snippets

Issue 47 - January 2025

Contents

- 1. Shubham Bokade, Gurujegan Murugesan. Empirical evidence for switch reference involving Agree(ment)
- 2. Imke Driemel, Abigail Anne Bimpeh, Reginald Duah. *Resumption as a novel DP/NP diagnostic*
- 3. Diego Feinmann. On breaking symmetry by complexity
- 4. Pasha Koval. An indicative null C in Russian, they said. But it is a slifting parenthetical
- 5. Jéssica Mendes. Against the blocking approach to the Bagel Problem



ISSN 1590-1807

Published in Led on Line - Electronic Archive by LED - Edizioni Universitarie di Lettere Economia Diritto - Milano - Italy https://www.ledonline.it

January 2025

Copyright

The works included in *Snippets* are the property of their authors and are used by permission. Readers must apply the same principles of fair use to the works in this electronic archive that they would to a printed archive. These works may be read online, downloaded and printed for personal use, copied and freely distributed, or the URL of *Snippets* included in another electronic document. Any reference to material included in *Snippets* must cite the author and the source. The texts may not be published commercially (in print or electronic form), edited, or otherwise altered without the permission of the author.

Editors

Sam Alxatib, Graduate Center, City University of New York Isaac Gould, Ewha Womans University Orin Percus, Université de Nantes

Review Board

Simon Charlow (Rutgers University), Christopher Davis (University of the Ryukyus),
Michael Yoshitaka Erlewine (National University of Singapore), Ilaria Frana (Università degli Studi di Enna "Kore"), Daniel Gutzmann (University of Cologne), Laura Kalin (Princeton University), Marie-Christine Meyer (Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft), Neil Myler (Boston University), Michelle Sheehan (Anglia Ruskin University), Yasutada Sudo (University College London), Ayaka Sugawara (Waseda University), Gary Thoms (New York University), Maziar Toosarvandani (University of California, Santa Cruz), Wataru Uegaki (University of Edinburgh), Coppe van Urk (Queen Mary University of London), Alexis Wellwood (University of Southern California), Rebecca Woods (Newcastle University).

The editors would also like to thank Moshe Bar-Lev, Matt Barros, Brian Buccola, Lucas Champollion, Keny Chatain, Emmanuel Chemla, Emily Clem, Peter Jenks, Andrew McKenzie, Paula Menendez-Benito, Augustina Owusu, Josep Quer, Jacopo Romoli, and Erik Zyman for their reviews.

Email: snippetsjournal@gmail.com

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 *Linguis-tic 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 <u>snippetsjournal@gmail.com</u>. 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 nameblind 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.

Empirical evidence for switch reference involving Agree(ment)

Shubham Bokade · Indira Gandhi National Tribal University, Amarkantak Gurujegan Murugesan · Indian Institute of Technology Jodhpur

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.7358/snip-2024-047-bomu

In the study of switch reference (SR), recent approaches (including Finer 1985, Baker and Camargo Souza 2020, Clem 2023, and Arregi and Hanink 2018;2022) consider the phenomenon to involve Agree(ment). In support of these approaches to switch reference, we present empirical data from Malto, a Dravidian language spoken by the Pahariya tribe in the Indian subcontinent. First, as originally observed by Kobayashi (2012), Malto exhibits a rare φ -inflectional ending when the subject in its own clause is referentially the same (i.e. "same subject", or SS) as the one in the adjacent clause (1). However, when the subjects of two adjacent clauses are referentially different (2) (i.e. "different subject", or DS), the switch reference is encoded by a default *-ko* that does not inflect for any φ -features.

(1)	Geeta:di bərc-ki:d	Geeta:d _i	ca:-en	bita:d.	
	Geeta return-ss.3sc	G.F Geeta	tea-ACC	make.PST.3SG.F	
	'After Geeta returned, Geeta made a tea.'				(data from fieldwork)
(2)	Geeta:d: borc-ko e:n	• ca:-en	hita-ke	n	

(2) Geeta:di bərc-ko e:nj ca:-en bita-ken.
Geeta return-<u>DS</u> 1SG.M tea-ACC make-PST.1SG.M
'After Geeta returned, I made a tea.' (data from fieldwork)

