Duvallon, Outi (2006) *Le pronom anaphorique et l'architecture de l'oral en finnois et en français*. Paris: Adéfo/L'Harmattan. Pp. 410.

Reviewed by Pekka Posio

Outi Duvallon's book *Le pronom anaphorique et l'architecture de l'oral en finnois et en français,* based on her doctoral dissertation from 2002, offers a qualitative approach to the uses of third person pronouns in oral corpora of Finnish and French. The line of research adopted in the book differs from traditional analyses of pronominal anaphora in which attention is focused on the way pronouns are used to refer to textual antecedents or on the choice of referring expressions on the basis of the accessibility of the referents. Duvallon sees anaphoric pronouns as construction tools of oral discourse in their own right, not as mere substitutes for other elements or markers of high accessibility of their referents. Thus the use of the term "anaphoric pronoun" to refer to the uses of third person pronouns studied by Duvallon might not seem very felicitous. However, the term is used in a very broad sense, independently of the existence and position of a possible antecedent.

The book is divided into six chapters: 1. Introduction (pp. 9–50), 2. L'anaphore pronominale (pp. 51–110), 3. Réalisations orales : emergence de la construction verbale (pp. 111–186), 4. Les texts oraux en trois dimensions : syntagmes, paradigmes et insertions (pp. 187–262), 5. Le pronom anaphorique dans les espaces textuels (pp. 263–370), and 6. Conclusion (pp. 371–376). The theoretic background of the book is introduced in chapter 1, which also contains an overview of the relevant areas of Finnish grammar such as case system and word order, thus making the book more accessible for readers with little knowledge of Finnish. Duvallon combines not only corpora from the two languages but also syntactic theories and tools developed by both French and Finnish linguists. The framework of Duvallon's syntactic analysis is a theory known as the pronominal approach (*l'approche pronominale*, cf. e.g. Blanche-Benveniste et al. 1987). In this approach, the verb (and not the clause) is considered the basic syntactic unit to be analyzed and pronouns (instead of noun phrases) are considered to be the basic forms of arguments. Instead of analyzing pronominal arguments as a result of pronominalization of NPs, the use of NPs is rather seen as the result of lexicalization of pronouns

(Blanche-Benveniste et al. 1987: 28). This privileged position given to verbs as nuclei of constructions and to pronouns as the basic forms of arguments has deep influence on Duvallon's analysis. The pronominal approach is complemented by the analysis of constituent order in terms of syntactic positions (Vilkuna 1989, 1995).

The differences between French and Finnish third person pronouns are discussed in chapter 2. Duvallon's analysis is centered on the Finnish third person subject pronoun *se* 's/he, it' and the French third person subject pronouns *il* 'he, it' and *elle* 'she, it', but some examples of the Finnish pronoun *hän* 's/he' and French *ce~ça* 'it' are also analyzed. The French pronominal system distinguishes between pronouns with uncategorized (*ce~ça*) and categorized referents (*il/elle*) and has a gender opposition for the latter category. Standard Finnish reserves the pronoun *hän* for human referents, but in colloquial spoken language there is usually no opposition between human and non-human referents. The pronoun *se* is used for both, while the pronoun *hän* is reserved to mark logophoricity (cf. Laitinen 2005). Despite these differences, Duvallon points out that third person pronouns are used in a remarkably similar way in both languages. She describes them as unmarked referential expressions that give only minimal, language-specific semantic information on their referents (such as gender in French and logophoricity or humanness in Finnish) but unlike other referential expressions such as NPs or demonstratives, third person pronouns carry no information on the lexical content of their referents or the perspective of the speaker.

Chapter 2 also contains an overview of former studies on pronominal anaphora. These studies can be divided roughly into three categories. The textual approach sees anaphoric pronouns basically as substitutes for preceding noun phrases (e.g. Milner 1982). Functional approaches (e.g. Givón 1983; Ariel 1988) focus on the effects that the cognitive accessibility of the referent has on the choice and use of different anaphoric expressions. The "structural" approach represented by Fox (1987) focuses on the way the structure of the text contributes to anaphora resolution. However, these approaches are not always able to account for the uses of anaphoric pronouns that have no clear antecedents, and these are the cases in which Duvallon is interested. The analysis of these uses of third person pronouns as something different from "traditional" anaphor is founded on two main arguments: the pronouns can be interpreted in their linguistic context without recurring to anaphoric or cataphoric elements and it is difficult to describe them as mere substitutes for NPs. They are rather used to "point"

at referents that have not been yet mentioned, to negotiate a proper term to be used with the addressee, or as hosts for lexical descriptions.

