish and German particles in this pattern is linked to a specific marking which differs from their use in the first basic pattern (see 4.1.).

In Polish, where the article category does not exist, *jeszcze* operates within a NP consisting of a noun necessarily preceded by the numeral *jeden* ('one'). This makes the scope on the quantifier extremely clear. Similarly, in German, where the plural indefinite article is realised as a zero article, it is necessary to add either a numeral, or another distinctivity marker such as *weitere* ('several'), as in example (9). However, if the theme is expressed by a singular NP and no other distinctivity marker is used, the particle *noch* is necessarily stressed.

From this we can conclude the following. Whenever two entities of the same type occur relatively close to each other, *encore* and its equivalents can be used in order to establish an additive relation between these entities, provided that their non-identity is made clear enough. The expression of non-identity seems to be even more important than the expression of the additive link. It is therefore not surprising that we may also find genuine distinctivity markers like the adjective *autre* in French and its Italian equivalent *altro*, in this kind of information structure.

(10) French speaker

1: *à droite   de la   papeterie   Müller   il y a   un **bâtiment***
   on the right of the   stationery   Muller   there is   a   building
   de quatre étages.
   of four   floors
2: *à côté   du   marché   il y a   un **AUTRE   bâtiment**.*
   To side   of the market   there is   an other   building
   'On the right of the Müller stationery shop there is a building with four floors. Beside the market there is another building'.

(11) Italian speaker

1: *al centro   sulla strada [...]   si   vede   un **palazzo***
   at the centre   of the street [...]   refl.   one sees   a   building
   di   cinque   piani.
   of   five   floors

2: *dopodiché   alla   destra   di questa   strada*
   Then   on   the right of this   street
   *c'è   un   **ALTRO   palazzo**.*
   there is an   other   building
   'At the centre of the street [...] you see a building with five floors. Then on the right of this street there is another building'.

In other words, *autre* and *altro* can replace *encore/ancora*. The German adjective *anderes* and the Polish *inny*, which are apparent equivalents of *autre/altro*, cannot replace, in this context, the particles *noch* and *jeszcze*, respectively. In fact, unlike *autre/altro*, *anderes* and *inny* cannot distinguish between two entities of the same type. They express the concept implied in the adjective *different*.

Speakers of Polish and German use other distinctivity markers in the same context. In the Polish data, we have identified the adjective *drugi* ('second'), which takes on a function similar to the French *autre* when contrasting either a simple noun or a noun preceded by *jeden*. This is a cardinal numeral which, in Polish, (a language where the article category is absent) functions as an indefinite article. Thus, in Polish speakers' descriptions, we find *drugi* being used to signal the absence of identity of two entities belonging to the same type, as shown in example (12).

(12) Polish speaker

1: *po lewej   stronie   **chłopiec jedzie na   rowerze***
   to left   side   boy   ride at   bike
2: *a   jak   się   wchodzi na to   podwórko   to   na tej*
   And as   one   enters   at that   yard   that   at that
   *pierwszej alejce   **DRUGI   chłopiec   jedzie na   rowerze**.*
   first   alley   second   boy   ride at   bike
   'To the left a boy is riding his bike. And when entering this courtyard on this first path a second boy is riding (his) bike'.

In contrast, in this type of context, the German speakers opt, to an important extent, for the adverb *wieder* ('again'), typically analysed as a temporal adverb of repetition in the literature. Here it just signals a repetition of mention.

(13) German speaker

1: *spielende **kinder**   sind   noch zu sehen*
   playing   children   are   still   to see

2: *es   ist   daneben   so   eine   hinterhofatmospäre   zu sehen*
   there is   beside it such a   back yard ambiance   to see

3: *so   eine   wäschestange*
   such a   washing line

4: *ein   kleinen   garten*
   a   little   garden

5: *einen baum*
   a   tree

6: **WIEDER** <u>kinder   die   spielen</u>
   again   children who   play
   'You can still see some children playing. Beside it you can notice a back yard ambiance/feel: a washing line, a little garden, a tree. Yet again some children playing'.

If theme entities of the same type (Tha, Tha') are clearly linked to two different relata (Rel1, Rel2), however, a slightly different pattern of maintained versus changed information occurs. The need to explicitly express non-identity is then no longer given, since the fact that the speaker is dealing with two tokens of the same type of theme follows from the different location of these entities. In the native speaker data of the four languages in question, this information structure is encoded by the use of the particle *aussi* and its equivalents. The domain of application of the particles is, then, as usual the changed information, namely the information corresponding to the relatum, as indicated by the examples listed below:

(14) French speaker

1: *dans la   rue   on   voit   des   femmes des   marchandes.*
   in   the   street one   sees   some women, some tradeswomen

2: *un peu   plus loin **un homme** rentre   un tonneau*
   a   little further a   man   enters   a barrel
   une   barrique   dans la   cave.
   a   cask   into the cellar

3: *en <u>se   dirigeant   vers   le   feuillet   central</u>*
   in refl. directing   towards the   sheet   central
   *on   aperçoit **AUSSI**   **un**   **homme**.*
   one   sees   also   a   man
   'In the street you see some women, some tradeswomen. A little further a man is taking a barrel a cask into the cellar. Going towards the central sheet you can also see a man'.

(15) Polish speaker

1: *na pierwszym   piętrze   tego   domu   znajduje się*
   on first   floor   of this house   there is

2: *piękny   **balkon**.*
   nice   balcony

2: *na którym   ustawione   są   kwiaty.*
   on which   arranged   are   flowers

3: <u>*idąc   wyżej*</u>   *widać   **TEŻ**   otwarty   **balkon**.*
   going upwards you see also   open   balcony
   'On the first floor of this house there is a nice balcony on which some flowers are arranged. Going upwards you see also an open balcony'.

(16) German speaker

1: *es   sind keine menschen   auf   den   häusern*
   there are no   people   on   the   houses

2: *bis auf   dieser   terasse*
   except   this   terrace

3: *da   sind spielende   **kinder**   wieder   zu sehen*
   there are   playing   children again   to see

4: <u>*und   auf   der   linken   straßenseite*</u> *[...]*
   and   on   the   left   street side   [...]
   *sind   **AUCH**[11] wieder   **kinder***
   are   ALSO   again   children
   'There are no people in the buildings except on this terrace. There you can again see some children playing. And on the left-hand side of the street [...] are ALSO some children'.

(17) Italian speaker

1: *a quaesto   incrocio   ci   sono varie   **venditrici***
   at this   crossroads there are   various sellers
   di   frutta   e   verdura   [...]
   of   fruit   and   vegetables [...]

2: *a questo   incrocio   ci   sono anche cinque   alberi.*
   at this   crossroad   there are   also five   trees.

3: <u>*a fianco   di questi*</u>   <u>*alberi*</u> ci   *sta   **ANCHE**   un **venditore**.*
   beside   these   trees   ci stand also   a salesman
   'At this crossroads there are various fruit and vegetable sellers. [...] at this crossroad there are also five trees. Beside these trees a salesman is standing as well'.

As with the examples discussed before, *homme* and *homme*, *balkon* and *balkon*, *kinder* and *kinder*, *venditrici* and *venditore* are different entities belonging to the same type (thus, the notation Th a'). But here, the set of alternatives corresponds to a set of relata in relation to which themes of this type are located. In this information context, the domain of application is therefore not the quantifier, but the relatum expressed by the locative expression (for instance, a PP).

