
“Automatically Arises the Question : K H W K H U c ^ \$ & R U S X V 6 W Postverbal Subjects in L2 English¹

Eleni Agathopoulou

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

agatho@enl.auth.gr

Abstract

3GD BTQQDMS RSTCX N#DQR @ MNUDK RDS NE C@S@ NM OG
English. We explored structures with unergative and unaccusative predicates in
SGD BNQOTR NE &QDDJ KD@QMDQR NE \$MFKHRG &1("+ \$ @M
BNQONQ@ 1DRTKSR RGNVDC SG@S ENQ ANSG SGD KD@QMD
conditioned by properties (a) of the lexicon-syntax interface, i.e. VS appears only with
unaccusatives and never with unergatives and (b) of the syntax-discourse interface,
i.e. postverbal S in unaccusatives expresses focus rather than topic. Moreover
word order is conditioned by properties of the syntax-phonology interface, in that
postverbal subjects tend to be phonologically heavy, albeit only in the learner data.
.TQ QDRTKSR @KLNRS QDOKHB@SD QDRTKSR HM OQDUHNTR I

1. Introduction

In generative second language (L2) research, subject (S) - verb (V) order has
been considered mainly as one of the properties of the NullS(subject) Parameter

D F 6GHS D +HBDQ@R 3RHLOKH 1NTRRNT
ENQLTK@SDC AX 1HYH HM SGD FDMDQ@K ROH
SGDNQX RTFFDRSDC SG@S NMD NE SGD CH#DQDQDMBDR ADSV
English and NullS languages like Italian is that the former generally disallow
ONRSUDQA@K 2 VGHKD SGD K@SSDQ @KKNV ANSG 25 @MC
mentioned L2 studies have shown that L1 speakers of NullS languages generally

¹ I would like to thank Maria Dimitrakopoulou for her insightful comments on an earlier version of this paper.



CHROQDEDQ 52 NQCDQ HM \$MFKHRG ,NQDNUDQ BNQOTR A@RD
 9NAK .RGHS@ +NY@MN ,DMCHJNDSWD@ G@
 that L1 speakers of NullS languages such as Italian, Spanish, Arabic and Japanese
 use VS order in English almost exclusively with certain intransitive verbs like the
 ones in the following examples.

- (1) In the town lived a small Indian _ + 2 O @ MHRG 1 TSGDQENQC
 _ SG Two Indians lived S + (S @ KH @ M .RGHS @

3GDRD UDQAR ADKNMF SN @ BK@RR NE HMSQ@MRHSHUD UDQAR
 from the other class of intransitive verbs, called 'unergative', on the basis of
 semantics and syntax. In unergatives, e.g. *walk, laugh*, S has the semantic role Agent
 @ MC NQHFM @ SDR HM SGD 2 ODBH¥DQ, He, S has the HM TM @ BBTR @ S
 semantic role Theme (or Patient) and originates inside the VP in a V-complement
 ONRSHNM /DQKLTSSDQ +DUHM 1 @ OO @ ONQS 'NU @ U

- (3) [TP [DP Mary][VP t [V [V walked]]]]
 (4) [TP [DP Mary][VP [V [V arrived] [t,]]]]

In English the default SV order that surfaces both with unaccusative and
 TMDQF @ SHUD UDQAR HR CTD SN SG @ S 2 G @ R SN LNUD SN SGD
 SN R @ SHREX SGD K @ MFT @ FD RODBH¥B QDPHQDLDMSE ENQ @ M
 and to get case. In null S languages the overt postverbal S originates within the
 VP and gets case through an Agree relation with a null expletive pronoun (*pro*)
 @ RRTLDC SN NBBTOX SGD RODBH¥DQ NE 3/ RDD D F 1NTRR
 and references therein; also see Section 2).

Importantly, VS order appears in English only with some unaccusatives
 which express existence or appearance, e.g. *come, appear, exist, arrive* and *live*.
 (M SGHR B @ RD SGD RODBH¥DQ NE 3/ HR ¥K @ DC AX DKDLDMSR
 (2), a Prepositional Phrase (PP) in locative inversion constructions (5), an adverb
 or another XP (see Biber et al. 1999: 912-3; also see section 4.2 for examples).
 Moreover, word order with unaccusatives is conditioned by discourse factors, such
 as the principle of 'end focus' (e.g. Leech & Short 2007, Chapter 7). Postverbal
 subjects tend to be *focus*, that is, they express new information (5) while preverbal
 subjects tend to be *topic*, that is, they refer to old information (6).

- (5) In it, lives a family.
 (6) This family lives in our neighbourhood.

