PAPERS

from the

THIRTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING

of the

ATLANTIC PROVINCES LINGUISTIC ASSOCIATION

University of New Brunswick
Saint John, New Brunswick
November 3 - 5, 1989

ACTES

du

TREIZIEME COLLOQUE ANNUEL

de

l'ASSOCIATION DE LINGUISTIQUE DES PROVINCES ATLANTIQUES

l'Université du Nouveau-Brunswick
Saint John, Nouveau Brunswick
le 3 - 5 novembre 1989

Edited by/Rédaction
D. H. Jory

PAPERS

from the

THIRTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING

of the

ATLANTIC PROVINCES LINGUISTIC ASSOCIATION

University of New Brunswick
Saint John, New Brunswick
November 3 - 5, 1989

ACTES

du

TREIZIEME COLLOQUE ANNUEL

de

l'ASSOCIATION DE LINGUISTIQUE DES PROVINCES ATLANTIQUES

l'Université du Nouveau-Brunswick
Saint John, Nouveau Brunswick
le 3 - 5 novembre 1989

Edited by/Rédaction
D. H. Jory

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS/REMERCIEMENTS

L'ALPA tient à remercier les organismes suivants dont les subventions ont permis la publication de ce volume:

Le Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines du Canada
L'Université du Nouveau-Brunswick:
le Recteur
la Vice-Rectrice (Saint John)
la Division of Humanities and Languages

APLA wishes to thank the following for grants which made the publication of this volume possible:

Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada
University of New Brunswick:
President
Vice-President (Saint John)
Division of Humanities and Languages

TABLE OF CONTENTS - TABLE DES MATIERS

Aleksandra Steinbergs and Barbara O'Dea. **Lexical addition in American Sign Language.** 1

Anthony C. Lister. **Equivalences in Written Chinese of French and English Relative Clauses..** 24

Jean-Claude Choul. **Testing a Prototype of Interactive Semantic Analyzer (PISA).** 37

John Hewson. **What is a Present?** 50

Juvénal Ndayiragije. **Mouvement-WH, Quantification et Redoublement Clitique.** 56

Kapele Kapanga. **La Francophonie en situation de polyglossie ou les Variations linguistiques du français au Zaire.** 80

Laszlo Szabo. **Factitive Verbs in Hungarian.** 101

Laszlo Szabo. **Politeness Level indicting the Acting Person in Japanese.** 108

Lilian Falk. **Regional Usage in the English of Cape Breton Island.** 114

Ronald Cosper. **Rates of Lexical Change in Egyptian and Semitic.** 129

Suzanne Pons-Ridler et Geneviève Quillard. **Quelques aspects de la négation: comparaison de l'anglais et du fancçais.** 145

Vincent O. Erickson. **The Diminutive in Mennonite Low German.** 161

OTHER PAPERS PRESENTED/AUTRES COMMUNICATIONS PRESENTEES

Les communications suivantes ont été faites au 13ème colloque annuel de l'ALPA, en plus de celles qui se trouvent dans ce volume.

The following papers were read at the Thirteenth Annual Meeting of APLA, in addition to those found in this volume.

Manfred Görlach. **Word Formation and Varieties of English.**

Anne-Marie Brousseau. **La relexification des mots composés en créole haitien.**

Karin Flikeid. **La durée vocalique dans les parlers acadiens de la Nouvelle-Ecosse.**

Catherine Bodin. **Variation phonologique des voyelles et liquides dans le français acadien de la Louisiane.**

Maurice Holder. **Accentual systems in Standard English, Romance, Caribbean English, and Japanese.**

Harold Paddock. **Mixed Sources of Pronominal Systems in Newfoundland English.**

Anthony House. **Code-Switching in the Novels of Jack Kerouac.**

T. K. Pratt. **Compiling a Dictionary of Prince Edward Island Sayings.**

Il y a eu aussi une table ronde, animée par Maurice Holder: "Langues en contact: adstrat anglais dans le fançais du Canada; substrat africain dans les Caraïbes: parallèles et contrastes."

There was also a round table discussion, led by Maurice Holder: "Languages in contact: English adstratum in Canadian French, African substratum in the Caribbean: parallels and contrasts"

Lexical addition in American Sign Language

Dr. Aleksandra Steinbergs[1]
Memorial University of Newfoundland

Ms. Barbara O'Dea
Newfoundland School for the Deaf

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the methods which ASL uses to add new signs to its lexicon. We show that ASL adds lexical items by utilizing both native and borrowed elements: native signs are used in the processes of compounding, affixation, reduplication, and metaphorical extension, while borrowed elements are loansigns which derive from finger-spelled English words. As in the case of spoken languages, ASL has phonotactic constraints on the form of lexical items, according to which all new signs are modified. We conclude that, despite the obvious differences between the media of communication, the methods used by ASL to create new lexical items are strikingly similar to those used by spoken languages.

Introduction

In this paper we will explore lexical addition in American Sign Language (which will henceforth be referred to as ASL). Since ASL is a visual/manual language, rather than an auditory/oral language, there must necessarily be obvious differences between the kinds of lexical items used in ASL (namely, signs) and those used in spoken human languages (which are, of course, words and other morphemes). However, apart from the medium of communication, the structure of ASL resembles other human languages in striking ways; thus, the processes which ASL utilizes to add new signs to its lexicon are often the same ones used by spoken languages. In this paper, we will identify which processes utilized by ASL are different from those used in spoken languages, and which processes are analogous to, or identical to, processes used in spoken languages.

We should mention that our conclusions about sign language are not based on any original experimental research we have done with native ASL signers. Our paper merely attempts to re-organize the observations of other scholars, in order to highlight certain conclusions we have drawn; we hope that our paper presents the data in such a way that our conclusions from the data are convincingly self-evident. In all cases we have used only examples which actually conform to current practise in the Newfoundland deaf community.

Just as in any other language, ASL has numerous dialects. Some of our example signs may not be standard ASL[2]; by "standard" ASL, we mean forms such as those used at Gallaudet College in Washington, D.C., which is presently the only college for the deaf in North America. Any non-standard signs which we use are dialectal variants commonly used in Newfoundland. As is now the accepted practise, the English glosses for signs will be written in capital letters.

Basic structure of ASL signs

It will be useful to provide a brief introduction to the basic structural parameters of ASL signs. Each sign can be analyzed as consisting of a minimum of three elements: the hand configuration, the place of articulation, and the movement of the sign. This can be thought of as the basic "phonological" structure of a sign; however, rather than "phonology", the term which the famous deaf educator William Stokoe uses is "cherology"[3], as shown in (1) below:

(1) Cherology of signs:

Hand configuration:	hand open & fingers together/ clenched fist, etc.
Place of articulation:	at forehead/ at cheek/ on wrist, etc.
Movement:	downwards/ outwards/ in a circle, etc.

Each of these parameters can make a distinctive difference. Note the examples in (2):

(2) Signs which differ only in:

Hand Configuration:	DEVIL	HORSE
Movement:	NAME	EGG
Place of Articulation:	SUMMER	UGLY

Thus, DEVIL and HORSE are identical in place of articulation (forehead) and movement (fingers bend twice), but differ in hand configuration (fingers spread vs. together). NAME and EGG are identical in hand configuration (first two fingers extended) and place of articulation (one hand on top of the other) but they differ in movement (hitting vs. sweeping movement). SUMMER and UGLY are identical in hand configuration (index finger crooked) and movement (sweeping across face), but differ in place of articulation (forehead vs. nose). As well as these three parameters, which all signs have, sometimes additional parameters may function distinctively. For example, facial expression or head movement can be contrastive. These are the parameters which distinguish between "late" and "not yet", as shown in (3):

(3) LATE

NOT-YET (head shake; tongue between teeth)

Both are produced with the elbow extended, the hand hanging downwards waving backwards from the wrist, but in addition to this NOT-YET has an additional negative headshake, and the tongue is between the teeth.

Finally, it should be noted that signs are restricted to a specified signing space: the overwhelming majority of signs are produced in an area between the top of the head and the waist, from left to right as far as the hands can reach with the elbows next to the torso, and in front of the body as far as the hands can reach with the elbows next to the torso.

A brief history of ASL

In order to clarify the process of lexical addition, we will briefly describe how the original lexicon of ASL was first gathered. The first ASL signs were collected by the American educator Thomas Gallaudet in the early 1800's. He travelled to Paris and saw how signs were used by the deaf, and teachers of the deaf, at the Paris National Institute for Deaf-Mutes. He returned to the United States, accompanied by a brilliant deaf graduate of this school named Laurent Clerc. Between the two of them, they set up a method of deaf education at the American Asylum for the Deaf and Dumb, which involved the use of signs.

(4) Paris National Institute for Deaf-Mutes
Laurent Clerc

American Asylum for the Deaf and Dumb
Thomas Gallaudet & Laurent Clerc

To quote Klima and Bellugi (1979:68-9):".. the most important effect of a school was that it created a signing community, bringing together deaf people from different parts of the country, each with his idiosyncratic signs, and thus creating the conditions for evolving a language of standardized signing". Thus, the original signs of ASL, which were first collected and standardized in the 19th century, developed, for the most part, from the signs already used by individual deaf Americans, along with a few French signs introduced by Laurent Clerc. Since then, of course, many signs have gone out of use and many more have been added to the sign lexicon. In the rest of the paper, we will look at the methods deaf signers have used to add new signs to their lexicon.

Methods of lexical addition

One method of lexical addition which, at first glance, seems quite unlike methods used in spoken languages, is the invention of mimetic signs. By this we mean signs which are intended to pantomime an action in real life. An example of a novel creation of this type is the sign which was invented for "computer".

(5) Recently invented mimetic signs:

COMPUTER

VIDEOTAPE-RECORDER

The large early computers had reels of tape containing data on the front of the machines which would whirl around. The sign imitates the movement of the tape reels (each hand looks like it is grasping a cantaloupe and rotates twice).

Another example of a novel sign invented recently, is the one for "videotape-recorder". Early videotape recorders were large boxes with reels of videotape on top. The first version of the sign for "videotape recorder" imitated this movement (index fingers pointing downwards and circling). At first the sign used both hands moving in the same direction counterclockwise, as did the data tape reels; then the sign became somewhat more arbitrary: with the hands moving in opposite directions towards the centre.[4]

Although this method of lexical addition is not and cannot be the same as a method used for spoken languages, nevertheless it does resemble one particular method of word creation used by spoken languages, namely the creation of onomatopoeic words.

(6) Onomatopoeic words:

tick-tock	sound made by a clock
whoo-whoo	sound made by a train
baa-baa	sound made by a sheep

That is, onomatopoeic words are analogous to these mimetic signs in that such words are <u>oral</u> attempts to mimic <u>noises</u> in the real world, while mimetic signs are <u>manual</u> attempts to mimic <u>actions or movements</u> in the real world.

The next process of lexical addition we will look at is compounding. All languages have ways of creating new words by compounding, and ASL is no exception; consider the example in (7):

(7) Compounding:

FACE	SAME
FACE+SAME	"resembles/seems"

ASL compounds have all the characteristics of compounds in other languages: for example, the meaning of the compound is often not predictable from the meaning of the individual elements; this is certainly the case with many ASL compounds, as is evident from the examples in (8):

(8) Unpredictability of meaning in compounds:

GIRL	RIGHT
GIRL+RIGHT	"sister"
THINK	TOUCH
THINK+TOUCH	"keep thinking about"

Just as in many languages, the compounds are signed slightly faster than each individual component signed alone. Thus, the compound which means "sister" is signed more quickly than its components GIRL and RIGHT signed separately. This is evident if one compares utterances like (9) which contain the sequence of GIRL and RIGHT used as a compound, as compared to sentence (10) which contains the same sequence used as different lexical items. The sequence GIRL RIGHT is signed much more slowly than GIRL+RIGHT.

(9) SHE MY GIRL+RIGHT "She's my sister"

(10) GIRL RIGHT "The girl is right"

It appears that one of the constraints on sign structure is that signs may not be excessively long in duration; during narration an average sign takes about half a second (Klima & Bellugi 1979:184). However, when a compound sign is used it does <u>not</u> take a whole second to sign, because the first element of the sign is drastically shortened and simplified so that the whole length of the compound sign takes about the same length of time to sign as one simple sign.

This compares significantly with the way that native speakers of English pronounce compound words. In English the first element of a compound receives primary stress and the second may be unstressed; thus, the second element is shorter than it would be if used as an independent word.

(11) English compounds:

hótdog	"frankfurter in a bun"
hòt dóg	"overheated canine"
gréenhouse	"structure for plants"
grèen hóuse	"house which is green"

Compared to ASL, the difference is only that in ASL it is the <u>first</u> element which is short and perfunctory, while the second receives more emphasis. Thus, in each language compounding has a "suprasegmental" marking, related to duration and emphasis; the difference is only in the location of the marker: in ASL the first element of the compound is shorter and less emphatic than the second; in English the second element of the compound is shorter and less emphatic than the first.

Another method used to create lexical item, both by spoken languages and by ASL, is the process of affixation. For example, in ASL the agentive marker, referred to in (12), identifies a person who performs an action habitually.

(12) AGENT

This sign is an suffix, which can be attached to verbal signs to create agentive nouns, thus:

(13)	DANCE	DANCE+AGENT	"dancer"
	COOK	COOK+AGENT	"cook"

TEACH	TEACH+AGENT	"teacher"

Another process by which both spoken languages and ASL create additional lexical items is the process of reduplication. Reduplication is particularly widespread in ASL; we will illustrate only two examples of reduplicative process in ASL, but, in fact, ASL utilizes a number of different kinds of reduplication (Klima & Bellugi 1979:266). For example, a simple repetition of the sign for a time word such as "week" can create the adverbial form "weekly" as shown in (14):

(14) Creates adverbs of time:

WEEK	reduplicated:	WEEKLY

Repetition of a verbal sign with a small circular motion implies a long-term and/or continuous action, as shown in (15):

(15) Creates durative/continuative forms:

WORK	reduplicated:	WORKED-AND-WORKED

Reduplicative processes are not only utilized derivationally (as in the above examples), but also inflectionally, as in the creation of plurals of certain nouns.

Another process by which signs are added to the lexicon is the process of borrowing. In ASL loansigns can develop from English words which are fingerspelled. Normally fingerspelling is only used in ASL for spelling out proper nouns. However, a number of signs have been created by modifying finger spelled English words to fit with the phonotactic (or rather, "cherological") constraints of ASL. Note the following examples:

(16) Loansigns:

finger spelling	loansign	native ASL sign
O-F-F	O+F	LIGHTS-OFF (2 hands)
J-O-B	J-B	WORK, JOB (2 hands)

A-L-L	A-L	ALL (2 hands)
F-U-C-K	F-K	
B-A-C-K	B-K	
H-A-H-A-H-A	H+A; H+A; H+A	LAUGH (2 hands)
G-O	G+(O)	GO (2 hands)
S-O-O-N	S-N; S-N	
D-O-G	D-G	DOG (1 hand: 2 parts, 2nd part below waist)

All loansigns are modified to comply with the phonotactic constraints of ASL. When one is fingerspelling, the only time constraint is the length of the word in English; a word which is a dozen letters long may take several seconds to finger spell. However, ASL signs must fit into the canonical time allotted each individual sign (approximately half a second). In order to accomplish this, loansigns based on English words of more than two letters almost always leave out the middle letter or letters. Note also that the majority of loansigns used in ASL derive from English words which are two or three letters long, and that loansigns based on English words which are <u>more than four</u> letters long are very rare.

Note that, fingerspelling often has no movement: the hand is held is in a stationary position near the right[5] shoulder and moves (slightly) to the right only if a double letter needs to be indicated. Some manual alphabet signs do incorporate movement as part of the meaning of the letter (such as "J" or "Q"), but the majority do not. In order for loansigns to fit in with the three basic parameters to which all native signs conform, they must have movement; thus, all loansigns have indeed added movements. What kind of movements have been added sometimes depends on the semantics of the sign. For example, loansigns movements may resemble the movements of native signs of identical or related meaning. Thus, the loansign for "soon" is signed in the same location (at the cheek) and with the same type of small movement utilized by other time signs such as yesterday and tomorrow:

(17) YESTERDAY (signed at cheek)

TOMORROW (signed at cheek)

Similarly, note that the loansign for "dog" uses a twist of the wrist. It may be significant here that the first part of the native sign for dog is a snap of the fingers; the twist of the wrist movement in the loansign closely resembles the twist of the wrist involved in snapping the fingers. However, apparently, other loansign movements may occasionally derive from the movements of the few manual alphabet letters which actually do incorporate movement; thus, the loansign for "job" has a movement that mirrors the downward curve of the manual alphabet letter "J".

Regardless of the origin of the type of movement, the addition of movement, and the restriction of the sign to a canonical length are all modifications which exactly correspond to the kinds of modifications spoken languages also undergo in order to fit borrowed words into the pattern of the native language's phonotactic constraints. For example, in OshiKwanyama, a Bantu language of Namibia, phonotactic constraints require that words end in vowels, that voiced stops occur only in combination with a preceding homorganic nasal, that clusters involving liquids are disallowed, and the morphology of the language requires that all nouns must have a noun class prefix, usually <u>o</u>- or <u>oši</u>-, as shown in (18).

(18) OshiKwanyama phonotactic & morphological constraints:

a) words must end in vowels
b) nasal + voiced stop allowed; voiced stop alone is not allowed
c) C + liquid, or liquid + C not allowed
d) nouns must have noun class prefix, usually <u>o</u>-, or <u>oši</u>-

<u>source word</u>	<u>loanword</u>
bet	[mbeta]
gold	[ošiŋgolodo]

In order to fit loanwords into this system, they may undergo processes of vowel insertion, nasal insertion, and prefixation; thus, "bet" and "gold" have undergone final vowel insertion, to accomodate constraint (a); both words have undergone homorganic nasal insertion, in order to accomodate constraint (b); "gold" has undergone medial vowel insertion to split up a liquid and stop combination (as per constraint (c)); and "gold" has also undergone noun class prefixation, in accordance with constraint (d).

In order to fit in with ASL requirements that (a) signs may only be about half a second long, and (b) that all signs must have movements, loansigns undergo very similar kinds of modifications. Thus, the "cherological" constraints of ASL impose the same kinds of modifications on loansigns as phonotactic constraints impose on loanwords.

Note also, that loansigns have a number of advantages which some native ASL signs may lack. One of these advantages is that loansigns are always one handed, while many ASL signs require two hands (see the examples of native ASL signs in (16)). Using only one hand can be a definite <u>social</u> advantage; it allows you to hold a cigarette or coffee cup in one hand while signing with the other! Loansigns have an additional advantage in that their location is visually more prominent than that of many native signs: because finger spelling is done in an ideal area within the signing space which is close to eye-level, the loansigns derived from it also have this advantage. Native signs which are done in the periphery of the signing space (such as EGG) or outside of the canonical signing space (such as DOG) do not have this advantage.

(19) EGG (2 hands, held just above the waist)

DOG (1 hand: 2 parts, 2nd part below waist)

An additional kind of borrowing occurs in which existing signs can be modified under the influence of English words. This type of borrowing is referred to as the "initializing" of signs, since it involves modifying the hand configuration of a native sign to resemble the manual alphabet form of the first letter of the English word. Thus the native sign for YEAR (one fist circles the other, as the Earth circles the sun) when done with the handshape for the letter "W" now means "world". Another example, is the word for box or parcel; when done with the handshape for the letter "R" it can be translated as "room".

(20) <u>native sign</u>	<u>initialized sign</u>
YEAR	WORLD
BOX	ROOM

It should be noted that, although use of these initialized loansigns is widespread in the deaf community, initialized signs are less likely to be used by deaf signers who are less well-educated, and, who, therefore, have less knowledge of English. Thus, some deaf people use the sign for BOX in its native form not only for "box" but for "room" also, and do not have the initialized form of "room" at all.

Finally, ASL also adds lexical items by the metaphorical extension of existing signs. These metaphorical meanings are usually accompanied by some change in the type of movement and in the facial expression. Note the examples in (21):

(21) Metaphorical extension in ASL:

HUNGRY	modified produces:	HORNY
FEEL	modified produces:	HAVE-A-HUNCH

In the case of HORNY not only is the movement of HUNGRY repeated but also the expression of the face is appropriate to the meaning. For HAVE-A-HUNCH, the face has a tentative expression and the movement is repeated several times, not merely twice, as for FEEL. Thus, both the increased repetitions and the appropriate facial expression are the overt markers of a metaphorical extension of meaning. Of course, a metaphorical meaning does not need to be overtly marked, as shown by the English examples in (22):

(22) Metaphorical extension in English:

chicken	used metaphorically:	"coward"

blue used metaphorically: "sad"

These examples are pronounced exactly like their literal counterparts: it is the context which identifies whether the meaning is literal or metaphorical, as shown in (23) & (24):

(23) I'm too blue for words.

(24) It's too blue for that room.

This is a case in which the method of lexical addition is the same for both English and ASL, but where the latter is slightly more redundant, in that <u>overt</u> markers of the metaphorical usage normally occur in ASL. Of course, facial expression and tone of voice may come into play in spoken languages as well; in addition, the larger context of the conversation can aid in distinguishing between the metaphorical and literal meanings, as in the sample English sentences (25b) and (26b):

(25) a) What flavour of entrée do we have in these boxes?

b) They're all chicken.

(26) a) Why don't you want to take them on the hiking trip?

b) They're all chicken.

<u>Conclusion</u>

This paper has looked at several methods of lexical addition in ASL and has pointed out certain commonalities of structure between ASL and spoken languages. We have seen that ASL uses some word creation process which are identical to those used in spoken languages, such as compounding, affixation, reduplication, borrowing, and metaphorical extension, as well as other processes which are analogous (if one takes into account the differences in the medium of communication), namely mimetic signs which are analogous to onomatopoeic words. In other words, we have seen that in all cases there are striking similarities between the word creation processes used in ASL and those used in spoken languages.

FOOTNOTES

1. Dr. Steinbergs has a very limited minimal knowledge of ASL; she is primarily a phonologist. However, Ms. O'Dea, though not herself deaf, nor a native signer, uses ASL every day in her interactions with her students at the Newfoundland School for the Deaf, as well as in daily interactions with deaf adults.

2. Complete descriptions of the signs used in this article are provided in an appendix at the end.

3. Which derives from <u>kheir</u>, the Greek word for "hand".

4. However, we must mention that neither of the signs described are necessarily the standard signs for VIDEOTAPE-RECORDER; since videotape and VCR's are still very new technically, there <u>are</u> as yet no widely accepted or commonly agreed-upon standard signs for these items.

5. For a right-handed signer. Obviously, left-handed signers sign near the left shoulder.

APPENDIX OF SIGNS

HC:	Hand Configuration
PA:	Place of Articulation
M:	Movement
O:	Other parameters

AGENT	Two hands. HC: all fingers extended and spread. PA: hands at chest, palms facing, about one foot apart. M: both hands move down to waist in a sharp vertical movement.
A-L	One hand. HC: "A" position but with palm upwards, then "L" position with palm upwards. PA: opposite side of chest from hand being used to sign. M: hand sweeps from one side of torso to the other in a semi-circle.
ALL	Two hands. HC: fingers extended and together. PA: dominant hand above, the other below, palms facing each other, about one foot apart. M: dominant hand makes a circle around the other hand, sweeping outside the lower hand, below it, and ends up slapping it, but with the palm turned upwards.
B-K	One hand. HC: "B" position with palm facing chest, (then, sometimes a "C" position), then a "K" positon. PA: close to and in front of middle of chest. M: moves in direction which speaker wishes to indicate. Note: "coming back" may also indicate a movement back to the speaker, in which case the hand starts out away from the body and moves in towards the chest.
BOX	Two hands. HC: fingers extended and together; dominant hand in front of other hand, about 6 inches apart, palms facing chest. PA: held out in front of

body just above waist. M: move to a position in which hands are opposite each other, fingers pointing forwards, palms facing each other.

COMPUTER	Two hands. HC: thumb and all fingers extended, spread, and slightly curved, as if grasping two cantelopes. PA: hands held up in front of chest. M: hands rotate slightly, twice.
COOK	Two hands. HC: bottom hand held out, palm up; dominant hand has fingers extended & together. PA: dominant hand touches bottom hand. M: dominant hand slaps bottom hand palm down, then palm up.
COOK+AGENT	COOK followed by AGENT
DANCE	Two hands. HC: bottom hand held out, palm up; dominant hand first two fingers extended & pointing downwards. PA: dominant hand fingers touch palm of bottom hand. M: dominant hand moves backwards and forwards lengthwise along upturned bottom hand.
DANCE+AGENT	DANCE followed by AGENT
DEVIL	One hand. HC: thumb and 1st two fingers extended and spread. PA: side of forehead. M: 1st two fingers bend twice.
D-G	One hand. HC: "D" positon, then "G" position sideways. PA: hand held up at side, below shoulder. M: wrist twists quickly.
DOG	One hand. HC: finger snap; then hand open, fingers together. PA: in front of shoulder, then thigh. M: fingers snap, then hand slaps thigh.
EGG	Two hands. HC: first two fingers of each hand extended. PA: hands crossed, dominant hand above touching at middle

	knuckle of an extended finger. M: dominant hand hits bottom hand as hands sweep down and apart.
FACE	One hand. HC: index finger extended. PA: face. M: hand circles outside of face, counterclockwise.
FACE+SAME	One hand. HC: index finger extended, then folded in while thumb and little finger are extended sideways. PA: face then same side of chest as hand signing. M: finger touches cheek, then moves from side to side.
FEEL	One hand. HC: fingers extended and spread, middle finger lowered. PA: middle finger touches middle of chest. M: hand touches chest and remains in position.
F-K	One hand. HC: "F" position, then "K" position. PA: close to and just in front of middle of chest. M: sharp outward movement.
GIRL	One hand. HC: fist, thumb extended. PA: cheek. M: thumb strokes cheek downwards, twice.
GIRL+RIGHT	Two hands. HC: fist, thumb extended, then, quickly index finger is extended, then thumb is folded down; other hand is in RIGHT position. PA: cheek, then dominant hand on top of bottom hand. M: thumb strokes cheek downwards quickly and hand continues moving until hits top of other hand.
G+(O)	One hand. HC: "G" position, then index finger and thumb come together (approximates "O" positon). PA: in front of shoulder. M: hand movest away from body in desired direction.
GO	Two hands. HC: fists, index finger extendeds, pointing upwards. PA: hands held up in front of chest. M: both

	hands move away from chest in direction which signer wishes to indicate; fingers end up pointing in that direction.
H+A; H+A; H+A	One hand. HC: thumb and first two fingers extended (combination of "H" and "A" positions); palm upwards. PA: side of chest opposite hand signing. M: hand sweeps sideways in a large semicircle.
HAVE-A-HUNCH	One hand. HC: fingers extended and spread, middle finger lowered. PA: middle finger touches middle of chest. M: hand moves downwards; movement is repeated two or three times. O: face has a tentative, uncertain expression.
HORNY	One hand. HC: fingers extended, spread, and slightly curved. PA: hand touches upper chest, with thumb pointing upwards. M: hand moves downwards repeatedly. O: lascivious expression on the face.
HORSE	One hand. HC: thumb and 1st two fingers extended, two fingers together. PA: side of forehead. M: 1st two fingers bend twice.
HUNGRY	One hand. HC: fingers extended, spread, and slightly curved. PA: hand touches upper chest, with thumb pointing upwards. M: hand moves slightly downwards.
J-B	One hand. HC: sideways "J" position, then sideways "B" position. PA: in front of chest. M: at bottom of sweep used for "J", hand position changes to "B" and palm of hand ends up facing chest.
JOB	Two hands. HC: closed fists. PA: bottom hand held sideways, knuckles to front, just above waist level; dominant hand sits on top. M: dominant hand hits bottom hand twice.

LATE	One hand. HC: hand open, palm flat. PA: elbow raised to shoulder level; forearm dangles downwards. M: hand waves backward twice.
LAUGH	Two hands. HC: fingers extended, spread, and slightly curved. PA: dominant hand above, the other below, palms facing each other, about one foot apart. M: hands move sideways in opposite directions several times; slight pause at the end of each zig-zag movement.
LIGHTS-OFF	Two hands. HC: fingers extended, spread, and slightly curved. PA: hands held up at chest level. M: fingers come together and fingertips meet.
NAME	Two hands. HC: first two fingers of each hand extended. PA: hands crossed, dominant hand above touching at middle knuckle of an extended finger. M: hit twice.
NOT-YET	One hand. HC: hand open, palm flat. PA: elbow raised to shoulder level; forearm dangles downwards. M: hand waves backward twice. O: negative headshake; tongue between teeth.
O+F	One hand. HC: "O" position, then "F" position. PA: in front of chest. M: moves outward and away from body.
RIGHT	Two hands. HC: fist, index finger extended. PA: dominant fist on top of bottom fist, at thumb joint. M: hit twice.
ROOM	Two hands. HC: "R" position: first two fingers extended and crossed; dominant hand in front of other hand, about 6 inches apart, palms facing chest. PA: held out in front of body just above waist. M: move to a position in which hands are opposite each other, fingers

pointing forwards, palms facing each other.

SAME	One hand. HC: thumb and little finger extended sideways. PA: in front of torso, at chest level. M: hand moves sideways to opposite side of torso, then back.
S-N; S-N	One hand. HC: "S" position (but with first two fingers almost in "N" position), then "N" position. PA: hand held close to cheek. M: first two fingers are flicked outwards twice.
SUMMER	One hand. HC: index finger crooked. PA: across forehead. M: hand sweeps from opposite side to same side of face as hand being used for sign.
TEACH	Two hands. HC: both hands in pinching position (thumb and index finger touching. PA: hands held up, at forehead level. M: hands move forward, twice.
TEACH+AGENT	TEACH (with only one forward movement) followed by AGENT
THINK	One hand. HC: fist, index finger extended. PA: side of forehead. M: touches forehead and stays there.
THINK+TOUCH	Two hands. HC: first hand is fist with index finger is extended, then middle finger is extended downwards, other fingers spread; bottom hand has fingers loosely spread, palm downwards. PA: first the forehead, then the bottom hand. M: index finger touches forehead, then moves to other hand in TOUCH position; while top hand is touching it, bottom hand makes two or three small circles in a forward motion.
TOMORROW	One hand. HC: fist, thumb extended. PA: cheek. M: hand twists forwards, causing thumb to make a small semicircle

into the air in front of the cheek.

TOUCH — Two hands. HC: bottom hand has fingers loosely spread, palm downwards; top hand middle finger extended downwards, other fingers spread. PA: top hand touches bottom hand, which is just above waist. M: top hand touches and stays.

UGLY — One hand. HC: index finger crooked. PA: across middle of face past nose. M: hand sweeps from opposite side to same side of face as hand.

VIDEOTAPE-RECORDER — Two hands. HC: index finger pointing downwards. PA: hands in front of chest, pointing downwards. M: fingers draw two complete circles in air, both moving towards the centre.

WEEK — Two hands. HC: bottom hand held out, palm up; top hand is fist, with index finger extended. PA: dominant hand rests on bottom hand. M: dominant hand sweeps forward from heel of hand to fingertips.

WEEKLY — WEEK is repeated three or four times.

WORLD — Two hands. HC: "W" position: middle three fingers extended. PA: bottom hand held sideways, knuckles to front, just above waist level; dominant hand sits on top. M: dominant hand circles bottom hand, moving in front, then below, then behind it, and end up hitting bottom hand.

WORK — Two hands. HC: closed fists. PA: bottom hand held sideways, knuckles to front, just above waist level; dominant hand sits on top. M: dominant hand hits bottom hand.

WORKED-AND-WORKED	HC and PA of WORK. M: dominant hand makes several medium-sized circles off to the side, hitting the bottom hand at the bottom of each circle.
YEAR	Two hands. HC: closed fists. PA: bottom hand held sideways, knuckles to front, just above waist level; dominant hand sits on top. M: dominant hand circles bottom hand, moving in front, then below, then behind it, and end up hitting bottom hand.
YESTERDAY	One hand. HC: fist, thumb extended. PA: cheek. M: hand twists backwards, causing thumb to make a small semicircle at the cheek.

REFERENCES

Battison, Robbin. 1978. Lexical borrowing in American Sign Language. Silver Spring, Maryland: Linstok Press, Inc.

Fisher, Susan. 1974. Sign language and linguistic universals. In C. Rohrer & N. Ruwet (eds.) Actes du Colloque Franco-Allemand de Grammaire Transformationnelle. Vol. II Etudes de Semantique et autres. [Linguistische Arbeiten] Tubingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag. Pp. 187 - 204.

Humphries, Tom, C. Padden, & T. O'Rourke. 1980. A basic course in American Sign Language. Silver Spring, Maryland: T. J. Publishers.

Klima, E., & Bellugi, U. 1979. The Signs of Language. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Lane, Harlan, & Grosjean, Francois. 1980. Recent Perspectives on American Sign Language. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Madsen, Willard. 1982. Intermediate conversational sign language. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet College Press.

Steinbergs, Aleksandra. 1985. The role of MSC's in OshiKwanyama loan phonology. Studies in African linguistics 16(1):89-101.

Wilbur, R. 1980. The linguistic description of American Sign Language. In H. Lane & F. Grosjean (eds.) Recent perspectives on American Sign Language. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

EQUIVALENCES IN WRITTEN CHINESE OF FRENCH AND ENGLISH RELATIVE CLAUSES

Anthony C. Lister

University of New Brunswick

ABSTRACT

Relative clauses present considerable difficulties for Chinese learners of English and French owing to large structural differences. In Chinese there are no relative pronouns, the antecedent _ce_ (_ce qui_, _ce que_, _ce dont_) is not always expressed nor is a preposition preceding and/or following a relative clause. The qualifying clause precedes the modified noun, and the clause is marked by a subordinative particle _de_, which is sometimes deleted, or in certain circumstance by _zhi_. In cases of _de_ deletion the boundary between word and clause is sometimes blurred. The same is also true when words are formed with the suffix _zhe_. Very occasionally qualifying clauses follow the modified noun. In Chinese qualifying clauses are sometimes avoided by the use of two separate sentences.

One of the most difficult structures of English and French for native Chinese speakers to acquire is the relative clause, and English and French native speakers will also have great difficulty in rendering relative clauses into Chinese. This is because there are no exact equivalents in Chinese of the English relative pronouns _who_, _whom_, _which_, _that_, _whose_ etc, or the French relative pronouns _qui_, _que_, _lequel_, _dont_ etc. Indeed if one examines a Chinese textbook for learners of the language one does not usually find a section on relative clauses, or even the Chinese equivalent, adjectival or modifying clauses. For some reason, this structure, so well codified in English and French, and so stressed for foreign learners, is not given prominent attention in Chinese grammars. Even for English students of French, the relative clauses are not easy structures to master, in spite of the fact that a word by word translation is often possible.

In this article I shall examine the various ways French and English relative clauses are expressed in Chinese. The corpus was composed of thirty-four equivalents of English or French relative clauses taken from Hong Kong newspapers and magazines. While this research is based on the written language, the structure in the spoken language is fairly similar. However, I should like to mention a few points concerning the differences between the written and spoken language concerning Hong Kong. The spoken language or dialect in the territory is Cantonese while the written language is Mandarin, officially called Putongwa in China, or referred to as Modern Standard Chinese (MSC) by many linguists. The main difference between the two dialects is that of pronunciation, and they are mutually incomprehensible. However, there are also differences of vocabulary and structure. Grammatically the two dialects are very similar and Chao (1968:13) writes concerning Chinese dialects in general, «Apart from some minor divergencies, ..., one can say that there is practically one universal Chinese grammar.» It is well known that written Chinese may be read in any Chinese dialect, but written Chinese means Mandarin. It is not possible to write down directly non-standard dialects like Cantonese. One does find a modified form of written Mandarin containing Cantonese words and expressions. However, it is not an exact rendering of Cantonese, which is impossible due to the lack of Chinese characters for many Cantonese words. Thus the written language on which this research is based is basically Mandarin even though it appears in material published in Hong Kong, an almost exclusively Cantonese-speaking area. A further research project based on spoken Cantonese, to show up any difference of structure between that dialect and Mandarin would be profitable. It should be pointed out that written and spoken Mandarin are fairly similar but obviously not identical.

The two major differences between relative clauses in English and French and the equivalent clauses in Chinese are, firstly, the lack of a relative pronoun in Chinese and, secondly, the word order. In English and French the relative clause follows the qualified noun while in Chinese it precedes it, just as prepositional phrases acting as qualifiers also precede the noun. Thus in English the expression «the cat on the mat» becomes in Chinese <u>dianzi shang de mao</u>, «the on the mat cat». The order of the English relative clause «the cat which sits on the mat» in Chinese would be «the on the mat sitting cat». The general structure of English and French relative clauses is as follows:

qualified noun + relative pronoun (subject) + verb
e.g. the cat which sits

qualified noun + relative pronoun (object) + noun + verb
e.g. the cat which I see

The two corresponding Chinese structures would be:

verb + de (subordinative particle) + noun
e.g. sitting <u>de</u> cat

noun + verb + de + qualified noun
e.g. I see <u>de</u> cat

Below are two examples of the Chinese equivalents of English and French clauses where the relative pronoun is subject of the relative clause:

Shou Yuenan chuanmín yingxiang de guojia jiang yu xia xingqi zai Mangu kai hui.[1]

The countries which receive the influence of the Vietnamese boat people will meet next week in Bangkok.

(lit. Receive Vietnam boat people influence de (subordinative particle) countries will next week in Bangkok meet.)

It should be noted that in the above sentence «which receive» could be replaced with «receiving». Chinese has only one equivalent of «the countries which receive the influence» and «the countries receiving the influence».

Zai yi ge zixu wei minzhu ziyou de shehui li dou jí bu minzhu, wo bu gan xiangxiang yi jiu jiu qi nian hou Xianggang jiang biancheng shima yangzi.[2]

If even in a society which praises itself as democratic and free it is not at all democratic, I do not dare to imagine what Hong Kong will be like after 1997.

(lit. In a praise itself as democratic free de society, even extremely not democratic I not dare imagine 1997 after Hong Kong will become what appearance.)

In these two examples the English and French equivalents have relative pronouns which are subjects of verbs followed by an object noun. The following Chinese sentence is the equivalent of French and English relative clauses where the relative pronouns are subjects of verbs in the passive:

Zhege bei shijie renmen yu wei «guaguo zhi wang» de zhenggui guopin,---»[3]

This precious fruit which is praised by the world's people as the «King of the melons»,---

(lit. This by world's people praised as melon King de precious fruit product---)

Following is an example of the Chinese equivalent of an English or French relative clause where the relative pronoun is the object of the verb:

Xigua shi quan shijie renmen dou hen xi ai de xiatian guopin[4]

Watermelons are a summer fruit that people throughout the world all love.

(lit. Watermelons are world people all very much love de summer fruits.)

The main difference between the English translation and the Chinese original is that in Chinese there is no relative pronoun, the modifying clause precedes the noun, and this noun is directly preceded by the subordinative particle de.

I am now going to examine the equivalents in Chinese of English and French relative clauses following a preposition. Of the thirty-four clauses I examined only four fell into this category, and in all four cases the preposition was omitted in Chinese but would be required in English or French. Below are three of the Chinese clauses.

> Deng Xiaoping gaosu Mengesitu, xianzai you yige bijiao haode guoji huanjing, yige bu da di san ci shijie dazhan de guoji huanjing.[5]
>
> Deng Xiaoping told Mengistu, now there is a relatively good international situation, a situation in which a third world war will not be fought.
>
> (lit. Deng Xiaoping told Mengistu, now there is a relatively good international environment, a not fight a third world war de international environment)

In this example the preposition in in the English translation «situation in which» does not exist in the original Chinese. In the second example the required English preposition in is similarly not expressed in the original Chinese.

> Aozhou zhifa jiguan zuijin pohuo yi zong Xianggang Huaren zai Xueli yu nei zhihui dupin fanyun zhi anjian.[6]
>
> The Australian law enforcement agency recently cracked a case in which a group of Hong Kong Chinese in Sydney's prisons were directing drug trafficing.
>
> (lit. Australia's enforce law agency recently cracked a group of Hong Kong Chinese in Sydney's prison directing drug trafficing zhi case.)

In this case the more usual subordinative particle de is replaced with another particle zhi, a matter to be dealt with below. The third example contains the Chinese equivalent of «the date on which» and again the preposition is omitted:

> Xianggang huigui Zhongguo dalu de rizi---[7]
>
> The date on which Hong Kong returns to Mainland China---
>
> (lit. Hong Kong returns to China Mainland de date---)

While in all of the above examples the preposition is omitted in Chinese, there are times when it could be retained. Chao Y.R. (1968: 112) states: «It is possible when necessary for clarity, to specify the relation and say 我从那儿来的地方儿 woo tsorng nall lai de dih fangl 'I from there come's place -- the place I come from', but such constructions are considered awkward and are rarely needed.» «Similarly, a construction like 我对他说了多谢的

那个人 woo duey ta shuole 'duoshieh' de nevg ren 'the man to whom I said 'many thanks'' is also awkward, but is nevertheless sometimes heard.»

There is one case where English and French relative clauses following a preposition seem to have a verv similar equivalent in Chinese. This is where the preposition concerned is among in English or parmi in French. The Chinese expression 其中 qizhong can sometimes be translated as among which. However it originallv meant among these, among those and still does in its literal translation. Newnham (1971: 119) writes «... 其 qi, has literarv antecedents. Originallv, it meant 'that (thing)', somewhat like a third person indicator. Todav, following a noun and joined to another element, it keeps its old force referring back to that noun and on to the joined element. Thus --- 其中 qizhong ('that-among') means 'among which'.»

I examined five cases where two sentences were linked by means of qizhong, but in no case was there a direct parallel with English or French. In two cases qizhong does not directlv follow the noun it refers to:

> Che shang wu ming nanzi ju shou qing shang, qizhong si ren zixing pa hui lu mian[8]
>
> The five men in the car all received light injuries. Among them four people by themselves climbed back to the road.
>
> (lit. Car in five men all received light injuries, among them four people by themselves climbed back road surface.)

One factor which makes the second clause appear to be a subordinate relative clause rather than an independent sentence is the fact that the two sentences are separated bv a coma. However, in Chinese it is common practice to use comas rather than full stops between sentences concerning one particular topic. In deciding whether there are two sentences or just one in the above quotation, it would be more relevant to hear it read, and measure the time gap between the two. From mv own observation there is a longer gap between the noun referred to and qizhong than between the antecedent and among in English and parmi in French, which would indicate that qizhong does not introduce a true relative clause.

The second case is similar in that qizhong does not directlv follow the noun referred to and is preceded by a coma. Again it does not seem to introduce a true relative clause:

> Cai Juncai zai ben Gang chu le ji ben you guan shizhuang sheji de shuji, jun shen shou huanying, qizhong 'Shizhuang Sheji' geng shi ben Gang divi ben Zhongwen ban de shizhuang sheji zhuanzhu, ---[9]

Cai Juncai in Hong Kong published several books about fashion design. All received a good welcome. Among them «Fashion Design» is moreover Hong Kong's first Chinese fashion design monograph,---

(lit. Cai Juncai in Hong Kong published several about fashion design books, all very received welcome, among them/which «Fashion Design» moreover is Hong Kong's first Chinese edition fashion design monograph---)

In the third case qizhong even more clearly introduces a new sentence in spite of the preceding comma. The complete quotation is not given here but may be found in the appendix. The relevant section is as follows:

---, beipu san ren, qizhong yi ren xiangxin shi jituan nei de zhongyao renwu, san ren shaohou jiang luo an kongyi youguan zuiming.[10]

---, among the three people arrested one person is believed to be an important person in the group. The three people later will make a statement and be charged with related crimes.

(lit. ---, arrested three people, among them one person believed is group inside important person, three people later will make a statement and be charged with related crimes.)

In the two other cases qizhong follows a full stop and therefore means among them. For example:

lu ren wei zhe kan renao. Qizhong yige shuo:---[11]

The people on the road surrounded them and watched excitedly. Among them one said: ---

(lit. road people surrounded watched excitedly Among them one said:---)

Furthermore I came across no case where the antecedent was separated from its verb by a clause introduced by qizhong and it is not possible to translate literally by means of this expression a sentence such as «The people among whom she worked were Chinese». To sum up, in none of the cases I have examined does qizhong clearly introduce a subordinate relative clause and in every case it appears to signal the start of a new sentence.

Concerning the Chinese equivalents of French ce dont 'that of which' and celui qui 'he who', I came across one example of each. The sentence containing the equivalent of ce dont is as follows:

Zhi de jiao'ao de shi ta de xuesheng hen duo dou zai ben Gang de cheng yi jie zhong chuang xia ziji de shiye---[12]

Ce dont il faut être fier c'est que beaucoup de ses étudiants ont créé leurs propres opérations à Hong Kong dans le monde du prêt-à-porter.

(lit. il vaut la peine d'être fier c'est que ses étudiants beaucoup à Hong Kong prêt-à-porter monde dans ont créé propres opérations)

Not only are the relative pronoun and preposition (contained in the amalgam dont) omitted as is usual, but so is the antecedent ce.

In the case of celui qui 'he who', again, neither element of the expression, be it the antecedent or the relative pronoun, occurs in the Chinese sentence:

Yao zuo yi ge haode shejishi xu buduan xishou xinde shiwu---[13]

Celui qui veut devenir un bon couturier doit absorber sans cesse de nouvelles choses.

