

PREPOSITION STRANDING AND QUE-DELETION IN VARIETIES OF NORTH AMERICAN FRENCH

Yves Roberge and Nicole Rosen
University of Toronto

ABSTRACT

Comparative studies of the differences between North-American varieties of French (NAF) and Standard French (SF) reveal that most variation is found in the lexical and phonological systems. This type of variation is well-documented. However, this is not the case for the syntactic component, which could lead one to believe that there are very few syntactic differences between NAF and SF. This article deals with some differences between NAF and SF in the prepositional and complementizer systems. More precisely, we argue that the fact that stranded prepositions appear more freely in NAF than in SF is related to facts regarding variation in the complementizer system.

1. INTRODUCTION¹

Within certain discourse contexts, the sentences in (1) are completely acceptable in all varieties of French.

- (1) Grevisse (1986: 1509)
- a. Et vous coulez avec.
and you sink with (it)
 - b. Tu n'es pas fait pour.
you are not made for (it)
 - c. Il a écrit des poèmes avec rimes et des poèmes sans.
he has written poems with rhyme and poems without

Those in (2), on the other hand, while completely excluded in SF, are acceptable to various degrees in most NAF varieties.

- (2) a. (*) C'est la personne que j'ai du trouble avec.
b. (*) Qui as-tu fait ce gâteau pour?
c. (*) Jean a été voté contre.

1 This paper is partly an extension of previous work done in collaboration with Ruth King; see King & Roberge (1990) and Roberge (1998). A previous version of this paper was delivered at the Southeastern Conference on Linguistics (University of Southwestern Louisiana, March 1998). We would like to thank Ruth King as well as Becky Brown, Rose-Marie Déchaine, Terry Nadasdi, Diane Massam and an anonymous reviewer for their help and comments. The research reported on in this paper was funded in part by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (Roberge; 410-94-0284).

The English equivalents in (3) of the sentences in (2) are also grammatical in spoken English.

- (3) a. This is the person I am having trouble with.
 b. Who did you bake this cake for?
 c. John was voted against.

Since, at first sight, this difference seems to be potentially due to an English influence on NAF, we will ask whether the existence of stranded prepositions in those varieties can be the result of direct syntactic borrowing. However, Vinet (1996) argues that the syntactic component of a grammar is quite insensitive to exchanges between languages. If this is true, we are faced with a paradox: most NAF varieties are in a fairly intense contact situation with English and are therefore used in a social context which seems to favour English influences. Even more paradoxically, Van Riemsdijk (1978) shows that stranded preposition constructions are quite rare among the languages of the world. Again, if the generalized use of English-type stranded prepositions in NAF is indeed attributable to an English influence, then we must ask how such a marked construction has been so easily integrated to the grammar of NAF. We argue in this paper that stranded preposition constructions in NAF have not been borrowed directly from English but arose as contact with English allowed for a reanalysis of some properties of the complementizer system which in turn triggered a shift in the prepositional system.

2. STRANDED PREPOSITIONS

We will first attempt to distinguish the Standard French-type stranded prepositions from their English counterparts.

2.1. Standard French

Traditional descriptive grammars contain many examples of stranded prepositions in SF. It is generally assumed that prepositions can appear with an implicit object when they are used as adverbs; cf. Grevisse (1986: 1473) and Togeby (1984: 26). For Martinet et al. (1979: 135, 142), the missing object is recovered through discourse linking. Arrivé et al. (1986: 49, 55, 561) propose a deletion rule which results in a kind of pronominalization. Zribi-Hertz (1984) presents the most detailed comparative analysis of French and English stranded prepositions. She argues that the missing object in French does not correspond to the missing object in English, which is the trace of the moved complement. In French, moving the com-

plement of the preposition gives an ungrammatical result. Compare (4) and (5).

- (4) Cette chaise_i, Jean a monté dessus -_i.
 this chair, Jean climbed on (it)
- (5) a. * [Qu'est-ce que]_i Jean a monté dessus -_i?
 what did Jean climb on
 b. * [Quelle chaise]_i Jean a-t-il monté dessus -_i?
 which chair did Jean climb on
 c. * [Cette chaise]_i a été montée dessus -_i.
 this chair was climbed on

It thus appears that we have in (4) a simple coreference relation between the missing object and its antecedent which is different from the relation established between a topicalized or WH element and its trace. Tuller (1986: 370-384) analyses the missing object in (4) as *pro*, (here an empty resumptive pronoun) the content of which must be recovered by a dislocated element. This element can be empty and act as an operator having a discourse reference as shown in (6).

