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The speech in the recording is that of a 67-year-old male from the town of Meilen, some 15 kilometers south-west of the city of Zurich. It represents the dialect of an older, linguistically somewhat conservative generation, a fact of which the speaker is well aware. The audio samples were obtained in the following way: for the first recording session, the speaker had at his disposal a list of lexical items and short phrases, which he spontaneously placed into meaningful utterances. In the second session, he had to read out lexical items or short phrases placed in a carrier sentence.
Consonants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants</th>
<th>Bilabial</th>
<th>Labiodental</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Post-alveolar</th>
<th>Palatal</th>
<th>Velar</th>
<th>Glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plosive</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>ġ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affricate</td>
<td>pʰ</td>
<td>tʃ</td>
<td>ʃ</td>
<td>kʃ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n̥</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trill</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricative</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>ŋ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximant</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>ŋ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral approximant</td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table of consonants displays only phonemes and does not contain allophones. For instance, the labiodental nasal [n̥] occurs as a conditioned variant before a following labiodental. The uvular fricatives [X] and [Â] appear as free variants of /x/ and /G/, and there are several allophones of the phoneme /r/ – such as the alveolar tap [ɾ] and, more frequently, the uvular variants [R], [Â], [Â] or [§].

Words can begin with a vowel; i.e. in contrast to Standard German, initial vowels are not preceded by the glottal stop [], which occurs only marginally, for example, in the reinforced negation particle [nœʔœ] /[hœʔœ] ‘nope’. Also in contrast to Standard German, unvoiced plosives before stressed vowels are not aspirated; rather, aspiration is lexically determined and typical of borrowed items, such as [pʰkÂ] ‘parcel’ or [tʰe]: ‘tea’.

A striking structural feature of the Zurich German consonant system is that it completely lacks voiced obstruents; nevertheless, two series of homorganic obstruents are distinguished. Winteler (1876: 21) labeled the two series FORTIS and LENIS, using the Latin adjectives meaning ‘strong’ and ‘soft’, respectively. He pointed to articulatory strength (as well as to duration) as the phonetic correlate of the contrast. This terminology has been taken over by, among others, Sievers (1876: 65) and Dieth (1950: 174). Jakobson & Halle (1964: 99f.), quoting Winteler (1876), refer to the Swiss German consonantal pattern in order to illustrate tenseness and laxness with respect to consonants. Haas (1978: 311) proposes using the feature
[±long] instead of [±tense] to account for the phonological difference between fortes and lenes, arguing that duration is more easily detectable by instrumental analyses. Indeed, for Zurich German, Fulop (1994: 60) finds remarkable differences in closure duration between fortis and lenis stops. Similarly, Willi (1995: 263, 1996: 174) has shown that the segmental duration of intervocalic plosives is the relevant acoustic and perceptual cue that allows listeners to differentiate between the two series. For the closely related Thurgovian dialect, Kraehenmann (2001: 121–137, 2003: 102–168) has measured plosives and fricatives in other phonotactic contexts, and found that the underlying phonological distinction, which she views as an opposition between geminate and singleton consonants, ‘correlates with phonetic sound duration’ (Kraehenmann 2003: 166). In the present description, the terms ‘fortis’ and ‘lenis’ are employed in accordance with their traditional definition. Thus, the terms refer to two phonologically distinct series of homorganic obstruents that are both unvoiced, meaning that a feature other than [±voiced] is the phonetic correlate of the distinction; they are not used in line with a broader interpretation that has been proposed in more recent work (cf., for instance, Kohler 1984, Jessen 1998).

