

Anaphora in the African Languages

Anaphora Questionnaire Response for Babanki (Kejom) - version 1.3

NSF grant BCS-0303447: Principal Investigator - Ken Safir, Rutgers University

Respondent - Pius W. Akumbu, University of Buea

PART 1 General information

Babanki (ISO 693-3 [bbk]), or Kejom as the native speakers prefer to call it, is a Centre Ring Grassfields Bantu Language spoken in Kejom Ketinguh and Kejom Keku in the North West Region of Cameroon.

Pius W. Akumbu (Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Arts, University of Buea, Cameroon: akumbu_pius@yahoo.fr) is the Afranaph consultant for Kejom and the judgments presented are his own. Dr Akumbu received his Ph.D. in Linguistics from University of Yaounde I, Cameroon in 2007. Dr. Akumbu's primary training is in phonology and he describes his familiarity with the other subfields of linguistics as follows:

- (a) Syntax: some
- (b) Typological linguistics: some
- (c) Formal semantics: some
- (d) Pragmatics or discourse analysis: some
- (e) Other relevant subfield: Morphology and some Lexicograph

Language biography

- a. What language(s) did your parents speak at home? Kejom
- b. What language(s) do/did your parents speak natively? Kejom
- c. What language (languages) did you receive school instruction in? English
- d. How old were you when you learned the subject language? I acquired Kejom from birth
- e. Do you speak an identifiable subdialect of this language? What is it called? No

PART 2 An inventory of reflexive and reciprocal strategies

2.1 Coreference in a single clause

2.1.1 "Primary" reflexive strategy - Translate the following example to your language, and indicate the element (if any) that expresses the reflexive relationship. If the verb see is

somehow unusual in your language, use a more typical transitive verb instead.

A1) John saw himself.

dzöyn tâ yén àwén á wén
dzöyn tâ yén à-wén á wén
John P3 see c5-body AM 3SG
'John saw himself'

Comment: Strategy A = 'body-pronoun' (where P3 = past tense marker of yesterday, c = noun class marker and AM = associative marker). The difference between à-wén 'body' and wén '3SG (third person singular pronoun)' is that the former has a prefix.

2.1.2 Is there another way, or are there other ways, to express coreference in A1 (that is, with the verb see held constant).

2.1.3 Other verb types - Some languages use a special reflexive strategy with certain verbs, especially "commonly reflexive" verbs of grooming such as "wash", "shave", "bathe", "dress", etc. Do any of the following (or any other verbs you can think of) involve a strategy that you have not listed already? If so, give an example now and label it with a new name (or letter).

A2a) John washes himself.

dzöyn á shù àwén á wén
dzöyn á shù à-wén á wén
Mary PRES wash c5-body AM 3SG
'John washes himself.'

b) Mary cut herself. [accidentally]

mèrí tâ lyòm-sá àwén á wén
mèrí tâ lyòm-sá à-wén á wén
Mary P3 wound-EXT c5-body AM 3SG
'Mary cut herself. [accidentally]'

c) John is ashamed of himself.

dzöyn á bànè àwén á wén
dzöyn á bànè à-wén á wén
John PRES hate c5-body AM 3SG
'John is ashamed himself.'

d) John destroyed himself.

dʒɔ̃yn t̃ə byìpsá əw é̃n əwén
dʒɔ̃yn t̃ə byìp-sáə-wén ə wén
John P3 spoil-EXT c5-body AM 3SG
‘John destroyed himself.’

e) We hate ourselves.

yès ə b̃ànə t̃əwén ə tyés(tá)
yès ə b̃àn-ə t̃ə-wén ə tyés(tá)
1P PRES hate-EXT c13-body AM 1pp
‘We hate ourselves.’

f) They praise themselves

vəwá(ná) bwómsə t̃əwén tá ṽəwá(ná)
vəwá(ná) bwóm-sə t̃ə-wén tá ṽəwá(ná)
3P praise-EXT c13-body AM 3pp
‘They praise themselves.’

Comment: No new strategy uncovered. The extensions (EXT) are suffixed to the verb roots to derive attenuative meaning in the above data. The other extensions that occur in Kejom are *tə* (repetitive, used with transitive verbs), *kə* (repetitive, used with intransitive verbs), and *mə* (intensifier). These extensions have an underlying CV structure and are suffixed to verb roots.

Comment: The glossing of *ə-wén ə wén* renders the word *wén* with two different glosses, where the first one bearing the class agreement morpheme is 'body' and the second is '3SG'. Examples (A2e) and (A2f) justify this analysis of these two occurrences as homonyms.

Comment: The noun class agreement changes from *c5* to *c13* in (A2e-f) because *c13* is the plural of *c5* (as well as *c3*).

2.1.4 Obliques and other argument types - In the preceding examples, the coindexed arguments were subject and object. Many languages use a different coreference strategy for oblique arguments. Does yours? Consider a variety of oblique objects (dative, genitive, etc., as appropriate for your language), as well subcategorized prepositional arguments (e.g., English Karl counted on himself) and finally prepositional adjuncts (e.g., Sally saw a snake near her/herself).

A3a) John spoke to Mary.

dʒɔ̃yn t̃ə g̃à? ə mèrí
dʒɔ̃yn t̃ə g̃à? ə mèrí

John P3 speak to mary

'John spoke to Mary.'

b) John spoke about himself. (subject/PP argument)

dʒöyn t̂ə gáʔ byìʔ əwén á wén

dʒöyn t̂ə gáʔ byìʔ ə-wén á wén
John P3 speak about c5-body AM 3SG

'John spoke about himself.'

c) 'John told Mary about himself.' (same, with intervening NP)

dʒöyn t̂ə shəʔtə bjiʔ əwén á wén á mèrí

dʒöyn t̂ə shəʔ-tə byìʔ ə-wén á wén á mèrí
John P3 tell-EXT about c5-body AM 3SG to Mary

'John told Mary about himself.'

d) Bill told us about ourselves. (object/argument)

bíl t̂ə shəʔtə byìʔ yès à yès

bíl t̂ə shəʔ-tə byìʔ yès àyès
Bill P3 tell-EXT about 1p to 1p

'Bill told us about ourselves.'

e) Mary gave the children themselves. (ind.object/object)

mèrí t̂ə kú á vwón á vyǐ

mèrí t̂ə kú á vwón á vyǐ
Mary P3 give LOC c2.child OM them

'Mary gave the children themselves.'

f) Mary saw a book behind her. (subject/locative)

mèrí t̂ə yén ŋwàʔlè á wé(nó) bàṃ

mèrí t̂ə yén ŋwàʔlè á wé(nó) bàṃ
Mary P3 see c1.book LOC 3SG back

Comment: The portion in parentheses does not have a separate gloss. I am trying to say that wé and wénó mean exactly the same thing. Any of them can be used freely in all contexts, as far as I know.

'Mary saw a book behind her.'

g) John bought the book for himself. (benefactive)

dʒöyn t̂ə vì nó ŋwàʔlè yì á wén á wén

dʒöyn t̂ə vì nó ŋwàʔlè yì á wé(nó) wén
John P3 come with book that LOC 3SG body

'John bought the book for himself.'

Also consider things like experiencer-subject verbs:

A4a) Etta likes herself.

ètá é kù òwén é wén
 ètà é kù ò-wén é wén
 Etta PRES like c5-body AM 3SG
 'Etta likes herself.'

b) Etta scares herself.

ètá é báḡsá òwén ówén
 ètà é báḡ-sá ò-wén é wén
 Etta PRES frighten-EXT c5-body AM 3SG
 'Etta scares herself.'

c) Etta worries herself.

ètá é kú ḡó? á òwén ówén
 ètàé kú ḡó? á ò-wén é wén
 Etta PRES give trouble LOC c5-body AM 3SG
 'Etta worries herself.'

2.1.5 Person and number - Some languages use different strategies depending on person or number.

Consider the preceding sentences with first and second person subjects, and also with plurals. Also check for differences between full NPs, overt third person pronouns, and null subjects/objects (if your language allows them).

A5a) I saw myself.

mà yí yèn òwén é ḡómá
 màyí yèn ò-wén é ḡómá
 1S P2 see C5-body AM 1ps
 'I saw myself'

b) You cut yourself [accidentally].

wù yí lyòmsá òwén é wú
 wùyí lyòmsá ò-wén é ḡó
 2S P2 wound C5-body AM 2ps
 'You cut yourself [accidentally]'

c) We will wash ourselves.

yè(sá) né shù t̃-wén á tyés(tá)
yè(sá) né shù t̃-wén á tyés(tá)
1P F2 wash c13-body AM 1pp

Comment: As I said above, the portion in parentheses does not have a separate meaning. tyés and tyés(tá) mean exactly the same thing. Either of them can be used freely in all contexts, as far as I know.

'We will wash ourselves.'

d) You must help yourselves.

ghèη díʔí gyàmt̃ t̃-wén á tyéη(tá)
ghèη díʔí gyàmt̃t̃-wén á tyéη(tá)
2P should help c13-body AM 2pp

'You must help yourselves.'

2.1.6 Strategies for other clausemate environments - If there are any additional reflexive strategies known to you (from grammars, or from your linguistic knowledge), list them now. Name each new strategy with a short name or label, and give one example.

(a) Is there any strategy which is only possible with some special aspectual class of a verb?

Some examples:

A6a) Peter knows himself.

bítà á kíʔí èwén ówén
bítà á kíʔí è-wén á wén
Peter PRES know c5-body AM 3SG

'Peter knows himself'

b) Peter (habitually) criticizes himself.

bítà á kíʔí èwén ówén
bítà á gháʔá è-wén á wén
Peter PRES accuse c5-body AM 3SG

'Peter (habitually) criticizes himself'

c) Peter is likely to praise himself.

bítà zì ghè kúʔsá èwén ówén
bítà zì ghè kúʔsá è-wén á wén
Peter can him praise c5-body AM 3SG

'Peter is likely to praise himself'

(b) Do quantificational constructions involve a separate strategy?

A7a) Every boy looked at himself.

nô wàn wùlím kò ŋkyĩ òwén ówén
 nô wàn wù-lím kò ŋ-kyĩ ò-wén ó wén
 each C1.child c2-male any P4-look c5-body AM 3SG
 'Every boy looked at himself'

Comment: Both nô (that qualifies the subject) and kò must occur together. If one is dropped the other must also be dropped. Therefore it seems to be an obligatory discontinuous part of every (nô...kò)

b) All the women described John to themselves.

nô kyĩ vyí nô vètsəm ŋgá?àlí byì dʒöyn à tètén tá vówá(ná)
 nô kyĩ vyí vè-tsəm ŋ-gá?à-lí byì dʒöyn à tèt-wén tá vówá(ná)
 each c2.woman C2.the C2-all P4-speak-P4 about John to c13-body AM 3pp
 'All the women described John to themselves.'

c) Every teacher introduced himself to Bob.

nô ndʒi? sèttsəm ŋshètá byì òwéná vówá à bôb
 nô ndʒi? sèt-tsəm ŋ-shètá-lí byì ò-wéná vówá à bôb
 each teacher.c10 c10-all P4-speak-P4 about c5-body 3pp to Bob
 'Every teacher introduced himself to Bob.'

KS: There is a missing morpheme corresponding to 'to'

d) Some children only help themselves.

vwón váttsává gyàmtè tà tètén tá vówá(ná)
 vwón vát-tsává gyàmtè tà tèt-wén tá vówá(ná)
 c2.child c2-some help only C13-body AM 3pp
 'Some children only help themselves.'

(c) If your language has a system of grammaticized honorifics, do some types of honorific allow a strategy that has not been listed yet?

A8) They saw themselves.

vèwá yí yèn tètén tá vówá(ná)
 vèwá yí yèn tèt-wén té vówá(ná)
 3P P2 see C13-body AM 3pp

"They saw *themselves*." or "They saw *each other*." or "They saw *their bodies*."

Comment: The reading is not honorific.

(d) Experiment with placing both coreferring arguments in various types of subordinate clauses, as your language allows.

A9a) Sol says that Alice loves herself.

sól gà? lá àlís é kù òwén ówén
 sól gà? lá àlís é kù òwén é wén
 Sol speak that Alice PRES love c5-body AM 3SG
 'Sol says that Alice loves herself'

b) Sol required that Alice praise herself.

sól t̀ gà? lá àlís kú?só òwén ówén
 sól t̀ gà? lá àlís kú?só òwén é wén
 Sol P3 speak that Alice praise c5-body AM 3SG
 'Sol required that Alice praise herself'

c) Sol thought Alice should praise herself.

sól t̀ kwò?t̀ lá àlís kú?só òwén ówén
 sól t̀ kwò?t̀ lá àlís kú?só ò-wén é wén
 Sol P3 think that Alice praise c5-body AM 3SG
 'Sol thought that Alice should praise herself'

d) Sol asked Alice to praise herself.

sól t̀ gà? á àlís lá ghè kú?só òwén ówén
 sól t̀ gà? á àlís lá ghè kú?só ò-wén é wén
 Sol P3 speak to Alice that 3SG praise c5-body AM 3SG
 'Sol asked Alice to praise herself'

Comment: The same verb mean 'ask', 'speak' and 'require'.

e) Sol wants to praise himself.

sól é ká kú?só òwén ówén
 sól é ká kú?sé ò-wén é wén
 Sol PRES want praise c5-body AM 3SG
 'Sol wants to praise himself'

f) Sol expects Alice to praise herself.

sól é k̀t̀ lá àlís kú?só òwén ówén
 sól é k̀t̀ lá àlís kú?só ò-wén é wén
 Sol PRES expect that Alice praise c5-body AM 3SG
 'Sol expects Alice to praise herself'

g) Sol heard Alice praising herself.

sól tǎ zhwù àlís ghè kúʔsǎ òwén ówén
sól tǎ zhwù àlís ghè kúʔsǎ ò-wén ó wén
Sol P3 hear Alice 3SG praise c5-body AM 3SG
'Sol heard Alice praising herself'

2.2 Ordinary (potentially independent) pronouns

2.2.1 First, show that the pronouns can be independent by using them in a sentence where they do not have an antecedent. In the paradigms below, for example, the first sentence provides a context, and, for A10a,b the pronoun appears in the second sentence without an antecedent in that sentence, but referring to Abraham. The same test is made with first and second person pronouns in (A10c).

A10a) I spoke with Abraham yesterday. He saw Lela.

mà tǎ gàʔ yúwù ábràhám zón. ghě tǎ yèn léla
màtǎ gàʔ yúwù ábràhám zón. Ghè tǎ yèn léla
1S P3 speak with Abraham yesterday. 3S P3 see lela

"I spoke with Abraham yesterday. He saw Lela."

b) Where is Abraham? I saw him in the market.

ábràhám yê. mà yì yèn ó wén á wón
ábràhám yê. Mà yì yèn ó-wén á wón
Abraham where 1S P2 see c5-him LOC market

"Where is Abraham? I saw him in the market."

c) We saw you. Did you see me/us?

yè(sǎ) yì yen wù. wù yì yèn mô/yés à
yè(sǎ) yì yen wù. Wù yì yèn mô/yés à
1P P2 see you. 2S P2 see me/us question

"We saw you. Did you see me/us?"

2.2.2 If your language has more than one type of pronouns (e.g., null, clitic and non-clitic pronouns, strong, or stressable pronouns, etc.), list each type with examples.

Subject pronouns: mà 'I', wù 'you', ghè 'he/she/it', yès 'we', ghèŋ 'you', vèwê 'they'

Object pronouns: mò 'me', wù 'you', wén 'him/her/it', yès 'us', ghèŋ 'you', vèwê 'them'

Indirect object: mò 'mine', wù 'you', wén 'him/her/it', yès 'us', ghèŋ 'you', vèwê 'them'

Possessive (noun class 7): khóm 'mine', kyè 'yours', kówén 'his/hers/its', kyés 'ours', khón

‘yours’, kónwô ‘theirs’

Prepositional object: à mò ‘me’, à wù ‘you’, á wén ‘him/her/it’, à yès ‘us’, à ghèḡ ‘you’, à vèwô ‘them’

Note: [a] is toneless and gets its tone by spreading from the object pronoun.

2.2.3 Null arguments - If your language allows argument drop (null pronouns, or pro-drop) as a pronominalization strategy in simple (single clause) sentences, then name it here as an additional pronominalization option.

A10d) Ate fish. (meaning *he/she/they/it/we/you/I ate fish*)

* mpfɪʔlí shú

m-pfɪʔ-lí shú

P4-eat-P4 fish

‘Ate fish. (*he/she/they/it/we/you/I ate fish*)’

e) Hal hit (meaning *Hal hit him/her/them/it/us/you/me*)

*hal ḡghóm

hal ḡ-ghóm-é-lí

hal P4-beat-P4

‘Hal hit (*him/her/them/it/us/you/me*)’

f) Hal talked to (meaning *Hal talked to him/her/them/it/us/you/me*)

*hal ḡgáʔàlí à

hal ḡ-gáʔ-à-lí à

hal P4-speak-P4 to

‘Hal talked to (*him/her/them/it/us/you/me*)’

Comment: These sentences are unacceptable without overt subject and or overt object.

2.2.4 The use of otherwise independent pronouns for clausemate anaphora

Even if your language has a special strategy for local anaphora, as English does (e.g., the use of pronoun-*self*), we still need to know whether or not a simple pronoun, a pronoun that could be used in contexts like those in (A10a-c), could also be used to form a reflexive reading.

A10g) Ali praised him.

àlí ḡkúʔsólí wén

àlí ḡ-kúʔs-é-lí wén

Ali P4-beat-P4 3SG
'Ali praised him'

Comment: *wén* (3SG) above can only refer to someone else, not Ali. In other words, it cannot be used here to form a reflexive reading.

h) Ali liked him.
àlí ηkôηlí wén
àlí η-kôη-lí wén
Ali P4-like-P4 3SG
'Ali praised him'

Comment: *wén* (3SG) above can only refer to someone else, not Ali. In other words, it cannot be used here to form a reflexive reading.

i) Ali saw him.
àlí nyénlí wén
àlí n-yén-lí wén
Ali P4-see-P4 3SG
'Ali saw him'

Comment: *wén* (3SG) above can only refer to someone else, not Ali. In other words, it cannot be used here to form a reflexive reading.

j) Ali talked to him
àlí ηgá?àlí wén
àlí η-gá?à-lí wén
Ali P4-talk-P4 3SG
'Ali talked him'

Comment: *wén* (3SG) above can only refer to someone else, not Ali. In other words, it cannot be used here to form a reflexive reading.

k) Ali sent a book to him.
àlí ntímlí ηwà?lè á wén
àlí n-tím-lí ηwà?lè á wén
Ali P4-send-P4 book to 3SG
'Ali sent a book to him'

Comment: *wén* (3SG) above can only refer to someone else, not Ali. In other words, it cannot

be used here to form a reflexive reading.

l) Ali helped him

àlí ηgyámtəlí wén

àlí η-gyámtə-lí wén

Ali P4-help-P4 3SG

‘Ali helped him’

Comment: *wén* (3SG) above can only refer to someone else, not Ali. In other words, it cannot be used here to form a reflexive reading.

m) Ali surprised him

àlí ηkímsəlí wén

àlí η-kímsə-lí wén

Ali P4-surprise-P4 3SG

‘Ali surprised him’

Comment: *wén* (3SG) above can only refer to someone else, not Ali. In other words, it cannot be used here to form a reflexive reading.

n) Ali bought a book for him

àlí nzénlí ηwàʔlè á wén

àlí n-zén-lí ηwàʔlè á wén

Ali P4-send-P4 book to 3SG

‘Ali bought a book for him’

Comment: This could be interpreted to refer to Ali but it remains less natural.

o) Ali read a book about him

àlí ndzánəlí ηwàʔlè byì wén

àlí n-dzánə-lí ηwàʔlè byì wén

Ali P4-read-P4 book about 3SG

‘Ali read a book about him’

Comment: This could be interpreted to refer to Ali but it remains less natural.

p) Ali found a book near him

àlí nyénlí ηwàʔlè á wé(nə) bén

àlí n-yén-lí ηwàʔlè á wé(nə) bén

Ali P4-see-P4 book LOC 3SG side

‘Ali found a book near him’

Comment: This could be interpreted to refer to Ali but it remains less natural.

