

## ON THE OCCASION OF THE PUBLICATION OF *EPD15*\*

TSUTOMU AKAMATSU

Department of Linguistics and Phonetics. The University of Leeds  
Leeds LS2 9JT. England

La decimoquinta edición del *English Pronouncing Dictionary* (1997) es susceptible de un examen crítico desde una perspectiva teórica. Para este fin me centro en los contenidos de la introducción que abre el diccionario, señalando y discutiendo una serie de imprecisiones teóricas. También se tienen en cuenta en la discusión algunos aspectos relativos a las facilidades que este diccionario ofrece al usuario, ya que el *EPD15* no parece, después de todo y por diversas razones, presentar grandes ventajas para el usuario.

Palabras clave: *EPD* (= *English Pronouncing Dictionary*), inglés de la BBC, inglés general americano, transcripción fonémica, (no) rotacismo.

The 15th edition of *English Pronouncing Dictionary* (1997) is subjected to critical scrutiny, mainly from a theoretical point of view. To this end, I concentrate on the contents of the Introduction with which the dictionary begins. A number of theoretical weaknesses are identified and discussed. Also taken into account during the discussion are some aspects of user-friendliness of the dictionary. *EPD15* may not, after all, be the most user-friendly for a variety of reasons.

Key-words: *EPD* (= *English Pronouncing Dictionary*), BBC English, General American, phonemic notation, (non-) rhoticity.

For all those, both scholars and students, who wish to know or confirm the pronunciation of English words in British English, *the* standard work to consult has been, for over these three-quarters of a century, *An English Pronouncing Dictionary* (which has come to be generally referred to as *EPD*) originally compiled by Daniel Jones (1881-1967), a world-famous British phonetician. The compiler of the 1st edition of *EPD* (1917) through to the 12th edition (1963) was Jones himself. The reprint (1964) of the 12th

---

\* Daniel Jones: *English Pronouncing Dictionary*, 15th ed., edited by Peter ROACH and James HARTMAN, Cambridge University Press, 1997, xix + 559 pp.

edition was revised and edited by Alfred Charles Gimson (1917-1985), one of Jones's disciples. The 13th edition (1967) along with its successive reprints (1969, 1972, 1974, 1975) was brought out under Gimson's editorship; it is thus from the 13th edition that the editor of *EPD* ceased to be Jones whose death occurred in 1967. The 14th edition came out in 1977 under Gimson's editorship, and its revised edition with a Supplement was published in 1988, after Gimson's death, under the editorship of Gimson and Susan Ramsaran. Further reprints followed (1989, 1993). Meanwhile, its publisher changed; Cambridge University Press re-published the 14th edition in 1991, with the relevant transfer of the copyright. There ensued a long period of half a decade till the 15th edition of *EPD*, whose publication was eagerly awaited by all those interested in English pronunciation, finally appeared in 1997 edited by two scholars, Peter Roach the Englishman and James Hartman the American. The long-awaited (some might even say, the long overdue) publication of the 15th edition of *EPD* marks a significant event and understandably deserves major attention by all those concerned with English pronunciation, all the more so because, in the meantime, there appeared back in 1990 another English pronouncing dictionary in the form of *LPD* (= *Longman Pronunciation Dictionary*) which lies outside the tradition of *EPD* and which, like it or not, deliberately or otherwise, constitutes a direct rival to *EPD*, in particular the 15th edition of *EPD*. Hereafter in this article, I will refer to the 15th edition of *EPD* as *EPD15* in conformity with the practice of the two editors themselves.

I originally started drafting the present article as just a review of *EPD15*, but quickly realized that a substantial treatment of *EPD15* would be necessary to properly assess it. Consequently the present article largely exceeds the average length of a book review.

*EPD15* marks a notable departure in a good number of respects from all the previous editions of *EPD*. Anyone who has been accustomed to consulting *EPD* would hardly recognize *EPD15* as another edition of *EPD* from its outward appearance in the first place. The external look of *EPD15* is strikingly new in that its front cover is in multicolour, unlike that of any previous edition of *EPD* which was monochrome, whatever colours were used for the individual editions. *EPD15* is thicker and larger than all the previous editions of *EPD*. *EPD15* is just over three centimetres thick without taking the covers into account (there exist both a paperback and a

hardback) as against two centimetres in the case of *EPD14* (though some earlier editions of *EPD* were thicker than two centimetres but never exceeded three centimetres), and each page in *EPD15* is approximately 15 centimetres (give or take a few millimetres) by 22.75 centimetres, as against 12 centimetres by 19.5 centimetres in the case of the previous editions of *EPD*, though each page in *EPD14* measures 12 centimetres by 18.8 centimetres. (The measurements are mine and may not be absolutely correct, but are close enough to enable a reasonable comparison.) The first impression one has when casting a glance at *EPD15* is that it is an impressively hefty volume when compared with any previous edition of *EPD*. The title ENGLISH PRONOUNCING DICTIONARY (clearly printed in black on a light greenish background) is on the front cover, but even more prominent is the publisher's name CAMBRIDGE in sky-blue on a black background. Personally, I find this aggressive advertisement of the publisher's name to be over the top and off-putting. The name of Daniel Jones and the mention of the 15th edition occur on the front cover as well, and also, though in smaller letters, the names of the two editors. The unusually blatant advertisement of the publisher's name also occurs on the spine of *EPD15*, taking 70% of the spine (top to bottom) while 30% is given to the title of the book in smaller letters and the name Daniel Jones (in yet smaller letters) and the names of the two editors (in further smaller letters), in the same colour combinations as on the front cover. By contrast, both the front and back covers of any of the previous editions of *EPD* were plain and only the spine indicated the title, the author's name and the publisher's name.

One of the best ways to assess a pronouncing dictionary, such as the present, which radically differs in nature and format from other books on phonetics is, in my opinion, to submit to critical discussion the Introduction with which the work begins. It is undeniably the Introduction that spells out the principles on which the work has been conceived and implemented and gives a pretty good idea of what the reader may expect to find in the body of the work. This I intend to do in this article. It so happens that the introductory and explanatory parts – rather lengthy in not a few cases – of a pronouncing dictionary is what many an average user of it may underestimate or even skip when starting to use the pronouncing dictionary. This must be considered unfortunate.

As mentioned earlier, there are two editors for *EPD15*, namely Peter Roach and John Hartman. Their exact division of labour in the writing of the Introduction (signed by both) is unknown to me. Unwilling to hazard a guess as to which of the two editors is responsible for which parts of the Introduction and which other for the other parts, I will refer to them simply as the Editors in the rest of this article.

*EPD15* starts, following the Table of Contents, with an interesting brief historical account of *EPD* (p. iv) which the Editors provide in the section which is entitled *Editors' Preface to the 15th Edition* (pp. iv-v) and which precedes the Introduction (pp. v-xix). My objection must be registered straightaway to the Editors' use, in reference to *EPD*, of the title *The English Pronouncing Dictionary* (the Editors' italics) instead of *An English Pronouncing Dictionary*; I should add that the indefinite article has been dropped over the years. The motivation of the Editors' recourse to the use of the definite article here is unknown to me – Jones himself always used the title *An English Pronouncing Dictionary* – and is reminiscent of a similar practice, which was justly criticized by at least one of the reviewers of *The Sound Pattern of English* (1968) co-authored by Noam Chomsky and Morris Halle, as being pretentious and overconfident. The user of *EPD15* is reminded that there exist other English pronouncing dictionaries of basically similar nature currently on the market which also deserve our attention. Curiously but appropriately, on the cover and on the title page, the title of *EPD15* reads *English pronunciation Pronouncing Dictionary*, not *The English Pronouncing Dictionary*.

The Editors emphasize the number, i.e. about 80,000, of English words and phrases whose pronunciations are recorded in *EPD15*. As many as 18,000 of these are said to be new additions “to serve the interests and needs of today's users” (p. iv), which is highly welcome. The figure of 80,000 is undoubtedly an impressive one compared with those for other English pronouncing dictionaries. *EPD14* (in its original edition published in 1977) had 59,664 (a Supplement attached to the revised edition published in 1988 contains about 1,000 words), *LPD* approximately 59,000, and *CPDBAE* (= *A Concise Pronouncing Dictionary of British and American English*) approximately 24,000.

The question of “Whose pronunciation is represented?”, as the Editors themselves put it (p. v), is justifiably very important. The Editors are

strongly opposed to the term “RP” (Received Pronunciation). In their own words: “The time has come to abandon the archaic name *Received Pronunciation*” (p. v). It should be noted in this connection that the term “RP” was still retained, though avowedly with wider application, in *EPD14* (p. vii). It is understandable that there *are* pros and cons about the term “RP”, given the continuing changes over the years in present-day English pronunciation itself, in the status of RP *per se*, in social mobility of speakers, and in the attitudes of native speakers of English towards RP, and so on. What other term do the Editors propose to replace “RP” with? The replacement term is “BBC English”, which in itself is not a novel term for average readers. However, because the term “BBC English” has traditionally been understood, notably by the general public, more in the sense of RP and may be confusing to many readers, I will deliberately write this term “BBC English” in italics (but without double quotation marks) hereafter in the present article when referring to this term as chosen by the Editors. The Editors write as follows about *BBC English*: “... this is the pronunciation of professional speakers employed by the BBC as newsreaders and announcers on BBC1 and BBC2 television, the World Service and BBC Radio 3 and 4, as well as many commercial broadcasting organisations such as ITN” (p. v). The Editors go on to say that *BBC English*, to quote again the Editors' own words, “does not carry for most people the connotations of high social class and privilege that PSP [Public School Pronunciation] and RP have had in the past”. The first half of the Editor's defining statement about *BBC English* is, however, susceptible to potential misapprehension on the part of many readers, especially those non-British readers resident outside the U.K., for they may not be sufficiently well aware what types of spoken English *are* employed on the above-mentioned radio and television media in the U.K. It is important to point out here that what the Editors refer to as *BBC English* is supposed to be non-rhotic, that is to say, there are supposed to occur no *r*-type sounds in the pronunciation of words whose spelling contains the letter *r* syllable-finally or preconsonantly. The non-rhoticity of *BBC English* is, unfortunately, not specifically mentioned by the Editors when they define *BBC English*, and this could cause initial misunderstanding on the part of some readers. This is implied on p. x (in the course of the Editors' explanation of American English) and is explicitly indicated much later in

the section called *Treatment of /r/* (p. xiv). Whilst it is true that what the Editors describe as “the pronunciation of professional speakers employed by the BBC as newsreaders and announcers on BBC 1 and BBC 2 ... and also on ITN” (p. v) is heard, it is not true on the other hand that *BBC English* as the Editors understand is necessarily heard on BBC World Service and on BBC Radio 3 and 4 where (spoken) types of English which are unmistakably associated with localities like Wales, Scotland and Ireland as well as England are also frequently heard, even from the mouths of newsreaders, announcers, commentators and correspondents. Thus, the reader is expected to understand that *BBC English* is non-rhotic, though in reality it *can* be rhotic, depending on individual broadcasters. It is extremely important for the reader to interpret such a notation as 'wɹ̥tʰ' for *water* in *EPD15* as *not* referring to rhoticity such as is observed in Welsh, Scottish or Irish pronunciation as well as in certain regional pronunciations in England. It is well to remember that the small raised symbol <sup>ɹ</sup> in no way indicates rhoticity so far as *BBC English* is concerned but does the so-called “linking r”, a designation that the Editors themselves employ in explaining the meaning of the raised small symbol <sup>ɹ</sup> in *EPD15* and the phenomenon itself of “linking r” in the section called *Treatment of /r/* (p. xiv).

