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[TT] French Studies

[TT] Language and Linguistics

[A] By Paul Rowlett, University of Salford

1. General


2. History of the Language


3.[H2] Phonetics and Phonology

N. Armstrong and J. Low, ‘C’est encoeur plus jeuli, le Mareuc: some evidence for the spread of /i/-fronting in French’, *TPS*, 106:432–55, consider recorded speech data from Roanne and conclude that young female speakers may be leading change, also finding evidence of /i/ unrounding after /i/, auditorily similar to fronting. The phenomena are seen in the context of
phonological leveling, characteristic of contemporary Fr., where they constitute accommodation of the dominant variety and are indicative of mobility and openness, rather than standardization or dedialectalization. J. Goslin and U. H. Frauenfelder, ‘Vowel aperture and syllable segmentation in French’, *LSp*, 51:199–222, present the results from two segmentation experiments (a metalinguistic repetition task and an online fragment detection task) to support the purported correspondence in Fr. between mid-open vowels and closed syllables and between mid-close vowels and open syllables. N. Nguyen and Z. Fagyal, ‘Acoustic aspects of vowel harmony in French’, *JPh*, 36:1–27, explore vowel harmony (regressive vowel-to-vowel assimilation) in two regional varieties of Fr., finding the phenomenon (which is more systematic in the North than in the South) acoustically consistent with variations in tongue height and tongue movement along the front–back axis.

C. Paradis and D. LaCharité, ‘Apparent phonetic approximation: English loanwords in Old Quebec French’, *JL*, 44:87–128, ask on the basis of English loanwords into 19th/20th-c. and contemporary Quebec Fr. whether loanword adaptation is primarily phonetic or phonological, and whether the answer depends on the level of access that the ‘adapters’ have to L2 phonology and therefore to the degree of bilingualism. M.-H. Côté, ‘Empty elements in schwa, liaison and h aspiré: the French Holy Trinity revisited’, pp. 61–103 of *Sounds of Silence: Empty Elements in Syntax and Phonology* (North-Holland Linguistic Series, vol. 63), ed. Jutta Hartmann, Veronika Hegedűs and Henk van Riemsdijk, Amsterdam, Elsevier, xiii + 332 pp., rejects emptiness (that is, segment defectiveness and/or deficient structures) as an account for the three phenomena, arguing instead that schwa is to be understood in terms of perceptual requirements, the variable pronunciation of liaison consonants as deriving from epenthesis, prefixation and/or lexical allomorphy, and h-aspiré words as having the same relevant structure as non-h-aspiré words but being subject to a lexically specific word-to-syllable alignment.
constraint. A. Bonneau and Y. Laprie, ‘Selective acoustic cues for French voiceless stops’, *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 123:4482–97. E. Shoemaker and D. Birdsong, *‘La résolution de la liaison en français par des locuteurs natifs et non-natifs’, Acquisition et Interaction en Langue Étrangère*, 27, use the results of a forced-choice identification task to reject the hypothesis that speakers give listeners acoustic clues to allow the reliable distinction between *un air* and *un nerf*, for example, by lengthening word-initial consonants, with neither native nor non-native speakers performing above chance levels.


Svetlana Kaminskaïa, *La variation intonative dialectale en français: une approche phonologique* (LINCOM Studies in French Linguistics, vol. 7), Munich, Lincom, 132 pp., explores the hypothesis that intonation in the Fr. of France is less modulated and more compact than in Quebec Fr.

4.[H2] Morphology

dans la morphologie du verbe français’ (133–54); M. Roché, ‘Quelques exemples de morphologie non conventionnelle dans les formations construites à partir d’un mot en -ouille(r)’ (215–38). See also T. Petitpas, ‘Origine, diversité, forme et fonction des pseudo-suffixes dans l’argot français’, CLe, 93:101–13, describes one of the main word-formation processes in Fr. slang, namely pseudo-suffixation (e.g. -ouille, -oche, -uche, -aque, -oque), a very old process of derivational morphology which is used by numerous social groups as a sociolinguistic marker and has the unusual characteristic of semantic vacuity.

