

Studies of particular languages

ENGLISH See also abstracts 75–4, –68

75–15 **Algeo, John.** The voguish uses of 'non'. *American Speech* (New York), **46**, 1/2 (1971) [published 1974], 87–105.

The history of the use of the prefix *non* is briefly sketched in, from its use in legal terminology in the fourteenth to sixteenth centuries to its increasing variety of uses at the present time. It filled a need in defining a class that had no other common characteristic than the exclusion of some other group, e.g. *nonverbal communication*. It was felt to be more unemotional than other negative prefixes (cf. *nonreligious/irreligious*): this is called its privative use. Its use for euphemism (*nonstandard* rather than *substandard*) and prestige (*nonprofit organisations*, *nonsalaried official*) is noted. Its original basic meaning was simple negation, impartial in tone.

Since 1960, it has undergone a morphemic split into several homophonous prefixes. Pejorative *non*, with a connotation of emotional judgement (a *nonbook* is a book with the external appearance but without the value of a real book); and dissimulative *non*, the opposite (*nonacting* is acting so restrained as to appear not to be acting), i.e. something with the value but without the obvious external appearances. This usage often implies admiration. The vogue for pejorative *non*, which is much more commonly used, is due to the ironic contrast with privative *non*: it sounds equally objective but is not. [The wide-ranging grammatical use of these morphemes is illustrated, and objections are cited.] [Glossary gives 80 examples of pejorative and 16 of dissimulative *non*.]

75–16 **Allerton, D. J. and Cruttenden, A.** English sentence adverbials: their syntax and their intonation in British English. *Lingua* (Amsterdam), **34**, 1 (1974), 1–29.

The tests of Davies and Greenbaum for subcategorising sentence adverbials (viz. adverbs, adverbial phrases, prepositional phrases, NP of time, etc.) are critically reviewed and a new and detailed analysis is offered. This ranges over syntactic and semantic properties like position in the string, co-occurrence restrictions and paraphrase relations. Further, it is hypothesised that intonational variations on adverbs will be constrained by the syntactic–semantic subcategorisation. Detailed examination of intonation on sentence initial adverbs confirms that particular intonation patterns correlate with certain semantic, modal, and informational (focus) characteristics of adverbs. Thus conjunctive adverbs, such as *therefore*, require a separate intonational group for the

adverbial with a consequent nuclear tune, whereas most other classes can occur as part of the pre-nuclear tune. Supporting verification for the hypothesis comes from tests of informant reaction to a variety of intonations on differing subcategories of sentence initial adverbials. [References.]

75-17 Baron, Naomi S. The structure of English causatives. *Lingua* (Amsterdam), 33, 4 (1974), 299-342.

Causation is defined: NP or sentence Z changes state of affairs X at time T_1 to state of affairs X' at later time T_2 . The formal devices available for the expression of causation in English are listed: vowel alternation in verbs (*to fall, to fell*), suppletion (*die, kill*), verbs that have both ergative and non-ergative forms (*dry*), affixation (*enrich*), and periphrasis (*make, have, get*, etc., + complement sentence). Only periphrasis is examined in detail and a set of semantic/syntactic parameters is established to (begin to) define the properties and internal relations of periphrastic constructions. Among those noted are co-occurrence restrictions on types of complement with particular causatives, and co-occurrence restrictions and transformational input conditions affected by (i) the choice of simultaneous features $\begin{bmatrix} \pm\text{stative} \\ \pm\text{ergative} \end{bmatrix}$ in the complement, (ii) the role (Agent or Instrument) of the causer, (iii) whether or not the action is intended (this affects the passivisability of the complement), (iv) the manner of causing (if this is predictable from the verb it cannot be expressed in surface structure). [References.]

75-18 Legrand-Granger, Sylviane. On some active and passive complex structures. *Cahiers de l'Institut de Linguistique* (Louvain), 1, 5 (1972) [published 1974], 705-32.

Transformational grammar [references] is used to contrast 'object with infinitive' active structures and the corresponding passives in French and English. Following discussion of Chomsky's study of *expect* and *persuade*, four characterisations of the matrix verb of English are proposed: thinking, judging, declaring, volition or causation, with or without effect on another person, and perception, together with *let* and *make*. Although the richer categories of English are the study's starting-point, the categories in the two languages are not symmetrical. Consideration is given to the grammaticality of sentences drawn from French as calques of the English examples for each category. Subdivisions within the English data are analysed [examples and discussion].

