



Discours

Revue de linguistique, psycholinguistique et informatique. A journal of linguistics, psycholinguistics and computational linguistics

31 | 2022

Varia

Marking Contrastive Topics in a Topic Shift Context: Contrastive Adverbs versus Emphatic Pronouns

Marquage des topiques contrastifs dans un contexte de changement de topique : adverbess contrastifs versus pronoms emphatiques

Jorina Brysbaert and Karen Lahousse



Electronic version

URL: <https://journals.openedition.org/discours/12189>

DOI: 10.4000/discours.12189

ISSN: 1963-1723

Publisher:

Laboratoire LATTICE, Presses universitaires de Caen

Brought to you by KU Leuven Bibliotheken



Electronic reference

Jorina Brysbaert and Karen Lahousse, "Marking Contrastive Topics in a Topic Shift Context: Contrastive Adverbs versus Emphatic Pronouns", *Discours* [Online], 31 | 2022, Online since 22 December 2022, connection on 13 February 2023. URL: <http://journals.openedition.org/discours/12189> ; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/discours.12189>



Creative Commons - Attribution 4.0 International - CC BY 4.0
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Marking Contrastive Topics in a Topic Shift Context: Contrastive Adverbs versus Emphatic Pronouns

Jorina Brysbaert

Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO) & KU Leuven

Karen Lahousse

KU Leuven

.....
Jorina Brysbaert, Karen Lahousse, « Marking Contrastive Topics in a Topic Shift Context: Contrastive Adverbs versus Emphatic Pronouns », *Discours* [En ligne], 31 | 2022, mis en ligne le 22 décembre 2022.

.....
URL : <http://journals.openedition.org/discours/12189>

.....
Titre du numéro : *Varia*

Coordination : Laure Sarda & Denis Vigier

Date de réception de l'article : 16/04/2022

Date d'acceptation de l'article : 05/06/2022

Marking Contrastive Topics in a Topic Shift Context: Contrastive Adverbs versus Emphatic Pronouns

Jorina Brysbaert

Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO) & KU Leuven

Karen Lahousse

KU Leuven

.....

This paper is about two competing marking strategies for contrastive topics in a topic shift context in French: emphatic pronouns and contrastive adverbs. We analyse the choice between these markers in one specific syntactic position, i.e. when they occur between the subject and the finite verb, in different corpora consisting of formal written, informal written and spoken French. Our results indicate that the frequency of emphatic pronouns and contrastive adverbs is register-dependent. Emphatic pronouns appear more often between the subject and the finite verb in the informal written and spoken corpora, whereas contrastive adverbs occur more frequently in this position in the formal newspaper corpora. Moreover, we show that the use of emphatic pronouns is affected by pragmatic constraints, which is not the case for contrastive adverbs: emphatic pronouns typically modify subjects with a clearly identifiable – preferably human – referent. Hence, in a more general way, this study provides evidence for the idea that both language-internal and language-external factors should be taken into account when analysing the “free” choice between two similar linguistic marking strategies.

Keywords: contrastive topic, topic shift, contrastive adverb, emphatic pronoun, corpus analysis, diaphasic variation

.....

Cet article porte sur deux stratégies concurrentes pour marquer des topiques contrastifs dans un contexte de changement de topique en français : les pronoms emphatiques et les adverbes contrastifs. Nous analysons le choix entre ces marqueurs dans une position syntaxique spécifique, c'est-à-dire lorsqu'ils figurent entre le sujet et le verbe fléchi, dans différents corpus de français écrit formel, français écrit informel et français parlé. Nos résultats indiquent que la fréquence des pronoms emphatiques et des adverbes contrastifs dépend du registre. Les pronoms emphatiques se trouvent plus souvent entre le sujet et le verbe fléchi dans les corpus de français écrit informel et français parlé, tandis que les adverbes contrastifs apparaissent plus fréquemment dans cette position dans les corpus de français formel journalistique. Nous montrons également que l'emploi des pronoms emphatiques est influencé par des contraintes pragmatiques, ce qui n'est pas le cas pour les adverbes contrastifs : les pronoms emphatiques modifient généralement des sujets avec un référent clairement identifiable, qui est de préférence humain. Ainsi, de façon plus générale, cette étude indique qu'il est important de prendre en compte des facteurs internes et externes à la langue lors de l'analyse du choix « libre » entre deux stratégies de marquage similaires.

Mots clés : *topique contrastif, changement de topique, adverb contrastif, pronom emphatique, analyse de corpus, variation diaphasique*

1. Introduction

- 1 Contrastive topics (underlined in the following examples) have typically been studied on the basis of question-answer pairs as in [1]–[2] (Büiring, 2016; Wagner, 2012).

[1] A: Who ate what?
B: Fred ate the beans and Mary ate the spinach.
(adapted from Wagner, 2012: 3)

[2] A: Who do they want to kick out?
B: She wants to kick me out.
(adapted from Büiring, 2016: 65)

- 2 These examples illustrate that contrastive topics always introduce alternatives, which can be mentioned explicitly (e.g., *Fred* versus *Mary* in [1]) or remain implicit (e.g., *she* versus “others who want to do some kicking out” in [2]). In this paper, we focus on cases with explicit alternatives, like [1], where there is an overt topic shift from the first topic (i.e., *Fred*) to the second topic (i.e., *Mary*).

- 3 Several strategies exist to mark such contrastive topics. Cross-linguistically, most attention has gone to prosodic marking (e.g., Veselá et al., 2004 on Czech; Hedberg & Sosa, 2007 on English; Lee, 2007 on Korean and English; Ambrazaitis & Frid, 2012 on Swedish; Yasavul, 2013 on K’iche’; Sahkai & Mihkla, 2017 on Estonian; Zerbian et al., 2016 and Riester et al., 2020 on German; Gürer, 2020 on Turkish). In French however, preverbal subjects cannot be stressed (Lambrecht, 1994; Klein, 2012), which means that it is impossible to prosodically mark contrastive topics as *le moineau domestique* “the house sparrow” and *le rouge-gorge* “the robin” in [3].

[3] Le moineau domestique adore les graines de tournesol. Le rouge-gorge préfère les vers de farine.
‘The house sparrow loves sunflower seeds. The robin prefers mealworms.’

- 4 Instead, several other linguistic means can be used to explicitly express contrast on the subject, such as an explicit topic marker (e.g., *quant à* “as for”, *de son côté* “on his side”) (see [4a]) (Choi-Jonin, 2003; Lagae, 2007; Velghe & Lahousse, 2015), an emphatic pronoun (see [4b]) or a contrastive adverb (e.g., *par contre* “on the other hand”, *en revanche* “on the other hand”) (see [4c]).

[4a] Le moineau domestique adore les graines de tournesol. Le rouge-gorge, **quant à lui**, préfère les vers de farine.
‘The house sparrow loves sunflower seeds. The robin, **as for him**, prefers mealworms.’

[4b] Le moineau domestique adore les graines de tournesol. Le rouge-gorge, **lui**, préfère les vers de farine.
‘The house sparrow loves sunflower seeds. The robin, **him**, prefers mealworms.’

- [4c] Le moineau domestique adore les graines de tournesol. Le rouge-gorge, **par contre**, préfère les vers de farine.
 ‘The house sparrow loves sunflower seeds. The robin, **on the other hand**, prefers mealworms.’

5 Importantly, the three marking strategies in [4] can only mark contrastive topics in topic shift contexts, where the alternatives are explicitly mentioned (example [1]), and not in cases with implicit alternatives (example [2]). Moreover, they can only accompany the second contrastive topic (i.e., *le rouge-gorge* “the robin” in [4]), and not the first one (i.e., *le moineau domestique* “the house sparrow”) (Anscombe, 2006; Cappeau, 1999; Choi-Jonin, 2003; Fløttum, 1999, 2003; Lagae, 2007).

6 Although there is a rich literature on the information-structural and semantic properties of contrastive topics in general (e.g., Wagner, 2012; Büring, 2016; Lee, 2017), the interchangeability of different marking strategies has not been extensively studied on the basis of corpus analyses. Moreover, as far as we can tell, little is known about the way in which register influences the choice for a certain marking.

7 In this paper, we focus on the interchangeability of two non-prosodic marking strategies of contrastive topics in a topic shift context, emphatic pronouns (E-Pros) (see [4b]) and contrastive adverbs (C-Advs) (see [4c]), in spoken French (interviews) and two types of written French: rather informal extracts from a discussion platform and more formal texts from two newspapers. The goal is to analyse the choice between C-Advs and E-Pros in cases where they occur between the subject (S) and the finite verb (fin-V), as in [4b-c] above, depending on the type of corpus (i.e., register). We will show that the frequency of both marking strategies is register-dependent: E-Pros occur more often between the S and the fin-V in the informal written and spoken corpora, whereas C-Advs are more frequent in this position in the formal newspaper corpora. In addition, we will demonstrate that the use of E-Pros is influenced by pragmatic constraints, which is not the case for C-Advs: E-Pros typically modify subjects with a clearly identifiable – preferably human – referent.