As far as the marking of scope is concerned, certain cross-linguistic differences with respect to the integration of additive particles in this pattern are noted. In the four languages concerned, the particle can have non-adjacent scope to the left, affecting the locative expression that refers to the relatum, whilst occupying a post-verbal position. A comparison with the structures discussed in section 4.1 shows that this position is ambiguous with respect to the position of the particles' domain of application. While in Italian and French the context itself must be sufficient to identify the actual domain of application, German *auch* in postverbal position must carry the main stress in order to mark that its domain of application is to the left and at a distance (cf. example 16). With regard to the postverbal placement of *też* with distant scope in Polish, the domain of application should, as a rule, be more stressed than the other constituents of the utterance (cf. Grochowski 1983, 1989). Although it is possible in all the languages concerned to place the particle beside the constituent it affects (adjacent scope)[12], only the native Polish speakers do so, as exemplified below:

(18) Polish speaker
1: *następnie ehm   jak   gdyby   wchodząc /   przechodząc dalej*
   then   as   if   entering /   going   further
   na /   od   tego   od   tej   kamienicy   na prawo +
   on /   from   this   from   this   building   at   right
   *nieco   w   głębi   znajduje się   **kamienica***
   little   in   back   is situated   building
2: *ale   **TEŻ**   en face   oglądającego   patrzącego   na to*
   but   also   opposite   facing   facing   at   that one
   znajduje się   kamienica   bardzo   stara.
   is situated   building   very   old
   'Then as if entering / going further on / from this building on the right a little in the background there is a building. But opposite, facing that one there is also a very old building'.

To summarise then what happens under the condition "maintenance of type of theme", we can compare the functioning of *encore* and its equivalents, and also the functioning of the adjectives *autre/altro/drugi/weitere*, etc. on the one hand, to the functioning of *aussi* and its equivalents with different relata on the other hand. With *encore*, the information status of the relatum is not taken into consideration since maintenance of the type of theme is the only necessary condition. In contrast, however, with *aussi*, the change in the domain of the relata as well as maintenance of the type of theme are both necessary conditions. As a consequence, there is also a difference in the distribution of the scope of *encore* et *aussi*, in spite of their equivalent interpretation in context. Example (19) clarifies this difference.

(19)
1:	*[dans la place] il y a [une femme]*	Rel 1 - Th a
	[in the square] there is [a woman]	
2a:	*[dans la rue] il y a [une **autre** femme]*	Rel 2 - Th a'
	[in the street] there is [another woman]	
2b:	*[dans la rue] il y a [**encore** une femme]*	Rel 2 - Th a'
	[in the street] there is [still a woman]	
2c:	*[dans la rue] il y a **aussi** [une femme]*	Rel 2 - Th a'
	[in the street] there is also [a woman]	
2d:	*???[dans la place] il y a **aussi** [une femme]*	Rel 1 - Th a'
	[in the square] there is also [a woman]	
2e:	*[dans la place] il y a **aussi** [une autre femme]*	Rel 1 - Th a'
	[in the square] there is also [another woman]	
2f:	*[dans la place] il y a **encore** [une femme]*	Rel 1 - Th a'
	[in the square] there is [another woman]	

The examples[13] in (19) show that *encore un X* ('still a X') implies *un autre X* ('another X'), since the two forms represent the expression referring to the theme-entity. *Encore* affects the quantifier (in example 2b, *une*), whereas *autre* belongs to the NP and specifies the theme. In some of the languages considered here, particles of the *encore* type express the non-identity between tokens of the same type of theme alone (e.g. French, Italian); in other languages some additional distinctivity marking is required (e.g. Polish, and, to some extent also German). With or without further marking, it is important to note that the *encore* type particles are compatible with both, changed information in the domain of the relatum (cf. 2b) and maintained information in the domain of the relatum (cf. 2f).

In contrast, as can be seen by comparing utterances 2c, 2d, and 2e, *aussi* is not compatible with maintained information in the domain of the relatum when the type of theme is maintained as well. *Aussi* affects the changed information, which in 2c corresponds to the relatum. Utterance 2d is not appropriate in the context of utterance 1 because there is no change of information: in 2d, the relatum and the type of theme are maintained. Utterance 2d does not contain the means to express the fact that the two themes of the same type (*femme* in 1 and *femme* in 2d) are not identical. The particle *aussi* by itself does not express this information. Thus, it is necessary to add the adjective *autre* as it occurs in 2e: in this case, the change in information corresponds to the theme and *aussi* affects the NP referring to this theme.

The information structures of the patterns discussed so far are all characterised by some information kept constant and other information which is changed. Indeed, we have noted that *aussi* and its equivalents, as well as *noch* and *jeszcze* (cf. pattern I in section 4.1), always affect the changing information of the utterance. In information structure II (section 4.2), the use of *encore* and its equivalents is linked to the maintenance of the type of referent. The particles then exert scope over the quantifier referring to the change in information. In this pattern of information distribution, the terms *man* and *man* may refer to the type maintained, whereas the article/numeral *a* affected by the particles corresponds to the changed token.

Thus, to summarise, additive scope particles make explicit the addition of a new entity (which can of course refer to already introduced information) to the whole of the entities belonging to a set of alternatives. If, in an utterance, some information is maintained and some other changed, the additive particles affect the changed information. Table 1 below provides a summary of the principal points concerning the functioning of additive particles in spatial descriptive discourse in German, Italian, French, and Polish.

Table 1. Possible sentence patterns and permutations of constituents

information structure	language	particles	scope marking
I Rel1 - Th a Rel 1 - Th b	Fr	*aussi* 0	LOC-V-*aussi*-NP-aussi 0-V-aussi-NP-aussi V-aussi-NP-LOC
	It	*anche* 0	LOC-V-*anche*-NP 0-V-*anche*-NP V-*anche*-NP-LOC
	Pol	*też* *jeszcze*	LOC-V-*też*-NP LOC-V-*jeszcze*-NP
	Ger	*auch* *noch*	LOC-V-*auch*-NP (LOC-V)-*noch*-NP
IIa Rel 1- Th a Rel 1,2 - Th a'	Fr	*autre* *encore*	LOC-V-*autre*-NP LOC-V-*encore*-quant-N
	It	*altro* *ancora*	LOC-V-*altro*-NP LOC-V-*ancora*-quant-N
	Pol	*drugi* *jeszcze*	LOC-V-*drugi*-NP LOC-V-*jeszcze*-quant-N
	Ger	*noch,* *weitere,* *wieder*	LOC-V-*noch*-quant-N LOC-V-*weitere*-NP LOC-V-*wieder*-NP
IIb Rel1-Tha Rel2-Tha'	Fr	*aussi*	LOC-V-*aussi*-NP
	It	*anche*	LOC-V-*anche*-NP
	Pol	*też*	*też*1-LOC-*też*2-V-*też*3-NP
	Ger	*áuch* *(wieder)*	LOC-V-*áuch(wieder)*-NP

4.3. Other uses

There is a limited number of occurrences of these particles (particularly of *encore* and its equivalents) in information structures which diverge from the ones presented so far.

First of all, in the spatial description, *encore* and its equivalents can also express a specific kind of maintenance of the relatum, comparable to maintenance of the type of theme discussed in 4.2. The locative expression preceded

by the particle then refers to a sub-space that is situated along the same trajectory as the one of the preceding utterance. Compare the following examples for French: *encore plus à gauche* ('still further to the left'), Italian: *ancora più a sinistra*, Polish: *jeszcze dalej po lewej*, German: *noch weiter links*. In the four languages, the particles affect the comparative, which allows the maintenance of the type of relatum to be expressed. Due to the fact that this type of use is not attested in the learner data we will not expand on this point any further.

A final instance of additive particles that do not function as discussed in the preceding sections, concerns both relatum and theme being changed from one utterance to another. In such a case, the utterance containing the particle has a meta discursive value, and is responding to a question which already contains the particle: *What is still there in X/what can I still see/what can I still say/add?*. In our opinion, these units are not used as scope particles but rather as enunciative particles (cf. Fernandez 1994).

This type of information structure in which a change is attested from one utterance to another in the two referential domains concerned (relatum and theme domains) defines the functioning of scalar particles in spatial descriptive discourse, as can be seen in the following example from French.

