

Pačesová, Jaroslava

[Kloster Jensen, Martin. Tonemicity]

Sborník prací Filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity. A, Řada jazykovědná.
1962, vol. 11, iss. A10, pp. 226-229

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/100187>

Access Date: 01. 03. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

Tichý umožňuje posluchačům kursu rychlé pokroky promyšleným postupem, jakož i jasností a srozumitelností svých výkladů.

K přednostem příručky patří poměrně značný počet konverzačně použitelných vět a pestrost i účelnost cvičení, vhodné doplněných dobrým klíčem, který se prakticky omezuje jen na to, v čem by studující mohl chybovat. Upozorňujeme, že na str. 177 jde v lekci 3. o cvičení 4. (nikoliv 3.) a že k 15. lekci by měl být v klíči též 6. oddíl.

Uvedeme nyní několik připomínek, které mohou autorovi prospět při eventuálním 2. vydání. Co se týká výslovnosti, nemělo by se mluvit na straně 13 o e uprostřed slabiky, nýbrž o e v slabice zavřené, popřípadě o e v slabice zakončené souhláskou (mezi příklady je *elle*). Popis výslovnosti není vždy dosti přesný, zvláště pokud jde o „polonémé e“ (str. 13) a r (str. 16). Také se mi nezdá dost vhodné nadvíčovati otevřené o s úsměvem a zavřené o „jako když se chceme zlobit“ (20). Od přízvuku je třeba odlišovat intonaci.

Co se týká jinak užitečného přehledu pravopisu a výslovnosti, bylo by třeba užívat častěji slůvka „zpravidla“, neboť např. *ay* (24) se vyslovuje také *è* (*Epervay* aj.), *o* (28) může být zavřené i uprostřed slova (*rose* atd.), koncové *-s* (29) se někdy čte (*filis, hélas* apod.), koncové *x* (30) rovněž, a to buď *ks* (*codex, larynx...*) nebo *s* (*six, dix*).

Femininum *longue* bych neuváděl jako nepravidelnost, ale vysvětlil důvod grafiky (56).

Normální místo příslovečného určení není na začátku věty (59), ale na jejím konci, i když bývá na začátku velmi často (někdy též uprostřed).

Pokud jde o tvoření imperativu, uvedl bych již na str. 63 to, co se dodatečně uvádí až na str. 65 (-s).

Předložka *de* se substantivem bez členu nevyjadřuje zápor naprostý (79), nýbrž jen prostý. K úplnému popření užíváme *pas un* (*Il n'a pas un sou*).

V hovorové mluvě je běžné *style*, ne *stylographe*.

Na str. 97 by bylo vhodné uvést, že pomocným slovesem *être* tvoří složené časy zejména slovesa označující příchod nebo odchod, a to jak ve vlastním, tak i v přeneseném slova smyslu.

V 10. a zvláště v 25. lekci je nahromaděno příliš mnoho nepravidelných sloves. Z lekce 25 by bylo možno je rozdělit do 25–30. Obdobné rozdělení by v těchto lekcích bylo možno provést i s mluvnickou látkou a konverzačními větami.

Nedosti vhodná se mi zdá francouzská věta „... pour se baigner dans la nature, c'est-à-dire dans l'eau“ (47) a česká věta „... z jejich jazyka se uchovalo... jen několik zbytků“ (7).

Pokud jde o terminologii, dal bych přednost termínu „temné“ e (naznačuje akustický vjem) před termínem „polonémé“ a na straně 24 bych *-ne* označil jako konec slova a ne jako koncovku.

Uvedené připomínky nechtějí nikterak snižovat záslušnost recenzovaného kursu a příručky, nýbrž mají přispět k jejich dalšímu zdokonalení.

Závěrem je třeba konstatovat, že jde o dílo velmi užitečné, pro jazykovou výuku významné a pro samouky, kteří se chtějí naučit francouzsky i aktivně, nepostradatelné.

Otto Ducháček

Martin Kloster Jensen: Tonemicity. Norwegian University Press, Bergen—Oslo, 1961. Pp. 197. tables 19, diagrams 11, maps 5.

