

Natural classes in cooccurrence constraints*

Gillian Gallagher, New York University

June, 2015

Abstract

Natural classes are typically defined by some shared phonetic property, though the segments within such a class may differ substantially along other dimensions. This paper explores two such classes in Quechua: the class of [spread glottis] segments, aspirates and [h], and the class of [constricted glottis] segments, ejectives and [ʔ]. While aspirates and ejectives pattern with their glottal counterparts in the cooccurrence phonotactics of the language, nonce word tasks only find weak evidence of these natural classes. Instead, there is evidence for strong phonotactic restrictions on aspirates and ejectives to the exclusion of their glottal counterparts. It is proposed that the preference for classes of laryngeally marked stops is phonetically based, deriving from the salience of the phonetic properties unique to stops.

1 Introduction

Phonological generalizations are stated over features, which pick out the natural class of segments relevant to the phonological pattern. Typically, features reference some phonetic property that is shared by a set of segments (Jakobson Fant & Halle 1952; Chomsky & Halle 1968), and may emerge as a result of the phonologically active classes in a given language (Blevins 2004; Mielke 2008). Within a phonetically defined and phonologically active natural class, however, substantial phonetic diversity may also be found. A natural class based on place of articulation, for example, may include obstruents and sonorants, voiced and voiceless sounds, nasal and non-nasal sounds.

This paper explores the relationship between phonological patterning and phonetic properties by investigating two standardly assumed natural classes in Quechua: [spread glottis] ([sg]) and [constricted glottis] ([cg]) (Parker & Weber 1996; MacEachern 1999). The two laryngeal features [sg] and [cg] refer to articulatory properties, and thus are phonetically definable, but in Quechua they group together segments that are otherwise quite phonetically disparate: aspirated stops and [h] for [sg] and ejective stops and [ʔ] for [cg]. The phonological patterns of Quechua provide support for the [sg] and [cg] classes, in the form of phonotactic restrictions on these natural classes. Other phonotactic restrictions in the language, however, target ejective and aspirate stops to the exclusion of their glottal counterparts. The experiments here suggest that speakers have learned only relatively weak phonotactic restrictions on [sg] and [cg]; phonotactic restrictions on ejective and aspirated stops, however, have a strong effect on speakers behavior on multiple tasks. The proposed explanation for the preference for restrictions on ejectives and aspirates is that the phonetic properties that distinguish ejectives and aspirates from their glottal counterparts are more salient than the properties that group these segments together, and that phonological grammars favor constraints on more salient features.

The broader context for this work is the connection between featural representations and the formal properties of a grammatical statement. Much recent work in phonological learning has evaluated the role of naturalness and structural complexity in how patterns are learned by speakers, both in artificial grammar learning experiments with adults (Moreton 2008; Moreton &

* I am indebted to... This work was funded by the National Science Foundation, BCS 1222700.

1 Pater 2012; Moreton 2012) and infants (Saffran & Thiessen 2003), and in experiments probing
 2 what speakers' have learned about their native language (Hayes et al. 2009; Hayes & White
 3 2013). In these studies, more natural patterns and less complex patterns are found to be learned
 4 more easily. The definitions of naturalness and complexity, however, are based over features or
 5 assume particular featural representations. Similarly, the inductive learner proposed in Hayes &
 6 Wilson (2008) uses the featural content of constraints to define both complexity and generality,
 7 concepts that are critical to which constraints end up in the grammar. As documented at length in
 8 Flemming (1995), as well as other work in phonetically based phonology (Hayes et al. 2004),
 9 many phonological patterns that appear complex when represented with standard distinctive
 10 features appear quite simple once the correct phonetic properties of the interacting sounds are
 11 taken into consideration.

12 The paper begins by laying out the Quechua data and analytic issues in Section 2. Section 3
 13 presents an acoustic study evaluating the evidence for initial glottal stop. Section 4 addresses
 14 phonological representations by probing speakers' behavior on two nonce word tasks, a
 15 repetition task and a forced choice judgment task. Section 5 discusses the results and Section 6
 16 concludes.

17
 18

19 2 Quechua phonotactics

20

21 This paper presents data from speakers of Quechua from the Cochabamba department of Bolivia.
 22 The impressionistic, descriptive facts are shared between other varieties of South Bolivian
 23 Quechua (the term used by Lewis et al. 2014) and many varieties of Peruvian Quechua,
 24 particularly Cusco Quechua (Adelaar with Muysken 2004), grouped together in group IIC of the
 25 Quechua language family (Torero 1964). For the rest of the paper, the language will be referred to
 26 simply as 'Quechua'.

27 The phonemic consonantal inventory of Quechua is given in Table 1 (Rowe 1950;
 28 Cusihuamán 1976; Bills et al. 1971). The language has a ternary laryngeal contrast between
 29 voiceless unaspirated (plain), aspirated and ejective stops (affricates consistently pattern as stops
 30 with respect to the phonology of the language), as well as the accompanying glottals [h] and [ʔ].
 31 The phonemic status of the glottal fricative [h] is uncontroversial; the status of glottal stop [ʔ] is
 32 less clear, partially motivating the studies presented here.

33

	labial	dental	postalveolar	velar	uvular	glottal
plain	p	t	tʃ	k	q	
aspirate	p ^h	t ^h	tʃ ^h	k ^h	q ^h	h
ejective	p'	t'	tʃ'	k'	q'	(ʔ)
fricative		s				
nasal	m	n	ɲ			
liquid		l r	ʎ			
glide	w		j			

34

35

Table 1: Quechua consonant inventory.

36

37 Quechua has three phonemic vowels /i u a/. The high vowels /i u/ lower to [e o] preceding or
 38 following a uvular (Bills et al. 1971; Adelaar with Muysken 2004; Laime Ajacopa 2007), and

1 this allophonic process is reflected in the transcriptions throughout the paper. Additionally, velar
 2 and uvular stops spirantize in coda position and are transcribed as [x χ].

3 The laryngeally marked stops and glottal consonants are subject to a range of combinatoric
 4 and distributional restrictions (Rowe 1950; Orr & Longacre 1968; Carelko 1975; Mannheim
 5 1991; Parker & Weber 1996; MacEachern 1999; Gallagher 2011). Ejectives and aspirates occur
 6 only in roots, which are primarily C₁V(C)C₂V, and only in onset (pre-vocalic) position. Ejectives
 7 and aspirates may appear in C₁ of a root, or in C₂ if C₁ is not a stop, as shown in (1). Examples
 8 throughout the paper come from Laime Ajacopa (2007) or the author's fieldwork.

- 9
- | | | | | | | | |
|----|--------|---------|----------|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 10 | (1) a. | p'upu | 'jug' | b. | p ^h iri | 'type of food' | |
| 11 | | t'anta | 'bread' | | t ^h aski | 'to walk' | |
| 12 | | tʃ'aki | 'dry' | | tʃ ^h uʎa | 'sleet' | |
| 13 | | k'atʃa | 'pretty' | | k ^h uska | 'together' | |
| 14 | | q'osʃni | 'trash' | | q ^h ari | 'man' | |
| 15 | | | | | | | |
| 16 | | c. | hap'i | 'to grab' | d. | ʎimp ^h u | 'clean' |
| 17 | | | sut'i | 'clear' | | mut ^h u | 'curly' |
| 18 | | | satʃ'a | 'tree' | | itʃ ^h u | 'hay' |
| 19 | | | ʎank'a | 'to work' | | rak ^h u | 'thick' |
| 20 | | | loq'o | 'hat' | | aq ^h a | 'corn beer' |

21

22 Ejectives and aspirates are both prohibited from occurring in C₂ in roots where C₁ is a stop,
 23 whether C₁ is plain, ejective or aspirate. These unattested root types are shown in (2).

- 24
- | | | | | |
|----|--------|----------------------|----|-----------------------------------|
| 25 | (2) a. | *kap'i | b. | *kap ^h i |
| 26 | | *k'ap'i | | *k'ap ^h i |
| 27 | | *k ^h ap'i | | *k ^h ap ^h i |

28


29 Additionally, there are restrictions between ejectives/aspirates and the glottal consonants, shown
 30 in (3) and (4). Aspirates may not occur in [h] initial roots (3c), though ejectives may (3b), and
 31 ejectives may not occur in [ʔ] initial roots (4c), though aspirates may (4b). Plain stops and other
 32 consonants may all occur in [h] and [ʔ] initial roots, as shown in (3a) and (4a).

- 33
- | | | | | | | | | | |
|----|-----|----|-------|-----------------|----|---------------------|-------------|----|---------------------|
| 34 | (3) | a. | hatun | 'big' | b. | hak'u | 'flour' | c. | *hak ^h u |
| 35 | | | hampi | 'to cure' | | hap'i | 'to grab' | | *hap ^h i |
| 36 | | | | | | | | | |
| 37 | (4) | a. | ʔapi | 'corn porridge' | b. | ʔaq ^h a | 'corn beer' | c. | *ʔap'i |
| 38 | | | ʔutʃu | 'hot pepper' | | ʔuk ^h u | 'inside' | | *ʔutʃ'u |
| 39 | | | ʔinti | 'sun' | | ʔitʃ ^h u | 'hay' | | *ʔint'i |

40

41 Glottal stop is non-contrastive in Quechua, and only occurs in initial position. The only
 42 phonological evidence that these roots are glottal stop initial, e.g., [ʔinti] 'sun', as opposed to
 43 vowel initial, e.g., [inti], comes from the phonotactic restriction on ejectives (Parker & Weber
 44 1996; MacEachern 1999). If roots of the type in (4) are in fact glottal stop initial, then the
 45 absence of ejectives in such roots is unsurprising phonologically, since both glottal stop and
 46 ejectives are articulated with a constricted glottis and share the feature [constricted glottis] ([cg]).
 47 The restriction on pairs of ejectives and the restriction on ejectives in glottal-stop initial words

1 can both be accounted for under a prohibition on multiple [cg] specifications within a root
 2 (Parker & Weber 1996; MacEachern 1999; Gallagher 2011), i.e., an Obligatory Contour
 3 Principle (OCP) effect (Leben 1973; Goldsmith 1976; McCarthy 1988; Suzuki 1998). An OCP
 4 constraint on [spread glottis] ([sg]), which groups together aspirates and [h], accounts for the
 5 absence of roots with two aspirates or an [h]-aspirate pair. This analysis is shown in (5).



15 If, on the other hand, there are truly vowel-initial roots, then Quechua must be described as
 16 having a phonologically arbitrary restriction against ejectives in vowel initial roots. Such a
 17 restriction would be stated as in (6), referring to a word boundary followed immediately by a
 18 vowel, and then followed non-locally by a [cg] segment.