8 The paper is structured as follows. We first address the interchangeability of C-Advs and E-Pros (§2), by discussing previous work on these markers (§2.1), and by illustrating in which syntactic contexts (§2.2) and in which syntactic positions (§2.3) they can actually compete with each other. This is followed by a methodological section (§3), in which we present the corpora (§3.1) and the way in which the data were extracted from these corpora (§3.2). Next, we present and discuss the results of our corpus analysis on the choice between C-Advs and E-Pros (§4), by focusing on their frequency (§4.1), the syntactic type of subject (§4.2) and the semantic type of subject (§4.3).

2. Interchangeability of C-Advs and E-Pros

9 Before tackling the choice between C-Advs and E-Pros, it is important to briefly discuss previous research on these markers (§2.1) and to clarify in which cases exactly

these two markers are interchangeable, i.e. in which syntactic contexts (§2.2) and in which syntactic positions (§2.3) E-Pros can be replaced by C-Advs.

2.1. Previous literature on C-Advs and E-Pros

10 There is quite a rich literature on French C-Advs, but most studies are based only on formal language data and are restricted to one or two specific C-Adv(s) (e.g., Anscombre, 1983 on *pourtant* “yet”, *pour autant* “however”; Danjou-Flaux, 1980 on *au contraire* “on the contrary”, *par contre* “on the other hand”, *en revanche* “on the other hand”; Danjou-Flaux, 1983, 1984 on *au contraire* “on the contrary”; Hamma & Haillet, 2002 on *par contre* “on the other hand”, *en revanche* “on the other hand”; Jayez, 1982 on *pourtant* “yet”, *quand même* “nevertheless”; Lenepveu, 2009 on *toutefois* “however”; Lenepveu, 2007 and Mellet & Monte, 2005 on *toutefois* “however”, *néanmoins* “however”; Masseron & Wiederspiel, 2003 on *au contraire* “on the contrary”, *par contre* “on the other hand”; Mellet & Ruggia, 2010 and Moeschler & Spengler, 1981 on *quand même* “nevertheless”; Rivara, 2008 on *pour autant* “however”; Veland, 1998 on *quand même* “nevertheless”, *tout de même* “nevertheless”). As far as we can tell, the only linguists who consider a set of C-Advs in different registers are Csűry (2001) and Dupont (2019, 2020). However, Csűry (2001) does not systematically distinguish between the different registers in his corpus (novels, newspaper data, formal and informal speech) when presenting his results, and Dupont (2019, 2020) only focuses on two registers that are very similar in terms of their level of formality (newspaper editorials and research articles). In addition, previous research on French C-Advs mainly deals with their semantic properties and with the different types of contrastive discourse relation (concessive, corrective, etc.) they can express. These semantic analyses are not relevant for our study on the choice between C-Advs and E-Pros, because E-Pros always mark a simple contrast or antithesis.

11 The use of E-Pros in French has less extensively been studied. Cappeau (2004) and Bahtchevanova & Van Gelderen (2016) provide a (non-exhaustive) overview of the different contexts in which E-Pros can occur (see §2.2 for more details), but they do not deal with E-Pros as markers of contrastive topics in a topic shift context. Other analyses focus on specific uses of E-Pros, for example in cases with clitic doubling (*moi, je trouve que* “me, I think that”) (Detges & Waltereit, 2014) or in constructions with a locative (*je lui arrivais à l’épaule* “I him came to the shoulder” [literally]) (Blanche-Benveniste, 2001). As far as we know, the only researchers who discuss the use of E-Pros to mark contrastive topics are Rocquet (2014), who analyses the syntactic and discursive properties of E-Pros versus prepositional phrases with *quant à* “as for” + pronoun (see example [4a] above), and Caddéo (2004), who compares clauses with an E-Pro followed by a noun phrase (NP) (*lui, le propriétaire, trouve que* “him, the owner, thinks that”) to clauses with an NP followed by an E-Pro (*le propriétaire, lui, trouve que* “the owner, him, thinks that”) (see §2.2 for more details). Caddéo (2004) illustrates that E-Pros can in the latter case only modify NP-subjects (and not NP-objects)

and that these subjects can have a human or inanimate referent – but we will show that they have a preference for human subjects (see §4.3).

- 12 Importantly, C-Advs and E-Pros have never been compared, although they can compete with each other when marking contrastive topics in a topic shift context, as we will illustrate in the next sections.

2.2. Different syntactic contexts for E-Pros

- 13 Whereas the function of C-Advs is limited to the expression of a contrastive discourse relation between two clauses or constituents¹, French E-Pros have a much larger use. As in most Indo-European languages, the emphatic forms of the pronoun are used after prepositions (e.g., *J'achète des graines pour eux* “I buy seeds for them”), but in French, the third person E-Pros can themselves also function as subject (Cappeau, 2004; Bahtchevanova & Van Gelderen, 2016). As subject of the clause, the E-Pro does not mark a topic shift, but signals topic continuity with respect to the topic of the preceding clause, i.e. *le rouge-gorge* “the robin” in [5].

- [5] Le moineau domestique adore les graines de tournesol, mais le rouge-gorge est un véritable insectivore. **Lui** préfère les vers de farine.

‘The house sparrow loves sunflower seeds, but the robin is a real insectivore. **Him** prefers mealworms.’

- 14 In addition, E-Pros can function as a dislocated subject, with a clitic (underlined in the following examples) as the resumptive pronoun (De Cat, 2007) (see [6a]). The dislocated E-Pro assures topic continuity (*lui* “him” = *il* “he” = *le rouge-gorge* “the robin”) while also highlighting the contrast between the current topic (i.e., *le rouge-gorge* “the robin”) and the previous topic (i.e., *le moineau domestique* “the house sparrow”). As shown in example [6b], replacement by a C-Adv would be pragmatically infelicitous, because this marker is not able to signal topic continuity and contrast at the same time. The C-Adv tries to establish a contrastive relation between the clause *le rouge-gorge est un véritable insectivore* “the robin is a real insectivore” and the clause *il préfère les vers de farine* “he prefers mealworms”, which is impossible, since there is no contrast at the level of the subject (instead of contrast, there is continuity between *rouge-gorge* “robin” and *il* “he”) nor within the predicate (instead of contrast, there is continuity between *insectivore* “insectivore” and *vers de farine* “mealworms”).

1. In some rare cases, the C-Adv is used as a complement or predicate, as illustrated in the following example.

(i) *Pour ce qui est de l'Allemagne, on peut peut-être, par facilité de langage, comparer Gerhard Schröder à Tony Blair, mais c'est ignorer que leurs points de départ sont à l'opposé.*
(LM)

‘As far as Germany is concerned, one can perhaps, for ease of language, compare Gerhard Schröder to Tony Blair, but this ignores the fact that their starting points are **opposite**.’

- [6a] Le moineau domestique adore les graines de tournesol, mais le rouge-gorge est un véritable insectivore. **Lui**, il préfère les vers de farine.
 ‘The house sparrow loves sunflower seeds, but the robin is a real insectivore. **Him**, he prefers mealworms.’
- [6b] Le moineau domestique adore les graines de tournesol, mais le rouge-gorge est un véritable insectivore. **#Par contre**, il préfère les vers de farine.
 ‘The house sparrow loves sunflower seeds, but the robin is a real insectivore. **#On the other hand**, he prefers mealworms.’

15 C-Adv can only appear in clauses with a pronominal subject signalling topic continuity when there is a contrast within the predicate, which is then emphasized by the C-Adv. This is illustrated in example [7a], where *par contre* “on the other hand” highlights the contrast between *vers de farine* “mealworms” and *graines de tournesol* “sunflower seeds”. In this type of context, the use of a dislocated E-Pro would be grammatically possible, but pragmatically unacceptable, since the E-Pro requires contrast at the level of the topic, and in [7b], there is no other discourse referent (such as *le moineau domestique* “the house sparrow” in the previous examples) with which *le rouge-gorge* “the robin” could be contrasted.

- [7a] Le rouge-gorge adore les vers de farine. **Par contre**, il n’aime pas les graines de tournesol.
 ‘The robin loves mealworms. **On the other hand**, he does not like sunflower seeds.’
- [7b] Le rouge-gorge adore les vers de farine. **#Lui**, il n’aime pas les graines de tournesol.
 ‘The robin loves mealworms. **#Him**, he does not like sunflower seeds.’

