

# The link between tongue root advancement and the voicing effect: an ultrasound study of Italian and Polish

Stefano Coretta<sup>a,\*</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *University of Manchester, Linguistics and English Language, School of Arts, Languages and Cultures, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL, UK*

---

## Abstract

In this paper I demonstrate that longer vowel duration before voiced stops is linked to another correlate of obstruent voicing, namely tongue root advancement. A wide variety of languages have been reported to show the so-called voicing effect, whereby vowels tend to be longer before voiced than before voiceless stops. Using acoustic and ultrasound data from eight speakers of Italian and Polish (reportedly a voicing-effect and a non-voicing-effect language respectively), I show that voiced stops produced with tongue root advancement correlate with a stronger effect of voicing on the duration of the preceding vowels. The results of this study indicate that, contrary to previous findings, both Italian and Polish have a voicing effect. Vowels followed by voiced stops are on average 22 ms longer in Italian and 8 ms longer in Polish. Crucially, the size of the voicing effect is greater in speakers producing voiced stops with root advancement compared to speakers without it, independent of their language. I suggest that the relationship between the size of the effect and tongue root advancement points to a new articulatory account of vowel duration as a covariate of voicing, by which root advancement is proposed as a plausible diachronic precursor of the voicing effect.

*Keywords:* voicing effect, vowel duration, tongue root advancement, ultrasound, Italian, Polish

---

## 1. Introduction

This paper reports a previously undocumented link between tongue root advancement in the production of voiced stops and longer duration of the preceding vowels. Using ultrasonic data from speakers of Italian and Polish, I demonstrate that the presence of tongue root advancement correlates with that of the so-called voicing effect, whereby vowels tend to be longer before voiced than before voiceless stops. I further suggest that such correlation points to a new articulatory account of vowel duration as a covariate of consonantal voicing, by which tongue root advancement is proposed as a plausible diachronic precursor of the voicing effect.

An extensive number of studies show that vowels tend to be longer when followed by voiced obstruents than when they are followed by voiceless obstruents (House and Fairbanks, 1953; Peterson and Lehiste, 1960; Chen, 1970; Klatt, 1973; Lisker, 1974; Farnetani and Kori, 1986; Fowler, 1992; Hussein, 1994; Esposito, 2002; Lampp and Reklis, 2004; Durvasula and Luo, 2012). This phenomenon, known as the voicing effect, has been reported in a variety of languages, including (but not limited to) English, German, Hindi, Russian, Italian, Arabic, and Korean (see Maddieson and Gandour 1976 for a more

comprehensive list). A common stance in the literature is that the magnitude of the voicing effect differs depending on the language (although see Laeuffer 1992), and that this phenomenon is not a universal tendency, since the duration of vowels is not affected by the voicing of the following obstruents in some languages, like Polish and Czech (Keating, 1984). Although several attempts have been made to explain the voicing effect, an account that survives all empirical data is still lacking (Durvasula and Luo, 2012).

To provide a rationale for the language-specificity of the voicing effect, Kluender et al. (1988) propose that the source of the effect is to be found in the perceptual system. They argue that speakers actively manipulate vowel durations to enhance the closure-duration difference which can cue the voicing distinction in obstruents. However, Fowler (1992) shows by means of perceptual experiments that speakers judge vowels to be longer if the consonant closure duration is increased, and that, conversely, consonant closure is perceived to be longer when vowel duration is increased. Fowler's experimental results thus challenge the premise that speakers exploit durational contrasts to enhance voicing distinctions.

In the light of the difficulties incurred by perceptual explanations, we have reason to seek an alternative account of the voicing effect with the following attributes: (1) it allows for a language-specific implementation of the voicing effect, and (2) it places the source of the effect in articulatory properties of voiced or voiceless obstruents that could

---

\*Corresponding author

Email address: stefano.coretta@manchester.ac.uk (Stefano Coretta)

favour longer or shorter vowel durations. One of the first articulatory accounts to be proposed points to differences in the adjustment of the glottis before voiced and voiceless stops (Halle and Stevens 1967, reiterated in Chomsky and Halle 1968). Halle and Stevens (1967) state that the glottal configuration during voicing in vowels is different from that of the closure of voiced consonants. Their argument is that vowels are longer before voiced consonants so that more time is available to the glottis to achieve a position suitable for maintaining within-closure voicing. This guarantees that such configuration is secured before the onset of the consonant closure. Later studies, however, established that the glottal configuration of voicing in obstruents does not differ from the one in vowels (Lisker, 1974; Kagaya and Hirose, 1975). As a consequence of this observation, it is reasonable to look for the articulatory source of the voicing effect not in properties of vocal folds activity during obstruent voicing, but rather in the supra-glottal adjustments that accompany it.

