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To be completed asap

The following points to be dealt with

Errata. A full list will be published on page 137. Most are minor typos, but two serious matters must be mentioned. Firstly, my (somewhat embarrassing) substitution of the terms *inner* and *outer* (rounding) for each other. This has been rectified throughout the present text. Secondly, remnants of an older numerical grid than the present one on page 128 in the VP drawing on page 130 (not yet corrected), and in the last three lines (now corrected) of page 127. The older grid will be added for clarification on page 128.

A separate list in ordinary spelling of all the pronunciation exercises in phonetic transcription is to be added as an Appendix.

The original recorded exercises have now been transferred to mp3. It is hoped to add a size-reduced version as another Appendix and/or make them available on cd.

Reasons for this (final, desperate) attempt at popularizing articulatory phonetics in the context of learning foreign languages. There are many, the most important perhaps being the general decline of the discipline since the death of Daniel Jones in 1967 and the closing down by the IPA of Le Maître Phonétique (and thereby of the art of phonetic transcription) three years later. Not to mention the standard of English spoken by many Dutch people nowadays.

To point out a number of (in my view) useful innovations and ideas in these ‘teaching notes’ compiled over 30 years of teaching English phonetics and pronunciation to university students, such as:
- a (timed, exhaustive) parametric approach, denying the existence of the ‘segment’ and not leaving any gaps or ‘open spaces’. See the drawing on page 130. Note that such drawings could easily be computer generated, and if then ‘translated’ into acoustic terms might well result in far better speech synthesis than hitherto.
- reversal of the (realizational) approach from phoneme to sound to that of the (functional) one from articulatory feature to phonology. See for instance the rules on page 127.
- abolition of the syllabic consonant marker and the associated idea of shwa-elision. See Comment 1990 on page 50.
- the concept of ‘postura’ to replace ‘secondary articulation’. See chapter 11.
- combining the teaching of idiom with phonetic exercises. See the recorded examples.
And so on.
Preface to the second edition

Walking through Trafalgar Square with my wife recently we were hailed (at the bus-stop, actually, not any of the other monuments) by a student of some 12 or 15 years ago. She mentioned, among other things, that she was still using my first-year phonetics course in her own teaching of English to foreign students. Naturally, I felt pleased as Punch (so did she, for that matter, as I still knew her by name), but I had to tell her that her version of it was now very much out of date. What else could I do but promise her a recent update? So this is it, and here is to you, Ms Schellekens.

Other former students have told me, some with undisguised horror, that all they remember from their university education is *The Story of Arthur the Rat*, our first-year English pronunciation test reproduced on page 132. Since 1969 this has stood like a Rock of Gibraltar in a sea of continuous change, and it is probably the only thing all our alumni have in common. It is a pleasing thought that at least we have made some impression. By my reckoning some three to four thousand students at Amsterdam University have now gone through this course, including many taking only one year of English as a subsidiary. I am hoping that this book may find its way to some of them as well, as a kind of after-service and as a reminder, perhaps, of their youth.

This is one reason why I have not re-written the course, but left it as much as possible as it was first written in the early seventies and subsequently added to and modified. The original examples have been left unchanged. Consequently, some of it looks like a compilation of notes with later comments and second thoughts rather than a carefully laid-out final version. The idea is that this should enable any former student to pick it up where he/she left off in the distant or not so distant past. Another reason is of course that, while I am writing a completely new textbook, I would hate to throw away this record of my thinking on English phonetics over the past twenty-two years.

To present-day students of English I would say this. Unlike many people, I am not convinced that they are more stupid and ignorant than previous generations. On the contrary, I am quite impressed by their work on English pronunciation, often resulting in standards indistinguishable from native speakers. First-year students know intuitively that a good, normal pronunciation is a sine qua non for being fully accepted in any English speaking company. A Dutch accent (often taken for an Afrikaans one in the English-speaking world) tends to put people off. As Marshall McLuhan used to say, *the medium is the message*. If I have one criticism to make, however, it is that students nowadays tend to read rather superficially. This is not their fault: it is the fault of the present criminal Dutch system of university teaching devised by their elders, forcing them to collect ‘credit-points’ rather than studying like normal human beings. Anyway, I would ask students to think about the following pages not so much in depth perhaps, but often and regularly, in lost moments if need be. I should be honoured if they would regard English phonetics, at least, as a game rather than a duty.

And a game it is. Speaking a foreign language may be regarded as one big act intended to take in the natives. Another former student told me recently that for him this advice had worked like a charm, to the point of leaving English people astounded that he could converse with Dutchmen in their own language! Thank you Mr Landsman, for your kind and perceptive comments. It goes without saying that like any good actor, one must of course know the tricks of the trade (beginning with English phonetics) or one will look and sound like an amateur.
This brings me to the whole philosophy underlying the present course and the way it developed over the years.

In 1960, professor P.N.U. Harting (the then head of the Amsterdam English Department) offered me a candidate-assistantship to teach English pronunciation. I had just returned from a post-candidate year in Edinburgh studying phonetics and Scottish dialects on what is nowadays called the ‘Harting-scholarship.’ Both as a student of English and as a budding phonetician I was not too happy with the prevailing (Jonesian) phonetics so I thought I would try something different.

Phoneticians are always saying that phonetics ought to be parametric rather than segmental. You only have to look at a spectrogram to realise that speech-sound is not a string of segments coming out of the mouth like a goods-train from a tunnel, but rather a number of different processes or parameters going on at the same time, like the sections in an orchestra. Think of pitch, nasality, airstream, jaw-movement, tongue-movement, etc. as the violins, cellos, brass-section, woodwind, percussion, etc., of vocalisation. Still, most phonetic approaches remain completely segmental. My approach has always been wholly parametric, on the principle that ‘segments don’t exist.’

Perhaps my major objection to traditional phonetics teaching, however, was (and is) that it is very incomplete and condescending. For instance, there is much talk about clear and dark [l] in English. As a student I wanted to know whether all the other English consonants are clear or dark, or what, but the only answer one ever got was that ‘it doesn’t matter in order to be understood.’ My ambition, of course, was not just to be ‘understood’ but to speak proper English. Only gradually did it dawn on me that English phonetics (partly because of its segmental approach) dealt almost exclusively with word-distinctive features such as those differentiating between ship and sip or pen and bang. There was next to nothing on ‘redundant’ features like clearness in [n], darkness in [r], glottal stop, whisper or consonant-duration, nor (apart from some work on intonation) on overall features like pitch, voice-quality and rhythm. Since then, there has been great progress in areas like phonation, ‘articulatory setting’ and intonation, but so far little of this has filtered through to English phonetics teaching. Still arguing as a student, I wanted all the information I was paying for without somebody else deciding what was bad for me. Arguing as a linguist and teacher I felt that I must describe everything one has to learn to sound English, and make that information available to my students. That, too, has always been my approach.

After graduating in 1962 I specialised for two more years at Edinburgh University, where Abercrombie, Halliday and Catford were still teaching at the time. I then taught English and related matters for a number of years at the Universities of Ibadan (Nigeria) and Wales. In 1969, the University of Amsterdam invited me to return, offering the prospect of a senior lectureship. Foolishly enough I accepted, leaving a perfectly good lectureship at a British university for what turned out, albeit 16 years later, to be a con. That was in 1985 when all senior lecturers were suddenly demoted to lecturer. One was then allowed to apply for a senior lectureship. In the English Department, as in the rest of the University of Amsterdam, this naturally led to bloody battles with the bullies coming out on top in the usual manner, completely poisoning the working atmosphere for good.

From 1969 to 1985, however, I worked productively and with considerable freedom, developing courses on English phonetics, fluency and grammar. This was made possible...
by the then professors J. Swart (literature) and A.L. Vos (language), both true scholars and excellent Englishists themselves, who might sometimes interfere with all manner of things, but never with academic freedom. Unfortunately, professor Swart passed away around 1980, and professor Vos retired a few years later. They were succeeded by professors D. Baker-Smith and P. Werth, respectively.

The phonetics teaching, as developed in the Amsterdam English Department, consists of three parts, for the first, second and third year. The present edition contains only Phonetics-1, but Phonetics 2 and 3 are to be included in the third edition. Contrary to established opinion, pronouncing a foreign language is not difficult, but it takes time to assimilate what one has learnt into one’s own speech. On this principle, the first-year course leads up to an oral exam (reading and theory) of a short prepared text given in phonetic transcription, The Story of Arthur the Rat. Phonetics-2 leads up to an oral exam reading (or acting out, rather) a chapter from Winnie-the-Pooh. For this, extra marks are given for doing (and explaining) different voice-qualities, intonations and rhythms for such protagonists as Pooh, Piglet, Eeyore, Owl and Rabbit, and many students throw themselves into this ‘acting experience’ with remarkable gusto. So the second-year course deals in particular with transcription (including word and compound structure), rhythm, intonation and voice-quality. Since students obtaining high marks in Phonetics 1 and 2 may still sound Dutch in spontaneous speech, Phonetics-3 concentrates on ‘beyond phonetics’, (i) things not to do, especially Dutch noises, etc., (ii) things to do, such as strategies to ‘keep the ball rolling’ (leading into stopgaps, clichés and ultimately vocabulary), (iii) working on one’s English at an advanced level in a non-English speaking culture. The associated Pro&Flu exam, based on a recorded interview, allocates marks for pronunciation and fluency in spontaneous speech.

All this has been done for many years in close co-operation with my colleagues A.R. James, H.F. Tak, and others, who have since left for greener pastures. Together with H.F. Tak, I also taught descriptive grammar (from a speaker’s rather than the usual reader’s point of view), and we have lately begun to work on the teaching of vocabulary. Our Pro&Flu experience has led to the conclusion that, ever since the so-called Chomskyan revolution, grammar teaching is very much overdone to the detriment of vocabulary teaching. We are now working on a collection of (some 20,000) words which we actually use ourselves in speech, grading them into first, second, third and fourth year levels. In due course, we are hoping to present this to students in a learnable form, inter alia by incorporating them into the relevant phonetics course.

Preface to the third edition

Only minor changes and additions have been made, including two new transcriptions of Arthur the Rat with rhythm and intonation marked as read on the accompanying cassette-recording. However, parts 2 and 3 have still not been added due to the pressure of non-work, i.e. constant interference in one’s teaching and research by armies of university officials. Phonetics-3 was recently abolished by these apparatchiks after my grammar course had already been ‘taken over’ by some helpful ‘generative’ grammarians whose practical L2 experience seems somewhat elementary. On the bright side, however, the University of Amsterdam have finally decided (after some legal prodding) to re-appoint me as Senior Lecturer for English Language, so I am hoping to now start rebuilding what is left of English teaching.

September 1991

October 1992
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Introduction

Take a random English sentence:

```
towels will be provided, but not soap
```

melody: `---` `---` `---` `---`

As a student of English you want to be able to pronounce any such sentence really well; much better, we hope, than the average tourist-guide. But, as an adult, you cannot achieve this by just trying to imitate native speakers, or you wouldn’t be reading this book.

What that boils down to is this: you must learn to make the right movements, and know when to make them. And whichever way you look at it, that means you must combine practical skill and theoretical knowledge.

