Studies of particular languages

76–245 **George, K. E. M.** Anglicisms in contemporary French. I-Sociolinguistic aspects. *Modern Languages* (London), **57**, 1 (1976), 6–11.

Consideration is given to the nature and extent of borrowings from English (including interpenetration), which has increased greatly in the last few decades. The majority are jargon terms, forming part of terminologies relating to specialised areas, some of which (e.g. sport, fashion) are accessible to the general public, but most of which are highly specialised. One specialised word may be acquired at different times and in different spheres and take on independent meanings. The role played by organisations and individuals in 'defending' French against English is seen as misguided and largely unavailing. Distinctions need to be made between non-specialist (vogue-words) and specialist (specific and stable) vocabulary, and between written and spoken usage. [Examples, notes.]

76–246 **Goudret, Pierre.** 'Quelques', 'plusieurs', 'certains', 'divers': étude sémantique. [Semantic study of four French numerical determiners.] *Français Moderne* (Paris), **44**, 2 (1976), 143–52.

The four words appear at first sight to have the same meaning and to be definable in terms of each other. A study of their distribution as regards syntactical and semantic use and inadmissibility shows them to be terms of a micro-system with two semantic and two syntactical axes. Thus *quelques* and *certains* contrast [examples] in the environment of particular semantic and syntactical collocations in such a way that *quelques* is seen to focus primarily on the concept of number, *certains* on quality and identity. Similarly, *quelques* and *plusieurs* contrast as connoting respectively restriction and augmentation of expected numbers. *Divers* falls into the fourth position as connoting augmentation of expected quality or identity. Syntactically, *quelques* and *divers* may be predetermined by the definite article, demonstratives and possessives, whereas *plusieurs* and *certains* may operate pronominally. This syntactical opposition is explicable in terms of their semantic significance, as are other syntactical features of these words [examples].

222

76–247 **Thun, H.** Quelques relations systématiques entre groupements de mots figés. [Some systematic relations between fixed word-groups.] *Cahiers de Lexicologie* (Paris), **27**, 2 (1975), 52–71.

The paradigmatic relations between fixed word-groups (idioms) have seldom been studied. A study of French materials shows that systematic relations exist between certain fixed word-groups of analogous form (fixed word-groups of entirely different form are not taken into consideration). As systematic relations must be semantic, direct and oppositional, variants and equivalents existing on different regional, social and stylistic levels of the language as well as homonyms are excluded. The oppositions discovered on a homogeneous level are not only of a lexical nature (type: *avoir la main heureuse – avoir la main malheureuse*) but also of a grammatical nature (type: *se mettre sur les rangs – être sur les rangs*). A rough classification of oppositional fixed word-groups is given according to material, functional and semantic criteria. It is characteristic of the oppositional possibility of fixed word-groups always to be highly restricted, both as to the number of oppositional partners (normally two) and the choice of oppositional components.

SPANISH

76–248 **Nuessel, Frank H., Jr.** The Spanish conjunction 'que' – some theoretical considerations. *Lenguaje y Ciencias* (Trujillo, Peru), **15**, 3 (1975), 124–32.

Certain statements in various traditional Spanish grammatical analyses dealing with the subordinating conjunction *que* are examined and evaluated in the light of generative transformational theory. The study deals with one aspect of sentential complementation, the study of the syntax and semantics of the noun clause and its derivative from the infinitive. The focus is on the similarities in the two approaches as well as the contributions of generative grammar.

RUSSIAN

76–249 **Croft, Lee B.** The expression of modality in English and Russian: a contrastive analysis. *Russian Language Journal* (Michigan), **29**, 104 (1975), 5–24.

Modality, defined as 'an attitude toward the content of what is said', may be expressed by various syntactic means. [Modality is a deictic phenomenon which may have referents in the speech event or the narrated event.] Verbs expressing modality may be arranged along two axes – factivity (concern with truth-value)

and fictivity (concern with realisational status). The axis of factivity includes 'factive' (*знать*), 'factively committal' (*думать*), 'inverse factively committal' (*сомневаться*), and 'neg-factive' verbs (*лгать*). These classes are defined both by the type of deixis exhibited and syntactically (the possibility or not of a *чтобы* complement). Similarly the axis of fictivity covers 'fictive' (*хотеть*), 'fictively committal' (*воспрещать*), 'inverse fictively committal' (*разрешать*), and 'neg-fictive' verbs (*заставлять*) [examples].