One of the known differences in supra-glottal articulation between voiced and voiceless consonants concerns the position of the tongue root along the front-back plane of the oral tract. It has been observed that the tongue root is in a more advanced position in voiced than in voiceless stops (Kent and Moll, 1969; Perkell, 1969; Westbury, 1983). This gesture has been interpreted as a mechanism to ensure voicing during closure. The realisation of vocal fold vibration (i.e. voicing) requires the air pressure in the supra-glottal cavity to be lower than the air pressure below the glottis. During the production of voiced obstruents, the supra-glottal pressure quickly increases. Such pressure increase can hinder the ability to maintain voicing during closure, to the point that voicing can cease if the supra-glottal pressure is higher than the sub-glottal pressure (Ohala, 2011). An articulatory solution to counterbalance the increase in pressure is to expand the supra-glottal cavity by advancing the root of the tongue. The ability to lower the supra-glottal air pressure by advancing the tongue root is put to a different use in Korean, where it facilitates the maintenance of short lag VOT in tense stops (Ahn and Davidson, 2016).

The link between tongue root advancement and properties of phonation like voicing and VOT duration on one hand, and between voicing and duration of vowels on the other, raises the question of whether a direct correlation exists between tongue root advancement and vowel duration. If tongue root advancement plays a role in determining the presence or development of the voicing effect, then it is expected that voiced consonants should be articulated with tongue root advancement in voicing-effect languages, but not in languages without the voicing effect.

For this study ultrasonic tongue data were recorded from speakers of Italian and Polish, two languages that have been reported to have and lack the voicing effect respectively. In an investigation of the general properties of segmental durations of Italian, Farnetani and Kori (1986) show that the first vowel in /lada/ is on average 35 mil-

Table 1: Sociolinguistic information on participants. The right-most column indicates whether the participant spent more than 6 consecutive months abroad.

id	sex	age	city	> 6 mo
IT01	m	28	Verbania	yes
IT02	m	26	Udine	yes
IT03	f	27	Verbania	no
IT04	f	54	Verbania	no
PL02	f	32	Poznań	yes
PL03	m	26	Poznań	yes
PL04	f	34	Warsaw	no
PL05	m	34	Przasnysz	no

liseconds longer than the vowel in /lata/ ( $\bar{x} = 223$  ms,  $sd = 18$  in /lata/;  $\bar{x} = 258$  ms,  $sd = 13$  in /lada/, Farnetani and Kori 1986, 26). Esposito (2002) extends Farnetani’s research to all the vowels and stops of Italian and confirms that vowels are longer when followed by a voiced stop, with an estimated mean duration similar to that reported in Farnetani and Kori (1986). As for Polish, although a difference of 2 milliseconds in vowel duration can be observed (167.5 ms in /rata/, 169.5 ms in /rada/), such difference has been deemed as non-significant according to statistical testing (Keating, 1984). Vowels in Polish are thus not affected by the voicing of the following consonant.

Based on the hypothesis that tongue root advancement correlates with the voicing effect (and hence with vowel duration), the expectations with regard to Italian and Polish are the following: (1) since vowels are longer before voiced stops in Italian, voiced stops in this language should be articulated with tongue root advancement, and (2) given that vowels before voiceless and voiced stops in Polish are about the same duration, the position of the tongue root in voiced stops should not differ from that of voiceless stops.

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1. Participants

Eight native speakers of Italian (2 females, 2 males) and Polish (2 females, 2 males) were recorded in Manchester and in Italy (see Table 1). The Italian speakers were from Northern Italy (three from the north-west and one from north-east). The Polish group was more heterogeneous, with two speakers from the West (Poznań), and two from the East (Warsaw and Przasnysz). Ethical clearance was obtained for this study from the University of Manchester (REF 2016-0099-76). The participants received a small monetary compensation.

