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Problems of English Interference in the Teaching of Russian Pronunciation: An Approach to Contrastive Analysis

By Howard I. Aronson
University of Chicago

The purpose of the present paper is to illustrate, through the discussion of selected problems of interference which arise in the teaching of Russian pronunciation to native speakers of American English, one approach to a contrastive analysis of phonologies for pedagogic purposes. Basic to this approach are the following concepts: (1) The Need for Hierarchy. This need is a consequence of what is the primary aim of learning a foreign phonological system—the acquisition of the ability to communicate in a foreign language. This goal of communication entails the recognition of the existence of a "hierarchy of errors," because, although all errors in pronunciation contribute to a foreign accent, they do not all impair intelligibility to an equal extent. The goals of pronunciation would, it is clear, be greater in a course with an audio-lingual orientation than in a grammar-and-reading approach, but the hierarchy of errors would remain the same: highest on the list would be those errors which result in the greatest lack of intelligibility. The factors determining such a hierarchy are complex, and not solely linguistic. A crucial factor is how the native speaker of the target language will reinterpret the errors of the learner. This depends to a large measure upon a cultural consideration: to what extent the accent of the learner is familiar to the native speaker. The fact that most Americans are more familiar with English spoken with a French accent than with English spoken with, let us say, an East Indian accent is one of the important factors whereby a Frenchman with relatively poor pronunciation of English may be more readily understood than a Hindi-speaker with a relatively better pronunciation in English. In setting up the minimal goals of pronunciation training one should take into consideration the degree to which the average Russian is "used to" an American accent. This, then, is an area of contrastive analysis which calls for further research. (2) The Importance of the Phonetic Level of Analysis. The immediate aim of learning to pronounce a foreign language should be viewed, from this point of view, as the acquisition of a new set of phonetic habits, and not the acquisition of a
new phonemic system. In fact, the concept of the phoneme need not play a great role here, since from the point of view of the teaching of pronunciation it is the individual sounds that must be learned. The fact that [i] and [y] are variants of the same phoneme does not mean that the learner can substitute [i] for [y] and still be understood; nor is the substitution of one phoneme for another always the cause of a lack of intelligibility—the Russian hearing *görat* for Russian *górat* 'city' will understood what is meant. 1 Similarly, we all too often find statements to the effect that Russian *t* differs from English *t* in that the former is dental and unaspirated, while the latter is alveolar and aspirated. Such statements do not take into account the presence of such variants of English *t/ as [θ] in *button* [ˈbaθ] or [t] (a tense single-flap *r*) as in *metal* [ˈmetəl] (in those dialects which distinguish between *metal* and *medal.*). The equation of the English phoneme *d/* with the Russian *d/* leaves unexplained why a Russian is very likely to hear an American's pronunciation of *vodu* 'water' (acc. sg.) as *vóru* 'thief' (dat. sg.). It should be clear, then, that a most important prerequisite for effective teaching of Russian pronunciation to speakers of American English is a knowledge of the phonemes and their variants in the dialect of English native to the learners.

Perhaps most critical are those errors which arise from the different systems of word and word-boundary signals (*Grenzsignale*) in English and Russian. These differences can lead to a situation in which a Russian might not understand a Russian utterance produced by an American, even though the linear phonemes (i.e., consonants and vowels) are properly pronounced, since the Russian will not be able to break down the stream of speech into discreet words. The major cause of such a situation lies in the differences between the stress systems of Russian and English. In beginning our discussion of the stress systems we shall assume that the phonetic basis of stress in Russian and English is the same, i.e., relative loudness. (We shall see later that there is strong evidence that such a definition does not, in reality, apply to what we call "stress" in English.)

The basic English stress pattern consists of an alternating series of stressed and unstressed vowels within the word. One of the stressed vowels bears the primary stress.2 Thus polysyllabic English words have in general more than one stress, cf. "*para*phrase." Russian words are, on the other hand, marked by the fact that they can contain only one stress, cf. Russian [poʃfras] 'of the paraphrases.' A Russian sentence contains (if one exclude the various enclitics) as many words as stressed syllables,3 while an English sentence may contain fewer words than stressed syllables. The American who applies his English stress pattern to an attempt at pronouncing Russian *para*frás will probably say [ˈparaʃtras], which will be interpreted by a Russian as the two words *páva frás*
'a couple of phrases.' It is to be noted that in the pretonic syllable, in English, there is a strong tendency to reduce /a/ to /o/. In Russian, on the other hand, [a] never occurs immediately before the stressed vowel of the word in which it occurs. The presence of [a] in such a position is therefore a word-boundary marker, reinforcing the incorrect interpretation made by the Russian. Similar interference occurs when a form which is in Russian atonic (e.g., prepositions, particles) receives a secondary stress: Russian нaдo всeм [нaдаfс'ём] 'above everything' becomes, with the secondary stress an American would naturally use, ['нaда''fс''ём], i.e., нaдo всeм 'everybody has to.'