(lit. veut devenir un bon couturier doit sans cesse absorber nouvelles choses.)

According to most grammars an adjectival clause in Chinese is marked by the so-called modifying particle de. Chao (1968: 111) writes, «A clause can modify any nominal expression by adding the subordinative particle de» and all the examples of adjectival clauses which he provides are followed by the particle. However, the omission of de is not uncommon and it is omitted in seven of the thirty-four adjectival clauses which I examined. In three of the cases the clause is short and all occur in the same article:

---muqian zhi Gang nanmin---[14]

---refugees who are stuck at present in Hong Kong---
(lit. presently stuck Hong Kong refugees)

Qu nian lai Gang Yuenan nanmin---[15]

The Vietnamese refugees who came to Hong Kong last year---
(lit. Last year came Hong Kong Vietnamese refugees)

---buduan yong Gang Yuenan nanmin renshu[16]

---the number of Vietnamese refugees who are continuously flooding to Hong Kong

(lit. continuously flood Hong Kong Vietnamese refugees number)

However, in one case the adjectival clause is much longer:

Wei lai liang nian shou qingchai yingxiang renshu yu san wan ren[17]

In the coming two years the number of people who receive the influence of a complete demolition (i.e. of their homes) will exceed thirty thousand.

(lit. Coming two years receive demolition influence number of people will exceed thirty thousand people.)

In the other two cases where de is deleted the boundary between an adjectival clause and a word is blurred. For example «fanzui fenzi»[18] which may be translated as «offender» or «criminal» is structurally the same as a qualifying clause plus a noun meaning «elements who commit crimes» «You zuzhi fanzui huo dong»[19] meaning «organized crime activities» is also structurally the same as a qualifying clause plus a noun meaning «crime activities which have organization».

Another case where de is absent and where there is also a blurring of the boundary between word and qualifying clause is that of the bound morpheme zhe 'a person'. It is normally described as a suffix, and has a meaning similar to that of the English ending -er. For example, du means «to read» while duzhe means «a reader», literally «a reading person» or «a person who reads». Duzhe is structurally made up of a qualifying clause du and a qualified noun zhe. In the resultant compound the boundary between word and adjectival clause is blurred, but it would normally be considered a polysyllabic word.[20] In longer expressions the boundary is less clear. «Jinru juesai zhe» which literally means «enter final competition person» i.e. «a finalist» might still be considered a polysyllabic word, but it would be more difficult to so consider the first four words of the following sign:

Bu chuan yongyi zhe bu zhun shang chi mian.[21]

Those not wearing swimming costumes may not go up to the pool area.

(lit. Not wear swimming costumes people not allowed go up pool area)

Another participle, which sometimes indicates a qualifying clause, is zhi and has already been mentioned above. According to Richard Newnham (1971: 119-120): «One more relative particle has also come down from wenyan: zhi showing the genitive as does de, and found in 'five per cent'--- and at the end of other statements involving one item among several». While this is true, it has a broader use as can be seen in the sentence I have already quoted.[22] As it only occurred once in the corpus, it is not possible to draw any comparisons between it and de.

However, in the case where it did occur it could have been replaced by de.

In all the examples quoted so far the Chinese modifying clause precedes the nominal expression and this is the normal pattern. However, I came across one sentence where what appears to be the modifying clause follows the noun:

> Waiguo qingnian lai Hua liuxue ye xiangying zengjia[23]
>
> Young foreigners who are coming to China to study are also increasing correspondingly.
>
> (lit. Foreign young people coming China to study also correspondingly increase.)

It might be possible to consider both lai «to come» and zengjia «to increase» as main verbs, but there is no conjunction and the fact remains that in English or French lai would be part of a relative clause.

Before concluding, it should be mentioned that what is a relative clause in English or French is not necessarily a qualifying clause in Chinese, and vice versa. Thus, in the following example Chinese uses two separate sentences whereas English or French would prefer a main clause followed by a relative clause:

> Beijing xiaoxi: Zhong Gong lingdaoren Deng Xiaoping zuotian zai zheli zhichu, Zhongguo dalu xuxao guo jige guan, zui da de guan shi yao zonghe zhili, gaige jiage he gongzi.[24]
>
> Beijing news: the Chinese Communist Party leader Deng Xiaoping indicated here yesterday that China must pass several barriers. The biggest barrier is that it must structure its administration, and reform prices and wages.

In this paper I have attempted to describe the basic structure of Chinese qualifying clauses and have shown the major differences between them and French and English relative clauses. Since this study is based on a very small corpus, it is certain that further research would show that other equivalents of relative clauses exist in Chinese. In addition, a study of the spoken language in this area, particularly Cantonese, would be very useful both from a purely linguistic point of view and for the practical value of helping Hong Kong students master relative clauses in English and French. Further research could also be carried out on the rules governing de deletion in qualifying clauses, both in the written and spoken language, a matter related to the whole question of ellipsis in Chinese.

FOOTNOTES

1 Wah Kiu Yat Po, Hong Kong, July 15, 1988.

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid. July 25, 1988.

4 Ibid.

5 Sing Dao Yat Bou, Hong Kong, June 23, 1988.

6 Ibid.

7 Ibid.

8 Ibid.

9 Ibid.

10 Wah Kiu Yat Po, Hong Kong, July 15, 1988.

11 Ibid, July 25, 1988.

12 Sing Dao Yat Bou, loc. cit.

13 Ibid.

14 Sing Pao Daily News, Hong Kong, June 16, 1988.

15 Ibid.

16 Ibid.

17 Wah Kiu Yat Po, loc. cit.

18 Sing Dao Yat Bou, loc. cit.

19 Ibid.

20 Ibid.

21 Public sign.

22 See quotation referred to in footnote 6.

23 Cheng Ming (Magazine), vol. 91, p. 63, Hong Kong, May, 1985.

24 Sing Dao Yat Bou, loc. cit.

REFERENCES

CHAO, Yuen Ren. 1968. A Grammar of Spoken Chinese. Berkeley, Los Angeles, London: University of California Press.

NEWNHAM, Richard. 1971. About Chinese. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books Ltd.

7) 香港回歸中國大陸的日子。

8) 車上五名男子俱受輕傷，其中四人自行爬回路面。

9) 蔡俊才在本港出了幾本有關時裝設計的書籍，均甚受歡迎，其中"時裝設計"更是本港第一本中文版的時裝設計專著。

10) 在警方的行動中，共拘捕三名涉嫌者，而警方相信今次繳獲的毒品，相信是一個國際性華人販毒集團有關，被捕三人，其中一人相信是集團內的重要人物，三人稍後將落案控以有關罪名。

11) 路人圍着看熱鬧，其中一個說。—

CHINESE TEXT OF QUOTATIONS

1） 受越南船民影响的國家將於下星期在曼谷開會。

2） 在一個自詡為民主自由的社會裡者極不民主，我不敢想像一九九七年後香港將變成什麽樣子。

3） …… 這個被世界人們譽為"瓜果之王"的珍貴果品。

4） 西瓜是全世界人們都很喜愛的夏天果品。

5） 鄧小平告訴門格斯圖，現在有一個比較好的國際環境，一個不打第三次世界大戰的國際環境。……

6） 澳洲執法機關最近破獲一宗香港華人在雪梨獄內指揮毒品販運之案件。

12) 值得驕傲的是他的学生很多都在本港的成衣界中創下自己的事業。

13) 要做一个好的設計師須不斷吸收新的事物。

14) …… 目前滯港難民 ……

15) 去年來港越南難民增加了百分之六十五。

16) 但外國收容額卻沒有增加來配合不斷湧港越南難民人數。

17) 未來兩年受清拆影响人數逾三萬人。

18) 犯罪份子。

19) 澳洲國家滅罪局……專門對付有組織犯罪活動。

20) 進入決賽者。

21) 不穿泳衣者不准上池面。

23) 外國青年來華留学也相應增加。

24) 北京消息：
中共領導人鄧小平昨天在這裏指出，中國大陸需要過幾個関，最大的関是要綜合治理，改革價格和工資。……

I should like to thank Dr. Larry Shyu for writing out this Chinese text, and for giving advice on the translations.

TESTING A PROTOTYPE OF INTERACTIVE SEMANTIC ANALYZER (PISA)

Jean-Claude Choul (Montreal)

ABSTRACT

This paper uses Borland's Turbo Prolog version 2.0 as a formalizing tool to test the basic assumptions of a Value Assignment Semantic Theory. A Prolog rule is conditional, just as a meaning assignment is a value attributed IF certain conditions are satisfied. Semantic analysis thus becomes the study of conditions governing a sense attribution. As a Prolog clause, meaning is a relation holding between two arguments of a sense predicate where metalinguisic equivalence is the most economical way of describing meaning.

Introduction: Earlier Work

Although semantic research is active on various horizons (Rastier 1987, Traugott 1989), I will mainly refer to earlier works, in particular to my own research for the past ten years, which was practically initiated by a paper read (Choul 1981a) at one of the first annual meetings of this Association, where I explored the potential notion of set meaning, to return later to the more traditional label of «idioms» (Choul 1982a; 1987c). I will call on some more recent work, but in a slightly different field, which could be called, to avoid any confusion with the formalist approach, « automated semantics », that is, the automation of the theory of semantic operations which has been my main research concern over the recent years (Choul 1987b).

Semantics

My recent work in connection with this on-going research dealt both with applications to the lexicographic field (Choul 1986; 1987a) and with finalizing various attempts at formalizing the basic assignment rule (Choul 1987d).

This rule, reworked over the years, is the basis of the present paper and of the Prototype of Interactive Semantic Analyzer (PISA), following the theoretical principles laid down in Choul (1985) for the description of meaning in linguistics.

Verifiability

Since January 88, Prolog in Borland's Turbo dialect (Borland 1988) has played an increasingly important role in my research and has already been used for metalinguistic purposes. In Choul (1988b), I presented an expert system shell for dictionary making, from which PISA was first derived. The same year prototype programs had been developed to illustrate a translation rule and an anaphora rule, as well as some teaching material based on sentence cohesion and coherence (Choul 1988a). Earlier this year, prototype expert systems were designed for synonymy, antonymy and word-formation (Choul 1989b).

At this stage, it is possible to say that the theoretical construction is entering its verification phase with the use of Prolog: formalization is no longer a metaphor used for rigor's sake. Rules and relations are immediately verifiable (a basic program can be written in about twenty minutes), as I had the opportunity to demonstrate in the study of what is now called a semiotic operator (Choul 1989a).

The use of logic programming and Horn clauses (cf. Gram 1986) not only confirms previous intuitions, but also guarantees functionality, beyond an agreement-seeking demonstration, to become a truly scientific testing procedure.

Logic Programming and Semantics

The use of a computer in this type of research was just a matter of time, although it required the development of artificial intelligence. Mandelbrot (1957) had already compared words to sub-routines and clichés to routines. The epistemological consequences of the Information Theory metaphor and Winograd's (1972) work had a considerable influence on my first doctoral dissertation (Choul 1979). It is quite ironical that the language I am learning to use originated in Predicate Calculus (cf. Gram 1986), while I always have fought the logicist position in semantics, especially for the representation of meaning, although it was quite clear from the beginning that the semantic operation is an inference (Choul 1979:44*sq*.).

The Prolog rule is an inference, that is, a conclusion whose truth depends on one or more conditions. As such, it is perfect to account for a semi-formalized notation like the one I have developed over the years, shown in (1) in its canonic form, which reads « A is attributed the metalinguistic value D as a function of syntagmatic condition B and paradigmatic condition C »:

(1) A/__B(C):=D

The two classes of conditions (syntagmatic and paradigmatic) relay the Saussurean axes, used by Granger (1968) and Besse (1970), among others. No matter how many conditions apply, they will always belong to one of these classes, as long as they are linguistic.

Although the list of condition types is not closed, there are 13 of them at present, described briefly in Choul (1988b), if we exclude the situational condition which applies in the pragmatic phase of interpretation. Some testing conditions were designed in the description of semiotic operators (Choul 1989a): permutation, semanticity and paraphrase, which are used to verify an assignment.

Meaningfulness and paraphrasability belong to the fundamental principles of the theory (cf. Choul 1985[1]): any portion of an utterrance where a rule applies is deemed to "make sense" and all assignments are verified through their insertion into a paraphrase. Permutation is a variety of substitution derived from the principle of equivalence: the basic maifestation of meaning is equivalence, either linguistic or metalinguistic. Although equivalence is axiomatic in the theory, it is also defensible from the point of view of economy.

The study of meaning becomes the study of its conditions: of how words and sentences "make sense". In the computer language used for formalizing or, rather, automating meaning, the sense conditions are sub-goals that have to be proven true for the goal representing meaning assignment, which is the head of the inference, to be proven true.

As a Prolog clause or fact, the meaning correlation is a relationship between the arguments of a predicate, where one can be the <u>signifier</u> and the other the <u>signified</u>. In the present terminology, the lexical form is the <u>base</u> and the semantic element is its <u>value</u>.

A classical dictionary definition (whether aristotelian or modernized) is then broken down into a value (which can be a string) and conditions that govern that specific attribution. The result is a production rule, where the semantizing process is an inference on the model of (2), rewritten in Prolog in (3):

(2) «If Mary and John love each other, then their feeling is reciprocal»

(3)
```
reciprocal_feeling(mary,john):-
love(mary,john),
love(john,mary).
```

Example (4) illustrates the application of one condition to an interlinguistic assignment dealing with a Dutch compound. This condition is said to be positional, since it takes into account the incidence of word-order on meaning.

(4)
```
meaning_is(apple,orange):-
in_the_context_before(apple,sinaas).
```

To be executable in Prolog, (4) requires one or more extra conditions that will connect or associate <u>orange</u> to <u>sinaas</u>, to account for the fact that a «chinese apple» is an orange, something like <u>compound</u>(sinaas, apple, orange).

<u>Pisa: Interaction and Testing</u>

The prototype under study was meant to be interactive to the extent it would have used the properties of diagnostic expert systems described in Choul (1988a; 1988b; 1989a). In order to avoid duplicating part of the work devoted to the lexicographic potential of Prolog, after a series of intermediate trials, it seemed more profitable to move directly to a partial automation of the rule, where interaction is limited to entering the lexical form and the hypothetical value.

In fact, there is no single prototype, since the various trials led to the design of 19 different programs, which to a certain extent complement each other. None of these are definitive. The analyzer as such is more of a working hypothesis than an actual objective. The purpose of the present research is not to develop a program that would understand natural language, but to arrive at a satisfactory model of semantic operations.

There are various commercial or prototype software packages that make claims to understanding natural language, but their interest is not clear: most make use of a controlled vocabulary and syntax that makes them cumbersome, such as the Intelligent Assistant in <u>Q&A</u> produced by Symantec (cf. Ewing and Langenes 1986) and <u>Geobase</u>, written in Prolog and offered free to Turbo Prolog users by Borland. <u>Geobase</u>, which describes the geography of the U.S., is characterized by the fact it uses a model borrowed from indexing languages (cf. Chaumier 1982), two entities being linked by an association. In both cases, there is a vocabulary enrichment interface based on synonymy (this means that the semantics of the system cannot be changed, only its lexicon).

<u>Automatic Meaning Assignment</u>

The term <u>analyzer</u> is probably misleading. This is not an attempt at making a parser, such as SANAL proposed by Borland, which produces only a structural description of a sentence on the model of generative grammar. In PISA, syntax is reduced to its incidence on meaning and is present in the form of a modular or semio-modular condition (the latter includes aspects, cases and features). The module is shown in (5) as a negation - the standard predicate <u>not</u> allows the removal of the earlier notation « - » in front of <u>xMIXy</u>:

```
(5)   is_assigned(mixed,incongruous):-
      positional_before(mixed,metaphor),
      not(modular(mixed,xMIXy).
```

Example (5) reads: « the base <u>mixed</u> is attributed value "incongruous" IF <u>mixed</u> is in the context before <u>metaphor</u> AND IF module <u>xMIXy</u> does not apply ». This second condition can be reinforced by adding a figurative condition or inserting a feature in the module, as shown in (6) and (7):

```
(6)   figurative(mixed,abstract).

(7)   modular(mixed,xMIX_abstract_y).
```

It should be pointed out that while (6) and (7) are conditions of a particular version of the rule in (5), they must also belong to a knowledge or fact base in order for the program to run. This is also valid for the other conditions in (5). Here Prolog makes an important contribution to the modelling of the semantizing process. As in the theory of semantic operations developed independently of Prolog, there is a requirement for a set of rules and a set of facts (both will vary with individuals, in their form as well as in their number).

The main advantage of Prolog is the possibility of immediate verification in the course of condition analysis. This has been done separately of PISA, for the three variants of the <u>mixed metaphor</u> rule, in a program caled MIXED.PRO. To allow two variables in interrogating, it was necessary to add a new predicate « sense(Word,Value) » as a condition; it is a constraint inherent to Prolog, but it also allows for the possibility to consider assignment as the application of a precorrelation to preceding conditions.

<u>Testing: Theory and Method</u>

Although my command of Prolog is still superficial, it is clear that this language allows for various internal lexicon models, especially in its simplest form, with no rule other than the interface of a relational database, which is included in the Prolog Editor; the minimal lexical structure is then the dictionary type, where the word would be the predicate and its attributes the arguments, as illustrated in (8):

(8) word(category,gender,number,sense,example,usage)

While this approach is valid, although a little impractical, previous results (Choul 1988a; 1988b; 1989a; 1989b) have shown that it is possible to distinguish, in a dichotomic model, operations from relations, whatever shape these may have. Prolog makes it possible to give a workable form to earlier metaphorical hypotheses on the representation of the comprehension and reading process as a «natural» computer diagram (Choul 1979; 1982b).

The other extreme version of the internal lexicon, apart from the database model, is hypothetically a model where rules dominate, each sense being a rule, as in expert systems using production rules. But even in this case, generality has to be accounted for, and leads to the development of inference engines. Similarly, the Prolog database is interrogated through the inference engine built in the language. We may, then, consider the semantizing inference as a particular instance of a more general psychological or semiotic mechanism.

Let us now proceed with the description of this PISA which is not a proper analyzer. The first three programs to be designed were chronologically AUTORAIL, AUTORS1, AUTORS2 and AUTORS3. The first is an adaptation of a research tool used for semiotic operators and contains four meanings for <u>incendiary</u> in a fact base where there are only two types of predicates: substitution(Argument1, Argument2) et paraphrase(Arg1, Arg2). It is a consultation software environment which allows us by entering the word, its value or its context to respectively check the value (four answers), the word and its context (one answer), and the word and the corresponding value (one answer). The basic rule of the program is found in (9) and (10), the latter giving the exact format, with the <u>bound</u> predicate, preventing the occurrence of a free variable:

```
(9)   instanciation(Base,Valeur):-
      substitution(Base,Valeur),
      paraphrase(Contexte,Valeur).

(10)  instanciation(Base,Valeur):-
      substitution(Base,Valeur),
      paraphrase(Contexte,Valeur),bound(Contexte).

      paraphrase(Contexte,Valeur,Base):-
      substitution(Base,Valeur),
      paraphrase(Contexte,Valeur),bound(Contexte).
```

AUTORS1.PRO uses the same rule for paraphrase, but has a new fact (category) and a new condition (morphological), given in (11), which is also a rule, as it can be observed:

```
(11)  morphologique(Base,Forme,Valeur):-
      catégorie(Base,Forme,Valeur).
```

Entering a value for the Form variable with the standard predicate readln will make it possible to differenciate "arsonist" from "inflammatory".

AUTORS2.PRO differs considerably from the previous programs: it has a fact base of nine types of clauses to describe the meanings of incarnation, and the rule calls each predicate interactively, the user making his selection from a menu. (12) illustrates the general predicate structure:

```
(12)  contextuelle(base,condition,valeur).
```

AUTORS3.PRO shows a refinement in making the conditions for purpose correspond to sub-rules, as shown in (13):

```
(13)  context(Base,Valeur):-
      write(" The contextual condition deals with the domain of ap-
      plication."),
      write(" Possible selections:"),
      write(" trip, quality, determination,object, act."),
      write(" Enter a condition: "),
      readln(Condition6),
      write(" You selected condition «",Condition6,"»."),
      contextuelle(Base,Condition6,Valeur).
```

The problem for the user is to give a coherent set of conditions that will apply for a given sense. This turns out to be a guessing game and the failure rate is high. The obvious conclusion that we can draw at this point is that for a given assignment no set of conditions is exhaustive. Truly applicable conditions at a given point are limited to a very small number.

PISA-1.PRO, developed according to those principles, using the rule in (14) as its main rule, confirmed this impression. For a great number of conditions, a consistently successful application is a function of a semantic redundancy in rules and facts.

```
(14)  instanciation(Base,Valeur):-
      floating_feature(Base,Valeur),
      position_before(Base,Valeur),
      position_after(Base,Valeur),
      position_between(Base,Valeur),
      context(Base,Valeur),
      syntagmatic(Base,Valeur),
      morphology(Base,Valeur),
      modular(Base,Valeur),
      parametric(Base,Valeur).
```

PISA-1 uses the clauses from AUTORS3, as well as its sub-rules. If it seems logical to write facts connecting the lexical form, its value and the type of condition, the use of three different positional conditions for a given sense, as in (14), may be superfluous. The other possibility consists of constructing one rule per sense, which was attempted in TRAD1S1R.PRO, variant of PISATRAD which is incomplete. This program is quite speculative, since interlingual translation may not be governed by the the same rules as intralingual equivalence. (15) gives the two rules for this program which uses a numerical convention to recognize sense, which is obviously not realistic, except for a dictionary.

```
(15)  traduction_française(Base,Exemple,Traduction):-
      sens(Base,Condition,Valeur),
      position_avant(Condition,Valeur,Position),
      position_après(Condition,Position,Position2),
      contextuelle(Condition,Position2,Régime),
      morphologique(Condition,Régime,Article),
      exemple(Condition,Article,Exemple),
      substitution(Condition,Traduction),!.

      sens(Base,Condition,Valeur):-
      write(" Choose on of the following English equivalents as a
      condition:"),
      write(" 1 - aim          "),
      write(" 2 - intention    "),
      write(" 3 - message      "),
      readint(Condition),
      flottante(Base,Condition,Valeur),!.
```

This version already moves from interaction to automation, with only the floating condition allowing data entry. Note also the addition of conditions such as <u>example</u> and <u>substitution</u>. The same format will apply in the new version of the translation rule, called SISATRAD.PRO, SI standing for «semi-interactive». It contains an extra meaning, represented here by its corresponding example, in (16):

```
(16)  exemple(4,"the","What is the purpose of this meeting?").
```

PISA-2.PRO is an intermediary version, using numerical conditions and supplying four meanings, while PISA-3.PRO is an illustration of the one sense/one rule principle, on the model of one form/one sense principle. (17) and (18) illustrate rules found in PISA-3.

```
(17)  instanciation(purpose,"intentionally"):-
      flottante(purpose,"action","intentionally"),
      position_avant(purpose,"on"),
      position_après(purpose,"zero"),
      contextuelle(purpose,"wrong action"),
      morphologique(purpose,"adverb"),
      modulaire(purpose,"verb + on purpose"),
      syntagmatique(purpose,"on purpose").
```

```
(18)  instanciation(purpose,"intention"):-
      flottante(purpose,"action","intention"),
      write(" If it refers to an action and"),
      position_avant(purpose,"article"),
      write(" if it is preceded by an article and"),
      position_après(purpose,"preposition"),
      write(" if it is followed by a preposition and"),
      contextuelle(purpose,"action"),
      morphologique(purpose,"noun"),
      write("if it is a noun and"),
      modulaire(purpose,"of + verb"),
      write("if the preposition is followed by a verb, THEN").
```

(18) is characterized by the fact that it comments every step of the execution. There is no data entry, and therefore no interaction. PISA-4.PRO is also a strict description of the process, using only four conditions (floating, morphological, modular - shown in (19) - and parametric).

```
(19)  modular(Base,Valeur):-
      modulaire(Base,Condition,Valeur),
      write(" The modular condition deals with syntactic incidence on
      meaning."),
      write(" Here the modular condition is ",Condition," - ").
```

The first program of the testing series (CONTROL.PRO) used the rules of the AUTO series, that is, substitution and instanciation, the paraphrase being only the call of a fact. CONTROLT and CTRLTRAD followed. In the T version, testing is carried out after the entry of the equivalent and the English word. Three meanings of <u>purpose</u> are described as well as one each for <u>aim</u> and <u>intention</u>. (20) shows the main rule:

```
(20)  traduction(Base,Basef):-
      équivalence(Base,Valeurf,Valeur),
      paraphrase(Base,Basef,Contextef,Contexte),
```

The corresponding analytical rules are shwon in (21), which amount to a formal definition of translation:

(21)
```
équivalence(Base,Valeurf,Valeur):-
sens_français(Base,Valeurf),
même_sens(Valeurf,Valeur).

même_sens(Valeurf,Valeur):-
sens_français(Base,Valeurf),
sens_anglais(Basef,Valeur),
sens_mot(Base,Valeur),
sens_équivalent(Basef,Valeurf),
write(" Le mot ",Base," a le même sens que ",Basef,".").

paraphrase(Base,Basef,Contextef,Contexte):-
contextef(Base,Contextef),
contexte(Basef,Contexte),
même_contexte(Contextef,Contexte).
```

In the TRAD version, the paraphrase rule was modified to ensure a more efficient execution, as shown in (22):

(22)
```
paraphrase(Base,Basef):-
contextef(Base,Contextef),
contexte_mot(Base,Contexte),
contexte(Basef,Contexte),
contexte_équivalent(Basef,Contextef),
write(" Avec pour contextes équivalents: ",Contexte,"  et
",Contextef,".").
```

After translation, it was the turn of synonymy, with the help of CONTROLS.PRO, where the phenomenon is governed by two classical conditions, substitution and paraphrase, as shown in (23):

(23)
```
instanciation(Mot,Syn):-
substitution(Mot,Syn),
paraphrase(Mot,Syn),
write("alors le synonyme du mot ",Mot," est donc ",Syn,".").
```

These two conditions, which are in turn rules themselves, are dependent on two conditions that are facts in the knowledge base, as illustrated in (24) and in (25) which is a sample of the fact base:

(24)
```
substitution(Mot,Syn):-
sens(Mot,Valeur),
même_sens(Syn,Valeur),
write("Si le synonyme ",Syn," a une valeur analogue ",Valeur,"
au mot ",Mot,",").

paraphrase(Mot,Syn):-
intégration(Mot,Contexte),
phrase(Syn,Contexte),
write(" et si le synonyme ",Syn," du mot ",Mot," s'intègre de
façon naturelle au contexte ",Contexte,",").
```

(25)
```
mot(purpose).
mot(aim).
mot(intention).
```

```
synonyme(aim).
synonyme(use).
synonyme(intentionally).
synonyme(purpose).
```

With the testing mechanisms in place, it was then possible to return to the assignment rule, with CONTROLA.PRO which has two executable forms: CTRLA1.PRO, where the failure, in case of a fact not belonging to the fact base, is anticipated, and CTRLA2.PRO where the same failure happens only at the insertion phase. The basic rule is still instanciation, conditioned by substitution and paraphrase. The substitution rule is dependent on assignment and the paraphrase rule is subject to the success of the reference rule and the predicate <u>example sentence</u> in the fact base. The knowledge base is special since it has only two predicate types: <u>meaning</u> and <u>example sentence</u>. The assignment rule itself depends on conditions which are rules as well, using the same model as <u>reference</u>, with anonymous variables - noted with an underscore _, in Prolog - as it can be seen with the examples in (26):

```
(26)  paramétrique(Valeur,Expression):-
      sens(_,Valeur,_,_,_,_,_,_,_,Expression).

      réfère(Mot,Valeur,Référence):-
      sens(Mot,Valeur,_,_,_,Référence,_,_,_,_).
```

The last program designed in the current research is simply called RULE.PRO and differenciates only two meanings, but it returns to a more plausible model of lexical organization. If effectively meaning is assigned in the course of an inference operation, conditions should then be associated only to form and sense, as shown in (27), where figurativeness is bound to reference, following earlier observations (Choul 1982a; 1987c).

```
(27)  figurée(intention,"actual desire","oppose effet et désir").
      figurée(purpose,"with a particular plan","rattache effet et
            intention").
```

This is also what happened to the illustrative sentence, which is the paradigm of use for a given meaning, witnessed in (28):

```
(28)  phrase_exemple(purpose,"I came here on purpose to see you",
      "rattache effet et intention").
      phrase_exemple(intention,"It wasn't my intention to hurt
      her","oppose effet et désir").
```

There should be a specific rule, in the form of a program, to actually carry out substitution, rather than consider it as a correlation between the two arguments of a predicate; still, theoretically, nothing prevents us from representing substitution as a fact, as a function of a type of context.

There is also a more delicate program to consider, where the assignment rule would not interlock all conditions, making them somewhat optional. This would allow for a greater number of facts in the representation of meaning conditions in the knowledge base. There may be a syntactic difficulty in Prolog, since the OR operator is a little trickier to use than the AND operator. An indirect solution to this would be to write rules in decreasing number of applicable conditions. This was experimented with a very simple program with no user interface, on the basis that Prolog, just as a human is only satisfied when a solution is found; the whole program, called AS.PRO is given in (29):

(29)
```
% Date: 7-10-89 - 13h49 - titre as.pro
domains
mot,valeur,sème=symbol
contexte=string
predicates
as(mot,valeur)
au_sens_de(mot,valeur)
dans_le_contexte(mot,contexte,valeur)
sème_flottant(mot,sème,valeur)
reçoit_le_sens_de(mot,valeur)
clauses
reçoit_le_sens_de(Mot,Valeur):-
as(Mot,Valeur).
reçoit_le_sens_de(Mot,Valeur):-
au_sens_de(Mot,Valeur).
reçoit_le_sens_de(Mot,Valeur):-
dans_le_contexte(Mot,Contexte,Valeur),
bound(Contexte).
reçoit_le_sens_de(Mot,Valeur):-
sème_flottant(Mot,Sème,Valeur),bound(Sème).
% base de faits
as(coffee,beans).
as(coffee,infusion).
au_sens_de(chat,chaton).
au_sens_de(mouton,doux).
dans_le_contexte(coffee,"fine ground",beans).
dans_le_contexte(coffee,"with cream",infusion).
dans_le_contexte(chat,"un petit",chaton).
dans_le_contexte(mouton,"comme un",doux).
sème_flottant(coffee,sugar,infusion).
sème_flottant(coffee,roasted,beans).
sème_flottant(chat,petit,chaton).
sème_flottant(mouton,comme,doux).
% fin de programme
```

Although there are still many aspects to investigate, the contribution of Prolog to semantic research and more specifically to the verification of hypotheses and observations is both significant and rewarding. Its main advantages remain its descriptive and relational nature and its built-in inference engine, which account for the compatibility with the Value Assignment Semantic Theory.

NOTES

1. These 3Ø principles were extensively discussed in my 1987 disssertation and during my defence; they form a deductive system which is now being empirically and automatically verified.

REFERENCES

BESSE, Henri. 197Ø. 'Problèmes de sens dans l'enseignement d'une langue étrangère'. Langue française 8.62-77. Paris: Larousse.

BORLAND. 1988. Turbo Prolog 2.Ø User's Guide. Scotts Valley, CA: Borland International.

CHAUMIER, Jacques. 1982. Analyse et langages documentaires. Le traitement linguistique de l'information documentaire. Paris: Entreprise Moderne d'Edition.

CHOUL, Jean-Claude. 1979. Le sens de la lecture, contribution aux recherches sémantiques et sémiotiques. Unpublished doctoral dissertation (Doctorat de 3e cycle). Paris: Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales.

_____. 1981a. 'Is There Such a Thing as Set Meaning, and do weneed it?'. A.M. Kinloch & A.B. House (eds), Papers from the 4th Annual Meeting of the Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association 48-59. Fredericton, NB: U.N.B.

_____. 1981b. 'Lisibilité et seuil de redondance sémantique'. The Canadian Journal of Information Science 6.77-87.

_____. 1982a. 'Règle d'interprétation idiomatique'. Journal of the Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association 4.36-53.

_____. 1982b. 'La traitement de l'information dans un modèle de la lecture'. The Canadian Journal of Information Science 7.57-68.

_____. 1985. 'The Description of Meaning and its Principles'. L. Falk, K. Flikeid & M. Harry (eds), Papers from the 9th Annual Meeting of the Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association 13-24. Halifax, N.S.: Saint Mary's University.

_____. 1986. 'Procedures for Testing and Pre-Testing Dictionaries'. A.M. Kinloch et al. (eds), Papers from the 1Øth Annual Meeting of the Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association 25-37. Fredericton, N.B.: U.N.B.

_____. 1987a. 'Contrôle de l'équivalence dans les dictionnaires bilingues'. R. Ilson (ed.), A Spectrum of Lexicography 75-89. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

_____. 1987b. Sémantisation: théorie des opérations sémantiques. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation (Doctorat d'État) under the direction of B. Pottier. Paris: Université Paris IV-Sorbonne.

_____. 1987c. 'Sémantique de la locution'. Revue québécoise de linguistique théorique et appliquée 6:3.117-130.

_____. 1987d. 'Meaning As A Rule'. XIVth World Congress of Linguists (August 1987), East-Berlin (DDR). [To appear.]

_____. 1988a. 'Systèmes experts d'apprentissage: traduction, lexico-sémantique, morphosyntaxe, anaphore'. XIXth Symposium of the Canadian Association of Applied Linguistics, (May 26-28, 1988), Toronto, Ont., Glendon College.

_____. 1988b. 'An Expert System Shell for Lexicographic Research'. T. K. Pratt (ed.), Papers from the 12th Annual Meeting of the Atlantic Provinces Linguistic Association 11-21. Charlottetown, P.E.I.: U.P.E.I.

_____. 1989a. 'Opérateurs sémiotiques: systèmes experts de recherche sémiotique'. Congrès de l'Association internationale de sémiotique, Perpignan (April 1989). [To appear.]

_____. 1989b. 'Synonymes et systèmes experts'. First Canadian Conference On Computer-Assisted Language Learning (April 89), University of Guelph - York University, Guelph-North York (Ont.). [To appear.]

EWING, David P. and Bill LANGENES. 1986. Using Q&A. Indianapolis IN: Que Corporation.

GRAM, Anna. 1986. Raisonner pour programmer. Paris: Dunod-informatique.

GRANGER, Gilles-Gaston. 1968. Essai d'une philosophie du style. Paris: Armand Colin.

MANDELBROT, B. 1957. 'Linguistique statistique macroscopique', L. Apostel, B. Mandelbrot et A. Morf (eds), Logique, langage et théorie de l'information 1-78. Paris: Puf.

RASTIER, François. 1987. Sémantique interprétative. Paris: Puf.

TRAUGOTT, Elizabeth Closs. 1989. 'On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: An example of subjectification in semantic change'. Language 65:1.31-55.

WINOGRAD, Terry. 1972. Understanding Natural Language. New York, NJ: Academic Press.

WHAT IS A PRESENT?

John Hewson
Memorial University of Newfoundland

ABSTRACT

When one defines the present in concrete cognitive terms, it is possible to explain differential usage between two different cognitive tense systems, such as those of English and French. There are certain differences of usage that are absolutely consistent between the two languages, showing quite clearly that what is in question is a difference in the underlying system, in this case the different cognitive representation of the present. A survey of all the different usage shows quite clearly that it all can be explained as the result of a single fundamental systemic contrast.

Introduction

What is the present? What is the universal human - even animal-experience that we call the present? In cognitive terms, we are entitled to say that the present is the activity of recording the stream of consciousness. The present is the moment of recording experience in the memory, when the memory acts in recording mode. It is that time when the areas of the cortex that are allocated to recording the short term memory are busy at work.

Concrete cognitive activity

To understand what is entailed in such cognitive activity, we may make comparisons with the tape in a cassette recorder passing over the recording head, or the film in a movie camera passing through the chamber where it will be exposed to light. And just as there is a fundamental physical difference between film that has been exposed and film that has not, there is also a difference between brain cells that already carry the traces of memory and those that do not. This physical difference in the brain cells allows us to make a simple binary distinction at the cognitive level between memorial and non-memorial time, between a past and a non-past. In so doing we relate a cognitive activity to a bodily function, in the style of Johnson (1987), thereby dealing with cognition in concrete rather than abstract terms. Abstract definitions in the style of Reichenbach (1947), Comrie (1976, 1985) or Dahl (1985) unfortunately leave ambiguities and unanswered questions, being predicated of time or the situation represented rather than of the cognitive experience or the cognitive representation. In language it is not what is represented but how we represent it that is linguistically distinctive, and therefore important to the linguist.

Inevitably such a distinction calls into play the necessity of a threshold, where a given brain cell, which previously has carried no memory trace, is used for recording a moment of experience. Thereafter such a brain cell carries a memory trace, just as each frame of the unexposed film, as it passes through the camera, is exposed to the light and thereafter joins the sequence of frames of exposed film that will then need to be developed. This threshold lies between those cells that carry a memory trace and those that do not; it is this threshold that is the universal experience we call the present.

The nature of a threshold

If we zero in on this moment of the threshold on the moving film, we may distinguish two separate frames, the one that has just been exposed, the last one in the sequence of exposed frames, and the one that is in the chamber, with the shutter open, the first one in the sequence of not yet exposed frames. The last of the exposed frames we shall call Moment Omega, since it is the most recent moment of the past, the last moment of the past. The frame in the chamber we shall call Moment Alpha, since it is the first moment of the future. I have extrapolated these terms from the work of Gustave Guillaume (see, for example 1929:51, or 1964:60-1), merely giving Guillaume's original of _chronotype_ a concrete cognitive sense.

In this way the present is a threshold between past and future, formed, in the manner appropriate to every threshold, by a quantum of the past and a quantum of the future. Any threshold that separates one space from another is necessarily composed of a quantum from each of the two spaces; a threshold that did not itself have dimension would of course be inexistent. This is seen most clearly in practical terms when a sheet of plywood is sawn in two: the cut of the saw has a certain dimension, so that the two resultant pieces of plywood are no longer as big as the original single sheet, as any carpenter knows.

Cognitive contrasts

All languages, as we know, analyse experience differently. French distinguishes _savoir_ and _connaître_, where English has only _to know_. English, on the other hand distinguishes _say_ and _tell_, where French has only _dire_, or _make_ and _do_, where French has only _faire_. It is not surprising, therefore, that different languages should choose to represent the cognitive experience of the present in different systemic ways.

Tense contrasts

English, for example, has traditionally been analysed by the grammarians as having only two tenses, and represents the future periphrastically, by means of aspect, not by tense. The two tenses of English have traditionally been called the past and the non-past, and it can be seen that the English tense system is constructed by making a simple binary contrast between memorial and non-memorial time, so that I talk in the English tense system represents not so much the moment of the present, of the here and now, but an event that has a permanence, that occupies future time as well:

```
-----------------------> ----------------------->
                       ω α
```

Presumably it was to circumvent this representation of permanence that the so-called progressive I am talking was developed and came into full flower in the middle of the eighteenth century.

French, by contrast, has both past and future tenses, and may be analysed as having five tenses in contrast to the two of English. Having both past and future tenses, the present in such a system necessarily represents the no-man's-land between past and future, and one would expect that the representation of the present in such a system would incorporate at least the alpha and omega moments, thus effectively representing the present of cognitive experience in the system of tenses.

```
<-------------------I ω α I------------------->
```

Because of this fundamentally different structure of the tense system, French represents the cognitive experience of the present, the alpha and omega moments, as a separate entity within the tense system, whereas English simply uses these two moments of experience as a threshold to make the break between past and non-past. In the English representation of tense, the present is seen as a watershed: one switches between past and non-past. In the French representation, on the other hand, the present is seen as a summit from which the rest of the landscape can be viewed.

Contrastive usage: past versus present

As a consequence of these diametrically different representations of the same cognitive experience, there are fundamentally different usages of tense in French and English that the translator, for example, has to be aware of. If for example we wish to represent an event as belonging to the most recent past, which includes the Omega Moment, we find the past tense used in English, but the present tense used in French. The child arriving in the convenience store, for example, on being asked what he wants, may reply

(1) I came to buy some milk

Or a colleague may enter an office and say

(2) I came to get your signature

In both cases the event is so recent that it reaches into the cognitive present, and includes the Omega Moment, which is of course represented in the English system as the last moment of the past tense. In the French system, however, where the Omega Moment is represented as a segment of the present tense, the natural tense in both these cases is a present:

(3) Je viens acheter du lait

(4) Je viens chercher ta signature

The same phenomenon occurs with such sentences as

(5) He just left

(6) I just told you that

which pose a problem of representation in French that is solved by the use of the idiom *venir de*, which allows the speaker to use the present to represent this omega moment where the Anglophone speaker uses the past:

(7) Il vient de partir

(8) Mais je viens de te le dire

Contrastive usage: present perfect versus present

Much better known to the teachers of both languages are the differences of representation that occur with such words as *since* and *depuis*. Where an event continues over a period of time into the present, the present perfect must be used in English, whereas French may use the simple present tense, as in the following.

(9) J'habite ici depuis dix ans
    I have lived here for ten years

If one were to say in English

(10) I live here for ten years

the meaning would be that I have just arrived on a ten year stay, after which I am scheduled to go elsewhere, as in

(11) I live here for ten years, and then I live in France for ten years

In other words the use of the non-past tense in English necessarily carries with it the representation of the Alpha Moment and the time which follows it, that is from the present into the future, not into the past.

The use of the present perfect, on the other hand, indicates the present possession, in the Alpha Moment, of a past event which includes the Omega Moment:

```
<------------------- I ------------------->
     lived          ω   α      have
```

Both of these moments, however, are already represented in the French present, which we may represent as follows:

```
                    habite
<- - - - - - - - - -I<-- -->I
                    ω   α
```

Where the extended dotted line indicates that the event has been extended by the adverbial phrase *depuis dix ans*. This extended dotted line is not an inherent part of the verbal representation, but an addition which is brought to the representation by the adverbial phrase.

Contrastive usage: the first time

We may note that English also uses the present perfect with the phrase _It is the first time that_ whereas French here uses the simple present tense.

(13) C'est la première fois que je mange du caviar

(14) This is the first time I have eaten caviar

The English usage may in fact be considered strange: why would I use a present perfect here when I have never before eaten caviar? The answer here lies once more in the problem of the threshold, this time the threshold between the actual eating and the claiming of a first. One must start to eat _before_ it can be a first time. One cannot claim a first time before one is actually involved with the activity. Once the involvement has started, then the claim can be established.

It is this priority that is shared between the Omega and Alpha Moments. The eating occupies the Omega Moment, and the establishement of the dependent claim of a first time then appropriately belongs to the Alpha moment. Hence the use of the present perfect in English, where this contrast is available, and the use of the simple present in French, which contains both moments in its representation.

Here it is important to realise that language usage is not conscious but subconscious, not logical but psychological. These subtle distinctions of the priorities of a threshold show up in more than one way. Verbs in French, for example, typically show either _à_, _de_, or zero before a dependent infinitive. But there are three verbs and only three, that show variation: an alternation between _à_ and _de_.

(16) Il a commencé à/de manger (recommencé, continué)

What do _begin_, _begin again_, and _continue_ have in common? The answer is the problem of the threshold. Does one begin to eat by sitting down at the table (= à), or does one begin to eat when one has taken the first bite (= de)? Note that _se mettre à_ allows of no variation: only the preposition _à_ is allowed. The verbs _recommencer_ and _continuer_ pose the same problem as _commencer_ and for the very same reason: at what cognitive moment does the notion of continuing operate. Does one continue to eat before taking the next bite (intentional), or after taking it (resultative)? English faces the same problem by allowing variation between infinitive and gerund.

(17) He began to eat = Il a commencé à manger

(18) He began eating = Il a commencé de manger

The infinitive with _to_ represents an event prospectively: the gerund represents an event that is already under way: (17) indicates that the act of beginning precedes the first bite; (18) indicates that the act of beginning depends on the first bite.

Contrastive usage: passé composé versus preterit

The fourth and final major difference between English and French that concerns the present is the use of the _passé composé_ in French where English may not use the present perfect, but only the preterit. This occurs typically where the sentence contains an adverb of past time.

(19) J'ai vu ce film hier

(20) I saw that film yesterday

*I have seen that film yesterday

This usage presents a significant problem for francophones, who are used to translating the passé composé with the English present perfect.

(21) J'ai vu ce film

(22) I have seen that film

If the translation is perfectly appropriate when there is no adverb of past time, why does it become impossible, as in (20) when an adverb of past time is introduced?

The problem here is that the representation of the English present perfect is based on the Alpha Moment that is an inherent part of the auxiliary. The Alpha Moment, in short, is an inherent part of the representation of the English present perfect. There is no way that a representation that cannot escape the Alpha Moment can possibly represent an event that, by definition, belongs wholly and completely to the past. Hence the element of "present reference" as the grammarians call it, that is a necessary and fundamental part of the representation of the English present perfect.

The French present tense, on the other hand, since as a single cognitive unit, it may represent either the Alpha Moment

(23) J'arrive!

or the Omega Moment as in

(24) Enfin tu arrives

may be used with either past or future reference, depending on which feature is chosen. In (23), where the Alpha Moment is involved, the correct English is I'll be there right away. In (24), where the Omega Moment is involved, the correct translation is You finally arrived.

