Syntactic variation in French: diglossia and language change

Rowlett, PA

Title	Syntactic variation in French: diglossia and language change
Authors	Rowlett, PA
Type	Conference or Workshop Item
URL	This version is available at: http://usir.salford.ac.uk/id/eprint/10075/
Published Date	2010

SYNTACTIC VARIATION IN FRENCH: DIGLOSSIA AND LANGUAGE CHANGE
(OR: "WE HAVE THEREFORE ARRIVED AT A VERY EXCITING MOMENT IN THE STUDY OF FRENCH SYNTAX")
Paul Rowlett (P.A.Rowlett@salford.ac.uk)
University of Salford

1. INTRODUCTION

Focus: syntactic variation within the French of France; what its status is; how it relates to syntactic change

Brief comments on tradition of studying syntactic variation in French

Brief comments on personal attempts at corpus linguistics

Review Massot's (2008) approach to syntactic variation in French based on notion of diglossia

Case study of fragment of grammar suggesting more subtle approach to diglossia needed

Brief comments on relevance to language change

2. SYNTACTIC VARIATION AND CHANGE IN FRENCH

Much has changed in recent years in the linguistic study of variation and change generally, but:

'It's sometimes claimed that there's been no significant syntactic change in French since the end of the seventeenth century, and that the label Mod(ern)F(rench) reflects a three-century-long period of grammatical stability.' (Rowlett 2007: 9)

Gadet (2009):

(a) Corpora, esp. re spoken language, were developed later for French than, e.g., for English and Italian; due to 'ideology of the standard' (Milroy & Milroy 1985);

(b) Interest in syntactic variation within specifically spoken language = recent development, e.g., GARS (Groupe aixois de recherches en syntaxe; Claire Blanche-Benveniste) looking at VP-related valency variation (micro-syntax) and CP-related discourse/pragmatic variation (macro-syntax) (question mark over status of sentence as fundamental unit of description – below);

(c) Focus of work now broadened out beyond narrow normative written French, i.e., (i) social/stylistic variation within France; (ii) French in contact situations; (iii) diatopic variation outside France, including comparison with 'le français de référence' and across 'non-standard' varieties.

Conclusion: "We have therefore arrived at a very exciting moment in the study of French syntax" (p. 118).

3. CORPORA IN FRENCH

For example: work on French as used online: Damar (2008), van Compernolle (2008). French corpus linguistics: Durand (ed.) (2008).

How not to do it?

Using the Internet for examples:

On the distribution of floating quantifiers:

"Cinque (1999: 120) suggests that FQs can't intervene between *déjà* [already] and *plus* [anymore]. However, the example in [1] was found on the Internet:

(1) Nous ne serions <u>déjà tous plus</u> de ce monde.
       we NEG would.be already all no.more of this world
       'We would already no longer be for this world.'

   Cinque also disputes the existence of an FQ position preceding *pas*. However, example [2], found on the Internet, again suggests otherwise:

(2) Ils n'ont <u>tous pas</u> ces caractères antiques.
       they NEG-have all not these characters antiquated
       'They don't all have these antiquated characters.'"   (Rowlett 2007: 117)

On clitic clusters:

" . . . (c) *lui* [IND.OBJ] and *y* [LOC] are sometimes claimed to be mutually incompatible . . . [C]onstraint (c) can possibly be explained on phonetic grounds: *lui y* = [lɥii]. However, a number of examples of *lui y* were found on the Internet:

(3) a. Une vie sans persécution ne <u>lui y</u> serait plus possible.
         a life without persecution NEG to.him there would.be no more possible
         'A life without persecution would no longer be possible for him there.'

     b. Les Togolais de la Diaspora ne <u>lui y</u> ont jamais rendu visite.
         the Togolese of the diaspora NEG to.him there have never given visit
         'The Togolese from the diaspora never visited him there.'"   (Rowlett 2007: 128–9)

On double *c'est que* ['it's that'] in one particular variety/grammar of French:

"The following non-invented examples were found on the Internet:

(4) a. Qui <u>c'est que c'est que</u> vous écoutez aussi attentivement.
         who it-is that it-is that you listen.to so attentively
         'Who are you listening to so attentively?'

