

# Interrogative Constructions in Cuban Spanish as a Second Language

Ellen Thompson\*, Nandi Sims, Reyneiro Castro

College of Arts, Sciences & Education, Florida International University, Miami, FL 33199, USA

Received October 14, 2021; Revised April 12, 2022; Accepted May 9, 2022

## Cite This Paper in the following Citation Styles

(a): [1] Ellen Thompson, Nandi Sims, Reyneiro Castro, "Interrogative Constructions in Cuban Spanish as a Second Language," *Linguistics and Literature Studies*, Vol. 10, No. 3, pp. 43 - 52, 2022. DOI: 10.13189/lls.2022.100301.

(b): Ellen Thompson, Nandi Sims, Reyneiro Castro (2022). *Interrogative Constructions in Cuban Spanish as a Second Language*. *Linguistics and Literature Studies*, 10(3), 43 - 52. DOI: 10.13189/lls.2022.100301.

Copyright©2022 by authors, all rights reserved. Authors agree that this article remains permanently open access under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 International License

**Abstract** This work investigates the structure and meaning of main clause wh-questions in Cuban Spanish and argues that individuals learning Cuban Spanish as a Second Language will benefit from practice with grammatical structures that illustrate this behavior. We show that grammaticality judgment data that we obtained from monolingual Cuban Spanish speakers indicate that inverted word order is more likely with non-D-linked and non-Complex wh-expressions, and least likely with D-linked and Complex wh-expressions. More broadly, we argue that this data indicates that Interrogative Inversion in Cuban Spanish is syntactically distinct from Inversion in English wh-questions, and that learners of Spanish as a Second Language thus benefit from exposure to these specific constructions.

**Keywords** Second Language Acquisition, Syntax, Wh-Questions, Cuban Spanish

---

## 1. Introduction

This work investigates the structure and meaning of main clause wh-questions in Cuban Spanish and discusses the implications of this investigation for pedagogical approaches to teaching Spanish. We show that while there seems to be a significant overlap between the structure of main clause wh-constructions in English and Cuban Spanish, this similarity is illusory, and that teachers of Spanish as a Second Language will be able to encourage the development of the target Cuban Spanish syntax by highlighting particular wh-question constructions in the

language.

It has been noted that in Cuban Spanish multiple factors influence word order in wh-questions (see [1-4]). These factors include semantic and syntactic properties of the subject of the sentence, as well as semantic and syntactic properties of the wh-expression of the sentence. In this paper, we investigate inverted word order effects in wh-questions that correlate with semantic (D-linked versus non-D-linked) and structural (Complex versus non-Complex) properties of the wh-expression.

We argue that grammaticality judgment data that we collected from monolingual Cuban Spanish speakers shows that inverted word order is more likely with non-D-linked and non-Complex wh-expressions, and least likely with D-linked and Complex wh-expressions. Interestingly, constructions which vary in these semantic and syntactic features show a graded acceptability with Inversion. This suggests that both semantic and syntactic features of the wh-expression are crucial to determining the possibility of Inversion in Cuban Spanish wh-questions. These results provide interesting implications for teaching Spanish as a second language to speakers of English.

## 2. Inversion in Spanish Wh-questions

In this work, we adopt the Minimalist Program developed by Chomsky [5-7]. We follow Chomsky [8] and the literature on the syntax of these constructions by using the terms: wh-movement, wh-expression, wh-construction.

Several of the foundational works in the syntax of wh-constructions in Spanish use Peninsular Spanish as their data source (see [2,10-12]).

Several authors have noted that Peninsular Spanish (PS) requires inverted word order in main clause wh-questions, as shown in the contrast between (1a) and (1b) (see [9,13]). Note that use the term “inverted word order” descriptively, to refer to the order: wh-Expression - Main Verb–Subject ..., in contrast to uninverted order: wh-expression - Subject–Main Verb....

- (1) a.           ¿Qué           quería           su           hermano?  
           What           wants           your           brother  
           “What does your brother want?”
- b.           \*¿Qué           su           hermano           quería  
           What           your           brother           wants  
           “What does your brother want?”

The configuration presented for wh-constructions in Spanish in (1a) is reminiscent of the word order used in wh-constructions in English, following the pattern: wh-Expression – Verb – Subject, as seen in (2).

