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1. Introduction
Introduction

Databases such as UPSID (Maddieson 1984), P-base (Mielke 2008), and PHOIBLE (Moran & McCloy 2019) represent phonological inventories as sets of IPA symbols, with each symbol standing for a phonetic description akin to a set of fully specified distinctive features (as in Chomsky & Halle 1968).

Valuable though these resources are, we contend (Drescher & Rice 2015) that this approach obscures the fundamental role of the phoneme as a unit in a language-specific system of contrasts.

We argue that phoneme inventories are best understood in terms of contrastive feature specifications, assigned in language-specific hierarchies by the Successive Division Algorithm (SDA; Drescher 2009).
In the SDA, features are assigned so as to divide the inventory recursively into smaller subsets until each phoneme has a distinct representation; no feature is assigned unless it serves to mark some phonemic contrast that has not already been encoded.

Specification by the SDA accounts for phonological processes that ignore non-contrastive features, while avoiding problems with other forms of underspecification (see Archangeli 1988).

Understanding phoneme inventories in terms of contrastive hierarchies of features has consequences for what kinds of typological generalizations can meaningfully be made about them.

The phonetic shapes of inventories and their phonological feature specifications mutually constrain each other, but neither wholly determines the other.
Introduction

In this presentation we will first discuss phonological databases and show how, in the absence of distinctive features, they obscure the contrastive nature of inventories and can give a misleading picture of the inventories themselves.

We will then turn to the relationship between the phonetics of inventories and phonological features and show that the phonetic shapes of inventories constrain, but do not dictate, feature specifications.

Conversely, we will show that feature specifications constrain, but do not dictate, the phonetic shapes of inventories.
2. Phonological Databases
Phonological Databases

Phonological databases have become an important resource for typological research.

Some notable examples are: the Stanford Phonology Archive (SPA, Crothers et al. 1979); the UCLA Phonological Segment Inventory Database (UPSID, Maddieson 1984, Maddieson & Precoda 1990); P-base (Mielke 2008); and PHOIBLE (Moran & McCloy, 2019), an online database of phonological inventories that incorporates a number of earlier ones.

These databases include phonological inventories of hundreds of languages and are easily accessible for use in cross-linguistic surveys.
Phonological Databases

However, the very qualities that make these databases easy to use also significantly limit their reliability: they provide a single (sometimes misleading) symbol for every phoneme of an inventory.

Though the problems inherent in such databases are well known (Simpson 1999), they continue to be used because there are no real alternatives.

Drescher & Rice (2015) illustrate how such databases can give a misleading picture of inventories by looking at PHOIBLE’s treatment of the vowel inventories of Pama-Nyungan languages.
Pama-Nyungan 3-vowel Inventories

PHOIBLE lists 12 Pama-Nyungan languages with three vowels, and 2 with three short and three long vowels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Vowels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antakarinya; Dieri; Dyirbal; Eastern Arrernte; Kalkutung; Kuku-Yalanji; Wangaaybuwan-Ngiyambaa; Yidiny</td>
<td>/i, a, u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yanyuwa</td>
<td>/i, a, u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Arrarnta</td>
<td>/i, a, ə/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karadjeri</td>
<td>/i, a, u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhuwal</td>
<td>/i, ə, u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngarinman</td>
<td>/i, a, u, i:, a:, u:/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antakarinya</td>
<td>/i, a, u, i:, a:, u:/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pama-Nyungan 3-vowel Inventories

Setting aside for the moment the long vowels in two of the entries, we observe that 9 languages are listed as having /i, a, u/, and another 5 have different inventories.

Dresher & Rice (2015) argue that these groupings are not significant: we cannot trust that the difference between /i/ and /ɪ/, or /u/ and /ʊ/, or /a/, /ɑ/, and /ɛ/, is real or phonologically important. That is, the inventories of languages listed as /i, a, u/ are not necessarily more similar to each other than any of them is to one of the languages with another inventory.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inventories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/i, a, u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ɪ, a, u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ɪ, a, ə/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/i, a, u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ɛ, u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/i, a, u, iː, aː, uː/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/i, a, ʊ, iː, aː, uː/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Antakarinya Vowel System

Consider Antakarinya. It is listed twice in PHOIBLE:

- once from UPSID as a 3-vowel inventory /i, a, u/;
- and once from SPA as a 6-vowel inventory /i, a, u, iː, aː, uː/.

