

- DRAFT prepared for *The Handbook of Phonological Theory*, 2nd Ed., Blackwell (John Goldsmith, Jason Riggle & Alan Yu, eds) • Comments welcome

Tone: Is it Different?

Larry M. Hyman
University of California, Berkeley

1. Introduction

Except for a brief period in the late 1970s and early 1980s, tone has generally fallen outside the central concerns of theoretical phonology. During that period, the concepts and formalisms of Goldsmith's (1976a,b) autosegmental approach to tone provided the model to address other aspects of "non-linear phonology" including vowel harmony (Clements 1977, 1981), nasal harmony (Hyman 1982), and feature geometry (Clements 1985, Sagey 1986). In addition, autosegmental approaches to templatic morphology (McCarthy 1981), reduplication (Marantz 1982), and other aspects of "prosodic morphology" owed their inspiration to tone, which through the work of Pulleyblank (1986) provided important insights into the developing framework of lexical phonology and morphology (Kiparsky 1982, 1985; Mohanan 1986). Most generative work prior to and during this period had centered around African tone systems (Leben 1973a, Hyman & Schuh 1974, Goldsmith 1976, Clements & Ford 1979, Clements & Goldsmith's 1984), two notable exceptions being Haraguchi (1977) and Yip (1980), who dealt with the tonal dialectology of Japanese and Chinese, respectively. Finally, Pierrehumbert (1980) developed an influential autosegmental approach to intonation based on English, which was subsequently applied to Japanese (Beckman & Pierrehumbert 1986) and many other languages since. While the autosegmental legacy is still quite alive, tone has not contributed as centrally to subsequent theoretical innovations in phonology. In the case of optimality theory (Prince & Smolensky 1993, McCarthy 2002), there have been some interesting applications, e.g. Myers' (1997) treatment of the obligatory contour principle (OCP), but theoretical developments have largely been based either on segmental phonology or on stress, syllabification, reduplication and other aspects of prosodic phonology and morphology.

My goal in writing this chapter is twofold. First, I propose to cover some of the aforementioned contributions that tone has made to phonological theory. Second, I wish to show that there is still much more for phonologists and others to learn from tone. I suggest that linguists should be very concerned about tone, for at least three reasons:

(i) Tone systems are found in approximately 50% of the languages of the world. The greatest concentrations of "tone languages" are found in Sub-Saharan Africa, East and Southeast Asia, Southcentral Mexico, and parts of Amazonia and New Guinea. While we have had access to information about the first three areas for some time, comparatively little has been available on tone in Amazonia and New Guinea until recently. The emerging picture is that these tone systems have interesting and diverse properties which complement the already varied African, Asian, and Mexican systems. The result is an extraordinary richness and a potential gold mine for future investigations.

(ii) The study of tone has influenced the history of phonology and promises to contribute further to our understanding of language in general, particular as concerns interface issues. For instance, some of the most detailed and influential studies concerning the syntax-phonology

interface have drawn from tonal alternations applying at the phrase level (Clements 1978, Chen 1987). More recently, several meetings have brought together scholars interested in the relation between tone, phrasal accent, and intonation, especially in the languages of Europe and East Asia (Germanic, Slavic, Basque, Chinese, Japanese, Korean etc.), areas covered in some detail by Gussenhoven (2004), among others. Three collections of note are van der Hulst (1999), Jun (2005), and Riad & Gussenhoven (2007). Cutting across the components of grammar, both abstract and instrumental research have been concerned with how focus and other aspects of information structure, often sometimes marked by stress or intonation, are realized when there is a competing tone system. Some of this work has shown that focus is not necessarily prosodically marked in certain languages with tone (Downing 2007).

(iii) Tone systems have properties which SURPASS segmental and metrical systems. In §6 I conclude that tone can do everything that segmental and metrical phonology can do, but that the reverse is not true. This is especially true of the long-distance effects that tone exhibits both within and across words, as when the tone of one word migrates several syllables or words to its right. Since some tonal phenomena have no segmental or stress analogues, anyone who is interested in the outer limits of what is possible in phonology would thus be well-served to understand how tone systems work.

Despite the widespread occurrence of tone in the world's language and the important contributions tone has already made to our understanding of phonology and its interfaces, the lack of familiarity of some scholars with tone has allowed certain old misconceptions to persist. The rest of the chapter is organized as follows. In §2, I begin by defining tone and characterizing these persistent misconceptions. In §3 I discuss the autosegmental insight to tone. The next section deals with the question of whether tone has different properties from other phonology, either quantitatively (§4.1) or qualitatively (§4.2). §5 takes us the issue of whether tone should sometimes be analyzed in accentual terms. Throughout the discussion focus will be on the question of what tone has to teach phonologists, and therefore crucially, whether there are phonological properties that are found only in tone systems. The conclusion in §6 summarizes the key points of the preceding sections, concluding that the capabilities of tone do surpass those of either segmental or metrical phonology.

2. Defining tone: Three misconceptions

A logical place to begin is by raising an old, but most essential question, “What is tone?” How do we know if a language has tone? As given in (1), two early definitions of a language with tone is a language

- (1) a. “... having significant, contrastive, but relative pitch on each syllable” (Pike 1948:3)
- b. “... in which both pitch phonemes and segmental phonemes enter into the composition of at least some morphemes” (Welmers 1959:2)

While Pike originally saw tone as a contrastive feature on each syllable or other tone-bearing unit (TBU), Welmers' definition insists on the MORPHOLOGICAL nature of tone: tone is not a property of syllables, as expressed by Pike, but rather of morphemes. Welmers correctly pointed out that not all morphemes need to have a tone—some may be toneless. Similarly, not all morphemes need to have a TBU—they may be “tonal morphemes” (§2, §3). We will see that there is great advantage in approaching tone from this morphological perspective. However, it is

useful to update and slightly modify Welmers' definition as in (2). A language with tone is a language

- (2) "... in which an indication of pitch enters into the lexical realization of at least some morphemes." (Hyman 2001a:1368; Hyman 2006:229)

The above statement defines tone in terms of the morphemes which in turn are amalgamated to form words. Since word-level tones may be assigned by rule, "lexical realization" refers to the output of lexical phonology, not necessarily underlying representations. For example, it could be argued that the Somali noun roots in (3) are underlyingly toneless:

(3)	root	masculine		feminine
a.	/inan/	ínan	'boy'	inán
	/naʕas/	náʕas	'stupid man'	naʕás
	/goray/	góray	'male ostrich'	goráy
b.	/darmaan/	darmáan	'colt'	darmaán
	/ʕeesaan/	ʕeesáan	'young he-goat'	ʕeesaán
	/dameer/	daméer	'he-donkey'	dameér

For these nouns, the masculine morpheme assigns a high (H) tone (´) to the penultimate vowel, while the feminine morpheme assigns a H tone to the final vowel (Hyman 1981, Saeed 1999). Toneless vowels which follow a H are realized low (L), while vowels which precede a H tone are realized mid (M). The contrast in (3a) is thus between [H-L] vs. [M-H], while the contrast in (3b) is between [M-HL] vs. [M-MH], where the last long-vowel syllable is either falling or rising. Somali also illustrates the importance of the wording "indication of pitch" in the definition in (2), which is taken to mean tone features or any other analytical device whose only function is to characterize pitch. In the above analysis, a H tone is assigned to one of the last two vowels of the noun. Although an analyst may prefer to assign a diacritic accent (*) to the relevant vowel instead, the diacritic device would still be marking only H tone, which in fact may be entirely absent on a word, e.g. on both the subject noun and verb in the utterance *inan wáa dhaʕay* 'a boy fell'. The definition in (2) would thus include Somali, but would exclude languages where all indications of pitch are introduced post-lexically, i.e. at the phrase or utterance level.

While it is possible to view the above Somali roots as underlyingly toneless, and the gender markers as tonal morphemes devoid of a TBU, the most common situation is for morphemes to consist of both segmental and tonal features. This is seen in the minimal pairs, triplets, quadruplets and quintuplets in (4)-(7) showing examples contrasting two, three, four, and five contrastive tone heights, respectively:

- (4) Two levels: Dadibi [Papua New Guinea] (MacDonald & MacDonald 1974:151)

a.	L (low) tone	:	wà	'string bag'	nà	'shoulder'
b.	H (high) tone	:	wá	'edible greens'	ná	'aunt'

- (5) Three levels: Nupe [Nigeria] (Banfield 1914)

a.	L (low) tone	:	bà	'to count'	wà	'to scratch'
b.	M (mid) tone	:	bā	'to cut'	wā	'to extract'

c. H (high) tone : bá ‘to be bitter’ wá ‘to want’

(6) Four levels: Chatino (Yaitepec) [Mexico] (McKaughan 1954:27)

L (low) tone	Lower mid tone	Higher mid tone	High (H) tone
kù	kù	kū	kú
‘dove’	‘sweet potato’	‘I grind’	‘I eat’

(7) Five levels: Kam (Shidong) [China] (Edmondson & Gregerson 1992)

ta ¹¹	ta ²²	ta ³³	ta ⁴⁴	ta ⁵⁵
‘thorn’	‘eggplant’	‘father’	‘step over’	‘cut down’

The contrasts in (7) show that it is sometimes difficult to give names and use accent marks for each tone level, in which case it is more practical to indicate pitch levels by numbers (5 = highest, 1 = lowest). In addition to such level tones, some languages also have contour tones which either rise, fall, or both. The best known such example is Standard Mandarin, whose four-way contrast is frequently exemplified by means of the minimal quadruplet in (8).

(8)	Tone I	(high level)	ma ⁵⁵	‘mother’
	Tone II	(rising)	ma ³⁵	‘hemp’
	Tone III	(falling-rising)	ma ²¹⁴	‘horse’
	Tone IV	(falling)	ma ⁵¹	‘scold’

By exploiting other contours as well as differences in phonation, e.g. breathiness or glottalization, a language can have even more tonal contrasts on monosyllables, as in the following Trique (Itunyoso) [Mexico] examples (Dicinio 2006):

(9)	Level		Falling		Rising	
	bbe ⁴	‘hair’	li ⁴³	‘small’	yāh ⁴⁵	‘wax’
	nne ³	‘plough (n.)’	nne ³²	‘water’	yah ¹³	‘dust’
	nne ²	‘to tell lie’	nne ³¹	‘meat’		
	nne ¹	‘naked’				

As many people do not speak a native language with tone, tonal contrasts such as the above can be quite unfamiliar to linguists and language learners alike:

“Most language students, and even a shocking number of linguists, still seem to think of tone as a species of esoteric, inscrutable, and utterly unfortunate accretion characteristic of underprivileged languages—a sort of cancerous malignancy afflicting an otherwise normal linguistic organism. Since there is thought to be no cure—or even reliable diagnosis—for this regrettable malady, the usual treatment is to ignore it, in hope that it will go away of itself.” (Welmers (1959:1)

In this chapter we are concerned with whether and, if so, how tone is different from other aspects of phonology. While few phonologists would like to be identified with the above caricature, which Welmers (1973:77) felt compelled to repeat fourteen years later, there are occasional indications that “a shocking number of linguists” feel that tone is different from segmental

phonology in rather dramatic ways. While we will conclude that there ARE important differences, let us first reject three rather extreme misconceptions about tone which are sometimes expressed:

(i) *Tone cannot be studied the same way as other phonological phenomena.* Upon encountering their first tonal experience, even seasoned field workers have asked me: “How can I tell how many tones my language has?” Each time this happens I am tempted to answer back with the rhetorical question: “How can you tell how many vowels your language has?” I have seen investigators try to discover the tonal categories by first eliciting long utterances, and then marking the relative pitch changes between syllables, as one might initially do when approaching intonation. At best, this complicates the task. As in the case of voicing, nasality, vowel length and other phonological contrasts, the normal technique is to first elicit individual words to determine the phonetic properties, and ultimately the phonemic contrasts. In the case of tone, this might then yield the tonal minimal pairs, triplets, quadruplets and quintuplets seen in (4)-(8) above. Other languages may offer fewer minimal pairs and/or require specific contexts or “frames” in which the full range of contrasts can be discerned. For example, as seen in (10), the largely monosyllabic words of Hakha Lai [Burma] are pronounced with either HL falling (ˆ) or level L (˘) tone in isolation (Hyman & VanBik 2004):

(10)	in isolation		after ka=	‘my’
a.	hmâa	‘wound’	ka hmâa	‘my wound’
	lûŋ	‘heart’	ka lûŋ	‘my heart’
b.	kêe	‘leg’	ka kěe	‘my leg’
	kôoy	‘friend’	ka kǒoy	‘my friend’
c.	sàa	‘animal’	ka sàa	‘my animal’
	kâl	‘kidney’	ka kâl	‘my kidney’

However, as seen in the forms on the right, the falling tone nouns split into two classes when following toneless proclitics such as ka= ‘my’: the nouns in (10a) remain HL, while those in (10b) are pronounced with a LH rising (˘) tone. The natural conclusion to draw is that Hakha Lai has three underlying tones, /HL, LH, L/, and a LH → HL rule that applies after pause (and in certain other environments—see Hyman & VanBik 2004).

Such observations do not make tone different from other aspects of phonology—one has but to think of the languages which merge segmental contrasts on words in isolation, e.g. the voicing contrast on German *Rat* ‘advise’ vs. *Rad* ‘wheel’. In studying tone we need to be rigorous and comprehensive, just as we would have to be in attempting to analyze anything else. As we shall see, the issues that come up in the study of tone are quite complex, with more processes being available to tone, particularly at the phrase level, than to segmental phonology (cf. §4.2). However, since tones enter into “paradigmatic” contrasts very much like consonant and vowel features, we need not seek new methodologies. As Welmers (1959:9) put it: “The more information we acquire about even the most complex tone systems, the more encouragement we receive that we already have the equipment needed to handle them.” In short, tone CAN be studied just like other aspects of phonology.

(ii) *Tone cannot mark certain things.* A second misconception is that tone is used only to mark certain things. Most of the examples in (4)-(10) illustrate the LEXICAL function of tone: Different monomorphemic nouns, verbs etc. differ only in tone. However, the Somali examples in (3) show that tone can also be implicated in grammar, i.e. it can have a MORPHOLOGICAL function. Further examples of morphological tone are seen in (11)-(13).