- (2) [What] [does] your brother want?

### 3. The Syntax of Spanish Wh-Questions

It has been argued in the literature that inverted word order in Spanish questions (wh-V-S ...) is syntactically distinct from inverted word order in English questions (see [11]). Several authors have argued that Spanish inverted wh-questions pattern differently with respect to several properties from their English counterparts [2,13,14,]<sup>1</sup>.

In this paper, we focus on the structure of wh-constructions in Main Clauses. However, one of the major ways in which Spanish and English wh-constructions differ is with respect to embedded clauses. In these constructions, inverted order is required in Spanish, but is disallowed in many varieties of English, as shown in (3) versus (4).

- (3) a.           María           preguntó           qué           dijo           Pedro.  
           Maria           Asked           What           Said           Pedro  
           “Maria asked what Pedro said.”
- b.           \*María           preguntó           qué           Pedro           dijo.  
           Maria           asked           What           Pedro           said  
           “Maria asked what Pedro said.”

- (4) a. Mary asked what Peter would say.  
       b. \*Mary asked what would Peter say.

Furthermore, these constructions behave distinctly with respect to the distribution of adverbs [13]. As seen in (5), while Spanish wh-interrogative inversion allows adverbials to occur between the wh-expression and the verb, this does not seem to be permitted in their English counterparts.

- (5) a.           ¿Con           quién           nunca           [además de los jamases]  
           With           whom           never           ever ever
- Piensas           (tu)           hablar?  
           think           you           speak  
           “Who would you never in your life think of speaking with?”
- b.           \*With whom [never] do you plan to speak?  
           With who do you [never] plan to speak?

<sup>1</sup> Our study investigates Main Clause wh-questions with wh-argument Constructions involving the Direct Object. It has been noted in the literature that wh-questions with “por que”, why, seem to follow a different pattern (see [13], and references therein). The generalizations about wh-questions in Cuban Spanish with respect to inversion with wh-adjuncts is thus left open here.

- (6) a. \*¿Cuándo ha Juan comprado una bicicleta?  
When has Juan bought a bike  
“When did Juan buy a bike?”
- b. ¿Cuándo ha comprado Juan una bicicleta?  
When has bought Juan a bike  
“When did Juan buy a bike?”
- (7) a. When has John bought a bike?  
b. \*When has bought John a bike?

In addition, *wh*-interrogative constructions behave differently with respect to Auxiliary Verbs in Spanish and English [2], as shown in (6) and (7).

Goodall argues, from an experimental investigation, that *wh*-question inverted orders are distinct constructions in the two languages. He shows that a satiation effect attains with non-inverted word order in Spanish (*wh*-Subject-Verb) while it does not attain in English [15,16]. In his experiment, Spanish Speakers who are presented with repeated exposure to the unacceptable *wh*-Subject-Verb order judge these sentences to be more acceptable over time. However, the same does not hold true for English speakers; when repeatedly presented with *wh*-Subject-Aux-Verb order in English questions, English speakers do not judge these sentences to be acceptable over time. Therefore, Goodall argues that the syntactic description of inverted word order in *wh*-questions in Spanish appears to be distinct from the syntactic description of inverted word order in *wh*-questions in English.

The present study argues similarly that the experimental data discussed here from inversion constructions in Spanish and English *wh*-questions indicate that these constructions are structurally distinct in the two languages.

#### 4. *Wh*-Questions in Caribbean Spanish

It has been claimed in the literature on the syntax of *wh*-questions in Caribbean Spanish that the structure of *wh*-interrogative clauses in these varieties differ from Peninsular Spanish [13,17,18].

Authors have argued that Caribbean Spanish varieties differ from PS in that they do not show inverted word order in *wh*-question contexts, as seen in (8a) and (8b) (see [18]).

- (8) a. ¿Qué su hermano quería?  
what your brother wants  
“What does your brother want?”
- b. ¿Qué quería? su hermano  
what wants your brother  
“What does your brother want?”

Firstly, while “Caribbean Spanish” has been described as having a unitary syntactic configuration for *wh*-questions, it is well known that Cuban, Puerto Rican, and Dominican Spanish varieties vary significantly in their syntax. For example, it appears that the use of an overt expletive “ello” in existential constructions is a significant innovation in Dominican Spanish, but this feature has not been noted in Puerto Rican and Cuban Spanish (see Toribio[19] for relevant discussion.)