2.3 Reciprocal Readings

2.3.1 If you have already listed a reflexive strategy that can also have reciprocal meaning, provide an example here with a reciprocal translation.

Some children only help themselves.

vwón vátśávé é gyàmtè tà tèténté vówá(nó)
vwón vátśávé é gyàmtè tà tèt-wén té vówá(nó)
c2.child c2-some PRES help only C13-body AM 3pp
'Some children only help each other.'

2.3.2 As a means of assessing what sorts of reciprocal strategies your language contains, consider these typical sorts of reciprocal sentences in English. If a new strategy is involved (a special reciprocal form, or affix, or clitic or argument drop, or verb form, etc.), name it and give an example. (For argument drop, consider English *They argued*, which can be understood to mean that 'they argued with each other').

A11a) The women see each other.

kyĩ vyí yéná tèténté vówá(nó)
kyĩ vyí yén é tèt-wén té vówá(nó)
c2.woman c2.the see PRES C13-body AM 3pp
'The women see each other.'

b) The boys washed each other.

vwú lúmá vyí yî shù tèténté vówá(nó)
vwú lúmá vyí yî shù tèt-wén té vówá(nó)
c2.child c2.male c2.the P2 wash C13-body AM 3pp
'The boys washed each other.'

c) The men combed each other's hair.

lúmá vyí yî sàsè ètá é vówá(nó)
lúmá vyí yî sàs è-tá é vówá(nó)
c2.man c2.the P2 comb c8-head AM 3pp
'The men combed each other's hair.'

Comment: 'body' is not used with 'hair' as in (c) above.

d) They argued with each other.

vèwá yî tàmá (vówá vówá)

vəwá yí tàŋmá (vəwá vəwá)
 3P P2 argue (them them)
 ‘They argued with each other.’

Comment: KS: I see the 'them-them' phrase can be used with other verbs (A12b). Is it only used with verbs that can be understood as reciprocal in the absence of Agr-BODY AM PRN?

ANS: I think so.

e) The boys kicked each other.

vwú lúmá vyí yí chyè təwéntə vəwá(nə)
 vwú lúmá vyí yí chyè tə-wén tá vəwá(nə)
 c2.child c2.male c2.the P2 kick C13-body AM 3pp
 ‘The boys kicked each other.’

e) They hate each other.

vəwá bənə təwéntə vəwá(nə)
 vəwá bənə tə-wén tá vəwá(nə)
 3P hate C13-body AM 3pp
 ‘They hate each other.’

2.3.3 Oblique arguments - Continue looking for new reciprocal strategies by translating sentences like those in (A12), which involve reciprocals embedded in prepositional phrases.

A12a) The men introduced Bill to each other.

lúmá vyí yí jì? bíl à təwéntə vəwá(nə)
 lúmá vyí yí jì? bíl à tə-wén tá vəwá(nə)
 c2.manc2.the P2 show Bill to c13-body AM they

KS: Missing gloss.

‘The men introduced Bill to each other.’

b) The travelers spoke to each other.

ví?í jè?ə tə gə?à (vəwá vəwá)
 ví?í jè?ə tə gə?à (vəwá vəwá)
 c2.person walk P3 speak (them them)
 ‘The travelers spoke to each other.’

c) The priests heard stories about each other.

nshə?təshìsə zhú lí mətítì byì vəwé vəwá
 nshə?tə-shì-sə zhú lí mətítì byì vəwé vəwá
 priest-the-c10 hear P1 c6-story about them them

‘The priests heard stories about each other.’

d) They left presents in front of each other.

vəwá yì wà á-fó à vəwê shí

vəwá	yì	wà	á-fó	à	vəwê	shí
3P	P2	keep	c8-thing	LOC	them	front

‘They left presents in front of each other.’

e) We heard stories about each other.

yèsá zhú lí mətítì byì yès yès

yèsá	zhú	lí	mə-títì	byì	yès	yès
1p	hear	P1	c6-story	about	us	us

‘We heard stories about each other.’

f) You heard stories about each other.

ghèḅá zhú lí mətítì byì ghèḅ ghèḅ

ghèḅá	zhú	lí	mə-títì	byì	ghèḅ	ghèḅ
2p	hear	P1	c6-story	about	you	you

‘You heard stories about each other.’

2.3.4 Other persons and numbers, etc. If another, so-far unknown strategy is used in some persons or numbers, or special aspectual classes etc., name it here.

A13a) We saw each other.

yè(sá) yî yen táwé(ná) tyás(tá)

yè(sá)	yî	yen	tá-wé(ná)	tyás(tá)
1P	P2	see	c13-body	ours

‘We saw each other.’

b) You(pl.) must help each other.

ghèḅ dìʔí gyàmtə táwé(ná) tyáḅ(tá)

ghèḅ	dìʔí	gyàmtə	tá-wé(ná)	tyáḅ(tá)
2P	be	help	c13-body	yours

‘You(pl) must help each other.’

c) We will wash ourselves.

yè(sá) né shù táwé(ná) tyás(tá)

yè(sá)	né	shù	tá-wé(ná)	tyás(tá)
1P	F2	wash	c13-body	ours

‘We will wash ourselves.’

d) They always criticize each other.

vəwá nǎ gháʔá təwéntá vǎwǎ(nǎ)

vəwá nǎ gháʔá tə-wén tá vǎwǎ(nǎ)
3P always hold c13-body AM them

'They always criticize each other.'

e) Many boys kicked each other.

kəđɨŋ kǎ vwú lyúmǎ ɨʔǎlí təwéntá vǎwǎ(nǎ)

kə-đɨŋ kǎ vwú lyúmǎ ɨ-ʔǎ-lí tə-wén tá vǎwǎ(nǎ)
c7-lot AM c2.child male P4-kick-P4 c13-body AM them

'Many boys kicked each other.'

KS: Are A13a-e OK with reflexive interpretation here too? Is pronoun-pronoun and reciprocal interpretation possible here? If pronoun-pronoun is used here is it necessarily reciprocal in interpretation? Please give these examples again replacing body-pronoun with pronoun-pronoun and reporting the results.

JP: This is where Billy left off with data entry

2.3.5 Other clause types, and other strategies: Briefly consider various types of reciprocal embedded clauses; if a new coreference strategy can be used with some of them, name it here.

A14a) Sol says that Alice loves herself.

sól gǎʔ lá vwú kyǐ vyí ǎ kù təwéntá vǎwǎ(nǎ)

sól gǎʔ lá vwú kyǐ vyí ǎ kù tə-wén tá vǎwǎ(nǎ)
Sol speak that c2.child c2.female c2.the PRES love c13-body AM 3pp

'Sol says that the girls love each other '

b) Sol required that the girls praise each other.

sól tə gǎʔ lá vwú kyǐ vyí kúʔsǎ təwéntá vǎwǎ(nǎ)

sól tə gǎʔ lá vwú kyǐ vyí
Sol P3 speak that c2.child c2.female c2.the
kúʔsǎ tə-wén tá vǎwǎ(nǎ)
praise c13-body AM 3pp

'Sol required that the girls praise each other '

c) Sol thought the girls should praise each other.

sól tə kwòʔtə lá vwú kyǐ vyí kúʔsǎ təwéntá vǎwǎ(nǎ)

sól tə kwòʔtə lá vwú kyǐ vyí kúʔsǎ tə-wén tá vǎwǎ(nǎ)
Sol P3 think that c2.child c2.female c2.the praise c13-body AM 3pp

'Sol thought the girls should praise each other '

d) Sol asked the girls to praise each other.

sól t̃ə g̃əʔ á vwú kyĩ vyí la ṽəwó kúʔsá t̃əwéntá v́wé(ná)

sól t̃ə g̃əʔ á vwú kyĩ vyí la ṽəwó kúʔsá t̃ə-wén t́ v́wó
Sol P3 speak to c2.child c2.female c2.the that 3P praise c13-body AM 3pp
'Sol asked the girls to praise each other.'

e) The girls want to praise each other.

vwú kyĩ vyí é ká kúʔsá t̃əwéntá v́wé(ná)

vwú kyĩ vyí é ká kúʔsé t̃ə-wén t́ v́wé(ná)
c2.child c2.female c2.the PRES want praise c13-body AM 3pp

'The girls want to praise each other.'

f) Sol expects the girls to praise themselves.

sól é k̃əʔt̃ə lá vwú kyĩ vyí kúʔsá t̃əwéntá v́wé(ná)

sól é k̃əʔt̃ə lá vwú kyĩ vyí kúʔsá t̃ə-wén t́ v́wó
Sol PRES expect that c2.child c2.female c2.the praise c13-body AM 3pp
' Sol expects the girls to praise themselves. '

g) Sol heard the girls praising themselves.

sól t̃ə zhwù vwú kyĩ vyí v́ kúʔsá t̃əwéntá v́wé(ná)

sól t̃ə zhwù vwú kyĩ vyí v́ kúʔsá t̃ə-wéntá v́wó
Sol P3 hear c2.child c2.female c2.the 3P praise c13-body AM 3pp
'Sol heard the girls praising themselves. '

h) 'The girls heard Sol praise each other.'

vwú kyĩ vyí t̃ə zhwù sól kúʔsě v́wé(ná)

vwú kyĩ vyí t̃ə zhwù sól kúʔsě v́wé(ná)
c2.child c2.female c2. the P3 hear Sol praise 3pp

'The girls heard Sol praise each other.'

a) John made the boys wash themselves.

d̃zõyn t̃ə nè vwú lỹmá vyí shù t̃əwén t́ v́wé(ná)

d̃zõyn t̃ə nè vwú lỹmá vyí shù t̃əwén t́ v́wé(ná)
John P3 do c2.child c2.male c2.the wash c13-body AM 3SG

'John made the boys wash themselves.'

b) The boys made John wash themselves.

vwú lỹmá vyí t̃ə nè d̃zõyn shù t̃əwén t́ v́wé(ná)

vwú lỹmá vyí t̃ə nè d̃zõyn shù t̃əwén t́ v́wé(ná)

c2.child c2.male c2.the P3 do John wash c13-body AM 3SG
 'The boys made John wash themselves.'

c) The boys made John wash only them.

vwú lyámá vyí tà nè dzöyn shù tà vówé vówé
 vwú lyámá vyí tà nè dzöyn shù tà vówé vówé
 c2.child c2.male c2.the P3 do John wash only them them
 'The boys made John wash only them.'

KS: Is it the case that this sentence cannot be interpreted as reciprocal for the pronoun-pronoun strategy?

d) John made the boys wash only us.

dzöyn tà nè vwú lyámá vyí shù tà yès yès
 dzöyn tà nè vwú lyámá vyí shù tà yès yès
 John P3 do c2.child c2.male c2.the wash only us us
 'John made the boys wash only us.'

KS: Is it the case that this sentence cannot be interpreted as reciprocal for the pronoun-pronoun strategy?

2.4 Other types of local coreference

2.4.1 Possessives, alienable and inalienable - Please translate these sentences and provide the best gloss that you can. Is one of the strategies described above used?

A15a) Paul lost his shoes.

pól mmá lí gwúsé wén
 pól m-má-lí gwá-sé wén
 Paul P4-throw-P4 shoe-c10 his
 'Paul lost his shoes.'

b) Paul raised his hand. (e.g., in class).

pól ñkú?sá lí ká vú ká wén
 pól ñ-kú?sá-lí ká-vú ká wén
 Paul P4-raise-P4 c7-hand AM his
 'Paul raised his hand. (e.g., in class).'

c) Paul cut his hand. (e.g., accidentally)

pól ñshá lí ká vú ká wén
 pól ñ-shá-lí ká-vú ká wén
 Paul P4-cut-P4 c7-hand AM his

'Paul cut his hand. (e.g., accidentally).'

d) Paul examined his hand.

pól nlyélí kónú kówén

pól	n-lyé-lí	ká-vú	ká	wén
Paul	P4-look-P4	c7-hand	AM	his

'Paul examined his hand.'

e) Paul twisted his ankle (or 'stubbed his toe')

pól mbísàlí kówú kówén

pól	m-bísà-lí	ká-wú	ká	wén
Paul	P4-twist-P4	c7-foot	AM	his

'Paul examined his hand.'

2.4.2 Reflexives and reciprocals in nominals - Some languages use a different affix or form to establish a reflexive relationship inside of a nominal. Identify any strategies that can apply to nouns rather than verbs. (Other possibilities: self-destruction, self-help, etc.)

A16) Andrew's self-confidence annoyed Mary.

àkúʔsâ áwèn é ándrù yí zàf méri

à-kúʔsâ	á-wèn	é	ándrù	yí	zàf	méri
INF-raise	c5-body	of	Andrew	P2	annoy	Mary

'Andrew's self-confidence annoyed Mary.'

A17a) Andrew's introduction of himself impressed the teacher.

èsháʔtâ áwèn é ándrù yí bòn à njiʔsè

è-sháʔtâ	á-wèn	é	ándrù	yí	bòn	à	njiʔ-sè
INF-tell	c5-body	of	Andrew	P2	good	to	teach-c10

'Andrew's introduction of himself impressed the teacher.'

b) Andrew's evaluation of himself was too critical.

dʒì á ándrù lyé áwèn áwèn fá tsú yí tó

dʒì	á	ándrù	yí	lyé	á-wèn	á	wèn	fá	tsú	yí	tó
way	that	Andrew	P2	look	c5-body	AM	his	of	it	P2	strong

'Andrew's evaluation of himself was too critical.'

c) Their instructions to each other were not clear.

tè-sóʔ tá vówá vówá kô yì lán

tè-sóʔ	tá	vówá	vówá	kô	yì	lán
c13-law	AM	them	them	NEG	P2	clear

'Their instructions to each other were not clear.'

Comment: This example requires the pronoun-pronoun strategy instead of the body-pronoun strategy because it has only reciprocal meaning.

d) Their evaluations of each other were too generous.

dʒì á vòwé yì lyé t̀wéntá vówé(nó) fá tsú yì bwà?m̀è

dʒì	á	vówé	yì	lyé	t̀wén	tá	vówé	fá	tsú	yì	bwà?m̀è
way	that	3P	P2	look	c13-body	AM	their	of	it	P2	easy

‘Their evaluations of themselves was too critical.’

2.4.4 It would be useful to us if you could provide a list of the different strategies so we are both clear as to which ones you distinguish. This you may revise on the basis of new ones you come across in filling out the form, if there are any.

- The ‘body-pronoun’ strategy
- The ‘pronoun-pronoun’ strategy
- The ‘EMPH-pronoun’ strategy
- The null object strategy
- The simple pronoun strategy
- The *yì* strategy (logophoric?)

Part 3 General details about the strategies

3.1 Marking

3.1.1 We would like to focus for part of this section on the way strategies are marked in your language.

Marking Strategies for coconstrued interpretations

- Ma) Marking on a coconstrued argument or adjunct. (E.g., English *himself*)
- b) Marking on the verb or an auxiliary. (French clitic *se*, the Bantu reflexive marker)
- c) Coconstrual is marked by dropping an argument. (as in English *John washed*)
- d) Coconstrual is signaled by a specialized adjunct. (Such as *I’un l’autre* in (Y1)).

Comment: The body-pronoun strategy used in Kejom is (Ma) which is similar to the English reflexive ‘himself’.

KS: I would think that pronoun-pronoun would be of this class.

a) wàn yí nó ghò̀m̀è ówéná wén

wan	yí	nó	ghòmè	á-wén	á	wén
c1.child	that	HAB	beat	c5-body	AM	his

‘That child usually beats himself.’

b)	ghèŋ	dīíí	gyàmtè	tá-wé(nó)	tyáŋ(tá)
	2P	be	help	c13-body	yours

‘You(pl) must help each other.’

Comment: Sometimes the null object strategy (Mc) is used, marking the argument as null but obligatorily coconstrued with a coargument antecedent. This strategy is uncommon because it is usually incomplete requiring further explanation to what object NP is acted upon.

a) The travelers spoke to each other.

vííí jè?á tê gà?à (vówá vówá)

vííí jè?á tê gà?à (vówá vówá)

c2.person walk P3 speak (them them)

‘The travelers spoke to each other.’

b) They argued with each other.

vèwá yí tàŋmá (vówá vówá)

vèwá yí tàŋmá (vówá vówá)

3P P2 argue (them them)

‘They argued with each other.’

Comment: In these sentences the optional appearance of pronoun-pronoun is actually required for the reciprocal meaning to be understood.

KS: The pronoun-pronoun strategy needs to be presented as a separate strategy.

3.2 Productivity

3.2.1 How productive is this strategy, with respect to which verbs or predicates allow it? when you write up this section, indicate that the strategy in question is either *extremely productive*, *fairly productive*, or *I am not sure*.

Comment: The body-pronoun strategy is extremely productive, capable of being applied to nearly every verb. For example: kú?só ‘praise’, lyé ‘look’, kú ‘give’, báŋsá ‘frighten’, bàn ‘hate’, gà? ‘speak’, zhú ‘hear’, shè?tè ‘tell’, kòŋ ‘love’, ghá? ‘criticize’, dži?sè ‘teach’, tʃá ‘kick’, ghá? ‘hold’, gyàmtè ‘help’, shù ‘wash’, kímsá ‘surprise’, kòŋ ‘like’, ghòm ‘beat’, dži?

‘show’, dʒè? ‘walk’.

KS: How productive is the pronoun-pronoun strategy?

3.2.2 Is the use of this strategy lexically restricted to certain verb classes, or is it unrestricted (applies across all verb classes)?

Comment: The use of the body-pronoun strategy has a few exceptions. For example ‘body’ is not used when referring to action on body parts.

a) The men combed each other's hair.
lúmá vyí yî sàsè ètchú é vówá(ná)
lúmá vyí yî sàs è-tchú é vówá(ná)
c2.man c2.the P2 comb c8-head AM them

‘The men combed each other's hair.’

b) Paul examined his hand.
pól mbísèlí káwú kówén
pól m-bísè-lí ká-wú ká wén
Paul P4-twist-P4 c7-foot AM his

‘Paul examined his hand.’

KS: You mean his foot or his hand?

3.3 Context of Use

3.3.1 How marked or natural is this strategy?

Comment: The body-pronoun strategy is natural. This is the way people talk to each other in any context.

KS: What about the pronoun-pronoun strategy?

3.3.2 Is special intonation or emphasis necessary, and if so, where (e.g., is it on the morpheme that constitutes the marker for the strategy or is it a contour on the verb, or perhaps a special contour for the whole sentence).

Comment: No special intonation or emphasis is necessary for the body-pronoun strategy.

KS: What about the pronoun-pronoun strategy?

3.3.3 Is a particular discourse context (e.g., contradicting) necessary?

Comment: No particular discourse context is necessary for the body-pronoun strategy.

KS: What about the pronoun-pronoun strategy?

3.4 Morphology

3.4.1 Does the reflexive element, in its entirety, have a stateable lexical translation?

Comment: The reflexive or reciprocal element consists of ‘body-pronoun’.

We saw each other.
yè(sá) yî yen tówé(ná) tyás(tá)
yè(sá) yî yen tó-wé(ná) tyás(tá)
1P P2 see c13-body 1pp
‘We saw each other.’

3.4.2 If the term used as a reflexive or reciprocal can be used for a non-reflexive/non-reciprocal meaning, is it an ordinary noun that can be possessed by other pronouns?

Comment: ówén ‘body’ is an ordinary noun that can be possessed by other pronouns without changing its meaning.

3.4.3 If the reflexive element has clear syntactic and part-of-speech sub-structure (e.g., head and modifiers, determiners, possessives) show it here.