S. Leroy, ‘Les noms propres et la dérivation suffixale’, NMI, 109:39–55, considers numerous examples of proper nouns which feed derivational suffixation processes, distinguishing ethnic adjectives and suffixed forenames from other derived suffixations, and arguing that the distinction is based on properties of the stem: in the former case the stem is ‘incarné’ and strictly denominal; in the latter it is ‘désincarné’ with more general, descriptive and complex semantics. P. Lauwers, ‘The nominalization of adjectives in French: from morphological conversion to categorial mismatch’, FLin, 42:135–76, considers nominalized adjectives (le vrai), rejecting the standard analysis in terms of a zero morphological conversion (they do not behave like morphologically derived nouns), and proposing instead a Construction Grammar analysis.

K. Van Goethem, ‘Les constructions préverbales du français et du néerlandais: typologie et grammaticalisation’, JFLS, 18:227–48, examines verbs which appear to contain a prefix derived from a preposition, and identifies evidence of a grammaticalization cline from genuine relational prefixes (e.g. survoler) to non-relational prefixes (e.g. surestimer) to lexicalized non-prefixes (e.g. pourlécher). M. Aurnague and M. Plénat, ‘Sémantique de l’espace et morphologie: le cas de la préfixation en é-’, BSLP, 103:201–36, identifies a semantic constraint on the process, namely the presence of a ‘usual attachment’ between natural entities and the
deliberate separation/removal of one part of the attachment.

5. [H2] Syntax

Paul Rowlett, *The Syntax of French* (Cambridge Syntax Guides), CUP, 2007, xi + 254 pp., offers a contemporary Chomskyan perspective on a broad range of topics relating to the structure of nominals (e.g. (in)definites, generics, partitives, demonstratives, possessives), clauses (e.g. floated quantifiers, proclisis and enclisis) and left-peripheral phenomena (e.g. dislocation, wh/focus fronting, clefting, inversion). P. Rowlett, ‘Cinque’s functional verbs in French’, *LSc*, 29, 2007:755–86, investigates Fr. verbs expressing tense, mood, modality, aspect, voice, perception, causation and locomotion which share the property of selecting a bare infinitive, and captures this within the framework of Cinque’s exploded hierarchical IP structure.

F. Drijkoningen and B. Kampers-Manhe, ‘On inversions and the interpretation of subjects in French’, *Probus*, 20:147–209, explore the interaction between post-verbal subjects in Fr. and the interpretation of (in)definite DPs (topic/focus), proposing a partial functional hierarchy of clausal FPs, various types of remnant movement, and pose a set of questions surrounding the (in)definiteness effects on post-verbal subjects.

*LaF*, no. 158 (3–143), *‘Les proformes indéfinies: indéfinition et prédication’* (ed. F. Lefeuvre and M. Pierrard), includes an introduction by the editors and eight articles. N. Flaux, ‘Les pronoms indéfinis en français: une classe à (re)définir’, *TrL*, 56:7–46, argues on the basis of various criteria (e.g. right dislocation, impersonal constructions, the *de* + adjective construction) that numerous so-called indefinite pronouns do not behave like NPs, are not indefinite referring expressions and are actually determiners; in fact very few true indefinite
pronouns remain, e.g. negative universals and free-choice items.


