

# Langage & société

Éditions de la Maison des sciences de l'homme

**Le français en milieu minoritaire**

**numéro 129 – septembre 2009**

Fondateur: Pierre Achard

Directeurs de la publication:

Josiane Boutet et Didier Demazière

Revue soutenue par l'Institut des Sciences Humaines et  
Sociales du CNRS

Neumann-Holzschuh, Ingrid (2009):

„Contact-induced structural change in Acadian  
and Louisiana French.

Mechanisms and motivations.“

in *Langage et société*, 129, (3), 47– 68.

2009

for Prince Edward Island by Ruth King (2000), whose research contains groundbreaking information about contact-induced language change<sup>2</sup>.

Only recently have Françoise Gader and Mari Jones taken up the topic of how contact affects the scope of variation within French, using a very specific formulation of the question. They attempt to "examine the relationship that exists between variation and interference at a syntactic level by considering issues such as how contact affects the scope of variation within the French language, taking the latter in its widest possible meaning" (2008:1).

My contribution picks up at this point, as I aim to show that especially in Acadian and Louisiana French certain grammatical and syntactical structures have emerged for which there is no clear indication that they are connected to the English language or whether certain internal motivations of language change like simplification, neutralization, tendency for analytic constructions, iconicity, analogy or other functional and cognitive principles of markedness have played a role.<sup>3</sup>

With regard to those phenomena that have a complex explanation in that both the external and internal motivation may be reinforcing one another, I have in principle followed the line of argumentation of Gader / Jones (2008). I have however enlarged the data sample and added some theoretical reflections as far as language contact and grammatical change is concerned.

Within the limited framework of this paper it is not possible to treat the question of how the fact that the varieties of Acadian French do not have the same status in every region affects the process of language change (cf. King 2005). Without a doubt language change that occurs when a dying language like Louisiana French or the variety of Acadian French in NF comes in contact with another language has vastly different results than language contact in regions where this is not the case, such as NB and IdM<sup>4</sup>.

## Contact-induced structural change in Acadian and Louisiana French: mechanisms and motivations

Ingrid Neumann-Holzschuh

Département de Langues Romanes, Université de Regensburg, RFA  
ingrid.neumann-holzschuh@sprachlit.uni-regensburg.de

### 1. Introduction

This paper deals with the linguistic mechanisms of contact-induced grammatical change in Acadian French as it is spoken in the Maritime Provinces and in Newfoundland (NF) as well as in Louisiana/Cajun French (LOU), a close relative of Acadian French (AcFr). The fact that English has been the dominant language in these areas for a very long time has had severe consequences on the minority language, which is on the verge of extinction in Newfoundland and Louisiana.<sup>1</sup>

The purpose of this contribution is to discover what influence English has had on the grammatical and syntactical structures of Acadian and Louisiana French. So far this question has primarily been investigated

1. The data are taken from the corpus of Acadian and Louisiana French collected in the project *Grammaire Comparée des Parlers Acadiens* (GraCopAc) directed by Ingrid Neumann-Holzschuh (cf. Neumann-Holzschuh/Wiesmath 2006). Further abbreviations: Nova Scotia (NS), Îles-de-la-Madeleine (IdM), Prince Edward Island (PEI). The main sources for Acadian French are the corpora of Wiesmath (2006), J. Hennemann (Regensburg) as well as the study of Arrighi (2005a) and King (2001), the data for Newfoundland were provided by P. Basseur; the Louisiana corpus is based on various studies (especially on Stabler 1995a and Rotter 2001) as well as on the corpus collected by A. Valdman: *À la découverte du français cadien à travers la parole/Discovering Cajun French through the spoken word*, CD-ROM 2004, Indiana University Creole Institute, Bloomington. I followed the indicated sources as far as the transcriptions are concerned.

2. For other studies on this topic cf. Mongeon/Beniak (1991), Wiesmath (2001), Filkaid (1989, 1999), Perrot (1995), Slezák (2007).

3. This is not a question of phenomena such as *code-switching* and *code-mixing*, i.e. English multi-word sequences not integrated morphologically or syntactically into French, or of the borrowing of single lexical items with possible morphological integration into AcFr. Moreover, it is not a question of what is referred to in the relevant literature as *code neutralization*, a phenomenon that is noticeably more common in Louisiana French than in Acadian French (cf. Picone 1997, Dubois/Noerzel/Salmon 2005).

4. Studies in Louisiana French have made clear the importance of differentiating between frequent users of French, occasional and semi-speakers (Rotter 2001).

## 2. Theoretical remarks

The influence exerted by English on the grammatical structures of North American French is connected with two basic problems of language change.

1) Does structural borrowing ever happen or is grammatical borrowing intimately connected to the lexicon? What are the mechanisms of structural change?

According to Sankoff it is still in question whether grammar or syntax can be borrowed at all or whether the phonological and lexical levels have to be considered the major "gateways" to all other aspects of contact-induced change (2002: 652, 643). This view is shared by King who sees grammatical change subsequent to contact as a consequence of lexical and pragmatic inter-influence, which may then lead to internal syntactic change. The opposite opinion is held, among others, by Thomason and Kaufman (1988), who argue that structural borrowing may take place independently of the borrowing of individual lexical items. More recently, this view has been supported by Heine/Kuteva (2005, 2006), who try to find new answers to the questions of language contact and grammatical change. Within the framework of grammaticalization theory, these authors attempt to describe the mechanisms underlying the transfer of grammatical use patterns from a "model language" (M) into a "replica language" (R).<sup>5</sup> What they call "grammatical replication" means essentially that speakers "aim at establishing some kind of equivalence relation between use patterns and categories of different languages" (Heine/Kuteva 2005:219).<sup>6</sup> A direct effect of grammatical replication can be either the creation of a new use pattern by using principles of grammaticalization or the "restructuring" of an existing structure in the sense of its extension, rearrangement or replacement (ibid. 64-65). As far as Acadian French is concerned: (a) *category extension*, i.e. the assignment of a new pattern to some old category, with the effect that the latter acquires a larger range of uses, and (b) *category replacement* seem to be particularly interesting.

