

Prosody and Syntax in Sign Languages

Wendy Sandler

University of Haifa

wsandler@research.haifa.ac.il

revision: April 8, 2010

To appear in *Transactions of the Philological Society*

Prosody and Syntax in Sign Languages¹

Prosody and syntax are intimately related but, as in romance, intimacy only happens between two separate entities. Sign languages present a particularly interesting domain for considering the relationship between prosody and syntax, in part because a consensus has not yet been reached on where to draw the line between the two. In a language modality that affords the use of a multitude of articulators on different parts of the body, it should not be surprising that sorting out the whole system is a nontrivial endeavor, resulting in certain indeterminacies. And an innocent romp through the literature reveals that one linguist's syntax may be another linguist's prosody and vice versa. The very fact that there are unresolved ambiguities here shows how closely linked prosody and syntax can be. This article makes an attempt to articulate the prosodic component in these visual languages, and to draw the lines more clearly where possible, laying some groundwork for future inquiry. A distinction is drawn between two approaches to the interpretation of certain ubiquitous facial expressions in sign languages -- a direct syntax approach and a prosodic approach -- and the latter will be supported here.

In the research on sign language over the past half century, a good deal of evidence has been presented for linguistic properties that are shared between the

¹ My thanks to Diane Lillo-Martin, Harry van der Hulst, Roland Pfau, Laura Downing, Mark Aronoff, Irit Meir, and Carol Padden, for helpful comments. Research on ISL prosody was supported by Israel Science Foundation grant 750/99-1. Research on ABSL prosody is supported by U.S. National Institutes of Health grant DC 6473.

auditory and visual modalities, functional properties, and – perhaps more interestingly because of the obvious differences in physical modality – formal properties as well (e.g., Sandler & Lillo-Martin 2006). And indeed, as will be argued here, certain key properties of prosody found in spoken languages are found in sign languages as well. The differences in structure that result from the differences in the physical modality of transmission serve to illuminate not only the nature of the sign language system, but also aspects of the spoken language system that may appear to be formal universals, but that are actually modality-driven, such as the phonetic content and distribution of intonational tunes. The focus here is on prosodic constituents and on the intonational system of sign languages.

As early as the 1970s, researchers discovered that certain types of expressions, such as interrogatives, relative clauses, and conditionals, are typically accompanied by particular markers, conveyed not by the hands, but by the face, head, and body. This discovery attributed syntactic complexity to the sentences so marked in American Sign Language (ASL), such as embedding in the case of relative clauses, and led to treatments of the formal markers of this system as inherently syntactic entities. Others have proposed that the forms in question mark prosodic constituents and provide intonational meanings. We aim for a higher resolution of data and analysis in order to better understand the relation between the two.

In the theory of sign language prosody laid out here, prosodically marked constituents (demarcated by changes in timing, including pause, and manifested

by the signing hands) bear the same relation to syntax in signed languages as they do in spoken languages, insofar as they interact with syntactic units but do not overlap perfectly. Intonational elements (conveyed primarily by facial expression and head position) are aligned with prosodic constituents, so that intonational patterns have only an indirect relation with syntax.² This view implies that assigning syntactic structural properties directly to intonational elements, and using their distribution as a diagnostic for underlying syntactic structure -- an integral part of some sign language research programs -- is putting the cart before the horse. Conversely, attempting to predict the occurrence and distribution of intonational elements by syntax alone will also lead us astray.

The definition of intonation supported here has both functional and formal aspects. Functionally, intonation conveys particular kinds of (essentially pragmatic) meanings in utterances, such as illocutionary force, shared knowledge, and the like. Formally, intonation is realized suprasegmentally (simultaneously with the text) and distributed on the basis of prosodic constituency. The formal/distributional part of this definition distinguishes intonation from lexical particles that are represented in the syntactic string and provide intonational functions, such as those that have been found in some tone languages (e.g., Hyman & Monaka 2008, Wakefield 2010). The fact that sign language intonation shares both functional and formal characteristics with that of spoken languages, as demonstrated below, reveals the ubiquity of such a system in human language generally.

² Since the intonation system might be thought of as having its own syntax (Gussenhoven 1984, 2004), it is worth pointing out at the outset that, 'syntax' as used in this article refers to the traditional notion of phrase structure or sentence syntax.

The treatment of sign language prosody presented here attributes particular roles to different articulators of the body in articulating prosodic structure. The hands, face, and body each play a role in shaping the prosodic system, even as each serves other grammatical functions as well. The physical form of language in the two modalities is quite different, but many key organizational principles are the same.

Some of the issues dealt with here are reminiscent of debates in the spoken language literature on prosody, as will no doubt be clear from the other papers in this special issue. Here, the goal is to demonstrate that the syntactic component and the prosodic component must be distinguished in sign languages, and to provide a theoretical framework for investigating the prosodic component, with details of the interaction between the two left for future research.

We begin in §1 with an introductory description of some of the linguistic markers in question and the functions traditionally attributed to them. A prosodic hierarchy is introduced and its existence in sign languages argued for in §2, based mainly on evidence from Israeli Sign Language (ISL). Intonation, which often conveys critical information, is conveyed primarily through facial expression on the upper face. Section 3 develops this theory of sign language intonation, showing that the facial intonation of sign language conveys pragmatic information, that it is compositional in content, and prosodic in its distribution. Taken together, Sections 2 and 3 present the **prosodic approach** to the analysis of phonologically conveyed constituency and intonation in sign language.

The association, in early research, of particular markers of the face and head with syntactic constructions led later to more detailed analyses which claim that the distribution and role of these markers is part of the syntactic component of the grammar. These analyses have argued either (1) that the occurrence of these markers is predicted by syntactic configurations, (2) that the markers themselves manifest syntactic properties, or, recently, (3) that the articulations in question are intonational in nature but are an integral part of the syntax. In §4 some of the analyses of the **direct syntax approach** to the interpretation and patterning of particular nonmanual markers will be sketched as a point of reference. The principal argument against the direct syntax approach comes from nonisomorphism between prosody and syntax, demonstrated in §5. In that section, the prosodic approach favored here, according to which the relation between the markers in question and the syntax is mediated by the prosodic component, is further supported. Additional evidence for the claim that intonation is separate from syntax in sign languages comes from acquisition research, briefly described in §6.

Whatever the analysis, the literature very often presents a picture in which so-called “nonmanuals” have a unified role, one that is different from that of the hands. Closer observation suggests that some of these assumptions are at best premature. The division of labor between the hands and the rest of the body is not so neat, and exploring the interaction between the physical articulators and the grammar promises to reveal important insight into the relation between the two. The hands, whose main function is to transmit words, also play an important role

in prosody, while other—nonmanual -- articulators of the body play a number of different linguistic and paralinguistic roles in sign languages in addition to prosodic roles. Section 7 provides a kind of map, linking the various articulators of sign languages to particular linguistic roles, grammatical components, and paralinguistic functions, and suggesting that not all the links can be connected at this stage.

Although prosody is often considered to be somehow primal, present in all languages, and even assiduously attended to by infants, the prosodic elements of rhythm or timing, stress, and intonation comprise a linguistic system of some complexity. The study of sign languages offers us a rare opportunity to observe how prosody and syntax arise in a new language just forming. The emergence of prosody in a young sign language in a small village with many deaf people, Al-Sayyid Bedouin Sign Language, will be the topic of §8. Section 9 is a brief summary and conclusion.

A caveat about cross-sign-language generalizations is in order. Certain aspects of the system to be explored here have been documented in a number of sign languages, though not necessarily in connection with prosody. Many of the examples here come from ASL and ISL, languages in which the linguistic elements in question have been explored in detail, and which have a good deal in common in their prosodic systems at the level of description that we have attained so far -- although possible differences in this domain from language to language are allowed for in what follows. Most of the analyses and theoretical positions

put forth here are proposed as hypotheses about the prosody of sign languages in general as currently understood.

1. Background: Consistent markers of clause and sentence types

In the early decades of sign language research, following publication of William Stokoe's monograph, *Sign Language Structure* (1960), linguists made it their business to discover what other aspects of grammatical structure could be found in the visually transmitted natural languages of deaf communities. A group of researchers at the Language and Cognition Lab at the Salk Institute identified a number grammatical structures and processes for the first time (see Klima & Bellugi 1979). To account for the grammar of ASL, some of these researchers began to look beyond the words transmitted by the hands to actions of the face, head, and body.

Certain configurations of facial expression and head and body posture were shown to co-occur with particular types of sentences and clauses. Yes/no questions in ASL are associated with raised brows, head tilted forward and widened eyes, and wh-questions with furrowed brow and head forward (Liddell 1980; Baker-Shenk 1983). These two configurations, shown in Figure 1 for ISL, commonly mark these two sentence types in numerous sign languages (e.g., Coerts 1992, Sign Language of the Netherlands; Nespor & Sandler 1999, ISL; Sutton-Spence & Woll 1999, British Sign Language; Engberg-Pedersen 1990, Danish Sign Language; Bergman 1984 Swedish Sign Language; see Zeshan 2004, 2006 for a survey).



Figure 1. Typical ISL nonmanual configurations for (a) yes/no and (b) wh-questions

Topics are marked by raised brows and head slightly back in ASL, and negatives by a headshake (Liddell 1980).³ By identifying fronted topicalized elements through these markers, Liddell's work helped to determine that the basic word order of ASL is SVO. Objects with no special nonmanual marking occur after the verb, while objects at the beginning of an utterance have topic marking, indicating to Liddell that they were moved to that position. ASL conditional sentences also have typical marking: raised brows and head tilt across the antecedent or 'if' clause, head thrust at the end of that clause, and an eyeblink at the juncture between the two clauses (Baker & Padden 1978; Liddell 1986; Reilly, McIntire, & Bellugi 1990) -- also similar across many sign languages that have been studied.

³ A study of ISL (Rosenstein 2001) found more variation in the facial expression and head position for topics in that language, but identified consistent timing breaks and changes of head position after this constituent. This is consistent with the prosodic approach put forward here, according to which facial expression is supplied by the pragmatics and aligned with prosodic constituents.

On the basis of these markers, Liddell argued that there are complex sentences in ASL. For example, strings interpreted as relative clauses are accompanied by a particular nonmanual configuration: raised eyebrows, head tilted backward, raised cheeks and upper lip (Liddell 1978). This marking does not appear on coordinate structures, and was presented as evidence of embedding in ASL. In later work, purely syntactic tests of bi-clausal sentences distinguished subordinate from coordinate structures. For example, sentence final negation negates the matrix clause in sentences with embedded clauses, but the last clause in coordinate structures. This and similar tests showed unequivocally that complex sentences with subordinate and coordinate clauses occur in ASL, and that the two can be distinguished (Padden 1988).

The elements of facial expression and head position introduced in most detail by Liddell (see also Baker & Cokely 1978) were claimed to be syntactic marking, on a par with relativizers such as *that* in a language like English, a perspective that is integral to some syntactic analyses in later studies.

Other researchers began to investigate prosodic characteristics of the same markers, leading to claims that a cluster of nonmanual elements like Brow Raise, head tilt, etc., aligned with timing elements such as holds and pauses, pattern like prosodic systems in sign languages. If they are indeed prosodic, then they must be related in some way to syntax. And it is not uncommon to find the markers called intonational and syntactic in the same study, with no further explanation.

