

Dear reviewer,

dear editors,

thank you very much for the review! I commented all comments below.

1. STRUCTURE

The body of the manuscript is structured in a clear and logical way. I much appreciate the strategy of moving from the highest projections downwards. The only structural decision I am uncomfortable with concerns the Introduction, which, I think is an unfortunate mix of information that is truly introductory and theoretical background.

In other words: the study should contain a Theoretical Background chapter, and this chapter should include the information that is now provided in Section 1.1. Given that the hypotheses (Section 1.5) build on the theoretical underpinnings, the hypotheses could be the final section within the Theoretical Background. The Introduction would then start with the section on sign languages as natural languages. I think the section on non-manual markers should be a subsection within this section. In this way, the Introduction would move from the more general to the more specific: from sign languages to DGS to the specific data used for the study. Also see my comments under point 3 regarding the sections on DGS and data sources.

I restructured the sections as proposed.

2. STYLE / SMALL MISTAKES

Note that, as for style issues and typos, I cannot be as meticulous as I would usually be in reviewing a journal article. I only mention a number of flaws that I spotted coincidentally.

First of all, throughout the manuscript the style is excellent. FB writes in a

lucid, varied (e.g. choice of verbs), and engaging way, creating sufficient coherence between sentences, paragraphs, and sections/chapters. English is also very good. As a whole, the text is very clear and readable. Very good use is made of illustrations/figures.

I guess the manuscript has been prepared using LaTeX. It looks very neat, but I noted at various points that text and tree structures fall outside the text margins. In some examples, e.g. (104), I noticed that the formatting is slightly off. Also, in final version, it should be made sure that no page breaks appear within examples (e.g. examples 92, 122).

I tried my best to avoid that, but there may be some issues left that will be handled in the final typesetting round.

Below I offer only a few comments on style issues and typos, mostly from the first part of the manuscript, as I was more ambitious at the outset. ☐

☐ First paragraph of Preface: the coordination in the sentence starting “As I do not assume ...” does not work: that-clause coordinated with infinitival clause and use of negation in the latter.

Fixed.

☐ Something that may have to be checked: I think coordinated full clauses have to be separated by comma. I spotted instances in first and last paragraph of Preface (“... the cheeks, and categories ...”).

Fixed.

☐ This is not a style issue, but I noted that on page 11 “Mendeleev” is mentioned in header – this may well be an appropriate metaphor, but its role/impact does not become clear; the term is not mentioned again in the section.

This goes back to Rizzi (2013) => Mentioned in Section 1.1.2.3 (now 1.3.3)

☐ Page 12, below (9): plural marking “Other languages ...”; same on page 13, 6 lines below (11): “similar constraints” – maybe this has to be checked.

Checked and fixed.

☐ Page 12f: last sentence reads very cumbersome, maybe even ungrammatical (“the choice of a language if a category ... and if it is overtly expressed, by the choice of how ...”).

Fixed.

☐ Page 13, first paragraph below 1.1.2.2: I think it should read “is clearly marked by a special intonation”.

Fixed.

☐ Page 18, (19), and possibly elsewhere: I’m not sure but given that these are just noun phrases, I think the translations should not start with capital and not include period.

Fixed.

☐ In Section 1.2 and then again in Section 1.5, noted that the numbering is odd. Why header 1.2.0.1 below header 1.2 instead of 1.2.1? Note that if this adapted, the third-level headers will have to be included in the ToC.

Fixed.

☐ Page 22: first sentence below 1.2.0.1 (SL emergence): this issue should be

addressed in previous paragraph.

Fixed.

☐ Page 36, first and third paragraph: should be “sign languages for which it is unclear”, “articulators for which it can be clearly stated”; same again on page 222 below box: “sign language for which”.

My grammar is odd sometimes ☺ Fixed.

☐ Page 42: “to make themselves familiar” ☐ “to familiarize themselves”

Fixed

☐ Page 89: there is something weird concerning source of examples: why are Aboh 2004a and 2004b mentioned? Only one source should be provided.

Fixed.

