# 24.914 <br> Geographical variation in the phonetics and phonology of English <br> - Transcription 

## Readings and assignments

- Reading: Labov et al (1997) 'A National Map of the Regional Dialects of American English’
- Assignment: Phonetic transcription exercise, due session 4


## Geographical variation

- Languages are spoken differently in different geographical areas.
- Some examples
- We will survey variation in phonetics and phonology across dialects of English in the USA (and the UK).
- We will then explore explanations for properties of the observed patterns of variation based on theories about how sound change operates.
- First we need ways to describe and analyze the varieties that we find.
$>$ Phonetic transcription
$>$ Phonological analysis


## Phonetic transcription

- A phonetic transcription system provides a useful means of recording speech.
- We will be using the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA)
$>$ 'The IPA is intended to be a set of symbols for representing all the possible sounds of the world's languages.' IPA (1990)
$>$ 'There should be a separate letter for each distinctive sound' Aims and Principles (1949)


## Describing speech sounds

- In phonetic transcription and in phonological analysis, speech sounds are commonly described in terms of the way in which they are produced.
- Later we will see how to characterize some sounds in terms of measured acoustic properties.


## Speech production system

- The speech production system comprises the lungs and the vocal tract.



## Vowels

- Vowel sounds are usually voiced.
- They are all produced without any very narrow constriction of the vocal tract (not narrow enough to generate turbulent air flow).
- Vowel qualities are differentiated by the shape of the vocal tract, resulting from different positions of tongue and lips.
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## Describing vowels

Four parameters:

- Height (high-mid-low)
- Backness (front-central-back)
- Lip rounding (rounded-unrounded)
- Tense-lax
- We will see that judgments of height and backness generally reflect acoustic properties of vowels more directly than tongue body position


## Vowel height

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
{[\mathrm{i}]} & \text { heed } & \text { high } \\
{[\mathrm{I}]} & \text { hid } & \text { high (lax) } \\
{[\varepsilon]} & \text { head } & \text { mid } \\
{[\mathfrak{~}]} & \text { had } & \text { low }
\end{array}
$$

[u] who'd high
[u] hood high (lax)
[a] hod low


## Vowel height



## Vowel rounding

$\left.\begin{array}{ll}{[\mathrm{i}]} & \text { heed } \\ {[\mathrm{I}]} & \text { hid } \\ {[\varepsilon]} & \text { head } \\ {[æ]} & \text { had } \\ {[\mathrm{I}]} & \text { hut }\end{array}\right]$ unrounded

## American English vowels

- Some American English vowels

|  | rounded |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Front | Central | Back |
| High | tense | i |  | u <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> lax |
| I |  | $u$ |  |  |
| Mid | higher <br> lower | eI |  | ou |
|  | $\varepsilon$ | $\Lambda$ | 0 |  |
| Low |  | $æ$ |  | a |

Diphthongs:
[ar] 'eye', [av] 'how', [כт] 'boy’
[i] heat
[I] hit
[u] hoot
[u] hood
[eI] hate
[ $\varepsilon$ ] head
[^] hut
[ov] hoe
[ว] ought
[æ] hat
[a] odd
Unstressed: [ə] ‘attack’

## Diphthongs

- Diphthongs are vowels that change quality during the duration of the vowel.
- Transcribed with vowel symbols indicating starting and ending qualities, e.g. [ar] hide.
- Some sources use glides to transcribe the offsets of English diphthongs [aj] ([ar]), [ej] ([er]), [ow] ([ou])
- [j] is similar to [i] and [w] is similar to [u]
- In the vowels [er] (rate) [ou] (wrote), the nuclei are mid [e, o], while the offglides are high.
- The monophthongs $[\mathrm{e}, \mathrm{o}]$ are found in many languages (e.g. Spanish, Italian, Scottish English, Minnesota Eng.).


