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Since Chomsky and Halle (1968) made a proposal regarding phonological rules, a great deal has been learned concerning the position of phonology within generative grammar. According to Chomsky and Halle's original work (restated by Nespor and Vogel (1982)), "phonological rules apply to the linear surface structure of a sentence, that is, to the output of the syntactic rules" (p. 225). So, the phonological components were seen as independent of the syntactic components of a sentence. Since then, however, evidence has been found which suggests that there is a much closer relationship between syntax and phonology. This paper supports this claim and provides evidence for why it should be so.

There are many phonological rules, but the one I will be dealing with is known as an external sandhi rule. This type of rule alters the segmental phonology of words in a phrase and is a strictly local phenomenon. Rotenberg (1977) discusses sandhi, saying that it makes an adjacent word-final bundle of features influence or be influenced by a word-initial bundle (p. 1). Sandhi is the general term including any such phenomenon in any language. Liaison in French is one type of sandhi rule and is the phenomenon that this study investigates.

Liaison in French has been an extremely controversial subject for linguists throughout the past fifteen to twenty years. When and why it occurs seems at times to be almost completely arbitrary, but recent investigations by many prominent phonologists and syntacticians have shed more light on the subject. In this study I have collected data from native French speakers. The data will include reading tasks exhibiting various styles of speech in which
environments for so-called forbidden, optional, and obligatory liaison will appear. These reading tasks are taken mainly from a pilot study done by Ceil Kovac in 1979, but it will be augmented, using examples from Selkirk (1974, 1980), Morin and Kaye (1982), and myself. I have also recorded casual conversation in order to discover some differences in the contexts in which liaison occurs and the number of occurrences in careful versus casual conversation. I will compare the results of these findings to the predictions made about where liaison should occur by Selkirk, Kaisse (1985), Morin and Kaye, and others and then discuss what the data reveal and how the theories relate to the data.

Liaison has typically been defined as the phonological deletion of a consonant word finally or when it is followed by a vowel. Schane (1968) formalizes a rule of deletion which states that in word final position consonants are dropped before [+consonantal] segments when they are alone or at the end of a phrase. He notes that this deletion rule applies not only between words but between morphemes as well. For example:

petits / camarades (little friends).

Here the two final consonants of petits are dropped, not only the final s (p. 5). He separates liquids and glides from the other consonants and says that they are never dropped (p. 2). However, if one abides by these traditional rules, a multitude of exceptions results. Schane lists some of these phonological exceptions, e.g., /l/ is deleted after a high, back, unrounded vowel, (gentil) or /r/ is deleted after a low, mid front, unrounded vowel (quartier) (p. 11). He goes on to say that other restrictions are based on syntax. For example, there is liaison between an adjective and a
noun but not between a singular noun and an adjective that follows:

un savant^anglais (a learned Englishman)
un savant / anglais (an English scholar) (p. 12)

(Where "^" represents a context with liaison and "/" represents a context without liaison.) In the second example the final consonant is deleted although it is followed by a vowel. Schane then says that liaison is optional between a plural noun and a following adjective:

des camarades(^/)anglais (p.13).

It was brought to my attention that liaison may be optional in this case because of the consonantal d that precedes the final s sound. Because a [+consonantal] is already present it serves as the sound used in the liaison context:

/kamarad ägle/

(Jean Perkins, personal communication.)

So Schane rewrites his rule concerning word final consonants.

Delete a word final consonant:
1) obligatorily
   a) in phrase final position
   b) in singular nouns
2) optionally in a plural noun

There, however, seems to be no independent motivation for these generalizations and exceptions can still be found even to the revised rule. Schane notes that according to generative grammar, "the output of the syntactic component becomes the input to the phonological component" (p. 12). The syntax is necessary for determining phonological processes. One must find a closer relationship between phonology and syntax or else argue for either one or the other approaches. Schane does not concern himself with this in his discussion, but it seems necessary for a clearer
understanding of liaison.