Another factor conditioning speakers' choice of word order has been accounted
 for by the 'end weight' principle (Quirk & Greenbaum 1977: 410-411), which
 states that that structurally complex constituents tend to appear at the end of

an utterance for processing reasons. This principle can be illustrated by what is called 'heavy Noun Phrase (NP) shift'. As shown by the following examples (from Hawkins 2004: 26), shifting a complex direct object NP before its simple complement PP (7) renders the sentence easier to parse, rather than keeping this complex object in its original position (8).

- (7) Mary VP[gave PP[to Bill] NP[the book she had been searching for since last Christmas]]
 (8) Mary VP[gave NP[the book she had been searching for since last Christmas] PP[to Bill]]

Note that structural complexity implies phonological heaviness: complex constituents generally consist of more syllables or words than simple constituents and, therefore, the former can be considered 'heavy' and the latter 'light'. (See Section 4.1 about the criteria for such a distinction.)

3GD VDMC VDHFGSW OQHMBHOKD L@X @ DBS VNQC NQCDQ @ subjects tend to be more complex than preverbal ones (see Lozano & Mendikoetxea 2010 and references therein), as can be shown by (9) and (10) respectively.

- (9) Then there arrived a man who knew of a proven remedy for the illness of the prince.
 (10) A tall man arrived before noon.

Given the above, SV/VS order in English pertains to three linguistic interfaces: the lexicon-syntax interface (unergative vs unaccusative verbs), the syntax-discourse interface (focus vs. topic S) and the syntax-phonology interface (heavy vs light S). The aim of the present paper is to investigate whether these three interface conditions restrict word order in the Greek-English interlanguage by partially replicating Lozano and Mendikoetxea's (2008, 2010) research, detailed in the latter mentioned study.

2. Subject Position in Greek

Greek is a NullS language allowing VS order both with unaccusative and unergative verbs regardless of whether S is topic or focus as illustrated by (11) and (12).

- (11) Eftasan J @ O I H (to S) \$ DIR \$ (to S) R UNACCUSATIVE
 arrived some students / the students
 (12) Edho dulevun J @ O I H (to S) \$ DIR \$ (to S) R 4 - \$ 1 & 3 (5 \$
 here work some students / the students

However, VS seems to be favoured with unaccusatives and SV with unergatives.

This can be shown by comparing word order between and within the two verb

BK@RRDR HM@MRVDQR SN@VHCD ENBTR PTDRSHNM RTBG@14, cf. Lozano 2006: 373-74), where # indicates a pragmatically less felicitous word order (for references see, e.g. Lozano*ibid.*).

- 3 H DIHMD
What happened?
 B: (i) #Ena pedhi irthe (#SV) UNACCUSATIVE
 A boy arrived.
 (ii) Irthe ena pedhi (VS)
 3 H DIHMD
What happened?
 B: (i) Ena pedhi eklapse (SV) 4-\$1 & 3(5\$)
 A boy shouted.
 (ii) #Eklapse ena pedhi (#VS)

3GD TMC DQKX HMF CH DQDMBD HM RTAIDBS ONRHSNM ADSV unergatives in Greek is illustrated by (15) and (16) respectively.

- (15) [TP_{pro} [VP [V'] [V irthe]] [ena pedhi]]]
 (16) [TP [DP Ena pedhi] [V eklapse]_k] [VP [V' t_i] [V t_k]]]

(M SGD TM@BBTR@SHUD 52 RSQTBSTQD SGD RODBH DQ NE occupied by an expletive null *pro* that licenses the postverbal S and shares with it agreement and case features. This is the structure assumed also for NullS K@MFT@FDR RTBG@R 2O@MRHG@MC (S@KH@M 1HYH ,NQDNUDQ VNQC NQCDQ HM TM@BBTR@SHUDR L@X AD @ DBS that a topic S increases the probability for SV order, as shown by the comparison between (17) and (18) (from Tsimpli et al. 2004: 88).

- (17) Htes vradhi to moro ekleje²
 Last night the baby was crying.
 (18) Htes vradhi ekleje ena moro
 Last night a baby was crying.

2 3RHLOKH DS @K RS@SD SG@S YHMCD MHS D #/R Q@QDKX L SGDM AD @RRTLDC SG@S SGD SNOHB ENBTR CHRSHMBSHNM QNTFGKX HMC D MHS D CHRSHMBSHNM .SGDQR GNV DUDQ RTOONQS SG@S 52 NQ CD MHS DMDRR QDRSQHBSHNM R TMKHJD SGDHQ BNTMSDQO@QSR HM \$ (Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1999: 96).