16 Finally, when E-Pros occur after a nominal subject (underlined in the following examples), they function as markers of contrastive topics in a topic shift context. For instance, in example [8a], the E-Pro highlights that the sentence topic changes from *le moineau domestique* “the house sparrow” to *le rouge-gorge* “the robin”. In this topic shift context, E-Pros are fully interchangeable with C-Adv, as shown in [8b]. Hence, in the remainder of this paper, we will focus on examples like [8a-b], where E-Pros and C-Adv compete with each other.

- [8a] Le moineau domestique adore les graines de tournesol. Le rouge-gorge **lui** préfère les vers de farine.
 ‘The house sparrow loves sunflower seeds. The robin **him** prefers mealworms.’
- [8b] Le moineau domestique adore les graines de tournesol. Le rouge-gorge **par contre** préfère les vers de farine.
 ‘The house sparrow loves sunflower seeds. The robin **on the other hand** prefers mealworms.’

2.3. Different syntactic positions for C-Adv and E-Pros

- 17 From a syntactic point of view, both C-Adv and E-Pros with a topic shift interpretation are mobile elements (e.g., Altenberg, 1998, 2006; Caddéo, 2004; Csúry, 2001; Dupont, 2015, 2019, 2020; Lenker, 2014). As shown in examples [9a-b], they can appear in different positions in the clause.

[9a] Le moineau domestique adore les graines de tournesol. [***Lui**] le rouge-gorge [**lui**] préfère [**lui**] les vers de farine [**lui**].

‘The house sparrow loves sunflower seeds. [***Him**] the robin [**him**] prefers [**him**] mealworms [**him**].’

[9b] Le moineau domestique adore les graines de tournesol. [**Par contre**] le rouge-gorge [**par contre**] préfère [**par contre**] les vers de farine [**par contre**].

‘The house sparrow loves sunflower seeds. [**On the other hand**] the robin [**on the other hand**] prefers [**on the other hand**] mealworms [**on the other hand**].’

- 18 There is however one important exception: E-Pros with a topic shift interpretation cannot occur before a nominal subject, as indicated in example [9a]. It is possible for E-Pros to appear before an NP, but in those cases, the E-Pro itself functions as the subject (see example [5] above) and it does not give rise to a topic shift interpretation. For instance, in [10], the E-Pro *lui* ‘him’ signals topic continuity with respect to the sentence topic of the preceding clause, i.e. *Jean*. It is followed by the NP *le grand frère de Pierre* ‘Pierre’s older brother’ (underlined), which is not a contrastive topic, but functions as an apposition to the E-Pro (see Caddéo [2004] for an analysis of examples with an E-Pro followed by an apposition).

[10] Sabine a deux enfants: Pierre, qui a cinq ans, et Jean, qui a douze ans. Pierre joue au foot et il aime aussi beaucoup le tennis. Pendant les vacances d’été, il a participé pour la première fois à un camp sportif. Mais Jean n’aime pas du tout le sport. **Lui**, le grand frère de Pierre, préfère la musique et la peinture.

‘Sabine has two children: Pierre, who is five years old, and Jean, who is twelve years old. Pierre plays football and he also likes tennis very much. During the summer holidays, he took part in a sports camp for the first time. But Jean does not like sports at all. **Him**, Pierre’s older brother, prefers music and painting.’

- 19 This means that, except for clauses where a C-Adv precedes a nominal subject, the two markers are interchangeable, as illustrated in examples [9a-b] above. In our corpus study however, we focus on the interchangeability in one specific position, namely cases where the C-Adv or E-Pro occurs between the S and the fin-V, as in [11].

[11] Le moineau domestique adore les graines de tournesol. [Le rouge-gorge]_s [**par contre/lui**] [préfère]_{fin-V} les vers de farine.

‘The house sparrow loves sunflower seeds. [The robin]_s [**on the other hand/him**] [prefers]_{fin-V} mealworms.’

20 This decision is based on the hypothesis that this syntactic position is the most ideal one to mark contrastive subject topics, allowing to clearly “isolate” the entities that are being contrasted and to highlight the topical shift (Altenberg, 2006; Cappeau, 1999; Dupont, 2019; Lenker, 2014). Yet, with respect to French C-Adv and E-Pros, this position between S and fin-V has not yet been studied in detail. Moreover, by focusing on this one specific case, we avoid that syntactic position as a factor interferes with our findings regarding the syntactic and semantic properties of the subject (see Brysbaert & Lahousse, 2020a on the choice between C-Adv and E-Pro depending on the syntactic position).

3. Methodology

3.1. Corpora

21 We study the choice between C-Adv and E-Pros using data from six corpora: *Le Monde* (LM) (Le Monde, 2000), *Est Républicain* (ER) (Gaiffe et al., 2018), *Yahoo Contrastive Corpus of Questions and Answers* (YCC) (De Smet, 2009), *Corpus oral de français de Suisse romande* (OFROM) (<http://www11.unine.ch/>) (Avanzi et al., 2012–2020), *Corpus de français parlé parisien des années 2000* (CFPP) (<http://cfpp2000.univ-paris3.fr/>) (Branca-Rosoff et al., 2011, 2012) and *Corpus de référence du français parlé* (CRFP) (Équipe DELIC, 2004).

22 Table 1 summarises the properties of the different corpora. Three of them consist of written French (LM, ER and YCC), while the others contain spoken French (OFROM, CFPP and CRFP). In the remainder of this paper, we will group together the results for the three spoken corpora, given their relatively small size.

	LM	ER	YCC	OFROM	CFPP	CRFP
Mode	written	written	written	spoken	spoken	spoken
Level of formality	+ formal	± formal	- formal	± formal	± formal	± formal
Type	national news-paper	regional news-paper	online discussion platform	interview	interview	interview & public speech
Year	1998	2010–2011 ²	2006–2009	2012–2020	2005–2019	1998–2004
Number of words	25.7 million	74 million	6.1 million	1.01 million	0.7 million	0.44 million

Table 1 – Properties of the six corpora

2. The full ER corpus contains data from 1999–2003 and 2006–2011, but we only consulted the most recent years 2010–2011, which already count about 74 million words.

- 23 These corpora are representative of different levels of formality. Based on the continuum between “language of distance” (formal) to “language of immediacy” (informal) described by Koch and Oesterreicher (1985, 2007), the three written corpora can be ranged from most formal (LM) to least formal (YCC). The articles in LM clearly correspond to what is typically characterised as “language of distance”: they deal with public events and topics, relevant to a large audience, and are written in a neat and thoughtful style, with low to zero emotional involvement of the journalist. The data in the ER corpus are similar to those in LM as far as the text type is concerned. However, the content of this regional newspaper is mainly restricted to more local events and topics (e.g., sport competitions, weddings, births, politics on the level of the municipality, etc.), and is therefore of interest only to a smaller audience. As a consequence, journalists of ER also adopt a much more personal and involved writing style. The ER corpus should thus be situated somewhat further away from the “language of distance” pole. The third written corpus, YCC, comes closest to the “language of immediacy” pole. Users of this online discussion platform often write as they think, without editing their posts, which leads to a very direct and engaged writing style. The topics discussed on the platform (e.g., health issues, relational problems, etc.) are to some extent also more private than those in the two journalistic corpora, even though the users of the forum are anonymous and do not know each other.
- 24 The three spoken corpora (OFROM, CFPP and CRFP) cannot be further distinguished based on the level of formality. They all represent more or less informal spoken French, consisting of conversations between an interviewer and one or more interviewees who are not familiar with each other – except for CRFP which also contains some public speech. However, due to the interview setting, the conversations are less spontaneous than if they took place with the same people without being recorded. Interviewees might feel inhibited to tell details, and they are supposedly not always comfortable with the topics addressed by the interviewer.
- 25 As indicated in Table 1, there are also some differences between the corpora with respect to their year(s) of collection and their size, but we believe that these differences do not have an effect on the results of our study.

3.2. Data extraction

- 26 With respect to the C-Advs, we extracted examples containing one of the following adverbs: *en revanche* (similar to English “on the other hand”), *par contre* (similar to English “on the other hand”), *au contraire* (similar to English “on the contrary”), *à l’opposé* (similar to English “to the contrary”), *à l’inverse* (similar to English “to the contrary”), *inversement* (similar to English “conversely”) or *a contrario* (similar to English “conversely”). These seven C-Advs were selected because they express a simple contrast or antithesis, which is the type of contrast that corresponds best to the contrastive interpretation conveyed by E-Pros³.