0.1. Theoretical description.

Pronouncing the example in the manner indicated takes me about three seconds, not much more or less. That is one fact to be considered. Within these three seconds I close and open my lips four times. You should keep a small mirror to check for yourself. Such a ‘labial stop’ is clearly a characteristic feature of the kind of English accent (one form of Educated Southern British) I have in mind. There are many such regular features, as will appear gradually later on.

Restricting ourselves to these labial stops for the moment, it is hardly sufficient to say that they occur, without saying also when they occur, within the three seconds available. It is also characteristic of this kind of English that they are ‘timed’ in a certain way, approximately like this:

```
0 --- --- --- 3
```

At this point we may attempt a first generalisation. In order to describe fully how a particular accent is pronounced, it seems to me that one must do two things: first, one must list all the features (or movements) that are characteristic of that accent, and secondly one must say when they are characteristically made. This, if you like, is my definition of a phonetic description. Or putting it in slightly different words, this is the kind of

1 Footnote 1980: RP, see Introduction to EPD14. Footnote 1990: I now refer to this accent (following J. Windsor Lewis) as General British or GB.
theoretical *information* about English that should be available, and which I shall try to make available.

**0.2. Practical skill.**

Clearly, even the most accurate and exhaustive theoretical knowledge of English pronunciation is of no use whatever to a student, unless she or he (henceforward both sexes to be referred to by the neutral ‘he’1) can put this knowledge into practice. ‘Paper-phonetics’ may perhaps be a popular and interesting pastime, but at the same time it is sterile.

The greater part of my phonetics courses has always been concerned with the teaching of actual articulatory movements, which, to my mind, is simply crucial. But although academically satisfying, this proves to be very time-consuming: it means checking regularly on the performance of each individual student, and coaching him along in the right direction. Sadly, with the recent rapid increase in student numbers in our Departments of English such beautiful old-fashioned academic relationships now seem a thing of the past, and we must look for more ‘efficient’ means to achieve the same ends. Here then lies my principal motive, admittedly a rather negative one, for writing out the present course2.

So its primary aim is not so much the description, which could easily be summarised in a few pages3. It is meant first of all for students (in particular my own students, but hopefully others as well) to develop sufficient practical skill under their own steam, if it so happens without any supervision whatsoever.

My approach in this respect will be seen to be very circuitous and at times indeed repetitious to the point of boredom. It is made up of many related hints, tricks of the trade, references to Dutch, and constant appeals for self-analysis, which, in their totality, will hopefully lead to a finished end-product.

All this is going to put highly unusual, though not impossible demands on a reader. He is faced with a double handicap: besides being left ‘on his own’, but precisely for that reason, he must also respond actively. The

---

1Fn. 1990. In retrospect ‘he’ does not seem all that neutral. Nowadays I use ‘heshe’, ‘himher’ and ‘hisher’ to refer to either or both sexes.

2Fn. 1990. The future of university teaching in the Netherlands looked bleak enough in 1973, when this was written. Since then we have had two decades of so-called no-nonsense governments stuffing the universities with third-rate academics, politicians and bureaucrats. See preface.

reader must be willing to utter strange and weird noises, to explore, to practise and to listen, without all of which his time will be wasted.

0.3. Teaching-aids.

The present combination of practical and theoretical information is a challenge to the old adage that ‘you can’t learn pronunciation from a book’. I believe that, given the right kind of information, the foundations can be laid for a keen and intelligent student to achieve eventually a well-nigh perfect pronunciation, such as will be accepted as ‘native’ by any English person.

Naturally, there is no implication here that this could or should be done in splendid isolation. What you have learnt must ultimately be tested and perfected in real-life situations, that is in talking with English people. This course merely attempts to create the conditions for doing so successfully.

Taking this argument one step further, it may be said that, although this course is meant to be self-sufficient in a way, that does not mean you should therefore ignore everything else. On the contrary, it is advisable to exploit intelligently any extra help that may come your way, be it from competent teachers, language labs, television, or the wide and varied literature on the subject.

The inclusion of tape-recorded exercises must also be looked upon in this way: to give you one form of extra support. This should be made quite clear, because their purpose is often misunderstood. They are definitely not part of the body of the course, but only an appendix, a kind of half-way house towards real-life situations. Tapes can be very useful as a provisional check on what you have assimilated already, but no attempts should be made to reverse the process. There is abundant evidence that people learn very little, or indeed reinforce the wrong habits, by just trying to imitate others, so there is absolutely no point in listening to them until you know exactly what to listen for.

Addition 1980. The exercises have now been recorded onto cassette.

There is in fact one particular work that is indispensable, viz. Daniel Jones’ English Pronouncing Dictionary, a copy of which you should own. It should be ‘at the student’s elbow’ all the time, since without it this course is incomplete.

Note 1980. We now work from the 14th ed, 1977.

Note 1990. It is possible that the EPD may in due course be superseded by J.C. Wells’ Longman Pronunciation Dictionary published earlier this year. However, we find it more difficult to work with.

Having said all this, there remains one final remark. Many students fail to
realise that their single most invaluable source of inspiration is the BBC. Whereas in many parts of the world students of English have to go to great lengths to hear any British English spoken at all, we are fortunate in having the BBC transmitters practically next door. Indeed, it is a pleasing thought that reception on the Long and Medium Wave bands is better in this country than in some parts of the British Isles. Regular, critical listening to all kinds of speakers on the radio will facilitate your study of pronunciation enormously, and it would clearly be foolish not to make use of this cheapest and most versatile of all ‘teaching-aids’.


Useful information on AM radio-reception:
W. van Bussel, Radio- en Televisieboek, Spectrum, 1969

Notes 1980. Since this was first written cassette recorders have become cheap and reliable. Students should have one, preferably with a ‘quick repeat’ button. We use a Sony TCM 757.

AM radio reception has deteriorated although BBC 4 can still be easily received e.g. on a car-radio, on 1500 metres long wave. But BBC radio is now piped through on the TV cable, so even if you haven’t got it yourself you can always make recordings off somebody else’s.

0.4. Comment 1990. Some of this information now looks decidedly dated. AM radio has become largely irrelevant since we now receive BBC television via the cable. Also, most students now have (access to) video-recorders, which make audio-recording easier as well. After four or five years of watching BBC television we may perhaps conclude that it has had no positive effect at all on the average Dutch person’s English pronunciation. This seems to support our view that listening has virtually no effect upon one’s pronunciation unless one listens analytically, knowing exactly what to listen for. Naturally, students of English should exploit all these wonderful facilities as much as possible by collecting a variety of recordings and studying them in detail.
Chapter 1

Transcription

1.1. The less said about the principles of transcription the better. Many library-shelves strain under the weight of writings on the subject, but the issue is still far from clear. Suffice it to make a few practical remarks.

We need transcription. And not only that, but our transcriptions, and the parts thereof, must be given time values, so that thereby they become arranged on a time-scale. Only then is it possible to say when a particular feature occurs.

transcription:  tauəlz wɪl bi prəvaɪd bət nɔt səup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tau</th>
<th>əl</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>wɪl</th>
<th>bi</th>
<th>prəvaɪd</th>
<th>bət</th>
<th>nɔt</th>
<th>səup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total 32 = c.3 sec</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| timing: syllable length: |
| 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 7 |

| phoneme length: |
| aʊ, aɻ, əʊ are of medium length, other V’s are short. All C’s (consonants) are short. But p2, t2 are lengthened, and so on. |

| sequence: |
| (not so self-evident for Arabic or Chinese readers) left → right corresponds to first → later. |

This is not quite as terrible as it looks. Provided you can do the transcription, the timing can be worked out by a few simple mechanical rules. But leaving that aside, we now have a fairly accurate (still incomplete) arrangement on a (three-second) time-scale. We have in effect a map in time, something like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ta</th>
<th>əl</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>wɪl</th>
<th>bi</th>
<th>prəva</th>
<th>ɪd</th>
<th>dəbet</th>
<th>nət</th>
<th>sə</th>
<th>up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we now say that labial stop occurs during b₁, b₂, p₁ and during the beginning of p₂, we have indicated, albeit in a somewhat roundabout manner, when they are made. Compare this with the undivided time-scale on page 1.

A map, whether an ordinary two-dimensional one or one on the single dimension of time, tells you next to nothing about the physical shape of what it represents. Unlike an aerial photograph or a film, it is very abstract. A transcription is not a ‘picture’ of speech. It is no more than a
frame of reference, a drawing, that enables you to say that this or that must happen here and there and there.

If you desire to navigate your way around the oceans of English pronunciation, it is clearly necessary that you learn to read and write transcriptions. But I will not, at this point, describe the procedure. Rather I trust that, since this book is full of them, you will get the hang of it as you go along. Where a teacher is available it may help to attempt some transcriptions of longer passages at a fairly early stage, and have these corrected for errors.

1.2. For the moment just a few hints. In English transcription our starting-point is Daniel Jones’ English Pronouncing Dictionary. When in doubt about the transcription of a particular word, you should always look it up in the EPD, and I would suggest that, generally speaking, one ought to spend a good deal of time browsing through this invaluable work.

With the EPD in hand one can almost produce a so-called EPD transcription, leaving aside only a few uncertain points, notably ‘weak forms’ (see next chapter) and the placing of stress-marks.

An Edinburgh transcription1 is an EPD transcription in which all the V symbols have been systematically replaced by others. By comparing the following two passages you can see what has been done.

**EPD 13th.**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wind} & \quad \text{ende} \quad \text{sans} \quad \text{dispjutuq-wit} \quad \text{waez} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{str} \quad \text{wen} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{traevale} \quad \text{keim} \quad \text{jorn} \quad \text{ræpt} \quad \text{in} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{wom} \quad \text{klouk} \quad \text{dei} \quad \text{agrid} \quad \text{det} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{wan} \quad \text{u} \quad \text{faest} \quad \text{saksidid} \quad \text{in} \quad \text{mekiih} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{traevale} \quad \text{teik} \quad \text{iz} \quad \text{klouk} \quad \text{cf} \quad \text{fæd} \quad \text{bi} \quad \text{kænsidæd} \\
\text{strænga} \quad \text{dei} \quad \text{dei} \quad \text{vi} \quad \text{dei} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{na} \quad \text{wind} \quad \text{blu} : \quad \text{ez} \quad \text{hald} \quad \text{ez} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{kud} \quad \text{bet} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{ma} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{blu} : \quad \text{de} \quad \text{mo} \quad \text{klousli} \quad \text{did} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{traevale} \quad \text{foold} \quad \text{iz} \quad \text{klouk} \quad \text{around} \quad \text{im} \quad \text{et} \quad \text{last} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{na} \quad \text{wind} \quad \text{geiv} \quad \text{ap} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{atempt} \quad \text{den} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{san} \quad \text{fæ} \quad \text{aut} \quad \text{wçmli} \quad \text{en} \\
\text{imi} \quad \text{diætli} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{traevale} \quad \text{tuk} \quad \text{cf} \quad \text{iz} \quad \text{klouk} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{soo} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{na} \quad \text{wind} \quad \text{wæz} \quad \text{ablaidzde} \quad \text{te} \quad \text{kænfes} \quad \text{det} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{san} \quad \text{wæz} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{stræneg} \quad \text{e} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{tu} : \\
\end{align*}
\]

