

Vachek, Josef

[Kučera, Henry. The phonology of Czech]

Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. A, Řada jazykovědná.
1962, vol. 11, iss. A10, pp. 203-206

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/100214>

Access Date: 29. 11. 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.

NOTES

¹ The *Économie* was commented upon in the present reviewer's paper. *Dvě významné fonologické publikace zahraniční* [Two Outstanding Foreign Books on Phonology], Slovo a slovesnost 19, 1958, pp. 52–60.

² J. Vachek, *Some Less Familiar Aspects of the Analytical Trend of English*, Brno Studies in English 3, 1961, pp. 9–78.

³ As early as in 1931, B. Havránek pointed out that "ce ne sont que des raisons intrinsèques qui peuvent résoudre la question de savoir pourquoi certaines influences étrangères agissent, tandis que d'autres restent sans effet" (Travaux du CLP 4, 1931, p. 304).—As a concrete illustration of the said thesis may be adduced the influence exercised upon English by French in the centuries following the Norman Conquest. It is now commonly admitted that this influence had its share in the reshaping of the originally synthetic morphological structure of English on analytical lines, French morphology being already markedly analytical at the time when English and French got into close mutual contact. But this influence could only assert itself because as early as in Late Old English soil had been prepared for the ensuing victory of the analytical principle. (Cp. A. C. Baugh, *A History of the English Language*, London 1952, p. 205).

⁴ For a discussion of the problems of the written norm of language see, e. g., J. Vachek, *Zum Problem der geschriebenen Sprache*, Travaux du CLP 8, 1939, pp. 94–104; Same, *Two Chapters on Written English*, Brno Studies in English 1, 1959, pp. 7–38.

Josef Vachek

Henry Kučera: *The Phonology of Czech*. 's-Gravenhage (Mouton & Co) 1961. Pp. 112.

It is certainly rather humiliating for Czech phonologists, who proudly and justly refer to their own country as the cradle of phonology, to see their own language for the first time phonologically described, in a systematic manner, by a scholar of some other country. The author of the reviewed monograph, an American of Czech extraction, is no novice in problems of Czech phonology: he has made himself known in linguistic circles by a number of articles treating of Modern Czech (and, especially, Modern Colloquial Czech); one of these papers was read at the 1958 Slavist Congress in Moscow.

The author's approach to the involved problems is, of course, different from that of the Prague group: the theoretical and terminological framework employed for the purpose is basically that of the Harvard group, working with the concept of distinctive sound features, standing in binary oppositions. (1) This framework is, however, modified by some descriptivist elements in the variety represented by C. F. Hockett. (2) Within the possibilities afforded by this approach the author has managed to outline a fairly consistent and practically workable (if rather static, and therefore not quite convincing) scheme, and, in addition to this, to illustrate by some concrete, though somewhat scanty materials his theory of the mixed character of Modern Colloquial Czech. In the author's opinion, Colloquial Czech /ClCz/ has not the status of another literary code, different both from Literary Czech /LCz/ and from the Czech common language /CnCz/ (the latter being an interdialect steadily replacing Czech dialects), but rather a mixture of elements characteristic of the other two codes, i. e. of LCz and CnCz (p. 16). The question is, of course, highly controversial: apart from the fact that the author's use of the term ClCz does not tally with that established in Czech linguistic tradition, it should be noted that the specific purpose of ClCz, different both from that of LCz and from that of CnCz, seems to suggest that the elements constituting ClCz should be regarded, for all their variability, rather as a synthetic whole, than as a kind of mechanical mixture. One should especially note the hierarchy that can be established in the manner in which the elements of LCz and CnCz can be combined for the purpose of ClCz (for some highly suggestive observations on this point, see Kučera, p. 101f). Such hierarchy appears to show that, despite its vacillation, the constitution of ClCz is governed by some structural laws. Fortunately, whatever may be the actual status of ClCz, the phonological problems of LCz and, for that matter, of ClCz, are not affected by it.

In analyzing Czech utterances phonematically, the author bases his procedure on purely formal criteria. He establishes three categories of junctures (which he calls, more aptly, disjunctures), viz. the terminal /#/ , the external /+/, and the internal /=/, e. g., /# ještě + se + ne = = vra:fil# / and, consequently, divides utterances, as most descriptivists do, into macrosegments (i. e. phonematic sequences roughly corresponding to closed sentences), phonemic measures (determined by successive strong stresses), microsegments (portions of macrosegments between two successive occurrences of disjuncture, i. e. — very roughly — stem morphemes, prefixal morphemes, and a small number of suffixal morphemes), and the like. However formal, however,

his approach may be, the author never fails to confront and to correlate the formal facts to their semantic opposite numbers. It should be noted that in his analysis the external disjuncture mostly coincides with the word-limit. As already noted, internal disjunctures are most frequently found to tally with morphematic sutures separating prefixes from word-stems, while the analogous sutures found between stems and suffixes are usually disregarded by the author, on the ground that "suffixes (whether grammatical or derivational morphemes) show no phonological manifestations of disjuncture and thus do not constitute microsegments" (p. 66). The only exception is provided by the imperative suffixes which are therefore classified as having microsegmental status (transcribed, e. g., /+me+/, /+te+/, though they are not regarded as "phonological words").

