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Abstract

"C'est either que tu parles français, c'est either que tu parles anglais":

A Cognitive Approach to Chiac as a Contact Language

by

Hilary A. N. Young

This thesis concerns Chiac, a dialect of Acadian French (AF) that emerged in a small speech community of AF-English bilingual teenagers in Moncton, Canada. Syntactically and morphologically, Chiac closely resembles AF, but it also makes use of a number of English lexical items and other English-influenced constructions. This thesis addresses two related questions with regard to Chiac: how (and why) did it emerge, and what is its structure?

I answer the first question in Chapters 2-3, arguing that Chiac emerged as a result of a confluence of social factors. Speakers' age, their bilingualism, their urban environment and their attitudes toward the languages spoken in Moncton resulted in speakers sharing a sense of identity and wanting to distinguish themselves from other social groups. Within the framework of Cognitive Grammar (CG) I model the emergence of Chiac due to these social factors. The advantage of a CG approach is that, in addition to allowing for a unified analysis of how social factors influence linguistic structure, it treats the bilingual linguistic system in the same way as the monolingual linguistic system in that no special modules or formal devices are needed to account for bilingual language usage.
Chapters 4-6 address the second question: what is the structure of Chiac? Still using the framework of CG I describe the Chiac lexicon, as well as some of its noun phrase and verb phrase constructions. I find, for example, that English-based lexical items in Chiac tend to involve certain semantic domains related to teen culture (drugs, social groups at school etc.). The motivation for this usage seems to be that speakers' adolescence is highly relevant to their sense of identity, and that mixing English with their parents' language (AF) is a way of asserting that identity.

This thesis therefore has both theoretical and descriptive relevance in that, in addition to describing specific constructions, I show how constructions and ultimately an entire system emerged as a result of language mixing that is motivated by social factors.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1. Introductory Remarks

In the summer of 2001 I interviewed a young French-English bilingual from Moncton, Canada. When I asked him about Chiac, one of the languages he speaks, he told me: “Le chiac c’est pas un langue man, c’est nous aut’ qui a inventé ça. C’est either que tu parles français c’est either que tu parles anglais” (“Chiac isn’t a language, man, we invented that. You either speak French or you speak English”). French-speakers will recognize the irony in this statement: in declaring that one speaks either French or English, this speaker has mixed the two. The type of mixing seen in this quote is, in fact, characteristic of Chiac, which, contrary to the speaker’s assertion can be regarded as a language: specifically as a dialect of French.

Why, then, does the speaker not recognize Chiac as a language? There are several reasons for this. First, Chiac is highly variable in some regards (semi-grammaticalized). In addition, it makes use of constructions from two other languages with long and proud histories: Acadian French (AF) and English. Acadian French, as we shall see, is an eastern Canadian dialect of French that is known for its archaic constructions and for its anglicisms. Finally, speakers do not always construe Chiac as a “real language” because, as we saw in the quote that opened this chapter, they feel they invented it, whereas they
do not feel the same sense of ownership toward AF and English, which they do construe as languages.

What does it mean that Chiac speakers invented their language? I do not mean, of course, that Chiac is an artificial language like Esperanto or Klingon. Rather, Chiac is the dialect of a relatively small bilingual speech community, and its structure clearly reflects elements of its speakers' experience. Chiac speakers therefore invented their dialect on two levels: it emerged in their cognitive systems, and it emerged as a result of speakers' shared social background.

This thesis deals with the emergence and the structure of Chiac from both a cognitive and a social perspective. Before examining the focus of this project in more detail, however, it will be helpful for the reader to know more about this dialect. In section 1.2 I provide a brief grammatical sketch of Chiac and in section 1.3 I define it.

1.2. Grammatical Sketch

As I mentioned above, Chiac is a dialect of AF spoken by AF-English bilinguals in Moncton, New Brunswick, Canada. Speakers are young – typically high school students, and Chiac reflects their bilingualism in that it includes constructions of both AF and
English origin, as well as ones that are uniquely Chiac. The following passage from my corpus of spoken Chiac is typical\(^1\).

\(1\) **Je m'ais fait arrested alright. Pour comme vandalizing pi la shit xx total-er un car. Pi la mes parents étaient tout comme, ch'ais pas, c'était right pas comme, i care-aient pas comme ils étaient comme 'yeah whatever' pi là. Moi, moi j'avais pas besoin de curfew pi la shit. I respectaient. Pi là je m'ai fait kick-é out du Mall pi Crystal. Look out. Je m'ai fait arrested but je m'ai fait kick-é out. Asteure ma curfew est onze! Onze! Un un zero zero man.**

"I got arrested, alright. For like vandalizing and shit, xx totaling a car. And so my parents were all like "yeah whatever" n' that. Me, I didn't need a curfew and shit. They respected (me). And then I get myself kicked out of the Mall and Crystal (Palace). Look out. I get arrested but I get kicked out. Now my curfew is eleven! Eleven! One one zero zero man."

As the example above suggests, lexical items in Chiac are predominantly (but not overwhelmingly) AF-based\(^2\). Both content and function words can be English-based (cf. Chapter 4 for more on this). Thus in addition to lexemes like *curfew, car* and *arrested*, Chiac has *but, so* and *around* as conventional units, as in (2) and (3) below.

\(2\) **oui but comme j'aimerais avoir un petit peu de cash pour comme spend-er**

"yeah, but like, I'd like to have a little bit of cash to, like, spend"

---

\(^1\) Note that here and throughout the thesis I use a modified Standard French orthography for transcribing the data. Modifications include using a conventional Acadian spelling when one exists (eg. *Asteure* "now" from *a cette heure* and *arrater* "stop" instead of SF *arrêter, i* and *a* for the pronouns *il* and *elle*, etc.). In addition, when word stems are English-based but take AF morphology, I separate the root and the suffix with a hyphen (e.g. *kick-é out*). Also, with English-based roots I do not indicate any morphology unless it is overt. For example, if an English-based root is written with a plural -s suffix, this indicates an overt English-based morpheme. With AF-based units I use the conventional spelling. There is no ambiguity since English-based overt morphology does not occur with AF-based roots. If a pronunciation is ambiguous, as in the case of *concert*, for example, I include a phonological transcription. Finally, I use the symbol "xx" to indicate passages that are inaudible or otherwise uninterpretable.

\(^2\) By AF- or English-based I mean that a unit is part of the Chiac inventory but is etymologically related to a unit in AF or English.
(3) je trouve c'est pretty boring around iciette so sport comme skating c'est all the way
"I find it pretty boring around here so sports, like skating (skateboarding), it’s all the way."

In addition, Chiac has many English and French-based synonyms where the motivation for choosing one over the other is not always clear. Note, for example, the use of argent and cash for ‘money’ in the following two examples.

(4) ouiais i disont tout le temps l'argent pousse pas dans les arbres but moi je suis comme whatever, je veux de la cash anyways
"yeah they always say that money doesn’t grow on trees but I’m like ‘whatever’, I want money anyway"

Syntactically, Chiac shares much with the languages from which it emerged: it has SVO word order, a nominative/accusative system, and lacks case marking. Chiac morphosyntax, however, has more in common with AF than English. It has TAM markers similar to those of AF. The present tense, for example, is marked as in AF and SF except in the third person plural, where the AF -ont suffix alternates with the SF and AF -Ø.

(5) je marche [maRf]
tu marches [maRf]
il, elle, on\(^4\) marche [maRf]
vous marchez [maRfe]
i(ls) marchent/marchont [maRf] [maRf\(\bar{0}\)]

\(^3\) Although it is not clear from this example, others show that cash in Chiac has a meaning more similar to "money" than to English "cash".

\(^4\) "Nous", the 1p pronoun, is not attested in Chiac in subject position (rather on gets used for 1p.). It does still exist in object position. This non-use of nous is not unique to Chiac - it is apparently disappearing from spoken SF as well.
The alternation can be seen in the following examples:

(6) *qu'est ce qu'i disent* [diz] *de ça là? I care-ont* [kɛʁɔ̃] *pas*
    "What do they say about that? Don't they care?"

(7) *i comprennont* [kɔ̃prɛ̃nɔ̃] *pas*
    "they (my parents) don't understand"

(8) *i party(-ent)* [paʁi-Ø] *pas mal souvent*
    "they party a lot."

There seem to be no formal or semantic factors conditioning the choice of *-ont* versus *-Ø* and the alternation therefore appears to be a case of free variation.

The imperfect aspect in Chiac is marked as in SF and AF. The following paradigm is based on attested examples in my corpus, with the exception of the second person plural *vous étiez*, which was not attested\(^5\).

(9) \[\begin{array}{lcl}
    j' & étais & [ete] \\
    tu   & étais & [ete] \\
    il, elle, on & était & [ete] \\
    (vous & étiez) & \\
    ils & étaient & [ete] \\
\end{array} \]

---

\(^5\) As in many dialects of French, the second person plural *vous* does not occur or occurs only rarely. Instead *on* is used.
Turning to nominal morphology, plurality in Chiac is often indicated only by the article, as in SF and AF (but see Chapter 5 for a detailed analysis).

(10) *moi j’ai les same problèmes* [le sejm pʁɔblem]
    “I have the same problems”

(11) *y’a les punk, y’a les hippie*
    “you’ve got punks, you’ve got hippies”

It can, however, also be marked on the noun when the root is English-based. This is the case in example 12.

(12) *comme il a le mall pi les shows* [ʃəwz]
    “like there’s the mall and shows”

Finally, it should be noted that with regard to pronunciation, English-origin words retain English-like phonological patterns. In fact, even English-based words that were borrowed into AF and adapted to AF phonology are often pronounced as in English by Chiac speakers who recognize the English origins of the words. Consider the following example:

    “I was in Montreal last weekend and I partied. Hard core. I’m still burnt out from Montreal.”

*Weekend* is a loanword in SF and AF, pronounced with stress on the second syllable, but in the Chiac example above, it is pronounced as in English with stress on the first
syllable. In addition, party-é is pronounced [pātʁi], with a flap, whereas adapted to AF phonology it would sound something like [pāstʁi].

From this brief grammatical sketch it is apparent that Chiac has consistent, predictable properties, such as how it marks tense/aspect. It also exhibits a good deal of variation, however, with regard to plural marking, for instance, and especially with regard to the use of English- versus AF-based lexical items. Sometimes this variation is conditioned by the linguistic source of the root, as is the case with plural marking, but much of it is also free, as with the third person plural verbal suffixes –ont vs. Ø.

1.3. Defining Chiac

Describing characteristic properties of Chiac is one thing, but defining it is quite another. Answering the question “what is Chiac” is one of the goals of this thesis and each chapter reveals part of the answer. Nevertheless, a working definition is needed - especially since the term “Chiac” can be problematic. It is a difficult term for two reasons. First, the word “Chiac” is used to refer to a variety of types of speech, ranging from that of all francophones in southeastern New Brunswick, Canada to that of young bilinguals from Moncton, New Brunswick. One speaker, Jenna, explained:
Le chiac ça peut dire deux choses. Y'a une langue pi c'est justement chiac avec toutes sortes de mots vraiment différents là. Pi là y'a le chiac ici à Moncton que c'est le français et l'anglais mélangés ensemble.

"Chiac can mean two things. There's a language and it's Chiac with lots of really different words. And then there's the Chiac here in Moncton which is French and English mixed together."

This quote reveals two important things. First, Jenna refers to Chiac in the first sense (i.e. meaning something like AF) as a language, whereas she refers to Chiac in the second sense as simply a mixture of two languages. She does not accord it the status of a language in its own right.

The quote also reveals that Chiac in the first sense (i.e. AF) is not just spoken in Moncton. Jenna later cites Bouctouche and Shediac as other places where it is spoken, whereas Chiac in the second sense (the mixture of English and French, as she characterizes it) is described as being unique to Moncton.

The second problem with the term "Chiac" is that it evokes a number of emotional responses that are not necessarily evoked by paraphrases such as “the dialect of young francophone Monctonians”. These emotions can range from pride to shame or derision – sometimes all within the same person. These reactions will be examined in Chapter 2, but the following quote from a newspaper editorial serves to illustrate that the term is charged. “... On n’aime pas le nom shiac! Trouvez-moi un autre nom qui veut dire mêler deux langues et on nous ennuira pas avec le mot” ("we don’t like the term shiac!

---

6 After asking for clarification, it was clear that by this she meant AF.
Find me another term that means mixing two languages and we won’t be annoyed by the word") (Evangéline March 12, 1970).

For the purposes of my analyses, I define the term Chiac as follows. Chiac is a dialect of AF spoken by bilingual Monctonian teenagers. It involves a number of regular patterns, which we shall explore in detail in Chapters 4-6. These patterns have been influenced by AF, by English, and perhaps even by Standard French (SF), which is taught in the schools. Among the patterns of Chiac is occasional code-switching into English. That is, Chiac cannot be defined only in terms of code-switching, but does frequently involve it.

It will occasionally be useful to define Chiac in a narrower way that would exclude code-switching. In describing Chiac structure, for example, I shall be concerned only with Chiac in this narrow sense. That is, units that occur only in code-switches are not considered to be part of the structure of Chiac in the narrow sense. This does not mean that code-switching is not an important part of what it means to speak Chiac (in the broader sense) – clearly it is. It is simply not my goal to describe here AF and English usage patterns, which are well documented elsewhere. To avoid confusion I shall specify “Chiac in the narrow sense” when this is meant. Otherwise, I use the term in the broad sense.

---

7 The alternate spelling “shiac” is sometimes found in earlier references to the language. The initial “sh” reflects the origin of the word, which is said to derive from the name of the nearby town of Shediac.

8 Chiac may be spoken by youth in neighbouring towns, but since my corpus was collected in Moncton, I make no claims about the dialects spoken in Shediac, Memramcook, etc.
Chiac as I have defined it is not radically different from other dialects of Acadian French. Instead, it differs largely in degree from other dialects, which have not been influenced by English (or by SF) to the same extent. English nevertheless plays a role in all varieties of AF, since the Acadians have lived alongside an anglophone majority for centuries with varying degrees of contact. Thus, we can posit a continuum of AF dialects along several parameters including degree of anglicization, degree/amount of code-switching, use of archaic constructions, etc. These parameters correlate with social factors such as rural versus urban speakers, speakers’ age, degree of bilingualism, etc. Chiac represents one end of the continuum where there is a relatively high degree of anglicization and code-switching and a relatively low use of archaic constructions. This correlates with an urban setting, and with speakers who are young and proficient in English. At the other end of the continuum is the speech of older, less educated, more rural speakers (which is what is typically meant by “AF”)

Given that there is a dialect continuum of Acadian French dialects, ranging from “traditional” AF to Chiac, I need to qualify my claims regarding Chiac structure.

Although I refer to the constructions in Chapters 4-6 as being Chiac (and sometimes as uniquely Chiac or as Chiac innovations), they may also exist in other dialects of AF.

Some, such as the lexical items struggler (cf. Chapter 4) seem to only occur in the speech

---

9 Since most of the research available on AF relates to the speech of older generations, I shall use the term AF to refer to this speech. Given that little if any research has been done on the speech patterns of younger Monctonian adults (those aged 30-60), it is not clear to what extent their speech resembles traditional AF. What is clear (as we shall see in Chapter 2) is that Chiac is a youth dialect, and therefore different from the speech of its speakers’ parents. For the sake of simplicity I generally refer to all non-Chiac speaking francophones as AF-speakers. It is an empirical question, however, whether the speech of younger adults more closely resembles Chiac or the traditional AF dialect.
of young people in and around Moncton. The use of but, so and the particle back, on the other hand, are found in other dialects of AF (and even of Ontario French), including those spoken in Nova Scotia, Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island (cf. Roy 1979, Pérot 1995, King 2000: 115-133, etc.). Where the Chiac constructions I explore are attested for other dialects of AF, I make reference to this. The fact that a construction is not described in a grammar of AF, however, certainly does not preclude it from occurring in AF dialects. It is therefore quite possible that some of the constructions I describe for Chiac are also found in other AF dialects.

1.4. Questions for Research

Based on what I have presented so far, we can make several observations. Chiac is variable in many respects and conventional in others. It has its own name, but is often not considered a language. It incorporates structures from two source languages, but also has its own unique constructions. Its speakers are already bilingual yet created a third dialect. These observations lead to a number of questions. First, what is the nature of the linguistic system that allows speakers to mix AF and English in conventional and unconventional ways, as well as to create its own unique structures? Second, how did Chiac come about? What cognitive processes led to its emergence? Third, given that speakers were already bilingual, why did it emerge? Why did speakers “invent” it? These are the questions that I shall attempt to answer in this thesis.
The answers to these questions are all related. The nature of the system is the result of how it emerged and how it emerged is related to the particular motivating factors that influenced it. In other words, social factors motivated the emergence of a particular linguistic system and shaped its structure. Specifically, I argue that Chiac speakers form a social group by virtue of their shared adolescence, their shared city, their common historical and cultural background, etc. As bilinguals, they can manipulate the units of two different languages in order to express themselves. Assuming that linguistic expression involves not only denotative meaning but also communicating aspects of the social situation, speakers’ attitudes, etc., Chiac speakers, like all of us, use their linguistic inventory to tell us something about themselves. By mixing AF and English units, Chiac speakers distinguish themselves linguistically from their AF-speaking families and from the anglophone majority in Moncton, thereby asserting their distinct identity. Over time, this mixing, which may have initially simply resembled code-switching, became partially conventionalized. That is, patterns of regularity emerged within speakers’ individual linguistic systems and throughout the Chiac speech community.

The issues I shall be addressing, therefore, are related to the influence of social factors on linguistic structure and to modeling that structure. In order to present my analyses in a unified way, one must use a framework that allows one to account for the impact of social factors on cognitive, and specifically linguistic structures. The framework I feel is most amenable to such a unified analysis is Cognitive Grammar.
1.5. Theoretical Framework: Cognitive Grammar – A Usage-Based Model

Cognitive Grammar (CG) is a general theory of language that seeks to describe and account for linguistic structures in cognitively plausible ways. Thus, linguistic units posited within this model are hypotheses regarding a speaker’s cognitive structures. It is a usage-based model in the sense of Langacker 1988 and Kemmer and Barlow 2000 in that it assumes a significant relationship between linguistic structure and instances of language use. These instances of language use, or “usage events”, involve specific occasions where speakers produce and understand speech. In order to do so, speakers and hearers draw on a number of resources including “memory, planning, ...general knowledge, ...as well as full apprehension of the physical, social cultural and linguistic context” (Langacker 2000: 9). Since usage events involve articulating an awareness of the various contexts of the speech situation, “the advent of cognitive linguistics can also be heralded as a return to cultural linguistics” (Langacker 1994: 31). Usage-based frameworks such as CG therefore allow one to model the relationship between social factors and linguistic structures in a cognitively plausible way.

In CG in particular, this relationship follows from the fact that meaning is viewed as the concepts that are evoked by a linguistic form. Concepts related to social information are evoked by forms and are therefore treated as part of their semantic content. Formal registers of speech, for example, evoke certain concepts related to formal contexts: the workplace, speeches, social distance, etc. When selecting units to encode a conceptualization, one will choose these formal units only if one wants to evoke concepts
of formality. Similarly, in the case of the Chiac speaker, part of the meaning of AF units (although not a very central part) is that they are used by older AF speakers: Chiac speakers’ parents and grandparents, for example. Thus, selecting those units evokes, at some level, concepts related to other AF speakers. Given that Chiac speakers are bilingual, they have a number of linguistic options and can choose to mix AF and English units in order to evoke different concepts.

Over time, this motivated mixing leads to the emergence of new linguistic units, and some of these become conventionalized. Then, because these patterns of usage are shared by members of a speech community, they acquire as part of their meaning an association with that group. In this way, Chiac becomes a symbol of group identity.

In Chapter 3 I describe the CG framework in more detail and use it to model the Chiac speaker’s linguistic system and its emergence. Then, in subsequent chapters, I use CG to model specific Chiac constructions. It should be noted, however, that although I make use of CG terminology and concepts, my analyses are generally compatible with other usage-based models of language.

1.6. The Corpus

As one who takes a usage-based approach to language, I feel it is important to consider actual speech data - actual usage events. My analyses are therefore based almost entirely on a corpus of spoken Chiac that was collected in the summer of 2000 with the assistance
of Line Losier and which I transcribed along with Evelyne Arsenault. Although I assume that my findings hold for other speakers in different situations, I can only comment on the speech habits exhibited in my corpus data or described elsewhere in the literature.

My corpus consists of approximately 53,000 words of relatively informal conversation recorded at a youth hang-out in Moncton – “la Maison des Jeunes”. Speakers (in groups of two to four) were asked to discuss a number of topics that were given to them on a sheet of paper. Each session lasted about 40 minutes. An assistant remained in the large room with them, but was generally out of earshot. The microphone was visible at all times. Topics of discussion included “qu'est-ce qui serait pour toi un monde parfait?” (“what's your idea of a perfect world?”), “dans quel pays que tu ne connais pas encore aimerais-tu aller? Pourquoi ce pays et pas un autre?” (“which country would you like to visit that you have not yet been to? Why this country and not another?”), “qu'est-ce que tu trouves qui manque à la ville [Moncton]?” (“what do you think is missing in the city [Moncton]?”), etc. These were written in a fairly informal style of French, but not specifically in Chiac. Many of the questions deliberately resembled those used by Marie-Eve Pérot when she collected her 1990 corpus (published with her 1995 dissertation), so that my findings could more validly be compared to hers if diachronic change\textsuperscript{10} or other variation seemed to be involved.

\textsuperscript{10} Although it may seem odd to consider diachronic change over a period of only ten years, when dealing with a teen dialect this is certainly a possibility.
In all, 29 speakers participated for a total of 13 different sessions. Speakers ranged in age from 13 to 18 but most were between 14 and 16. All live in or near Moncton (Moncton, Dieppe, Memramcook, Shediac) and most live in Moncton proper. With the exception of one participant, all have lived most of their life in the Moncton area. Many, but not all, had at least one parent from Moncton. Participants come from a wide range of economic backgrounds as judged by their parents’ professions. These included a civil servant, a surveyor, a figure skating coach, a postal employee, an engineer, a cashier, a secretary and a carpenter.

All the data I use are from this corpus unless otherwise indicated. Furthermore, all conclusions are drawn based on corpus data with the exception of the semantic analyses of *back* (Chapter 6), *struggle* and *chill* (Chapter 4). For these, I used some elicited data, and these examples are clearly marked as such. In addition, I occasionally supplement my examples with ones from Pérrot’s corpus of spoken Chiac. For these too the source is clearly identified.

1.7. Previous Research

This is not the first corpus-based approach to Chiac. In 1995 Marie-Eve Pérrot wrote a dissertation called “Aspects Fondamentaux du Métissage Français/ Anglais dans le Chiac de Moncton (Nouveau-Brunswick, Canada)”. This is a descriptive work based on a corpus of spoken Chiac and is the only other comprehensive study that deals specifically with Chiac structure (as opposed to that of AF more generally). Pérrot describes those
elements of Chiac that differ significantly from the structure of Standard French and from other Acadian varieties. As the first major work to be dedicated to Chiac structure, her analyses brought valuable data and insight, and a certain validation, to a dialect that many people previously considered to be random mixing.

Where my work differs from Pérrot’s is that in addition to describing social factors and constructions (both of which Pérrot does), I create a model of the Chiac speaker’s linguistic system that allows for a unified account of how these social factors motivate the mixing that ultimately leads to the Chiac system. That Pérrot has not done this is not a criticism of her study. Her intent was to describe Chiac usage, and the fact that she has done this means that other linguists, such as myself, can build on her work.

This thesis also builds on extensive sociolinguistic research that has been conducted on Chiac and AF speakers in Moncton. Of particular importance is Annette Boudreau’s 1998 dissertation *Représentations et attitudes linguistiques des jeunes francophones de l’Acadie du Nouveau Brunswick*. It provides a detailed description of the social situation of Chiac speakers – including their attitudes toward their language. Although my description of Chiac speakers’ experience is based on a number of sources, including my own interviews, Boudreau’s thesis was invaluable. It enabled me to provide a detailed account of Chiac speakers’ social situation, which in turn allowed me to model the emergence of Chiac.
In addition to the descriptive and sociolinguistic literature on Chiac, previous research on AF was essential in distinguishing uniquely Chiac constructions from ones that are earlier AF innovations. As I mentioned above, AF has also been influenced by English, and it is important that one distinguish between AF and Chiac innovations, since these are presumably motivated by different social factors. The most important descriptive studies of AF are Louise Péronnet’s *Le parler acadien du sud-est du Nouveau-Brunswick*, which is primarily concerned with the AF lexicon. In addition, Péronnet has written a number of important papers, including: “Système des conjugaisons verbales dans le parler acadien du sud-est du Nouveau-Brunswick” (1990) and “Système des modalités verbales dans le parler acadien du sud-est du Nouveau-Brunswick” (1991). These describe in detail the AF verbal system. Virginia Motapanyane has written a small volume on the structure of AF (entitled *Acadian French*), including its phonology. Like Péronnet’s work, it too is based on the southeastern New Brunswick dialect.

There are accounts of the structure of other AF dialects – especially those of the French shore of Nova Scotia (cf. Gesner 1979), of Newfoundland (cf. King 1984) and of Prince Edward Island (cf. King 2000). These too proved relevant in distinguishing Chiac from AF usage. The particle *back*, for example, is found in the AF of each of these regions and is used in a similar way as in Chiac, whereas a verb particle construction is not described for these dialects\(^\text{11}\). This literature therefore helped me to determine what constitutes a Chiac innovation as opposed to an earlier AF innovation or archaic

\(^{11}\) King 2000 describes preposition stranding for Prince Edward Island French, but this is different than the Chiac VPC.
construction. Nevertheless, it is worth noting again that there is a dialect continuum between Chiac and AF (especially the AF of southeastern New Brunswick). There is therefore no strict dividing line between Chiac and AF. Instead, they differ in degree—especially with regard to the degree of English influence.

With regard to specific features of Chiac and AF, there are Masters theses and papers that deal with some of the most salient constructions. For example, Marie-Marthe Roy’s M.A. thesis considers the use of the conjunctions but and so in AF (Roy 1979). Pérot has a paper on the use of comme in Chiac (Pérot 1992). In a 1998 paper, Danielle Turpin, a linguist from the Moncton region, examines English-origin nouns in Acadian French. Turpin takes a variationist approach (cf. Poplack 1980, Poplack et al. 1988) and is largely interested in whether specific instances of noun use constitute code-switches or whether the nouns are loanwords. She therefore examines several parameters of integration with regard to English-origin nouns (especially plural marking and article use) in order to construct a methodology for distinguishing loanwords from code-switched forms. Although I take a different approach to the issue of code-switching versus borrowing, the general patterns she describes are informative and confirm several patterns in my corpus data.

In addition to work on AF and Chiac, this thesis also builds on the literature on language contact and bilingualism. The literature on bilingualism is almost endless. Nevertheless, three works particularly influenced my views on bilingualism in general: Grosjean’s Life with Two Languages, Hamers and Blanc’s Bilinguality and Bilingualism, and
Hoffmann's *An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Each of these describes the relevant issues in the study of bilingualism and how they have been approached by various scholars.

If we look specifically at the literature on contact phenomena, especially relevant is the research on language mixing in bilingual communities. Of particular interest were *Mixed Languages* (Bakker and Mous 1994), Carol Pfaff's “Constraints on language mixing” and Shana Poplack's “Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y TERMINO EN ESPANOL: toward a typology of code-switching”. The first contains fifteen case studies of mixed languages and the other two describe patterns of mixing in Spanish-English bilingual communities (in the American Southwest and Puerto Rico respectively). The patterns described in these works often mirror patterns in Chiac. For example, Pfaff finds that “prepositions alone are never switched” but can occur in idiomatic expressions (i.e. you never get an English preposition followed by a Spanish NP) (Pfaff 1979:310). As we shall see in Chapter 4, with the exception of *about* and *around*, we never find English-based prepositions followed by AF-based NPs in Chiac.

The focus of work such as Pfaff and Poplack's, however, is different from mine in that they are ultimately trying to find constraints on code-switching, whereas I am more interested in the social motivations for language mixing. Since I treat languages in the bilingual linguistic system as interconnected rather than distinct, there is no need to clearly and explicitly distinguish between code-switching and borrowing. That is, whereas most theoretical approaches to contact languages require deciding which system a token belongs to (whether it is a unit in language A or is a code-switch into language
B), mine does not. Instead, I treat the distinction between an integrated unit and a non-integrated one as a matter of degree. There is therefore no theoretical need to set specific boundaries between code-switched units and loanwords.

Since my model of bilingualism is a cognitive one, my work also builds on the cognitive literature. Cognitive Grammar has not previously been used, in any extensive way, to deal with issues of contact. Rohde et al. 1999 treats the topic of loanwords in a usage-based model, showing that loanwords are not simply transferred from one system to another but involve subtle (and not so subtle) semantic and formal changes to the constructions as they are integrated into a new system. This paper influenced my discussion of loanwords in Chapter 3. There are, however, no cognitively-oriented examinations of contact languages or of bilingual linguistic systems of which I am aware. Thus, this thesis contributes to the cognitive/usage-based literature in that I have devised a cognitive model of the (Chiac speaker's) bilingual linguistic system as well as describing how various contact phenomena work within the CG framework.

1.8. Structure of the Present Work

What follows is an investigation of Chiac along two major lines. In the first section (Chapters 2-3), I show how Chiac reflects its speakers’ experience by first examining speakers’ social and cultural background, then using this background to motivate the emergence of their linguistic system. I argue that a combination of the speech community’s bilingualism, age, the community they live in, and even the history of the
Acadian people play a role in the emergence of Chiac. The second section (Chapters 4-6) is a detailed examination of various Chiac constructions. In addition to giving the reader a sense of the structure of Chiac, the analyses show in a cognitively plausible way how various Chiac constructions may have emerged given a linguistic inventory that previously consisted of AF and English units.

Specifically, Chapter 2 presents background on Chiac speakers that will be essential in accounting for the emergence of their dialect. I examine Acadian history, the demographics of Moncton, the languages and dialects spoken in the region, and the age and experience of Chiac speakers. In addition, I explore the attitudes of Chiac speakers and non-Chiac speakers to the dialects spoken in Moncton.

In Chapter 3 I show how Chiac reflects the experience of its speakers. Building on the data presented in Chapter 2, I construct a model of the Chiac speaker's linguistic system within the framework of Cognitive Grammar. Since speakers are bilingual, they have units of at least two languages to draw from and they can manipulate units of both AF and English with each other and still be understood. In addition, Chiac speakers are teenagers. The desire of teenagers to distinguish themselves from other groups (children and adults – especially their parents) through a variety of means, including language, has been well documented. Bilingualism and adolescence therefore provide both the means and (some of) the motive for extensive language mixing. In this Chapter I show in detail how this led to the emergence of a new system, and describe the nature of this system.
In Chapter 4, which marks the beginning of the descriptive section of the thesis, I examine the Chiac lexicon, showing which units (and types of units) are conventional. In addition to drawing general observations (such as the fact that content words are more likely to be English-based than function words are), I analyze a number of specific Chiac constructions. For example, the adverbs *right* and *vraiment* have overlapping meanings, but are also used in slightly different contexts. In addition, Chiac has a verb *chiller*, meaning "be cool", which is described in Chapter 4. It relates to the English verb *to chill*, but has an extended meaning found only in Chiac.

In Chapter 5 I explore the Chiac noun phrase. Although Chiac (non-root) morphology is generally the same as in AF, there are some interesting differences that tend to involve English-based roots taking AF-based inflectional morphology (but not vice versa). For example, English-based roots can sometimes occur in the plural without overt plural morphology. Presumably, this occurs by analogy to the AF plural system where nouns take no overt suffix. Instead, plurality is indicated on the determiner. In addition to nominal morphology, Chapter 5 also addresses questions of adjective order, patterns of quantifier use, etc.

Chapter 6 is concerned with the Chiac verb phrase. Although there are few differences between Chiac and AF with regard to the verb phrase, there are nevertheless ways in which Chiac usage is distinctive. Certain irregular verb stems are regularized in Chiac. In addition, there are conditions under which verbs occasionally do not agree with their subjects for number. Perhaps most interesting is the Chiac verb particle construction.
Although clearly based on the English VPC, the Chiac VPC has properties not found in English (such as allowing negation to come between the verb and the particle) and seems to be (becoming) productive.

1.9. Conclusions

In short, this thesis will show that the Chiac speaker was correct when he said “le chiac… c’est nous aut’ qui a inventé ça”. Chiac emerged in the cognitive systems of the members of a small speech community due to social factors that made them want to distinguish themselves from AF- and English-speaking speech communities. I provide a model of the Chiac speaker’s linguistic system that allows for a unified account of the emergence of Chiac due to specific social factors. This model treats the bilingual linguistic system in exactly the same way as the monolingual system with regard to how new structures emerge from usage events.

Contrary to the speaker’s assertion (“c’est pas un langue”), however, I show that Chiac is a language (specifically a dialect of French), if only a semi-grammaticalized one. I describe some of its patterns in detail such that a global picture of the Chiac system emerges. Some patterns, such as the use of French-based articles, are highly regular. Others exhibit a lesser degree of predictability: plural marking on English-based nouns, for example, tends to be overt as in English, but sometimes takes a zero suffix. At the other end of the spectrum are certain lexical items, whose occurrence has a low degree of
predictability. The use of *film* versus *movie* or of *argent* versus *cash*, for example, is much less predictable than the use of *le* versus *the*.

The first step in the process of modeling the emergence and the structure of Chiac is to describe the social context of its use. In order to see how social factors influenced the emergence of Chiac we need to know what those factors are. Thus, in Chapter 2, I set the scene by describing the social experience of Chiac speakers.
Chapter 2

The Specific Social and Cultural Circumstances of Chiac Speakers

2.1. Introduction

On rencontre dans le parler francophone urbain de Moncton tous les degrés possible d’anglicisation. Il semblerait donc difficile de présenter ce parler anglicisé comme celui d’un groupe. (Lucci 1972: 15)

“In the francophone speech of urban Moncton we find all possible degrees of anglicization. It would seem difficult, then, to declare this anglicised speech to be that of a particular group.”