**Edinburgh.**

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wind} & \quad \text{ende} \quad \text{sans} \quad \text{dispjutuq-wit} \quad \text{wæz} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{strænga} \quad \text{wen} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{traevale} \quad \text{keim} \quad \text{jorn} \quad \text{ræpt} \quad \text{in} \quad \text{a} \quad \text{wom} \quad \text{klouk} \quad \text{dei} \quad \text{agrid} \quad \text{det} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{wan} \quad \text{u} \quad \text{faest} \quad \text{saksidid} \quad \text{in} \quad \text{mekiih} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{traevale} \quad \text{teik} \quad \text{iz} \quad \text{klouk} \quad \text{cf} \quad \text{fæd} \quad \text{bi} \quad \text{kænsidæd} \\
\text{strænga} \quad \text{dei} \quad \text{dei} \quad \text{vi} \quad \text{dei} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{na} \quad \text{wind} \quad \text{blu} : \quad \text{ez} \quad \text{hald} \quad \text{ez} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{kud} \quad \text{bet} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{ma} \quad \text{i} \quad \text{blu} : \quad \text{de} \quad \text{mo} \quad \text{klousli} \quad \text{did} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{traevale} \quad \text{foold} \quad \text{iz} \quad \text{klouk} \quad \text{around} \quad \text{im} \quad \text{et} \quad \text{last} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{na} \quad \text{wind} \quad \text{geiv} \quad \text{ap} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{atempt} \quad \text{den} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{san} \quad \text{fæ} \quad \text{aut} \quad \text{wçmli} \quad \text{en} \\
\text{imi} \quad \text{diætli} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{traevale} \quad \text{tuk} \quad \text{cf} \quad \text{iz} \quad \text{klouk} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{soo} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{na} \quad \text{wind} \quad \text{wæz} \quad \text{ablaidzde} \quad \text{te} \quad \text{kænfes} \quad \text{det} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{san} \quad \text{wæz} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{stræneg} \quad \text{e} \quad \text{de} \quad \text{tu} \\
\end{align*}
\]

---

1Fn 1978. We are now replacing our Edinburgh transcriptions by a modified EPD14.
Neither of these two systems of transcription fulfil our requirements, in that they do not provide sufficiently accurate maps. As will be seen, we shall gradually elaborate on the Edinburgh type.

1.3. In this book nearly all the English examples are transcribed according to one system, in a systemic transcription. All other transcribed examples, for instance the Dutch ones, are unsystematic, or impressionistic, or ad hoc. Systemic transcriptions are maps to be used for the whole language, rather as is done in an atlas of the whole world: they follow specific rules, from which you cannot deviate on your own initiative. Ad hoc transcriptions on the other hand, are maps that are drawn for a specific occasion, as the need arises. They may be varied on the spur of the moment to include more detailed phonetic information, or to highlight a particular point, as when one draws a quick sketch to show somebody the way. They are at the same time much less accurate, while being more immediately related to certain points of pronunciation.

**systemic**

\[k\text{i}p\ \delta\varepsilon m\ \delta\varepsilon\ t\varepsilon u\z\]

\[k\text{i}p\ \delta\varepsilon m\ \delta\varepsilon\ t\varepsilon u\z\ (vowel quality and length)\]

**ad hoc**

\[k^h\text{i}p\ \delta\varepsilon m\ \delta\varepsilon\ t\delta\varepsilon u\z\ (aspiration and gl. stop)\]

And so on. Like any good map, a systemic transcription should, among other things be abstract, economical in its use of symbols, and easily legible. Needless to say, even the best maps may contain inaccuracies.

1.4. Notes 1975. In the latest reprint (13th edition) of the EPD \(\text{o}u\) has been replaced by \(u\), so st\(\text{oun}\) → st\(\text{oun}\), so presumably Edinburgh st\(\text{oun}\) → st\(\text{oun}\). This is confusing. Having made your choice once, you will do well to stick to it. I only use \(u\), Edinburgh \(\text{oo}\).  (Note 1980. I am now replacing Edinburgh by modified EPD 14. See below.)

The EPD often gives a number of variants. Always take the first one given, unless this is manifestly unusual or old-fashioned, or when it is itself ambiguous. In that case, rely on ALD, 3rd ed. I adhere to the principle that, apart from formwords (see 2.2-2.4), each word has only one transcriptional form, which can never be changed except by a general mutation rule.


**Further reading.** D. Abercrombie, English Phonetic Texts.
1.5. Additions 1978/80/90. A 14th edition (1977) of the EPD has just appeared. It has been completely revised, so that the colon is no longer used as the sole distinction between two phonemes. Indeed, the colons may be omitted, which will result in something very much like Edinburgh (which has slightly more complex symbol shapes) and ALD3 (see next page). In my teaching, I hope to replace Edinburgh by EPD without dots.

Recorded Exercise 1.1. The North Wind and the Sun.

New EPD, with dots.

Recorded Exercise 1.1. The North Wind and the Sun.

Modified EPD (1980). Further refinements later. Note final $i \to i$, $u \to u$.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edin</th>
<th>ALD3</th>
<th>EPD</th>
<th>EPD14</th>
<th>ModEPD14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>old</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>unstr</td>
<td>stressed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i ↔ i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>e ↔ e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æ</td>
<td>ææ</td>
<td>ææ</td>
<td>ææ</td>
<td>æ ↔ æ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Λ</td>
<td>Λ</td>
<td>Λ</td>
<td>Λ</td>
<td>Λ ↔ Λ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ω</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>u ↔ u</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At this stage there is no need to bother about the theories underlying the various approaches. It is for practical reasons that you are required to be familiar with them. Some practical hints, then.

1) In any transcription you may be asked to do, apply the rules given in the handouts (formwords, syllabic contoids, etc.).

2) If the EPD gives more than one transcription of non-formwords, choose the one you find in the ALD. (This dictionary will not help with proper names, though there are some useful appendices).

3) EPD also has u:i c: e:. They should never appear in any of your transcriptions. In our variety of English

ui → u:i  (= Edin. ui)
ææ → æ:  (= Edin. æ)
ææ → æ:  (same in Edin).

4) Please realize that, although there is some relation between transcription and pronunciation, the former is a very abstract systematization of the latter and can be read only after a great many “reading-rules” have been interiorized. Therefore never base your transcriptions on what you think you sound like or ought to sound like. Instead, consult handouts and dictionaries.

1.7. Note 1990. Unfortunately, ALD4 has gone back to an EPD transcription, again showing the fluidity of the transcriptional situation in recent decades. It can be seen that our present version of ModEPD was arrived at only after considerable experimentation. We tried (i) to stay as closely as possible to EPD14, (ii) get rid of the colons, (iii) use digraphs for longer and single letters for shorter vowels. Hence EPD kætsɪŋ, kæveɪʃəs, vízɪbɪlɪtɪ are analysed as kætsɪŋ, kæveɪʃəs, vízɪbɪlɪtɪ, etc. Notice especially the following in column 5: i ↔ i;  i, u, ju ↔ i, uu, juu;  a, ɔ, ɔ ↔ aa, ɔɔ, ɔɔ.
Chapter 2

Formwords

2.1. The Dutch sentence nou ja, dan had hij het haar maar niet moeten vragen might conceivably be transcribed (ad hoc) as nou ja\| dan hat he\| het har mar nit mut\(\_\)e vraay\(\_\)e\]. But this would represent a most pedantic and unnatural pronunciation, such as one might expect perhaps from a foreigner or from a bad actor, but hardly from an ordinary Dutch speaker. A much more realistic representation would be something like nou ja\| dan hat i t \(\alpha\)\(\_\)r ma(r) ni mut\(\_\)e vraay\(\_\)e\]. Words like hij, zij, zijn, haar, er, niet are formwords in Dutch: they have a strong and a weak form, which are used under different conditions.

One would almost expect that the related phenomenon of formwords in English should give little trouble to Dutchmen, but whatever the reason may be, this is certainly not the case. Dutch students use almost exclusively strong forms in English, where the native speaker would use weak forms. So, unless you want to go through life speaking English in a pedantic and unnatural tone of voice, you must acquire a knowledge of the various forms and their usage, before you can even attempt to pronounce them. Such information is most easily presented as a set of transcription rules.

2.2. The formwords are: regular: V \(\rightarrow\) \(\alpha\) in weak form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. prepositions</td>
<td>from, on, tuu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. modal/periphrastic</td>
<td>will, would, mast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auxiliaries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. ‘be’-copula/auxiliaries</td>
<td>am, is, are, was, is, are, was</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. ‘have’-auxiliary</td>
<td>have, has, had</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. conjunctions/negativiser</td>
<td>not, and, not, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. relative/indefinite</td>
<td>him, him, his</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronouns, articles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. personal/possessive</td>
<td>my, his, her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronouns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.3. Simple irregularities.

I. $tuu \rightarrow tu$ before $V$, $ə$ before $C$.

II. $mast \rightarrow məst$ before $V$, $məs$ before $C$.

III. $iz \rightarrow uz$ after $s$, $z$, $ʃ$, $ʒ$, $dʒ$; $s$ after $p$, $t$, $k$, $f$, $θ$; $z$ elsewhere.

IV. $not \rightarrow ænt$ (see also ch. 6 for $æn \rightarrow ð = nn$).

V. $ænd \rightarrow æn$ before $V$ and $h$, $əænd$ elsewhere.

VI. $ðii \rightarrow ði$ before $V$, $ðə$ before $C$.

VII. $hww \rightarrow huu$ phrase-initially $\rightarrow u$ elsewhere.

2.4. Complex irregularities, some of it still in need of further research.

II. $wl$, $wəd$ usually $\rightarrow æl$, $əd$, especially after pronouns, but in phrase-initial position $\rightarrow wl$, $wəd : wəd ðæt bɪ ŋæft$. These ‘intermediate forms’ also occur elsewhere sometimes, as in $ðə ðiπæl wel ðæsæld$.

III. $ænd$ generally $\rightarrow æn$ ($\rightarrow ð = nn$) in set phrases as well: $bækæn æn$ eggz, juu æn miiti, bed œn breiktɔst, æn wɔts moɔ.

IV. Phrase-initially use special $h$-forms: $hæv$, $hæz$, $həd$. But elsewhere:

$hædz \rightarrow æd$ after $s$, $z$, $ʃ$, $ʒ$, $dʒ$; $ə$ $bæs æd$ $gon$.

$hæz \rightarrow æz$ after $s$, $z$, $ʃ$, $ʒ$, $dʒ$; $ə$ $bæs æz$ $gon$.

$s$ after $p$, $t$, $k$, $f$, $θ$; $ə$ $kæts$, $tts$ $gon$.

$z$ elsewhere: $hiz$, $ʃiz$, $ðə$ $dʊgz$ $gon$.

$hæv \rightarrow v$ after pronouns: $æv$, $juv$, $wiv$, $ðəv$, $huv$ $gon$.

$əv$ elsewhere: $ði$ $qami $ $æv$ $gon$, $ði$ $qami$ $wəl$ $æv$ $gon$.

Comment 1990. The formwords $hæv$, $hæz$, $həd$ and $həz^*$ have $h$-elision in their weak forms: $æv$, $æz$, $əd$ and $ə^*$ Only at the beginning of an utterance is $h$ retained: $hæv$, $hæz$, $həd$ and $hə^*$.

Similarly, the non-formwords $hww$, $hi$, $him$ have $h$-elision in their unstressed forms: $u$, $i$, $um$, again except phrase-initially: $hu$, $hi$, $hum$.