Aside from the length contrast, there is a discrepancy between UPSID /u/ versus SPA /ʊ/. Note that UPSID does use /ʊ/ for a 3-vowel Pama-Nyungan language, as in Yanyuwa /ɪ, a, u/.

PHOIBLE treats the distinction between /u/ and /ʊ/ as significant. Thus, the UPSID listing of the phonemes of Antakarinya is counted as one of the 1873 languages (87% of the total) that contain /u/.

The SPA listing is one of the 341 (16% of the total) languages that contain /ʊ/.
One might suppose that the discrepancies between UPSID and SPA are due to having different sources, but this is not the case; they both use the same sources by W. H. Douglas:


Douglas 1964 links only to the first few front pages (the date is 1958, not 1964). We could not find this monograph.
The name “Antakarinya” does not appear in this article, which refers to “the Australian Aboriginal language spoken at Ooldea, South Australia”.

“The language is regarded as a dialect of the great desert language of South and Western Australia.”

PHOIBLE gives the source name as “Western Desert”. WALS refers to it as “Western Desert (Ooldea)”.

---

**Antakarinya Sources**

Douglas 1955 is available online:

PHONOLOGY OF THE AUSTRALIAN ABORIGINAL LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT OOLDEA, SOUTH AUSTRALIA, 1951–1952

By W. H. Douglas

I. ORIENTATION

THIS description is based on research conducted personally at the United Aborigines Mission Station, Ooldea, South Australia, during six months of 1951 and two and a half months of 1952.

The language is regarded as a dialect of the great desert language of South and Western Australia. The area includes Cundeelee, Kalgoorlie, Laverton and Warburton Ranges, in Western Australia, and Ermabell, Oodnadatta and the trans-Australian railway line in South Australia.¹

Ooldea was, at the time of the study,² a popular native ceremonial ground, as well as a government ration depot and mission station. Visitors from other dialect areas were frequently passing through the district, and it was noted that informants modified their speech according to their temporary associations with members of other dialect areas. The phonological modifications followed definable lines, and receive mention in the following description of the Ooldea dialect.

II. CHART OF THE PHONETIC NORMS OF THE PHONEMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Sounds</th>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Cerebral</th>
<th>Velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stops</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t'</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasals</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n'</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral liquids</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central liquids</td>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-syllabic vocoids</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vowels</td>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>u</td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² The Ooldea Mission has since been closed down.
Antakarinya Vowel System

On p. 216 Douglas gives a “Chart of the Phonetic Norms of the Phonemes” which lists three vowels: $i$, $a$, and $u$.

Maybe the UPSID inventory comes from here.

However, Douglas writes (p. 217) that the symbols are chosen for “convenience in printing and typing”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consonants</th>
<th>Labial</th>
<th>Dental</th>
<th>Alveolar</th>
<th>Cerebral</th>
<th>Velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stops ...</td>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>$i'$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>$t$</td>
<td>$k$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasals ...</td>
<td>$m$</td>
<td>$n'$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral liquids ...</td>
<td>$l'$</td>
<td>$l$</td>
<td>$l$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central liquids</td>
<td></td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$r$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-syllabic vocoids</td>
<td></td>
<td>$w$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$y$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowels</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$i$</td>
<td></td>
<td>$u$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low ...</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$a$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Antakarinya Vowel System

On p. 220 is a description of the “phonetic norms” of the vowels:

- /i/ is a “voiced high close front unrounded syllabic vocoid,” that Douglas transcribes as [i].

- /a/ is a “voiced low open central unrounded syllabic vocoid,” transcribed [ʌ].

- /u/ is a “voiced high open back rounded syllabic vocoid,” transcribed [ʊ].

If we take these norms as the inventory, we ought to list it as /i, ʌ, u/; the /u/ is as in SPA, but both UPSID and SPA have /a/, not /ʌ/. 
So far there is no indication of a length contrast, which would be easy to overlook.

However, Douglas states on p. 222:

“Associated with vowels is a phoneme of length.”

Length appears to be contrastive as shown by the following examples; however, we will focus here on the short vowels only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>yungku</th>
<th>‘will give’</th>
<th>yu:ngku</th>
<th>‘the wind-break’ (subj.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mal-malpa</td>
<td>‘dangerous’</td>
<td>ma:l-ma:lpa</td>
<td>‘feint’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Antakarinya Vowel System

Douglas (1955) gives details of the variants of each vowel.

- /i/ has allophones [i]; retroflex [i] before retroflex consonants; open [i] “in free fluctuation with [i]” in certain contexts; and [e] “freely fluctuating with [i] and [i]” word-medially before alveolar consonants.

