A. MURRAY KINLOCH LECTURE

DIALECTS: ARE THEY MELTING LIKE BUTTER ON A STOVE

Joan Houston Hall
University of Wisconsin-Madison, WI
jdhall@wisc.edu

Good evening. It's a real pleasure for me to be part of this conference, with its exploration of non-standard dialects, both those that are thriving and those that are threatened. It's particularly pleasant for me to be in the Atlantic Provinces, because I have been treated to tantalizing tastes of this part of the world through its regional dictionaries for nearly thirty years.

The *Dictionary of Newfoundland English*, first published by George Story, William Kirwin, and J.D.A. Widdowson in 1982, was given by its authors to the staff of the *DARE* project several years before *our* first volume was published. In many ways it served as a model for how we might treat similar (or even the same) words, and it definitely gave us hope that our project too, could ultimately see the light of day.

Six years later, in 1988, when Terry Pratt's *Dictionary of Prince Edward Island English* was published, we were similarly encouraged. Here was another very carefully researched and presented regional dictionary that reinforced the value of dialect lexicography and that appealed to people's legitimate pride in their local ways of speaking.

And before too long, I anticipate being similarly pleased with the publication of the *Dictionary of Cape Breton English,* under way right here in Sydney by Bill Davey and Richard MacKinnon, two of the organizers of this conference.

Although few people make it a practice to read the prefaces and acknowledgments of dictionaries, lexicographers are an exception. And I read and took comfort in Terry Pratt's acknowledgment of George Story's advice to him, which was, "Do not listen to counsels of perfection."

Try as we may (and try as we do), lexicographers, like other scholars, are destined ultimately to discover that annoying typo, that misattributed source, or, worse, that failure of insight. Nevertheless, we are proud to have done our fieldwork, gathered and sorted quotations, identified headwords, organized senses, written definitions, and proofread the text (and proofread the text, and proofread the text once again).

At *DARE,* we have just finished that painstaking proofreading process for the nearly 1,300 pages of the final volume of the *Dictionary of American Regional English.* This fifth volume of text, which goes from Sl through Z (*slab* through *zydeco*, to be specific) is now in production and will be published by Harvard University Press in March of 2012.

As that date approaches, and as I think about the journalists who will want quick sound bites to encapsulate this five-volume, fifty-year endeavor, I've been thinking about how to answer the question I know to be inevitable: "Isn't American English being homogenized by the media and the fact that we're such a mobile population?" So the

theme of this conference, "Language on the Outer Edge," with its exploration of non-standard dialects and the factors that either threaten or sustain them, is germane to the question I'll be facing very soon: "Are American English dialects dying out?"

The question has, of course, come up before. A couple of years ago there was a very nice Associated Press article about *DARE* that got a lot of play across the nation. In addition to appearing widely in print and online, it also generated a large number of radio interviews, from local stations, to CBS, to NPR, to the BBC. And there were lots of spinoff articles reacting to the AP article, in which journalists took the opportunity to celebrate whatever local words were dear to the hearts of their readers. These were fun to see, and they reinforced the point that regional terms are indeed still used, recognized, and cherished.

One article, though, caught me by surprise. It was called "Words that fail the test of time," appearing in *The Financial Times* of London (March 27, 2009:13). Christopher Caldwell, an American, was the author. I'd like to quote some of his remarks to you, as we explore whether dialects are really being "homogenized."

Caldwell wrote,

> This book is beloved of columnists and autodidacts. . . .
> William Safire . . . told a reporter that Dare . . . "shows the richness and diversity of our language".

> But is this really true? Is American English really that rich and diverse? What diversity it has is certainly on prominent display, but that is only because American English has . . . been standardised by mass media and the bureaucratisation of working life. It is thus—if you measure it on a per-speaker or per-acre basis—remarkably un-diverse. It is astonishingly dialect-free . . .. (2009:13)

Then, a bit later,

> A good many of the curiosities that Dare lays out are not really dialectal. They are words that immigrants use in their transition out of one language and into another. What could be less interesting than to learn that people in the Swedish-settled areas of the upper Midwest use the word "lutefisk" . . . to mean dried fish? This is a word that will either disappear or be thoroughly integrated into mainstream English. It is no more a sign of the richness and diversity of English than words such as spaghetti or wiener schnitzel. (2009:13)

Had Christopher Caldwell ever lived in Minnesota or Wisconsin, or even traveled through the region in the weeks before Christmas, when local churches have their lutefisk dinners, he would recognize that *lutefisk* is not only a very nice regionalism, it is also a cultural icon. And although many more people now know about lutefisk because of Garrison Keillor's stories on "A Prairie Home Companion," the word is distinctly unlikely ever to be "thoroughly integrated into mainstream English"; but it is equally unlikely to disappear, because its status as a marker of identity, not just for people of Scandinavian descent, but also for Upper Midwesterners in general, is firmly entrenched.

There's a copy of the *DARE* map for *lutefisk* on the second page of your handout, so this is a good time for me to mention those strange-looking maps. As the first page of the handout explains, *DARE*'s map has been adjusted to reflect population density of the states as of the 1960 census rather than to show purely geographic relationships among the states. So Connecticut, which is a very small state in terms of square miles but has a large population, has been enlarged on the *DARE* map, while New Mexico, which is a very large state with a very small population, has been shrunk to a sliver. On the whole, though, the states retain their general shapes.

The map shows where *lutefisk* was given in answer to two questions: one asked about dishes made with meat, fish, or poultry that people in the community would know but that other people would not be familiar with; and the other asked about foreign foods that people in the community favored. As you can see, the dots cluster in the Upper Midwest and the North Central states, especially Minnesota and Wisconsin, and the term is only rarely found elsewhere.

Caldwell went on to explain that the fieldwork for *DARE* was done between 1965 and 1970 and that there was an emphasis on interviewing older people. He said:

> This backward focus is an implicit admission that, in the television age (and even more in the internet age), quirks of language melt away like butter on a stove. Dare might more accurately be called a historical dictionary. Its main use will be for clarifying obscure references in old oral histories. (2009:13)

Well, yes! *DARE* is most certainly a historical dictionary, and one of its purposes was to record words that were going out of use. But Caldwell seems to have a skewed notion of what a historical dictionary does. There is no attempt to eschew the contemporary in a historical dictionary. And there are no cutoff dates that allow only for inclusion of "funny old stuff" in a historical dictionary. When Volume V of *DARE* is published in March, there will be quotations from 2011 as well as examples from 1700, not to mention all the years in between.

As for words "melting away like butter on a stove" because of the influence of television and the internet, well, not exactly. Do some words go out of use over time? Of course. Do some local terms get supplanted by commercial names that have succeeded in nationwide dominance? Certainly.

Let's take a look at some examples: One of the questions in the *DARE* Questionnaire was, "*When eggs are taken out of the shells and cooked in boiling water, you call them _____.*" (I expect that you would probably call them *poached eggs*, as did most of the *DARE* Informants.) But we also had examples of *pouched eggs* (a nice folk-etymology)*, porched eggs* (found chiefly in the South and South Midland, especially frequent among speakers with grade school education or less, and more common among women than men), and *proached eggs* (heard chiefly in the South, and especially frequently among African-Americans). But we also discovered that in New England, poached eggs were often called *dropped eggs*. Not only was this a very striking regionalism, as you can see on your handout, but it had an interesting social distribution as well. Of the 41 people who offered this term for a poached egg, 33 were older than 60 at the time of the fieldwork (between 1965 and 1970). So it seems very likely that if we were to go to the same communities again, and ask the same question of people who had also lived there

all their lives, very few (if any) would give the response *dropped egg.*

We don't know *why* some words simply go out of fashion. Perhaps a new emphasis on sophisticated cooking, spurred by the publication of books such as *Mastering the Art of French Cooking* (the first volume in 1961 and the second in1970) might have made *dropped egg* sound homely and uncultivated; perhaps restaurants stopped calling them *dropped eggs* and switched to *poached eggs.* We'll probably never know. But it is true that words sometimes disappear, whether because the thing itself goes out of use, or because another term simply begins to feel more appropriate.

At another point in the *DARE* Questionnaire we asked two questions about how water is collected from the roof and taken to the ground. We asked, "*What hangs below the edge of the roof to carry off rain-water?*" and "*What's the name of the pipe that takes the collected rain-water down to the ground or to a storage tank?* For the first question, the most common response was *gutters,* but we also had nice concentrations of *eaves(s)spouts, eaves troughs* (or *trofts, troths*), *rain spouts, spouting, troughs,* and *water troughs.* We also had six examples of *leaders.* For the question about the pipe that takes the water to the ground, *downspout* was the most common response, but we also had such terms as *drainpipe, eave spout, rain spout, spout,* and *water spout.* Again, the term *leader* appeared. There were 24 examples of *leader* and four of *leader pipe.* So we mapped all those *leaders* and discovered the very nice distribution shown on the map on your handout. You can see that, with one stray exception in Iowa, all the responses are from southeastern New York, northern New Jersey, eastern Pennsylvania, and a few places in Connecticut and Rhode Island. This is the kind of map we love to find. And the written citations supported the regionality, with the first one from southeastern New York in an 1868 issue of *Putnam's Magazine.* Other examples were found in the *Linguistic Atlas of New England,* and we had a singleton from the *Wisconsin English Language Survey.*

But as was true with our *dropped egg* distribution, in the case of *leader,* 26 of 30 Informants were old at the time of the fieldwork. So again I suspect that if we were to replicate the fieldwork today, *leader* responses would be few and far between. But here it is easier to understand why: a look at trade magazines shows that by the early 1970s, *gutters* had become the standard term for carpenters, roofers, and their suppliers; when that kind of standardization happens, the local terms have tough going to hold their own.

Similarly, when the *DARE* field workers asked the questions about foreign foods and foods that others would not know (the same questions as those that elicited *lutefisk*), the responses made a great map for *enchilada,* as you can see on your handout. There are scattered responses outside the Southwest, but this is definitely a nicely regional map. Today, of course, "everyone" knows enchiladas, and the change can easily be traced to the rapid rise in fast food chains that have had nationwide distribution.

So if examples like these were the norm, it would not be unreasonable for people to think that our language is becoming homogenized and that dialects are quickly on their way out.

But what of all the other words we use in our day-to-day interactions with our families, friends, and others in our communities? These are not the kinds of words that are affected by our exposure to television or the internet. What do we call our grandparents? Are they *grandma* and *grandpa? Granny* and *grampy? Nana* and *poppa? Memaw* and *papaw? Murmur* and *Murfar? Oma* and *opa?* Or, like Barack Obama, do we call our grandmother *Toot*, short for the Hawaiian term *tutu?*

What do children say if they are going to play hooky? Do they *bag school*, as kids used to do in Pennsylvania and New Jersey? *Bum school* as in Michigan and Illinois? *Ditch* as in California? *Hook school* as in Maryland? *Lay out* of school, as in the Southeast? Or *slough* (pronounced "sluff") as in Utah?

If they play a children's game involving sitting in a circle and having someone go around the outside tapping players lightly on the head, is it *duck, duck, goose?* In most of the Inland North it certainly is. But if you're from Minnesota, you'll insist to the death that the *right* name for the game is not *duck, duck goose* but *duck, duck, gray duck.*

If a guest spends the night and there's no spare bedroom, in the South you'll put a *pallet* (or a *Baptist pallet* or a *Methodist pallet*) on the floor, but in the Northeast you're likely to call it a *shakedown.* And when your children spend the night with friends, they could go to a *slumber party*, but they might instead call it a *sleep-over.*

These are the kinds of words that we use casually and un-self-consciously, and that we usually assume are used by "everyone else."

So the notion of the continued existence of local dialects in America is *not* that when we travel to other parts of the country we won't understand one another; in most cases we communicate very clearly. But we *are* often surprised and delighted to discover that differences permeate the language of our everyday conversations.

To give you some other examples, let me call on my own experience in moving around the United States. I moved to Wisconsin in 1975 after having lived in Ohio, California, Idaho, Georgia, Oregon, and Maine. In all those parts of the country, I had been aware of various differences from my northern California dialect (many more, of course, in Georgia and in Maine than in the Western states). But somehow, I naively thought that those experiences would have prepared me for moving to Wisconsin. After all, the Midwest is "General American," right? I soon found that I was mistaken.

Shortly after I arrived in Madison, I saw a big sign out in front of the student union that said, I thought, "*Brats on the Terrace.*" Why, I wondered, would they be advertising the presence of unruly little children on the Terrace? And what was the terrace? My colleagues could not believe that I didn't know what a *brat* was, and that I thought it rhymed with *rat* rather than with *rot.* I soon learned that brats were not just pork sausages, but that in Wisconsin they could also be pork and beef, chicken and apple, turkey and spinach, even tofu and curry. And some places have so many varieties, they even advertise the "brat of the week."

I also learned that the *terrace,* in one sense, anyway, was the lovely large patio area at the edge of beautiful Lake Mendota. But the *terrace* was also the strip of grass between the sidewalk and the street—something for which I didn't have a name at all, since there wasn't such a thing in the community where I grew up. But through *DARE* I discovered that there are dozens of very nicely regional terms throughout the country for that item, from *boulevard,* to *grass plot,* to *median, neutral ground, no-man's land, parking, parking strip, parkway, tree bank, tree belt, tree lawn, swale,* and *verge,* to name the most common.

Not long after my introduction to *brats,* a colleague said she was going out to get some *bakery* and asked if I would like some; that was initially a puzzle, because to me, the bakery was where you bought sweet things, it wasn't the pastries themselves. Other Wisconsin terms that were new to me were *stop and goes* (for traffic lights); *squeaky cheese* (for cheese curds---and I have to admit that I didn't even know what cheese curds

were); *Spanish hamburger* for a sloppy joe; *flowage* (for a lake created by damming a river or stream); *budge* in the sense 'to cut in line' or 'butt in line'; *bealer* for a mischievous child or an unruly person; the tradition of the *golden birthday*; and there were also names like *cuyoo, five hundred, sheepshead* (or *schafskopf*) and *skat* for various card games that are extremely popular and played in taverns throughout Wisconsin; and of course there was the stereotypic question, "Where's the nearest bubbler?" (In southeastern Wisconsin, *bubblers* are drinking fountains. And it turns out that the isogloss for the use of *bubbler* in southeastern Wisconsin matches very closely the marketing area of the Kohler Company, a manufacturer of plumbing fixtures, in about 1918.)

I also found when I moved to Wisconsin that it wasn't only the lexicon that could be puzzling; sometimes little grammatical constructions intruded as well. I was taken aback when our office manager asked if I would "pass her a paperclip once." Only once? I would have been happy to do it three or four times! (This vaguely emphatic use of *once* is probably a calque of German *einmal* in Wisconsin, but there are also similar uses in English dialects.) Later, after I had borrowed her stapler and she had seen me use it, she asked, "Are you using the stapler yet?" It took me a minute to realize that she was using "yet" where I would use "still." Similarly, the question, "Could you borrow me five dollars?" was a bit of a surprise, as were sentences such as "Meet me up against Walgreens" and "Let's go by John's for dinner" (when the plan is to stop and eat, not just drive by John's house). All of these reflect the very strong German heritage of Wisconsin, particularly in the southeastern part of the state.

There are also tag questions modeled on German *nicht wahr,* in various forms, such as, "That was a good movie, ainna?"(stereotypical of Milwaukee); or "You're a college graduate now, ain't?"(found in Pennsylvania German as well as other German settlement areas); or, among children, "Johnny hit me first, inso, inso?" which is characteristic of the Fox River Valley area of Wisconsin.

And then there's the very common question, "I'm going to the store. Want to come with?" This is characteristic not just of German-heritage areas in Wisconsin, where people would be familiar with the German *mitgehen*, but also throughout the Upper Midwest in places where there have been large numbers of Dutch, Danish, Frisian, Norwegian, Swedish, or Yiddish speakers as well.

And where those speakers of other languages settled, they left many traces of their native cultures. It's not only *lutefisk* that characterizes the ethnic lexicon of Wisconsin and the Upper Midwest; we're blessed with delicacies such as *booya, czarnina, kielbasa, kolacky, kringle, krumkake, lefse, limpa, paczki, pierogi, rommegrot, sandbakkels, suelze,* and *trippe*, among food items, and *julebukking*, the *kermiss* and *kilby* among ethnic traditions.

Then there's the Norwegian way of expressing distaste, as in, "Ooooh, that's *ishy*!" (rather than *icky*). Or the Finnish word *sisu*, used in northern Wisconsin to mean 'perseverance' or 'determination.' And of course, there's that wonderfully expressive Norwegian phrase, "*Uff da!*" an all-purpose exclamation that can evoke anything from surprise, to aversion, to disgust, or to pain.

I suspect that Christopher Caldwell would be surprised to discover just how much of the everyday vocabulary of people in the Midwest (and other regions as well) he was unfamiliar with. But they aren't the kinds of words he would hear on the television in the

airport in Minneapolis (or in Denver, Austin, Atlanta, or Baltimore). They are the kinds of words he would hear only if he left the airport, came into town, and stopped long enough to meet the family, share a meal, and become a friend. And these words are not going to disappear just because a journalist from the Northeast has never heard of them.

But enough of Caldwell. I think this is good evidence to suggest that the differences that still exist from one dialect to another, as well as the words that formerly existed in one place or another, justify the exercise of collecting and recording them. But if the scholarly effort were not justifiable in and of itself, there would still be some very tangible and practical uses for this project that might convince even the most skeptical of our critics. So, "Who Needs *DARE*?"

In talking about the people who use *DARE*, I like to start first with librarians, because they are the people we assumed from the beginning would purchase this reference and use it in their work. And we know that they *have* used it when we get letters such as this one, from a librarian in Tennessee:

> *"DARE* . . . has come to my rescue on numerous occasions when I had no idea that an expression or word was regional.
>
> A good example: a library patron wanted information on dry-land fish. We looked in every "fish" book we could think of, to no avail. As the patron kept repeating that this fish "grew in the woods," and as I could not imagine *any* type of fish that would "grow in the woods," I finally got to wondering if this was a regional expression. And of course it was: a dry-land fish is an edible mushroom."

It was not surprising that this letter came from Tennessee, for 15 of our 16 examples of the phrase came either from Kentucky or Tennessee (the other was from north Georgia). The term seems to be applied particularly to morels, which have a reputation for being rather fragrant as they decay. As one of our Informants put it, "they smells bad like a feesh when they's rotten."

