

Sign Language and Linguistic Universals

Sign languages are of great interest to linguists, because, although they are the product of the same brain, their physical transmission differs greatly from that of spoken languages. In this pioneering and original study, Wendy Sandler and Diane Lillo-Martin compare sign languages with spoken languages, in order to seek the universal properties they share. Drawing on general linguistic theory, they describe and analyze sign language structure, showing linguistic universals in the phonology, morphology, and syntax of sign language, while also revealing non-universal aspects of its structure that must be attributed to its physical transmission system. No prior background in sign language linguistics is assumed, and numerous pictures are provided to make descriptions of signs and facial expressions accessible to readers. Engaging and informative, *Sign Language and Linguistic Universals* will be invaluable to linguists, psychologists, and all those interested in sign languages, linguistic theory, and the universal properties of human languages.

WENDY SANDLER is Professor of Linguistics in the Department of English Language and Literature at the University of Haifa, Israel, and has been investigating the phonology and morphology of American Sign Language and Israeli Sign Language for almost twenty years. She has previously published *Phonological Representation of the Sign* (1989) and *Language in Space: A Window on Israeli Sign Language* (co-authored with Irit Meir, 2004).

DIANE LILLO-MARTIN is Professor and Head in the Department of Linguistics, University of Connecticut, and Senior Research Scientist at the Haskins Laboratories, with research interests in both the structure and acquisition of American Sign Language. She has previously published *Universal Grammar and American Sign Language: Setting the Null Argument Parameters* (1991) and *Linguistic Theory and Language Acquisition* (co-authored with Stephen Crain, 1999).

Cambridge University Press
0521483956 - Sign Language and Linguistic Universals
Wendy Sandler and Diane Lillo-Martin
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

Sign Language and Linguistic Universals

WENDY SANDLER
DIANE LILLO-MARTIN



Cambridge University Press
0521483956 - Sign Language and Linguistic Universals
Wendy Sandler and Diane Lillo-Martin
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521482486

© Wendy Sandler and Diane Lillo-Martin 2006

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2006

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN-13 978-0-521-48248-6 hardback
ISBN-10 0-521-48248-8 hardback
ISBN-13 978-0-521-48395-7 paperback
ISBN-10 0-521-48395-6 paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this book, and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

Cambridge University Press
0521483956 - Sign Language and Linguistic Universals
Wendy Sandler and Diane Lillo-Martin
Frontmatter
[More information](#)

We dedicate this book to our parents

Milton Sandler (1919–2005)
Bernice Sandler

Clifford LeRoy Lillo
Elizabeth Mae Lillo (1924–2004)

Contents

<i>Preface</i>	xv
<i>Notation conventions</i>	xx
UNIT I INTRODUCTION	1
1 One human language or two?	3
1.1 Separating the code from the mode: the role of linguistic theory	4
1.1.1 <i>The word and its structure</i>	6
1.1.2 <i>Sublexical units</i>	8
1.1.3 <i>The sentence</i>	11
1.2 The mode and its implications for the study of language	16
UNIT II MORPHOLOGY	19
2 Morphology: introduction	21
3 Inflectional morphology	23
3.1 Verb agreement	23
3.1.1 <i>Sign language verb agreement – basic description</i>	24
3.1.2 <i>Sign language verb agreement – additional complexities</i>	29
3.1.3 <i>Sign language verb agreement – accounting for verb classes</i>	31
3.1.4 <i>Determining agreement from nominal controllers</i>	34
3.1.5 <i>Determining agreement based on the thematic structure of verbs</i>	35
3.1.6 <i>Number agreement</i>	39
	vii