- (11) Tone marking person in Zapotec (Macuiltianguis) [Mexico] (Broadwell 2000:7)
- a. 1st person: bè-xáttā?-yà?-nà ‘I ironed it’ bè-gállá?-yà?-nà ‘I hung it up’
 b. 3rd person: bè-xáttā?-nà-nà ‘he ironed it’ bè-gállá?-nà-nà ‘he hung it up’
- (12) Tone marking tense-aspect in Nambikuára [Brazil] (Kroeker 1977:129)
- a. present: xyău-nără ‘he is staying’ săsă-nără ‘he is taking’
 b. past: xyău-nără ‘he stayed’ săsô-nără ‘he took’
- (13) Tone marking negation in Igbo (Aboh) [Nigeria] (elicited by the author)
- a. /ò jè kọ/ → ò jè kọ ‘he is going’
 b. /ó jè kọ/ → ó jé kọ ‘he isn’t going’ (H of subject /ó/ spreads onto /jè/)

In (11) we see that the 1st person Zapotec verbs begin with a H tone, while the 3rd person verbs begin with L. In (12) the only difference between the present and past tense is tonal in Nambikuára (where $\hat{\text{^}}$ and $\check{\text{^}}$ mark HL falling and LH rising tones, respectively). Finally, in the Aboh dialect of Igbo, the only difference between the affirmative and negative utterances in (13) is the tone on the third person subject pronoun /o/ (whose H spreads onto /jè/ ‘go’ in the second example). It is thus clear that tone can have a grammatical function as well as a lexical one.

The question is whether there are grammatical notions that tone cannot mark. At a recent annual conference in the US, a distinguished senior scholar presented a plenary talk at which, in passing, he proposed the following alleged universal: “No language uses tone to mark case.” The Maasai [Kenya] data in (14), however, provide a rather clear counterexample to this claim (Tucker & Ole Mpaayei 1955:177-184):

(14)	nominative	accusative	
class I:	èlùkùnyá	èlúkúnyá	‘head’
	èncùmàtá	èncúmátá	‘horse’
class II:	èndéròni	èndèróni	‘rat’
	ènkólòpà	ènkòlópà	‘centipede’
class III:	òlmérégèsh	òlmèrègèsh	‘ram’
	òlósówùàn	òlòsòwùàn	‘buffalo’
class IV:	òmótònyî	òmótònyî	‘bird’
	òsínkírî	òsínkírî	‘fish’

In Maasai, native nouns usually consist of a gender prefix (masculine sg. *ol-*, feminine sg. *en-*) followed by a stem of one or more syllables. Except for class IV, nouns take different tones in nominative vs. accusative case. Although there are other complications, the four-syllable nouns which are cited show the following: In class I, the nominative has a single H on the last syllable, while the accusatives have one L followed by all H syllables. In class II, nouns have a single H which is realized on the first stem syllable in the nominative vs. the second stem syllable in the accusative. In class III, the nominative has a H tone on the first and second stem syllables, while the accusative has a H only on the first stem syllable.

While Maasai is rather clear on the issue of tone marking case, the proposal is all the more surprising as so much of the tonal discussion in the 1960s and 1970s concerned the analysis of the so-called associative tone in certain West African languages such as Igbo (see Williamson 1986 and references cited therein). One analysis is that the associative marker consists of a H

tonal morpheme which, as seen in the examples in (14), is assigned to the left in Central Igbo, but to the right in Aboh Igbo (Hyman & Schuh 1974:98-9):

- (15) Central Igbo: àgbà + ´ + èṅwè → àgbá èṅwè ‘jaw of monkey’
 Aboh Igbo: ègbà + ´ + èṅwè → ègbà éṅwè ‘jaw of monkey’

In Igbo, the /L-L/ words *àgbà* ~ *ègbà* ‘jaw’ and *èṅwè* ‘monkey’ are pronounced L-L in isolation. As seen, according to the dialect, an intervening H tonal morpheme is realized either on the preceding or following TBU in the associative construction. But what is this “associative morpheme” if not a genitive case marker? The more pressing question is why anyone would seek to limit the kinds of constructions or semantic notions that tone can mark. The failure here is to appreciate the full morphological nature of tone: If a tone can be a morpheme, then it can do anything that a morpheme can do. This follows from the fact that tonal morphemes most commonly derive historically from earlier segmental+tonal morphemes whose segments have been lost (cf. §3). Thus, anything that can be marked by a segmental+tonal morpheme, can also be marked by a tonal morpheme. In other words, “tonal morphology... exhibits essentially the same range of morphological properties as in all of segmental morphology” (Hyman & Leben 2000:588).

The alternative view, that tone is better suited to express certain ideas rather than others, has, however, occasionally also been expressed:

“In a tone language, tone is not a purely harmonic or musical element, it is the expression of a thought, of an idea; it belongs to the intellectual domain, such that we can formulate the following axiom: SEEK THE IDEA AND YOU WILL HAVE THE TONE.” (Stoll 1955:5) (my translation, his emphasis)

Along these lines, Stoll suggests that H tone indicates “everything that is woman, female, feminine” while L tone indicates “everything that is masculine, male, man” (p.156). While certain languages occasionally exhibit indications of tonal iconicity (cf. Ratliff 1992), there is no reason for H vs. L tones to signify feminine and masculine any more than voiceless vs. voiced consonants (with which these tones often correlate, respectively). Once again, tone is not different from other phonological features.

(iii) *Tone is expendable*. The third misconception is that tone is somehow less essential in a language than other phonological features. This is seen in the way tones and tone systems are sometimes dealt with in the literature. First, many descriptive and pedagogical grammars do not analyze or present the tone system in any detail. Those that do may have a section on tone, but then elect not to transcribe tone in the rest of the study. Different excuses are variously provided: (i) the tones are not important because they do not have a heavy functional load (i.e. there are few minimal pairs); (ii) the tones are a typographical inconvenience (e.g. an accent mark gets in the way of marking nasalized vowels with a tilde); (iii) the tones have not yet been analyzed; (iv) in order to learn the tones you have to listen to a native speaker anyway; (v) native speakers prefer not to write the tones, etc. There are, of course, practical orthographies that do not mark tone, just as there are those which fail to mark all of the segmental contrasts. While there is a growing experimental literature on whether it is advantageous to readers if tone is marked, and if yes, when and how (see, for example, Bird 1999a,b), the minimal contrasts cited in the above numbered examples establish that tone is extremely important in many, if not most languages which have a tone system.

The view that tone is expendable is not limited to those designing practical orthographies. In general linguistic work, even phonologists commonly cite language data without indicating the tones. The most egregious cases occur when linguists REMOVE the tones from tone-marked examples cited from other sources, sometimes adding in a footnote that they have done so because “the tones are not relevant to the current study.” Perhaps this is also encouraged by an awareness that stress, another prosodic property (which may be predictable or have a low functional load), is also often omitted from linguistic transcriptions, as it is from many practical orthographies. However, no other phonological feature is treated with such indifference as tone: contrastive voicing on consonants or contrastive rounding on vowels is never removed from original fully-marked examples because voicing/rounding “is not relevant to the current study.” On the other hand, there are speech situations where the speakers themselves omit the segments in favor of the tones:

“...when, for some physical reason, it is inconvenient for a Nambikuára to separate his teeth, he may still participate in a conversation by talking through closed teeth using tone as his principle means of communication.” (Kroeker 1977:133-4)

The inherent importance of tone should therefore not be underestimated.

As I have tried to indicate, although the above three misconceptions are sometimes explicitly expressed, they are more frequently implicit in the way linguists go about doing their work. Whether overtly expressed or not, the evidence is that tone is thought of as something different from the rest of what phonologists—or linguists in general—study. The above misconceptions are both extreme and wrongheaded. However, the question still remains: Is tone significantly different from other aspects of phonology? For example, is tone more independent from other phonological features than these latter are from each other? Is tone capable of greater variability than other features? Are there special processes which are found only in tone systems? Or, as Leben (1973b:117) once put it:

“Is tone such a special phenomenon that it must be viewed as a feature on morphemes or larger units in some languages, as a feature on syllables in others, and as a feature on segments in still others? If so, then there is something left to explain: namely, why tone, unlike any other linguistic entity we know anything about, is capable of this many different types of representation.”

Such questions are taken up in the following sections.

3. The autosegmental insight

Over the past several decades there has been an exponential increase in the documentation, analysis, and theoretical understanding of tone systems from throughout the world. Numerous formal proposals have been made concerning tone features and feature geometry, register effects such as downstep, and the interaction between tone and stress (de Lacy 2002), among other issues. In addition, the treatment of globality issues in tone has led to the development of Optimal Domains Theory (Cassimjee & Kisseberth 1998). However, as mentioned in §1, the greatest impact of tone on phonological theory occurred in the 1970s when tone provided the model for autosegmental phonology (Goldsmith 1976a,b). As a preliminary to the question of

whether tone is “different”, it is therefore appropriate to begin by considering the fundamental insight of autosegmental tonology, stated in (16).

(16) Tones are SEMI-AUTONOMOUS from the tone-bearing units on which they are realized.

This view constituted a reaction to the “segmental” approach of standard generative phonology (Chomsky & Halle 1968), which represented consonants and vowel segments in terms of a single matrix of binary distinctive features. For example, the vowel /a/ could be characterized by the vertical array of the binary feature values [-cons], [+back], [-round], and [+low], as in (17).

- (17) a. High tone [á]
- | |
|--------|
| -cons |
| +back |
| -round |
| +low |
| +HIGH |
- b. Rising tone [ǎ]
- | |
|---------|
| -cons |
| +back |
| -round |
| +low |
| +RISING |

The question was how to represent the various level and contour tones in terms of features. An ad hoc response was to add tonal feature values to the segmental matrices in (17), e.g. [+HIGH] for H tone, [+RISING] for rising tone (the capitals being used so as not to confuse tonal and vowel height features). However, there are two problems with the representations in (17).

The first problem stems from the inherent claim that tones are inseparable features on segments, whereas tones have considerable autonomy from their TBUs. As argued by Leben (1973a,b), some languages have a limited number of suprasegmental “tonal melodies” which must be abstracted away from the the TBUs on which they are realized. Although his example was Mende (cf. Leben 1978), I cite examples in (18) which illustrate the corresponding five tonal melodies of closely related Kpelle [Liberia] (Welmers 1962:86):

- (18) a. High throughout
- | | |
|----------------|-------------|
| pá ‘come’ | bóa ‘knife’ |
| láa ‘lie down’ | píli ‘jump’ |
- b. Low throughout
- | | |
|----------------|--------------|
| kpòo ‘padlock’ | kpàki ‘loom’ |
| tònò ‘chisel’ | tòloŋ ‘dove’ |
- c. High followed by low (low begins on the next vowel if there is one)
- | | |
|--------------|----------------------|
| yê ‘for you’ | tôa ‘pygmy antelope’ |
| kpôŋ ‘door’ | kâli ‘hoe’ |
- d. Mid throughout
- | | |
|----------------|--------------|
| kpɔŋ ‘help’ | sua ‘animal’ |
| see ‘sit down’ | kali ‘snake’ |
- e. Mid with first vowel, then high followed by low
- | | |
|--------------------|------------------|
| teê ‘black duiker’ | konâ ‘mortar’ |
| yuô ‘axe’ | kpanâŋ ‘village’ |

In the above, I have adopted Welmers' practice of using only one tone mark per word (M is unmarked). He thus writes /kâli/ for what is pronounced [káli] 'hoe', i.e. H-L. Second, there is no difficulty reducing Kpelle to an underlying two-level system: The M that occurs in the MHL melody in (18e) is straightforwardly analyzed as a L which is raised before H (cf. §4.2), and the "mid throughout" melody in (18d) is underlyingly /LH/, as is seen when two "mid throughout" words occur in sequence:

"In mid-mid, for the dialect being described here, the first mid has a slightly rising allotone.... In some areas, the first mid is level, but the second mid begins a little higher and drops quickly to the level of the first. In still other areas, both phenomena occur: the first mid ends a little higher, and the second begins a little higher. In all cases, the conjunction of two mids is accompanied by an upward pressure." (Welmers 1962:87, note 2)

The important observation is that only five tone patterns (or "melodies") are possible independent of the number or nature of the TBUs: /H/, /L/, /HL/, /LH/, /LHL/. If, on the other hand, each TBU were capable of carrying an independent, underlying /H/, /L/, rising, or falling tone, we would expect $4 \times 4 = 16$ combinations on two TBUs, rather than the five that are observed. In this sense the tones are autonomous from the TBUs.

The second problem with (17) has to do with the representation of contour tones. Features such as [RISING] and [FALLING] encode a change within the segment which is not made explicit. In a two-level tone systems, a rising typically tone acts as if it is a sequence of L+H realized on a single TBU, while a falling tone acts as if it is a H+L sequence on a single TBU. We see this need in the following noun forms from Mende [Sierra Leone] (Leben 1978), which are arranged according to the same five tonal melodies as in Kpelle:

(19)		base noun		+ hu 'in'	+ ma 'on'
a.	/H/	kɔ́	'war'	kɔ́-hú	kɔ́-má
b.	/L/	bêlê	'trousers'	bêlê-hù	bêlê-mà
c.	/HL/	mbû	'owl'	mbú-hù	mbú-mà
d.	/LH/	mbǎ	'rice'	mbà-hú	mbà-má
e.	/LHL/	nyàhâ	'woman'	nyàhá-hù	nyàhá-mà

As seen, the two locative enclitics =hu and =ma take their tone according to the tone of the preceding noun. When the noun ends in a H or L, as in (19a,b), the enclitic takes the same tone. When the noun ends in a falling (HL) tone, as in (19c,e) or a rising tone, as in (19d), the two parts of the contour "split": the first part goes on the last syllable of the noun, while the second goes on the enclitic. We thus see that when there is an extra available syllable, a falling tone maps as a H-L sequence and a rising tone maps as a L-H sequence. This then provides the evidence that contours should not be characterized by features such as [FALLING] and [RISING] but rather as sequenced level tone features, as in (20).

In (22b), however, the two words are realized differently before pause. As seen, there is a H → M rule which affects the last H feature before pause, not just the last H TBU. The contrasting representations in (22a), which had no equivalence in pre-autosegmental tonology, provide the structural difference that results in the surface opposition of H-M vs. M-M before pause. This difference largely correlates with a morphological difference: *má-bá* consists of two morphemes while *wátá* consists of one. In general, the double representation seen in *má-bá* is possible only when each H belongs to a different morpheme, while the branching representation of *wátá* is expected of single morphemes. There are exceptions in both directions, but in general the Obligatory Contour Principle (OCP) (Leben 1973a, Goldsmith 1976a) prohibits sequences of identical tonal features within the same morpheme.

The second argument for the semi-autonomy of tones from their TBUs concerns STABILITY EFFECTS. When a TBU is deleted, its tone is not necessarily deleted, but may either be relinked to another TBU, or it may “float” and have an effect on other tones. Both possibilities can be observed in Twi [Ghana] (Schachter & Fromkin 1968) in (23).

- (23) a. /me ɔ-bo/ ‘my stone’ b. mē bó c. mé ↓bó
- | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | |
| H | L | H | | H | L | H | H | L |

The input in (23a) consists of a /H-L-H/ sequence. When the historical L tone prefix /ɔ-/ is deleted, there are two options: In (23b), as indicated by the dotted association line, some speakers reassociate the L to the H tone pronoun /mē/ ‘my’ to form a HL falling tone. The more common option in (23c), however, is for the L to stay afloat and cause a lowering or “phonemic” DOWNSTEP of the following H of the root /bó/ ‘stone’. Since the deletion of a vowel does not require the deletion of its tone, we have a strong validation of the decision to represent the tone on its own tier.