Last, research has shown that the principle of 'end weight' applies in Greek too since phonologically heavy S usually occurs postverbally (Laskaratou 1989; 2 O X Q N O N T K N R 1 D U X S G H @ C N T

3. Interfaces of the Unergative/unaccusative Split in L2 English

Given the scarcity of research in the area described by the section title, this Q D U H D V B N M B D Q M R N M K X S G Q D D R S T C H D R N E V G H B G S G D and Mendikoetxea (hereafter L&M) in 2008 and 2010. L&M's studies resemble D @ B G N S G D Q V H S G Q D R O D B S S N @ H L R L D S G N C @ M C Q D R T Q D F @ Q C H M F S G D E N K K N V H M F S G @ S B N M B D Q M T R G D Q D . M \$ M F K H R G C @ S @ E Q N L K D @ Q M D Q R N E S V N C H # D Q D M S + R @ M data from native English speakers too. For purposes of brevity the following description will not distinguish between the two studies, unless necessary.

As mentioned in Section 1, L&M investigated whether SV/VS order in L2 English is restricted by all three linguistic interfaces that restrict L1 English SV/VS order: the lexicon-syntax interface (unergative vs. unaccusative verbs), the syntax-discourse interface (focus vs. topic S) and the syntax-phonology interface (heavy vs. light S). To this aim they examined written corpora produced by Spanish and Italian university students with upper intermediate to advanced English language O Q N # B H D M B X 3 G D R D B N Q O N Q @ B N M R H R S D C N E @ Q F T L D M S to the guidelines provided by the International Corpus of Learner English (ICLE, Granger et al. 2002; also see <http://www.uclouvain.be/en-317607.htm>) and totalled more than 200,000 words each. L&M also analysed comparable native \$ M F K H R G B N Q O N Q @ 1 D R T K S R R G N V D C S G @ S K D @ Q M D Q R K only with unaccusatives and mainly so when S was focus (new information) and G D @ U X K N M F ' N V D U D Q K D @ Q M D Q R O Q N C T B D C 5 2 V H S G T M than the natives and made syntactic errors. In both learner corpora these errors were due mostly to insertion of *it* expletive S (19) (38 occurrences in the Spanish corpus and 27 occurrences in the Italian corpus (L&M 2008: 107)), while the rest of the errors consisted in wrongful omission of *there* expletive (20).

- (19) *In the name of religion it had occurred many important events.
(S H R C H S @ B E K T S O L G @ S S) with such a feeling against it.

Based on their results, L&M concluded that for both natives and learners SV/VS order in English is constrained by properties of all three of the discussed H M S D Q E @ B D R A T S S G @ S K D @ Q M D Q R C H # D Q D C E Q N L S G D M F Q @ L L @ S H B @ K H S X N E S G D N T S O T S R N E R X M S @ B S H B D M B N

(M @CCHSHNM SGD SVN KD@QMDQ FQNTOR CH#DQDC EQNL 2O@MHRG OQNCTBDC 52 RHFH#B@MSKX LNQD SG@M SGD (S respectively). L&M attributed these results to two factors. First, the verbs *exist* and *appear* were more frequent in the Spanish than in the Italian BNQOTR @MC SGDQD V@R @ YRHFH#B@MS BNQQDK@SHNM BNMBNQC@MBDR @MC SGD EQDPTDMBX NE HMUDQRHNM HM 2DBNMC SGD 2O@MHRG KD@QMDQRW \$MFKHRG OQN#BHD lower than that of the Italian's, as attested also by the higher percentage of ungrammatical VS sentences in the Spanish than in the Italian corpus (65 and 53.3 respectively) ³ 3GD @ANUD RDDL SN N#DQ @ OK@TRHAKD D ENQ SGD CH#DQDMBDR ADSVDDM SGD SVN KD@QMDQ FQNTOR QDIDBSDC AX + , HAHC YFHU DM SGD RHLHK@QHSHDR ADSV with respect to word order. However, other research has revealed that there @QD EDVDQ QDRSQHBSHNMR NM 52 . NQCDQ HM 2O@MHRG S 3RHLOKH @MC QDEDQDMBDR SGDQD 3GDQDENQD one of the reasons for the discrepancies observed between the two learner corpora in L&M's study.

Danavassi (2009) investigated the lexicon-syntax and the syntax-phonology interface in unergatives and unaccusatives via a grammaticality judgement task administered to adult Greek learners of English and native English controls. The learners were divided into an intermediate and an advanced group according SN SGDHQ ODQENQL@MBD @S SGD .WENQC 0THBJ /K@BDLDMS showed that the learners resembled the English natives in that (a) they accepted VS more with unaccusatives than with unergatives and (b) they accepted VS more with unaccusatives when S was heavy rather than light. However, while the VHSGHM FQNTO CH#DQDMBD HM SGD @BBDOS@MBD ADSVDDM C 2 V@R RHFH#B@MS ENQ SGD M@SHUDR @MC SGD @CU@MBD RHFH#B@MS O ENQ SGD HMSDQLDCH@SD FQNTO CCHS CH#DQDMBD HM SGD @BBDOS@MBD ADSVDDM 52 VHSG TM@BB V@R RHFH#B@MS ENQ SGD M@SHUDR @MC SGD HMSDQLDCH advanced ones.

