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Introduction

This third volume of the Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics covers a diversity of topics which range from general Linguistic Theory to child language. To provide coherency, we have, therefore, grouped the papers into a number of major sections as reflected in the Table of Contents. What follows is our attempt to capture the major point of each paper, organized according to those sections.

The first paper is Ken Miner's "On the Notion of Restricted Linguistic Theory: Toward Error Free Data in Linguistics." Miner maintains that linguistic theories must be more firmly grounded on secure data bases. He contends that the attempt to construct theories based on limited data from a few languages leads to serious errors. Rather than seeking to construct general theories, Miner advocates that we should limit ourselves to "restricted theories" which may be confined to one language family.

The Phonetics-Phonology section contains four very different papers. Geoff Gathercole's research demonstrates that instrumental evidence can play a crucial role in phonological analysis. His instrumental research on strong and weak stops in Kansas Pottawatomie clearly indicates that the underlying contrast between these series is preserved even in final positions, not neutralized as heretofore supposed. In addition, the paper provides evidence for the interaction between stress and the syntactic structure of Pottawatomie.

Nemet Yavas' paper on the implications of borrowing for Turkish phonology provides a modus operandi for the analysis of languages which have lexicons replete with loan words. In the case of Turkish, previous analyses, though recognizing the importance of loan words, have neglected to incorporate them into their descriptions. Drawing evidence from borrowing, Yavas proposes that current treatments of vowel and consonant harmony should be drastically revised: consonant harmony plays the pivotal role in determining the vowel choice, not conversely. By so analyzing Turkish, he is able to account for a wide range of data unaccounted for by treatments which assume the primacy of vowel harmony.

Robert Rankin's study of Ojibwaw as a dying language supports the evidence from child language acquisition, aphasial, and comparative linguistics that there exists a universal hierarchy of sound-type complexity. As Ojibwaw functioned less and less as a native language, principled changes occurred in its phonology: the types of series lost and the order in which they were lost were determined by their relative complexity, with the most marked being lost first.

Code-mixing is the topic of Maria Dobozy's paper. Taking a letter written by a bilingual American-Hungarian as her data, Dobozy describes the phonological rules that are operating in such a code-mixing, with special emphasis on vowel harmony. She demonstrates that vowel harmony is an important process in the system and plays a central role in the rendition of English words by such speakers.

The first paper in the Syntax-Semantics section is Gerald Denning's, "Meaning and Placement of Spanish Adjectives." Denning attempts to clarify the problems of the differences in the meaning and treatment
of restrictive adjectives in three dialects of Spanish. He argues that a strict generative semantic approach will not handle the data and suggests an analysis within the framework of pragmatics.

Virginia Gathercole provides a cross-linguistic study of the use of the deictic verbs "here" and "there" in eleven languages by extending Talmay's (1975) model for verbs of motion to include a presuppositional component. Gathercole divides the contexts in which "come" and "go" are used into (a) immediate deixis and (b) extended deixis. Her goal is to characterize the use of deictic verbs of motion in the eleven languages studied by a limited number of assertional and presuppositional components and thus suggest a possible universal framework for such verbs.

Whereas Balasing and Gathercole focus on language-related issues, Juan Abogattas takes a more general, philosophical approach in his discussion of speech acts. He claims that previous speech act analyses used the sentence as the basic unit. Abogattas believes, however, that we must go beyond the sentence: "social reality" dictates that we categorize sets of sentences into speech acts, which he calls "complex acts."

Kurt Bodean's paper, "Problems in Machine Translation Between Thai and English using Montague Grammar," brings us to a specific language-oriented concern: how to mechanically translate sentences, in particular those containing restrictive relative clauses, from one language to the other. He enumerates the problems related to such a task and proposes a solution involving meaning postulates and context within a Montague framework.

Historical and Comparative Linguistics is represented by Karen Booker's "On the Origin of Number Marking in Muskogean." Booker reconstructs two proto-Muskogean number markers, one dualizer and one pluralizer which were first used with intransitive verbs of location and then generalized to locative transitives. Later these markers spread to transitive non-locatives. Booker maintains that the highly complex suppletive verb system of Muskogean arose when these markers lost their original meaning.