Conclusion

The conflicting usage of present tense between French and English might lead one to the conclusion that all is inconsistency and conflict: present tense translated here by a future, there by a past. When one makes a careful examination of the usage, however, regular and consistent patterns emerge, and the systematic differences indicate clearly that they are based upon simple distinctions that belong to an underlying cognitive system.

REFERENCES

Comrie, Bernard. 1976. Aspect. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 1985. Tense. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dahl, Osten. 1985. Tense and Aspect Systems. Oxford: Blackwell.

Guillaume, Gustave. 1929. Temps et verbe, théorie des aspects, des modes et des temps. Paris: Champion (new edn. 1965).

Guillaume, Gustave. 1964. Langage et science du langage. Paris: Nizet; Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval (2nd. edn. 1969).

Johnson, Mark. 1987. The Body in the Mind. Chicago: University Press.

Reichenbach, Hans. 1947. Elements of Symbolic Logic. New York: Free Press; London: Collier-Macmillan (new edn. 1966).

Mouvement-WH, Quantification et Redoublement Clitique

Juvénal Ndayiragije
Université du Québéc à Montréal

RESUME

Dans cet article, nous examinons le comportement des structures à redoublement clitique par rapport à l'extraction syntaxique et la quantification. Dans la plupart des langues où le phénomène de redoublement clitique est attesté, on admet généralement que le NP redoublé par un clitique résiste autant à l'extraction-Wh qu'à la quantification. Cependant, des cas ont été relevés dans la littérature où cette généralisation est remise en cause. Nous voulons démontrer ici que ces prétendus contre-exemples ont été mal interprétés, et donc que la distribution complémentaire entre Redoublement clitique, Mouvement-Wh et Quantification est une propriété inhérente à toute configuration à NP redoublé par un clitique, théoriquement justifiée par le statut d'opérateur <u>défini</u> du clitique de redoublement.

0. <u>Introduction</u>

Les constructions à redoublement clitique présentent deux caractéristiques essentielles. Elles résistent à l'extraction syntaxique et à la quantification du NP redoublé. Les deux propriétés (1) sont illustrées en (2).

(1) a*. WH + Cl
    b*. Quant. + Cl

(2) a. Pierre$_i$ il$_i$ est venu
    b*. Qui t$_i$ il$_i$ est venu?
    c*. quelques amis$_i$ ils$_i$ sont venus

On relève cependant dans la littérature sur le redoublement clitique, quelques langues/dialectes où les propriétés (1) ne sont pas toujours attestées. Ces langues se répartissent en trois catégories: celles qui se conforment seulement à (1a), celles qui ne retiennent que (1b) et enfin celles qui n'obéissent à aucune des deux restrictions.

A partir de cette disparité, certaines analyses (cf. section1) ont conclu que la distribution complémentaire entre le redoublement clitique et les extractions (en syntaxe/en Forme Logique) n'est pas une propriété inhérente à toutes les configurations à redoublement clitique.

Le but de cet article est de démontrer que les deux restrictions en (1) s'appliquent à toutes les constructions à NP redoublé par un clitique. Nous montrerons en effet que les prétendus contre-exemples à (1) ont été mal interprétés, par confusion entre clitiques et marques d'accord d'une part, entre quantifieurs définis et quantifieurs indéfinis d'autre part. Les données du kirundi[1] présentées dans la section 2 permettent de lever cette confusion et de confirmer, en les précisant, les généralisations en (1).

Théoriquement, nous expliquerons ces restrictions par le statut d'opérateur [+déf] du clitique de redoublement.

1. Quelques faits de redoublement clitique

Dans cette section, nous exposons quelques illustrations de constructions à redoublement clitique relevées dans la littérature, en mettant l'accent sur les cas apparus comme des contre-exemples à (1).

1.1. Espagnol de Rio de Plata (Jaeggli1982)

(3) a. Lo_i vimos a $Juan_i$
Cl voir-1pl à Jean
'Nous avons vu Jean '

b*. A $quién_i$ lo_i vimos t_i ?
à qui Cl voir-1pl
'qui avons-nous vu?'

c. A $quién_i$ vimos t_i?
à qui voir-1p
'Qui avons-nous vu?'

En (a), le NP objet est redoublé par le clitique coïndicé. La présence du clitique objet dans la structure (b) résultant de l'extraction-WH du NP redoublé engendre l'agrammaticalité (comparer (b*) et (c)). Il en est de même de la quantification de l'objet redoublé en (4).

(4) a. Lo_i vimos a $Juan_i$
Cl voir-1p à Jean
'Nous avons vu Jean'

b*. Lo$_i$ vimos a un chico$_i$
Cl voir-1p à un garçon
' Nous avons vu un garçon'

c*. Las$_i$ vimos a todas las chicas$_i$
Cl voir-1p à tous les filles
'Nous avons vu toutes les filles'

d.*. Las$_i$ encontré a algunos mujeres$_i$
Cl rencontrer-1s à quelques femmes
'J'ai rencontré toutes les femmes'

Les structures (b*-d*) dans lesquelles le NP objet redoublé est quantifié sont toutes agrammaticales. Ces faits et ceux en (3) montrent que l'Espagnol de Rio de Plata obéit aux deux restrictions imposées aux configurations à redoublement clitique. Les mêmes effets sont attestés en Français populaire.

1.2. Français populaire (Roberge 1986)

(5) a. Pierre$_i$ (il$_i$) aime la tarte
b*. Qui$_i$ t$_i$ (il$_i$) aime la tarte?
c. Qui$_i$ t$_i$ aime la tarte?

(6) a. Mes amis$_i$ ils$_i$ viennent à soir
b*. Beaucoup d'amis$_i$ ils$_i$ viennent à soir
c*. Une fille$_i$ elle$_i$ est venue[2]

Dans ce dialecte, le redoublement clitique touche optionnellement le NP sujet, comme en (5a). Ce dernier ne peut cependant pas subir l'extraction syntaxique quand le clitique est réalisé, en témoigne l'agrammaticalité de (5b*).

Les structures (6b* et c*) illustrent quant à elles l'impossibilité de quantifier le sujet redoublé. Le français populaire se comporte donc comme l'espagnol de Rio de Plata eu égard aux deux contraintes sur le redoublement clitique présentées en (1). Observons à présent les données d'un autre dialecte français.

1.3. Français Pied Noir (Roberge 1986)

(7) a. Pierre$_i$ (il$_i$) est venu
b*. Qui$_i$ t$_i$ il$_i$ est venu?
c. Qui$_i$ t$_i$ est venu?

(8) a. Marie l$_i$'aime à Jean$_i$
b. Je lui$_i$ ai donné la pomme au professeur$_i$
c*. A qui$_i$ que tu l$_i$'as vu t$_i$?
d*. A qui$_i$ que tu le$_i$ frappes t$_i$?

(9) a. Le soleil$_i$ (il$_i$) brille pour tout le monde
b. Un homme$_i$ il$_i$ est venu
c. Plusieurs hommes$_i$ ils$_i$ sont venus
d. Personne$_i$ il$_i$ sait qui c'est leur mère
e. Leurs complices les$_i$ ont accusés à tous les voleurs$_i$

Comme dans le cas du français populaire (FP), le redoublement clitique du NP sujet est optionnel en français Pied Noir (FPN) et l'extraction syntaxique du sujet redoublé est incompatible avec la réalisation du clitique, en témoigne l'agrammaticalité de (7b). Tel est également le cas pour l'objet redoublé en (8c* - d*). Les deux dialectes se conforment donc à la restriction (1a) qui exclut l'extraction par Mouvement-WH des NPs redoublés par un clitique.

La différence majeure entre le FP et le FPN est que dans ce dernier cas, le NP redoublé peut subir la quantification, comme en(9).

Le FPN échappe donc à la contrainte (1b) imposée aux configurations à redoublement clitique.

La restriction (1b) est également violée dans deux variétés dialectales de l'italien: le Trentino et le Fiorentino.

1.4. Trentino (Jaeggli 1984):

(10) a. Qualche putel$_i$ l$_i$' é vegnu ?
quelques garçons Cl être-3p venir
'Quelques garçons sont venus'

b. Una putela$_i$ l$_i$ ' ei vegnuda.
une fille Cl être-3s venir-f
'Une fille est venue'

Le paradigme en (10) montre que le trentino autorise la co-occurence du NP quantifié/indéfini et du clitique coïndexé, comme c'est le cas en FPN. Les exemples en (11) illustrent quant à eux l'impossibilité d'appliquer Mouvement-Wh au NP sujet redoublé.

(11) a. Quante putele$_i$ t$_i$ è na via ?
Combien filles être-3p aller à
'Combien de filles sont parties?'

b*. Quante putele$_i$ le$_i$ è nade via ?
c. Quante putele$_i$ t$_i$ è nade via ?

L'agrammaticalité de (b) est attribuée à la présence du clitique sujet lorsque le NP coréférentiel est extrait en syntaxe.

1.5. Fiorentino (Jaeggli 1984).

(12) a. una raggaza$_i$ l$_i$' é venuta
une fille Cl être-3s venir
'Une fille est venue'

b*. Chi_i t_i l_i ' é venuta ?
c*. Chi t_i é venuta ?
d. Chi_i gl_i' é venuta ?

En (a), la quantification du NP sujet est compatible avec la présence du clitique sujet, comme c'est le cas en trentino (10a-b).
En (b), l'extraction-Wh du NP sujet redoublé est bloquée par la réalisation du clitique de redoublement. Cependant, ce dernier est absent en (c) mais la structure résultante est agrammaticale, contrairement à (11c) du trentino. La seule structure acceptable est (d) où l'extraction du sujet redoublé engendre la réalisation du clitique impersonnel gl_. Notons en passant que ce dernier est par ailleurs obligatoirement présent quels que soient les traits grammaticaux du NP sujet extrait. A partir des données en (12), on doit admettre que le fiorentino autorise l'extraction syntaxique du sujet redoublé (comme en (d)), à moins d'assumer que ce dialecte ne permet tout simplement pas l'application de Mouvement-Wh aux NPs sujets, ce qui serait un cas unique en son genre. Ces données montrent donc que la question n'est plus de savoir si l'extraction syntaxique d'un NP redoublé est permise ou non, mais d'expliquer pourquoi cette opération requiert la réalisation (ou l'absence) de tel clitique plutôt que de tel autre. Ceci sera discuté dans la section 2. Ces faits d'extraction-Wh du sujet redoublé en fiorentino se retrouvent également en berbère.

1.6. Berbère (Guerssel 1988)

(13) a. Y_i-rwel $wryaz_i$
3ms-s'enfuir homme
'L'homme s'est enfui'

b*. Y_i-rwel kull $aryaz_i$
3ms-s'enfuir chaque homme

c*. W_i ay y_i-rwel ?
d. W ay y-rwel-n ?
qui que Cl(imp) s'enfuir
'Qui s'est enfui?'

En (a), le NP sujet est redoublé par le clitique coïndexé. La présence de ce dernier est obligatoire indépendamment de la réalisation ou non du sujet lexical, comme dans les dialectes italiens ci- haut.

En (b), la quantification du NP sujet est incompatible avec la présence du clitique. La restriction (1b) est donc respectée.

En (c), la présence (ou l'absence) du clitique sujet lorsque le NP coréférent est questionné engendre une structure agrammaticale.

La seule structure permise est celle en (d) où l'extraction du sujet redoublé réalise le clitique "neutre" Y-n (Guerssel 1988), non marqué pour les traits grammaticaux du sujet. Ceci est mieux perceptible dans les structures relatives en (14) où ce clitique apparaît quels que soient les traits grammaticaux du NP sujet extrait.

(14) a. aryaz din y-rwel-n
homme qui Cl-s'est enfui
'L'homme qui s'est enfui'
b. iryazn din y-rwel-n
hommes qui Cl - se sont enfuis
'Les hommes qui se sont enfuis'

c. tamttutt din y-rwel-n
femme qui Cl-s'enfuir
'La femme qui s'est enfuie'

Les paradigmes (13-14) montrent que l'extraction syntaxique du sujet redoublé en berbère produit le même effet qu'en fiorentino:
la réalisation du clitique impersonnel, non marqué pour les traits grammaticaux de genre, de personne et de nombre. Les deux langues diffèrent uniquement en ce qui concerne la quantification du NP redoublé. Celle-ci est permise en fiorentino (12a), alors qu'elle ne l'est pas en berbère (13b*).

La dernière catégorie des contre-exemples aux généralisations en (1) comprend les langues qui, selon la littérature, autorisent l'extraction syntaxique (sans recourir au clitique impersonnel comme en fiorentino ou berbère) et la quantification du NP redoublé. Dans cette catégorie rentrent notamment les dialectes espagnols parlés en Argentine et en Uruguay.

1.7. Espagnol argentin/uruguayen (Hurtado 1984b)

(15) a. A quién$_i$ lo$_i$ acuso su complice t$_i$?
A qui Cl a accusé son complice
'Qui son complice a-t-il accusé?'

b. Sus complices los$_i$ acusaron a todos los estudiantes$_i$.
leurs Cl à tous les étudiants
'Leurs complices ont accusé tous les étudiants'

En (a), la co-occurence du mot-Wh et du clitique coïndexé est permise. Autant l'est la quantification du NP objet redoublé en (b).
A partir de ces constatations, la conclusion serait que dans ce dialecte espagnol, l'extraction syntaxique et la quantification sont autorisées dans un environnement à redoublement clitique.

1.8. Récapitulation

Les faits décrits dans cette section sont résumés dans le tableau (16). Les signes "+" et "-" signifient respectivement que l'extraction-WH/-FL est permise ou non, tandis que "ø" indique qu'il n'y a tout simplement pas de redoublement.

(16)

	NPs redoublés Sujet	NPs redoublés Objet	Extraction-WH	Extraction-FL
Espagnol de RP	ø	+	-	-
Français populaire	+	ø	-	-
Français PN	+	+	-	+
Trentino	+	ø	-	+
Fiorentino	+	ø	+	+
Berbère	+	ø	+	-
Espagnol Arg/Ur.	ø	+	+	+

Les disparités observées dans le tableau (16) incitent à conclure, à priori, que la distribution complémentaire entre le redoublement clitique et les extractions-WH/-FL ne constitue pas une propriété inhérente à toute configuration à NP redoublé par un clitique.

Dans la section qui suit, nous démontrons, sur base des données du kirundi, que cette exclusion mutuelle entre le redoublement clitique et les extractions s'applique à toute structure à NP redoublé.

En prélude à cette démonstration, nous rappelons brièvement l'essentiel des analyses récentes sur ce phénomène.

2. Discussion

Roberge (1986) et Guerssel (1988) recourent tous à la notion de "c-chaîne" pour expliquer la dichotomie entre le redoublement clitique et les extractions. Cette notion est définie en (17) par Roberge.

(17) A et B forment une c-chaîne si:
(i) A et B sont coïndexés;
(ii) A gouverne B;
(iii) B est localement libre. (p. 225: notre traduction)

A cette définition, Roberge ajoute la condition de bonne-formation en (18) régissant l'occurence des clitiques.

(18) Tout clitique doit faire partie d'une c-chaîne. (p. 226: traduction)

A partir de (17-18), il explique les faits de redoublement en (16) de la façon suivante.

- Dans les langues où les NPs redoublés résistent autant au Mouvement-WH qu' à l'extraction en FL (cf. espagnol de RP et français populaire), la condition (18) s'applique en FL. Elle bloque l'occurence du clitique de redoublement qui, autrement violerait (17iii).
- Dans les langues permettant seulement l'extraction en FL des NPs redoublés quantifiés (cf.le français Pied Noir et les deux dialectes italiens[3]), (18) s'applique uniquement à S-Structure, et la variable laissée par l'extraction en FL n'est pas sujette à (17iii).

Roberge postule enfin une variation paramétrique liée au niveau d'application (en grammaire) de la condition (18).

Il assume que celle-ci s'applique à FL dans les cas non marqués (les langues où les restrictions en (1) sont respectées) et à S-Structure dans les autres cas.

Cette analyse laisse en suspens deux problèmes non résolus: d'une part les langues autorisant les extractions aussi bien en syntaxe qu'en FL, comme l'espagnol argentin/uruguayen et le fiorentino, d'autre part les langues permettant uniquement l'extraction-WH, comme le berbère.

C'est précisement ce dernier cas qui a amené Guerssel (1988) à proposer une autre définition de la "c-chaîne" (19) pour expliquer la dichotomie entre le redoublement clitique et les extractions.

(19) Un clitique s'accorde en genre, en nombre et en personne avec le NP auquel il est coïndexé. Le clitique et le NP forment ainsi une c-chaine.

Essentiellement, Guerssel assume que l'extraction syntaxique est toujours possible dans les NPs redoublés, pour autant que (19) soit respecté. Il explique comme suit les faits d'extraction-WH en (16).
- Dans les langues comme le berbère et le fiorentino où l'extraction syntaxique du NP sujet redoublé entraîne l'apparition du clitique "neutre" (non marqué pour les traits grammaticaux de genre, de personne et de nombre), (19) est respecté puisque la trace laissée par le NP sujet extrait est également non marquée pour ces traits.
- Dans les langues ne recourant pas au clitique "neutre" (l'espagnol de Rio de Plata, le français populaire, le français Pied Noir et le trentino), l'extraction syntaxique du NP redoublé est également possible. Selon Guerssel, la position du clitique dans ces cas est phonologiquement

nulle. En d'autres termes, il assume que l'out-put de l'extraction syntaxique d'un NP redoublé est superficiellement identique à la structure résultant de l'extraction d'un NP non redoublé, bien que les deux structures soient dérivées de deux configurations différentes. Nous faisons remarquer que les données de l'espagnol argentin vont à l'encontre de cette affirmation et restent inexpliquées dans ce modèle comme dans celui de Roberge.

- Enfin, quant aux extractions-FL des NPs redoublés, Guerssel estime que l'extraction syntaxique et l'extraction en FL d'un NP redoublé constituent deux questions non reliées qui, par conséquent, ne requièrent pas forcément une interprétation unifiée. Dans le premier cas, il s'agit de l'accord de traits entre les membres d'une "c-chaîne". Dans le second, il est plutôt question de portée de la quantification qui, d'après lui, pourrait probablement trouver une explication dans la théorie développée par Roberge (1986).

Dans la discussion qui suit, nous justifions d'abord pourquoi les faits de l'espagnol argentin/uruguayen échappent aux deux analyses présentées ci-haut. Nous montrons ensuite que l'analyse en termes de 'C-chaîne' est descriptivement inadéquate dans la mesure où elle ne peut expliquer pourquoi dans les structures relatives ou clivées, le clitique de redoublement est obligatoirement absent. Nous proposons enfin une interprétation des restrictions (1) basée sur le statut d'opérateur défini du clitique de redoublement.

2.1. <u>Mouvement-WH et Redoublement clitique</u>

La distribution complémentaire entre le redoublement clitique et l'extraction par Mouvement-Wh telle que formulée en (1a) est remise en cause par les données du berbère et du fiorentino où l'extraction syntaxique du NP sujet redoublé fait apparaître un clitique "neutre", non marqué pour les traits grammaticaux de genre, de personne et de nombre [g-traits]. Pour qu'elle soit généralisable, la restriction (1a) doit être reformulée comme en (20) où il est spécifié que seulement les clitiques marqués pour [g-traits] sont exclus dans l'out-put de l'extraction syntaxique des NPs redoublés.

(20) *WH + CL
[g-traits]

Cependant, l'espagnol argentin échappe à (20) et pose un problème à l'analyse basée sur la notion de "c-chaîne". Dans ce dialecte en effet, le clitique apparaissant lors de l'extraction du NP objet redoublé est marqué pour [g-traits]. Comment expliquer ces faits? Nous assumons que le morphème réalisant sur le verbe les traits grammaticaux du NP objet n'est pas un clitique mais plutôt un marqueur d'accord (AGR). Une telle supposition est motivée par les faits similaires observés en kirundi et illustrés en (21-23).

(21) a. abáana$_i$ ba$_i$-zoo-ja ku ishuúle
enfants 3p-fut-aller à école
'Les enfants iront à l'école'
b*. abáana - zoo - ja ku ishuúle
enfants -fut - aller à école

c. ni ba-ndé$_i$ t$_i$ ba$_i$-zóo-já ku ishuúle?
est 3p-qui 3p-fut-aller à école
'Qui iront à l'école?'

d*. ni ba-ndé - zóo-já ku ishuúle
est 3p-qui -fut-aller à école

En (a), le morphème ba préfixé au verbe reprend les traits grammaticaux du NP sujet abáana. Sa présence est obligatoire indépendamment de la réalisation du sujet lexical. Ceci explique l'agrammaticalité de (b). Si la co-occurence du morphème ba et du NP sujet abáana en (1a) était un cas de redoublement clitique, on s'attendrait à ce que l'extraction-WH du NP sujet bloque la réalisation de ce morphème. Autrement dit, (d*) serait grammaticale et (c) ne le serait pas. Or, c'est justement le contraire que l'on remarque. Examinons à présent les structures en (22) illustrant la quantification du NP sujet.

(22) a. [umunyéeshuúle wéese]$_i$ a$_i$-zoo-soma igitabo
étudiant chaque 3s-fut-lire livre
'Chaque étudiant lira un livre'

b. [abanyéeshuúle beénshi]$_i$ ba$_i$ - a - a - je
étudiants plusieurs 3p-passé-foc-venir
'Plusieurs étudiants sont venus'

En (22), la quantification du NP sujet n'exclut pas la présence du morphème réalisant les traits grammaticaux du sujet sur le verbe. Les paradigmes (21-22) montrent ainsi que l'extraction du NP sujet en kirundi produit les mêmes effets que dans le cas du NP objet "redoublé" en espagnol argentin. Il en est autrement pour les NPs objets redoublés en kirundi. Soient les exemples en (23).

(23) a. Mariyá a - á - ra - guze ibitabo
Marie 3s-passé-foc-acheter:perf livres
'Marie a acheté des livres.'

b. Mariyá a - á -ra - bi_i - guze vyáa $bitabo_i$
Cl ces livres
'Marie a acheté les livres-là'

c. ni $ibíihé_i$ Mariyá a - á - guze t_i ?
c'est lesquels Marie 3s-passé-acheter:perf
'Lesquels Marie a-t-elle achetés?'

d*. ni $ibíihé_i$ Mariyá a -á - bi_i - guze t_i ?
c'est lesquels Marie 3s-passé-Cl-acheter:perf

e*. Mariyá a - á - ra - bi - guze vyáa bitabo vyiínshi
Marie 3s-passé-foc-Cl-acheter:perf Dém livres plusieurs

En (b), le morphème bi préfixé à la racine verbale reprend les traits grammaticaux du NP objet ibitabo .Celui-ci reçoit une interprétation définie, rendue par la présence du démonstratif vyáa .
En (d*), l'extraction par Mouvement-WH du NP objet redoublé exclut la réalisation du marqueur de l'objet. La présence de ce dernier engendre l'agrammaticalité.
Enfin, (e*) montre que le marqueur de l'objet est incompatible avec la quantification du NP coïndicé.

Les faits observés en (21-23) montrent qu'en kirundi, la réalisation morphologique, sur le verbe, des traits grammaticaux de ses arguments produit deux effets distincts par rapport aux extractions, selon que c'est le sujet ou l'objet qui est concerné. L'extraction en syntaxe et en FL du NP sujet requiert la présence du morphème reprenant ses traits grammaticaux; tandis que celle du NP objet exclut la réalisation du marqueur de l'objet.

Si dans cette langue, les morphèmes reprenant les traits grammaticaux du sujet et de l'objet étaient tous des clitiques, on s'attendrait à ce que l'extraction syntaxique des NPs coïndicés respecte la condition (19). Or, seule l'extraction du NP objet s'y conforme.

Ce comportement différent du sujet et de l'objet par rapport aux extractions implique que les marqueurs du sujet et de l'objet en kirundi constituent deux éléments morphologiques syntaxiquement distincts. Nous assumons que les premiers sont des marques d'accord (AGR) sujet-verbe, alors que les seconds sont effectivement des clitiques pronominaux dont la co-occurence avec les NPs objets coréférents est un cas de redoublement clitique.

L'implication résultant de ce contraste entre sujet/objet redoublé en kirundi est que la définition de "c-chaîne" en (19) s'applique uniquement aux NPs redoublés par un clitique et non aux cas d'accord entre le verbe et ses arguments.

En outre, la similarité des faits d'extraction du sujet en kirundi et de l'objet en espagnol argentin incite à conclure qu'il s'agit, dans ce dernier cas, d'une relation d'accord verbe-objet et non d'une structure à redoublement clitique. Ceci expliquerait pourquoi les données de l'espagnol argentin en (15) échappent à la définition de 'c-chaîne' (19).

Si cette interprétation des faits de l'espagnol argentin est correcte, nous conclurons que la restriction (1a=20) s'applique à toutes les configurations à redoublement clitique.

La question qui se pose maintenant est d'expliquer pourquoi les faits sont comme en (20) et pas autrement. Ce qu'il faut d'abord noter, c'est que l'explication de (20) en termes de 'C-Chaîne' telle que proposée par Roberge (1986) et Guerssel (1988) est inadéquate. Rappelons que leur analyse repose sur l'accord de traits exigé entre les membres de la chaîne clitique [Cl_i, NP_i]. Ainsi, les faits du berbère et du fiorentino où l'extraction-Wh du NP sujet redoublé entraîne la réalisation du clitique 'neutre' non marqué pour [g-traits], comme la trace laissée par le NP sujet extrait, obéissent à cet accord de traits dans la 'c-chaîne'. Le problème qui surgit cependant concerne la définition même d'une chaîne clitique. Le NP sujet/objet redoublé fait-il partie de la 'c-chaîne'? Si non, pourquoi pas ? Si oui, l'analyse en termes d'accord de traits dans une 'c-chaîne' fait de mauvaises prédictions. Ainsi, elle ne peut rendre compte du fait que dans les structures relatives/clivées, le clitique de redoublement soit paradoxalement absent (ou 'neutre' comme en berbère (14)).

On pourrait simplement expliquer la restriction (20) en se basant sur le statut d'opérateur défini du clitique de redoublement.
En prenant pour acquis que tout opérateur défini doit avoir une portée sur IP (May 1985), le clitique de redoublement en étant un, il doit monter en Forme Logique dans la position [SPEC, CP] pour avoir IP dans sa portée. Or, cette position étant déjà occupée par le NP redoublé, extrait par Mouvement-Wh. Etant donné que la position SPEC ne peut contenir qu'un seul élément lexical (Chomsky 1986), la montée en FL de l'opérateur clitique sera ainsi bloquée, ce qui simplement explique la restriction (20).

2.2. L'effet défini et la quantification

Dans cette section, nous démontrons que la restriction (1b) constitue également une propriété inhérente à tout environnement à redoublement clitique et qu'elle s'explique théoriquement par le statut d'opérateur [+déf] du clitique de redoublement.

Nous avons vu que le redoublement clitique requiert l'interprétation définie/spécifique du NP redoublé. Ceci justifie pourquoi ce dernier ne peut pas être quantifié. Cependant, trois langues ont été relevées dans le tableau (16) qui contreviennent à cette contrainte: le français Pied Noir et les deux dialectes italiens, dont les illustrations sont reprises en (24-26).

(24) Français Pied Noir

a. une fille$_i$ elle$_i$ est venue
b. quelques filles$_i$ elles$_i$ sont venues

(25) Trentino

a. Una putela$_i$ l$_i$'ei vegnuda
b. Qualche putele$_i$ l$_i$'e vegnuda

(26) Fiorentino

a. Una ragazza$_i$ l$_i$'é venuta

On s'attendait à ce que la quantification du NP sujet dans les exemples ci-haut bloque l'occurence du clitique sujet. Or, tel n'est pas le cas. Les structures résultantes sont toutes grammaticales. La restriction (1b) est donc violée. Observons à présent les données du kirundi en (27).

(27) a. Yohani a - a - a - bi_i - guze [vyáa bitabo <u>vyóóse</u>$]_i$
Jean 3s-passé-foc-Cl-acheter:perf Dém. livres tous
'Jean a acheté tous les livres-là'

b*. Yohani a - a - a - bi_i - guze [vyáa bitabo <u>bimwéebímwe</u>$]_i$
Cl les-uns-les-uns
'Jean a acheté certains livres'

c*. Yohani a - a - a - bi_i - gur -ye "vyáa ibitabo <u>vyiínshi</u>$]_i$
Cl plusieurs
'Jean a acheté plusieurs livres'

En (a), le NP objet redoublé prend le quantifieur <u>vyóóse</u>'tous'. La bonne-formation de cette structure viole ainsi la restriction (1b). Celle-ci est par contre respectée en (b*-c*) où l'objet redoublé est modifié par les quantifieurs <u>bimwéebímwe</u> "certains" et <u>vyiínshi</u> "plusieurs". Ces faits montrent qu'une distinction doit être établie entre deux types de quantifieurs: définis et indéfinis. Et comme le redoublement clitique requiert une interprétation définie/spécifique du NP redoublé, on s'attend à ce que seuls les quantifieurs indéfinis soient exclus dans un environnement de redoublement clitique. C'est effectivement ce que montre le contraste de grammaticalité entre (a) et (b*-c*) en (27). En (a), la quantification de l'objet redoublé utilise le quantifieur défini <u>vyóose</u>, contrairement à (b*-c*) où elle se fait avec les quantifeurs indéfinis <u>bimwéebímwe</u> et <u>vyiínshi</u> . Ces évidences nous amènent à reformuler la restriction (1b) comme en (28):

(28) * Quant. + CL
[-défini] [g-traits]

Cette restriction se justifie théoriquement par le trait [+déf] de l'opérateur clitique. L'application de QR en FL au NP redoublé quantifié bloque la montée de l'opérateur clitique [+déf] pour la même raison que dans l'extraction-Wh.

Les données du kirundi en (27) illustrant la distinction à faire entre quantifieurs définis / indéfinis impliquent deux conséquences. Premièrement, la règle QR ne touche que les NPs à quantifieurs indéfinis. Deuxièmement, ce n'est pas certain que les données du français populaire et des deux dialectes italiens soient vraiment des contre-exemples à la généralisation (1b=28). Nous pensons que les quantifieurs <u>une</u> , <u>quelques</u> , <u>una</u> et <u>qualche</u> en (24-26) impliquent une interprétation <u>spécifique</u> et non <u>indéfinie</u> du NP redoublé qu'ils modifient (cf. note 2 par ailleurs), comme le quantifieur <u>vyóóse</u> en (27a), auquel cas la présence du clitique de redoublement est légitime. Autrement, on expliquerait difficilement le contraste de grammaticalité entre (a) et (b*-c*) dans le paradigme (27) du kirundi.

3. <u>Conclusion</u>

Dans cet article, nous avons démontré que la distribution complémentaire entre le redoublement clitique et les extractions (en Syntaxe et en Forme Logique) constitue une propriété inhérente à toute configuration à NP redoublé par un clitique, et donc que les prétendus contre-exemples relevés dans la littérature ne sont qu'apparents.

En plus, nous avons proposé une interprétation unifiée des deux restrictions imposées aux structures à redoublement clitique, basée sur le statut d'opérateur [+déf] du clitique de redoublement.

Une précision a été faite pour justifier les faits de l'espagnol argentin, apparus comme des entorses à cette analyse (et à celles de Roberge (1986) et Guerssel (1988)). Sur base des données du kirundi, nous avons postulé qu'en espagnol uruguayen / argentin, le marqueur de l'objet n'est pas un clitique, mais plutôt une marque d'accord (AGR) objet-verbe, comme le marqueur du sujet (et non de l'objet) en kirundi. L'extraction syntaxique de l'objet en espagnol argentin et celle du sujet en kirundi sont permises puisque, dans aucun des deux cas, il n'est question de configuration à redoublement clitique.

Enfin, nous avons clarifié le type de quantification incompatible avec le redoublement clitique, en montrant que les quantifieurs définis sont autorisés dans les NPs redoublés par un clitique, contrairement aux quantifieurs indéfinis. Nous avons expliqué cette dernière restriction également par le trait [+défini] du clitique de redoublement.

NOTES

1) Le kirundi est une langue bantu parlée au Burundi. L'une des caractéristiques de cette famille linguistique est l'existence de marqueurs de classes nominales. Ceux-ci sont des morphèmes préfixés aux racines nominales et qui spécifient souvent la classe sémantique à laquelle appartient chaque nom. Ils interviennent également dans la distinction singulier/pluriel et dans la réalisation de l'accord

syntaxique. Ces propriétés sont illustrées dans les exemples du kirundi en (i-ii).

(i) umuntu / abantu 'homme(s)'
ikintu / ibintu 'objet(s)'
ahantu / ahantu 'lieu(s)'

(ii) a<u>ba</u>-ntu <u>ba</u>-inshi <u>ba</u>-zooza
gens plusieurs viendront
'Plusieurs personnes viendront'

2) Pour certains locuteurs, cette structure est grammaticale et le quantifieur <u>une</u> implique une interprétation plutôt spécifique qu'indéfinie du NP sujet.

3) Dans l'analyse de Roberge (1986), le trentino et le fiorentino rentrent dans la catégorie des langues qui violent la restriction (1b). Dans le tableau (16), nous avons marqué par "+" la possibilité d'extraction du sujet en fiorentino, étant donné la similarité des faits entre ce dialecte et le berbère, en supposant avec Guerssel que ce dernier autorise Mouvement-Wh du NP sujet redoublé.

4) Nous assumons que le NP redoublé est en position non-argumentale (voir Ndayiragije 1989 pour des évidences empiriques à l'appui). La trace laissée par l'extraction-Wh est cependant 'proprement gouvernée' si l'on adopte la définition du Gouvernement Propre de Chomsky (1986) en termes de gouvernement par antécédant.

REFERENCES

Aoun, J. (1981). The formal nature of anaphoric relations. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge.

Borer, H. (1984). Parametric Syntax: Case Studies in Semitic and Romance Languages. Foris: Dordrecht.

Chomsky, N. (1988). "Some notes on Economy of Derivation and Representation". ms. MIT.

Guerssel, M. (1988). "Subject Clitic Doubling in Berber: Implications for Syntactic Extraction". ms. UQAM.

Hurtado, A. (1984b). "On the Properties of LF", Cornell Working Papers in Linguistics 5.

------------ (1985). "Clitic Chains", dans A. Hurtado (éds.), Reidel: Dordrecht.

Jaeggli, O.A. (1984). "Subject Extraction and the Null Subject Parameter", Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the North Eastern Linguistic Society, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

----------- (1985). "Three Issues in the Theory of Clitics: Case, Doubled NPs, and Extraction", dans H. Borer (éds.).

May, R. (1985). Logical Form. Its Structure and Derivation. MIT Press: Cambridge.

Mchombo, S.A. (1984). "The Nonexistence of Verb-Object Agreement in Bantu", ms. University of Malawi and MIT.

Ndayiragije, J. (1989). "Extraction Syntaxique et Redoublement Clitique en Kirundi". Association canadienne de Linguistique. Québéc.

Pollock, J.Y (1988). "Verb Movement, UG and the structure of IP". ms.

LA FRANCOPHONIE EN SITUATION DE POLYGLOSSIE
ou
LES VARIATIONS LINGUISTIQUES DU FRANCAIS DU ZAIRE

KAPANGA, Kapele M.K.
University of New Brunswick

ABSTRACT.

Les variations linguistiques du français zaïrois, résultat d'une mauvaise planification de l'enseignement, témoignent de l'asphyxie des langues nationales, bloquées dans leur pouvoir de créativité et de renouvellment endogène. Le français en sort incompréhensible pour d'autres francophones à cause du mélange de lexiques et de structures. Remède: à moyen terme, rétablir les langues zaïroises dans leur droit en tant que langues et retarder l'introduction du français, comme langue seconde, dans le programme d'enseignement, au niveau avancé de scolarité; à long terme, en réserver l'enseignement aux spécialistes et l'usage aux relations extérieures.

Introduction

Il y a un peu plus de cinq ans, Paris, la capitale française, proclamait Kinshasa, capitale du Zaïre, deuxième plus grande ville francophone au monde. Kinshasa venait ainsi détrôner Montréal. Cette déclaration a réjoui les Kinois (c'est ainsi qu'on appelle les habitants de Kinshasa), gagnants du "grand prix" de la francophonie; mais de ce côté-ci de l'Atlantique, elle a provoqué l'ire chez les Montréalais, qui venaient de perdre leur position "privilégiée" à côté de la métropole héxagonale.

Mais, la raison de la proclamation controversée, loin d'être linguistique (Rubango 1986:253)[1], était plutôt politique et démographique. Politique parce que Kinshasa n'est francophone que par la décision du législateur; démographique car c'est l'accroissement de la population kinoise qui a motivé la décision et non la pratique de la langue de Molière.

Quelles sont alors les conséquences réellement linguistiques de la francophonie au Zaïre? Pour aborder cette question, nous avons scindé cet exposé en cinq points: la situation géo-politi-que du Zaïre(1), la montée du français et la réaction des populations(2), les conséquences linguistiques immédiates de cette situation(3), ses conséquences à long terme(4) et notre conclusion(5).

Développement.

1. **La situation géo-politique du Zaïre**.

Le Zaïre, pays de l'Afrique centrale, mesure 2.344.932 kilomètres carrés. Sa population est estimée à 35.000.000 d'habitants. Le hasard de l'histoire l'a glissé dans le giron francophone. En effet, la Belgique, métropole colonisatrice à majorité flamande[2], a préféré enseigner à sa colonie congolaise d'alors[3] la langue de sa minorité: le français.

Après les premiers cinq ans d'indépendance, marqués par les troubles interethniques, le Zaïre connaît, depuis le coup d'Etat de 1965, une dictature musclée et vit sous un régime fortement centralisé. Au plan économique, c'est un pays à vocation agricole; mais l'agriculture, plusieurs fois proclamée "priorité des priorités", est abandonnée au profit de l'exploitation minière. Le sous-sol zaïrois a toujours été qualifié de "scandale géologique", paradoxalement, la majorité des habitants du pays est scandaleusement pauvre. Le contrôle du marché des matières premières par l'Occident mercantilliste fait que le Zaïre, comme tous les autres pays du Tiers-Monde, cherche encore sa voie pour sortir son économie du marasme où elle est plongée.

A son accession à l'indépendance politique, il y a bientôt une trentaine d'années, le Zaïre, alors République du Congo, opta pour le français comme sa seule langue officielle, sa langue de l'enseignement[4], de l'administration publique et de la diplomatie.

Ce faisant, il créait une nouvelle situation au niveau de l'administration publique. La décision éliminait la dichotomie coloniale[5] qui imposait le néerlandais (ou le flamand) et le français dans la gestion des affaires de la colonie. Mais, au niveau culturel, c'était pire qu'avant car la jeune république venait d'éliminer ses propres langues nationales du programme de l'enseignement, tant comme véhicule que comme matière[6].

Dans ce domaine, les déclarations du législateur n'ont apparemment eu pour but que de distraire les masses populaires. Les dispositions prises plus tard en cette matière sont si superficielles et si peu fondées en logique qu'elles ne convainquent personne[7].

Comme le colonisateur d'antan, le Zaïre n'a retenu que quatre des quelques cent langues et dialectes nationaux, il les a confirmés langues nationales: il s'agit du **kikongo**, du **lingala**, du **swahili** et du **tshiluba**.

Par cette décision, le Zaïre créait en son sein une structure linguistique pyramidale[8] suivante: le français au sommet, les quatre langues nationales comme tronc, la base étant constituée de quatre cent autres langues et dialectes, jugés de moindre importance parce que "pratiqués par trop de locuteurs".

Ainsi, dans Kinshasa, la capitale, l'on a d'abord le français, langue officielle, mais minoritaire, suivi du lingala (langue de l'armée et des artistes musiciens). Les trois autres langues se disputent les autres positions, mais ne sont réellement pratiquées que dans des familles, en cercles clos. Aucune d'elles n'est utilisée dans des écoles, ni dans l'affichage, ni dans la presse officielle[9]. En dessous de tout se trouvent enfouis tous les autres langues et dialectes, qui ne sont plus parlés que dans des familles, par une génération en voie d'extinction.

En régions (provinces), le panorama est similaire ou peu s'en faut: le français tient le haut du pavé, en tant que langue officielle de l'administration et langue de l'enseignement. En deuxième lieu, les langues nationales locales respectives et le lingala[10]. En arrière-garde, les dialectes tribaux ferment la marche.

Après ce bref aperçu, voyons la situation du français au milieu de cet ensemble hétérogène.

2. La montée du français et la réaction des populations au plan linguistique.

Au niveau social, le français ne gagne pas les masses populaires. Le système d'enseignement et la non-qualification des enseignants n'en favorisent pas la maîtrise par les apprenants. En plus, la situation de polyglossie dans laquelle baigne l'enfant zaïrois à l'âge scolaire n'y contribue pas positivement. En effet, en classe, le jeune écolier entend parler français, dans la cour de récréation, il s'exprime dans l'une des langues nationales, en famille, il entend ses parents parler l'un des multiples langues et dialectes tribaux[11]. Les échecs scolaires, très nombreux en ce moment, font que les rangs de ceux qui auront un jour entendu parler le français grossissent très rapidement, et le nombre de "francophones", dans les mêmes proportions. Mais, tous ces francophones accidentels (des zones si éloignées les unes des autres) ne se portent pas dans leurs coeurs.

Après l'admiration que les populations vouaient aux "parlant-fran-çais", il s'en est suivi une répulsion, voire une haine, à l'égard des membres de cette "caste privilégiée". Tous les semi-lettrés et tous les illettrés considèrent ceux qui maîtrisent le français comme des étrangers et les traitent de "je-le-connais", c'est-à-dire ceux qui répètent inlassablement "je le connais", en d'autres mots: "ceux qui ont la prétention de tout savoir". C'est une situation de fermeture de la part de la majorité de la population.

Mais, paradoxalement, tous ceux-là qui rejettent les "je-le-con-nais" sont en même temps attirés par le français, langue du savoir et du pouvoir, langue de la promotion sociale et de la "civilisation". Les masses populaires imitent donc le langage des "je-le-connais" honnis!

Les semi-lettrés bariolent leur parler de mots français, souvent déformés phonétiquement et même sémantiquement. Il n'est pas jusqu'à la vendeuse du marché qui ne teigne son langage de quelques vocables empruntés au français. Les lettrés eux-mêmes, dans leurs relations avec le peuple, métissent leur langage. L'intention chez ces derniers est souvent (sinon toujours) de s'approcher de la masse populaire sans "perdre" leur identité d'intellectuel - chèrement acquise - et de préserver leur anonymat ethnique si prisé dans les milieux kinois en particulier et zaïrois en général.

Alors le français, sans pour autant devenir une langue nationale, acquiert une coloration locale, renfermant plus de mots des langues nationales et des dialectes que du lexique originel. Mais, la part qu'il apporte aux langues nationales est même plus importante que celle qu'il en reçoit. Parmi les mots qu'il prête, on note les locutions adverbiales et prépositives comme "tout de suite, en tout cas, quand même", etc. Au plan structurel, les substantifs du français sont employés sans article et les verbes à l'infinitif.

3. **Résultats sur le terrain**.

Il s'est créé un déséquilibre au détriment des langues nationales parce que la lutte se livre entre béligérants inégalement "armés". Cette situation est favorisée par l'inégalité qui sous-tend les relations sociales au Zaïre. Les citoyens qui parlent français sont conscients de tenir là un instrument du pouvoir et du prestige socio-culturel[12]. Ceux qui ne le parlent pas se sont convaincus, au contact de la société, qu'ils ne participent pas au pouvoir; qu'ils ne sont pas cultivés... bref, qu'ils sont inférieurs par rapport aux parlant-français.

3.1 **Equilibre instable**.

Les langues en contact, ne jouissant ni du même statut ni de la même considération, n'évoluent pas de la même façon. Il en résulte un équilibre instable entre le français et les langues nationales. Le tronc subit le joug du sommet et ploie sous son poids. En conséquence, le sommet ne peut pas profiter de l'apport du tronc. L'interaction se traduit en appauvrissement de toutes les composantes de la structure.

3.1.1 <u>Pour le français: pas d'assise populaire solide</u>.

Malgré son statut officiel privilégié, le français n'a pas d'assise populaire solide. A notre avis, les raisons sont d'abord d'ordre structurel et socio-économique.

Structurellement, l'enseignement élémentaire et même secondaire est généralement confié aux non-spécialistes qui, souvent, ne maîtrisent ni la langue enseignée, ni la méthode de son enseignement. En effet, les maîtres de l'école primaire sont pour la plupart ceux qui n'ont pas réussi leurs examens pour l'obtention du diplôme d'Etat (il s'agit du diplôme qui sanctionne la fin fructueuse des études secondaires) ou qu'ils ont obtenu avec un pourcentage si faible qu'ils ne sont pas admissibles aux études supérieures. L'école primaire, base de tout système d'enseignement, est donc considérée comme un "fourre-tout" où se retrouvent tous ceux qui ne peuvent pas exercer un emploi d'intellectuel.

Le résultat ne peut alors être qu'à l'image des maîtres. Or l'on sait que l'acquisition des structures d'une langue seconde est très ardue à quiconque n'a pas maîtrisé celles de la première qu'il parle. L'on peut en déduire que pour les enfants zaïrois, n'ayant pas appris leur langue maternelle d'une façon "scientifique", les structures du français - réputées difficiles pour tout nouvel apprenant - ne leur sont pas facilement accessibles.