*BBC English*, as conceived and defined by the Editors, excludes a good number of regional pronunciations. This is admitted by the Editors themselves in a section entitled *Regional Accents* (p. vi) where we understand that only placenames have additional information about local pronunciations. For instance, one thus looks in vain for the fairly front short [a] characteristic of northern pronunciation as in *grass*, whose pronunciation (in *BBC English*) is in *EPD15* simply shown to be grɹ̥s. It seems that *EPD15* in this respect is no more informative than *EPD14* or *LPD* which already provide the same information.

One of the features of *EPD15*, which is absent in all the previous editions of *EPD*, is the inclusion of American pronunciations of such words with regard to which there are differences between British pronunciation and American pronunciation. The indication of each American pronunciation is signalled by the symbol  $\text{Ⓢ}$  preceding it, thus, e.g.  $\text{Ⓢ}$ 'wɹ̥tʰ for *water*. I hasten to add that inclusion of American pronunciation beside the corresponding British pronunciation is not a novelty that *EPD15* is the first

to have introduced; *CPDBAE* in 1972 and *LPD* in 1990 did so previously. It should be emphasized that no previous edition of *EPD* included American pronunciation and consequently *EPD15* represents a notable departure from all the previous editions of *EPD* and instead deliberately follows suit in this respect with some other pronouncing dictionaries like *CPDBAE* (compiled by a single editor) and *LPD* (also compiled by a single editor). The type of American pronunciation adopted for inclusion in *EPD15* is what the Editors call “General American” (as a number of other phoneticians have already done) which they describe as “a geographically (i.e. largely non-coastal) and socially based set of pronunciation features” (p. v). It is interesting to see here that the choice of “General American” is based, at least partly, on social factors, the criterion negatively viewed in the Editors' choice of *BBC English* rather than RP. The Editors consider “Network English” in its most colourless form as “a *relatively* [my italics] homogeneous dialect that reflects the ongoing development of progressive American dialects” (p. vi). “Network English” is considered fully rhotic, which would for this reason exclude American English spoken in southern U.S.A. and that spoken in parts of eastern U.S.A., as these are non-rhotic. Going through the entries in the body of *EPD15*, the reader will be led to understand that “Network English” is after all equivalent to “General American” so far as its inclusion in *EPD15* is concerned. Rhoticity is systematically indicated for the relevant words in General American.

We thus have the distinction between the non-rhoticity of *BBC English* and the rhoticity of General American, so far as *EPD15* is concerned.

The general tenor of *EPD15* is basically descriptive. Nevertheless, on at least two occasions in the Introduction, the Editors elect to be prescriptive on certain points. First, the Editors proscribe the use of “intrusive r” where foreign learners are concerned (and consequently do not indicate it in *EPD15*), though they admit – as much as I myself would – its widespread practice among native speakers of English (p. xiv). How often one hears even such a pronunciation with “intrusive r” as 'drɪŋr̩ instead of 'drɪŋ, for *drawing*, or 'sɔr̩ instead of 'sɔ, for *saw it*, from left, right and centre nowadays, even from the mouths of educated English speakers! Second, the Editors recommend different alternative pronunciations *according to different styles of speech*. I explain this by way of a pair of example pronunciations the Editors themselves adduce. Of the

two alternative pronunciations 'vʒɹ.ʌ.ʌ.★ and 'vʒɹ.ɹ.★ for *virtuous* in *BBC English*, the first is indicated as the 1st choice which is said to be commoner and to be typical in “a more casual, informal style of speaking” (p. vi) and the second as the 2nd choice. But of the two alternative pronunciations \*vʒɹ.ɹ.★ and \*vʒɹ.ʌ.★ for *virtuoso* in *BBC English*, the first is indicated as being “in general... typical of more careful speech” (p. vi). I agree in principle with the Editors about their reasoning for choosing one rather than the other alternative pronunciation(s) as the first, second, etc. choices in such cases. (Incidentally, \*vʒɹ.ɹ.★, which is correctly printed in the body of *EPD15* (p. 536), is misprinted as 'vʒɹ.ɹ.★ in the Introduction (p. vi).) The Editors are at pains to emphasize that “When more than one pronunciation of a word is given, the order of the alternatives is important” (p. vi). This means that, in effect, they recommend one rather than the other alternative(s) to users of *EPD15*, presumably in many cases foreign teachers/learners of spoken English. There is here something akin to prescriptiveness. I doubt, however, that foreign teachers/learners of spoken English can be expected to remember which is the recommended alternative for *virtuoso* and which for *virtuous* in such-and-such speech styles. If anything, the phenomenon concerns native speakers of British English in their everyday speaking activity in their mother tongue, and if so, the Editors' above reference would be taken to be descriptive. I should add, if merely for supplementary information, that *LPD* (p. 765) indicates the pronunciation with -tʌ- as the 1st choice for both *virtuous* and *virtuoso* and for one or more associated words. It is interesting to see further that *EPD15* (p. 536) enters only the alternative with -tʌ- for all these words as the corresponding pronunciations in General American. Is one to understand that American speakers consider *virtuoso* (as against *virtuous*) as a common word on the one hand and as an easily recognizable word (as is *virtuous*) on the other which does not require a careful articulation? The reasoning which the Editors put forward for the existence in *BBC English* of the above-mentioned two (or more in many cases) alternative pronunciations linked to the words being more common or less common and to the possibility of less careful or more careful articulation does not seem to operate for General American. It would be worth looking further into this matter.





already enjoyed consulting *LPD* where the opposite principle *is* adopted. *EPD15* strikes me personally as rather insular for this reason.

As a matter of comparison on the particular feature mentioned in the preceding paragraph, it is necessary to draw the reader's attention specifically to *LPD* (with which *EPD15* can reasonably be considered as being in direct competition) which includes the indication of the pronunciation of foreign words in the original languages on a regular and substantial basis in appropriately narrow phonetic notation. In *LPD*, the above-cited three foreign words, for example, receive the indications “Fr [maʎ s<sup>ə</sup> j<sup>ə</sup> z<sup>ə</sup>]” (p. 435) for *Marseillaise*; “Fr Marseille [maʎ s<sup>ə</sup> j]” (p. 435) for *Marseilles* (incidentally, [maʎ s<sup>ə</sup> j] should read [maʎ s<sup>ə</sup> z<sup>ə</sup> j] if *LPD* is to be consistent; cf. [maʎ s<sup>ə</sup> j<sup>ə</sup> z<sup>ə</sup>]); and finally “Russ [ˈmu s<sup>ə</sup> rk sk<sup>i</sup> j]” (p. 466) for *Mussorgsky*. *EPD15* has of course no such indications not only for these example words but for any other foreign words. Yet, one can safely understand that *LDP* is no less intended than *EPD15* to record “the pronunciations which are widespread among educated speakers of British English [and General American]” as *LDP* (p. viii) puts it. The principle to include in *LPD* the pronunciation of foreign words in the original languages is clearly enunciated as follows: “*Pronunciation of foreign words*: For words belonging to foreign languages which are in use in English, the dictionary shows both their anglicized pronunciation and their pronunciation in the language of origin” (p. viii). Indicating the original pronunciation of foreign words in addition to the anglicized pronunciation was an excellent and welcome feature of *LPD*, and I would personally have wished that *EPD15* had not only continued but, above all, expanded the traditional, but meagre, feature of indicating the original pronunciation of foreign words in the previous editions of *EPD*, instead of departing from the traditional practice so drastically in the way that *EPD15* has opted. The decision for *EPD15* to provide supplementary information headed by the indication “as if Italian”, whereby *bɔl.ˈnje.ze* (which the Editors are full aware is not the authentic Italian pronunciation of the word) for the word *bolognese* is only a half-way measure and of little interest. Any intellectually curious user of *EPD15* would not remain satisfied with such information and would go on to ask what the genuine pronunciation of the Italian word is in Italian.

It can be said that not only would information about the pronunciation of foreign words in the original languages stir intellectual curiosity on the part of many users of English pronouncing dictionaries, but also would help the genuinely interested to discover *how* the anglicized pronunciation differs from the original pronunciation. This is totally denied to them in *EPD15*.

It would indeed be an intellectual pleasure for a user of *LPD* to find out, if he wished, how, for *futon*, for example, the usual anglicized pronunciations (e.g. [ˈfuʧtən] etc.) differ from the standard Japanese pronunciation [ɸʉʧtoɴ] (*LPD* puts [ɸʉʧtoɴ]) and understand why the Japanese are at a loss as to what a native speaker of English wishes to mean by, say, [ˈfuʧtən], be it in spoken English or spoken Japanese. (I should add that [ɴ] stands for voiced dorso-uvular nasal consonant and [ɸ] for voiceless bilabial fricative consonant.) Even worse, the anglicized pronunciation [ˈdenən] for *Den'on* (a well-known Japanese audio equipment manufacturer) - not entered in either *LPD* or *EPD15* - is completely incomprehensible to native speakers of Japanese who pronounce it [deɴ→oɴ] ([V→] here is a convenient symbol I employ to indicate a nasalized vowel of a certain quality; concerning [V→], see Akamatsu 1997, pp. 54-68). Even if the matter is not so serious as this which is in effect an instance of breakdown in communication, the sheer information of the original pronunciation of foreign words may well be a source of intellectual challenge. *LPD*'s indication of the French pronunciation of *Saint-Saëns* (a well-known French composer) as [sɛ̃sãs] (p. 617) - *EPD14* puts [sɛ̃sãs] (p. 434) - would turn out to be revealing to many English speakers and certainly leave red-faced a number of those presenters of BBC Radio 3 and Classic FM, and even a few professional musicians, who are under the impression that *Saint-Saëns* is to be pronounced [sɛ̃sã] (*cinq cents?*). As for *Boiëldieu* (the family name of another French composer) which is consistently mispronounced even in anglicized pronunciation, this is a *cause perdue* in English-speaking countries; this is not entered in any edition of *EPD* including *EPD15* and even in *LPD*.

Following the lengthy general remarks above, I now move on to substantive points worth discussing in the Introduction.