Many differing transcription conventions to represent the two series of obstruents are found in the literature. For instance, the minimal pair consisting of the words for ‘store’ (displaying an intervocalic lenis plosive) and ‘lath’ (displaying an intervocalic fortis plosive) could be transcribed in different ways, as is illustrated in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lenis</td>
<td>ˈlʌð</td>
<td>ˈlʌð</td>
<td>ˈlʌð</td>
<td>ˈlʌð</td>
<td>ˈlʌð</td>
<td>ˈlʌð</td>
<td>ˈlʌð</td>
<td>ˈlʌð</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortis</td>
<td>ˈlʌt</td>
<td>ˈlʌt</td>
<td>ˈlʌt</td>
<td>ˈlʌt</td>
<td>ˈlʌt</td>
<td>ˈlʌt</td>
<td>ˈlʌt</td>
<td>ˈlʌt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lenes can be transcribed by using the symbols that stand for voiced obstruents in the IPA system, with or without a diacritic indicating the unvoiced quality, but also by the symbols that stand for unvoiced obstruents in the IPA system. Fortes can be transcribed by the simple symbols that stand for unvoiced obstruents in the IPA system, but also by doubling the respective symbols or by adding [:]. Note that there is some potential for confusion, since a single symbol rendering an unvoiced obstruent in the IPA system is used by some authors to transcribe a fortis consonant, whereas others use it for a lenis. The situation is further complicated by the fact that different systems may be used for different phonotactic contexts (for instance, intervocalic fortis plosives are often represented by a doubled symbol, but by a single symbol when in initial position). In addition, fricatives are often not represented according to the same conventions as plosives.

Most of the possible systems illustrated in the above table have been adopted by different scholars: Nübling & Schrambke (2004) use system 2, Moulton (1986) employs system 3, Willi (1995, 1996) adopts system 4, Dieth (1950) sways between systems 4, 5 and 6, while Kraehenmann (2003) opts for system 8. In the present description, we adopt system 4 in the broad transcription, but use system 5 in the narrow transcription.

As regards the structure of the phoneme inventory, both the consonant chart and the word list show that the fortis–lenis contrast is regularly exploited for plosives and fricatives, whereas there is only a single series of affricates. Plosives occur as fortes and lenes in word-initial, word-internal and word-final position, whereas fricatives have a slightly more restricted phonotactic distribution: word-initially, they occur only as lenes (Dieth 1950: 360), but in both word-internal and word-final context, the fortis–lenis contrast is relevant (note, however, that /ɔ/ tends to occur only after long vowels, while /x/ only stands after short vowels).
There is no equivalent to the final devoicing process (AUSLAUTVERHÄRTUNG) of Standard German, since duration differences between fortis and lenis obstruents are preserved to a large extent in word-final position. In the closely-related Thurgovian dialect, contrast neutralization has been observed only phrase-internally (Kraehenmann 2003: 128).

With regard to fortis plosives and affricates, the core lexicon exhibits a structural asymmetry for velars: the phonemes /k/ and /kʰ/ appear mainly in word-internal and word-final contexts, as in [ˈhoʊkə] ‘hook’ (n), [ˈhoʊkʰax] ‘to hack’ and [ˈʃnaekə] ‘snail’, [ˈdrækʰax] ‘dirt’. Historically, this state of affairs is due to the fact that the initial Germanic *k- in High Alemannic (as opposed to most other High German dialects) was affected by the Old High German sound shift, originally giving rise to an initial velar affricate that was eventually simplified to a fricative, yielding, for instance, [ˈʃiŋdə] ‘child’ (cf. Standard German Kind). The phonemes /k/ and /kʰ/ may occur word-initially, but in native items only as instantiations of morphologically conditioned fortition, e.g. [ˈkʰɔeui̯fə] ‘bought’ as opposed to [ˈʃauməfa] ‘to buy’ or [ˈkʰeː] ‘given’ as opposed to [ˈʒeː] ‘to give’ (perceptually, the contrast is more salient in the prefixed forms [ˈdʒeː] ‘to state’ as opposed to [ˈbokeː] ‘stated’). Morphologically underived word-initial [k] appears in French and English loanwords (e.g. [ˈkəfdʃeur] ‘hairdresser’, cf. French coiffeur, [ˈkɔər] ‘coach’ (n), cf. English car), while word-initial [kʰ] is typical of quite a number of loanwords from Standard German (e.g. [ˈkʰɔmpf] ‘fight’, cf. Standard German Kampf) and a few – presumably recent – borrowings from English, such as [ˈkʰuːl] ‘cool (figurative sense)

