

University of Groningen

Laryngeal contrast and phonetic voicing

Jansen, Wouter

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2004

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Jansen, W. (2004). *Laryngeal contrast and phonetic voicing: A laboratory phonology approach to English, Hungarian, and Dutch*. [Thesis fully internal (DIV), University of Groningen]. s.n.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

Laryngeal Contrast and Phonetic Voicing: A
Laboratory Phonology Approach to English,
Hungarian, and Dutch

Wouter Jansen

The work in this thesis was supported by grants from the Behavioral and Cognitive Neurosciences (BCN) research school Groningen, the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO; grant number 200-50-068), and the European Union's Training and Mobility of Researchers (TMR) programme through the Learning Computational Grammars (LCG) project (grant ERBFM-RXCT980237, principal investigator: John Nerbonne)

Copyright © 2004 by Wouter Jansen
Document prepared with L^AT_EX 2_ε and typeset by pdfT_EX
Printed by PrintPartners Ipskamp Enschede



Groningen Dissertations in Linguistics 47
ISSN 0928-0030

RIJKSUNIVERSITEIT GRONINGEN

Laryngeal Contrast and Phonetic Voicing: A Laboratory
Phonology Approach to English, Hungarian, and Dutch

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van het doctoraat in de
Letteren
aan de Rijksuniversiteit Groningen
op gezag van de
Rector Magnificus, dr. F. Zwarts,
in het openbaar te verdedigen op
donderdag 27 mei 2004
om 13.15 uur

door

Wouter Jansen

geboren op 26 januari 1973
te Zuidhorn

Promotor : Prof. dr. ir. J. Nerbonne

Copromotor : Dr. D.G. Gilbers

Beoordelingscommissie : Prof. dr. C. Gussenhoven
Prof. dr. J. Hoeksema
Prof. dr. V. van Heuven

Preface

The work presented in this dissertation has greatly benefited from the generosity and patience of a number of people, and I am pleased to be able to repay some of my debt to them, finally.

First, much of the work presented here was supported financially by NWO (Gebied Geesteswetenschappen), in the form of grant 200-50-068. This grant, and the travel grant from NWO that allowed me to spend nearly six weeks at Ohio State University during the summer of 2000, are gratefully acknowledged. Two further sources of financial and infrastructural support should be acknowledged here, and with the same gratitude. First, the first four months of my PhD project were funded by a grant from the BCN graduate school of the University of Groningen. Second, towards the end of the project I was able to further develop and broaden my work at the Department of Linguistics of the University of Tübingen through generous financial support from the *Learning Computational Grammars* (LCG) project, which was funded by the European Union's *Training and Mobility of Researchers* (TMR) programme (grant ERBFMRXCT980237, principal investigator: John Nerbonne).

Next, I would like to thank my supervisors, Dicky Gilbers and John Nerbonne for helping me start a PhD project back in 1997, for encouragement, feedback, support in many practical matters, and above all for great amounts of patience in the face of ever-shifting topics and a major disappearing act. Thanks are also due to the members of my committee, Carlos Gussenhoven, Jack Hoeksema, and Vincent van Heuven, for their comments on the original manuscript. Thanks, furthermore, to Ilse van Gemert for all her help in getting this document printed.

None of the experimental part of this book would have been realised without the help of the volunteer subjects who took part in my experiments; I owe them many thanks for their time and effort.

Moreover, I am indebted to the following people for helpful feedback on parts of the work presented below as well as on my thinking on the subject matter in a more general way. They are listed here not in order of importance, nor alphabetically, but in a quasi-chronological order: John Harris, Moira Yip and the other members of the London phonology reading group;

Sue Barry, Stefan Ploch, Peter Sherwood, Mária Gósy, Péter Siptár, Miklós Törkenczy, Szilárd Szentgyörgyi, Sylvia Blaho, Catherine Ringen, Jim Scobbie, Patrick Honeybone, Wiebke Brockhaus, Heinz Giegerich. I am especially grateful to Gert Heise at Groningen and Bernard Howard at the School of Oriental and African Studies in London for their technical support during the recording of the speech material discussed in chapters 2, 4, and in particular 5, 6 and 7.