(20) French speaker

1: à gauche   il y a   un immeuble   jaune
   to the left there is a   building   yellow
2: à côté de   la   place   on   trouve   **MÊME**   un *cinéma*.
   beside   the   square   one   finds   even   a   cinema
   'To the left there is a yellow building. Beside the square we find even a cinema'.

In principle we are not concerned with scalar particles here, but since Italian has just one form, *anche*, which assumes either the additive value ('also/too/as well') or the scalar value ('even') we shall return to this point in the following section, where it helps to explain some particle uses by Italian learners of French.

5.   Additive particles in advanced learners' discourse: their integration in different information structures

The description of the functioning of additive scope particles in advanced learner varieties is based on data produced by Polish learners of German and

French, and by Italian learners of French. Thus, the following relationship between target languages (henceforth TLs) and source languages (henceforth SLs) is obtained:

TL   German   French
             | / |

SL   Polish   Italian

Thanks to this situation, it is possible, on the one hand, to identify the role of individual target and source languages in the use of additive particles by advanced learners, and, on the other hand, to identify features that are common to all learners, irrespective of the target or source language concerned.

The learners performed exactly the same descriptive task as the native speakers. The data produced by the Italian learners of French are part of a data set collected by Watorek 1996a, and analysed as part of an investigation of scope phenomena in Watorek and Perdue 1999[14]. The data of the Polish learners of French and German were collected under the same elicitation conditions.[15]

In the following sections (5.1 and 5.2), we shall describe how learners deal with additive particles in the two information structures described and discussed in sections 4.1 and 4.2 for native speakers. Our observations thereby concern the choice of the particle, the way the scope of the particle is marked, and - if necessary - the syntactic structure of the Ausgangsstrukturen in question. Our findings concerning the acquisition data are summarised in table 2 below.

Table 2. Possible sentence patterns and permutations of constituents

information structure	learners	particles	scope marking
I Rel1 - Th a Rel 1 - Th b	It > Fr	*aussi* *même*	LOC-V-*aussi*-<u>NP</u> V-*aussi*-<u>NP</u> *aussi*-<u>NP</u> LOC-V-*même*-<u>NP</u>
	Pol > Fr	*aussi* *encore*	LOC-V-*aussi*-<u>NP</u> V-*aussi*-<u>NP</u> *aussi*-<u>NP</u> V-*encore*-<u>NP</u> *encore*-<u>NP</u>
	Pol > Ger	*auch* *noch*	(LOC-V)-*auch*-<u>NP</u> LOC-V-<u>NP</u>-*auch* LOC-*auch*-V-<u>NP</u> NP-*auch*-V ... (1) LOC-V-*noch*-<u>NP</u>
IIa Rel 1- Th a Rel 1,2 - Th a'	It > Fr	*autre* *encore*	LOC-V-*autre*-NP LOC-V-*encore*-<u>quant</u>-N V-*encore*-<u>quant</u>-N
	Pol > Fr	*autre, 0*	LOC-V-*autre*-NP
	Pol > Ger	*noch* *wieder* *auch*	Pro-V-*noch*-<u>quant</u>-N-LOC *noch*-<u>quant</u>-N-V-LOC Adv-(V-LOC)-<u>wieder</u>-NP LOC-*wieder*-V-NP LOC-V-*auch*-<u>NP</u>
IIb Rel1-Th a Rel2-Th a'	It > Fr	*aussi* *autre* *même*	<u>LOC</u>-V-*aussi*-NP V-*aussi*-<u>LOC</u>-NP <u>LOC</u>-V-*autre*-NP <u>LOC</u>-V-*même*-NP
	Pol > Fr	*autre, 0*	LOC-V-*autre*-NP
	Pol > Ger	*auch*	LOC-V-*auch*-NP LOC-*auch*-V-NP Pro-V-*auch*-<u>LOC</u>-NP

5.1. Maintenance of relatum

Rel 1 - Th a Rel 1 - Th b

In principle, the advanced learners investigated did not manifest any problem with the realisation of this pattern of information distribution in neither of the target languages. There are, however, some small differences in the productions of the learners of French as compared to the native speakers of French. In the latter group of speakers, the particle *aussi* is the only one attested with maintenance of the relatum. Both groups of learners of French, that is to say, the Italian and Polish learners, principally use *aussi*, similar to the French native speakers. Nonetheless, in this context, we also find occurences of *encore* in the French data of speakers with L1 Polish, and ocurrences of *même* in the French data of speakers with L1 Italian. The use of *encore* by Polish learners of French is illustrated in example (21).

(21)   Polish learner of French
 1: *plus   loin   il y a   un monsieur qui   peint   quelque chose*
    further   on   there is   a   man   who   paints   something
 2: *et   ENCORE des enfants   qui   jouent.*
    and   still   children   that   play
    'A bit further there is a man who is painting something. And again some children who are playing'.

This particle choice can be explained in terms of linguistic transfer from the learners' source language, Polish. As shown in table 1, in Polish, this pattern of information distribution is marked either by *też* or by *jeszcze*. In fact, with maintenance of relatum, these particles are interchangeable. However, the data produced by the Polish learners of German cast a doubt over the interpretation of (21) as an example of linguistic transfer. Apart from one single occurrence, these learners only produce the particle *auch*, i.e. they do not try to use the equivalent to Polish *jeszcze* in their target language, in spite of the fact that German, like Polish, allows the use of both particles, *noch* and *auch*, in this information structure.

   With regard to the Italian learners of French, it must be remembered that the form *anche* in Italian conveys two different values, one being additive and the other being scalar. In French, these are translated with two separate particles, namely *aussi* and *même*. Although the Italian learners of French show a tendency which strongly suggests that they have acquired the new distinction,

there are, nonetheless, some occurrences of *même* corresponding to *aussi* in the first pattern of information distribution.

(22) Italian learners of French

1: *on   peut   voir   sur   les   toits   de ce   ville*
   one   can   see   on   the   roofs of this   town
   de   petits   chats.
   (some)   little   cats

2 : *sur   les   toits   de   ce   ville   il y a   MÊME*
   on   the   roofs of   this   town   there are   even
   des   petites   terrasses.
   (some)   little   terrasses.
   'We can see some little cats on the roofs of this town. There are even some little terasses on the roofs of this town'.

Utterance 2 is acceptable in French, since it is always possible to use a scalar particle in this information structure to express, not the simple addition of the specified entity to the set of alternatives, but rather an attribution to the entity specified in this set, namely its status of being an unexpected occurrence[16]. However, with regard to the Italian learners of French, one must consider the possibility of an inappropriate use on a lexical level. This is quite possible since, in the French descriptions produced by the Italian learners, *aussi* also occurs in information structures where both the relatum and theme change from one utterance to another. Thus, as exemplified below, *aussi* can be interpreted as having a scalar value as well (namely, that of *même*).

(23) Italian learner of French

1: *après   nous   avons   une   place (...).*
   Next/after   we   have   a   square (...)

2: *puis   il y a   un restaurant.*
   then   there is   a   restaurant

3: *où   il y a   AUSSI[17]   un jardin.*
   where there is   also   a   garden.
   'Afterwards we have a square [...]. Then there is a restaurant where there's also a garden'.

Where the scope marking of additive particles with maintenance of the relatum is concerned, no differences between the four languages are noted. The particles are placed in such a way that their domain of application, the NP, is immediately to their right. In most cases, the particles occupy a postverbal

position (they are situated between the finite verb and the NP they affect). Although the particle chosen is not always appropriate with respect to the information structure, all the learners place the particles attested in this information structure according to the syntactic constraints of their target languages. The particles' scope over the NP referring to the theme is marked by right adjacency.

