Bamberger Beiträge zur Englischen Sprachwissenschaft

Bamberg Studies in English Linguistics

Begründet von / founded by Wolfgang Viereck

Herausgegeben von / edited by Manfred Krug, Heinrich Ramisch und / and Wolfgang Viereck

Barry Heselwood / Clive Upton (eds.)

Proceedings of Methods XIII

Papers from the Thirteenth International Conference on Methods in Dialectology, 2008

54

PETER LANG
Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften

This volume of papers from the 13th International Conference on Methods in Dialectology, held at the University of Leeds in 2008, collects together current research and recent methodological developments in the study of dialects by new and established scholars. It is organised into themed sections reporting on historical dialectology, dialect literature, the production of dialect maps and atlases, and the collection and organisation of material for dialect dictionaries and corpora. Perceptual dialectology and dialect intelligibility are also featured, and there are linguistic analyses of dialectal data from many language varieties.

Barry Heselwood is Senior Lecturer in the Department of Phonetics & Linguistics at the University of Leeds, where he teaches articulatory and instrumental phonetics.
Clive Upton, a specialist in English dialectology, is Professor of English Language in the School of English, University of Leeds, and pronunciation advisor to the OED.

www.peterlang.de

Proceedings of Methods XIII

Bamberger Beiträge zur Englischen Sprachwissenschaft

Bamberg Studies in English Linguistics

Begründet von / founded by Wolfgang Viereck

Herausgegeben von / edited by Manfred Krug,
Heinrich Ramisch und / and Wolfgang Viereck

Bd. / Vol. 54

PETER LANG
Frankfurt am Main · Berlin · Bern · Bruxelles · New York · Oxford · Wien

Barry Heselwood / Clive Upton
(eds.)

Proceedings of Methods XIII

Papers from the Thirteenth International Conference on Methods in Dialectology, 2008

PETER LANG
Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften

Bibliographic Information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the internet at http://dnb.d-nb.de.

D 473
ISSN 0721-281X (Print Ausgabe)
ISBN 978-3-631-61240-8 E-ISBN 978-3-653-00057-3

© Peter Lang GmbH
Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften
Frankfurt am Main 2010
All rights reserved.

All parts of this publication are protected by copyright. Any utilisation outside the strict limits of the copyright law, without the permission of the publisher, is forbidden and liable to prosecution. This applies in particular to reproductions, translations, microfilming, and storage and processing in electronic retrieval systems.

www.peterlang.de

CONTENTS

Editorial preface ix

Foreword by David Britain xi

List of contributors xiii

PART I. Historical Dialectology And Dialect Literature

1. Reallocation and codification in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Paris. *R. Anthony Lodge* 3

2. Attraction du germanique sur le roman, abandon de l'enclise et naissance du français. *Jean Feuillet* 21

3. Towards a history of English literary dialects and dialect literature in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries: the Salamanca corpus. *Maria F. García-Bermejo Giner* 31

4. From dialectology to diachrony: evidence from lexical and morpho-syntactic reconstruction in Romance dialects. *Michèle Oliviéri* 42

5. I'll tell o how Gilbert Scott sowd is mere Berry: 'A Lancashire Tale' as a source for Lancashire speech in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century. *Javier Ruano-García* 53

6. Northern English transported: the nineteenth-century goldrushes and the formation of a diaspora? *Katie Wales* 67

PART II. Maps And Atlases

7. Identifying dialect regions: specific features vs. overall measures using the Romanian Online Dialect Atlas and multidimensional scaling. *Sheila Embleton, Dorin Uritescu and Eric S. Wheeler* 79

8. Atlas of Ingrian Finnish dialects: making the most of our data. *Dmitri Evmenov & Mehmet Muslimov* 91

9. Choix technologiques pour l'informatisation de l'Atlas Linguistique de la Wallonie. *Nicolas Mazziotta* 100

PART III. Dictionaries And Corpora

10. The Nordic dialect corpus and database: methodological challenges in collecting data. *Janne Bondi Johannessen, Øystein Alexander Vangsnes, Signe Laake, Arne Martinus Lindstad, Tor Anders Åfarli* 113

11. The research centre for Modern Greek dialects and the Historical Dictionary of the Greek Language. *Chryssoula Karantzi* 123

12. The dialect dictionary: what is it good for? *Rob Penhallurick* 133

13. Retrieving the sound: applying speech synthesis to dialectal data. *Maria-Pilar Perea* 143

14. Dialect relations in the English Dialect Dictionary. *Christoph Praxmarer* 153

PART IV. Perceptual Dialectology And Dialect Intelligibility

15. Is Danish an intrinsically more difficult language to understand than Swedish? *Charlotte Gooskens, Vincent J. van Heuven , Renée van Bezooijen & Jos Pacilly* 163

16. RTT retelling method: an alternative approach to interdialectal comprehension testing. *Angela Kluge* 174

17. Dialect conceptions of Finns. *Marjatta Palander* 184

18. The influence of extra-linguistic factors on mutual intelligibility: some preliminary results from Danish and Swedish pre-schoolers *Anja Schüppert & Charlotte Gooskens* 194

PART V. Lexis, Grammar And Discourse

19. The correlation between morphological, syntactic and phonological variation in the Basque language. *Gotzon Aurrekoetxea* 207

20. 'Nice day, eh?': Canadian and New Zealand *eh* compared. *Georgie Columbus* 219

21. Using the web as a corpus: an analysis of the distribution and use of the BE *sat* construction. *Martina Häcker* 229

22. Filled pauses as evidence of L2 proficiency: Finnish Australians speaking English. *Timo Lauttamus, John Nerbonne & Wybo Wiersma* 240

23. Past participles as adjectives in Saarland German dialects. *Sabine Mayer-Saar* 252

24. Object clitic placement in the history of Cypriot Greek. *Panayiotis A. Pappas* 260

25. The preservation of morphophonological complexity in first language attrition: the case of Ingrian Finnish dialect in Estonia. *Helka Riionheimo* 270

26. Past habituality in traditional British English dialects. *Monika Edith Schulz* 279

27. Past Tense *Be*: old and new variants. *Anna-Liisa Vasko* 289

28. Goodbye *dolly*?: lexical erosion in the dialect of Sheffield *J.D.A.Widdowson* 299

29. Language variation and diffusion in Japan: research through the use of glottograms. *Akemi Yamashita & Yasushi Hanzawa* 310

PART VI. Phonetics And Phonology

30. On the relationship of two Japanese regional koines: evidence from pitch-accent patterns in Karafuto and Hokkaido Japanese. *Yoshiyuki Asahi* 321

31. Assessing rhoticity using auditory, acoustic and psycho-acoustic methods. *Barry Heselwood, Leendert Plug & Alison Tickle* 331

32. Dialect contact in the Anglophone community of Japan: modifications in the TRAP and BATH Vowels of American English Speakers. *Keiko Hirano* 341

33. Accommodating (ING): individual variation in mixed-ethnicity interviews. *Tyler Kendall* 351

34. Variability of phrasal tone in Fukuoka Japanese. *Ichiro Ota, Hitoshi Nikaido & Shoji Takano* 362

35. VOT variation in Japanese word-initial stops. *Mieko Takada* 372

Editorial Preface

We are very pleased to present this collection of papers from the 13th International Conference on Methods in Dialectology which was held at the University of Leeds in August 2008. The chapters are arranged in six themed sections – Historical Dialectology And Dialect Literature, Maps And Atlases, Dictionaries And Corpora, Perceptual Dialectology And Dialect Intelligibility, Lexis, Grammar And Discourse, and Phonetics And Phonology.

Our sincere thanks are due to all the authors, reviewers, conference participants and all those who helped in the organisation of what proved to be a very successful and enjoyable conference.