The effect of the stress upon the reduction of vowels has been noted above. There is a further complication. Pretonic /a/ in many Northern dialects of American English is a highly unstable vowel which tends to be lost in normal rates of speech if the resultant cluster already occurs. Forms such as /pa'lɪʃ/ 'police,' /gə'raʃ/ 'garage,' and even /sə'pɔɪzɪp/ 'supposing' are commonly pronounced, according to the above rule, as /pliʃ/, /graʃ/, and /spɔɪzp/. In the same dialects (basically in the North) /a/ is also lost in allegro speech in instances where the resultant clusters did not already occur. (Often these resultant clusters are identical with Russian clusters which traditionally present great difficulties for American students. Examples are English allegro forms /'pteɪdə/ 'potato,' cf. Russian птеиа 'bird'; /'dviʒə/ 'division,' cf. две 'two'; /'ktaэstrəfi/ 'catastrophe,' cf. кто 'who'; /'gnaʃt/ 'good night,' cf. gnát 'chase'; /'mgnifisəp/ 'magnificent,' cf. мgnовённе 'moment'; /'fslidɪj/ 'facility,' cf. вс'e 'everything'; etc. Such allegro pronunciations could be utilized by the language teacher to introduce the Russian words with similar clusters.) The danger exists that when the student acquires greater fluency in Russian and increases his rate of speech he will apply his native, English patterns, rather than the patterns of Russian allegro speech, to which he has probably never been introduced. Applying English stress patternings, Russian голова 'head' becomes [galo'va], which in turn becomes in allegro speech either ['gal''va] or even [ga'va]. The Russian pattern would be: голова → голова. This is also the reason for such apparently perverse errors as [fəvat'] for Russian дават' but [da'va] for Russian дав', 4 These factors make it likely that an increase in fluency may result in decreased rather than increased intelligibility.

There is a reverse side to the above. Rather than dropping a [a] which is the result of the reduction of [a], the learner may insert [a] to break up what is an inadmissible cluster in normal (non-allegro) English. Here are two potential sources of interference: (a) an inserted [o] will have the same treatment as unstressed Russian /a/ and so в Ниле 'in the Nile' and ванилли 'vanilla' (gen. sg.) become pronounced by the American identically as [va'nilli] or (b) the
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epenthetic vowel acquires a secondary stress as when *mgnovénie
"moment" is pronounced [\'mgnovénie], which would probably sound
to the Russian as a nonsensical *mygno ven\'e.

Inseparably bound with the stress system of English is what has
been called plus juncture. For our purposes, plus juncture can be
viewed as a distinctive syllable division. The phoneme immediately
before plus juncture appears as if it were the variant of word final
position and the phoneme immediately following plus juncture as if
it were word initial. The occurrence of plus juncture and secondary
stress seems to be somehow connected, one definite correlation
being: "Between a primary stress and a secondary stress there is
always at least one /+/." In the examples given above, the presence
of plus junctures was most likely conditioned by the stress
patterning (i.e., the Russian forms were interpreted as 'para+"fráz,
'nado+"vesém, 'golot+"va, 'mgnov+"vene'). There are also instances
where the secondary stress is conditioned by the presence of a plus
juncture. In English, plus juncture is used to separate a clearly
meaningful prefix from the stem. This can be seen from a compari-
son of re'act with re+act (to act again), recrea'tion with recrea-
tion (creating again), etc. There is a tendency for this pattern to
be carried over to Russian and a plus juncture is often inserted be-
tween a prefix and root. This occurs after the student has learned
to recognize prefixes as such and explains why he will pronounce
lovít' 'to catch' as [la'vit'] (without secondary stress and with re-
duction of Russian /a/ to [a]) while razbit' 'to shatter' will be
[raz+bit'].