☐ Page 130, figure caption: I’m not sure, but is the caption correct? Looking at the images, it seems to me that in the bottom example, the second wh-phrase is signed on the side. In second line of caption, it should be “the first wh-element”.

Fixed.

☐ Structures and glossed examples in (125) and (126) are extremely small.

Fixed (but I try to improve this even more in the final typesetting round)

☐ Page 165, three lines below (147): “negation is not allowed in DGS

imperatives” – I’m surprised, after all (147a) is negated; should it maybe read
“regular negation is not allowed”?

True! Fixed.

☐ Presentation of structures in (148) appears a bit skewed.

I hope it’s better now.

☐ Typo in header 2.10.1 on page 167.

Fixed.

☐ First line on page 169: why “their left peripheral position”?

Fixed.

☐ Third line on page 170: sorry, maybe I missed something, but what is “SpecP”?

Fixed.

☐ Page 177: why reference \emptyset (11) below (6) instead of (6)?

Fixed.

☐ Top of page 179: when mentioning the interrogative suffix in (8), one could
refer back to relevant section in previous chapter (InterP).

Fixed.

☐ Example (10) on page 181 is very small and falls outside page margin.

I really hope the typesetting team can help me with this issue: I'm somehow trapped: Making the text bigger and the whole structure smaller to fit in the margin seems to be an impossible task to me.

☐ Maybe hierarchy in (11) on page 182 could be moved up such that it is not split over two pages.

I'll wait with this until final typesetting.

☐ Overview of subsections on page 183: as for the "interrupting" subsections, why not in the order in which they appear? Also, there is an additional interrupting subsection on modality (3.6).

Fixed.

☐ Page 184, six lines below 3.2.2: "also slightly different variants of it exist".

Fixed.

☐ Page 186: paragraph above 3.3.2: delete closing bracket after "2016"; below

Fixed.

3.3.2: typo in "Surprisingly".

Fixed.

☐ Page 195: interesting mess up in running header.

I really don't know where this came from, but it's gone now ☺

☐ Page 197, (20): here, and maybe in preceding hierarchies, check number of closing brackets – here it seems to be one too many.

Fixed.

☐ Typo in (21c): “early”

Fixed.

☐ Page 198, (22): here, I was a bit bothered by the fact that different non manuals are glossed in the same way.

Fixed. I didn’t meant to bother you.

☐ Last line on p. 200 and first paragraph on p. 201: figure number now within parentheses; on page 201 “Figure” missing.

Fixed.

☐ Above (25): should it be “is shown in (25).”?

Fixed.

☐ Page 203(27b): “wahrscheinlich” should be “vielleicht”; at bottom of page: typo in “certainly’.

Fixed.

☐ Page 209: “Swiss Sign Language” should be “Swiss German Sign Language”.

Fixed.

- ☐ Page 211: “will have more to say ...in Section 3.8”– please check, as this is already Section 3.11.

Fixed.

- ☐ Above quote on page 214: “for the sentence to be true”.

Fixed.

- ☐ Page 229: present (58c), the expected pattern, first and also refer to it in text.

Fixed.

- ☐ Page 264, above (3): better “to be more precise, if habitual II was located ...”

Fixed.

- ☐ Page 266: “Wilbur” with capital W in footnote.

Fixed.

- ☐ Page 267, below (8): typo in “continuative”.

Fixed.

- ☐ Page 270: I think in header of excursus, FINISH and THROUGH have to be in small caps.

I'll ask the typesetting team for help. I really don't know why the small caps are ignored here.

3. PARTS THAT REQUIRE ELABORATION / FURTHER ISSUES

☐ Background on DGS: I find this section a bit meager. Where is the demographic information concerning DGS coming from? I think it should be made clear that DGS is a comparably well-studied sign language, and a brief overview of the grammatical domains that have been studied should be provided (most of the relevant sources are mentioned throughout the manuscript anyway): e.g. pronouns/agreement, negation, pluralization, classifiers, role shift, modal meaning – for sure, FB is familiar with the relevant studies. A distinction could be made between Generative work and more descriptive/functional work (e.g. Hessmann, Hansen, Konrad).