     b. Mais qui <u>c'est que c'est qui</u> est là?
         but who it-is that it-is that is there
         'But who's there?'"   (Rowlett 2007: 211 fn 80)

On passivised perception verbs:

"Veland (1998) notes that such passives are 'in principle' impossible in the modern language (although they were possible previously):

(5) a. *Paul a été laissé/vu/entendu/mené sortir.
         P. has been let/seen/heard/led leave

     b. *Le ministre a été entendu dire que ces mesures seraient rapportées.
         the minister has been heard say that these measures would.be postponed

However, a Google search turned up examples such as those in [6] (see also Miller and Lowrey 2003: 154–5):

(6) a. Hurley et Grant <u>ont été vus</u> faire des emplettes ensemble.
       H. and G. have been seen do of.the purchases together
       'H. and G. were seen out shopping together.'

     b. Pierre Nicolas <u>a été vu</u> faire des tours de terrain bien après minuit.
        P. N. has been seen do of.the rounds of field well after midnight
        'P. N. was seen running around the pitch well after midnight.'"   (Rowlett 2007: 169–70)

Using the Internet for absolute and relative numerical data:

Oui/non as pro-assertive-clauses:

"The notion that *oui/non* specifically replace an *assertive* clause is supported by the contrast between [7a, b][Footnote]:

(7) a. J'espère que <u>oui/non</u>.   b. *Je souhaite que <u>oui/non</u>.
       I-hope that yes/no   I wish that yes/no
       'I hope so/not.'

Footnote: Judgements aren't categorical here. Nevertheless, a Google search on 20 April 2004 found approximately 1,730 and 4,386 webpages containing the strings <espère que oui> and <espère que non>, respectively (ignoring webpages containing the irrelevant string <espère que non seulement>), but just 19 and 68 containing <souhaite que oui> and <souhaite que non>, respectively (and, again, ignoring webpages containing the irrelevant string <souhaite que non seulement>). Given that there were approximately 477,000 and 538,000 webpages containing <espère> and <souhaite>, respectively, the small number of <souhaite que oui/non> hits is unexpected if the sequence is grammatical."   (Rowlett 2007: 100–1)

On the widespread existence of *pour ne pas que* 'lest':

"However, a cross-linguistically odd alternative . . . is available, namely, [8a], in which the negative markers *ne pas* precede the complementiser *que*. Examples [8b, c] show that other negative adverbials like *plus* and *jamais* can also occur here.[Footnote]

(8) a. Elle le fait <u>pour (ne) pas que</u> je tombe.
        she it does for NEG not that I fall
        . . .

     b. Je veux t'offrir ma chaleur . . . <u>pour (ne) jamais que</u> tu pleures.
        I want you offer my warmth for NEG never that you cry
        'I want to give you my warmth so that you never cry.'

     c. . . . les rend invisibles <u>pour (ne) plus que</u> vous soyez conscient de . . .
        them makes invisible for NEG no.more that you be aware of
        ' . . . makes them invisible so that you're no longer aware of . . . '

Footnote: Example [8a] is condemned by prescriptive grammarians. . . . Google searches on 29 March 2004 found approximately 11,400 web-page occurrences of *pour ne pas que*, 507 of *pour ne plus que* and 25 of *pour ne jamais que*."

                                                                              (Rowlett 2007: 140)

On the ungrammaticality of *sans ne*:

"Interestingly, while *sans* can select a bare infinitival IP*, as in [9a], which can contain negative XPs . . ., the infinitive cannot occur with negative *ne*, as shown in [9b]:[Footnote]

(9) a. sans payer   b. *sans <u>ne</u> rien faire
     without pay   without NEG nothing do
     'without paying'

This is odd since infinitival IP*s are typically either positive or negative . . ., and when they are negative, they are compatible with negative *ne* . . ..

