

e. g., his mistaken belief, referred to above, of the glottal stop belonging to the optimal phonological system of LCz. Similarly, some of his ideas with which he proceeds to examine ClCz (mainly those concerning the CnCz elements contained in it) are rather drawn from older literature than from actual speech materials, which, in the long run, disprove the validity of such ideas — this is the case, e. g., of CnCz /ou/, supposedly corresponding to LCz /u:/ after disjuncture (i. e. in word-initial positions, cp. *ouřad*, *ouřoda*, etc.). In reality, this /ou/ proves to be the least common of all CnCz elements whose existence in ClCz has been examined. A first-hand knowledge of Bohemian ClCz (and even CnCz) would have revealed that *ou-*, even in CnCz, is now felt rather as a kind of comically archaic feature, deliberately employed for expressive purposes (thus, e. g., the word-form *ouřad* satirizingly implies a clumsy, bureaucratically conducted office, etc.).

The author can hardly be taken to task for such errors — they inevitably result from lack of direct contact with the country and people whose language he has been examining. For analogous reasons, the relatively scanty corpus on which his examination was based and the very casual contact he obviously had with his informants (*émigrés*, some of whom were absent from Czechoslovakia for months and even years, no more participating in the extra-linguistic reality of the Czech life, so that the up-to-dateness of their utterances may be open to some doubt) can hardly guarantee an absolute reliability of the obtained materials and, consequently, of the conclusions drawn from them. For conducting an examination of the intended type the investigator should live in close contact with his informants for weeks, if not months (as, e. g., E. Sivertsen did in examining Cockney English) so as to get a really dependable first-hand knowledge of a sufficient quantity of the examined materials. Obviously, such research can only be effected in the country in which the language is spoken and where all its dynamic trends can be observed in pure, undistorted form.

What has been said here in the way of commentary to Kučera's monograph does not in the least detract from its value. The book is a vast treasury of interesting observations, only some of which could be singled out. Excellent chapters deal with Czech stress and sentence melody, but lack of space does not allow the reviewer to discuss them here. The exactness and care with which the author has tackled his problems, his admirable knowledge of the literature of the subject (including books and papers published in Czechoslovakia) (8) as well as his sound common sense make the bulk of his monograph most helpful to anyone interested in the study of Czech, and highly stimulating for any expert worker in the field.

Josef Vachek

NOTES

¹ Cf. *Janua Linguarum*, No. 1 ('s-Gravenhage 1956), pp. 20ff.

² C. F. Hockett, *A Manual of Phonology* (Suppl. to *IJAL* vol. 21), Baltimore 1955.

³ J. Vachek, *Dictionnaire de linguistique de l'École de Prague* (Utrecht — Anvers 1960), s. v. *contraste de contact des phonèmes*.

⁴ See B. Trnka's paper *General Laws of Phonemic Combinations*, *Travaux du CLP* 6, 1935, pp. 57—62, somewhat unjustly treated of by N. S. Trubetzkoy in his *Grundzüge der Phonologie*, *Travaux du CLP* 7, 1939, pp. 221f.

⁵ Similarly, it may be seen that the Cockney dialect of English has been able to do away with some structural deficiencies still incumbent on the Southern British standard of English (see the present reviewer's evaluation of E. Sivertsen's *Cockney Phonology*, Oslo 1960, in *Philologica Pragensia* 5, 1962, pp. 159—166).

⁶ See, e. g., *Travaux du CLP* 2, 1929, pp. 15f., *ibid.* 4, 1931, pp. 264f.

⁷ Cp. A. Lamprrecht, *Slovo a slovesnost* 17, 1956, pp. 65—78; M. Komárek, *Ztschr. f. Slavistik* 2, 1957, pp. 52—60 (esp. p. 56).

⁸ It is only difficult to see why among the "sources for population statistics" the Czechoslovak sources have not been quoted at all.

Eugen Paulíny: Fonológia spisovnej slovenčiny. [Phonology of Standard Slovak.] Bratislava 1961. Pp. 121.