Au plan social et économique, à cause des difficultés d'ordre pécuniaire[13], les enfants des familles pauvres sont enclins à "décrocher" plus facilement que ceux des familles aisées minoritaires, la masse des "décrocheurs" est donc potentiellement et même réellement plus grande (numériquement) que la petite poignée d'enfants de la bourgeoisie, qui persévèrent et arrivent, à coups d'efforts, à maîtriser le français. Le bassin véritablement francophone se voit donc cerner chaque année, voire chaque trimestre davantage, d'une aura aux nuances francophones imprécises, cela menace en permanence le français dit "pur" ou standard.

L'équilibre instable marque aussi les langues nationales. Le lingala, par exemple, actuellement parlé dans toutes les grandes villes zaïroises, est truffé de mots français. De ce fait, il perd progressivement de sa pureté déjà relative[14]. Son extension que soutiennent ses emprunts faits au français ne compense pas ses pertes de l'essentiel. Par ailleurs, en même temps qu'il se teint du saupoudrage du français, il colore le parler français des intellectuels qui, dans des conversations familières (et même certains professeurs dans leurs cours universitaires), n'hésitent pas à juxtaposer un mot du français et un mot du lingala pour s'exprimer.

Quant aux autres langues nationales, elles subissent une érosion généralisée à cause de l'intrusion du français dans le parler quotidien. Disposant de bassins de pratique plus réduits que celui du lingala, elles ne se recréent pas aussi facilement que ce dernier. Les noms des chiffres, par exemple, ont tendance à disparaître tant de ces langues que des dialectes zaïrois[15]. Tous les Zaïrois (ou à peu près) ne peuvent plus s'identifier comme tel qu'en recourant au néologisme "zaïrois" car le vocable désignant l'habitant du Zaïre n'existe officiellement qu'en français.

3.2 **Au plan du parler**.

A ce plan, il s'est produit un brassage de sons, il s'est créé de nouveaux sèmes et de nouveaux morphèmes. La conséquence est la contamination phonétique. Tous ces phénomènes sont préjudiciables pour les langues pratiquées et ont engendré de nouveaux langages qui ne sont plus ni du français, ni des langues nationales.

3.2.1 De nouveaux langages: le Kin-doubil et le sabir.

3.2.1.1 Le Kin-doubil

La populeuse classe mouvante de la jeunesse désoeuvrée a créé, à Kinshasa, un nouveau langage dénommé "Kin-doubil". Non seulement les mots du français y sont "lingalisés" ou ceux du lingala francisés[16], mais ils sont aussi adaptés tant bien que mal à la structure de l'une ou l'autre des langues en présence. De part et d'autre, on crée des substantifs à partir de verbes (ou vice-versa), selon le principe bien connu de provignement. Ainsi, par exemple, du substantif français "rapidité" l'on a formé le verbe "rapiditer" (qui ne sera utilisé qu'à l'infinitif!) pour dire "se précipiter" ou "agir rapidement". C'est ainsi qu'un jeune homme, demandant à un chauffeur de taxi de l'amener rapidement à sa destination, lui dira:

"Vieux, rapiditer ngai na Matonge!"

pour signifier à peu près ceci:
Vieux (vénérable), conduisez-moi rapidement à Matonge.

3.2.1.2 Le Sabir.

De leur côté, les travailleurs semi-lettrés, et même certains intellectuels, puisent abondamment et simultanément dans les lexiques des deux camps (celui du français et celui des langues nationales) pour exprimer leurs idées. Pour la catégorie des intellectuels, il s'agit soit de la paresse "intellectuelle", soit du snobisme - il faut que le peuple sache qu'un tel connaît le français et que, par sa bonne volonté, il fournit des efforts pour nous parler dans notre langue. Pour la première catégorie, c'est plutôt par souci de communication, certes, mais aussi pour ne pas paraître trop inférieur par rapport au clan des intellectuels; ou encore pour ne pas être assimilé à la grosse majorité des ouvriers illettrés, considérés comme non cultivés et inférieurs.

Cette volonté délibérée de combiner les langues par trop différentes engendre le pérégrinisme (ou l'étrangisme, selon Etiemble), ou plus précisément le "sabir", dont l'aspect hybride ne contribue nullement à l'enrichissement des langues nationales.

3.2.2 **Contamination phonétique pour le français et perte au plan lexico-sémantique pour les langues nationales.**

Compte tenu du grand nombre des langues et dialectes parlés au Zaïre et du fait que les locuteurs du français, pour la plupart, ne le maîtrisent pas, cette langue cible subit des modifications qui, bien que localement circonscrites, sont très importantes au niveau phonétique[17]. Ces modifications sont dues au fait que les locuteurs moyens, dont les langues maternelles ne disposent pas de certains phonèmes équivalant à ceux du français, ne se gênent pas de substituer au phonème "inconnu" du français un autre phonème tiré de leur dialecte: tant est grand leur désir de s'exprimer en français!

Ainsi, la "carence" de certaines langues maternelles entraînera chez ces locuteurs occasionnels du français - comme cela se doit - une réduction au niveau phonique et phonétique du français. Par exemple, peu de langues zaïroises connaissent les voyelles orales antérieures ou centrales, que celles-ci soient ouvertes ou fermées, arrondies ou écartées, comme le:

le [ə] de /le garçon/, le [œ] de /fleur/ et le [y] de /juron/.

L'on entend donc prononcer [lɛgarso], [flɛr], [ʒiro].

Pour les consonnes, le [ʒ] devient [z] chez les locuteurs du kikongo et du lingala; il devient [ʃ] chez certains locuteurs du tshiluba. Le mot /jour/, par exemple, se prononcra [zur] chez les premiers et [ʃur] chez les seconds. La combinaison "d+i" se prononce respectivement [dzi] et [dʒi] selon que le locuteur moyen est "lingalaphone" ou "tshilubaphone". Les groupes dits "indivisibles": occlusive + liquide frappée (bl, tl, cl, gl, pl) ou fricative labio-dentale + liquide frappée (fl) produisent le rhotacisme chez les locuteurs du swahili de la province du Kivu [br, tr, cr, gr, fr], car le son "l" est quasiment inexistant dans la plupart des langues de cette partie du pays. Pour des syntagmes comme /la fleur/ et /la table/, l'on entendra donc:

[ra frer] et [ra tabre].

Sans parler du point de vue sociologique, psychologique et pédagogique, ces altérations ont été inventoriées comme suit[18]:

> "au niveau phonique et phonologique: réduction du système vocalique et semi-vocalique due à la perte de certaines oppositions pertinentes du français commun, dénasalisation et délabialisation, formation de complexes nasaux, confusion de certaines consonnes, apparition d'une voyelle épenthétique interconsonantique, perturbation des règles d'accentuation et d'intonation; au niveau syntaxique: élimination de la distinction de genre et de nombre dans le syntagme nominal, absence de syntagme verbal ou de sujet dans certains énoncés, omission et/ou mauvais emploi des prépositions, changement de régime de certains verbes,

> pronominalisation des verbes non pronominaux, transposition de tours de langues maternelles, réduction de l'adverbe de négation à l'élément "ne", confusion des auxiliaires, mélange du discours directe et du discours indirect."

3.2.3 **Dénotation et connotation.**

La dénotation semble préservée dans les emprunts que les Zaïrois font au français et dans les prêts qu'ils lui consentent. Les traits sémantiques des lexèmes demeurent les mêmes. Mais, il n'en est pas ainsi au niveau de la connotation. Les besoins d'expression étant généralement plus grands que ne l'est le lexique français des locuteurs, les seuls mots connus doivent combler la carence. Ils sont alors sur-chargés de sens, non pas au plan de la polysémie, mais à celui de l'extension: les traits sémantiques étant à préciser en fonction du contexte.

Par exemple, les termes français "grand, vieux, petit, père, mère, soeur", employés par un lingalaphone de Kinshasa de niveau scolaire de 4e ou de 5e primaire, signalent certes des rapports d'âge et de parenté; mais ils sont surtout des termes "respectueux" et mélioratifs. Ils marquent l'estime dans laquelle le locuteur tient son interlocuteur. Ils peuvent aussi référer à la hiérarchie sociale et à la philosophie culturelle des locuteurs.

Aussi "grand" ne désignera-t-il pas nécessairement quelqu'un de plus grande taille ou de plus âgé que le locuteur. Il référera à une personne à qui on doit du respect à cause de sa position sociale. "Vieux" est un terme respectueux qui désigne tous ceux à qui on accorde la présomption de la sagesse; en conséquence "petit" désigne généralement une personne qui occupe un rang social inférieur à celui du locuteur, ou celui qui est présumé tel. "Père" et "mère" s'emploient pour désigner tout homme ou toute femme qui semble avoir l'âge de paternité ou de maternité; "soeur" est employé pour appeler toute jeune femme (sans doute parce qu'elle semble avoir l'âge de la soeur aînée du locuteur ou tout simplement parce qu'elle semble plus âgée que lui).

Il n'a pas forcément la notion de parenté qui existerait entre le locuteur et sont interlocuteur. Dès lors, il ne faut certes pas exclure l'esprit astucieux de la part de certains locuteurs qui cherchent à soutirer un service ou une faveur à l'interlocuteur ainsi respectueusement appelé.

4. Conséquences.

Cette tendance à emprunter des mots à d'autres langues aurait été sans importance si elle n'était qu'unidirectionnelle vers le français: elle aurait créé une "parlure" francophone, c'est-à-dire un langage issu du français, mais limité à une zone sociale présise. La communication n'en aurait pas été gênée, pas plus que le français international, qui jouit des apports d'autres francophonies de par le monde et s'appuie sur le conservatisme des "Immortels" de son Académie.

Mais la tendance est malheureusement bidirectionnelle: elle agit ainsi par le fait des semi-lettrés qui vont jusqu'à remplacer dans leur langage les mots des langues nationales par ceux du français, ceux-ci étant souvent mal prononcés et mal adaptés. Les langues zaïroises perdent alors au plan lexicologique et sémantique. Les locuteurs emprunteurs croient s'approcher du français mais ils restent loin de l'objectif convoité.

Le résultat est l'appauvrissement systématique de ces langues sans appui. N'étant plus depuis longtemps ni langues, ni matière d'enseignement, les opérations citées plus haut les affaiblissent et bloquent leur processus normal de renouvellement endogène.

L'on sait par ailleurs que la forme type ou correcte d'une langue, c'est-à-dire la prononciation, la grammaire et l'expression en général, bien que relevant de l'idéal, est néanmoins essentielle pour sa survie; qu'elle n'est assurée que par l'éducation qui, selon les spécialistes de la sociolinguistique, "constitue la force de conservation la plus puissante en cette matière" (Pande, 1966: 209). Si l'on sait aussi, pour le cas des langues nationales du Zaïre, que depuis longtemps elles ont cessé d'être véhicule et matière d'enseignement[19], on peut penser qu'en définitive, l'effet de toutes les modifications invoquées plus haut sera de les étouffer dans leur évolution, et ce, dans un futur très proche.

Quant aux dialectes, qui ne jouissent d'aucun appui structurel, ils sont confrontés à une mort rapide. Abandonnés au simple niveau oral, ils ne résisteront pas longtemps à leur mort.

Malgré l'engoûment de ce pays pour la langue française, le système de l'enseignement est tel son avenir est compromis, tant au niveau du parler qu'à celui de l'écriture (nous parlons en termes de pourcentage de la population[20]). Plus grave encore: cette compromission entraîne celle des langues locales.

Conclusion.

5. Désastre pour les langues en contact.

Les variations du français du Zaïre sont le résultat d'une entreprise en faillite. Elles se traduisent en appauvrissement voire en asphyxie des langues nationales et en détérioration de la langue importée. La situation force à reconnaître honnêtement la dégradation qui aboutira, localement, à la ruine des langues en présence.

Si la "ruine" n'en est pas une pour le français international - pieuvre qui étend ses tentacules dans plusieurs pays francophones -, plus qu'une menace, elle est une réalité et doit s'accomplir dans un avenir très rapproché pour les langues nationales.

5.1 Le sort de la langue dominante: la détérioration.

La langue dominante, le français, peut-elle l'emporter sur les langues dominées? Apparemment oui. Mais, malgré son immortalité présumée par Weinstein (1980: 227-229, 239), le français remportera une victoire "à la Pyrrhus" car elle sortira de cette "guerre" meurtrie de plusieurs contusions. Son déclin progressif est évident à tous les niveaux.

Selon Le Boul (1978:25), il tournerait dans "un cercle vicieux qui enchaîne des structures entières. En effet, à cause de la contamination et d'autres facteurs que nous avons cités plus haut, le même auteur écrit que "le français subit dans sa forme aussi bien écrite que parlée une baisse générale due principalement à l'affaiblissement de certaines structures nationales; inversement, le niveau général de l'enseignement penche, étant donné l'absence croissante de maîtrise de la langue qui sert de canal de transmission et d'acquisition des connaissances scientifiques".

Dans les écoles, ce déclin saute "aux oreilles" par les altérations relevées à tous les niveaux linguistiques et rendues par divers écarts, entorses ou fautes et interférences.

Après sa victoire - sûrement proche, compte tenu de la léthargie complice de l'autorité politique - il ne présentera qu'une face créolisée, difficilement reconnaissable par les autres francophones. Synchroniquement, c'est déjà la situation de 1989; quant aux perspectives d'avenir, elles ne sont guère reluisantes car le taux de contamination est tel que les lendemains s'annoncent plutôt sombres.

5.2 <u>Le sort des langues dominées: la ruine!</u>

Pour elles, c'est le "vae victis" (malheur aux vaincus!): le linguicide. Leur mort entraînera sûrement celle des cultures de toutes les communautés qui les pratiquent.

Les socio-linguistes lient la survie d'une langue à plusieurs conditions jugées essentielles: dont "la forme type d'une langue, de prononciation, de grammaire et d'expression" (Pande, 1966:209). Mais, en donnant "5000 ans à une langue pour se refaire", ces spécialistes ne considèrent qu'une langue qui évolue dans son sein, et non celle qui subit une agression d'une autre langue concurrente plus forte qu'elle. Vu les conditions qui leur sont faites par la conjoncture socio-économique et surtout politique, les langues zaïroises pourraient subir leur mort plus rapidement que ne le prévoient les socio-linguistes. Ces langues souffrent de l'atteinte à leur statut, en tant que langues, et à leur popularuté, en tant que moyens de communication.

5.3 A l'avantage de qui?

Dans le contexte polyglossique où il se débat, s'écorche et se mutile tout en asphyxiant les langues partenaires, le français ne tire aucun avantage réel et honnête. "Le rendez-vous du donner et du recevoir", si cher à l'instigateur de la francophonie, l'académicien sénégalais Léopold-Sédar Senghor, n'aura-t-il été qu'un dangereux appât, empoisonnant les pauvres et les naïfs qui jouent leur vie culturelle?

A y regarder de bien près, au "banquet" de ce rendez-vous, les convives ne jouissent pas des mêmes privilèges: les uns y sont venus pour vivre à jamais, les autres, pour mourir à brève échéance, d'une mort culturelle, j'entends.

5.4 Quelle serait la solution?

Mais, la solution doit venir des élites zaïroises, elles qui tiennent le levier des commandes politiques. Si elles tiennent tant soit peu à la survie culturelle des peuples du Zaïre, elles doivent élaborer des politiques linguistiques qui veillent non seulement à la (re)valorisation des langues nationales, mais aussi à l'équilibre qui permette à ces dernières de côtoyer les langues étrangères, néccessaires aux contacts interpersonnels et internationaux, sans risquer de se noyer et ainsi de disparaître.

Il faut une réglementation qui donne une place prépondérante aux langues locales et réserve, dans le premier temps, le français aux relations extérieures, au commerce international et à la diplomatie.

Peut-être ne faut-il pas exclure le français de la vie nationale (Rubango 1986:264), puisque, comme toutes les autres langues étrangères "établies" en Afrique à la faveur de la violence coloniale, cette langue permet déjà les contacts au niveau international et même national. Néanmoins, il convient de donner à ces langues la place et la considération qu'elles méritent en tant que langues nationales. Il faut redéfinir des priorités culturelles. Cela implique, de la part des élites zaïroises, la redéfinition des priorités culturelles, le courage politique et l'honneteté intellectuelle.

Le plan de redressement devrait porter sur:
1° la **réintroduction** des langues nationales en tant que matière dans les programmes de l'enseignement primaire et secondaire. La recherche fondamentale et appliquée en enseignement de ces langues s'en suivra et elle devra être encouragée;
2° **l'alphabétisation** des populations en ces langues aura pour effet de favoriser la lecture par de larges couches de la population et la naissance d'une littérature véritablement nationale, en plus de créer des marchés pour les écrivains et les éditeurs;
3° enfin, à long terme, **l'enseignement en langues** nationales.

Clé de la réussite scolaire et de la confiance en soi, un tel plan redonnera vie aux langues zaïroises et fierté aux peuples qui les parlent. Le développement des cultures nationales et, pourquoi pas, le développement du Zaïre tout court, en sera stimulé. Par ricochet, l'étude de toute langue étrangère en sera faciltée et la maîtrise assurée, car il sera plus aisé et plus rentable de semer sur un terrain déjà fertilisé par l'engrais des langues premières.

NOTES

(1) En effet, Kinshasa est francophone sans la langue. A en croire Faïk (1977), le taux de la francophonie zaïroise (4%) serait même inférieur à celui d'autres pays africains. En 1960, écrit Weinstein (1980:62), l'Afrique occidentale française comptait déjà 10% de francophones; le Sénégal seul représentait, en 1975, 12% de francophones africains; le Togo comptait, en 1974, 25% de francophones dans sa population, dont 20% d'hommes et 4% de femmes en milieux urbains,et 1% d'hommes en milieux ruraux.

(2) L'on estime (Larochette, 1952:77; Le Boul, 1978:24; Faïk, 1979: 441,443) la population flamande quatre fois supérieure à la population wallonne dans la colonie congolaise à cette époque.

(3) Selon Rubango (1986), le français est de pratique courante au Zaïre depuis le 19e siècle, époque à laquelle Léopold II acquit la colonie africaine. Langue officielle "de facto" depuis l'occupation belge, le français l'est devenu "de jure" à partir de 1887. Par la circulaire du 6 août 1887, tous les agents et fonctionnaires coloniaux devaient l'utiliser comme langue de travail. Malgré le titre de langue officielle conféré au néerlandais (le flamand) par l'article 3 de la "Charte coloniale", cette dernière langue ne fut jamais une concurrente sérieuse du français. La création, au Congo, des écoles professionnelles (1906) a inauguré son apprentissage par l'indigène; la réforme Frank (1922) l'a intensifié. De 1958 à 1962, le français était le "véhicule exclusif" du 2e degré de l'enseignement primaire, c'est-à-dire à partir de la 3e année primaire.

(4) L'ordonnance n° 174 du 17 octobre 1962 l'a étendu à tous les niveaux de l'enseignement. Quant à la réforme de 1974, elle lui a non seulement confirmé la qualité d'outil, mais aussi conféré celle de matière depuis la 3e primaire.

(5) Cette dichotomie entraînait des désagréments comme la répercussion dans la colonie des querelles linguistiques entre Flamands et Wallons. Ce qui était un véritable "apartheid" à la belge: le ghetto flamand, le ghetto wallon (à l'instar de la Belgique d'alors et d'aujourd'hui), sans parler du ghetto "noir".

(6) En 1970, l'école primaire a dispensé 9 heures de français sur 20 en 1e et en 2e années, 8 sur 29 en 3e et en 4e années et 7 sur 12 en 5e et 6e années (Faïk, 1977:17, 19). En 1975, l'école secondaire aurait dispensé, selon le même auteur, 10 heures en 1e année, 8 en 2e et 5 à 6 par semaine de la 3e à la 6e (source: Programme National de l'Enseignement).

(7) Les principes suivants sont censés guider la politique linguistique scolaire du Zaïre: "que les élèves maîtrisent progressivement le français parlé et écrit et s'en servent pour comprendre l'enseignement des autres matières contenues dans le programme, que le français élargisse partout les possibilités de communication et n'expose pas la jeunesse au risque de l'aliénation, de l'assomption d'une culture étrangère, que l'enseignement du français n'aille pas à

l'encontre de l'étude des langues nationales, que la politique linguitique garantisse une continuité ou un équilibre entre la vie scoalaire, la vie familiale, la vie sociale, la vie nationale et la vie internationale." Les mêmes principes ont été répétés au Sommet de la francophonie par le président du Zaïre (Mobutu, 1987:A23). Parlant des questions de l'identité nationale qui semblent gênées par l'adoption d'une langue étrangère comme langue officielle, il déclara: "Au Zaïre, la politique linguistique est basée sur l'apprentissage et la promotion équilibrés de quatre langues nationales: le lingala, le swahili, le tshiluba et le kikongo". Entretemps, et ce depuis l'indépendance du pays, le 30 juin 1960, les tâtonnements des gouvernants en cette matière font que, c'est seulement depuis septembre 1984 (soit 24 années après l'indépendance!), que le département de l'enseignement primaire et secondaire expérimente un programme de réforme pour l'essentiel conforme au modèle "audio-visuel et structuro-global du Celta" (Centre de Linguistique Théorique et Appliquée) annoncée 10 ans plus tôt, en intégrant davantage les langues venues des régions, comme le tshiluba, le kikongo et le swahili (Rubango, 1986:255). Notons au passage qu'à part le lingala et le kikongo, qui ont une bonne audience à Kinshasa, les autres langues n'ont pas beaucoup de chance, non seulement d'être acceptées par les populations, - beaucoup de "citoyens" ne partageant aucune des langues nationales, se parlent en français -, mais aussi d'avoir un prolongement dans les familles en particulier et dans la cité en général. L'environnement est presqu'entièrement lingalaphone. Mais, la vie socio-culturelle zaïroise, elle, se déroule presqu'exclusivement en français: à cette langue, la presse écrite consacre 97% de son espace; la presse visuelle et parlée, environ 70% (Faïk et al., 1977: 8, 15; Faïk, 1979: 450). Quant à la politique officielle, elle n'apporte aucun soutien aux langues nationales: aucun texte des différentes constitutions n'a eu de version en langues nationales; tous les hymnes nationaux, la congolaise et même la zaïroise, (chant du "Nouveau-Régime" qui prône l'authenticité), n'ont que la version française; le "Manifeste de la Nsele", charte politique du parti-Etat, le M.P.R. (le Mouvement Populaire de la Révolution), n'est rédigé qu'en français.

(8) C'est le même modèle des pays "multimodaux" tracé par J. Fisman (1969, cité par Rubango, 1986:2554).

(9) Il faut noter néanmoins que la Radio nationale présente de temps en temps des programmes en kikongo, langue des peuplades qui occupaient cet endroit avant la colonisation; en swahili, langue internationale, venue de la côte orientale (et parlée principalement dans trois provinces: le Shaba ou le Katanga d'antan, le Kivu et le Haut-Zaïre), importée par les migrations de l'Est, et en tshiluba, l'une des langues des deux provinces du Kasaï.

(10) Ce dernier se propage rapidement pour des raisons politiques et à la faveur de la musique zaïroise moderne.

(11) Sauf dans des rares familles de l'aristocratie ou dont les enfants ont été (ou sont encore) scolarisés en Europe francophone ou au Canada, le français est utilisé comme langue "de communication".

(12) A en croire Mudimbe (1979:195), au Zaïre, cette langue est fortement identifiée à l'excellence d'une norme et d'une culture.

(13) Quant à l'organisation de l'enseignement, au départ, l'enseignement primaire était déclaré gratuit par le gouvernement. Les seuls cycles payants étaient le secondaire et l'universitaire. Aujourd'hui, tout est payant et l'école primaire est même plus onéreuse pour les parents que les autres cycles (les enseignants de ce niveau étant les moins payés de tous!). Au niveau universitaire, le régime de bourse d'études, jadis généralisé et accessible à tous les étudiants zaïrois (et mêmes étrangers des pays limitrophes), est restreint "officiellement" aux seuls candidats méritants, mais officieusement "réservé" aux seuls enfants dont les parents ont des connexions avec le pouvoir politique. Pour les enfants du peuple, la seule façon d'y avoir accès est la corruption des fonctionnaires qui gèrent ce régime. Mais, considérant le revenu moyen de la population, cette possibilité se révèle elle aussi inaccessible. Pour la grande majorité de la population, la chance d'apprendre et de maîtriser la langue de l'enseignement est donc ténue.

(14) Le lingala est une création du colonisateur qui a assemblé des mots tirés des divers langues et dialectes des régions où il avait implanté des casernes de soldats, plus particulièrement dans la région de l'Equateur. L'on comprend dès lors que d'abord ce ne soit pas une langue pure, et

qu'ensuite il n'appartienne à aucun peuple spécifique du Zaïre.

(15) La nouvelle monnaie du pays n'ayant été frappée qu'en français, le comptage de l'argent ne se fait qu'en cette langue.

(16) Les mots tirés des langues nationales sont francisés par l'ajout d'un article défini. Il s'agit surtout du lingala et du kikongo, langues les plus parlées à Kinshasa.

(17) Nkongolo (1985, cité par Rubango 1986:260) se situe à ce plan et explique cette crise à la fois "quantitative et qualitative" par la conjoncture: l'attitude hostile des "nouveaux riches" et des masses zaïroises à l'endroit du français; l'indifférence ou l'absence de motivation et d'habitude d'usage des élèves mêmes qui utilisent cette langue à l'école et/ou à la maison, la carence de professeurs de français qualifiés, le manque d'esprit de collaboration et de dialogue entre professeurs de français et leurs collègues qui enseignent d'autres matières, la frustration générale des enseignants, la pauvreté ou l'absence de manuels, l'inadéquation des programmes et des méthodes d'enseignement du français, le manque ou l'insuffisance des sessions de formation et de recyclage des enseignants.

(18) Kapay, M. 1982. Contribution à l'étude du français zaïrois. Quelques aspects socio-linguistiques (mémoire de licence inédit), p. 70.

(19) Les langues nationales zaïroises avaient cessé d'être enseignées à l'école primaire depuis 1962; depuis 1978, de timides expérimentations se font dans quelques écoles "pilote" de la capitale pour leur éventuelle réintroduction. Quant à l'enseignement en langues nationales, ayant fait l'objet de plusieurs colloques scientifiques, il ne se limite qu'aux premières années de l'école primaire. Le législateur n'en fait pas sa préoccupation.

(20) Rubango (1986, citant Faïk, 1977), signale qu'"en réalité, un seul Zaïrois parmi 25 "parle" le français et un parmi 130 est censé l'"écrire" correctement"; ceci montre statistiquement que 1.400.000 de Zaïrois sont présumés locuteurs du français et qu'à peine 269.230 peuvent l'écrire tant soit peu correctement. Le taux de la francophonie zaïroise est donc de 4%.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE

1) CALVET, L.J., 1974. Linguistique et colonialisme. Petit traité de glottophagie. Paris: Payot.

2) FAIK, S., 1979. 'Le français au Zaïre'. A. Valdman (dir.). Le français hors de France. Paris: Champion, p. 441-472.

3) FAIK, S. et al., 1977. Le Zaïre, deuxième pays francophone du monde? Québec: CIRB.

4) FISHMAN, J., 1969. 'National Languages and Languages of Wider Communication in the Developing Nations'. Anthropological Linguistics. 11/4. 111-135.

5) KAPAY, M., 1982. Contribution à l'étude du français zaïrois. Quelques aspects socio-linguistiques. (mémoire de licence inédit). Lubumbashi: Faculté des Lettres.

6) LAROCHETTE, J., 1952. 'Le problème des langues dans l'enseignement aux indigènes du Congo Belge'. Problèmes d'Afrique Centrale. 16. 72-78.

7) MOBUTU, S.S., 1987. 'Discours au Sommet de la francophonie'. Rapport général: Deuxième conférence des Chefs d'Etat et de gouvernement des pays ayant en commun l'usage du français. Québec, 2, 3 et 4 septembre 1987.

8) LE BOUL, P., 1978. 'L'enseignement du français au Zaïre'. Etudes scientifiques. (septembre 1978). 21-25.

9) MANESSY, G. et P. WALD, 1984. Le français en Afrique noire, tel qu'on le parle, tel qu'on le dit. Paris: L. Harmattan.

10) MARTIN, G., 1983. 'Les fondements historiques et politiques de la politique africaine de la France: du colonialisme au néo-colonialisme.' Genève-Afrique. 21/2. 39-68.

11) NKONGOLO, M., 1985. 'La crise du français chez les élèves zaïrois de l'école secondaire'. Africa. 40/1. 149-160.

12) PANDE, G.C. et al., 1966. 'Vie et mort des langues'. Problèmes du langage. 197-214.

13) RUBANGO, Nyunda ya, 1986. 'Le français au Zaïre: Langue "supérieure" et chances de "survie" dans un pays africain'. Language Problems & Language Planning. vol. 10, no 3. 253-266.

14) WEINSTEIN, B., 1980. 'Language Planning in Francophone Africa'. Language Problems and Language Planning. 4/1. 55-77.

FACTITIVE VERBS IN HUNGARIAN

Laszlo Szabo
University of New Brunswick

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is a classification of the Hungarian factitive verbs on the basis of their optimal environment in the sentences: V(NNV). While the causative verbs of Hungarian have been studied by many scholars, I am the first to investigate the "factitive" verbs. In this paper, a list of the Hungarian factitive verbs will be presented, as well as new observations about regularities in the behaviour of the four words: V/1, V/2, N/1 and N/2. There are surprising regularities in occurrence, or the lack of occurrence, of certain combinations of grammatical forms in Hungarian sentences with factitive verbs.

Let us take Hungarian sentences which contain four words each. These four words must have peculiarities as follows:

Two of the four words must be nouns, one of them without, the other with, a case ending. Two of the four words in the sentences must be verbs, one in indicative and one in imperative.

The "master" among the four words is the verb in indicative, the other three words depend on this one.

The other three words are necessary to give the "master" word adequate content and they are enough to form an understandable sentence.

The noun in nominative depends syntactically only on the verb in indicative, not on the other verb.

Further into this paper, I shall present an alphabetical list of Hungarian verbs which can figure as "master"-words in such sentences. I call then "factitive verbs". It is beyond my scope to investigate the so-called "causative" verbs (verbs with the suffix *-tat*, *-tet*, *-at*, *-et*.) Our verbs render ideas similar to the causative suffix, i.e., urging, encouragement, forcing somebody to action. While the causative verbs of Hungarian have been studied by many scholars, I am the first to investigate the factitive verbs.[1].

A generalizing description of our sentences is V(NNV) in which the word order and potentially some additional words are ignored.

The purpose of this article is a classification of the Hungarian factitive verbs on the basis of their optimal environment in the sentences.

Let us study first the morphological peculiarities of the second noun (N[2]). This noun can have the following case endings in our sentences: 1. accusative (*-t*), 2. dative (*-nak*, *-nek*), 3. ablative (*-tól*, *-től*), 4. sublative (*-ra*), *-re*)[2]. In the present article I mark these four cases with the four numbers 1, 2, 3, and 4.

The second verb follows the conjunction *hogy* 'that'. Before that conjunction, a demonstrative pronoun is sometimes compulsory (I), in other sentences it is possible but not compulsory (II):

The pronoun is	The ending of N[2] is			
	1.accusative	2.dative	3.ablative	4.sublative
possible II	+	+	+	+
necessary I	+	-	-	-

Examples for the five possibilities, shown in the table above:

1+I: *Az orvos eltiltotta a beteget attól, bogy dohányozzék*. 'The doctor prohibited the patient from smoking'.

1+II: *Péter (arra) biztatta a legényeket, hogy tiltakozzanak* 'Peter urged the lads to protest'.

2+II: *A vezető (azt) tanácsolta az embereknek, hogy dolgozzanak még jobban* 'The leader advised the people to work still better'.

3+II: A házigazda (azt) követelte a lakótól, hogy fizesse ki a lakbért 'The landlord requested the rent from the tenant'.

4+II: A tulajdonos (azt) bízta ra Nagyra, hogy vegye meg a traktort 'The owner authorized Mr. Nagy to buy the tractor'.

In the alphabetical list of our factitive verbs, there are only two with two possible combinations. With the verb kérni 'to beg, to request' both combinations 1+II and 3+II are possible; and with the verb segíteni 'help' we find either 1+II or 2+II. With each of the other 80 verbs only one combination materializes in real sentences. On the basis of these possible combinations, there are seven subgroups of the Hungarian factitive verbs: 1+I, 1+II, 2+II, 3+II, 4+II, (1+II or 2+II), (1+II or 3+II). If we take into consideration the number of verbs belonging to one or the other sub-group, we then have to say that there are only four major subgroups of the Hungarian factitive verbs: 1+II, 2+II, 1+I and 3+II.

The detailed semantic study of the factitive verbs is beyond my scope. However, one semantic comment should be made about the subgroup 1+I. There are 10 verbs in this subgroup and 8 of them denote "advise not to do something". These 8 verbs are Nos. 2, 13, 27, 50, 52, 62, 66 and 82.

Let us investigate the other "verb", V[2], the verb which depends on the factitive verb. This can be an imperative, an infinitive or a deverbal noun. In other words, our sentence S: V(N[1] N[2] V[imp]) can become through transformation S[1]:V(N[1] N[2] V[inf]) or S[2]: V (N[1] N[2] N[v]). Let us mark these three types of our sentences with the three numbers 0, 1 and 2. The sentence type No. 0 can appear with all 82 of our factitive verbs. With some of them no infinitive and no deverbal noun can appear. With others, either an infinitive or a deverbal noun can be used (besides the imperative). Again, with other factitive verbs both of these possibilities (infinitive and deverbal noun) can appear. In the following table, I list all logical possibilities for the dependent verb and one dependent noun. I mark appearance with +, pure logical possibility without actual appearance with –:

The potential forms of the dependant verbs:		The potential forms of the dependant nouns: 1.acc.	2.dat.	3.abl.	4.subl.
imperative, infinitive, deverbal noun	012	+	+	–	–
imperative, deverbal noun	02	+	+	+	+
imperative, infinitive	01	+	–	–	–
imperative	0	–	+	–	–

Mathematically, there are 16 possible combinations, but only 8 of them actually appear. In the following formulas, the numbers of the horizontal and the vertical paradigms are added together:

1+012

(a) Az apa elküldte a fiút, hogy vadásszon 'The father sent the son (there), so he would go hunting'.

(b) Az apa elküldte a fiút vadászni 'The father sent the son to go hunting (lit. to hunt)'.

(c) Az apa elküldte a fiút a vadászatra 'The father sent the son to the hunting (party)'.

1+01

(a) Az anya hagyta a gyereket, hogy sírjon 'The mother let the child cry (lit. so it would cry)'.

(b) Az anya hagyta a gyereket sírni 'The mother let the child cry (lit. inf.)

2+012

(a) A katona segített a fogolynak, hogy meneküljön 'The soldier helped the prisoner to escape (lit. so he would escape).

(b) A katona segített a fogolynak menekülni 'The soldier helped the prisoner to escape (lit. inf.)'.

(c) A katona segített a fogolynak a menekülésben 'The soldier helped the prisoner to escape (lit. in escaping)'.

2+02

(a) Az úr megengedte a fiataloknak, hogy vasárnap szórakozzanak 'The master allowed the young people to amuse themselves (lit. so they would amuse themselves) on Sundays'.

(b) Az úr megengedte a fiataloknak a vasárnapi szórakozást 'The master allowed the young people the amusements on Sundays'.

2+0

(a) Az agronómus meghagyta az embereknek, hogy dolgozzanak 'The agronomist directed (i.e. told) the men to work (lit. so they would work)'.

3+02

(a) A fiú követelte az apjától, hogy adja ki neki az anyai örökségét 'The boy requested from his father to give him (lit. so he would give him out) his inheritance after his mother'.

(b) A fiú az anyai örökségének kiadását követelte az apjától 'The boy requested from his father his inheritance (lit. the "giving out" of his inheritance) after his mother'.

4+02

(a) A tanár rábízta a fiúra, hogy végezze el a feladatot 'The teacher entrusted it to the boy, to complete (lit. so he would complete) the assignment'.

(b) A tanár rábízta a fiúra a feladat elvégzését 'The teacher entrusted the completion of the assignment to the boy'.

We can subdivide Hungarian factitive verbs on the basis of the paradigms of the nouns and verbs which depend on the factitive verbs. With the exception of two factitive verbs (kérni 'to ask' and segíteni 'to help') there is only one combination for each factitive verb. With the verb kérni 'to ask' to beg' we find either the combination 1+02 or 3+02. With the verb segíteni 'to help' the alternatives are: 1+02 or 2+012. In this way, we can distinguish 10 subgroups of Hungarian factitive verbs, i.e., the verbs which belong to the 8 combinations in our table and the 2 verbs with alternatives.

In the German version of this article, published in Amsterdam, I made further subdivisions of Hungarian factitive verbs, based on the number of verbs in one or the other subgroup. Then I completed additional studies on the other verb, i.e., the verb which depends on the factitive verb in our four-word sentences, as well as on the dependent noun. In the present paper, there is no space for these additional sections.

Finally, I present a list of 82 Hungarian factitive verbs, with the comment that further verbs could be added to my list.

1. *ajánlani* 'recommend'
2. *akadályozni* 'hinder'
3. *behívni* 'call in, ask to enter'
4. *biztatni* 'encourage'
5. *bujtogatni* 'incite, stir up'
6. *buzdítani* 'encourage, stimulate'
7. *csalogatni* 'entice, lure'
8. *csábítani* 'allure, lure, attract'
9. *elengedni* 'let go'
10. *elküldeni* 'send, send away'
11. *előírni* 'prescribe'
12. *elrendelni* 'command, order'
13. *eltiltani* 'forbid, prohibit'
14. *engedni* 'let, allow, permit'
15. *engedélyezni* 'allow, permit, authorize'
16. *esedezni* 'implore, beseech'
17. *felbiztatni* 'encourage'
18. *felbujtani* 'abet, instigate'
19. *felhívni* 'call upon'
20. *felizgatni* 'rouse'
21. *felkérni* 'ask, request'
22. *felküldeni* 'send up'
23. *felszólítani* 'invite, dun'
24. *figyelmeztetni* 'warn'
25. *hagyni* 'let'
26. *háborgatni* 'disturb, bother'
27. *hívni* 'call'
28. *indítványozni* 'propose, suggest'
29. *ingerelni* 'stimulate, irritate, vex'
30. *izgatni* 'agitate, stir up, provoke'
31. *javasolni* 'propose, suggest'
32. *kényszeríteni* 'force, compel'
33. *kérni* 'ask, request'
34. *kérlelni* 'ask, request'
35. *késztetni* 'induce'
36. *kicsikarni* 'wring, extort sg from sy'
37. *kierőszakolni* 'wring, force sg from sy'
38. *kihívni* 'call out, challenge'
39. *kikönyörögni* 'ask, request (repeatedly until it is given)
40. *kikövetelni* 'demand, request (with success)
41. *kiküldeni* 'send out, delegate'
42. *kioktatni* 'teach, direct, supply information'
43. *kivánni* 'want, desire, request'
44. *könyörögni* 'beg, beseech, supplicate'
45. *kötelezni* 'oblige, compel, force'

46. <u>követelni</u> 'request, claim, demand'
47. <u>küldeni</u> 'send'
48. <u>lebeszélni</u> 'talk sy out of sg'
49. <u>leküldeni</u> 'send down'
50. <u>megakadályozni</u> 'hinder, prevent'
60. <u>megtanítani</u> 'teach'
61. <u>megtiltani</u> 'prohibit'
62. <u>megzavarni</u> 'disturb'
63. <u>mondani</u> 'say'
64. <u>mondogatni</u> 'say several times'
65. <u>oktatni</u> 'teach, instruct'
66. <u>óvni</u> 'warn, protest against sg'
67. <u>ösztönözni</u> 'urge, incite, stimulate'
68. <u>parancsolni</u> 'command, order'
69. <u>parancsolgatni</u> 'command, order (several times)'
70. <u>rábeszélni</u> 'persuade sy to do sg'
71. <u>rábírni</u> 'persuade'
72. <u>rábízni</u> 'entrust'
73. <u>rákényszeríteni</u> 'force, compel'
74. <u>rávenni</u> 'get sy to do sg, persuade'
75. <u>rimánkodni</u> 'supplicate'
76. <u>segíteni</u> 'urge, spur on, stimulate'
78. <u>tanácsolni</u> 'advise'
79. <u>tanítani</u> 'teach'
80. <u>tiltani</u> 'prohibit'
81. <u>uszítani</u> 'incite, instigate'
82. <u>zavarni</u> 'disturb'.

FOOTNOTES

1 See Laszlo Szabo, "Sätze mit faktitiven Verben im Ungarischen." <u>Lingua</u> 17 (1967). North-Holland Publishing Co.

2 I take the names of the case endings from the book <u>A mai magyar nyely rendszere. Leíró nyelvtan</u> I. (The System of Today's Hungarian. Descriptive Grammar I). Budapest: Hungarian Academy of Science, 1961.

POLITENESS LEVEL INDICATING THE ACTING PERSON IN JAPANESE

Laszlo Szabo
University of New Brunswick

ABSTRACT

Japanese verbs do not have any person-number suffixes. They have words for "I", "you", "he", etc., but use them very seldom. How do they know, anyway, who is the acting person in a sentence? Besides the context, there are several devices to make this unmistakably clear. One of these devices will be studied in this paper, namely: the politeness level. Many superpolite verbs distinguish clearly whether I or somebody else is acting. They use different nouns for "my wife" and "your wife" without adding the devices for "my" or "your".

In the Japanese language, there are abrupt, formal, neutral superpolite, humble superpolite and honorific superpolite words, grammatical forms and constructions. Some of them are completely independent from the involvement of first, second or third person in the sentence. Others are used only if one or the other of these "persons" is involved. There are no person marker endings in the Japanese verb conjugation, but there are personal pronouns, for instance watakushi 'I', anata 'you'. However, they like to avoid any person marking if the sentence is understandable without it.

How can they do it? Besides the context, the politeness level makes it clear in many sentences who is acting on whom.

In most languages there are 1st, 2nd and 3rd person, i.e., at least three possibilities in singular and three in plural. Some languages distinguish duality. Some other languages distinguish between 'yourselves, including myself' and 'yourselves, excluding myself'. (For instance, Malecite). In Japanese, the use of the person marking devices is reduced to a potential minimum.

Is Japanese understandable, anyway? Of course, it is. If you must choose between A and B, you can do it more easily than choosing among A, B, and C. Some Japanese expressions can refer only or mostly to first person; others, mostly to second or third person. Reducing the number of possibilities means that a little help from the context makes it clear in most sentences who is acting or who is involved.

In certain contexts, particularly in stressing, the personal pronouns watakushi (watashi, boku) 'I', anata (kimi) 'you', etc., are used. E.g., Anata to watashi-wa ii tomodachi desu 'You and I are good friends'.

Sometimes the situation or the meaning of the sentence makes it clear that it refers, for instance, to 'you'. The word for 'you' is not necessarily in the Japanese sentence: Motto takusan hoshii desu-ka? 'Do you wish to have more?'. Word for word it means 'Is still more desirable?'. We do not usually ask such a question about ourselves or a person who is not present. The situation makes it clear that the speaker is addressing somebody who is present, that is 'you' in English or its equivalents in other languages.

In other Japanese sentences, the use of certain words reduces the number of the possibly involved persons. If I use the verb kudasaru (or kureru) 'to give', in most occurrences it means 'give to me'. The verb ageru indicates 'give to you' (sometimes '... to him'), etc.

The politeness level is one of the most common ways of eliminating the necessity of person marking, or reducing it to the minimum.

The nouns denoting relatives distinguish very strictly whether I am speaking about 'my mother' (haha) or 'your mother' (okāsan); ani 'my elder brother', niisan ' your elder brother', chichi 'my father', otōsan 'your father'. The more polite nouns for relatives often have the final syllable -san. This is actually a politeness suffix which can join last names, first names, nouns of occupation and many other words. A -san-ended word can never refer to 'me'. For instance, if they use the combination niisan 'the elder brother', they mean 'your elder brother'. Added to family names, it can be taken for the equivalent of the English words Mr., Mrs., Miss or Ms. But while in English one could say I am Mr. Taylor, a Japanese never uses the suffix -san in speaking about himself. Yamamoto-san means 'Mr. Yamamoto', Uehara-san can denote 'Mrs. Uehara', Umeko-san can mean 'Miss Umeko'. If they buy fish on the market, they usually address the fishmonger sakanaya-san, i.e., "Mr. fishmonger'. In the address forms, the possibility of person is reduced to the second person, even though the word for 'you' is not there in the Japanese sentence. There are many other expressions in which the use of the suffix -san or other politeness devices implies 'you' without person marking, for instance, danna-san 'your husband', 'your honorable husband', literally 'Mr. husband'. If they say otaku-no minasan 'everybody (lit. Mr. everybody) in your honorable house', they again do not use any person marking, but the politeness level indicates that they mean second person.

The honorific prefix o- is another very commonly used device in Japanese. It is not a person marker, but it is never used to denote 'I' or 'mine'. Even though the real meaning of this prefix is something like 'the honorable ...', 'the respectable ...', it is used most commonly when other languages use 'you', 'your', or sometimes 'his, her, their'.