But librarians are expectable users of a reference tool like *DARE*. An unanticipated use was described by Roger Shuy, a Georgetown University professor who became a forensic linguist after retirement. While he was at Georgetown, he had a student who was working for the FBI. I quote from Roger's letter:

> "[This student] got me involved in the Unibomber case and I analyzed all of the Unibomber's threat letters, then his manifesto (before it was made public). Using language clues of region, age, race, gender, education level, religious background, and social status, I produced a linguistic profile that differed considerably from the one that their profilers had made. I found him to be from the Chicago area (but who lived for some part of his life in northern California), well educated (as I put it, probably with a doctorate, but not in the humanities or social sciences), about 50 years old, male, white (or well educated black), and some religious background that is probably no longer practiced. The FBI profile had him as from the coast, young, male, white, relatively uneducated, and a tradesman. . .
>
> I describe this work here to point out the value of *DARE* as a tool that I use in

doing this profiling. I suspect that it may not have occurred to anyone that law enforcement investigation is aided by reference tools such as *DARE*. I keep my three volumes of *DARE* very handy to my desk along with my unabridged dictionaries, dictionaries of slang, usage texts, regional dialect atlases, encyclopedias, and other important reference works. I find it invaluable. Needless to say, it would be even more valuable it if went beyond the letter O."

Obviously, Roger's letter was written before Volume IV was published, so by now he has all the letters up through Sk. And by March of next year, he'll have everything through Z.

Roger has told us of other cases as well, in which he has been able to eliminate suspects from a police list or to narrow in on a criminal party by checking *DARE* for the distributions of words that turn up in threat letters and ransom notes. For instance, one pencil-scrawled ransom note, left at the doorstep of the parents of an abducted juvenile, said this:

"Do you ever want to see your precious little girl again?
Put $10,000 cash in a diaper bag.
Put it in the green trash kan on the devil strip at the corner of 18th and Carlson.
Don't bring anybody along. No kops!! Come alone!
I'll be watching you all the time. Anyone with you,
deal is off and dautter is dead!!!"

There are several interesting things about this note: One is that the writer spelled "trash can" as "kan," "cops" as "kops," and "daughter" as "dautter." But he correctly spelled *precious*, he didn't forget the *a* in *diaper,* and he spelled *watching* right; and, except for the exclamation points, the punctuation was standard. This suggested that the writer was faking his educational background and that a fairly educated person was "dumbing down" here.

But what really caught Roger's eye was the sentence "Put it in the green trash kan on the devil strip." The devil strip? Where could he find out about that? It wasn't in *Webster's Third* or any other standard American dictionary, it's not in the *OED*, the *Dictionary of Americanisms*, or the *Dictionary of American English*. But it *is* in *DARE*. The devil strip is that strip of grass between the sidewalk and the street that I mentioned before that has so many regional names. And the citations show that it is used *almost* solely in northeastern Ohio, in the triangle outlined by Cleveland, Akron, and Youngstown. As it turned out, the list of suspects compiled by the police in this case included one well educated man from Akron; when he was confronted with these bits of linguistic evidence as well as the other evidence, he confessed to the kidnapping. We were delighted to hear about this use of *DARE*.

More recently, we've heard from computer scientists at the Illinois Institute of Technology that they are eager to use the electronic version of *DARE* in what they call "automatic authorship profiling"–the automated version of what Roger has done with the print volumes. Their hope is that the regional data in *DARE* can be combined with programs they have already developed to estimate age, gender, native language, and other characteristics to help identify authors of documents such as ransom notes, crime-related e-mails, etc.

In addition to forensic linguists, lawyers are also folks who need *DARE*. Questions that we receive from lawyers can range from the mundane to the amusing, but for the attorneys themselves, they are all, of course, important. One strange query came from a lawyer in Washington state who wanted to know whether we could document the term *mudflap* as an endearment.

Apparently his client had written about a former girlfriend, calling her a *mudflap.* The woman was not amused. He tried to deflect her anger by replying that it was intended as a compliment. We checked our own fieldwork and all the slang dictionaries we had, but came up empty. I wondered about it for a long time, though. It didn't dawn on me what was probably going on until years later when I was driving behind a huge semi and happened to see the curvaceous female outlined on the mudflaps. Depending on one's point of view, I suppose it could be an endearment!

On another occasion, I got a call from a New Hampshire Public Defender, who wanted to know whether we had evidence that people routinely say such things as, "I could kill him," without ever intending to follow through with any violence. Of course we all know that people say things like that all the time. But *DARE* had hard evidence, in the form of responses to half a dozen or so questions in our questionnaire:

For instance, in response to the prompt, "*He's a whole week late. I'm going to _____.*" we collected responses such as "bash his head in," "beat his head in," "blow him up," "fan his ass," "kill him," and "murder him."

And to the question about a person you think is worthless, "*He isn't worth _____,*" we had lots of answers of the type "He isn't worth the bullet it would take to shoot him," "the powder and lead it would take to kill him (blow him up, blow his brains out)," "the rope it would take to hang him" and "the time it would take to bury him."

To another question, "*He's run off with my hammer again, _____!*" we had such responses as, "I'll kill him," "I'll shoot him," and "I'll wring his neck."

And these were all in answer to some pretty mild provocations! None of these Informants, of course, had any intention of doing such a thing; the point is that the defendant in New Hampshire had uttered such a "threat," and someone had turned up dead. The Public Defender had to show that the man was just saying what people say in such situations. Unfortunately, I didn't ever hear the outcome of the case, but it's conceivable that evidence of the sort we had collected could have been useful for a defense.

A more typical use of *DARE* by lawyers is simply to consult the *Dictionary* as any other reader would. A lawyer in Atlanta recently told of working with a mediator who used the term *dogfall settlement.* This was a totally unfamiliar phrase to him, so he had to do some quick research. Fortunately, the first four volumes of *DARE* have been scanned for Google Books (with about ten percent of the total being available to an individual reader), and our entry for *dogfall* was on one of the available pages. It is defined as a tie in a fight or a wrestling match. The lawyer wrote, "Looks like it is used primarily in Arkansas, Kentucky, etc., which is interesting because this mediator was from Louisville."

So lawyers and law enforcement are wonderful examples of fields that we hadn't predicted as benefitting from *DARE*, but which we are, of course, very pleased to be able to assist. Another group is physicians. Imagine for a moment what it would be like to

grow up, say, in New York, go to NYU for undergraduate work, and then attend NYU's School of Medicine. And then, on Match Day, to find that your residency was to be in rural northern Maine? Southern Appalachia? Western New Mexico? What would you say to the patient who complained that he had been riftin' and had jags in his leaders? Or had the ground itch? Or a case of dew poison? Or a bealing? Or the salt rheum? Or pipjennies? Or kernels? Or pones? If you had *DARE* available, you could save yourself some embarrassment by excusing yourself, quickly looking those words up, and going back with the appropriate questions and suggestions.

DARE has also proved to be surprisingly important to the fields of psychiatry and geriatrics. Several years ago we received a phone call from a psychiatrist at the University of Chicago. He wanted to know what we could tell him about the terms *false face, tom walkers, harp,* and *mouth organ*. We could tell him that *false face* (for a face mask) was not too common in the US, but seemed to be found more often in the South than elsewhere. *Tom walkers* was an easier problem because one of the questions in the *DARE* Questionnaire had asked for names of "long wooden poles with a foot piece that children walk around on to make them tall." While most people would call them *stilts,* we have a very nice map showing that *tom walkers* is the regional term found throughout the South and the South Midland. Similarly, *harp* and *mouth organ* are both regional terms for what most people probably call a 'harmonica.' *Harp* is found chiefly in the South and South Midland while *mouth organ* occurs primarily in the Inland North and North Midland.

The reason that the psychiatrist was asking about these terms is that there is a widely used diagnostic test to determine whether a person has aphasia (the inability to come up with appropriate words for things). The test consists of 60 full-page line-drawings of common items (a gate, a trellis, a spoon, a saw, an accordion, etc.) and asks people to name them. Unfortunately, however, the makers of the test seem to have been totally unaware of the kinds of regional and social variation that characterize American English. So, when patients respond to the pictures using the words they have grown up with, and those words happen *not* to be common where the test-makers live, the patients are marked "wrong" for using their legitimate regional words. To further complicate things, the test is set up with the presumed easier terms first, with the harder ones at the end. If a patient has trouble early on, the test is discontinued. So if the pictures for which you use your regional terms happen to appear in the early sections of the test, you are doubly penalized, because you're marked wrong and then you're tossed out of the game.

I looked at a copy of the test to see whether the three pictures the Chicago doctor had asked about were the only ones that were likely to present this kind of problem. Unfortunately, they were not. While a drawing of a pencil might seem unlikely to elicit any other names than *pencil*, a look at the responses to the *DARE* question about pens and pencils showed more variation than I would have guessed. For some respondents, the brand name had become generic, so that pencils were simply *Eagles* or *Mongols*, or, for a mechanical pencil, *Eversharps*; to a test administrator who wasn't familiar with these brand names, "wrong" would be the only logical conclusion.

A picture of a mushroom might also seem to be hard to misidentify, but our data show that, in addition to *dry-land fish,* terms like *cat stool, frog table, fairy table, fairy platform,* and *devil's footstool* are also heard, among many other regional and folk names for this plant.

13

And what would happen to a patient who responded with *tunnel* to a picture of a funnel? This sounds like phonological interference, doesn't it? Only a test administrator who knew that *tunnel* is an old-fashioned, chiefly New England word for a funnel would give the patient the benefit of the doubt for that response.

The Chicago psychiatrist and his colleagues found that 13% of the tests they examined contained inaccuracies in scoring because regional terms were marked as incorrect. And he was judging them only on the basis of the three questions he had asked us about (for the pictures of the face mask, the stilts, and the harmonica). Had he known of the other possibilities for regional synonyms, the results would doubtless have been even more distressing. All of this is bad enough in terms of leading to a bad diagnosis. But it can be even more insidious.

I mentioned this situation to a friend who is a geriatric nurse, and she was truly appalled. She explained to me that if a person were diagnosed with aphasia or another brain abnormality as a result of this test, the normal procedure would be to start a course of language therapy. After a period of perhaps six weeks, the test would be administered again. And if patients had the temerity to continue to use their own regional words, they would *again* be marked "wrong." The test results would show that the therapy was doing nothing to help. Patients receiving Medicare support for the treatments would find payments discontinued, because they had not demonstrated that they were "progressing." (Medicare continues payments only if the patient can be said to be "progressing.") So an inadequate test key can not only confuse the initial diagnosis but also confound the recovery.

To get a feeling for how widely this diagnostic test is used, I did a quick internet search and discovered that it is indeed considered a standard neuropsychological test, and it is used not only all across the U.S. and Canada, but in Australia and New Zealand as well. (Imagine the additional complications in scoring the test for those varieties of English.) I also discovered that learning how to use this test is one of the specific requirements in the neuropsychology rotation for doctors in the U.S. Army. It's hard to imagine a more diverse patient group than that in the Army, so the implications of relying on an inadequate answer key are extremely serious.

Fortunately, a few years ago at a conference, I learned that the original publisher of the test had recently sold it to a new publisher. I met the new person in charge of that book, and she assured me that the next time it is revised, she will make a point of working with me to expand the answer key to recognize regional variation. I will be extremely pleased to be able to remedy a problem that may well have disadvantaged many speakers of regional varieties over a period of close to forty years.

Those are some of the most dramatic examples of people who need *DARE*, but I can also point to the oral historian, who does indeed use *DARE* as Christopher Caldwell suggested, to understand the old-fashioned and archaic terms as well as the regional terms he comes across in oral histories. I point to the historian of science and agriculture, who needs to know about the terms used to describe old-fashioned tools, harnesses, wagons, derricks, etc. I mention the screen writer who needs to know about *rent parties* and discovers that *DARE* gives a much more complete picture than the *OED* can of the life of the expression *rent party* and the place of the rent party in African-American culture. I give a nod to the natural science researcher who needs to know that the bittern can also be called by more than fifty other names, including such wonderfully creative ones as

barrel-maker, belcher-squelcher, bog-pumper, bottle-kachunk, dunkadoo, Johnny Gongle, postdriver, slough-pumper, slugtoot, thunder pumper, and wollerkertoot. And I point to the linguist who told me that most grammars say that the so-called "get passive" (as in "I got shot" rather than "I was shot") is used with only a handful of verbs. She is a native German speaker, but had the feeling that Americans use the get-passive with many verbs. I invited her to look at *DARE*'s fieldwork data*,* and she found that the get- passive was used with more than seventy different verbs. And I take pleasure in mentioning the writer Tom Wolfe, who sent me an e-mail message saying, "*DARE* has become my favorite reading and has helped me in the Blue Ridge Mountains section of the novel I'm now working on [=*I Am Charlotte Simmons* (2004)]."

And finally, to show how mainstream *DARE* has become, I can report that a year or so ago on the television quiz show "Who Wants to be a Millionaire?" the question for the $250,000 prize was, "According to the *Dictionary of American Regional English,* a "railroad daisy" is what kind of a flower?" (They gave four choices, including the right answer, a black-eyed Susan.)

So I hope you'll agree with me that *DARE* is beloved not just by Caldwell's "columnists and autodidacts," but by scholars of many stripes and language lovers of any stripe. And those dialect words that are "melting away like butter on a stove?" Don't count on it. One of the best places to find contemporary examples of regional terms is in chat groups and blogs on the Internet, where people unselfconsciously use the words they've grown up with.

If dialects are not disappearing but are continuing to change in many different ways, what's next for *DARE?* Is it finished? Far from it! We are currently at work on a volume of supplemental materials that will make *DARE* even more useful.

This volume will include three parts: the first is a large section of contrastive maps, showing in one place the synonyms for a particular item or concept (very much like the maps for *potluck* on the back of your handout). Rather than having to look through the five text volumes to see maps for *potluck, covered dish dinner, carry-in dinner, pitch-in,* and *tureen supper,* you'll have them laid out together so the contrastive distributions are easily recognized. These maps will be fascinating for general language lovers; and teachers whose libraries do not include the five *DARE* text volumes, or whose classrooms are not wired, can also use this book to demonstrate the wide variety of regional patterns in American English.

The second part is an Index to all the regional, usage, and etymological labels in the five volumes of text. What this means is that if you want to know what words are characteristic of, for instance, Texas, Connecticut, or the Pacific Northwest, you can look up that regional label and see the list of every entry that mentions that place in its regional label.

You can also look there to see what entries are labeled as being more common among old people, women or men, Black speakers, well or poorly educated speakers, or urban vs. rural people.

And for teachers, it means that if you're talking about linguistic processes such as back-formation, folk-etymology, metathesis, or metanalysis, you can look up those terms and find examples as they occur in American English, rather than pulling standard but fusty examples from the *OED*; and it means that readers who want to know what words have come into American English from Spanish, Polish, Quechua, Swedish, or

Algonquin, can look up each term and find a list of such words.

The third part is the Data Summary, which is the record of all the responses gathered during the *DARE* fieldwork. So if you're curious about how people responded to the question about dust balls under the bed, you can go to that question and see that *DARE* Informants had more than 170 different terms for it (including such nice terms as *house moss, moots,* and *woozies* in addition to the common *dust bunnies* and *dust kitties*); or you could discover that a heavy rain storm can be a *bridge lifter, chunk floater, goose drownder, lightwood-knot floater, toad-strangler,* or *trash mover* as well as a *cloudburst, downpour,* or *gully washer.* These lists will provide much amusement, but they are also tangible evidence of the continuing vitality of regional expressions, and for scholars, they provide ideas and materials for additional research.

The supplementary volume will appear early in 2013. At the same time we are working on that, we are also working on the specifications for a digital edition, which Harvard University Press plans to launch late in 2013. Once that is up and running, we will be able to expand and improve upon the existing entries, using the new and productive electronic resources that are available now. We will also start adding entirely new entries and begin the process of tracking the ongoing changes in American English. Although a few local terms may seem to "melt like butter on a stove," variation in American dialects continues to thrive and to provide grist for the lexicographic mill.

REFERENCES

Caldwell, Christopher. 2009. Words that fail the test of time. *Financial Times* [London, UK]. 28 March. Available at: http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/f3ed0d74-1b01-11de-8aa3-0000779fd2ac.html#axzz2LeapiyjC.

Cassidy, Frederic G., ed.1985. *Dictionary of American Regional English, Volume I, A-C*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Cassidy, Frederic G. and Joan Houston Hall, eds. 1991. *Dictionary of American Regional English, Volume II, D-H*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Cassidy, Frederic G. and Joan Houston Hall, eds. 1996. *Dictionary of American Regional English, Volume III, I-O*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Cassidy, Frederic G. c. 1950. Wisconsin English Language Survey. Unpublished questionnaire answered by Wisconsin residents.

Child, Julia, et al. 1961 *Mastering the Art of French Cooking, Volume 1*. New York: Knopf.

Child, Julia, et al. 1970. *Mastering the Art of French Cooking, Volume II*. New York: Knopf.

Hall, Joan Houston, ed. 2002. *Dictionary of American Regional English, Volume IV, P-Sk*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Hall, Joan Houston, ed. 2012 [published after the conference]. *Dictionary of American Regional English Volume V, Sl-Z*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Hall, Joan Houston, with Luanne von Schneidemesser. 2013 [published after the conference]. *Dictionary of American Regional English, Volume VI, Contrastive Maps, Index to Entry Labels, Questionnaire, and Fieldwork Data*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Gove, Philip Babcock, ed. 1993. *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language.* Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.

Keillor, Garrison. 1974 –. *Prairie Home Companion*. Available at: http://prairiehome.publicradio.org/.

Kurath, Hans. 1939-1943. *Linguistic Atlas of New England.* Rpt. New York: AMS, 1972.