The infinitive construction is very restricted in French. It is not possible for the NP which is constituent in the embedded sentence to be raised to the matrix (as for *I expected the doctor to examine John*). While the construction is possible

with *voir*, *entendre*, *laisser* and *faire*, in other cases French does not exhibit ambiguity such as *He wouldn't allow John to go with them*, distinguishing one interpretation as an infinitive construction, the other as a dependent clause construction. The rarity of passivation in French is best accounted for by grammatical constraints, such as the constraint on an indirect object as subject of a passive verb, and the constraint on raising the embedded NP. [Bibliography.]

FRENCH See also abstracts 75–18, –25

75–19 Ford, Jerome C. The semantics of direct address pronouns in French. *French Review* (Baltimore, Md), 47, 6 (1974), 1142–57.

The pronouns of power and solidarity by Brown and Gilman (1960) is examined in the light of changes in the use of *tu* and *vous* during and after May 1968. Notions of 'distance' and 'disdain' are added to the categories for *vous*; the notion of 'shared fate' among users of *tu* is discarded. Use of *tu* was gradually expanding before 1968, and became pervasive during the May crisis; where *vous* was temporarily ousted it did not subsequently make a complete return in all situations. [Field observations made in 1968, 1971 and 1973: corroboration of native speakers.] The likelihood of *tu* being spontaneously used by total strangers is estimated by such factors as geography (Paris v. regions); age (up to 30 v. over 30), sex of the speaker *vis-à-vis* that of the interlocutor, and student v. non-student status. When a speaker feels solidarity with a group of interlocutors *tu* may be used to address more than one person.

74–20 Lifetree-Majumdar, M. J. Contribution à l'analyse des modes de composition nominale en français écrit contemporain. [Contribution to the analysis of ways of making compound nouns in current written French.] *Cahiers de Lexicologie* (Paris), 24, 1 (1974), 63–84.

Of 5,049 neologisms culled from *Le Monde* in 1955, 1306 are compound nouns. The sources of new compounds are usually: popularisation of technical jargon; public interest in new phenomena (*ville-champignon*), and nonce creations for brevity by authors of newspaper articles. Sixteen nouns lose part of their semantic content to assume a partly suffixal role (*guerre-éclair*; *diffusion-éclair*; *voyage-éclair*). This compounding mode is potentially very fruitful. 276 compounds combine elements which retain their full semantic content: 33 of them are sociological or financial jargon; 14 appear in subsequent dictionaries. Two substantives in apposition, each with undiminished semantic force, may be used to designate and define something, usually a person's profession or a place – this is economical of time and newsprint but clumsy to pronounce and probably rarely used in conversation. 149 examples show hiatus, usually of a preposition

(*allocation-ménage*), sometimes of much more (*franc-tourisme, dollar-café*). Some compounds render nouns invariable which would have plural form in the fully realised syntagm. Many of these apposition compounds appear in dictionaries published 16 years later; administrators' jargon is likely to be lexicalised. [Elided syntagms: *en, à partir de, à la*, etc. *Côté* becomes almost a preposition.] Bound elements (*eurasiatique*) are uncommon. Enough examples are available to permit construction of a typology of noun-compounding modes in informal written French. [Analyses, examples.]

GERMAN

75-21 Helbig, Gerhard and Kempster, Fritz. Die uneingeleiteten Nebensätze im Deutschen und ihre Vermittlung im Fremdsprachenunterricht. [Subordinate clauses not introduced by conjunctions and their place in the teaching of German as a foreign language.] *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* (Leipzig), 11, 2 (1974), 75-86.

Syntactically, subordinate clauses depend on and are part of main clauses. Hence unreal wish-clauses (*Käme er doch jetzt!*) are not classed as such. These subordinate clauses are equivalent to those clauses with conjunctions, but having neither a conjunction nor a finite verb at the end, are signalled by intonation. If equal to a subordinate clause with *daß*, they have their finite verb in second place; if equal to a *wenn* or *obwohl* clause, they have their finite verb in first place.

Subordinate clauses without conjunctions, if subject or object clauses, will depend on the verbs, adjectives or nouns (usually indicating statement or feeling) with which they are connected. Otherwise they may be conditional clauses, with or without modal verb, or concessive clauses, requiring inclusion of *auch* and adding *doch* to the main clause. Subordinate clauses without conjunctions are roughly as frequent as equivalent clauses with conjunctions, and in practice most of them are object clauses. Presenting no word-order problems, they should be taught quite early in the course – actively in oral courses and passively in reading or translation-type courses. Pupils should first hear or see the clauses in significant forms of communication, and then be made specifically aware of them and the rules pertaining to them. The material should then be reinforced and activated in relevant and meaningful exercises.