Selkirk tries to devise a theory of liaison that is based on syntax alone. After looking at all the contexts where liaison does and does not occur, Selkirk formulates a rule which she summarizes by saying that liaison occurs when just one word boundary separates the two words in question. According to her, the occurrence of liaison is, therefore, syntactically-based (p. 579). The placement of word boundaries was originally laid out in Chomsky and Halle (1968) and Selkirk states it as follows:

"The boundary # is automatically inserted at the beginning and end of every string dominated by a major category, i.e. by one of the lexical categories "noun", "verb", "adjective", or by a category such as "sentence", "noun phrase", "verb phrase", which dominates a lexical category. (p. 577)

Therefore, she notes that nonlexical categories such as articles, complementizers, prepositions, and modals, do not have word boundaries (p. 577).

However, there are many exceptions to the rule that liaison occurs when one word boundary (#) separates two words. Other linguists, such as Napoli and Nespor (1979) and Nespor and Vogel (1982), argue against her claim. They argue in favor of a closer relationship between syntax and phonology based on data from Italian and an external sandhi rule called raddoppiamento sintattico (RS). This rule produces a phonetic lengthening of the initial consonant of a word:

Fa caldo (It's hot)

without RS    [fá kaldo]
with RS        [fá k:aldo] (p. 812)
They discovered that in Italian RS is sensitive to the left branch of a tree, a syntactic notion. However, the phonological rules must be able to distinguish between the right and left branches of trees (Napoli and Nespor, p. 812, Nespor and Vogel, p. 225).

Let us return to the primary phonological rule involved in liaison, one of final obstruent deletion. Selkirk states it as follows:

\[-\text{sonorants} \rightarrow \emptyset / \_\_\_ \{[+ \text{cons}]\}\] (p. 579).

That is, final consonants (obstruents) are dropped when the following word begins with a consonant. So, for example, the final $s$ of $des$ in $des$ pommes is not pronounced because $pommes$ begins with a consonant.

Selkirk makes use of another rule laid out by Chomsky and Halle which actually limits the number of word boundaries in a sequence. It eliminates "extra" word boundaries in a string of them in the S-Structure. This convention as well as the first rule of boundary insertion led to the hypothesis that two words in the SS may be separated by either zero, one, or two word boundaries (p. 578). (I am not going to further analyze this claim, but will accept it and use it as a basis for much of my discussion. For further discussion of the claim, see pp. 578-579.)

Selkirk defends her theory that liaison occurs when one word boundary separates the two words in question by a set of readjustment rules. She notes that in elevated speech, or lecture, there is sometimes liaison between words when there are double word boundaries. She, therefore, postulates a readjustment rule: "A head noun, verb, or adjective which is inflected may be in a liaison context with the word that follows if that word is in its
complement" (p. 581). (A complement is the sister of the noun, verb, or adjective in the syntactic tree.)

X-Comp Rule:

\[ x'[#Yx'[x[[-inflected#]xZ]x']x'] \]

This rule takes away the word boundary to the right of the head noun, verb, or adjective (p. 582). This means that anything in the complement to N within N' can be in a liaison context, including prepositional phrases, adjectives, verb phrases, or sentences. Selkirk gives the following examples:

- \( \text{deux voitures}^{\text{à deux chevaux}} \)
- \( \text{des endroits}^{\text{obscur}} \)

However, a plural noun, for example, will not be in a liaison context with an adjective not in its own complement. The phrase,

- \( \text{un marchand de draps}^{\text{anglais}} \)

has only one meaning, "a merchant of English sheets". However, the phrase,

- \( \text{un marchand de draps} / \text{anglais} \)

can have either the meaning, "a merchant of English sheets" or "an English merchant of sheets". The trees of the surface structures show the distinction:
The X-Comp Rule says that liaison can occur only in (1) because *anglais* is in the complement of *draps* (p. 582). Again, however, this readjustment rule seems ad hoc. That is, why should a word boundary, which is a syntactic entity, delete in a context that is essentially semantically conditioned? (It's semantic because *anglais* modifies *draps* in (1), while *anglais* modifies *marchand* in (2).) Selkirk says that the word in question may undergo liaison with a word that follows but it doesn't have to. And in my data I found examples of words that underwent liaison with words that followed and others that did not. But Selkirk then gives sample contexts where liaison should not occur and according to her X-Comp Rule:

Nothing outside an NP will be in liaison with something inside the NP:

*Donnez ces lunettes / à Marcel.*

There will be no liaison between a DO and a verbal complement or adverbial that follows:
Elle partageait ses bonbons / avec ses copines.
J'ai trouvé mes lunettes / à la mairie.