Last but by no means least we wish to thank Heinrich Ramisch, the Series Editor, for his very valuable advice and assistance.

Barry Heselwood and Clive Upton
Leeds, October 2009

Foreword

The *International Conference on Methods in Dialectology* is THE truly global meeting for those interested in language variation. It brings together specialists from all over the world and from all traditions of dialectology and its neighbouring disciplines – it is therefore the only forum where, for example, North American variationists can rub shoulders with Finnish traditional dialectologists and researchers from the Japanese dialectological tradition, where dialect dictionaries meet advanced computerised cartography, and where Varbrul meets vernacular dialect literature. And, as the title of the conference suggests, it is one of the only regularly occurring linguistics conferences that foregrounds *methodological* concerns, so crucial to good research, yet so rarely given the prominence they deserve in the published academic literature.

As the conference was to be held in England, then it was especially appropriate that it should take place at the University of Leeds, which has, more than any other university in the country, the right to call itself the home of English dialectology. It was from Leeds, of course, that the *Survey of English Dialects* was launched over 50 years ago, a survey that remains to this day the only systematic nationwide account of how England spoke.

This volume, edited by Barry Heselwood and Clive Upton, brings together a selection of the papers presented at the conference that took place in August 2008, reflecting both the diversity of approaches, traditions and speech communities as well as the healthy balance of method and theory that we have come to expect from the *Methods* conference. The papers draw evidence from almost twenty countries, and, in addition to examining variation, both past and present, in the structural building blocks of language, also reflect work in the rapidly expanding subdiscipline of perceptual dialectology, as well as in the applications of dialectology and its interactions with cartography, lexicography and literature.

David Britain
University of Bern, Switzerland

List of Contributors

Tor Anders Åfarli *Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim, Norway*

Yoshiyuki Asahi *The National Institute for Japanese Language, Japan*

Gotzon Aurrekoetxea *University of the Basque Country (UPV-EHU), Spain*

Renée van Bezooijen *University of Groningen, The Netherlands*

Georgie Columbus *University of Alberta, Canada*

Sheila Embleton *York University, Toronto, Canada*

Dmitri Evmenov *St. Petersburg State University, Russia*

Jean Feuillet *Université de Paris VIII, France*

María F. García-Bermejo Giner *University of Salamanca, Spain*

Charlotte Gooskens *University of Groningen, The Netherlands*

Martina Häcker *University of Paderborn, Germany*

Yasushi Hanzawa *Fukushima University, Japan*

Barry Heselwood *University of Leeds, UK*

Vincent J. van Heuven *Leiden University, The Netherlands*

Keiko Hirano *University of Kitakyushu, Japan*

Janne Bondi Johannessen *University of Oslo, Norway*

Chryssoula Karantzi *Academy of Athens, Greece*

Tyler Kendall *Duke University/North Carolina State University, US*

Angela Kluge *SIL International*

Signe Laake *University of Oslo, Norway*

Timo Lauttamus *University of Oulu, Finland*

Arne Martinus Lindstad *University of Oslo, Norway*

R. Anthony Lodge *University of Saint Andrews, UK*

Sabine Mayer-Saar *Saarland University, Germany*

Nicolas Mazziotta *Université de Liège, Belgium*

Mehmet Muslimov *Institute of Linguistic Studies, St. Petersburg, Russia*

John Nerbonne *University of Groningen, The Netherlands*

Hitoshi Nikaido *Fukuoka Jo-Gakuin University, Japan*

Michèle Oliviéri *University of Nice, France*

Ichiro Ota *Kagoshima University, Japan*

Jos Pacilly *Leiden University, The Netherlands*

Marjatta Palander *University of Joensuu, Finland*

Panayiotis A. Pappas *Simon Fraser University, Canada*

Rob Penhallurick *Swansea University, UK*

Maria-Pilar Perea *Universitat de Barcelona, Spain*

Leendert Plug *University of Leeds, UK*

Christoph Praxmarer *University of Innsbruck, Austria*

Helka Riionheimo *University of Joensuu, Finland*

Javier Ruano-García *University of Salamanca, Spain*

Anja Schüppert *University of Groningen, The Netherlands*

Monika Edith Schulz *Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Germany*

Mieko Takada *Aichi Gakuin University, Japan*

Shoji Takano *Hokuseigakuen University, Japan*

Alison Tickle *University of Newcastle, UK*

Dorin Uritescu *York University, Toronto, Canada*

Øystein Alexander Vangsnes *University of Tromsø, Norway*

Anna-Liisa Vasko *University of Helsinki, Finland*

Katie Wales *University of Nottingham, UK*

Eric S. Wheeler *York University, Toronto, Canada*

J. D. A. Widdowson *University of Sheffield, UK*

Wybo Wiersma *University of Groningen, The Netherlands*

Akemi Yamashita *Meikai University, Japan*

Part I

Historical Dialectology And Dialect Literature

1. Reallocation and codification in seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Paris

R. Anthony Lodge

University of Saint Andrews, UK

1. Introduction

Histories of French usually structure their narrative around the development of the standard language, following the processes identified by E. Haugen in his classic 1968 study of standardisation: *selection* of the speech of Paris as the basis for the future standard in the thirteenth century, *elaboration* of the functional capacity of French in the later Middle Ages, *codification* of the norms of the standard language during the early-modern period, and *acceptance* of standard French by the relevant population during the nineteenth-twentieth centuries (see for example Lodge 1993). This top-down approach works well in France, thanks to the dominant position occupied since the thirteenth century by the country's capital city. However, a model which locates the engine of language change primarily in the standard language is hard to reconcile with the idea that linguistic change develops essentially in the everyday interactions of ordinary speakers, and involves the speech community as a whole, not merely as passive recipients of the standard, but as active participants in the development and diffusion of new linguistic norms. Pressure for linguistic uniformity undoubtedly comes from top-down standardisation, but it also comes from bottom-up levelling and koineization (Hornsby 2006). In this paper, I will argue that the codification movement in seventeenth-eighteenth-century Paris, while obviously forming part of the standardisation process, had its roots in an ongoing (and more basic) process of koineization in the city. We may see the codification of French at this time, in part at least, as an explicit form of what Trudgill (1986) calls 'reallocation'.

Our attention will focus on a series of political pamphlets which were circulated in Paris at various points in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, satirising the political and religious establishment of the day. The interesting feature of these (highly ephemeral) texts is that their authors presented their criticism of the establishment as emanating from the Common Man, adopting the voice of the Common Man, mimicking low-class speech, and modifying conventional orthography to represent vulgar pronunciation. Parodies such as these have to be approached with caution, but, read intelligently, they provide potentially useful material for the historical sociolinguist: they might broaden

our vision of the range of linguistic variables present in seventeenth-eighteenth-century Parisian speech, beyond the restricted confines of the literary *salons*. Since they involve caricature and stereotyping, they might give us an image of the relative salience of particular vernacular features. Since they span two centuries, they might provide insights into the development of codification and linguistic change. But before considering the texts themselves, let us sketch the earlier history of Parisian French, and the demographic and social context in which these texts were written.

2. The historical context

2.1 Origins of Parisian French

For the Neogrammarians, the origins of Parisian French were unproblematic: medieval Paris was situated in the Ile-de-France, so the speech of Paris was simply the dialect of that region. They chose to call this dialect *le francien* to distinguish it from the standard language (*le français*) which emerged out of it. The *francien* hypothesis remained the orthodox one until the 1970s, by which time dialect surveys in the Ile-de-France had revealed that the speech of the rural hinterland of Paris was significantly different from that of the city itself. City speech (*le français*) embodies basic features of the Ile-de-France dialect, marking it off from Picard, Norman, Champenois etc., but it also contains elements acquired from dialects spoken outside the Ile-de-France, notably Norman and Champenois.

