

Reciprocal Connection in French

Pascal Montchaud

Abstract

Discourse correlations show a reciprocal relation of projection and of presupposition between two segments that are otherwise independent. The connection is said to be marked with reciprocal connectives (RCs). These have three functions: (i) fulfilling the expectation, or carrying the presupposition, opened and required, respectively, by the other RC; (ii) categorizing and delineating a sequence as a member of a whole; (iii) conveying a relation between the members. 100+ authentic examples of correlations in French showing either *d'une part* 'on the one hand', or *non seulement* 'not only', and containing a second member with no connective are analyzed. The results indicate that different features can assume the functions attributed to the RCs. Furthermore, they show that these functions are intricately. Finally, I conclude that the reciprocal connection can be marked through many processes, and that reciprocal connectives are, rather than a process of marking the structure, a process to emphasize its components.

Keywords: *connectives, correlation, discourse, French, syntax*

1. Introduction

Linguistic correlation is a phenomenon widespread in many Indo-European languages. Linguists studying French have focused mainly on sentences where an adverb or a conjunction is used twice. Savelli (1993) called them *constructions siamoises* (conjoined constructions), and Roig (2013) *corrélatives isomorphes* (isomorphic correlatives). Apart from the frequently quoted article by Turco and Coltier (1988), the works of Schnedecker (1998: 2006), Schnedecker and Bras (2011), and the dissertation of Svensson (2010), little work has been done in the field of correlation in discourse, or on reciprocal connectives (RCs). Although data shows that correlations where the second connective is not the one normatively co-occurring, or is simply lacking, are common, these works only tend to account for regular structures (i.e. where e.g. *d'autre part*¹ 'on the other hand' follows *d'une part* 'on the one hand', or where *mais aussi* 'but also' follows *non seulement* 'not only'). This is the case with

* This research is funded by the Swiss National Fund for Scientific Research (SNF) through the project «Marqueurs corrélatifs entre syntaxe et discours» ('Correlative Markers Between Syntax and Discourse'; no 100012_146773). It is supervised by Emeritus Professor M.-J. Béguelin.

¹ Notice that, in French, two different markers can follow *d'une part*: *d'autre part* (with the zero article, *lit.* 'from other part') and *de l'autre* (with the definite article, *lit.* 'from the other').

Svensson (2010: 20),² who states that “the presence of both elements is the main criterion for identifying correlative markers”, in line with Turco and Coltier (1988: 69), who consider that *d'une part* not followed by *d'autre part* is “uncooperative, [and] is of questionable acceptability”.

That is the reason why I will focus on discourse correlation, and more specifically on occurrences where the reciprocal connective in the projected member fails to appear. This paper intends to demonstrate that several processes work together to mark the structures, and that reciprocal connectives are just one way, among others, to achieve this goal. Thus, I will assume that reciprocal connectives are optional markers, and when present they act as a process to outline the correlation's components.

2. Framework

This study adopts a framework developed by Berrendonner and Béguelin (1989, 1996, 1997), Berrendonner (1990, 1993, 2002, 2003), Béguelin (2000, 2002), and Groupe de Fribourg (2012), where it is assumed that speech is a multi-layered structure.

2.1. A theory of linguistic units

It is believed that language is structured in separate but overlapping levels of unit combinations, which Martinet (1967: 13) called “articulations of language”. Following this author, Groupe de Fribourg (2012: 26-27) characterize these levels with four features:

- (i) a particular *function* involved in the general economy of language;
- (ii) a set of *minimal units* (of form but not of substance);
- (iii) a group of specific *assembly rules* that allow minimal units to combine to compose non-minimal units of the same function; and
- (iv) a range of *maximal units* that play the role of an upper boundary in the relevant level of speech unit combination.

Given these features, it is possible to draft a theory of linguistic units composed of three speech levels, or articulations.

² The quote is my translation from a work originally in French. In order to make the text clearer, only original quotes will be referenced; a quote without a reference is translated from French.

Table 1. *Features of discourse articulations according to Groupe de Fribourg (2012)*

	Function	Ground Units	Assembly Rules	Upper Units
First Articulation	Distinctive	Phonemes	Phonemes combination rules specific to each language	Syllables
Second Articulation	Significant	Morphemes	Government, or rection ³	Clauses, utterances
Third Articulation	Communicative	Actions	Heterogeneous and praxeological syntax (“pragma-syntax”)	Intonational units, i.e. a program of actions ending with a final pitch contour

2.2. Integrative relations

According to Groupe de Fribourg (2012: 26-27), the relation between ground units and upper units within a single articulation is *compositional*, i.e. the whole is the sum of its parts (like a clause is the sum of the morphemes that it is composed of). But from the upper unit of a given articulation to the ground unit of the upper articulation, the relation is that of *incorporation*, because they have different functions. Thus, speech is to be conceptualized as a *multi-layered structure, separated by functional thresholds*, and not as a continuum of units that include each other (cf. *ibid.*: 37). A morpheme is certainly “made” of syllables; but a morpheme is something different from a syllable, because it has a meaning, while a syllable only has a distinctive property. Therefore, a morpheme cannot be analyzed within the same framework as a syllable. Each level of description demands its own tools of analysis, in accordance with its function and with its specific assembly rules.

2.3. Dependency grammar and discourse syntax

The second articulation will be called *syntax* (understood as dependency grammar), and the third articulation *discourse syntax*⁴. The model, as presented in Table 1, is restricted to three articulations. But speech has more than three levels of unit combinations. That is why at least one articulation should be added. This fourth articulation, which would have an *interactive* function, is still to be characterized. I suggest the use of notions provided by *conversation analysis*, also called *interactional grammar* (Ochs, Schegloff and Thompson 1996). This approach insists on the emergent and adaptive nature (Hopper 1987, 2011) of the linguistic system. The question that needs to be asked is: how can this framework account for correlation?

³ As understood in the sense of Groupe de Fribourg (2012), in line with Hjelmslev (1968), according to whom the various dependency links existing within the upper unit of the second articulation may be reduced to a single basic relationship, called rection, i.e. the implication between occurrences. Formally, it is defined as follows: A governs B if the occurrence of B implies, on logical grounds, the occurrence of A.