Danavassi attempted to account for her results based on Sorace (2000) who G@R BK@RRH#DC HMSQ@MRHSHUD UDQAR HMSN @ BNMSHMT to core unergatives, depending on whether they take 'be' or 'have' as their auxiliaries (in e.g. Italian). Thus verbs denoting change of location (e.g. arrive, come) are categorized as core unaccusatives while verbs meaning existence

3 For the basis of this assumption see reference in (L&M 2008: 115). However, as pointed NTS AX SGD QDRD@QBGDQR SGD RODBH#B KD@QMDQ BNQONQ@ CN LD@RTQD NE OQN#BHDMBX ENQ D@BG O@QSHBHO@MSZ + , HAHC

or state (e.g. exist, lie) are considered peripheral unaccusatives. Verbs related with controlled process (e.g. work, speak) are core unergatives and those implying uncontrolled process (e.g. sleep, cry) are peripheral unergatives. Danavassi suggested that her results may be due to that the acceptability judgement task included mostly 'core' unergatives but both 'core' and 'peripheral' unaccusatives and that the advanced learners were more able than the intermediate learners to "treat the most peripheral unaccusative the case, one wonders why the same factor, i.e. coreness or peripherality of the native speakers' use of word order. Also, Danavassi speculated that lack in the intermediate group is due to that these learners had not had enough assumed to be a universal one (see references in Callies 2009: 17) and has been shown to apply in Greek too (see Section 2). Therefore Danavassi's speculation seems unwarranted. Perhaps, it could be the case that syntax (i.e. word order) overrides universal phonetic principles at less advanced stages of learning L2.

4. The Present Study

VS word order with intransitive verbs is conditioned by the three interfaces mentioned above. In view of results from previous L2 research discussed in section 3, we hypothesized that the Greek learners will resemble the English natives in that they will use

- ^ VS with unaccusatives but not with unergatives (Hypothesis 1, regarding the lexicon-syntax interface)
- ^ VS with unaccusatives when S is focus rather than topic (Hypothesis 2, regarding the syntax-discourse interface) and
- ^ VS with unaccusatives when S is heavy rather than light (Hypothesis 3, regarding the syntax-phonology interface).

4.1. Data

The non-native English data used here came from The Greek Corpus of Learner

English data used here came from The Greek Corpus of Learner English (GCL) database. The data consists of 1000 sentences from the GCL database. The data is divided into two groups: 500 sentences from the GCL database and 500 sentences from the GCL database.

the Department of English Language and Literature of the Aristotle University
 HM & QDDBD 3GD DRR@X @TSGNQR NE & 1 ("+\$
 assumed to be advanced learners of English by virtue of the fact that they were
 third or fourth year students of the above mentioned Department. The native
 English data were from essays written by American students in two corpora,
 +."-\$22 +NTU@HM "NQOTR NE -@SHUD \$MFKHRG \$RR@XR @M
 \$MFKHRG +@MFT@FD "NQONQ@ ENQ 1DRD@QBG @MC OOKHB
 175,047 words altogether (for more details on the native English data see e.g.
 Hatzitheodorou & Mattheoudakis 2011). The target verbs were sixteen in total,
 eight unaccusative and eight unergatives (Table X). These verbs are shown in
 Table 1.

Table 1.
 Target verbs in the present study.

Unaccusative verbs		Unergative verbs	
Core	Peripheral	Core	Peripheral
appear, come, emerge	arise, begin, exist, lie, occur	laugh, run, speak, talk, walk, work	cry, breathe

4RHMFGD BNMBNQC@MBD RNESV@QD ,NMN"NMB /QN !@
 VD HCDMSH¥DC SGD S@QFDS UDQAR @MC SGDM VD B@QQHD
 examine the contexts in which these verbs appeared. This search included
 also possible misspellings (e.g. 'occured', 'ocur(s)' 'ocurs') or wrong verb forms
 (e.g. 'arouse' or 'aroused'). We counted out all cases of the target verbs that
 were transitive (e.g. *They began the revolution*), passive (e.g. *There have been
 appeared many problems* MNM ¥M Ht S Dse Dta Fto exist room for hope),
 ENKKNVDC AX @ MNM ¥M Ht S Dse Dta Fto exist room for hope),
 BK@TRDR 6D @KRN DWBKT CDC @KK NE SGD S@QFDS UDQAR
 highly frequent expressions than may have been memorized by the learners
 as chunks (e.g. *the time has come / dreams come true / come home / come in
 contact / come to a standstill* ESDQ SGHR ¥KSDQHMF NE SGD S@QFDS
 native English corpora yielded 163 unergatives and 289 unaccusatives and
 the learner corpus 139 unergatives and 372 unaccusatives.

