

## *Studies of particular languages*

---

**ENGLISH** See also abstracts 74-149, -156, -173

**74-160 Crean, John E., Jr.** The extended modifier: German or English? *American Speech* (New York), **44**, 4 (1969) [appeared late 1973], 272-8.

The extended modifier, a basic construction in German, is becoming increasingly popular both in America and Britain. Its advantages (economy and impact) and disadvantages (ambiguity resulting from over-compression) are illustrated by many examples drawn mainly from journalism and advertising. The constructions which are shown to occur as extended modifiers in English include: (1) adverbs of time or place ('a *today* writer'); (2) prepositional phrases ('*in store* bakery', 'the *all-in-the-ear* hearing aid'); (3) adjectives and nouns modified by phrases ('this *in so many ways* excellent work', 'overweight as a *cradle-to-early-grave* phenomenon'); (4) complex verbal phrases with the verb either uninflected or as a present or past participle or a *to*-infinitive ('a *do-it-yourself* kit', 'the *Tell-It-Like-It-Is-Baby* syndrome', 'the *made-to-order* insurance', 'the *asked-for* motor oil'), and (5) complete sentences ('our *What-the-Hell* look', '*he-went-thataway* country').

**74-161 Gnutzmann, C., Ilson, R. and Webster, Joy.** Comparative constructions in contemporary English. *English Studies* (Amsterdam), **54**, 5 (1973), 417-38.

While there have been differences in approaches to the study of comparative constructions within transformational grammar, most investigations start from the assumption that these constructions derive from underlying complex sentences. Moreover, in the cases treated, the standard of comparison (e.g. *than Bill* in *John is cleverer than Bill*) is never taken to be deleted, and *than* is generally used

## STUDIES OF PARTICULAR LANGUAGES

as the only marker of explicitness. Using data from the files of the Survey of English Usage, University College, London, adjectives compared by means of *-er/-est*, *more/most*, *less/least*, are discussed. Structures were singled out which contained an 'explicit standard of comparison', characterised as belonging to (1) a *than* construction, (2) a restrictive relative clause, full or reduced (as *John is the tallest boy in the room*), (3) some prepositional phrases not derivable from relative clauses (as *John is the taller of the two boys*), or (4) a genitive/possessive construction paraphrasable by a restrictive relative clause (as *John is Frank's tallest brother*) or by a deictic (as *that taller boy is John*). The significance of these distinctions is indicated by constraints on their combination.

It appeared from the corpus that explicit comparisons (as *John is taller than Paul*) are far less frequent than non-explicit ones (*John is taller*). It was found that an adequate test for true comparatives was provided by the insertion of one of a small number of 'grading' adverbs, of which *much* could be taken as typical. Some problems of interpretation are involved in the use of this test [examples and discussion]. A classification is proposed for all comparative and superlative constructions in English [tables and discussion of tables]. The explicit construction is 'marked' in relation to non-explicit ones. *Less* and *least* are marked equivalents of *-er/more* and *-est/most*. Pseudo-comparatives (excluded by the *much* test) are discussed [examples]. The implications for further research are considered. [References.]

74-162 **Halle, Morris.** Stress rules in English: a new version. *Linguistic Inquiry* (Cambridge, Mass) 4, 4 (1973), 451-64.

In *The Sound Pattern of English* the stress contours of words were derived in the main with the help of six rules [rules stated], of which five served to assign primary stress to a certain vowel in the word, and then to subordinate the stress level of other vowels within the domain of the rule. The derivation of the stress contour is discussed in adjectives formed by the addition of the suffix *-ory*

and verbs in *-ate*. Words such as *peregrinate*<sup>1 3</sup> should be treated exactly like words such as *assimilatory*<sup>1 3</sup>. A consequence of this is a proposal for the elimination of the Alternating Stress Rule (rule 5), and its replacement by a redundancy rule, which distinguishes verbs in *-ate* with a strong prefinal cluster from those with a weak prefinal cluster. For the Stressed Syllable Rule (rule 3) to take over the function of the eliminated rule, a modification of the 'Tense' Suffix Rule (rule 1) is necessary, ensuring that the words in question receive stress by a rule which applies before the stressed syllable rule. The modification can operate to include other apparent exceptions to the existing rules [discussion and examples].