## Tense vs. Lax Vowels

- Tense and lax vowels in English are distinguished more on phonological rather than phonetic grounds.
- Lax vowels cannot occur at the end of a word while tense vowels can.
- [si] see, [ser] say, [su] Sue, [sou] so, [sa] saw
$-*[\mathrm{si}], *[\mathrm{~s} \varepsilon], *[\mathrm{su}], *[\mathrm{sæ}]$
- By this criterion [כ] is not lax since it can occur at the end of words: [so] saw. But many feature systems analyze [ov]/[כ] as a tense-lax pair.
- Phonetically, tense vowels are longer than most of the lax vowels, and in tense-lax pairs like [i-ז], [u-v], [ei- $\varepsilon$ ] the tense vowel is higher and more peripheral on the frontback dimension.
- [e, o] are higher (or close) mid and [ $\varepsilon, \nu]$ are lower (or open) mid.


## Schwa [ə]

- [ə] is usually said to be a mid central unrounded vowel, but that's not really how this symbols is used in the transcription of English.
- It is mainly used to transcribe short, unstressed vowels of contextually variable quality
- about [əbawt], pretend [pıətend], panda [pændə]
- [ $\Lambda$ ] is a lax mid central unrounded vowel
- but [bıt], sun [s $\wedge \mathrm{n}]$
- The vowel at the end of words like panda and comma can be similar to [ $\Lambda$ ], although conventionally transcribed with [ 2 ], but in most other contexts [ $ə$ ] is not only shorter than [ $\wedge$ ], but often much higher.
- abut [әb $\wedge t]$


## More vowels

- The IPA distinguishes the following vowel symbols:


Notes:

- Close = high, Open = low
- The IPA says [a] is a low front vowel - we will call it central
- [ $\Lambda$ ] is officially a back vowel, but in transcription of English, it is conventionally used to transcribe a lower-mid central vowel (hut, bud)


## More vowels

- In English, only back vowels are rounded [u, u, ou, o .
- It is common across languages for front vowels to be unrounded and for non-low back vowels to be rounded.
- E.g. Spanish

| $i$ | $u$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $e$ | 0 |

- But some languages have front rounded vowels as well
- High front rounded [y], e.g. French une [yn]
- Mid front rounded [ $\varnothing$ ], e.g. French bleu [blø]
- Non-low back unrounded vowels occur as well, e.g. the 'u' of Tokyo Japanese is high back unrounded [u]


## Geographical distribution of the cot-caught merger.



The Merger of/o/ and /oh/
Contrast in production of $/ \mathrm{o} / \mathrm{and} / \mathrm{oh} /$ before $/ \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{in}$ COT vs. CAUGHT.

Figure by MIT OpenCourseWare. Adapted from the Linguistics Laboratory of the University of Pennsylvania.

## Consonants

- Consonants differ from vowels in that they are produced with narrower constrictions of the vocal tract.
- Parameters for describing consonants:
- Voicing: voiced or voiceless
- Place of articulation: where the constriction is formed, and with what articulator.
- Manner of articulation: how narrow the constriction is.
- Oral/Nasal: whether the velum is lowered.
- Lateral(/Central)


## Place of articulation

- Specified in terms of the articulator that forms the consonant constriction and the location of the constriction.



## English consonants

|  | bilabial | labio- <br> dental | dental | alveolar | alveo- <br> palatal | palatal | velar | glottal |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| stop | p b |  |  | t d |  |  | kg |  |
| nasal | m |  |  | n |  |  | y |  |
| fricative |  | fv | t d | s z | $\int 3$ |  |  | h |
| affricate |  |  |  |  | tf d 3 |  |  |  |
| liquid <br> - lateral |  |  |  | t |  |  |  |  |
| glide | w |  |  |  |  | j |  |  |

- It's not clear where to put [ 1 ] and [w] on the chart since [w] has two constrictions (labial and velar), and [ $\mu$ ] has various pronunciations.