The Editors say that the type of notation whereby the pronunciation of English words is indicated in *EPD15* is phonemic, as it was – so they claim – in all the previous editions of *EPD*. The truth of this statement is actually not borne out, since the Editors have adopted a type of notation which comprises not only both phonemes and archiphonemes (this latter, if not by name) but also, in addition, (certain) variants, i.e. what others call allophones, of phonemes (see below). There are at least two fundamental problems. First, the term *phonemic* is not the most felicitous one whereby to describe a type of notation which indicates both phonemes and archiphonemes. These are the two types of distinctive unit of the second articulation of a language, English in the present case. (It is at the second articulation that the signifiers of monemes are analyzed into distinctive units; for “second articulation” see e.g. Martinet 1991, sec. 1.8) The term *phonological* may be suggested instead as more appropriate. Secondly, considering as a phonemic notation, as the Editors do, the type of notation (as used in *EPD15*) wherein even variants of phonemes are indicated is indefensible. The Editors' statement that the notation of the pronunciation of English words in *EPD15* is phonemic means – or rather, should mean – that each symbol stands for a phoneme and nothing but a phoneme, which is not the case in *EPD15*. I will now turn to yet another rather controversial point which derives from the Editors' pronouncement that the notation in *EPD15* is phonemic. This can be seen in their adoption (p. viii) of such notations as /'get ɹ̥.ɹ̥/ (for *getting*) and /'bet ɹ̥.ɹ̥/ (for *better*) for General American and unambiguously employing the notation /t ɹ̥/ (p. xi) – the use of the oblique lines here are the Editors' – as well as the notation /t/ elsewhere. Surely, the Editors cannot possibly imply thereby that General American has two separate phonemes symbolizable as /t/ and /t ɹ̥/. Every time they employ the symbol t ɹ̥ in such examples in the Introduction and in the body of *EPD15*, they are effectively implying the existence in General American of two phonemes, /t/ (as in /t ɹ̥rt/ *tart*) and /t ɹ̥/ (as in the examples above). What the Editors mean by the inappropriate notation /t ɹ̥/ is actually [t ɹ̥], a positional variant of /t/. In fact, they do list on the inside of the front cover, the symbol t ɹ̥, among others, as “Non-phonemic symbol [s] for English”. I know that the Editors unequivocally admit (p. viii) that their use of the diacritic ɹ̥ for “flapping (of /t/)” is one of the exceptions to the phonemic principle of their notation in *EPD15*. However,

the Editors clearly contradict themselves by resorting to such notations as /'get ɪ.ʊ.ʔ/ and /'bet ɪ.ʊ./, which I am convinced should never be allowed. It is therefore necessary for the Editors either to rethink of the alleged phonemicness of the type of notation for both British English and General American in *EPD15*, or the alleged phonemicness for British English only but not necessarily for General American, or to abandon the alleged phonemicness for the type of notation for both British English and General American. The choice of an ameliorative decision rests with the Editors in future editions. The Editors' (incorrect) implicit recognition of two phonemes /t/ and /t̥/ in General American might logically lead us to expect their identifying two separate phonemes in a word like *lull* (p. 300) in British English, one being the so-called “clear l” and the other the so-called “dark l”, which are two positional variants of a single phoneme /l/ in English (p. xi) and are traditionally notated [l] and [ɫ], i.e. not two phonemes. One would be right to assume that the Editors do not envisage such two phonemes either formally or explicitly but acknowledge just one phoneme, i.e. /l/. It is therefore regrettable that the Editors should use such a phrase as “the difference between “clear” and “dark” /l/” (p. xi); such is, at best, ambiguous and, at worst, erroneous. Their self-contradictory practice should be discarded. Incidentally, one would prefer that the Editors are more decisive in stating the fact that “dark l” is predominantly used by many speakers of American English even in prevocalic position and before [j]. This is what the Editors write: “It should also be noted that the difference between “clear” and “dark” /l/ [a phrase already quoted and criticized above] is much less marked in American than in the BBC accent, so that even prevocalic /l/ in American pronunciation *sounds dark to English ears* [my italics]” (p. xi). What is the reader of this quoted passage expected to understand? At any rate, any proclaimed characterization of the type of notation in a pronouncing dictionary as phonemic, such as the Editors of *EPD15* resort to, is liable to court problems. It would be wiser to conceive of and employ such a type of notation that is less broad than “broad notation” (equivalent to phonemic notation) and is comprehensive enough to allow both phonemes and variants of phonemes, and also variants of archiphonemes, if and as required, to be indicated. It would also be wiser for the Editors not to understand and make users of *EPD15* understand that the pronunciation of any word (English or otherwise)

entered in *EPD15* is couched in a type of notation considered *phonemic* which is compatible with the use of oblique lines, i.e. //.

The Editors provide a section (p. xiv) entitled *Use of /i/ and /u/* (note specifically, not /i<sup>↙</sup>/ and /u<sup>↙</sup>/) in which they explain the phenomenon of the neutralization of the opposition between /i<sup>↙</sup>/ and /i<sup>↘</sup>/ and that between /u<sup>↙</sup>/ and /u<sup>↘</sup>/ in certain contexts, e.g. in prepausal position (cf. *muddy*) or prevocally in unaccented syllable (cf. *Mantua*). They are right not to resort to the designation of “archiphoneme” in *EPD15* (for doing otherwise might unnecessarily confuse some users of *EPD15*) and to say simply instead that “the final vowel of 'city' and 'seedy' seems to belong neither to the /i<sup>↘</sup>/ phoneme nor to /i<sup>↙</sup>/” (p. xiv). The question of the symbolization of the archiphonemes in such cases is dealt with by the Editors by conveniently resorting to the notation /i/ and /u/, warning at the same time that these do not, strictly speaking, stand for phonemes. This is compatible with the Editors listing on the inside of the front cover, i and u, among other symbols, as “Non-phonemic symbols for English”. The Editors wish to find suitable brackets other than // (oblique lines) but elect not to use any other kind of brackets than //. An alternative solution might be to use a special type of bracket, but the possibility of finding such is obviously limited. The Editors are right not to proceed beyond what they have chosen to do, i.e. to employ the notations /i/ and /u/ (which differs from both /i<sup>↙</sup>/ and /i<sup>↘</sup>/, and from both /u<sup>↙</sup>/ and /u<sup>↘</sup>/).

I will continue discussing the Editors' decision to incorporate instances of the neutralization of the opposition between /i<sup>↙</sup>/ and /i<sup>↘</sup>/ through the use of the notation /i/ and that of the opposition between /u<sup>↙</sup>/ and /u<sup>↘</sup>/ through the use of the notation /u/. To begin with, we need a brief historical account here. One of the Editors, Peter Roach, in his earlier work of 1983 entitled *English Phonetics and Phonology*, already mentions these cases of neutralization and the use of the proposed notations /i/ and /u/ (pp. 65-66, p. 100). Subsequently, John Wells, the compiler of *LPD*, in 1990, incorporates those ideas in *LPD*, not only by indicating the pronunciation of relevant words but also by providing a half-page note entitled Neutralization (p. 476) to explain his ideas on the matter with a few illustrations. Both Roach's and Wells's explanations of the concept of neutralization are, unfortunately, theoretically largely flawed, but this is not a place for me to discuss the problem. Rather, there are two other issues that must be

addressed; namely, first, incorporating cases of neutralization in the manner in which both *LPD* and *EPD15* do and, second, employing two extra symbols in the notation of the pronunciation of relevant words in pronouncing dictionaries. As both *LPD* and *EPD15* do likewise in the above-mentioned respects, my reference below to *EPD15* should be taken to refer by implication to *LPD* too. The two issues (see (1) and (2) below) will now be discussed.

(1) *EPD15* is right to point to the neutralization of the opposition between /i<sup>ɘ</sup>/ and /i<sup>o</sup>/ and also to that of the opposition between /u<sup>ɘ</sup>/ and /u<sup>o</sup>/. But why just these two particular cases of neutralization to the exclusion of others in English? In other words, it is this “partial selection” of cases of neutralization in English that I criticize. Why not, for instance, the neutralization of the opposition between /p/-/b/, /t/-/d/, /k/-/g/ and /t<sup>h</sup>/-/d<sup>h</sup>/ after /s/, and of course cases of neutralization of the opposition between certain other vowel phonemes? I suspect that what induces the Editors of *EPD15* to concentrate on the neutralization of the opposition between /i<sup>ɘ</sup>/ and /i<sup>o</sup>/ and that of the opposition between /u<sup>ɘ</sup>/ and /u<sup>o</sup>/ is the relatively wide-ranging phonetic instability in realizations of the associated archiphonemes to which they refer (p. xiv). In other words, if they were to compile a Danish pronouncing dictionary, for instance, they might be tempted to take into account the neutralization of the opposition between, for instance, /p/ and /b/ in absolute final context because the associated archiphoneme is realized by [p] and [b] in free variation. On the other hand, in cases where, say in English, the archiphoneme associated with the opposition between /k/-/g/ after /s/ is realized regularly by [k] (voiceless unaspirated dorso-velar plosive), they seem not to be tempted to devise and employ an extra symbol with which to indicate the archiphoneme associated with the neutralization of the opposition /k/-/g/ in their pronouncing dictionary. It seems that what motivates the Editors to take account of the neutralization of the opposition between /i<sup>ɘ</sup>/ and /i<sup>o</sup>/ and that of the opposition between /u<sup>ɘ</sup>/ and /u<sup>o</sup>/ by employing two specific extra symbols, i and u, and hence the notations /i/ and /u/, is basically a *phonetic* fact, though it is true that they duly also recognize the phonological fact of the neutralization in question. Naturally, if all cases of neutralization in English were taken into account in *EPD15*, this would result in an increase in the number of symbols (standing for the

archiphonemes) and render the pronouncing dictionary much less user-friendly. We see that *EPD15* notates, for example, *discus* as 'd<sup>Ⓜ</sup>s.k★|s – or rather /d<sup>Ⓜ</sup>s.k★|s/ in the Editors' view – (where the symbol k, not an extra symbol, is employed) despite the neutralization of the opposition between /k/ and /g/, and *discuss* as d<sup>Ⓜ</sup>'sk⊕s – or rather /d<sup>Ⓜ</sup>'sk⊕s/ in the Editors' view – where again the symbol k, this time correctly, is employed as there occurs no neutralization of the opposition between /k/ and /g/ (cf. *disgust* d<sup>Ⓜ</sup>'s'g⊕st, or rather /d<sup>Ⓜ</sup>'s'g⊕st/ in the Editors' view). This leads to the other issue.

(2) *EPD15* (like *LPD*), just as much as any previous edition of *EPD*, is a pronouncing dictionary in which the type of notation certainly need not and should not be phonological (cf. phonemes, archiphonemes), attended by extra symbols for archiphonemes as well as symbols for phonemes. The type of notation may rather be phonemic if that is what the Editors want, in which case each symbol should stand for phonemes only, compatible as it is with the principle “once a phoneme, always a phoneme”. Incorporating in a pronouncing dictionary in phonological garb the facts of neutralization tends to bring about complications in presentation (extra symbols with which to notate the archiphonemes) and problems of interpretation about the extra symbols on the part of the users of the pronouncing dictionaries. After all, a pronouncing dictionary is not a phonological dictionary, and the best alternative would seem to be a pronouncing dictionary in which the indication of the pronunciation is at a basically *phonetic* level and the type of notation is phonetic (with different degrees of narrowness, as appropriate in individual cases) rather than phonological. One would not like to have for example, a German pronouncing dictionary in which extra symbols are employed in order to indicate the archiphonemes. One would not like to see a notation like ta<sup>Ⓕ</sup>T for *Tat* “fact” (ta<sup>Ⓕ</sup>T corresponding to /ta<sup>Ⓕ</sup>T/) but prefer to see ta<sup>Ⓕ</sup>t (this corresponds to [ta<sup>Ⓕ</sup>t]). See in connection, for example, *Das Wörterbuch der deutschen Aussprache* (1969) or *Duden Aussprachewörterbuch* (1974) which are in my view just right. See also *Dictionnaire de la prononciation française dans son usage réel* (1973) which is also in my view just right and in which, for example *maison* “house” is indicated as mezo<sup>Ⓜ</sup> and m<sup>Ⓜ</sup>zo<sup>Ⓜ</sup>, i.e. [mezo<sup>Ⓜ</sup>] and [m<sup>Ⓜ</sup>zo<sup>Ⓜ</sup>] (note, never in the sense of /mezo<sup>Ⓜ</sup>/ and /m<sup>Ⓜ</sup>zo<sup>Ⓜ</sup>/), phonetic notations both of which correspond to the phonological notation /mEzo<sup>Ⓜ</sup>/ in which



the neutralization of the opposition between /e/ and /ɛ̃/ is taken into account and the associated archiphoneme is indicated by E. The type of notation advocated by *EPD15*, at least by taking account of the neutralization of the opposition between /i̥/ and /ĩ̥/ and that of the opposition between /u̥/ and /ũ̥/, corresponds to a notation like /tḁ̃T/ or /mEzõ̥/ rather than [ta:t] or [mezõ̥] and [m̥̃zõ̥] in the German and French examples above. I now move on to discuss other points.