Fixed.

I don't think that Frankfurt can still be considered a "sign language research center"; the Hamburg corpus project should be mentioned.

Fixed.

☐ Methodology: In the section "Data Sources" more information should be provided. I even considered suggesting that this be turned into a separate Methodology chapter, but I realize that it would be a rather short chapter. In any case, a distinction should be made between subsections on participants, procedure, and annotation.

Given that there were only 9 participants, an overview table with participants' characteristics should be provided (gender, age, region, age of acquisition).

Unfortunately, I'm not able to provide such a table for data privacy reasons. All consultants signed a data protection contract which only allows me to provide summarized data. Combining gender, age, region and age of acquisition in a table would allow the reader, for example, to match ages to people (for example, one figure shows how signers from Baden-Württemberg mark contrastive focus compared to signers from Bavaria; given their obvious genders the table would allow to combine the different information).

However, I tried to provide as much information as I could in the section.

As for the procedure, please provide an example of elicitation sentence with context (I assume the materials that informants received one week before were also written sentences?). Maybe provide one example of input, elicited DGS sentence, discussion of paraphrases, and acceptability rating.

A section on annotation is actually missing. How was this done? For instance, if sentences were annotated in ELAN, which tiers were used? For sure, there must have been annotation of non-manuals. Please provide more detail.

I included examples and tried to make everything as transparent as possible. The section is much longer now.

□ Iconicity: in the very first paragraph of the Introduction, we read that “scopal relations are mapped onto the body in an iconic way”, but it seems to me that it is never made clear what that means. In fact, the issue of iconicity is not discussed at all, and actually the term – some scattered different uses notwithstanding – only comes back in the Conclusion on page 276. Iconicity usually refers to a transparent relation between form and meaning at the lexical level (e.g. work by Sarah Taub) or morphological level (reduplication), but FB's approach refers to a different type of iconicity: high in structure is high on body. Clearly, there is no – or at least a different – iconic relation between, say, a certain modal feature and a lower face non-manual. This should be made clear, or the term “iconic” should be avoided (maybe simply “systematic”).

I think this is a topic of a whole article ☺ I don't think that iconicity is confined to the lexical or morphological level. Sarah Taub actually explicitly includes iconicity on the syntactic level in her definition. But it is true that the literature is mainly concerned with a relation between linguistic form and a concrete meaning. In this case, it is a correspondence between linguistic form and a rather abstract meaning (scope). Additionally, it is a relationship between linguistic form and linguistic meaning. But I think, if one adopts a fairly broad conception of iconicity in the tradition of Jespersen and Jakobson, it is justified to talk about an iconic mapping relation.

I "solved" this issue in the following way: I mitigated the iconicity claim (instead of saying "is mapped iconically" the text now says "in a way that could even be called iconic") and then refer the reader to an excursus on iconicity where I discuss the issues just mentioned.

Footnote 7, page 23: this discussion is somewhat superficial. If FB wants to keep this footnote, then it should be made clear that most researchers consider iconicity at the sublexical level; the fact that the same building blocks are also used non-iconically does not matter here. See van der Kooij (2002) for including iconicity in a phonological model, and Zwitserlood (2008) for a Generative approach to sublexical iconicity.

I included the references (thanks!) and made it clear that this kind of sublexical iconicity clearly exists. I tried to make it clearer that my point is that Sandler (2009), for example, claims that each sublexical unit in a sign language has a meaning (Sandler 2009: „What is unusual about this subsystem is that each formational element – the hand shape, the location, and the movement – has meaning”). I think: There are iconic cases, but this does not mean that each formational element in every sign has a meaning. (I think the same applies to spoken languages.)

☐ Nonmanuals (on vertical axis): I was glad to read that FB himself points out that some non-manuals (e.g. head movements) are not easily classified with respect to position on the vertical axis. Since he mentions head nod (page 36), I was wondering whether one could still distinguish between single head nods (e.g. Focus – FocP) and repeated head nods (e.g. affirmation – SigmaP or PolP), i.e. punctual versus domain marking, where one would be located higher in the structure than the other (I realize that this type of speculation would probably go into a footnote).