Contrary to Lucci’s claim, I will argue that Moncton French (and specifically Chiac) is very much the language of a group. More precisely, there are many ways of speaking French in Moncton and there are, of course, different social groups. The different dialects (or different points along the dialect continuum) are spoken by different sets of people, and sometimes by the same person, depending on the group they choose to identify with at a given time. I claim that social factors including group identity are highly relevant to the way in which bilingual Monctonians, and particularly Chiac speakers, use language, and in Chapter 3 I shall show how and why. In this Chapter, I lay the foundation by presenting a detailed description of Chiac speakers: their history, the city they live in, their experiential and linguistic background, and their attitudes towards various ways of speaking.
2.2. The History of the Acadians

Today's Acadians, of which Chiac speakers are a subgroup, are descendants of French colonists who came to l'Acadie (various settlements in what are now Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and northeastern Maine) in the 17th century. The early settlers were mostly farmers, sailors and poor artisans who came for the land that would allow them and their children to have a better life than in France. The first colony was at Port Royal, which by 1671 comprised about 320 people. Throughout the 17th century, settlers set up colonies throughout the Canadian Maritimes provinces and Maine. The Acadians were agricultural people or fishermen who were isolated from English settlements, such as Halifax. As a result, Acadians retained their language and their Catholic religion.
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Figure 2.1
Control over the region that included l’Acadie changed hands fourteen times during the 17th century as Europe waged war. After the 1713 Treaty of Utrecht, Nova Scotia was ceded to the English and would not be a French territory again. The Acadians had lived in Nova Scotia for several generations with little contact with or support from France, and they claimed to be militarily neutral. Nevertheless, the local government believed that the Acadians would side with France in the event of another war with Britain. When the struggle for control of North America intensified in the mid-18th century, the English decided to deport the Acadians.

Between 1755 and 1762 about 8,000 Acadians, 80% of their population, were deported. Their settlements were burned and their crops and livestock confiscated to prevent anyone from trying to remain or return. Families were often separated and many never saw their loved ones again. The deportees were sent to various colonies throughout British North America, such as the Carolinas, Virginia and Maryland, where they were generally not welcomed. From there, some were sent to France, others to England. Many who remained in North America wandered the continent, often by foot, seeking family members and trying to reestablish an Acadian community. Some chose to go to Louisiana. These Acadians were the ancestors of today’s Louisiana Cajuns, the term “cajun” being derived, via the loss of the first vowel and the palatalization of the second consonant, from “acadien”.

Back in Nova Scotia (where the majority of Acadians had lived), some Acadians had escaped deportation and had survived with the help of the Mi’kmaq native people. After
1763, Acadians were permitted to return to the Maritime provinces, although in most cases not to their old lands. By 1771, about two thousand Acadians had resettled in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. Over the next thirty years, their population more than quadrupled due to a high birthrate – few Acadians returned after the 1770’s.

Despite the lack of a single geographic “homeland”, and despite the dominance of the English language and culture, the Acadians and their language have continued to survive in the Maritime Provinces of Canada. French-speaking Acadians\(^1\) now make up more than a third of the population of New Brunswick, 5% of the population of Nova Scotia, and about 13% of the population of Prince Edward Island. The survival of the Acadian culture, language and religion is due in part to the fact that Acadians had to re-settle in areas where the soil was poor and where the weather was harsh since the English had claimed the best lands. As a result, the Acadians were isolated from the English, who made no attempt to assimilate them.

Another reason why the Acadian culture and language have survived is because of a strong sense of community. Even before the deportation it is known that the community was of central importance to Acadians. Only by working together were they able to survive. After the deportation, the shared experience of that event, “le Grand Dérangement” brought them even closer together. The fact that they were the only

\(^1\) As opposed to people of Acadian descent who do not speak French.
French speaking Catholics in the region also strengthened their sense of community and identity.

Despite this strong sense of culture and a history of activism, Acadians do not seem to be interested in a separate Acadian state. Unlike their Québécois neighbors, whose nationalist feelings run deep and who have had a powerful and popular separatist movement for decades, Acadians are content to exist within a larger anglophone society (cf. Griffiths: 1973). Griffiths writes:

> While claiming cultural objectives, the Acadians rarely, if ever used arguments which would entail the separation of the Acadians from the control of their present government. The belief in their community, their desire to preserve their traditions, their language and their religion... were not attached to pressure for an "Acadie libre" (1973: 82).

2.3. Moncton

Most Acadian communities today are fairly small and rural, but there is one major exception, the city of Moncton, New Brunswick, where approximately 30,000 francophone Acadians live. They share the city with 85,000 anglophones, making them a minority of about 30%. Moncton is a small, commercial city in the southeast of the province, and is therefore much closer to (predominantly) anglophone Nova Scotia than to francophone Québec. Its primary industries are manufacturing, retail sales, social services and healthcare. Moncton’s population is well educated, with more than 50% of residents over the age of 14 having some postsecondary education.
There are French and English television and radio stations, but many more of the latter than of the former. Furthermore, most French-language media in New Brunswick broadcast in a standard French that is spoken only in the most formal circumstances (if at all) by the local inhabitants. For example, the local CBC (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, a national public radio and television institution) tends to have programs where literature, politics etc. are discussed. The French used is a standard one or, as we shall see in section 2.4 below, an approximation of SF where regionalisms are avoided but the dialect is not any recognizable standard (i.e. Parisian French, Québécois).

One notable exception to this media trend is Radio Beauséjour, which broadcasts in Acadian French (cf. Boudreau 1998: 302-306). It is a community radio station staffed largely by volunteers, and its programming tends to be popular in both senses of the word. Radio Beauséjour has programming with a general appeal, such as Acadian music and the Marché aux Puces where people call in to offer items for sale. It has also reached a wide audience – more than 35,000 people² according to Boudreau (1998: 302).

Despite the popularity of Radio Beauséjour, the language of most media accessible to Monctonians is English. Most people have cable television, which provides access to dozens of American channels as well as to the national English and French stations. Moncton teenagers watch Much Music, the Canadian equivalent of MTV. People watch

² These are not all in Moncton, but throughout Kent and Westmoreland counties in New Brunswick.
soap operas on the American networks and many watch American sitcoms. There are no French language programs to equal the popularity of Friends or The Simpsons, for example. The local movie theatres play Hollywood blockbusters in English, and although you can rent movies with French dubbing, many bilinguals prefer to watch films in their original language.

When entering a shop or restaurant in Moncton, you rarely know which language the person you are about to address speaks. “First contact” is usually made in English, however. Not only is it the majority language, but all francophones in the Moncton area learn English and learn it fairly well. Many Acadians in Moncton speak English even before entering school. Anglophones, on the other hand, receive some French instruction in school, but generally their French skills are poor. The use of English as a lingua franca is so widespread, that businesses dealing with the public will often hire monolingual anglophones to interact with their customers. It is assumed that if the customer is francophone, s/he will be able to conduct his/her business in English. This assumption is not always appreciated by francophone Monctonians, who occasionally insist on being served in French, but it is generally accepted that English will be used in such circumstances, sometimes even in predominantly francophone neighborhoods.

Although New Brunswick is the only officially bilingual province in Canada, although language policy dictates that French and English are equal, and although French language rights are protected, it is clear to anyone who has spent time in Moncton that English and French are not equal in that city. They do not have the same number of speakers, they are
not used equally in private companies, they do not get the same amount of media coverage, and English native speakers are not as likely to be bilingual as Acadians are.

2.4. Moncton Dialects

As Vincent Lucci noted in the quote that opens this chapter, Moncton francophones, like any large heterogeneous population, do not all speak in the same way. He mentions the continuum of anglicization, but this is not the only parameter of variation. Péronnet also identifies a trend toward standardization in the speech of Acadian francophones (which holds for speakers in the Moncton area) (Péronnet 1996: 129-132).

Péronnet’s starting point in describing this trend (as well as the trend toward anglicization) is what she calls “Traditional Acadian French”, and what others have simply referred to as “Acadian French” (AF). As we saw in Chapter 1, AF typically refers to the dialect of older rural Acadians, and especially to those from New Brunswick\(^3\), although the French spoken throughout the Atlantic provinces is often referred to as AF. Regional dialects have been extensively described by Péronnet 1989 (southeastern New Brunswick), Flikeid 1984 (New Brunswick), Motapanyane 1997 (New Brunswick), Gesner 1979 (Baie Sainte-Marie, Nova Scotia), and King 1984 and 2000 (Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island). In addition, Lucci has written a phonology of AF (Lucci 1972).

---

\(^3\) This is the case not because of any particular features found only in New Brunswick, but because more studies have been conducted in that province, where the Acadian populations are larger than elsewhere.
In addition to its interesting phonological patterns (cf. Lucci 1972), AF is characterized by the use of archaic constructions – ones that were used in France in the 17th century, which are no longer used in France, but of which there are still traces in AF. The lexeme espérer, meaning “to wait” (“to hope” in modern SF), is an example of an archaic construction in AF. AF is also known for its inventory of English loanwords and other English-influenced constructions. Péronnet provides the examples below (cf. also Landry 1973):

(14)  *J’irai pas, à cause qu’i mouille.*
     “I won’t go because it’s raining.” (archaic – SF: parce qu’il pleut)

(15)  *Je peux pas afforder de m’acheter ça.*
     “I can’t afford to buy myself that.” (Eng. loanword – SF: se payer qqch.)

(16)  *Je vas appliquer pour une job.*
     “I’m going to apply for a job” (calque – SF: faire une demande d’emploi)
     (Péronnet 1996: 125)

The traditional dialect that Péronnet and Motapanyane describe is attributed especially to older, less educated and more rural speakers. In fact, Péronnet’s corpus of the southeastern dialect deliberately excludes Moncton. Furthermore, the average age of her consultants, who are lumberjacks, fishermen, etc. is 76. She is trying to capture a dying dialect, and recognizes that speech of the urban young (i.e. Chiac speakers) is quite different. As villages became less isolated from English settlements, and as the population became more educated, the speech of Acadians began to change rapidly. This is especially true in Moncton, where Acadians have a great deal of contact with English
speakers. The most obvious change is the increased use of anglicisms, but let us look first at the trend toward standardization.

Standardization, particularly toward the Québécois standard, has long been observed in Acadian communities in northern New Brunswick. This is unsurprising given their proximity to Québec. In a 1996 paper, however, Péronnet shows that this trend has spread to the southeast – to Moncton, which is hundreds of kilometers from Québec. She identifies three types of standardization: the introduction of super-regional traits, the mixing of regional and standard varieties, and the approximation of standard usage (Péronnet 1996: 130-131). For example, she notes the use of the interrogative particle tu in the Moncton area. Tu is used in Québec whereas the traditional Acadian equivalent would be ti.

(17)  \textit{Y a-tu queque chose?} (vs. AF \textit{Y a-ti queque chose})
\textquoteleft Is something wrong?\textquoteright  (Péronnet 1996: 130)

Although tu here is not standard in the sense of being prescriptively correct, it is a feature of Québécois, which has a higher prestige than AF (which we shall see in section 2.7 below) and can be considered a national standard.

More extreme types of standardization include frequent hypercorrection (1996: 131). For example in 18 there is a hypercorrection – dont, which would be que in the (Québécois or European) standard.
Although Péronnet does not discuss motivations for this trend, the teaching of Standard French (SF) in the classroom combined with a general belief that SF (or Québécois) is better than any Acadian dialect is likely responsible. It seems, therefore, that Acadians are generally not fluent SF speakers, since they are prone to hypercorrection and other “errors”, such as unintentionally mixing SF registers (cf. Péronnet 1996: 131). The situation is much the same as that of an English speaker whose dialect does not include the use of whom, but who uses it, perhaps “mistakenly” in the nominative, because s/he knows it to be a feature of a prestige dialect.

Péronnet’s study indicates that this trend is occurring in Moncton, but the formality of the speech contexts in her data makes it difficult to generalize about who is using a more standard dialect and in which contexts. Her data come from two sources: interviews among adults and youths and Moncton Radio-Canada broadcasts – both very formal situations. Nevertheless, it is clear that at least some Monctonians can and do use a more standard dialect than AF (or use features of that dialect in their AF) in some contexts.

The other trend that Péronnet identifies is one away from both standardization and from AF. This includes anglicization as well as “structural simplification” and “stylistic reduction”. This trend, she notes, is especially relevant to the speech of young people, and most of her examples come from 12-18 year-olds. The trend, in other words, is
typical of Chiac rather than of AF. In the category of anglicization (i.e. English influence beyond what is found in AF) she identifies “emprunts composés”, sequences of several loanwords which together make up a kind of phrase (“locution”) (1996: 125), and the borrowing of pronouns and determiners\(^4\). For example:

\[
\begin{align*}
(19) & \quad J'ai \textbf{kind of peur}.
& \quad \text{'I'm kind of scared'} \\
(20) & \quad J'ai \textbf{mon own car}.
& \quad \text{'I have my own car. (1996: 126)'}
\end{align*}
\]

Examples of this kind are extremely frequent in my corpus of Chiac, as we shall see in subsequent chapters.

Péronnet's structural simplifications include the regularization of irregular verb forms (therefore the simplification of the verbal system) (21), the dissociation of article contractions (22) and the non-use of the auxiliary être (23).

\[
\begin{align*}
(21) & \quad \textbf{Quoi ce tu ferais avec zex? (vs. ferais)}
& \quad \text{"What would you do with them?"} \\
(22) & \quad \textit{On va à les danses à l'école. (vs. aux danses)}
& \quad \text{"We go to the danses at school"} \\
(23) & \quad \textbf{J'ai tanné d'être dans les High Schools. (vs. je suis or chu)}
& \quad \text{"I'm sick of being in High Schools."} \quad \text{(Péronnet 1996:127-28)}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^4\) Péronnet refers to 20 as an example of the borrowing of "pronom et déterminants" (1996:126) but I analyse own as an adjective in section 4.4. I found no borrowing of pronouns and determiners, as we shall
Of these, Péronnet claims:

L’apparition de nouveaux types de simplification, allant au-delà de la variation habituelle et touchant la zone normalement invariable d’une langue, est un phénomène particulièrement significatif, qui n’apparaît que dans des situations de contact interlinguistique important.

“The appearance of new types of simplification, which go beyond normal variation and reach the normally invariable aspects of a language, is a particularly revealing phenomenon – one that only occurs in situations of significant language contact” (1996: 126).

In other words, this trend is likely the result of extensive English-French bilingualism.

Finally, what Péronnet calls “réduction stylistique” (“stylistic reduction”) involves the loss of features of AF, which she attributes, in part, to bilingualism. Some speakers, she claims, retain no traditional features, such that the only French they can speak is one they learn at school and speak only in a few contexts⁵. These speakers might say:

(24)  *le livre de mon ami* (vs. *à mon ami*)

“my friend’s book”

(25)  *téléphoner quelqu’un* (vs. *téléphoner à quelqu’un*)

“to phone someone”  (Péronnet 1995: 129)

It is clear that the trends toward anglicization and Péronnet’s “réduction stylistique” are especially prevalent in Chiac, although it is not clear to what degree, if any, they are present in the French of other Moncton speech communities. Many linguists have written about the anglicization of French in the Moncton area (cf. Pérot 1995, Gérin and

---

⁵ see in Chapter 4.
Philipponneau 1984, etc.). There is general agreement that the most anglicized French is spoken by young Acadians in and around Moncton. Péronnet writes of “un nouveau parler franglais ... qui est le fait des dernières générations (1989: 6)”. Similarly, Gérin and Philipponneau state:

...si les générations les plus anciennes utilisent encore le FA (français acadien), il n'en est pas de même pour les générations les plus jeunes: celles-ci se sont forgé au contact de l'AN (anglais) un code, le chiac, qui tend a devenir la langue socio-maternelle d'un grand nombre de jeunes Acadiens.

"...If the oldest generations still use AF (Acadian French), this is not the case with the younger generations: due to contact with English, they have created a code, Chiac, which is becoming the "socio-maternal" language of a large number of young Acadians" (1984: 88).

This is not to say that the young are the only ones who use frequent anglicisms - the trend is seen throughout French-speaking Moncton. It is simply a matter of degree, where the least anglicized, most traditional French is spoken by older, less educated, more isolated people and the most anglicised by young urban Acadians. In the middle are, presumably, urban, educated adults, although little research has been conducted on the speech of this segment of the population. Thus, the dialect one speaks as a Monctonian francophone is the language of a group, defined in terms of social factors like age, schooling, contact with English, etc.

Finally, the English spoken in Moncton is basically American English. There are a few regional features worth mentioning, however. One is the use of right as an intensifier meaning something like very, as in I'm right tired (or in some dialects even I'm right

5 Péronnet does not seem to be including Chiac as a French dialect here.
some tired). This usage is found throughout the Atlantic provinces of Canada. Chiac reflects this use of right, as seen in the discussion of the VPC in section 6.6. Another feature of eastern Canadian English is the use of somewheres, anywheres and everywheres instead of somewhere, etc. For example, a New Brunswicker might say Let's go somewheres else.

2.5. Chiac Speakers

Let us look in more detail at the people who speak Chiac. I have established that they are young, but more precisely, they tend to be adolescents rather than children. When interviewing two brothers, one aged 13 and the other aged 15, I was struck by the difference in the way they spoke. The younger's French was somewhere between "traditional" AF and Chiac: he used many of the most common anglicisms, like but and so and did occasionally code-switch. He claimed he did not use some of the constructions found in my examples (which were taken from my corpus of Chiac) and replaced them with more standard ones. This could, of course, be the result of schooling and a belief that Chiac is "bad". Nevertheless, he did accept certain constructions involving anglicization, while at the same time not knowing the meaning of certain Chiac constructions that occurred frequently in the corpus. This led me to conclude that he is not a Chiac speaker in denial but rather that he speaks a somewhat less Anglicised dialect of Moncton French. His French is, in fact, more like his mother's (with whom I also had a brief conversation) than his brother's.
His 15-year-old older brother, in contrast, is a prototypical Chiac speaker. He uses many English-based lexical items and calques, he code-switches frequently, and also uses constructions that are neither French, nor English, but derive from these (e.g. struggle and chill, the verb particle construction, etc.—cf. section 4.11 and 6.6). The older brother is a high school student at Mathieu Martin, the largest French high school in Moncton. The younger brother attends a francophone junior high school. The difference between the brothers could be due to a number of factors, including the schools themselves, the attitudes and behaviours of 15- versus 13-year-olds, individual personalities, etc. It is likely not the high school itself that influences Chiac speech (since Chiac speakers don’t all go to Mathieu Martin) but related factors such as the goals, attitudes and concerns of high school students as compared with those of younger children and adults.

What are, then, the experiences of high school students and in what way are they different from the experiences of others? When people are in high school, they are in a transitory stage in their lives. They are still financially dependent on their parents, but they generally long for more independence. They rebel against the restrictions of parents and school, but most are not ready for and do not really want all the responsibilities of adult life. When asked how they felt about the way adults treated teenagers, one Chiac speaker responded:

(26) Okay well, i devraient les traiter comme adultes là...But still jeune comme. I nous donnont right beaucoup de responsabilités qu'on a pas besoin right now.
“Okay well, they should treat them like adults... But still young, like. They give us a lot of responsibilities that we don’t need right now.”
Chiac speakers, who are mostly high school students, are neither adults nor children — they form their own social group.

Chiac speakers are, of course, not alone in this respect. As Penelope Eckert and many others have noted, North American adolescents share various aspects of their experience such that they tend to form a social group (cf. Eckert 1989). Although there are many subgroups of teen culture (Eckert’s “jocks” and “burnouts”, Chiac speakers’ “tchezzes”, “preps”, etc.), for the purposes of my analysis I shall consider only teen culture as a whole. The social subgroups that Chiac speakers belong to doubtless influence their speech patterns (i.e. “preps” likely speak differently than “tchezzes”). Nevertheless, a fine-grained analysis based on social groups is beyond the scope of this thesis.

One of the roles of a social group is that it distinguishes its members from those of other social groups. This is particularly true of adolescents, who are beginning to acquire independence from their parents. To signal membership in a social group, one behaves in ways that sets one apart from members of other social groups. As Eckert notes, the way one dresses, the activities one participates in (such as smoking or playing sports) and the way one speaks can help distinguish the members of different groups (Eckert 1989: 49-72). These behaviours eventually acquire the status of “symbols of category

---

5 “Tchez” is a category I was unfamiliar with and I was unable to find out the origin of the word, although I was told that anglophone teens have the same category. The term refers to a group similar to Eckert’s burnouts — they wear leather jackets, do drugs, etc.
membership". This, I think, is an important factor in explaining why high school seems to be the domain of Chiac and I shall elaborate on this in Chapter 3.

Returning to the experience of Chiac speakers in particular, they have been exposed to many different ways of speaking. Their parents likely use a dialect similar to AF, or something between AF and Chiac in terms of the degree of anglicization. In school they are taught Standard French (defined as French which can not be identified as spoken in a particular region, or sometimes as French from Québec or France). They are penalized in school for using anglicisms in their French.

English is also taught in school, although unlike Standard French, its use extends far beyond the classroom. Chiac speakers may have an anglophone parent and likely have monolingual anglophone friends. They go to see English movies and listen to the latest American and anglo-Canadian music. Their Little League soccer team may have been an English one and they may use English in a part-time job. One consultant I spoke to goes to one English church and one French church: she goes to the French one on Sunday mornings but is a member of a youth group at the English one.

Chiac speakers are therefore urban teenagers who use a variety of languages in their daily experience. The language of school is SF and, to a lesser extent, AF. English is the language of most commercial transactions and media. Socially Chiac speakers use

---

7 It should be noted that many Chiac speakers have an anglophone or non-Acadian francophone parent.
English and Chiac. Depending on familial attitudes, they may speak Chiac at home as well, whereas their parents and their elders in general speak AF.

2.6. Attitudes Toward Acadian, English and Chiac Cultures

Relevant to the emergence of Chiac are the attitudes that Monctonians – particularly Acadians - have toward Acadian and anglophone cultural groups and their languages. Although feelings about language and cultures are clearly related, I shall deal with them separately since in Moncton, as we shall see, attitudes toward a language do not always mirror those toward its speakers.

As we saw above, Acadians in general are proud to be Canadian. Unlike many francophone Québécois, they are not interested in a separate francophone state (cf. Griffiths 1973: 81-85). The following passage, taken from my Chiac corpus, shows that Chiac speakers in particular also self-identify as Canadian.

(27) A: *Canadien, moi j’aime la télévision Canadienne.*
   B: *Yeah, comme celle là de la bière de Molson Canadian pi le guy qui est Joe là qui dit la, le grous speech de ‘I am Canadian’. Ca ça rock!*
   A: “Canadian, I like Canadian television.”
   B: “Yeah, like that one with the Molson Canadian beer and the guy named Joe who says the, the big ‘I am Canadian’ speech. That rocks!”

(28) *Ah, moi je pense que c’est un pretty cool pays.*
    “Ah, I think it’s a pretty cool country.”

---

8 Note that the traditional Sunday service is the one she attends in French and her youth group is English-speaking - not vice versa. This reflects the roles of the two languages in her life.
(29) *Chu proud d'être canadienne, comme je veux pas être anything else. Comme, j'aimerais aussitent de vivre au Canada que, comme, aux Etats Unis or anywhere else, comme.*

“I’m proud to be Canadian, like I don’t want to be anything else. Like, I’d like to live in Canada as much as, like, in the United States or anywhere else, like.”

Like their elders, Chiac speakers are not interested in forming their own French-only community or in joining the Québécois. In fact, those who expressed an opinion on the Québécois separatist movement in my corpus were avidly against it:

(30) A: *Si le Québec veut séparer...*
   B: *Oh ça je trouve ça assez stupide là.*
   C: *Yeah, il a pas de point comme il a pas de point whatsoever.*
   A: *Les séparatistes my ass.*
   A: “If Québec wants to separate...”
   B: “Oh, I think that’s pretty dumb.”
   C: “Yeah, there’s no point, there’s no point whatsoever.”
   A: “Separatists my ass.”

Francophone Monctonians consider themselves both Canadian and Acadian. There is considerable cultural awareness and pride regarding Acadian heritage, especially among adult Acadians. This is reflected in events such as the *jeux d'Acadie*, an athletic tournament held every year; in the “fête nationale des acadiens”, celebrated every year on August 15; in the popularity of traditional Acadian musicians (e.g. 1755⁹), etc. It is clear that francophone Monctonians are proud to be Acadian and want their culture preserved.

In a “texte acadien” found on the internet, the author writes:
j’u chanceux d’être un Acadien!... On a pas besoins d’ouère honte de note passé.
Nos ancêtes avont travaillé dur pi y nouns avont laissé un héritage que nous
pouvons être fiers
“I’m lucky to be an Acadian!... We have no reason to be ashamed of our past.
Our ancestors worked hard and they left us a heritage we can be proud of”
(www.acadian.org/viveacad.html)

Chiac speakers seem not to exhibit the same pride and enthusiasm for Acadian culture
that their elders often do. Instead, they express ambivalence regarding their heritage.
Sometimes they will show pride in being francophone, as speaker B in 31 does below (in
response to the anti-French behaviour of some anglophones). Also frequent, however,
are comments like A’s in 32:

(31) A: Est-ce que tu penses que Moncton est une ville assez open-minded?
   B : Non cause ils bashont right les français pis les français kick-ont du tchu...
       Vive l’Acadie.
   A: “Do you think that Moncton is open-minded enough?”
   B: “No, because they bash the French and the French kick ass. Long live
       l’Acadie.”

(32) A : L’Acadie suce la marde - j’u contre les Acadiens. J’viens juste de find-er
       out j’u acadienne pis j’u right pas impressed, but c’est okay.10
   B : À cause t’es pas impressed d’être acadienne?
   A: C’est à cause que je haïe la musique
   B: Yeah la musique acadienne.
   A: “L’Acadie sucks shit – I’m against Acadians. I just found out that I’m
       Acadian and I’m right unimpressed, but it’s okay.”
   B: “Because you’re not impressed with being Acadian?”
   A: “It’s because I hate the music.”
   B: “Yeah, Acadian music.”

---

9 1755 is an Acadian musical group. Their name is the year of the Acadian deportation. In addition, there
is another Acadian group called Grand Dérangement, which is the Acadian term for the deportation.
10 It is not clear to me how this person could not have known she was Acadian.
Similarly, one consultant in my corpus declared: “Ma culture? J’aime pas les acadiens.”
(“My culture? I don’t like Acadians”).

There are indications that Chiac speakers think of Acadian culture as old-fashioned and rural. The following is a passage taken from my corpus. The consultants are singing songs when one says: “ça continue, un autre farmer song” (“moving right along, another farmer song”) then sings a traditional Acadian song, Viens Voir l’Acadie:

(33) Viens voir l’Acadie, viens voir le pays le pays qui m’étonne. Je vous le dis, je vous le cris, je vous le tchèque affaire, je vous le montre.11
“Come see l’Acadie, come see the country, the country that surprises me. I say it to you, I shout it to you, I something or other to you, I show it to you.”

Perhaps the most telling sign that Chiac speakers are ambivalent about being Acadian is the fact that they rarely mention it. Even though the questions being discussed in the corpus included one on culture, speakers often ignored that topic, claimed they had nothing to say on that subject, or identified their culture as being other than Acadian:

(34) Ma culture, eu acadien whatever. Acadien ça me dérange pas. J’aime pas ça but je mind pas ça non plus.
“My culture, uh Acadian whatever. Acadian, it doesn’t bother me. I don’t like it but I don’t mind it either.”

(35) (Donne ton opinion sur ta culture) Chépas. Je n’ai rien a vraiment, a besoin dire about ça. Ma culture... quoique que ça veut dire?
(Give your opinion on your culture) “I dunno. I have nothing to, need to say nothing about that. My culture... what does that mean?”

11 The song’s actual lyrics are: “Viens voir l’acadie, viens voir le pays le pays qui m’enchante. Je te le dis, je te le chante, je te le cris, je te le montre.”
Regardless of how they feel about being Acadian, it is clear that both AF and Chiac speakers distinguish themselves from the anglophone majority in Moncton. This is especially clear when there is a conflict between Acadian and English cultures (or between anglophones and francophones), in which case Acadians will self-identify as such. Consider the following passage from the corpus:

(37) *Okay (reading a question) "est-ce que tu trouves que Moncton est une ville open-minded?" Right pas cause qu'ils ont même pas accepté que la ville soit bilingue. Dans les années passées là, quand-ce que les hippies français ont fait leur manifestations, pi moi je crois que Moncton devrait être officiellement bilingue cause whatever les anglais rule-ont pas le monde.  
"Okay 'do you think that Moncton is open-minded enough?' Definitely not cause they haven’t even accepted that the city is bilingual. In past years when the French hippies protested, and I think that Moncton should be officially bilingual cause whatever – the English don’t rule the world."

A more personal conflict between francophones and anglophones is described below:

(38) A: *(Est-ce que les anglais respectent les français ici?) Right pas, right pas parce que zeux peuvent pas le parler, zeux i sont right jaloux pi comme, comme au hockey quand je vas au hockey je joue avec les anglais, pi i sont tout comme 'frenchie frenchie'.
B: *French Frog, non c'est French Frog, c'est ça qu'i nous appellent - les French Frog. C'est juste comme si t'appelles un noir un nigger except en français French Frog. C'est stupid but, ça me piss pas off. Moi chu juste comme 'man est un moron'.
A: *(Do the English respect the French here?) Definitely not, definitely not, because they can’t speak it they’re right jealous and like, at hockey when I
go to hockey I play with English people, and they’re all like ‘Frenchie, Frenchie.’”

B: “French Frog, no it’s French Frog, that’s what they call us – French Frogs. It’s just like if you called a black person a nigger except in French it’s French Frog. It’s stupid, but it doesn’t piss me off. I’m just like ‘man’s a moron’.” (HY 2001)

Nevertheless, Chiac speakers generally view anglophones and anglophone culture positively. In an interview, one Chiac speaker claimed:

(39) **Beaucoup de mes amis sont anglais. J’aime l’anglais. Je me considère parfois anglophone parfois francophone - je peux pas mal les utiliser également**

“Many of my friends are English. I like English. I sometimes consider myself to be anglophone, sometimes francophone – I can pretty much use them equally” (HY 2001).

Even speaker A from example 38 above told me that he speaks English with his anglophone friends, indicating that he doesn’t have a problem with anglophones in general.

It seems, therefore, that while Monctonian francophones feel positively toward both English and Acadian cultures, AF speakers are more likely to take pride in their Acadian heritage than are Chiac speakers. Although the latter clearly consider themselves more Acadian than English (as shown by the fact that they defend French against English and Acadians against anglophones), they do not strongly identify with Acadian culture. This is presumably because their parents and grandparents do, and as a result, Chiac speakers

---

12 HY 2001 refers to my own elicitation as opposed to corpus data.
associate Acadian culture with older generations and a less modern way of life. Chiac speakers therefore constitute a third cultural group which does not identify strongly with either Acadian or English cultures.

2.7. Attitudes Toward French, English and Chiac

Although clearly related to attitudes toward speakers, the attitudes that Monctonians have toward English, French (SF and AF) and Chiac do not always follow from attitudes toward cultures. For example, AF speakers tend to disapprove of anglicisms in particular and of Chiac in general without having particularly negative attitudes toward Chiac speakers. The attitudes that francophone Monctonians have toward the languages spoken in their city are examined below.

AF speakers construe French (both AF and especially SF) positively. Boudreau cites a newspaper editorial where the anonymous author writes:

...on trouve en plus à Moncton toute une classe... d’Acadiens... qui parlent un français qui se compare avantageusement à celui des Québécois... Nous disons avantageusement parce qu’il est reconnu et souvent écrit que les Acadiens ont un accent beaucoup plus pur et une prononciation beaucoup plus belle... “...there is also in Moncton a whole class... of Acadians... who speak a French that compares advantageously with that of Québécois... We say advantageously because it is recognized and often written that Acadians have a much purer accent and a much more beautiful pronunciation” (*Évangéline*, February 4, 1970).

---

13 From the context it seems that this group of Acadians is being distinguished from Chiac speakers, whose French would not compare well to Québécois in his/her mind.
In this quote, both the author’s approval of a non-Acadian standard (here Québécois) and his/her approval of the regional dialect are evident.

Chiac speakers also construe French positively. When asked “est-ce que la langue française\(^{14}\) est importante pour toi?” (is the French language important to you?), young francophone Monctonians overwhelming said it was:

\(\text{(40)}\) \(C'\text{'est notre langue à nous autres; on devrait pas prendre celle des autres}

“It’s our language: we shouldn’t take that of others” (Boudreau 1993: 4).

\(\text{(41)}\) \(C'\text{'est une belle langue; i-y-a beaucoup de façons de s'exprimer; i-y-a des beaux mots; on dirait c'est comme plus ou moins romantique, la langue française.}

“It’s a beautiful language; there are many ways of expressing oneself; there are beautiful words; it’s like it’s more or less romantic, the French language” (Boudreau 1993: 4).

Nevertheless, Chiac speakers feel a certain discomfort with French. Whereas their parents speak a dialect that is the regional standard and is closer to SF, Chiac speakers’ dialect is so anglicized that they often do not consider it to be (good) French at all. When Boudreau asked speakers \textit{Est-ce que tu parles bien le français?} “Do you speak French well?” their answers revealed their linguistic insecurity.

\(\text{(42)}\) \textit{Non, moi j'ai des expressions de par icitte.}

“No, I have expressions from around here” (Boudreau 1993: 8)

\(^{14}\) These quotes are taken from Boudreau 1993 and it is not clear exactly what respondents understand as “la langue française”. Presumably it means AF or SF but not Chiac.
(43) On parle mal le français là, chiac, on parle half français half anglais.
“We speak French badly, Chiac, we speak half French half English”
(Boudreau 1993: 8).

Many also claim to find French difficult – even more so than English. This is a strange claim from people who are supposed to have a French dialect as a first language and English as a second, but Boudreau found that this was a common sentiment:

(44) C’est certain le français… c’est plus compliqué… avec le français t’as… toutes sortes de choses qui – on dirait que l’anglais c’est toujours du pareil
“It’s certain that French… it’s more complicated… with French you have all sorts of things which – it seems that with English it’s always the same”.
(Boudreau 1993: 5).

(45) Le français, c’est plus difficile.
“French is harder”. (Boudreau 1993: 5).

The reason Chiac speakers find French difficult is perhaps because the French they’re referring to is not their first language (Chiac or something like AF) but rather the French they learn in school, Standard French, which, like English, is essentially a “foreign” language to them. The following comment supports the hypothesis that it is SF, rather than their own dialect, that they find difficult.