Three papers, Esther (Etli) Dromi's analysis of the acquisition of locative prepositions by Hebrew children, Gregory Simpson's study of children's categorization processes, and John Moore's review of relative clause research, constitute the Child Language Acquisition section of the working papers. Dromi's study, which is one of the few published works in the acquisition of Hebrew, compares the order of acquisition of Hebrew locatives with Brown's (1973) order for English and also with Stolin's (1973) universals. Among her findings, Hebrew at "come" is acquired later than English on. Her findings for Hebrew locatives are particularly interesting in that they allow a comparison of the acquisition of prefixes with that of full prepositions. Her conclusions point to the pivotal role of morphological complexity in the order of acquisition of locatives in Hebrew.

Gregory Simpson's major concern has to do with the process by which children form conceptual categories. He argues, on the basis of experimental data, that overextensions should not be taken as evidence
for category formation. His data suggest a distinction between concept formation and object naming, a distinction not made in previous studies. "Function," what objects can do or what can be done to them, determines how that object is conceptualized, but an object's perceptual properties may determine the name given to it. Therefore, "the child may know that two objects don't really belong together, but gives them the same name until he has more evidence."

The acquisition of relative clauses has been a topic of great interest among psycholinguists. John More presents a valuable critical review of the recent literature with special emphasis on the debate between Dan Slobin (1971), Amy Sheldon (1974), Michael Smith (1975), Tavakolian (1977), and de Villiers et al. (1976). The Minimal Distance Principle, the Noun-Verb-Noun Strategy, the Parallel Function Hypothesis, and Slobin's operating principles are compared, along with the formulations of de Villiers and Tavakolian.

Five major topic areas are represented in this third volume of the Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics. Each paper in its own way is a contribution to linguistic scholarship: some provide evidence in new areas of inquiry, others bring new evidence to bear on old questions, while still others suggest future courses of research.
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In 1971 Dan Slobin proposed that center embedded relative clauses should be more difficult for children than right-branching relative clauses, and in support of this proposal he points to data from many studies of child language which show that children do, in fact, have more trouble repeating center embedded than right-branching relative clauses. This difference is explained by the increase in mental load placed on the child by the interruption of the main clause. On the other hand, Sheldon (1974) set up a hierarchy of sentence types from easiest to most difficult based on the relationship holding between the coreferential NP and the other sentence elements in both of the clauses in which it appears. According to Sheldon's parallel function hypothesis, a sentence will be easier if the coreferential NP is either the subject or object of both clauses.

These studies represent two polarities among a variety of possible approaches and combinations of approaches in the study of relative clause acquisition. Slobin's study places emphasis on the acquisition process and on learning strategies, while studies like Sheldon's emphasize more the linguistic structures involved. Specifically, in Sheldon's study, the grammatical function of the relativized NP is taken as a more likely indicator of the relative ease with which a child will master a given sentence than the strategies with which he presumably processes surface strings.

Most, but not all studies of relative clause acquisition report on experiments in which children were instructed to act out the content of sentences containing relative clauses by manipulating toy animals. By observing children's responses over the course of many experiments, investigators have been able to systematize children's responses into a number code of response types. Only specified response types will be appropriate for a particular sentence type. The classification of a response type is determined by the order in which nouns and verbs appear in a sentence:

(1) The horse kicked the cow that pushed the pig.
(2) (1) (2) (3)

Sentence types are coded according to the grammatical function of the coreferential NP's in the clauses in which they appear, as follows:
(2) OS \textit{(object in both clauses)}
SS \textit{(subject in both clauses)}
SO \textit{(subject in main clause; object in relative clause)}
OS \textit{(object in main clause; subject in relative clause)}

In sentence (1) the verbs are numbered above and the nouns below. The code for a response type will contain two numerals followed by a comma followed by two more numerals, as follows:

(3) 12, 23

The response type coded in (3) is to be read so that the numerals to the left of the comma give the subject-object relation for the first verb in the sentence, and the numerals to the right of the comma give the subject-object relations for the second verb in the sentence. So, a child who gives (3) as a response to (1) has the horse \( H \), kick \( O \), the cow and the cow push the pig. His response is an accurate reflection of the grammatical and semantic relations expressed in (1) and it is therefore correct: a 12, 23 response is appropriate to an OS sentence like (1).