I added a footnote.

Second, and related to the previous point, I was wondering about body leans, which may also fulfill various functions (cf. Wilbur & Patschke 1998), and which are mentioned (“leaning”) at various points throughout the text. If these fulfill a pragmatic function, then they should probably be rather high in the structure, right?

I discuss this now at the end of Section 4.13 (Tense) as this section is about shoulder movements.

This brings me to a third point: lexical non-manuals. Wilbur & Patschke point out (if I remember correctly) that body leans can also be lexically specified (e.g. RESIST vs. INVOLVE). More important in the present context, Pendzich (2017) presents a thorough investigation of lexical non-manuals in DGS, and some of the non-manuals she addresses overlap with non-manuals included in the present study (she also distinguishes upper face and lower face actions, for instance). The term “lexical non-manual” is not mentioned at all in the manuscript. While I do not expect a detailed discussion of lexical non-manuals, the work by Pendzich has to be mentioned and something has to be said about the fact that such lexical non-manuals are, of course, not associated with a position in the phrase structure in the way proposed in the study. An upper face action, for instance, may well be associated with a lexical element that is merged below VoiceP.

Discussed now in Section 4.29.2

□ Excursus on topicalization in conditionals (page 63): since FB refers to Pfau (2008) elsewhere, it might be worth pointing out here that Pfau considers similar examples for NGT. Importantly, he distinguishes cases like the one in (30b) from cases where the topic follows the optional conditional conjunction SUPPOSE. (29) and (30a) are not parallel to (28), and the topics might indeed be outside the conditional clause.

I included the reference to Pfau (2008) (I must have missed this part somehow!). I also included the fact that the topics can precede the optional manual conditional marker in DGS.

□ The discussion of *wh*-copying in Section 2.7.2 seems unnecessarily long. I appreciate that FB demonstrates familiarity with the rich literature on the topic, but as far as I can see, not all of the details really become relevant later on (apologies in case I overlooked something). Also, different phenomena are mixed: multiple *wh*-questions (investigated for ASL by Churng 2009, 2011), *wh*-copying in German complex clauses (in addition, there is the phenomenon of ‘partial *wh*-movement’ as in *Was glaubst du, wen er gesehen hat*), and *wh*-copying in simple sentences in Italian dialects. I realize that FB will later need the two CPs, and that the Veronese examples are particularly relevant. Below (117), one could refer back to the relevant Italian example.

I agree that this section is rather long, but I could not figure out a way to shorten it. I think, I need the discussion of *wh*-copying in German to compare it to the relevant facts in DGS (that doubling of *wh*-phrases included in a PP is possible). Similarly, the discussion of the Strijen Dutch data is later needed for the discussion of the landing site of simple *wh*-elements and *wh*-elements contained in a PP in DGS and the Italian dialect data is later on directly compared to the situation found in DGS. In all these cases I refer back to the section under discussion.

Side note: I did not check, but have PAM (which I first spotted in (116)) and BEM (117b) been introduced?

True! They were introduced at the very beginning (so, a long time ago). I added a short sentence and also made a pointer.

□ Discussion of imperative verb on page 161f: this is just a side note, but I’m pretty certain that in DGS and other SLs, verbs can also show agreement in what would usually be considered infinitival complements, e.g. ‘I want him to help me’.

True! I added a sentence.

☐ Referring to my remark on methodology further up, in particular participants' characteristics: in cases where it turns out that signers fall into different classes, as is the case with optatives (p. 167), I think it would be worth checking and including participants' characteristics (e.g. age of acquisition). Should it turn out that class membership is not determined by sociolinguistic factors, that would also be worth mentioning (also see e.g. page 252).

Unfortunately, I could not find a pattern (yet). (I wrote: "It is yet unclear where this variation comes from").

☐ At the very end of Chapter 2 (the summary is excellent), I was wondering about FinP, which is also part of the CP system, but never addressed.

