

the more regular, imperfect form to change-of-state verbs just as English children generalize -ed to irregular pasts.

In fact, how is it that English children generalize in this way when Italian children do not? If everyone has the same bioprogram, how come everyone doesn't learn the same way? Let us explore this problem in some depth, for by so doing we will not only answer these and other questions, but we will also better understand how the same bioprogram can yield superficially different results when it interacts with two languages that differ in structure.

First, let us dispose of a possible objection. It might be argued that the two English-speaking children learning first irregular, then regular Pasts – are not really commensurate. So they are not, from an adult point of view. But the child does not have an adult point of view, and for the child they must be completely commensurate. The adult knows that Italian has two tense forms with different meanings, whereas English has only a single form, expressed in diverse ways. But there is no way a child could know this unless he were born with a complete grammar of Indo-European in his head, as well as Aspects. Remember,

the children we are talking about are under three. Not only can they not have the slightest idea what the mature tense system of their language will eventually look like, but even on the most favorable accounts, they can have no vaguest notion of what past means, and by some accounts, they can have no notion at all.

What must really happen is something like the following. Around age two, the child who happens to be learning Italian becomes aware of a set of rather irregular forms, which are past-reference forms in adult speech (the English "weak" past tenses). Learning Italian encouters a set of quite regular forms, once again past-treference forms in adult speech (the English "strong" past tenses). Shortly afterwards, the child is aware of a set of rather irregular forms, which are also past-treference forms in adult speech (the English "weak" past tenses). Around age two, reference forms in adult speech (the English "weak" past tenses).

Up until this point, the experiences of the two children have been, from their point of view, identical. I defy anyone to explain how those experiences could be differently interpreted by the two children – except in a single respect, which we shall deal with shortly. From the child's point of view, in both cases he has begun by finding some irregular forms that mean past (from the traditional perspective) or punctual (from the perspective of this volume), and he has gone on to find by finding some irregular forms that mean past (from the traditional perspective) or punctual (from the perspective of this volume).

Once this viewpoint is established, we can proceed to look at the acquisition of TMA systems as systems, bearing in mind all the while the misrecognition of the bioprogram; "Make sure that punctuals and nonpunctuals are adequately different units that subsystem has and what the other units mean.

units that subsystem has and what the other units mean.
 term where such labels are applicable, is entirely determined by how many other that, in consequence, what "perfective" and "imperfective" mean, in any subsystems – of grammatical subsystems cannot be defined independently of those systems – terms like "perfective", and "imperfective", totally ignores the fact that the units like Cormier's, which tries to extract some kind of Platonic core meaning from this issue in Chapter 4; for the moment, suffice it to say that an approach like Ichenebach (1947) to Cormier (1976) and Woeste-Schaefer (1977). We shall return studies, in spite of (I would prefer to say, because of) work in the field from Re-
 The situation was not helped any by the primitive state of the art in TMA same time integrate those subsystems into an overall system.

morphemes in isolation from one another; they build up subsystems and at the system composed of even tigheer subsystems. Children do not learn individual good deal less dull. For what both groups forgot was that language is a trigger not much more irrelevant to the central problem of syntax acquisition, but a off across the meadows of pragmatics, cognition, "motherese", etc., which were it, as we have seen, the sterility of this approach sent acquisitionists gamboiling concentration exclusively on the acquisition of isolated features. Small wonder process in a way it has not been looked at hitherto – even though everything we know about language points to that way as the most logical and fruitful. Alas,

To understand the answer, we have to get used to looking at the acquisition punctual verbs, and saving the -ed affix for activity verbs?

(like came, went, bought, sold, gave, broke – all good changes-of-state, note) for same kind of distinction as the Italian learner, maintaining the irregular forms realization? Or, to put it differently, why doesn't the English learner make the adult grammar rules. Why? Why doesn't the Italian learner make a similar gen-irregular set, applying "weak" tense endings to "strong" verbs in defiance of English learner, on the contrary, proceeds to generalize the regular set to the separate, applying one set to one class of verbs and the other to another. The learner keeps the two sets of forms, the regular and the irregular, completely But now, the Italian learner and the English learner part company. The Italian some regular forms that also mean past (from the traditional perspective).