Pratt, T. K., ed. 1988. *Dictionary of Prince Edward Island English*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Story, G. M., W. J. Kirwin, and J. D. A. Widdowson, eds. 1990. *Dictionary of Newfoundland English, Second Edition with Supplement.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

PAST TIME REFERENCE IN CHINESE – A TEXT ANALYSIS

Anthony C. Lister
University of New Brunswick (retired), Fredericton, NB
anthonylister2@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

A major difference between Indo-European Languages and Chinese is that Chinese verbs do not conjugate. This does not mean however that there is no temporal reference in the language. In this paper, a text from a Chinese newspaper is analyzed to determine the role and importance of the various indicators of past time: 1.The context. 2. Certain verbs which, by their very nature, imply past time. 3. Post-verbal suffixes. 4. Adverbs *ceng2* or *ceng2jing1,* and *yi3*. 5. Specific time and date words. It was found that there was overlap between the various categories and instances where several indicators were used in combination. With reference to category three, *le* and *guo* are considered to be aspect rather than tense markers, *le* being a completed action marker, and *guo* indicating an action which has already been experienced. However, they generally do refer to past actions or events. In order of frequency, the most common specific markers were adverbs and time and date words, and the least frequent were the post-verbal suffixes.

Keywords: Chinese, past time reference

RÉSUMÉ

Une différence majeure entre les langues indo-européennes et chinoises est que les verbes chinois ne se conjuguent pas. Cela ne signifie pas pour autant qu'il n'y ait pas de référence temporelle dans la langue. Dans cet article, un texte tiré d'un journal chinois est analysé pour déterminer le rôle et l'importance des différents indicateurs du temps passé: 1. Le contexte. 2. Certains verbes qui, par leur nature même, impliquent le temps passé. 3. Des suffixes post-verbaux . 4. Les adverbes *ceng2* ou *ceng2jing1* et *yi3*. 5. Des références précises à la date et à l'heure. Il a été constaté qu'il y avait un chevauchement entre les différentes catégories aussi bien que des cas où plusieurs indicateurs ont été utilisés en combinaison. En ce qui concerne la catégorie trois*, le* et *guo* sont considérés comme des marqueurs d'aspect plutôt que de temps, *le* indiquant une action achevée, et *guo* une action qu'on a déjà vécue. Cependant, les deux suffixes indiquent généralement des actions ou des événements qui ont eu lieu dans le passé. Par ordre de fréquence, les marqueurs les plus nombreux étaient les adverbes et les références précises à la date et à l'heure, et les moins fréquents étaient les suffixes post-verbaux.

Mots-clés : chinois, référence au temps passé

1. INTRODUCTION

Chinese verbs have a single form and do not conjugate, and in general Chinese does not distinguish tense. That the events recounted occurred in the past is often first indicated by date or time words like *zuo2tian1 "*yesterday" and *shang4zhou1* "last week" and once it is clear that the actions occurred in the past, there is no need for further clarification.

However, there can be rudimentary markings indicating past or future time reference.

The material for this study was an article taken from the online May 5, 2011 edition of the Hong Kong newspaper *Mingpao* and it was examined in detail to determine how past time was expressed.

The item recounts an event which took place in the past and concerns a firefighter who on his day off continued to search for an elderly man suffering from Alzheimer's disease who had become lost in the woods, and how he finally found and rescued him. The account includes reported speech from an interview with the rescued man's wife.

Below is the English translation of the article heading and the first paragraph, followed by a word by word translation, showing exactly how what would be past tenses in English are expressed in Chinese.

1.1. Article Heading

An off-duty firefighter found and rescued an old man suffering from Alzheimer' s disease, who had got lost deep in the mountains for four days.

1.2. First paragraph of the article

Whether on or off duty, a firefighter did not forget his vocation and with relentless determination saved a life. A seventy year old man, suffering from brain degeneration (Alzheimer's disease), was lost for four days and a fire fighting team was unable to find him after continuously searching for him everywhere. One member, unwilling to abandon the search after going off duty, took advantage of a holiday, rushed on his own to the remote mountains of Shan Tseng and finally found the old man in a mountain stream. Afterwards, the firefighter modestly said that it was nothing and he avoided interviews from the media, wishing to remain an unnamed hero.

1.3. Word by word translation of the headline and first paragraph

Headline

Xia1 ban1 bu4 xiu1xi5 xiao1fang2 xun2   hui2 shi1zong1 weng1   huan4
Off duty not rest   firefighter searches back lost   old man suffering

nao3   tui4hui4   shen1 shan1   mi2lu4   4 tian1.
brain   degeneration   deep mountains   loses way   4 days

First paragraph

Shang4ban1 ji2 xia4ban1   jun1   bu4 wang4 jiu4   ren2 tian1zhi de5
being at work and getting off work equally   not forget rescue people vocation *de*

yi1 ming2 xiao1fang2yuan2, ping2jie4   yi1 gu3 "bu4fu2 qi4"   de5 jue2xin1
a   *ming* firefighter,   relying on   a *gu* "not convinced" *de* determination,

zheng3jiu4   **le**5 yi1 tiao2 ren2ming4. Yi1 ming2 huan4   nao3 tui4hua4
zheng4 **saved**   *le* a   *tiao* life.   A   *ming* suffering brain
degeneration illness

(chi1dai1zheng4)   de5   qi1   xun2   lao3weng1 shi1zong1 4 ri4,
(old age dementia illness) *de*   seven decades old man   missing   4 days,

xiao1fang2 sou1suo3 dui4 lian2   ri4   bian4   xun2 bu4 huo4, dan4
firefighter   search   team several days everywhere search not find,   but

qi2zhong1   yi1 ming2 xiao1fang2yuan2 xia4ban1   hou4 bu4 ken3   fang4qi4
among them a *ming* firefighter   finish work   after not willing give up

chen4   fang4jia4 du2   chuang3 Shen1Jing3   shen1 shan1,
takes advantage holiday   on his own rushes   Sham Tseng   deep mountains,

zhong1   zai4 shan1   jian4   xun2   hui2 lao3weng1. Xiao1fang2yuan2 shi4
in the end in   mountain stream   searches back old man.   Firefighter   event

hou4 qian1   cheng1 "ju3shou3zhi1 lao2", **bi4 guo4** chuan2mei2 fang3wen4,
after modestly says   "no effort at all", **avoided** media   interviews,

gan1yuan4 zuo4   wu2ming2 ying1xiong2
willingly   acts as unnamed   hero

2. DISCUSSION

There are only two verbs which are formally marked as expressing a past action, *zheng3jiu4   le5* "saved" and *bi4 guo4* **"**avoided", the markers being *le* and *guo. Le* has two completely different functions in Chinese. Firstly, as in this case, it is a completed action aspect suffix, and secondly it is a final modal particle which intensifies a preceding clause. The completed action suffix may not be separated from the verb, while the intensifying particle may be. Since completed actions tend to occur in the past, *le* can often be considered an indicator of past time as in the case of *zheng3jiu4 le5* "saved**".** *Guo4* is an experienced action marker, with a literal meaning of "to cross, to go over" and again usually indicates past time. Like *le*, it is fully grammaticalized when used as a verbal suffix.

Verbs in the article heading are not marked, and even in English the present tense often occurs in headings to describe past events. However, the context on its own, is a sufficient indicator that the event recounted could only have happened in the past and in addition some verbs always imply past time reference. Thus in the headline the verb *shi1zong1*, "lost", implies that a man had got lost. The past time reference is reinforced in the second part of the head line where the verb *mi2lu4* "to lose one's way, lost", is qualified by a time expression 4 *tian1* "4 days", "he lost his way for four days." Thus, from the very beginning of the article, the time frame is set, even though the verbs are not formally marked to indicate past time. Later we read that "a search team several days

everywhere search not find." Context, plus the very meaning of the verbs imply that the event happened in the past, and there is no risk of any ambiguity. However, in the first sentence of the article, the main verb is formally marked to express a past time event, *zheng3jiu4 le5* "saved". The number of marked verbs is very few compared with what would be verbs in the past tense in English in this opening paragraph. Two compared to about ten.

2.1. List of sentences containing verbs marked for past time reference

In the whole article, nine verbs are marked to indicate past time, some doubly:

上班及下班均不忘救人天職的一名消防員，憑借一股「不服氣」的決心，拯救了一
shang4ban1　　ji1　xia4ban1　　　　jun1　　bu4 wang4 jiu4　　ren2　tian1zhi2
being at work　and　getting off work　equally　not forget　rescue　people vocation

條人命　yi1 ming2 xiao1fan2yuan2, ping2jie4　yi1 gu3 "bu4fu2 qi4"　　de5
de5　　　a　*ming*　firefighter,　　　relying on　a　*gu*　"not convinced"　*de*

jue2xin1,　　　**zheng3jiu4 le**5 yi1 tiao2 ren2ming4.
determination, **rescue**　*le* a *tiao* life.

Whether on or off duty, a fire-fighter, not forgetting his vocation and with a relentless determination **saved** a life

消 防 員............ 避過　傳 媒 訪 問
Xiao1fang2yuan2 ….. **bi4**　**guo4** chuan2mei2　fang3wen4
Firefighter................　**avoid** *guo* media　　　interview
The firefighter **avoided** media interviews

他感謝曾經協助搜索的人.
Ta1　gan3xie4 **ceng2jing1**　　　**xie2zhu4** sou1suo3　de5　　ren2
He　thank　**previously/already**　**help**　　search　　*de*　people
He thanked those who **had helped** in the search

In this case, past time is indicated by the adverb *ceng2jing1*. *Ceng2* literally means "once, previously, already, former", and the basic meaning of *jing1* is "to pass through". The compound *ceng2jing1* literally means "already, previously" but has become partially grammaticalized, and in the online *MDBG Chinese-English Dictionary* it is described as "a past tense marker, used before verb or clause." An indication that the compound is indeed partly grammaticalized and has lost some of its literal meaning is that it occurs far more frequently than *already* does in English texts. It is also likely that the use of *ceng2jing1* to express past reference has become more common in recent times, reflecting one of the major tendencies in modern Chinese of an increased occurrence of formal marking, as noted by Kratochvil (1968:143).

他在電話中說迷路不懂回家，並稱有數個已去世的朋友陪伴
Ta1 zai4 dian4hua4 zhong4 shuo1 mi2lu4　bu4　dong3　　hui2 jia1,　bing4
He in　telephone during　says　lose way　not　understand　return home, and

cheng1　you3　　shu3　ge4　**yi3**　　**qu4shi4** de5　　peng2you5 pei2ban4
states　there are　several *ge*　**already die**　　*de*　　friends　　accompany

During a telephone call, he said that he had lost his way and couldn't return home, and stated that several **deceased** friends were accompanying him.

　　That his friends had already died is obvious from the context and from the meaning of the verb *qu4shi4* itself and the addition of *yi3*"already" seems unnecessary. However, the adverb is similar in meaning and usage to *ceng2jing1* and like the compound seems to have a higher frequency than *already* in English, indicating some lose of its literal meaning and a partial grammatical function.

曾致電妻求救：跌落山邊
ceng2　　　　　　　　**zhi4dian4** qi1　　qiu2jiu4: die1luo4 shan1　　bian1
already/previously　　**telephone** wife　seek help: fall　　mountain side
He **had telephoned** his wife to seek help; he had fallen into a　crevasse

Ceng2 is an abbreviated form of *Cengjing1* discussed above, and plays the same function.

林伯妻子其後記起，丈夫曾提過想往深井 吃燒鵝.
Lin2 bo2　qi1zi5 qi2hou4　ji4qi3,　　　zhang4fu5
Lin Mr. wife　later　　remember, husband

ceng2　　　　　　　**ti2**　　**guo4** xiang3 wang3 Shen1Jing3　chi1 shao1　e2
already/previously　mention *guo* want　　go　　Sham Tseng　eat roast　goose

Mr. Lin's wife remembered later that her husband **had mentioned** that he wanted to go to Sham Tseng to eat goose.

　　There is no formal time marker for the verb *ji4qi3* "remember" though the preceding adverb *qi2hou4* "later" would indicate a past event. The verb *ti2* "mention" is doubly marked by the preceding adverb *ceng2* and the verb suffix *guo*.

林俊良表示，之前曾把救生電話寫在簿上讓父親隨身攜帶，…
Lin2 Jun4Liang2 biao3shi4, zhi1qian2　**ceng2**　　　ba3 jiu4sheng1 dian4hua4 **xie3**
Lin Junliang　　said,　　　previously **previously** *ba* save life　　telephone　**write**

zai4 bu4　　　shang4　rang4 fu4jin1 sui2shen1　　xie2dai4 ....
in　note-book on　　　let　　father　on his person　carry

Lin Junliang said that earlier **she had written** the rescue telephone number in a note-book and let her father carry it on him.

The past time marker *ceng2* in this case is separated from the verb *xie3* "write" by the preverbal object *jiu4sheng1 dian4hua4* "rescue telephone number." Past time is also indicated by the time word *zhi1qian2* "previously".

他說，曾向警方要求擴大搜索範圍.
Ta1 shuo1**, ceng2**   xiang4 jing3fang1 **yao1qiu2** kuo4da4 sou1suo3 fan4wei2
She says, **previously** to   police   **ask**   expand search   area
She said **she had asked** the police to expand the search area

In this case the marker *ceng2* is again separated from the verb *yao1qiu2* "ask".

他 說 既 已 找 回 父親，便 不 再 追究
Ta1 shuo1 ji4   **yi3**   **zhao3 hui2**   fu4qin1, bian4 bu4zai4   zhui1jiu1
She says since **already find** back   father,   thus no longer investigate
She said that since her father **had been found**, she would not investigate further

In addition to the cases above, where the verbs are marked either by the post verbal suffixes *le* and *quo*, or partially grammaticalized preverbal adverbs, there are also five date words which refer specifically to the past: *qian2ri4* "the day before yesterday", *shang4zhou1liu4* "last Saturday", *shang4zhou1liu4 zao3shang4* "early last Saturday", *ji3 nian2 qian2* "several years ago", and *zuo2chen2* "yesterday morning".

3. CONCLUSION

It was found that there were five levels of past time reference, from the general to the more specific.

> 1 The context, the reader's experience and general understanding. Certain events could only have happened in the past

> 2 Certain verbs by their very nature imply that a particular event happened in the past

> 3 Post-verbal suffixes (3)

> 4 adverbs *ceng2, ceng2jing1,* and y*i3* (7)

> 5 Date words referring to the past (5)

Eight other newspaper articles were examined to ascertain whether the frequency of items 3, 4 and 5 in the above list, were similar. The statistics were as follows:

> Date words: 44
> Adverbs *ceng2jing1* and *yi3or ji3jing1*:19
> Post-verbal suffixes:12

While the percentage of date words was higher than adverbs, in both the text studied in this paper and the eight other newspaper articles adverbs occurred more frequently than verbal suffixes to indicate past time.

As to the actual adverbs and their frequency, the breakdown was as follows:

In the text studied:	ceng2 or ceng2jing1	5
	yi3	2
In the eight other newspaper articles:	ceng2 or ceng2jing1	7
	yi3 or yi3jing1	12

The order of frequency of the two adverbs is reversed, an inconsistency which could probably be explained by the small amount of data in the text. Further research based on a larger corpus would provide a more accurate picture and could determine whether there are any semantic or grammatical differences between the two adverbs.

While there is general agreement that adverbs play a dominant role in the indication of past time in Chinese, little attention has been paid to which adverbs are involved. A cursory look at any Chinese newspaper article referring to past events reveals a high frequency of occurrence of *ceng2, cheng2jing1, yi3* and *yi3jing1*, which all have the general meaning of *already*, but are either becoming or have become grammaticalized. To discover whether this is a new trend, it would be necessary to look at similar texts from the past. This study concentrated on written texts, so it would be instructive to examine whether the same patterns are found in the spoken language. Much of the discussion about time reference in Chinese has centred on the verbal suffixes *le* and *guo*, and to what extent they are aspect markers or past time markers. However, they occur far less frequently than the adverbs discussed in this paper, and may play a less important role than adverbs in past time reference.

REFERENCES

Combrie, Bernard. 1985. *Tense.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kratochvil, Paul. 1968. *The Chinese Language Today.* London: Hutchinson.

Li, Charles N. and Sandra A. Thompson. 1989. *Mandarin Chinese: A Functional Reference Grammar.* Berkeley: University of California Press. (First published 1981)

Mathews, Steven and Virginia Yip. 1994. *Cantonese: A Comprehensive Grammar.* London and New York: Routledge.

MDBG Chinese-English Dictionary. Available at: http://www.mdbg.net/chindict/chindict.php.

Sun, Chaofen. 1996. *Word-Order Change and Grammaticalization in the History of Chinese.* Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Sybesma, Rint. 2003. The Expression of Tense in Chinese Languages. *IIAS*

Newsletter 31:47. Leiden University.

THE PRAXES OF SUBJECTIVITIES IN THE ACADEMY: INSTITUTIONAL DEMOLECTS VS. INDIVIDUAL IDIOLECTS

Emmanuel Aito
University of Regina, Regina, SK
Emmanuel.Aito@uregina.ca

ABSTRACT

Price (2001) evokes the constraints of social contexts on language use by this quote from P. L. Berger and T. Luckmann (1967) thus: "I encounter language as a facility external to myself and it is coercive in its effect on me. Language forces me into patterns". The dissemination of knowledge through established conventions of academic discourse seemingly demonstrates the capacity of the discourse to effectuate the learning and expression of such knowledge (Hyland and Hamp-Lyons 2002). This crucial proficiency therefore means specific practices in academic contexts and communicative behaviours. Academic literacy thus applies to a complex set of skills to which allude Dudley-Evans and St. John (1988), and to a "common core of universal skills or language forms" (Hutchison and Walters 1998; Spack 1988). Inescapably, critical questions arise to wit: Does a Language for Academic Purposes (LAP) exist to delineate disciplines? Is its specificity defensible in heterogeneous academic communities? How inherently different are individual discourse communities and disciplines vis-à-vis their social, communicative and cognitive dimensions?

Keywords: Discourse community; Academic literacy; Knowledge communication and evaluation

RÉSUMÉ

Price (2001) soulève les contraintes imposées par des contextes sociaux sur la langue en citant L. Berger et T. Luckmann (1967) ainsi : « I encounter language as a facility external to myself and it is coercive in its effect on me. Language forces me into patterns ». La diffusion des connaissances par l'intermédiaire des conventions consacrées au discours académique est censée faciliter l'apprentissage et l'expression des mêmes connaissances (Hyland et Hamp-Lyons 2002). Cette importante compétence sous-tend donc des pratiques distinctives dans les instances académiques et selon les comportements communicatifs requis. La lecture et l'écriture académiques ont trait à des aptitudes complexes auxquelles font allusion Dudley-Evans et St. John (1988), ainsi qu'à un tronc commun de compétences universelles ou de formes d'expression, selon Hutchison et Walters (1998) et Spark (1988). Par conséquent, nombreuses sont les interrogations critiques qui y sont inéluctablement afférentes comme suit : Y a-t-il une forme d'expression exclusive à l'œuvre académique dans le but de démarquer les différentes disciplines? Cette spécificité, est-elle justifiable devant l'hétérogénéité des communautés académiques? Quelles sont les différences fondamentales que l'on pourrait attribuer à des communautés et à des champs de connaissances par rapport à leurs dimensions sociales, communicatives et cognitives?