One of the clearest tendencies in modern American English is to
generalize the stress on the initial syllable of the word. As was
seen above, in the North this is often accomplished by reducing pre-
tonic vowels to /a/, which then is lost. In many dialects of the Sou:
a different tendency is at work. Here the tendency is to shift
the stress to the initial syllable whenever possible. In such dialects
police will be pronounced /pəlɪs/. The consequences for con-
trastive analysis should be clear: speakers of such dialects will
tend to transform Russian pôrvét' into [\'poyr\'vet\'], while in the
North the same word would become ['pry\'vet\']. This means that
contrastive analysis must proceed from the analysis of the dialect
of the students being taught, not from a "general American" nor from
any diasystem. This analysis must further take into account the
changes or transformations which occur in going from a normal speech
rate to a slow rate (representing the speed the learner will use in
attempting to speak Russian in the earlier stages) and those which
occur in going from the normal rate of speech to an allegro rate.

Up to now the assumption has been made that Russian and English
stress are phonetically the same; the only difference, it was as-
sumed, lay in the systems of patterning. There is much evidence
to indicate that the relationship between stress and pitch in English
is anything but simple, and that, within English, one may be interpreted for the other. So Joos says, "Another experience that we teachers of English phonemics have all had is that our pupils at first mishear high pitch as maximum stress." A related problem is why Russians hear initial stress when the American speaker of Russian insists he is using final stress. An example of this is the pronunciation of xorosť, which a Russian may hear as /'xaraʃɔ/. In such cases the speaker often, in fact, had the greatest relative loudness on the first syllable, but the last syllable had a most perceptible rise of pitch: [/'xaraʃɔ]. On the other hand, an American hearing a Russian pronounce moloko 'milk' with citation-form intonation might reproduce the word as [ma'ʃlakə], interpreting the rise of pitch anticipatory to the final stress as the stress itself, i.e., Russian [ma'ʃlako]≠ [ma'ʃlakə]. There is reason, therefore, to suspect that in certain dialects and/or styles of speech the English "stress" may in reality be a definite rise (or, perhaps, change) in tone, which may or may not have a concomitant increase in loudness.

It would seem that in such dialects the position of greatest loudness may vary stylistically between the initial syllable of the word and the syllable with the distinctive rise in tone. The interference from such a pattern is seen most strongly in those Russian words, like xorosť, which have a stress pattern of the type XXX... These show a strong tendency to be reinterpreted by speakers of American English as 'XXX or 'XXX. (Similar variation is seen within American English; nouns with a stress pattern XX'X... have variants of the type "XXX...: Portu'guese or "Portuguese, aba'alone or "abalone, ciga'ret or"cigaret, Cali'fornia or "California, etc. Often the native speaker hears no difference between the two types, especially since the vowel from which the stress has shifted does not undergo reduction to /ə/.

The same patterning is then carried over to Russian words of the type xorosť, golovă, erundă, etc.) The stress system and its concomitant vowel reduction patterns do not form the totality of the Russian Grenzsignale. Among the other demarcational signals, the neutralization of voice oppositions word finally should be mentioned. A clear example of a loss of intelligibility due to the failure to devoice a final consonant is the following phrase, mnógo sadøv i pärkov "many gardens and parks," which was pronounced [mnógo sad ø v i pärkوف]. The absence of devoicing of the final v of sadov (concomitant with a general lack of distinction between Russian [l] and [y]) served as a negative Grenzsignal; it marks the absence of a word boundary. As a result, the phrase, as pronounced, would probably be interpreted as the non-grammatical mnógo sadøvý färkov.

It is the contention of this paper that the errors which can be grouped into the general category of "errors resulting in an incorrect assignment of word boundaries," and which are connected most intimately with differences in the systems of prosodics of the two
languages represent possibly the most grave type of interference. Such errors are all too often present even in students who have had three and four years of college Russian. Even if the student were to pronounce all the “segmental phonemes” of Russian correctly, the presence of the type of errors discussed above could severely hinder communication.