There will be no liaison between a plural subject and a verb:

Les gens / étaient fatigués. (p. 584)

My data agree with all of these predictions. No informants used liaison in any of these contexts and these data do not contradict her X-Comp Rule. That is, an inflected N, V, or A is not in liaison with a word that follows that is not in its complement. However, these data do not provide evidence to directly support her X-Comp Rule either, since the X-Comp Rule applies within an NP and not outside of it.

And Selkirk (1980) hasn't yet explained away all of the problems that her theory creates. One problem is that she found that no adverbs exhibit liaison with verbs in informal conversation:

ils ont facilement / avancé (p. 214).

This didn't occur at all in my sample of casual conversation. In fact, there was very little liaison at all in this type of conversation. Selkirk says that in casual conversation or what is called conversation familiale in French, anything that precedes a head noun within a noun phrase is always in a liaison environment. She says that this is true for determiners, quantifiers, and adjectives (des ennuis, grand amour), but is more restrictive for adjective phrases and verb phrases. Also, words ending in -ment are not in liaison with any word that follows:

extremement / amusante (p. 211).

This was true in my data not only in conversation familiale but also in lecture. However, one of my informants used liaison in the phrase
in lecture. Maybe this was a result of analogy or hyper-correction. Whatever the reason, it goes against Selkirk's rule. In addition, there is no independent motivation for her restrictions. She makes a distinction based on grammatical functions (GF) and not syntax, so she is consequently making a claim that isn't formalized within her theory.

On the other hand, liaison occurs between many adverbs and adjectives where Selkirk's rules do not predict it and she takes note of this and makes allowances. She says that certain adverbs are of a different class. Consider the following phrases:

très^incommode, bien^aimable, moins^utile.

Selkirk suggests that these adverbs are nonlexical items. That is, they are not members of an open class of lexical items (p.211) and they should therefore not receive word boundaries on either end. She says that this lexical/nonlexical distinction affects whether or not liaison will occur between two words. However, here again she is making her results fit with her theory. How does one decide which words are lexical and which are nonlexical? She suggests that there is also another kind of related distinction that is involved, a monosyllabic/polysyllabic distinction. For example, assez is in the same class as plus, moins, tres, etc. but there is no liaison between it and whatever follows and Selkirk says that this is because assez is polysyllabic (p. 212). She says that liaison can occur between a verb and a past participle, a pronoun and a verb, a preposition and a noun, or a verb and an adjective but this liaison only occurs when the first item is a nonlexical, monosyllabic item:
"Everything in an adjective phrase or a verb phrase that is in a basic liaison environment with what follows is a nonlexical item, a monosyllabic one... Those not in liaison are polysyllabic lexical and nonlexical" (p. 214). But the number of syllables is not a syntactic or semantic distinction and is therefore completely unrelated to whether or not an item is lexical or nonlexical. Some of my data do not agree with her postulations. Two of my informants did not use liaison between a verb and a past participle or a verb and an adjective even when the first item was in the putative nonlexical, monosyllabic class that Selkirk identified:

Il est / allé...
C'est / amusante.

Overall, however, monosyllabic items were in liaison with the word that followed much more often than polysyllabic items. In fact, several speakers had precisely those results—every monosyllabic item in this class followed by a word beginning with a vowel was in liaison with that word and no polysyllabic item was in liaison with what followed. I will return to an analysis of this observation later (See page 13).

