

Un problema parecido se presenta en la interpretación del fonema nasal /n/. Los autores lo escogieron, en el capítulo de introducción, para demostrar la relación entre los fonemas y sus alófonos. Opinamos que no es exacta la definición de que "En español existe, por ejemplo, un fonema nasal /n/ que se articula gracias al contacto del ápice de la lengua y los alvéolos;<sup>1</sup> [lana] lana; esta /n/ puede presentar diversas variaciones combinatorias..." (pág. 7). Se nota que los autores se inclinan a la concepción que recuerda la de W. Doroszewski; éste ve la diferencia entre el fonema y el sonido (o alófono) como una diferencia entre unidad autónoma y noautónoma del sistema fonético.<sup>3</sup> Esta interpretación significa en sus consecuencias que el fonema se considera como un sonido tipo realizado en posición aislada y las variantes como productos de la combinación. Los autores del Curso, adoptando tal posición, no le son siempre fieles puesto que en otras ocasiones incluyen la [n] linguoalveolar entre otros alófonos (págs. 8,104). Tal vez cabría hablar del archifonema N en que diferentes localizaciones no son fonológicamente pertinentes y que viene representado por cualquier sonido que tenga ciertos rasgos pertinentes (un sonido nasal, no líquido).

Este pequeño comentario que nos permitimos agregar, no quiere ni puede disminuir el gran mérito de Quilis y Fernández, el de dar a los estudiantes angloamericanos y a los profesores un manual que bien puede ser modelo en lo novedoso, en la exposición de la materia y en los procedimientos metodológicos aplicados. La lectura del libro convence que los autores han cumplido plenamente el fin que pretenden en la presentación, el de lograr que los estudiantes angloamericanos "lleguen a pronunciar con la mayor corrección posible el español..."

*Lubomír Bartoš*

*Owen Thomas: Transformational Grammar and the Teacher of English.* Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York—Chicago—San Francisco—Toronto—London 1965. Pp. 240.

In this useful book, the author proposes "to describe those aspects of transformational grammar that... have the greatest relevance for teachers and prospective teachers of English." From traditional linguistic concepts and terms, he gradually proceeds to concepts and terms employed by the transformationalists and on the basis of his own pedagogical experience explains the fundamentals of transformational grammar as lucidly as possible. Finally, he discusses the possibilities of how and where the theory of transformational grammar can be applied in the process of teaching English.

In the first chapter, entitled "New Terms and Old Ideas," the author explains such terms as scientific grammar and pedagogical grammar, competence and performance, transformational and generative, syntax and semantics, states and operations, and shows the place of transformational grammar against the background of older linguistic theories. For the reviewer, however, it is rather surprising to find that the author, who so skilfully takes advantage of the reader's presupposed knowledge of traditional grammar, does not take into account some highly important conclusions the non-transformationalists have arrived at. Thus concluding his brief evaluation of traditional linguistic theories, the author says: "The achievements of the structuralists are many. Perhaps most important, they noted that the study of language can and should be divided into two parts: syntax and semantics." (P. 13.) But this evaluation neglects the fact that a third part (level) must be reckoned with, the one which "makes it possible to understand how the semantic and the grammatical structures function in the very act of communication, i. e. at the moment they are called upon to convey some extra-linguistic reality reflected by thought and are to appear in an adequate kind of perspective" (J. Firbas, *Notes on the Function of the Sentence in the Act of Communication*, SPFFBU 1962, A 10, p. 137). In short, it is to be regretted that no notice has been taken of what has been termed by F. Daneš "the level of the organization of utterance" (*A Three-Level Approach to Syntax*, *Travaux linguistiques de Prague* 1, Prague 1964 p. 225). In the reviewer's opinion, even for a teacher or prospective teacher of English the explanation of the difference between the two sentences "John is easy to please. John is eager to please." on the basis of the "deep structure" can hardly be regarded as sufficient. The problems *why* the particular structure has such and such character and *why* it is often necessary to employ other structures for expressing the same extra-linguistic reality in different languages cannot be solved merely within the semantic and the formally syntactic levels, but the laws and tendencies asserting themselves on the level of the organization of utterance are to be taken into account as well. This is why the omission of the third level cannot be considered a pedagogically justifiable

<sup>3</sup> W. Doroszewski, *Autor du phonème*, *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Prague*, 4, Prague 1931, p. 61—74.

simplification, but rather a distortion of the non-transformational approach to language. A number of studies concerning the level of the organization of utterance have been produced by the Prague Linguistic School. (References to such studies, especially those of V. Mathesius, will be found in the two papers noted above, and in J. Vachek's edition of V. Mathesius' book "Obsahový rozbor současné angličtiny na základě obecné lingvistické" [A Functional Analysis of Present-Day English on a General Linguistic Basis], Prague 1961.) These studies, opening new vistas of further research, use a good deal of traditional terminology. The reviewer cannot therefore help adding the remark that it would be a great pity if old terms should be thrown away together with new ideas.