An analysis of the native speaker texts has shown that the four languages investigated generally allow the deletion of the locative expression referring to this relatum (PP or adverb) when the relatum is maintained. Only German requires, in these cases, that the preverbal position occupied by the locative expression in the standard pattern be filled by a dummy pronoun or adverb. A comparison of the native speaker data with those of the learners demonstrates that the Italian and Polish learners of French exploit the possibility of deleting the locative expression to a larger extent than the native speakers. Moreover, in the case of the Polish learners of French, but unlike the Polish learners of German, the deletion of the locative expression is also noted when *encore* occurs in this pattern. The avoidance demonstrated by the Polish learners of German is probably a result of the influence of the more complex TL (German) structure. We shall return to this point in section 6.

5.2. Maintenance of (type of) theme

Rel 1 - Th aRel 1/2 - Th a'

As outlined in section 4.2, the information structure represented in this pattern is characterised by the maintenance of the type of occurrence in the domain of the theme-entities. In all the native languages concerned, this pattern is encoded by the particle *encore* and its equivalents. However, the particle can be replaced by other elements that function as distinctivity markers in this context (German speakers use *wieder*, whereas Italian, French, and Polish speakers use the adjectives *altro, autre,* and *drugi,* respectively).

The Italian learners of French use the particle *encore* and the adjective *autre* in a similar way to the native speakers of French. The same holds for the Polish learners of German who chose, similarly to native German speakers, the particles *noch* and *wieder*. The only deviant group is the Polish learners of French; they only produced the adjective *autre*, the scope particle *encore* never being attested in this context. Our observations concerning *encore* and scope marking therefore only refer to the data produced by the Italian learners of French and the Polish learners of German. In the data of the Polish learners

of German and the Italian learners of French, *noch* and *encore* affect the quantifier, which is in accordance with the TL rules (cf. examples in section 4.2).

An analysis that integrates utterance level and discourse level constraints, however, also shows that there are subtle differences in information structure between these advanced learners and the native speakers. *Encore* and its equivalent are never used by the native speakers when the information referring to the relatum is maintained. This is in spite of the fact that such a maintenance is possible, since the information status of the relatum has no influence on the distribution of the particle (it is only the maintenance of type of theme that matters).

In contrast, in the data of the Italian learners of French, *encore* is attested in contexts where the type of theme **and** the relatum are maintained. What changes is the occurrence of the theme expressed by the quantifier. In this case, *encore* affects the quantifier but the effect of the distribution of *encore* is not limited to the phrase (in this case NP), as in the native French and Italian data. Learners systematically omit the locative expression, which is reminiscent of the information structure discussed here. Such deletion is only possible since the relatum is kept constant. In the examples below, *encore* shares the discursive properties of *aussi* as produced by the same learners.

(24) Italian speaker of French
1: *nous avons   une   rue*
    we   have   a   street
2: *où   travaille   un monsieur*
   where   works   a   man
3: *et   des   dames   font   shopping [...]*
   and   (some)   women   do   shopping [...]
4: *et   nous avons   ENCORE des   dames   qui [...]*
   And   we   have   still   (some)   women   who [...]
'We have a street in which a man is working and women do their shopping [...] and we have some more women who [...]'.

The second difference concerns contexts in which maintenance of type of theme co-occurs with a change in the domain of the relata. In the native speaker data, only the particle *aussi* and its equivalents were attested in these cases. Besides the particle *aussi*, the Italian learners of French also use the particle *même* in this pattern. Such a tendency strengthens our interpretation of *même* as functioning in the same way as the additive *aussi*, in the productions of Italian learners of French, as exemplified in (25):

(25) Italian learner of French
1: *alors ce   ruisseau se trouve entre   l'atelier*
   So   this   stream   is   between   the workshop
   de   l'homme [...] qui   répare   les   bicyclettes
   of   the man [...] who   repairs   the   bikes
   et   [...]   une   construction   caractérisée   en bas
   and   [...]   a   construction   characterised   below
   par   le   café.
   by   the   cafe
2: *et   le   ruisseau est [...] soulevé   par   un pont* (...).
   and   the   stream   is   crossed   by   a   bridge (...)
3: *au-delà du   pont   on   voit   MÊME*
   beyond   the   bridge   one   sees   even
   des   autres   constructions.
   some   other   buildings
'So, this stream is between the workshop of the man (...) who is repairing the bikes and (...) a building characterised downstairs by a café. And the stream is crossed by a bridge. Beyond the bridge one can even see other constructions'.

In the data of the Polish learners of French, no occurrence of *aussi* is attested in this pattern. In fact there are several other possibilities for this kind of information structure that are attested in our data; there might simply be no marking at all, or other linguistic means are used, e.g. the adverbials like *autre* (other). On the contrary, the Polish learners of German produce *auch* in line with the TL rules.

The native speaker data show that this pattern where the relatum is changed, is quite complex in terms of cognitive processing: the particle occupies a postverbal position and affects a non-adjacent constituent situated to its left, namely the locative expression referring to the changed relatum. All the native speakers investigated placed the particle in that distant, postverbal position. Although the languages concerned allow the particle to be moved to a position adjacent to the element it affects (cf. note 14), this type of pattern occurs only in the Polish data (L1 Polish) (cf. section 4.2). When expressing this kind of information structure, the learners use a number of strategies in order to avoid distant scope. As a consequence, the tendency to conserve adjacent scope persists even in advanced acquisition (cf. section 2). The Italian learners of French, for instance, place the locative expression after the particle, as exemplified in 26. In other words, the particle does not change from a postverbal position, whereas the other constituents undergo various permutations.

Whilst an utterance such as 2 is acceptable in French, it is not attested in the French native speaker data[18].

(26) Italian learner of French

1: *[...] une place   où   il y a   **une   personne   ancienne**.*
   [...] a   square   where   there is   an   person   old

2: *il y a   **AUSSI**   près   le   deuxième   arbre   une   **personne**.*
   There is   also   near   the   second   tree   a   person

   'A square where there is an old person. There is also a person near the second tree'.

The Polish learners of German demonstrate a slight tendency to move the particle without changing the constituent order. Thus, the particle is placed between the locative expression and the verb (LOC-*auch*-V-NP), a position which is not allowed in German, since it contradicts the V2 rule. This may offer one explanation as to why this pattern is only rarely attested.

(27) Polish learner of German

1: *auf   diesem   platz   [...]   jemand   verkauft   gemüse*
   on   this   square   [...]   someone   sells   vegetables

2: *und   hinten   diese   platz   **AUCH**   läuft   eine   straße*
   and   behind   this   square   also   runs   by   a   street

   'In this square [...] someone is selling vegetables and behind this square also a street passes by'.

With regard to the Polish learners of French, as previously mentioned, the particle *aussi* is not attested in this kind of information structure. On the contrary, in contexts requiring the use of *aussi* with distant scope, these learners systematically produce the adjective *autre*.

(28) Polish learner of French

1: *au   rez-de-chaussée   de cette   maison   **un   homme***
   On   the ground floor   of this   house   a   man

   repare   son   vélo
   repairs   his   bike

2: *sur   le   bitume   on   voit   un   **AUTRE   monsieur***
   On   the pavement   one   sees   an   other   man

   qui   roule sur   son   vélo.
   who   rides on   his   bike

3: *devant   lui   se trouve un AUTRE   **monsieur***
   In front of   him   there is   an other   man

   qui   répare [...].
   who   repairs [...]

   'On the ground floor of this house a man is repairing his bike. On the pavement you see another man who is riding his bike . In fornt of him there is another man who is repairing [...]'.

5.3. Other uses of additive particles in learner discourse

In the learner data, apart from those occurrences of particles which can be interpreted in relation to the TL, we also find some occurrences which do not lend themselves as easily to such an interpretation. Some of these examples demonstrate the metadiscursive usage of particles referred to in relation to the native speaker; others reflect a more learner-specific usage of such particles.

The Italian learners of French

Example 29 expresses an information structure where the relatum is maintained and the theme changed (pattern I from section 5.1).