Chapter 3 is dedicated to the syntagmatic, paradigmatic, and parenthetic (cf. Duvallon & Routarinne 2001) dimensions of oral texts. The main tool used in the analysis (chapters 3, 4, and 5) is the syntactic grid (*analyse syntaxique en grille*) developed by the research group GARS (Groupe aixois de recherches en syntaxe) in the University of Aix-en-Provence (cf. e.g. Blanche-Benveniste 1990). This method is especially useful in the description of phenomena that are often discarded from the syntactic analysis, namely repetition and reformulation of parts of the utterances. The method consists quite simply of writing the transcription of the sequence of text to be analyzed in the form of a grid in which constituents having the same syntactic function are placed in the same column. As a result, the grid makes visible both paradigmatic and syntagmatic relations between the elements of the text, as illustrated by the example (1) in which the speaker hesitates on the choice of a preposition:

(1) *on all-ait   à   d-   chez un dans un pharma- chez un pharmacien*
     PRO go-IMP.3SG PREP PREP PREP DET PREP DET pharma- PREP DET pharmacist
     'we used to go to a pharmacy'

on allait	
à	
d-	
chez un	
dans un pharma-	
chez un pharmacien	(Duvallon 2006: 120.)

The linearity of the speech is broken in order to make visible the paradigmatic relations between the elements of the utterance by placing them in the same column of the grid. As Duvallon (2006: 120) notes, the choice of preposition is connected to the type of lexeme to be used, not to the valence of the verb, and indicates that the speaker is hesitating also between expressions like *à une pharmacie* 'to a pharmacy' ~ *chez un pharmacien*, literally 'to a pharmacist'.

Example (2) from the Finnish corpus represents another use of the syntactic grid. In this example, the speaker returns to a verbal construction in order to modify a lexical choice through a construction analyzable as a concessive repair (cf. Couper-Kuhlen & Thompson 2005):

(2)   S1 (…) *pitäs-kö   mu-n   laihduttaa   ku   mu-l   on   tämmönen   maha   tai   {ei*
              should-Q I-GEN lose.weight as   I-ADE is   like.this   belly   or   not
       S2 *{nii*
              yeah
       S1 *laihduttaa   mut   siis   kiinteyttää   se*
              lose.weight but   PRT   firm.up   it
           'should I lose weight because I have a belly like this, I mean, not to lose weight
           but firm it up'

---

pitäskö mun	*laihduttaa*	*ku mul on tämmönen maha*
tai ei	*laihduttaa*	
mut siis	*kiinteyttää se*	

                                                                 (Duvallon 2006: 246.)

The example (2) illustrates the use of columns in the syntactic grid: the
verbs are placed underneath each other in the center of the grid, and a
sufficient number of empty spaces are left open at the lines in order to be
filled in with the elements that are added to the construction at subsequent
lines, such as the object pronoun *se* 'it' at the last line of the example (2).
These empty spaces are meant to represent the slots that belong to the
valence of the verb and can be either filled by the speaker or left empty.
The transcription system is slightly anachronic in the sense that slots are
left empty only at places which are filled later on in the text, and one might
naturally argue that the empty slots are mere byproducts of the form of
annotation itself and have no real existence in the construction. Duvallon's
analysis, however, supports the view that the empty slots form a part of the
syntactic moulds that speakers reuse and modify while they speak. The grid
transcription method proves to be very useful in the analysis of the
paradigmatic relations between lexical items in a relatively short stretch of
text with few or no changes of turns; however, it seems technically less
adaptable for analyzing longer sequences of conversational data.