The derivation of a contour tone or downstep from the loss of a TBU is very common. Another example of the latter comes from Bamileke-Dschang [Cameroon] (Tadadjeu 1974):

- (24) a. séŋ è séŋ ‘the bird of the bird’ → séŋ ↓séŋ
- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| H | L | H | | H | L | H |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|
- b. séŋ ↓séŋ ↓séŋ ↓séŋ ↓séŋ ‘the bird of the bird of the bird of the bird....’
- | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| H | L | H | L | H | L | H | L | H |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

In very deliberate speech, the input associative (genitive) marker /è/ ‘of’ is pronounced as a L tone [è]. When the vowel is deleted, however, the stable L tone produces a downstep on the possessor. The artificial, but grammatical, sequence in (24b) shows that the downstep effect is iterative: each floating L tone conditions a successive drop on the following H.

The Bamileke-Dschang example leads naturally into the third argument for the semi-autonomy of tones from their TBUs, the possibility of ZERO REPRESENTATION: a morpheme can consist solely of a tone without a TBU and without segmental features. Tonal morphemes of course derive from full syllables which have deleted. At a point where future Bamileke-Dschang speakers can no longer pronounce the /è/ in (24a), they will have derived a L associative tonal morpheme, much like the H associative tonal morpheme that was seen in Igbo in (15).

While a tone can be a morpheme until itself, other floating tones can be lexical. Such a situation obtains in Peñoles Mixtec [Mexico], whose TBUs show an underlying contrast between /H/, /L/ and /Ø/ (Daly & Hyman 2007):

doubly linked H tone vs. *ngó^htó* ‘sheep’, which, in violation of the OCP, has two underlying H tone features, the first causing the second to downstep. Similar issues arise concerning underlying L tone in Dioula (Odienné) [Ivory Coast] (Braconnier 1982):

- (27) a. before pause b. before H
- | | | |
|--------|--------|---------------------|
| sèbè | sèbé | ‘paper’ |
| tùrù | túrí | ‘oil’ |
| kàràkà | kàràká | ‘bed’ |
| sùmàrà | sùmárá | ‘soubala’ (a spice) |

As seen in (27a), the four monomorphemic nouns are pronounced all L before pause. When followed by a H, as in (27b), both the bisyllabic and trisyllabic nouns show two patterns: either one or two L tone syllables become H. The analysis may depend on how the rule is formulated. If the rule is as in (28a), the observed differences can be represented in one of two ways:

- (28) a. $L \rightarrow H / \{ //, L \} _ H$
- | | | | | |
|----|------|------|--------|--------|
| b. | sèbè | туру | karaka | sumara |
| | | ∇ | ∇ | ∇ |
| | L L | L | L L | L L |
| c. | sèbè | туру | karaka | sumara |
| | | ∇ | | ∇ |
| | L | L | L | L |

In (28b) a noun may have one vs. two L tone features, where only the L feature which precedes the H is raised to H. Depending on one’s theoretical assumptions, this analysis potentially has two problems: (i) the forms with two Ls violate the OCP intramorphemically; (ii) the rule in (28a) is formulated as a feature-changing rule rather than a tone-spreading rule—which is the most common way to express tonal assimilations (§4.1). In response to the first problem we might instead propose the representational differences in (28c). As seen, there is now only one /L/, linked either to one or two TBUs. As also seen, this /L/ can be preceded by one or more toneless TBUs. The idea here is that the raising rule affects only those TBUs that are prelinked to the /L/.

Proposals of underlying /H, L, Ø/ systems go back at least to Pulleyblank’s (1986) treatment of Margi [Nigeria], which realizes /Ø/ as [H] or [L] and Yoruba [Nigeria], which realizes /Ø/ as [M] (cf. Akinlabi 1985). If /L/ contrasts with /Ø/ in Dioula, still another alternative is to propose the underlying representations as in (29a), where the nouns end in one or more toneless syllable:

- (29) a.
- | | | | |
|------|------|--------|--------|
| sèbè | туру | karaka | sumara |
| | | ∇ | |
| L | | L | L |
- b. $\{ //, L \}$ $\underline{\sigma}^n \# \sigma$
- |
- H

With these representations, the tonal assimilation rule can be reformulated as an anticipatory spreading rule, as in (29b), where the underlined $\underline{\sigma}^n$ represents one or more toneless TBUs.

Which one of the above is the most satisfactory account of the facts can be determined only by an in depth analysis of Dioula d’Odienné, which is not an isolated case: We face similar analytic choices in Acatlán Mixtec [Mexico] (Pike & Wistrand 1974), where some L-L words become H-L, others H-H after what is most naturally analyzed as a floating H tone. Such representational issues pervade tonological analysis, perhaps even more than in the analysis of segmental systems.

4. Is tone different?

With the semi-autonomy of tone now firmly established, we turn to the question of whether tone is different from the rest of phonology. In her textbook on tone, Yip (2002:65) observes the following possible differences between tone and segmental phonology:

- (30) “Tone differs from many other phonological features in the following ways, rarely or never observed in more familiar consonant or vocalic features:
- a. Mobility: Movement away from point of origin
 - b. Stability: Survival after loss of original host segment
 - c. One-to-many: A single tonal feature shared by two or more segments
 - d. Many-to-one: Multiple tonal features surfacing on a single host segment
 - e. Toneless segments: Potentially tone-bearing segments that never acquire phonological tone”

As seen, Yip’s summary essentially recapitulates the autosegmental nature of tone, such that tone would seem to have more semi-autonomy than consonant or vowel features. We might therefore say that *tone is like segmental phonology in every way—only more so!* The phrase “only more so” can have two meanings: (i) QUANTITATIVELY more so: tone does certain things more frequently, to a greater extent, or more obviously (i.e. in a more straightforward fashion) than segmental phonology. (ii) QUALITATIVELY more so: tone can do everything segments and non-tonal prosodies can do, but segments and non-tonal cannot do everything tone can do. In fact, both of these characterizations are correct, as we shall see in the following two subsections.

4.1. Quantitative differences between tonal and nontonal phonology

In this section I discuss the following properties of tones, as they apply within the word domain: spreading, local shifts, non-local shifts, plateauing and polarity. Each of these are frequently attested in tone systems, but only the first is robustly attested in segmental phonology. I begin with the most common tonal process, tone spreading, whose properties are summarized in (31).

- (31) Horizontal assimilation (or tone spreading) (Hyman 1975:223)

a. Natural	b. Unnatural
L-H → L-LH	L-H → LH-H
H-L → H-HL	H-L → HL-L
(perseverative)	(anticipatory)

- (37) a. e-ri-túm-a/ → e-rí-tum-a... ‘to send’
 b. /e-ri-na-túm-a/ → e-ri-ná-tum-a... ‘to send indeed’

It should be noted, however, that anticipatory spreading and shifting are quite different from their perseverative counterparts (Philipsson 1991:180, Hyman 2007b). Whereas the latter were said to derive from the phonetic tendency for tonal targets to be realized late, there is no corresponding phonetic tendency to realize tonal targets early. Instead, the above examples appear to have the property of anticipating prominent tones, in particular a /H/ tone which is opposed to /Ø/. Except as a phrasal property (§4.2), unbounded tone spreading is also rare, and unbounded anticipatory tone shifting even more so. In some cases tonal anticipation is restricted to applying from a weak final to strong penultimate syllable, e.g. Chichewa /pez-á/ → *peézá* ~ *peéza* ‘find!’ (Kanerva 1989). This, then, suggests two different motivations for tones to spread and shift: the phonetic perseverative tendency and the attraction of a tone to a metrically strong position. We should thus expect more unbounded perseverative (vs. anticipatory) spreading/shifting to a metrically syllable, since such processes are doubly motivated.

If segmental features show more favor to anticipatory assimilation than tone, we should expect more anticipatory spreading and shifting. The numerous harmonies known as Umlaut or metaphony fall into this category, as in the case of Servigliano Italian reported by Walker (2005:918):

- (38) a. verd-ó ‘very green (m.sg.)’ vird-ú ‘very green (m.pl.)’
 b. kommonek-á ‘to communicate’ kummunik-ímo ‘we communicate’

As seen, the mid vowels of the roots seen in (38a) assimilate in height to the high vowel of the following suffix in (38b). While most anticipatory cases involve suffix triggers, Esimbi [Cameroon] has a rather curious vowel height shift from root to prefix (Stallcup 1980, Hyman 1988), exemplified in (39).

- (39) a. /u-ri/ → u-ri ‘to eat’ /u-mu/ → u-mu ‘to drink’
 b. /u-se/ → o-si ‘to laugh’ /u-kǎ/ → o-kǎ ‘to beg’ /u-mo/ → o-mu ‘to go up’
 c. /u-yɛ/ → ɔ-yi ‘to wear’ /ú-tǎ/ → ǒ-tǎ ‘to leave’ /ú-mɔ/ → ǒ-mu ‘to sit’

The verbs in (39) consist of a verb root preceded by the infinitive prefix /u-/, which is specified only for rounding. As seen, the height feature of the root transfers to the prefix. This produces the minimal triplet involving the phonetic root [mu]. Stallcup (1980) hypothesizes that the prefix became accented, thereby driving an anticipatory vowel height harmony. Subsequently, root vowels reduced to [+high], which, if unmarked for height, can be characterized as delinking. Given the relatively small number of cases, it is not clear if anticipatory shifting favors segmental vs. tonal features.

Another process which is distinctly tonal is H tone plateauing. A number of tone systems prohibit *H-L-H or *H-Ø-H sequences (Cahill 2007), which Yip (2002:137) refers to as *TROUGH. A common repair is for the non-H TBU(s) to be raised, such that a H tone plateau is created. In some languages, the process is limited to a single L TBU wedged between Hs, e.g. Kihunde (Goldsmith 1990:36) and Mamaindé [Brazil], about which Eberhard (2007:297) writes “The heart of the tone sandhi issue in Mamaindé verbs resolves around sequences of HLH. There seems to be some sort of restriction against any HLH sequences in certain contexts (across the

makes the Kirundi facts interesting are the forms in the left column of (43a). When a toneless verb root occurs with one or no object prefix, the whole infinitive is toneless (vs. the corresponding forms involving a H verb root). However, as soon as a second object prefix is added in (43b), we obtain not one H, but two. It would seem that as soon as one H is introduced by the morphology, it must be alternated within the tone span. While the Kirundi facts are reminiscent of alternating stress, I am unaware of any parallel case where a segmental feature is assigned on an alternating basis.

In this section we have examined several tonal phenomena as they apply roughly within the word domain. In each case it was suggested that the tonal process is more natural and frequent than its segmental analogue. One way to look at this is to say that tone is less restricted than segmental phonology. This interpretation receives support from a common restriction in segmental phonology which seems rarely to apply to tone: root control (Clements 1981). Whereas many harmony processes involve the assimilation of (underspecified) affixes to segmental features of the root, even word-level tonal assimilations seem largely to apply across-the-board. To take just one example, it has been oft noted that prefixes rarely, if ever, condition vowel harmony on a following root (Hall & Hall 1980:227n). However, it is quite commonplace for the tone of a prefix to spread onto the following root, as seen in the Aghem examples in (44):

- (44) a. HTS: /kí-kòǝ/ → kí-kòǝ ‘cutlass’
 b. LTS: /kì-téε/ → kì-téε ‘cricket’

It would appear that the perseverative tendency for tonal targets to be realized late overrides any counteracting tendency for prefixal tones to assimilate to roots. Since segmental assimilations were said to have an apparent anticipatory bias, we make the following statistical prediction: Roots will tend to assimilate to the tones of prefixes, but to the segmental features of suffixes. While we should not expect this prediction to be without exception, I believe that the asymmetry is quite real (Hyman 2002).

4.2. Qualitative differences between tonal and nontonal phonology

In the preceding section, the comparison of tonal to segmental processes was largely limited to the word domain. In this section we will consider tonal properties that apply across words. As will seen, once we do so, the differences become more pronounced. We begin by considering “register effects” and then move on to discuss long-distance processes that apply at the phrase level.

In §4.1 it was said that tones tend to perseverate in “horizontal” assimilations. This is true only if we are looking at full tone assimilation. A second possibility is for tones to undergo “vertical assimilation” or register adjustments. In this case, the asymmetries are quite different, as summarized below:

(45)

		Compression				Polarization	
a. Input:	Anticipatory	Perseverative		b. Input:	Anticipatory	Perseverative	
L-H	M-H	L-M		L-H	? [↓] L-H	? L- [↑] H	
H-L	? M-L	? H-M		H-L	[↑] H-L	H- [↓] L	

As seen in (45a), either tone of a /L-H/ input can undergo a pitch register adjustment and ultimately become a third level tone: the L may be raised to M, the H may be lowered to M, or as we saw in Kpelle in (18d), both may apply in which case /L-H/ is realized [M-M]. The result is tonal COMPRESSION: the difference in the interval between the two output tones becomes smaller than in the input. An input /H-L/ does not show this effect. As indicated by the question marks, it is quite unusual for the H to be lowered or the L to be raised. In fact, as seen in (45b), the opposite effect of POLARIZATION is observed: /H-L/ (but not /L-H/) may undergo raising of the H or lowering of the L. The raising process is seen in the Engenni [Nigeria] example in (46a) (Thomas 1974:12):

- (46) a. /únwónì/ ‘mouth’
 ↓
 [únwóòní]
- b. /únwónì + ólíló/ ‘mouth of a bottle’
 ↓
 [únwóón ólíló]

In Thomas’ analysis a single H TBU is raised to a “top” or superhigh (˘) tone before a L. In (46b) the L tone vowel /í/ is elided, but still has the raising effect on the preceding tone. The result is a surface contrast between the H and superhigh tone.

H tone raising before L is a quite widespread phenomenon, also occurring for example in Kirimi (Cahi) [Tanzania] (Hyman 1993), (Edopi [Indonesia (Papua)] (Kim 1996), and Chinantec (Lealao) [Mexico] (Rupp 1990). Tesfaye & Wedekind (1990:360) report that in Shinasha [Ethiopia] a H-L drop is realized “with about four semitones” while a L-H rise “is realized as a pitch increase of only two, sometimes three semitones.” The question is whether there is a physiological reason for such differences or whether H-raising is a strategy for maximizing the tonal space—or both? Many languages have “downdrift” or “non-phonemic” downstep whereby the second H of a H-L-H sequence is realized on a lower pitch than the first. If there are enough transitions from H to L to H, Hs which are late in the utterance may become quite low. Since it increases the tonal space, raising a H before a L could thus be useful as a counterforce to processes which lower tones.

