Interactions of Tone and Phonation in Santiago Laxopa Zapotec

Mykel Loren Brinkerhoff

Questions

- How does phonology interact with phonetics?
- How does tone and phonation interact at the phonetics-phonology interface?
- How does tone and phonation interact in Santiago Laxopa Zapotec?

1 Introduction

- This paper investigates how tone and phonation interact with each other and with the phonetics-phonology interface.
- This investigation uses Santiago Laxopa Zapotec to answer these questions.
- Santiago Laxopa Zapotec (SLZ) is a variety of Sierra Norte Zapotec, an Oto-Manguean language (Adler et al. 2018, Sichel & Toosarvandani 2020).
- SLZ is spoken by ~1200 people in the municipality of Santiago Laxopa, Oaxaca, Mexico with a small number of speakers in Oaxaca City, Mexico and Santa Cruz, CA.
- Similar to other Oto-Manguean languages, SLZ has both tone and phonation (Campbell, Kaufman & Smith-Stark 1986, Stolz & Stolz 2001, E. Campbell 2017, E. W. Campbell 2017).
- Data is drawn from elicitations conducted 2020-2021 with two native speakers of SLZ that live in the Santa Cruz, CA area.

2 Phonetics-Phonology Interface

- Kingston (2007) explains that there are three ways in which phonetics can interface with the phonology.
    1. Phonetics *defines* distinctive features
    2. Phonetics *explains* many phonological patterns
    3. Phonetics *implements* phonological representations.
- Using these three ways in which the phonetics interacts with the phonology, we can account for the ways that tone and phonation interact.
- We can *define* what the tones and phonation types are in SLZ.
    - This can be accomplished through frameworks such as Articulatory Phonology (Browman & Goldstein 1992) and Auditorism (Kingston & Randy L. Diehl 1994, 1995).

- We can *explain* what the tones and phonation types are in SLZ.
  - This can be done through discussing the physical, physiological, and/or psychological properties of speaking and listening.
  - For tones, this means discussing the f0 measures and perceived pitch
  - For phonation, this means discussing relevant acoustic measurements like spectral tilt and CPP (Garellek 2019).
- We can *implement* the phonological representations of tone and phonation types in SLZ.
  - This would be accomplished by discussing what the abstract abstract phonological categories are and what factors control how those categories are actually implemented within the phonetics.
- This paper will tackle the way *explaining* what the tones and phonation types are and how those phonological representations are *implemented.*
  - This will be accomplished by describing the acoustic measurements that correlate with the different phonation types.
  - Additionally, I will explain the different f0 measurements and how they correlate to the different tonemes of the language.

3 Phonemic Inventory

- This section lays out what is currently known about the vowel and tone inventories of Santiago Laxopa Zapotec based on fieldwork conducted by myself and other researchers at UCSC.

3.1 Vowels

- SLZ follows the majority of languages in exhibiting a basic five vowel inventory.

Table 1: SLZ Vowels

	front	central	back
high	i		u
mid	e		o
low		a	

- Like other Oto-Manguean langauages, SLZ can manipulate these five vowel categories by making them laryngeally-complex (Silverman 1997).

- This is accomplished through the addition of three different laryngeally-complex phonations, which are all contrastive as seen in the the near-minimal triple (1)
  - Breathy: [a̤] *ah*
  - Checked: [aˀ] *a'*
  - Laryngealized: [aˀa] *a'a*[1]

(1) Near-minimal triple
  a. *yah* [ja̤³] 'iron; rifle'
  b. *yu'* [çuˀ³] 'earth'
  c. *yu'u* [juˀu¹³] 'house'

- Each of these phonation types are associated with different configurations of the larynx (Esling et al. 2019).
- Breathy phonation is produced with an open supraglottic tube during the production of the vowel
- Checked phonation consists of modal phonation which is abruptly stopped which is associated with a glottal stop.[2]
- Laryngealized vowels in SLZ and other closely related varieties (Yalálag Zapotec) show a variable pronunciation ranging from a vowel that has a glottal stop interrupting the vowel to the use of creaky voice throughout the vowel or a portion.
- Table **??** shows the variable pronunciation of laryngealized vowels in Yalálag Zapotec, taken from Avelino Becerra (2004) and Avelino (2010).

Table 2: Layngealized Vowels in Yalálag Zapotec

/VˀV/	[VʔV]
	[VV̰V]
	[VV̰:V̆]
	[VV̰V̰]

- In order to explain and define this vowels, I will be taking acoustic measurements.