(46) En anglais, y’a moins de règles de grammaire, pi en français ben on dirait qu’i faut toujours toutes les règles de grammaire pi (faut) toujours tu watch ça.
“In English there are fewer grammatical rules, and in French, well it’s like you always need all the grammatical rules, and you’ve always got to watch (out for) that” (Boudreau 1993: 5).
It seems, therefore, that while both Chiac and AF speakers evaluate French positively (whether it be SF or AF), Chiac speakers are embarrassed about the way they speak French. AF speakers often suffer from linguistic insecurity as well, but their dialect is certainly less stigmatized than Chiac — especially in Moncton, where AF is the francophone norm. Many Chiac speakers struggle with Standard French.

To some degree, both AF and Chiac speakers construe English positively. English is a prestige language in the region, and bilingual francophones are pleased to be able to speak it. In Moncton, if you cannot speak English you are not only limited in the jobs you can get, but you cannot understand most movies at the cinema, you may not be able to communicate with a salesperson, etc.¹⁵

Despite, or perhaps because of the need for English, it is often perceived of as a threat to the Acadian language - and with good reason. It is true, especially in smaller Acadian communities outside of New Brunswick, but also in Moncton, that French is endangered. It seems, however, that it is not English itself that Acadians, and especially AF speakers disapprove of, but the use of English features in AF and especially in Chiac. We shall see evidence for this below.

As we saw above, Chiac speakers seem to have a comfort level with English that older

¹⁵ Once at a grocery store in Moncton an elderly lady asked me if I spoke French. When I said I did, she asked me if nutmeg was muscat. The product was only labeled in English and she was not sure if it was what she wanted. It is not possible to ignore or avoid English in Moncton.
generations often do not. Ironically, this is because Chiac speakers have been schooled in French whereas their parents and earlier generations were likely schooled in English. Since for older generations AF was the language of the home and English the language of school, they were not exposed to SF to the same extent that young Monctonians now are. Chiac speakers hear AF at home and in public, but are schooled largely in SF. As a result, AF features are often construed as incorrect or as regionalisms to be aware of, while SF remains a second language. English is comfortable to Chiac speakers because they speak it at least as well as SF but the expectations are not as high for competence in English as in the French dialects. Boudreau concludes that:

Si l’Acadien minoritaire a honte de parler sa langue française, il peut opter pour l’anglais, terrain linguistique où il risque moins de se faire juger dans sa compétence car s’il y rencontre des problèmes d’expressions, il peut toujours évoquer le fait que cette langue n’est pas sa langue maternelle.

"If the minority Acadian is ashamed to speak his French language, he can opt for English, linguistic domain where there is less chance that his competence will be judged, for if he encounters expressive difficulty, he can invoke the fact that this language is not his mother tongue" (1998: 324).

This is not to say that English comes naturally to Chiac speakers. While they speak it well, it is not a “native language” to them:

(47) \( j’{\text{ai de la misère à parler anglais bien}} \)
     “I have a hard time speaking English well” (Boudreau 1998: 316)

(48) \( (Etes-vous fier de parler chiac?) Chu pas moi chu comme j’aimerais plus être capable de parler bien français ou bien anglais \)
     “(Are you proud of speaking Chiac?) I’m not, like I’d rather be able to speak French well or English well” (HY 2001).

---

16 French schooling was not widely available in the region until the 1970’s.
The third dialect we are concerned with here, Chiac, is the most controversial. AF speakers generally disapprove of Chiac and language mixing in general. Boudreau claims:

Les archaïsmes sont plus acceptés que les anglicismes, et sans doute également parce que la population admet mieux la langue des vielles personnes que celle des adolescents.

“Archaic constructions are more accepted than anglicisms, and surely this is because the population is more accepting of the language of older people than that of adolescents” (Boudreau 1998: 287).

In addition to the fact that the speech of older generations is usually less objectionable than that of younger generations, the use of English features in Chiac represents a potential shift away from AF and toward English only. For this reason as well I believe that AF speakers disapprove of Chiac.

The following quote taken from a letter to the editor exemplifies AF speakers’ disapproval of Chiac: “une classe d’Acadiens… déflorent leur langue française par des anglicismes nombreux et affreux” (“a class of Acadians ‘deflower’ their French language with numerous horrible anglicisms”) (Evangéline, February 1970).

Chiac speakers, however, have mixed feelings about the way they speak. Many believe on some level that mixing constitutes improper language use. Note the following passage from my corpus:
(49) A: ...Moi je fais pu rien avec zeux whatsoever, so –
B: Whatever?
A: Basically-
B: Arrête de parler chiac!
A: “I don’t do anything whatsoever with them anymore, so –“
B: “Whatever?”
A: “Basically –”
B: “Stop speaking Chiac!”

Here speaker A uses English-based units consistently with Chiac speech. Speaker B who, it is worth noting, has spent time in France, picks up on the English words and is annoyed by them. He finally tells speaker A to stop speaking Chiac. B, however, has a more laissez faire attitude. She responds: “Hey! Je vis à Moncton. Quoicque tu veux?” ("Hey! I live in Moncton. What do you expect?").

Similarly, while interviewing two Chiac speakers I asked them (in French) if they were proud to speak Chiac. One responded: Oh yeah, yeah. The other, however, as seen in 48 above, said: “Chu pas moi. Chu comme - j’aimerais plus être capable de parler bien français ou bien anglais” (“I’m not. I’m like – I’d rather be able to speak French well or English well”).

Part of their negative attitude toward Chiac stems from the fact that they do not consider it to be a language in the same way that they consider French and English to be languages. When asked how many languages he spoke, one Chiac speaker said two. It was his answer to this question that provided the title of this thesis:
(50) Deux... le chiac c’est pas un langue, man, c’est nous aut qui a inventé ça, c’est either que tu parles français c’est either que tu parles anglais
"Two... Chiac isn’t a language, man, we made that up ourselves. You either speak French or you speak English.” (reproduced from Chapter 1).

Similarly, when asked if she was proud to speak Chiac, another speaker answered:

(51) C’est une manière de parler, c’est le fun. Comme j’appellerai pas ça une langue officielle là mais c’est d’la fun à parler, entre amis
“It’s a way of talking, it’s fun. Like, I wouldn’t call it an official language but it’s fun to speak, among friends.”

Although many believe on some level that Chiac is improper or inferior language use, they still enjoy speaking it, especially in informal contexts (as the above quote suggests). It can even be a source of pride, as it is for the speaker above who responded oh yeah yeah. In addition, the increasing use of Chiac as a medium of public expression is giving legitimacy to the dialect. Boudreau discusses the case of the Moncton band Zero Degrés Celcius which performs in Chiac:

…en raison de leur popularité, [ils] ont donné le ton à une certaine “mode” voulant que le chiac devienne une langue “cool” dans laquelle il est possible de s’exprimer sans s’expliquer ou s’excuser
“…because of their popularity, [they] have given rise to a certain style such that Chiac has become a ‘cool’ language in which it is possible to express oneself without having to explain oneself or apologize” (Boudreau 1998: 307).

Why might Chiac be a source of pride? It seems to function as a symbol of identity for its speakers. First, they recognise that they created it themselves ("c’est nous aut’ qui a inventé ça"). In addition, they take pride in it because it signals their solidarity and is a way of a distinguishing themselves from others. As Hamers and Blanc conclude:
Adolescents, caught between the dialect as a sign of the past, an alien French standard norm imposed by the school system, and the English of the dominant majority, have evolved an original vernacular, called chic... It seems to us that chic is the symbol and instrument of a group’s allegiance: these adolescents could identify neither with the language of the older generation (because it represented a depressed past) nor with the language of the dominant group without losing their own sense of identity. The hybrid vernacular is a way of resolving their conflict. Basically French in its structure, chic expresses their roots in a community which is fighting for survival; mixed and switched with English, it looks to the other community and the modern world of employment, the media and the north american culture (1989: 183-84).

2.8. Conclusions

In Chapter 2 I have argued that, contrary to Lucci’s claim, Chic is the dialect of a group, which I have defined in terms of historical, demographic and attitudinal features. Although there is no distinct boundary between Chic speakers and non-Chic speakers (just as there is no distinct boundary between Chic and non-Chic speech), I nevertheless feel justified in considering Chic speakers a group. They share an approximate age and occupation (i.e. being a [high school] student), they share a city and a history. They also share linguistics experience – not only Chic, but also bilingualism in general and the roles of various languages and dialects in their daily lives.

In Chapter 3 I include these aspects of Chic speakers’ experience in a model of their linguistic system, in order to show the relationship between experience and the emergence of Chic.
Chapter 3
The Chiac Speaker’s Linguistic System

3.1. Introduction

In Chapter Two I presented a number of social factors relevant to the lives of Chiac speakers, including the languages they speak and in what contexts. Now that we know something about Chiac speakers, we can model their linguistic system in a usage-based framework that integrates social factors and linguistic structure. Such a model must take into account issues relevant to the storage, access and interaction of units of AF, English, and ultimately of Chiac, within the linguistic system of an individual. The model I present is based on the theory of Cognitive Grammar, but is largely compatible with other cognitive and functional theories of language. Within this framework I first describe the linguistic system of the Chiac speaker (its units and how they are structured), then show how Chiac emerges from repeated usage events involving particular contexts and existing linguistic structures.

In the process of modeling the (at least) bilingual Chiac speaker’s linguistic system, we shall see that it can be described and accounted for in exactly the same way as a monolingual’s linguistic system. We shall see that Chiac usage, like monolingual usage, is conditioned by the particular context of the utterance based on previous use of those structures in similar circumstances. Thus, I posit no explanatory tools that are unique to
the bilingual linguistic system. Instead, bilingual language use can be accounted for in terms of the meaning of units (which includes social and contextual factors), and the desire to communicate. In addition, general cognitive processes such as entrenchment, schema abstraction, blending, etc. allow for the manipulation and modification of the system in the same way for bilinguals as for monolinguals.

3.2 Cognitive Grammar

In order to describe the linguistic system of the Chiac speaker I must first introduce certain theoretical concepts. Cognitive Grammar is a usage-based approach to language that models linguistic structures in cognitively plausible ways. It has been developed by Ronald Langacker since the 1970's and its basic tenet is that language is symbolic in nature. The linguistic system of an individual, whether monolingual or bilingual, is treated as a single inventory of symbolic units that are interconnected within a system or network on the basis of general cognitive principles such as symbolization and categorization. In this section I shall explore these ideas in detail and in 3.3-3.6 I show how they can be adapted to a model of Chiac.

In CG, the linguistic system is made up only of symbolic units and their component parts. Symbolic units are cognitive routines that link a particular conceptualization (known as the semantic pole) with a particular form (known as the phonological pole). The symbolic relationship results from and further allows for a routine correspondence
between the two. That is, repeated use of a particular form in a particular context leads to the creation of a symbolic relationship between them, and this relationship results in one pole being evoked in future usage when the other pole is used. Symbolic relationships are therefore arbitrary in the sense that there need be no inherent similarity between the meaning and the form. They are not arbitrary, however, in that form-meaning units do not evolve randomly but are based on instances of usage\(^1\).

One consequence of such a view of language is that lexical and syntactic structures have the same status (as linguistic units)—there is no strict lexicon/rule distinction posited in CG. Lexical and syntactic units differ only in degree with regard to parameters such as specificity, the number of similar items (i.e. open versus closed class), etc.

Let us consider the structure of the symbolic unit in more detail. As we saw, it is a symbolic pairing of form and meaning. The semantics of a unit is known as its symbolic pole. In CG, meaning is equated with conceptualization, such that all the concepts that are evoked by a form in a given usage event constitute that form’s symbolic pole. Thus, the meaning of a word like *table* includes a wide range of concepts associated with tables such as having a flat surface, being made of wood, having legs, being used to put things on, etc. Of course not all tables are made of wood, and not all have legs (they can be

---

\(^1\) The conventional notation for symbolic units in CG is as follows: the unit *tree*, for example, can be represented as \([\text{TREE}/\text{tree}]\), where unit status is indicated by square brackets, the semantic pole is the upper case word on the left and the phonological pole the lower case word on the right (which is usually written in standard orthography rather than in IPA). The slash indicates that a symbolic relationship holds between the poles. For convenience I shall usually represent units only in lower case, as in \([\text{table}]\) and will include both poles only where relevant.
bolted to a wall, for example) but many people nevertheless associate these concepts with tables as a direct result of the way that the unit is used. That is, these concepts are associated with the form [tejbəl] because they are often relevant to the contexts in which that form occurs.

Meaning in CG is therefore not simply denotative, like a dictionary entry, but rather "encyclopedic" (cf. Langacker 1987: 154-166). A wide range of concepts are part of a unit's meaning including, for example, pragmatic information and world knowledge. This encyclopedic view of meaning is not unique to CG, of course. Haiman (1980) has discussed encyclopedic versus dictionary approaches to meaning, arguing for the relevance of cultural knowledge and the fuzzy boundary between semantics and pragmatics.

Let us consider an example. If the word *nevertheless* is part of an English speaker's linguistic inventory, it is likely to have as part of its meaning an association with formal contexts, since *nevertheless* tends to occur only in such contexts. Similarly, expletives evoke much more than their denotative referents. They also evoke concepts related to emotion (usually negative), to rebelliousness (of varying degrees) and of informal contexts of usage. In CG, these contexts of usage make up part of a word's meaning in the same way that other more denotative concepts do: they are all concepts that are evoked by the unit and therefore all contribute to its meaning.
In CG syntactic units are also meaningful and in exactly the same way that lexical units are. They too are associated with concepts related to the function of the unit and also to the contexts in which they tend to be used. For example, a Chiac speaker will have a syntactic unit [SVO/...], which represents the basic transitive word order construction in both AF and English (and Chiac). Its meaning is something like “S does V to O”, and since it occurs in most contexts, it will not evoke any particular social context (just as the word leg, in the sense of the body part, will not (for the monolingual anyway) because its usage is not particular to any specific contexts of usage).

Given that meaning is based on usage, it is necessarily different from individual to individual, since every person’s linguistic experience is different. For example, for a given speaker the use of a particular unit may evoke a person who uses it or even a particular usage event. For me the phrase “that’s right” evokes an Australian friend because of the somewhat unconventional way in which she uses it. Similarly, my meaning of the word heron includes that my sister once confused it with herring at a restaurant, resulting in the new Young family lexeme “Great Blue Herring”. Thus, while there is a good deal of overlap in the concepts that members of the same speech community associate with forms (thereby allowing for communication), the semantics of symbolic units are individual and very complex, involving a wide range of concepts that have come to be associated with particular forms due to past instances of usage.
In addition to meaning, language is, of course, also made up of forms. In CG, the formal part of a symbolic unit is known as its phonological pole. Again, both lexical and syntactic units have phonological poles, although those of syntactic units are often more schematic than those of lexical items or are completely unspecified. To return to the examples of *table* and SOV word order, *table* has a phonological pole that captures the similarities in the way that the word is pronounced. We can represent this phonetically as [tejbəl]², but the CG convention is to use conventional lower case orthography – [table]. For SOV, the phonological pole is left unspecified since subjects, verbs and objects can take a wide variety of forms. This is represented by an ellipsis […]. Note that although it is unspecified, SOV still has a phonological pole that dictates the order of its elements. It is, however, very schematic in that it only specifies word order.

Symbolic units are not isolated within the system, but are connected to other symbolic units through two other types of relationship, categorizing and syntagmatic, which I shall explore below. The linguistic system is therefore said to consist of a structured inventory of symbolic units. Let us now turn to the ways in which these units and the relationships that hold between them form the structured inventory that is the linguistic system.

A categorizing relationship holds between two units when one includes all the properties of the other but is more specific. For example, the AF unit [rouge] “red” is in a categorizing relationship with the unit [couleur] “colour” since the former incorporates

² The square brackets indicate unit status rather than a phonetic versus a phonemic transcription.
all the meaning of the latter but is more specific. Similarly, [V/...], which is a schematic unit representing the similarities among verbs, is in a categorizing relationship with specific verbs, such as [GO/go] and [ALLER/aller], which have the properties of [V/...] but are more specific with regard to their meaning and form. These relationships are represented in Figure 3.1. Note that whereas symbolic relationships are indicated with dotted lines, categorizing relations are represented by solid arrows going from the more general to the more specific construction.

![Diagram](image.png)

**Figure 3.1**

Although [jump] and [sauter] are units that belong to “different languages”, they are not treated any differently in the model than units of the same language (such as [walk] and [jump]). CG posits no modules, filters or any purely formal devices for separating the units of different languages. They do get distinguished, but as we shall see, this happens not because of any formal devices. Instead, the principles of organization of the system result in the separation of units belonging to different languages. This will be explored in section 3.4.
In the examples above, categorizing relationships were based on semantic (or both formal and semantic) overlap, but such relationships can also occur between units on the basis of phonological similarity alone. For example, allophones are units that are in a categorizing relationship with a single more schematic unit (a phoneme). Figure 2, which is based on Langacker 1987: 389-394, shows the categorizing relations that hold between voiceless stops ([T]) and the phonological units [p], [t] and [k]\(^3\), and between these and allophones such as [ʔ], [tʰ], etc.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{[T]} & \quad \text{[p]} & \quad \text{[t]} & \quad \text{[k]} \\
\text{[tʰ]} & \quad [ʔ] & \quad [ɾ] & \quad [ɾ']
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 3.2

In Figure 3.2, [p], [t] and [k] categorize [T], which represents all voiceless stops. Each has all the features of voiceless stops while being more specific with regard to place of articulation. Similarly, the allophones [tʰ], [ʔ], etc. have all the properties of the unit [t], whose structure includes, by definition, the similarity between all the allophones.

\(^3\) Again, the square brackets simply indicate unit status – they do not indicate phonetic versus phonemic status here.
Categorizing relationships can therefore hold between conceptual, formal and symbolic units.

The third type of relation, syntagmatic, is the integration of component structures resulting in a composite structure whose meaning is different than the sum of its parts (cf. Langacker 1987: 94). Langacker provides the example of the idiomatic expression *the cat is out of the bag*, where there are correspondences between *cat*, *out of*, and *bag*[^4], allowing for a single integrated expression (Langacker 1987: 94-95). Similarly, there are syntagmatic relations between morphemes. For example, the English plural morpheme *[[PL]/[s]]* so frequently occurs after a noun, that a schema for plural nouns emerges - *[[[THING]/[...]]-[[PL]/[s]]]* (cf. Langacker 1987: 84). Note that both the idiomatic and grammatical syntagmatic relations above emerge in the same way. The collocation of units results in a composite unit that has different semantic and/or formal properties than the sum of its components.

The network of symbolic units therefore involves three different types of relation: symbolic, categorizing and syntagmatic. Positing only these structures (as well as phonological and semantic poles), we can account for linguistic usage. Before we turn to Chiac, however, one more key aspect of the CG model needs to be addressed - its dynamicity.

[^4]: For simplicity's sake, Langacker ignores the determiners and the copula.
So far I have been treating the linguistic system as a static and immutable inventory of symbolic units. This is certainly not the case. Rather, CG holds that language is constantly emerging based on instances of usage (Langacker refers to CG as a "dynamic usage-based model" in a paper by the same name – Langacker 2000). Usage events are considered to be the input for (and the result of) linguistic structures. A usage event is defined as "actual utterances in the full richness of their phonetic detail and contextual understanding" (Langacker 1991: 2). It is the result of a problem solving activity. Symbolic units that best convey the intended conceptualization are selected to encode this meaning, and all this takes place within a particular context, which includes the relation of the speech act participants to each other, the environment in which the conversation is occurring, etc.

The linguistic system emerges as general cognitive processes allow the speaker to manipulate the units in his/her inventory. These processes include comparison, entrenchment, abstraction, and blending (cf. Langacker 1987: 99-146), and the last three will be of particular importance to my analyses. Entrenchment results from use or non-use of a unit and influences the likelihood that it will be selected in the future: the more entrenched a unit the more easily it is activated and vice versa. "Every use of a structure has a positive impact on its degree of entrenchment, whereas extended periods of disuse have a negative impact" (Langacker 1987: 59).
Whereas entrenchment influences the status of units (and potential units), abstraction and blending can result in new structures. Abstraction involves ignoring some information such that the resulting structure is more schematic than the structure(s) from which it emerged (cf. Langacker 1987: 132-137). Schematic units, or schemas, emerge in the following way. Given a number of usage events involving, for example, the word cat, some commonalities in the form and function are reinforced and become part of the schema while some commonalities and most differences are not reinforced and do not become part of the unit. Slight differences in pronunciation are ignored while the basic form [kæt] is abstracted and entrenched. Similarly, conceptual differences (i.e. size, color, breed, behavior, context of mention etc.) are “filtered out” while the commonalities (a schematic shape configuration, having whiskers, meowing, etc.) are entrenched and become part of the schema. Thus, a schema is: “the commonality that emerges from distinct structures when one abstracts away from their points of difference by portraying them with lesser precision and specificity” (Langacker 2000: 4).

This process works in exactly the same way for syntactic constructions. Consider SVO word order, for example. Based on thousands of usage events, an English speaker will abstract a schema representing the frequent relationship between word order and function. That is, a child will realize (subconsciously) that the first participant is usually the agent and the second participant the patient and will therefore acquire a word order schema that allows the child to make use of this meaningful pattern in her own speech. This view of the acquisition of grammatical meaning is consistent with recent language
acquisition research. In a study of English-speaking children's acquisition of lexicon and
grammar, Bates and Goodman (1997) find no evidence to support a modular distinction
between the two. They argue instead that the emergence of grammar is highly dependent
on vocabulary size. In addition, Bates and MacWhinney (1982) argue for functional
motivations for grammatical structure.

In addition to schematization, new units can emerge through blending, a process that, like
schema abstraction, is not specifically linguistic. It involves merging aspects of each of
two or more input structures resulting in a new third structure. In Mappings in Thought
and Language, Fauconnier states: "the blend inherits partial structure from the input
spaces and has emergent structure of its own" (i.e. structure that is not provided by the
inputs) (1997: 149). In addition to familiar lexical blends such as smog (from smoke and
fog), Fauconnier and Turner (1996) have claimed that many grammatical constructions,
such as the Caused Motion Construction, are blends. They argue that the motivation for
such blends is "the linguistic pressure to represent complex integrations of events by
making maximum use of existing grammatical constructions" (Fauconnier 1997: 173).
Blending is relevant to several of my analyses of contact-influenced Chinese constructions.

---

5 Fauconnier's theory is based on a space metaphor, therefore he refers to the input structures as input
spaces. For more on mental spaces see Fauconnier 1997: 34-70.
6 The caused motion construction, which has been described in detail by Goldberg 1995, is treated by
Fauconnier as a blend of two input structures: \( a_0 \, b_0 \, c_0 \, d_0 \) (where \( d_0 \) is an action that causes motion
and transfer of \( b_0 \) from the agent \( a_0 \) to some location \( c_0 \), as in John throws the ball to Susan) and a causal
sequence \( ([a \, ACTS] \, CAUSES \, [b \, MOVE \, TO \, c]) \) (Fauconnier 1997:173).
The role of schemas (and of blends) is to serve as templates for the categorization of conceptualization. In producing or interpreting speech, we must associate concepts with symbolic units in order to encode or decode meaning. The most appropriate linguistic expression for a conceptualization is referred to as its target structure. If a unit [A] is fully consistent with the target structure, then [A] is said to fully sanction it. In this case, "the relation between the sanctioning structure and the target structure is one of identity" (Langacker 1987: 66). This is, however, a rare situation. Usually, the speaker can find no unit or set of units that exactly corresponds with the conceptualization s/he is trying to evoke. For example, our conceptualizations are usually more detailed than the linguistic units we use to categorize them. This is hardly surprising given that linguistic units are often formed through a process of abstraction.

Another possibility is that the target structure is in some way incompatible with the sanctioning units. Langacker provides the example of the term *mouse* being extended to apply to a piece of computer equipment (2000: 11-12). When this first happened (i.e. before this extension of the meaning of *mouse* acquired unit status), speakers faced the challenge of finding a linguistic unit or units to categorize the concept of what is now called a computer mouse. Although the unit [MOUSE/mouse] was not fully compatible with the target (a computer mouse is not an animal, it does not eat cheese, etc.), there were shared concepts – especially with regard to form and size. Despite only partially sanctioning the target, the unit [MOUSE/mouse] formed the basis of categorization. The resulting usage event (MOUSE’/mouse), (where MOUSE’ refers to the extended
meaning of a computer mouse and the rounded brackets indicate non-unit status) provided input for further instances of categorization. Eventually, as the extended usage was repeated, the pattern was entrenched and eventually acquired the status of a unit [MOUSE'/mouse]. This case of extension is, in fact, a blend where the piece of computer equipment and the rodent are the inputs for the new blended schema – the linguistic unit [MOUSE'/mouse].

If units need not fully sanction a target in order to categorize it, how do we as speakers select from a variety of potential categorizing units that are all available to (partially) sanction the target? CG makes use of an activation model that resembles those of McClelland and Elman (1986a and b) and of MacWhinney 1987, among others. A particular target activates a number of constructions that partially sanction the target. Those units that most closely resemble the target with regard to factors such as degree of detail, appropriateness to the context (i.e. formality, etc.) and other aspects of conceptualization will receive the most activation.

In addition, factors such as entrenchment (degree of previous activation, as seen above) and specificity will be relevant in the activation and therefore the selection of a unit to categorize the target (cf. Langacker 2000, 15-17). With regard to specificity, the more features a target shares with a linguistic unit, the more likely it is to be selected to categorize it. Thus, low-level (i.e. specific) schemas have an advantage in competition over high-level (i.e. schematic) units. For instance, if I want to refer to the verb go in the
past tense, there are at least two English units that partially sanction the target. One is the past tense schema \([V/\ldots] \text{[PAST/-d]}\), which specifies that a verb in the past tense takes a suffix \(-d\). Another relevant schema is that of the lexical unit \([\text{GO.PAST/went}]\). Both are well-entrenched schemas, but \([V/\ldots] \text{[PAST/-d]}\) will have greater entrenchment since it is activated and selected more often than \([\text{GO.PAST/went}]\). Nevertheless, if the latter were to succeed in coding the concept of \textit{go} in the past, the result would be the infelicitous \textit{goed}. Instead, \([\text{GO.PAST/went}]\) is selected to encode the concept because it shares more features with the target (specifically the verb \textit{go}) than \([V/\ldots] \text{[PAST/-d]}\) does.

3.3. The Chiac Speaker's Linguistic System

Given what we know about the social situation of Chiac speakers and about Cognitive Grammar, we can begin to describe the linguistic system of a Chiac speaker. For the moment, however, I shall consider only AF and English. This is because there is a good deal of overlap between the units of Chiac and AF, and Chiac and English. In addition, Chiac is relatively unconventional (i.e. it exhibits a fair amount of free variation). Then, in section 3.4 I will show how Chiac emerged based on the linguistic system described in this section and social factors described in Chapter 2. Specific Chiac constructions will be examined in subsequent chapters.
In describing the Chiac speaker's linguistic system, I treat it in the same way as I would the linguistic system of a monolingual. In effect, I shall compare different languages and dialects (in this case English, AF) to different registers of a single language. Both involve a symbolic link between particular forms and particular contexts of usage.

This is not to say that being bilingual is the same in all respects as being monolingual. There is evidence to suggest, for example, that bilinguals make greater (or at least different) use of the right hemispheres of their brains than do monolinguals (cf. Galloway 1980, Genesee et al 1978), although this is controversial (cf. Zatorre 1989, Vaid and Hall 1991). I simply mean that we need not posit any special theoretical mechanisms in order to deal with issues of language contact in CG.

As is the case with all bilinguals, the linguistic system of a Chiac speaker simply "includes units used by two or more different speech communities (i.e. units from 'different languages')" (Rohde et al. 1999: 267). In this case the different languages that Chiac speakers have in common are AF, English and to some extent SF (we are ignoring Chiac for the moment). The exact nature of the units will vary from speaker to speaker. Some will have more English units than others depending on their exposure to that language. Similarly, some will have more AF units than others just as any monolingual can have a smaller or larger vocabulary than another. Nevertheless, Chiac speakers will have certain things in common. Their linguistic inventory will include low-level lexical items such as [été/été], [hiver/hiver], [summer/summer], [winter/winter]. It will also
include a range of syntactic units including [SVO/] and [BACK.V/back ...] (cf. section 6.5). These units form part of a highly structured network, formed on the basis of linguistic usage as described above. Units of the same language can share structure, as can units of different languages. Let us look at how some of the units in the Chiac speaker’s linguistic system are structured.

Linguistic structure is based on three kinds of correspondences: symbolic, categorizing, and syntagmatic, as we saw above. Let us look first at symbolic relationships in the Chiac speaker’s linguistic system. We know that all units consist of a form that has a symbolic relationship with a number of different concepts that are evoked by the unit. This includes any contexts in which a unit is generally used. We know from Chapter 2 that for Chiac speakers, English is used with anglophone friends (I represent this as [A.FRIEND]), in many commercial transactions ([MALL]), and it is the language of pop culture (television, films, music) ([POP.CULTURE]). AF is used predominantly with the family ([FAMILY]) and in school ([SCHOOL]), where a more standard dialect of French is also used. As a result, these contexts will be part of the meaning evoked by English and AF units.

This contextual aspect of the units’ meaning will be learned in the same way that other semantic information is. Through repeated usage events involving the unit [ELE/été], for example, the Chiac speaker will learn what it sounds like (i.e. its phonological form), what it is used to designate (a specific season, the time when it is hot and there is no
school...), and the contexts in which the word is used (family members say this, the teacher says this, my Acadian friends say this, but my anglophone friends say "summer" to refer to the "same thing"). From this it follows that all AF units will be structurally differentiated from English units in that they share correspondences to different contexts of usage.

Using the examples [ÉTÉ/été], [SUMMER/summer], we can model some of the differences in meaning between the AF and English units (specifically the contexts of their use). Note that in Figure 3.3, the dotted lines indicate symbolic relationships.

```
[MALL] [POP.CULTURE] [A.FRIEND] [FAMILY] [SCHOOL]

[SUMMER/summer] [ÉTÉ/été]

[HOT] [SEASON]
```

Figure 3.3

Figure 3.3 essentially represents a situation of diglossia, where different codes are conventionally used in different social situations.
In addition to the contexts in which they are used, AF and English units in the Chiac speaker's linguistic system will be differentiated with regard to other concepts they evoke. For example, AF units will share a symbolic relation with concepts related to Acadian history, to tradition, to family (i.e. to the concept of family as opposed to the context of speech with family members), and to some aspects of school. Similarly, English units will evoke concepts related to the anglophone majority in Moncton and in North America, to American and Canadian pop culture, etc. Thus, as in Figure 3.3, the units of AF and English will be symbolically linked to different concepts. This is not to say that every time a Chiac speaker uses an AF construction s/he cannot help of but think of family, or that when using an English construction pop culture comes to mind. The connections are not very entrenched, since concepts related to family do not always co-occur with conversations in AF, nor do conversations in English always relate to popular culture. Nevertheless, we can posit such connections on the basis of shared knowledge of the history and current social situation of Chiac speakers. These relationships will help us to account for certain aspects of Chiac usage in section 3.3.

Thus, although they are not treated differently in any theoretical way, the units of AF, Chiac and English are differentiated in the Chiac speaker's linguistic system. As I showed in Figure 3.3, the contexts of usage unite units of same language and not units of different languages (although some contexts, such as "informal situation", could be conventionally associated with both AF and English units). Other concepts such as [HOT] and [SEASON], however, do link units of different languages (although
synonyms are an example where a single concept can be in a symbolic relation with units of the same language). The important point is that units of the same language are united in this way, not that they are the only units that share relationships, which is clearly not the case.

Different syntagmatic relations also help to unify the units of the “same language” and to distinguish them from those of other languages. The collocation of units leads to syntagmatic relations between them. Given that the unmarked bilingual usage situation is to use one language at a time (i.e. code-switching is marked), AF-English bilinguals tend to use AF units with other AF units and similarly for English units⁷. As a result, syntagmatic relations evolve that unite units of the same language. In addition to specific lexical collocations such as fin de semaine “weekend”, laid back, etc. more schematic syntagmatic relations will also emerge. Recall that a monolingual English speaker will acquire the unit [[[THING]/[...]]-[[PL]/[-s]]], which represents the frequent usage pattern whereby a plural suffix -s (which can be phonetically realized as [s], [z] or [əz]) follows a noun. I shall unite the phonological and semantic poles and represent this schema as [[N PL] [-s]]. For the monolingual English speaker, most nouns will elaborate this schema. Mass nouns, however, will not, and [N PL] above therefore represents only a subset of nouns – count nouns that take the regular plural. The Chicà speaker will have a similar

---

⁷ It could be argued that mixing is, in fact, unmarked for bilinguals talking to other bilinguals. Certainly for Chicà speakers, mixing is not particularly marked. However, I am considering not only bilinguals talking to other bilinguals, but also to monolinguals. In addition, not switching is undeniably more common than switching in that, even among populations that frequently make use of code-switching, they tend to switch over relatively large pieces of discourse, such that one English word is more likely to be followed by another than by a French word.
plural schema with the same set of nouns that elaborates it. The main difference is that for the Chiac speaker, this particular subset of nouns represents a smaller fraction of the nouns in their inventory, which includes AF nouns. To indicate that only English units elaborate a particular schema I use a subscript 'E', as in \([N_E \text{PL} \ [-s]]\). Chiac speakers have another set of nouns in their inventory that collocates with the zero plural suffix \([-\emptyset]\), resulting in the plural noun schema \([N_F \text{PL} \ [-\emptyset]]\) (cf. section 5.4 for more on Chiac plural constructions). Thus, (most) English-based nouns are unified in the system by virtue of sharing correspondences to \([-s]\) and (most) AF-based nouns are unified by virtue of sharing syntagmatic correspondences to \([-\emptyset]\).

Note that when I use a notation such as \(N_F\) or \(N_E\) to represent nouns that participate in a construction, I am referring to a subset of nouns in the speaker's inventory that share certain properties. In addition to occurring in the construction in question, they occur in other constructions together, they have similar phonetic properties, they occur in the same pragmatic contexts, etc. In other words, AF and English are not \(a\ priori\) categories but are distinguished in the system because they have different properties.

I have shown how differences in symbolic and syntagmatic relations result in linguistic structure that connects the units of the "same language" to each other (as well as to units of other languages). The structure described above will allow for an account of how Chiac speakers (and other bilinguals) are able to speak one language at a time, as well as how and why they might mix the languages.
3.4. One Language at a Time

The model I have presented thus far allows for the possibility of speaking one language at a time (i.e. not mixing) in that units that share correspondences (to a particular construction, for example, or to a context of usage) can coactivate each other. When a unit is activated, all other units that share structure with it, whether these belong to the same language or not, are also activated. There are many factors that then influence which units are selected to encode the target conceptualization, as we saw in section 3.2 above. We saw that specificity and entrenchment play a role, but most important is the semantic overlap between the units in the speaker’s inventory and the target conceptualization.

