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Verb types (Padden 1988)

1. Agreement verbs

2. Spatial verbs

3. Plain verbs

(Examples from DGS Corpus)
Plain verbs (Padden 1988)

We make a subdivision:

A. Body-anchored verbs
B. Neutral verbs

(Examples from DGS Corpus)
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Null subjects in sign languages


• American SL has two types of null arguments:
  1. Empty category *pro* licensed by agreement: agreement verbs
  2. Variable bound by an empty topic: agreement + plain verbs

Glück & Pfau (1998) and Bos (1993) report similar results for German SL (DGS) and SL of the Netherlands.

Bahan et al. (2000):

• There is always agreement in American SL:
  1. Manual (agreement verbs)
  2. Non-manual (all verbs): head tilt/eye gaze

→ Subject drop is licensed under either form of agreement.
Hypothesis

1. Subjects in clauses with body-anchored verbs can only be dropped when they are *first person* (based on Oomen 2017).
   → Iconicity effect

2. In clauses with neutral verbs, subjects of all persons can be dropped.

→ We investigate two sign languages:
   • German Sign Language (DGS)
   • Russian Sign Language (RSL)
Data

• DGS Corpus: subset of 58 dialogues (~8h30) (Blanck et al. 2010)
• RSL corpus: ~230 mostly monologues (~5h30) (Burkova 2015)

• Verbs selected based on 80 verb meanings from ValPaL list (Hartmann et al. 2013; Malchukov & Comrie 2015)

Tokens identified (excl. impersonals):
• DGS: 630 tokens
• RSL: 220 tokens
Annotation

1. Verb, e.g. BOIL, BE-SAD1, LOOK-AT2...

2. Verb type:
   - Body-anchored
   - Neutral

3. Subject referent:
   - Person: 1/2*/3
   - Overtness: O/N
## Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DGS:</th>
<th>RSL:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Body-anchored (N=471)</td>
<td>Body-anchored (N=151)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overt</td>
<td>Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Neutral (N=159)</th>
<th>Neutral (N=69)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overt</td>
<td>Null</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The exceptions

Expectation:

• Categorical pattern (i.e. no null 3rd person subjects with body-anchored verbs)
• Reality
  • Very few examples, but how to assess it?

• Solution 1: statistical analysis
• Solution 2: look at counterexamples
Solution 1

- **Mixed-effect logistic regression**
  - Dependent variable: 3N; binary
  - Independent variable: verb type
  - Random factors: verb, signer
  - **Hypothesis**: 3N are significantly less likely with body-anchored verbs

- **Result:**
  - Significant negative effect of body-anchored verb type in both languages
Solution 2

Possible explanations:

• Example can be interpreted as impersonal construction
• Person of the subject unclear from context (→ can be first person)
• Very slight pointing present (→ subject is in fact overt)
• 2 examples in RSL: parentheticals
Conclusions

• Body-anchored verbs and neutral verbs in RSL and DGS behave differently w.r.t. subject drop patterns.
  • Body-anchored verbs allow subject drop when the subject is first person only.
    → iconicity effect: default first-person interpretation.
    → Modality-specific constraint.
  • Neutral verbs do not pose constraints on subject drop.
Thank you!
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What’s role shift?

• A mechanism to construct the thoughts, utterances, or actions of a referent; triggers a context shift.
• Shoulder shift; facial expressions; change in eye gaze direction:

Example from NGT

BEAR / CL(w/e):MOVE / BE-NERVOUS
‘The bear approached. [The boy] got nervous.’
## Results – examples with role shift

### DGS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body-anchored (N=100)</th>
<th>Overt</th>
<th>Non-overt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neutral (N=13)</th>
<th>Overt</th>
<th>Non-overt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### RSL:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Body-anchored (N=200)</th>
<th>Overt</th>
<th>Non-overt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neutral (N=34)</th>
<th>Overt</th>
<th>Non-overt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statistical analysis

• **Expectation**: categorical pattern (no non-overt 3rd person subjects with body-anchored verbs)

• **Reality**: very few examples, but how to assess it?

• **Solution 1a**: mixed-effect logistic regression
  • Dependent variable: 3N (3rd person non-overt); binary
  • Independent variables: verb type, role shift
  • Random factors: verb, signer
  • **Hypothesis**: 3N are significantly less likely with body-anchored verbs without role shift
Statistical analysis

• **Expectation**: categorical pattern (no non-overt 3rd person subjects with body-anchored verbs)
• **Reality**: very few examples, but how to assess it?

• **Solution 1b**: mixed-effect logistic regression without role shift
  • Dependent variable: 3N; binary
  • Independent variables: verb type
  • Random factors: verb, signer
  • **Hypothesis**: 3N are significantly less likely with body-anchored verbs
Statistical analysis

• **Expectation**: categorical pattern (no non-overt 3rd person subjects with body-anchored verbs)

• **Reality**: very few examples, but how to assess it?

• **Solutions 1a-b**: statistical analysis

• **Solution 2**: look at counterexamples in detail, try to find out what is going on there
Statistical analysis

• **Model 1:** predicting 3N based on verb type and role shift:
  - Significant negative effect of body-anchored verb type in both languages
  - Significant positive effect of role shift in both languages
  - Significant positive interaction in RSL, non-significant positive interaction in DGS

• **Model 2:** predicting 3N based on verb type (no role shift)
  - Significant negative effect of body-anchored verb type in both languages

• Hypothesis confirmed