However, prosodic and syntactic structure are not isomorphic, so that the precise relationship can only be determined through rigorous investigation – and

that is perhaps the most important message to be conveyed here. The content of intonational tunes is removed from syntactic structure both distributionally, by aligning temporally with prosodic constituents, and semantically, where pragmatic considerations may trump syntactic structure, as we will see. The following two sections present a theory of prosodic constituency and intonation in sign languages based on a study of Israeli Sign Language (Nespor & Sandler 1999). Most of the examples here come from ASL and ISL, two unrelated sign languages that appear to have similar, though not identical, prosodic systems. After that, in §4, certain syntactic analyses that appeal to some of the same markers will be discussed.

2. The prosodic hierarchy

Evidence from a wide range of languages shows that the prosodic component organizes utterances into hierarchically organized constituents. Example (1) shows Nespor & Vogel's (1986) hierarchy.

1. mora > syllable > foot > prosodic word > clitic group > phonological phrase > intonational phrase > phonological utterance

Other proposals exist, and most of them assume the same or similar levels of constituency.⁴ A large body of work has demonstrated that these prosodic

⁴ Selkirk and Tateishi (1988) motivate a Minor Phrase level in the prosodic hierarchy, and a Focus Phrase level is proposed in Kanerva (1990). A principled difference in the prosodic hierarchy is

constituents are related to syntactic constituents, but that they are not always isomorphic with them (e.g., Bolinger 1978; Selkirk 1984; Nespor & Vogel 1986; Selkirk 2002). We adopt this view and present arguments from sign language in this section and in §5.

In ISL, we find evidence for the hierarchy in Example (2), to be described in the following sections.⁵

2. prosodic hierarchy in Israeli Sign Language (Nespor & Sandler 1999)

Syllable > prosodic word > phonological phrase > intonational phrase

2.1. Syllables

Rhythmic structure of relevance to prosody/syntax interaction in sign languages begins at the syllable.⁶ Syllables are associated with movement (Coulter 1982; Liddell & Johnson 1989; Sandler 1989; Brentari 1990; Perlmutter 1992; Sandler 1993; Wilbur 1993). This movement can be a path movement of the hand from one location to another, either on the body or in space; a change in the position of the fingers, such as opening or closing; a change in the orientation of the hand; or some combination of these. One movement or more than one simultaneously constitutes a syllable. Most signs have simple movement, but complex (i.e., more

made by Itô and Mester, who propose to collapse the phonological phrase and the intonational phrase into one recursive category (Itô & Mester 2007).

⁵ Klima and Bellugi (1979) write that stress falls on the second member of a compound in ASL. In unreduced compounds, in which each member consists of one syllable, this can be seen as evidence for a foot in that language.

⁶ See Perlmutter 1992 and Brentari 1998 for proposals that there are lower levels of prosodic structure, the mora and the weight unit, respectively.

than one simultaneous) movement is present in 18% of the signs in Stokoe's Dictionary of American Sign Language (Stokoe 1960; Brentari 1998). An example of a simultaneous combination is opening the fingers from a fist position to an open hand, while at the same time moving the hand in a path outward from the body, as in the ISL sign SEND (Figure 2).



Figure 2. ISL SEND, a monosyllabic sign with simultaneous path and hand internal movement

The words of sign languages have a strong tendency to be monosyllabic (Coulter 1982 on ASL). Even when more than one morpheme is involved, there is typically a single syllable in a sign, at least in ASL and ISL. For example, a verb that is inflected for agreement might have different beginning and ending locations (which mark subject and object), that is, three morphemes, but there is still a single movement, one syllable. Lexical compounds, which combine two words, each typically monosyllabic, often reduce to monosyllables (Liddell & Johnson 1986; Sandler 1989, 1999a). Figure 3 shows the ISL compound THINK^STOP, 'daydream'. Each member of the compound is monosyllabic and, when combined, the first movement is dropped, so that the compound is monosyllabic instead of disyllabic. Regressive assimilation of hand configuration

(two-handed in this case) also occurs in this lexical compound, and is common under reduction in both ASL and ISL.



Figure 3. An ISL lexical compound reduced to a monosyllable: a. MIND b. STOP c. THINK^STOP ('daydream').

Despite this tendency toward monosyllabicity, the word, the morpheme and the syllable are not isomorphic (Brentari 1990,1998; Sandler 2008; Sandler & Lillo-Martin 2006), as Table 1 shows. As in spoken languages, in sign languages too, rules and constraints must refer to the syllable independently from the word or morpheme (Sandler 1989, 2008; Sandler & Lillo-Martin 2006)

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--|
| ω μ σ | ω μ / \ σ σ | ω / \ μ μ \ σ | ω / \ μ μ σ σ |
| Monomorphemic monosyllabic words | monomorphemic disyllabic words | bimorphemic monosyllabic words | bimorphemic, disyllabic words |

Table 1. The word, the morpheme, and the syllable are distinguished by their disjoint cooccurrence patterns. All the possibilities shown are attested, but those in bold are most common (Sandler 2008).

2.2 Prosodic words

The tendency toward monosyllabicity – one movement beat per signed word -- motivates the proposal that monosyllabicity is a (violable) constraint on prosodic words in sign languages like ASL and ISL. Not all prosodic words are monosyllabic, as Table 1 shows, but there is a strong tendency in that direction. Evidence for the optimal monosyllabic prosodic word comes not only from reduction in lexical compounds of ASL and ISL, which, by reducing to monosyllables, satisfy the optimal form of the prosodic word, but also from cliticization in ISL. Specifically, when a pronoun occurs in the final, strong position of a phonological phrase in that language, it can cliticize onto the preceding content word so that the two together are perceived as conforming to a monosyllabic envelope (Sandler 1999a). The data here and for the next two sections are from a study of 30 sentences elicited from three signers, 90 sentences in all (Nespor & Sandler 1999).

An example of cliticization is taken from the sentence shown in Example (3).

3. [[SHOP-THERE] [AROUND-CORNER]] [BANKRUPT]

‘The shop around the corner went bankrupt.’

The sign THERE occurs at the end of the phonological phrase (discussed shortly), and cliticizes with SHOP by a process of coalescence. The sign SHOP is a symmetrical two-handed sign, which means roughly that in citation form, the dominant (i.e., the preferred, and typically the moving) hand and the nondominant hand are the same in shape and movement. In this example, both hands begins the two-handed sign SHOP, but in mid-path the handshape and direction of movement of the dominant hand change to sign THERE while the nondominant hand coterminally completes the sign SHOP. The change in handshape on the dominant hand would normally signal a new syllable; however, the nondominant hand persists in the handshape from SHOP and completes the single movement of that sign, providing an envelope for the one syllable of the optimal prosodic word. The two signs in isolation and the coalesced form are shown in Figure 4.⁷

⁷ See Brentari 1998 for phenomena related to prosodic words in ASL.



Figure 4. Cliticization produces non-structure-preserving monosyllables, the optimal form of the prosodic word. SHOP, THERE, and SHOP-THERE.

The cliticized form violates a lexical constraint on the type of two-handed signs in which both hands move, according to which the hands must be symmetrical in shape and movement (Battison, 1978). This non-structure preserving violation in favor of monosyllabicity is compatible with the fact that the prosodic coalescence we see here is post-lexical in the sense that it applies across morpho-syntactic word boundaries, that is, close to the surface (Sandler 1999a). SHOP-THERE is two morphosyntactic words but one prosodic word in ISL, just as *Sally's* (in *Sally's reticent*) is two morphosyntactic words, *Sally* and *is*, but one prosodic word in English. Nonisomorphism between prosody and syntax at higher levels will figure in the argument for distinguishing prosodic from syntactic structure in §5.

2.3. Phonological phrases

The Nespor and Sandler study found evidence for both phonological and intonational phrases in ISL. We begin here with the former. Phonological

Wendy Sandler 6/14/10 8:29 PM

Deleted: -

Wendy Sandler 6/14/10 8:29 PM

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

phrases, similar to intermediate phrases (Beckman and Pierrehumbert 1986) or MaPs (Selkirk 2002), are domains that correspond roughly to syntactic phrases projected from major lexical categories, such as noun phrases and verb phrases. There may be more than one phonological phrase within an intonational phrase (the next level up), and more than one intonational phrase in an utterance.⁸

Example (4) shows a long sentence of the former type from Nespor and Vogel (1986). In (4), phonological phrases are indicated with a ‘P’ subscript, and intonational phrases with an ‘I’ subscript.

4. [[The giant panda]_P [eats]_P [only one type]_P [of bamboo]_P]_I] [in its natural habitat]_P]_I

Nespor and Vogel provide an algorithm for projecting phonological phrases from syntactic phrases. In addition to cues of rhythm and prominence delineating phonological phrase boundaries, the authors demonstrate that languages have phonological rules such as rules of external sandhi, i.e., segmental assimilation and other processes between the end of one word and the beginning of the next, which have the phonological phrase as their domain. For example, these rules apply across word boundaries but not across phonological phrase boundaries. In the French sentence divided by brackets into phonological phrases, [*les enfants*] [*sont allés*] [*à l'école*], liaison applies across words within phonological phrases, so that the ‘s’ ([z]) is pronounced at the end of *les* in [*les enfants*], but is not

⁸ Some recent work posits a level of prosodic structure between the phonological phrase and the intonation phrase, but we will not deal with these levels here.

pronounced at the end of *allés*, blocked by the phonological phrase boundary *allés*] [á . Such processes, which have the effect of binding phrases as phonological constituents, provide evidence for the existence of the domain, in this case, the phonological phrase.

In our study of ISL, we found consistent phonetic cues at phonological phrase boundaries as well as a sandhi rule within that domain (Nespor and Sandler 1999; Sandler 2006). The final boundary of a phonological phrase is consistently marked either by a hold (holding the hands in place), a pause (relaxing the hands), or a reiteration of the last sign. These are the timing cues that mark the domain.

The sandhi rule is observable where two-handed signs occur within a phrase. Most signs are made with one hand, the dominant or preferred hand, but many are two-handed. Of the two-handed type, the nondominant hand may either be symmetrical in shape and movement with the dominant hand (as in SHOP above) or else it is stationery and functions as a place of articulation. Two-handed signs of either type may trigger an external sandhi rule within the phonological phrase. Under this rule, called Nondominant Hand Spread (NHS), the nondominant hand, configured and located according to the specifications of the triggering sign, stays in the signing space, beyond the sign that triggers it, up to the phonological phrase boundary. The spread may be either regressive or progressive. While the rule is optional, when it does apply, it respects the phonological phrase boundary in the corpus of elicited sentences studied by Nespor and Sandler.

Consider the ISL sentence in (5). Here, there are holds, pauses, or reiterations

at the phonological phrase boundaries, and an intonational phrase break between the two intonational phrases, discussed below). In this sentence, the configuration and location of the nondominant hand from the sign BAKE spreads to the end of the phonological phrase by remaining in the same configuration as in the source sign, BAKE, throughout the next sign, CAKE, which is a one-handed sign. As in the example of French liaison, NHS serves to bind together the signs in the phonological phrase as a phonological unit.