Traditionally, $h$-elision has been dealt with under Formwords. It seems better to take it separately. For one thing, this would remove $hww$, $hi$, $him$ from the list of formwords, thereby simplifying it somewhat. Note that in GB $h$ is never elided from any other words than the ones just mentioned and that we recognise no other formwords or ‘gradation-words’ than the ones given on page 10.

2.5. Combined forms.

There are some unusual combinations involving formwords, most of which you know already from written English. I add them here for the sake of completeness.
III, IV s, z are joined onto preceding subject: hiz, its, ðə ðogz, ðə kæts ðæn / gən.

II, IV æl, æd, III æm, æ are joined onto preceding pronoun: æel ɡəv, juəd ɡəv, juəd ɡən, æəm, wə ɡənəŋ.

ent is joined onto preceding auxiliary: hævənt, didənt → didənt = didn't.

Negatives:

ai æm+ənt → æəm not  dou+ənt →  daunt
æmənt ai → aənt ai  wil+ənt →  wənt
mei+ənt → mi not  kæn+ənt →  kənt
deər+ənt → deənt  jæəl+ənt →  jənt
dər+ənt → aənt  mæst+ənt →  məsnnt
wəər+ənt →  wənt

The following are more troublesome:

jʊn+ə → jcc when stressed: 'jcc ðə əm əm wən ðəm ˈluːkɪŋ fək.'
jə when unstressed: 'let mə nəf əf jəə ˈkʌməŋ.'

ðeɪə → ðəə: ðəə ˈluːkɪŋ əf jʊn.
ðeɪəl → ðəəl: ðəəl ˈfeɪnd ɪm.
ðæəə+ə → ðəə: ðəə ləts əv pɪpəl.
ðəə+ə → ðəə: ə ˈkwɔɪt ə ˈlɔt əv əm.

2.6. Odds and ends.

As in the EPD, a * after a word means: write r if a V follows, otherwise delete: hə* → hər ʌŋkəl, hə pərənts.

By a further transcription rule (see Syllabic Consonants, chapter 6) ø may sometimes ‘coalesce’ with a following n, l or r, hence didənt, bidənt, bed nən brəkˈfæst, ðæt ll ðʌu.

fɔːr usually → fər before a personal pronoun: ðeeəl ˈdɔu ət ʃər ɪm/ə/ɪt/əs.

əv occasionally → ə in set phrases / single words like kæpəti, painəˈbitə.

It is interesting to note that a number of weak forms turn out the same: æ → hæz, ðæ, ei, æv; æn → æn, ænd; æə → æəz, hæz; ðə → ðeeə, ðii; æd → wəd, hæd. What does spots ø træbəl mean?
2.7. When to use weak forms.

The answer to this is: nearly always, unless there are very special reasons to use the strong form. So it is much simpler to answer the question by saying when strong forms are obligatory.

1. Strong forms are used when the meaning of the formword is made to stand out or contrasted with some other meaning, most frequently therefore in contradictions: δις ιτ ιτι σελούην, βελ αι αεμ ηλ, αι ωντ ηζα τα γαυ, αν ιαξ μεικ γα θιρκ, δαζνντ ιτ.

2. Only personal pronouns and negative can be weak at the end of a phrase; all others must be strong: τελ ας, η δαζνντ. So one cannot say αι ωντ *τα, δαέτς δα ωει *αϊεμ.

3. With negatived auxiliaries only one element can be weak: αι κανντ, αι καδ νοτ, but not αι *καδνντ.

4. With preposition + pronoun only one element can usually be weak: δεαλ δυν δαετ γαρ ας / φρρ ας, but not *φρρ ας.

5. Prepositions are always strong when they are used as post-positions: τα ωδ γεν, ωδ το το γεν, not ωδ ωτ *τα γεν.

2.8. Articulation.

So far, this is all very abstract, and nothing has been said about the actual pronunciation. Many of the details can only be left till later, so it is hoped that you will return to this chapter later on. Since the weak forms prove to be the most troublesome, I shall give some hints on their pronunciation, especially on those containing ο in their transcription.

Where ο is written, the pronunciation is much the same as in Dutch aadολααα, with the lips spread, not as in D. μυδολοοο, with rounded lips.


‘Stutter’ aadοβοβοβοβολααα and observe the difference in lip-mudοβοβοβολοοο shape and sound during aδοβοβοβο.

Now articulate exactly the same vowels, first with rounded lips, then with spread lips, in de de de de de de ... te te te te te ...
fa fa fa fa fa fa ... kεν κεν κεν κεν κεν κεν ...

Remember that in English you use only the spread version.
The following material should be tried out in conjunction with recorded exercise 2.1.

**weak prepositions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word(s)</th>
<th>Translation(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>te</td>
<td>to, at, or for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fe</td>
<td>for, to, or at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at</td>
<td>at, at, or nait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from</td>
<td>from, as, or dea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ev</td>
<td>ev, as, or pripel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**compare similarities in:**

- tadei, jestedi, sätedi, tamaatau
- D. tameer, ik hep at fayeeta
- D. raafalox, zə is e-ra ñalee-ra
- atraeaktiv, a_traeakt,a, etlaenaktiv
- D. laat at mar zitə zoo
- præmævynn, frætsænti, æærædænti
- D. həi vraaxt of wə m eevə trəx bələ
- ανv, αν v, αν pripel
- D. helovutsløys

**weak modals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word(s)</th>
<th>Translation(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kən</td>
<td>can or may</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ked</td>
<td>could or ask</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fæl</td>
<td>fall or insist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fæd</td>
<td>faed or think səv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el</td>
<td>eat or duu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æd</td>
<td>eat or bi nais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mæs</td>
<td>mas or kwim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dæz</td>
<td>hau dæz or tiil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**compare similarities in:**

- e kænæidæn kənum, e kæneæri bæd, sikænæj
- D. an kanaari, və raaken an am eevə
- D. an bikæd abaut it, lækeææizæl
- D. an læøk kædootfæ, jylı maakæøer vət fæv
- an æfæfæl investigæfyn
- D. mus jə læxe
- hi wəz æfæd in
- D. mus jə dør cm læxe
- in bættl dres, æ bættl æuæænæ
- D. haat(ə)lakheææ, kit(ə)l ær nɔy əs
- ai daant ænk æt mætæd veri mætfj, sætædi
- D. və zetə dær æn pynt æxær
- ææ krisææs kæææl
- D. daamas æn heææ
Recorded exercise 2.1. Prepositions, modal and periphrastic auxiliaries.

**strong**

δζ νανβαδί αι και λιβιν ντ τνν

ων διδ ι δνν δις ιν

ων δε δεντ ν αι εινμην ηεν

ιν δεν λωτς καλ δις ηανιν εν ηην

[αν δεν]

αι βετ ν καν

ιτ κυνντ αν διν βετα

βεν κελζ δενθαν βαιζ ριλβι βαιζ

λων νυν

μαι νυλ βελ αι δαν

βι νυν εν αν κν αν μανναν ϋαντ

αν πνιζ μαστ νυ βερι απ δις

[παγμεντ αγεν] καντς μασ βι λεφ ι δε θαεκρχυμ

**weak**

αν ιεν ιεν τν ντ τε μιι

θε γον ιαν δων

αεο εινμην αν δε τρανθ ηεν κακος

ιν καλ εν ειν ντ εντον ηα απ καλινθ

[ηε ηεν]

αι βετ καν δαν

κεθ δεν ηε βετ αι καδ δου

αι λυντ αι βανηθεν γανδοζ ιζ δαν

θα βελ ηε γανμαν νυδοντ ττ

αι δαν αι θαοκνυθην νυδοντ ιον

αι θοε θαοκ ηα τεν ηνν νυν

αι γκε θαοκ ηε ηεν νυν τνν

[παγμεντ αγεν] καντς μασ βι λεφ ι δε θαεκρχυμ

Recorded exercise 2.2. All formwords and combined forms.

θε ηνπεπ ρε ταινη ιζ διι πεπε

Ααντ νυ ηενθυν ηε ι δα δενθαθ ηενβολ ηραννεν ηιε

δεν ων δαυντ νυ ταιν δεν ρεθ ινν ιν ηακ ιεν τιι

ιτ δακ καλ ην αν δεντ ιν ηδα ηνθ αζ ιεν ηεκος

δα θαοκλεν ιδ ανησθαν ναφανθεν ιζ δα εκ ιεν ηνν

γανμε εν δαν δεν αι δινθντ μιν ττ αθεν δενμ

θεν ιν ηαν ηειν αι ιεγ ιν εν ηαν δεν αν ηεκολθληθηθηθ

αι νυνθντ ιεν θοκ δεθ δα ωνον ινθ αλτηαθηθ

θαη τα θηιν ηε ηενθηνς δαν ηε μαρθ ηε μαθεβαλ

ων ιεν ιν λαθηθ μανθ αθαν δεν κακν ιεν θαθ

ων ιεν α ηνληθ ιθ ιεν ηαλλιην γοτ ιντυ ιεν ηθαγολ

ιν κακνθ ηεθ δαθ ιεν γοτ εθεϊν ιν η ελθεεηη ηεη ηεη καν νυν

αι γοτ ιε ιν αυη ναην ταη ιν δα νυνθεθηθηθ ηαη αθαη ιενθυη ιν

δεν δα νηθαθηθ δα ηνθνθ εν ηενν ιν ηεν ιαυν ιεν ηελογ ηαηλεθηθ

ων ι δηνθνθ ρεηλαθιη ηεθ δαθ ιν καθ ιηθ ιηθ επ ιεν ηηλε

δε λογ ιθ δα ιεοκ ιν ηι ιζ δαθ ιυν γοτ ιεν ηενθ αυη

δα καθ ιθ λαηθηθ ηε ηεη δου ιζθθ διη

δεν καλ ηεη ηην ιεν ην ιηθ δαεθ μαιηθ αμ αυη ιεν ιενθυη
2.9. Some common transcription problems

You will have observed that I deliberately avoid ordinary spelling in the examples, although I am aware that the present abundance of phonetic signs may put you off initially. Spoken language should however become associated in your mind with transcription, not with spelling, and this is learnt most effectively when one is thrown in at the deep end.

If you look at Daniel Jones’ Outline, you will find that he recognises more formwords than I have done. Some of these are definitely peculiar or only characteristic of other accents, such as mi, na, bun, təmz ← maɪ, ɔnə, bɪn, təmz. Others, like original meni, bədi, pens, beri occur only as recognisable elements in words such as həʊməni, səʊməni, səmbədi, təpəns, strəʊˌbərri. All these may be safely ignored.

But more serious attention should be given to Jones’ analysis of jʊ, dəʊ, təʊ, həʊ and hɪ, jɪ, wi, mi, bɪ as having weak forms jʊ, dʊ, tʊ, hʊ with the V of wʊmən, butʃə and hɪ, jɪ, wi, mi, bɪ, with the V of sɪŋə.

I think it is preferable not to follow him in this, nor in the related matter of writing i for ɪ in sərɪ, mənɪ, də θəsˈtɪz and fəˈtɪz.

There is clearly a problem here. Many kinds of English exhibit a degree of overlap or congruence between iɪ and ɪ, uʊ and v. But complete congruence does not seem to me very representative in these instances. I would insist on a distinction between gəʊ tə bəˈlɛrisɪz and ə bəntʃ əv dɛrɪz, which according to Jones must rhyme.