The book under review, though intended only as a textbook for university students, deserves registering by linguists, because it constitutes the first systematic phonological description ever presented by a Czechoslovak scholar of his own mother tongue. It even appeared a few weeks earlier than its Czech opposite number, H. Kučera's *The Phonology of Czech* (published by Mouton & Co. in the Hague). Unlike Kučera, Paulíny excludes sentence phonology from his survey, but includes a chapter on the combination of morphemes — both on somewhat disputable

grounds. One can hardly agree to the author's statement that the means employed by sentence phonology do not constitute (or, at least, do not reveal) oppositions: since Karcevskij's time the existence of such oppositions has been admitted, and American scholars (such as Hockett and Kučera) have gone a long way to provide a methodology describing the system of such oppositions. — As regards the inclusion into phonology of such facts as are usually classified as belonging to morphonology, one can only wait for more detailed argument to be given in one of Prof. Pauliny's forthcoming papers.

Having pedagogical aims in view, the author duly included in his book also a brief section (pp. 7—15) dealing with the phonetics of Slovak. In delimiting phonetics and phonology, the author rightly insists on the fact that "in the practice of everyday life... phonology represents the primary and fundamental kind of approach to the examination of the phonic aspect of language", while the phonetic approach to this examination is "secondary and abstract, purely analytic" (p. 6). The author aptly refutes the frequently held view that phonology approaches the phonic facts of language "in an unnatural, idealistic manner."

The above argument shows that Pauliny's aim was not just to compile a handbook describing a concrete language but that he never shrank from attacking problems of general phonology. In doing so, he declared himself a follower of the Prague group; he is never afraid, however, of going off beaten tracks. He often combines the Prague and Harvard methods (among other things, he accepts the principle of binary oppositions, advocated by Harvard theoreticians), adapting both as he thinks fit. The conclusions he offers are not always convincing but they never lack originality and even provocativeness. If some of the conclusions appear rather provisional, this is perhaps due to the fact that the book was compiled as a textbook, whose formulas are often worded "on the spur of the moment", in discussions with students; had the book been written exclusively for experts in phonology, its arguments would undoubtedly have taken on a more definite and pregnant shape.

The said provisional character is reflected in some of the basic definitions. Thus, for inst., phonemes are defined as "generalized abstractions of sounds living in the linguistic consciousness of the users of a given language" (p. 21). After a few lines, the phoneme is said to be "a generalized abstraction of the basic features of sounds characteristic of the given language" (*ibid.*). These rather vague formulas strike one by their psychologicistic approach, which has certainly not been typical of the Prague group since the early 'thirties. At the same time, the author does not hesitate to subscribe to the Harvard thesis establishing a limited number of distinctive features, whose oppositions are believed to build up the phonological systems of all existing languages (p. 26). The Harvard theses, of course, take for granted the conception of a phoneme equal to the sum of its distinctive features, and it is rather difficult to see how this conception can be compatible with one based more or less on psychologicistic considerations.

Pauliny's concrete observations of Slovak phonic facts and their phonematic interpretation are often fine and delicate. Thus, e. g., starting from his conception of the syllable (which he conceives as a fundamental constitutive procedure in the chain of language), he accounts for the fact that clusters combining [t, d, t', d'] with [s, z, š, ž] cannot exist in Slovak as due to the very vague contrast that would exist between the two elements of such clusters — the syllable, as he takes it, should include phonemes with more sharply contrasting qualities. — Also the phonematic relation of the Slovak sounds [i] and [j] is, in principle, dealt with adequately: in their contextual distribution the two sounds are indeed perfectly complementary, and only instances of the type, *šija zmija* disprove their phonematic identification, because such an interpretation would violate the rules of phonematic grouping prevailing in Slovak (as is commonly known, geminated phonemes are unknown inside Slovak morphemes). It does not seem probable, of course, that the [j]-sound in words of this category should be functionally irrelevant, constituting — at least in the pronunciation of some speakers — a mere hiatus phenomenon, as Pauliny is inclined to believe, trying to dispute away instances of the type *šija, zmija* (and so to save the phonematic unity of Slovak [i] and [j]). Obviously, forms like /ši-a/, /zmi-a/ would only too strikingly contrast with the rules of morphematic structure otherwise prevailing in Slovak.