5. [I-TELL HIM]_P [BAKE CAKE]_P [TASTY]_P]_I [[ONE FOR-ME]_P [ONE FOR SISTER]_P]_I

‘I told him to bake a tasty cake, one for me and one for my sister’

The end of the phonological phrase BAKE CAKE is marked by a hold – holding the hand in position at the end of the last sign. As can be seen in Figure 5, the signs on either side of this boundary, HIM and TASTY, are not affected by NHS. On those signs, the nondominant hand is in a configuration and position that are neutral for this signer. The retraction of the fingers to the neutral, closed position between CAKE]_P and [TASTY]_P]_I, and lowering of the hand after CAKE]_P, though hard to discern in the still pictures, are very salient in the moving image.⁹

⁹ The phenomenon of NHS was noted earlier in ASL lexical compounds (Liddell & Johnson 1986; Sandler 1987). Since the citation forms of lexical compounds always constitute phonological phrases, it was impossible to learn the extent of the spread from these isolated forms. The ISL prosody project revealed that, in ISL at least, the spread, though optional, is to the phonological phrase boundary. Brentari & Crossley (2002) found a similar phenomenon in ASL, but with somewhat different characteristics. Since the assumptions and methods differed in the two studies, it is not yet known whether the nondominant hand behaves the same way in the two languages.



Figure 5. Nondominant Hand Spread from BAKE to CAKE within a phonological phrase. The signs pictured are HIM BAKE CAKE TASTY. (Figure from Sandler 2006).

Note that, syntactically, a verb phrase with an object noun phrase containing an adjective phrase could in principle consist of three phonological phrases, and would be likely to do so if there were more words in each phrase. For example, if the string were, ‘He carefully baked a huge layer cake’, the object noun phrase would be more likely to be separated from the verb by a phonological phrase boundary. Instead, BAKE and CAKE are ‘restructured’ (Nespor and Vogel 1986) into a single phonological phrase. Here, as in the cliticized example above in which two morphosyntactic words combine to form one prosodic word, syntactic constituency cannot fully predict prosodic constituency.

2.4. Intonational phrases

The intonational phrase is the unit marked by clearly perceptible breaks, informally often called ‘intonation breaks’, setting off clauses and other constituents, most saliently in such structures as parentheticals, nonrestrictive relative clauses, topics, and extraposed elements (Nespor and Vogel 1986). A

unit of this kind has been studied in depth in ASL by Wilbur (see Wilbur 2000 and references cited there). The presentation here is from the ISL study (Nespor and Sandler 1999). As with other levels of the hierarchy, intonational phrase breaks often correspond to particular syntactic constituents, but not always.

In ISL, final Intonational Phrase (IP) boundaries are marked by the same cues as phonological phrase boundaries, often by greater size and slower articulation of the last sign. But there are two other salient signals at this boundary: a change in head and/or body posture, and an across the board change in facial expression. Nespor and Sandler interpreted the marking on the last sign of the phrase as contributing prominence phrase finally. In the ISL study, all markers were coded, but their perception was by the human eye of the coder. Wilbur's careful instrumental study of stress in ASL shows prominence on the final sign of IPs in that language as well (Wilbur 1999). Wilbur argues that ASL is a non-plastic language like Catalan (Vallduví 1992), which shifts focused elements into the prominent final position of the IP, rather than a plastic language like English, which instead shifts the stress in the phrase to mark focus.¹⁰

Judging by Wilbur's studies, it appears that the syntactic content and rhythmic form of Intonational Phrases in ASL are comparable to those of ISL, presented here (see Wilbur 2000 for an overview). In both languages, an eyeblink commonly occurs at the juncture between two IPs (see also Baker and Padden 1978). The blinks are optional but very common, and, if they occur, it is at the end of an IP. Just as speakers time the biological function of breathing to

¹⁰ Little is said here about stress/prominence. The reader is referred to Wilbur (1999), Nespor and Sandler (1999), van der Kooij, Crasborn, and Emmerik (2006), and Sandler (to appear a) for investigations and discussions of this issue.

coincide with intonational phrase groupings in speech, so do signers time the biological function of blinking at those same boundaries during the transmission of sign language.

While it is difficult to demonstrate the manual effects (e.g., changes in size, speed, and timing) at the IP boundary in still pictures, the change in facial expression and head position are seen clearly in Figure 6 below, a (counterfactual) conditional sentence with two IPs, meaning, ‘If the goalkeeper had caught the ball, (the team) would have won the game.’ The figure and the coding beneath it reflect the typical distribution of the relevant nonmanual markers: Brow Raise, Squint, Head Forward on the first IP and Head Up and Back on the second IP. They are relatively constant across whole prosodic constituents and all change at the intonational phrase boundary. These nonmanual signals align with the manual timing signals: Hold and Slow at the end of the first IP and Hold at the end of the second.




Figure 6. Counterfactual conditional sentence in ISL with timing cues and intonational arrays (from Dachkovsky and Sandler 2009).




Figure 7. Close-up shows change of facial expression and head/body posture at the IP boundary.

The break between the two IPs is saliently marked by a change in head position and body posture, and in all aspects of facial expression, is shown in the close-up of the juncture in Figure 7. The functions of facial expression will be shown in §3 to correspond to those of intonation in spoken language. For the purposes of prosodic constituency, the relevant fact is its distribution. The IP is the primary domain for intonational tunes (Pierrehumbert and Beckman 1986), and this same constituent is the primary domain for linguistic facial expression in sign language.

Not all speakers and signers divide up strings in the same way. Prosodic constituency is determined not only by syntactic constituency, but also by factors such as information structure, emphasis, rate of speech, and even personal style. In the ISL data, the string meaning ‘The present for you disappeared’, though signed in isolation, was divided up in two different ways by different signers, shown in Example (6). The cues that typically mark phonological and intonational phrases indicate that the string in (6a) has three separate IPs, while (6b) has two IPs, with two phonological phrases in the first one. The IP boundary is characterized by stronger prominence phrase finally, as well as by a salient change in head position and facial expression. In (6a), the facial expression and head position, interpreted as part of the intonational array, changes twice, once at each IP boundary. In other words, there are three facial expressions and head positions, one for each IP. In (6b), the intonation is constant over the whole first intonational phrase [PRESENT-THERE]_p [FOR-YOU]_p]_I, changing on the second, [[DISAPPEARED]_p]_I, since this version of the utterance has only two

IPs. The intonation aligns with prosodic structure, but is not a reliable indicator of syntactic structure, since the syntactic structure is the same in both versions.

6a. [PRESENT-THERE]_p]_i [FOR-YOU]_p]_i [[DISAPPEARED]_p]_i

b. [PRESENT-THERE]_p [FOR-YOU]_p]_i [[DISAPPEARED]_p]_i

We see, then, that at all levels of the prosodic hierarchy, prosodic constituents correspond to (morpho)syntactic structure, but that there is not always a perfect fit. As argued in §5, this nonisomorphism means that the distribution of a particular marker is not determined solely by syntactic structure, implying that its distribution cannot be used as a reliable diagnostic for syntactic structure.

3. Intonation on the face: a compositional analysis

The idea that sign language facial expression is comparable to intonation in spoken language has been in the air for some time (e.g., Reilly, McIntire, and Bellugi 1990; Wilbur 2000; Nespor and Sandler 1999; Sandler 1999b, 2005), and continues to occupy researchers (e.g., Dachkovsky and Sandler 2009, Cecchetto et al 2009, de Vos, van der Kooij, and Crasborn 2009). Like the intonation of spoken language, which has both emotional (paralinguistic) functions and grammatical (linguistic) functions (Ladd 1996, Gussenhoven 2004), so too do the facial expressions of sign language serve both functions. Their distribution and

physical characteristics are different in each system, however. For example, the onset and offset are sharper in linguistic facial expressions; they are aligned with prosodic constituents, unlike paralinguistic expressions; and linguistic expressions typically involve fewer facial articulators (Baker-Shenk 1983; Dachkovsky 2005, de Vos, van der Kooij, and Crasborn 2009).

There are many muscles in the face, capable of creating numerous different expressions; Ekman and Friesen's (1978) Facial Action Coding System lists 52 facial actions of the brows, eyes, cheeks, nose, mouth, and chin, and another 12 head positions and gaze directions. However, it seems that only a restricted number of action units articulated by the brows and eyelids are involved in linguistic intonation in sign language, those involving the upper face, specifically, the brows and upper and lower eyelids (Wilbur 2000). Many accounts do not list individual action units (AUs), such as those involving the inner or outer brows, instead giving general descriptions, such as 'Brow Raise'.

When linguists first began to turn their attention to facial expression in ASL, they described constellations of expressions and head positions that typically accompany particular structures, as explained in §1. A closer look reveals that each of these articulations can make a semantic contribution of its own. Wilbur and Patschke (1998) propose that head position in ASL makes an independent contribution to meaning: forward head position connotes inclusion/involvement and affirmation, while backward position signifies exclusion/noninvolvement and negation.

It is not only the position of the head that contributes particular meanings to intonational configurations, but individual facial articulations as well. Brow Raise typically occurs on constituents such as topics, temporal and other adverbial phrases, and the ‘if’ clause of conditional sentences. It also occurs on yes/no questions. Constituents characterized by Brow Raise, in ISL and in ASL according to the literature, are followed by other material without Brow Raise, material signed either by the signer him/herself, or, in the case of yes/no questions, by the interlocutor. Coulter (1978, 1979) proposed that all structures with Brow Raise in ASL describe background information and can be considered various kinds of topics. Coulter’s general intuition, that facial expressions have meanings reflecting information structure, is on the right track.

Research on ISL has shown further that linguistic facial expressions consist of components that combine compositionally to create complex meanings (Nespor and Sandler 1999; Sandler 1999b, 2005). The example first used in this line of investigation was a yes/no question about ‘shared information’ in ISL. Yes/no questions take Brow Raise (Figure 8a), constituents about shared information such as many relative clauses in ISL typically take Squint (Figure 8b), and a yes/no question about shared information like *Did you buy that car (that we were talking about)?* is characterized by Brow Raise and Squint together (Figure 8c).



Figure 8. Compositionality of facial intonation. (a) Brow Raise on a yes/no question, (b) Squint on a constituent about ‘shared information’, and (c) Brow Raise and Squint together on a yes/no question about shared information.

Dachkovsky (2005; Dachkovsky and Sandler 2009) looked more deeply into the meaning of these articulations and arrived at a coherent semantic analysis of the facial articulations Brow Raise and Squint in ISL that accounts for the distribution of each independently and for their cooccurrence on a range of structures.

According to Dachkovsky’s analysis, Brow Raise signals continuation and forward directionality, reflecting dependency relations between phrases and clauses.¹¹ It means that the phonological or intonational phrase marked by it is to be followed by another constituent, produced either by the same interlocutor or, in the case of yes/no questions, by another. In this way, Brow Raise corresponds to the meaning of the High boundary tone in many spoken languages (Bolinger, 1978; Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg, 1990; Bartels 1999). In her analysis of H% boundary tones, Bartels explains that this general continuation dependency can

¹¹ A dependency relation is taken to mean a satisfaction-precedence relationship in the sense of Grosz & Sidner (1986).

via implicature have different, relatively more concrete semantic or pragmatic interpretations, depending on other properties of the utterance, and the same is true of Brow Raise.

Squint (narrowing of the upper and lower eyelids) is a common articulation in ISL. It is observed in other sign languages, but has only been discussed briefly for Danish Sign Language (Engberg-Pedersen 1990), where its meaning and use appear to be similar to those of ISL. In ISL, Squint marks restrictive relative clauses, and is often found on parentheticals, temporal clauses referring to the remote past, counterfactual conditionals, and certain topics, among other structures. It is associated with constituents whose status is negotiated between the interlocutors as retrievable, and is interpreted as an instruction to retrieve mutually accessible information that is not currently prominent in the discourse. The idea that intonation can signal shared knowledge between the speaker and the addressee is developed for English in Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg (1990). In ISL, Dachkovsky's interpretation of Squint explains its distribution both independently and in combination with Brow Raise.