M. Labelle, ‘The French reflexive and reciprocal *se*’, *NLLT*, 26:833–76, rejects as semantically inadequate and syntactically too local the view that *se* lexically creates a one-place reflexive verb and/or absorbs a case feature of the verb, arguing instead that *se* merges in the syntax as a Voice head which introduces the external argument and indicates that the reference of the object is determined by that of the subject. A. Zribi-Hertz, ‘From intensive to reflexive: the prosodic factor’, pp. 591–631 of *Reciprocals and Reflexives: Theoretical and Typological Explorations* (Trends in Linguistics), ed. Ekkehard König and Volker Gast, Berlin, Mouton de
M. López Díaz, ‘Noms communs et noms propres “qualitatifs”?’, TrL, 56:69–85, looks at bare common and proper nouns functioning like adjectives (Le cinéma et art, Dieu est amour, Les costumes sont très théâtre, Il est très Monoprix), in particular in advertising, and argues that they occupy a middle ground between adjectival predicates and full NP predicates with determiners. T. Grüter, ‘When learners know more than linguists: (French) direct object clitics are not objects’, Probus, 20:211–34, uses child-language data to evaluate analyses of object clitics in adult Fr. in respect of their argumental status and their site of first merge. On the basis of the observation that children persistently omit object clitics but never misplace them, the author concludes that clitics are not argumental, that is, not merged as complement of the verb. F. Tayalati, ‘La distinction ergatif/inergatif et son incidence sur le placement des clitiques datifs dans les constructions causatives avec faire et rendre’, Probus, 20:301–21, concludes that Fr. adjectives are either ‘ergative’ or ‘inergative’, the latter having an external argument, and that cliticization of dative pronouns onto faire/rendre is only possible with ergative verbs/adjectives. P. Lauwers, ‘Les emplois attributifs de faire’, SN, 80:43–64, describes five (quasi-)attributive uses of faire and provides a taxonomy of dynamic and stative readings on the basis of a common semantic property of assigning non-intrinsic properties to a referant.


6.[H2] Lexis
P. Frath, ‘Pour commencer, il faut arrêter de décoder: plaidoyer pour une linguistique sans métaphysique’, *JFLS*, 18:147–73, makes a philosophical contribution to the Frath–Peeters debate on the verb *commencer* and the relevance/value of speaker encoding and hearer decoding. A. Theissen, ‘Le SN démonstratif cette fois(-ci/-là)’, *JFLS*, 18:209–26, and ‘À propos de la détermination du N fois par l’article défini et par l’adjectif démonstratif’, *TrL*, 56:125–39, considers the unique distribution of the noun *fois* and attributes it to its lack of nominal ‘substance’. *LaF*, no. 157 (5–137), *‘Enigmatique prépositions’* (ed. D. Leeman), includes an introduction and five articles. *Ici et maintenant* (Cahiers Chronos, vol. 20), ed. Marcel Vuillaume, Amsterdam, Rodopi, xi + 219 pp., includes an introduction and eleven articles exploring various dimensions of these indexicals.

*Adpositions: Pragmatic, Semantic and Syntactic Perspectives* (Typological Studies in Language, vol. 74), ed. Dennis Kurzon and Silvia Adler, Amsterdam, Benjamins, viii + 307 pp., includes: P. Cadiot and F. Lebas, ‘Pragmatics of prepositions: a study of the French connectives *pour le coup* and *du coup*’ (115–32); L. Fraczak, ‘French prepositions à and de in infinitival complements: a pragma-semantic analysis’ (171–90), who argues against the semantic ‘emptiness’ of the French non-finite complementizers à and de, but goes beyond accounts based on presupposition to propose a description à-marked infinitives as presenting facts in an ‘ambivalent’ way and de-marked infinitives in a ‘monovalent’ way; and S. Adler, ‘French compound prepositions, prepositional locutions and prepositional phrases in the scope of the absolute use’ (17–35), who aims, first, to categorize complex prepositions of the form [preposition – definite article – noun – preposition] on lexical and semantic grounds, distinguishing absolute and non-absolute uses and, second, to examine why many temporal and spatial expressions, but not expressions denoting cause, goal, opposition, concession, etc.,
accept the absolute use, thereby significantly reducing what is usually considered as their ‘arbitrary behaviour’. See also the related S. Adler, **‘De la possibilité de suppression du régime des expressions prépositionnelles de concession, comparaison, addition et destination’, *RevR*, 43:151–70.