Some support for this interpretation is obtained from languages which raise H tone in anticipation of a contrastive downstep (↓H). In languages which contrast H-H vs. H-↓H there can be multiple downsteps within an utterance, with each ↓H being produced at a lower pitch level than the previous H. Starting at a higher level could thus be quite useful. In this context consider the following pairs of examples from Amo [Nigeria] (Hyman 1979b:25) and Luganda (personal notes with Francis Katamba):

- (47) Non-local H → ↑H in anticipation of (long-distant) phonemic downstep
- a. kíté úkóómí fínáwà ‘the place of the bed of the animal’
 kì↑té úkóómí fíká↓lé ‘the place of the bed of the monkey’
- b. à-bá-síb-á kígùùndú ‘the ones who tie up Kigundu’
 tè-↑bá-síb-á ↓kígùùndú ‘they do not tie up Kigundu’

In each pair the second utterance contains a ↓H which is lacking in the first. As indicated, but not usually transcribed, a sequence of Hs is quite audibly raised in anticipation of the downstep. Thus, between the first and second syllables, there is a step up of [+1] in the examples lacking a ↓H vs. [+2] in the examples having a later ↓H. While the raising of H before L appears to be

local, it is striking how early the first H is raised in anticipation of the non-local H-[↓]H interval. As we shall see below, other such long-distance interactions are quite typical of phrasal tonology.

The properties of what I refer to as canonical downstep (Clements 1979, Hyman 1979b) are as follows: (i) H contrasts with [↓]H only after another ([↓])H; (ii) [↓]H establishes a “ceiling effect” until the register is re-set: thus, a following H will be pronounced at the same pitch level rather than higher; (iii) there is a theoretically unlimited number of downstep pitch levels (H-[↓]H-[↓]H-[↓]H-[↓]H...). While such systems are best known from Sub-Saharan Africa, they are in fact found in languages from throughout the world, e.g. Kuki-Thaadow [Burma] (Hyman 2007c), Kairi (Rumu) [Papua New Guinea] (Newman & Petterson 1990), Mixtec (Coatzospan) [Mexico] (Pike & Small 1974), Tatuyo [Colombia] (Gomez-Imbert 1980), among many others. Downstep is, thus, a very natural tonal phenomenon. The question, then, is what, if anything, corresponds to downstep in segmental phonology? The brief answer: Nothing. Again, we might look to vowel height for a parallel. Recall from (39) the transfer of vowel height features from root to prefix in Esimbi. The eight underlying root vowels are exemplified in (48) as they are in their singular and plural forms:

(48)	URs	gloss	class 3 sg. /u-/	class 6 pl. /a-/
a.	/-tili/	‘end’	u-tili	o-tili
	/-wúsu/	‘fire’	u-wúsu	o-wúsu
b.	/-yembe/	‘song’	o-yimbi	ε-yimbi
	/-góro/	‘foot’	o-gúru	ɔ-gúru
	/-námə	‘tongue’	o-ními	ɔ-ními
c.	/-semɛ/	‘grain’	ɔ-simi	a-simi
	/-gðnɔ/	‘disease’	ɔ-gùnu	a-gùnu
	/-kara/	‘rope’	ɔ-kiri	a-kiri

When occurring with the class 3 singular prefix /u-/, there are no complications: the vowel height of the root simply transfers to the prefix (and all root vowels are pronounced [+high]). However, when the prefix is plural class 6 /a-/, we observe that it is one step lower than the corresponding singular. This is obtained by fusing the transferred root vowel height with the lower vowel height of /a-/. (Although this would predict that /a-/ should be realized ə- or ʌ-, secondary processes modify these impermissible outputs to o-, ε- and ɔ-.) The fact that there is a step-wise lowering of the prefix might suggest that /a-/ functions like a downstep marker operating on vowel height (Hyman 1988:263). However, neither the Esimbi facts nor any other such scalar segmental process shows the properties of canonical tonal downstep: Thus, there is no language where hypothetical[↓]i, [↓]u (perhaps pronounced [ɪ, ʊ] or [e, o]) contrasts only after /i, u/, as [↓]H contrasts only after another H. There also is no “ceiling effect” on subsequent vowels, such that C[↓]iCe and C[↓]eCε are pronounced [CeCε] and [CεCæ], respectively—and there certainly is no such effect on subsequent words in the phrase, as in the case of tonal downstep. Since tone and vowel height otherwise share properties, e.g. their gradient along a single F0 vs. F1 dimension, the only conclusion to draw is that register effects such as downstep make tone qualitatively different from segmental features.

In fact, perhaps the most significant difference between tone and segmental phonology concerns the ability of tonal processes other than register to apply at long distances at the phrase

level. Recall from (33) that Ndebele spreads, while Zulu shifts a H tone to word-antepenultimate position. In other Bantu languages a H tone spreads or shifts to a designated syllable in a FOLLOWING word. The words in the Shambala utterance in (49a) are all underlyingly toneless, and are therefore pronounced all L (Philippson 1998:320):

- (49) a. mawe magana mane na= miloŋgo mine ‘440 stones’
 b. magí magána matátú ná= mílón̄go mine ‘340 eggs’

However, in (49b) the two underlying H tones (originating on the underlined vowels of /magí/ ‘eggs’ and /matátu/ ‘three’) spread to the penultimate syllable of the following phonological word (or clitic group). Corresponding to the word-level spreading vs. shifting difference of Ndebele vs. Zulu in (33), the following Giryama examples show a long-distance rightward shift or displacement to the penultimate syllable of the following word (Philippson 1998:321; cf. Kisseberth & Volk 2007):

- (50) a. ku-tsol-a ki-revu ‘to choose a beard’ /-tsol-/ ‘choose’
 b. ku-on-a ki-révu ‘to see a beard’ /-ón-/ ‘see’

As in Shambala, the words in (50a) are both toneless, and the phrase is pronounced all L. In (50b), the verb root /-ón-/ ‘see’ carries a H tone which is displaced onto the penult of the toneless word /ki-revu/ ‘beard’. It is examples such as these which motivate Yip (2002:133) to remark that “the most striking property of African tone is its mobility.” One looks in vain for a phrasal spreading or displacement of a segmental property in this way: Vowel-, consonant, and nasal harmonies, which appear to most closely mimic the effects of tone spreading, are typically limited to a word-size domain (which may include clitics). In the rare cases where vowel harmony hops over a word boundary, the affected target is typically a grammatical morpheme, as in Kinande, or the process instead represents a local coarticulatory effect, as in Nez Perce (Aoki 1966). In (50b) we have a robust case of a H tone shifting from one lexical word to another—something which is exactly duplicated in a number of other Bantu languages, e.g. Digo (Kisseberth 1984:163-4) and Zigula (Kenstowicz & Kisseberth 1990:175).

While anticipatory spreading and shifting were said to be rare at the word level, phrasal anticipation appears to be quite natural. Consider the following forms from Tiriki [Kenya] (Paster & Kim 2007) in (51).

- (51) /xu-molom-el-a/ ‘to speak for’ /xu-rhúm̄ul-il-a/ ‘to hit for’
- | | | | |
|----|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|
| a. | xù-mòlòm-èl-à mù-lìmì | xú-rhúm̄ul-ìl-à mù-lìmì | /mu-limi/ ‘farmer’ |
| b. | xú-mólóm-él-á mú-línà | xú-rhúm̄ul-íl-á mú-línà | /mu-lína/ ‘friend’ |

Both /xu-molom-el-a/ and /mu-limi/ are underlyingly toneless and pronounced all L in isolation, while /xu-rhúm̄ul-il-a/ and /mu-lína/ have an underlying H on their first root syllable, which spreads onto the prefix: [xú-rhúm̄ul-ìl-à], [mú-línà]. In (51a), where the infinitive is followed by toneless /mu-limi/, no further change is observed. In (51b), however, the H of /mu-lína/ is anticipated not only onto its prefix /mu-/, but also onto all of the toneless TBUs of the preceding word. As seen, the toneless verb /xu-molom-el-a/ becomes all H, while the H of /mu-lína/ is anticipated up to the H of /xu-rhúm̄ul-il-a/. Where the two H tones meet, we observe the indicated downstep. The same anticipatory process will apply through multiple words and

- (54) a. ‘illuminate’ ‘symbol’ ‘machine’ → ‘camera’

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \text{tsɔ} & + & \text{ɕiã} & + & \text{tɕi} & \rightarrow & \text{tsɔ} \text{ ɕiã} \text{ tɕi} & \rightarrow & \text{tsɔ} & \text{ɕiã} & \text{tɕi} \\ \wedge & & \wedge & & \wedge & & \wedge & & | & | & | \\ \text{M} & \text{H} & \text{M} & \text{H} & \text{M} & \text{H} & \text{M} & \text{H} & \text{M} & \text{H} & (\text{L}) \end{array}$$
- b. ‘sky’ ‘studies’ ‘terrace’ → ‘observatory’

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \text{tʰi} & + & \text{vəŋ} & + & \text{dɛ} & \rightarrow & \text{tʰi} \text{ vəŋ} \text{ dɛ} & \rightarrow & \text{tʰi} & \text{vəŋ} & \text{dɛ} \\ \wedge & & \wedge & & \wedge & & \wedge & & | & | & | \\ \text{H} & \text{L} & \text{L} & \text{H} & \text{L} & \text{H} & \text{H} & \text{L} & \text{H} & \text{L} & (\text{L}) \end{array}$$

While the tone melodies of languages such as Kpelle, seen earlier in (18), are normally a property of words, the Shanghai data show that tones may also be mapped over phrases. In fact, it is quite common for the tones of syntactically conditioned constituents to be determined by the underlying tone or tone pattern of the first word. Based on their tonal behavior, Efere (2001:158-9) sets up the four following classes A-D in Izon (Bumo) [Nigeria]:

- (55) class schema tone pattern determined by the A-D class of the phrase-initial word
- | | | |
|---|------------|--|
| A | (L) H + H | all TBUs in the phrase = H |
| D | (L) H + HL | first word = all H, H spreads one TBU to the right; other TBUs = L |
| B | (L) H + L | first word = all H; subsequent TBUs = L |
| C | (L) HL + L | first word keeps its HL drop, remaining TBUs = L |

The (L) in parentheses refers to the fact that vowel-initial words can begin H or L, whereas consonant-initial words begin H. Since only the tones of the first word are relevant, we can assume, as in Shanghai, that the tones of non-initial words are first deleted. The four classes are illustrated in (55) in the frame ... /náná kímí/ ‘man who owns/has...’ (whose underlying H tones are deleted):

- (56) A (L) H + H bélé ‘pot(s)’ → bélé náná kímí (H spreading to end)
 D (L) H + HL ìkíé ‘friend’ → ìkíé nánà kìmì (H spreading one TBU)
 B (L) H + L wárí ‘house’ → wárí nà nà kìmì (no H spreading)
 C (L) HL + L séřì ‘scarf’ → séřì nà nà kìmì (no H spreading)

As indicated, classes A, B and D have a first word which is all H (class C words, which have a pitch drop, are largely borrowings). They differ by the degree to which this H affects subsequent words within the tonal phrase: all the way to the end (A), one TBU onto the second word (D), no spreading (B).

While Williamson (1988) uses a system of tonal melodies + floating tones to account for the variations in such tone patterns found in related Ijoid languages and dialects, at some point it becomes quite difficult to predict the phrasal patterns from specific underlying tones on the first word which determine them. As a case in point, in Urarina [Peru], tone is also determined by the first word of the phrase, which (Olawsky 2006) groups into the four classes A-D:

- (57) class tone pattern determined by A-D class of the phrase-initial word
- A first word = L; H is assigned to initial syllable of following word
 - B first word = L; H is assigned to 3rd syllable of following word
 - C first word = L; H is assigned to last syllable of final word of phrase
 - D first word keeps its H tone when a word follows, all the rest = L

In isolation, Urarina words generally have a single final H. Whereas the first word is all H in three out of the four classes in Izon, in Urarina the first word of a phrase is L except in class D (which also includes some words that have their H on the penult rather than final syllable). As summarized above and illustrated when preceding the trisyllabic verb *rũ.a.kaa* ‘carries/carried (3sg)’ below, the difference concerns the placement of a H tone on the next word:

- (58)
- | | | | | | |
|---|------------|-----------------|---|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| A | raaná | ‘peccary (sp.)’ | → | raana rú.a.kaa | ‘he has carried peccary’ |
| B | obaná | ‘peccary (sp.)’ | → | obana rũ.a.káa | ‘he has carried peccary’ |
| C | reemaé | ‘dog’ | → | reemae rũ.a.kaá | ‘he has carried dog’ |
| D | makusajarí | ‘pepper’ | → | makusajarí rũ.a.kaa | ‘he has carried the pepper’ |

The above represents the general case. One complication is that class B will assign the H to the second syllable of a trisyllabic word whose last syllable is short. It is possible to treat class C as assigning a toneless pattern (with the phrase-final mora being due to a default rule) and class D as borrowings and exceptions. This still would leave the difference between class A and class B. One is tempted to start with a H assigned to one syllable which then shifts two or three syllables to the right, but there does not appear to be any evidence for this, hence Olawsky’s class A-D approach.

The same conclusion is suggested by the facts from the Move dialect of Yagaría [Papua New Guinea]. As indicated in (59), according to Ford (1993:196-7) words either have stable (S) tones or belong to one of three “unstable” tone classes (U_1 - U_3):

- (59)
- | | | | | | | | |
|----|-------|--------|----------|---|---------------|--------------|---------------------|
| a. | S | hógà | ‘left’ | → | hógà kàyàlè | ‘left pig’ | (no change + all L |
| | S | fáipái | ‘white’ | → | fáipái kàyàlè | ‘white pig’ | (no change) + all L |
| b. | U_1 | lòlé | ‘two’ | → | lòlè kàyàlé | ‘two pigs’ | (all L + L-L-H) |
| | U_3 | fèlá | ‘wild’ | → | fèlà kàyálé | ‘wild pig’ | (all L + L-H-H) |
| | U_2 | kòlí | ‘scared’ | → | kòli káyálé | ‘scared pig’ | (all L + H-H-H) |

In the above examples the second word is /kàyàlè/ ‘pig’, which becomes all L after a stable tone word, as in (59a). In (59b), all three unstable tone words have L-H tone in isolation. As seen, they have different effects on the next word: U_1 places a single H on the last syllable, U_2 assigns H to the last two syllables, and U_3 assigns H to all three syllables. One interpretation might be to view the second word as becoming toneless after a stable tone word (and hence all L). Unstable tone words would lose their H tone, and assign a single H to one syllable of the next word, which then spreads onto following syllables. In this case, we would obtain /kayalé/ (after U_1), /kayále/ (after U_2), and /káyale/ (after U_3). It is not clear how these different H tone placements could be predicted from different underlying representations on the first word. While the assignment of a single H to the next word in Urarina and Yagaría might suggest “accent-like” behavior, it is important to note that stress-accent systems do not appear to show such effects. Thus, there appear to be no language where class A words assign a final stress to the next word, class B a

penultimate stress, and class C an initial stress. Rather, phrase-level arbitrary classes seem to be a tonal phenomenon.

