

Different outcomes in the acquisition of *do*-support in two Norwegian/English bilinguals: Delay and acceleration.

It is widely accepted that although bilingual children separate their languages from very early on (Genesee 1989, Meisel 1989), cross-linguistic influence between a bilingual's languages is common and a typical aspect of bilingual language development. Frequently, such cross-linguistic influence leads to production that is deviant from the production of monolingual peers (e.g. Hulk & Müller 2000, Patuto et al. 2011, Anderssen & Bentzen 2013). In such cases, one could argue that cross-linguistic influence causes a delayed development in bilinguals compared to monolinguals. On the other hand, it has also been shown that cross-linguistic influence in some cases may lead to acceleration in bilingual development compared to monolingual development (e.g. Kupisch 2006, Kupisch & Bernardini 2007, Liceras et al. 2011).

In this paper we compare data from two Norwegian/English bilingual girls, Emma (2;7-2;10) and Sunniva (1;7-2;8), growing up in Norway with English-speaking parents. Both children are fairly balanced bilinguals. However, we argue that cross-linguistic influence from Norwegian leads to two different paths in the acquisition of *do*-support for these two children. A central syntactic difference between Norwegian and English is that Norwegian is a V2 language, while English is not. Due to this, Norwegian displays verb movement of the main verb across negation in negated clauses, (1) and across the subject in interrogative clauses, (2-3). As the translations show, English requires *do*-support in these contexts.

In previous research, Bentzen (2000, 2013) has shown that Emma displays clear patterns of cross-linguistic influence from Norwegian in her acquisition of verb placement in English. Like monolinguals, Emma produces a high proportion of negative clauses without *do* (4a). However, in sharp contrast to monolingual peers, Emma frequently employs verb movement across negation and subjects in negated, interrogative and non-subject initial clauses, as in (4b,c,d). Moreover, most of Emma's attempts at *do*-support come out non-target-like (4e). Monolingual peers productively use *do*-support at this stage (Bentzen 2013), especially in negative clauses where it is attested first in most children (see also Bohnacker 2013 and references therein).

In contrast, the other bilingual girl in our study, Sunniva, makes use of *do*-support in questions very early (5a,b). She also produces negative clauses quite early (5c,d,e), but *do*-support is not attested in these structures until later on (5f). Unlike monolinguals, she never produces negative clauses without an auxiliary. There is only one potential structure with transfer of V2 in Sunniva's files (5g). Thus, the outcome of the bilingual situation is very different for the two children, and Sunniva appears much more target-like, despite being considerably younger and having a much lower MLU than Emma, even at comparable ages (MLU_w range: Sunniva 1.99-3.67, Emma 3.07-4).

Both Norwegian and English are SVO languages. In addition, English auxiliaries move across negation, and also across subjects in interrogative clauses. In this respect, English word order superficially overlaps with Norwegian V2 word order. We argue that this superficial structural similarity between English and Norwegian (Müller & Hulk 2001) can have two possible outcomes. For Emma, cross-linguistic influence results in transfer of V2. For Sunniva, on the other hand, V2 in Norwegian appears to enhance the awareness of the need for lexicalizing higher functional projections by a verbal element in negated and interrogative clauses in English, and we argue that this accelerates Sunniva's acquisition of *do*-support compared to that of her monolinguals peers, especially with respect to interrogative clauses.

- (1) Vi **bor** ikke der lengre.
we live not there anymore
 'We **don't** live there anymore.'
- (2) Når **kjøpte** hun bilen?
when bought she car.the
 'When **did** she buy the car?'
- (3) **Lagde** han middag?
made he dinner
 'Did he make dinner?'
- (4) a. I **not** know. (Emma2 2;7.14)
TARGET: I don't know.
 b. I **gonna** not do it. (Emma6 2;8.16)
TARGET: I'm not gonna do it.
 c. **Drive** daddy me to barnehage [= nursery]? (Emma2 2;7.14)
TARGET: Will daddy drive me to nursery?
 d. Now **is** this door closed. (Emma4 2;8.5)
TARGET: Now this door is closed.
 e. **Does** your chicken can come out of your egg? (Emma6, 2;8.17)
TARGET: I'm not gonna do it.
- (5) a. Where **did** you make some waffles? (Sunniva6 1;11.22)
 b. **Does** it go this way? (Sunniva7 2;1.16)
 c. Can you **not** find kangaroo ? (Sunniva6 1;11.22)
 d. Baby kangaroo's **not** [/] ikkje [=not] in here. (Sunniva6 1;11.22)
 e. Winnie the Pooh's **not** broken, mummy. (Sunniva9 2;4.6)
 f. She looks a bit angry. **Doesn't** she, mummy? (Sunniva10 2;6.1)
 g. And he [/] he [/] he's **says not** xxx, mummy. (Sunniva11 2;8.0)

References

- Anderssen, M. & K. Bentzen. 2013. Cross-linguistic influence outside the syntax-pragmatics interface: A case study of the acquisition of definiteness. *Studia Linguistica* 67 1: 82–100.
- Bentzen, K. 2000. *I like not it like du like it: A Case Study of Language Transfer in Bilingual First Language Acquisition*. Cand. philol., University of Tromsø.
- Bentzen, K. 2013. Cross-linguistic influence and structural overlap affecting English verb placement. Paper presented at the GLOW workshop *Acquisition of syntax in close varieties* in Lund, 2013.
- Genesee, F. 1989. Early bilingual development, one language or two?. *Journal of Child Language* 16, 161–179.
- Kupisch, T. & P. Bernardini. 2007. Determiner use in Italian-Swedish and Italian-German children: Do Swedish and German represent the same parameter-setting? Papers from the Language Acquisition Workshop, SCL 2006, eds. M. Anderssen & M. Westergaard. *Nordlyd* 34.3:209–229.
- Kupisch, T. 2006. *The acquisition of determiners in German-Italian and German-French children*. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Liceras, J. M., R. Fernández Fuertes & A. Alba de la Fuente. 2011. Overt subject and copula omission in the Spanish and the English grammar of English-Spanish bilinguals: On the locus and directionality of interlinguistic influence. *First Language* 32 1: 88–115.
- Meisel, J. 1989. Early differentiation of language in bilingual children. In K. Hyldenstam & L. Obler (eds.), *Bilingualism across a lifespan: Aspects of acquisition, maturity and loss*, pp. 13–40. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Müller, N. & A. Hulk. 2001. Crosslinguistic influence in bilingual language acquisition: Italian and French as recipient languages. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 4 1: 1–21.
- Patuto, M., V. Repetto & N. Müller. 2011. Delay and acceleration in bilingual first language acquisition: The same or different? In E. Rinke & T. Kupisch (eds.) *The development of grammar: Language acquisition and diachronic change. In honour of Jürgen M. Meisel*, pp. 231–261. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.