Agreement Mismatches in Cayuga and Configurationality

**Nutshell:** Comitative arguments in Cayuga exhibit an uncommon agreement pattern. In a sentence such as *John and I left*, the verb exhibits 1.dual agreement; however, the only overt nominal is *John*. This observation has been used as an argument that overt nominals are not directly selected by verbs (Koenig & Michelson 2015, for Oneida, closely related to Cayuga). We present prosodic evidence that such mismatched nominals are clause peripheral as Koenig & Michelson argue, while agreeing nominals are, in fact, clause internal. Coupled with previous research on clause structure in Cayuga (Dyck 2009; Dyck et al. 2014), we argue for a configurational view of Cayuga.

**Background:** Cayuga is traditionally described as discourse-configurational or non-configurational (in the sense of Hale 1983). It exhibits extremely free word order and complex agreement patterns indexing both subject and object. Following Jelinek (1984) all overt nominal are clause peripheral. An example of mismatched agreement is found in (1). The agreement on the verb (1.dual) reflects the understood subject; however, the overt subject is simply *John*.

(1) E-j-áhy-a:-k-Ø
  FACT-1.DU.EXCL-fruit-JOIN-eat-PUNC

  John
  ‘You and John ate an apple.’

**Data:** We present three lines of evidence that mismatched arguments are clause peripheral, while matched arguments are clause internal. (1) Mismatched arguments form their own intonational phrase (IntP), (2) differ in prosodic shape from matched arguments, and (3) cannot undergo wh-movement. First, non-utterance-final words have stress on the ultima, while utterance-final words do not (Chafe 1977). Observe that the verb in (1) does not have stress on the ultima. Contrast this with (2), where the verb is stressed on the ultima, as expected as it is non-final.

(2) John ahahyá:k óhya
  John he.fruit.ate.it apple

  ‘John ate an apple.’

Nominals with mismatched agreement, (1), often terminate in a low tone similar to a low boundary tone of an IntP (Williams 2013). We do not show the pitch contours for lack of space. Finally, while wh-movement of an agreeing nominal is unremarkable, (3)b, wh-movement of a mismatched nominal is not, (3)a.

(3) a. *? Shǫ:náht ejáhy:a:k?
   who you.two.ate.fruit?
   ‘Who did you eat fruit with?’

b. Shǫ:náht asheyá’dó:ha:i? who you.body.washed.her/them
   ‘Who did you wash?’

**Discussion:** The data above show that *John* is not part of the IntP in (1), while it is in (2). Crucially, in (2) *John* does not end in a low boundary tone, and in (1), the verb preceding *John* does not have final stress, indicating that the verb is the final word in the IntP. Finally, (3)a shows that wh-movement of the mismatched argument is degraded without the verb form in brackets, whereas (3)b shows that wh-movement of a matched argument is fine. Cayuga has canonical wh-movement (Baker 1996, for Mohawk (closely related to Cayuga); Barrie & Deer 2012). Assuming wh-movement cannot take place from a clause peripheral position, we conclude that the agreeing wh-phrase is an argument of the verb and undergoes wh-movement, while the mismatched wh-phrase is clause peripheral and cannot undergo wh-movement. Taken together, we conclude that agreeing arguments appear in argument position (and can subsequently move), while mismatched arguments are clause peripheral per Koenig & Michelson.

**Conclusion:** We have argued using prosodic evidence and wh-movement that agreeing nominals in Cayuga are clause internal and in some cases originate in argument position, while mismatched nominal are clause peripheral.


Hale, K. 1983. Warlpiri and the Grammar of Non-Configurational Languages. NLLT 1.5-47.


Antipassives in cross-linguistic perspective

While the passive has historically been the focus of much of the research on voice and valency, the antipassive has recently received more attention (e.g. Janic 2016; Polinsky 2013; workshop ‘The crosslinguistic diversity of antipassives: Function, meaning and structure’ at SLE 49, 2016, workshop ‘Antipassives in African Languages’ at WOCAL 7, 2012). This paper builds on this recent research to provide a clearer, more comprehensive picture of the types of languages which have antipassive structures, to test typological claims about antipassives, and to discover new relationships between antipassives and other typological constructions. I report new findings from the largest survey of antipassive-type structures to date (conducted by the author), involving data from 445 languages from 144 language families (including isolates).

