

JOSEF VACHEK

PHONEMIC REMARKS ON THE "LONG MIXED VOWEL"  
OF MODERN ENGLISH

In one of our earlier papers<sup>1</sup> we discussed the problem of the phonemic value of ModE [ə]. We arrived at the conclusion that the ModE 'short mixed vowel' cannot be denied independent phonemic status but that the /ə/-phoneme, whose occurrence is virtually confined to unstressed syllables (the only instances of /ə/ in stressed syllables being those found in the centring diphthongs), begins to loom as a kind of systemic anomaly (l. c., p. 86).

In the present paper we would like to take up the problem of the phonemic value of what the phoneticians regard as the long counterpart of [ə], viz. [ɜ:]. One might be tempted to class [ə] with [ɜ:] as its allophone in view of the fact that the positions of occurrence of the two sounds are mutually exclusive, the former of the two being found only in unstressed, the latter only in the stressed syllables.<sup>2</sup> This solution of the problem, however, does not appear feasible, as it would be completely isolated in the system of ModE vocalic phonemes where the 'short' (more exactly, checked) and the corresponding 'long' (more exactly, free) vowels regularly implement separate phonemes each. As, moreover, some evidence can be detected in the Southern British standard of ModE (to be further abbreviated as SB) to the effect that [ə] tends to be phonemically merged with [ʌ],<sup>3</sup> it appears that [ə] and [ɜ:] will have to be treated as implementations of separate phonemic entities,<sup>4</sup> in other words, that the problem of the phonemic value of [ɜ:] will have to be tackled independently from that of [ə]. (Oddly enough, the problem of the phonemic interpretation of [ɜ:] has, by now, escaped the attention of the phonemic analysis of ModE.)

First of all, it will be useful to restate our earlier evaluation of the general phonemic situation in the system of ModE stressed vowels. In some of our papers<sup>5</sup> we schematized it as follows:

/ɪ/	/ʊ/	/i:/	/ɔ:/	/u:/
/ɛ/	/ɔ/	/eɪ/	/ɔ:/	/oʊ/
/æ/	/ʌ/	/aɪ/	/ɑ:/	/aʊ/

(+ /ɔɪ/ outside the system)

The so-called centring diphthongs are not entered in the scheme, as they clearly implement biphonemic groups, viz. /ɪə/, /ʊə/, /ɛə/ (or, possibly, /æə/).<sup>6</sup>

A glance at the above scheme reveals that the members of the central column of the sub-group of the 'long' vowel phonemes differ from the rest of the phonemes of that sub-group by their purely monophthongal implementation, since all other members of that sub-group are more or less regularly implemented by diphthongs. Moreover, not all the members of the central column can be more or less safely assigned to some of the 'short' vowel phonemes as their correlative partners. The only safe pair appears to be /ɔ/ — /ɔ:/. The checked /æ/, in view of its palatal quality, should be correlated rather to /aɪ/ than to /ɑ:/, while /ʌ/ is probably a partner of /aʊ/ (though some arguments might be adduced in favour of the correlative relation

of / $\Delta$ / — / $a:$ /). The most difficult problem, however, appears to be connected exactly with establishing the correlative partner of / $\text{ə}:$ /.

It has already been noted above that the short [ $\text{ə}$ ]-vowel, which in itself presents some difficult phonemic problems, cannot be correlated to [ $\text{ə}:$ ]. As the occurrence of the former is, for the greatest part, confined to unstressed syllables, it cannot even be unconditionally qualified as a checked vowel, because the opposition 'free' vs. 'checked' can only assert itself in stressed syllables. The other short vowel, relatively close in quality to [ $\text{ə}:$ ], is the [ $\Delta$ ]-vowel which, besides, might claim the partnership of [ $\text{ə}:$ ] by its undoubtedly checked quality. It has been shown, however, that / $\Delta$ / is much more probably the correlative partner of some other free phoneme, viz. / $a\text{U}$ / (not to speak of the claims of / $a:$ /, which would certainly, too, have preference over those of / $\text{ə}:$ /).

