Svoboda, Aleš

[Greenbaum, S.; Leech, G.; Svartvik, J., ed. Studies in English linguistics for Randolph Quirk]

Brno studies in English. 1983, vol. 15, iss. 1, pp. [159]-160

SBORNÍK PRACÍ FILOZOFICKÉ FAKULTY BRNĚNSKÉ UNIVERZITY
STUDIA MINORA FACULTATIS PHILOSOPHICAE UNIVERSITATIS BRUNENSIS
K 5(1983) — BRNO STUDIES IN ENGLISH 15

S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, J. Svartvik (editors): **Studies in English Linguistics for Randolph Quirk,** Longman 1979, pp. 16+304.

'*Studies in English Lingustics* covers a broad range of research in modern English, and thus mirrors, in part, the breadth of scholarship of the man whose work it celebrates', say the editors in the preface, and this is probably the briefest and most fitting characterization of the collection of 26 papers written in honour of Randolph Quirk by his scholarly friends, collaborators and former students.

There can hardly be any more appropriate introduction to the book than the select list of publications by Randolph Quirk (compiled by Valerie Adams). Both the number of items (90 within the period from 1950 to 1980) as well as their titles testify to the vast range of Randolph Quirk's contribution to the development of English studies in particular and 'world' linguistics in general.

The papers of Professor Quirk's collaborators and friends are arranged in seven thematic sections, entitled Language theory, English grammar, Semantics of English modals, Text and Discourse, Stylistics, Attitudes to language, Lexicology and phonology. The scope of linguistics problems touched upon - or even solved - is so extensive that I do not feel competent to offer as highly a qualified comment as most of the papers deserve. For this reason I confine myself to enumerating the topics and adducing a closing - in many ways subjective - remark.

Language theory: N. Chomsky, On opacity; R. M. Kempson, Ambiguity and word meaning.

English grammar: S. Greenbaum, The treatment of clause and sentence in *A Grammar of Contemporary English;* D. Bolinger, *Couple:* an English dual; P. H. Matthews, Complex intransitive constructions; S. Jacobson, Some English verbs and the contrast incompletion/completion; M. A. K. Halliday, On being teaching; R. Huddleston, Criteria for auxiliaries and modals.

Semantics of English modals: G. Leech and J. Coates, Semantic indeterminacy and the modals; F. R. Palmer, *Can, will* and actuality; R. A. Close, *Will* in *if*-clauses.

Text and discourse: J. McH: Sinclair, Discourse in relation to language structure and semiotics; J. Firbas, Post-intonation-centre prosodic shade in the modern English clause; N. E. Enkvist, Marked focus: functions and constraints; D. Crystal, Neglected grammatical factors in conversational English; J. Svartvik, *Well* in conversation; W.-D. Bald, Some functions of *yes* and *no* in conversation; W. N. Francis, A tagged corpus - problems and prospects.

Stylistics: M. W. Blomfield, Episodic juxtaposition or the syntax of episodes in narration; E. L. Epstein, Non-restrictive modifiers: poetic features of language; J. Lyons, Pronouns of address in *Anna Karenina:* the stylistics of bilingualism and the impossibility of translation.

Attitudes to language: A. A. Hill, Bad words, good words, misused words; J. Sledd, Linguistic relativism: the divorce of word from work; R. I. McDavid, jr. - R. K. O'Cain and L. L. Barnes, Subjective appraisal of phonological variants.

Lexicology and phonology: J. Vachek, Remarks on the typology of modern English; B. M. H. Strang, The ecology of the English monosyllable.

If the editors aimed 'to capture a Quirkian sense of the unity underlying diversities of model, method and topic in contemporary research of English', they definitely did not miss the target, because the majority of contributions can bear the strictest Quirkian criteria of 'scientific' approach to language. As to the remaining few, they may be regarded as samples of diversities which wait for a linguist like Randolph Quirk to find them their proper place within the system of language.

Aleš Svoboda

Eugene Ehrlich, Stuart Berg Flexner, Gorton Carruth, Joyce M. Haxkins, **Oxford American dictionary,** Oxford University Press, New York-Oxford, 1980.

The *Oxford American dictionary (= OAD),* based on *The Oxford paperback dictionary (= OPD),* 'has been prepared especially for those who need a compact, up-to-date guide to American English' (quoted from the *Preface).* The *OAD* is the first Oxford dictionary to be compiled by American lexicographers and editors, as we learn from the introductory note *From OED to OAD* (giving the history of the Oxford dictionaries).

The *OAD* then is a dictionary of the American variant of English, not recording the differences between British and American English (the British spelling of *aluminum* is probably an exception to the rule). As a majority of words is common to the two variants of English, the *OAD* takes over most of the entries from the *OPD,* usually preserving the definitions and using the same examples (the definitions are very clear, the sequence of meanings is not historical, and the examples - not always sample sentences, as the editors claim - have been well chosen). In some cases the *OPD* definition has been preserved, although the *OAD* term is different *(fire brigade - fire department)* and in some cases we find alternations in the definitions *(dead duck, deaf mute).*

The grouping of entries may not be the same in the *OPD* and the *OAD:* while the *OPD* includes *dead pan* under *dead* and *deaf mute* under *deaf,* in *OAD* they are treated as separate entries. Similarly *soft pedal, v.,* is entered separate from *soft* in *OAD,* while the literal meaning of *soft pedal* as part of a piano is included under *soft;* this does not mean, however, that a distinction between literal and figurative meaning has decided the arrangement of the entries: *soft boiled, soft cover, soft wood* are also independent entries in *OAD.*

OAD is not an encyclopaedic dictionary (unlike most American dictionaries), but it includes a number of geographical names and the reader is even told who Napoleon was. Also recorded are the most frequent trade names.

OAD also corrects the *OPD* in some minor points: *Managua* is in its proper alphabetical place, the *marathon* is (correctly) shorter by a quarter of a mile.

The authors of *OAD* have furnished the entries with a number of helpful usage notes, pointing out the difference between *fictitious* and *fictional, allow* and *permit, accede* and *exceed,* explaining the abbreviation *LIFO* or the meaning of *acid test,* or warning against confusion between *drank* and *drunk.* Usage labels are supplied wherever necessary (there is some inconsistency between the *OPD* and the *OAD* in the entries *mama/mamma* and *mammy:* the *OPD* labels the first as 'old use' and the second one as 'American,' while *OAD* says that *mama/mamma* is 'informal' and *mammy* is 'old use.'

The above comments refer to a very small number of entries in *OAD* and they should not blur the fact the the *Oxford American dictionary* is a welcome addition to the Oxford dictionaries, with a clearly defined and well served purpose: to be a compact, reliabe and up-to-date guide to American English.

Josef Hladký