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ABSTRACT
The sibilant groove was EPG analysed in Swedish /s/ /z/ and [s]. Groove position and width of each sibilant varied between but not within speakers. No correlation was found between groove width and sibilant identity. /s/ was produced clearly frontmost, but /z/ had the same groove front position as [s] in phrases. The articulatory place of /s/ and [s] is not their primary distinguishing articulatory feature. The description of sibilants must attend more to the size of the groove anterior cavity.

INTRODUCTION
Acoustic modelling of fricative production has advanced in the last decade [1, 2, 3]. For further development, the need for empirical production data is great [4]. One important practical application of this growing knowledge is to give a scientific phonetic base to dental prosthesis constructing [5]. Especially [s] is often deteriorated by prostheses [5].

With three phonemically contrasted front tongue sibilants - /s/, /z/ and [s] - Swedish is especially suitable for an investigation with the aim to further the development of the articulatory modelling work. These sounds are acoustically and perceptually closely related. /s/ is intermediate perceptually in brightness, and acoustically in spectral energy distribution [6]. Detailed articulatory descriptions of these sounds are given in [6, 7]. [s] is a common allophone of the Swedish /s/ phone, which also has a common, non-sibilant variant [6].

The best way to analyse the sibilant groove - one of the two crucial articulatory features in sibilants - is by electropalatography (EPG) [8]. This method has been used in several studies of sibilant production e.g English [8, 9]. Swedish sibilants have been treated in two EPG investigations: of /s/ based on ten speakers [10], and of a large number of consonants, including /s/, /z/ and [s] - for only one speaker, however [11].

The other crucial articulatory feature in sibilants is the incison, being hit by an air jet emanating from the groove. About this phenomenon, neither EPG nor any other existing method gives direct information. However, the combination of EPG data with jaw movement and acoustic information, and dental casts of the upper and lower jaws, will be able to contribute to the advancement of the understanding of the role of this feature.

We have procured this combination of data and have short-term plans to work with it, due to important new theoretical aspects in [1] of alveolar ridge and tooth contribution to the sibilant source generation.

METHOD AND MATERIAL
Our equipment was of the Reading EPG type. For a thorough description, see [12]. In short terms, the speaker wears a thin palate, extending from the upper teeth back to the velum. In this palate, 62 electrodes are placed in a regular pattern. In the alveolar region, where the sibilant groove is produced, both longitudinal and transverse inter-electrode distances are about 4 mm. The electrode diameter is 1.4 mm. The tongue contact pattern is registered 100 times/sec and stored in a computer.

Each EPG registration frame is a kind of map, representing the tongue palate contact every 10 milliseconds. In this map, each electrode is represented by a specific point as either touched or free (untouched). The map points are arranged in a pattern, similar to the electrode pattern, with eight transverse rows and eight longitudinal columns of points. In our sibilant groove analysis, we decided in which row the frontmost minimum constriction was (construction place, CP), and counted the number of free electrodes in that row (construction width, CW). Also back and front groove opening shapes were measured. All groove measurement parameters were taken from [8, 11].

In parallel with EPG registration, also optoelectronic recording of jaw movement and acoustic registration were made, at the Dept of Prosthetic Dentistry, University of Göteborg.

Our investigation was based on 10 Swedish speakers, 4 women and 6 men (mean age 31 years, range 23-49 years). All had normal speech with strong dialect or hearing defects. Six spoke varieties of central Swedish, 4 spoke south Swedish varieties. South Swedish lacks [s], but each of /s/ and /z/ are produced in the same way in all Sweden, just as [s] in central Swedish [6].

The subjects had worn dummy palates, similar to the EPG ones, during a whole fortnight two years before, in connection with another study. In this study, they wore these dummy palates for four hours or more before each of three registration sessions.

The material consisted mainly of various long, natural phrases with the three sibilants in systematically varied vowel context - /a/ - produced long or short. (For /s/, the consonant context, stress and phrase position were varied, too, but the effect of these parameter changes is not reported here.) Also isolated pronunciations of the sibilants were registered. The whole material was produced nine times.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION
Inter- and intraregional variation
Interindividual variation was great and intraregional variation small for groove position and width of each sibilant. This agrees with other sibilant studies, e.g. [6, 9, 10, 13]. The main explanation of the inter-speaker variability is that speakers with different shapes and sizes of teeth, alveolar ridge, jaw, and front tongue must reasonably produce the sibilant groove in different ways as concerns the details, in order to achieve similar acoustic and perceptual results [6, 10].

The small intraspeaker variability is probably mainly explained by the strong demands on preciseness in directing the air jet against the front teeth in sibilants [6, 10].

Groove position and especially the /s/ - [s] distinction
Not unexpected, /s/ was produced furthest in front, generally with a clear distance to /z/ and [s]. The groove front end position in /s/ ranged from immediately behind the upper front incisors to about 10 mm behind. The average distance between [s] and the other two siblants was about 4 mm.

In phrases, /z/ and [s] had the same groove front end position, almost mid to back alveolar - about 8-16 mm from the upper front incisors - except in one marginal case. Uttered in isolation, [s] was however produced distinctly further back than /z/ and /s/ in speaker of /s/ in 3 out of 7. Also, the minimum groove width of these sounds was similar (usually below 7 mm). Often, their groove length, and back and front groove orifice width changed shapes were also similar.

These facts support the hypothesis that the articulatory place of /s/ and [s] is not their primary distinguishing articulatory feature [6]. Instead, the description of sibilants must attend more to the size of the groove anterior cavity. Perhaps also the groove posterior cavity shall be considered [8], but according to [14], only the anterior cavity is important for the resonance shaping.