(29) Italian learner of French

1: *en bas   de la   feuille   c'est   un   marché*
   at the bottom   of the   sheet   it is   a   market

2: *il y a   des   gens   dans la   rue.*
   there are   (some)   people   in   the   street

3: *et   **AUSSI**   il y a   un ouvrier.*
   and   also   there is   a   worker

   'At the bottom of the sheet there is a market. There are some people in the street and there is also a worker'.

In utterance 3, the relatum is maintained in an implicit way. The theme *ouvrier* ('worker'), in 3, is located in the same place as the theme of 2, *people*. As such, the theme *worker* corresponds to the domain of application of *aussi*. It must be asked why the learner opts for this position, which is inappropriate in

French (when placed in a frontal position, *aussi* expresses the value of a discursive consequence, cf. English *so*), and which also involves distant scope. Occurrences of this type, even if found only in limited numbers, are not in line with the learners' tendency to avoid distant scope. However, they do conceal another phenomenon: for the learner, the information structure can suffice in and of itself to define the domain of application. In this case, the syntactic position plays a secondary role in marking scope (cf. Dimroth and Watorek 1999).

(30) Italian learner of French

1:	*dans*	*cette*	*place*	*au*	*centre*	*il y a*	*une*	*statue*
	in	this	square,	in the middle,		there is	a	statue

2:	*dans*	*cette*	*place*	*il y a*	*aussi*	*une*	*personne*
	in	this	square	there is	also	a	person

	qui	*vend*	*des*	*fleurs*
	who	sells	(some)	flowers

3:	*AUSSI*	*il y a*	*des*	*indications*
	also	there are	(some)	signs

'In this square, in the middle, there is a statue. In this square there is also a person who is selling some flowers and there are also some signs'.

A superficial analysis might lead us to interpret this example in the same way as example 29. However, in view of the picture depicted in the poster, it is impossible to hypothesise that the relatum in utterance 3 is maintained in the same way as presented by utterances 1 and 2, since the theme *signs* is not located in the relatum space (*square*). Therefore, the question is asked as to why a learner who places *aussi* after the verb in 2 (as required in the target language) should change its position in 3? In our opinion, the position of *aussi* in 3 - inappropriate in French - is of important significance in this learner's variety. In 3, a change in referential movement occurs, namely the speaker changes the "spatial episode". This, however, unlike that which occurs in the native speaker data, is not explicitly marked by a locative expression. *Aussi* marks this change of information: unlike in 2, the learner refers to the whole picture. Three provides an answer to a question such as "Qu'est-ce qu'il y a sur l'affiche aussi?" (What is there on the picture as well?). The value of *aussi* can be defined as metadiscursive. This value is never assigned either to *aussi* in French or to *anche* in Italian. It corresponds to the metadiscursive function of the particle *encore/ancora*, attested in the productions of the native French and Italian speakers. It is, therefore, not surprising to also find the particle

encore with a metadiscursive value in the descriptions produced by the Italian learners of French.

In conclusion, we note that these learners transfer the metadiscursive value of *encore* to *aussi* even though their SL does not allow the expression of such a value.

Polish learners of French

A similar phenomenon is attested in the Polish learners of French. They use *encore* with a metadiscursive value in accordance with the TL rules. Occurrences of *aussi* with a metadiscursive value were also found, as seen in example 31.

(31) Polish learner of French

1:	*je*	*vois*	*un*	*rivière*
	I	see	a	river

2:	*et*	*derrière*	*est*	*petite jardin*
	and	behind	is	little garden

3:	*avec*	*deux*	*petites*	*maisons*
	with	two	little	houses

4:	*pour*	*cacher*	*des*	*choses*	*pour*	*travail*	*dans*	*le*	*jardin*
	to	hide	some	things	for	work	in	the	garden

5:	*AUSSI*	*derrière*	*il y a*	*beaucoup*	*d' arbres*
	also	behind	there are	a lot	of trees

'I see a river and behind it is a little garden with two little houses to hide things for working in the garden. Also behind it there are a lot of trees'.

In 4, the relatum is maintained in relation to utterance 2. Utterance 5 can be interpreted as answering the question "qu'est-ce qu'il y a aussi derrière?" (What is there also behind it?). As in example 30, produced by an Italian learner of French, such a position for *aussi* as an additive particle is not attested in the TL data.

This use of *aussi* corresponds to the use of the Polish particle *też* (=aussi) attested in the data of the native speakers of Polish, as illustrated in 32.

(32) Polish native speaker

1:	*a*	*przed*	*kioskiem z*	*gazetami*	*widać*
	and	in front of	kiosk	with newspapers	one sees

	starszego mężczyznę	
	old	man

2: *stojącego   tuż   pod   jednym   z   drzewek*
    standing   nearby   under one   of little trees
3: **RÓWNIEŻ   przed   kioskiem   z   gazetami**
    also   in front of kiosk   with   newspapers
    nieco w lewo przed   drugim   drzewem
    little to left in front of the second/other tree
    które   otacza   rynek   widać   stojący   rower
    which   surround market   one sees standing bike
    'Also in front of the newspaper stand, slightly to the feft in frontof the
    second tree which surrounds the market place, you see a stationary
    bike'.

The transfer of the metadiscursive function of *encore* to *aussi* by the Polish
learners of French reflects the influence of their SL, an explanation that does
not apply to the Italian learners of French.

Polish learners of German

Similar to the two previous groups, these learners also tend to use the particles
noch and *auch* in a metadiscursive way, in spite of the fact that German only
permits *noch* in examples such as 33. However, it must be added that the meta-
discursive use of these two particles is more important in these learners than in
the other groups (48% out of the total number of occurrences of *noch* and
auch)[19].

(33) Polish learners of German
1: *wo   dieses   kleines   fluß   fließt   ist eine   brücke*
    where this   little   river   flows   is a   bridge
2: *und   hinten   wir   sehen   **AUCH**   kleine garten*
    and   behind   we   see   also   little garden
    'Where this little river flows, there is a bridge and behind it we also see
    small garden'.

The context in which *auch* and *noch* appear - which can be interpreted as
metadiscursive - is generally characterised by a change in the two referential
domains implied: that of the relata-entities and that of the theme-entities.
Thus, in example 33, the relatum in 1 corresponds to the place where the river
flows, whereas the theme located in relation to this relatum is the bridge. In 2,
the relatum is *hinten* ('in the background'), whereas the theme is *little garden*

(or possibly some little garden). Since none of the four entities has been men-
tioned before, there is no maintained information.

In the German native speaker data, we also find some occurrences (only of
noch) in contexts which do not obey the basic conditions surrounding the use
of additive particles, since they are characterised by the absence of maintained
information. However, this function is less frequent than in the Polish learners.

In the three groups of learners, we observe a transfer of the metadiscursive
function of *encore* and *noch* to *aussi* in French and *auch* in German. The meta-
discursive function of *encore* and its equivalents is attested by all the native
speakers. The metadiscursive value is not appropriate for *aussi* in French and
its equivalents in Italian and German. Nonetheless, in native speaker Polish,
też can express this value. Thus, for Polish learners of French and German, it
is possible to assume the influence of the SL in the TL data. However, the
presence of this same phenomenon in the data of the Italian learners of French
leads us to suppose the existence of a more general strategy common to the
learners.

6. The interaction between information structure and linguistic struc-ture in advanced second language acquisition

In this section, we shall discuss the interaction that occurs, at an advanced
level of acquisition, between the two factors mentioned in section 1, namely
the information structure which spurs acquisition, on the one hand, and, on the
other hand, the linguistic structure which shapes the acquisition path. Our
discussion shall relate such an interactional relationship to the phenomena at
work behind the functioning of scope additive particles in static spatial de-
scriptions, as produced by our advanced learners.