Historically speaking, Parisian French is a mixed dialect. How could such a mixture have arisen? The explanation currently in vogue is the one articulated by Cerquiglini (1993:124): the mixed variety, which subsequently became standard French, was created initially in writing by an enlightened group of administrators and literary men working, at a very early date, in the long-term interests of the nation. This written *koinè* was progressively diffused top-down through Paris society as a model for speech, reaching speakers situated at the bottom of the pile only after the 1789 Revolution and universal education (Fondet 1995:201).

The plausibility of this account suffers from a reluctance to take social and demographic factors adequately into account. At a period when levels of literacy were very low, it is hard to imagine the written language having any impact on the speech of a large population. Moreover, once we set the history of Parisian French in the context of the demographic history of the city, we find that the beginnings of Parisian French coincide with the beginnings of Paris as a metropolis: during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries Paris came from almost nowhere, demographically, to become the largest human concentration in Europe, with a population some historical demographers put at 200,000. Given the conditions of life (and death) in medieval towns, demographic growth on

this scale could only come about through sustained immigration from the surrounding dialect-speaking provinces. Analogous patterns of urbanisation in the modern world (e.g. in Abidjan and Brasilia) invariably result in dialect-mixing and new-dialect formation. We have no direct evidence to show this process at work in twelfth-century Paris, but the results are there for all to see – a new urban dialect which progressively detached itself from the dialect continuum of north Gallo-Romance. Koineization and levelling did not, of course, stop in the thirteenth century: they have been a fact of life in Parisian French ever since.

2.2 Parisian French in the Early Modern period

The Renaissance saw the beginnings of language standardisation in all the emerging nation states of Europe. In France, this movement was enacted essentially in Paris, where extraordinary efforts were deployed to codify the rules of the standard language. Conventional histories of this period tend to treat the standard language as synonymous with the language itself: 'The seventeenth century may be characterised as a period of rigid codification of French, in contrast to the richness, expansion and relative freedom of usage of the previous century'. They portray the process of codification as being initiated and directed by groups of learned and cultivated individuals, encouraged by the State, injecting order and rationality into the language, in order for it to supersede Latin as the H language of the country (and indeed the continent) and to outshine all the other vernaculars, notably Italian. They see the basis for the codification as being rooted in universal principles of clarity, precision and elegance.

The plausibility of this account suffers from a reluctance to see the standard language as part of a wider array of language varieties, and the codification movement as a reflection of broader social concerns. A stable urban population became established in Paris probably in the thirteenth century, but beneath it there existed a floating population showing various degrees of detachment from their rural (dialect-speaking) roots and integration with the urban community. During the late medieval and early modern period, the population of Paris fluctuated wildly, as a result of bad harvests, epidemics and prolonged periods of warfare. Paris was like an accordeon, pulling in population at one point in the economic cycle and pushing it out at another. From a low base caused by the Wars of Religion, the first half of the seventeenth century saw the population of Paris double in size through in-migration. It is in this context of social and linguistic insecurity that we must set the intense activity in linguistic codification associated with figures like Malherbe (1630) and Vaugelas (1647), and the French Academy (founded in 1636).

Social stratification in Paris, as elsewhere in Europe, had changed significantly in the course of the sixteenth century. Following the model of the

Italian cities, large sections of the landed aristocracy began moving into the city. Proto-industrial cities were everywhere the locus of conflict (a) between the elites and the masses, and (b) within the elites themselves (between the traditional urban patricians and their new aristocratic arrivals). The whole movement of the Renaissance and Enlightenment has been seen in terms of the development of a new high culture, distancing the urban elites from the ancestral low culture of the mass of the population (Hohenberg & Lees 1985:150). Urbanity became an object of prestige, rusticity one of disparagement. The sociolinguistic world-view of Parisians looks indeed to have become dominated by an opposition between Good Usage and Bad Usage, embodied in the cultural prototypes of the 'Gentleman' (the *Honnête Homme*) and the 'Urban Peasant' (the *Paysan de Ville*). The voice of the former is attested in all the 'good' literature of the period. But what of the latter? The vernacular of early modern Paris has, as always, left few traces in the historical record. We can hear it occasionally in the writings of the less-educated (Branca-Rosoff & Schneider 1994), in relic forms surviving in the French exported to North America (Mougeon & Béniak 1994), and in metalinguistic comments by grammarians and lexicographers (Thurot 1881-3). We hear it too in literary parodies of colloquial speech.

3. Parodies of low-class Parisian speech

Parisians started mimicking the French spoken by outsiders as early as the twelfth century. To begin with, the outsiders were non-Parisians established in the city – Italians, Anglo-Normans, Picards, Limousins. At the time of the Renaissance, Parisians began finding outsiders among their fellow citizens in the sump of half-assimilated rustics which had become such a feature of life in the city. The uncultivated speech of these *paysans de ville* was mimicked in popular farces and comic poems in the sixteenth century, and in novels, burlesques and comedies in the seventeenth century, most famously in the work of Cyrano de Bergerac and Molière. In the eighteenth century, this low-class variety finally gets a name – *Poissard* – associated with the fishwives in the Halles market. If Paris has ever had an equivalent of London's Cockney, this is probably it. Plays, songs and poems, written in *Poissard* style, continued to be popular until the middle of the nineteenth century.

Alongside these literary texts, the middle of the seventeenth century sees parodies of vernacular speech in more scurrilous material – polemical pamphlets written at the time of the Fronde (1648–1653) – a mini civil war waged in the Paris region at the time of the more serious Civil War in Britain. A striking feature of the use of language in these texts is that vernacular forms serve not to ridicule the boorishness of people at the bottom of the pile, but to satirise the malfeasance of people at the top. The most celebrated example of texts of this

type are *Les Agréables Conférences de deux paysans de Saint Ouen et de Montmorency sur les affaires du temps (1649-1651)* (Deloffre 1999). However, the same techniques continued to be used in the eighteenth century with the *Sarcelades* of Nicolas Jouin (Randell 2008), the *Lettres de Montmartre* (Lodge 1995), and a whole spate of pamphlets distributed at the time of the 1789 Revolution (Cook 1994).

3.1 Two specimen texts

The language of the *Agréables Conférences* has been analysed and described in detail, and has distracted researchers from a whole set of similar texts, known as *Mazarinades* (so called because they targeted the chief minister of the time, Cardinal Mazarin). Here are short extracts from two specimen texts:

Text 1 (1644)

Nouveaux Complimens de la place Maubert, des halles, cimetière S.-Jean, Marché neuf, et autres places publiques. Ensemble la résjouissance des harengères et poissonnières faite ces jours passés au gasteau de leurs Reines, Paris, 1644.

LA RENCONTRE ET COMPLIMENTS DE DEUX FRUICTIERES.

La Première: Bon vespre, dame Quienette! Hé! qu'est-ce, comme va la santé? Comment se porte st homme et vos enfants? Je n'ay pas velu passé dans ce quarqué-ci sans avoir le bonheur de vous vouer!

La Deuxième: Je nous portons bien, Guieu marci! tretou cheu nou, à vot

sarvice; mais que bien vou sçait, vou voyé la plus malade. Queule bonne affaires ou queu bon van vous amène en ces quarquiez?

La Première: C'est que je vien de la halle, faire marché à note garnetière de tras ou quatre sequiez de pouas. Ce n'est pas que n'en ayains faite notre bonne fournication dez le mouas d'oux; mais j'avons peur que je n'en avain pas assé, et je tramblon d'apprehendation qu'on ne nou les rancherisse. Et pis aprè ne dit en

pas *beati-geniti* vau bien pus mieux que *beati auorum.*

La Deuxième: C'est pourquoy je vous scay bon gré d'avoir fait le voyage que vous vené de faire. Je pance, pour moy, que j'en auron assé: car nous n'en vendon qu'à des pauve personnes, et je les faison cuire à la grosse mode, en pleine yau: je bouton tras sciaux d'yau dans un grand chaudron, puis j'y metton environ demy boiciau de pouas, et quant y sont un peu trop clairs, j'y laissons les escales et meslons avec cela des chapelures de pain salé, cela les fait senty un peu de sé, et pi j'y bouton un petit tantinet de faines harbes. Mamie, y trouvon cela si bon qu'i en lichon leur doigts, encore trop heureux à qui en aira.

