

TRANSCRIPTION POLICY FOLLOWED IN THIS DATABASE

Note: This explanation of transcription policy does **NOT** apply to the **CHIPAYA** data in this database. Please see the separate section in the Reference Forms document on the Status of Chipaya Data.

PURPOSE OF THESE TRANSCRIPTIONS

The transcriptions here are **NOT** close phonetic transcriptions: those will be completed at a later stage of this research. For the moment our transcriptions are simply intended to support our comparisons between Andean language varieties in their *lexical semantics*, to help identify which words are correlate with which. Nonetheless, we also intend to provide here at least an indication of the *major phonological and phonetic differences between varieties of the Andean languages*, while work continues on finalising our more precise phonetic transcriptions.

There may be certain inconsistencies in transcriptions from one word to another in varieties where there is variation in the pronunciation of a given sound, often due to a sound change in progress and also common in highly endangered varieties. Thus far we have not completed cross-checking for these inconsistencies.

We therefore do not put these forward as reference transcriptions suitable for research to any great phonetic precision. Rather, we invite and would be most grateful for any comments and corrections to our transcriptions.

PHONETIC DIFFERENCES WE **DO** AIM TO TRANSCRIBE

We aim to transcribe any phonetic differences that reflect differences in the **PHONOLOGICAL STATUS** of given phones between different varieties.

e.g. in Ecuadoran Quechua, Proto-Quechua */q/ has merged with */k/, and both are now realised as [k], which is how we transcribe them.

This also includes individual cases where two phonemes exist in a language, and allophonic changes in certain phonological contexts have led to a sound being analysed as 'switching allegiance' from the original proto-language phoneme to the other:

e.g. in many varieties of Quechua, including Cuzco, while Proto-Quechua */m/ is generally maintained, it has merged with */n/ in certain contexts, such as word finally */qam/ > /qan/ *you* (sg), or before an alveolar */kimsa/ > /kinsa/ *three*. We do transcribe these as [n] in Cuzco Quechua.

We also aim to take the level of phonetic detail of our transcription to that of *all MAJOR ALLOPHONES that reflect significant differences between varieties of the Andean languages*.

This includes cases where different varieties retain the same Proto-Quechua phoneme, but the main (default, or 'elsewhere condition') allophone is phonetically markedly different:

e.g. in a number of Quechua varieties (particularly Ecuador and northern Peru), Proto-Quechua */k/ is now pronounced as [ʒ] (IPA [ʒ]) in its main allophone, which we duly transcribe.

This also includes cases where different varieties retain the same Proto-Quechua phoneme with the same main allophone, but markedly different allophones in other important contexts:

e.g. in most southern Quechua varieties, Proto-Quechua stops are fricativised in syllable-final position, such as */q/ now realised as [χ], which we duly transcribe.

ALLOPHONIC DETAIL **NOT** COVERED HERE

What this policy of transcribing all major allophones does **NOT** cover is cases where the variation in the distribution of those allophones is not a clear-cut marker of significant differences between varieties of the Andean languages, or in some cases, is simply an issue of phonetic detail in which standardising analysis across all varieties requires very detailed phonetic research. We have therefore left these issues until our more detailed look into the comparative phonetics of these varieties in due course.

An example is given by the major allophones of the */n/ phoneme. Before velars, this is generally realised as [ŋ], and before uvulars as [N], but so far we do not know of significant differences between varieties in this, and do not attempt to transcribe them. There are differences in realisations of /n/ much more widely as [ŋ] rather than [n] in many other contexts (including word finally), particularly in southern Quechua, though this is a detail we will transcribe only in our more detailed phonetic transcriptions to come. Another example is raising of [a] to [æ] in certain contexts, particularly in the sequence */ay/ (IPA [aj]) after /k/ or /č/ (IPA [tʃ]), as in the demonstrative *that* <chay>. This seems a widespread phenomenon in Quechua varieties, though perhaps particularly southern Quechua. Where many central varieties have changed all */ay/ sequences to /e:/, this is a very significant phonemic rather than purely allophonic change, which we do of course transcribe, as per our principles above. See below for more details.

Also, we transcribe citation forms pronounced in isolation rather than in connected speech. The main impact this has had is in our transcription of varieties which exhibit vowel elision in certain contexts (particularly word finally). This is strongest in Chachapoyas, which is not yet included in our survey, but also present in Cañaris (Ferreñafe) Quechua, our variety of Incahuasi, though does not occur to any great extent in our citation forms, so our transcriptions here generally include all vowels in the 'full pronunciation'. See Cerrón-Palomino (2003: 182) for a brief account and further references.

TRANSCRIPTION OF VOWELS: OPEN ALLOPHONES OF /i/ AND /u/

In these transcriptions we have not attempted to transcribe variants of the Quechua and Aymara **VOWEL PHONEMES**: the low vowel /a/, and most significantly the high vowels /i/ and /u/. Other than in Ecuador, most Andean language varieties have a range of increasingly open realisations of these as [ɪ], [e], [ɛ]; and [ʊ], [o], [ɔ]. The main conditioning context for such opening is proximity to a uvular consonant, whether as the original stop [q], or fricativised as [χ] in some contexts in many varieties. In

Ecuador this */q/ has merged with */k/ and is consistently realised only as [k], hence the absence of the open vowel allophones in these varieties.