⁴ The dichotomy between dependency grammar and discourse syntax is also known as the distinction between micro-syntax versus macro-syntax.

3. Linguistic correlation

Broadly defined, linguistic correlation is an *interdependent relationship* between two members of varying size. A member can be a phrase, a clause, or an utterance, and may span over larger discourse sections. There are (at least) two types of linguistic correlations, according to the theory of units presented above: grammatical, and discourse correlations (respectively 2nd and 3rd articulations).

3.1. Grammatical correlation

In dependency grammar, correlation is a bilateral relation of implication between two “parts”, segment A and segment B, where A *cannot occur without* B, and where B *cannot occur without* A. Both members are thus required so that the utterance has a complete meaning and an achieved syntactic structure. Example (1) shows a typical reciprocal grammatical dependency of this kind in French.

- (1) **Plus** il court vite, **plus** il va loin.
 more he runs fast, more he goes far
 ‘The faster he runs, the further he goes.’

The phenomenon already existed in ancient languages, such as Latin and Greek. According to Latin experts, like Fruyt (2004, 2005), the correlative scheme in Latin gave birth to subordination in French. Nowadays, correlation is still present in many Indo-European languages, such as Russian (2), English (see (1) above), German (3), and Italian (4). In these languages, grammatical correlation always has to do with a couple of parts being implicated one with another.

- (2) Позвонил **тогда, когда** я меньше всего этого ждала. (Inkova 2013: ex. 3)
 phone-SG.M.PAST **then, when** I less all that-GEN expect-SG.F.PAST
 ‘He called me when I least expected it.’
- (3) Haben Sie schon mal **darüber** nachgedacht, **dass** Enttäuschung immer etwas
 have you already time **about that** thought, **that** disappointment always something
 mit unseren Erwartungen zu tun hat? (web)
 with our expectations to do has?
 ‘Have you ever thought that disappointment has always something to do with our expectations?’
- (4) Ho un sogno **così** grande **che** non entra in un cassetto. (web)
 have-1PS a dream **so** big **that** NEG enters in a drawer
 ‘I have a dream so big that it doesn’t fit in a drawer.’

But, what exactly are these correlated “parts”? The answer largely depends on whom you ask. Within the field of French linguistics, some linguists (like Allaire 1982; Savelli 1993; Roig 2013; or Mouret 2005, 2013) argue that the reciprocal relation applies to adverbs or conjunctions such as those highlighted in bold in examples (1)-(4), considering that these devices are “grammatical markers that come into contextual dependency relationship in order

to establish formal links of complementarity between words” (Allaire 1982: 23). On the other hand, some authors (Deulofeu 2007; Benzitoun and Sabio 2010; Gachet 2013; Corminboeuf 2013a, 2013b) support the view that grammatical dependencies are not necessarily marked within the morphological structure. Thus, they take the propositional content to be the correlated members. As stated by Benzitoun and Sabio (2010: 10), these are the “verbal constructions [that are] in a bilateral implication relationship”.

The latter claim turns to a radical semantic conception of correlation, moving the mutual relation from a morpho-syntactic to a purely semantic ground. According to this model, correlation exists as a semantic pattern, expressing “different types of logical relations, for example opposition, concurrence, co-variation or also implication” (Inkova and Hadermann 2013: 7). This pattern can be marked not only through morphology, but also by means of lexical or prosodic features. Corminboeuf (2013b) gives examples of correlative sentences where the standard correlation scheme is marked by means of an accentual prominence on the adjective (5), which occurs instead of the morphological outlined equivalent (6).

- (5) *on a fait deux cents litres de jus de pomme + mais alors il est SUCRÉ⁵ qu'on doit mettre de l'eau avec*
 (spoken, Corminboeuf 2013b: ex. 14)
 ‘we made two hundred liters of apple juice + but then it is SWEET **that** we must put water with’
- (6) *il est si sucré qu'on doit mettre de l'eau avec* (modified example)
 ‘it is **so** sweet **that** we must put water with’

This example supports the idea that prosodic features, such as an accentual prominence, may substitute for the morphological marking of grammatical relations.

3.2. Discourse correlation

At the discourse level, an interdependent relation is achieved through pragmatic means regarding projection and presupposition. It is commonly assumed (Svensson 2010; Corminboeuf 2013a; Turco and Coltier 1988) that “opening” connectives like *on the one hand* or *at first sight* project a “next step” to be performed afterwards. As Turco and Coltier (1988: 68) mention: “the mere presence of *d'une part* implies the existence of another correlated item”. The utterance of the projected sequence fulfills the expectation previously opened, while this one signals its relation to the first with a marking device presupposing the utterance of a previous part (see § 4 below). When they occur, “closing” or “relay” connectives such as *on the other hand*, *at second sight* or *but looking more carefully* are intended to play this role.

Thus, in discourse syntax, correlation is a reciprocal connection which stands between sequence A and sequence B, where A *projects* the utterance of B and where B *presupposes* the utterance of A. Both of these notions demand a brief explanation of how they are conceived within the adopted framework.

The concept of projection comes from conversation analysis and is defined as follows:

⁵ Capital letters indicate a pitch or an intensity accent.

The fact that an individual action or part of it foreshadows another. In order to understand what is projected, interactants need some kind of knowledge about how actions (or action components) are typically (i.e., qua types) sequenced, i.e. how they follow each other in time.

(Auer 2002: 1, original quote)

In discourse syntax, “projection” is known as *expectation*, and the notion of expectation springs from that of *prerequisite*.

Considering two communicative actions, simple or complex, A_1 and A_2 , as the latter can only be executed if the first was previously accomplished. [...] We will assume, then, that A_1 is a *prerequisite* (or is necessary on a logical ground) to A_2 .

(Groupe de Fribourg 2012: 132)

A typical case is illustrated by example (7).