Therefore, in this paper, we explore the syntax of *wh*-question constructions in one variety of Caribbean Spanish, Cuban Spanish (CS). While the claims that we make here for CS may hold for other varieties of Caribbean Spanish, we do not test these predictions here.

Secondly, recent work argues that inverted word order is in fact productive in Caribbean Spanish questions and that the lack of inverted order is restricted to a subset of constructions. Two factors that have been claimed to be relevant relative to the possibility of inversion in these constructions is the syntax and semantics of the Subject of the sentence, as well as syntactic and semantic properties of the *wh*-expression (see [1,4,20-26]).

In this paper, we focus on examining the role of the *wh*-expression in this construction, and we do not discuss features of the subject, as has been debated in the literature (see [22]). We follow the recent literature which claims that there are multiple features of importance to determining the syntax of these constructions from the point of view of the semantics and syntax of the *wh*-Expression itself, and we investigate the features of [D-linked] and [Complex].

We follow Pesetsky’s [27] discussion of the term “D(iscourse)-linked”: “I wish to suggest that the crucial difference between a *which*-phrase and the *normal* occurrence of *who* or *what* is found in discourse (See [28:94] for similar discussion, as well as [29]). Roughly, *which*-phrases are *discourse-linked* (*D-linked*), whereas *who* and *what* are normally not D-linked. When a speaker asks a question like *Which book did you read?*, the range of felicitous answers is limited by a set of books that both speaker and hearer have in mind. If the hearer is ignorant of the context assumed by the speaker, a *which* question

sounds odd...” (pg. 107-108)<sup>2</sup>.

To distinguish between syntactically simple and complex wh-Expressions, we follow McCawley [40], who argues that a simple wh-expression bears an index that appears on the Q(uestion), such as “who”, versus a complex wh-expression, in which an expression contains a wh-element that bears that index, such as “whose book” (498).

In part I of this project, we investigate whether inverted order is possible when (i) the wh-expression is structurally Complex, (ii) the wh-expression is D(iscourse)-linked.

#### 4.1. [D-linked] versus [Complex]

Discussion on this topic has tended to conflate the semantic feature of D-linkedness with the syntactic feature of Complexity. Indeed, examples which are D-linked are typically Complex (as in (9a)), while examples which are non-D-linked are typically Simple, as in (9b).

- (9) a. [+D-linked, +Complex]  
 [Qué] disturbio que interrumpió  
 what disturbance that interrupted
- el semestre Juan causó  
 the semester Juan caused  
 “What disturbance that interrupted the semester did Juan cause?”
- b. [-D-linked, -Complex]  
 [Qué] buscaba Carla?  
 what looked for Carla  
 “What did Carla look for?”

In order to independently investigate the semantic and syntactic features of the wh-expression, we conduct an experimental investigation into their distinct roles. We thus use four types of wh-expressions and explore their correlation with inverted word order: (1) [+D-linked, +Complex], (2) [-D-linked, -Complex], (3) [-D-linked, +Complex], and (4) [+D-linked, -Complex]. We expect that there may be variation across dialects of Spanish with respect to the contrasts of acceptability between these constructions.

Crucially, questions with wh-expressions which are [-D-linked, +Complex], and [+D-linked, -Complex] will allow us to investigate these two features independent of each other; in the typical pattern, D-linked phrases are also syntactically complex, while non-D-linked phrases are syntactically non-complex.

##### 4.1.1. Wh-Epithets

In order to construct questions with wh-expressions which are [-D-linked, +Complex], we utilize wh-epithet

constructions. Following Pesetsky [27], we assume that wh-epithets are “aggressively non-D-linked”. For example, in the sentence in (9), the expression “who the hell” is not dependent semantically for its reference on previous material in discourse; the semantic import of wh-epithet constructions is to express surprise and shock.

- (10) Who the hell did Mary invite?

Note that wh-epithets, although necessarily [-D-linked], and typically syntactically non-complex, do permit a complex syntactic structure, as seen in (11) (see [36]).