The fundamentals of transformational grammar are explained in the following six chapters, entitled The English Sentence, Words and Morphemes, Nouns and Nominals, The Verb, Adjectives and Adverbs, Rearranging the Basic Sentence. The simplicity and clarity with which the explanations are offered deserves special praise. The readers will gratefully appreciate the author's art to expound even complicated phenomena in a most lucid way. 'Don't be afraid of transformational grammar' seems to be the leading idea underlying the text of the book from beginning to end.

The usefulness of the book is further enhanced by short summaries concluding the chapters; the model grammars (adduced in four chapters), which enable the reader to test his knowledge acquired through the study of the book; and lists of points, which occur after the summaries and are to provoke further discussion. As many a point to be discussed is based on the comparison of the views of "traditional grammarians" with those of the transformationalists, Czech students will have the possibility of confronting the views presented in the reviewed book with those offered by their own textbooks based on the achievements of the Prague School. Such discussions will undoubtedly help to assess the situation in present-day linguistic research and possibly even stimulate the birth of new ideas.

While dealing with the chapters representing the central part of the book, the reviewer feels he ought to draw attention to two errors that might be misleading. On p. 114 Sentence 4.39 should run "The friend is a boy. → boyfriend" instead of "The boy is a friend. → boyfriend" (cf. Lees, *The Grammar of English Nominalizations*, p. 126: "GIRLFRIEND The friend is a girl."), and on p. 169 the sentence "The matrix probably has the form SOMETHING + be + Adj." should be replaced by "The constituent sentence probably has the form SOMETHING + be + Adj."

In the last chapter, "Grammar and the School," the author sets forth the basic aims of a teacher of English in an American school: "... we want to explain the nature of language to our pupils, and we want, if possible, to instill in them some awareness of the humanistic values that inhere in the study of literature." At the end the author focusses his attention on the possibility of applying transformational grammar to the linguistic analysis of literary texts in the course of school tuition. It is chiefly at this point that the reviewer misses the employment of the third level mentioned above.

To sum up. None of the objections raised belittle the value of the book. It is an excellent university textbook, serving both as a lucid introduction to the theory of transformational grammar and as a thought-provoking source of suggestions for seminar discussions. It should be made accessible to every Czechoslovak Anglicist, student or teacher.

*Aleš Svoboda*

*Alfred Senn: Handbuch der litauischen Sprache. Band I: Grammatik. — Heidelberg, C. Winter, 1966. 495 SS.*

Noch vor kurzem gehörte das Litauische — die altertümlichste unter den lebenden indoeuropäischen Sprachen — merkwürdigerweise zu den am meisten vernachlässigten: es mangelte an modernen Grammatiken, Wörterbüchern, Mundartsbeschreibungen usw. Das letzte Jahrzehnt hat indessen eine radikale Besserung gebracht: Vollendet wurde (posthum) das etymologische Wörterbuch von E. Fraenkel, das große litauisch-deutsche Wörterbuch (Niedermann—Senn—Brender—Salys) hat bereits den Buchstaben *v* erreicht und auch die einzelnen Bände von *Lietuvių kalbos žodynas* erscheinen in nicht allzu langen Intervallen (bisher 7 Bde.). Ein wohl noch größerer Fortschritt ist auf dem Gebiet der Grammatik zu verzeichnen: neben den drei Bänden von Otrębski (*Gramatyka języka litewskiego*, I 1958, II 1965, III 1965) verfügen wir nunmehr über den ersten Teil der großen einheimischen Grammatik (*Lietuvių kalbos gramatika I*, Vilnius 1965) und neulich können wir auch das Erscheinen des ersten Bandes von Senns *Handbuch* begrüßen. Band II (Lesebuch und Glossar) ist bereits vor zehn Jahren erschienen (1957); darüber haben wir in SFFBU A-7 (1958), SS. 151—2 berichtet. Das lange Intervall