

Towards a typology of prosody-segment interaction: The case of tone-driven epenthesis

Nicholas Rolle (Leibniz-ZAS, Berlin)

rolle@leibniz-zas.de

Virtual talk for EVOTONE project – LMU München

12 Sep 2022

Paper version: <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/006615>

1 INTRODUCTION

- (1) This talk presents on an oft-neglected topic in phonological typology: the **interaction between segments and prosody** (e.g. pitch/tone/intonation/etc.)
- (2) One such interaction is ‘**intonation-driven epenthesis**’
 - The phonological insertion of a vowel in order to host an intonational tune
- (3) **Take-away point for this talk:**
 - A parallel and overlooked process of ‘**tone-driven epenthesis**’ also exists in certain African tonal languages
 - Defined as the phonological insertion of a vowel in order to host a tone
- (4) **Tone-intonation parallelism** is predicted under a model where:
 - Both types of prosodic systems make use of the same **phonological substance** (i.e. H/L tonemes) and **architecture** (e.g. **autosegmental representations**)
 - Both have the same functional pressures to **cultivate segmental environments** best suited for **realizing pitch targets**
- (5) Roadmap of today’s talk
 - §2 Our starting point: Prosodic typology
 - §3 Case study: Tone-driven epenthesis in Ghomala’
 - §4 Zooming out: Why is tone-driven epenthesis so rare?
 - §5 Summary

2 STARTING POINT: PROSODIC TYPOLOGY

2.1 *Tone-segment interactions*

- (6) Although the empirical landscape of **tone-segment interactions** is not firmly established, there are some things we know

- (7) Known to be common: **Depressor effects**
 - Tone lowering with depressor consonants
 - “Broadly, it has been found that voiced segments lower F0, while voiceless segments raise it” (Cibelli 2015; see therein for extensive references)
 - Reflected in tonogenesis, tone distributions and alignment, and sometimes in intonation (e.g. Jun 1998 on Seoul Korean)
- (8) Known to be rare: **Tone height dependent on vowel height** (Jiang-King 1999, Yip 2002:31, Kingston 2007, Becker & Jurgec 2017, Arnold 2020)
 - This, despite “connection between vowel height and fundamental frequency: the higher the vowel, the higher the pitch” (Fox 2002:232, references therein)
- (9) **Segments affecting tone** much more common than **tones affecting segments**
 - “There is ... little evidence of reciprocation and very little evidence of tone affecting segments” (Wee 2019:208)
 - To date, most common pattern of tones affecting segments involves depression, i.e. **low tone inducing consonant voicing** (Poser 1981, Hansson 2004, Pearce 2007, Sossoukpe 2017, *inter alia*)

2.2 Even rarer – Prosody-driven vowel epenthesis

- (10) ‘Text-tune’ relationships in **intonation**
 - When **mismatch** between the **segmental structure** (the ‘text’) and the **intonational melody** (the ‘tune’), usually **melody accommodates**
 - E.g. via compression, simplification, truncation of tune
- (11) However, growing literature shows opposite pattern: manipulating the segments to **accommodate intonation** (Roettger 2017, Grice et al. 2018, Roettger & Grice 2019)
- (12) Tunisian Arabic [aeb] intonation (Hellmuth 2022)
 - Yes-no questions realized with rise-fall complex (i.e. L*+H H-L%) at the right edge of an intonational phrase
 - This intonational complex typically co-occurs with an **epenthetic** vowel [ə]:

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------|---|--------------|------------------|
| nkemmil | t̪u:l | → | [nkemmil | t̪u:lə:] |
| I-continue | straight.ahead | | ‘Should I go | straight ahead?’ |
 - Epenthesis **never** appears when there is only a **simple** rise or **simple** fall, even in the context of a yes/no question
- (13) Such prosody-driven epenthesis is a prediction of autosegmental representation

Table 1: Autosegmental representational possibilities

| a. Pre-specified | b. Toneless V | c. Floating T | d. Combinations... |
|------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|
| H | | H | H |
| | | | |
| á | a | | a |

Table 2: Schema of logically possible repairs to deficient representations

| | Spreading | | Epenthesis | |
|---------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Toneless V | H á t =a | → H á t á | H á t =a | → H á t L á t à |
| b. Floating T | H =L á t | → H L â t | H =L á t | → H L á t L á t ɛ |

(14) If intonation-driven vowel epenthesis is possible, then what a counterpart **tone-driven epenthesis** in tone languages – is this possible?

