snippets

Issue 37 - December 2019
Special issue in honor of Uli Sauerland

Contents

1. Andreea C. Nicolae, Patrick D. Elliott, and Yasutada Sudo
Introduction 1
2. Dorothy Ahn
ASL IX to locus as a modifier 2
3. Artemis Alexiadou
Decomposing scalar approximatives in Greek 4
4. Anna Alsop, Lucas Champollion, and Ioana Grosu
A problem for Fox's (2007) account of free choice disjunction 7
5. Anton Benz and Nicole Gotzner
Quantifier irgendein *and local implicature* 10
6. Jonathan David Bobaljik and Susi Wurmbrand
Fake indexicals, binding, and the PCC 13
7. Brian Buccola and Emmanuel Chemla
Alternatives of disjunctions: when a disjunct contains the antecedent of a pronoun 16
8. Luka Crnič and Brian Buccola
Scoping NPIs out of DPs 19
9. Chris Cummins
Some contexts requiring precise number meanings 22
10. Patrick D. Elliott and Paul Marty
Exactly one theory of multiplicity inferences 24

11. Anamaria Fălăuş and Andreea C. Nicolae
Two coordinating particles are better than one: free choice items in Romanian 27
12. Danny Fox
Individual concepts and narrow scope illusions 30
13. Danny Fox
Degree concepts and narrow scope illusions 33
14. Nicole Gotzner
Disjunction, conjunction, and exhaustivity 35
15. Martin Hackl
On Haddock's puzzle and the role of presupposition in reference resolution 37
16. Andreas Haida
Symmetry, density, and formal alternatives 40
17. Nina Haslinger and Viola Schmitt
Strengthened disjunction or non-classical conjunction? 43
18. Fabian Heck and Anke Himmelreich
Two observations about reconstruction 46
19. Aron Hirsch
Modal adverbs and constraints on type-flexibility 49
20. Natalia Ivlieva and Alexander Podobryaev
On variable agreement and scope reconstruction in Russian 52
21. Hadil Karawani
The past is rewritten 54
22. Manfred Krifka and Fereshteh Modarresi
Persian ezafe *and proportional quantifiers* 56
23. Paul Marty
Maximize Presupposition! and presupposition satisfaction 59
24. Lisa Matthewson, Sihwei Chen, Marianne Huijsmans,
Marcin Morzycki, Daniel Reisinger, and Hotze Rullmann
Restricting the English past tense 61
25. Clemens Mayr
On a seemingly nonexistent cumulative reading 65
26. Marie-Christine Meyer
Scalar Implicatures in complex contexts 67
27. Moreno Mitrović
Null disjunction in disguise 70
28. Andreea C. Nicolae and Yasutada Sudo
The exhaustive relevance of complex conjunctions 72
29. Rick Nouwen
Scalar vagueness regulation and locative reference 75

30. Robert Pasternak
Unifying partitive and adjective-modifying percent 77
31. Hazel Pearson and Frank Sode
'Not in my wildest dreams': a part time minimizer? 80
32. Orin Percus
Uli and our generation: some reminiscences 82
33. Jacopo Romoli
Why them*?* 84
34. Fabienne Salfner
The rise and fall of non-conservatives 87
35. Petra B. Schumacher
Vagueness and context-sensitivity of absolute gradable adjectives 90
36. Stephanie Solt
More or less an approximator 93
37. Giorgos Spathas
Plural anaphoric reference and non-conservativity 95
38. Benjamin Spector
An argument for the trivalent approach to presupposition projection 97
39. Bob van Tiel
'The case against fuzzy logic revisited' revisited 100
40. Lyn Tieu
A developmental asymmetry between the singular and plural 103
41. Tue Trinh
A tense question 106
42. Hubert Truckenbrodt
On remind-me presuppositions and embedded question acts 108
43. Michael Wagner
Disjuncts must be mutually excludable 111
44. E. Cameron Wilson
Constraints on non-conservative readings in English 114
45. Susi Wurmbrand
Indexical shift meets ECM 117

ASL IX to locus as a modifier

Dorothy Ahn · Harvard University

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.7358/snip-2019-037-dahn

In ASL, a pointing gesture with an index finger (IX) can be used to refer to entities. When the referent is not physically present in the context, it can be associated with different locations in the signing space (locus) so that IX to that locus refers to that referent. It has been argued that loci are overt instantiations of indices (Lillo-Martin and Klima 1990) that the pronominal element IX carries. I propose an alternative analysis of IX to a locus (IX_{LOC}), where it is analyzed as a relative clause modifier, taking a locational variable *a*.