- (11) Who [on god’s green earth] is Mary going out with?

An example of a wh-epithet construction in Cuban Spanish with complex structure is as follows in (12).

- (12) ¿[A quién en este condena’o  
 to whom on this condemned  
 Mundo] ofendió Pablo?  
 world insulted Pablo  
 “Who on god’s green earth did Pablo insult?”

These constructions thus allow us to investigate the potentially independent roles of D-linkedness and Complexity on the inversion construction discussed here.

##### 4.1.2. Verbs of Destruction

In order to exemplify questions with [+D-linked, -Complex] wh-expressions, we use the direct object of verbs of destruction that hence require a D-linked interpretation (see [41]). Verbs of destruction, such as “burn”, “destroy”, etc. require their direct objects to be [+Specific], using Diesing’s terms. In (13), “a book” refers to a [+Specific] direct object, according to which there was a particular book such that Mary destroyed it. The nonspecific interpretation of the indefinite expression is not permitted – (13) cannot mean that Mary destroyed some books or other. In the analysis of this paper, [+Specific] is equivalent to [+D-linked].

- (13) Mary destroyed a book.

As seen in (14), the Direct Object of verbs of destruction is strongly D-linked but may be simple in structure, containing only one word, “cuáles”.

- (14) ¿[Cuáles] Quemó Guillermito?  
 Which burned Guillermito?  
 “Which ones did Guillermito burn?”

## 5. Methodology

### 5.1. Experimental Design

We conduct a Grammaticality Judgment Task experiment in order to elicit judgments from 38 Native

2 For further discussion and development of the concept of D-linkedness and its role in syntax, see the following: [12,30-39].

Monolingual speakers of Cuban Spanish.

The study consists of an acceptability judgment task. Subjects provide judgments for forty sentences, presented one-by-one in questionnaire format on a computer using Qualtrics survey software. The questionnaire is completely in Cuban Spanish, and a research team member spoke to the participants in Cuban Spanish about completing the survey.

The experimental questions consist of forty sentences, twenty of which are target sentences. These are wh-questions divided into the four types described above: (1) [+D-linked, +Complex], (2) [-D-linked, -Complex], (3) [-D-linked, +Complex], and [+D-linked, -Complex]. Twenty filler sentences serve as distracters, equally comprised of acceptable and unacceptable sentences. In addition, twenty of these forty sentences are followed by comprehension questions in order to gauge participants' attentiveness to the research task.

Recall from the discussion in Section 4 above that it has been argued in the literature that semantic and syntactic features of the subject of the sentence play a role in determining the possibility of inverted word order. Thus, each sentence in the questionnaire consists of a human, referential subject, such as "Tomás" or "Pedro", in order to avoid the potential effects of differing subject features. In addition, it is important to note that all wh-constructions involve a main clause.

#### 5.1.1. Participants

Participants are thirty-eight Native Monolingual speakers of Cuban Spanish who are from a beginner-level course in English as a Second Language at Miami Dade College. All of these participants were born and raised in Cuba. They range in age from 23-66. The participants are recent immigrants to Miami, having been in the United States for approximately four months to sixteen months. All of these participants attended school exclusively in Spanish.

#### 5.1.2. Procedure

Participants were initially presented with a consent form to read and to then initial, as well as a description of the acceptability judgment task. They were provided with

several examples of sentences ranging from completely acceptable to completely unacceptable. Participants were asked to rate each sentence on a scale from 1. "completamente imposible" (completely unacceptable), to 5. "completamente posible" (completely acceptable). We utilized two counterbalanced lists of experimental sentences so that both variants of each sentence – inverted and uninverted – were presented to distinct participants.

Participants filled out a Linguistic Background questionnaire made up of fifty Questions about the participants' sociological and linguistic background. In this work, we discuss only generalizations that hold across speakers. However, there may be sociolinguistic factors that are relevant that are not attended here. We reserve investigation of these issues for future research. Participants are also given a Spanish Competence Test in order to ensure the native speaker status of each participant.

## 6. Results

### 6.1. [+D-linked], [+Complex] Wh-Expressions

Below, we present the results of the subjects' acceptability judgments for sentences containing a [+D-linked], [+Complex] wh-expression with inverted order: wh-Verb-Subject. The sentences are below, in (15) to (19), and a table of the results is presented in Table 1.

