

Re: Subtitutes for English /T/ and /D/

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2007-07/msg00835.html>

- *From:* Seán O'Leathlóbhair <jwlawler@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 17 Jul 2007 05:20:19 -0700
-

On 17 Jul, 12:46, "Peter T. Daniels" <gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Jul 16, 8:37 pm, "Richard Wordingham" <jrw0...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

<jwlaw...@xxxxxxxx> wrote in message
<news:1184618982.238706.154190@xx>
On Jul 16, 5:41 pm, Oliver Cromm <lispamat...@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

* Seán O'Leathlóbhair wrote:

On 16 Jul, 09:21, "John Atkinson"
<johna...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

<phogl...@xxxxxx> wrote...
Ruud Harmsen
<realemailons...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
wrote:

Many
people
now
often
use
a
correct
[T]
(but
not
a
correct
/D/!).
But

Re: Substitutes for English /T/ and /D/

if
they
do
substitute
it
bu
anything
also,
it
is
by
[s],
not
[t].

I guess we
use mostly
[t] and [d]
here in
Finland.
The good
old days
when "the"
was
rendered as
"röh" are
regrettably
gone.

Why do French speakers
from France use [s] and [z],
while those from
Quebec use [t] and [d]?

Not just the French but also the Spanish.

Even Germans.

I have often wondered why non-natives use
[s] and [z] or [t] and [d]
but many natives use [f] and [v]. [s] and [z]
or [t] and [d] mark you
as non-native but [f] and [v] might not.

Re: Substitutes for English /T/ and /D/

Presumably because to their foreigners' ears, [T] and [f] or [d] and [v] sound too different. We foreigners don't substitute, we approximate. Likewise I hear foreigners approximate German ü (/y/) as /u/ or /yu/, where, from a German perspective, /i/ would be the more natural replacement.

I recommended /d/ several times as a better alternative to /z/ to Germans who couldn't do /D/, should I reconsider?

It depends on your objective. If you wish to sound native then consider using [f] and [v] but an argument against is that these dialects are not very prestigious. To conform to them you may need to also drop [h]. I don't know if all dialects which replace [T] with [f] also drop [h] but the ones that I am familiar with do. If you can't do [T] and don't want to substitute [f] then I would also recommend [t], ditto [D] to [d]. Some Irish do that. (Hard to know which brackets I should be using here.)

The reason for choosing [f v] is that they are acoustically almost indistinguishable from [T D]. As for non-prestigious dialect, if the hearer hears the difference, that non-prestigiousness holds for only a very small and localized audience.

Why a small and localised audience? Do you just mean that at any one time probably only a few people are listening? That may be true but over many conversations that few could add up to many.

Speakers of a dialect which uses [T D] usually notice when they hear the [f v] variety. My impression is that many [T D] speakers regard [f v] and also dropped [h] forms as undesirable. Maybe they should not but that does not mean that they do not. I would rarely use my [f v] accent in a business context though I am tempted when I speak to one customer who is in the area in which I grew up.

Would you recommend a learner to consider [f v] rather than [t d] or [s z] if he cannot manage [T D]?

Are there any [f v] accents in the US?

Re: Substitutes for English /T/ and /D/

Re: Subtitutes for English /T/ and /D/

—
Seán Ó Leathlóbhair