(7) [‘The man with the red cap,’]₁[**his** name’s Alan Hollinghurst.’]₂ (invented example)

Sequence 1 is a noun phrase (NP), standing as an autonomous utterance. The goal of this communicative action is to increase shared knowledge with an under-specified “discourse object”. Sequence 2 is a predicate construction, which provides an attribute to this object. The latter sequence contains a possessive article (in bold), whose interpretation requires the previous action in order to be relevant. Namely, *his name* stands for *the name of X*, where the referent of X is to be found in the previous utterance. That is why sequence 1 is called a *prerequisite* of sequence 2. Indeed, the operation of introducing (or of reactivating) an object in mutual knowledge “is a logical prerequisite for the very possibility of attaching attributes” to this object (*ibid.*). Consequently,

if an action A_1 is achieved, and is (in general, *per se*) a prerequisite to the execution of another action A_2 , then we can conclude that A_2 is likely to occur. [...] Whenever such a reasoning is feasible, we will say that A_1 creates the *expectation* of A_2 .

(*op. cit.*: 134)

The notion of expectation is thus nothing more than predictability of a logical nature, whose success depends on the reliability of abductive reasoning based on the notion of the prerequisite. In this sense, it differs from projection, as this notion is defined in relation to the knowledge of the way actions are generally sequenced. In short, the notion of projection is founded on habits, while the concept of expectation is based on logic.

Regarding presuppositions, I consider that they are “what is taken by the speaker to be the common ground of the participants in the conversation, what is treated as their common knowledge or mutual knowledge” (Stalnaker 1999: 83, original quote). This classic conception was reworded by Groupe de Fribourg (2012: 88) as follows: “a linguistic signifié S presupposes the discourse object O if the utterance of S implies the presence of O in the discourse memory”.⁶ This definition assumes a distinction between *presuppositions* and *presupposing terms*. The former is an element of discourse memory, and, as such, is already validated by the

⁶ A *discourse object* is a “cognitive referent”, while *discourse memory* corresponds to mutual knowledge shared by the speakers. Discourse memory consists of discourse objects.

interaction partners; the latter is a content unit, and is therefore of a linguistic nature (a sign). This view opposes the theory stating that presuppositions are part of the semantic content of language units (see e.g. Ducrot 1972).

But back on topic. We may define discourse correlation as a play of projection and of presupposition between two grammatically independent sequences. In example (8) below, when *non seulement* ‘not only’ appears, one expects the utterance of a second statement. This second statement is introduced by the connective *mais* ‘but’, which presupposes the execution of a previous utterance.

- (8) *il est certain que + + par exemple dans notre classe de de première y avait une fille qui était fiancée et bien + non seulement on l’enviait pas mais + on considérait qu’elle était vraiment + que c’était vraiment une catastrophe* (CFPP, 07-05, 1178”-1226”)
 ‘it is certain that + + for example in our first grade class there was a girl who was engaged and well + **not only** we didn’t envy her **but** + we thought that she was really + that this was really a disaster’

The main features of discourse correlations are the theme, the introductory device, the members and the reciprocal connectives.

The *theme* – the term is borrowed from Adam and Revaz (1989) – is a whole (a paradigm) that gathers both members together under a property that they share with each other, and also with the theme. There is always a theme, though it is often implied. It must therefore be drawn out from the context. It is crucial to understand that the theme is not a segment of the text itself, but an “object”, of a cognitive nature, belonging to the *common ground of the participants* (see note 6). For our convenience, I will henceforth put them into words (between angle brackets), but the reader should keep in mind that these statements are only representations of cognitive objects. Therefore, they should not be taken for anything else than a verbal expression of a piece of mutual knowledge.

The *introductory device*, which is optional, is an explicit announcement of the two-item list to follow. It often appears as a predication of existence containing an NP determined with a numeral, and announcing the list to follow. Typical examples are *there are two things*, or *I will make two / a double + N* (e.g. *comment(s), remark(s)*, etc.). As Svensson (2010: 109) states, “the introducer can also evoke a division or an opposition, e.g. *division, difference, opposition*”, or *contradiction, distinction, etc.*, and their verbal equivalents: *divide, differ, oppose, contradict, distinguish*, etc. Because the introductory device generally does not convey much meaning, it projects the achievement of a development, which ensures its relevance within shared knowledge. Informing participants about the nature and the number of items to follow are the two main characteristics of such devices.

On theoretical grounds, the distinction made here between *theme* and *introductory device* is of some importance, given that it is most often overlooked in works dealing with correlation or enumeration. Turco and Coltier (1988: 68) use the term “announcements” (*Fr. Phénomènes d’annonce*) in connection with the fact that “components to be considered are explicitly announced” (*ibid.*). Also, Svensson (2010: 108) mixes up both of them in a single concept: “the correlated series [...] is often preceded by an introducer which announces two or more phenomena, or a division”. For their part, Rebeyrolle and Péry-Woodley (2014: 3188) propose two types of introductory devices, called *primers* (*Fr. Amorce*). According to them, there are,

firstly, “*predictive primers*, which have realization features that engage the writer in a listing process, in triggering in the reader a strong expectation of an enumeration. Secondly, *primers-announcements*, where the predictive aspect is absent, but which express, or allow to infer, [...] the implied criterion gathering the items together”. All in all, these three ideas only account for the text segment foreshadowing the list to follow, while I suggest that the theme and the introductory device should be distinguished on the basis of their ontological status. Indeed, the introductory device is a linguistic sign, while the theme belongs to discourse memory. This difference is about the same as that, described above, between presupposing terms and presuppositions.

The *members* are discourse units (actions, turn units), which constitute the whole expressed in the theme. Semantically, each of them belongs to the same category – or paradigm. The two items can, or cannot, be ordered, as they can, or cannot, be hierarchized. Different relations can occur between them: accumulation (unmarked case), opposition, addition, concession, and so on. The relation between the members is distinct from the relation between the whole and its parts, though the former has something to do with the latter, and *vice versa*. Schiffrin (2006: 163, original quote) states that “although lists can present a set of taxonomic categories in which each entity is an example of the class through which it is known, they can also present more *ad hoc* collections (Barsalou 1983) or schematic knowledge in which each entity is known through its participation or place in a collection”. That is to say, in accordance with Rebeyrolle and Péry-Woodley (2014: 3194), “while categorization stands as the primary function of enumerative structures, it is far from expressing existing classifications only. The diversity of examples [...] leads us to assert, on the contrary, that it is rather used to “construct” relevant categories for the scriptor’s speech”.