3.1.7	<i>Non-manual marking of agreement</i>	42
3.1.8	<i>Verb agreement summary</i>	46
3.2	Verbal aspect	47
3.3	Pluralization	50
3.4	Models of templatic morphology	51
4	Derivational morphology	55
4.1	Templatic derivational morphology in sign languages	55
4.1.1	<i>Templatic derivational morphology in ASL</i>	55
4.1.2	<i>Allomorphy</i>	58
4.1.3	<i>An ASL morpheme</i>	59
4.1.4	<i>Morphemes realized on the face</i>	60
4.2	Morpheme sequences: non-templatic derivational morphology in sign languages	63
4.2.1	<i>Sequential morphology in ASL</i>	64
4.2.2	<i>Sequential morphology in Israeli Sign Language</i>	69
4.3	Compounds	72
4.3.1	<i>Lexicalized and novel compounds</i>	72
4.3.2	<i>Coordinate compounds</i>	73
4.4	Interim summary	74
5	Classifier constructions	76
5.1	A basic description	77
5.2	Verbal classifiers and Noun Incorporation	83
5.2.1	<i>Properties of classifiers that evolved from Noun Incorporation</i>	85
5.3	Classifier constructions: bound morphemes combined postlexically	89
5.4	Understanding classifier constructions through poetry	92
5.5	Conclusion	93
6	Entering the lexicon: lexicalization, backformation, and cross-modal borrowing	94
6.1	Classifier constructions: from postlexical to lexical and back again	95
6.1.1	<i>Prosodic transformation under lexicalization</i>	97
6.2	Productivity and lexicalization: the case of SAUNTER	98
6.2.1	<i>Spatial verbs as lexicalized classifier constructions</i>	102
6.3	Foreign vocabulary	104
6.3.1	<i>Mouthing is sign, not speech</i>	104

6.3.2	<i>Borrowing through fingerspelling: structure, meaning, and iconicity</i>	105
7	Morphology: conclusion	108
UNIT III PHONOLOGY		111
8	Meaningless linguistic elements and how they pattern	113
9	Sequentiality and simultaneity in sign language phonology	120
9.1	Liberation of the segment: excursus on non-linear theories of phonology and morphology	122
9.2	Sequential Structure in the sign	123
9.3	The Move–Hold model: sequential segments in sign language	128
9.4	The Hand Tier model: hand configuration as an autosegment	132
9.5	The phonology of non-linear morphology in sign language: prosodic templates	139
9.6	Conclusion	142
10	Hand configuration	144
10.1	Parameters of contrast	145
10.2	Hierarchical representation of feature classes: handshape	151
	10.2.1 <i>Feature Geometry in spoken language phonology</i>	152
	10.2.2 <i>The geometry of selected fingers and finger position</i>	152
	10.2.3 <i>The representation of internal movement</i>	154
10.3	Orientation and the hand configuration hierarchy	156
10.4	Terminal features	159
	10.4.1 <i>Unariness and markedness in handshapes</i>	160
	10.4.2 <i>Orientation features</i>	166
	10.4.3 <i>Phonetic redundancy and other predictable properties</i>	168
10.5	Where is hand configuration in the overall phonological model?	169
10.6	Summary and conclusion	171
11	Location: feature content and segmental status	174
11.1	Two classes of location features	174

11.2	A 3-D hierarchy of signing spaces	179
11.3	Summary and unresolved issues	181
12	The non-dominant hand in the sign language lexicon	182
12.1	The two-role theory	183
12.2	The one-role theory: a dependency model	189
12.3	Advantages and disadvantages of each theory of h2	192
12.4	Phonology vs. phonetics, and the central consensus	194
12.5	The roles of the non-dominant hand beyond the lexicon	195
13	Movement	196
13.1	The movement category: preliminary description	197
13.2	Evidence for a movement category	199
13.3	Representation of movement as a sequential segment	202
13.4	Another proposal: movement as prosody	206
	<i>13.4.1 Discussion</i>	210
13.5	Movement in words is constrained	214
14	Is there a syllable in sign language?	216
14.1	The sign language syllable: preliminary description	217
14.2	Theoretical background: the syllable in spoken language	218
14.3	The sign language syllable as a timing unit	219
14.4	Distinguishing the sign language syllable, the morpheme, and the word: constraints on structure	220
	<i>14.4.1 Constraints on the syllable</i>	221
	<i>14.4.2 Morpheme structure constraints</i>	223
	<i>14.4.3 The word</i>	226
14.5	The monosyllable conspiracy and other syllable level generalizations	227
	<i>14.5.1 The monosyllable conspiracy</i>	228
	<i>14.5.2 Stress</i>	231
	<i>14.5.3 Final syllable reduplication</i>	232
14.6	Sonority in sign language	235
	<i>14.6.1 Sonority in a sequentially organized syllable</i>	236
	<i>14.6.2 Other theories of sonority</i>	238
	<i>14.6.3 Sonority versus loudness</i>	241
	<i>14.6.4 Sonority summary: assessing the relation between visual salience and linguistic sonority</i>	243
14.7	Syllables and sonority: conclusion	244