A further modification of the Stressed Syllable Rule is proposed, and the consequent elimination of the Auxiliary Reduction Rule II (rule 6). Proposals by Schane (mimeographed paper) for a Stress Lowering Convention and a 'Detail' Rule are discussed [examples]. Modifications of the rule are suggested. Although the 'Detail' Rule is a complex one, it can be incorporated in the expression of the Compound Stress Rule. It is necessary to modify the Nuclear Stress Rule to take over one of the previous functions of the Compound Stress Rule, that of accounting for stress adjustment in simple words, as in the lowering of the secondary stress for the last vowel of *assimilate*.

An Initial Stress Rule is proposed, to follow the Primary Stress Rule and Stressed Syllable Rule, but to precede the two Stress Subordination rules [example derivation]. [Examples, including trisyllabic and longer words.] The paper provides support for the claim that stress subordination is a process distinct and separate from stress assignment: this is an insight into the nature of language rather than a fact about English. [Reference.]

**74-163 Marino, M.** A feature analysis of the modal system of English. *Lingua* (Amsterdam), **32**, 4 (1973), 309-23.

Data from the modal system of English is used to suggest how feature analysis has a useful place in the analysis of the verb system

## STUDIES OF PARTICULAR LANGUAGES

for a generative lexicon. The need for feature matrices is given impetus by the use of increasingly larger numbers of embedded sentences to explain the presence of various elements of meaning [review of Ross (1967), McCawley (1971) and others]. Problems involved in a systematic treatment of the modals are indicated. Modality is seen as a means of embodying the speaker's view of the potential involved in a predication and in the basic rewrite rule. Modality has two mandatory feature selections [Tense+Stative] and four optional [Perfective, Q, Neg and Emph], with the Tense choice resolving itself into [Tense+], a real predication, and [Tense-], an unrealised predication. The [Tense-] choice yields a matrix of three features [Necessity, Possible, Execution] that in a binary system of obligatory choice results in eight categories: Future; Imperative; Obligation; Advisability; Possibility; Permissibility; Wish and (implied) Negative. Besides characterising the closed modals, the system can be extended to other areas of the grammar and offers a reasonable view of some major diachronic changes.

**74-164 Tregidgo, P. S.** English tense usage: a Bull's eye view. *English Language Teaching Journal* (London), **28**, 2 (1974), 97-107.

[Explanation and discussion of Bull's system of analysing time and tense, as described in his *Time, Tense, and the Verb*, University of California, 1960.] Each of the four 'times' – present, past, future, and future-in-the-past – has three aspects: a negative backward-looking aspect, a positive forward-looking one, and a main neutral aspect. Bull's view that the present perfect is a present tense looking backwards into the past is satisfactory for English. The English past tense refers to the *definite* past, whereas the present perfect refers either to a period of time extending up to the present or to an *undefined* past moment or period. As far as tense sequence is concerned, the present perfect functions like the ordinary present. Choice between a past and a past perfect (or pre-past) often seems

arbitrary. The latter is chosen only when a significant relationship needs to be established between two past times [examples]. *Going to*, *will* and *would* are discussed [examples]. Bull's analysis is valuable because he treats tenses as concepts and not as forms. Most linguists doubt whether English has a future tense, but *will* and *shall* are often non-modal. For teaching purposes it is unhelpful to use 'tense' in too restricted a sense, nor need teachers concern themselves much with the distinction between tense and aspect.

## FRENCH

74-165 **Jonas, Pol.** Si et aussi dans les systèmes comparatifs d'égalité niée à deux termes en français contemporain. ['Si' and 'aussi' in contemporary French structures of comparison containing two expressions whose equivalence is negated.] *Revue de linguistique romane* (Lyon), 37, 147/8 (1973), 292-341.

Works in French written after 1900 [131 titles in the bibliography] were examined for occurrences of *si* and *aussi*. [The uses are described and classified according to position in the sentence and relationship with particular parts of speech.] The conclusions are that when the mark is parenthetical to a word which belongs to a negative verb in two parts, or to a word which is linked to its support by a negative verb acting as intermediary, or to one which has as support a negative element, *si* and *aussi* alternate in proportions decided by the notional content of the first term. If the notional load is light in the first term, there is a clear predominance of *si*; in the first term in which the notional content is heavy, there is marked predominance of *aussi*. When the mark is parenthetical to a word whose links are other than those enumerated above, *aussi* is the only possible form in practice.