Mots clés : communauté discursive; lecture et écriture académique; diffusion et évaluation de connaissances.

1. PROEM

While they have served useful traditional purposes, constraints imposed on academic expression within the Academy by institutions or peers are a legitimate subject of critical appraisal. Thus, it could be argued that they are stifling to the uninitiated or neophyte who must submit to institutional processes of evaluation for career progress and peer recognition. More importantly, entrenched practices seem deliberately oblivious of the migratory trends among academics from different parts of the world, which fact necessitates at the very least some democratization of established norms of academic discourse. This paper therefore highlights some of the effects of these practices on individual expressions of knowledge, and concludes in favour of a less inhibiting discourse framework in order to maximize individual expression in the Academy.

Price (2001) evokes the constraints of social contexts on language use by this quote from P. L. Berger and T. Luckmann (1967): "I encounter language as a facility external to myself and it is coercive in its effect on me. Language forces me into patterns". The dissemination of knowledge through established conventions of academic discourse seemingly demonstrates the capacity of the discourse to effectuate its learning and expression (Hyland and Hamp-Lyons 2002). This proficiency ensures that specific practices in academic contexts and communicative behaviours are reinforced and perpetuated. Academic literacy thus applies to a complex set of skills to which Dudley-Evans and St. John (1988) allude, and to a "common core of universal skills or language forms" in the words of Hutchison and Walters (1998), a point also echoed by Spack (1988). Thus, critical questions are inescapable. First and foremost, does a Language for Academic Purposes (LAP) truly exist, and is it necessary to clearly delineate disciplines? Is its domain-specificity defensible in heterogeneous discourse communities? How inherently different are disciplines vis-à-vis their social, communicative and cognitive dimensions? Academic literacy indubitably affects institutional practices such as the hiring and promotion of academics, student awards (Hyland 2000a), success in securing research grants, annual performance appraisals, vision statements and action plans. It equally imposes restrictions and disadvantages on academics in developing countries. Given the magnitude and reach of these consequences, it is therefore difficult to assume that the global academic discourse community is politically and ideologically neutral. Finally, how do institutions and academic communities fashion their own discourses (Hyland 2000b), and should these discourse patterns remain inflexible with regard to regional or national conditions and language varieties?

Personal and anecdotal accounts abound of contemporaries who have struggled to adjust to new demands in the Academy as they settled in to teach and conduct research. Also of some note are my initial personal experiences as a first-timer changing roles from being a doctoral student to one who had to *perform* in a mutating environment where academic demands and teaching responsibilities have become more complex in novel ways. Hence, the arduous task of periodically documenting scholarship and research as they are defined in many North American universities has forced my hand, literally, in contemplating these reflections.

The most evident and cherished conventional wisdom acquired by a graduate student is that research and dissertation are independent and solitary work, at least in the humanities. This independence, somewhat circumscribed by the limitations on its

expression, is nonetheless treasured. The psychology that is often suggestive of the proprietary rights earned through the defence processes, may all too often inflate the sense of discursive and intellectual autonomy beyond what is sustainable in reality. Perhaps it provides a false sense of preparation and security, given the myriad of institutional constraints that await the freshly minted tenure-track faculty member upon his insertion into the Academy. Personal and professional evolution woven into one indissoluble experience therefore imposes compelling reasons to examine whether *I am who I wanted and want to be*. Simply put, am I being transformed only within the limits imposed by my social, professional or institutional affiliations, expectations and allegiances? Although I evoke Price's words in my introduction, it is difficult to generalize for every new entrant into the Academy and state which of the constraints mentioned above is the more coercive for the new member of Faculty. However, in my experience chief among the constrictions are the newly encountered institutional values and mission statements and the governing discourses of individual disciplines.

For the young academic, the choice of subjects of inquiry, or long term research programs consisting of smaller individual projects, is influenced by forces beyond the individual as he or she strives to gain acceptance for both space and work in the domain-specific discourse community. As I mentioned earlier, disseminating knowledge invariably implies the use of established conventions of academic discourses. Such proficiency is therefore deemed to reflect a mastery of specific practices in academic contexts and the adherence to specific academic behaviours. Academic literacy (Dudley-Evans and St. John1988), thus conjures up a complex set of skills, and alludes to a "common core of universal skills or language forms" (Hutchinson and Walters, 1998; Spack 1988).

It is no secret that institutions rationalize their resources in favour of galvanizing their search for avenues of excellence. There are more and more comparisons being drawn between competing institutions both within and outside of the Academy, of which university administrators are acutely aware (although they may feverishly deny it when ratings are not so favorable). As a direct consequence, (new) faculty members invariably toil and grope for the right devices in the bid to provide an account of performance which purports to document success, one that is subject to periodic peer-evaluation through publications and other institutional instruments of appraisal. For this reason, I will also delve briefly into the issue of academic literacy. Finally, I will attempt to ponder the notion and possible effects of the specificity of a language for academic purposes in heterogeneous communities.

2. *SELF* AND *OTHER* IN (AND) THE ACADEMY

Price (2001:2) provides a premise from which to appraise the subjectivity inherent in the process of thought. He theorizes that thinking "validates our very existence". He credits Descartes with "dismantling philosophical inquiries prior to his lifetime and replacing what came to be considered as metaphysical babble with the simple profundity (of) *I think, therefore I am*". This premise accepts and extends the place and value of subjective ruminations into an existential realm and prominence. It affords us the notion that we can experience and value our existence and survival via our own thoughts, though we are "inextricably dependent on the manipulation of verbal symbols" and which act is

governed by conventions agreed or imposed by a specific community. Consciousness therefore is reliant upon the device of language. Taken to the extreme, this revolution in human consciousness almost attributes deific powers to humanity's most intimate confidant, the brain. Certainly, a mesmerizing thought!

Though, in Price's own words, "this mental revolution is only a restatement of a primitive mind-set that had gods talking to men", it remains a fascinatingly new dialectic. The existential import of this formulation arms us with the ability to subtract ourselves from the cultural dependency and control of our mental processes. Hence our unabashed search for individuality through which we plead for the acceptance of our subjective perceptions as the true representation of 'what is'. It is therefore not unfounded that, given our cherished individuality, we are beset with the propensity to question whatever is pronounced as *official*. It is not far-fetched either that while we relish our capacity to have thought and expression to match how we perceive the universe around us, it is not always in conformity with standards installed outside of our perceptions. We therefore experience a breach when confronted with externally imposed standards which contradict us. Just as we react to the *otherness* we suspect in all things external to us, any contradictions that threaten our convictions are viewed as frontal assaults on our very existence and survival. For Price therefore, "heresy is, to us, as much a biological threat as an ideological one. It is a logical outcome of our trust (…) in ourselves". It would thus seem devastating to our being, to our ego, to the sense of certainty and security longed for by the *self*, should we contemplate the possibility that we are not in the end faithfully identical to our own thoughts, that they may be mediated by uncontrollable forces that do not inhabit us. It is the equivalent of a blasphemy against our fundamental belief and against the self-coronation of our deified individuality, and given the dogmatic connection "between what we think and what we are, our instinctual reaction is adrenal and defensive". However, we seem to feel no such instinctual urgency when we step into the *other*'s lifespace or his "mental chatter" and proclaim their invalidity. As Price notes, we would rather qualify as perceptual deficiencies those disagreeable thoughts expressed by others which we may suppress or repress though a combination of social coercion and institutional restraint. As Price (2001:2-3) also sagely asserts, "it seems not to occur to us that if one set of perceptions can be judged invalid, so may they all, including our own".

As individuals, we may be hard pressed to acknowledge that the very thoughts we appropriate and attempt to guard so jealously may not, after all, be all that personal. They are in all likelihood openly or discreetly imposed as external agents by the extent of our access to the grammar and rules of expression or the limited varieties of symbols that govern the discourse in which we partake. This overarching circumscription may or may not be effectuated with subtlety. Most important to this discussion is the likelihood that our thoughts may be hamstrung and predetermined by "something other than ourselves" through "social intervention into the individual psyche" in the words of Price (2001:3). At the very least and at the most elemental level, by using familiar rhetorical devices, we may be content to blur the distinctions that exist between our own thoughts and those superimposed on our faculties by influential external agents to whom we owe some statutory allegiance. The Academy and the various entities that support it are replete with such agents at various administrative and editorial levels.

None can gainsay the common fact that we identify, and are increasingly identified, with the mental constructs that have characterized our training and education. However,

these may not entirely be in consonance with who and what we are and desire to become, although we are constrained to remain within the paradigms that have been prescribed for our performances, like actors on a stage. For instance, when we improvise or choose a different medium of knowledge dissemination, it is called to question, and we are required to defend our choices against existing standards, or to simply acquiesce. For example, not long ago, publishing via electronic media was frowned upon within the Academy. Also, creative writing still confounds many a peer-review committee whose memberships are often drawn from across disciplines. Little wonder that Chubin and Hackett (1990:192) could demonstrate in their survey that only 8% agreed that "peer review works well as it is". And, according to Horrobin (2001) a U.S. Supreme Court decision has substantiated complaints that peer review may be blocking the flow of innovation and public support for science. The question therefore begs itself whether the thoughts and creativity we have are what we are allowed to harbour and express in ever straitening circumstances. If so, are we simply being who we are permitted to be? When we deviate from prescribed paths, expressions and thinking patterns, are we simply deviants who await sanctions, or simply candidates for some psychological evaluation in order to be coaxed into fitting the bill of some disorder? As Price (2001:3) would ask "could psychosis be the healthy reaction of a mind defending itself from obliteration?" When we choose to be intrepid and challenge consensus by bypassing "internalized injunctions and propaganda", are we facing special dangers of being characterized as unable to remain cultural artifacts imbued with pre-programmed tools of perception? One thing is clear: we may be endangering our career progress!

The urge to question both academic and institutional authority should naturally be most vivid among newly graduated academics, but it could be curtailed by the sheer necessity for tenure and career growth. The inherent ability to question tyrannical authority is neither a mark of disrespect for authority, nor is it a sign of immaturity. On the contrary, it is a function of a thinking mind that seeks to express itself without the stranglehold of forced conformity. Almost like a spell cast on a hypnotic subject, power relations in social groups are evidently mediated by language and the norms that regulate its use in each group. Price argues therefore that there exists a "fundamental relationship between ritualized forms of language and authoritarian control of language".

Commands are said to be older than speech, and to be one of the earliest forms of linguistic communication. If it were not so, could we successfully explain why creatures without speech understand commands only after they have received training in human language? Besides, there is a long-standing philosophical tradition (Price 2001), which differentiates humans from animals on the basis of language skills. For this reason, I would also argue that every response to a command, an external conative stimulus, no matter how discreetly it is given, remains alien to the recipient who obeys it. It is also a reflection of the fact that the initiator of the command is in a stronger position than the recipient whose behaviour is expected to change, even if solely on account of the command. Price (2001:3) therefore makes the point that the "evolution of subjective sovereignty (is) developmentally more advanced and mature than the mental passivity and behavioural complacency that is so assiduously advanced and promoted by those entrenched as nodes of power in any society". Whether or not the listener intends to obey, it is still the intention of the giver of the command to infuse the recipient with ideas

perhaps entirely formed and maintained by the one in authority. The expected outcomes can be summed up as obedience, acceptance or conformity. To exemplify his points, Price compiled a lexical field that applies to these discourse situations, of which we select what applies generally to this discussion.

Suggestion	Persuasion	Order	Indoctrinate
propaganda	Conversion	Decree	Promote
proselytize	Brain	Mandate	Jingoism
Promulgate	Hype	Pitch	Direct
Educate	Command	Tease	Push
Rhetoric	Pull	Insist	Patronize
Incite	Directive	Polemicize	Posture
Lecture	Rouse	Bamboozle	Anathematize
Amuse	Ridicule	Proscribe	Demonize
Delegitimize	Prescribe	Chastise	Forbid
Oblige	Dictate	Proclaim	Correct
indict	advance	Mesmerize	Arm
lionize	inspire	Instill	Speechify
rally		Demagoguery	Sensationalize
influence			Blame
desensitize			

In the same vein, Newt Gingrich (1974), former speaker of the US House of Representatives and his GOPAC (Political Action Committee) are known to have circulated a pamphlet comprising a list of psychologically active words to be used by Republicans to gain a majority during an imminent election. What is fascinating is the title of the document, to wit *Language, a Key Mechanism of Control*.

2.1 Contrasting Words

In the pamphlet, the thrust is on searching and finding the words that help define opponents. Counseling against being hesitant to use contrast, it urges partisans to remember that creating a difference helps their cause. The following are such powerful words that can create a clear and easily understood contrast. The pamphlet enjoins its readers to apply the following words in various ways to describe their opponents, their record, proposals and their party:

decay... failure (fail)... collapse(ing)... deeper... crisis... urgent(cy)... destructive... destroy... sick... pathetic... lie... liberal... they/them... unionized bureaucracy... "compassion" is not enough... betray... consequences... limit(s)... shallow... traitors... sensationalists... endanger... coercion... hypocrisy... radical... threaten... devour... waste... corruption... incompetent... permissive attitudes... destructive... impose... self-serving... greed... ideological... insecure... anti-(issue): flag, family, child, jobs... pessimistic... excuses... intolerant... stagnation... welfare... corrupt... selfish... insensitive... status quo...

mandate(s)... taxes... spend(ing)... shame... disgrace... punish (poor...)... bizarre... cynicism... cheat... steal... abuse of power... machine... bosses... obsolete... criminal rights... red tape... patronage

2.2 Optimistic Positive Governing Words

On the other hand, using the list below is said to help define your campaign and your vision of public service. These words can help burnish your message with extra power. In addition, they help develop the positive side of the contrast you should create with your opponent, giving your community something to vote for!

share... change... opportunity... legacy... challenge... control... truth... moral... courage... reform... prosperity... crusade... movement... children... family... debate... compete... active(ly)... we/us/our... candid(ly)... humane... pristine... provide... liberty... commitment... principle(d)... unique... duty... precious... premise... care(ing)... tough... listen... learn... help... lead... vision... success... empower(ment)... citizen... activist... mobilize... conflict... light... dream... freedom... peace... rights... pioneer... proud/pride... building... preserve... pro-(issue): flag, environment... reform... workfare... eliminate good-time in prison... strength... choice/choose... fair... protect... confident... incentive... hard work... initiative... common sense... passionate.

Can these rhetorical devices more often attributed to the realms of religion and politics apply reasonably well to the Academy? Of course, there are no *opponents* in the political sense in the Academy, although there are opposing views. So, it may be forlorn to attempt to draw comparisons between academic diction and these devices meant to inspire crowds and provoke fanatical sentiments and fervor. Nonetheless, I opt for a more nuanced position by stating that our view also depends on how far along we are in our career path. Or do we irretrievably attract condemnation by indulging in these sorts of ruminations when, for all intents and purposes, the Academy appears to be functioning relatively well and providing a safe haven for students, teachers, intellectuals and scientists? The point I make, unfortunately, is that although it may appear innocuous, for most new scholars the Academy can be quite stifling and intimidating.

3. ACADEMICS AS RHETORICIANS: EPIDEICTIC DISCOURSE AND CAREER PROGRESS

I wish to address the use of the language of persuasion employed to promote career interests within the Academy. In so doing, I shall adopt specific processes and practices that govern the evaluation of output in the professoriate in the context of Kennedy's views (2001) on academic duty. Kennedy points out that the Academy is so different from other workplaces that we have invented the term "ivory tower" to describe it in order to distinguish it from the "real world" in the eyes of inquisitive outsiders (2001:2). Nevertheless, it is no less a mystery within its walls, as little is often said about academic duty to new faculty members, while yet little is to be found in academic literature about faculty members' responsibilities outside of the obvious ones of teaching and research. Even more experienced academics can only boast a vague understanding of what duty entails institutionally, given the differences inherent in both its diachronic and synchronic

interpretations. This notwithstanding, new recruits are required to concoct a narrative of their accomplishments once in the system. Each academic unit or department, supported by the refrain of academic freedom, is also quick to insist that it has its own practices and traditions. A recent example in my experience is the confusing interpretation of the policy on core language requirements which informs the attitude of some colleagues in the social sciences toward second or foreign languages in the undergraduate degrees in my Faculty.

Performance evaluation is a recurrent subject uppermost in the minds of new faculty members. In cases whereby institutional regulations are rigidly set with deadlines and pre-established formats, the trepidation and confusion felt by inexperienced academics are often overlooked or viewed as an occupation hazard. On their part, new faculty are either ignorant of the far-reaching implications of this annual ritual, or they are timid about asking questions. I will identify the devices that support this narrative process as *reflexive epideictic* from the Greek epideictic meaning "fit for display".

Aristotle subdivided classical rhetoric into three parts, to wit: *forensic rhetoric* is essentially justificatory and apologetic, usually with respect to one's past choices; secondly, *epideictic rhetoric* addresses others' opinions as they relate to blame (*vituperation*) or praise (*encomium*) of current actions and behaviours; thirdly is *deliberative rhetoric* which is prospective, and seeks to persuade in the instance of a future action (Kennedy 1972). As Witherington (1997) underscores, these varieties of classical rhetorical strategies comprise a narration, a proposition and a peroration. It is the second of these tools that is adapted for performance accounts, directed at peers and other evaluators, and meant to put in relief conformity to institutional values and ideals stated as mission statements, visions and goals. For instance, when universities or institutions that award research grants and fellowships enthrone specific academic trends such as multi-, pluri- or transdisciplinarity, academics are judged by their compliance or resistance in their research production which they are required to chronicle.

Epideictic rhetoric, usually defined as the persuasive use of praise or blame, assists in the clarification of values and beliefs, acceptable and undesirable modes of conduct within a cultural group. Epideictic discourse can thus magnify the audience's adherence to shared values. But it can also be the vehicle for the negotiation of individual subjectivity and social attitudes and beliefs. Thus, one wonders unavoidably if a purported language for academic purposes is sufficiently cognizant of the diversity of modes of expressing knowledge.