La Première: Je n'oseriain faire cela à note quarqué, y sont trop friandes, et si faineman madrées, seulement quan ti trouvon queuque gra vouas croquez sous lieus dans, y nous faison de grosses repluches dans note bouticle, soit qu'en lieu donne des colles; y s'en von tou grondans en nou donnan des fièvre quartaine. Mais pour les espinars, j'y on faict un peu note petit comte, et si j'y hachiain des fueilles de poirée, m'amie, je n'en on pas a demy.

La Deuxième: Aguieu! C'est trop babillé. En vous remarciant.

La Première: Et attendez, en ira au vin.

La Deuxième: Nennin, je ne boiray pas davantage. C'est la mode de Paris: quand on est à la porte on prie de boire. Et aguieu; je me recommande.

Vostre très-humble et affectionné serviteur. Le Boiteux, *Dit le Beau Chanteur*.

(éd. E. Fournier 1859:229-239)

Text 2 (1649)

La Gazette de la Place Maubert. ou suitte de la Gazette des Halles touchant les affaires du temps SECONDE NOUVELLE[…]

D. DENISE

Mamy tout les jours à tout heure
Jamais on un lieu ne demeure.
Il passe les nuicts à cheva
Par ma foy il a bian du ma 4
Parguieu je ne suis qu'une fame,
Mais je vous jure par mon ame
Que le jour qu'on nous vint querir
Que nous allisioos secourir 8
G'y coru comme une perduë
J'u casi la teste fenduë
Car ces giuebles de Mazarins
Ne visions pas où ils frappins. 12
Je pary de ma hallabard
Demandez à dame Filbarde
A me servira de tesmoing
Par ma foy je ne vous m'en point 16
Insi moy qui estoit en furie
Je fandy la cavallerie,
Mais je ne faisois pas trois pas
Que je ne tombisse par bas. 20
Car nous estions tous pelle melle,
Les mousqués plus drus que la gresle
Petiens la de touales costes.
Guien don les autres espouvantez, 24
Prindre comme tu dis la fuitte.
Dieu sçait si on alioit en fuitte
C'estoit marveille de les voir
Ses animaux se laissing choir. 28
On les tuoit à toute outrance
C'est la ou je vis la vaillance
De mon bon Monsieur de Biaufort
Y lan frappy luy seul à mort 32
Bien plus d'une demy douzaine.
Enfin il estoit hors d'haleine
Cy tu sçavois quand je le vi
Je failly de m' esvanouy 36
Qui n'ut pleuré a chaude larme?
Per ma foy n'en faut point manty,
Jamais je ne m'en put teni.
De le voir la luy mesme en arme 40

D. BARBE

On dit que l'armée estoit belle,
C'on n'en vit jamais une telle,
Car tout nos bon Praince & Seigneurs
I fure avec tout leurs Messieurs 44
Ma foy je voudroi pour grand chore
Avoir veu cela & pour caure
Et je voudroi pour un teston,
Avoir esté à Chalenton 48
Où se fit la si grand carnage.
C'est par ma foy pourtant domage
Il ly mourut bien des Signeurs
Qui auriens bien sarvy ailleurs 52
Tant de soldat que capitaine
La canpagne estoit toute plaine.
On dit c'on n'y voyoit que feu.
Las ce bon Monsieu de Clanleu 56
Ne fit-il pas bien la paraistre
Qui n'avoit jamais esté traistre,
Car on avoit biau luy crié
Ren toy Clanleu, point de carquié, 60
Respondy t'il comme home sage
Car y montry la son courage.
Apres Monsieur de Chastillon
Qui estoit plus vayant qu'un Lion 64
Ne perdit-il pas la la vie
Rohan à sa belle sortie
Et tant d'autre qu'on ne sçait pas,
Mais vramen y ne m'ennui pas. 68

Je cause ly a plus d'un heure.

D. DENISE

Demeuse come se demeuse.

(Bibliothèque Mazarine, MS 12965/ MS 21013)

3.2 Vernacular forms

Because these texts were designed to be read aloud, the authors felt the need to modify conventional orthography to steer the reciter towards particular vernacular pronunciations. The non-conventional spelling systems they devised are a far cry from the scientific alphabets designed by grammarians like Meigret (1980 [1550]) in the sixteenth century and Vaudelin (Martinet 1969) in the eighteenth. The spellings they propose represent low-class pronunciation in a very approximate way. Occasionally one senses that bizarre spellings were used simply to make the text look more illiterate, an impression strengthened by the large number of printing errors which survive in these hastily produced documents. Table 1 lists vernacular variants used by the authors of texts 1 and 2, with references to comments made by contemporary grammarians.

Table 1

Phonetics

(1) [ɛr] ~ [ar] Estienne (1582): «Plebs […] praesertim Parisina hanc literam a pro e in multis vocibus pronuntiat, dicens Pierre […] guarre […] at vero aulici […] caterrhe pronun tiant.» (quoted by Thurot, 1881-3, t. I: 18-l9). See also Brunot (1966, t. X/1: 94-95), Joseph (1987:135, 148-49), Ayres-Bennett (1990:154-15).

Text 1 1644	Text 2 1649
marci (4), *sarvice* (4), *remarciant* (24)	*marveille* (27), *sarvi* (52). *Cf. per (38) = par.*

(2) Distribution of [e], [wɛ], [wa] Bèze (1584): 'Pour voirre ou, comme d'autres l'écrivent, verre, on prononce vulgairement à Paris et on écrit très mal voarre.' (quoted by Thurot, 1881-3, t. I: 356-359, 362, 375, 394, 411-13). See also Brunot (1966, t. X/1: 95-96), Joseph (1987:136-37, 150-51) and Ayres-Bennett (1990:155-56).

vouer (3) *sçait* (5) *tras* (7, 14) *pouas (8, 15), mouas (8)*	—

(3) [o] ~ [jo] Péletier (1549): 'Les Parisiens ... au lieu d'un séau d'éau diset un sio d'io.' (quoted by Thurot, 1881-3, t. I: 439-40).

sciaux (14), *yau* (14), *boiciau* (15)	*Biaufort* (31), *biau* (59)

(4) [o] ~ [ɔ] in initial syllables Vaugelas (1647): 'Plusieurs Parisiens doivent prendre garde à une mauvaise prononciation de ce verbe, que j'ay remarquée mesme en des personnes celebres à la chaire et au barreau [...] ils prononcent commencer tout de mesme que si l'on escrivoit guemencer.' (quoted by Thurot, 1881-3, t. I:268). See also Brunot (1966, t. X/1:90-91).

velu (2)	—

(5) Opening of nasal vowels Tabourot (1587): ‘Les Parisiens prononcent [...] un a au lieu d’une e, surtout quet il suit un i’; ‘ient est de molle prononciation [...].’ (quoted by Thurot, 1881-3, t. II:438, 462).

van (4), *tramblon* (9), *rancherisse* (10), *pance* (13), *faineman* (19), *dans* (20)	*bian* (4)

(6) Opening of [i] + nasal consonant > [ɛ]

faines (17), *faineman* (19)	—

(7) Reduction of [ɥi] > [i]

pis (10), *pi* (17) *cf. puis* (15)	*ly* (69)

(8) Rhotacism Erasmus (1528): ‘Idem faciunt hodie mulierculae Parisinae, pro Maria sonantes Masia, pro ma mere, ma mese.’ (quoted by Thurot, 1881-3, t. II:270-274). See also Joseph (1987:155-156) and Ayres-Bennett (1990:157).