7.[H2] Lexicography and Lexicology


8.[H2] Semantics

P. Haas and F. Tayalati, ‘Les adjectifs français et l’opposition aspectuelle *statif* vs *dynamique*’, *TrL*, 56:47–67, argue that, like verbs and nouns, Fr. adjectives can be divided into stative and dynamic ones, in line with the distinction between adjectives with agentive or non-agentive
subjects, whereby dynamic adjectives usually relate to behaviours, but can relate to qualities given a specific aspectual context. C. Vénérin-Guénez, ‘Da la partition à la quantification: le cas des verbes de séparation V X en Ypl’, *TrL*, 56:141–63, discusses the properties of verbs denoting the breaking up of a coherent whole/set into a plurality of elements with distinct spatio-temporal properties, e.g. *briser un vase en morceaux*. C. Corteer, ‘Divers et différents “déterminants” sont-ils vraiment équivalents?’, *FM*, 76:182–202, explores the semantic contrast between the two determiners, sometimes claimed to be synonymous, and concludes that *divers* indicates variation between a plurality of entities, while *différents* goes one step further in stressing the individuality of each member of the plural set.

*Langages*, no. 169 (3–128), ‘Événements, prédicats, arguments’ (ed. Maria Asnès and Lucien Kupferman), is a contribution to Fr. lexical semantics containing two introductory pieces by the editors and six further articles.

Maj-Britt Mosegaard Hansen, *Particles at the Semantics/Pragmatics Interface: Synchronic and Diachronic Issues: A Study with Special Reference to the French Phrasal Adverbs* (Current Research in the Semantics/Pragmatics Interface, vol. 19), Amsterdam, Elsevier, 248 pp., has a theoretical and a description dimension. Theoretically, the author establishes a synchronic model for the interface between lexical semantics and pragmatic interpretation and a diachronic model for the pragmatic influence on speakers’ shifting lexical representations (how pragmatic interpretations become semanticized). Descriptively, the author adopts a multi-level perspective to consider whether the wide range of uses of phrasal adverbs *déjà, encore, toujours, enfin* amount to mere polyfunctionality or genuine polysemy, and offers a polysemy ‘network’ for each item. See also M.-B. Mosegaard Hansen and E. Strudsholm, ‘The semantics of particles: advantages of a contrastive and panchronic approach: a study of the polysemy of French *déjà* and Italian *già*’, *Linguistics*, 46:471–505, which proposes a method of
semantic–pragmatic analysis with illustration from the synchrony/diachrony of the Romance cognates *déjà* and *già*, concluding that the two are polysemous rather than monosemous.


9.[H2] Regional French and Dialects

Henriette Walter, “*Aventures et mésaventures des langues de France*, Editions du Temps, 287 pp., is a review of France’s linguistic heritage and regional languages, profiling each for a non-specialist audience and showing how they have survived against the odds. Véronique Bertile, *Langues régionales ou minoritaires et Constitution: France, Espagne et Italie* (Droit public comparé et européen), Emile Bruylant, 516 pp., explains first how it is that, despite their comparable linguistic situations, France, Spain and Italy have adopted quite different legislative approaches to regional and minority languages, and then shows how the issues are now being seen as related to the rights of speakers rather than the rights of the languages. Robert J. Blackwood, *The State, the Activists and the Islanders: Language Policy on Corsica* (Language Policy, vol. 8), Dordrecht, Springer, 161 pp., shows how the status of Corsican in relation to Fr. is the result of interaction over the decades between the three key ‘participants’ in the island’s