The size of this front cavity has been shown to be about 10 mm than in /l/, in two different respects [6, 7]. First, [s] tends to be lip-rounded, whereas /z/ has spread lips, like [l]. The [s] rounding is analogous to [j] rounding in English and other languages. Second, the sublingual cavity is larger in [s] than in /z/. The sagittal horizontal width of the upper part of this cavity is about 10 mm in [s] and half that width in /z/. The depth of this pocket is around 25 mm and 15 mm, respectively [6]. This sublingual cavity difference is produced by different overall tongue gestures. The tongue body is brought forwards and upwards in /l/. The dorsum is convex, and the subapical tongue wall is perpendicular and tense [6]. In [s], the tongue body is lower and further back. The dorsum is concave, and the subapical wall is concave and lax [6].

There is a close connection between these aspects of the upper and lower tongue walls [6], which hopefully soon be accounted for by the developing, anatomically detailed tongue models, e.g. [15].

The fact that two different phonemes have the same constriction in the same position in a single speaker, and also often at the same time have similar groove width and length, has implications for the general system of consonant description, as expressed in the universally used IPA.
two-dimensional scheme of articulatory places and manners. This scheme is obviously the best general frame for consonantal classification, but it is not equally suitable for an adequate treating of distinctions within all classes of sounds. The sibilants are an evident example of this.

Secondary and primary palatal /l/ constriction

Behind the alveolar groove in /l/ and separated from it by a usually considerable widening of the vocal tract, an almost equally narrow secondary palatal constriction was found in 2 speakers, 15 to 20 mm broad. In one of them this constriction was general in phrases, in the other it occurred before /l/ but not /l/. Two other speakers had a related but much wider secondary palatal constriction. Still another speaker pronounced /l/ before /l/ - but not before /l/, /l/ - with a primary palatal constriction, which was quite narrow - on average between 4 and 10 mm. In this exceptional case, /l/ was palatal. Otherwise, /l/ was alveolar, with a groove equal in width to /s/ and [s], and in equal length to in /l/, but tending to be longer than in [s].

EPG data for one single central Swedish speaker in [11] disagrees with this general alveolar /l/ pronunciation of 6 central and 4 southern Swedish speakers. In [11], the /l/ constriction was consistently palatal and wide, with a position much further back than [s]. This is similar to the exceptional /l/ context case above, except for the wide constriction. It is evident that the most common Swedish /l/ pronunciation is alveolar.

Groove width

On average, the groove width in /s/ was a little narrower than in the other two sibilants, which were quite similar. However, the differences were not significant. Each sound occurred with the closest groove in at least one subject, both in phrases and as isolated. In phrases, /s/ was closest in 4 subjects, and /l/ and [s] in one case each. However, in 4 subjects, the sibilants had fairly equal average groove widths. In isolation, the corresponding pattern was related, but the combination of individual speakers and closest sibilant was only partly identical. For example, as pronounced isolated, /l/ had the narrowest groove in 3 subjects.

In phrases, the average width of each sibilant was near 2 CW units (1 e 2 free electrodes, which corresponds to 5-11 mm) in 6 subjects. Two subjects had a generally closer constriction, around 1.5 units. Two subjects had a generally wider constriction around 3 units in /l/ and [s], excluding /s/, with 2 units. Obviously, each subject tended to have a general width style for all sibilants in phrases. This tendency was found also in isolated sibilants, but less pervading: Three subjects lacked this pattern there. The average groove width in isolated sibilants was generally higher in the phrasal data.

This fairly constant groove width pattern in Swedish sibilants differs from English sibilants, where [ʃ] is significantly wider than [s] [9]. This difference has to be analysed more closely.

Groove width variation, related to vowel context, was found in Swedish. The pattern was complicated. In [s], the variation was great, but with no general pattern. For each of /s/ and /l/, the variation was small in five subjects and considerable in five (whereof three subjects are the same). For /l/, there was a general pattern: The width was smallest before /a/ and greatest before /u/. The /l/ variation pattern was partly similar, with greatest narrowing in /a/, but not greatest width in /s/.

Apparently, this contextual /s/ and /l/ groove width variation in several speakers had connection with tongue body position, especially height: Low tongue position was connected with a narrower groove. The same pattern was found in [10], where the first /s/ in /A sadist - [osa'dist] - was significantly narrower and had a lower tongue body position context than the second /s/. It appears that when the tongue mass is lower, the conditions for the narrow shaping of the groove are more favourable.

One possible explanation of this pattern has to do with conditions for muscular cooperation: When the authors' tongue bases are high and front like in /l/, the tongue blade feels stiff. In /a/ on the other hand, it is slack. To shape the sibilant front tongue groove is probably the most complicated of all articulatory gestures: All seven tongue muscle groups cooperate with a delicate balance [16]. To create a narrow groove with a stiff front tongue should be especially difficult.

A more penetrating exploratory analysis of this kind of phenomenon will hopefully soon be possible, within the framework of the now developing, detailed tongue models, e.g [15]. Empirical data patterns like the groove variation above may also serve as touchstones for parts of such models.

Another factor which might contribute to the observed pattern has to do with variation in mechanical resistance: When the tongue mass is close to the oral ceiling and pressed against it, the effort to lower its median longitudinal front part will meet more resistance than otherwise. Therefore, the muscular effort to create the groove may be distributed horizontally to a greater extent.
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