[1]Previous descriptions of the the vowel system of closely related languages have used various different terms for this vowel including broken, rearticulated, interrupted, and creaky (Long & Cruz 2005, Avelino 2010, Avelino Becerra 2004, Sonnenschein 2005, Adler & Morimoto 2016). In order to avoid confusion, I will use the term laryngealized following Avelino (2010).

[2]There are two ways in which this vowel can be analyzed. One is the traditional way where the glottal stop is considered inseparable from the vowel. The other is to treat this as a consonant which is restricted to only reside in codas (similar to how the sound /ŋ/ is restricted to codas in English). This second approach is the one taken by Avelino Becerra (2004). I will follow the traditional way of analyzing these vowels through this paper.

  - Data from Adler & Morimoto (2016) and preliminary data from myself shows that H1-H2 and CPP are both measures that correspond to the phonation types.

- Answer questions regarding the moraic status of the different phonations.
- Answer questions about the interaction of tone and phonation.

3.2 Tone

- Tonal analysis was done following Pike (1948) and K. L. Snider (2018)
- SLZ exhibits five different tonal patterns as shown in Table 3
  - Three level tones: H, M, and L (represented using Pike's numbers)
  - Two contours: MH and HL

Table 3: SLZ tones

high	a^{1}	*xha*	[z̨a^{1}]	'clothing.POSS'
mid	a^{2}	*nu'ulhe*	[ɾiʒ^{2}]	'house.POSS'
low	a^{3}	*yu'*	[ç̣u^{ˀ3}]	'earth'
rising	a^{21}	*yu'u*	[ju^{ˀ}u^{21}]	'quicklime (sp. cal)'
falling	a^{13}	*yu'u*	[ju^{ˀ}u^{13}]	'house'

- We believe that the mora is the tone bearing unit in SLZ.
- This also in keeping with other analyses of tone in Zapotecan languages (e.g., Chávez-Peón 2010).
- With the mora being the TBU in SLZ and only one tone per mora the contour tones must be born on syllables containing two morae or split across the multiple syllables.
- However, if fortis consonants are moraic in nature then the question arises as to how tone interacts with these moraic consonants.
- It is a well established fact that tone can appear on sonorant consonants but less likely on obstruents (e.g., Yip 2002, Hyman 2014, K. Snider 2014, K. L. Snider 2018).
- This has been well-established for other Zapotec varieties but with one exception. Only vowels and fortis sonorants are able to bear tone in Quiaviní Zapotec (Chávez-Peón 2010: Ch. 5).

4 Interaction of Tone and phonation

- The interaction of tone and phonation is a well-established fact and has been heavily studied in Asian tonal languages (see references in Yip 2002, Michaud 2012, Brunelle & Kirby 2016).
- In these languages it is common for certain phonation types to co-occur with certain tones.
- The interaction between tone and phonation in the languages of the America's has been studied but to a lesser extant than Asian languages (Adler & Morimoto 2016, Chávez-Peón 2010, DiCanio 2012).
- Chávez-Peón (2010) showed that the similar restrictions in tone and phonation co-occurrence appear in Quiaviní Zapotec but are at the same time much more free, see Table 4.

Table 4: SLQZ tone and phonation

	High	Low	Falling	Rising
Modal	✓	✓	✓	✓
Breathy	X	✓	✓	X
Creaky	✓	✓	✓	X
Interrupted	✓	✓	✓	X

- One previous studied attempted to explore this question in SLZ, but was ultimately flawed (Morimoto 2017).
- I am currently trying to determine to what extent tone and phonation interact in SLZ.

5 Methodology

- Two native speakers of SLZ (1 male and 1 female) were asked to perform two tasks:
  1. Word lists elicitation
  2. A narrative elicitation
- Word list elicitation consisted of approximately 200 words repeated three times each in a carrier sentence.
- Consultants where recorded using a Zoom H4n audio recorder (44.1kHz and 16bit) and Zencastr, a professional podcasting service that records in high quality audio.

(2) Carrier Sentence
sh-ni=a'^{13} _____ cho^{2}ne^{2} las^{2}
CONT-speak=1SG three times
'I say _____ three times'

- Because carrier sentence elicitation is rather artificial an additional task was chosen to produce a more natural context.
- This was done in order to test the claims made by Garellek & Esposito (2021) that in narrative contexts the only acoustic measure that indicates different phonation types is CPP.
- This was done by having consultants tell the story presented in a picture book called "Where are you, Frog?"