The major problem in the vocalism, the lack of proper reduction of unstressed vowels, has already been discussed in connection with the stress. At this point, though, it should be noted that the interference generally ascribed to okan’ee, ekan’ee, etc., in the learner is really due to the presence of secondary stresses which tend to be concomitant with a full vowel in English. If Russian storo’ná ‘side’ were pronounced [storo’na], with only one stress, the Russian would interpret it correctly, just as he understands the speech of fellow-Russians from the North. But the American tends to say [’xou’tou’’xou], with clear secondary stresses.9

It is especially important to know the phonetic nature of the vowels of the learner’s dialect. Although most Americans pronounce moon as /mu:n/, there are dialects in which it is pronounced /mi:n/. This sound [i:] is then transferred to Russian for the Russian /u/, and a word like luno ‘moon’ may be realized as [’liyná]. In other dialects certain phonemes may be absent or have defective distributions. A comparison of the vocalic inventories of the two languages (for English, the author’s dialect is chosen) will show that the larger system is found in English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>Unrounded</th>
<th>Rounded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>Back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>/i/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>/e/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>/a/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>/1/</td>
<td>/6/</td>
<td>/6/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid</td>
<td>/6/</td>
<td>/6/</td>
<td>/6/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>/a/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/6/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Some linguists regard the homorganic diphthongs as unit phonemes.)

A concomitant feature of the smaller vocalic inventory of Russian is that the domain of variation of a Russian vowel is greater than that
of an English vowel phoneme. In Russian the phonetic variation of
the phoneme gives additional, redundant information about the sur-
rounding consonants; in English, it is often the consonant which
gives additional information about the nature of the following vowel.
Examples of the situation in English are: [k], [g], [t], [l], etc.
come before front vowels, while [k], [g], [t], [l], etc. occur
before back vowels. In Russian, non-distinguishingly fronted vowels
come in the immediate vicinity of palatalized consonants: the pres-
ence of [a], [e], [o], [u] signals that the vowel is surrounded by
palatalized consonants. These facts can be utilized in teaching
Americans to speak Russian. The use of English /æ/ in Russian,
between soft consonants would give the hearer additional information,
and would thereby decrease the danger leading to a loss of intelli-
gibility. The major difference between the phonetic realizations
of the Russian and English phonemes lies, probably, in the lack of
distinguishable rounding in the English vowels /i/ and /u/. Such vowels
never occur with the degree of rounding inherent in Russian /i/ and
/u/, and are sometimes almost completely unrounded. English /bul/
‘bull’ may sound to a Russian more like his b峪 than like a possible
Russian b峪. The diphthong /u-/ in English is generally more
rounded than English /u/, but if it is substituted for Russian /u/
before syllable final /l, l', r, r', / the danger exists that the re-
sultant form will have an extra syllable due to the insertion of [a]
after the diphthong. Russian d峪 ‘he blew’ can become in this fash-
on ['dуп] or ['dуп], homophonous with English duel; the Imper-
active дуп blow may become homophonous with English Dewey, etc.
The same situation obtains for the other homorganic diphthongs.
Perhaps the most important vocalic distinction is that between Rus-
sian [i] and [y]. Although these are variants of one phoneme, /i/,
for pedagogical purposes they must be regarded as separate sounds.
This is because Americans will hear the difference between Russian
b峪 ([b'í], /b'íl/) ‘he beat’ and b峪 ([bí], /bíl/) ‘he was’ in
the vowels and not in the consonants. It is for this reason that such
learners will be more likely to omit palatalization before /l/ than
before any other Russian vowel. But this lack of palatalization will
not cause a major interference in communication if the opposition
between [y] and [i] is properly maintained. (This is another example
of utilizing what is redundant in the Russian phonological system
to increase the probability of the American being understood.)

In unstressed position Russian distinguishes only three vowels:
/i, u, a/. Assuming that the American speaker can get the proper
“rhythm” of the Russian reduction, there is still a strong possibility
that the qualitative nature of his reduction will be wrong, because
in English unstressed /i/ and /u/ tend to be in stylistic variation
with unstressed /a/. Compare mystery with [mis]terious or
[mæ]terious, super with [so]periority, etc.
The contrastive analysis of the consonantism must be carried out on both the paradigmatic and syntagmatic levels. There are two levels of syntagmatic analysis which must be studied. The first treats the distribution of the variants ["allophones"] in the spoken chain; the second—the distribution of the phonemes themselves in the spoken chain. For pedagogical purposes it is generally simplest to treat these two levels together.