This will be a new book project. I added a sentence in the summary that future research will address FinP elements.

☐ Combinations of markers: I think it would be nice for the reader to see some more examples of combinations of markers (manual and non-manual). For instance, at the bottom of page 173, one naturally wonders about a combination of a higher CP non-manual and a non-manual used with or without a manual adverbial. Would there be conflicts or trade-offs?

The same I was wondering on page 211, and subsequently: What about combinations of manual markers related to lower CP area? Can these be combined, and if yes, do they follow the predicted order? Later on, page 229, examples are given of combination of deontic modal and habitual, but here I was missing comparable examples (also see later on for combination of habitual with other aspect types).

This is one of the very interesting questions that would require a lot of data elicitation (that I have started already). I added a discussion (and some data) on this point in Section 4.11, but will leave this open for future research as I think this will be a complicated matter (it seems as if sometimes non-manuals combine and sometime one marker overrides another marker).

Page 233: what about combination of AGAIN and OFTEN? Also, if the different position of OFTEN and SELDOM is the result of object shift, I would predict that OFTEN can also follow the object when it is definite.

I added some examples and a brief discussion.

☐ First paragraph on page 188: left vs. right headed: alternatively, as mentioned previously in the book, movement of an XP to specifier only in the case of higher CP area. This possibility could be repeated here.

Added.

☐ Non-manuals and not-at-issue meaning (page 218): First, I think the claim below header 3.12.2 is too strong; it has just been shown that scalarity, a category above T, is not marked by upper-face non-manuals. Second, the claim that non-manuals in general only contribute not-at-issue meaning also appears too strong. This only holds for the non-manuals discussed here, i.e. non-manuals related to categories above T. I refer back to my note above concerning lexical non-manuals, but negative headshakes may also behave differently ('He did not buy a book' marked only by headshake in DGS can most certainly receive the reaction 'That's not true. He bought a book.'). Negation is interesting, as it has been claimed that its position vis-à-vis Tense can be parameterized. I realize, of course, that FB does not address negation, so my concern is only about the scope of the statement made here (and again in the Summary on page 260).

Thanks! This actually was way too broad! Changed both in the Section as well as in the summary.

☐ Page 224: as for position of modals, remember that on page 83, it was said

that they “follow rather than precede the verb”. In (52), I was wondering about two modals being adjacent (e.g. MUST CAN BIKE-RIDE).

I had the same question and, fortunately, have a lot of data on this. I added examples showing that it is only the relative order that matters here.

□ Similarly, on page 228, I was wondering about other positions for USUALLY / TYPICALLY: clause-initial and between O and V. Actually, this is a more general note: for various manual markers, it is made clear that they precede VP and that clause-final placement is ungrammatical (except if there is an intonational break), but the position between object and verb is usually not addressed (e.g. 86). In (67) vs. (68), the different positions of the two markers are not addressed – here INTENTIONALLY actually appears between object and verb. Maybe a general remark would solve the problem.

I made a general remark after example (68) and pointed back to the remark about the *seldom*-examples.

It is also worth noting that Hoiting & Slobin (2001) describe the use of lower-face non-manuals for certain aspect types (iterative, habitual) in NGT. Of course, this may well be different in DGS, but given that the bodily-mapping hypothesis is meant to apply “maybe universally in all sign languages”, something has to be said about possible non-manual aspect marking.

I added a discussion of this at the end of Section 5.1.

□ As FB frequently refers to Happ & Vorköper, I was wondering about the relation of the sign glossed as ALREADY in 3.25 to the sign that H&V gloss as PERF. In H&V this sign consistently occupies a clause-final position. Note that H&V also mention the use of a head nod in this context (also see Grose 2003).

I added a footnote that the sign ALREADY is different from what H&V gloss PERF.

☐ Page 241: I'm insecure but I learned that NOT-YET is the negative counterpart of ALREADY and not of STILL. According to Happ & Vorköper and Papaspyrou et al. NOT-YET occupies a clause-final position. Actually, it is not entirely clear why FB sometimes refers to these sources for alternative positions of the relevant manual markers, and sometimes doesn't.