- (6) A: Pardon. Où se trouve le forum_i?
 pardon me. Where is the forum
 B: **Op_i** [Ah! Mais vous venez de passer devant **pro_i**]
 well, you have just passed in front

We can then ask what property French prepositions have which allows them to appear with *pro*, a question to which we return shortly. In this respect, Vinet (1984) notes that English does not accept French-type stranded prepositions as shown in (7), which would be perfectly acceptable in French (*Je voyage toujours avec*).

- (7) A: This is a very nice bag.
 B: * Thank you, I always travel with.

It must therefore be the case that such a property is not shared by English prepositions. Let us now turn to English-type stranded prepositions.

2.2. English

According to Kayne (1984), the possibility of extracting the complement of a preposition in English is related to the existence of exceptional Case-marking (ECM) exemplified in (8a) and which does not exist in French (8b).

- (8) a. John believes Bill to have lied.
 b. * Jean croit Bill avoir menti.

Kayne argues that because the preposition *for* is sometimes required to assign Nominative Case to the subject of the embedded infinitival clause as in (9), it is possible to assume that an empty preposition is responsible for ECM in (8a).

- (9) a. It would be a pity for something to happen to him.
 b. * Ce serait dommage de quelque chose lui arriver.
 c. For John to leave now would be a mistake.
 d. * Pour Jean partir maintenant serait une erreur.

He goes on to show that the equivalent construction is ungrammatical in French (see 9b, d) because the preposition *de* (as opposed to *for*) cannot govern and assign Case to the embedded subject. As for stranded prepositions, Kayne assumes, following Hornstein & Weinberg (1981), that they are allowed when the verb and preposition can be reanalyzed as a [V+P] constituent. This is supported by the fact that stranded prepositions must be structurally adjacent to the verb as shown in (10). Otherwise, reanalysis cannot take place and stranded prepositions are impossible.

- (10) a. Pugsley gave a book to Mao yesterday.
 b. Pugsley gave a book yesterday to Mao.
 c. Who did Pugsley give a book to yesterday?
 d. * Who did Pugsley give a book yesterday to?

Crucially, reanalysis can only affect verbs and prepositions which govern their object in the same way. This is the case in English given the existence of ECM constructions. Conversely, reanalysis cannot take place in French because the non-existence of ECM constructions is evidence that verbs and prepositions do not govern in the same way in this language.

2.3. North American French varieties

It is now possible to explore the intermediate constructions available in NAF varieties. Let us first classify the various possible constructions and varieties. We use the five varieties given in (11), labelled according to the province or state in which they are spoken. Note that these labels are somewhat arbitrary and artificial, but our goal here is not to draw sociolinguistic generalizations; what is important is the existence of the constructions more than who uses them where.

- (11)
- | | |
|------|--|
| PEIF | Prince Edward Island—King & Roberge (1990). |
| QF | Québec—Bouchard (1982), Vinet (1984) + intuitions. |
| OF | Ontario—mainly Pembroke, Terry Nadasdi. |
| AF | Alberta—Sainte-Lina, Rose-Marie Déchaine. |
| LF | Louisiana—Stäbler (1995), Becky Brown. |

Based on King & Roberge (1990), we examine the level of acceptability of the following constructions in the five NAF varieties and include English (E) as a point of reference. SF accepts none of the constructions.

A complement of a full preposition can be moved in relatives (12a) in PEIF, QF, OF, AF, LF and E; in interrogatives (12b) and in pseudo-passives (12c) in PEIF, AF, LF and E.

- (12) a. Le gars que je travaille pour.
(The man I work for.)
b. Qui tu as fait le gâteau pour?
(Who did you bake the cake for?)
c. Le ciment a été marché dedans.
(The concrete was stepped in.)

A complement of the prepositions *à* (to) and *de* (of) can be moved in relatives (13a) in PEIF and E; in interrogatives (13b) in PEIF, ?AF and E; and in pseudo-passives (13c) in PEIF and E.

