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**12. The weaker language in bilingual Swedish–French children**

**SUZANNE SCHLYTER**

**BACKGROUND**

*Bilingual children*

Studies of grammatical development in young bilingual children have mostly concentrated on the cases where the children have a *more* or less balanced proficiency in two languages (cf. De Houwer, 1987, and most of the papers in Meisel, 1990). There are however studies of bilingual children aged 1–5 which mention that the two languages are not quite in balance during their development, but that, at least for periods of time, one of the languages is weaker (e.g. Leopold, 1939–49; Aronberg, 1981; Lanza, 1988). Normally the majority language will be the stronger one, whereas the minority language is weaker.

Studies of bilinguals also indicate that if the two languages are both equally strong (Meisel, 1989), each language develops in the same way as the same language of a monolingual child. We do not know very much, however, about the quality of the weaker language. Does it develop like a normal first language, but with some retardation? Or does it develop more like a second language? According to some authors (e.g. De Houwer, 1987; Berman, 1979; Parodi, 1990) the weaker language is retarded in relation to the stronger one, and later follows the same development as a normal first language.²

However, owing to the fact that the child may have acquired
certain concepts in the stronger language, we can also expect him/her to be influenced by these in the acquisition of the weaker, i.e., the later, one, and thus transfer this similarly to a second language.

Differences in the acquisition of L1/L2

Before going into the question of whether the weaker language behaves like L1 or L2, we need to establish what the differences are between these two types of acquisition.

Even though it is evident that there are similarities between first and second language acquisition, as far as e.g., similar developmental sequences of specific morphemes (cf. Wode, 1981) are concerned, there are also differences.

First language acquisition is often reported to be practically error-free, whereas second language acquisition is rich in errors, especially in language-specific morphology, such as agreement, gender etc. Thus, Andersson and Strömqvist (1990), on the acquisition of gender in Swedish L1 and L2 (p. 19), conclude that ‘child L1 acquisition is strikingly error-free, whereas adult L2 acquisition is error-intense’.

The special word order phenomena in subordinate clauses are reported as being acquired practically error-free in L1, but not in L2: in German, the finite verb is sentence-final (cf. Clahsen, 1988); in Swedish, the negation is before instead of after the finite verb (cf. Plunkett and Strömqvist, 1990; Hyltenstam, 1977. However, cf. Håkansson, 1989, for counter-examples.)

According to Clahsen (1988), and also Meisel (1991) specific phenomena concerning word order and inflection in German are acquired in clearly different ways in L1 and in L2.

Meisel (1991:272) summarizes the linguistic differences relevant to his hypothesis (cf. below) on the acquisition of German in the following way:

- L1 development
  - initially prefer pronominal subjects
  - once subjects are used, frequency of use rises rapidly to approach 100%
  - rapid development of agreement; soon 100% correct
  - if there is a subject, V agrees with it; virtually no errors
  - non-finite verbs always in final position; acquisition of inflection triggers V-second

- L2 acquisition
  - initially marked preference for nominal subjects
  - frequency of use varies over time; omissions constrained by situational and structural context
  - some learners: no agreement; others: limited success
  - over the entire period studied: numerous errors
  - position of V independent of +/−finite distinction; non-finite V in second position

In French acquired as an L2 (e.g. Harley, 1984) there are similar differences: subject–verb agreement and gender agreement are the most difficult, and last acquired, morphological items. In French L1 (in monolinguals or in balanced bilinguals, cf. Meisel, 1990), on the other hand, these phenomena are acquired early and correctly.

Differences between L1 and L2 acquisition have been accounted for as being due to differences in cognitive development (McLaughlin, 1978). Similar views are held by Wode (1981), Felix (1987), for whom the similarities are evidence of operation of the same linguistic–cognitive principle, and the differences due to differences in cognitive maturity. Andersson and Strömqvist also account for their facts in terms of cognitive differences in the 2 types of learners, in the sense that rote learning (in unanlyzed units) plays a more central role in young children.

At present, there is an intense discussion in the framework of GB theory as to whether a second language is acquired following the principles of Universal Grammar (UG) or not. Whereas these
principles per definition govern the acquisition of a first language, functioning as (at least a part of) the Language Acquisition Device, it is not evident that this also is the case for a second language (cf. e.g. White, 1989; Eubank, 1991).

