

Anaphora Typology Questionnaire

Utrecht institute of Linguistics OTS

Alexis Dimitriadis
alexis.dimitriadis@let.uu.nl

Martin Everaert
martin.everaert@let.uu.nl

VERSION 0.50

THIS IS A DRAFT VERSION. PLEASE LET US KNOW OF ANY
ERRORS OR SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Contents

Introduction	1
About the questionnaire	1
1 General information	3
1.1 Identify the subject language	3
1.2 Identify yourself	3
1.3 Identify your language consultant(s)	4
2 An inventory of reflexive and reciprocal strategies	5
2.1 Coreference in a single clause	5
2.2 Less-local coreference	7
2.3 Other types of local coreference (investigated in less detail)	7
2.3.1 Reciprocal coreference	8
2.3.2 Possessives, alienable and inalienable	8
2.3.3 Picture NPs	8
2.3.4 Nominal reflexives	9

Complete The Following Sections For *All* Strategies:

3 General description	9
4 Morphology	10
4.1 About the entire reflexive element	10
4.2 Complete this for <i>each</i> morpheme in the strategy:	11
4.3 The agreement paradigm	11
4.4 Interaction with verb morphology	11
4.4.1 (IF KNOWN:) Known restrictions	11

4.4.2	Exploration: Potential incompatibilities	12
5	Non-coreference uses	12
6	Directions for the syntax sections	13
7	Binding in a single clause	14
7.1	Clause types	14
7.2	Argument positions	15
7.3	Passives etc.	16
7.4	Variation in the NP types	16
7.5	Reverse binding	17
8	Cross-clausal binding	17
8.1	Tensed clausal complement	18
8.1.1	Climbing	18
8.2	Reverse binding	18
9	Extended binding domains	19
9.1	Inventory of embedding types	19
9.2	Test each type	19
9.2.1	Non-finite complements	20
9.2.2	Subjunctive clauses, etc.	20
9.2.3	Small clauses	20
9.2.4	Infinitival clauses without (overt) subjects	20
9.2.5	Adjuncts, finite or non-finite	20
9.2.6	Do the same with other embedding types you have identified	21
10	Long-distance strategies	21
10.1	Position of antecedent	21
10.2	Blocking Effects	21
10.2.1	Features of intervening subjects	21
10.2.2	Positions of the intervener	22
10.3	Islands	22
11	Discourse binding etc.	22
11.1	In an earlier sentence	22
11.2	Deictically	22
11.3	Logophoricity etc.	23
12	Properties of the antecedents	23

12.1 NP types	23
12.2 Split antecedents	23
12.3 Strict/sloppy identity	23
13 Interpretation	24
13.1 Distribution and reciprocity	24
13.2 Reciprocal readings	24
13.3 Long-distance reciprocal readings	25
14 Other phenomena	25
15 Final questions	25
15.1 Comparison of the strategies	25
16 Appendix: Syntactic conditions overview	26

Introduction

Dear linguist,

Thank you for helping us build a cross-linguistic database on the typology of Anaphors. Our aim is to collect relevant, quality information about each subject language included in the database. In order to accomplish this we will rely not only on your knowledge of the subject language, but also on your skills as a linguist. In many cases we simply ask you to translate certain sentences into the subject language and evaluate the grammaticality of the results. But in many others we will ask you to identify relevant examples or grammatical constructions; we will then try to guide you, through the questionnaire, in testing the construction you have identified with respect to the matters that our database should represent.

Although the result will emphasize the exploration rather than interpretation of reflexivization in your subject language, it is no less a creative work. You may remain anonymous if you wish, but we hope that you will agree to be identified so that we can acknowledge you as the author of your portion.

No questionnaire could fully anticipate the complexities of unknown languages; accordingly, we provide ample opportunity for you to explain if a question is inappropriate or misleading. Feel free to provide additional comments as necessary. Your responses will be carefully considered prior to incorporation of your answers into the database.

