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1. Purpose.

The aim of Snippets is to publish specific remarks that motivate research or that make theoretical points germane to current work. The ideal contribution is the ideal footnote: a side remark that taken on its own is not worth lengthy development but that needs to be said. One encounters many short comments of this kind in the literature of the seventies. We feel that there no longer is a forum for them. We want Snippets to help fill that gap.

2. Content.

We will publish notes that contribute to the study of syntax and semantics in generative grammar. The notes are to be brief, self-contained and explicit. They may do any of the following things:

- point out an empirical phenomenon that goes against accepted generalizations or that shows that some aspect of a theory is problematic;
- point out unnoticed minimal pairs that fall outside the scope of any existing theory;
- point out an empirical phenomenon that confirms the predictions of a theory in an area where the theory has not been tested;
- explicitly describe technical inconsistencies in a theory or in a set of frequently adopted assumptions;
- explicitly describe unnoticed assumptions that underlie a theory or assumptions that a theory needs to be supplemented with in order to make desired predictions;
- call attention to little-known or forgotten literature in which issues of immediate relevance are discussed.

We also encourage submissions that connect psycholinguistic data to theoretical issues. A proposal for a pilot experiment in language acquisition or language processing could make for an excellent snippet.

The earliest Linguistic Inquiry squibs exemplify the kind of note we would like to publish. Some of them posed unobserved puzzles. For instance, a squib by Postal and Ross in LI 1:1 ("A Problem of Adverb Preposing") noted that whether or not we can construe a sentence-initial temporal adverb with an embedded verb depends on the tense of the matrix verb. A squib by Perlmutter and Ross in LI 1:3 ("Relative Clauses with Split Antecedents"), challenging the prevailing analyses of coordination and extraposition, noted that conjoined clauses neither of which contain a plural noun phrase can appear next to an "extraposed" relative that can only describe groups. Other squibs drew attention to particular theoretical assumptions. For instance, a squib by Bresnan in LI 1:2 ("A Grammatical Fiction") outlined an alternative account of the derivation of sentences containing believe and force, and asked whether there were principled reasons for dismissing any of the underlying assumptions (among them that semantic interpretation is sensitive to details of a syntactic derivation). A squib by Zwicky in LI 1:2 ("Class Complements in Phonology") asked to what extent phonological rules refer to complements of classes. None of these squibs was more than a couple of paragraphs; all of them limited themselves to a precise question or observation.

*Snippets* is an electronic journal. We will publish issues roughly twice a year, and all issues will remain on the website.

*Snippets* is intended as a service to the linguistics community. Consequently, authors are advised that, when they submit to *Snippets*, we understand them as allowing their submission to be reproduced if published. At the same time, the rights for the notes themselves will remain with the authors. As a result, citation of *Snippets* material will have to indicate the author’s name and the specific source of the material.

We will accept electronic submissions at the address snippetsjournal@gmail.com. Electronic submissions may take the form of (a) the text of an e-mail message, or (b) an attached file. The attached file should be a simple text file, a Word file (Mac or Windows), or a Rich Text Format (RTF) file. All submissions must state the name and affiliation of the author(s), and a (postal or electronic) return address.

Submissions are to be a maximum of 500 words (including examples), with an additional half page allowed for diagrams, tables and references. Given that we envision the submissions themselves as footnotes, the submissions may not contain footnotes of their own. The ideal submission is one paragraph; a submission of five lines is perfectly acceptable. We will not consider abstracts.

4. Editorial policy.

Submissions will be reviewed by our editorial board, and review will be name-blind both ways. We will provide a response within 3 months of the moment when we acknowledge receipt of a submission. At the same time, we do not guarantee more than a simple yes/no response to the submitter. We will not require revisions (barring exceptional cases). We allow resubmission (once) of the same piece.
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It is sometimes claimed that true distributive adnominal quantifiers like every cannot form DPs with the predicate interpretation; cf. Partee 1986. One possible counterexample is presented by the Yuman language Maricopa (David Gil, pers. com.). This generalization is also violated in the Circassian languages (Kabardian and Adyghe) of the Northwest Caucasian family. We illustrate this with examples from Ulap Besleney, a Kabardian variety spoken in the village of Ulap (Adygea, Russia).