To identify the information status of S used with the target verbs, that is,
 whether S was topic or focus, we read through each of the essays in which
 these verbs appeared. Last, we considered as phonologically light subjects
 that consisted of a pronoun, a noun, a determiner+noun or a determiner +
 adjective + noun. The rest or the subjects that had a larger number of words
 and more complex structure were categorized as phonologically heavy (cf.
 Lozano & Mendikoetkea 2010: 485). For examples, see the next section.

1 D R T K S R

First we present results from SV vs. VS order in the unergative and unaccusative predicates dealt with here. As Table 2 reveals, in both the native speaker (NS)

and the non-native speaker (NNS) corpora, (a) the predominant order was SV

@ M C A 5 2 @ O O D @ Q D C N M K X V H S G T M @ B B T R @ S H U D R R V N Q C N Q C D Q A D S V D D M S G D S V N U D Q A S X O D R V @ R R S @ S H

the NS and the NNS data ($\chi^2(1,451) = 6.953, p < .01$ and $\chi^2(1,510) = 13,610, p < .01$ respectively). However, the NNS employed VS with unaccusatives more than

twice as much as the NS (9.13% and 4.15%, respectively), which proved to be

@ R S @ S H R S H B @ K K X R H F M H ¥ B @ M S G D @ S G D @ M I P Q N T O C H ¥ D Q D

Table 2.

VS at the lexicon-syntax interface

	SV		VS	
	<i>Unergatives</i>	<i>Unaccusatives</i>	<i>Unergatives</i>	<i>Unaccusatives</i>
NS	100% (163/163)	95.85% (277/289)	0% (0/163)	4.15% (12/289)
NNS	100% (139/139)	90.87% (338/372)	0% (0/139)	9.13% (34/372)

1 D F @ Q C H M F S X O D R N E 5 2 R S Q T B S T Q D H M S G D -- 2 C @ S @ S

was that of *There*-insertion (21). The next more common structures included AdvP-insertion (23) or another XP-insertion (24), while locative inversion occurred only once (26). \emptyset -insertion structure (27) occurred twice and the ungrammatical It-insertion once (28) In the NS data, on the other hand, there was only one instance of *There*-insertion (22) with the rest of the structures including XP-insertion (25)⁴.

There-insertion⁵

(21) *There* @ O O D @ Q D C S G D ¥ Q R S E D L H M H R S R V G N _
_ *there* D W H R S D C R N B H @ K H K K R _ - 2

AdvP-insertion

_ @ M C A 5 2 @ O O D @ Q D C N M K X V H S G T M @ B B T R @ S H U D R R V N Q C N Q C D Q A D S V D D M S G D S V N U D Q A S X O D R V @ R R S @ S H

⁴ All examples are presented as they appeared in the corpora.

⁵ Examples (21) and (22) illustrate the distinction between 'presentational' *there* and 'existential' *there* (respectively). We return to this distinction in Section 5.

XP-insertion

_due to this alienation B @ LD SN SGD RTQE @ BD @ KK _
 (25) *With the rioting* B @ LD @ RTQFD NE @ QS-~~H~~BKDR _

Locative inversion

_in certain channels @ OOD @ Q E @ RGHNM- ~~C~~DRHFMDQR _

∅-insertion

(27) In contrast to the advantages that a university student has, ∅ comes unemployment. NNS

It-insertion

(28) *It* BNTKC DWHRS RDQHNTROQNAK~~D~~LR HM DUDQXC @ X KHED _

With respect to errors in VS structures, perhaps the only clearly ungrammatical construction was the one with It -insertion (28). To verify this, we asked six highly educated native English speakers to judge the acceptability of all sentences with VS in our data. However, these judgements did not enlighten us much. Besides the sentence with It -insertion, which was unanimously disliked, regarding the rest of the sentences there was great variation between the judges and their QDL @ QJR QDUD @ KDC SG @ S ITCFDLDMRS VDQD @ ~~∅~~DBSDC L @ H
 Many of these remarks also showed indecision and were of the kind "I don't like HS LTBG ATS ODNOKD R @ X HSZ NQ Y , @ X AD HS VNTKC AD . * HM
 it be pointed out that, probably for the same reasons, the judges also disliked some VS structures produced by the NS.

Table 3 presents token numbers as well as percentage frequencies of VS for each of the target unaccusative verbs in the corpora. The shadowed rows include data about the core unaccusatives.

Table 3.
 Token numbers and frequency of VS with unaccusatives

	NS	NNS
appear	0% (0/23)	3.63% (2/55)
arise	0% (0/13)	9.09% (1/11)
begin	0% (0/69)	2.98% (2/67)
come	8.03% (11/137)	9.56% (11/115)
emerge	-	16.6% (2/12)
exist	4.34% (1/23)	14.6% (13/89)
lie	0% (0/8)	18.75% (3/16)
occur	0% (0/43)	-

In all corpora *come* was the most frequent unaccusative. In the NS data, (a) VS appeared almost exclusively with *come* – except once with *exist* too, (b) the next most frequent unaccusatives were *begin*, *occur*, *appear* and *exist* in this order and (c) there were no tokens of *emerge*. In the NNS data, (a) VS appeared with all of the target verbs used but mostly with *lie*, (b) the next most frequent unaccusatives after *come* were *exist*, *begin* and *appear* in this order and (c) there were no tokens of *emerge*.