The pattern seen in (1) and (2) is the inverse of what has been observed before in switch reference typology, where it is the different-subject marking that involves φ -agreemen, but not the same-subject marking. For instance, Hua medial markers (Haiman 1980a,b), Quechua φ -agreement in different-subject clauses (Cole 1983, Assmann 2012, Georgi 2012), and Amahuaca 3PL different-subject marking (Clem 2019:146) exhibit φ -agreement only in different-subject contexts, but not in the case of same-subject contexts. Malto, however, has a switch reference agreement paradigm only in the same-subject context, where the relevant morphology can be analysed as a portmanteau of switch reference and subject agreement (note that following the initial $\langle k \rangle$ for switch reference, the same-subject φ -endings appear to match those for typical subject inflection). In contrast, all the different-subject contexts have invariable -ko. The paradigm is given in Table 1.

In addition to the φ -covariance, Malto presents another piece of empirical evidence that supports the Agree(ment) view of switch reference. The same-subject marker is sensitive to the case markers of the subjects that are involved. When one or both of the subjects is marked with dative case, switch reference is encoded by default *-ko*, despite both subjects having the same reference (3).

(3) a. Eŋga_i meru korc-<u>ko</u> e:n_i əda-k bərc-ken. 1SG.M.**DAT** sick get-<u>DS</u> 1SG.M home-DAT return-PST.1SG.M 'After I got sick, I returned home.' (data from fieldwork)

	1SG	1pl.incl	1pl.excl	2sg.m	2SG.F	3sg.m	3sg.f	2/3pl
1SG	-ken	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ko
1PL.INCL	-ko	-ket	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ko
1PL.EXCL	-ko	-ko	-kem	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ko
2sg.m	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ke	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ko
2SG.F	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ki	-ko	-ko	-ko
3sg.m	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ke	-ko	-ko
3SG.F	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ki:d	-ko
2/3PL	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ko	-ker

Table 1: Switch reference paradigm in Malto

b. Eŋga_i meru tin dini becc-ko e:n_i əda-k bərc-ken. 1SG.M.**DAT** sick three days stay-<u>DS</u> 1SG.M home-DAT return-PST.1SG.M 'After I stayed sick for three days, I returned home.' (data from fieldwork)

In (3), the dative case blocks the expected same-subject φ -agreement, and instead results in default *-ko*. An anonymous reviewer raises an interesting question as to whether non-case-marked *meru* can be construed as a subject instead of dative-marked *enga* in (3). If *meru* is the subject, then this would be a different-subject context, naturally resulting in *-ko*. However, there is good reason to think that it is not *meru*, but rather the dative-marked *enga* that is the subject. Having *meru* in both clauses, as in (4), still results in *-ko*, suggesting that switch reference is not tracking *meru*.

(4) Eŋgai meru korc-ko eŋgai meru tin dini becca.
1SG.M.DAT sick get-DS 1SG.M.DAT sick three days stay.PST
'After I got sick, I stayed sick for three days.' (data from fieldwork)

Accordingly, this kind of case sensitivity confirms a prediction in both Arregi and Hanink 2022 and Clem 2023, which suggest capturing the subject-only nature of switch reference in various languages via probing that is case-sensitive in tracking only nominative DPs. The data in Malto then advance this case-based proposal by showing that a same-subject context is, as predicted, not sufficient for same-subject marking: even when there are same-subject experiencer dative subjects, switch reference probing does not track such non-nominative DPs.

References

- Arregi, Karlos, and Emily Hanink. 2018. Switch reference in Washo as multiple subject agreement. In NELS 48: Proceedings of the forty-eighth annual meeting of the North East Linguistic Society, Vol. 1, Sherry Hucklebridge and Max Nelson (eds.), 39–48. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Arregi, Karlos, and Emily Hanink. 2022. Switch reference as index agreement. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 40:651–702.
- Assmann, Anke. 2012. Switch-reference as interclausal tense agreement: Evidence from Quechua. *Linguistische Arbeitsberichte* 89:41–81.