Finally, *reciprocal connectives* (RCs) are generally said to be the “morphological expression” of the reciprocal relation (Svensson 2010; Turco and Coltier 1988, *inter alia*). RCs connect one member with the other. According to Turco and Coltier (1988), they have a double function in the economy of speech. Namely, they act as “packing” and “guiding” devices. Turco and Coltier use the term *packing* with relation to the fact that an RC generally allows us to “mark the boundaries of the constituents that are to be integrated in a single motion” (*op. cit.*: 63), i.e. RCs pack utterances together to form a higher range unit.⁷ What they call *guiding* has to do with the fact that RCs “provide instructions – indications of anticipation or of feedback – that allow the processing of information of a non-sequential nature” (*op. cit.*: 71). In other words, RCs are used to guide, and therefore to facilitate, the interpretation.

Here is an example of a typical discourse correlation, illustrating the notions just described.

- (9) *Cela dit, la question du cancer se présente d'une double manière: d'une part*[c'est une maladie du corps, dont il est bien probable que je mourrai prochainement, mais peut-être aussi puis-je la vaincre et survivre ;]_{M1}*d'autre part*, [c'est une maladie de l'âme, dont je ne puis dire qu'une chose : c'est une chance qu'elle se soit enfin déclarée.]_{M2} (E. Carrère, *D'autres vies que la mienne*, 2009: 139, frantext)

⁷ Members can span large discourse sections. See example (12) below for a Turn Unit large member.

‘That being said, the matter of cancer shows a double sided face: **on the one hand** [it is a physical disease that I will probably soon die of, though I could just as well survive it;]_{M1} **on the other hand**, [it is a spiritual disease, on which I can only say one thing: it is a chance that it eventually broke out.]_{M2}’

In example (9), the theme could be paraphrased in these words: <*the double nature of cancer*>. Introducing the correlation, the statement *la question du cancer se présente d’une double manière* ‘the matter of cancer shows a double sided face’ (*lit.* ‘the question of cancer itself presents from a double way’) is a predication of existence, which contains a stative verb, *se présenter* ‘show’ (*lit.* ‘present itself’), which governs a manner complement, the prepositional phrase (PreP) *d’une double manière* ‘a double sided face’ (*lit.* ‘from a double way’). This statement, and more accurately the NP *une double manière* ‘a double sided face’ (*lit.* ‘a double way’), acts as the introductory device. It announces two “things” about cancer that the writer is about to develop in the correlation. Each member states one aspect of the theme (*maladie du corps* versus *maladie de l’âme* – ‘physical disease’ versus ‘spiritual disease’). The RCs, namely *d’une part* and *d’autre part* ‘on the one hand’ and ‘on the other hand’, delineate each member by being placed before the first and second members respectively. The relation between the first member and the second member is one of accumulation (the whole consists of both members) and of opposition (they share one property but they differ in another).

3.3. Methodology

This paper presents corpus-based research, and more specifically a corpus-illustrated study, based on authentic data of spoken and written French. Three databases were investigated, and the data search was focused on two markers, namely *d’une part* ‘on the one hand’ and *non seulement* ‘not only’. Results were sorted so that only occurrences where the second member was *not* marked with a reciprocal connective were selected. I proceeded as follows.

Spoken data was taken from OFROM (*Corpus Oral de Français parlé en Suisse Romande*; Avanzi, Béguelin and Diémoz 2012-2014), which contains nearly 30 hours of spoken French (232,536 words), and from CFPP (*Corpus de Français Parlé Parisien des années 2000*; Branca-Rosoff, Fleury, Lefeuvre and Pires 2012), which has around 40 hours of speech (578,908 words). The former yielded four examples of *non seulement*, with one occurrence of an unmarked second member, and six of *d’une part*, with three unmarked examples, while the latter provided nine examples of *non seulement* (four occurrences of an unmarked second member) and nine of *d’une part* (four unmarked). The small number of collected items, compared to the total number of words, tends to indicate that the use of RCs in spoken language is rather infrequent.

Written data was collected from Frantext (ATILF – CNRS and Université de Lorraine), a database made up of digitalized texts (mostly literature, but also scientific writings and press articles) from the Middle Age to the 21st century. I selected all the texts between 1901 and 2000, which amounted to 1,798 texts or 115,897,588 words. In this sub-corpus, I searched for occurrences of *d’une part* ‘on the one hand’, not followed, within the next 300 words, by *d’autre part* ‘on the other hand’ or *de l’autre* (*lit.* ‘from the other’), which is an abbreviated

(and definite) form of *d'autre part*. It yielded 120 results, 87 of them showing an unmarked second item. Then I searched for occurrences of *non seulement* 'not only', not followed by *mais* 'but' within the next 300 words. This search led to 16 new results, among which five were occurrences showing an unmarked second member.

The total number of collected and selected items, both spoken and written, is as follows.

Table 2. *Quantity of collected and selected examples, and percentage of selected items out of the total amount of collected data*

	Items	Spoken	Written	Total
<i>D'une part</i>	Collected	15	120	135
	Selected	7 (46%)	87 (73%)	94 (70%)
<i>Non seulement</i>	Collected	13	16	29
	Selected	5 (38%)	5 (31%)	10 (34%)
Total	Collected	28	136	164
	Selected	12 (43%)	92 (68%)	104 (63%)
	Words	811,444	115,897,588	116,709,032

In summary, the research is based on 104 occurrences of discourse correlations, whose first member contains a reciprocal connective, and whose second member does not.

4. Analysis

The analysis being based on examples of correlations whose second member contains no connective, I will address the following two issues.

- 1) What linguistic markers allow for a projecting connective to be relevant when no connective appears in the projected next item?
- 2) What linguistic resources allow us to categorize a sequence as the second item of a correlative structure and to identify the semantic and pragmatic relation between the members?

As we will see, the marking used to fulfill the expectation opened with the RC in the first member, and the marking used to categorize a sequence as a member of a correlation and to communicate the relation between the two members are closely related. Moreover, several marking processes are used together for this purpose. That is why I will comment on the examples' both ways of marking at the same time.

