

Karen Miller and Cristina Schmitt, Michigan State University

Background Several studies have revealed that English children produce and comprehend nominal plural morphology (AGE: 2;0) approximately one year before they produce verbal morphology (AGE: 3;0) (third person singular) (Brown 1973, de Villiers, Radford 1990, Rice & Wexler 2002, Ferenz & Prasada 2003) and that inferring subject nominal number indirectly through the presence or absence of the third person singular marker on the verb is very difficult for 3;0 – 4;0 year old Standard American English speaking children and 5;0 – 6;0 year old African American English speaking children (agreement is often omitted in the adult language (Johnson, in press). It is tempting to say that this finding is a reflex of the fact that agreement morphology is uninterpretable on the verb and interpretable on the nominal. **In this paper** we explore this idea by looking at the use of verbal and nominal plural morphology in comprehension in child Spanish. We present two experiments that show that Chilean children are good at using verbal number morphology to infer the plurality of the subject, even though they not good at using nominal morphology. We argue that this result follows from properties of the input that the children receive, and shows that interpretability in the grammatical sense doesn't map directly onto interpretation with respect to language processing. Chilean Spanish has two properties that make it an interesting comparison to the English data: (1) *verbal* morphology is more reliable in Spanish than in English and (2) the *nominal* plural marker ([s]/[h]) is not reliable (it is sometimes omitted by adult speakers). Studies have shown that there is a delay in nominal plural morphology comprehension in Chilean children (Miller & Schmitt 2004, 2005a, 2005b).

Experiment 1 Nominal Morphology 4-6 year old Chilean children were presented with displays with characters with singleton and plural sets of objects and answered questions either like (1a) or (1b) by pointing to the appropriate character within the display.

(1a) *¿Cuál niño tiene un mono?*

Which boy has one monkey?

(1b) *¿Cuál niño tiene unos monos?*

Which boy has some monkeys?

Results Adults treated UNOS as plural 100% and UN as plural 0% of the time. Middle Class (MC) children treated indefinite plurals as plural 60% and Working Class (WC) children 25% of the time, which patterns with the amount of variation in the MC and WC input. MC children treated the plurals significantly different from indefinite plurals ($t(9)=4.445, p=.002$). WC children did not ($t(9)=.183, p=.859$).

Experiment 2 Verbal Morphology Given that many 4;0-6;0 year old Chilean children treat the plural indefinite 'unos/unas' as meaning 'one', we tested 13 Chilean WC children (Mean: 5;2) to see whether they could use number marking on the verb to assign plurality to the subject DP. Importantly, the children tested in this experiment had previously failed to distinguish plural indefinites vs. singular indefinites in object position (where verbal morphology is irrelevant). Children were asked to distinguish between sentences like (2a) vs. (2b). Importantly, in addition to the plural and singular indefinite nouns, the verb in (2a) has singular agreement and the verb in (2b) has plural agreement.

(2a) *Muéstrame una niña que está saltando*

Show.me a girl that is.sg jumping

(2b) *Muéstrame unas niñas que están saltando*

Show.me some.pl girls.pl that are.pl jumping

The results showed that Chilean WC children assigned a plural reading to (2b) 77% of the time, which is significantly different from chance ($t(1,12)=2.607, p<.05$) and indicates that Chilean children use verbal morphology, but not nominal morphology, to assign number to nominal subjects. The results of this study suggest that interpretability in the grammatical sense is not a predictor of patterns of sentence comprehension.