- (13) a. La fille que je te parle de. / La fille que j'ai donné la job à...
(The girl I am talking of. / The girl I gave the job to.)
b. Où il vient de? / Quelle heure elle a arrivé à?
(Where does he come from? / What time did he arrive at?)
c. Robert a été parlé de.
(Robert was talked about.)

Finally, no NAF variety allows Exceptional Case-marking with *V* or *de* (for), a possibility that exists in E, of course.

- (14) a. * Paul veut Jean partir.
(Paul wants John to leave.)
b. * Ce serait platte de quelque chose lui arriver.
(It would be a drag for something to happen to him.)

The following tendencies emerge. PEIF is the variety which accepts stranded prepositions most freely. In fact, King & Roberge (1990) point out that, with the exception of ECM, PEIF is even freer than English because it does not impose an adjacency requirement on *V* and *P* in stranded preposition constructions. More constrained than PEIF but freer than the other NAF varieties, AF and LF seem resistant to extending the stranded preposition construction to *à* and *de*. OF and QF behave in a similar fashion in allowing stranded prepositions only in relative clauses with full prepositions. Finally, ECM is impossible in all NAF varieties.

There are in fact four grammar types: Grammar 1 corresponds to SF; Grammar 2, including OF and QF, extends the possibility of stranded prepositions to relative clauses with full prepositions; Grammar 3 is repre-

sented by AF and LJ: extraction from PP is always possible but only with full prepositions; Grammar 4 is PEIF, allowing extraction from any PP.

2.4. Analysis

Intuitively speaking, there is no doubt that at least some of the NAF constructions must have arisen through interference from English. Before examining one possible scenario as to how this might have happened, it is important to account for the differences between SF and English, between SF and NAF, and among the NAF varieties.

2.4.1. On the difference between Standard French and English

We have adopted an analysis of the SF construction in which the null complement of the stranded preposition is the base-generated empty resumptive pronoun *pro*. It has been proposed in the literature that *pro* differs from phonologically realized pronouns in that it is not Case-marked; cf. Roberge (1990). Assuming this, a natural hypothesis would consist in saying that SF prepositions only assign Case optionally. One possible implementation of this is that the SF prepositional system be divided into two paradigms, one including the prepositions that assign Case, the other the ones that do not assign Case. In some instances the forms are the same in both paradigms such that a preposition like *avec* (with) can be either [+Case] or [-Case], whereas *sur* (on) is [+Case] but *dessus* (over) is [-Case].²

The prepositions *à* and *de* are often considered to be elements which assign Case but no semantic role to their complement. Theta theory can thus be used, through the feature [+/-θ], to differentiate *à* and *de* from other prepositions. We would then not expect *à* and *de* to appear in the [-Case] paradigm excluding them therefore from stranded preposition constructions in SF. This is the case as shown in (15).

- (15) a. * Cet homme, je parle souvent à.
 this man, I often talk to
 b. * Ce problème, je parle souvent de.
 this problem, I often talk of(about)

The typology system in (16) can thus account for the constructions found in SF.

2 A reviewer pointed out to us that the same situation occurs in pronominal paradigms where a unique form can be part of both the strong and weak paradigms (*no is, vous*, subject).

(16) Standard French Prepositions

	+ θ	- θ
+ case	sur, avec, dans, etc.	à, de
- case	dessus, avec, dedans, etc.	—

The [-Case] prepositions appear with *pro* and correspond to what traditional grammars refer to as detransitivized prepositions. The [+Case] prepositions appear with a phonologically realized complement.

Extending this approach, we simply assume that English prepositions are always Case-assigners except for those used as particles to form verbal constituents such as *go down* or *look up*. Such particles do not assign semantic roles. The English system is represented in (17).

(17) English Prepositions

	+ θ	- θ
+ case	with, about, after, etc.	to, of, for
- case	—	down, up, etc.

2.4.2. On the difference Between Standard French and the North American Varieties

We turn first to type 2 grammars (QF and OF) which extend stranded prepositions to relative clause environments. We argue, following Bouchard (1982) and Vinet (1984), that the difference between SF and OF/QF is not to be attributed to properties of prepositions but in fact to the relative clause construction itself. Both Bouchard and Vinet show that relative clauses in QF are not built through WH-movement but involve rather an empty resumptive pronoun strategy. The fact that subagency requirements do not apply in QF relatives, though they do in English, supports this conclusion.