3. For example, C-Advs such as *néanmoins* (similar to English “however”) and *pourtant* (similar to English “yet”) were excluded, since they typically signal a concession.

27 As for the E-Pros, we focused on clauses with the masculine singular form *lui* “him” and the masculine plural form *eux* “them”. The female forms of the E-Pro *elle* “her” and *elles* “them” were disregarded, since they cannot be formally distinguished from the female forms of the clitic pronoun, i.e. *elle* “she” and *elles* “they” (Cappeau, 2004). Consequently, as shown in example [12a], it is difficult to set apart clitic left dislocations (with *elle(s)* as a clitic resuming the dislocated subject) from topic shift constructions (with *elle(s)* as E-Pro), unless relying on other cues such as prosody or punctuation, which are not always available, especially in informal written French. This ambiguity does not exist for the masculine pronouns, because their emphatic forms (*lui* “him” and *eux* “them”) are different from their clitic ones (*il* “he” and *ils* “they”) (see [12b]).

[12a] Le moineau domestique adore les graines de tournesol. La mésange bleue [*elle*^{clitic}/*elle*^{E-Pro}] préfère les cacahuètes.

‘The house sparrow loves sunflower seeds. The blue tit [*she*^{clitic}/*her*^{E-Pro}] prefers peanuts.’

[12b] Le moineau domestique adore les graines de tournesol. Le rouge-gorge [*il*^{clitic}/*lui*^{E-Pro}] préfère les vers de farine.

‘The house sparrow loves sunflower seeds. The robin [*he*^{clitic}/*him*^{E-Pro}] prefers mealworms.’

28 In total, our dataset consists of 12,411 cases with a C-Adv and 5,252 with an E-Pro. With respect to the LM corpus, examples of the C-Adv and E-Pros were extracted by Piet Mertens (KU Leuven) and Serge Verlinde (ILT KU Leuven)⁴. As for the five other corpora, we performed the data extraction ourselves using the concordancer AntConc (Anthony, 2018).

4. Results and discussion

29 In this section, we present and discuss the results of our corpus study on the choice between C-Adv and E-Pros in different registers of French. We start with an overview of their frequency in the six corpora (§4.1), followed by an analysis of the syntactic (§4.2) and semantic (§4.3) properties of the subject in one of the positions where the two marking strategies are interchangeable, i.e. in cases where the C-Adv or E-Pro occurs between S and fin-V.

4.1. Frequency

4.1.1. All syntactic positions

30 Before focusing on the number of occurrences of C-Adv and E-Pros in the position between S and fin-V (§4.1.2), it is interesting to have a look at their overall frequency

4. We thank Piet Mertens and Serge Verlinde for their extractions.

in the different registers. The frequency of the seven C-Advs (see §3.2) is provided in Table 2. The results show that there is a clear register difference: the C-Advs are much more frequent in the informal written corpus (YCC) and the spoken corpora (OFROM, CFPP and CRFP) (between 259 and 460 occurrences per million words) than in the two formal journalistic written corpora (LM and ER) (between 81 and 131 occurrences per million words). This finding nuances the claims in the linguistic literature that the frequency of C-Advs differs between spoken and written French (e.g., Bilger & Cappeau, 2003; Csűry, 2001; Danjou-Flaux, 1980; Masseron & Wiederspiel, 2003)⁵: our data show that the level of formality (formal versus informal) has more influence than the mode (written versus spoken).

31 Interestingly, no such register difference is attested for the E-Pros, which occur almost as frequently in all corpora (between 40 and 73 occurrences per million words), as is represented in Table 3.

32 We hypothesise that this quantitative difference between C-Advs (register effect) and E-Pros (no register effect) is due to differences with respect to specific adverbs. The set of C-Advs is more heterogeneous, and the results abstract away from individual frequency differences between the adverbs. For example, the C-Adv *par contre* “on the other hand” is especially frequent in informal written and spoken French, whereas *en revanche* “on the other hand” occurs most often in formal written French (Brysbaert & Lahousse, 2020b).

	LM	ER	YCC	OFROM	CFPP	CRFP
Absolute frequency	3,377	5,995	2,323	280	322	114
Relative frequency	131/ million words	81/ million words	381/ million words	277/ million words	460/ million words	259/ million words

Table 2 – Overall frequency of C-Advs per corpus

	LM	ER	YCC	OFROM	CFPP	CRFP
Absolute frequency	1,881	2,938	309	51	43	30
Relative frequency	73/ million words	40/ million words	51/ million words	50/ million words	61/ million words	68/ million words

Table 3 – Overall frequency of E-Pros per corpus

5. These studies only distinguish between written and spoken French and do not take into account different levels of formality.

33 Also note that the C-AdvS (Table 2) are overall more frequent than the E-Pros (Table 3): the relative frequencies of the C-AdvS range from 81 to 460 occurrences per million words, whereas those of the E-Pros vary between 40 and 73 occurrences per million words. This can be partly explained by the fact that C-AdvS have a larger distribution than E-Pros. As was shown in examples [9a-b] above, E-Pros with a topic shift interpretation cannot occur before nominal subjects. Hence, when users of French want to add contrastive marking before the nominal subject, they can only opt for a C-Adv.

4.1.2. Position between S and fin-V

34 If we zoom in on the cases with a C-Adv or E-Pro occurring between the S and the fin-V, as in example [11] above, it becomes clear that E-Pros are much more frequent in this position than C-AdvS⁶. The results in Table 4 also show that the frequency of C-AdvS and E-Pros in this specific syntactic position is register-dependent. The C-AdvS occur most often between S and fin-V in the formal written corpus LM (14%), with only a few rare cases in spoken French (1%). The E-Pros, on the other hand, appear more frequently in this position in the informal written corpus (83%) and spoken corpora (82%), compared to the two journalistic corpora (54% and 61%). This finding suggests that, with respect to their frequency in different registers, these two non-prosodic marking strategies are more or less “complementary”: as the level of formality decreases, the C-AdvS appear less often between S and fin-V, while the E-Pros occur more often in this position.

35 In what follows, we focus on these examples with a C-Adv or E-Pro between S and fin-V, to determine which language-internal factors play a role in the choice between the two marking strategies, more specifically the syntactic (§4.2) and semantic (§4.3) properties of the subject.

	LM	ER	YCC	OFRON, CFPP and CRFP
C-Adv between S and fin-V	14% (365)	6% (276)	3% (47)	1% (8)
E-Pro between S and fin-V	61% (1,093)	54% (1,519)	83% (235)	82% (67)

Table 4 – Position between S and fin-V: frequency of C-AdvS versus E-Pros⁷

6. The C-AdvS occur most frequently before the subject (Brysbaert & Lahousse, 2020a).

7. The relative frequencies were calculated with respect to the total number of analysed examples of C-AdvS versus E-Pros.

4.2. Syntactic type of subject

36 Table 5 provides an overview of the syntactic type of subject per register for cases with a C-Adv occurring between S and fin-V (see example [11] above). With respect to the spoken register, it is not possible to make any generalisations due to scarceness of data (see Table 4 above). We will therefore not consider the examples from the spoken corpora in the discussion of the results for C-Adv.

37 As becomes clear from Table 5, there are no significant differences between the registers (Fisher exact test (4, $N = 680$), $p = 0.14$)⁸. In all corpora, the subject modified by the C-Adv most frequently takes the form of a noun (between 72% and 79%) (see [13])⁹. The C-Adv can also modify a relative pronoun (between 4% and 12%) (see [14]) or another type of pronoun (between 13% and 17%), such as *ceux-ci* “these”, *d’autres* “others” or *rien* “nothing”, illustrated in [15]–[17]. In some rare cases (between 0.4% and 6%), the subject is neither a noun nor a pronoun, but for example a verb phrase (VP) (see [18]).

	LM	ER	YCC	OFROM, CFPP and CRFP	Total
Noun	79% (289)	75% (206)	72% (34)	62.5% (5)	77% (534)
Relative pronoun	6% (23)	12% (32)	4% (2)	25% (2)	8% (59)
Other pronoun	13% (49)	13% (37)	17% (8)	12.5% (1)	14% (95)
Other	1% (4)	0.4% (1)	6% (3)	0% (0)	1% (8)
Total	100% (365)	100% (276)	100% (47)	100% (8)	100% (696)

Table 5 – C-Adv between S and fin-V: syntactic type of S per register

[13] Ce sont surtout les actifs qui lisent des livres, mais aussi des journaux, et ce sont eux aussi qui utilisent un ordinateur et écoutent la radio; les retraités, **en revanche**, lisent de moins en moins, préférant la télévision.

(LM)

‘It is mainly working people who read books, but also newspapers, and they are also the ones who use a computer and listen to the radio; pensioners, **on the other hand**, read less and less, preferring television.’