10.[H2] French in North America

*CanJL*, no. 53.1 (1–82), ‘Acadian French/Le français acadien’ (ed. P. Balcom et al.), includes: an Introduction (7–34) by the editors presenting the origins of the variety and its relative linguistic isolation; P. Balcom, ‘On the learning of auxiliary use in the referential French variety by speakers of New Brunswick Acadian French’ (7–34), who discusses the generalization of *avoir* in perfective paradigms, an innovative feature which has flourished in the absence of normative pressure; L. Beaulieu and W. Cichocki, ‘La flexion postverbale -ont en français acadien: une analyse sociolinguistique’ (35–62), who discuss an archaic verbal morphological feature which has been retained but which other varieties have lost; and G. R. Butler and R. King, ‘The French discourse marker *mais dame*: past and present functions’ (63–82). N. Rosen,
‘French–Algonquian interaction in Canada: a Michif case study’, *Clinical Linguistics & Phonetics*, 22:610–24, describes the linguistic (phonological/morphological/syntactic) conflict sites between the grammars of Fr. and Plains Cree in the context of Michif, a Fr.–Plains Cree mixed language. L. Oakes, ‘‘Language planning and policy in Quebec’, pp. 345–85 of Ayoun, *Studies*, examines long-standing policies in Quebec aimed to improve the status of Fr., broaden its acquisition and enhance its quality, and considers the contemporary challenges from immigration and globalization which are proving that language policy and planning in Quebec have more creativity and adaptability than they do in some other Fr.-speaking areas.

11.[H2] French in Africa

F. Aitsiselmi and D. Marley, ‘‘The role and status of the French language in North Africa’, pp. 185–222 of Ayoun, *Studies*, begin with a background historical overview and then show that despite an Arabization policy, Fr. continues to play a key role in the Maghreb. André Marie Ntsobé, Edmond Biloa and George Echu, *Le Camfranglais: quelle parlure? Etude linguistique et sociolinguistique*, Oxford, etc., Lang, 159 pp., offers an overview of Cameroonian multilingualism, a sociolinguistic description of Camfranglais (a mixture of indigenous languages, pidgin English, Fr. and English) and lexical descriptions of phonology, lexis and morphosyntax.

12.[H2] Pidgins and Creoles

A. Rajah-Carrim, ‘Choosing a spelling system for Mauritian Creole’, *JPCL*, 23:193–226, considers, from the perspective of the notion that orthographic choices reflect language beliefs
and that standardization can reflect an ideologically loaded sense of inferiority toward the lexifier, the 2004 government-sponsored attempt to devise a standard orthography for Kreol, a widely used but not officially standardized Fr.-lexifier creole from Mauritius, presenting evidence of support for the promotion of literacy but low rates of usage of the written form, and evidence of tension between Kreol and colonial Fr./English and of the role of Kreol as an index of national identity. K. Managan, "Anthropological linguistic perspectives on writing Guadeloupean Kréyòl: struggles for recognition of the language and struggles over authority", pp. 223–53 of Ayoun, Studies, analyses efforts to disseminate a standardized and distinct orthography for Guadeloupean Kréyòl within the context of a broader ideological struggle over Kréyòl and Guadeloupean identity in relation to Fr. language/identity.

Marie-Christine Hazaël-Massieux, *Textes anciens en créole français de la Caraïbe: Histoire et analyse* (Lettres et Langues: Linguistique), Publibook, 487 pp., uses texts dating back to the time of colonization, to the abolition of slavery, the second half of the 19th c. and the length of the 20th c. to ask how creoles are formed within a complex historical context, taking into account the various languages present in multilingual environments. I. Neumann-Holzschuh, "A la recherche du “superstrat”: what North American French can and cannot tell us about the input to creolization", pp. 357–83 of *Roots of Creole Structures: Weighing the Contribution of Substrates and Superstrates* (Creole Language Library, vol. 33), ed. Susanne Michaelis, Amsterdam, Benjamins, xvii + 425 pp., argues, in the context of the debate on the input into creolization, that a close analysis of Acadian Fr. sheds light on the language spoken by settlers which was a source for several creole features. E. Russell Webb, ‘Formalizing creole sound change: an Optimality Theoretic account’, *JPCL*, 23:227–63, focuses in particular on the neutralization of the [round] contrast in the formation of Fr.-lexifier creoles.
13. [H2] Contact and Sociolinguistics