The survey includes information not only on antipassives and antipassive-like features that particular constructions exhibit in all surveyed languages, but also on typological characteristics which are relevant to voice, valency, and argument structure. This allows for an evaluation of the connections between antipassives and other typological factors including alignment, basic word order, locus of grammatical marking, and valency, as well as genetic affiliation and geographical location. The first section presents an overview of the dataset, the range of criteria used as benchmarks for identification of the antipassive, and some general findings. For example, findings show that about 28% of the sampled languages have antipassive constructions, and about 33% also have some sort of passive construction. Also, although antipassives are found in languages all over the world, they are concentrated in only 27% of the language families sampled.

The second section uses the dataset to evaluate several specific claims which have been made in the literature, especially those involving antipassives and alignment. For example, antipassives have long been associated with ergativity (some argue antipassives should not exist in nominative-accusative languages, e.g. Palmer 1994:197); however, by the criteria used here about 45% of antipassives in the sample are found in non-ergative languages. This includes 36% of active-inactive languages, which have also been claimed to eschew voice operations in general (cf. Dixon 1994:31). As such, it seems the correlation between ergativity and antipassives may be symptomatic of some other more relevant correlation. I make the case that antipassives (and ergativity) are more likely to be present in languages with strictly distinguished transitivity classes for verbs (see relatedly Givón 1984:151-164 on ergativity).

This larger dataset allows linguists to address issues relating to antipassives more thoroughly and accurately than has previously been possible. When researchers become aware of the wide variety of information in this database on voice, valency, word order, and antipassive-related characteristics, they can use it to investigate other questions beyond those addressed here.
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Complicating categories: Personae mediate racialized expectations of non-native speech

Research in speech perception and social psychology has shown that American listeners link certain racialized groups to non-native English speech. Photographs leading listeners to believe that a speaker is Asian, versus White, can hinder comprehension of L1-American English speech (e.g., Rubin 1992) and facilitate processing of L2-accented English (McGowan 2014). Such studies rely on the notion that an Asian face primes expectations of L2-accented English. However, the treatment of “Asian” as a monolithic social category in prior work may not accurately characterize listeners’ sociolinguistic expectations. Recent work has shown that specific personae, or social types, can mediate links between linguistic styles and larger-scale social categories (e.g., D’Onofrio 2016). This paper presents a listening comprehension experiment with persona-based primes. Results illustrate that listeners’ expectations of Asians as non-native speakers are not categorical, but are instead mediated by more specific social types, supporting models of sociolinguistic knowledge that move beyond macro-social categories to incorporate personae.

Three visual primes were selected through an online rating task. American listeners rated two photographs of the same Korean male actor significantly differently on “foreign accentedness” (p=0.024). I term these photos, which differ in hairstyle and clothing, the “K-pop” (higher accentedness) and “Bro” (lower accentedness). A third picture of a white male was given similar ratings to the Korean photos on traits like “friendliness” and “attractiveness.”

162 participants completed a listening comprehension experiment online. Each saw one of the primes (K-pop, Bro or White), described as the speaker. Listeners then heard a recorded English passage, read by either an L1-American English speaker or by an L1-Korean speaker. This yielded six total between-subjects conditions (3 photographs x 2 voices). Participants then completed a cloze test, a measure of comprehension (Rubin 1992), in which they filled in missing words from the passage they heard.

Voice and social prime significantly affected cloze task performance. Listeners hearing the L1-accented voice were more accurate overall than those hearing the Korean-accented voice (p=0.0038). For both voices, listeners who saw the “K-pop” prime performed better than those with the “White” prime (p=0.033). This was expected for the Korean-accented voice (McGowan 2014), but contradicted prior work showing that Asian faces hinder comprehension of L1-English (Rubin 1992, Babel & Russell 2015). Here, the K-pop picture improved performance regardless of voice, perhaps indicating that listeners anticipated comprehension difficulty and thus showed greater attention in listening.

Crucially, two depictions of the same Korean individual differed significantly: listeners with the “K-pop” picture performed better than those with the “Bro” picture (p=0.028); “Bro” patterned nearly identically to the “White” picture. This suggests that racialized linguistic expectations, and accompanying differences in comprehension, are linked with specific types within the racialized category, rather than with some phenotypical notion of “Asian.” Indeed, results reflect contradictory ideological notions of Asians as forever-foreigners or honorary-whites in the American imaginary (e.g., Lo & Reyes 2009). Claims relating broadly racialized categories to accentedness therefore elide significant aspects of listeners’ sociolinguistic expectations, as these expectations appear to be linked with more detailed social personae inhabiting these categories.
Gender, Power, and Princeses: A qualitative and quantitative study of directive use in children’s movies