## STUDIES OF PARTICULAR LANGUAGES

74-166 **Osipov, Vladimir.** Grammaticalité au futur antérieur. [Grammaticality in the future perfect.] *Français Moderne* (Paris), 42, 1 (1973), 20-33.

Verb forms have primary and secondary functions. In its primary function, the French future perfect specifies actions completed at a future time (its 'indicative' sense). This futurity can be transposed into a past narrative. Further, statements about future events take on the force of anticipatory judgements [examples]. This function appears in a subordinate clause where the timing of the verb of the superordinate clause is fixed by the completion of the subordinated action. There are, however, cases where a subordinated future perfect requires a future perfect in the superordinate clause. Although rare in both spoken and written texts [table], this tense has value (*disponibilité*) in the language system. The parameters of its grammaticality therefore require elucidation [examples of relevant grammatical and ungrammatical sentences].

The internal parameters relate to the semantic nature of the verb. The basic distinction is between verbs denoting terminable (*conclusif*) or non-terminable action, where the future perfect is normally ungrammatical with a non-terminable verb [examples]. With polysemic verbs, the subject may be significant, especially for the interpretation of the form [examples]. External parameters relate to the governing adjunct [table]. Where the time-marker is non-future, the interpretation is conjectural; in its absence, conjectural or retrospective. Another determinant is the subordinating conjunction [list and examples]. An occasional determinant is the nature of the sentence, especially the exclamatory utterance [examples]. This investigation of a single tense indicates the desirability of a categorising lexicon and a grammar which accounts for ungrammaticality.

74-167 **Warnant, Léon.** Dialectes du français et français régionaux. [French dialects and regional forms of French.] *Langue Française* (Paris), 18 (1973), 100-25.

The term 'dialect' as used in structural linguistics differs from its traditional use in French. [Commentary.] It is therefore necessary to distinguish two types of dialect: Dialect 1, the original vernaculars, submerged by standard French, and Dialect 2, regional varieties of the standard language. This raises the question of the nature of this norm ('neutralised French'). To regard it as the common ground of several dialects is unsatisfactory. It is better regarded as a particular Dialect 2 plus certain features found in other dialects which are not otherwise covered in the language. [Examples and specifications.] Generative linguistics appears unhelpful because of the difficulty of distinguishing between native intuition and learned behaviour. Psycho-systematics may offer an approach.

The notion of good usage underlies the concept of a norm. [Historical and critical account.] But it can be shown that most Dialect 2 speakers depart from good usage only to a slight degree. It appears to be a matter of regional traits rather than regional dialects. There is also a raising of the level of regional French, whereby what would have been regarded 50 years ago as regional now seems dialectal, and what is now termed regional would have appeared virtually standard. The study of dialects is supposed to exclude phonological features, but it can be shown that two varieties of speech may share the same formal properties to the phonological level, but may be mutually incomprehensible if the realisation is different enough. [Examples from Belgian French.]

There appears to be no value in the concept of Dialect 2. It is French with regional traits, and these are outside the competence of structural or generative grammars to account for. [The entire issue is devoted to *les parlers régionaux* (regional speech forms).]

## GERMAN

**74-168 Bock, R. and others.** Zur deutschen Gegenwartssprache in der DDR und in der BRD. [Modern German in the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany.] *Zeitschrift für Phonetik, Sprachwissenschaft und Kommunikationsforschung* (Berlin), **26**, 5 (1973), 511-32.

Since 1945 there have been many more neologisms in the German Democratic Republic (GDR) than in the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG), mostly in words dealing with social activities. [Five examples are given of different words used in GDR and FRG to describe the same thing.] FRG has very many borrowings and transliterations from Anglo-American sources, GDR has some from Russian. Russian influence is also seen in neologisms consisting of noun + following attribute in the genitive. In FRG there is American influence in a new use of inversion (e.g. *Befand SPD-Sprecher Barsig in Bonn...*), in the transitive use of intransitive verbs (e.g. *eine Sache lästern*), and in omission of the definite article; British English influence is seen in the use of active rather than passive. There are some differences in GDR and FRG in intonation, especially in sentence endings.

Examples are given of the emotive use of language in GDR and FRG in the mass communication media, commerce and politics. The outstanding differences relate to ideological words. [References.]

**74-169 Esau, Helmut.** Form and function of German adjective endings. *Folia Linguistica* (The Hague), **6**, 1/2 (1973), 136-45.