Many scholars argue in favour of some kind of biogenetic programming operating in childhood only (cf. Long, 1990), and related to the principles of UG (cf. Clahsen, 1988; Meisel, 1991), whereas at least adolescent and adult L2 learning follows other principles.

Some of the arguments in favour of such an approach concern the facts that all healthy and normal children acquire language, rapidly and all in a similar way, going through the same developmental stages, independently of their IQ, motivation, attitude etc. In L2 acquisition, on the other hand, there is great variability according to these factors: some learners may acquire a second language almost as well as children, others will never acquire it in spite of much exposure, most learners acquire a second language in some way but slowly and with many errors (cf. Long, 1990).

Other arguments are of a more detailed linguistic nature (cf. Clahsen, 1988; Meisel, 1991), indicating that L1 development – but not L2 learning – can be accounted for as the setting of language-specific parameters, cf. the linguistic data given above. The fact that these different phenomena are acquired simultaneously with one another, rapidly and correctly, indicates that they are ‘triggered’ in L1 and thus should be considered as a case of parameterized language development, according to UG principles.

Lundin and Platzack (1988) account, in a similar way, for the rapid and correct acquisition of finiteness, V2 word order, subordinate clauses – with correct placement of the negation as an instance of the setting of the ‘V2-parameter’ in Swedish.

In this paper, I will show that, in spite of many evident similarities between the stronger language and the weaker language, there are certain specific differences between them, concerning the facts crucial for the ‘UG only in L1’ position.

PRESENT INVESTIGATION

The present study is part of a larger project which aims at discussing, among other things, questions such as those presented above. In this project, 6 bilingual French–Swedish children were investigated longitudinally over a period of 2 years from the age of about 2. The parents are middle class, living in the suburbs of Stockholm. In each family one parent is Swedish-speaking, the other is French-speaking. The children were recorded every fourth month. In each recording session, they played and talked spontaneously with each of their parents, for half an hour in French and half an hour in Swedish.

The recordings were transcribed and coded on computer. The linguistic level was measured with the help of MLU (= Mean Length of Utterances) calculated in words. The general linguistic profile for each speech sample was calculated with the help of the computer, along the lines of the ‘Profile Analysis’ of Clahsen (1986), adapted to French (cf. the DUFDE project, as described in Meisel, 1990) and to Swedish. The profile thus obtained makes it possible to (a) define the developmental level of each sample qualitatively; (b) observe whether there are differences between a sample of a ‘weaker language’ and a sample of a ‘stronger language’ of corresponding level.

The developmental level is accounted for in terms of stages, along the lines of Clahsen (1986). Roughly, these stages can be described as follows:

Stage I = the one word stage; Stage II = the two word stage; Stage III = the stage where grammatical morphemes appear, such as auxiliaries, articles, personal pronouns, prepositions etc.; Stage IV = the stage where language specific word order etc. of main clauses is established; Stage V = the stage where subordinate clauses of different kinds, narratives etc. appear.

In this study, samples of the stronger and of the weaker language have been matched on two grounds: MLU and qualitative analyses,
i.e. according to features characteristic of a certain stage of development. Whereas it was relatively easy to state the developmental stage for each sample of the stronger language, the elaboration of a profile for each speech sample often turned out to be more difficult in the weaker language, since typical indicators of a higher level could be found alongside indicators of a lower level, in a sort of ‘mixed-stage’ pattern. Developmental level has therefore been defined as a combination of MLU and of certain stage indicators, even if the child does not combine all of them. These partial ‘Stage Criteria’, which thus constitute the similarities between the stronger and the weaker language, are described here:

At ‘Stage III’ in both the stronger and the weaker language, the children studied here start using articles, auxiliary verbs, finite verb forms, and prepositions. Sentences with SVO or SVX structure appear. Except for PPs (and, partly, NPs), these phenomena are however unstable and variable in the weaker language. MLU is roughly between 2 and 3 (but with certain individual variations).

At ‘Stage IV’ in both the stronger and the weaker language, the utterances become longer and more complex. In Swedish there is often inversion after a preposed adverb, in French we find preposed adverbs and dislocated subjects or objects. Typical of French, at this level, are object clitics (e.g. je le vois). Possessive pronouns, paratactic constructions and relative clauses of ‘cleft’ type are found in both languages.

At ‘Stage V’ we find, in the stronger and in the weaker language, subordinate clauses with conjunctions, also marking for past and future tense, where the child starts speaking about what is not ‘here-and-now,’ and attempts to tell stories.

