[in: H.Hendricks (ed.), 2005, *The Structure of Learner Varieties*, Berlin-New York, Mouton de Gruyter]

Additive and Restrictive Particles in Italian as a Second Language. Embedding in the verbal utterance structure

Cecilia Andorno

1. Introduction

In this paper we examine the emergence and use of additive and restrictive particles (AP, RP; together: ARP) in Italian as a second language, drawing attention both to their semantic value and to their syntactic behaviour. The study follows the approach proposed by Dimroth and Klein (1996) and is based on the model outlined by Klein and Perdue (1993), where the interaction of information structure, semantics and syntax is involved to explain the development of the utterance structure in learner varieties. The interaction of the three levels mentioned is analyzed here through the development of the "grammar of scope" (Becker and Dietrich 1996), that is, the syntactic rules and the form-function patterns laid out by a language for the use of ARP.

The acquisition of ARP has been widely investigated in recent years in ESF projects (cf. Perdue, Benazzo, Giuliano 2002 and Watorek 1998 for a review). Italian, however, was not included among the target languages considered: our findings will therefore

offer new material to this field of research (cf. also Andorno 2000, Andorno and Bernini 2003a). They will be compared with findings obtained in various target languages and with studies concerning other optional elements such as negation, already studied in Italian as a second language by Bernini (1996, 1998, 1999, cf. also Andorno and Bernini 2003a).

The study is based on a corpus of four untutored learners, whose first languages are Wú Chinese and Tigrinya. The corpus is taken from the data base collected in the Pavia Project on Italian as a second language[1]. The learners have been longitudinally monitored through a series of interviews recorded over a period of 6 to 12 months. The data primarily consist of free conversations, but specific linguistic tasks, such as picture descriptions, film and comic-strip retelling, are also available: a variety of text types (narrative, descriptive, argumentative) is therefore included. The corpus partly overlaps with the corpus selected by Bernini for his studies on negation in Italian as a L2, so that a comparison between these two fields can be made. Essential information about the learners is provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Essential learners' data

Learner	*Length of stay at 1st recording*	*No. of recordings*	*First language*	*Language level*
Markos	1 month	12	Tigrinya	basic → initial postbasic
Ababa	12 months	12	Tigrinya	advanced postbasic
Chu	11 months	17	Chinese	initial postbasic
Xiao	18 months	18	Chinese	advanced postbasic

1.1. The ARP scopal system in Italian

The contribution of ARP to the sentence can be described through the following steps:

- the particle selects one part of the sentence as its **domain of application** (called *scope* (Becker and Dietrich 1996), *Skopus* (Dimroth and Klein 1996) or *portée* (Watorek 1998))[2];
- an AP states that a proposition is valid for its domain of application and for at least one alternative element; a RP states that a proposition is invalid for any alternative element of its domain of application[3]:

(1) *Bevo* *birra*
I-drink beer
'I drink beer'

(2) *Bevo* ***anche*** *birra*
I-drink AP beer
'I drink beer and something else'

(3) *Bevo* ***solo*** *birra*
I-drink RP beer
'I drink beer and nothing else'

Some ARP can also have a scalar value: in this case, the element in the domain of application is marked as high (AP) or low (RP) on a scale of possible alternatives[4]:

(4) *Bevo* ***perfino*** *superalcolici*
I-drink AP high-proof spirits
'I *even* drink high-proof spirits'

The group of Italian AP has negative elements - *nemmeno, neanche, neppure* - that is particles with additive meaning used in negative sentences.

A complete overview of the Italian ARP system is provided in Table 2[5].

Table 2. The Italian ARP system; an overview

Additive particles	consistent wf. scalar value	*anche, pure*
	with inherent scalar value	*perfino, persino, addirittura*
Additive-negative particles		*neanche, nemmeno, neppure*
Restrictive particles	Consistent wf. scalar value	*solo, soltanto, solamente*
	with inherent scalar value	*semplicemente, unicamente, puramente, esclusivamente*

Additive Particles include:

- anche, *pure,* (≈also) that are inherently additive and neutral as to the scalar value, i.e., they can have scalar interpretation if the context suggests it;
- addirittura, (≈ even) which is inherently scalar and can lose its additive value;
- perfino, persino, (≈ even) which are inherently scalar **and** additive:

(5) *Voleva un orologio e ha ricevuto* ***anche***
He-wanted a watch and he-has received AP
il telefonino
the cellular-phone
'He wanted a watch and has received a watch and a cellular phone as well'

(6) *Voleva un orologio e ha ricevuto*
He-wanted a watch and he-has received
addirittura *il telefonino*
AP the cellular-phone
'He wanted a watch and has received a cellular phone – no claim is made about reception of the watch. The cellular phone is more precious'

(7) *Voleva un orologio e ha ricevuto*
He-wanted a watch and he-has received
perfino *il telefonino*
AP the cellular-phone
'He wanted a watch and has received a watch and even a cellular phone. The cellular phone is more precious'

Negative AP include *neanche, nemmeno, neppure*, (≈ not … either) which are all neutral as to the scalar value:

(8) *Voleva un orologio e non ha ricevuto*
He-wanted a watch and not he-has received
neanche *il telefonino*
neg-AP the cellular-phone
'He wanted a watch and has received neither watch nor cellular phone'

Restrictive Particles include:

- *solo, soltanto, solamente*, (≈ only, just) which are neutral as to the scalar value and have a restrictive meaning only;
- unicamente, esclusivamente (≈ exclusively) which are not scalar.

(9) *Voleva un orologio e ha ricevuto*
He-wanted a watch and he-has received
solo *il telefonino*
RP the cellular-phone
'He wanted a watch but has received only a cellular phone and not a watch'. [Two interpretations are possible: the scalar interpretation tells the listener that the cellular phone is less precious; the non-scalar interpretation merely says that only the cellular phone as received.]

(10) *Voleva un orologio e ha ricevuto*
He-wanted a watch and he-has received
esclusivamente *il telefonino*
RP the cellular-phone

'He wanted a watch but has received only a cellular phone and not a watch'

Solo can lose its restrictive value and preserve only a scalar value when it affects time or numeric expressions:

(11) *E'* *arrivato* ***solo*** *ieri*
He-is arrived RP yesterday
'He arrived only yesterday and not before'

Our analyses in this paper will concentrate on *anche* and *solo*, which are by far the most frequent particles in our data. As for their distribution, *anche* and *solo* can always occur in front of their domain of application; the postposition, on the contrary, is not always possible. The particle and its domain of application form a single tone group, which carries a pitch accent on its final part:

(12) *Anche* *MARIO* *ha* *parlato* *con* *suo* *fratello*
AP Mario has spoken with his brother
'Mario has spoken with his brother, as did someone else'

(13) *Mario* *ANCHE* *ha* *parlato* *con* *suo* *fratello*
Mario AP has spoken with his brother
'Mario has spoken with his brother, as well as someone else'
[not: Mario has spoken with his brother, besides greeting him]

(14) ***Solo*** *MARIO* *ha* *parlato* *con* *suo* *fratello*
RP Mario has spoken with his brother
'Only Mario has spoken with his brother'

(15) *?Mario* *SOLO* *ha* *parlato* *con* *suo* *fratello*
Mario RP has spoken with his brother

(16) Mario ha portato *anche* UNA TORTA a suo fratello
Mario has brought AP a cake to his brother

'Mario has also brought a cake to his brother, besides something else'

(17) *?Mario ha portato una torta ANCHE a suo fratello*
Mario has brought a cake AP to his brother

(18) *Mario ha portato* ***solo*** *UNA TORTA a suo fratello*
Mario has brought RP a cake to his brother
'Mario only brought his brother a cake and nothing else'

(19) *?Mario ha portato una torta SOLO a suo fratello*
Mario has brought a cake RP to his brother

The only exception to the right-adjacent tendency of the domain of application is the case of a particle which affects the VP: the particle must be placed after the finite form of the verb (post-V_{Fin} position)[6]. From the post-V_{Fin} position, the particle can affect the whole VP (wide scope) or part of it (narrow scope): the exact extension of the domain of application in these cases is marked by the pitch accent.