- /a/ has allophones [ʌ]; retroflex [ʌ] before retroflexes; [α] before bi-labial and alveo-dental consonants; and “slightly rounded” [œ] in free fluctuation with [α] near velars and /w/.

Douglas (1955: 221) sums up the phonetic realization of the vowels with the following chart:

We can say that there are 3 contrasting vowels, /I, A, U/, that can be distinguished by 2 features. This is often what /i, a, u/ really means. But which features?
Let us begin with the low vowel, /A/. The range of this vowel extends across the low region, which we can designate [+low].

It appears to have no other contrastive features.

The other vowels, /I/ and /U/, are non-low. /I/ is front and non-round, /U/ is back and round. Backness and roundness go together here and cannot be disentangled.
We propose that the contrastive feature that distinguishes them be called [front-unround] or [back-round] (cf. Jakobson 1962 [1931]; Kaye, Lowenstamm & Vergnaud 1985).
Turning to phonological activity, Douglas (1955) does not describe any alternations triggered by vowels, or other types of activity that could help us pinpoint what the contrastive features are.

He does (p. 218) mention an effect of vowels on dental consonants:

“At Ooldea there was fluctuation between the use of the interdental and the alveo-dental varieties of these consonants preceding the vowels "a" and "u"; but before "i" the alveo-dental only occurred.”

This could suggest that /I/ has a marked feature that the other vowels lack, that we can identify with [+front-unround].
In a contrastive feature hierarchy, 3 segments require 2 features; for the Antakarinya vowels we have identified 2 features.

Since we have no evidence that the low vowel is contrastive for anything but [+low], it follows that the order of the features must be: [low] > [front-unround].
Another dialect of the Western Desert Language of central Australia is Pitjantjatjara (not listed in PHOIBLE).

Its vowels have been studied by Tabain & Butcher (2014). They write (2014: 195):

“Pitjantjatjara has three vowel qualities [ɪ ø ʊ]...However, for phonemic purposes these are more commonly written /i a u/”.

They provide plots of the distribution of the vowels:
Pitjantjatjara Vowel System

The figure on the left shows the positions of the short vowels.

The plot on the right show formants from 3 speakers for short and long vowels, collapsed across consonantal contexts.
Pitjantjatjara Vowel System

Compare these vowel distributions with those of Antakarinya, which we analyzed as [low] > [front-unround].

It appears that the height feature in Pitjantjatjara is [high], not [low]. Thus, the feature hierarchy is [high] > [front-unround].
# Pama-Nyungan 3-vowel Inventories

One of the Pama-Nyungan languages in PHOIBLE has a /ə/ where the other languages have /U/. What is the status of this /ə/?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Vowel Inventory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antakarinya; Dieri; Dyirbal; Eastern Arrernte; Kalkutung; Kuku-Yalanji; Wangaaybuwan-Ngiyambaa; Yidiny</td>
<td>/i, a, u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yanyuwa</td>
<td>/i, a, u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Western Arrarnta</strong></td>
<td>/i, a, ə/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karadjeri</td>
<td>/i, a, u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhuwal</td>
<td>/i, ə, u/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngarinman</td>
<td>/i, a, u, i:, a:, u:/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antakarinya</td>
<td>/i, a, u, i:, a:, u:/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Western Arrarnta Vowel System

The source for this inventory is Anderson (2000), who calls the language Western Arrernte (aka Aranda, Arrarnta).

She writes (2000: 36–7): “Vowel phonology in Arandic languages is as yet imperfectly understood. An emerging analytical consensus, following Breen (1990), suggests that W. Arrernte has three vowel phonemes varying in height: /i/, /ə/, /a/; and that contrastive rounding is associated with some syllables, to yield rounded vowels (allophones of /ə/.)”

The above makes it sound that this language has a vertical system, but this does not appear to be correct, as can be seen from Anderson’s impressionistic plot of the vowel space (p. 37):
Western Arrarnta Vowel System

The vowel /a/ is restricted to a very small space; we infer it is [low].

/i/ “varies in quality from [ɛ] to [i].” We can assign it [front].

/ə/ is “extremely variable” in height and backness and has unrounded and rounded allophones.

It also appears to be the epenthetic vowel.