< \! ?

of one of the difficulties involved in getting from the bioprogram to English. which show a principle relationship, then there is no coincidence, but rather a joint reflection suggested later in this chapter, decreolization and the later stages of acquisition are processes course of decreolization (see Bickerton (1975: 126ff) for details on the latter process? If, as form to be acquired by both children learning English and speakers of an English creole in the past marking on the basis of "relevance to present state", why should the meaning of perfect be so "subtle", in the child's view, and why should it not be the first, rather than the last, verb past marking only opens up a host of other issues. For instance, if the meaning of English perfect is "relevance to present state", and if, as Antinucci & Miller suggest, the child assigns this early easier for the child to grasp than the meaning of the English perfect (a punctual meaning). the case that the meaning of the "composite past" in French or Italian (a punctual meaning) is used around them for years, probably stems from its subtle meaning, and indeed it is surely Maratesos (1979) observes of the latter that "its late acquisition, coming after children have it acquired by French and Italian learners - is among the last to be acquired by English learners. "The question is the more interesting in that the form auxillary + past participle - the first to be

regular past -ed. Since they already have markers for punctual and nonpunctual sides of the PNP. But shortly afterwards they become aware of a third form punctuation one. > that Italian learners add is a past form -the participle-which they interpret as a punctuation one. But since there is no similar form in Italian, the first new form Italian has not. Therefore, the first new term that English learners add is a non-punctuation. English has a distinct (and frequent) form for present progressives; the system. English present tenses determine the first addition to the complex to be explored fully here. However, it seems likely that the difference between Italian and English present tenses is the irregular past, which second new form acquired by English learners is the irregular past, which they interpret as marking punctuality. They are therefore now able to mark both sides of the PNP. But shortly afterwards they become aware of a third form punctuation one.

The question of what determines the order in which new forms are acquired is between the situations of the two The reason why they do not do this can stem only from the unique difference regular/irregular past opposition must look formally identical to the child learner. above (p. 176), the Italian participial/imperfect opposition and the English irregular past opposition must look formally identical to the child learner. Learners: English learners have already marked both sides of - verbs of all types, just as English learners generalize -ed-form as noted sets of paragraphs will show.

but they exert a profound influence on the acquisition process, as the following and durative reference also. The child, needless to say, cannot foresee these facts,

(36) Lookit a boy play ball.

(35) I see you sit down.

(34) Watch me draw circles.

(33) I don't want you read that book.

(32) I want mommy do it.

of actual child speech:

The final complement forms cited by Ljimber which we can assume to be examples following series of examples represents, with one exception, all the sentences because evidence is that they function so far the children."

tablising rules for the calculation of mean length of utterance: "gonna, wanna-hasta ... [were] counted as single morphemes rather than as going to or want to because such, certainly, is the assumption made by Brown (1973: 54) when es-
as variant (perhaps phonologically conditioned) forms of the verb stems con-
or that, at the very least, hasta, kinda, wanna should be entered in the lexicon
would be that the canonical form of the verb was wanna rather than want -
Faced with such data, the most reasonable conclusion on the part of the child

(31) I wanna go (unambiguous verb).

(30) I wanna drink (ambiguous noun and verb).

(29) I wanna cookie (ambiguous noun).

to hear or failed to produce themselves: infinitives. Consider the following sentences, which few children can have failed what the child (as opposed to the adult) knows that the child has acquired marked a similar form, hasta, in his Table 1), then it is not at all clear from the viewpoint of aseems probable, this is just an orthographic regularization of the actual utter-
dured early, this is not clearly the case from the example given: I want to go. If, heuristic purposes. Thus, although Ljimber states that "marked infinity" is ac-
ment whether a given example is an actual child utterance or one presented for Ljimber's data are more problematic in that it is not always clear from his treat-
but "the children did not use it".