(20) *Mario ha* ***solo*** *SALUTATO suo fratello*
Mario has RP greeted his brother
'Mario only greeted his brother, but he didn't speak to him'

(21) *Mario ha* ***solo*** *salutato suo FRATELLO*
Mario has RP greeted his brother
'Mario only greeted his brother and nobody else'

Finally, from post-V_{Fin}, *anche*, but not *solo*, can also affect the preverbal constituent. In this case the sentence has a distinctive intonation, with a high rise on the constituent in the domain of application and a high fall on the VP including the particle ("bridge accent", see Becker and Dietrich 1996)[7]:

(22) *↑MARIO ↓ ha* ***anche*** *parlato con suo fratello*
Mario has AP spoken with his brother
'Mario also spoke to his brother, as well as someone else'

Anche and *solo* can also affect the whole sentence, as connective particles with copulative meaning (*anche*) and adversative meaning (*solo*). Note, however, that sentences linked by *anche* cannot simply be added as different assertions, as is the case with sentences linked by *e* (*and*), but they are expected to contribute to one same discursive goal. If a relevant correlation between a sequence of sentences connected with *anche* is unclear, the use of the particle is not permitted, as in (24) and (26) and *e* should be used. In some cases, the correlation between connected sentences only becomes clear through the addition of a final sentence, as in (27) and (28). We can therefore describe the connective *anche* as an AP working at the pragmatic level, "adding" different assertions to each other to support the same conclusion.

(23) *La Torre di Pisa è inclinata e la Torre*
The Tower of Pisa is inclined and the Tower
degli Asinelli è diritta
of-the Asinelli is upright
'The Tower of Pisa is inclined and the Asinelli Tower is upright'

(24) *La Torre di Pisa è inclinata.*
The Tower of Pisa is inclined
***Anche** la Torre degli Asinelli è diritta.*
AP the Tower of Asinelli is upright

(25) *Oggi è giovedì e c'è luna piena*
Today is Thursday and there-is moon full
'Today is Thursday and there is full moon'

(26) *?Oggi è giovedì. C'è* ***anche*** *luna piena*
Today is Thursday. There-is AP moon full

(27) *I professori sono più severi quest'anno.*
The professors are more strict this year

Mario studia ***anche*** *poco. Forse sarà bocciato*
Mario study AP a-few Maybe he-will-be rejected
'The professors are stricter this year, and Mario does not study much. Maybe he will fail'

(28) *Gianni ha trovato lavoro. Marta si è laureata.*
Gianni has found job Marta is-graduated
Anche *Sandro si è riconciliatocon la moglie:*
AP Sandro is reconciled with the wife
le cose in famiglia vanno bene.
the things in family they-go fine
'Gianni has found a job, Marta is graduated and Sandro is reconciled with his wife: things are going fine in our family'

As a connective particle, *anche* occurs in the wide scope position, i.e. in post-V_{FIN} position, while *solo* occurs at the beginning of the sentence (narrow scope only) generally with the complementizer *che* (*that*):

(29) *I professori sono meno severi quest'anno.*
The professors are less strict this year
Solo *che Mario studia poco. Forse sarà bocciato*
RP that Mario study little Maybe he-will-be rejected
'Professors are less strict this year, but Mario does not study much. Maybe he will fail'

1.2. Quantitative data

Despite their non-nuclear status, ARP appear right from the early stages in learner varieties. In our corpus we find the AP *anche* from the earliest prebasic stages onward[8], the RP *solo* and the negative AP *neanche* from early postbasic stages. The order of appearance corresponds to their frequency in use in the learner data: *anche* is the most frequent particle during the whole period of observation; *solo* is less frequent, while *neanche* which appears latest is also used more

rarely. Table 3 and 4 present the total number of occurrences and the relative frequency of ARP in learners data[9].

Table 3. Total occurrences of ARP

	Anche	*Pure*	*Addirittura*	*Neanche*	*Solo*	*Soltanto*
Chu	225	3	--	2	70	--
Xiao	103	35	1	13	61	2
Markos	60	--	--	3	16	--
Ababa	136	--	--	4	29	--
Total	524	38	1	22	176	2

Table 4. Frequency of *anche*, *solo*, and *neanche*[10]

	Anche	*Solo*	*Neanche*
Chu	489	161	4
Xiao	296	94	20
Markos	138	44	7
Ababa	281	65	9

2. The results

Following Dimroth and Klein (1996), we will examine two aspects of the syntactic behaviour of ARP: their position in relation to sentence structure and to their domain of application.

As regards sentence structure organization, all learners considered, from the first recordings onwards, produce utterances including verbal information: sentence organization is based on semantic principles concerning the role of the participants in the event described by the verb (see Klein and Perdue 1992). A main semantic principle that has been found to govern utterance organization

concerns the **controller** of the event, that is the NP-referent with the highest degree of control:

> "Controller comes first" (Klein and Perdue 1992)

Pragmatic principles, such as the topic-focus order, have also found to be significant for non-guided learner data utterance organization. One such main pragmatic principle is:

> "Focus comes last" (Klein and Perdue 1992)

Chu, Ababa and Xiao, from the first recordings onward, use inflected verb forms to mark oppositions of temporal and aspectual values (cf. Banfi and Bernini 2003). For example, in (30) Chu used the infinitive form (INF) *mangiare* and the participial form (PT) *mangiato* to express different aspectual values of the verb *mangiare* (*to eat*):

(30) CH: ***mangiare****: ++* *pane e* *pr/prosc/+eh pro&sciutto&*
eat-INF bread and ham
mangiato *poi:* *eh ++* *eh +++ eh +++*
eat-PT then
va ++ *cucina eh + eh* *lavo eh ++ lava* *tutto*
he-go kitchen I-wash he-wash all
'He **eats** bread and ham; he **has eaten**; he goes into the kitchen and wash everything' (Chu, 3.59)

The same three learners, Chu, Ababa and Xiao also use the copula *essere* (*to be*) in attributive and locative predicates as in examples (31) to (33):

(31) NS: *che* *macchina* *è?*
which car it-is
CH: *macchina* ***è*** *roso*
car is red
'Which car is it? It **is** a red car' (Chu, 1.144)

(32) NS: *e qui invece dove siamo*?
and here on-the-contrary where we-are
CH: *questo* ***è*** + *mare*
this **is** sea
'And where are we here? This is the sea' (Chu, 1.149)

(33) CH: *eh lei* + ***è*** *in cucina a: lavo* ++ *eh* ++ *eh piatto*
she **is** in kitchen to wash dish
'She is in the kitchen washing dishes' (Chu, 4.131)

All four learners use the existential *c'è* (*there is*) with existential, locative or possessive function (see Bernini 1990; Giacalone Ramat 1993b, Banfi and Bernini 2003):

(34) NS: *perchè sei venuto in italia*?
why you-are come in Italy
MK: *eh* + ***c'è*** *problema - la, militaria*
there-is problem the military
'Why did you come in Italy? There's (I have) a problem, the military service' (Markos, 1.70)

(35) NS: *lavori anche*?
you-work too
MK: *sì eh* + *no non* ***c'è*** *lavoro*
yes no not there-is work
'Do you work too? No, I haven't any job (there isn't any job)' (Markos, 1.94)

(36) NS: *e* + *sei? - la tua famiglia*?
and you-are the your family
Mk: *sì* + *mio mam/madre sì* + ***c'è*** *qua*
yes my mother yes there-is here
'And you are? your family? Yes, my mother is here' (Markos, 1.99)

In our data, the copula or the existential *c'è* can be followed by a verb form carrying full lexical meaning. This strategy produces non-native structures, as shown by the following example:

(37) CH: *io ho fato scuola media anche*
I have done school intermediate AP
anche ***c'era*** *eh eh no* ***capisco*** *l'altr(a)*
AP there-was not I-understand the other
eh + eh + eh parole
words
'I did the secondary school and and there was also I didn't understand the words' (Chu, 12.496)

This usage of copula and verbal inflections with varying temporal and aspectual values, or, the use of finite verb forms assign Chu, Ababa and Xiao to the post-basic variety stage from the first recordings onward (see Klein and Perdue 1993, Banfi and Bernini 2003). This stage is also reached by Markos but further into the observed period.

