# Studies of particular languages

ENGLISH See also abstract 75-162

75-165 Braddock, R. The frequency and placement of topic sentences in expository prose. Research in the Teaching of English (Champaign, Ill), 8, 3 (1974), 287-302.

A corpus of expository prose from sources such as *The New Yorker* is analysed in terms of Hunt's T-units, and a typology of topic sentences (delayed, assembled and inferred) and a rank scale (major topic sentences, topic sentences and sub-topic sentences) is offered. Only 13 per cent of the corpus paragraphs began with a topic sentence.

**75–166** White, David. The geography of words. *New Society* (London), **32**, 645 (13 February 1975), 381–4.

A discussion of dialect usage, based on the work of Orton, particularly A word geography of England (1975), and others. Diverse speech forms are now tolerated and even desired as badges of belonging, particularly among working-class men. Local rural dialects and the localised speech of schoolchildren preserve many traditional features [examples and isoglosses]. Sociolinguists often use methods which confirm hypotheses devised to confirm hypotheses: the emphasis should be on the researcher/hearer rather than the speaker [Pellowe's method]. Most dialect speakers are bidialectal [prejudices and propriety with regard to accents]. Many people retain their dialect.

## FRENCH See also abstract 75-162

75-167 Pohl, Jacques. L'omission de 'ne' dans le français contemporain. [The omission of 'ne' in present-day French.] Français dans le Monde (Paris), 111 (1975), 17-23.

Four major differences between nineteenth-century and present-day French are: replacement of the nasal un by in; loss of phonological vowel length [examples]; dropping of the pronoun complement when of negligible informational content, and the omission of ne in negative or restrictive constructions. The ratio of omission is the percentage of times ne is dropped from negative or restrictive constructions. This varies according to the level of formality of language, the speaker's personality and the form of the utterance. [Tables give omission ratios for speakers of Lorraine dialect, Parisians and other groups.]

In writing, omission is rare in formal texts, but frequent in graffiti and informal correspondence [examples]. A high degree of retention marks formal speech, but a wide variation appears in written dialogue. Among other determinants, the nature of the subject is significant [table]; also the number of syllables between *ne* position and the negative or restrictive particle. Articulatory economy seems a minor factor. Historically, the omission of *ne* spread from substandard speech from about 1820–50, and is now so common that unvarying retention is a mark of a non-native speaker.

#### GERMAN

75-168 Droescher, W. O. Das deutsche Adverbialsystem. [The adverbial system in German.] Deutsch als Fremdsprache (Leipzig), 11, 5 (1974), 279-85.

Whereas adjectives are always inflected (disregarding their use after sein), adverbs are uninflected, except in comparative forms. They are single words or preposition+nominal group. They fall into three main groups – manner, time, and place – and are either context-free (-m) or context-related (+m); many can form 'pro-adverbialia' with da- or hin/her.

The generally accepted order in a sentence is: subject, finite verb, pronoun field (including pro-adverbialia of time), the general pro-adverbial field (including subject, if it is displaced by inversion etc.), pro-adverbialia of place, time and *nicht*, adjunct field (including adverbs of manner and place), and completion field, e.g. separable prefix or past participle. [References.]

#### SPANISH

75-169 Lipski, J. M. Toward a production model of Spanish morphology: a further look at plurals. *Studia Linguistica* (Lund, Sweden), 28, 1 (1974), 83-99.

It is doubtful whether rules of standard generative phonology (as stated by Schane) actually form part of the speakers' mechanism for understanding or producing utterances. The validity of recent phonologies describing Iberian Romance pluralisation systems on the basis of abstract underlying forms is therefore disputed. [Work generated by the contributions of Foley and Saltarelli is discussed.] The Latin Stress Rule, which motivates most of these previous analyses, is felt to be inadequate to describe native speakers' intuitions, as with few exceptions stress is predictable on the surface form of Spanish plurals. Spanish grammarians' insights on stress (marking with an accent all the unpredictable cases) represent a valid intuition. Separate algorithms are sug-

#### STUDIES OF PARTICULAR LANGUAGES

gested for the decoding and encoding of plural forms, although it is not maintained that either would be universally valid among Spanish speakers. The decoding algorithm is centred around the high degree of correlation between plurality and unstressed-vowel-plus-s endings. The encoding algorithm is based on the position of stress, rather than the stress being dictated absolutely by phonological shape. [References.]

### RUSSIAN

**75–170 Rejser, S. R.** Из истории русской политической лексики: 'буржуй'. [From the history of Russian political vocabulary: 'буржуй' bourgeois.] *Серия литературы и языка* (Moscow), **33**, 4 (1974), 362–7.

The form  $\delta yp m y \tilde{u}$  probably arose as a colloquial by-form of  $\delta yp m y a$  (a rare morphological type in Russian) in the 1860s, on the model of words like  $xony\tilde{u}$  'lackey', and was first used in print by Turgenev in 1877. The two words were not exact synonyms in the late nineteenth century:  $\delta yp m y a$  referred to a member of a given social class, whereas  $\delta yp m y \tilde{u}$  was more expressive, referring to a crude and greedy kulak.  $\delta yp m y \tilde{u}$  is not attested in dictionaries until 1912, and Lenin used  $\delta yp m y a$  much more frequently than  $\delta yp m y \tilde{u}$ .

75–171 **Trubačev, O. N.** Ранние славянские этнонимы—свидетели миграций славян. [Early Slavonic ethnonyms – evidence for the migrations of the Slavs.] *Вопросы языкознания* (Moscow), **6** (1974), 48–67.

Recent work on early Slavonic ethnonyms has unfortunately reached the negative conclusion that similar ethnonyms occur in different Slavonic areas simply by chance. In discussing ethnonyms in relation to migrations, it is important to consider evidence for both the centre of ethnolinguistic movements and the direction of movement. At some period, the Carpathians were a focal

point for the Slavs. [Both the Croats and the Dudlebi migrated round the Carpathians, following reports of more favourable lands to be occupied.]

Comparison of Slavonic and other Indo-European ethnonyms should not be purely semantic, but also formal. [Examples of derivational parallels and divergences among Slavonic, Baltic, Germanic, Celtic, Illyrian, Thracian.] Derivatives in -t- and -n- and the virtual absence of appellatives link Slavonic with Celtic and especially Illyrian and Thracian, although the parallels are typological and the result of contact. As with the southern Indo-European groups, there is a common name for the whole Slavonic group.

Similarities between East and South Slavonic ethnonyms are too numerous to be fortuitous [examples]. The southward migrations comprised Slavs other than those from contiguous areas, including East Slavs. The traditional tripartite split into Western, Eastern and Southern Slavs is too simplistic to account for the patchwork of ethnolinguistic and other lexical isoglosses.