"there is also a complementizer that", which can occur in sentences like (24)-(27); like (28), but the complication is that they did not. He does observe, however, that He does not state whether or not the children in his sample produced sentences

Stated more formally, Linber's study would suggest that children have only the

(38) *That John called early annoyed Bill.*

(38) below did not occur in child speech:

any subject NPs." Brown (1973: 21) also observed that sentences of the type of sequence for certain noun phrases ... [but] do not apply syntactic operations to the common simple sentence ... [children] expand (or substitute) an N-V-N sequences prior to age three in the following manner: "An N-V-N sequence is Linber goes on to "informally summarize" the major developments in complex relevant to the present discussion.

by "finite -ing" or as main verbs followed by NP. Either way, (37) would not be finished and all done are interpreted by the child either as quasi-modals followed does not explicitly draw it, it would seem legitimate to draw the conclusion that in sentences like (37), i.e., "with *finish* or *all done*." Although Linber himself (as distinct from the "finite -ing" discussed in a previous section) occurred only a case of a quasi-modal *like*). He further comments that nonfinite -ing forms common *I like to eat lollipops*, (which, as already suggested, is more probably of -ing complements; for example, *I like eating lollipops* in contrast to the very himself explicitly observes that in his recordings there is no trace of "a variety This might at first seem like a clear case of a nonfinite complement S. But Linber

(37) *I all done eating.*

The only example of Linber's which was not cited above is:

verb forms consist of unmarked stems anyway. which Linber's examples are taken (1: 6 to 3:0), the vast majority of children's tense. But it would be legitimate to expect such evidence, since at the ages from cannot point to the presence of markers of tense or aspect in the embedded sentence 2, when the same question of finite versus non-finite analysis was at issue; we tally prior to (34) – may be what is operative in this case.

If we look at these five examples together with the four cited by Brown (and these, strange to say, seem to be virtually the only complement-S constructions cited in the literature), we will note first that not one of them has an overt complementizer, and second, that with the exception of (34) the complements could stand on their own as independent simple sentences. Moreover, since me as subject has been widely reported for black children, it is by no means certain that effect has been

(55) You have two things that turn around (relativeization).

such as the following:

- This last stage is all the more puzzling because children who remain in it are often more complex than those required for correctly forming English WH-sentences, at the same time producing sentences which indicate mastery of rules seemingly

(54) Where the other Joe will drive?

(53) Why he don't know how to pretend?

absent from WH-questions:

At a later stage, when inversion begins to appear in yes-no questions, it is still

(52) You can't fix it?

(51) This can't write a flower?

plex, all the question words but yes-no questions retain the form of (51) and (52): state of affairs changes only very slowly. Sentences grow longer and more complex WH-word; in neither type is there any trace of Subject-Aux inversion. This initial WH-word only by a rising intonation contour, and WH-questions only by a sentence movements only a rising intonation contour, and WH-questions only by a sentence-

Among English learners, yes-no questions are at first distinguished from state-challenged.

than these authors recognized, their principal findings have not been seriously some subsequent observers have found more variation in question development than forms was first studied intensively by Klima & Bellugi (1966), and although the two-word stage, and probably earlier even than that. The acquisition of yes-

Let us now turn to questions. Children acquire questions early – certainly by to differentiate case roles.

prepositions are available in the input, and therefore serialization is not needed serialization are probably the reasons why child language doesn't have verb seeing for it). But then, the reasons why child language doesn't have verb counts; I would not rule out the possibility that it might turn up if people started exception: children show no evidence of verb serialization (at least in existing acceptations for incorporating sentences within sentences are highly similar, with one creoles for incorporating sentences within sentences are highly similar, with one We may justifiably conclude, then, that the mechanics of child language and nonpunctual cannot be assigned any other function.