In order to better characterize the learner varieties we are dealing with, some further information should be added. Both Markos and Chu, though having reached the basic (Markos) and the post-basic (Chu and later Markos) variety stage, still show substantial traces of the previous stage: prebasic features, that is utterances with a non-verbal organization, governed only by pragmatic principles, are still frequently observed. Ababa and Xiao, on the contrary, have reached a dominant postbasic stage: they completely manage not only the verbal organization of the utterance but also the verbal inflections[11]. We will therefore separate, within the post-basic variety, Markos and Chu as less advanced learners, with only partial verbal organisation and inflectional system, and Ababa and Xiao as more advanced learners, with dominant verbal organisation and inflectional system.

In all learners, we will only consider ARP occurring in utterances with verbal organization, in order to show how their embedding in sentence structure is worked out within the development of verbal utterance organization in particular.

2.1. Organization of utterances including ARPs

The structure of verbal utterances containing ARP in our data can be described by the following schemata[12]:

X_1 V X_2 X_3
X_1 V_1 V_2 X_2 X_3

Verb forms in those structures can be simple (V) or composed of two forms: a modal verb, an auxiliary or *c'è* (V_1) and a lexical verb (V_2) in the present, participial or infinitive form:

(38) XI: *alliva a la Cina^ **deve stai** a Italia*
come to the China must you-stay to Italy
qualche anni già + poi anda Cina
some years already then go China
'I come from China; I must stay in Italy for some years, then I go to China' (Xiao, 9.614)

(39) XI: *adesso c'è sole e ha **ha***
now there-is sun and he-has he-has
***chiuso** omblello*
closed umbrella
'Now there is the sun and he has closed his umbrella' (Xiao, 2.103)

(40) NS: *se volevo rubare prima non ti: non ti*
if I-wanted steal before not you not you
davo il mio numero di telefono ti pare?
I-gave the my number of telephone you it-seems
XI: ***c'è dato*** *giá*
there-is given already
'NS: If I wanted to STEAL, I wouldn't give you my telephone number before, don't you think? XI: He has already given it' (Xiao, 8.234)

Among the simple verb forms we can find lexical verbs, copula followed (in position X_2) by an adjective or a noun carrying the lexical content (see ex. 31-33) or the existential *c'è* with different functions (see ex. 34-36).

X_1, X_2, X_3 can be any type of non-verbal constituent, with different functions and forms. Furthermore, each of these positions can be "empty". Other sentence structures, such as a sentence with two non-verbal initial constituents, are rarely found. Semantic and pragmatic constraints govern sentence organisation at the earlier levels of proficiency. Thus, the controller of the event is usually in X_1:

(41) XI: *pule anghe* ***mia nonna*** *metti occhiali* ***anche***
AP my grandmother wear glasses AP
'My grandmother wear glasses, too' (Xiao, 7.395)

However, at higher levels of proficiency as in the more advanced learners Ababa and Xiao, other constituents such as objects, can also be found in X_1, when specific pragmatic effects are being expressed. Thus, in (42), the object NP is fronted and contrasted to its previously mentioned alternatives:

(42) NS: *hai visto solo Milano*?
have-you seen RP Milano
AB: *Milano Cremona, Torino*
Milano Cremona Torino

anche ***Bologna*** *ho* *visto*
AP Bologna I-have seen
'Have you seen only Milano? Milano, Cremona, Torino, and I have seen Bologna too' (Ababa, 4.147)

The postverbal constituents X_2 and X_3 are usually non-controller referents, again in accordance with semantic organization principles:

(43) MK: *io voglio* *continuare* ***la*** ***mia: programma***
I want continue the my program
di studiare
of study
'I want to go on with my program of studying' (Markos, 5.644)

In the Ababa and Xiao data, however, controller referents in postverbal position can also be found:

(44) XI: *si gioca* ***anche*** ***femmine*** *nascondino*
plays AP girls hide-and-seek
'Also girls play hide-and-seek' (Xiao, 18.936)

Local and temporal constituents usually occur at sentence boundaries.

The structure of "*c'è"* sentences is in general simpler, often consisting of only one constituent (subject or local / temporal information) preceding or following *c'è*:

(45) XI: ***anghe*** *Italia* *c'è*
AP Italy there-is
'There is also in Italy' (Xiao, 2.262)

(46) XI: ***pule anghe*** *!lingale!* *c'è*
AP presents there is
'There are also presents' (Xiao, 2.423)

(47) XI: *c'è* ***anghe*** *l'uva* + *aranci*
there-is AP grapes oranges
'There are also grapes, oranges' (Xiao, 4.726)

(48) XI: *g'è* ***anghe*** *adesso*?
there-is AP now
'Is there also now?' (Xiao, 18.294)

In *c'è* sentences containing two constituents both the subject and the local / temporal constituent can be in initial position. If the sentence has a possessive value, the possessor is generally in X_1 and the possessed in X_2:

(49) MK: *i* *bambini* *non* *c'è* *la* *forza*
the children not there-is the strength
'Children haven't any power' (Markos, 5.454)

Because of their different, more stable and simpler organisation, in the following section we will treat separately utterances with *c'è,* and utterances with any other verb. Utterances where *c'è* is used as a copula or as an auxiliary are discussed within the second group.

2.2. The position of the ARP in the basic structure

Given the basic structure of the verbal utterance as found in the learner data, the ARP used by the learners can occur in one of the positions denoted in the schema below. We distinguish the verbal adjacent position on the left ('preverbal'); the verbal adjacent position on the right ('postverbal'); and we call 'interverbal' a particle inserted in any complex of two verb forms (V_1 and V_2) which constitute a unit. In all this, we did not consider native-likeness of the structures. Moreover, the notion of finiteness plays no role in this section; we will come back to its role in 2.6. only.

Sentence	X_1	V_1	V_2	X_2	X_3
ARP position	initial external	prev.	interv. internal	postv.	postv. final external

Besides the distinction between internal and external positions as shown in the schedule above, we will draw particular attention to the verb adjacent positions, because of their relevance in the target language: post-V_{Fin} is in native Italian the wide scope position and the only allowed position for ARP affecting the verb; consequently, pre-V_{Fin} is only allowed if it affects the constituent on its left (as was shown in ex. 13). The structures and positions found for additive particles are listed in Table 5.