(a) Agreement features etc.

à-wén	ó	wén
c5-body	AM	3SG
tà-wén	tá	vówá(ná)
C13-body	AM	3pp

Comment: The presence of absence of (ná) does not have any semantic implications. This means that it may or may not occur but the meaning remains the same.

(b) Does this morpheme have a lexical meaning?

Comment: wén means ‘body’ and clearly makes reference to the people concerned in any discourse.

òwén ó dí?ó zhùtò
à-wén ó dí?ó àzhùtò
c5-body it must c5-rest
‘The body must get rest.’

dzöyn yì kòŋ əwén ə wén					
dzöyn yì	kòŋ	əwén	ə	wén	
John	P2	admire	c5-body	AM	3s
‘John admired her body.’					

3.5 The agreement paradigm

3.5.1 Give the morphological paradigm of each reflexive strategy. Be sure to vary all features that could cause the form of the reflexive to vary, even if some feature is only relevant in combination with a single combination of other feature values (e.g., include gender even if it is only relevant in nominative uses of the reflexive).

Body-pronoun strategy: əwénə ghómə, əwénə wú, əwénə wén, əwénə yésə, əwénə ghəŋə, əwénə vówánə, təwénə tyómtə, təwénə tyátə, təwéntə wén, təwénə tyéstə, təwénə tyəŋtə, təwéntə vówánə,

Pronoun-pronoun strategy: mò mò, wù wù, wén wén, yès yès, ghèŋ ghèŋ, vèwə vèwə.

KS: I have edited above – is it the way you want it? This might work better as a table with the feature values specified. Also, do we have any examples of pronoun-pronoun when it is not plural? If this strategy is uniquely reciprocal in interpretation, we would not expect them. Can you show that this does or does not occur (for all singular persons).

3.5.2 For each morphological feature, what determines its value? (For example, agreement with the antecedent, or agreement, in the case of possessives in some languages, with the possessed N.) In particular, for each agreement feature, indicate whether it must agree with the antecedent, or perhaps with something else, and whether it must do so (a) obligatorily, or (b) usually or optionally.

Comment: The value of the strategy is determined by agreement depending on the noun class of BODY. If it is singular (from noun class five) then it takes the noun class five agreement marker [ə] but if it plural (from noun class thirteen where class five forms its plural) then it takes the noun class thirteen agreement marker [tə].

KS: Would it be correct to say (a) that ‘body’ agrees in number, not noun class, with its antecedent, such that a plural antecedent requires the plural noun class for body, but (b) the pronoun agrees with the noun class of the antecedent? This is true for person, but are there

pronouns of any other class than what you call 3pp that occur with the body-pronoun strategy, or for that matter, any third person pronouns of any other noun class? The evidence in C18 suggests that there is no noun class distinction beyond plural and person.

KS: For the pronoun-pronoun strategy, is it ever the case that the pronoun agrees with its antecedent in noun class other than in person, or are all third person pronouns the same?

3.6 Interaction with verb morphology - Incompatibilities

3.6.1 Tense, Mood, Aspect.

It is sometimes observed that coconstrual strategies are sensitive to the tense, mood or aspect of a clause, particularly if the aspect (whether an event is complete or not) has other syntactic effects. If there is any sign that coconstrual for some strategy is blocked or peculiar for a given tense (e.g., simple past, habitual, generic), mood (such as subjunctive, if your language marks it), or aspect, please comment and provide examples. Check with at least the verbs meaning *see, praise, help, like, know, and wash*.

B3a) Gina (generally) washes herself

dʒínà nɔ́ nshù ɔ́wénɔ́ wén

dʒínà	nɔ́	n-shù	ɔ́-wén ɔ́	wén	
Gina	HAB	HAB-wash	C5-body	AM	her

‘Gina (generally) washes herself.’

b) Gina has washed/was washing herself.

dʒínà yí shù ɔ́wénɔ́ wén

dʒínà	yí	shù	ɔ́-wén ɔ́	wén	
Gina	P2	wash	C5-body	AM	her

‘Gina has washed.’

c) Gina should wash herself.

dʒínà shù ɔ́wénɔ́ wén

dʒínà shù	ɔ́-wén	ɔ́	wén	
Gina	wash.HOR	C5-body	AM	her

‘Gina should wash herself.’

Comment: Tense and aspect do not have any syntactic effect on the strategy (HAB = habitual aspect and HOR = hortative mood).

3.6.2 Grammatical Function (GF)-changing - Consider GF-changing constructions or operations in your language that affect the argument structure of a verb, adding, promoting, or demoting arguments. For example, passive, antipassive, stative, benefactive, applicative, etc. Manipulate the verbs meaning *talk to*, *give*, *visit*, and *kill*.

B4a) Gina killed herself.

dʒínà yì zhwì éwénó wén
 dʒínà yì zhwì é-wén é wén
 Gina P2 kill C5-body AM her
 ‘Gina killed herself.’

b) Gina was killed by herself.

dʒínà yì zhwì éwénó wén tà wén
 dʒínà yì zhwì é-wén é wén tà wén
 Gina P2 kill C5-body AM her by her
 ‘Gina was killed by herself.’

Comment: The extensions mentioned above do not occur in Kejom. Kejom is a somewhat isolating language and most of the constructions are expressed using separate lexical items rather than verbal extensions. There is no causative morpheme, no applicative, no passive, no middle, no impositive.

3.6.3 If you are aware of operations or morphemes that cannot co-occur with this strategy, then list them here, providing an example and a brief statement of what the incompatible morphemes or constructions are. So for example, if your language distinguishes accusative case from dative case, is one or the other case exclusively compatible or incompatible with a particular strategy?

Comment: Does not apply.

3.7 Uses that are not quite coreference

Are there other uses of this strategy, in which it does not express coreference between two arguments or adjuncts (e.g., like locatives or directionals)? Many languages use reflexive morphology for purposes not obviously connected to reflexivization. If so, explain and provide a few examples. Some frequent uses of reflexive strategies:

3.7.1 Idiosyncratic or inherent.

Comment: I am not aware of any verbs that lexically require a reflexive which does not correspond to an argument. There is nothing like 'behave oneself' or 'perjure oneself'?

3.7.2 Emphatic or intensifier.

B1c) John ate fish himself.

dʒǒyn yì pfiʔ shù fá wá ηgǒη
 dʒǒyn yì pfiʔ shù fá wén ηgǒη
 John P2 chew c9.fish by 3SG EMPH
 ‘John ate fish himself.’

Comment: There is no independent context where ηgǒη independently means something else.

d) John himself ate fish.

ηkà dʒǒyn yì pfiʔ shù
 ηkà dʒǒyn yì pfiʔ shù
 real John P2 chew c9.fish
 ‘John himself ate fish.’

Please translate (B1c,d). Which of the readings below are permitted? (English adverbial reflexives permit readings (C) and (D), but other languages permit (A) and (D) with forms that seem more like English *himself* than English *alone*.)

- A) John alone did this - i.e., only John and no other individuals did this.
- B) John did this alone - John was unaccompanied when he did this.
- C) John himself did this - John appearing in person did this (no one did it for him)
- D) John himself did this - Even John did this (e.g. Although you would not have thought

he

would, John also ate the crispy jellyfish)

Comment: (C) is most permitted. (D) can also be permitted marginally but will generally require n̂ ‘even’ at the beginning of the sentence. In other words, ‘even’ is required to obtain the meaning in (D) but not (C).

3.7.3 Middle. The argument structure of the verb is changed into a form that has an explicit patient, but no agent is present and an agent may or may not be implied.

kàkáj kyì ká pfǎ lí
 kà-káj kyì ká pfǎ lí
 c7-pan c7.the AM die P1
 ‘The plate is broken.’

Comment: There is no overt morphology marking for middles. In the following example the

speaker acts on the plate but reports it as if the plate broke itself.

3.7.4 Distributive, sociative, etc. Some strategies (reciprocal markers most frequently) can also be used to mean that some action was performed separately, or jointly, or repeatedly, etc. You should only report uses that do not involve coconstrual between two logical arguments.

lyámá vyí yì yèn mèrí á mú?ǎ
lyámá vyí yì yèn mèrí á mú?ǎ
c2.man c2.the P2 see Mary together
'The men saw Mary together.'

lyámá vyí lù á mú?ǎ
lyámá vyí yì lù á mú?ǎ
c2.man c2.the P2 leave together
'The men left together.'

3.7.5 Deictic use - If the current strategy involves a nominal form (e.g., English himself) Can this form be used when the antecedent is physically present or otherwise prominent, but has not been mentioned (such that X does not refer to Bill or Mary)? (Suggest a context if necessary).

B5a) Bill did not see X

bíl kô yì yèn ghǎŋ
bíl kô yì yèn ghǎŋ
Bill NEG P2 see 2pp
'Bill did not see you.'

b) Does Mary like X?

mèrí á kù wén à
mèrí á kù wén à
Mary PRES like 3SG QUES
'Does Mary like him/her.'

c) X went to the bank yesterday.

ghè tǎ djù á bán zón
ghè tǎ djù á bán zón
3S P3 go to bank yesterday
'He/SHe went to the bank yesterday.'

Comment: The 'body-pronoun' or 'self-(pro)noun' strategy can be used only if X has

been mentioned before otherwise X will be pointed to at that moment. For example, if we have been talking about Mary's misdeeds, it would be possible to say something like 'the elders criticized Agr-BODY AM Pron' where the reflexive refers to Mary? It is also possible to point to Mary if the speakers had not been talking about her but now wish to refer to her.

Can this form be used to refer to one of the participants in the conversation who is not otherwise mentioned in that sentence?

B6a) Bill insulted X. (X = speaker, X = addressee)

bíl yì télá mò
 bíl yì télá mò
 Bill P2 insult 1ps
 'Bill insulted me.'

b) Many people do not like anchovies, but X likes them.

(X = speaker, X = addressee)

ŋghóʔó víʔí kô kòŋ m̀ndéʔndéʔ m̀ shúsá áli wù kù
 ŋghóʔó víʔí kô kòŋ m̀-ndéʔndéʔ m̀ shúsá áli wù kù
 many c2.person NEG like c6-tiny AM fish-c10 but 2ps like
 'Many people do not like anchovies, but you like them.'

Comment: Only a noun or pronoun that has been mentioned in the sentence can be used in place of X. In this contrastive context, the direct object of *kù* can be dropped.

Comment: Is there really supposed to be a high tone on the "h"?

Can the form in question be used in a sense like that of English generic one (which is not evenly acceptable for English speakers in non-subject environments). Or is there a meaning that means "arbitrary person". There are otherwise local anaphors in Hindi, for example, that can have the latter usage.

B7a) I don't like the way he speaks to one.

mǎ kô kòŋ dʒì á ghə gàʔà à wìʔ
 mǎ kô kòŋ dʒì á ghə gàʔà à wìʔ
 1S NEG like way that 3S speak to c1.person
 'I don't like the way he speaks to one.'

b) One cannot be too careful

wìʔ kô zì ghè túʔmá djù m̀è
 wìʔ kô zì ghè túʔmá djù m̀è

c1.person NEG can 3S care go end
 ‘One cannot be too careful.’

c) Bill insults one before one can say a word.

bíl á télá wì? mímbú wì? sá gà? kènyù
 Bìll PRES insult c1.person before c1.person do speak c7-thing
 ‘Bill insults one before one can say a word.’

Comment: The form cannot be used. Rather wì? ‘person’ is used.

3.7.6 Focus.

Please translate these question-answer pairs. (Numbers are out of sequence here for a reason)

B15) Who did the farmers see?

ví?í àsím vyí yì yèn ndá
 ví?í à-sím vyí yì yèn ndá
 c2.person c5-farm c2.the P2 see who
 ‘Who did the farmers see?’

They saw *him*.

vèwé yì yèná wén
 vèwé yì yèná wén
 3pp P2 see 3SG
 ‘They saw him.’

(For example, the children are playing hide and seek in the yard, four girls and one boy, John. The farmers entered the yard but they only saw John).

B16) The farmers didn’t see Mary. They saw *him*.

ví?í àsím vyí kô yì yèn mèrí. vèwé yì yèná wén
 ví?í à-sím vyí kô yì yèn mèrí. vèwé yì yèná wén
 c2.person c5-farm c2.the NEG P2 see who. 3pp P2 see 3SG
 ‘The farmers didn’t see Mary. They saw *him*.’

Comment: B15 and B16 are correct if the addressee knows that John is the one referred to. Otherwise, John must be stated clearly.

3.7.7 Other. Are there other ways to use the strategy that do not express coreference (or reciprocal coreference) between two arguments? If so, give examples and a brief explanation here.

Comment: I can't think of any right now.

3.8 Proxy readings

One interpretation that the choice of coreferent strategy is sometimes sensitive to is proxy interpretation. A proxy reading is one where the coreferent argument is understood as a representation of or a "stand in" for the reference of the antecedent. This is often the case with statues, for example, or authors (e.g., Grisham) and their work. Feel free to substitute your favorite national author for Grisham.

B8a) Castro admired himself in the wax museum. (himself = statue of Castro)

b) Grisham has not read himself in Swahili, though he has read himself in Spanish. (himself = Grisham's writings)

The differences emerge in English for cases like those in (B9). Imagine that the wax museum is having a special event, which the wax statues of each celebrity will be washed and dressed by the celebrity they represent.

B9a) Castro washed himself carefully, so as not to damage the wax.

b) Castro washed carefully, so as not to damage the wax.

c) The movie star dressed herself carefully, so as not to damage the wax.

d) The movie star dressed carefully, so as not to damage the wax.

e) Castro saw himself in the show, but he didn't like what he saw.

Test for proxy readings in your language and see if there are instances where they are possible and others where they are not. Proxy readings do not require locality, so cases like B10a-c are also generally possible.

B10a) Grisham says he sounds better in Swahili. (where he = Grisham's writings)

gríshàm gà? lá yì nyò?ò á ñkàn á swàhílì

gríshàm é gà? lá yì nyò?ò á ñkàn á swàhílì

Grisham PRES say that him write well in Swahili

‘Grisham says he sounds better in Swahili’

b) Castro thought that he looked handsome. (he = statue of Castro)

kástrò ñkwò lá kəntyíf ká wèn é wén ká mbù

kástrò ñ-kwò lá kə-ntyíf ká wèn é wén ká mbù

Castro P4-think that c7-statue AM body of himself AM

nice

‘Castro thought that he looked handsome’

Proxy readings are also possible for reciprocals in many languages. For (B11a), once again the antecedents are the authors and each other describes the works these authors have written, such that Mark Twain did not read Victor Hugo's novels in Swahili and Victor Hugo did not read Mark Twain's novels in Berber. For (B11b), imagine a show where there are actors masquerading as our two protagonists. The first each other refers to the person Marlene and Castro, but the second each other refers to the actors (or statues) representing them on the stage or in the show.

B11a) Mark Twain and Victor Hugo did not read each other in Berber.

b) Marlene and Castro did not see each other in the audience, but they did see each other on the stage/in the show.

Comment: The strategies are not used for proxy readings in Babanki. Instead there is overt mention of the proxy element referred to, as can be seen in the following sentences. Notice that (a) is not acceptable (although it could mean that *Abong called himself*, which is unusual).

a) Abong read his book.

àbòŋ yì dzàŋ àwéná wén
 àbòŋ yì dzàŋ à-wén ó wén
 Abong P2 call c5-body AM 3SG
 *‘Abong read his book’

b) Abong read his book.

àbòŋ yì dzàŋ ŋwà?lè àwén
 àbòŋ yì dzàŋ ŋwà?lè à wén
 Abong P2 call c1.book AM 3SG
 ‘Abong read his book (Abong = author)’

3.9 Ellipsis

Consider the following examples, which all have an ellipsis of one sort or another. In (B12), there is missing structure that is parallel or identical to stated structure and it is interpreted as if it is there.

B12a) SHerman likes/praises himself more than Bill

b) SHerman likes/praises himself more than Bill does

Comment: B12b is not possible in Kejom

English permits both of these, though I suspect (B12b) may not be as widely available as (B12a). If not, then concentrate on (B12a). The following readings, where the Italicized portions are what is missing for (B12a,b) but can be interpreted as if it was there (which is what is meant here by ‘ellipsis’)

- i. SHerman likes/praises himself more than *SHerman likes* Bill.
- ii. SHerman likes/praises himself more than Bill *likes him* (= SHerman).
- iii. SHerman likes/praises himself more than Bill *likes himself*.

B12ai) Abong likes himself more than Ase.

àbòŋ ɔ̀ kù ɛ̀wéná wén tʃò àsè
 àbòŋ ɔ̀ kù ɛ̀-wén ɔ̀ wén tʃò àsè
 Abong PRES like c5-body AM 3SG pass Ase
 ‘Abong likes himself more than Ase’

aii) Abong cares for himself more than Ase.

àbòŋ ɔ̀ tùʔmè nɛ̀ ɛ̀wéná wén tʃò àsè
 àbòŋ ɔ̀ tùʔmè nɛ̀ ɛ̀-wén ɔ̀ wén tʃò àsè
 Abong PRES care with c5-body AM 3SG pass Ase
 ‘Abong cares for himself more than Ase’

aiii) Abong protects himself more than Ase.

àbòŋ ɔ̀ tʃíʔtə̀ ɛ̀wéná wén tʃò àsè
 àbòŋ ɔ̀ tʃíʔtə̀ ɛ̀-wén ɔ̀ wén tʃò àsè
 Abong PRES like c5-body AM 3SG pass Ase
 ‘Abong protects himself more than Ase’

aiv) Abong feeds himself more than Ase.

àbòŋ ɔ̀ zísá ɛ̀wéná wén tʃò àsè
 àbòŋ ɔ̀ zísá ɛ̀-wén ɔ̀ wén tʃò àsè
 Abong PRES feed c5-body AM 3SG pass Ase
 ‘Abong feeds himself more than Ase’

Comment: These ellipsis sentences are interpretable with all the readings i-iii.

PART 4 Exploration of syntactic domains

4.1 Clausemate coconstrual

The following questions will provide a broad outline of the types of predicates that allow the use of each strategy.

4.1.1 Verb class restrictions

4.1.1.1 Canonical transitives - Can this strategy be used with ordinary transitive verbs, such as the verb meaning "see"? Give some examples, including the following.

C1a) Bob saw X.

bôb yî yèn tǒm
bôb yî yèn tǒm
Bob P2 see Tom
'Bob saw Tom.'

b) The women described X.

kyǐ vyí yî shəʔtə byì nyàm yì
kyǐ vyí yî shəʔtə byì nyàm yì
c2.woman c2.the P2 tell about animal c9.the
'The women described the animal.'

c) You(pl.) kicked X.

ghəŋ yî tʃə tǒm
ghəŋ yî tʃə tǒm
2P P2 kick Tom
'You(pl.) kicked Tom.'

d) They praised X

vəwə yî kùʔsə fɔn ə vəwé
vəwə yî kùʔsə fɔn ə vəwé
3P P2 raise Fon AM their
'They praised their Fon.'

4.1.1.2 Commonly reflexive predicates - Can this strategy be used with verbs of grooming, inalienable-possession objects, etc? Give judgements on the following. Provide some additional examples of your own.

C3a) Donna washed X. (X = Donna)

dónà yî shù əwénə wén

dónà yí shù ò-wén ó wén
 Donna P2 wash c5-body AM her
 ‘Donna washed herself.’

b) Don cut X's hair. (X = Don).

dòn yí fâ? kà-tú kó wén
 Dòn yí fâ? kà-tú kó wén
 Don P2 shave c7-head AM his
 ‘Don cut his hair.’

c) The girl cut X [unintentionally] (X = the girl)

wàn wù-wì yì yí shè ówénó wén
 wàn wù-wì yì yí shè ó-wén ó wén
 c1.child c2-female c1.the P2 cut c5-body AM her
 ‘The girl cut herself [unintentionally].’

d) The dog saw X. (X = dog).