- Baker, Mark, and Livia Camargo Souza. 2020. Agree without agreement: Switch-reference and reflexive voice in two Panoan languages. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 38:1053–1114.
- Clem, Emily. 2019. Agreement, Case, and Switch-reference in Amahuaca. Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley.
- Clem, Emily. 2023. Cyclic expansion in Agree: Maximal projections as probes. *Linguistic Inquiry* 54:39–78.
- Cole, Peter. 1983. Switch-reference in two Quechua languages. In *Switch-reference and Universal Grammar*, John Haiman and Pamela Munro (eds.), 1–15. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Finer, Daniel. 1985. The syntax of switch-reference. Linguistic Inquiry 16:35-55.
- Georgi, Doreen. 2012. Switch-reference by movement. Linguistische Arbeitsberichte 89:1-40.
- Haiman, John. 1980a. *Hua: A Papuan language of the eastern highlands of New Guinea*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Haiman, John. 1980b. The iconicity of grammar: Isomorphism and motivation. *Language* 56:515–540.
- Kobayashi. 2012. Texts and Grammar of Malto. Vizianagaram: Kotoba Books.

Shubham Bokade shubhambokade32@gmail.com Department of English and Foreign Languages Indira Gandhi National Tribal University Amarkantak India

Gurujegan Murugesan gurujeganm@iitj.ac.in School of Liberal Arts IIT Jodhpur India

Resumption as a novel DP/NP diagnostic

Imke Driemel · University of York Abigail Anne Bimpeh · Humboldt University Berlin Reginald Duah · University of Ghana

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.7358/snip-2024-047-drbd

The syntactic status of determiners is still very much under debate (cf. Abney 1987, Bošković 2005, and Bruening 2009). Little attention has been given to bare argument languages, specifically those in which only a certain type of definite occurs with a determiner. For instance, in Akan (Kwa) anaphoric definites (1a) are marked with $n\delta$ but unique definites (1b) occur as bare nouns (Arkoh and Matthewson 2013; examples in (1) from *ibid*:5, 11). The latter refers to a set of referents which are taken to be unique based on shared world knowledge. (Note, though, that this characterization of bare nouns is disputed in other work; see Bombi 2018 and Owusu 2022 for further discussion.)

- a. mò-tó-ò èkùtú. èkùtú nó yè dèw pápá.
 1SG-buy-PST orange orange DEF be nice good
 'I bought an orange. The orange is/was really tasty.'
 - b. Kwámi nyá-à kràtàá fí-ì Ègyá krónkrón **pópe** hó. Kwame get-PST letter from-PST father holy pope there 'Kwame got a letter from the holy father Pope.'

Under Jenks's (2018) analysis of classifier languages, uniqueness-based definites constitute NPs, for which an t-type shift derives uniqueness. For anaphoric definites, Jenks follows Schwarz (2009) by assuming that they are DPs, where the D head introduces an index. This analysis aims to derive the fact that only anaphoric definites occur with a determiner. Uniqueness-based definites never occur with a determiner due to the Blocking Principle (Chierchia 1998). We transfer the analysis to Akan in (2).

- (2) Definites in Akan based on Jenks 2018
 - a. Uniqueness-based definite in (1b):

NP
$$\exists !x[POPE(x)(s_r)] . \iota x[POPE(x)(s_r)]$$

 $\uparrow \iota - shift$
NP

b. Anaphoricity-based definite in (1a):



In this snippet, we will provide an additional argument in favour of a DP/NP distinction correlating with the semantic type of definiteness in Akan.

Kwa languages display productive resumption patterns. For Akan in particular, it has been observed that the tail of a movement dependency is realized as a pronoun, which is mostly shown with proper names and definites (e.g. Saah 1994, Ameka 2010, and Korsah 2016). Interestingly, the availability of resumptive pronouns is related to the meaning of the moved phrase. Hein and Georgi (2021) show that focused objects leave gaps if they are non-referential. We present (3) with non-specific indefinites (slightly adjusted from their paper).

(3) Context: You tell a classmate that you're planning to rent a school uniform. However, you don't know if that's possible. Your classmate asks: 'Will you ask the headmaster?' But you say:

dààbí. **òkyèrèkyérèní**_i nà m-é-bísá ____i kàné. no teacher FOC 1SG-FUT-ask first 'No. I will ask a (random) TEACHER first.' (one of the many teachers around)

Hein and Georgi (2021) argue that resumption in Akan is derived via partial lower copy deletion. Chain reduction for movement chains only deletes NP in Akan. Non-specific indefinites are NPs, hence the gap in (3). But for DP-arguments the D head remains.