I will focus on the role of semantic similarities, the repetition of syntactic patterns and on the role of the introductory device to delineate the second member and to identify the relation between the members. I will present the examples in the following order: to begin with, an example where the second item is unmarked, then examples where the second member is marked by means of a noun phrase, and lastly I will show examples marked with an introductory device.

4.1. Marking through syntactic patterns and lexical similarities

In the absence of an RC or another marking device like an NP (see below § 4.2), the second member of the correlation can be indicated as such with the repetition of a syntactic construction or the iteration of a discourse pattern already used in the first member. This marking process is often coupled with lexical similarities or semantic relations (like synonymy, antonymy, etc.) between lexical items. Reproducing the same syntactic pattern and establishing logical links between two sequences indicate a common identity that marks them as belonging to a paradigm (the theme).

In example (10) below, there is no introductory device, but the correlation is made visible with the occurrence of *non seulement* ‘not only’. This RC marks the first member, and therefore a second member that owns a common property with the first one is expected, this property being at a higher degree. However, this expectation is not fulfilled with the normatively co-occurring RC.

- (10) *L'étranger pesa sur l'opinion française par l'intermédiaire de l'intelligence française. Si cette opinion ne réagit point avant Sadowa, si, après Sadowa, elle n'imposa point une politique énergique à l'empereur, c'est à l'intelligence mue par l'argent, parce qu'elle était sensible à l'argent, qu'en remonte toute la faute. Non seulement l'intelligence, ne fit pas son métier d'éclairer et d'orienter les masses, obscures: elle, fit le contraire de son métier, elle, les, trompa.* (Maurras, *L'Avenir de l'intelligence*, 1905: 77, frantext)
- Foreign affairs weighed on French public opinion through the French Intelligence. If this opinion did not react before Sadowa, if, after Sadowa, they did not impose an energetic policy on the Emperor, it is to the Intelligence driven by money, because they were sensitive to money, that goes all the blame. **Not only** the Intelligence, did not do their job to inform and guide the masses; they, did the opposite of their job, they, deceived them,

Although the expectation of a second member created by the projecting RC *non seulement* ‘not only’ is not fulfilled with another RC, the repetition of the expression *faire son métier* ‘do their job’ makes the second member still identifiable and categorized as such. Furthermore, the expectation of a higher degree object is fulfilled with the semantic gradation between the negation *ne fit pas (son métier)* ‘did not do (their job)’, and the adversative NP *fit le contraire de (son métier)* ‘did the opposite of (their job)’. In addition, the opposition between *éclairer et orienter les masses obscures* ‘inform and guide the masses’ and *tromper les masses* ‘deceive the masses’ also contributes to a gradation between both members.

4.2. Marking with an NP

Another marking used to categorize the second member as an item in a list is uttering a noun phrase (NP), signaling a reciprocal connection to the first member. This nominal segment generally stands in front and has the syntactic status of a functionally independent unit. It introduces (or leads one to expect) an upcoming speech through a cataphoric expression (see the words *chose* ‘thing’ and *objection* ‘objection’ respectively in examples (11), (12)) and a non-final intonation contour. Within the economy of the structure, the NP plays the same role as a reciprocal connective like *on the other hand*. Indeed, it puts an end to the previous

member and signals the beginning of the second. Also, it has the same paradigmaticizing properties, i.e. it presupposes the existence of other elements belonging to the same category. In some cases, the NP may also contribute to the marking of the semantic and pragmatic relationship between the two items in the list. The following example shows such features.

- (11) *Dans mes écrits, j'ai été d'une sincérité absolue. Non seulement je n'ai dit rien que ce que je pense ; chose bien plus rare et plus difficile, j'ai dit tout ce que je pense.*

(Renan, Souvenirs d'enfance et de jeunesse, 1883: 151, frantext)

In my writings, I have been absolutely sincere. **Not only** I have said only what is on my mind; **thing much more infrequent and more difficult**, I have said everything that is on my mind.

The theme of this correlative structure can be drawn out from the sentence *dans mes écrits, j'ai été d'une sincérité absolue* 'in my writings, I have been absolutely sincere', because the following speech is an elaboration or the cause of this utterance, i.e. both members elaborate on what is meant under this statement. Nevertheless, there is no introductory device, because the theme does not infer a list. Here again, one of the means used to identify each sequence as an item in the list and to reveal the relation between them is the repetition of a syntactic pattern, with some slight changes, and a semantic relation of opposition between the lexical items. Namely, *j'ai dit tout ce que je pense* 'I have said everything that is on my mind' repeats *je n'ai dit rien que ce que je pense* 'I have said only what is on my mind' with an opposition between *only what* and *everything that*. This opposition leads us to view the second member as a higher level item in comparison to the first one. As in example (10), the first member is marked with *non seulement*.

What is new in this example is that the second member is indicated with the NP *chose bien plus rare et plus difficile* 'thing much more infrequent and more difficult'. This NP provides a right boundary to the first member and a left boundary to the second. Furthermore, it contributes to making the sequence it introduces have a higher degree than the previous member, which is retrospectively identified as a *thing* of the same category but to a lower degree.

4.3. Marking with an introductory device

When it occurs, the explicit mention of the list to follow can help to delineate the members and to identify the relation that they have with each other.

The following example shows some of the features seen before. The first member is marked with the RC *d'une part* 'on the one hand', and the second with an NP, namely *l'autre objection* 'the other objection'.

- (12) *Pour M. Arrhenius, le monde est infini et les astres y sont distribués d'une façon sensiblement uniforme ; si nos télescopes semblent assigner des limites à l'univers, c'est parce qu'ils sont trop faibles, et que la lumière qui nous vient des soleils les plus éloignés est absorbée en route. On a fait à cette hypothèse une double objection. **D'une part**,¹[si la densité des étoiles est constante dans tout l'espace, leur lumière totalisée devrait donner au ciel entier l'éclat même du soleil. Cela serait vrai si le vide interstellaire laissait passer toute la lumière qui le traverse sans en rien garder, de sorte que l'éclat apparent d'un astre varierait en raison inverse du carré de la distance].²[Il suffit, pour échapper à cette difficulté, de supposer que le milieu qui sépare les étoiles est absorbant ; il peut d'ailleurs l'être très peu]. **L'autre objection**, c'est que ¹[l'attraction newtonienne*

serait infinie ou indéterminée]; ²[pour nous tirer d'affaire, il nous faut alors supposer que la loi de Newton n'est pas rigoureusement exacte, et que la gravitation subit une sorte d'absorption, se traduisant par un facteur exponentiel]. Si on consent à faire *cette hypothèse*, les conclusions de Lord Kelvin ne s'imposent plus, car nous les avons établies en partant de la loi de Newton [...].