Bú yì t̃ yèn òwénó wén
 Bú yì t̃ yèn òwén ó wén
 C9.dog c9.the P3 see c5-body AM it
 ‘The dog saw itself.’

e) Sam helped X. (X = Sam).

sâm t̃ gyàm̃t̃ òwénó wén
 sâm t̃ gyàm̃t̃ òwén ó wén
 Sam P3 help c5-body AM his
 ‘Sam helped himself.’

KS: I would like these examples tested with pronoun-pronoun where the pronoun is singular please. I would like to know if singular pronoun-pronoun is possible, and if possible, is it favored or disfavored where singular body-pronoun is also available.

4.1.1.3 Psychological predicates. Please provide examples for verbs like those below, even if nothing exact seems appropriate for the current strategy, marking them according to the level of their acceptability based on the scale given above.

C4a) John hates/fears X

dzõyn ó bàñ/fwàñ m̃kúm
 dzõyn ó bàñ/fwàñ m̃kúm
 John PRES hate/fear c6-juju

‘John hates/fears jujus.’

b) John is ashamed of X

dzöyn é dzìʔsè kètá byì məkúm

dzöyn	é	dzìʔsè	kètá	byì	mè-kúm
John	PRES	burden	c7-head	because.of	c6-juju

‘John is ashamed of jujus.’

c) John is worried about X

dzöyn é kwòʔtè byì vètsón

dzöyn	é	kwòʔtè byì	vètsón	
John	PRES	think	because.of	c2-thief

‘John is worried about thieves.’

d) John is proud of X

dzöyn é sánlè byì məkúm

dzöyn	é	sánlè	byì	mè-kúm
John	PRES	happy	because of	c6-juju

‘John is proud of jujus.’

e) John worries/troubles/pleases X

dzöyn é kú ŋgáʔ à víʔí

dzöyn	é	kú	ŋgáʔ	à	víʔí
John	PRES	give	trouble	to	c2-person

‘John worries/troubles.’

f) John pleases X

dzöyn é nè wàn sánlè

dzöyn	é	nè	wàn	yì	sánlè
John	PRES	make	c1.child	c1.the	happy

‘John pleases the child.’

KS: My mistake. I wanted these with X=John and I would like you to try them with pronoun-pronoun and body-pronoun (but don't erase these examples).

4.1.1.4 Creation and destruction predicates. Provide examples in addition to (C5) using verbs of creation (e.g., "sew", "make", "form") or destruction (e.g. "kill", "eliminate", "make disappear").

C5a) The women will destroy X

kyí vyí né byípsó wán yì

kyǐ vyí né byípsó wán yì
 c2.woman c2.the F2 destroy c1.child c1.the

‘The women will destroy the child.’

b) The women will kill X

kyǐ vyí né zhwí wán yì

kyǐ vyí né zhwí wán yì
 c2.woman c2.the F2 kill c1.child c1.the

‘The women will kill the child.’

c) The women will make disappear X

kyǐ vyí né lyèsó wán yì

kyǐ vyí né lyèsó wán yì
 c2.woman c2.the F2 hide c1.child c1.the

‘The women will make the child to disappear.’

d) The machines built X (X = themselves)

mànshíng myí yì mbwòm táwéntá vówé(nó)

mànshíng myí yì mbwòm tá-wén tá vówé(nó)
 c6-machine c6.the P2 build c13-body AM them

‘The machines built themselves.’

e) The children formed lines X (X = themselves)

vwún vyí yì bǐ? vè-láin tà vówé(nó)

vwún vyí yì bǐ? vè-láin tà vówé(nó)
 c2-child c2.the P2 form c2-line by them

‘The children formed lines themselves.’

KS: Is body-pronoun possible here? Pronoun-pronoun?

f) The women will make oil for X (X = themselves)

kyǐ vyí né shìtê mánshi? à vèwá vówá

kyǐ vyí né shìtê mǎ-nshi? à vèwá vówá
 c2.woman c2.the F2 arrange c6-oil for them them

‘The women will make oil for themselves.’

KS: Is body-pronoun possible here? Simple pronoun?

4.1.1.5 Verbs of representation. Reflexive versions of these verbs include instances where individuals act on their own behalf, rather than have someone act in their name or for them.

C6a) The boys represented X.

vwú lúmá vyí yì ãímá à vèwé èzhí?
 vwú lúmá vyí yì ãímá à vèwé è-zhí?
 c2.child male c2.the P2 stand for 3p c5-name
 ‘The boys represented themselves.’

b) John spoke for X.

dzöyn yì gà? á zhí? ñkà wén
 dzöyn yì gà? á è-zhí? ñkà wén
 John P2 speak for c5-name self 3s
 ‘John spoke for himself.’

4.1.2 Argument position pairings

4.1.2.1 Subject-indirect object - The preceding questions asked mostly about subject-object coreference. Can this strategy be used to express coreference between a subject and an indirect object? Choose verbs that have an indirect object in your language.

C7a) Mary gave the gift to X (X = Mary)

mèrí tèt kù káfó kyi à ówén ó wén
 mèrí tèt kù káfó kyi à ówén ó wén
 Mary P3 give c7-thing c7.the to c5-body AM her
 ‘Mary gave the gift to herself.’

b) John showed the house to X (X = John)

dzöyn tèt dzì? ñgèñ yi à ówén ó wén
 dzöyn tèt dzì? ñgèñ yi à ówén ó wén
 John P3 show c9.house c9.the to c5-body AM her
 ‘John showed the house to himself.’

For comparison, also provide judgements for the following:

C8a) Mary gave X the gift (X = Mary)

mèrí tèt kù káfó kyi à ówén ó wén
 mèrí tèt kù káfó kyi à ówén ó wén
 Mary P3 give c7-thing c7.the to c5-body AM her
 ‘Mary gave the gift to herself.’

b) John showed X to the children (X = John)

dʒöyn tɛ dʒi? áwén á wén á vwún vyí
 dʒöyn tɛ dʒi? á-wén á wén á vwún vyí
 John P3 show c5-body AM her to c2.child c2.the
 ‘John showed himself to the children.’

Comment: the same strategy is used to express coreference between a subject and an indirect object.

4.1.2.2 Oblique arguments - Give some examples with oblique arguments, in whatever forms your language allows.

C9a) Dan talked to X.

dán tɛ gà? á mɛrí
 dán tɛ gà? á mɛrí
 Dan P3 speak to mary
 ‘Dan talked to Mary.’

b) Dan told Mary about X (X = Dan)

Dán tɛ gà? á mɛrí byì òwén á wén
 dán tɛ gà? á mɛrí byì òwén á wén
 Dan P3 speak to mary because.of c5-body AM his
 ‘Dan told Mary about himself’

c) Dan gave X a book.

Dán tɛ kù ŋwà?lè á mɛrí
 dán tɛ kù ŋwà?lè á mɛrí
 Dan P3 give c1.book to mary
 ‘Dan gave Mary a book.’

4.1.2.3 Subject-adjunct - Provide some examples of coreference between a subject and an adjunct, e.g., a locative PP. If appropriate translations are not prepositional objects, try to construct appropriate examples.

C10a) Mary saw a snake behind X (X = Mary)

mɛrí tɛ yén zhù á bà m è ŋkà wén
 mɛrí tɛ yén zhù á bà m è ŋkà wén
 mary P3 see snake LOC back of EMPH her

Comment: The morpheme *ŋkà* does not have an independent meaning. It is used before subjects

or objects to emphasize that it is specifically that subject or object referred to. In the examples above, it makes reference to the subject as opposed to the object.

‘Mary saw a snake behind herself.’

- b) Mary called me because of an article about X (X = Mary)

mèrí t̂ dzàŋ mò byì k̂nyù byì ŋkà wén

mèrí	t̂	dzàŋ	mò	byì	k̂nyù	byì	ŋkà	wén
Mary	P3	call	me	because of	c7-thing	because.of	EMPH	her

‘Mary called me because of an article about herself.’

- a) John offended Mary because of X (X = John)

dʒǒyn t̂ nè tyín é mèrí fwí byì ŋkà dʒòn

dʒǒyn	t̂	nè	tyín	é	mèrí	fwí	byì	ŋkà	dʒǒyn
John	P3	do	inside of		Mary	burn	because of	EMPH	John

‘John offended Mary because of himself.’

- d) We laughed because of X

yèsè yì tʃá? byì k̂ŋkón

yèsè	yì	tʃá?	byì	k̂ŋkón
we	P2	laugh	because.of	c7-foolish

‘We laughed because of foolishness.’

Comment: The EMPH-(pro)noun strategy is required to specify whether X refers to the subject or the direct object.

4.1.2.4 Ditransitives and double complements- Can the strategy be used to indicate coreference between the two non-subject arguments of a verb?. If there is more than one way to express the two non-subject arguments of a verb like "give", give examples for each type of construction. In English, for example, we would want examples both of the type "show Hal the book" and "show the book to Hal." (where X = Hal for C11a-d). For example, for (C11c), Bill gave Hal himself, which is admittedly pragmatically awkward, but imagine for (C11a) that Mary is showing Hal his image in the mirror - imagine Hal had never seen a mirror before.

- C11a) Mary showed Hal to X.

mèrí yì dʒì? hál á éwéné wén

mèrí	yì	dʒì?	hál	á	é-wén	é	wén
Mary	P2	show	Hal	to	c5-body	AM	him

‘Mary showed Hal to himself.’

Comment: To clarify, in this sentence, the body-pronoun construction can have the direct object as its antecedent.

b) Mary showed X to Hal.

mèrí yì dzì? òwénó wén à hál
 mèrí yì dzì? ò-wén é wén à hál
 Mary P2 show c5-body AM her to Hal
 ‘Mary showed herself to Hal.’

c) Bill gave Hal X.

bíl yì kù hál á ówénó wén
 bíl yì kù hál á ó-wén é wén
 Bill P2 give Hal to c5-body AM him
 ‘Bill gave Hal to himself.’

d) Bill gave X Hal.

bíl yì kù hál á ówénó wén
 bíl yì kù hál á ó-wén é wén
 Bill P2 give Hal to c5-body AM him
 ‘Bill gave Hal to himself.’

e) Mary told/asked the boys about themselves.

mèrí yì shè?tò/bòm á vwú lyúmá vyí byì tètántá vówó
 mèrí yì shè?tò/bòm á vwú lyúmá vyí byì tèt-wón tó vówó
 Mary P2 tell/ask to c2.child c2.male c2.the because of c13-body AM them
 ‘Mary told/asked the boys about themselves.’

f) Mary told/asked the boys about each other.

mèrí yì shè?tò/bòm á vwú lyúmá vyí byì vètá vówó
 mèrí yì shè?tò/bòm á vwú lyúmá vyí byì vètá vówó
 Mary P2 tell/ask to c2.child c2.male c2.the because.of them them
 ‘Mary told/asked the boys about each other.’

g) Mary showed/introduced/presented the boys to each other.

mèrí yì dzì? vwú lyúmá vyí à vètá vówó
 mèrí yì dzì? vwú lyúmá vyí à vètá vówó
 Mary P2 show/introduce c2.child c2.male c2.the to them them
 ‘Mary showed/introduced the boys to each other.’

Comment: It looks like the pronoun-pronoun strategy has a more reciprocal than reflexive reading. Therefore (g) would not be ok with the body-pronoun strategy.

4.1.2.5 Two internal arguments or adjuncts - Consider coreference between two arguments of adjunct NPs in the same clause, neither of which is a subject and neither of which is a direct object (if your language has such constructions - if not just say so and move on). Consider X = Hal in (C12). If I were answering for English, I would say that (C12c) is successful with the pronoun-SELF strategy, (C12b,d) fail with both pronoun-SELF and the independent pronoun strategies, and C12a is marginal with the independent pronoun strategy.

C12a) Bill talked about Hal to X.

bíl yì gà? byì hál á ñkà wén
 Bìl yì gà? byì hál á ñkà wén
 Bill P2 talk about Hal to EMPH 3s
 ‘Bill talked about Hal to himself (Bill or Hal).’

b) Mary talked about X to Hal.

mèrí yì gà? byì ñkà wén á hál
 mèrí yì gà? byì ñkà wén á hál
 Mary P2 talk about EMPH 3s to Hal
 ‘Mary talked about himself/herself to Hal.’

c) Mary talked to Hal about X

mèrí yì gà? á hál byì wén
 bíl yì gà? á hál byì wén
 Bìl P2 talk to Hal about 3s
 ‘Mary talked to Hal about him (Hal or some other person).’

d) Mary talked to X about Hal.

mèrí yì gà? á wén byì hál
 mèrí yì gà? á wén byì hál
 Mary P2 talk to 3s about Hal
 ‘Mary talked to him (Hal or some other person) about Hal.’

Comment: It is not possible for X to refer solely to Hal in the above constructions. X can refer either to the subject or the direct object or to someone else.

KS: Your comment is a little confusing. Do you mean to say that the pronoun can refer to Hal,

to Mary, or to some third person, equally well?

4.1.2.6 Clausemate noncoarguments

Possessives - Give examples based on the following sentences, and/or by constructing analogous examples from reflexive sentences from the previous sections. For each of (C13) and (C14), X = Nick.

C13a) Nick telephoned X's mother.

	ník	yì	lì	ηkà	wén		
ník		yì	dzàŋ	lì		ηkà	wén
Nick		P2	call	mother		EMPH	him

‘Nick telephoned his own mother.’

b) Nick combed X's hair.

	ník	yì	sàs	kótá	kó	ηkà	wén
ník		yì	sàs	ká-tá	kó		ηkà wén
Nick		P2	comb	c7-head	AM		EMPH him

‘Nick combed his own hair.’

c) Nick spoke to X's boss.

	ník	yì	gà?	à	tì	è-shè?	ηkà	wén
ník		yì	gà?	à	tì	è-shè?		ηkà wén
Nick		P2	speak	to	owner	c-5work		EMPH him

‘Nick spoke to his own boss.’

d) Nick put X's book on the table.

	ník	yì	wè	ηwà?lè	ηkà	wén	á	táblè
ník		yì	wè	ηwà?lè	ηkà	wén	á	táblè
Nick		P2	keep	c1.book	EMPH	him	LOC	table

‘Nick put his own book on the table.’

e) The king gave Nick a prize in X's village.

	fòn	yì	kǔ	ntá?	á	ník	á	é-ló?	ηkà	ník
fòn		yì	kǔ	ntá?	á	ník	á	é-ló?		ηkà ník
Fon		P2	give	prize	to	Nick	LOC	c5.village		EMPH Nick

‘The king gave Nick a prize in Nick's village.’

f) The boys washed X's face.

	vwú	lyúmá	vyí	yì	shù	è-kó?	ník
vwú		lyúmá	vyí	yì	shù	è-kó?	ník

c2.child c2.male c2.the P2 wash c5-face Nick
 ‘The boys washed Nick's face.’

C14a) Nick's father admires X.

tî ník é kù ník
 tî ník é kù ník
 c1.father Nick PRES admire Nick
 ‘Nick's father admires Nick.’

b) Nick's ambition destroyed X.

kúʔsê wèn é ník tâ byìpsé ñkà wén
 kúʔsê wèn é ník tâ byìpsé ñkà wén
 lift body of Nick P3 destroy EMPH him
 ‘Nick's ambition destroyed Nick himself.’

c) Nick's mother sold X's car.

lì ník tâ bàʔlò mántù mà ník
 lì ník tâ bàʔlò mǎ-ntù mà ník
 c1.mother Nick P3 sell c6-car AM Nick
 ‘Nick's mother sold Nick's car.’

Comment: The EMPH-(pro)noun strategy is necessary to specify that X refers to either the subject or the direct object.

KS: I am not sure which sentences this comment applies to. Please clarify. Also, for (C14c), please add sentences that replace the second ‘Nick’ with a pronoun, with EMPH-pronoun, body-pronoun, and pronoun-pronoun, and tell me which ones work, please.

Please provide translations and judgments for the following examples where the plural pronoun is coconstrued with the boys or the politicians.

X20a) The boys saw pictures of themselves/each other/them

vwú lyúmá vyí yì yèn èndéndém má ñkà vèwé
 vwú lyúmá vyí yì yèn è-ndéndém má ñkà vèwé
 c2.child c2.male c2.the P2 see c8-picture AM EMPH them
 ‘The boys saw pictures of themselves/each other/them.’

Comment: In (X20a), the EMPH-(pro)noun strategy refers to the subject.

KS: Is this sentence OK with pronoun-pronoun or body-pronoun (with reflexive interpretation) in place of EMPH-pronoun? It would be useful to have those sentences as well. Same for X20b.

b) Mary told the boys about pictures of themselves/each other/them

mèrí yì shèʔtə á vwú lyúmá vyí byì èndéndém má ñkà vèwé
 Mèrí yì shèʔtə á vwú lyúmá vyí yì yèn è-ndéndém má ñkà vèwé
 Mary P2 tell to c2.child c2.male c2.the P2 see c8-picture AM EMPH them
 ‘Mary told the boys about pictures of themselves/each other/them.’

c) The politicians planned attacks against each other.

víʔí pólítìk vyí yì wè tásón tà vèwé vèwé
 víʔí pólítìk vyí yì wè tásón tà vèwé vèwé
 c2.person politics c2.the P2 keep c13-fight with them them
 ‘The politicians planned attacks against each other’

d) The politicians faked/simulated attacks against themselves/them.

víʔí pólítìk vyí yì wè nlóptá tásón tà vèwé vèwé
 víʔí pólítìk vyí yì wè nlóptá tásón tà vèwé vèwé
 c2.person politics c2.the P2 keep fake c13-fight with them them
 ‘The politicians faked/simulated attacks against themselves/them’

Comment: The ‘pronoun-pronoun’ strategy is restricted to reciprocal meaning. Both the ‘pronoun-pronoun’ strategy and the EMPH-pronoun strategy are acceptable for reciprocal readings but if there is need for emphasis then the EMPH-pronoun strategy is employed.

4.1.2.7 Demoted arguments - Refer back to the range of grammatical function-changing operations (such as passive, antipassive, applicative, possessor ascension, dative alternation) that you considered for section 3.6 (if you did that). For each one, construct some representative non-reflexive examples. Then apply each coreference strategy to various pairs of arguments and report their grammaticality status. It might be easier to go back to 3.6 to do what is asked there once you have done this section.

C15a) Polly was killed by herself.

pólí yì zhwì éwéná wén tà wén
 pólí yì zhwì é-wén é wén tà wén
 Polly P2 kill C5-body AM 3SG by 3SG
 ‘Polly was killed by herself.’

Comment: There is really no emphasis implied here. It simply says that the action was done on the subject by the subject itself. If there were need for emphasis then ñkà will be added.

b) Polly killed herself.

pólí yì zhwì éwéná wén
 pólí yì zhwì é-wén é wén

Polly P2 kill C5-body AM her
 ‘Polly killed herself.’

c) Polly was helped by herself.

pólí yì gyàm̀tè ówéná wén tà wén
 pólí yì gyàm̀tè-á-wén é wén tà wén
 Polly P2 help C5-body AM her by her
 ‘Polly was helped by herself.’

d) Polly helped herself.

pólí yì gyàm̀tè ówéná wén
 pólí yì gyàm̀tè é-wén é wén
 Polly P2 kill C5-body AM her
 ‘Polly helped herself.’

Comment: The argument structure of the verb is not affected.

4.1.3 Properties of antecedents

4.1.3.1 Pronouns, person and number - Consider all possible person/number combinations for the subject of the following sentence. (Once again, start with a predicate that allows use of the current strategy, if the verb meaning "see" does not). If there is any variation in judgements, provide examples for the entire paradigm. Otherwise, provide a couple of representative examples. However, in some languages, a strategy that works for singulars does not work for plurals (Danish, for example, shows such asymmetries), and in other languages, a strategy that works for third person does not work for first and/or second person. It is intended here that X is the pronoun or anaphoric reflexive strategy that would be coconstructed with the subject to produce a grammatical result.