I've been very lucky over the years to work alongside, and sometimes even with, a number of people whose academic specialisms are different from my own to a greater or lesser extent, but whose views, tastes, and passions –and working hours of course– made me feel at home in academia more than anywhere else. I'll single out Ivelin Stoianov and Stasinou Konstantopoulos (formerly) at Groningen, as well as Michelle Gregory, Jason Brenier, Katja Jasinskaja, and Stefan Benus.

Many thanks to my other friends and my family, Nynke, Flip, Inge, Etienne, Maarten, Richard, Margaret, Kate, Al, for moral and financial support, for kindness, good humour, welcome distractions and more generosity in many other respects than would fit these pages. And I mean this to include well-timed supplies of fresh socks, and evil red-eyed bears, by the way.

Finally, and most importantly, thank you Zoë, for your unwavering support, encouragement, and help in every possible respect with the completion of this book. Far above all else, thank you for walking down Wilmslow Road with me that day in Manchester, and for everything that has come of it.

Dublin, 13th May 2004

Contents

Preface	v
Contents	vii
List of Tables	xi
List of Figures	xiii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Synopsis	2
1.2 Notes on transcription	5
1.3 The descriptive framework	6
1.3.1 Linguistic and extralinguistic speech processing	6
1.3.2 Phonology and phonetics	8
1.3.3 Phonetic rules and representations	10
1.3.4 Hypoarticulation and prosody	14
1.3.5 Absent targets: phonetic underspecification	16
1.4 Formalism vs. functionalism	18
1.4.1 Radical formalism	19
1.4.2 Synchronic functionalism	21
1.4.3 Diachronic functionalism	24
1.4.4 The emergence of structure	26
1.4.5 Perceptibility	28
1.5 Conclusion: the phonetics-phonology interface revisited	30
2 The phonetics of the fortis-lenis contrast	35
2.1 The production of voicing in obstruents	36
2.2 Plosives	41
2.2.1 Voicing targets for (utterance-)initial fortis and lenis plosives	41
2.2.2 Positional variation in stop voicing: word-medial and word-final contexts	44

2.2.3	Other correlates of [tense] in plosives	51
2.3	Fricatives and affricates	55
2.3.1	Voicing targets for tense and lax fricatives	55
2.3.2	Other features of tense and lax fricatives	57
2.3.3	A note on tense vs. lax in affricates	58
2.4	Summary and remaining issues	60
3	Laryngeal neutralisation	63
3.1	Theories of (final) laryngeal neutralisation	65
3.1.1	The nature of neutralisation processes	66
3.1.2	Syllable-driven approaches to laryngeal neutralisation	67
3.1.3	Cue-based approaches to laryngeal neutralisation	69
3.2	The phonetics of laryngeal neutralisation	71
3.2.1	Laryngeal neutralisation as phonetic underspecification	71
3.2.2	Incomplete laryngeal neutralisation and its implications	74
3.3	Obstruent feature asymmetries: voicing vs. aspirating languages	78
3.4	Obstruent feature asymmetries: plosives vs. fricatives	79
3.5	Context asymmetries: right and left-adjacent sounds	84
3.6	The word-initial vs. word-final asymmetry	90
3.7	Summary and remaining issues	95
4	Voicing assimilation	99
4.1	Modelling voicing assimilation	101
4.1.1	Phonological analyses of voicing assimilation	103
4.1.2	Articulation-driven voicing assimilation	107
4.2	Voicing assimilation in morphological paradigms	112
4.3	Progressive devoicing at word boundaries	114
4.4	Regressive voicing assimilation at word boundaries	116
4.5	Summary	120
5	Experiment 1: regressive voicing assimilation in English	121
5.1	Predictions	122
5.2	Previous descriptions of the phonetics of English obstruent clusters	123
5.3	Methods	127
5.4	Results	131
5.4.1	Phonetic features of C ₂	131
5.4.2	Phonetic features of C ₁ in the baseline environment	133
5.4.3	C ₁ voicing in obstruent clusters	134
5.4.4	Segmental duration and obstruent clusters	137
5.4.5	F ₀ and F ₁ preceding obstruent clusters	139
5.5	General discussion and conclusions	141