—	*demeuse* (70). *Cf. chore* (45), *caure* (46).

(9) Velarisation of [dj] and [tj] This development is not mentioned in Thurot (1881-3), but it is widely attsted in the dialects of d’Ile-de-France (see *ALF*,maps 403, 404, 846).

Guieu (4), *aguieu* (24, 28) *quarqué* (2, 19), *quarquiez* (6), *sequiez* (8)	*Parguie* (5), *guiebles* (11), *guie* (24), carquié (60)

(10) Reduction of the group consonant + [rə]

vot (4), *note* (7, 19, 21, 22), *pauve* (13) *Cf. bouticle* (21)	—

(11) Elision of post-vocalic [r] Duez (1639): ‘Le petit peuple de Paris prononce cueillié [...]. Les honnestes bourgeois y disent cueillère [...]. Nous disons cueillèr en Anjou: et cette prononciation est la véritable.’ (quoted by Thurot 1881-3, t. I:198, 270, t. II:5, 150, 171). See also Ayres-Bennett (1990:156-157).

1644	1649
senty (17) Cf. *sé* (17)	*esvanouy* (36), *manty* (38), *teni* (39) Cf. *ma* (4), *cheva* (3)

(12) Elision of pre-consonantal [l] Richelet (1680): ‘(kécun et kéque) tous les Parisiens qui parlent bien les prononcent en faisant sentir la lettre l’.

queuque (20) Cf. *queule* (5), *queu* (5),	—

Morphology

(1) Subject pronouns	1644	1649
elle	—	*a* (15)
nous	*- je* + *-ons* (4, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15, 16, 17, 22, 23)	—

on *leur*	- *en* (10, 21, 25) *Cf. on* (9) - *lieu* (21)	— —
(2) Demonstrative adjectives		
cet	*st* (2)	—
(3) Verb-endings	1644	1649
Présent 6e p. en - *ont*	- *trouvon* (18, 20), *lichon* (18), *faison* (20)	—
Imparfait/condition-nel/présent du sub-jonctif 4 p. en -*ain*	- *ayains* (8), *avains* (9), *hachiain* (23)	—
Imparfait/conditionnel 6e p. en -*ain*	- *oseriain* (19)	- *visions* (12), *frappins* (12), *laissings* (28), *petiens* (23), *auriens* (52).
Passé simple/ imparfait du subjonctif en -*i*	—	- *frappy* (32), *montry* (62). *allisioos* (8), *tombisse* (20).
(4) Irregular verbs	1644	1649
avons (ind. prés. 4e p. d'*avoir*)	- *on* (22)	—

Lexis

	1644	1649
Swear-words	—	—
Archaisms	*vespre* (1), *tretou* (4), *escales* (16), *bouton* (17), *fièvre quartaine* (22) *nennin* (27)	—
Colloquialisms	*tantinet* (17), *colles* (21)	—
Deformation of Learned words	*fournication* (8), *apprehendation* (9)	—
Proverbial expressions	*beati-geniti vau bien pus mieux que beati auorum* (10-11) *C'est la mode de Paris: quand on est à la porte on prie de boire* (27-28)	—

4. Linguistic value of the texts

The way scholars estimate the evidential value of texts like these has changed significantly since they were first brought to public attention by Charles Nisard (1872).

4.1 The Neogrammarian approach

Heavily influenced by romanticism, the Neogrammarians considered pre-industrial culture to be more 'natural', more 'spontaneous', less subject to social convention than that of the modern age. For scholars like Nisard (1872) and

Rosset (1911), these political pamphlets were authentic popular texts, recording in a faithful way low-class speech under the Ancien Régime. They offered a slice of dialectal life. What confirmed them in this view was that the vernacular forms found in these pamphlets were all the subject of prescriptive comments by the seventeenth-eighteenth-century grammarians then being collated by Charles Thurot (1881-3), and many were showing up in the dialect atlases currently in preparation (notably the *Atlas linguistique de la France* (1901-1911)). The Neogrammarians observed, quite rightly, that the individual vernacular features present in these texts were perfectly authentic. After the publication of Rosset's thesis, scholars lost interest in texts of this sort, until the publication fifty years later of Deloffre's edition of the *Agréables Conférences*. However, by this time scholars had adopted a rather lower estimation of the linguistic value of these texts.

4.2 The structuralist approach

Parisian linguists in the last third of the twentieth century, heavily influenced by structuralism, showed little interest in language variation. They stressed the conventional, non-natural character of linguistic systems, playing down the importance of extra-linguistic (referential) relations between signs and the 'real world', in favour of intra-linguistic relations between the different parts of the linguistic system. Our body of texts mimicking the speech of the proletariat had virtually no linguistic interest for structuralists. The stylisation and exaggeration of the vernacular features present reduced their referential value to zero: what we have here, they believed, is a stereotyped, conventional representation of uneducated speech, maintained by a cultured elite with profound disdain for popular culture. The similarities they observed between the language of these texts and literary depictions of proletarian speech in authors like Molière confirmed their belief that these texts were simply the products of a literary convention. The popular speech represented in these parodies floated in some extra-terrestrial sphere with no attachment to any popular speech observable in the real world.

4.3 A sociolinguistic approach

A historical sociolinguist will be the first to recognise the limitations of data such as these. Our political pamphlets, far from being authentic vernacular data, are artefacts. The majority of them are anonymous, but what little we know about their authors tells us that they were all educated people. Because people who write are also people who read, the authors of these texts were necessarily influenced by their predecessors, and literary conventions can be very powerful and persistent. These parodies of vernacular speech necessarily involve selection, stylisation and exaggeration of particular linguistic variants. But does this automatically destroy their evidential value? It is too easy to see these texts

simply as an exercise in intertextuality. Their success as polemic required that the language being mimicked corresponded to a reality which the public could recognise. The mechanical application of a fossilised literary convention, elaborated in upper-class salons, would have done nothing to strengthen their satirical impact. To help gauge the linguistic value of these texts, let us look at the degree of fossilisation present in these representations of popular speech.

All of these parodies of low-class speech are similar, but, with a degree of implicational scaling in the variants selected, no two are identical. A simple comparison between Texts 1 and 2 above reveals how the caricature varies between two authors writing at roughly the same date. Comparison with other analogous texts shows that the caricature also varies across space, and it changes with time. Most of the political pamphlets in this 'genre' were produced for circulation in Paris, but there survive numerous specimens which were produced for provincial readerships. We can point to the *Dialogue de trois vignerons du pays du Maine sur les misères de ce temps par Jean Sousnor, sieur de la Nichilière,* produced in Le Mans in 1624 (Chauveau to appear), the *Dialogue de deux Guépeins sur les affaires du temps*, printed in Orleans in 1649 (ed. Moreau, *Choix de Mazarinades*, t. 1, p. 88-89), and *Les Maltotiers ou les Pecheurs en eau trouble. En vers Burlesques, langue Normande. Les Pesqueux en yau trouble*, circulated in Rouen in 1649. The vernacular features present in these texts involve regional forms which are absent from the Parisian pamphlets, but which are fully attested in the region concerned. The authors were not simply locked into a Parisian literary convention.