The Circassian languages are highly polysynthetic, with many arguments cross-referenced in the predicate. It has been suggested that such languages express arguments by morphological rather than syntactic elements (cf. Jelinek and Demers 1994, Van Valin 1985 among others, see also Baker 1996) and lack true adnominal quantifiers (Jelinek 1995; Baker 1995; Faltz 1995). As we will see, in Besleney, the apparent adnominal distributive quantifiers do not behave as true quantifiers in many respects.

We consider two Besleney quantifiers: q'as, found with time expressions, and pabʒ, found elsewhere. Their interpretation is strictly distributive:

(1) maːxʷa-q'as aː-bəm zə qʷəja-ʒərja j-ə-ʃ'
  day-every that-ABL one cheese-circle 3SG.ERG-DYN-make
  ‘She makes one cheese every day.’

(2) maːxʷa-q'as sahaː-tə-r tʷaːʒʷ-ra pə-ra-ʃʷa j-a-gʷəʃ/ jaː-gʷəʃ
  day-every hour-ABS twenty-COORD four-COORD-INS 3SG.ERG-DYN-divide /
  ‘Every day divides (the time) into 24 hours.’ 3PL.ERG-divide

(3) tʃʷaːɮa-pabʒ swam-jaːʃa sa O-ja-s-t-a: / jaː-s-t-a:
  boy-every ruble-LNK-hundred I 3SG.IO-DAT-1SG.ERG-give-PST /
  ‘I gave 100 rubles to each boy. 3PL.IO+DAT-1SG.ERG-give-PST

However, these quantifiers appear in constructions non-typical for distributive quantifiers.

First, DPs containing distributive quantifiers may behave as if they refer to plural entities. As (2)-(3) demonstrate, they are optionally cross-referenced with plural prefixes, a property that seemingly has not been observed outside of the Northwest Caucasian family (Tatevosov 2002: 80). Moreover, phrases with distributive quantifiers appear as “heads” of internally-headed relative clauses, where the predicate takes the “external” case and the internal head is marked with the predicative suffix (which usually marks various adverbials including secondary predicates). Semantically, such “heads” have scope over the relative clause (cf. Grosu 2000): for example, (4)
lacks the narrow scope interpretation ‘He gave his friends certain books such that each of
them was read by him’. Yet as the same example shows, the whole DP may be
marked as plural despite the wide scope of the quantifier:

(4) aː-ťə [txə-pab3-wə z-a-djə-a:(-xa)-r] ja-drug-xa-m
ja: r-jə-t-a:
3PL.IO-DAT-3SG.ERG-give-PST
‘He gave each book he had read to his friends.’

Second, when focused, the DPs under discussion appear as predicates in
pseudocleft constructions, clearly violating the predictions made earlier:

(5) qʷəja fə-ja-ʃə-r ma:xʷa-q’as
cheese TEMP-3SG.ERG-make-ABS day-every
‘She makes cheese every day.’
Lit.: ‘When she makes cheese is every day.’

(6) sa ə-swam z-a-s-t-a:(-xa)-r ʃʧə:la-pab3-q’əm,
I one ruble REL.IO-DAT-1SG.ERG-give-PST-PL-ABS boy-every-NEG
pša:la-pab3 na: h
girl-every more
‘I gave a ruble to every girl rather than to every boy.’
Lit.: ‘Whom I gave a ruble is not every boy, rather every girl.’

Although not mentioned in the otherwise detailed description Nikolaeva 2012, similar patterns are found in Adyghe (Lander 2012):

(7) ha:tsə ‘a qə-zə-tja-fa-xa-r ʃʧə:la-papʧ
pie DIR-REL.IO-LOC-fall-PST-ABS boy-every
‘Every boy got a pie.’
Lit: ‘On whom a pie fell is every boy.’

These constructions clearly show that in Circassian languages DPs with
quantifiers may refer to properties/sets of individuals, or plural individuals and hence
need not be true quantificational phrases.