By his procedure the author ascertains the existence in Czech of 10 vocalic phonemes /i, i:, e, e:, a, a:, o, o:, u, u:/, rightly pointing out the opposition front — back as basic for Czech vowels, while the opposition unrounded — rounded is, unlike in Russian vowels, redundant (or, in Prague terms, concomitant). Some doubts are raised by the author's placing of the [o:] — vowel on the same phonematic level, in his scheme, as the other long vowels (p. 26), the more so that later on (p. 28) he rightly dwells on the point that [o:] has a phonematic status only in a small number of loan-morphemes, whereas elsewhere it represents an expressive variant of /o/. — The mutual phonematic relation of Czech /i/ and /j/ is duly discussed, and the separate status of the two phonemes aptly emphasized, despite the high amount of distributive complementariness that undoubtedly exists between the occurrences of the two. — On the other hand, the author's statements (see also p. 58) referring to the occurrence of the glottal stop [ʔ] in LCz in prevocalic word-initial and morpheme-initial positions certainly goes rather too far: even in LCz the glottal stop is much more sparingly used than in A. Frinta's days (see Frinta, *Novočeská výslovnost*, Prague 1909, p. 44). It certainly appears doubtful whether one can ascribe the use of the glottal stop to the "optimal phonological system" of Czech (Kučera, p. 63); the recommendations of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences pronunciation manual of 1955, considerably restricting the use of the glottal stop, only reflect the practice now prevailing in cultured speech utterances.

The author's discussion of Czech consonant phonemes, elaborately classified on the ground of their distinctive features, lists 25 (not 24, as is mistakenly stated on p. 30) items: /p, b, t, d, t̥, d̥, k, g, f, v, s, z, ž, ẓ̌, x, h, c, č, m, n, ň, l, j, r, ř/. Special attention is duly given to /v/, which, distributionally, is not exactly a voiced counterpart of /f/, and to /ř/, whose classification as a sonorant, on one level with (r, l), may raise some doubts, in view of the strident character of /ř/ — rather, /ř/ is a transitional phenomenon, a "fuzzy point" (to use Hockett's term) of the phonematic system. The monophonematic interpretation of /c/ and /č/ should, of course, be emphatically approved of, though perhaps not on the grounds presented by the author, who believes that in oppositions like [hr̥š̥i:] 'prouder' — [hr̥či:] 'clatters' the only alternative to acknowledging the phonematic distinction between (t̥š̥) and (č) would be to consider syllable boundaries phonematically distinctive. Apart from the fact that the suffixal morpheme in (hrt=š̥i:) obviously plays a more important part here than the author is ready to admit, the crucial difference between [t̥š̥] and [č] (and, analogously, between [ts] and [c]) lies in the fact that what Prof. B. Trnka calls contactual contrast (3) is present in the first but absent in the second, members of the above oppositions. In practice, the difference of the phonematic status of [t̥š̥] and [č] is evidenced by the possibility of inserting a brief off-glide in [t-s] and by the impossibility of such an insertion between the supposed component parts of [c], unless the concerned word were made unrecognizable or, at least, unless such a pronunciation were regarded as pathological (thus, [celi:, čin] cannot be implemented as [t-seli:, t-šin]). — Very apt are the author's remarks on /h/ and /x/ whose phonematic relation, despite some articulatory difficulties, is rightly identified with that of /ž/ — /ṣ̌/, /z/ /s/, and the like. — Also the phonematic status of [g] (constituting a phoneme in loan-words only, while in domestic words it functions as an allophone of /k/) is awarded due attention.

Also the relative frequency of phonemes in literary context has been dealt with, and a tentative frequency count, affected by means of the Magnetic Drum Computer, in principle confirms the results arrived at by V. Mazlová some fifteen years ago.

A most interesting and valuable chapter is devoted to the phonematic structure of the syllable. The author not only registers all syllable types found in Czech but also carefully ascertains all types of restrictions imposed on sequences of phonemes within the limits of Czech syllables (not including, of course, non-syllabic prefixes and prepositions, such as *s-*, *z-*, *v-* and the like, which he classifies as "isolated consonantal microsegments"). Consistently applying the Harvard group principle of classification by means of binary distinctive features, he succeeds in discovering a number of important rules limiting the combinableness of phonemes within the syllable (such as, e. g., the impossibility of combining non-compact grave non-continuous consonants, like /p, b/, with compact grave non-continuous consonants, such as /k, g/). As a rule such restrictions are explained as due to the fact of partial (if not total) identity of distinctive features of subsequent

phonemes (p. 79). Here the author took up and further developed the idea of "the law of minimal phonological contrast", formulated by B. Trnka a quarter of a century ago. (4) Although some of the details of the last-mentioned chapter may be subject to some improvement (for one of such details see below), there can be no doubt that it is exactly this chapter that constitutes our author's most valuable contribution to research in Czech phonology.