The *Agréables Conférence* (Text 3) were printed in Paris at the time of the Fronde (1649). They take place, ostensibly, in the outlying villages of St-Ouen and Montmorency. A century later (1749), Nicolas Jouin used the same convention in his *Sarcelade* (Text 4), where the action takes place in the village of Sarcelles, located not far away. By situating these texts outside the city limits, the authors were not necessarily targetting the rustic speech of the Ile-de-France. They were aiming more broadly at speech felt to stand outside the bounds of civilised society, i.e. speech which was culturally *extra muros.*

Text 3

Extract from the *Agréables Conférences* (1649)

Hé ban n'importe cest une tache douile, ça sen va à la leuscivre. Mai say tu ban que je revinme jesque dan nout vilage: bon jou bon soir, je ne sçay san que tu devins, je m'en alli sous l'orme, où je trouvi nout vilage amassé qui m'attendien pour var le zerticle de la Paix. Dé que je fu venu, nan lé baiy à luise à Colin, qui lui queme un Ange, quer y chante l'Eupitre queme un enragé, quan y leust luy tou depi un bou jesqu'a l'outre, vla tou le mondre qui se boutte a marmuze: voize diset lun, vla ban opezé, je some ban planté pour rvardi, nou vla tretou oussi gras que de liau; queman sdiset loutre, ne vlati pas la taye à cu, morgué je nan poigeron poen ce quarquié cy; ban entandu slidije, quer jay beu l'argen de mon viau, je nan poigeray poen; ty es laisti chouar sdit le receveux, stu nas poen doutre chifflet ton chian est pardu, nan ne tan rabattra pas une oborle, lui ce

placart tou ton sou, si tu li trouve je veux que nan me pele la berbe. Enfen je feme luize é reluize, é à la parfen nan conclui qui nan jazet rian, é qui diset an seuleman que le Rouay an fezait sn'infirmation pour y prouvoar selon Guieu é rairon. Là dessu nan tin consey, é nan regoulu qui faillet éluize deux depité pour aller faize leu harangle au Rouay, pour ly preché nout misere, é ly demandé la remission de la taye pour la moiquié d'un an; là dessu y fu quesquion de lé lomé é de choiri le pu caplabe, morgué je quemance a me cazé a tou mon biau pourpoen vioulet, a rebroucher mon cappiau & ma moustache, é bouté la main su lé roignon, güian nan de targi gueze à méluize aveu courain Guillot, aveu qui jon eté Margouillé dan nout Parouesse, a fin de party é quan?

(ed. Deloffre 1999:126-8)

Text 4

Extract from the *Sarcelades* of Nicolas Jouin (1749)

Les Eglisiers se soucíont guère
Si d'autres sont dans la misère,
Parnan qu'ils en ayont assez.
2.25 Quand ils sont tretous ramassez,
Il faut voüar comme les bons Drôles
Font la vie & joüont leux roles.
Vartiguié ne font-ils pas bian,
Ayant le tems & le moyan?
2.30 Si, comme eux, j'étions aussi Prêtres,
Je ne seriemmes pas plus traîtres
A notre corps, qu'ils ne le sont,
Et je feriemmes comme ils font.
Vous ne sçavez pas palsanguienne,
2.35 Monsigneur, ce qui nous ameine?
Je venons tretous en troupiau,
Pour vous ôter notre chapiau,
Et vous dire, ne vous déplaise,
Que vous nous avez fait bian aise,
2.40 En nous ôtant notre Curé.
Il étoit tourjours entarré
Comme un Renard dans sa tagniere.
Mathureinne sa Chambriere
2.45 Nele voyoit le plus souvent,
Que comme an voit un Revenant
Par-ci par-là. Dans le village
Il étoit comme un vras sauvage:
Bonjour stici, bonjour stilà;
2.50 Ah! maître Claude, vous vela!
Comment vous va? Votre famille?
Catho votre petite fille?
Colin votre petit garçon?
Apprennent-ils bian leux leçon?

(ed. Randell 2008)

Comparison of these two texts, composed a century apart, reveals that, while they share certain vernacular features, all was not set in stone. Things change as we move from one century to the next.

What then is the linguistic value of these texts? Taken alongside contemporary metalinguistic comments which attribute them all to low-class Parisian speech, they have something to tell us about contemporary vernacular usage: they offer us a rich repertoire of forms (phonetic, lexical and grammatical) which we would not otherwise have known very much about. However, what these caricatural representations of vernacular speech do not provide, is hard evidence about the real-life frequency of these variants and their socio-stylistic distribution, i.e. who used these forms, how much and when. Indeed the evidence they provide at this level is extravagantly distorted. But this does not mean that they have nothing more to tell us.

5. Selection and salience

The fact that the individual linguistic variants exploited in these parodies are not fictitious or imaginary should not surprise us. The success of these texts, as vehicles of polemic, required that the contemporary public recognise the voices of the characters speaking. The satirists seem to have operated rather like British actors asked to put on an American accent: the pervading presence of Americans in our country and in our media forbids them to employ forms which are not American, but they can normally get away with reproducing only the most salient features of American speech. What is unreal about our parodies is not the variants themselves, but the particular selection of variants we find there, and the exagerated frequency with which they occur in relatively short stretches of discourse. Satirists create fantasy worlds where individual features are grotesquely exaggerated, where the normal rules of society are inverted or abolished. In our texts the authors were engaged in an exercise in stylistic incongruity. The normal rule is for 'top people' to be addressed in the high style, so here they are addressed in very low style. Unlike nineteenth-century novelists, our Ancien Régime satirists were not aiming at a realistic representation of vernacular speech. They were not concerned with authenticity. They were concerned above all with the social value of the variants they selected.

How did our satirists select the particular features which they incorporated into their caricatures? How did they set the frequency with which they occurred? The variants we find in our texts were the ones judged at the time of writing to be the most stigmatised, the furthest removed from cultivated usage. These variants went from low-conscious to high-conscious, from indicators to stereotypes in the Labovian sense. The less interesting texts made do with the endless repetition of stereotypical variants. The more interesting ones offer a range covering variants from the whole consciousness scale. The principal interest of these texts for sociolinguists is the help it gives us in gauging the social value of particular variants at a particular time. The very fact of being selected for inclusion means that the variants we find here all had a high level of salience in the society concerned.

Salience, or the degree of consciousness which speakers have about particular variants, comprises several elements, including degree of stigmatisation, phonetic distance, and neutralisation of phonological contrasts. Kerswill & Williams (2002) have shown that the notion of salience is not straightforward and that it involves a degree of circularity, but they concede the usefulness of the term, especially when we are attempting to explain the spread of linguistic changes through the community. The most salient variables tend to be the ones most vulnerable to change. With this in mind, I took a 1000-word sample from a number of these satirical texts spread across the period 1550 to 1750. I counted

the frequency of each pronunciation variable in the tables we have just examined, producing an average score for the three dates 1550, 1650 and 1750. *Grosso modo*, the more frequently a variant occurs in a particular parody, the more salient we may deem it to have been at the time of writing. I then ranked each variable by order of frequency, as in Table 2, which may be read as barometer of salience for these variables over the period covered.

Table 2 reveals a high degree of continuity from the mid-sixteenth century to the mid-seventeenth. Indeed, the /er/~ /ar/ variable remains at the top of the hierarchy throughout. However, there is something of a break between the mid-seventeenth century and the mid-eighteenth. The nature of the variables changes: in the mid-seventeenth century the highest salience variables involve dialectal variants distinguishing town from country; in the mid-eighteenth century they involve particularly stylistic variants distinguishing rapid speech from carefully monitored speech. Could we correlate this shift with the evolution of Parisian demography over the seventeenth century?

RANK ORDER		1550 1650 1750
Group I (variants found in 6-7 texts)	(1) [ɛr~ar] (3) [o~jo] (27) *Elision of* [r] (2) [ɛ~wɛ~wa] (5) [ĩ] → [ɛ̃] (6) *Ouisme* (25) [r~z] (31) *ique* → *icle* (33) [dj~gj] (21) [nj~ɲ]	
Group II (variants found in 4-5 texts)	(18) [ɥi~i] (22) [lj~j] (23) [ɛl~œ]	
Group III (variants found in 2-3 texts)	(4) [jɛ̃~jɑ̃]	
Group IV (variants not found)	(12) [y~œ]	

Table 2. Salience of variables 1550-1750 in rank order

In the half-century before 1650 the city saw massive immigration of patois-speakers from the surrounding countryside. Thereafter, the population stabilised, the incomers assimilated and the balance of social awareness may well have shifted from the social/dialectal axis to the stylistic.