This approach is compatible with research on spoken language, showing that the content of intonational tunes (Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg 1990; Gussenhoven 1984, 2004), and even minute details of their timing with respect to the words on which they occur (Gussenhoven 1984, 2004), depend on meaning and information structure within a discourse.

By understanding facial intonation of sign language in this way, we now understand why the same specific action unit may occur on a range of structures,

and even why the same combination of articulations can occur on different kinds of sentences. For example, Brow Raise and Squint can co-occur on yes/no questions, relative clauses, and certain conditionals, providing each has the requisite combined meanings: dependency/continuation plus mutually retrievable (but not easily accessible) information. Counterfactual conditionals are reliably marked by Brow Raise and Squint together, as they contain information that is not readily retrievable because it is false. Figure 6 above shows a counterfactual conditional, with a similar facial configuration to that in the yes/no question with information to be retrieved shown in Figure 8c above. There is surely a great deal more to learn about the facial intonation of sign languages, and the kind of analysis summarized briefly here is a promising direction to take in investigating this system.

The analysis shows that sign language intonation has compositional structure, a characteristic of spoken language intonation as well (Hayes and Lahiri 1991; Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg 1990). But there is a difference in the two modalities in the distribution of intonation. In spoken languages, intonational tunes consist of sequences of tones that cluster on stressed syllables and at prosodic boundaries. In sign languages, intonational arrays often characterize whole prosodic constituents, a possibility not available to spoken languages. Since the arrays are conveyed by different articulators (of the face and head) than those that transmit words (the hands), this simultaneity is available, and sign languages exploit it.

The ‘prosodic approach’ to the prosody/syntax relationship, sketched

above, takes the view that prosodic constituents are related to a syntactic representation that is close to the surface, that these constituents may be altered due to various factors such as complexity of the syntactic constituent, information structure, and rate of speech, and that intonational patterns align themselves with those prosodic constituents. We now turn to the direct syntax approach.

4. The direct syntax approach

A number of studies on sign languages have linked nonmanual markers to syntactic structure in a direct way. Brow Raise and Brow Furrow are examples to be dealt with here, in brief. The Brow Raise articulation discussed in Section 2 receives a syntactic analysis in Wilbur and Patschke (1999). In their treatment, the marker itself is assigned neither intonational nor syntactic status inherently, but the authors argue that its distribution is determined on purely syntactic grounds, demonstrated in §4.1.

Three analyses of *wh* questions – the basic position of *wh* phrases and constraints on their movement -- rely heavily on the distribution of the furrowed brow facial expression that typically accompanies these structures. The problem to be accounted for in ASL is that the *wh* word, accompanied by the Furrowed Brow nonmanual marker, can occur in situ, on the right, or on the left, and sometimes in more than one position in a sentence (examples follow in §4.2), and the direction of movement is the focus of the debate. The two analyses to be described in 4.2. posit different base structures, but share the idea that the nonmanual markers themselves are part of the syntax.

For Italian Sign Language (LIS, Cecchetto et al 2009), the claim is made that *wh*-movement is rightward, once again relying on the distribution of the nonmanual marker. The authors attempt to explain why, in LIS, object *wh* words are never initial, this explanation relying crucially on the position and spreading or non-spreading of the nonmanual marker. In the LIS study, the authors acknowledge that the marker itself is intonational but claim that its distribution marks explicitly syntactic constituents. They propose that sign languages as a group differ from spoken languages in this way, a proposal to which we will return below.

Each proposal, though different from the others, shares the supposition that the markers in question are intimately related to syntactic structure, hence the label adopted here: ‘the direct syntax approach’. The prosodic approach promoted here proposes that the relevant nonmanual markers are intonational in function and prosodic in distribution, and are therefore connected to syntax only indirectly. On this view, intonational ‘tunes’ express meanings such as continuation or semantic dependency, or pragmatic notions such as illocutionary force and shared knowledge, and their distribution with respect to the text is determined by the factors that govern prosodic constituency. We return to the prosodic approach and the nonisomorphism that supports it in §5.

4.1. Brow Raise

We begin with Brow Raise, a facial articulation that characterizes a range of sentence types, some of them noted in §2 and unified under the prosodic

approach by the explanation that they all involve continuation and/or dependency. The Wilbur and Patschke (1999) analysis does not rule out the possibility that Brow Raise is intonational. However, their account rejects a pragmatic/semantic explanation of the meaning of Brow Raise as would be expected if it is intonational, and proposes instead that the distribution of Brow Raise makes direct reference to syntax, rather than indirect reference through prosody. Therefore, their treatment meets the criteria for inclusion as a direct syntax approach. The authors provide many examples of structures with Brow Raise in ASL, some of them shown in Example (7). In keeping with conventions in the sign language literature, the scope of the nonmanual marking is indicated by a line over the text.

7. Some ASL structures with Brow Raise (Wilbur and Patschke 1999)

- (7a) Topics: $\overline{\text{br}}$ JOHN_i, $\overline{\text{br}}$ VEGETABLE, HE_i PREFER ARTICHOKE
 ‘As for John, as for vegetables, he prefers artichokes.’
- (b) Yes/No questions: $\overline{\text{br}}$ THINK HAVE ENOUGH MONEY
 ‘Do you think we have enough money?’
- (c) Relative clauses: DOG BITE₁ [$\overline{\text{br}}$ CHASE CAT BEFORE]_S THAT_C]_{NP}
 ‘The dog bit me that chased the cat before.’
- (d) wh-clefts: $\overline{\text{br}}$ SHE GAVE HARRY WHAT, NEW SHIRT
 ‘What she gave Harry was a new shirt.’
- (e) conditionals: $\overline{\text{br}}$ (IF) RAIN TOMORROW, WE CAN GO-TO MOVIES
 ‘If it rains tomorrow, we can go to the movies.’

The authors give considered arguments against Coulter's pragmatic explanation according to which Brow Raise is found on structures providing background information (Coulter 1979). The authors argue convincingly that this is not always the case, and they offer instead a direct syntactic analysis: that Brow Raise characterizes material in A-bar positions associated with non-*wh* operator features. According to the syntactic theory that they assume, this means that material characterized by Brow Raise is syntactically outside the domain of the matrix sentence. The authors stipulate that the only constituents in an A-bar position that do not get Brow Raise are *wh* phrases, which are characterized by furrowed brow and other markers, and they are excluded on empirical (but not theoretical) grounds. The authors argue that their syntactic characterization thus stated includes the relevant structures while correctly ruling out others.

For a range of structures, either a syntactic or a prosodic account will do. For example, the distinction between the two sentences in Example (8) depends on whether the subject is also marked as the topic. Only in the latter case does it get Brow Raise. Under any analysis, the topic forms a separate syntactic and a separate prosodic constituent.

8. DOG RAN-AWAY 'The dog ran away'
 ___br
 DOG RAN-AWAY 'As for the dog, it ran away.'

Wilbur and Patschke's treatment describes a wide range of structures, including various types of topics with subtly different nonmanual marking (Aarons 1994), for which any comprehensive analysis of Brow Raise will have to account.¹² However, their treatment suffers from two problems, one empirical and the other theoretical.

Empirically, the non-*wh* A-bar position proposal cannot explain why there is never sentence final material marked by Brow Raise. For example, the so-called focus doubles analyzed by Petronio and Lillo-Martin (1997), exemplified in Example (9), though not dealt with in Wilbur and Patschke (1999), are in non-*wh*-A-bar positions, and, according to their syntactic analysis, are therefore predicted to get Brow Raise, but they do not (see Sandler and Lillo-Martin 2006). The prosodic approach, which assigns the Brow Raise intonation to mark prosodic constituents for continuation regardless of the specific type of syntactic constituent they correspond to, explains this distribution.¹³

9. I CAN READ **CAN**
 I WANT GO **WANT**
 I BUY THREE BOOK **THREE**

¹² A prosodic analysis which assumes that the nonmanual markings in question are intonational will also have to account for the different kinds of topics described by Aarons. The notion of topic is a pragmatic one to begin with, and the topics discerned by Aarons are expected to lend themselves to an intonational treatment, which is left to future research.

¹³ Brow raise is found at the end of the sentence in yes/no questions, to be continued by the addressee.

The prosodic account of Brow Raise, though based on ISL, appears to be compatible with the ASL data provided in Wilbur and Patschke (e.g., Example (7) above), but has the theoretical advantage of providing a simpler explanation, and one that need not rely directly on syntactic structure, referring instead to structure that is closer to the surface realization -- the linearized bracketed structure that is the domain of prosody. On this view, the structures in question get Brow Raise because they are intended to be continued, similar to constituents that get H% in many familiar spoken languages. The prosodic approach correctly rules out Brow Raise on focus doubles, since these forms, though in A bar position, do not bear the meaning of continuation or dependency with respect to what comes next.

4.2. Brow Furrow and *wh*-questions

Wh-questions are characterized by a different intonational configuration from the one described above. Rather than Raised Brows, they are typically marked in ASL by a Furrowed Brow, as well as a head tilt and forward body position (Baker-Shenk 1983). The issue of *wh*-movement in the syntactic approach has hinged on the role and distribution of nonmanual markers in ASL and, more recently in Italian Sign Language (LIS). In ASL, the challenge has been to determine the basic syntactic position and movement properties of the *wh* phrase, since it appears in more than one position on the surface, as noted above and exemplified presently. The analyses cannot be properly evaluated in the space allotted here (see Sandler and Lillo-Martin 2006). However, there are

particular problems connected to the syntactic approach that are worth noting in the present context.

One analysis of the direct syntax type claims that the *wh* element found at the beginning of a sentence is the result of leftward movement to a particular syntactic position, as in spoken languages generally (Petronio and Lillo-Martin 1997), and those at the end are base generated focus doubles, on a par with other doubled constituents in the language. Another analysis holds that the *wh* element found at the beginning are base generated topics, while those found at the end have been moved rightward into a syntactic position marked for that feature (Neidle, Kegl, MacLaughlin, Bahan, and Lee 2000). Neidle et al take the extreme view that “nonmanual syntactic markings are frequently associated with syntactic features residing in the heads of functional projections”, and that these markers spread over syntactically defined domains, such as Spec-head or c-command (p 43). The authors proceed to provide a detailed account of the syntax of ASL which is in many instances explicitly motivated by the distribution of these markers. In both treatments, the distribution in the sentence of nonmanual markers typically associated with *wh* questions is used to reveal the basic position of the *wh* element as well as the direction of movement to its surface position. The details of the analyses would take us too far afield here; we focus instead on empirical and theoretical problems inherent in such an approach.

An important problem in arriving at the right analysis is differences of opinion over the nature of the data. Some sentences reported to be judged acceptable by one research team are reported to be judged ungrammatical by the

other. One problem is the nature of the coding system and the generality and reliability of judgments.¹⁴ But some discrepancies may well be better understood if the full prosodic structure is taken into account, rather than looking only at the lexical string and facial expression.

For example, Petronio and Lillo-Martin (1997) report sentence (10a) to be acceptable, while Neidle et al (2000) say that the similar string in (10b) is out.

- _____ wh
- 10a. WHO YOU LIKE ‘Who do you like?’
-
- _____ wh
- b. * WHO JOHN HATE ‘Who does John hate?’

