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We argue that ASL 'high' loci can simultaneously display a behavior which is:

(i) iconic [= loci may stand in geometric relations that reflect the geometric arrangement of their denotations];
(ii) quasi-gradient [= when two loci are interpreted iconically, a third one can be 'sandwiched' between them, with the expected interpretation];
(iii) phi-feature-like [= height specifications can be disregarded – possibly under agreement – by ellipsis and focus-sensitive constructions];
(iv) irreducible to the behavior of co-occurring and possibly non-featural elements, such as classifiers.

Schlenker et al. 2013 and Schlenker 2014 established points (i) and (iii), but not points (ii) and (iv). (The crucial examples involved 3 levels only [high, normal, low], as well as classifiers in various positions, which could be taken to be responsible for the iconic effects that we observed.)

In (1), the pronouns index 4 different heights that reflect the height of [the heads of] their denotations, which begins to establish Points (i) and (ii). (1c) shows that these height specifications are disregarded in the course of ellipsis resolution, for otherwise the elided occurrences of \textit{SELF} taking \textit{IX-b} and \textit{IX-d} as antecedents would have the 'wrong' feature specifications – which in turn should yield deviance, as in the control sentence in (1b), which contrasts with (1a); this establishes Point (iii), and the absence of classifiers establishes Point (iv). Acceptability ratings were obtained by the 'playback method' from repeated judgments by a native ASL signer [Deaf child of Deaf, signing parents] on a 7-point scale, with 7 = best.

\begin{itemize}
\item (1) SHOW HAVE 4 GYMNAS'T STAND-CL BAR ORDER HEIGHT.
\item a. \textit{SELF} signed at various, appropriate heights
  \begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{IX-a} PRESENT \textit{SELF-a} WELL, \textit{IX-b} MAYBE NOT PRESENT \textit{SELF-b} WELL, \textit{IX-c} NOT CLEAR, \textit{IX-d} DEFINITELY NOT PRESENT \textit{SELF-d} WELL.
  \end{itemize}
\item b. \textit{SELF} signed at a constant, low height
  \begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{IX-a} PRESENT \textit{SELF-a} WELL, \textit{IX-b} MAYBE NOT PRESENT \textit{SELF-b} WELL, \textit{IX-c} NOT CLEAR, \textit{IX-d} DEFINITELY NOT PRESENT \textit{SELF-d} WELL.
  \end{itemize}
\item c. \textit{SELF} signed low, only once (with ellipsis of the second and fourth VP's)
  \begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{IX-a} PRESENT \textit{SELF-a} WELL, \textit{IX-b} MAYBE NOT, \textit{IX-c} NOT CLEAR, \textit{IX-d} DEFINITELY NOT. => bound variable reading
  \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

'During a show, four gymnasts were standing on a bar, ranked by height. One [a short one] presented himself well; the second [taller] one possibly didn't present himself well; for the third [still taller] one, it was unclear; and the fourth [still taller] one definitely didn't present himself well.'
The first sentence of (2) is analogous to (1a). The third sentence establishes that the gymnasts operated a vertical rotation, hence additional heights, but now below the position of the bar – which reinforces Points (i) and (ii); Points (iii) and (iv) are preserved as in (1).

(2) SHOW HAVE 4 GYMNAST STAND-CL BAR ORDER HEIGHT.
IX-a PRESENT SELF-a BAD, IX-b MAYBE NOT, IX-c NOT CLEAR, IX-d DEFINITELY NOT.
SUDDENLY STAND-CL HANG-CL. WEIRD – NOW
a. SELF signed at various, appropriate heights
6.3 IX-a’ PRESENT SELF-a’ WELL, IX-b’ MAYBE NOT PRESENT SELF-b’ WELL, IX-c’ NOT CLEAR, IX-d’ DEFINITELY NOT PRESENT SELF-d’ WELL.
b. SELF signed at a constant, intermediate height
3.7 IX-a’ PRESENT SELF-a’ WELL, IX-b’ MAYBE NOT PRESENT SELF-b’ WELL, IX-c’ NOT CLEAR, IX-d’ DEFINITELY NOT PRESENT SELF-d’ WELL.
c. SELF signed low, only once (with ellipsis of the the second and fourth VPs)
6.3 IX-a’ PRESENT SELF-a’ WELL, IX-b’ MAYBE NOT, IX-c’ NOT CLEAR, IX-d’ DEFINITELY NOT. => bound variable reading

'During a show, four gymnasts were standing on a bar, ranked by height. One [a short one] presented himself badly; the second [taller] one didn't present himself badly; for the third [still taller] one, it was unclear; and the fourth [still taller] one definitely didn't present badly. Suddenly, they effected a vertical rotation. Oddly, now the short one presented himself well; the second one possibly didn't present himself well; for the third one, it was unclear; and the fourth one definitely didn't present himself well.'

Arguably, then, height specifications of loci display grammatical properties of phi-features and a highly iconic/gradient behavior.
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