Slobin's (1971) proposal that right-branching relative clauses should be easier for a child than center embedded clauses follows from his UNIVERSAL 04: "The greater the separation between related parts of a sentence, the greater the tendency that the sentence will not be processed." This "universal" formalizes the child's tendency to interpret contiguous elements within a string to be more closely related grammatically and semantically than non-contiguous elements.

The NNV strategy, proposed by Bever (1970), predicts that any sequence of noun-verb-noun corresponding to subject-verb-object will be easier to process than the same sequence when it corresponds to other grammatical relations. Under an analysis that incorporates this strategy, one would expect that sentences (5) and (6) are easier than (4) and (7) on the basis of the fact that in (5) and (6) the main clause is not interrupted and can therefore be processed by the NNV strategy. Also, under this kind of analysis, sentence (7) should be especially difficult since it contains a NV sequence with little indication of the roles of the associated nouns.

(4) The cow who pushed the horse licked the goat. (S,S)
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
N & V & N & V \\
& & & \\
\end{array}
\]

(5) The cow pushed the horse who licked the goat. (O,S)
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
N & V & N & V \\
& & & \\
\end{array}
\]

(6) The cow pushed the horse who the goat licked. (O,O)
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
N & V & N & V \\
& & & \\
\end{array}
\]

(7) The cow who the goat kicked hit the dog. (S,O)
\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
N & N & V & V \\
& & & \\
\end{array}
\]
Further, the minimal distance principle (MDP), first developed in Rosenbaum (1965, 1967), and introduced into the study of child language by C. Chomsky (1969) in her studies of complement verbs, has come to figure prominently in the study of relative clause acquisition. According to the MDP, as originally developed, the subject of a complement verb (e.g., the one preceding it) is the NP most immediately preceding it. However, the relevance of the MDP to relative clause acquisition has been questioned by at least one investigator (see below and de Villiers et al., 1976).

Sheldon (1974) objects to Slobin's claim on the grounds that his evidence consists exclusively of production data, which she says is "not a reliable indicator of the way a sentence is understood" (p. 2). She reports on an experiment in which children were given relative clause sentences and required to act them out with toy animals. She reports that her results disconfirm Slobin's prediction and that they support her own PARALLEL FUNCTION HYPOTHESIS, which she states as follows:

In a complex sentence, if co-referential NPs have the same grammatical function in their respective clauses, then that sentence will be easier-to-process than one in which the co-referential NPs have different grammatical functions. The grammatical function of the relative pronoun will be interpreted to be the same as the antecedent.

Sheldon's children were divided into three age groups. Within each age group the number of correct answers was significantly greater for the parallel function sentences (55, 50) than for the other sentence types. Her totals for all age groups combined (with 99 total response scores for each sentence type) are as follows: 55: 52; 50; 17; 50: 29; 00: 50. In an attempt to explain some of the incorrect answers in her data, Sheldon introduces the notion of extrapolation. She discovered that in interpreting object relatives (00 and 05) many children understood the relative clause as modifying the subject of the sentence. For example, in the OS sentence (8):

(8) The pig bumps into the horse that jumps over the giraffe.