### 2.2. Equipment set-up

An Articulate Instruments Ltd™ set-up was used for this study (Figure 1). The ultrasonic data was collected through a TELEMED Echo Blaster 128 unit with a




Figure 1: Schematic representation of the equipment setup (Articulate Instruments Ltd<sup>TM</sup> 2011). The system is described in details in Section 2.2.

TELEMED C3.5/20/128Z-3 ultrasonic transducer (20mm radius, 2-4 MHz). A synchronisation unit (P-Stretch) was plugged into the Echo Blaster unit and used for automatic audio/ultrasound synchronisation. A FocusRight Scarlett Solo pre-amplifier and a Movo LV4-O2 Lavalier microphone were used for audio recording. The acquisition of the ultrasonic and audio signals was achieved with the software Articulate Assistant Advanced (AAA, v2.17.2) running on a Hewlett-Packard ProBook 6750b laptop with Microsoft Windows 7. Stabilisation of the ultrasonic transducer was ensured by using a headset produced by Articulate Instruments Ltd<sup>TM</sup> (2008).

### 2.3. Materials

Disyllabic words of the form  $C_1V_1C_2V_2$  were used as targets, where  $C_1 = /p/$ ,  $V_1 = /a, o, u/$ ,  $C_2 = /t, d, k, g/$ , and  $V_2 = V_1$  (e.g. /pata/, /pada/, /poto/, etc.), giving a total of 12 target words. A labial stop was chosen as the first consonant to reduce possible coarticulation with the following vowel (although see Vazquez-Alvarez and Hewlett 2007). Only coronal and velar stops were used as target consonants since labial consonants cannot be imaged with ultrasonography. The target words were embedded in a frame sentence. Prosodically similar sentences were used to ensure comparability between languages. The frame sentence was *Dico X lentamente* ‘I say X slowly’ for Italian, and *Mówię X teraz* ‘I say X now’ for Polish.

### 2.4. Procedure

The sentences with the target words were randomised for each participant, although the order was kept the same between repetitions within participant due to software constraints. Each participant repeated the list of randomised stimuli six times. A grand total of 576 tokens (288 per language) was recorded. The participant’s occlusal plane was obtained using a bite plate (Scobbie et al., 2011), and the hard palate was imaged by asking the participant to swallow water (Epstein and Stone, 2005). The frame rate

of the acquisition of the ultrasonic data ranged between 43 and 68 frames per second. Other settings values varied depending on the frame rate. The ranges of these settings in this study were: scanlines = 88–114, pixel per scanline = 980–988, field of view = 71–93, pixel offset = 109–263, depth (mm) = 75–180. The audio signal was recorded at 22050 MHz (16-bit).

### 2.5. Data processing and analysis

Synchronisation of the ultrasonic and audio signal was achieved in post-processing, using a built-in procedure of AAA. The audio data were subject to force alignment using the SPeech Phonetisation Alignment and Syllabification software (SPPAS) (Bigi, 2015). The outcome of the automatic annotation was manually corrected after the force alignment, according to the criteria in Table 2. The onset of the target consonant burst (C2 burst) was detected automatically in Praat (Boersma and Weenink, 2016) by means of the algorithm described in Ananthapadmanabha et al. (2014). The durations of the following intervals were extracted from the annotated acoustic landmarks using an automated procedure in Praat: vowel duration (V1 onset to V1 offset), consonant duration (V1 offset to V2 onset), and closure duration (V1 offset to C2 burst).

Spline curves were automatically fitted to the visible contours using the AAA batch tracking function. Manual correction was applied in those cases that showed clear tracking errors. The time of maximum tongue displacement within consonant closure was then calculated in AAA following the method in Strycharczuk and Scobbie (2015). A fan-like frame consisting of 42 equidistant radial lines was used as the coordinate system. The origin of the 42 fan-lines coincides with the centre of the ultrasonic probe, such that each fan-line is parallel to the direction of the ultrasonic signal. Tongue displacement was thus calculated as the displacement of the fitted splines along the fan-line vectors. The time of maximum tongue displacement was the time of greater displacement along the vector that showed

Table 2: List of measurements as extracted from acoustics.

landmark		criteria
vowel onset	(V1 onset)	appearance of higher formants in the spectrogram following the burst of /p/ (C1)
vowel offset	(V1 offset)	disappearance of the higher formants in the spectrogram preceding the target consonant (C2)
consonant onset	(C2 onset)	corresponds to V1 offset
closure onset	(C2 closure onset)	corresponds to V1 offset
consonant offset	(C2 offset)	appearance of higher formants of the vowel following C2 (V2); corresponds to V2 onset
consonant burst onset	(C2 burst)	automatic detection (Ananthapadmanabha et al., 2014)

the greatest standard deviation. The vector search area was restricted to the portion of the splines corresponding to the tongue tip for coronal consonants, and to the portion corresponding to the tongue dorsum for velar consonants.