## More consonants

|  | Bilabial | Labiodental | Dental | Alveolar | Postalveolar | Retroflex | Palatal | Velar | Uvular | Pharyngeal | Glotal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Plosive | p b |  |  | t d |  | t d | C f | k g | q G |  | ? |
| Nasal | m | I] |  | n |  | $\eta$ | J1 | $1]$ | N |  |  |
| Trill | B |  |  | r |  |  |  |  | R |  |  |
| Tap or Flap |  | $V$ |  | I |  | [ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fricative | $\phi \beta$ | f V | $\theta$ ठ | S Z | $\int 3$ | S Z | ç j | X 8 | $\chi$ в | ¢ S | h 1 |
| Lateral fricative |  |  |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Approximant |  | $v$ |  | I |  | I | j | U |  |  |  |
| Lateral approximant |  |  |  | I |  | l | $\Lambda$ | L |  |  |  |

Where symbols appear in pairs, the one to the right represents a voiced consonant. Shaded areas denote articulations judged impossible.

- [r] tap (a.k.a flap) - butter, metal, medal
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- [?] glottal stop


## Geographical variation in English

- English is spoken differently in different parts of the USA, UK, etc.
- We will survey variation in phonetics and phonology across dialects of English in the USA (and the UK).
- We will then explore explanations for properties of the observed patterns of variation based on theories about how sound change operates.


## Geographical variation in English

- We can observe geographical variation in all aspects of languages, but for now we are focusing on phonetics and phonology.
- Accent variation
- Cf. Lexical variation
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- Syntactic variation, e.g. ‘The car needs repaired', ‘The house needs painted'



## Geographical variation in English

- Dialects of English can differ in all aspects of phonetics and phonology
- Contrastive sounds ('phonemes')
- How many
- Basic phonetic realization
- Allophonic variation in the realization of these sounds.
- Including phonetic details such as patterns of coarticulation.
- Restrictions on the distribution of contrasts
- E.g. positional neutralization of contrasts


## Variation in inventory of vowel contrasts

- Accents of English differ in the number of contrasting low/lower-mid back vowels.
- Most British accents contrasts three lower back vowels, e.g. Standard Southern British English (a.k.a. Received Pronunciation) / $\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{o}, \mathrm{b} /$
f. [k $\left.{ }^{\text {h }} \mathrm{tt}\right]$ 'cart', [ $\left.\mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{vt}\right]$ 'caught', [ $\left.\mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{Dt}\right]$ 'cot' g.[dan] 'darn', [don] ‘dawn', [dmn] 'Don'
- Some N. American accents contrast two lower back vowels, e.g. Inland North (Detroit, Chicago etc).
- [k' kt$] /\left[\mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{h}} a t\right]$ 'cot', [k$\left.{ }^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{t} \mathrm{t}\right]$ 'caught'
- [dan]/[dan] ‘Don’, [don] ‘dawn’
- Buffalo Chicago Kenosha
${ }_{27}$ - Also a difference in the phonetic realization [a] vs. [a]


## Variation in inventory of vowel contrasts

- Others have only one lower back vowel, e.g. the West.
- [k'ht] 'cot, caught', [dan] ‘Don, dawn’
- Los Angeles ‘awful'
- Los Angeles 'thought'


Image by MIT OCW.
Adapted from the Linguistics Laboratory of the University of Pennsylvania.

## Variation in inventory of vowel contrasts

- What are the differences between the grammars of these varieties of English?
Quick review of phonology:
- Phonological grammars map all logically possible input representations onto well-formed output representations.
- Accounts for phonotactic restrictions
- e.g. if phonology always maps $/ \mathrm{p} / \rightarrow$ [a] (and doesn't map any other sound onto [ D$]$ ), then words containing [ D$]$ are ill-formed.
- Accounts for alternations - the same morpheme can be mapped onto different pronunciations in different contexts.
- E.g. /bet/ $\rightarrow$ [bet], /bet-in/ $\rightarrow$ [berip]
- The mapping from input to output is specified by a ranked set of constraints (Optimality Theory)


## Variation in inventory of vowel contrasts

- The mapping from input to output is specified by a ranked set of constraints (Optimality Theory)
- The output for a given input is the representation that best satisfies the set of constraints.
- There are two basic types of constraints:
- Markedness constraints - penalize dispreferred output configurations
- E.g. *[+low, +round] (violated by [p])
- Correspondence constraints (a.k.a. faithfulness constraints) - require the output to be similar to the input (ideally identical).
- E.g. IDENT(round) - corresponding input and output segments must have the same [round] specifications.