What is different about this vowel system is that the unmarked features [non-low] and [non-front] are not enhanced by [high] and [round], resulting in great variation of the /U/ vowel.
Phonological Inventories and Contrast

To sum up what we have seen to here, the vowel systems of Pama-Nyungan (and by extension, all vowel and consonant systems) are not a set of points that can be represented by IPA symbols.

Rather, they are inherently contrastive systems that are best expressed by feature hierarchies.

IPA-based databases can be very misleading in that they make artificial distinctions (such as between /i/ ~ /ɪ/ and /u/ ~ /ʊ/ in P-N 3-vowel systems) that are then used in typological statistics.

Conversely, vowel systems that look the same in a database may turn out to be based on different contrastive features.
3. Phonetic shapes of inventories constrain (but don’t dictate) feature specifications
Phonetic and Phonological Properties of Inventories

The SDA does not stipulate an ordering of features (cf. Clements 2009).

With variation in feature ordering, phonetically similar inventories may be phonologically distinct, even if the same features are used to specify them.
Laryngeal Harmony in Ngizim and Hausa

Ngizim and Hausa are Chadic languages with distinct systems of laryngeal harmony.

Based on inventories in Schuh (1971, 2002) and Newman (2000), both languages have a three-way laryngeal contrast among coronals with voiced, voiceless, and implosive stops resulting in the inventory /t, d, d/. 
Laryngeal Harmony in Ngizim and Hausa

Ngizim stop inventory (Schuh, 2002)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>labial</th>
<th>alveol.</th>
<th>(alveo)palatal</th>
<th>lateral</th>
<th>velar</th>
<th>lab, velar</th>
<th>laryngeal</th>
<th>lab, laryngeal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>voiceless stop</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>t'</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>k\textsuperscript{w}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced stop</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d\textsubscript{3}</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g\textsuperscript{w}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glottal stop</td>
<td>b'</td>
<td>d'</td>
<td>d'/'y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hausa stop inventory (Newman, 2000)
Ngizim Voicing Harmony

Ngizim has a cooccurrence restriction which prohibits voiced pulmonic obstruents from following voiceless ones (Schuh, 1997; Hansson 2004, 2010; Mackenzie, 2012, 2013).

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
gâ:zá & ‘chicken’ \\
ðébâ & ‘woven tray’ \\
zëdù & ‘six’ \\
kùtér & ‘tail’ \\
tàsáu & ‘find’ \\
\end{array}
\]

\[\begin{array}{ll}
*k...z \\
*{t...b} \\
*{s...d} \\
\end{array}\]  
(Schuh, 1997)
Ngizim Voicing Harmony

Although phonetically voiced, implosives do not participate in the restriction and occur freely following voiceless stops.

kì:ɗú ‘eat (meat)’

póɗék ‘morning’

(Schuh, 1997)

The voiced and voiceless stops interact in voicing harmony to the exclusion of the implosives.

This can be accounted for with a hierarchy in which the feature [constricted glottis] is ordered above the feature [voice].
Ngizim Contrastive Hierarchy

[t, d, ð/]

[+c.g.] [ -c.g. ]

/ ð / [ +voice ] [ -voice ]

/ d/ / d/ / t/

[constricted glottis] > [voice]
Ngizim Voicing Harmony

In the proposed hierarchy, implosive /ɗ/ is not contrastively specified for the feature [voice].

If voicing harmony follows from a restriction barring [+voice] segments from occurring after [-voice] ones, the implosive is expected to be neutral.

The absence of [+voice] specification for Ngizim /ɗ/ is supported by other aspects of phonological patterning. Ngizim implosives fail to pattern with voiced stops in restrictions on consonant clusters (Schuh, 1997), local assimilation processes, and consonant-tone interaction (e.g. Tang, 2008).
Hausa implosives may not co-occur with their homorganic pulmonic counterparts.

\textit{ɓaɓe} ‘quarrel’ \hspace{1cm} *\textit{ɓaba} \hspace{1cm} (Newman, 2000)

\textit{ɗaɗa} ‘to strike a blow’ \hspace{1cm} *\textit{ɗadi}

This pattern has been analyzed as harmony in the feature [constricted glottis] which is parasitic on place (e.g. Hansson, 2010; Rose and Walker, 2004).
Hausa [constricted glottis] harmony

Significantly, implosives may occur with homorganic stops that differ in voicing.

data ‘a small, bitter, green tomato’ (Newman, 2000)
The implosive and pulmonic voiced stops interact in [constricted glottis] harmony to the exclusion of the voiceless stop.