I believe that both King's lexicon based approach and the Heine/Kuteva model contain useful points that help to explain contact-induced language

5. Cf. Heine/Kuteva (2005:6) for alternative headings such as grammatical calquing, interference, congruence, convergence. Cf. also Johanson who uses the term *code-copying* (2002:288).

6. Grammatical replication is of course easier when the codes have essential structures in common or when these structures are perceived as being the same, although this is no *conditio sine qua non*.

change in Acadian French. At least as far as the almost-extinct Louisiana French is concerned, replication in the sense of restructuring (i.e. loss and rearrangement of existing structures) seems to be of particular importance.

2) In what sense do external factors interact with internal ones? In other words: Are the processes described really externally induced, i.e. are they due to language contact, or rather to internal development? And: In what respect does intrasystemic variability facilitate contact-induced change?

It is by now widely accepted that a full explanation of language change has to be multifunctional and pluralistic (cf. for example Farrar/Jones 2002, Johanson 2002). Internal motivations for language change like analogy, optimality, etc., and external factors like language contact do not exclude each other; on the contrary, there are quite a number of linguistic outcomes that can only be explained by an interplay of external and internal motivations.<sup>7</sup> This framework, called "multiple causation" by Thomason/Kaufman (1988:57), is adopted by Gader/Jones (2008) in order to explain some of the most apparent deviations between the peripheral varieties of French and Standard French. These authors also ask whether the areas that typically display intrasystemic variation are also those where borrowing is most likely to occur.

A notion that usually appears in this context and which is anything but unproblematic is *convergence*, which has been applied to a wide range of phenomena. Convergence, a well-known type of contact-induced language change (Farrar/Jones 2002:9), means that languages become more alike in contact situations as a result of similar structures (Heine/Kuteva 2005:11). Thus, if codes have essential structures in common, code-copying in the sense of Johanson and – as the result – convergence are possible scenarios. Under the influence of isomorphic structures in M, a minor pattern in R can become a major pattern through grammatical replication and, in some circumstances, even category replacement can occur, with the effect that some structures in the "pool of variants" that have an equivalent in M and are therefore relatively more attractive are favoured. Based on the interpretation of Sasse, Gader/Jones (2008) define the notion of convergence, as: "The loss of a native form without counterpart in the other language, to the benefit of a form having a counterpart in the dominant language" (Sasse 1992:77).

7. Contact-induced grammaticalization has both a universal/language-internal and an external/contact-related component.

### 3. Contact-induced structural changes in Acadian French: Selected cases

The examples of the English influence on grammatical-syntactical structures of Acadian French can be divided into three large categories, the borrowing of morphological/grammatical categories being excluded:

- Cases of grammatical changes in which the data seem to exhibit both external and internal motivation in the sense of multiple causation. The focus of this article lies on this case.
  - Cases of clearly contact-induced semantic or combinational copying (lexical replication; calquing).
  - Lexical borrowings from English which trigger specific processes of reanalysis on the lexical, syntactical, semantic and pragmatic level.

#### 3.1. Possible cases of multiple causation

As Gadet/Jones (2008) correctly observe, it is often difficult to decide whether certain structural changes are contact-induced or simply a linguistic development which the code in question could have undergone had contact not existed. As far as Acadian and Louisiana French is concerned there are indeed a number of phenomena which can be described as examples of “intrasystemic weakness and intersystemic convergence” between structures of English and French, where a particular form in the less dominant language is given up in preference to another, which is “backed” by a similar structure in the dominant language.

The aim of this chapter is to offer some linguistic data that go beyond what is listed in Gadet/Jones (2008). Given the fact, however, that this chapter is more of an overview, the theoretical discussion remains rather superficial, *i.e.* the precise relationship between internal and external factors should be examined more closely for each individual phenomenon.

##### 3.1.1. avoir and être

In the varieties of Acadian French, *avoir* has almost completely replaced *être* as an auxiliary.

[1] Je dernier coup qu'i a vnu chez nous, je m'en souviens encore (NS - Isle Madame; corpus Hennemann)

[2] J'ai tombé plusieurs fois (NB - Wiesmath, 1, R274)

[3] Elle s'avait marié, elle avait eu un petit et il est mort et, you know, elle était plus une petite fille (LOU - Valdman, Mamou, Évangéline)

Without a doubt the generalization of *avoir* in the perfect tense is an internal development in French, which can also be observed in other varie-

ties of French.<sup>8</sup> It cannot be excluded, however, that the English auxiliary *have* might have reinforced this tendency: According to Heine/Kuteva (2005:141) several languages with co-occurring auxiliaries tend to extend the use of the “possessive perfect” under the influence of the contact language, which – according to the authors – can be interpreted as an instance of grammatical replication.

#### 3.1.2. The subjunctive

Whereas the subjunctive is being replaced more and more often by indicative forms (imperfect, future) or by the conditional especially in LOU and in NF, it has retained a certain vitality in NB und NS (even in the epistemic domain), which does of course not exclude the use of non-subjunctive forms in these areas as well.

[4] Je voudrais pas qu'elle ferait un fricot au lapin (NB - Wiesmath, 1, B519)

[5] Je veux pas qu'ils venont me tuer (LOU - Stabler 1995a:66)

[6] Faut je sors dessus la galerie pour la barrer. Là faurrait je marcherais d'en bas et puis revenir (LOU - Stabler 1995a:65)

The question whether the fluctuations of mood are a result of internal developments in overseas French, the preservation of an older form of the language or the influence of English has been dealt with by Neumann-Holzschuh (2005). Although the non-existence of the subjunctive in English as just a reinforcing factor should not be overestimated, all three factors have certainly played a role as far as the present form of the language is concerned.