One short remark is in order regarding the choice of some symbols employed by the Editors. The affricate (a single phoneme) occurring at the beginning and end of the word *church*, for example, is symbolized by t♣ in *EPD15* (as in e.g. *EPD14*), there being more space between the symbol t and the symbol ♣ than the corresponding symbols in e.g. *LPD*. It would have been preferable for the Editors to choose t♣, available in the IPA font. This problem, *mutatis mutandis*, does not arise for d♣, in which case, in *EPD15*, there is not much offending space between d and ♣, though d♣ could have been chosen instead.

The Editors provide (pp. viii-xi) accounts of the vowel (phonemes?) and the consonant (phonemes?), separately for British English and American English, complete with diagrams showing (but for British English only) the highest points of the tongue in the articulation of the vowels, a tabular presentation of the consonants (again, for British English only). On the whole, the Editors' account of American English (vowels, diphthongs, consonants, according to their classification) is subsidiary to their account of *BBC English* and is to be seen in terms of comparisons and supplements to their account of British English counterparts.

In Fig. 1 (p. viii), the Editors satisfactorily place *BBC English* /ʌ/ quite near Cardinal Vowel No. 4 (rather than between Cardinal Vowels Nos. 3 and 4). They appropriately mention the on-going evolution in opposite directions for /ʌ/ in British English (opening) (p. ix) and in American English (closing) (p. x). Buttressed as it is by the Editors' suitable explanation, it can be considered ultimately notationally acceptable for them to employ the same notation, i.e. /ʌ/, for both *BBC English* and American English in the body of *EPD15*, though the Editors rightly write that "the symbol /a/ might one day be considered preferable" for *BBC English* (p. ix). Another aspect of /ʌ/ in British and American English could have been mentioned by the Editors. They refer to lengthening of

realizations of /ɹ/ (they do not postulate such an opposition as /ɹ/ versus /ɹ̥/). I would be happier if the Editors mentioned somewhere in the Introduction, while talking about /ɹ/ in British English (p. ix) and in American English (p. x), that realizations of /ɹ/ in American English typically tend to be lengthened even before voiceless consonants (cf. e.g. *pat, pack, pap, patch, pass, path*, etc.), though they correctly mention lengthening of realizations of /ɹ/ in British English before /b, d, g, dʒ, m, n/ and cite e.g. *bag* (p. ix) if not specifically in connection with American English.

It is a pity that the Editors do not provide, either separately or in an overlapping fashion, the placements of the American vowels and diphthongs in diagrams, in comparison with those in *BBC English*.

One debatable decision has been made by the Editors with regard to the symbol employed in their phonemic notation of a certain sound which occurs in American English. I have in mind the vowel which occurs in, for example, *bird, curd* and *jerk*. Consult first in this connection what the Editors write in the section called *American English* on pp. ix-x. The phonemic notation that the Editors adopt is /ɹ̥r/ (hence, /bɹ̥rd/ *bird*, /kɹ̥rd/ *curd*, /dʒɹ̥rk/ *jerk*), not, as many readers might expect, /ɹ̥/ (hence, /bɹ̥d/ *bird*, /kɹ̥d/ *curd*, /dʒɹ̥k/ *jerk*) which is familiar to those who are acquainted with works on American pronunciation including, among others, Kenyon & Knott's *A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English* (1951), and also to users of *LDP* which indicates both British and American pronunciation. This is a problem not only of the symbols chosen but also of how the users of *EPD15* may interpret (or even misinterpret) the notation /ɹ̥r/. It is evident from their own words that the Editors mean by the phonemic notation /ɹ̥r/ a sequence of two phonemes, i.e. /ɹ̥/ followed by /r/. Note their statement that “[in American English...] All vowels occurring before /r/ within a syllable are likely to become “r-coloured” to some extent” (p. x). They do *not* mean a unitary phoneme by the notation /ɹ̥r/, i.e. a single phoneme which consists in a rhoticized vowel of a certain quality, or what the Editors themselves call a “retroflexed vowel /ɹ̥r/” (p. ix). At any rate, the Editors say nothing to warn against an interpretation in favour of a unitary phoneme in connection with their symbolization /ɹ̥r/. Their choice of the symbolization /ɹ̥r/ rather than /ɹ̥/ for American English is all the more problematic and

strange when, on the other hand, they choose, rightly in my opinion, for American English the symbolization /r̥/, rather than, say, /r̥r̥/; see e.g. *water* notated as 'w̥r̥:t̥|̥. This use of the symbolization of /r̥/ is justifiable and appropriate, and raises no problem. Why not, then, choose /r̥r̥/ which would be parallel to /r̥r̥/? The Editors say nothing to explain it. Incidentally, I have happened to run into *courage/Courage* being notated simply as /k̥r̥.d̥/ in EPD15 (p. 116), without the indication of the corresponding American English pronunciation. This is probably an accidental lapse (they notate *hurry/Hurry* as /h̥r̥r̥.ɹ̥-/ in addition to /h̥r̥r̥.i/ (for British English). EPD15 should add /h̥r̥r̥.ɹ̥-/ for American English). LPD correctly gives /k̥r̥r̥.d̥/ (for American pronunciation) as well as /k̥r̥.d̥/ (for British pronunciation).

The notation /r̥r̥/ chosen by the Editors rather than /r̥r̥/ for American English should of course not be mistaken for the notation /r̥r̥/ which they employ for *BBC English* (according to them, non-rhotic) as in *deter* /d̥t̥r̥r̥/. It is important to remember that the notation /r̥r̥/ is intended by the Editors to refer to a sequence of two phonemes, /r̥/ and /r̥/ with the implication that /r̥/ does not occur unless “r-linking” happens. In this respect, there is a parallel between the notation /r̥r̥/ as in *cur* and the notation /r̥r̥/ as in *here*, with regard, of course, to *BBC English*, not American English.

Still on the subject of the symbolization of a single sound in ‘phonemic notation’, I must bring up for a comment the Editors' choice of *hl*, or /*hl*/ as they conceive of it in terms of phonemic notation, in indicating the existence of two alternative anglicized pronunciations of Welsh proper names like *Llanberis* and *Llanelli*. The symbolization *hl* is meant to correspond simultaneously to [h̥] (voiceless lateral fricative) which is indicated by *hl* and [l] (voiced lateral non-fricative) which is unproblematically indicated by *l*. The Editors are of course familiar with the symbol *h̥*; they actually use the notation [h̥] on p. xi, but they list on the inside of the front cover the symbol *hl* which they indicate as standing for “voiceless lateral fricative”. Ultimately the Editors opt to employ the symbol *hl* in the body of EPD15 whereby they intend to indicate simultaneously the two alternative pronunciations. The problem that arises immediately in employing *hl*, or /*hl*/ as they conceive of it in terms of

phonemic notation, concerns the meaning of *h* or /*h*/ here. As the Editors clearly put it in the tabular presentation of English consonants (p. x), *h* or /*h*/ stands for (voiceless) glottal fricative. It is obvious that *h* of *hl* has a different meaning from *h* or /*h*/ in the above-mentioned tabular presentation and that it is made to mean voicelessness; this reminds one of how Charles Francis Hockett employs the symbol *H* as standing for voicelessness in his *A Manual of Phonology* (1955, p. 165), but in a context of a discussion entirely different from the present case. The Editors themselves write: "...*hl* to indicate that it may be pronounced as a voiceless [ʰ]" (p. xi). Thus, the Editors' ambivalent use of the symbol *h* (though we are aware that they in fact do use *h*, not *h*) is theoretically problematic. Since /*hl*/ is supposed to be phonemic notation, both /*h*/ and /*l*/ are supposed to be two phonemes (which occur sequentially), yet /*h*/ here is not a phoneme whereas the /*h*/ is in the above-mentioned table of consonants or the /*h*/ in e.g. /*h*ʌt/ *hat* is. The Editors' notation /*hl*/ with the meaning of "either [l] or [ʰ]" is acceptable only as a convenient device of symbolization, but is flawed on theoretical grounds. Incidentally, the phonemic notation given of *Llanberis* on p. xi (i.e. in the Introduction) is infelicitous (there being too much space between *h* and *l*) compared with that given on p. 295 (i.e. in the body of *EPD15*). It should be mentioned lastly that the Editors' choice of the symbol *hl* (or /*hl*/) may well be motivated by Zulu orthography as in *Hluluwe* (recorded in *LPD*, p. 339) in which *hl* corresponds to [ʰ].

The Editors follow suit with the practice, previously resorted to in *LPD*, of employing the length-mark, i.e.  $\text{̄}$ , for the five vowel phonemes: viz. /i $\text{̄}$ / (as in *key*); /ɜ $\text{̄}$ / (as in *car* in British English or in *father* – and according to *LPD* and *EPD15* – also as in *pot* in American English); /ɔ $\text{̄}$ / (as in *core* in both British and American English, or also as in *caught* in American English – which is also pronounced with /ɜ $\text{̄}$ / according to *EPD15* or with /ɔ $\text{̄}$ / according to *LPD*); /ɹ $\text{̄}$ / (as in *cur* in British English) together with /ɹ $\text{̄}$ r/ (as in *bird* in American English); and /u $\text{̄}$ / as in *coo* in both British and American English. They do not follow suit with the practice in e.g. Kenyon and Knott's *A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English* (1951) (in which no length-mark is employed) in order to, as they put it, "mark their [i.e. the American tense vowels] relationship to the English long vowels" (p. ix). Incidentally, /u $\text{̄}$ / is not mentioned in

this particular connection in *EPD15* (p. ix) and this vowel is missing from the list of the American vowel phonemes on the inside of the front cover.

The Editors consistently indicate /ɔ̃/ (note, with the length-mark) for American English (as in *pot*) in all cases where British English has /ɔ/ (as in *pot*) in addition to all those cases where British English too has /ɔ̃/ (as in *father*). This practice was already seen in *LPD*. *EPD15* therefore indicates /nɔ̃r'kɔ̃tɪk/ for *narcotic* in American English. Notice that /ɔ̃/ with the length-mark in the second syllable of *narcotic* in American English corresponds to /ɔ/ in British English (as in *pot*). *EPD15* shows, as does *LPD*, /ɔ̃/ as being susceptible of occurring not only in accented syllable but also in unaccented syllable, whether in a pre-accented unaccented syllable as in *octet(te)* /ɔ̃k'tet/, or in a post-accented unaccented syllable as in *pathos* /'peɪ.θɔ̃s/.