The nasals /m/ and /n/ are allowed in all phonotactic contexts, but the velar nasal /ŋ/ does not occur in initial position (historically, this is due to the fact that /ŋ/, originally a conditioned variant of /n/ before /ɡ/, became phonemicized after /ɡ/ was dropped in these contexts). In intervocalic position, many Swiss German dialects have nasal geminates, whereas in traditional Zurich German, nasals are only short (e.g. [ˈhimɔl] ‘sky’, [ˈbruŋə] ‘well’ (n), [ˈʒtɔŋə] ‘pole’). However, younger people tend to pronounce bilabial and velar nasals as long in this position, a phenomenon which seems to be particularly common before [ɐɹ] and [ɔl], e.g. [ˈhɔmɔr] ‘hammer’, [ˈ:lenər] ‘longer’; incidentally, the same differentiation may also apply to /l/, e.g. [ˈmiːrə] ‘miller’. This recent development may be due to influence from neighboring Swiss German dialects or may even be viewed as an instance of spelling pronunciation (many of the corresponding words are spelled with double consonant graphemes in Standard German, viz. Hammer, Müller, etc.). Note that our speaker produces rather short nasals in intervocalic position. By contrast, he lengthens /n/ in one realization of the word /ˈzunə/ → [ˈzunə] ‘sun’ in order to compensate for the apocope of the unstressed vowel.

Vowels
Zurich German has the eleven vowel qualities shown in the quadrilateral. In this analysis, the system distinguishes four degrees of height (close, close-mid, open-mid, open) and three series on the anterior vs. posterior axis (front, central, back). Additionally, lip-rounding is relevant for front vowels. In unstressed syllables, the core lexicon only contains [ə] and [i], as shown by the minimal pair [ɛˈuɛxə] ‘weaken’ vs. [ɛˈuɛxi] ‘weakness’. Other unstressed vowels may appear in borrowings, e.g. [ˈbɔmbus] ‘bamboo’, [ˈkɔbɔre] ‘cabaret’, [ˈyɔrælo] ‘trout’, etc. The schwa vowel [ə] is restricted to unstressed syllables.

Traditionally, a further series of phonemes between the close and close-mid series is assumed, which would add /ɪ y u/ and /ɪː yː uː/ to the inventory. Vowel systems containing such a full additional series are attested in the most clear-cut way for the Toggenburg dialect, as has been shown by Moulton (1973). The area of Toggenburg immediately borders the south-east of the Zurich German territory, the so-called Zurich Highlands, for which Weber (1923: 43) presents data illustrating near-minimal pairs such as [ɪˈɡæl] ‘hedgehog’ vs. [ɪˈɾɡæl] ‘bolt’. According to Keller (1961: 37, 39, 40, 41), minimal pairs such as [ɪˈɜːr] ‘expensive’ vs. [ɪˈɜːr] ‘dry’ exist in the whole of the Zurich German territory with the exception of the north-eastern Winterthur area. However, the additional vowel series seems about to disappear, as is also noted in the popular account by Schobinger (2000: 118); as a matter of fact, our speaker does not produce it.

Phonetically, short [i y u] are only slightly lower than their long counterparts, as shown by the formant measurements in Schmid (2004: 110f.). For this reason, short and long high vowels are represented by the same symbols here, whereas in the narrow transcription the appropriate diacritic [ː] is used.

In stressed syllables, all vowel qualities are used for both short and long phonemes with the exception of short [æ], which has only a marginal status. According to Keller (1961: 36), this vowel can occur only as a long phoneme, but it is reported before /ɛ/ and /ɛː/ by Weber (1964: 29) in some native items. One such example, not mentioned by Weber (1964: 29), would be [ˈhɔer.ˈdɔpʃəl] ‘potato’, pronounced [ˈhɔer.ˈdɔpʃəl] by many speakers. In addition, short [æ] exists in English borrowings as a substitute for [ʌ], e.g. [blovf] ‘bluff’ (n).

The short vowels /ɛ/ and /ɛː/ were originally in complementary distribution, with [ɛ] only occurring before /ɛ/ and /ɛː/, but, as Moulton (1960: 164f.) has convincingly argued for the dialect of the city of Zurich, phonemicization of /ɛ/ has taken place through analogy and borrowing. Note that the corresponding long vowels easily form minimal pairs, e.g. /ˈhɛr/ ‘army’ vs. /ˈhɛr/ ‘from’.

Quantity turns out to be an essential feature of the Zurich German vowel system. For almost all vowel qualities, minimal pairs only differentiated by length can be found, as is illustrated by the word list above.

As to distributional patterns, it can be observed that there is a tendency for short vowels in monosyllabic nouns to be followed by a fortis obstruent, but in the (often monosyllabic) imperative singular form, lenis obstruents occur regularly after short vowels, e.g. [heb] ‘hold!’, [bić ruig] ‘be quiet!’. After long vowels, both lenis and fortis obstruents appear (with the
exception of /x/, which only appears after short vowels), e.g. [ʒnɔk] ‘midge’, [ʒlɔj] ‘stroke’, [ʒlɔf] ‘sleep’ (n), [ʒnuv] ‘breath’.