Modality may also be expressed by 'modal words' (which are a separate part of speech) which can also be factive (*безусловно*) or fictive (*обязательно*). English modal auxiliaries are divided into root and epistemic modals; these correspond to degrees of fictivity and factivity respectively. Russian modal auxiliaries correspond only to root or 'fictive' modals. The indicative in English and Russian assumes factivity; non-indicative moods have a basic meaning of fictivity. These moods in Russian involve *бы* and imperative forms, both of which may be used in contexts typically reserved for the other. Thus mood in English and mood in Russian do not coincide syntactically or semantically. However, the total expression of modality is equally varied with the axes of factivity and fictivity underlying both.

76–250 Lopatin, V. V. Глагольная основа и структура отглагольного слова в русском языке. [The verbal stem and the structure of the verbal derivative in Russian.] *Серия литературы и языка* (Moscow), **34**, 5 (1975), 409–17.

The term 'stem' may be used for the stem of a word form or the stem of a word. In the latter sense Russian verbs usually have one stem; in the former sense they have more than one stem. A word stem has both inflectional and word-formative functions. Verbal inflectional stems usually have two forms: one vocalic (normally called the past stem) and one consonantal (present stem). Secondary stems are based on one of these (derived by alternation). Either of the two main stems may be taken as basic. The word-formative stem is secondary to the inflectional stems; the verbal derivatives should therefore be viewed as the result of a modification of one of the inflectional stems. This is the 'perspective' approach, working from the 'motivating' to the 'motivated' word.

Verbs can be grouped naturally according to inflectional classes: each inflectional class and sub-class has a specific correlation of inflectional stems and specific means of modifying them for word-formation purposes. A convenient classification of inflectional classes – disregarding productivity – is given in the Academy Grammar (1970). The basic stem is taken provisionally to be the vocalic inflectional stem (convenient in that it appears in the infinitive). The word-formative stem may coincide with an inflectional stem or be a linear

modification of it. This stem may be vocalic or consonantal. At a second stage non-linear modifications (alternations) occur. [Examples of the different types.]

76–251 Sal'nikov, Nikolaj. Еще раз о видовых парах (глаголы типа 'нравиться' и 'понравиться'). [Once again on aspectual pairs (verbs of the type нравиться and понравиться).] *Russian Linguistics* (Dordrecht), **2**, 3/4 (1975), 303–15.

It is now accepted that many verbs are not members of aspectual pairs. After a survey of the literature it is concluded that *нравиться* and *понравиться* do not form a pair. *Понравиться* is perfective but its meaning is close to that of an inceptive – unusual as it is the inceptive of a stative. Thus *нравиться* may be glossed as 'to cause in someone a state of being favourably impressed or disposed' (cf. *быть по нраву*) and *понравиться* as 'to cause in someone the beginning of a state...' (cf. *прийтись по нраву*) [examples].

Tense is analysed with regard to the past: the imperfective involves a generalisation of a process-state: this is not so with perfective verbs which may be resultative. This allows an interpretation of: *Вчера мы были на выставке; мне очень понравилась/*нравилась. выставка. Нравилась* is ungrammatical as it does not express the temporal (and causal) link: the exhibition precedes the beginning of the impression. Verbs of a similar type are listed. [References.]

SWISS LANGUAGES

76–252 Rubattel, Christian. Recherches sur les langues en contact. [Research on languages in contact.] *Études de Linguistique Appliquée* (Paris), **21** (1976), 20–32.

A review, with brief descriptions, of the literature on Swiss multilingualism (excluding dialectology and linguistic geography), covering general and juridicial language frontiers, diglossia in German-speaking cantons (Swiss Low German used for conversation and business, and *Hochdeutsch* used in official announcements, books, etc.) with contrastive analysis. Switzerland is really a federation of unilingual territories, with few truly bilingual areas. *Romansch* is in retreat. Standard German is still a written code. Studies mostly ignore immigrants who form 15 per cent of the population. A full and up-to-date sociolinguistic survey is still lacking.