From the more theoretical chapters, the one informing about the development of the concept of phoneme (pp. 50—57) is fairly instructive, at least as regards the approach to the problem by Soviet scholars; somewhat less adequately are handled the views of the Western linguists. Thus, e. g., D. Jones's conception of the phoneme is not analogous to, but widely different from, that of O. Jespersen (cf. J. Vachek in *Charisteria Gu. Mathesio...* oblata, Prague 1932, pp. 25 ff); similarly, one can hardly do justice to J. R. Firth's views by labelling them as "an English branch of behaviorism"; as a matter of fact, the behaviorist approach, typical of the American descriptivist school has always been bitterly opposed by members of the London group (see the present reviewer's account of that group in *Sborník fil. fak. Brno A7, 1958*, pp. 106 ff). (Incidentally, in J. R. Firth's name J. stands for John, not for Jones, as the misprint has it on Pauliny's page 54.)

Paulíny goes his own way also in the application of the Harvard group principle of binary oppositions, regarded as basic components of the structure of the phonic plane to the phonic facts of Slovak. In more than one instance, he establishes different kinds of opposition (and, consequently, of distinctive features) than the Harvard scholars. Thus, in Paulíny's view, the mutual relations of the Slovak consonant phonemes /p, t, t', k/ cannot be classified as compact vs. diffuse /k, t' - p, t/ and acute vs. grave /t, t' - k, p/. In his opinion, the labials like /p, b/ are opposed both to /t, d/ and to /t', d'/ as "non-accommodated vs. accommodated". This distinction he bases on the circumstance that the members of the *t*- and *t'*-series are, at least to a degree, susceptible to mutual neutralizations, when standing in immediate contact, while the members of the *p*-series, when contacted with the members of the *t*, *t'*- or *k*-series, show no trace of such susceptibility.

The difference undoubtedly exists, but it is rather doubtful whether it can serve as a criterion deciding the number and kind of distinctive features in a language. The difference, that is to say, is concerned with the positional distribution of phonemes, while the Harvard scholars base their own classification of distinctive features exclusively on non-distributive, i. e. purely phonic facts (mainly acoustic, but having ascertainable physiological correlates). As, later on, Paulíny classifies the "accommodated phonemes" further as grave vs. acute /k - t, t'/, it is obvious that he combines here the phonic and distributional criteria in a manner that markedly differs from the procedure of the Harvard group. A thorough consideration of all aspects of this sort of combination will be needed to show whether such a procedure can be justified: in any case, the classification resulting from Paulíny's procedure would be qualitatively different from the classification resulting from the procedure employed by the Harvard group.

Some other distinctions of Paulíny's, too, differ from the established Harvard pattern: see e. g., the replacement of the Harvard opposition mellow vs. strident by Paulíny's non-sibilant, vs. sibilant /t, d - s, z/, to which are added /t, d - c, dz/ and /t', d' - š, ž, č, dž/. — The classification of the opposition /t' - t/ (in the Harvard terminology denoted as sharp vs. plain) as dark vs. light is obviously due to some misunderstanding, not only because the terms suggested by Paulíny have long been applied to different phonic oppositions (e. g., /u - i/), but also because [t'] characterized by a higher tone than [t], could claim the metaphorical term "light" much more justly than its counterpart in the given opposition.