The study of the construction of gender in sociolinguistics relies increasingly on the idea of cultural discourses. Kiesling (2005) notes that cultural discourses are “reflected in, and created by... performances, and in widely shared cultural performances such as literature and film.” (2005: 696). However, although third wave sociolinguistic studies have turned their attention to the enacting of gender discourses in interpersonal contexts, there has been little study of language in the cultural artifacts which supposedly help create these gender ideologies. In addition, researchers in other areas such as media studies who have analyzed gender in these contexts have relied mainly on interpretations of character and plot, which, although valuable, overlook the key role language plays in building character interaction. This research project seeks to address these concerns by applying critical discourse analytical methods to the presentation of gender in the Disney Princess and Pixar films. Studies in child development have shown that children use these films in playing with and constructing their gender identities (Baker-Sperry 2007, Coyne et al. 2016). We hope to shed some light on how these vastly popular films contribute to ideologies about gendered language use.

In this paper we turn our attention to the gendered construction of power in Disney and Pixar movies. We do so by examining directives, defined by Searle (1969) as a speech act in which a speaker attempts to get a recipient to carry out or refrain from some action. Directive use has been correlated with intersections of gender, power, and politeness in previous studies (e.g. Goodwin 1988; West 1990; Aronsson & Thorell 1999). We carried out a quantitative study on all directives found in Disney Princess films. The study revealed that gender and power both play a statistically significant role in determining mitigation strategies as applied to directives, with powerful characters mitigating less than subordinates (p=0.0048) and male characters mitigating significantly less often than the female ones (p=0.0248).

This quantitative study serves to triangulate and contextualize a qualitative analysis of the intersections of language and power in Disney and Pixar. By closely examining scenes where power imbalances are salient, we show that males in power are likely to use direct or aggravated directives to assert their dominance. This strategy is ratified in the world of the film by unmarked compliance and serious tone. Feminine power, in contrast, involves a heavier reliance on mitigated directives. Even in positions of royalty, female characters mitigated more heavily unless they were villains, reinforcing the ideology that associates gender non-conformity with deviance and evil. Our analysis also reveals patterns of domesticity and feminine power; women often take control through bald and aggravated directives in domestic situations, and seem to call on discourses of domesticity and maternity when enacting power in more public spheres. As a whole, these findings confirm previous observations about sex roles in children’s films and highlight the usefulness of linguistic methodology in analyzing media discourses.
Head movement and ellipsis licensing

I argue that evidence from ellipsis licensing supports the view that head movement (HM) is not a narrow syntactic operation (Boeckx and Stjepanović 2001; Chomsky 2001; Schoorlemmer and Temmerman 2012, i.a). Assuming certain heads license ellipsis, ellipsis behaves as though those heads do not move, even when they undergo HM. This observation follows if they remain in situ at LF and PF, and this falls out straightforwardly if HM is not narrow syntactic movement.

1. The observation The standard view of verb phrase ellipsis (VPE) is that it is triggered by a licensing head (LH) bearing the [E] feature (in English, an auxiliary). The LH imposes an identity requirement over its complement at LF and deletes its complement at PF (Merchant 2001). Critically, auxiliaries undergo HM to T° and C°, but they can only delete their complements in the position from which they move, not the position to which they move (1, 2). The identity requirement holds over only this deleted material. Thus, ellipsis behaves as though the LH does not move from its base position at both PF and LF.

   (1) Subject–auxiliary inversion:

   [\text{Sally claims that she has kissed a pig, but } \text{[CP } \text{has[E] } \text{[TP she } \text{[AuxP } \text{t } \text{[TP } \text{kissed a pig]]]}]]?

   Possible TP antecedent

   vP antecedent

   Lic. Head

   Ime possible ellipsis target

   Head movement

   Observed ellipsis

(2) Auxiliary movement over negation:

   [\text{Mary has not kissed a pig, and } \text{[TP Bill has[E] } \text{[NegP not } \text{[AuxP } \text{t } \text{[TP } \text{kissed a pig]]]}]]?

   Possible NegP antecedent

   vP antecedent

   Lic. Head

   Impossible ellipsis target

   Head movement

   Observed ellipsis

If LHs delete their complements at PF, it is unclear why they cannot delete their complements after movement or how they delete phrases they are no longer adjacent to. Similar observations date to the 1970s. Lobeck (1995) accounts for this by assuming heads can govern ellipsis sites through their traces; Merchant (2001) and subsequent approaches provide no account of these observations.

2. What I propose I argue these facts fall out if HM is not narrow-syntactic movement but the result of sharing phonological matrices between adjacent heads. The LH will be adjacent to the deleted verb phrase at both PF and LF, ensuring that the right constituent is deleted at PF and that the identity condition is construed over the correct material at LF.