Table 5. Position of *anche* in the sentence structure (not *c'è* sentences)[13]

Markos	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*	*Tot*
Initial	--	--	--	2	2	2	--	--	1	2	3	--	12
PreV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	--	2
PostV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	2
Final	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1

Chu	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*	*13*	*14*	*15*	*16*	*17*	*Tot*
Initial	--	--	1	--	2	--	3	1	1	2	1	11	--	2	8	2	2	36
PreV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	3	--	1	3	--	5	13
InterV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1
PostV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	5	1	1	--	1	1	9
Final	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	--	2

Ababa	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*	*Tot*
Initial	1	4	--	9	8	--	--	1	2	1	3	--	29
PreV	--	3	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	6
InterV	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2
PostV	--	1	--	3	3	--	--	1	2	2	--	2	14

Final	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	2

Xiao	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*	*13*	*14*	*15*	*16*	*17*	*18*	*Tot*
Initial	--	5	1	1	--	1	2	--	2	3	--	1	2	--	1	6	4	1	30
PreV	--	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	2	--	--	--	--	5
PostV	--	2	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	1	--	--	1	1	2	5	15
Final	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	3	--	4

Some tendencies can easily be noticed. As for *anche*, the initial position is the preferred option in all learners, but this preference is stronger in less advanced learners. In their data clear developmental lines can be drawn from the exclusive use of initial position (Markos I-IX and Chu I-X) to the development of a range of different solutions. Concerning internal positions, in the less advanced learners the preverbal and the postverbal position appear simultaneously and occur equally as frequently. In the more advanced learners, the preverbal position decreases whereas the use of the postverbal position increases. In the latest recordings of the more advanced learners a clear hierarchy sets in, with ARP occurrences shared between the initial and the postverbal position. The development pattern of the use of the various positions by the learners is represented in table 6.

Table 6. Position of *anche* in verbal utterances: developmental phases

I	*II*	*III*
Initial	Initial Preverbal, postverbal	Initial Preverbal Postverbal
Chu		
Markos		
		Xiao, Ababa

The development of the placement of ARPs in *c'è* sentences (Table 7) follows the same principles, with some differences due to their simpler structure. Some stages are reached earlier than in full verbal utterances: ARPs appear earlier in *c'è* sentences than in other sentences; particles are also earlier inserted in the internal positions. Because of the frequent absence of X_1, the initial and the preverbal position tend to coincide: therefore, the ARP occurs in frequent collocation with the verb resulting in the forms *anche c'è* or *anche c'era* (there is/are also). These more or less fixed expressions are slower to develop to further stages. Ababa's data show that the decrease of *anche* in preverbal positions in *c'è* sentences is slower than in sentences with other verbs. Only in Xiao's data, the pattern *anche c'è* can be shown to have steadily changed into the native-like pattern *c'è anche*, which in the second part of the Xiao corpus presents almost the total number of *c'è* sentences.

Table 7. Position of *anche* in the sentence structure (*c'è* sentences).

Markos	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*	*Tot*
Initial	--	--	3	3	2	--	1	--	--	1	2	--	12
PreV	--	--	2	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	4
PostV	--	--	4	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	6
Final	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	4

Chu	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*	*13*	*14*	*15*	*16*	*17*	*Tot*
Initial	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	3	3	2	1	3	7	21
PreV	--	--	--	--	2	--	1	--	1	--	1	1	--	1	2	1	1	11
PostV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	2
Final	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1

Ababa	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*	*Tot*

Initial	1	2	--	3	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	1	9
PreV	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	2
PostV	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	2	1	3	--	8

Xiao	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*	*13*	*14*	*15*	*16*	*17*	*18*	*Tot.*
Initial	--	4	1	--	2	--	2	2	2	--	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	1	16
PreV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PostV	--	2	1	3	1	--	--	--	2	--	--	--	3	2	2	5	2	4	27
Final	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	3

We have fewer occurrences of *solo* in the data (Table 8), but they are sufficient to show some important divergences from the development outlined for *anche*: we find a higher balance between the internal and external positions also in the less advanced learners; the use of the preverbal position is absent altogether; a more frequent use is made of the final position. Finally, it is not on the basis of developmental stages, but rather on the basis of individual differences that a position is chosen: Markos places *solo* in postverbal or final position, while Chu shows an equal use of postverbal and initial position. Ababa and Xiao furthermore show two opposite developmental lines, the former from the initial to the postverbal position, the latter from the postverbal to the initial position. In conclusion, *solo* seems to occupy different positions right from early stages on more easily than *anche*.

Table 8. Position of *solo* in the sentence structure.

Markos	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*	*Tot*
Initial	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
PreV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
InterV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1
PostV	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	3	--	4
Final	--	--	--	--	3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	3

Chu	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*	*13*	*14*	*15*	*16*	*17*	*Tot*
Initial	--	--	--	--	--	--	2	1	--	--	--	1	3	1	--	--	1	9
PreV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1
PostV	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	2	--	--	1	--	2	7
Final	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	--	--	1

Ababa	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*	*Tot*
Initial	--	1	1	2	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	5
PreV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
InterV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1
PostV	--	--	2	--	--	--	--	2	--	--	2	1	7
Final	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	1

Xiao	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*	*10*	*11*	*12*	*13*	*14*	*15*	*16*	*17*	*18*	*Tot*
Initial	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	2	1	--	3	2	1	3	13
PreV	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
PostV	--	--	1	1	--	--	--	--	1	--	1	--	--	--	1	1	--	--	6
Final	--	1	1	1	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	1	--	--	--	5

Further differences between *anche* and *solo* will arise in the following paragraphs, where we will be looking at the relative position of the ARP and its domain of application.

2.3. The position of the ARP in regard to the domain of application

The second considered parameter is the relative position of the ARP and its domain of application. In this analysis we touch upon a crucial problem, that is the criteria with which the domain of application of a ARP should be defined. According to the definition of "domain of application" given in 1.1, the constituent affected by

the ARP is identified with the help of the meaning of the adverb - additive or restrictive. Still, in a learner variety it cannot always simply be assumed that the meaning of the adverb corresponds to the target language meaning without further control on the basis of contextual data. Thus, if we consider some of our contexts, we find that a proper additive meaning cannot always be assigned to *anche*. The two sentences (50) and (51) contain each two points of contrast:

(50) MK: *adesso in *Kasselà* non c'è niente ufficio,sì?*
now in Kasselà not there-is nothing office, yes
*in *Kartùm* **anche** –ci sono_ ficci*
in Kartùm AP there-are offices
'Now in Kasselà there are no offices. In Kartùm there are offices' (Markos, k5.569)

(51) CH: *eh **anche** un/ **anche** un fratelo eh più lei*
AP a AP a brother more her
*eh an/ eh **anche** eh meno*
AP less
'One of the brothers is older than she is. (The other) is younger' (Chu, 4.286)

This "oppositive" value of *anche* – not allowed by the target language and similar in meaning to the target language particle *invece* (*on the contrary*) – is related to a specific developmental stage: it is observed in the less advanced learners, Chu and Markos, while the particle *invece* is not found in Chu and appears only in Markos' latest recordings; *invece* is found, on the contrary, in both more advanced learners, in which the oppositive use of *anche* is not found.

In a further series of examples, it is not possible to decide upon the domain of application, the AP has an additive value only in the generic sense of conjunction of sentences ("copulative coordination", in terms of Dik 1968):

(52) CH: *questo + eh paese è piccola eh trova eh eh **anche***
this village is small find AP

ci/ mh +++ città di cap/ capitale è lontano
town of capital is far
'The village is small. And he finds that the capital is far' (Chu, 12.421)

(53) XI: ***anghe** i/ c'è un volta inverno e poi +*
AP there-is a time winter and then
c'è un volta estate
there-is a time summer
'One time is winter and the next is summer' (Xiao, 9.427)

(54) CH: *c'era due persone +*
there-were two persons
anghe +++ l'altro è: eh capo +
AP the other is boss
***anche**: + eh ++ **anche** compagno di capo*
AP AP mate of boss
'There were two people, one was the boss, the other was the mate of the boss' (Chu, 15.354)

In all mentioned cases, we can not single out a specific domain of application for the particle: an additive value can be found only at the sentence level and we will therefore consider the whole sentence as the domain of application.

Given these exceptions, we can now consider the relation between ARP and their domain of application when the domain consists of only part of the sentence on the basis of two parameters: adjacency and reciprocal position. The quantitative data are listed in Tables 9 and 10.