(18) Vinet (1984)

- a. La fille que je connais très bien le gars qui sort avec.
- b. * The girl that I know very well the guy who went out with.

Grammar 3 (AF, LF) on the other hand, seems to involve a shift in the prepositional system such that the [-Case] paradigm has become part of the [+Case] one. This means that the Standard French-type stranded prepositions are not available allowing the emergence of the English-type stranded prepositions although AF and LF have not extended this to *à* and

de; this may be due in part to the semantically underspecified nature of those prepositions.

(19) Alberta French / Louisiana French Prepositions

	+ θ	- θ
+ case	sur, avec, dans, etc.	à, de
- case	dessus, avec, dedans, etc.	—

Grammar 4 (PEIF) corresponds to Grammar 3 but the English-type stranded preposition construction has spread to *à* and *de*.

(20) Prince Edward Island French Prepositions

	+ θ	- θ
+ case	sur, avec, dans, etc.	à, de
- case	dessus, avec, dedans, etc.	—

3. QUE DELETION IN NORTH AMERICAN FRENCH

We wish to argue that the shift in the prepositional system from [-Case] to [+Case], postulated above in order to account for the difference between AF/LF/PEIF and SF/OF/QF, may be attributed to a change observed in popular French generally: the tendency to delete the complementizer *que* as in the following examples:

(21) Frei (1929: 123)

- a. Tu veux je vienne?
you want I come
- b. Il a dit i viendrait.
he said he would come

It is thus important to examine this phenomenon more closely. In varieties of NAF, we find that the conjunction *que* is either deleted or optional in many environments, which is never the case in Standard French (SF). Several environments permit the complementizer to be deleted in NAF. We will concentrate the discussion on examples from LF, all taken from Stäbler (1995). However, these same types of examples can be found in other varieties of popular French, as in Frei (1929), Sankoff (1980) and Martineau (1988).

3.1 Examples of que-deletion

There are several different environments which allow deletion of *que*. Relative, circumstantial and complement clauses can all be found without the complementizer *que*, obligatory in SF:

- (22) LF: je crois pas $\emptyset$ on parle de la même femme
 SF: Je crois pas qu'on parle de la même femme.
 I don't think $\emptyset$ we are talking about the same woman.
- (23) LF: c'est là $\emptyset$ ma mère à moi vivait
 SF: C'est là que ma mère vivait.
 it's there $\emptyset$ my mother lived
- (24) LF: c'était S.L.I. habitude avant $\emptyset$ ça soyait une université
 SF: C'était le S.L.I. avant que ça soit une université
 it used to be S.L.I. before $\emptyset$ it was a university
- (25) LF: ils ont bâti un tas de maisons depuis $\emptyset$ moi je m'ai marié
 SF: ils ont bâti un tas de maisons depuis que je me suis marié
 they've built a lot of houses since $\emptyset$ I got married.
- (26) LF: et c'est peut-être ça qui a sauvé qu'il a pas brûlé plus mauvais,
 parce $\emptyset$ y avait de l'eau qui coulait dehors
 SF: et c'est peut-être ça qui a fait qu'il n'a pas brûlé plus, parce qu'il
 y avait de l'eau qui coulait dehors
 and maybe that's what saved that he didn't burn worse, because $\emptyset$ there
 was water outside

3.2. Previous analyses

Previous work on this subject has proved unsatisfactory or inconclusive for our purposes. A few studies have been made, specifically by Sankoff (1980a,b), Connors (1975), and Martineau (1988). Sankoff concludes that *que*-deletion is phonologically governed, based on the sonority hierarchy. A sonorant or a vowel is less likely to trigger deletion, whereas a sibilant is most likely to trigger the deletion. This is determined because of the high number of cases of deletion after /s/. However, there is no explanation as to why this should be; there does not appear to be any general cross-linguistic pattern where /s/ triggers a deletion, leaving the question pending as to why this would be the case.