The prefix o- can precede nouns. The noun kuni means 'country'. The combination o-kuni means 'your country'. (Sometimes 'his country'). The noun kaimono means 'shopping'. With the honorific prefix o- it can indicate 'your shopping'. E.g., Kore-kara o-kaimono-ni irashhaimasu-ka? 'Are you going shopping now?'. If I want to ask somebody 'What is your name?' I have to ask: Shitsurei desu ga, o-namae-wa? 'Excuse me, what is your name, please?'. The noun denwa means 'telephone'. If somebody is wanted on the telephone, the polite way of telling him about it is: Shitsurei shimasu. o-denwa desu. 'Excuse me, sir, you are wanted on the telephone'. Lit. 'there is an honorable telephone', no person marker. The polite expressions for 'your house' or 'your husband' are O-uchi or O-taku 'the honorable house'. Asking a person politely whether he has an appointment, one can say: O-yakusoku de gozaimasu-ka? 'Have you an appointment, sir?', again without a person marker or without the word for 'sir'.

How do we know that this prefix o- is not a person marker but an honorific prefix? Because it is used in other situations without reference to any person. They say, for instance, omiya 'shrine' or o-tera 'temple' because they are honorable places. They sometimes call the famous Japanese rice wine o-sake instead of just sake because people like it or at least they respect it. Food or drink is in many expressions an honorable item, no matter whether it is 'yours' or even 'ours'. E.g., O-hiru-ni shimashō 'Let us go and have lunch'.

The prefix o- can precede certain adjectives as well, for instance 'quiet' or 'good'. E.g., O-yoroshii hō desu-ka? 'Are you getting better?' I quote more examples: Mā, o-shizuka-ni 'Be quiet!'. The adjective isogashii means 'busy'. If they say O-isogashii tokoro dōmo arigatō gozaimashita 'Thank you very much for your time when you are so busy'. The word jōzu means 'good in something'. With the honorific prefix o- plus the copula desu, it means 'you are good in it'. E.g., Totemo o-jōzu desu ne "you are very good', 'You do it well'.

The honorific prefix o- precedes stems of verbs in very many polite expressions. The so-called "one stem verbs", "ichidan-verbs", have only one stem, which ends in an i or in an e. The so-called "conjugated" or "five stem verbs" are used with a final i in these expressions. After this stem, there is one more verb in our superpolite constructions. I list here a few possibilities with at least one example for each.

o + stem + copula (2nd person, no person marker). E.g., O-wakari deshita-ka 'Did you understand?'.

o + stem + the polite imperative for 'do'. Second person, no person marker. E.g., O-yasumi-nasai 'Good night (to you)'. Lit. 'Rest well!'

The next type of polite second person without person marker is extremely common in Japanese: o + stem + kudasai (imperative of the verb kudasaru 'give to me'). E.g., Dōzo, o-agari-kudasai 'Please, come in!": Mā, o-kake-kudasai 'Do sit down!'.

The next type of superpolite honorific expression also is very common. This consists of four components: the prefix o + the stem of the main verb + the postpositioned particle -ni + some form of the verb naru 'get', 'get on'. E.g., Ashita-wa nan-ji-goro o-tachi-ni-narimasu ka? "About what time are you leaving tomorrow?'; O-ori-ni-naritai toki-ni-wa botan-o oshite kudasai 'When you wish to get off push the button!".

This type of construction is also rather common when it refers to third person. E.g., Hā, o-wakari-ni-narimasu 'Yes, he understands'. In each occurrence, the context has to make it clear whether the subject is second or third person. First person meaning is impossible in these and other superpolite honorific expressions.

There is another superpolite honorific prefix, go-, which can be used when somebody is speaking about 'you' or 'him', but never about 'me'. It is there in many terms of relationship. E.g., go-kazoku 'your, his, her family'; go-kyōdai 'your, his, her brothers and sisters'; go-shinrui 'your, his, her relatives'.

This prefix can be there before nouns, making them related to 'you'. E.g., Go-shōbai-wa ikaga desu ka? "How is business (i.e., your business)?'; Raishū, taku-e go-shōtai shitai desu 'I wish to invite you to my home for the next week'; Go-tsugō-ga yokereba kyō-no gogo ikaga desu ka" 'This afternoon, if convenient to you'; Hiroku dekimasu kara, go-shimpai naku 'I can make it bigger (lit. wide), so don't worry'.

The prefix go- can precede the word jibun 'myself, yourself, himself', the adverb ishho-ni 'together' and some adjectives. The second person is involved, without person marker, mostly just like 'you', sometimes 'you and me'. E.g., Go-jibun-de shite-mo shite moratte-mo kamaimasen' It does not matter whether you do it yourself or have it done'; Dono-kurai go-byōki deshita-ka? 'How long have you been sick?'; Go-issho-ni dekakemashō 'Let us go together'.

If the prefix go- precedes the stem of a verb, this compound makes a superpolite honorific verb, addressed to a second person, without person marker. E.g., Ano hujin-o go-zonji desu ka? 'Do you know that lady?'.

There are many more superpolite verbs in the Japanese vocabulary without any honorific prefix. The Japanese verbs have abrupt forms, for instance iku 'I go, you go, etc.'; they can be formal, for instance ikimasu 'I go, you go, etc.'. Many verbs have superpolite equivalents as well, which can be either neutral superpolite, humble superpolite or superpolite honorific. Here we meet again a clear distinction between persons without person marker devices. The superpolite honorific verbs are usually addressed to a second person or report about a third person in sentences, while the humble superpolite verbs are used mostly if I am speaking about myself.

I quote a few examples, first for the superpolite honorific verbs: Shitsurei-de gozaimasu ga, kekkon shite irasshaimashita-ka? 'Excuse me, are you married?'; Itte irasshai 'Goodbye' (lit. Going come back!)'; Kinō nasatta to osshaimashita 'He said he did it yesterday'; Biiru-o meshiagarimasu-ka? "Will you have some beer?'.

I quote examples for the superpolite humble verbs, which are used mostly if "I" am the subject, and there is no word for 'I' or any other person marker device in the sentence: Kinō itashimashita 'I did it yesterday'; Ima haiken-shi-tai no desu ga 'Thank you, I will have just a little more'; Itte mairimasu 'I am going'. 'I am leaving'. 'Goodbye'. (Lit. Going I return'. This is said by the person who is leaving home). Yūbe shibai-ni orimashita 'I was at the theatre last night'; Zonjite orimasu 'I know'.

Finally, I would like to make only these brief comments: Most descriptive grammars of Japanese try to create rules how to be polite. But they do not usually connect politeness level with the unmarked first, second or third person. They do not call politeness level "person marker". The native speakers of this language are certainly right. The phenomenon is so complex that the only way to learn it is by learning sentence patterns by heart. I tried to simplify it in the present paper, making attempts to create some rules.

I must say at the end that, in many sentences, at least two persons are involved, for instance, me and you. If they want to say 'I am sorry to have kept you waiting', they still do not necessarily use any person marker devices. The superpolite prefix o- before the causative verb matase- can refer to 'you', while the other verb in the sentence is a humble verb to make it understandable that I am acting: O-matase-itashimashita 'I am sorry to have kept you waiting'.

I finish my paper with another brief superpolite Japanese sentence: Yoku irasshaimashita which means 'I am glad you have come', and I add the well known phrase: Arigatō gozaimashita 'Thank you very much'.

Regional Usage

In

The English of Cape Breton Island

Lilian Falk
Saint Mary's University

ABSTRACT

The present paper examines features of regional usage in the English of Cape Breton, Nova Scotia. Examples of syntactic constructions, grammatical forms, and vocabulary were extracted from one year's edition of Cape Breton's Magazine (1973).

Non-Standard syntax includes especially certain types of extraposition of subject (e.g. my cousin, he made all kinds of knots) and asyndetic constructions. Grammatical forms and constructions include the formation of verb tenses (e.g. get, hear,, (I) says, to refer to the past), plurals of nouns without formal markers, non-standard uses of prepositions (e.g.) into to indicate location, not direction) as well as pronouns, adverbs, and intensifiers. Comparisons with relevant regional word-books and dictionaries point out that most of these grammatical and syntactic features are shared with other parts of Atlantic Canada. Some items of vocabulary are also widely shared (e.g. dinner for midday meal) while others are shared with a specific region; thus, for instance, eyestone is listed in the South Shore Phrase Book, killic in DPEIE and DNE. On the other hand such items as curiosity work or fyke nets point to links with older British usage.

Introduction

The present paper is based on an examination of the stories and interviews in the Collectors' Edition of Cape Breton's Magazine, edited by Ronald Caplan, 1973. Stories served mainly as source of vocabulary items, while the interviews were checked both for vocabulary and grammar. From the hundred and sixty-six pages of text, 473 occurrences of local expressions, grammatical forms and vocabulary items were extracted. Of these, roughly one half were examples of grammatical constructions, the other half of vocabulary. The present paper will deal mainly with the grammar; i.e. with syntax, grammatical constructions, and morphology, the vocabulary being touched upon only briefly.

1. Syntax

The syntax of the interviews does not differ greatly from the syntax of general colloquial English, being characterized by loose rather than periodic sentences, general preference for coordination rather than subordination, and short sentences and clauses. The following, therefore, exemplify only some of the more noticeable features.

Extraposition

One noticeable syntactic construction involves a repetition of the subject as in:

(1) And a boy he brought me that when they were first making the national park F 5:2

(2) My cousin, he made all kinds of knots F 5:2

(3) My older sister, Caroline, she slept in one corner. F 5:15

(4) Everybody that doesn't want a thing, they bring it to me F 5:2

(5) And the old woman in heaven, she told her, she said, "That ring is wrapped up in a rag..." M 6:0

(6) Well the woman who broke my first little cup she died last fall. F 5:2

(7) My cousin, this night, he came to visit grandfather and grandmother. M 5:0

(8) The sun off the water -- some people it used to hurt their eyes. M 4:1

The construction, though rare, is used repeatedly by some speakers. In these examples it occurs when the subject is a noun or pronoun, referring to humans, except <u>the</u> <u>sun</u> 8, whether definite (my cousin) or indefinite (a boy) or a noun with another noun in apposition (my sister, Caroline) or a noun with a prepositional phrase as modifier (in heaven), or even a noun modified by a relative clause 6. While it might appear that indefinite subjects (a boy, everybody) predominate in this construction, 5 and 6 show that a definite subject can also so appear. Except for 5 the tendency is to use it when the subject is introduced for the first time. It remains to be added that the speaker who uses it most frequently, is a resident of Cheticamp whose speech is generally characterized by features which may be attributed to influence of French.

If the repetition of the formal subject may be called extraposition, there is also another form of postponing the subject where the subject is not stated until after the main verb.

(9) Kept putting a little water in her mouth. Mrs. MacLennan did. F 5:17

(10) Get [i.e. he got] about 12 dollars a barrel, he told me. M 4:2

Subordination

An asyndetic construction can occur in sentences starting with <u>there</u> <u>is/was</u>.

(11) There is nobody knows yet what was the meaning it had M 6:0

(12) There were bad things happened there F 5:15

(13) There used to be a train ran from Donkin...to Glace Bay...And there were some blackened their faces. M 3:5 & 6

(14) And there was hundreds used to come here. M 4:4

Parataxis is favored, and it is also common for clauses to be connected by juxtaposition only:

(15) Sometimes you'd go to bed at night the moon would be shining. F 5:16

There can also be sentences where different syntactic constructions become fused:

(16) Anyway, the last boat that came in that fall with supplies for the winter -- didn't that old carcass come back to the island for the boys to eat that winter? F 5:16

In this form the sentence is much more dramatic than if it was completed as *the last boat that came in the fall...brought the old carcass back to the island.

Example 16 shows no formal links between the two parts, no anaphoric pronouns, for instance.

One kind of coordination consists of the use of _except,_ _regardless,_ and _on_ _account_ _of_ in the function of a subordinating conjunction:

(17) Put in the Heel Stay and Toe Stay as in the drawing -- _except_ they are to be drawn fairly snug ... along the inside of the Bow.... M 2:13

(18) You could go and buy until -- until it reached a stage _regardless_ the father was sick, when you went to the company store they had what you call you've drawn up your lot, and if you didn't have enough in to cover for that pound of butter you didn't get it. 3:14

(19) Then I quit school _on_ _account_ _of_ my father had a stroke. M 1:3

Examples 17, 18, 19 can be said to use _except_, _regardless_, and _on account of_ as if they were conjunctions; on the other hand one can consider the clauses _the father was sick my father had a stroke_ as given the function of a phrase without formal elements. Such a view, could perhaps also account for the following:

(20) They got scarce. They started fishing them offshore, is what probably caused that. M 4:4

2. Verbs

Forms

In the uses of verbs standard forms as well as standard constructions predominate. However, non-standard forms occur with some of the speakers, and these are reported below.

Among verbs with known alternative forms only _dive_ and _lie_ show non-standard forms. Atwood states (p. 9) "in the northeastern area _dove_ is almost universal."

(1) This fellow [i.e. the swordfish] went crazy and _dove_ down 60-70 fathom of water. M 4:6

It is possible that _dove_ is used for a sudden plunge, and _dived_ for a plunge performed as a sport or professional activity. But, as this was a single example, the point cannot be supported. A speaker may use both forms of a verb in one continuous utterance, as in 2 below. Atwood (p.18) says that _lie_ predominates, without a clear geographical distribution, and _lay_ is limited to certain communities.

(2) And he said that people were surprised to see the horse where he would be _laying_...they went up close to where the horse would be _lying_ down with the sheep. M 4:13

The form _done_ can indicate the past, especially remote past:

(3) That's the way we _done_ that. M 5:15

The form _done_ comes here at the conclusion of a detailed account of how seals were hunted, long ago.

Atwood (p.43) says that this levelling where the past participle served also as preterite is limited mainly to rung, begun, swum, and seen, done, and taken.

A short interrupted sequence suggests that been can also indicate the past:

(4) Oh, I been...I suppose now 40 years since I knew about that. M 6:5

The forms get, see, and hear can be used in sentences referring to the past, though these verbs then seem to signify a non-specific, tense. Atwood (p.20) notes that see as preterite is common in New England. He does not cite hear or get as preterites, examples of which were found in the present text:

(5) That's the only time 1 hear tell of that. M 4:2

(6) Get about 12 dollars a barrel, he told me [i.e.he got] M 4:2

(7) Then after a while they started putting stands on the little boats. Get a few. They weren't worth a great deal. Nothing was in them days. M 4:2

(8) And then a lot of times you see them and couldn't get them. M 4:1

The forms in examples 5, 6, 7, and 8 are used by the same speaker. More frequent is the use of I says, he says, she says in past narrative. This can be interchanged with I said but for speaker M 5:15 I said occurred only once, in the locution I went in and I said (not followed by direct speech) whereas the five occurrences of direct speech were all preceded by I says/he says as they were in the speech of another speaker. The construction says I did not occur in the present corpus. Attwood (p.26) notes that says I is common in northern New England but I says is more common in southern New England. I heard tell occurs also.

The form come, identified in the Shorter Oxford Dictionary as Present Conjunctive, (archaic and dialectal) occurs as follows:

(9) Come a rough wind you had to get down out of it, get off the mast and steer below. M 4:1

(10) Come in, they'd have two days fishing. M 4:4

Though used by the same speaker, the examples differ, in that 9 resembles more closely the "present conjunctive" use identified by Sh.O., whereas in 10 the subject of come is the same as the subject of the main clause, namely they; therefore the form come may be even seen as a P.Pple., with the sense "when they came in" This use of come is not mentioned by Atwood. Somewhat different from the preceding is the use of present form as a reference to a habitual action in the past:

(11) We were living in the same house, every time he takes the fiddle I hear the tune. After a while, I'm playing by ear. M 1:3

There are some uses of is/was with plural subject, but none of were with the singular. Examples with there is/there was, with the subject following:

(12) There's no boats now; it's all lobster boats. There was about nine swordfishing boats there in Neil's Harbour....There was nine just there alone, and there was hundreds used to come there. M 4:4

(13) There was four or five of us on the oars. M 5:15

Plural subject followed by was:

(14) Me and the cook was pretty good friends. M 5:15

(15) See, the ones that wasn't fattened he wouldn't put the rods to. 6:15

Noteworthy also is the following construction:

(16) And many's the man that when payday would come he wouldn't have any pay. M 3:3

Forms of Infinitive and Present Participle:

In the present text the infinitive takes the usual standard forms, except for two speakers, who use the form for to verb repeatedly. Atwood (p.34) mentions it as frequent in n.e. New England, and further south along the Southern coast.

(17) Back in the Bible ... where Jacob put the rods in the tubs for to turn the animals in the different colors... M 6:5

(18) You'd have to hunt. You may have quite a bit for to find one. M 6:7

(19) When we killed the pig late in the fall we always took the bristles for to have to sew. You took the bristles before you scalded it for to clean it. M 6:5

All these instances of infinitive with for to occur with the sense of purpose or intent. Yet, even with these two speakers the for to forms are the exception, rather than the rule.

The form a+ Present Participle occurred once only. Atwood mentions it as widely distributed.

(20) And the light kept a-going for over five hours. F 5:18

This sentence carries a great emphasis regarding the fact that the light continued to function in spite of fears to the contrary. However, the one example does not provide sufficient background for conclusions.

Constructions with Verbs:

A rather older construction with never saw occurs where modern standard is likely to use have never seen.

(21) I have seen a lot, but I never saw one like this. [about a cougar] M 2:19

This use is similar to Jane Bennet's enthusiastic description of Mr. Bingley:

(22) He is just what a young man ought to be ... sensible, good humored, lively; and I never saw such happy manners!
Jane Austen, Pride and Prejudice Chap. 4.

Similar examples can be adduced from Samuel Pepys, as in his famous quip about a performance of Midsummer Night's Dream: "it is the most insipid ridiculous play that ever I saw in my life. (Entry, 29 Sept. 1662)

This construction appears to have the force of a very strong assertion, whether affirmative or negative, and it is used by speakers who ordinarily would use I have (not) seen in un-emphatic use. This particular emphatic force would account for its use with the first person singular pronoun, and not with other pronouns.

While conditional sentences usually follow the pattern of Standard, the following show the use of would or would have in both parts of the sentence.

(23) I was frightened if I'd fall asleep, that I wouldn't get up. [to wind the light in the lighthouse]
F 5:17

(24) And a fellow came in there half-drunk and put a bureau on his back and walked out through the door. He fell 30 feet. If he'd've been sober he'd've broke his neck but he didn't get hurt.
[broke has wide distribution, Atwood, p.7] M 3:6

A construction with since also can show a pattern diverging from standard:

(25) Well, I'll bet it's been 45 years since I didn't make that. [i.e. "wax" from tar and resin] M 4:17

Where standard is more likely to have "45 years since I made that" or: "45 years that I haven't made any."

3. Adjectives, Adverbs, and Intensifiers

While the word-order with respect to modifiers must be treated separately, (e.g. this was the only really time we did that), it can be said here that familiar adverbs often have no formal adverbial ending or adverbial form, as in

(1) They came back in the spring and brought their families. But they did not do _too_ _good_ there. M 1:12

(2) And you pull the hair off the hide. It'll come off _easy_. M 6:16

(3) They pretty _near_ starved to death. M 1:12

The use of adjective-complement is also frequent, where Standard would perhaps favor an adverb:

(4) It would break _square_ M 5:10

(5) All ships are built _different_ M 6:3

(6) If you don't sharpen it _too_ _coarse_... M 6:13

(7) ...take an old fashioned jack plane -- you turn it bottom up and you set it _coarse_ _like_...

Plenty was found once to occur in the comparative form:

(8) Where the swordfish turned to be _plentier_ was what they called the Edge, on the edge of the bank. M 4:4

And _a_ _lot_ was found to serve in adverbial, perhaps temporal, function:

(9) And _a_ _lot_ they get under the water; they don't show their fins at all ... M 4:1

Of the familiar colloquial intensifiers the following are favored:

too (as in _not_ _too_ _good_), _awful_ (as in _awful_ _lonesome_), _pretty_ (as in _pretty_ _near_), and _right_ (as in _right_ _hot_).

Right as intensifier, in the dozen or so occurrences attested here, refers to actions and events rather than to static condition.

(10) You take lime and put it in a barrel and put water on it and it will just boil. Then it will start to shake out and it gets _right_ _hot_. M 6:16

After several utterances with _right_ (cut it _right_ around, slit it _right_ down, spread it _right_ out with a layer of bark, put it <u>right</u> there) the speaker says:

(11) And it's quite thick.

The chief distinction is that uses like <u>right hot</u> indicate a process or result of a process, but <u>quite thick</u>, indicates a static condition.

The adverbial forms <u>anyways</u>, <u>anywheres</u> and <u>often times</u> alternate with the standard forms <u>anyway</u>, <u>anywhere</u> and <u>often</u>. Adjectives can be intensified by reduplication, or use of synonyms, as <u>strange strange sight</u> (2:0) <u>great big</u> bedroom (5:15); <u>great big</u> chunks (5:11); a nice <u>great big</u> fresh halibut (5:19); and even a <u>great big-mouthed</u> woman (5:25) but also <u>small little</u> five cent pieces (6:7).

4. Pronouns

Some notable features of pronouns include the use of <u>she</u> with reference to boats, ships, and even a ferry, by both male and female speakers, with one occurrence with reference to a pocket.

(1) You wouldn't have that in your pocket...I'd have to take one quarter out of <u>her</u>... M 6:7

<u>He</u> is often used to refer to a fish (swordfish) or a seal, or even a bird (heron), in contexts where they are seen as adversary, object of hunt, or 'friend', respectively. A king fisher is once referred to as <u>she</u>. The context shows that the swordfish in question was actually female; the others were not determined by context in this respect.

<u>Them</u>

Demonstrative use of <u>them</u> is infrequent, and tends to occur in set expressions, as (<u>in</u>) <u>them</u> days, <u>them fellows</u>, usually when the following noun is an object:

(2) Well, you remember <u>them</u> small little five cent pieces? M 6:7

or when it is a subject.

(3) And <u>them</u> fellows said by Jesus what are we doing here? M 3:5

Even more rare is the use of <u>this</u> in introductory phrases.

(4) And we were in this big great bedroom... F 5:15

It occurs in two stories of the supernatural and seems to increase the effect of facing the dangerous unknown.

5. Prepositions

One of the noticeable forms of prepositions is <u>onto</u> in the sense of 'to' - especially after <u>come</u> and <u>go</u>:

(1) ...they had come <u>onto</u> the main street where they had a big wooden platform built. M 5:9

The other one is <u>into</u> which tends to indicate location rather than direction:

(2) There's a dot of gold <u>into</u> it... M 6:7

(3) His son went <u>into</u> a ship...he went to Australia. M 1:12

The preposition <u>of</u> alternates with <u>off</u> <u>of</u> as in

(4) And you pull that hair <u>off</u> <u>of</u> the hide.

<u>At,</u> <u>on,</u> can come after certain verbs, e.g.

(5) ...where I'm standing at. M 6:5

(6) His house is where the Gaelic College is at ... M 1:11

(7) ...when you were hired <u>on</u>... 3:3

Omission of prepositions can be noted as follows:

(8) Plant a couple seeds 3:8 [cf. couple of]

(9) Cut both places 5:17 [cf. cut in/at]

(10) You were notified a certain day 3:4 [cf. on a certain day]

The use of <u>to</u> is favoured in such expressions as these:

(11) This was no great difference to what we'd already done. M 6:21

(12) He was so hard to work M 4:13

(13) To my mind it gives you a lighter color... M 6:15

In indicating geographical locations in and at often combine with up, so that up in, up at are frequently used:

(14) They were lobster fishing up in their towns. M 4:4

(15) You've heard of him I guess. He was up at St. Ann's. M 1:11

There were no similar examples with down in/at. While it is difficult to draw a clear-cut contrast between up and down, up tends to indicate location farther from the speaker (e.g. up in the States) and down closer by. Thus down here, down north, are quite common as is come down.

At and in alternate with place names, at occuring with both smaller and larger communities. (at Wreck Cove; at Sydney). In Cape Breton alternates with On Cape Breton. Back of is similar in meaning to standard behind: [He] discovered it in the yard back of the new co-op building. 5:11

6. Nouns

For the most part nouns show the usual forms of singular and plural, except in certain words referring to fish and animals, and in the words pair and foot (as measure) which may have an unchanged plural.

Other examples are:

(1) Swordfish come to the surface. They're not up all the time. M 4:1

(2) There wasn't many fish M 4:2

(3) The Lynx seem to travel in families. 2:22

(4) You'd have to go out and get among the seal -- they

were thick, thousands of them. M 5:14

(5) [The Lynx] also eat mice, muskrats, beavers, moose, caribou, cow, sheep, deer -- almost any living creature they can overcome, including frogs, snakes, birds, and insects. 2:24

7. Vocabulary

Since space does not permit to deal with vocabulary in detail, only selected examples will be considered, especially in comparison with listings in dictionaries of the Eastern region.
One hundred and ninety-two words were checked against SSPB DPEIE, DNE, and some also in DARE. Of these, 18 were listed in SSPB, 28 in DPEIE, 42 in DNE (not counting words in DNE which were listed, but in a sense so different, that comparison was not instructive; e.g. C.B. bottle 'to make preserves'; in DNE bottle-arse-spider 'common spider with bulbous body' (which would bring rain if you killed it).

While none of the CB words are listed in all three dictionaries, listings in one or two of them are of interest. Among the words also listed in SSPB one notes Boston States, cellar [porch], cramp [knot], eyestone, to fire 'fling', and warming closet.

Listed in DPEIE are Boston States, box socials, brushing the ice, dish (as container, rather than 'a plate') frolic, ice cake, kellic, mocan (CB mogan), stock skates, weather 'storm'. And in DNE there are these words: cramp [knot], crutch (in CB, 'Y type of branch'), killic, kettle, machine (as a general word when the speaker cannot recall the exact one), mog (C.B. mogans) Pancake Night, rand 'cord', rot, v. (of ice), (C.B. of water), stand n. in fishing, sulky n. 'a carriage' weather 'storm'.

While the inclusion of the above words in the respective dictionaries attests to their currency in the given region, the omission of certain other words does not signify their absence in the region, and may rather be a result of editorial decisions in the case of words with wide distribution in the Atlantic region.

Nevertheless, certain words, found in the present text, and absent in the regional dictionaries, are of some interest. These include:

bobtail paycheck 'a slip showing that the worker's pay was taken by the company store'

burl 'a knot on a tree', couch, crooked knife (squaw knife), crotch 'a sawhorse to skin a lamb on', curiosity work 'a hobby', dinner 'midday meal', earthbound 'a spirit', to fin (of swordfish), fyke nets, labasagan (squaw knife), manure (a euphemism), reiteach 'an engagement', saucy 'having too much liquid' (of preserves), Scotch (of people), stew meat (cf stewing meat), stone (of rock), to take a pain, waltes 'a traditional Indian game'.

CONCLUSION

The present inquiry shows that while the speech of Cape Breton is not unique in either syntax, grammar, or vocabulary, it nevertheless occupies an important position among the varieties of the Atlantic Region, sharing, as it does, its features with other regions, and showing itself unique in the particular blend of regional features to be found "on the Island."

REFERENCES

ATWOOD, E. Bagby. A Survey of Verb Forms in the Eastern United States. Ann Arbor: U. of Michigan Press, (1953) 1967.

CAPLAN, Ronald, Ed. A Collectors' Edition of Cape Breton's Magazine. Wreck Cove, Cape Breton, Nova Scotia, 1973.

POTEET, L.J. The South Shore Phrase Book. Hantsport, Nova Scotia: Lancelot Press, 1985.

PRATT, T.K. Dictionary of Prince Edward Island English. Toronto: U. of Toronto Press, 1988.

STORY, G.M., W.J. Kirwin, and J.D.A. Widdowson. Dictionary of Newfoundland English. Toronto: U. of Toronto Press, 1982.

RATES OF LEXICAL CHANGE IN EGYPTIAN AND SEMITIC

Ronald Cosper
Saint Mary's University

ABSTRACT

Rates of lexical change were studied for Egyptian and Semitic languages with a written historical form. Sampling is more adequate in that 200 words are used, rather than 100. More statistical sensitivity is used in the calculation of percentages of cognates. The statistic R (percentage of lexical retention per millenium) is calculated for 4 Semitic groupings (Ethiopic, South Arabian, West Aramaic and East Aramaic) and for Egyptian. For the Semitic family, R is calculated as equalling 62.7 %. For Egyptian, R equals 69.6 %. These differences are not statistically significant (t = 1.76), although the (insignificantly) higher figure for Egyptian may be related to greater linguistic isolation, and to the powerful and continuing written tradition.

Introduction

Studying rates of lexical change is probably now out of fashion, although it was quite the rage only a decade or two ago. Today, statistical analyses of cognates in related languages are used mainly as indicators of relative closeness of relationship in a genetic "tree" of dispersed languages, and even this use is not without its detractors. Of course, the reasons for the decline of glottochronology are well known: the presumed untenability of the assumption of uniform rates of change, difficulties of selection of meanings, the assumption of a core vocabulary more resistant to borrowing and other sources of change, difficulties in recognition of cognates, diminishing base of shared lexicon over a few centuries, and difficulties in identifying lexemes of equivalent meaning in various languages, to name some of the major objections raised.

It is not the purpose of this paper to advocate or apply the technique of glottochronology. It is rather to empirically investigate perhaps the major stumbling block of the approach:

that is, how rapidly are words replaced in a language? Is the rate of change uniform or variable? Do related languages have similar rates of lexical change? In the process of carrying out this investigation, other issues in lexicostatistics will also be investigated, such as sample size, and assessment and measurment of relatedness, in particular.

In this paper, the languages to be investigated belong to the Afro-Asiatic family. Most comparative work, particularly in relation to rates of lexical change, has been done on Indo-European, because these languages, in their historical as well as modern forms, have been the best known to Western researchers. Afro-Asiatic, however, is also an ideal candidate for this type of study, because several languages have known historical and contemporary forms. Biblical Semitic has, of course, been known to Western scholars for a long time, but other historical and contemporary Semitic languages are rapidly becoming better documented. In addition, since the decipherment of Egyptian hieroglyphics, materials in Ancient Egyptian have become more complete, and Coptic provides a more recent point of comparison. Little is known of historical representatives of other branches of Afro-Asiatic, such as Cushitic, Chadic, Berber or Omotic, although it is possible that additional discoveries in regard to such languages as ancient Libyan, Meroitic and Guanche may partially remedy this situation.

Languages to be Investigated

The present paper is an analysis of the rate of lexical replacement in several Afro-Asiatic languages. Sufficient data exist for Egyptian, and four branches of Semitic, three of which are represented by two languages each. In the case of Egyptian, texts range over a period of many centuries, but the classical form of Middle Egyptian is the period selected as "Time 1" for the comparison; texts are assumed to reflect, on the average, the state of the language at approximately 1700 B.C. Coptic reflects a later period of the the language, after contact with the Koine of the Greek Mediterranean had led to the development of a distinctive, standardized script. In this paper the Sahidic dialect is used, and available glossaries are assumed to reflect the state of the language in about 300 A.D. The basic source for Middle Egyptian is Faulkner (1981), together with Shennum's (1977) index to this dictionary; additional words were located in Budge (1978). For Coptic, Smith's (1983) lexicon was used, and additional materials were drawn from Crum (1939) and Walters (1972).

One of the branches of the Semitic languages is the Northern or Northeastern one (Akkadian), which is now extinct. Given sufficient precision of dating of texts and systematic glossaries from earlier and later periods, it might be possible to analyze lexical change in this branch, but this problem is beyond the more narrow objectives and resources of the present effort. In the Northwest Semitic languages, two representatives are selected for study: East and West Aramaic. The presumed ancestral form of East Aramaic in this research is taken as represented by classical Mandaic. This language is represented by texts dating on the average perhaps to 500 a.d. Several dialects existed that were fairly close to one another. In general, our source for classical Mandaic is the dictionary of Drower and Macuch, although occasionally Babylonian (Kutscher, 1967) or Syriac (Köbert, 1967) forms are used. Two modern forms of Eastern Aramaic are used for this analysis. One is the dialect of Ahwāz, in Iran, which relies on the vocabulary of Macuch (1965). The other is the Jewish Aramaic of Azerbaijan, as described by Garbell (1965).

In the case of West Aramaic, for which materials are sparse, the historical language was Samaritan, as spoken in approximately 400 A.D. The sources of vocabulary for West Aramaic were Ben-Hayyim (1967), with supplementary data from Nichols (1858) and Koehler and Baumgartner (1958). The modern form of West Aramaic is that spoken today in the village of Ma'lūla, in Syria, as described by Spitaler (1967).

Several comparisons are also made for the Southeast Semitic languages. Old South Arabian is attested in texts called "Sabaic", which date from the sixth century B.C. to the sixth century of the modern era. Our data are derived largely from Beeston, et al. (1982). Two contemporary forms of South Arabian are compared to Sabaic; these are Mehri, as described by Johnstone (1987) and Ḥarsūsi, a numerically more important language which Johnstone had already documented in 1977. Ethiopic languages are also classed together with the Southeast (or sometimes "Southwest" or perhaps more properly *Southern*) Semitic languages. The well-attested forbearer is Ge'ez, the classical Ethiopic language which can be perhaps be assigned an average date of 700 A.D. for the spoken form; data for Ge'ez come from Lambdin (1978). Ge'ez is compared to two modern Ethiopic languages: Amharic, as discribed by Leslau (1976), and the Beni Amer dialect of Tigre (Nakano and Tsuge, 1982).

Technique of Lexical Comparison

The present research uses a slightly modified version of the Swadesh 200-word list of core vocabulary. (See Swadesh, 1955.) Modifications were introduced to take into account regional peculiarities of a largely geographical sort (i.e., *moon* instead of *cold*; *knee* instead of *fog*; *claw* instead of *ice*; *full* instead of *snow*; *horn* instead of *woods*). The techniques employed are based on those outlined by Gudschinsky (1956). If possible, the most frequently occurring form corresponding semantically to the English word is selected. If there is more than one word of similar meaning, and it is impossible to decide on the semantically best or most frequently occurring one, then both or all are listed.

The method of scoring cognates I used also contains a major innovation: partial cognate status is identified by a fraction between 0 and 1. For example, in Ge'ez, two verbs for 'burn' were in use: *ḥarra* and *nadda*. My data indicates that one of these terms survived in Amharic: *nä̃ddä̃dä̃*; consequently, this correspondance gets a rating of 1/2, rather than 1, since only 1 of the 2 Ge'ez terms corresponds to a form in Amharic. A fractional rating an also be given if the phonological correspondance is not close, but there is still a chance of cognate status. This is especially important for languages with histories that are poorly known. For example, in Sabaic the word for blood is the common Semitic root *DM*. In Mehri, the form *dor* gets a rating of 1/2, because the degree of resemblance does not permit confident matching. If principles governing sound change are known for the languages in question, these can be applied; otherwise it is necessary to rely on more superficial criteria of phonetic similarity.

The rate of retention per millenium is calculated according to the following formula:

$$\ln R = \frac{\ln C,}{t}$$

where t is the time separation in millenia, C is the percentage of cognates, and R is the rate of lexical retention. (ln refers to natural logarithms.)

Statistical comparisons between rates were made using T-tests, for which sample size is the number of words with data known for both languages. For example, data were available for

196 of the 200 words for Middle Egyptian and Coptic, and for only 69 of 200 words for Sabaic and Mehri. (Knowledge of Sabaic comes largely from monumental inscriptions, which have, of course, a limited range of vocabulary items.)

Results

Results of the lexicostatistical calculations are shown in Table 2. The rate for Egyptian is 0.696, while the average rate for Semitic is less-- at 0.627. This difference is not statistically significant, although Student's T is calculated at 1.76. (For a 2-tailed test to be significant at the .05 level, T would have to be equal to or greater than 1.96.)

Data for individual Semitic comparisons lend credence to the overall average, for, in each save West Aramaic, the Semitic rates are consistently lower than the Egyptian rate. It is perhaps noteworthy that the figure for West Aramaic is also based on only 67 comparisons out of 200, due to inadequate data.

The results also support the idea that closely related languages tend to have similar rates of lexical retention. The uniformity of the rates for Southeast Semitic is especially interesting; their range is very narrow around the mean of 0.610-- from 0.603 for Sabaic and Mehri to 0.617 for Ge'ez and Amharic. The rates for Ethiopic and South Arabian are almost identical, thereby suggesting that genetic similarity, rather than geographical propinquity, may be the key factor.

The rates of lexical retention for Northwest Semitic are more variable, but generally higher than those of the Southeast, and lower than that of Egyptian.

When the average of Semitic and Egyptian is taken, it comes out to be 0.661, which we tentatively call "Afro-Asiatic R", although, of course, the figure is based on only two of the six families of A-A. In order to compare these results to Indo-European, the identical technique was applied to calculating a rate of retention for English, as between Old and New English, and R turns out to be 0.621, very close to the Semitic average. (Data for Old English-- Late West Saxon-- are from Jember, 1975, and Sweet, 1963.)

Discussion

It is interesting that the rates of retention we have found for Egyptian and Semitic are generally lower than the R statistics obtained by early workers in lexicostatistics. Lees (1953) proposed an average R of 0.81, and subsequent researchers have generally taken this as the figure for 200-word lists, and .86 as the rate for lists of 100 core vocabulary items. More lexicostatistical work has been done using lists of 100 words, but the longer lists would seem, at least statistically, to have more reliability. Generally sampling error varies inversely as the square root of sample size, so that the error in the samples of 200 is 1.41 times smaller.

Specifically, Lees reports a rate of lexical retention of 0.760 for Egyptian, compared to our rate of 0.696. He, however, separates Middle Eyptian and Coptic by a time of 2.2 millenia, whereas I used an estimate of 2.0. Lees assigns a date of 300 A.D. to Coptic, as do we, but he uses Middle Eyptian texts that range from 2100 to 1700 B.C., whereas I assigned the date 1700 B.C. to mine. It may be more accurate to use 400 A.D. for spoken Coptic, which would tend to increase still further the rate of retention of Eyptian.

Much less work has been done on the lexicostatistics of Semitic-- the exception being Ethiopic. Bender (1968) compares Ge'ez with Tigre, Tigrinya and Amharic, assigning the date of 750 A.D. to Ge'ez, compared with our 700 A.D. His cognate percentages, using a 100-word list, were, for Ge'ez and Tigre, 0.70, and for Ge'ez and Amharic, 0.67. These figures would correspond to R's of 0.743 and 0.716, respectively. The present study, in comparison, found lower R's for Ethiopic, being 0.607 for Tigre and 0.617 for Amharic. Had Bender used a date of 700, also, his figures would have increased to 0.757 for Tigre and 0.731 for Amharic. Cohen (1970: 23-24) reports even higher rates of retention for Ethiopic, using a modified word list which he claims is better adapted to Semitic, and he obtains higher percentages of cognates.

It is likely that the lower rates of retention found in the present research result from the use of larger samples and from diffrences in methods of analysis. For example, some investigators either ignore amgiguous cognates, count them as non-agreeing, or may tend to score them as cognates. In the method used here, it is possible to give partial scores to these ambiguous pairs, which may tend to lower the overall percentage of cognates. Higher scores may also result when researchers select only one equivalent, when there may two or more available. They may tend to select the equivalent that is a cognate of the word in related languages, and this (even unconscious) selectivity would tend to raise the apparent rate of retention. I would argue that the method used here of partial scoring and permitting multiple equivalencies gives a more valid indication of the actual degree of correspondance and the rate of retention. This method of scoring is also less arbitrary and probably yields more stable and reliable results.

Any statistical procedure involves an error due to sampling. In the present work, the size of the error depends on the number of items in the sample of vocabulary. In the case of Egyptian, for example, C, the percentage of cognates, is 0.4847 + 0.0700; consequently, R could vary between 0.644 and 0.745, at a confidence level of 95 %. For Semitic, R is averaged over several languages, so the confidence interval is smaller, being 0.627 + 0.030.

Our test for Old English (presumably Late West Saxon) yielded an R of 0.621, while Lees reported a figure of 0.766. Again the lower value results from the method used, and I believe the lower estimates more accurately reflect the rate of lexical replacement occurring in languages. In selecting among synonyms, it is too easy to select the cognate rather than the most frequently occurring form or easier than listing all plausible synonyms in the absence of an indication of frequency. I would note that in this test, an inventory of word frequencies for Old English was used to select the most usual lexeme (Madden and Magoun, 1957; Bessinger, 1960).

In sum, then, in this paper, it has been demonstrated that the technique of lexicostatistical comparison developed here yields consistent results within language families. Moreover, differences between families are not statistically significant, although such differences *approach* significance. It has also been shown that the particular coefficients obtained depend on the methodology used. Therefor, it is not easy to make comparisons among results obtained by researchers when different techniques have been employed. Nevertheless, it should be possible to make some estimates of the time-depth of language diversification using the technique developed here.

The differences between Egyptian and Semitic approach statistical significance, and one is tempted to attribute the slower rate of change of Egyptian to its traditional isolation, and to its long standing literary tradition, which may have acted as a conservative force on lexical retention. Semitic languages and dialects, in contrast, for much of this period, were unwritten and the people were less settled and more in contact with outsiders. There is also increasing evidence for invasions of external elements into the Near East, from the well-known incursions of Persians to the archaeologically probable arrival of Indo-Europeans at an earlier date. Contact with such languages as Sumerian, Dravidian, Hittite and Hurrian has also been demonstrated. In later times, which really are more the concern of this paper, empires have come and gone, and some Semitic tongues have been dispersed to Africa and Iran, where there has been much contact with other indigenous languages, such as Cushitic and Turkic. Although Egypt has been subject to conquest in the later period, the numerical superiority and political position of the Egyptians guaranteed their predominance until the Islamic conquest.

REFERENCES

Beeston, A.F.L., M.A. Ghul, W.W. Muller, and J. Ryckman. 1982. *Dictionnaire Sabéen (Anglais-Francais-Arabe).* Beyrouth: Librairie du Liban.

Bender, Marvin L. 1966. "Notes on Lexical Correlations in Some Ethiopian Languages". *Journal of Ethiopian Studies* 4.5-16.

Bender, Marvin L. 1969. "Remarks on Glottochronology of Northern Ethiopian Semitic Languages". *Journal of Ethiopian Studies* 6.1-8.

Bessinger, J.B. 1960. *A Short Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon Poetry.* Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Budge, E.A. Wallis. 1978. *An Egyptian Hieroglyphic Dictionary.* (originally 1926). New York: Dover Publications.

Cohen, David. *Etudes de Linguistique Sémitique et Arabe.* The Hague: Mouton.

Crum, W. E. 1939. *A Coptic Dictionary.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Drover, E. S. and R. Macuch. 1963. *A Mandaic Dictionary.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Faulkner, Raymond Oliver. 1981. *A Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian.* Oxford: Griffith Institute, Ashmolean Museum.

Garbell, Irene. 1965. *The Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Persian Azerbaijan.* The Hague: Mouton.

Gudzhinsky, Sarah. 1956. "The ABC's of Lexicostatistics (Glottochronology)." Word. 12.175-210.

Jember, Gregory K. 1975. *English-Old English, Old English-English Dictionary.* Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

Johnstone, T.M. 1977. *Ḥarsūsi Lexicon and English-Ḥarsūsi WordList.* London: Oxford University Press.

Johnstone, T.M. 1987. *Mehri Lexicon and English-Mehri Word-List.* London: University of London School of Oriental and African Studies.

Kobert, Raimund. 1967. "Syriac." *An Aramaic Handbook,* ed. by Franz Rosenthal, Part II/2, 29-58. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Koehler, Ludwig and W. Baumgartner. 1958. *Supplementum ad Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros.* Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Kutscher, Eduard Yechezkel. 1967. "Babylonian Talmudic", *An Aramaic Handbook,* ed. by Franz Rosenthal, Part II/2, 59-66. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Lambdin, Thomas O. 1978. *Introduction to Classical Ethiopic (Ge'ez).* Missoula, U.S.A. Scholar's Press.

Lees, Robert B. 1953. "The Basis of Glottochronology." *Language.* 29.113-127.

Leslau, Wolf. 1976. *Concise Amharic Dictionary.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Macuch, Rudolf. 1965. *Handbook of Classical and Modern Mandaic.* Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Madden, John F. and Francis P. Magoun. 1957. *A Grouped Frequency Word-List of Anglo-Saxon Poetry.* Cambridge, United States of America: Harvard University, Department of English.

Nakano, Aki'o and Yoichi Tsuge. 1982. *A Vocabulary of Beni Amer Dialect of Tigre.* Tokyo: Tokyo University of Foreign Studies, Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.

Nichols, G. F. 1858. *A Grammar of the Samaritan Language, with Extracts and Vocabulary.* London: Samuel Bagster and Sons.

Shennum, David. 1977. *English-Egyptian Index of Faulkner's Concise Dictionary of Middle Egyptian.* Malibu: Undena.

Smith, Richard. 1983. *A Concise Coptic-English Lexicon.* Grand Rapids, U.S.A: William B. Eendmans Publishing.

Spitaler, Anton. 1967. "The Aramaic Dialect of Ma'lula." *An Aramaic Handbook,* ed. by Franz Rosenthal, Part II/2, 82-96. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.

Swadesh, Morris. 1955. "Towards Greater Accuracy in Lexico-Statistic Dating." *International Journal of American Linguistics.* 21.121-137.

Sweet, Henry. 1963. *The Student's Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon.* Oxford: The Clarendon Press (originally 1896).

Walters, C. C. 1972. *An Elementary Coptic Grammar of the Sahidic Dialect.* Oxford: Blackwell.