Table 9. Adjacency of ARP and their scope (%)

	Anche (V_{LEX})	*Anche* (V_{LEX})	*Solo*
Markos	65	73	89

Chu	90	69	89
Ababa	86	50	87
Xiao	93	79	96

Table 10. Preposition of ARP to their scope (%)

	Anche (V_{LEX})	*Anche* (V_{LEX})	*Solo*
Markos	82	81	67
Chu	92	91	94
Ababa	96	94	81
Xiao	86	87	83

As for the adjacency parameter, the large majority of ARP occurs adjacent to the domain of application, both in the less advanced and in the more advanced learners: this tendency is stronger for *solo* than for *anche*[14]. Non-adjacency is mostly due to external positions, which are more common for *anche* than for *solo*, as was shown by Tables 6, 7 and 8.

As for the relative position of the ARP and their domain of application, the data show that in the large majority of cases the ARP are put in front of the constituent affected. This result confirms the principle "operator first", observed by Becker and Dietrich (1996) for both negation and ARP in German as a second language[15]. Differences among AP and RP are salient both from a static and from a dynamic point of view. The occurrences of *anche* postponed to its domain of application are mainly found when *anche* is in preverbal position:

$\underline{X_1}$ *anche* V X_2

The use of this position diminishes with development. For *solo*, on the contrary, the postposition is found in all learners at all levels of proficiency and in a variety of sentence structures:

X_1	V	$\underline{X_2}$	*solo*
$\underline{X_1}$	*solo*	V	X_2

2.4. The different sentence positions in detail: ***anche***

If we consider the position in the sentence structure together with the relative position of ARP and their domain of application, it is possible to describe the specific syntactic behaviour of *anche* and *solo*.
Six sentence structures cover most of the occurrences of *anche* in the corpus.

1. Initial position with X_1 as the domain of application:
anche **$\underline{X_1}$** **V** **(X_2)**

(55) XI: *sei* *gente* *gira* + ***anche*** *l/* ***anche*** *lei* *gira*
if people turn AP AP she turn
'If people turn, it (a bear in the zoo) also turns' (Xiao, 9.583)

2. Initial position with the whole sentence as the domain of application:
anche **($\underline{X_1}$)** **$\underline{V}$** **($\underline{X_2}$)**

(56) AB: *non* *c'è/* *non* *c/* *non* *fa* *rumore*
not there-is not not make noise
eh ***anche*** *non - /* *non* *ha* *bisogno* *di*
AP not not have need of
qualcosa *quando* *beve* *acqua*
anything when drink water
'It does not make noise; it also does not need anything else when it has drunk water' (Ababa explains why the camel is useful for Eritrean guerrillieros) (Ababa, 11.289)

3. Initial position with X_2 as the domain of application (distant):
anche **(X_1)** **V** **$\underline{X_2}$**

(57) XI: *quasi quasi lo sa parlare in cinese ++*
nearly nearly it can speak in chinese
*ai /**anghe** quasi però sa parlare italiano*
AP nearly but can speak italian
'He can speak Chinese quite good; he can speak Italian quite good too' (Xiao, 4.786)

4. Preverbal position with X_1 as the domain of application:
X_1 *anche* V (X_2)

(58) MK: *con *tëf* con *sernai* **anche** possiamo fare*
with *tëf* with *sernai* AP we-can do
'We can do it with *tëf* and also with *sernai*' (Markos is explaining a traditional recipe) (Mk11.722)

5. Preverbal position with (part of) VP as the domain of application:
(X_1) *anche* V X_2

(59) MK: *noi no: andiamo **solo** al matrimonio,*
we not we-go RP to-the wedding
*così **anche** ce l'abbiamo: feste del:/ delle scuole*
'We don't play just to weddings, we also play to school parties' (Markos is talking about his activity as a musician in an orchestra) (Markos, 11.364)

6. Postverbal position with the following constituent (X_2 or X_3) as the domain of application:
X_1 V *anche* X2

(60) NS: *ma è una parola italiana*
but is a word italian
AB: *usiamo **anche** noi*
we-use AP we
'But it is an Italian word. We (= in Eritrea) also use it'. (Ababa, 4.632)

We can resume these findings as follows. From initial position, *anche* can have any part of the sentence as its domain of application, that is, the initial position works as a wide scope position. In internal position, *anche* has generally narrow scope on the constituent to its right, the only exception being the structure 4., which is an infrequent one. Two principles are here at work: the non-interruption of the sentence structure, which produces the structure 1., 2., and 3. (AP in initial, that is external, position), and the principle of adjacency between the AP and its domain of application, which produces the structures 1., 4., 5., 6, with a strong preference for the positioning of the affected constituent to the right, that is, an "operator first" strategy.

The data also show some developmental lines from a first stage at which both the non-interruption and the adjacency principle are working, to a stage at which the adjacency principle is dominant, resulting in a progressive drop of non-native structures. The different uses of AP in initial position are progressively reduced. In particular, structure 2 (the whole sentence as domain of application) is frequent in Markos' and Chu's data, but decreases in Ababa and disappears in the latest recordings of Xiao. Structure 3 (non-adjacent constituent as the domain of application) is at all levels an infrequent strategy. In advanced learners, therefore, the non-native initial positions (structures 2 and 3) are strongly reduced.

On the contrary, the initial position with X_1 as the domain of application (structure 1) is maintained from the less advanced stages to the more advanced stages of postbasic varieties, when another structure develops and increases, that is the postverbal position with X_2 as the domain of application (structure 6). The learner variety has at this point (dominant verbal utterance organization) two sentence patterns based on the same strategy: "put the constituent [*anche* X] in the position required for X":

[*anche* X_1] V X_2
X_1 V [*anche* X_2]

This strategy is also in line with the native variety, the only exception being the lack of the postverbal position of *anche* with wide scope value or affecting the VP. From this stage, the main area of syntactic development concerns the treatment of *anche* affecting the VP, in which slow progress can be seen during the whole observed period. This will be the topic of section 2.6.

2.5. The different sentence positions in detail: ***solo***

The adjacency strategy shapes almost all occurrences of *solo* as well.

In most cases, *solo* in initial position has X_1 as the domain of application:

solo **$\underline{X_1}$** **V** **(X_2)**

(61) XI: ***solo*** *Torino* *che* *vai* *tu?*
RP Turin that go you?
'Do you go only to Turin?' (Xiao, 14.100)

even if X2 as domain of application is also found in a few cases:

solo **(X_1)** **V** **$\underline{X_2}$**

(62) XI: *in Cina fa* *film* *quela* *no.*
in China makes movie that no.
solo*: fa mh (x)* *i* *altri*
RP make the others
'In China they don't make these movies, only the others' (Xiao, 15.931)

In postverbal position it has X_2 as the domain of application:

(X_1) **V** ***solo*** **$\underline{X_2}$**

(63) XI: *la* *maestra S.* *vuole* *portare* ***solo*** *io*
the teacher S. want bring RP I
'The teacher, S., want to bring just me' (Xiao, 11.141)

In final position, the domain of application of *solo* is generally the preceding constituent:
X_1 V $\underline{X_2}$ *solo*

(64) NS: ***anche*** *lei* *al collegio* **La Salle**?
AP her at residence *La Salle*
MK: no:, perché a: eh collegio *La Salle* è per –
no because college *La Salle* is for
uomini ***solo***
men RP
'Is she also in La Salle College? No, because La Salle College is for men only' (Markos, 5.178)

No other patterns and functions are found. The preverbal position is almost absent for *solo*, whereas this position was found for *anche* (affecting the VP on the right or affecting X_1 on the left). The extension of the domain of application to the whole sentence is for *solo* a later acquisition, often in the more accurate form *solo che*:

(65) TE: *sì* *l'eritrei* *si vivono* *bene -altro paesi*
yes the eritrean they-livefine other countries
qui *in Italia no*
here in Italy no
AB: ***solo*** ***che*** *non* *possono* - *andare* *a* *vedere* *nostro*
RP that not they-can go to see our
paese questo *è* *il* *problema* *di loro*
country this is the problem of them
'Yes, Erithreans live well in other countries, not in Italy. But they can not return to their country, that is their problem' (Ababa, 3.971)

In conclusion, the picture found for *anche* in late postbasic variety is observed for *solo* already in early postbasic stages:

[*solo* X_1] V X_2
X_1 V [*solo* X_2]

As Table 10 shows, the tendency to the "operator first" is less strong for *solo*. The following structure is therefore also frequent:

X_1 V [X_2 *solo*]

Similarly as for *anche,* this acquisitional stage is in line with the native variety, which generally prefers adjacent positions. The postponed position of RP affecting the VP, obligatory in native variety for *solo* such as for *anche,* is the main area of development from this stage onward and will be treated in next section.