means nonpunctual, nothing more, and because of the form-meaning binarity means that characterizes both child speech and creoles, the form chosen to mark

stem from incomplete applications of standard transformational processes. „double-WHs“ don't occur at all casts strong doubt on the assumption that children's mistakes (1978) for criticism of this proposal). The fact that „double pasts“ occur so frequently while delete the original occurrence of past tense under the Aux node (but see Maratsos & Kuczaj marker in Aux onto the verb-stem, as in the familiar „Aux-Hopping“ rules, but then fails to generate active accounts (e.g., Hurford 1975) to stem from a process which copies the past-tense ⁷ For instance, „double pasts“ of the kind discussed in Note 5 above are assumed in orthodox

on several grounds.

duently use to form questions of their own. Clark's explanation is implausible questions; in this way, they acquire the univocal structures which they use that children are sure to listen with special attention to the answers to their own *Teddy?* may often be answered by *I don't know WHERE TEDDY IS*. Clark argues that children caregivers (Clark 1977). For example, the child who asks where-ers and other caregivers (Clark 1977). An alternative explanation is suggested by Ruth Clark, who claims that uninflected WH-questions are modeled on the embedded clauses produced by mothers.

An alternative explanation is suggested by Ruth Clark, who claims that unin-

the whole explanation becomes circular.

are psychologically complex is that they take longer to acquire. In other words, two-rearrangement argument, the only reason for supposing that WH-questions those errors do not in fact occur. If indeed there is no evidence to support the yet been reported and that it will constitute counter-evidence to their claims if a candor as rare as it is commendable, they observe that such errors have not as it children do really derive WH-questions in this way, one would expect to find generalize statement, make the same assumption. However, the latter note that errors resulting from incomplete application of the process, such as *you doing what?* or *what you doing what?* in place of the expected *what you doing?* with it children do really derive WH-questions in this way, one would expect to find sentence, the operations which a generative grammar of English would apply strictly for these authors) that children actually carry out, in the processing of sentences, the auxiliaries verb" (emphasis added). This claim assumes (rather uncharacte- because they require two rearrangements: movement of the WH from where it would have been to initial position in the sentence and inversion of the subject Clarke & Clark (1977: 354) suggest that "WH-questions may be more difficult to derive WH-questions. Erreichen & Witzemer (1980), writing from an orthodox sentential, the operations which a generative grammar of English would apply strictly for these authors) that children actually carry out, in the processing of sentences, the auxiliaries verb" (emphasis added). This claim assumes (rather uncharac- and auxiliaries verb" (emphasis added). This claim assumes (rather uncharac- because they require two rearrangements: movement of the WH from where it would have been to initial position in the sentence and inversion of the subject Clarke & Clark (1977: 354) suggest that "WH-questions may be more difficult to derive WH-questions. Erreichen & Witzemer (1980), writing from an orthodox sentential, the operations which a generative grammar of English would apply strictly for these authors) that children actually carry out, in the processing of sentences, the auxiliaries verb" (emphasis added). This claim assumes (rather uncharac-

ferent from the many well-formed questions which they must have heard? Why do children at this level of development persist in using structures so dif-

and subordinate-clause causative construction).

(57) Let's go upstairs and take it from him because it's mine (coordination

embedding plus embedded nonfinite WH-clause).

(56) I told you I know how to put the train together (double complement

verb. In either case, there may be several different types of marking, especially distinction may be marked on the subject (as in ergative languages) or on the of making the causative-nominalization distinction (henceforth the CNC). This language in this area), we must bear in mind that there are many different ways First (for we shall be drawing evidence from the acquisition of more than one

the acquisition of causative constructions.