C16a) I saw X.

mà yì yèn wù
 mà yì yèn wù
 1s P2 see 2ps
 ‘I saw you.’

b) I saw X.

mà yì yèn vèwê
 mà yì yèn vèwê
 1s P2 see 3p

'I saw them.'

c) You saw X.

wù yì yèn mó

wù yì yèn mó
2s P2 see 1ps

'You saw me.'

d) You saw X.

wù yì yèn yés

wù yì yèn yés
2s P2 see 1pp

'You saw us.'

e) It saw X.

ghè yì yèn mó

wù yì yèn mó
3s P2 see 1ps

'It saw me.'

f) It saw X.

ghè yì yèn yés

wù yì yèn yés
3s P2 see 1pp

'It saw them.'

Repeat with the following sentences, or other suitable examples from section 4.1.1.

C17a) I washed X

mà yì shù ghèn

mà yì shù ghèn
1S P2 wash 2pp

'I saw you.'

b) I hate X.

mà bàn è wén

mà bàn è wén
1S hate PRES 3SG

'I hate her.'

c) I told John about X

mà yì shèʔtè byì wù à dzǒyn
 mà yì shèʔtè byì wù à dzǒyn
 1S P2 tell about 2s to John
 ‘I told John about you.’

d) I saw a snake near X

mà yì yèn zhù à ghè(ηó) bén
 mà yì yèn zhù à ghè(ηó) bén
 1s P2 see c9.snake LOC 2p side
 ‘I saw a snake near you.’

e) I am liked by X.

ghè kù mò
 ghè kù mò
 3s.PRES like me
 ‘She likes me.’

Comment: The passive reading in C17e is not possible.

f) I telephoned X's mother

mà yì dzàŋ lì vèwê
 mà yì dzàŋ lì vèwê
 1s P2 call c1.mother 3p
 ‘I telephoned their mother.’

g) My father admires X

tí ghómá kù yès
 tí ghómá kù yès
 c1.father my PRES admire 1p
 ‘My father admires us.’

Comment: There are restrictions on the person/number combinations.

4.1.3.2 Animacy or humanity- If animacy plays a role in choice of strategy or if a strategy is restricted to human (or metaphorically human) entities, please give examples showing both success and failure of the strategy in a way that illustrates the difference.

C18a) History repeats X

fǎfǎfǎ fǎ bwìnsè èwéné wén
 fǎ-fǎfǎ fǎ bwìnsè è-wén é wén
 c19-story AM repeat c5-body AM it

‘History repeats itself.’

b) This type of fish cannibalizes X

kâ shù yèn á pfi òwénó wén

kâ	shù	yèn	á	pfi	ò-wén	á	wén
type	C9.fish	c9.this	PRES	eat	c5-body	AM	it

‘This type of fish cannibalizes itself.’

c) This machine destroys X (e.g., after you use it)

mànshíng mén á byípsá òwénó wén

mànshíng	mén	á	byípsá	ò-wén	á	wén
c1.machine	c1.this	PRES	destroy	c5-body	AM	it

‘This machine destroys itself.’

Comment: There is no distinction between animacy and humanity.

4.1.3.3 Pronoun types - If your language has more than one class of subject pronouns (e.g., clitic and non-clitic), repeat the tests of the previous section for each type. Also repeat for null pronouns, if applicable.

Comment: Not applicable

4.1.3.4 Quantifiers - Provide judgements for the following sentences, where X is a pronoun corresponding to the subject successfully, or X is the anaphoric (reflexive) strategy that achieves a reflexive (coconstrued) reading.

C19a) Every woman saw X.

nô kyĩ vòtsèmá yì yèn tòwéntá vòwê

nô	kyĩ	vò-tsèmá	yì	yèn	tòwén	tá	vòwê
all	c2.woman	c2-all	P2	see	c13-body	AM	them

‘Every woman saw themselves.’

b) Every child washed X.

nô vwún vòtsèmá yì shù tòwéntá vòwê

nô	vwún	vò-tsèmá	yì	shù	tòwén	tá	vòwê
all	c2.child	c2-all	P2	wash	c13-body	AM	them

‘Every child washed themselves.’

c) Every student hates X.

nô vwúndíó ñwà?lè vòtsèmá bànè tòwéntá vòwê

nô	vwúndíó	ñwà?lè	vò-tsèmá	bàn è	tòwén	tá	vòwê
----	---------	--------	----------	-------	-------	----	------

all c2.child c1-book c2-all hate PRES c13-body AM them
 ‘Every student hates themselves.’

d) Every child saw a snake near X.

nô vwún vè-tsémá yì yèn zhù à vèwê bén
 all c2.child c2-all P2 see snake at their side
 ‘Every child saw a snake near themselves.’

e) Every child telephoned X's mother.

nô vwún vè-tsémá yì dzàŋ lì ŋkà vèwê
 all c2.child c2-all P2 call c1.mother EMPH their
 ‘Every child called their own mother.’

f) Every child's father admires X.

nô vèti vévwúná vè-tsémá é shímtè vwú vèwê
 all c2-father SM c2.child c2-all PRES admire c2.child their
 ‘Every child's father admires their children.’

Repeat, replacing the quantifier "Every N" with "No N", and if any quantified antecedents behave differently from these, please provide the same paradigm.

g) No woman saw X.

nô tà wùwí kó yì yèn è-wén é wén
 all only c2-woman NEG P2 see c5-body AM her
 ‘No woman saw herself.’

h) No child washed X.

nô tà wàné kó yì shù è-wén é wén
 all only c1-child NEG P2 wash c5-body AM him
 ‘No washed himself.’

i) No student hates X.

nô tà wándiè ŋwà?lè kó bànè èwén é wén
 all only c1.child c1.book not hate c5-body AM them
 ‘No student hates himself.’

j) No child saw a snake near X.

nô tà wándìè kó yì yèn zhù á wé(nó) bén
 nô tà wándìè kó yì yèn zhù á wé(nó) bén
 all only c1.child NEG P2 see snake LOC her side
 ‘No child saw a snake near herself.’

k) No child telephoned X's mother.

nô tà wàné kó yì dzàŋ lì ŋkà wèwê
 nô tà wàné kó yì dzàŋ lì ŋkà wén
 all only c1.child NEG P2 call c1.mother EMPH their
 ‘No child telephoned her mother’

l) No child's father admires X.

nô tà tì wàné kó kù wyé wén
 nô tà tì wàné kó shímtè wyé wén
 all only c2-father c1.child NEG admire c1.child his
 ‘No child’s father admires his child.’

Comment: The quantifiers seem to behave in an identical manner. The body-self strategy dominates and the EMPH-(pro)noun strategy is necessary to specify that the ‘mother’ referred to in (e) and (k) is strictly that of the child(ren).

4.1.3.5 Questioned antecedents - As in (C19), X is coreferent with the wh-word in all of the following (if C20e is possible in your language). If your language leaves question words in situ, translate accordingly, and if your language allows both in situ and fronted questions, then provide examples of both possibilities and judgments for each of the coreference strategies.

C20a) Who saw X?

à yì yèn ndó nyén ndě
 à yì yèn ndó n-yén ndě
 QUES P2 see who PST-see who.QUES
 ‘Who saw who?’

b) Who washed X?

à yì shù ndó nshú ndě
 à yì shù ndó n-shú ndě
 QUES P2 wash who PST-wash who.QUES
 ‘Who washed who?’

c) Who saw a snake near X?

à yì yèn ndó nyén zhù á bé(nè) ndè

à	yì	yèn	ndó	n-yén	zhù	á	bé(nè)	ndè
QUES	P2	see	who	PST-see	snake	LOC	side	who

‘Who saw a snake near who?’

d) Who telephoned X's mother?

à yì dzàŋ ndó ndzáŋ lì ndè

à	yì	dzàŋ	ndó	n-dzáŋ	lì	ndè
QUES	P2	see	who	PST-call	c1.mother	who

‘Who telephoned whose mother?’

e) Whose father admires X?

à shímtè tì ndè shímtè ndè

à	shímtè tì	ndè	shímtè ndè
QUES	admire	c1.father	who admire who

‘Whose father admires who?’

Comment: Question words are fronted. (PST = general past tense and QUES = question mark.)

KS: Actually, what I wanted were examples like “who saw himself”, not a second wh-word. These are interesting and we will keep the sentences, but what I would like to know is whether all the strategies are unaffected by questioning of the antecedent. I would be interested to know also how “Whose parents saw each other” or “Which boys saw each other”, tested with both pronoun-pronoun and body-pronoun turn out.

KS: It is not necessary for our project, but the distribution of question words is of interest to me. It looks like questions leave the questioned constituent in place and the sentence is marked as a question by the particle á. Is this correct?

4.1.3.6 Reverse binding - In the following examples, the full NP ('antecedent') appears in the lower (prototypically, object) position..

C21a) X saw Fred.

*èwénó wén yì yèn fréd

è-wén	ó	wén	yì	yèn	fréd
c-5 body	AM	his	P2	see	Fred

*‘himself saw Fred’

b) X saw us. (X = us)

*èwénó yésó yì yèn yés

tè-wénó	tyésó	yì	yèn	yés
---------	-------	----	-----	-----

c-5 body AM his P2 see Fred

*‘ourselves saw us’

c) X saw a snake behind Fred.

*èwéná wén yì yèn zhù á bànmè fréd

è-wén á wén yì yèn zhù á bànmè fréd
c-5 body AM his P2 see snake LOC back Fred

*‘himself saw a snake behind Fred’

d) X impressed Fred

*èwéná wén yì kù?sá fréd

è-wén á wén yì kù?sá fréd
c-5 body AM his P2 raise Fred

*‘himself impressed Fred’

e) Bill spoke to X about Fred.

bíl yì gà? á èwéná wén byì fréd

bíl yì gà? á è-wén á wén byì fréd
Bill P2 speak to c-5 body AM his about Fred

‘Bill spoke to himself about Fred’

Comment: The reflexive refers to the subject, not the direct object.

f) Bill told X about Fred

bíl yì gà? á èwéná wén byì fréd

bíl yì gà? á è-wén á wén byì fréd
Bill P2 speak to c-5 body AM his about Fred

‘Bill told himself about Fred’

Comment: The reflexive refers to the subject, not the direct object.

g) X was praised by Fred.

fréd yì kù?sá èwéná wén

fréd yì kù?sá è-wén á wén
Fred P2 raise c-5 body AM his

‘Fred praised himself’

Comment: Passivisation is not possible in Kejom.

h) X is liked by you. (X = you)

wú kù èwéná wù

wù kù è-wén á wù
you like c-5 body AM you

‘You like yourself’

Comment: Passivisation is not possible in Kejom.

If the current strategy permits a possessive position to be coreferent with its antecedent, please indicate if an anaphor or a pronoun is possible in the position of X, which should correspond to George in all of these examples.

C22a) X telephoned George's mother.

wú yì dzàŋ lì jós
wù yì dzàŋ lì jós
you P2 call c1.mother George
'You telephoned George's mother'

KS: What I wanted here was "He telephoned George's mother" where he = George. Could you provide that please? If it is not possible, it is useful for us to know.

b) X's mother wanted to improve George.

lì wù yî ñkǎʔǎ gyàmtá jós
lì wù yî ñkǎʔǎ gyàmtá jós
c1.mother you P2 want help George
'Your mother wanted to improve George'

KS: What I wanted here was "His mother wanted to improve George" where his = George. Could you provide that please?

c) X's mother worried/impressed George.

lì wù yî ñkúŋǎʔ/kúʔsǎ jós
lì wù yî ñkúŋǎʔ/kúʔsǎ jós
c1.mother you P2 worried/impressed George
'Your mother worried/impressed George.'

KS: What I wanted here was "His mother worried/impressed George" where his = George. Could you provide that please?

d) Mary told X's mother about George.

mèrí yî gàʔ á lì wén byì jós
mèrí yî gàʔ á lì wén byì jós
Mary P2 speak to c1.mother his about George
'Mary told his mother about George.'

e) A picture of X's mother fell on George.

fǎtù fǎ lì wén yì fān á wé(ná) jós
 fǎtù fǎ lì wén yì fān á wé(ná) jós
 c1.picture AM c1.mother his P2 fall on body George
 ‘A picture of his mother fell on George.’

f) A picture of X's mother pleased George.

fǎtù fǎ lì wén yì bàn á (wé(ná)) jós
 fǎtù fǎ lì wén yì bàn á (wé(ná)) jós
 c1.picture AM c1.mother his P2 nice on body George
 ‘A picture of his mother pleased George.’

Comment: The possessive position refers to the direct object of the sentence, which is neither George nor mother. **KS:** Can you say why it is necessary to have 'body' in (e) and why is it even optional in (f)? Is it because one is a physical event and one is a psychological event? **ANS:** You are right. It is surely optional in (f) because it is a psychological event.

In some languages, it is possible to scramble the positions of argument nominals so that objects can precede subjects, or perhaps the order of arguments in the VP is less fixed.

Comment: The word order is quite fixed and it is not common to scramble arguments.

4.1.4 Some matters of interpretation

4.1.4.1 Distribution, reflexivity and reciprocity - Select and translate a simple example illustrating the using a clausemate coreference strategy successfully, such as (C23).

C23) The women help X.

kyǐ vyí á gyamtè tǎwéntǎ vǎwê
 kyǐ vyí á gyamtè tǎ-wén tá vǎwê
 c2.woman c2.the PRES help c13-body AM them
 ‘The women help each other/themselves.’

Which of the following meanings can this example have? Say which it can have and which it can't have. We will say that if the form in place of X permits at least (C24a) or (C24f) as a reading, then the form in question permits a reciprocal interpretation.

C24a) Each woman helps all (or almost all) of the women, excluding herself.

b) Each woman helps all of the women, including herself.

- c) Each woman helps at least some of the other women.
- d) Each woman helps herself.
- e) The women together as a group help the women together as a group.
- f) Each woman helps one of the women other than herself, such that all of the women are helped by one of the others.

Comment: With either *tə-wén* *tə vówê* in place of X, (C24b, c, e) are possible. I have checked again but still think C24d is not possible.

KS: With the *them-them* strategy, if it is possible for C23, are all the same interpretations possible? (Please provide a translation of (C23) with 'them-them' and if it is ungrammatical altogether, please just mark it so)

C23b) The women help X.

* kyĩ vyí é gyamtə təwéntá vówé vówé
 kyĩ vyí é gyamtə tə-wén tá vówé vówé
 c2.woman c2.the PRES help c13-body AM them them
 ‘The women help each other/themselves.’

KS: What I meant was, is it possible to have *kyĩ vyí é gyamtə vówé vówé* with an appropriate reciprocal interpretation? If so, which of the scenarios in C24 are compatible?

Translate each of the following examples, which are compatible with collective action, and state their possible interpretations as above.

C25a) The women praised X.

kyĩ vyí tə kùʔsá təwéntá vówê
 kyĩ vyí tə kùʔsá tə-wén tá vówê
 c2.woman c2.the PRES raise c13-body AM them
 ‘The women praised each other/themselves.’

b) The women will support X.

kyĩ vyí né tómsá təwéntá vówê
 kyĩ vyí tə tómsá tə-wén tá vówê
 c2.woman c2.the PRES support c13-body AM them
 ‘The women will support each other/themselves.’

c) The women photographed X.

kyĩ vyí tə fâʔ təwéntá vówê
 kyĩ vyí tə fâʔ tə-wén tá vówê
 c2.woman c2.the PRES snap c13-body AM them

‘The women photographed each other/themselves.’

d) The women betrayed X.

kyĩ vyí t̃̀ bàʔl̃̀ t̃̀wéntá ṽ̀wê

kyĩ	vyí	t̃̀	bàʔl̃̀	t̃̀-wén	tá	ṽ̀wê
c2.woman	c2.the	PRES	sell	c13-body	AM	them

‘The women betrayed each other/themselves.’

Comment: The body-self strategy permits both reciprocal and reflexive meanings.

KS: I would like to have all of these with the pronoun-pronoun strategy.

4.1.4. b) Does the strategy allow the constructions where X is understood to be a reciprocal which has a plural antecedent consisting of John and Bill (i.e., it would be understood as "John and Bill saw each other"). Are both "see" and "meet" possible in (C27), or is only one sort of verb acceptable?

C27) John met/saw X with Bill (Meaning: "John and Bill met/saw each other.")

KS: Since we noticed earlier that 'argue' can be understood reciprocally in the absence of a direct object, I was wondering if there are any other verbs for which this is possible.

i) They met with each other.

ṽ̀wá yî bwùmt̃̀ (ṽ̀wá ṽ̀wá)

ṽ̀wá	yî	bwùmt̃̀	(ṽ̀wá ṽ̀wá)
3P	P2	meet	(them them)

‘They met with each other.’

ii) They fought with each other.

ṽ̀wá yî s̃̀n (ṽ̀wá ṽ̀wá)

ṽ̀wá	yî	s̃̀n	(ṽ̀wá ṽ̀wá)
3P	P2	argue	(them them)

‘They fought with each other.’

Comment: 'kiss' is not possible.

c) Is there any difference in the range of interpretations permitted for (C28a) as opposed to (C28b), or any difference in reciprocal strategies that support these interpretations? If so, tell us what you think the problem is and provide pairs like these for subsequent tests in this section (and let us know if male/female gender pairings introduce any complications).

C28a) John and Mary praised X.

dzöyn nè mèrí yì kùʔsá t̀wéntá v́wê
 dzöyn nè mèrí yì kùʔsá t̀- wén tá v́wê
 John and Mary P2 praise c13-body AM them
 ‘John and Mary praised each other.’

C28b) John and Mary praised X.

*dzöyn nè mèrí yì kùʔsá t̀wéntá v́wá v́wá
 dzöyn nè mèrí yì kùʔsá t̀- wén tá v́wá v́wá
 John and Mary P2 praise c13-body AM them them
 ‘John and Mary praised each other.’

b) The women praised X.

kyĩ vyí yì kùʔsá t̀wéntá v́wê
 kyĩ vyí yì kùʔsá t̀- wén tá v́wê
 c2.woman c2.the P2 praise c13-body AM them
 ‘The women praised each other.’

C28b) John and Mary praised X.

*kyĩ vyí yì kùʔsá t̀wéntá v́wê
 kyĩ vyí yì kùʔsá t̀- wén tá v́wê
 c2.woman c2.the P2 praise c13-body AM them
 ‘The women praised each other.’

KS: Please translate (C28a,b) with pronoun-pronoun and see if there is any preference vs. body-pronoun. Even a negative answer is useful.

Remarks: *In some languages, a different reciprocal is favored or required when the antecedent phrase refers to pairs (or perhaps distributed groups) rather than large pluralities.*

d) Can the strategy express reciprocity between a subject and an indirect object?

C29a) John and Mary spoke to X.

dzöyn nè mèrí yì gàʔ (à t̀wéntá v́wê)
 dzöyn nè mèrí yì gàʔ à t̀- wén tá v́wê
 John and Mary P2 speak to c13-body AM them
 ‘John and Mary spoke to each other.’

b) John and Mary met with X.

dzöyn nè mèrí yì bwùmtà (t̀wéntá v́wê)
 dzöyn nè mèrí yì bwùmtà t̀- wén tá v́wê

John and Mary P2 meet c13-body AM them
 ‘John and Mary met each other.’

c) John and Mary gave this book to X.

dzɔ̃yn nɛ̀ mèrí yì kù ɲwàʔlè yèn à tɛ̀wéntá vówê
 dzɔ̃yn nɛ̀ mèrí yì kù ɲwàʔlè yèn à tɛ̀-wén tá vówê
 John and Mary P2 give c1.book c1.this to c13-body AM them
 ‘John and Mary gave this book to each other.’

KS: Please give the pronoun-pronoun version of (C29c), whether it is good or bad.

e) Long-distance reciprocal readings - For any of the strategies that permit a reciprocal reading, can the following sentence be translated to mean "Bill thinks he likes Mary, and Mary thinks she likes Bill"?