8. We did not include the examples from the column “OFROM, CFPP and CRFP” (8 in total) and the row “Other” (8 in total) in the statistical test, due to the very low number of occurrences in this column/row.

9. We present the examples as they occur in our corpora, without correcting any typographical, spelling or grammar mistakes.

- [14] De toute évidence, la rigueur scientifique n'est pas le principal apanage de ces ouvrages qui, **en revanche**, flattent l'imagination.

(LM)

'Obviously, scientific rigor is not the main prerogative of these works which, **on the other hand**, flatter the imagination.'

- [15] Les Auriverde ont appliqué la même recette qu'en demi-finale pour mettre les Cubains dans le rouge. Ceux-ci, **en revanche**, ont multiplié les bourdes, payant clairement leur manque d'expérience.

(ER)

'The Auriverde applied the same recipe as in the semi-finals to drive the Cubans into a corner. These, **on the other hand**, multiplied the blunders, clearly paying for their lack of experience.'

- [16] Si quelques-unes de ces affiches paraissent avoir assez mal vieilli, d'autres, **en revanche**, frappent par leur caractère prémonitoire.

(LM)

'If some of these posters seem to have aged rather badly, others, **on the other hand**, strike by their premonitory character.'

- [17] Si la récupération du pont de l'Ascension peut être admise, rien **en revanche** ne justifie le deuxième samedi imposé.

(ER)

'If the recuperation of the "bridge" of Ascension Day can be admitted, nothing **on the other hand** justifies the second imposed Saturday.'

- [18] Mélanger les ingrédients avec une spatule, ça c'est fastoche. Râper les carottes, **en revanche**, fait mal aux bras.

(ER)

'Mixing the ingredients with a spatula is easy. Grating carrots, **on the other hand**, hurts your arms.'

38 The results for the examples with an E-Pro between S and fin-V are summarised in Table 6.

39 In contrast to the C-AdvS (Table 5), the syntactic type of subject in examples with an E-Pro is clearly influenced by the register. In the two journalistic corpora (LM and ER), the subject is a noun in the majority of the cases (between 84% and 90%) (see [19]), whereas in the spoken corpora (OFROM, CFPP and CRFP), the subject predominantly takes the form of a relative pronoun (78%) (see [20]). The results for the informal written corpus (YCC) are situated in between, with nominal subjects being slightly more frequent (54%) than relative pronouns (45%).

	LM	ER	YCC	OFROM, CFPP and CRFP	Total
Noun	90% (984)	84% (1,283)	54% (126)	22% (15)	83% (2,408)
Relative pronoun	10% (107)	16% (236)	45% (106)	78% (52)	17% (501)
Other pronoun	0.2% (2)	0% (0)	1% (3)	0% (0)	0.2% (5)
Other	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)
Total	100% (1,093)	100% (1,519)	100% (235)	100% (67)	100% (2,914)

Table 6 – E-Pro between S and fin-V: syntactic type of S per register

- [19] Le conducteur n'est pas parfaitement bien assis, mais les passagers installés à l'arrière, eux, sont à l'aise.
(LM)

'The driver is not perfectly seated, but the passengers in the back, them, are comfortable.'

- [20] sinon à côté de ça on a des des gens comme euh Éric Orsenna un autre euh académicien qui lui veut défendre la grammaire
(OFROM)

'otherwise besides that we have people like uh Éric Orsenna another uh academician who him wants to defend grammar'

40 These register differences are statistically significant ($\chi^2(3, N = 2,909) = 348.37$, $p < 0.001$, with a moderate effect size, Cramer's $V = 0.35$), but not straightforward to explain¹⁰. It could be the case that relative pronouns are in general more often used in the informal written (YCC) and spoken corpora (OFROM, CFPP and CRFP), but it seems unlikely that this would be the only reason for the register difference, especially because no similar tendency is attested for the C-Advs (Table 5).

41 A comparison of the results for the C-Advs (Table 5) and the E-Pros (Table 6) reveals that the use of E-Pros is more restricted than the use of C-Advs. First, E-Pros cannot appear when the subject is a VP as in [21] (compared to [18] above).

- [21] Mélanger les ingrédients avec une spatule, ça c'est fastoche. Râper les carottes, *lui, fait mal aux bras.
(ER)

'Mixing the ingredients with a spatula is easy. Grating carrots, *him, hurts your arms.'

10. We did not include the examples from the row "Other pronoun" (5 in total) in the statistical test, due to the very low number of occurrences in this row.

- 42 This is due to the fact that the E-Pro *lui* “him” requires a subject referring to a specific discourse referent, which is not the case with VP-subjects, since these describe an event. For the same reason, pronominal subjects such as *cela* “that” and *ceci* “this” cannot be modified by the E-Pro *lui* “him”. In these cases, speakers of French would have to use an E-Pro that is specialised in referring to events, i.e. *ça* “that”¹¹. However, this results in a topic shift construction which is formally indistinguishable from clitic left dislocation (see [22]), as we explained for the female form *elle* “she/her” above [12a].

[22] Mélanger les ingrédients avec une spatule, ça c’est fastoche. Râper les carottes [ça^{resumptive}/ça^{E-Pro}] fait mal aux bras.
(ER)
‘Mixing the ingredients with a spatula is easy. Grating carrots [that^{resumptive}/that^{E-Pro}] hurts your arms.’

- 43 Second, the use of an E-Pro is very rare in cases where the subject is a pronoun other than a relative one. Our dataset contains only five examples of this type, either with the possessive pronoun *le tien* “yours” or the demonstrative pronoun *ceux* “these/those” as the subject (see [23]).

[23] Question: Les idées vieillissent-elles?
Réponse: Certaines oui, d’autres jamais. Mais un constat évident s’impose: ceux qui les émettent, eux, vieillissent!
(YCC)
‘Question: Do ideas age?
Answer: Some yes, some never. But one obvious observation is clear: those who express them, them, are getting old!’

- 44 Although our corpora do not contain such examples, E-Pros can also occur after pronouns such as *certain* “some” (see [24]). This shows that it is possible, but rather infrequent, for E-Pros to refer to an indefinite pronoun.

[24] Fessée pas fessées, privé de ses jeux favoris, le piquet, etc etc... De nombreuses punitions existent et sont un élément qui fait partie de l’éducation des enfants. Certains, eux, ne punissent pas leur enfant sous couvert de laisser son enfant de développer en liberté, ce qu’on appelle actuellement les enfants roi.
(<http://latiteorange.blogspot.com/2011/03/reflexion-sur-leducation-des-enfants.html>)

11. The same pattern applies to clitic left dislocations, where in case of an event, the resumptive pronoun is *c’* “it” instead of *il* “he”.
(i) *Râper des carottes, *il est fatigant.* ‘Grating carrots, *he is tiring.’
(ii) *Râper des carottes, c’est fatigant.* ‘Grating carrots, it is tiring.’

‘Spanking no spanking, deprived of his/her favourite games, the picket, etc etc... Many punishments exist and are an element that is part of the education of children. Some, **them**, do not punish their child under the guise of letting their child develop freely, what is currently called king children.’

45 This finding is in line with the idea that E-Pros prefer to modify subjects referring to a specific discourse referent. The discourse referent of the subject *certain* “some” is quite vague – which makes it unattractive for E-Pros – but it is still specific enough to allow modification by an E-Pro. By contrast, with indefinite pronouns such as *rien* “nothing”, *personne* “nobody” or *tout* “everything”, which refer to a very general discourse referent, modification by an E-Pro is impossible as in [25] (compared to [17] above).

[25] Si la récupération du pont de l’Ascension peut être admise, rien ***lui** ne justifie le deuxième samedi imposé.
(ER)

‘If the recuperation of the “bridge” of Ascension Day can be admitted, nothing ***him** justifies the second imposed Saturday.’

46 The comparison between the results for C-Advs (Table 5) and E-Pros (Table 6) also reveals that in general, the E-Pros (17%) more often modify a subject relative pronoun than the C-Advs (8%). This difference is statistically significant (χ^2 (1, $N = 3,502$) = 19.40, $p < 0.001$, with a very small effect size, Cramer’s $V = 0.07$), and supports our hypothesis that E-Pros preferably modify a subject that has a clearly identifiable discourse referent: relative pronouns have an antecedent which often refers to a clear discourse referent¹².

4.3. Semantic type of subject

47 The semantic properties of the subject in examples with a C-Adv/E-Pro between S and fin-V were coded based on the animacy annotation guidelines provided by Zaenen et al. (2004). Following Thuilier and Danlos (2012), we made a three-way distinction between subjects with a human referent (example [26]), an animate referent, i.e. an animal (example [27]) or an organisation/collectivity (examples [28] and [29])¹³, and an inanimate referent (example [30]).