Literacy and disciplinary practices, for Johns and Swales (2002), usually become more complex as one ascends the educational ladder, as do the level of sophistication of the resources employed and the profundity of the conclusions reached. However, they also pose the question of how to find the personal voice amid institutional expectations.

English for Academic Purposes (EAP), from which term we extrapolate the broader concept of Language for Academic Purposes (LAP) can claim English for Special Purposes (ESP) as its parent. However, LAP has witnessed an expanded reach from simply teaching English with the singular aim of assisting learners' study or research in that language, to the more complex process of "tailoring instruction to specific rather than general purposes" and focusing "on the specific communicative needs and practices of particular groups in academic contexts" in the estimation of Hyland and Hamp-Lyons (2002:2). Thus, it now addresses the processes of "grounding instruction in an

understanding of the cognitive, social and linguistic demands of specific academic disciplines" (by) "equipping students with the communicative skills to participate in particular academic and cultural contexts". Where these programmes are persistent, they lead up to preparing doctoral students for their dissertations (thus through all proficiency levels), as well as working on article-style writing to prepare the students for life after graduation. At this level, efforts are concentrated on the constraints of social contexts on language use, hence the reference to Price's citation in my opening paragraph. Within the Academy, instructors go to great lengths to imbue students with the inevitability of adhering to prescribed norms of academic discourse according to a variety of disciplinary traditions.

Academic literacy attempts to equip the student with the sets of skills and linguistic forms and discursive practices that are judged to be indispensable in an academic atmosphere. Of necessity, these skills are conceptualized in relation to individual disciplines and their prevailing ethos. Each community boasts different worldviews, which in turn dictate distinct practices, genres and communicative conventions. As a result, discourse specificity affects the ways knowledge is organized in relation to its target audience and those who have editorial control, although academic challenges and conventions within the same disciplines can no longer be considered to be homogeneous in light of the multiplicity of new audiences and challenges addressed. However, as Hyland and Hamp-Lyons (2002:6) ask, "where (…) is specificity feasible, and what does it consist of in different fields?"

Communities differ in their character as reflected in ways of talking, argument structures and aims in social and cognitive dimensions, according to Hyland and Hamp-Lyons (2002:6). The mastery of the characteristics of a particular discourse allows individuals to acquire and display their expertise and competencies which give credence to their professional membership and identity in the community. So, are discourse communities therefore to be understood as disciplines? Do they profess mutually alienating pedagogic agendas?

Bazerman (1994) notes that, "most definitions of discourse community get ragged around the edges rapidly". Therefore, it is difficult to state with certainty if a discipline comprising a multitude of allegiances, competing theories and methodologies is a community or a series of mini-communities. Is a department or faculty a community? Are whole universities communities, and are they distinct from colleges and other tertiary institutions within the same territorial, political and ideological boundaries? Do all these groupings share communally acceptable genres as academic communities? In my view, without diversifying the discourse regimen, there will remain a silo mentality among academics and in the disciplines. It seems to me that institutions are moving, albeit weakly, in melding disciplinary practices, although entrenched traditions in the disciplines themselves are more reticent and resistant to this progress. It is therefore germane to mention the role of technology in mitigating the threat of exclusion and isolation by breaking down barriers along cultural, linguistic and even disciplinary lines.

The astronomical growth and complexity of new technologies as applied to academic literacy has provoked myriad issues. In the view of Taylor and Ward (1998), it now seems that on-line information is fast becoming the dominant resource for academic writing, particularly for undergraduate students. But to return to the pressing issue of the Academy, it is now also clear that textual processes and manipulations are increasingly

ineluctably dependent on these technologies. Hyland and Hamp-Lyons (2002:7) point out that hirings, performance evaluations and promotions, student selections, grant applications, annual appraisals, institutional visions, plans and statements, now "all come with their own new sets of genre constraints and expectations". It is almost inconceivable that important lectures and other forms of presentation will avoid media and genres such as PowerPoint, e-mail, web postings and electronic lists.

The facilitation and cost mitigation of access to new knowledge enabled by new technologies also set us apart in real terms from those who lack the wherewithal to acquire these tools. With computers dominating every facet of academic life in the West, it would only seem improbable to many that a substantial swath of the world's population is yet to be connected to the internet. According to the March 02, 2009 UN press release on the *Information and Communication Technology* (*ICT*) study among 154 countries worldwide, Northern European countries, notably Sweden, are the most advanced (*Scoop Independent News*, www.scoop.co.nz). The *ICT Development Index* (IDI), produced under the aegis of the UN International Telecommunication Union (ITU), reveals once again the magnitude of the global divide which remains unabated since the last such studies it conducted between 2002 and 2007. The ITU report further notes that 23 out of 100 inhabitants globally used the Internet at the end of 2008, but that penetration levels in the developing countries remained low, with Africa's penetration lagging behind. York et al. (2005:369) point to consequences of this disparity in that "[c]yber optimists assert that […] access to IT promotes development whereas cyber pessimists assert that such access simply exacerbates global inequality". A corollary of this problem, often overlooked, is the increasing dominance of North American English as the model of academic writing that is spread by the internet to other English speaking global communities.

4. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, a critical interrogation of the discourse community and its practices is not tantamount to its condemnation. Rather, it suggests that it should move beyond the mere replication and justification of its discourse boundaries to incorporate emergent possibilities such as computer-mediated genres and other culturally and linguistically divergent practices. On the former, it is instructive to refer to the recent open debate on the Linguist List started by scholars in developing countries (www.linguistlist.org). They vigorously lamented the exclusionary practices of major editors and publishers who required scholars outside of the West to adopt standards of content and expression that are almost always insensitive to the unique perspectives and situation of scholars in poorer countries. If all scholarship is to be truly reflective of the diversity of our collective human culture, then the points they raised are valid. It is essential to note that although computer-mediated practices promise a panacea to this endemic problem, they are still largely unavailable to those that would most benefit for a host of reasons, including those of distance, accessibility, portability and infrastructure.

Discourse specificity should of necessity be pluralized in order to obtain *specificities*. Hyland and Hamp-Lyons (2002:9) theorize that as physical distances become ever more narrowed, a "socio-theoretical stance" should clarify the fact that language use, in the sense of the broader society, is socially situated and should therefore be more hospitable to broader social practices. As a result, it is logical to expect that "issues of individual

competitiveness, alliances among particular groups, the role of gatekeepers, and vested interests and institutionalized reward systems have therefore become legitimate areas" of interrogation. The self-perpetuating relationship between language and power and the limiting character attributed to prestigious academic literacy practices seem for now to enjoy the unalloyed support of institutions and influential individuals within the Academy. While this may be legitimately defended, such an argument will only serve to buttress the claim that the Academy is not yet modernizing itself or reacting quickly enough to new practices and resources, not least its inherent diversity.

I conclude with a reference to Canagarajah (2002) who skillfully deconstructs the inherent complexities and inconsistencies of globalization in the expression, communication and exchange of ideas in relation to non-Western academics. The inequities and unrealistic expectations endured by scholars relegated to the periphery on account of the varieties of English (e.g. of Africa and Asia) in which they express themselves constitute almost insurmountable hurdles. Through a gripping introspection, Canagarajah poignantly describes his predicaments as an academic in Sri Lanka, experiences that clearly typify Euro-American intellectual imperialism, which extends to the control of mainstream publication avenues. As Werry (2005) aptly observes, linguists rarely allow self-reflexive scrutiny, assuming that linguistic discourse is a transparent metalanguage. On the contrary, I am of the opinion that the discourses that characterize disciplinary communities must lend themselves to self-reflexive examination in order to reveal and counter perceived injustices and unfair practices.

REFERENCES

Bazerman, C. 1994. *Constructing Experience*. Carbondale: South Illinois University Press.

Berger, P. and T. Luckman. 1967. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Anchor Books.

Canagarajah, S. 2002. *A Geopolitics of Academic Writing*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Chubin, D. and E. Hackett. 1990. *Peerless Science, Peer Review and U.S. Science Policy*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Dudley-Evans, T. and M.-J. St John. 1988. *Developments in ESP*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gingrich, N. 1974. *Language, a Key Mechanism of Control*. [Pamphlet]

Horrobin, D. 2001. Something rotten at the core of science? *Trends in Pharmacological Sciences* Vol. 22(2). Available at: www.whale.to/vaccine/sci.html.

Hutchison, T. and A. Walters. 1998. *English for Specific Purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyland, K. 2000a. Specificity revisited: How far should we go now? *English for Special Purposes* 21.

-----. 2000b. *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. London: Longman.

-----. and L. Hamp Lyons. 2002. EAP: Issues and directions. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* Vol. 21(1):1-12.

Johns, A. and J. Swales. 2002. Literacy and disciplinary practices: Opening and closing perspectives. *Journal of English for Special Purposes* 21(1):13-28.

Kennedy, D. 2001. *Academic Duty*. Cambridge/London: Harvard University Press.

Kennedy, G. K. 1972. *Persuasion in Greece, or the Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Price, B. 2001. Authoritarian grammar and fundamental articulation. *Working Papers in Iconicity/Iconicity in Language*. Available at: www.trimestos.com.

Prior, P. 1998. *Writing/Disciplinarity: A Socio-historic Account of Literate Activity in the Academy*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Scoop Independent News. Available at: www.scoop.co.nz.

Spack, R. 1988. Students into the discourse community: How far should we go? *TESOL Quarterly* 22(1):29-52.

Swales, J. 1998. *Other Floors, Other Voices*: *A Textography of a Small University Building*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Taylor, T. and I. Ward. 1998. *Literacy Theory in the Age of the Internet*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Werry, C. 2005. Rhetoric and reflexivity in cognitive theories of language. *Language and Communication* 25:337-397.

Witherington III, B. 1997. *A Socio-rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

York, W. et al. 2005. Wiring the world: Access to information technology and development in poor countries. *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility* 23:369-392.

LA VARIATION PRAGMATIQUE RÉGIONALE EN FRANÇAIS

Bernard Mulo Farenkia
Cape Breton University, Sydney, NS
bernard_farenkia@cbu.ca

RÉSUMÉ

Cette étude analyse et compare la formulation de l'acte de compliment en français camerounais et en français canadien (québécois). Elle contribue à la pragmatique contrastive et interculturelle des pratiques langagières en francophonie, avec un accent particulier sur les français dits périphériques.

Mots-clés : français périphériques, actes de langage, variation diatopique

ABSTRACT

This study describes and compares the realization of the speech act of complimenting in Cameroon and Canadian (Québec) French. It is a contribution to cross-cultural pragmatics in the francophonie, with focus on non-hexagonal varieties of French.

Keywords: non-hexagonal French, speech acts, regional variation

1. OBJECTIFS

Cette contribution livre quelques résultats d'une étude comparée de la réalisation de l'acte de compliment en français au Québec et au Cameroun. Le principal objectif ici est de présenter un exemple de la variation pragmatique régionale en français.

.

2. CADRE THÉORIQUE

L'analyse se fonde sur la conception du français comme une 'langue pluricentrique', c'est-à-dire comme « une langue qui n'a pas qu'un seul centre dont émanent les normes ». (Pöll : 2005 : 19), et l'étude s'inscrit dans le cadre des *Francophonies Périphériques* (Pöll 2001). Nous avons constaté que les études précédentes de la variation régionale du français se sont beaucoup plus consacrées aux aspects lexicaux, morphosyntaxiques, phoniques, sémantiques et phraséologiques. De l'autre côté, l'analyse comparée des actes de langage et d'autres phénomènes pragmatiques a surtout adopté une perspective interlinguale / interculturelle, destinée à mettre en lumière les différences et similitudes entre deux ou plusieurs langues ou cultures différentes. Les recherches récentes en pragmatique interculturelle ont montré que l'approche comparative et/ou interculturelle peut aussi s'appliquer aux variétés régionales d'une même langue. Et l'on doit cette mise au point, entre autres, à Schneider et Barron (2008), qui ont élaboré un cadre théorique et méthodologique appelé *variational pragmatics*, permettant de poser un regard croisé sur les variations pragmatiques dans deux ou plusieurs variétés régionales d'une même langue. Cet aspect étudié s'appelle la variation pragmatique régionale. Cette approche a donné lieu à plusieurs travaux dont la plupart portent sur les actes de langage (requêtes, remerciements, demandes d'excuse, etc.) dans

les variétés régionales de l'anglais, de l'espagnol, de l'allemand, du néerlandais, du français, etc.[1]

La présente étude exploite ce « nouveau paradigme » théorique et méthodologique pour mettre en lumière quelques différences et similarités pragmatiques en français régionaux. Il convient de préciser que les travaux antérieurs sur la variation pragmatique régionale en français portent surtout sur le français au Québec et en France (Bernicot et. al 1994, Dubois 2000, Berrier 2004, Schölmberger 2008, Drescher 2009, Rohrbacher 2010). Une comparaison de deux ou plusieurs variétés non-hexagonales du français, à l'instar du français québécois et du français camerounais, reste à faire. Pour étendre ce champ de recherche, nous avons justement choisi le français camerounais et québécois et nos analyses porteront sur une seule variable pragmatique, l'acte de compliment, que l'on peut définir comme « toute assertion évaluative positive portant sur une qualité ou une propriété de l'allocutaire A ([c'est-à-dire] une louange adressée à la personne « concernée », ou bien encore, sur une qualité ou propriété d'une personne plus ou moins étroitement liée à A (Kerbrat-Orecchioni : 1998 : 202).

3. MÉTHODOLOGIE

Les données utilisées ont été obtenues au moyen d'un questionnaire comportant 16 situations (huit pour le compliment et huit pour les réactions au compliment) distribué à 39 élèves (10 filles et 29 garçons âgés de 14 à 17 ans) d'une école secondaire à Montréal (Québec) en octobre 2010 et à 55 élèves (39 filles et 16 garçons âgés de 15 à 19 ans (50/55) et de 20 à 22 (5/55)) de trois lycées à Yaoundé (Cameroun) en janvier 2011. Après dépouillement, nous avons obtenu 862 exemples (dont 428 compliments et 434 réponses au compliment) des informateurs camerounais et 615 occurrences (dont 306 compliments et 309 réponses au compliment) des informateurs québécois. La présente étude se base sur trois situations, notamment les compliments sur les possessions suivantes : a) le téléphone d'un inconnu, b) la maison (des parents) d'un ami et c) la voiture d'un professeur. Les informateurs camerounais ont généré au total 162 compliments tandis que leurs homologues québécois ont produit au total 112 occurrences laudatives. Les résultats présentés ci-dessous sont relatifs aux trois aspects suivants:

- 1) les types de formulations (réalisations directes vs. indirectes ; simples vs. complexes)
- 2) le contenu lexico-sémantique des formulations attestées
- 3) les autres types d'actes associés aux compliments.

---

[1] Pour des détails voir le collectif édité par Schneider et Barron (2008) qui rassemble dix études sur divers types d'actes de langage dans les variétés régionales de l'anglais, du néerlandais, de l'allemand, de l'espagnol et du français.

4. RÉSULTATS ET DISCUSSION

4.1 Les formulations simples

Par formulation simple, nous entendons toute forme de réalisation constituée d'un seul énoncé. Comme le montrent les tableaux 1 et 2, les participants des deux groupes ont utilisé aussi bien des formes directes que des formes indirectes.

Tableau 1: Fréquences[2] des compliments directs en français camerounais et en français québécois

Situations	Compliments directs	
	Cameroun	Québec
Téléphone	1 (0.61%)	5 (4.46%)
Maison	7 (4.32%)	8 (7.14%)
Voiture	3 (1.85%)	13 (11.60%)
Total	11 (6.79%)	26 (23.21%)

Tableau 2: Fréquences de compliments indirects en français camerounais et en français québécois

Situations	Cameroun	Québec
Téléphone	1	3
Maison	1	0
Voiture	2	2
Total	4 (2.49%)	5 (4.46%)

Dans l'ensemble, le taux d'emploi des formes directes est plus élevé chez les jeunes Québécois que chez les jeunes Camerounais. On observe aussi que dans le corpus québécois, les formulations directes sont plus employées pour faire des compliments sur la voiture, alors que les informateurs camerounais ont plus utilisé les compliments dans la situation de la maison. Les exemples ci-dessous sont des cas typiques de compliments directs :

1) *Il est vraiment très beau ton téléphone[3]*. [Téléphone, Cameroun]
2) *J'aime ton cell.* [Téléphone, Québec]
3) *Qu'elle est belle votre résidence* [Maison, Cameroun]
4) *Nouveau char il est cool.* [Voiture, Québec]

En ce qui concerne les réalisations indirectes, le taux d'emploi des formules est plus haut chez les Québécois. A cette différence se greffe le fait qu'il n'y a aucune occurrence d'indirection en rapport avec la maison dans le corpus québécois. Quelques exemples du corpus :

5) *Dis-moi que tu habite maintenant le palais.* [Maison, Cameroun]

---

[2] Il faut rappeler que la fréquence dans tous les tableaux porte sur un total de 162 compliments dans le corpus camerounais et 112 compliments dans le corpus québécois.
[3] Les exemples sont donnés tels qu'ils se présentent dans le corpus. Autrement dit, les erreurs grammaticales et orthographiques restes inchangées.

6) *Combien elle a couté votre voiture, j'en veux une pareille*. [Voiture, Québec]

4.2 Les formulations complexes

Les formulations complexes sont constituées d'au moins deux énoncés. Deux types de formulations complexes ont été recensés : a) La combinaison d'au moins deux formules laudatives ; b) La combinaison des formules laudatives aux pré- et/ou post-compliments.

En ce qui concerne la combinaison ou réduplication des formules laudatives, le tableau 3 montre que les participants des deux groupes combinent deux et trois formules laudatives dans une même intervention. Si le taux de combinaison de deux compliments directs est plus élevé chez les Camerounais que chez les Québécois, l'association de trois formules laudatives ne présente pas de différence quantitative dans les deux corpus. La différence s'observe plutôt au niveau de la répartition situationnelle de cette stratégie.

