Studies of particular languages

ENGLISH

81–347 Bache, Carl and Jakobsen, Leif Kvistgaard. On the distinction between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses in modern English. *Lingua* (Amsterdam), **52**, 3/4 (1980), 243–67.

The formal characteristics of restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses are discussed. In order to make an exhaustive classification of relative clauses into these two types, we cannot simply rely on formal criteria but need to take communicative characteristics into consideration. The shortcomings of a number of notional definitions of the distinction are pointed out and three requirements are formulated that such a definition must fulfil. An analysis of the problem in terms of information structure, as suggested by Halliday, can be elaborated so as to fulfil the three requirements stipulated: namely that a definition should be applicable to (1) both definite and indefinite noun phrases, including indefinite specific noun phrases, (2) both countable (singular as well as plural) and uncountable noun phrases, and (3) should make explicit in what sense a restrictive relative clause can be said to restrict. A restrictive relative clause restricts in the sense that, by belonging to the same information unit as the remainder of the NP^{rel}, it contributes to establishing a contrast between what an addresser is talking about and what he is not talking about.

81–348 Coates, Jennifer and Leech, Geoffrey. The meanings of the modals in modern British and American English. *York Papers in Linguistics* (York), **8** (1980), 23–34.

Some of the results are reported of an investigation into the meanings of the English modal auxiliary verbs, using data provided by a computer corpus of approximately 2 000 000 words of modern English printed texts. This corpus consists of two sub-corpuses: the 1 000 000-word Brown University corpus of American English, and a matching Lancaster University corpus of British English.

In the pairs of modals discussed here – SHOULD/OUGHT, MUST/HAVE TO, SHALL/WILL, CAN/MAY – a compensatory relationship was found in each case to obtain between British and American usage. The American use of root SHOULD was balanced by the equivalent British use of root OUGHT; the American use of epistemic HAVE TO corresponded to the British use of epistemic MUST; the American use of epistemic WILL was counterblanced by the British use of epistemic SHALL; the American use of root MAY was balanced by the British use of root CAN.

The general conclusion is that in American English SHALL and OUGHT

are rare and apparently obsolescent, their main senses being expressed by WILL and SHOULD respectively. Moreover, American English tends to categorise the modals in formal–informal terms, leaing to specialisation, particularly in the case of SHALL and MAY. On the other hand, British English preserves a more general use of modal auxiliaries, with each modal covering more ground, both semantically and stylistically.

81–349 Fodor, J. A. and Fodor, J. D. Functional structure, quantifiers, and meaning postulates. *Linguistic Inquiry* (Cambridge, Mass), **11**, 4 (1980), 759–70.

Some verbs in English, such as *sing*, *read*, *eat*, can occur with or without a direct object. This paper surveys various attempts at capturing entailments between sentences containing such predicates. For example, *Gill ate* entails *Gill ate something*, a fact which Bresnan treats by means of a lexical mapping rule. But lexical rules are inadequate for sentences containing quantifiers or other scoped elements. The sentence *Everyone ate* entails *Everyone ate something*, which is ambiguous; however, the lexical rule relating these two sentences fails to restrict *Everyone ate* to the unambiguous weaker reading. Verb entailments should be handled instead by meaning postulates, i.e. rules of logical inference, expressed in logical form, rather than the mixed syntactic/semantic notation of lexical rules. The advantage of the meaning postulate approach is that the non-ambiguity of *Everyone ate* requires no further stipulation, but follows from general principles of logic. The separation of quantification from functional structure in linguistic theory is well motivated; the temptation to posit logical form unsupported by surface structure should be resisted.

81–350 O'Grady, William D. The derived intransitive construction in English. *Lingua* (Amsterdam), **52**, 1/2 (1980), 57–72.

The little-studied English derived intransitive construction (e.g. *Marines don't kill easy*) is examined and is shown to be characterised by a subject–verb relation in which properties of the referent of the grammatical subject either facilitate or hinder the development of the event denoted by the verb. This characterisation of the derived intransitive is shown to account for the construction's syntactic and semantic behaviour and is demonstrated to be superior to two competing analyses developed within the framework of transformational grammar.