Thus the phonemic value of ModE (especially SB) [ $\text{ə}:$ ] remains an urgent problem of phonemic research. It seems that [ $\text{ə}:$ ] might be interpreted as another anomalous phoneme, such as are frequently found in the phonological systems of modern cultured languages, in which rigid normalization prevents the abolishment of some of the structural deficiencies of the pattern.<sup>7</sup> Such an interpretation, however, should only be resorted to when all other attempts at the phonemic explanation of the examined fact have failed. And it might indeed appear that in the case of ModE [ $\text{ə}:$ ] another possibility of a phonemic interpretation still exists which, to our knowledge, has not yet been duly considered by phonological research.

The said possibility seems to be suggested by a number of phonetic and phonemic facts of ModE. First, it is the above-mentioned presence in the ModE phonemic pattern of biphonemic centring diphthongs / $\text{I}\text{ə}$ ,  $\text{e}\text{ə}$ ,  $\text{u}\text{ə}$ /. There appears to be room in the pattern for other such biphonemic items, e. g. / $\text{ɔ}\text{ə}$ ,  $\Delta\text{ə}$ /. As is well known, some speakers of the SB standard still pronounce the diphthong [ $\text{ɔ}\text{ə}$ ] in words like *more*, *door*, in other words, still have the cluster / $\text{ɔ}\text{ə}$ / in their phonemic patterns. — Another fact that may be mentioned in this context is the obvious tendency of SB to a phonemic merger of the stressed / $\Delta$ / and the unstressed / $\text{ə}$ / (see our paper quoted here above, Note 1). One might thus consider, at least as a theoretical possibility, the phonemic evaluation of the [ $\text{ə}:$ ]-vowel as a biphonemic cluster / $\Delta\text{ə}$ /. An interpretation of the kind might be propped up, positively, by the presence of several clusters of the type "vowel phoneme + / $\text{ə}$ /" in the vocalic pattern of SB phonemes, and negatively, by the complete absence of the opposition of [ $\text{ə}:$ ] — [ $\Delta\text{ə}$ ] in SB contexts.

On the other hand, the suggested interpretation appears to be contradicted by the unquestionably monophthongal articulation of [ $\text{ə}:$ ]. It might be argued, that is, that a monophthong cannot be interpreted biphonemically unless a very urgent reason can be adduced for such interpretation. That occasionally such urgent reasons do exist in languages, has been demonstrated in our monograph (quoted above, Note 7) with regard to the consonants [W] and [ŋ]. In these two instances, the biphonemic interpretation appears to be indicated by important structural considerations. It remains to be seen whether analogous weighty circumstances can be ascertained that might justify the biphonemic interpretation of [ $\text{ə}:$ ].

The two above-mentioned facts (two positive and one negative) might, indeed, be regarded as structural evidence of the kind but by themselves they do not carry so much weight as to decide the problem definitely. It indeed appears that the facts of SB are hardly able to throw very much light on the whole problem. Some help can perhaps be obtained here from the comparison of the SB situation with that found in General American (to be further abbreviated as GA).

As is well known, GA differs from SB, among other things, in two important points. First, the stressed [ʌ]-vowel of GA is virtually identical in quality to the unstressed [ə]-vowel, so that one can safely regard the two vowels as allophones of one and the same phoneme. (Some scholars, especially the followers of L. Bloomfield, have also derived due consequences from this fact by transcribing the stressed [ʌ]-vowel as [ə].) — The other important specific feature of GA is that the non-prevocalic consonant [r] has not disappeared in it without leaving any trace, as it indeed has in SB. The [r] has left its trace in the inverted articulation of the mixed vowel originally followed by [r]; see instances like *further* [fɜ̀ðə], *fear* [fiə], *for* [fɔ̀ə], *fare* [fæə] and even *far* [fɑ̀ə].<sup>8</sup> In SB, as is well known, these words are pronounced, respectively, as [fɜ̀:ðə], [fiə], [fɔ̀:], [fæə], and [fɑ̀:].