Connors, using the same data as Sankoff (from a study by Sankoff, Sarrasin & Cedergren 1971), concludes that this deletion is not phonologically but syntactically conditioned, since the deletion seems to occur most often before pronouns in complement clauses. According to the data, *que* is less often deleted before a noun phrase. However, Martineau (1988) points

out that this explanation is problematic, as the speaker would need to know that they were going to use a pronoun and not a noun in the complement clause, even before pronouncing the *que*. As well, Connors neglects to explain why pronouns in relative and circumstantial clauses are less often deleted.

Martineau (1983) argues that there is a strong lexical influence affecting *que*-deletion in certain complex conjunctions. For example, in Martineau's study the *que* was most often deleted with *parce que* (32% of occurrences), a fact which she attributes to the form of the conjunction; it is made up of the preposition *par* which has incorporated the sequence *ce que*, has been reanalyzed and lexicalized in the form *parce*. The problem with this explanation is that it is not general enough and does not extend to other *que*-deletion environments.

3.3. The two functional roles of *que* in SF

Que has two functional roles in SF. It acts both as a relative pronoun, and as a complementizer. The relative pronoun, although it must be generated in COMP, superficially acts both as an antecedent for another NP, and to introduce the subordinate clause. The complementizer role of *que*, however, is not related to an NP, but it is also in the position of COMP. It acts as a complementizer in expressions such as *après que*, *depuis que*, etc., as well as in complement clauses such as *je pense que*, *je crois que*, etc. It acts as a relative pronoun in relative clauses, alongside other relative pronouns such as *qui*, *dont*, *lequel*, *auquel*, etc. The difference between the two is that relative *que* agrees with an empty accusative WH element in the Spec C" position whereas complementizer *que* is simply generated in COMP.

3.3.1. Relatives in LF

In LF, *que* is by far the most used relative pronoun. *Qui* and *ça* are also frequently used, but *que* in LF seems to act as a default relative pronoun, taking the place of *dont* and *lequel*, which do not occur in LF.

- (27) LF: la femm.e...**que** le canal appartient
 the woman that the canal belongs
 SF: la femm.e...à **laquelle** le canal appartient
 The woman to whom the canal belongs.
- (28) LF: le tit enfant de cet homme-là qu'a brûlé..**que** sa maison a brûlé..
 the grandchild of that man... that burned...that his house burned..
 SF: le petit enfant de cet homme..**qui** a brûlé..**dont** la maison a brûlé..
 The child of that man...who burned...whose house burned..

This is also a fact commonly observed in other popular French varieties.

(29) Frei (1929: 184-186)

- a. Tu me diras si tu m'as envoyé le colis que tu me parlais. (= dont)
you will tell me if you sent the package that you told me
- b. J'ai reçu ta carte que tu me parles de Marie. (= dans laquelle)
I received your card that you talk to me about Marie
- c. Une chose que je n'ai pas fait attention. (= à laquelle)
a thing that I didn't pay attention
- d. Je vous écris une lettre que je pense vous fera plaisir. (= qui)
I am writing you a letter that I think will please you

In LF, the relation between the antecedent noun and the subordinate clause is not recoverable from the relative pronoun. The *que* no longer serves as an antecedent, but rather has been reanalyzed simply as a complementizer. This reanalysis is common in varieties of NAF. However, when a grammatical item is burdened with more functions, the recoverability of meaning must suffer. In other words, if *que* is now functioning as a general relative pronoun as well as a complementizer for complement clauses, one would expect this to entail changes elsewhere in the grammar. The relativizing function of *que* supercedes its complementizing function, which is consequently weakened. Since its complementizing function is no longer important, it can disappear from the COMP position.

3.3.2. Complex conjunctions in LF

These complex conjunctions are made up of two elements: a preposition (ie. *après, aussitôt, pour, parce*, etc), and the complementizer *que*. If the complementizer is deleted, and if it did have a functional role before its deletion, presumably something else must have taken over that functional role, in order for the sentence to remain grammatical. Consider the example in (27):

- (30) LF: n a quelqu'un qui la prend avant $\emptyset$ tu la payes et
avant $\emptyset$ le jour se refait
- SF: il y a quelqu'un qui la prend avant que tu la payes et
avant que le jour se refasse
Someone takes it before you pay for it, and before the day starts over.