From the point of view of morpho-syntax, the advanced learner demon-
strates a high level of proficiency in relation to the TL by constructing his/her
utterances in accordance with the TL rules. In other words, (s)he knows the
linguistic structures of the TL. The acquisition task requires that (s)he applies
the linguistic TL structures mastered to the information structures to be ex-
pressed during a given task, in the case at hand, a spatial description. With
regard to the range of linguistic structures mastered by the advanced learner in
the TL, it appears that some are more operational and thus more easily "ap-
plied" than others during an on-line task (see Watorek 1996b) and conse-
quently, more directly available to the learner of this variety than other struc-
tures demanding more complex processing procedures. It should also be noted
that certain target languages impose greater constraints on the linguistic struc-

tures used to encode the same information structure across languages. For instance, we have observed that the particle *aussi* has distant and leftward scope in all the languages concerned when it applies to contrastive information in the domain of the relatum. Nonetheless, German imposes a specific type of marking, whereby *auch* must carry contrasting emphatic stress. Furthermore, although the four languages allow the particle to be moved to a position adjacent to its domain of application (cf. *supra*, note 14), native Polish speakers are the only ones to exploit this possibility. Thus, we can state that, with regard to the realisation of this pattern of information distribution, German is the most constraining language from the viewpoint of linguistic structure. In contrast, Polish is the least constraining.

As a result, in the advanced learner data presented in the previous sections, we have been able to identify two types of phenomena as characteristic of the interaction occurring between the information structure and the linguistic structure concerned, on the one hand, and the functioning of scope marking, on the other.

Firstly (i), if the TL (e.g. French) is less constraining than other target languages (e.g. German), learners develop strategies which allow a simplification of the information to be expressed by turning to available linguistic means that are more operational in their variety and easier to retrieve in the given context. These means are often less complex, i.e. they do not correspond to the strongly grammaticalised categories. The frequent use of the pattern V-SN without a locative expression, for example, allows the learner to avoid the use of specific linguistic means for the encoding of spatial intervals (e.g. local prepositions). We shall demonstrate this principle in TL French. Secondly (ii), in those cases where the TL is more constraining, like with German, learners tend to use the complex linguistic structures of the TL rather than relying on learner strategies which would lead to ungrammatical utterances. This principle shall be described in relation to TL German.

(i) Analysis of the French native speaker descriptions (but also those of the Italian and Polish speakers) shows that pattern I (where the relatum is maintained but the theme is changed) can be realised with *aussi* and its equivalents (*anche* and *też*). The domain of application corresponds to the NP referring to the theme and the scope is adjacent and rightward. Since the relatum is maintained, Italian, French, and Polish allow the deletion of the locative expression referring to this relatum. A comparison between the French native speaker data and those of the Italian and Polish learners of French suggests a tendency by the latter speakers to exploit the possibility of deleting the locative expression. Table 3 shows this tendency.

Table 3. Percentage use of the particle aussi and its equivalents following pattern I, in utterances of type (LOC-V)+NP where LOC and/or V can be omitted

	Native Speakers		Learners
Italian	25% (9/36)	Italian > French	75% (27/36)
French	38% (14/37)	Polish > French	64% (7/11)
Polish	50% (7/14)		
total	55% (48/87)		72% (34/47)

In order to illustrate this tendency and the consequences it entails for the interaction between the linguistic structure and the information structure, we shall consider two extracts concerning the description of the square represented in the poster. One has been produced by a native French speaker, and the other by an Italian learner of French. The description of the processes at work in these examples is equally valid for the productions of the Polish learners of French (cf. appendix for similar examples from the Polish native speaker data (c) and the Polish learners of French (d)).

(34) French speaker

1: *alors par rapport au   bâtiment   jaune   toblerone*
   so   in relation   to the building   yellow   Toblerone
   en allant vers   la   droite il y a   une   espèce
   going   towards   the   right there is   a   sort
   de petit square   avec cinq arbres.
   of little square   with five trees.

2: *au   milieu   un kiosque où   il y a   marqué tabac.*
   in the   middle   a kiosk   where   there is   marked Tabac

3: *avec une   vieille   dame   qui   tricote.*
   with an   old   woman   who   knits

4: *à   gauche   du   kiosque   trois   enfants   s'amusent*
   to left   of the   kiosk   three   children play
   sur   les   échasses.
   on   the   stilts

5: *et   devant   il y a   un monsieur   qui   donne*
   and   in front there is   a gentleman   who   gives
   à   manger   aux   pigeons.
   to eat   to the   pigeons
   'So, in relation to the yellow Toblerone building, going rightwards, there is a sort of little square with five trees. In the middle a kiosk where it is marked 'tabacconist's' with an old woman who is knitting.

To the left of the kiosk three children are messing around on the stilts and in front there is a gentleman who is feeding the pigeons'.

(35) Italian learner of French

1: *après il y a   une   place.*
   then   there is a   square
2: *où   il y a   beaucoup de gens.*
   where   there are a lot of   people
3: *il y a   des   voitures.*
   there are   (some)   cars
4: *il y a   AUSSI   des   arbres.*
   there are also   (some)   trees
5: *il y a   un   tabac.*
   there is   a   tobacconist's shop
6: *il y a   AUSSI   un homme   qui   lit   le   journal.*
   there is   also   a man   who   reads the   paper
   'Then there is a square where there are a lot of people. There are some cars, there are also some trees. There is a tabacconist's. There's also a man who is reading the paper'.

The learner's description (ex. 35) is completely acceptable in TL French. We also find this type of passage in the French native speaker data, albeit to a lesser extent. This particular learner makes use of the reduced syntactic structure *V + NP* in which the particle *aussi* occurs. In the extract from the French speaker, we observe a more subtle division of the relatum space *square*, (for instance, *in the middle*, in utterance 2 of example 34), as well as reference to a sub-space of this relatum (this reference is based on a relatum situated in the space of the relatum *square*, as in utterance 4 *to the left of the kiosk*). This is how the speaker encodes different types of spatial, topological and projective relations.

In the learner's extract, the relatum *square* is kept constant without any division. The non-native speaker avoids resorting to more explicit means (such as the PPs - locative expressions - which are more diverse in the French native speaker data) in order to refer to the relatum. Unlike the native speaker, the learner thus expresses only simple inclusive topological relations. The particle *aussi* applied to the different themes establishes an additive relation between these themes and thereby anaphorically refers back to their common relatum. The additive particle can thus be said to strengthen discourse cohesion in the absence of more sophisticated linguistic means.

The above examples demonstrate how the use of additive scope particles can contribute, in spatial descriptive discourse, to the processing of spatial information, and, for the advanced learner at least, function as compensatory means of expressing spatial concepts (cf., "prototypical processing" within a spatial description task, as described in Watorek 1996b). Watorek and Perdue (1999) confirm this tendency for French learners of Italian.

However, as already stated in 4, this is not the case for Polish learners of German. As a rule, the deletion of the locative expression in German is only possible under certain conditions relating to whether the verb-second-rule comes into operation. Otherwise, the utterance is not acceptable. A limited number of cases are attested in the German native speaker data, where the omitted locative expression co-occurs with either the deletion of the verb or the addition, in preverbal position, of a pronoun functioning as a subject, such as *es* (it). This subject, which lacks any real semantic meaning, preserves the V2 rule. Nonetheless, these processes are not frequent in TL German and are even rarer in the productions of the Polish learners of German, even though in the learners' SL, Polish, deletion of the relatum as such is allowed. The simple deletion of the locative expression in the TL, however, would lead learners to create ungrammatical utterances in the TL. The syntactic pattern of the German sentence leads them to encode pattern I with a non-reduced syntactic structure and to elaborate the means specific to the expression of spatial concepts; different types of grammaticalised locative expressions are attested.