- Question remains **unaddressed in major tone surveys** (Pike 1948, Fromkin 1978, Yip 2002, Hyman 2011b, 2018, Wee 2019, *inter alia*)
- **Unaddressed across major works of epenthesis** (Broselow 1982, Ito 1989, Piggott 1995, de Lacy 2006, Hall 2006, 2011, Baković 2007, Moore-Cantwell 2016, *inter alia*)
- Works which do address it: tone-driven epenthesis is **impossible/unattested** (e.g. Blumenfeld 2006, Gleim 2019)

3 CASE STUDY: TONE-DRIVEN EPENTHESIS IN GHOMALA'

3.1 Ghomala' language

- (15) Ghomala' [IPA: **yòmáláʔ** – ISO 639-3: **bbj**]
- Grassfields Bantoid language of western Cameroon (closely related to Bantu)
 - Data largely from previous description (Nissim 1972, 1981; Piron 1997; Eichholzer 2010)
 - Supplemented with recordings on YouTube and from 1970s (Hyman p.c., from Nissim)

Table 3: Segmental inventory of Ghomala'¹

| LAB. | DENT. | PAL. | VEL. | GLOT. | FRONT | CENTRAL | BACK |
|----------|-------|-------|------------|----------|-------|---------|------|
| p | b | t d | k g | ʔ | i | ɤ | u |
| pf | bv | ts dz | c j | | e | ə | o |
| f | v | s | š ž | ɣ h | ɛ | ɑ | ɔ |
| m | n | | ŋ | | | a | |
| | l | y | ɰ | | | | |
| | | w̃ | w̃ | | | | |

(16) Possible codas are in bold (will become important later): **p k ʔ m ŋ**

3.2 Tone-driven epenthesis

- (17) **The tone system**
- Basic **H vs. L** tonal distinction, at an abstract level
 - On surface, lexical **six-way contrast** on roots

¹ More marginal phones include **z**, aspirated stops (e.g. **t^h** <th>), pre-nasalized stops, as well as various consonant + glide sequences.

Table 4: Six-way tone contrast on open syllables (Nissim 1981:150,153)

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----|------|--------|---|-------------|---|--------------------------------|
| a. <i>High</i> | H | fá | [fá] | ↑ | [ǒ yó fá] | ↑ | ‘you saw the parent ’ |
| b. <i>Downstep</i> | ↑H | ↑dhá | [dhá] | ↑ | [ǒ yó ↑dhá] | ↑ | ‘you saw the spouse ’ |
| c. <i>Level-low</i> | L° | tsə° | [tsə°] | ↓ | [ǒ yó tsə°] | ↓ | ‘you saw the cola nut ’ |
| d. <i>Low</i> | L | tà | [tà] | ↓ | [ǒ yó tà] | ↓ | ‘you saw the pot ’ |
| e. <i>Falling</i> | HL | buẽ | [buẽ] | ↘ | [ǒ yó buẽ] | ↘ | ‘you saw the madman ’ |
| f. <i>Rising</i> | LH | bvǔ | [bvǔ] | ↗ | [ǒ yó ↑bvǔ] | ↑ | ‘you saw the dog ’ |

- (18) For our purposes we shall leave aside the lexical downstep (row b. from Table 4)

Table 5: Same set of tone contrasts with syllables closed with a sonorant (i.e. **m ŋ**)

| | | | | |
|-------|------|--------|--------------|--|
| a. H | kóm | [kóm] | ‘crab’ | (Nissim 1981: 216) |
| b. L° | ləm° | [ləm°] | ‘condiment’ | (Nissim 1981: 72) |
| c. L | ləm | [ləm] | ‘dry season’ | (Nissim 1981: 72) |
| d. HL | fâm | [fâm] | ‘plantation’ | (Eichholzer 2010: 16; from English <i>farm</i>) |
| e. LH | běm | [běm] | ‘destiny’ | (Nissim 1981: 74) |

- (19) The star of the show today: **Tone-driven epenthesis**
- Seen with obstruent codas when they co-occur with a rising tone
 - A /cǔk/ sequence variably becomes [cǔkǔ], with a final epenthetic vowel