   First, I show the observations in Section 1 hold even when modern constraints on licensing are considered (the Verbal Identity Constraint and MaxElide). Given this, if we adopt the view that HM is the result of sharing phonological matrices between heads (Harley 2004; Platzack 2013), the LH will remain in situ at PF and LF, accounting for the above observations. I discuss several alternatives that assume HM is syntactic movement, showing why they are inadequate; e.g., I argue that reconstruction of the LH derives mismatches between the identity requirement and the material that is deleted and cannot explain how the LH can delete vPs at a distance from the positions to which they move.

3. Impact Thus, I argue that movement of auxiliaries provides evidence HM is not narrow syntactic movement. This conflicts with Hartman's (2011) claim, also based on the interaction of HM with ellipsis, that HM must leave traces. I discuss how the conclusions here are consistent with Messick and Thoms' (2016) criticisms of Hartman's paper. I also discuss what this means for the head-licensing theory of ellipsis and show that the data here are still a problem for phase-based approaches to ellipsis, though for different reasons.
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Post-syntactic inflection of the degree phrase in German

Intro. Recent treatments of concord contend that adjectival inflection occurs post-syntactically through the insertion of Agr nodes onto individual, concord-bearing heads after Spell-Out (i.a. Norris 2014). I examine these claims against German inflection, demonstrating that current formulations of this approach are untenable. I argue however that a post-syntactic treatment of concord can desirably be maintained through the proposal that Agr node insertion occurs phrasally, at DegP.

Problem. Norris (2014) proposes that the realization of inflection is determined on a head-by-head basis: only concord-bearing elements in a language (e.g. A⁰) trigger Agr node insertion, and it is only where Agr nodes are inserted that agreement is realized. (1) gives Norris’s rule, where X is determined language-specifically:

(1)  Agr node insertion:  X⁰ \rightarrow [X⁰ Agr⁰]_X  

Norris (2014: 151)

German poses a problem for (1). While attributive adjectives appear to be concord-bearing elements – agreeing with N⁰ in case, number, and gender (INFL) as in (2) – inflection in synthetic comparatives shows that Agr node insertion must occur outside the degree head -er, not the adjective itself schnell (3a). If A⁰ were truly a concord-bearing element, it would trigger the rule in (1), resulting in the ungrammatical pattern shown. Importantly moreover, inflection in analytic degree expressions is realized on the adjective, not Deg⁰ (e.g. equative wie ‘as’; (3b)), likewise ruling out Deg⁰ as a concord-bearing element.

(2)  a.  ein schnell-es Auto 
     a fast-INFL car  
     ‘a fast car’

b.  ein groß-er  Mann 
     a tall-INFL man  
     ‘a tall man’

(3)  a.  ein schnell(*-es)-er(*-es) Auto 
     a fast-INFL-COMP-INFL car  
     ‘a faster car’

b.  ein so(*-es) schnell(*-es) Auto 
     a so-INFL fast-INFL  car  
     ‘such a fast car’

These facts are only compatible with (1) if we adopt a lexicalist view that synthetic comparatives are formed pre-syntactically as adjectives in the lexicon (Kiparsky 2005). Otherwise, it is not clear why (1) seems to apply sometimes at Deg⁰ (3a), and other times at A⁰ (3b). Given compelling arguments that comparatives are derived in the syntax (e.g. the competition between analytic and synthetic comparatives in English; Bobaljik (2012)), this result is undesirable.

Proposal. I argue that a post-syntactic account of concord must be formulated to apply at the phrasal level. Adopting the claim that AP is housed in DegP (Kennedy 1997), we can account for both synthetic and analytic degree expressions if Agr node insertion occurs at DegP, explaining why inflection is always realized on the rightmost edge of the modifier.

(4)  Agr node insertion (for adjectival concord):  DegP \rightarrow [DegP Agr⁰]_{DegP}

In comparatives (5), A⁰ head-moves to Deg in the syntax. The exponent of Agr node then undergoes post-syntactic local dislocation (Embick & Noyer 2001) to the rightmost element in DegP: -er (following the proposal that morphological concord precedes linear operations (Arregi & Nevins 2012)). In analytic degree expressions (e.g. (3b)), the rightmost element is instead the adjective, and Agr dislocates there, explaining the inflectional contrast found in (3a-b).

(5)  a.  

b.  Linearization:  
    [DegP [DegP schnell * er ] * [Agr es ]]  

c.  Local dislocation:  
    [DegP [DegP schnell * er * es ]]  

d.  Phonological representation:  
    schnelleres

Importantly, non-phrasal inflection of coordinate adjectives that remains unaccounted for by syntactic approaches (i.a. van Riemsdijk 1998; Roehrs 2006; Leu 2008) – omitted due to space – is also possible to capture in this analysis through the pointwise application of local dislocation (McNabb 2014), suggesting it is worthwhile to maintain a post-syntactic account.