Footnote: In fact, Google searches on 4 June 2005 turned up several *sans ne* V_{inf} sequences. The ungrammaticality judgement in the text assumes the attested sequences to be hypercorrective performance errors. . . . This conclusion is based on the observation that the relevant sequences occur considerably less frequently than would be expected if they were grammatical. . . . The Google search found 314,000 webpages containing <rien faire> (without *ne*) and 162,000 containing <ne rien faire> (without preceding *sans*). Negative *ne* was therefore retained 34% of the time. If *sans ne* V_{inf} is grammatical, a similar rate of *ne* retention is expected. However, the figures for <sans rien faire> and <sans ne rien faire> were 68,700 and 290, respectively, giving a *ne* retention rate of 0.42%. Similarly stark contrasts were found with other negative infinitives, suggesting that *sans ne* V_{inf} is in fact ungrammatical, and that use of *ne* in this context is due to hypercorrection."

(Rowlett 2007: 144)

'Rowlett, rather bewilderingly, once uses word counts made by Google to prove his point, instead of using the far more sophisticated and reliable tools that corpora provide today' (Fuchs nd).

German version: ' . . . dass Rowlett irritierenderweise in einem Abschnitt auf die unterschiedliche Anzahl von Treffern für bestimmte Formulierungen auf Google hinweist, um seinem Argument Nachdruck zu verleihen, obwohl die Korpuslinguistik weit ausgefeiltere und verlässlichere Werkzeuge zur Verfügung stellt.'

4. SYNTACTIC VARIATION IN FRENCH

4.1. DATA

Case studies considered by Massot (2008)

(10) Pre-verbal negative marker: *ne* or Ø?:
     a. Jean ne vient pas.   b. Jean Ø vient pas.
        J. *ne* comes not   J. comes not
        'John's not coming.'

(11) Clitic left dislocation of topical subjects: yes or no?:
     a. Jean arrive demain.   b. Jean, il arrive demain.
        J. arrives tomorrow   J. he arrives tomorrow
        'John's arriving tomorrow.'

(12) 'Inversion' in (non-presuppositional) yes–no interrogatives or *est-ce que*?:
     a. Est-il parti?   b. Est-ce qu'il est parti?
        Is-he left   is-it that-he is left
        'Has he left?'

(13) Exclamatives: *(Ah) que . . . !* or *Qu'est-ce que . . . !* ?:
    a. (Ah) que tu es belle!   b. Qu'est-ce que tu es belle!
        oh that you are beautiful   what-is-it that you are beautiful
        'My, how beautiful you are!'

(14) 2PL subject proform: *nous* or *on*?:
    a. Nous allons partir.   b. On va partir.
        we go leave   one goes leave
        'We're going to leave.'

(15) Non-adjectival past-participle agreement: yes or no?
    a. les lettres que j'ai écrites [ekrit]   b. les lettres que j'ai écrit [ekri]
        the letters that I-have written-AGR   the letters that I-have written
        'the letters I wrote'

In (10)–(15) the (a) and (b) variants have clearly contrasting relative sociolinguistic status: (a) = H; (b) = L.

Where no unmarked variant exists, as in (10)–(15), only marked H and marked L, clear separation of social situations in which each is appropriate.

4.2. VARIATIONIST EXPLANATION

Speakers have a single grammar which provides for variation internally, with choices of variant used in a particular utterance made on the hoof.

Model predicts that speakers can freely combine marked H and marked L syntactic features.

Problem identified by Massot (2008): this isn't what's found:

(16)   a. Nous allons à la mer.   b. On va à la mer. [✓ all focus; ✗ *on* = topic]
       c. ??*Nous, nous allons à la mer.   d. Nous, on va à la mer.

Rejection (in context of relevant datasets) of notion of variant selection within single grammar.

4.3. FRANCE AS DIGLOSSIC (ZRIBI-HERTZ; MASSOT; A LA FERGUSON 1959)

High-status French versus low-status French: "[T]o talk of stability is to massively oversimplify the situation with a convenient sociopolitical fiction hiding a degree of variation which suggests that two distinct grammatical systems co-exist, each with its own properties, in a situation of diglossia. Thus, . . . the conservative variety taught in schools, is distinguished from . . . the more innovative vernacular learnt in the home. . . . Some linguists have gone so far as to suggest that the degree of innovation which has occurred in the vernacular is such that [the conservative variety] is no longer a coherent or psychologically real variety (Bauche 1926; Côté 1999). For others, the variation found within French is to be explained by concluding that speakers switch, on the basis of sociosituational factors, between two grammars, which differ from each other in a number of quite specific ways . . . From such a perspective, what looks superficially like sociolinguistic variation along a continuum is code-switching between the two grammars, and possibly amounts to an extended period of change in progress."   (Rowlett 2007: 9)

France is diglossic; individual speakers have competence in two grammars, one = the conservative variety taught in schools, the other = the more innovative vernacular learnt in the home.

