

snippets

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

Contents

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

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

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

ASL IX to locus as a modifier

Dorothy Ahn · Harvard University

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7358/snippet-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. $[[\text{JIN IX}_A]] = [\text{jín} [\text{who is signed at A}]]$ ‘Jin’
 b. $[[\text{IX}_A]] = [[\emptyset \text{IX}_A]] = \iota x. x \text{ is signed at A}$ ‘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 *Paranthenicals*, 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