75-22 Metschkowa-Atanassowa, S. Zur Synonymie zwischen der Konstruktion 'haben+zu+Infinitiv' und den Modalverben. [The synonymy of the 'haben+zu+infinitive' construction and the modal verbs.] *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* (Leipzig), 11, 2 (1974), 106-10.

Twenty-four examples show synonymous uses of *haben+zu+infinitive* for *müssen, können, wollen, sollen*; but with some uses of *haben+zu+infinitive* the

meaning depends on the infinitive: thus it can mean 'to have good cause to' or it may even have an imperative sense. The *haben+zu+infinitive* construction has more nuances than the modal verbs; it expresses its modal value less definitely and this lexical indefiniteness allows free play to subjective interpretation, and even to differentiation between two-stage complex modalities.

- 75-23 **Schluroff, Michael.** Flexionsklassen von Substantiven und ihre Häufigkeitsverteilung. [Nouns arranged in inflectional classes and their distribution according to frequency.] *Linguistische Berichte* (Braunschweig), 31 (1974), 19-30.

Almost all inflected nouns in German can be categorised in 18 singular and 16 plural classes. The frequency of distribution among these classes will be important for the effectiveness of either machine analysis or of the generation of texts in natural language. For the most frequent inflectional classes, generation by morpho-syntactical rules is more economical than storing inflectional forms in a lexicon and calling for them by lexical rules. For the less frequent inflectional classes the decision on the use of lexical or morpho-syntactical rules will depend on the particular text or lexicon available. If the decision is to use both sets of rules, it will be best to separate singulars from plurals and often it will be sensible to use morpho-syntactical rules to produce singular forms only or plural forms only.

- 75-24 **Weber, Siegfried.** Die Verwendung des Verbs in Sätzen mit adjektivischem Prädikativ im Deutschen. [The use of the verb in sentences with an adjectival predicate in German.] *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* (Berlin), 27, 1/3 (1974), 241-5.

The use of various verbs is studied in sentences where the predicative adjective refers to the subject (*Er ist zuverlässig*) and those where it refers to the object (*Ich halte ihn für zuverlässig*). (In the first group, the subject denotes the bearer of a given quality (*Merkmalträger* = M_1) and the predicative adjective or participle denotes the quality (*Merkmal* = M_2). The basic verb *sein* may be replaced by *werden*, *bleiben*, *scheinen* and *heissen*, all of which serve to alter the viewpoint of the sentence. Five main possibilities are envisaged within the subject predicative type sentence: (1) verbs which emphasise the appearance of M_1 ; (2) behavioural verbs; (3) verbs expressing subjective feelings; (4) verbs denoting a progressive process, and (5) verbs denoting the condition of M_1 .

The second type of sentence has a different pattern: *Er (M_3) hält ihn (M_1) für zuverlässig (M_2)*. Here the subject denotes the person (M_3) assigning the quality

(M_2) to its bearer (M_1). Three possibilities of verb usage are discussed in this group: (a) verbs forming a judgment of the object, (b) verbs designating the object, and (c) verbs expressing result or effect. This brief survey shows the need for a more systematic examination of the semantic aspect of verb usage, which is only touched upon in most grammars. [Many examples.]

ITALIAN

75-25 **Borsari, A. Valeria.** Quantificazione ed uso dell'articolo in italiano e francese. [Quantification and use of the article in Italian and French.] *Lingua e stile* (Bologna), 9, 1 (1974), 101-16.

Articles are quantifiers whose function is essentially predicative. Their role is best examined by using 'free logic' – which relates to all possible universes (and hence to contexts of discourse) rather than to the 'real' universe of Peano and Russell. Such an approach harmonises the operations of natural languages with the laws of logic, making the languages appear less irregular.

Un corresponds to an existential quantifier [its relationship with uncountables is examined]. The numerical semantic trait of *un* with an uncountable or a unique class is characteristic and fundamental: the issue is not one of countability or uniqueness in a real universe but of the intrinsic possibility of referring to various elements belonging to the same class. From this basis the functions of *un* can be compared with the functions of other parts of speech.

A thing is nowadays considered to be a class of events, so any one thing or object constitutes a class in itself at the moment that it is first introduced into a discourse; *il/le* is here used as a truly universal quantifier (not just in the restricted 'real' universe of Russell). In its other function as an indicator, *il/le* can be formalised by referring to a contextual operator analogous to the iota operator but functioning solely within the universe (i.e. the context) to which the discourse refers. *Il/le* operates here at a subordinate level and refers by means of its indicative function to arguments initially presented by either the existential or the universal quantifier.

SPANISH

75-26 **Bracamonte, Ana María.** The syntactic behaviour of some adjectives in Spanish. *Lenguaje* (Trujillo, Peru), 14, 1 (1974), 10-16.