FRENCH

81–351 Crompton, Andrew. Timing patterns in French. *Phonetica* (Basle), **37**, 4 (1980), 205–34.

The observed timing pattern of an utterance reflects a number of linguistic factors, including rate of utterance, accent, and phonological

units such as segment, syllable, stress group, phonological phrase, etc. This investigation seeks to isolate the durational correlates of accent and of the higher-level phonological units. An experimental method is adopted which enables the effects of the other, extraneous factors (rate of utterance, etc.) to be filtered out. Once this has been done, the results show consistent durational correlates for the units phonological word, phonological phrase, etc., but none for accent. An abstract timing pattern for French utterances is proposed.

81–352 **Kayne, Richard S.** De certaines différences entre le français et l'anglais. [On some differences between French and English.] *Langages* (Paris), **14**, 60 (1980), 47–63.

English permits stranding of prepositions; French does not: (1) *Which candidate have you voted for?* (2) **Quel candidat as-tu voté pour?* English permits verbs of believing to have a lexical subject in their infinitival complements; French does not: (3) *John believes Bill to have lied.* (4) **Jean croit Bill avoir menti.* These two phenomena are explained, and shown to be related.

The explanation involves first of all the demonstration that French *de* (in *Je lui ai dit de partir*) is a complementiser like English *for* (in *It would be unwise for you to talk to him*). *De* differs from *for*, however, in that *for* governs (in Chomsky's sense) a following NP whereas *de* does not. This accounts for the unacceptability of **Ce serait dommage de quelque chose lui arriver* as against the acceptability of *It would be a pity for something to happen to him*. The verbs of believing are taken to have a null propositional complementiser, hence the difference between (3) and (4). (1) is taken to involve a reanalysis of *vote for* as, in effect, a complex verb. Such reanalysis is possible only when the categories in question govern in the same way. In English, verbs and prepositions govern in the same way; in French they do not.

SPANISH

81–353 **Pease-Gorrissen, Margarita.** The use of the article in Spanish habitual and generic sentences. *Lingua* (Amsterdam), **51**, 4 (1980), 311–36.

In Spanish, NPs can be articulated or unarticulated. In generic and habitual sentences, the articulated cases can be explained by a scenario-representation of the form $\forall t \forall x(\text{NP } x^t \supset p^t)$ both in the subject and the object cases, where the NP in question appears in the antecedent and is the topic of the sentence. The parallel unarticulated cases in object position are analysed and two alternatives are proposed: a verb-conditioned scenario-structure with a crucial pragmatic variable in the antecedent, and a lambda-expression, where the unarticulated NP forms a logical predicate together with the verb.

RUSSIAN

81–354 Akimova, G. N. Новые явления в грамматическом строе современного русского языка. [New phenomena in the grammatical structure of contemporary Russian.] *Русский язык в национальной школе* (Moscow), **5** (1980), 10–16.

Russian is claimed to be moving towards structures of an analytic type, exemplified in a whole range of morphological and syntactic structures: the simplification of case paradigms of nouns and numerals, and the development of new prepositional constructions, the rapid growth in the number of indeclinable nouns and adjectives, the development of new types of phrasal structures, the tendency to shorter sentences and weaker syntactic relations within them, and the use of segmented and repetitive types of utterance. The origin of these constructions in colloquial Russian is discussed, and three stages of the incorporation of such constructions into the literary form of the language are charted.

81–355 Iomdin, L. L. О русских существительных так называемого общего рода. [On Russian nouns of the so-called common gender.] *Серия литературы и языка* (Moscow), **39**, 5 (1980), 456–61.

Do Russian nouns which can be used as either masculine or feminine (e.g. *сирота, коллега*) constitute a single lexical item or two? The latter position is defended, as it requires no special grammatical machinery to put into use, while the idea that these words are single lexical items requires for instance, that agreement of adjectives with nouns is determined not by purely formal factors, as is the case with the other nouns, but by independent semantic factors.

Some observations are made on the complexity of agreement of adjectives with such nouns, and three classes of these 'common gender' nouns are noted: those where gender and sex are mutually predictable (e.g. *сирота*), those where the feminine gender can also be used for males (e.g. *зануда*), and those where the masculine gender can also be used for females (e.g. *староста*).