The cartesian coordinates of the tongue contours were exported from two time points: the onset of C2 closure, and the time of maximum tongue displacement (which is always within C2 closure). The contours were normalised within speaker by applying offsetting and rotation relative to the participant’s occlusal plane (Scobbie et al., 2011). The durational data were analysed with linear mixed effects models using `lme4` in R (R Core Team, 2017; Bates et al., 2015). *P*-values were obtained with likelihood ratio tests comparing the full model with a nested model without the relevant predictor. Generalised additive mixed models (GAMMs, Wood, 2006; Zuur, 2012) were used for the statistical analysis of tongue contour data. Significance testing in GAMMs was achieved through model comparison with `itsadug` (van Rij et al., 2017) and visual inspection of the difference smooth, as suggested in Sós-kuthy (2017). A first-order autoregressive model was used to correct for the high autocorrelation of the residuals in GAMMs.

### 3. Results

The following sections report the results of the durational data (Section 3.1), and of the ultrasonic data (Section 3.2) separately. Given the poor quality of the ultrasonic data for /u/, this vowel was not included in the statistical analysis of tongue contours, but the durational data of /u/ were kept in the linear regression models. The results in Section 3.2 thus refer only to /a/ and /o/.

#### 3.1. Vowel duration and voicing

A linear mixed effects regression model was fitted to the Italian vowel duration data with VOWEL DURATION (in milliseconds) as the outcome variable; VOWEL IDENTITY (/a, o, u/), VOICING (voiceless vs. voiced) and PLACE OF ARTICULATION (coronal vs. velar) of the following consonant, SENTENCE DURATION (in seconds) as fixed effects;




Figure 2: By-speaker random intercepts (left) and coefficients (right) for the effect of C2 voicing on vowel duration in Polish. The higher coefficient estimate (+6.3 ms) for PL05 indicates a relatively stronger effect of voicing for this participant.

BY-SPEAKER and BY-WORD random INTERCEPTS, and BY-SPEAKER random COEFFICIENTS for voicing. An interaction between voicing and vowel quality was also included, since it significantly improved the model. According to the full model as specified above, Italian vowels are 22 milliseconds longer ( $se = 6$ ) if followed by a voiced stop ( $\chi^2 = 16.61$ ;  $p < 0.001$ ;  $df = 3$ ; see Table 3 for a summary of the fixed effects).

For Polish, the same model structure was used, to the exclusion of the voicing/vowel-identity interaction (which did not improve the model). Contrary to previous findings, the model reveals an 8 millisecond effect ( $se = 3$ ) of consonantal voicing on the preceding vowel ( $\chi^2 = 5.4$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ;  $df = 1$ ; see Table 4 for a summary of the fixed effects). Vowel identity, C2 place of articulation, and sentence duration also had an effect on vowel duration. The inspection of the model residuals confirmed the assumptions of normality and homoscedasticity.

The exploration of the random coefficients for each speaker indicated that PL05 has a particularly higher coefficient for voicing, meaning that the effect of voicing is stronger in his data (Figure 2). Note that the exclusion of this speaker from the model doesn’t remove the effect

Table 3: Summary of fixed effects of the linear mixed-effects regression fitted to the Italian vowel duration data (see Section 3.1 for the model details).

	$\beta$	se	df	t
Intercept	14.51	12.43	133.6	1.16
voicing	21.84	6.07	12.7	3.59
place	-8.52	2.80	15.7	-3.04
vowel /o/	-8.69	4.864	15.8	-1.78
vowel /u/	-29.68	4.860	15.8	-6.10
sent. dur.	77.00	6.66	336.6	11.55
voi:vow /o/	2.56	6.86	15.7	0.37
voi:vow /u/	-15.57	6.86	15.7	-2.26

Table 4: Summary of fixed effects of the linear mixed-effects regression fitted to the Polish vowel duration data (see Section 3.1 for the model details).

