

Urbanová, Ludmila

[Jones, Daniel. **Everyman's English pronouncing dictionary**]

Brno studies in English. 1983, vol. 15, iss. 1, pp. 161-162

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/104003>

Access Date: 16. 02. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

Daniel Jones, *Everyman's English pronouncing dictionary*, revised by A. C. Gimson, 14th edition, London Melbourne and Toronto, 1977, reprinted 1979, 1980.

The fourteenth edition of *Everyman's English pronouncing dictionary* reflects the dynamic character of English pronunciation, recording the substantial changes which have taken place in it in recent decades and simultaneously representing, in the interpretation of its editor, A. C. Gimson, a revision of some basic concepts, the notation and the arrangement of entries in the dictionary. The *Introduction* has been expanded and completely revised, and the *Explanatory notes* largely rewritten. The most striking change concerns the definition of 'Received Pronunciation'.

The character of RP is no longer strictly bound to a social type of pronunciation ('Public School Pronunciation'). In Gimson's new conception, RP represents a style of pronunciation which has a regional, geographical basis, and has wide intelligibility.

Gimson stresses the decreasing influence of social criteria in pronunciation and considerable influence of broadcasting in the spread of RP. On the basis of this new conception of RP, the hierarchy of pronunciation variants has changed and new variants have been included in the dictionary. Thus RP status has been extended to include those regional variants of pronunciation which are current and acceptable from the point of view of the present state of pronunciation.

The delimitation of RP as the type of pronunciation of speakers educated at public boarding schools no longer corresponds to reality. Gimson points out the influence of Cockney and Mid-Atlantic (as prestigious types of pronunciation) on the pronunciation of young people. According to Gimson, RP pronunciation cannot be labelled 'educated' since on the one hand it is characteristic of people who cannot be classed among 'educated' with certainty, and on the other hand it is not used by all educated people. Thus the label 'RP' remains, but the content of this concept has substantially changed, due to the new trends.

The basic criteria for the delimitation of the RP model according to Gimson are the following:

- (i) the pronunciation is limited as to generation — the middle generation pronunciation (this criterion takes into account speakers using English as a foreign language; the pronunciation of the older generation is often considered to be obsolete; the pronunciation of the young generation is not yet fully shaped, lacking stability, and representing a transitive trend);
- (ii) the pronunciation is limited by the very phonological system of the language, by the number of distinctive sounds in the system and their functional use (i.e. incidence);
- (iii) the pronunciation is limited phonetically (as to sound quality), this limitation influencing the determination of allophones.

The notation in the dictionary is basically phonological. Changes in the inventory of phonetic symbols of vowels and diphthongs correspond to basic qualitative differences in the English vocalic system. Oppositions of vocalic quality are represented by specific symbols; at the same time, however, the mark of length is used as an auxiliary, accompanying sign. The use of the length mark is certainly redundant from the phonological point of view, but it continues to serve a good purpose in the eyes of the language learners. For a similar reason the symbol [ẽ] should perhaps not have been replaced by [ea], but retained. Even if the possibility of this change was already mentioned in Gimson's *Introduction to the pronunciation of English* (1970), it does not correspond to the emphasis laid on the vocalic quality.

The comments on the pronunciation of unstressed syllables are highly instructive. At present the pronunciation with [ð] prevails over the traditionally more frequent [I] in certain suffixes (-ity, -ate).

As for consonants, Gimson mentions an interesting factor concerning the phoneme distinction [p] - [b], which is predominantly due to aspiration versus non-aspiration.

In the clusters [sp], [st], [sk], in which [p], [t], [k] are non-aspirated, it is often a problem to determine the syllable boundary. In such cases, according to Gimson, the decisive factor is the "intuitively transparent morpheme boundary".

In Gimson's interpretation, the occurrences of the linking [r] and the intrusive [r] are restricted in comparison with Jones'.

The arrangement of the dictionary also bears some traces of revision. A total of 1032 new entries have been included in the dictionary, 208 entries have been omitted.

The present extent of the dictionary records the pronunciation of approximately 59,664 words. It was impossible to record all the neologisms in the English word-stock, especially terms and words that cannot yet be regarded as well established in the language.

The revised edition of *Everyman's English pronouncing dictionary* is a valuable reference book for all speakers of English, both native and foreign.

Ludmila Urbanová

Peter Newmark, **Approaches to Translation**. Oxford: Pergamon Press. 1981. 200 pp.

Professor Newmark's book on the theory and practice of translation is a selection from his papers published between the years 1969 and 1980 and arranged in such a way that discussions of related topics are grouped together. The first nine chapters, assembled under the heading "Aspects of Translation Theory", are followed by "some propositions on translation" in 145 sections, varying in length from one sentence to several pages of print. They display the author's principal ideas on numerous theoretical and practical aspects of the translator's work. This arrangement of the book results in some overlapping and, in some instances, in slightly unsystematic presentation of problems, but the reader can always find his way to the principal issues by consulting the name and subject indexes. A bibliography of over 230 items greatly enhances the value of the publication, for it includes, besides some philosophical and linguistic writings that are relevant to the matter considered, a highly representative list of books and articles illustrating various approaches to translation.

In the author's view, "all translation remains a craft requiring a trained skill, continually renewed linguistic and non-linguistic knowledge and a great deal of flair and imagination, as well as intelligence and above all common sense" (p. 63). At the present early stage of the development of translation theory the last attribute is equally important for those who write about translation as for those who practice it, and Professor Newmark displays it to a degree not too frequently found in books on the subject. In addition, his long experience of teaching how to translate has provided him with innumerable examples of happy and less happy renderings of source-language texts into English. On these foundations the author erects a structure of practical comments which are of lasting value for all those who need assistance in such matters as the translation of proper names, punctuation, the choice of a stylistic variant, etc. In constructing a hierarchy of values concerning translation he adopts a functional approach, though he never formulates it as principle and himself uses the word "functional" in a severely restricted sense. This approach, apparent behind his observations on specific subjects, makes his book very useful and instructive reading for translators even outside the English-speaking world, even for those who may already be well acquainted with the linguistic background explained by Professor Newmark as well as those who may find his practical suggestions inapplicable in their own languages.

The author's view of translation as a craft rather than a science is reflected in his cautious treatment of the theoretical problems in the first part of his book. He is never tired of warning against a dogmatic approach and even goes so far as to reject the possibility of a general theory of the subject. He believes that the purpose of translation theory is to elaborate the methods of translation for the benefit of the practical worker in the field, for the critic and, last but not least, for the linguist. This proposition, together with the author's emphasis on linguistic analysis, and his suggestion of the translatability of all texts, shows that his basic ideas spring from the linguistic approach to translation, as exemplified especially by Eugene Nida (the author of the *Foreword* to this book) and the Leipzig School. However, Professor Newmark makes continual efforts to develop, on this foundation, a more comprehensive view of the matter and to bring the specific problems of imaginative literature into the picture. This approach leads to positive results, not so much in his paper on the translation of metaphor as in his rejection of the principle of dynamic equivalence in texts in which "the culture is as important as the message" (p. 11), and in his original dichotomy of semantic translation, offering the precise contextual meaning of the author, and communicative translation, aiming at full dynamic equivalence.