True! This was a mistake! I moved the examples in the section about ALREADY. I also made a note that NOT-YET was described as occurring clause-finally. I wasn't aware of this. I think this may be a dialectal variation.

☐ In the context of 3.29, it may be interesting to note that the non-manual marker (==), according to my experience, is not only used for the temporal meaning of 'just' but also for the spatial meaning ('just around the corner'). Wouldn't that be additional evidence in favor of the claim made here?

I will check this in future elicitation sessions. Thanks!

☐ In the context of 3.33 and 3.34, I was wondering about the aspect type that has been labeled 'unrealized inceptive' (Liddell 1984) or 'delayed completive' in the literature – Rathmann subsumes these under the label 'conative' (but 'conative' is only addressed in 3.38); see Rathmann (2005: 43f).

The unrealized inceptive is discussed in Section 4.38.1.

☐ I got a bit confused about Section 3.39 on completive aspect. In the sign language literature, the label is generally used to refer to the use of signs like FINISH (ASL, Fischer & Gough 1972/1999) or DONE/FATTO (LIS), not to the meaning 'completely' – Oh, I realize that this issue is addressed in an excursus on page 270. Maybe FB could already point to the excursus here, as otherwise

readers might stumble just like I did.

I made a pointer.

□ I have to admit that I got quite confused with celerative aspect II. This follows continuative aspect II, and it is said that celerative aspect II corresponds to durative aspect, which in turn (for ASL) has been subsumed under continuative. I am aware that in the sign language literature, ‘durative’ and ‘continuative’ are often used for the same aspect type, but I really don’t understand how the meanings ‘fast/early’ (in header 4.5) relate to continuative or durative, that is, to the examples in (9); also, I don’t see the relation to celerative aspect I (‘raise hand quickly’). I’m not convinced that the aspectual meanings in (9) have anything to do with the speed of the action; there is not necessarily a ‘slow’ reading in these examples.

You are confused because I was confused. I mixed up two different things: The temporal extension of an event and its speed. My fault! I reorganized the section and added a new section 5.3 to discuss what has been labeled ‘durative aspect’ in the sign language literature. There is a lot of work to do to clean up the terminological confusions caused by the many labels out there.

□ In general, I was struggling a little bit with Chapter 4. The excursus on perfective aspect is much appreciated, but it could be noted that it has been claimed that e.g. ASL FINISH can be used for completive and perfective aspect (also see Meir (1999) on Israeli SL) – in both spoken and sign languages, grammaticalization may be involved.

Included.

Below header 4.6.2: I don’t think “completive II is signed by incorporation into the verb”; rather, it “is realized by modification of the verb”. The two examples given are good, but what about other verbs, e.g. body anchored verbs? I don’t

understand why ‘completely forget’ (page 256) is different from what is discussed here (because it does not have natural endpoint?). And what about the ‘eat’ examples in 3.39 (distributive reading, it seems) versus 4.6?

Right, this is a difference between not having (completive I) and not having a natural endpoint (completive II). I added some remarks and made some pointers.

Honestly, I do not know (yet) what happens with body-anchored verbs. But I added a sentence that this is an open issue.

Finally, is frequentative the same as what is often labeled ‘iterative’ (cf. Pfau, Steinbach & Woll 2012)? The term ‘iterative’ is not mentioned at all. I’m not sure I understand the relation/difference between repetitive and frequentative. Note that example (13) is translated with ‘repeatedly’ rather than ‘often’.

I included a remark on ‘iterative’ and added a clarifying sentence to the section about repetitive aspect II on the distinction between frequentative (*often*) and repetitive (*again, once more*).

I’m not convinced that the relevant difference between ‘tropfen’ and ‘tröpfeln’ is one of frequency – the latter type is sometimes referred to as a ‘verbal diminutive’ (cf. kochen – köcheln, tanzen – tänzeln, husten – husteln; Weidhaas & Schmid 2015).