C30) Bill and Mary think that they like X.

bíl nɛ̀ mèrí kwòʔtá lá vèwé kù tɛ̀wéntá vówé
 bíl nɛ̀ mèrí kwòʔtá lá vèwé kù tɛ̀-wén tá vówé
 Bill and Mary think.PRES that they love c13-body AM they
 ‘Bill and Mary think that they like themselves.’

Comment: It is possible with the body-pronoun. The other strategies, such as pronoun-pronoun, cannot be used.

4.1.4.3 Sociative readings

Please translate these sentences, more than one way, if possible. Please be sure to let us know if an of the reciprocal or reflexive strategies can be used to achieve these readings.

C31a) The baboons left together

ɛ̀tsím vyí yì lù á múʔá
 è-tsím vyí yì lù á múʔá
 c8-baboon c8.the P2 leave together
 ‘The baboons left together.’

b) The baboons ate fish together

ɛ̀tsím vyí yì mpfíʔ shúsá á múʔá
 è-tsím vyí yì mpfíʔ shú-sá á múʔá
 c8-baboon c8.the P2 eat fish-c10 together
 ‘The baboons ate fish together.’

Comment: The sentences can be said only in the above ways. The body-self strategy cannot be used to achieve the above readings.

4.1.4.4 Antipassive readings

C32a) That animal bites people.

nyàm yí lím é ví?í
 c9.animal that bite PRES c2.person

‘That animal bites people.’

b) The government arrests people.

gúmnà é gá?á ví?í
 c1.government PRES hold c2.person

‘The government arrests people.’

c) Bill praises people

bíl é kú?sé ví?í
 Bill PRES raise c2.person

‘Bill praises people.’

4.2 Cross-clausal binding

X4) John expects himself to win.

dzöyn é kwò?tè lá ñkà yì á zhí
 John PRES think that self him F1 win

‘John expects himself to win.’

KS: I still need an example with body-pronoun in the subject position. I realize that it is not acceptable (or at least I expect it is not), but, once again, we need sentences that show what is not possible.

KS: Throughout section 4.2, I would like you to consider whether the position of X can be Agr-BODY AM Pron, self-pron, or 'them-them' as well as a simple pronoun. I suspect that Agr-BODY AM Pron and 'them-them' are subject to locality restrictions, but I don't know for sure unless I have sentences showing that they are unacceptable when they are too far from their

antecedents. So if you can show that they are unacceptable for D1a-c (replacing *Jack* with *the men* so we have a plural antecedent) and for D3a-c (replacing *Jeff* with *the men* so we have a plural antecedent), then we can see if these forms, Agr-BODY AM Pron and 'them-them', are then local and you do not have to test all the other long distance cases in this section, especially if it looks to you like they will always be bad when anteceded from too far away.

I don't know how this will turn out for self-pron, however. My guess would be that it might not be subject to the same locality restrictions. If it is, then proceed in the same way as for

Agr-BODY AM Pron and 'them-them', but if not, and self-pron can be anteceded at a distance, then I need for you to fill in section xx as instructed below

4.2.1 Coreference relations across typical tensed clausal complement

4.2.1.1 Tensed complement, long distance relations, anaphor in situ - Please provide translations for all of these sentences where X is Jack.

D1a) Jack said that X is smart.

ják yì gà? lá yì líftə
 Jack P2 say that himself smart
 'Jack said that he is smart.'

b) Jack knows that George likes X.

ják é kílí lá jós kù è wén
 Jack PRES know that George like PRES him
 'Jack knows that George likes him.'

c) Jack knows that Bill said that X is smart.

ják é kílí lá bíl yì gà? lá yì líftə
 Jack PRES know that Bill P2 say that himself smart
 'Jack knows that Bill said that he is smart.'

d) Jack thinks that Lisa knows that Wendy likes X.

ják é kwò?tə lá lízà é kílí lá wéndì é kù è wén
 Jack PRES think that Lisa PRES know that Wendy PRES like PRES him

‘Jack thinks that Lisa knows that Wendy likes him.’

e) Jack thinks that Lisa knows that X likes Alice.

ják ó kwòʔtè lá lízà ó kílí lá yì kù è àlís

ják ó kwòʔtè lá lízà ó kílí lá yì kù è àlís
Jack PRES think that Lisa PRES know that himself like PRES Alice

‘Jack thinks that Lisa knows that he likes Alice.’

f) Sarah told Jack that Lisa loves X.

sárá yì shèʔtè á ják lá lízà ó kù wén

sárá yì shèʔtè á ják lá lízà ó kù wén
Sarah P2 tell to Jack that Lisa PRES like him

‘Sarah told Jack that Lisa loves him.’

g) Sarah told Jack that X loves Wendy.

sárá yì shèʔtè á ják lá ghó kù ó wéndì

sárá yì shèʔtè á ják lá ghó kù ó wéndì
Sarah P2 tell to Jack that he like PRES Wendy

‘Sarah told Jack that he loves Wendy.’

Comment: (wén) in (D1b, d, f and e) can be Jack or someone else.

h) The men said that X are smart.

lyámó vyí yì gàʔ lá vèwé ó líftè

lyámó vyí yì gàʔ lá vèwé ó líftè
c2.man c2.the P2 say that they PRES smart

‘The men said that they are smart.’

i) The men know that George likes X.

lyámó vyí ó kílí lá jós kù è vèwé

lyámó vyí ó kílí lá jós kù è vèwé
c2.man c2.the PRES know that George like PRES they

‘The men know that George likes them.’

j) The men know that Bill said that X are smart.

lyámó vyí ó kílí lá bíl yì gàʔ lá vèwé ó líftè

lyámó vyí ó kílí lá bíl yì gàʔ lá vèwé ó líftè
c2.man c2.the PRES know that Bill P2 say that they PRES smart

‘The men know that Bill said that they are smart.’

D2a) Jack admitted that Mary loved X.

ják mbyĩmó lá mèrí ŋkù wén

ják m-byĩmó lá mèrí ŋ-kù wén

Jack P4-accept that Mary P4-like him
 ‘Jack admitted that Mary loved him.’

b) Jack admitted that Mary loved X.

ják ηkílí lá mèrí ηkù wén

ják η-kí-lí lá mèrí η-kù wén
 Jack P4-know-P4 that Mary P4-like him
 ‘Jack knew that Mary loved him.’

c) Jack suspected that Mary loved X.

ják ηkwò?mè lá mèrí ηkù wén

ják η-kwò?mè lá mèrí η-kù wén
 Jack P4-suspect that Mary P4-like him
 ‘Jack suspected that Mary loved him.’

c) Jack thought that Mary loved X.

ják ηkwò lá mèrí ηkù wén

ják η-kwò lá mèrí η-kù wén
 Jack P4-think that Mary P4-like him
 ‘Jack thought that Mary loved him.’

Comment: wén = Jack or someone else. The distinction in the suppositions is determined by the verb used.

KS: Just to be clear, would body-pronoun be possible in any of the positions you have rendered with pronouns (where the antecedent is ‘Jack’)?

Please also test adjuncts, such as those in (D3), where X = Jeff.

D3a) Jeff complained about Mary when Ella blamed X

jóf ηkwùlè byì mèrí àndó èlà ηghá?á wén

jóf η-kwùlè byì mèrí àndó èlà η-ghá?á wén
 Jeff P4-complain about Mary when Ella P4-blame him
 ‘Jeff complained about Mary when Ella blamed him.’

b) Jeff returned home when/before/after X became tired.

jóf mbwìnè pfwó mímbú bwá?

jóf m-bwìnè pfwó mímbú bwá?
 Jeff P4-return home before weak
 ‘Jeff returned home before he became tired.’

c) When/before/after Mary wrote to X, Jeff returned home.

mímbú mèrí sá nyò? á jóf mú ghó mbwìnè pfwó

mímúbú m̀erí ś nỳd̀? á j́f mú gh́ m-bwìnè pfẃo
 before Mary do write to Jeff while he P4-return home
 ‘Before Mary wrote to Jeff, he returned home.’

d) Jeff left without Mary seeing X.

j́f nľ kă m̀erí nyénlí wén
 j́f n-ľ kă m̀erí n-yén-lí wén
 Jeff P4-leave NEG Mary P4-see-P4 him
 ‘Jeff left without Mary seeing him.’

e) Mary condemned Jeff without meeting X.

m̀erí mbyífsá ézhí? é j́f kă gh́ mbúmt̀lí wén
 m̀erí m-byífsá è-zhí? é j́f kă gh́ m-búmt̀lí wén
 Mary P4-spoil c5-name of Jeff NEG she P4-see-P4 him
 ‘Mary condemned Jeff without meeting him.’

f) The men complained about Mary when Ella blamed X

lyámá vyí ŋkẁĺ byí m̀erí àndá èlà ŋghá?á v̀wé
 lyámá vyí ŋ-kẁĺ byí m̀erí àndá èlà ŋ-ghá?á v̀wé
 c2.man c2.the P4-complain about Mary when Ella P4-blame they
 ‘The men complained about Mary when Ella blamed them.’

g) The men returned home when/before/after X became tired.

lyámá vyí mbwìnè pfẃo mímúbú bwá?
 lyámá vyí m-bwìnè pfẃo mímúbú bwá?
 c2.man c2.the P4-return home before weak
 ‘The men returned home before they became tired.’

h) When/before/after Mary wrote to X, the men returned home.

mímúbú m̀erí ś nỳd̀? á lyámá vyí mú v̀wé mbwìnè pfw̃
 mímúbú m̀erí ś nỳd̀? á lyámá vyí mú v̀wé m-bwìnè
 pfw̃
 before Mary do write to c2.man c2.the while they P4-return home
 ‘Before Mary wrote to the men, they returned home.’

Comment: When adverbs of time are used (wén) is omitted, as in (D3b).

KS: Once again, is body-pronoun bad in all the places where you have used a pronoun to achieve the coreference in D3a-g. If any cases are good, please provide example sentences for them.

We are naturally interested if there is any difference in the way that complements and adjuncts

behave.

Please do not forget to test reciprocal strategies in these long distance contexts (adjusting for plural antecedents), but if none of them work, it is not necessary to provide examples for all of them. Just let us know. However, if any of the distinctions above reveal contrasts such that some permit reciprocals and others don't please let us know and we will probably be interested in some follow-up questions.

Please also let us know if differences in gender, plurality or person make a difference for which strategy succeeds. For example, if you replace Jack in all of the Jack sentences with first person "I" or second person "you" does the pattern change in any way? If so, we will follow up about this in section 4.4, so set it aside for now.

Comment: Different antecedents, involving gender, plurality or person only induce change in agreement, not strategy.

KS: In particular, I would like to know if the 'them-them' strategy would work at a distance (across clause boundaries) with a reciprocal interpretation, such that a sentence like 'The two men think that Mary loves them-them' could mean 'Each man believes that Mary loves the other man'. If this is not possible with a simple plural pronoun, or 'them-them' or Agr-BODY AM Pron as an interpretation, please let me know that too.

h) The two men think that Mary loves them.

lyámá vyí vè-bò é kwò?tè lá mèrí kù è vèwé
c2.man c2.the c2-two PRES think that Mary love PRES them
'The two men think that Mary loves only them'.

i) The two men think that Mary loves only them.

lyámá vyí vè-bò é kwò?tè lá mèrí kù è tà vèwé
c2.man c2.the c2-two PRES think that Mary love PRES only them
'The two men think that Mary loves only them'.

j) The two men think that Mary loves them.

*lyámá vyí vè-bò é kwò?tè lá mèrí kù è vèwé vèwé
c2.man c2.the c2-two PRES think that Mary love PRES them them
'The two men think that Mary loves them'.

KS: Thanks. This shows that the pronoun-pronoun strategy is restricted as to how far pronoun-pronoun can be from its antecedent. One more such case: 'The two men think that each other is smart'. Is it possible with either pronoun-pronoun in the position of each other, or body

pronoun? Please provide sentences (starred, if necessary) for both.

4.2.1.2 Climbing from tensed complements - This test applies particularly to reflexives in close association with a verb, either as affixes or clitic pronouns, but there are some languages where a form of focus movement can place a more an argument-marked anaphor in a higher clause.

Comment: Not evident

4.2.2 Long distance relations and the variety of clausal embedding types

Consider what a list of major clause embedding types in your language would include. In English, it would include, besides tensed complements like those in the last subsection, infinitives, bare infinitives, gerunds, subjunctives (a lexically restricted class) and small clauses, each of which are illustrated in brackets in (X12).

- X12a) I hope [to leave]
I hope [for Bill to leave]
I expect [Bill to be unpleasant]
I persuaded Bill [to leave]
b) I made [Bill leave]
c) I saw [someone leaving]
d) I require [that he speak softly]
e) I consider [Bill unpleasant]

In this subsection, we want you to construct sentences along the lines of those presented for tensed clauses above adjusting for the different complement clause types allowed in your language (which may be radically fewer than those in English, or may involve types of complementation not found in English). Then test each clausal type for the success or failure of each coreference strategy.

For subjunctives, if your language permits them and if your language permits them to have lexical subjects, the tests can probably proceed on the model of tensed clause complements. However, some of these clausal types require some adjustments if they require null subjects. For example, in providing data for infinitives (if your language has infinitives), and where X = Edgar, we want you to give us a range of examples where the infinitive subject is not controlled by the matrix subject. In other words, the understood subject of the infinitive

(the understood giver or talker) should never be Edgar, but Bill (or else we will actually testing just a clausemate strategy instead of a long distance one). Thus in (D4a), for example, Bill is understood to be the one trusting, and we want to test whether or not X could be Edgar, and if so, which form makes the possible (in English, it is the otherwise independent pronoun him).

D4a) Edgar asked Bill to trust X.

étgà yì gà? á bíl lá ghè chósó wén
 étgà yì gà? á bíl lá ghè chósó wén
 Edgar P2 speak to Bill that 3s trust 3SG
 ‘Edgar asked Bill to trust him.’

b) Edgar asked Bill to give a book to X.

étgà yì gà? á bíl lá ghè kú ηwà?lè á wén
 étgà yì gà? á bíl lá ghè kú ηwà?lè á wén
 Edgar P2 speak to Bill that 3s give c1.book to 3SG
 ‘Edgar asked Bill to give a book to him.’

c) Edgar asked Bill to talk to X.

étgà yì gà? á bíl lá ghè gá? á wén
 étgà yì gà? á bíl lá ghè gá? á wén
 Edgar P2 speak to Bill that 3s speak to 3SG
 ‘Edgar asked Bill to talk to him.’

d) Edgar asked Bill to talk about X.

étgà yì gà? á bíl lá ghè gá? byì wén
 étgà yì gà? á bíl lá ghè gá? byì wén
 Edgar P2 speak to Bill that 3s speak about 3SG
 ‘Edgar asked Bill to talk about him.’

e) Edgar expected Bill to trust X.

étgà yì ηkwò?tè lá bíl chósó wén
 étgà yì ηkwò?tè lá bíl chósó wén
 Edgar P2 expect that Bill trust 3SG
 ‘Edgar expected Bill to trust him.’

f) Edgar ordered Bill to pay X.

étgà yì kǔ só? lá bíl ló? wén
 étgà yì kǔ só? lá bíl ló? wén
 Edgar P2 give order that Bill pay 3SG
 ‘Edgar ordered Bill to pay him.’

g) Edgar ordered Bill to say that X was smart.

étgà yì kǔ sǒ? lá bíl gá? lá yì n-líptè
 étgà yì kǔ sǒ? lá bíl gá? lá yì n-líptè
 Edgar P2 give order that Bill speak that him PST-smart
 ‘Edgar ordered Bill to say that he was smart’

h) Edgar ordered Bill to say that Mary loved X.

étgà yì kǔ sǒ? lá bíl gá? lá mèrí ηkǔ wén
 étgà yì kǔ sǒ? lá bíl gá? lá mèrí ηkǔ wén
 Edgar P2 give order that Bill speak that Mary PST-love him
 ‘Edgar ordered Bill to say that Mary loved him’

Comment: wén refers to Edgar in the above sentences. It can also refer to another person other than Bill who is known to the speaker and listener. yì in (D4g) refers to Edgar only.

If infinitives in your language permit lexical subjects, either by exceptional Casemarking, as in (D5), or by a more general strategy (in English tied to the complementizer for) as in (D6), please also provide examples of this type.

D5a) Edgar expects X to win.

étgà ǎ kwò?tè lá ηkà wén á zhí
 étgà ǎ kwò?tè lá ηkà wén ði?ǎ zhí
 Edgar PRES expect that self 3SG be win
 ‘Edgar expects himself to win.’

b) Edgar expects Bill to defeat X.

étgà ǎ kwò?tè lá bíl zhí (ηkà) wén
 étgà ǎ kwò?tè lá bíl zhí (ηkà) wén
 Edgar PRES expect that Bill win self 3SG
 ‘Edgar expects Bill to defeat him.’

D6a) Edgar hopes for X to win.

étgà ǎ kè?tè lá ηkà wén á zhí
 étgà ǎ kè?tè lá ηkà wén ði?ǎ zhí
 Edgar PRES hope that self 3SG be win
 ‘Edgar hopes for himself to win.’

b) Edgar hopes for Bill to defeat X.

étgà ǎ kè?tè lá bíl zhí (ηkà) wén
 étgà ǎ kè?tè lá bíl zhí (ηkà) wén
 Edgar PRES hope that Bill win self 3SG

‘Edgar hopes for Bill to defeat him.’

Comment: (ɲkà) wén in the sentences above can either refer to Edgar or somebody known to the speaker and listener.

D7a) Edgar expects Bill to defeat X's brother.

étgà ɔ kwòʔtè lá bíl zhí ləmè wén							
étgà	ɔ	kwòʔtè	lá	bíl	zhí	ləmè	wén
Edgar	PRES	expect	that	Bill	win	c1.brother	3SG

‘Edgar expects Bill to defeat his brother.’

b) Edgar hopes for Bill to defeat X's brother.

étgà ɔ kèʔtè lá bíl zhí ləmè wén							
étgà	ɔ	kèʔtè	lá	bíl	zhí	ləmè	wén
Edgar	PRES	hope	that	Bill	win	brother	3SG

‘Edgar hopes for Bill to defeat his brother.’

c) Edgar expects X's brother to defeat him.

étgà ɔ kwòʔtè lá ləmè wén zhí wén							
étgà	ɔ	kwòʔtè	lá	ləmè	wén	zhí	wén
Edgar	PRES	expect	that	c1.brother	3SG	win	3SG

‘Edgar expects his brother to defeat him.’

d) Edgar hopes for X's brother to defeat him.

étgà ɔ kèʔtè lá ləmè wén zhí wén							
étgà	ɔ	kèʔtè	lá	ləmè	wén	zhí	wén
Edgar	PRES	hope	that	c1.brother	3SG	win	3SG

‘Edgar expects his brother to defeat him.’

Comment: wén in (D7a-d) can refer to Edgar, Bill or any other person known to the speaker and listener.

D5c) Edgar X-expects to win.

d) Edgar X-expects Bill to defeat.

D6c) Edgar X-hopes for to win.

d) Edgar X-hopes for Bill to defeat.

Comment: Not possible

If your language permits small clauses, such as English John considers Mary intelligent, where intelligent is thus predicated of Mary, then try the following tests, where X = Tom.

D8a) Tom considers X intelligent.

tǒm é kwò?tè lá yì tóf é
 Tom PRES consider that him intelligent PRES
 ‘Tom considers himself intelligent.’

KS: Is this * with body-pronoun?

b) Tom considers Mary fond of X.

tǒm é kwò?tè lá mèrí kǔ wén
 Tom PRES consider that Mary like 3SG
 ‘Tom considers Mary fond of him.’