While these properties of quantifiers may correlate with the typological features
of Besleney, their compositional interpretation is problematic and probably requires a
treatment where distributivity need not be related to quantification proper.

Abbreviations.  ABS – absolutive;  COORD – coordination;  DAT – dative preverb;  DIR – directive 
preverb;  DYN – dynamic marker;  ERG – ergative cross-reference;  INS – instrumental;  IO – indirect 
object cross-reference;  LNK – linker;  NEG – negation;  OBL – oblique case;  PL – plural;  POSS –
possessive;  PRED – predicative;  PST – past;  REL – relative;  SG – singular;  TEMP – temporal preverb
(‘when’).
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Background. A well-known descriptive trait of Right Node Raising (RNR) is the Right Edge Constraint (REC): material targeted by RNR must occur rightmost in all coordinates (cf. Wilder 1999, Sabbagh 2007, Bachrach and Katzir 2009 a.o.). (1) illustrates the REC for German: in (1a), but not in ungrammatical (1b), the material targeted by RNR is rightmost in all coordinates.

(1) a. Hans heiratete seine Freundin vor ___ und Maria trennte sich von ihrem Freund nach ___ den olympischen Spielen.
   Hans married his girlfriend before and Maria separated REFL from her boyfriend after the Olympic games.
   ‘Hans married his girlfriend before and Maria separated from her boyfriend after the Olympics.’

b. * Hans heiratete seine Freundin vor ___ und Maria trennte sich nach ___
   Hans married his girlfriend before and Maria separated REFL after
   den olympischen Spielen von ihrem Freund.
   the Olympic games from her boyfriend

The problem. While some have pointed at spurious exceptions to the REC (cf. Wilder 1999), German exhibits a hitherto unnoticed class of regular exceptions: (2) is a possible configuration with \(D\) being the RNR-ed material, if \(E\) is a negation or a focus sensitive particle.

(2) A B and / or / but C D E.

(3) involves RNR of the reflexive pronoun. Since negation follows it in the second conjunct, it too should have undergone RNR. However, negation is interpreted exclusively in the second conjunct. It therefore has not been targeted by RNR, yielding a violation of the REC.

(3) Die Schauspieler verbeugten ___ aber bedankten ___ sich nicht.
   The actors bowed but thanked REFL not.
   ‘The actors bowed, but didn’t thank the audience.’

The phenomenon is not tied to the conjunction \(aber\) (which might be argued to be a positive polarity item), (4b), (4c), nor to the RNR-ed material in (3) being a “phonologically light” reflexive pronoun, (4a), (4c). Further, it is found not only with negation, but with focus-sensitive particles, (4b), (4c), or, more generally, material sensitive to contrast, (5).

(4) a. Die Jugendlich schlugen ___ aber töteten ___ Hans nicht.
   The teenagers beat but killed Hans not.
   ‘The teenagers beat Hans, but they did not kill him.’
b. Die Schauspieler verbeugten ___und bedankten ___sich sogar.
The actors bowed and thanked REFLEX even.
‘The actors bowed and even thanked the audience.’

c. Die Jugendlichen töteten ___oder verletzten ___Hans nur.
The teenagers killed or hurt Hans only.
‘The teenagers killed Hans or they only hurt him.’

(5) Die Jugendlichen mögen ___aber verprügeln ___Hans trotzdem.
The teenagers like but beat-up Hans still
‘The teenagers like Hans, but they still beat him up.’

In sum, the REC is a descriptive property of RNR in most cases, but can be blocked by elements that contrast the second coordinate with the first one.

Overt movement theories of RNR (cf. Sabbagh 2007) cannot account for the data in (4), (5), since the target position of movement of the shared element is above the coordinate structure, therefore it should occur in the rightmost position. Prosodic deletion accounts (as in Hartmann 2000) could in principle assume that the overt counterpart of the elided material does not have to be peripheral in the second coordinate, but this would lead to massive overgeneralization. Sharing analyses (cf. for instance Wilder 1999, Bachrach and Katzir 2009) essentially face the same problem: they could assume that material is shared and linearized non-peripherally within the second coordinate, but again the resulting system would be too unconstrained.
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A classical approach to nominal semantics assumes that each NP contains a single plural operator PL (corresponding to plural morphology) which performs two semantic operations: PL is responsible for closing off the set of atoms denoted by its complement singular count noun (closure operation; Link 1983); furthermore, PL contributes the plurality inference, plausibly through some mechanism of competition with singular morphology (P-inference operation; Sauerland 2003, Spector 2007 a.o.).

