# Studies of particular languages

## FRENCH

**75–95**     **Boyse, James A.** Determined nouns, direct objects, and 'de'. *French Review* (Champaign, Ill), **48**, 1 (1974), 40–6.

Noun objects relate to the verb either directly or through the intermediary of a preposition. But a preposition may function as part of a verb-cluster or as part of a noun-marker. Noun-markers can distinguish determined from undetermined nouns. Once the verb+preposition structure is known, these separate characteristics can be used to demonstrate a regularity of pattern in apparently idiomatic changes of sequence [examples]. The concept of determined/undetermined noun, in which *de* plays a major role, can help to clarify (*a*) the agreement of the past participle with the third person object pronouns preceding the auxiliary; (*b*) choice of pronouns referring to people; (*c*) *en* and *dans* in expressions of time and place; (*d*) the exclamatory interrogatives *Quel* and *Que de*, and (*e*) *Quel* and *Combien de*.

**75–96**     **Casagrande, J.** 'Sûr' et 'certain' en français et en anglais. ['Sure' and 'certain' in French and English.] *Français Moderne* (Paris), **42**, 2 (1974), 121–32.

*X être (sûr, certain) de INFINITIF* ≠ *Il être (certain, sûr) que P*. On the other hand, *X be (sure, certain) to Infinitive* = *It be (sure, certain) that P*. Investigations of animacy/inanimacy of the subject and of the effects of transformations into the passive show that the resemblance of *X être (sûr, certain) de Infinitif* to *X be (sure, certain) to Infinitive* is fortuitous and superficial. The syntactic and semantic constraints on the use of *sûr, certain* (F) and of *sure, certain* (E) show differences on two points: raising of the noun phrase and ellipsis. Both rules have the effect of obscuring the subject of the subordinate proposition by using an infinitive – an operation which makes the resulting sentences resemble each other even more.

**75–97**     **Lapierre, André.** Quelques aspects quantitatifs de la conjugaison en français contemporain. [Some quantitative aspects of conjugation in modern French.] *Français Moderne* (Paris), **42**, 2 (1974), 97–107.

Juilland's *Frequency dictionary of French words* [bibliographical reference] gives for each word not only its overall frequency, but also that of each of its forms. This makes possible statistical operations leading to a theory of the quantitative

aspects of conjugation. Taking as the population the inflected forms of verbs contained in Juilland's dictionary, with certain exceptions [list and justification], 25,890 forms give a distribution by tense and person in raw figures and percentages [tables]. If the chi squared probabilities at the five per cent level are calculated for the occurrence of the tenses, the occurrence of the persons in the tenses deviates markedly from a random distribution [table and discussion].

By another operation, an 'index of inflexional power' may be established for a given verb. The number of verbs can be tabulated according to the number of inflexions they give, and from this the number of inflected forms can be plotted against the frequency of the verbs in which they occur [graph]. Each verb frequency can then be correlated with the mean number of forms occurring for verbs of that frequency [table]. Inflexional power is high where the number of inflexions exceeds the mean for that verb frequency, and conversely. This agrees with experience [test of three selected verbs] and so may be regarded as a research tool. These findings for written French (Juilland's corpus) are now in process of being tested for the spoken language.


# GERMAN

**75–98**   **Latour, Bernd.** Zur Nominalisierung zweiwertiger Verben. [The nominalisation of bi-valent verbs.] *Zielsprache Deutsch* (Munich), **3** (1974), 100–9.

The nominalisation of verbs has traditionally been seen as a means of enlarging the lexicon of a language. This process is, however, also of syntactic importance, and its modalities and rules are worth investigating. During nominalisation of a sentence, or N-transformation, certain elements of the bi-valent verb are eliminated, such as the endings denoting number and person, as well as the indicators of tense and mood and of the active and passive voice. By contrast, the situation regarding the initiator and object of the action expressed by the verb remains unchanged. In the process of nominalisation the verb becomes a noun, usually with the aid of a suffix. The subject and object of the original sentence becomes attributes of the newly formed noun. [Examples, with special emphasis on word-order.]

An investigation is made into which noun of the original sentence appears in the genitive after nominalisation, and which with a preposition; also, which attribute in a nominalised sentence is the original active element and which is the object. These investigations are based on four types of sentences, three with intransitive verbs and one with a transitive verb. The N-transformation is basically the same for all sentences with intransitive verbs [examples, analysis]. However, the N-transformation of sentences with transitive verbs is less uniform [examples, especially illustrated through *fragen* and *befragen*; two

subcategories and an explanation of the divergences are given]. Reversed transformation in nominalised sentences is discussed [examples]. It is pointed out that in many cases the syntax and context of nominalisation determine its interpretation.