Diglossia: Ferguson (1959): relatively stable co-existence of two varieties.

Various labels used to describe the two varieties.

Massot: L gammar = *français démotique* (FD); H grammar = *français classique tardif* (FCT).

Speaker's unique FD = L (socially stigmatised) = vernacular, acquired early, in naturalistic setting; stable 'native speaker' competence achieved.

Speaker's unique FCT = H = acquired later, to varying degrees of competence/stability (cf. issue above re psychological reality), influenced by schooling and normative tradition (some uncertainty, e.g., *le fait que* + IND 'the fact that . . . '; some hypercorrection, e.g., *après que* + SUB 'after . . . ').

FD and FCT co-exist in speakers' minds; FD and FCT 'partially overlap': some surface forms have same status in both grammars: common ground = both H and L, therefore = sociolinguistically unmarked; uniquely FCT features = H = prestigious, valued, normative; uniquely FD features = L = stigmatised, non-normative.

(17) a. Si elle avait su . . .   b. Si elle aurait su . . .
     if she have.IMP known   if she have.COND known
     UNMARKED   MARKED: LOW
     'If she had known, . . . '

(18) a. Si elle avait pu . . .   b. Si elle eût pu . . .
     if she have.IMP known   if she have.IMP.SUB
     UNMARKED   MARKED: HIGH
     'If she had been able to, . . . '

Cf. (10)–(15) where there is no unmarked variant.

FD/FCT distinction ≠ oral/written distinction. Therefore, uniquely FD and uniquely FCT features appear in both written and oral language. Also, modal properties of oral/written medium don't explain the FD vs. FCT differences.

Only one grammar active at any one time; speakers use one or the other, on the basis of a sociolx assessment of the context.

Model predicts that, within relevant utterance unit, speakers stick to one grammar, and so won't combine uniquely FD features with uniquely FCT features. Massot (2008): relevant unit = sentence (cf. Gadet's comment above). Counterexamples = interference.

Approach = wrt to individual speakers; purported cross-speaker counterexamples are irrelevant because speakers' FD/FCTs won't be identical.

Some instances of variation are dialectal/geographic:

(19) Direct object clitic for inanimates in dislocated structures: *le/la/l'/les* or *y*?:
     a. La pomme, je l'ai mangée hier.   b. La pomme, j'y ai mangé(e?) hier.
     the apple I it-have eaten yesterday   the apple I-there have eaten yesterday
     'I ate the apple yesterday'

4.4. 'COMMON GROUND' BETWEEN FCT AND FD: A SUPERFICIAL OR DEEP PERSPECTIVE?

Common ground used above to refer to forms which can be generated by FCT *and* FD, e.g., (17a):

(17) a. Si elle avait su . . .   b. Si elle aurait su . . .
     if she have.IMP known   if she have.COND known
     UNMARKED   MARKED: LOW
     'If she had known, . . . '

However, *same* surface form can have *different* status within each grammar.

(Qu')est-ce que/qui '(what) is it that', used to mark interrogative clauses, deserves special attention (ignore *que–qui* alternation).

Est-ce que/qui: diachronically = syntactic inversion of *c'est que/qui* 'it's that' = cleft structure marking pragmatic focus; synchronically not so straightforward.

Est-ce que/qui in FCT = unproblematic because FCT retains 'inversion' (= understood theoretically as a Q feature on I*°) (see (12a)).

But: *est-ce que/qui* = also found in FD (see (12b)). Problematic because FD doesn't have 'inversion' (Q feature = on C*°).

So: different analysis needed: *est-ce que* = grammaticalised C*° in FD (atomic element drawn from

lexicon ready made, rather than output of syntactic inversion), *without* marking pragmatic focus.

Two analyses cut across two dimensions, one syntactic, one pragmatic.

(20) a. Est-ce que tu pars? in FCT: consequence of Q on I*° within *C'est que tu pars* = inverted cleft.
  b. Est-ce que tu pars? in FD: consequence of Q on C*° within *Tu pars* = non-inverted, non-cleft.