19
 20 (6) *#V...[cg]
 21

22 An arbitrary restriction like that in (6) may be expected to be underlearned relative to a
 23 typologically common and phonologically natural restriction like the OCP, as has been found in
 24 recent work exploring speakers' knowledge of natural and unnatural patterns (Hayes et al 2009;
 25 Becker et al. 2011; Becker et al. 2012; Hayes and White 2013).

26 The natural classes of [sg] and [cg] segments are supported by the phonotactic patterns of
 27 Quechua, but they also receive phonetic and typological support. Phonetically, segments in these
 28 classes share an articulatory property, the spreading or constriction of the vocal folds, as well as
 29 some acoustic consequences of this articulation, aspiration noise and breathiness in the case of
 30 [sg] or creaky or tense phonation in the case of [cg]. Typologically, there is support for [sg] and
 31 [cg] classes from phonotactic patterns in other languages, as discussed in MacEachern (1999)
 32 and Gallagher (2011). In Hausa (Chadic), for example, a cooccurrence restriction targets the
 33 class of [cg] segments, which consists of ejectives, implosive and [ʔ]. In Souletin Basque, the
 34 [sg] class of aspirates and [h] are restricted from cooccurring, and in Sanskrit the [sg] class of
 35 voiceless aspirates, voiced aspirates and [h] are restricted. Peruvian and Bolivian variants of
 36 Aymara also show restrictions very similar to those in Quechua. There is thus good typological
 37 evidence that a shared articulatory state of the glottis may underly the grouping of phonetically
 38 diverse sounds into a natural class. In addition to the languages just discussed, however, there are
 39 also languages that target a smaller, more phonetically uniform class of sounds with phonotactic
 40 restrictions. In Chol (Mayan), for example, ejectives are subject to cooccurrence restrictions but
 41 may cooccur freely with the implosive [ɓ] or [ʔ] (Gallagher & Coon 2009). Outside of the
 42 domain of cooccurrence restrictions, ejectives and aspirated stops have been found to pattern
 43 differently from other laryngeally marked segments in positional neutralization and cluster
 44 phonotactics (Lloret 1995; Steriade 1997; Pulleyblank & Howe 2001).

45 While OCP constraints on [sg] and [cg] account for some of the unattested consonant pairs in
 46 Quechua roots, restrictions on ejective-aspirate pairs (*[k'ap^hi], *[k^hap'i]), as well as restrictions

1 on ejectives and aspirates in plain stop initial roots (*[kap'i], *[kap^hi]), suggest reference to the
 2 classes of ejective and aspirated stops independent of their glottal counterparts. While these
 3 restrictions could be captured with additional constraints on [sg] and [cg], Gallagher (2011)
 4 proposes that ejectives and aspirates are grouped together under the acoustically based feature
 5 [long VOT], referring to the distinctive voice onset time (VOT) lag in aspirates and ejectives.
 6 Given the feature [long VOT], a single constraint can rule out all combinations of stops in C₁ and
 7 ejectives or aspirates in C₂: *[-cont, -son][long VOT] (see Mackenzie 2013 for a proposal of this
 8 type). Alternatively, distinct constraints may refer to features picking out aspirates and ejectives
 9 separately: *[-cont, -son][aspirate] and *[-cont, -son][ejective]. The phonotactic restrictions of
 10 Quechua thus provide support for grouping ejectives and aspirates with their glottal counterparts,
 11 in the natural classes [sg] and [cg], but also for referring to ejectives and aspirates to the
 12 exclusion of their glottal counterparts, as summarized in Table 2.
 13

natural class	supporting phonotactics		
[sg]	*k ^h -p ^h	*h-p ^h	
[cg]	*k'-p'	*ʔ-p'	
[long VOT] <i>or</i> [aspirate] and [ejective]	*k ^h -p ^h	*k'-p ^h	*k-p ^h
	*k'-p'	*k ^h -p'	*k-p'

14 Table 2: Natural classes supported by phonotactic restrictions. Boxing indicates forms that
 15 support multiple natural classes.
 16

17 The main goal of this paper is to test the reality of the natural classes in Table 2 in Quechua by
 18 examining native speakers' behavior for evidence of phonotactic restrictions on these classes. If
 19 Quechua speakers have learned the articulatory based features [sg] and [cg], then the absence of
 20 [h]-aspirate and [ʔ]-ejective pairs should be represented as OCP restrictions and are expected to
 21 have a strong effect on speakers' behavior, comparable to restrictions specific to aspirates and
 22 ejectives. Alternatively, the distinctive acoustic properties of ejectives and aspirates may lead
 23 speakers to attend asymmetrically to the phonotactic patterning of these segments to the
 24 exclusion of their glottal counterparts, resulting in stronger effects for restrictions based on [long
 25 VOT] or [aspirate]/[ejective].

26 Before assessing the status of the [sg] and [cg] natural classes in speakers' grammars, the
 27 production study in Section 3 begins by evaluating acoustic evidence for initial glottal stop. Once
 28 the phonetic basis for the [cg] natural class is quantified, Section 4 presents examines results of
 29 two nonce word studies for evidence of restrictions on [sg] and [cg] classes.
 30
 31

32 **3 Production study: evaluating glottal stop**

33
 34 To evaluate the presence of glottal stop in vowel initial roots in Quechua, such roots were
 35 recorded in three contexts: isolation, e.g., [inti] 'sun', phrase medial post-vocalic, e.g., [k'atʃa
 36 inti] 'pretty sun', and phrase medial post-consonantal, e.g., [yuraχ inti] 'white sun'. All vowel
 37 initial roots in this study are in prosodically prominent positions, which have been shown to
 38 increase the likelihood of a non-contrastive glottal stop (Pierrehumbert & Talkin 1991;
 39 Pierrehumbert 1995; Dilley et al. 1996; Garellek 2013; Garellek 2014): isolation words are
 40 necessarily phrase initial, and in the two-word phrases used here the target word bears the

1 phrasal accent. Quechua is a strictly suffixing language, so roots are always word initial; ‘root
2 initial’ and ‘word initial’ thus refer to the same position.

3 In addition to evaluating the distribution of glottal stop preceding vowel initial roots, voice
4 quality in the initial vowel of a vowel initial root was also examined by measuring the
5 harmonics-to-noise ratio (HNR). Voice quality in vowel initial roots was compared to voice
6 quality following an ejective, which unambiguously has a glottal closure, and following a plain
7 stop, which does not. This comparison serves to determine whether vowel initial and ejective
8 initial roots share phonetic properties that may underlie their phonological patterning.

9 10 **3.1 Participants**

11 The participants were twelve native speakers of Quechua from the Cochabamba department of
12 Bolivia. All participants were bilingual in Spanish and had a university education. The
13 production task required reading, and thus participants needed to be proficient in reading
14 Quechua. While there is a standard orthography for Bolivian Quechua that is taught in schools,
15 most Quechua speakers are only literate in Spanish and are not comfortable reading in Quechua.
16 The participants for this study, then, were both highly educated and had made a conscious effort
17 to become fluent readers of Quechua. Eight males and four females completed the study, aged
18 25-45.

19 20 **3.2 Materials**

21 The stimuli are given in Table 3. Twelve vowel initial roots were selected, 4 each with initial /a i
22 u/. These roots were presented either in isolation, or in post-vocalic or post-consonantal position
23 within a two word phrase. In post-vocalic position, the preceding vowel was always the low
24 vowel [a]; the preceding consonant in post-consonantal position was variable. In addition to
25 vowel initial words, which were of primary interest, twelve plain stop and twelve ejective initial
26 words were included as isolation words in order to assess baseline voice quality in glottal and
27 non-glottal environments.¹ Stress in Quechua is penultimate, so all target words have stress on
28 the initial syllable with the exception of [i'miʎa] ‘young girl’ and [u'susi] ‘daughter’.

29 30 **3.3 Procedure**

31 The stimulus items were presented in Bolivian Quechua orthography using the experimental
32 software PsyScope X B77 (Cohen et al. 1993). In Bolivian Quechua orthography, vowel initial
33 roots are written as vowel initial, and ejectives are marked with a following apostrophe, e.g.,
34 <inti> [inti] ‘sun’, <p'acha> [p'atʃa] ‘clothes’. Items were randomized and the experiment was
35 self-paced. Participants were seated in front of a MacBook Air laptop with Audio Technica
36 headphones; they were instructed to read what appeared on the screen and to then press the space
37 bar to proceed. Responses were recorded with a Marantz PMD560 digital recorder and an Audio
38 Technica 831b microphone. Items were not presented in a carrier phrase.

39
40
41
42
43

¹ Two ejective-initial words, [p'esqo] ‘bird’ and [p'olqo] ‘sock’, contain uvular consonants, resulting in lowering of /i u/ to [e o].

isolation	vowel initial		plain initial		ejective initial	
	ajtʃa	‘meat’	tʃaki	‘foot’	tʃʰaki	‘dry’
	aʎqo	‘dog’	katʃi	‘salt’	kʰaŋka	‘rooster’
	ajʎu	‘village’	patʃa	‘earth’	pʰatʃa	‘clothes’
	atoχ	‘fox’	para	‘rain’	tʰanta	‘bread’
	inti	‘sun’	tʃiri	‘cold’	kʰiti	‘area’
	itʃʰu	‘hay’	kiʎa	‘moon’	tʃʰisi	‘evening’
	iŋka	‘Inca’	pitʃaj	‘to sweep’	tʰika	‘flower’
	imiʎa	‘young girl’	kiru	‘tooth’	pʰesqo	‘bird’
	utʃu	‘chile’	tʃuʎpa	‘mummy’	tʰuru	‘brother’
	uma	‘head’	tuʎu	‘skinny’	pʰolqo	‘sock’
	ususi	‘daughter’	kuti	‘time’	kʰuʎu	‘wood’
urpi	‘pigeon’	tukuj	‘everything’	tʃʰuru	‘shell’	
phrase	post-vocalic		post-consonantal			
	puka	ajtʃa	‘red meat’	aŋqas	ajtʃa	‘blue meat’
	jana	aʎqo	‘black dog’	kurax	aʎqo	‘old dog’
	kʰatʃa	ajʎu	‘pretty village’	hatun	ajʎu	‘big village’
	puka	atoχ	‘red fox’	jurax	atoχ	‘white fox’
	wira	imiʎa	‘fat young girl’	kurax	imiʎa	‘older young girl’
	kʰatʃa	inti	‘pretty sun’	hatun	iŋka	‘big Inca’
	jana	iŋka	‘black Inca’	jurax	inti	‘white sun’
	jana	itʃʰu	‘black hay’	aŋqas	itʃʰu	‘blue hay’
	puka	utʃu	‘red chile’	aŋqas	utʃu	‘blue chile’
	jana	uma	‘black head’	hatun	uma	‘big head’
	kʰatʃa	ususi	‘pretty daughter’	jurax	urpi	‘white pigeon’
jana	urpi	‘black pigeon’	kurax	ususi	‘older daughter’	

Table 3: Production study stimuli.