RESULTS

General tendencies

At the time of investigation, the children in this project were not all dominant in Swedish, the majority language, but 3 of them had

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>stronger language</th>
<th>weaker language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>French (only some words)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Léo</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>French (some words and formulas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jean</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dany</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Swedish (only slightly weaker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimi</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Swedish</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can observe that:
- one of the languages was always acquired without problems;
- there is great variation as to the acquisition of the other language:
  one child, Dany, learned it almost perfectly, whereas some children dropped the second language after initial bilingualism at the one-and two-word stage (Paul, Léo). Still others had a more or less parallel, but clearly weaker, language over a long period of time.

These general observations are congruent with other cases cited in the literature on unbalanced bilingualism (cf. above).

This variation is similar to what has been observed for L2 acquisition, as opposed to L1 acquisition.

Finiteness, pronominal subjects and word order in the stronger and weaker language

The factors which have been studied most intensively as far as the difference between L1 and L2 is concerned are finiteness, pronominal subjects, agreement, and word order. Further, these factors have been examined in a clear theoretical framework, namely the possible access to UG in L2. These phenomena have, therefore, been concentrated on here.

In the stronger language, just as Meisel (1989, 1991) points out for L1 in German and French, the children studied here started using personal pronouns in combination with finite verbs, in their correct form and with a correct word order, in a systematic and productive way, e.g.:
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personal pronouns, but place them in an incorrect position, and/or combine them with a verb which is not marked for finiteness. He/she may use the correct verb form to mark past or future tense, but fail to mark person/number agreement correctly. The word order may be more incorrect than in a corresponding sample of the stronger language.

Quantitative and qualitative evidence for points (B) and (C) will be given here, based on a detailed analysis of 3 of the children of this project (Jean, Mimi and Anne):

Quantitative analysis of some of the samples. ‘Correct finiteness’ has been calculated according to the following criteria:

- correct finite verb form (correct for tense and person marking)
- explicitly stated subject (normally personal pronouns)
- correct word order (in Swedish: verb-second, in French: (X)SV.)

If one or more of these criteria are lacking, the sentence is counted as having ‘incorrect finiteness’. The number of sentences with correct finiteness is calculated here in comparison with all comprehensible utterances (except yes/no), in order to account for both ‘incorrect finiteness’ and for the cases where the subject + verb is avoided by the child or replaced by items in the stronger language.

Language samples are matched with one another with the help of MLU and stage criteria. Since there are certain individual differences concerning the extent to which the children structure the finiteness of their language, the most revealing comparison is between the stronger and the (retarded) weaker language of the same child.

In Table 12.1, the number after the name refers to the recording, the F or S to the language. Stage level in inverted commas means mixed or irregular stage criteria. The dotted line indicates the level at which comparison has been made: since the recordings are rather sparse, we do not always have a recording of exactly comparable level, but the comparison must be a constructed level between the 2 documented here.

il a fini ‘he has finished’ dom kommer ‘they come’
elle est là hon är här ‘she is here’
ge veux manger jag vill åta ‘I want to eat’

Earlier, in Stage II, the grammatical subjects were normally lexical (e.g. teddy, mamma), the verbs were infinite, and the subject could occur before or after the verb.

In a corresponding sample of the weaker language, however, the children had problems with these phenomena, of the following kinds:

(A) The child may use just some single (non-functional) words of the language (in the cases where the language is very weak).

(B) The child may avoid the combination subject + verb altogether, which gives a profile with an unusually high frequency of PP’s and NP’s.

Examples:

Jean 5F: dans la coquille ‘in the shell’
dans les pieds ‘in the feet’
pas des oursins dans le pied! ‘no sea urchins in the foot!’

In these cases, the rest of the sentence (i.e. pronominal subject + finite verb—often auxiliary or copula) may be replaced by items from the stronger language. This results in sentences of the following type (the words from the ‘incorrect,’ i.e. stronger language, are italicized):

Léo 2F: biter vachen ‘bites, the cow’
det är en dame. ‘that is a lady’
sönder, dame ‘broken, (the) lady’

Léo 3F: och det är också soleil ‘and that is also (the) sun’
jag dormir dans la fauteuil ‘I (to) sleep in the chair’

(Cf. the weaker language in a child studied by Parodi (1990), which is of a similar type).