## Variation in inventory of vowel contrasts

- Conflict between constraints is resolved by reference to the constraint ranking: the higher-ranked constraint prevails.
- E.g. *[+low, +round] >> IDENT(round)

| $/ \mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{pt} /$ | *[+low,+round] | IDENT(round) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{dt}$ | *! |  |
| $\mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{at}$ |  | * |


|  | $\mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{at} /$ |  | $*[+$ low,+round $]$ |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| a | IDENT(round) |  |  |
|  | $\mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{pt}$ | $*!$ |  |
| b. | $\mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{at}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

- No contrast between [ p ] and [ a ]
- in general only [a] occurs.


## Variation in inventory of vowel contrasts

- In general, a feature is contrastive in a context if faithfulness to that feature outranks all markedness constraints against a value of that feature occurring in that context.
- E.g. rounding contrast among low vowels [a, p], as in RP English:
IDENT(round) >> *[+low, +round]

| /k $\mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{p} t /}$ | IDENT(round) | *[+low,+round] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ( $\mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{pt}$ |  | * |
| $\mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{at}$ | *! |  |


| $/ \mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{at} /$ | IDENT(round) | *[+low,+round] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{pt}$ | *! | * |
| $\leftrightarrow \mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{at}$ |  |  |

- No contrast between [p] and [a], only [a] occurs:
*[+low, +round] >> IDENT(round)


## Variation in inventory of vowel contrasts

- Identifying the constraints that regulate vowel inventories is an interesting (and hard) problem (e.g. Flemming 2004).
- For now, we will adopt simplistic markedness constraints:
- *[+low, +round] - *p, ce
- *[-high, -tense, +round] - * ${ }^{2}$, D
- Note we are using [tense] to distinguish [o] from [ 0 ] in spite of the conflict with the use of [-tense] to group the vowels that cannot occur word-finally in English.
- Constraint rankings for RP, Inland North and West?

Variation in the phonetic realization of equivalent

## vowels

- [a] vs. [a] in words like cot, Don, hot, lot, father
- [u] vs. [t] - e.g. Detroit AAVE vs. S. California
- [ov] vs. [əъ] - e.g. Detroit AAVE vs. SSBrE
- /ov/ 'fronting' is also a characteristic of the Philadelphia, Baltimore and some Southern accents.
- Phonological analysis?


## Variation in the distribution of contrasts

- In many Southern and African-American Vernacular English (AAVE) accents, the contrast between $/ \mathrm{I} /$ and $/ \varepsilon /$ is neutralized to [I] before nasals.
- 'pin-pen merger'

| pit | $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{It}$ | pin | $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{In}$ | him | him |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| pet | $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \varepsilon \mathrm{t}$ | pen | $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{In}$ | hem | him |
| Rick | IIk | many | 'mıni | length | link $\theta$ |
| wreck | $\mathrm{I} \varepsilon \mathrm{k}$ | mini | 'mıni |  |  |

## Pin-pen merger

- Geographical distribution of the pin-pen merger


Figure by MIT OpenCourseWare. Adapted from the Linguistics Laboratory of the University of Pennsylvania.