3.4 Analysis

All vowel initial words were coded for the presence of a glottal stop based on examination of the waveform for evidence of aperiodicity; F0 contours were also consulted. Tokens were classified as ‘glottalized’ if the waveform was aperiodic, or if a clear glottal burst was present. Most often, aperiodic vowels had irregularly spaced, low amplitude pitch pulses, often accompanied by depressed F0. The criteria for aperiodicity were based on those used in previous work (Dilley et al. 1996; Redi & Shattuck-Hufnagel 2001; Garellek 2013, 2014), though previous studies also relied on a percept of glottalization for a token to be coded as glottalized. In the current study, glottalization was often present for only a very short interval, with perhaps only two pitch periods showing irregularity, and many tokens with visible aperiodicity did not sound glottalized. Consequently, in the current study a percept of glottalization was not required to classify a token as glottalized. Figure 1 shows an example of a vowel initial token with no irregularity (a), a glottal burst (b), and an aperiodic waveform (c).




Figure 1: Sample waveforms illustrating (a) no irregularity in [imiλa] from speaker M2, (b) a single glottal pulse in [urpi] from speaker F3 (c) aperiodicity in [atoχ] from speaker F1. An arrow indicates the glottal pulse in (b) and a line indicates the duration of aperiodicity in (c).

In addition to impressionistic coding of vowel initial words, the HNR for the first half of the vowel was measured for all items, using the ‘voice report’ function in Praat (Boersma & Weenink 2014). Vowels were segmented from the onset of periodicity or aperiodic noise (when present) until the offset of F2. Lower HNR is expected in tokens with aperiodic noise, which is likely indicative of glottal closure. Two types of comparisons were done on voice quality measures. First, acoustic measures were used to supplement the impressionistic coding of vowel initial words as glottalized or not. Second, voice quality measures were compared between isolation tokens of vowel, ejective and plain stop initial words to determine whether voice quality serves to group vowel and ejective initial words.

3.5 Results

3.5.1 Presence of glottal stop preceding vowel initial words

The proportion of vowel initial roots with evidence of glottal stop is shown in Figure 3. Overall, vowel initial words are frequently (72% of the time) produced with clear visual evidence of a glottal stop, which manifests most often as aperiodicity in the initial portion of the vowel. Nine percent of tokens had only a single pulse corresponding to the glottal burst, with no evidence of aperiodicity in the waveform. Because these items were so infrequent, they are not analyzed separately from tokens with aperiodicity. Glottal stop preceding vowel initial words is most common in isolation (80%) and post-consonantal position (79%), and is relatively less frequent in post-vocalic position (57%).




Figure 2: Proportion of vowel initial words produced with visual evidence of glottal closure.

To evaluate the differences in phonation types between contexts, a Mixed Logit Model (MLM) was fit using the *lmer* function in the LanguageR package (Bates et al. 2014) in R (R Core Development Team 2014, www.r-project.org). The dependent variable was presence vs. absence of visual cues to glottal closure. The model had a single predictor of context, with post-consonantal position set as the baseline, and a maximal random effects structure, with random intercepts for participant and item and random slopes by participant. The model finds that glottal closure is less common in post-vocalic position ($\beta = 1.25$, $SE = 0.55$, $z = 2.24$, $p < 0.03$), but that the difference between post-consonantal and isolation contexts is not significant ($\beta = 0.01$, $SE = 0.50$, $z = 0.01$, $p = 0.99$).

3.5.2 Voice quality measures

HNR in vowel initial words is shown in Figure 3, broken down by context and whether there was visual evidence of a preceding glottal closure. As can be seen, HNR values are much lower for vowels with aperiodicity in the waveform than in those without. Furthermore, this difference is more pronounced for vowels in post-vocalic or post-consonantal position than for those in isolation words, suggesting generally higher HNR in phrase medial position.




Figure 3: HNR in vowel initial words, by context and whether there was evidence in the waveform of a preceding glottal closure. Errors bars indicate the Standard Error Measure.

1 A Linear Mixed Model (LMM) was fit with a dependent variable of HNR, predictors of glottal
2 closure, context and their interaction, as well as random intercepts by participant and item and
3 random slopes by participant. The predictor of glottal closure was a two-level, contrast coded
4 predictor comparing items with evidence of glottal closure to those without. The predictor of
5 context was Helmert coded such that post-consonantal and post-vocalic contexts were compared
6 to one another, and isolation context was compared to post-consonantal and post-vocalic
7 contexts as a group. Following Gelman and Hill (2006), t values greater than ± 2 are considered
8 significant. The model finds a significant effect of glottal closure ($\beta = 4.10$, $SE = .78$, $t = 5.29$):
9 vowels with visual evidence of preceding glottal closure have a lower HNR than vowels with no
10 such evidence. There is also a significant interaction of glottal closure and type ($\beta = -3.29$, $SE =$
11 1.33 , $t = -2.48$): the effect of glottal closure on HNR is smaller in isolation context than in post-
12 consonantal or post-vocalic contexts.

13 HNR was also compared between the three types of isolation words: vowel initial, plain stop
14 initial and ejective initial. The results are shown in Figure 4. The purpose of this comparison is to
15 determine whether vowel initial and ejective initial words have acoustic similarities that may
16 suggest articulatory similarities and warrant grouping them as a class. Consequently, here all
17 vowel initial tokens are grouped together, regardless of whether there was visual evidence of
18 glottal closure or not. As expected, HNR is higher following plain stops than following ejectives
19 or in vowel initial words.




Figure 4: HNR in plain stop, ejective and vowel initial isolation words.

36 To assess the differences in HNR between these three classes of words, a LMM was fit with a
37 predictor of type with ejective initial words as the baseline. The model finds that vowels
38 following plain stops have a significantly higher HNR than vowels following ejectives ($\beta = 2.96$,
39 $SE = 1.05$, $t = 2.83$), and that vowels following ejectives in turn have a significantly higher HNR
40 than word initial vowels ($\beta = -2.43$, $SE = 1.15$, $t = -2.11$).

41 The lower HNR in vowel initial isolation words than ejective initial isolation words is
42 notable given that all vowel initial words are grouped together here, regardless of whether they
43 showed evidence of glottal closure or not. Looking only at vowel initial isolation words without
44 evidence of glottal closure, we find HNR values intermediate between those in vowels following
45 ejectives and those following plain stops (ejective = 11.55 dB , non-glottalized vowel = 12.23 ,
46 plain = 14.36 dB). An additional LMM finds that non-glottalized, word initial vowels do not

1 differ significantly in HNR from vowels following ejectives ($\beta = -0.31$, $SE = 1.42$, $t = -0.22$), nor
2 from vowels following plain stops ($\beta = -2.64$, $SE = 1.35$, $t = 1.96$), though this latter difference is
3 nearly significant. Even in vowels with no visual evidence of glottal closure, then, HNR
4 measures suggest some irregularity associated with absolute utterance initial position.

6 **3.6 Discussion**

7 Glottal closure, as evidenced by both visual examination of the waveform and HNR measures,
8 occurs preceding the majority of vowel initial words. The presence of glottal stop is variable: in
9 28% of tokens, there is no visual evidence of glottal closure. Glottal stop is also context
10 dependent. While glottal closure is common across all contexts, it is relatively less frequent in
11 post-vocalic position. This finding differs from what has been observed for English, in which
12 non-contrastive glottal closure is more common in post-vocalic position, where it breaks up
13 hiatus, than in post-consonantal position (Umeda 1978; Pierrehumbert 1995; Dilley et al. 1996;
14 Mompeán & Gómez 2011; Garellek 2012, 2014; Davidson & Erker 2014).

15 The frequency of glottal closure in vowel initial words is consistent with these words being
16 glottal stop initial at some level of representation, and in turn makes an OCP constraint on glottal
17 stop and ejectives as [cg] segments plausible, though not certain. HNR is significantly lower in
18 word-initial vowels than in vowels following ejectives, suggesting that the articulation of glottal
19 closure differs between glottal stop and ejectives and that the voice quality correlates of this
20 closure are substantially different. This difference may follow from differences in the alignment
21 of the glottal constriction gesture with the following vowel (Lindau 1984; Kingston 1990) or
22 from the strength or type of the glottal closure. More detailed instrumental work, for example
23 electro-glottagraphy, is needed to ascertain the phonetic similarity between ejectives and glottal
24 stop.

25 In sum, the results of the production task find that glottal closure is often present in vowel
26 initial words, consistent with previous impressionistic descriptions. The phonological coherence
27 of a natural class including ejectives and glottal stop, however, is still in question. The
28 experiments reported in Section 4 take up this question by probing speakers' knowledge of
29 phonotactic restrictions.

32 **4 Nonce word studies: the phonological representation of laryngeal phonotactics**

34 This section presents the results of two nonce word studies – a repetition task and a forced choice
35 acceptability judgment task – aimed at assessing Quechua speakers' phonotactic knowledge. The
36 goal of these studies is to determine whether speakers' treatment of nonce words is consistent
37 with grammatical restrictions on [sg] and [cg] sound classes, and to assess the strength of
38 restrictions on these classes relative to restrictions specific to ejectives and aspirates. Both
39 experiments compared speakers' treatment of four types of phonotactically illegal nonce words.
40 Words with two aspirates or two ejectives, e.g., *[k^hup^hi] *[k'up'i], violate a putative
41 cooccurrence restriction on [sg] and [cg] by having two laryngeally marked stops, but also fall
42 under the scope of a restriction on stops followed by ejectives or aspirates. Stimulus items of this
43 type will be referred to as 'double' violations. Double violations were compared to 'glottal'
44 violations, where one of the [sg] or [cg] specifications is associated with a glottal segment, e.g.,

1 *[hup^hu], *[ʔup^hu]. All four types of phonotactically illegal nonce words are compared to
2 phonotactically legal controls, e.g., [ʎup^hu], [ʎip^hu].

