

Leo Conroy  
Dept. of German, Russian and Swedish studies.

## **Extended Processability Theory and its application to L2-Swedish**

### **“Canonicity, iconicity, syntagmatic juxtaposition and unification”**

In my paper, I discuss canonicity, iconicity, syntagmatic juxtaposition and unification (of grammatical information) from the perspective of Extended P[rocessability] T[heory] (Pienemann, 2005) and will illustrate my operationalisation of those notions in the analysis of L2-Swedish interlanguage. The notions of canonicity and unification are both central in Extended PT's conceptualisation of the incremental, sequential and implicational nature of language acquisition and production, while the notion of iconicity, although not explicitly invoked by proponents of Extended PT, nevertheless overlaps conceptually with that of canonicity to a considerable degree and, in my own view, can be profitably exploited to further enrich the explanatory scope of the latter notion. The construct of syntagmatic juxtaposition represents my own attempt to conceptualise my intuition that the notion of unification, if applied uncritically to structural phenomena entailing an apparent exchange of grammatical information, may conceal other processes involved in second language acquisition and production. Such processes may not rely so much on the operation of highly task-specific processing procedures (as postulated in Extended PT) but rather on psycholinguistic mechanisms whose operation is enabled by the inherent iconicity of certain morphosyntactic structures of the target language.

In my paper, I will focus primarily on the longitudinal written data of one informant. He was taking a course in Swedish as part of his undergraduate studies and had no knowledge of Swedish prior to the commencement of the course. He had received instruction in Swedish for six weeks when the first set of data was collected from him. The data in general consist of two basic types – 1. assignments written as homework and 2. tasks performed in test conditions – and represent the informant's production of L2-Swedish over a period of approximately three and a half semesters.

I hope to be able to provide evidence from my data which illustrates the utility of the notions of canonicity, iconicity, syntagmatic juxtaposition and unification for the purpose of analysing my Swedish interlanguage data. From my discussion it will emerge that Pienemann's increasingly stronger emphasis on the role of abstract, universal principles in guiding the process of language acquisition and production makes possible a theoretically motivated analysis and interpretation of a broad range of interlanguage phenomena. However, my operationalisation of the notions of syntagmatic juxtaposition and unification will to some extent reveal that it may not always be possible to make unqualified inferences or assumptions about whether an apparent intra- or cross-constituent merging of grammatical features involves unification as conceptualised by Pienemann or some other process relying on factors such as the spatial proximity (in the case of written language) of the constituents of a morphosyntactic unit or the inherent iconicity of a particular morphosyntactic structure.