*FM*, no. 76 (1–96), ‘Nouveaux regards sur le purisme’ (ed. Laurence Rosier), offers a number of interesting perspectives on the (widely dismissed) notion of purism and includes: P. Zoberman, ‘Purisme et académie: l’académie des femmes savantes’ (4–13), who looks at the relation between purism and ideology in Molière’s *Les Femmes savantes*; G. Philippe, ‘Purisme linguistique et purisme stylistique’ (14–23), who introduces two kinds of purism, *Le Bon Usage* vs *La Belle Langue*, in the context of post-World War II literature; R. Delveroudi, ‘Les avatars du purisme en Grèce et en France’ (24–37), who considers Fr./Francophone purism within a cross-cultural perspective and its relevance to national and cultural identity, arguing that the ideological basis of purism is a myth, in the context of Fr. the myth of clarity, universality and ‘fixité’; L. Rosier, ‘De la sociolinguistique d’amateur, ou purisme et lutte des classes’ (51–65), who shows how, by stereotyping social groups by their linguistic behaviour, purists are behaving like amateur sociolinguists; D. Meunier, ‘Le purisme enfantin au prisme du discours spontané’ (66–82), who identifies parallels between child purism and other aspects of their regulated
behaviour.

F. Grim, ‘The topics and roles of the situational code-switching of an English–French bilingual’, *JFLS*, 18:189–208, concludes that topic triggers code-switching in a four-year-old boy, as does a desire to be leader and to express emotions. T. Pooley, ‘Analyzing urban youth vernaculars in French cities: lexicographical, variationist and ethnographic approaches’, pp. 317–44 of *Studies*, compares sociolinguistic work on youth vernaculars in France and other neighbouring countries, identifying a number of themes which are deemed to be important elsewhere but not in France. A. Le Nevez, ‘Rethinking diversity and difference in French language practices’, *Language Policy*, 7:309–22, reviews the perspectives of France as linguistically homogenous with a standardized and universally practised language or as linguistically diverse and heterogenous, seeing the latter as a fundamental feature of the country, and arguing for a critical and inclusive approach to France’s cultural and linguistic differences. J.-M. Klinkenberg, ‘Une identité problématique: les quatre fragilités du francophone belge’, *FR*, 81:1106–18, studies the sociolinguistic fragility of Fr.-speaking Belgium within the context of thirty years of sociopolitical change and from the perspective of its relationship with France (its *grand frère*), with Flanders (its *frère ennemi*), with the USA (big brother) and its immigrants (its *enfants adoptés*). E. E. Davies, ‘Crossing les barricades: the use of French in some English newspaper articles’, *LComm*, 28:225–41, takes a fascinating look at how English-medium newspapers used Fr. words in coverage of the November 2005 riots in France, seeing these gallicisms as effective communication devices, facilitating clarity of reference, generating particular associations, producing an identifying/distancing effect, as well as for sarcasm/humour. Henri Boyer, *Langue et identité: sure le nationalism linguistique*, Limoges, Lambert–Lucas, 98 pp., focuses on France and Spain. M. Elsig, ‘Variability within the French interrogative system: a diachronic perspective’, pp. 135–62 of *Language Contact and Contact*
14.[H2] Discourse and Pragmatics