Selkirk (1980) also finds some problems with her predictions, though different ones. According to her, these SPE conventions make the wrong predictions about polysyllabic nonlexical items. But she simply formulates another readjustment rule to make a distinction between monosyllabic and polysyllabic nonlexical items. Selkirk gives the following readjustment rule which adds a word boundary to polysyllabic items:

\[ [C_o \ V_C \ V_C \ X] \rightarrow [\#C_o \ V_C \ V_C \ X] \] (p. 218).
She defends this monosyllabic/polysyllabic distinction by saying that it actually is not so unusual. She notes that there is the same distinction in other languages. For example, monosyllabic nonlexical items undergo stress reduction in English, and in Italian, monosyllabic pronouns cliticize to the verb (p. 219). But her comparisons only show that the number of syllables is relevant to phonological rules. They do not show that the number of word boundaries correlates in any way to the number of syllables. The readjustment rule is unmotivated and this monosyllabic/polysyllabic distinction is simply not a syntactic distinction and therefore does not fit in with or support her theory. This is not to say that one should ignore these facts in the data, but only that Selkirk's rule, being syntactically based, is incorrect and one cannot take account of the monosyllabic/polysyllabic distinction in a principled way if a theory of liaison is to be based on syntax alone.

Selkirk notes that in conversation soignée an adverb that follows its modifier does not undergo liaison with what follows the adverb:

Il dépense extrêmement / en voyages
Elle allait fréquemment / à Paris (p. 231).

There was no liaison following adverbs that followed their modifiers for my informants in conversation soignée either.

In 1984 Selkirk presented another theory, still based on syntactic structure, that liaison is obligatory when there is at most one silent demibeat between the two words in question (p. 1007, Booij and de Jong). A demibeat is a position on the metrical grid of a sentence. She says that a silent demibeat is added at
the end of a metrical grid aligned with:

- a word
- a word that's head of a nonadjunct constituent
- a phrase
- a daughter phrase of S

Demibeats are not added after function words. However, I discovered from my recordings that this theory is not empirically supported and Booij and de Jong note that it is because in fast, informal speech the actual time value of the demibeats decreases and there is "less rhythmic disjuncture" in the phrases (p. 1008). Selkirk reanalyzes her claim and gives a readjustment rule in which she separates the analysis of optional liaison from that of obligatory liaison:

In such contexts [of optional liaison] liaison is no longer an essentially phonological phenomenon, but one being maintained by some rules that may be quite 'grammaticized' or 'syntacticized' and no longer reflect the processes of 'core phonology'. (1984) (p. 1008)

However, making such a distinction between phonological liaison and syntactic liaison based on the level of speech in which it occurs does not solve the problem because in my data there was evidence that liaison is optional for different speakers in all levels of speech and there is even variation within a given speaker's speech.

Love (1981) has doubts about the validity of Selkirk's readjustment rules because he says that "since then doubt has been raised whether universal theory should license analyses of this sort" (p. 399, Zonnevald). He cites Napoli and Nespor's (1979) counterarguments concerning RS as the most convincing.
Morin and Kaye (1982) raise some objections to Selkirk's optional domain theory. They said that there is liaison between an inflected head and its complement not only in formal speech, which is where Selkirk identified it, but also in casual conversation. However, I found no examples of this in my recordings of lecture or conversation familière. They found that it also occurs between two complements:

des attaques nucleaires américaines

and also between an inflected head and a non-complement:

Ils réfléchissent avant de répondre.

Although I found no evidence of liaison contexts such as these in my data, Morin and Kaye did find some in their research. The apparent rarity of such examples, however, shows why Selkirk found evidence to devise her theory and suggests that her claim may be the most commonly found; Morin and Kaye's counterexamples being rare exceptions. Finally Morin and Kaye noted that liaison applies more frequently to a verb in the third person than to a verb in the first person and it also applies more frequently when the head is a verb instead of a noun (p. 1011, Booij and de Jong). According to my data, liaison did occur with verbs in the third person, but it also almost never occurred with first person plural verbs or first person singular verbs preceded by a pronoun. And this is an interesting observation. Maybe theorists have been on the wrong track all along if something such as the discourse factor of what person the subject is can affect whether liaison occurs or not. Perhaps, as was suggested by Selkirk's monosyllabic/polysyllabic distinction, it has to do with the length of the word. Most of the contexts in which liaison did not occur were one-syllable verbs
followed by prepositions. Other evidence is given below.