Interaction between these various dimensions of variation is illustrated in (21) in the context of the question 'Who can you see?':

(21)

	FCT ([Q] on I*°)	FD ([Q] on C*°)
Non-cleft	Qui vois-tu?	Qui [∅] tu vois? Qui [que] tu vois? *Qui [est-ce que] tu vois?* Qui [c'est que] tu vois?
Cleft	*Qui est-ce que tu vois?*	Qui [∅] c'est que tu vois? Qui [que] c'est que tu vois? Qui [est-ce que] c'est que tu vois? Qui [c'est que] c'est que tu vois?

Qui est-ce que tu vois? 'Who can you see?' appears twice in (21) (italicised).

Bottom left = FCT cleft with inversion and wh fronting.

Top right = FD non-cleft with wh fronting, atomic complementiser *est-ce que* drawn straight from lexicon, but no inversion.

Qui est-ce que tu vois? = different pragmatic status depending on associated grammar: cleft in FCT, non-cleft in FD.

Similarly for *est-ce qui* in *Qui est-ce qui parle?* 'Who's speaking?':

(22)

	ModF ([Q] on I*°)	ConF ([Q] on C*°)
Non-cleft	Qui parle?	Qui [∅] parle? Qui [qui] parle? *Qui [est-ce qui] parle?* Qui [c'est qui] parle?
Cleft	*Qui est-ce qui parle?*	Qui [∅] c'est qui parle? Qui [que] c'est qui parle? Qui [est-ce que] c'est qui parle? Qui [c'est que] c'est qui parle?

The two analyses of *est-ce que/qui*, one for FCT, another for FD, address several issues:

4.4.1. Double clefting

FD examples in (23) and (24), based on examples from bottom right-hand corner of (21) and (22):

(23) a. Qui <u>est-ce que</u> c'est que tu vois?   b. Qui <u>est-ce que</u> c'est qui parle?
  who is-it that it-is that you saw   who is-it that it-is that spoke
  'Who can you see?'   'Who's speaking?'

(24) a. Qui <u>c'est que</u> c'est que tu vois?   b. Qui <u>c'est que</u> c'est qui parle?
      who it-is that it-is that you saw   who it-is that it-is that spoke
      = (23a)   = (23b)

If *est-ce que* in (23) = always result of inversion, then these examples = derived from uninverted structures in (25):

(25) a. C'est qui que c'est que tu vois? b. C'est qui que c'est qui parle?

Problem: purported uninverted structures in (25) each contain double clefting; hard to motivate pragmatically. Also true of (24).

But, if *c'est/est-ce que/qui* = atomic complementiser in FD drawn from lexicon, without pragmatics of clefts, then no need to derive (23) from (25): (23) = single, pragmatically motivated cleft and formally complex, but syntactically atomic, complementiser.

4.4.2. Tense marking

Two analyses of *est-ce que/qui* = contrasting predictions re tense marking:

In FCT = inverted clefts; *est* = regular finite verb; therefore tense variation expected (with sequence-of-tense implications):

(26) a. Qui était-ce que tu voyais?   a′.   Qui était-ce qui parlait?
     b. Qui sera-ce que tu verras?   b′.   Qui sera-ce qui parlera?
     c. Qui serait-ce que tu verrais?   c′.   Qui serait-ce qui parlerait?
     d. Qui fut-ce que tu vis?   d′.   Qui fut-ce qui parla?

Non-present-tense clefts = rare but attested:

(27) a. Quand <u>sera-ce que</u> nous serons petits?   (FCT)
       when will.be-it that we will.be small
       'When shall we be small?'

     b. Qui <u>était-ce qui</u> avait préparé . . . ?   (FCT)
       who was-it that had prepared
       'Who had prepared . . . ?'

     c. Pourquoi <u>fut-ce que</u> les Romains firent telle chose?   (FCT)
       why was-it that the Romans did such thing
       'Why did the Romans do such a thing?'

As expected: (27) = stylistically highly marked, not characteristic of FD.