TABLE 1

LEXICAL RETENTION IN EGYPTIAN

	English	Middle Egyptian	Coptic (Sahidic)	Rating
1.	all	nb	nim; tēp-	1\4
	and	ḥnꜥ	aū; m̄n	0
	animal	ꜥby; ꜥ3m	tb̄nē	0
	ashes	ss	kr̄mes	0
	at	r; ḫr	e, a; erɔ, ara	1
	back	s3; i3t	soi (L.)	1/2
	bad	bin; ḏw	βōn; thɔ; hw	1
	bark	gg		
	because	ḫr	eβɔl je-; etβe je	0
10.	belly	ẖt	hē, hēt	1
	big	ꜥ3(wr)	nasu; aiai	1/2
	bird	3pd	halēt	0
	bite	psḥ	loks; pohs	1/2
	black	km	kēm, kmɔm	1
	blood	snfw	snɔf	1
	blow	nf3	nife	1
	bone	ḳs	kas	1
	breathe	ẖnm	nife	.0
	burn	m3ẖ	muh; pokh; fjf	1/3
20.	child	ms	lelu; šere; keke	0
	cloud	igp	klɔɔle; ǧepe	1/2
	(moon)	iꜥḥ	ɔɔh	1
	come	ii	ei	1
	count	ḥsb	ep	1/2
	cut	ḥsḳ	šɔtšl; ǧoojej; jej	0
	day	sw; hrw	hɔu	1/2
	die	m(w)t	mu, mut	1
	dig	š3d	pɔlpl; šok; ǧoje	0
	dirty	ḥwd3	čɔrch (L.)	0
30.	dog	iw	uhɔr	1
	drink	sw(r)i	so	1
	dry	šw	bošt̄	0
	dust	ḫmw	kr̄mes; šɔeiš	0
	ear	msḏr	maaje	1
	earth	ha st; t	eitn̄; tɔ; kah	1/2
	eat	wnm	um	1
	egg	swḥt	suhe	1
	eye	irt	bal; eiat	1/2
40.	fall	h3	he	1
	far	w3	ue	1
	fat-grease	ꜥḏ	ōt	1
	father	it	eiɔt	1
	fear	snḏ	šlah; r̄ hɔte	1/2

		Middle Egyptian	Coptic (Sahidic)	
	feather	ɔhwt	mchε	0
	few	ˁnd	kuiñ; ǧɔpε	0
	fight	ˁḥ3; šfˁ	misε; ton	0
	fire	ḫt	krɔm; koht; satε	1/3
	fish	rm	tβt	0
50.	five	diw	tε	1
	float	nmi	neeβε	1/2
	flow	ḥdi	pɔht; šol; hatε	1/2
	flower	ḥrrt; wnb	hrērε	1/2
	fly (v)	p3; ˁḥi	hal	1/4
	(knee)	pd; m 3st	kllε; pat	1/2
	foot	rd	wεrētε	1
	four	fdw	ftū	1
	(breast)	mnd	ekipε; mεsthēt	0
	fruit	dkr	utah	0
60.	give	(r)di	ti	1
	good	nfr	nanu; nεfr	1/2
	grass	šnw	ɔim	1/2
	green	w3ḏ	ut	1
	guts	k3b	maht	0
	hair	šm3	fō	0
	hand	dt, ḏrt	tore; ǧij	1/2
	he	sw, -f	ntɔf	1
	head	tp	ape	0
70.	hear	sḏm	jisme; sotm̄	1/2
	heart	ib	hēt	0
	heavy	dns	hrɔš	0
	here	ˁ3	(h)n̄nεεima; tai	0
	hit	sḥi	klps; soš; roht	1/3
	hold-take	šsp	čope	1
	how?	ib	aš nhε	1/2
	hunt	bḥs; grg	šorǧ	1/2
	husband	hi	hut	1
	I	ink	anɔk	1
	(claw)	ˁnt	εib	0
80.	if	ir	šopε	0
	in	m	hn̄; n̄het	0
	kill	sm3; ḥḏb	mut; hotβ	1/2
	know	rḫ	εimε; sun	0
	lake	š	samnt	1/2
	laugh	sbṯ	sōbε	1
	leaf	ḏrḏ	joopε	0
	left (side)	i3bi	hbur	1
	leg	wˁrt	uerētε	1
	lie	sḏr	n̄kotk̄	0
90.	live	ˁnḫ	rahε; unh	1/2

		Middle Egyptian	Coptic (Sahidic)	
	liver	mist	mouse	1
	long	3w	siai	0
	louse	pai	hlōm	0
	man-male	ṯ3y;s	hut	0
	many	ʿš3	mate;hah;nasu	0
	meat,flesh	iwf	af	1
	mother	mwt	mau	1
	mountain	ḏw	tu	1
	mouth	r	pɔ;taprɔ	0
100.	name	rn	ran	1
	narrow	g3w;ḫns	ǧu	1/2
	near	tkn	sahē	0
	neck	nḥbt	makh	0
	new	m3w	βr̄rɛ;šai	0
	night	grḥ;ḫ3wy	ušē;ǧurh	1/2
	nose	fnd	sa	0
	not	n	an	1
	old	i3w;is;nḫḫ	as	1/3
	one	wʿ	ua	1
110.	other	ky	kɜ	1
	person	s	rōme	0
	play	ḥbʿ	sōbe	1/2
	pull	sṯɛ	sōk	1
	push	win	βōrɛ	0
	rain,v.	hwi	hu	1
	red	ḏsr	torš	1
	right (correct)	m3ʿ	nanou	0
	right (side)	inm	unam	1
	river	itrw	iɛrɔ	1
120.	road	w3t	mɔɛit;hie;hutn̄	0
	root	w3b	nunɛ	0
	rope	nwh	nuh	1
	rotten	ḥw3;rpw;ʿw3	lɔf lF	1/3
	rub	sin	hitɛ	0
	salt	ḥm3t	mlh;hmu	1/2
	sand	šʿy	šo	1/2
	say	ḏd	jo	0
	scratch	3ḥʿ	hɛk;hoh	1
	sea	ym	ɛiom	1
130.	see	m33	nau	0
	seed	prt	βlβilɛ;ɛpra	1
	sew	idr	tōrp	1/2
	sharp	spd	tōm	0
	short	šrr	šar	1
	sing	ḥsi	hōs	1/2

		Middle Egyptian	Coptic (Sahidic)	
	sit	ḥmsi	hmoos	1
	skin	inm	šaar	0
	sky	pt	pε	1
	sleep	ʿʿwy	nkɔt; opš; hinep	0
140.	small	nḏs; ktt; šri	kuiṉ; šēm; sirε	1/3
	smell	ḫnm; sn	šolm	0
	smoke	hty	lhop	0
	smooth	nʿʿ	kεh; sločlč; čon	0
	snake	ḥfзw; fnṯ	hof	1/2
	(full)	mḥ	muh	1
	some	nhy	laau; ouon	0
	spit	psg; bši	pej, pagšε	1/2
	split	pḫз	potš	1
	squeeze	ḥnk		
150.	stab, pierce	wbb	ǧoth	0
	stand	ʿḥʿ	uhε	1
	star	sbз; gnḥt	siu	1/2
	stick	ḫt		
	stone	inr	al; onε	1/2
	straight	swnw	sutn	1/2
	suck	snk	sohp; sonk	1/2
	sun	rʿ	rē	1
	swell	šf	noufṯ; šafε; čoč	1/3
	swim	nbi	neepε	1
160.	tail	sd	sat	1
	that	pf	etm̄mau; pe	1/2
	there	im	mau	1
	they	sn	ntū	0
	thick	wmt	oumot	1
	thin	gзw	pokf; hōōmε	0
	think	ib	mεεuε	0
	this	pw	pai	1
	thou	-ek; tw	n̄tɔk	1/2
	three	ḫmt	šmn̄t	1
170.	throw	ḫзʿ	hwl; nouxε; tōk	0
	tie	ṯs	mur; sɔnh	0
	tongue	ns	las	1
	tooth	ibḥ	naj; hε; ɔph ε; šɔl	1/3
	tree	ht; šn; nht	šēn	1/3
	turn	pḫr	tkato	0
	two	šnw	snau	1
	vomit	kзs	kavɔl	0
	walk	šm	mɔɔšε	0
	warm	srf	hmɔm, šmɔm	0
180.	wash	iʿi	εio; rohε; j ukm̄	1/3

		Middle Egyptian	Coptic (Sahidic)	
	water	mw	mu	1
	we	-n	an	1
	wet	npȝ	čhōkm̄	0
	what?	m	aš ; u	0
	when?	ṯn	tnau	1
	where?	ṯn	ton	1
	white	ḥḏ	uβ aš	0
	who?	m	aš ; nim	0
	wide	wsḫ	ouostn, ouō šc	1
190.	wife	ḥmt	ḥimε	1
	wind	ṯȝw	teu	1
	wing	ḏnḥ	tn̄h	1
	wipe	sk	Fō tε	0
	with	ḥnᶜ	mn̄- ; n̄-	0
	woman	st ; ḥmt	shimε	1/2
	(horn)	ᶜb ; db ; ḥnwt	tap	1/3
	worm	tȝmw ; ḏdft	Fēt	0
	ye	ṯn	ntotn	1
	year	rnpt	rompε	1
200.	yellow	ḳni ; ȝᶜd	mros ; ugotoγεt	0

TABLE 2
Rates of Lexical Retention (R) per Millenium
For Egyptian and Semitic

Language	R	R
Egyptian and Coptic		.696 (196)
Semitic		.627 (576)
Northwest	.647 (266)	
East Aramaic	.625 (199)	
Mandaic	.646 (155)	
Jewish	.596 (110)	
West Aramaic	.714 (67)	
Southeast	.610 (310)	
South Arabian	.606 (106)	
Sabaic and Mehri	.603 (69)	
Sabaic and Harsusi	.610 (68)	
Ethiopic	.612 (207)	
Ge'ez and Amharic	.617 (145)	
Ge'ez and Tigre	.607 (131)	
Afro-Asiatic		.661
Old English and New English		.621

QUELQUES ASPECTS DE LA NÉGATION : COMPARAISON DE L'ANGLAIS ET DU FRANÇAIS

Suzanne Pons-Ridler, Geneviève Quillard
The University of New Brunswick, York University

RÉSUMÉ

Cet article vise à montrer combien l'anglais et le français diffèrent dans l'enploi qu'ils font de la négation : sauf dans des cas bien particuliers, l'anglais a tendance à utiliser des formes affirmatives, alors que le français privilégie les formes négatives, au niveau des marqueurs grammaticaux du moins. Nous tenterons de dégager certaines lignes directrices et d'émettre certaines hypothèses sur les divergences que présentent les deux codes linguistiques dans ce domaine.

****

Les formes interro-négatives et, d'une manière plus générale, les énoncés négatifs sont-ils plus fréquents en anglais qu'en français et, dans l'affirmative, peut-on expliquer ce phénomène par les attributs du code linguistique et en donner une interprétation?

S'il est actuellement difficile de prouver statistiquement la préférence que marque le français pour la question négative[1], l'écoute attentive de conversations courantes, d'entrevues à la radio ou à la télévision, ainsi que la comparaison de documents traduits nous en ont persuadé. Nous allons donc tout d'abord montrer que les francophones emploient fréquemment une forme négative dans des situations où les anglophones se servent plus volontiers d'une forme affirmative. Nous nous proposons ensuite d'expliquer cette divergence par les caractéristiques des deux codes linguistiques, puis d'envisager ce que la flexibilité du français en ce domaine apporte au francophone et l'usage affectif qu'il en fait, tandis que l'anglophone, privé de cet outil, doit avoir recours à d'autres moyens pour y parvenir. Finalement nous voudrions montrer que ce phénomène s'inscrit dans une tendance générale du français à privilégier les formes négatives.

Poser des questions à la forme négative est très naturel, semble-t-il, pour un francophone. En témoignent de nombreux exemples de la vie courante. Un automobiliste heurte légèrement un autre véhicule : "Il n'y a rien?"

(Is there any damage?/Is there anything?) Un enfant tombe : "Tu ne t'es pas fait mal?" (Did you hurt yourself?). On cherche une place dans un bus ou dans un train : "Il n'y a personne ici/Cette place n'est pas prise?" (Is there someone sitting here/Is this seat taken?). L'heure du repas approche : "Tu n'as pas faim?" (Are you hungry?). On a égaré un objet : "Tu n'as pas vu mes lunettes/mes clefs/mon livre?" (Did you see my glasses/my keys/my book?). On a besoin d'emprunter quelque chose : "Tu n'as pas un crayon/une feuille de papier/un dollar?" (Have you got a pencil/a sheet of paper/a dollar?). On a besoin d'aide : "Tu ne peux pas me donner un coup de main/venir/me consacrer cinq minutes?" (Can you give me a hand/come here/give me five minutes of your time?). On veut inviter un ami : "Tu ne veux pas venir diner?" (Would you like to come for supper?), etc.

Il est intéressant de noter que la négation possède alors, selon l'énoncé, des significations totalement opposées. "Il n'y a rien", "Tu ne t'es pas fait mal", "Il n'y a personne ici" semblent exprimer un désir de réponse négative. "Tu n'as pas faim" et "Tu n'as pas vu mes lunettes" impliquent d'une part "Moi, j'ai faim", d'autre part "Moi, je ne les vois pas" ou "J'ai cherché sans succès". Dans ces deux cas, comme dans les exemples qui suivent, la question interro-négative projette au contraire un désir de réponse positive. Toutefois, que le locuteur désire une réponse positive ou négative, il ne s'agit généralement que d'une simple demande de renseignements que l'anglophone préfère aborder par une question affirmative. Il y a donc lieu de s'interroger sur les raisons de cette divergence.

Il faut remarquer tout d'abord qu'en français la réponse à une question négative n'est pas ambiguë, ce qui est loin d'être toujours le cas en anglais. Le "non" confirme la négation, alors que le "si" contredit l'énoncé et annonce une affirmation sans détour. Certes, "il peut arriver que le "oui" serve à confirmer une proposition négative; on lui fait signifier alors "il en est bien ainsi : telle chose n'est pas[2]"; "oui" peut également survenir après une question négative lorsque la pensée de celui qui répond s'arrête non sur la forme de la question, mais sur l'idée positive qu'elle implique"[3]. Les écrivains utilisent toutes les formes que la flexibilité du français leur permet sur ce point. On relève ainsi dans *Madame Bovary* : "Ne sommes-nous pas heureux? reprenait doucement le jeune homme, lui passant la main sur ses bandeaux" "Oui, c'est vrai, disait-elle, je suis folle, embrasse-moi"[4], ou dans *Le rouge et le noir* : "Danton n'était-il pas un boucher? lui dit-elle," "Oui, aux yeux de certaines personnes."[5] Mais ces nuances ont rarement cours dans les conversations familières, et le "si" est systématiquement employé pour démentir la proposition négative.

La langue anglaise ne possède aucune de ces nuances. Par ailleurs, une réponse positive à une question interro-négative risque d'être ambiguë : "Don't you want any?" "Yes" peut vouloir dire soit : "Yes, I want some", soit "Yes, I don't want any". Il arrive assez fréquemment, du reste, que l'interlocuteur éprouve le besoin d'une clarification et demande alors : "Yes, what?"[6].

Il se pourrait donc que la fréquence des formes interro-négatives en français soit due à ce que les réponses ne comportent aucune ambiguïté. A ce propos, il est intéressant de noter que le français est une des rares langues indo-européennes avec l'allemand qui dispose d'un système d'opposition à deux termes pour l'affirmation ("ja", "doch"). Les autres langues romanes ne possèdent qu'un terme, "si", venant du latin "sic = ainsi" que le français a adopté en conservant le "oïl" dialectal, et en établissant des règles d'utilisation relativement strictes : "si" suit une négation, "oui" généralement une affirmation. L'élément affirmatif d'ordre sémantique est renforcé par une contrainte d'ordre morpho-syntaxique. Ces mots que l'on pourrait croire synonymes ne le sont pas, puisqu'ils ne sont pas interchangeables : ils apparaissent dans des contextes différents et ne possèdent pas la même valeur. Le "si" apportant une contradiction affirmative à une question ou une assertion négatives est beaucoup plus fort qu'un simple "oui". *Le bon usage* note d'ailleurs à ce sujet : "Comme si détruit une opinion exprimée par l'interlocuteur, il y a des cas où la politesse interdit de l'employer. On peut alors le remplacer par *Je vous demande bien pardon* ou par quelque autre formule déférente ."[7]

Les règles sémantiques de base montrent que les rares mots qui sont interchangeables dans des contextes de même registre ne sont pas appelés à coexister longtemps : l'un des deux est très vite préféré par la majorité des locuteurs et utilisé exclusivement, si bien que l'autre devient désuet ou change de sens. Si "oui" et "si" avaient été perçus comme parfaitement équivalents et si la nécessité de contredire clairement une question ou une assertion négatives n'avait pas été sentie comme utile et même importante, la règle d'économie aurait joué et l'une des deux formes serait tombée dans l'oubli ou aurait pris une autre valeur. Or ce n'est pas le cas, contrairement à ce qui s'est passé pour les deux formes négatives "pas" et "point", parfaitement équivalentes sur le plan sémantique, mais relevant aujourd'hui de registres différents.

La préférence marquée du francophone pour la question négative peut également s'expliquer par la valeur renforcée du "si". Il est permis de penser que ce choix est assez souvent motivé par le plaisir ou le besoin d'entendre une affirmation positive plus forte qu'un simple "oui". C'est en effet dans le domaine affectif que ces formes semblent être les plus nombreuses : doute, désir d'être rassuré, naïveté, étonnement s'expriment souvent par une question négative ou par une exclamation à la forme négative : "Tu n'as pas eu peur?", "Tu ne m'aimes pas?", "Tu ne lui as pas dit?", "Ce n'est pas possible!", "Ce n'est pas vrai!", "Tu n'as pas fait ça!". Dans ces cas-là, le "si" de la réponse rassure et réconforte beaucoup plus, nous semble-t-il, qu'un simple "oui". Certes, l'anglophone peut lui aussi utiliser des formes négatives dans ce genre de situation, mais le "yes" de la réponse, s'il est employé seul, n'apporte pas la contradiction attendue avec autant de force.[8]

Un troisième facteur pourrait expliquer la fréquence des formes interro-négatives en français : elles ne semblent être chargées d'aucun implicite et demeurent fondamentalement des demandes d'information. Or tel ne paraît pas être le cas en anglais.

Cette préférence du français pour les formes interro-négatives s'inscrit dans une tendance à privilégier les formes négatives en général.

Les litotes par exemple abondent dans le discours du francophone : "Il n'est pas mal", "Ce n'est pas mauvais", "Elle n'est pas bête", "Ils ont pas mal d'argent", etc. Elles ont d'ailleurs souvent une valeur emphatique. Tel est le cas par exemple de : "Ce n'est pas rien"[9], ou de "Tu ne peux pas ne pas le faire/le dire", etc. Les anglophones préfèrent généralement la forme affirmative équivalente, tempérée par un quantificateur ("quite", "fairly" ou "rather" par exemple) : "He is quite good-looking", "It's quite good", "She is quite smart", "They have quite a bit of money".

Les jeunes en particulier apprécient les expressions négatives du type : "Ce n'est pas évident", "Il n'est pas aidé", "Il n'est pas possible, celui-là"[10] qui, à la différence des litotes, ne signifient pas le contraire. Dans ces cas-là, l'anglais emploierait parfois la forme négative ("It's not obvious/clear"), parfois la forme affirmative ("He's rather stupid", "He's crazy/unreliable").

Le français offre également une impressionnante batterie d'expressions impersonnelles à la forme négative dont les locuteurs n'hésitent pas à se servir, et qu'ils semblent même particulièrement chérir, surtout à l'écrit : "Il n'est pas dit que", "Il va sans dire que", "Il n'en est pas moins vrai que", "Il n'en reste/demeure pas moins que", "Il n'en va pas ainsi pour", "Il n'est pas impossible que", "Il n'est pas sans intérêt de", "Il n'est pas inutile de", etc. Ces expressions paraissent inutilement complexes aux anglophones, qui leur préfèrent des formules plus "compactes" telles que "It remains true that", ou plus simplement "It remains that". Par ailleurs, comme le discours anglais présente beaucoup moins de charnières que le français, ces expressions sont souvent omises des traductions; lorsqu'elles y figurent, c'est presque toujours sous une forme positive.

Plusieurs autres facteurs linguistiques pourraient eux aussi intervenir dans la "négativisation" du discours français :

1. nous possédons un système de semi-négations (ne...que, ne...guère), ainsi qu'un "ne" explétif qui augmentent le nombre d'occurrences des marqueurs grammaticaux de la négation et donnent à l'ensemble du discours une plus grande impression de négativité. Certains auteurs jouent d'ailleurs sur cet effet négatif de la semi-négation lorsqu'ils font débuter leur phrases par le "ne" : "Ne viendront dans ma maison que mes propres invités"[11].

2. "sans" peut être suivi de "rien" ou "jamais", alors que l'anglais exclut "nothing" ou "never" après "without" et "tempère" en quelque sorte la négation par "anything" ou "ever".

3. nombre de locutions françaises incluent un marqueur grammatical de la négation, tandis que, dans les expressions anglaises équivalentes, les marqueurs de négation découlent de propriétés sémantiques. C'est le cas notamment de nonobstant (in spite of), non sans peine (laboriously), naguère (formerly), sans cesse (continuously), d'aucuns (some), sans détour/sans ambages (plainly), ainsi que de la série n'importe qui, n'importe

quand, n'importe où, etc. (anyone, anywhere, etc.).

4. un grand nombre d'expressions plus ou moins figées ou d'expressions imagées présentent elles aussi cette opposition, forme négative en français, forme affirmative en anglais, telles que : "Il n'y a pas de quoi" : "You are welcome"; "Ne vous gênez pas" : "Make yourself at home"; "Je ne suis pas le patron" : "I only work here"; "Ne tardez pas" : "Come back soon"; "Hold on" : "ne quittez pas"; "Sans mentir" : "Tell me the truth"; "Sans blague!" : "really?"/"You're kidding!"; "Il n'arrête pas de dire" : "He keeps saying"; "Je brûle d'envie de..." : "I can't wait..."; "Tu ne peux pas savoir/tu ne pourras jamais deviner ce qui m'est arrivé" : "Guess what happened to me"; "Je ne bouge pas" : "I am staying here"; "Entrer sans frapper" : "Please walk in"; "N'hésitez pas à vous adresser à nous" : "Please contact us"; "Ne bougez plus" : "Hold it there"; "Si je ne me trompe"/"Sauf erreur" : "I understand that"; "Ne pas être dans son assiette" : "To be under the weather", etc.

Il faut remarquer par ailleurs qu'un certain nombre de mots ou expressions, qui ont un équivalent positif en français, sont souvent rendus en contexte par des formes négatives. Tel est notamment le cas de : of course[12] : inutile de dire/il va sans dire; soon ou early[13] : sans tarder; keep/bear in mind, remember : n'oubliez pas[14]; may : sans doute[15]; it is common to : il n'est pas rare de; I think I am right in saying : je ne crois pas me tromper, etc.

De même, certains termes dont la valeur négative découle de propriétés sémantiques et qui possèdent en français un équivalent doté des mêmes propriétés sont souvent traduits par des formes grammaticalement négatives : to fail : ne pas parvenir/réussir[16]; to ignore : ne pas tenir compte/ne pas prendre en considération[17].

Les (bons) traducteurs reprennent d'ailleurs instinctivement les formes que privilégie leur langue maternelle et il est fréquent de voir, dans des traductions françaises, une quantité de formes négatives là où la formulation était positive dans le texte de départ[18], ou inversement[19]. A ce propos, deux phénomènes méritent qu'on s'y arrête :

1. Il arrive fréquemment qu'en français apparaissent des charnières négatives ou restrictives qui étaient absentes du texte anglais[20], ou qui étaient totalement différentes dans le texte de départ[21].

2. Lorsque, dans le texte anglais, les termes sont

forts, emphatiques ou perçus comme tels par le traducteur, celui-ci a tendance à les traduire par des litotes à la forme négative.[22]

Lorsqu'on considère les cas où l'anglais donne la préférence à des formes négatives qui se traduiraient en français par des tournures affirmatives, on constate que les exemples relevés dans les textes dépouillés sont beaucoup moins nombreux. Au lieu de grammaticaliser la négation, l'anglais a tendance à utiliser des affixes ou des suffixes spécialisés ("un" (unimportant, uneasy, uninhabited) ou "less" (speechless, useless, lifeless)), ou des lexèmes à teneur négative. Dans certains cas, toutefois, il utilise systématiquement un marqueur grammatical de négation.

Tel est notamment le cas des interdictions formelles : "No parking" ; "Do not lean out of the window", "You may not", etc. En français, à l'écrit ou dans le cas de défenses catégoriques, le contenu négatif est alors tranmis par des lexèmes à teneur négative : "défense de", "il est interdit de", "je vous défends/ interdis de", mais le marqueur grammatical de négation réapparaît dans la langue parlée familière : "Ne fais pas/tu ne peux pas faire cela".

Toutefois, lorsque l'interdiction se fait moins catégorique, l'anglais revient à une forme positive, alors que le français choisit une forme négative : "Restricted smoking area" : "Ici on ne fume pas" (Canada); "Section non-fumeur" (France).

Lorsqu'on examine le traitement de l'exclamation dans les deux langues, on constate qu'il se produit une sorte de chassé-croisé négatif/affirmatif parmi les formes qui relèvent du même registre. Les deux langues ont recours à des formes négatives, alors que le sens est affirmatif, mais l'usage est souvent inversé. Ceci est surtout lié à des contraintes syntaxiques, qui permettent de distinguer entre les formes exclamatives, interrogatives ou les ordres, et à la complexité ou simplicité des formes utilisées, qui donnent un ton plus ou moins recherché à l'énoncé. En français, l'exclamation introduite par "que" est suivie de l'inversion du sujet et soit du "ne" explétif ("Que ne le disiez-vous!"), soit de la négation complète avec "quel", "que de" ou "combien" ("Quels progrès n'a-t-il pas faits depuis lors!"), ce qui la situe à un niveau de langue recherché. En anglais, par contre, c'est la forme enclitique de la négation qui s'impose dans les phrases exclamatives, ce qui tend à donner à ces formes ("Isn't she pretty!", "Wasn't it a wonderful concert!") un tour familier.[23] Or, au niveau familier, le français utilise des formes affirmatives précédées de "comme", "ce que", ou "quel", formes qui excluent tout marqueur grammatical de négation. Par contre, aux formes recherchées du français correspondent cette fois des tournures positives en anglais, le ton recherché dépendant du choix lexical : "You really ought to have said so!", "What great progress he has made since then!".

Il est intéressant de noter que la tournure "Que ne l'avez-vous dit!" devient dans la langue courante : "Vous auriez dû le dire" ou même, avec une semi-négation : "Vous n'aviez qu'à le dire!". La tournure anglaise familière garde la forme affirmative et choisit "should" plutôt que "ought to" ou "enormous" plutôt que "great".

La tendance française est donc d'éviter les exclamations négatives avec un sens affirmatif, dans des phrases commençant par "que", sauf si l'on recherche un effet stylistique, alors que les locuteurs de langue anglaise y ont fréquemment recours.

Le traitement que font les deux langues des conditionnelles concessives, qu'elle soient alternatives ou universelles, mérite également d'être mentionné, car en anglais la séquence est négative, alors qu'elle ne l'est pas en français. Ainsi pour marquer l'alternative, on a des phrases du type : "No matter whether right or wrong" (Que ce soit vrai ou faux), "No matter whether she finds a job or not" (Qu'elle trouve un emploi ou non/pas). Pour les concessives plus générales introduites par "no matter where/which/how, etc., les exemples dans les textes dépouillés étaient relativement nombreux : "No matter how good it looked" (*Canadian*, July/juillet 1989, p. 44) : "Quelle que soit la situation du marché"; "No matter which careers are being pursued" (*Canadian*, October/octobre 1989, p. 16) : "Quelle que soit la carrière choisie"; "No matter how many hours you have slept at night" (*Canadian*, October/octobre 1989, p. 32) : "Quel que soit le nombre d'heures de sommeil que vous croyez avoir accumulées la nuit précédente". En ce qui concerne ce type de phrase, le passage à l'affirmative en français est automatique : la seule alternative serait d'utiliser "peu importe", mais ce tour plus restrictif, bien qu'affirmatif, apparaît peu à l'écrit, sans doute parce qu'il est perçu comme familier. Il n'a du reste jamais été choisi par les traducteurs dans le corpus étudié.

Le cas de phrases anglaises négatives avec "if" précédé de "well" ou de "why" mérite lui aussi d'être mentionné, bien que ces tournures de langue parlée soient relativement peu courantes. En français elles seraient rendues par une forme affirmative, le conditionnel se substituant alors à la négation pour moduler la surprise : "Well, if it isn't the Manager!" (Mais ce serait le président en personne!).

Une autre remarque s'impose : lorsque le ton des articles anglais est familier, les traducteurs changent parfois de registre. Dans ce cas, la négation est souvent lexicalisée ou sémantisée en français. Cela se produit notamment dans les énoncés qui font appel au lecteur par l'intermédiaire du "you". Cette tournure, très courante elle aussi en français parlé, est difficilement acceptée à l'écrit. En voici quelques exemples :

> "You might not have known this was the very aircraft" :
> "Les passagers [...] avaient parfois du mal à croire" *(Canadian*, July/juillet 1989, p. 68 et 69)
> "you couldn't fly from here to Honolulu direct. You had to stop in San Francisco. And you couldn't fly from Honolulu to Fidji. You had to stop at Canton Island" : "Pour se rendre à Honolulu, il fallait faire escale à San Francisco. Pour se rendre d'Honolulu aux îles Fidji, il fallait faire escale à l'île Canton." *(Canadian*, July/juillet 1989, p. 68 et 69)
> "Yet the Incas did not have writing or currency" : "La culture des Incas était alors très avancée, malgré l'absence d'écriture et de monnaie" (*Canadian*, October/octobre 1989, p. 61)

D'après les données de notre corpus, les mots ou expressions idiomatiques qui se présentent sous une forme négative en anglais et affirmative en français sont très peu nombreux : "no doubt", souvent traduit par "certainement"; "I can't imagine", "I am not sure", "I can't think (who/what) : "je me demande"; "I can't wait for" : "Il me tarde de"; "I don't care/don't mind" : "Cela m'est égal".

Cet article avait pour but de montrer que le francophone fait un plus grand usage de la forme interro-négative que l'anglophone, que ce penchant pour l'utilisation de marqueurs grammaticaux de la négation se reflète dans d'autres aspects du discours et peut être noté dans un grand nombre de traductions. Nous avons émis l'hypothèse que l'existence du "si" affirmatif qui enlevait toute ambiguïté à la réponse, ainsi que l'absence d'implicitation dans la plupart des questions interro-négatives, étaient des facteurs susceptibles d'expliquer la fréquence de ces formes en français. Une étude du même type faite pour l'allemand qui dispose aussi de la double affirmation permettrait, si elle s'avère parallèle, d'arriver à un plus fort indice de corrélation en faveur de notre hypothèse. L'étude de cette question et d'une plus grande négativité du discours français (sur le plan grammatical du moins) par rapport au discours anglais nous paraît importante à poursuivre, car elle pourrait mener à l'explication de bien des attitudes ou tendances spécifiques à la culture des anglophones et des francophones.

NOTES :

1. Interrogé sur ce point, le Centre national de la recherche scientifique et Institut national de la langue française de l'université de Chicago a répondu ne pas être encore en mesure de faire des analyses comparatives de ce type.

2. Grevisse, *Le bon usage*, 10ᵉ édition, Éditions Duculot, Paris-Gembloux, 1975, p. 923, no. 868.

3. Grevisse, *Le bon usage*, 10ᵉ édition, Éditions Duculot, Paris-Gembloux, 1975, p. 923, no. 869, remarque n°. 1.

4. Flaubert, *Madame Bovary*, Livre de poche, 1983, p. 306.

5. Stendhal, *Le rouge et le noir*, édition Garnier, 1960, p. 291.

6. Les répliques suivantes sont révélatrices à ce sujet :

"You mean that you have not included that incident in any of your recitals to your friends?"

"Yes, sir."

"Good, William. I put my question badly, but I see that you have the intelligence to stick to the main clause."

Rex Stout, *Fer-de-lance*, Pyramid Books, New York, 1974, p. 117.

7. Grevisse, *Le bon usage*, 10ᵉ édition, Éditions Duculot, Paris-Gembloux, 1975, p. 924, n° 869, remarque n°. 2.

8. Il faut toutefois remarquer que le "si" de renforcement positif à une question ou exclamation négatives n'est quasiment jamais employé au Québec. Est-ce parce que cette forme était rare en

8. Il faut toutefois remarquer que le "si" de renforcement positif à une question ou exclamation négatives n'est quasiment jamais employé au Québec. Est-ce parce que cette forme était rare en France au XVII^{e} siècle et qu'elle ne s'est stabilisée que plus tard, ou cette disparition est-elle due à l'influence de l'anglais? Pour le déterminer, il faudrait étudier attentivement des textes de différentes époques et de différentes provenances géographiques. Le *Dictionnaire des fréquences* (CNRS, Paris, Didier, 1971) indique une augmentation importante et régulière des termes négatifs : non (du 139^{e} au 71^{e} rang), jamais (du 113^{e} au 94^{e} rang), rien (du 127^{e} au 72^{e} rang)... entre 1789 et 1964, ce qui tendrait à indiquer que notre discours s'est "négativisé". Malheureusement l'analyse statistique de ce dictionnaire est insuffisante (une seule entrée pour si) et ne permet pas de déterminer si le "si" dont il est question est devenu plus courant d'emploi.

9. Nous empruntons cet exemple à Antoine Culioli : "La négation : marqueurs et opérations", article ronéotypé.

10. Walter, Henriette, *Le français dans tous les sens*, Paris, Laffont, 1989, p. 289.

11. Audiberti, *Le mal court*, Paris, Gallimard, 1948, p. 291.

12. "OF COURSE, Canadians traditionally have placed a high value on higher education." (*Access to excellence : being Canadian... Working together for post-secondary education.* Status Report by the Secretary of State of Canada, 1988, p. 2) : "INUTILE DE DIRE que les Canadiens ont toujours hautement prisé l'enseignement supérieur." *La recherche de l'excellence : être Canadiens... Travailler ensemble pour l'enseignement postsecondaire.* Rapport d'étape du secrétaire d'État du Canada, 1988, p. 2.

13. "the Forum had identified no fewer than four specific areas of PSE policy as suitable for EARLY intergovernmental cooperation" *(Access to excellence : being Canadian... Working together for post-secondary education.* Status Report by the Secretary of State of Canada, 1988, p. 5) : "les participants relevèrent pas moins de quatre secteurs particuliers où les gouvernements pourraient faire montre SANS TARDER de collaboration sur la question de l'enseignement postsecondaire" (*La recherche de l'excellence : être Canadiens... Travailler ensemble pour l'enseignement postsecondaire.* Rapport d'étape du secrétaire d'État du Canada, 1988, p. 5)
"particularly in those specific areas identified during the Forum as most suitable for EARLY action." (*Access to excellence : being Canadian... Working together for post-secondary education.* Status

Report by the Secretary of State of Canada, 1988, p. 9) : "surtout dans les domaines où les participants au colloque avaient jugé qu'il fallait agir SANS TARDER." (*La recherche de l'excellence : être Canadiens... Travailler ensemble pour l'enseignement postsecondaire.* Rapport d'étape du secrétaire d'État du Canada, 1988, p. 9)

14. "participants had to BEAR IN MIND the national yearning for intellectual achievement" (*Access to excellence : being Canadian... Working together for post-secondary education.* Status Report by the Secretary of State of Canada, 1988, p. 6) : "les participants étaient priés DE NE PAS OUBLIER que le pays voulait aussi réaliser de grandes choses sur le plan intellectuel" (*La recherche de l'excellence : être Canadiens... Travailler ensemble pour l'enseignement postsecondaire*. Rapport d'étape du secrétaire d'État du Canada, 1988, p. 6)
"KEEP all this IN MIND while you analyze [...]" (*En Route* magazine, May/mai 1989, p. 24) : "N'OUBLIEZ PAS ce rendement ni ces risques quand vous vous demanderez [...]", p. 24.
We must KEEP IN MIND that..." (*CAUT/ACPU Bulletin*) : "Il NE FAUT PAS OUBLIER que..."
"Please REMEMBER to show your Air Canada boarding pass" (The Hat Trick bonus certificate, Air Canada) : "N'OUBLIEZ PAS de montrer votre carte d'embarquement"
"BE AWARE that ancient rainforests are disappearing at a phenomenal rate worldwide." (*Canadian* Magazine, May/mai 1989, p. 24-26) : "N'OUBLIEZ PAS QUE les anciennes forêts humides disparaissent à une vitesse phénoménale à l'échelle mondiale".

15. "this [...] issue [...] is therefore given entirely to a subject that MAY well be the most important educational development in the linguistic affairs of our country" (*Language and society*, n°. 12, Winter 1984, p. 3) : "Nous avons donc décidé de consacrer ce [...] numéro [...] à cette innovation pédagogique qui, plus que tout autre réalisation, aura SANS DOUTE contribué à modifier le climat linguistique au Canada" (*Langue et société*, n°. 12, Hiver 1984, p. 3)
"Those of us who are involved with language policy and bilingualism on a daily basis MAY be inclined to assume that what French immersion is all about must be COMMON knowledge to ALL CANADIANS." (*Language and society*, n°. 12, Winter 1984, p. 3) : "Les professionnels du bilinguisme et de la politique linguistique ont SANS DOUTE l'impression que l'enseignement immersif en français N'A PLUS de secrets pour personne." (*Langue et société*, n°. 12, Hiver 1984, p. 3)

16. "Most have FAILED" (*Canadian* Magazine, May/mai 1989, p. 60) : "la plupart N'Y SONT PAS PARVENUS"
"now cross at a world that FAILS to understand her" (*En Route*, May/mai 1989, p. 85) : "tantôt furieuse contre un monde qui NE la COMPREND PAS"

17. "the interests of faculty are being IGNORED by many administrations and provincial governments." (*CAUT/ACPU Bulletin*, January/janvier 1989, vol. 36, n°.1, p. 3) : "plusieurs administrations et gouvernements provinciaux NE TIENNENT PAS COMPTE des intérêts des professeurs."
" [...] would be to IGNORE the [...] impact" (*CAUT/ACPU Bulletin*, January/janvier 1989, vol. 36, n°.1, p. 3) : "Ce serait fort regrettable de NE PAS TENIR COMPTE des conséquences"

18. En voici quelques exemples : "For all those interested in social tennis with a hint of competition" (Memorandum, Glendon College, York University, May 10, 1989) : "Bonne nouvelle pour tous ceux qui aiment jouer au tennis et qui NE DÉDAIGNENT PAS un brin de compétition."; "Envisaging the future means different things to different people" (*En route* magazine, October/octobre 1989, p. 1) : "Sonder l'avenir est un exercice ardu qui N'A PAS le même sens pour tous."; "Some LEGITIMATE questions remain, to be sure" (*Language and society*, n°. 12, Winter 1984, p. 3.) : "Évidemment, ce régime fait l'objet de contestations NON DÉNUÉES de fondement"; "And for the sports-minded, festival organizers plan" (*Canadian* Magazine, May/mai 1989, p. 12) : "Et les sportifs N'ONT PAS ÉTÉ LAISSÉS POUR COMPTE. Les organisateurs du festival ont planifié"; "Join me at my booth in the Publisher's Exhibit area, June 4-11" (M. Barry Yeates, lettre envoyée aux participants des Sociétés Savantes, juin 1988) : "NE MANQUEZ PAS de passer me voir, entre les 4 et 11 juin, à mon kiosque situé dans la section des maisons d'édition."; "EPF history CLEARLY shows" (*CAUT/ACPU Bulletin*, vol. 36, n°. 8, October/octobre 1989, p. 3) : "L'historique du FPE prouve SANS ÉQUIVOQUE"; "Is that really English?/Ça, c'est pas de l'anglais!" (titre bilingue d'une communication de Mary Plaice, traductrice-réviseure auprès du Ministère des Communications du Québec).

19. "NE PENSE PLUS à ces Gaulois", "Eh bien dis à ton chien de garde de se rendormir et NE T'OCCUPE DE RIEN!", "Vous n'avez pas vu mon frérot?", "JAMAIS je n'ai douté du petit! JAMAIS!" (*Astérix aux Jeux Olympiques*, Dargaud éditeur, 1968, pp. 24, 44, 45, 48) : "FORGET about those Gauls", "Well, you tell your great watchdog to go back to sleep, and MIND YOUR OWN BUSINESS!", "Have you seen my

brother?", "I ALWAYS knew the little fellow had it in him!" (*Asterix at the Olympic Games*, Hodder & Stoughton, 1972, translated by Anthea Bell and Derek Hockridge.); "Personne n'a un peu de miel?", "faire disparaître un questeur N'EST PAS POUR ME DÉPLAIRE" (*Astérix chez les Helvètes*, Dargaud éditeur, 1974, pp. 14, 21) : "Has anyone got a spot of honey?", "disposing of a questor will be a POSITIVE PLEASURE!" (*Asterix in Switzerland*, translated by Anthea Bell & Derek Hockridge, Hodder & Stoughton); "Les autorités N'ONT PAS ENCORE réagi à la dernière bravade du Prix Nobel de la Paix 1984" (*Le Monde*, 6-9-88, p. 1) : "The South African authorities HAVE YET to react [...]" (*Manchester Guardian*, September 18, 1988, p. 13.).

20. "Despite a great deal of effort on our part" (*CAUT/ACPU Bulletin*, April/avril 1989, p. 3) : "TOUTEFOIS, bien que nous NE MÉNAGIONS PAS nos efforts"; "It was in 1963" (*Canadian* Magazine, May/mai 1989, p. 100.) : "Ce N'est TOUTEFOIS QU'en 1963"; "but our exports to it are one-twentieth" (*En route*, May/mai 1989, p. 78) : "mais nos exportations N'y sont QUE d'un vingtième de celles [...]"; "and until the government introduces alternative incentives for private investments, our producers -the alchemists of any country's movie business- must rely on this single annual allotment to tell us our tales and dazzle us with their images." (*En Route*, March/mars 1989, p. 45) : "et tant que l'État N'AURA PAS proposé d'autres stimulants aux particuliers, nos producteurs, SANS LESQUELS, comme partout, NE POURRAIT s'opérer l'alchimie de l'industrie cinématographique, NE peuvent compter QUE sur cette allocation annuelle pour nous raconter des histoires de chez nous et nous éblouir de leurs images."

21. "AT THE SAME TIME, we recognize" (*Language and society*, n°. 12, Winter 1984, p. 3) : "Nous nous rendons CEPENDANT bien compte"; "It will ALSO help to promote a better understanding" (Book News from the Canadian Government Publishing Centre. Glossary of Generic Terms in Canada's Geographical Names) : "Elle contribuera SANS DOUTE à faire mieux apprécier"; "They called for better communication among institutions of higher learning. AND, perhaps most important of all" (*Access to excellence : being Canadian... Working together for post-secondary education.* Status Report by the Secretary of State of Canada, 1988, p. 7) : "Ils ont incité les institutions de haut savoir à entretenir entre elles de meilleures communications. TOUTEFOIS, et ce qui importe peut-être le plus" (*La recherche de l'excellence : être Canadiens... Travailler ensemble pour l'enseignement postsecondaire*. Rapport d'étape du

secrétaire d'État du Canada, 1988, p. 8); "the house was sold out AND full of electricity" (*En Route* magazine, May/Mai 1989, p. 46) : "la salle était NON SEULEMENT comble [...], MAIS chargée d'électricité", p. 43.

22. Ainsi le film de Arthur Hiller, *OUTRAGEOUS Fortune*, a été traduit par : *Une chance PAS CROYABLE*.
"For dessert, crumb-crusted amaretto cheesecake and pecan pie are among the SATISFYING EXCESSES" ; "[He] is HOUNDED by the press in France"; "Doctor Faustus [...] has been a CONSTANT source of fascination for writers"; "the first Canadian Film Awards ceremonies were held at the Little Elgin Theatre in Ottawa. This MILESTONE event provided the perfect vehicle to raise public awareness" *(En Route*, March 1989, pp. 32, 84, 98, 124) : "Pour dessert, PERSONNE NE SE PLAINDRA du gâteau à l'amaretto et de la tarte au pacane"; "En France, IL NE SE PASSE PAS une semaine SANS qu'on l'interviewe dans les journaux ou à la télé"; "le Dr. Faust, N'A CESSÉ de fasciner les écrivains"; "on inaugura les premières cérémonies de remise des prix pour films canadiens au Little Elgin Theatre d'Ottawa. RIEN NE pouvait mieux sensibiliser le public NI stimuler la production"
"There has been a FAIR SHARE of discontent" ; "True, skeptics could have claimed -- and MANY DID"; "She has QUITE A BIT of support" (*En Route* magazine, May/mai 1989, pp. 36, 46, 76) : "Ce NE sont PAS les déplaisirs qui ont MANQUÉ"; "Évidemment, les sceptiques auraient pu prétendre -- et beaucoup N'Y ONT PAS MANQUÉ"; "Elle N'est PAS SANS partisans".
"They were ASTONISHED with me"; "These MUCH-VAUNTED superfast trains"; "The EPITOME of efficient Japanese rail service are the *Shinkansen*" (*Canadian* magazine, May/mai 1989, pp. 18, 62) : "Je NE CESSAIS de les surprendre"; "Ces trains ultra-rapides dont la renommée N'EST PLUS à faire"; "Les *Shinkansen* sont SANS CONTREDIT les modèles PAR EXCELLENCE du réseau ferroviaire japonais."
"Faculty members SHOULD ALSO BE INCLUDED" (*CAUT/ACPU Bulletin*, March/mars 1988, vol. 35, n°.3, p. 3) : "Les professeurs NE FONT PAS NON PLUS EXCEPTION à la règle."
"True, there was the Lortie report which EXPLICITLY advocated"; "Clearly, it is a MAJOR part of the universities' function to help develop a high level cadre." (*CAUT/ACPU* Bulletin, March/mars 1989, p. 2) : "Certes, on a publié le rapport Lortie qui recommandait SANS ÉQUIVOQUE" ; "Bien sûr, le rôle que doivent jouer les universités dans l'édification d'un ensemble de chercheurs de grand calibre N'EST PAS NÉGLIGEABLE."
"I trust that Council will reaffirm our position in STRONG terms." *(CAUT/ACPU* Bulletin ACPU, May/mai 1989, vol. 36, n°. 5, p. 3) : "Je suis confiant que le Conseil réitérera notre position en des termes ON NE PEUT PLUS CLAIRS."