15	Prosody	246
15.1	The Prosodic Word	247
15.2	The Phonological Phrase	250
15.3	The Intonational Phrase and intonation in sign language	253
15.4	Superarticulation: facial expression as intonation	257
	15.4.1 <i>Superarticulation is linguistic</i>	258
	15.4.2 <i>Superarticulation is componential</i>	259
	15.4.3 <i>The physical instantiation of intonation versus superarticulation</i>	260
	15.4.4 <i>Grammaticization and language specificity of superarticulation</i>	261
	15.4.5 <i>Linguistic and nonlinguistic superarticulation</i>	262
15.5	Nonisomorphism	264
15.6	Summary, conclusion, and future research	265
16	Phonology: theoretical implications	266
16.1	Consensus and unresolved issues	266
16.2	The architecture of the phonological component: lexical, postlexical, and non-lexical	268
	16.2.1 <i>Lexical and postlexical phenomena in sign language</i>	269
	16.2.2 <i>A non-lexical level in sign language</i>	271
16.3	Universals and modality effects in both modalities	272
UNIT IV	SYNTAX	279
17	Syntax: introduction	281
17.1	Unit overview	281
17.2	The generative approach	284
18	Clausal structure	288
18.1	Basic word order	289
18.2	Embedding	298
18.3	Phrase structure	300
	18.3.1 <i>Generative approaches to phrase structure</i>	301
	18.3.2 <i>Do sign language sentences have structure?</i>	304
	18.3.3 <i>Mini-topicalization</i>	308

18.3.4	<i>Split headedness</i>	309
18.3.5	<i>Non-manual markers as key to phrase structure</i>	310
18.3.6	<i>Modals provide evidence for phrase structure</i>	315
18.4	Summary and conclusion	318
19	Clausal structure across sign languages	320
19.1	Auxiliary signs	321
19.2	LSB phrase structure	323
19.2.1	<i>A universal theory of phrase structure</i>	323
19.2.2	<i>Verb types in LSB</i>	325
19.3	LSB compared with ASL	332
20	Variations and extensions on basic sentence structures	334
20.1	DP structure	335
20.1.1	<i>Determiners</i>	339
20.1.2	<i>Adjectives and quantifiers</i>	341
20.2	The syntax of classifier constructions	344
20.2.1	<i>A Noun Incorporation analysis</i>	344
20.2.2	<i>Classifiers as agreement</i>	348
20.3	Verb sandwiches and object shift	352
20.4	Negatives	358
20.4.1	<i>Phrase structure of negation</i>	359
20.4.2	<i>Negative headshake</i>	364
21	Pronouns	369
21.1	Overt pronouns	371
21.1.1	<i>Personal pronoun system – description</i>	371
21.1.2	<i>Personal pronoun system – issues</i>	374
21.1.3	<i>Point of view and logophoricity</i>	379
21.2	Two kinds of null arguments in ASL?	389
21.2.1	<i>Null arguments and agreement</i>	389
21.2.2	<i>Null arguments without agreement</i>	390
21.2.3	<i>Null arguments in ASL</i>	393
21.2.4	<i>Are null arguments in ASL uniformly licensed by agreement?</i>	398
22	Topic and focus	404
22.1	Information packaging	404
22.2	Topics in sign languages	406

