

tzitakoei". Ohar batean (172. or., 42. oh.) azaltzen du itzultzaileak nola uler daitekeen pasartea, arazoak sortzen baititu berezko zentzuak; baina ez du esaten beste itzultzaile batzuek erabat ezberdin ere ulertu dutena, besteak beste *coronatos* hitza ez delako testuaren transmisio aldetik batere ziurra. Irakurleak berak jakingo zukeen hori aparatu kritikoa izan balu, baina itzultzaileak jakinerazi behar dio bestela. Gehiegi izango litzateke agian, oharrak ere atzera bidali dituen editoreari aparatu kritikoa orripean sartzeko eskatzea, baina horren ordainean azalpen bat zor dio irakurleari, duela ia bi mila urte sorturiko testu batek, duela hogeitazorturikoak (normalean) ez dituen transmisio arazoak dituela eta horrenbestez itzulpenak ere askotan irakurketa jakin bat isladatuko duela jakin dezan. Bibliografia osteko oharra urrats bat da Francisco de Vitoriaren lanen itzulpena argitaratzean egindako astakeriaren aldean, baina ez da nahiko.

Bada testuaren aurretik, besteak beste honako hau dioen ohar bat ere (35. or.):

Klasikoak elkarrekin *De brevitae vitae, De vita beata, De otio* [sic] lehen argitalpen elebiduna aurkezten du, jatorrizko testua eta euskarazko itzulpena barne dituela.

Jon Gotzon Etxebarriaren lan eskerga ahazten dute. Urte askotan aritu da Santurtziko seme hau, latinetik eta grekotik era guztietako lanak euskaratu eta bere diruarekin argitara ematen. Berak sortu, egin eta zabaltzen zuen *Excerpta* aldizkariko 34. zenbakian hasita (1989ko martxoa), hilerio irakurtzen genuen, latinez eta euskaraz, Senekaren *De brevitae vitae*-ko zati bat. Eten egin zen aldizkariaren kaleratzea lana bukatu gabe, baina hor dago zati handi bat irakurtzeko moduan. Hori jakinik gainera, eta Jon Gotzon Etxebarria irakasleak lanean jarraitzen duela kontutan izanda, eztabaidagarri —ziurrenik ez arbuigarri, baina bai gutxienez eztabaidagarri— izan daiteke testu honen itzulpena bigarren itzultzaile bati eskatzearen egokitasuna.

Ez dugu gauza handirik esango Unzurrunzagaren itzulpen lanari buruz. Eta horixe da hain zuzen egin diezaiokegun goraipamenik sentikorrena. Xabier Andonegik berrikusi duen itzulpena bera da liburu honetan ere, *Indio aurkitu berriak* liburuaren iruzkina egitean Charrittonen lanari buruz genioen bezala, gehien balio duena. Pozez txalotzekoa da Imanol Unzurrunzagaren lana, inongo aitzakiarik gabekoa. Eskaini zaien diseinu dotoreaz gain, ardura handiagoz zainduriko edizioa merezi dute hain itzultzaile bikainek.

Gidor Bilbao Tellexea
(EHU-UPV)

J.C. WELLS: *Longman Pronunciation Dictionary*, Harlow 1990, Longman Group UK Ltd.

This dictionary was published at the beginning of 1990 and since then it has already been reviewed by other phoneticians. However I would like to contribute my own opinions since I feel a certain personal attachment to the author and his work.

From the moment of its publication the Longman Pronunciation Dictionary quickly became a valuable tool for all those working or interested in the world of English phonetics and also, as the title suggests, for those concerned with the pronunciation of English itself.

There are many points worth discussing in this dictionary but since a detailed account of each of them would make this review far too lengthy, I have preferred to limit my comments to those aspects which I have found of particular interest.

First of all, there are theoretical sections, in general alphabetical order, which deal with the most relevant issues of English phonemics, such as diphthongs, syllable structure, phonological processes, etc. Such theoretical explanations are presented in a brief though comprehensive manner which should be quite accessible to the general public and which constitute at the same time quick reference points for phoneticians and language teachers. As is to be expected, to judge from his other works, Professor Wells provides very clear explanations as well as a wealth of practical examples. Some of the entries include a brief phonetic / phonological definition of the term plus cross references to other related phenomena discussed elsewhere. Within the theoretical entries there are some which reflect the author's own approach to questions such as allophonic vowel shortening, for which he justifies the use of the new term "Clipping", or certain syllable structure phenomena, previously considered separate but which Wells joins under the heading of Compression because of their effect.

At the beginning of each alphabetical section there is an interesting attempt to provide guidelines for pronunciation in the manner of correspondences between spelling and pronunciation. Although some of the rules are too complicated to remember, and as the author himself frequently points out, there are many cases in which no rule at all is possible, many foreign students of English have already found these sections useful in imposing some kind of structure on the dumbfounding matter of spoken versus written English. This procedure is followed throughout the dictionary. Additionally, in certain individual entries we find a considerably long comment on the possible pronunciations of the word, or, more interestingly, the morpheme. Such is the case with the plural morpheme *-s* (pg. 615) and the past tense morpheme *-ed* (pg. 234), (pg. 256) for example.

As for the dictionary entries themselves, there are several features which I find very appealing. On the one hand, following a code of italics versus raised letters the reader is guided through the area of optional sounds. Italics represent sounds which are not pronounced by native speakers but which, foreign speakers in particular, and often for the sake of intelligibility, are advised to include. Superscript letters stand for sounds commonly elided in current English and for which the speaker is advised to follow that trend.