	$\beta$	se	df	t
Intercept	22.92	10.43	127.13	2.19
voicing	7.88	3.25	6.860	2.41
vowel (/o/)	-11.79	3.00	7.000	-3.92
vowel (/u/)	-29.27	3.01	7.100	-9.70
place	-5.57	2.45	7.00	-2.27
sent. dur.	70.81	9.74	261.04	7.26

( $\beta = 6$  ms;  $se = 2$ ;  $\chi^2 = 8.28$ ;  $p < 0.01$ ;  $df = 1$ ). The estimated effect of voicing on vowel duration for PL05 was about 14 milliseconds (vowels followed by voiced stops are on average 14 ms longer in PL05). These observations will become relevant in the next section, in which the results of the tongue contour data will be discussed.

### 3.2. Tongue contours

GAMMs were fitted to the data of each speaker individually: the Y-COORDINATES of the contours were included in the model as the outcome variable; the X-COORDINATES as the only parametric term. The following smooths were specified: a REFERENCE SMOOTH term for the X-COORDINATES, three DIFFERENCE SMOOTHS for the x-coordinates by VOICING, VOWEL IDENTITY, and PLACE of articulation of the following consonant respectively, and BY-WORD RANDOM SMOOTHS.

The analysis of the Italian ultrasonic data shows that voiced stops are produced with advancement of the tongue root. Figure 3 (top half) shows for each Italian speaker the estimated tongue contours in voiceless (dashed green lines) and voiced stops (continuous blue lines) at the time of maximum tongue displacement. Below each tongue contour panel, the by-voicing difference smooth is also shown (confidence interval in grey). Tongue contours are significantly different in those points in which the confidence interval of the difference smooth does not include 0 on the ordinate axis (also indicated by a shaded red background).

In two participants out of four (IT01, IT02), the root was significantly more front in voiced stops in both vocalic

contexts (/a, o/). On the other hand, one participant (IT03) had tongue root advancement only in the context of the vowel /a/, while the fourth participant (IT04) didn't show advancement at all. For Polish (bottom half of Figure 3), three out of four speakers (PL02, PL03, PL04) did not have tongue root advancement, while the fourth speaker (PL05) had significant advancement in voiced stops in both vocalic contexts.

An additional contour analysis was carried out at C2 closure onset for the Italian and Polish speakers showing advancement. The tongue root at closure onset was found to be advanced in the voiced consonants of all these speakers. Comparisons of tongue contours at C2 onset and at the time of maximum tongue displacement in voiced consonants further indicated that the degree of root advancement was larger at maximum displacement for the Italian speakers (IT01, IT02, IT03), but not for the Polish speaker (PL05). Figure 4 exemplifies the results with the model results from IT01 and PL05.

The ultrasonic data also showed that the tongue body was raised in speakers with tongue root advancement. The presence of this additional gesture makes sense from an anatomical point of view. Raising the tongue body is a way to counterbalance the compression of the tongue mass caused by the advancement of the root (Perkell, 1969; Jackson, 1988; Sproat and Fujimura, 1993; Kingston et al., 1997; Fulop et al., 1998). It is thus not surprising to observe a raised tongue body in voiced stops accompanying root advancement.

## 4. Discussion

Based on the previously established link between tongue root advancement and voicing, it was proposed at the beginning of this paper that the presence of the voicing effect in a language could be correlated with the presence of tongue root advancement in the voiced stops of that language. To test the correlation between tongue root advancement and vowel durations, ultrasonic data were collected from speakers of two languages that differ in the presence/absence of the voicing effect, Italian and Polish respectively. It was predicted that voiced consonants should be produced with an advanced tongue root in Italian, but not in Polish. The results of this study do not bear out this simple scenario, however, suggesting instead that the voicing effect is related to tongue root advancement in voiced stops in a complex way.

Keating (1984) investigated the effect of consonant voicing on the duration of preceding vowels in Polish and reported that vowels followed by voiceless and voiced stops do not differ in duration. Nevertheless, the analysis of the durational data discussed above indicates that an effect of voicing exists in the Polish speakers of this study, such that vowels followed by voiced stops are on average 8 milliseconds longer. The hypothesis that voiced consonants should not have tongue root advancement in Polish rested on previous reports that Polish is a




Figure 3: Comparison of tongue contours at the time of maximum tongue displacement (within C2 closure) in Italian (top half) and Polish (bottom half). The plotted contours are the estimated curves in the context of the vowel /a/ followed by coronal consonants. By-voicing difference smooths are shown below the estimated curves. See Section 3.2 for more details.