In this discussion we have emphasised the differences between the various parodies we have been examining, focussing particularly upon changes visible between the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries. At the same time, the impression has remained of a high level of commonality between the parodies. This commonality is traditionally explained in terms of inter-textuality. However, the pervasive nature of the variables used, corroborated as they are by numerous contemporary observers, suggests that we are dealing with something more deeply embedded in the collective psyche than a mere literary stereotype. The inhabitants of a metropolis may not be united by their speech habits, which are remarkably variable, but they are by their linguistic attitudes and prejudices, which are remarkably consistent, and slow to change.

6. Conclusion: codification and 'reallocation'

Identifying the most salient sociolinguistic variables at particular points in the past is clearly of great value to the linguistic historian, for these are the variables most vulnerable to change. After the initial stages of new-dialect development, which imply convergence of non-contiguous dialects, Trudgill points to a second phase of 'reallocation', which can, under certain circumstances, lead to divergence within the speech of the community:

> Even after koinéization,..., some variants left over from the original mixture may survive. Where this occurs, *reallocation* may occur, such that variants originally from different regional dialects may in the new dialect become *social-class dialect variants, stylistic variants, areal variants,* or, in the case of phonology *allophonic variants.* (Trudgill 1986:126)

Residual dialect variants may be redistributed across the whole community as stylistic variants, but they can also become the prerogative of particular sub-groups within society, either as areal variants or as social-class variants. Groups within the urban population which, for whatever reason, wish to set themselves apart from the rest will develop their own in-group linguistic norms, appropriating particular variants as markers of their own identity.

Social-class markers and stylistic variants are never invented *de toutes pièces*: they can be borrowed from outside, but, in the main, they involve the

reassignment of variants already current in the community. Reallocation normally takes place implicitly, even subconsciously, but the parallel with certain aspects of codification is clear. It is possible to see reallocation in progress explicitly and consciously in the process of linguistic codification and class-based standardisation. Grammarians do not innovate. Their role is restricted to choosing between existing variants, attributing high social value to some and low value to others. In the historiography of the French language there is a predisposition to see the direction of linguistic change being controled by enlightened individuals – grammarians, lexicographers, 'good' writers, the *Académie Française*. The grammarians of *Ancien Régime* Paris are believed to have designed a new set of acrolectal speech-norms, based on elegance and good taste, which they imposed top-down on society at large. It is more realistic, however, to see them acting as the agents not the initiators of reallocation. The grammarians gave an explicit formulation of the norms of the standard language, but the norms themselves were based on social evaluations in which the whole community was to some extent involved. Looking at the history of French in terms of koineization may prove to be more in tune with current notions of language change than persisting with a standard-based model.

References

ALF 1901-1911. Gilliéron, Jules & Edmont, Edmond. *Atlas linguistique de la France*. Paris: Champion.

Anonyme (1649), *Les Maltotiers ou les Pecheurs en eau trouble. En vers burlesques en langue Normande*. Paris: no publisher named.

Ayres-Bennett, Wendy. 1990. Variation and Change in the Pronunciation of French in the Seventeenth Century. In: J.N. Green/Wendy Ayres-Bennett (eds). *Variation and Change in French*. London: Routledge, 151-179.

Branca-Rosoff, Sonia & Nathalie Schneider. 1994. *L'Ecriture des citoyens*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Brunot, Ferdinand. 1966. *Histoire de la langue française*. Paris: A. Colin.

Cerquiglini, Bernard. 1993. *La Naissance du français*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Chauveau, Jean-Pierre. To appear. Dialectes et français dans la formation des français expatriés en Amérique. *Romanistik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Hamburg: Buske.

Cook, Malcolm. 1994. *Dialogues révolutionnaires*. Exeter: Exeter University Press.

Deloffre, Frédéric (ed.). 1999. *Agréables Conférences en patois parisien (1649-1651)*. Genève: Slatkine.

Fondet, Claire. 1995. Contribution à la question des origines du français: quelques aperçus à partir de la dialectologie de l'Essonne. In: M. Tamine (ed.). *Ces Mots qui sont nos mots. Mélanges d'histoire de la langue francaise, de dialectologie et d'onomastique offerts au professeur Jacques Chaurand.* Charleville-Mézières, 189-206.

Fournier, Edouard. 1859. *Variétés historiques et littéraires*. Paris: Jannet.

Haugen, Einar. 1968. Dialect, language, nation . Repr. in J.B. Pride & J. Holmes (eds). 1972. *Sociolinguistics*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 97-111.

Hohenberg, P.M. & Lees, L.H. 1985. *The Making of Urban Europe 1000-1950*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Hornsby, David. 2006. *Redefining Regional French*. London: Legenda.

Kerswill, Paul & Ann Williams. 2002. 'Salience' as an explanatory factor in language change: evidence from dialect levelling in urban England. In: M.C. Jones (ed.). *Language Change.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 81-110.

Lodge, R. Anthony. 1993. *French form Dialect to Standard*. London: Routledge.

Lodge, R. Anthony. 1995. Les Lettres de Montmartre et l'idéologie normative. *Revue de linguistique romane* 59, 439-65.

Martinet, André. 1969. *Le Français sans fard*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Meigret, Louis. 1980 [1550]. *Le Tretté de la grammaire française,* ed. F. J. Hausmann. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

Moreau, Célestin (ed.). 1853. *Choix de Mazarinades*. Paris: Société d'Histoire de France. 2 vols.

Mougeon, R. & Béniak, E. (eds). 1994. *Les Origines du français québécois*. Sainte Foy: Les Presses de l'Université Laval.

Nisard, Charles. 1872. *Etude sur le langage populaire ou patois de Paris et de sa banlieue*. Paris: Franck.

Randell, Elizabeth. 2008. The 'Sarcelades' of Nicolas Jouin (1684-1757). Unpublished PhD. Thesis, University of Saint Andrews.

Rosset, Théodore. 1911. *Les Origines de la prononciation moderne étudiées au XVIIe siècle*. Paris: Colin.

Thurot, Charles. 1881-1883. *De la prononciation française depuis le commencement du XVIe siècle*. Paris: Imprimerie nationale. 2 vols.

Trudgill, Peter. 1986. *Dialects in Contact*. Oxford: Blackwell.
Vaugelas, Claude Favre de. 1971 [1647]. *Remarques sur la langue française. Utiles à ceux qui veulent bien parler et bien escrire*. Paris: Hachette.

2. Attraction du germanique sur le roman, abandon de l'enclise et naissance du français

Jean Feuillet

Université de Paris VIII

1. Les difficultés soulevées par la proclise ou l'enclise dans une approche traditionnelle

C'est d'un intérêt particulier pour le mot ou pour ses éléments constitutifs qu'est née la linguistique. En définissant des « lois phonétiques », en se livrant à des généralisations à partir d'unités dénuées de signification, les auteurs du XIXème siècle ont sorti le débat concernant la langue de l'antre logique ou philosophique : le signe éclipse, à cette époque, la proposition et le langage apparaît non plus tant comme le reflet d'une pensée naturelle que comme le lieu de l'aléatoire ou de l'arbitraire. Certes, parallèlement aux lois phonétiques, les auteurs du temps ont pu concevoir une « grammaire comparée », faire porter leurs observations, donc, sur une structuration significative du mot, une structuration en morphèmes. Mais cela pour en constater, justement, le caractère secondaire, délétère face à l'impérieuse nécessité de donner au mot une base sonore quelconque.