If we wish to account for the variations that have been observed by
Jones, it seems sufficient for the moment to say that \( \text{i} \) and \( \text{u} \) are usually fairly long, but relatively very short when unstressed.

Note 1990. The last paragraph explains why we gradually came to write \( \text{i} \), \( \text{u} \) for unstressed \( \text{i}\text{i} \), \( \text{uu} \), as well as \( \text{3} \) for unstressed \( \text{3} \). Our analysis now appears to find some support in J.C. Wells’ 1990 Longman Pronunciation Dictionary, which has similarly introduced \( \text{i} \) in words like \( \text{sri} \), \( \text{mani} \), \( \text{izi} \), thereby making a distinction between \( \text{bleiziz} \) and \( \text{deiziz} \).

Consider how Jones would transcribe the following examples, and try to make a length difference by pronouncing unstressed \( \text{i} \) and \( \text{u} \) relatively short.

At this point a word of warning seems in order. It appears that some students, once they have become aware of weak forms, overshoot the mark by collecting some from other sources, such as those just mentioned, or worse, inventing a few of their own.

Please note that the following words are not formwords. They have no weak forms!

- prepositions: \( \text{bn}, \text{in}, \text{bai} \)
- have - main verb: \( \text{hevn}, \text{heez}, \text{hæd} \)
- conjunctions: \( \text{ncc} / \text{nc}, \text{cc} / \text{c} \)
- demonstrative pronoun: \( \text{ðæt} \)
- adverb: \( \text{ðæ} \)
- personal pronouns: \( \text{ai}, \text{jou} / \text{ju}, \text{fii} / \text{fi}, \text{wi} / \text{wi}, \text{mi} / \text{mi}, \text{it} / \text{it} \)
- possessive pronouns: \( \text{mai}, \text{joc} / \text{jo}, \text{its} / \text{ts}, \text{au} / \text{æ}, \text{ðæ} \)

Work out your own examples.

2.10. Note 1990. Some independent minds still insist on transcribing/pronouncing \( *\text{a}, \text{mi}, \text{ja}, \text{jar}, \text{am}, \text{an}, \text{at}, \text{æ} \) instead of \( \text{ai}, \text{mai}, \text{ju}, \text{jar}, \text{ðæm}, \text{ön}, \text{it}, \text{æ}, \text{t} \) etc. Although some of these may occur in other accents or dialects of English, they tend to sound rather quaint coming out of a Dutch mouth. The fact that we may write \( \text{joc}, \text{jo}, \text{joc} \text{or} \text{jo} \text{etc.}, \text{depending on the word being stressed/unstressed and followed by C or V} \text{has of course nothing to do with form-words, but results from a general transcription rule. Transcription exercises will be given in Second Year Phonetics.}

Chapter 3

Voice and breath, manner, placing, nasality.

Roughly speaking, our vocal tract is made up of four parts: lungs, throat, mouth and nose. Of these the mouth and the throat are the most complicated, and indeed the most versatile in their actions. The ‘nasal cavity’ functions in a very simple manner, and, as everyone knows, the lungs act only as a bellows.

3.1. **Voice and breath.**

The throat contains the larynx, an extremely delicate construction of bone, cartilage, tissue and muscles. Some of it shows, as the Adam’s apple, and you can feel it with your fingers and move it about somewhat. Inside the larynx are the vocal cords, best likened to a horizontal pair of curtains, which may be made to block the airstream to and from the lungs completely, or to ‘flap in the wind’ in a variety of ways. The right one is shown in the drawing as a fat irregular line. When the vocal cords are made to vibrate rapidly, this gives rise to a tone, just like an oboe does when its reed is set in vibration. We call it **voice**. When there is voice one always hears a humming noise, and in the head one can feel the vibrations that are naturally transmitted through the skull and the teeth. The best way to check if a sound is voiced is by singing it up and down, covering your ears with your hands. Singing **must** be voiced.

When the vocal cords are wide open, as in ordinary breathing, no sound should originate from them at all. If you cover your ears again, you will hear nothing. This position is called breath or breathed (pronounce: brěð). A breathed sound can not be sung up and down the scale. Sing a very long mmmmm on a monotone, and you will sound (and feel!) rather like an electric generator.

Sing the same mmmmm slowly up and down, to make it sound rather like an American police-siren.

If you take a deep breath and then let all the air out through your nose, you will have exactly the same thing, but this time breathed: mmmmmm.
You can’t sing this. Try to alternate: mmmmmmm..., covering your ears.

Something like perhaps 90 percent of our speech is voiced. But some of it is breathed. In English breath is mainly associated with the symbols p, t, k and f, θ, s, j, tj (the ‘fathecius packet’ or ‘hard’ contoids).

Compare Dutch еф - е ва, рәвә - әэзыә, етә - е дә, орә - о әрә, and try to lengthen the sound in the middle as much as circumstances allow, first with and then without covering your ears with your hands.

The last two can only be lengthened a little, before the voice dies out. It helps to blow up your cheeks! All the others can be lengthened indefinitely.

Amsterdam speakers and others who find it difficult to manage the first two pairs may try this instead:

ssssssss the breathed sound that you make in Dutch when asking for silence.
zzzzzzzzz singing it up and down: the sound of a gnat preparing to land on your face while you are desperately trying to fall asleep.

Alcohol has an adverse effect on articulatory control, especially on the more rapid, minute adjustments we have to make in speech, such as breath. Drunken speech is usually fully voiced from beginning to end. As in driving, it becomes difficult to stop once things have been set in motion. Experiment with these two:

After taking a deep breath try to alternate voice and breath without stopping in between. First cover your ears.

vfvfvfvf one long utterance with smooth transitions, do not stop blowing, do not move your lips.
zszszszs do not stop blowing, do not move your tongue.
ммммммм do not stop blowing; more air going through nose during breath.
)))))))))))) similarly, more air going through mouth when breathed.
similarly, a rolled r (een rollende r).

similarly, voiced parts loud, breathed parts hardly audible.

without opening your lips, not βερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβεरβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβεরβερβερβερβερβερβεरβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβεরβερβερβερβερβερβεルβερβερβερβερβερβεরβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβεرβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβερβεরβερβεরβερβερβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβেรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεרβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβেรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβেรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβেรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβেรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβেรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβেรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβেรβεรβεรβεรβেรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβেรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβেรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβেรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβেรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβেรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβেรβεรβεรβেรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβεรβABILITY
Trill. An automatically repeated stop. If a stop is a single gun-shot, a trill is a burst of machine-gun fire. Say the Dutch name aːrɪ, as clearly as you can, and lengthen the sound in the middle. Most Dutch speakers when doing so will trill either the tip of the tongue or the uvula. But speakers from Brabant and Limburg do not generally use a trilled r, nor do many other speakers of fairly modernistic or class accents. If you are one of those try a different type of trill by saying ‘Brrrrrrr’, with both lips and appropriate shaking of the head, as if to indicate that you are shivering with cold or horror. Having tried all these sounds the only thing to remember is that none of them should ever be used in English. Trills, in particular, do not occur in English.

Fric, fricative, or friction. Again, let us say, almost like a stop, but this time with a tiny little hole left in the middle, through which air may (but need not!) pass with a lot of hissing or fricative noise. A comparison is often drawn with letting air out through the valve of a bicycle or car tyre, pressure-cooker, steam-engine, air-brakes of a lorry. See if you can make some of these noises.

Say <s >s<s >s<s >s alternately breathing out and in, egressively and ingressively, to feel the jet of air passing over the centre of the tongue. Say zzzzzzzzzz. This is the same fric, but now combined with voice. A fric is, in a way, the inverse of a lateral, which has two holes on the sides and a closure in the middle.

Say ʌfʌʌʌʌ, ʃʃʃʃʃʃ, and isolate ʃʃʃʃʃʃ... Continuous friction in different places of the mouth, i.e. one long fric. Frics are very common in Dutch and in English, often combining with either breath or voice (or with something in between; see ch. 12):

D. ɛfə -eɛvə, æsəm -vaazəx, mɛsɪə -hɔrlouzə, lʌxə -vaʌɣə.
Limburg and Brabant (limbɔɡ and brɔbænt): waaz maə waaz.
E. ɒfə - əʊvə, ʃʃθə -aiðə, mesi -biζi, smæθɪŋ -pleθə.

Prox, approximant, or frictionless continuant. A fric with the friction taken out. The hole in the centre is made slightly bigger, say as big as the two holes of a lateral taken together, and unless one blows unusually hard, no friction will be heard. Say D. əɛvaarə, əɛvaarə ( = Ondermoerdijks əɛwaarə). Contrast vuvvnnnn. Similarly, try to reduce the friction in zzzzzzzz by varying the size of the hole: zjɪzjɪzjɪzj. Proxes are very important in English, especially in connection with r, much less so in Dutch.
Vowel. Leaving aside approximants, all the preceding manners involve complete or near-complete contact between one articulator and another. Let us call these consonants, by definition. This leaves a whole range of possibilities where there is little or no contact between the articulators, and these we call vowels. You may wish to compare this with other definitions of consonants and vowels. Ours is somewhat arbitrary, but has the advantage of being at least clear-cut.

English, like Dutch, has a complicated set of vowel articulations, mainly associated with the V symbols and with h. For the moment, here are just two examples to emphasize their nature and variety:

D. ɔi ʊt ʊəə ɹəə, made with the lower lip against the upper teeth.
Southern D. ʰi ʊt ɹəə, made with both lips.
E. ə veɾi ɱeɾi kɹɜɪɾəəs, made with the tongue-tip.
ʃuəɾ ɹəɾi ɹəɾnt, made with the lips.
ʃuəɾ jɔɾəɾŋ ʃeself made with the front of the tongue.

Note 1990. It will be seen that we sometimes use the symbol ɾ for the Northern Dutch w–phoneme and ɹ for the English r-phoneme. This is not to confuse or to be inconsistent. As explained in ch. 1, one uses the simplest symbols available in a systemic or phonemic transcription. But in order to emphasize certain details one may write ad hoc transcriptions with more specific symbols or diacritics.

It seems, from what I have said, that there is hardly any difference between vowels with some contact between the articulators and approximants. Indeed, there is none. Nevertheless, we now decide to include the proxes in the category of consonants, again by definition, or if you prefer, by sleight of hand.

The reason behind this amazing piece of logic is really very simple. Some articulations are on the borderline between frics and straightforward vowels, and it is not immediately obvious how they should be regarded. When they associate in all sorts of ways with other consonants, as they often do, we may wish to call them consonants, and when they fall in with other vowels, we feel free to call them vowels. For instance: the manner during r in ræt is one of open contact. One would label it proximant rather than vowel, because, to mention a few reasons, (i) in very emphatic speech it would be replaced by a fric, (ii) it is made in a typical consonant place, (iii) it is made with the characteristic speed of an initial consonant, and (iv) r is more often a C than a V.
Recapitulation. Consonants and vowels are manners of articulation: the former are positively defined by being stop, lateral, trill, fric or prox, the latter negatively by not being consonants. This definition allows for some overlap between consonants and vowels.

I have now put myself in a position where I can use the terms consonant and vowel only with reference to articulation. When talking about transcription I’ll use the terms C (contoid) and V (vocoid), a V being the central symbol or phoneme of a syllable, and the C’s being the ones before and after it. There may be close correlations, but we assume that they are not necessarily the same thing. Examples: *rait* - CVC, *haï* - CV, *waïa* - CVV, *strændz* - CCCVCCC, *beikæn*, *bætm* - CVCVC.