There are surely several meanings related to the suffix. I revised the paragraph as I’m still convinced that the suffix does add the meaning of several (small) subevents if it is attached to an already existing verb: *tänzeln* consists of at least three steps (**Er tänzelte einen Schritt* ‘He tänzelte one step’), *husteln* consists of repeated small coughs and it is not possible to say **Der Wasserhahn wird ein mal tröpfeln* ‘The tap will tröpfeln one time’ (or it will mean that there are several small drops coming out of the tap). I found no counterexamples to this claim in Weidhaas & Schmid’s paper (the only counterexamples are examples where the suffix is attached to another part of speech, e.g., an adjective, or when the verb has no suffixless counterpart).

Maybe it would help to include Figure 5.3 already in Chapter 4.

I moved the Figure to Chapter 4.

4. REFERENCES

To quote Sheldon Cooper (Big Bang Theory, Season 1, Episode 3): “It was a little sparsely sourced but I think the basic science is valid.” Well, actually the list of references is certainly not on the short side – i.e. the book as a whole is not “sparsely sourced” – and moreover, FB certainly demonstrates that he is familiar with the relevant literature. Still, there are some omissions, and also references that are included in the study but are not mentioned at all places where they are relevant. In the list below, I sometimes specify a specific page number and sometimes only provide a reference that might be included at various places.

I added all suggested references.

- ☐ Order within DP (page 19): Zhang (2007) on Taiwan SL; Mantovan & Geraci (2017) on LIS.
- ☐ Left periphery / antisymmetry and sign language: Brunelli (2011) on LIS and NGT (discussing many of the structures addressed in the study) – this reference might be relevant at various points.
- ☐ Page 22, emergence of sign language: reference? Maybe Kegl et al. (1999) on Nicaraguan SL.
- ☐ In Section 1.2.0.1, I miss crucial references on SL phonology, such as Sandler (1989) and Brentari (1998); same in 1.2.0.2: e.g. Branchini (2014) on LIS, van Gijn (2004) on NGT, Pfau et al. (2016) and/or Pfau & Steinbach (2016) for various SLs.
- ☐ Section 1.3: for overview on nonmanuals: Pfau & Quer (2010).
- ☐ On page 60, I think it would be appropriate to include reference to Lillo-Martin (1986) on different types of null arguments (in ASL – included in references anyway); note that (24) includes a plain verb, hence no licensing by agreement.
- ☐ In the discussion of focus in DGS, I miss mentioning of Herrmann (2013), which

is mentioned elsewhere.

☐ In Section 2.3.2, when first addressing pseudo clefts, Caponigro & Davidson's (2011) alternative account should be mentioned – and be it in a footnote. Later on, when discussing rhetorical questions, above (133), one could refer back to the discussion of pseudo clefts and make the distinction between the clefts and “real rhetorical questions” clearer.

☐ When mentioning the position of negation and modals ~~vis-à-vis~~ vis the verb in DGS (page 83), Pfau & Quer (2007) should be added. Also, later on, this reference should be added: Section 3.7 and, more crucially, 3.16 (and possibly 3.36). Note that P&Q claim that combination of two modals is ungrammatical in DGS, and they also briefly discuss the use of a head nod with deontic modal.

☐ In the discussion of polar interrogatives in Section 2.6.2, Wilbur & Patschke (1999) should be added.

☐ As for modality and nonmanual marking, Lackner (2013) on ÖGS could be added.

☐ In the discussion of Tense in sign language, Metzger (2009) should be added, as it is on DGS. Note that study by Pfau and Makharoblidze has been published as Makharoblidze & Pfau (2018).

☐ In 3.37 on modal doubling, I missed reference to e.g. Petronio (1993) and Nunes & de Quadros (2008) – the former is in the references.

References

Branchini, C. 2014. On relativization and clefting. An analysis of Italian Sign Language. Berlin &

Nijmegen: De Gruyter Mouton & Ishara Press.

Brunelli, M. 2011. Antisymmetry and sign languages: A comparison between NGT and LIS. PhD dissertation, University of Amsterdam. Utrecht: LOT.