Kratzer (in progress, Ch. 4) develops a different picture. According to her Lexical Cumulativity Hypothesis (LCH), all natural language predicates are already closed off at the lexical level. Thus, PL is relieved from the duty of performing the closure operation. Kratzer provides arguments for the LCH in the event domain. For the nominal domain, she shows that the LCH is not incompatible with morphologically marked singular nouns: “we do not have to worry about nouns. In one way or other, they comply” with the LCH (p. 5). Yet she provides no arguments. This squib provides an argument for the nominal LCH.

Suppose by contradiction that the nominal LCH were false: nouns come out of the lexicon denoting sets of atoms which are closed by the same operator PL which is responsible for the P-inference. By the contradictory assumption that the nominal LCH is false, boy denotes a property of single boys, not their sums. By the standard semantics for collective predicates, the modifier who met in the room denotes a property of sums of boys, not individual boys. The intersection of these two properties is thus empty and the structure (1) is not a viable parse for the phrase the boys who met in the room. The structure (2) is needed instead, which allows PL to close off the denotation of the atomic noun underneath the modifier.

(1)     NP                         (2)                  NP
        PL                        Mod

boy      Mod                      boy
who met in the room

Now replace the modifier in (2) with in the room, as in (3). As PL doesn’t scope over the modifier in (3), the P-inference triggered by PL doesn’t involve the modifier. This structure thus incorrectly predicts the phrase the boys in the room to be licit in a scenario where there are multiple boys but only one of them is in the room. In order to
block this incorrect P-inference and derive the desired one, the structure (3) needs to be ruled out, with (4) counting as the only licit parse.

(3)                              NP                          (4)                   NP
  Mod
  boy  PL in the room                                boy           Mod
       in the room

In conclusion, we face a scope paradox: the closure operation and the P-inference operation need to be performed at different scope sites, as in (2) and (4) respectively. Allowing for movement of PL from the embedded position (underneath the modifier) to the wider position (above the modifier) would not solve the paradox: movement would need to be mandatory for the distributive modifier in the room, which would in turn yield a parse uninterpretable for the collective modifier who met in the room. The nominal LCH relieves PL from the duty of performing the closure operation and thus avoids this scope paradox.
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Kratzer (2009) notes that, while (1a) in German has only a strict reading (others don’t care for my son), its English translation (1b) also allows a sloppy reading (others don’t care for their sons):

(1) a. Ich bin der Einzige, der meinen Sohn versorgt
   b. I am the only one who takes care of my son

According to Kratzer, spelling out the sloppy LF requires finding a possessive and verb inflection compatible with both first and third person (i.e. gender) features (resulting from two chains of feature transmission). This leads to unresolvable conflicts in German. English spell-out encounters similar conflicts, but these are resolvable by appealing to the independent markedness of nominal gender and verbal person. Kratzer presents two arguments for nominal gender markedness: most English nouns are neuter, and English tends to avoid putting gender on bound pronouns, by resorting to plurals:

(2) {Everybody/nobody} did their homework.

Verbal person is marked because the only verb that makes person distinctions is the copula -- a “quirk”.

We observe that the Dutch equivalent of (1) allows an English-style sloppy reading. To test this intuition, we turned it into an acceptability judgment task by considering inherently reflexive predicates not admitting strict readings. A survey (12 items, 48 naïve Dutch participants, 5-point scale) confirms that sloppy first person possessives in constructions like (1) are fine in Dutch (in fact, (3) was rated much higher than the predicted variants with third person possessive):

(3) Ben ik de enige die m’n {best doet / belangstelling toont / fouten toegeeft}?
   ‘Am I the only one who {does my best / shows my interest / admits my mistakes}?’

