

11. The consonant ʔ, called the glottal stop, was heard very frequently before initial stressed vowels in the speech recorded. The following words, which were listed 233 times, were illustrative of the repeated occurrence of the sound throughout the records of many of the speakers: *after, asked, attitude, economic, education, even, every, interest, office, often, operate, opportunity, our, out*. Table XI presents the data on this consonant.

12. The nasalization of vowels was referred to in Sections 2 and 3, where the presence of nasalized vowels was noted in the pronunciation of numerous speakers. Those words have been listed with others to make a total of 289 pronunciations of words with various vowels which are followed by nasal consonants. The words listed are *attention, congress, council, down, interest, kind, man, many, men, mind, not, now, principle, programme, responsibility, science, thing, think, time*. Table XII records the words with frequencies and variations in pronunciation indicated.

13. The omission of other final consonants than the nasals, particularly *t, d, v* and *l*, was recorded for 45 per cent. of the words listed under this heading, or in 98 pronunciations out of 207. The words studied were *almost, around, asked, can't, depend, fact, find, five, government, hand, interest, kind, most, school, subject, well*. The data are recorded in Table XIII.

65. Dr H. E. PALMER (Tokyo): *Some notes on the place of phonetics in Japan.*

In connexion with the teaching of phonetics in Japan, there are notably two points which will be of interest to those taking part in this Congress. The first is that Japan is seemingly the only country in which phonetic theory and notation is looked upon as a normal part of the study of English (and other languages); and the second, that the Japanese are among those whose pronunciation of foreign languages is the least influenced by traditional orthography.

Dealing with the first point:

It is true that phonetic theory and notation is not specifically prescribed in the Department of Education regulations, but inasmuch as the examining bodies to whom the Department delegates its authority have for many years past included a phonetics test, no Japanese teacher can qualify for a teaching licence who is unable to satisfy his examiners in this regard. This in itself might not mean much if it were not coupled with the facts that phonetics is not an unpopular subject, and that there is practically no anti-phonetics feeling. I have had occasion to note that any lecture dwelling on the advantages of phonetics meets with little attention and is rather resented: the need for phonetics—theory, notation and practice—being taken for granted.

Although some twenty years ago the Webster diacritic system was in general vogue, to-day almost without exception the Japanese-English dictionaries include phonetic transcriptions of every word. This is largely due to the existence of the JONES *Dictionary*, and to

the praiseworthy efforts notably of Dr S. ICHIKAWA and Prof. Y. OKAKURA, whose authority in matters phonetic is unquestioned. Much credit also is due to the wisdom and farsightedness of the leading publishing firms, their authors and advisers. When in 1901 Mr P. A. SMITH, a revered American teacher of English, introduced phonetic theory and transcription for the first time (so far as I can ascertain and remember) at what is now the Hiroshima University of Literature and Science, the subject was either unknown, or at best looked upon as a fad; to-day the subject is so respectable that none dare or wish to ignore it. If an English or American passenger on a Japanese liner is known to be a language teacher, the table, cabin or bar steward may ask him to explain certain English pronunciation phenomena in terms of phonetic notation. In common with other radio broadcasters I frequently receive similar requests from listeners. Indeed, according to my experience, a foreign teacher in Japan who is ignorant of phonetic theory and transcription risks being regarded as a back number.

In many countries there is a difficulty about the printing of phonetic notation; the printers have not the types, and the type-founders are unwilling to provide them. Not so in Japan. Practically every phonetic type is obtainable at a moment's notice. My book, *The Principles of Romanization*, was set up in the workshop of a fifth-rate printer by compositors who knew no English—and this book required a printer's fount that would almost exhaust the resources of a Teubner.

Now dealing with the second point:

When one is asked: "What are the purposes to be served by phonetic notation?" the answer seems to be: Three main purposes, viz.

(1) To indicate unequivocally in dictionaries, and similar works of reference, what are the sounds contained in a given word. In other terms, to provide in a simple manner what used to be provided by complicated systems of diacritical marks or, worse, "imitated pronunciations" (of the type *zher swee* for French *je suis*).

(2) To serve as an instrument in the hands of a teacher who wishes to give systematic exercises in hearing and articulation; an instrument more easy to handle than the device of "Sound No. 1 . . . , Sound No. 37 . . ."; an instrument by which he can show objectively and with immediate results, e.g., the difference between the English words *seat* and *sit* as compared with the French word *site*, or, e.g., the difference between the English words *bus* and *bath* as compared with the Japanese word *basu*.

(3) To react against the tendency to pronounce foreign spellings as if they were spellings of one's mother tongue. I don't believe that any Englishman would pronounce the French word *pain* as the English word *pain*, but I do know that the average Frenchman pronounces, e.g., *Southampton Row* in a way that sounds to us *Sootangtong Roff*.

Now, so far as Purpose 1 is concerned, the Japanese use phonetic notation on an extensive scale. They see the word *thoroughly* in

phonetic notation and so know that it should be pronounced ^lθarəli and not torug^llai. It is true that they will probably render it as sarari, but they know at least what they are aiming at even if they miss the bull's eye. They have no objection to learning each English word twice over: once for its spelling and once for its pronunciation, for they regard this as inevitable. This is perhaps not to be wondered at when we remember that the Japanese language may be written according to at least six different systems or alphabets, singly or in combination. It is interesting to note, too, that they keep orthography and phonetic notation in watertight compartments and do not confuse one with the other.