For our fourth and final area of creole acquisition comparison, we will look at

I have not seen any reports of sentences like (64), but that in itself is no indication that they never occur in child language. If they do not occur, then the "common sense" argument given above could well be the answer. If they do occur, then an argument based on the order of acquisition of negative indefinites cannot account for all the data, and in light of the creole evidence, the workings of the bioprogram must again be suspected.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \text{No dog bit any cat} \\
 \text{no dog not bite no cat} \\
 (64) \quad \text{non dag na bat non kyat}
 \end{array}$$

NP as in the following GC sentence:

Here is a case where fuller and more careful collection of data may help to resolve the issue. In creoles, negative subjects/negative verb is by no means restricted to generic indefinites like *nobody*, *no one*, *nothing*. It also involves Neg + solve the issue. In creoles, negative subjects/negative verb is by no means restricted to generic indefinites like *nobody*, *no one*, *nothing*.

This argument stands up much better than most others which seek to explain multiple negation in more natural than single negation, despite the pedagogues predication negation in languages generally. There must be some way in which negative subjects/negative verb in creoles and the greater frequency of double mon than *nobody* in adult input. It leaves mysterious both the frequency of that *nobody* is acquired before *anybody*, which may be as common or more common than *nobody* in adult input. It depends crucially on independent motivation for the fact that *nobody* is acquired before *anybody*. However, it is by no means away creole-like structures in child language. However, it is by no means in- aware to question. It depends crucially on independent motivation for the fact that *nobody* is acquired before *anybody*. However, it is by no means in-

the process of learning English.

bioprogram to produce multiple negatives, but rather from factors inherent in this showing, sentences like (63) would issue, not from some command of the negation which, as we have just seen, cost him so much difficulty to acquire. On too, to expect him to abandon at once, in sentences like (63), the system of verbal

underlying structure of sentences like (66). We shall return to this point shortly that would assume something like *Bill caused the door to become open* as the causative verb casts strong doubts on those generative-semantician analyses are acquired earlier and more easily than structures involving two clauses and morphemes and single-clause structures (the case in both Turkish and Kaluli) The fact that CNC'D strategies that involve marking of causatives by bound without ever being generalized to nonagentive subjects.

applied to causative agents is fully acquired and apparently used by age 2;2, for Kaluli, an ergative language of Papua-New Guinea. Here, the suffix which is equally early and errorless marking of the CNC'D is reported by Schieffelin (1979) other of those cases of "errorless learning", we discussed earlier in this chapter. suffix is learned and used productively and correctly by the age of two – an- This finding is hardly surprising in light of the fact that the Turkish causative Italian speakers averaged between only 60 and 80 percent.

this level until they were four or over, while even at age four the English and children before the age of three. Serbo-Croat speakers, however, did not reach The task was performed with almost 100 percent accuracy by Turkish-speaking

, 'The horse made the camel run' (lit., the horse ran the camel)

Horse-NOM camel-ACC run-Causative-Optative-3rd pers.

◀ co-affrs

(76) At devy*i* kosturusun

ever, uses single verb + affix: examples of the three other English ways of marking the CNC'D. Turkish, however, and Serbo-Croat, such sentences have rather similar structures, involving two toy animals such as *the horse made the camel run*. In English, Italian, than others, Slobin (1978) reports a cross-linguistic experiment on the interpretation of causative constructions in which the subjects were children of English, Italian, Serbo-Croat, and Turkish. Subjects were required to act out with some methods of expressing the CNC'D would seem to be more easily acquired

function of all of these varying devices is identical. to make the CNC'D will, of course, reflect the typology of that language. But the marker. The particular strategy or selection of strategies chosen by any language of noncausatives are marked, like objects of causatives, with the accusative case-verb, but mark causative subjects only with the ergative case-marker; subjects by means of a verbal affix. Ergative languages, too, generally use the same lexical verb, is to employ the same lexical verb in both cases but differentiate them in Turkish, yet another verb-marking method, not used by English but found, for example,

gram may look too much like some bizarre kind of providentiality, as if a well-put like this, without any supporting evidence, the structure of the biopro-

of the program.

tion, and only if they failed to find any would they need the implementation part. Thus, children would start early searching for means to express the distinctive means of implementation until the third or fourth year. to emerge prior to two, possibly around eighteen months or earlier, while the

