



University of  
**Salford**  
MANCHESTER

# Review of Yves Roberge & Marie-Thérèse Vinet (1989) *La variation dialectale en grammaire universelle*. (Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal/Les Editions de l'Université de Sherbrooke.)

Rowlett, PA

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0959269500001447>

<b>Title</b>	Review of Yves Roberge & Marie-Thérèse Vinet (1989) <i>La variation dialectale en grammaire universelle</i> . (Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal/Les Editions de l'Université de Sherbrooke.)
<b>Authors</b>	Rowlett, PA
<b>Publication title</b>	Journal of French Language Studies
<b>Publisher</b>	Cambridge University Press
<b>Type</b>	Article
<b>USIR URL</b>	This version is available at: <a href="http://usir.salford.ac.uk/id/eprint/12856/">http://usir.salford.ac.uk/id/eprint/12856/</a>
<b>Published Date</b>	1992

USIR is a digital collection of the research output of the University of Salford. Where copyright permits, full text material held in the repository is made freely available online and can be read, downloaded and copied for non-commercial private study or research purposes. Please check the manuscript for any further copyright restrictions.

For more information, including our policy and submission procedure, please contact the Repository Team at: [library-research@salford.ac.uk](mailto:library-research@salford.ac.uk).

## Reviews

lization and restriction are overriding sociological processes that cut across the whole social spectrum and free the structural forces at play' (p. 13). Another major difference between monolingual and bilingual speech communities is the size of the innovating group. In monolingual communities, the innovating group is taken to be quite small. It is potentially quite large, however, in bilingual communities where simultaneous autonomous innovations are attested in the speech of a number of speakers.

This book is recommended for its important contribution to sociolinguistic theory, its fascinating and high quality data, and its consistently careful and insightful analyses of linguistic performance. It will undoubtedly be of interest to scholars of sociolinguistics, second language acquisition, and bilingualism, as well as those readers who wish to acquaint themselves with a lesser known variety of North American French.

### REFERENCES

- Andersen, Roger, W. (1982). Determining the linguistic attributes of language attrition. In Richard D. Lambert and Barbara F. Freed (eds.), *The Loss of Language Skills*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House Publishers, pp. 83–118.
- Dorian, Nancy (1981). *Language Death: the Life Cycle of a Scottish Gaelic Dialect*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Wardhaugh, Ronald (1987). *Languages in Competition: Dominance, Diversity, and Decline*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Carl Blyth  
Department of French and Italian  
Louisiana State University

(Received 7 January 1992)

Roberge, Yves and Vinet, Marie-Thérèse, *La Variation dialectale en grammaire universelle*. Preface by Luigi Rizzi. Montreal: Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, and Sherbrooke: Les Éditions de l'Université de Sherbrooke, 1989, 143 pp.

This work, cast within the Government and Binding framework of generative grammar, aims to demonstrate the importance of dialectology to the study of U(niversal) G(rammar) and language acquisition. In the introductory first chapter, the authors use this claim to validate their own work on the dialects of French and Italian.

Chapter 2, by far the longest of the book's five chapters, deals with the issue of 'recoverability', pertinent within the context of Rizzi's (1982) pro-drop parameter with respect to clitic pronouns and null subjects, which are considered on the basis of (not entirely reliable) data from *occitan*, *franco-provençal*, eight varieties spoken in northern Italy (*bolonese*, *cremonese*, *florentine*, *milanese*, *paduan*, *piacentese*, *piemontese* and *trentese*), *ladin* and two non-standard varieties of French (*pied-noir* and *québécois*). From their analysis of *ladin*, the authors conclude, contra Rizzi, that there is no necessary link between 'rich' verbal morphology and the pro-drop parameter. After a brief review of the literature, the authors suggest that clitic pronouns and null subjects might best be given a unified account. The account which they endorse analyses clitic pronouns as preverbal inflection, i.e., as part of verbal morphology.

Still in chapter 2, the authors highlight a gap in the theoretically possible array of four combinations of the two features [ $\pm$  null subject] and [ $\pm$  subject clitic], namely the combination [+ null subject, + subject clitic], which, the authors claim, is unattested. Thus, they argue, the system of classification is deficient. They claim that languages classified as [- null subject, + subject clitic], e.g., French, are in fact also [+ null subject] languages. They differ from standard Italian, for example, in the way in which pro in structural subject position can be recovered: via postverbal inflection in standard Italian; via preverbal subject clitic in French. The missing configuration, i.e., [<sub>NP</sub> pro<sub>i</sub>] [<sub>INFL</sub> [<sub>scI</sub>  $\emptyset$ ]] V, is then ruled out as a consequence of the fact that, where the subject is  $\emptyset$  at D-structure, it must be recovered by a clitic.

Chapter 3 considers the properties of adjunction with reference to the québécois construction exemplified by *Avoir su, j'aurais téléphoné avant* and *Jean sortir sa vieille Plymouth, là on aurait du fun* (p. 83). After discussing the properties of the construction, the authors compare it with the similar gerundive and absolute participial constructions, which also involve non- $\theta$ -marked adjuncts. All these sentence-initial adjuncts are analysed as IP constituents (A'-)adjoined to VP at D-structure and therefore governed by the matrix I. On the basis of a discussion of the control relationships which obtain (where the adjunct has a null subject, it is controlled by the subject of the matrix clause) and the nature of Case-assignment to the external argument in these adjuncts, the authors argue that a non-referential empty category (pro) can, contra Rizzi's pro-drop parameter, be licensed.