Imagine that two Chiac-speaking friends are talking and one wants to introduce the concept of her cat, Fluffy, who has been tearing up the furniture. The hearer does not know that the speaker’s cat is named Fluffy. When the speaker activates the concepts related to her cat, a number of units that share structure with these concepts will be activated, including many that will not succeed in encoding the utterance ([animal], [cat nap], [IT/it], etc.).

Aside from the context of which language was being used up to this point, let us assume that my cat and mon chat (but not Fluffy or it) are equally appropriate in the context of this conversation. (This is the case because the speaker knows that the hearer does not
know who *Fluffy* is, and because the cat has not previously been introduced). If the language our bilingual has been using for the rest of this utterance is AF, previous units will have activated other AF constructions related to context, phonological, morphological and syntactic patterns, etc., making them more likely to be selected than English units. In addition, the context of the discourse that led the speaker to use AF in the first place presumably still applies. That is, if AF was initially selected for the conversation because both interlocutors are AF speakers who are more comfortable in AF than in English, or because the discourse is taking place in a Moncton school, then this context will still apply and will continue to influence the selection of units. Thus, *mon chat* will receive more activation than *my cat* and will be selected to encode the target conceptualization because *mon chat* evokes meaning (specifically a context) that is more appropriate to the target than the contexts evoked by *cat*.

In addition, because speaking one language at a time is the norm in most bilingual speech communities, language mixing is seen as a marked behaviour that is inherently meaningful and may be evaluated negatively by interlocutors. This markedness, combined with the potential for displeasing one’s interlocutor, may send further activation to units of the language used for the rest of the utterance (AF in the case above) such that *mon chat* is even more likely to be selected by the AF-English bilingual than *my cat*.

---

8 Alternately, one could hypothesize that the English units are inhibited (rather than positing extra activation to AF units), but inhibition is not an essential theoretical tool in accounting for the continued use of units of the same language.
Given the structure I have posited for Chiac speakers, it should be clear that a language has no special status in the bilingual language system that distinguishes it from other languages. It is a confluence of shared structures (symbolic, categorizing and syntagmatic) that relate to context of use, formal properties, collocation, etc. The status of AF and English for the Chiac speaker is no different than that of different registers or dialects of the same language (i.e. AF and SF) for a monolingual. When speaking in a particular register, for example, just as when speaking a given language, the context of the utterance activates units that are symbolically linked to that context. In the case of a formal register of English used in the context of a speech to colleagues, for instance, units activated would include specific vocabulary items (such as therefore, however, infrastructure, etc.), syntactic patterns (multiclausal sentences, passives), etc. The difference between a language and a register is one of degree - the units of different registers of the same language will be less differentiated with regard to their formal properties than those of different languages. In addition, registers will tend to vary more by context than languages will (i.e. one is more likely to switch registers than languages as the contexts of the conversation change).

3.5. Language Mixing by Chiac Speakers

If there are no distinct boundaries between languages, and if we view language use as a series of choices made in order to convey meaning, language mixing can be treated in precisely the same way as using one language at a time. Note that I use the term mixing
to refer to all types of contact phenomena where units of one language occur with units of
another. It therefore subsumes code-switching, but not the use of loanwords since these
are, by definition, integrated into the borrowing language’s inventory. On occasion I will
use the term code-switching for convenience sake, but I do not mean to imply by it that
the speaker is actually switching from one distinct code to another.

Given the usage-based model I have laid out in this chapter, it is clear that the use of units
of AF and English by Chiac speakers will evoke the concepts that they associate with
these languages and their speakers. Approached this way, mixing is simply another way
of manipulating the linguistic inventory in order to evoke meaning. While monolinguals
can select lexical items, constructions, register, intonation patterns, etc. to convey
meaning, Chiac speakers (and other bilinguals) have the additional ability to alternate
between one language and another, in addition to drawing from both. In this section I
shall examine some of the factors that motivate Chiac speakers to mix languages and the
types of mixing that result.

I begin with the assumption that speakers generally do not mix languages – not because
that is some kind of a priori rule, but because they have reason not to do so (their
interlocutor might not understand, they may be viewed as uneducated or, conversely, as
showing off. In addition, whatever contextual and social factors led the bilingual to
choose one particular language over the other in the first place presumably applies
throughout the conversation). Just as social factors result in bilinguals usually using one
language at a time, I argue that social factors result in Chiac speakers mixing AF and English. In Chapter 2 I presented some of the relevant social factors in the lives of Chiac speakers, and now I shall show how they influence Chiac speakers to mix English and AF resulting, ultimately, in Chiac.

Motivating factors for mixing that surely exist for all bilinguals, including Chiac speakers, include the desire to encode a concept that one does not know the word for, that one has forgotten the word for, or for which there is a more precise conventional unit in the other language. Consider a particular usage event where a Chiac speaker intends to communicate the concept of a kitchen hand mixer in a conversation that has so far been conducted entirely in AF. The target concept [MIXER] is activated and this, in turn, sends activation to a variety of units that partially sanction the target. These would include the English [mixer] and may also include the French [malaxeur]. If both units are accessible, the latter may be selected since the conversation has been in AF up to this point and therefore an AF unit should receive greater activation than an English one. [malaxeur] may not be accessible, however, for several reasons: the unit may not be known to the speaker or s/he may have temporarily forgotten the word. In such a situation, an English synonym such as [mixer] may be selected. Whether the speaker chooses an AF or an English synonym will depend on a number of factors, such as the interlocutors' general willingness to mix, the meanings of the synonyms (i.e. how close they are to the target conceptualization), the speaker's belief that her interlocutor will understand the English word, etc.
It is worth noting that from a cognitive perspective, the case above where the speaker does not have an AF target unit "malaxeur" and therefore uses "mixer" (this can be considered a case of code-switching) is similar to many cases of transfer. Consider the phenomenon of a foreign accent. This is another situation where a target language structure is unavailable to the speaker, who instead makes use of a non-target language construction. For example, a French-English bilingual may not pronounce the [ð] in English words but rather [d], which is found in French. Since [d], one of the closest phonological units in the bilingual's inventory, is more entrenched than (ð) for this speaker, it gets selected instead of (ð) in the context of English. In this situation, the choice of [d] versus (ð) is not a choice at all. One cannot use a phoneme that is not a unit in one's linguistic system any more than one can use a lexeme that is not in one's vocabulary. The primary difference between a foreign accent and the type of mixing I described above (i.e. code-switching) is the greater degree of awareness and control the speaker has over the use of lexical items versus phonological patterns.

The first type of mixing I considered was motivated by a lexical gap (or phonological, in the case of foreign accent) of some kind. However, if mixing only occurred when a target structure was unavailable, one would expect it to occur less often the more bilingual a speaker is. This is clearly not the case for Chic speakers, nor is it the case in many other bilingual speech communities — in Puerto Rico, for example (cf. Poplack
1980) or in the American southwest (cf. Pfaff 1979). The Puerto Ricans in Poplack’s study, the Mexican-Americans in Pfaff’s study and Chiac speakers all make frequent use of code-switching and borrowing despite a high degree of fluency in both languages (Spanish and English in the first two cases, AF and English for Chiac). There must therefore be other reasons for mixing that will help us to account for Chiac usage. I shall first consider the motivations that led Chiac speakers to mix AF and English in general. Then, I shall look at the factors that influence the specific ways in which Chiac speakers mix the units in their inventories.

As we saw in Chapter 2, adolescents often form a social group – one which is particularly concerned with differentiating themselves from other groups. Whereas monolingual teens may develop particular registers, swear, invent lexemes and/or even pronounce words differently in order to set their speech apart, bilinguals such as Chiac speakers have an additional tool at their disposal. By mixing English with their French, Chiac speakers distinguish themselves both from their parents and from the anglophone population of Moncton. They could use English only, which would maximally distinguish them from their parents, but this would mean not only rejecting AF but also embracing English. As we saw in Chapter 2, Chiac speakers do not consider themselves part of anglophone Moncton culture and often bear hostility toward those who favour a monolingual English Moncton. Thus, by mixing units of both AF and English, they set themselves apart from other social groups in Moncton.
One could also treat the mixing of AF and English as a way to evoke the Acadian and English aspects of Chiac speakers' identity. We know that for these speakers, the use of English units evokes concepts associated with anglophone culture in Moncton (such as economic dominance, medium for pop culture, etc.) and that the use of AF evokes concepts related to Acadian culture. Given that these concepts are all relevant to a Chiac speaker's identity, it makes sense that s/he would use both languages. That is, the form of their speech iconically reflects aspects of their social identity.

Now that we have examined some general motivations for Chiac speakers' mixing of AF and English, let us look at some specific patterns of mixing. As we shall see in more detail in Chapter 4, certain types of lexemes seem to occur more frequently in AF or in English. For example, swearing and drug-related terms are frequently English-based in Chiac, whereas words related to family and religion are often AF-based. The meanings of swearing and of drug-related terms are compatible with the concepts evoked by English in the Chiac speech community. As we saw above, the use of English with AF is a way of distinguishing oneself from Acadian culture and specifically from one's parents. It is a symbol of membership in a social group of teenage, bilingual Monctonian Acadians. Eckert has shown that smoking, doing drugs and swearing are also symbols of teen category membership (specifically to the teen category of burnouts) (Eckert 1989: 60-72). It is therefore not surprising that Chiac speakers often encode swearing and drug-related concepts using units of the same language, and that the language they use more often than not for this purpose is English.
Imagine that a Chiac speaker wants to evoke the concept of being high on drugs. There are several units in her inventory that partially sanction the target: [high], [stoned], [défoncé]⁹ etc. Doing drugs is an activity associated with the peer group and is usually not associated with parents or family. As a result, while [défoncé] does evoke many of the relevant concepts, it also evokes family to a greater extent than its English-based synonyms. The English term [high] (or [stoned], etc.), on the other hand, evokes the relevant activity but in addition evokes a culture distinct from that of the speaker's parents. As a result, the English-based terms that evoke drug-related concepts will usually receive greater activation than the AF-based ones and similarly for other activities related to teen culture.

When it comes to evoking members of one's family, however, the opposite is true. Since AF units will evoke (to some degree) concepts related to tradition and family, Chiac speakers usually select specific AF units to encode such concepts. For example, if a Chiac speaker wants to evoke the concept of her mother she will have several units at her disposal that partially sanction the target. These include [mother] and [mère]. Since the AF unit is more compatible with the concept of family than the English one, [mère] will receive additional activation and will be selected more often than [mother]. This prediction is confirmed in my Chiac corpus where the word *mother* only occurred twice –

⁹ There is no evidence that défoncé is a unit in Chiac speakers’ linguistic systems, but I use it for the purpose of illustration.
in the name of an English band (*I Mother Earth*) and in the lexeme *mother fuckers*. In both of these cases, the unit [mother] is not involved, but rather more complex units. [mère], on the other hand, occurred 75 times.

There are, of course, exceptions. In the case of the concept of smoking pot, the most conventional AF verb would be [bouquer] and in English, the best equivalent is probably [to smoke up]. Although given my previous remarks we would expect [smoke up] to be more common than [bouquer], the opposite is true. This may be because [bouquer] is a single verb that conveys both the activity of smoking and the thing being smoked, whereas in English you need to specify the object (as in [smoke pot]) or use a phrasal verb (such as [smoke up]) in order to convey a similar amount of information. In other words, it may be a matter of efficiency. It may also be relevant that [bouquer] is not found in AF with this meaning and therefore will not evoke concepts associated with AF – at least not to the same degree as a unit like [mère].

Clearly, then, the influence of concepts associated with the use of a particular language on the choice of unit is subtle. Nevertheless, in cases where the meaning of two units such as [mère] and [mother] is very similar, the additional activation provided by the shared context of family (or of differentiation in the case of [high] vs. [défoncé]) can result in one unit being conventionally selected over the other.
Up to this point I have been essentially ignoring Chiac. I first described the structure of the Chiac speaker’s linguistic inventory with regard to AF and English, I then described how these two mix. But Chiac is clearly more than just unconventional mixing (i.e. code-switching). In this section I show how the mixing of AF and English, which I motivated in the last section, resulted in the semi-grammaticalized patterns of Chiac. I refer to the patterns as semi-grammaticalized because although there are constructions that are characteristic of Chiac, and although Chiac has certain predictable properties, it also exhibits a high degree of free variation – particularly with regard to lexical choice.

Chiac speakers mix AF and English for the reasons mentioned above, and the result is fairly unpredictable usage. Chiac also has many regular patterns, however, that cannot be accounted for in terms of code-switching only. I contend that the semantically motivated mixing of English and AF units in a particular speech context (that of young bilingual Monctonians speaking casually, and especially to each other) led to the grammaticalization of certain patterns of usage. Grammaticalization results in new constructions and new structure in Chiac just as it does for monolinguals. Given that linguistic structure emerges from repeated instances of language use, if speakers frequently mix languages, that pattern of usage will become entrenched. Schematic units

---

10 *Bouquer* does not exist with this meaning in modern French. There is an archaic AF unit *bouquer* which means something like “to be stubborn”.

emerge that sanction further mixing, and mixing becomes a conventional pattern in the linguistic system of Chiac speakers. In such a system, mixing requires less activation than in the situations described in 3.4 since it constitutes an entrenched pattern (or more accurately a number of entrenched patterns).

Consider borrowing, which is a common process whereby an unconventional pattern of mixing (code-switching, for example) becomes regular and conventional, such that the loanword becomes part of the borrowing language's inventory. Within a cognitive model of the bilingual linguistic system, borrowing works as follows. A bilingual decides to use a unit from a language other than the one s/he has been using in an utterance for one of a number of possible reasons (because s/he has forgotten the target structure, for example). Although it may be a nonce usage, this usage event, like all usage events, helps to shape linguistic structure. If the unit in question is used in similar contexts several times, structures will form that join the potential loanword to the new contexts of use (the borrowing language contexts). Eventually the new contexts become part of the meaning of the loanword in addition to the old contexts (i.e. the contexts of the other language).

Connections to contexts are not the only new structures that are formed. The formal changes that typically occur with borrowing (i.e. phonological and morphological assimilation) are the result of acquiring and strengthening connections between the loanword and other borrowing-language constructions. A loanword forms syntagmatic relations with other borrowing-language units, for example. Gradually it becomes
connected to the borrowing-language's phonological and morphological schemas such that it can take the same morphology and phonological patterns as “native” borrowing language units.

Consider, for example, the borrowing of the French lexeme *déjà vu* into English. Although this borrowing is not specific to the English of Chiac speakers, it will serve as an illustration. The first stage would involve a French-English bilingual speaker who has the unit *déjà vu*, but it has connections predominantly to French language contexts and constructions. The speaker then encounters a situation where s/he is speaking in English and wants to evoke the concept [DÉJÀ VU], but finds no satisfactory English unit to categorize it. The bilingual therefore uses the French lexeme in an otherwise English utterance. His/her interlocutor may understand French, or the meaning may just be obvious from context. Through this usage event, the bilingual has begun the process of forming and entrenching new correspondences between [déjà vu] and English schemas – especially with regard to context of use. The more this lexeme is used in this context, the more entrenched the connections will become until eventually, for this speaker at least, [déjà vu] can be considered an English lexeme\(^\text{11}\).

As correspondences between [déjà vu] and English contexts get strengthened, so too do its connections to other English schemas. English morphological constructions like the

\(^{11}\) There is, of course, no specific degree of entrenchment that must be reached in order for the unit to be considered an English lexeme. The process is a gradual one.
[[Nₚ PL] [-s]] plural, for example, share correspondences with other English schemas (such as particular contexts, specific English lexical items, syntactic patterns, etc.) just as [déjà vu] now does. Future use of the noun [déjà vu] in an English context will therefore activate English nominal morphological schemas. Eventually, [déjà vu] in an English context will pluralize with [[Nₑ PL] [-s]] rather than the French [[Nₑ PL] [-Ø]], resulting in usage such as I've been having a lot of déjà vus [vuz] lately.

In Figure 3.4 we see some of the relations between [déjà vu] and various contexts and constructions. The bolded lines (solid and dotted) indicate more entrenched symbolic relationships between [déjà vu] and the French unit [F.CONTEXT] than between it and the English unit [E.CONTEXT] for this particular bilingual speaker. In addition, there is a more entrenched categorizing relationship between [Nₑ] and [déjà vu] than between [Nₑ] and [déjà vu]. The solid lines between the plural constructions and [Nₑ] and [Nₑ] indicate relations of composition or identity. That is, [Nₑ] in the plural construction is the same [Nₑ] represented below it.

![Figure 3.4](image_url)
When a loanword spreads to a monolingual population, the influence of the morphological and phonological patterns of their language on the loanword is almost inevitable. Whereas a French-English bilingual may still say *I've been having a lot of déjà vu* [deʒə vυ] *lately* because of connections to French schemas, if speakers do not know French, they are less likely to apply French morphology and pronunciation to this particular unit. Given that English does not have a unit [y], an anglophone will likely say [dejʒə vυw].

The regularization and conventionalization of other patterns of mixing in Chiac occurs in precisely the same way as borrowing. Consider the fact that any verb in the Chiac speaker's inventory, whether it be of English or AF origin, can occur with most AF verbal morphology in (the context of) Chiac. If we look specifically at the third person singular imperfective aspect suffix *-ais* we can describe this pattern by positing a schema [[V.3sSUB.IMP] [-ais]]. Note that in the case of a more traditional French-English bilingual, we would have to specify that verbs taking this suffix must be French (i.e. [[V.F.3sSUB.IMP] [-ais]]) since bilinguals will generally not use English verbs in this construction.

We can account for the emergence of the Chiac schema as follows. As specific English verbs are mixed with AF, they begin to acquire connections to a variety of schemas, as we saw above for [déjà vu]. When English-origin verbs come to be used with the AF verbal suffix *-ais*, (either through mixing or borrowing), a new schema [[V.3sSUB.IMP] [
ais]] will gradually emerge that makes no distinction between verbs of English versus AF origin. An early stage is depicted in Figure 3.5 whereas Figure 3.6 shows the new schema. In Figure 3.5, [Vₚ] participates in the 3s. imperfect construction whereas [Vₑ] does not.

![Diagram from Figure 3.5]

In Figure 3.6, [Vₑ] does participate in [[Vₚ.3sSUB.IMP] [-ais]].

![Diagram from Figure 3.6]

The result of this change in structure is that the elaborations of the schema [Vₑ] (i.e. specific English verbs) can now be used (in a limited way) in contexts associated with Chiac speech. These include "spoken with (francophone) peers", "spoken by teens", "informal" etc. The same thing is true of specific AF lexical items, and of English verbs and other English words that participate in a variety of Chiac constructions. Some units
occur in a variety of contexts (i.e. in some or all of the contexts of AF, English and Chiac speech). *Traffic* and *TV* [tivi] for example, are units of English origin, of course, but also occur in Chiac: each occurs several times in my corpus. They are also units of AF in that they are conventional loanwords (Landry 1973). Most lexical units in the Chiac speaker’s inventory, however, occur in fewer contexts. *But* is found in English and in Chiac, but generally not in AF. *Semaine* ‘week’ is a unit in AF and in Chiac, but not in English. *Parents* [pe.rents] occurs only in English while *struggle* (with the meaning “to suck” – see section 4.11.3 for a semantic analysis) occurs only in the context of Chiac speech.

It should also be noted that we are dealing with a continuum and not with strict boundaries. The use of *espérer* “to wait”, for example, is found in both AF and Chiac, but it is more strongly associated with AF structures since it is a well-known example of an archaism and therefore of a difference between AF and SF. In addition, the standardization of French in the schools may be contributing to the loss of such features in the French of younger Acadians. Correspondences can have varying strengths/degrees of entrenchment such that one unit may be more conventional and/or frequent in one language than in another. Thus, *espérer* is not unique to AF, but its connections to AF constructions are stronger than to Chiac constructions.

In addition, the plural unit [[Nₐ pl] [-s]] occurs in both English and Chiac. In English, however, it is by far the most frequent way of indicating plural and is highly entrenched.
It competes only with a few non-productive suffixes such as [-∅] and [-en] (as in two deer-∅, two ox-en). In Chiac, on the other hand, [N_E PL] [-s]] occurs often, but much less frequently than the French-based plural construction [[N_F PL] [-∅]]. So while [[N_E PL] [-s]] shares structure with Chiac contexts and constructions, it is less entrenched in these contexts than [[N_F PL] [-∅]] is, and than [[N_E PL] [-s]] is in English.

Now that we have examined a variety of constructions and how they are interconnected, we can represent the Chiac speaker's linguistic system as in Figure 3.7. The dotted circles labeled “AF”, “Chiac” and “English” indicate the confluence of structures that join specific contexts and constructions – in other words, they represent these languages. The circles are dotted because units of different languages will share structures, as we saw above. AF, English and Chiac are therefore not clearly delineated. The regular dotted lines (representing symbolic relations) in Figure 3.7 correspond to weaker (i.e. less entrenched) connections between units and the bolded dotted lines to stronger ones. Although the use of English is associated with the mall in Moncton, one can hear AF and Chiac spoken and some sales clerks will communicate with customers in AF or Chiac. The mall context therefore is connected to other Chiac and AF constructions, although to a lesser degree than to English constructions. Similarly, although Chiac is strongly associated with teenagers, Chiac speakers have teenage anglophone friends with whom they speak English. Chiac is therefore not the only language that has a symbolic relation to the context of teen speakers. Note that these connections will vary by individual.
Some Chiac speakers, for example, have an anglophone parent. In that case, English, as well as AF, would likely be associated with the home, whereas for others it is not.
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**Figure 3.7**

### 3.7. Conclusions

In this chapter I have explored the Chiac speaker's linguistic system from a usage-based (specifically CG) perspective. I began by describing units of AF and English and how they are structured, including their contexts of use. Given the social situation of Chiac speakers, I then provided an account of how and why they mixed AF and English units. For example, mixing was an ideal way for these speakers to assert their identity, which is different from that of their parents and of Moncton anglophones. Finally, I showed how such motivated mixing led to the emergence of new constructions and new structures that sanctioned further mixed usage, some of which is quite predictable and conventional.

In addition to showing how Chiac emerged, I attempted to make clear that Chiac, like all languages, has no special status that isolates it from other languages or dialects. Only the
fact that specific patterns of usage occur (semi-) regularly and conventionally in specific contexts qualifies Chiac as a distinct system. In this regard Chiac is no different than a particular register of language, for example. This is a much different way of viewing language than a modular approach, for example, but I think that this usage-based model is consistent with what we know about cognition as well as with the ways in which languages behave.

Having considered the more theoretical aspects of Chiac usage, in the remaining chapters (Part Two) I examine specific Chiac units in order to illustrate how the processes described above result in "new"\textsuperscript{12} constructions. I show that each unit can be accounted for in terms of AF and English constructions that have acquired new contexts of use, and in some cases extended meanings and new formal properties. Many of these "new" constructions are lexical items, and these are the subject of Chapter 4.

\textsuperscript{12} By this I mean that the Chiac constructions are significantly different than the relevant source-language ones, but this is, of course, a matter of degree. All Chiac units are, in some way, different than their source-language constructions by virtue of the different contexts in which they are used and the different units they compete with in the speakers' inventories.
Chapter 4

The Chiac Lexicon

4.1. Introduction

To this point we have examined the Chiac speaker's experience, how it shapes the units s/he has access to and how it motivates the selection of particular units in particular contexts. Speakers' bilingualism gives them two languages to work with, their youth and other aspects of their identity make them want to distinguish themselves, and their parents' francophone background means that they can distinguish themselves by incorporating English into their speech. Such commonalities of experience have led to commonalities of linguistic usage among young francophone Monctonians. Over time, patterns of regularity have emerged that result from and reflect the Chiac experience. The linguistic units a Chiac speaker has access to are therefore not only AF and English. In addition, conventional Chiac constructions have emerged that are based on AF and English patterns, but are unique by virtue of the contexts they are associated with (i.e. Chiac contexts), and sometimes also by virtue of their semantic and formal properties. It is this set of conventionalized units, in fact, that constitute Chiac in the narrow sense.

Chapter 4 marks the beginning of my examination of those patterns that distinguish Chiac usage from AF, from English, and from AF-English code-switching. The lexicon seems a fitting place to begin since, as Edward Sapir noted: “vocabulary is a very sensitive index of the culture of a people” (Sapir 1949: 27). In addition, Wierzbicka claims that:
"the lexicon is the clearest possible guide to everyday cognition and to the patterning of everyday discourse" (1997: 31). Nowhere in the structure of Chiac is the culture of its speakers reflected more clearly than in the lexicon. Not only does Chiac vocabulary tell us something about what is important and relevant to its speakers (just as Inuktitut words for snow tell us something about its importance to Inuit culture), but their choice of AF-versus English-based units also tells us something about the roles of these languages in the lives of Chiac speakers. We shall see, for example, that the roles of AF and English are reflected in the vocabulary speakers use to discuss their families and drugs.

Before beginning to describe the lexicon, I must first make explicit how I define lexical items with regard to Chiac. The issue of what constitutes a lexeme is never straightforward, and it is even less so in Chiac since code-switching is quite frequent in the context of Chiac speech. Clearly a lexeme need not be a single word since that would potentially exclude compounds (word processor, Maison des Jeunes) and other idioms (kick the bucket, on your own). What distinguishes these compounds and idioms from non-lexical items (since I would claim that the examples above are all lexemes) is their non-compositional nature. Their meaning is not derivable from the meanings of the words they contain. Of course compositionality is a matter of degree. It could be argued that apple pie is a single lexeme even though its meaning is fairly transparent given apple and pie. Rather than create arbitrary criteria for distinguishing lexemes from non-lexemes, for marginal cases I shall acknowledge the fact that a piece of language may or may not constitute a single lexical unit.
Another issue regarding the Chiac lexicon is whether to include units that occur in code-switches. Since the structure of English and AF are well described elsewhere, in describing Chiac structure I shall be concerned only with Chiac in the narrow sense (as defined in Chapter 1). That is, units that occur only in code-switches are not considered to be part of the structure of Chiac.

Although I ultimately consider code-switching to be just another example of selecting particular units in order to convey meaning, and although it is notoriously difficult to define (precisely because it differs in degree and not in kind from other types of mixing), I must be more explicit about what I mean by code-switching if I am to exclude it from my description of Chiac patterns. Prototypically, code-switching involves using the units of one language consistently over a stretch of several words, or even sentences, then using the units of another language for a stretch of discourse. Relatively clear-cut examples in my Chiac corpus include:

(52)  pi i était comme “you guys are gonna be sorry ‘cause I’m gonna survive and you guys are not” pi moi j’étais comme “oh my God” “and he was like ‘you guys are gonna be sorry ‘cause I’m gonna survive and you guys are not’ and I was like ‘oh my God’”

(53)  on vivrait juste pi on prendrait juste comme les amerindiens ce qu’i devraient avoir pour survivre comme moi je trouve ça serait cool but whatever. It’s pretty screwed up right now so j’figure. Chu pretty lucky I’ve got Texas ‘cause Moncton suck “we’d just live and just take like the native americans what they need to survive, like I think that would be cool, but whatever. It’s pretty screwed up right now so, I figure. I’m pretty lucky I’ve got Texas ‘cause Moncton sucks”
In 52 a switch to English is triggered by the direct speech act. The utterance therefore consists of an introduction to the direct speech act in Chiac (in the narrow sense) followed by a complete sentence in English, and this is then repeated again\(^1\). 53 is less clear-cut, but a Chiac utterance is followed by an English one beginning with *it's pretty screwed up right now*. It is a less clear example because of the pronoun *j*' on the verb *figure*. This can be interpreted as a switch back to Chiac (in which case *figure* can be treated as a Chiac verb), but this is not clear. (If it is a switch back to Chiac, does it begin with *j*' or with *so*, which is clearly a Chiac lexeme as well as an English one?) Then, the last part of the utterance (beginning with *I've got Texas*) seems to be another code-switch into English except that there is no person agreement on the verb *suck*, which one would expect in English but expect not to occur in Chiac or AF.

For the purposes of my descriptions and analyses, I will reject constructions as Chiac structures on the basis that they occur in code-switches only when the potential code-switch involves an English subject and VP (as with *you guys are gonna be sorry* and *it's pretty screwed up right now* above). In addition, the combined subject and VP must not be part of a single lexical unit by the criteria given above (i.e. idioms such as *you know* are not considered code-switches). Code-switching may, of course, also occur in more marginal cases, but these will not be considered code-switches for the purposes of analyzing the Chiac lexicon. If phenomena occur only in marginal cases, I shall suggest

---

\(^1\) It is not clear, however, whether *oh my God* represents another switch into English or whether it is simply a single Chiac lexeme.
the possibility that they are a result of code-switching, but also acknowledge the possibility that they are part of the Chiac inventory.

Code-switches into AF are even more difficult to identify than code-switches into English. This is because AF differs from Chiac in degree - largely with regard to the amount of English influence it exhibits. That is, a sentence that has or lacks English-based units can be considered either AF or Chiac (even in the narrow sense) in many cases. The best evidence that an utterance is in a more traditional AF rather than Chiac would be if an English-based construction that conventionally occurs in Chiac does not occur. For example, if *mais* occurs rather than the more conventional *but*, as in examples 54 and 55, the utterance could be considered AF. There are problems with this, however, in that *mais* sometimes occurs in what otherwise look like Chiac utterances (as in example 55). In addition, *but* is sometimes considered a feature of AF.

(54)  
\[j'aurais peut-être plus de linges mais j'aurais pas plus de beau linges\]  
"maybe I'd have more clothes but I wouldn't have more nice clothes"

(55)  
\[c'est pas comme si que je porte still ça même si c'était confortable je le porte plus auster so mais je suis la mode\]  
"it's not like I still wear that even if it was comfortable I don't wear that anymore, but I follow fashion"

The best examples of AF utterances seem to be long passages where no English units are used, as in 56.

(56)  
\[Moi je trouve que c'est pas du tout important pour moi d'être indépendent financièrement parce que je veux que mes parents m'achètent des choses.\]
Mais quand même chu pas gâté je trouve parce que c'est tout le temps moi qu'achète mes ah, mon matériel que j'ai besoin souvent mais i m'achètent quand même du linge pi ah, la nourriture ça que j'ai besoin.

"I find that it's not important to me at all to be financially independent because I want my parents to buy me things. But still I'm not spoiled. I think, because I always buy my uh, my things that I need all the time, but they still buy me clothes and food, stuff that I need."

56 is problematic, however, in that AF also makes use of English-based lexical items, and so it is not clear whether 56 is better thought of as SF or AF. Even if we could agree on a definition in terms of a lack of English units, the fact is that such passages rarely occur in my corpus. Thus, AF passages in my corpus occur either very infrequently or in such a way that it is difficult to distinguish them from Chiac usage. I shall therefore not exclude any data from my analyses on the basis that they are AF rather than Chiac.

Given the criteria for the Chiac lexicon that I have set out, a clear pattern emerges in the first part of this Chapter (4.2-4.10). Specifically, lexemes belonging to open/content word classes are much more likely to be English-based than lexemes belonging to closed class/function word classes. This is in accordance with the behaviour of other bilingual speech behaviour. Thomason and Kaufman, for example, have devised a borrowing hierarchy where lexical items are the easiest to borrow, with only minimal language contact required, whereas structural borrowing requires more intense contact (Thomason and Kaufman 1991: 74-75).²

² Although I am not claiming that English-based lexical units in Chiac are loanwords in the usual sense, the observations of Thomason and Kaufman are relevant to the extent that Chiac speakers’ competence in AF is greater than that for English.
Of course, not all lexical items in Chiac can be straightforwardly considered AF- versus English-based. Some Chiac units are not conventional in the local English or AF dialects but rather are Chiac innovations. These are treated in section 4.11 of this chapter. I explore three cases of semantic extension. In two, chill and struggle, the meanings of the Chiac units are extensions of the semantics of English units, and the change in meaning has led to changes in their formal properties. A third example, regarder, involves a semantic extension of an AF verb.

A final caveat is that, as I stated in Chapter 1, this description of the Chiac lexicon is based almost solely on my corpus of Chiac – not on Pérot’s corpus and not on elicitation (with the exception of the semantic analyses of chill and struggle in Part Two). The claims I make therefore apply only to the corpus and may not hold for a larger set of texts or for different genres of texts.

4.2. Nouns

This section is concerned with which of the nouns in the Chiac speaker’s inventory are regularly and conventionally selected in the context of Chiac speech. In other words, what nouns (and types of nouns) are units in Chiac. The general pattern of noun use in my corpus is that almost any noun that is part of the speaker’s AF or English inventory can occur in the context of Chiac. And although it is difficult to determine whether these nouns are conventional since there are often only a few tokens of each, concepts that relate to teen culture are more likely to be coded with English nouns than other concepts
are. Similarly, concepts related to family and tradition are more likely to be coded with AF nouns than other concepts are.

If we examine the English-based nouns that occur in the corpus we find that the majority are related to teen and popular culture. This was also noted by Marie-Eve Pérrrot who writes:


> “The domains that favour – in an extremely sharp way - the use of English are, in effect, those that relate to the daily and communal life of the group, and notably to leisure and to culture in general: sports, cinema, music, fashion, television”.

In my corpus, as in Pérrrot’s, names for sports are coded almost exclusively with English-based nouns: *baseball*, *basketball*, *skating* (i.e. skateboarding), etc. (which is, of course, the case in many dialects of French). Concepts related to domains of television and cinema are often expressed using English nouns. *TV* [tivi], *movie*, and *show* are all attested. The same is true of the vocabulary of popular music, such that *music* [mjuːzɪk], *tune* (i.e. ‘song’), *band, CD* [sidi], etc. all occur. Many items of clothing are coded with English nouns, such as *bandana, tank top, sweatshirt, jeans, (leather) jacket*, etc. In addition, other concepts related to teen life are expressed using English-based nouns. *Mall*, for example, occurs 8 times while no AF-based synonyms are attested. *Curfew* and *allowance*, which evoke concepts clearly related to teen life, are conventional whereas no
AF synonyms occur. Similarly, all the names of social groups are coded with English terms such as *preps*, *nerds*, *headbangers*, *jocks*, *skinheads*, etc.