#### 3.1.3. The increase of non-finite forms

Gadet/Jones (2008) assume a non-contact or internal explanation – *i.e.* avoidance of the subjunctive – for constructions with *pour* like

[7] Il a fait faire un gros plancher pour nous-autres danser dessus (LOU - Stabler 1995a:181)

An additional example from Louisiana, where this phenomenon is especially frequent, are:

[8] Ça fait, il vous avait euh demandé pour vous se, pour vous se marier (LOU - Valdman, Mamou, Évangéline)

8. Cf. Gadet/Jones (2008), Boilée/Neumann-Holzschuh (1998). As to PEI King/Nadaodi (2000) show that in this area *être* is still used in certain contexts.

The fact that non-finite forms are also frequent in other popular and dialectal varieties of French<sup>9</sup> cause these examples indeed to appear as cases of paradigmatic simplification. It is therefore not surprising that they are especially frequent in the language of the semi-speakers in Louisiana. On the other hand, as this type of subordinate clause resembles the English *for*-*to* clause type, at least a partial influence from English cannot completely be discarded (cf. Rottet 2001:256).

Note however, that in Cajun the subordinate clause is not always purposive:

[9] *Esse veit pour nous-autres aller pour 7h ?* (LOU – Rottet 2001:255)

The use of a non-finite form in the following example seems to be a direct calque of the equivalent English structures:

[10] *Qui eusse veit nous-autres à ramener ?* 'What do they want us to bring?' (LOU – Rottet 2001:256)

### 3.1.4. *The syntax of object pronouns*

Although the pattern with preverbal object clitics is still the most frequent one in the Acadian varieties, examples of the postverbal stressed pronouns in the function of a direct or indirect object (with or without a "redundant" preverbal clitic) can be found in all varieties of Acadian French<sup>10</sup>. Two clitics in preverbal position are generally avoided:

[11] *C'est là-dessus qu'elle les nourrissait, ieusses* (NF – Brasseur, AC 059206)

[12] *je le donne à lui* (NF – King 1982:109)

[13] *il nous a assisté nous-autres* (LOU – Stäbler 1995a:212)

– without preverbal clitic

[14] ... *mais il a dit à moi* (LOU – Valdman, Châteaugner, Évangéline)

[15] *Son amie venait ici trouver ielle* (NF – Brasseur 2001:252)

[16] *on l'a apporté eux* (LOU – Stäbler 1995a:114)

9. Cf. Bauche (1946:110); for *pour*-clauses cf. Rottet (2001:255sq.), Neumann-Holzschuh (2005:137-8), Neumann-Holzschuh (2003).

10. This phenomenon is especially frequent in the speech of semi-speakers in Louisiana, who also tend to replace unstressed subject pronouns by stressed ones. Although this can be correlated to the tendency to prefer free and salient morphemes, English influence cannot completely be excluded (cf. Rottet 2001:222).

Even if the preference for stressed postverbal object may be interpreted as contact-induced – English object pronouns are always placed postverbally –, attestations in other varieties of overseas French as well as from 17<sup>th</sup> century French demonstrate that this word order is not uncommon in French. The fact, however, that the postverbal position of the object pronoun is only described for the indirect object in French (Brunot/Bruneau 1949:277) makes the word order <verb + postposed accusative Pronoun> appear as a case of replacement of one type of syntactic organization with another type as a result of language contact.

### 3.1.5. *que-deletion in subordinate and relative clauses*<sup>11</sup>

[17] *je savais pas \* c'était elle* (NB – Wiesmath, 7, O106)

[18] *je vas parler aussi d'une/... une chanson Angèle Arsenault \* Marcel fera jouer euh plus tard* (NB – Wiesmath 2002:396)

[19] *J'aurais pu apprendre à signer mon nom si j'avais dit \* je voulais apprendre* (LOU – Valdman, Châteaugner, Évangéline)

[20] *le premier char \* mon papa a acheté c'était un MARLEY FORD* (LOU – Stäbler 1995a:202)

That *que*-deletion can have internal as well as external motivations is made quite clear by Rottet:

Rather than being attributable to English influence, it is clear that the vernacular relatives are a natural and native development of the French language. The role of English is at most one of reinforcing the structures in question in contact varieties such as CF (2001:173).

Wiesmath also stresses the fact that this development is found in varieties of French having no obvious contact with English. She thus prefers to see *que*-deletion as "une tendance évolutive interne du français" (2002:405) but does not deny that in some cases "convergence" between Acadian French and English cannot be excluded altogether.

### 3.1.6. *Preposition stranding*

Preposition stranding is without a doubt one of the most dealt with aspects in terms of contact-induced language change and its various syntactic and semantic levels cannot be fully discussed here (cf. King 2000, Rottet 2001, 167sq., Roberge/Rosen 1999, Arrighi 2005a, 2005b). Preposition stranding with English as well as French prepositions is evidenced in every

11. Cf. Wiesmath (2002) for a detailed analysis of the different cases of *que*-deletion in Acadian French. As to attestations of this phenomenon in French cf. Gadet (1992), Bauche (1946:124), Stäbler (1995b:185sq.).

variety of Acadian French in declarative, relative and interrogative sentences. The frequency of this phenomenon appears to be especially high in PEI, although apart from that there is "considerable leeway in terms of where stranding can take place" (King 2002:248) in this variety.

- [21] *Quoi ce-qu'ils parlont about ?* (PEI – King 2000:142)  
 [22] *à l'Université de Moncton, c'est là que j'suis gradué de.* (NS - Isle Madame; corpus Hennemann)  
 [23] *Tu connais pas la femme que je te parle de* (PEI – King 2000:141)  
 [24] *La première paire de souliers que mon j'ai mis mes pieds dedans là, j'ai payé pour mon-même* (LOU – Rottet ms.)  
 [25] *Qui ce-que t'as fait le gâteau pour?* (PEI – King 2000:139)  
 [26] *Ça fait c'est plus le même Mardi Gras que nous-autres on a été élevés avec* (LOU – Rottet ms.)