The team that rejects (10b) concedes that such sentences are accepted under two conditions, one, if the position of the nondominant hand in the two-handed generic *wh*-sign is held throughout the utterance, and the other in which the Furrowed Brow facial expression is more intense at the end of the sentence, the basic position of the *wh* element. In both cases, Neidle et al make the claim that the true syntactic position of the *wh*-phrase is marked -- either by the ‘perseveration’ of the nondominant hand through to the end of the utterance or by

¹⁴ Since prosodic structure, and especially intonational patterns, reflect information and discourse structure, it is imperative to elicit the structures to be analyzed in isolation at first, without any potentially confounding context, before looking at them embedded in discourse in later studies. Several examples of the same structures should each be collected from several subjects, to control for idiosyncracies and unforeseen extraneous interpretations of the material by subjects. Finally, coding is laborious but necessary. Unlike studies of spoken language, sign language does not yet have the benefit of instrumental recording, so that meticulous coding of each articulation, including rhythmic behavior of the hands, and its temporal distribution in each phrase, is essential.

intensity of the facial marker at the end of the utterance. But are these markers inherently part of the syntactic representation, as Neidle et al assume, or are they intonational elements whose distribution is determined prosodically? And are the data better understood by choosing one over the other?

Here is how a prosodic analysis could offer an alternative explanation for the acceptability of (10b). Wilbur (1999) describes the final position in an Intonational Phrase in ASL as prominent, measured in terms of increased manual muscle tension, peak velocity, and displacement. This observation motivates a hypothesis according to which the intensity of the facial expression in the Neidle et al example is explained by prosodic position as well. In the analysis of ISL, both intensity and nondominant hand spread are argued to be prosodically determined. Specifically, it was noted in the Nespor and Sandler (1999) study that facial expression often intensifies toward the ends of phrases (argued to mark phrase final prominence together with manual markers), and that the nondominant hand may spread (NHS) within phonological phrases, as shown in Section 2.3. If ASL has similar prosodic markers, then it is conceivable that phrases like (10b), when uttered in isolation, are simply judged more grammatical when they have the earmarks of more natural prosodic constituents, in this case, of phonological phrases. In other words, if (10b) shows phrase final prominence and is unified by external sandhi in the form of NHS, then it looks like a proper phonological phrase and is judged to be grammatical. There is no way to know whether the form of (10a), judged grammatical, was prosodically identical to that of (10b), judged to be ungrammatical, because the studies do not provide the relevant

prosodic descriptions and analyses. In the absence of a more detailed representation of the prosodic form in the data, we can't evaluate these reports (see note 13).

The Neidle et al group does occasionally make note of intonation breaks in their analysis, but comparison of their glosses to the videotaped examples, posted at <http://www.bu.edu/asllrp/book>, indicates that this is not done systematically, and the criteria are never spelled out. The group assumes a priori that syntactic structure is inherently manifested in nonmanual markings, but, since prosodic structure on the same syntactic string can take many different forms, their position cannot be confirmed without a prosodic analysis.

Cecchetto et al (2009) also use the distribution of nonmanual elements as a diagnostic for determining the syntactic position of the words with which they are associated. But the LIS team departs from the syntax-only conception in the sense that they attribute intonational status to the nonmanual markers ("NMMs") themselves. For them, intonation is directly connected to syntax. While the team notes that spoken languages occasionally also use intonation to mark syntactic structure, providing an example from Japanese, they suggest that sign languages do this much more. According to the authors, "sign languages differ from spoken languages in the way they use prosodic devices to mark [syntactic/WS] dependencies" (p.281). The dependencies they refer to are between abstract positions in tree structure, one of which is the proposed COMP position. But is such an abstract analysis supported? And are sign languages anomalous, as the authors' account forces them to claim?

In their analysis of LIS, the Furrowed Brow associated with *wh* words is an intonational element that is not part of a syntactic position, as the Neidle group stipulates, but rather is part of the lexical description of the *wh* words. It spreads over various stretches of the utterance, its scope reflecting syntactic structure. Specifically, they argue that the spreading of the NMM from *wh* phrases to other material marks syntactic dependency between the *wh* phrase and the complementizer position that they hypothesize, by analogy with common assumptions about spoken languages, to exist in the tree (LIS apparently does not have overt complementizers).

The analysis is internally coherent and empirically explanatory, and the data are straightforward -- carefully elicited isolated target sentences from five native signers. However, potential problems arise from mixing prosody with syntax in an unconstrained way. This is because it can be demonstrated that the two are not one and the same, as we will see for both spoken and signed language in the following section. If this is the case, then assuming a direct link between intonation and syntax is an unreliable strategy.

5. Nonisomorphism as a challenge to the direct syntax approach

From spoken language research, we know that the interaction between syntax and prosody is actually very complex. On the one hand, the prosodic form of an utterance can reflect syntactic structure, so that the pairs of strings *No people will go* vs. *No, people will go* and *People will go happily* vs. *People will go, happily* have different syntactic structures reflected in different prosodic

structures, and result in different interpretations (examples from Selkirk 2002).

And since syntax and prosody are closely related, it is expected that some structures can be accounted for by either a direct syntax or a prosodic account.

Neidle et al (2000) give an example of an ASL sentence in which the *wh*-question is interrupted by a topic, shown in Example (11) from Neidle et al (2000:116).

_____ wh _____ t2-bg _____ wh
 11. WHO, VEGETABLE, PREFER POTATO WHO

‘Who, as for vegetables, who prefers potatoes?’

Under the authors’ analysis, the distribution of nonmanual markers seen here is expected, since VEGETABLE is analyzed as a topic and outside the scope of the *wh* markers. Under a prosodic account, topics form their own intonational phrases, which could also receive a different intonational marking from the surrounding material. Perhaps the resumption of the intonational element on the other side of the interrupting constituent is an example of the ‘bookmark effect’, attributed to non-syntactic factors, described presently.¹⁵

On the other hand, some structures cannot be explained equally well by the two approaches. Two different kinds of nonisomorphism raise problems for the direct syntax approach: nonisomorphism between prosodic and syntactic constituents, and nonisomorphism between syntactic structures and intonational

¹⁵This interpretation was suggested to me by Laszlo Hunyadi (p.c.).

meaning. Let us look at some examples from spoken and sign language which underscore how the direct syntax approach can potentially go awry.

We begin with spoken language. The two Bengali sentences in Example 5a and b (Hayes and Lahiri 1991) show that the same stretch can have two different prosodic constituent structures depending in this case on rate of speech, and that the different structures form domains for particular intonational and phonological patterns. Example (12) shows assimilation applying within phonological phrases (12b), but not across their boundaries (12a). The prosodic constituent boundaries are different depending on speech rate while the syntactic structure is the same in both examples. In the notation used in this example, H and L stand for high and low tones, the asterisk means that the tone is accented, and the percent symbol indicates the end of an intonational phrase.

(12a) $(\emptyset^{L*}mor^{H-}) (t\beta a^{L*}dor^{H-}) (ta^{L*}ra-ke^{H-}) (d\acute{e}^{L*}t\beta e^{H-})^{L\%}$
 [r] [tβ] [r] [t]

Amor scarf Tara –to gave

‘Amor gave the scarf to Tara.’

(b) $(\emptyset^{L*}mor\ t\beta ador\ tara-ke^{H-}) (d\acute{e}^{L*}t\beta e^{H-})^{L\%}$
 [tβtβ] [tt]

‘Amor gave the scarf to Tara.’

In the example, a L* tone marks the beginning of phonological phrases, and an H tone marks the end, while the final L% signals an assertion. The sequence corresponding to *Amor scarf Tara* has three L*H sequences in the slow

version (12a), one for each word which constitutes its own phrase, but only one L*H sequence in the fast version (12b), which collapses the three phrases into one. The Bengali example shows, then, that the distribution of intonational elements alone might not be a reliable indicator of syntactic structure.

Furthermore, it is not always the case that structures such as *wh* questions have the same intonational marking. It is therefore not clear how either a direct syntax approach or a mixed approach of kind proposed for Italian Sign Language would account for the distribution of *wh* words with a different intonation pattern. These possibilities call into question the reliability of analyses which derive syntactic structure directly from the distribution of intonation.

An example of nonisomorphism of this type is provided in the form of a choice question by Pierrehumbert and Hirschberg (1990). The interpretation of the question in Example (13) is that a piece of fruit and a piece of cake are being offered: *Do you want an apple (?) - or banana cake?*

(13) Do you want an apple or banana cake? (fruit or cake)
 H* H H* L L%

On the other hand, a different pattern leads to a different interpretation. In Example (14), the choices being offered are two kinds of ice cream. The difference is signaled by the intonation. In both examples, the final intonation contour differs from that of a typical interrogative, which is L* H H% according to the authors.

(14) Do you like vanilla ice cream or chocolate?

L* H* L L%

A similar pattern is found in choice questions in ISL, illustrated in Example (15) and Figure 9. If Raised Brows is akin to High tone, then the non-manual marking in (15) shows behavior comparable to that of the English example in (13) in which the yes/no question H may characterize the end of the first conjunct but not the end of the second, and to both (13 and (14) in that there is no question intonation on the second constituent, although it is syntactically part of the question. A possible interpretation is one in which the part of the sentence with a question marker has the illocutionary intent of a real question, while the second part is declaratively offering another option.

15. ISL (Meir and Sandler 2004)

y/n

Index2 LIKE ICE CREAM VANILLA OR CHOCOLATE

‘Do you like vanilla ice cream or chocolate ice cream?’




Figure 9. Choice question in ISL, ‘Do you like vanilla ice cream or chocolate?’ The question intonation spans only the first phrase of the question (pictured here for the expression VANILLA-INDEX), though the whole string (including CHOCOLATE-INDEX shown here) is a question syntactically.

If the choice questions above are regarded as single sentences, they show clear distinctions between syntactic structure and prosodic domains. In the ISL example the question non-manual ends where the pitch accent is placed in the comparable English sentence, rather than at the end of the question. The ISL and English examples have much in common. Both are questions syntactically, and both are characterized by a rising intonation pattern. But in both, the rising intonation identifiable with a yes/no question does not characterize the whole question. Instead, the second choice is outside the scope of the yes/no intonation pattern. The point is that the intonational tune is not coextensive with the syntactic constituent in either language; the intonation and the syntax are non-isomorphic.

Not only can prosodic constituency be different from syntactic constituency, the nature of the intonational pattern – facial expression in the case of sign language – may vary on the same syntactic structure. As in English, in

these languages, rhetorical questions, ironic questions, and exclamative questions do not have the intonational patterns associated with canonical *wh* questions.

This illustrates nonisomorphism between syntax and prosody at the level of the meaning of intonational patterns. Since it is meaning or pragmatic considerations, and not syntax, that determine the pattern, this disconnect is another argument against inferring a direct connection between intonational markers and syntactic structure. Figure 10a shows a canonical *wh* question marker in ISL, while 10b shows an atypical intonation on a *wh* question meaning, ‘Why didn’t you tell me you were going to the party? (If I’d known, I would have asked for a ride)’.



Figure 10. Intonational arrays vary according to meaning. (a) typical *wh*-question intonation in ISL, and (b) atypical intonation on a *wh*-question.

In this example, the intonation that overrides the canonical *wh* question intonation may be paralinguistic, but it demonstrates that attempting to use an intonational element as a diagnostic for syntactic structure would be confounded in such a case (see also Lillo-Martin and Quadros 2010).