3 Comparison of speakers' treatment of double and glottal violations tests whether [sg] and
4 [cg] are the natural classes relevant to cooccurrence restrictions, or whether aspirate and ejective
5 stops are represented differently from their glottal counterparts. If [sg] and [cg] are the correct
6 representational units, then double and glottal violations should be treated comparably.
7 Comparison of the two types of glottal violations, [sg] and [cg], further serves to assess the
8 representation of vowel initial roots as glottal stop initial. If such roots are phonologically glottal
9 stop initial, then *[ʔup^hu] and *[hup^hu] should be treated similarly. If such roots are instead
10 phonologically vowel initial, then *[up^hu] may be treated differently from *[hup^hu].

11 Any study that aims to investigate speakers' knowledge of categorical phonotactic
12 restrictions has to contend with the novelty of the stimuli that are presented to speakers. In
13 addition to a hypothesized restriction on the stimulus in the phonotactic grammar,
14 phonotactically illegal stimuli contain unattested structures that pose perceptual and articulatory
15 challenges to speakers that may be independent of the grammar. The aim of using two
16 substantially different tasks to assess speakers' phonotactic knowledge of unattested structures is
17 to abstract away at least partially from effects associated with a particular method of stimulus
18 presentation or a particular type of response (e.g., production vs. a metalinguistic judgment).

20 **4.1 Repetition**

21 The first experiment compared speakers' accuracy at repeating nonce words. Previous work has
22 found that this task elicits errors on phonotactically illegal nonce roots violating the restriction on
23 pairs of ejectives in Quechua (Author 2013, 2014). In these previous studies, nonce forms with
24 pairs of ejectives, e.g., *[k^hup^hi], were found to be repeated by Quechua speakers as
25 phonotactically legal forms with a single ejective, [k^hupi], a significant portion of the time.
26 Repetition errors are also found to occur at different rates for different types of illegal stimuli;
27 forms with identical pairs of ejectives, e.g., *[k^huk^hi], are found to be repeated more accurately
28 than forms with two non-identical ejectives (Author 2014), as are forms with a plain stop-
29 ejective pair, e.g., *[kup^hi] (Author 2013). Repetition tasks have also been used to observe
30 English speakers' treatment of unattested onset clusters (Davidson 2010; Shaw & Davidson
31 2011; Wilson et al. 2015). In these consonant cluster studies, participants were also found to
32 repair phonotactic violations, but do so in a way that closely tracks acoustic properties of the
33 stimuli, e.g., the length of the release burst in a stop-stop cluster. Consonant clusters pose
34 substantially different perceptual and articulatory challenges than the combinations of non-
35 adjacent consonants that are the focus of the present study (Ussishkin & Wedel 2003).

37 *4.1.1 Participants*

38 Twenty-three native speakers of Quechua from the Cochabamba area of Bolivia completed the
39 experiment. The participants were thirteen males and ten females, ages 21-47. All participants
40 were fully bilingual in Spanish and had completed a university degree.

42 *4.1.2 Materials*

43 The critical test stimuli were C₁VC₂V nonce words with an ejective or aspirate in C₂. The test
44 stimuli fell into one of three types, depending on C₁. *Control* forms had a fricative or sonorant in
45 C₁ and were phonotactically legal, e.g., [ʎup^hu], [ʎip^hu]. *Double* forms had an ejective or aspirate

1 in C₁ and were phonotactically illegal, e.g., *[k'up'i], *[k^hup^hi]. *Glottal* forms were either glottal
 2 stop or [h] initial and were phonotactically illegal, e.g., *[ʔup'u], *[hup^hu]. There were 6 items in
 3 each type, for a total of 36 stimulus items, given in Table 4.
 4

	control	double	glottal
ejective	hak'i	k'up'i	ʔatʃ'i
	ʎitʃ'u	k'atʃ'u	ʔak'i
	ʎup'u	p'uk'a	ʔik'u
	mip'a	p'atʃ'i	ʔip'a
	nik'u	tʃ'ak'u	ʔutʃ'a
	satʃ'i	tʃ'up'i	ʔup'u
aspirate	juk ^h i	k ^h up ^h i	hatʃ ^h i
	jatʃ ^h i	k ^h itʃ ^h a	hak ^h i
	ʎip ^h u	p ^h ak ^h i	hik ^h u
	nak ^h u	p ^h utʃ ^h a	hip ^h a
	nutʃ ^h i	tʃ ^h ik ^h u	hutʃ ^h a
	sap ^h u	tʃ ^h up ^h a	hup ^h u

5
 6 Table 4: Critical stimuli in the repetition experiment.
 7

8 Each critical item was matched with a filler item with a plain stop in C₂, e.g., *ejective double*
 9 *filler* [k'upi] (cf. critical item [k'up'i]), *aspirate glottal filler* [hupu] (cf. critical item [hup^hu]),
 10 etc. Stops were drawn evenly from /p' tʃ' k' p^h tʃ^h k^h p tʃ k/ and V₁ was drawn evenly from /a i
 11 u/. Fricatives and sonorants in the control stimuli and vowels in V₂ were selected as needed to
 12 make sure all items were nonce words. The stimuli were selected so that no item had a near
 13 neighbor that differed in only a change in laryngeal feature or glottal segment. For example, the
 14 stimulus [ʔup'u] is a nonce word, but so are [ʔupu], [ʔup^hu] and [hup'u].

15 The stimuli were made from recordings of a native speaker from Cochabamba reading
 16 phonotactically legal nonce words. All items were cross-spliced during the closure of the medial
 17 stop, e.g., [hupu] was made by cross-splicing [hupu] and [ʔupu] during the closure of [p]. Cross-
 18 splicing was used to avoid asking a native speaker to produce phonotactically illegal forms for
 19 use as stimuli. Intensity was scaled for each stimulus using the 'Scale Intensity' function in Praat
 20 (Boersma & Weenink 2014).
 21

22 4.1.3 Procedure

23 The experiment was conducted partially at the Quechua Indigenous University of Bolivia
 24 (Universidad Indígena Boliviana Quechua) in Chimore, a town in the Cochabamba department
 25 of Bolivia, and partially in a hotel room in the city of Cochabamba. Participants were seated in
 26 front of a MacBook Air with Audio Technica headphones and an Audio Technica 831b lapel mic
 27 connected to a Marantz PMD560 digital recorder, at a sampling rate of 44kHz. Stimuli were
 28 presented aurally, in a unique random order, using the PsyScope X B77 software (Cohen et al.
 29 1993). Each stimulus was presented two times with a 400 ms ISI. The full set of stimuli was
 30 presented twice, for a total of 144 items. The ejective and aspirate items were presented in
 31 separate blocks, balanced for order across participants.


1 Participants were told that the words they would hear would contain sounds that existed in
2 Quechua, but that they had no meaning in Quechua or in any other language, and that they were
3 to repeat what they heard as precisely as possible. The instructions were given orally in Spanish.
4 Participants were allowed to practice for as long as they needed to become comfortable with the
5 task, which took between 3 and 8 trials per participant. The experiment was self-paced, and
6 participants pressed a key to move on to the next trial. The entire experiment took about 10
7 minutes.

8 9 4.1.4 Analysis

10 All responses were transcribed by two phonetically trained transcribers (the author and a
11 graduate student research assistant). 29 tokens were removed because background noise made
12 transcription impossible or because the response was disfluent or differed dramatically from the
13 stimulus. In 76 cases, 5% of the data, the transcribers disagreed as to whether a given stop was
14 ejective or plain. In these cases, the syllable on which the transcribers disagreed was spliced out
15 of the response and presented to a native Quechua speaker to be classified as ejective or plain;
16 the native speaker's judgment was then used as the transcription for that token. Once transcribed,
17 responses were coded for accuracy and type of error. The main error type was de-ejectivization
18 or de-aspiration of the medial stop, e.g., target *[k'up'i] produced as [k'upi], accounting for 97%
19 of all errors. Additional errors (i) modified C₁, e.g., target *[ʔup'u] produced as [hup'u], (ii)
20 changed an ejective to an aspirate or vice-versa, e.g., *[hup^hu] produced as [hup'u] or (iii) de-
21 aspirated both stops, e.g., *[k^hup^hi] produced as [kupi]. Finally, 11 tokens were removed because
22 they contained an error that did not repair the phonotactic violation, e.g, target *[k'up'i]
23 produced as [kup'i], which is also phonotactically illegal.

24 25 4.1.5 Results

26 For both ejectives and aspirates, accuracy on double violations is much lower than control, while
27 accuracy on glottal violations is only slightly lower than control. The results are shown in Figure
28 5.



44 Figure 5: Accuracy on the repetition task, by laryngeal type and stimulus type. Error bars indicate
45 Standard Error Measure.

1 Two Mixed Logit Models were fit to analyze accuracy on the aspirate and ejective stimuli. Each
2 model had a predictor of type with *control* as the baseline, and random intercepts by participant
3 and item and random slopes by participant. The dependent variable was correct/incorrect. For
4 both models, *double* did differ significantly from *control* (aspirate: $\beta = -1.64$, $SE = 0.64$, $z = -$
5 2.57 , $p < 0.02$, ejective: $\beta = -4.14$, $SE = 0.92$, $z = -34.5$, $p < 0.0001$), while *glottal* did not
6 (aspirate: $\beta = -0.71$, $SE = 0.65$, $z = -1.09$, $p = 0.28$, ejective: $\beta = -0.45$, $SE = 1.02$, $z = -0.44$, $p =$
7 0.66).

8 As the control and glottal categories did not differ from one another, these were not subjected
9 to any further analysis. The double category stimuli with ejectives and aspirates were directly
10 compared to one another in a separate Mixed Logit Model, revealing that accuracy is
11 significantly higher on aspirate double violations than on ejective double violations ($\beta = 0.92$, SE
12 $= 0.43$, $z = 2.11$, $p < 0.04$).

14 4.1.6 Discussion

15 The results of the repetition task show evidence of a strong restriction against pairs of ejectives
16 or aspirates, but do not show any evidence of a dispreference for [h]-aspirate or [ʔ]-ejective
17 combinations. The large difference in treatment of double and glottal items in the experiment
18 argues against a unified treatment of these restrictions, suggesting that [sg] and [cg] are not the
19 natural classes over which phonotactic restrictions are stated. Instead, ejectives and aspirates
20 appear to be treated quite differently from their glottal counterparts.