So far as Purpose 2 is concerned, there is a real need in Japan for systematic exercises in ear-training and articulation. The difficulty in finding a sufficient number of competent teachers is being partially overcome by the use of the radio and of gramophone records. In both cases the voice is supplemented by printed material illustrating the phenomena by phonetic transcription.

So far as Purpose 3 is concerned, there is no need or hardly any need in Japan for phonetic notation. A Frenchman will cheerfully pronounce *Shaftesbury* as ^lʃaftzby^lri, a German will interpret *Edward* as ^lɛxtvart, but there is obviously no temptation for a Japanese to interpret an English spelling in terms of a native spelling system. It would never occur to him to read such words as *usage* or *sausage* as u-sa-ge or sau-sa-ge. The only exception, perhaps, is that there is a tendency for the Japanese to dwell on doubled consonants and to lengthen a final, but this is due to lapses on the part of those who first devised the system of transliterating English spellings into the Japanese syllabary.

Now concerning phonetic research. The first phonetics laboratory in Japan was set up by Prof. KANEHIRO about fourteen years ago at the Osaka University of Commerce, and there he did much excellent pioneer work. Had Prof. T. CHIBA of the Tokyo School of Foreign Languages been able to attend this Congress, he would have described the founding and work of his splendid phonetics laboratory at Tokyo—probably the best equipped one in the world. He would also have presented the recently published report of his research on Japanese sounds, this containing a complete set of diagrams (oscillograms, X-ray photos, and intonation curves) for every sound or phoneme, together with his dissertation on the nature of Japanese "accent". In his absence, I would commend this document to your attention.

Finally, I would state this as my opinion: that if the Japanese are less skilful in pronouncing foreign languages than are certain other peoples, it is to be attributed to a natural reserve and shyness rather than to any natural incapacity; and this we may say equally of the average Englishman. But the continued efforts of those Japanese scholars who popularized phonetic transcription in their country are likely to bring about, within the next few years, a marked improvement in the skill of pronouncing.

66. Prof. DELFI DALMAU (Barcelona): *Active and passive phonetics.*

You all know that when a person of your country goes abroad, even if he goes with his family and they wish to conserve their own language, if they remain many years in an atmosphere linguistically alien, on their return you will realize that there are variations and corruptions of the accent, the intonation, the rhythm, and, in many cases, of the syntax and vocabulary of their native language.

One day a French professor, Monsieur ALEXIS LEVESQUE, of Nozay (Loire Inférieure), told me that he was going to study and work successively in Les Couëts, Nantes, Troyes and Paris, intending to go to Germany in 1901, when he would be twenty-six years of age, to take a position as French teacher at the Duisburg Berlitz School for a period of seven months. He did so, and then passed on to the Berlitz School in Barcelona, where he worked for three years, after which he worked in other cities of Spain until 1909, when he returned to France to visit his family at Nozay and at Nantes. On hearing him speak his friends exclaimed, slightly exaggerating of course: "Mais vous ne parlez plus français!" This at the end of eight years of teaching French abroad! And similarly, the Castilians who come to Catalonia, however much they may wish to preserve the purity of their language, are often taken for Catalans when they return to Castilia, owing to the general corruption which their language has suffered. The phonetic examples which could be quoted are infinite in number. I will confine myself to some which best contrast the prosodic characteristics of Catalan and Castilian:

Let us take the Catalan word *però* (but), which in Castilian is *péro* (but). There is no difficulty in distinguishing the pronunciation with the stressed or tonic syllable transposed. The same occurs with the Catalan *sinó* (but) and the Castilian *sino* (but), the Catalan *perquè* (because) and the Castilian *pórque* (because).

In Catalan it frequently occurs that a distinction is made between substantive and verb by placing the stress on a different syllable, thus: *ell copia* (he copies), *ell fa una còpia* (he makes a copy); *ell diferencia* (he distinguishes), *ell fa una diferència* (he makes a distinction); *ell renuncia* (he renounces), *ell fa renúncia* (he makes a renunciation); *ell odia* (he hates), *ell té òdi* (he has hatred); *ell estudia* (he studies), *ell fa un estudi* (he makes a study). Castilian does not make this distinction, and says: *él copia* (he copies), *él hace una còpia* (he makes a copy); *él diferencia* (he distinguishes), *él hace una diferència* (he makes a distinction); etc. Now, there are Catalans and Castilians who transpose the phonetic difference of the verb in speaking the two languages. This, naturally, does not happen when it is a question of two verbs of an entirely different form, as the Catalan *estalviar* (to economize) and the Castilian *ahorrar* (to economize). No Catalan pronounces *estalvia* (he economizes) badly, because this word is not disturbed or influenced phonetically by any similar alternative Castilian word expressing the same meaning.

Syllables which, in their etymological origin, contained only one vowel, remain one-vowel syllables in Catalan; whereas in Castilian,