Figure 4: Comparison of tongue contours of voiced consonants at C2 closure onset and maximum tongue displacement (within C2 closure) in IT01 (Italian) and PL05 (Polish). See Section 3.2 for more details.

non-voicing-effect language. The data from this study indicate instead the presence of a voicing effect. Crucially, the Polish speaker with the strongest effect of voicing (PL05, cf. Section 3.1) is also the only Polish speaker who produced voiced consonants with an advanced tongue root, both at C2 closure onset and at the time of maximum tongue displacement.

This pattern is similar to that of the Italian speakers, who have both a relatively strong voicing effect and tongue root advancement. This is true for all the speakers of Italian in this sample, except IT04. The vowels in this speaker are 22 milliseconds longer when followed by voiced stops, but her tongue root position does not differ in voiced and voiceless stops (see below for a tentative explanation).

Overall, the speakers who produced voiced consonants with an advanced tongue root had a relatively strong voicing effect, with estimates of the durational differences ranging between 15 and 30 milliseconds. Bear in mind that the inverse is not true: IT04 had a strong voicing effect, without accompanying tongue root advancement. Nonetheless, the generalisation that tongue root advancement is correlated with a relatively strong voicing effect holds independently of the speaker’s language: speakers of both Italian and Polish pattern according to this principle. All things considered, the following implication can be inferred: if a speaker realises voiced consonants with concomitant advancement of the tongue root, other things being equal, then that same speaker will also show a considerable durational difference in vowels, with longer vowels preceding voiced consonants.

The fact that the degree of tongue advancement at C2 closure onset and at maximum displacement does not differ in PL05’s voiced consonants could be linked to the relative weaker effect of voicing in this speaker compared to the Italian speakers (14 vs 22 milliseconds). The weaker voicing effect in PL05 suggests that the relationship between tongue root advancement and vowel duration might be gradient rather than categorical (presence vs. absence). If this

is the case, the magnitude of the voicing effect should correlate with the degree of tongue root advancement. More specifically, vowel duration is predicted to be directly correlated with the degree of advancement. Future work will set out to investigate the putative gradient effect of tongue root advancement on vowel duration.

The association between a relatively strong voicing effect and tongue root advancement in voiced stops constitutes the premise for the discussion of tongue root advancement as the precursor of the voicing effect. As pointed out in Section 1, the source of the voicing effect should be found among the supra-glottal articulatory properties of stops. Such putative source should also be subject to language- and/or speaker-specific behaviour. As evinced from the data presented here, tongue root advancement satisfies both of these requirements.

Tongue root advancement as an oral gesture does not need discussion, since it involves a lingual articulation. As for the second requisite, the results of this study show that speakers can adopt tongue root advancement or not, but, if they do, they do so in such a way that the root in voiced stops is already advanced at the onset of the consonant closure. The most straightforward interpretation is that the advancement of the root is initiated before the consonant closure is achieved. This implies that the advancement gesture is implemented even during the articulation of the vowel. Adapting the reasoning of the proposal by Halle and Stevens (1967, see Section 1), a possible source of the longer duration of vowels before voiced consonants could therefore be the additional time required to achieve tongue root advancement in the context of voiced stops.

Such gestural account is intended as a diachronic source of the voicing effect, rather than as a mechanistic condition according to which the voicing effect should be observed synchronically. This is in compliance with the fact that one speaker of Italian did not produce voiced consonants with tongue root advancement, while still having a relatively strong voicing effect. A speculative

explanation is that, once a strong voicing effect is stabilised in a language (or a variety of a language), speakers of that language will learn the effect while being able to adopt different strategies to cope with the decreasing trans-glottal pressure drop.

To conclude, the gestural-timing account proposed here places greater emphasis on the size of the effect of voicing on vowel duration. If present, tongue root advancement is expected to co-occur with a relatively stronger voicing effect. As we saw earlier, the presence of tongue root advancement in the Polish speaker PL05 was accompanied by an 8 millisecond increase in the degree to which voicing affects vowel duration. This aspect, coupled with the hypothesis explored above that the effect of voicing on vowel duration could be gradient, evidently illustrates the complexity of this phenomenon, which has been escaping our understanding for almost a century.