Tableau 3: Combinaison des formules laudatives s en français camerounais et en français québécois

Situations	Deux compliments		Trois compliments	
	Cameroun	Québec	Cameroun	Québec
Téléphone	2	1	0	0
Maison	8	5	0	1
Voiture	6	4	2	1
Total	16 (9.87%)	10 (8.92%)	2 (1.23%)	2 (1.78%)

Quelques exemples typiques de formules complexes avec deux énoncés sont présentés ci-dessous:

7) *Vous avez un jolie téléphone, il a de la valeur !* [Téléphone, Cameroun]
8) *J'aime bien ton téléphone, il est cool avec toutes ces options.* [Téléphone, Québec]
9) *Je kife votre nouvelle maison, elle est vraiment chic*. [Maison, Cameroun]
10) *Vous avez bien fait de déménager. Cette maison-là est 100 x [fois] plus belle que l'autre.* [Maison, Québec]

Les exemples (11) et (12) sont des cas typiques de formules complexes avec deux énoncés.

1) *Tu est vraiment chanceux de vivre ici, c'est vraiment trop beau, j'adore* ! [Maison, Québec]
2) *Votre nouvelle voiture est très belle, elle me plaît et sa couleur est très discrète.* [Voiture, Cameroun]

4.3 Contenu lexico-sémantique et stylistique des formules laudatives

Les analyses révèlent la présence dans les énoncés laudatifs attestés de plusieurs types de procédés lexico-sémantiques et stylistiques, dont la fonction est d'intensifier ou d'adoucir

la valeur illocutoire et relationnelle des énoncés laudatifs. Le tableau 4 récapitule les résultats de l'analyse menée.

Tableau 4 : Inventaire des procédés lexico-sémantiques et stylistiques en français camerounais et en français québécois

		Cameroun (n = 353)	Québec (n = 207)
Procédés lexicaux	Adjectifs	163 (46.17%)	98 (47.34%)
	Adverbes	112 (31.72%)	68 (32.85%)
	Verbes	45 (12.74%)	34 (16.42%)
	Substantifs	16 (4.53%)	2 (0.96%)
Procédés stylistiques		17 (4.81%)	5 (2.41%)
Total		353 (100%)	207 (100%)

On constate que les locuteurs des deux variétés de français emploient les procédés lexicaux tels que les adjectifs, les adverbes, les verbes et les substantifs et les procédés stylistiques tels que les pré-compliments et les métaphores dans leurs énoncés. A bien regarder, les adjectifs et les adverbes sont les procédés les plus mobilisés dans les deux corpus. En ce qui concerne les procédés stylistiques, l'on peut surtout relever la formule « je voulais juste te dire que », employée sous forme de pré-compliment pour annoncer l'intention laudative et en adoucir le caractère dérangeant, comme dans les deux exemples suivants:

> 3) *(...)* ***Au fait je voulais juste te dire que*** *je trouve ton phone très beau.* [Téléphone, Cameroun]
> 4) *(...)* ***je voulais juste te dire que*** *j'aime ton nouveau cell.* [Téléphone, Québec]

Cependant, la plupart des procédés stylistiques recensés dans le corpus camerounais sont des procédés d'intensification qui portent sur la composante valorisante du compliment. Comme les deux exemples ci-dessous le montrent, ces procédés sont soit des formules d'annonce ou des formules métaphoriques.

> 5) *(...)* **Je ne saurais vous dire combien est ce que** j'admire ce téléphone. [Téléphone, Cameroun]
> 6) *Ma chérie bonjour, Tu as* ***la mort du téléphone*** *tu l'as acheté à combien?* [*Téléphone*, Cameroun]

4.4 Autres types de formulations complexes : le recours aux pré- et aux post-compliments

La combinaison des formules laudatives proprement dites à d'autres types d'actes de langage (actes subsidiaires) dans le même énoncé aboutit à des formulations complexes dans lesquelles les actes pré- ou postposés servent à intensifier ou à adoucir l'acte laudatif principal. Trois catégories d'actes subsidiaires ont été recensées : a) les actes qui précèdent les compliments ; b) les actes précèdent et suivent les compliments ; c) les actes qui suivent les compliments proprement dits. Les Québécois ont employé au total

109 et les Camerounais ont utilisé 247 actes subsidiaires, dont les fréquences sont présentées dans les tableaux suivants.

a) Les actes qui précèdent les formules laudatives

Tableau 5: Inventaire des actes subsidiaires qui précèdent les formules laudatives

Actes subsidiaires	Cameroun (N = 169)	Québec (N = 48)
Interjections	64 (25.91%)	33 (30.27%)
Formes nominales d'adresse	50 (20.24%)	10 (9.17%)
Salutations	43 (17.40%)	2 (1.83%)
Demandes d'excuse	10 (4.04%)	3 (2.75%)
Présentations	2 (0.81%)	0
Total	169 (68.42%)	48 (44.03%)

Ces types d'actes servent surtout à créer le contact avec l'interlocuteur ou à capter son attention (formes d'adresse, salutations, présentations), à exprimer un état émotionnel du laudateur (interjections) ou à désamorcer tout empiètement qu'implique le compliment sur le territoire de l'allocutaire (demande d'excuse). La fréquence des pré-compliments est plus élevée chez les jeunes Camerounais : le recours aux salutations et aux formes nominales d'adresse en donne une parfaite illustration. Quelques exemples du corpus:

7) **Bonjour mademoiselle[4]. Pardonnez mon dérangement**, *mais il m'était impossible de vous traverser sans vous dire combien j'apprécie votre téléphone*. [Téléphone, Cameroun]

8) **Yo, je sais que j't'ais jamais parlé**, *mais je voulais juste te dire que j'aime trop ton cell*. [Téléphone, Québec]

b) Les actes qui précèdent et/ou suivent les compliments

Tableau 6 : Inventaire des actes subsidiaires qui précèdent et/ou suivent les compliments

Actes subsidiaires	Cameroun (N = 60)	Québec (N = 46)
Questions	39 (15.78%)	29 (26.60%)
Commentaires	15 (6.07%)	14 (12.84%)
Requêtes	6 (2.43%)	3 (2.75%)
Total	60 (24.29%)	46 (42.20%)

On remarque que les Camerounais sont plus prolifiques que leurs homologues Québécois. Les questions sont les plus représentées dans cette sous-catégorie. Elles portent sur divers aspects de l'objet complimenté et fonctionnent comme des marques de sollicitude envers l'interlocuteur. Dans les deux corpus, les questions sont surtout combinées aux compliments sur le téléphone. Quelques exemples:

---

[4] Les actes subsidiaires sont en caractères gras.

9) ***Wow, tu as un jolie téléphone, et ou l'as-tu acheté ? Qui te l'as offert et à quel occasion l'as-t eu?*** [Téléphone, Cameroun]
10) *C'est trop hot ton cell. C'est quand que tu l'as eu?* [Téléphone, Québec]

c) Les actes qui suivent les compliments

Tableau 7 : Inventaire des actes subsidiaires qui suivent les compliments

Actes subsidiaires	Cameroun (N = 18)	Québec (N = 15)
Vœux	16 (6.47%)	12 (11%)
Conseil	1 (0.40%)	0
Rappel	1 (0.40%)	0
Regret	0	1 (0.91%)
Suggestion	0	1 (0.91%)
Promesse	0	1 (0.91%)
Total	18 (7.28%)	15 (13.76%)

En dehors des formules de vœux qui sont attestées dans les deux corpus, le conseil et le rappel accompagnent les compliments des Camerounais, tandis que la suggestion, la promesse et l'expression du regret sont exclusivement attestées dans les exemples québécois. Quelques exemples du corpus.

11) ***Madame*** *votre voiture déchire,* ***j'espère beaucoup monter à l'intérieur avec vous un jour****.* [Voiture, Cameroun]
12) ***Oh mon dieu !*** *C'est tellement beau,* ***j'aimerais vivre dans une maison comme ça, moi.*** [Maison, Québec]

5 CONCLUSION

Cette étude a permis de relever quelques différences et similitudes dans la réalisation du compliment chez les jeunes francophones au Cameroun et au Québec. On a pu constater que le taux d'emploi des formulations directes et indirectes est plus élevé chez les Québécois. Concernant le contenu lexico-sémantique, les adjectifs et les adverbes sont les éléments les plus fréquents dans les deux variétés de français et les Camerounais interrogés emploient plus de procédés lexicaux et stylistiques (d'intensification) que leurs homologues Québécois. L'examen des formulations complexes a montré que les informateurs des deux groupes emploient aussi bien des combinaisons de deux ou trois formules laudatives que des structures complexes dans lesquelles les formules laudatives sont combinées aux pré- et/ou aux post-compliments. Les Camerounais ont livré un répertoire d'actes additionnels plus riche et varié, avec la particularité que les salutations et les formes nominales d'adresse présentent des fréquences nettement plus élevées que chez les jeunes Québécois. Il convient de préciser que ces résultats ne peuvent pas être généralisés dans la mesure où la population étudiée est restreinte. L'on devrait donc approfondir les analyses en s'appuyant sur des données provenant d'autres groupes et d'autres régions du Québec et du Cameroun.

RÉFÉRENCES

Bernicot J., J. Comeau and H. Feider. 1994. Dialogues between French-speaking mothers and daughters in two cultures: France and Quebec. *Discourse Processes* 18:19-34.

Berrier, A. 2004. *Conversations francophones. A la recherche d'une communication interculturelle*. Paris : L'Harmattan.

Drescher, M. 2009. Sacres québécois et jurons français : Vers une pragmaticalisation des fonctions communicatives ? Dans *Français du Canada – Français de France. Actes du huitième colloque international de Trèves, du 12 au 15 avril 2007*, ed. Béatrice Bagola. Tübingen : Niemeyer, 177-185.

Kerbrat-Orecchioni, C. 1998. *Les interactions verbales*, t.3. Paris : Armand Colin.

Pöll, B. 2001. *Francophonies périphériques. Histoire, statut et profil des principales variétés du français hors de France*. Paris : L'Harmattan.

-----. 2005. *Le français langue pluricentrique? Étude sur la variation diatopique d'une langue standard.* Frankfurt am Main : Peter Lang.

Rohrbacher, A. 2010. *Der Sprechakt der Bitte in Frankreich un Quebec. Ein interkultureller Vergleich aus dem Breich der Variational Prgamtics*. Saarbrücken: VDM.

Schneider, K. P. and A. Barron (eds.) 2008. *Variational Pragmatics. A Focus on Regional Varieties in Pluricentric Languages.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Schölmberger, U. 2008. Apologizing in French French and Canadian French. In *Variational Pragmatics. A Focus on Regional Varieties in Pluricentric Languages,* ed. K.P Schneider and A. Barron, 329-350. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

RESETTING THE FUNCTIONAL FEATURES OF THE ACCUSATIVE CLITIC IN THE SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION OF SPANISH

Mona-Luiza Ungureanu
Université de Moncton Campus de Shippagan, Shippagan, N-B
mona-luiza.ungureanu@umoncton.ca

ABSTRACT

This paper contributes supporting evidence for the Full Access Hypothesis of second language acquisition, as proposed by White (1985b, 1986, 2000, 2003) and Duffield et al. (1999, 2002), among others, according to which adult second language learners have access to principles and parameters of Universal Grammar (UG) and can thus acquire the features of syntactic functional categories present in the second language. Here, we present the results and constitution of a small pilot study that investigates the ultimate attainment of functional features related to accusative clitic doubling agreement in the second language acquisition of Spanish by native speakers of Romanian. The aim is to determine whether the final state interlanguage language competence of the functional features under discussion complies with the grammar of (1) the second language (language to be acquired), (2) the first language of the learner, or (3) neither the rules of the first language nor those of the second language. We show that the features of the accusative clitic functional category are reset to the values of the L2 in a configuration in which the set of features of the L1 is restricted to those of the L2.

Key Words: L2 acquisition of Spanish, accusative DP clitic doubling, advanced L2 learners of Spanish

RÉSUMÉ

Cet article corrobore les recherches sur « l'hypothèse de transfert complet et l'accès complet d'acquisition des langues secondes », proposées, entre autres, par White (1985b, 1986, 2000, 2003) et Duffield et al. (1999, 2002). Selon ces recherches, les apprenants adultes d'une langue seconde ont accès complet aux principes et aux paramètres de la grammaire universelle (UG) et peuvent ainsi acquérir les caractéristiques des catégories fonctionnelles syntaxiques présentes dans la langue seconde. Dans cet article, nous présentons les résultats d'une étude exploratoire qui examine la réalisation ultime des caractéristiques fonctionnelles liées à l'accord du dédoublement clitique accusatif dans l'acquisition de l'espagnol comme deuxième langue par des locuteurs natifs du roumain. L'objectif est de déterminer si, en phase avancée d'acquisition, la maitrise des caractéristiques fonctionnelles à l'étude est conforme aux normes de la langue seconde ou à celles la langue maternelle de l'apprenant, ou si cette compétence ne correspond à aucun des deux cas. Nous démontrons que les caractéristiques de la catégorie fonctionnelle du clitique accusatif sont réinitialisées aux valeurs de la langue seconde dans une configuration dans laquelle les caractéristiques présentes dans la langue maternelle sont limitées à celles qui sont également présentes dans la langue seconde.

Mots-clés : *Acquisition de l'espagnol comme langue seconde; expression déterminant accusatif et dédoublement clitique ; apprenants avancés de l'espagnol comme langue seconde*

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper discusses the second language acquisition (henceforth SLA) of features of syntactic functional categories, specifically the features of the accusative clitic involved in accusative clitic doubling constructions, by native speakers of Romanian learning Spanish. The main research goal is to determine whether syntactic features associated with IP-internal (Inflectional Phrase) accusative clitic doubling constructions (henceforth ACDCs) are eventually acquired/reset in the inter language (IL) grammar of an advanced second language learner to those of the second language.[5] Since the focus here is on the eventual/ultimate resetting of features of functional categories, this experiment bears consequence on the end-state grammar only and does not make any claims about the initial or intermediate stages of acquisition.

In terms of SLA theories, the results of the present investigation provide additional support for the Full Access/No Impairment Hypothesis, according to which adult learners of a second language (henceforth L2) have full and unimpaired access to principles and parameters of Universal Grammar (UG). That is, features of functional categories of the L2 can be acquired/reset. Furthermore, the present results challenge theories of SLA such as the No Access Hypothesis, as in Clahsen (1988, 1990, 1991) and Meisel (1998); the Failed Feature Hypothesis, as in Schachter (1996) and Tsimpli and Roussou (1991); and the Local Impairment Hypothesis, as in Beck (1998). According to these hypotheses adult grammars of L2 learners do not have access to UG, only have access to principles of UG that are present in the first language (henceforth L1), or access to UG is impaired resulting in an IL that does not obey principles of UG, respectively. That is, according to the latter three hypotheses features of functional categories either cannot be reset in the IL grammars of adult L2 learners altogether or are only partially acquired.

This study targets the resetting of the features of functional categories and not the acquisition of the functional categories themselves. To do so, the features are isolated by zeroing in on the features of a functional category that is present in both the L1, Romanian, and in the L2, Spanish. The functional category is the accusative clitic and the features under observation are the agreement features that instantiate accusative clitic doubling in the two languages. The specific aim of the present study is to determine whether native speakers of Romanian acquiring Spanish as a second/foreign language can ultimately reset the parametric features of the accusative clitic in the environment of accusative clitic doubling to those present in L2. Since both Romanian and Spanish have accusative clitic projections, the acquisition of this functional category (FC) could be equally argued to be transferred from L1 or to be retrieved from UG. Consequently, no predictions are made as to the acquisition of the accusative clitic FC as such; rather, the focus is on the agreement features of the accusative clitic in accusative clitic doubling constructions. Central to the present study are issues pertaining to the resetting of features of functional categories from the L1 into the L2 because both L1 and L2 have accusative clitic doubling constructions but the features that trigger clitic doubling in the two

---

[5] This study only considers IP-internal ACDC, where the associate DP is in situ at surface structure. That is, constructions where the direct object is in the left periphery of the Complementizer Phrase (CP) are not considered.

languages are sometimes different. Thus, this syntactic context provides us the opportunity to directly monitor the extent to which transfer from L1 into L2 takes place, if instances of transfer are indeed present.

2. SYNTACTIC BACKGROUND

Pronominal clitics are pronoun-like elements, also referred to as deficient/weak pronominal as they cannot be stressed and they depend morphologically on another word. In Romance languages, they are usually dependent on the verb complex (verb and/or auxiliary) and they have person, number, gender and case features. Some examples of direct object/accusative clitics from French, Spanish and Romanian are provided below.

(1) Marie **le** voit (Fr.)
     Mary   him sees
     "Mary sees him"

(2) Maria **lo** vea (Sp.)
     Mary   him see
     "Mary sees him"

(3) **Maria** **o̸l** vede (Rom.)
     Mary   him see
     "Mary sees him"

Following Roberge (1990), Sportiche (1996) Cuervo (2003) and Hill and Tasmowski (2008), among others, I assume that accusative clitics are functional categories base-generated in their surface position that can be associated with a DP in argument position with which they agree in person, number, gender and case. This association is contingent upon the features exhibited by the determiner phrase (henceforth DP) and is subject to parametric variation.

For constructions where the accusative clitic occurs on its own, that is, it is not followed by an overt direct object DP in the same IP, it is assume that the direct object is in fact a [+pronominal] [- anaphoric] empty category, also known as 'pro'. This 'pro' is directly licensed by the presence of the accusative clitic with which it forms a chain for the purposes of case and theta role assignment. This and similar analyses are proposed by Jaeggli (1982), Borer (1984) and Sportiche (1996) and account for all languages and dialects that make use of accusative clitics, including those that do not permit clitic doubling, such as French.[6]

In accusative clitic doubling constructions, the overt DP associate of the clitic is also restricted in terms of its features. For instance, while in most Romanian dialects the accusative clitic in a doubling construction may only be associated with a [+human] [+specific/+restricted] DP; the accusative clitic in some Spanish dialects may only be

---

[6] Due to space limitations, I do not provide a detailed presentation of the syntax of clitics; rather, I refer the reader to Kayne (1975, 1991) Torrego (1995), Uriagereka (1995), Sportiche (1996), Suñer (1988) and Belletti (1999), among others.

associated with a [+animate] [+specific] DP.[7] It has been widely argued in the theoretical syntax literature that it is the accusative clitic that places restrictions on the material that it licenses in its associate DP. According to Sportiche (1996), these restrictions are subject to parametric variations triggered by the features that are present in the feature matrices of the clitic and its associate DP. Furthermore, he argues that the doubled DP moves to the specifier position of the accusative clitic phrase by LF (Logical Form) as an instance of Spec-Head licensing. Suñer (1988) also notes that in addition to person, number, gender and case, the accusative clitic in Spanish ACDC also agrees with features of animacy and specificity. Importantly, these restrictions and cross-linguistic differences are subject to parametric variation.