In her monograph on the Acadian French of Prince Edward Island, King describes this phenomenon in great detail. In her opinion, borrowed English prepositions triggered the stranding of French prepositions: "The direct borrowing of English-origin prepositions has resulted in the extension of a property of English prepositions, the ability to be stranded, to the whole set of Prince Edward Island prepositions" (2000:147). Whereas borrowed English prepositions are indeed frequent in NB and NS, they are rare in Newfoundland and in LOU, where the phenomenon of prepositional stranding is, however, evidenced (cf. Rottet ms.).<sup>12</sup> It thus seems to be questionable whether it is inevitable that the direct borrowing of English prepositions is the trigger, or whether it is more likely a case of grammatical replication, as Heine/Kuteva (2005:53) see it: speakers have replicated the strategy to put adpositions in contexts where they are detached from their complements. At least for Louisiana French this explanatory framework seems to be more apt.

Although English influence can certainly not be ruled out as far as these constructions are concerned – prepositional stranding is a very common construction in English and the use of orphan prepositions is heavily constrained in French<sup>13</sup> – an alternative scenario, *i.e.* the generalization of

12. In Prince Edward Island English-origin verb plus prepositions combinations are frequent (King 2000:142); for Nova Scotia cf. Arrighi (2005) and Filkeld (1989); in LOU phrasal verbs combining an English (or French) verb with an English preposition are more rare (Rottet 2002).

13. King (2000, 2002) stresses that in these cases the syntactic similarity with the English constructions is only superficial.

an intrasyntemic rule with English just playing "un rôle catalysateur [...]" (Arrighi 2005b:245) is possible, since non-standard prepositional patterns are also wide-spread in other varieties of non-standard French; apart from that the range of syntactic possibilities was greater in the 17<sup>th</sup> century French as far as preposition placement is concerned (Gadet/Jones 2008:6).

### 3.1.7. *The conditional in Louisiana French*

One of the most interesting evolutions in the Cajun as spoken by younger speakers is the use of other constructions in place of the synthetic conditional. There is a general tendency to replace the conditional with periphrastic constructions which allow the imperfect speaker to memorize a single invariant form and attach it to any verb infinitive (or past participle, in the case of the past conditional), instead of having to correctly form the target synthetic conditional.

- [27] *Si j'aurais plus de temps je voudrais aller avec toi* (LOU – Rottet 2001:241)  
 [28] [...] *Ma fille et son mari l'autre bord, ils pourraient ENJOY ça* (LOU – Rottet 2001:242)

In Heine/Kuteva's framework the transition from a synthetic to an analytic form can be interpreted as grammatical replication in that a certain pattern – in this case the English analytic past conditional – is generalized to other contexts. But again – although there is evidence in favour of language contact contributing to the evolution from synthetic to analytic expressions, these authors also concede that language contact might just accelerate an ongoing grammatical change (Heine/Kuteva 2006:73-79). According to Rottet, this phenomenon can indeed be explained internally as well as externally:

The periphrases thus illustrate a well-known principle of language death, that speakers prefer analytic over synthetic constructions, and invariant, salient, free morphemes over bound, variable morphemes. The periphrastic conditionals have the further advantage of resembling the English conditional mood, which is constructed with the free morpheme *would* plus the infinitive of any verb (Rottet 2001:247).

### 3.1.8. *Prepositions*

Since prepositions constitute one of the most variable areas in French, it is often unclear whether the Acadian structures are borrowings from English or whether variability in French favours the adoption of English structures. Although the examples given seem to be calques in the first place, an explanation not based on language contact might be possible as well.

- *avec pas* 'sans'

[29] i s'a trouvé là **avec pas** la cenne et rien à manger (NS – Arrighi 2005a:284) ('il s'est trouvé là sans un sou et sans rien à manger', traduction: INH)

[30] C'est dur **avec pas de** compas! (NF – Brasseur 2001:337)

Although *avec pas* probably has to be interpreted primarily as a calque from the English preposition *without*, internal explanations (for example transparency) cannot be rejected altogether: the fact that *avec pas* is not uncommon in spoken French and other languages like in non-standard German (*mit ohne*) may favour a multifactorial explanation for *avec pas* in the Acadian varieties (Arrighi 2005a:333).

- *pour* as a temporal preposition (pendant, lors de')

In all varieties of Acadian French, *pour* can be used in the sense of temporal 'for' (cf. Arrighi 2005a:344).

[31] Alle a tenu école **pour** trente-neuf ans, ielle. (NF – Brasseur 2001:367)

[32] J'avais un padna qui travaillait là-bas, il a été *feed* des veaux **pour** un an. (LOU – Valdman; Isle Saint-Jean, Terrebonne)

English interference is a plausible explanation for this use of *pour*, Wiesmath (2006:245), however, does not want to exclude an intrasystemic explanation altogether.

### 3.2. Morphological and syntactic calques

A number of other structural changes seem to be unmistakably attributable to contact with English, although it has to be examined in how far intrasystemic reasons might also play a role. Since calques basically involve change in the semantic properties of lexical items, the establishment of a calque in a language usually does not mean extensive grammatical restructuring (cf. King 2000:109).

#### 3.2.1. Preposition calquing

All corpora of Acadian French contain a number of phrasal verbs calqued on English constructions (loan translations), which help to increase the number of analytic constructions (cf. Rotret 2000, King 2000:108).<sup>14</sup>

14. Gader/Jones (2008:5) confirm that the insertion of prepositions in certain verbal contexts are far from uncommon in popular French.

- Verbs with prepositional objects *pour* (calqued on engl. 'for') is frequent in most varieties with the exception of NB: *demandier pour* 'ask for'

[33] ...pis/euh/cette semaine, il y avait une femme qui m'a **demandé pour** écrite quelque chose. (NS - Isle Madame; corpus Hennemann)

[34] I m'a **demandé pou** du pain. (NF – Brasseur 2001:367)

(re) *garder pour*, *chercher pour* 'look for'

[35] T'arais té ici assis sus le bord du cap là, à **regarder** au large **pour** du jubier, oir s' t'en arais vu [...] (NF – Brasseur 2001:367)

[36] Tout d'un coup v'la un marliot qui **cherchait pour** de la nourriture aussi. (NF – Brasseur 2001:292)

*avoir pour* 'to have to'

This periphrasis only exists in Louisiana<sup>15</sup>.