## 5. Conclusion

This paper focussed on the so called voicing effect, by which vowels tend to be longer before voiced than before voiceless stops in a variety of languages. No consensus has been reached in the literature regarding the source of this effect. Voicing in stops has long been known to be facilitated by pharyngeal cavity expansion, which is often implemented by means of tongue root advancement. I therefore offered the hypothesis that tongue root advancement in voiced stops might play a role in determining the presence vs. absence of the voicing effect in a particular language.

Drawing on acoustic and ultrasonic data from Italian (a voicing-effect language) and Polish (a non-voicing-effect language), I showed that:

- Vowels followed by voiced stops are on average 22 milliseconds longer in Italian and 6 milliseconds longer in Polish.
- Voiced stops were realised with tongue root advancement in three Italian speakers and one Polish speaker.
- The durational increment in the Polish speaker with tongue root advancement is double compared to the other Polish speakers, although still smaller than that of the Italian speakers.
- Tongue root advancement was found at closure onset and within closure in voiced consonants in Italian and Polish.
- The advancement of the root increases during closure in the Italian speakers but not in the Polish speaker.

These results indicate that tongue root advancement does not determine the presence of the voicing effect or its absence, but it is rather correlated with vowel duration in a more complex way. More specifically, the difference in vowel duration was greater in speakers who produce voiced consonants with tongue root advancement, than in speakers without tongue root advancement, independent of their

language. I thus advanced the hypothesis that the relation between the degree of tongue root advancement and the magnitude of the voicing effect is gradient rather than a matter of presence vs. absence. Finally, it was speculated that the additional time required for the tongue root to reach an advanced position is a possible diachronic precursor of the longer duration of vowels followed by voiced stops.

## Reproducibility statement

The data and code used in this work are available at XXX. We obtained written consent from the participants in this study, who agreed to make their data publicly available.

## Acknowledgements

I am extremely grateful to the participants of this study who patiently wore the equipment for several minutes. I would like to thank Dr Ricardo Bermúdez-Otero and Dr Patrycja Strycharczuk for their invaluable input on both content and form of this research. I also wish to thank all the graduate members of the University of Manchester Phonetics Lab for their crucial support and writing assistance, and the participants of the Ultrafest VIII conference for their influential feedback. Any errors are still my own. This work was supported by the School of Arts, Cultures and Humanities of the University of Manchester, UK.

## References

- Ahn, S., Davidson, L., 2016. Tongue root positioning in English voiced obstruents: Effects of manner and vowel context. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 140, 3221–3221.
- Ananthapadmanabha, T.V., Prathosh, A.P., Ramakrishnan, A.G., 2014. Detection of the closure-burst transitions of stops and affricates in continuous speech using the plosion index. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 135, 460–471.
- Articulate Instruments Ltd™, 2008. Ultrasound stabilisation headset users manual: Revision 1.4. Edinburgh, UK: Articulate Instruments Ltd.
- Articulate Instruments Ltd™, 2011. Articulate Assistant Advanced user guide. Version 2.16.
- Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., Walker, S., 2015. Fitting linear mixed-effects models using lme4. *Journal of Statistical Software* 67, 1–48.
- Bigi, B., 2015. SPPAS - Multi-lingual approaches to the automatic annotation of speech. *The Phonetician* 111–112, 54–69.
- Boersma, P., Weenink, D., 2016. Praat: doing phonetics by computer [Computer program]. Version 6.0.23. URL: <http://www.praat.org/>.
- Chen, M., 1970. Vowel length variation as a function of the voicing of the consonant environment. *Phonetica* 22, 129–159.
- Chomsky, N., Halle, M., 1968. *The sound pattern of English*. New York, Evanston, and London: Harper & Row.
- Durvasula, K., Luo, Q., 2012. Voicing, aspiration, and vowel duration in Hindi. *Proceedings of Meetings on Acoustics* 18, 1–10.
- Epstein, M.A., Stone, M., 2005. The tongue stops here: Ultrasound imaging of the palate. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 118, 2128–2131.
- Esposito, A., 2002. On vowel height and consonantal voicing effects: Data from Italian. *Phonetica* 59, 197–231.