The final evidence that more is going on than a simple mapping from the first word to the phrase is found in Wuxi, a Northern Wu dialect that has been studied in detail by Chan & Ren (1989). The following table is reproduced from Chen (2000:323) (cf. also Yip 1989:156-159):

(60)

1st σ		2nd σ		
		T3, 4, 5, 6	T1, 2	T7, 8
A LLH	T3	→	C LHH	
	T6	→	D LHL	
B HHL	T1	→	A LLH	
	T4	→	A LLH	D LHL
	T7q	→	A LLH	D LHL B HHL
C LHH	T5	→	B HHL	
D LHL	T2	→	B HHL	
	T8q	→	A LLH	D LHL

Synchronic Wuxi contrasts four surface tones (A-D), which, as indicated, are characterized in terms of three tone features (which Yip 1989 reanalyzes, respectively, as L+LH, LH+L, H and L+HL, where LH and HL are tonal contours in sense of (21a)). These tones derive from various mergers of the Middle Chinese eight categories (T1-T8), where T7q and T8q refer to the two tones on stopped syllables. Wuxi, like Shanghai, maps a single tone pattern over a phrasal domain. However, as seen in (60), the exact shape of the pattern is determined not only by A-D identity of the first tone, which represents mergers of the Middle Chinese tones, but also by a three-way contrast in the historical identity of the second tone. There thus is considerable arbitrariness from a synchronic point of view. As Chan & Ren (1989) point out, Wuxi tone sandhi was originally right-dominant (whereby the first tone changes), but then became left-dominant, deleting the second tone, as in Shanghai. Chen (2000:325) provides the following sample derivation to illustrate:

- (61) a. na + dā 'milk candy'
 HHL LHL (base tones)
 LHL LHL (sandhied first tone)
- b. LHL Ø (deletion of second tone)
 LH HL (tone spread)

In (61a) the initial HHL (B) tone changes into a LHL (D) tone. This is followed in (61b) by first deleting the LHL (D) tone of the second morpheme, which then allows the one LHL tone to map over the two syllables. The result is an alternation between the /HHL/ of the first syllable with a /LHL/ which it maps over the two syllables. The Wuxi situation demonstrates the extent to which synchronic tonal properties can encode the history of a language, particularly at the phrase level. It would be extremely interesting to know the historical origins of the Izon, Urarina, and Yagaría systems.

Recall that we have been concerned with the fact that while a phrase-initial word can assign an arbitrary tone to a following word, this does not seem to be true either of segmental phonology or of stress: There is no language where, say, the first word arbitrarily assigns a

[+nasal] to different syllables of the next word, nor are there stress classes that assign different stresses to a following word. It should be noted that the examples cited above are all head-final, such that it is an initial modifier or complement which determines the tonal properties of the phrase. This contrasts with grammatical feature assignments which normally go from head to dependent. In this context consider the highly unusual tonal agreement from Barasana [Colombia] (Gomez-Imbert & Kenstowicz 2000:438-9), which has an underlying contrast between bimoraic morphemes which are all H vs. HL. As seen in (62), possessive pronouns condition tonal agreement on the following noun:

(62)

	~kúbú (H) ‘shaman’	~bídi (HL) ‘pet’
~bádí (H) ‘our’	~bádí ~kúbú	~bádí ~ <u>bídí</u>
~ídà (HL) ‘their’	~ídà ~ <u>kúbù</u>	~ídà ~bídi

When the pronoun is H, as in the case of ~bádí ‘our’, ~bídi ‘pet’ changes to H. Similarly, when the possessive pronoun is HL, as in the case of ~ídà ‘their’, ~kúbú ‘shaman’ changes to HL. Since agreement is normally a grammatical concept, one might be tempted to consider the above facts not as tonal agreement, but as grammatical agreement (where H and HL are exponents of grammatical features). However, the agreement in Barasana goes from modifier to head, hence again, in the wrong direction. It is tempting to instead see the examples in (54)-(62) as cases where the head (and potentially other non-initial words) undergoes reduction, followed by additional processes of tone spreading, tone assignment, tone agreement etc.

To summarize this section, we have seen that tone is capable of reaching deeply across word boundaries for both grounded and not-so-grounded processes, e.g. downstep anticipation, non-local H spreading, shifting and plateauing, OCP effects, tone mapping. Segmental phonology does not have such a long reach, but rather is restricted to local adjustments, as when the last segment of one word interacts with the first segment of the next. Stress offers more possibilities, particularly when the stress of one word is retracted or deleted so as to avoid a clash with the stress of another word. It too, however, does not show all of the parallels illustrated in the above discussion. If tone is really different, then these findings have the following implication for word-prosodic typology: any system that does what only tone can do IS tone. The issue of typology is taken up in the following section.

5. Tone vs. accent

While I have treated each of the phenomena and all of the examples of preceding sections as strictly tonal, there has been a tendency to view languages which restrict the distribution of their tones as “accentual”. For example, since Urarina assigns a single H within the appropriate phrasal domain, might this H be a “pitch-accent”? However, since most of the properties discussed in §4.2 do not have analogues in stress-accent systems, their identification as accentual phenomena is not obvious. In this section, I will argue that the phenomena in question are typical of tone systems, particularly those which place restrictions on the distribution of their tones.

Within the generative tradition, the study of word-prosodic typology was greatly influenced by McCawley (1968, 1970), who attempted to set up a principled distinction between tone vs. pitch-accent systems based both on distributional properties and rule types (tones tend to assimilate, accents tend to dissimilate or reduce). A survey of subsequent literature reveals that

the terms “accent”, “pitch accent” and “tonal accent” have generally been used to refer to tone systems which are defective in the sense of restricting tones by number of contrasts or by position: “A pitch-accent system is one in which pitch is the primary correlate of prominence and there are significant constraints on the pitch patterns for words...” (Bybee et al 1998:277). Among such “significant constraints” are those enumerated in (63), where the tone in question is most commonly /H/:

(63) A tone may be...

- a. obligatory: “at least one” must occur per domain (e.g. word)
- b. culminative: “at most one” can occur per domain
- c. privative: the underlying contrast is between presence vs. absence of the tone
- d. predictable: assigned to positions by rule
- e. restricted: occurring in only in certain positions (stressed syllable, first two syllables)
- f. reducible: subject to reduction, subordination (e.g. in compounding, defocusing)

The problem is that most or all of the above properties can be found in unambiguous tone systems. For example, consider OBLIGATORINESS as reflected in the attested tone patterns of Chuave [Papua New Guinea] (Swick 1966, Donohue 1997:355) in (64).

(64) scheme: /H/ /HL/ /LH/ /HLH/ /LHL/

1σ = 1	H				
2σ = 3	H-H	H-L	L-H		
3σ = 7	H-H-H	H-H-L H-L-L	L-H-H L-L-H	H-L-H	L-H-L
4σ = 15	H-H-H-H	H-H-H-L H-H-L-L H-L-L-L	L-H-H-H L-L-H-H L-L-L-H	H-H-L-H H-L-H-H H-L-L-H	L-H-H-L L-H-L-L L-L-H-L

As seen, all combinations of H and L tone are found on words of one to four syllables, except an all L pattern. H tone is therefore “obligatory”, but hardly accentual, given, for example, the 15 patterns possible on four-syllable words. Numerous other tone systems have two, three or four word-tone patterns requiring a H, e.g. /H, LH/ in Hup [Colombia] (Epps 2005), /H, HL, LH/ in Dom [Papua New Guinea] (Chida 2001), /H, HL, LH, LHL/ in Dogon (Jamsay) [Mali] (Heath 2006). It is not clear that there is anything special about such obligatory-H systems vs. those which allow a /L/ pattern. In fact, the distributions in (65) suggest that the obligatoriness of H in Tanimuca [Colombia] (Keller 1999) may be accidental:

(65) 2σ = 3

H-H	H-L	L-H				*L-L	
3σ = 6	H-H-H	H-H-L	H-L-H	L-L-H	L-H-H	L-H-L	*L-L-L, *H-L-L

All patterns occur on bisyllabic words except L-L, suggesting obligatory H. However, three syllable words show only six patterns. Obligatoriness predicts that L-L-L should not be possible, but has nothing to say about the absence of H-L-L. The generalization, therefore, may be that a word cannot end in two L tones. (Unfortunately there are no monosyllabic words in the

language.) In any case, the patterns which do contrast on three syllables again argue for a tonal rather than accentual interpretation.

While obligatory H is much more common, there are also cases of obligatory L: In Hakha Lai [Burma], the three underlying tones are /HL/, /LH/ and /L/ (§2). Not only does /H/ not exist, but all of the tonal alternations conspire to preserve input L features (Hyman & VanBik 2004). A number of languages have a tonal contrast on only one (possibly stressed) syllable per word. Thus, Dadibi (Macdonald & Macdonald 1974) and Fasu (May & Loeweke 1964), both spoken in the Southern Highlands Province of Papua New Guinea, require one syllable per word to be /H/ or /L/, remaining syllables being toneless, while Pame (Central) [Mexico] (Gibson 1956), has one obligatory /H/, /HL/ or /L/ syllable per word.

It appears that tone is the only phonological feature which can have this obligatory property. (In the case of stress, it is the metrical structure that is obligatory.) Although all phonological systems have at least two contrastive vowel heights (Maddieson 1997:636), no language requires every word to have at least one high vowel. Similarly, all languages have oral stops, but unless Rotokas is analyzed as /p, t, k, b, d, g/ rather than Firchow & Firchow's (1969) /p, t, k, β, r, g/, no language requires every word to contain at least one stop. Although tone is once again different from segmental phonology, obligatory H or L does not mean that a tone is an accent.

The next restrictive property on tone is CULMINATIVITY: In some languages tone is not obligatory, but is restricted to at most one occurrence per domain. The standard example here is Tokyo Japanese, which, as seen in (66), has been subject to both accentual and tonal analyses (McCawley 1978, Haraguchi 1979, Poser 1984, Pierrehumbert & Beckman 1988 etc.):

(66) 'pillow' + nom. 'heart' + nom. 'head' + nom. 'fish' + nom.

accentual	ma ^l kura ga	koko ^l ro ga	atama ^l ga	sakana ga
tonal	ma H kura ga	koko H ro ga	atama H ga	sakana ga
output	má ^k ùrà gà	kó ^k ó ^r ò gà	átá ^m á gà	sáká ⁿ á gá
output w/%L	má ^k ùrà gà	kò ^k ò ^r ò gà	à ^t á ^m á gà	sà ^k á ⁿ á gá

Tokyo Japanese has been characterized as having at most one abstract accent (*) per word, one HL pitch drop, or one prelinked H tone. Culminative /H/ occurs in Somali (Hyman 1981, Saeed 1999) and Ocaina [Peru] (Agnew & Pike 1957), and is particularly well-attested in Papua New Guinea, e.g. in Bahinemo (Dye 1992), Baruya (Lloyd & Lloyd 1992), Tinputz (Hostetler & Hostetler 1975), Wantoat (Davis 1969). As in the case of obligatoriness, there are variations on the identity of the culminative tone(s): /HL/ (vs. /H, L/) in Obukitai [Indonesia, Papua] (Jenison & Jenison 1991), /H/ or /HL/ (vs. /Ø/) in Awad Bing [Papua New Guinea] (Cahill 2001), /H/, /HL/, or /LH/ (vs. /L/) in Puinave [Colombia] (Girón Higuaita & Wetzels 2007).

While it was pointed out that only stress and tone can be obligatory, a number of other features have been reported to have the culminative property, e.g. aspiration and glottalization in Cuzco Quechua (Parker 1997:2), vowel length in Mam (Willard (2004:7), mid vowels in Punu (Kwenzi Mikala 1980:8, Fontaney 1980:55), nasalized vowels in Karo (Gabas 1999:42n). Since one does not speak of "mid vowel accent" or "nasal accent", etc., we can assume that the culminativity is simply a restriction that can be placed on tone, as it can be on other features.

That this is the right move is seen from Donohue's (1997:367-8) presentation of the tone patterns in Arigibi Kiwai [Papua New Guinea] in (67).

(67) schema **1σ** **2σ** **3σ** **4σ**

/L/	L	L-L	L-L-L	L-L-L-L
/HL/		H-L	H-L-L	H-L-L-L
/LH/		L-H	L-L-H	L-L-L-H
/LHL/			L-H-L	L-H-L-L L-L-H-L

As seen, /L/ is obligatory, but /H/ is culminative. If these are taken to be diagnostics for accent, then the question would be: Which is the accent? On the other hand, /H/ is both obligatory and culminative in languages such as Kinga (Schadeberg 1973), Una [Indonesia, Papua] (Donohue 1997), and Nubi [Uganda] (Gussenhoven 2006). In such cases, since only pitch is involved in marking the obligatory+culminative prominence, it is not clear whether the H tone should be viewed in metrical vs. strictly tonal terms. In Kinga, at least, where the /H/ is assigned by mora, thereby creating syllables with a [HL] vs. [LH] contrast, as in Somali in (3b), this would be an important difference with canonical metrical systems where the syllable is the stress-bearing unit.

The remaining properties in (63) are probably even less reliable indicators of an accentual system, although they have historically played into such analyses. Some of the studies in Clements & Goldsmith (1984), van der Hulst & Smith (1988), and Inkelas & Zec (1990) deal with Bantu systems which have a privative /H/ vs. /Ø/ opposition (cf. Odden 1988, 1999). One such system is Haya, where one might also be misled by the fact that nouns in isolation can bear at most one H or HL tone, e.g. *o-mu-zi* 'root', *o-mú-ti* 'tree', *o-mu-limi* 'farmer', *o-bu-gólo* 'snuff', *o-mu-kâzi* 'woman'. However, as seen in (68), the word /ó-mu-tí/ 'tree' has two underlying H tones and can be realized with any of the eight possible combinations of H and L (</Ø/) tones (Hyman & Byarushengo 1984:56):

(68) a. L-L-L : o-mu-ti gwaa káto 'Kato's tree'
 L-L-H : o-mu-tí gwange 'my tree'
 L-H-L : o-mú-ti 'tree'
 L-H-H : o-mú-tí káto 'a tree, Kato!'

b. H-L-L : a-gul' ó-mu-ti gwaa káto 'he buys Kato's tree'
 H-L-H : a-gul' ó-mu-tí gwange 'he buys my tree'
 H-H-L : a-gul' ó-mú-ti 'he buys a tree'
 H-H-H : a-gul' ó-mú-tí káto 'he buys a tree, Kato!'