[37] t'as **pour** aimer ton voisin (LOU – Stäbler 1995a:216)

The following phrasal verbs are not in evidence for LOU in the corpora consulted:

*attendre/espérer pour* 'wait for'

[38] pis... aujourd'hui. c'est que l'autre peut pas **espérer pour** l'autre pour grandir (NB - Wiesmath, 2, F733)

[39] I **spère pour** le fermier [...]. (NF - Brasseur 2001:187)

*passer à travers* 'to go through'

[40] mais je me lamente pas quoi j'ai **passé à travers** je me lamente pas (PEI – Arrighi 2005a:363)

*dépendre sus* 'to depend on'<sup>16</sup>

[41] Parce que s'i faut tu **dépends sus** tou T' c'tés PUSH-BUTTON là là (NS - Isle Madame; corpus Hennemann)

[42] je travaillais jusqu'à deux trois heures du matin des fois quatre heures du matin **dépendant sus** le nettoyage fallait que tu fasses après (NB – Arrighi 2005a:349)

15. This periphrasis is not attested to by Gougenheim (1929). cf. Bollée/Neumann-Holzschuh (1998:195).

16. *sus* 'sur' is well attested in 17<sup>th</sup> century French and in the French dialects (cf. Brasseur 2001:435). According to Arrighi (2005a:349) *dépendre sur* also occurs in Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba and Newfoundland, as a calque from the English construction *to depend upon someone/something*.

- Prepositional phrases

Apart from the calquing of phrasal verbs the use of prepositions in the Acadian varieties as well as in Louisiana French is frequently calqued on English constructions, although an internal explanation cannot always be ruled out (cf. Dubois/Noetzel/Salmon 2005, Arrighi 2005a).

*sur, sus, dessus* 'on' are especially frequent in combination with the nouns *radio, telephone, TV*

[43] pis i *watchiont* les GAMES de HAWKS sur le TV (NB – Arrighi 2005a:348)

[44] I me disiont **sur le phone** [...] (NF – Brasseur 2001:435)

but they are also attested in other contexts:

[45] Tu peux élever un cochon **sus** quasiment n'importe quoi, mais si tu veux élever un cochon **sus** du poisson, il a le goût de poisson. (NF – Brasseur 2001:434)

[46] Ça fait vous-autres faisait ça **sur** le week-end, je pense, **sur** le fin de semaine? (LOU – Valdman, Châtagnier, Evangéline)

### 3.2.2. Other calques

- *Être supposé (de) faire qc.* 'to be supposed to'<sup>17</sup>

[47] T'es pas **supposé de le dire**. (NF – Brasseur 2001:434)

[48] on dirait t'es pas **supposé connaître** tes voisins (LOU – Stabler 1995a:215)

- *ça* as a relative pronoun

Transfer from English may also play a role in the use younger speakers make of *ça* as a relative pronoun. In English the demonstrative pronoun *that* and the relative *that* are homophonous. It is possible that younger speakers of CF strove to create a similar homophony in CF, thus reducing the distance between their two languages (Rottet 2001:230).

[49] t'as pas de l'argent ben. va pas à l'hôpital le BILL. **ça** ils vont te donner **ça** va finir de tuer **ça** (LOU – Stabler 1995a:206)

[50] Camille Doucet **ça** fait. **ça** prenait à parler de **ça** **ça** il fait (LOU – Stabler 1995b:187)

Wicmath (2002), however, suggests a more nuanced approach as far as this phenomenon is concerned because, from a comparative point of view, the use of *ça* as a relative has to be seen in combination with the omission

17. *supposer* à selon King (1982), cf. also Brasseur (2001:434) and Arrighi (2005a:202).

of the relative *que*, which is frequent in NB and NS. While in the other Acadian varieties *ça* is always the antecedent of the relative *que*, even if it is deleted, Louisiana French seems to have undergone a restructuring process making *ça* a real relative pronoun (Stabler 1995b:186sq.).

- *combien* and *comment*

Some uses of the interrogative adverbs *combien* and *comment* are very likely calqued on English *how* (Brasseur 2001 s.v. *combien, comment*) but have yet to be analyzed in more detail. Whereas in Standard French *combien* serves as an adverb with which one can ask for a number, *comment* could be used to ask for a degree in older French (Grevisse/Goosse 2007: § 997a, b).

[51] On a resté quelques mois là mais je me rappelle pas au juste **combien longtemps**. (LOU – Valdman, Church Point, Acadia)<sup>18</sup>

[52] Ben i a resté j'ais j'ais pas **comment longtemps** pis i est parti pis i vient BACK. (NS – Isle Madame; corpus Hennemann)

[53] [À propos du café soluble]. Je sais pas **comment fort** tu le veux. (NF – Brasseur 2001:120)

[54] Ça dépend **comment grand** la chaudière, tu connais? (LOU – Valdman, Châtagnier, Evangéline)

### 3.3. Lexical borrowings and grammatical change

The third important instance of grammatical change triggered by language contact – the borrowing of a lexical item from M into R and subsequent structural changes in R – cannot be dealt with in detail here.

#### 3.3.1. back

The best known example in this context are loanblends involving the English adverb *back*, which has become highly productive in all varieties of Acadian French (King 2001:115sq.)<sup>19</sup> and in Louisiana (Rottet 2000, 2005). Apart from agreeing with the English usage ('return to a former state or place') with certain movement verbs often reinforcing the prefix re- (see ex. (55) to (56)), the varieties of Acadian French do make frequent use of *back* in a meaning not characteristic of the English source word at all by adopting the meaning 'again' (see ex. (57) to (59)):

18. *Combien longtemps* is very frequent in LOU. According to Brasseur 2001 s.v. *combien longtemps*, 'combien de temps' is a hapax in NF.

19. According to King the usage of *back* in the Prince Edward Island varieties is much more advanced than in the Newfoundland and New Brunswick variety of Acadian, where it has only the meaning of 'return to a former state or place'.