One may wonder why one informant said,

\begin{quote}
Je la mets / en haut.
Je les vois / à la gare.
\end{quote}

but

\begin{quote}
Je vois au supermarché...
\end{quote}

The constructions are identical except that a pronoun precedes the verb in the first two sentences. Perhaps this pronoun/verb combination is regarded as a single entity in the lexicon and therefore liaison does not follow. However, in the shorter, monosyllabic words, liaison occurs with the preposition that follows. Most first person plural verbs have more syllables than the verbs of the other persons and consequently liaison would not occur following most first person plural verbs. Consider also the following data:

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\textbf{1} & \textbf{2} \\
certains\^obstacles, & tapisseries/anciennes \\
murs\^étroits & collections/immenses \\
noms\^amusants & \textbf{but} oeuvres/exquises \\
fenêtres\^ouvertes & \\
\textbf{but} artisans\^anciens & \\
\end{tabular}

Liaison is used in all of the examples in column 1, in which the first words are generally short words, and not in the examples in column 2, in which the first words are longer words. This seems to be more evidence that the number of syllables in the word preceding the projected liaison context helps to determine if liaison will occur. However, these examples do not support the theory completely. For example, artisans contains three syllables, but
undergoes liaison with anciens, and oeuvres contains only one syllable, yet it undergoes liaison with exquises. However, if a speaker uses liaison between oeuvres and a word that follows, oeuvres becomes two syllables. This type of word, ending in a uvular r, seems to create a problem for liaison. French speakers are not sure whether liaison is to be used with this type of noun because the number of syllables changes depending on whether liaison is involved. For example, one speaker used liaison between fenêtres and the following adjective. Fenêtres pronounced alone contains only two syllables, so, according to my theory, a speaker would use liaison. But when fenêtres is placed in a liaison context, another syllable is pronounced and the word becomes three syllables. Thus, these words may be exceptional and therefore do not contradict the hypothesis concerning word length. Several speakers still used liaison in all of these examples, but for the other speakers there seemed to be a definite tendency to use liaison more often with short words than with long words. In addition, the fact that adverbs ending in -ment are not normally in liaison with what follows would be further evidence that the length of the words is related to liaison because this type of adverb is usually several syllables long.

I propose that there is a closer relationship between syntax and phonology, as suggested by Napoli and Nespor, and Nespor and Vogel. Selkirk's analysis was inconsistent because the monosyllabic/polysyllabic distinction is not a syntactic distinction, so it interfered with her theory instead of supporting it. However, by proposing a theory more closely related to phonology, one can incorporate her generalization as well as the
ones discussed above.

In 1981 Selkirk did another study in which she had liaison contexts after prenominal adjectives such as le sot enfant and mon idiot ami. But Morin says that the data from the study as well as from several others is based on monitored interviews in which the informant is required to make unnatural constructions (p. 827). The purpose of these studies is to record data as it is actually spoken, not to construct unnatural utterances. Morin says that his informants found that such constructions were "utterly ridiculous and that no one could say that" and even if they could say it, they didn't always use liaison (p. 827, Morin). So, he concludes that there don't appear to be any internalized rules about new liaison contexts from such constructions (p. 828). All of my informants said that they would never use such constructions. They said that they were either poetic and cute or just not said at all. So Morin must be correct in saying that there are no internalized rules about constructions such as these and they should not be used as evidence in a theory of liaison.

Other theorists have proposed various analyses of liaison. Schane (1968) has a theory that French strives for a CVCVCV pattern and liaison occurs to make this pattern happen (p. 397, Zonnevald). However, my data gave very little evidence to support this claim.

