snippets

Issue 41 - July 2021

Contents

Copyright

Editors

Review Board

Email: snippetsjournal@gmail.com

ii

Editorial Statement

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 brief, self-contained and explicit. One encounters short comments of this kind in earlier literature in linguistics. 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 challenges accepted generalizations or influential theoretical proposals;

- 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 remark we would like to publish. Some of them posed unobserved puzzles. For instance, a squib by Postal and Ross in *Linguistic Inquiry* 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 contains 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.

3. Submission details

Snippets is an electronic journal. We will solicit submissions twice a year. The submissions that we accept will be posted on the journal website approximately 3 months after each deadline, and all accepted submissions will remain permanently 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 published snippets 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), a Rich Text Format (RTF) file, or a PDF. The files must be anonymous, but must be accompanied with information about the authors: name, affiliation, and (postal or electronic) address. Submissions can be of any length below 500 words (including examples), with an additional half page allowed for diagrams, tables, and references. The submissions may not contain footnotes or general acknowledgments, except acknowledgements of funding sources, which must be credited in a line following the references. Authors who wish to acknowledge language consultants are allowed but not required to do so. We will not consider abstracts.

4. Editorial policy

Submissions will be reviewed by our editorial board and review board, and review will be name-blind both ways. While we guarantee a response within 3 months of the submission deadline, we will not necessarily provide more than a yes/no response to the submitter. We allow resubmission (once) of the same piece.

This statement reproduces with minor modifications the editorial statement in Issue 1 of Snippets (January 2000), edited by Carlo Cecchetto, Caterina Donati and Orin Percus.

Not all occurrences of logophoric pronouns are bound by a logophoric operator: The case of Ewe

Abigail Anne Bimpeh · Leibniz-Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft
Frank Sode · Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität

The question whether logophoric pronouns have "fake" occurrences has not, to our knowledge, been addressed in the literature. We present data from Ewe that suggest that the answer is: yes. It is a shared assumption on all accounts that the Ewe pronoun *yè* is licensed under binding by an operator, associated either with the embedding predicate (Schlenker 2003; von Stechow 2004; Pearson 2013, 2015) or the complementizer *be* (O'Neill 2016; Bimpeh 2019; Satik 2021). Our data show that this is not the only way to license *yè*, and that any account of logophoric pronouns must make room for "fake" instances.

The possessive pronoun in (1) can either have a strict or a sloppy interpretation (2) (confirmed by 12 native speaker consultants). This is the same as with the possessive pronoun *his* in the English translation.

(1) Kofi$_i$ súsú be   yè$_i$ ko yé wɔ yè$_i$-ɖe   dɔ
     Kofi think COMP LOG only FOC do LOG-POSS work
     'Kofi$_i$ thinks that only he$_i$ did his$_i$ work'

(2) Kofi thinks that he is the only one of whom $\begin{cases} (\lambda x . x \text{ does Kofi's work}) \text{ is true} & \textbf{strict} \\ (\lambda x . x \text{ does } x\text{'s work}) \text{ is true} & \textbf{sloppy} \end{cases}$

Given that (1) has the same readings as its English counterpart, and given that there is no evidence to the contrary, we assume that the [DP *ko yé*]-construction in Ewe has the same interpretation options as the [*only* DP]-construction in English.

The interesting case is the sloppy reading. In the literature, we find two general strategies for how to derive this reading with an *only*-DP: via focus alternatives or structured propositions (Rooth 1992; Krifka 1991 resp.), or by treating the *only*-DP as a quantifier (e.g. Heim 2008). On both kinds of accounts, the sloppy interpretation requires the pronoun to be bound at LF by the focused DP. If Ewe is like English in that it requires the pronoun on a sloppy interpretation to be bound, it cannot be bound by the logophoric operator. This suggests that the logophoric feature in Ewe can undergo a similar feature transmission/deletion process as ϕ-features in a focus-construction in English, i.e., some overt occurrences of logophoric pronouns are not directly bound by a logophoric operator but are "fake" (Kratzer 2009) logophors.