We have seen, then, that the intonation may vary on the same syntactic structure. The converse is also attested: A high tone can mark many different kinds of syntactic structures in spoken language, and Brow Raise can do the same in sign language. A recent study on Hungarian and English shows that certain long-distance intonational relations are determined by information structure regardless of syntactic structure. Hunyadi (2010) shows that both center embedded clauses and parenthetical clauses trigger a ‘bookmark effect’, according to which the resuming phrase rises to the same pitch as that which precedes the interrupting material. For example, in the center-embedded sentence, *The cat that the dog that was rabid bit ran away*, the particular (high) F0 level on *cat* is resumed on *bit*, across the lower-toned embedded structure. Similarly, but, crucially, in a different syntactic structure, the pitch level is resumed on the other side of the parenthetical in the sentence, *Could you tell me – my watch has stopped – what time it is?* In each case, the tonal pattern is aligned with some prosodic constituent, but the types of syntactic structures evoking this ‘tonal continuity’ – center embedded clauses and parenthetical clauses -- are quite different. It is the pragmatic function – signaling to the addressee the resumption of an interrupted constituent – that is the same. Clearly, attempting to use the resumptive High tone as a diagnostic for the type of syntactic structure it characterizes would lead us astray. The same is true of Furrowed Brow (or other intonational articulations) in sign language.

Also attested are cases where the typical *wh* intonational marking occurs with no *wh* word anywhere in sight. Examples from ASL (Aarons 1994) and ISL

(Meir and Sandler 2008) are shown in (16). The intonation is introduced by the pragmatic force of the utterance rather than by the syntax (Sandler and Lillo-Martin 2006).

16. ISL and ASL: $\frac{\text{wh}}{\text{TIME}}$ 'What time is it?'
 ISL: $\frac{\text{wh}}{\text{AGE}}$ 'How old is he?'
 ASL: $\frac{\text{wh}}{\text{JOHN BUY YESTERDAY}}$ 'What did John buy yesterday?'

Cases such as the first two in (16) are easy to imagine in a language like English. For example, in interviewing someone in order to fill out a questionnaire, one might ask 'Age?' with a question intonation. Many contexts for questions like 'The time?' or 'His age?' can be imagined. Of course, it is always possible to supply an elaborate syntactic structure with mostly covert elements that bring such sentences in line with syntactically canonical questions, but such a structure does not seem warranted here. Let us illustrate this point by pushing the syntactic approach to its logical extreme. In response to a statement like, *I think I'm going to flunk the driving test again*, one might respond, *Really?* or even, *mm?*. The intonation is like that of a sentence such as, *Do you really think so?* -- but is the syntactic structure of such a sentence really 'there' in *mm?* Occam's razor selects the simpler analysis according to which the pragmatics supplies both the questioning illocutionary force of the utterance and the intonation pattern to go with it.

The LIS study (Cecchetto et al 2009) does attribute intonational status to the relevant nonmanual markers. Yet the authors cite Neidle et al's (2000) claim that nonmanual markers directly manifest numerous syntactic elements, and, like the ASL group, use the markers as diagnostics of syntactic structure. The authors of the Italian Sign Language study are forced to propose that sign language is different from spoken language in using intonational markers extensively in the syntax, and suggest that this is due to the options for simultaneity afforded by the modality. However, this explanation is not satisfactory, since intonation in spoken language is also 'simultaneous', in the sense of being suprasegmentally superimposed on the text. In principle, then, there is no physical obstacle for intonation to manifest syntactic elements in spoken language either, yet this is rarely the case. In any event, without a prosodic analysis to complement the syntactic analysis, we cannot know if an alternative explanation in terms of prosodic constituents and associated intonation can account for the same data, and this indeterminacy calls into question whether it is necessary or empirically justified to propose such a typological cleft.

Research on sign languages is only about half a century old, and researchers are certainly justified in gleaning whatever evidence they can for understanding the structure of these languages. Yet the direct syntax approach that stipulates unmediated identity between intonational markers and underlying syntactic structure ignores the meaning of intonation on the one hand and the non-unity of syntactic and prosodic constituent structure on the other. A more nuanced approach, one that attributes pragmatic meaning to intonation and

respects prosody as an independent component of the grammar while seeking to understand its interaction with other components, is likely to be more illuminating and ultimately more explanatory.

6. Evidence from Acquisition

Interesting support for the claim that the connection between syntax and intonation in sign languages is not direct comes from acquisition research. Studies on the acquisition of the intonational cues accompanying *wh* questions and conditionals in ASL show that syntactic and intonational markers are not acquired in tandem. Children acquire the syntactic structure of these sentence types, including appropriate use of function words for different kinds of *wh* questions and the manual sign IF in conditionals, long before they command the articulation and scope of the grammatical nonmanual marking (Reilly, McIntire, and Bellugi 1990; Anderson and Reilly 1998; Lillo-Martin 2000). In fact, Reilly and colleagues show that the individual markers of ASL antecedent clauses of conditionals – Brow Raise, head tilt, head thrust clause finally, and blink – are acquired component by component, i.e., that mastery of this intonational marking is gradual. This pattern shows a disconnect between intonation and syntax, and does not mesh with a grammar in which the markers themselves are part of the most basic syntactic structure.

7. Nonmanuals are not a natural class

Certain nonmanual signals have played an important role in the discussion so far, assigned either to syntactic or to intonational components of the system. However, in order to arrive at a comprehensive model of sign language grammar, it is necessary to acknowledge that the physical articulators themselves do not correspond directly to grammatical components. While the discovery that other parts of the body besides the hands are also recruited by the grammar of ‘manual’ languages was a breakthrough, this discovery has had the undesirable effect of grouping all signals that are not made with the hands into a single category, usually called nonmanual markers (NMMs) or nonmanuals. This lumping together of everything articulated by parts of the body that are not the hands is misleading, as it obscures genuine divisions made by the grammar.

We have seen, for example, that the prosodic system is comprised of signals by the head and body, but also, crucially by the hands. It is the hands that transmit the words in sign language utterances, and they convey the temporal changes that delineate prosodic constituents. Head/torso movements and facial expressions typically align themselves with the boundaries of these constituents. The hands, then, do the talking and the prosodic phrasing, while the head and face add intonational information.

Just as the configurations and movements of the hands play more than one role in the grammatical system of sign languages, so too do body position and facial articulations play roles that have nothing to do with intonation. For example, the upper body is mentioned in the present article as participating in the

prosodic system, and it does so by shifting at major prosodic boundaries (not described here). In addition, the upper body may shift to express the point of view of different participants in a discourse (e.g., Lillo-Martin 1995, to appear) in a way that corresponds to the structure of higher levels of discourse organization rather than to prosody per se.

While some facial expressions may be intonational, like Brow Raise, Brow Furrow, and Squint discussed above, others are better understood as adverbial or adjectival morphemes. Different configurations of the lower face (lips, cheeks, and tongue) convey meanings such as ‘carelessly’, ‘with enjoyment and relaxation’, ‘meticulously’, or ‘for a long time’, in ASL (Liddell 1980, Wilbur 2000), ISL (Meir and Sandler 2008), and other sign languages. These articulations tend to occur on predicates, which is a different type of distribution than we see for the intonational facial expressions described above which often characterize whole clauses. But their temporal distribution has not been investigated in detail, and it remains to be seen how they interact with syntactic and/or prosodic constituents.

The mouth has a variety of other functions associated with different components of the grammar of sign languages (see Boyes-Braem and Sutton-Spence 2001 and Crasborn et al 2008 for cross-sign-linguistic descriptions and analyses of mouth configurations and actions). One prosodic function of mouth action is observed when words from the spoken language are mouthed during signing. The mouthing of content words may spread over clitics, to mark the domain of the prosodic word (Sandler 1999a, Crasborn et al 2008). Certain

(meaningless) mouth configurations or movements are obligatorily associated with specific lexical items (Anderson and Reilly 1998; Woll 2001; Meir and Sandler 2008); they are part of the lexical (not the prosodic) representation. The mouth may also articulate nonlinguistic gestures corresponding to manual co-speech gestures of hearing speakers. These gestures iconically represent physical properties and sensations such as heaviness, fullness, types of textures, or sounds (air disturbances) like that of water escaping from a hose (Sandler 2009). The mouth, then, is decidedly nonmanual, but it has a variety of different functions, linguistic and non-linguistic, in sign languages.

Another type of facial action is affective or paralinguistic facial expression, mentioned above. This system uses (some of) the same articulators as linguistic facial expression, but has different properties in terms of temporal distribution, number of articulators involved, and pragmatic function (Baker-Shenk 1983; Dachkovsky 2005; Vos, vander Kooij, and Crasborn 2009). It appears then that some facial configurations are intonational but, like affective intonation in spoken language, they are not part of the linguistic grammar (Ladd 1996), and any grammatical description must take this distinction into account.¹⁶

Negative headshake is another example of a nonmanual action whose assignment to a component of the grammar is not yet fully determined, although aspects of its behavior have been documented for many sign languages (e.g., ASL: Liddell 1980; German Sign Language: Pfau 2002; Catalan Sign Language and German Sign Language: Pfau and Quer 2007; Sign Language of the

¹⁶ Corina, Bellugi, & Reilly (1999) show neurological differences in the representation of linguistic and emotional facial expressions.

Netherlands: Coerts 1992; ISL: Meir and Sandler 2008; Chinese Sign Language: Yang and Fischer 2002; LIS: Geraci 2006; see Zeshan 2006 for a survey).

Sometimes attributed to prosody generally or to intonation, the headshake at least sometimes performs as a nonlinguistic gesture, as it does for hearing speakers in the ambient culture. Unlike linguistic intonation, it may occur without any signs for signers of some sign languages, but, like intonation, it may also perform its negating function in an utterance without a negative manual sign, also in some but not all sign languages. The distribution of negative headshake seems to show quite a bit of variation, and it may be that this variation has to do with scope marking properties of the languages more than with prosodic constituency. In any case, more research is needed in order to understand whether it is indeed more closely tied to morpho-syntax than are the intonational elements described above.

Eye gaze is also nonmanual, but nonintonational, and there is no consensus on its role or roles. In our work on ISL, we have found that this element does not line up reliably with prosodic constituency. Instead, gaze may perform nonlinguistic functions such as turn-taking (Baker 1977) and other forms of attention direction. Some have argued that gaze performs the syntactic role of marking agreement (Neidle et al 2000), while others have refuted this claim, using eye tracking to show that gaze does not perform reliably as an agreement marker (Thompson, Emmorey, and Kluender 2006).

The issue of the range of functions served by nonmanual articulations has not gone completely unnoticed. A recent paper provides a sophisticated survey of these forms and their role in sign language grammar, noting some prosodic

functions as well (Pfau and Quer in press). In short, it is a mistake to lump together all nonmanual markers into a single category, whether syntactic or prosodic, assuming a priori that they belong to a single system. It is similarly inaccurate to keep the hands out of prosody; the timing and displacement of the hands in conveying the text are the primary cues to prosodic constituency. Sign languages are visual languages, and, as such, they recruit all articulators that are within the field of vision of interlocutors in the service of language. It is a compelling challenge to work out the contributions made by each of these elements and their articulations to the overall grammatical structure of sign languages, one that promises to pay off, but that is still in the early stages.

8. The emergence of prosodic complexity in a new sign language

Linguists and nonlinguists alike share an intuitive feeling that prosody is a very basic property in language. Babies babble their pitch excursions in endearing yet meaningless intonational phrases. Pidgins are thought to use prosody to mark different types of constituents and syntactic dependencies before syntax has had a chance to develop (Givón 1979). Yet how primal -- how 'automatic' -- is prosody really?