Table 6: Tone-driven vowel epenthesis with syllables closed by an obstruent

| | | | | |
|---------|--------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| a. H | /káp/ | [káp] | ‘pipe’ | (Eichholzer 2010: 23) |
| b. L° | /bàp°/ | [bàp°] | ‘animal’ | (Eichholzer 2010: 3) |
| c. L | /pàp/ | [pàp] | ‘wing’ | (Nissim 1981: 218) |
| d. HL | /lâp/ | [lâp] | ‘elegance’ | (Eichholzer 2010: 31) |
| → e. LH | /lǎp/ | [lǎp ~ làpǎ] | ‘pool of water’ | (Eichholzer 2010: 31) |

- (20) This variation is found consistently across Ghomala’ literature/recordings
- Same word, different transcription: **vòpǎ** ‘dust’ (Nissim 1981:198) VS. **vǔp** (Moguo 2021:141) – **No contrast** between such forms
- (21) Tone-driven epenthesis happens with all coda obstruents (i.e. **p k ?**)

Table 7: Tone-driven epenthesis with all coda obstruents (Nissim 1981)

| | | | | | |
|------|--------|---------|------------|----------|---------|
| a. p | /gǔp/ | [gǔpǎ] | ‘hen’ | (p. 63) | |
| | /ŋkǎp/ | [ŋkǎpǎ] | ‘money’ | (p. 300) | [AUDIO] |
| b. k | /mǔk/ | [mǔkǎ] | ‘fire’ | (p. 48) | [AUDIO] |
| | /sǎk/ | [sǎkǎ] | ‘wall’ | (p. 65) | |
| c. ? | /gwǔʔ/ | [gwǔʔǎ] | ‘termite’ | (p. 146) | |
| | /lǎʔ/ | [lǎʔǎ] | ‘village’ | (p. 74) | |
| | /pǔʔ/ | [pǔʔǎ] | ‘package’ | (p. 146) | |
| | /gǔʔ/ | [gǔʔǎ] | ‘strength’ | (p. 90) | |

- (22) Nissim is explicit in treating this final vowel as epenthesis, stating that its only function is to support a tone (Nissim 1981:65,90)

- (23) No epenthesis with other tonal contrasts (i.e. rows a-d from Table 6)
- bàp° ‘animal’ → only [bàp°] Cf. *[bàpè°] [AUDIO]
 - lâp ‘elegance’ → only [lâp] Cf. *[lâpè]
 - lòʔ° ‘yam’ → only [lòʔ°] Cf. *[lòʔè°] [AUDIO]
- (24) Demonstrates epenthesis not due purely to markedness of obstruent codas
- (25) Against a deletion alternative – I.e. */cvcv/ → [cvc]
- The analytic indeterminacy of epenthesis is notoriously difficult (Morley 2015)
- (26) Evidence from **root phonotactics**
- Vast majority of roots in language are monosyllabic (e.g. **CV/CVC shapes**)
 - Major exception to this generalization are exactly these [c̀vć] forms
- (27) Evidence from **closed syllable restrictions** – Applies to [c̀vć] too
- Recall the vowel inventory /i e ε u ə α a u o ɔ/ (where α is IPA [ɐ])
 - Before coda **p** and **k** only the low vowels ɔ and a are allowed
 - If this were underlying /c̀vcə/, we would expect full range of vowels, I.e. expect non-existent roots */b̀uṕ/ or */g̀èḱ/
 - In other words, **c̀vk** patterns as a closed syllable underlyingly

3.3 Morpho-phonological alternations

- (28) Further evidence comes from **morpho-phonological alternations**
- Reveal **complete co-variation** between rising tones and epenthetic vowels
- (29) **Deverbal nominalization** mirrors the distribution of the monomorphemic lexicon
- Lexical tone of root overwritten with LH tone
 - If this involves a coda obstruent, an epenthetic vowel must be added
- (30) **Deverbal nominalization** (Nissim 1981: 288-289)
- t̩ə̀ ð ‘be strong’ → t̩ə̀ʔ ‘iron’
 - sú ‘(to) weed’ → sũ ‘hoe’
 - t̩̀ŋ ‘dig inside’ → nt̩̀ŋ ‘throat’
 - t̩̀m ‘push’ → t̩̀m ‘fruit’
 - tsàʔ ‘twist’ → dz̩̀ʔ́ ‘liana (vine)’
 - f̩̀k ‘blow (cold)’ → f̩̀ḱ ‘cold’
- (31) Morpho-phonological alternation in **[N of N] constructions**
- Used for possession, compounds, and other meanings of association
- (32) Like most Bantoid/Bantu languages, Ghomala’ has a **noun class system**, albeit relatively reduced with only 6 classes (SG-PL pairings 1-2, 3-4, and 5-6)
- Evidence for these classes comes from **distinct concord patterns**
 - Class 2 plural ms̩̀ŋ ‘birds’ ms̩̀ŋ pá-puə́ ‘two birds’
 - Class 4 plural mkẁ̩ə̀ ‘feet’ mkẁ̩ə̀ má-buə́ ‘two feet’
 - Class 6 plural dz̩̀ ‘goats’ dz̩̀ tsá-puə́ ‘two goats’