[26] Alain et Martine décidaient de faire les vingt kilomètres, Claude et Mireille, **eux**, sortaient des sentiers battus pour se rendre à Saint-Germain des Prés.
(ER)

12. It could however also be the case that C-Advs occur less often in subordinate clauses in general. We leave this for further research. The statistical test is based on the examples with a noun or a relative pronoun as subject, since E-Pros cannot easily modify other syntactic types of subjects (see above).

13. In our corpora, the vast majority of the examples in this category belong to the type “organisation” rather than “animal”.

‘Alain and Martine decided to do the twenty kilometres, Claude and Mireille, **them**, went of the beaten track to get to Saint-Germain-des-Prés.’

- [27] Si la guêpe germanique préfère les endroits confinés, le frelon asiatique, **lui**, est adepte des nids aériens.
(ER)
‘If the German wasp prefers confined places, the Asian hornet, **him**, is a fan of aerial nests.’

- [28] Le premier [i.e. Goodyear] développe actuellement un pneu, l’EMT (Extended Mobility Tyre), aux vertus similaires à celles du PAV et pourrait donc être un partenaire idéal pour Michelin. Bridgestone, **lui**, ne semble pas s’intéresser à cette voie.
(LM)
‘The first [i.e. Goodyear] is currently developing a tire, the EMT (Extended Mobility Tyre), with properties similar to those of PAV and could therefore be an ideal partner for Michelin. Bridgestone, **him**, does not seem to be interested in this path.’

- [29] Le pays de Galles, pays hôte de l’épreuve, est également qualifié d’office. L’Angleterre, l’Écosse et l’Irlande, **en revanche**, doivent passer par des tournois qualificatifs organisés cet automne.
(LM)
‘Wales, the host country of the event, is also automatically qualified. England, Scotland and Ireland, **on the other hand**, must go through qualifying tournaments organised this autumn.’

- [30] La faiblesse est quelque chose d’intérieur, qu’on ressent en soi, par exemple on se sent faible quand on est malade. [...] La fragilité **au contraire** est une caractéristique appliquée à quelqu’un après une évaluation faite de l’extérieur.
(YCC)
‘Weakness is something inside, that we feel in ourselves, for example we feel weak when we are sick. [...] Fragility, **on the contrary**, is a characteristic applied to someone after an evaluation made from the outside.’

48 Our goal was to code the animacy status of the discourse referent to which the subject is referring, and not of the linguistic expression itself. For example, in [31], the subject *Louis* was categorised as inanimate, since it is referring to “the name Louis” and not to “a specific person named Louis”.

- [31] Pour les prénoms masculins et féminins, les trois premiers ne changent pas, commente l’auteur, Stéphanie Rapoport. Louis, **par contre**, remonte en 4^e position.
(ER)
‘For male and female first names, the first three do not change, comments the author, Stéphanie Rapoport. Louis, **on the other hand**, moves up to 4th position.’

	LM	ER	YCC	OFROM, CFPP and CRFP	Total
Human	38% (138)	34% (94)	38% (18)	37.5% (3)	36% (253)
Animate	24% (89)	30% (83)	11% (5)	12.5% (1)	26% (178)
Inanimate	38% (138)	36% (99)	51% (24)	50% (4)	38% (265)
Total	100% (365)	100% (276)	100% (47)	100% (8)	100% (696)

Table 7 – C-Adv between S and fin-V: semantic type of S per register

	LM	ER	YCC	OFROM, CFPP and CRFP	Total
Human	72% (788)	69% (1,047)	60% (140)	84% (56)	70% (2,031)
Animate	14% (158)	15% (225)	16% (38)	15% (10)	15% (431)
Inanimate	13% (147)	16% (247)	24% (57)	1% (1)	16% (452)
Total	100% (1,093)	100% (1,519)	100% (235)	100% (67)	100% (2,914)

Table 8 – E-Pro between S and fin-V: semantic type of S per register

49 Table 7 provides an overview of the results for the C-Advs. It is clear that this marker does not have a preference for a certain semantic type of subject: C-Advs occur almost as frequently after human subjects (36%) than after inanimate subjects (38%). Modification of an animate subject (organisation or animal) is slightly less common (26%), which can probably be explained by a lower frequency of this type of subjects in general. There is one important difference between the corpora: in the two journalistic corpora (LM and ER), C-Advs combine more frequently with animate subjects than in the informal written corpus (YCC), where they combine more often with inanimate subjects. According to us, this difference is related to the type of text rather than to the level of formality. In the two journalistic corpora, articles often deal with topics facilitating the use of organisational (animate) subjects, such as *le gouvernement* “the government”, *Arsenal* or *Danone*. By contrast, on the discussion platform, there is for example a separate thread about computer problems, which could increase the chance of using inanimate subjects (e.g., the mouse, the software program, etc.).

50 In contrast to the C-Advs, the E-Pros have a pronounced preference for human subjects (between 60% and 84%) (Table 8). This difference between the C-Advs and the E-Pros is statistically significant ($\chi^2(2, N = 3,610) = 281.49, p < 0.001$, with a small effect size, Cramer’s $V = 0.28$), and is in line with the hypothesis that E-Pros preferably modify subjects referring to a specific discourse referent (see §4.2). Human subjects have a more clearly identifiable – and active – discourse referent

than (organisational) animate and inanimate subjects. As for the C-Adv_s, we argue that the differences between the corpora are due to the text type rather than to the level of formality. For instance, in the spoken corpora, E-Pros almost never modify an inanimate subject (only 1 occurrence), probably because the interviewees prefer to talk about the human and animate beings in their life rather than about inanimate things, which is also stimulated by the questions asked by the interviewer.

5. Conclusion

51 In this paper, we studied the choice between C-Adv_s and E-Pros, which are two competing marking strategies for contrastive topics in a topic shift context in French. We first showed that C-Adv_s and E-Pros are only interchangeable (i) when used as topic shift markers with a nominal subject and (ii) when occurring in a syntactic position after this nominal subject (i.e., immediately after the subject or within the predicate). Next, based on a corpus analysis of a subset of these cases, i.e. examples where the C-Adv/E-Pro occurs between the S and the fin-V, in six corpora representing different registers, we provided evidence for the hypothesis that the choice between C-Adv_s and E-Pros is influenced by (i) language-internal pragmatic constraints and by (ii) the language-external factor register. More specifically, the frequency of E-Pros and C-Adv_s is register-dependent: as the level of formality decreases, E-Pros appear more often between S and fin-V, while C-Adv_s are less frequently used in this position. In addition, the use of E-Pros is influenced by pragmatic constraints, in the sense that they typically modify subjects referring to a clearly identifiable – preferably human – discourse referent, whereas C-Adv_s easily appear in combination with any type of subject. More generally, this paper shows that, when analysing the “free” choice between two comparable linguistic markers, it is important to study the combined effect of language-internal and -external factors (see e.g., Engel et al., 2021 on English).

52 Further research is needed (i) to examine whether similar effects can be found for C-Adv_s and E-Pros occurring in other syntactic positions (i.e., after the fin-V), (ii) to statistically assess the importance of the different factors at play in the choice between C-Adv_s and E-Pros, and (iii) to study the competition with other topic shift markers which can also appear in several syntactic positions, such as *quant à lui* “as for him”, *de son côté* “on his/her side” and *pour sa part* “for his/her part”.

References

- ALTENBERG, B. 1998. Connectors and Sentence Openings in English and Swedish. In S. JOHANSSON & S. OKSEFJELL (eds.), *Corpora and Cross-Linguistic Research: Theory, Method, and Case Studies*. Amsterdam – Atlanta: Rodopi: 115-143.
- ALTENBERG, B. 2006. The Function of Adverbial Connectors in Second Initial Position in English and Swedish. In K. AIJMER & A.-M. SIMON-VANDENBERGEN (eds.), *Pragmatic Markers in Contrast*. Oxford – Amsterdam – Paris: Elsevier: 11-37.