From the phonemic point-of-view it is clear that in GA the (inverted) consonant [ə] and the [ɜ̀]-vowel, equally characterized by inverted articulation, constitute allophones of one and the same phoneme /r/, so that words like *better*, *fear*, *fare*, *far* should be phonemically transcribed there as /bɛtɚ, fiɚ, fæɚ, fɑ̀ɚ/.<sup>9</sup> If this is so, then a question emerges of how is to be phonemically evaluated the GA 'long mixed vowel' [ɜ̀], equally "r-coloured" (i.e. characterized by the inverted articulation).

One answer to this question is suggested by some American contributors to Le Maître Phonétique, who transcribe the r-coloured long mixed vowel as /r:/. This solution of the problem might be prompted by the fact that the actual difference between the GA vowels [ɜ̀] and [ɜ̀] appears to be mainly one of quantity. To this it should be objected, however, first, that even in pure (i.e., not r-coloured) GA vowels the quantitative differences obviously do not constitute the dominant opposite feature of pairs like [i — i:], [u — u:], etc.; it is the qualitative difference that manifestly plays the leading part here.<sup>10</sup> Thus the difference between the sounds [ɜ̀] and [ɜ̀] cannot be reduced to quantitative factors only.

Besides, there is another objection that may be raised against the phonemic interpretation of the difference between [ɜ̀] and [ɜ̀] done exclusively in terms of quantity. Such quantitative phonemic difference would not only be contrary to what is known about GA differences in quantity in general, but in addition to that it would constitute the only GA case in which the quantitative difference of consonants would be utilized for phonemic purposes. It thus appears most improbable that the suggested interpretation /r — r:/ could be upheld; it is only too obvious that some other phonemic evaluation of the GA difference must be attempted.

This other evaluation is prompted by an interesting fact registered by phonetic descriptions of American English (see, e.g., Kenyon, § 309): Words like *hurry*, *current*, *worry*, pronounced by SB speakers as [hʌɹɪ], [kʌɹənt], [wʌɹɪ], have the GA forms [hɜ̀ɪ], [kɜ̀ənt], [wɜ̀ɪ]. If one confronts these forms with the GA pronunciations of words like *spirit*, *very* (which is, respectively, [spɪɹəɪt], [vɜ̀əɪ]), it is seen that the GA [ɜ̀]-vowel here takes the place of the combination [ʌə]. Here it should be recalled that the GA [ʌ]-vowel and the unstressed not r-coloured [ə] virtually coincide in quality and their positional distribution is perfectly complementary, so that one may safely conclude that the two GA vowels are allophones of one and the same phoneme /ə/.<sup>11</sup> If this interpretation of GA [ʌ] is correct, then it is clear that the sound combination [ʌə], referred to above, would stand for the phonemic combination /ər/. Further, if GA regularly replaces [ʌə] by [ɜ̀], it may be concluded that the correct phonemic evaluation of the GA long mixed vowel is again /ər/. To put the thing differently, GA words like *first*, *church*, *word* appear to have the phonemic structures /fɜ̀ɹst, tʃɜ̀ɹtʃ, wɜ̀ɹd/, respectively.

The above analysis of the phonemic status of the long mixed vowel of GA is able to throw some light at the phonemic status of its SB opposite number, the vowel [æ:]. One should naturally beware of mechanical analogies and of drawing hasty conclusions, because the situation found in the SB phonemic pattern cannot be unconditionally identified with that found in the pattern of GA. Yet, some analogies do exist and they can be profitably employed in solving our problem.

The difference between the SB and the GA states of things is, first, that the SB [Δ] and [æ] are qualitatively not so similar as their GA opposite numbers. This is closely connected with the fact that the two SB vowels are only tending to be phonemically merged, while in the corresponding GA vowels the merger has already been effected. Second, the non-prevocalic [r]-sound has left distinct traces in the GA pronunciation, while in the SB pronunciation it has disappeared completely.<sup>12</sup> As a consequence, there is no possibility in SB of identifying any of the articulatory features of the [æ:]-vowel with the consonantal phoneme /r/ (as shown above, such possibility actually exists in GA, where the inverted articulation, most impressive also acoustically, invariably implements the /r/-phoneme).<sup>13</sup> Admittedly, the two phonemic items implemented by the GA 'long mixed vowel' are clearly discernible within the articulatory and acoustic structures of the sound, while in the corresponding SB sound no such clear distinction, pointing to the presence of the two supposed phonemic components (/Δ/ and /æ/), can be ascertained.