Phonetically, the vowel quantity contrast is implemented by clear duration differences: duration measurements yield an average V/V: ratio of .56 for stressed vowels of the same timbre. On the other hand, there are only slight height differences between short and long high vowels, and the contact pattern between short/long vowels and the following consonants seems to be the same (Schmid 2004: 111–113).

The degree of lip rounding of the low back vowel may vary to some extent among individual speakers, leading to [a] as a free variant of the phoneme /o/. The articulation of the central vowel [a] is somewhat advanced compared to its Standard German equivalent.

Diphthongs are formed with the non-syllabic vowels [i ʊ ɔ] as second elements, as illustrated by the following list:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ei</th>
<th>ɣreɪ</th>
<th>‘free’</th>
<th>iɛ</th>
<th>ɲιɛ</th>
<th>‘never’</th>
<th>æu</th>
<th>æu</th>
<th>‘also’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>æi</td>
<td>naɛi</td>
<td>‘no’</td>
<td>ɣɔ</td>
<td>mjang</td>
<td>‘tired’</td>
<td>ʊi</td>
<td>ʒʊ</td>
<td>‘pig’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oɪ</td>
<td>noɪ</td>
<td>‘new’</td>
<td>ʊɔ</td>
<td>ɣyɔŋ</td>
<td>‘cow’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Originally, two diphthongs containing a mid rounded vowel as their first and [i] as their second element – transcribed as [oi] and [aoi] by Keller (1961: 36) – were distinguished; one near-minimal pair would be [noɪ] ‘new’ vs. [hoei] ‘hay’ (cf. Keller 1961: 42, Weber 1964: 31f.). In present-day Zurich German (including the variety used by our speaker), they seem to have merged into a single diphthong, transcribed here as [oi]. In addition to the diphthongs illustrated in the above list, a diphthong [uɪ] marginally occurs in exclamations such as [pɹuɪ] ‘uhg!’.

**Sandhi**

Zurich German has a somewhat ‘opaque’ phonetic surface, which results from the application of three general types of sandhi processes: the first two concern patterns of consonantal contact, whereas the third aims at hiatus avoidance by means of consonant epenthesis.

Firstly, the fortis vs. lenis contrast yields four possible contact patterns between obstruents: fortis # fortis, fortis # lenis, lenis # fortis and lenis # lenis. In all four patterns, the opposition between fortis and lenis obstruents is neutralized, as illustrated by the following examples displaying plosive # plosive contact: /az hæt tiʃ̯/ → [az hæ.tiʃ̯] ‘there are animals around’, /az hæt diʃh̯/ → [az hæ.tiʃh̯] ‘there are thieves around’, /dɔ zæp tɔʃ̯/ → [dɔ zæp tɔʃ̯] ‘that day’, /heb di/ → [hep ti] ‘hold tight!’. The phonetic result of this neutralization has sometimes been viewed as ‘half fortis’ (Moulton 1986: 386); in our description, it is represented by the fortis symbols. Note that, in allegro speech, the first plosive may be unreleased, e.g. [dɔ zæp.ʃ̯ɔʃ̯], [‘hep’ ti]. If two lenis plosives share their place of articulation, the result is a fortis plosive, e.g. /zæb ʃild/ → [zæ.ʃild] ‘that picture’. In the case of /d/, the place of articulation is assimilated altogether (see below). Fortition also occurs in the case of plosive # fricative contact, e.g. /ɡib zɨ/ → [ɡip si] ‘give her’ (acc), /zæb ʃind/ → [zæp ʃind] ‘that child’. If the place of articulation is shared, an affricate emerges as the result of the assimilation, e.g. /dʒɔ zæb ɣraŋ/ → [dʒɔ zæp ɣraŋ] ‘that woman’.