Spelling out the sloppy readings for these Dutch sentences we’d run into the same spell-out conflicts as before. So, we’d need the two markedness principles. However, in Dutch, as opposed to English, all nouns are marked for gender (cf. definite articles: de [m/f] vs het [n]). In addition, Dutch doesn’t allow plurals for gender avoidance in (2):

(4) {iedereen/Niemand} heeft {zijn [‘his’] /*hun [‘their’]} huiswerk gedaan.

Hence, Dutch gender seems no more marked than German.

Likewise for verbal person. While in English there is only one quirky person-sensitive verb, most singular verb inflections in Dutch crucially depend on one or more person features:
(5) present tense inflection of *doe- ('do')*

1.sg  ↔ -Ø
2.sg  ↔ -t (-Ø under inversion)
m/n/f.sg ↔ -t
elsewhere  ↔ -n

Even ignoring the [2.sg]-specific word-order effect, we cannot lump second and third person together into a single person-free spell-out rule, ‘sg ↔ -t’, because that would incorrectly generate *ik ben de enige die m’n huiswerk doe* (‘I am the only one who do.1sg my.1sg homework’) for the sloppy [m.1.sg] LF.

To sum up, none of Kratzer's reasons for the markedness of nominal gender and verbal person apply to Dutch, so her theory would predict Dutch to behave like German: sloppy first person means [m.1.sg], which cannot be spelled out, predicting ungrammaticality for (3) as for (1a). Our survey shows that this is prediction is not borne out.

**Reference**

Fox and Katzir (2011) propose a principled characterization of alternatives for scalar implicatures based on structure. They define the notion of formal alternatives in (1), based on the notion of ‘being at most as complex as’ in (2), and that of ‘substitution source’ in (3).

(1) **Formal alternatives**: given a sentence $\phi$ and a context $C$,
$$A(\phi, C) = \{ \psi : \psi \text{ derived from } \phi \text{ by replacing focused constituents } x_1, \ldots, x_n \text{ with } y_1, \ldots, y_n \text{ where } y_1 \lesssim_c x_1, \ldots, y_n \lesssim_c x_n \}$$

(2) **Complexity**: $\phi \lesssim_c \psi$ if $\phi$ can be derived from $\psi$ by successive substitutions of subconstituents of $\psi$ with elements of the substitution source for $\psi$ in $C$.

(3) **The substitution source**: the substitution source for $X$ in a context $C$ is the union of the following sets:
   a. the Lexicon
   b. the subconstituents of $X$
   c. the set of salient constituents in $C$.

If we integrate this theory of alternatives with any theory of scalar implicatures which allows the exclusion of logically independent alternatives (e.g., Fox 2007 and Spector 2007), a problem arises with sentences like (4), in which a strong scalar term like *all* is embedded in the scope of a downward entailing operator like negation.

(4) The committee didn’t pass all of my students.

(4) gives rise to the inference in (6) and this is commonly derived as a scalar implicature by negating the alternative in (5).

(5) The committee didn’t pass some (/any) of my students.

(6) The committee passed some of my students.

Consider a representation for (4) where the focused constituent is at least as big as didn’t pass all of my students. According to the structural definition of alternatives, the alternatives that we obtain for (4) in that case are those in (7), where crucially the two without negation are subconstituents of the corresponding ones with negation.

(7) {The committee didn’t pass all of my students, The committee didn’t pass some of my students, The committee passed all of my students, The committee passed some of my students}

The presence of the additional alternative identical to the scalar implicature in (6) renders the alternative in (5) non excludable (cf. Fox 2007), therefore no scalar implicature is predicted from (4).
Notice that while alternatives can be reduced contextually, it is not clear how a notion of relevance could distinguish between an alternative and its negation (cf. Chierchia et al. to appear). Notice, further, that (1) makes reference to focus constituents, therefore more precisely no scalar implicature is predicted to arise from a sentence like (4) if both negation and the scalar term are within the focus constituent. This prediction does not appear right, however. Consider (8-b), in which the focus constituent is presumably the entire sentence given the question in (8-a) (e.g., Rooth 1992). In this case the alternatives are going to either include both (5) and (6) or neither of them, either way the scalar implicature in (6) is not predicted in this case. Nonetheless intuitively it appears as strong as in other cases.