To turn now to the analogies existing between the SB and GA situations, the most essential one appears to be the parallel origin of the 'long mixed vowel' in both standards. Clearly, the common source of both has been the combination of some ə-like vowel with the consonant r (of inverted articulation); between the two sounds there was an ə-like glide. The stage [ər] is believed to have been incipient in the 16th century and general in the late 17th century.<sup>14</sup> At this stage, both the SB and the GA [ər] were obviously evaluated as biphonemic groups. From then on, however, each of the two standards went its own way in developing the group.

In GA the inverted articulation was extended so as to cover the whole of the vowel ([ə°ə:] > [æ]), while in SB the consonantal articulation was to be dropped altogether with the result that the vowel [ə] and the original glide [°] coalesced into the monophthongal [æ:]. As the loss of [r] must have taken place in the 18th century,<sup>15</sup> the rise of [æ:], resulting from the loss, must have taken place immediately after it.

It should be noted that at the time of the coalescence of [ə] and [°] the other ə-vowel, going back to ME *u*, had not yet been lowered to the degree revealed by the present-day [Δ]-sound: according to Gimson, l. c., "a half-open stage (probably somewhat fronted from true back) may be postulated for the eighteenth century". Consequently, this other ə-sound (which perhaps had already entered the sphere of what is now denoted as [Δ], even if its quality could not yet be identified with that of present-day [Δ]) may have been, at that time, somewhat related in quality to the ə-sound of the original group [ər]. This being so, one might have expected the group to be phonemically evaluated as \*/Δr/. Such an evaluation would have added another specimen to the group of the kind represented, at that time, by /aə/ and /oə/. The two last-mentioned groups were later simplified into /a:/ and, respectively, /o:/ (at least with the majority of SB speakers). The said simplification was obviously due to the fact that the sounds implementing /a/ and /o/ were more sonorous than the sound implementing /ə/. If this was so, then an analogously built group \*/Δə/ (in which the phoneme /Δ/, too, was soon to be implemented by a sound more sonorous than [ə]) might likewise have been expected to become soon simplified into \*/Δ:/.

Since, however, no such simplification ever took place, it can be safely assumed that the first component of the group [ə<sup>ɹ</sup>] has, in fact, never become phonemically associated with the 18th century ə-sound which was soon to be lowered to [ʌ]. With the near qualitative closeness of the two component parts of [ə<sup>ɹ</sup>] it may only seem too natural for them to have coalesced into [ə:], and any further comment might seem superfluous. Yet there are some circumstances here that call for the analyst's attention.

First, by the said 18th century coalescence the original ME *u* of SB words like *church*, *hurt* was to become definitely separated from the original ME *u* of words like *curry*, *hurry*, *courage*, etc., while in GA the development of the *u*-sound in both word-groups has been parallel. The reason of this different development again appears to be that in SB the above-mentioned extension of the inverted articulation of [r] so as to cover the whole of the vowel has never taken place, probably because the very inverted articulation of [r] was given up. Thus, the not *r*-coloured mixed vowel in the SB combination [ər] in words like *curry*, *hurry*, *courage* could have developed more independently of the following [r] than its GA opposite number.

The other circumstance that deserves to be noted here is the fact that the non-emergence in SB of the centring diphthong \*[ʌə] may be regarded as connected, in a way, with the tendency aimed at the abolishment of the centring diphthongs in SB. This tendency, commented-upon in our paper quoted here above (Note 1), obviously aims at the elimination of those cases in which the anomalous phoneme /ə/ occurs in stressed syllables, and so at making that phoneme an exclusive affair of the unstressed syllables. Though one certainly cannot affirm that this tendency was responsible for the non-emergence of SB \*[ʌə] (the coalescence of [ə<sup>ɹ</sup>] to [ə:] had taken place too early to admit of such an explanation), it certainly appears as though this non-emergence had made easier the operation of the said tendency in the following stages of development. The said coalescence thus appears to have played an important part in the re-arrangement of the SB phonemic pattern, in the situation called forth by the phonemicization of the [ə]-sound after the ultimate loss of the non-prevocalic [r] in the 18th century. (That the loss of [r] was indeed responsible for the phonemic difficulties is clearly shown, negatively, by the fact that in GA, where the non-prevocalic [r] has been phonemically preserved, the structural difficulties have not arisen.) The tax that had to be paid for the re-arrangement, however partial, of the pattern, was the emergence of another free phoneme lacking its checked counterpart in the vocalic phonemic pattern, viz. /ə:/ which, manifestly, cannot be evaluated in SB as a biphonemic group of the /ʌə/-type.