Secondly, according to a general phonological process of Zurich German, alveolar plosives and nasals assimilate their place of articulation to following labials and velars. This assimilation occurs not only within morphemes, as in [kʊŋjɪ] ‘jam’ (cf. French confiture, Standard German Konfitüre), but even more frequently over morpheme and word boundaries, giving rise to a wide variety of internal and external sandhi phenomena (cf. Moulton 1986: 388–390, Féry & Meier 1993: 1096–1100). Three types of assimilation to the following consonant can be distinguished, depending on whether the process affects word-final /n/ (or /t/), /d/ or the cluster /nd/.
In the case of /n/, the sandhi process only implies assimilation with regard to the place of articulation. This can be shown with the nominative-accusative case form of the masculine singular indefinite article /an/ in combination with different nouns: /an ßaUM/ → [ßan ßaUM] ‘a tree’, /an ylUS/ → [ßan ylUS] ‘a river’, /an turM/ → [ßan turM] ‘a tower’, /an ßopf/ → [ßan ßopf] ‘a head’. Similarly, /t/ assimilates its place of articulation to a following obstruent across morpheme (and word) boundaries, e.g. /vaelt/+ /ßo/ryamt/ → [vaelpo.ryamt] ‘world famous’, /vaelt/+ /fromd/ → [vaelp.ßromd] ‘unworldly’.

More interesting are the assimilation processes in connection with word-final /d/, which can be illustrated with the negation particle /n/do/ ‘not’ (our speaker sometimes uses the more traditional form /n/ðy/): /n/do ßouß/ → [ßon ßouß] ‘not to construct’, /n/do yiil/ → [ßon ßiil] ‘not much’, /n/do ßo/ → [ßon ßo] ‘not here’, /n/do ßo:n/ → [ßon ßo:n] ‘not beautiful’, /n/do ßo/ → [ßon ßo] ‘not to go’, /n/do ßo:/ → [ßon ßo:] ‘not to come’. As is evident from these examples, the assimilation of the place of articulation is accompanied by the fortition of lenis consonants, leading either to the ‘fusion’ of two lenes into one fortis or to the affrication of the following fricative. Before word-initial /m/, the assimilated plosive may be unreleased or may even lead to the glottalization of the nasal in allegro speech, e.g. /n/do ßonßa/ → [ßonßa] or [ßonßa] ‘not to do’. Glottalization is also observed word-externally, e.g. /ordner/ → [orßner] ‘folder’.

Assimilation of word-final nasal + plosive clusters appears in cases like /hond/ + /ßols/ → [homp.ßols] ‘ball of the thumb’, /mar zindo myßd/ → [mar zimp:myßd] ‘we are tired’, /ßond/ + /ßo:/ → [ßond.ßo:] ‘sandpit’, /mar ßend ßælt/ → [mar ßend.ßælt] ‘we have money’. In this case, regressive assimilation affects both the plosive and the nasal of the consonant cluster.

In all of the examples seen so far, assimilation applies only regressively. Only with sibilants may assimilation apply both regressively and progressively, when an alveolar fricative is assimilated to a postalveolar fricative, e.g. /iß zi ßuß/ → [iß kiß] ‘has she gone’, /ßaeß zi kseß/ → [ßaeß kseß] ‘have you seen her/them’, /iß ßlos/ → [iß ßlos] ‘into the castle’ (cf. Weber 1964: 42). Progressive assimilation seems to occur exclusively in the combination of verb-final /ß/ followed by the third person singular feminine/third person plural pronoun /ßi/ ‘she/her, they/them’; it is not produced by our speaker in the utterance recorded.

Finally, turning to the third category of sandhi phenomena, one can observe that a hiatus is often avoided by an alveolar nasal introduced between two vowels at a word boundary. This process is particularly common if the first vowel is schwa in an inflected part of speech: /ßumßa ßaeß/ → [ßumßa ßaeß] ‘number one’, /ßon ßoßa ßboß/ → [ßon ßoßa ßboß] ‘down to the floor’ (cf. Moulton 1986: 390f., Nübling & Schrambke 2004: 293f., 300f.). In some cases, this linking /n/ may be analyzed as a remnant of an older form containing a final /ß/, e.g. /ßin i/ ‘am I’ vs. /ßi ßi/ ‘I am’ (cf. Standard German bin ich ‘am I’ and ich bin ‘I am’). However, an epenthetic nasal also appears in contexts in which historically there has never been an /n/, e.g. /ßon i/ → [ßon i] ‘when I’. Moreover, /n/ epenthesis depends on morpho-syntactic factors: it takes place predominantly after certain parts of speech, as has been pointed out by Ortmann (1998: 58–65) for High Alemannic in general.