Kaisse (1985) has a simple rule about liaison that says that it occurs between a and b where b is in the c-command domain of a:

\[ \text{Il est très intelligent et modeste.} \]

where he is very intelligent and he is also modest (with no superlative).

\[ \text{Il est très / intelligent et modeste.} \]
where he is both very intelligent and very modest. The trees of the structures show the distinction:

But Morin (1987) says this difference is related to a pause, not to the syntactic construction because "As is well known, liaison is less frequent after a pause, particularly when it's deliberate" (p. 829). He suggests that you wouldn't hear such a distinction based on meaning in natural speech. He also gives numerous other examples that show why such a general theory of c-command cannot be made from only the above evidence (see pp. 828-830 for further explanation and examples).

Morin does further research based on Selkirk's 1981 research in which she gives examples of speakers saying

allons nous à la gare

but

songent ils / à partir
and she says that these are examples of "false liaisons". Morin
doesn't find this very satisfying and neither do I (p. 835). In
addition, in my data there was no evidence of liaison in either
context, so I have no further examples to study.

It is obvious that the current theories of liaison do not
adequately account for all of the restrictions on the domain of
liaison. The original theories simply listed the contexts in which
"obligatory", "optional" and "forbidden" liaison was to take place
or gave such vague rules as "liaison takes place only between words
closely connected in thought" (Varney, p. 127). However,
contradictions of all of these rules were found in normal French
speech, so the list of exceptions began to grow and no one seemed
to be able to account for the apparent arbitrariness of liaison's
occurrence. Selkirk was the first to devise a purely syntactic
theory for liaison, but it seems clear that her theories as well as
Kaisse's, Schane's, etc. are also inadequate as they seem to place
an arbitrary distinction on language between phonological liaison
and syntactic liaison.

Native French speakers themselves are also confused about
liaison. All of my informants said that after reading the prepared
lists they were very conscious of the liaison, though, of course,
they hadn't been told that that was the purpose of the study. They
said they often didn't know what to do and they could have either
used liaison or left it out. There was variation within the
individual's speech as well. One informant said c'est^amusante
using liaison and several seconds later she said c'est/amusante
without liaison. Many studies have shown that liaison is also
contingent upon social class--it occurs much more frequently among
higher social classes. (See Verluyten and Hendrickx (1987).)

However, it is becoming much more acceptable to use less liaison, regardless of social class. One of my informants said she had lived in Paris for ten years and she had noticed that liaison was used much less there than in other parts of the country, even among the upper class. Of course, schools have long been encouraging the use of liaison and my informants said they used to be continually reprimanded while growing up by their teachers and older relatives for not using liaison between words, and today liaison is still used much more by older speakers. Verluyten and Hendrickx's (1987) study takes into account the question of age and proves that it is most definitely an influential factor. (It would be a fascinating study to listen to pre-school children's speech and see in what cases they keep liaison and in what cases they drop it. Maybe this would give us more of a sense of non-prescriptive use of liaison.)

In this study, I have elaborated on a suggestion made by Selkirk of when liaison tends to occur (that is, it occurs more often following shorter words), but it seems that we may never get much further than finding places where liaison usually occurs, or tends to occur, or occurs under certain circumstances. However, all of this is not to say that any further research is in vain. Every study opens up new doors in linguistics and of course the research must continue, as it will give answers not only for the question of liaison but also for linguistics in general.
Reading List
Informants are labelled a, b, and c and the contexts in which they used liaison are followed by the letter of the informant. If no letters precede, no one used liaison.

Reading Task
Votre ami m'a parlé du jour quand vous êtes allés (a) ensemble aux musées orientaux près de Saint-Jean. J'y suis allé (abc) aussi, il y a cinq ou six ans. On y voit encore (c) des collections immenses (b) de vases chinois et sur les murs amples (ab) se trouvent encore (bc) des tapisseries anciennes (bc). A travers les fenêtres ouvertes (abc), on voit l'obélisque égyptien. Après avoir visité le musée, les touristes sortent assez lentement et achètent des glaces qu'ils mangent en se promenant. En tout cas, votre ami m'a dit que vous avez été enchanté par les miniatures en ivoire que les artisans adroits sculpaient excellemment. Ces miniatures, œuvres exquises (c), portent encore la signature des artisans anciens (a). Il paraît que vous vous êtes allés après avoir admiré les anciens parchemins qui se trouvent assez (bc) près des miniatures.