Another problem in solving which Paulíny goes his own way is that of the phonematic identification of the Slovak sounds [n] and [ŋ]. In Paulíny's opinion, [ŋ] can be identified with /n/ because it lacks the feature of darkness (possessed by /ň/), and, on the other hand, cannot be identified with the "non-accommodated" /m/. Paulíny has penetratingly realized here the difficulty, pointed out by other scholars too (e. g. by E. Fischer—Jørgensen in Proceedings of the Eighth International Congress of Linguists, Oslo 1958, p.), consisting in the fact that the distributionally complementary sounds [n] and [ŋ] do not seem to be definable in terms of such distinctive features, common to both as would justify their phonematic identification. But the solution of the problem, as suggested by Paulíny, appears somewhat artificial; a simpler theory has been suggested by R. Jakobson (J. Whatmough's volume, p. 109), who classifies the opposition of /m - n/ as grave vs. non-grave, while the opposition of /ň - n/ is evaluated as acute vs. non-acute, /n/ being thus non-grave and non-acute at the same time. The difference between the two Czech (and, analogously, Slovak) variants [n] nad [ŋ] is formulated in terms of different kinds of pitch in the murmur and in the release: the articulation of [n] joins low pitch murmur and high pitch release, while that of [ŋ] presents exactly the opposite combination of the two resonances, i. e. high pitch murmur and low pitch release. — In this manner, the acoustic analysis supports the well-known fact that from the point of view of complementary distribution [ŋ] can only be phonematically joined with /n/, not with /m/ or /ň/: see word-pairs like *Manka - manka*, *banĕka - baňka*, while none such pair can be found contrasting [n] and [ŋ].

Interesting remarks are concerned with Slovak diphthongs. Paulíny is undoubtedly right in denying the phonematically diphthongal status to the combination [ou]. It certainly does not represent, from the phonematic viewpoint, /o/ + /u/. One should, indeed, interpret it phonematically as /ov/. This is evidenced both by the analogy of instances like *bratov*, *slivka*, *polievka* etc. (in which /v/ is manifested as [u]), and by the absence of "rhythmical shortening" of long vowels in the syllable preceding the instrumental ending *-ou* (e. g. *krásnou*, *krávou*). In this connection the author should have pointed out that here the current Slovak spelling is decidedly anti-phonological.

On the other hand, Paulíny's classification of the oppositions /s - š, z - ž, c - č, dz - dž/ with those of /t - t', d - d', n - ň/ under the heading of the correlation "light - dark" is very improbable, as the phonic differences involved can hardly be brought to one common denominator. Also the interpretation of instances like *olca*, *svetský* (pronounced without the separate plosion of the [t]-sounds) like /occa, svecki:/ can hardly be approved of. In the first instance there

is no geminated affricate but simply one act of plosion common to two consecutive sounds, [t] and [c]. Cases of such economy of articulation are quite commonplace in languages (see instances like *lamp*, *hand*, Slovak *lampa*, *banda*). The phonemetic structure /otca/ thus obviously remains in force. In the other instance, [sveoki:], the supposed /c/-phoneme is clearly dissociated into two parts — and thus into two phonemes — /t/ and /s/ by the operation of what Prof. Trnka calls contactual contrast (see J. Vachek, *Dictionnaire de linguistique de l'École de Prague*, Utrecht-Anvers 1960, v. s. *contraste de contact des phonemes*).

It was possible to point out only a few items from those presented by Prof. Paulíny's little but comprehensive book. Even this selection, however, may have convinced the reader that the book abounds in observations and suggestions that are both stimulating and inspiring, sometimes even provocative. Though quite a number of such statements will be found disputable, the book as a whole will certainly rank as a most useful handbook, profitable not only to the students of Slovak phonology but to research workers in general phonology as well.