KS: Is this * with body-pronoun?

c) Tom considers Mary angry at X.

tǒm é kwò?tè lá mèrí fwísó tìn á wén
 Tom PRES consider that Mary burn heart for 3SG
 ‘Tom considers Mary fond of him.’

KS: Is this * with body-pronoun?

Comment: wén can be Tom or someone else known to speaker and listener.

Remember to test all strategies, reciprocal and reflexive, for all of the clause types you provide evidence for. Be alert to differences in the person of the antecedent, but save your evidence about such cases for section 4.4. Finally, provide paradigms like the Jack, Edgar or Jeff paradigms for any form of embedding that we have not discussed up to now.

Note: If your language permits verb serialization, special issues may arise for some of the questions we have been raising.

Comment: Verb serialization is possible

a) Alice cook eat the meat.

àlís pfè pfi? nyàm yì
 Alice cook eat c9.meat c9.the
 ‘Alice cook and eat the meat.’

b) Bill bought the meat. Alice cook eat the meat.

bíl yì zèn nyàm. àlís mpfè pfi?
 b́il yì zèn nyàm. àlís m-pfè pfi?
 Bill P2 buy c9.animal, Alice P4-cook eat
 ‘Bill bought meat and Alice cooked it and ate.’

a) Alice praises and promotes herself.

àlís é bwòmsó kú?sá òwén é wén
 àlís é bwòmsó kú?sá ò-wén é wén
 Alice PRES praise raise c5-body AM 3SG
 ‘Alice praises and promotes herself.’

In (a) it is more natural to have the object between the two verbs.

4.2.3 Backwards anaphora

succeeds where X is a pronoun or anaphor coconstructed with Oliver. Your language may not have a verb like implicate, but if so, try a verb that seems close, if possible. If your language does not permit clauses to be subjects without head nouns, then try something like “the fact that X was late upset Oliver.” *English permits the independent pronouns strategy to be used for such cases, but not all speakers like every example.*

D9a) That X was late upset Oliver.

kó yì zàf ólívà lá ghè yì vì á zhù chóghó
 kó yì zàf ólívà lá ghè yì vì á zhù chóghó
 it P2 pain Oliver that 3SG P2 come at time passpfí
 ‘It upset Oliver that he came late.’

b) That X was late suggested that Oliver was guilty.

àndé ghó yì vì á zhù chóghó kó yì nè ólívà ñkó? lá yǐ bvǐ lí
 àndé ghó yì vì á zhù chóghó kó yì nè ólívà ñkó? lá yǐ bvǐ lí
 because 3SG P2 come at time pass it P2 make Oliver look that 3SG fail P1
 ‘That he was late suggested that Oliver was guilty.’

c) That X was late made Oliver look guilty.

àndé ghó yì vì á zhù chóghó kó yì nè ólívà ñkó? sá ghè á bvǐ
 àndé ghó yì vì á zhù chóghó kó yì nè ólívà ñkó? sá ghè á bvǐ
 because 3SG P2 come at time pass it P2 make Oliver look as 3SG
 be fail

‘That he was late made Oliver look guilty.’

d) That X was late implicated Oliver.

àndó ghá yì vì á zhù chóghá ká yì nè ólívà ñkwén á ñgá?
àndó ghá yì vì á zhù chóghá ká yì nè ólívà ñ-kwén á ñgá?
because 3s P2 come at time pass it P2 make Oliver PST-enter into trouble
‘That he was late implicated Oliver.’

Comment: *yi* can refer to Oliver or the speaker.

KS: I do not understand the comment – do I have the right gloss for ‘yi’. It looks like a tense marker here.

Section 4.3 Principle C-type effects

In English it is not possible to interpret he = Malik or he = the boy in (E1), except in some exceptional discourse circumstances such as extra stress and/or focus (and then not for everybody). For all of these examples, give judgments that indicate whether or not it is possible in normal discourse circumstances for the pronoun to be either Malik or the boy.

- E1a) He criticized Malik.
- b) He said Mariam criticized Malik.
- c) He criticized the boy.
- d) He said Mariam criticized the boy.
- E2a) His mother criticized Malik.
- b) His mother said Mariam criticized Malik.
- c) His mother criticized the boy.
- d) His mother said Mariam criticized the boy.
- E3a) The man who he liked criticized Malik
- b) The man who he liked criticized the boy.
- c) The man who liked him criticized the boy.

Comment: It is not possible for the pronoun to be either Malik or the boy.

Now consider whether or not, in place of the pronoun, the name Malik could work as the antecedent for either Malik or the boy could work as the antecedent for the boy in the following sentences, again, paying attention to whether special discourse circumstances must be appealed to make the sentence sound natural (e.g., in English, (E4a) would sound natural if preceded by “Everyone criticized Malik. Bill criticized Malik, Mary did, and even Malik criticized Malik”, but this is one example of what I mean by a special discourse circumstance).

E4a) Malik criticized Malik

màlik yì ghàʔá òwénó wén
 màlik yì ghàʔá ò-wén ó wén
 Malik P2 criticise c5-body AM 3SG
 ‘Malik criticized himself.’

b) Malik said Mariam criticized Malik.

màlik yì gàʔ lá míriàm yì ghàʔ yí
 màlik yì gàʔ lá míriàm yì ghàʔ yí
 Malik P2 say that Miriam P2 criticise him
 ‘Malik said that Miriam criticized him.’

c) The boy criticized the boy.

wàn wùlím yì yì ghàʔá òwénó wén
 wàn wùlím yì yì ghàʔá ò-wén ó wén
 c1.child c1-male c1.the P2 criticise c5-body AM 3SG
 ‘The boy criticized himself.’

d) The boy said Mariam criticized the boy.

wàn wùlím yì yì gàʔ lá míriàm yì ghàʔ yí
 wàn wùlím yì yì gàʔ lá míriàm yì ghàʔ yí
 c1.child c1-male c1.the P2 say that Miriam P2 criticise him
 ‘The boy said that Miriam criticized him.’

E5a) Malik’s mother criticized Malik.

lì màlik yì ghàʔá wén
 lì màlik yì ghàʔá wén
 c1.mother Malik P2 criticise 3SG
 ‘Malik’s mother criticized him.’

b) Malik’s mother said Mariam criticized Malik.

lì màlik yì gàʔ lá míriàm yì ghàʔá wén
 lì màlik yì gàʔ lá míriàm yì ghàʔá wén
 c1.mother Malik P2 say that Miriam P2 criticise
 3SG

‘Malik’s mother said Mariam criticized him.’

c) The boy’s mother criticized the boy.

lì wàn wùlím yì yì ghàʔá wén

lì	wàn	wùlím	yì	yì	ghà?á	wén
c1.mother	c1.child	c1-male	c1.the	P2	criticise	3SG

‘The boy’s mother criticized him.’

d) The boy’s mother said Mariam criticized the boy.

lì	wàn	wùlím	yì	yì	gà?	lá	mírìàm	yì	ghà?á	wén
c1.mother	c1.child	c1-male	c1.the	P2	say	that	Miriam	P2	criticise	him

‘The boy’s mother said Mariam criticized him.’

E6a) The man who Malik liked criticized Malik

wi?	yì	á	màlìk	yì	kù	yì	ghà?á	wén
c1.person	c1.the	who	Malik	P2	like	P2	criticise	3SG

‘The man who Malik liked criticized him.’

b) The man who the boy liked criticized the boy.

wi?	yì	á	wàn	wùlím	yì	yì	kù	yì	ghà?á	wén
c1.person	c1.the	who	c1.child	c1-male	c1.the	P2	like	P2	criticise	3SG

‘The man who the boy liked criticized him.’

c) The man who liked the boy criticized the boy.

wi?	yì	á	ghó	yì	kù	wàn	wùlím	yì	yì	ghà?á	wén
c1.person	c1.the	who	3s	P2	like	c1.child	c1-male	c1.the	P2	criticise	3SG

‘The man who liked the boy criticized the boy him.’

Now consider whether the boy = Malik for the following examples

E7a) The boy criticized Malik.

wàn	wùlím	yì	yì	ghà?á	è-wén	ó	wén
c1.child	c1-male	c1.the	P2	criticise	c5-body	AM	3SG

‘The boy criticized himself.’

b) The boy said Mariam criticized Malik.

wàn	wùlím	yì	yì	gà?	lá	mírìàm	yì	ghà?	yì
c1.child	c1-male	c1.the	P2	say	that	Miriam	P2	criticise	him

‘The boy said that Miriam criticized him.’

c) Malik criticized the boy.

màlik yì ghàʔá òwénó wén
 màlik yì ghàʔá ò-wén ó wén
 Malik P2 criticise c5-body AM 3SG
 ‘Malik criticized himself.’

d) Malik said Mariam criticized the boy.

màlik yì gàʔ lá míriàm yì ghàʔ yí
 màlik yì gàʔ lá míriàm yì ghàʔ yí
 Malik P2 say that Miriam P2 criticise him
 ‘Malik said that Miriam criticized him.’

E8a) The boy’s mother criticized Malik.

lì wàn wùlím yì yì ghàʔá wén
 lì wàn wùlím yì yì ghàʔá wén
 c1.mother c1.child c1-male c1.the P2 criticise 3SG
 ‘The boy’s mother criticized him.’

b) The boy’s mother said Mariam criticized Malik.

lì wàn wùlím yì yì gàʔ lá míriàm yì ghàʔá yí
 lì wàn wùlím yì yì gàʔ lá míriàm yì ghàʔá wén
 c1.mother c1.child c1-male c1.the P2 say that Miriam P2 criticise him
 ‘The boy’s mother said Mariam criticized him.’

c) Malik’s mother criticized the boy.

lì màlik yì ghàʔá wén
 lì màlik yì ghàʔá wén
 c1.mother Malik P2 criticise 3SG
 ‘Malik’s mother criticized him.’

d) Malik’s mother said Mariam criticized the boy.

lì màlik yì gàʔ lá míriàm yì ghàʔá wén
 lì màlik yì gàʔ lá míriàm yì ghàʔá wén
 c1.mother Malik P2 say that Miriam P2 criticise
 3SG
 ‘Malik’s mother said Mariam criticized him.’

E9a) The man who the boy liked criticized Malik

wiʔ yì á wàn wùlím yì yí kù yì ghàʔá wén
 wiʔ yì á wàn wùlím yì yí kù yì ghàʔá wén
 c1.person c1.the who c1.child c1-male c1.the P2 like P2 criticise 3SG
 ‘The man who the boy liked criticized him.’

b) The man who Malik liked criticized the boy.

wi? yì á màlìk yī kù yì ghà?á wén

wi?	yì	á	màlìk	yī	kù	yì	ghà?á	wén
c1.person	c1.the	who	Malik	P2	like	P2	criticise	3SG

‘The man who Malik liked criticized him.’

c) The man who liked Malik criticized the boy.

wi? yì á ghó yī kù màlìk yì ghà?á wén

wi?	yì	á	ghó	yī	kù	màlìk	yì	ghà?á	wén
c1.person	c1.the	who	3s	P2	like	Malik	P2	criticise	3SG

‘The man who liked the boy criticized the boy him.’

d) The man who liked the boy criticized Malik

wi? yì á ghó yī kù wàn wùlím yì yì ghà?á wén

wi?	yì	á	ghó	yī	kù	wàn	wùlím	yì	yì	ghà?á	wén
c1.person	c1.the	who	3s	P2	like	c1.child	c1-male	c1.the	P2	criticise	3SG

‘The man who liked the boy criticized the boy him.’

Comment: The pronouns in (E4) and (E7) refer only to either Malik or the boy. In (E5, E8) and (E6, E9) they can mean Malik or the boy but can also refer to someone else.

4.4 More on long distance anaphor strategies

Strategies that allow coreference across tensed clause boundaries, but where the marked argument is one that is not a typical pronoun, we will call "long distance anaphor strategies", hereafter, LDA strategies. In some languages, the LDA form is the same form that is used in clausemate anaphora, while in some cases, the LDA form is that of a pronoun of a special type or else it is an anaphor of a type that may be used in a more local strategy as well (to form reflexives, for example) . In many other languages, such as English, there is no long distance anaphor, and the independent pronoun strategy is used.

If your language uses a special pronoun for LDA, it may be that the special pronoun has other uses. In some languages a special pronoun of this type is particularly required when referring back to the reported speaker or believer (a logophoric antecedent), as in D10.

D10) *John* believes *he* is guilty.

In other words, a language with this strategy would have a special morphological form for he just in case he refers to John (but not if it refers to someone else). We will call this a

"logophoric" pronoun strategy, and in some languages, this form of pronoun has only this use.. English does not have such a form, but if your language does, then we will eventually ask you more questions than those that are found in this section.

Comment: There is no special form.

4.4.1 Position of the antecedent - Long-distance coreference is often constrained in ways that local coreference is not (especially: subject-orientation). Which possible syntactic positions can be occupied by a long-distance antecedent of the current strategy? Construct examples and give judgments where X = Zeke. In English, the independent pronoun strategy is all that works for these (i.e., where X = he or him). If your language is like English, then the reflexive form does not work in the position of X where X = Zeke.

D11a) Larry told Zeke that Mike does not like X.

lári yì gà? á zèkè lá máìk ó kô kòṅè wén
 lári yì gà? á zèkè lá máìk ó kô kù wén
 Larry P2 tell to Zeke that Mike PRES NEG like 3SG
 ‘Larry told Zeke that Mike does not like him.’

b) Zeke told Larry that Mike does not like X.

zèkè yì gà? á lári lá máìk ó kô kòṅè wén
 zèkè yì gà? á lári lá máìk ó kô kù wén
 Zeke P2 tell to Larry that Mike PRES NEG like 3SG
 ‘Zeke told Larry that Mike does not like him.’

c) Zeke told Larry that X does not like Mike.

zèkè yì gà? á lári lá ghè ó kô kòṅ máìk
 zèkè yì gà? á lári lá ghè ó kô kòṅ máìk
 Zeke P2 tell to Larry that 3s PRES NEG like Mike
 ‘Zeke told Larry that he does not like Mike.’

d) Larry told Zeke that X does not like Mike.

lári yì gà? á zèkè lá ghè ó kô kòṅ máìk
 lári yì gà? á zèkè lá ghè ó kô kòṅ máìk
 Larry P2 tell to Zeke that 3s PRES NEG like Mike
 ‘Zeke told Larry that he does not like Mike.’

e) Larry knows that Zeke thinks that Mike does not like X.

lári ó kílí lá zèkè ó kwò?tè lá máìk ó kô kù wén
 lári ó kílí lá zèkè ó kwò?tè lá máìk ó kô kù wén

Larry PRES know that Zeke PRES think that Mike PRES NEG like 3SG
 ‘Larry knows that Zeke thinks that Mike does not like him.’

f) Zeke knows that Larry thinks that Mike does not like X.

zèkè é kílí lá lárì é kwò?tè lá máik é kô kù wén
 zèkè é kílí lá lárì é kwò?tè lá máik é kô kù wén
 Zeke PRES know that Larry PRES think that Mike PRES NEG like 3SG
 ‘Zeke knows that Larry thinks that Mike does not like him.’

D12a) Zeke's mother thinks that Mike does not like X.

li zèkè é kwò?tè lá máik é kô kù wén
 li zèkè é kwò?tè lá máik é kô kù wén
 c1.mother Zeke PRES know that Mike PRES NEG like 3SG
 ‘Zeke's mother thinks that Mike does not like him.’

b) Zeke's mother thinks that X does not like Mike.

li zèkè é kwò?tè lá ghè é kô kù máik
 li zèkè é kwò?tè lá ghè é kô kù máik
 c1.mother Zeke PRES know that 3s PRES NEG like Mike
 ‘Zeke's mother thinks that he does not like Mike’

c) Zeke thinks that Mike does not like X.

zèkè é kwò?tè lá ghè é kô kù máik
 zèkè é kwò?tè lá máik é kô kù wén
 Zeke PRES know that Mike PRES NEG like 3SG
 ‘Zeke thinks that Mike does not like him.’

d) Zeke's letter said that Mike does not like X.

ŋwà?lè zèkè yì gà? lá máik é kô kù wén
 ŋwà?lè zèkè yì gà? lá máik é kô kù wén
 c1.book Zeke P2 say that Mike PRES NEG like 3SG
 ‘Zeke's letter said that Mike does not like him.’

e) Zeke heard that Mary did not like X.

zèkè yì zhù lá mèrí kô yì kòŋ wén
 zèkè yì zhù lá mèrí kô yì kòŋ wén
 Zeke P2 hear that Mary NEG P2 like 3SG
 ‘Zeke heard that Mary did not like him.’

f) Zeke was told that Mary did not like X. (if your language permits passive)

D13a) Zeke said that X had dressed X.

zèkè yì gà? lá yí yí láfís é wén yí

zèkè yì gà? lá yǐ yî láfsó à-wénó yí
 Zeke P2 say that him P2 dress c5-body him
 ‘Zeke said that he had dressed himself.’

b) Zeke said that X had wounded X.

zèkè yì gà? lá yǐ yî lyòmsó à-wénó yí
 zèkè yì gà? lá yǐ yî lyòmsó à-wénó yí
 Zeke P2 say that him P2 wound c5-body him
 ‘Zeke said that he had wounded himself.’

c) Zeke said that X had tattooed X.

zèkè yì gà? lá yǐ yî lyòmsó à-wénó yí
 zèkè yì gà? lá yǐ yî màkó à-wénó yí
 Zeke P2 say that him P2 màkó c5-body him
 ‘Zeke said that he had tattooed himself.’

Comment: wén refers to Zeke but may also refer to someone else. The EMPH-pron strategy would be ok with the same interpretation in all of D11.

KS: I have lately been noticing that yí is used for coreference with the matrix subject when the matrix verb is ‘say’. Is this why wén is not used in these cases?

Consider potential antecedents in other non-subject syntactic positions, as allowed by your language (e.g., in English, John related to Bill that Mary had slandered him where Bill = him).

Comment: In all such cases wén still refers to either Bill or someone else and the EMPH-pron is also possible with the same interpretation.

4.4.2 Antecedent properties

4.4.2.1 Person - Please replace Zeke in the Zeke paradigm of 4.4.1 with first and second person pronouns, and report the results. Even if most of the examples pattern exactly as third person cases do, please be careful to include sentences corresponding to (D13) in the Zeke paradigm.

Comment: They pattern as third person case do as the (D13) paradigm shows:

D13a) I said that X had dressed X.

mà yì gà? lá mǎ yî láfsó à-wénó ghómó
 mà yì gà? lá mǎ yî láfsó à-wénó ghómó
 I P2 say that I P2 dress c5-body mine
 ‘I said that I had dressed myself.’

b) You said that X had wounded X.

wù yì gà? lá wǔ yí lyòmsó òwénó yó
 you P2 say that you P2 wound c5-body your
 ‘You said that you had wounded yourself.’

c) We said that X had tattooed X.

yè yì gà? lá yě yí lyòmsó tǎwénó tyéstá
 we P2 say that we P2 màkó c13-body our
 ‘We said that we had tattooed ourselves.’

4.4.2.2 Quantified antecedents - Review the examples in the Jack, Zeke and Edgar paradigms, replacing these names with "every child" and "no child" or "many children". Report all examples that differ in acceptability from the examples you have already provided for those paradigms. If there are no differences, just provide a few representative examples.

a) Every child admitted that Mary loved X.

nô vwún vètsèmá yì mbyímá lá mèrí ñkù vèwê
 all c2.child c2-all P2 accept that Mary P4-like 3pp

‘Every child admitted that Mary loved them.’

b) Every child thought that Bill trusted X.

nô vwún vètsèmá yì kwò?tà lá bíl yì chò?só wén
 all c2.child c2-all P2 think that Bill trust 3pp

‘Every child thought that Bill trusted them.’

c) Every child said that Mike does not like X.

nô vwún vètsèmá yì gà? lá máik kô kù vèwê
 all c2.child c2-all P2 say that Mike NEG like 3pp

‘Every child said that Mike does not like them.’