In some cases, a linking /ß/ is introduced instead of /n/. This is particularly common with some forms of the definite article (e.g. /ßoß olt moi/ → [ßor ßoß olt moi] ‘the old man’) and with the pronoun [ma] ‘one, we’ (e.g. [ma ßoßt] ‘one goes’, but [mar ßiß ßoßt] ‘one is satisfied’; cf. Moulton 1986: 391). In these cases, /ß/ may be seen as a remnant of an older form containing final /ß/ (at least if we allow for mutual influencing of the pronouns corresponding to Standard German wir ‘we’ and man ‘one’).

Sentence phonetics and prosody
The sandhi phenomena, as well as the lack of generalized [?] before morpheme-initial stressed vowels, indicate a fundamental property of Zurich German (and of Swiss German generally):
post-lexical resyllabification regularly takes place (very much as in the Romance languages, but in contrast to Standard German), e.g. /min ‘umikla/ → [mi. ŋum. kla] ‘my uncle’. In other words, neither word boundaries nor morpheme boundaries are phonologically relevant (cf. Moulton 1986: 385, Nübling & Schrambke 2004: 294).

As for lexical stress, Zurich German behaves in many respects like Standard German. In the core lexicon, word stress is basically assigned to the lexical root and is thus morphologically conditioned. In many cases, the root happens to be the first syllable, yielding a very high overall frequency of words stressed on the first syllable. Given this state of affairs, Zurich German also shows a preference for word-initial stress in loans and acronyms, e.g. [ˈhotel] ‘hotel’ or [ˈɛdəpɔlɛ] ‘FDP = Liberal Democratic Party’; in the corresponding words, Standard German has final stress. On the other hand, Zurich German displays final stress in some words where Standard German has initial stress, e.g. [ˈmoːtoːɾ] ‘motor’.

Owing to the morphological bias of stress assignment in native items, genuine prosodic regularities can be best observed in loan words. It seems to be the case that stress assignment is partially governed by syllable weight (cf. Kraehenmann 2003: 169–217 for the closely-related Thurgovian dialect), but there are some exceptions. For instance, [ˈlɔbɔɾ] ‘laboratory’ displays initial stress although the final syllable is heavy, contrary to the above example [ˈmoːtoːɾ] ‘motor’.

Regrettably, not much is known about the intonation of Zurich German; Weber (1964: 52f.) offers at least some impressionistic observations. Still, evidence from the Bernese dialect (Fitzpatrick-Cole 1999) as well as from Swiss High German (Stock 2000, Ulbrich 2004) reveals some intonational patterns that are probably also typical of Zurich German. Compared to (northern) Standard German, Zurich German seems to display a larger overall F0 range with a greater number of pitch movements, the default pitch accent consisting of a low-rising contour, as illustrated by figure 1, which is the first clause of the recorded passage.

With regard to phrasing and timing, typical features of our speaker are a relatively strong lengthening of phrase-initial syllables, a pattern that also appears in a less clear-cut way in
Transcription

Narrow transcription of recorded passage

Orthographic version

In the Swiss German diglossic situation, dialect is usually not written (if we disregard the special genre of dialect literature and some types of informal written texts in electronic communication such as e-mail, chat and SMS text messages, in which the use of written dialect is especially popular among the younger generation). There is no officially recognized standard orthography of Zurich (or Swiss) German. Our ‘orthographic version’ follows the proposals of Dieth & Schmid-Cadalbert (1986), as does the popular account by Schobinger (2004). The most important points to be aware of are: long vowels are rendered by doubling the respective vowel grapheme (thus, \(e = /e/, \, ee = /e:/\)); openness of vowels is rendered by the grave accent, thus, \(e = /e/, \, è = /ê/\); schwa is represented by \(e\) (as in the Standard German orthography).

De Biiswind und d Sune
Emaal händ de Biiswind und d Sune gschtritte, wèër vo báidne das ácht de schtèrcher seig. Da chunt en Maa dethëër, won en ticke Mantel aaghaa hät. Doo sind s rööttig woorde, das dée de schtèrcher seig, wo dèë Maa dezue bringi, das er sin Mantel abziei. De Biiswind hät aafè blaase so fesch das er hät chône, aber de Maa hät nu de Mantel änger gnaa. Doo hät d Sune aafè schiine, imer wèërmer, bis de Maa de Mantel abzoge hät. Doo hät de Biiswind müese zuegèë, das d Sun schtèrcher seig weder èëër.
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