Table 4 displays SV vs. VS order with unaccusatives at the syntax-discourse interface. In all corpora, preverbal S is slightly more often topic rather than focus but it is predominantly focus when in postverbal position (100% and 93.75% for the NS and the NNS respectively). The statistical analysis showed that for both

Table 4.
SV vs. VS with unaccusatives at the syntax-discourse interface

	SV		VS	
	S Focus	S Topic	S Focus	S Topic
English Natives	44.76% (124/277)	55.24% (153/277)	100% (12/12)	0% (0/12)
Greeks	46.6% (144/338)	57.4% (194/338)	93.75% (32/34)	6.25% (2/34)

Here are some examples from VS structures.

S topic

(29) So it is true that there *lies the battle of the two sexes* _ - - 2

S focus

(30) With a good football team comes *free publicity*. NS

(31) There exists *some prejudice in the workplace* _ - - 2

Table 5 provides results regarding the syntax-phonology interface. As shown, in SV order light S was about twice as much as heavy S in both the NS and the NNS

the same degree (50% in each case) while the NNS used predominantly heavy S (82.35%). The statistical analysis showed that the heaviness of the subject G @ C L @ H M D @ D B S R (E N Q = S G, 82, p <.01) and that in the VS B N M C H S H N M S G D A D S V D D M F Q N T O C H @ D Q D (M B D) R V D Q D R S @ S H R = 4,815, p <.05).

Table 5.
SV vs. VS with unaccusatives at the syntax-phonology interface

	SV		VS	
	S Light	6 + H D Y \	S Light	6 + H D Y \
English Natives	65.34% (181/277)	34.66% (96/277)	50% (6/12)	50% (6/12)
Greeks	66.86%/ (226/338)	33.14% (112/338)	16,65% (6/34)	82,35% (28/34)

Here are some examples from VS structures with light and heavy S.

S light

KNMF VHSG SGD SQ @ \$ B B N M F D R S B N M B N L D R
(33) There may exist *different religions* A T S _ - - 2

S heavy

(34) Along with respected sources come *well thought studies that have been completed.* NS
_ S G D Q D D L D O E S D C to sustain and perpetuate the fear of the individual. NNS

5. Discussion

First, results showed that in all corpora (a) VS occurred only with unaccusatives and never with unergatives and that (b) in VS with unaccusatives, S was O Q D C N L H M @ M S K X E N B T R M N S S N O H B 3 G D R D Q D R T K S R R D D hypotheses, namely that in both the NS and the NNS data SV/VS order would be conditioned by properties of the lexicon-syntax interface (Hypothesis 1), and by O Q N O D Q S H D R N E S G D R X M S @ W C H R B N T Q R D H M S D Q E @ B D ' X O N D @ D B S N E O G N M N K N F H B @ K G D @ U H M D R R N E 2 N M V N Q C N Q C D Q corpora, where in VS structures S was predominantly heavy. Thus, our Hypothesis 3, according to which SV/VS order would also be conditioned by properties of S G D R X M S @ W O G N M N K N F X H M S D Q E @ B D H R M N S E T K K X B N M % Q L Q D R T K S R O Q N A @ A K X H M C H B @ S D S G @ S S G D Y D M C V D H F G S Z O Q

phonological properties of S, may not override (a) the clear bias for SV order in English, hence the NS results and (b) the clear bias for VS in Greek, which in the NS data disagree with those in the studies by Lozano and Mendikoetxea

methodology, given that Danavassi had employed grammaticality judgements and that L&M's corpus search included 31 types of unaccusatives while our

solid base than ours, let us mention that when we further searched our NS corpora for all of the 31 types of unaccusatives dealt with in L&M, we did not discover any more VS constructions than those we had already found with the 8 types of unaccusatives in our initial search. Thus, all in all, whether word order in intransitives is conditioned by properties of the syntax-phonology interface seems an issue worthy of further investigation.