21 These results are not informative about the status of glottal stop in phonological
22 representations. The absence of a difference between control and glottal items with ejectives
23 suggests that the restriction on ejectives in glottal stop/vowel initial roots is very weak. Since
24 control and glottal items with aspirates also do not differ, however, the absence of a control vs.
25 glottal difference for ejectives is not interpretable. It could mean that Quechua has
26 phonologically vowel initial roots, and the restriction $*\#V\dots[cg]$ is weak. Alternatively, Quechua
27 may have phonologically glottal stop initial roots, and the restrictions on laryngeally marked
28 stops and their glottal counterparts are stated differently from, and are weaker than, restrictions
29 on pairs of stops (this is the conclusion from the experiments to follow in Section 4.2).

30 While the results of the repetition task are consistent with the phonotactic restrictions on
31 pairs of ejectives and aspirates in the lexicon, it is possible that participants' performance is due
32 to factors other than their phonotactic grammar. One possibility is that repetition errors are a
33 result of the perceptual similarity of forms with two ejectives or aspirates and forms with a single
34 ejective or aspirate, pairs like [k'up'i]-[k'upi] or [k^hup^hi]-[k^hupi]. Gallagher (2010) found that
35 such pairs of forms were confusable for English speakers, suggesting that this contrast may be
36 perceptually difficult independent of the grammar. It may be that participants' greater accuracy
37 on glottal forms like $*[\up'u]$ and $*[hup^h u]$ relative to double forms like $*[k'up'i]$ and $[k^h up^h i]$ is
38 not due to a weaker grammatical restriction on glottal forms, but rather is due to less perceptual
39 uncertainty about the glottal forms. If true, this explanation still points to a strong distinction
40 between ejective and aspirate stops on the one hand and [sg] and [cg] classes on the other: what
41 is difficult is accurately perceiving multiple ejectives or aspirates, not multiple [sg] or [cg]
42 segments.

4.2 Forced choice acceptability

In addition to the repetition task presented above, a forced choice acceptability task was also conducted to gauge the role of natural classes in the phonotactic grammar. In this task, participants were asked to make a metalinguistic judgment about which of two nonce forms is more wellformed.

A forced choice task was chosen instead of a rating task of individual stimuli because of the difficulty with presenting phonotactically illegal stimuli. When presented with a phonotactically illegal stimulus, listeners are likely to repair the stimulus to something legal. This effect can be seen in the repetition task above, where phonotactically illegal forms with two aspirates or two ejectives are systematically repaired to phonotactically legal forms, e.g., [k'up'i] repaired to [k'upi]. The ABX discrimination task reported in Author (2014) also shows that forms with two ejectives are not perceived veridically by Quechua speakers. The design of the current study addressed the issue of presenting phonotactically illegal stimuli in two ways. First, a minimal pair forced choice design was chosen to attract participants attention to the distinction between an illegal and legal stimulus. When presented with a minimal pair like *[k'amp'i]-[k'ampi], for example, participants attention is directed to the difference between these forms before making their judgment. If participants were instead presented with an illegal form like *[k'amp'i] in isolation, they may repair the stimulus to legal [k'ampi] and then make a judgment about this repaired form.² Second, stimuli were presented orthographically as well as aurally to aid participants in accurately perceiving the distinction between the minimal pairs.

Two forced choice studies were conducted, differing in the segments that contrasted in a minimal pair. Experiment a (Section 4.2.1) was run first, and Experiment b (Section 4.2.2) was run as a follow-up given the results of Experiment a.

4.2.1 Forced choice experiment a

4.2.1.1 Participants

Nineteen native speakers of Quechua from the Cochabamba area of Bolivia completed the experiment. The participants were nine males and ten females, ages 21-37. All participants were fully bilingual in Spanish and had completed a university degree, and all participants completed the repetition task prior to the forced choice task.

4.2.1.2 Materials

The stimuli were pairs of C₁V(C)C₂V nonce words that minimally contrasted an ejective and a plain stop or an aspirate and a plain stop. There were three types of pairs. *Double* pairs contrasted a form with two ejectives or aspirates with a form with one ejective or aspirate, e.g., *[k'up'u] vs. [k'upu] and *[k^hup^hu] vs. [k^hupu]. *Glottal* pairs contrasted a form with a [ʔ]-ejective or [h]-aspirate combination with a [ʔ]-plain or [h]-plain combination, e.g., *[ʔup'u] vs. [ʔupu] and *[haʔp^hu] vs. [haʔpu]. *Control* forms contrasted an ejective or an aspirate with a plain

² In informal pilot studies, this effect was observed. Participants judged illegal forms with two ejectives *[k'up'i] or two aspirates *[k^hup^hi] as wellformed. When questioned about their responses, however, it was revealed that participants were judging a form with just one ejective [k'upi] or aspirate [k^hupi]. Participants often repeated the form to themselves before judging it, repairing the phonotactic violation. When corrected by the experimenter that the form in fact had two ejectives, the participants responded that such a form was impossible to say in Quechua, and that in Quechua it would have to be pronounced with a single ejective.

1 stop in phonotactically legal forms, e.g., [ʎup'i] vs. [ʎupi] and [ʎip^hu] vs. [ʎipu]. There were 12
 2 pairs of each type, for a total of 72 trials, given in Table 5.

	control	double	glottal	
ejective	hap'u - hapu	tʃak'u - tʃaku	ʔatʃ'a - ʔatʃa	
	hitʃ'u - hitʃu	tʃaʎp'u - tʃaʎpu	ʔak'i - ʔaki	
	huk'a - huka	tʃik'u - tʃiku	ʔaʎp'u - ʔaʎpu	
	ʎatʃ'u - ʎatʃu	k'amp'i - k'ampi	ʔamp'a - ʔampa	
	ʎuk'a - ʎuka	k'iʎp'u - k'iʎpu	ʔik'a - ʔika	
	ʎup'i - ʎupi	k'untʃ'a - k'untʃa	ʔik'u - ʔiku	
	ʎak'u - ʎaku	k'up'u - k'upu	ʔiʎp'u - ʔiʎpu	
	ʎutʃ'i - ʎutʃi	p'ach'u - p'achu	ʔintʃ'a - ʔintʃa	
	ʎup'a - ʎupa	p'ik'u - p'iku	ʔutʃ'i - ʔutʃi	
	sap'i - sapi	p'intʃ'a - p'intʃa	ʔuk'i - ʔuki	
	sitʃ'a - sitʃa	p'utʃ'i - p'utʃi	ʔuntʃ'a - ʔuntʃa	
	suk'i - suki	p'uk'i - p'uki	ʔup'u - ʔupu	
	aspirate	ʎatʃ ^h u - ʎatʃu	tʃ ^h ak ^h i - tʃ ^h aki	hatʃ ^h a - hatʃa
		ʎip ^h u - ʎipu	tʃ ^h aʎp ^h u - tʃ ^h aʎpu	hak ^h i - haki
ʎuk ^h a - ʎuka		tʃ ^h ik ^h u - tʃ ^h iku	haʎp ^h u - haʎpu	
ʎak ^h u - ʎaku		k ^h amp ^h i - k ^h ampi	hamp ^h a - hampa	
ʎutʃ ^h i - ʎutʃi		k ^h iʎp ^h u - k ^h iʎpu	hik ^h a - hika	
ʎup ^h a - ʎupa		k ^h untʃ ^h a - k ^h untʃa	hiʎp ^h a - hiʎpa	
sap ^h u - sapu		k ^h up ^h u - k ^h upu	hintʃ ^h i - hintʃi	
sitʃ ^h a - sitʃa		p ^h atʃ ^h u - p ^h atʃu	hink ^h u - hinku	
suk ^h i - suki		p ^h ik ^h u - p ^h iku	hutʃ ^h i - hutʃi	
ʎatʃ ^h i - ʎatʃi		p ^h intʃ ^h a - p ^h intʃa	huk ^h a - huka	
ʎap ^h i - ʎapi		p ^h utʃ ^h i - p ^h utʃi	huntʃ ^h a - huntʃa	
ʎuk ^h i - ʎuki		p ^h uk ^h i - p ^h uki	hup ^h u - hupu	

4
 5 Table 5: Stimulus pairs in forced choice experiment a.

6
 7 As for the repetition task, and all stimuli were cross-spliced and normalized for intensity.

8 In addition to the contrast between phonotactically legal and illegal stimuli in the double and
 9 glottal pairs, all pairs of stimuli differed in phonotactic probability. In medial position, plain
 10 stops are much more frequent (42% of all medial consonants) than ejectives (12%) or aspirates
 11 (5%). Due to this frequency difference, a general preference is expected for stimuli with medial
 12 plain stops. The question, then, is whether this preference is stronger in the double and glottal
 13 pairs, where it is consistent with a phonotactic restriction, than in the control forms, where no
 14 phonotactic restrictions apply to either form.

15
 16 *4.2.1.3 Procedure*


17 The experiment was conducted in a hotel room in the city of Cochabamba. Participants were
 18 seated in front of a MacBook Air with Audio Technica headphones. Stimuli were presented
 19 aurally and orthographically, in a unique random order, using the PsyScope X (B77) software
 20 (Cohen et al. 1993). Ejectives are represented with an apostrophe following the stop, and
 21 aspirates with a <h> following the stop, e.g., [k'ampi] <k'ampi> and [p^hiku] <phiku>. The

1 orthographic representation of the stimulus followed the aural presentation by 50 ms, and there
2 was a 500 ms interval between the two stimuli in a trial. The order in which the words were
3 presented was randomized by participant. For example, the pair *[k'amp'i]-[k'ampi] was
4 presented as *[k'amp'i]-[k'ampi] to some participants and as [k'ampi]-*[k'amp'i] to others. All
5 trials were randomized and presented to participants in a single block.

6 Participants were told that they would hear words that contained sounds from Quechua, but
7 didn't mean anything. The instructions, given orally in Spanish, were to listen to both words and
8 to choose the word that sounded most natural as a word of Quechua. Participants pressed the "1"
9 key to select the first word, on the left side of the screen, and the "0" (marked with a "2" label) to
10 select the second word, on the right side of the screen. Participants practiced with 3-6 trials until
11 they were comfortable with the format of the experiment. The experiment was self-paced and
12 took about 5 minutes.

14 4.2.1.4 Results

15 Responses were coded for whether the stimulus with the plain medial stop was chosen or not. As
16 can be seen in Figure 6, there is a dispreference for stimuli with plain stops in the control and
17 glottal pairs, but a strong preference for stimuli with plain stops in double pairs.



33 Figure 6: Proportion of stimuli with medial plain stops chosen, by trial type. Errors bars indicate
34 Standard Error.