Comment: The pattern seems to be the same.

4.4.2.3 Split antecedents - Sometimes coreference is permitted when the antecedents for the

anaphor or pronoun are separate arguments. Please provide examples that correspond to those in the Ozzie (male) and Harriet (female) paradigm. In all cases, X = Ozzie and Harriet (together). For example, in English, (D14d) would be "Ozzie told Harriet that Bill dislikes *them*," where them would be Ozzie and Harriet.

D14a) Ozzie talked about Harriet to X.

òzìè yì gà? byì hárièt à vèwê
 òzìè yì gà? byì hárièt à vèwê
 Ozzie P2 talk about Harriet to them
 ‘Ozzie talked about Harriet to them.’

KS: Does this work with pronoun-pronoun (for reciprocal) or body-pronoun (reflexive)?

b) Ozzie talked about X to Harriet.

òzìè yì gà? byì vèwê à hárièt
 òzìè yì gà? byì vèwê à hárièt
 Ozzie P2 talk about 3pp to Harriet
 ‘Ozzie talked about them to Harriet.’

KS: Does this work with pronoun-pronoun (for reciprocal) or body-pronoun (reflexive)?

c) Ozzie told Harriet that X should leave.

òzìè yì gà? á hárièt lá vèwê lû
 òzìè yì gà? á hárièt lá vèwê lû
 Ozzie P2 talk to Harriet that 3pp leave.HOR
 ‘Ozzie told Harriet that they should leave.’

d) Ozzie told Harriet that Bill dislikes X.

òzìè yì gà? á hárièt lá bíl é kô kòŋ vèwê
 òzìè yì gà? á hárièt lá bíl é kô kòŋ vèwê
 Ozzie P2 talk to Harriet that Bill PRES NEG like 3pp
 ‘Ozzie told Harriet that Bill dislikes them.’

e) Ozzie said that Harriet thinks that Bill dislikes X.

òzìè yì gà? lá hárièt é kwò?tè lá bíl é kô kòŋ vèwê
 òzìè yì gà? lá hárièt é kwò?tè lá bíl é kô kòŋ vèwê
 Ozzie P2 talk that Harriet PRES think that Bill PRES NEG like 3pp
 ‘Ozzie said that Harriet thinks that Bill dislikes them.’

Comment: vèwê in these examples can refer to Ozzie and Harriet as well as to others including the listener and excluding the speaker. ŋkà can be added to lay emphasis on the (pro)noun without altering the interpretation.

4.4.2.4 Discourse antecedents - Sometimes, LDA strategies do not have to have antecedents in the same sentence if the discourse connections between sentences is strong. Please translate the following scenarios using only the acceptable strategies that permit the corresponding English pronouns all to refer to Mark (English allows only the independent pronoun strategy). Then give please tell us which strategies do not work, providing a translation and gloss, if it is significantly different from your acceptable translations of (D15) and (D16) (save time by setting aside cases where a given strategy could not ever work in the relevant grammatical position, e.g., English *himself* can never be the subject of a tensed sentence). Suppose that in the following scenarios we are being told what was going on in Mark's mind.

D15) Mark feared that his son was not safe. He was ashamed that he could not protect his closest relative. What would his cousins think of him?

	mák	yì	fwàn	lá	wyé	wén	yí	dí?	á	ngó?	kə-tá	kó	wén	kó	sə	dí?	lá	ghó	kô	zì	ghə	tú?má	nə	wì?	ngəŋ	wén.	və-ləmə	vó	wén	á	kwò?tà	lá	ghò?ò	byì	wén	á?		
Mark	P2	fear	that	c1.child	3SG	P2	be	LOC	c9.trouble	c7-head																												
AM	3SG	CON	be	heavy	that	3s	NEG	fit	3s	protect	with																											
c1.person	c9.house	3SG.	c2-kind	AM	3SG	SM	think	that																														

'Mark feared that his son was not safe. He was ashamed that he could not protect his closest relative. What would his cousins think of him?'

D16) Mark was shocked to see his picture in the paper. All of his supporters would abandon him. How would he tell his mother?

	ká	yì	chò	mák	lá	ghə	yì	yèn	fátù	fá	wén	á	ví?í	á	vó	tómsə	wén	á	nyín	ə	wén	ghó	lá	shə?tà	álé	à	lì	wén	á?									
it	P2	pass	Mark	that	3s	P2	see	c1.picture	AM	3SG	LOC																											
paper	c1.person	that	SM	support	3SG	CON	run	PRES	3SG	wì?																												
ghó	lá	shə?tà	álé	à	lì	wén	á?																															

3s CON tell how to c1.mother 3SG QUES

‘Mark was shocked to see his picture in the paper. All of his supporters would abandon him. How would he tell his mother?’

Comment: CON= concord marker. Only the independent pronoun strategy is allowed.

The following scenario concerns what Morris is reporting to us about Mark, where all of the English pronouns are understood as referring to Mark, not to Morris. Please translate using any (or every) strategy for coreference with Mark that works (including the independent pronoun strategy). Then give please tell us which strategies do not work, providing a translation and gloss, if it is significantly different from your acceptable translations of (D17). If your language permits null subjects understood as pronouns, don’t forget to consider that strategy.

D17) Morris said it was a difficult day for Mark. First, Morris told him that his car had been stolen. Then he had to hire a taxi to take him to work. Morris thought he might be angry.

mòrís yì gà? lá à yǐ ndí? kàtsí ká byíká á mák. mòrís yì gà? á wén lá vó yì tsòṅ mǎntù mǎ wén. ghě nló? mǎntù má mpfwó nè wén á wén gá. mòrís kwò?tè lá tyí wén fwílí.

mòrís	yì	gà?	lá	à	yǐ	n-dí?	kàtsí	ká	byíká	á	mák.
Morris	P2	say	that	it	P2	PST-be	c7-day	AM	bad	for	Mark.
mòrís	yì	gà?	á	wén	lá	vó	yì	tsòṅ	mǎntù	mǎ	wén.
Morris	P2	say	to	3SG	that	someone	P2	steal	c1.car	AM	3SG.
ghě	n-ló?	mǎntù	má	mpfwó	nè	wén	á	wén	gá.	mòrís	
3s	PST-pay	c1.car	AM	return	with	3SG	LOC	3SG	home.	Morris	
yì	kwò?tè	lá	tyí	wén	fwílí.						
P2	think	that	inside	3SG	burn						

‘Morris said it was a difficult day for Mark. First, Morris told him that his car had been stolen. Then he had to hire a taxi to take him to work. Morris thought he might be angry’

Comment: ñkà can be added to lay emphasis without altering the interpretation.

KS: Please remember to test self-pron referring back to Mark in these contexts.

Now suppose that Mark has recently been in the news and he is the topic of our conversation. Speakers A and B use pronouns to refer to him. Please translate using the strategy or strategies in your language that permit coreference with Mark. Once again, please tell us which

strategies do not work, providing a translation and gloss, if it is significantly different from your acceptable translations of (D18).

D18) A: Look, there's Mark!

yén mák á
 yén mák á
 see Mark EXCL
 'Look, there's Mark!'

B: He is so handsome.

ghè dì? nò ηgésè wì?
 ghè dì? nò ηgésè wì?
 3s be very nice person
 'He is so handsome.'

A: I would not want to be his wife though. All the women are chasing him.

mǎ kô zì mà kóη é ndí? wyí wén bwèn. nò kyĩ vètsèm é ká wén.
 mǎ kô zì mà kóη é n-dí? wyí wén bwèn. nò
 1s NEG want 1s like PRES PST-be wife 3SG NEG every
 kyĩ vè-tsèm é ká wén.
 c1.woman c2-all PRES chase 3SG

'I would not want to be his wife though. All the women are chasing him.'

B: Also, I think he praises himself too much.

áli mà kwò lá ghè kú?só èwéné wén nà ntó.
 áli mà kwò lá ghè kú?só è-wén é wén nà ntó.
 also I think that 3s praise c5-body AM 3SG too much
 'Also, I think he praises himself too much.'

In considering your responses to this subsection, are there any generalizations that you think would be of interest to us in understanding the circumstances or nuances of meaning that a given choice of coreference strategy might reflect?

Comment: wén refers to the person spoken about but also may refer to any other person known to the speaker and listener.

KS: Is body-pronoun generally possible or impossible in place of wén in these cases? You can just answer this with a list of sentence numbers where replacing the pronoun with body-pronoun would produce the same judgment.

4.4.3 Blocking Effects

The agreement features of nominals intervening between an anaphor and its antecedent can sometimes affect the grammaticality of coconstrual in some languages.

4.4.3.1 Features of intervening subjects - The following examples test for an intervening subject that is mismatched for person, gender, or number. Construct more examples if you suspect that other feature combinations are relevant in your language. In each case in (D19), X = Larry, unless designated otherwise. If the only successful strategy permitted here is the independent pronoun strategy, then please indicate this.

D19a) Larry thinks that John respects X.

lári kwò lá dzǒyn é fwà wén.

lári kwò lá dzǒyn é fwà wén.

Larry think that John PRES respect 3SG

‘Larry thinks that John respects him.’

b) Larry thinks that I respect X.

lári kwò lá mà fwà wén.

lári kwò lá mà fwà wén.

Larry think that Is respect 3SG

‘Larry thinks that I respect him.’

c) Larry thinks that Mary respects X.

lári kwò lá mèrí é fwà wén.

lári kwò lá mèrí é fwà wén.

Larry think that Mary PRES respect 3SG

‘Larry thinks that Mary respects him.’

d) Larry thinks that the boys respect X.

lári kwò lá vwú lyúmá vyí fwà wén.

lári kwò lá vwú lyúmá vyí fwà wén.

Larry think that c2.child c2.male c2.the respect 3SG

‘Larry thinks that the boys respect him.’

e) The men think that the boys respect X. (X = the men)

lyúmá vyí kwò lá vwú lyúmá vyí fwà vèwá.

lyúmá vyí kwò lá vwú lyúmá vyí fwà vèwá.

c2.male c2.the think that c2.child c2.male c2.the respect 3pp

‘The men think that the boys respect them.’

Comment: The examples are acceptable only with the independent pronoun strategy. If *ɲkà* is added it does not change the interpretation. It just plays an emphatic role.

Same tests, with the intervening subject in an intermediate clause:

D20a) Larry thinks that Bill knows that Dave respects X.

lári kwò lá bíl é kílí lá dév é fwà wén.

lári kwò lá bíl é kílí lá dév é fwà wén.

Larry think that Bill PRES know that Dave PRES respect 3SG

‘Larry thinks that Bill knows that Dave respects him.’

b) Larry thinks that I know that Dave respects X.

lári kwò lá mǎ kílí lá dév é fwà wén.

lári kwò lá mǎ kílí lá dév é fwà wén.

Larry think that 1s know that Dave PRES respect 3SG

‘Larry thinks that I know that Dave respects him.’

c) Larry thinks that Mary knows that Dave respects X.

lári kwò lá méri é kílí lá dév é fwà wén.

lári kwò lá méri é kílí lá dév é fwà wén.

Larry think that Mary PRES know that Dave PRES respect 3SG

‘Larry thinks that Mary knows that Dave respects him.’

d) Larry thinks that the boys know that Dave respects X.

lári kwò lá vwú lyúmé vyí kílí lá dév é fwà wén.

lári kwò lá vwú lyúmé vyí kílí lá dév é fwà wén.

Larry think that c2.child c2.male c2.the know that Dave PRES respect 3SG

‘Larry thinks that the boys know that Dave respects him.’

e) The men think that the boys know that Dave respects. (the men = X)

lyúmé vyí kwò lá vwú lyúmé vyí kílí lá dév é fwà wén.

lyúmé vyí kwò lá vwú lyúmé vyí kílí lá dév é fwà wén.

c2.male c2.the think that c2.child c2.male c2.the know that Dave PRES respect 3pp

‘The men think that the boys know that Dave respects them.’

4.4.3.2 Positions of the intervener - The above interveners were subjects (the most common case). We now look for interveners in other positions.

The following examples rely only on person mismatches (where X = Walter). If you also found number or gender mismatches above, give some examples. Once again, if all of

these examples are only acceptable with the independent pronoun strategy, then just say so and provide translations.

Comment: There are no gender mismatches. The examples are only acceptable with the independent pronoun strategy.

D21a) Walter thinks that Bill told Harry that Dave respects X.

wáltà kwò è lá bíl yì gà? á lárì lá dév é fwà wén.

wáltà kwò è lá bíl yì gà? á hárì lá dév é fwà wén.
Walter think PRES that Bill P2 say to Harry that Dave PRES respect 3SG

‘Walter thinks that Bill told Harry that Dave respects him.’

b) Walter thinks that Bill told me that Dave respects X.

wáltà kwò è lá bíl yì gà? à mò lá dév é fwà wén.

wáltà kwò è lá bíl yì gà? à mò lá dév é fwà wén.
Walter think PRES that Bill P2 say to 1ps that Dave PRES respect 3SG

‘Walter thinks that Bill told me that Dave respects him.’

c) Walter told me that Dave respects X.

wáltà yì gà? à mò lá dév é fwà yì.

wáltà yì gà? à mò lá dév é fwà yì.
Walter P2 say to 1ps that Dave PRES respect 3SG

‘Walter told me that Dave respects him.’

Comment: The third person pronoun in (D21c) can only be *yì*, not *wén*.

KS: I suspect I have been missing something about the distribution of *yì* as opposed to *wén*.

Why do you think that *yì* must be used here?

d) Walter said that Dave gave me a book about X.

wáltà yì gà? lá dév yì kù ηwà?lè à mò byì wén.

wáltà yì gà? lá dév yì kù ηwà?lè à mò byì wén
Walter P2 say that Dave P2 give c1.book to 1ps about 3SG

‘Walter said that Dave gave me a book about him.’

KS: Is this possible with *yì* in place of *wén* referring to Walter?

4.4.4 Islands

Do syntactic islands affect the acceptability of the current strategy? For all the examples in this section, Ira = X. As in 4.3, if the independent pronoun strategy is all that works, please say so, translate, and move on, but if more than one strategy works, please let us know which

ones do. Also, if your language permits more than one type of pronoun, be sure to test both kinds (including null arguments interpreted pronominally).

D22a) Ira resents the fact that Mary hates X.

îra é bà kènyú kèn ká mèrí bà wén là.

îra	é	bà	kè-nyú	kèn	ká	á	mèrí	bà	wén	là
Ira	PRES	resent	c7-thing	DEM	AM	which	Mary	hate	3SG	CON

‘Ira resents the fact that Mary hates him.’

b) Ira respects the man who likes X.

îra é fwà wì? yèn á ghó kù wén là.

îra	é	fwà	wì?	yèn	á	ghó	kù	é	wén	là
Ira	PRES	respect	c1.person	DEM	who	3s	like	PRES	3SG	CON

‘Ira resents the fact that Mary hates him.’

c) Ira says that the man who likes X is intelligent.

îrà gà? lá wì? yì á ghó kù wén tófó.

îra	gà?	lá	wì?	yì	á	ghó	kù	wén	é	tófó
Ira	say	that	c1.person	DEM	who	3s	like	3SG	PRES	intelligent

‘Ira says that the man who likes him is intelligent.’

d) Ira asked whether Bill saw X.

îrà yì bèm lá bíl yì yèn yí múlósó.

îra	yì	bèm	lá	bíl	yì	yèn	yí	múlósó
Ira	P2	ask	that	Bill	P2	see	him	whether

‘Ira asked whether Bill saw him.’

e) Ira asked when Bill saw X.

îrà yì bèm lá bíl yì yèn yí zélósó.

îra	yì	bèm	lá	bíl	yì	yèn	yí	zélósó
Ira	P2	ask	that	Bill	P2	see	him	when

‘Ira asked when Bill saw him.’

f) Ira did not realize that George followed X.

îrà kô yì yèn lá jósó yì dzĩmtè wén bwèn.

îra	kô	yì	yèn	lá	jósó	yì	dzĩmtè	wén	bwèn
Ira	NEG	P2	see	that	George	P2	follow	3SG	NEG

‘Ira did not realize that George followed him.’

g) Ira said that Mary was pretty and that she would marry X.

îrà yì gà? lá mèrí yì bù dí?í ghè à làm yí.

îra yì gà? lá m̀èrí yì bù dí?í ghè à làm yí.
 Ira P2 say that Mary P2 pretty be 3s SM marry 3SG
 ‘Ira said that Mary was pretty and that she would marry him.’

4.4.5 De se reading

Sometimes an interpretation of identity with an antecedent is tinged by a different meaning distinction. There is a famous ambiguity in D23 depending on whether or not the subject of believe is aware that he is referring to himself. The distinction is between two readings where his = Oedipus, that is, we are not interested, for these cases, in readings where his is not Oedipus. Now imagine that Oedipus thinks his step-mother (Step) is his biological mother - he just calls her "mother", because Step is the only mother he has ever known. Now let us suppose that Oedipus is the only one in town who is unaware who his biological mother (Bio) is, perhaps because Bio is a notorious person of whom polite people do not normally speak. People in town, in spite of what they know, generally refer to Step as Oedipus' mother, since no one wants to bring up the subject of Bio. Then Bio, long out of town, makes a surprise visit to the town to see Oedipus, whom she finds scowling in his front yard, angry at Step because she has punished him.. Bio spends some time with Oedipus, as others watch suspiciously, but Bio does not tell Oedipus who she is. Oedipus thinks Bio is nice. Then someone says D23a or D23b.

D23a) *Oedipus* thinks/says *his* mother is nice.

b) *Oedipus* thinks/says *his* mother is mean.

Now his in both examples is to be coconstrued with Oedipus, but his mother in (23a) refers to Bio, whom he does not know is his mother, while (D23b) refers to Step, who is the only one Oedipus thinks is his mother (though others know otherwise), and Oedipus is angry at her just now. In some languages, a different morphological form, a different pronoun for example, is used to distinguish the two readings. If your language is like English, then there is no morphological distinction between the pronouns in (D23a,b). Just say so and move on.

Comment: There is no morphological distinction between the pronouns in (D23a, b).

KS: I am wondering if I was looking at the wrong contrast when I was trying to find the relevant distinction. Is there a distinction like this depending on whether *yí* or *wén*? I don't know if *yí* can be a possessor or if it can be a subject. Is there a contrast like that between *yí*

and *wén* for two different versions of a subject pronoun? The difference between *yí* and *wén* appears to show up when the main verb is a verb of saying, maybe only the verb meaning 'say', and the pronoun coreferring with the matrix subject is in the clause immediately below. Tell me if you think any of this is plausible and we will explore it further. It could be that we will have to introduce a *yí* strategy, which I suspect is a limited logophoric pronoun. Of course I could be completely wrong. Let me know what you think.

However, other languages have such a morphological distinction (often it is like the logophoric distinction, discussed above, but not always). For example, Adésolá (2004) reports that Yoruba permits a non-logophoric pronoun (a weak pronoun) to be coconstrued with the matrix subject, but the logophoric marked one (the strong pronoun) is still distinguished insofar as it must be *de se*. The verb meaning 'believe' selects for the logophoric complementizer *pé* and the pronouns are distinguished as weak (w) and strong (s).

D24a) Olú gbàgbó pé ilé rẹ̀ ti wó.

Olu believe that house he(w) ASP fall

b) Olú gbàgbó pé ilé òun ti wó.

Olu believe that house he(s) ASP fall

Both: "Olu believes that his house has collapsed."

As Adésolá remarks, "...a strong pronoun [*òun*] is used when self-reference is intended by the reported speaker (or believer) [15b], while a weak pronoun [*rẹ̀*] is used when the reported speaker (or believer) does not know that he was in fact referring to his own house [15a]." The weak pronoun does not have to refer to Olu, but the strong one must.

If there is such a distinction in your language, then translate the examples indicating the difference in pronouns and we will ask you more about it after we get the questionnaire responses. If you don't understand what is asked for in this section, skip it or ask for assistance.