P. Mertens, ‘Syntaxe, prosodie et structure informationnelle: une approche prédictive pour l’analyse de l’intonation dans le discours’, *TrL*, 56:87–124, considers the role of intonation in discourse, in organizing information and in expressing speaker attitude, placing intonation centre stage alongside semantico-syntactic properties, and arguing that syntactic structures are not intonation-neutral and that, consequently, information structure can be identified from intonation without the need to interpret pragmatic/semantic structure. F. Chevalier, **‘Unfinished turns in French conversation: how context matters’**, *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 41:1–30, and F. Chevalier and R. Clift, ‘Unfinished turns in French conversation: projectibility, syntax and action’, *JP*, 40:1731–52, show how, rather than triggering repair or misunderstanding, syntactically incomplete conversational turns are treated by hearers as interactionally complete, and responded to accordingly, thanks first to their sequential position within a context and second to the ability of turn-initial cues to project the speaker’s intended action.

C. Rossari and C. Cojocariu, ‘Constructions of the type *la cause*/*la raison*/*la preuve* + utterance: grammaticalization, pragmaticalization, or something else?’, *JP*, 40:1435–54, provide for an account for these constructions, which in contemporary Fr. characteristically do not include the complementizer *que*. The authors reject both the grammaticalization view and the pragmaticalization view, opting instead for an analysis based on the routinization of a complex discourse structure such as a coupled question–answer segment in which the initial NP (the
question) was originally an autonomous speech act. R. Pauna, ‘La modalisation des
connecteurs: l’exemple de la cause’, ZFSL, 118:225–36, illustrates, using causal connectors,
how connectors are not frozen units and how they can be modified modally, with the available
modalizing mechanisms dependent on the connectors’ syntactico-semantic properties.

*Concession et dialogisme (Sciences pour la communication, vol. 85), ed. Sylvie Mellet,
Oxford, etc., Lang, xii + 281 pp., contains an Introduction by the editor and seven articles
considering the apparent synonymy between cependant, néanmoins, pourtant, pour autant and
toutefois from both a synchronic and diachronic perspective, as well as comparable concessive
adverbs in German, Latin and Ancient Greek. *‘Subordination’ versus ‘Coordination’ in Sentence
Cathrine Fabricius-Hansen and Wiebke Ramm, Amsterdam, Benjamins, vi + 359 pp., includes
C. Cosme, ‘A corpus-based perspective on clause linking patterns in English, French and Dutch’
and L. Delort, ‘Exploring the role of clause subordination in discourse structure: the case of
French avant que’. C. Schnedecker, ‘La locution adverbiale d’une certaine manière: entre

15.[H2] Computer-mediated communication

R. A. van Compernolle, ‘Morphosyntactic and phonological constraints on negative particle
variation in French-language chat discourse’, LVC, 20:317–39, investigates the variable use of
the Fr. negative particle ne in online chatrooms, noting overwhelming omission along the same
lines as conversational spoken Fr., and identifying the factors determining its retention,
particularly subject type (nominals as opposed to pronominals), but also phonological features
of subject pronouns and the nature of the second negative element. Relatedly, R. A. van
Compernolle, ‘Language variation in online personal ads from Quebec: the case of *ne*,’ *language@internet*, 5, article 1, notes that *ne* use remains strong in online personals, with VARBRUL analyses showing variable *ne* usage to be conditioned by age and the presence vs absence of second-person address. The results are also considered within the context of audience design in online communication contexts. M.-E. Damar, ‘Le subjonctif: norme et représentations de la norme dans le discours des internautes’, *FM*, 76:83–96, examines electronic web-based exchanges and finds evidence of the subjunctive being highly socially marked, with users from all backgrounds being far from indifferent to the indicative/subjunctive distinction, happy to correct other users’ ‘mistakes’ and apparently feeling guilty about their own ‘poor’ usage. C. Pérez-Sabater et al., ‘*A spoken genre gets written: online football commentaries in English, French and Spanish*,’ *Written Communication*, 25:235–61, examine how the distinction between oral and written genres is blurred in the context of online sports commentaries, demonstrating features of both radio/television and newspapers.