Conclusion. Post-syntactic accounts of concord face real challenges from adjectival inflection in German. I show that a post-syntactic account straightforwardly extends to the German facts if Agr node insertion occurs phrasally at DegP, not A⁰.
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The Role of Voice in Narrative: Prosody and Embodiment in Chilean Youth Narratives About Police Violence

This paper examines the use of prosodic features in narrative constructions of identity in the context of a modern carceral state (Foucault 1977). Data comes from ethnographic interviews with two 9th grade students about experiences of police violence during a 2016 student protest in Santiago de Chile. I argue that attention to prosody in oral narration adds qualitative contextual meaning by anchoring the speakers’ past and present embodied experiences in the multimodal semiotic organization of the body during narration (Mendoza-Denton & Jannedy 2015). Analysis of prosody in relation to speakers’ descriptions of violence against their bodies thus highlights the body as a source, instrument, and topic of personal narrative (Heavey 2015). The analysis contributes to a small but growing field of research involving voice quality, intonation, and social identity (Thomas 2011; Podesva & Callier 2015) by extending qualitative socio-prosodic methods (c.f. Selting 1994; M.H. Goodwin et al. 2012; Sicoli 2014) to narrative analysis.

Narratives of personal experience are valuable for research involving language and identity (Hill 1995; Schiffrin 1996) because they provide insight into the discursive emergence of “the self” in relation to others (Ochs & Capps 1996). In narratives described in this paper, speakers discursively perform identity (Bucholtz & Hall 2005) in relation to peer student protestors and carabineros, Chile’s militarized police force. Sociocultural linguistic approaches to narrative analysis contextualize stories as collaborative interactional processes between speakers (Bauman 1985; Georgakopoulou 2006; De Fina 2009), with most focusing on morphosyntactic features like discourse markers (Schiffrin 1988), tense, and aspect (Perrino 2011). I argue that because voices are socially mediated through embodied practices of speaking and hearing (Zimman 2012), analytical attention to prosody grounds emergent processes of collaborative meaning in the embodied material experiences of language-users.

The following example represents a speaker’s intonation and voice quality while describing an experience of witnessing a fellow student protestors being beat up by a group of carabineros. She describes witnessing the police violence against the boy as enraging, thus driving her to throw herself on top of the police in hopes that they would stop hurting him—an action that ultimately led to her also being attacked by an officer, and her subsequent hospitalization. Intonation was annotated in Praat (Boersma & Weenink 2016) using Spanish ToBI conventions (Beckman et al. 2002).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>te</th>
<th>lo</th>
<th>juro</th>
<th>que</th>
<th>fui</th>
<th>asi</th>
<th>me</th>
<th>tiré</th>
<th>encima</th>
<th>asi</th>
<th>como</th>
<th>literal</th>
<th>pa</th>
<th>para</th>
<th>quato</th>
<th>soltaran</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

```
I swear to you that I went and threw myself on top like literally so that they would drop him
```

The messages codified through use of segmental features (e.g. textual discourse and subjunctive tense) are elaborated upon through the use of suprasegmental prosodic features, inculcating the message with qualitative affective meaning (Harkness 2011). Repetition of the bitonal L*+H pitch accent on fui (I went), encima (on top), and literal (literally) elaborates upon the account of the climatic experience of rage that drove the speaker to throw herself on top of the police in attempt to save boy. The use of phrase-final falsetto with subjunctive soltaran (so that they would drop him) sonically imbues the message with an embodied feeling of disbelief at the experience of witnessing police violence against a peer.
Why a unified theory of language shift is not possible.

Language shift is the major mechanism of language endangerment and loss (LEL) motivating linguists to understand how and why language shift occurs or doesn’t occur, both as a theoretical question, and to aid applied collaborative work for language maintenance and revitalization. The macro variables of language shift are already well understood, e.g., economic pressures to use a non-local language, removal of children from home for schooling, and standard “monoglot” language ideology and concomitant “ideology of contempt” for divergent linguistic practices (Silverstein 1996, Dorian 1998). Even so, we must ask, when is reference to generalized factors explanatory? In addition to generalized factors, Grenoble and Whaley note that “it is at the level of micro-variables where one can account for…differences in the rate, outcome, and reversibility of language-shift” (1998:28) and that understanding micro-variables requires accounts of “social meaning” involving “the attitudes, beliefs, and values of a community” (1998:33).