**75–99   Winter, Roger.** The study of East and West German. *New German Studies* (Hull), **2**, 2 (1974), 82–95.

Most of the lexical studies on the observable differences between East and West German are undertaken by West Germans. Before 1960 most of the publications were superficial and polemical; thereafter, because of new psychological studies of language, the studies were more serious and usually of the synchronic semantic type. There were enquiries into the possibility of manipulating the language and of developing two languages (*Sprachspaltung*); some of the neologisms of East German and the East and West German editions of Duden were investigated.

   At present there are two separate semantic systems but with the same grammar and phonology; changes in the language are the result, not of political pressures, but of changes in society. A serious study in depth is the pre-requisite for any pronouncement on *Sprachspaltung*. [References.]

## SPANISH

**75–100   Bobes Naves, María del Carmen.** Construcciones castellanas con 'se'. Análisis transformacional. [A transformational analysis of constructions in 'se' in Castilian Spanish.] *Revista Española de Lingüística* (Madrid), **4**, 1 (1974), 87–127, and **4**, 2 (1974), 301–25.

All constructions with *se* are becoming more frequent in Spanish; they do not all, however, fall under a single categorial, functional or semantic heading. Pronominal and syntactic uses of *se* are distinguished. Pronominal *se* has a semantic content dependent on its linguistic context, and a restricted NP-replacement function (e.g. object position). It can be related to sentence – or discourse – internal reduction transformations removing NPs having formal or functional identity with preceding NPs (both the reflexive and the reciprocal *se* are meant here). Unlike syntactic *se*, it distinguishes case and number in conjunction with its verb. [History of the use of pronominal se.] Like other Spanish pronouns, it may not co-ordinate with other NPs in object position: *\*Juan se lava y a su perro* is ungrammatical. Functionally, pronominal *se* replaces items under an NP node, not nouns per se. The type of pronominal *se* not originating through a reduction transformation (*Juan se marcha*) is a realisation by transformation of a middle-voice marker. [History of pronominal

*se* with intransitive verbs.] A personal *se* is isolated which replaces *le* under fixed conditions [historical description]. It can be shown not to be reflexive because it is intensified with *él mismo* rather than *sí mismo*. Reciprocal *se* is seen as marking the simultaneous subject and object function of pairs of NPs.

In Part II, the non-pronominal (syntactic) uses of *se* are considered: the reflexive passive (*pasiva refleja*) and the impersonal. The latter differs from the former only in the absence of an object. They do not participate in paradigms like true reflexives, and do not appear to replace lexical nouns. They are rather syntactic markers of subjects whose surface case and number are neutralised, and they are consequently verbal morphemes. [History of syntactic *se*; the emergence of impersonals (*se va a los estudiantes*).] The function of the expressed NP in the *pasiva refleja* is felt to be that of Object, because the verb – noun number agreement which is usual here is found elsewhere in Spanish where there is no overt subject (*hubieron fiestas*). Where a direct object is preceded by *a*, agreement does not occur. Examples from elsewhere in Spanish show a close bond between the verb and object where the subject may be suppressed. Agentless sentences of the type *se*+verb+NP are transforms of agentless actives; a Fillmore-type case analysis reveals the functional identity of corresponding NPs in all transformationally related sentences (passive, *pasiva refleja*, active).

Syntactic *se* is not analogous to French *on* or Old Spanish *ome*; the latter forms could be referred to by, e.g., possessive adjectives within the same sentence. The frequency of *se* is accounted for by polite avoidance of second-person reference, desire for narrative objectivity, etc. Purely formalist methods of analysis are rejected, as they would identify pronominal and syntactic *se* as one entity, and likewise would fail to distinguish the several types of pronominal *se*. Transformational grammar permits the examination of underlying functional, syntactic and lexical relations.

**75–101    Prado, Eduardo.** Uso y abuso de las mayúsculas. [Use and abuse of capital letters.] *Yelmo* (Madrid), **19** (1974), 19–20.

Inconsistency in the usage of capital letters is echoed by vagueness in the teaching of this aspect of the Spanish language. A list of 23 rules for relieving this situation is given, contrasting established and modern press usage.

**75–102    Tabón de Castro, Lucía and Rodríguez Rondón, Jaime.** Algunas consideraciones sobre el aspecto verbal en español. [Some thoughts on aspect in the Spanish verb system.] *Thesaurus: Boletín del Instituto Caro y Cuervo* (Bogotá, Colombia), **29**, 1 (1974), 34–47.