If only NPs are deleted at the tail of a movement chain and the analysis in (2) is correct, we expect anaphoric definites to leave a resumptive pronoun, whereas unique definites are predicted to leave a gap. In (4) and (5), we show that this prediction is borne out. (We intentionally do not mention *pope* in the context in (4) to avoid a competition between the unique and the anaphoric form.)

(4) Context: My friend is glancing through a magazine. She sees a nice man but does not know who he is. She says "I like this man!" I exclaim:

éiì! **pope**_{*i*} nà wó pé ____*i* sèèséí? PRT pope FOC 2SG like now 'Hey! You like the POPE now?'

(5) Context: We both talk about Yaw and that he met a boy and [a girl]_i yesterday. I think I heard that the boy needed some help, so Yaw helped him. But you disagree and tell me: dààbí. [àbáaáyéwá nó]_i nà Yaw bóá-à [#](nó_i) ènórà. no girl DEF FOC Yaw help-PST 3SG.RES yesterday 'No. Yaw helped the GIRL yesterday.'

By considering the availability of resumptive pronouns, we are able to provide independent evidence for the definiteness account in Jenks 2018 and partial copy deletion in Akan (Hein and Georgi 2021). Future research can show how far resumption can serve as a novel test for syntactic size in more languages than Akan.

References

- Abney, Steven Paul. 1987. The English Noun Phrase in its Sentential Aspect. Doctoral Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Ameka, Felix K. 2010. Information packaging constructions in Kwa: Micro-variation and typology. In *Topics in Kwa Syntax*, Enoch O. Aboh and James Essegbey (eds.), 141–176. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Arkoh, Ruby Becky, and Lisa Matthewson. 2013. A familiar definite article in Akan. *Lingua* 123:1–30.
- Bombi, Carla. 2018. Definiteness in Akan: Familiarity and uniqueness revisited. In *Proceedings* of SALT 28, Sireemas Maspong, Brynhildur Stefánsdóttir, Katherine Blake, and Forrest Davis (eds.), 141–160. Linguistic Society of America.
- Bošković, Željko. 2005. On the locality of left branch extraction and the structure of NP. *Studia Linguistica* 59:1–45.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2009. Selectional asymmetries between CP and DP suggest that the DP hypothesis is wrong. *Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 15 (1):26–35.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 1998. Reference to kinds across languages. *Natural Language Semantics* 6:339-405.
- Hein, Johannes, and Doreen Georgi. 2021. Asymmetries in Asante Twi A'-movement: On the role of noun type in resumption. In *Proceeding of the Fifty-First Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS 51)*, Alessa Farinella and Angelica Hill (eds.), 223–236. Amherst, MA: GLSA.
- Jenks, Peter. 2018. Articulated definiteness without articles. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26:287–350.
- Korsah, Sampson. 2016. Beyond resumptives and expletives in Akan. In Diversity in African Languages: Selected papers from the 46th Annual Conference on African Linguistics, Doris L. Payne, Sara Pacchiarotti, and Mokaya Bosire (eds.), 103–117. Berlin: Language Science Press.
- Owusu, Augustina. 2022. Cross-Categorial Definiteness/Familiarity. Doctoral Dissertation, Rutgers University.
- Saah, Kofi Korankyi. 1994. Studies in Akan Syntax, Acquisition, and Sentence Processing. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Ottawa.
- Schwarz, Florian. 2009. Two Types of Definites in Natural Language. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

This work has been funded by the DFG Network 'Definiteness across domains' (project number: 493949122). We thank all members of the network for useful feedback.

Imke Driemel imke.driemel@york.ac.uk University of York YO105DD, York UK

Abigail Anne Bimpeh abigail.anne.bimpeh@hu-berlin.de Humboldt University Berlin Unter den Linden 6, D-10099, Berlin Germany

Reginald Akuoko Duah raduah@ug.edu.gh University of Ghana Accra (Legon) Ghana

On breaking symmetry by complexity

Diego Feinmann · Institute of Computer Science Polish Academy of Sciences

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.7358/snip-2024-047-fein

Katzir's (2007) proposed solution to the symmetry problem relies on structural complexity: in a nutshell, (1a) has the negation of (1b) as its implicature, but not the negation of (1c), because (1b) is not structurally more complex than (1a), while (1c) is.