Contents		xiii
22.3	Information packaging in ASL	413
22.4	Double constructions	416
	22.4.1 <i>Focus doubling in ASL</i>	416
	22.4.2 <i>Focus doubling in LSB</i>	423
	22.4.3 <i>Doubles versus tags</i>	425
22.5	Clefting: so-called rhetorical questions	427
23	WH-questions	431
23.1	A cross-linguistic look at WH-questions	432
23.2	Is WH-movement to left or right?	435
	23.2.1 <i>WH-questions with more than one WH-phrase</i>	437
	23.2.2 <i>Sentence-initial WH-objects</i>	445
	23.2.3 <i>Sentence-final WH-subjects</i>	448
	23.2.4 <i>Spread of WH-question non-manual marker</i>	449
	23.2.5 <i>Indirect questions</i>	452
23.3	Interim summary	454
23.4	LSB WH-movement	455
23.5	WH-questions and intonation	459
	23.5.1 <i>Sentence structure and presence of WH-question non-manual marker</i>	464
	23.5.2 <i>Sentence structure and spread of WH-question non-manual marker</i>	468
23.6	Conclusions	470
24	Syntax: summary and directions	472
24.1	Summary	472
24.2	Future research	473
24.3	Modality effects	474
UNIT V	MODALITY	475
25	The effects of modality: linguistic universals and sign language universals	477
25.1	Signed languages and linguistic universals	477
25.2	The use of space	479
	25.2.1 <i>Pronouns and the use of space</i>	481
	25.2.2 <i>Verb agreement and the use of space: linguistic and extralinguistic aspects</i>	482
	25.2.3 <i>Other uses of space</i>	488

25.3	Simultaneity	489
	25.3.1 <i>Motivatedness and simultaneity</i>	491
	25.3.2 <i>Production/perception and simultaneity</i>	492
	25.3.3 <i>Processing and simultaneity</i>	492
25.4	Iconicity/motivatedness	493
	25.4.1 <i>Iconic motivation at the lexical level</i>	496
	25.4.2 <i>Iconic motivation in morphological processes of all sign languages</i>	500
	25.4.3 <i>Motivatedness can penetrate phonology</i>	501
25.5	Language age and language structure	503
	25.5.1 <i>Resolving the contradiction</i>	504
	25.5.2 <i>Diachronic development of sign-language- typical morphology</i>	507
25.6	Conclusion, implications, and directions for future research	508
	<i>References</i>	511
	<i>Index</i>	541

Preface

Natural sign languages are clearly very similar to natural spoken languages in many significant ways. Sign languages are conventional communication systems that arise spontaneously in all deaf communities. They are acquired during childhood through normal exposure without instruction. Sign languages effectively fulfill the same social and mental functions as spoken languages, and they can even be simultaneously interpreted into and from spoken languages in real time. These basic common characteristics lead to a compelling expectation: that natural languages in the two modalities will be similar to one another from a strictly linguistic point of view as well, in both content and organization.

But how similar are sign languages and spoken languages *really*? When we attempt to describe and analyze morphology, syntax, and phonology in sign language, are we wandering in the realm of metaphor? Or are we traveling in familiar territory? By “sign language phonology,” for example, do we only mean that sign languages have a taxonomy of formational components? Or do we really mean they have a finite set of meaningless contrastive units that combine in constrained ways to form meaningful morphemes and words, and that the mental representations of these lexical items may differ predictably and discretely from their actual realization? The difference between the latter characterization and the former is the difference between metaphorical analogy with spoken language phonology and concrete comparison. More than that, the latter characterization describes a linguistic system and the former, well, almost anything.