6 Next Steps

- Finish extracting tokens from word list elicitations
- Process audio for "Where are you, Frog?" from speaker f1
- Continue reading Esling et al. (2019) on Voice Quality
- Due readings on the phonetic-phonology interface (Keating 1996, Kingston 2007, Zsiga 2020)

References

Adler, Jeff, Steven Foley, Jed Pizarro-Guevara, Kelsey Sasaki & Maziar Toosarvandani. 2018. The derivation of verb initiality in Santiago Laxopa Zapotec. In Jason Merchant, Line Mikkelsen, Deniz Rudin & Kelsey Sasaki (eds.), *A reasonable way to proceed: essays in honor of Jim McCloskey*, 31–49. Santa Cruz, Berkeley, Chicago: University of California.

Adler, Jeffrey M. & Maho Morimoto. 2016. Acoustics of phonation types and tones in Santiago Laxopa Zapotec. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 140(4). 3109–3109. https://doi.org/10.1121/1.4969713.

Arellanes, Francisco. 2009. *El sistema fonológico y las propiedades fonéticas del zapoteco de San Pablo Güilá: descripción y análisis formal*. El Colegio de México.

Avelino, Heriberto. 2010. Acoustic and Electroglottographic Analyses of Nonpathological, Nonmodal Phonation. *Journal of Voice* 24(3). 270–280. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvoice.2008.10.002.

Avelino Becerra, Heriberto. 2004. *Topics in Yalálag Zapotec, with particular reference to its phonetic structures*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California, Los Angeles dissertation. 315 pp.

Browman, Catherine P. & Louis Goldstein. 1992. Articulatory Phonology: an Overview. *Phonetica* 49(3-4). 155–180. https://doi.org/10.1159/000261913.

Brunelle, Marc & James Kirby. 2016. Tone and Phonation in Southeast Asian Languages. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 10(4). 191–207. https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12182.

Campbell, Eric. 2017. Otomanguean historical linguistics: exploring the subgroups. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 11(7). e12244.

Campbell, Eric W. 2017. Otomanguean historical linguistics: past, present, and prospects for the future. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 11(4). e12240. https://doi.org/10.1111/lnc3.12240.

Campbell, Lyle, Terrence Kaufman & Thomas Smith-Stark. 1986. Meso-America as a linguistic area. *Language* 62(3). 530–570.

Chávez-Peón, Mario E. 2010. *The interaction of metrical structure, tone, and phonation types in Quiaviní Zapotec*. University of British Columbia dissertation. https://doi.org/10.14288/1.0071253.

DiCanio, Christian T. 2012. Coarticulation between tone and glottal consonants in Itunyoso Trique. *Journal of Phonetics* 40(1). 162–176. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wocn.2011.10.006.

Esling, John H., Scott R. Moisik, Allison Benner & Lise Crevier-Buchman. 2019. *Voice Quality: the Laryngeal Articulator Model*. 1st edn. (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 162). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108696555.

Garellek, Marc. 2019. The phonetics of voice. In William F. Katz & Peter F. Assmann (eds.), *The Routledge handbook of phonetics* (Routledge Handbooks in Linguistics), 75–106. Abingdon, Oxon ; New York, NY: Routledge.

Garellek, Marc & Christina M. Esposito. 2021. Phonetics of White Hmong vowel and tonal contrasts. *Journal of the International Phonetic Association*. 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0025100321000104.

Hyman, Larry M. 2014. How To Study a Tone Language, with exemplification from Oku (Grassfields Bantu, Cameroon). *Language Documentation* 8. 38.

Jaeger, Jeri J. & Robert D. Van Valin. 1982. Initial Consonant Clusters in Yateé Zapotec. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 48(2). 125–138. https://doi.org/10.1086/465724.

Keating, Patricia A. 1996. The phonology-phonetics interface. In *Interfaces in phonology*, 262–278. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Kingston, John. 2007. The phonetics–phonology interface. In Paul de Lacy (ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Phonology*, 401–434. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486371.018.

Kingston, John & Randy L Diehl. 1995. Intermediate properties in the perception of distinctive feature values. *Papers in laboratory phonology* 4. 7–27.

Kingston, John & Randy L. Diehl. 1994. Phonetic Knowledge. *Language* 70(3). 419. https://doi.org/10.2307/416481.

Long, Rebecca & Sofronio Cruz. 2005. *Diccionario zapoteco de San Bartolomé Zoogocho, Oaxaca*. 2nd edition (Serie de vocabularios y diccionarios indígenas "Mariano Silva y Aceves" no. 38). Coyoacán, D.F. [Mexico]: Instituto Lingüístico de Verano. 531 pp.

Michaud, Alexis. 2012. The Complex Tones of East/Southeast Asian Languages: current Challenges for Typology and Modelling. 8.

