Appraisal and Alternatives

Ivy Sichel

UC Santa Cruz and The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

(joint work with Martina Wiltschko, UBC)

In some languages, such as Hebrew and German, a demonstrative pronoun (a demonstrative which can exhaust the entire DP, henceforth d-pronoun) may refer to a human. When it does, the use of the d-pronoun may be associated with a pejorative effect, implying a negative evaluation of the denoted individual (henceforth *N(egative)-effect*), as in (1b) / (1d) and (2). The N-effect is triggered, however, only under certain conditions. For example, when the d-pronoun is modified (3), no N-effect is triggered. It is shown that the distribution of this N-effect is alternative-sensitive: the N-effect is triggered only when a personal pronoun could also have been used; in a variety of contexts in which only a d-pronoun is available, such as the modification contexts in (3), the effect is absent. This suggests that everything else being equal, a personal pronoun is preferred over a d-pronoun (Patel-Grosz and Grosz 2017); it also suggests that the N-effect is not intrinsically, or lexically, encoded (Sichel and Wiltschko 2018). It must derive, instead, from the non-use of a personal pronoun: either because (a) in the spirit of conversational implicatures, the choice of a d-pronoun over a personal pronoun must be justified, and the N-effect in some sense 'justifies' this choice; or because (b) the N-effect encodes the absence of a marked property associated with personal pronouns. On the logic of markedness and under-specification, when the speaker avoids the use of a personal pronoun, the absence of some aspect of meaning is implied, and the N-effect encodes the absence of this aspect of pronominal meaning. The goals of the talk are (i) to situate the type of indexical and alternative-sensitive evaluative meaning observed with d-pronouns within the broader landscape of expressives (Potts 2005 among others) and pejoratives (Averintseva-Klisch 2016 among others), and (ii) to derive the N-effect as a consequence of the non-selection of a personal pronoun, and the implied absence of a meaning ingredient associated with personal pronouns: the N-effect encodes that the human referent denoted by the pronoun is a non-discourse participant / a non-perspectival center.

EXAMPLES

(1) no N-effect

    a. hi_1 xoSevet Se-hi_1 gvoha

      she_1 think.3fs that she_1 tall

      'She_1 thinks that she_1's tall.'

    b. N-effect

      zot_1 xoSevet Se-hi_1 gvoha

      $Z.f.s_1$ think-3fs that-she_1 tall

      '[This one]$_1$ thinks that she_1's tall.'

    c. Sie glaubt **sie** ist gross.

      she_1 think. she_1 is.3sg tall

      'She_1 thinks that she_1's tall.'

    d. Die glaubt die ist gross

      d-f.sg believe.3sg d-f.sg is.3sg tall

      '[This one]$_1$ thinks that she_1's tall.'

(2) a. zot / ha-hi gvoha.

    Z.f.sg / the-H.f.sg tall.f.sg

    'This one / that one is tall.'

    b. Sie/die ist gross.

      f.sg/d-f.sg is.3sg tall

      This one / that one is tall.'

    Said of a person: there is an N-effect; said of a lamp, there is no N-effect.

(3)   a. [$_{DP}$ zot_1 [$_{PP}$ im ha-nemaSim]] xoSevet Se-hi_1 gvoha (no N-effect)

      [$_{DP}$ $Z.f.s_1$ [$_{PP}$ with the-freckles] thinks that-she_1 tall

      'The one with the freckles thinks that she's tall.'

    b. [$_{DP}$ zot_1 [$_{CP}$ Se-yac'a im dani]] xoSevet Se-hi_1 gvoha (no N-effect)

      [$_{DP}$ $Z.f.s_1$ [$_{CP}$ that-went.out with dani]] thinks that-she_1 tall

      'The one that went out with Dani thinks that she's tall.'

    c. Die mit den Sommersprossen glaubt die ist gross

      d-f.sg with the freckles believe.3sg d-f.sg is.3sg tall

      'The one with the freckles thinks that she's tall.'

    d. Die, die mit der Dani befreundet ist glaubt die ist gross

      d-f.sg d-f.sg with the Dani friended is believe.3sg d-f.sg is.3sg tall

      'The one who is friends with Dani thinks she's tall.'

Selected References

Acton, E. & C. Potts. 2014. That straight talk: Sarah Palin and the sociolinguistics of demonstratives. *Journal of Sociolinguistics.* 18: 3-31

Bosch, P. & C. Umbach 2007. Reference determination for demonstrative pronouns. *ZAS Papers in Linguistics* 48: 39-51.

Cardinaletti A. & M. Starke. 1999. "The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of three classes of pronouns". In *Clitics in the languages of Europe*, ed. by Henk van Riemsdijk, 145–233. Berlin: Mouton.

Déchaine, Rose-Marie, and Martina Wiltschko. 2002. Decomposing pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33:409–442.

Doran, R & G. Ward 2015. Proximal Demonstratives in Predicate NPs. Proceedings of the Annual Meetings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, 41 (http://escholarship.org/uc/item/6w63n6mf)

Imai, S. 2003. *Spatial Deixis*. PhD dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo

Lakoff, R. 1974. Remarks on this and that. In *Chicago Linguistic Society* 10: 345-356. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Patel-Grosz, P. and P. G. Grosz. 2017. Revisiting pronominal typology. Linguistic Inquiry 48:259-297.

Potts, C. & F. Schwarz. 2010. Affective 'this'. *Linguistic Issues in Language Technology* 3(5). 1–30.

Sichel, I. and M. Wiltschko. 2018. Demonstrative pronouns and the linguistic encoding of appraisal. In Wm. G. Bennet, L. Hracs, and D. Ryan (eds.) Proceedings of the 36th West Coast Conference in Linguistics p. 365-373. Cascadilla press.