**Table 1.** Ratings of acceptability judgments for sentences containing a [+D-linked],[+Complex] WH expression with inverted order.

EXAMPLE	RATING
15	2.65
16	2.73
17	3.45
18	3
19	4
<b>Average</b>	3.17

- (15) ¿[Qué]            disturbio            que            interrumpió            el  
           what            disturbance            that            interrupted            the
- semestre            Juan            Causó¿  
           semester            Juan            caused
- "What disturbance that interrupted the semester did Juan cause?"

- (16) ¿[A quién que había trabajado para ellos  
To whom that has worked for them  
durante un año] despidió Pablo?  
for a year fired Pablo  
“Which person who has worked for them for a year did Pablo fire?”
- (17) ¿[Qué cosa que el profesor  
What thing that the professor  
repartió] necesita Maritza?  
handed out needed Maritza  
“Which item that the professor handed out did Maritza need?”
- (18) ¿[Qué programa en que se había enrolado  
What program in that had enrolled  
hacia cinco años] terminó Marcos?  
has five years ended Marcos  
“Which program that he had joined five years ago did Marcos end?”
- (19) ¿[Qué discurso sobre política Internacional] dio Carlos?  
What speech on politics international gave Carlos  
“Which speech about international politics did Carlos give?”

## 6.2. [-D-linked, +Complex] Wh-Expressions

Sentences from the experiment that exemplify the use of [-D-linked, +Complex] wh-expressions make use of wh-epithets and are presented along with their average acceptability ratings in examples (20) to (24).

- (20) ¿[Con quien Pinga] está saliendo María?  
With whom cock was going out Maria  
“Who the fuck was Maria going out with?”
- (21) ¿[Qué coño de su madre] hace Oscar?  
What pussy of his mother did Oscar  
“What the hell did Oscar do?”
- (22) ¿[Qué rayos] pensó Maritza?  
What stripes thought Maritza?  
“What the heck did Maritza think?”
- (23) ¿[Qué diablo] lee Marlén?  
What devil read Marlén  
“What the devil did Marlén read?”
- (24) ¿[A quién en este condena’o  
To whom on this condemned  
Mundo] ofendió Pablo?  
world insulted Pablo  
“Who on god’s green earth did Pablo insult?”

**Table 2.** Ratings of acceptability judgments for sentences containing a [-D-linked],[+Complex] wh-expression with inverted order

EXAMPLE	RATING
20	4.7
21	3.85
22	4.84
23	3.63
24	3.45
Average	4.09

### 6.3. [+D-linked, -Complex] Wh-Expressions

Presented below are example sentences with [+D-linked, -Complex] wh-expressions – recall that these are the “cual” expressions combined with verbs of destruction<sup>3</sup>. (Note that it is possible that in particular dialects of Spanish, verbs of destruction do not behave in the way that we claim that they do in Cuban Spanish, and therefore it is necessary to investigate these constructions in various dialects.)

- (25) ¿[Cuál] rompió Francisca?  
Which broke Francisca  
“Which one did Francisca break?”
- (26) ¿[A quién] mató María?  
To whom killed María  
“Who did Maria kill?”
- (27) ¿[Cuáles] quemó Guillermito?  
Which burned Guillermito  
“Which ones did Guillermito burn?”
- (28) ¿[Cuáles] aniquiló David?  
Which annihilated David  
“Which ones did David annihilate?”

**Table 3.** Ratings of acceptability judgments for sentences containing a [+D-linked],[-Complex] wh-expression with inverted order

EXAMPLE	RATING
25	3.21
26	4.45
27	3.63
28	3.10
Average	3.46

<sup>3</sup> Note that the figures for [+D-linked, -Complex] wh-expressions contain only four instances of average acceptability judgments, while the other figures contain five instances. This is because one pair of this class was mistakenly left out of the experimental stimuli.

### 6.4. [-D-linked, -Complex] Wh-Expressions

- (29) ¿[A quién] admiraba Pablo?  
To whom admired Pablo  
“Who did Paul admire?”
- (30) ¿[Qué] ganó María?  
What won María?  
“What did Maria win?”
- (31) ¿[A quién] quería Pablo?  
To whom wanted Pablo  
“Who did Pablo want?”
- (32) ¿[Qué] buscaba Carla?  
What looked for Carla  
“What did Carla look for?”
- (33) ¿[En quién] pensaba Justina?  
In whom thought Justina  
“Who was Justina thinking about?”