In this paper we argue that rather than seek a common denominator that predicts when shift will occur, explanatory adequacy in a science of language shift can only be achieved through ethnographic engagement with the particular histories and interpretive practices of linguistic communities in the process of transformation to understand what changing patterns of language use mean for the people in question. Although language shift might be describable as a unified phenomenon from an etic point of view, there is a vast range of culturally organized meaning systems through which linguistic practices, and their change, are experienced, interpreted, and responded to. In support and illustration of our claim we compare and contrast the ethnographic details of case studies involving (1) relationships between language shift, multilingual maintenance, and linguistically exogamous marriage practices in Indigenous Latin America; (2) the relationship between the shift to the lingua franca Tok Pisin and the cultural attribution of high status to goods acquired from far way in Papua New Guinea; and (3) how school-based language programs in North America intended to stem language shift and revitalize Native American languages have led to results evaluated by community members as disappointing because they situate language transmission in an institutional context dissociated from the kinds of home-based, multi-generational kinship relations that an emic view of successful language learning presupposes.

We show through these ethnographic engagements that language shift occurs at the interface between languages and culturally-elaborated meanings, beliefs, and habits that guide people’s interpretations and actions as they move through their world making linguistic choices. While we argue that a unified theory of language shift is not possible we do not discount a possibility of a scientific study of language shift. An important step toward this goal is recognizing that studies of language shift must engage the locally meaningful systems in which languages and their speakers participate. It may ultimately be possible to make predictions about language shift and LEL, but these predictions will necessarily be limited in socio-geographic scope, and they will necessarily build upon in-depth ethnographic studies of the particular situations in which language loss, maintenance, and expansion are taking place.


The role of tongue position in laryngeal contrasts: Comparing Thai and Hindi

**Background.** Many languages have laryngeal contrasts in their obstruents, but there continues to be debate about their phonological and phonetic characterization. Utterance-initially, English voiced stops are often phonetically voiceless and voiceless stops are aspirated whereas Spanish voiced stops are realized with closure voicing (Lisker & Abramson 1964). One articulatory adjustment for initiating phonation is enlarging the supraglottal cavity volume via tongue root advancement (Westbury 1983). Previous research on English stops has shown that tongue position is more fronted for voiced than voiceless stops, and articulatory differences align with a more abstract two-way laryngeal distinction that is the same for Spanish and English even though the acoustic implementation is different (Ahn 2016). The current ultrasound study expands this line of research to examine the articulatory adjustments in laryngeal contrasts of Thai (three-way contrast) and Hindi (four-way contrast) by comparing tongue position of voiced, voiceless unaspirated, and voiceless aspirated stops.

**Hypothesis.** (1) If Thai and Hindi show the most advanced tongue root in voiced stops, with more advancement of voiceless unaspirated compared to voiceless aspirated ones, it might suggest that the advancement gesture facilitates a three-way contrast. (2) If two languages show advancement only for voiced stops, tongue root advancement is used to accomplish the voiced stops. (3) If two languages show tongue root advancement only for voiceless unaspirated stops, it would suggest that advancement is used for aspiration.

**Method.** Ultrasound images and acoustic data were collected simultaneously. Eight speakers of each language recorded phrase-initial stops followed by the vowel /a/. Thai speakers recorded /b, d, p, t, k, pʰ, tʰ, kʰ/ (80 stimuli) and Hindi speakers recorded /b, d, g, bʱ, dʱ, gʱ, p, t, k, pʰ, tʰ, kʰ/ (120 stimuli). The last frame before the release was analyzed (Edgetrak: Li et al. 2005).

**Results.** In both languages, ultrasound images showed a clear distinction between voiced and voiceless unaspirated stops in tongue position with some variation across speakers. For Thai labial stops, speakers showed lowered tongue body/front for voiced than voiceless stops (1a). For alveolar stops, voiced showed more advanced tongue root compared to voiceless ones (1b). In Thai, the difference in tongue position of voiceless unaspirated and aspirated stops was not consistent across places of articulation (cf. Rischel 1985). In Hindi, tongue root advancement was shown in voiced stops (red/green curves) in all places of articulation. Tongue root position among voiceless stops does not exhibit differences based on aspiration (blue vs. purple, Figure 2).