44% of the children gave an incorrect 12,13 response, which Sheldon takes as clear disconfirmation of Slobin's OPERATING PRINCIPLE D because these children are using an extrapolation strategy in their interpretation of sentences like (8). Under this analysis, extrapolation and parallel function are related as follows: "In attempting to find the antecedent to the relative pronoun in object relatives, children over-relied on the extrapolation interpretation. In attempting to assign a function to the relativized NP they over-relied on the parallel function interpretation" (p. 12). Sheldon concludes that her findings clearly support the parallel function hypothesis, that 00 and 55 sentences should
be easier for children, and that the incorrect responses in her data can be traced to a breakdown of both the parallel function analysis and
extraposition. In her final remarks, she says that 'one fruitful avenue
for future research would be an investigation of the role that the Paral-
lel Function hypothesis has in the acquisition of other languages' (p.13).
As we will see below, the results of at least one study, of Japanese,
definitely do not bear out the expectations of the parallel function
hypothesis.

Subsequent to Sheldon's study, most investigators have expressed
dissatisfaction with the analysis based on parallel function, principally
because of its over-emphasis on opaque grammatical relations and its dis-
regard of important surface features, like word order. Michael Smith
(1974) reports on a study that gives very different results from those
evacuated by Sheldon. Smith used nonsense words in an elicited imi-
tation task. His results show that, contrary to the predictions of
the parallel function hypothesis, OS sentences are the easiest of all
sentence types, followed by SS, CO, and SO in increasing order of dif-

ficulty. He explains his results by means of (1) embeddedness, (2) the
NNN strategy, and (3) the minimal distance principle.

In an attempt to test the differing results obtained by Sheldon and
by Smith, de Villiers et. al. (1976) introduced an additional complication
into the study of relative clauses by including among their test items
some act-out directives containing indirect objects. The introduction
of indirect objects increases the number of sentence types to nine, rather
than the four used by Sheldon and Smith, and the verbs used in the de Villiers
study were limited to 'shouted to', 'spoke to', 'whispered to', and 'yelled to',
in order to avoid further complications involved with verbs like give,
which take direct as well as indirect objects. Table 4 from this study is
given as (9) and it shows the percentage of children who gave each re-
sponse type for each sentence type (the correct responses are starred).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>1-2</th>
<th>1-3</th>
<th>2-1</th>
<th>2-3</th>
<th>3-1</th>
<th>3-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UD</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OI</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The error analysis is by far the most important -- and most in-
novative, section of the de Villiers paper. Since 75% of their children
responded correctly to the first act-out response for sentence types SS,
SO, and OI, the authors state that their results definitely disconfirm
the parallel function hypothesis, and so they definitely favor a process-
ing heuristics approach such as that followed by Smith (1974), and their
order of accessibility is given in (10) along with Sheldon's and Smith's
for ease of reference:
However, the fact that such a high percentage of their subjects dis so well on the first NVN sequence of each sentence leads these authors to disregard right branchingness as a major processing strategy. They propose that the child initiates his analytic procedure to the left, that is, with the first NVN sequence, and then on the basis of what is left (NV, NV) conducts a kind of search for either a subject or object in order to complete the remaining grammatical relations. The reason their children did so poorly on SO and SI sentences is that these do not have an Initial NVN sequence, and in addition, they have what the authors call a "deceptive" NVN sequence (NVVN). De Villiers et al. dismiss Smith's invocation of the minimal distance principle entirely, claiming that "... it reduces to a more limited version of the NVN strategy" (p. 24) and "... we do not need to invoke a special minimal distance principle, with its own theoretical and empirical history, to account for the present results or those of Smith."

There is evidence from Japanese which disconfirms the PARALLEL FUNCTION HYPOTHESIS and supports the processing heuristics approach. Kewaj Hakuta (1976) reports on an act-out experiment on relative clause comprehension. Before going into the details of that experiment and its results, we examine several complications introduced by the structure of the Japanese language: the following paragraph is a close paraphrase of Hakuta (pp. 10-11).

Both SOV and OSV are possible word orders in Japanese. In the case of SOV-ordered sentences, SS sentences are left-branching, and OS sentences are center-embedded. On the other hand, for the OSV order, SS sentences are center-branching and OS sentences are left-branching. This is different from, and more complicated than, the situation in English, where embeddedness is always correlated to the case role of the complex NP. Thus in Japanese the relative clause sentence is expounded by eight different types: the four dealt with extensively in English times (SOV, OSV).