In his newly published book the author offers a technique for determining the phonemic status of suprasegmental patterns in pairs of lexical units, applied to a group of West-Norwegian dialects and to Faroese. The diversity of the phonetic phenomena in which Scandinavian tonemes manifest themselves calls for a neat distinction between a physical and functional approach to the problem of tonemic contrast. The phenomenon of neutralization, though perfectly recognized, has been so far described in terms of phonetic sameness without regard to phonemic value. The same may be said about the accentology in Swedish dialects, where the lack of one of the accents may be an example of erroneous interpretation of tonemes. The present study is a discussion of a method of determining the existence of phonemically contrastive suprasegmental features. The method is based on the possibility of commutation between certain phonetically undefined patterns superimposed on the segmental sequence. The suprasegmental patterns are left unqualified. It does not mean, however, that the author establishes phonemic pitch contrast and not, for example, distinction of stress. Though a suprasegmental difference is found to be phonemic it is still a matter of debate whether the difference lies in modulation of pitch and not of stress.

The problem of distinctive tone is so deeply rooted in both phonetics and phonemics and these two aspects are in their turn so completely interwoven that it does not seem possible — in the author's view — to single out two modes of approach. As phonetics seems to imply phonemics more than vice versa, the author proceeds from the purely phonemic to the phonetic analysis, ending up with a survey of the discussions on the physical correlate to tonemes.

The author refers to distinctive suprasegmental features including pitch patterns as tonemes;

the function of such features is termed tonemic, the existence of the function is spoken of as tonemicity.

In the first chapter we are introduced by the author to the problematics of the tonemicity in Scandinavian dialects. Most of them are tonemic in the sense that patterns including pitch modulation occur in lexical or — in the author's terminology — word-differentiating contrast ('løse "loose" x'løse "to read"). There are, however, also cases, where the contrastive function of tonemes is grammatical (word-form differentiating) e. g. 'daw "day" x'daw "days." Shift of tonemes is thus capable of distinguishing both lexical and grammatical units. The recognition of tonemicity in Swedish is on record since 1737 and is closely connected with such names as Høysgaard and Andersen. The development of the tonemic contrast as well as of the stød distinction is, however, still a matter of debate. The author offers a thorough account of the various theories of the origin of tonemicity (Kock, Oftedal, Rhedin, O. von Essen, Kuryłowicz, Jespersen, Ekblom, Sweet, Pedersen). Another problem the author tries to solve is the question of the number of tonemes in Scandinavian. Unlike some other scholars (Christiansen, Levander, Meyer) he comes to the conclusion that tonemicity in Scandinavian rests on only two terms of opposition so that a survey of tonemes need only consider one type of minimal pairs: accent 1 × accent 2.

Though tonemes are generally considered as "word accent", they occur in solidarity with primary stress and increase their segmental span as the number of stressed syllables is reduced in fluent speech, for which reason they may as well be considered as typical of stress groups, without of course therefore belonging to the intonational system and no longer characterizing the word form as such. The function of intonation is left outside the scope of this study. Due attention is paid to the problem whether accent 1 should be considered "unmarked" (merkmalos) contrasted thus to the accent 2 as "marked" (merkmaltraged). The importance of this question for the establishment of tonemic contrast is expressed by the author as follows: if the opposition can be considered privative (merkmaltraged × merkmalos) then further support has been found for the assumption that the tonemic contrast rests on only two terms of opposition. The adoption of the view that accent 1 is "unmarked" solves the problem of the phonemic status of the suprasegmental features of monosyllables as having accent 1 without speaking either of neutralization or of "Funktionlosigkeit". It has not been shown that the unstressed syllable gives any indication of a toneme realization, either by itself or in relation to the stressed syllable. The author deals with the relation of toneme realization to sentence intonation and in spite of the fact that the structure of intonation has been insufficiently described, he stresses the point that Scandinavian dialects have an intonational system in coexistence with tonemicity, mentioning three important aspects of interaction between toneme realization and sentence melody. They are as follows: 1. word tones influencing sentence intonation, 2. sentence intonation influencing word tones, 3. realization of tonemes in emphasis.

The functional load of tonemes cannot—in the author's view—be quantified at the present state of research. Even a workable definition of the term functional load seems to be lacking. What can be done at this point in toneme statistics for text occurrence in Norwegian, is to find the ratio between toneme 1 and toneme 2 realizations, secondly, to decide the average segmental span of tonemes by counting segmental phones under each accent realization, and thirdly, to structuralize the arrangement in sequence of the realizations of tonemes. The author's results speak for the fact that toneme 1 is slightly more frequent than toneme 2 in a certain type of Norwegian running text. When distributing tonemes, the author points out a certain degree of dialectal variation in lexical material. Accent 1 in some informants may be less marked or even completely loses its character. This phenomenon, however, does not result in homonyms, because in such cases compensations in the vowel length and quality may be found. It is illustrated by an example in the Hordaland dialect where "faret" (the trace) and "fare" (pret. of fara—to go) have a difference in the vocoids a which in the absence of tonemic contrast becomes distinctive (is phonologized). The same holds good for the older stages of language (lengthening in Old Norse as compensation for the disappearance of any accentual difference).