- (33) Class 1 nouns such as **mú** ‘child’ versus Class 3 nouns such as **thé** ‘head’
- Different concord patterns in [N of N] constructions
 - mú L bvǎ → [mû **bvǎ**]
child_[CL1] of.CL1 dog ‘the child of the dog’ (Nissim 1981: 264)
 - thé H bvǎ → [thé **↑bvǎ**]
head_[CL3] of.CL3 dog ‘the head of the dog’ (Nissim 1981: 153)
- (34) [N of N] constructions and tone-segment co-variation (Nissim 1981: 157-158, 250-252)
- mú L gǎp → [mû **gǎpǎ**] ‘the child of the hen’
 - kòǎ° L gǎp → [kòǎ° **gǎpǎ**] ‘the rooster of the hen’
 - gǎ L gǎp → [gǎ **gǎpǎ**] ‘the voice of the hen’ [\[AUDIO\]](#)
 - dyǎ L gǎp → [dyǎ **gǎpǎ**] ‘the house of the hen’
 - thé H gǎp → [thé **↑gǎp**] ‘the head of the hen’
 - mkòǎ° H gǎp → [mkòǎ° **gǎp**] ‘the roosters of the hen’
 - kwǎ H gǎp → [kwǎ **gǎp**] ‘the foot of the hen’ [\[AUDIO\]](#)
 - táŋ H gǎp → [táŋ **↑gǎp**] ‘the ear of the hen’
- (35) **Complete tone/segment co-variation**
- If you add rising tone to [**cvk**], then you **feed** epenthesis (i.e. [**cvkǎ**])
 - If you eliminate rising tone from [**cvk**], then you **bleed** epenthesis (i.e. [**cvk**])

4 ZOOMING OUT: WHY IS TONE-DRIVEN EPENTHESIS SO RARE?

4.1 *A common constraint*

- (36) Let us refer to this constraint in Ghomala’ as ‘**the *[cvk] constraint**’
- Sonorous segments such as vowels and sonorants possess richer harmonic structures than obstruents → make for better tone-bearing units
 - It is well-known that rising pitch takes longer to execute than a falling pitch and consequently has greater duration on average (e.g. Sundberg 1973, *etc.*)
 - Taking together, [**cvk**] structures may not provide enough sonorous material to adequately realize the rising tone within its allotted duration
- (37) **Two common repair families:**
- Reduce the contour tone (effect the ‘tune’)
 - Expand the vowel duration (effect the ‘text’)
- (38) **Reduce** the ‘contourness’ of tone – Compression, simplification, or flattening
- May result in complete neutralization
 - In Xhosa [**xho**], HL contours are merged with H tones when a vowel is shortened in unstressed (i.e. pre-penultimate) environment (Lanham 1958, Zhang 2013)
- (39) **Expand** the vowel duration
- Non-neutralizing lengthening in Mitla Zapotec [**zaw**] for syllables with rising but not falling contours (Briggs 1961, cited in Zhang 2013)

4.2 *Epenthesis as a rare repair*

- (40) A common constraint but a rare repair:
- The motivation is very common, i.e. avoiding rising tone on suboptimal host
 - However, tone-driven epenthesis as a repair is extremely rare
 - E.g. no such repair in aforementioned typological surveys (Gordon 2001, Zhang 2013)
- (41) In fact, works which posit a maximally restrictive theory of epenthesis assume tone-driven epenthesis to be **impossible/unattested** (Blumenfeld 2006; Gleim 2019)
- “Tone conditions cannot affect string structure” and therefore tone “cannot force epenthesis/syncope” (Blumenfeld 2006:41)
 - Epenthesis is “used exclusively as a response to pressures of syllable structure, sonority sequencing, syllable contact, and word minimality” (Blumenfeld 2006:5)
- (42) Outside of Ghomala’, tone-driven epenthesis entertained only in:
- Wamey [cou] Tenda, Niger-Congo: Senegal (Santos 1996)
 - Kejom [bbk] Grassfields, N.-Congo: Cameroon (Akumbu et al. 2020)
 - Kifuliiru [flr] Bantu, N.-Congo: DRC (van Otterloo 2011)
 - Hdi [xed] Chadic: Nigeria/Cameroon (Frajzyngier 2002, Gleim 2019)
 - Barain [bva] Chadic: Chad (Lovstrand 2012)
 - Arapaho [arp] Algonquian: USA (Cowell & Moss 2008, Gleim 2019)
- (43) Only in **Wamey** is there good evidence for *bona fide* epenthesis (Rolle & Merrill *to appear*)
- Out soon in *Phonology* – Draft: <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/006624>
 - Arguments parallel to those developed for Ghomala’ showing that **rising tones on closed syllables trigger epenthesis**