Many of the nouns above occur to the exclusion of AF-based synonyms. In some cases, however, conventional English-based nouns in Chiak exist alongside AF-based synonyms. This is true of *friend*, *movie*, and *music*, for example. That is, in addition to *friend* (39 tokens), *movie* (16 tokens) and *music* [mjuwzrik] (15 tokens), AF-based *ami* (21 tokens), *film* [film]3 (22 tokens) and *musique* (96 tokens) also occur. We can therefore clearly not claim that domains of teen culture are the exclusive territory of English-based nouns. We can nevertheless claim that vocabulary related to these domains is more often coded by English-based nouns than vocabulary related to other domains.

It is not the case, however, that all English-based nouns in the corpus are related to teen culture, or occur in utterances whose topic relates to teen culture. The word *thing*, for example, occurs 14 times throughout the corpus including in utterances where the topic is not related to teen culture. In example 57, the topic of discussion is travel in other countries, and someone has suggested that the world would be better off without countries because then there would not be any war.

---

3 Although *film* is an English loanword, it is pronounced [film] as in AF. *Film* with the English pronunciation [film] is not attested. *Movie* seems to be the only conventional English-based unit referring to films.
(57) yeah but le monde serait psycho sans pays pi sans thing de même
"yeah, but the world would be psycho without countries or things like that"

In addition, nouns like day and lawn, occur, as in examples 58 and 59.

(58) ma day est jam-packed
"my day is jam-packed"

(59) i faut que je tonde comme je faise le lawn
"I have to mow, like do the lawn"

In addition to examples such as 58 and 59, English-based nouns that are not specifically related to topics of teen culture often appear in code-switches. Of course it is possible that 58 and 59 also represent code-switches over a single word. By my definition of code-switching, however, (as stated section 4.1 above) day and lawn do not qualify.

Clearer examples of English-based nouns that occur in the context of code-switching can be seen in 60 below, where the nouns devil and yard occur despite the fact that they are not particularly relevant to teen culture in this context. 61 is also a clear example of code-switching. Here the change of topic from describing general habits (role of music in the speaker’s life) to relating a personal experience (and perhaps also the topic of sex) triggers a switch into English. In this passage, the word parents, which is related to family, of course, and which is almost always pronounced as in AF, is pronounced as in English – [pæˌrænts].
(60) j'étais comme 'I'm the devil' pi i étaient comme 'you're the devil?' J'étais comme 'yeah'. I étaient comme 'I'm not going to go into your devil yard.'
"I was like 'I'm the devil' and they were like 'you're the devil?'. I was like 'yeah'. They were like 'I'm not going into your devil yard'."

(61) je pense à d' Aut affaires quand j'écoute la musique. And when you're having sex in front of your parents, they don't have to - t'entendont moins en tout cas
"I think of other things when I listen to music. And when you're having sex in front of your parents they don't have to -- (they) hear you less anyway"

With the exception of nouns in code-switches, which we are excluding from the data set, there is a general pattern that if an English-based noun is unrelated to teen culture, it is less likely to occur in Chiac than if it were related to domains of teen culture.

Similarly, the more an AF-based noun has to do with family, tradition and religion, the more likely it is to occur in Chiac. As an extreme example, nouns for kinship relations are exclusively AF-based in my corpus. While mère, père, frère, soeur, grandpère, etc. are attested, not once does mother/mom, or father/dad occur (except in the name of a band, I Mother Earth and in the compound mother fuckers).

In addition to particular lexical units, we can therefore also posit a unit [N] of which all the nouns in the Chiac speaker's inventory are elaborations. [N] is an abstract schema that represents the commonality among all nouns (profiling a region in some domain in CG terms). [N] will sanction the use of both English- and AF-based nouns in Chiac discourse although, as we shall see in Chapter 5, not in all constructions. Furthermore, some nouns are clearly more likely to occur in Chiac than others. Thus, while [N]
sanctions the use of the English-based *mother* in Chiac, as well as *mère*, the more entrenched unit [*mère*] will almost always be selected instead.

4.3. Verbs

Verbs in Chiac behave somewhat differently from nouns with regard to the semantic properties many AF- versus English-based nouns share. Pérot discusses the motivations for selecting English- versus AF-based verbs in detail (1995: 135-36). And although she finds that semantic domains of teen culture are relevant to the choice of an English-based verb over an AF-based one (particularly with regard to sports-related verbs), these domains seem to be less relevant for verbs than for nouns. Instead, she argues that factors such as avoiding reflexive verbs or longer expressions can result in the use of an English unit over an AF one. For example, she cites the use of the non-reflexive *feel-er* and *complain-er* rather than *se sentir* and *se plaindre*. Similarly, she suggests that *stavr-er* and *trust-er* are used to avoid lengthier expressions (such as *mourrir de fain* or *manquer de nourriture* and *avoir confiance*). In addition, some English-based verbs in Pérot's corpus are loanwords in AF. These include *drive-er, spend-er* and *clean-er*. Finally, some verbs seem to be derived from conventional English-based nouns and adjectives, as is the case with *drive-er (un drive), dat-er (un date)* and *party-er (un party)* (Pérot 1995: 135-36).

Pérot's general findings seem to be supported by my corpus data. The semantic domains related to teen culture do have some relevance. For example, swearing (which is a way
of differentiating or rebelling) was often accomplished using English verbs, as in sentences 62 and 63.

(62)  *fuck les petits vieux man*
    “fuck the little old guys, man”

(63)  *pi moi c’est juste ça qui me piss off*
    “and it’s just that that pisses me off”

In addition, verbs such as *hang-er out, dance-er* [daːnse], and *smoke-er* suggest the continued relevance of the domains of teen culture. Compared to Chiac nouns, however, there are many more English-based verbs that do not seem to relate to these domains.

As in Pérot’s corpus, the AF loanwords *start-er, spend-er* and *clean-er* occurred several times, suggesting a certain degree of entrenchment. It may also be that some English-based verbs derive from conventional English-based nouns and adjectives, but in most cases this seems difficult to determine. It does not necessarily follow that because the English verb *party* derives from the English noun *party* that the Chiac verb derives from the Chiac noun. It could be that the Chiac verb derives from the English noun (i.e. without an intermediate stage where the noun *party* is conventional in Chiac but the verb is not).

Finally, claims regarding motivations of efficiency and avoiding reflexives are also difficult to prove. Although it is certainly true that some English-based verbs in Chiac would be translated with longer AF expressions, the opposite is also true. Many of the
English-based particle verbs in Chiac could be translated into AF with a single word. This is the case with take off versus partir, kick out versus envoyer, chill out versus relaxer, etc. (And although these AF infinitives are at least as long as the particle verbs in terms of syllables, they are shorter or the same length when used with singular subjects - i.e.3s. take off versus part). Therefore, if economy is a factor, which it may be, it is likely not an overwhelming one.

A similar argument can be made regarding the use of English verbs to avoid reflexive verbs. Although there are examples where an AF verb is reflexive and its English counterpart is not, there is no other evidence to suggest that Chiac speakers avoid the reflexive. In fact, Chiac speakers sometimes make the verb être, which is not reflexive in AF, reflexive.

(64) le Canada va aller pretty good là si qu'on continue à, you know, s'être un chilling pays là
"Canada is gonna go pretty good if we continue to, you know, be a chilling country"

(65) i faut qu'i portent du stuff de comme de Gap ou comme d'la shit de même... pour s'être cool là
"they have to wear stuff like from Gap or like shit like that... to be cool"

(66) tes parents ne touj- peux pas toujours s'être là pour toi
"your parents can't al- can't always be there for you"

Although this use of the reflexive does not speak to the motivation for using the specific verbs Pérot mentions, I would rather not posit such a motivation. This is not only due to
a general lack of evidence for speakers avoiding the reflexive but also since the very idea of using one form to avoid another is problematic.

The use of English-based verbs in Chiac seems less straightforward than the use of English-based nouns. We can nevertheless make several observations. First, English-based verbs are less frequent than AF-based ones in Chiac and make up a smaller percentage of all verbs than English-based nouns do of the total inventory of nouns. Second, although domains related to teen culture influence the selection of an English-based verb over an AF-based one, that influence seems to be weaker for verbs than for nouns. Finally, there are English-based borrowed verbs in AF that occur conventionally in Chiac (the same is, of course, true of nouns). We should not expect these to relate to teen culture since they were borrowed not by Chiac speakers but by AF speakers, whose motivations for mixing would have been different.

4.4. Adjectives

Adjectives, like nouns and verbs, can be AF- or English-based in Chiac. The relative numbers of AF- versus English-based adjectives are quite different, however, for attributive and predicate adjectives. Whereas AF-based attributive adjectives greatly outnumber English-based attributive adjectives (about 100 tokens versus about 30 in a section of the corpus), English-based predicate adjectives occur more often than AF-based predicate adjectives (80 tokens versus 50 tokens in the same segment of the corpus). This makes predicate adjectives the only category we have seen thus far (and
will see) where English-based units occur more frequently than AF-based ones. Examples of predicate and attributive adjectives from my corpus include:

(67)  *leur cheveux ils sont comme perfect*
      "their hair is like perfect"

(68)  *y’a du monde qu’alme pas Eminem… but moi je trouve qu’i est pretty cool*
      "there are people who don’t like Eminem… but I think he’s pretty cool"

(69)  *c’est populaire, but chu right against ça*
      "it’s popular [Tommy Hilfiger clothes], but I’m right against that"

(70)  *je voyais ce grous⁴ pays là sur le globe*
      "I saw this big country there on the globe"

(71)  *strip poker est pretty much une game populaire à Moncton*
      "strip poker is pretty much a popular game in Moncton"

I believe that this difference between predicate and attributive adjectives can be accounted for in terms of the difference in their functions. As Englebretson 1997 and Thompson 1988 have argued, predicative adjectives often predicate something of a previously introduced participant while attributive adjectives often introduce new participants. Englebretson writes:

...interactions where participants are evaluating and commenting on shared referents tend to be heavy on predicate adjectives, while interactions... which involve the introduction of new referents into the discourse tend to be heavier on attributive adjectives (emphases Englebretson’s) (1997: 8).

Thus, predicate adjectives tend to encode evaluations or assessments, while attributive

---

⁴ This is a conventional spelling of the AF pronunciation of *gros* "big". *Grous* is pronounced [ɡʁu].
adjectives are less likely to do so. This is certainly the case in my corpus, where there are twice as many evaluative as non-evaluative uses of predicate adjectives\(^5\). Attributive adjectives, on the other hand, were evaluative in only 8 of 76 instances in a section of the corpus.

In Chiac, a large number of evaluative lexical units are English-based. These include cool, awesome, intense [intens], prim-é\(^6\), allright, fine, nice, perfect, (pretty) good, bad and okay. There were, of course, AF-based adjectives of assessment (bon, fou, bien), but the English-based ones occurred more frequently (by a ratio of about 5:1). Note that some of these (cool, awesome, intense) are evaluative adjectives whose meaning includes some sort of cultural reference. Awesome is used by teenagers in the late twentieth (and early 21\(^{st}\)) century, while groovy (which is not attested), for example, is strongly associated with teenagers in the sixties and seventies. The fact that evaluative adjectives often evoke some aspect of the identity of those who use it makes them a likely candidate for English-based or novel units in Chiac. By using units like perfect, awesome, etc., Chiac speakers evoke both their youth and their connection to anglophone language and culture.

\(^5\) It is, of course, not always straightforward to determine what is evaluative and what is not. In cases where there was doubt, I counted the token as non-evaluative. Thus, je suis bien, c’est awesome, etc. were counted as evaluative while c’est populaire, on est jeune, chu pas poor were counted as non-evaluative. It could be argued that c’est populaire, for example, is evaluative, and so the ratio of evaluative to non-evaluative could actually be greater than 2:1.

\(^6\) Prim-é means something like “excited” or “hyped-up”. It is derived from the English word prime, as in “to prime an engine”, but this use is not attested, to my knowledge, in English.
We therefore find more English-based than AF-based predicate adjectives in Chiac not because there is something unusual about that word class, but because predicate adjectives tend to be used to encode evaluation. We can motivate the use of English-based evaluative units in that certain evaluative adjectives also function as symbols of group identity. As we have seen in previous sections, those units that evoke aspects of group identity are prime candidates for English-based units in Chiac.

Aside from the general pattern of predicate versus attributive adjectives, there are other interesting aspects of the Chiac adjectival system. For example, participial adjectives are one of the few types of words that can occur with English-based (non-root) morphology. Most of the time, participial adjectives in Chiac take AF-based suffixes, whether the root is AF- or English-based, as in 72-75.

(72)  
*trois cent million de dollars but non c'est exagéré I guess*
“three hundred million dollars but no that’s exaggerated, I guess”

(73)  
*ben c'est compliqué*
“well it’s complicated”

(74)  
*on a vu... comme un brand new car tout streak-é*
“we saw... like a brand new car all streaked”

(75)  
*ça c'est tannant tanner les parents pour la cash*
“It’s annoying bugging your parents for cash”

In my corpus, however, there were no examples of an English-based root with the AF-based present participle suffix –ant\(^7\).

---
\(^7\) I do not include *important* [impow.tant] since there is no evidence that speakers analyze this as import + -ant.
Certain English-based participial adjectives (but not participial verbs) can take the English-based suffix -ed, as in 76-80.

(76)  
\[ j\text{'}\text{étais right baked } \]
"I was right baked"

(77)  
\[ i\text{l devrait avoir pluS de stuff wicked à faire } \]
"there should be more wicked stuff to do"

(78)  
\[ m\text{a day est jam-packed } \]
"my day is jam packed" (this is a repeat of example 58)

(79)  
\[ y\text{a moins moins mois d'enfants sur la terre, pi le monde va right être vieux pi ça va right être boring } \]
"there are fewer and fewer kids in the world, and the world is gonna be right old and it's gonna be right boring"

(80)  
\[ c\text{omme i sont plus outgoing que certains parents } \]
"like they're more outgoing than certain parents"

The most likely explanation for this is that units such as outgoing, wicked, baked are analyzed as whole units rather than as bake + past participle, etc. This is especially likely since these "roots" are never used as verbs with the same meaning (in English or in Chiac). In other words, they are not really roots with participial adjective suffixes at all but rather monomorphemic units in Chiac.

There is, however, one root that occurs as a verb and an adjective and can take either -ed or -é when it functions as a participial adjective: piss off.
(81) *si chu right piss-é off like je peux juste jouer du piano*
   “if I’m right pissed off like I can just play the piano”

(82) *j’étais pretty pissed off*
   “I was pretty pissed off”

We can obviously not claim that *pissed off* in 82 is an unanalyzable unit since *piss-é off* also occurs, as does *piss-er off*, etc. (unless the difference is attributable to differences in idiolect between speakers). *Pissed off* was likely integrated into Chiac as a whole and, over time, is becoming reanalyzed as *piss* + past participle + *off*. As this reanalysis occurs, the root takes on AF participial morphology, as is the case with other English-based roots in Chiac.

Before leaving the topic of adjectives, there is one in particular that is worth examining: the Chiac possessive adjective *own*, exemplified in 83-85.

(83) *c’est tannant d’acheter ton own stuff*
   “it’s annoying buying your own stuff”

(84) *j’ai même pas visité mon own pays*
   “I haven’t even visited my own country”

(85) *faut que tu vives responsable avec ton own argent*
   “you have to live responsibly with your own money”

*Own* is clearly a Chiac unit. It occurs several times (19 tokens) and more often than *propre* (4 tokens), which has a similar meaning in AF. In addition, while *own* can occur with AF- and English-based nouns, *propre* only seems to occur with AF-based nouns (although with only 4 tokens this is impossible to say). Although it collocates very
strongly with (English) possessive pronouns in English, own occurs only with AF-based possessive pronouns in Chiac. This, as we shall see, is not a property of own but of the Chiac pronominal system.

Adjectives are a particularly interesting word class in Chiac given the unusually large proportion of English-based predicative adjectives relative to AF-based ones. As we saw, this can largely be accounted for in terms of the evaluative function of predicative adjectives, since evaluative adjectives are often used to evoke aspects of social identity (although clearly more work needs to be done to clearly establish the relationship between such adjectives and identity). Another interesting fact regarding Chiac adjectives is that at least one English-based participial adjective that was incorporated into Chiac as a whole (pissed off) seems to be undergoing a process of reanalysis such that piss-é off is also attested. Finally, I described an English-based possessive adjective in Chiac, own.

4.5. Adverbs

Chiac has adverbs ending in both -ment, an AF and SF adverbial suffix, and -ly, an English adverbial suffix. My corpus includes the adverbs vraiment, facilement, probablement, nécessairement, seulement, certainement, rarement, etc., as well as usually, basically, completely, probably, actually, normally, obviously, etc.
Only -ment, however, seems to be productive. All instances of adverbs ending in -ly were conventional English adverbs. With -ment adverbs in Chiac, on the other hand, there was at least one root that is unconventional in AF and likely reflects the influence of English: \textit{especiallement}.

\begin{align*}
(86) & \quad \text{\textit{toutes les diff{é}rens gang pi \textipa{ça es}
\textit{speciallement les nazis}} } \\
& \quad \text{“all the different gangs/groups and that, especially the nazis”}
\end{align*}

In addition, \textit{occasionellement} may occur (instead of \textit{parfois}) in part because of English influence, although it is conventional in some dialects of French.

\begin{align*}
(87) & \quad \text{\textit{j’aime … fumer un joint } [\textipa{3wî}] \textit{occasionellement avec mes amis}} \\
& \quad \text{“I like … to smoke a joint occasionally with my friends”}
\end{align*}

The adverb \textit{especiallement} (and perhaps \textit{occasionellement}) is likely a calque of the English \textit{especially} (and \textit{occasionally}). The fact that new adverbs are formed with -ment suggests that -ment is productive.

Unfortunately there were not enough tokens of \textit{especiallement} or \textit{occasionellement} (or of most of the other adverbs ending in -ment and -ly) to determine whether these constitute lexical units in Chiac or nonce usages (or something in between). However, \textit{n{é}cessairement, tellement, actuellement, definitely, seriously, probably} and \textit{especially} occurred as lexical units (as opposed to in code-switches or idioms) between 5 and 10 times, while \textit{usually, basically and actually} occurred between 15 and 25 times each, suggesting unit status for these.
Aside from -ment and -ly adverbs, there are several others that are clearly conventional. For example, the English-based *right* competes with *vraiment* as a means of evoking emphasis in Chiac. (The English-based *really* occurs only once, *very* occurs only twice and *très* only ten times. It seems, therefore, that *vraiment* and *right* are the conventional emphatic adverbs in Chiac). *Right* with an emphatic meaning occurs over 300 times in my corpus, as in 88-91.

(88)  *mes parents sont right cool*  
"my parents are right (really, very) cool"

(89)  *but comme si chu loin de chez nous comme qui arrive right souvent*  
"but, like, if I’m far from home, which, like, happens really/right often"

(90)  *je babysit right pas beaucoup lately*  
"I’m really not babysitting a lot lately"

(91)  *moi je demande comme des fois là comme pas right souvent*  
"I ask, like, sometimes, like, not very often"

Although this use of *right* is ungrammatical in many dialects of English, it is a feature of some local English dialects. For many anglophones from eastern Canada, the sentence *it's right cold today* would be perfectly grammatical. Although the use of *right* as an emphatic adverb could have evolved independently in Chiac, I think it more likely that it occurs as a result of Chiac speakers’ knowledge of the local English dialect. Examples 88 and 89 reflect typical anglophone usage of *right*. 
Sentences 90 and 91, however, show that Chiac speakers have extended the possible contexts in which *right* can occur. Although I can rely only on my native speaker intuition as an anglophone from Nova Scotia, I believe that *right* cannot be used in negative clauses in the local English dialect. That is, whereas *my parents are right cool* sounds fine to me, *my parents are not right cool* or *my parents are right not cool* sound strange at best. I believe, therefore, that speakers' use of *right* in negative clauses constitutes an extension and is a use that is unique to Chiac.

*Vraiment* is also clearly conventional and occurs 182 times.

(92)  *j'ai actually vraiment aimé ça*  
     "I actually really liked that"

(93)  *écoutez-les c'est vraiment bon*  
     "listen to them it's really good"

(94)  *moi ma famille c'est vraiment important pour moi*  
     "my family is really important to me"

Although the meanings of *right* and *vraiment* overlap, this overlap is not total. They seem to generally be interchangeable when their meanings are emphatic, as in 88-91 and 92-94 above. This is not the case in some constructions, however. There is an expression *right pas* in Chiac, for example, which means something like "no way", or "(that's) really not (so)" or "I really disagree*. *Vraiment pas*, however, is unattested except when followed by an adjective, noun or verb that it modifies (*c'est vraiment pas bon*). It cannot stand on its own.
There is another context in which right and vraiment are not interchangeable. Only vraiment can be used to assert the veracity of something — right does not seem to ever mean “in reality”. In examples 95-97 below, vraiment means something like “in reality” (although emphasis can be evoked at the same time).

(95) j'ai pas vraiment le droit de sortir
    “I'm not really allowed to go out”
    (as opposed to: “I'm really (emph.) not allowed to go out”)

(96) but qui est-ce qui peut vraiment afford-er aller là every day
    “but who can really (*very [much]) afford to go there every day”

(97) but right now c'est juste le soccer que je garde vraiment
    “but right now it's really just soccer [as opposed to other sports] that I'm keeping (*it's very much soccer...)

In each of 95-97 above, right cannot replace vraiment: either the meaning would change (as in 96, which would sound a little strange) or the sentence would become ungrammatical (as in 95, 97).

We can therefore claim that both vraiment and right are adverbs in the Chiac inventory. Although they overlap somewhat in that they can both have an emphatic meaning, they also differ. Vraiment can mean “in reality”, whereas right does not seem to. In addition, right occurs in the conventional expression right pas, whereas there is no equivalent expression with vraiment.
Two other Chiac adverbs that overlap semantically are *aussi* and *itou*. *Aussi* means “also”, and the *Glossaire Acadien* defines *itou* as “aussi”. Usage of *aussi* and *itou* is given below.

(98)  *pi i a une big head itou, comme sa tête est seriously huge*  
“and he has a big head also, like his head is seriously huge”

(99)  *mon père fait pitié - ma mère itou*  
“my father is pitiful – my mother too”

(100) *but à d’autres écoles comme Moncton High ... pi Riverview itou... il a plutôt comme des nazis pi tout des skinheads pi tout ça*  
“but at other schools like Moncton High ... and Riverview also ... there are more, like, nazis and all skinheads and all that”

(101) *ben itou si y’aurait plu de concerts*  
“well also if there were more concerts”

(102) *Yeah Rush c’est pretty good. Y’a aussi Our Lady Peace*  
“Yeah, Rush is pretty good. There’s also Our Lady Peace”

(103) *moi aussi j’ai vraiment aimé ‘American History X’*  
“I also really liked *American History X*”

Both *itou* and *aussi* are conventional in Chiac – they occur 24 and 47 times respectively. Their meanings seem to be quite similar, as do their distributions. Both can occur clause finally (*ma mère itou, la France aussi*). It seems that only *aussi* can occur after verbs (*il y a aussi Our Lady Peace, *il y a itou Our Lady Peace*), but more data are needed.

Other conventional adverbs in Chiac include *usually*, which occurs frequently (23 times) while the closest AF equivalents (such as *normalement* and *habituellement*) do not occur (*d’habitude* occurs once). *Icitte* “here” occurs 55 times while *here* occurs only three
times. Each of these tokens of here, however, involves the same idiom, same here, which further suggests that here is not a unit in Chiac. Jamais occurs 37 times whereas never never does (except in the idiom never mind). Loin is found 15 times in the corpus while far is not attested. Souvent is used 48 times but often is not used at all. Assez occurs 58 times compared to one token of enough.

Although I have identified several conventional adverbs in Chiac, most others do not occur frequently enough to be considered conventional units in Chiac. This is not to say that they are not units — only that there is not enough data to draw any conclusions. Rapidement, for example, was not attested, nor were fast (as an adverb) or quickly, but I would not therefore want to claim that none of these is conventional in Chiac. Similarly, normally occurred once and normalement did not occur at all, but I would not want to claim that normally is therefore conventional and normalement is not. In order to compile a complete inventory of conventional Chiac adverbs, then, a larger corpus than mine is needed.

Nevertheless, I have identified some of the conventional adverbs in Chiac and these include units of both AF and English origin. AF-based adverbs, of which there are several, tend to end in -ment (vraiment, seulement, probablement, etc.). There are fewer English-based adverbs, which include usually, basically, actually and right. Finally, there is at least one adverb that is neither AF- or English-based per se but reflects the influence of both — especiallement. It is not clear from the corpus, however, whether
*especiallement* constitutes a unit in the Chiac inventory or a nonce usage (or something in between).

### 4.6. Prepositions

Whereas almost any AF or English noun seems able to occur in Chiac speech, the same is not true of prepositions. The general pattern with Chiac prepositions is that they are AF-based. English prepositions occur, sometimes quite frequently, but are usually restricted to larger English-based units (i.e. idioms that are part of the Chiac inventory) or to code-switched utterances. In addition, English particles derived from prepositions also occur frequently, but these do not function as prepositions (cf. section 6.6 for more on the verb particle construction).

One of the most common prepositions in my corpus was *à*. It occurred 244 times (with *au* occurring 39 times) in a section of my corpus, not including usage before infinitives or in idioms such as *tout à l’heure*. Usage was similar to that in SF and AF, including encoding locative relations and metaphorical extensions of these. Examples include 104-106:

(104) *je m’ai en*joy-ée à *Somersault* les *années* passées
    “I enjoyed myself at *Somersault* the past few years”

(105) *j’ai un tel montant d’argent à la banque*
    “I have a certain amount of money in the bank”
The nearest synonyms in English (of the static use of à) are at, in and on. At does occur, but very infrequently (two tokens not including instances of the idiom at least) and only in English idioms. It never precedes an AF noun phrase, for example. In addition to at least, it occurred in the expressions at one time and at that time. At is clearly not a conventional preposition in the context of Chiác.

Similarly, in as a preposition occurs seldom and (with one exception – in aut’ ways) only in English idioms or in utterances entirely in English. These include in a way and once in a lifetime. Like at, it too can only occur in very limited contexts and is therefore not a conventional preposition in Chiác.

Finally, on, like at and to occurs only in English expressions. The three tokens I found included the name of a band (New Kids on the Block) and the idiom on your own. The word on occurs much more frequently, but the vast majority of these tokens are particles rather than prepositions.

Clearly, then, when one wants to encode concepts related to localization in the context of Chiác speech, one will select à and not the English prepositions at, in or on.

---

8 Vandeloise discusses the semantics of static à in detail, arguing that it can serve to localize an entity with regard to another and also to associate a participant with a routine called to mind by the NP that follows the preposition (Vandeloise 1991: 157-185). These meanings are encoded in English with the prepositions at, in and on.
Another frequently occurring preposition in Chiac is *pour*, which occurred 206 times. It is clearly conventional in Chiac whereas *for*, an English synonym of *pour*, is not. *For* occurred only once in the expression *unity for all* and can therefore not be considered a Chiac lexeme (i.e. one that occurs in the context of Chiac speech – it is still a unit in the Chiac speaker’s inventory).

We see the same pattern with *dans*, which occurs 115 times. *Dans*, according to Vandeloise, indicates a relationship of containment, either physical or metaphorical (1991: 210-234). The English unit that overlaps most in meaning with (static) *dans*, and therefore would compete with it to encode concepts of containment, is *in*, which is not conventional in Chiac. *In*, as we saw above, is used in idioms such as *back in the days* and *once in a lifetime*. Similarly, *into*, which is similar in meaning to a dynamic use of *dans* is used only four times and in English utterances such as *madness spawns into desire*. This pattern repeats itself for *après* and *after*, for *avant* and *before/ahead* (which do not occur at all), for *avec* and *with*, and for *par* and *by*. That is, only the AF-based prepositions occur as units in Chiac.

The only English prepositions that are units in the context of Chiac speech are *about* and *around*. *About* occurs 38 times and can be used regardless of whether the rest of the utterance is English-based or not. We see this in examples 107 and 108.

(107)  *i chiont toujours about qu’i ont pas d’argent*
        “they always complain that they don’t have money”
Note that this preposition is most frequently used in Chiac to refer to a topic (of conversation, or of a story). While English encodes this meaning with a preposition about (as, apparently, does Chiac), AF uses either the preposition de or a phrase such as à propos de, au sujet de, etc. In contexts where the preposition de (with this meaning of “on the topic of”) is appropriate in AF (i.e. after the verbs penser, dire, parler, etc.) you find either de or about in Chiac, as in:

(109) qu'est-ce qu'i disent de ça
“what do they say about that”

(110) y'a rien que tu peux dire about it
“there's nothing you can say about it”

(111) c'est ça que je pense de ça
“that's what I think about that”

(112) si tu penses about it
“if you think about it”

About is clearly dominant, however, in contexts where de is impossible in AF and SF. These include after nouns, as in tunes about fumer du pot “tunes about smoking pot” and after certain verbs, as in examples 107 and 108 above. Since de is not conventional in these contexts, the English-based preposition occurs - perhaps because it is shorter than expression such as au sujet de and à propos de, which do not occur in the corpus. The use of about may therefore be attributable to economy. In addition, phrases like au sujet
*de* sound relatively formal and may be avoided in Chiac given the informality of the contexts in which this dialect is used.

It seems, therefore, that both *de* and *about* are conventional prepositions in Chiac. They overlap in certain contexts such that their usage is not predictable (examples 109-112). In contexts where *de* cannot occur in AF, however, the English preposition *about* occurs predictably in Chiac.

The other English preposition that is conventional in Chiac is *around*. The meaning of *around* overlaps with that of a number of AF and SF units such as *autour de*, *sur*, etc. *Autour de*, does not occur in my Chiac corpus, nor does *sur* with the meaning of *around* (as in *j'ai cherché sur Paris* “I looked around Paris”). Usage of *around* includes:

(113)  
*on est yinque des Indians around icitte*  
“we're nothing but Indians around here”

(114)  
*but faut je faise du stuff around la house*  
“but I have to do stuff around the house”

Note that in 113 and 114 *around* means something like “an imprecise location at” rather than “the perimeter”. That is, *around* in English has a number of meanings, only one of which is attested for the Chiac unit. This meaning of *around* overlaps with the AF preposition *par* in the phrase *par icitte*, as in:

(115)  
*la violence est pas that bad par icitte*  
“violence isn’t that bad around here”
Par is only a possible paraphrase of around in 113, however, not in 114. It may therefore be that about in Chiac has only this meaning of “here and there”, and that other meanings evoked by about in English are encoded with an AF-based preposition in Chiac. If this is the case then autour could still occur in Chiac to evoke the concept of “around the perimeter”.

The general pattern for prepositional usage in Chiac is therefore as follows. AF-based prepositions are strongly preferred and each constitutes a unit in the context of Chiac (i.e. [à], [dans], [pour], etc.). Most English-based prepositions are used, but are not considered units in Chiac because they occur only as parts of larger (idiomatic) units or in code-switches into English. We do not, therefore, want to posit a unit [P] (elaborated by all prepositions in the Chiac speaker’s inventory) that participates directly in prepositional phrases, but rather we need to specify that speakers construct Chiac prepositional phrases from units elaborating the set [P_F].

There are two exceptions to this tendency: [about] and [around] do constitute prepositional units in Chiac. They can occur outside of idiomatic expressions and regardless of whether the rest of the utterance is English or not. Thus, the inventory of Chiac prepositions can be represented as [P_F], [about] and [around]. As we have seen, however, about and around in Chiac have somewhat different semantic and formal properties than in English.
4.7. Pronouns

In this section, I define the set of Chiac (in the narrow sense) pronouns. Whereas this was impossible for the open class of nouns, the fact that pronouns are a closed class and occur frequently allows us to identify which of the pronouns in a speaker’s inventory are conventional in Chiac. I found that whereas a noun can be of either AF or English origin (as we saw in section 4.2), a pronoun is always AF-based unless it occurs in a code-switched English utterance or an English-based idiom. That is, English-based pronouns are not conventional Chiac in the narrow sense.

The AF-based personal pronouns je, tu, il, elle, ça, on, nous, and ils can occur regardless of whether the preceding and following units are AF- or English-based.

(116) si que t’es pas right haut dans la pyramide sociale tu peux pas
   “if you’re not right high on the social pyramid you can’t”

(117) who cares si tu feed-ais les poules
   “who cares if you fed the chickens”

English-based personal pronouns, however, occur only in English idioms or in code-switched English utterances. One therefore never finds an English-based pronoun followed by an AF verb. Some examples of idioms and code-switches are shown in examples 118-120.

(118) pi the next thing you know j’étais à Petit Rocher
   “and the next thing you know I was at Petit Rocher”
The same pattern occurs with other types of pronouns. AF possessive pronouns, for example, can take an AF or an English possessed noun (examples 121, 122). English possessive pronouns in Chiac occur only with English possessed nouns, and almost always as part of a larger English idiom or utterance (examples 123, 124).

(121) je me fais quinze piasses pour faire mon lit
"I make five bucks for making my bed"

(122) j'ai landé mon shin right sur le curb
"I landed (on) my shin right on the curb"

(123) oh my God oui
"oh my God yes"

(124) non parce que mes parents read my mind man
"no because my parents read my mind, man"

Finally, interrogative pronouns behave like other pronouns in Chiac. AF-based interrogative pronouns occur as in AF and SF, as seen in examples 125 and 126. English based interrogative pronouns, however, occur only in lexical constructions (examples 127-128).

(125) où-ce qu'on est rendu
"where are we"
(126) *comment-ce t’as fait tes bruisse anyways*  
“how did you get your bruises anyways”

(127) *who cares si tu trouves que chu comme un snob ou whatever*  
“who cares if you think I’m a snob or whatever”

(128) *comme how dumb is that mettre des golf balls sur la lune*  
“like how dumb is that putting golf balls on the moon”

English relative and reflexive pronouns are not attested in the corpus with the exception of *myself*, which occurs only in the movie title *Me, Myself and Irene*.

Given the corpus data, I see no reason to posit units such as [he], [my] etc. in the context of Chiac. Speakers have these units as part of their inventory of English and can therefore use them when speaking English (including code-switches into English). In addition, they occur as parts of larger English(-based) units that are part of the Chiac inventory. These include [oh my god] and [read one’s mind]. The pronominal inventory of Chiac therefore includes only pronouns of AF origin.