Caponigro, I. & K. Davidson. 2011. Ask, and tell as well: Clausal question-answer pairs in ASL. *Natural Language Semantics* 19(4), 323-371.

Churng, S. 2011. Syntax and prosodic consequences in ASL: Evidence from multiple WH-questions. *Sign Language & Linguistics* 14(1), 9-48.

Fischer, S. & B. Gough. 1972/1999. Some unfinished thoughts on FINISH. *Sign Language & Linguistics* 2(1), 67-77.

Gijn, I. van. 2004. The quest for syntactic dependency. Sentential complementation in Sign Language of the Netherlands. PhD dissertation, University of Amsterdam. Utrecht: LOT.

Grose, D.R. 2003. The perfect tenses in American Sign Language: Nonmanually marked compound tenses. MA thesis, Purdue University.

Hoiting, N. & D.I. Slobin. 2001. Typological and modality constraints on borrowing: Examples from the Sign Language of the Netherlands. In Brentari, D. (ed.), *Foreign vocabulary in sign languages. A cross-linguistic investigation of word formation*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum, 121-137.

Kegl, J., A. Senghas & M. Coppola. 1999. Creation through contact: sign language emergence and sign language change in Nicaragua. In DeGraff, M. (ed.), *Language creation and language change: creolization, diachrony, and development*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 179-237.

Kooij, E. van der. 2002. Phonological categories in Sign Language of the Netherlands. The role of phonetic implementation and iconicity. PhD dissertation, University of Leiden. Utrecht: LOT.

Lackner, A. 2013. Linguistic functions of head and body movements in Austrian Sign Language (ÖGS). A corpus-based analysis. Graz: Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz PhD dissertation.

Makharoblidze, T. & R. Pfau. 2018. A negation-tense interaction in Georgian Sign Language. *Sign Language & Linguistics* 21(1), 136-151.

Mantovan, L. & C. Geraci. 2017. The syntax of nominal modification in Italian Sign Language (LIS). *Sign Language & Linguistics* 20(2), 183-220.

Meir, I. 1999. A perfect marker in Israeli Sign Language. *Sign Language & Linguistics* 2(1), 43-62.

Metzger, C. 2009. *Zeitlinien und temporale Gebärden in der Deutschen Gebärdensprache*. Hamburg: Signum.

- Nunes, J. & R.M. de Quadros. 2008. Phonetically realized traces in American Sign Language and Brazilian Sign Language. In Quer, J. (ed.), *Signs of the time. Selected papers from TISLR 8*. Hamburg: Signum, 177-190.
- Pendzich, N. 2017. Lexical nonmanuals in German Sign Language (DGS): An empirical and theoretical investigation. PhD dissertation, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen.
- Pfau, R. & J. Quer. 2010. Nonmanuals: their grammatical and prosodic roles. In Brentari, D. (ed.), *Sign languages (Cambridge Language Surveys)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 381-402.
- Pfau, R. & M. Steinbach. 2016. Complex sentences in sign languages: Modality – typology – discourse. In Pfau, R., M. Steinbach & A. Herrmann (eds.), *A matter of complexity: Subordination in sign languages*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 1-35.
- Pfau, R., M. Steinbach & A. Herrmann (eds.) 2016. *A matter of complexity: Subordination in sign languages*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Pfau, R., M. Steinbach & B. Woll. 2012. Tense, aspect, and modality. In Pfau, R., M. Steinbach & B. Woll (eds.), *Sign language. An international handbook (HSK – Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science)*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 186-204.
- Weidhaas, T. & H.-J. Schmid. 2015. Diminutive verbs in German: semantic analysis and theoretical implications. *Morphology* 25(2), 183-227.
- Zhang, N.N. 2007. Universal 20 and Taiwan Sign Language. *Sign Language & Linguistics* 10(1), 55-81.
- Zwitserlood, I. 2008. Morphology below the level of the sign: “Frozen” forms and classifier predicates. In Quer, J. (ed.), *Signs of the time. Selected papers from TISLR 8*. Hamburg: Signum, 251-272.