While on the subject of the length-mark for /ɔ̃/ in American English corresponding to /ɔ/ in British English, I must stress that I am not altogether happy that *EPD15* does not sufficiently indicate that /ɑ/ in American English, particularly in accented vowels, is long. To give just a couple of examples which actually stand for all other relevant examples, *passable* is given as /'pɑs.ə-/- and *half* as /hɑlf/, and I am fearful of a possible danger for many foreign learners/teachers who consult *EPD15* to wrongly pronounce in their American English these words (and many other relevant words) with too short [ɑ] while, on the other hand, appropriately lengthening [ɔ̃] (as in *pothole*). This would produce an effect both strange and wrong. The same can be said of even /ɑ/ in American English occurring in unaccented syllables as in *impasse* which *EPD15* gives as /'im.pɑs.ə-/-/. The lengthening for /ɑ/, i.e. [ɑ̃] (fully long) or [ɑ̃̄] (half long), as the case may be, in American English would be desirable, in actual pronunciation and, even in pronouncing dictionaries. I should mention in this connection as being relevant that I am personally always struck by the short length of [a] that many Northern English speakers produce in pronouncing words like *passable* and *impasse* where other English speakers of certain dialects have [ɔ̃] and many American speakers have [ɑ̃] or [ɑ̃̄]. I should say that I am aware of the Editors mentioning (p. ix) the lengthening of /ɑ/ in connection with “before /b, d, g, dʒ, m, n/” in British English so that /ɑ/ in *bag* is much longer than that in *back*. They go on to write (p. x) that it [i.e. “the /ɑ/

symbol”, as they put it] is phonetically appropriate for the corresponding American vowel”. I do not think, however, that the Editors in this last quoted sentence give justice to the lengthening of the said vowel in American English, for by “phonetically” in the above quoted sentence, the Editors refer to the quality, not the quantity (i.e. the length) of the vowel.

The Editors correctly describe the phonetic context in which aspiration occurs immediately following the release of the occlusion in the articulation of voiceless plosives (but they should also mention voiceless affricates like  $tʃ$  and  $ts$ ; cf. *chin*, *tsar*) as “initial in a stressed syllable” (p. xi). Many an author wrongly describes the phonetic context in question as “word-initial position”, which is obviously not altogether correct (cf. *apartment*). The Editors refer, in this connection, to /p/, /t/ and /k/. They also mention e.g. /sp-/, /st-/ and /sk-/ – their notation, not mine – in which case there occurs no aspiration. As was previously done in *LPD*, *EPD15* discriminately places the accent mark in those instances of the sequence sp, st and sk in which the occurrence of accent is involved according to whether there occurs aspiration after p, t and k after s. Thus, in *disclaim* there is aspiration so that they put -s'k-, but in *discuss* there is none so that they put -'sk-. One might suppose that, judging from their notation like /sp/, /st/ and /sk/ in both accented and unaccented syllables, they do *not* subscribe to the concepts of neutralization and the archiphoneme, unlike in the case of their use of the symbols i and u (/i/, /u/), as we have earlier seen. They neither implicitly nor explicitly refer to neutralization and the archiphoneme in connection with sp-, st- and sk-, or -sp, -st and -sk, or -sp-, -st- and -sk-. Thus, they in their capacity as Editors of *EPD15* seem to be free from the error of simplistically linking a lack of aspiration for p, t and k after s with the neutralization of the opposition between /p/ and /b/, /t/ and /d/, or /k/ and /g/, the error that John Wells commits in *LPD* (p. 476). However, at an early date, Peter Roach in his *English Phonetics and Phonology*, (1983, p. 100) does commit this error. It is important to remember a case like *discuss* (vs. *disgust*) in which, though aspiration does not occur after the release of [k], there is no neutralization of the opposition between /k/ and /g/ after /s/.

The Editors refer to the four French nasalized (nasal?) vowels, viz. /ɛ̃/, /ɔ̃/, /ɑ̃/ and /ɔ̃/, for which they provide “*vin rouge*”, “*restaurant*”, “*bon marché*” and “*Verdun*” as illustrative words (p. xi). This is fair. Then,

they go on to provide four symbols which are supposed to stand for the approximate equivalents that English speakers produce in pronouncing relevant French words (in English). These are four from among the symbols for English vowels (that are elsewhere employed in notating English words) surmounted by tildes (p. xii). The table of equivalents that the Editors provide (*ibid.*) is reproduced here :

French	English
ɛ̃	ɛ̃
ɔ̃	ɔ̃
ɛ̃	ɛ̃
ɔ̃	ɔ̃

Note that the four symbols for the nasalized vowels which are vertically listed on the right under “English” are not to be associated with the corresponding symbols employed in the previous editions of *EPD* but rather with those employed in *LPD* (see the inside of the back cover of *LPD* and also p. xxii in *LPD*).

The proposed use of  $\text{ɛ̃}$ ,  $\text{ɔ̃}$  and  $\text{ɛ̃}$ , as shown above, as approximate equivalents of the respective French nasal(ized) vowels is fair enough, albeit with reservations about the retention of the length-mark (which *is* used in the body of *EPD15*, in notating the anglicized pronunciation of French words) as in *restaurant* /- $\text{ɛ̃}$  ʒ ɑ̃ ʁ ɑ̃ ʒ ɑ̃/, - $\text{ɔ̃}$  ʁ ɑ̃ ʒ ɑ̃/. Note that, for example, *vin* is notated with /- $\text{ɛ̃}$  ɑ̃ ʁ ɑ̃/ without the length-mark (not /- $\text{ɛ̃}$  ɑ̃ ʁ ɑ̃/). One wonders if recourse or non-recourse to the length-mark is really necessary in these anglicized pronunciations. One's attention is attracted by the use of  $\text{ɔ̃}$  in anglicized pronunciation for  $\text{ɔ̃}$  in native French pronunciation (at least of some French speakers). The use of the symbol  $\text{ɔ̃}$  for  $\text{ɔ̃}$  for which the Editors cite *Verdun* (p. xi) does not even occur for the word *Verdun* in the body of *EPD15* (p. 533), an unexpected slip, though it does occur for the word *Lebrun* (p. 289) which is instanced in connection with the symbol  $\text{ɔ̃}$ , the very symbol that is listed on the inside of the front cover and for which *Lebrun* is cited as an example. Incidentally, one need hardly be reminded that many French

speakers have ② or ③, instead of ④ in words like *Verdun* and *Lebrun*.

There follows in the Introduction a section entitled *Stress* (pp. xii-xiii). I omit any extensive discussion of this section, as no serious points occur in what the Editors write within the theoretical and working frameworks that they adopt, though I do not necessarily agree with what they believe in. However (and it is a big “however”), I am compelled to raise one particular point which has substantial repercussion on the body of *EPD15*. It is understandable that the Editors recognize not only “stressed” and “unstressed” but also “secondary stress” (p. xii). They write, among other things, that “Secondary stresses have only limited occurrence after a primary stress: such a secondary stress is only marked in closed or hyphenated compound words where the second element is polysyllabic (e.g. ‘fish\*monger’)” (p. xii). The Editors’ indication of secondary accent (or a secondary stress, as they call it) is wildly inadequate when it comes to their notation of American English pronunciation, and I do not necessarily mean the types of compounds that they specifically mention. It is well known that American English, which has an accentual behaviour and a rhythmic pattern different from British English, typically manifests secondary accent even where none occurs in British English. For example, all such words as *civilize*, *contributory*, *military*, *officiate* and *salutary* (and a host of others) bear secondary accent, following primary accent. Kenyon & Knott’s *A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English* (1951) indicates as follows the pronunciations of these example words: ‘s<sup>h</sup>vl\*<sup>h</sup>IIa<sup>h</sup>z; k\*nhbj\*<sup>h</sup>tor<sup>h</sup>, -\*<sup>h</sup>t<sup>h</sup>r<sup>h</sup>; ‘m<sup>h</sup>l\*<sup>h</sup>t<sup>h</sup>r<sup>h</sup>; \*<sup>h</sup>f<sup>h</sup>o<sup>h</sup>\*<sup>h</sup>et; ‘s<sup>h</sup>lj\*<sup>h</sup>t<sup>h</sup>r<sup>h</sup>, -jU-. Secondary accent which follows primary accent in each such word is thus properly indicated. *EPD15*, which proposes to record General American pronunciation in addition to British English pronunciation, completely fails in the marking of secondary accent in words of the types I have adduced above. On the other hand, *the* two specific symbols *EPD15* employs regularly for American English are the length-mark in ⑤ (corresponding to ① in British English; cf. e.g. *pot*) and the diacritic ⑥ for “flapping” (of /t/) as in ‘get<sup>h</sup>⑥<sup>h</sup> for *getting*. The Editors’ omission of the indication of secondary accent after primary accent in the American pronunciation of all relevant words throughout the body of *EPD15* must be considered a serious flaw, with a potential consequence



that many users (in particular, foreign learners/teachers) of *EPD15* who happen to practise or wish to practise American English with help from *EPD15* will get the wrong information about the accentual behaviour and the rhythmic pattern typical of American English. Seeing that *LPD* is guilty of the same omission about the indication of secondary accent following primary accent in American English, it is more than likely that this is one of the features inherited by *EPD15* from *CPDBAE* and more directly from *LPD*.

Syllable division in the pronunciation of English words is a notorious and treacherous matter. The Editors touch on this subject by bringing in some solutions arising from one or two recently developed types of phonology in the post-generative phonology era.

I skip discussions about the rest of the sections contained in the Introduction, as they do not seem to raise very serious problems.

The Introduction ends with some explanatory notes about what the user of *EPD15* is to understand from individual entries of the pronunciation of words in the body of *EPD15*, and a list of references to the works made use of in the Introduction, and a list of recommended works on British and American pronunciation (pp. xviii-xix).

The foregoing constitutes my discussions of the Introduction in *EPD15* principally from a theoretical point of view. It is now time for me to turn to the nitty-gritty, so to speak, of *EPD15*.

This necessarily involves, for reasons which will become apparent, comparing *EPD15* with one other English pronouncing dictionary currently on the market and with which *EPD15* must objectively be said to be in direct competition. I have in mind *LPD*, to which I have made frequent references in the foregoing and which has been around since 1990, the time of its publication. The Editors of *EPD15* themselves describe *LPD* as “An alternative pronouncing dictionary to this one” (p. xix). It may be reminded that *EPD14* came out in 1977, and the revised edition of it in 1988. Those scholars and students who are interested in matters of English pronunciation became acquainted with *LPD* whilst eagerly awaiting the publication of *EPD15*.

(1) There is no doubt that the figure of 80,000 for the number of words and phrases that *EPD15* proudly mentions are contained therein is

impressive (even when we leave out of account the number of phrases, as distinct from words) when compared with that of 59,000 words that *LPD* contains. The revised edition of *EPD14* (1988) contained a Supplement (pp. 561-576) which consisted of approximately 1,000 words which were to be added to the original edition of *EPD14* (1977). Practically all these words have been incorporated in *EPD15*; and only the following four words have been dropped by the Editors for some reason or other; *calabrese*, *diastalsis*, *filing-clerk* and *non-contentious*. (*LPD* happens not to enter *diastalsis* but the rest are entered.)