The precise degree of opening is determined by complex phonological contexts which we have not yet been able to analyse for all the varieties we cover. Moreover, in almost varieties we observed a striking degree of freedom in realisation of vowel allophones in most contexts – disconcertingly so by comparison with European languages. For both of these reasons, we have chosen not to attempt to cover transcribe these vowel allophones at this stage, in order to avoid inconsistencies between our representations of different varieties.

At this point, we limit ourselves to pointing out these very general tendencies:

- word finally there is a slight opening effect in almost all dialects;
- indeed, for many analysts even the main default allophone of the high vowels is taken to be slightly more open than Spanish [i] and [u];
- this tendency is clearest in Cajamarca and Cañaris Quechua, where the main default allophone clearly appears to be not close [i] and [u] but a more open [ɪ] and [ʊ] (see the analyses by Taylor);
- in southern varieties with ejective stops, it appears in our fieldwork that there may be to be some opening influence in the context of ejectives, a question we hope to look into more closely once we have completed transcriptions of our fieldwork recordings;
- there also appears to be a significant difference between Kawki (Cachuy) and Jaqaru (Tupe) in that the former typically has more open realisations of high vowels than the latter – though this may be more down to ideolectal differences between our informants, and remains to be confirmed.

TRANSCRIPTION OF VOWELS: PHONEMIC (?) /e/ AND /o/, AND VOWEL LENGTH

The only cases in which we **DO** use [e] and [o] mid vowel symbols in these transcriptions is in those varieties in which these sounds do clearly have a different phonological status, rather than just as simple allophones of /i/ and /u/ as in most varieties. This occurs in some central Quechua varieties, where the mid vowels are derived from original sequences of /a/ + semivowel (or stressed vowels in Spanish loanwords), by historical processes of [ay] > [e:] and [aw] > [o:]. In most cases, these vowels are long, so are transcribed with the usual **LENGTH** marker : (IPA [ː]), though sometimes in citation form they are pronounced without particular length, as is normal in some varieties before a pause.

We also use the usual length marker : to transcribe long vowels in Aymara. For Jaqaru, for now for practical purposes we follow Cerrón-Palomino's analysis of Jaqaru, seeing the length contrast in terms of unmarked normal *vs.* marked long vowels, rather than Hardman's analysis of unmarked normal *vs.* marked short vowels.

ALTERNATIVE PRONUNCIATIONS AND POTENTIAL INCONSISTENCIES

Many of the varieties on which carried out our fieldwork seem to be still in the midst of the process of phonetic changes that have not been fully completed, such that different informants, and sometimes the same informant in different utterances, produced different realisations of the same phoneme in the same phonological context. This is already clear from analysis of some of our fieldwork recordings, but since our detailed phonetic transcriptions and analyses of these varieties are not yet complete, there may well be some inconsistencies in our transcriptions for particular sounds in particular varieties.

Where in the same language variety we came across clear variation in phonetic realisations of a form by our informants, we give both alternative pronunciations, as we indicate by separating them with a comma in our transcriptions, e.g. for the word *five*, for some varieties our transcription is given as: **pičxa, pičqa**; for *nine* **hisγ'un, isγun**; for *ear* **ninri, rinri**.

Where variation in phonetic realisations was simply in the presence of absence of a certain sound, we give only one transcription, with the sound in question in brackets. Examples include a more or less clear epenthetic schwa inserted between consonants, which we have transcribed as a schwa in brackets, as in pronunciations such as **pič(ə)γa** for *five*, and **qaq(ə)la** for *face*.

We have already pointed out the scope for enormous variance in realisations of vowel phonemes, as part of our reason for not attempting to transcribe them at this stage. For the allophonic variation that we do attempt to cover, inconsistency in our current transcriptions is most likely with the following sound contrasts:

- velar [x] vs. uvular [χ] vs. 'glottal' [h] voiceless fricatives
- voiced and voiceless uvular stops and fricatives
- realisations of Proto-Quechua /r/ and /ʎ/
- realisations of Proto-Quechua /ʃ/ and /ʂ/.

Where we came across forms we found surprising and questionable, which we intend to confirm if possible, we have indicated this with a question mark. We surround the question mark by spaces to ensure no confusion with the glottal stop symbol, not yet required for the varieties currently included but which will be when extended to varieties like Junín Quechua.

POLICY ON PHONETIC SYMBOLS AND PRACTICAL ORTHOGRAPHIC FORMS

We offer our transcriptions here only for the purposes of comparison between different varieties of Andean languages. This, and the practicalities of avoiding the need for phonetic fonts rather than the standard Windows Unicode characters, is why we have chosen not to use IPA symbols, though those will be provided for our later close phonetic transcriptions. Instead we have used the more practical set of symbols listed in the Table that can also be downloaded from our website, to keep as closely as possible to the what on might call the *Andean Consensus Phonetic Symbols*.

Importantly, we do **NOT** put forward any of the symbols we use as orthographic ones for writing Quechua for general purposes. We do greatly support the harmonisation of practical spellings across all varieties of Andean languages, as far as it is in practice possible and useful to do so, and we salute the crucial and courageous steps in that direction taken recently in all Andean countries.

At a later stage we shall provide, along with our technical transcriptions here, the corresponding spelling that we feel is most appropriate for harmonising orthographies.