Traditional Jonesian phonetics recognises at least four other manners, which seem to arise to a large extent from a confusion of articulatory and transcriptional considerations:
- vowel-like: a consonant that is made during a V: *bɒtlz*, *bʌtnz*.
- semi-vowel: a vowel that is made during a C: *wel*, *jes*.
- affricate: combination of stop and fric functioning as a single C: *tʃædʒ*.
- nasal: combination of stop + nasality made over a single C: *mæn*.

And so on, one might say, ad infinitum.

Only five manners occur in the accent under description, viz. stop, lateral, fric, prox and vowel.

Note 1990. In the rules and elsewhere, we now recognise a sixth manner, which we call ‘zero’ or ‘nix’. A nix is a prox we don’t want to call a prox; the articulator does nothing. Examples, with nix indicated by [ ]: English [greɪt], French [ak't], bel', kan', set 'm[r] vs English [aкт'], bel, kæn, bɔm]. See my Foundation of Linguistic Study, p. 116.

3.3. Consonant placing.

As we have seen, there are only a small number of consonant manners, but most of these can be performed almost anywhere against the roof of the mouth, by almost any part of the active articulators, in particular the tongue.

If you look at the roof of the mouth in my drawing of the vocal tract, you will see that it yields a more or less natural division into upper lip, upper teeth, gums, hard palate, soft velum, uvula and back wall of pharynx. This you can check on yourself with your finger (which tickles), tongue tip, and the indispensable little mirror. Abiding by common usage we use the Latin names *labial, dental, alveolar, palatal, velar, uvular and pharyngal*. At this point you should perhaps reach for that other inseparable companion, the EPD, to see how some of these terms are transcribed. These ‘places’ may be further subdivided into pre
and post, the larger ones, if required into pre, mid and post. The term inter-dental is preferred to mid-dental to describe an articulation against the cutting edge of the teeth. For articulations on rather vague border-lines one joins the two terms, thus: palato-alveolar, palato-velar, uvulovelar. So we have already well over twenty places or passive articulators where something may happen. This number may be multiplied several times to account for larger areas covering more of them at a time.

The only natural division into active articulators is: lower lip and tongue, the function of the lower teeth being negligible. We obviously need some further division of the tongue, although this poses a bit of a problem. The tongue is a rubbery ball of muscles, that can take up a variety of shapes, sometimes reminiscent of those bizarre flat-fish and jelly-fish on display in the Amsterdam Aquarium. All one can say is that it has a beginning and an end, with a long stretch in between. Please take a good look at your tongue, while letting it swim around a little.

Fortunately, we can find a way round this difficulty. First you spread the whole of your tongue against the roof of the mouth in such a way that the tip just touches the teeth (post-dental), and then you mentally project the natural division of the roof of the mouth onto the tongue. The uvula, since it comprises such a small area, is better ignored. This gives quite a satisfactory division of the tongue into five parts, as shown in the drawing: tip, blade, front, back, root. Together with the lower lip this makes six active articulators. Further sub-division is rarely required.

Placings are generally described by first stating the ‘placer’ or active articulator, and then the ‘place’ or passive articulator it goes to, using ‘labio’ instead of lip, thus: tip→alveolar, blade→postdental, labio→dental, front→palato-alveolar, back→mid-velar, etc. Instead of → we usually write a hyphen. When the active articulator is the opposite number, it may be left unmentioned: labial, dental, alveolar, palatal, velar, uvular, pharyngal then stand for labio-labial (or bi-labial), tip-dental, blade-alveolar, front-palatal, back-velar, back-root→uvular and root-pharyngal.

3.4. Exercises consonant placing

1. This is the most basic and important exercise in this whole book. You should take your time over it and come back to it again and again. Starting with the tip, see how many different points between labial and pharyngal you can touch with each active articulator. You will find that tip and blade are the most, and lower lip is the least versatile.
Use a mirror at first, and then go only by your sense of touch and feeling (‘kinesthetic feeling’).

2. Reverse the process by determining, kinesthetically and with a mirror, the place of articulation in your pronunciation of D. eetə, oorə, haakə, ɔaatʃə, ɛvər, laaxə, haaʃə, ɔantʃə, keetəl, beezyə.

3. By keeping the tip against pre-palatal, make a breathed stop, with a vowel before it and after it: aːta. The result is a strange kind of t-sound, such as can be heard from Indians and Irishmen. Repeat this process in some of the other places you can reach, to make some more familiar and unfamiliar t-sounds. Then also with the blade.

4. In the same way, make a breathed tip-pre-palatal fric: aːgə. You will get a funny kind of s-sound, not unlike what you hear in D. hɪvəʁsəm əən when said quickly. Again, make tip fricatives in some other places, and then try blade fricatives.

3.5. Placing and manner.

Same place, different manners in hɪ wənts tə gəv. The tip+blade goes towards the gums only once, and stays there during nts t. Description: stop during nt, during t², fric during s; tip+blade alveolar (tba) around nts t; also nasality around n.

Comment 1990. The term during is used in the case of manners, which generally have clear-cut beginnings and endings; but for placings and nasality, having vague beginnings and endings, around is preferred.

Same manner, different places in ʃfsxəvələk. Description: fric during fsx, labio-dental around f, blade post-alveolar around s, uvular around x.

Comment 1990. The term around also accounts for the fact that the three placings do not follow each other, but overlap in time.

A more traditional description would state exactly the same facts in this sort of way: nts t : n is a tba stop (= nasal), t = tba stop, s = tba fric, t = tba stop. It almost looks as if there are more movements to be made! And fsx : f = labio-dental fric, s = blade post-alveolar fric, x = uvular fric.

Note the difference in approach. Traditionally, speech is looked upon as a sequence of separate sounds that comes riding out of your mouth like a goods-train emerging from a tunnel. Each symbol of the transcription stands for a new unit coming out. In a more modern view speech is regarded as a stream of closely interwoven bodily movements of different kinds. The transcription bears no immediate relation to this process; it merely provides the pegs to hang up phonetic labels on.

In description it is simpler and more realistic to state placing and manner separately than to take them together.
Some more of this. In D. takt there are two stops in succession: the velar stop is released before the alveolar stop is made, and one can hear two plosive noises. Therefore two stops, two places. In E. tækt the velar articulation is released after the alveolar stop is made, so only one plosive sound can be heard. Therefore one stop, two places. Please try it, it is quite simple. This kind of overlap is very common in English.

Note 1990. So Dutch (like French) has stop-nix-stop-nix for -kt, English has stop-nix.

Only one stop, two places in: lukt, æpt, græbd, hægd, blækDog, walt kæt, getGeuŋ, stop_tocŋ, hi støpt_tocŋ, det støpt pleiŋ.

Only in a few cases, when there are variations in placing and manner going on, it may be necessary to take them together. If you want to work out why, keep it for some rainy Sunday afternoon. First say pspspsps..., as when calling a cat, and you will observe that your lips move, but not your tongue. Now compare:

æ pækt æv krisps: tba fric around sps, stop during p, labial around p.
hi qæks: tba fric during sks, stop during k, mid-velar around k.
twelv pleiæz åsfxyloæk: tba lateral during lv pl, fric during v, stop during p, labio-dental around v, labial around p.

3.6. Placings in Dutch and English.

Contrary to what the layman seems to assume, Dutch and English have not many placings in common. Why should they, when there is such a lot to choose from? As always, the Dutch examples are based, naturally, on my own speech, which is a kind of Haarlem ABN, somewhat knocked about over the years. You may find that your own speech is at variance with my observations in many respects.

Placings common to Dutch and English.

labial around:
D. ooopa en oooma, ja kæn me wat, jyf heil stampt mæ
E. aɪm æ bit gæzeld, kæm bæk, ten_mins, jɪ wept bitæli

labio-dental around:
D. fɛwɛŋefteɪʃ, vø nɪl eel eewa æfwaɛ, di tvee kænə vɑt æfweβælæ
E. fɪŋfɪŋfɪ, frr evør æn evæ, jɪ læv fæβidın fruuts

mid, pre and post-velar around:
D. kærəl de kælæ æn zike kɪs kĩfə mæt ɛxbɛk
E. æ kæp æn keʊkæn gɪv mi æ kɪs æ gʊd kæ
Placings of Dutch.

pre and post uvular around: ɣroot, ɣot, ɣu, mɣ

tip post-dental or tip alveolar around: ɣt is ɣt, ɣnit, ɣløek

blade post alveolar around: ɣj je ɣnit ɣt se ɣt zuko

blade-front→post-alveolar to pre-palatal, associated in particular with j.

This is the ‘smacking noise’ to be carefully avoided in English.

Note 1990. See also exercises 5.5 and 5.5 ctd.

Placings of English.

tba around: aɪ didnt wont te tel ju, kən samwan pliz stand dis bas

tip interdental around: diɛnt sei wont dis ðʊŋ

tip palato-alveolar around: ræt henri trai not te get dræŋk

tip+blade→palato-alveolar around: dʒæk ən dʒil went te ðə fɪʃntʃip ðap

and one or two others

3.7. Nasality.

The function of the nasal cavity, we said, is a simple one. As you may already have worked out, it either does or does not function as a passage-way, but it contains no articulators. The passage-way through the nose (see arrows in the diagram) is effectively closed off by pulling the rear upper part of the velum, the ‘velic’, up against the wall of the pharynx. When the velic is down there is nasality, when it is up there is none.

Exercises nasality.

1. While keeping your mouth wide open, breathe in and out, first through your mouth, then through your nose, and then through mouth and nose together. The up and downward velic movements can be seen quite clearly in a mirror. Try to close and open the velic in quick succession, while watching it in your mirror. Then, without looking, only kinesthetically.

Say oop::a, oom::a. Can you feel whether the velic is up or down?

2. Sing a long aaaaa through the mouth. Now, with the mouth still open, divert the airstream through the nose. This should result in ðʊŋðʊŋ, a velar stop closing off the mouth-passage, plus nasality. Then through mouth and nose together: ðʊŋðʊŋ, vowel + nasality. If
you find this difficult, remember that it is the same as exercise 1, with only voice added.

Repeat with other vowels: \( \varepsilon - \eta - \epsilon, \ i - \eta - \dot{i}, \ u - \eta - \ddot{u}, \ o - \eta - \ddot{o} \)

3. Say \( \text{pmmpmpmp} \) as in D. \( \text{knpmes} \), without opening the lips. The movements you feel at the back of the mouth are the velic approach and release. The same with \( \text{tnntntn} \) and \( \text{kqkqkq} \), both with one long stop.

Nasality may vary between strong and weak, depending on the extent of the velic opening. Please remember for the moment that strong nasality occurs in English only around \( m, n, \eta \), where it combines with voice and stop, and nowhere else: \( \text{aiem singu in de rein} \).

Note 1990: This remark was meant for students who have a lot of nasality in their speech. In fact, the distribution of nasality in English may also extend to intervening \( o \) and \( i \) and to some other C’s. See rule NS1 on page 126.