(C) If the language is only slightly weaker, the child may use
Table 12.1. Percentage of ‘correct finiteness’ per comprehensible utterances

| Anne | Anne 3F (2.7 years) | Stage III, MLU 2.7: 40% |
|-----------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| Anne 5S (2.11 years) | Stage III, MLU 2.5: 6% |
| St. III +, MLU 3.2: | 55% |
| Anne 7S (3.3 years) | Anno 'IV,' MLU 2.9: 34% |
| Anne 7F (3.3 years) | St. IV, MLU 2.9: | 47% |
| Mimi | Mimi 1F (2.0 years) | 18% |
| St. III, MLU 2.1: | Mimi 2S (2.2 years) |
| St. IV, MLU 2.6: 14% |
| Mimi 2F (2.2 years) | St. IV, MLU 3.2: | 52% |
| Jean: | Jean 3S (2.2 years) | 12% |
| St. III, MLU 1.7: | St. III, MLU 2.0: 9% |
| Jean 5S (2.6 years) | Jean 8F (3.1 years) |
| St. IV, MLU 2.7: | St. IV-V, MLU 3.0: 5% |

As can be seen in Table 12.1, the proportion of correct finiteness is smaller in a sample of a weaker language than in a stronger language. More precisely, it can be observed that, when the stronger language of a child has entered Stage III, and attained an MLU of c. 2.5 (in words), the percentage of 'correct finiteness' calculated in this way increases rapidly to about 50%, whereas this proportion is smaller in the weaker language of a corresponding level, i.e. at a somewhat later age. (The proportion varies depending on the degree of weakness of the weaker language.)

Qualitative analysis of some of the samples. Here, the language of different children will have to be compared, because the qualitative comparison must be between two samples of the same language.

Comparison (A), Swedish at Stage III:
- Stronger Ig: Jean 3S (Stage III, MLU 1.7, age 2:2)
- Weaker Ig: Anne 3S (Stage III, MLU 1.9, age 2:7)

Jean 3S: Here Jean speaks his stronger language Swedish very willingly, and does not use any French words in a Swedish-speaking situation. Of the 43 verbs used, 28 have the present tense ending 'r.' Of these, 14 have a pronoun subject, which is systematically placed after the verb. There are no instances of a personal pronoun combined with an incorrect verb form, which supports the findings of Meisel (1991) (cf. above). Examples:

- bygger dom 'build they'
- pumpar dom 'pump they'
- klipper man 'cuts one' 3 occurrences
- åker dom 'ride they'
- onklar dom '? they'
- a ritar dom 'draw they'
- målar dom 'paint they'
- brinner dom 'burn they'
- där står den 'there stands it'
- där var den 'there was it'

The personal pronoun is systematically placed after the verb, which is perfectly correct in the last 2 cases, where an adverb is preposited, but in the other cases constitutes a target-deviant word order. I have considered it as representing 'correct finiteness', since it seems to be a normal step in the development in at least some Swedish children. The child is, in any case, now developing a productive system, concerning finiteness, by using pronoun subject and finite verbs.

Anne 3S: At this age, the French of Anne is very fluent, and has a very elaborate finiteness (40%, cf. Table 12.1). Her Swedish is
clearly weaker. She is also unwilling to speak, often answers with 'mm' or 'nej', or uses French words.

In contrast to Jean 3S, and to her own French language, Anne 3S does not have a very regular system of 'subj-pron + finite Verb' structures in Swedish. Anne uses only 2 precursors to the '-r' ending on verbs – both with a precursor to a personal pronoun:

n kissa(r)  'n pee(s)'
n titta(r)  'n look(s)'

The copula, är, is used most times without subject:

'nej är Mimmi, den där.  'no is Mimmi, that one'
'ja, är Mimmi.          'yes, is Mimmi'

An * is here put before utterance which are incorrect not only according to the adult norm, but presumably also to the 'child language norm,' in the sense that utterances of this type have not been found in the samples of the same language as the stronger language in this material.

Anne may omit the subject which is obligatory in Swedish after the finite verb when an object, adverb etc. is preposed:

'den där vill inte ha!  'that one want not (to) have'.

There are also instances of correct finiteness, often with the verb 'vill' (= wish, want to), but these are less systematic than those of Jean 3S.

Comparison (B) Swedish at Stage IV.