- AMBRAZAITIS, G. & FRID, J. 2012. The Prosody of Contrastive Topics in Southern Swedish. In A. ERIKSSON & A. ABELIN (eds.), *Proceedings from FONETIK 2012: The XXVth Swedish Phonetics Conference*. Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg: 1-4. Available online: <https://lnu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1313650/FULLTEXT01.pdf>.
- ANSCOMBRE, J.-C. 1983. *Pour autant, pourtant (et comment): à petites causes, grands effets*. *Cahiers de linguistique française* 5: 37-84. Available online: https://clf.unige.ch/index.php/download_file/view/400/159/.
- ANSCOMBRE, J.-C. 2006. Les locutions *quant à, pour ce qui est de, en ce qui concerne*: chronique d'un discours annoncé. *Modèles linguistiques* 54: 155-169. Available online: <https://journals.openedition.org/ml/587>.
- ANTHONY, L. 2018. AntConc (Version 3.5.7) [Computer Software]. Tokyo: Waseda University. Available online: <https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software.html>.
- AVANZI, M., BÉGUELIN, M.-J., CORMINBOEUF, G., DIÉMOZ, F. & JOHNSEN, L.A. 2012-2020. Corpus OFROM – Corpus oral de français de Suisse romande [Corpus]. Neuchâtel: Université de Neuchâtel. Available online: <http://www11.unine.ch/>.
- BAHTCHEVANOVA, M. & VAN GELDEREN, E. 2016. The Interaction between the French Subject and Object Cycles. In E. VAN GELDEREN (ed.), *Cyclical Change Continued*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: J. Benjamins: 113-136.
- BILGER, M. & CAPPEAU, P. 2003. Les emplois de *contre* dans les corpus de français parlé et de presse écrite. In P. PÉROZ (ed.), *Contre: identité sémantique et variation catégorielle*. Recherches linguistiques 26. Metz: Université de Metz: 91-111.
- BLANCHE-BENVENISTE, C. 2001. Le clitique *lui* lié au locatif: “ça lui arrivait là”. In C. MULLER (ed.), *Clitiques et cliticisation: actes du colloque de Bordeaux, octobre 1998*. Paris: H. Champion: 201-225.
- BRANCA-ROSOFF, S., FLEURY, S., LEFEUVRE, F. & PIRES, M. 2011. Constitution et exploitation d'un corpus de français parlé parisien. *Corpus* 10: 81-98. Available online: <https://journals.openedition.org/corpus/2033>.
- BRANCA-ROSOFF, S., FLEURY, S., LEFEUVRE, F. & PIRES, M. 2012. *Discours sur la ville. Corpus de français parlé parisien des années 2000 (CFPP2000)*. Technical report. Available online: <http://cfpp2000.univ-paris3.fr/CFPP2000.pdf>.
- BRYLSBAERT, J. & LAHOUSSE, K. 2020a. Register Differences in the Marking of Contrastivity in French: Syntactic Position of Contrastive Adverbs versus Emphatic Pronouns. Talk presented at Linguists' day (Linguistic Society of Belgium), University of Namur, 16 October 2020. See: <https://sites.uclouvain.be/bkl-cbl/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/linguistsday2020.pdf>.
- BRYLSBAERT, J. & LAHOUSSE, K. 2020b. Les marqueurs de contraste *au contraire, par contre* et *en revanche* en français parlé et écrit, formel et informel. In F. NEVEU, B. HARMEGNIES, L. HRIBA, S. PRÉVOST & A. STEUCKARDT (eds.), *SHS Web of Conferences. Actes du 7^e congrès mondial de Linguistique française – CMLF 2020 (6-10 juillet 2020, Montpellier, France)*. Les Ulis: EDP Sciences. Vol. 78: Paper 01010: 1-15. Available online: https://www.shs-conferences.org/articles/shsconf/pdf/2020/06/shsconf_cmlf2020_01010.pdf.
- BÜRING, D. 2016. (Contrastive) Topic. In C. FÉRY & S. ISHIHARA (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Information Structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 64-85.

- CADDÉO, S. 2004. *Lui, le propriétaire, le propriétaire, lui*: deux constructions bien distinctes. *Recherches sur le français parlé* 18: 145-161. Available online: https://repository.ortolang.fr/api/content/recherches-francais-parle/v1/pdf/volume_18/145_18_RSFP.pdf.
- CAPPEAU, P. 1999. Sujets éloignés: esquisse d'une caractérisation des sujets lexicaux séparés de leur verbe. *Recherches sur le français parlé* 15: 199-231. Available online: https://repository.ortolang.fr/api/content/recherches-francais-parle/v1/pdf/volume_15/199_15_RSFP.pdf.
- CAPPEAU, P. 2004. Les formes disjointes des pronoms sujets. *Recherches sur le français parlé* 18: 107-125. Available online: https://repository.ortolang.fr/api/content/recherches-francais-parle/v1/pdf/volume_18/107_18_RSFP.pdf.
- CHOI-JONIN, I. 2003. Ordre syntaxique et ordre référentiel: emplois de la locution prépositive *quant à*. In B. COMBETTES, C. SCHNEDECKER & A. THEISSEN (eds.), *Ordre et distinction dans la langue et le discours: actes du colloque international de Metz (18, 19, 20 mars 1999)*. Paris: H. Champion: 133-147.
- CSÚRY, I. 2001. *Le champ lexical de mais: étude lexico-grammaticale des termes d'opposition du français contemporain dans un cadre textologique*. Debrecen: Kossuth Egyetemi Kiadó.
- DANJOU-FLAUX, N. 1980. *Au contraire, par contre, en revanche*: une évaluation de la synonymie. *Bulletin du Centre d'analyse du discours* 4: 123-148.
- DANJOU-FLAUX, N. 1983. *Au contraire*, connecteur adversatif. *Cahiers de linguistique française* 5: 275-303. Available online: https://clf.unige.ch/index.php/download_file/view/409/159/.
- DANJOU-FLAUX, N. 1984. *Au contraire* comme opérateur d'antonymie dans les dialogues. In P. ATTAL & C. MULLER (eds.), *De la syntaxe à la pragmatique*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: J. Benjamins: 75-94.
- DE CAT, C. 2007. *French Dislocation: Interpretation, Syntax, Acquisition*. Oxford – New York: Oxford University Press.
- DE SMET, H. 2009. Yahoo-Based Contrastive Corpus of Questions and Answers – YCCQA [Corpus]. Leuven: University of Leuven, Department of Linguistics.
- DETGES, U. & WALTEREIT, R. 2014. *Moi je ne sais pas* vs. *Je ne sais pas moi*: French Disjoint Pronouns in the Left vs. Right Periphery. In K. BEECHING & U. DETGES (eds.), *Discourse Functions at the Left and Right Periphery: Crosslinguistic Investigations of Language Use and Language Change*. Leiden – Boston: Brill: 24-46.
- DUPONT, M. 2015. Word Order in English and French: The Position of English and French Adverbial Connectors of Contrast. *English Text Construction* 8 (1): 88-124.
- DUPONT, M. 2019. *Conjunctive Markers of Contrast in English and French: From Syntax to Lexis and Discourse*. PhD thesis. Université catholique de Louvain, Faculty of Philosophy, Arts and Letters. Louvain-la-Neuve.
- DUPONT, M. 2020. Placement Patterns of English and French Conjunctive Adjuncts of Contrast: The Impact of Register. *Languages in Contrast* 20 (2): 263-287.
- ENGEL, A., GRAFMILLER, J., ROSSEEL, L., SZMRECSANYI, B. & VAN DE VELDE, F. 2021. How Register-Specific Is Probabilistic Grammatical Knowledge? A Programmatic Sketch and a Case Study on the Dative Alternation with *Give*. In E. SEOANE & D. BIBER (eds.), *Corpus-Based Approaches to Register Variation*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins: 51-84.