**Table 4.** Ratings of acceptability judgments for sentences containing a [-D-linked],[-Complex] wh-expression with inverted order

EXAMPLE	RATING
29	4.80
30	4.80
31	4.35
32	4.80
33	4.68
Average	4.70

### 6.3. Summary

Table 5 presents a summary of the average ratings for the wh-expression constructions that we investigate here, showing that sentences with [+D-linked, +Complex] wh-expressions are judged to be least acceptable with inversion, those with [-D-linked, -Complex] wh-expressions are rated as more acceptable, and those with [-D-linked, +Complex] wh-expressions are found to be more acceptable than these, and the most acceptable combination of wh-expressions with inversion is found with [+D-linked, -Complex] wh-expressions.

**Table 5.** Summary of the average ratings for the wh-expression constructions

SENTENCE TYPE	AVERAGE RATING
[+D-linked, +Complex]	3.17
[-D-linked, -Complex]	3.46
[-D-linked, +Complex]	4.70
[+D-linked, -Complex]	4.09

## 7. Pedagogical Implications

The results presented in Section 6 show that grammaticality judgment data from monolingual Cuban Spanish speakers confirms the claim that has been made in the literature that inverted word order in *wh*-questions is dependent on the structure and meaning of the *wh*-expression. In particular, the data indicate that the semantically and syntactically lightest of the classes—[-D-linked] and [-Complex]—is the most acceptable with the *wh*-Verb-Subject Order. Conversely, *wh*-expressions which are [+D-linked] and [+Complex]—those which are heavy both semantically and syntactically—are the least acceptable of all of the classes with inversion.

An important question raised by this research is how Spanish as a Second Language teachers can apply this analysis to the teaching of these constructions in the second-language learning environment. In their acquisition of Spanish syntax, native speakers of English will encounter evidence leading them to conclude that Spanish *wh*-constructions behave as they do in English main clauses: with *wh*-movement to initial position, and inversion of the Verb, as in, for instance, our example from (1a) above, repeated here as (34).

- (34) ¿Qué quería su hermano?  
 What wants your brother  
 “What does your brother want?”

In addition, Turrero Garcia investigates the acquisition of *wh*-questions in Spanish by native speakers of English, and argues, based on a production task study, that there is: “a much larger use of creativity in the question-forming

strategies used by near-native and native speakers, whereas the intermediate group shows a significantly higher use of avoidance strategies that allow them to form the shortest, most semantically and syntactically simple questions possible [42].”

In other words, second language learners of Spanish will tend to be conservative and create constructions that involve less complex structures. This highlights the importance of the data such as that in (35-37), which forces language learners to analyze sentences of various complexities in the acquisitional process of language learning.

Therefore, the second language learner of Spanish encounters data which is consistent with an analysis of *wh*-movement in Spanish as identical to English. This conclusion would lead the second language learner to the incorrect hypothesis that Spanish Interrogatives are structurally identical to English Interrogatives. What data would serve to assist the second-language learner of Spanish in learning that it is differentiated from English?

From the perspective of our work, the crucial piece of evidence that could lead a learner of Spanish to the conclusion that Spanish has a *wh*-construction that functions differently from English, and that is dependent upon both syntactic and semantic factors, are sentences with a [+D-linked], [+Complex] *wh*-expression with uninverted order: *wh*-Subject-Verb. The sentences are in (35) – (37). Crucially, given that second language learners of Spanish have been shown to favor the production of less complex questions (following Turrero Garcia), it is thus crucial for second language teachers to be aware of and utilize constructions of greater complexity.

- (35) ¿[Qué]                    disturbio                    que                    interrumpió                    el  
 what                    disturbance                    that                    interrupted                    the

                  semestre                    Juan                    Causó?  
 semester                    Juan  
 “What disturbance that interrupted the semester did Juan cause?”