- (1) a. Julia ate <u>some</u> of the cookies.
 - b. Julia ate all of the cookies.
 - c. Julia ate some, but not all of the cookies.

This account has a serious over-generation problem, one that seems to have gone unnoticed (for other problems, see Romoli 2013, Swanson 2010, Breheny et al. 2018, and Buccola et al. 2022). Consider, for example, (2a-b) and (3a-b).

- (2) a. Julia killed Jane.
 - b. Julia murdered Jane.
- (3) a. Julia bought a computer.
 - b. Julia bought a laptop.

(2a) does not implicate \neg (2b), nor does (3a) implicate \neg (3b); however, the (b) sentences here are of the same complexity as the (a) sentences, so there is no formal obstacle to transforming (2b)/(3b) into (secondary) implicatures of (2a)/(3a).

It could be argued that the (a) examples have other alternatives that make symmetric pairs with the (b) structures. Such alternatives would have to be semantically equivalent to (2c)/(3c) below.

- (2) c. Julia unintentionally killed Jane.
- (3) c. Julia bought a desktop computer.

If this was true, the unwanted implicatures would indeed be blocked, but such an account is unlikely. First, there do not appear to be paraphrases of (2c)/(3c) that are as overtly simple as (2a)/(3a). Second, assuming that these paraphrases exist introduces a new problem: the (a) examples would be incorrectly predicted to license obligatory ignorance inferences. (3a), for example, would be predicted to license the inference that the speaker does not know whether Julia bought a laptop computer or a desktop computer (cf. Feinmann 2023).

Another possibility is that the (b) structures themselves are underlyingly more complex than the (a) sentences. For example, *laptop* might underlyingly be *laptop computer* (and therefore more complex than *computer*), and *murder* might be *intentionally kill*. Such an assumption would also block the unwanted implicatures of (2a)/(3a). However, with or without this assumption, the negations of the (b) examples would be predicted to license the (a) examples as implicatures. The contrast between (4) and (5)/(6) shows that this prediction is incorrect.

- (4) Julia didn't eat all of the cookies.
 → Julia ate some of the cookies (i.e. ¬(Julia didn't eat some/any of the cookies))
- (5) Julia didn't murder Jane.

 √→ Julia killed Jane (i.e. ¬(Julia didn't kill Jane))
- (6) Julia didn't buy a laptop.

 √→ Julia bought a computer (i.e. ¬(Julia didn't buy a computer))

It's worth noting something that Moysh Bar-Lev pointed out to me: the contrast between (1a) and (2a)/(3a) persists even after controlling for relevance (QUD relevance, as in Roberts 2012). Compare (7) with (8)/(9):

- (7) a. Has Julia eaten all of the cookies?
 - b. \sqrt{N} No, she ate some of the cookies.
 - c. \checkmark No, she ate some, but not all of the cookies.
- (8) a. Has Julia murdered Jane?
 - b. ??No, she killed her.
 - c. \sqrt{No} , she killed her, but didn't murder her.
- (9) a. Has Julia bought a laptop?
 - b. ??No, she bought a computer.
 - c. \sqrt{No} , she bought a computer, but didn't buy a laptop.

(7b), as expected, reads as (7c); (8b)/(9b), however, do not have the readings in (8c)/(9c).

Before closing, I'd like to share some additional examples that make the same point as those discussed above. There is to my knowledge no lexical item in English that means 'shoes to the exclusion of sneakers'; despite this, 'shoes' doesn't implicate 'not sneakers' (as can easily be shown by applying the test in (7)-(9)). Likewise, 'He died' doesn't implicate 'He didn't drown', despite the fact that, in English there is no lexical item meaning 'to die, but not by drowning'. Finally, in Spanish, there's a term that means 'to run at a slow pace' (*trotar*), but there's no term, at least no term I am aware of, that means 'to run quickly'; despite this, when I hear *está corriendo* ('s/he is running'), I don't derive the implicature *no está trotando* ('s/he is not running at a slow pace').