Josef Vachek

N. J. Švedova: *Очерки по синтаксису русской разговорной речи*. АН СССР, Институт русского языка, Москва 1960, 377 str.

Natalja Juljevna Švedovová, vědecká pracovnice Ústavu ruského jazyka při Akademii nauk SSSR v Moskvě přinesla touto svou monografií cennou materiálovou práci, spolehlivě teoreticky fundovanou, která z nemalé části zaplňuje dosavadní mezeru v průzkumu syntaxe hovorové ruské mluvy. Dosud zejména rusisté pracující mimo SSSR (jakož i překladatelé z ruštiny) opravdu citelně postrádali systematictější poučení o formální a významové stránce takových strukturálních typů jednoduché věty jako celku (nebo predikačního větného jádra), jimiž se živá, hovorová ruština odlišuje od stylových vrstev jiných a v nichž se obráží téměř nepřeberné bohatství jemných odstínů modálních, emocionálních nebo i věcně významových.¹

Studie ze sklady hovorové ruštiny názorně ukazují, jak mnohotvárná a přitom systémově zakotvená jsou jistá syntaktická schémata, příznačná pro ruský hovor vůbec a pro dialog zvláště, a jaké poměrně hluboké difference se tu rýsují zejména proti jazyku psanému. Autorka klade — snad až příliš přímočaře — hovorovou mluvu jakožto jednu funkční podobu celonárodního jazyka, všeobecně charakterizovanou bezprostředností, nepřipraveností a nezaměřeností na písemnou fixaci, do základního protikladu k druhé funkční podobě, totiž k jazyku psanému, pro nějž je příznačná předěbná zpracovanost a zpravidla fixace. (Přesně vzato bylo by snad výstižnější mluvit o protikladu jazyka psaného vůči jazyku mluvenému.) Je zajímavé, že obě tyto základní funkční podoby (formy) vykazují v ruštině výraznější rozdíly ještě jen v lexiku a frazeologii, kdežto v plánu morfologickém a fonetickém se od sebe v ničem podstatném neliší; to je situace zcela jiná než např. v češtině, kde se hovorový styl a zvláště obecná čeština zřetelně odchyľuje od psaného spisovného jazyka také v hláskosloví a tvarosloví tím, že se tu méně nebo více využívá prvků nespisovných.

Syntaktická charakteristika hovorové ruštiny není ovšem v knize zpracována v úplnosti, všestranně. Avšak výběr látky, jak jej autorka provedla, soustřeďuje se na úseky zvláště důležité, typické, které kromě toho spolu dosti těsně souvisí svou náplní: jde v nich o využívání speciálních výrazových prostředků (jmenovitě částic, citoslovcí, opakování slov, asyndetického nebo spojko-vého spojení slov) tvořících strukturální součást rozmanitých typů vět nebo alespoň jejich predikátu, tak či onak modálně, expresivně a věcně odstíněných. Výklady jsou rozvrženy do pěti obsáhlých oddílů. V prvním (str. 27—196) se probírají konstrukce, které obsahují spojení plnovýznamových slov, týchž nebo různých, a to nejprve spojení asyndetická (např. *думал-думал; леса, леса; сидит не пикиет; бросил-погабыл; тороплюсь пишу; верить не верю; воз не воз; шутки шутками, а...*), pak spojení pomocí spojky (např. *шел и шел; мужичок и мужичок; улетит, да и улетит; купи да купи; одета как одета; вял да умер*) a konečně pomocí spojovací částice (např. *братъ, так братъ; вот был плотник, так плотник*). Druhý oddíl (str. 197—248) probírá konstrukce obsahující spojení plnovýznamového slova s částicí, přičemž se přihlíží v nižší instanci k tomu, zda běží o částici slovesnou (např. *знай кричит; дай-ка пойдю; смотри не упади; ушел было; рыбака — рыбака и ешь*) a adverbialní (např. *вот девчушка!; вот так распоряжения! — adverbialní hodnocení částice вот však je problematické —; так и вестя; куда ему плясать?; он как закричит!*;

¹ N. J. Švedovová se zabývá výzkumem hovorové ruštiny už několik let (viz např. její stat *К изучению русской диалогической речи*, *Вопросы языкознания*, 1956, č. 2, 66—82). Reozenzovaná kniha je úpravou její doktorské disertace z r. 1957/58; škoda, že nevyšla dříve, byli by se o ni mohli při výkladech o modálnosti, o citových větech, o predikátu atd. opřít autoři *Přruční mluvnice ruštiny pro Čechy II*, vydané v r. 1960.