To the above argumentation it might be objected that it only proves the inadequacy of the biphonemic interpretation of SB [ə:] for the end of the 18th century, not for the present-day period. One might argue that in present-day SB [ə:] can be interpreted as /ʌə/, just as SB [ɔ:] may be interpreted as an implementation of /ɔə/, and SB [a:], perhaps, as /æa/.<sup>16</sup> In an earlier paper of ours it was shown that the last-mentioned interpretation cannot be endorsed, as /æə/ should much more probably be implemented by [eə] (with its variant [æə]) than by [a:].<sup>17</sup> Also the phonemic relationship of [ɔ] and [ɔ:] appears to be too evident to admit of any other phonemic interpretation of [ɔ:] than /ɔ:/. It thus seems that the two SB free non-diphthongal vowels [ə:] and [a:] indeed implement phonemes which stand isolated in the SB vocalic pattern, lacking any checked counterparts. Both these phonemes, however, are not on the same level. It is to be noted that /ə:/ constitutes what R. Jakobson calls "voyelle neutre", i.e. a vowel opposed to all other vowels of its group (in this case, to all other free vowels) by its lack of all qualities possessed by them,<sup>18</sup> being non-front

as well as non-back, non-high as well as non-low. The /a:/-phoneme, on the other hand, is positively characterized at least as a 'low' phoneme (it cannot be classed as 'back' because SB possesses no 'front' [æ:] or [a:] — the [a:] < [aɪə] is stylistically placed on a level different from that of [a:], see our paper quoted in Note 5).

Thus the tentative solution of the phonemic problem of SB [ə:], as suggested in the early part of the present paper, appears to be essentially correct. SB /ə:/ implements a separate phoneme, neutral with regard to all other phonemes with which it forms the sub-group of free vowel phonemes. It indeed stands isolated in the pattern but, on the other hand, can hardly be denoted as a "peripheral" element of the system: by being neutral with regard to all the other items it rather constitutes something like the centre of the sub-group.

As far as SB /a:/ is concerned, it equally lacks a checked phonemic counterpart but, unlike /ə:/, is not a neutral element of the sub-group and thus cannot claim a place in the centre of the latter. Thus it must indeed be evaluated as an anomalous case and (as already stated in our paper quoted above, Note 5) as a peripheral element of the SB phonemic system.

The phonemic evaluation of the long mixed vowel is not the only point in which the scheme of the SB vowels presented in the early part of the present paper needs to be adapted. The other point to be revised is the diphthongal /ou/ which has been replaced, especially by the younger generation, by what is most frequently transcribed as /əʊ/. By this change the said diphthong has obviously severed its original phonemic relationship to short /ɔ/, and is now clearly devoid of any checked counterpart in the system of vocalic phonemes. One cannot say, however, that the phoneme /əʊ/ is isolated in the pattern. It appears to have its phonemic counterpart in the diphthongal /ɔɪ/ which, for a long time, had been felt as isolated in the system on account of its foreign (mostly Norman French) provenience. Though this diphthong is still found, for the greatest part, in synchronically foreign words (and may indeed be regarded as a signal of their synchronically foreign status),<sup>19</sup> sometimes its presence may be detected in words which are undoubtedly evaluated as entirely domesticated (such as, e.g., *boy, toy, noise*, etc.). Until very recently, the SB diphthong [ɔɪ] was also isolated formally: there was no other diphthong that could be assigned to it as its symmetrical opposite number (some sort of \*[ɛʊ]). Viewed in this light, the replacement of SB /ou/ by /əʊ/ may be interpreted as due to the tendency aimed at some integration of the diphthongal phoneme /ɔɪ/ in the SB phonemic pattern: it will be admitted that the said replacement was to provide the diphthong /ɔɪ/ with the symmetric partner so long badly missed<sup>20</sup>. — The other factor that may have called forth the replacement of /ou/ by /əʊ/ may have been the obvious articulatory and acoustic closeness of /ɔ/ and /ɔ:/ which very urgently suggested the existence of the correlative link between them. The diphthongal /ou/ may have been felt, as a consequence, released from the correlative link originally binding it to /ɔ/ with the result that the way leading to profound articulatory and acoustic changes was made wide open.

