INTRALINGUAL AND INTERLINGUAL LEXICAL, GRAMMATICAL

AND PHONOLOGICAL „FALSE FRIENDS"

Dumitru MELENCIUC

Catedra Filologie Engleză

„Prietenii perfizi" există nu doar în cazul traducerii unităților lexicale din limba-sursă în limba-țintă. Acest fenomen se atestă în comunicarea intralinguală și interlinguală la nivel gramatical, lexical, lexical-gramatical și fonologic, în plan semiotic și metasemiotic, inclusiv în cazul sinonimiei, omonimiei, paronimiei contextuale și stilistice. Sunt de menționat, de asemenea, diferențele lexical-fonologice și gramaticale în cadrul dialectelor și al variantelor limbii engleze, care prezintă și ele dificultăți pentru purtătorii de limbă.

„False friends" are looked for in interlingual translations. In the present paper we have made an attempt to single out this phenomenon in different language compartments. „Deceptive cognates" can be found not only in the vocabulary due to the development of polysemy, semantic change, change of forms, graphical and sound forms in various functional styles. Some examples will be given concerning phonological lexicology, grammatical and some other unusual lexical „cognates".

1. Phonological level. We should state the fact that verbal communication is based on a system of differences - on the ability of the speaker or listener to distinguish between differences and similarities of meaningful phonetic prosody. In discourse we can realize several meanings using different prosodic patterns. Thus, the lexeme „\pretty" in „She is \pretty" used with a simple falling tone is a statement stating the fact that the young lady is lovely. If the speaker is greatly impressed and exclaims „She is quite \pretty!", he uses an emphatic high fall, wide range, increased loudness and slowed down tempo to really express his enthusiasm and admiration. In case of „/pretty?" used with a low rise it may be a simple question or even express some doubt of her being pretty. In case of „\/pretty" a fall rise with specific voice qualifications like in „She is quite \/pretty" we have a pejorative enantiosemic meaning created by means of suprasyntactic prosody: She might be pretty, but I don't like her! Thus, the particular prosodic pattern with which the utterance is pronounced affects the meaning and understanding of an utterance. It can be a case of „false friends" for foreign learners of English, who are not familiar with all the subtleties of suprasegmental prosody. Even one prosodic element can change the meaning of the utterance. In what follows we shall quote some examples from „An Outline of English Phonetics" (edited by O.Akhmanova and L.Minajeva, MSU, 1973), where the ordinary literate user of the language becomes conscious of differences and similarities of sounds only in the more obvious cases. While the less well trained native speakers and foreigners may find it difficult to always be aware of the exact meaning rendered by this or that prosodic structure. Thus, in the sentences ||What are you working \for?|| (what are you trying to obtain?) and What are you \working.for? (Why are you working?) – the difference in meaning is created by the use of the emphatic fall on different lexemes in the given utterances. The difference in meaning may be caused by a simple stress pattern: *dancing girl* (fata dansândă) and dancing girl (dansatoarea). A simple pause in an utterance can create confusion. For example: ||The sun's rays meet|| and ||The sons raise meat|| – pronounced in the same way, only the pause helps us clearly distinguish in speech the difference in meaning. Let us take one more example with different tone patterns: || He doesn't 'lend his "books to \anybody|| and || He doesn't lend his books to \/anybody||. In the first case nobody will get the books, in the second, only some people will get them [5, 163-164]. There are plenty of examples where the variation of stress-patterns causes differences in meaning: a 'blackbird's \ nest = nest of a blackbird (*mierlă*); a '*black \bird's nest* – the nest of a black-coloured bird. In the written form in this case we find some difference, but in oral communication we may have difficulties if we are not aware of the specific rules in this case. Pauses can be used to create different meanings in speech: || *The sun's rays | meet* || and | *The sons | raise meat* || are pronounced in the same way, they are practically indistinguishable in speech, the ambivalence being resolved by the place of the pause and the context as well. We find the same in: || *When I eat ice-cream, I love it,* vs. || *When I eat,| I scream: „I \love it"* [2, p.21-26]. Lexicological phonetics goes into the problems of the vocabulary much deeper. The following usage of the word *common*, realize different meanings: ||*Why*

he is a 'common ..labouring \boy.|| ||ˈWhy he is a \common 'labouring ˌboy. **||** In this example there is a semio-logically relevant opposition of prosodic features helping to differentiate the two meanings: 1) ordinary, and 2) vulgar. The meaning of the word depends on the way it is uttered [2, p.21-26].

