**Coveney, A. (2005). Subject doubling in spoken French: A sociolinguistic approach. *The French Review*, 96-111.**

Coveney examines subject doubling from a sociolinguistic approach. He reviews grammarians’ feelings towards subject doubling, estimated frequency from previous literature, and what should count as SD. He draws utterances from the Picardy Corpus of Spoken French; the speakers are thirty adults working in *colonies de vacance*.

He finds that SD typically has a stigma, as early as the 17th century. Instead of SD appearing in an “all-or-nothing” type parameter in varieties of French, it is more useful to view it as a “more-or-less” type, similar to *ne-*retention.

Through the corpus, he finds an age-grading with respect to SD, where it becomes less common as one gets older. He attributes this to people conforming to a more standard speech once they get a stable job. Despite it appearing more frequently in children, standard non-SD is still more common and overestimated by some previous studies.

In the study, he includes two speakers of Picard, in which SD is obligatory. These speakers had the lowest rates of SD, which he claims is because they are hyperaware of SD due to Picard’s quasi-obligation of SD and the stigmatization of it in French.

Of interest in the low rates of SD in francophone adults than predicted (although it is present to varying degrees), and the high frequency of SD in Picard. Why does Picard feature SD so often?

**ANNE-JOSÉ VILLENEUVE and JULIE AUGER (2013). ‘chtileu qu'i m'freumereu m'bouque i n'est point coér au monne’: Grammatical variation and diglossia in Picardie. Journal of French Language Studies, 23, pp 109-133 doi:10.1017/ S0959269512000385**

**Gotowski, M. (2014). Subject clitics in child French.**

**Gotowski, M. (2015). Subject doubling in child French. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*, *21*(1), 12.**

Gotowski outlines a syntactic and a morphological approach to subjects in French, where they can be treated as either syntactic arguments or as preverbal inflectional affixes respectively, in both child and adult French despite contrasting data. Gotowski proposes another approach, the “developmental” approach”, influenced by competition-based models of language acquisition. She claims that the contrast between child and adult speech in respect to subjects can be explained by children and adults having two separate grammars. Children treat subjects as preverbal affixes (morphological approach), whereas adults treat subjects as syntactic arguments (syntactic approach). Children then adopt the syntactic approach as that grammar is rewarded more as they grow.

She uses the CHILDES corpus to test the following hypothesis: 1) Do children produce double subjects more often than adults? 2) Do children exhibit *ne-*retention less frequently than adults? 3) Do children exhibit subject-verb inversion less frequently than adults? In her developmental model, children will produce double subjects more often and exhibit *ne-*retention and subject-verb inversion less often.

All three of her predictions were found to be true and significant. She used these arguments to claim that children and adults have different grammatical representations of subjects, and that children have competing grammars of subjects as affixes vs syntactic arguments.

I am not convinced about the model that she uses to explain the results; I would like to see this interpreted in a different way. She claims that francophone children produce more root infinitives than would be expected by an NSL, but she is claiming that a competing grammar they have is NS. Do francophone children produce subjects with RIs? I also find a problem with the corpus as a source of data for adult speakers, as it is primarily child-addressed speech when it’s known that children pay attention to adult-to-adult conversations. In sum, I believe there is another, better explanation to this than what is proposed here.