Any solution to the symmetry problem has to be compatible with the empirical facts in (1)-(9). Katzir's (2007) solution isn't. Prima facie, what appears to be needed is an account that (i) treats (1b), but not (1c), as an alternative; (ii) either treats both (2b)/(2c) and (3b)/(3c) as alternatives (while somehow circumventing the ignorance inference prediction), or treats neither (2b)/(2c) nor (3b)/(3c) as alternatives; and (iii) doesn't predict the inferences in (5) and (6). To my knowledge, no such account has yet been developed. The structural complexity condition may or may not play a role in such an account, but if it does, additional considerations will need to come into play. As Matsumoto (1995) has noted, this condition is not necessary, and as shown here, it is not sufficient either.

References

- Breheny, Richard, Nathan Klinedinst, Jacopo Romoli, and Yasutada Sudo. 2018. The symmetry problem: Current theories and prospects. *Natural Language Semantics* 26:85–110.
- Buccola, Brian, Manuel Križ, and Emmanuel Chemla. 2022. Conceptual alternatives: Competition in language and beyond. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 45:265–291.
- Feinmann, Diego. 2023. Ignorance is a problem. Snippets 45:1-2.
- Katzir, Roni. 2007. Structurally-defined alternatives. Linguistics and Philosophy 30:669-690.
- Matsumoto, Yo. 1995. The conversational condition on Horn Scales. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 18:21–60.
- Roberts, Craige. 2012. Information structure in discourse: Towards an integrated formal theory of pragmatics. *Semantics and Pragmatics* 5:6.1–69.
- Romoli, Jacopo. 2013. A problem for the structural characterization of alternatives. *Snippets* 27:14–15.
- Swanson, Eric. 2010. Structurally defined alternatives and lexicalizations of XOR. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 33:31–36.

Diego Feinmann diego.feinmann@ipipan.waw.pl IPI PAN, ul. Jana Kazimierza 5, 01-248 Warszawa Poland

An indicative null C in Russian, they said. But it is a slifting parenthetical

Pasha Koval · Johns Hopkins University

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.7358/snip-2024-047-kova

A growing body of work assumes that Russian has an indicative null C that can be used in clausal embedding, as in (1); see for example Bailyn 1992, Stepanov and Georgopoulos 1997, Szczegielniak 1999, Antonenko 2006, Rojina 2011, Hansen et al. 2016, and Morgunova 2021. This assumption merits a closer look. This snippet reports on a series of tests that assess the presence of an indicative null C in complement clauses in Russian. The findings contribute to our understanding of Russian syntax and the general theory of complementation. It also provides a roadmap for researchers studying this phenomenon in other languages.

 Ja znaju, Maša xočet stat' veterinarom.
 I know Masha wants to.become veterinarian 'I know Masha wants to become a vet.'

Stepanov (2001) notes "a possibility that [the matrix clause in (1)] is some sort of a parenthetical constituent" (p. 190), but contends that it is impossible to decide without a definitive test. The tests below suggest that (1) should be analyzed as a sentence-lifting (*slifting*) parenthetical (2a) and not clausal embedding (2b). See Bresnan 1968, Jackendoff 1972, Ross 1973, Corver 1994, Rooryck 2001, and Potts 2005 on slifting parentheticals in English.

(2)	a.	The Titanic, John knew, is unsinkable.	(slifting parenthetical	
	b.	John knew the Titanic was unsinkable.	(clausal embedding)	

First, the structure in Russian does not allow local *wh*-movement (3a), which follows if *wh*-movement originates inside a syntactically-orphaned parenthetical, but is unexpected for a wellbehaved matrix clause. Importantly, if an indicative null C were available, it would mask the parenthetical structure, rendering the *čto*-less option in (3a) grammatical, cf. (3b).

- (3) a. Kto skazal, *(čto) ja uvlekajus' begom?
 who said that I like running
 'Who said I like running?'
 - b. Who said (that) the Titanic was unsinkable?

Second, the structure cannot be embedded (4), typical for slifting parentheticals.

 Maša uverena, čto Kolja dumajet, *(čto) lošadi ljubjat saxar.
 Masha is.certain that Kolya thinks that horses love sugar 'Masha is certain that Kolya thinks horses love sugar.'

Third, it blocks negation inside the slift, similar to slifting parentheticals; see Koev 2021:130ff.

(5) Ja ne dumaju, *(čto) Kolja čital Montenja.I not think that Kolya read Montaigne 'I don't think Kolya read Montaigne.'