Hakuta found in preliminary testing that older Japanese children experienced an unusual amount of difficulty on these eight sentence types, so in order to simplify the task, he introduced intransitive verbs into some of his test items, with the result that only six of the eight possible sentence types were represented. These sentences are given in Hakuta's Table 3, and are reproduced here as (I).

(I) (1) SS SOV [LAUGHED ELEPHANT]-ga FROG-o KICKED.
(2) SS OSV FROG-o [LAUGHED ELEPHANT]-ga KICKED.
(3) OS SOV ELEPHANT-ga [LAUGHED FROG]-o KICKED.
(4) OS OSV [LAUGHED FROG]-o ELEPHANT-ga KICKED.

The elephant kicked the frog that laughed.
(11) (Continued)
(3) SS (OSV) [ELEPHANT-o KICKED FROG] -ga LAUGHED.
The frog that kicked the elephant laughed.
(6) SO (SV0) [ELEPHANT-ga KICKED FROG] -ga LAUGHED.
The frog that the elephant kicked laughed.

Hakuta found that "for SS... SOV is easier for the children" (p. 12) but that for OS, OV is easier. He attributes the difference to the fact that SS/OOV and OS/OSV are left-branching, but OS/OOV and OOV/OSV are center embedded (p. 12). In addition to the word-order complexities pointed out here, there are further complications in Japanese related to the use of case-marking particles (-ga = subject; -o = object). Hakuta proposes a strategy hierarchy based on the interaction of word order and case marking. Major strategies are related to order, and strategies further down in the hierarchy come into play when order strategies turn out not to function, (e.g., when a verb appears sentence initially).

The important point is that Hakuta (1976) clearly disconfirms the parallel function hypothesis: "When SS and OS sentences are compared... children perform better on OS than on SS. This is clearly against the parallel function hypothesis, which would predict SS to be easier" (p.13). Tavakolian (1977) reports that in her study, 12, 13 was the predominante response type for SS and OS sentences, and that for the other sentence types, it was a common response. On the basis of this fact, she hypothesizes that in processing relative clauses, children rely most heavily on a conjoined clause analysis. The linear arrangement of SS and SO types (ignoring the presence of the relative pronouns) is identical to the arrangements of conjoined sentences.

(12) N that V N V N (SS)
N V N and V N (Conjoined)
The cow (that) hit the horse pushed the goat.
The cow hit the horse and pushed the goat.
N V N that VN
N V N and VN
The horse licked the goat who pushed the cow. (OS)
The horse licked the goat and pushed the cow. (Conjoined)

Tavakolian sets up a hierarchy of relative clause sentences as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This hierarchy differs from those suggested by previous investigators principally in that it is not designed to show ease of processing. Rather, it is a description over time of the learning process. Initially, the conjoined sentence analysis is applied to all sentence types in the
First, with appropriate results only in the case of those sentences (SS) whose surface structures correspond to conjoined sentences. As he matures, the child begins to eliminate sentences from the hierarchy, starting with those (00) that most widely diverge from the form of a conjunct, so that at any given point in his development, if the child applies the conjoined sentence analysis to a particular sentence, he also applies that analysis to the sentences above it in the hierarchy. "The conjoined clause analysis required either an expressed or a missing subject in the second clause." (p. 38). Unlike the situation with 00 relatives where the conjoined-clause analysis easily generalized to them, children have no general strategy which could apply to 00 relatives to specify the referent of the missing object" (p. 39).

It will be recalled that Sheldon (1974) attempted to explain some of the errors in her data by suggesting that children overgeneralize an extrapolation strategy, especially in the case of 00 sentences. Tavakolian objects to this suggestion on two counts. In the first place, she points out, "because a child knows that some relative clauses modify the matrix object, he does not overgeneralize that all of them modify the matrix object" (p. 40). And secondly, she says that "... we would expect children who incorrectly comprehend 00 relatives because of extrapolation to get 50 relatives correct" (p. 40), and this is of course not the case.