(8) a. You look disappointed. What’s up?
   b. [The committee didn’t pass all of my students].
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Lillo-Martin (1991) argues that in American Sign Language (ASL) (i) Strong Crossover effects (SCO) exist when movement is to the left ((1a)); and (ii) the effects are obviated if the original position of the moved element contains a resumptive pronoun ((1b)), or a null pronoun licensed by verb agreement ((1c)).

(1)

\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{a. } *\text{LOVE}_t, \\
&\text{b. } \text{LOVE}_t, \\
&\text{c. } \text{FALL-FOR},_t(\text{PRONOUN})
\end{align*} \]

Intended: Steve, he, expects me to a. love / b. love him / c. fall for (him)

Importantly, (1) does not involve a quantificational element, contrary to standard Crossover examples; and the deviance of (1a) could be explained in terms of obligatory reconstruction of the moved proper name, combined with a Condition C effect. We thus investigated the existence of SCO effects involving wh-elements in ASL.

We tested three deaf native signers of deaf, signing parents, using the following 'playback' method: controlled paradigms were signed by Inf1, and were then played back to him (repeatedly, on separate occasions) and to two further informants, InfA1 and InfA2, to obtain contrastive judgments on a 7-point scale (informants who were not fully native were excluded from this analysis). Raw scores for a SCO configuration are provided in (2), where we considered various patterns of doubling for the wh-word. Scores are given in the format: $\text{Inf1} | \text{InfA1} | \text{InfA2}$ (references following the examples are to videos made with Inf1).

(2)

\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{a. } \text{WHO-CL}_a \text{ IX-CL}_a \text{ THINK MARY LOVE NO-MATTER WHAT?} \\
&\quad 2 \quad 2 \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 2 \quad 5 \\
&\text{b. } \text{IX-CL}_a \text{ THINK MARY LOVE WHO NO-MATTER WHAT?} \\
&\quad 2 \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \\
&\text{c. } \text{IX-CL}_a \text{ THINK MARY LOVE NO-MATTER WHAT WHO?} \\
&\quad 3 \quad 2 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 2 \quad 4 \\
&\text{d. } \text{WHO-CL}_a \text{ IX-CL}_a \text{ THINK MARY LOVE WHO NO-MATTER WHAT WHO?} \\
&\quad 3 \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 1.5 \quad 5 \\
&\text{e. } \text{WHO-CL}_a \text{ IX-CL}_a \text{ THINK MARY LOVE NO-MATTER WHAT WHO?} \\
&\quad 3 \quad 2 \quad 2 \quad 2 \quad 2 \quad 1.5 \quad 5
\end{align*} \]

Intended meaning: Which person x is such that x thinks that Mary loves x unconditionally? (7, 129; 7, 134; 7, 156; 7, 264; 14, 1)
Two remarks should be made at the outset. First, we used a form of _WHO_ co-occurring with the _ONE_ classifier, glossed as _CL_, signed in locus _a_. _IX-CL_a_ was a pointing sign towards _a_, co-occurring with the classifier. Second, _NO-MATTER WHAT_ is a frozen expression that means 'unconditionally', and the presence of _WHAT_ in that expression definitely does not suggest that we are dealing with a multiple _wh_-question. As is seen, ratings in (2) are uniformly low, except for InfA2’s second session (ratings were for the intended meanings, which were shown in English to Inf1, an experienced informant; they might not have been made sufficiently clear to InfA1 and InfA2, which might account for the reversal in judgments in (2d,e).