According to Stowell (1981), a tensed clause introduced by the complementizer cannot receive case, and so the role of *que* is to assure that the clauses it introduces cannot receive case. This is necessary, since the prepositions in these complex conjunctions do not assign case. If the preposition does not assign a case, then the following clause cannot receive case without violating case theory.

3.3.3. Comparatives

If we look at comparatives in LF, we see a contrast in allowable *que*-deletion. In Ståhle's (1995) corpus, there are no occurrences of *que*-deletion in comparative constructions, as in (31) and (32).

- (31) ça c'éta t aussi vert que tu peux les faire
That was as green as you could make them.
- (32) J'aimerais tant élever les serpents sonnettes
qui manier les cocodries.
I'd like to raise rattlesnakes as much as I'd like to handle a crocodile.

These same sentences without complementizer appear to be ungrammatical in LF, raising the question of how they are different from the complement, circumstantial and relative clauses which have optional deletion. The impossibility of deletion in these comparatives shows us that it is not the *que* itself which is optional, but rather that there are other syntactic relations which enter into play to determine the optionality of the complementizer. *Que* is not erased across-the-board, but rather in specific syntactic environments.

3.4. *That*-deletion in English

3.4.1. Complement Clauses

In English, the complementizer *that* is optional in complement clauses.

- (33) a. I thought that she wanted to come.
b. I thought $\emptyset$ she wanted to come.

The *that* is a complementizer, not a relative pronoun. The complementizer in English is optional, unlike in SF, where COMP must always be filled phonologically.

3.4.2. Conjunctives

In English, there cannot be a complementizer *that* in the analogous sentences to those that we have seen with *que* in SF.

- (34) *I will not eat before that world peace has been declared.

(However, it seems that historically these sentences were grammatical in English, cf. Dubinsky & Williams 1995). If we accept Stowell's hypothesis, then we see that this is due to the fact that all prepositions assign case in English. If a complementizer were inserted (or not deleted), there would be a case assigned by the preposition. This would violate case theory be-

cause of the presence of the complementizer, rendering the sentence ungrammatical.

3.4.3. Relatives

The relative pronouns in English are *who*, *whom*, *which*, *whose*. etc. We also find the relativizer *that* in relative clauses.

- (35) a. I ate the cake that he made for my birthday.
b. I ate the cake $\emptyset$ he made for my birthday.

Both (35a, b) are grammatical, but examine the following examples.

- (36) a. I saw the man who gave you the flowers.
b. * I saw the man $\emptyset$ gave you the flowers.

The ungrammaticality of (36b) is due to the form of the relative. In (35a), *that* is a complementizer, and not an antecedent, while in (36a), *who* is an NP and an antecedent. Given that complementizers are optional in English, the *that* that has been reanalyzed as a complementizer in relative clauses is also optional.

3.5. NAF and English

The fact that complementizer *que* can delete in NAF need not necessarily be attributed to borrowing from English; it seems, rather, to be a natural consequence of the weakening of this element arising as a consequence of the relative *que* replacing most other relative pronouns. Our claim is that in a contact situation it is possible that *que*-deletion in complex conjunctions such as (24), (25) and (30) has been reinterpreted in some NAF grammars as an indication that prepositions are obligatory case-assigners thereby allowing for the emergence of English-type stranded prepositions. In this sense, NAF has not 'borrowed' the construction. Instead, contact with English may have stirred the change in a direction not attested across-the-board in Popular French.

4. CONCLUSION

We have seen that in popular varieties of French in general, relative *que* replaces most other relative pronouns. We have claimed that this shift in the complementizer system may be responsible for the weakening of complementizer (i.e. not relative) *que* and for the fact that its presence is in most contexts optional.

Standard French:

- $Op_i \dots P + pro_i$
- full relative pronoun system

Popular French/Ontario French/Québec French:

- $Op_i \dots P + pro_i$
- • reduced relative pronoun system (*que*)
- ▶ • optional *que* complementizer

There is no reason to believe that this change could have occurred only in NAF. In our view however, the intense contact situation between English and French in North America has triggered another shift, one in which *que*-deletion has affected the prepositional system such that prepositions are reinterpreted as obligatory Case-assigners. A consequence of this change is that the complement of a preposition can be extracted.