Chapter 4 considers null pleonastic subjects more generally. The claim is made that their distribution cannot be accounted for by the pro-drop parameter alone. Instead, it is proposed that these subjects are identified by a parametrised principle involving I, based in part of Rizzi's (1986) model for indentifying referential pro. The authors' conclusions are brought together in chapter 5.

There is no doubt that this book is of general interest to comparative Romance syntacticians working within Chomskyan generative grammar (and not, as the title might lead some to suspect, to sociolinguists looking for variationist work à la Labov). Whether or not the authors are justified in their claim (p. 7) that this is a potential textbook for students following an advanced course on dialectal variation is less certain. My own impression is that the book sits (rather uncomfortably) on the fence between a textbook and a presentation of original research. The coverage of recent literature which the book offers may well be as broad as one would expect from a textbook; however, the declared intention of the authors, namely to cast doubt over the value of Rizzi's (1982) pro-drop parameter, is so specific (not to mention theoretically controversial) as to ill-fit what one might see as the purpose of any textbook, i.e., to give (relative) newcomers a firm and, as far as possible, uncontentious foundation on which to be able to tackle the primary literature and perhaps even to participate in the academic debate.

In terms of the theoretical sophistication assumed on the part of the reader, too, the position of the authors atop the fence is shown to be nothing if not precarious. In the first pages, for instance, s/he is introduced to such (quite basic) Chomskyan notions as Universal Grammar (UG), E-language and I-language. Later, s/he is offered a brief introduction to the principles of Binding Theory. In subsequent chapters, in contrast, the authors assume, with little if any comment, that the reader is familiar with the concepts of structural & inherent Case, barriers and L-marking!

REFERENCES

- Rizzi, L. (1982). *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.  
Rizzi, L. (1986). Null objects in Italian and the theory of pro. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17:501-557.

Paul Rowlett  
Department of Modern Languages  
University of Salford

(Received 17 February 1992)

Zanola, Maria Teresa, *L'Emprunt lexical anglais dans le français contemporain: analyse d'un corpus de presse (1982-1989)*. (Quaderni del Centro di Linguistica dell'Università Cattolica, 3.) Brescia: La Scuola, 1991, 96 pp.

The high scorers common to 1982 and 1989 in the thirty or so conceptual fields statistically tabulated seem well integrated into contemporary spoken French (*score*, *hit-parade*, *marketing*), while the low scorers are, one suspects, firmly locked within the journalistic graphosphere. What French, or indeed English, speaker says *new-glasnost-wave*, *teenager dope slave*? One marvels at the subliterate Serendip inhabited by French journalists' anglophone interlocutors (*jean destroyed*, *a chest of drawer*, *one old man show*, *boop-oop-a-doop*, *how know*, *sitcome gay*, *sporting suit*, *tossing*). The sabiresque flavour is enhanced when English words are pressganged by the journallect into French syntactic structures (*look very british*, *look sexy chic*, *western-spaghetti*, *lyrics hip*, *art new futurist*). What miscegenated Tarzanspeak this? The author does not delineate the twin vectors of the borrowing couple, necessity arising from a certain *inopia linguae* and factitious xenophilic snobbery – a kind of latter-day exotrophic tushery – on a word by word basis, an admittedly intuitive task, although the phenomenon is discussed in the brief but informative introductory chapter, which also competently surveys work in the field. Zanola's *travail de bénédictin(e)* catalogues an avalanche of integrated anglicisms, xenisms, loan blends and abbreviation-borne pseudo-anglicisms, the latter (*twin*, *body*, etc.) particularly mystifying for the English speaker, the disconcerting 'Tu veux faire un baby[foot] avec moi?' remaining indelibly with your reviewer, for example. Despite reservations one might have concerning the representativity of the corpus, the diligently compiled statistics provide a barometer of anglicisms *en hausse et en baisse* over the decade and help pinpoint those peregrinisms which have become fully integrated loans. The tables present a *hit-parade* of (amer)anglicisms, some trendy politically correct excrescences (*no woman's land*), others simply crass (*chanteur hyperbrancheman*), hapaxes one trusts condemned to disappear like snow off a dyke, while certain established items will perhaps acquire historical status as technology (*pick-up*) and fashions (*hippy*) evolve. The text is littered with intrusions from Italian, some mentioned in the corrigenda attached, some, including the *ivi*-clad footnotes, unfortunately not. More importantly, *hand-ball* is not an anglicism (Himmel forfend!) nor is *tout de go* (sixteenth century *tout de gob*, from *gober*). Why are a few gnomic utterances (*turnover is vanity – profit is sanity*) included in what is essentially a list of individual words and noun phrases? Imagine a study of the latinisms in Montaigne done on this basis. 413 anglicisms out of some 2,000 items inventoried seem stable, occurring in both the 1982 and 1989 lists. A larger work would ideally provide a philological perspective