(2) Users of *EPD15* need to be rather patient in case they first think that compound words (of various types) they wish to consult seem not to be included in *EPD15*. This is due to the fact that the Editors adopt a certain principle whereby some compound words beginning with a given word (e.g. *horse*) as the first constituent (e.g. *horsebox*, *horsefly*) appear as separate entries, while other compound words (e.g. *horse chestnut*, *horsepower*) with the same word (*horse*) as the first constituent appear under the headword (*horse*) and not as separate entries. It is therefore important for the users of *EPD15* not to rush to the hasty conclusion, after trying but failing to find, for example, *horse chestnut* or *horsepower* as separate entries, that these compound words are not included in *EPD15*. (*EPD14* lists *horse-chestnut* and *horse-power* as well as *horse-box* and *horse-fly* as separate entries, but earlier editions of *EPD* did not necessarily show the same pattern; *LPD* lists *horsebox*, *horsefly* and *horsepower* as separate entries, but *horse chestnut* under the headword *horse*.) The users are advised to look under the separate entry (*horse* in the above example) with a view to seeking the compound words which are not listed as separate entries. Users of *EPD15* or any other pronouncing dictionary may understandably expect to find all compound words as separate entries, as this is the practice in non-pronouncing dictionaries. The Editors of *EPD15* provide no explanation in the Introduction or elsewhere about the criterion or criteria which may determine the two modes of listing compound words in the manner we have seen above. It might seem at first that those compound words (*horse chestnut*, *horse show*) having both primary accent and secondary accent are listed under the first constituent (*horse*) which appears as a separate entry while those compound words (e.g. *horsebox*, *horsefly*) having only primary accent are listed as separate entries.

However, this surmise proves wrong because other compound words (e.g. *horsepower*) which are also listed as separate entries have both primary accent and secondary accent (e.g. *horsepower* given as 'hɹɔ̃s\*paʃ★). Besides, a compound word with primary accent only (e.g. *horseshoe*) is also listed as a separate entry. On the other hand, all those compound words that are listed under the first constituent are spelled without either hyphens or spaces between the first and second constituents (e.g. *horse chestnut*, *horse opera*, *horse sense*, *horse show*, *horse trials*). This leads one to think that the reason why these compound words are listed in the way they are may be a less tight cohesion between the constituents and has nothing to do with accentual phenomena. It is true that all those compound words that are listed as separate entries are spelled either with hyphenation (e.g. *horse-trading*) or with neither hyphenation nor spacing (e.g. *horsebox*). (Note, however, that *EPD14*, for example, spells *horse-box*.) In the absence of any relevant explanation provided by the Editors, all this seems to make one feel that whatever criterion or criteria the Editors have chosen is or are ambiguous or indeterminate. It goes without saying that phrases like *flog a dead horse*, *hold your horses* and (*straight*) *from the horse's mouth* which invariably involve spaces between constituents are entered under the headword *horse*. I should lastly mention that listing compound words in a non-uniform fashion, as I have illustrated above, is not peculiar to *EPD15* but is already present, if not identically, in *LPD*.

(3) One innovative feature of *EPD15* is the inclusion of phrases, in addition to independent words, with a view to indicating the distribution of primary and secondary accent in the pronunciation of phrases. (In these cases, the segmental pronunciation of the constituent words is not indicated.) A few examples of such phrases have already been adduced just above. I will reproduce them here but this time together with the indication of the accent marks that the Editors add: \**flog a* \**dead* 'horse, \**hold your* 'horses and (\**straight*) from the \**horse's* 'mouth. Similarly, under the headword *house*, for example, they give the following: \**eat one out of* \**house* and 'home, \**bring the* 'house \**down*, get \**on* like a 'house on \**fire*, \**set one's* 'house in \**order*. It might be thought at first sight that the inclusion of such and other phrases in a pronouncing dictionary (no previous editions of *EPD* have done this, nor have other pronouncing dictionaries, including *LPD*, so far as I know) is somewhat strange and

redundant, for this goes beyond being concerned with the pronunciation of individual words. It will have been seen above, and will be seen in the case of many other phrases which *EPD15* includes, that they are useful and well-known idiomatic phrases that foreign learners/teachers of English should be acquainted with. The correct distribution of primary accent and secondary accent in phrases, including idiomatic phrases in English, is generally one of the most difficult and elusive tasks for foreign learners/teachers to achieve, but something that comes natural to native speakers of English. For this reason, although not all idiomatic phrases can be included, this is a helpful feature for foreign users of *EPD15*. Substantial attention to the indication of the distribution of primary accent and secondary accent in idiomatic phrases as given in *EPD15* will help foreign learners/teachers of English to arrive at a working generalization of this aspect of spoken English. The Editors take pains to indicate, where this is the case, the different accentual patterns in phrases between British English and American English; witness e.g. \*sell like \*hot 'cakes [and] (US) \*sell like 'hot \*cakes, to be found under the headword *hot*. In fact, *EPD15* does not stop at indicating the distribution of primary accent and secondary accent in idiomatic phrases and also indicates noun phrases like \*human 'being, \*human 'nature, \*human 'race and \*human 'right, which are all given under the headword *human*. In these cases, however, the point of diminishing returns is quickly reached and the generalization easily and promptly drawn. The generalization is such that it could be formulated succinctly, if the Editors wished to provide one in the Introduction for the benefit of the users, which they do not.

(4) In a somewhat similar vein, *EPD15* also shows, regularly and accompanied by illustrative examples, how a compound word (e.g. *highborn*) whose accentual pattern is such that the first constituent bears secondary accent and the second constituent primary accent undergoes a change in the distribution of primary accent and secondary accent when the compound word occurs in concatenation with other words. Thus, for example, we find the following: “*highborn* \*ha' bɔ:n (US) 'ha \*bɔ:n stress shift, *British only*: \*highborn 'lady” (p. 235); or “*ill-starred* \*ɪl'stɜ:d (US) -stɜ:rd stress shift: \*ill-starred 'love” (p. 240). The indication of the change in the accentual pattern *with the accompaniment of illustrative examples* is previously not regularly

observed (see e.g. *EPD14* or *LPD*). Previous editions of *EPD* formulaically give such a type of indication as “[also ‘-- when attributive]” (for e.g. *ill-starred*) (but none for *highborn*) or “[also ‘-- according to sentence-stress]” (for e.g. *well-bred*), but without illustrative examples. Though it is true that manuals of English phonetics traditionally explain such change in the accentual pattern by providing examples of relevant concatenations, regular indication of such change in the accentual pattern in *EPD15* is helpful to foreign learners/teachers.

(5) My general visual impression of *EPD15* is that it is relatively poor in readability, and hence perhaps little user-friendly, for the following variety of reasons.

(i) The letter shapes used for *EPD15* are somewhat smaller (both horizontally and vertically) than those used for *LPD* or for the previous editions of *EPD*. The difference can be ascertained with particular ease by looking at some of the capital letters like C, O and E which are horizontally less extensive in *EPD15* than in *LPD* or in the previous editions of *EPD*, but can also be ascertained in respect to lower-case letters too. Besides, the letters of which the individual headwords consist in *EPD15* are printed horizontally closer to each other than in *LPD* or in the previous editions of *EPD*, and this results in each headword looking compressed and uncomfortably small.

(ii) Moreover, the headwords are printed in three columns to a page in *EPD15* (no doubt in order to accommodate the 80,000 words and phrases in a reasonable number of pages; a price to be paid) instead of in two columns to a page as in *LPD* or in all the previous editions of *EPD*, or in fact any other pronouncing dictionaries I happen to be acquainted with. This further accentuates the visual impression that the information is presented in a very compact fashion, too compact I dare say.

(iii) The headwords (e.g. *ethic*) and associated derivative endings (-al, -ally) are printed in boldface but the corresponding pronunciations are printed in lightface, just as they are in *LPD* or in the previous editions of *EPD*. The headwords and the endings, and the corresponding pronunciations, are all monochrome, i.e. in black, in *EPD15*, as has been traditionally so in all editions of *EPD*. It should be pointed out in this connection that in *LPD*, both the headwords and the endings are printed in

black, while those pronunciations which are presented as the 1st choices in those cases where alternative pronunciations exist are printed in blue, and the other choices in black, with the result that this bicoloured contrast enhances the visual distinction between the words and their pronunciations.

(iv) Visually, then, *LPD* is, as are the previous editions of *EPD*, incomparably more user-friendly than *EPD15*, on account of the three above-mentioned factors ((i) to (iii)).

(6) Syllable division is indicated in *EPD15* by a dot or dots, as the case may be (e.g. 'es.t<sup>h</sup>.me<sup>h</sup>t for *estimate* (v.)), which it is a strain to the eye for the reader to identify, rather than by a space or spaces as in *LPD* (e.g. 'est<sup>h</sup> me<sup>h</sup>t), all the more so because, as I said under (i) and (ii) of (5) above, the letter shapes are fairly small and the letters themselves are placed horizontally pretty compactly.


(7) In a number of cases, *EPD15* indicates what is known as (post-primary) secondary accent where previous pronouncing dictionaries do not. For example, *A.C.A.S* was added in the Supplement to *EPD14* but without secondary accent (thus, 'eik<sup>h</sup>s) and occurs similarly in *LPD* (where it is spelled *ACAS*) (thus, 'eik<sup>h</sup>s), but *ACAS* appears with secondary accent in *EPD15* (thus 'e<sup>h</sup>•k<sup>h</sup>s). This is not the case with, e.g. *AWACS* which *EPD15* indicates as 'e<sup>h</sup>.w<sup>h</sup>ks. Most presumably, one should not see here any link between the concomitance of the presence of the secondary accent mark with the absence of the syllable division mark (i.e. a dot) in 'e<sup>h</sup>•k<sup>h</sup>s (in *EPD15*), and the concomitance of the presence of the syllable division mark with the absence of the secondary accent mark in 'e<sup>h</sup>.w<sup>h</sup>ks (also in *EPD15*). I should additionally cite *UCAS* (*Ucas*) for which *EPD15* indicates 'ju<sup>h</sup>k<sup>h</sup>s, without (post-primary) secondary accent, a word which, incidentally, was not included in either the original edition (1977) of *EPD14* or the Supplement to the revised edition (1988) of *EPD14* or even in *LPD* (1990). Given substantial similarity in the phonetic makeup of e.g. *ACAS*, *AWACKS* and *UCAS* (*Ucas*), one wonders what principle governs the presence or absence of *post*-primary secondary accent in such cases. I should add that the examples above happen to be all acronyms but the point I have made could have been illustrated with examples other than acronyms.

(8) It is good to see that *EPD15* incorporates the Welsh place-name *Llanfairpwllgwyngyllgogerychwyrndrobwllllantysiliogogoch* (p. 296), an item which was missing both in *EPD14* in its original edition (1977) and in the Supplement to the revised edition of *EPD14* (1988) but was included in *LPD*, in 1990, if not as a headword (see p. 414). This world-famous long Welsh village name (and the name of the railway station) deserved for a long time to appear in a pronouncing dictionary. (Incidentally, this village name means “St. Mary's church in the hollow of the white hazel near to the rapid whirlpool of St. Tysillio's church, by the red cave”. Its inclusion would be of special interest to foreign learners/teachers of English. Unlike *LPD*, *EPD15* fails to offer any information about the native Welsh pronunciation. Provision of such information is of course against the principles of *EPD15*, as has been seen further above.