**Discussion.** Thai/Hindi speakers may advance the tongue root/lower the tongue body for voiced stops whereas the role of tongue position for voiceless aspirated stops is not clear. The tongue position difference between English laryngeal contrasts may be similar to the difference in voiced and voiceless unaspirated stops of Thai/Hindi even though English voiceless stops are aspirated. There may be a single abstract phonological specification that languages share, but which can be realized different phonetically in the different languages (Keating 1984). Tongue position during closure can be a part of articulatory properties in laryngeal contrast, and models which refer to aerodynamic gestures (e.g. McGowan & Saltzman 1995) might be a helpful way of understanding how speakers achieve laryngeal contrasts.
Recent work (Goldman 2017) found that when participating in Twitter discourse about gender equality, female Twitter users showed significant variation in features of stereotypical “women’s” or “powerless” language (Lakoff, 1975; O’Barr & Atkins, 1980). Specifically, when posting tweets tagged with “#yesallwomen”, women displayed higher frequency of profanity and significantly lower frequency of hedges, politeness markers, and stable nonstandard variants as compared to their Twitter posts on other topics.

The current study conducts a quantitative intraspeaker variation analysis in a group of self-identified men who contribute to feminist discourses on Twitter to see whether the previously observed intraspeaker variation is borne out in a male population. It was predicted that men would conform to the women’s linguistic style in female-dominated virtual spaces (Herring, 1996). Following Goldman (2017), the linguistic features studied here included markers of politeness, hedges, profanity, and stable nonstandard variants such as “wanna” or “gonna”, as well as missing apostrophes in negative contractions. The results shed light on how male feminist allyship is linguistically performed.

In prior studies of “cyberfeminism” (Daniels, 2009; Hall, 1996; Wilding, 1998), some argue that men who respect the online feminist community express their solidarity by respecting women’s spaces, rather than intruding on these spaces in an attempt to prove their feminism (Hall, 1996). Indeed, in Phillips’s (2014) corpus of 2.7 million tweets tagged with #yesallwomen, only six men provided enough tweets to constitute a usable experimental corpus for a within-speaker analysis, so the inclusion criteria were expanded to include other overtly feminist Twitter hashtags. These expanded criteria identified 15 men who authored enough feminist-hashtagged tweets to compose a substantial “feminist tweet” corpus (N=2438 tweets). This corpus was compared to a collection of each man’s most recently authored tweets on any topic regardless of subject or hashtag (N= 28209 tweets). The two corpora’s frequencies of the features described above were compared using paired-sample t-tests. The relative scarcity of hashtagged feminist tweets authored by men alone is an interesting result, suggesting that silence or self-recusal may itself be a component of allyship performance. The intraspeaker variation analysis also suggested stark contrast between men’s and women’s language choices when participating in the same discourses.

Contrary to the hypothesis, the 15 men’s paired corpora showed no significant intraspeaker variation in any of the four dimensions studied, although the direction of change did mirror the women’s in all features but profanity. These results suggest that while these linguistic variables carry meaning in women’s construction of online feminist personae, the same is not true of self-proclaimed male feminist allies. When men participate in feminist discourses, non-significant intraspeaker variation indicates that accommodation (Giles, Coupland, & Coupland, 1991) is not a dimension of allyship expression. In fact, men appear to temper their profanity use when participating in feminist discourse where women increase theirs. I argue that in construction of online feminist identities, neither frequent contribution nor an “empowered” linguistic style carries the same indexical value for men as for women due to the gender politics underlying feminist discourses.
Children’s use of prosody and word order to indicate information status in English phrasal conjuncts

Adults typically mention old referents first before mentioning new referents (Bock and Irwin 1980; Arnold et al. 2000). However, Narasimhan & Dimroth (2008) showed that German preschoolers prefer to order new referents before old ones when using phrasal conjuncts (e.g., ‘a spoon and an egg’). Here we investigate phrasal conjuncts in 3-5-year-old and adult speakers of English to address the following questions: 1) Does ordering of new and old referents in phrasal conjuncts differ crosslinguistically in children and adults? 2) Do adults and children use prosody to signal information status reliably?

German has a relatively flexible word order, and adult speakers are relatively likely to order constituents based on their information status, ‘old’ or ‘new’. In contrast, children learning languages with a relatively rigid word order, such as English, might avoid ordering referents based on information status. If English speakers nevertheless use word order to distinguish ‘old’ and ‘new’ referents, we have evidence of the strong influence of information status irrespective of crosslinguistic differences in word order flexibility. **B: Not**

In Germanic languages, noun phrases labeling new referents tend to bear nuclear accent, whereas noun phrases labeling old referents are often deaccented and acoustically reduced (e.g., Aylett & Turk, 2004). Here we ask: Do English speakers reliably mark information status prosodically in phrasal conjuncts, and how does this interact with their ordering preference?