2.6. The verb as the domain of application: ***anche, solo*** *and other predicate adverbs*

As the different patterns listed in 2.4 show, the preverbal position of *anche* can be described in our learners as a wide scope position: from this position the particle can affect any part of the sentence and the precise extension of its domain of application can only be inferred from the context[16].

The preverbal position is also chosen if just the verb is affected by the ARP:

(66) XI: s(è) scuola *anche* <u>mancia</u> *anche* <u>dormi</u>
yes school AP eat AP sleep
'In the school you can eat and sleep' (Xiao, 14.527)

This solution is still found in the more advanced learners Ababa and Xiao. The difficulty in the acquisition of the post-V_{Fin} position as the wide scope position - the target structure - is not in line with previous results reported for other target languages. According to Dimroth 1998, Dimroth and Dittmar 1998, and Benazzo and Giuliano 1998, the post-V_{FIN} position, both with wide and narrow scope, in German and French as L2 start to be acquired after the transition from the

non-finite to the finite utterance organization variety, that is, it is already found in early postbasic varieties.

Our analysis of elements affecting the VP will use ARP data in addition to the data of other adverbs which have the VP as their domain of application and are placed in the native variety in the post-V_{Fin} position: we mean the temporal adverbs of contrast (TACS) *ancora* (*still*), *già* (*already*), *mai* (*never*) and *sempre* (*always*). At the end, we will compare our findings with those of Bernini (Bernini 1996, 1998 and 1999, cf. also Andorno and Bernini 2003) about the acquisition of negative adverbs.

The relative positions of ARP and TACS affecting the VP, both with simple and compound verb forms, are listed at Table 11 and 12.

Table 11. Position of ARP and TACS with predicate scope (simple verb forms)

	Not adjacent	*Preverbal*	*Postverbal*
Chu	--	43	6
Markos	7	7	5
Ababa	5	12	11
Xiao	8	49	40

Table 12. Position of ARP and TACS with predicate scope (compound verb forms)

	Not adjacent	*Preverbal*	*Postverbal*	*Interverbal*
Chu	--	--	--	--
Markos	1	7	1	1
Ababa	--	6	5	4
Xiao	2	14	13	34

In Chu only simple verb forms are found and ARP and TACS are almost always in preverbal position. In Markos the preverbal position is also dominant, especially for compound verb forms; the postverbal position is also found, both for simple and compound verb forms,

while the interverbal position has only one occurrence. In Ababa the preverbal and the postverbal position are equally found both in simple and compound verb forms; the interverbal position for compound verb forms is more frequent than in Markos data. Xiao presents the same balance between preverbal and postverbal position for simple verb forms, while the interverbal position is by far the most frequent among compound verb forms.

Making a distinction, among the simple verb forms, between verbs with full lexical content (V_{LEX}) and verbs with weak lexical content (V_{NLEX}), that is, the copula or the existential *c'è*, offers further information.

Table 13. Position of ARP and TACS in V_{LEX} and V_{NLEX} (simple verb forms)

	V_{LEX}			*V_{NLEX}*		
	Not adjacent	*Pre-V*	*Post-V*	*Not adjacent*	*Pre-V*	*Post-V*
Chu	--	39	2	--	4	4
Markos	4	6	3	2	1	2
Ababa	3	10	9	2	2	2
Xiao	5	48	24	3	1	26

As Table 13 shows, for three of our learners - Chu, Markos, Xiao - the preference for **preverbal position primarily concerns V_{LEX}**, while a similar preference can not be seen for V_{Nlex}; in particular, in the Xiao data the postverbal position is clearly preferred for V_{NLEX}. The distinction between V_{LEX} and V_{NLEX} can then be used in order to give a consistent description of the Xiao data. With V_{LEX}, ARP and TACS precede the verb, that is the element to which their semantic value applies:

Simple verb forms with full lexical content:
ARP / TACS V_{LEX}

With existential constructions or predicates with copula, the lexical content of the predication is due to the element following V_{NLEX} (NP, PP, AdjP, AdvP), that we will call "LEX". In this case, ARP and TACS are placed immediately after the V_{NLEX}, that is before the element carrying the lexical content:

Existential constructions (*C'è* + NP, PP, AdvP):
V_{NLEX} ARP / TACS LEX

Nominal predicates (*Essere* + NP, AdjP, PP):
V_{NLEX} ARP / TACS LEX

Compound verb forms can be described as composed of a "non-lexical" part – an auxiliary or modal - and a lexical part; in this case ARP and TACS are placed in the inter-verbal position, that is immediately before the element carrying the lexical content:

Compound verb forms:
V_{NLEX} ARP / TACS V_{LEX}

From this point of view, the position of ARP and TACS in relation to different verb patterns in the Xiao data is consistent with the already shown semantic principle “operator first”: the adverb precedes the part of the VP carrying the lexical information. The preverbal position is more frequent with V_{LEX}, while in V_{NLEX} the most frequent position is the postverbal. In fact, the adverb can easily step over a non lexical verb in order to get closer to the element which it semantically applies to. In Xiao a sensitivity to the morphological aspects of language can also be seen: ARP and TACS follow simple V_{LEX} in present or imperfective forms, while they precede participial forms. This distribution matches the target language, the only difference being the absence of the auxiliary in the Xiao data.

The picture in the other learners, although less clear, can be drawn on similar lines: the simple form V_{NLEX} is more frequently passed over than the simple form V_{LEX} in the Markos and Chu data. However, the Markos data do not show the inter-verbal position, that

is the V_{NLEX} is not passed over in compound forms and the verb complex is treated as a single form. On the contrary, in the Ababa data the tendency to V_{NLEX} "overpassing" can be seen only in compound forms, where the inter-verbal position is found, while a different treatment of simple V_{LEX} and V_{NLEX} can not be seen: preverbal and postverbal positions are equally present. In the Ababa data, a weakening of the "operator first" tendency linked to syntactic differentiation can also be seen, as the ARP and TACS postposition is more frequent with verbs than with other constituent types. The learners whose postbasic variety is more advanced (Ababa, Xiao) seem then to be more sensitive to position rules linked to morphosyntactic distinctions.

If we consider these results and those produced by Bernini concerning the acquisition of negation (NEG), a more complete picture of the acquisition of predicate adverbs in Italian can be drawn. According to the studies by Bernini (1996, 1998, 1999, and this volume), the acquisition of NEG in Italian follows four stages, each of them being reached earlier with "reduced" verb forms such as the copula or the existential / possessive form *c'è*. In the prebasic variety the negation (*non, no*) is placed at the "point of transition" between topic and focus constituents. The preverbal position of the predicate negator *non*, typical of the basic variety, comes from the prefocal position. The post-V_{FIN} position, typical of other negative Italian forms (NEG-ADV), such as *mica* (a negative adverb with reinforcing function), *niente* (*nothing*), *nessuno* (*nobody*), *mai* (*never*) is acquired over a longer period of time in the development of the postbasic variety.