[55] pis i se levait debout' pis i rentrait back dans le bois (NB – Wismath, 1, B313)

[56] Et là il revenait back le lendemain ou le surlendemain (LOU – Valdman, Pointe-aux-Chênes, Terrebonne)

[57] Elle va le refaire back (PEI – King 2000:129)

[58] J'ai commencé à refumer back 'I started smoking again' (LOU – Rortet 2000:120)

[59] Et là quand ça venait assez platte, peut-être trois ou six mois, je sais pas combien longtemps, well il fallait qu'on défait ça back, ôter la mousse, et il fallait qu'on étille la mousse encore comme ça là (LOU – Valdman, Pointe-aux-Chênes, Terrebonne)

In the *chiasm* variety of NB as well as in NS, PEI and in LOU, the use of *back* has undergone specific restructurings: not only can it be used without the prefix *re-*, the syntactic behaviour of this adverb has changed as well.

[60] I m'a back callé la même soirée (NB – Perrot 1995:243) ('il m'a rappelé le même soir', traduction : INH)

[61] Je l'ai jamais back fait 'I never did it again' (PEI – King 2000:131)

[62] Ça fait, on s'a mis à marcher au long du bayou au ras du Bayou des Cannes pour aller back trouver nos bicyclettes ayoté on avait laissé ça dans les grandes herbes (LOU – Valdman, Jennings, Jefferson)

Although the complexity of the matter can only be alluded to here, it should be apparent to what extent direct borrowings can lead to new structures that do not converge entirely with structures that already appear in the languages.<sup>20</sup> However, in what respects the new behaviour of *back* has been influenced not only by the French prefix *re-* (King 2000:118) but also by the French adverb *arrière* (Gadet/Jones 2008) has to be analyzed in more detail.

### 3.3.2. Other examples

Apart from this classic example there are other instances of direct loans which have certain effects on grammatical and syntactic structures.

20. For a detailed analysis of this particle cf. King (2000), Perrot (1995), Wismath (2001), Rortet (2002), Tremblay (2005). According to King and Tremblay *back* does not behave like the other particles borrowed from English; not only does the syntactic behaviour of *back* show that its syntactic patterns differ in Acadian French from English, also the meaning is not identical in both languages. For other 'verbes à particules' in Acadian French cf. Chevalier/Long (2005).

• As to the borrowing of WH-words, this phenomenon seems to be especially frequent in PEI, although there are examples for the other Acadian varieties as well (King 2000:151sq.). In the LOU-corpora consulted, however, there are no examples.

[63] L'argent which qu'il a donné à Desmond est dans sa poche. (NB – Motapanyane 1997:28; King 1991:72)

[64] c'était tout' fait à la main je/which que je l'ai fait irou (NB – Wismath 2002:399)

• In what respect the borrowing of "utterance modifiers" or discourse markers from the pragmatically dominant language – a phenomenon that can be observed in all varieties of Acadian French (cf. Neumann-Holzschuh 2008 and in press; Chevalier 2002) – is linked to the borrowing of other functional words like conjunctions and to what extent the changes in the syntactical behaviour can be observed has to be analyzed in more detail.

[65] So ma défunte mère ielle, ce tait ène chasse-femme, je pense alle a éné plus qu'un mille-z-enfants, ielle. (TN – Brasseur 2001:105).

[66] So a' mettait un morceau de fromage ou deux <well > i dit pis des gros/maman menait des gros morceaux (NB – Wismath, 2, F289)

[67] Et lui il a resté là, il a appris, well, il use son français, mais il y a un tas du monde dans l'ouest là qui connaît bien le français (LOU – Valdman, Isle Saint Jean, Terrebonne)

The most frequently borrowed conjunctions are *but* and *so*, although it is not always clear whether they are acting as discourse markers or conjunctions. The conjunction *but*, for example, has totally supplanted the French equivalent *mais* in *chiac* in NB; in LOU, on the other hand, it is just an occasional borrowing which has no effects on the semantic and syntactic behaviour of the equivalent (cf. Wismath 2002, 2006:119–120, Perrot 1995:236).

[68] le prêtre parlait longtemps c'était des grands prônes pis c'était tu sais but t'avais pas de choix tu restais pas à (la) maison le dimanche matin là (NB – Wismath 2006:120).

Other borrowed conjunctions like *except*, *because* and *since*, however, apparently lead to certain changes within the borrowing language. Not only do new combinations of the English particle and French *que* arise (*because que*, *unless que*, *since que*), there are also restructurations within the French conjunctions especially in *chiac*. Thus *excepté que* loses *que*

under the influence of *excepté*; *because* and *parce que* apparently undergo some kind of semantic specialization (Wiesmath 2002; 2006:150):

[69] j'ai rien su hier . . . excepté i avont dit que ç'avait *slacké* (NB - Wiesmath , 3, D417) ('je n'ai rien appris hier [à propos du nombre de poissons pêchés] sauf qu'ils ont dit que la pêche a baissé')

[70] donc lorce vous produisez vous-même . pour vous autres c'est aussi certe économie informelle domicilière i y a rien d'illégal là . . . excepté dans nos chiffres de production ça apparaît pas (NB - Wiesmath, 14, Y98)

[71] i y avait personne qui disait t'étais paresseux pis t'as pas voulu venir . because tout le monde était dedans le même bateau (NB - Wiesmath, 1, B722)

[72] pis l'automne dans ce temps-là t'avais pas une licence dans l'automne culh sus mon père à la cave/souais i avont tué des originaux tu sais là> since que t'es pas un GAME WARDEN hein (NB - Wiesmath, 1, B415)

[73] je me juge pas/but je suis pas un *prep/pi* j'ai rien contre les *preps/unless* que zeux qui avont de quoi contre moi/tu vois quoi je veux dire/moi j'ai rien contre *anybody* (NB - Perrot 1995, vol. 2: 8)

#### 4. Conclusion

I agree with Gader/Jones that "it is difficult to separate out internal and external factors in language change in terms of their effects on the structure of certain varieties of French" (2008:9-8). Only a pluralistic approach can do justice to the complexity of language change: in many cases language contact is just a contributing factor reinforcing language internal evolutionary tendencies, in others, either language contact or internal evolution offer a plausible explanation by themselves. In any case "the two kinds of account – internal vs. external change – neither contradict one another nor are they mutually exclusive; rather, they tend to complement one another in producing grammatical change" (Heine/Kuteva 2006:79).