In early Germanic dialects weak and strong adjective endings conveyed a definite and indefinite meaning, but it is doubtful whether this distinction continues to be important in modern German. Quantifiers are distinguished according to the strong and weak endings which follow them; does this represent a linguistically significant grouping or is it due to chance alone? Earlier solutions are described: Prokosch attributed an individualising sense to strong



endings and a generalising sense to weak ones, whereas Lockwood came to almost the opposite conclusion, and Curme's concept of the distinction was different again.

Strong and weak adjective endings can only be adequately explained in terms of their function in the total noun phrase [definition and diagram of a noun phrase]; modern adjective endings in German are defined as the result of an interplay of their definiteness-marking function and case-marking function within the noun phrase, of which the case-marking function is seen as the more important one. The optional quantifier in the noun phrase, usually the definite article, carries the specific surface case marker. If there is no quantifier, the case endings belonging to it are attached instead to the qualifier, the adjective. Quantifiers that are followed by adjectives with strong endings occur in two positions, that of the quantifier and that of the qualifier [examples and diagrams]. From this a principle is formulated which permits one consistent case-marking interpretation for all qualifiers, i.e. adjectives. Quantifiers are divided into groups according to whether or not they are seen as inherently carrying the case marker [lists and diagrams]. The conclusion is that a qualifier, or adjective, carries a surface case marker, or ending, only if there is no lexical item in the quantifier position that carries the case marker.

**74–170 Helbig, Gerhard.** Zur Verwendung der Infinitiv- und Partizipialkonstruktion in der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. [The use of infinitive and participial constructions in modern German.] *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* (Leipzig), **10**, 5 (1973), 281–92.

Standard grammars give no clear and acceptable guide-lines on the use of the infinitive with *zu*, the infinitive with *um* . . . *zu*, *ohne* . . . *zu*, *anstatt* . . . *zu*, or on clauses based on present or past participles. Infinitive clauses are of two kinds: those which are *valenzbedingt* (valency-conditioned) and those which are not. Participial constructions are not *valenzbedingt* and are usually attributive, but they

## STUDIES OF PARTICULAR LANGUAGES

do admit of other semantic interpretations, e.g. modal, temporal, causal, conditional and concessive. Infinitive constructions which are not *valenzbedingt* are syntactically free and are of an adverbial nature; they are the ones using *um...zu*, *ohne...zu*, and *anstatt...zu*. [These abbreviated generalisations are based on detailed analysis with examples which could be of interest and use to the advanced student of grammar and syntax.]

**74-171 Kaufmann, Gerhard.** Zum Bedingungsgefüge. [On conditional structures.] *Zielsprache Deutsche* (Munich), 4 (1973), 141-54.

The paper is principally concerned with: (a) the presuppositions which determine the choice between indicative and imperfect subjunctive in conditional structures; (b) the syntactic relations in these structures; (c) the expression of the protasis (as a condition for the apodosis) and of the result of the condition named in the protasis; and (d) textual linguistic problems. In discussing (a), the author points to the neutrality of the speaker using the indicative in the protasis with regard to the factualness of the utterance. The speaker is concerned only with the conditional relationship between the clauses. The form of such structures is discussed, with reference to the notions of *contradiction* and *incompatibility* as characterised by Lyons (*Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*). The use of the imperfect subjunctive in the protasis negates the factualness of what is expressly named in that clause, and the consequence named in the apodosis is thereby blocked [discussion and examples].

The conjunctions which introduce the protasis are discussed, together with the relative positions of the clauses, and the variations of word order initially within the clauses. A wide range of clauses and phrases (the latter by ellipsis or the use of nominals) is illustrated and discussed. The examples from texts illustrate the variable relations of *dann*, *da*, *so* with their co-texts. This variation presents a serious problem for learners of German, but the materials for teaching the textual structures are lacking for German. [References.]

## SPANISH

**74-172 Beinhauer, Werner.** Sentido de lugar y dirección y su manifestación lingüística en español. [Sense of place and direction and their linguistic realisation in Spanish.] *Yelmo* (Madrid), 14 (1973), 11-13.