Crucially, we need to consider control conditions to determine whether the deviance of the examples in (2) is really due to SCO:

(3) a. **WHO IX-2 THINK MARY LOVE NO-MATTER WHAT?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>7</th>
<th></th>
<th>6</th>
<th></th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

b. **IX-2 THINK MARY LOVE WHO NO-MATTER WHAT?**

| 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 |   | 6 |  | 7 |

c. **IX-2 THINK MARY LOVE NO-MATTER WHAT WHO?**

| 6 | 7 |  | 7 |   | 4 |  | 3 |

d. **WHO IX-2 THINK MARY LOVE WHO NO-MATTER WHAT?**

| 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 1 |

e. **WHO IX-2 THINK MARY LOVE NO-MATTER WHAT WHO?**

| 7 | 7 | 7 |  |   | 3 |  | 5 |

‘Who do you think Mary loves unconditionally?’ (7, 127; 7, 133; 7, 157; 7, 265; 14, 2)

The effect seems clear for all signers in the (a) and (b) sentences. Inf1 displays clear effects in all other sentences as well, and InfA2 might display an effect in e. But it seems that (3c,d, e) have independent problems that make it difficult to conclude to a clear SCO effect in (2c,d) and possibly (2e) for InfA1 and InfA2.

Is the SCO effect obviated by resumptive pronouns? While we have fewer judgments, the answer seems to be positive in all cases for Inf1, as shown in (4). To the extent that there was a SCO effect in the first place, it seems to be obviated for the other two informants in d-e; but given the data in (3d-e), it is hard to come to a clear conclusion.

(4) a. **WHO-CL_a IX-CL_a THINK MARY LOVE IX-a NO-MATTER WHAT?**

| 7 | 7 | 4 |   | 3 | 1 |

de. **WHO-CL_a IX-CL_a THINK MARY LOVE IX-a NO-MATTER WHAT WHO?**

| 7 | 7 |  | 2 |   | 1 |

e. **WHO-CL_a IX-CL_a THINK MARY LOVE IX-a NO-MATTER WHAT WHO?**

| 5 | 6 | 5 | 6 |

*Intended meaning:* Which person x is such that x thinks that Mary loves x unconditionally? (7, 128; 7, 135; 14, 3)
It is standardly assumed that ASL pronouns are deviant when they come before their antecedents. Importantly, this might suffice to explain the deviance of (2b), but not that of (2a) (in addition, for Inf 1 (4b) is significantly better than (2b), which suggests that an additional violation is incurred by the latter sentence). This suggests that SCO effects are responsible for the deviance of (2a).

Still, one might be further worried by (i) the precise role played by the classifier CL in our paradigm, and (ii) the possible ambiguity of the index that comes before THINK: we analyze it as a locus-recovering pronoun, but it could potentially be taken as a locus-establishing component of a complex interrogative sign. If so, the interrogative could be extracted from the subject position of THINK, with LOVE taking a null object bound by the subject trace. The paradigm in (5), obtained post hoc from Inf1 only, controls for (i) and (ii): first, it involves examples with and without CL; second, it guarantees that IX is genuinely a subject pronoun because it is separated from the interrogative by one level of embedding. The judgments fit the earlier pattern and confirm that SCO is involved – and is probably obviated by resumption. (As emphasized by McCloskey 2006, the analysis of the obviation effect is non-trivial: it might be that resumptive pronouns are not subject to SCO; or that in these cases the higher pronoun is the variable, while the lower pronoun trivially satisfies SCO because it is bound by the higher pronoun.)

(5) **Context:** You reported various opinions people supposedly have about who loves whom.
   
   a. 2 2 WHO IX-2 SAY IX-a THINK MARY LOVE?
   b. 6 7 WHO IX-2 SAY IX-a THINK MARY LOVE IX-a?
   c. 3 2 WHO-CL IX-2 SAY IX-CL IX-a THINK MARY LOVE?
   d. 7 7 WHO-CL IX-2 SAY IX-CL IX-a THINK MARY LOVE IX-CL?

   **Intended meaning:** Which person x is such that you said that x thinks Mary loves x?

(14, 7; 14, 8; 14, 12)

(6) **Context:** You reported various opinions I supposedly have about who loves whom.
   
   a. 7 6 WHO IX-2 SAY IX-1 THINK MARY LOVE?
   b. 5 4 WHO IX-2 SAY IX-1 THINK MARY LOVE IX-a?
   c. 6 5 WHO-CL IX-2 SAY IX-1 THINK MARY LOVE?
   d. 5 7 WHO-CL IX-2 THINK IX-1 SAY MARY LOVE IX-CL?