We think that the way to address this question is to take linguistic theory seriously, as a theory about universal properties of human language, and to use it in the investigation of natural human languages in a different physical modality. It is this approach that we take in this book, as described in detail in Unit 1. The more rigorous the specific theory or subtheory appealed to in a particular analysis, the more convincing the cross-modality similarities that it reveals. And wherever this approach uncovers differences, it exposes the effects of the physical modality on each of the two natural language systems. The goal, then, is to appeal to

general theories of linguistic structure to analyze the morphology, phonology, and syntax of sign languages, and in so doing, to arrive at a pool of properties that are truly universal. The results of that endeavor form the content of Units 2–4. Properties attributed to the modality of transmission are dealt with in Unit 5.

Throughout, we try to make the sign language phenomena and analyses clear and accessible, so that linguists can sink their teeth into them, whether or not they work in the same theoretical frameworks as those presented, and whether or not they have a sign language background. To the same end, the book is profusely illustrated with examples. We also try to avoid analyses that are overly theory-internal, in the hope that the accounts presented will be informative in their own right, and that the properties ascribed to sign language will be valid, regardless of the particular theoretical framework with which they are explored.

The field of sign language research is dynamic and prolific. Many phenomena have been described by different researchers from different points of view, but often without clarifying areas of convergence or divergence. Different models of various aspects of sign language structure abound as well. Even if it were possible to summarize all the work in the field, such an effort would be ill-advised, as it would likely leave the reader in a hopeless maze. Therefore, the book is not intended to be an exhaustive overview of the field, and much work has been left out.

The field has also been branching out and becoming specialized. There is a large and growing body of research in many areas such as psycholinguistics, acquisition, neurolinguistics, sociolinguistics, and bilingualism. Unfortunately, we were not able to include discussion of the many important and influential works in these areas. We have limited our discussion to studies which deal with the linguistic structure of sign language from the perspective of theoretical linguistics.

Our strategy has been twofold. First, we select phenomena that are important for understanding the structure of sign language and its relation to spoken language. Second, in accounting for those phenomena, we focus mainly on analyses that are (a) explanatory, (b) informed by general linguistic theory, and (c) part of more comprehensive sign language models. In this way, the same models are returned to at different points throughout the book, making it possible, we hope, for a coherent view of sign language linguistic structure to emerge, and for certain prominent models of that structure to be compared. We have attempted to include a fairly wide range of phenomena even though by necessity some works of relevance and interest have not been selected. This strategy is guided by our stated goal: to discover linguistic universals by viewing signed and spoken languages through the medium of linguistic theories that purport to capture such universals.

We are governed by the same strategy in selecting which sign languages to report on from among the ever growing list of sign languages being studied around the world. Our main focus is American Sign Language (ASL) because that language has been the subject of the most intensive theoretical research over the longest period of time so far. But theoretical research is on the rise in other places, and research on Israeli Sign Language (ISL), Sign Language of the Netherlands (SLN), Brazilian Sign Language (LSB), and other sign languages will also be reported.

Work on one sign language often reveals properties common to sign languages in general. There are two reasons for this. First, the modality appears to influence certain key aspects of the structure of these languages, though this does not mean that the structures so influenced necessarily fall outside the predictions of general linguistic theory (see Unit 5). Second, the field of sign language research is not very old, and for the most part we have not yet arrived at the level of detail that will ultimately distinguish grammars cross-sign-linguistically in a significant way. Therefore, at this point in the development of the field, analyses of specific sign languages shed light on the structure of languages in this modality more generally.

Another choice was to refrain from taking a position here on metatheoretical issues such as innateness and cognitive modularity. Such issues are, of course, of great importance, as they relate to the question of *why* there should be linguistic universals. However, our approach at this stage has been to contribute to the scientific discourse a detailed account of what we take those universals to be, and to separate them from characteristics that are widespread within each natural language modality, but not shared by the two.