In connection with the author's discussion of various kinds of disjunctures and their phonological consequences for Czech, referred to above, it may be found useful to take up, once more, his main thesis of the different phonological relevance of different kinds of morphematic limits. The author's ascertainment that Czech "delimits phonologically word boundaries, as well as the boundaries of prepositions, prefixes, members of compound words, and of the imperative suffix, but not other morpheme boundaries" (p. 66) is, upon the whole, sound. Still, at times instances can be found in which the suffixal suture other than imperative can reveal phonematic phenomena not found in other positions within the word — see, e. g., the phonematic group /r = l/ in /ze = sta:r = l/ 'he grew old', an instance which cannot, in the reviewer's opinion, be discussed away by the author's procedure of dividing "interludes" (i. e. phonematic groups found between two syllabic peaks, in other words, between two successive bearers of syllable) into successive "codas" and "onsets" (i. e., post-peak and pre-peak consonant groups, respectively). The syllabic division of the discussed word is only too clearly /ze.sta:r.l/, i. e. with the final syllable violating the author's Rule OC 6 (p. 76), based on his statement that within one and the same syllable a liquid is not allowed to stand after another liquid; in syllable-initial positions, naturally, [r-] does not exist. The difficulty can be easily removed if even the non-imperative suffixal suture is admitted to show, in some instances at least, "phonological manifestations of disjuncture", categorically denied to them by the author.

Incidentally, it is interesting to note that in CnCz the above-said word has a different structure, viz. /ze.sta:r/ or /ze.sta:r-nul/ (recently, the latter form has been admitted into the norm of LCz), whose phonematic make-up fully conforms to the author's rules. It so appears that CnCz has abolished here one of the "fuzzy points" found in the structure of the literary language whose cultural functions, entailing certain conservative speech habits, may often prevent the dismissal of such points from that structure (or, to put the thing differently, may defer the solution of some of the phonematic problems incumbent on the structure of the cultured language). (5) Still, as long as such fuzzy points exist in the literary standard, they should be registered as such and their explanation should be attempted. It is exactly in points like this that the author's handling of the Czech phonological system appears rather static, with little attention paid in it to the dynamic forces that are at work in it. This does not imply, of course, that the author should have included in his book a systematic treatment of problems of historical phonology relative to the Czech language; the synchronistic approach to the task has been the only one to adopt. But the point is — as was duly stated in the very earliest writings of the Prague group (6) — that synchrony should not be identified with statics, any and every stage of the development of language containing elements that rank as archaisms or, as the case may be, as neologisms. Consequently, any dependable phonematic description of a given language should single out such points as indicative of the dynamic forces operating in the language at the given period.

Similar comment could be made on a number of points, carefully selected by the author, in which CnCz differs from LCz. In many of them the existing differences can be accounted for in terms of the abolishment by the interdialect of some structural deficiencies found in the phonological system of the literary language, or at least, as steps leading to such abolishment — see, e. g., the abolishment of word-initial pre-consonantal *j*- in instances like *jdu*, *jméno*, *jsem* (CnCz *du*, *meno*, *sem*), preparing the way for the phonemic merger of [i] and [j], such as has (or almost has) been accomplished in Slovak. Or, to quote another instance, the defective structure of the system of long vowel phonemes of LCz, in which /e:/ has no back counterpart, has been remedied in CnCz where /e:/ has been abolished (except in loan-words and in emotional expressions). (7)

This lack of historical perspective and disregard of forces that are at work in the phonological system is, of course, easily explained as due to the strong influence of the American descriptivist, essentially a-historic (if not anti-historic) atmosphere which, oddly enough, has not been sufficiently counterbalanced in Kučera's book by the influence of the Harvard group whose founder was, in the late 'twenties, among the first to stress the non-identity of synchronics and statics.

Some more comment may be needed on the author's comparison of the phonological systems of LCz and ClCz (and, indirectly, of CnCz as well). The author should be credited for having attacked this delicate problem, rather neglected by Czech phonologists. And it would be wrong to deny that his conclusions are, for all the lack of historical perspective noted above, certainly stimulating. But the bulk of the work still remains to be done. For all his imposing knowledge of books and papers dealing with the subject of his study, the author may be seen at times not to be perfectly acquainted with all of the numerous delicate aspects of the examined reality — see,

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