The rules involved are as follows: (i) A H tone vowel becomes L after pause, as in (68a); (ii) a phrase-final H tone is anticipated onto the penult (e.g. before vocative 'Kato!'); (iii) a H tone becomes L before pause (where it also will be phrase-final). (The apostrophe the examples in (68b) indicates the elision of the final vowel of a-gul-a 'he buys'.) Even though the underlying /H/ vs. /Ø/ contrast is privative, the system is clearly tonal. The same is true of systems where Hs are attracted to metrically strong positions, e.g. the penult in Shambala (49b) and Giryama (50b). Finally, bona fide tone systems may also show phrasal reduction phenomena reminiscent of loss of stress when out of focus or stress subordination in compounding. For example, the East

Sudanic language Nara [Eritrea] distinguishes at least the tone patterns in (69), taken from Hayward (2000:255), where the mora (μ) is a vowel or sonorant:

(69) schema	μ	$\mu\mu$	$\mu\mu\mu$	$\mu-\mu$	$\mu\mu-\mu$	$\mu-\mu\mu$	$\mu-\mu-\mu$	$\mu\mu-\mu-\mu(\mu)$
/L/	(L)	LL	(LLL)	(L-L)	LL-L	(L-LL)	L-L-L	LL-L-L
/H/	H	HH	(HHH)	H-H	HH-H	(H-HH)	H-H-H	(HH-H-H)
/LH/		LH	LLH	L-H	LL-H	L-LH, L-HH		LL-L-H
/HL/	HL	HL	HLL	H-HL	HL-L, HH-L	H-LL	H-H-L	
/LHL/			LHL		LH-L	L-HL	L-H-L	LL-L-HL

As seen, the five schemas establish that there is a full tone system, although with the following constraint: "...attention is directed towards an obvious asymmetry with regard to the distribution of the two tones, for we do not find a HLH contour as a counterpart to the LHL contour..." (Hayward (2000:256). Recall that /HLH/ was also missing from Kpelle in (18), and that this sequence served as the input to H tone plateauing in Luganda in (40b) and (52b). In fact, as summarized in the table in (70), whenever two words occur which produce a H-L-H sequence in a COMPLEMENT+HEAD construction, the second H becomes L, as indicated by L in the appropriate cells:

(70) $W_1\downarrow/W_2 \rightarrow$	/L/	/H/	/LH/	/HL/	/LHL/
/L/					
/H/			L		L
/LH/			L		L
/HL/		L	L	L	L
/LHL/		L	L	L	L

Thus, H-H # L-H will become H-H # L-L, H-L # H-H will become H-L # L-L, and so forth. Whereas Luganda changes H-L-H to H-H-H, Nara modifies H-L-H to H-L-L. Both are a response to the constraint against *HLH (Cahill 2007) or *TROUGH (Yip 2002:137). Since the relevant Luganda constructions have the reverse HEAD+COMPLEMENT structure, the two languages reveal that it is the tones of the head that are modified to avoid a tonal trough. While this corresponds with the observation that the focus position is often post-verbal in a VO language, but pre-verbal in an OV language (Harries-Delisle 1978:464), we needn't see the phenomenon as accentual. Rather, prosodic features such as stress, tone and also vowel length (Kisseberth & Abasheikh 1974) can be sensitive to specific syntactic configurations.

To summarize this section, we have seen that tones can be relatively free or considerably restricted. At one end of the spectrum, tone specifications are "dense", with a tone feature required for every TBU. At the other end, tone specification is "sparse", with tone features subject to obligatoriness, culminativity, privativity, or restriction to specific positions. While systems which tend toward the latter characterization have sometimes been termed "accentual," this is an analytical move which is hard to justify on independent grounds. As Gussenhoven (2004:42) puts it, "'Accent'... is an analytical notion and cannot be measured. [It is] thus different from stress, which is typically an observable phenomenon, and different also from tone, whose existence is equally measurable.." Thus, while some languages must be analyzed with stress and others with tone, it is important to underscore that no language MUST be analyzed as "pitch accent". A tonal interpretation is always possible.

The greatest challenge to this position comes from tone systems which have a metrical character. Consider, for example, the case of the Iroquoian language Seneca [Iroquoian] (Chafe 1977, 1996). Seneca and closely related Cayuga have received considerable attention in the metrical literature (see Hayes 1995:222-226 and references cited therein), which has generally analyzed Seneca as having iterative iambs constructed left to right. The properties of Seneca in (71) summarize the trochaic reanalysis in Melinger (2002):

- (71) a. mark the first syllable extrametrical
- b. build bisyllabic trochees left-to-right
- c. assign a H tone to the first syllable of a trochee iff either syllable is closed

As indicated, Seneca clearly has a metrical system. However, several things set it apart from more usual stress systems. First, the trochees are not used to establish stress, but to assign H tones. Second, the H tones are assigned by open vs. closed syllable. Third, the required closed syllable can be in either position of the trochee. This produces the rather unusual tonal distributions seen in the schemas in (72).

- (72) a. < σ > (CáC.Ca) (CaCa)
- b. < σ > (Cá.CaC) (CaCa)
- c. < σ > (Cá.CaC) (CáC.Ca)
- d. < σ > (Ca.Ca) (Ca.Ca)

In each example, the first syllable has been marked off as extrametrical, and the following four syllables have been grouped into two trochees. In (72a) the head of the first trochee consists of a closed syllable and thus receives a H tone (vs. the second trochee which consists of two open syllables). (72b) also receives a H on the head of the first trochee, although in this case it is the closed syllable of the non-head which licenses the H. In (72c) both trochees contain a closed syllable, and so a H tone is assigned to the first syllable of both, in violation of culminativity. Finally, since there are no closed syllables in (72d), no H tone is assigned, in violation of obligatoriness. The question here is whether Seneca has a stress system, a tone system, both, or something else. Following Prince (1983), Hayes suggests that “Lake Iroquoian accent is partly metrical, partly tonal” (Hayes (1995:225). In other words, Seneca has a stress system, which happens to be realized in terms of non-obligatory, non-culminative H tone (as well as by other means, e.g. lengthening of a strong open-syllable penultimate vowel). Seneca thus offers a case of where tone is superimposed on stress (Hyman 1978:5), something which might be designated as “a metrical tone system” for convenience. With time, the subsequent segmental changes which have already begun to obscure the transparency of the metrical system, may make the placement of H tones less predictable. In any case, we are far from the phenomena which are called “accent” because of the sparseness of their H tones. The general conclusion of this section is that so-called pitch-accent has no independent properties, rather represents a “pick-and-choose” between a number of properties which are normally associated with stress vs. tone systems (Hyman 2001a,b). The languages cited in this section are thus better viewed as “restricted tone systems” (Voorhoeve 1973) rather than belonging to a coherent third category.

6. Conclusion

In the preceding sections I have covered some of the conceptual and analytical problems one faces in approaching the study of tone. As we have seen, tone systems are both complex and diverse. The impression one gets is that Hs, Ls, Ms etc. may exhibit as much variation as all of segmental phonology combined: *Tone can do everything that segmental or metrical phonology can do, but the reverse is not true.* Although we rejected the misconceptions about tone in §2, the conclusion nonetheless is that tone is both quantitatively and qualitatively different from segmental features and from the other two traditional suprasegmentals (length and stress). Compare to other phonological properties, we can say the following about tone:

(i) *Tone is the most “syntagmatic”*: As we saw especially in the phrasal examples in §4.2, tone shows the greatest tendency either to wander from its original TBU (Yip’s “mobility”) or to have effects with other tones at great distance. As few if any other features show such postlexical action at a distance, it is not clear what tone’s closest competitor

(ii) *Tone is the most “paradigmatic”*: Despite the highly syntagmatic nature of tone, tone can also be highly paradigmatic, especially in languages in which monosyllabic languages contrast multiple tone levels and tonal contours on monosyllabic words (recall Trique (Itunyoso) in (7)). No other single phonetic dimension offers as many potential phonological contrasts along a single dimension as F0 does for tone—up to five tone heights, as was exemplified from Kam (Shidong) in (7). The only close competitor is vowel height. Among the 451 languages in the UPSID database (Maddieson & Precoda 1990) the only language which has the five-way contrast /i, ɪ, e, ε, æ/ in its inventory of short front unrounded oral vowels is Somali. However, it is clear that this is made possible by the fact that Somali has two sets of vowels which harmonize: peripheral /i, e, æ, u, o/ vs. centralized /ɪ, ε, a, ʊ, ö/ (Saeed 1993). This suggests that another phonetic dimension, perhaps [±ATR], is involved. While some tone systems show that the multiple levels naturally group in higher vs. lower registers (Yip 1980), sometimes with accompanying phonation differences (breathiness, creakiness), in many multilevel tone systems, the only differences are in F0. The possibility for multiple paradigmatic contrasts on a single syllable, including tonal contours, is the aspect of tone that makes it the most different from the use of pitch to mark stress and intonation.

(iii) *Tone is the most “ambiguous”*: Tone appears to offer a wider range of reasonable analyses and interpretations than other phonological features. In different languages, a two-level tone system is best analyzed as /H, L/, /H, Ø/, /Ø, L/, and there are more options if one succumbs to the temptation to treat tone as “accent” (§5). Similarly, depending on the language, the M of a three-level system can be a lowered H, a raised L, an independent third tone, or /Ø/. Using the tone features introduced by Yip (1980), M can be [+upper, -raised] or [-upper, +raised]. While this feature difference is quite useful when there are four contrastive tone levels, even a three-level tone system can have two phonetically M tones which contrast in certain contexts, suggesting that they are underlyingly different. While it has been occasionally claimed (e.g. by Goldsmith 1985) that other features can be binary in some languages but function privatively in others, or that one feature value can be marked in one language vs. unmarked in another (Hume 2003, 2007), tone offers especially compelling examples of both. Thus, while /H/ vs. /Ø/ is more common than /L/ vs. /Ø/, both are found in Bantu and in Athabaskan (Hargus & Rice 2005), and “marked L” is also found in Malinke (Kita) [(Creissels & Grégoire 1993), Galo [NE India] (Post 2007), and the closely related NW Amazonian languages Bora (Weber & Thiesen 2000) and Miraña (Seifart 2005).

(iv) *Tone is the most “abstract”*: In many cases the relation between input and output tones is a very abstract or indirect one. In the case of two-level tone systems, this is in part due to the

considerable possibilities for spreading, shifting, deletion and insertion, as when the tones of Haya /ó-mu-tí/ ‘tree’ appeared to become inverted to [ò-mú-tì] in (68) above. In addition, underlying systems can be realized with more levels in the output than they started with. Thus, although Ngamambo only has underlying /H, L/, after a H, there is a five-way surface contrast between H, M, ¹M, L and L°, the last being a level L tone distinct from a L which falls in pitch before pause (Hyman 1986). Floating tones add considerably to the possibilities for abstract underlying representations, which are often easier to motivate than their segmental counterparts.

(v) *Tone is the most “arbitrary”*: While much of tonology is phonetically grounded in a transparent way, many tonal alternations appear arbitrary from a synchronic point of view. This occurs both in morphology, e.g. nominative vs. accusative tone marking in Maasai in (14), as well as at the phrase level, e.g. the Wuxi case discussed in §4.2. In many cases one tone pattern simply corresponds arbitrarily to another. Perhaps the most famous case of this occurs involves Xiamen tone sandhi rule in (73a) (Chen 1987):

- (73) a. $T \rightarrow T' / _ T$ within a tone group (T = base tone; T' = sandhi tone)
 b. 24, 44 → 22 → 21 → 53 → 44
 c. # yi kiong-kiong kio gua ke k'uah puah tiam-tsing ku ts'eq #
 44 24 24 21 53 44 21 21 53 44 53 32 = T
 22 22 22 53 44 22 53 53 44 22 44 = T'
 he by force cause I more read half hour long book
 ‘he insisted that I read for another half an hour’ (Chen 1987:113)

While the chain shift in (73b) shows that each of the five non-stopped base tones is replaced by another tone, the actual featural changes cannot be motivated synchronically. It hard to think of an equally complex arbitrary input-output relation outside tone.

vi. *Tone is the most “autosegmental”*: As was seen in §3, tone is THE autosegmental property par excellence. Compared to segmental features, tone is far more likely to float as a lexical or grammatical tone, to show stability effects, to undergo dislocation, or to interact with like features at a distance. Tone sequences are much more likely to be treated as contours which can be manipulated as units or as “melodies” which can be mapped over multiple TBUs. While there are analogues to many of the autosegmental properties of tone, tone provided—and still provides—the model.

To sum up the above observations in one sentence, tone is extraordinarily versatile, a lot of things at once. Over the past several decades there has been tremendous progress both in documenting this versatility and in developing models to deal with it. Autosegmental phonology has been successful largely, because, as Kenstowicz (1994:312) puts it, “...tone behaves independently from other features and so can be discussed in relative isolation.” However, it is when we approach the INTERDEPENDENCY of tone with other features that the picture becomes less clear. Although of great practicality, the use of informal Hs, Ls, Cs, and Vs disguises several interrelated questions which have not been settled: (i) What is or can be a TBU? The syllable? mora? segment within a rime? onset? (ii) Where does tone link up within the feature geometry? Exclusively to the TBU? In addition or instead to the laryngeal node, where Halle & Stevens’ (1971) pitch-affecting glottal features [stiff], [slack], [constricted] and [spread] can naturally interact with tone? (iii) What is the correct set of tonal features? Is a unique set of tonal features even possible, or does it vary from language to language? Possible solutions to such questions

are considered in several monographs and dissertations, e.g. Duanmu (1990), Bao (1999), Bradshaw (1999), Snider (1999), Yip (2002), Pearce (2007). The answers ultimately also bear on the question of how laryngeal gestures are implicated in the process of tonogenesis (Matisoff 1973, Hombert et al 1979, Thurgood 2002). However, despite the large number of proposals, the field is far from consensus. Given the “diversatility” of tone, perhaps there will not be a single, definitive answer to one or more of these questions. In fact, the above set of questions may even contain a misunderstanding that we still have either about tone, or more likely, about phonology in general. Perhaps when these questions are answered, tone will once again contribute in a central way to phonological theory.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to various audiences who had heard and responded to different sections of this chapter under titles such as “Is tone different?” and “There is no pitch-accent prototype”. I would especially like to thank Nick Clements, Grev Corbett, Denis Creissels, Carlos Gussenhoven, Morris Halle, Will Leben, Doug Pulleyblank, and Donca Steriade for their stimulating reactions, which still keep me thinking.