Stronger Ig: Jean 5S (Stage IV, MLU 2.7, age 2;6)
Weaker Ig: Mimi 2S (Stage IV, MLU 2.6, age 2;2):

The children Jean and Mimi are well suited for comparison with each other because of their similarities: both are early learners, both structure their stronger language very well, both speak the weaker language rather well and normally quite willingly.

Jean 5S: Jean has a very well-structured Swedish as stronger language at this stage. Of the 77 verbs he uses, almost 90% have correct finiteness in the sense defined above. Only 8 are in non-finite form, and none of these occurs with a subject pronoun. All other verbs are in finite forms and take a pronominal subject, e.g.:

det är bara mattan  'it's only the mat'
jag vill inte  'I want not'
dom gungar  'they swing'
man sprutar vatten  'one sprays water'
han gräver, pappan  'he digs, the father'
hon har ta' skenorna  'she has take (sic) the rails'
vad ska vi ha i där?  'what shall we have in there?'
hur ska man öppna då?  'how shall one open then?'

Tense is well marked, in the sense that Jean uses the correct Swedish morphology for present, past and future tense. (This is a good illustration of the systematic acquisition of finiteness, such as Meisel (1991) has shown for other children.)

Mimi 2S: At this age, the French of Mimi shows perfect structuring, and its profile is very similar to the Swedish profile of Jean 5S. (Cf. also the quantitative data above.) As for her weaker language, Swedish, Mimi is not unwilling to speak, and she uses rather complex utterance types, but the profile of her Swedish differs from Jean’s Swedish at the comparable level.

Mimi uses 63 verbs in this speech sample. Of these, only 19, i.e. 30% of them, have correct finiteness, in the sense defined above. These are of the following type:

det är vatten  'that is water'
den är min  'that is mine'
jag vet inte  'I don’t know'
det är där han springer  'that’s where he is running'
titta vad jag gör!  'look what I am doing'

The last two utterances, with a simple kind of subordination,
indicate quite a high developmental level – Stage IV or V – as do the preterite forms below. Still, Mimi makes a great number of errors concerning finiteness: often she aims at the finite form of the verb, but does not mark present with ‘-r’ – except in the one case cited above. (Mimi articulates very clearly, so it cannot be the case that the -r disappears for phonetic reasons.) Examples:

(Mimi is describing the pictures of 'Alice in Wonderland,' where a rabbit is running.)

‘kanin spring sådär’ ‘rabbit run like that’
‘ja sådär han spring’ ‘yes like that he run’
‘titta han spring sådär’ ‘look he run like that’

After inversion, Mimi often omits the subject (cf. Anne 3S above):

‘så, så där ska vara.’ ‘so, like that shall be’
‘titta vad gör!’ ‘look what does!’
‘titta vad gjorde!’ ‘look what did!’

Mimi also makes errors in word order:

‘den också är grön’ ‘this also is green’
‘och den också sån är grön’ ‘and this also such is green’
‘där jag skrivit’ ‘there I written’
‘titta vad gjorde Nat bollen!’ ‘look what did Nat the ball!’

Errors of these types have not been observed in this material in Swedish as a stronger language.

Comparison (C) French Stage IV:

Stronger Ig: Mimi 2F (St. IV, MLU 3,2, age 2:2)
Weak Ig: Jean 6F (St. IV, MLU 3,5, age 2:9)

Stronger Ig: Mimi 3F (St. IV, MLU 3,5, age 2:6)
Weak Ig: Jean 8F (St. IV-V, MLU 3,0, age 3:0)

In these samples, the French of Mimi has a qualitatively somewhat lower developmental level than the matched sample of Jean – which only makes the grammatical differences more interesting. Both children have acquired tense marking for immediate past and future, i.e. they have a productive use of ‘passé composé’ and ‘futur proche’. Subordinate clauses, reference to remote past, and ‘imparfait’ (indicators of Stage V in French) start to appear in Jean 8F.

In Mimi 2F, the child starts marking person/number agreement between subject and finite verb:

ou il est le avion? ‘where is it, the aeroplane?’
ils sont là (talking about points) ‘they are there’
j’ai trouvé! ‘I have (1ps) found!’
t’as vu? ‘you have (2ps) seen?’
il a écrit comme ça ‘he has written like that’

In Mimi 3F, the subject–verb agreement is further developed, and she now also marks plural agreement with the copula:

(speaking about puzzle parts)
ils sont là, les yeux! ‘they are there, the eyes’
là il est, le rouge! ‘there it is, the red one!’
ils sont là, les souliers! ‘they are there, the shoes’
il est là, là! ‘he is there, there!’