The observation that Ewe has "fake" logophors is of theoretical interest not because the facts couldn't in principle be handled by existing accounts; on some accounts it might even be predicted ?- although not explicitly so. Rather it is not obvious, given current understanding, that the answer should be positive in the first place. Since the [log]-feature that is commonly associated with *yè* is more closely related to features that mark anaphoric pronouns as anaphoric than to ϕ-features

(cf. von Stechow 2004), and since the features that mark pronouns as anaphoric typically are not "fake", it could have turned out that there are no fake logophors.

To be somewhat more concrete: One way to explain the licensing of the logophoric feature of the bound pronoun on a sloppy interpretation is by assuming that logophoric features in Ewe are subject to Heim (2008)'s principle of feature transmission (Heim 2008:50): "In the derivation of PF, all features of a DP must be copied onto all variables that it binds." The details would look as follows, assuming that the logophoric feature comes with the complementizer *be* and is transmitted under binding in a binding chain with *be* as the source of licensing; cf. Heim (2008:49).

(3) Base-generated:
Kofi thinks [*be*$_4$-LOG [[only $\varnothing_4$] did $\varnothing_2$'s work]]

After transmission, at PF:
Kofi thinks [*be*-LOG 4 [*LOG*-[only *LOG*$_4$] 2 [*LOG*$_2$ did *LOG*$_2$'s work]]]

References

Bimpeh, Abigail Anne. 2019. Default de se: The interpretation of the Ewe logophor. In *Proceedings of TripleA, Vol. 5*, ed. Ryan Bochnak, Miriam Butt, Erlinde Meertens, and Mark-Matthias Zymla, 1–15. Tübingen: Universitätsbibliothek Tübingen, Publikationssystem.

Heim, Irene. 2008. Features on bound pronouns. In *Phi Theory: Phi-features across Modules and Interfaces*, ed. Daniel Harbour, David Adger, and Susana Béjar, 35–56. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kratzer, Angelika. 2009. Making a pronoun: Fake indexicals as windows into the properties of pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 40:187–237.

Krifka, Manfred. 1991. A compositional semantics for multiple focus constructions. In *Proceedings of the 1st Semantics and Linguistic Theory Conference (SALT 1)*, ed. Steven K. Moore and Adam Zachary Wyner, 127–158. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.

O'Neill, Teresa. 2016. The distribution of the Danyi Ewe logophor *yi*. Talk presented at the 90th Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, Washington, D.C.

Pearson, Hazel. 2013. The Sense of Self: Topics in the Semantics of De Se Expressions. Doctoral Dissertation, Harvard University.

Pearson, Hazel. 2015. The interpretation of the logophoric pronoun in Ewe. *Natural Language Semantics* 23:77–118.

Rooth, Mats. 1992. A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1:75–116.

Satik, Deniz. 2021. Control is not movement: Evidence from overt PRO in Ewe. Ms., Harvard University.

Schlenker, Philippe. 2003. A plea for monsters. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26:29–120.

von Stechow, Arnim. 2004. Binding by verbs: Tense, person, and mood under attitudes. In *The Syntax and Semantics of the Left Periphery*, ed. Horst Lohnstein and Susanne Trissler, 431–488. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Abigail Anne Bimpeh
Leibniz-Zentrum für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft (ZAS)

bimpeh@leibniz-zas.de
Schützenstr. 18,
10117-Berlin
Germany

Frank Sode
Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität
frank_sode@gmx.de, sode@em.uni-frankfurt.de
Fachbereich Neuere Philologien
Institut für Linguistik
Norbert-Wollheim-Platz 1
60629 Frankfurt am Main
Germany

Pitch and causal inference in English temporal adverbial answers

Hagen Blix · New York University
Adina Williams · Facebook AI Research

We report a mismatch in standard American English between the focus alternatives one would expect based on pitch accent placement and the ones we actually entertain. Consider the following unbiased information-seeking *wh*-question:

(1)   When did you start studying linguistics?

We discuss two possible answers. In (2), the nuclear pitch accent is on the verb, which allows for a neutral or broad focus interpretation, as well as a narrow one. However, in (3), it falls on the object, which allows only for a narrow focus interpretation (examples annotated in ToBI, Beckman and Hirschberg 1994; Beckman and Elam 1997, an autosegmental metrical transcription system, Beckman and Pierrehumbert 1986).