- Farnetani, E., Kori, S., 1986. Effects of syllable and word structure on segmental durations in spoken Italian. *Speech communication* 5, 17–34.
- Fowler, C.A., 1992. Vowel duration and closure duration in voiced and unvoiced stops: There are no contrast effects here. *Journal of Phonetics* 20, 143–165.
- Fulop, S.A., Kari, E., Ladefoged, P., 1998. An acoustic study of the tongue root contrast in degema vowels. *Phonetica* 55, 80–98.
- Halle, M., Stevens, K., 1967. Mechanism of glottal vibration for vowels and consonants. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 41, 1613–1613.
- House, A.S., Fairbanks, G., 1953. The influence of consonant environment upon the secondary acoustical characteristics of vowels. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 25, 105–113.
- Hussein, L., 1994. Voicing-dependent vowel duration in Standard Arabic and its acquisition by adult American students. Ph.D. thesis. The Ohio State University.
- Jackson, M.T.T., 1988. Phonetic theory and cross-linguistic variation in vowel articulation, in: *Working Papers in Phonetics*, University of California: Los Angeles.
- Kagaya, R., Hirose, H., 1975. Fiberoptic electromyographic and acoustic analyses of hindi stop consonants. *Annual Bulletin, Research Institute of Logopedics and Phoniatrics* 9, 27–46.
- Keating, P.A., 1984. Universal phonetics and the organization of grammars. *UCLA Working Papers in Phonetics* 59.
- Kent, R.D., Moll, K.L., 1969. Vocal-tract characteristics of the stop cognates. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 46, 1549–1555.
- Kingston, J., Macmillan, N.A., Dickey, L.W., Thorburn, R., Bartels, C., 1997. Integrality in the perception of tongue root position and voice quality in vowels. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 101, 1696–1709.
- Klatt, D.H., 1973. Interaction between two factors that influence vowel duration. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 54, 1102–1104.
- Kluender, K.R., Diehl, R.L., Wright, B.A., 1988. Vowel-length differences before voiced and voiceless consonants: An auditory explanation. *Journal of Phonetics* 16, 153–169.
- Laeuffer, C., 1992. Patterns of voicing-conditioned vowel duration in French and English. *Journal of Phonetics* 20, 411–440.
- Lampp, C., Reklis, H., 2004. Effects of coda voicing and aspiration on Hindi vowels. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 115, 2540–2540.
- Lisker, L., 1974. On “explaining” vowel duration variation, in: *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America*, pp. 225–232.
- Maddieson, I., Gandour, J., 1976. Vowel length before aspirated consonants, in: *UCLA Working papers in Phonetics*, pp. 46–52.
- Ohala, J.J., 2011. Accommodation to the aerodynamic voicing constraint and its phonological relevance, in: *Proceedings of the 17th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences*, pp. 64–67.
- Perkell, J.S., 1969. *Physiology of Speech production: Results and implication of quantitative cineradiographic study*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Peterson, G.E., Lehiste, I., 1960. Duration of syllable nuclei in english. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 32, 693–703.
- R Core Team, 2017. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. URL: <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- Scobbie, J.M., Lawson, E., Cowen, S., Cleland, J., Wrench, A.A., 2011. A common co-ordinate system for mid-sagittal articulatory measurement, in: *QMU CASL Working Papers*, pp. 1–4.
- Sóskuthy, M., 2017. Generalised additive mixed models for dynamic analysis in linguistics: a practical introduction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.05339*.
- Sproat, R., Fujimura, O., 1993. Allophonic variation in English /l/ and its implications for phonetic implementation. *Journal of Phonetics* 21, 291–311.
- Strycharczuk, P., Scobbie, J.M., 2015. Velocity measures in ultrasound data. Gestural timing of post-vocalic /l/ in English, in: *Proceedings of the 18th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences*, pp. 1–5.
- van Rij, J., Wieling, M., Baayen, R.H., van Rijn, H., 2017. *itsadug*: Interpreting time series and autocorrelated data using GAMMs. R package version 2.3.
- Vazquez-Alvarez, Y., Hewlett, N., 2007. The ‘trough effect’: an ultrasound study. *Phonetica* 64, 105–121.
- Westbury, J.R., 1983. Enlargement of the supraglottal cavity and its relation to stop consonant voicing. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America* 73, 1322–1336.
- Wood, S., 2006. *Generalized additive models: An introduction with R*. CRC Press.
- Zuur, A.F., 2012. *A beginner’s guide to generalized additive models with R*. Highland Statistics Limited: Newburgh.