On the paradigmatic level the greatest interference is generally seen as coming from the presence of a series of distinctively palatalized consonants in Russian and the absence of similar series from English. The basic patterning of the interference can be viewed as the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/b'/, /v'/, /f'/, /m'/, /n'/</td>
<td>/b/, /v/, /f/, /m/, /n/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/d', /z', /s'/</td>
<td>/d/, /z/, /s/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(The patterning of the velars causes no difficulty and the problems presented by /r/ cannot be separated from the very question of Russian /r/.) In pattern I the plain consonant tends to occur word finally, preconsonantally, and before /l/, while the sequence with /l/ tends to occur before Russian /e, a, o, u/. In pattern II the distribution of the plain and jotated forms is as in the first pattern; however a palatal (English /6, 3/ for Russian /t', d'/, less frequently /5, 2/ for /s', z'/) may be substituted instead, in all positions. This substitution of a palatal tends to be more common than the separation of the element of palatalization into /l/ especially since, in English, sequences of the type /tl/ have the pattern of becoming /l/, etc., in sandhi positions such as in can't you, did you, etc.
Russian /t/ and /d/ may also be interpreted as English /ts/, /dz/.

This is most likely word finally and precon-onantally. Such an interpretation is due to the maximalization of the Russian oppositions /t/: /t/ and /d/: /d'/ in the speech of many speakers of Russian by affricating the palatalized member of the opposition, yielding [c'] and [t']. It is for this reason that the palatalization of Russian c before e, due to interference from the Russian system of orthography, can cause serious misunderstanding. A pronunciation [c'ěl] for Russian cěl will be interpreted as těl, [c'ěx] for cěx as těx, etc.

The third pattern applies only to the Russian opposition /j/: /j'/, where the distribution of the two variants of English /l/ does not correspond to the Russian.

The failure of American students to palatalize properly presents special dangers only in those environments where palatalization is distinctive. Before /e/ the opposition between palatalized and non-palatalized consonants is neutralized, and so, in a hierarchy of errors, the lack of palatalization by the American in this environment is not a very critical mistake. In fact, a false reinterpretation of the Russian palatalization in this environment can lead to graver errors than the absence of any attempt at palatalization. The two examples which follow illustrate this:

Russian:                        Reinterpreted by the American as:
/t'ěm/ 'that' (instr. sg.)    /ćem/
/abab'ě/ 'about the bean'    /aba' bića/

Which the Russian may hear as:

ěm 'than'
o bab'ě 'about the peasant women'
(from nom. sg. bab'ě)

There remains the problem of the Russian consonants which for one reason or another can be said not to have equivalents in English. These fall into three categories: (1) Sounds which do not occur in English and for which there is no readily fillable slot in the English phonological system; belonging to this category are Russian /x, r, r'/. (2) Russian unit phonemes which correspond to English sequences of phonemes, i.e., Russian /c/, which is to the American student /ts/. The problem here is basically syntagmatic—to produce the already familiar sequence /ts/ in environments (e.g., initial) where it does not occur in English. (3) The variants of the English phoneme do not correspond to the variants of the Russian. This is true in various ways, depending upon the dialect of English, for English /t/, /d/ vis-à-vis Russian /t/, /d/: Intervocically post-tonic English /t/ may have the variant [ɾ] (a tense single flap), as in the dialects of those who distinguish medal from medal, or may be completely missing as in the dialects of those who pronounce
The two words alike. Before /n/ (and in some dialects /l/) English /t/ has the variant [ʔ] (glottal stop) as in buttos or the New York pronunciation of bottle. In some speakers, the glottal stop may also occur finally in stylistic variation with unreleased [t]. English /d/ may have the variant [r] (a lax single flap) intervocally. This may represent also the result of the neutralization of the /t/ /d/ opposition. If these variants are used by the learner in speaking Russian, it is very likely that his intelligibility will be severely impaired, and forms like műt̜nyj 'turbid,' kôt 'tom-cat,' padat 'to fall.'