/d/ and /ɗ/ are partners which share a specification for [voice] and differ only in the feature [constricted glottis].

This can be accounted for with a hierarchy in which the feature [voice] is ordered above the feature [constricted glottis] (Mackenzie 2012, 2013).
Hausa Contrastive Hierarchy

\[
/t, d, d'/
\]

\[
/+voice\] [/-voice\]
\]

\[
/+c.g.\] [/-c.g.\] /t/
\]

\[
/d'/ /d/
\]

[voice] > [constricted glottis]
Hausa [constricted glottis] Harmony

In the proposed hierarchy, /t/ is not contrastively specified for the feature [constricted glottis].

If harmony follows from a restriction barring segments which differ only in [constricted glottis] from co-occurring, we expect /t/ to pattern as neutral.
Hausa and Ngizim have phonetically similar inventories of coronal stops.

Differences in the order of features in the contrastive hierarchies of the two languages result in differences in feature specifications for phonetically similar segments.
Ngizim and Hausa Feature Hierarchies

Ngizim
/t, d, d'/

\ [+c.g.] \quad \ [-c.g.]
\ / d'/ \quad [+voice] \quad [-voice]
\ /d/ \quad /t/

Hausa
/t, d, d'/

\ [+voice] \quad [-voice]
\ [+c.g.] \quad [-c.g.]
\ / d'/ \quad /d/ \quad /t/

[constricted glottis] > [voice]  [voice] > [constricted glottis]
Ngizim and Hausa Implosives in PHOIBLE

PHOIBLE represents the voiced, glottalized, coronal stop in Ngizm as /d̰/ - a symbol representing a laryngealized, voiced plosive (Moran, 2012: 617).

The voiced, glottalized, coronal stop in Hausa is represented as /ɗ/ - a symbol representing a voiced implosive (Moran, 2012: 620).
These different symbols are accompanied by different sets of feature specifications.

Ngizim /ɗ/  
[+constricted glottis]  
[-lowered larynx implosive]  
[+periodic glottal source]

Hausa /ɗ/  
[-constricted glottis],  
[+lowered larynx implosive]  
[+periodic glottal source]
Ngizim and Hausa Implosives in PHOIBLE

This raises the question of whether the implosives in Ngizim and Hausa have distinct phonetic properties that could play a role in their differing phonological behaviour.

However, a number of points suggest that the distinct feature specifications used in PHOIBLE are not motivated by phonetic facts.
Ngizim and Hausa Implosives in PHOIBLE

Instead, the different features likely follow from a principle of PHOIBLE that “if two phonemes differ in their graphemic representation, then they necessarily differ in their featural representation as well” (Moran & McCloy, 2019).
Ngizim and Hausa Implosives in PHOIBLE

Whereas PHOIBLE lists a number of sources for the Hausa inventory, the inventory for Ngizim is based on UPSID and both databases list a single source, Schuh, 1972.

Schuh (1972) lists /ɗ/ as a glottalized stop in the consonant chart but provides no phonetic description in the phonological sketch of Ngizim.

Elsewhere (e.g. Schuh, 1997), Schuh uses the feature [implosive] to characterize /ɗ/.

There is therefore no phonetic description in the source that motivates the choice of [+constricted glottis], [-lowered larynx implosive] for Ngizim /ɗ/.
The PHOIBLE feature specifications also pose a challenge for the characterization of the class of glottalized stops in Hausa.

In PHOIBLE, Hausa /ɗ/ and /k’/ do not share any laryngeal features.

Hausa /ɗ/ is specified as [-constricted glottis], [+lowered larynx implosive], [+periodic glottal source], [-raised larynx ejective]

Hausa /k’/ is specified as [+constricted glottis], [-lowered larynx implosive], [-periodic glottal source], [+raised larynx ejective]
Yet /ɗ/ and /k’/ both participate in laryngeal harmony in Hausa which is parasitic on place and voicing.

ɗaɗa ‘to strike a blow’ *ɗadi (Newman, 2000)
k’uk’uta ‘try hard’ *k’aka

Both segments also participate in a general restriction on the cooccurrence of multiple, unlike glottalized segments.

*ɓak’a *s’aba *k’ada
Ngizim and Hausa Implosives in PHOIBLE

The use of [+constricted glottis] to characterize Ngizim /d/ and [+lowered larynx implosive] to characterize Hausa /ɗ/ follows only from differences in informal descriptions in the source documents and PHOIBLE’s commitment to representing graphemic distinctions as feature-based ones, not from phonetic or phonological factors.
Nonetheless, in the theory of the contrastive hierarchy, it is not crucial that the feature used to distinguish relevant segments be ‘the same’ across languages.