- (36) ¿[A                    quién                    que                    había                    trabajado                    para  
 To                    whom                    that                    has                    worked                    for

ellos                    durante                    un                    año]                    Pablo                    Despidió?  
 them                    for                    a                    year                    Pablo                    fired  
 “Which person who has worked for them for a year did Pablo fire?”

- (37) ¿[Qué                    cosa                    que                    el                    profesor  
 what                    thing                    that                    the                    professor

repartió]                    Maritza                    necesita  
 handed out                    Maritza                    needed  
 “Which item that the professor handed out did Maritza need?”



## 8. Conclusions

The consistent finding in our research is that native speakers accept uninverted Verb word order when the wh-expression is [+D-linked], [+Complex]. Therefore, in terms of the acquisition of the syntax of Cuban Spanish, it is beneficial for teachers of Spanish to include discussion of examples such as (35) – (37). Exposure to such constructions reinforces the idea that inversion is linked to these semantic and syntactic features. In other words, if all of the examples involving questions being taught to Spanish as second language learners were of the simple sort, with expressions such as ‘what’, ‘who’, it would be difficult for Spanish learners to converge on the correct grammar.

This would not provide the second language learner of English with the data required to converge on the link in the syntactic system of Spanish between inverted word order and the weight of the wh-expression, and overt introduction of wh-constructions of greater structural complexity are thus, perhaps surprisingly, clearly central to the native speaker of English’s learning of this construction in Cuban Spanish.

This proposal makes the interesting prediction that second language learners of Spanish who are native speakers of English should be aided in the progression of their wh-interrogative clauses in Cuban Spanish by exposure to constructions which illustrate the crucial difference between English and Spanish main clause wh-questions, those such as in (35) – (37). This prediction provides interesting future research possibilities in the acquisition of Spanish questions by native speakers of English, which we hope to be able to investigate in the future.

---

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. L. Zubizarreta. The constraint on preverbal subjects in Romance interrogatives: A minimality effect. In Aafke Hulk and Jean-Yves Pollock (eds.) *Subject Inversion in Romance and the Theory of Universal Grammar*. 183-204. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2001.
- [2] P. Barbosa. On inversion in wh-questions in Romance, Subject Inversion in Romance and theory of Universal Grammar. In Aafke Hulk and Jean-Yves Pollock (eds.) *Subject Inversion in Romance and the Oxford*: Oxford University Press. 20–59, 2001.
- [3] K. Zagona. *The Syntax of Spanish*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- [4] F. Ordóñez, A. Olarrea. *Weak Subject Pronouns in Caribbean Spanish and XP Pied-Piping*. Features and Interfaces in Romance. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 2001.
- [5] N. Chomsky. Some Notes on Economy of Derivation and Representation. In *Principles and Parameters in Comparative Grammar*. Current Studies in Linguistics, Series no. 20, edited by Robert Freidin, 417-54. Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press, 1991.
- [6] N. Chomsky. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA and London: The MIT Press. 1995.
- [7] N. Chomsky. Minimalist Inquiries. In *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*. Ed. Roger Martin, David Michales, Juan Uriagereka, and Samuel J. Keyser. Pages 89 – 155. MIT Press, 2000.
- [8] N. Chomsky. *Essays on Form and Interpretation*. New York: North Holland. 1977.
- [9] E. Torrego. On inversion in Spanish and some of its effects. *Linguistic Inquiry*: 1984.
- [10] Ausin and Marti, L. Subject verb inversion and the status of preverbal subjects in Spanish. *Proceedings of the IV Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*. 2001.
- [11] G. Goodall. Spec of IP and Spec of CP in Spanish wh-questions. In W. Ashby, M. Mithun, G. Perissinotto, E. Raposo. (eds.) *Linguistic Perspectives on the Romance Languages: Selected Papers from the XXI Linguistics Symposium on Romance Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 199-209. 1993.
- [12] J. Uriagereka. Aspects of the syntax of clitic placement in Western Romance. *Linguistic Inquiry*. 79-123. 1995.
- [13] M. Suñer. Verb movement and the licensing of argumental wh-phrases in Spanish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 335-372. 1994.
- [14] M. Suñer, C. Lizardi. Dialectal variation in an argumentation/non-argumental asymmetry in Spanish. *Contemporary Research in Romance Linguistics: Papers from the XXII Linguistics Symposium on Romance Languages*. 187-203 .1995.
- [15] G. Goodall. Syntactic Satiation and the Inversion Effect in English and Spanish Wh-Questions, *Syntax*, Vol.14, No.1, 29–47, 2011.
- [16] G. Goodall. Experimenting with wh-movement in Spanish. *Romance Linguistics 2008: Interactions in Romance. Selected Papers from the 38th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL), Urbana-Champaign, April 2008*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing, 2010.
- [17] J. P. Lantolf. Constraints on interrogative word order in Puerto Rican Spanish, *Bilingual Review/La Revista Bilingüe*, Vol.7, No.2, 113–122, 1980.
- [18] J. Toribio. Parametric variation in the licensing of null subjects, *Doctoral dissertation*, Cornell University, 1993.
- [19] J. Toribio. Setting parametric limits on dialectal variation in Spanish. *Lingua*: 110,5. 315-341. 2000.
- [20] B. G. Carlos. The subject-gap restriction in Spanish wh-questions: Some empirical and theoretical consequences. *Second Gen. Exam*, University of Connecticut, Storrs, 2008.
- [21] J.-Y. Pollock. Verb Movement, Universal Grammar, and the Structure of IP, *Linguistic Inquiry*, Vol.20, No.3, 365–424, 1989.
- [22] F. Ordóñez. Word order and clause structure in Spanish and