The problem described last can serve as a transition between the paradigmatic aspects of the consonantism and the syntagmatic. On the syntagmatic level, the major problem lies in the difference in the types of consonant clusters permitted in the two languages. Some of these problems have already been discussed in the sections dealing with stress. Here we should note that in normal American English there are more (and more complex) consonant clusters word finally than word initially. Russian tends to have more (and more complex) clusters initially than finally. But in more rapid styles of American English, there is a striking simplification of final consonant clusters (concomitant with an ever-increasing complexity of the initial clusters, due to the loss of unstressed /s/ in initial syllables). Even in normal rates of speech months tends to be /mans/ and texts /teks/. The danger is that these patterns of simplification might be carried over into Russian. A student who pronounces English most as /mows/ is likely to pronounce Russian mőst 'bridge' without a final /t/. Similarly, when the learner begins to accelerate his rate of speech, Russian otec 'father' may become /at'ês/, just as English /yêts/ becomes /yês/ (what's).

The use of American English intonation while speaking Russian seldom results in a lack of communication, so problems of intonation should occupy a different level in the "hierarchy of errors" from some of the errors described above. However it is interesting to note that the sources of interference between the intonational systems of the two languages are twofold in nature: (a) the usual difference in intonational patterns between the two languages, and, (b) a cultural factor—the variations in voice pitch found in Russian intonation are much greater than those found in English; Russian intonation will sound exaggerated, "funny" to the learner, and he will avoid imitating it, so that he himself will not sound "funny." (Another difficulty in teaching Russian intonation to American students is due to the fact that, unlike the segmental phonemes and stress, intonational patterns are not marked in Russian orthography or in beginning textbooks.)

The above discussion has attempted to throw light on some of the areas of Russian pronunciation which, due to interference from the English phonological system, are likely to result in the American
learner's not being understood. The list of errors is not exhaustive, and different types of errors will occur depending upon the dialect of the students being taught. This approach is basically etiological, the basic assumption being that mistakes in pronunciation cannot be corrected unless both the teacher and the student are aware of their causes. Acquiring a new phonological system is just as much a process of "unlearning" as it is of learning, and the student must know exactly what he is to "unlearn." Finally, it must be emphasized that errors do not exist in isolation. There is a clear correlation and interrelation between the various parts of any system. In phonology, an error by the student in the pronunciation of a Russian consonant can cause an error in the pronunciation of the following vowel, which in turn can cause errors in the stress system.

Notes

1. Phonetic transcriptions are enclosed in square brackets and phonemic transcriptions in slants. Orthography (and transliteration from Russian) are italicized. In some instances only the relevant part of a work is given phonetically and the remainder is in transliteration. The following should be noted about the symbols used: The main stress of English words (and Russian forms pronounced with the stress system of English) is marked by " if there is also a secondary stress (') and by ' if there is no secondary stress. Stress is not marked on monosyllables. The acute (') marks stress in Russian but is also in pitch in English. A modified phonemicization of English is used. /aq/ represents the vowel of English bird (/bird/) in the pronunciation of Chicago. /b, m, l, v/ represent the initial sounds of Yale, rail, and fail respectively, as well as the non-syllabic elements of diphthongs such as bay, bar, bough (/boj/, /bag/, bay/). Syllabic consonants are marked by a subscript.


3. Secondary stress is found in Russian in certain compounds such as samolëtostroënie, däl'nevostënyj, skperobolëžka, etc., although in many cases such a stress is facultative. Since Russian words with a secondary stress tend to be in technical terms, both native and borrowed, and are most unlikely to turn up in the first two years of Russian learning, the presence of such a secondary stress in Russian can be ignored in the initial stages of teaching. See also E. J. Vlassesnov, "Фонетика современного русского литературного языка" (М., 1956), стр. 84-87.

4. Два! presents relatively little difficulty to the learner, and therefore can soon be pronounced according to the allegro pattern. An initial sequence /dv/ as in dva however, does not occur in normal speed English. The unfamiliarity of the cluster orthographically probably is one of the factors preventing dva from being pronounced according to the allegro pattern.


9. Okan’e, as the failure to have the proper assimilation of voicing, the insertion of [a] in such forms as s tobēj—[sotəbəj] (where the /st/ cluster already occurs in English), and many other errors of pronunciation are due to interference caused by the orthographic system of Russian, and not necessarily to interference from English. This has an interesting further consequence: the problems of interference are different depending on whether the learner is repeating a Russian utterance he has heard or pronouncing something he is reading. To illustrate the difference in interference, the Russian /vōru/ "to the thief" will most likely be repeated in the first instance correctly as [ˈvɔrʊ], while the orthographic vōru will most likely be read as [ˈvɔrʊ].