2. Grammatical „false cognates”. While learning the native and foreign languages we find out that many grammatical forms present difficulties as to properly understanding their meanings. There are quite a number of cases when we are confronted with grammatical forms which display characteristic features of „false friends” or „false cognates”. The ing-forms or gerund and participle one can find various interpreta-tions in grammar books. Thus, analyzing the material we can conclude that there are polysemantic grammati-cal perfect forms, and some of them which do not express anteriority. The past perfect form in the indicative can be used to express an anterior action to a moment or action in the past: *When I came home he **had** **already left***. In clauses of time and condition it expresses a future anterior action: *He said that he would return the book as soon as he **had read** it/* The same form is used in subjunctive II to express anterior actions in the past and future and non-anterior meaning (devoid of anteriority) in the simple past actions: 1. Ante-riority in the past: *He said he would have come earlier if he had known; El a spus că ar fi venit (venea) mai devreme dacă ar fi avut (să fi avut, dacă avea) timp;* 2. Subjunctive II, anteriority to the present moment of speech: *If she had come in time yesterday you would have seen her; Dacă ea ar fi venit (să fi venit, dacă venea) la timp ieri, ai fi văzut-o (o vedeai);* In this case in both languages there is no grammatical anteriority expressed. 3. Subjunctive II, future anteriority in the past**:** *I knew he would say that he would have come if he had known; Eu știam că el va spune că ar fi venit (venea) dacă ar fi știut (să fi știut).* 4. Subjunctive II, ante-riority to a moment or action in the future: *She thinks he will say that he would have come if he had known; Ea crede că el va spune că ar fi venit (venea) dacă ar fi știut (să fi știut, dacă știa).* This phenomenon is not clearly expressed for the learner of the language. Another example of polyfunctionality polysemy and homo-nymy is *should*. 1. **Should**+infinitive in the secondary clause of the type (*it) is recommended (suggested,* etc**.) that...,** in object clauses after verbs like *to recommend, to suggest, to demand,* etc**.;** in subject clauses, etc. *Should* in this case is used in the suppositional mood (which is synonymous to subjunctive I in the second meaning): *The best thing the commission can do is to recommend that the Geneva conference should begin again with renewed energy.* 2. The conditional clause with **should** + infinitive: *Should the U.N. fail* (*If the U.N. should fail) to produce an early settlement, are we then to wash our hands of the whole matter.* 3. The modal *should* in various meanings. ***Obligation***: *He said that she should be there in time.* ***Emotional emphatic function; attitude towards the event***, etc.: It is strange that he *should be* there at this time. *It is good that* the *Government should have recognized the opportunity and the obligations.* As to grammatical „false friends” there is a lot to be explained to the learners of the native and foreign languages in order to have a better understanding of the corresponding systems. In grammatical contexts it is the syntactic structure context serving to determine the meanings of a polysemantic word: the verb *make* in the meaning of *'to force, to enduce',* is found in the context of the structure *to make somebody do something* or if *make* is followed by a noun and the infinitive of a verb, adjective (*to make smb. laugh, go, work; to make a good wife, a good teacher,* etc.). Examples like *she will make a good teacher* are syntactically bound meanings [2, p.68-74].