6	Experiment 2: regressive voicing assimilation in Hungarian	143
6.1	Background	145
6.2	The Experiment	147
6.2.1	Methods	147
6.3	Results	151
6.3.1	Phonetic features of C_2	151
6.3.2	Voicing of C_1	153
6.3.3	Duration of C_1	156
6.3.4	Duration of preceding vowels	160
6.4	General discussion and conclusions	163
7	Experiment 3: voicing assimilation in Dutch three-term clusters	165
7.1	Predictions	166
7.1.1	Predictions of the ‘standard’ analysis	167
7.1.2	Predictions of the phonetic theory	170
7.1.3	Observations on assimilation in three-term obstruent clusters	172
7.2	Methods	172
7.2.1	Main results	176
7.2.2	Reading task effects	184
7.3	Conclusions	191
8	Formalist models of laryngeal neutralisation and voicing assimilation	195
8.1	Binary and unary features	198
8.2	[tense]-based models	200
8.2.1	Phonetic interpretation of fortis and lenis obstruents	202
8.2.2	Modelling regressive voicing assimilation in [tense]-based models	203
8.2.3	Laryngeal neutralisation	207
8.2.4	Postobstruent devoicing and the Germanic past tense paradigm	208
8.2.5	Excursus: Lombardi’s (1999) OT model and privativity in Optimality Theory	211
8.3	VOT-based models	215
8.3.1	Phonetic interpretation of fortis and lenis obstruents	217
8.3.2	Regressive voicing assimilation in VOT-based models	218
8.3.3	Laryngeal neutralisation	221
8.3.4	Progressive devoicing and the Germanic past tense paradigm	224
8.4	Between discrete and continuous representations	227
8.4.1	A refined autosegmental model	228

8.4.2	Advantages of the refined model	232
8.4.3	Problems with the refined model	235
8.5	Conclusions	239
9	Summary, conclusions, remaining issues	241
A	Stimuli and supplementary data for experiment 1	247
A.1	Stimuli	247
A.2	Supplementary data	249
B	Stimuli and supplementary data for experiment 2	251
B.1	Stimuli	251
B.2	Supplementary data	255
C	Stimuli and supplementary data for experiment 3	257
C.1	Stimuli	257
C.2	Supplementary data	260
	Bibliography	261
	Nederlandse samenvatting	281

List of Tables

5.1	N. Thorsen's (1971) data on voicing in English /t/ and /d/	126
5.2	Acoustic measurements and derived measures for experiment 1 .	130
5.3	Experiment 1: voicing and duration of C ₂	131
5.4	Experiment 1: F ₁ preceding obstruent clusters	140
6.1	Acoustic measurements and derived measures for Experiment 2	150
6.2	Experiment 2: voicing and duration of C ₂	152
7.1	Acoustic measurements and derived measures for experiment 3 .	176
7.2	Experiment 3: voicing and duration of C ₃ plosives	177
7.3	Experiment 3: results of post hoc tests for C ₁ + C ₂ voicing and segmental duration	180
7.4	Experiment 3: F ₁ values before C ₁	184
7.5	Experiment 3: global phonetic effects of reading task	186
7.6	Experiment 3: effects of reading task on C ₁ + C ₂ voicing ratio .	191
A.1	Experiment 1: C ₁ voicing	249
A.2	Experiment 1: segmental duration	249
B.1	Experiment 2: plosive C ₁ voicing	255
B.2	Experiment 2: plosive C ₁ duration	255
B.3	Experiment 2: fricative C ₁ voicing and duration	256
B.4	Experiment 2: V ₁ duration	256
C.1	Experiment 3: voicing of C ₁ and C ₂	260
C.2	Experiment 3: duration of C ₁ , C ₂ and V ₁ duration	260