L2 English corpora with essays from L1 speakers of NullS languages (Italian and Spanish). However, a comparison between our data and L&M's revealed that VS with English unaccusatives was used the most by the Spanish (52/640=8.1%) and the least by the Italians (15/574=2.6%), while the Greeks were somewhere

<.01) as well as between the Italian and the Greek data (χ^2 (1,945) 19.576, p <.01) but not between the Spanish and the Greek data.

with L&M's assumption that the Italians were advanced while the Spanish were intermediate learners of English and also assume that the Greek learners' (contra Hatzitheodorou and Mattheoudakis 2009, 2011). Nevertheless, this is merely a speculation since there was no independent measure for the learners' constructions prevailed in the Spanish and the Italian corpora (see Section

Cardinaletti (1997) has proposed that languages have two subject positions, one hosted by a higher Agreement Phrase and the other by a lower one (Agr1P and Agr2P respectively), depending on the referentiality of the subject. In NullS languages like Italian, referential subjects, such as full DPs and overt strong pronouns (e.g. lui 'he') as well as overt weak subject pronouns (e.g. egli 'he')

Download Date | 10/21/19 4:19 AM

tu pronoun used in subjunctives. In non-NullS languages like English only strong (RTAIDBSR NBBTQ HM SGD GHFGDRS RODBH¥DQ ONRHSHNM VGD expletive) *it* NBBTQR @S SGD 2ODBH¥DQ NE FQ / !@RDC NM " @QCHM may assume that the error of It-insertion in the Italian corpus is due to that Italian has more cases of phonological realisation of a pronoun in subject position than Greek (which has no weak subject pronouns) and it is this option that is used in the English-Italian interlanguage, in the form of the expletive *it*.

1DF@QCHMF SGD R@LD DQQNQ HM SGD 2O@MHRG BNQOTR N 2O@MHRG KD@QMDQR G@C @M HMSDQLDCH@SD KDUDK NE \$F + , N¤DQ SGD ENKKNVHMF DWOK@M@SHNM 6GHKD KD exposed to many instances of existential *there* D F 3GDQD @QD SVN BG@HQR _ I early on, presentational *there* D F 3GDQD @OOD@QDC_ HR MNS @R EQD input. As a result, learners learn 'there + be' constructions as formulaic units, which may be attested by that learners also overuse such constructions (see references therein). Consequently these learners may not have yet acquired the use of *there* as an independent expletive and thus use it interchangeably with the expletive *it* 6D @FQDD VHSG + , HAHC SG@S SGD K@SSDQ @E YGHFGKX RODBTk@SHUDZ 'NVDUDQ @R VD @QD XDS TM@AKD hypothesis, we may concede that the wider occurrence of It-insertion errors in the Spanish than in the Greek corpus could be due to that the Spanish learners had had less exposure to English than the Greek learners (but see relevant remark above in this section).

6. Conclusion

.TQ QDRTKSR HMCHB@SD SG@S @CTKS + @BPTRHSHNM B@MM that in English VS is rare, even with unaccusatives. Thus an input-based approach to L2 could not explain the strong discrimination between unaccusatives and unergatives in English attested in data from L1 speakers of a NullS language KHJD &QDDJ VGDQD 52 HR SGD TML@QJDC NOSHNM 1@SGDQ @ SN AD FTHCDC AX JMNVKDCFD BNMBDQM HMF CH¤DQD MBDR HM properties between the two classes of intransitive predicates. Given that these CH¤DQD MBDR @QD MNS FDMDQ@KKX HMUNKUDC HM + HMRSQ nature of L2 knowledge discussed here is more plausible driven by Universal &Q@LL@Q OQHMBHOKDR .TQ RSTCX K@QFDKX QDOKHB@SDC S + , N¤DQHMF ETQSGDQ RTOONQS SN + , WR @RRTLOSHNM SG@ conditioned not only by properties of the syntax-lexicon interface, but also of the syntax-discourse and the syntax-phonology interface. With respect to the SVN K@SSDQ HMSDQE@BDR GNVDUDQ HS HR ONRRHAKD SG@S D¤DBS @MC MNS HMDQ JMNVKDCFD NE TMHUDQR@K OQHMBHO phonology.

1 D E D Q D M B D R

Alexiadou, A. and E. Anagnostopoulou. 1999. EPP without Spec,IP. In D. Adger, S. Pintzuk, B. Plunkette and G. Tsoulas (eds.), *Specifiers: Minimalist Approaches*.

. WENQC . WENQC 4MHUDQRHSX /QDRR

Barlow, M. 2003. *Concordancing and Corpus Analysis Using MP2.2*. Houston: Athelstan.

Biber, D., S. Johansson, G. Leech, S. Conrad and E. Finnegan. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Pearson.

Callies, M. 2009. *Information Highlighting in Advanced Learner English*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Cardinaletti, A. 1997. Subjects and Clause Structure. In L. Haegeman (ed.), *The New Comparative Syntax*. London, N.Y.: Longman.

Chomsky, N. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris, 33-63.

Danavassi, T. 2009. *The Status of the Unaccusative-Unergative Split in the Greek-English Interlanguage*. Unpublished MA thesis, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki,

& QDDBD 1DSQHDUDC)TKX EQNL GSSO HMUDMHN KH
¥KDR C @ M @ U @ RH OCE UDQRHNM

Granger, S., E. Dagneaux and F. Meunier. 2002. *The International Corpus of Learner English*. Louvain-la-Neuve: Presses Universitaires de Louvain.