36 A Mixed Logit Model was fit with a ternary predictor of type (with control as the baseline) and a
37 binary predictor of condition (ejective or aspirate) and their interaction. The dependent variable
38 was whether the form with a plain stop was chosen or not. The model had random intercepts by
39 item and participant and random slopes by participant. In the full model, there is a significant
40 interaction between type:double and condition ($\beta = 2.59$, $SE = 0.71$, $z = 3.65$, $p < 0.001$). To
41 determine the source of this interaction, two additional models were fit comparing control pairs
42 and double pairs between the ejective and aspirate conditions. In control pairs, plain stops were
43 chosen significantly less often in the ejective condition than in the aspirate condition ($\beta = -1.20$,
44 $SE = 0.43$, $z = -2.82$, $p < 0.01$); in double pairs, plain stops were chosen significant more often in
45 the ejective condition than in the aspirate condition ($\beta = 1.31$, $SE = 0.38$, $z = 3.43$, $p < 0.001$).
46 The significant interaction term thus indicates a stronger effect of type (control or double) in the
47 ejective condition than the aspirate condition. A third model was fit with a predictor of condition

1 and a binary predictor of type (glottal or control) to assess any differences between glottal and
2 control pairs. This model returned a significant effect of condition, indicating that plain stops
3 were dispreferred in the ejective condition ($\beta = -1.16$, $SE = 0.40$, $z = -2.93$, $p < 0.01$), but no
4 effect of type or interaction between type and condition.

5 6 4.2.1.5 Discussion

7 The forced choice task finds a strong preference for medial ejective and aspirate stops in control
8 and glottal pairs, and a strong dispreference for medial ejective and aspirate stops in double
9 pairs. The preference for ejectives and aspirates in control and glottal pairs is the opposite of
10 what would be expected based on frequency (plain stops are more frequent) and phonotactics
11 (ejectives and aspirates are restricted in glottal forms). This unexpected preference for ejectives
12 and aspirates is likely reflects participants' knowledge that ejectives and aspirates are found in
13 Quechua but not in Spanish, and hence make a word particularly "like Quechua".

14 Despite this overall preference for ejectives and aspirates, a comparison between glottal and
15 double pairs is still informative. Glottal pairs are treated identically to controls, indicating that
16 the phonotactic restriction contributes nothing to participants judgments. For double pairs,
17 however, the phonotactic restriction does seem to contribute and overrides the general preference
18 for ejectives and aspirates. In double pairs, plain stops are preferred, as is expected based on both
19 frequency and phonotactics.

20 The results of the forced choice task, like the repetition task, show strong evidence for a
21 restriction against pairs of ejective or aspirates, but do not show any evidence of a restriction on
22 [h]-aspirate or [ʔ]-ejective combinations. The results again suggest phonotactic restrictions over
23 ejective and aspirate classes, as opposed to [sg] and [cg] classes.

24 The lack of support for restrictions on [h]-aspirate or [ʔ]-ejective combinations could mean
25 that these combinations are not actually restricted in speakers' grammars, or it could be that the
26 two tasks run so far are not sensitive enough to detect a relatively weak restriction. There may be
27 restrictions on [h]-aspirate and [ʔ]-ejective combinations, but these restrictions are not strong
28 enough to cause repetition errors or to override the preference for ejectives and aspirates in the
29 forced choice task. A second forced choice task was run to pursue this possibility by presenting
30 participants with minimal pairs that contrasted [h] and [ʔ], as opposed to an ejective or aspirate
31 and a plain stop, e.g., *[ʔak'i] was compared to [hak'i] and [ʔak^hi] to *[hak^hi].

32 33 4.2.2 Forced choice experiment b

34 4.2.2.1 Participants

35 Nineteen native speakers of Quechua from the Cochabamba area of Bolivia completed the
36 experiment. The participants were six males and thirteen females, ages 20-37. All participants
37 were fully bilingual in Spanish and had completed a university degree. None of the participants
38 had participated in any of the experiments presented so far.

39 40 4.2.2.3 Materials

41 The stimuli were pairs of $C_1V(C)C_2V$ nonce words that minimally contrasted an initial [h] and
42 [ʔ]. There were three types of pairs depending on C_2 . In *aspirate* and *ejective* pairs, C_2 was an
43 aspirate or an ejective and the pair contrasted a legal and an illegal form, e.g., [hak^hi] vs. [ʔak^hi]
44 and [hak'i] vs. [ʔak'i]. In *plain* pairs, C_2 was a plain stop and the pair contrasted two legal forms,
45 e.g., [haki] vs. [ʔaki]. There 10 pairs in each type, shown in Table 6. There were also 30 fillers

1 (contrasting legal forms with ejectives, aspirates and plain stops) for a total of 60 items. All
 2 stimuli were cross-spliced and normalized for intensity.

control	ejective	aspirate
haki - ʔaki	hak'ɪ - ʔak'ɪ	hak ^h ɪ - ʔak ^h ɪ
haɬpu - ʔaɬpu	hamp'a - ʔamp'a	haɬp ^h u - ʔaɬp ^h u
hampa - ʔampa	hatʃ'a - ʔatʃ'a	hamp ^h a - ʔamp ^h a
hatʃa - ʔatʃa	hik'a - ʔik'a	hatʃ ^h a - ʔatʃ ^h a
hika - ʔika	hik'u - ʔik'u	hik ^h a - ʔik ^h a
hiku - ʔiku	hiɬp'u - ʔiɬp'u	hink ^h u - ʔink ^h u
hinku - ʔinku	huk'ɪ - ʔuk'ɪ	hintʃ ^h ɪ - ʔintʃ ^h ɪ
huka - ʔuka	huntʃ'a - ʔuntʃ'a	huk ^h a - ʔuk ^h a
huki - ʔuki	hup'u - ʔup'u	hup ^h u - ʔup ^h u
huntʃa - ʔuntʃa	hutʃ'ɪ - ʔutʃ'ɪ	hutʃ ^h ɪ - ʔutʃ ^h ɪ

4
5 Table 6: Stimulus pairs in forced choice experiment b.

6
7 As in forced choice experiment a, the pairs in experiment b differ in phonotactic probability. If
8 glottal stop initial words are truly glottal stop initial, then they are more frequent (12% of all
9 initial segments) than [h] initial words (6%), and a general preference for [ʔ] initial forms should
10 be observed in the control condition. If instead words may be vowel initial, then [h] and [a] (6%)
11 are equally frequent, and [h] is more frequent than any of the three initial vowels [a] (5.9%), [i]
12 (2%) or [u] (4%), and a general preference for [h] initial forms should be observed in the control
13 condition. In either case, ejective and aspirate pairs can be compared to control forms to assess
14 deviations from the general preference when no phonotactic violation is involved.

15
16 *4.2.2.4 Procedure*

17 The procedure was the same as for forced choice experiment a.

18
19 *4.2.2.5 Results*

20 Responses were coded for whether the stimulus with initial [h] was chosen or not. As can be seen
21 in Figure 7, there is a preference of [h] initial stimuli in across all three types of pairs. This
22 preference is slightly weaker in aspirate pairs than in control pairs, and stronger in ejective pairs,
23 consistent with the phonotactic restrictions.




Figure 7: Proportion of stimuli with initial [h] chosen, by trial type. Errors bars indicate Standard Error.

A Mixed Logit Model was fit with a ternary predictor of type (with control as the baseline) and a dependent variable of whether the [h] initial form was chosen or not. The model had random intercepts by item and participant and random slopes by participant. The model finds that the preference for [h]-initial forms is significantly higher in ejective pairs than in control pairs ($\beta = 0.83$, $SE = 0.28$, $z = 2.97$, $p < 0.01$), but did not differ between aspirate pairs and control pairs.

To understand why the somewhat surprising finding of a significant effect for ejective pairs but not aspirate pairs, the data was explored in some more detail. For aspirate pairs, pairs with medial affricates were found to pattern quite differently from pairs with medial stops, as shown in Figure 8. The preference for [h] initial forms is much weaker for aspirate pairs than control pairs when there is a medial stop, but not when it is a medial affricate.




Figure 8: Proportion of stimuli with initial [h] chosen, by trial type and manner of medial consonant. Errors bars indicate Standard Error.

A second Mixed Logit Model was fit adding a predictor of manner. This model found a significant interaction between aspirate type pairs and manner ($\beta = -1.78$, $SE = 0.57$, $z = -3.14$, $p < 0.01$). Two follow-up models were fit separately for stops and affricates. For stops, [h] initial

1 forms were chosen significantly more often in ejective pairs than in control pairs ($\beta = 0.80$, SE =
2 0.31, $z = 2.54$, $p < 0.02$), and significantly less often in aspirate pairs than in control pairs ($\beta = -$
3 0.84, SE = 0.31, $z = -2.72$, $p < 0.01$). For affricates, [h] initial forms are chosen significantly
4 more often in both ejective ($\beta = 1.03$, SE = 0.43, $z = 2.41$, $p < 0.02$) and aspirate ($\beta = 1.02$, SE =
5 0.40, $z = 2.57$, $p < 0.02$) pairs than in control pairs. It is not entirely clear why stimuli with
6 aspirated affricates would pattern so differently from stimuli with affricated stops, but this
7 pattern may be related to the infrequency of aspirated affricates in medial position (.5% of all
8 medial consonants as opposed to 1.3% for [p^h] and 1.6% for [k^h]).

9 10 4.2.2.6 Discussion

11 The main result of forced choice experiment b is that an effect of a phonotactic restriction on
12 both [ʔ]-ejective and [h]-aspirate combinations was found, unlike in forced choice experiment a
13 or in the repetition task. Participants chose [h] initial forms more often when the alternative was
14 a form with a [ʔ]-ejective pair, e.g., [hakʔi] is chosen over *[ʔakʔi] more often than [haki] is
15 chosen over [ʔaki], and less often when the [h] initial form contained an aspirate, e.g., *[hak^hi] is
16 chosen over [ʔak^hi] less often than [haki] is chosen over [ʔaki]. This effect for [h]-aspirate
17 combinations is only found when for aspirated stops [p^h] or [k^h], as opposed to the affricate [tʃ^h].

18 Restrictions on [h]-aspirate and [ʔ]-ejective forms yielded significant effects in opposite
19 directions; the magnitude of these effects, however, was comparable, as indicated by the β
20 coefficients (for forms with medial stops): 0.80 for ejectives, -0.84 for aspirates. This pattern is
21 consistent with [ʔ] being present phonologically. Contradictorily, then, a preference for [h] initial
22 forms was also found in control pairs ($p < 0.0001$), which is surprising given that [ʔ] initial roots
23 are more frequent than [h] initial roots. More work is needed to determine if a factor other than
24 simple positional frequency could lead speakers to prefer [h] initial forms.