To conclude the first chapter the author turns to some primarily phonetic aspects of tonemes. The object is to show the relationship and the inseparability of the perceptual qualities—stress, tonal pattern and length: 1. syllables with primary stress are long and carry a tonemic manifestation. A matter of debate is the monosyllable where no toneme commutation is possible. 2. Syllables with secondary stress are doubtful as to the length and do not carry a toneme manifestation. 3. Syllables with "no stress" are short and do not carry a toneme manifestation. The role of stress and length as concomitant features to the distinctive tonal pattern, though widely discussed, remains unsolved even in the present study.

In chapter two the author deals with the question of which of the North Germanic dialects classified under Icelandic, Faroese, Danish, Swedish and Norwegian have no tonemic (respectively

stød) contrast. The reports on tonemic merging have been treated rather insufficiently and are mostly made on the basis of direct listening, in many cases by phoneticians who are not native speakers of the dialect in question. More cautious judgements are given by representatives of experimental phonetics. Their research, however, produced no decision as to phonemic value, helping thus only as a means to illustrate non-tonemicity. The author's opinion on the origin and stages in the process of tonemic merging is the following: some previously tonemic word pairs seem to have resisted merging more successfully than others. The merging of tonemes did not take place simultaneously in all grammatical categories and with all speakers. Some speakers are more apt in the end to give up the distinction completely than other speakers according to their being "musical". The effect of tonemic merging means not only a great increase of homonyms or sometimes a phonologization of concomitant features. Another consequence of the abolishment of tonemic contrast is the failure to keep apart word forms which formerly contrasted also in segmental structure but which by analogy acquire the same form, because some related forms sound identical.

In determining the phonemic status of suprasegmental features two methods have been used so far:

Method A—direct observation by ear and method B—instrumental approach. Both of them, in the author's view, involve serious shortcomings. As the physical correlates to tonemes in a dialect are often hard to grasp for a non-native speaker, it cannot be considered a proper method to go by ear in deciding whether or not a dialect is tonemic (method A). The instrumental approach to the question of tonemicity, namely the method of determining from pitch (and stress) curves whether a certain dialect has relevant suprasegmental patterns for the realizations of tonemes (method B) is also found inappropriate, for the reason that it does not allow of interpretation of sound features as perceived by the ear.

As may be seen from the preceding, the ideal method for establishing tonemic contrast is neither that of direct listening to the subjects' realizations of patterns which may or may not be correlates to tonemes, nor that of comparing pitch curves as recorded by means of mechanical devices. That is why the author applies a third method (C) by which the subject is given the choice between two items as pronounced by himself and recorded for subsequent playback and which will permit, or induce, tonemic subjects to make a "positive" recognition score and prevent non-tonemic subjects from making other than a "negative" score.

Chapter III deals with the description and the discussion of a technique for determining the phonemic status of suprasegmental patterns. The reader will find no pictorial display of the physical correlates to toneme realizations. Pitch curves and recordings have not been the material of the author's investigation. They have been mentioned only in so far as they can explain and justify his choice of method. All tape recordings, about 140,000 items from nearly 700 subjects are still in existence and will allow of future studies of pitch, stress and length patterns in the various dialects here investigated.

The leading principle of the method applied in the present study is to test the subjects for identification of paired test words as spoken by themselves and subsequently listened to from a sound tape. There were two reasons for the author's adopting the pair test in his investigation, first, that the presentation in pairs is the safest and easiest opening if naive subjects are used as informants, secondly, that toneme realizations are influenced by differences in vowels and consonants so that the segmental structure of the paired word forms used for testing should be kept identical, leaving to suprasegmental features the possibility of completely unpredictable shifting. This will help to exclude from substitution anything but distinctive features.