In this work, I assume that, in ACDC, the accusative clitic licenses its associate DP and enters in an agreement relation with it, where the functional features relevant to ACD are present in the feature matrices of the accusative clitic and of the DP, in line with Sportiche (1996) and Suñer (1988).

2.2. Accusative Clitic Doubling in Romanian and Spanish

As noted, the functional features relevant to ACDC are subject to parametric variation cross-linguistically and among dialects of the same language. That is, the configuration of the feature matrices of the accusative clitic and its associate DP in ACDCs are language and dialect dependent, as is the obligatory versus optional status of ACDC. This fact is of great importance to the present study, given that the object of investigation is the acquisition/resetting of the functional features relevant to ACDC in L2 Spanish. Consequently, this section centers on the differences between Romanian and Spanish in terms of the functional features involved in ACDC but also considers dialectal variation.[8] Moreover, two different types of Spanish dialects are considered here. These two types group Spanish dialects on the basis of the functional features relevant to ACDCs. This is necessary because the L2 learner in this study, like many L2 learners of Spanish in North American cities, has been exposed to Standard (European) Spanish, mainly through oral and written instructional input and literature, and to various Central and South American dialects of Spanish, through oral interaction. Importantly, in these dialect types, ACDCs are licensed under different functional feature configurations. Only one Romanian dialect is considered here because I am only concerned with the specific dialect spoken by the subject of the study and Romanian exhibits less cross-dialectal variation with respect to ACDC.

---

[7] According to Suñer (1988), the relevant feature for accusative clitic doubling in most dialects of Spanish is [+specific] rather than [+definite]. Also note that there is great variation among Spanish dialects in terms of the features relevant to ACDC.

[8] Here, the focus is placed on the descriptive facts and syntactic functional features that are directly relevant to the present study. Also, although discourse plays a role in the felicitous realization of some ACDCs, these issues are not discussed in the present work, where the focus is on narrow-syntax and the agreement of functional features. However, pragmatic (discourse) well-formedness was considered in the construction of the test items in the tasks.

2.2.1. Romanian ACDC

In Romanian, IP internal accusative clitic agreement is obligatory with [+human] nominals of the following types: personal pronouns (definite/specific), proper names, lexical bare nouns and definite DPs (where the DP [+restricted]) as in (4).[9] Note that all the aforementioned DPs are interpreted as definite, including the bare nouns. Indefinite DPs with lexical nouns can also be clitic doubled if they have a specific interpretation, as in (5).[10] Ungrammatical ACDCs (IP internally) include those with non-human DP-associates (irrespective of definiteness and/or specificity), as in (6); and human indefinite DPs that are not specific. Interestingly, even human DPs with a lexical noun that are marked as definite cannot be in an ACDC if the noun is not further restricted, as in (6). This ungrammaticality is independent of ACDC and is related to the linearization of the preposition and the definite article. This phenomenon is analysed by Dobrovie-Sorin (2007) as an instance of article-drop, a morpho-phonological rule that applies on the output of the syntactic derivation at PF (Phonetic Form). However, definiteness is present in the structure for the purposes of syntax and semantics. I will assume this analysis here. Below is a list that summarises the above descriptions.

Romanian ACDC only with [+ human] DPs
> **Obligatory:** definite/specific pronouns, proper names, bare nouns, [+def.] DPs with lexical N [+restricted]
> **Optional**: DPs with lexical N [-def] if [+ specific]
> **Ungrammatical:** DPs [-human], DPs with lexical N [+def.] [-restricted]

(4) L   -am   vazut pe el   / Ion / băiat / băiat-ul blond
    cl.3. sg. m.acc.; have 1 sg; seen   to   him/ John / boy   / boy-the blond
    'I saw him/John/the boy/the blond boy.'

(5) L   -am   vazut   pe un băiat (blond)
    cl.3. sg. m.acc.; have 1 sg;   seen   to a boy   (blond)
    'I saw a blond boy'

(6) *L   -am   vazut   pe /câine-(le)/băiat-ul
    cl.3. sg. m.acc;   have 1 sg; seen   to /dog-(le) / boy-the
    'I saw the dog/the boy'

---

[9] Descriptively, in examples like (4) the associate DP that has a lexical noun must be a human and must be further modified/ restricted by an adjective, relative clause, possessive or prepositional phrase.

[10] For the purposes of this paper I will assume Dobrovie-Sorin (1990, 1992), according to whom the relevant feature of the DP relative to ACDC is [+specific]. However, the specificity issue in clitic doubling constructions is not unproblematic and is still debated.

2.2.2. Spanish ACDC

In Spanish, IP-internal ACDC is subject to considerable dialectal variation; however, there is one feature of ACDC that is common to all dialects of Spanish. In all dialects of Spanish, ACDC is obligatory with pronouns, as in (7). Moreover, in many spoken dialects (including Peninsular Spanish) ACDC is optional with proper names, as in (8). Also, in the great majority of dialects the relevant animacy agreement feature in ACDCs is [+animate], (c.f. 8 and 10).[11] Dialectal variation related to ACDC consists of the extent to which clitic doubling is licensed with various types of DPs. Specifically, two main dialect types emerge relative to ACDC, which I arbitrarily call dialect 1 and dialect 2 for lack of genuine geographical cohesiveness.

Dialect 1 is mainly represented by Standard (European) Spanish and by dialects spoken in many regions of Central and South America and is characterised by the fact that it only licenses obligatory ACD with definite/specific pronouns that are animate and optionally with proper names.

In dialect type 2, spoken in parts of Spain and Central and South America, in addition to definite/specific pronouns and proper names, ACD is also optional with DPs with lexical nouns, provided that the DP is [+animate] (anim.) and [+ definite] or [+animate] and [- definite] [+specific], as in (8) and (9) respectively. ACDC is ungrammatical with inanimate DPs, as in (10) (see footnote7), with indefinite DPs that are not specific and with DPs with a lexical bare noun, as in (11). Below is a list that summarises the above generalizations.

Spanish ACDC, dialect 1:only with [+ animate] DPs
> **Obligatory**: definite/specific pronouns
> **Optional**: proper names (in spoken and colloquial Spanish)
> **Ungrammatical:** DPs with a lexical N

Spanish ACDC, dialect 2 only with [+animate] (see footnote 11)
> **Obligatory**: pronouns
> **Optional**: proper names; DPs with a lexical N [+animate], [+definite]; DPs with a lexical N [+animate], [-definite], [+specific]
> **Ungrammatical:** DPs [-animate]; DPs with lexical N [+animate], [-definite], [-specific], DPs with a lexical bare N

(7) *Ø/Lo   vi   a él.
    cl.3. sg. m.acc saw   to him   Belloro (2007)
    'I saw him.'

---

[11] A few Spanish dialects spoken in the Basque country, Madrid, Buenos Aires, Chile and Quito allow ACD with [-animate] DPs. These dialects are not considered in the present study. Although irrelevant for the purposes of this study, it should be mentioned that in some dialects of Spanish, referred to as the 'leista' dialect, the case marking on the direct object clitic is the one of dative instead of accusative.

(8) (La)   oían   a   Paca / a la   niña / a la   gata.
    cl.3. sg. f.acc   hear   to   Paca/ to the girl/   to the cat   Suñer (1988)
    'They listened to Paca / the girl / the cat.'   [+anim, +spec, (+def)]

(9) Diariamente, (**la**) escuchaba **a una mujer que cantaba tangos**.   Suñer (1988)
    'Daily, he/she listened to a woman who sang tangos.'   [+anim, +spec, (-def)]

(10) ***La**   compramos (**a**) **esa   novela**.
    cl.3. sg. f.acc bought   to   this   novel   Suñer (1988)
    'We bought that novel.'   [-anim, +spec, (+def)]

(11) *La   oían   a   niña / a   gata.
    They   listened to   girl/   to cat.
    'They listened to the girl/ to the cat'

2.3. Syntactic issues on the L2 acquisition of agreement in ACDC in Spanish L2 by Romanian L1

The above sections have established the feature relevant to accusative clitic doubling in Romanian and in two dialects of Spanish. I assumed that the features relevant to agreement in ACDC must be present in the feature matrix of the clitic and of the associate DP. In this section, I provide a brief review of the parameters that need to be changed from L1 Romanian to the two dialects of L2 Spanish in order to consider the resetting of the agreement clitic features in ACDC successful.[12]

Learners acquiring dialect 1 of Spanish must pre-empt the features of L1, Romanian, in order to successfully produce L2-like ACDC. Specifically, they must restrict the set of features that allows ACDC in Romanian, a superset, to the subset of features that allows ACDC in dialect 1. Recall that in Romanian ACD agreement is obligatory, with more types of DPs (specific/definite pronouns, proper names and definite/specific lexical Ns) than it is in Spanish dialect 1, which obligatorily licenses ACDC with [+specific]/[+definite, +pronominal] DPs and optionally with proper names. That is, the IL grammar of the successful learner will not licence ACDCs with [+animate, + specific, -pronominal] lexical DPs (or with [+human, +specific, +definite, -pronominal] DPs). Crucially, ACD is obligatory with the latter DPs in L1, Romanian. Moreover, the animacy features must be reset from L1 to L2: from [+human], a subset to [+animate], a superset.

Learners acquiring dialect 2 of Spanish also have to reset the animacy feature from [+human] to [+animate]. In addition, they must acquire that ACD with a bare lexical noun is ungrammatical in Spanish although it is obligatory in Romanian, and that a [+definite] [-restricted] DP with a lexical noun is grammatical in Spanish, yet ungrammatical in Romanian.

---

[12] The fact that L2 learners may have input from two or more different dialects can lead to an IL that has characteristics of more than one dialect yet is not L2-like. This issue does not arise in the present study where the L2 participant's forms are decidedly those of dialect1.

52

3. THEORETICAL SLA BACKGROUND

3.1. Brief overview of SLA hypotheses on the acquisition of functional categories and their features

This pilot experiment is concerned with the eventual acquisition of the features associated with functional categories, specifically, the features of the accusative clitic projection. It has been argued in the field of theoretical linguistics that FCs contribute greatly to cross-linguistic variation. Not only are functional categories not universally present cross-linguistically, but the features and the feature values associated with the FCs are subject to parametric variation. Thus, it is assumed that, while FCs, their features and feature values are present in UG, they are not necessarily instantiated in all languages. These assumptions are of particular interest to second language acquisition since L2 acquisition patterns of FCs, their features and feature values that are missing or distinct in L1, can provide direct evidence on the status of access to UG. In the debate on access or lack of thereof to UG principles, three main views can be distinguished: Full Access, No Access and Failed Feature Hypothesis, all of which I briefly present below.

According to the Full Access (Full Transfer) Hypothesis, L2 speakers have full and unimpaired access to UG. Schwartz and Sprouse (1994), Vainikka and Young-Scholten (1994) and Duffield et al. (1999, 2002) all argue in favor of the eventual acquisition of functional categories, their features and feature values. This Hypothesis assumes that mature IL grammars are subject to principles and constrains of UG. In consequence, the IL will be L2-like, at least as far as narrow syntax is concerned, and L1 properties are taken to be present only in the initial stages of acquisition as an instance of Full Transfer.[13]

Representative of the No Access Hypothesis are Clahsen (1988, 1990, 1991) and Meisel (1998) who conclude on the basis of studies observing verb raising and general knowledge of inflectional features that UG principles are not available to the adult L2 learner.

Under the Failed Feature Hypothesis, L2 learners are assumed to access only UG principles that are present in the L1. This view predicts that parameters cannot be reset and that L2 learners will use the parameters provided by the L1. This view was proposed by Schachter (1996) based on subjacency and XP movement. Tsimpli and Roussou (1991) reach a similar conclusion based on the acquisition of null subjects in L2, where they argue that parameters cannot be reset. This suggests that, in the case of FCs, L2 learners are restricted to the functional categories, their feature and feature values as instantiated in L1 since access to the properties of UG is taken to be only via L1. According to this view the inter language (IL) looks much like the L1 and, thus, obeys general UG principles.[14]

---

[13] Further studies that argue for the Full Access Hypothesis include Schwartz and Sprouse (1996, 2000b); Duffield et al. (1999, 2002) White (19845b, 1986, 2000, 2003) Yuan (1998), Slabakowa (2000)

[14] Other studies supporting the Failed Feature hypothesis include Hawkins (1998, 2000); Hawkins & Chan(1997); and Smith & Tsimpli (1995).

3.2. SLA Context of the Experiment

In this pilot study, I test the Full Access Hypothesis. I predict that an adult, native speaker of Romanian who is an advanced learner of L2 Spanish can reset the clitic features of L1 Romanian to those of the dialect of Spanish acquired and the IL grammatical judgments and production data of the L2 learner parallel those of a native speaker of the same dialect.[15]

For dialect 1, the IL grammar of the L2 learner will obligatorily license ACDC with [+pronominal, +specific, +animate] DPs and optionally with proper names, but not with [-pronominal, +specific, +human] DPs, as it is the case in L1. That is, the learner will pre-empt the features of L1. If on the other hand the learner acquired dialect 2, she will acquire that the definite article is not subject to the article-drop rule that is present in Romanian. Thus, the learner will judge as grammatical and may produce ACDC with DPs that [-pronominal, +specific] in the absence of further modification of the DP. She will also judge as ungrammatical ACDC with bare nominals, which are grammatical in L1. This hypothesis also predicts that, for both dialects, the animacy feature can be reset from L1 [+human] to L2 [+animate]. Thus [+animate, -human, +specific] DPs will be licensed in ACDC.

Previous research on accusative clitics has mainly been concerned with the acquisition of the clitic projection itself, its status as a functional category and its placement within the phrase, as in Duffield et al. (1999, 2002). Other studies considered the acquisition (at the stage of ultimate attainment) of clitics as they play out at the syntax-pragmatics/discourse, interface as in Valenzuela (2006), and Ivanov (2009). However, I am not aware of any studies that specifically target the functional features considered here, or the issue of feature preemption in light of IP internal ACDC.

4. THE PILOT EXPERIMENT

4.1. Participants

Since this pilot study is only concerned with ultimate attainment, I have chosen an advanced L2 learner who proved a high proficiency in a preliminary placement test of Spanish.[16] The L2 participant, a 21-year-old student, had been enrolled for the previous 3 years in Spanish courses (reaching the advanced level) at the University, which was the main source of Spanish input. She had also been exposed, in social settings, to different spoken dialects of Spanish, mainly from South and Central America (Colombia, Bogota; and Mexico, Mexico City). The participant is also fluent in English and French, both of which she had acquired as a teenager.

The two control participants each represent one of the dialects considered here. The first L1 speaker, speaks a dialect particular to Caracas, Venezuela, that does not permit IP

---

[15] As I am only concerned with the ultimate attainment of features I will make no predictions regarding the initial or intermediate stages of acquisition.

[16] Two other participants had been initially enlisted for the study; however, their results on the pre-test placed them at the intermediate and below intermediate proficiency.

internal ACDC with DPs other than animate pronominals and proper names. At the time of the study, he was 22 years old, had been living in Canada for one year and his social life was mainly conducted in Spanish. The second control participant speaks a dialect of European Spanish (Southern Spain) that uses optional IP-internal ACDC. He immigrated to Canada ten years prior to the test and spoke only Spanish at home with his family. He also socialized regularly with other Spanish speakers, mainly from Spain.

4.2. Methodology: Overview of the Tasks

The experiment consists of three different tasks. The first one, a grammaticality judgment task, is meant to expose the participant to ACDC and to control for avoidance and preference effects, which can be present in elicitation tasks, especially since ACDC is optional with lexical DPs in Spanish. The instructions specified that the sentences provided could be formulated differently, but corresponding alternative sentences (non-ACDC) were not provided in the judgment test in order to avoid preference effects. The participants were presented with 70 relevant sentences (10 sentences for each condition) and 50 distracter sentences, all of which were randomized. The distracters were very different constructions from those tested. Throughout the task, for each grammatical token an ungrammatical one was presented and vice-versa. Importantly, some of the grammatical sentences in Spanish have ungrammatical counterparts in Romanian. The acceptance of these sentences and the rejection of the ungrammatical Spanish sentences would indicate that the learner has reset the features under consideration in accordance with those of Spanish.

4.2.1. First Task: Conditions Tested, Stimuli and Predictions

Below is a table depicting the conditions tested, including the feature matrices of the associate DPs. Grammaticality is symbolized by (√) and ungrammaticality by (*). Following, is an example of the test items provided for condition 1.[17]
Table 1

Cond.	Associate DP	Romanian	Dialect 1	Dialect 2
1	lexical DP [+def.] [-restricted] [+human] [-pron.]	*	*	√ optional
2	lexical DP [+def.] [+restricted] [+human] [-pron.]	√ obligatory	*	√ optional
3	lexical DP [-def.] [-restricted]	√ optional	*	√ optional
4	Pronouns [+def.] [+pron.] (personal pronouns) proper names	√ obligatory	√ obligatory √ optional	√ obligatory
5	lexical DP [+def.] [+restricted]	*	*	√ optional

---

[17] For condition 1, in the ungrammatical sentences used as counterexamples for the grammatical ones, the definite article was left out so that they parallel the Romanian bare root NP (noun phrase) constructions. If the subject uses L1 parameters these sentences would be accepted as grammatical.

	[+animate] [-human] [-pron.]			
6	lexical DP [+animate] [+def.] [+human] [+restricted] [-pron.]	√ obligatory	*	√ optional
7	lexical DP [+def.] [+restricted] [-animate] [-human] [-pron.]	*	*	*

(12) Todos lo   felicitan   al   profesor por su conferencia
     All   cl:acc/3/sg/m congratulate to/PP-the professor for his lecture
   'Everyone congratulates the professor for his lecture'

The data obtained from the conditions depicted above allow us to infer whether the participant (1) reset the ACD parameters of L1 Romanian to L2 Spanish, dialect 1 or dialect 2; or (2) did not reset the ACD parameters to L2, rather they are those of L1; or (3) the ACD parameters are neither those of L1 nor those of L2.[18]

    If the participant acquired dialect 1, she will reject all the ACD constructions, except for those in condition 4. However, if she acquired dialect 2 she will judge as grammatical all ACDCs, except for those in condition 7. If the participant's L2 grammar has the ACD parameters of L1, she will reject the sentences in conditions 1, 5 and 7 and accept as grammatical those in 2, 3, 4 and 6. Any other combinations of grammaticality judgements indicate that the ACD parameters of the current IL of the participant are neither reset to those of L2 nor fully transferred from L1.