## Pin-pen merger

General recipe for phonological analysis of contextual neutralization:

- Context-sensitive markedness >> 'Faith' >> Context-free markedness
- A simplistic analysis of the pin-pen merger:
- *\&[+nasal] >> IDENT(high) >> * $\varepsilon$
- Contrast between $[\mathrm{I}, \varepsilon]$ before non-nasals:
a.

| $/ \mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{It} /$ | $* \varepsilon[+$ nasal $]$ | IDENT(high) | $* \varepsilon$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{It}$ |  |  | $*$ |
| $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \varepsilon \mathrm{t}$ |  | $*!$ |  |

a.

| $/ \mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \varepsilon \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{F}$ | $* \varepsilon[+\mathrm{naSal}]$ | IDENT(high) | $* \varepsilon$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{It}$ |  | $*!$ |  |
| $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \varepsilon \mathrm{t}$ |  |  | $*$ |

## Pin-pen merger

- A simplistic analysis of the pin-pen merger:
- *\&[+nasal] >> IDENT(high) >> * $\varepsilon$
- Neutralization of $[\mathrm{I}, \varepsilon]$ before nasals:
a.

| $/ \mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{In} /$ | $* \varepsilon[+$ nasal $]$ | IDENT(high) | $* \varepsilon$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{In}$ |  | $*$ | $*$ |
| $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \varepsilon \mathrm{n}$ | $*!$ |  | $*$ |

a.

| $/ \mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \varepsilon \mathrm{n} /$ | $* \varepsilon[+$ nasal $]$ | IDENT(high) | $* \varepsilon$ |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{In}$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \varepsilon \mathrm{n}$ | $*!$ | $*$ | $*$ |  |

## Patterns of distribution

- So far we have considered three patterns of distribution of a pair of sounds (or two sets of sounds):

1. Contrast in all (relevant) contexts

- e.g. RP [a] vs. [b]

2. Positional neutralization - the sounds contrast in some contexts, but only one appears in other contexts.

- e.g. pin-pen neutralization

3. No contrast in any context - only one sound appears.

- e.g. US [a], *[p]
- There is a variant of (3): No contrast, allophonic variation
- One sounds appears in one context, the other appears elsewhere.
- E.g. nasalized vowels before nasals, oral vowels elsewhere


## Allophonic variation

- Allophonic variation can be derived from the following ranking schema:
- Context-sensitive markedness >> Context-free markedness >> 'Faith'
- *ORALV-N >> *NASALV >> IDENT(nasal)
- Only nasalized vowels preceding a nasal consonant
a.

| $/ \mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \varepsilon \mathrm{n} /$ | *ORALV-N | *NASALV | IDENT(nasal) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \varepsilon \mathrm{n}$ | $*!$ |  |  |
| $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathrm{n}$ |  | $*$ | $*$ |

a.

| $/ \mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathrm{n} /$ | *ORALV-N | *NASALV | IDENT(nasal) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \varepsilon \mathrm{n}$ | $*!$ |  | $*$ |
| $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathrm{n}$ |  | $*$ |  |

## Allophonic variation

- Allophonic variation can be derived from the following ranking schema:
- Context-sensitive markedness >> Context-free markedness >> 'Faith'
- *ORALV-N >> *NASALV >> IDENT(nasal)
- Only oral vowels elsewhere
a.

| $/ \mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \varepsilon \mathrm{ct} /$ | *OR ALV-N | *NASALV | IDENT(nasal) |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \varepsilon \mathrm{\varepsilon}$ |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathrm{t}$ |  | $*!$ | $*$ |

a.

| $/ \mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \tilde{\mathrm{c}} \mathrm{t} /$ | *ORALV-N | *NASALV | IDENT(nasal) |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \varepsilon \mathrm{\varepsilon}$ |  |  | $*$ |
| $\mathrm{p}^{\mathrm{h}} \tilde{\varepsilon} \mathrm{t}$ |  | $*!$ |  |

## Patterns of distribution

- These four patterns of distribution follow can all be derived from the possible rankings of three types of constraints:
- Ident(F) >> MC-SEnsitive >> MC-Free $\mid$ Contrast in all contexts
- Ident(F) >> MC-Free >> MC-SENSITIVE
- MC-Free >> Ident(F) >> MC-SENSITIVE
- MC-FREE >> MC-SENSITIVE >> IdENT(F)
- MC-SENSITIVE >> MC-Free >> Ident(F)
- MC-SEnsitive >> Ident(F) >> MC-FReE

No contrast

- only one sound appears

No contrast, allophonic variation

Contextual neutralization
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