List of Figures

1.1	The hyperspace effect	12
1.2	Model of speech production and perception	31
2.1	Broad band spectrogram and EGG trace of a Dutch apical trill	38
2.2	Broad band spectrograms and EGG traces of medial labial stops in English and Dutch	47
2.3	Broad band spectrograms and EGG traces of English word-initial affricates	59
3.1	The Laryngeal Constraint	68
4.1	An autosegmental analysis of voicing assimilation and its phonetic manifestations	104
4.2	Progressive devoicing in English	115
5.1	Experiment 1: sample spectrogram of an English /gz/ cluster	129
5.2	Experiment 1: F_0 after C_2	132
5.3	Experiment 1: F_1 before $C_1 + /r/$	134
5.4	Experiment 1: C_1 voicing across C_2 contexts	136
5.5	Experiment 1: V_1 duration across C_2 contexts	138
5.6	Experiment 1: C_1 duration across C_2 contexts	140
6.1	Experiment 2: pitch contour of responses	149
6.2	Experiment 2: F_0 after C_2	152
6.3	Experiment 2: voicing of /k/ and /g/ across C_2 contexts	154
6.4	Experiment 2: voicing of /f/ and /ʒ/ across C_2 contexts	155
6.5	Experiment 2: duration of /k/ and /g/ across C_2 contexts	156
6.6	Experiment 2: scatter plot of C_1 voicing against C_1 closure duration	158
6.7	Experiment 2: duration of /f/ and /ʒ/ across C_2 contexts	160
6.8	Experiment 2: V_1 duration before /k/ and /g/ across C_2 contexts	162
6.9	Experiment 2: V_1 duration before /f/ and /ʒ/ across C_2 contexts	163

7.1	Experiment 3: sample segmentation of glottal stop preceded by /ps/	175
7.2	Experiment 3: F_0 after C_3	177
7.3	Experiment 3: voicing and duration of $C_1 + C_2$	179
7.4	Experiment 3: frequencies of ‘devoiced’, ‘neutral’, and ‘voiced’ /ps/ clusters	182
7.5	Experiment 3: V_1 duration	183
7.6	Experiment 3: effects of reading task on VOT in C_3 plosives	188
7.7	Experiment 3: scatter plot of $C_1 + C_2$ voicing duration against $C_1 + C_2 + C_3$ duration	189
8.1	Binary rules in monovalent models	200
8.2	Representation of laryngeal contrast in tense-based models	201
8.3	Regressive assimilation according to Lombardi (1994, 1995a)	204
8.4	Laryngeal feature configuration for fortis + lenis obstruent clusters in privative tense-based models	209
8.5	Representation of the fortis-lenis contrast in plosives according to Harris (1994)	216
8.6	Representation of fortis and lenis fricatives in VOT-based models	218
8.7	RVA in aspirating systems according to VOT-based models	220
8.8	Final neutralisation as fortition in aspirating and voicing languages, according to a VOT-based model	222
8.9	Final neutralisation as delinking in aspirating and voicing languages, according to a VOT-based model	224
8.10	Progressive devoicing and the Germanic past tense paradigm in VOT-based models	225
8.11	VOT-based analysis of past tense forms of lenis-final stems in voicing languages	226
8.12	Refined autosegmental representations for fortis and lenis plosives	230
8.13	Regressive voicing assimilation in the refined autosegmental model	233
8.14	The ‘Germanic’ past tense paradigm in the refined autosegmental model	234
8.15	Prosodic representation of durational cues to the fortis-lenis distinction	237