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This study is an investigation of an aspiration contrast among affricates in five Dene (Athabaskan) languages. In the Dene languages, stops, including affricates, are characterized as exhibiting a three way contrast: aspirated, unaspirated, and ejective, although the contrast is written orthographically as a voicing contrast. However, in a study of plain stop contrasts, McDonough and Wood (2008) show that the voiced plain stops /t/ and /k/ in the Dene languages are affricates. Additionally, in some of the Dene languages, the unaspirated versions of the stops are voiced (McDonough 2003). So while the contrast between unaspirated and unaspirated affricates is a common cross linguistic contrast, one question is the nature of the contrast in Dene. Data was collected from native speakers reciting a word list exemplifying the phonemic contrasts in the languages. This paper looks at the cues to the contrast between aspirated and unaspirated affricates to determine the nature of this contrast.

Processing Pronouns and Reflexives: Constraints beyond the Binding Theory
Kim Morse, Linguistics MA

The fact that humans are able to interpret words that require a referent to be properly understood points to a system of language that necessitates interpretive constraints. Otherwise, we would not be able to make sense of words such as him, her, herself, or himself as these must refer to a specific individual previously mentioned in the discourse. How does our language system constrain interpretation? This paper presents the results of a visual world eye-tracking experiment focusing on identifying how the structural constraints of the binding theory apply during the processing of pronouns (e.g. him, her) and reflexives (e.g. himself, herself). Previous studies suggest that constraints on coreference create a filter capable of removing any syntactically irrelevant antecedent candidates from interpretation (the “initial filter” view; Nicol and Swimney 1989, Sturt 2003). Other studies have shown that several factors may apply simultaneously to the process of interpretation, thus activating antecedents that may not be immediately licensable according to traditional interpretations of the Binding Theory (the “multiple constraints” view; Badecker and Straub 2002, Kennison 2003, Runner 2006). Our current study is a response to Runner and Head (2014) – a visual world eye-tracking approach to examining this question. Their results provided novel evidence for the multiple constraints view. We have found an asymmetry in the design of Runner and Head that potentially undermines the validity of their results. Our study is designed to correct for this confound. Our results are consistent with those of Runner and Head (2014) and therefore also support the multiple constraints view.

The effects of verb transitivity and transitivity bias on VP ellipsis and anaphora
Amanda Baker, Linguistics BA

Hankamer and Sag (1976) observed a variety of differences between verb phrase ellipsis (VPE) and verb phrase anaphora (VPA). They suggested that VPE is more sensitive to syntactic structure, while VPA concerns semantic information. The current study continues the observations and methods of Snider and Runner (2011), which studied eye movements during the processing of VPE and VPA, and found that both elicit looks to their elided objects as well as semantically-related objects. This new experiment introduces the manipulation of syntactic transitivity as a way to look for differences between VPE and VPA. It also tests verbs biased towards transitivity against verbs biased toward intransitivity. We predicted that these manipulations would affect VPE more than VPA. The usage manipulation showed that the VPE condition was more successful at triggering target fixations than VPA. Contrary to our prediction, however, the transitivity bias had a similar effect on VPE and VPA.