In FD: *est-ce que/qui* = atomic complementiser drawn ready made from lexicon. Therefore not expected to have tense-related variant forms:

(28) a. Quand <u>est-ce que</u> nous serons petits?   (FD)
       when is-it that we will.be small
       = (27a)

     b. Qui <u>est-ce qui</u> avait préparé . . . ?   (FD)
       who is-it that had prepared
       = (27b)

     c. Pourquoi <u>est-ce que</u> les Romains firent telle chose?   (FD)
       why is-it that the Romans did such thing
       = (27c)

4.4.3. 'Inversion' in subordinate interrogatives

Dual analysis of *est-ce que/qui* also explains mystery of (29) (Jones 1999):

(29) a. Je me demande quand <u>est-ce que</u> le train arrivera.   (FD)
       I me ask when is-it that the train will.arrive
       'I wonder when the train will arrive.'

b. *Je me demande quand <u>arrivera-t-il</u>.
   I me ask when will.arrive-it

Est-ce que/qui is found (in FD) in embedded interrogatives like (29a), but 'inversion' isn't (in any variety), as in (29b). If *est-ce que/qui* = inversion in all grammars, then judgements = unexplained.

But, if *est-ce que/qui* = atomic complementiser in FD, then explanation = possible: 'inversion' in (29b) = ungrammatical, even in FCT, because Q = in CP* rather than IP* in embedded interrogatives; *est-ce que* in (29a) = grammatical (in FD) because it's not generated by 'inversion'; rather, it's one of several available lexical realisations of C*°$_{[\alpha]}$ (alongside ⊘, *que* and *c'est que*):

(30) a. Je me demande quand <u>⊘</u> le train arrivera.
     b. Je me demande quand <u>que</u> le train arrivera.
     c. Je me demande quand <u>c'est que</u> le train arrivera.
        a–c: = (29a)

4.4.4. 'Est-ce que' vs. 'si'

Finally, *est-ce que/qui* as atomic C*°$_{[\alpha]}$ in FD explains two behaviours parallel to *si*:

(31) a. Il demande s'il pleut.   b. Il demande est-ce qu'il pleut.
     he asks if-it rains (FCT/?FD)   he asks is-it that'it rains (FD)
     a, b: 'He wants to know whether it's raining.'

(32) [<u>Est-ce que</u> vous viendrez] ou [<u>si</u> c'est lui]?   Goosse (2000: 114)
     is-it that you will.come or if it-is him
     'Will you come or will he?'

Est-ce que and *si* both = complementiser.

Therefore, crucial for understanding of diglossia model that analysis allows 'same' surface forms to have different status is each grammar.

5. SYNTACTIC CHANGE

Issues:

▸ Nature of relationship between FCT and FD: stages in development of same language?
▸ Nature of difference between FCT and FD: expected pattern of change, or not?
▸ E.g. negative *ne*: increasing rates of omission
▸ Ashby (2001): increased level of *ne* drop: change in progress vs. age grading (shifts in linguistic behaviour over lifetime of speakers within community);
▸ Or: ? age grading PLUS sociological shift: two stable grammars, but increased tendency to use one rather than the other.

6. CONCLUSION

▸ Grammatical variation exists in contemporary French French, ≠written–spoken distinction.
▸ Interest developed later than for other languages.
▸ Clear cases of syntactic variation where variants are sociolinguistically marked H or L or unmarked.
▸ Variationist sociolinguistic approach fails, using Massot's (2008) reasoning, to explain why certain a priori possible variants don't co-occur.
▸ Diglossia approach does explain these otherwise mysterious non-co-occurrences.
▸ However, Massot's (2008) diglossia model fails to recognise that single superficial form can be generated by two partially overlapping grammars, but have different syntactic status in each.
▸ *(Qu')est-ce que/qui* = example of such a single surface form.

7. REFERENCES

Ashby, William J. 2001. ,Un nouveau regard sur la chute du *ne* en français parlé tourangeau: s'agit-il d'un changement en cours?' *Journal of French Language Studies*, 11:1–22.
Auger, Julie and Anne-José Villeneuve. 2008. '*Ne* deletion in Picard and in regional French:

evidence for distinct grammars', in Meyerhoff and Nagy (eds), 223–47.

Bauche, Henri. 1926. *Le langage populaire*. Paris: Payot.