It is to be noted that Tavakolian's hierarchy is not based on the number of correct responses given in testing, as were those offered by previous investigators. A hierarchy of sentences that is based on the number of correct answers in her data is given in (13) as Tavakolian, C. Tavakolian S (strategy) refers to the order (right-to-left) in which children abandon the conjoined-clause strategy in their attempts to process relative clause sentences.

(13) Hiearchies of accessibility according to various investigators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigator</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Sentences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sheldon (1974)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>(S5-00) (05-50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith (1975)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>(S5-50) (05-00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Villiers (1976)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>(S5-50) (05-00) (10-11) (50-51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tavakolian (1977)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>(S5-50) (05-00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice the close resemblance between Tavakolian's C and Sheldon's order. In this connection, Tavakolian offers a bit of insightful reasoning:

By arranging children's responses in terms of exclusion from the conjoined-clause analysis, we can see which relative clauses are excluded first and examine their characteristics. It is worth noting that the order of relative clauses established in this way is different from the order in which results if the relative clauses are ordered according to the number of correct responses. The latter order, from
most correct to least correct, is SS, 00, 60 and 05. The relative clause which receives the fewest correct responses is the last to be excluded from the conjoined clause analysis. The hierarchy established in (13) reflects the ease of imposing an interpretation on sentences containing various relative clause types and does not correspond to the number of correct responses.

The main approach here is by way of the preponderance of response types: since the 12, 13 type is the one that predominates in relation to SS and 05 sentences, and since these sentences are the ones whose linear surface order most closely resembles that of conjoined structures, it is reasonable to suspect that children may process these sentences as if they were conjoined structures. Throughout her discussion Tavakolian stresses her position that children interpret SS sentences correctly not because they can generate them spontaneously (that is, not because they are part of the child's grammar) but because the SS surface form happens to be identical to the form of a conjoined clause sentence (which has a missing subject in the second conjunct, and which is part of the child's grammar), and it is therefore easy for the child to use this analysis. It is worth pointing out that the conjoined-clause hypothesis is similar to the approach taken by de Villiers et al. In that it sees the child as beginning his analysis to the left and proceeding to the right. But some important differences will be pointed out below.

Along with the conjoined clause analysis, Tavakolian suggests that children use lexical information in processing relative clause sentences. She specifies this as a companion hypothesis to the combined-clause analysis (p. 33).

Hypothesis B: Where the correlation of thematic relations and subcategorization features of a verb occurring in a surface string differs from the correlation of thematic relations and subcategorization features of the verb in deep structure, then children will attempt the most direct projection of thematic relations onto the surface string when the verb occurs in a complicated sentence whose structure they are uncertain of.

In the case of sentence types SS and 05, the child's reliance on Hypothesis B is clearly greater than it is with 00 or 50. As Tavakolian points out, "The conjoined-clause analysis requires either an expressed or a missing subject in the second clause" (p. 38). Since 00 sentences do not meet this requirement, they are the first ones for which the child abandons the conjoined clause analysis. But the child has no functional strategy for applying lexical information, so he is in the position of guessing which of the two NPs in the first clause is the referent of the second. This accounts for the "variation between 12, 11 and 12, 52 responses by individual children" (p. 43). This suggestion
that at certain points in their analyses children simply do not have adequate strategies to deal with some surface structures and are reduced to guessing. Is of great interest to our understanding of language acquisition and it jibes well with Tavakolian's very careful analysis of the errors in her data.

The SO sentence type is subject to insightful analysis in Tavakolian's discussion. With two nouns preceding the first verb, it is the one children found the most difficult to comprehend in terms of concentration and spread of response types. Two productive strategies come into conflict when the child tries to determine the subject of the first verb:

a) The first NP of the sentence is the subject.
b) The NP preceding the verb is the NP.