Taken together, our comments show how the expression of an information structure in a TL such as German obliges the learner to use complex linguistic means, which are in fact the only ones available. On the other hand, however, when it is possible to do so in the TL (for instance, French), learners choose the least complex linguistic means, such as the reduced syntactic structure *V + NP*, which influences both the choice and the organisation of the information expressed. This syntactic pattern, however, obliges the speaker to choose a salient relatum that allows him to establish a topological relation of simple inclusion between this relatum and a large number of themes, and thus to keep this relatum constant.

(ii) We have already seen that, in relation to an information pattern where the relatum is changed and the type of theme is maintained, learners with L1 Polish react in two different ways, depending on whether they are learning French or German.

In the case of the Polish learners of French, we find neither examples of *aussi* with distant scope, nor examples of *encore* exerting scope on the quantifier. These learners' productions were examined in order to see how they encode, in coherent discourse, information structures where the relatum changes

while the type of occurrence is maintained in the theme entities domain. It was found that, whenever this type of maintenance is required, Polish learners of French produce the adjective *autre*. In example 19, we saw that the use of *aussi*, *encore*, and *autre* within this information pattern involves a lexical equivalence, in spite of the fact that the distribution of scope is different. The learners perceive this lexical equivalence and opt for this linguistic device, namely the adjective *autre*, which is, on a structural level, the simplest means available in the TL. Thus, this linguistic expedient (which is in accordance with the TL rules) becomes, for these learners, the most applicable. On the contrary, the Polish learners of German use the stressed particle *auch* with distant scope for the same pattern, and the particles *noch* and *wieder* when there is no changed information in the domain of the relatum. The two information structures are encoded as distinct structures by the appropriate linguistic means available in the TL. German does not offer an equivalent lexical means to the French *autre*[20]. Moreover, unlike the Italian learners of French (cf. *supra*, ex. 26), these learners cannot freely move either the particle or the utterance constituents in order to avoid distant scope. The few examples demonstrating the structure *LOC-auch-V-NP* are unacceptable in the TL because they contradict the V2 rule. Once again, the constraining linguistic structure of German obliges these learners to use structurally complex linguistic means.

7. Conclusion

As outlined in the introduction, on a general level, our study aims at contributing to the description of the structure of learner varieties (cf. Watorek 1998b). More precisely, however, it attempts to discover the rules behind the functioning of scope phenomena in advanced learner discourse by considering the interactional relationship between scope particles and the speech construction process.

Two factors, namely the information structure and the linguistic structure of the TL, could be shown to interact in advanced second language acquisition. Whilst advanced learners may master the morpho-syntactic patterns of the TL, they must also learn to use them in tandem with the information structures to be expressed during a given communicative task. If the TL allows a choice between different linguistic means in relation to a single information structure, they opt for the linguistic expedient involving the least structurally complex operations (for instance, the Polish learners of French prefer *autre* rather than *aussi* and *encore*). In contrast, if the TL imposes more constraints from the point of view of linguistic structure, as for instance in German (as our

study indicates, it is precisely the V2 rule which limits the other choices), the learners are prompted to use complex forms. If they do not use such forms, their utterances are unacceptable from the point of view of the TL grammar. Finally, it seems that the advanced learner prefers to work within the confines of the TL rules, rather than choose compensatory means not belonging to the TL grammar.

Notes

1. In Polish, three interchangable forms co-exist, namely *też/także/również*. We included all of them in our analysis but use the word *też* only as a label in the running text.
2. The elements of the relevant set of alternatives are not necessarily explicitly mentioned in the context.
3. This is often called 'focus', as for instance in König (1991).
4. For an overview of the diverse use of the term "scope" in the literature on scope particles, see Dimroth (1998a).
5. Cf. Becker and Dietrich 1996 (L1 Italian, L2 German); Benazzo and Giuliano 1998 (L1 Spanish, L2 French); Dimroth 1998a (L1 Polish, L2 German); Dimroth and Watorek 2000 (cross-sectional study on the acquisition of Dutch, German, and French by learners with various L1s); Giacomi et al. 1994 (L1 Moroccan Arabic, L2 French)
6. Throughout the paper, the domain of application is underlined.
7. Complete information on the collection of the French and Italian native speaker data can be found in Watorek 1996b and in Watorek and Perdue 1999. The German and Polish native speaker data were collected under the same conditions. Our findings are based on the total number of occurrences of additive particles attested and analyzed in the whole data set: German data - 76 occurrences, Italian data - 36 occurrences, French data - 37 occurrences, and Polish data - 33 occurrences.
8. Watorek 1996a shows that other types of referential movement occur in a static spatial description. However, for the purposes of the analysis of additive particles in this study, we are only concerned with the more pertinent types.
9. In the examples, the underlined form(s) correspond(s) to the particle's domain of application.
10. What 'near' signifies here is an open empirical question that can not be decided on the basis of the evidence from the stative spatial descriptions alone.
11. Capital letters indicate that the particle carries the pitch accent of the utterance.
12. In this pattern, *aussi* and its equivalents may theoretically occur in the following positions:

Italian	anche	*Loc*	anche	V	anche	NP
French		*Loc*	aussi	V	aussi	NP
Polish	też	*Loc*	też	V	też	NP
German	auch	*Loc*		V	AUCH	NP

13. This example reflects the comparison between *encore/ancora* and *aussi/anche* proposed by Watorek and Perdue 1999.

14. The details concerning these data and the additive particles attested in them can be found in Watorek and Perdue 1999: 321. Our comparison with the Polish learners of French and German is based on 36 occurrences of additive particles appearing in the productions of the Italian learners of French.

15. Our observations are based on the total number of additive particles attested: 76 occurrences in the data from the Polish learners of German, and 18 occurrences in the data from the Polish learners of French.

16. The basic meaning of scalar particles is defined as follows by Dimroth et Klein 1996:78 : "x, even though it is not the most plausible candidate in the set of alternatives".

17. The analysis of *aussi* as an additive particle can only be justified by the extralinguistic context. If several gardens were portrayed in the poster, the particle *aussi* could also refer to them, although they may not be explicitly mentioned in the description. In this case, pattern II would be necessary, whereby the scope of *aussi* would be on the locative expression referring to the relatum.

18. Nonetheless, the grammatical acceptability tests used in Watorek and Perdue 1999 show that native French and Italian speakers consider the position of *aussi* and *anche* between the locative expression and the verb to be acceptable.

19. It should be noted here that the overall number of occurrences of particles is higher in these learners' data than in the other two groups, in which the Polish learners of German follow the trend found in the native speaker data : Germans also use more particles than Italian, French and Polish. Although it is not clear if these factors influence the higher frequency of metalinguistic uses, it cannot be excluded either.

20. In the German native speaker data, we find just one occurrence of the adjective *weitere* which encodes pattern II. This potentially exploitable means in German is not used to encode this type of information structure.

References

Bartning, Inge
    1997   L'apprenant dit avancé et son acquisition d'une langue étrangère. Tour d'horizon et esquisse d'une caractérisation de la variété avancée.. *Acquisition et Interaction en Langue Etrangère* 9: 9-50.

Bayer, Josef
    1996   *Directionality and Logical Form: On the Scope of Focusing Particles and Wh-in-situ*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Becker, Angelika and Rainer Dietrich
    1996   The acquisition of scope in German. *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 104: 115-141.

Benazzo, Sandra and Patrizia Giuliano
    1998   Marqueurs de négation et particules de portée en français L2 : où les placer? *Acquisition et Interaction en Langue Etrangère* 11: 35-62.

Carroll, Mary et Christiane von Stutterheim
    1997   Relations entre grammaticalisation et conceptualisation et implications sur l'acquisition d'une langue étrangère. *Acquisition et Interaction en Langue Etrangère* 9: 83-116.

Dimroth, Christine
    1998a Indiquer la portée en allemand L2 : une étude longitudinale de l'acquisition des particules de portée. *Acquisition et Interaction en Langue Etrangère* 11: 11-34.