3. Lexical „false cognates”. The factors accounting for semantic change may be subdivided into: extra-linguistic and linguistic causes. By extra-linguistic causes we mean various changes in the life of the spea-king community: in economic and social structure, changes of ideas, scientific concepts, way of life and other spheres of human activities. Among the linguistic and extra-linguistic means of semantic change we could mention: *generalization, specialization, melioration, pejoration or deterioration, metaphorical usage,* etc. Confronting lexemes, taken from related languages, we try to find out elements of common origin and differences. The degree of change is greater in borrowings. The borrowed words continue to modify their semantic structures under the influence of the new extra-linguistic reality of the given linguistic community: historic conditions, traditions, culture, development of science and technology. In prehistoric times the economic, political, ecological situation, the relatively low level of development of the existing society and other extra-linguistic reasons imposed the separation of population into smaller groups, migrating to other territories, in order to survive and develop their own variant of the common language. An interesting example of diachronic evolution represents the lexeme ***garbage*** (syn. *food waste, refuse, entrails, offal, trash, cor-rupted data* in computers), borrowed into Engl. (via Norman French) from the Italian *garbuzo,* coming from the Old Italian *garbuglio*. In Modern Italian *garbuglio* means *confusion, muddle, mess; jumble, mishmash*. In

Engl. we find backformations like *garble*. Of the same origin with the It. *garbulio* are the Rom. *harababură* (variant – *arababură*) – (*disorder, noise, scuffle, scandal*), the Sp. *garbullo (1. brawl, fight, scuffle, thrashing, whipping, beating; 2. disposal dump, refuse dump, refuse tip, rubbish dump*), and the Fr. *grabuge* (*quarrel; altercation; variance; falling-out, wrangle, squabble; noise, scandal; scuffle, fight*) [1]. In Hindi the related word is **gar-bar** [3, p.323] *uneven* (of roads); 2) *disorderly, confused; twisted; 2. м. 1) disorder, confusion, mess; muddle, jumble, mishmash; chaos*; 2) *confusion, disarray (embarrassment, confusion); commotion, perturbation (panic), implication*. See also the Hindi *харбба м. 1) беспорядок, анархия; 2) шум, гам. Harb* (war) sounds identical in Arabic and Turkish, in their turn they seem related to the Rom. *grabă - în grabă – in a hurry*; a *grăbi – to act quickly, to move in a hurry, to accelerate...* (cf. Bolgarian - *grabja*), Rus. *грабеж - robbery; pillage, plunder(ing), robber; burglar;* Ukranian – *грабувати, грабіж*. Cf. the Engl. *grab* and the Germ. *graben, Grab* [1]. In Engl. *grab* has developed a rich semantic structure: *clutch, grasp, seizure; snatcher, resurrectionist, catchpoll, bumbailiff, policeman*. It also has a number of semes belonging to technical terminology: *excavator, digger, power shovel, steam shovel, earth-moving machine, scoop, dipper, ladle; bucket*. In the Germ. *Selbst sein Grab graben* we find identical meanings to the Rus. *гроб* and the Ukr. *гріб, гробу*. The Rom. *gropar (grave digger)*, the Rus. *грабарить* (dig out), *грабарский*, the Ukr. *грабарь (navvy; digger)* and *грабарувати* (dig out) [4] are in a way identical to the Germ. *graben*. Many semantic structures have most of their specific semes developed in the given speaking communities. Any remnants of complete or partial coincidence of certain semes of a given lexeme are very important to be singled out from those which have developed different semes and still recognizable forms characteristic to „false friends".