- > of the first four years or so of life. The distinctions would then be programmed bioprogram is not present at birth, but unfold gradually during the course but are not necessarily constant in the program. We have already claimed that the as follows: both distinctive and means for implementing them are programmed, into a pidgin-speaking community). I suspect that the bioprogram may turn out fail to meet their expectations (as is the case, most drastically, if they are born grammaed with the means to realize these distinctions should their native tongue somehow. It is less clear whether, or to what extent, they are specifically pro- of basic distinctions which they expect that their native tongue will implement torily. If there is a language bioprogram, then children are programmed with a set Far from being counter-evidence, the Turkish and Kahlili cases are confirming we shall see.

equally early age; it is the three other types of causative that create problems, as causatives of the door opened/Bill opened door type are certainly acquired at an early underruled, as it were, by the addition of a further marker. Moreover, English Kahlili solutions are already transitive-intransitive alternatives which are sim- creoles make. This is a most unlikely finding because, in fact, the Turkish and required before the simple transitive-intransitive alternatives of the kind that one would have to show that Turkish-type or Kahlili-type solutions were ac-

The answer is: not in the slightest. To provide counter-evidence of any value,

solutions of Turkish and Kahlili are so quickly acquired?

Is it not then counter-evidence to the language bioprogram that the bound-morphology chapter, i.e., (65)-(66). Notoriously, creoles avoid bound-morphology solutions. Chapter 2 - were identical in structure with the English examples in the present alternation), creoles use only the last named. The examples given - (86)-(91), periphrasis, passivization, lexical alternation, and simple transitive-intransitive presssing the CNCI described above (case-marking, verbal affixation, causal-verb creole case. We saw in Chapter 2 that out of the six potential strategies for ex-

causatives. First, however, we should ask how the cases of Turkish and Kahlili relate to the

when we discuss the treatment by Bowerman (1974) of the acquisition of English

This strategy would be applied in a wide variety of cases: in English pluralization, past tense, and, again, in causatives. The child would note the existence of

Step 4: Remove the exceptions (if any) which appear when Step 3 is applied.

match.

Step 3: Compare output with input, and note cases (if any) where these do not

Step 2: Apply that form in all possible environments.

Step 1: Look for any regular form with a consistent core of meaning.

Let us suppose that children learn language by adopting a series of "strategies": whether learned or innate is immaterial here. Such strategies would clearly include generalization, one of the best-attested concomitants of acquisition. The strategy of generalization might be informally defined as follows:



to English of the regular creole strategy. But a good deal more is involved than is significant about these cases is precisely that they constitute a generalization them with the child's over-generalization of regular plural forms. Indeed, what Clark & Clark (1977: 51), in discussing these developments, explicitly compare

(sc., make her eat, feed her)

Child: But I can't eat her!

Mother: Just pretend, honey.

(81) Child (pretending to feed doll): See, she can't eat!

if they were potential causatives:

except where cannibalism is practiced, to nonhuman objects are also treated as

which are restricted to noncausative meanings (see (70), (71) above) and hence,

This process does not limit itself to intransitives. Transitive verbs like eat

as it is in creoles.

Note that this creative process extends to adjectives as well as verbs (80), and that the line between adjectives and verbs may therefore, at this stage, be as thin

(sc., make it flat, flatten it)

(80) How would you flat it?