Aspect is often not touched on in studies of the Spanish verb. In Romance languages, aspect and tense may be confused because the same morphs are used

in both systems; this confusion has its roots in Roman grammatical thinking. [Summary of earlier theories of aspect.] Aspect is contrasted with (i) tense and (ii) mode of action as a grammatical category; it relates to the speaker's own point of view as against (*a*) time proper and (*b*) lexical meaning-contrasts. The aspect system has the three terms perfective, imperfective and durative. Perfective and imperfective are distinguished with relation to the time prior to speaking; this has led either to a confusion of the *haber*+past participle and the preterite forms, or to the obsolescence of, e.g., the *pretérito anterior* and *pretérito perfecto*. For the moment of speaking, there are generally no aspectual distinctions. There is a perfective/imperfective opposition relating to the time after speaking, expressed formally by compound v. simple tense forms. By means of periphrases in the verb system, all three aspects may be distinguished for the time prior to, the time of, and the time after speaking [examples]. Formally, the three aspects (perfective, imperfective, durative) are expressed by past participial, infinitival and gerundial forms respectively; but, in contrast to compound tense forms, aspect is expressed also in the auxiliary. There are also syntactic and lexical means of expressing aspect. [Bibliography.]

## RUSSIAN

**75–103**  **Andreyewsky, A. B.** К употреблению местоимения 'свой' в русском языке.  [The use of the pronoun 'svoy' in Russian.] *Russian Language Journal* (Ottawa), **27**, 98 (1973), 1–17.

In attempting to establish rules for the use of the reflexive possessive *svoy*, the lexical functions of the word are first enumerated: pronominal, adjectival and substantive; in free use and in fixed expressions. The pronominal function in free use is considered. There has been some argument as to the interchange-ability of the reflexive and personal possessives (first and second persons) [References]. The reflexive is here taken to be the norm, and reasons for the use of personal possessives are suggested. The work is based on examples from a number of works of Russian literature. While interchange is possible in many cases, in others it is clearly not, producing inappropriate emphasis or unintended implications, e.g. the personal form may imply the actual existence of an object, while reference to a hypothetical object is carried out by using the reflexive; a similar distinction is applied to actions as opposed to facts, and to the various degrees in which objects may be possessed (a part of the body, for example, being possessed to a high degree).

The difficulties of synonymity are pointed out when the personal and reflexive possessives are used in complex sentences. In order to establish who is referred to as possessor it is suggested that 'sentences' be distinguished from 'utterances' (i.e. that forms be examined in context).

**75-104    Benson, Morton.** The spelling of past passive participles in Russian. *Slavic and East European Journal* (Urbana, Ill), **17**, 4 (1974), 433–6.

Spelling with single or double *н* in Russian past passive participles and adjectives derived from them is difficult for foreign learners and even native speakers. Participles proper may (but need not) have accompanying objects or adverbials; true adjectives may be qualified by adverbs of degree, compared and co-ordinated with other qualitative adjectives; these collocation possibilities can be used as discriminatory tests. Participles proper are spelled with double *н* attributively, single *н* predicatively. Adjectives, which may differ from participles in stress, when used attributively have double *н* if formed from perfective verbs or verbs with the suffix *-ова*, otherwise single *н*; there are a few exceptions. The predicative forms of adjectives with double *н* retain double *н*, except in the masculine singular. [Examples.] Some simplification of the spelling rules is called for, taking into account actual pronunciation.

**75-105    Levin, Maurice I.** Some uses of the accusative case in time expressions. *Russian Language Journal* (Ottowa), **27**, 97 (1973), 45–9.

The use of the accusative, with or without preposition, in Russian time expressions should be presented via the meaning of the Russian, not its English translation(s). The prepositionless accusative indicates a period of time entirely covered by the action of the verb (usually imperfective, or with the prefix *по-* 'for a short time', *про-* 'for a long time'). *Через* with the accusative specifies the period after the passage of which an action occurs; the start of this period may be marked by *после*, e.g. *через два часа после обеда*. *За* with the accusative indicates the amount of time necessary for the accomplishment of an action, usually expressed by a perfective verb (except for regularly repeated actions); *за* with the accusative together with *до* indicates a period of time prior to some other action, e.g. *за два часа до обеда*. *В* with the accusative may designate the period required for the accomplishment of an action, differing from *за* in that it suggests the period is shorter than might be expected; it may also indicate the period within which a number of items are specified as occurring, e.g. *три раза в неделю*; and is used with names of the days of the week, parts of the day, seasons of the year, time units, natural phenomena, events. *На* with the accusative designates the period of time that the result of an action is seen to last. [Examples.] [Exercises: explanation of Russian sentences; translation into Russian; blank fill-ins.]

**75-106  Maksimov, V. I.**  Суффиксы и их роль в словообразовании.  [Suffixes and their role in word-formation.] *Русский язык в национальной школе* (Moscow), **5** (1974), 75–8.