[Originally published in German.] Parallels are drawn between the place adverb system (*aquí, ahí, allí*) and the demonstrative adjective/pronoun system (*este, ese, aquel*) in Spanish. They interrelate in the matter of distance from the speaker and also the latter group may have personal reference to first, second, and non-first/second person, respectively. Besides their literal application to place, these words have temporal reference. In both the spatial and temporal location systems, 'static' versus 'dynamic' modes are distinguished (*allí/allá*, etc.). Within the dynamic system, motion towards and away from the speaker are further distinguished (*acá/allá*, etc.). This distinction is observed elsewhere in the Spanish lexicon (*traer/llevar*, etc.).

There is a tendency in popular Spanish to replace static verbs by dynamic verbs, e.g. *el tren tiene retraso* (the train is late) may alternatively be expressed as *el tren trae retraso*. Expressions requiring a dynamic verb with no explicit reference to direction are realised by using *andar*; but where the speaker uses the *ir/venir* plus gerund construction, the choice of the former implies progress of the action towards an indeterminate future, of the latter from an indeterminate past.

## RUSSIAN

**74-173 Barkhudarov, L. S.** Русско-английские языковые параллели. Очерк четвертый. Вид. [Russian-English linguistic parallels. Study four. Aspect.] *Русский язык за рубежом* (Moscow), 4 (1973), 63-8.

Russian distinguishes perfective and imperfective aspect; English distinguishes indefinite and continuous aspect. There is no one-to-

## STUDIES OF PARTICULAR LANGUAGES

one correspondence between aspectual categories in the two languages. The Russian perfective indicates a completed, concrete action, while the imperfective indicates an incompleted action without specifying whether the action takes place at a given point of time or is iterative/habitual [examples]. The English continuous indicates an incompleted concrete action, assigned to a given point or period of time and viewed in process; the indefinite gives no concrete characterisation of the action, such differences as semelfactive, iterative, durative, habitual being indicated by the context [examples]. The English continuous is narrower than the Russian imperfective, and is always to be translated by the imperfective (though not vice versa). The Russian perfective is narrower than the English indefinite, and is always to be translated by the indefinite (though not vice versa) [diagrams; examples].

The English perfect indicates neither tense nor aspect, but relative time, i.e. an action occurring prior to some point of time or other action [examples]. Relative time exists overtly in Russian in subordinate clauses (especially indirect speech) and with participles (though the past participle active may also be used to indicate absolute past time) and gerunds [examples]. In English, unlike Russian, the perfect/non-perfect distinction pervades the whole verbal system. The English perfect will not necessarily be translated by a Russian perfective, if it indicates a durative or temporally unlimited action [examples].

**74-174 Voïtovich, N. T.** О позиционной долготе гласных и развитии аканья. [On the positional length of vowels and the development of akan'ye]. *Вопросы языкознания* (Moscow), 6 (1973), 68-79.

The dialect of Malye Ostyuki (S. Byelorussia) has akan'ye-okan'ye (unstressed *a, o* usually neutralised to *a*, less commonly to *o*, especially before stressed *o*), but pretonic *a, o, e* are lengthened before stressed high (less consistently: high-mid) vowels, have a rising-falling intonation and are not neutralised [examples]. A similar phenomenon

occurs in the genetically related Chernigov dialects (N. Ukraine) with *akan'ye*, and in the Vladimir–Volga dialects with *okan'ye* in the immediate pretonic syllable. This non-phonematic lengthening may once have been more widespread in East Slavonic, cf. accent retraction in isolated words in some North Russian dialects, and more consistently in old accented North Russian texts.

The Ostyuki pretonic vocalism is similar to dissimilative *akan'ye* of the archaic type, though in Ostyuki the distinction is only of length, not of quality. Modern East Slavonic dialects, including those of Southern Byelorussia, which have *akan'ye* with (partial) assimilation are not, however, developing towards dissimilative *akan'ye*, but towards strong (non-dissimilative) *akan'ye*. In Modern East Slavonic, high vowels are phonetically shorter than low vowels. This shortening was a historic process, and may have led to the compensatory lengthening of pretonic vowels before high vowels, also facilitating the earlier development of *akan'ye* (of short vowels) before low stressed vowels. The subsequent reinterpretation of this length distinction in pretonic vowels as a qualitative distinction would give dissimilative *akan'ye*, with long vowels interpreted as low, short vowels as non-low. The Ostyuki dialect, retaining the archaic pretonic lengthening, recapitulates the earlier development of *akan'ye*. These hypotheses must be tested on other dialect material.