In the case of Ngizim and Hausa, it is not important whether [constricted glottis] or [implosive] is the relevant feature distinguishing /ɗ/ from /d/.

It is a feature’s role in a language-specific systems of oppositions that is crucial, rather than its phonetic definition, which may be more or less abstract.
4. Feature specifications constrain (but don’t dictate) phonetic shapes of inventories
Dispersedness: The phenomenon

Phoneme inventories tend to consist of segments that are robustly phonetically distinct.

E.g., /i a u/ is a very common three-vowel inventory; /ɨ ɘ ʉ/ is not.
To some extent, this is an artefact of the symbols people tend to choose, especially in the case of vowel inventories. E.g., a vowel whose phonetic realizations range from [i] to [e] to [ɨ] is more likely to be represented as /i/ than as /ɪ/ or /ı/, partly for reasons of typographical convenience (cf. slide 14). But it’s also a real cross-linguistic tendency. Dispersion Theory (e.g., Liljencrants & Lindblom 1972; Flemming 2002, 2004; Padgett 2003; Sanders 2003) posits that dispersedness is an explicit desideratum.
But the Successive Division Algorithm gives us a way of seeing dispersedness as an epiphenomenon (Hall 2011).

Recall that in the SDA, “no feature is assigned unless it serves to mark some phonemic contrast that has not already been encoded” (slide 4). In other words, features can only indicate how phonemes differ from one another.
There’s no set of specifications that can be assigned to /ɨ ɘ ʉ/ that couldn’t equally well represent /i a u/:

```
/ɨ ɘ ʉ/
  /ʉ/
 /i/  /ɘ/  /ʉ/

/ɨ ɘ ʉ/
  /u/
 /i/  /ɘ/  /ʉ/

/ɨ ɘ ʉ/
  /ɘ/
 /i/  /ʉ/
```

Whatever order the features are assigned in, /i/ always ends up with specifications that could represent /i/; /u/ could always be /u/; and /ɘ/ could always be /a/.
Okay, so the inventory /ɨ ə u/ can’t be represented in a way that distinguishes it from /i a u/. But by itself, that doesn’t mean that it will be /i a u/ instead.

The other piece of the picture is enhancement (Stevens, Keyser & Kawasaki 1986; Stevens & Keyser 1989, 2010; Keyser & Stevens 2001, 2006). Distinctive features tend to be reinforced in phonetic realization by additional articulatory gestures with similar auditory effects.
For example, suppose /ɨ ɘ ʉ/ is specified like this:

```
/ɨ ɘ ʉ/
      /ɨ/  /ʉ/  /ɘ/
[+high]  [-high]  [-round]  [+round]
```

How might the specified features be enhanced?

- [-high] on /ɘ/ can be enhanced by making it low (higher F1) → [a]
- [-round] on /ɨ/ can be enhanced by making it front (higher F2). → [i]
- [+round] on /ʉ/ can be enhanced by making it back (lower F2). → [u]
SDA + Enhancement = dispersedness (without Dispersion)

• The SDA ensures that only contrastive features are specified.
• Enhancement amplifies the phonetic effects of specified features.
• Therefore, contrast is phonetically amplified.
• We don’t need a separate mechanism that evaluates or enforces distinctness at the phonetic level (like Flemming’s MIN DIST constraints).
SDA + Enhancement = dispersedness (without Dispersion)

Enhancement isn’t uniform; its exact effects vary from language to language, and from one environment to another within a language.

But in general, it tends to make inventories more dispersed, and to make smaller inventories more dispersed than larger ones. Contrastive features always mark differences between phonemes; they mark similarities among phonemes within a subset of the inventory only if those similarities distinguish that subset from some other subset.
5. Conclusions
Conclusions

• Phonological inventories exist in phonological space: a system of oppositions expressed by distinctive features (Trubetzkoy 1939).

• Phonemes correspond to regions in phonetic space, not points. To represent them as phonetic points is a category error (a foible of PHOIBLE).

• Phonetically similar inventories can have important phonological differences (as in Ngizim and Hausa).

• The phonetic shape of an inventory limits what features can be assigned to it, but does not dictate a specific set of features.

• Conversely, distinctive features encode some information about phonetic properties of segments, but leave other properties up to phonetic implementation (which often includes enhancement).
THANK YOU!
References


