

# *Studies of particular languages*

---

**ENGLISH** *See also abstracts* 80–10, –21

**80–27 Cannon, Garland.** Statistical etymologies of new words in American English. *Journal of English Linguistics* (Bellingham, Wash), **12** (1978), 12–18.

In Merriam-Webster's (1976) collection of new meanings and words in American English, called *6,000 words*, new meanings account for 18 per cent of the main entries; affixation, 20 per cent; compounding, 28 per cent; borrowing, 5 per cent if we exclude the British importation of 1 per cent; proper-noun derivatives, 5 per cent; and other categories, less than 4 per cent each. The many Latin and Greek affixes and roots in English have massively contributed. Borrowing has become a small source. If the new meanings were analysed in the way that the new words are treated, it is likely that at least as much creativity would be found. English seems to be developing in the dynamic way it did in the Middle Ages, when the expanding meanings and lexicon accommodated the more precise and varied expression needed to carry on communication. A casual check of *Barnhart* and the *A-N Supplement* of the *OED* seems to confirm this dynamism.

**EUROPEAN LANGUAGES** *See also abstract* 80–20

**80–28 Filipović, R.** English words in European mouths and minds. *Folia Linguistica* (The Hague), **11**, 3/4 (1977), 195–206.

A description of aspects of the author's project on 'The English element in European languages', the aim of which was to show which linguistic features of borrowing are common to all and which to only some languages. The corpus was restricted to about 20 European borrowing languages. In the analysis of English loan words in these languages special attention was paid to systemic and structural differences between English and the various languages since these are the main areas where interference arises. The course of adaptation of loan words into the borrowing language depends on the path of borrowing: (a) direct or (b) via an intermediary language. In both cases, there are two possible media: oral (English pronunciation influences phonological form of loan) and written (spelling influences form of loan) [examples]. An intermediary language often helps to explain how loan words have been adapted.

A *Dictionary of anglicisms in European languages* records all the English words collected which have been transferred into one or more of the other languages in the corpus. They are analysed in the dictionary on three levels: phonological, morphological and semantic [discussion

of the main findings for each level, with examples]. English is shown to have been a generous lender, as well as a great borrower.

**FRENCH** *See also abstracts 80–11, –78*

**80–29 Connors, Kathleen.** The meaning of the French subjunctive. *Linguistics* (The Hague), 211 (1978), 45–56.

There are fundamentally two uses of the subjunctive in French: an 'automatic' (lexically determined) subjunctive and a 'non-automatic' (syntactically and semantically marked) subjunctive. Attention is focused on the latter. Two possible semantic contrasts between the subjunctive and the indicative were found: (A) a volition v. assertion contrast, when the higher verb can sustain both interpretations, and (B) a hypothetical v. non-hypothetical distinction, in all remaining non-automatic subjunctives.

Subjunctives in relative clauses mark the latter as having hypothetical status, as in (B). The 'meanings' of both the automatic and non-automatic subjunctive are examined: the latter (only) imposes a unified 'potentiality' (as against 'reification') interpretation on its clause.

Semantic and syntactic evidence shows that in present-day French the subjunctive is two separate phenomena: a (redundant) morphological marker of certain classes of lexical items, and an optional differentiator of a type of systematic ambiguity in subordinate clauses.

**80–30 Fiengo, Robert and Gitterman, Martin R.** Remarks on French clitic order. *Linguistic Analysis* (New York), 4, 2 (1978), 115–47.

A new solution to the problems of French clitic pronouns is presented which rests on the metatheoretical assumptions that the cliticisation process aims to move pronouns into second position (in a S, not a  $\bar{S}$ ) and that the rules in question obey the A-over-A condition and the A-before-A condition. The Structure-Preserving Hypothesis is also assumed. Rules obeying these conditions are proposed to generate the correct combinations and ordering of the clitic pronouns.

**80–31 Giry-Schneider, Jacqueline.** A propos de quelques nominalisations. [On certain nominalisations.] *Langue Française* (Paris), 39 (1978), 30–48.

The expressions under investigation are those involving the verb *faire* of the type illustrated by *Jean fait des cajoleries à Marie*, *Jean fait la morale à Marie*. Also considered are similar expressions where the nominal in question has no corresponding verb (*faire du cinéma à quelqu'un*), and cases where the noun and the verb differ semantically (*faire une observation à quelqu'un*  $\neq$  *observer quelqu'un*).

The syntactic properties of these constructions are examined, and are shown to be systematically different from those of other, apparently similar but semantically distinct, expressions. Certain aspects of their semantics are discussed, including selectional restrictions on subjects and indirect objects, meaning differences between nouns and the corresponding verbs, etc. Finally, noun phrases of the type *l'offense de Jean à Marie, les soins de Jean à Marie* are examined, with particular reference to the relation between them and the corresponding constructions with *faire*. [Appendix listing relevant verbs and nouns according to the constructions they may enter into.]

**80–32 Muller, Claude.** La négation explétive dans les constructions complétives. [Expletive negation in complement constructions.] *Langue Française* (Paris), 39 (1978), 76–103.

The term 'expletive' is used to characterise elements which add nothing to the meaning of a sentence and whose presence is not syntactically obligatory. Thus *ne* is expletive in *Je crains qu'il ne vienne*, which means the same as *Je crains qu'il vienne*. However, *ne* is not considered to be expletive in *Paul n'est pas venu*, despite the fact that this means the same as *Paul est pas venu*. Expletive *ne* in comparative constructions is not discussed.