Pronouns are clearly a closed class and provide a limited range of information, which tends to be grammatical in nature (person, number, gender, deixis, etc.). The pattern of usage described above is clearly consistent with the general pattern for Chiac whereby more grammatical or closed class word classes have almost exclusively AF-based members and the more lexical or open word classes have the most English-based units.
4.8. Auxiliaries and Copulas

In this section I define the set of Chiac auxiliaries and copulas and examine their behaviour. Although the auxiliaries in the Chiac speaker’s inventory include English-based *should, would, might, could*, etc., as well as the AF-based *devoir, pouvoir, être* and *avoir*, only the AF-based auxiliaries are conventional in the context of Chiac. Similarly, we shall see that Chiac copulas include *être* but not the English-based *be*. The other Chiac copula is *avoir*, which is used differently in Chiac than in AF.

The AF-based auxiliaries *devoir* and *pouvoir* occur frequently in Chiac and essentially as in AF and SF. They can be used with an AF- or English-based main verb.

(129) *moi je crois que Moncton devrait être officiellement bilingue cause whatever les anglais rul-ont pas le monde* “I think that Moncton should be officially bilingual because, whatever, the anglos don’t rule the world”

(130) *i sont après de faire un CD là on devrait acheter ça c’est right bon* “they’re making a CD, we should buy it, it’s right good”

(131) *ah well tu peux still venir à onze* “ah well, you can still come at eleven”

(132) *je trouve qu’i devraient legal-, legalis-ar, legalis-er le pot* “I think they should legal-, legaliz-, legalize pot”

(133) *pi jouer à strip poker avec la c’est pretty cool because tu peux cheat-er* “and playing strip poker with her is pretty cool because you can cheat”

English-based modal auxiliaries, however, are rarely attested. Of *should, would, could, must, might, ought, shall, can, may* and *will*, only *can, ought, and might* occurred at all.
When they did occur (once each), it was in English expressions or code-switches into English, as shown in 134-136.

(134) ça coûte rien de demander hein, so might as well demander
"it doesn’t cost anything to ask, eh, so might as well ask"

(135) so yeah it ought to be Amsterdam ça kick du ass
"so yeah it ought to be Amsterdam, it kicks ass"

(136) pi xx ‘can I help you anything’ comme quoice que tu fais icitte là
"and xx ‘can I help you (with) anything’ like what are you doing here?"

In example 134, might is used in an English expression might as well which is hardly prototypical of modal use. In 136, although some of the utterance is inaudible, the code-switch is clearly signaled by the direct speech act. What’s more, can here is also used in an expression can I help you ([with] anything). It seems, therefore, that English-based modal auxiliaries do not occur in Chiac (in the narrow sense).

The same is true of other (i.e. non-modal) auxiliaries. There are no occurrences of do as an auxiliary nor any of have as an aspectual auxiliary. Instead, Chiac uses the auxiliaries être and avoir, as in AF and SF. Examples from the corpus include j’ai besoin, j’ai entendu, t’es né, je serais arrivé, etc. There is some indication that the auxiliary avoir is being used in some of the contexts formerly the domain of être. For example, avoir is used rather than être with reflexive verbs.

---

9 See section 4.11.5 for more on the construction kick du ass.
(137) *je m'ai fait arrested*  
"I got (myself) arrested"

(138) *je m'ai jamais vraiment posé la question là*  
"I’ve never asked myself that question"

(139) *quand le guy s'a fait shoot-é*  
"when they guy got himself shot"

(140) *comme moi je m'ai enjoy-ée à Somersault les années passées*  
"like, I really enjoyed myself at Somersault in past years"

There were no examples with a reflexive verb and the auxiliary *être*\(^{10}\). This therefore seems to be a conventional pattern in Chiac.

With non-reflexive verbs, however, *être* is still used more or less as in AF. The only non-reflexive examples I found of “non-standard” use of the auxiliaries *avoir* and *être* are as follows.

(141) *j'ai été comme à Moncton, j'ai resté à Moncton pretty much*  
"I've been to Moncton, I've stayed in Moncton pretty much"

(142) *elle a fait un home run so que j'ai rentré*  
"she hit a home run so I came in (I scored)"

Despite these examples, there are many cases where verbs that take *être* in AF also take *être* in Chiac. These include *(chu) rentré, (mon papa est) arrivé, (on est) parti, (chu pas) revenu*, etc. We therefore, still need to posit an auxiliary *être* for Chiac. It seems, however, that this auxiliary is not conventionally used with reflexive verbs.

\(^{10}\) It should be noted, however, that in the third person singular it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between *avoir* *(il s'a fait shoot-é)* and *être* *(il s'est ...).*
Copulas in Chiac are also AF-based. As with auxiliaries, the only exceptions are of English expressions or code-switches into English, as in example 143.

(143) *comme how dumb is that mettre des golf balls sur la lune?*
     “like, how dumb is that putting golf balls on the moon?”

Unlike AF and SF, however, the copula in Chiac is not always *être*. It can also be *avoir*, although *être* is still more frequent by far.\(^{11}\) While *avoir* as a copula occurs only a handful of times, *être* is attested hundreds of times in the corpus.

*Avoir* occurs in both predicate nominatives and predicate adjectives, as seen in 144-147.

(144) *yeah je m'appelle uh Junior là, j'ai un gros tchezz là yeah right*
     “yeah, my name is Junior, I’m a big tchezz yeah, right”

(145) *y'en a qui disent que j'ai un prep*
     “there are some who say that I’m a prep”

(146) *moi j'ai right gaté comme mes parents me donnent tout ce que je veux*
     “I’m right spoiled, lik emy parents give me everything I want”

(147) *ouais j'ai pas vraiment souvent bored ‘cause…*
     “yeah I’m not really bored very often ‘cause…”

There may, however, be restrictions on the ways in which the copula *avoir* can be used. First, it occurs in predicate adjectives more often than in predicate nominatives. 144 and 145 are the only two examples I have of predicate nominatives with *avoir* and it is worth

\(^{11}\) *Avoir* can be considered a copula in SF/AF usage such as *j'ai faim or il a trois ans*. We shall see, however, that the Chiac copula *avoir* behaves differently than the AF copula *avoir*. 
noting that they both involve social groups. In addition, the copula *avoir* occurred only in the first person singular in my corpus. This may be the only way it is used, or it could be a limitation of the database. Since the speakers in the corpus are largely speaking about themselves, and since the corpus is relatively small, we cannot determine whether the copula *avoir* gets used in the second or third persons or with plural subjects.

Interestingly, Péronnet notes this copular use of *avoir* in speech of young Monctonians, and remarks that it is: “entièrement nouveau dans le français parlé en Acadie du NB, quelle que soit la région” (“entirely new in the French spoken in Acadian New Brunswick, regardless of the region”) (Péronnet 1996: 128). It seems, therefore, that this use of *avoir* as a copula is a Chiac innovation and not a feature of AF.

For Chiac we therefore need to posit two copulas: *avoir* and *être*. The latter is clearly the more entrenched of the two, especially in the context of predicate nominals.

4.9. Articles

The Chiac inventory of articles includes all the French-based articles (*le, la, les, un, une, des, Ø*), and their usage mirrors that of SF and AF. English-based articles do not occur in Chiac (in the narrow sense). In the following examples we see AF-based articles used in Chiac as they are in AF and SF. *Le* is used with a definite singular masculine noun, *la* with a definite singular feminine noun, *les* with a definite plural noun, *un* with an
indefinite singular masculine noun, *une* with an indefinite singular feminine noun, and *des* with an indefinite plural noun.

(148)  *il était sur le bord de la rue*  
"it was on the side of the road"

(149)  *well quasiment tous les sports faut que tu use les jambes*  
"well almost all sports you have to use your legs"

(150)  *disons que j’ais pas bien à un test*  
"say that I don’t do well on a test"

(151)  *quelqu’un qu’avait spill-é des fish guts sur une fille*  
"someone who spilled fish guts on a girl"

(152)  *y’a des scènes... qu’étaient pas nécessaire*  
"there are scenes that weren’t necessary"

In addition, the zero article, which will be examined in more detail in section 5.6, is often used as in AF (i.e. before people’s names and names of cities and islands, with the direct object of a verb in the negative when it is introduced by *pas de*, etc. (cf. Lang and Perez 1996: 19-21, 28, Byrne and Churchill 1993: 21-24).

(153)  *je veux move [muv] à Ø Amsterdam*  
"I want to move to Amsterdam"

(154)  *y’a pas de Ø musique qui est meilleur que la punk*  
"there’s no music that’s better than punk"

English-based articles do not to occur except in idiomatic expressions or in code-switched utterances, as in 155-157 below.
(155) *si que y'aurait pas de lois je serais naked all the time*  
"if there weren't any laws I'd be naked all the time"

(156) *elle vient de nous tell-er off - what a bitch*  
"she just told us off – what a bitch"

(157) *un quote de Pete: “Seeing your best friend passed-out with his pants down in the bathroom is not as great as it seems to be”*  
"a quote from Pete: ‘Seeing your best friend...’"

Demonstratives exhibit exactly the same pattern as non-deictic articles. That is, only AF demonstratives occur in Chiac except in English idiomatic expressions or instances of code-switching (e.g. *at that time, ‘That 70’s Show’*). The AF-based determiners in Chiac are *cet(te) and ces*, as in 158-161 below. Note that I assume that the determiner agrees for gender in the singular, but it is impossible to tell since *cet* and *cette* are homophonous.

(158) *cet été je garde d’aut kids qui sont right tannant*  
"this summer I’m babysitting kids who are right annoying"

(159) *tu crois que cet(te) story est pretty fucked up*  
"you think that that story is pretty fucked up"

(160) *dire comme Britney Spears pi toute cet(te) shit là*  
"say, like, Britney Spears and all that shit"

(161) *non but comme garde Spiderman pi ces affaires là*  
"no but like look at Spiderman and stuff like that"

*Ce* does not occur in Chiac speech except in a few specific constructions such as *ce que*  
"that which".

(162) *je trouve que c’est vraiment queer ce que Marc vient de dire*  
"I think it’s really queer what (that which) Marc just said"
In addition, there were tokens of *ces...-là* and *cet(te)...-là* (but not *ce...-ci*) which allow the Chiac speaker to specify a degree of distance (actual or metaphorical). It may be that *ce...-ci* is not used in Chiac or it simply may not have occurred in my corpus.

(163) *tu les apprends du stuff qu'i vont comme... comme avoir besoin d'utiliser comme dans c'te [sta] région- là du monde*

"you teach them stuff that they’ll, like, that they’ll need to use in that region of the world"

(164) *moi je trouve que le gouvernement de, de Canada ou de any other pays devrait aider ces enfants- là*

"I think that the government of, of Canada or of any other country should help those children"

The Chiac inventory of demonstratives therefore includes *cet/te*, *ces*, *cet/te...-là* and *ces...-là*.

Given these findings, I do not posit units [the], [a], [this] or [that] for Chiac, although speakers will have these as units in English. Instead, the inventory of Chiac articles is the same as that of AF – [le], [la], [cet], [ces], etc. This is another example of how closed word classes in Chiac tend to have AF-based units and not English-based ones.

4.10. Conjunctions

In this section I examine the Chiac inventory of conjunctions. Unlike other closed-class categories in Chiac, conjunctions include both AF and English based units. In fact, two
English-based conjunctions, *but* and *so* occur more frequently than AF-based units with similar meanings.

Much has been written about *but* and *so* in Acadian French dialects (and also in other French Canadian dialects – cf. Mougeon 1993). The most detailed work for the Moncton region is Marie-Marthe Roy’s Masters thesis (Roy 1979) in which she claims that *but* and *so* are features of Acadian French. She also notes, however, that young people’s usage (i.e. Chiac as I have defined it) contains more tokens of *but* and *so* (1979: 162).

In her dissertation on Chiac, Pérot makes a diachronic claim regarding these conjunctions. Whereas Roy noted the alternation between *but* and *so* and AF conjunctions such as *mais* and *ça fait que*, Pérot’s corpus compiled about ten years later includes very few competing AF-based conjunctions. *But* and *so* occurred almost to the exclusion of comparable AF units (there were no AF-based synonyms for *so* and only 3 tokens of *mais*). Pérot’s claim is that *but* and *so* have essentially replaced AF conjunctions such as *ben, mais* and *ça fait que* in Chiac (Pérot 1995: 236).

In my corpus, *but* and especially *so* are certainly dominant. Unlike Pérot’s findings, however, my corpus contained a significant number of tokens of *mais*. It occurred 43 times, which is many fewer than the 522 instances of *but*. Nevertheless, based on my corpus it seems that *mais* is still a unit in Chiac. The process of *but* replacing *mais* in Chiac has either reversed itself somewhat since Pérot’s corpus was collected (in 1990 – about 10 years before mine), or else the difference is attributable perhaps to the
differences between our corpora. (It should be noted, however, that *mais* was used by several different speakers, and the speakers in my corpus and Pérot’s were of a similar age and background, and the questions discussed were similar. Thus, differences between the corpora seems a relatively unlikely cause of the different usage patterns.)

The following examples are representative of the use of *but*, *so* and *mais* in my corpus.

(165) *tu études but comme tu viens juste blank des fois*
"you study but, like, you just go blank sometimes"

(166) *je travaillais à Tim Hortons avant but j'ai quit-é*
"I worked at Tim Hortons before but I quit"

(167) *on est encore jeune so... on a encore une vie*
"we’re still young so... we still have a life"

(168) *la technologie est vraiment plus avancée, so on a, on sait plus de manières a comme destruct-er d’aut monde*
"technology is really more advanced [now] so we have, we know more ways to, like, destroy other people"

(169) *l’avenir du Canada est pas bon - well i est bon mais i est pas*
"the future of Canada isn’t good - well it’s good but it isn’t"

(170) *moi je regarde peut-être violent des fois mais chu pas violent*
"I might look violent sometimes but I’m not violent"

Both distributionally and semantically *but* and *mais* seem to be interchangeable. Both are used to express a situation counter to expectations (which can be based either on the statement in the first noun phrase or on world knowledge). In addition, there were no occurrences of either *but* or of *mais* as noun phrase coordinators (i.e. *not only x but y*).
Aside from *but* and *so*, all conjunctions that have unit status in Chiac are AF-based. To encode the meaning(s) evoked by English *and*, Chiac uses both *pi* and *et*, but not *and*. *Pi*, which is derived historically from *puis* "then", is by far the more common, occurring about 1200 times. *Et*, on the other hand, is attested only 98 times.

(171) *moins de personnes qui sont ... addictés ... aux casinos pi c'èt shit là*  
"fewer people that are ... addicted... to casinos and shit (like that)"

(172) *mon papa est arrivé pi on s'en va*  
"my father has arrived and we’re going"

(173) *i avont right des beaux linges et c'est right expensive*  
"they have really nice clothes and it’s [the store] really expensive"

(174) *i ont joué au golf sur la lune et i ont laissé des golf balls là*  
"they played golf on the moon and they left golf balls there"

In addition to *et* and *pi*, *puis* occurred 16 times, but all tokens were uttered by a single speaker. For him, then, *puis* is also a unit, but this is not necessarily the case for other Chiac speakers.

The ways in which *et* is used suggest that *pi* is much more entrenched in the context of Chiac. Not only is *pi* used more often than *et*, but many tokens of *et* occur in restricted contexts. For example, 11 of 98 tokens of *et* were in expressions of time such as *onze heures et demi*. *Pi* does not occur in this context (i.e. *onze heures pi demi*), so the use of *et* in this construction is well entrenched. In addition, another 29 tokens occurred as participants read out loud the questions I had formulated. It is impossible to know whether they would have selected *et* over *pi* if they had been encoding those concepts
themselves. Nevertheless, usage such as 173 above suggests that *et* is still a unit in Chiac.

There is a fair amount of semantic overlap between *et* and *pi*. Coordinators can serve a number of functions, such as indicating consequence, temporal sequence, contrast, condition, etc. (Quirk *et al.* 1985: 930-32), and it seems that *et* can serve any function that *pi* can. Eliminating the tokens that occurred as speakers read aloud questions I had formulated, *et* functioned to indicate sequentiality (as in 174 above *joué... et...laissé*), “pure addition” (*les petits vieux et les petites vieilles*), similarity (*moi j'aime du heavy metal et je joue dans une band*), and consequence (*j'ai fait un ten-eighty en même temps que xx [j'ai perdu] mes culottes, et puis j'ai flash-é tout le monde*). Thus, although one might expect only *pi* to be used to indicate sequentiality given its relationship to *puis*, this does not seem to be the case. In 174, the conjunction *et* seems to be used sequentially. Similarly, in 175, the events must occur in sequence since one cannot meet actors in California before one has gone to California.

(175)  *j'irais à California et meet-er les actors*  
*“I’d go to California and meet actors”*

There are, however, at least two differences between the use of *pi* and *et*. First, *pi* occurs in the expression *pi ça*, approximately equivalent to English *and that or and stuff*. There were over fifty tokens of *pi ça* and none of *et ça*. 
(176)  *on fait des activités en famille comme, des family reunions pi ça pi*
  "we do family activities like, family reunions n’ that and"

(177)  *je vais à un camp cet été pi ça j’ai right hâte pi ça so*
  "I’m going to a camp this summer n’that (?) I’m really looking forward to
  it n’ that so"

In addition, *pi* frequently occurs as a discourse marker rather than a conjunction. In this
role, it occurs at the end of a clause (and often at the end of an intonation unit). *Et* does
not have a similar discourse function. One example of this use of *pi* is in 176 above.
Here the following sentence *ben je m’enviens tanner aller à ça* could be interpreted as
conjoined to the previous one, but *pi* also occurs before a change in topic or even a
change in interlocutors, as in 178.

(178)  A. *des friggin love songs pi c’est tout comme about la comme guerre qui
  va on pi*
B. ‘I love you, I love you’. *Non, c’est pas de même*
A. “friggin love songs and it’s all about, like, the war that’s going on and”
B. “‘I love you I love you’. No, it’s not like that”

In 178, *pi* occurs at the end of an intonation unit and speaker A is not interrupted when B.
begins.

As for other conjunctions, both *or* and *ou* occur in Chiac (in the broad sense), but only *ou*
is a unit in Chiac in the narrow sense. This is because *or* occurs only in restricted
contexts – specifically in the expressions *or something, or anything* and *or whatever*. *Or*
was attested 13 times, of which *or something* occurred 8 times, *or whatever* twice and *or*
anything, or nothing (as in 180) once each. The only example of or that seemed non-
idiomatic was 181.

(179) unless que j'ai high or something
      "unless I’m high or something"

(180) c'est pas comme si ça veut pas dire qu’ils sont pas cool or nothin
      "it’s not as if that doesn’t mean they’re cool or nothin"

(181) comme j’aimerais aussitôt de vivre au Canada que comme aux Etats Unis
      or anywhere else
      "like I’d like to live in Canada as much as in the United States or
      anywhere else"

Example 181 could be a code-switch (although it does not meet the criteria I set out for
code-switching). Even if it is not, this one token is not enough to make the claim that or
has unit status in Chioc.

Ou, on the other hand, occurs 142 times and in a range of expressions, including ou
anything.

(182) les soirs c’est soit que je vas party-er ou que je vas bouquer
     "evenings it’s either I go party or I go smoke up”

(183) je care pas si ça regarde bien ou mal
     "I don’t care if it looks good or bad”

(184) donne-le moi de nouveau dans comme dans deux semaines ou whatever
     "give it back to me in like two weeks or something”

(185) I devriont … comme faire des purse ou something
     "they should … like make purses or something"
It seems, therefore, that [ou] is a unit in Chiac whereas [or] is not. The inventory of Chiac conjunctions can be said to include [but], [so], [mais], [pi], [et] and [ou] but not [done], [and], or [or].

4.11. - Uniquely Chiac Lexical Items

4.11.1. Introduction

To this point we have been assuming that Chiac constructions are very similar, if not the same, as the AF and English constructions from which they emerged. There are, however, also lexical constructions in Chiac that have a form and/or function that differs significantly from source language constructions. These can be words whose form is the same as that of an AF or English unit, but whose meaning is significantly different in Chiac. They can also have a unique form. Note that the distinction is a matter of degree. By virtue of being used in the context of Chiac, all Chiac units are at least somewhat different from their source-language constructions. In the case of right, as we saw in section 4.5 above, there are some minor differences between the English use of right and the use of the Chiac unit right that emerged from it. (Specifically, right can be used to emphatically negate in Chiac, but not in English). The cases I examine in this section represent a point even further along that continuum where Chiac units are significantly different from the source language units they emerged from.
First, I consider two cases of semantic extension involving the verbs *chill* and *struggle*, where the meanings of the Chiac verbs are quite different from those of the English verbs they derive from. Then I consider the unit *especiallement*, which has a form not found in AF or English (although it has elements of both). Finally, I consider the verb *regarder*, which, although it has a conventional AF form, has a meaning that differs from that of the AF unit with the same form.

### 4.11.2. Chill

Among the units unique to Chiac is a verb, *chiller*. It is based on the English *to chill (out)*, but has acquired an extended meaning not found in English. In English *chill* has two related meanings. One is “to hang out”, to spend time alone or with friends doing something involving little effort or excitement, like watching TV or talking, as exemplified in 186. The second related meaning, usually found in the imperative, is “to relax” or “back off”, as in 187.

(186) *Last night I just stayed home and chilled (out) in front of the TV.*

(187) *Just chill (out), man, I'm not done yet.*

*Chill* with the former meaning is always intransitive in English (thus the impossibility of 188), while *chill* with the second meaning can be transitive, especially if the subject is an

---

12 These examples, as well as 188 and 189 are made up based on my intuitions as a speaker of English.
inanimate object such as an event. When transitive, it seems that the verb must be *chill out* and not just *chill*.

(188) *I chilled my friends
  *I chilled my evening away

(189) *The music chilled me out.*

The Chiac lexeme *chill* can have the same meanings as in English, as seen in 190-192, which are taken from my corpus.

(190) *okay les soirs de la semaine j’va à la Maison des Jeunes pi je chill ynine icitte pour la soirée
  “okay on weeknights I go to the Maison des Jeunes and I just chill here for the evening”

(191) *moi je trouve juste que ma mère devrait chiller out, parce qu’a freak out des fois pi a me frappe
  “I think that my mom should just chill out, because sometimes she freaks out and hits me.”

(192) *non, non chill out, t’a skipé cette page là
  “no, no, chill out, you skipped that page.”

What is interesting about *chill* in Chiac is that it has an extended meaning not found in English, and as a result, it also has different formal properties. This extended meaning is something like “to be cool”. It refers to a positive (but not overwhelmingly so) construal.

(193) *Canada ça chill comme la weed chill pi le monde chill whatever Canada rock
  “Canada’s cool, like weed is cool and people are cool whatever Canada rocks”*
(194) Yeah, moi j’ai enjoy-é cecitte. Five bucks pour cecitte ça freakin rule. Whatever, ça chill.
“Yeah, I enjoyed this. Five bucks for this, that freakin’ rules. Whatever, it’s cool.”

(195) la country music chill
“country music is cool”

Because it has this extended meaning, chill in Chiac can take an inanimate subject, as in 194.

Although the verb chill does not get used with the meaning “to be cool” in English, there is a related English adjective, chillin(g), as in That’s a chillin’ car or That girl is chillin’.

My Chiac corpus included a few tokens of this adjective as well:

(195) J’aime Discovery Channel. Y’a pretty du chilling stuff dessus ça. C’est pretty cool
“I like Discovery Channel. There’s some pretty chillin’ stuff on that. It’s pretty cool.”

(196) moi j’trouve que le Canada va aller pretty good là, si qu’on continue a, you know, s’être un chilling pays là
“I think that Canada will go pretty well eh, if we continue to, you know, be a chillin’ country”

The extension from English chill to Chiac chill meaning “be cool” could have progressed in several ways. Since both chill and cool are words that evoke cold temperature, it is possible that chill in Chiac acquired the meaning of positive construal in the same way that cool did in English. That is, coldness becomes associated with detachment, control and general lack of emotion (i.e. the emotion is heat metaphor). This control and lack of emotion is construed positively, perhaps (for cool) because of an association with a
popular restrained style of jazz music (cf. Oxford English Dictionary). Certainly in some contexts it is seen as preferable to be detached, objective, and unemotional than to be emotional.

I think it more likely, however, that chill in Chiac did not evolve from the English meaning related to cold but rather directly from the English meaning(s) “hang out” or “relax” (which also reflect the EMOTION IS HEAT metaphor). Hanging out and relaxing both involve emotional detachment in the same way that being cool (i.e. popular) does. Just as cool did in English, chill in Chiac acquired the additional meaning of positive construal since having control and lacking emotion are generally construed positively – at least in certain contexts.

4.11.3. Struggle

Another uniquely Chiac lexical item is the verb struggle meaning “to suck”, as in:

(197) Quand tu party comme, music is the best. Comme si t’as pas de music ça struggle.
      “When you party like, music is the best. Like, if you don’t have music it sucks.”

(198) well I guess ma mère struggle pas that much, elle est pretty cool, j’ai pas de curfew pi ça
      “well, I guess my mom isn’t too bad/doesn’t suck too bad, she’s pretty cool, I don’t have a curfew n’ that.”
Like chill, struggle is based on an English verb, to struggle, which means "to make great effort" or "to fight", as in she struggled with her homework. In Chiac, struggle can apparently be used in this way, as in 199. It should be noted, however, that the only examples of struggle with this meaning were elicited. It could therefore be that speakers' knowledge of English influenced their willingness to accept sentence 199.

(199) ↑j'ai strugglé avec mes devoirs
     "I struggled with my homework"\textsuperscript{13}

In Chiac, as well as in English, the meaning of struggle can be extended from "have difficulty with" to "be bad at" when it occurs in the habitual present, as in English he struggles with Math, and in the Chiac example 200 below. This makes sense, since to be bad at something is essentially to have habitual difficulties with it.

(200) ↑i struggle au football
     "he sucks at football" ("i est pas bon, i suce")

Unlike in English, however, in Chiac the meaning "be bad at" for struggle was extended to "be bad" in a more general sense, perhaps best summed up with the English verb suck. If one is making great effort, s/he is not immediately successful. This lack of success leads to a negative construal resulting in the extended meaning "to suck". This is the meaning most often conveyed by the Chiac verb and is exemplified in 197 and 198 above.

\textsuperscript{13} Sentences marked with an upwards-pointing arrow indicate elicited examples, as opposed to corpus examples.
In fact, the earlier (English) meaning of “to make a great effort” no longer seems to be used in intransitive sentences (if at all). Given the sentence \( \text{ma mère struggle} \), one consultant said one would say this if “elle est en train de me pisser off” (“she’s pissing me off”). Asked if it could mean that she is making a great effort, the consultant said no, that it was an insult. Furthermore, when I suggested the sentence \( \text{elle struggling pour se liberer} \) (“she struggled to free herself”) one consultant accepted the sentence but noted: “c’est anglais, ça sonne plus emprunté” (“it’s English, it sounds more borrowed”). This is a clear indication that \text{struggle} \ in Chiac is not simply the English lexeme, but rather a distinct unit that exists alongside the English lexeme \text{struggle} \ in the Chiac speaker’s inventory.

Finally, another way in which Chiac differs from English with regard to \text{struggle} \ is that in Chiac, \text{struggle} \ is almost never used as a noun. The one exception from my corpus is the following:

\[
(201) \quad \text{‘Star Wars’) ça c’était un struggle... c’est right fake.}
\]
\[
\quad \text{‘(Star Wars) that was a struggle... it’s right fake.’}
\]

In follow-up with several consultants, however, they rejected the example above, replacing it with either ‘\text{Star Wars’ ça a struggled} or ‘\text{Star Wars’ suck}’. Consultants even rejected nominal usage when the meaning was more like that of the English noun. When asked if they could say \text{cet examen, ça c’était un struggle} \ or \text{cet examen était un struggle}, they responded negatively, correcting to \text{j’ai strugglé à mon examen}.
Given what we know about the Chiac speaker’s linguistic system (and about language use in general) it should come as no surprise that Chiac speakers extend the meanings of units in the same way that monolinguals do. *Struggle* and *chill* are examples of how units can take on new meanings and, as a result, different formal properties, as speakers manipulate the lexical items in their vocabulary.

4.11.4. Regarder

A somewhat different example of semantic extension in Chiac is *regarder* “to look” as in examples 202-205.

(202) *et je voyais ce grous pays là sur le globe pi j’étais wow, ben le pays là regarder right cool* 
“and I saw this big country on the globe and I was like ‘wow’, well that country looks right cool”

(203) *je care pas si ça regarder bien ou mal but si que c’est comfy c’est cool* 
“I don’t care whether it looks good or bad but if it’s comfy it’s cool”

(204) *parce que moi je regarder peut-être violent des fois, mais chu pas violent* 
“because maybe I look violent sometimes, but I’m not violent”

(205) *because je care pas quoice ça regarder comme c’est juste as long que chu confortable* 
“because I don’t care what it looks like just as long as I’m comfortable”
Although the English verb *look* can be used in all the contexts above, the SF\textsuperscript{14} verb *regarder* cannot. That is, *regarder* in SF encodes the concepts *watch* or *look at*, whereas to encode *seem* or *look like*, SF uses *sembler*, *avoir l’air*, etc.

4.11.5. Kick du ass/tchu

Finally, Chiac has a construction that reflects elements of both AF and English, but which is found in neither: *kick du ass/kick du tchu*. All five examples in the corpus are given below.

(206) *Amsterdam kick du tchu*
    “Amsterdam kicks ass”

(207) *Rage Against the Machine kick du tchu. Right on.*
    “Rage Against the Machine kicks ass. Right on.”

(208) *Amsterdam ça kick du ass*
    “Amsterdam kicks ass” (different speaker than above)

(209) *Canada rock comme Canada kick du a- well i voulont savoir mon opinion*

    “Canada rocks like Canada kicks a- well they want to know my opinion”

\textsuperscript{14} Although I have not seen references to *regarder* with this meaning in AF, it seems that it does exist (i.e. that the meaning was extended in AF as well as Chiac). Evidence in support of this is the Glossaire Acadien, which indicates that *regarder* can be used as follows: *ça regarde mal* “it looks bad”. Another reason is that *regarder* with the meaning “seem” or “look like” occurs very frequently and conventionally in Chiac. Of course it could simply have emerged in Chiac and conventionalized, but to avoid making false claims about AF, I treat this as a blend of SF and English elements rather than of AF and English elements. The only relevant difference to the analysis is that we cannot account for such blending in terms of uniquely Chiac social or linguistic factors.

\textsuperscript{15} Although this speaker changes direction in mid word, it seems clear that he is about to say *ass*. 
(210)  *i bash-ont right les français pi les français kick-ont du tchu*
     “they really bash the French and the French kick ass”

Although there were only a few tokens, this construction is worth exploring for two reasons. First, although it is clearly based on an English expression *kick ass*, the Chiac construction always includes the determiner *du*. Second, both the English noun *ass* and the AF-based *tchu* (a palatalized form of *cul*, meaning “ass”) can occur in the construction.

With so few examples it is difficult to argue for how this construction might have emerged. Nevertheless, the occurrence of *du* in the Chiac but not the English expression needs to be addressed. One possible explanation is that *kick du tchu*/*ass* is a calque of English *kick some ass*. Then, two things would have to have happened: the meaning would have changed from that of English “kick some ass” (i.e. “beat”) to that of “kick ass” (“be great”), and the English noun *ass*, as well as *tchu*, came to be used in this expression.

*Kick some ass*, however, is not attested in my corpus. In addition, *kick du ass* has the same meaning as English *kick ass*, which is different from *kick some ass* in English. The former means “be the best, be great” whereas the latter means something like “win, beat one’s opponents, do really well”. A larger corpus is needed to determine whether *kick some ass* occurs, and whether *kick du ass* can ever have the meaning “win, beat one’s opponents”, etc.
Another and more promising possibility is that *kick du ass/tchu* is a blend of *kick ass* and *botter du tchu*, which seems to have a similar meaning to *kick ass*. Although *botter du tchu* was not attested in my corpus, I did find one token of it in a transcribed interview with the Moncton band Zéro Degré Celcius.

(211) *c'était quasiment too much! Ca bottait du tchu!*

"it was almost too much! It kicked ass! (?)" (Vallium: 25)

Although *botter* is an AF word meaning "[for snow or mud] to stick to the feet of a horse" (*Glossaire Acadien*), it is clearly not used in this sense above. The usage in 211 (which presumably means *kick*, but we cannot be sure) could be an extension of the AF usage or could be an innovation based on a verbalization of the noun *botte* "boot"\(^\text{16}\). If *botter du tchu* existed before *kick-er du ass* in Chiac, then the latter could very well be a blend of *botter du tchu* and the English *kick ass*.

I have accounted for the innovations presented in 4.11 in terms of cognitive processes that are not strictly bilingual: semantic extension and blending. It may be that Chiac speakers’ desire to differentiate themselves from other social groups served as a motivating factor in these processes. After all, units such as *chill* and *struggle* are neither AF, nor English, yet are understandable to bilinguals even as nonce usages. In addition, since they are coined by members of a particular speech community, they comme to be associated with that group in particular. Regardless, I have shown that the semantic

\(^{16}\) Note that in English we have *to boot out*, meaning "to kick out", or *give someone the boot*. 
extensions came about in precisely the same way as they do in monolingual populations. Both Chiac *chill* and English *cool*, for example, evoke positive evaluation and both are related to the EMOTION IS HEAT metaphor.

4.12. Conclusions

We have seen in this Chapter that the Chiac lexicon is made up of both AF- and English-based units, and that the majority of lexical items are, in fact, AF-based. For all word classes but one (predicate adjectives), AF-based units outnumbered English-based units, and this is one of the reasons that Chiac is considered a dialect of French.

In general there is a continuum in Chiac regarding the percentage of English-based units in various word classes. As we move from function words to content words, the percentage of English-based units increases. Thus, the categories of adjective, adverb, noun and verb all include a greater proportion of English-based units than pronouns, articles, etc. (which have no conventional English-based units). In between are prepositions and conjunctions which are predominantly AF-based but do have some English-based units.

In addition to whether a units belongs to an open versus a closed class category, the semantics of an AF or English unit can help determine whether it will become conventional in Chiac or not. Nouns referring to family members, for example, are conventionally AF-based while drug-related vocabulary is predominantly English-based.
Regardless of whether a Chiac lexeme is AF- or English-based, it is important to note that it is, in fact, a different unit than in the source language\textsuperscript{17}. The difference between the Chiac and the source language units may be very subtle, as in the case of \textit{mère} and \textit{shirt} which seem to differ primarily in that they are used in the context of Chiac as well as in AF and English respectively. It can be less subtle, as with the English versus the Chiac usage of \textit{right}, where Chiac allows negation with \textit{right} but English does not. Finally, lexemes can be significantly different in their form and/or function from units in AF or English, as is the case with \textit{struggle}, \textit{chill} and \textit{regarder}.