(9) Most users of *EPD15* as well as any other pronouncing dictionaries would be interested to find out the hierarchical order (1st choice, 2nd choice, etc.) regarding competing current pronunciations of many English words, i.e. alternative pronunciations of such words, in respect of accentual patterns and/or segmental units (be they vowels, semivowels or consonants). The sorts of words I have in mind are *ate*, *controversy*, *data*, *exquisite*, *harass*, and many others. As most users of *LPD* will be well aware, *LPD* provides the results of the postal opinion poll surveys conducted with regard to 66 selected such words (in fact conducted with regard to nearly a hundred words). The surveys were concerned basically with British English; the whole of the 275 informants were native speakers of British English. The identities of these 66 words are as follows: *accomplish*, *again*, *applicable*, *ate*, *auction*, *baths*, *bedroom*, *been*, *bouquet*, *brochure*, *casual*, *caviar*, *chrysanthemum*, *cigaret/cigarette*, *clandestine*, *contribute*, *controversy*, *covert*, *data*, *debut/début*, *decade*, *deity*, *delirious*, *dispute* (n), *distribute*, *drastic*, *economic*, *envelope*, *exasperate*, *exit*, *exquisite*, *formidable*, *graph*, *harass*, *homosexual*, *hospitable*, *ice cream*, *increase* (n, v), *inherent*, *issue*, *kilometre*, *lather*, *luxury*, *maintain*, *masquerade*, *nephew*, *patriotic*, *plaque*, *plastic*, *poor*, *presume*, *primarily*, *privacy*, *research*, *room*, *sandwich*, *schism*, *spectator*, *stereo*, *submarine*, *substantial*, *suit*, *transistor*, *transition*, *year* and *zebra*. Most users of English pronouncing dictionaries will certainly have a pretty good guess as to the phonetic points with regard to which competing alternative

pronunciations exist for these words and in which *LPD* is interested, and so I need not go into detail here. Very unfortunately, I cannot reproduce the interesting percentage figures that *LPD* gives for the competing alternative pronunciations of each word, as this would take up too much space. As for *EPD15*, true to the *EPD* tradition, it has to its credit no *LPD*-type surveys, nor any numerical data in whatever shape or form. The postal opinion poll surveys conducted for *LPD* are limited with regard to the number of words investigated and suffer from less than satisfactory methodology employed. Nevertheless, the very fact that numerical data are given in terms of percentages for the competing pronunciations of each word affords an interesting and informative picture of the hierarchical nature of the alternative pronunciations of the above-mentioned words. It is possible that no sea change has taken place during the period of just less than a decade that separates *LPD* and *EPD15* so far as the hierarchy in the preference of competing pronunciations of those words is concerned. On the other hand, some significant change may have been taking place, as one major factor for a change in the above-mentioned hierarchy is the *age* of speakers of British English. At any rate, no validly direct comparison is either possible or profitable on this matter between *EPD15* and *LPD*. However, it is interesting to see those few cases in which the hierarchical order of alternative pronunciations as indicated in *LPD* and *EPD15* is the reverse of each other. The following are some such cases as shown in *EPD15*; it is to be understood that the indication in *LPD* is in the reverse order in each case: *applicable* (- ' - -, ' - - -), *bedroom* (... ru<sup>↙</sup>m, ... r<sup>↑</sup>m) (see below), *kilometre* (- ' - - -, ' - - - -), *plaque* (-<sup>↘</sup>↙-, -<sup>↘</sup>-), *primarily* (- ' - - -, ' - - - -), *submarine* (●- - '-', ' - - -). Note that *EPD14*, *EPD15* and *LPD* all indicate *room* as ru<sup>↙</sup>m, r<sup>↑</sup>m (not r<sup>↑</sup>m, ru<sup>↙</sup>m), no doubt due to the word receiving (primary) accent in normal circumstances. However, interestingly, *EPD1* (1917) gives r<sup>↑</sup>m, ru<sup>↙</sup>m. In the rest of the above words, *EPD15* and *LPD* agree. For *baths* *EPD15* gives only -<sup>↘</sup>z whereas *LPD* gives both -<sup>↘</sup>z and -<sup>↘</sup>s; for *data* *EPD15* indicates -<sup>↘</sup>- as <sup>ⓐ</sup> while *LPD* considers it as non-RP; for *issue* *EPD15* puts -'●ju<sup>↙</sup> as <sup>ⓐ</sup> while *LPD* lists it as the third alternative in British English and indicates -'●u<sup>↙</sup> as always <sup>ⓐ</sup>; for *luxury* *LPD* gives both -k●- and -g<sup>↙</sup>- but *EPD15* lists only -k●- for British English but both -k●- (1st choice) and -g<sup>↙</sup>- (2nd choice) as alternatives in <sup>ⓐ</sup>; for *presume* -<sup>↙</sup>u<sup>↙</sup>- is listed as the third



alternative but is absent in *EPD15*; for *spectator LPD* gives both - ' - - and ' - - - in this order but *EPD15* gives only ' - - - (surprisingly, not ' - - - even as ). Personally, I would strongly suggest that any interested users of *EPD15* (or for that matter those of *LPD* too) should look *in detail* at the percentage figures given in *LPD* for the competing alternative pronunciations of those words about which *EPD15* and *LPD* agree. Users of English pronouncing dictionaries may be somewhat surprised that both *LPD* and *EPD15* record a word like *controversy* with ' - - - (1st choice) and - ' - - - (2nd choice) rather than the other way about in British English; the difference in the percentage figures is fairly small between ' - - - - (44%) and - ' - - - (56%) in the opinion poll survey conducted for *LPD*. The same can be said of a word like *formidable* for which the postal opinion poll survey conducted for *LPD* gives ' - - - - (46%) and - ' - - - (54%) but for which *LPD* indicates ' - - - - (1st choice) and - ' - - - (2nd choice). It is important to note that variant pronunciations of each of the 66 words that *LPD* indicates as the 1st choice is that pronunciation which the Editor (John Wells) considers as being “recommended for EFL/[ESL] purposes” (*LPD*, p. x), which may or may not coincide with the results of the postal opinion poll survey. This pedagogic slant in *LPD* is important to bear in mind in the matter. The Editors of *EPD15* too take a pedagogic stand in so far as they say “the decisions about which pronunciation to *recommend* [my italics] ...” (p. vi). Which one of the variant pronunciations of a word is indicated in *EPD15* as the 1st choice, i.e. the one “believed to be the most usual one” (p. vi), “is based on the editors' intuitions as professional phoneticians and observers of the pronunciation of English (particularly broadcast English) over many years” (p. vi). At any rate, the Editors are of the view that “When more than one pronunciation of a word is given, the order of the alternatives is important” (p. vi). There is no reference, either covert or overt, to any opinion poll surveys which are evidently not in the programme for the compilation of *EPD15*. Inclusion of a statistical survey of some sort concerning competing alternative pronunciations of words such as exemplified by the 66 words in *LPD* – (but more, if possible) – would be a welcome feature in future editions of *EPD*, the more so if there is a reasonable amount of time gap between 1990 and the future edition(s) of *EPD*.

(10) It would be helpful to many users of *EPD15* if the Editors briefly explained in the Introduction what is meant by the symbol ®, which has never been used in the previous editions of *EPD*. Not every user can be expected to know already that ® stands for “registered trademark”. One reads, for instance in *The Random House Dictionary of the English Language* (2nd ed., 1987, p. 1589): “registered trademark: written as superscript ® following a name registered with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office”. A few examples of the words accompanied by ® in *EPD15* are: *Pentax*®, *Rolls-Royce*®, *Seiko*®, *Snoopy*®, *Tabasco*® and *Velcro*®. But there are plenty of others in *EPD15*. Some of them (e.g. *Seiko*®) may be better known to many users of *EPD15* than others (e.g. *Tabasco*®). Long-time average users of *EPD* would certainly appreciate an explanation of the symbol ® in the Introduction by the Editors. Incidentally, *LPD* employs the abbreviation *trmk* (for *trademark*, of course), so that we find *Pentax tdmk*, *Rolls-Royce tdmk*, etc., though *Seiko* is curiously missing.

(11) Users of *EPD15* will find usefully interesting a number of Notes – not a few of them longish – here and there for specific words which other pronouncing dictionaries do not generally give. For instance, there are longish Notes under *ahem*, *humph*, *phew*, *pshaw*, *tsk*, *tut*, *uh-huh*, etc., which happen to be all interjections; but *erm* is not entered, though *er* is (with no Note), nor *huh* nor *uh*, for that matter. A fair number of Notes concern prefixes, suffixes and combining forms (see next under (12)).

(12) *EPD15* provides copious Notes concerning the phonetic behaviour, both segmental and suprasegmental (in the main, accentual), of individual prefixes (e.g. *ab-*), suffixes (e.g. *-able*) and combining forms (e.g. *acro-*; the Editors curiously consider it as a prefix and do not use the term “combining form” anyway) and also the Notes concerning the phonetic repercussion that they may or may not have on the pronunciation of the rest of the constituents of the derivative words. Other Notes concern words like *a*, *am*, *and*, *are*, *as*, *because* and *some*, i.e. those “small” words whose variant pronunciations many foreigners are not necessarily sure of. Such Notes are a handy summary of the information for foreign teachers/learners. The contents of these Notes are of course nothing new, as they are found in manuals of English phonetics, but it is convenient to find

them summarized in the form of Notes at appropriate places. The idea itself of incorporating these Notes in *EPD15* has obviously been adopted from *LPD* which already provides similar information, though not as Notes. The contents of these Notes are not identical between *EPD15* and *LPD* and differ in length and detail. Some of the Notes seem to be out of place in a pronouncing dictionary like *EPD15* (e.g. *ar-* which is presented as a prefix with examples like *arrogate* and *array*) just as much as some remarks in *LPD* (e.g. *ac-* which is presented as a prefix with examples like *accelerate* and *acclaim*).

(13) One nightmare that regularly awaits a foreign user of an English pronouncing dictionary concerns the whereabouts of surnames which start with *Mc*, *Mac*, *M'* or *M'*. (That the stem may be attached to the *Mc* (etc.) or, often in Ireland, detached from it, or that the stem begins with a lower-case or an upper-case presents no problem, of course.) Not a little time is wasted before our poor foreign user finally lands the particular *Mc* (etc.) name he is looking for, as he often fails to understand the principle according to which the *Mc* (etc.) names are arranged. I dispense here with a description of the sort of difficulty that our foreign user encounters. *EPD15* has renounced the complicated way of listing the *Mc* (etc.) names such as was adopted in most previous successive editions of *EPD* and reverted to a neat alphabetical arrangement, as seen in *EPD1* (and possibly some following editions of *EPD*) whereby all the *Mac* names (from *MacAdam* to *MacTavish*) are found before all the *Mc* names (from *McAdam* to *McWilliams*). This is a highly welcome change from the way these names are listed in e.g. *LPD* and some previous editions of *EPD* which is simply a quagmire to a foreign user of it, such that one sees, for example, *McBain*, *Macbeth*, *McBride*, *Maccabees*, *Maccabeus*, *McCall*, etc. listed consecutively in this order. The way *EPD15* (for that matter, e.g. *EPD1* too) lists the *Mc* (etc.) names inevitably separates by a fair distance, for example, *MacArthur* (p. 302) from *McArthur* (p. 312), interspersed in between by a number of *Mc* (etc.) names and other words that have nothing to do with *Mc* (etc.) names. This cannot be considered a defect in any way. On the contrary, substantial user-friendliness is achieved this way. The strict alphabetic order observed for the words contained in *EPD15*, even in the case of the *Mc* (etc.) names, is a winning feature.

