

# Comparing cross-language phonological profiles

George Moroz

Linguistic Convergence Laboratory (HSE University)

November 9, 2021



presentation is available here: [tinyurl.com/yj2tacek](https://tinyurl.com/yj2tacek)

## How I decided to give this talk?

- During the talk in our Lab with Misha and Ezequiel

**Jeff Good:** How you came up with the idea of calculating phonological distances? Is it some established procedure?

**Me:** No, we thought that it is the most obvious step...

# How I decided to give this talk?

- During the talk in our Lab with Misha and Ezequiel

**Jeff Good:** How you came up with the idea of calculating phonological distances? Is it some established procedure?

**Me:** No, we thought that it is the most obvious step...

- The second reason:



**Johann-Mattis List**

@LinguList



New preprint with Cormac Anderson, [@tresoldi](#), [@xrotwang](#), [@SimonJGreenhill](#), and Russell Gray: "Measuring Variation in Phoneme Inventories" [doi.org/10.21203/rs.3...](https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3...)



## Measuring variation in phoneme inventories

For over a century, the phoneme has played a central role in linguistic research. In recent years, collections of phoneme inventories, originally designed for cross-researchsquare.com

# Overview

Materials for the analysis

Criticism by [Simpson 1999]

Complexity based approaches

Distance based approaches

# Materials for the analysis

Materials for the analysis can be different:

- segment<sup>1</sup> inventory (and grammar, if you are lucky);
- dictionaries;
- parallel corpora;
- unparalleled corpora.

---

<sup>1</sup>Lets leave the phonology vs. phonetics debate aside.

# Overview

Materials for the analysis

Criticism by [Simpson 1999]

Complexity based approaches

Distance based approaches

# Criticism by [Simpson 1999]

[Simpson 1999] attacks UPSID<sup>1</sup>-like researches:

- phoneme masks allophones
  - Standard High German /ç/ stands for [ç], [x] and [χ];
  - “The allophone no longer represents the phoneme, it *replaces* it”;
- phonological relations between segments is lost
  - comparing just vowel inventories it is impossible to get information about e. g. vowel harmony;
- there is no non-arbitrary way of assign phonological features (e. g. SPE [Chomsky and Halle 1968]) to segments.

---

<sup>1</sup>UPSID stands for UCLA Phonological Segment Inventory Database [Maddieson and Abramson 1987] which consists of the phonemic systems of a representative sample of 451 (this number changes from publication to publication) of the world's languages in machine-readable form. Now UPSID can be accessed via PHOIBLE database [Moran and McCloy 2019].

# Overview

Materials for the analysis

Criticism by [Simpson 1999]

Complexity based approaches

Distance based approaches



[Pellegrino et al. 2009]



[Pellegrino et al. 2009]

- [Pellegrino et al. 2009]
  - [Chitoran and Cohn 2009]
  - [Ohala 2009]
  - [Maddieson 2009]
  - [Coupé et al. 2009]
- criticism of the complexity approach [Deutscher 2009]

# Overview

Materials for the analysis

Criticism by [Simpson 1999]

Complexity based approaches

Distance based approaches

# Distance based approaches

- [[Hoppenbrouwers and Hoppenbrouwers 2001](#)] (after [[Heeringa 2004](#)])
- [[Heeringa 2004](#)]
- [[Eden 2018](#)] — Hamming distance
- [[Anderson et al. 2021](#)] — Jaccard similarity

Thank you for your attention!

## References

- Anderson, C., Tresoldi, T., Greenhill, S. J., Forkel, R., Gray, R. D., and List, J.-M. (2021). Measuring variation in phoneme inventories (preprint v1). *Research Square*.
- Chitoran, I. and Cohn, A. C. (2009). Complexity in phonetics and phonology: gradience, categoriality, and naturalness. In *Approaches to phonological complexity*, pages 19–46. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Chomsky, N. and Halle, M. (1968). *The sound pattern of English*. Harper and Row.
- Coupé, C., Marsico, E., and Pellegrino, F. (2009). Structural complexity of phonological systems. In *Approaches to phonological complexity*, pages 141–170. De Gruyter Mouton.

## References

- Deutscher, G. (2009). "overall complexity": a wild goose chase? In *Language complexity as an evolving variable*, pages 243–252. Oxford University Press.
- Eden, S. E. (2018). *Measuring phonological distance between languages*. PhD thesis, University College London.
- Heeringa, W. J. (2004). *Measuring dialect pronunciation differences using Levenshtein distance*. PhD thesis, University Library Groningen][Host].
- Hoppenbrouwers, C. A. J. and Hoppenbrouwers, G. A. (2001). *De indeling van de Nederlandse streektaalen: dialecten van 156 steden en dorpen geklasseerd volgens de FFM*. Uitgeverij Van Gorcum.
- Maddieson, I. (2009). Calculating phonological complexity. In *Approaches to phonological complexity*, pages 83–110. De Gruyter Mouton.

## References

- Maddieson, I. and Abramson, A. S. (1987). Patterns of Sounds. *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, 82(S1):720–721.
- Moran, S. and McCloy, D., editors (2019). *PHOIBLE 2.0*. Max Planck Institute for the Science of Human History, Jena.
- Ohala, J. J. (2009). Languages' sound inventories: the devil in the details. In *Approaches to phonological complexity*, pages 47–58. De Gruyter Mouton.
- Pellegrino, F., Marsico, E., Chitoran, I., and Coupé, C. (2009). *Approaches to phonological complexity*, volume 16. Walter de Gruyter.
- Simpson, A. P. (1999). Fundamental problems in comparative phonetics and phonology: does UPSID help to solve them. In *Proceedings of the 14th international congress of phonetic sciences*, volume 1, pages 349–352.