**Some instances of nasality.**

In Dutch, as in English, nasality is in the first place associated with \( m, n \) and \( \eta \), but it also combines with vowel: \( \text{\^varentwoordesk, \^chelvaksi} \), as against \( \text{\^nderdaanesk} \). Nasalised vowels are, as you are probably aware, a much more common feature in French: \( \text{\^oe b\^o vel b\^la} \).

In many Dutch accents, e.g. Zaankant, Zeeland, and also in Friesian, nasality is much more widespread. You should try to become aware of such nasality in your own speech, and be careful not to transfer it into English. How would you say D. \( \text{\^lch mens \^czin we neem\^em em \^chemoon als aande\^ekwa mee} \)? Then try, without nasality during the vowels: E. \( \text{\^ai ^o^nlir ^dwe\^nt tu aanse \^e fan d\^is mocm\^np} \).

If someone uses nasality all the time, or nearly all the time, he is said to ‘speak through the nose’. Many speakers of American English do this (the nasal twang), but one also hears it in British English and in Dutch, usually as an individual characteristic. It follows, by the way, that nasality is not exclusively restricted to stops and vowels. Complete absence of nasality, on the other hand, may also be heard occasionally, mainly from people suffering from a severe cold blocking the nasal passage. Now read this paragraph aloud a few times, with different degrees of nasality between very strong and none at all.

Classical singing has to be somewhat nasalised, pop-singing is usually non-nasalised. Please try it out for yourself.

**Complementary reading.** Outline, III, IX, XII, 586, XXIV.

Chapter 4

All about r

4.1. There are two sides to this story. Firstly, when to transcribe r and when not, and secondly how to articulate when there is an r in the transcription.

Transcription-wise, the position of r in English is somewhat comparable to that of n in Dutch.

As the spelling of Dutch still indicates, we used to say at one time something like we hadan di joga eeven mutan laatun praatun. In most kinds of Dutch this is now we hada di joga eeven muta laat praat. Only in the North-East and along the German border have such ‘post-vocalic’ n’s been preserved. The Dutch speech community may thus be divided into a minority of n-pronouncers, and a majority of non-n-pronouncers.

Of course not all post-vocalic n’s were affected. They disappeared only after a (shwa), but not if followed by an unstressed V in the next syllable. So n is perfectly regular in non n-pronouncing se wian eev n teep eeven at rook en en druk en cntsexe.

One may assume that the average non n-pronouncing Dutchman is unaware of all this. He has merely learnt to insert n between a ø [ʃwa] and a following unstressed V, and not surprisingly, he also does this quite naturally when there is no historical precedent for it.

So far, so good. To the native speaker this all seems perfectly regular and straightforward. But Dutch also has a written form, and something is known of its history. This in itself is of course a highly unusual situation from the point of view of normal linguistic development. It could give rise to an academic distinction that otherwise would never have been made, that between linking n, with historical precedent and spelling equivalent, and intrusive n, without these attributes.

Still, the average speaker has never paid much attention to purely academic distinctions. What has really upset the apple-cart however, is...
the recent advent of general literacy, with its concomitant notion that ‘n’ should be pronounced where it is spelled, while at the same time leaving the majority of the population unable to spell with confidence. As a result, one man I know has given up speaking and writing altogether. These were his last words:

Nee, vrienden, neen. Jullie worde ten laatsten male aangeraden niet te eeuwigen dagen kippe-eieren en dergenlijke te toon ten stellen, onder anderen in het honendonk of de molen, doch uitsluitend in het daartoe eigenlijk aangewezen en ingerichten gekkehuis.

Presumably none of us have completely escaped this particular bug, although it seems to aim its attacks mainly at school-teachers, actors, and news-readers, to whom it amounts almost to an occupational hazard. One may observe for instance:

If I have to summarize the situation, I will venture to say that in uninhibited spontaneous Dutch there is no difference in the handling of post-vocalic, linking and intrusive n by children and illiterates on the one hand, and by literate adults on the other. Especially in reading aloud, but also in pronouncing surnames, in public speaking, acting, preaching, telephoning, etc., spelling-pronunciations are both very common and erratic. These attempts never achieve the level of consistency of n-pronouncing Dutchmen.

So much by way of introduction. I felt that by drawing attention to familiar features of Dutch, similar phenomena in English, often met with unwarranted incredulity and scepticism, might be more easily appreciated.

4.2. Rhotic and non-rhotic types of English.

English divides into so-called r-pronouncing and non-r-pronouncing accents. In the latter r disappeared several centuries ago after V’s, but not between V’s.

1Fn. 1980. Koot en Bie often do this sort of thing.
r-pronouncing: ai fiil embitərd tʃaəlz ət ju fɔːst mi tə dʌvəs jɔr
mədər wen ju dɪskraʊərd əid mɛərˈpɜrld dɪ əv peər ɡərl

non-r-pronouncing: ai fiil embitərd tʃaəlz ət ju fɔːst mi tə dʌvəs ʃɔ
mədər wen ju dɪskraʊərd əid mɛərˈpɜrld dɪ əv peər ɡərl

The majority of the English speaking world are presumably r-
pronouncing, including Scotland, Ireland, the West Country, Canada, and
most of the U.S. Many accents, e.g. New York English, take up
intermediate positions of varying complexity. But nearly fifty million
Englishmen are non-r-pronouncing, and so are English speakers in
Australia and New Zealand, Africa, the Far East, the West Indies, and
parts of the U.S., notably New England and the Southern States. The
accent under description is of this type.

Note 1978. Black English is ‘non-rhotic’. But otherwise there seems to
be social pressure on ‘non-rhotic’ Americans to “pronounce their r’s”.

4.3. Absence of r.

In transcription r can occur only when the following phoneme in the
same phrase is a V. Rather superfluously, I may add that the articulations
associated with r are never made where there can be no r, not even when
reading aloud!

Dutch learners find it most disturbing that there should often be no r in
speech when there is an r in the spelling, and, of course, vice versa. Even
if they can be persuaded not to transcribe it, it still goes against the grain
not to pronounce something resembling an ‘r’. The trouble is obviously
that most of us have learned English through the written medium, with
all our inherent notions about having to pronounce what we see. Technic-
ally speaking, there is of course no problem in not pronouncing some-
thing; the difficulty is a purely psychological one, that may resolve itself
if approached with and open mind.

It is a well-established fact that the following sets of words are
homophones in many Southern English accents, including the one under
description.

poor-pour-paw: pɔː, shore-Shaw-sure: ʃɔː, barmy-balmy: bɑːmi, source-
sauce: sɔːs, caught-court: kɔːt, calves-carves: kæ✈z, cheetah-cheater:
tʃiɪtə, Dinah-diner: dainə.

And to a native speaker the following words are perfect rhymes. Please
transcribe them for yourself, \textipa{fain\oe, stra\øt\oe, woc\oe, etc.}: \footnote{Fn. 1990. When not sure look up in the EPD.}


Most difficulty is experienced with word-final \textipa{\oe}, as in \textipa{tʃi\øt\oe, daɪ\ø, maɪ\ø, hɔr\ø.} The articulation during \textipa{\oe} is here approximately the same as the first vowel in D. \textipa{hænt\æ, mænt\æ, lænt\æ, plænt\æ}, (which is quite unlike that in \textipa{hænt, mænt, lænt, plænt}). Try to ‘isolate’ this vowel and to ‘transplant’ it onto the English examples.

Note 1990: I find that, in pronunciation coaching, it is often suggestive to write (ad hoc): \textipa{tʃi\øt\æ, daɪ\ø, maɪ\ø, hɔr\ø, etc.}

Read aloud:

banana, semolina, chipolata, cinema, camera, orchestra, pukka, Jehovah: \textipa{bənənə, seməlɪnə, tʃɪrəlætə, pʌkə, etc.}

Paula, Laura, Celia, Barbara, Veronica, Samantha, China, India, Persia, America, California, cholera, phobia, mania, insomnia, stamina, vendetta, etcetera, inter alia, data, quota, Magna Carta.

Similarly, with the same \textipa{\ø} at the end:

larder, cleverer, pucker, honour, solar, odour, summer, Julius Caesar, terror, horror, mirror: \textipa{laʊə, ðə, əʊdə, terə, etc.}

Also, with approximately the same vowel\footnote{Fn. 1990. See page 82 and VP rule 7 on p. 128 for the two different placings for \textipa{\ø}.} as in D. \textipa{ædəlær, fərxeetə. E. tá mi, tʃedəi :}

the Americans, Jehovah’s witness, Laura’s, storers, bananas, honours, mirrors, cheetahs, readers: \textipa{dʒɪəvəz, ðəz, mɪrəz, etc.}

buttered, embittered, littered, puckered, papered, endangered: \textipa{pʌkəd, peɪpəd, ʌndɪndʒəd, etc.}

I have said that \textipa{r} can only occur before a V in the same \textit{phrase}, thereby implying among other things, that it cannot occur at the end of a phrase. What is a phrase?

(Addition 1980. I now use the term \textit{piece} (of information), indicated
by ||. However, r does occur at the end of some pieces, but not at the end of locutions, shown by ||| or ###. Addition 1990: further observation has revealed that pieces are generally linked, so we would now say that r can only occur before V in the same locution. Therefore piece-final linking r for instance in əʊ| ju aar|| aa ju||, faɪv| sɪks| fоо|| eɪt| sɪks| nain| tuu||).

When we speak, we don’t just ramble on without stopping, but we cut up what we have to say into chunks of information, at the end of which there is a rhythmic delay, and possibly a silence. A speaker wants this information to sink in before he embarks on the next lot, if any. In transcription such chunks of information, or phrases, may be delimited by a ||. Please read this paragraph aloud, at your top speed, in one breath as it were. Prayers, like Our Father, are often said in this way, and legal documents may be read like this, pro forma. Such a delivery is not meant to convey any information at all. Then read this same paragraph as if you are trying to put its meaning across to a very stupid person, and note how often you slow down.

Recorded exercise 4.1. No r.
4.4. Linking r.

This is a simple matter. It is inserted in the transcription before any V in the same phrase, where the spelling has r, and EPD (and my list of formwords) have *. The V preceding can only be θ, αθ, θθ, θθ, θθ, θθ. Note 1990. Replace ‘phrase’ by ‘locution’. It should be realised that this is one of a number of transcription rules to be applied in (second-year) transcription assignments. The TR rules (over and above ‘buy the EPD’) are those for EPD modifications, V weakening, strong forms, syllabic C and r-insertion. TR rules for rhythmic and intonational markings to be dealt with at a later stage.

Recorded exercise 4.2. Linking r.

4.5. Intrusive r.

It is almost impossible to come to any definite conclusion regarding intrusive r in English. Everybody agrees that other people use it, but hardly any English speaker would admit to using it himself. In character it is like intrusive n in Dutch. In the sense, however, that the subject is again bedevilled by spelling-inspired notions of ‘correctness’, it resembles D. post-vocalic n.

Since the occurrence of intrusive r has not been investigated scientifically to my knowledge, I must rely on my own impressions. In uninhibited spontaneous English, not excepting radio and television, intrusive r’s are abundant. Newsreaders avoid it altogether. It would be incongruous with a pronounced foreign accent, or any kind of laboured speech. Young children use it consistently after non-starred θ, αθ and θθ, and the word aθtθ on the analogy of linking r. My daughter, when little, applied the analogy also to the weak forms tθ, θ and δθ, in aθ dθtθt tθt θθk θ, kθt aθ hθv θr θθpl, kθt aθ hθv δθr θθrδt hθm, a habit that took her a long time to break. Instances like aθ sθθr ιt pθθnθ daθn are not in-
frequent from adults who care about their speech.

