Working Papers 12 - 1975 Lund University

TEMPORAL ORGANIZATION AND PERCEPTION OF VOWEL-CONSONANT SEQUENCES IN CENTRAL BAVARIAN^{*}

Robert Bannert

The phonological description of Central Bavarian sound structure faces a central problem, namely the analysis of stressed vowel-consonant sequences, According to the literature these sequences are of two kinds: A long vowel is followed by a lenis, weak or short consonant, while a short vowel is followed by a fortis, strong or long consonant. The contrast between the two sequences is illustrated by a word pair like $[k\underline{e:gal}]$ (name of a hill) and $[k\underline{ekal}]$ (roast chicken).

Although no phonetic data are provided in the literature, the following four features are postulated as the one distinctive feature of both segments:

- Weak of strong accent ("schwach bzw. stark geschnittener Akzent", Pfalz 1913 following Sievers 1881).
- (2) Offglide ("Abglitt", Gladiator 1971 following Pilch 1964).
- (3) Force of articulation or intensity of the consonant (Koekkoek 1955, Keller 1961). This opposition is labelled Fortis-Lenis.
- (4) Length of the consonant (Kufner 1956).

I shall propose here that also the Central Bavarian vowel-consonant sequences represent a case of temporal organization of a vowel and the following consonant, which is called complementary length or mutual complementation of

* Paper presented at the Eighth International Congress of Phonetic Sciences, Leeds, August 17-23 1975 vowel and consonant (Lehiste 1970) and which is found in other germanic languages, too (e.g. Standard Central Swedish).

In view of the lack of phonetic measurements, I commenced an investigation of Central Bavarian vowel-consonant sequences on two levels of the speech communication process. Firstly, an acoustical analysis and description of the vowel and the consonant of such sequences was made. Secondly, the perception of minimally contrasting pairs was studied using natural stimuli in which several acoustical features of the vowel and the consonant were altered.

In this report I shall first give the durations of both segments and some conclusions I have drawn regarding the temporal organization of the sequences in two word pairs. I shall then give an account of the perception tests where vowel and consonant durations were altered.

Temporal organization of vowel-consonant sequences

Segment durations of vowels and consonants were measured in meaningful, bisyllabic words which consists of a /CVC/-root and the suffix /al/ denoting the diminutive. The two test pairs, the first of which shows the minimal contrast in the vowel-consonant sequences, are the following:

/<u>CVCal</u>/

 v:c
 VC

 [ke:gal] (name of a hill)
 [kekal] (roast chicken)

 [pi:bal] (chicken)
 [pupal] (little doll)

The initial consonant is a voiceless, non-aspirated stop, either /k/ or /p/. The manifestation of the postvocalic stop varies. Following a short vowel it is voiceless and nonaspirated. Following a long vowel, however, it may be a voiced stop or even a voiced fricative. This variation lies behind the phonological dispute.

The absolute durations of the segments were forced to vary considerably in order to study the temporal organization of

the vowel and the consonant under widely varying conditions. To achieve this, the test words were all placed in five different prosodic patterns. All were statements:

Е

N F emphatic

- (1) The testword produced
 alone:
- (2) The test word placed in a sentence:

Sm test word in medial position, answer to the question: "What have you seen?": /i hap s____ gseŋ/ (I have seen the ___).

neutral with normal tempo

neutral with fast tempo

S: test word in initial position, carries contrastive stress: /s_____ tat i meŋ/ (It's the I would like to have).

The data on segment durations reported here pertain to speaker 2. He is 45 years old, a carpenter by profession and lives in the village of Polling near Weilheim/Obb. (about 30 miles south of Munich). The measurements of the other two informants show a similar picture.

Figure 1 gives the segment durations of the vowels and the consonants of the four test words in the five prosodic patterns in msec. Not only the long and short vowels, but also the consonant following them show clear differences of duration. It is therefore justified to talk of long and short consonants in Central Bavarian.

If the absolute differences of duration between long and short vowels and consonants within the pairs are compared (Figure 2), it turns out that the difference of segment duration between the consonants in all the prosodic patterns is considerably larger than that between the long and short vowels. This may explain the findings on vowel ratios in Bavarian reported by Zwirner (1961) and therefore is likely to weaken one important point in the argumentation of Gladiator (1971). The proportion of each segment in the total duration of the vowel-consonant sequence may be expressed by calculating the vowel-to-sequence ratio $(V/(V+C) \times 100 \%, Figure 3)$. The relative segment duration within the sequences does not remain constant throughout the prosodic patterns, although its values appear to fall into two classes: It is higher in those patterns in which the test word is stressed particularly (given special prominence), it is lower in the cases of more neutral stress. The variation of the vowel-to-sequence ratio is similar to the variation of vowel duration, especially in the sequence /VC:/ (cf. Figure 1). This is because the absolute duration of the vowels.

The same temporal pattern has been found for corresponding Central Swedish vowel-consonant sequences (Bannert 1972), calculated on data given by Elert (1964).

Perception of vowel-consonant sequences

As the starting stimuli for the listening tests, one rendering each of the following four minimal pairs was used. The words were produced in isolation by speaker 1:

	$\underline{V:C}$	VC:	
$C_m = stop$	[fe:da] (feather)) [\$ et:a]	(male cousin)
	[ke:gal] (name of	a hill) [kek;al]	(roast chicken)
C _m =fricative	[o:fa] (stove) [vi:sn] (meadow)	[of:a] [vis:p]	(open)

The vowel-consonant sequences of the test words were manipulated manually (using tape cutting and splicing techniques) and electronically (by means of a segmentator). The main aim was to change the temporal relations between the two segments. The part of the tape containing the segment boundary between the vowel and the consonant was not touched. Ten listeners were asked to identify the stimuli either as the one or the other member of the four minimal pairs.