The child has no device for resolving this conflict, and this lack is reflected in the inconsistency of the responses in the data. Here again the child is guessing. Tavakolian's concluding observations (p. 50) are instructive:

There was a much greater variety of responses to O0 and SO relatives, which do not conform to the order in conjoined clauses, than to SS and OS relatives, which do conform. This difference in the relative difficulty of assigning a consistent interpretation to a string is due to the lack of direct correspondence between the correlation of thematic relations and sub-categorization features in the lexical entry and the correlation of thematic relations and the order of NP's in the surface structure.

Direct comparison of the conclusions reached by de Villiers (1976) and by Tavakolian (1977) is difficult, in the first place because of the very different results they obtained on OS sentences. De Villiers et al. found them among the most correctly responded to, while for Tavakolian they are the ones with which her subjects had the most difficulty. Further, the two sets of conclusions are based on differing assumptions about the child's processing abilities in relation to the flow of language. Pointing to their subject's "remarkably high" (p. 18) performance on initial NNN sequences, de Villiers et al. propose that processing is a left-to-right enterprise: the child interprets the first NNN sequence and then uses additional strategies to deal with the remainder of the sentence. In support of this "segmenting," they refer to the widespread utility of the NNN strategy in dealing with simple active declarative sentences and (to) its overextension by children to passive constructions" (p. 23). On the other hand, Tavakolian sees children as attempting to impose the conjoined clause analysis on the entire sentence. Her argument is based on the general pervasiveness of the T2, T3 response type: it is "the only response consistently used on all four types of relative clauses" (p. 12). She cites studies which show
that conjunction of elements with and, including clausal conjunction, occurs very early in spontaneous speech.

Recently, an attempt has been made by Solan and Roeppe (1977) to show that neither the parallel function hypothesis (Sheldon) nor the structural misrepresentation hypothesis (Taygord) can account exclusively for the errors children make in relative clause interpretation, but that, taken together, these two approaches do satisfactorily explain the kinds of errors children make. The investigators conducted an experiment which was "intended to separate errors according to whether they are caused by the child's misunderstanding of the syntactic structure, or the grammatical relations within the sentence" (p. 6). The principal way in which this study differs from previous ones is that it looks at children's knowledge of verbal subcategorization features other than [+ NP]; specifically, it contrasts this feature with [+ NP, PP] (both are transitive). The verbs used by the investigator's were push and put. Errors were separated into two classes, functional and structural. An error is designated structural when a child either a) interprets the relative clause as modifying the subject instead of the object, or b) fails to attach the relative clause at all (has to ask "Who did what?"). "...whether or not a child will commit either of these errors depends crucially on whether or not the main verb is push or put..." "...whether or not a child makes one of these structural mistakes has nothing to do with whether the sentence is an OS or an OS sentence" (p. 11). Additionally there are functional errors and these are unrelated to whether the main verb is push or put, but rather, "...involve misinterpreting the roles of the NP's within the relative clause, regardless of which NP the relative clause is interpreted as modifying" (p. 13). The investigators' summary comments are instructive:

We can see from the above data that the types of structural errors that children make in their interpretation of relative clauses are not specific to this aspect of their grammars. Instead, they follow directly from the much more general notion of children positing syntactic structures at early stages which have relatively little embedding. As their linguistic development progresses, they learn to embed clauses and other material more deeply. This developmental sequence itself may follow from the fact that embedded structures are more difficult to understand than conjoined ones (see, e.g., Chomsky and Miller, 1963). But the point to be made here is that structural, as well as functional strategies and generalizations play a substantial role in the child's acquisition of syntax.

Available studies on the acquisition of relative clauses offer a variety of conflicting and frequently confusing information. Early proposals that children experience more difficulty in processing dis-continuous, as distinct from contiguous elements, have been contradicted by the parallel function hypothesis. More recent studies tend to
emphasize an examination of the processing heuristics used by children, and they show that at times children have no adequate processing strategies. All of the studies reviewed here have in common the virtue of suggesting new avenues of approach to an understanding of children's acquisition of relative clauses, and there is no sign that students of child language intend to leave any of these avenues unexplored. With one exception, the investigations reviewed here have dealt with English. Hopefully, we will soon see more data and more analyses from other languages.
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