Just as productive roots have many functions in word-formation, conditioning the choice of suffix, forming the semantic content, stylistic colouring and stress characteristics of the derivative, so too suffixes have many important roles to play in word-formation. In forming a derivative form with a productive root, they condition the flexional system and provide the derivative with a grammatical function. In addition, they provide indications of lexical properties: noun suffixes, for example, may be markers of gender, animate or inanimate status, qualities concerned with number (e.g. collectives, singularia or pluralia tantum nouns); an adjectival suffix may mark, for example, the abstract nature of the concept involved. In terminology, a suffix may have a very narrow, well-defined significance, in other words a wide range of different semantic functions. Suffixal derivatives may be straightforward, their meaning being directly dependent on the meaning of the productive root, or indirect, in which the sense is transferred, conditioned by circumstantial usage. Sometimes a suffix is used to form a one-word rendering as an abbreviation of a two-word concept, and here the suffix supplies the grammatical function of the deleted word. Suffixes play a role in shaping the stress characteristics of derivatives. They may also bear significance as stylistic markers.

**75-107  Tobolova, M.**  Ударение в стихах. [Stress in poetry.] *Русская речь* (Moscow), **5** (1974), 42–7.

Though distortion of word-stress appears common in Russian poetry, licence in the use of stress is largely confined to the early eighteenth century, and was even then criticised by writers. By comparing stress in poetry with data from contemporary grammars and dictionaries [no references] it becomes clear that apparent distortions were in fact normal forms or accepted variants, which have since lost their currency. Stress may have changed in the process of the language's development, or a popular variant may acquire literary status. Various explanatory factors include analogy, e.g. within a single declension class between groups of words with different stress-patterns (fixed or mobile). Poets have also used popular or dialectal forms which have not gained acceptance. Stress variants in words of foreign origin have arisen when a word is borrowed from or influenced by more than one foreign language with different stress habits. Many foreign words as well as native ones had different stress in the nineteenth century from present-day forms. [Examples and illustrations from early nineteenth-century poetry].

**75–108** **Žuravlev, V. K.** Генезис аканья с точки зрения теории нейтрализации. [The origin of akan'ye from the viewpoint of the theory of neutralisation.] *Вопросы языкознания* (Moscow), **4** (1974), 37–47.

Synchronically, akan'ye is the neutralisation of the equipollent opposition *a*: *o* (low unrounded: non-low rounded), the archiphoneme being non-low unrounded *α* (maximally unmarked) or, less commonly, low rounded *oᵃ*, or various positionally conditioned allophones. According to Trubetzkoy, however, only privative oppositions can be neutralised, the archiphoneme being the unmarked member.

The *a*: *o* opposition derives from the Common Slavonic privative *ā*: *ă* opposition (any labialisation of *ă* being non-distinctive). The general replacement of vowel length oppositions by height oppositions gave subseqently *a*: *α*. The acquisition of labialisation by *α*, giving *o*, was a gradual process, proceeding at different rates in different environments, in different Slavonic languages. Relevant controlling factors are: labial or labiovelar environment; tone; stress (especially this in East Slavonic, where phonetic length is predictable from stress position); marked (high, low) versus unmarked (mid) nature of adjacent vowels (this last factor giving rise to assimilative and dissimilative akan'ye). Some Russian dialects still have a non-low unrounded vowel *ъ* distinct from *a* in unstressed syllables, but more usually either even unstressed *α* acquires labialisation (giving okan'ye, though often with traces of non-labialisation), or unstressed *α* and *a* are neutralised to *α* (giving akan'ye; or if the shift *α* > *o* is generalised to unstressed syllables, Konotop-type vocalism with unstressed *o* for both *a* and *α*). Neutralisation of *a*: *α* is more likely where other vowel neutralisations also take place.

## SERBO-CROAT

**75–109** **Murphy, A. B.** Aspectual usage of the present tense in Serbo-Croat. *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* (Dublin), **C**, 6 (1974), 183–236.

Whereas in Russian the choice of aspect forms in the present tense is frequently determined by the necessity to express future meaning, in Serbo-Croat the existence of a periphrastic future in each aspect leaves the present tense forms free to express purely aspectual distinctions. In examining these aspectual distinctions care is needed to distinguish cases of pure perfectivisation from other semantic changes, particularly those introduced by prefixation. In main clauses the imperfective must be used for happenings which occur in the 'actual' present or for most statements of permanent scientific truth. Proverbs are traditionally fixed in one particular aspect, although gnomic utterances usually

enjoy a choice of aspect dependent on the visualisation of the action in the mind of the speaker. Actions in the planned future can only be phrased in the imperfective; in the habitual, sporadic and historic categories either aspect may be employed. Stage directions present a particularly interesting case where only aspectual and semantic considerations are present and where the perfective tends to predominate with certain verbs. The realisation of the aspect after most auxiliaries depends on the point of view which the speaker wishes to adopt. The choice of aspect usually carries a semantic load and is determined principally by the individual speaker's preference to convey a particular meaning as he wills it under the circumstances of a given moment.