(H. Poincaré, *Leçons sur les hypothèses cosmogoniques*, 1911: 66, frantext)

For Mr. Arrhenius, the world is infinite and the stars are distributed in a substantially uniform manner; if our telescopes seem to set limits to the universe, it is because they are too weak, and because the light that comes from the most distant suns is absorbed on the way. It has been done a double objection to this hypothesis. **On the one hand**, ¹[if the density of stars is constant throughout space, their light totalized should give the whole sky the same brightness as the sun. This would be true if the interstellar vacuum let through all the light that passes through it without keeping anything of it, so that the apparent brightness of a star would vary inversely as the square of the distance]. ²[To escape this difficulty, just let us assume that the environment between the stars is absorbing; it can be very little, besides]. **The other objection**, it is that ¹[the Newtonian attraction would be infinite or indeterminate]; ²[to pull us through, we then must assume that Newton's law is not strictly accurate, and that gravitation undergoes a kind of absorption, resulting in an exponential factor]. If we agree to make this assumption, the conclusions of Lord Kelvin are no longer needed, because we have them established starting from Newton's law [...].

Actually, the correlation would be perfectly correct without these devices, as the explicit mention of the theme, *on a fait à cette hypothèse une double objection* 'it has been done a double objection to this hypothesis', works as a projecting device. Indeed, the indefinite NP *une double objection* 'a double objection' leads us to expect the utterance of a statement – or two statements – about what these objections are, because the mere mention of the existence of a double objection has no relevance if it is not said what these objections are. The following discourse fulfills this expectation with the utterance of the two-item list. Moreover, both members show a very similar composition: the objection is first recalled (no. 1 sequences between square brackets) using conditional sentences (*if* and *would*), then there is a refutation (no. 2 sequences). The repetition of this discourse structure helps to identify each member and to delineate both of them. Even if it was reduced to the introductory device and the members, the correlation could be comprehended. The theme not only allows us to identify and to delineate each member, but it also allows us to infer the relation that they have, namely a relation of enumeration, the objections being neither hierarchized nor ordered.

In summary, example (12) shows, as marking features, an introductory device, which explicitly states the category enumerated afterwards, the first member marked with an RC placed in front, and the second member marked with a definite NP. But there is more. Notably, there is an interaction between the theme and the NP, resulting in a play of projections and presuppositions, which is of direct interest in both of the members' identification. As mentioned above, the introductory device adds a projection to the shared knowledge, i.e. the expectation that this *double objection* will be elaborated. The RC *d'une part* 'on the one hand' functions as the left-boundary to the first member. The NP *l'autre objection* 'the other objection' serves as the left boundary of the second member, in addition to playing the role of the right-boundary to the first one. This is a purely syntactic function, determined by the position within the discourse. On semantic and pragmatic grounds though, the same NP has a double function. First, it categorizes the upcoming speech as being an objection; second, the adjective *autre* 'other' presupposes the previous utterance of at least one object of

the same nature, i.e. it retrospectively categorizes the previous sequence as an objection as well. As the introductory device announces a *double objection*, the anaphoric repetition of the noun *objection* guarantees the cohesion of the structure. This “reciprocal NP” recalls the theme of the correlation, as it recalls the listing operation initiated by the utterer.

5. Conclusion

This paper aimed at demonstrating that discourse correlations can be marked through a wide range of processes, and not only with RCs. Contrary to what most of the works on the subject claim (see the quote of Turco and Coltier and that of Svensson in the introduction), RCs appear to be optional in making the structure recognizable. Different forms of marking allow a sequence to be part of a correlative structure. These marks play three noticeable roles: to make the projection created by the opening RC relevant, to categorize a sequence as an item of a correlation, and to convey the semantic and pragmatic relations between the members. The examples commented on in section 4 showed three major groups of markers, namely marking through syntactic patterns and lexical (dis)similarities, marking with an NP, and marking with an introductory device. These categories are applicable to the whole of the corpus investigated (104 examples).

It was also shown that these markers assume the same roles as reciprocal connectives. The fact that the identified markers have the same functions as the RCs suggests that the latter are just one way of marking the correlation. The four types of markers do not function independently, but are involved together in fulfilling the expectation opened by the first member, in helping to delineate each of the members, and to convey a relation between the members. These three functions are closely intertwined.

Looking at canonical examples such as (9) in section 3.2, or (13) below, it is noticeable that the utterance of an RC within the second member does not make the alternative marking irrelevant. In fact, markings with a noun phrase, with an introductory device or through syntactic patterns and lexical similarities also occur in addition to a reciprocal connective.

- (13) *plusieurs sentiments divers se sont | _ | manifestés lorsque Christoph Blocher | _ | puisque c'est de lui qu'il s'agit n'a pas été réélu au Conseil fédéral | _ | [il y a eu], d'une part | _ | je dirais [à gauche de l'échiquier politique | _ | et parfois même au centre de ce même échiquier]_x | _ | euh [des manifestations de joie]_z | _ | presque un peu décalées | _ | je dirais discutables pour le moins | _ | [...] et puis d'autre part | _ | euh par exemple [sur les bancs radicaux]_x | _ | se [s'est manifesté]_y [une attitude de retenue]_z | _ | et enfin | _ | euh [pour ce qui est de l'UDC]_x puisque Christoph Blocher appartient à ce parti et était soutenu | _ | par lui | _ | eh bien [c'est]_y [la consternation]_z qui dans le fond euh | _ | euh était le sentiment prédominant*

[OFRON, unine08-rra, 42”-130”]