Tel qu'a pu le mettre en évidence le XIXème siècle, tel qu'on vient de le présenter, le principe d'une double articulation du langage a ses limites. S'il est vrai que certaines unités de la langue – les mots – ne se laissent analyser en composants sémantiques que de manière tendancieuse, jamais de manière systématique en tout cas, il est inexact que ces mêmes unités intègrent un contexte en vertu de leur seule signification. On connaît ces phénomènes de dédoublement que sont la proclise et l'enclise, la possibilité de rencontrer des unités accentuelles composées de deux mots. Bref, on sait que le passage de l'analyse phonétique à l'analyse grammaticale n'est pas toujours immédiat, que certaines entités acquièrent un rang syntaxique tout en continuant à appeler des commentaires de teneur matérielle, prosodique.

Un tel chevauchement entre niveaux d'analyse – une telle anticipation du contexte ou de l'emploi dans l'identification de l'unité – trouve de multiples illustrations parmi les descriptions fondées sur les « lois phonétiques ». Dans le passage du latin au roman, le phénomène d'aphérèse a pu concerner non seulement des phonèmes, des voyelles initiales en l'occurrence, mais aussi des unités de contenu – des mots – se caractérisant en propre par un emploi proclitique (songeons à ce propos à l'émergence de l'article-pronom *lo*/*la*, voire

à la formation, en italien ou en français, des démonstratifs *questo*/*quello*, *cest*/*cel*). Une des particularités du portugais est d'avoir fait suivre, dans l'évolution de l'article-pronom précité, le phénomène d'aphérèse par un amuïssement de la consonne devenue initiale : pareil amuïssement ne s'observant, cependant, que dans les emplois proclitiques ordinaires de *lo*/*la*, étant inopérant lorsque ce dernier constitue un enclitique postverbal (opposer les syntagmes *o cantar*/*a cantar* à *cantalo*/*cantala*).

La confusion que proclise ou enclise induisent entre le plan de l'expression et celui du contenu pourrait paraître négligeable. On pourrait tenir que, une fois les phonèmes regroupés en unités de signification, il importe peu de savoir si de tels regroupements sont absolument consistants, s'ils sont vraiment autonomes quant à la prosodie : considérer que seul compte, une fois ce niveau d'analyse atteint, l'aspect sémantique de la configuration qu'on identifie. Un tel point de vue semblerait d'autant plus justifié si les propriétés phonétiques d'une langue se laissaient toutes inférer d'une description du mot « minimal » – du mot accentué – et n'étaient en rien fonction de la proclise ou de l'enclise, si ces deux phénomènes, donc, apparaissaient comme un rallongement facultatif et sans réelle pertinence de l'entité précitée.

Mais une telle démarche serait démentie par les faits. Si l'on s'en réfère à l'évolution phonétique du latin, il est impossible d'ignorer que celle-ci a été largement conditionnée par le phénomène de l'enclise, que les propriétés accentuelles du mot latin ou sa constitution en phonèmes se sont avérées, au cours du temps, découler de sa capacité à être allongé d'éléments satellites du point de vue prosodique.

On sait en effet que le latin convertit très tôt les proparoxytons en paroxytons (et ce soit par apocope, soit par syncope : *cf.* l'évolution divergente de *homine(m)* en *homem* (ptg.), *home*/*hòmen* (cat.), *òme* (occ.) d'une part et *hombre* (esp.), *homme* (de *omne*) (fr.) d'autre part). Ledit usage n'en abandonne pas pour autant l'accentuation sur l'antépénultième, celle-ci subsistant grâce à l'enclise pronominale (à l'oeuvre dans le complexe *CANTA(-)LA* de l'italien, de l'espagnol ou du catalan par exemple). Rien d'étonnant donc à ce que, peu de temps après en avoir été éliminés, les proparoxytons aient été réintroduits dans le lexique (par voie d'emprunt donc, *cf.* le nom *ANIMA* du roman péninsulaire) ou dans la conjugaison (sur la base de réfections, *cf.* le déplacement d'accent caractérisant les formes ibéro-romanes *CANTAVAMOS*, *CANTASSEMOS*).

De la nécessité de ne pas maintenir l'analyse phonétique dans le cadre strict du mot mais de l'étendre à des unités accentuelles plus vastes témoigne également une distribution élargie de la voyelle *o* en catalan. Amuï en syllabe postaccentuelle à époque prélittéraire, le *o* catalan réintègre un tel contexte dès la fin du Moyen Age, et cela en référence aux complexes du genre de *pren-lo*[1]. Plus exactement, redoublant la valeur matérielle ou sémantique de l'enclitique mentionné à l'instant, un *o* posttonique masculin se présente, dès le XIVème

siècle, dans les formes refaites *cuiro*, *ferro*, *mesos*, *braços* ou dans les substantifs empruntés au castillan *amo*, *moro*.

2. Les propriétés morphosyntaxiques originelles du français

A tout cela il convient d'ajouter que si la possibilité d'enclise a été, dans l'évolution du roman, apte à enrayer les effets des lois phonétiques, son abandon a pu à l'inverse y accroître le poids de celles-ci. Une telle remarque traite du cas du français qui dispose, dès l'origine, de pronoms postposés toniques. Autrement dit, le caractère oxytonique des complexes *chante-la*, *chante-moi* est en rapport avec les nombreuses évolutions phonétiques qui ont caractérisé, voire isolé cette langue au sein de l'ensemble roman.

Accentuation du pronom dans *chante-la*, *chante-moi* ou confusion des types flexionnels verbaux au pluriel, subordination du genre au nombre en matière de morphologie nominale, ces deux dernières propriétés morphologiques se laissant en effet directement assimiler à la première dans le schéma évolutif du français.

Avant de démontrer cet ensemble de corrélations, illustrons l'attraction de la conjugaison dite « thématique » sur les autres conjugaisons en français et opposons la paire *chantez, mettez* aux *cantáis*, *metéis* de l'espagnol par exemple. Rappelons en outre que, pas plus que l'occitan, le français n'a conservé le morphème de masculin *–o* (celui des *muro*, *duro* péninsulaires) ; il a cependant, à la différence de ce premier, éliminé le neutre *o* du système des pronoms et ainsi exclu toute analyse de l'élément *lo* participant de ce même système (alternant avec *o*, *lo* apparaît constitué d'une base référentielle, personnelle *l-*., sinon, il est insécable et intègre en même temps deux catégories dont l'une, le genre, s'adjoint en principe à des radicaux et l'autre, le nombre, à des formes globales). Une intrication que l'on peut postuler dans tous les contextes où ces deux catégories sont attestées, notamment dans le pluriel *les* (*les*, marqué explicitement pour le nombre, n'a plus à exprimer le genre, son marquage relevant aussi, en définitive, de cette dernière catégorie), ou dans les noms et les adjectifs féminins assortis d'un *e* final (cette voyelle n'exprime pas le genre au même titre que le radical ou le phénomène d'accord associés : on ne saurait la tenir en soi pour féminine sans compromettre l'analyse du pluriel *les* précité – voire du singulier *le* qui a fini par supplanter *lo* – et il faut donc admettre qu'elle n'apparaît telle qu'au sein d'une forme globale, aussi informée pour le nombre).

Pour ce qui est, à présent, de l'équivalence entre les deux caractéristiques morphosyntaxiques illustrées ci-dessus et le caractère accentué des pronoms postposés, elle se laisse déduire de la notion chomskyenne de « projection », de l'idée qu'une entité de langue peut en appeler une autre, en identifier une autre qui lui est *a priori* extérieure, voire, qu'une simple frontière peut recevoir une extension (on connaît le concept de catégorie vide). Ce genre de postulat reposant, en réalité, sur deux axiomes : l'un, que certains éléments de la langue