25 26 4.3 Summary

27 The results presented in this section reveal clear effects of restrictions on pairs of aspirate and
28 ejective stops that influence both linguistic performance, in the form of the repetition task, and
29 metalinguistic judgments, in the form of the forced choice task. The results also support
30 restrictions on [h]-aspirate and [ʔ]-ejective pairs, though these effects are found only in one of
31 the two forced choice tasks. This pattern is consistent with strong phonotactic restrictions stated
32 over features that uniquely pick out aspirate and ejective stops, and relatively weaker restrictions
33 on [sg] and [cg], which group aspirates and ejectives with their glottal counterparts.

34 35 36 5 General discussion

37
38 The main finding in this paper is that stronger phonotactic constraints target the classes of
39 aspirate and ejective stops independently from their glottal counterparts. The classes of [sg] and
40 [cg] segments are also supported by one of the three experiments, suggesting relatively weaker
41 restrictions on these classes. Two hypotheses were outlined earlier for how ejectives and
42 aspirates may be represented as distinct from their glottal counterparts, either as a single class
43 picked out by [long VOT], or as independent classes [aspirate] and [ejective]. The experimental
44 results support the second hypothesis with two distinct class [aspirate] and [ejective] because
45 aspirates and ejectives were treated differently on both the repetition task and the forced choice

1 task. In both cases, a restriction on pairs of ejectives had a significantly stronger effect on
 2 participants' performance than a restriction on pairs of aspirates; this difference is unexpected if
 3 ejectives and aspirates make up a single natural class.

4 The presence of the smaller classes of aspirates and ejectives in addition to the larger classes
 5 [sg] and [cg] may arise because they refer to more phonetically salient properties of the relevant
 6 segments. Both ejectives and aspirates have a long voice onset time (VOT), and ejectives
 7 additionally have a high amplitude burst. The varied acoustic profile of ejective and aspirate
 8 stops – a closure, burst and VOT portion – gives ejective and aspirate stops a high degree of
 9 distinctness in amplitude and spectral properties relative to surrounding sounds, increasing their
 10 perceptual salience (Ohala & Kawasaki-Fukimori 1997; Henke et al. 2012). Articulatorily,
 11 ejectives and aspirates differ from their glottal counterparts in involving the coordination of both
 12 an oral and a laryngeal gesture. Coordination of multiple gestures, and the acoustic consequences
 13 of varying coordination, has been argued to be a core property of the representation of
 14 laryngeally marked stops (Kingston 1990; Steriade 1997) and a main contributor to articulatory
 15 complexity (Goldstein et al. 2007).

16 The importance of different types of phonetic similarity in determining natural classes and
 17 the strength of phonotactic restrictions on those classes could be tested through work with other
 18 languages whose phonologies target phonetically disparate classes. In Hausa, for example,
 19 mentioned earlier in Section 2, a cooccurrence restriction targets the series of [cg] segments,
 20 which includes ejectives, implosives and [ʔ]. Based on the data here, it would be expected that
 21 Hausa speakers would treat pairs of ejectives as more illformed than ejective-implosive or [ʔ]-
 22 ejective pairs. If this is not the case, additional, specific properties of the phonetics or phonology
 23 of Quechua may be responsible for the importance of [aspirate] and [ejective] classes.

24 Given the classes [aspirate] and [ejective], speakers' behavior on the experiment tasks may
 25 be seen to reflect a phonotactic grammar like that in Table 7. OCP constraints target the features
 26 [aspirate] ([asp]) and [ejective] ([ej]), penalizing pairs of aspirates and pairs of ejectives. OCP
 27 constraints also target [sg] and [cg] classes, penalizing pairs of aspirates and pairs of ejectives as
 28 well as [h]-aspirate and [ʔ]-ejective pairs. The stronger and more persistent effect of constraints
 29 on [ej] and [asp] on participants' behavior is indicated here with a solid line, representing a
 30 higher weighting of these constraints in the phonotactic grammar.

	*[ej][ej]	*[asp][asp]	*[cg][cg]	*[sg][sg]
*[k'up'i]	*		*	
*[k ^h up ^h i]		*		*
*[ʔup'i]			*	
*[hup ^h i]				*

32
 33 Table 7: Constraint violations for stimulus types include in the experiments.

34
 35 To account for the full range of unattested consonant combinations in Quechua, additional
 36 constraints are necessary that rule out medial ejectives and aspirates in roots with initial plain
 37 stops (*[kup'i], *[kup^hi]) or combinations of ejectives and aspirates within a root (*[k'up^hi],
 38 *[k^hup'i]). These illformed combinations can be ruled out with two additional constraints that
 39 penalize a stop followed by an ejective or aspirate later in the root: *[-cont, -son][aspirate] and
 40 *[-cont, -son][ejective]. These constraints will also penalize pairs of two ejectives or two
 41 aspirates, duplicating the work of *[ej][ej] and *[asp][asp]. The argument that both sets of

1 constraints are necessary comes from previous studies comparing forms with two ejectives and
 2 forms with a plain stop-ejective pair, e.g., *[k'ap'u] and *[kap'u] (Author 2013). Forms with two
 3 ejectives were subject to a greater repair rate than forms with a plain stop ejective combination,
 4 suggesting that the grammar penalizes ejective pairs more heavily. This result argues in favor of
 5 a strong OCP restriction penalizing ejective-ejective pairs, in addition to the violations incurred
 6 for *[-cont, -son][ej]. The full phonotactic grammar for laryngeal features is shown in Table 8.
 7 Wellformed combinations of [ʔ]-aspirate or [h]-ejective do not violate any constraints, as these
 8 pairs of segments do not fall into a natural class.³

	*[ej][ej]	*[asp][asp]	*[-cont, -son][ej]	*[-cont, -son][asp]	*[cg][cg]	*[sg][sg]
*[k'up'i]	*		*		*	
*[k ^h up ^h i]		*		*		*
*[ʔup'i]					*	
*[hup ^h i]						*
*[kup'i]			*			
*[k ^h up'i]			*			
*[kup ^h i]				*		
*[k'up ^h i]				*		
[ʔup ^h i]						
[hup'i]						

10 Table 8: Constraint violations of all unattested forms with a laryngeally marked segment, as well
 11 as attested combinations of [ʔ]-aspirate and [h]-ejective.

12
 13
 14 With this set of constraints, forms with two ejectives or two aspirates violate both sets of OCP
 15 constraints as well as the constraints on ejectives and aspirates following any kind of stop. In
 16 models of gradient wellformedness, grammaticality is correlated with both the number of
 17 violations incurred and the weighting or ranking of the violated constraints (Coetzee & Pater
 18 2008; Hayes & Wilson 2008). The multiple constraint violations incurred by pairs of ejectives
 19 and pairs of aspirates also contribute to the illformedness of these forms, though the
 20 experimental results suggest that *[cg][cg] and *[sg][sg] may not be strong enough to have an
 21 impact on all tasks.

22 23 24 **6 Conclusion**

25
 26 This paper has shown that phonotactic restrictions in Quechua target aspirate and ejective stops
 27 to the exclusion of their glottal counterparts, supporting the natural classes [aspirate] and
 28 [ejective] in addition to [sg] and [cg]. While the laryngeal phonotactics of Quechua can be
 29 described with constraints on [sg] and [cg] alone (Parker & Weber 1996; MacEachern 1999;
 30 Mackenzie 2013), Quechua speakers' experimental behavior reflects restrictions on aspirate and
 31 ejective stops specifically, and only weakly shows evidence for restrictions on the [sg] and [cg]
 32 classes. It is proposed that the particularly salient acoustic properties of aspirate and ejective

³ The assumption here is that [ʔ] is not truly a stop (Garellek 2014).

1 stops relative to their glottal counterparts is responsible for the use of these classes in the
2 phonological grammar.

3 While the results here provide support for the activity of aspirate and ejective classes, the
4 results also reflect restrictions on [sg] and [cg]. Roots with [h]-aspirate and [ʔ]-ejective
5 combinations are unattested, and a dispreference for roots with these combinations is found on
6 one of the three behavioral tasks. Indeed, it would be quite surprising if Quechua speakers' had
7 no representation of this restriction, as much previous work has found evidence for speaker
8 knowledge of very fine grained phonotactic patterns (Vitevitch & Luce 1999; Bailey & Hahn
9 2001; Kessler & Treiman 1997; Frisch et al. 2001; Vitevitch & Luce 2005; Daland et al. 2011).
10 The repetition task and forced choice experiment may have found no effect of restrictions on [sg]
11 and [cg] because the restriction is relatively weak and doesn't cause the same perceptual and
12 production difficulties that restrictions on aspirates and ejectives do. Alternatively, it may be that
13 these restrictions only show up on specific tasks because they are represented differently than
14 restrictions on aspirates and ejectives. If the dispreference for [h]-aspirate and [ʔ]-ejective
15 combinations is due to a relatively weak phonotactic restriction on [sg] and [cg], then these
16 structures should be treated as more illformed than other non-existent structures that would
17 traditionally be analyzed as accidental gaps, e.g., there are no [j]-ejective combinations in
18 Quechua, [ɲ]-[p^h] is an unattested onset combination, etc. Future work will aim to further
19 understand the role of the [sg] and [cg] natural classes in Quechua by exploring these
20 comparisons.

23 References

- 24 Adelaar, William with Pieter Muysken. 2004. *The languages of the Andes*. Cambridge:
25 Cambridge University Press.
26 Author 2013.
27 Author 2014.
28 Bailey, Todd and Ulrike Hahn. 2001. Determinants of word likeness: phonotactics or lexical
29 neighborhoods? *Journal of Memory and Language* 44:568-591.
30 Bates, Doug, M. Maechler, B. Bolker and S. Walker. 2014. *lme4: Linear mixed-effects models*
31 *using Eigen and S4*. R package version 1.1-7, <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lme4>.
32 Becker, Michael, Nihan Ketzrez and Andrew Nevins. 2011. The surfeit of the stimulus: Analytic
33 biases filter lexical statistics in Turkish laryngeal alternations. *Language* 87: 84-125.
34 Becker, Michael, Andrew Nevins and Jonathan Levine. 2012. Asymmetries in generalizing
35 alternations to and from initial syllables. *Language* 88:231-268.
36 Bills, Garland and Rudolph C Troike; Bernardo Vallejo. 1971. *An Introduction to Spoken*
37 *Bolivian Quechua*. Austin:University of Texas Press.
38 Blevins, Juliette. 2004. *Evolutionary Phonology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
39 Boersma, Paul and David Weenink. 2014. Praat: doing phonetics by computer. Version 5.3.34,
40 available at www.praat.org.
41 Carenko, E.I. [1972] 1975. Identity and featural correspondence: the Athapaskan case. In Kiyomi
42 Kusumoto ed. *Proceedings of the North East Linguistics Society* 27, 93-101. Amherst, MA:
43 GLSA.
44 Chomsky, Noam & Morris Halle. 1968. *The Sound Pattern of English*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
45 Coetzee, Andries and Joe Pater. 2008. Weighted constraints and gradient restrictions on place co-
46 occurrence in Muna and Arabic. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 26:289-337.