‘Several different feelings were – expressed when Christophe Blocher – since it is about him was not re-elected to the Federal Council – [there was]_y, **on the one hand** – I would say [to the left of the political spectrum – and sometimes even to the center of the same spectrum]_x – uh [demonstrations of joy]_z – almost a little staggered – I would say questionable at least – [...] and then **on the other hand** – uh for example [on the benches of radicals]_x – [manifested]_y [an attitude of restraint]_z – and **finally** – uh [regarding UDC]_x since Christoph Blocher belongs to this party and has been supported – by him – well [it was]_y [consternation]_z that basically uh – uh was the predominant feeling’

In this example, the theme (<feelings expressed when C. B. was not re-elected>) is explicitly mentioned in the first sentence, which contains an introductory device announcing a listing of feelings related to a singular event. The three members are composed following the same pattern: a complement introducing a validity frame (marked 'x'), then a statement of existence (*there was, manifested, it was*; marked 'y'), where a name of feeling occurs each time, twice with the same structure (*N+of+N: demonstrations of joy, and an attitude of restraint*, marked 'z') and the third time with the single mention of a noun (*consternation*) embedded in a cleft-sentence. The fact that this correlation would be perfectly correct without any connectives leads us to think that these are optional.

In conclusion, different markers act together to mark the correlations at the discourse level. Deulofeu (2001: 117), comparing grammatical correlations to discourse correlations, had already mentioned the optionality of reciprocal connectives: "the use of *on the one hand* does not necessarily imply *on the other hand* in spontaneous speech. In order that such a speech be coherent, it is sufficient that the "other hand" occurs farther on, whatever its actualization". In view of this, I would suggest that connectives are, rather than a process of marking the reciprocal connection, a process of *emphasizing its components*.

Further research is needed for a better understanding of the reasons why speakers choose, or not, to have recourse to connectives when performing a discourse operation such as listing. At this stage, my hypothesis is that the use of reciprocal connectives has something to do with the planning of speech, be it from the addressee's point of view, in order to facilitate the interpretation, or be it from the addresser's point of view, to facilitate the programming of his speech. In this way, I would compare reciprocal connectives to *milestones* in the progress of speech.

References

- Adam, Jean-Michel, and Françoise Revaz. 1989. Aspects de la structuration du texte descriptif: les marqueurs d'énumération et de reformulation [Some aspects of the structuring of the descriptive text: enumerative and rephrasing markers]. *Langue française* 81, 59-98.
- Allaire, Suzanne. 1982. *Le Modèle Syntaxique des Systèmes Corrélatifs: Étude en Français Moderne* [The syntactic model of correlative systems: study of modern French]. Thèse Rennes II (1977). Lille: Service de reproduction des thèses. Université de Lille III, PhD dissertation.
- Auer, Peter. 2002. Projection in Interaction and Projection in Grammar. *InList (Interaction and Linguistic Structures)* 33. <http://www.inlist.uni-bayreuth.de/issues/33/Inlist33.pdf>.
- Avanzi, Mathieu, Marie-José Béguelin, and Federica Diémoz. 2012-2014. Présentation du corpus OFROM – corpus oral de français de Suisse romande [OFROM Database: Presentation]. Université de Neuchâtel. <http://www.unine.ch/ofrom>
- Barsalou, Lawrence W. 1983. Ad hoc Categories. *Memory and Cognition* 11 (3), 211-227.
- Béguelin, Marie-José. 2000. *De la Phrase aux Énoncés. Grammaire Scolaire et Descriptions Linguistiques* [From the sentence to the utterances. Scholar grammar and linguistic description]. Bruxelles: De Boeck and Duculot.
- Béguelin, Marie-José. 2002. Clause, période, ou autre? La phrase graphique et la question des niveaux d'analyse ['Clause', 'période', or else? The graphic sentence and the question of analysis levels]. *Verbum* XXIV (1-2), 85-107.