Beeching, Kate, Nigel Armstrong and Françoise Gadet (eds). 2009. *Sociolinguistic variation in contemporary French* (IMPACT: Studies in Language and Society, 26). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Blanche-Benveniste, Claire, Mireille Bilger, Christine Rouget and Karel van den Eynde, with Piet Mertens. 1991. *Le français parlé: études grammaticales*. Paris: CNRS.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads: a cross-linguistic perspective*. Oxford University Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo, Jan Koster, Jean-Yves Pollock, Luigi Rizzi and Raffaella Zanuttini (eds). 1994. *Paths towards Universal Grammar: studies in honor of Richard S. Kayne*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.

van Compernolle, René A. 2008. 'Morphosyntactic and phonological constraints on negative particle variation in French-language chat discourse' *Language Variation and Change*, 20:317–39.

Côté, Marie-Hélène. 1999. 'Issues in the analysis and acquisition of clitics in (spoken) French.' Ms. MIT.

Damar, M.-E. 2008. 'Le subjonctif: norme et représentations de la norme dans le discours des internautes' *Français Moderne*, 76:83–96.

Durand, Jacques (ed.). 2008. 'Le français à la lumière des corpus' *Journal of French Language Studies*, 18:1–145.

Ferguson, Charles A. 1959. 'Diglossia', *Word*, 15:325–40.

Frei, Henri. 1929. *La grammaire des fautes*. Paris: Geuthner.

Fuchs, Robert. nd. Review of Rowlett 2007. Posted on Roter Dorn website www.roterdorn.de.

Gadet, Françoise. 1997. *Le français ordinaire*, 2nd edn. Paris: Colin.

Gadet, Françoise. 2009. 'Stylistic and syntactic variation: introduction', in Beeching et al. (eds), 115–20.

Hundt, Marianne, Nadja Nesselhauf and Carolin Biewer (eds) 2007. *Corpus linguistics and the Web* (Language & Computers). Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Massot, Benjamin. 2003. *Eléments linguistiques pour une vision diglossique du français contemporain*. DEA dissertation. University of Paris 8. [Available for download at inferno. philosophie.uni-stuttgart.de/~benjamin/pdf/DEAmassot.pdf]

Massot, Benjamin. 2008. *Français et diglossie: décrire la situation linguistique française contemporaine comme une diglossie: arguments morphosyntaxiques*. Doctoral thesis. University of Paris 8. [Available for download at inferno.philosophie.uni-stuttgart.de/~benjamin/pdf/these-benjamin-massot-version-soutenance.pdf]

Meyerhoff, Miriam and Naomi Nagy (eds). 2008. *Social lives in language: sociolinguistics and multilingual speech communities: celebrating the work of Gillian Sankoff* (IMPACT: Studies in Language and Society, 24). Amsterdam: Benjamins

Miller, Philip and Brian Lowrey. 2003. 'La complémentation des verbes de perception en français et en anglais', in Miller and Zribi-Hertz (eds), 131–88.

Miller, Philip and Anne Zribi-Hertz (eds). 2003. *Essais sur la grammaire comparée du français et de l'anglais*. Presses Universitaires de Vincennes.

Milroy, James and Leslie Milroy. 1985. *Authority in language: investigating language prescription and standardisation*. London: Routledge.

Rowlett, Paul. 1992. 'On the D-structure position of negative sentence adverbials in French.' *First Manchester Postgraduate Linguistics Conference*, March.

Rowlett, Paul. 1993. 'French *pas*, NegP, sentential and constituent negation.' *Second Manchester Postgraduate Linguistics Conference*, March.

Rowlett, Paul. 1996. *Negative configurations in French*. Doctoral thesis, University of York.

Rowlett, Paul. 1998. *Sentential negation in French*. Oxford University Press. [Available for download at www.usir.salford.ac.uk/2703]

Rowlett, Paul. 2007. *The syntax of French*. Cambridge University Press. [Available for download at www.usir.salford.ac.uk/1355]

Veland, Reidar. 1998. 'Une construction dite ne pas exister en français moderne: le passif suivi d'un infinitif nu' *Journal of French Language Studies* 8, 97–113.

Zribi-Hertz, Anne.1994. 'The syntax of nominative clitics in standard and advanced French', in Cinque et al. (eds), 453–72.