We hope that this book will be read and used by linguists who are familiar with sign languages and those who are not. Because of the surface differences between sign and oral languages, and the concomitant differences in jargon and assumptions, too often researchers unfamiliar with sign languages find this field inaccessible or irrelevant. We believe it is highly relevant, and thus aim to make it accessible. Exposure to sign language linguistics can be like looking into a kaleidoscope. A multitude of colorful fragments fleetingly arranges itself into one pattern and then dissolves into another – with every slight turn of the barrel, another mysterious and alluring array presents itself. We hope that this volume will serve to make the patterns more clearly focused and less elusive, leading to an increase in research on sign languages that will benefit the study of theoretical linguistics and of language more generally.

This book was written over many years, sparked by a suggestion from Harry van der Hulst that there was a gap in the theoretical sign language literature that ought to be filled. We are grateful to Harry for encouraging us to fill it. The book was written by the two authors

working together in Storrs and in Haifa, and by each going it alone, at home and during extended visits elsewhere. We are deeply indebted to many colleagues, friends, and family members for making it possible.

We extend our gratitude to Mark Aronoff, Željko Bošković, Diane Brentari, Laura Downing, Karen Emmorey, Richard Meier, and Carol Padden for taking the time to read large parts of the manuscript and to make thoughtful and detailed comments that were of immeasurable value to the final outcome. We are also grateful to John Kingston, Irit Meir, Carol Padden, Gunter Senft, and Rachel Sutton-Spence for discussions of data, specific concepts, and analyses. We applaud and thank Sarah Felber, who produced our index. There are others to whom the two authors wish to express gratitude individually.

WS spent 2001–2002, a critical year for book writing, on sabbatical, mostly at the University of Nijmegen, through the generosity of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO). I owe many thanks to colleagues on the sign language prosody project there: Onno Crasborn, Carlos Gussenhoven, Wim Emmerik, and Els van der Kooij. Thank you to Carlos Gussenhoven for being a most thoughtful and gracious host, and for teaching me a great deal about intonation and about all that I still must learn. Thanks also to researchers and students associated with the Language and Cognition Group and the Gesture Group at the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics in Nijmegen, for their interest, support, and most helpful discussions, especially Nick Enfield, Marianne Gullberg, Satoro Kita, Stephen Levinson, Asli Özürek, and Gunter Senft, and to Jennie Pyers and other members of the outstanding Sign Language Research Group that Dan Slobin organized there that year. The first two sabbatical months were spent at my alma mater, the University of Texas at Austin. Thanks to Richard Meier and his students for welcoming me to the lively sign language atmosphere at UT. I also wish to express my gratitude to my teacher Peter MacNeilage for discussions of sign language in the broader context during that period, and over the course of many years, discussions which have always been inspirational.

DLM would like to thank Željko Bošković, Deborah Chen Pichler, Gaurav Mathur, Karen Petronio, Ronice Quadros, Doreen Simons-Marques, and Sandra Wood for stimulating discussions about the structure of ASL and other sign languages which influenced portions of the text and the work on which it draws. I also extend appreciation to University of Connecticut graduate students attending my courses on the structure of ASL for their discussions and feedback on drafts of portions of the book.

As we acknowledge those with whom we have had stimulating and informative discussions, we want to single out for special mention two of our former students who have become close research colleagues. Irit Meir

and Ronice Quadros worked with us first as students to be instructed and guided in the ways of theoretical linguistics. Over time, regular discussions in which the mentor leads the way became dialogues to which both teacher and student contribute. By now, our roles have morphed to that of collaborators, walking together on paths of search and discovery. Exploring the nature of a system like the grammar of sign languages is especially fruitful when ideas can be bounced off someone who shares the same background knowledge – particularly when that person is also able to tell us when an idea just isn't convincing. Thank you – *todos* – and *obrigado* for continuing to stimulate our fascination for sign linguistics.

Many thanks to Haifa research assistants Ofra Rosenstein and Svetlana Dachkovsky for their enthusiastic and capable help on this project, and to video technician Shai Davidi for always finding better and better techniques for producing the ISL pictures. We are deeply indebted to ISL research colleagues Meir Etedgi, Doron Levy, and Orna Levy who for many years have been deeply involved in the ISL research reported in this book, and who doubled as models for illustrations, together with Debi Menashe and Tali Mor. Special thanks to Carol Padden for modeling some of the ASL signs.