The different Spanish equivalents of the past participle *known* functioning as an adjective are explained with examples. The selection of the conjunctions may depend on the type of adjectives and their grade (*bueno* only admits *que*; *mejor*

admits *que* and *si*). Another class of adjectives have restrictions as to infinitive transformations. Some other adjectives show peculiarities with regard to accompanying adverbs functioning as intensifiers (*muy concurrido* but not *enormemente-concurrido*; *demasiado pesado para llevarlo* but not *pesado para llevarlo*). Adjectives may also be classified according to their co-occurrence with nouns (*enseñanza eficiente* but not *enseñanza eficaz*; *método eficaz* but not *método eficiente*).

- 75-27 **Kvavik, Karen H. and Olsen, Carroll L.** Theories and methods in Spanish intonational studies: survey. *Phonetica* (Basle), 30, 2 (1974), 65-100.

The various approaches used in Spanish intonational research are demonstrated and evaluated. Dialectical studies, theoretical and methodological approaches, and intonation representational schemata are reviewed in a chronological order and integrated with the main theoretical currents of the field. The authors suggest directions for future research and present a summary of their own investigations into two dialects of Spanish – Castilian and Mexican – using the computerised intonation extractor of the University of Toronto.

RUSSIAN See also abstracts 75-6, -39

- 75-28 **Filin, F. P.** Об истоках русского литературного языка. [On the sources of the Russian literary language.] *Вопросы языкознания* (Moscow), 3 (1974), 3-13.

The question of how many literary languages existed in Kievan Russian is an eternal problem of Russian linguistics. Šaxmatov considered there to be only one such language, Church Slavonic, subsequently russified to give the Russian literary language; certainly writing in Russia was introduced from Bulgaria via Church Slavonic. Obnorskij claimed that there were two literary languages, Church Slavonic and Old Russian, the latter based on East Slavonic speech; Obnorskij would have Old Russian distinct in origin from Church Slavonic, and only subsequently influenced by it; however, textual evidence is against so distinct an origin for Old Russian. The Šaxmatov school neglects Old Russian legal and commercial documents, claiming that these are not within the literary language, but this is based on too narrow a conception of the literary language.

In fact, with the introduction of writing to Russian there arose two closely related, but independent literary languages, Church Slavonic and Old Russian. The latter had both a written and an oral variant. In the ninth–eleventh centuries Common Slavonic had already disintegrated, so Russian and Old Church Slavonic were distinct languages. The precise origins of the Russian

literary language still remain to be investigated in detail; some progress can be made by studying the proportion of Church Slavonic and East Slavonic elements in the modern literary language and, although much work remains to be done, it seems that the basis of the literary language was popular Russian speech, with Church Slavonic as an important supplement.

- 75-29 **Lauder, Michael K.** Prefixal-suffixal derivation of the Russian adverb. *Slavic and East European Journal* (Urbana, Ill), 17, 3 (1973), 301-7.

One of the means by which Russian builds adverbial forms is on the pattern of the prepositional phrase: preposition + nominal stem + case-ending. The nominal element may be an extant noun, but in some cases is a verbal root which does not function independently as a noun; alternatively, it may be derived from a nominalised adjectival or adverbial root. The nominalising of the adjectival or adverbial root is illustrated by the fact that the root may assume the features (e.g. marking as 'temporal') of nouns in analogous preposition + noun constructions. However, since these nominalised roots do not function normally as nouns outside these constructions, adverbs so formed must be regarded as different from prepositional phrases. An adverb built on this model round an adverbial root usually has a suffix which is identical to the nominal case-ending required by the preposition from which the prefix employed is derived. [Many examples.]

- 75-30 **Ulukhanov, I. S.** Компоненты значения членимых слов. [Meaning components of segmentable words.] *Вопросы языкознания* (Moscow), 2 (1974), 71-8.

The meaning of a derivationally motivated word has three components. The motivating base is the word with the same root as the more complex word and closest to it semantically (e.g. *грязнить* 'make dirty' from *грязный* 'dirty'); the second component is the meaning of the derivational affix, paying due regard to homonymy and polysemy. Some derivationally motivated words are idiomatic, their meaning not being fully predictable from the meaning of motivating base and affix, e.g. *кожанка* 'leather jacket' (from *кожаный* 'leather') [examples]. In non-motivated segmentable words, the semantic component not attributable to the affix is to be attributed to the root (e.g. *говядина* 'beef', where *-ина* is 'meat') [examples]. Where an affix occurs only in one word (e.g. *стеклярус* 'glass beads', cf. *стекло* 'glass'), the meaning of the affix consists of those semantic elements that are not part of the meaning of the motivating base.