Abridged units are a considerable source of „false friends". Speaking of blendings like *brunch (breakfast+lunch), mimsy (miserable+flimsy), galumph (gallop+triumph)* we should mention the fact that the lexemes they resemble in form (brunch – *ramură, filială* etc.) and possess there own semantic structures and meanings to be know learners not to have „false friends". In case of abbreviations we should specially single out the acronyms, which usually resemble some existing words, or are pronounced and written like lexical units. The most important drawback of acronyms is homonymy. Thus, the acronym ABC [eibisi] is used in different semantic meanings, which practically result in about 30 homonyms. The acronym AIDS as „acquired immunodeficiency syndrome", has 16 homonymous terms [7]. The acronym variants of PET and Pet have 127 homonyms! The decoding of many proper noun homonymous abbreviations demonstrates the fact that they possess two or more homonymous meanings: **ADAM** – *Advanced Data Management System (MITRE Corp. - US), Aid in Design and Evaluation of Data Management (IBM-US), Automatic Data Management System (US), Automatic Document Abstracting Method (Ohio State University - US)*, **EMIE** – *Education Management Information Exchange (GB), Educational Media Institute Evaluation Project*. Many acronyms have homonyms both in English and other foreign languages as well. Thus, **MIDAS** – has 11 homonyms. Many acronyms do not just represent combinations of words; they gradually developed features of independent lexical units with new global meanings. Thus, *LASER* – well known as *Light Amplification by Stimulated Emission of Radiation* (there also such homonymous combinations as: *Learning Achievement through Saturated Educational Resources; London and South Eastern Library Region; Learning Achievement through Saturated Educational Resources; London and South*) may be used as a noun, adjective, verb: *to lase* – print some materials by using *a laser printer; a laser aircraft – an aircraft with a laser engine, laser –* in the meaning of *quantum/laser amplifier*, etc. [1]. As there are more than half a million abbreviated units, we can imagine the „false friend-ness" of most of them!

4. The British and American English variants have developed phonological and lexical differences which serve as „false cognates" for foreign learners of English: *dumb – stupid, cracker, cookie – biscuit, sick – ill, elevator – lift, truck – lorry, baggage – luggage, candy – sweets, apartment – flat; dormitory (fraternity, sorority) – hostel; cereal – porridge; pants – trousers; vacation – holiday; campus – grounds; accord – agreement*, etc. The lexeme *bug* in British English has a much narrower meaning (*ploşniţă*) than in the American variant, where it has acquired a wider meaning of *insect*, and also that of *bacteria, fashion*, etc. *Bug* in both variants has acquired the meaning of „electronic listening device" [6, 77-82]. Within the same language we observe considerable semantic change of lexical units. Thus, in the New England or Boston dialect one comes across familiar with their meanings different from the literary variant of English: *I calculate* is used, in the meaning of *I know* (*I calculate he is at school*). *To swim* means *to bathe*; the lexeme *master* is synonymous to *excellent* (*a master job*); I *aim to work in the garden* means I *intend to work in the garden*.

Body may be used in the meaning of *person* (*How can a body get to the airport?*). In Pennsylvania Dutch Country people use a dialect, preserving elements of German, with specific syntactic structures: *come and eat yourself = come and have dinner with us, help yourself*; *if I eat myself = if I pay for my food; He wants rain = He* predicts *rain* [6, 77-82].

„False friends" are expected occur in interlingual translations. In reality we can come across this pheno-menon in intralingual and interlingual communication on different levels: grammatical, lexical, lelxical-grammatical, lexical-phonological, on semiotic, intersemiotic and metasemiotic planes, including cases of synonymy, homonymy, paronymy, etc. The following sociolinguistic factors should be taken into conside-ration in our research: the level of knowledge of the speaker of the native language in case of intralingual interpretation; the level of knowledge of the foreign language speaker in case of interlanguage interpretation. Deceptive cognates can also appear due to the development of polysemy, semantic change, and change of forms, graphical and sound forms in various functional styles. We have not analyzed here the traditional „false friends" given in various publications. We wanted to give some examples of other types of possible „false cognates".

References:

1. ABBYY Lingvo 10, 2004 ABBYY Software Ltd.
2. Melenciuc D. (alcătuitor). A Reader in English Lexicology. - Chişinău, CEP USM, 2005.
3. Бескровный В.М. (составитель). Хинди-русский словарь. - Москва, 1959.
4. Украиньско-російський словник. - Київ, 1984.
5. Melenciuc D. A Reader in English Theoretical Phonetics. - Chişinău, CEP USM, 2005.
6. Melenciuc D. Semantic and Structural Changes of Lexemes in Closely and Distantly Related Languages // Studia Universitatis. Seria „Ştiinţe umanistice", nr.10. - Chişinău, CEP USM, 2008.
7. McCully C.B. Some Notes on the Structure of Acronyms, 1988.

Prezentat la 29.04.2011