In this connection, two more details are worth pointing out, both of them noted very recently by a competent British phonetician.<sup>21</sup> First, as regards the diphthong [eɪ], it is pointed out that "in advanced RP there may be little or no vocalic glide in the realization of this phoneme, especially in the fully long allophone, e.g. *day, game, made*, with [ɛ:] or [e:]; this monophthongized form may also be heard in cases where, for rhythmic reasons, the quantity is somewhat reduced, e.g. *lady, nature, relation...*". Obviously, this [ɛ:] fits in perfectly as the systemic counterpart of [ɔ:]. —

Second, among the variants of the /əʊ/-diphthong is also adduced one that “has a starting point more forward than the central area, i.e. [somewhat centralized, J. V.] [ɛ].” This variety is said to be “usually characterized as an affectation”; for all that, it certainly follows the general trend ascertainable in the vocalic pattern of SB. It is hardly necessary to dwell on the fact that a diphthong like /ɛʊ/ supplies exactly that kind of systemic counterpart of /ɔɪ/ which had been needed for the definite incorporation of /ɔɪ/ in the SB vocalic system.

All in all, the SB vocalic pattern of phonemes appears to tend to the following structure:

/ɪ/	/ʊ/	/i:/		/u:/
/ɛ/	/ɔ/	/ɛ:/	°/ə:/	/ɔ:/
			°/əʊ/	°/ɔɪ/
/æ/	/ʌ/	/aɪ/	°/ɑ:/	/aʊ/

° free phonemes lacking checked counterparts.

The above remarks will have revealed at least one thing with sufficient clearness: even in modern, strictly normalized cultured languages tendencies appear to be at work which are aimed at making their phonemic systems more regular, and thus more efficient.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> J. Vachek, *Phonemic Remarks on the ‘Short Mixed Vowel’ of Modern English*, SPFFBU A 4, 1956, pp. 81–92; also *Brno Studies in English* 4, 1964, pp. 71–78.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. A. C. Gimson, *An Introduction to the Pronunciation of English* (London 1962), p. 116.

<sup>3</sup> See our paper quoted here above, Note 1, esp. pp. 86 f.

<sup>4</sup> Clearly, under these circumstances they cannot be classed as correlative phonemes, despite their close phonetic relationship.

<sup>5</sup> Most recently, in our paper *The Phonematic Status of Modern English Long Vowels and Diphthongs*, *Philologica Pragensia* 6, 1963, pp. 59–71.

<sup>6</sup> Evidence for this biphonemic evaluation is adduced in the paper quoted here above, Note 5.

<sup>7</sup> A number of such structural “weak points” of ModE has been discussed in our monograph *On Peripheral Phonemes of Modern English*, *Brno Studies in English* 4, 1964, pp. 7–109.

<sup>8</sup> See, e.g., J. S. Kenyon, *American Pronunciation*, 9th ed., (Ann Arbor 1948), §§ 234 ff.

<sup>9</sup> Instances like *error* [ɛə – ə] (cf. Kenyon, § 234 note) do not contradict the phonemic identification of GA vocalic and consonantal [ə], because the two consecutive allophones of the phoneme /r/ are here separated by a morphemic limit: /ɛr – r/.

<sup>10</sup> This is also convincingly reflected in the manner in which the opposed sounds are phonetically transcribed: the ‘short’ and ‘long’ vowels are distinguished here by the use of different symbols, not by the use of one and the same symbol followed or not by the symbol of length [:], as is common in most of the transcriptions of SB.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Kemp Malone, *Phonemes and Phonemic Combinations in Current English*, *English Studies* (Amsterdam) 18, 1936, pp. 159 ff. – Similarly, G. L. Trager – B. Bloch, *The Syllabic Phonemes of English*, *Language* 17, 1941, pp. 225 ff.