23. La forme complète "not" et son déplacement après le sujet transforment l'exclamation en question : "Is she not prettY?", "Was the concert not good?". Voir *A Comprehensive Grammar of English*, Randolph Quirk, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, Jan Svartvik, Longman, London and New York, 1985, 11.22.

The Diminutive in Mennonite Low German

Vincent O. Erickson
University of New Brunswick

ABSTRACT

The orthographic representation of the diminutive in Mennonite Low German is currently under discussion by Mennonite Low German writers. In this paper the diminutive in Low German is viewed diachronically and synchronically in Mennonite Low German and East Frisian Low German. A suggestion is offered that the form of the diminutive should reflect the underlying phonological structure of the language and not perceived notions of ethnic identity. For this reason /ke/ is suggested to be the best form to use.

One problem in morphology is the identification and description of derivational morphemes. One class of such morphemes is the diminutive, examples of which are widely found in the West Germanic languages. As long as a derivational morpheme remains productive, i.e., is used to form new words, the isolation of such a morpheme is quite easy. When diminutive morphemes of a language or a group of related languages or dialects is in a state of flux, the arrangement, classification, description, and certainly the making of prescriptive statements about correct usage of diminutives becomes more problematic.

The realization of this occurred to me when I wrote a review for JAPLA recently on Friesen's work on Mennonite Plattdeutsch spoken in Western Canada (Erickson 1989). The Western Canadian Mennonites are descendents of two dialect groups of Low German speakers who came to the Ukraine in the 18th and 19th centuries from West Prussia (Krahn 1959:186-187; Krahn 1959:381; Thiessen 1963). Speakers of a more traditional Low German were the first to arrive in 1788 and are called the Old Colony Mennonites. Those arriving in the Ukraine between the years 1804 and 1837 represent the second wave of Mennonites from the delta of the Vistula and speak the Molotschna dialect. It contains more High German influences than Old Colony speech (Krahn 1959:257).

Mennonite scholars in attempting to devise a common orthography appropriate for use for the two dialects were confronted with certain problems which have proven difficult to overcome and have not yet been fully resolved.

The purpose of this paper is to attempt to shed some light on this problem. First, I plan to discuss the subject of diminutivization in West Germanic languages. Next, I wish to examine evidence concerning the use of the diminutive in related dialects of Low-German speakers in West and East Prussia. After this, I wish to look at the topic of influences impinging upon the development of Mennonite Low German, and the solution arrived at by a group of 15 scholars at Winnipeg in 1982, who collectively developed a common orthography for both dialects. Finally, I will make a few observations about the goodness of fit of the orthography with the underlying phonological structure, and to suggest a few modifications so as to provide a somewhat better fit between orthography and language.

The Diminutive in West Germanic

The -l as a diminutive is used in all groups. There is a tendency for it to be lost in Low German except in a few proper nouns (Raveling n.d.:16). In English the valorized l in "little" may represent this morpheme.

ling/ing. In German this morpheme refers to immature things requiring assistance, for example plants. Keimling "seedling" and Sprössling "sprout" are two examples (Duden 1959:#700). In English this morpheme is seen in the word "seedling" which first appears in 1660 (Oxford English Dictionary).[1] It is also used to refer to immature birds and animals. "Nestling" first appeared during late Middle English and "suckling" in 1440. In High German the morpheme can refer to small things. Fäustling "mitten, cudgel" and Silberling "small silver coin" are two examples (Duden 1959:#709). Related concepts in English are "darling" (from Old English), "earthling" (from 1593) and "worldling" (from 1615). Although this morpheme is not common in Low German, it is found in a few proper names, for example, in the East Frisian dialect in Ibeling and Frieling (Raveling n.d.:17). Related concepts in High German are Sperling "sparrow", Schmetterling "butterfly", and Jungling "male youth", as well as in Nestling and Säugling "suckling" (Duden 1959:#720).

en. The Middle German Küchen, Low German Küken, Dutch keuken, and English "chicken" are all related to the Gothic diminutive termination -îna- (Kluge 1891:197). The English word "chicken" goes back to Old English.

lein. This form remains very productive in High German. The old -l diminutive became merged with the in/en diminutive (Duden 1959:#724). It became lin in Low German and is retained in a few proper names, for example, Herlyn (Raveling n.d.:17).

Specific to Low German, Dutch and Frisian is -ke which, especially in Low German is a very productive morpheme. It was taken over in High German and merged with the -in diminutive to produce -chen (Duden 1959:#724; Prokosch 1935:89). Both -chen and -lein are equally productive.

ken/kin. The presence of these forms in other West Germanic languages suggests that -chen is very old, and that Low German once had the final n as well. English examples are "napkin" from late Middle English, "lambkin" from 1579 and "munchkin" which is recent. Dutch has liedeken "song" dating to 1539 if not earlier (van der Zijpp 1956:873).

je/tje. These forms are derived from -ke which became palatalized to -tje (de Vries 1971:736; ten Doornkaat Koolman 1882, Vol. 2:195-196). This form is very productive in Frisian and somewhat less so in the Low German spoken in Groningen and in the adjacent province of East Friesland in Germany. In modern Dutch tje/je/pje comprise most of the diminutives formed (de Vries 1971:736:Lindenburg 1960:27). The morpheme is unknown in English except for Dutch loan words such as "cookie".

A modern diminutive and/or term of endearment is -i which is found in all West Germanic languages. German examples are Mutti "mommy", Vati "daddy", and in many nicknames such as Leni and Rudi, to name but two (Duden 1959:#724). This fashion has also been adopted in Low German (Raveling n.d.:16), and is extremely productive. This morpheme is also the most common form of endearment - also heard in baby talk - to be found in English. Examples are kitty, puppy, horsy, Granny, Bobby, Jennie, etc. In Scottish these forms go back to 1400. The Oxford Universal Dictionary gives no etymology for this morpheme.

The Diminutive in East and West Prussian Plattdeutsch

A cursory survey of Prussian Plattdeutsch examples from collections made by two Dutch scholars Leopold and Leopold and published in 1882 from six communities or regions, Danzig, Marienburger Werder, Elbing, Köngisberg, Samland and Rastenburg, yielded only the following diminutive or diminutive-like endings:

-ke/-ske	-sche
-ken/-sken	

The s in the forms -ske and -sken is epenthetic (Duden 1959:#724) to facilitate the transition from stem final k to affix initial k. The Elbing dialect provided the word Stöcksken "little trick" (Leopold and Leopold 1882:313), the Rastenburg dialect Stöckske "little piece" (Ibid.:319). In the Marienburger Werder dialect (Ibid.:306), Knöwske "little button" is found. The [v] is unexpected, as /p/ is anticipated. The reason for the epenthetic s here is not clear. Of the other 22 examples of the diminutive in the data, 20 are represented by -ke and two by-ken.[2] Of the six communities, three -Danzig, Elbing and Marienburger Werder - form a triangle which encompasses the delta of the Vistula which was the homeland of the Prussian Mennonites from the 16th to mid-20th centuries. Although the religious affiliation of the informants providing information in the Leopold and Leopold collection was not given, one assumes that they were not Mennonite. The significant finding is that there is no evidence of tje/-je as a diminutive ending at this time.

The Origin of Mennonite Low German

When the first Mennonite religious refugees arrived in East Prussia from Belgium, Holland and North Germany in the second quarter of the 16th century, the area had already been settled for 300 years by the Teutonic Knights and their followers. The speech community of these colonists in the 13th and 14th centuries was likely never homogeneous. Low German gained dominance, likely aided by Danzig which was an important Hansa center. When the Mennonites arrived they found themselves face to face with persons whom they could generally understand if not readily speak with.

The speech of the 16th century Mennonite was not homogeneous either. The refugees consisted of speakers of at least three major branches of West Germanic (Penner 1959:922). A dialect based on Franconian was spoken by those coming from Belgium and the west coast of Holland. Frisian was used by those coming from the province of Friesland which abuts on the North and the Zuider seas. Plattdeutsch of Lower Saxon origin was spoken by the refugees from Groningen in Holland, from East Frisia, and from a scattering of other places along the North Sea German coast. The church language of these refugees was Dutch based mostly on Franconian.

The 16th century rural Mennonite communities in the delta of the Vistula were not immune from the influences coming from their Low German speaking Lutheran neighbors. The Mennonite communities, nevertheless, constituted "... relatively compact blocks, with but a small intermixture of non-Mennonites, since the land had previously been unoccupied (Bender 1956:304)." By the early 18th century, however, the Mennonites acquired land as individuals and their holdings were scattered among the region's Lutherans who were primarily Low German speaking (Penner 1959:924). The Mennonites, although extremely successful as farmers, remained a small minority in Danzig and East Prussia. Their population did not exceed 13,000 to 15,000 persons at any time during their stay (Ibid: 920).

At the time of their arrival in the 16th century, the Low German speaking Mennonites probably found it easier to communicate with the Baltic Low German Lutherans than with the Dutch Franconians and the Frisians. The church language of the Baltic Low Germans was High German.

Dutch remained the church language of the Mennonites both in the rural and urban areas until the second half of the 18th century (Krahn 1959:256-257). Although the official language of the government of Prussia was High German, the medium of communication of Mennonite to non-Mennonite was West Prussian Low German. Few Mennonites had a need to learn High German in the 16th and 17th centuries as Low German was the language of trade in the rural areas. Whether originally Franconian, Frisian or Saxon Low German speaking, West Prussian Low German was the language the Mennonites adopted long before they gave up Dutch as their church language (Krahn 1959: 187). Gradually, the Mennonites acquired High German to facilitate their entering an expanding economic network. By the middle of the 18th century most West Prussian Mennonites knew High German better than Dutch. The first High German sermon was preached in a West Prussian Mennonite rural community in 1757. Some Mennonites in Danzig may have retained Dutch longer because of constant contact through sea commerce with Holland. By 1781 the last Mennonite elder in Danzig to insist that Dutch be used in church services had died. Although some Mennonite families brought Dutch bibles and hymnals with them when they left for the Ukraine in 1788, High German religious books were probably more usual, although some families may have been none too fluent in either Dutch or High German. The first Mennonite High German hymnal to be used by West Prussian Mennonites was published in 1761.

The 462 families who established the "Old Colony" at Chortitza in the Ukraine in 1788 came from among the poorer classes in Danzig and Elbing and spoke primarily Low German (Krahn 1959:381; Krahn 1959:187). By 1803, when the Molotschna Mennonite colony was founded in Russia by a second wave of settlers from the Vistula, the Dutch influences were even weaker, Low German was still spoken but it had been altered by High German influences (Krahn 1959: 187). High German gradually came to be the prestige language of the Mennonites who formed only a small portion of the total German population in the Ukraine (Krahn 1959:384). At Molotschna and its satellite colonies, the transition from Plattdeutsch to High German became almost total for some families. A like trend continued among the Mennonites who remained on the Vistula. When evacuated to the west or overseas after the Second World War, some no longer spoke Low German except with their non-Mennonite workers (Krahn 1959: 187).

It should come as no surprise that the Low German spoken by the Canadian Mennonites in the prairie provinces reflects the speech patterns of the Mennonite communities from which their ancestors in the Ukraine came, and that this colors what members of the respective groups want to see and "hear" in their orthography. Canadians who identify with the "Old Colony" want to see more traditional Low German forms (Friesen 1988: 36). Canadians who identify with Molotschna influences appear to want to emphasize their Dutch origins (Ibid.: 38) even though the Dutch influence had become secondary to Low German for more than 100 years prior to their leaving for the Ukraine.

How is this reflected in the orthography? Besides complications arising from the view that since we once were Dutch we will always remain Dutch, Mennonite Plattdeutsch appears to be undergoing changes in its sound system which further complicate the picture. The /k/ in some environments has become palatalized, and for descendents of some Molotschna speakers has become fronted to such a degree that it is heard as palatalized t.[3] Given this development the writing of the diminutive becomes even more problematic. Should it be written as -kje or -tje? Old Colony speakers prefer the "k" variant, Molotschna speakers the "t". The argument presented by Molotschna speakers is that since the Mennonites came originally from the Netherlands, and in Dutch the diminutive is represented by tje/je, Mennonite writers should use -tje, especially since k and t are becoming indistinguishable in their Molotschna dialect.

A compromise was reached at the Winnipeg conference held in 1982 (Friesen 1988:38): kj is to be used word initially, tj word medially and finally. This results in the diminutive being written tje exclusively. The compromise was not wholly acceptable. According to Friesen, (*Ibid*.) Herman Rempel revised his Mennonite Low German dictionary using kj throughout to show its Old Colony orientation.

Friesen's solution in *The Windmill Turning* (1988) is to select kj when the tj usage produced forms so unusual that they would not be recognized by either English or High German speakers as cognates of English or German. Friesen insists that "fork" should be spelled *Forkj* rather than *Fortj*; "milk" as *Malkj* rather than *Maltj* and "I" *ekj* not *etj*. For Friesen all diminutives remain -tje/je. Thiessen (1977) uses tj throughout for palatalized stops which are derived from words having an underlying /k/. His 1963 publication represents these words [ķx].

I favor the "Old Colony" suggestions, because they remain truer to the underlying forms of Low German. In addition to retaining the -kje diminutive, which parallels in every case the diminutives found in the Leopold and Leopold 1882 collection from six West and East Prussian communities, the Old Colony writers want to retain the /n/ in writing the infinitive ending. Even though the /n/ appears no longer to be pronounced, the conservative writers feel that it should be kept in the spelling, possibly because it is found in the written form in High German. I favor keeping the n, too, even though it is no longer pronounced either in Low German or High German in the Prussian region. Retaining the n can avoid ambiguities, especially if a writer insists upon using -tje word finally.

Clearly -tje is not unknown in some other dialects of Low German, especially in East Frisian where the Dutch influence has been greater and has continued longer than in West Prussia (Bender 1957:291). Dutch was the religious language of the Mennonite church in East Frisia until World War I - admittedly with only 1/10th of the membership it had in East and West Prussia. Dutch, however, was also the religious language of the East Frisian Calvinists, who numbered at least 100,000 members by the beginning of the 20th century. During the 19th century Dutch was replaced gradually by High German as the church language of the East Frisian Calvinists. Together, the Mennonites and Calvinists of East Frisia were outnumbered by East Frisian Lutherans in the 16th and following centuries whose church language was High German.

East Frisian Low German maintains a balance between the use of -tje and -ke.[4] The -tje is used after noun stems ending in d, t, n, g, or k. Ke is used elsewhere with but few exceptions. One is the Dutch loan term *bolletje*, literally "little ball" but specifically a rock candy of that shape (ten Doornkaat Koolman 1879:, Vol. 1:200). The East Frisian Low German form *balke* refers to any other "little ball". Anke, "little Ann", a form more common in other Low German dialects, replaces the expected form Antje among some East Frisian parents, because the latter is felt to be too common. The adjectival form "little", *Lűtje*, shares a spot with the far less frequent noun form *Lűtke* which refers to a baby or infant, human or animal (*Ibid*. Vol. 2: 556-557).

Mennonite Low German, in other ways, retains striking parallels with East and West Prussian Low German. Noun plurals ending in -s suffixed to stems ending in an underlying /r/ become -sch, for example, the Mennonite Low German *Schniedasch* "cutters or taylors" (Friesen 1988). The Mennonite feminine noun marker, as in East Prussian, is -sche, for example, in *kjääkjsche* "kitchen maid/female cook" (Friesen 1988).[5] The palatalization of the velar stop, in my limited sample, is found in the written forms of one East Prussian community, Rastenburg. Two examples of the underlying /g/ become gj are *Dingj* "thing and *langj* "long" (Leopold and Leopold 1882:318-320).

Palatalization of t and k with a subsequent merging is not unknown in other Germanic languages. Swedish has examples of this process, with tj and kj/k becoming ç in some environments.[6] The underlying phonemes are kept in the Swedish orthography despite a continuing emphasis in Swedish to modernize its orthography.

Mennonite Low German appears to have no example whereby underlying alveolar stops have become palatalized to tj. East Frisian Plattdeutsch shows this tendency in a few ancient personal names. Theorik becomes Tjark or Tiark (Tiarks or Tiarks as family names); Theohard becomes Tjard, Tiard or Schat; Theoher remains unpalatalized as Tade/Tado/Taade (Raveling n.d.:31). Thiessen (1977) does not suggest the phonetic representation of the tj words in his Mennonite Plattdeutsch dictionary to be anything other than [ķx] and every one of these words clearly comes from a form containing an underlying /k/.[7]

If one were to remain true to the phonology of Mennonite Low German the tj should not be used in the writing system. Rempel, whose dictionary I have not seen, may come closest to representing the underlying phonology in this regard. Friesen's usage of kj/tj is insightful. He uses the tj only for the diminutive when the noun stem does not end in k. This enables the reader to recognize most diminutives and not to confuse them with words having another inflectional ending, the infinitive, which for most Mennonite speakers of Low german lacks a final n. If one were to use kj for all diminutives and n for the infinitive, which is what Old Colony Mennonites prefer, the writing system would parallel the underlying phonology even more closely. If there were clear cases of borrowing from Dutch or Frisian in Mennonite Low German, of the type *Bolletje*/*Balke* found in East Frisian Low German, then there would be justification for retaining -tje. I suspect, however, that none can be found.

In closing it might be useful to speculate on how this orthographic problem may have developed in Mennonite Low German. Several months ago when I began research on this paper, I spoke briefly with a non-Mennonite woman born in Königsberg. She left the community as a young child at the close of World War II. I asked her if she knew *Plattdeutsch*. She said that she knew it slightly, but had spoken it only with her parents after emigrating to West Germany and with no one after coming to Canada. I could not resist asking her which form of the diminutive she felt to be better, -ke or -tje. She blushed and said that she supposed -ke might be. Among speakers, who do not know *Plattdeutsch* well, -che [çə] is frequently used because such speakers are only transferring the -chen in High German to [çə]. The final n is dropped in both East Prussian High German and East and West Prussian Low German producing a new form which is neither -tje nor -ke. Could the speakers of Mennonite *Plattdeutch*, especially the Molotschna latecomers who were strongly influenced by High German in West Prussia, have come under the same influence?

Evidence is present, moreover, of possible influences from Slavic on Mennonite *Plattdeutsch*. The k and the g are palatalized in Russian and the feminine diminutive ending in Russian is -ka. The Mennonites during their 150 year sojourn in the Ukraine were strongly influenced by the speech of their non-German neighbors. Many Russian words were taken over into Mennonite *Plattdeutsch*. Those containing "k" retained the palatalized pronunciation.[8] Those containing the feminine diminutive -ka were treated as neuter nouns (Thiessen 1963:176-177), in Low German.

Hearing the k in the diminutive, they may have consciously or unconsciously viewed it as a Slavicism, and among the North American mennonites, aware of the Dutch diminutive ending -tje, this may have been reason why they favored the -tje. It could be a symbol of their 16th century "Dutch" origins.

In the future, we may anticipate that Mennonite Plattdeutsch spoken in North America will experience two contradictory influences from English. One will be in the direction of a loss of the palatalized k because cognate terms in English most frequently lack the palatalization. As more and more English loans containing /k/ are adopted into Mennonite Low German, one might anticipate that they will be pronounced without palatalization. The second influence is that some English cognates - as is true also in Frisian, which have an underlying /k/ - have been palatalized and fronted to [tʃ]. Their influence will be of the kind that will favor the Molotschna tj pronunciations in North America. Thiessen (1977:62) provides one example of a likely loan of this type Tjill "chill". More English words with /k/ rather than with /č/ are apt to be borrowed in Mennonite Low German, but this does not mean that the most frequently heard or used forms will direct, necessarily, future changes in the language.

The pronunciations of the Old Colony Mennonites in the United States, Canada, Mexico and Paraguay, however, are important for determining the oldest forms of Mennonite Plattdeutsch. Their attempts to perpetuate the language may be the last viable means of doing so for remnants of any of the former East or West Prussian Low German speech communities.

FOOTNOTES

1 All references to dates of first appearance of an English word come from the 1955 printing of the Oxford Universal Dictionary on Historical Principles.

2 The other diminutives are as follows:
Danzig (1882:304-305): Jahnke "little John", Schurkes "scoundrels"
Stopken "little step" (cf. Mennonite Low German staupe "to step"), Mäkens "girls" (cf. Mennonite Low German Meatje "girl").
Marienburger Werder (1882:306): Schächtkes "small shafts of boots", Boddemke "little bottom" (cf. Mennonite Low German Boddem "bottom of a barrel.")
Elbing (1882:307-315): Schischkewater "dirty water".
Königsberg (1882:315-316): Pracherke "little beggar" (cf. Mennonite Low German Pracha "beggar"); Breederke "little brother"; Himmelke "little heaven"; Sinnke "little sun"; Schwoarke "rain cloud" (cf. Mennonite Low German Schwoatj "black thunder cloud"); Dittke "a little this (?)"; Julke (personal name); Spuhlke "little spool"; Soldatenpoppkes "soldiers' sweethearts"; Beenke "little leg"; Daomkes "little ladies" and Ohlerke "little old person".
Samland (1882:317-318): Ochkes "little eyes."
Rastenburg (1882:318-320): Bätke "a little bit" and Wielke "a little while."

3 Thiessen (1963:30) suggests that the k is palatalized when it precedes or follows a front vowel. His 1977 dictionary provides contradictory evidence: The [k], represented tj in the orthography, is preceded and followed by [a] in the word Fenstatjast (1977:18). In eenkelearich the non-palatalized k is followed by e, a front vowel, an environment which is shared in the words doake and enbucke, none of which are palatalized. The k is palatalized, however, in entjelt, enpeatjele and in most cases in which e occurs word finally preceded by /k/. Friesen (1988) appears to have followed Thiessen's rule for writing k except when it occurs in the diminutive where it is written tj.

4 This generalization is arrived at after making note of every use of the diminutive in Siefkes' Tŭschen Saat un Seise (1959), a volume of poetry. The findings are compatible with my impression of the use of the diminutive in the East Frisian Plattdeutsch spoken to the north of Emden.

5 Thiessen (1977:62) provides the spelling *Tjäatjsche*.

6 For example *tjugo* "twenty" and *kjol* "skirt" (Johnson 1952:273,288). Many examples of palatalized k are spelled k in Swedish rather than kj. See also Haugen (1976:268-272).

7 There is at least one exception in Mennonite Low German as is seen in the word "fart". Thiessen (1977:19) writes it *Fortjs* [forḳxs] The s would not be anticipated. I would have expected the word to be *Fort* and the t to be unpalatalized.

8 For example, *Dresientje* "railway handcar", *Desjatnitj* "a person holding a position of authority" and *Bultje* "white bread" (cf. russ.-ukr. *bulka*). This is not to suggest that the only influence for palatalization comes from Russian. The small sample of Rastenburg *Plattdeutsch* provided two examples of palatalized g and the few Polish loanwords in Mennonite *Plattdeutsch* also contain palatalized k, for example *Flatj* "animal intestines used for making sausages" which may come from the Polish word *flaki*.

REFERENCES

BENDER, Harold S. 1956. 'Farming and Settlement.' Mennonite Encyclopedia. Vol. 2; 303-306.

------ 1957. 'Language Problem.' Mennonite Encyclopedia. Vol.3: 290-292.

DOORNKAAT KOOLMAN, J. ten. 1879-1884. Wörterbuch der ostfriesischen Sprache. Norden: Herm. Braams.

DRIEDGER, Johannes. 1956. 'Farming among the Mennonites in West Prussia and East Prussia.' Mennonite Encyclopedia Vol. 2:311-313.

ERICKSON, Vincent. 1989. "Review of V.C. Friesen The Windmill Turning," JAPLA 11:148-151.

FRIESEN, Victor Carl. 1988. The Windmill Turning: Nursery Rhymes, Maxims, and Other Expressions of Western Canadian Mennonites. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.

DER GROSSE DUDEN. 1959. Bd. 4. Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. Mannheim: Im Dudenverlag.

HAUGEN, Einar. 1976. The Scandinavian Languages: An Introduction to Their History. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

JOHNSON, Walter. 1952. Beginning Swedish. Rock Island, Ill.: Augustana Book Concern.

KLUGE, Friedrich. 1891. An Etymological Dictionary of the German Language. Translated by John Francis Davis from the 4th German ed. London: George Bell & Sons.

KRAHN, Cornelius. 1959. 'Mennonite Plattdeutsch' Mennonite Quarterly Review 33:256-259.

-------- 1959. 'Plattdeutsch (Plautdietsch)' Mennonite Encyclopedia. Vol. 4:186-188.

--------- 1959. 'Russia.' Mennonite Encyclopedia. Vol. 4:381-393.

LEOPOLD, Joh. A. and L. LEOPOLD. 1882. Van de Schelde tot de Weichsel: Nederduitsche Dialecten in Dicht en Ondicht. Groningen: J.B. Wolters.

LINDENBURG, C.W.H. 1960. Kleine Niederländische Sprachlehre. Heidelberg: Julius Groos Verlag.

MENNONITE ENCYCLOPEDIA. 1956-1959. Vols. I-IV. Scottsdale, Pa.: Mennonite Publishing House.

OXFORD UNIVERSAL DICTIONARY ON HISTORICAL PRINCIPLES. 1955. 3rd ed. with Corrections and Revised Addenda. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

PENNER, Horst. 1959. 'West Prussia' Mennonite Encyclopedia. Vol. 4: 921-926.

PROKOSCH, Ernst. 1933. An Outline of German Historical Grammar. New York: Oxford University Press.

RAVELING, Irma. n.d. Vornamen und Namengebung in Ostfriesland. Norden: Heinrich Soltau.

SIEFKES, Wilhelmina. 1959. Tüschen Saat un Seise. Hamburg-Wellingsbüttel:Verlag der Fehrs-Gilde.

THIESSEN, John (Jack). 1963. Studien zum Wortschatz der kanadischen Mennoniten. Bd. 64, Deutsche Dialektgeographie. Marburg: N.G. Elwert Verlag.

------- 1977. Mennonite Low-German Dictionary (Mennonitisches Wörterbuch). Marburg: N.G. Elwert Verlag.

VRIES, Jan de. 1971. Nederlands Etymologisch Woordenboek. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

ZIJPP, N. van der. 1956. 'Hymnology of the Mennonites in the Netherlands.' Mennonite Encyclopedia. Vol.2:873-875.

QUELQUES ASPECTS DE LA NÉGATION : COMPARAISON DE L'ANGLAIS ET DU FRANÇAIS

Suzanne Pons-Ridler, Geneviève Quillard
The University of New Brunswick, York University

RÉSUMÉ

Cet article vise à montrer combien l'anglais et le français diffèrent dans l'enploi qu'ils font de la négation : sauf dans des cas bien particuliers, l'anglais a tendance à utiliser des formes affirmatives, alors que le français privilégie les formes négatives, au niveau des marqueurs grammaticaux du moins. Nous tenterons de dégager certaines lignes directrices et d'émettre certaines hypothèses sur les divergences que présentent les deux codes linguistiques dans ce domaine.

****

Les formes interro-négatives et, d'une manière plus générale, les énoncés négatifs sont-ils plus fréquents en anglais qu'en français et, dans l'affirmative, peut-on expliquer ce phénomène par les attributs du code linguistique et en donner une interprétation?

S'il est actuellement difficile de prouver statistiquement la préférence que marque le français pour la question négative[1], l'écoute attentive de conversations courantes, d'entrevues à la radio ou à la télévision, ainsi que la comparaison de documents traduits nous en ont persuadé. Nous allons donc tout d'abord montrer que les francophones emploient fréquemment une forme négative dans des situations où les anglophones se servent plus volontiers d'une forme affirmative. Nous nous proposons ensuite d'expliquer cette divergence par les caractéristiques des deux codes linguistiques, puis d'envisager ce que la flexibilité du français en ce domaine apporte au francophone et l'usage affectif qu'il en fait, tandis que l'anglophone, privé de cet outil, doit avoir recours à d'autres moyens pour y parvenir. Finalement nous voudrions montrer que ce phénomène s'inscrit dans une tendance générale du français à privilégier les formes négatives.

Poser des questions à la forme négative est très naturel, semble-t-il, pour un francophone. En témoignent de nombreux exemples de la vie courante. Un automobiliste heurte légèrement un autre véhicule : "Il n'y a rien?"

(Is there any damage?/Is there anything?) Un enfant tombe : "Tu ne t'es pas fait mal?" (Did you hurt yourself?). On cherche une place dans un bus ou dans un train : "Il n'y a personne ici/Cette place n'est pas prise?" (Is there someone sitting here/Is this seat taken?). L'heure du repas approche : "Tu n'as pas faim?" (Are you hungry?). On a égaré un objet : "Tu n'as pas vu mes lunettes/mes clefs/mon livre?" (Did you see my glasses/my keys/my book?). On a besoin d'emprunter quelque chose : "Tu n'as pas un crayon/une feuille de papier/un dollar?" (Have you got a pencil/a sheet of paper/a dollar?). On a besoin d'aide : "Tu ne peux pas me donner un coup de main/venir/me consacrer cinq minutes?" (Can you give me a hand/come here/give me five minutes of your time?). On veut inviter un ami : "Tu ne veux pas venir diner?" (Would you like to come for supper?), etc.

Il est intéressant de noter que la négation possède alors, selon l'énoncé, des significations totalement opposées. "Il n'y a rien", "Tu ne t'es pas fait mal", "Il n'y a personne ici" semblent exprimer un désir de réponse négative. "Tu n'as pas faim" et "Tu n'as pas vu mes lunettes" impliquent d'une part "Moi, j'ai faim", d'autre part "Moi, je ne les vois pas" ou "J'ai cherché sans succès". Dans ces deux cas, comme dans les exemples qui suivent, la question interro-négative projette au contraire un désir de réponse positive. Toutefois, que le locuteur désire une réponse positive ou négative, il ne s'agit généralement que d'une simple demande de renseignements que l'anglophone préfère aborder par une question affirmative. Il y a donc lieu de s'interroger sur les raisons de cette divergence.

Il faut remarquer tout d'abord qu'en français la réponse à une question négative n'est pas ambiguë, ce qui est loin d'être toujours le cas en anglais. Le "non" confirme la négation, alors que le "si" contredit l'énoncé et annonce une affirmation sans détour. Certes, "il peut arriver que le "oui" serve à confirmer une proposition négative; on lui fait signifier alors "il en est bien ainsi : telle chose n'est pas[2]"; "oui" peut également survenir après une question négative lorsque la pensée de celui qui répond s'arrête non sur la forme de la question, mais sur l'idée positive qu'elle implique"[3]. Les écrivains utilisent toutes les formes que la flexibilité du français leur permet sur ce point. On relève ainsi dans *Madame Bovary* : "Ne sommes-nous pas heureux? reprenait doucement le jeune homme, lui passant la main sur ses bandeaux" "Oui, c'est vrai, disait-elle, je suis folle, embrasse-moi"[4], ou dans *Le rouge et le noir* : "Danton n'était-il pas un boucher? lui dit-elle," "Oui, aux yeux de certaines personnes."[5] Mais ces nuances ont rarement cours dans les conversations familières, et le "si" est systématiquement employé pour démentir la proposition négative.

La langue anglaise ne possède aucune de ces nuances. Par ailleurs, une réponse positive à une question interro-négative risque d'être ambiguë : "Don't you want any?" "Yes" peut vouloir dire soit : "Yes, I want some", soit "Yes, I don't want any". Il arrive assez fréquemment, du reste, que l'interlocuteur éprouve le besoin d'une clarification et demande alors : "Yes, what?"[6].

Il se pourrait donc que la fréquence des formes interro-négatives en français soit due à ce que les réponses ne comportent aucune ambiguïté. A ce propos, il est intéressant de noter que le français est une des rares langues indo-européennes avec l'allemand qui dispose d'un système d'opposition à deux termes pour l'affirmation ("ja", "doch"). Les autres langues romanes ne possèdent qu'un terme, "si", venant du latin "sic = ainsi" que le français a adopté en conservant le "oïl" dialectal, et en établissant des règles d'utilisation relativement strictes : "si" suit une négation, "oui" généralement une affirmation. L'élément affirmatif d'ordre sémantique est renforcé par une contrainte d'ordre morpho-syntaxique. Ces mots que l'on pourrait croire synonymes ne le sont pas, puisqu'ils ne sont pas interchangeables : ils apparaissent dans des contextes différents et ne possèdent pas la même valeur. Le "si" apportant une contradiction affirmative à une question ou une assertion négatives est beaucoup plus fort qu'un simple "oui". *Le bon usage* note d'ailleurs à ce sujet : "Comme si détruit une opinion exprimée par l'interlocuteur, il y a des cas où la politesse interdit de l'employer. On peut alors le remplacer par *Je vous demande bien pardon* ou par quelque autre formule déférente ."[7]

Les règles sémantiques de base montrent que les rares mots qui sont interchangeables dans des contextes de même registre ne sont pas appelés à coexister longtemps : l'un des deux est très vite préféré par la majorité des locuteurs et utilisé exclusivement, si bien que l'autre devient désuet ou change de sens. Si "oui" et "si" avaient été perçus comme parfaitement équivalents et si la nécessité de contredire clairement une question ou une assertion négatives n'avait pas été sentie comme utile et même importante, la règle d'économie aurait joué et l'une des deux formes serait tombée dans l'oubli ou aurait pris une autre valeur. Or ce n'est pas le cas, contrairement à ce qui s'est passé pour les deux formes négatives "pas" et "point", parfaitement équivalentes sur le plan sémantique, mais relevant aujourd'hui de registres différents.

La préférence marquée du francophone pour la question négative peut également s'expliquer par la valeur renforcée du "si". Il est permis de penser que ce choix est assez souvent motivé par le plaisir ou le besoin d'entendre une affirmation positive plus forte qu'un simple "oui". C'est en effet dans le domaine affectif que ces formes semblent être les plus nombreuses : doute, désir d'être rassuré, naïveté, étonnement s'expriment souvent par une question négative ou par une exclamation à la forme négative : "Tu n'as pas eu peur?", "Tu ne m'aimes pas?", "Tu ne lui as pas dit?", "Ce n'est pas possible!", "Ce n'est pas vrai!", "Tu n'as pas fait ça!". Dans ces cas-là, le "si" de la réponse rassure et réconforte beaucoup plus, nous semble-t-il, qu'un simple "oui". Certes, l'anglophone peut lui aussi utiliser des formes négatives dans ce genre de situation, mais le "yes" de la réponse, s'il est employé seul, n'apporte pas la contradiction attendue avec autant de force.[8]

Un troisième facteur pourrait expliquer la fréquence des formes interro-négatives en français : elles ne semblent être chargées d'aucun implicite et demeurent fondamentalement des demandes d'information. Or tel ne paraît pas être le cas en anglais.

Cette préférence du français pour les formes interro-négatives s'inscrit dans une tendance à privilégier les formes négatives en général.

Les litotes par exemple abondent dans le discours du francophone : "Il n'est pas mal", "Ce n'est pas mauvais", "Elle n'est pas bête", "Ils ont pas mal d'argent", etc. Elles ont d'ailleurs souvent une valeur emphatique. Tel est le cas par exemple de : "Ce n'est pas rien"[9], ou de "Tu ne peux pas ne pas le faire/le dire", etc. Les anglophones préfèrent généralement la forme affirmative équivalente, tempérée par un quantificateur ("quite", "fairly" ou "rather" par exemple) : "He is quite good-looking", "It's quite good", "She is quite smart", "They have quite a bit of money".

Les jeunes en particulier apprécient les expressions négatives du type : "Ce n'est pas évident", "Il n'est pas aidé", "Il n'est pas possible, celui-là"[10] qui, à la différence des litotes, ne signifient pas le contraire. Dans ces cas-là, l'anglais emploierait parfois la forme négative ("It's not obvious/clear"), parfois la forme affirmative ("He's rather stupid", "He's crazy/unreliable").

Le français offre également une impressionnante batterie d'expressions impersonnelles à la forme négative dont les locuteurs n'hésitent pas à se servir, et qu'ils semblent même particulièrement chérir, surtout à l'écrit : "Il n'est pas dit que", "Il va sans dire que", "Il n'en est pas moins vrai que", "Il n'en reste/demeure pas moins que", "Il n'en va pas ainsi pour", "Il n'est pas impossible que", "Il n'est pas sans intérêt de", "Il n'est pas inutile de", etc. Ces expressions paraissent inutilement complexes aux anglophones, qui leur préfèrent des formules plus "compactes" telles que "It remains true that", ou plus simplement "It remains that". Par ailleurs, comme le discours anglais présente beaucoup moins de charnières que le français, ces expressions sont souvent omises des traductions; lorsqu'elles y figurent, c'est presque toujours sous une forme positive.

Plusieurs autres facteurs linguistiques pourraient eux aussi intervenir dans la "négativisation" du discours français :

1. nous possédons un système de semi-négations (ne...que, ne...guère), ainsi qu'un "ne" explétif qui augmentent le nombre d'occurrences des marqueurs grammaticaux de la négation et donnent à l'ensemble du discours une plus grande impression de négativité. Certains auteurs jouent d'ailleurs sur cet effet négatif de la semi-négation lorsqu'ils font débuter leur phrases par le "ne" : "Ne viendront dans ma maison que mes propres invités"[11].

2. "sans" peut être suivi de "rien" ou "jamais", alors que l'anglais exclut "nothing" ou "never" après "without" et "tempère" en quelque sorte la négation par "anything" ou "ever".

3. nombre de locutions françaises incluent un marqueur grammatical de la négation, tandis que, dans les expressions anglaises équivalentes, les marqueurs de négation découlent de propriétés sémantiques. C'est le cas notamment de nonobstant (in spite of), non sans peine (laboriously), naguère (formerly), sans cesse (continuously), d'aucuns (some), sans détour/sans ambages (plainly), ainsi que de la série n'importe qui, n'importe

quand, n'importe où, etc. (anyone, anywhere, etc.).

4. un grand nombre d'expressions plus ou moins figées ou d'expressions imagées présentent elles aussi cette opposition, forme négative en français, forme affirmative en anglais, telles que : "Il n'y a pas de quoi" : "You are welcome"; "Ne vous gênez pas" : "Make yourself at home"; "Je ne suis pas le patron" : "I only work here"; "Ne tardez pas" : "Come back soon"; "Hold on" : "ne quittez pas"; "Sans mentir" : "Tell me the truth"; "Sans blague!" : "really?"/"You're kidding!"; "Il n'arrête pas de dire" : "He keeps saying"; "Je brûle d'envie de..." : "I can't wait..."; "Tu ne peux pas savoir/tu ne pourras jamais deviner ce qui m'est arrivé" : "Guess what happened to me"; "Je ne bouge pas" : "I am staying here"; "Entrer sans frapper" : "Please walk in"; "N'hésitez pas à vous adresser à nous" : "Please contact us"; "Ne bougez plus" : "Hold it there"; "Si je ne me trompe"/"Sauf erreur" : "I understand that"; "Ne pas être dans son assiette" : "To be under the weather", etc.

Il faut remarquer par ailleurs qu'un certain nombre de mots ou expressions, qui ont un équivalent positif en français, sont souvent rendus en contexte par des formes négatives. Tel est notamment le cas de : of course[12] : inutile de dire/il va sans dire; soon ou early[13] : sans tarder; keep/bear in mind, remember : n'oubliez pas[14]; may : sans doute[15]; it is common to : il n'est pas rare de; I think I am right in saying : je ne crois pas me tromper, etc.

De même, certains termes dont la valeur négative découle de propriétés sémantiques et qui possèdent en français un équivalent doté des mêmes propriétés sont souvent traduits par des formes grammaticalement négatives : to fail : ne pas parvenir/réussir[16]; to ignore : ne pas tenir compte/ne pas prendre en considération[17].

Les (bons) traducteurs reprennent d'ailleurs instinctivement les formes que privilégie leur langue maternelle et il est fréquent de voir, dans des traductions françaises, une quantité de formes négatives là où la formulation était positive dans le texte de départ[18], ou inversement[19]. A ce propos, deux phénomènes méritent qu'on s'y arrête :

1. Il arrive fréquemment qu'en français apparaissent des charnières négatives ou restrictives qui étaient absentes du texte anglais[20], ou qui étaient totalement différentes dans le texte de départ[21].

2. Lorsque, dans le texte anglais, les termes sont

forts, emphatiques ou perçus comme tels par le traducteur, celui-ci a tendance à les traduire par des litotes à la forme négative.[22]

Lorsqu'on considère les cas où l'anglais donne la préférence à des formes négatives qui se traduiraient en français par des tournures affirmatives, on constate que les exemples relevés dans les textes dépouillés sont beaucoup moins nombreux. Au lieu de grammaticaliser la négation, l'anglais a tendance à utiliser des affixes ou des suffixes spécialisés ("un" (unimportant, uneasy, uninhabited) ou "less" (speechless, useless, lifeless)), ou des lexèmes à teneur négative. Dans certains cas, toutefois, il utilise systématiquement un marqueur grammatical de négation.

Tel est notamment le cas des interdictions formelles : "No parking" ; "Do not lean out of the window", "You may not", etc. En français, à l'écrit ou dans le cas de défenses catégoriques, le contenu négatif est alors tranmis par des lexèmes à teneur négative : "défense de", "il est interdit de", "je vous défends/ interdis de", mais le marqueur grammatical de négation réapparaît dans la langue parlée familière : "Ne fais pas/tu ne peux pas faire cela".

Toutefois, lorsque l'interdiction se fait moins catégorique, l'anglais revient à une forme positive, alors que le français choisit une forme négative : "Restricted smoking area" : "Ici on ne fume pas" (Canada); "Section non-fumeur" (France).

Lorsqu'on examine le traitement de l'exclamation dans les deux langues, on constate qu'il se produit une sorte de chassé-croisé négatif/affirmatif parmi les formes qui relèvent du même registre. Les deux langues ont recours à des formes négatives, alors que le sens est affirmatif, mais l'usage est souvent inversé. Ceci est surtout lié à des contraintes syntaxiques, qui permettent de distinguer entre les formes exclamatives, interrogatives ou les ordres, et à la complexité ou simplicité des formes utilisées, qui donnent un ton plus ou moins recherché à l'énoncé. En français, l'exclamation introduite par "que" est suivie de l'inversion du sujet et soit du "ne" explétif ("Que ne le disiez-vous!"), soit de la négation complète avec "quel", "que de" ou "combien" ("Quels progrès n'a-t-il pas faits depuis lors!"), ce qui la situe à un niveau de langue recherché. En anglais, par contre, c'est la forme enclitique de la négation qui s'impose dans les phrases exclamatives, ce qui tend à donner à ces formes ("Isn't she pretty!", "Wasn't it a wonderful concert!") un tour familier.[23] Or, au niveau familier, le français utilise des formes affirmatives précédées de "comme", "ce que", ou "quel", formes qui excluent tout marqueur grammatical de négation. Par contre, aux formes recherchées du français correspondent cette fois des tournures positives en anglais, le ton recherché dépendant du choix lexical : "You really ought to have said so!", "What great progress he has made since then!".

Il est intéressant de noter que la tournure "Que ne l'avez-vous dit!" devient dans la langue courante : "Vous auriez dû le dire" ou même, avec une semi-négation : "Vous n'aviez qu'à le dire!". La tournure anglaise familière garde la forme affirmative et choisit "should" plutôt que "ought to" ou "enormous" plutôt que "great".

La tendance française est donc d'éviter les exclamations négatives avec un sens affirmatif, dans des phrases commençant par "que", sauf si l'on recherche un effet stylistique, alors que les locuteurs de langue anglaise y ont fréquemment recours.

