

# Re: Redefining [a] and [æ]? or using a better vowel quadrilateral?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2008-08/msg00437.html>

---

- *From:* "ranjit\_mathews@xxxxxxxxx" <ranjit\_mathews@xxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Sun, 10 Aug 2008 09:31:15 -0700 (PDT)
- 

On Aug 10, 7:31 am, "Peter T. Daniels" <gramma...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

On Aug 10, 2:11 am, "ranjit\_math...@xxxxxxxxxxxxx"

These would be reference noises for a given audience. Hindi speakers don't have [E] or [æ]; they have something inbetween and a little retracted. So, both their "ax" and "ex" would come out like French "Aix". To generate an [E] exactly 3/4 of the way from their [e:] to their merged [E]/[æ] would take a computer. To generate an [æ] such that the generated [E] is exactly halfway between the generated [æ] and their [e:] would require a computer too.

There are varieties of English in which ax = ex.

Speaking such a variety is, unfortunately, detrimental to advanced one's career in a field of endeavor where one communicates primarily with people rather than with computers or machines. How many CEOs (including Presidents of Universities) have you heard, with ax = ex?

What makes you think that the brain's response to linear scales is linear?

In the case of formants, the linearity of scales is arrived at by measuring distances between formants of vowels in people's speech; the frequencies are clearly in arithmetic rather than geometric progression. If babies learn to reproduce them, their brains must respond linearly.

Why do you think the scale of decibels is logarithmic?

## Re: Redefining [a] and [æ]? or using a better vowel quadrilateral?

Decibels, in psychoacoustics, are not linearly perceived. In addition, equal decibels of different frequencies are not perceived as having equal loudness which is why we have Fletcher–Munson curves.

"Aerate" is three syllables.

The 3 syllable pronunciation in Hindi speakers' English would be [e:j@re:t.] which tends to sound much grosser to Anglos

Nonetheless, it is the (American?) pronunciation of the word.

The Hindi speaker's /e:j/ is realized as [e:i] which is very different

Now \_you're\_ the one mixing together // and [ ] .

Where the realization comes from is the way I had to put it once I figured that our [ej]s were different diphthongs; I might add that in Hindi, it comes from a sequence of two phonemes /e:/ and /j/ whereas in English, /eI/ is a single phoneme. To illustrate the Hindi pronunciation, Brazilian Portuguese, in the word "baia", has a diphthong ending in an equally high [i] before a vowel which makes it strikingly different from the Anglo's pronunciation of "buyer". This [i] also occurs in the diphthong in their "cadeira" albeit not followed by a vowel in that word.

from anything preceding a vowel in American pronunciation. Americans probably have something between [eI] and [eI].

Which I suppose might be a weird rendition (with final stress) of the name of the Afroasiaticist and Africanist Chris Ehret.

He's at UCLA. Even with stress, Americans wouldn't pronounce [ret] with the first vowel in a German's pronunciation of "Beethoven" which is the vowel I mean by [e:].

Our concern is with the first syllable.

About the 1st syllable you're right.

Re: Redefining [a] and [æ]? or using a better vowel quadrilateral?

Re: Redefining [a] and [æ]? or using a better vowel quadrilateral?