

## **Two-Year-Olds correctly adjust their syntactic interpretations following the information provided by different syntactic contexts**

Alex de Carvalho, Isabelle Dautriche & Anne Christophe  
École Normale Supérieure – PSL Research University, Paris, France  
Contact: alex.carvalho@ens.fr

To understand sentences, adults integrate their prior expectations about likely utterances (world-knowledge, linguistic regularities (Trueswell & Kim, 1998) with the information they extract from the input (auditory, visual (Tanenhaus, Spivey, Eberhard, & Sedivy, 1995)). Depending on the level of uncertainty of a given environment (noise, accents, new talker), adults adjust their prior linguistic expectations to weigh the plausibility of different information sources (Gibson, Bergen, & Piantadosi, 2013). Here we test whether toddlers learning their language engage in a similar process while interpreting novel verbs.

Concretely, we rely on the work of Dautriche et al., (2014) who showed that French 2-year-olds incorrectly expect novel verbs embedded in right-dislocated sentences (e.g. *,il<sub>i</sub> VERB, le bébé<sub>i</sub>* ‘he<sub>i</sub> is VERBing, the baby<sub>i</sub>’ meaning ‘the baby is VERBing’) to map to a causal action (someone else is VERBing the baby), even though the post-verbal intonational phrase boundary should block this interpretation. Importantly, toddlers correctly interpret right-dislocated sentences with familiar verbs (*it<sub>i</sub> eats, the rabbit<sub>i</sub>*). Thus, their failure to integrate prosodic cues when interpreting novel verbs is not a failure to use prosody *per se* but a reflection of their prior syntactic expectations. Indeed, several studies (e.g., Yuan & Fisher, 2009) suggest that toddlers’ initial representation of sentences is driven by the set of noun phrases (NPs): each NP gets a participant role. By default, any novel verb appearing in a NP-verb-NP sentence would thus refer to a causal action where an agent (the first NP) acts on a patient (the second NP).

We hypothesize that enriching the learning context of the novel verb may help toddlers to depart from their default interpretation. More specifically, the *set* of syntactic frames in which a verb appears, rather than a single frame, may help toddlers to infer its meaning (Scott & Fisher, 2012). For example hearing “She<sub>i</sub> *blicks*, the baby<sub>j</sub>! Oh, she *blicked!*” may increase the probability of *blick* being considered intransitive, and hence refer to a non-causal action (since *blick* also appeared in an intransitive sentence).

Following the preferential looking paradigm of Yuan & Fisher (2009), we presented 28-month-olds (n=80) with dialogues introducing a novel verb (*'daser'*) in one of four conditions (20 babies in each condition): transitive-intransitive sentences, dislocated-intransitive sentences, dislocated sentences only and intransitive sentences only. After being exposed to the dialogue phase, toddlers were then asked to look for *'daser'* while viewing two videos displayed side-by-side in a TV screen: a causal action featuring two participants, and a one-participant action.

As expected, children in the dislocated only condition associated the novel verb to the causal action, and so did children in the transitive-intransitive condition. Indeed, many verbs relating two participants (e.g., *eat*) can enter an alternating pattern between transitive and intransitive sentences in which the object is sometimes dropped. Crucially, in the dislocated-intransitive condition, children behaved as in the intransitive only condition: they did not show any preference for the causal action. Thus, the presence of intransitive sentences in the dialogue increased the plausibility of the non-causal interpretation, only when combined with dislocated sentences. We conclude that toddlers can adjust their prior syntactic expectations when given more information in the input, and flexibly revise a default interpretation.

*Key-words: syntax; language acquisition ; prosody ; online sentence processing; rational inference*

## **References:**

- Dautriche, I., Cristia, A., Brusini, P., Yuan, S., Fisher, C., & Christophe, A. (2014). Toddlers Default to Canonical Surface-to-Meaning Mapping When Learning Verbs. *Child Development, 85*(3), 1168–1180.
- Gibson, E., Bergen, L., & Piantadosi, S. T. (2013). Rational integration of noisy evidence and prior semantic expectations in sentence interpretation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 110*(20), 8051–6.
- Scott, R. M., & Fisher, C. (2012). 2.5-Year-Olds Use Cross-Situational Consistency To Learn Verbs Under Referential Uncertainty. *Cognition, 122*(2), 163–80.
- Tanenhaus, M. K., Spivey, M. J., Eberhard, K. M., & Sedivy, J. C. (1995). Integration of Visual and Linguistic Information in Spoken Language. *Science, 268*(5217), 1632–1634.
- Trueswell, J. C., & Kim, A. E. (1998). How to Prune a Garden Path by Nipping It in the Bud : Fast Priming of Verb Argument Structure. *Journal of Memory and Language, 123*(39), 102–123.
- Yuan, S., & Fisher, C. (2009). “Really? She blicked the baby?”: Two-year-olds Learn Combinatorial Facts about Verbs By Listening. *Psychological Science, (217)*, 1–25.