- 1 Cohen, J.D., B. MacWhinney, M. Flatt and J. Provost. 1993. PsyScope: A new graphic
2 interactive environment for designing psychology experiments. *Behavior Research Methods,*
3 *Instruments and Computers* 25(2): 257-271.
- 4 Cusihuamán, Antonio. 1976. *Diccionario Quechua: Cuzco-Collao*. Lima: Ministerio de
5 Educación and Instituto de Estudios Peruanos.
- 6 Daland, Robert, Bruce Hayes, James White, Marc Garellek, Andrea Davis & Ingrid Norrman.
7 2011. Explaining sonority projection effects. *Phonology* 28:197-234.
- 8 Davidson, Lisa. 2010. Phonetic bases of similarities in cross-language production: Evidence
9 from English and Catalan. *Journal of Phonetics* 38:272-288.
- 10 Davidson, Lisa & Danny Erker. 2014. Hiatus resolution in American English: The case against
11 glide insertion. *Language* 90(2): 482-514.
- 12 Dilley, Laura, Stefanie Shattuck-Hufnagel and Mari Ostendorf. 1996. Glottalization of word-
13 initial vowels as a function of prosodic structure. *Journal of Phonetics* 24:423-444.
- 14 Flemming, Edward. 1995. Auditory representations in phonology. Doctoral Dissertation,
15 University of California, Los Angeles.
- 16 Frisch, Stefan, Nathan Large and David Pisoni. 2001. Perception of wordlikeness: effects of
17 segment probability and length on the processing of nonwords. *Journal of Memory and*
18 *Language* 42:481-496.
- 19 Gallagher, Gillian and Jessica Coon. 2009. Distinguishing total and partial identity: evidence
20 from Chol. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 27: 545-582.
- 21 Gallagher, Gillian. 2010. Perceptual distinctness and long-distance laryngeal restrictions.
22 *Phonology* 27:435-480.
- 23 Gallagher, Gillian. 2011. Auditory features in Phonology – The case for [long VOT]. *The*
24 *Linguistic Review* 28:281-313.
- 25 Garellek, Marc. 2012. The timing and sequencing of coarticulated non-modal phonation in
26 English and White Hmong. *Journal of Phonetics* 40:152-161.
- 27 Garellek, Marc. 2013. Production and perception of glottal stops. Doctoral dissertation,
28 University of California, Los Angeles.
- 29 Garellek, Marc. 2014. Voice quality strengthening and glottalization. *Journal of Phonetics*
30 45(1):106-113.
- 31 Gelman, Andrew & Jennifer Hill. 2006. Data analysis using regression and
32 multilevel/hierarchical models. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 33 Goldsmith, John. 1976. *Autosegmental Phonology*. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts
34 Institute of Technology.
- 35 Goldstein, Louis, Marianne Pouplier, Larissa Chen, Elliot Saltzman and Dani Byrd. 2007.
36 Dynamic action units slip in speech production errors. *Cognition* 103:386-412.
- 37 Hayes, Bruce, Robert Kirchner & Donca Steriade. 2004. *Phonetically based phonology*.
38 Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 39 Hayes, Bruce and Colin Wilson. 2008. A maximum entropy model of phonotactics and
40 phonotactic learning. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39:379-440.
- 41 Hayes, Bruce, Peter Siptar, Kie Zuraw and Zsuzsa Cziráký Londe. 2009. Natural and unnatural
42 constraints in Hungarian vowel harmony. *Language* 85:822-863.
- 43 Hayes, Bruce and James White. 2013. Phonological naturalness and phonotactic learning.
44 *Linguistic Inquiry* 44: 45-75.
- 45 Henke, Eric, Ellen Kaisse & Richard Wright. 2012. Is the Sonority Sequencing Principle an
46 epiphenomenon? In Steve Parker, ed., *The Sonority Controversy*, 65-100. Berlin: DeGruyter.
- 47 Howe, Darin and Douglas Pulleyblank. 2001. Patterns and timing of glottalization. *Phonology*
48 18: 45-80.

- 1 Jakobson, Roman, Gunnar Fant & Morris Halle. 1952. Preliminaries to speech analysis: The
2 distinctive features and their correlates. *Acoustics Laboratory, Massachusetts Institute of*
3 *Technology, Technical Report 13.*
- 4 Kessler, Brett and Rebecca Treiman. 1997. Syllable structure and the distribution of phonemes in
5 English syllables. *Journal of Memory and Language 37*: 295-311.
- 6 Kingston, John. 1990. Articulatory binding. In John Kingston and Mary Beckman, eds., *Papers*
7 *in Laboratory Phonology I: Between the grammar and physics of speech*, 406-434.
8 Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- 9 Laime Ajacopa, Teofilo. 2007. *Diccionario Bilingüe, Iskay Simipi Yuyayk'ancha: Quechua –*
10 *Castellano Castellano –Quechua*. La Paz, Bolivia.
- 11 Leben, W. 1973. Suprasegmental Phonology. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of
12 Technology.
- 13 Lewis, M. Paul, Gary F. Simons & Charles D. Fennig (eds.). 2014. *Ethnologue: Languages of*
14 *the World, 17th edition*. Dallas, TX: SIL International. Online at www.ethnologue.com.
- 15 Lindau, Mona. 1984. Phonetic differences in glottalic consonants. *Journal of Phonetics 12*: 147-
16 155.
- 17 Lloret, Maria-Rosa. 1995. The representation of glottals in Oromo. *Phonology 12*(2):257-280.
- 18 MacEachern, Margaret. 1999. *Laryngeal co-occurrence restrictions*. New York: Garland.
- 19 Mackenzie, Sara. 2013. Laryngeal co-occurrence restrictions in Aymara: contrastive
20 representations and constraint interaction. *Phonology 30*(2): 297-345.
- 21 Mannheim, Bruce. 1991. *The language of the Inka since the European invasion*. Austin, TX:
22 University of Texas Press.
- 23 McCarthy, John. 1988. Feature geometry and dependency: A review. *Phonetica 43*: 84-108.
- 24 Mielke, Jeff. 2008. *The emergence of distinctive features*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 25 Mompeán, J. & F. A. Gómez. 2011. Hiatus resolution strategies in non-rhotic English: The case
26 of /r/-liaison. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Phonetic Sciences*, 1414-
27 1417. Hong Kong.
- 28 Moreton, Elliott & Joe Pater. 2012. Structurally biased phonology: Complexity in learning and
29 typology. In K.G. Vijayakrishnan (ed.) *Journal of the English and Foreign Languages*
30 *University Special Issue*, 1-44. Hyderabad.
- 31 Moreton, Elliott. 2008. Analytic bias and phonological typology. *Phonology 25*:83-127.
- 32 Moreton, Elliott. 2012. Inter- and intra-dimensional dependencies in implicit phonotactic
33 learning. *Journal of Memory and Language 67*(1):165-183.
- 34 Ohala, John & Haruko Kawasaki-Fukimori. 1997. Alternatives to the sonority hierarchy for
35 explaining segmental sequential constraints. In Stig Eliasson & Ernst Hakon Jahr, eds.,
36 *Language and its ecology: Essays in memory of Einar Haugen. Trends in Linguistics, Studies*
37 *and Monographs 100*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- 38 Orr, Carolyn and Robert E. Longacre. 1968. Proto-Quechumaran. *Language 44*:528-554.
- 39 Parker, Steve and David Weber. 1996. Glottalized and aspirated stops in Cuzco Quechua.
40 *International Journal of American Linguistics 62*:70-85.
- 41 Pierrehumbert, Janet and David Talkin. 1991. Lenition of /h/ and glottal stop. In G. Docherty and
42 D. Ladd, eds. *Papers in Laboratory Phonology II*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 43 Pierrehumbert, Janet. 1995. Prosodic effects on glottal allophones. In O Fujimura and M Hirano,
44 eds., *Vocal fold physiology*, 39-60. San Diego: Singular Publishing Group.
- 45 Redi, Laura & Stefanie Shattuck-Hufnagel. 2001. Variation in the realization of glottalization in
46 normal speakers. *Journal of Phonetics 29*:407-429.

- 1 Rowe, J.H. 1950. Sound patterns in three Inca dialects. *International Journal of American*
2 *Linguistics* 16:137-248.
- 3 Saffran, Jenny and Erik Thiessen. 2003. Pattern induction by infant language learners.
4 *Developmental Psychology* 39(3): 484-494.
- 5 Shaw, Jason and Lisa Davidson. 2011. Perceptual similarity in input-output mappings: A
6 computational/experimental study of non-native speech production. *Lingua* 121:1344-1358.
- 7 Steriade, Donca. 1997. Phonetics in phonology: the case of laryngeal neutralization. Ms. UCLA.
- 8 Stevens, Kenneth. 2000. *Acoustic phonetics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- 9 Suzuki, Keiichiro. 1998. A typological investigation of dissimilation. Doctoral dissertation,
10 University of Arizona, Tucson.
- 11 Torero, Alfredo. 1964. Los dialectos Quechuas [The dialects of Quechua]. *Anales Científicos de*
12 *la Universidad Agraria* 2:446-478.
- 13 Umeda, N. 1978. Occurrence of glottal stops in fluent speech. *Journal of the Acoustical Society*
14 *of America* 64(1):88-94.
- 15 Ussishkin, Adam and Andrew Wedel. 2003. Gestural motor programs and the nature of
16 phonotactic restrictions: Evidence from loanword phonology. In M. Tsujimura and G.
17 Garding, eds., *WCCFL 22 Proceedings*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.
- 18 Vitevitch, Michael and Paul Luce. 1999. Probabilistic phonotactics and neighborhood activation
19 in spoken word recognition. *Journal of Memory and Language* 40: 374-408.
- 20 Vitevitch, Michael and Paul Luce. 2005. Increases in phonotactic probability facilitate spoken
21 nonword repetition. *Journal of Memory and Language* 52(2): 193–204.
- 22 Wilson, Colin, Lisa Davidson and Sean Martin. 2015. Effects of acoustic-phonetic detail on
23 cross-language speech production. *Journal of Memory and Language* 77:1-24.