- ÉQUIPE DELIC 2004. Présentation du *Corpus de référence du français parlé*. *Recherches sur le français parlé* 18: 11-42. Available online: https://repository.ortolang.fr/api/content/recherches-francais-parle/v1/pdf/volume_18/11_18_RSFP.pdf.
- FLØTTUM, K. 1999. *Quant à* – thématisateur et focalisateur. In C. GUIMIER (ed.), *La thématisation dans les langues: actes du colloque de Caen, 9-11 octobre 1997*. Bern: P. Lang: 135-149.
- FLØTTUM, K. 2003. À propos de *quant à* et *en ce qui concerne*. In B. COMBETTES, C. SCHNEDECKER & A. THEISSEN (eds.), *Ordre et distinction dans la langue et le discours: actes du colloque international de Metz (18, 19, 20 mars 1999)*. Paris: H. Champion: 185-202.
- GAIFFE, B., NEHBI, K. & TONNELIER, M. 2018. Corpus journalistique issu de l'Est Républicain [Corpus]. Nancy: Analyse et traitement informatique de la langue française [ATILF]. 2 ed. Available online: https://hdl.handle.net/11403/est_republicain/v2.
- GÜRER, A. 2020. The Prosody of Aboutness and Contrastive Topics in Turkish. *Journal of Turkish Language and Literature* 60 (2): 561-585.
- HAMMA, B. & HAILLET, P.P. 2002. *Par contre*: un type particulier de dynamique discursive. *Linx* 46: 103-113. Available online: <https://journals.openedition.org/linx/101>.
- HEDBERG, N. & SOSA, J.M. 2007. The Prosody of Topic and Focus in Spontaneous English Dialogue. In C. LEE, M.K. GORDON & D. BÜRING (eds.), *Topic and Focus: Cross-Linguistic Perspectives on Meaning and Intonation*. Dordrecht: Springer: 101-120.
- JAYEZ, J. 1982. Quand bien même *pourtant*, *pourtant quand même*. *Cahiers de linguistique française* 4: 189-217.
- KLEIN, W. 2012. The Information Structure of French. In M. KRIFKA & R. MUSAN (eds.), *The Expression of Information Structure*. Berlin – Boston: De Gruyter Mouton: 95-126.
- KOCH, P. & OESTERREICHER, W. 1985. Sprache der Nähe – Sprache der Distanz. Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit im Spannungsfeld von Sprachtheorie und Sprachgeschichte. *Romanistisches Jahrbuch* 36 (1): 15-43.
- KOCH, P. & OESTERREICHER, W. 2007. Schriftlichkeit und kommunikative Distanz. *Zeitschrift für germanistische Linguistik* 35 (3): 346-375.
- LAGAE, V. 2007. Left-Detachment and Topic-Marking in French: The Case of *quant à* and *en fait de*. *Folia Linguistica* 41 (3-4): 327-355.
- LAMBRECHT, K. 1994. *Information Structure and Sentence Form: Topic, Focus and the Mental Representations of Discourse Referents*. Cambridge – New York – Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- LEE, C. 2007. Contrastive (Predicate) Topic, Intonation, and Scalar Meanings. In C. LEE, M.K. GORDON & D. BÜRING (eds.), *Topic and Focus: Cross-Linguistic Perspectives on Meaning and Intonation*. Dordrecht: Springer: 151-175.
- LEE, C. 2017. Contrastive Topic, Contrastive Focus, Alternatives, and Scalar Implicatures. In C. LEE, F. KIEFER & M. KRIFKA (eds.), *Contrastiveness in Information Structure, Alternatives, and Scalar Implicatures*. Cham: Springer: 3-21.
- LE MONDE 2000. Le Monde sur CD-ROM: 1999-2000 [Corpus]. Paris: CEDROM-SNI.
- LENEPVEU, V. 2007. *Toutefois* et *néanmoins*, une synonymie partielle. *Syntaxe et sémantique* 8: 91-106.

- LENEPVEU, V. 2009. *Toutefois* dans le système adverbial concessif. *Revue québécoise de linguistique* 33 (1): 109-134. Available online: https://linguistique.uqam.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/71/2017/08/rql_lenepveu_33_1_09.pdf.
- LENKER, U. 2014. Knitting and Splitting Information: Medial Placement of Linking Adverbials in the History of English. In S.E. PFENNINGER, O. TIMOFEEVA, A.-C. GARDNER, A. HONKAPOHJA, M. HUNDT & D. SCHREIER (eds.), *Contact, Variation, and Change in the History of English*. Amsterdam – Philadelphia: J. Benjamins: 11-38.
- MASSERON, C. & WIEDERSPIEL, B. 2003. Contrastivité adverbiale: *au contraire*, *contrairement à*, *par contre*. In P. PÉROZ (ed.), *Contre: identité sémantique et variation catégorielle*. Recherches linguistiques 26. Metz: Université de Metz: 311-341.
- MELLET, S. & MONTE, M. 2005. *Néanmoins* et *toutefois*: polyphonie ou dialogisme? In J. BRES, P.P. HAILLET, S. MELLET, H. NØLKE & L. ROSIER (eds.), *Dialogisme et polyphonie: approches linguistiques*. Brussels: De Boeck-Duculot: 249-263.
- MELLET, S. & RUGGIA, S. 2010. *Quand même*, à la croisée des approches énonciatives. In M. ILIESCU, H. SILLER-RUNGGALDIER & P. DANLER (eds.), *Actes du XXV^e congrès international de Linguistique et Philologie romanes, Innsbruck, 3-8 septembre 2007*. Berlin – New York: De Gruyter: 201-209.
- MOESCHLER, J. & SPENGLER, N. de 1981. *Quand même*: de la concession à la réfutation. *Cahiers de linguistique française* 2: 93-112. Available online: https://clf.unige.ch/index.php/download_file/view/435/162/.
- RIESTER, A., SCHRÖER, T. & BAUMANN, S. 2020. On the Prosody of Contrastive Topics in German Interviews. In N. MINEMATSU, M. KONDO, T. ARAI & R. HAYASHI (eds.), *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Speech Prosody (25-28 May 2020, Tokyo, Japan)*. Baixas: International Speech Communication Association (ISCA): 280-284. Available online: https://www.isca-speech.org/archive_v0/SpeechProsody_2020/pdfs/282.pdf.
- RIVARA, R. 2008. *Pour autant*, un connecteur argumentatif complexe et néanmoins à la mode. *Modèles linguistiques* 57: 123-137. Available online: <https://journals.openedition.org/ml/267>.
- ROCQUET, A. 2014. The Discourse-Marking Effect of Strong Pronoun Doubling in French. *Phrasis: Studies in Language and Literature* 50 (2): 95-112.
- SAHKAI, H. & MIHKLA, M. 2017. Intonation of Contrastive Topic in Estonian. In F. LACERDA (ed.), *Proceedings of Interspeech 2017 (20-24 August 2017, Stockholm, Sweden)*. Baixas: International Speech Communication Association (ISCA): 3181-3185. Available online: https://www.isca-speech.org/archive/pdfs/interspeech_2017/sahkai17_interspeech.pdf.
- THUILIER, J. & DANLOS, L. 2012. Semantic Annotation of French Corpora: Animacy and Verb Semantic Classes. In N. CALZOLARI, K. CHOUKRI, T. DECLERCK, M. UĞUR DOĞAN, B. MAEGAARD, J. MARIANI, A. MORENO, J. ODIJK & S. PIPERIDIS (eds.), *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation – LREC 2012*. Paris: European Language Resources Association (ELRA): 1533-1537. Available online: http://www.lrec-conf.org/proceedings/lrec2012/pdf/552_Paper.pdf.
- VELAND, R. 1998. *Quand même* et *tout de même*: concessivité, synonymie, évolution. *Revue Romane* 33 (2): 217-247. Available online: https://tidsskrift.dk/revue_romane/article/view/30003/27616.

- VELGHE, T. & LAHOUSSE, K. 2015. Thematic Markers in Informal Written French: *pour ce qui est de*, *au niveau (de)* and *en matière de*. *Journal of French Language Studies* 25 (3): 423-444.
- VESELÁ, K., PETEREK, N. & HAJIČOVÁ, E. 2004. Prosodic Characteristics of Czech Contrastive Topic. In D.H. YOUN (ed.), *Proceedings of Interspeech 2004 (4-8 October 2004, Jeju Island, Korea)*. Baixas: International Speech Communication Association (ISCA): 805-808. Available online: https://www.isca-speech.org/archive/pdfs/interspeech_2004/vesela04_interspeech.pdf.
- WAGNER, M. 2012. Contrastive Topics Decomposed. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 5: 1-54. Available online: <https://semprag.org/index.php/sp/article/view/sp.5.8/pdf>.
- YASAVUL, M. 2013. Prosody of Focus and Contrastive Topic in K'iche'. *Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics* 60: 129-160. Available online: https://linguistics.osu.edu/sites/linguistics.osu.edu/files/wpl-vol60-7-Yasuval_0.pdf.
- ZAENEN, A., CARLETTA, J., GARRETSON, G., BRESNAN, J., KOONTZ-GARBODEN, A., NIKITINA, T., O'CONNOR, M.C. & WASOW, T. 2004. Animacy Encoding in English: Why and How. In B. WEBBER & D. BYRON (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2004 ACL Workshop on Discourse Annotation (25-26 July 2004, Barcelona, Spain)*. Stroudsburg: Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL): 118-125. Available online: <https://aclanthology.org/W04-0216.pdf>.
- ZERBIAN, S., TURCO, G., SCHAUFFLER, N., ZELLERS, M. & RIESTER, A. 2016. Contrastive Topic Constituents in German. In J. BARNES, A. BRUGOS, S. SHATTUCK-HUFNAGEL & N. VEILLEUX (eds.), *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Speech Prosody (31 May-3 June 2016, Boston, USA)*. Baixas: International Speech Communication Association (ISCA): 345-349. Available online: https://www.isca-speech.org/archive_v0/SpeechProsody_2016/pdfs/79.pdf.