References

- Agnew, Arlene & Evelyn G. Pike. 1957. Phonemes of Ocaina (Huitoto). *IJAL* 23.24-27.
- Akinlabi, Akinbiyi. 1985. *Tonal underspecification and Yorùbá tone*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Ibadan.
- Aoki, Haruo. 1966. Nez Perce vowel harmony and Proto-Sahaptian vowels. *Language* 42.759-767.
- Archangeli, Diana and Douglas Pulleyblank. 1994. *Grounded phonology*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Bao, Zhiming. 1999. *The structure of tone*. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Banfield, A. W. 1914. *Dictionary of the Nupe language*. Shonga, Nigeria: The Niger Press.
- Beckman, Mary E. & Janet Pierrehumbert. 1986. Intonational structure in Japanese and English. *Phonology* [Yearbook] 3.255-309.
- Bird, Steven. 1999a. When marking tone reduces fluency: an orthography experiment in Cameroon. *Language and Speech* 42.83-115.
- Bird, Steven. 1999b. Strategies for representing tone in African writing systems. *Written Language and Literacy* 2.1-44.
- Blust, Robert. 1996. Low vowel dissimilation in Ere. *Oceanic Linguistics* 36.96-112.
- Braconnier, Cassian. 1982. *Le système du dioula d’Odienné, tome 1*. Institut de Linguistique Appliquée, Publication 86. Abijan, Ivory Coast: University of Abidjan, Ivory Coast.
- Bradley, C. Henry. 1970. *A linguistic sketch of Jicaltepec Mixtec*. Norman, OK: SIL.
- Broadwell, George Aaron. 2000. Macuiltianguis Zapotec tone paradigms. Ms. SUNY Albany.
- Bybee, Joan L.; Chakraborti, Paromita; Jung, Dagmar; and Scheibman, Joanne. 1998. Prosody and segmental effect: some paths of evolution for word stress. *Studies in Language* 22.267-314.
- Cahill, Mike. 2001. The unusual tone system of Awad Bing. Handout of paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Washington DC. January 4-7, 2001.
- Cahill, Mike. 2007. More universals of tone. Ms. SIL.

- <http://www.sil.org/silewp/2007/silewp2007-007.pdf>
- Cassimjee, Farida & Charles W. Kisseberth. 1998. Optimality domains theory and Bantu tonology: a case study from Isixhosa and Shingazidja. In Larry M. Hyman & Charles W. Kisseberth (eds), *Theoretical aspects of Bantu tone*, 33-132. Stanford: CSLI.
- Chan, Marjorie & Hongmao Ren. 1989. Wuxi tone sandhi: from last to first syllable dominance. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia* 21.35-64.
- Chafe, Wallace L. 1977. Accent and related phenomena in the five nations Iroquois languages. In Larry M. Hyman (ed.), *Studies in stress and accent*, 169-181. Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics 4. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.
- Chafe, Wallace L. 1996. Sketch of Seneca: an Iroquian language. *Handbook of American Indian Linguistics*, vol. 17, 551-579. Washington DC: Smithsonian Institution.
- Chen, Matthew. 1987. The syntax of Xiamen tone sandhi. *Phonology [Yearbook]* 4.109-149.
- Chen, Matthew. 2000. *Tone sandhi*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chida, Shuntaro. 2001. *On the tone of the Dom language*. Ms. English translation by Yoshihiro Kawabata of Syuntarô Tida (2000), *Domugo no tōn ni kansuru kōsatu*. Masters Thesis, Kyoto University.
- Chomsky, Noam and Morris Halle (1968). *The sound pattern of English*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Clements, G. N. 1977. The autosegmental treatment of vowel harmony. In Wolfgang U. Dressler & Oskar E. Pfeiffer (eds), *Phonologica 1976*, 111-119. Innsbruck: Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft.
- Clements, G. N. 1978. Tone and syntax in Ewe. In Donna Jo Napoli (ed.), *Elements of tone, stress and intonation*, 21-99. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Clements, G. N. 1979. The description of terraced-level tone languages. *Language* 55.536-558.
- Clements, G. N. 1981. Akan vowel harmony: A non-linear analysis. *Harvard Studies in Phonology* 2.108-177.
- Clements, G. N. 1985. The geometry of phonological features. *Phonology [Yearbook]* 2.225-252.
- Clements, G.N. & John Goldsmith. 1984. *Autosegmental studies in Bantu tone*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Clements, G.N. & Elizabeth V. Hume. 1995. The internal organization of segments. In John A. Goldsmith (ed.), *The handbook of phonological theory*, 245-205. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Creissels, Denis & Claire Grégoire. 1993. La notion de ton marqué dans l'analyse d'une opposition tonale binaire: Le cas du mandingue. *Journal of African Languages & Linguistics* 14.107-154.
- Daly, John P. & Larry M. Hyman. 2007. On the representation of tone in Peñoles Mixtec. *IJAL* 73.165-208.
- Davis, Donald R. 1969. The distinctive features of Wantoat phonemes. *Linguistics* 47.5-17.
- de Lacy, Paul. 2002. The interaction of tone and stress in optimality theory. *Phonology* 19.1-32.
- Dicanio, Christian T. 2006. On Non-optimal Laryngeal Timing: The Case of Trique. To appear in *Proceedings from the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 32 (2006).
- Donohue, Mark. 1997. Tone in New Guinea languages. *Linguistic Typology* 1.347-386.
- Downing, Laura J. 1990. Local and metrical shift in Nguni. *Studies in African Linguistics* 21.261-317.
- Downing, Laura J. 2007. African languages and the typology of focus prosody. Paper presented at the Workshop on the Typology of African Languages, Paris, September 29, 2007.

- Duanmu, San. 1990. *A formal study of syllable, tone, stress and domain in Chinese languages*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Dürr, Michael. 1987. A Preliminary Reconstruction of the Proto-Mixtec Tonal System. *Indiana* 11.19-62. Berlin.
- Dye, Wayne. 1992. Bahinemo Organised Phonology Data. SIL Papua New Guinea website: <http://www.sil.org/pacific/png/pubs/0000048/Bahinemo.pdf>
- Eberhard, David. 2007. Mamaindé Tone. In Leo Wetzels (ed.), *Language endangerment and endangered languages*, 287-308. Leiden: CNWS Publications.
- Edmondson, Jerold A. & Kenneth J. Gregerson. 1992. On five-level tone systems. In Shina Ja J. Huang & William R. Merrifield (eds), *Language in Context: Essays for Robert E. Longacre*, 555-576. SIL & University of Texas at Arlington.
- Efere, Emmanuel Efereala. 2001. The pitch system of the Bùmọ dialect of Izon. In Suzanne Gessner, Sunyoung Oh & Kayono Shiobara (eds), *Current research on African languages and linguistics*, 115-259. UBCWPL 4.
- Epps, Patience. 2005. *A grammar of Hup*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia.
- Firchow, Irwin B. and Jacqueline Firchow (1969). An abbreviated phoneme inventory. *Anthropological Linguistics* 11.271-76.
- Fontaney, L. 1980. Le verbe. In F. Nsuka-Nkutsi (ed.), *Eléments de description du punu*, 51-114. CRLS, Université Lyon II.
- Ford, Kevin. 1993. A preliminary comparison of Kamano-Yagaria. *Language and Linguistics in Melanesia* 24.191-202.
- Furere, Rutinywa & Annie Riailand. 1983. Accent tonal en kinyarwanda. In Jonathan Kaye et al (eds), *Current approaches to African linguistics* (vol.2), 139–150. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Gabas, Nilson Jr. 1999. *A grammar of Karo, Tupí (Brazil)*. Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara.
- Gibson, Lorna F. 1956. Pame (Otomí) phonemics and morphophonemics. *IJAL* 22.242-265.
- Gilley, Leoma G. 1992. *An autosegmental approach to Shilluk phonology*. SIL & UT Arlington.
- Girón Higuita, Jesus Maria & W. Leo Wetzels. 2007. Tone in Wansöhöt (Puinave). In Leo Wetzels (ed.), *Language endangerment and endangered languages*, 129-156. Leiden: CNWS Publications.
- Goldsmith, John. 1976a. *Autosegmental phonology*. Doctoral dissertation. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Goldsmith, John. 1976b. An Overview of Autosegmental Phonology. *Linguistic Analysis* 2.23-68.
- Goldsmith, John. 1990. *Autosegmental & metrical phonology*. Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Goldsmith, John & Firmard Sabimana. 1986. The Kirundi Verb. In Francis Jouannet (ed.), *Modèles en tonologie*, 19-62. Paris: Editions du CNRS.
- Gomez-Imbert, Elsa. La faille tonale en tatuyo. Communication présentée aux Journées de Tonologie LP 3-121 du CNRS.
- Gomez, Elsa & Michael Kenstowicz. 2000. Barasana tone and accent. *IJAL* 66.419-463.
- Greenberg, Joseph H. 1957. *Essays in linguistics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Guirón Higuita, J.M. & W. Leo Wetzels. 2007. Tone in Wānsöhöt (Puinave). In Leo Wetzels (ed.), *Language endangerment and endangered languages*, 129-156. Leiden: CNWS Publications.

- Gussenhoven, Carlos. 2004. *The phonology of tone and intonation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gussenhoven, Carlos. 2006. Between stress and tone in Nubi word prosody. *Phonology* 23.193-223.
- Hall, Beatrice L. & R.M.R. Hall. 1980. Nez Perce vowel harmony: An Africanist explanation and some theoretical questions. In Robert M. Vago (ed.), *Issues in vowel harmony*, 201-236. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Halle, Morris & Kenneth Stevens. 1971. A note on laryngeal features. *Quarterly Progress Report* 101.198-213. Research Laboratory of Electronics, MIT.
- Haraguchi, Shoshuke. 1979. *The tone pattern of Japanese: an autosegmental theory of tonology*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Hargus, Sharon & Keren Rice (eds). *Athabaskan prosody*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hayes, Bruce. 1995. *Metrical stress theory: Principles and case studies*. University of Chicago Press.
- Hayward, Richard J. 2006. The OHO constraint. In Erhard Voeltz (ed.), *Studies in African Linguistic Typology*, 155-169. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Heath, Jeff. 2006. *Jamsay grammar*.
<http://www-personal.umich.edu/~jheath/jamsaygrammar.html>.
- Hinton, Leanne, Eugene Buckley, Marvin Karger & Michael Meacham. 1991. Preliminary analysis of Chacaltongo Mixtec tone. In James E. Redden (ed.), *Papers from the American Indian Languages Conference, University of California, Santa Cruz, July and August 1991*, 147-155. Occasional Papers in Linguistics 16. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University.
- Hollenbach, Elena Erickson de. 2004. Los tonos del mixteco de Magdalena Peñasco. Ms. SIL.
- Hombert, Jean-Marie, John J. Ohala & William G. Ewan. 1979. Phonetic explanations for the development of tones. *Language* 55.37-58.
- Hostetler, Roman & Carolyn Hostetler. 1975. A tentative description of Tinputz phonology. *Phonologies of five Austronesian languages. Workpapers in Papua New Guinea Languages* 13.51-44.
- Hulst, Harry van der (ed.). 1999b. *Word prosodic systems in the languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hulst, Harry van der & Norval Smith (eds). 1988. *Autosegmental studies on pitch accent*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Hume, Elizabeth (2003). Language specific markedness: The case of place of articulation. *Studies in Phonetics, Phonology & Morphology* 9.295-310.
- Hume, Elizabeth (2007). Markedness diagnostics and expectation. Ms. Ohio State University.
- Hyman, Larry M. 1975. *Phonology: theory and analysis*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Hyman, Larry M. 1978. Tone and/or accent. In Donna Jo Napoli (ed.), *Elements of tone, stress and intonation*, 1-20. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Hyman, Larry M. 1979a. Phonology and noun structure. Larry M. Hyman (ed.), *Aghem grammatical structure*, 1-72. Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics 6. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.
- Hyman, Larry M. 1979b. A reanalysis of tonal downstep. *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 1.9-29.
- Hyman, Larry M. 1981. Tonal accent in Somali. *Studies in African Linguistics* 12.169-203.

- Hyman, Larry M. 1986. The representation of multiple tone heights. In K. Bogers, H. van der Hulst, & M. Mous (eds), *The phonological representation of suprasegmentals*, 109-152. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Hyman, Larry M. 1987. Prosodic domains in Kikuyu". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 5.311-333.
- Hyman, Larry M. 1988. Underspecification and vowel height transfer in Esimbi. *Phonology* 5.255-273.
- Hyman, Larry M. 1992. Register tones and tonal geometry. In Keith Snider & Harry van der Hulst (eds), *The phonology of tone: the representation of tonal register*, 75-100. The Hague: Mouton/de Gruyter.
- Hyman, Larry M. 1998. Positional prominence and the 'prosodic trough' in Yaka. *Phonology* 15.41-75.
- Hyman, Larry M. 2001a. Tone systems. In Martin Haspelmath et al (eds), *Language typology and language universals: An international Handbook*, vol. 2, 1367-1380. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hyman, Larry M. 2001b. Privative tone in Bantu. In Shigeki Kaji (ed.), *Cross-linguistic studies of tonal phenomena*, 237-257. Tokyo: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures.
- Hyman, Larry M. 2002. Is there a right-to-left bias in vowel harmony? To appear in *Phonologica 2002*, John R. Rennison, Friedrich Neubarth, and Markus A. Pochtrager (eds). Berlin: Mouton.
- Hyman, Larry M. 2006. Word-prosodic typology. *Phonology*. 23.225-257.
- Hyman, Larry M. 2007a. Elicitation as experimental phonology: Thlantlang Lai tonology". In Maria-Josep Solé, Pam Beddor & Manjari Ohala (eds), *Experimental Approaches to Phonology in Honor of John J. Ohala*, 7-24. Oxford University Press.
- Hyman, Larry M. 2007b. Universals of tone rules: 30 years later. In Tomas Riad & Carlos Gussenhoven (eds), *Tones and Tunes I: Studies in Word and Sentence Prosody*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Hyman, Larry M. 2007c. Kuki-Thaadow: An African tone system in Southeast Asia.
http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/phonlab/annual_report/2007/Hyman_KT_Tone_PL_Annual.pdf
- Hyman, Larry M. & Ernest Rugwa Byarushengo. 1984. A model of Haya tonology. In G. N. Clements & John Goldsmith (eds), *Autosegmental studies in Bantu tone*, 53-103. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Hyman, Larry M., Francis X. Katamba & Livingstone Walusimbi. 1987. Luganda and the strict layer hypothesis. *Phonology [Yearbook]* 4.87-108.
- Hyman, Larry M. & William R. Leben. 2000. Suprasegmental processes. In G. Booij, Christian Lehmann & Joachim Mugdan (eds), *A Handbook on Inflection and Word Formation*, 587-594. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Hyman, Larry M. & Russell G. Schuh. 1974. Universals of tone rules: Evidence from West Africa. *Linguistic Inquiry* 5.81-115.
- Hyman, Larry M. & Maurice Tadadjeu. 1976. Floating tones in Mbam-Nkam. In Larry M. Hyman (ed.), *Studies in Bantu tonology*, 57-111. Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics 3. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.
- Hyman, Larry M. & Kenneth VanBik. 2004. Directional rule application and output problems in Hakha Lai tone. In *Phonetics and Phonology, Special Issue, Language and Linguistics* 5.821-861. Academia Sinica, Taipei.
- Inkelas, Sharon & Draga Zec. 1988. Serbo-Croatian pitch accent. *Language* 64.227-248.