16.[H2] Corpus Studies

*JFLS*, no. 18.1 (1–145), ‘Le français à la lumière des corpus’ (ed. Jacques Durand), contains a brief introduction (1–2) by the editor and six articles, including: B. Laks ‘Pour une phonologie de corpus’ (3–32), who highlights the view that linguistics (and especially phonology), unlike grammar, is an empirical science aiming to model observable data/phenomena; J. Durand and C. Lyche, ‘French liaison in the light of corpus data’ (33–66), who revisit Fr. liaison using data from the PFC (Phonologie du français contemporain) corpus, not with a view to providing a new analysis but rather to argue that any analysis needs to pay attention to sociolinguistic surveys, acquisition studies, experimental phonetics, etc., since Fr. liaison is a multifaceted
phenomenon, to be understood via various disciplinary techniques rather than mere recourse to past authorities; N. Hathout, F. Montermini and L. Tanguy, ‘Extensive data for morphology: using the World Wide Web’ (67–85), who use case studies involving the suffixes -esque, -este, -able and -ment to illustrate how web-based data-driven (derivational) morphological studies using large amounts of data can produce unexpected results and lead to new theoretical insights; C. Fabre and D. Bourigault, ‘Exploiter des corpus annotés syntaxiquement pour observer le continuum entre arguments et circonstants’ (87–102), who propose a quantificational methodology to test the relationship of PPs with respect to verbs along an autonomy continuum from argument to adjunct and explore the consequences of the results for the notion of selection; J. Carruthers, ‘Annotating an oral corpus using the Text Encoding Initiative: methodology, problems, solutions’ (103–119), who presents and critically evaluates how a specialized corpus of new-storytelling (‘néo-contage’) can use TEI to encode linguistic phenomena in an oral medium, focusing on the phenomena of negation, detachment and inversion; Groupe ICOR, ‘Tool-assisted analysis of interactional corpora: voilà in the CLAPI database’ (121–145), who analyse voilà using the Corpus de langue parlée en interaction and compare the results with those from previous studies. See also Langages, no. 171 (5–129), ‘Construction des faits en linguistique: la place des corpus’ (ed. Marcel Cori, Sophie David and Jacqueline Léon), which includes an introduction and six articles considering the origins of linguistic corpora and methodological issues in respect of the development of corpora, including audio corpora.

17.[H2] Contrastive Studies

K. Schmitz and N. Müller, ‘Strong and clitic pronouns in monolingual and bilingual acquisition of
French and Italian’, *BLC*, 11:19–41, identify, on the basis of the acquisition of Fr./It. pronominal systems by mono- and bilingual children, a stable asymmetry between object and reflexive clitics (acquired relatively late) and nominative clitics and strong pronouns (acquired relatively early), and conclude that the former nominals, but not the latter, have an internal N layer. M. Goldbach, ‘Die Stellung der Objektklitika im Französischen und Italienischen’, *ZRP*, 124:31–54, contrasts modern Fr./It. clitic placement and considers when/why the systems diverged diachronically. The author claims that modern enclisis is partially fossilized (restricted in modern Fr. to non-negative imperatives) and derived from a rule (Tobler–Mussafia) which was productive in varieties in the Middle Ages, which is why no theoretical model has successfully accounted for it. R. S. Kayne, ‘Some preliminary comparative remarks on French and Italian definite articles’, pp. 291–321 of *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud* (Current Studies in Linguistics, vol. 45), ed. Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta, MIT Press, xxxii + 389 pp., argues (on the basis of the DP hypothesis and the existence of remnant movement to SpecDP) that a particular kind of It./Fr. variation in nominals (e.g. *l’étudiant le plus intelligent* vs *lo studente* Ø *più intelligente; lequel* Ø vs Ø *quale* Ø; ) is due to presence/absence of an overt determiner (D), necessarily overt in Fr. (but not in It.) in the context of a filled SpecDP.


L. Lansari, ‘Commitment: a parameter for the contrastive analysis of *be going to* and