(2)   When I **mèt** you.
        H* L-L%
        My initiation into linguistics began around when I met you.

(3)   When I met **yòu**.
        L*+H
        My initiation into linguistics began around when I met you,
        and it has a cause/reason,
        and that cause/reason (indirectly) was our meeting.

With regard to interpretation, (2) allows for an additional causal inference, while (3) requires it. Note that this contrast is clearer with elements such as weak pronouns that can be deaccentuated (Cardinaletti and Starke 1994), since a proper noun like *Kim* (which will not avoid nuclear stress) would systematically obscure the prosodic contrast. We argue that this does not trivially follow from a classic approach to focus alternatives (Rooth 1992; Hamblin 1976), where narrow DP focus on *you* should result in focus alternatives of the structure *I met Logan/Sam/Chris/. . . .* Here, instead, it evokes alternative reasons that don't necessarily involve meeting anyone (e.g., . . . *the cause/reason for me to start studying linguistics was {I read Syntactic Structures, I always loved words, . . . }*). Even if we take temporal clauses to routinely introduce reasons (e.g., via *post hoc ergo propter hoc* reasoning; M. Esipova, p.c.), this alone does not explain why narrow focus on *you* would invite the alternatives we describe. Herein lies the mismatch.

Maxim of Relation.   One might think (A. Warstadt, p.c.) that the extra inference might merely arise from the Maxim of Relation, which states that an utterance should be "appropriate to the

immediate needs" of the conversation (Grice 1975:47). If the answerer assumed that the asker covertly sought a cause or reason when asking (1), then the Maxim of Relation would encourage the answerer to provide one. The following conjunctive extension of (1) explicitly requests a cause/reason, so we can use it to determine which answers are felicitous:

(4)   When did you start studying linguistics, and why?

Were (1) covertly picking out both alternative temporal intervals and alternative reasons in a parallel way to the conjunctive question in (4), we might expect (3) to be a felicitious answer to both questions. It isn't. An appropriate answer to (4) can be composed from either (2) or (3), but it must also be followed by an explicit articulation of the reason: for example, 'When I met you. Your overly Chomskyian ramblings convinced me to take a linguistics course.' As (3) alone isn't a felicitious answer to (4), but is a felicitious answer to (1), we can assume that (1) doesn't covertly request a cause or reason, and we shouldn't then expect a causal inference under the Maxim of Relation. Thus, the Maxim of Relation alone cannot be used to easily explain the presence of the causal inference in (3).

Conclusion.   We have shown that placement of nuclear pitch accent in English temporal adverbial phrases gives rise to a causal inference. The fact that the inference is *causal* cannot be easily accounted for either by Grice's Maxim of Relation or by a standard account of focus alternatives. This snippet raises the following questions: (i) why would narrow focus on the object allow for a causal inference, when the resulting set of alternatives does not plausibly correspond to the set of causes?; and (ii) why is this causal inference obligatory with narrow focus on the object, but optional with VP focus?

References

Beckman, Mary E., and Gayle Ayers Elam. 1997. Guidelines for ToBI labelling, version 3. The Ohio State University Research Foundation.

Beckman, Mary E., and Julia Hirschberg. 1994. The ToBI annotation conventions. Ms., The Ohio State University.

Beckman, Mary E., and Janet B. Pierrehumbert. 1986. Intonational structure in Japanese and English. *Phonology Yearbook* 3:255–309.

Cardinaletti, Anna, and Michal Starke. 1994. The typology of structural deficiency: On the three grammatical classes. *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 4:41–109.

Grice, H Paul. 1975. Logic and conversation. In *Syntax and Semantics 3: Speech Acts*, ed. Peter Cole and Jerry L. Morgan, 41–58. New York: Academic Press.

Hamblin, Charles L. 1976. Questions in Montague English. In *Montague Grammar*, ed. Barbara Partee, 247–259. New York: Academic Press.

Rooth, Mats. 1992. A theory of focus interpretation. *Natural Language Semantics* 1:75–116.

Hagen Blix
hagen.blix@nyu.edu
Department of Linguistics

New York University
10 Washington Square
New York, NY 10003
USA

Adina Williams
adinawilliams@fb.com
Facebook AI Research
770 Broadway
New York, NY 10003
USA