Table 8: **Wamey** – Complementary distribution of *cvc* and *cvcə* roots based on tone

| | Tone | CVC shape | CVCə shape |
|----|------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| a. | H | -cæw̃ ‘urinating’ | *cvcá |
| b. | L | -cəw̃ ‘hiding’ | *cvcə |
| c. | HL | -cəw̃ ‘domestic animal’ | *cvcə |
| d. | LH | *cvc | -nkæw̃ə ‘dance’ (n.) |

4.3 *Why so rare? – The functional load of tone*

- (44) Despite its occurrence in Wamey and Ghomala’, it is incredibly rare – **But why?**
- Towards an explanation: **the relatively low functional load of tone**
- (45) **Functional load** (Hockett 1955, 1966; Wedel et al. 2013; *inter alia*)
- “Functional load (FL) quantifies the contributions by phonological contrasts to distinctions made across the lexicon” (Round et al. 2022)
 - English contrast **t** vs. **d** has a high functional load (e.g. many minimal pairs – *tie/die, tall/doll, tune/dune, sat/sad*, etc.)
 - Cf. **θ** vs. **ð** with much **lower** functional load (e.g. *ether/either*) (Hall et al. 2019)
- (46) The number of tonal minimal pairs is often very low in tonal languages

- (47) **Hausa** [[hau](#)] (Chadic: Nigeria)
- “Although tone does not have a functional load comparable to that of many West African languages like Igbo or Yoruba, it does serve to distinguish a number of lexical items” (Newman 2000:599)
 - ràìná: LH ‘look after a baby’
 - ráínà: HL ‘despise, have contempt for’
- (48) **Relative functional load (FL) and entropy measures**
- How much information is lost if you merge all values of a category?
No vowel contrasts: rV̂V̂nV̂: vs. rV̂V̂nV̂:
No tone contrasts: raina: vs. raina:
 - Chinese tonal languages Mandarin and Cantonese – FL of vowels is largely equivalent to that of tone, demonstrating equal lexical importance (Surendran & Niyogi 2003, 2006; Surendran & Levow 2004; Oh et al. 2015)
 - In contrast in Hausa, FL of vowels is 3.5 times as important as tone (Rolle 2020)
 - What is more typical? Cross-linguistic quantitative study still required
- (49) **If functional load is low, little reason to excessively maintain tone contrast**
- In tonal languages, most morphemes bearing tone are expressed jointly by tonal and segmental material together, and more rarely by tone alone
 - If there is enough segmental material to differentiate the morpheme from other paradigmatically-related morphemes (e.g. all nominal roots, or all TAM suffixes), then **adding more segmental material** via epenthesis may be **costlier** than being **faithful to the underlying tone** pattern
- (50) In short, in most tonal languages if the H portion of a [cV̂k] sequence were simply deleted, little information would be lost to correctly identify the intended meaning

5 SUMMARY²

- (51) **To summarize:**
- We demonstrated one rare process termed ‘**tone-driven epenthesis**’, defined as the phonological insertion of a vowel to host a tone
 - We provided evidence for this process from the Cameroonian language Ghomala’, with evidence from **root phonotactics** and **morpho-phonological alternations** (both derivation and inflection)
 - Finally, we hypothesized that the reason tone-driven epenthesis is so rare is due to the **low functional load of tone** in many tone languages
- (52) These findings support **tone-intonation parallelism:**
- Both types of prosodic systems make use of the same **phonological substance** (i.e. H/L tonemes) and representation (e.g. **autosegmental architecture**)
 - Both have the same functional pressures to **cultivate segmental environments** best suited for **realizing pitch targets**

² For references: [[rtf](#)] [[bib](#)] (or see my website)