4.2.2. Second and Third Tasks: Conditions Tested and Predictions

The second and third tasks combine a translation task with an elicited production task. The translation task consists of four short paragraphs written in the form of stories in which [±definite], [±specific], [± animate] and [±human] accusative objects in the form of lexical DPs are manipulated. The stories use common vocabulary, which is easily accessible, and are written in English, which does not have clitics. This controls for the possibility of transfer of the clitic-doubling constructions from Romanian. Furthermore, the texts were constructed such that they provided felicitous discourse contexts for the use of ACD, which is discourse sensitive in Spanish, dialect 2. Each story is followed by a number of questions asking for the earlier manipulated DPs. The answers to these questions constitute the elicited production task. This task was included because it was observed within theoretical syntax literature that question-answer sequences can force the use of clitic doubling constructions (this has been attributed to the specificity and apparent topic-type character of the associate DP). In the instructions for this task, the participants are asked to provide as much information as possible in the answers, in order to further coerce ACDCs. It should be noted that many of the conditions tested involve constructions that trigger obligatory ACD in Romanian; thus, providing ample opportunities to observe L1 transfer if the case may be.

---

[18] It could also be argued that the learner's IL exhibits characteristics of the two dialects concurrently; however, this is not the case, as is revealed in the following section.

The following predictions are made for these tasks under the hypothesis tested here, Full Access. For Spanish dialect 1, there should be no ACDC, given that only lexical DPs are included here.[19] Lack of ACDC would also strongly suggest that the IL of the participant does not use the parameters of L1, given that many of the sentences in these tasks trigger obligatory/syntactic ACD in Romanian. For Spanish dialect 2, we predict that the participant will produce ACDCs that are consistent with the parameters of Spanish dialect 2.[20] That is, ACD will be present with [±definite] [+specific] DPs and with [+animate] [±human] DPs. This conclusion would be strengthened if the participant produces ACDCs with **[+definite, -restricted**, +human/animate] and [+definite, ±restricted, **+animate, -human]** DPs, which are ungrammatical in Romanian, and does not produce ACDCs with bare nouns, which are grammatical in Romanian, but ungrammatical in Spanish.

5. RESULTS

The L2 learner participant produced grammaticality judgements and elicited production data that were consistent with those of the L1 participant representing dialect 1 of Spanish: identicalness of grammaticality judgements and elicited production was observed in 100% of the ACD data (90% of the overall grammaticality judgements).[21] Below is a list of observations of the learner's linguistic behaviour relative to ACDC in Spanish, dialect 1.

- ❖ The learner judged as ungrammatical all ACDCs with lexical DPs (task 1)
- ❖ The learner did not produce any ACDCs with lexical DPs (tasks 2 and 3)
- ❖ The learner judged as grammatical all ACDCs with pronouns and proper names (task 1)
- ❖ The same linguistic behaviour was exhibited by the control subject of dialect 1 of Spanish (tasks 1-3)

The following generalizations can be inferred about the IL of the L2 learner on the basis of the above observations.

---

[19] A complete experiment should also include personal pronouns and proper names accusative objects in the elicitation task.

[20] Absence of ACDC in the elicitation task may also indicate that the participant's grammar is consistent with L2 dialect 2 at the narrow-syntax level but exhibits fossilization at the syntax-pragmatics/discourse interface. This interpretation of the results is consistent with the Interface Hypothesis, as proposed by Sorace (2006). Still, it must be recalled that such ACDCs are either obligatory or optional in Romanian. An in-depth consideration of this and other hypotheses will be warranted in a complete study.

[21] Given the decided convergence of results, the small sample of participants and the preliminary nature of the present investigation no advanced statistical analysis is necessary. A full-fledged study may need to include t-scores and multiple ANOVA test.

❖ In the IL, the functional category, the accusative clitic, and its feature matrix are consistent with those and only those of L2: the learner does produce ACDC in all and only those environments that license ACD in L2. Her grammaticality judgements and production data perfectly parallel those of the L2 dialect 1, the control participant for dialect 1, where the feature matrix of the accusative clitic that licenses ACD agreement in the IL corresponds to a subset of the feature matrix that licenses ACD in the L1.
❖ In the IL, the learner does not use all the clitic agreement features present in the L1: the learner judged as ungrammatical constructions that are obligatorily ACDC in L1. She also did not produce ACDC constructions in environments that trigger obligatory ACDC in L1.

6. CONCLUSION

The results of this study show that an advanced L2 learner of Spanish, dialect 1, whose L1 is Romanian can reset the feature matrix of the accusative clitic in ACDCs from a superset (that triggers agreement) in L1 to a subset in L2. In terms of SLA theories, the above results are consistent with the predictions made by the Full Access Hypothesis, according to which the IL grammar of the L2 learner is predicted to look much like that of mature grammars of native speakers, in this case Spanish, dialect 1. This is indeed the case in the present pilot study. The functional features of the accusative clitic that license ACD are those and only those of the L2. Moreover, the functional features involved in ACDC represent a subset of the features that trigger ACDC in L1. This indicates that the resetting of features took place in the absence of positive evidence and, according to a post-test questionnaire, in the absence of formal instruction on ACDC in L2. The issue of acquisition of functional features in the absence of positive evidence and formal instruction provides an interesting avenue of investigation for a complete study. Conversely, the results of the present study refute the Failed Features Hypothesis, which predicts that the IL grammar of the Spanish learner would resemble that of L1, here Romanian. However, the L2 participant judged as ungrammatical and did not produce forms that are obligatorily ACD in Romanian. Furthermore, The No Access Hypothesis is also not supported by these results since the features of the functional category of the IL are consistent with those of the L2. This suggests that the learner has access to UG in order to restrict the agreement feature matrix of the accusative clitic functional category to those of L2.

The conclusive results of the present pilot study suggest that by extending this investigation to a larger sample of participants more definitive results can be obtained; thus, contributing to a better understanding of the nature of L2 acquisition of agreement features in ACDC. This in turn will further contribute to identifying the extent of L2 learners' capacity to access UG and reset the features of functional categories of L1 to those of L2. It would be also very interesting to further investigate the resetting of functional features in the absence of positive evidence and formal instruction. Although this study is small in terms of participants, it provides a good indication that the tasks can be used on a larger scale study, albeit with some additions and alterations. For instance, the translation and elicitation tasks should also include sentences where ACD with

pronouns and proper names are elicited. These data would provide further evidence that L2 learners also produce ACD with pronouns and proper names. In the case of L2 learners who acquire dialect 2, these data would also help in testing the Interface Hypothesis, according to which learners at the ultimate attainment stage have native like forms in narrow-syntax but do exhibit residual effects of optionality at the interface between syntax and other grammar or cognitive modules, as in (Lardiere, 1998, 2006; Prévost & White, 1999, 2000; Sorace, 2000, 2003, 2005; Goad and White, 2006; Sorace and Filiaci, 2006). Given that in Romanian ACDC with lexical definite DPs is obligatory and that in Spanish dialect 2 ACDC with (definite/specific) lexical DPs is discourse sensitive, investigating the acquisition of ACDC at the syntax-discourse interface could provide additional insights into the acquisition of distinct grammar modules.

REFERENCES

Beck, M. 1998. L2 acquisition and obligatory head movement: English-speaking learners of German and the local impairment hypothesis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 20:311-348.

Belletti, A. (1999). Italian/Romance clitics: Structure and derivation. In *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, ed. H. van Riemsdijk, 543-579. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Belloro, V. 2007. Spanish Clitic Doubling: A Study of the Syntax-pragmatics Interface. Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo.

Birdsong, D. 1992. Ultimate attainment in second language acquisition. *Language* 68:706-755.

Borer, H. 1984. *Parametric Syntax: Case Studies in Semitic and Romance Languages*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

-----. 1986. *The Syntax of Pronominal Clitics, Syntax and Semantics 19*. Orlando: Academic Press.

Clahsen, Harald. 1988. Parameterized grammatical theory and language acquisition: A study of the acquisition of verb placement and inflection by children and adults. In *Linguistic Theory in Second Language Acquisition*, ed. S. Flynn and W. O'Neil, 47-75. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

-----. (1990). The comparative study of first and second language development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition* 12:135-154.

-----. (1991). Constraints on parameter setting. A grammatical analysis of some acquisition stages in German child language. *Language Acquisition* 1:361-391.

----- and U. Hong. 1995. Agreement and null subjects in German L2 development: New evidence from reaction-time experiments. *Second Language Research* 11:57-87.

Cuervo, María Cristina. 2003. Datives at Large. Ph.D. Dissertation, MIT.

Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen. 1990. Clitic doubling, *wh*-movement, and quantification in Romanian. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21:3.

-----. 1992. *The Syntax of Romanian: Comparative Studies in Romance*. Dodrecht: Foris.

-----. 1992. LF representations, weak islands, and the ECP. *GLOW Newsletter* 28:14-15.

-----. 2007. Article-drop in Romanian and extended heads. In *Pitar Mos: A Building with a View*: *Papers In Honor of Alexandra Cornilescu*, ed. Gabriela Alboiu, Andrei A. Avram, Larisa Avram and Dana Isac, 99-107. Editura Universitatii din Bucuresti.

Duffield, N. and L. White. 1999. Assessing L2 knowledge of Spanish clitic placement: Converging methodologies. *Second Language Research* 15:133-160.

----, L. White, J. Bruhn de Garavito, S. Montrul and P. Prévost. 2002. Clitic placement in L2 French: Evidence from sentence matching. *Journal of Linguistics* 38:487-525.

Goad, Heather and Lydia White. 2006. Ultimate Attainment in interlanguage grammars: A prosodic approach. *Second Language Research* 22(3):243-268.

Hamilton, R. (1998). Underdetermined binding of reflexives by adult Japanese-speaking learners of English. *Second Language Research* 14:292-320.

Hawkins, R. (1998). The inaccessibility of formal features of functional categories in second language acquisition. Paper presented at the "Pacific Second Language Research Forum", Tokyo, March 1998.

-----. 2000. Persistent selective fossilization in second language acquisition and the optimal design of the language faculty. *Essex Research Reports in Linguistics* 34:75-90.

-----. 2002. Incomplete acquisition and attrition of Spanish tense. *Linguistics* 34:75-90.

----- and Cecilia Yuet-hung Chan. 1997. The partial availability of universal grammar in second language acquisition: The "Failed functional features hypothesis" *Second Language Research* 13(3):187-226.

Hill, V. and L. Tasmowski. 2008. Romanian clitic doubling: A view from pragmatics-semantics and diachrony. In *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages,* ed. Dalina Kallulli and Liliane Tasmowski, 133-163. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ivanov, Ivan. 2009. Topicality and clitic doubling in L2 Bulgarian: A test case for the interface hypothesis. In *Proceedings of the 10th Generative Approaches to Second*

Language Acquisition Conference (GASLA 2009), ed. Melissa Bowles et al., 17-24. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. Available at: www.lingref.com, document #2253.

Ivanov, Ivan Prodanov. 2009. Second Language Acquisition of Bulgarian Object clitics: A Test Case for the Interface Hypothesis." PhD dissertation, University of Iowa. Available at: http://ir.uiowa.edu/etd/300.

Jaeggli, Osvaldo A. 1982. *Topics in Romance Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.

------. 1986. Three issues in the theory of clitics: Case, doubled NPs, and extraction. In *Syntax and Semantics 19: The Syntax of Pronominal Clitics*, ed. Hagit Borer. New York: Academic Press. 15-42.

Kayne, Richard. 1975. *French Syntax: The Transformational Cycle*. Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press.

Kayne, Richard S. 1991. Romance clitics, verb movement, and PRO. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22:647-686.

Lee, D. and J. Schachter. 1998. Sensitive period effect in binding theory. *Language Acquisition* 6:333-362.

Lardiere, Donna. 1998. Case and tense in the "fossilized" steady state. *Second Language Research* 14(1):1-26.

-----. (2000). Mapping features to forms in second language acquisition. In *Second Language Acquisition and Linguistic Theory*, 102-129, ed. J.Archibald. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

-----. 2006. Attainment and acquirability in second language acquisition. *Second Language Research* 22(3):239-411.

Leung. Yan-kit Ingrid. 2004. Gender agreement in nonnative Spanish: Evidence against failed features. *Applied Psycholinguistics* 25:105-133.

Meisel, Juergen. 1998. UG access revisited. Paper presented at the "18th Second Language Research Forum", University of Hawaii, October.

Prévost, Philippe and Lydia White. 1999. Finiteness and variability in SLA: More evidence for missing surface inflection. *Proceedings of the Annual Boston University Conference on Language Development* 23(2):575-586.

-----. 2000. Missing surface inflection or impairment in second language acquisition? Evidence from tense and agreement. *Second Language Research* 16(2):103-133.

Roberge, Y. 1990. *The Syntactic Recoverability of Null Arguments*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Schachter, J. (1989). Testing a proposed universal. In *Linguistic Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*, ed. S. Gass & J. Schachter, 73-38. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

-----. (1996). Maturation and the issue of universal grammar in second language acquisition. In *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*, ed. W.C. Ritchie and T.K. Bhatia, 159-193. San Diego: Academic Press.

Schwartz, Bonnie and Rex Sprouse. 1994. Word order and nominative case in non-native language acquisition: A longitudinal study of (L1 Turkish) German interlanguage. In *Language Acquisition Studies in Generative Grammar*, ed. T. Hoekstra and B. Schwartz, 317-368. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

-----. 1996. L2 cognitive states and the full transfer/full access model. *Second Language Research* 12:40-72.

-----. (2000). When syntactic theories evolve: Consequences for L2 acquisition research. In *Second Language Acquisition and Linguistic Theory*, ed. J. Archibald, 156-186. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Slabakova, Roumyana. (2000). L1 transfer revisited: The L2 acquisition of telicity marking in English by Spanish and Bulgarian native speakers. *Linguistics* 38:739–770.

-----. 2006. Is there a critical period for semantics? *Second Language Research* 22(3): 302-338.

-----. 2006. Learnabilty in the second language acquisition of semantics: A bidirectional study of a semantic parameter. *Second Language Research* 22(4):498-523.

-----. 2001. *Telicity in the Second Language*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Smith, Neil and Ianthi M. Tsimpli. 1995. *The Mind of a Savant*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Sorace, Antonella. 1999. Initial states, end-states and residual optionality in L2 acquisition. *BUCLD Proceedings* 23:666-674.

------. 2000. Syntactic optionality in non-native grammars. *Second Language Research* 16:93-102.

------. 2003. Near-nativeness. In *Handbook of Second Language Acquisition*, ed. M. Long and C. Doughty, 130-151. Oxford: Blackwell.

------. 2005. Syntactic optionality at interfaces. In *Syntax and variation: Reconciling the Biological and the Social*, ed. L. Cornips and K. Corrigan, 46-111. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

------. 2006. Gradedness and optionality in mature and developing grammars. In *Generative Perspectives*, ed. G. Fanselow, C. Fery, M. Schlesewsky and R. Vogel, 106-123. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

------ and Francesca Filiaci. 2006. Anaphora resolution in near-native speakers of Italian. *Second Language Research* 22:339-368.

Sportiche, Dominique.1996. Clitic constructions. In *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, ed. J. Rooryck and L. Zaring, 213-276. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

------. 1998. Pronominal clitic dependencies. In *Language Typology: Clitics in the European Languages,* ed. by H. van Riemsdijk, 679-710. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Suñer, M. (1988). The role of agreement in clitic-doubled constructions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6:391–434.

Torrego, Esther. 1995. On the nature of clitic doubling. In *Evolution and Revolution in Linguistic Theory,* ed. H. Campos and P. Kemchinsky, 399-414. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

-----. 1998. *The Dependencies of Objects*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Tsimpli, Ianthi-Maria and Anna Roussou. (1991). Parameter resetting in L2? *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 3:149-169.

Uriagereka, Juan. 1995. Aspects of the syntax of clitic placement in Western Romance. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26.79-123.

Vainikka, A. and M. Young-Scholten. 1994. Direct access to X'-theory: Evidence from Korean and Turkish adults learning German. In *Language Acquisition Studies in Generative Grammar*, ed. T. Hoekstra & B. Schwartz, 265-316. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Valenzuela, Elena. 2006. L2 end state grammars and incomplete acquisition of Spanish CLLD constructions. In *Inquiries in Linguistic Development: In Honor of Lydia White*, ed. R. Slabakova, S. Montrul and P. Prévost, 283-304. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Wexler, Kenneth. 1998. Very early parameter setting and the unique checking constraint: A new explanation of the optional infinitive stage. *Lingua* 106:23-79.

White, L. 1985. The acquisition of parameterized grammars: Subjacency in second

language acquisition. *Second Language Research* 1:1-17.

-----. 1985. The "pro-drop" parameter in adult second language learning. *Language Learning* 35:47-62.

-----. 1985. Is there a logical problem of second language acquisition? *TESL Canada* 2(2): 29-41.

-----. 1986. Implications of parametric variation for adult second language acquisition: An investigation of the pro-drop parameter. In *Experimental Approaches to Second Language Learning*, ed. V. Cook, 55-72. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

-----. 1986. Markedness and parameter-setting: Some implications for a theory of adult second language acquisition. In *Markedness*, ed. F. Eckman, E. Moravcsik and J. Wirth 309-327. New York: Plenum Press.

-----. 1999. M.S. *Universal Grammar in the Second Language: From Initial to Steady State.*

-----. 2000. Second language acquisition: From initial to final state. In *Second Language Acquisition and Linguistic Theory*, ed. J. Archibald, 130-155. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

-----. 2003. *Second Language Acquisition and Universal Grammar*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

-----. 2003. Fossilization in steady state L2 grammars: Persistent problems with inflectional morphology. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 6:129-141.

Yuan, B. (1998). Interpretation of binding and orientation of the Chinese reflexive *ziji* by English and Japanese speakers. *Second Language Research* 14:324-340.