   **Intended meaning:** Which person x is such that you said that I think Mary loves x?

(14, 5; 14, 6; 14, 11) [Inf1 mistakenly reversed THINK and SAY in d.]

Finally, in view of the variation found among our informants for (2), (3), (4), an experimental study might be needed to settle the status of Strong Crossover in ASL.
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It is usually assumed that long-distance scrambling (LDS) of adjuncts and subjects is impossible in Japanese (Saïto 1985; however, see Kuno 1980, Yamashita 2013, and references cited therein for the claim that LDS of subjects is indeed possible).

(1) a. *naze Ken-ga [t\_\_ Mari-ga yakkuri-to booru-o nageta-to] itta-no? Why K.-NOM M.-NOM slowly ball-ACC threw-C said-Q ‘Why did Ken say [Mari threw the ball slowly t].’
b. *yakkuri-to Ken-ga [Mari-ga t\_\_ booru-o nageta-to] itta-yo. slowly K.-NOM M.-NOM ball-ACC threw-C said-SFP ‘Ken said [Mari threw the ball slowly].’
c. *Mari-ga Ken-ga [naze t\_\_ yakkuri-to booru-o nageta-to] itta-no? ‘(same as (1a))’
d. *Mari-ga Ken-ga [t\_\_ yakkuri-to booru-o nageta-to] itta-yo. ‘(same as (1b))’

Koizumi (2000:241–243) observes, however, that the otherwise illicit LDS of adjuncts becomes possible if it is accompanied by another clausemate phrase which can undergo LDS on its own.

(2) a. *naze booru-o Ken-ga [t\_\_ Mari-ga yakkuri-to t\_\_ nageta-to] itta-no? ‘(same as (1a))’
b. yakkuri-to booru-o Ken-ga [Mari-ga t\_\_ t\_ nageta-to] itta-yo. ‘(same as (1b))’

Furthermore, as Fukui and Sakai (2003:335) and Agbayani et al (2009:4.1.2.) observe, even LDS of subjects becomes possible under the same circumstances.

(3) a. Mari-ga booru-o Ken-ga [naze t\_\_ yakkuri-to t\_\_ nageta-to] itta-no? ‘(same as (1a))’
b. Mari-ga booru-o Ken-ga [t\_\_ yakkuri-to t\_\_ nageta-to] itta-yo. ‘(same as (1b))’

Note, however, that the upgrading effects in (2)–(3) can be subsumed under additional scrambling effects which Boeckx and Sugisaki (1999) argue to be an instance of Richards’ 1998 Principle of Minimal Compliance (PMC); there is licit LDS of an object that “saves” the otherwise illicit LDS of adjuncts and subjects.

Consider now the following examples, which involve the combination of LDS of multiple adjuncts ((4a)) and adjunct and subject ((4b) and (5)). Quite surprisingly, these
multiple LDS are significantly much better than the single LDS of adjuncts ((1a,b)) and subjects ((1c,d)).

(4)  a. naze, yukkanri-to Ken-ga [t$_1$ Mari-ga t$_j$ booru-o nageta-to] itta-no?  
    ‘(same as (1a))’
  b. naze, Mari-ga Ken-ga [t$_1$, t$_j$ yukkanri-to booru-o nageta-to] itta-no?  
    ‘(same as (1a))’

(5)  yukkanri-to, Mari-ga Ken-ga [t$_1$, t$_j$ booru-o nageta-to] itta-yo.  
    ‘(same as (1b))’

The hitherto unnoticed upgrading effects in (4)–(5) do not fall under Boeckx and Sugisaki’s PMC-based additional scrambling effect since the participants here cannot undergo LDS on its own. (4)–(5) show us that the upgrading effect emerges in the case of multiple LDS even when it is composed of illicit LDS, meaning that some sort of a PMC-independent but “generalized” additional scrambling effect is at work.

It remains to be seen how we can explain why the deviance of LDS of adjuncts and subjects significantly improves when another scrambling takes place, even when the additional scrambling is LDS of adjuncts and subjects. I hope that the effect discussed here can help us to better understand the nature of Japanese (-type) scrambling, whose nature is still subject to ongoing and lively debate.
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