Nellis, Donald G. & Barbara E. Hollenbach. 1980. Fortis versus Lenis in Cajonos Zapotec Phonology. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 46(2). 92–105. https://doi.org/10.1086/465639.

Pike, Kenneth L. 1948. *Tone Languages: a Technique for Determining the Number and Type of Pitch Contrasts in a Language, with Studies in Tonemic Substitution and Fusion*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Sichel, Ivy & Maziar Toosarvandani. 2020. The featural life of nominals. lingbuzz/005523.

Silverman, Daniel. 1997. Laryngeal complexity in Otomanguean vowels. *Phonology* 14(2). 235–261. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0952675797003412.

Snider, Keith. 2014. On Establishing Underlying Tonal Contrast. *Language Documentation* 8. 31.
Snider, Keith L. 2018. *Tone analysis for field linguists*. Dallas: SIL International Publications. 183 pp.
Sonnenschein, Aaron H. 2005. *A descriptive grammar of San Bartolomé Zoogocho Zapotec*. Munich: Lincom Europa.
Stolz, Christel & Thomas Stolz. 2001. Mesoamerica as a linguistic area. *Language Typology and Language Universals. An International Handbook* 2. 1539–1553.
Uchihara, Hiroto & Gabriela Pérez Báez. 2016. Fortis/lenis, glides and vowels in Quiaviní Zapotec. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics* 1(1). 27. https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.13.
Yip, Moira Jean Winsland. 2002. *Tone* (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press. 341 pp.
Zsiga, Elizabeth C. 2020. *The phonology/phonetics interface*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. 312 pp.

Appendix

Consonants

- SLZ has approximately 27 consonants as shown in Table 5
- Like other Zapotecan languages consonants are divided between fortis and lenis (Nellis & Hollenbach 1980, Jaeger & Van Valin 1982, Uchihara & Pérez Báez 2016).
- Following Jaeger & Van Valin (1982) there are four reasons that we distinguish fortis/lenis instead of voiceless/voiced in Zapotecan languages.

    1. Fortis obstruents are always voiceless, while lenis can be voiced, partially devoiced, or voiceless.
    2. Fortis stops and affricates aalways retain their stop closure, whereas lenis stops and affricates are often realized as fricatives.
    3. Fortis obstruents are usually of longer duration than lenis obstruents
    4. Fortis and lenis sonorants are primarily distinguished by length, with fortis having a longer duration than lenis.

- The behavior that Jaeger & Van Valin (1982) described is illustrated in Table 6.
- This same behavior has been observed to some extent in SLZ and in other Sierra Norte varieties (Sonnenschein 2005).

    – It is quite common that lenis stops become their voiceless fricative counterpart word finall, e.g. *yag* [jax³] ‘wood; tree’

- One explanation for this behavior has to do with morae.

Table 5: SLZ Consonants

		bilabial	alveolar	retroflex	alveo-palatal	palatal	velar	labio-velar	uvular
nasal	lenis		n						
	fortis	mː	nː						
stop	lenis	b	d				g	g^w	
	fortis	p	t				k	k^w	
fricative	lenis		z	ʐ~ɻ	ʒ	ç			ʁ~χ
	fortis		s	ʂ	ʃ				
affricate	lenis		d͡z						
	fortis		t͡s		t͡ʃ				
lateral	lenis		l~ɾ						
	fortis		lː						
trill			r						
approximate						j		w	

Table 6: Allophones of some fortis and lenis obstruents in Yateé Zapotec

			Fortis				Lenis	
/t/	→	tˑ	initially	/d/	→	d, ɖ, ð, ð̠	initially
		tː	medially			d, ð	medially
		t^h	finally			ð̠, θ	finally
/t͡ʃ/	→	t͡ʃˑ	initially	/d͡ʒ/	→	d͡ʒ, ɖ͡ʒ̠, ʒ, ʒ̠	initially
		t͡ʃː	medially			d͡ʒ, ʒ	medially
		$\widehat{t\int^h}$	finally			ɖ͡ʒ̠, ʒ̠, ʃ	finally

- According to many authors the reason for this difference in behavior is because fortis consonants are inherently moraic (e.g., Chávez-Peón 2010, Uchihara & Pérez Báez 2016).
- Additional evidence for this comes from the behavior of vowels before fortis and lenis consonants (Arellanes 2009, Chávez-Peón 2010, Uchihara & Pérez Báez 2016).
  - Before fortis consonants vowels are short.
  - Before lenis consonants vowels are long.

(3) Lenis and fortis codas in Quiaviní Zapotec

Lenis		Fortis	
láːd	‘side’	látː	‘tin can’
táːn	‘Cayetana’	tasː	‘cup’