Finally, the parenthetical assertion cannot be weakened and included in the question under discussion (Simons et al. 2010, Koev 2022). In (6), adding a modal adverb to the slift highlights its not-at-issueness.

(6) Katja verojatno znaet, Serëža opozdaet na vstreču.
Katya probably knows Seryozha will.be.late for meeting
'Seryozha will be late for a meeting, as Katya probably knows.'
*'Katya probably knows that Seryozha will be late for a meeting.'

A reviewer notes a potential issue: according to their judgments, only attitude/factive predicates conform to these tests, whereas other predicates show the inverse pattern (except for negation). If this observation holds, it would imply that in Russian, factive verbs block a null C, similar to English (Kiparsky and Kiparsky 1970). Unfortunately, no consultants corroborated this distinction. Therefore, more research is needed to determine the nature of this individual difference.

In conclusion, we have seen evidence that a string-identical Russian counterpart of a null C sentence in English is underlyingly a slifting parenthetical, which is only possible if Russian does not have an indicative null C.

References

- Antonenko, Andrei. 2006. Scrambling in Russian and the subjunctive/indicative distinction. Ms., Stony Brook University.
- Bailyn, John F. 1992. LF movement of anaphors and the acquisition of embedded clauses in Russian. *Language Acquisition* 2:307–335.
- Bresnan, Joan. 1968. Remarks on adsententials. Ms., Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Corver, Norbert. 1994. Parenthetical clauses: Their nature and distribution. Ms., Tilburg University.

- Hansen, Björn, Alexander Letuchiy, and Izabela Błaszczyk. 2016. Complementizers in Slavonic (Russian, Polish, and Bulgarian). In *Complementizer Semantics in European Languages*, Kasper Boye and Petar Kehayov (eds.), 175–223. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1972. Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

Kiparsky, Paul, and Carol Kiparsky. 1970. Fact. In *Progress in Linguistics*, Manfred Bierwisch and Karl Erich Heidolph (eds.), 143–173. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.

- Koev, Todor. 2021. Parentheticality, assertion strength, and polarity. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 44:113–140.
- Koev, Todor. 2022. Parenthetical Meaning. Oxford University Press.
- Morgunova, Ekaterina. 2021. Complementizer-trace effects in Russian. In *ConSOLE XXIX: Proceedings of the 29th Conference of the Student Organization of Linguistics in Europe*, Annie Holtz, Iva Kovač, Rasmus Puggaard–Rode, and Joanna Wall (eds.), 1–20. Leiden: Leiden University Centre for Linguistics.

Potts, Christopher. 2005. *The Logic of Conventional Implicatures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rojina, Nina. 2011. The Syntactic Structures of Russian Wh-Questions. Doctoral Dissertation, Université de Genève.

Rooryck, Johan. 2001. Evidentiality, Part 1. Glot International 5:125-133.

- Ross, John Robert. 1973. Slifting. In *The Formal Analysis of Natural Language*, Maurice Gross, Morris Halle, and Marcel–P. Schützenberger (eds.), 133–169. The Hague: Mouton.
- Simons, Mandy, Judith Tonhauser, David Beaver, and Craige Roberts. 2010. What projects and why. In *Proceedings of the 20th Semantics and Linguistic Theory Conference (SALT 20)*, Nan Li and David Lutz (eds.), 309–327. Ithaca, NY: CLC Publications.
- Stepanov, Arthur. 2001. Cyclic Domains in Syntactic Theory. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- Stepanov, Arthur, and Carol Georgopoulos. 1997. Structure building and the conceptual interface: An analysis of Russian long-distance wh-questions. In Annual Workshop on Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics: The Indiana Meeting 1996, Martina Lindseth and Steven Franks (eds.), 275–294. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Szczegielniak, Adam. 1999. 'That-Trace Effects' cross-linguistically and successive cyclic movement. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 33:369–393.

Pasha Koval pasha.koval@jhu.edu 237 Krieger Hall 3400 N. Charles Street Baltimore, MD 21218 USA

Against the blocking approach to the Bagel Problem

Jéssica Mendes · Georg-August-Universität Göttingen

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.7358/snip-2024-047-mend

Some languages have polarity-sensitive items that are licensed in downward entailing (DE) environments, but not under sentential negation. Sentential negation creates antimorphic contexts, which have a proper superset of the formal properties of DE environments. Hence, the existence of polarity-sensitive items that are licensed in DE environments, but blocked under sentential negation creates a paradox, which became known as the 'Bagel Problem' (Pereltsvaig 2004).