By way of accounting for his choice of method the author describes various ways of establishing phonemic contrast. He is aware of the limitations as to the applicability of his method. By using a set of pairs it is possible to elicit responses as to the sameness and nonsameness in the expression plane of word forms, but it is hardly possible to know what is the nature of any such non-sameness. It cannot be concluded that the non-sameness is tonemic and not segmentally phonemic, since the assignment of the difference to segmental or suprasegmental qualities is a matter of evaluation and convenience and sometimes of taste. Another limitation in the usefulness is the phenomenon which the author calls "systematic guessing". Some of his subjects showed a very marked tendency to give the same accent indication for both pair members without making any attempt to interpret the item heard.

In compiling the test material, the author found the dissyllables most suitable. Dissyllabic forms are both far more numerous than tri- or quadrisyllabic, and they belong to everyday speech in a much higher degree than tri- or quadrisyllabic forms. A set of test words must of course contain more than one pair, and six paired test words have been found a most convenient set. The choice of test words has to some extent depend on phonetic characteristics of the sound chain, e. g. vowel quality and length within the pairs, on equalness of frequency in use and of

emotional content. Due attention is paid also to the rythmical arrangement of the context. When choosing the subjects, the author tried always to pick out typical representatives of one and only one dialect. He preferred young people to old, as the former were more willing to act as subjects, were capable of concentrating to a high degree and were more fit for the testing procedure chosen. After the recording was finished, the recognition test took place. Before starting this, however, the subjects were given opportunity to learn how their voices sounded, in playback. The best way to indicate the recognition of an item or a guess at a toneme was found to be a reference to the number of the test utterance in which the item belongs. Formulae for computation of the degree of identification (total score and part score) were developed. The chapter is concluded by giving a general survey of the results obtained in the testing procedure, giving extracts, in tabular form, of all the test sheets with explanatory notes.

In order to reveal possibly existing flaws in the method itself, various tests and checks were performed, of which the author gives an account in chapter IV. A simplified procedure of testing was followed to verify the allegation that speakers of the Bergen dialect have a very marked sense of tonemic contrast. The author was interested in seeing whether the method of pair testing would result in a 50% identification score for homonyms in another language. (American English, Norwegian and Icelandic). The test words had been picked out by the subjects as homonyms in pairs. The near 50% identification score is considered by the author to be a support for the method he has used for establishing phonemic contrasts.

Repeated testing was undertaken chiefly in order to determine whether the identification score could be improved with an increasing number of listenings. Also the technique of re-testing subjects with the test tape of another subject (cross-testing) was applied with a view to ascertaining of the extent to which the identification score would remain the same if the subject listened to a voice other than his own. No advantage was obtained from having a different person listened to the tape, as the results varied. In order to have an idea of the reliability of the individual scores the author performed some control calculation of the answers in each of the four listenings. It was thereby possible to see if an improvement of identification had taken place with increasing experience in listening. It turned out that in the case of low scores the identification was no better in the fourth than in the first listening, while for subjects with some degree of recognition ability the average curve indicated better identification from the first through the fourth listening. In the countings a distinction was made between subjects whose parents were both natives of the locality represented and those whose parents were not natives in this sense. No significant difference has been found between male and female subjects as to the tonemicity in general, though some of the female subjects made better scores.

In the last chapter we find the evaluation of the results. The author offers his report of how the completed test sheets have been utilized. The basis for an opinion as to the tonemicity in a tested person is defined. A comparison between the scores obtained for the subjects and the theoretical distribution of scores shows a high degree of conformity in the cases of clear tonemicity and absolute non-tonemicity. The scorers between 65% and 85% form—in the author's view—an independent group, characterized by an intermediary degree of tonemicity. The concept of "degrees of relevance" is discussed. An attempt is made to show that a suprasegmental contrast may have a status intermediary to phonemic and subphonemic.

To conclude his exhaustive study the author suggests that the use of his method is not restricted to segmental features but can probably be extended to any investigation on phonemic status or neutralization (e. g. *stød* and no *stød* distinction). By using this method it seems possible to find out to what extent subphonemic differences are recognizable at any stage of phonetic training. It would certainly be worth while to apply it with other linguistic problems. It also has practical implications (phonetic observation in learning foreign languages). First and foremost, however, the method is meant as an immanent approach to the problem of deciding to what extent the tonemic system exists in various parts of the Scandinavian speaking area. The relatively easy application of the method to Faroese, and the unambiguous results obtained, give promise for investigation in other places as well.

Jaroslava Pačesová