An overall picture of the acquisition of the position of the different adverbs considered (NEG, TACS and ARP) during the basic and the postbasic variety can be described as follows. In the basic variety the adverb position depends on the semantic principle of "operator first", regardless of the syntactic nature of the constituent affected and the adverb considered. The point of transition between topical and focal information, that is the point preceding the predication, is preferred for all adverbs affecting (part of) the VP: the

preverbal position assumes therefore a crucial place at this point of development.

In the postbasic variety, verbal inflection, in particular the verb forms of copula and auxiliaries cause a reorganization of the sentence structure, requiring an adjustment of the semantic-pragmatic principle just now adopted. Under the influence of the native model, the adverbs affecting VP start to differentiate from one another with regard to their position: *non* specializes in the preverbal position, while different strategies are worked out for the position of other elements, such as TACS and ARP. The distinction between V_{LEX} and V_{NLEX} shows to be of crucial importance in our data: based on the semantic distinction between lexical and non-lexical verbs, a different treatment of copula, existential and/or auxiliary start to be found, as ARP and TACS can easier pass over V_{NLEX} in simple verb forms - as it is attested in the Markos and Chu data - or in compound verb forms - as it is attested in the Ababa data. In Xiao, the distinction between V_{LEX} and V_{NLEX} is spread through all verb forms: the preverbal position in her earliest variety is completely reanalyzed as a pre-V_{LEX} position for ARP and TACS. In her more advanced productions, this pre-V_{LEX} strategy is integrated with some morphological distinctions: among simple V_{LEX}, ARP and TACS do not change the preverbal position with participial forms, but postverbal positions are simultaneously found with present and imperfective forms. This can be interpreted as a further step towards the target variety, which requires the postposition of ARP and TACS with all simple verb forms. In order to have a consistent strategy, the position of ARP and TACS should in the end be reanalyzed as being linked to the notion of "finiteness" (see Klein and Perdue 1996) resulting in the rule: "place the adverb after the finite form of the verb". This developmental stage is not attested in our data and should be described by further research.

3. Conclusions

The study of the ARP in learner varieties of Italian has confirmed some findings in the previous research on other target languages (Benazzo 1998; Becker and Dietrich 1996; Dimroth 1998; Dimroth and Dittmar 1998; Perdue, Benazzo and Giuliano 2002). In particular, the stage of appearance of the ARP (prebasic variety), their relative frequency (AP more frequent than RP) and the greater syntactic freedom and development of the AP compared to the RP are confirmed by our findings. As other studies already suggest, AP and RP have different functions not only from a semantic but also from a textual point of view. While the use of the RP is related to the specific notion of "restriction", the AP has a connective function between subsequent sentences. Therefore, in the prebasic, basic and early postbasic variety this connective function, which can not be included in the proper additive meaning outlined by Dimroth and Klein 1996, is also found in the learner data.

If we compare how the grammar of ARP develops, some relevant differences between Italian and other target languages can be observed. In German or French, the use of the native wide scope position (post-V_{FIN}) appears early after the developmental stage of finite utterance organization (postbasic variety). In our corpus all learners have reached or reach the postbasic variety during the observation period, but the position of ARP is still mainly based on the pragmatic and semantic principles of adjacency and "operator first". The group [ARP X] is inserted in the verbal utterance, either in initial or in internal position:

[ARP $\underline{X_1}$] V X_2 X_3
X_1 V [ARP $\underline{X_2}$] X_3

While the order of the main constituents can vary depending on both semantic and informational needs, the need of maintaining the group [ARP X] prevails over other possible constraints, such as the non-interruption of the basic syntactic structure, which is on the contrary the principle shaping the initial learner varieties of French (Benazzo

and Giuliano 1998). The larger amount of external positions in our basic and early postbasic data point at a similar strategy being present in our data as well, even though only as a minor strategy.

The post-V_{FIN} position is not frequently used, not even with ARP affecting the verb, that is, in a case where it is the only possible position in the target language. The differentiation between V_{LEX} and V_{NLEX}, based on the semantic value of the verb forms, allows for a consistent picture of our data, however. The pre-V_{LEX} position, acquired for simple and/or compound verb forms and later spread to all verb forms, can be seen as a precursor for the acquisition of the post-V_{FIN} position, still not completely attested in the data of our more advanced postbasic learner, Xiao. In the end, the notion of finiteness seems not yet operative in the placement of the ARP and TACS adverbs.

Both structural properties and the frequency of use in the target language may explain the late acquisition of the wide scope post-V_{FIN} position of Italian. On the one hand native speaker use allows relatively free word-order and shows a preference for the adjacency principle in the placement of ARP. This preference does not help learners to recognize the post-V_{FIN} with wide scope value in the input and does not motivate them to use it with this value. Moreover, the post-V_{FIN} position for ARP affecting the VP is a marked feature of the Italian system, as it is inconsistent with a system which fixes the position of ARP before any constituent type. Furthermore, only a few adverbs in native Italian, such as ARP and TACS, can be placed in post-V_{FIN} position; on the contrary, the more frequent negative adverb *non* occurs in the pre-V_{FIN} position, that is it precedes its domain of application. Finally, the post-V_{FIN} position required for ARP and TACS is inconsistent with the learner variety still at work. We have seen that in the basic and early postbasic variety the learner systematically seems to apply the rule "operator first" for *non* - preverbal - and for ARP with scope over non-verbal constituents.

If we compare the French and German L2 situation, several features that can help the acquisition of the post-V_{FIN} position can be pointed out. In target language German, the opposition between V_{FIN} and V_{NFIN} is clearly associated to specific sentence positions;

moreover, their status of single lexemes is made clear because of their distance in the "Satzklammer". The post-V_{FIN} position of NEG can act, both in German and in French, as a ready-to-use pattern for different adverb types, such as ARP and TACS. In fact, the German negation *nicht* has the post-V_{FIN} position, while in French the discontinuous negation *ne… pas* has in post-V_{FIN} its more salient part *pas* (often used as the only negator, see Benazzo and Giuliano 1998). The acquisition of ARP and TACS position in German and French can therefore follow the acquisition of the NEG position, without any other specific adjustment. Learners of Italian, on the contrary, need specific rule adjustments, linked in particular to the notion of finiteness.

Because of the specific features of the target language, the study of learner varieties of Italian has allowed us to observe some specific features of the development from dynamic learner varieties to the more stable native Italian variety in particular, and in addition some tendencies already described by preceding studies and here confirmed on other European languages could be attested as well.

First, it was possible to show how learners work out syntactic categories such as copula and auxiliary, starting from semantic notions such as the V_{LEX}/V_{NLEX} distinction. The translation of semantic principles into syntactic principles requires a long period of time and seems to happen within the developmental stage of the postbasic variety. We were able to observe and describe the various points in the linguistic evolution.

Second, it has been suggested in this paper that the developments found in the postbasic variety are more conditioned by the target language system than developments in the preceding stages. For example, the late acquisition of the post-V_{FIN} position in Italian with respect to French and German is here assumed to be due to some structural properties of Italian, in particular, the preference for the adjacency strategy in the native language, which reduces the occurrences of wide scope position; the stronger cohesion of the verbal group in Italian, which is weakened in German by the "Satzklammer" and in French by discontinuous negation; and the presence of pre-V_{FIN} negation, in comparison to post -V_{FIN} negation

in French and German, where negation can thus work as a model for the placement of ARP and TACS.