Jean 6F: Jean now uses most of the typical structures of Stage IV in French. However, there are certain small differences from the otherwise very similar Mimi 2F, which concern subject–verb agreement. Although he knows the pronoun ‘je’ and uses it for verbs which do not change forms in 1st and 3rd person sing (je sais, je veux), he incorrectly uses ‘il’ in speaking about himself in the past or future, with the auxiliary verb (which according to the norm should vary in person):

‘il a trouvé (=j’ai…)’ ‘he has (=I have) found’
(cf. Mimi, who uses the same phrase correctly)
‘il a fait caca, maman’ ‘he has (=I have) done poo-poo, mummy.’

‘il va pas la mordre’ ‘he (=I) will not bite her’
(= je vais pas…)}
Jean 8F: Before this recording, Jean has only spoken French with his mother, and his French is in certain respects less, but in others more advanced than in Jean 6F. It is more advanced in the sense that he uses subordinate clauses, a conditional construction, one 'imparfait,' and he sometimes refers to the remote past, all typical features of Stage V. In this sense, his language is more advanced than that of Mimi 3F.

However, he seems unable to mark subject-verb agreement correctly for the plural:

(speaking about more than one ice-cream:)
"où il est, les glaces? 'where is it, the ice-creams?"

He still does not use 'je' with the verb 'vais/va' when referring to himself, but avoids the pronoun altogether, using the verb incorrectly in the 3sg form:

va acheter des bonbons (=je vais ...)
va parler à papa (=je vais)
va chez papa (=je vais ...)

Negation

Another example of weaker language incorrectness is Mimi's placement of negation when she starts using subordinates. As mentioned above, this position is acquired differently in L1 and L2, and proposed as evidence for the 'UG in L1 only' position. 4 In the Swedish of Mimi (weaker language), no negation is correctly placed in subordinates, it is always in the incorrect position, after the finite verb.

Mimi 3S:
'som ramlar inte 'who falls not'
därför hon vill titta inte 'because she wants to look not Alice
Alice här bak ... 'here back'

The weaker language in bilingual children

Mimi 4S:
"att man kan inte 'that you can not'
"att man får inte gå 'that you may not go'
"som var inte bra 'which was not good'

Mimi 5S (3;2 years):
"nån som har inte drog eh 'someone who has not pulled my
drog mitt hår. hair"

Mimi 7S (3;10 years)
"om du skakar inte på 'if you shake not your hand'
handen"

DISCUSSION

I have tried to show that if a sample of the stronger language of a bilingual child is compared to a sample of the weaker language (of the same or of another child) of a corresponding linguistic developmental level, then – independently of whether French or Swedish is the stronger language – the following can be observed:

- the stronger language exhibits all characteristics of normal L1 development, as regards the central grammatical phenomena such as finiteness, word order, and placement of negation; whereas
- the weaker language exhibits great variation in these respects, from complete non-existence of the grammatical phenomena mentioned to a lower occurrence of them than in a corresponding sample of the stronger language.

This indicates that the stronger language in a bilingual child is exactly like a normal first language in monolingual children, whereas the weaker language in these respects has similarities with a second language. This also implies that, if a rapid and correct development of finiteness in L1 is taken as an argument in favour of access to UG, in contrast to L2 where finiteness is acquired slower,
with errors, and with much variation, then this reasoning could also be applied to the distinction stronger language – weaker language. I will not, however, go into the question of whether this approach is the best way to account for L1 – L2 differences, or whether a cognitive approach is preferable.

NOTES

1 An earlier version of this paper has appeared in Davies and Adelswärd: På väg mot ett nytt språk. Linköping 1990.
2 I owe much of the inspiration for this chapter to discussions with T. Parodi in Hamburg on the nature of the weaker language.
3 'The weaker language in bilingual children', financed by the Swedish Council for Research in the Humanities and Social Sciences, 'Humanistisk-Samhällsvetenskapliga Forskningsrådet'.
4 There is however one recent study, Håkansson (1989), which shows that the author’s young daughter – Swedish monolingual – uses negation in the incorrect position in subordinate clauses when the finite verb is a copula or auxiliary.
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