Cutting a long argument short, observations such as these have led me to conclude provisionally that intrusive \( r \) comes very naturally to an English speaker, and that he has to make a conscious effort to avoid it. This he does most successfully after \( \text{cc} \), especially in the middle of a word. In a teaching phonetics I cannot think of a better way to express this confusing situation than by the following transcription rule.

**TR rule for intrusive \( r \).** Insert intrusive \( r \) after word-final \( \text{e}, \text{aa}, \text{cc} \) and after \( \text{ai}, \text{ae}, \text{i} \), if the following word begins with a V, but not after unstarred weak forms. Then delete it again after \( \text{cc} \), optionally.

The following examples deserve careful study. To the untrained eye, they will be quite difficult at first sight, but you should aim at saying them convincingly. See if you can catch any intrusive \( r \)'s on radio and television. My average is about three a day.

**Recorded exercise 4.3. Intrusive \( r \).**
4.6. Syllabic r.

Syllabic C’s, including r are dealt with in chapter 6. Suffice it to say that articulations are no different during r, but in duration it is roughly twice as long as r.

Note 1990: this is one of the reasons why we now prefer to write nn, ll, rr instead of ŋ, ʃ, r.

4.7. Articulation.

In most languages r is associated with a trill, but not so in English. The difficulties for foreign learners arise from ignorance and misunderstanding, not from any technical problem.

On an elementary level, say in a school-teaching situation, E. r is best associated with D. [rzvŋ] which occurs only marginally, although suggestively, in [ændərzvʊŋk ʃa]. Or it might be associated with an equally rare [rzvŋ]. Still, we have ɔndərheɛnə ɔn vərzvɪərəŋ, an vərzvɪən, so why not an vərzwyyrəŋ? And similarly fərzvɪtəŋ and fərzvɪkəŋ easily lead to the nonsense-word fərzvɪkəŋ. In these Dutch examples there is already a good deal of overlap of place. The trick is in lengthening all the features simultaneously. See Fig 4.1.

However, this does no more than suggest a possible, and hopefully a vivid approach to teaching beginners. The end-product should be quite acceptable, but not the genuine article. Here is a more detailed treatment.

Taking raɪt and hɑɪri as examples, the manner is prox, the placing tpa, tip palato-alveolar. In the Dutch illustrations the placing was tip post-alveolar and the manner fric. The implication is obvious: try to curl the tip of the tongue back a little further, while reducing the friction.

The lips are rounded, but not rounded and protruded (‘inner rounding’) as in Dutch ɣ and v. English has only ‘outer rounding’, which means that the lips remain ‘glued’ to the teeth. Here then is another modification to be made. At the same time the lower lip moves back a little, towards the upper teeth, to make what is essentially a labio-dental prox, as in D. v. As we don’t want to be too specific we prefer to call this ‘labio-dentalisation’. Outer rounding plus labio-dentalisation together should make you look somewhat like a rabbit.

1 Anders wurk ik je, verzwering, verzuring, verzwuring, verzuchting, verzwikking, verzwuchting. Note 1990: all this ‘popularisation’ has proved a bit too much for most students, so perhaps we should restrict ourselves to one clear example.
Next, we take a closer look at the tongue again. The tip, we said, is curled back, but at the same time the back is raised to make a vowel articulation very close to a pre-velar prox. So the tongue should feel as if it were spoon-shaped. In fact, the back of the tongue is in the same position as in E. suun and more or less in between that for D. zyyr and zun. The term we use for this articulation is ‘pre-velarisation’.

So these are the movements primarily associated with English r: tpa, prox, close rounding, labio-dentalisation and pre-velarisation. This is quite a bagful, but none of them except the last is particularly difficult in itself. The following exercises should set you off on the right course.

Note 1980. The use of ‘tapped’ or ‘flapped’ r in words like veri is not recommended, being very much a minority usage.

4.8. Exercises: placing, manner and postures for r.

1. Say a long mmmmmm, and see if you can move your tongue about in the meantime.

2. The same long mmmmmm while alternating the tongue-position between D. y and u, thus yuyuyuyu: palatalised versus velarised, the lips remain rounded.

3. Similarly with long nnnnnnn, keeping tip+blade in place: yuyuyuyu.

4. Similarly with l, z: yuyuyuyu yuyuyuyu. With the latter, when done slowly, you can hear a kind of whistle going up and down, and if you stop in the middle you will have pre-velarisation, besides the alveolar friction and rounding already present.

5. During a long m alternate your lip-position from spreading to outer rounding + labio-dentalisation. The same lip-movements with n, l, z, s. With the last two you should hear marked variations in pitch.

6. Say a long outer-rounded v, while dragging the tip backwards and forwards along the roof, setting up friction. End up at tpa.

7. Compare again the description above of rait and harî, and D. farkvuzyćtţ, etc. Compare also tţeîn, dţeîn, place tba with the very similar tţeîn, dţeîn, place tpa.

8. Say rrr-ait, rrr-edi, rrr-îdţţ, ha-rrr-i, me-rrr-i.¹

When one says trâ1, the place in in t is tpa, in conformity with that in r, not tba as usual. Also rounding, labio-dentalisation and pre-velarisation, i.e. all the r-features except approximant, are present right from the begin-

¹Fn1990. Two or three decades ago we frequently had students who found it ‘impossible’ to pronounce English r, and would use uvular trill or fric instead. Nowadays, all our students seem to manage, so we would now cut down on the articulation aspect.
ning of t. One might say, as is sometimes done, that the typical r-articulations are anticipated in so far as possible in its own syllable, and sometimes even in the previous syllable.

This is a useful statement, well worth remembering in its generality. But the precise details can only be stated in more or less complicated phonetic rules. I hasten to add that these, like all rules, are best forgotten as soon as you have assimilated them in your own speech. The only sensible way to retain such rules is to consciously apply one at a time to your own speech for a few days, not to learn them by heart.

Note 1990. In spite of this advice, first-year students have in recent years taken more and more to learning the rules by heart, frequently without even understanding them. Such rote-learning is one mad consequence of the present Dutch system of university education, run by an army of so-called ‘managers’ who force students to chase modules and credits instead of acquiring knowledge and expertise.


Rounding, labio-dentalisation and pre-velarisation stretch over any syllable-initial C-cluster containing r and initial C-cluster + r (= rr). Examples: rait, hari, prei, traï, kraï, brait, draï, greï, fraï, θrii frïi, œvri, sprïj, streïndʒ, skraïmбал, entri, sekraïrrιι, litrrrrri, intraïstυγ.

Note 1990. Cf. rules PS4 and PS5B on page 125.

Tip palato-alveolar stretches back from r, until θ, s or j intervenes, into any immediately preceding C’s in its own syllable and any sequence of t, d, n, l immediately preceding that. Examples: rait, hari, traï, draï, wudṇt traï, didṇt kraï, judṇt promis, didṇt straïk, didṇt θrœu, didṇt frïïk, gæïlfrεnd, bætlldrʌmz:, hɛnri gɔt drʌŋk.


Tpa prox occurs around r-, pr-, br-, fr-, vr-, kr-, gr-. Examples: rait, hari, prei, brait, evri, kraï, greï, sprïj, skraïu, sïkɾt. One might say that the r-articulations are already fully formed during p, k, etc.

Note 1990. Cf. MN5 on page 126.

It appears that s, j and θ do not accommodate to a following r. The associated placings are, as always, tba, tbpa and tid, the manner being fric. It follows that there must be some considerable tongue movement from these positions to tpa prox in s(C)r, fr and θr: sprïj, strïŋ, skraïu, frïmps, θrii. These sequences are a source of continuous trouble to the uninitiated.
Exercise. Difficult sequences.

First say English \( = (r) \), with all the associated articulations, then make it breathed, and then, moving only tip and blade, change to tba, tbpa and tid fricative respectively:

Keep it all breathed, no voice in \( = \). Slowly from one position to the other, by the shortest route. Increase speed to 10 movements per 5 seconds. Only tongue moves!

Note 1980. This is important. Add also \( \theta \theta \theta \theta \theta \theta \theta \... \), \( \theta \theta \theta \theta \theta \... \)

Recorded exercise 4.4. Pronouncing \( r \)-complexes.

\[ \text{Biug in the rait| pleis|| et de rait| taim|| en haevi|| de rait| frenz||} \]
\[ \text{de tri|| oaz| e ridd| raiti|| en ari|| metik||} \]
\[ \text{de tri|| oamz| en de aevias|| e bi ati|| de kaeveli|| and bi infenti||} \]
\[ \text{gau en aask| de laibre|| frr| e maikre|| ridd|} \]
\[ \text{spring| e soprai| on um| bet dount| ran rait| in de r UDP| ruum|} \]
\[ \text{meri| en e krik| i aast mi| it aiad laik| sem nais| kriss| fredd| wiit|} \]
\[ \text{ai woz stil| raekj| mai brei| trai| te rumembo| de rait| en| wen i} \]
\[ \text{trip mi| ap} \]
\[ \text{juer ebselouti| rait| wiel haef| te trae| bis maet| auti sam| taim} \]
\[ \text{jes bet ju kaunt| meik| briks| wiout| stro| dount| feget| wie brei|} \]
\[ \text{nulj| graudit|} \]
\[ \text{raeg| raek| renuziz| e poklit| en renuziz| stick| te de ruul| en de raud} \]
\[ \text{[bets| not al| sei]} \]
\[ \text{de letist| flar| en ruumez| haez ut| bet de braidsrumz| col| brook| end nay| brein|} \]
\[ \text{de braid| woz rial| tre| az e rauz| wearin| e prit| fril| dres|} \]
\[ \text{col|ver|prim en propa| bettrend|mainjul| si neuz| col| de triks| en de trei|} \]
\[ \text{ai reken| iz en| nay| ke| griif| wny| de| fa| bi ruul| de ruust| de wul|} \]
\[ \text{de| col| sadz| bin pit| mani| after| en| laik sem dranken| sel| hiel} \]
\[ \text{[gau te rae| en ruum| wiz|} \]
\[ \text{hiz safrin| from| braita| c|red| thru| fia| wear| en tear| ai bet|} \]
\[ \text{aunt jul| strett| it| en litt| nay| ran| in de seim| eul| gruuv| col| de taim|} \]
\[ \text{en neuv| aie we| praktsrug| not al prit| end doun| e coccu| trei|} \]
\[ \text{[tuul| grui| greu| de rauz| hau|} \]
\[ \text{enwe|| wia| dro| in| de reinz| en litt| dount| wont| en ruu| de риск| en} \]
\[ \text{[reki| de hau| radi| ripem| dene| wul|} \]
\[ \text{iznut| de| thrui| trei| from| brisal| te| truud| gud| greif| hav ai} \]
\[ \text{[dropt| e bri|} \]
Note 1980. Bit division has been indicated by means of |. In some of the previous material locutions || and pieces || had already been marked. The cassette recording (1979) was read from unmarked transcriptions, so that there may be a few discrepancies between its rhythmic patterns and their marking here.

Note 1990. The cassette recording has now been updated. Having entered the computer age and gone up-market, we no longer speak of bits and pieces, but of bytes and pieces. For locution boundaries we now use || instead of ||.