References

Andorno, Cecilia
1999 Avverbi focalizzanti in italiano. Parametri per un'analisi. *Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata* 28-1.
Andorno, Cecilia
2000 *Focalizzatori fra Connessione e Messa a Fuoco. Il Caso delle Varietà di Apprendimento*. Milano, Angeli.
Andorno, Cecilia and Giuliano Bernini
2003a Sintassi della frase semplice. In: Anna Giacalone Ramat (ed.), *Verso l'italiano*, 117-154, Roma: Carocci.
Andorno, Cecilia and Giuliano Bernini
2003b Premesse teoriche e metodologiche. In: Anna Giacalone Ramat (ed.), *Verso l'italiano*, 30-38, Roma: Carocci.
Banfi, Emanuele and Giuliano Bernini
2003 Il verbo. In: Anna Giacalone Ramat (ed.), *Verso l'italiano*, 71-116, Roma: Carocci.
Becker, Angelika and Rainer Dietrich
1996 The acquisition of scope in L2 German. *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik* 26-104: 115-140.
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.
Bernini, Giuliano
1994 La banca dati del "Progetto di Pavia" sull'italiano lingua seconda. *Studi Italiani di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata* 23-2: 221-236.
Bernini, Giuliano
1996 Stadi di sviluppo della sintassi e della morfologia della negazione in italiano L2. *Linguistica e Filologia* 3: 7-33.
Bernini, Giuliano
1998 Developing complex negative structures in Italian as a second language: The acquisition of negative indefinites. *Linguistica e Filologia* 8: 55-86.
Bernini, Giuliano
1999 Percorsi di apprendimento della negazione. In: Norbert Dittmar and Anna Giacalone Ramat (eds.), *Grammatik und Diskurs / Grammatica e Discorso*. *Studi sull'acquisizione dell'italiano e del tedesco / Studien zum Erwerb des Deutschen und des Italienischen,* 91-124. Berlin: Stauffenburg.
De Mauro, Tullio, Federico Mancini, Massimo Vedovelli and Miriam Voghera
1993 *LIP - Lessico di frequenza dell'Italiano Parlato*. Milano: Etas Libri.
Dik, Simon

1968 *Coordination. Its Implications for the Theory of General Linguistics*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.

Dimroth, Christine

1998 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 and Norbert Dittmar

1998 Auf der Suche nach Steuerung Faktoren für den Erwerb von Fokuspartikeln: Längsschnittbeobachtungen am Beispiel polnischer und italienischer Lerner des Deutschen. In: Heide Wegener (ed.), *Eine zweite Sprache lernen. Empirische Untersuchungen zum Zweitspracherwerb*, 217-239. Tübingen: Narr.

Dimroth, Christine and Wolfgang Klein

1996 Fokuspartikeln in Lernervarietäten. Ein Analyserahmen und einige Beispiele. *Zeitschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Linguistik*, 26-104: 73-114.

Giacalone Ramat, Anna

1993a Italiano di stranieri. In: Roberto Sobrero (ed.), *Introduzione all'Italiano Contemporaneo, vol.II: La Variazione e gli Usi,* 341-410. Bologna: Il Mulino.

Giacalone Ramat, Anna

1993b Sur quelques manifestations de la grammaticalisation dans l'acquisition de l'italien comme deuxième langue. *Acquisition et Interaction en Langue Etrangère* 2: 173-200.

Kay, Paul

1990 "Even". *Linguistic and Philosophy* 13: 59-111.

Klein, Wolfgang and Clive Perdue

1993 Utterance Structure. In: Clive Perdue (ed.) *Adult Language Acquisition*, vol 2, 3-40. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

König, Ekkehart

1991 *The Meaning of Focus Particles. A comparative Perspective*. London / New York: Routledge.

Perdue, Clive, Sandra Benazzo and Patrizia Giuliano

2002 When finiteness gets marked: the relation between morphosyntactic delevolpment and use of scopal items in adult language acquisition. *Linguistics* 40-4: 849-890.

Picchi, Eugenio

1997 DBT – Data Base Testuale. Roma, Lexis Progetti Editoriali.

Reis, Marga and Inger Rosengren

1997 A modular approach to the grammar of additive particles: the case of German *auch*. *Journal of Semantics* 14: 237-309.

Ricca, Davide

1999 Osservazioni preliminari sui focalizzatori in italiano. In: Norbert Dittmar and Anna Giacalone Ramat (eds.), *Grammatik und Diskurs / Grammatica e Discorso. Studi sull'Acquisizione dell'Italiano e del Tedesco / Studien zum Erwerb des Deutschen und des Italienischen,* 145-164. Berlin: Stauffenburg.

Valentini, Ada

1992 *L'italiano dei Cinesi*. Milano: Guerini Studio.

von Stechow, Arnim

1991 Current Issues in the Theory of Focus. Arnim von Stechow and Dieter Wunderlich (eds.), *Semantics. An International Handbook of Contemporary Research,* 804-825. Berlin / NewYork: Mouton de Gruyter.

Watorek, Marzena

1998 Postface: la structure des lectes des apprenants. *Acquisition et Interaction en Langue Etrangère* 11: 219-244.

Endnotes

1. See Andorno and Bernini (2003b) for details.
2. A different use of the term 'scope' is found in König (1991): Scope according to him is the whole sentence affected by the particle. A strictly syntactic definition is offered by the generative model: the scope of a particle is its c-command domain (see von Stechow (1991)). We will preserve the term 'domain of application' here.
3. In examples, word-by-word glosses are used and a translation is added; * marks non-acceptable sentences in native Italian; ? marks partially acceptable sentences in native Italian; ***bold italics*** mark the ARP; underlining marks the constituent affected by the ARP; SMALL CAPITALS mark the pitch accent; ↑ marks a rising tone; ↓ marks a falling tone. More detailed transcription rules for the learners' data are listed in Bernini (1994); the learners are identified through two or three letters: Chu, Mk, Xi, Ab.
4. More precisely, following Kay (1990), the proposition as a whole is marked as high (AP) or low (RP) on a scale of informativeness. See Andorno (1999) for details on Italian.
5. The distinction between particles which are inherently scalar and particles which are consistent with a scalar interpretation comes from Ricca (1999).
6. Following Klein and Perdue (1993), we consider the verbform carrying temporal information and assertive force to be the finite form. We consider all verb forms carrying only lexical content to be 'non finite'. Note that it has been shown that the evolution of learner varieties is crucially linked to the acquisition

of finiteness. We will come back to this in 2.6 and following, when we talk about the acquisition of scope in relation to the acquisition of finiteness.

7. The same meaning can also be conveyed by the following utterance, in which the "bridge accent" is restricted to the AP alone. The use of the two structures is linked to different information structures:
   Mario ha ↑ ANCHE ↓ parlato con suo fratello
   Mario has AP spoken with his brother
   'Mario spoke to his brother, as well as did someone else'
8. *Anche* appears already in the prebasic variety of Hagos, a Tigrinia speaker not included in this study (but cf. Andorno 2000). See section 2. for the definition of 'prebasic', 'basic' and 'postbasic' variety.
9. Xiao frequently uses *anche* in an idiosyncratic combination with *pure*. This compound is not allowed in native Italian. The particular usage does result in a high frequency of *pure* in this learner, in contrast to the other learners.
10. The frequencies in this table are calculated taking into account the total number of occurrences of the considered item and the total number of words in the data of each learner.
11. This does not mean that non-verbal utterances can not be found in the Ababa and Xiao data, but they do not characterize them. Note that non-verbal utterances and the pragmatic organization of sentences is also present in native speaker discourse.
12. These are also the most frequent structures of most of the sentences in our data in general (see also Valentini 1992 for more Chinese learners). In the above, our observations will be restricted to sentences including ARP, however.
13. The numbers in the first row indicate the session number.
14. The result is even more significant for *solo* if we consider that, in cases of *anche* working at the sentence level, the particle is obviously adjacent to its domain of application.
15. "Operator" stands for any particle which affects one specific part of the sentence as its domain of application.
16. Before the preverbal position starts being used by the learners, the external positions - both initial and final - can be considered as wide scope positions. This can be observed for *anche* in the earliest data of Markos and Chu. Later, these positions are more frequently used with an adjacent scope. For *solo* both external positions - initial and final - can have wide scope as well, although this position is not used as frequently with wide scope as for *anche* (see 2.5).