Dimroth, Christine
    1998b Fokuspartikeln und Informationsgliederung im Diskurs. Doctoral Dissertation. Freie Universität Berlin.

Dimroth, Christine
    1999   Facteurs informationnelles „moteur" et facteurs structurelles „faconnants": quelle est leur influence sur l'acquisition de la grammaire de la portée en allemand L2? Paper presented at the Workschop of GdR 0113, CNRS "Acquisition des Langues", Berder, May.

Dimroth, Christine and Wolfgang Klein
    1996   Fokuspartikeln in Lernervarietäten. Ein Analyserahmen und einige Beispiele. *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 104: 73-113.

Dimroth, Christine and Marzena Watorek
    1997   Le fonctionnement et l'acquisition des particules de portée additives. Communication à la 7ème Conférence EUROSLA 7, Barcelone.

Dimroth, Christine and Marzena Watorek
    1998   Focus, scope and the learner variety approch. Communication à la European Research Conferences, The structure of learner language: From pragmatics to syntax - organisational principles of second language acquisition, Maratea, Italy, September.

Dimroth, Christine and Marzena Watorek
    2000   The scope of additive particles in basic learner languages. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 22,3: 307-336.

Fernandez, M.M.J.
    1994   *Les particules énonciatives.* Paris, PUF.

Giacomi, Alain, Henriette Stoffel and Daniel Véronique
    1994   Acquisition de la portée de quelques particules en français. Paper presented at the EUROSLA 4 Conference, Aix-en-Provence.

Grochowski, Maciej
    1982   O strukturze semantycznej zdań z partykułą *chociaż*. *Polonica* 8: 73 - 83.

Grochowski, Maciej
    1983   O partyku l lach restryktywnych (rozważania semantyczne). *Acta Universitatis Nicolai Copernici*, 138: 27 - 51.

Grochowski, Maciej
  1989   Preliminaries for semantic description of Polish particles. In: Harald Weydt
          (ed.), *Sprechen mit Partikeln*, 77-84. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
Klein, Wolfgang
  1998   Assertion and Finiteness. In: Norbert Dittmar and Zvi Penner (eds.), *Issues
          in the Theory of Language Acquisition, 225-245.* Bern: Lang Verlag.
Klein, Woflgang and Clive Perdue
  1997   The Basic Variety (or : Couldn't natural languages be much simpler ?). *Sec-
          ond Language Research* 4: 301-348.
Klein, Wolfgang and Christiane von Stutterheim
  1991   Text structure and referential movement. *Sprache und Pragmatik* 22: 1-32.
König, Ekkehard
  1991   *The Meaning of Focus Particles: A Comparative Perspective.* London:
          Routledge.
Krifka, Manfred
  1999   Additive particles under stress. *Proceedings of SALT 8, Cornell, CLC Pub-
          lications*, 111-128.
Perdue, Clive
  1999   Structure informationnelle et structure linguistique. Paper presented at the
          Workschop of GdR 0113, CNRS "Acquisition des Langues", Berder,
          March.
Perdue, Clive and Marzena Watorek
  1998   Comment les sciences du langage peuvent-elles mettre à contribution les
          résultats d'études sur l'acquisition des langues?. *Actes du Deuxième Collo-
          que COFDELA*, 135-144. Presses Universitaires de Strasbourg.
Skibińska, Elzbieta
  1996   *IL y a* w polskiej praktyce przekładowej. *Romanica Wratislaviensia 42*: 47-
          78.
Watorek, Marzena and Clive Perdue
  1999   Additive particles and focus: observations from learner and native speaker
          production. *Linguistics* 37,2: 297-323.
Watorek, Marzena
  1996a   Conceptualisation et représentation linguistique de l'espace en français et
          en italien, LM et LE. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Université Paris 8.
Watorek, Marzena
  1996b   Le traitement prototypique: définition et implications. *Toegepaste Taal-
          wetenschap in Artikelen* 55: 187-200.
Watorek, Marzena
  1998a   L'expression de la localisation spatiale dans les productions des locuteurs
          natifs italophones et francophones, et d'apprenants italophones du français.
          Cahiers d'Acquisition et de Pathologie du Langage, 16/17: 17 - 50.
Watorek, Marzena
  1998b   Postface: la structure des lectes des apprenants. *Acquisition et Interaction
          en Langue Etrangère* 11: 219 - 244.

Appendix

Examples illustrating pattern I from the Polish and Italian native speaker data:

<u>Polish native speaker</u>
  1: *idąc dalej ulicą można zauważyć plac*
      going further down the street you can see a square
  2: *przy którym stoi rower.*
      near which is standing (a) bicycle
  3: *na tymże placu znajduje się **również** <u>ogromny dom</u>.*
      on this square can be found also (a) huge house

<u>Italian native speaker</u>
  1: *[...] ancora un'altra strada.*
      yet another street
  2: *su questa strada troviamo un tram*
      on this street we find a tram.
  3: *e all'angolo una macchina.*
      and at the corner a car.
  4: *in questa strada ci sono **anche** <u>delle persone</u>.*
      in this street there are also some people.

Examples illustrating a description of the square in the native Polish speaker discourse and in the Polish learner production in French.

<u>Polish Learner of French</u>
  1: *en plein centre on aperçoit une place*
      right in the middle you see a square
  2: *où on voit des arbres*
      where you see (some) trees
  3: *il y a **aussi** un tabac*
      there is also a tobacconist's shop
  4: *et on voit **aussi** une fontaine.*
      and you see also a fountain

<u>Polish native speaker</u>
  1: *w samym centrum rysunku mały ryneczek*
      in the centre of the picture a small square
  2: *zamknięty z jednej strony właśnie jednym z tych budynków*
      surrounded on one side only by one of these/those buildings
  3: *w uliczce w głębi dzieci grają w piłkę*
      in the small street the children are playing with a ball
  4: *na samym łuku tam gdzie już zaczynamy gubić z oczu drogę widać wyjeżdża-
      jący z zakrętu tramwaj.*

in the corner, there where the road goes out of sight (goes off the page) you see arriving on the corner (a) tram.

Reading from outside: Acquisitional patterns in a cross-linguistic approach

Davide Ricca

Looking at the different contributions to this volume from an outsider's point of view, i.e. not being at all a specialist in language acquisition, a point which can be immediately appreciated is the cross-linguistic perspective resulting from the whole volume (and in several cases from the individual contributions as well). This is clearly to expect, since most authors worked within projects which were conceived as cross-linguistic from the beginning; at the same time it stimulates the reader from outside to formulate questions about the generality of application of the results and the approaches found in the book.

Needless to say, the very rich material discussed in this volume is not easy to comment from an outsider's perspective. All contributions rely upon a vast amount of data and long-range investigations which they could report only partially, and refer to several previous investigations on the same textual material, with which I certainly cannot claim to have full familiarity. There is no way of overcoming this matter of fact, and it would perhaps also make little sense to try to do so within the limits of a short discussion paper. As a consequence, my comments could well turn out to be obvious and/or irrelevant, or already widely discussed elsewhere, for people more involved in the domain. At any rate, I will try to focus on the one hand on broad considerations of typological character, and on the other hand on the more specific, but still cross-linguistic issues that are more extensively discussed throughout the contributions, namely negation and scope.

1. Klein and Perdue's "Basic Variety" and typology

All contributions in the volume take, as a main theoretical framework, a model of spontaneous L2 acquisition centered on the "Basic variety" as proposed by Klein and Perdue in various publications (cf. Klein and Perdue 1992, 1997). This model is thus not a main topic of the book, but rather a common presupposition. Nevertheless, I find it useful to spend some lines commenting on the generally shared framework from a typologist's point of view[1].

Taking for granted that learner varieties are language systems in their own right and so have to be studied, with no need of referring their structure to the one of the target language, Klein and Perdue (1997: 305) stress the fact that