Each entry includes both the Standard British English pronunciation (RP) and the General American one. This is an immediately apparent advantage in a world in which American English is becoming increasingly predominant. Besides consistently reflecting both accents, Prof. Wells includes alternative British pronunciations belonging to less common variants within RP as well as standard accents other

than RP. I find this particularly interesting and realistic. In current British English, and as even the BBC has started to acknowledge by its choice of speakers, RP has ceased to be regarded as the only educated, acceptable variety of English. Readers are often pleased to find that their pronunciation of a particular word is not absent—with the inference of not being “correct”—but is listed as a variant belonging to another accent. Unfortunately the dictionary does not include information as to which particular British variety each alternative belongs to other than whether it is considered to fall within RP or not; this is doubtlessly due to the need for conciseness.

Many foreign words are presented with both their British rendering, and more importantly the native pronunciation following IPA conventions for example

| | |
|------------------------------|---------------------|
| “angostura” / æŋgəs ˈtʃuərə/ | Spanish/ángos ˈtura |
| “cortege” / ,kɔː ˈteɪʒ/ | French /kɔʁteːʒ/ |

Sometimes entries may look confusing because of the amount of information they include. Apart from questions mentioned above, there are symbols indicating an alternative pronunciation which is the result of a certain process and not merely a variant, for example “mole” /ˈməʊl/ → /ˈmɒl/

“due” /ˈdjuː/ → /ˈdʒuː/
 “painkiller” /ˈpeɪn kɪlə/ /ˈpeɪŋ kɪlə/

There are some words for which two pronunciations are possible within the same variety of RP, and which are often a source of argument for and against amongst native speakers. In those cases Professor Wells includes the results of a poll he carried out as to the preferences of English speakers:

“often” /ˈɒftən/ → /ˈɒfən/,
 “patent” /ˈpeɪtənt/ /ˈpætənt/
 “research” /rɪ ˈsɜːtʃ/ /rɪ sɜːtʃ/
 “distribute” /dɪs ˈtrɪbjʊt/ /ˈdɪs trɪbjʊt/

Stress has been treated with particular care. Words with double stress in their citation form include a symbol warning the reader of the possibility of a stress shift when the word is not used in isolation:

ˌocci ˈdental ← // ˌsuper ˈstitious ←

Some morphemes are presented with their different pronunciations dependent on the stress of possible affixes, for instance *phono* and *hypo*. The same applies to certain problematic prefixes such as *ex-*, for example, where we may find a great amount of information as to the pronunciation of this string depending on the root to which it is attached.

The principles for syllable boundary location which the author proposes and follows in this dictionary maybe considered a controversial issue. He explains rival syllabification approaches together with his own view in the introductory section. Basically he will group consonants favouring stressed syllables, and to the left in the case of equally strong syllables, as long as morpheme boundaries that are still felt as

such are not violated, and affricate sequences are not split. According to the author the advantage of his approach is that it will be found to be consistent with and to account for phonetic processes that might otherwise be difficult to describe in terms of environment of application.

As for the set of symbols used for transcription, they agree in the main with the latest (14th) edition of Daniel Jones' *English Pronouncing Dictionary*. There are a few differences worth noting. The contrastive vowels high front /i:/ and half close centred from front /ɪ/ on the one hand, and high back /u:/ and half close centred from back /ʊ/ on the other, are still represented with different symbols reflecting their qualitative disparity in addition to their different, though not always distinctive duration. However this dictionary reflects the neutralisation process that has become increasingly common and widespread in its application environments in the course of this century by using a third different symbol, in both cases the choice is the higher member of the pair without the length diacritic /i/ and /u/ respectively.

This dictionary comes with a workbook and tape by Claire Fletcher which is a good complement that can be used for self study or class work, not only for pronunciation purposes but for a clear understanding of some of the phonemic processes dealt with in the dictionary's theory sections.

Bibliography

- Fletcher, C., 1990, *Longman Pronunciation Dictionary: Study Guide*, Harlow, Longman Group UK Ltd.
 Jones, D., 1977, *English Pronouncing Dictionary*, 14th edn., Dent.
 Wells, J. C., 1990, *Longman Pronunciation Dictionary*, Harlow, Longman Group UK Ltd.

M^a Luisa García Lecumberri
 (UPV-EHU)

G.J. WARNOCK: *J. L. Austin*. London, Routledge, 1989, 167 or.

John L. Austin filosofo oxoniarra 1960an hil zen 48 urte besterik ez zituela. Hala ere, ordurako Oxford-en bertan, Erresuma Batuan eta mundu anglo-saxoioan orohar, haren ospea eta eragina handiak ziren, argitara emandako lanak oso gutxi izan arren. Itzulpenak eta edizioak alde batera, zazpi paper bakarrik argitaratu zituen bere bizitzan zehar. Eskura dauzkagun Austin-en lanik gehienak —eta garrantzitsuenak, ezbairik gabe— bera hil ondoren argitaratutakoak dira: lehenik, aipatu zazpi artikuluhoriek eta beste hiruk osatzen duten *Philosophical Papers* argitaratu zuten 1961ean

(1) Honez gero, bat baino gehiagok *esaldi egintzaile* terminuaren erabilerarekiko egoneza sentitu du seguruasko. *Utterance* terminuak adierazten duen esatearen ekintzarentzat ez dugu euskarazko *esaldi* baino itzulpen hobea aurkitzen. Hizkuntza bateko hitzen kate gramatikala adierazten duen *sentence* itzultzeko, berriz, *perpaus* darabilgu, eta bere edukin semantikorako *proposamen*. *Performative*, berriz, esaldion goian aipatutako azken ezaugarria adierazteko Austin-ek asmatutako terminua da, eta, gainera bere iritziak itsusia eta traketsa. *Egintzaile* hitzak trakeskeria eta itsuskeriaz gain adierazgarritasunik ere baduelakoan hautatu dugu.