Now that we have seen something of the Chiac lexicon, let us now turn to constructions that involve more than one lexeme. We begin, in Chapter 5, with an examination of noun phrase constructions.

\footnotetext{17 This is not to say that a Chiac speaker has two different units \textit{mère} – one AF and one Chiac. I mean that a Chiac speaker’s unit \textit{mère} is different than that of a monolingual AF speaker by virtue of the fact that it has connections to Chiac usage.}
Chapter 5

The Chiac Noun Phrase

5.1. Introduction

As in the lexicon, where most lexical items are AF-based, the Chiac noun phrase in many ways resembles the AF noun phrase. It has the same constituent order, similar morphological patterns, etc. There are, nevertheless, interesting differences, and in this chapter I examine nominal constructions in Chiac, concentrating especially on those that are unique to Chiac. In addition to describing their structure, I show that these NP constructions emerge in Chiac in the same way as constructions (both lexical and syntactic) in non-contact languages. That is, they result from processes such as blending and schematization of existing schemas.

I shall look first at the gender of English-based nouns, which, although often quite variable, seems to be selected by analogy to the genders of AF nouns. Then, in section 5.3 I examine adjective-noun order. In addition to source language constructions, which sanction most usage, Chiac has also developed new constructions that allow for a more variable word order. In section 5.4 I discuss number (specifically plural), and a similar pattern to that seen with adjective order emerges. That is, plural marking in Chiac, like adjective noun order, usually conforms to the AF pattern. There is, nevertheless, usage that suggests the emergence of a more schematic construction [N-∅] in Chiac. This sanctions usage where nouns of English origin can occur with the French plural suffix -
Ø. Section 5.5 deals with quantifiers. Again, more schematic constructions have emerged in Chiac which compete with English- and AF-based ones. Among other patterns, these schemas allow English-based nouns to occur with French-based quantifiers but not vice versa. Finally, in section 5.6 I examine the zero article that sometimes occurs with proper nouns and generic mass nouns. This pattern clearly reflects the influence of English since AF requires the use of non-zero articles with most proper nouns and with generic mass nouns.

5.2. Gender

Chiac nouns, like those in AF, have gender. AF-based nouns tend to take the same gender in Chiac that they do in AF (and SF)\(^1\). Thus every token of télévision in my corpus is feminine while every instance of monde “world” is masculine. With English-based nouns, however, gender is not given by the source language, since English has no system of grammatical gender. As Pérrot notes, English-based nouns in Chiac tend to have variable gender. She concludes: “les informateurs paraissent en effet faire preuve d’une réelle indifférence quand au genre assigné aux substantifs anglais” (“the consultants seem, in effect, to exhibit a real indifference to the gender assigned to English nominals”) (Pérrot 1995: 103).

My findings, like Pérot’s, indicate variable gender assignment for most English-based

\(^1\) Although this is generally true, we have seen examples such as une job and un langue, where the genders are different than in SF.
nouns. Admittedly, however, most also show a preference for one gender over the other. *Pot* (i.e. marijuana), for example, was marked as masculine 37 times compared to the 7 times it was marked as feminine. *Movie* was masculine twice as often as feminine (6 vs. 3 tokens) while *thing* was feminine in 5 of 7 instances where the gender was marked. *Shirt* was always marked as feminine, as were *overshirt* and *sweatshirt*, but *T-shirt* was marked as masculine three times out of four. *Fun* was marked as feminine 8 times versus one masculine token.

Very few of the English-based nouns of which there were more than a few tokens had invariable gender. One was *cash*, which was feminine in each of the 15 tokens where gender was indicated\(^2\). Another was *TV* [tivi], which was also feminine in every occurrence.

Chiac speakers, when selecting a gender for an English-based noun (assuming that no specific gender is conventional for that unit\(^3\)), could choose one by analogy to an AF-based cognate’s gender, by analogy to some other feature\(^4\), or they could decide at random. Gender assignment in Chiac does not seem to be random – certainly not in all cases. Rather cognate words have an effect on gender assignment. *TV* [tivi], for

\(^2\) Although *cash* is of English origin, it is interesting to note that it is also a conventional lexeme in SF, but in SF its gender is masculine. The same is true of *fun*, which is masculine in SF.

\(^3\) That is, I am assuming that either no particular gender is conventional in Chiac or that we are at a stage in the evolution of Chiac where genders have not yet become conventionalized.

\(^4\) Another possibility is that English-based words in Chiac acquire gender by analogy to similar-sounding AF-based words. For example, AF words ending in the sound [st] are almost always feminine and this might lead to English-based words ending in [st] acquiring feminine gender. However, there were not enough relevant examples in the data in order to draw any conclusions regarding the role of phonological analogy on gender in Chiac.
example, was feminine in each of the 7 tokens where its gender was evident and, as we saw, the cognate *télévision* is always feminine. In addition, *musique*, is feminine in AF and was marked as such in 77 of 78 tokens in my Chiac corpus. *Music* [mjuwzɪk] similarly was feminine in 8 of 9 gender-marked tokens.

From a cognitive view, we can account for the assignment of gender by analogy with cognates or other units that share significant structure, such as synonyms, as follows. In the case of [TV] and [télévision], we can assume that speakers have these two cognate lexical units: an AF and an English one. The AF one has a particular gender as part of the construction [i.e. télévision –fem]. The English one, [TV], does not include gender information. In each instance that the English-based unit is used in the context of Chiac, it must be assigned a gender⁵, since gender marking is obligatorily marked in Chiac in the same contexts as in AF. Units that share formal and functional similarities, such as *TV* and *télévision*, will coactivate each other. When the English-based *TV* is used, AF-based *télé(vision)* is also activated, including its feminine gender. The English-based *TV* may therefore be assigned feminine gender since that gender is activated. Gradually this becomes part of the new unit such that the Chiac unit *TV* acquires its own feminine gender. This is essentially a blending process that can be modeled as follows (where the arrows refer to the blending process from input structures to blended construction rather than to any synchronic relationships between constructions).

---
⁵ This is true, at least, for each instance where gender is overtly indicated. There is no way of knowing whether a gender is assigned to Chiac nouns (or AF ones, for that matter) in contexts such as plurals where the gender is not marked.
Given these processes, one might wonder why the gender of many English-based nouns in Chiac, even ones with AF-based cognates, is still so invariable. It may simply be a matter of time – that the processes of entrenchment and conventionalization are still underway. It may also have to do with competition from other analogical factors (phonological analogy, etc.).

5.3. Adjective Order

We saw in Chapter 4 that adjectives in Chiac can be AF- or English-based. In this section I shall show how they behave in larger constructions – specifically what orders adjectives can have relative to nouns. Chiac makes use of some of the same constructions as English and French. That is, AF-based adjectives can precede or follow AF-based nouns more or less as they do in AF, and similarly for English-based adjectives. There are, however, additional constructions in Chiac that lead to usage not found in the source languages.

In AF, as in SF, certain adjectives conventionally occur either before or after the noun or have a different meaning before versus after the noun. For example, *gros, petit, bon,*
mauvais, etc. generally precede the noun in French while adjectives referring to colours and shape (blanc, rouge, rond, plat) generally follow the noun. Adjectives such as ancien and brave can occur before or after the noun in French, but with different meanings. Before the noun, ancien means “former, ex-“ whereas after the noun it means “old, ancient” (Byrne and Churchill 1993: 106-110). We can therefore posit the following constructions for French: [Nf Af] and [Af Nf] (where there is little overlap between the set of adjectives that participate in one versus the other).

The Chiac inventory also includes these constructions (i.e. they are part of the inventory of Chiac in the narrow sense as well as being part of the speaker’s linguistic inventory). The adjectives même, petit, and gros all occur only before the noun while adjectives referring to colours and nationalities (canadienne, français) occur after the noun. However, Chiac has an additional schema that allows for any English-based adjective to precede an English-based noun, regardless of its meaning. This suggests that the English schema for adjective order, [Af Ne], is also part of the Chiac inventory.

Chiac usage conforming to the AF and English patterns is seen in examples 212-215.

(212) Australie aussi avec les grosses bières qu’i avont
    “Australia too with the big beers they’ve got”

(213) faut still que t’aies une vie sociale
    “you still need to have a social life”

(214) le neighbor de ma best friend
    “my best friend’s neighbor”
These are not, however, the only patterns of order found in Chiac. In fact, we find every possible combination of noun-adjective order and source language. Thus, English-based nouns can be followed by French-based adjectives (216), English-based adjectives followed by French-based nouns (217), French-based adjectives followed by English-based nouns (218) French-based nouns followed by English-based adjectives (219) and even English-based nouns followed by English-based adjectives (220).

(216) *mettre du lipstick noir*
“put on some black lipstick”

(217) *j’ai pas besoin de fancy linges*
“I don’t need fancy clothes”

(218) *i voulont pas qu’on faise les même mistake*
“They don’t want us to make the same mistakes”

(219) *moi j’aime la musique comme mellow*
“I like mellow music/ I like music, like, mellow music”

(220) *les chicks punk… chicks nazi*\(^6\) *whatever*
“punk chicks… nazi chicks, whatever”

Clearly, then, Chiac has acquired its own constructions that govern adjective-noun order. Rather than positing constructions for each combination (i.e. \([N_E A_F]\), \([A_E N_F]\), etc.), I simply posit the more general constructions \([N A]\) and \([A N]\) where the nouns and

---

\(^6\) Although both *punk* and *nazi* can be considered adjectives in French as well as English, I consider them to be English-based here due to their pronunciation, specifically due to the pronunciation of *nazi*, which has stress on the first syllable and is pronounced [natzij].
adjectives can be of English or of AF origin. These emerge through a process of schematization whereby the source language distinction is lost.

Rather than replacing the more specific AF and English constructions, [N A] and [A N] exist alongside them. The reason that I posit the specific source language constructions in addition to [N A] and [A N] is that although all the possible combinations occur, they do not occur with equal frequency. Usage that elaborates [A$_f$ N$_r$], [N$_f$ A$_r$], and [A$_e$ N$_e$] is much more common than usage of the type found in 216-220: it accounts for about eighty percent of all tokens. Since more specific constructions are selected more easily than more general ones (as we saw for the irregular past form went in Chapter 3), the more frequent occurrence of patterns sanctioned by source language constructions suggests that these are also constructions in Chiac. The Chiac inventory of adjective-noun order constructions therefore consists of [A$_f$ N$_e$], [N$_f$ A$_e$], [A$_e$ N$_e$], [N A] and [A N].

We can represent the Chiac speaker's adjective phrase constructions as follows, where "English", etc. represents all contexts, constructions, formal properties, etc. that constitute what we generally call a language. They do not occur between square brackets because I am not suggesting that speakers have such units, nor am I suggesting that there is no overlap between the constructions of English, Chiac, etc. It is simply a notational convenience. The solid lines between the "languages" and the constructions represent a relationship of inclusion. That is, they are part of the inventories designated by "English", etc.
5.4. Plural

In Chiac, there are two ways of marking plurality: in the first, the plural is marked as in French: there is no overt plural marker on the noun (or there is a zero suffix). Instead, plurality is marked on the article - *les, des, mes*, etc. This variant can be represented as $[[Np/...][PL/\emptyset]]$ (hence $[Np-\emptyset]$), and is exemplified for Chiac in 221-222.

(221)  *c’est vrai, Christine a déjà vu mes vidéos* [video]  
        “it’s true, Christine already watched my videos”

(222)  *c’est les mêmes magasins* [magazî]  
        “it’s the same stores”

In addition to AF-based nouns like *vidéo*, however, English-based nouns can also be marked for plurality this way in Chiac, as in:

(223)  *moi je vais porter quoi que moi j’aime, comme des skate shirt* [de skejt [t,tt] pi ça  
        ‘I’m gonna wear what I like, like skate shirts and that.’

(224)  *ben les jock* [dʒæk] *c’est le monde qui fait du sport*  
        “well jocks are people who play sports”
Although this usage resembles the AF construction \([N_{r-\emptyset}]\), for Chiac we must modify it to allow English-based nouns to occur. We can posit a more schematic construction that sanctions the use of AF- and English-based nouns with the plural suffix -\(\emptyset\) - \([N-\emptyset]\). This can be regarded as either a schematization of \([N_{r-\emptyset}]\) or as a blend of \([N_{r-\emptyset}]\) and the Chiac noun schema \([N]\). Regardless, the resulting schema sanctions the use of examples 221-222 as well as 223-224. As was the case with adjective order, \([N-\emptyset]\) need not replace \([N_{r-\emptyset}]\) as a unit in Chiac, but can rather co-exist with it.

The second means of marking plurality in Chiac is with an overt plural suffix [-s/-z/-az] (represented henceforth as -s) on the noun, as in English.

(225) \(j'\text{aurais mieux aimé ... d'acheter des cool clothes} \) [de kul klow\(\emptyset\)z] \(de\) somewhere\(\text{s else}\).
     "I would rather have bought cool clothes from somewhere else"

(226) \(je\text{pourrais afford-er les fines} \) [le fajnz] \(de\) ... indecent exposure
     "I could afford the indecent exposure fines."

(227) \(mes\text{parents sont still comme back in the days} \) [dejz]
     "my parents are still, like, back in the days"

This means of marking plurality has a restricted distribution in that it can only occur with English-based nouns. Since this construction is the same as the English plural construction, we do not need to posit a new Chiac unit. We do need to specify, however, that the English \([N_{r-s}]\) occurs in the context of Chiac and not just in English conversation.
Since both [N<sub>E-s</sub>] and [N-Ø] subsume [N<sub>E</sub>] (recall that [N] subsumes [N<sub>E</sub>] and [N<sub>F</sub>]), we expect to find that the same noun root can occur in both constructions. This is, in fact, the case. The noun concert, which is pronounced as in English, occurs with the zero suffix in 228 and the -s suffix in 229.

(228)  c’est faite pour les concerts [kansaːts] te faire mal comme
      “That’s what concerts are for – like, hurting yourself”

(229)  les concert [le kansaːlt] de ‘1755’...
      “1755 concerts...”

In addition there are instances of les punks/les punk, les gangs/les gang, les hippies/les hippie, etc.

Although there are two ways of marking plural on English-based nouns, one occurs much more frequently than the other. Instances of [N-Ø] are much more frequent than instances of [N<sub>E-s</sub>], but this is because all French-based nouns and some English-based nouns elaborate this construction. If we look only at English-based nouns, we find that instances of [N<sub>E-s</sub>] occur about four times more frequently than elaborations of [N-Ø]. We need not posit a greater entrenchment of the former (although it may well be more entrenched) since its greater specificity leads us to predict that it will be selected more often than [N-Ø].

To summarize, there is a certain amount of variation in Chiac plural marking. If the noun is French-based, it will always take a -Ø ending on the noun. If it is English-based, it can
take -s or -∅, but is about four times more likely to occur with the former. The schemas that sanction this usage in Chiac are \([N-∅]\) and \([N_{e-s}]\). This situation can be diagrammed as follows.

![Diagram](image)

**Figure 5.3**

5.5. Quantifiers

Quantifiers in Chiac pattern in interesting and somewhat unexpected ways. Specifically, whereas non-numeric quantifiers can occur with both French- and English-based nouns, numerical quantifiers tend to have the same source language as the noun they modify.

In Chiac, both AF- and English-based cardinal numbers are conventional. That is, we find both *un* and *one*, *deux* and *two*, etc. This tends not to be true of non-numeric quantifiers, such as *many*, *plusieurs*, *few*, etc. In general, AF- and English-based synonyms for these are not both conventional in Chiac. This difference leads to different patterns of usage between numeric and non-numeric quantifiers in Chiac.

One of the most predictable patterns with quantifiers involves the use of cardinal numbers: English-based cardinal numbers usually occur with English-based nouns and
French-based cardinal numbers usually occur with French-based nouns. This can be seen in the following corpus examples:

(230) *on devrait acheter de la booze à seize ans man*  
"we should [be able to] buy booze at age sixteen, man"

(231) *mes deux frères on est close ensemble*  
"my two brothers, we're close"

(232) *on a fini on a five bucks pour cecitte*  
"we get five bucks for this"

(233) *volleyball quand j'ai fait ma one bonne spike*  
"in volleyball when I made my one good spike"

In my corpus there were only three cardinal number/noun combinations out of about one hundred and fifty instances that violated this pattern. They are:

(234) *ça serait right cool qui ait deux movies.*  
"it would be right cool if there were two movies"

(235) *on a eu comme deux trois fight*  
"we had like two three fights"

(236) *c'est comme vingt-cinq cents [sents] qu'i me donnont*  
"it's like twenty-five cents that they give me"

It is worth noting that while these are clearly exceptions to the general pattern, there are factors that may help account for their occurrence. In the case of *fight*, the lack of English plural morphology on the noun suggests that the lexeme is behaving in some ways more as a French unit (where nouns do not take overt plural suffixes) than if it took the –s plural. *Fight* therefore seems more likely to occur with a French-based quantifier
than *fights* does. In the case of *vingt-cinq cents*, I assume that *cents* functions as an English-based unit here since it takes the *-s* plural, which AF-based units never do. The phonological similarity between the French and English-based units *cents* [sen] and *cents* [sents], however, increases the likelihood that the English variant will be selected with a French-based quantifier. Since they share most of their semantic and phonological correspondences, both will be activated in any context where one can occur.

The fact that cardinal numbers tend to have the same source language as the noun they modify suggests that Chiac makes use of the AF and English constructions *[NUME NE]* and *[NUMF NF]* where “num” refers to cardinal numbers. Examples 230 and 231 instantiate the former and 232 and 233 the latter. Thus, unlike the case of adjectives and plurals, there does not seem to be a schematized or blended construction in Chiac that sanctions the use of English-based nouns with French-based cardinal numbers.

Is the scope of *[NUME NE]* and *[NUMF NF]* limited to cardinal numbers, or do other quantifiers behave in the same way? Let us look first at ordinals, then at non-numeric quantifiers, such as *every, any, chaque* etc. Ordinals in Chiac, such as *first, second, premier, etc.*, pattern like cardinal numbers. As with the latter, the source language of the noun is a strong predictor of the source language of the ordinal. That is, French-based ordinals occur with French-based nouns and English-based ordinals with English-based nouns.
Therefore, instead of \([\text{NUM}_E \text{ N}_E]\) and \([\text{NUM}_F \text{ N}_F]\), we can posit a more general construction \([\text{QUANT}_E \text{ N}_E]\) and \([\text{QUANT}_F \text{ N}_F]\) where “QUANT” so far only refers to numerals and ordinals. One should bear in mind, however, that there were only 24 tokens of ordinals in my corpus, and of these, all but two were first or premier(e). Interestingly, one of these two (second) was among the two tokens where the source language of the ordinal and of the noun were different. We may therefore not want to make a generalization about ordinals but rather about these two lexical items - \([1^{ST} \text{ N}_E]\) and \([1^{ER} \text{ N}_F]\). Since they seem to pattern like cardinal numbers, however, they can be considered elaborations of the more general \([\text{QUANT}_E \text{ N}_E]\) and \([\text{QUANT}_F \text{ N}_F]\).

Let us now consider non-numeric quantifiers. In Chiac we do not often find both French- and English-based synonyms for non-numeric quantifiers as we did for numerals and ordinals. Instead, there is usually one conventional unit that occurs to the exclusion of its synonym in the other source language. For example, beaucoup de is conventional while lots of and many do not occur. Similarly chaque occurs regularly, as does every, but not each. Finally, quelque occurs whereas some and a few seem not to be used as quantifiers
in Chiac. We cannot, therefore compare the source language of nouns occurring with
beaucoup de to that of the nouns occurring with lots of, for example. Nevertheless, we
can determine whether these quantifiers tend to share a source language with the nouns
they modify.

One of the most frequent French-based quantifiers in Chiac is beaucoup de “many”, “lots
of”. It occurs more often with French-based nouns than English-based ones (75 vs. 21
tokens in my corpus). Nevertheless, there is a much higher percentage of English-based
nouns with beaucoup de than there were with French-based numeric quantifiers.

(241) comme y’a right beaucoup de cool personnes
“like there are a lot of cool people”

(242) okay maybe qu’i y’a beaucoup d’anglais ici à
“okay, maybe there’s a lot of English here”

(243) regardes-tu beaucoup de TV [tivi]
“do you watch a lot of TV?”

(244) les jeunes ont pas beaucoup de cash
“young people don’t have a lot of cash”

Given that almost one in four tokens of beaucoup de occurs with an English-based noun,
one might wonder whether it is valid to make a generalization about the source language
of nominals that occur with it. Is the source language influenced by a [beaucoup de NF]
construction or is it determined by other factors? After all, the majority of nouns in
Chiac are French-based – the occurrence of French-based nouns with beaucoup de may
not have anything to do with the quantifier. How can we determine whether [beaucoup
de NF] is a construction in Chiac or not?
If the choice of an English-based versus a French-based noun is clearly motivated by its semantic domain, then we cannot attribute the source-language of that noun to a [beaucoup de N_F] construction. Instead, we must argue that nouns of French and English origin can occur, and that the choice of a particular lexical item is based on the how well the meaning of the word matches the concept to be conveyed. Of twenty-one tokens of English based nouns that occurred with beaucoup de, fifteen involved the nouns dance, bands, TV [tivi], chicks, pot, weed, smokers, skinheads, (mother)fuckers, and shit. These nouns refer to concepts that are more likely to be coded with English-based nouns, as discussed in Chapter 4. They often involve “cool” topics such as those related to pop and teen culture, and include the topic of drugs (weed, pot, smokers), of social groups (skinheads, smokers), and swearing ([mother] fucker, shit), etc.

Thus, by taking their semantics into account we see that English-based nouns behave in the same way with beaucoup de as they do in other environments. As a result, it seems more reasonable to claim that beaucoup de does not participate in the more general [QUANT_F N_F] construction, but rather that beaucoup de simply occurs with Chic accent nouns. It therefore patterns like the plural and adjective constructions.

The next non-numeric quantifier to be considered is chaque. It seems to occur overwhelmingly with French-based nouns (26 out of 27 tokens). The only example I found of it with an English-based noun is example 247, which is marginal at best given that gang is a loanword in many French dialects (i.e. it could function as an AF-based noun here).
(245) *ma mère me donne dix dollars chaque vendredi*
   "my mother gives me ten dollars every Friday"

(246) *je joue soccer ça fait cinq ans pi je joue ça chaque été*
   "I've been playing soccer for five years and I play it each summer"

(247) *chaque gang ont leur thing*
   "each gang has their thing"

Given the overwhelming preference for French-based nouns with *chaque*, we may want to argue that it patterns like cardinal numbers and ordinals rather than like *beaucoup de*. I believe, however, that the opposite is true. When one considers the nouns that occur with *chaque*, 11 of 14 (representing 22 of 27 tokens) denote times. They include *jour* "day", *semaine* "week", *vendredi* "Friday" and *soir* "evening". Three more tokens involve the noun *fois* "time", which combines with *chaque* in a frequent collocation *chaque fois* "each/every time". Another token involved the noun *ville* "city", referring to Moncton. None of these involve the semantic domains that English-based nouns in Chiac often share. Thus, there is no reason to believe that Chiac has anything other than a [chaque N_{E,F}] construction.

The remaining token is example 247 with *gang*. Even if we want to consider this an English-based noun, its use would clearly be motivated by its meaning – it refers to social divisions and means something like “cliques” or “social groups”.

Thus, although the majority of tokens with *chaque* involve French-based nouns, I still argue that the choice of a French- vs. and English-based noun is not dependent on a
quantifier construction. *Chaque*, like *beaucoup de*, therefore seems to participate in a construction [chaque N] rather than in [QUANTF N$_F$].

Now let us turn to English-based non-numeric quantifiers. Those that occur in Chiac include *every*, and *any*. These pattern like the French-based non-numeric quantifiers in that either French- or English-based nouns can co-occur. English-based nouns seem more likely to occur with English-based non-numeric quantifiers than with French-based ones, however, and I shall account for this below.

With *every* there seems to be no preference for English-based vs. French-based nouns, although, given a total of fourteen instances, more data are clearly needed.

(248) *moi j'ai un allowance every semaine*  
“I get an allowance every week”

(249) *moi je sors pretty much every soir*  
“I go out pretty much every night”

(250) *moi ça serait un différent article pour every day of the year*  
“for me it would be a different article (of clothing) for every day of the year”

(251) *moi j'aime every music except la western pi la country*  
“I like every (type of) music except western and country”

Of fourteen tokens, *every* occurred with a French-based noun four times and with an English-based one ten times. It is worth noting, however, that six tokens of *every* with an English-based noun were the frequent collocation *every day*. If we consider the data in terms of types rather than tokens, the ratio of French-based to English-based nouns
becomes 4:5. *Every*, therefore, seems to pattern like *beaucoup de* and *chaque*. That is, we can posit a construction [every N] where the source of the noun is not specified.

If the construction does not prefer AF- versus English-based nouns, and if AF-based nouns are generally more frequent in Chiac, why then is there a greater percentage of English-based nouns with *every* than with *chaque*, for example? This is because in addition to general schemas such as [every N] there are more specific units for frequent collocations, such as [every thing] [every time], etc. If *every day* and *every thing* are lexical units, this would explain why *day*, which on its own does not seem to be a Chiac lexeme (in the narrow sense) occurs.

Finally, *any* occurs in Chiac and competes with the French-based *n’importe quel(le)*. Like *every*, *any* also occurs with both French- and English-based nouns. There were three tokens of *any* with a French-based noun and five with an English-based noun.

(252) *nobody judge-erait [dʒʌdʒəɪ] anybody for comme any reason*  
“nobody would judge anybody for any reason”

(253) *je peux pas vraiment bash-er any style* [stajl]  
“I can’t really bash any style”

(254) *moi j’aime basically any style* [stil] *de musique*  
“I like basically any style of music”

(255) *comme any sport* [spɔʁ] *qui use comme tes jambes*  
“like, any sport that uses your legs”
Although there are not enough instances to draw any firm conclusions, it seems that any patterns like *every* (and therefore like all the other non-numeric quantifiers). That is it participates in a construction [any N] which does not specify the source-language of the noun.

Clearly numeric and non-numeric quantifiers do not pattern in the same way in Chiac. The non-numeric quantifiers follow a pattern similar to that seen for other nominal constructions – adjectives, plurals and, as we shall see in section 5.6, articles. Therefore, we need not posit a general construction for non-numeric quantifiers such as [NON-NUM.QUANT N]. Their behaviour follows from the existence of the Chiac schema [N] and from the more general schema [QUANT N], which specifies the order of the elements. Cardinal and ordinal numbers, on the other hand, behave differently. I posited the constructions [QUANT_E N_E] and [QUANT_F N_F] to account for their use.

Why would it be that cardinal and ordinal numbers pattern so differently not only from other quantifiers, but from other nominal constructions? One factor is that both French- and English-based numerical quantifiers are conventional in Chiac. Thus, when speakers select a particular noun to be quantified, they can select a cardinal number with the same source language. If they are modifying that noun with a non-numeric quantifier, however, there is usually only one conventional choice.

Within our model of a Chiac speaker’s linguistic system, we can model the quantifier constructions as follows. The Chiac speaker will have the English construction [QUANT_E
N_E] and the French construction [QUANT_F N_F]. These allow them to use only English units when speaking English and French units when speaking French. These constructions could have schematized resulting in a unit [QUANT_F N], where a French quantifier could occur with a French-based or English-based noun, but this has not happened. Instead, Chiac makes use of the AF construction [QUANT_F N_F] and the English [QUANT_E N_E] for numeric quantifiers. Non-numeric quantifiers, however, behave like articles, pronouns, etc. in that both AF- and English-based nouns can follow them.
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5.6. Zero Article\footnote{The use of the term "zero article" and of the symbol $\mathcal{O}$ are not meant to imply that something that should be present is missing or that there is an underlying article, but simply to draw attention to the fact that an article could have been used, but was not.}

In Chapter 4 we saw that articles in Chiac (in the narrow sense) are AF-based. This is not to say, however, that articles in Chiac behave in exactly the same way as AF articles. One difference is that in Chiac an article sometimes does not get used where AF would require one. The circumstances under which the Chiac zero article occurs are constrained, and are related to the use of the English article, as shown by Pérot (1995: 86-96). She argues that the zero article ("l'article $\mathcal{O}$") occurs with English-based (and
occasionally AF-based) nouns belonging to certain categories: the names of countries, provinces, and states, and before the names of games, sports and musical instruments, for example. Usage in my corpus confirms Perrot’s findings:

(256) *dans le Nouveau-Brunswick pi Ð Nova-Scotia pis l’Île du Prince Edward*  
“in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island”

(257) *ch’ais pas, Ð California serait pretty cool a visiter - Ð Australie aussi avec les grosses bières qu’i avont*  
“I dunno, it would be pretty cool to go to California – Australia too with the big beers they’ve got”

(258) *je faisais du baseball, je faisais du hockey, mais j’ai arrêté Ð baseball l’année dernière*  
“I did baseball, I did hockey, but I stopped baseball last year”

(259) *la seule affaire que j’étais dedans comme dans des teams c’était Ð volleyball pi Ð soccer dans ma whole vie, pi maybe Ð ping pong, pi Ð badminton*  
“the only thing I was involved in, like in teams, was volleyball and soccer in my whole life, and maybe ping pong and badminton”

Whereas the names of countries, regions, sports and games generally take articles in French, they usually do not in English. However, names of countries and regions constitute a different type of noun than names of sports and games, and these take the zero article for different reasons. The former are proper nouns and the latter are generic mass nouns. Let us first consider article use with proper nouns in English, in AF, and ultimately in Chiac.

In English, where the primary function of articles is to indicate definiteness, proper nouns tend not to take articles. As long as they refer to entities that are “uniquely apparent to
the speaker and hearer on the basis of this name alone” (Langacker 1991: 59), they will be construed as definite. That is, in most usage events a name will be used to indicate someone that is uniquely identifiable, and this will be clear regardless of whether a definite article is used. Because of this conventional use, definite articles are generally not used with proper nouns.\footnote{As a result, when the definite article is used with what are otherwise proper nouns, the noun is construed as non-unique – as a member of a category. As such, they can be definite or indefinite, as in “the France of the 1870’s” or “I met three Dobs last night”. In other words, they behave as common nouns: they do not have unique reference, they can take articles, be pluralised and quantified, etc.} We can therefore posit an English construction $[\emptyset \, \text{pn}]$ where \text{pn} refers to proper nouns and $\emptyset$ refers to the lack of an article.

In French, however, articles serve other functions in addition to marking definiteness. In terms of Greenberg’s cycle of the definite article (Greenberg 1978), modern French is between stage two and stage three. That is, in addition to indicating definiteness, the definite article also marks gender and number. Furthermore, “it has acquired an important non-referential usage, the marking of generic nouns, e.g. *j’aime le fromage* ‘I like cheese’” (Epstein 1994: 245). Because the French article has the function of marking gender and number, and because this marking is obligatory with nouns, (non-zero) articles are used with almost every noun, including many proper nouns. We can therefore posit the following AF schema: $[\text{art}, \text{pn}]$ where \text{art} refers to non-zero articles.

In Chiac, article usage, even with proper nouns, tends to follow the French pattern. That
is, names of countries generally take articles in Chiac, as in *le Canada, la France*, etc.

Chiac therefore also makes use of the \([\text{ART}_F \text{ PN}_F]\) construction.

Occasionally, however, the name of a country or region will occur in Chiac without an article, as we saw in 256-257 above. Given the English and French article/proper noun constructions, I suggest that the article-less Chiac usage results from a schema in which the English proper noun construction blends with the French-based one. (Note that in Figure 5.5 the arrows indicate the blending process rather than any synchronic relationships).

![Diagram](image)

The blended construction \([\emptyset \text{ PN}]\) then sanctions usage with both AF- and English-based proper nouns, such as \(\emptyset \text{ Australie}, \emptyset \text{ Nova Scotia} \) and \(\emptyset \text{ California} \) in 256 and 257.

Nevertheless, usage such as \(\emptyset \text{ Australie} \) is fairly rare. This is because the new Chiac schema \([\emptyset \text{ PN}]\) must compete with the French-based schema \([\text{ART}_F \text{ PN}_F]\) when a French name for a country, province or state is being coded in Chiac. At the present time, \([\text{ART}_F \text{ PN}_F]\) is successful in encoding French-based proper nouns much more often than \([\emptyset \text{ PN}]\). This is likely because it is more specific (it specifies the source language of the noun), but entrenchment may also be relevant.
We see a similar pattern with the names of games and sports in Chiac. These are generic mass nouns in French and in English. Prototypically, mass nouns designate homogeneous physical entities and generics designate classes of entities. More accurately, in CG a generic is treated as a “representative instance of the category” (Langacker 1991: 106) rather than the category itself. The names of sports and games are not prototypical mass nouns in that they do not specify physical entities and are not internally homogeneous in the way that water is, for example. Nevertheless, in English and in French, the names of sports and games are often construed as masses (rather than specific instances of a game). This can be seen by the greater felicity of a game of baseball has nine innings than baseball has nine innings. Note that baseball and other such nouns also have the formal properties of mass nouns: they do not pluralize and they can be full nominals without overt quantification or grounding (i.e. the use of articles).

Langacker argues that generics are inherently ambivalent to definiteness. While English has conventionalized the (zero-marked) indefinite construal of generics, French has conventionalized the definite (Langacker 1991: 101). That is, English generic mass nouns do not take articles while French ones do.

(260) a. Ø beauty is in the eye of the beholder
   b. Ø soccer is the most popular sport in Brazil
   c. she plays Ø piano

(261) a. j’aime le lait
    “I like milk”
   b. je joue à la balle molle
    “I play softball”
We can therefore posit the English construction $[\emptyset \text{ G.M.N.}_E]$, where \text{G.M.N.} stands for generic mass nouns. This exists alongside English constructions such as:

$[\emptyset \text{ I.M.N.}_E]$ (indefinite mass noun)  \hspace{1cm} \emptyset \text{ salt spilled on the table}

$[\text{the} \text{ G.C.N.}_E]$ (sg. generic count noun)  \hspace{1cm} \text{the dodo is extinct}

$[\text{G.C.N.}_E-5]$ (pl. generic count noun)  \hspace{1cm} \text{dodos are extinct}

Due to the frequent occurrence of names for sports in the generic, we can also posit the English schemas $[\emptyset \text{ baseball}]$, $[\emptyset \text{ hockey}]$. This is not to say that \textit{baseball}, \textit{hockey}, etc. are inherently generic. They can be specific and occur with articles – as in \textit{the baseball of my youth} or \textit{the hockey they play in Sweden}. Nevertheless, the fact that these nouns occur most frequently in the generic allows these schemas to emerge.