At first glance, the name of the book might seem a bit misleading, as
nearly half of the book (chapters 3 and 4) is dedicated to the analysis of
repetitions and reformulations in syntactic constructions and only one
chapter deals directly with third person pronouns. However, the chapters
dedicated to the analysis of the "architecture" of speech form a background
that is necessary in order to understand the analysis of pronouns in chapter
5, as the book is dedicated to the use of pronouns in constructing oral texts.
In addition, they offer an interesting perspective to phenomena that are
relatively seldom in the focus of analysis, such as repetition and

reformulation. An important point Duvallon makes after examining the modifications and repetitions found in her corpus is that they are not errors or indices of communication problems, but rather a normal way of constructing oral texts. This means that the addressee does not retain only the latest and "corrected" version of an utterance but rather reconstructs a maximal sequence as a synthesis of the fragments produced by the speaker. In addition, the repetition of syntactic constructions serves to increase the cohesion of an oral text and to reintroduce referents. The idea that speech is not constructed and understood linearly but rather as a sum of superimposed fragments is captured visually by the syntactic grids.

Although Duvallon's analysis is not meant to be quantitative, it would have been interesting to get a general idea of the frequency of the uses of third person pronouns studied in the book – more specifically, to know whether they are actually the main use of third person pronouns or if they rather represent a more marginal use along with the uses traditionally labeled anaphoric. The author also makes clear that she is not interested in the segmentation of texts, and the examples analyzed can be whole turns, parts of turns, or longer stretches of conversation. This is slightly problematic, as the terms referential space (*espace referentiel*) and textual space (*espace textuel*) are used to refer to the domain inside which an anaphoric pronoun can be interpreted, but it is not completely clear how such a space should be defined. However, Duvallon's book offers an interesting and relevant contribution to the study of the uses third person pronouns have in oral discourse. As the author remarks at the end of the conclusions (chapter 5), it would be interesting to widen the perspective offered in this book into two directions, namely by studying the use of anaphoric pronouns in the interaction between the speakers and the status of pronominal anaphora in the speakers' grammatical knowledge.

References

Ariel, Mira (1988) Referring and accessibility. *Journal of Linguistics* 24: 65–87.

Blanche-Benveniste, Claire (1990) Un modèle d'analyse syntaxique en « grilles » pour les productions orales. *Anuario de psicologia* 47: 11–28.

Blanche-Benveniste, Claire; Deulofeu, José; Stéfanini, Jean & Van den Eynde, Karel (1987) *Pronom et syntaxe : L'approche pronominale et son application au français*. Paris: SELAF.

Couper-Kuhlen, Elizabeth & Thompson, Sandra A. (2005) A Linguistic Practice for Retracting Overstatements: 'Concessive Repair'. In Auli Hakulinen & Margret Selting (eds.), *Syntax and Lexis in Conversation: Studies on the Use of Linguistic Resources in Talk-in-interaction*, Studies in Discourse and Grammar 17, pp. 257–288. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Duvallon, Outi & Routarinne, Sara (2001) Parenteesi keskustelun kieliopin voimavarana [Parenthesis as a conversational resource]. In Mia Halonen & Sara Routarinne (eds.), *Keskusteluanalyysin näkymiä [Approaches to discourse analysis]*, Kieli 13, pp. 122–154. Helsinki: The Department of Finnish Language of the University of Helsinki.

Fox, Barbara A. (1987) *Discourse Structure and Anaphora*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Givón, Talmy (1983) *Topic Continuity in Discourse: A Quantitative Cross-language Study.* Typological Studies in Language 3. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Laitinen, Lea (2005) *Hän*, the Third Speech Act Pronoun in Finnish. In Ritva Laury (ed.), *Minimal Reference: The Use of Pronouns in Finnish and Estonian Discourse*, Studia Fennica Linguistica 12, pp. 75–106. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Milner, Jean-Claude (1982) *Ordres et raisons de la langue*. Paris: Seuil.

Vilkuna, Maria (1989) *Free Word Order in Finnish: Its Syntax and Discourse Functions.* Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 500. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

—— (1995) Discourse Configurationality in Finnish. In Katalin É. Kiss (ed.), *Discourse Configurational Languages*, pp. 244–268. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Contact information:

Pekka Posio
Department of Modern Languages
Faculty of Arts
P.O. Box 24
00014 University of Helsinki
Finland
e-mail: pekka.posio(at)helsinki(dot)fi