One way to approach this question might be to look at the way a prosodic system develops in a new language. Pidgins are hard to find, and in any case their speakers already possess full-fledged prosodic systems in their native languages. In fact, there are no truly new spoken languages. But new sign languages do arise from time to time, whenever a deaf community first comes into being.

In the Al-Sayyid Bedouin village in the Negev Desert of present day Israel, four deaf children were born in a single household about 75 years ago. Due to its insular social structure, consanguineous marriage patterns and high birth rate, genetic deafness spread in the population (Scott, Carmi, Elbedour, Duyk, Stone, and Sheffield 1995) and today, there are about 150 deaf people in a village of 4,000 souls. An indigenous sign language arose among the deaf people and is used by many of the hearing villagers as well (Kisch 2000).

Over the past several years, our research team has learned that Al Sayyid Bedouin Sign Language (ABSL) functions as a full fledged language, used for a range of social interactions, instructions and plans, and to discuss such topics as personal histories, folk remedies, national insurance, childcare, or how to cajole a husband. The sentences of the second generation of ABSL signers are verb-final, with strict SOV word order in sentences with all three constituents, and noun phrases consistently have noun-modifier order (Sandler et al 2005). Major intonational breaks separate propositions (Padden et al 2009). Compounding is a common morphological process, and a particular type of noun-classifier compounding has developed (Meir et al 2010). Certain types of structure commonly found in more established sign languages are not fully developed in ABSL, such as verb agreement (Aronoff et al 2004, Padden et al in press), and phonological categories (Sandler et al in press, Israel 2009).

A study of four ABSL signers of the second generation, two in their late 40s and two in their late 20s, reveals that a system of prosody also takes time to develop (Sandler et al, to appear). While all four signers use pauses to separate

constituents, only the younger signers align pauses with other prosodic cues such as head position and facial expression. In fact, the narratives of the older signers use linguistic facial expression much more rarely than the younger signers.

Interestingly, only the younger signers use prosodic cues consistently to signal dependencies between clauses, producing conditionals, temporal adverbial clauses, and other complex utterances. The older signers tend to string clauses together in a coordinating or listing fashion. Prosody provides the first indication of complex utterances in this new language.¹⁷

Other differences were observed that similarly suggest the gradual layering on of linguistic structure. The older signers sometimes use mimetic forms, which require movement of the hands, face, head, and/or body in such a way as to interrupt the prosody. Younger signers did not use mime in the short spans of narrative studied, and their utterances were more coherent syntactically, including pronouns as well as clearly related verbs and arguments.

An example of an utterance whose complexity is signaled by prosody is a conditional produced by one of the younger signers. The string means, ‘If he says no, then there’s nothing I can do.’ The first prosodic constituent was characterized by raised brows, with pause and head forward at the end, and the second was marked by a change in head and body position and change to a neutral facial expression. This prosodic pattern is illustrated in Figure 11. The older signers’ narratives did not synchronize prosodic and intonational structure to

¹⁷ The authors do not attribute complex syntactic structure to the utterances rendered complex through intonational dependency, since there are no overt clues to syntactic complexity in the language. Apparently, it is not only new languages that signal complex expressions primarily through intonation without evidence for syntactic complexity. Mithun’s (2009) analysis demonstrates that the same is true in Mohawk. See Sandler et al (to appear) for discussion.

signal dependency relations between clauses. Their narratives were characterized by prosodic constituents separated mainly by pauses, but rarely by pragmatically determined facial expression, and where facial expression was present, it did not align with prosodic constituents as consistently as that of the younger signers.



Figure 11. Conditional prosody produced by a young second-generation signer of ABSL. ‘[If he says no], [then there’s nothing I can do].’

Studying prosody in a new sign language confirms that it is important and basic, arising early but taking form gradually. It is a grammatical system, and as such, its self-organization requires time and experience.

9. Conclusion

Nearly every movable body part is active in sign languages, and much progress has been made in understanding the structure of these languages at all levels by paying close attention to actions of its many articulators.¹⁸ Yet nowhere is the challenge to understand the interaction between prosody and syntax more

¹⁸ A detailed treatment of various kinds of movement in the phonology of sign language appears in Sandler (to appear b).

compelling than in these visually perceived languages. I have argued here that sign languages, like spoken languages, have a prosodic component of grammar. The body encodes the system by demarcating temporally delineated constituents with the hands and conveying intonational patterns with the face. There is a hierarchy of prosodic constituents that are related to morpho-syntactic constituents but are not isomorphic with them. The presence of prosodic signals in a new sign language highlights the centrality of prosody in human communication. At the same time, the fact that the prosodic system emerges gradually in a new language, and in children acquiring an established sign language -- that it is not in place as soon as words are strung together -- bears witness to the complexity of the system.

Prosodic organization reveals itself directly in the realization of a linguistic expression, while syntactic structure often has a less direct manifestation on the surface. Prosodic structure gives cues to syntactic structure, but it is necessary to posit a prosodic level of structure precisely because it is not identical to the syntactic structure. This is true of language generally, and sign language is no different.

The distinction between prosody and syntax elaborated here has been ignored in many sign language studies, by treating as inherently syntactic certain nonmanual markers that others have argued are part of the intonational system, with demonstrably problematic results. The challenge is to recognize the relationship between syntax and prosody without losing sight of the difference.

References

- Aarons, Debra. 1994. Aspects of the syntax of American Sign Language. Doctoral dissertation, Boston University.
- Anderson, Diane. and Reilly, Judy. 1998. PAH! The acquisition of non-manual adverbials in ASL. *International Journal of Sign Linguistics*, 1, 117-142.
- Aronoff, Mark, Padden, Carol, Meir, Irit, and Sandler, Wendy. 2004. Morphological universals and the sign language type. In G. Booij and J. van Marle (Eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology*. Dordrecht/Boston: Kluwer
- Baker-Shenk, Charlotte. 1983. *A micro analysis of the nonmanual components of American Sign Language*. PhD, University of California, Berkeley.
- Baker, Charlotte, and Cokely, Dennis. 1980. *American Sign Language: A Teacher's Resource Text on Grammar and Culture*. Silver Spring, MD: TJ Publishers.
- Baker, Charlotte, and Padden, Carol A. 1978. Focusing on the non-manual components of ASL. In P. Siple (Ed.), *Understanding Language through Sign Language Research*, 27–57. New York: Academic Press
- Baker, Charlotte. 1977. Regulators and turn-taking in American Sign Language discourse. In *On the Other Hand: New Perspectives on American Sign Language*, L. Friedman, (Ed.), 215–236. New York: Academic Press.
- Bartels, Christine (1999). *The intonation of English statements and questions: A compositional interpretation*. Garland Publishing: New York and London.
- Battison, Robin. 1978. *Lexical borrowing in American Sign Language*. Silver Spring, MD: Linstok Press.
- Beckman, Mary E. and Pierrehumbert, Janet B. (1986). Intonational structure in English and Japanese. *Phonology Yearbook*, 3, 255-310.
- Bergman, Brita. 1984. Non-manual components in signed language: Some sentence types in Swedish Sign Language. In: Loncke, Filip / Boyes Braem, Penny / Lebrun, Yvan (eds): *Recent Research on European Sign Languages*. (Proceedings of the European Meeting of Sign Language

- Research held in Brussels, September 19-25, 1982). Lisse : Swets and Zeitlinger pp. 49-59
- Bolinger, Dwight. 1978. Intonation across languages. In J.H. Greenberg, C.A. Ferguson and E.A. Moravcsik (Eds.), *Universals of human language*, vol. 2: *Phonology* (pp. 471-524). Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Bolinger, Dwight 1989. *Intonation and its uses: Melody in grammar and discourse*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Boyes Braem, Penny and Sutton-Spence, Rachel (Eds). 2001. *The hands are the head of the mouth: The mouth as articulator in sign languages*. Hamburg: Signum Press.
- Brentari, Diane and Crossley, Laurinda. 2002. Prosody on the hands and face: Evidence from American Sign Language. *Sign Language and Linguistics* 5:2. 105-130.
- Brentari, Diane. 1990. Theoretical foundations of American Sign Language phonology. Doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Brentari, Diane. 1998. *A Prosodic Model of Sign Language Morphology*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cecchetto, Carlo, Geraci, Carlo, and Zucchi Sandro. 2009. Another way to mark syntactic dependencies: The case for right-peripheral specifiers in sign languages. *Language* 85:2. 278-320
- Coerts, Jane. 1992. Non-manual grammatical markers: an analysis of interrogatives, negations, and topicalizations in Sign Language of the Netherlands. PhD dissertation, University of Amsterdam.
- Corina, David, Bellugi, Ursula, and Reilly, Judy. 1999. Neurological studies of linguistic and affective facial expressions in Deaf signers. *Language and Speech* 42: 307-331.
- Coulter, Geoffrey frey. 1982. On the nature of ASL as a monosyllabic language. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, San Diego, CA.
- Coulter, Geoffrey. (1978). Raised brows and wrinkled noses: The grammatical function of facial expression in relative clauses and related constructions.

- In F. Caccamise and D. Hicks (Eds.), *ASL as a bilingual, bicultural context. Proceedings of the second National Symposium on Sign Language Research and Teaching* (pp. 65-74). Coronado, CA: NAD.
- Coulter, Geoffrey. 1979. American Sign Language typology. Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, San Diego
- Crasborn, Onno, van der Kooij, Els, Waters, Daffyd, Woll, Bencie, and Mesch, Johanna. 2008. Frequency distribution and spreading behavior of different types of mouth actions in three sign languages. *Sign Language and Linguistics* 11:1, 45-67.
- Dachkovsky, Svetlana (2005). *Facial Expression as Intonation in ISL: The Case of Conditionals*. MA Thesis. University of Haifa.
- Dachkovsky, Svetlana and Sandler, Wendy. 2009. Visual intonation in the prosody of a sign language. *Language and Speech* 52(2/3), special issue on Visual Prosody, M. Swerts and E. Kraemer (Eds.) 287-314.
- De Vos, Connie, van der Kooij, Els, and Crasborn, Onno. 2009. Mixed Signals: Combining Linguistic and Affective Functions of Eyebrows in Questions in Sign Language of the Netherlands. *Language and Speech* 52: 2/3, 315-339.
- Ekman, Paul and Friesen, Wallace. 1978. *Facial Action Coding System: A Technique for the Measurement of Facial Movement. Investigator's Guide*. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Engberg-Pedersen, Elisabeth. 1990. Pragmatics of non-manual behaviour in Danish Sign Language. In *SLR '87: Papers from the Fourth International Symposium on Sign Language Research*, W. Edmondson and F. Karlsson (eds), 121–128. Hamburg: Signum.
- Geraci, Carlo. 2006. Negation in LIS. *North Eastern Linguistics Society* 35. 217-230.
- Givón, Talmy. 1979. *On Understanding Grammar*. New York: Academic Press
- Grosz, Barbara and Candace Sidner, Candace. 1986. Attention, Intentions, and the Structure of Discourse. *Computational Linguistics*, 12:3, 175-204.
- Gussenhoven, Carlos. 1984. *On the Grammar and Semantics of Sentence Accent*. Dordrecht: Foris.