We elicited conjoined noun phrases in 15 children (mean age 4;5) and 12 adult speakers, by asking participants to label 12 target pairs of objects. One of the objects was ‘old’, having been encountered and mentioned in the immediately previous trial. The second object was encountered for the first time, hence ‘new’. Responses were coded for word order (‘old-before-new’ vs. ‘new-before-old’). Responses were also coded by a trained phonetician (blind to the experimental condition) for whether referents sounded prosodically ‘new’ or ‘given’.

We predicted word order (new-old vs. old-new) using age group in a mixed-effects model to see if children differed from adults in their ordering preferences. Second, we predicted the phonetician’s prosodic judgments of information status (correct/incorrect) using age group and word order. We found that the ‘old-before-new’ order is less likely to be used by children (43%) than by adults (83%), (β = -2.0504, p < .0001; see Figure 1). Furthermore, we found an interaction between age group and word order for prosodic judgment: When children produced the conjuncts in the ‘old-before-new’ order, they prosodically signalled the referents’ information status less clearly than adults did (β = -2.8079, p < .0001; see Figure 2).

Our findings corroborate Narasimhan & Dimroth’s findings: like German children, English-speaking children are less likely than adults to produce the ‘old-before-new’ order. Also, when they use the “canonical” word order, they mark information status using prosody less reliably than adults. These findings suggest that children are less likely to employ the ‘old-before-new’ order than adults irrespective of word order flexibility in the input language; and that at age 4, they are not adult-like in their prosodic marking of information status.

![Figure 1](image1.png)  **Figure 1**: Relative proportion of new/old and old/new word order in adults and children.

![Figure 2](image2.png)  **Figure 2**: Relative proportion of correct/incorrect prosodic judgments by word and age group.
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Homophones, Lexical Retrieval, and Sensitivity to Detail

Homophones can exhibit phonetic differences (Gahl 2008), though only when produced in meaningful contexts (Guion 1995); listeners can be sensitive to such details (Babel & Johnson 2010). Speed of lexical access can be influenced by a word’s homophone mate (Jescheniak & Levelt 1994), but in a perceptual task could homophones act as phonological neighbors (cf. Vitevitch & Luce 1999) and impede decisions? I present results from a perceptual study that addresses how sub-phonemic details and knowledge of the lexicon influence decisions about word identity. Listeners are sensitive to homophones being separate lexical items, and are weakly influenced by acoustic details, but cannot discriminate between homophones.

17 native English speakers heard pairs of English words (produced in isolation), the words in the pair from different speakers, and decided whether the two sounded like the same word or not. Pairs were: (a) homophone-homophone (hph-hph) (e.g. maid-maid); (b) same, word with a homophone (e.g. made-made); (c) same, word without a homophone (e.g. cat-cat); (d) different, with a single segmental contrast. The ratio of apparent ‘same’ pairs (a-c) to ‘different’ pairs (d) was equal.

Hph-hph pairs patterned like same pairs: ‘same’ responses were significantly faster than ‘different’ responses, paralleling faster responses of ‘same’ for same pairs. The two items of each pair were not acoustically more distinct in hph-hph pairs than in same pairs. A subsequent task to identify words played individually confirmed that listeners could not distinguish between these recordings of homophones: accuracy was at chance (49.3%, p = .46).

Type c pairs (cat-cat) were identified as ‘same’ more frequently (88.8%) than type b pairs (made-made) (84.1%; p < .001) or hph-hph pairs (85.1%; p < .001); the latter two types did not differ (p = 0.38). Response times had a similar trend.

Response time was negatively correlated with word frequency in same pairs (made-made,cat-cat): r(248) = -0.16, p = .01. Among hph-hph pairs, response time was negatively correlated with the difference in frequency between the words (r(78) = -0.2, p = .07) and percent ‘same’ responses was positively correlated with the difference in frequency (r(78) = 0.21, p = .056).

Acoustic differences (mean F0, F0 range, duration, spectral tilt) between items had a consistent weak positive correlation with response time for pair types a-b (maid-maid, made-made), though it only reached significance in mean F0: r(158) = 0.18, p = .021. This trend was not present in type c pairs (cat-cat), suggesting that attention to these details is mediated by listeners expecting differences.

This study demonstrates that at least when evaluating words produced in isolation, listeners are more influenced by phonological contrasts than phonetic details, but are influenced by awareness of homophones. Listeners are more hesitant to identify phonologically identical forms with multiple possible lexical matches as the same, suggesting some uncertainty about phonological contrastiveness, which can focus their attention on smaller phonetic differences than they otherwise attend to. Because frequent words are accessed more quickly, the presence of multiple lexical matches to the phonological form is less salient when they differ in frequency.
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