(14) Here follows a small number of random observations on a few entries. These are of course not meant to be exhaustive.

(i) It is interesting to note that in the body of *EPD15*, it is the spellings *-ize*, *-ization*, etc. that are adopted as the 1st choice and *-ise*, *-isation*, etc. as the second, for the relevant headwords, as it is so in *EPD1* all the way down to *EPD15* itself, while *LPD* and *CPDABE* have only *-ize*, *-ization*, etc. to the exclusion of *-ise*, *-isation*, etc. (*LDCE*, which is not a pronouncing dictionary has also only *-ize*, *-ization*, etc.) However, in the Introduction in *EPD15*, it is *-ise*, *-isation*, etc. that are the rule. Two exceptions have accidentally crept in on p. xi, both for the word *glottalization* which, incidentally, is not entered in the body of *EPD15* (while *LPD* records both *glottalize* and *glottalization*). This inconsistency should be removed in future editions.

(ii) *EPD15* includes *Mao Tse-tung* and *Mao Zedong* (*EPD14* has *Mao Tse-tung*, while *LPD* lists neither but does *Mao*) – obviously alternative romanized spellings for the same Chinese name – and, curiously, indicates *dʒ* corresponding to *Ts* and *Z* rather than *dz*. Could *dʒ* here be a simple typographical error for *dz*, or do the Editors really mean it?

(iii) *EPD15* lists *hickey* but not *Hickey*. As *EPD15* seems elsewhere to make it a rule to indicate a proper name in case a common noun of the same spelling in lower-case letters exists, the absence of *Hickey* seems to be an oversight.

(iv) In spite of the huge number of 80,000 words and phrases that *EPD15* contains, it is possible that much consideration has been given by the Editors as to which proper names to add and which others to leave out. They have ensured that the surnames of the principal collaborators of *EPD15* are entered, including *Roach* (already in *EPD14* and *LPD*), *Hartman* (in neither *EPD14* nor *LPD*), *Setter* (in neither *EPD14* nor *LPD*), *Stromberg* (in neither *EPD14* nor *LPD*), if not all such surnames (for example, *Hornbrook*, *Tunley*, *McEnery*, etc. none of which occur in either *EPD14* or *LPD*). On the other hand, a number of important proper names which *LPD* has included are left out in *EPD15*, including (to adduce some linguists' names, for example) *Cruse*, *Cruttenden*, *Greenberg*, *Greenbaum*, *Hayakawa*, *Jakobson*, *Lass*, *Malinowski*, *Pullum*, *Trubetzkoy* and *Uldall*. Note that the following – which I cite randomly as they spring to mind – do

not appear in any of *EPD14*, *LPD* and *EPD15*: Anttila, Chao, Curme, Hamp, Hjelmslev, Hockett, Hoeningwald, Hoijer, Hymes, Joos, Kiparsky, Krashen, Lado, Langacker, Lenneberg, Levinson, Lieberman, Malmberg, McCawley, Meillet, Nida, Pedersen, Pyles, Rousselot, Selinker, Swadesh, Trnka, Vachek, Voegelin, Weinreich and Zandvoort. It is welcome that a good number of other surnames of linguists which appear in *LPD* are also retained in *EPD15*, such as *Bickerton*, *Bolinger*, *Chomsky* (not in *EPD14* at all), *Grimm*, *Katz*, *Panini*, *Pring* and *Saussure*. I happen to have adduced just above at random a few surnames of linguists. There are of course surnames of important scholars associated with other fields of human enquiries which deserve to be included in *EPD15*. I am aware that *EPD15* is not a pronouncing dictionary of linguists' surnames. I am also aware that *EPD15* is not specifically addressed to students of linguistics (or even those particularly interested in English phonetics) but to a more extensive readership. It is quite possible, however, that those who consult *EPD15* are more likely than not interested in linguistics, and phonetics in particular. Besides, quite a number of well-known linguists' names are not typically Anglo-Saxon and it is precisely such names whose pronunciation students of linguistics may well wish to confirm. The question of the coverage of proper names in a pronouncing dictionary is not an easy matter to clinch as it necessarily involves the question of choice among competing candidates for entries, and neither the Editors nor users of *EPD15* would agree on which proper names are to be included. One certainly does not expect a pronouncing dictionary, *EPD15* included, to be as comprehensive in the matter of proper names as, say, a telephone directory or an encyclopaedia.

(v) For alternative pronunciations in American English revolving round  $\text{r}$  and  $\text{r}$  in words like *law*, *saw* and *haw* (the Editors give  $\text{r}$  for *BBC English*) which involve no *r*-letter, the Editors regularly give  $\text{r}$  and  $\text{r}$  in this particular order. However, for at least one word, i.e. *talk*, which I happened to stumble on, the order is reversed. This is presumably a typographical error.

(vi) For *calm*, none of the previous editions of *EPD* lists  $\text{m}$  (a spelling pronunciation). *EPD15* gives only  $\text{m}$  for British English but  $\text{m}$  for American English, the italicized *l* indicating optionality. At an earlier date, *CPDBAE*, published in 1972, indicates  $\text{m}$  as British pronunciation and  $\text{m}$  as American pronunciation, which is misleading as both  $\text{m}$  and

kɹlm exist in American pronunciation. Subsequently, *LPD* presents kɹm and kɹlm in this order for both British and American English and then kɹlm as British non-RP. As has been seen, *EPD15* records both kɹm and kɹlm for American English, just as *LPD* does, but, unlike *LPD*, without committing which of the two alternative pronunciations of *calm* is the 1st choice and the other the 2nd choice. I should add in connection with the above remark concerning the pronunciations of *calm* that the alternative pronunciation (the spelling pronunciation) kɹlm does not appear in Kenyon & Knott's *A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English* published in 1951.

(vii) I have not perused *EPD15* with the specific intention of spotting typographical errors. Such are only noticed when one accidentally stumbles on them while consulting any pronouncing dictionary as occasion demands. It is for individual users of *EPD15* to report, if they wish to, to the Editors about any typographical errors they happen to notice. I have nevertheless noticed just a few, as already pointed out in the course of the foregoing part of this paper. Suffice it to mention just a few more to end with. For *graticule*, should the Editors not indicate ˈgrætɪk.əl (so that tɪ may be clearly indicated for ˈgrætɪ) rather than ˈgrætɪ.əl - as they do? Compare this with the Editors' correct indication ˈgrætɪ.əl for *gratify*. In the same vein, I do not understand why the Editors indicate -ti'er (with t) rather than -tɪ.i'er (with tɪ) as the second choice for *portière*. I am not clear on what is meant by the Editors' indication -ˈpɑːsɪbəl for *passible*, following their indication 'pɑːs.ə.bəl.

To round off my examination of *EPD15*, I am led to say that, in spite of some welcome innovations, this latest edition of *EPD* comes (at least to me) as something of a disappointment. The theoretical weaknesses which I believe are detectable in the Introduction have implications on the presentation of the pronunciations of English words in the body of *EPD15*. Besides, compared with previous editions of *EPD*, and also with its direct rival, *LPD*, it must be said that *EPD15* is not so user-friendly as one might wish it to be, mainly in its layout and typography which adversely affect its visual aspect and readability, a factor which should never be neglected in a pronouncing dictionary. In a number of respects, *EPD15* has deliberately intended to break away from all previous editions of *EPD* – in particular,

departing from the previous tradition of dealing with British English only and, by following suit with *CPDBAE* and *LPD*, dealing with both British and American English. I am aware that it has been a recent trend for pronouncing dictionaries to concern themselves with both British and American English; this might well lead to commercial success. I rather suspect, however, that these dictionaries offer surplus information to many average individual users of English who speak (be it natively or otherwise) either British English or American English, but this is of course for the individual users to judge.

#### REFERENCES

- A Concise Pronouncing Dictionary of British and American English* (1972). Compiled by Jack WINDSOR LEWIS. Oxford University Press. London.
- A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English* (1951). Edited by John Samuel KENYON and Thomas Albert KNOTT. G. & C. Merriam Company, Publishers. Springfield, Mass. U.S.A.
- AKAMATSU, Tsutomu (1997). *Japanese Phonetics: Theory and Practice*. Lincom Europa. München and Newcastle.
- CHOMSKY, Noam & HALLE, Morris (1968). *The Sound Pattern of English*. Harper & Row. New York and London.
- CPDBAE* (see under *A Concise Pronouncing Dictionary of British and American English*).
- Dictionnaire de la prononciation française dans son usage réel* (1973). Compiled by André MARTINET and Henriette WALTER. France-Expansion. Paris.
- Duden Aussprachewörterbuch* (1974). 2., völlig neu bearbeitete und erweiterte Auflage. Bearbeitet von Max MANGOLD in Zusammenarbeit mit der Dudenredaktion. DUDEN BAND 6. DUDENVERLAG. Mannheim, Wien and Zürich.
- English Pronouncing Dictionary* (1997) 15th ed. (= *EPD15*). Daniel JONES. Edited by Peter ROACH and James HARTMAN. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne.
- EPD* (= *An English Pronouncing Dictionary*). 1st ed. (1917). 12th ed. (1963). 13th ed. (1967). 14th ed. (1977). 15th ed. (1997).
- EPD14* (= 14th ed. of *EPD*).
- EPD15* (= 15th ed. of *EPD*).

- HOCKETT, Charles Francis (1955). *A Manual of Phonology* (= *International Journal of American Linguistics* 21:1). Indiana University Press. Baltimore.
- LDCE* (see under *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*).
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. 1st ed. Ed. Paul PROCTER *et al.* (1978). Longman Group Limited. Harlow and London. 2nd ed. Ed. Randolph QUIRK *et al.* (1987). Longman Group Limited. Harlow.
- Longman Pronunciation Dictionary* (1990). Compiled by John Christopher WELLS. Longman Group UK Limited. Harlow.
- LPD* (see under *Longman Pronunciation Dictionary*).
- MARTINET, André (1991). *Éléments de linguistique générale*. 3rd ed. Armand Colin. Paris.
- ROACH, Peter (1983). *English Phonetics and Phonology: A practical course*. [2nd ed. 1991]. Cambridge University Press. Cambridge, New York, Melbourne.
- The Random House Dictionary of the English Language* (1987). 2nd ed., unabridged. Edited by Stuart BERG FLEXNER. Random House Inc. New York.
- Wörterbuch der deutschen Aussprache* (1969). 2. überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage. Herausgegeben vom dem Kollektiv: Eva-Maria KRECH, Eduard KURKA, Helmut STELZIG, Eberhard STOCK, Ursula STÖTZER und Rudi TESKE, unter Mitwirkung von Kurt JUNG-ALSEN. VEB Bibliographisches Institut. Leipzig.