Hatzitheodorou, A.-M. and M. Mattheoudakis. 2009. "It is more than true that
SDKDUHRHNM QDOQNCTBDR KHEDZ 3GD DαDBS NE & QDDJ Q
learners' academic writing in English. In A. Tsagalidis (ed.), *Selected Papers from the 18th International Symposium on Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*. Thessaloniki, Greece, 167-176.

Hatzitheodorou, A.-M. and M. Mattheoudakis. 2011. The impact of culture on the native speaker corpora. In A. Frankenberg-Garcia, L. Flowerdew and G. Aston (eds), *New Trends in Corpora and Language Learning*. Continuum Press, 229-246.

Hawkins, J.A. 2004. *Efficiency and Complexity in Grammars*. University Press.

Laskaratou, C. 1989. *A Functional Approach to Constituent Order with Particular Reference to Modern Greek. Implications for Language Learning and Language Teaching*. Athens: Parousia Monograph Series 5.

Leech, G. and M. Short. 2007. *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose, 2nd Edition*. Harlow: Pearson/Longman.

+DUHM ! @MC , 1@OO@ONQS 'NU@U
Semantics Interface. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

+HBDQ@R) , .M RNLDOQNODQSHDR NE SGD OQN CQNO
missing subjects in non-native Spanish. In S.M. Gass and J. Schachter (eds), *Linguistic Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lozano, C. 2006. The development of the syntax-discourse interface: Greek learners of Spanish. In V. Torrens and L. Escobar (eds) *The Acquisition of Syntax in Romance Languages*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins, 371-399.

Lozano, C. and A. Mendikoetxea. 2008. Postverbal subjects at the interfaces in Spanish and Italian learners of L2 English: a corpus analysis. In G. Gilquin, S. Papp and M.B. Díez-Bedmar (eds) *Linking up contrastive and corpus learner research*.
LRSDQC@L 1NCNOH

Lozano, C. and A. Mendikoetxea. 2010. Interface conditions on postverbal subjects: a corpus study of L2 English. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 13(4): 475-497.

.RGHS@ ' 6G@S HRG@OODMDC L@X MNS AD VG@S @OOD
corpus study of 'passive' unaccusatives in L2 English. *Second Language Research* 16(4): 293-324.

.RGHS@ ' (RSGDQD @MKS RHMNFS SSGDQDD VGTNK DWOKDSHU
and second language data. *Second Language Research* 20(2): 95-130.

Perlmutter, D.M. 1978. Impersonal passives and the Unaccusative Hypothesis. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 4: 157-189.

OTHQJ 1 @ MC 2 & Q D D W A S Y T Grammar of English. London: Longman.

1 HYYH #ssues in Italian Syntax. Dordrecht: Foris.

1 HYYH + -TKK NAIDBSR HM (S @ K H S C M q @ Y MC SGD SGD 17(3): 501-58.

1 NTRRNT @ MC (, 3RHLOKH Journal of Linguistics 52. @ F @ HM 42(2): 317-354.

1 TSGDQENQC 6 (MSDQK @ MFT @ F.Dn @ M C a s Q @ FL @ SHB and J. Schachter (eds) *Linguistic Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 163-182.

Sorace, A. 2000. Gradients in auxiliary selection with intransitive verbs. *Language* 76(4): 859-890.

2 OXQNONTKNR 5 @ MC 1 DUHSGH @ CNT 2 TAIDBS B processing. In C.D. Halpert, J. Hartman and D. Hill (eds) *Proceedings of the 2007 Workshop in Greek Syntax and Semantics at MIT*. Cambridge, MA, 293-309.

3 RHLOKH (, @ MC 1 NTRRNT / @ Q @ LDSDQ QDRDSSH M London Working Papers in Linguistics 3: 148-69.

Tsimplı I.-M., A. Sorace, C. Heycock and F. Filiaci. 2004. First language attrition and syntactic subjects: a study of Greek and Italian near-native speakers of English. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 8: 257-277.

UCLES (2001). *Quick placement test* / @ ODQ @ MC ODMBHK UDQRHNM . W E University Press.

White, L. 1985. The pro-drop parameter in adult second language acquisition. *Language Learning* 35: 47-62.

White, L. 1986. Implications of parametric variation for adult second language acquisition: An investigation of the pro-drop parameter. In V. Cook (ed.), *Experimental approaches to second language acquisition* . WENQC / D Q F @ LNM Press, 55-72.

Zobl, H. 1989. Canonical typological structures and ergativity in English L2 acquisition. In S.M. Gass and J. Schachter (eds), *Linguistic Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 203-221.