- Benzitoun, Christophe, and Frédéric Sabio. 2010. Où finit la phrase? Où commence le texte? [Where does the sentence end? Where does the text begin?] *Discours* 7. Accessed June 17, 2011. <http://discours.revues.org/7966>.
- Berrendonner, Alain. 1990. Pour une macro-syntaxe [For a discourse syntax]. *Travaux de linguistique* 21, 25-36.
- Berrendonner, Alain. 1993. Périodes ['Périodes']. In *Temps et discours*, edited by Henri Parret, 47-62. Louvain: Louvain University Press.
- Berrendonner, Alain. 2002. Les deux syntaxes [The two syntaxes]. *Verbum* XXV (1-2), 23-35.
- Berrendonner, Alain. 2003. Éléments pour une macro-syntaxe: actions communicatives, types de clauses, structures périodiques [Elements for a discourse syntax: communicative actions, types of clauses, programs structures]. In *Macro-syntaxe et pragmatique. L'analyse linguistique de l'oral*, edited by Antonietta Scarano, 93-110. Roma: Bulzoni Editore.
- Berrendonner, Alain, and Marie-José Béguelin. 1989. Décalages: les niveaux de l'analyse linguistique [Lags: the levels of the linguistic analysis]. *Langue française* 81, 99-125.
- Berrendonner, Alain, and Marie-José Béguelin. 1996. De quelques adjectifs à rendement anaphorique: premier, dernier, autre. L'adjectif: une catégorie hétérogène [About some 'anaphoric' adjectives: first, last, other]. *Studi Italiana di Linguistica Teorica e Applicata* XXV (3), 475-502.
- Berrendonner, Alain, and Marie-José Béguelin. 1997. Left dislocation in French: varieties, use and norm. In *Taming the Vernacular: From Dialect to Written Standard Language*, edited by Jenny Cheshire, and Dieter Stein, 200-217. London, New York: Longman.
- Branca-Rosoff, Sonia, Serge Fleury, Florence Lefeuvre, and Mat Pires. 2012. Discours sur la ville. Présentation du Corpus de Français. Parlé Parisien des années 2000 (CFPP2000) [Speeches about the city. Presentation of the corpus of Parisian spoken French from years 2000 (CFPP2000)].
- Corminboeuf, Gilles. 2013a. Corrélation et rection [Correlation and rection]. In *La corrélation: aspects syntaxiques et sémantiques*, edited by Olga Inkova, and Pascale Hadermann, 41-55. Genève: Droz.
- Corminboeuf, Gilles. 2013b. Questions sur la correspondance morphologie - syntaxe [Questions about the connection between morphology and syntax]. *Studia UBB Philologia* LVIII (4), 11-26.
- Deulofeu, Henri-José. 2001. La notion de construction corrélatrice en français: typologie et limites [The concept of correlative construction in French: types and limits]. *Recherches sur le français parlé* 16, 103-124.
- Deulofeu, Henri-José. 2007. Les consécutives construites avec tellement ont-elles une syntaxe scalaire? [Do consecutive constructions built with *so* have a scalar syntax?] *Travaux de linguistique* 54, 133-146.
- Ducrot, Oswald. 1972. *Dire et ne pas Dire* [Saying and not saying]. Paris: Hermann.
- FRANTEXT (base textuelle -). ATILF – CNRS and Université de Lorraine. <http://www.frantext.fr>
- Fruyt, Michèle. 2004. La corrélation en latin: son rôle dans la subordination et l'endophrase [Correlation in Latin: its role in subordination and endophrase]. In *Anaphore, Cataphore et Corrélation en Latin*, edited by Colette Bodelot, 29-53. Clermont-Ferrand: Presses Universitaires Blaise Pascal.
- Fruyt, Michèle. 2005. La corrélation en latin: définition et description [Correlation in Latin: definition and description]. In *Structures Parallèles et corrélatives en grec et en latin*, edited by Paulo de Carvalho, and Frédéric Lambert, 17-44. Saint-Etienne: Publication de l'Université de Saint-Etienne.
- Gachet, Frédéric. 2013. Constructions à télescopage temporel [Time telescoping constructions]. In *La corrélation: aspects syntaxiques et sémantiques*, edited by Olga Inkova, and Pascale Hadermann, 323-341. Genève: Droz.
- Groupe de Fribourg. 2012. *Grammaire de la Période* [Grammar of the 'Période']. Berne: Peter Lang.
- Hjelmslev, Louis. 1968. *Prolégomènes à une Théorie du Langage* [Prolegomena to a theory of language]. Paris: Minuit.
- Hopper, Paul. 1987. Emergent grammar. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 13, 139-157.
- Hopper, Paul. 2011. Emergent grammar and temporality in interactional linguistics. In *Constructions: Emerging and Emergent*, edited by Peter Auer, and Stefan Pfänder, 22-45. Berlin and Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Inkova, Olga. 2013. Domaines de la corrélation en russe [Areas of correlation in Russian]. In *La corrélation: aspects syntaxiques et sémantiques*, edited by Olga Inkova, and Pascale Hadermann, 147-192. Genève: Droz.
- Inkova, Olga, and Pascale Hadermann. 2013. Introduction [Introduction]. In *La corrélation: aspects syntaxiques et sémantiques*, edited by Olga Inkova, and Pascale Hadermann, 7-16. Genève: Droz.
- Martinet, André. 1967. *Éléments de Linguistique Générale* [Elements of general linguistics]. Paris: Armand Colin.

- Mouret, François. 2005. La syntaxe des coordinations corrélatives en français [The syntax of correlative coordinations in French]. *Langages* 160, 67-92.
- Mouret, François. 2013. Sur la notion de connecteur corrélatif [About the concept of correlative connective]. In *La corrélation: aspects syntaxiques et sémantiques*, edited by Olga Inkova, and Pascale Hadermann, 217-233. Genève: Droz.
- Ochs, Elinor, Emmanuel A. Schegloff, and Sandra A. Thompson. 1996. *Interaction and Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rebeyrolle, Josette, and Marie-Paul Péry-Woodley. 2014. Énumération et structure discursive [Enumeration and speech structure]. *Congrès Mondial de Linguistique Française (CMLF 2014), SHS Web of Conferences* 8.
- Roig, Audrey. 2013. *Les Structures Corrélatives Isomorphes* [Isomorphic correlative structures]. Université Libre de Bruxelles, PhD dissertation.
- Savelli, Marie-José. 1993. *Contribution à l'Analyse Macro-Syntaxique. Les Constructions « Siamoises » du Type « plus V1... plus V2 »* [Contribution to discourse syntactic analysis. 'Conjoined' constructions like: 'the more V1... the more V2']. Université d'Aix-en-Provence, PhD dissertation.
- Schiffirin, Deborah. 2006. *In Other Words. Variation in Reference and Narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schnedecker, Catherine. 1998. *Les Corrélatifs Anaphoriques* [Anaphoric Correlates]. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Schnedecker, Catherine. 2006. *De l'un à l'autre et Réciproquement. Aspects Sémantiques, Discursifs et Cognitifs des Pronoms Anaphoriques Corrélatifs „l'un/l'autre” et „le premier/le second”* [Semantic, discursive and cognitive aspects of correlated anaphoric pronouns 'the former' and 'the latter']. Louvain-la-Neuve: De Boeck-Duculot, coll.
- Schnedecker, Catherine, and Myriam Bras. 2011. Description sémantique de 'dans un premier temps': de la composition syntagmatique au discours [Semantic description of 'first' ('in a first step'): From phrase composition to speech]. *Discours* 9. Accessed January 17, 2014. <http://discours.revues.org/8563>.
- Stalnaker, Robert. 1999. Assertion. In *Context and Content: Essays on Intentionality in Speech and Thought*, edited by Robert Stalnaker, 78-95. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Svensson, Maria. 2010. *Marqueurs Corrélatifs en Français et en Suédois. Étude Sémantico-Fonctionnelle de 'd'une part... d'autre part', 'd'un côté... de l'autre' et de 'non seulement... mais' en Contraste* [Correlative markers in French and Swedish. Semantic and functional study of 'd'une part... d'autre part', 'd'un côté... de l'autre' and of 'non seulement... mais' contrastively]. Västerås: Uppsala University Library.
- Turco, Gilbert, and Danièle Coltier. 1988. Des agents doubles de l'organisation textuelle: les marqueurs d'intégration linéaire ['Double Agents' of textual organisation: The linear integration markers]. *Pratiques* 57, 57-79.