The set of elements (verbs, nouns, conjunctions) with which expletive *ne* co-occurs is shown to be at least partially open. It is suggested that productive processes generate new instances of expletive *ne* on the basis of semantic similarity with elements in a memorised list.

The principal semantic and syntactic properties of expletive *ne* are reviewed and two main types of usage are distinguished: one tied to a negation which has been semantically displaced from the subordinate to the main clause, and one involving constructions with double negative polarity, where one of the main functions of *ne* is to negate a negative polarity expressed by the subjunctive.

**GERMAN** See also abstract 80–25

**80–33 Harweg, R.** Deixis und variable Referenz. [Deixis and variable reference.] *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* (Berlin), 31, 2 (1978), 132–42.

Deixis and variable reference are two characteristics of certain linguistic expressions which are closely related. This article intends to show that they are not identical. Deictic expressions have three subtypes: spatial (*hier, dort*), temporal (*heute, gestern*), and personal (*ich, du*). Variable reference means that their exact reference depends on by whom, when, or where the sentences containing them are uttered. The classes of deictic elements differ as to whether anaphoric pronouns are included or not.

The referential variability of anaphora is solely due to their reference to persons and objects previously mentioned in the text. Multi-referential proper names are not considered to have variable reference since they become unambiguous in context. The traditional deictics *hier*, *jetzt*, *ich*, differ also from multi-referential proper names in that they stand in a specific relation to certain utterance-specific loci. Neutralisation of variable reference does not imply that speakers know who is actually being referred to. True deictics combine neutralisation of referential variability with referential identification.

**80-34 Leirbukt, O.** Über dativische Appositionen bei akkusativischem Bezugswort. [On dative appositions with accusative antecedent.] *Linguistische Berichte* (Brunswick), 55 (1978), 1-17.

It is well known that the agreement in case between an antecedent and a following word in apposition is frequently 'wrong'. This article deals with the cases where the antecedent is in the accusative and the word in apposition in the dative and attempts to describe the characteristics of this construction which has mostly been neglected. It seems chiefly to occur after a preposition, e.g. *Der Preis für Brot, dem Grundnahrungsmittel der Bevölkerung*; an accusative after a transitive verb does not have the same effect. Some grammarians regard this construction as wrong but its regularity must be taken seriously. Sometimes several nouns in the dative follow a prepositional phrase in the accusative. Most prepositions which govern the accusative only or both the dative and accusative occur in this construction. The prepositional phrase can be a prepositional object, an adverbial or an attribute. The dative can immediately follow the accusative or be separated by *als*. It is concluded that this construction is a regularity of the modern language and not merely a mistake. It not only appears in the popular press but in serious works including literature.

**80-35 Schröder, Jochen.** Überlegungen zu zwei weiteren Untergruppen von Präpositionen im lokalen Bereich. [Considerations relating to two further subclasses of prepositions of place.] *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* (Leipzig), 156 (1978), 356-61.

Two types of preposition are investigated: prepositions expressing movement away from a place, and those expressing passage through a place. Differences in usage between the two main examples of the first type, *aus* and *von*, are explained. Similar structures, such as *von + aus* and the preposition *hervor*, are also considered.

Prepositions of the second type, *durch* and *über*, are distinguished, depending on whether the preposition denotes movement within, or transit through a space. The sets of features assigned to prepositions and to related verbal prefixes are compared. Cases where the correct

features are in doubt are discussed, and it is pointed out that these ambiguities are a particular problem in connection with lexical elements whose function is to represent relationships in the real world. [Numerous examples.]

## RUSSIAN

**80-36**    **Corbett, G. G.** Parallelism and syntactic distance. *International Review of Slavic Linguistics* (Edmonton, Canada), 3, 3 (1978), 407-14.

In a previous paper (*International Review of Slavic Linguistics* 1, 2/3 (1976), 293-306), it was claimed that when there is a syntactic choice of gender, number or case, the two options may not occur parallel to each other in modern Russian. Apparent exceptions are analysed and it is shown that most involve stacked rather than parallel elements. However, occasional genuine exceptions are found. This is not surprising as absolute parallelism is impossible in natural languages (two elements cannot be pronounced at once). Word order can therefore be viewed as the weakest form of stacking. While exceptions are very rare in Russian, other Slavonic languages (Polish and Serbo-Croat) do not observe the constraint. Nevertheless, when two parallel elements show different forms, it is always the element further from the controller which shows the semantically justifiable form. Thus real distance is found to be the weakest form of syntactic distance (the measure which determines the distribution of alternative agreement possibilities.).

**80-37**    **Furašov, V. I.** Присубстантивные наречия в строе предложения. [Adnominal adverbs in the structure of the sentence.] *Русский язык в национальной школе* (Moscow), 6 (1978), 77-82.

A detailed analysis of adverbial elements which may be used attributively to concrete nouns [e.g. *глаза навывкате*] in Russian. An analysis of such constructions within the noun phrase is rejected, as they may also be used as constituents of the sentence.

Syntactically, such adverbs usually follow the head noun, although under certain very restricted conditions they may precede it. Their meaning is somewhere between attributive and adverbial, depending to some extent on the semantic class of the nouns they modify. Their behaviour in coordination with genuine adjectival elements is examined and classified.