

An acoustic and articulatory study of the three-way laryngeal contrast in coronal stops of Balti

Qandeel Hussain, Jeff Mielke, Frankie Pennington

Department of English (Linguistics Program)

North Carolina State University, Raleigh


qhussai@ncsu.edu; jimielke@ncsu.edu; fmpennin@ncsu.edu

NC STATE
UNIVERSITY



Background




- Balti is an endangered Tibeto-Burman language spoken in Gilgit-Baltistan, Northern Pakistan (DeLancey, 2003).
- Around 327,000 speakers (Lewis et al., 2016).
- Along with Ladakhi and Purik, Balti belongs to the Western Archaic branch of the Tibetan family (DeLancey, 2003; Lobsang, 1995).
- It is considered one of the most archaic dialects of Tibetan. However, compared to other Tibetan languages, Balti is still an understudied language, particularly from a phonetic/phonological perspective.
- Except for a handful of acoustic studies (Caplow, 2016), no other data are available.




- Balti is characterized by a three-way laryngeal contrast (voiceless unaspirated, voiceless aspirated, and voiced unaspirated) at three coronal places of articulation (dental, retroflex, and palatal).
- Aim: present a preliminary acoustic and articulatory analysis of the coronal stops of Balti.

Methods

- Two speakers of Balti (Balti2 and Balti3).
- Recruited from Gilgit-Baltistan.
- Stop consonants followed by /a/ (/ta/, /tʰa/ etc.).
- Reading task (words elicited in isolation).
- Simultaneous audio (44100 Hz), ultrasound (60 fps), and video (30 fps) recording.
- Shure Beta 53 head-mounted condenser microphone.
- Terason t3000 ultrasound machine with ultraspeech software (Hueber et al., 2008).
- Articulate instrument headset for probe stabilization (Scobbie et al., 2008).
- Video camera (DFM 22BUC03-ML) for lip movements.
- Phone-level transcription was achieved using P2FA (Yuan & Liberman, 2008).
- Segmentation was manually corrected as necessary (Pennington, 2018).
- Ultrasound frames closest to 10ms before the end of each stop closure were selected.
- Tongue contours were analysed with SSANOVA.



Results



Discussion & Remaining Issues

- Articulation of retroflexes (apical or sub-apical) across Tibeto-Burman, Indo-Iranian, and Dravidian languages.
- Differences in sub-families: Lolo-Burmese, Karenic and other Tibeto-Burman languages.

References: Caplow, N. (2016). *Himalayan Linguistics*, 15(2), 1-49; DeLancey, S. (2003). In G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla (Eds.), *The Sino-Tibetan languages* (pp. 270-288); Hueber, T., Chollet, G., Denby, B., & Stone, M. (2008). *JSSP* (pp. 365-369); Lewis, M. P., Simons, G. S., & Fennig, C. D. (2016). SIL International; Lobsang, G. H. (1995). Institut für Sprachwissenschaft, Bern University; Pennington, F. (2018). NCSU MA Capstone Paper; Scobbie, J. M., Wrench, A. A., & Linden, V. M. (2008). *JSSP* (pp. 373-376); Yuan, J., & Liberman, M. (2008). *Proceedings of Acoustics* (pp. 5687-5690).

Funding: NSF Documenting Endangered Languages (BCS-1562134) and NCSU Department of English.