<sup>12</sup> The ‘linking’ and ‘intrusive’ r-sounds are, from the synchronistic viewpoint, no longer facts of word-phonology, but of syntactic phonology, being mainly used for purposes of stressing the limits of words (see J. Vachek, *The Decline of the Phoneme /r/ in English*, SPFFBU A 8, 1960, pp. 79–93, esp. p. 81 f.).

<sup>13</sup> The logical conclusion of all this is that, unlike in SB, the GA /r/ is anything but a declining phoneme. A more detailed consideration of this point would, however, take us too far from our main issue.

<sup>14</sup> Cf., most recently, A. C. Gimson, op. cit. Note 2, p. 118.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Gimson, l. c.

<sup>16</sup> This interpretation was suggested by W. Merlingen, *Über Ein- und Zweiphonemigkeit*, Zeitschr. f. Phonetik u. allg. Sprachw. 13, 1960, pp. 98–176 (see esp. pp. 158 ff.).

<sup>17</sup> Cf. our paper quoted here above, Note 5.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. R. Jakobson, *Observations sur le classement phonologique des consonnes*, Proceedings of the Third International Congress of Phonetic Sciences (Ghent 1938), pp. 34–41 (esp. p. 40). — N. S. Trubetzkoy, *Grundzüge der Phonologie* (Prague 1939) uses a less adequate term „unbestimmter Vokal“ (p. 105).

<sup>19</sup> Cf. J. Vachek, *On the Internal and External Factors in the Development of Language*, Lingua 11, 1962, pp. 433–448 (esp. pp. 439–443.) — The problem of the synchronically foreign and domestic elements of word-stock is discussed by V. Mathesius, *Zur synchronischen Analyse fremden Sprachguts*, Englische Studien 71, 1935, pp. 21–35.

<sup>20</sup> For a more detailed discussion of this issue, see our paper in Linguistics (The Hague), to appear in 1965.

<sup>21</sup> A. C. Gimson, l. c., pp. 122 and 129.

NOTE: For technical reasons, the *r*-coloured long mixed vowel of GA had to be transcribed here as [E].

### FONOLOGICKÉ POZNÁMKY O ‚DLOUHÉ MIXED VOWEL‘ V NOVÉ ANGLIČTINĚ

Podrobným rozbořem jak dnešní situace v jihoanglickém fonologickém systému, tak vývojového procesu, který tuto situaci přivodil, dovozuje autor, že jihoangl. [ə:] je nepárový ‚dlouhý‘ (přesněji ‚volný‘) samohláskový foném. Stav v jihoangl. standardu je srovnáván se stavem v nejrozšířenější variantě standardu americké angličtiny, jejíž ‚dlohá‘ mixed vowel se fonologicky bezpečně hodnotí, jak autor ukazuje, jako dvojfonénní skupina /ər/. Pro jihoangl. standard však takové hodnocení (právě tak jako apriorně možné hodnocení /ɹr/) nepřichází v úvahu, a to pro odlišnou strukturní situaci danou odchylkami ve vývoji fonologického systému, hlavně různými osudy souhláskového fonému /r/ v obou standardech. Jihoangl. /ə:/ se tak jeví jako neutrální ‚dlohý‘ vokalický foném, odlišný od ostatních ‚dlohých‘ vokalických fonémů nedostatkem pozitivních příznaků. Zaujímá proto ve vokalickém systému jakési centrální postavení a nelze jej tedy označit za foném periferní, jakým je nepochybně jihoangl. /a:/, charakterizované pozitivním příznakem otevřenosti („low“).

Závěrem se upozorňuje na pozoruhodnou tendenci začlenit do systému jihoangl. diftong /ɔɪ/, dosud stojící mimo systém jakožto fonologická cizost. Jeho systémovým partnerem se stává dosavadní /oʊ/, jež v úzu mladších generací ustupuje /əʊ/.