In Connecticut, gratitude goes to sign language research colleagues and sign models Laura Levesque, Brenda Schertz, Doreen Simons-Marques, and Sandra Wood. Invaluable technical assistance in preparing the book and the ASL illustrations was provided by Krystina Carver, Hayley Love, Angela Neff, and Serkan Şener. We also thank Ronice Quadros for providing LSB illustrations, and LSB sign model Gisele Rangel.

Financial support for the preparation of this book was provided in part by grants from the Israel Science Foundation (820/95 and 750/99–1) to Wendy Sandler, and from the US – Israel Binational Science Foundation (95–00310/2) to Wendy Sandler and Mark Aronoff. Support was also provided by a research grant from the National Institutes of Health to Diane Lillo-Martin, through Haskins Laboratories (NIDCD #00183), and by faculty grants from the University of Connecticut Research Foundation.

Our families have supported us with love, encouragement, patience, understanding, and humor through all the years that it took to produce this volume. Yoav and Hadar, and Steve, Stephanie, Amy, and Allan know how deeply grateful we are to them for helping us write this book, and we know that the best token of our appreciation is its completion!

Notation conventions

When we cite the work of others, we use their notation unless otherwise marked. Although this means that the notation used throughout the text is not uniform, we preferred to reproduce exactly the cited works rather than introduce our own interpretation of their notation.

Despite the variation found across sources, there are many conventions for sign language notation which are quite common. We provide here a summary of the conventions we have adopted. Other uses may include superscripts or subscripts where we keep the text on a single line; additional notational variants are described in the text.

SIGN	English glosses in small capital letters stand for signs with approximately the same meaning as the English word.
SIGN-SIGN	If more than one English word is required to gloss a single sign, the words are connected with hyphens.
S-I-G-N	Fingerspelling, representing each letter of a spelled-out English word by a different handshape, is indicated using hyphens.
#SIGN	Fingerspelled loan signs are represented with a preceding hatch mark.
SIGN^SIGN	Compounds are indicated with a caret between component signs.
_____ t	Non-manual markers are indicated by a solid line above the glosses for the signs they co-occur with. 't' indicates a topic non-manual; 'br' indicates brow raise; 'n' indicates a negative headshake; 'wh' indicates the WH-question non-manual; 'q' or 'y/n' indicates a yes/no question non-manual; 'hn' indicates head nod; 'mm' indicates the facial adverb 'with relaxed enjoyment'; 'th' indicates the facial adverb 'carelessly.'
SIGN[aspect]	When a sign is marked for an aspectual inflection, the name of that inflection is given in square brackets.

a-SIGN-b	Lower-case letters are used to indicate spatial locations. Nouns are marked with an index at the beginning of the gloss to indicate the locus with which they are associated. Verbs are marked with an index at the beginning to indicate the onset location, and/or at the end to indicate the endpoint location.
a-C-SIGN	Indices with a dash indicate a plural, in which the hand moves from locus 'a' to locus 'c.'
SIGN _i	Subscripts from the middle of the alphabet (or, in some cases, numbers) are used to indicate abstract coreference.
IX(loc)	Pointing signs, including pronouns, demonstratives, and locatives, are glossed IX (for 'index'). The object of the pointing is indicated in parentheses. Variants include PT ('point'), S/HE, THERE.
CL:C'x'	Classifiers are indicated using the abbreviation CL, followed by a symbol for the hand configuration used in the classifier, and a description of the meaning in single quotes.
*()	An asterisk indicates an ungrammatical string. An asterisk outside parentheses indicates that the elements inside are obligatory. An asterisk inside the parentheses indicates that the elements inside are ungrammatical.
(she)	A pronoun will be included in parentheses if it is not given in the original language but is needed for a grammatical English translation.
(-them)	A pronoun within parentheses is marked with a hyphen if it is signified by verb agreement.