Whether structural borrowing is exclusively lexically based requires further analysis. Sankoff (2002:658) and King (2000) are undoubtedly right in claiming that variation and change is intimately connected with the lexicon (King 2000:147). As far as structural changes like *que*-deletion or the innovative word order of object pronouns in Acadian are concerned, one might, however, discuss (a) whether these processes are due to internal motivations or rather (b) if an external motivation cannot completely be excluded, to what extent the approach of Heine/Kuteva (2005) or the integrative code copying approach of Johanson (2002) for example might offer a plausible description of the underlying mechanisms.

Internal variation, which is especially pronounced in non-standard varieties, certainly is a decisive condition for language change to take place. Thus variability in the case of the use of present perfect auxiliary as well as the use of the subjunctive undoubtedly accelerated restructuring in this domain, language contact being just a reinforcing element.

Gader/Jones (2008) correctly claim that grammatical data cannot justifiably be studied in isolation but that the consideration of the sociolinguistic context is necessary. This aspect has not been taken up in detail in this paper; it should be clear, however, that each area of the Acadian diaspora has its own sociolinguistic profile which has to be taken into account in the description of the data. The differences between the areas are considerable as far as English influence is concerned: compared to PEI, for example, Louisiana hardly has any borrowed conjunctions, the number of borrowed prepositions seems to be less important, and there are no borrowed WH-words, although contact with English is probably as intense as in PEI. How can these differences be explained? In what respect do the varieties differ with respect to the conventionalization of new structures?

The varieties of Acadian French, including Louisiana French, are the ideal laboratory in which to investigate these and other questions in connection with mechanisms and motivations of language change.

#### References

- Arrighi L. (2005a), *Étude morphosyntaxique du français parlé en Acadie – Une approche de la variation et du changement linguistique en français*, thèse de doctorat, Université d'Avignon.
- (2005b), Des prépositions dans un corpus acadien: Évolution du système linguistique français, archaïsmes et/ou calques de l'anglais? dans: Brasseur & Falkert (p. 239-247).
- Bauche H. (1928), *Le langage populaire. Grammaire, syntaxe et dictionnaire du français tel qu'on le parle dans le peuple de Paris*, Payot, Paris.
- Bollée A. & Neumann-Holzschuh I. (1998), Français marginaux et créoles, dans Brasseur P. (dir), *Français d'Amérique. Variation, créolisation, normalisation*. Actes du colloque: "Les français d'Amérique du Nord en situation minoritaire" (Université d'Avignon, 8-11 octobre 1996), Université d'Avignon, Centre d'Études Canadiennes (CECAV) (p. 181-203).
- Brasseur P. (2001), *Dictionnaire des régionalismes du français de Terre-Neuve*. (Canadiana Romanica; vol. 15), Tübingen, Max Niemeyer Verlag.

- Brasseur P. & Falkert A. (dirs) (2005), *Français d'Amérique: approches morphosyntaxiques. Actes du colloque international Grammaire comparée des variétés de français d'Amérique (Université d'Avignon, 17-20 mai 2004)*, Paris, L'Harmattan.
- Brunot F. & Bruneau Ch. (1969), *Précis de grammaire historique de la langue française*, Paris, Masson et C<sup>ie</sup>.
- Chevalier G. (2002), Description lexicographique de l'emprunt *well* dans une variété de français parlé du sud-est du Nouveau-Brunswick, dans D. Latin & C. Poirier (dirs), *Contacts de langues et identités culturelles. Perspectives lexicographiques*, Québec, Les Presses de l'Université Laval (p. 85-97).
- Chevalier G. & Long M. (2005), *Finder out, pour qu'on les frig pas up, comment t'qu'i workent out: les verbes à particules en chiac*, dans Brasseur & Falkert (p. 201-212).
- Dubois S. & Sankoff D. (1997), L'absence de flexion sur les emprunts à l'anglais dans le français cajun, dans J. Auger & Y. Rose (dirs), *Explorations du lexique*, Québec, CIRAL (p. 163-176).
- Dubois S., Noetzel S. & Salmon C. (2005), Les innovations en français cadien: interférences ou changements motivés de façon interne au système, dans Brasseur & Falkert (p. 27-38).
- (2006), L'usage des pratiques bilingues dans la communauté cadienne, dans R. Papien & G. Chevalier (dirs), *Les variétés de français en Amérique du Nord. Évolution, innovation et description*, Revue canadienne de linguistique appliquée 9.2./ Revue de l'Université de Moncton 37.2. (p. 207-219).
- Farrar K. & Jones M. (2002), Introduction, in M. Jones & E. Esch (eds), *Language Change. The Interplay of Internal, External and Extra-Linguistic Factors*, Berlin/New York, Mouton de Gruyter (p. 1-15).
- Flikeid K. (1989), 'Moitié anglais, moitié français' ? Emprunts et alternance de langues dans les communautés acadiennes de la Nouvelle-Écosse, *Revue québécoise de linguistique théorique et appliquée*, 8, p. 177-228.
- Gadet F. (1992), *Le français populaire (Que sais-je ? n° 1172)*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France.
- Gadet F. & Jones M. (2008), Variation, contact et convergence in French spoken outside France, *Journal of language contact* – THEMA 2, p. 1-11 [www.jlc-journal.org].
- Grevisse M. & Goosse A. (2007), *Le bon usage. Grammaire française*, Bruxelles, De Boeck/Ducloot.
- Heine B. & Kuteva T. (2005), *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- (2006), *The Changing Languages of Europe*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Johanson L. (2002), Contact-induced change in a code-copying framework, in M. Jones & E. Esch (eds), *Language Change: The Interplay of Internal, External and Extra-Linguistic Factors*, Mouton de Gruyter, Contributions to the Sociology of Language 86 (p. 285-313).
- Jones M. & Esch E. (dirs) (2002), *Language Change: The Interplay of Internal, External and Extra-Linguistic Factors*, Mouton de Gruyter, Contributions to the Sociology of Language 86.
- King R. (1982), Étude de certains traits communs au français et à l'anglais terre-neuviens, *Si que*, 5, p. 99-114.
- (2000), *The lexical basis of grammatical borrowing: a Prince Edward Island French case study*, Amsterdam, Benjamins.
- (2002), Crossing grammatical borders: tracing the path of contact-induced change. Paper presented at the Eleventh International Conference on Methods in Dialectology, 5-9 August 2002, University of Joensuu, Finland.
- (2005), Morphosyntactic variation and theory. Subject-verb agreement in Acadian French, in L. Cornips and K. Corrigan (eds), *Syntax and Variation: Reconciling the Biological and the Social*, Amsterdam, Benjamins (p. 199-229).
- King R. & Nadasdi T. (2000), How Auxiliaries Be/Have in Acadian French, in P. Balcom et al. (eds), *Papers from the Annual Meeting of the Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association* 24, p. 61-72.
- Motapanyane V. (1997), *Acadian French*, München/Newcastle, Lincom Europa.
- Mougeon, R. & Beniak, É. (1991), *Linguistic consequences of Language Contact and Restriction: the Case of French in Ontario*, Canada, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Neumann-Holzschuh I. (2003), Les formes verbales invariables en créole: un cas de réanalyse, dans S. Kriegel (éd.), *Grammaticalisation et réanalyse. Approches de la variation créole et française*, Paris, CNRS Éditions (p. 69-86).