Similarly, for French we can posit the schema $[\text{DEF.ART}_F \text{ G.N.}_F]$, which captures the generalization that generic nouns occur with the definite articles (\textit{le}, \textit{la}) in French. In Chiacc, we find usage that elaborates these French schemas, such as 262-263.

\begin{enumerate}
  \item \textit{(262) c'est ça que j'fais dans mon spare time c'est que j'écoute la musique}
  \begin{quote}
  "that's what I do in my spare time, I listen to \emptyset music"
  \end{quote}
  \item \textit{(263) j'aime vraiment la balle molle pi le soccer}
  \begin{quote}
  "I really like \emptyset softball and \emptyset soccer"
  \end{quote}
\end{enumerate}

---

9 Examples 260 and 261 are constructed, not corpus examples.
In addition, however, Chiac sometimes exhibits usage that conforms to the pattern of English where a generic mass noun, specifically the name of a game, occurs with a zero article, as in 258 and 259 above, repeated as 264-265 below.

\begin{quote}
(264) \textit{je faisais du baseball, je faisais du hockey, mais j'ai arrêté $\emptyset$ baseball l'année dernière}
\smallskip
"I did baseball, I did hockey, but I stopped baseball last year"
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
(265) \textit{la seule affaire que j'étais dedans comme dans des teams c'était $\emptyset$ volleyball $\pi$ $\emptyset$ soccer dans ma whole vie, $\pi$ maybe $\emptyset$ ping pong, $\pi$ $\emptyset$ badminton}
\smallskip
"the only thing I was involved in, like in teams, was volleyball and soccer in my whole life, and maybe ping pong and badminton"
\end{quote}

This suggests that Chiac makes use of both the French-based schema $[\text{DEF.ART}_f \text{G.N}_f]$ and the English-based schema $[\emptyset \text{G.M.N}_e]$. Alternately, one could argue that rather than $[\emptyset \text{G.M.N}_e]$, Chiac has specific constructions such as $[\emptyset \text{soccer}]$, etc. I think the former is a preferable analysis given the fact that the use of French-based articles is more common in this context than the use of the zero article. Given the greater specificity of $[\emptyset \text{soccer}]$, one would expect it to more often succeed in coding the target.

This analysis assumes that \textit{baseball, soccer}, etc. are functioning as English nouns. They may, however, be functioning as AF-based nouns given the fact that they are also loanwords in many dialects of French, including AF. If AF-based generic mass nouns occur with the zero article, we need to posit a new construction for Chiac. There was only one example of a clearly AF-based name for a sport that was used without an article, but it is somewhat marginal given the marked OSV word order:
(266) *euhm balle molle j'ai joué l'année passé*  
“uh, softball I played last year”

Assuming that 266 above constitutes an example of an AF-based generic mass noun taking the zero article, we must posit a blended construction to account for it. The zero article from the English schema \([\emptyset \text{ G.M.N}_E]\) (or from \([\emptyset \text{ baseball}], \text{ etc. individually}\) combines with the French nouns from the schema \([\text{DEF.ART}_F \text{ G.N}_F]\) resulting in the more schematic construction \([\emptyset \text{ G.M.N.}], \text{ where the zero article occurs and the source-language of the noun can be English or AF. More instances of AF-based generic mass nouns taking the zero article are needed, however, before we can convincingly argue for this construction.}

We can represent some of the Chiac speaker's inventory of article/noun constructions as follows (note that \([\emptyset \text{ G.M.N.}]\) is not included although it may be a unit):

![Diagram of article/noun construction]

Figure 5.6
5.7. Conclusions

In Chapter 5 I have examined some of the nominal constructions in Chiac, showing that, in addition to source language constructions, Chiac makes use of its own schematized and/or blended units\(^{10}\). A general pattern is that both AF- and English-based nouns ([N]) can occur in many AF-based constructions. This was the case with plurals ([N-Ø]) and with proper nouns ([Ø PN]). Adjective-noun constructions were similar, except both nouns and adjectives could be of either AF or English origin ([N A] [A N]).

There were, however, two constructions in particular that deviated from this general pattern. First, in the case of the zero article, it is an English-based construction ([Ø PN\(_e\)]) that has schematized – not an AF-based one. The second construction that showed a different pattern involved the use of cardinal and ordinal numbers, which almost always have the same source language as the noun they modify in Chiac.

In Chapter 6 we shall consider verb phrase constructions. These reflect the same processes of blending and schematization that we saw in this chapter. In addition, verb phrase constructions reflect the influence of standardization in a way we have not previously seen.

---

\(^{10}\) Recall that I have argued that constructions such as [Ø PN], where the source language of the root is not specified, can be considered either a blend of units such as [Ø PN\(_e\)] and [N] (or [PN]). They can also be analyzed as schematizations where a distinction (between source languages) has been lost.
Chapter 6

Chiac Verb Phrase Constructions

6.1 Introduction

In Chapter 5 we saw that Chiac differs from AF not only with regard to its lexicon, it also has unique noun phrase constructions. In this chapter I describe the ways in which Chiac verbal morphology and its verb phrase differ from those of AF and English. These reflect both the influence of English and a tendency toward regularizing irregular verbs, which cannot be attributed to English influence. For example, Chiac has a verb particle construction that clearly emerged as a result of speakers’ knowledge of English. The same is true of the AF/Chiac particle back. The use in Chiac of the root mour rather than meur for the verb mourrir, on the other hand, cannot be attributed to English influence. Rather, this likely occurred by analogy to other verb stems.

In exploring the Chiac verb phrase, I shall first consider unique Chiac verb stems that seem to have emerged by analogy to more regular verb stems. Then, in 6.3, I examine verbal agreement patterns, which, although they often mirror those of AF and SF, sometimes do not agree with their subjects in number. In section 6.4 I examine predicate nominatives, which differ from other nominals in Chiac (and from AF and SF predicate nominatives) with regard to article usage. In 6.5 I consider the relatively well-known Chiac particle back. In addition to presenting previous analyses, I show how usage in my corpus varies from that described elsewhere. Finally, in 6.6 I examine the Chiac verb
particle construction(s). Chiac makes use of various English-based verb particle combinations and as a result, a somewhat productive VPC has emerged in this dialect.

6.2. Verb Stem “Regularizations”

There are patterns in both AF and Chiac that can be considered regularizations of irregular verb forms. Given that Chiac is at one end of a dialect continuum, it often differs from AF in degree, and this is the case with verb stem regularizations. That is, Chiac makes use of the regularized AF verb stems as well as some that seem to be unique to Chiac usage. An example of a regularization found in both AF and Chiac involves the root of faire. In SF the third person plural form font has an irregular root - [f(ō)]. In AF and Chiac, although the SF forms of faire occur most often, there are also third person plural units faisont [fezō] and faisent [fez].

(267)  les nazis ils ont just pas de vie - I savent pas ce qu’i faisent comme
       “nazis, they just have no life - they don’t know what they’re doing, like”

(268)  juste pense à tout les taxes qu’on paye pi i faisent rien
       “just think of all the taxes we pay and they do nothing”

(269)  non mes parents faisont pas ça
       “no, my parents don’t do that”

It seems, therefore, that speakers have extended the use of the stem fais- [fez], which occurs in the first person plural, to the third person plural. They then used this root the regular third plural endings -ont and -ent.
Other verbs, such as *mourrir*, reflect a regularization of the verb stem that is only attested for Chiac.

(270)  
*y'a quelques enfants qui ... mourrent* [muʁʁɛ] *de famine*  
"there are several children who die of famine/hunger"  
(versus *meurent*)

(271)  
*y'a plus de monde qui mourre* [muʁʁɛ] *off du smokes que du pot*  
"there are more people who die from smokes than from pot"  
(versus *meurt*)

In addition, it seems that usage such as 272 below, with the verb *faire*, is found only in Chiac.

(272)  
*non, je m'excuse, mais ça ça ffairait de la shit à rien comme*  
"no, I’m sorry but that would cause a lot of shit for nothing, like"

In this example, *faire* involves an unconventional root for *faire* – *fai* [fe] (as opposed to AF [fa]), which presumably emerged by analogy with other roots such as *plai* for *plaire* and *tai* for *taire*. And although there is only one instance of this root in my corpus, Péronnet notes a similar example, which I have included below, in a corpus of young Monctonians’ speech.

(273)  
*quoix te faireis avec zeux*  
"what would you do with them?"  
(Péronnet 1996: 127)

*Fai* [fe] does not seem to be a conventional unit in that it occurs very seldom relative to *fai* [fa]. Nevertheless, its occasional use, combined with other instances of regularization
that we have seen, suggests that Chiac speakers occasionally modify the forms of even very frequently occurring verbs by analogy to more regular forms.

It should also be noted that when the third person plural suffix is -ont, as opposed to -ent, the roots of irregular verbs are regular in AF and Chiac – i.e. the irregular SF roots do not occur with the -ont suffix. In addition to faisont, we find the following:

(274) ça me dérange pas si qu’i comme qu’i venont de là “it doesn’t bother me if they, like, comme from there” (versus viennent)

(275) comme si qu’i voulont pas qu’on faise les même mista- mistake “like if they don’t want us to make the same mistakes” (versus veulent)

(276) les filles qu’avont pas des beau body faudraient qu’a s’habillent “the girls who don’t have nice bodies they’d have to wear clothes” (vers. ont)

(277) pi c’est zeux qu’avont créé le monde “and it’s them who created the world” (versus ont)

(278) i allont comme bucher comme du bois pi tout ça “they go cut down trees and all that” (versus vont)

With regard to 276-278, ont and vont are attested, but these are the SF way of expressing the third person plural of avoir and aller. With venir and vouloir, however, *veulent and *viennent are not attested.

In addition to stems, Chiac and AF TAM suffixes sometimes also reflect regularization. The verb faire consistently takes the subjunctive suffix -se [z] rather than -sse [s], which is conventional in SF.
(279) \textit{pi faut que je faise sûr de dire à ma mère où-ce que je vas}\ns\textquotedblleft and I have to be sure to tell my mom where I’m going\textquotedblright

(280) \textit{faut que je faise mon lit}\ns\textquotedblleft I have to make my bed\textquotedblright

Here too the use of \textit{faire} (which is described for AF by Péronnet 1990: 85) can be
interpreted as a regularization of the irregular subjunctive form \textit{fasse} by analogy to other
verbs ending in \textit{–aire}: \textit{plaire/plaise, taire/taise}. And whereas \textit{faisent/faisont} and \textit{font}
occurred about an equal number of times, \textit{fasse} was only attested once (versus about 10
tokens of subjunctive \textit{faire(s)}).

\textbf{6.3. Agreement}

In AF and SF, verbs agree in person and number with their subjects, and Chiac, for the
most part, is no different. Verbs, including English-based ones, agree with their subjects
for person and number. This can be seen in 281-285. (Recall that \textit{–ont} [6] is a third
person plural agreement suffix that alternates with \textit{–ent} [∅].)

(281) \textit{qu’est ce qu’i disent de ça là?}\ns\textquotedblleft what do they say about that?\textquotedblright

(282) \textit{pour le bien-être sociale là i faut seriously qu’i change-ont ça}\ns\textquotedblleft for welfare they seriously need to change that\textquotedblright

(283) \textit{c’est lui qui harrass-ait l’autre guy pi}\ns\textquotedblleft it’s him who was harassing the other guy\textquotedblright

(284) \textit{je move à une aut’ place}\ns\textquotedblleft I move to another place\textquotedblright
(285)  \textit{j'ai appliqué but i call-ont pas back}  
  \textit{“I applied but they don’t call (me) back”}  

It is, of course, sometimes difficult to tell whether verbs agree since agreement suffixes are sometimes homophonous or are zero-marked. This can be seen in 284 which could be agreeing with the first person singular subject \{Ø\} or there could simply be no agreement on the verb. Nevertheless, in cases where the agreement suffix is not -Ø or the form of the root differs, verbs do tend to agree in person and number with their subjects, regardless of whether the root is AF- or English-based.

This is not always the case with auxiliary verbs and copulas, however. We find that these sometimes do not agree with their subjects for number. Note the following examples.

(286)  \textit{mes passe-temps est just hang-er out avec mes friends}  
  \textit{“my favourite passtimes is just hanging out with my friends”}  

(287)  \textit{toutes les choses va être dominés}  
  \textit{“all things will be dominated”}  

(288)  \textit{non parce que les tchezes est racist [rejstst]}  
  \textit{“no because tchezes is racist”}  

In a majority of instances, auxiliaries and copulas do agree for number and person. Nevertheless, the pattern above may indicate change in progress toward a lack of agreement on such verbs.
It is interesting to note that King and Flikeid have found a lack of agreement for verbs in Nova Scotian and Prince Edward Island Acadian and Newfoundland dialects, but not just with auxiliaries and copulas and only in subject relative clauses. That is, you find ils *allont à la côte* "they are going to the shore" but *les hommes qui va à la côte..." the men who go to the shore..." (King 2000: 40). In my corpus, however, there was no lack of agreement in subject relative clauses, as in 289-291.¹

(289) *c'est zeux qui sont toujours là pour toi*
  "it's them who are always there for you"

(290) *y'a des personnes qui veulent être sur welfare*
  "there are people who want to be on welfare"

(291) *y a beaucoup de... smokers pis de monde qui hang-ont around dehors qui* *haient les jocks pis les preps*
  "there are a lot of ... smokers and people who hang around outside who
  hate jocks and preps"

(292) *c'est juste des jeunes qui va là*
  "it's just young people who go there"

Note that in 290 the third person plural agreement suffix is -Ø, but the form of the root changes for third person plural (veul- vs. veu- and voul-). There was one instance where there was no agreement in a relative clause (292), but this does not seem to be a pattern in Chiac.

¹ These are all examples of predicate nominals because I found no instances of subject relative clauses other than in predicate nominals in my corpus. This is not surprising since the first NP in a (AF or English) sentence tends to be old information and is therefore usually not modified by a relative clause.
6.4. Predicate Nominative Construction

Chiac predicate nominative constructions (PNCs) seem to differ somewhat from those of AF with regard to article use. Although there are not enough examples to draw any firm conclusions, the Chiac pattern is worth exploring. It seems that within the PNC one can use articles in Chiac where you cannot in AF and not use them in Chiac in environments where they always occur in AF. Specifically, Chiac seems to have a PNC not found in AF and that results, in certain environments, in usage without articles. There are relatively few examples of these, and so it is unclear at this stage whether these constitute Chiac patterns or nonce usages.

It seems that a predicated noun can occur without an article (and without overt plural marking)\textsuperscript{2} regardless of whether it takes one in other constructions. It is exemplified in 293-295.

(293) \textit{y'en a qui disent que je suis nerd}  
     "there are some who say I'm a nerd"

(294) \textit{les neighbor de ma best friend sont jew}  
     "my best friend's neighbors are jew(s)"

(295) \textit{i [les politiciens] sont tous cheat.}  
     "they [politicians] are all cheat(s)"

We know that this usage is shaped by a predicate nominative construction because the indefinite common singular noun in 293 above does not take an article as it would in

\textsuperscript{2} Here jew and cheat could take the AF -$\varnothing$ plural suffix, but of course there is no way to know.
subject position in Chiac, for example. Similarly, the indefinite plurals in 294 and 295 do not take articles as they would outside this PNC. Thus, we never find examples such as:

(296) *prep(s) portont du linge faite par des racistes
     “Preps wear clothes made by racists”

(297) *jew(s) sont les neighbors de ma best friend
     “jews are the neighbors of my best friend”

Instead, we find usage such as:

(298) les preps portont du linge faite par des racistes
     “Preps wear clothes made by racists”

(299) les tchezzes sont tout des doses
     “tchezzes are all idiots”

Given that examples 293-295 all involved English-based predicate nominals, one might wonder whether that too is a property of this PNC. This is difficult to determine. There are examples with French-based predicate nominals that fit the pattern of [NOM COP Ø N], but French nouns and adjectives often have the same form. Thus, a predicate nominative construction with the form [NOM COP Ø N] and an AF-based predicated noun would be indistinguishable from the AF predicate adjective construction [NOM COP ADI]. For example, the Chiac utterance beaucoup de tchezzes sont raciste(s) “a lot of tchezzes are racist/racists” is ambiguous if French nouns can occur in the Chiac [NOM COP Ø N] construction. To determine whether such an utterance could instantiate the predicate nominative construction would require a fine-grained semantic analysis that goes beyond
the scope of my corpus. Regardless of whether the predicate nominal can be French-based, it is clear that the [NOM COP \(\emptyset\) N] construction competes with the more entrenched [NOM COP NOM] and is selected much less frequently. Thus, predicate nominals in PNCs usually take articles as they would in other constructions.

6.5. Back

*Back* is probably the best known Chiac (and AF) particle, although it also occurs in other varieties of Canadian French (cf. Mousseau *et al.* 1982). *Back* has been written about by Massignon (1962), Péronnet (1984), King (2000: 119-133), Pérot (1995: 155-175), etc., and has often been cited as evidence that Chiac has its own grammatical patterns. Although related to the English adverb/particle *back*, the Chiac particle behaves differently from the English one.

First, there are semantic differences between English and Chiac *back*. Whereas in English the particle has a meaning something like “toward an original point” (reflexive meaning), in Chiac it can also mean “again” (iterative meaning) (cf. Pérot 1995: 156). Thus, of the two Chiac sentences 300 and 301, only the first can be translated into English with *back*.

\((300)\) \(\hat{\text{[i m'a frappé donc] je l'ai back fessé}}\)  
\([\text{he hit me so}] \text{ "I hit him back"}\)

\((301)\) \(\hat{\text{[i m'a frappé et] i m'a back frappé}}\)  
\([\text{he hit me and}] \text{ "he hit me again"}\)
The iterative back in Chiac occurs instead of the prefix re- (cf. Pérot 1995: 158-167 for a diachronic perspective on back) such that re- is now almost never used in Chiac. Exceptions tend to occur in conventionalized units where the meaning is no longer entirely transparent (e.g. rentrer “to come back”, recycler “to recycle”, revenir “to return”). Aside from these there were only two usage types of re- in my corpus: there was one token of repayer “to repay” and several of recommencer “to restart”, all of which occurred within a few minutes of discourse. Back, on the other hand, occurred 23 times, with 7 iterative uses, 10 reflexive uses, and 6 that were ambiguous.

Back in Chiac also differs formally from the English particle. Whereas English back can only follow the verb (finite or non-finite), as in 302-304, in Chiac it follows finite verbs but precedes non-finite verbs, as in 305 and 306.

(302)  I go back to work next Wednesday.

(303)  I'm going back to work now

(304)  *I back go to work next Wednesday! *I am back going to work now

(305)  je viens back à une heure
      "I come back at 1 o'clock"

(306)  je vais back aller chez nous
      "I will go back home"

Pérot has shown that the pattern of use for Chiac back with finite and non-finite verbs is:
non-finite:  \[ S + (\text{pro}) + \text{AUX/MOD} + (\text{neg}) + \text{BACK} + (\text{pro}) + V \]

finite:  \[ S + (\text{pro}) + (\text{pro}) + V + (\text{neg}) + \text{BACK} \]  

(Pérrot 1995: 167)

The examples in my corpus largely conform to these patterns. We can therefore posit two verbal constructions: a non-finite \textit{back} and a finite \textit{back}: \{AUX \textit{back} \textit{V} \text{\textit{n.f.}}\} and \{V \textit{\textit{t}} \textit{back}\}³.

There were, however, some interesting differences between the patterns described by Pérrot and those found in my data. First, although they do not produce it frequently, Chic languages will often accept a sentence with a non-finite verb where \textit{back} follows the verb, as in 307 and 308 below.

\begin{align*}
(307) & \uparrow i \text{ \textit{m'a pas callé back}} \\
& \ "he \ didn't \ call \ me \ back/he \ didn't \ call \ me \ again" \\
(308) & \uparrow j e \ l'\textit{ai sendé back} \\
& \ "I \ sent \ it \ back/ I \ resent \ it" \\
\end{align*}

Note that in both of these cases, the other order is also possible and is usually preferred (\textit{i m'a pas back call-é, je l'\textit{ai back send-é}}). One consultant said of example 307, "yeah [it's a good sentence] but c'est plus anglais, c'est pas chiac". In other words, this order is allowed here because \textit{back} is functioning as a particle in the verb particle construction (see section 6.6 below) rather than as the Chic particle \textit{back}. This analysis is supported by the fact that \textit{send back} and \textit{call back} are established English VPC combinations.

³ Here AUX stands for auxiliaries and modals, \textit{V\textit{n.f.}} for a non-finite verb and \textit{V\textit{t}} for a finite verb.
There also seems to be flexibility with regard to the position of *back* in the periphrastic future. While examples 307 and 308 were only marginally acceptable by virtue of resembling eng VPCs, example 309 is from my corpus and 309-310 were accepted without reservation. Furthermore, they do not involve English-based verb roots and are therefore less likely to be following the pattern of an English VPC.

(309)  i va venir back  
      "he’ll come back"

(310)  ↑je vais aller back’  
      "I’ll go back"

More data are certainly needed in order to confirm whether or not this seemingly more flexible word order actually exists, and if so, whether it is conditioned by the periphrastic future or by something else. Although the elicited data seem to suggest that there is flexibility in the future with regard to the order of *back* and the infinitive, almost all spontaneously produced utterances with *back* in the periphrastic future had the order *aller + back + INFIN*. In addition, there was not always agreement among consultants as to which order was preferable. One speaker said that *je vais aller back* was preferable to *je vais back aller*, while another said they were the same.

Given these observations, the Chiac linguistic inventory can be said to include the constructions [AUX *back Vn-t*] and [Vt *back*], as well as units for specific lexical items beginning in *re-* (*revenir, recycler, rentrer*). It does not seem to have a productive construction [re-* V]. In addition, Chiac has a VPC, described below, that sanctions usage
such as *je l'ai send-é back*. At this stage there is not enough evidence to support positing a construction `[AUX.ALLER INFIN back]` for the periphrastic future, but the apparent flexibility in word order is worthy of further investigation.

6.6. Verb Particle Construction

Chiac has a verb particle construction (VPC) which is exemplified in 311-313:

(311) *ça m'a totally turn-é off la dope*  
"it totally turned me off dope"

(312) *kick-le out, kick-le out du questionnaire*  
"kick him out, kick him out of the survey"

(313) *yeah mes parents freak-ont right out après moi souvent*  
"yeah, my parents always freak right out at me"

Since AF has no VPC it seems clear that the Chiac construction is based, at least in part, on English. Let us therefore first examine the structure of the English VPC, as defined in Lindner 1981. It includes literal and idiomatic instances, such as:

(314) *The kite floated up*  

(315) *John ran up a bill*  
(Lindner 1981: 2)

Formal properties include taking an object nominal before or after the particle⁴, as in:

---

⁴ There are particles in English, such as *after*, that can occur only directly after the verb root. The particle verb cannot be separated by a nominal element. Thus, we can say *look after it* but not *look it after* (O'Dowd 1998: 17). These particles do not occur in my Chiac corpus, nor in Perrot's.
(316) a. She called up her sister        b. She called her sister up

(317) a. They sold off their assets       b. They sold their assets off.

Material can generally not come between the verb and the particle (as in 318a, 319a, and 320, whereas adverbs, for example, can come between a verb and a preposition (as in 318b and 319b).

(318) a.*Harry looked furtively over the client.          b. Harry looked furtively over the fence. (Lindner 1981: 15)

(319) a.*He turned suddenly off the light   b. He turned suddenly off the road  (Lindner 1981: 15)

(320) *I freak(ed) him not/didn't out.

(321) That stresses me right out.

(322) She freaks me right out.

In eastern Canadian English, at least, 321 and 322 are grammatical utterances (cf. 4.5), but right seems to be the only adverb allowed in this position\textsuperscript{5}.

Now let us turn our attention to the structure of the Chiac VPC. It generally takes the form of an English-based verb with AF inflectional morphology and an English-based particle (see 311-313). Object nominals can occur before or after the particle, as in:

\textsuperscript{5} There is some evidence that right out is an adverbial unit that likely emerged as a result of the frequent collocation of right and VPCs with the particle out.
(323) a. c’est le gouvernement qui screw tout up
   “it’s the government that screws everything up” (G-94)

b. c’est un homme qui screw up tout
   “it’s one man who screws up everything” (G-94)

Material (adverbs, negation) can come between the verb and the particle.

(324) les tcheezes... i fuck-ont juste around
   “tchezz... they just fuck around”

(325) je hang pas vraiment around avec mes parents
   “I don’t really hang around with my parents”

(326) si tu écouteriont la musique française là i te kick-eriont pas out
   “if you were to listen to French music they wouldn’t kick you out”

To show how the Chiac VPC emerged, I first posit a set of English and French-based constructions that these speakers would have and that form the basis of the Chiac VPC. I then show how, through processes of blending and schematization, the VPC might have emerged.

English speakers (including AF/English bilinguals) will have symbolic units such as:

a.i [[freak.INFL out] NML] as in:  He freaked out all his friends
a.ii [[freak.INFL NML] out]  He freaked all his friends out
b.i [[screw.INFL up] NML]  I screwed up my chances
b.ii [[screw.INFL NML] up]  I screwed my chances up

---

6 All corpus examples are mine unless they are followed by a letter-number combination in brackets. This refers to a group of speakers and page number in Perrot’s 1995 corpus.
b.iii \([\text{screw.INFL up}], \text{etc.}\) \(\quad I \text{screwed up}\)

From many examples such as this, we can infer the emergence (both for monolingual English speakers and Chiac speakers) of more schematic symbolic units, which will sanction novel instances of the VPC:

\[
c.i \quad \left[\left[\text{V}_E \text{ P}_E \right] \text{ NML}_E \right]^{7} \\
c.ii \quad \left[\left[\text{V}_E \text{ NML}_E \right] \text{ P}_E \right] \\
c.iii \quad \left[\text{V}_E \text{ P}_E \right] \quad \text{(cf. Langacker 1987: 475-480)}
\]

We can also posit an AF verb construction \([V_F]\) that Chiac and AF speakers will have. Chiac speakers, who have these French- and English-based constructions in their inventories, begin to blend them to create new schemas. For instance, \([V_F]\) blends with schemas such as a.i-ii and b.i-iii. The result is several new schemas such as:

\[
f. \quad \left[\left[\text{freak.INFL}_F \text{ out} \right] \text{ NML}\right]^{8} \\
g. \quad \left[\left[\text{screw.INFL}_F \text{ up} \right] \text{ NML}\right]
\]

Although most instances of the Chiac VPC can be accounted for in terms of blended schemas such as f. and g., there are some that cannot. The following, for example, differ from conventional English VPCs in more than just their verbal inflection.

---

\(^7\) For monolingual anglophones, it is unnecessary to specify the origin of the verb root, etc. For Chiac speakers, however, the origin of these elements must be specified since, although they have both French- and English-based units in their linguistic inventory, they will only use English ones in a VPC at this first stage.

\(^8\) "\text{INFL}_F" \text{ represents AF inflectional suffixes and is subsumed within the } [V_F] \text{ schema.}
(327)  on a com-é out second place
     "we came out in second place" (A-13)

(328)  j'ai jigg-é out as a matter of fact
     "I skipped class (jigged out?) as a matter of fact" (A-18)

In 327, the argument structure is different than that of English. *Second place* functions as a direct object here, whereas in English it would be part of an oblique – *in second place*.

In 328, *jigg-er out* is not a conventional verb particle combination. It seems to have formed from the Chiac verb *jigger* "to skip class" by analogy to other VPCs.

To account for these, we need to posit productive VPCs in Chiac, and thus a more abstract schema h. [[V_e INF_{f} P_e] NML]. This will account for the presence of English-based verb roots in the Chiac construction even if there is no equivalent VP combination in English.

In the examples we have seen thus far, the verb root has always been English-based. There are, however, a few occurrences where it is French-based:

(329)  les tchezzes sont des type de mecs qu'assaient de prendre over la organisation à l'école
     "thezz are the kind of guys who try to take over the organization of the school"

(330)  usually je me trouve sur la samedi soir, si qui y'a rien qui va on, en train, soit watch-er la TV...
     "usually I find myself on Saturday nights - if there's nothing going on – either watching TV …"
Such instances suggest the existence of an even more schematic unit where the source of
the verb root is left unspecified – i. [[V.INFLP E NML]]. This schema also allows for new
verb roots formed derivationally from non-verbs. Such is the case with example 331
below, since to normal/normal-er are not verbs in English, French or Chiac (it does not
occur in the corpus, at any rate). Given the construction above, normal-er out could be
derived from the adjectives normal/normale.

(331) trouve-tu pas que dans le grade dix j’étais weird? j’ai normal- é out
trouve-tu pas ?
“don’t you think I was weird in grade ten? I’ve normaied out (become
more normal) don’t you think?”

The Chiac VPC is probably the most extreme example of English influence on the verb
phrase. Nevertheless, it is simply another example of speakers manipulating the units in
their inventory and of the system itself changing over time as a result of that usage.

6.7. Conclusions

In Chapter 6 we have seen some of the ways in which Chiac verb phrase constructions
differ from those of AF and English. Given that change occurs more rapidly in the
lexicon than in a language’s syntax, it is not surprising that the Chiac verb phrase differs
from the AF verb phrase in ways that are often more subtle than the ways in which the
Chiac lexicon differs from that of AF. This subtlety is reflected, for example, in the
difference between AF and Chiac article usage in the predicate nominative construction,
and also with the degree of regularization of verb stems. There is, however, at least one
Chiac verb phrase construction that differs significantly from AF structure. This is the case with the verb particle construction, which seems not to occur in AF. This represents perhaps the most extreme influence of English on Chiac grammar.

The examination of the Chiac verb phrase marks the end of my examination of Chiac constructions and, essentially, the end of this thesis. The constructions treated in Chapters 4-6 have served as illustrations of the processes described in Chapter 3. They result from the grammaticalization of patterns of mixing – mixing that was (and continues to be) motivated by a desire to communicate a sense of identity distinct from that of other social groups in Moncton.
Chapter 7

Concluding Remarks

7.1 General Conclusions

It should now be clear what the Chiac speaker cited in Chapter 1 meant when he said "le chiac c'est pas un langue man, c'est nous aut' qui a inventé ça. C'est either que tu parles français c'est either que tu parles anglais". There are two relevant points to this assertion and these are the main themes of this thesis. One is the issue of Chiac speakers inventing their language. It was not a deliberate act of creation, of course, but Chiac speakers did use the units at their disposal in novel ways, ultimately leading to the emergence of a new system. Using the framework of Cognitive Grammar I have shown how this system emerged as a result of a number of social factors such as the age of speakers, their urban environment, their attitudes toward language and culture, etc. Speakers wanted to differentiate themselves from other social groups that they did not identify with (their parents, anglophones, etc.). Since they were (and still are) bilingual, young francophone Monctonians had the units of two or more languages at their disposal. By mixing these, their linguistic usage set them apart from other speech communities. Over time certain patterns of mixing became conventionalized and the resulting dialect, Chiac, unsurprisingly became a symbol of Chiac speakers' identity.

An advantage of the usage-based framework I used to model this process was that I was able to treat the Chiac speaker's linguistic system in the same way as the linguistic
systems of monolinguals. In fact, the way I have dealt with Chiac ultimately allows one to treat a dialect in the same way as a register of language without needing to posit special theoretical tools or formal devices unique to the bilingual linguistic system.

The second issue addressed in the quote that opened this dissertation is the issue of the status of Chiac as a language. Although this is not a controversial linguistic point, thanks in large part of Marie-Eve Pérot’s dissertation on Chiac, a main focus of this work was to show not only that Chiac is a dialect in its own right ("un langue"), but also how one can account for the emergence of particular constructions given the Chiac speaker’s linguistic system (i.e. an inventory of units from AF, English, SF, etc.). Again, we can do this in Chiac in the same way that we can account for language change in a monolingual linguistic system given the framework of Cognitive Grammar.

7.2 Further Research

This thesis has provided a number of analyses of Chiac constructions, some preliminary and others more comprehensive. Many of the latter were necessarily preliminary given the size of the corpus upon which my analyses were based. Only with additional tokens can more conclusive analyses be arrived at. Furthermore, certain potentially interesting constructions were omitted from consideration due to a lack of data. One further area of research is therefore to reexamine many of these constructions (and new ones) based on a much larger database. This would help shed light on, for example, whether the order of back with regard to the verb is more flexible in the future or not (see section 6.5), or
whether ordinals behave more like numeric quantifiers or like non-numeric quantifiers (see section 5.5). Additional data would help to determine to what degree the reflexive s'être (as described in section 4.3) is conventional and how it differs, both formally and functionally, from être. Similarly, more data would presumably allow for a better semantic analysis of about (as in 4.6): can it only be used to mean “at an imprecise location”?

Another direction for further research is to conduct fine-grained semantic analyses of particular Chiac constructions. I have examined the semantics of a few particular constructions (struggle, chill, regarder) whose meaning is clearly different in Chiac that in a related source language construction. There are many more such constructions, as well as others where the difference between the Chiac unit and the source language one may be more subtle. A good semantic analysis of these would be valuable. For this, again, a larger corpus is needed in addition, ideally, to elicitation.

With regard to the more theoretical goals of the thesis, further study might involve a detailed social and linguistic study of 30-50 year-old francophones in Moncton. Only with such data can we know the true nature of the dialect continuum in Moncton. Most data and literature involve the oldest and youngest segments of the population, so it is not clear where on the continuum the generation between these falls. Anecdotal evidence (my own conversations with people in this age group, allusions in the literature, etc.) suggests that the speech of this group is less anglicised than that of Chiac speakers, but
also has fewer traditional AF features than the speech of the oldest generation. A study of this group is needed in order to confirm this.

Finally, further research could involve a more in-depth look at the role of social factors on certain language structures (as opposed to the system as a whole). For example, I suggested in section 4.4 that there is a link between predicate adjectives and social identity. Specifically, predicate adjectives tend to encode evaluation, and evaluation is closely tied to one's sense of identity (as reflected in an association evaluative adjectives often develop to particular social groups – *groovy* to teenagers in the sixties, *awesome* to late twentieth century teens, etc). The result, for Chiac, is that predicate adjectives tend to be English-based. The relationship between identity and evaluation needs to be confirmed both for Chiac and for other languages.
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