- Gussenhoven, Carlos. 2004. *The Phonology of Tone and Intonation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hayes, Bruce and Lahiri, Aditi. 1991. Bengali intonational phonology. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 9, 47-96.
- Hunyadi, Laszlo. 2010. Cognitive grouping and recursion in prosody. In Harry van der Hulst (ed.) *Recursion and Human Language*, Harry van der Hulst (ed.). Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 343-370
- Hyman, Larry and Monaka, Kemmony. 2008. Tonal and non-tonal intonation in Shekgalagari. *UC Berkeley Phonology Lab Annual Report*. 269-288.
- Israel, Assaf. 2009. Sublexical variation in three sign languages. MA thesis. University of Haifa.
- Ito, Junko and Mester, Armin. 2007. Categories and Projections in Prosodic Structure. Paper presented at OCP4. Rhodes, Greece.
- Kanerva, Jonni. 1990. Focus and Phrasing in Chichewa Phonology. New York: Garland.
- Kisch, Schifra. 2000. Deaf discourse: social construction of deafness in a Bedouin community in the Negev. MA thesis. Tel Aviv University.
- Klima, Edward S. and Bellugi, Ursula. 1979. *The Signs of Language*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press
- Ladd, Robert. 1996. *Intonational Phonology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Liddell, Scott . 1986. Head thrust in ASL conditional sentences. *Sign Language Studies* 52: 243-262.
- Liddell, Scott K. 1978. Non-manual signs and relative clauses in American Sign Language. In *Understanding Language through Sign Language Research*, P. Siple (ed.), 59-90. New York: Academic Press.
- Liddell, Scott K. 1980. *American Sign Language Syntax*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Liddell, Scott K., and Johnson, Robert E. 1986. American Sign Language compound formation processes, lexicalization, and phonological remnants. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 8: 445-513.
- Lillo-Martin, Diane. 1995. The point of view predicate in American Sign

- Language. In K. Emmorey and J. Reilly (Eds.), *Gesture, and Space*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. 155–170.
- Lillo-Martin, Diane. 2000. Early and late in language acquisition: Aspects of the syntax and acquisition of *wh*-questions in American Sign Language. In Karen Emmorey and Harlan Lane (eds.). *The Signs of Language Revisited: An Anthology to Honor Ursula Bellugi and Edward Klima*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum. 401-413
- Lillo-Martin, Diane. to appear. Utterance reports and constructed action in sign and spoken languages. In Pfau, Roland, Steinbach, Markus, and Woll, Bencie (eds), *Sign Language – An International Handbook*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Lillo-Martin, Diane and de Quadros, Ronice. 2010. Interfaces and WH-questions in sign language. Paper presented at Colloquium on Generative Grammar. Barcelona.
- Meir, Irit and Sandler, Wendy. 2008. *A Language in Space: The Story of Israeli Sign Language*. Mahwah/New York: Erlbaum/Taylor and Francis.
- Meir, Irit, Aronoff, Mark, Sandler, Wendy and Padden, Carol (2010). Sign languages and compounding. In S. Scalise and I. Vogel (Eds.): *Compounding*. John Benjamins [PAGE NUMBERS]
- Mithun, Marianne. 2009. Re(e)volving complexity: Adding intonation. In Givón, Talmy and Shibatani, Masayoshi (Eds.): *Syntactic Complexity*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 53-80.
- Neidle, Carol, Kegl, Judy, Maclaughlin, Dawn, Bahan, Benjamin, and Lee, Robert G. 2000. *The Syntax of American Sign Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Nespor, Marina and Sandler, Wendy (1999). Prosody in Israeli Sign Language. *Language and Speech*, 42, 2 and 3. Special Issue on Prosody in Spoken and Signed Languages, Sandler, Wendy (Ed.) 143- 176.
- Nespor, Marina and Vogel, Irene (1986). *Prosodic phonology*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Nespor, Marina, and Sandler, Wendy (1999). Prosodic phonology in Israeli Sign Language. *Language and Speech*, 42 (2and3), 143-176.

- Padden, Carol, Irit Meir, Mark Aronoff, and Wendy Sandler. In press. The grammar of space in two new sign languages. In Diane Brentari (Ed.) *Sign Languages*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Padden, Carol, Meir, Irit, Sandler, Wendy, and Aronoff, Mark (2009). Against all expectations: Encoding subjects and objects in a new language. In D. Gerdts, J. Moore and M. Polinsky, (Eds.), *Hypothesis A/Hypothesis B: Linguistic Explorations in Honor of David M. Perlmutter*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 383-400
- Padden, Carol. 1988. *Interaction of Morphology and Syntax in American Sign Language*. New York: Garland.
- Perlmutter, David. 1992. Sonority and syllable structure in American Sign Language. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23: 407–442. Reprinted as: Sonority and syllable structure in American Sign Language. In *Phonetics and Phonology, Volume 3: Current Issues in ASL Phonology*, ed. G. Coulter. San Diego, CA: Academic Press (1993).
- Petronio, K. and Lillo-Martin, D. (1997). Wh-movement and the position of spec-CP: Evidence from American Sign Language. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 23, 407-442.
- Pfau, Roland and Quer, Josep. In press. Nonmanuals: Their prosodic and grammatical roles. In Diane Brentari (Ed.), *Sign Languages*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Pfau, Roland and Quer, Josep. 2007. On the syntax of negation in modals in Catalan Sign Language and German Sign Language. In Pamela Perniss, Roland Pfau, and Markus Steinbach (Eds.), *Visible Variation*. Berlin/NY: Mouton de Gruyter. 129-162.
- Pfau, Roland. 2002. Applying morphosyntactic and phonological readjustment rules in natural language negation. In Richard Meier, Kearsy Cormier, and David Quinto-Pozos (Eds.), *Modality and structure in signed and spoken languages*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press. 263-295.
- Pierrehumbert, Janet and Hirschberg, Julia (1990). The meaning of intonational contours in interpretation of discourse. In *Intentions in communication*, P.

- R. Cohen, J. Morgan, and M. E. Pollack (Eds.), *Intentions in communication* (pp.271-311). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Reilly, Judy, McIntire, Marina and Bellugi, Ursula (1990.) The acquisition of conditionals in American sign language: Grammaticized facial expressions. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, **11**, 369-392.
- Rosenstein, Ofra. 2001. ISL as a topic prominent language. MA thesis, University of Haifa.
- Sandler, Wendy. 1993. A sonority cycle in American Sign Language. *Phonology* 10: 243–279.
- Sandler, Wendy 1989. *Phonological Representation of the Sign: Linearity and Non-linearity in American Sign Language*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Sandler, Wendy and Lillo-Martin, Diane. 2006. *Sign Language and Linguistic Universals*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sandler, Wendy, Aronoff, Mark, Meir, Irit, and Padden, Carol. In press. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*.
- Sandler, Wendy, Meir, Irit, Dachkovsky, Sveta, Padden, Carol, and Aronoff, Mark. To appear. The emergence of complexity in prosody and syntax. *Lingua*
- Sandler, Wendy, Meir, Irit, Padden, Carol, and Aronoff, Mark. 2005. The emergence of grammar in a new sign language. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 102 (7), 2661-2665.
- Sandler, Wendy. 1989. *Phonological Representation of the Sign: Linearity and Nonlinearity in American Sign Language*, Dordrecht: Foris.
- Sandler, Wendy. 1987. Assimilation and feature hierarchy in American Sign Language. In *Papers from the Chicago Linguistic Society, Parasession on Autosegmental and Metrical Phonology*, Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society. 266–278.
- Sandler, Wendy. 1999a. Cliticization and prosodic words in a sign language. In *Studies on the Phonological Word*, Hall, Tracy and Kleinhenz, Ursula (Eds.), 223-255. (Current Studies in Linguistic Theory). Amsterdam: Benjamins.

- Sandler, Wendy. 2005. Prosodic constituency and intonation in sign language. *Linguistische Berichte* 13, 59-86.
- Sandler, Wendy. 2006. Phonology, phonetics, and the nondominant hand. In *Papers in Laboratory Phonology: Varieties of Phonological Competence*, Louis Goldstein, D.H. Whalen, and Catherine Best (Eds.), 185-212. Berlin: Mouton-de Gruyter.
- Sandler, Wendy. 2008. The syllable in sign language: Considering the other natural language modality. In *The Syllable in Speech Production*, Barbara Davis and Kristine Zajdo (Eds.) 379-408., New York: Taylor Francis.
- Sandler, Wendy. 2009. Symbiotic symbolization by hand and mouth in sign language. *Semiotica* 174. 241–275.
- Sandler, Wendy. To appear a. The visual prosody of sign language. In R. Pfau, M. Steinbach, and B. Woll (Eds). *Sign Language: An International Handbook*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sandler, Wendy. To appear b. The phonology of movement in sign language. In *Companion to Phonology*, van Oostendorp, Marc, Ewen, Colin, Hume, Beth, and Rice, Keren (eds.) London: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Scott, D. A., Carmi, R., Elbedour, K., Duyk, G. M., Stone, E. M., and Sheffield, V. C. (1995). Nonsyndromic autosomal recessive deafness is linked to the DFNB1 locus in a large inbred Bedouin family from Israel. *American Journal of Human Genetics*, 54(4), 965-968.
- Selkirk, E. and K. Tateishi 1988 Constraints on minor phrase formation in Japanese. In Proceedings of the 24th Annual Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society. Chicago:Chicago Linguistic Society, 316-339.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth. 1984. *Phonology and Syntax: The Relation Between Sound and Structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
- Selkirk, Elisabeth. 2002. The syntax-phonology interface. *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Science* eds. N.J. Smelser and Paul B. Baltes. Oxford: Pergamon. 15407-15412.
- Stokoe, William C. 1960. *Sign language structure: An outline of the visual communication systems of the American deaf*. In *Studies in Linguistics*:

- Occasional Papers. Buffalo: University of Buffalo.
- Thompson, Robin, Emmorey, Karen, and Kluender, Robert (2006). The relationship between eye gaze and agreement in American Sign Language: An eye-tracking study. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 24, 571-604.
- Vallduví, Enric. 1992. *The Informational Component*. New York; Garland.
- Wakefield, John. 2010. *The English Equivalents of Cantonese Sentence-Final Particles: A Contrastive Analysis*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong.
- Wilbur, Ronnie. 1994. Eyeblinks and ASL phrase structure. *Sign Language Studies* 84. 221-240.
- Wilbur, Ronnie. 1999. Stress in ASL: Empirical evidence and linguistic issues. *Language and Speech* 42:2and3. 229-250.
- Wilbur Ronnie. 2000. Phonological and prosodic layering of nonmanuals in American Sign Language. In *The signs of language revisited: Festschrift for Ursula Bellugi and Edward Klima*, Lane, Harlan and Emmorey, Karen (eds.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. 213-241.
- Wilbur, Ronnie and PatchkePatschke, Cynthia. 1999. Syntactic correlates of brow raise in ASL.
- Wilbur, Ronnie. 1993. Syllables and segments: hold the movement and move the holds! In *Current Issues in ASL Phonology*, ed. Geoffrey R. Coulter. New York, San Francisco, London: Academic Press. 135–168.
- Woll, Bencie (2001). The sign that dares to speak its name: Echo phonology in British Sign Language. Boyes Braem, Penny and R. Sutton-Spence, Rachel.(Eds). 2002. *The Hands Are the Head of the Mouth: The Mouth as Articulator in Sign Languages*. Hamburg: Signum. 87-98.
- Yang, Jan Hui and Fischer, Susan. 2002. Expressing negation in Chinese Sign Language. *Sign Language and Linguistics* 5. 167-202.
- Zeshan, Ulrike, ed. 2006. *Interrogative and Negative Constructions in Sign Languages*. Nijmegen: Ishara Press.
- Zeshan, Ulrike. 2004. *Interrogative Constructions in Signed Languages: Cross-*

Linguistic Perspectives. *Language*, 80. 7-39.