- (2005), Le subjonctif en français acadien, dans Brasseur & Falkert (p. 125-144).
- (2008), Oui YEAH! Zu Syntax und Pragmatik 'gedoppelter' Diskursmarker im Louisiana-Französischen, in E. Stark, R. Schmidt-Riese & E. Stoll (eds), *Romanische Syntax im Wandel*, Tübingen, G. Narr (p. 469-485).
- [to be published 2009], Les marqueurs discursifs 'redoublés' dans les variétés du français acadien, in B. Bagola & H.-J. Niederehe (eds).
- Perrot M.-E. (1995), *Aspects fondamentaux du métissage français/anglais dans le chiac de Moncton*, Paris, Université de la Sorbonne Nouvelle, Paris III (thèse de doctorat).
- Picone M. (1997), Code-switching and loss of inflection in Louisiana French, in C. Bernstein, T. Nunnally & R. Sabino (eds), *Language variety in the South revisited*, Tuscaloosa, University of Alabama Press (p. 152-162).
- Roberge Y. & Rosen N. (1999), Preposition stranding and *que*-deletion in Varieties of North American French, *Linguistica Atlantica*, 21, p. 153-168.
- Rortter K. (2001), *Language Shift in the Coastal Marshes of Louisiana*, New York, Peter Lang.
- (2000), The calquing of phrasal verbs in language contact, in J. Auger & A. Word-Allbritton (eds), *IUWPL 2: The CVC of sociolinguistics: Contact, Variation and Culture*, Bloomington, IULC Publications (p. 109-126).
- (2005), Variation et étiolement en français acadien : perspectives comparées, dans A. Valdman, J. Auger & D. Piston-Hatlen (dirs), *Le français en Amérique du Nord. État présent*, Saint-Nicolas (Québec), Presses de l'Université Laval (p. 243-260).
- (ms.), Les prépositions orphelines en français louisianais, paper given at the XXV CILPR, 3-8 September 2007, Innsbruck.
- Sankoff G. (2002), Linguistic Outcomes of Language Contact, in J.K. Chambers, P. Trudgill & N. Schilling-Estes (eds), *The Handbook of Language Variation and Change*, Malden/Oxford, Blackwell (p. 638-668).
- Sasse H.-J. (1992), Language decay and contact-induced change: Similarities and differences, in M. Brenzinger (ed.), *Language death: Factual*

- and theoretical explorations with special reference to East Africa, New York, Mouton de Gruyter (p. 59-80).
- Silva-Corvalán C. (1994), *Language Contact and change. Spanish in Los Angeles*, Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Stabler C. (1995a), *La vie dans le temps et astéur. Ein Korpus von Gesprächen mit Cadiens in Louisiana*, Tübingen, Narr.
- (1995b), *Entwicklung mündlicher romanischer Syntax. Das français cadien in Louisiana*, Tübingen, Narr.
- Szlezák E. (2007), *La langue elle part avec les gens. Franco-Americans in Massachusetts*, thèse de doctorat, Regensburg.
- Thomason S. & Kaufman T. (1988), *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*, Berkeley, University of California Press.
- Tremblay M. (2005), *Back* en français acadien: archaïsme ou innovation, dans Brasseur & Falkert (eds) (p. 263-273).
- Vinet M.-Th. (1984), La syntaxe du québécois et les emprunts à l'anglais, *Revue de l'Association Québécoise de Linguistique*, 3-3, p. 221-242.
- Wiesmath R. (2001), Français acadien traditionnel, chiac und français cadiens in Neubraunschweig und Louisiana: drei Spielarten des akadischen englischen Sprachkontakts, in J. Born (ed.), *Mehrsprachigkeit in der Romania. Französisch im Kontakt und in der Konkurrenz zu anderen Sprachen*, Wien, Edition Praesens (p. 151-173).
- (2002), Présence et absence du relatif et conjonctif QUE dans le français acadien, in Pusch & Raible, *Romanische Korpuslinguistik I*, Tübingen, Narr (p. 393-408).
- (2006), *Le français acadien. Analyse syntaxique d'un corpus oral recueilli au Nouveau-Brunswick/Canada*, Paris, L'Harmattan.