- other Romance languages. PhD Dissertation. City University of New York, 1997.
- [23] F. Ordóñez, A. Olarrea. Microvariation in Caribbean/non Caribbean Spanish interrogatives, *Probus*. 18. 59-96. 2006.
- [24] F. Ordóñez, E. Treviño. Left dislocated subjects and the pro-drop parameter: A case study of Spanish, *Lingua*. 107. 39-68. 1999.
- [25] Olarrea. Pre and postverbal subject positions in Spanish: a minimalist account. University of Washington PhD Dissertation, 1996.
- [26] Poletto, J. Y. Pollock. On the left periphery of some Romance wh-questions. *The Structure of CP and IP*, L. Rizzi (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. 251-296. 2004.
- [27] Pesetsky. Wh-in-situ: Movement and unselective binding, *The Representation of (in) Definiteness*, E. Reuland and A. ter Muelen. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. Vol.98, 98-129, 1987.
- [28] J. Katz and P. Postal. An integrated theory of linguistic descriptions. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 1964.
- [29] S. Y. Kuroda. Remarks on selectional restrictions and presuppositions. *Studies in Syntax and Semantics*, 138-167, 1969.
- [30] M. Enç. The semantics of specificity. *Linguistic inquiry*. 1-23, 1991.
- [31] C. Dobrovie-Sorin. Clitic-doubling, wh-movement, and quantification in Romanian. *Linguistic Inquiry*:21, 399-437. 1991.
- [32] J. Uriagereka. Multiple spell out. *Working Minimalism*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 1999.
- [33] H. Rullmann. Maximality in the semantics of wh-constructions. PhD Dissertation, University of Massachusetts. 1995.
- [34] L. Rizzi. Comparative syntax and language acquisition. New York: Routledge. 2000.
- [35] M. Polinsky. Information structure and syntax: topic, discourse-linking, and agreement. *Third Workshop on Spoken and Written Texts*. Austin: Texas Linguistics Forum. 2001.
- [36] M. den Dikken, A. Giannakidou. 2002. From hell to polarity: Aggressively non-D-linked wh-phrases as polarity items. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33.1, 31-61, 2002.
- [37] C. Boeckx, K. K. Grohmann. SubMove: Towards a unified account of scrambling and D-linking. *Peripheries*. Singer, Dordrecht, 241-257. 2004.
- [38] M. Lubańska. Focus on wh-questions. Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main. 2005.
- [39] L. Grebenyova. Syntax, semantics, and acquisition of multiple interrogatives: who wants what? Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2012.
- [40] J. D. McCawley. The syntactic phenomena of English, University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- [41] M. Diesing. Indefinites. *Linguistic Inquiry Monograph* 20, Cambridge MA: The MIT Press, 1992.
- [42] M. Turrero Garcia. How far can they go?: Non-native speakers of Spanish and wh-questions. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Massachusetts. 2016.