(Not underlined in the text given to the informants)

Informant a used liaison in 33 1/3% of the cases.
Informant b used liaison in 50% of the cases.
Informant c used liaison in 50% of the cases.

Phrase List

abc 1. vous fûtes*arrivés
ab 2. les enfants*heureux
bc 3. il avait*attendu
abc 4. ils sortent*encore*

abc 13. vous êtes*arrivés
abc 14. il vit*encore

bc 16. elle sait*uniquement

15. la cent huitième**
5. un plan excellent

6. nous vîmes assez

7. il pleut encore

8. en Amérique

9. des actes historique

10. les murs étroits

11. des noms amusants

12. en onze jours

abc 17. aux États-Unis

b 18. ils tiennent énormément

19. un enfant atroce

ab 20. des soldats allemands

21. des idées compliquées

22. les violettes ouvertes

23. des ponts larges

24. les fenêtres étroites

for bold-numbered items, Kovac says liaison is forbidden

for italicized items, Kovac says liaison is obligatory

(not marked as such in the list given to informants)

* This is not a good test item because there is already a t sound so you don't know if there is liaison or not.

** This is an example that concerns the h-aspiré which I don't investigate in this study.

**Careful Speech

to elicit plural noun plus adjective:

*Comment décrivez-vous les étudiants à Swarthmore... c'est-à-dire, il y a des étudiants américains, et puis...?

*Décrivez-vous les fruits et les légumes que vous voyez au supermarché...

*Décrivez-vous les chemises (styles et couleurs) que vous voyez dans un grand magasin.

*Si vous marchez dans la rue, vous voyez des voitures... Décrivez les voitures (styles et couleurs).


to elicit verb plus past participle and verb plus adverb:

*Quel est le dernier film que vous avez vu... Pouvez-vous décrire ce qui s'est passé dans le film?

*Décrit ce que vous avez fait la semaine dernière. (p. 154)

verb plus past participle (first versus third person and monosyllabic versus polysyllabic):
Jean est allé à la gare.
Vous avez étonné votre frère.
Les couverts sont au dessous, Anne.
Les spaghettis était fait par Anne.
Les boîtes sont ouvertes.
Il dépense extrêmement en voyage.
Elle allait fréquemment à Paris.

Selkirk's examples of non-liaison contexts:
Donnez ces lunettes à Marcel.
Elle partageait ses bonbons avec ses copines.
J'ai trouvé mes lunettes à la mairie.
Les gens étaient fatigués.
Ils ont facilement avancé.

verb plus adverb (first person versus third person,
inflected head and non-complement):
Ils réfléchissent avant de répondre.
Il réfléchit avant de répondre.
Ils le disent avant de partir.
Il le dit avant de partir.
Elle pleuraient avant qu'il soit parti.

Selkirk's examples:
Allons-nous à la gare?
Songent-ils à partir?

Singular nouns followed by adjectives:
Donne un bonbon orange à Eloise.
Elle m'a donné un sachet ouvert.

First versus third person distinction:
Ils mangent à 2h.
Il aimait être pris au sérieux.
Nous les voyons au supermarché.
Je les vois à la gare.
Elles courent aux arbres.
Jean et Claude pensent à nous.
David et moi pensons à vous.
Marie la voyait au supermarché.
Je la mets en haut.
Claire et moi voulons une auto.
Elle court aux fleurs.
Je veux une pomme.

Selkirk's examples:
le sot enfant
mon idiot ami
des ennuis
grand amour
extrêmement amusante
un marchand de draps anglais
des attaques nucleaires américaines
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