Prince Edward Island French/Alberta French/Louisiana French:

- $Op_i \dots P + pro_i$
- reduced relative pronoun system (*que*)
- • optional *que* complementizer
- ▶ • $NP_i/Wh_i \dots P + t_i$

REFERENCES

- ARRIVÉ, MICHEL, FRANCOISE GADET & MICHEL GALMICHE. 1986. *La grammaire d'aujourd'hui*. Flammarion: Paris.
- BOUCHARD, DENIS. 1982. Les constructions relatives en français vernaculaire et en français standard: étude d'un paramètre. In Claire Lefebvre (ed.), *La syntaxe comparée du français standard et populaire*. Office de la langue française: Québec, 103-133.
- CONNORS, KATHLEEN. 1975. L'effacement de *que*—règle syntaxique. *Recherches linguistiques à Montréal* 4: 17-33.
- DUBINSKY, STANLEY & KEMP WILLIAMS. 1995. Recategorization of prepositions as complementizers: the case of temporal prepositions in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26: 125-137.
- FREL, HENRI. 1929. *La grammaire des fautes* (1971 edition). Slatkine Reprints: Geneva.
- GREVISSE, MAURICE. 1986. *Le bon usage* (12th edition). Duculot: Paris.
- HORNSTEIN, NORBERT. & AMY WEINBERG. 1981. Case theory and preposition stranding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12: 55-91.
- KAYNE, RICHARD S. 1984. *Connectedness and Binary Branching*. Foris: Dordrecht.
- KING, RUTH & YVES ROBERGE. 1990. Preposition stranding in Prince Edward Island French. *Probus* 2: 351-369.
- MARTINEAU, FRANCE. 1988. Variable deletion of *que* in the spoken French of Ottawa-Hull. In D. Birdsong & J.-P. Montreuil (eds.), *Advances in Romance Linguistics*. Foris: Dordrecht, p. 275-287.
- MARTINET, ANDRÉ et al. 1979. *Grammaire fonctionnelle du français*. Didier: Paris.
- RIEMSDIJK, HENK VAN. 1978. *A Case Study in Syntactic Markedness*. Peter de Ridder Press: Lisse.
- ROBERGE, YVES. 1990. *The Syntactic Recoverability of Null Arguments*. McGill-Queens University Press: Montreal.
1998. Les prépositions orphelines dans diverses variétés de français d'Amérique du Nord. In P. Brasseur (ed.), *Français d'Amérique: variation, créolisation, normalisation*. Centre d'études canadiennes, Université d'Avignon, 49-60.

- SANKOFF, GILLIAN. 1980a. A quantitative paradigm for the study of communicative competence. In Gillian Sankoff (ed.), *The Social Life of Language*. University of Pennsylvania Press: Philadelphia.
- 1980b. Above and beyond phonology in variable rules. In Gillian Sankoff (ed.), *The Social Life of Language*. University of Pennsylvania Press: Philadelphia, 44-61.
- SANKOFF, GILLIAN, ROBERT SARRASIN & HENRIETTA CEDERGREN. 1971. Quelques considérations sur la distribution de la variable *que* dans le français de Montréal. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association canadienne-française pour l'avancement des sciences.
- STÄBLER, CYNTHIA K. 1995. *La vie dans le temps et l'espace: ein Korpus von Gesprächen mit Cadiens in Louisiana*. Tübingen: G. Narr Verlag.
- STOWELL, TIM A. 1981. *Origins of Phrase Structure*. PhD Dissertation, MIT.
- TOGEBY, KNUD. 1984. *Grammaire française. Volume IV: les particules*. Akademisk forlag: Copenhagen.
- TULLER, LAURIE. 1986. *Bijective Relations in Universal Grammar and the Syntax of Hausa*. PhD Dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles.
- VINET, MARIE-THÉRÈSE. 1984. La syntaxe du québécois et les emprunts à l'anglais. *Revue de l'association québécoise de linguistique* 3, 3: 221-241.
1996. Lexique, emprunts et invariants: une analyse théorique des anglicismes en français du Québec. *Revue québécoise de linguistique* 24, 2: 165-181.
- ZRIBI-HERTZ, ANNE. 1984. Prépositions orphelines et pronoms nuls. *Recherches linguistiques* 12: 46-91.