Figure 1: The 'Bagel Problem' (Pereltsvaig 2004)

Although the Bagel Problem is often discussed in connection with weak NPIs, the paradox is also found in languages that have Free Choice Items (FCIs). For instance, Portuguese *qualquer* is licensed in existential modal sentences, and DE-environments, but banned under sentential negation. The *qualquer*-variant of (1) is only acceptable if the FCI is stressed; in that case, the sentence conveys that the speaker did not read just any book, but rather a special, or noteworthy one. Crucially, a basic existential reading of *qualquer* is unavailable for (1).

(1) Eu não li {×qualquer /√nenhum} livro desse autor.
 I NEG read { QUALQUER / NENHUM} book by this author
 Intended: 'I didn't read any book by this author.'

To explain the distribution of weak NPIs in a variety of languages with the Bagel Problem, Pereltsvaig develops a proposal based on morphological blocking: certain polarity-sensitive items compete for lexical insertion with Negative Concord Items (NCIs), which are exclusively licensed under negation. Since the former have a less specified lexical entry in comparison to NCIs, they lose the competition. Chierchia 2013:278 hypothesizes that blocking effects might also account for the incompatibility of some FCIs with negation.

A blocking approach predicts that words like *qualquer* should be *uniformly* unacceptable under negation. This prediction is not borne out: negated *qualquer* improves when it has abstract mass nouns (like *confidence*, *sensitivity*, and *interest*) in its restrictor. This is illustrated with the naturally-occurring Portuguese examples below:

- (2) a. Ele não tinha {√qualquer /√nenhuma} confiança em si mesmo. he NEG had { QUALQUER / NENHUMA} confidence in himself 'He didn't have any confidence in himself.'¹
 - b. A Petrobras não tem {√qualquer /√nenhuma} sensibilidade com a população. the Petrobras NEG has { QUALQUER / NENHUMA} sensitivity with the population 'Petrobras does not display any sensitivity to the population.'²
 - c. O Fluminense não tem {√qualquer /√nenhum} interesse em Moisés. the Fluminense NEG has { QUALQUER / NENHUM} interest in Moisés 'Fluminense does not have any interest in Moisés.'³

Similar facts hold for Russian *-libo* items (Polina Pleshak, p.c.). Moreover, Bar-Lev and Margulis 2014:74 make an observation about the distribution of the quantifier *kol*, in Hebrew, that seems to point to the same pattern. In all the sentences above, the NCI *nenhum(a)* could have been used instead of *qualquer*. That being the case, why would *nenhum(a)* block *qualquer* in (1), but not in (2a-c)? Note that some speakers *prefer* the counterparts of (2a-c) with an NCI — potentially because of competition. However, this preference alone is not enough to categorically block *qualquer*. Furthermore, even these speakers acknowledge that (1) is completely unacceptable, while the other sentences are only unnatural.

Future work might focus on the nature of the alternatives invoked by abstract mass nouns, and on the interplay of these alternatives with negation. That might lead to a more principled account of the Bagel Problem, and to a better understanding of the licensing of polarity-sensitive items more generally.

References

- Bar-Lev, Moshe E., and Daniel Margulis. 2014. Hebrew 'kol': A universal quantifier as an undercover existential. *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 18:60–76.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 2013. *Logic in Grammar: Polarity, Free Choice, and Intervention*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Pereltsvaig, Asya. 2004. Negative polarity items in Russian and the 'Bagel Problem'. In *Negation in Slavic*, Sue Brown and Adam Przepiórkowski (eds.), 153–178. Bloomington, IN: Slavica Publishers.

Jéssica Mendes jessica.vianamendes@uni-goettingen.de Nikolausberger Weg 23, office 2.114 37073 Göttingen Germany

¹https://nazareuniluz.org.br/confianca-inabalavel/

²https://www.poder360.com.br/governo/petrobras-nao-tem-qualquer-sensibilidade-diz-bolsonaro/

³https://www.saudacoestricolores.com/apesar-dos-rumores-fluminense-nao-tem-qualquer-interesse-em-moises/