(1) a. $[\![IX_{LOC}]\!] = \lambda a.\ \lambda x.$ x is signed at a
b. $[\![IX_{A}]\!] = \lambda x.$ x is signed at A

There are at least two motivations for this analysis. First, loci are neither obligatory nor licensed in all anaphoric contexts. ASL freely allows null arguments and bare nouns for anaphoric reference when there is a single salient entity in the discourse (Ahn, Kocab, and Davidson 2019). Also used in this context is a neutral IX, which points not to a previously established locus but to a neutral position. In contrary, IX to locus is not frequent in naturally produced data (Czubek 2017; Frederiksen and Mayberry 2016), and is licensed when contrast has to be drawn between referents (Ahn, Kocab, and Davidson 2019) as in (2). This suggests that the primary role of IX_{LOC} might be in distinguishing the intended referent from a set of other competing referents, rather than in anaphorically referring to that referent.

(2) BOY IX_A SEE GIRL IX_B READ. IX_A DANCE.
'A boy saw a girl read. He danced.'

Second, IX to locus is only licensed when the locus has been associated with the referent in previous discourse, a use that I call the introductory use. The introductory use is illustrated by the first instance of IX_A in (3), where the referent is associated with locus A.

(3) JIN *(IX_A) ENTER CLUB. IX_A DANCE.
'Jin entered a club. He danced.'

Note that without the first instance of IX_A in (3), it is infelicitous to use IX_A to refer to Jin in the second sentence. Thus, it is not possible to analyze both instances of IX_A as anaphoric elements. If IX to locus is analyzed as a pronoun carrying an index, the introductory use of IX_{LOC} would need a separate account from the anaphoric one.

If IX_{LOC} is analyzed as a modifier, the difference between the introductory use and the anaphoric use can be derived straightforwardly without proposing two separate denotations. In the introductory use, the referential expression *Jin* combines with a relative clause "that is signed at a" in an appositive manner, so that the resulting interpretation is Jin with the added information that Jin is the one signed at a. In the anaphoric use, I propose that a null anaphor, which is readily available in

the language, is the head noun of the same relative clause "that is signed at a", and that the relative clause is restrictive, as in (4b). Relative clauses with null heads are also found in spoken languages like Mandarin, as in (5).

(4) a. $[\![\text{JIN IX}_\text{A}]\!]$ = [*jin* [who is signed at A]] 'Jin'
b. $[\![\text{IX}_\text{A}]\!] = [\![\varnothing\ \text{IX}_\text{A}]\!] = \iota x.$ x is signed at A 'the one signed at A'

(5) Wo mai-de hen gui.
I buy-RC HEN expensive
'The thing I bought was expensive.'

The details of deriving the appositive meaning in (4a) have to be worked out further, as appositive relative clauses are standardly assumed to differ from restrictive ones in structure and meaning (cf. Del Gobbo 2007). But the basic analysis of IX_LOC as a modifier can remain consistent between introductory and anaphoric uses even if this difference is taken into account.

Thus, analyzing IX_LOC as a relative clause modifier allows us to unify the introductory and the anaphoric use and better account for the contrastive distribution.

References

Ahn, Dorothy, Annemarie Kocab, and Kathryn Davidson. 2019. Closer look at ASL IX: Locus as contrast-triggering modifier. Ms. Harvard University.

Czubek, Todd Alan. 2017. A Comprehensive Study of Referring Expressions in ASL. Doctoral Dissertation, Boston University.

Del Gobbo, Francesca. 2007. On the syntax and semantics of appositive relative clauses. In *Parentheticals*, ed. Nicole Dehé and Yordanka Kavalova, 173–201. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Frederiksen, Anne Therese, and Rachel I. Mayberry. 2016. Who's on first?: Investigating the referential hierarchy in simple native ASL narratives. *Lingua* 180:49–68.

Lillo-Martin, Diane, and Edward S. Klima. 1990. Pointing out differences: ASL pronouns in syntactic theory. *Theoretical Issues in Sign Language Research* 1:191–210.

Dorothy Ahn
dorothyahn@g.harvard.edu
Boylston Hall, 3rd Floor
Cambridge, MA 02138
USA