Le traitement que font les deux langues des conditionnelles concessives, qu'elle soient alternatives ou universelles, mérite également d'être mentionné, car en anglais la séquence est négative, alors qu'elle ne l'est pas en français. Ainsi pour marquer l'alternative, on a des phrases du type : "No matter whether right or wrong" (Que ce soit vrai ou faux), "No matter whether she finds a job or not" (Qu'elle trouve un emploi ou non/pas). Pour les concessives plus générales introduites par "no matter where/which/how, etc., les exemples dans les textes dépouillés étaient relativement nombreux : "No matter how good it looked" (*Canadian*, July/juillet 1989, p. 44) : "Quelle que soit la situation du marché"; "No matter which careers are being pursued" (*Canadian*, October/octobre 1989, p. 16) : "Quelle que soit la carrière choisie"; "No matter how many hours you have slept at night" (*Canadian*, October/octobre 1989, p. 32) : "Quel que soit le nombre d'heures de sommeil que vous croyez avoir accumulées la nuit précédente". En ce qui concerne ce type de phrase, le passage à l'affirmative en français est automatique : la seule alternative serait d'utiliser "peu importe", mais ce tour plus restrictif, bien qu'affirmatif, apparaît peu à l'écrit, sans doute parce qu'il est perçu comme familier. Il n'a du reste jamais été choisi par les traducteurs dans le corpus étudié.

Le cas de phrases anglaises négatives avec "if" précédé de "well" ou de "why" mérite lui aussi d'être mentionné, bien que ces tournures de langue parlée soient relativement peu courantes. En français elles seraient rendues par une forme affirmative, le conditionnel se substituant alors à la négation pour moduler la surprise : "Well, if it isn't the Manager!" (Mais ce serait le président en personne!).

Une autre remarque s'impose : lorsque le ton des articles anglais est familier, les traducteurs changent parfois de registre. Dans ce cas, la négation est souvent lexicalisée ou sémantisée en français. Cela se produit notamment dans les énoncés qui font appel au lecteur par l'intermédiaire du "you". Cette tournure, très courante elle aussi en français parlé, est difficilement acceptée à l'écrit. En voici quelques exemples :

> "You might not have known this was the very aircraft" :
> "Les passagers [...] avaient parfois du mal à croire" *(Canadian*, July/juillet 1989, p. 68 et 69)
> "you couldn't fly from here to Honolulu direct. You had to stop in San Francisco. And you couldn't fly from Honolulu to Fidji. You had to stop at Canton Island" : "Pour se rendre à Honolulu, il fallait faire escale à San Francisco. Pour se rendre d'Honolulu aux îles Fidji, il fallait faire escale à l'île Canton." *(Canadian*, July/juillet 1989, p. 68 et 69)
> "Yet the Incas did not have writing or currency" : "La culture des Incas était alors très avancée, malgré l'absence d'écriture et de monnaie" (*Canadian*, October/octobre 1989, p. 61)

D'après les données de notre corpus, les mots ou expressions idiomatiques qui se présentent sous une forme négative en anglais et affirmative en français sont très peu nombreux : "no doubt", souvent traduit par "certainement"; "I can't imagine", "I am not sure", "I can't think (who/what) : "je me demande"; "I can't wait for" : "Il me tarde de"; "I don't care/don't mind" : "Cela m'est égal".

Cet article avait pour but de montrer que le francophone fait un plus grand usage de la forme interro-négative que l'anglophone, que ce penchant pour l'utilisation de marqueurs grammaticaux de la négation se reflète dans d'autres aspects du discours et peut être noté dans un grand nombre de traductions. Nous avons émis l'hypothèse que l'existence du "si" affirmatif qui enlevait toute ambiguïté à la réponse, ainsi que l'absence d'implicitation dans la plupart des questions interro-négatives, étaient des facteurs susceptibles d'expliquer la fréquence de ces formes en français. Une étude du même type faite pour l'allemand qui dispose aussi de la double affirmation permettrait, si elle s'avère parallèle, d'arriver à un plus fort indice de corrélation en faveur de notre hypothèse. L'étude de cette question et d'une plus grande négativité du discours français (sur le plan grammatical du moins) par rapport au discours anglais nous paraît importante à poursuivre, car elle pourrait mener à l'explication de bien des attitudes ou tendances spécifiques à la culture des anglophones et des francophones.

NOTES :

1. Interrogé sur ce point, le Centre national de la recherche scientifique et Institut national de la langue française de l'université de Chicago a répondu ne pas être encore en mesure de faire des analyses comparatives de ce type.

2. Grevisse, *Le bon usage*, 10e édition, Éditions Duculot, Paris-Gembloux, 1975, p. 923, no. 868.

3. Grevisse, *Le bon usage*, 10e édition, Éditions Duculot, Paris-Gembloux, 1975, p. 923, no. 869, remarque n°. 1.

4. Flaubert, *Madame Bovary*, Livre de poche, 1983, p. 306.

5. Stendhal, *Le rouge et le noir*, édition Garnier, 1960, p. 291.

6. Les répliques suivantes sont révélatrices à ce sujet :
"You mean that you have not included that incident in any of your recitals to your friends?"
"Yes, sir."
"Good, William. I put my question badly, but I see that you have the intelligence to stick to the main clause."
Rex Stout, *Fer-de-lance*, Pyramid Books, New York, 1974, p. 117.

7. Grevisse, *Le bon usage*, 10e édition, Éditions Duculot, Paris-Gembloux, 1975, p. 924, n° 869, remarque n°. 2.

8. Il faut toutefois remarquer que le "si" de renforcement positif à une question ou exclamation négatives n'est quasiment jamais employé au Québec. Est-ce parce que cette forme était rare en

8. Il faut toutefois remarquer que le "si" de renforcement positif à une question ou exclamation négatives n'est quasiment jamais employé au Québec. Est-ce parce que cette forme était rare en France au XVII^{e} siècle et qu'elle ne s'est stabilisée que plus tard, ou cette disparition est-elle due à l'influence de l'anglais? Pour le déterminer, il faudrait étudier attentivement des textes de différentes époques et de différentes provenances géographiques. Le *Dictionnaire des fréquences* (CNRS, Paris, Didier, 1971) indique une augmentation importante et régulière des termes négatifs : non (du 139^{e} au 71^{e} rang), jamais (du 113^{e} au 94^{e} rang), rien (du 127^{e} au 72^{e} rang)... entre 1789 et 1964, ce qui tendrait à indiquer que notre discours s'est "négativisé". Malheureusement l'analyse statistique de ce dictionnaire est insuffisante (une seule entrée pour si) et ne permet pas de déterminer si le "si" dont il est question est devenu plus courant d'emploi.

9. Nous empruntons cet exemple à Antoine Culioli : "La négation : marqueurs et opérations", article ronéotypé.

10. Walter, Henriette, *Le français dans tous les sens*, Paris, Laffont, 1989, p. 289.

11. Audiberti, *Le mal court*, Paris, Gallimard, 1948, p. 291.

12. "OF COURSE, Canadians traditionally have placed a high value on higher education." (*Access to excellence : being Canadian... Working together for post-secondary education.* Status Report by the Secretary of State of Canada, 1988, p. 2) : "INUTILE DE DIRE que les Canadiens ont toujours hautement prisé l'enseignement supérieur." *La recherche de l'excellence : être Canadiens... Travailler ensemble pour l'enseignement postsecondaire.* Rapport d'étape du secrétaire d'État du Canada, 1988, p. 2.

13. "the Forum had identified no fewer than four specific areas of PSE policy as suitable for EARLY intergovernmental cooperation" *(Access to excellence : being Canadian... Working together for post-secondary education.* Status Report by the Secretary of State of Canada, 1988, p. 5) : "les participants relevèrent pas moins de quatre secteurs particuliers où les gouvernements pourraient faire montre SANS TARDER de collaboration sur la question de l'enseignement postsecondaire" (*La recherche de l'excellence : être Canadiens... Travailler ensemble pour l'enseignement postsecondaire*. Rapport d'étape du secrétaire d'État du Canada, 1988, p. 5)
"particularly in those specific areas identified during the Forum as most suitable for EARLY action." (*Access to excellence : being Canadian... Working together for post-secondary education.* Status

Report by the Secretary of State of Canada, 1988, p. 9) : "surtout dans les domaines où les participants au colloque avaient jugé qu'il fallait agir SANS TARDER." (*La recherche de l'excellence : être Canadiens... Travailler ensemble pour l'enseignement postsecondaire.* Rapport d'étape du secrétaire d'État du Canada, 1988, p. 9)

14. "participants had to BEAR IN MIND the national yearning for intellectual achievement" (*Access to excellence : being Canadian... Working together for post-secondary education.* Status Report by the Secretary of State of Canada, 1988, p. 6) : "les participants étaient priés DE NE PAS OUBLIER que le pays voulait aussi réaliser de grandes choses sur le plan intellectuel" (*La recherche de l'excellence : être Canadiens... Travailler ensemble pour l'enseignement postsecondaire.* Rapport d'étape du secrétaire d'État du Canada, 1988, p. 6)
"KEEP all this IN MIND while you analyze [...]" (*En Route* magazine, May/mai 1989, p. 24) : "N'OUBLIEZ PAS ce rendement ni ces risques quand vous vous demanderez [...]", p. 24.
We must KEEP IN MIND that..." (*CAUT/ACPU Bulletin*) : "Il NE FAUT PAS OUBLIER que..."
"Please REMEMBER to show your Air Canada boarding pass" (The Hat Trick bonus certificate, Air Canada) : "N'OUBLIEZ PAS de montrer votre carte d'embarquement"
"BE AWARE that ancient rainforests are disappearing at a phenomenal rate worldwide." (*Canadian* Magazine, May/mai 1989, p. 24-26) : "N'OUBLIEZ PAS QUE les anciennes forêts humides disparaissent à une vitesse phénoménale à l'échelle mondiale".

15. "this [...] issue [...] is therefore given entirely to a subject that MAY well be the most important educational development in the linguistic affairs of our country" (*Language and society*, n°. 12, Winter 1984, p. 3) : "Nous avons donc décidé de consacrer ce [...] numéro [...] à cette innovation pédagogique qui, plus que tout autre réalisation, aura SANS DOUTE contribué à modifier le climat linguistique au Canada" (*Langue et société*, n°. 12, Hiver 1984, p. 3)
"Those of us who are involved with language policy and bilingualism on a daily basis MAY be inclined to assume that what French immersion is all about must be COMMON knowledge to ALL CANADIANS." (*Language and society*, n°. 12, Winter 1984, p. 3) : "Les professionnels du bilinguisme et de la politique linguistique ont SANS DOUTE l'impression que l'enseignement immersif en français N'A PLUS de secrets pour personne." (*Langue et société*, n°. 12, Hiver 1984, p. 3)

16. "Most have FAILED" (*Canadian* Magazine, May/mai 1989, p. 60) : "la plupart N'Y SONT PAS PARVENUS"
"now cross at a world that FAILS to understand her" (*En Route*, May/mai 1989, p. 85) : "tantôt furieuse contre un monde qui NE la COMPREND PAS"

17. "the interests of faculty are being IGNORED by many administrations and provincial governments." (*CAUT/ACPU Bulletin*, January/janvier 1989, vol. 36, n°.1, p. 3) : "plusieurs administrations et gouvernements provinciaux NE TIENNENT PAS COMPTE des intérêts des professeurs."
" [...] would be to IGNORE the [...] impact" (*CAUT/ACPU Bulletin*, January/janvier 1989, vol. 36, n°.1, p. 3) : "Ce serait fort regrettable de NE PAS TENIR COMPTE des conséquences"

18. En voici quelques exemples : "For all those interested in social tennis with a hint of competition" (Memorandum, Glendon College, York University, May 10, 1989) : "Bonne nouvelle pour tous ceux qui aiment jouer au tennis et qui NE DÉDAIGNENT PAS un brin de compétition."; "Envisaging the future means different things to different people" (*En route* magazine, October/octobre 1989, p. 1) : "Sonder l'avenir est un exercice ardu qui N'A PAS le même sens pour tous."; "Some LEGITIMATE questions remain, to be sure" (*Language and society*, n°. 12, Winter 1984, p. 3.) : "Évidemment, ce régime fait l'objet de contestations NON DÉNUÉES de fondement"; "And for the sports-minded, festival organizers plan" (*Canadian* Magazine, May/mai 1989, p. 12) : "Et les sportifs N'ONT PAS ÉTÉ LAISSÉS POUR COMPTE. Les organisateurs du festival ont planifié"; "Join me at my booth in the Publisher's Exhibit area, June 4-11" (M. Barry Yeates, lettre envoyée aux participants des Sociétés Savantes, juin 1988) : "NE MANQUEZ PAS de passer me voir, entre les 4 et 11 juin, à mon kiosque situé dans la section des maisons d'édition."; "EPF history CLEARLY shows" (*CAUT/ACPU Bulletin*, vol. 36, n°. 8, October/octobre 1989, p. 3) : "L'historique du FPE prouve SANS ÉQUIVOQUE"; "Is that really English?/Ça, c'est pas de l'anglais!" (titre bilingue d'une communication de Mary Plaice, traductrice-réviseure auprès du Ministère des Communications du Québec).

19. "NE PENSE PLUS à ces Gaulois", "Eh bien dis à ton chien de garde de se rendormir et NE T'OCCUPE DE RIEN!", "Vous n'avez pas vu mon frérot?", "JAMAIS je n'ai douté du petit! JAMAIS!" (*Astérix aux Jeux Olympiques*, Dargaud éditeur, 1968, pp. 24, 44, 45, 48) : "FORGET about those Gauls", "Well, you tell your great watchdog to go back to sleep, and MIND YOUR OWN BUSINESS!", "Have you seen my

brother?", "I ALWAYS knew the little fellow had it in him!" (*Asterix at the Olympic Games*, Hodder & Stoughton, 1972, translated by Anthea Bell and Derek Hockridge.); "Personne n'a un peu de miel?", "faire disparaître un questeur N'EST PAS POUR ME DÉPLAIRE" (*Astérix chez les Helvètes*, Dargaud éditeur, 1974, pp. 14, 21) : "Has anyone got a spot of honey?", "disposing of a questor will be a POSITIVE PLEASURE!" (*Asterix in Switzerland*, translated by Anthea Bell & Derek Hockridge, Hodder & Stoughton); "Les autorités N'ONT PAS ENCORE réagi à la dernière bravade du Prix Nobel de la Paix 1984" (*Le Monde*, 6-9-88, p. 1) : "The South African authorities HAVE YET to react [...]" (*Manchester Guardian*, September 18, 1988, p. 13.).

20. "Despite a great deal of effort on our part" (*CAUT/ACPU Bulletin*, April/avril 1989, p. 3) : "TOUTEFOIS, bien que nous NE MÉNAGIONS PAS nos efforts"; "It was in 1963" (*Canadian* Magazine, May/mai 1989, p. 100.) : "Ce N'est TOUTEFOIS QU'en 1963"; "but our exports to it are one-twentieth" (*En route*, May/mai 1989, p. 78) : "mais nos exportations N'y sont QUE d'un vingtième de celles [...]"; "and until the government introduces alternative incentives for private investments, our producers -the alchemists of any country's movie business- must rely on this single annual allotment to tell us our tales and dazzle us with their images." (*En Route*, March/mars 1989, p. 45) : "et tant que l'État N'AURA PAS proposé d'autres stimulants aux particuliers, nos producteurs, SANS LESQUELS, comme partout, NE POURRAIT s'opérer l'alchimie de l'industrie cinématographique, NE peuvent compter QUE sur cette allocation annuelle pour nous raconter des histoires de chez nous et nous éblouir de leurs images."

21. "AT THE SAME TIME, we recognize" (*Language and society*, n°. 12, Winter 1984, p. 3) : "Nous nous rendons CEPENDANT bien compte"; "It will ALSO help to promote a better understanding" (Book News from the Canadian Government Publishing Centre. Glossary of Generic Terms in Canada's Geographical Names) : "Elle contribuera SANS DOUTE à faire mieux apprécier"; "They called for better communication among institutions of higher learning. AND, perhaps most important of all" (*Access to excellence : being Canadian... Working together for post-secondary education.* Status Report by the Secretary of State of Canada, 1988, p. 7) : "Ils ont incité les institutions de haut savoir à entretenir entre elles de meilleures communications. TOUTEFOIS, et ce qui importe peut-être le plus" (*La recherche de l'excellence : être Canadiens... Travailler ensemble pour l'enseignement postsecondaire.* Rapport d'étape du

secrétaire d'État du Canada, 1988, p. 8); "the house was sold out AND full of electricity" (*En Route* magazine, May/Mai 1989, p. 46) : "la salle était NON SEULEMENT comble [...], MAIS chargée d'électricité", p. 43.

22. Ainsi le film de Arthur Hiller, *OUTRAGEOUS Fortune*, a été traduit par : *Une chance PAS CROYABLE.*
"For dessert, crumb-crusted amaretto cheesecake and pecan pie are among the SATISFYING EXCESSES" ; "[He] is HOUNDED by the press in France"; "Doctor Faustus [...] has been a CONSTANT source of fascination for writers"; "the first Canadian Film Awards ceremonies were held at the Little Elgin Theatre in Ottawa. This MILESTONE event provided the perfect vehicle to raise public awareness" *(En Route*, March 1989, pp. 32, 84, 98, 124) : "Pour dessert, PERSONNE NE SE PLAINDRA du gâteau à l'amaretto et de la tarte au pacane"; "En France, IL NE SE PASSE PAS une semaine SANS qu'on l'interviewe dans les journaux ou à la télé"; "le Dr. Faust, N'A CESSÉ de fasciner les écrivains"; "on inaugura les premières cérémonies de remise des prix pour films canadiens au Little Elgin Theatre d'Ottawa. RIEN NE pouvait mieux sensibiliser le public NI stimuler la production"
"There has been a FAIR SHARE of discontent" ; "True, skeptics could have claimed -- and MANY DID"; "She has QUITE A BIT of support" (*En Route* magazine, May/mai 1989, pp. 36, 46, 76) : "Ce NE sont PAS les déplaisirs qui ont MANQUÉ"; "Évidemment, les sceptiques auraient pu prétendre -- et beaucoup N'Y ONT PAS MANQUÉ"; "Elle N'est PAS SANS partisans".
"They were ASTONISHED with me"; "These MUCH-VAUNTED superfast trains"; "The EPITOME of efficient Japanese rail service are the *Shinkansen*" (*Canadian* magazine, May/mai 1989, pp. 18, 62) : "Je NE CESSAIS de les surprendre"; "Ces trains ultra-rapides dont la renommée N'EST PLUS à faire"; "Les *Shinkansen* sont SANS CONTREDIT les modèles PAR EXCELLENCE du réseau ferroviaire japonais."
"Faculty members SHOULD ALSO BE INCLUDED" (*CAUT/ACPU Bulletin*, March/mars 1988, vol. 35, n°.3, p. 3) : "Les professeurs NE FONT PAS NON PLUS EXCEPTION à la règle."
"True, there was the Lortie report which EXPLICITLY advocated"; "Clearly, it is a MAJOR part of the universities' function to help develop a high level cadre." (*CAUT/ACPU* Bulletin, March/mars 1989, p. 2) : "Certes, on a publié le rapport Lortie qui recommandait SANS ÉQUIVOQUE" ; "Bien sûr, le rôle que doivent jouer les universités dans l'édification d'un ensemble de chercheurs de grand calibre N'EST PAS NÉGLIGEABLE."
"I trust that Council will reaffirm our position in STRONG terms." *(CAUT/ACPU* Bulletin ACPU, May/mai 1989, vol. 36, n°. 5, p. 3) : "Je suis confiant que le Conseil réitérera notre position en des termes ON NE PEUT PLUS CLAIRS."

23. La forme complète "not" et son déplacement après le sujet transforment l'exclamation en question : "Is she not prettY?", "Was the concert not good?". Voir *A Comprehensive Grammar of English*, Randolph Quirk, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, Jan Svartvik, Longman, London and New York, 1985, 11.22.

The Diminutive in Mennonite Low German

Vincent O. Erickson
University of New Brunswick

ABSTRACT

The orthographic representation of the diminutive in Mennonite Low German is currently under discussion by Mennonite Low German writers. In this paper the diminutive in Low German is viewed diachronically and synchronically in Mennonite Low German and East Frisian Low German. A suggestion is offered that the form of the diminutive should reflect the underlying phonological structure of the language and not perceived notions of ethnic identity. For this reason /ke/ is suggested to be the best form to use.

One problem in morphology is the identification and description of derivational morphemes. One class of such morphemes is the diminutive, examples of which are widely found in the West Germanic languages. As long as a derivational morpheme remains productive, i.e., is used to form new words, the isolation of such a morpheme is quite easy. When diminutive morphemes of a language or a group of related languages or dialects is in a state of flux, the arrangement, classification, description, and certainly the making of prescriptive statements about correct usage of diminutives becomes more problematic.

The realization of this occurred to me when I wrote a review for JAPLA recently on Friesen's work on Mennonite Plattdeutsch spoken in Western Canada (Erickson 1989). The Western Canadian Mennonites are descendents of two dialect groups of Low German speakers who came to the Ukraine in the 18th and 19th centuries from West Prussia (Krahn 1959:186-187; Krahn 1959:381; Thiessen 1963). Speakers of a more traditional Low German were the first to arrive in 1788 and are called the Old Colony Mennonites. Those arriving in the Ukraine between the years 1804 and 1837 represent the second wave of Mennonites from the delta of the Vistula and speak the Molotschna dialect. It contains more High German influences than Old Colony speech (Krahn 1959:257).

Mennonite scholars in attempting to devise a common orthography appropriate for use for the two dialects were confronted with certain problems which have proven difficult to overcome and have not yet been fully resolved.

The purpose of this paper is to attempt to shed some light on this problem. First, I plan to discuss the subject of diminutivization in West Germanic languages. Next, I wish to examine evidence concerning the use of the diminutive in related dialects of Low-German speakers in West and East Prussia. After this, I wish to look at the topic of influences impinging upon the development of Mennonite Low German, and the solution arrived at by a group of 15 scholars at Winnipeg in 1982, who collectively developed a common orthography for both dialects. Finally, I will make a few observations about the goodness of fit of the orthography with the underlying phonological structure, and to suggest a few modifications so as to provide a somewhat better fit between orthography and language.

The Diminutive in West Germanic

The -l as a diminutive is used in all groups. There is a tendency for it to be lost in Low German except in a few proper nouns (Raveling n.d.:16). In English the valorized l in "little" may represent this morpheme.

ling/ing. In German this morpheme refers to immature things requiring assistance, for example plants. Keimling "seedling" and Sprössling "sprout" are two examples (Duden 1959:#700). In English this morpheme is seen in the word "seedling" which first appears in 1660 (Oxford English Dictionary).[1] It is also used to refer to immature birds and animals. "Nestling" first appeared during late Middle English and "suckling" in 1440. In High German the morpheme can refer to small things. Fäustling "mitten, cudgel" and Silberling "small silver coin" are two examples (Duden 1959:#709). Related concepts in English are "darling" (from Old English), "earthling" (from 1593) and "worldling" (from 1615). Although this morpheme is not common in Low German, it is found in a few proper names, for example, in the East Frisian dialect in Ibeling and Frieling (Raveling n.d.:17). Related concepts in High German are Sperling "sparrow", Schmetterling "butterfly", and Jungling "male youth", as well as in Nestling and Säugling "suckling" (Duden 1959:#720).

en. The Middle German Küchen, Low German Küken, Dutch keuken, and English "chicken" are all related to the Gothic diminutive termination -îna- (Kluge 1891:197). The English word "chicken" goes back to Old English.

lein. This form remains very productive in High German. The old -l diminutive became merged with the in/en diminutive (Duden 1959:#724). It became lin in Low German and is retained in a few proper names, for example, Herlyn (Raveling n.d.:17).

Specific to Low German, Dutch and Frisian is -ke which, especially in Low German is a very productive morpheme. It was taken over in High German and merged with the -in diminutive to produce -chen (Duden 1959:#724; Prokosch 1935:89). Both -chen and -lein are equally productive.

ken/kin. The presence of these forms in other West Germanic languages suggests that -chen is very old, and that Low German once had the final n as well. English examples are "napkin" from late Middle English, "lambkin" from 1579 and "munchkin" which is recent. Dutch has liedeken "song" dating to 1539 if not earlier (van der Zijpp 1956:873).

je/tje. These forms are derived from -ke which became palatalized to -tje (de Vries 1971:736; ten Doornkaat Koolman 1882, Vol. 2:195-196). This form is very productive in Frisian and somewhat less so in the Low German spoken in Groningen and in the adjacent province of East Friesland in Germany. In modern Dutch tje/je/pje comprise most of the diminutives formed (de Vries 1971:736:Lindenburg 1960:27). The morpheme is unknown in English except for Dutch loan words such as "cookie".

A modern diminutive and/or term of endearment is -i which is found in all West Germanic languages. German examples are Mutti "mommy", Vati "daddy", and in many nicknames such as Leni and Rudi, to name but two (Duden 1959:#724). This fashion has also been adopted in Low German (Raveling n.d.:16), and is extremely productive. This morpheme is also the most common form of endearment - also heard in baby talk - to be found in English. Examples are kitty, puppy, horsy, Granny, Bobby, Jennie, etc. In Scottish these forms go back to 1400. The Oxford Universal Dictionary gives no etymology for this morpheme.

The Diminutive in East and West Prussian Plattdeutsch

A cursory survey of Prussian Plattdeutsch examples from collections made by two Dutch scholars Leopold and Leopold and published in 1882 from six communities or regions, Danzig, Marienburger Werder, Elbing, Köngisberg, Samland and Rastenburg, yielded only the following diminutive or diminutive-like endings:

-ke/-ske	-sche
-ken/-sken	

The s in the forms -ske and -sken is epenthetic (Duden 1959:#724) to facilitate the transition from stem final k to affix initial k. The Elbing dialect provided the word Stöcksken "little trick" (Leopold and Leopold 1882:313), the Rastenburg dialect Stöckske "little piece" (Ibid.:319). In the Marienburger Werder dialect (Ibid.:306), Knöwske "little button" is found. The [v] is unexpected, as /p/ is anticipated. The reason for the epenthetic s here is not clear. Of the other 22 examples of the diminutive in the data, 20 are represented by -ke and two by-ken.[2] Of the six communities, three -Danzig, Elbing and Marienburger Werder - form a triangle which encompasses the delta of the Vistula which was the homeland of the Prussian Mennonites from the 16th to mid-20th centuries. Although the religious affiliation of the informants providing information in the Leopold and Leopold collection was not given, one assumes that they were not Mennonite. The significant finding is that there is no evidence of tje/-je as a diminutive ending at this time.

The Origin of Mennonite Low German

When the first Mennonite religious refugees arrived in East Prussia from Belgium, Holland and North Germany in the second quarter of the 16th century, the area had already been settled for 300 years by the Teutonic Knights and their followers. The speech community of these colonists in the 13th and 14th centuries was likely never homogeneous. Low German gained dominance, likely aided by Danzig which was an important Hansa center. When the Mennonites arrived they found themselves face to face with persons whom they could generally understand if not readily speak with.

The speech of the 16th century Mennonite was not homogeneous either. The refugees consisted of speakers of at least three major branches of West Germanic (Penner 1959:922). A dialect based on Franconian was spoken by those coming from Belgium and the west coast of Holland. Frisian was used by those coming from the province of Friesland which abuts on the North and the Zuider seas. Plattdeutsch of Lower Saxon origin was spoken by the refugees from Groningen in Holland, from East Frisia, and from a scattering of other places along the North Sea German coast. The church language of these refugees was Dutch based mostly on Franconian.

The 16th century rural Mennonite communities in the delta of the Vistula were not immune from the influences coming from their Low German speaking Lutheran neighbors. The Mennonite communities, nevertheless, constituted "... relatively compact blocks, with but a small intermixture of non-Mennonites, since the land had previously been unoccupied (Bender 1956:304)." By the early 18th century, however, the Mennonites acquired land as individuals and their holdings were scattered among the region's Lutherans who were primarily Low German speaking (Penner 1959:924). The Mennonites, although extremely successful as farmers, remained a small minority in Danzig and East Prussia. Their population did not exceed 13,000 to 15,000 persons at any time during their stay (Ibid: 920).

At the time of their arrival in the 16th century, the Low German speaking Mennonites probably found it easier to communicate with the Baltic Low German Lutherans than with the Dutch Franconians and the Frisians. The church language of the Baltic Low Germans was High German.

Dutch remained the church language of the Mennonites both in the rural and urban areas until the second half of the 18th century (Krahn 1959:256-257). Although the official language of the government of Prussia was High German, the medium of communication of Mennonite to non-Mennonite was West Prussian Low German. Few Mennonites had a need to learn High German in the 16th and 17th centuries as Low German was the language of trade in the rural areas. Whether originally Franconian, Frisian or Saxon Low German speaking, West Prussian Low German was the language the Mennonites adopted long before they gave up Dutch as their church language (Krahn 1959: 187). Gradually, the Mennonites acquired High German to facilitate their entering an expanding economic network. By the middle of the 18th century most West Prussian Mennonites knew High German better than Dutch. The first High German sermon was preached in a West Prussian Mennonite rural community in 1757. Some Mennonites in Danzig may have retained Dutch longer because of constant contact through sea commerce with Holland. By 1781 the last Mennonite elder in Danzig to insist that Dutch be used in church services had died. Although some Mennonite families brought Dutch bibles and hymnals with them when they left for the Ukraine in 1788, High German religious books were probably more usual, although some families may have been none too fluent in either Dutch or High German. The first Mennonite High German hymnal to be used by West Prussian Mennonites was published in 1761.

The 462 families who established the "Old Colony" at Chortitza in the Ukraine in 1788 came from among the poorer classes in Danzig and Elbing and spoke primarily Low German (Krahn 1959:381; Krahn 1959:187). By 1803, when the Molotschna Mennonite colony was founded in Russia by a second wave of settlers from the Vistula, the Dutch influences were even weaker, Low German was still spoken but it had been altered by High German influences (Krahn 1959: 187). High German gradually came to be the prestige language of the Mennonites who formed only a small portion of the total German population in the Ukraine (Krahn 1959:384). At Molotschna and its satellite colonies, the transition from Plattdeutsch to High German became almost total for some families. A like trend continued among the Mennonites who remained on the Vistula. When evacuated to the west or overseas after the Second World War, some no longer spoke Low German except with their non-Mennonite workers (Krahn 1959: 187).

It should come as no surprise that the Low German spoken by the Canadian Mennonites in the prairie provinces reflects the speech patterns of the Mennonite communities from which their ancestors in the Ukraine came, and that this colors what members of the respective groups want to see and "hear" in their orthography. Canadians who identify with the "Old Colony" want to see more traditional Low German forms (Friesen 1988: 36). Canadians who identify with Molotschna influences appear to want to emphasize their Dutch origins (Ibid.: 38) even though the Dutch influence had become secondary to Low German for more than 100 years prior to their leaving for the Ukraine.

How is this reflected in the orthography? Besides complications arising from the view that since we once were Dutch we will always remain Dutch, Mennonite Plattdeutsch appears to be undergoing changes in its sound system which further complicate the picture. The /k/ in some environments has become palatalized, and for descendents of some Molotschna speakers has become fronted to such a degree that it is heard as palatalized t.[3] Given this development the writing of the diminutive becomes even more problematic. Should it be written as -kje or -tje? Old Colony speakers prefer the "k" variant, Molotschna speakers the "t". The argument presented by Molotschna speakers is that since the Mennonites came originally from the Netherlands, and in Dutch the diminutive is represented by tje/je, Mennonite writers should use -tje, especially since k and t are becoming indistinguishable in their Molotschna dialect.

A compromise was reached at the Winnipeg conference held in 1982 (Friesen 1988:38): kj is to be used word initially, tj word medially and finally. This results in the diminutive being written tje exclusively. The compromise was not wholly acceptable. According to Friesen, (*Ibid*.) Herman Rempel revised his Mennonite Low German dictionary using kj throughout to show its Old Colony orientation.

Friesen's solution in *The Windmill Turning* (1988) is to select kj when the tj usage produced forms so unusual that they would not be recognized by either English or High German speakers as cognates of English or German. Friesen insists that "fork" should be spelled *Forkj* rather than *Fortj*; "milk" as *Malkj* rather than *Maltj* and "I" *ekj* not *etj*. For Friesen all diminutives remain -tje/je. Thiessen (1977) uses tj throughout for palatalized stops which are derived from words having an underlying /k/. His 1963 publication represents these words [ķx].

I favor the "Old Colony" suggestions, because they remain truer to the underlying forms of Low German. In addition to retaining the -kje diminutive, which parallels in every case the diminutives found in the Leopold and Leopold 1882 collection from six West and East Prussian communities, the Old Colony writers want to retain the /n/ in writing the infinitive ending. Even though the /n/ appears no longer to be pronounced, the conservative writers feel that it should be kept in the spelling, possibly because it is found in the written form in High German. I favor keeping the n, too, even though it is no longer pronounced either in Low German or High German in the Prussian region. Retaining the n can avoid ambiguities, especially if a writer insists upon using -tje word finally.

Clearly -tje is not unknown in some other dialects of Low German, especially in East Frisian where the Dutch influence has been greater and has continued longer than in West Prussia (Bender 1957:291). Dutch was the religious language of the Mennonite church in East Frisia until World War I - admittedly with only 1/10th of the membership it had in East and West Prussia. Dutch, however, was also the religious language of the East Frisian Calvinists, who numbered at least 100,000 members by the beginning of the 20th century. During the 19th century Dutch was replaced gradually by High German as the church language of the East Frisian Calvinists. Together, the Mennonites and Calvinists of East Frisia were outnumbered by East Frisian Lutherans in the 16th and following centuries whose church language was High German.

East Frisian Low German maintains a balance between the use of -tje and -ke.[4] The -tje is used after noun stems ending in d, t, n, g, or k. Ke is used elsewhere with but few exceptions. One is the Dutch loan term bolletje, literally "little ball" but specifically a rock candy of that shape (ten Doornkaat Koolman 1879:, Vol. 1:200). The East Frisian Low German form balke refers to any other "little ball". Anke, "little Ann", a form more common in other Low German dialects, replaces the expected form Antje among some East Frisian parents, because the latter is felt to be too common. The adjectival form "little", Lűtje, shares a spot with the far less frequent noun form Lűtke which refers to a baby or infant, human or animal (Ibid. Vol. 2: 556-557).

Mennonite Low German, in other ways, retains striking parallels with East and West Prussian Low German. Noun plurals ending in -s suffixed to stems ending in an underlying /r/ become -sch, for example, the Mennonite Low German Schniedasch "cutters or taylors" (Friesen 1988). The Mennonite feminine noun marker, as in East Prussian, is -sche, for example, in kjääkjsche "kitchen maid/female cook" (Friesen 1988).[5] The palatalization of the velar stop, in my limited sample, is found in the written forms of one East Prussian community, Rastenburg. Two examples of the underlying /g/ become gj are Dingj "thing and langj "long" (Leopold and Leopold 1882:318-320).

Palatalization of t and k with a subsequent merging is not unknown in other Germanic languages. Swedish has examples of this process, with tj and kj/k becoming ç in some environments.[6] The underlying phonemes are kept in the Swedish orthography despite a continuing emphasis in Swedish to modernize its orthography.

Mennonite Low German appears to have no example whereby underlying alveolar stops have become palatalized to tj. East Frisian Plattdeutsch shows this tendency in a few ancient personal names. Theorik becomes Tjark or Tiark (Tiarks or Tiarks as family names); Theohard becomes Tjard, Tiard or Schat; Theoher remains unpalatalized as Tade/Tado/Taade (Raveling n.d.:31). Thiessen (1977) does not suggest the phonetic representation of the tj words in his Mennonite Plattdeutsch dictionary to be anything other than [ķx] and every one of these words clearly comes from a form containing an underlying /k/.[7]

If one were to remain true to the phonology of Mennonite Low German the tj should not be used in the writing system. Rempel, whose dictionary I have not seen, may come closest to representing the underlying phonology in this regard. Friesen's usage of kj/tj is insightful. He uses the tj only for the diminutive when the noun stem does not end in k. This enables the reader to recognize most diminutives and not to confuse them with words having another inflectional ending, the infinitive, which for most Mennonite speakers of Low german lacks a final n. If one were to use kj for all diminutives and n for the infinitive, which is what Old Colony Mennonites prefer, the writing system would parallel the underlying phonology even more closely. If there were clear cases of borrowing from Dutch or Frisian in Mennonite Low German, of the type Bolletje/Balke found in East Frisian Low German, then there would be justification for retaining -tje. I suspect, however, that none can be found.

In closing it might be useful to speculate on how this orthographic problem may have developed in Mennonite Low German. Several months ago when I began research on this paper, I spoke briefly with a non-Mennonite woman born in Königsberg. She left the community as a young child at the close of World War II. I asked her if she knew Plattdeutsch. She said that she knew it slightly, but had spoken it only with her parents after emigrating to West Germany and with no one after coming to Canada. I could not resist asking her which form of the diminutive she felt to be better, -ke or -tje. She blushed and said that she supposed -ke might be. Among speakers, who do not know Plattdeutsch well, -che [ç̠ə] is frequently used because such speakers are only transferring the -chen in High German to [ç̠ə]. The final n is dropped in both East Prussian High German and East and West Prussian Low German producing a new form which is neither -tje nor -ke. Could the speakers of Mennonite Plattdeutch, especially the Molotschna latecomers who were strongly influenced by High German in West Prussia, have come under the same influence?

Evidence is present, moreover, of possible influences from Slavic on Mennonite Plattdeutsch. The k and the g are palatalized in Russian and the feminine diminutive ending in Russian is -ka. The Mennonites during their 150 year sojourn in the Ukraine were strongly influenced by the speech of their non-German neighbors. Many Russian words were taken over into Mennonite Plattdeutsch. Those containing "k" retained the palatalized pronunciation.[8] Those containing the feminine diminutive -ka were treated as neuter nouns (Thiessen 1963:176-177), in Low German.

Hearing the k in the diminutive, they may have consciously or unconsciously viewed it as a Slavicism, and among the North American mennonites, aware of the Dutch diminutive ending -tje, this may have been reason why they favored the -tje. It could be a symbol of their 16th century "Dutch" origins.

In the future, we may anticipate that Mennonite *Plattdeutsch* spoken in North America will experience two contradictory influences from English. One will be in the direction of a loss of the palatalized k because cognate terms in English most frequently lack the palatalization. As more and more English loans containing /k/ are adopted into Mennonite Low German, one might anticipate that they will be pronounced without palatalization. The second influence is that some English cognates - as is true also in Frisian, which have an underlying /k/ - have been palatalized and fronted to [tʃ]. Their influence will be of the kind that will favor the Molotschna tj pronunciations in North America. Thiessen (1977:62) provides one example of a likely loan of this type *Tjill* "chill". More English words with /k/ rather than with /č/ are apt to be borrowed in Mennonite Low German, but this does not mean that the most frequently heard or used forms will direct, necessarily, future changes in the language.

The pronunciations of the Old Colony Mennonites in the United States, Canada, Mexico and Paraguay, however, are important for determining the oldest forms of Mennonite *Plattdeutsch*. Their attempts to perpetuate the language may be the last viable means of doing so for remnants of any of the former East or West Prussian Low German speech communities.

FOOTNOTES

1 All references to dates of first appearance of an English word come from the 1955 printing of the *Oxford Universal Dictionary on Historical Principles*.

2 The other diminutives are as follows:

Danzig (1882:304-305): Jahnke "little John", Schurkes "scoundrels" Stopken "little step" (cf. Mennonite Low German staupe "to step"), Mäkens "girls" (cf. Mennonite Low German Meatje "girl").

Marienburger Werder (1882:306): Schächtkes "small shafts of boots", Boddemke "little bottom" (cf. Mennonite Low German Boddem "bottom of a barrel.")

Elbing (1882:307-315): Schischkewater "dirty water".

Königsberg (1882:315-316): Pracherke "little beggar" (cf. Mennonite Low German Pracha "beggar"); Breederke "little brother"; Himmelke "little heaven"; Sinnke "little sun"; Schwoarke "rain cloud" (cf. Mennonite Low German Schwoatj "black thunder cloud"); Dittke "a little this (?)"; Julke (personal name); Spuhlke "little spool"; Soldatenpoppkes "soldiers' sweethearts"; Beenke "little leg"; Daomkes "little ladies" and Ohlerke "little old person".

Samland (1882:317-318): Ochkes "little eyes."

Rastenburg (1882:318-320): Bätke "a little bit" and Wielke "a little while."

3 Thiessen (1963:30) suggests that the k is palatalized when it precedes or follows a front vowel. His 1977 dictionary provides contradictory evidence: The [k], represented tj in the orthography, is preceded and followed by [a] in the word Fenstatjast (1977:18). In eenkelearich the non-palatalized k is followed by e, a front vowel, an environment which is shared in the words doake and enbucke, none of which are palatalized. The k is palatalized, however, in entjelt, enpeatjele and in most cases in which e occurs word finally preceded by /k/. Friesen (1988) appears to have followed Thiessen's rule for writing k except when it occurs in the diminutive where it is written tj.

4 This generalization is arrived at after making note of every use of the diminutive in Siefkes' Tŭschen Saat un Seise (1959), a volume of poetry. The findings are compatible with my impression of the use of the diminutive in the East Frisian Plattdeutsch spoken to the north of Emden.

5 Thiessen (1977:62) provides the spelling <u>Tjäatjsche</u>.

6 For example <u>tjugo</u> "twenty" and <u>kjol</u> "skirt" (Johnson 1952:273,288). Many examples of palatalized k are spelled k in Swedish rather than kj. See also Haugen (1976:268-272).

7 There is at least one exception in Mennonite Low German as is seen in the word "fart". Thiessen (1977:19) writes it <u>Fortjs</u> [fork̡xs] The s would not be anticipated. I would have expected the word to be <u>Fort</u> and the t to be unpalatalized.

8 For example, <u>Dresientje</u> "railway handcar", <u>Desjatnitj</u> "a person holding a position of authority" and <u>Bultje</u> "white bread" (cf. russ.-ukr. <u>bulka</u>). This is not to suggest that the only influence for palatalization comes from Russian. The small sample of Rastenburg <u>Plattdeutsch</u> provided two examples of palatalized g and the few Polish loanwords in Mennonite <u>Plattdeutsch</u> also contain palatalized k, for example <u>Flatj</u> "animal intestines used for making sausages" which may come from the Polish word <u>flaki</u>.

REFERENCES

BENDER, Harold S. 1956. 'Farming and Settlement.' _Mennonite Encyclopedia_. Vol. 2; 303-306.

------ 1957. 'Language Problem.' _Mennonite Encyclopedia_. Vol.3: 290-292.

DOORNKAAT KOOLMAN, J. ten. 1879-1884. _Wörterbuch der ostfriesischen Sprache_. Norden: Herm. Braams.

DRIEDGER, Johannes. 1956. 'Farming among the Mennonites in West Prussia and East Prussia.' _Mennonite Encyclopedia_ Vol. 2:311-313.

ERICKSON, Vincent. 1989. "Review of V.C. Friesen _The Windmill Turning_," JAPLA 11:148-151.

FRIESEN, Victor Carl. 1988. _The Windmill Turning: Nursery Rhymes, Maxims, and Other Expressions of Western Canadian Mennonites_. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press.

DER GROSSE DUDEN. 1959. Bd. 4. _Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache_. Mannheim: Im Dudenverlag.

HAUGEN, Einar. 1976. _The Scandinavian Languages: An Introduction to Their History_. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

JOHNSON, Walter. 1952. _Beginning Swedish_. Rock Island, Ill.: Augustana Book Concern.

KLUGE, Friedrich. 1891. _An Etymological Dictionary of the German Language_. Translated by John Francis Davis from the 4th German ed. London: George Bell & Sons.

KRAHN, Cornelius. 1959. 'Mennonite Plattdeutsch' _Mennonite Quarterly Review_ 33:256-259.

-------- 1959. 'Plattdeutsch (Plautdietsch)' _Mennonite Encyclopedia_. Vol. 4:186-188.

--------- 1959. 'Russia.' _Mennonite Encyclopedia_. Vol. 4:381-393.

LEOPOLD, Joh. A. and L. LEOPOLD. 1882. Van de Schelde tot de Weichsel: Nederduitsche Dialecten in Dicht en Ondicht. Groningen: J.B. Wolters.

LINDENBURG, C.W.H. 1960. Kleine Niederländische Sprachlehre. Heidelberg: Julius Groos Verlag.

MENNONITE ENCYCLOPEDIA. 1956-1959. Vols. I-IV. Scottsdale, Pa.: Mennonite Publishing House.

OXFORD UNIVERSAL DICTIONARY ON HISTORICAL PRINCIPLES. 1955. 3rd ed. with Corrections and Revised Addenda. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

PENNER, Horst. 1959. 'West Prussia' Mennonite Encyclopedia. Vol. 4: 921-926.

PROKOSCH, Ernst. 1933. An Outline of German Historical Grammar. New York: Oxford University Press.

RAVELING, Irma. n.d. Vornamen und Namengebung in Ostfriesland. Norden: Heinrich Soltau.

SIEFKES, Wilhelmina. 1959. Tüschen Saat un Seise. Hamburg-Wellingsbüttel:Verlag der Fehrs-Gilde.

THIESSEN, John (Jack). 1963. Studien zum Wortschatz der kanadischen Mennoniten. Bd. 64, Deutsche Dialektgeographie. Marburg: N.G. Elwert Verlag.

------- 1977. Mennonite Low-German Dictionary (Mennonitisches Wörterbuch). Marburg: N.G. Elwert Verlag.

VRIES, Jan de. 1971. Nederlands Etymologisch Woordenboek. Leiden: E.J. Brill.

ZIJPP, N. van der. 1956. 'Hymnology of the Mennonites in the Netherlands.' Mennonite Encyclopedia. Vol.2:873-875.