Here I shall give the identification scores of the listeners to three manipulations:

- (1) Shortening of the initial long vowel in [o:fa] (Figure 4).
- (2) Shortening of the long consonants (including the elimination of the explosion of both stops). The duration of stops was decreased by cutting out portions of the silent interval of occlusion (Figure 5).
- (3) Lengthening of the short stops in [fe:da] and [ke:gal]. The periodicity of the occlusion had been gated out previously.

All these changes of the duration of only one segment at a time led to the identification of a given vowel-consonant sequence as its counterpart (cf. Fliflet 1961, Heike 1969, Fischer-Jørgensen and Jørgensen 1969). This also happened when the relatively strong explosion of the considerably shortened, originally long stops was eliminated. This explosion may be considered part of the manifestation of the feature fortis.

If the results of the identification test are considered together with the temporal regularities observed in the vowel and the consonant, two things become evident:

- The auditive Fortis-Lenis contrast of the postvocalic consonant is always combined with clearly different durations of this segment (and the feature of voicing, cf. Bannert 1972, 1974, and forthcoming). This contrast is likely to be a consequence of the segment durations (cf. Ladefoged 1971).
- (2) Although the contact between the vowel and the consonant was retained unaltered, each kind of sequence could be turned into its respective counterpart. This total reversal of identification was obtained by varying segment duration alone and, as a consequence, the temporal relations between the vowel and the consonant.

Therefore, in consideration of these preliminary phonetic data it seems likely that the Central Bavarian vowelconsonant sequences in fact constitute a case of temporally distinctive organization of phonological segments. Hence the phonological analysis should take this fact in to account and handle the phenomenon of complementary length in Central Bavarian by applying the temporal distinctive feature of QUANTITY (cf. Lehiste 1970, Bannert 1973).

The phonological solution suggested here will lead to an analysis of the segmental phonological units (phonemes) of Central Bavarian, especially the stops, which differs from those hitherto found in the literature (Bannert forthcoming).

References

- Bannert R. 1972. Zur Stimmhaftigkeit und Quantität in einem bairischen Dialekt. Working Paper 6. Phonetics Laboratory, Lund University
- Bannert R. 1973. A binary treatment of the distinctive feature prosodic of quantity. Working Paper 9, 84-97. Phonetics Laboratory, Lund University
- Bannert R. 1974. The phonetic feature of voicing in the alveolar fricative of a Central Bavarian speaker. Mimeographed. Department of General Phonetics, Lund University
- Bannert R. Forthcoming. Quantität im Mittelbairischen. To appear in: Travaux de l'Institut de l'Linguistique du Lund. B. Malmberg and K. Hadding (eds). Lund
- Elert C.-C. 1964. Phonologic studies of quantity in Swedish. Uppsala
- Fliflet A.L. 1961. Einige Beobachtungen über Anschluss und Silbe. Proceedings of the 4th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences, 610-615
- Fischer-Jørgensen E. and H.P. Jørgensen. 1969. Close and loose contact ("Anschluss") with special reference to North German. Annual Report of the Institute of Phonetics 4, 43-80. University of Copenhagen
- Gladiator K. 1971. Untersuchungen zur Struktur der mittelbairischen Mundart von Grossberghofen. Münchner Studien zur Mundartforschung. H. Kuhn and I. Reiffenstein (eds). Munich

Heike G. 1969. Suprasegmentale Analyse. Marburger Beiträge zur Germanistik, Vol. 30. J. Kunz, E. Ruprecht and I.E. Schmitt (eds). Marburg

Keller R.E. 1961. German dialects. Manchester

- Koekkoek B.J. 1955. Zur Phonologie der Wiener Mundart. Beiträge zur deutschen Philologie, Vol. 6. W. Mitzka (ed). Giessen
- Kufner H. 1956. The dialect of the Freutsmoos area (Bavaria). Dissertation, Cornell
- Ladefoged P. 1971. Preliminaries to linguistic phonetics. Chicago
- Lehiste I. 1970. Suprasegmentals. Cambridge, Mass.
- Pfalz A. 1913. Die Mundart des Marchfeldes. Sitzungsberichte der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Phil.-hist. Klasse, Vol. 170, Part 6
- Pilch H. 1964. Phonemtheorie I. Teil. Bibliotheca Phonetica l. Basel and New York
- Sievers E. 1881. Grundzüge der Phonetik zur Einführung in das Studium der Lautlehre der indogermanischen Sprachen. Leipzig
- Zwirner E. 1961. Phonometrischer Beitrag zur Geographie der prosodischen Eigenschaften. Proceedings of the 4th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences, 500-518



gure 1. Durations of the vowels (left) and the consonants (right) in the four test words in msec. Prosodic patterns see text. $\begin{array}{c} & & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ & & & & & & \\ \end{array} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ \end{array} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ \end{array} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ \end{array} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ \end{array} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ \end{array} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ \end{array} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ \end{array} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ \end{array} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ \end{array} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ & & & & \\ \end{array} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \end{array} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ \end{array} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ \end{array} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ \end{array} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ \end{array} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ & & & & & \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \end{array} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \end{array} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \end{array} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & \\ \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \end{array} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \end{array} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \end{array} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \end{array} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \end{array} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \end{array} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \end{array} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & & \\ \end{array} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \end{array} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & \\ \\ \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \\ \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\ \\ \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} & & & & & & \\$



TIME

Figure 2.

Difference of durations (msec) between the long and the corresponding short segments of the two word pairs.



Figure 3. Vowel durations in relation to the duration of the entire vowel-consonant sequence, expressed by the vowel-to-sequence ratio in %.