(sc., made it come over there)

language containing him. The child is under pressure to talk, whether he is does not stand still until the child has mastered possible semantic classes in the language coincide with the formal differences perceptible in those data. But production for certain, given any body of partial data, whether semantic classes did or did not say anything, could fit into so many partially overlapping classes, that one could never say language contains (it then!). Each lexical item has so many parameters of meaning alone until he has at least experienced the full range of semantic classes that the relevant semantic sets are? He cannot construct semantic sets from experience involved in one case, but not in the other, unless he already knows what the child's viewpoint? How is the child supposed to recognize that semantic sets adult who knows something of the grammar of both languages – but from the point of view of an

It is true that the two cases are not comparable from the standpoint of an

but * the jockey ran the horse is not.

that the jockey walked the horse and the jockey galloped the horse are grammatical, perhaps, is not a natural semantic class; nothing but experience could tell one as opposed to those that take lexical alternation, passivization, or causal-verbal is involved. The sets of verbs that take simple transitive-intransitive alternation, causes things to happen and subjects that do not. In English, no such distinction is in Kalluli, there is a semantic and pragmatical distinction between subjects that

A simplistic answer might be: because the two cases are not really comparable.

case, but not in the other?

ing to Schieffelin, we do not do. Why is the generalization strategy chosen in one ergative case-markers applied to experiencer or patient subjects which, according to Kalluli learners applied the same strategy, then we should find large numbers of inaccurate description of what Kalluli Learners do about their causative marking. Unfortunately, while the generalization strategy provides an exact description of what English Learners do about causative marking, it provides a complete analysis of accusative affixes (Step 4).

Let us suppose that the Kalluli learner applied a similar strategy. He would fast observe that a number of nouns in subject position had an ergative affix (Step 1); he would then generalize the affix to all NPs in subject position (Step 2); he would then note that in fact a number of subjects had a different kind of affix (Step 3); he would then work toward a correct distribution of the ergative and

*X for false "regular," forms like Y ate X (Step 4).
Y fed X (Step 3); he would then gradually substitute "irregular," forms like Y fed a number of pairs like X ate/Y ate X (Step 1); he would generalize this, yielding pairs like X opened/Y opened X (Step 2); he would note counter-evidence such as*

"It should not need to be emphasized that, first, there is no evidence for "hyperstrategic" devices as such, beyond the problems whose solution might seem to call for them, and second, that if they did exist, they would constitute an imitate component no less surely (although with far less justification) than does the bioprogram proposed here.

But a more serious objection stems from Slobin's (1978) work. Slobin found that even at age four, English learners often could not act out make-X-do-Y sentences correctly, which suggests that even at that age, they understood them and didates for underying forms.

There are several problems with this argument. It is far from certain that two distinct propositions do underlie X-open-Y sentences; the mere existence of make-X-do-Y sentences is not itself evidence one way or the other. Certainly, the results of Slobin's experiments, discussed above, suggest that the latter sentences are perceptually more complex than the former, therefore intrinsically unlikely

(77)-(81).

However, once he had acquired make sentences, he could then analyze sentences with open- "break down", such sentences into "a cause proposition and an effect proposition", "migrate produce sentences like Mommy open door", he would not yet be able to generate semantic was still alive) that although the child at an early stage generalized to both transitive and intransitive causatives, as we saw in examples etc., in just the same way; and, once this reanalysis was complete, it could be the sentence into these propositions, he could then analyze sentences with open-". However, once he had acquired make sentences, which do formally divide facts, Bowerman argued (and the argument sounded a lot better in the days when do not appear until after the emergence of correct make sentences. From these quired before periphrastic causatives like Billy make Mommy open door are accurate in Bowerman (1974) that while "correct" causatives like Mommy open door are accurate before leaving causatives we should consider an observation made

However, before leaving causatives we should consider an observation made distinctions to be marked, so the second problem does not arise. A language-bioprogram approach picks the correct one the first time around. A language-bioprogram approach is able to deal with both problems. It has no strategies, so the first problem is a ghost problem. It specifies the set of and Käluüli morphemes, that child invariably picks the correct one the first time wide range of hypotheses that the child could form about the nature of Turkish A "hypothesis-forming" approach fails because it cannot show how, out of a "big", device which would tell the child which strategy to use in which case, but not in the case of Käluüli causatives - unless it introduces some "hyperstrategic" fails to explain why the child over-generalizes in the case of English causatives the learning of the CND in English, Turkish, and Käluüli. A "strategic" approach