- Inkelas, Sharon & Draga Zec (eds). 1990. *The phonology-syntax connection*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Javkin, H. 1979. *Phonetic universals and phonological change. Report of the Phonology Laboratory 4*. UC Berkeley.
- Jenison, Scott, D. & Priscilla B. Jenison. 1991. Obokuitai phonology. *Workpapers in Indonesian Languages & Culture* 9.69-90.
- Jun, Sun-Ah. 2005. *Prosodic typology: the phonology of intonation and phrasing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kanerva, Jonni. 1989. *Focus and phrasing in Chichewa phonology*. Doctoral dissertation, Stanford University.
- Keller, Natalia Eraso. 1999. Cambios tonales en la palabra verbal de la lengua tanimuca. *Congreso de Lingüística Amerindia y Criolla, 72-95*. Memorias. Lenguas Aborígenes de Colombia.
- Kenstowicz, Michael. 1994. *Phonology in generative grammar*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Kentsowicz, Michael & Charles W. Kisseberth. 1990. Chizigula tonology: the word and beyond. In Sharon Inkelas & Draga Zec (eds), *The phonology-syntax connection*, 163-194. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kim, Eui-Jung. 1996. Edopi phonology. Ms. SIL.
- Kingston, John. 2003. Mechanisms of tone reversal. In S. Kaji (ed.), *Cross-linguistic studies of tonal phenomena*, 57-120. Tokyo: ILCAA.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1982. Lexical phonology and morphology. In I.-S. Yang (ed.), *Linguistics in the morning calm*, 3-91. Seoul: Hanshin.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1985. Some consequences of lexical phonology. *Phonology [Yearbook]* 2.83-136.85-138.
- Kisseberth, Charles W. 1984. Digo tonology. In G. N. Clements & John Goldsmith (eds), *Autosegmental studies in Bantu tone*, 105-182. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Kisseberth, Charles W. & Mohammad Imam Abasheikh. 1974. Vowel length in ChiMwi:ni: A case study of the role of grammar in phonology. In A. Bruck et al (eds), *Papers from the Parasession on Natural Phonology*, 193-209. Chicago Linguistic Society.
- Kisseberth, Charles & Erez Volk. 2007. Theoretical consequences of depressor consonants. Paper presented at the Workshop on Segments and Tone, Meertens Instituut, Amsterdam, June 6-7, 2007.
- Kroeker, Menno H. 1977. The role of tone in Nambikuára. *Arquivos de Anatomia e Antropologia* 2.119-143.
- Kwenzi Mikala, J. 1980. Esquisse phonologique du punu. In F. Nsuka-Nkutsi (ed.), *Eléments de description du punu*, 7-18. CRLS, Université Lyon II.
- Laniran, Yetundo O. & G. N. Clements. 2003. Downstep and high raising: interacting factors in Yoruba tone production. *Journal of Phonetics* 31.203-250.
- Leben, William R. 1973a. *Suprasegmental phonology*. Doctoral dissertation. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Leben, William R. 1973b. The role of tone in segmental phonology. In Larry M. Hyman (ed.), *Consonant types and tone*, 117-149. USC, Los Angeles: Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics 1.
- Leben, William R. 1978. The representation of tone. In Victoria A. Fromkin (ed.), *Tone: a linguistic survey*, 177-219. New York: Academic Press.
- Liphola, Marcelino M. 1999. Neutralizing vowel reduction in Shimakonde. Ms. OSU.

- Liphola, Marcelino M. 2001. *Aspects of the phonology and morphology of Shimakonde*. Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University.
- Lloyd, R. & J. Lloyd. 1992. Baruya Organised Phonology Data. SIL Papua New Guinea Website: <http://www.sil.org/pacific/png/pubs/0000057/Baruya.pdf>
- Longacre, Robert E. 1957. *Proto-Mixtecan*. Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore and Linguistics, Memoir 5. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- MacDonald, George & Georgetta MacDonald. 1974. Dadibi phonology. In *Phonologies of Four Papua New Guinea Languages. Workpapers in Papua New Guinea Languages* 4.129-158.
- Maddieson, Ian (1997). Phonetic universals. In William Hardcastle and John Laver (eds.), *The Handbook of Phonetic Sciences*, 619-639. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Maddieson, Ian and Kristin Precoda. 1990. Updating UPSID. *UCLA Working Papers in Phonetics* 74.104-111.
- Mak, Cornelia. 1953. A comparison of two Mixtec tonemic systems. *IJAL* 19.85-100.
- Pike, Eunice V. & Kent Wistrand. 1974. Step-up terrace tone in Acatlán Mixtec. In Ruth Brend (ed.), *Advances in Tagmemics*, 83-104. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.
- Marantz, Alec. 1982. Re reduplication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18.483-545.
- Matisoff, James A. 1973. Tonogenesis in Southeast Asia. In Larry M. Hyman (ed.), *Consonant types and tone*, 71-95. Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics 1. Los Angeles: University of Southern California.
- May, Jean and Eunice Loeweke. 1964. The phonological hierarchy in Fasu. *Anthropological Linguistics* 7.5, 89-97.
- McCarthy, John J. 1981. A prosodic theory of nonconcatenative morphology. *Linguistic Inquiry* 12.373-418.
- McCarthy, John J. 2002. *A thematic guide to optimality theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCawley, James D. 1968. *The phonological component of a grammar of Japanese*. Monographs on Linguistic Analysis 2. The Hague: Mouton.
- McCawley, James D. 1970. Some tonal systems that come close to being pitch accent but don't quite make it. *Papers from the Sixth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 526-532.
- McCawley, James D. 1978. What is a tone language? In Victoria A. Fromkin (ed.), *Tone: a linguistic survey*, 113-131. New York: Academic Press.
- McKaughan, Howard P. 1954. Chatino formulas and phonemes. *IJAL* 19.23-27.
- Melinger, Alissa. 2002. Foot structure and accent in Seneca. *IJAL* 68.287-315.
- Mohanan, K. P. 1986. *The theory of lexical phonology*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
- Montes-Rodriguez, María Emilia. 1995. *Tonología de la lengua ticuna*. Lenguas Aborígenes de Colombia. Descripciones. Universidad de los Andes. Colciencias.
- Mutaka, Ngessimo. 1994. *The lexical tonology of Kinande*. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Myers, Scott. 1997. OCP effects in optimality theory. *NLLT* 15.847-892.
- Newman, John & Robert G. Pettersen. 1990. The tones of Kairi. *Oceanic Linguistics* 29.49-76.
- Odden, David. 1982. Tonal phenomena in Kishambaa. *Studies in African Linguistics* 13.177-208.
- Odden, David. 1986. On the role of the obligatory contour principle in phonological theory. *Language* 62.353-383.
- Odden, David. 1988. Predictable tone systems in Bantu. In Harry van der Hulst & Norval Smith (eds), *Autosegmental studies on pitch accent*, 225-251. Dordrecht: Foris.

- Odden, David. 1999. Typological issues in tone and stress in Bantu. In Shigeki Kaji (ed.), *Cross-linguistic studies in tonogenesis, typology, and related topics*, 187-215. Tokyo University of Foreign Studies: Institute for the Study of Languages and Cultures.
- Olawsky, Knut J. 2006. *A grammar of Urarina*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Parker, Steve. 1997. An OT account of laryngealization in Cuzco Quechua. *Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics*, University of North Dakota, 41.1-11.
- Paster, Mary & Yuni Kim. 2007. Downstep in Tiriki. Ms. Pomona College & University of California, Berkeley.
- Paulian, Christiane (1975). *Le kukuya: langue teke du Congo*. Paris: SELAF.
- Pearce, Mary Dorothy. 2007. *The interaction of tone with voicing and foot structure: Evidence from Kera phonetics and phonology*. Doctoral dissertation, University of London.
- Philippon, Gérard. 1998. Tone reduction vs. metrical attraction in the evolution of Eastern Bantu tone systems. In L. M. Hyman & C. W. Kisseberth (eds), *Theoretical aspects of Bantu tone*, 315–329. Stanford: CSLI.
- Philippon, Gérard 1991 *Ton et accent dans les langues bantu d’Afrique Orientale: Étude comparative typologique et diachronique*. Doctorat d’Etat dissertation, Université René Descartes, Paris.
- Pierrehumbert, Janet B. & Mary E. Beckman. 1988. *Japanese tone structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Pike, Eunice V. & Priscilla Small. 1974. Downstepping terrace tone in Coatzospan Mixtec. In Ruth Brend (ed.), *Advances in Tagmemics*, 105-134. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.
- Pike, Eunice V. & Kent Wistrand. 1974. Step-up terrace tone in Acatlán Mixtec. In Ruth Brend (ed.), *Advances in Tagmemics*, 83-104. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company.
- Pike, Kenneth L. 1948. *Tone languages: A technique for determining the number and type of pitch contrasts in a language*. University of Michigan Publications in Linguistics 4. Ann Arbor, MI.
- Poser, William. 1984. *The phonetics and phonology of tone and intonation in Japanese*. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Post, Mark William. 2007. *A grammar of Galo*. Doctoral dissertation, La Trobe University.
- Prince, Alan. 1983. Relating to the grid. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14.19-100.
- Prince, Alan and Paul Smolensky (1993). *Optimality theory: constraint interaction in generative grammar*. [Rutgers Optimality Archive; ROA-537-0802]
- Pulleyblank, Douglas. 1986. *Tone in lexical phonology*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.
- Ratliff, Martha. 1992. *Meaningful tone: A study of tonal morphology in compounds, form classes, and expressive phrases in White Hmong*. Special Report No. 27. Monograph Series on Southeast Asia. Center for Southeast Asia. Northern Illinois University.
- Riad, Tomas & Carlos Gussenhoven (eds). 2007. *Tones and Tunes I: Studies in Word and Sentence Prosody*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Rupp, James E. 1990. The Lealao Chinantec syllable. In William R. Merrifield & Calvin R. Rensch (eds), *Syllables, tone, and verb paradigms* (Studies in Chinantec Languages 4), 63-73. Dallas: SIL & University of Texas at Arlington.
- Russell, Robert & Dolores Russell. 1959. Syntactotonomics in Amahuaca (Pano). *Série Linguística Especial*, 128-167. Publicações do Museu Nacional, Rio de Janeiro, Brasil.
- Saeed, John. 1993. *Somali reference grammar*. 2nd rev. ed. Kensington, Md.: Dunwoody Press.
- Saeed, John. 1999. *Somali*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Sagey, Elizabeth. 1986. The representation of features and relations in nonlinear phonology. Doctoral dissertation. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Schachter, Paul & Victoria Fromkin. 1968. *A phonology of Akan: Akuapem, Asante, and Fante*. Working Papers in Phonetics 9. Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles.
- Schadeberg, Thilo C. 1973. Kinga: a restricted tone language. *Studies in African Linguistics* 4.23-48.
- Seifart, Frank. 2005. *The structure and use of shape-based noun classes in Miraña (North West Amazon)*. Doctoral dissertation, Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen. Nijmegen: MPI Series in Psycholinguistics.
- Sibanda, Galen. 2004. *Verbal phonology and morphology of Ndebele*. Doctoral dissertation, UC Berkeley.
- Snider, Keith. 1999. *The geometry and features of tone*. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Stallcup, Kenneth. 1980. Noun classes in Esimbi. In Larry M. Hyman (ed.), *Noun classes in the Grassfields Bantu borderland*, 139-153. Southern California Occasional Papers in Linguistics 8.
- Stevick, E. W. 1969. Pitch and duration in Ganda. *Journal of African Languages* 8.1-28.
- Stoll, R.P. 1955. *Tonétique des langues bantu et semi-bantu du Cameroun*. Yaounde: IFAN.
- Swick, Joyce. 1966. Chuave phonological hierarchy. *Pacific Linguistics Series A*, 7.33-148.
- Tadadjeu, Maurice. 1974. Floating tones, shifting rules, and downstep in Dschang-Bamileke. In William R. Leben (ed.), *Papers from the 5th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*, 283-290. *Studies in African Linguistics*, Supplement 5.
- Tesfaye, Ashenafi & Klaus Wedekind. 1990. Characteristics of Omotic tone: Shinasha (Borna). *Studies in African Linguistics* 347-368.
- Thomas, Elaine. 1974. Engenni. In John Bendor-Samuel (ed.), *Ten Nigerian tone systems*. *Studies in Nigerian Languages* 4.13-26. Dallas and Arlington: Summer Institute of Linguistics and University of Texas.
- Thurgood, Graham. 2002. Vietnamese and tonogenesis: Revising the model and the analysis. *Diachronica* 19.333-363.
- Walker, Rachel. 2005. Weak triggers in vowel harmony. *NLLT* 23.917-989.
- Tucker, A. N. and J. Tompo Ole Mpaayei. 1955. *A Maasai Grammar with Vocabulary*. London: Longmans, Green and Company.
- Voorhoeve, Jan. 1971. Tonology of the Bamileke noun. *Journal of African Languages* 10.44-53.
- Voorhoeve, Jan. 1973. Safwa as restricted tone system. *Studies in African Linguistics* 4.1-22.
- Weber, David & Wesley Thiesen. 2000. A synopsis of Bora tone. Ms. SIL. (Work Papers of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, North Dakota Session 45. Online 2001).
- Welmers, Wm. E. 1959. Tonemics, morphotonemics, and tonal morphemes. *General Linguistics* 4.1-9.
- Welmers, Wm. E. 1962. The phonology of Kpelle. *Journal of African Languages* 1.69-93.
- Welmers, Wm. E. 1973. *African language structures*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Willard, E. Rainbow. 2004. Dominance effects in a dialect of Mam Maya. Ms. University of California, Berkeley.
- Williamson, Kay. 1986. The Igbo associative and specific constructions. In Koen Bogers, Harry van der Hulst & Maarten Mous (eds), *The phonological representation of suprasegmentals*, 195-208. Dordrecht: Foris.

- Williamson, Kay. 1988. Tone and accent in Ijò. In Harry van der Hulst & Norval Smith (eds), *Autosegmental studies on pitch accent*, 253-278. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Yip, Moira. 1980. *The tonal phonology of Chinese*. Doctoral dissertation, M.I.T.
- Yip, Moira. 1989. Contour tones. *Phonology* 6.149-174.
- Yip, Moira. 1995. Tone in East Asian languages. In John A. Goldsmith (ed.), *The handbook of phonological theory*, 476-494. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Yip, Moira. 2002. *Tone*. Cambridge University Press.
- Zee, Eric and Ian Maddieson. 1979. Tones and tone sandhi in Shanghai: phonetic evidence and phonological analysis. *UCLA Working Papers in Phonetics* 45.93-129. Also in *Glossa* 14.45-88 (1980).