About the questionnaire

Our goal is to collect information on all “strategies” that your language uses to express a **a reflexive or reciprocal relationship**.¹ We use the term “strategy” (rather than, say, “anaphor” or “reflexive morpheme”), because it is not always possible to identify a specific word or morpheme that can be said to *be* the reflexive.

What counts as a reflexive or reciprocal relationship? Our intent is to study any construction involving **coreference**, including bound or partial coreference, between two arguments of a predicate. Each grammatical device the language can use to express such a relationship is called a *local coreference strategy*, or *strategy* for short.

What is included in the questionnaire? We study the properties of each strategy when used as a reflexive, of course, including coreference with adjuncts. But many local coreference strategies are also used to express coreference between arguments that are *not* in the same clause; and in many cases, a strategy can be used to express something other than coreference (e.g., as an intensifier). Such uses are also explored for each strategy we identify.²

To decide what is a *local* coreference strategy, we rely on local coreference only; then its uses, local and non-local, are explored. In addition, the same sets of questions will be asked for pronouns (which are in principle a *non-local* coreference strategy).³

We proceed as follows to determine what will be included:

¹**Explanation:** We refer to the language for which you are completing this questionnaire as the *subject language*, or simply *your language*.

²**Explanation:** Note that, for example, the use of *himself* in the following examples is only of interest to us because we know that *himself* is used in constructions that involve genuine local coreference.

- (i) The pope *himself* was at the meeting.
- (ii) John enjoyed himself.

This questionnaire is not intended to study intensifiers, etc., on their own right.

³**Explanation:** Since this questionnaire is not intended to study the properties of pronouns, only properties relevant to the behavior of reflexives are explored.

1. Make an inventory of strategies that have a clearly reflexive or reciprocal use.⁴
2. Investigate the uses of each such strategy, (a) for local coreference, (b) for non-local coreference, and (c) any unrelated uses.
3. For comparison purposes, pronouns are also treated as a strategy and subjected to the same tests.

Before this, the questionnaire begins with some general sections about the language and the source of the information (you).

⁴**Explanation:** We sometimes refer to local coreference strategies that are specifically used for reflexivization as *reflexive strategies*.

1 General information

1.1 Identify the subject language⁵

1. Name of the language.
2. Ethnologue code.
3. Dialect and/or area.
4. What is the information you are providing based on?
 - (a) My own judgements
 - (b) Judgements by one or more consultants
 - (c) My general knowledge about the language (not as a speaker)
 - (d) Published reference: _____

1.2 Identify yourself

Please provide some descriptive information about yourself, the person collecting data for the completion of this questionnaire.⁶

In order to make full use of the information you provide, some information about your linguistic background is necessary. If you wish, your name and contact information will be excluded from the public version of this database. However, if you are a fellow linguist we encourage you to make this information available; this will make it possible to properly acknowledge your role in creating this database, and will also (if you wish) allow other linguists interested in this language to contact you.

Answer the following about yourself (the person completing the survey), even if you rely on someone else's speaker judgements.

1. Name: _____
2. Your email, or other contact information: _____
3. Do you want the database to reveal your name and contact information?
4. Your level of training in linguistics:
Ph. D. / (post-)graduate student / undergraduate linguistics / philology or other related discipline.
5. If you are a linguist, please indicate the extent of your exposure to the following subfields. Also specify the broad school (e.g., GB or LFG syntax) if appropriate. Your background might be relevant to your choice of terminology in morphological and syntactic descriptions, etc.
Scale: little or none / some / intimately familiar.
 - (a) Syntax
 - (b) Typological linguistics

⁵**Explanation:** By "subject language" we mean the language and/or dialect for which you are providing information at the moment. Having detailed information makes it possible to recognize dialectal variation, etc.

⁶**Explanation:** We assume that the questionnaire is being completed by a linguist (possibly more), relying on one or more consultants for judgements. If you are relying on your own judgements, please complete the next section about yourself as well.

- (c) Formal semantics
- (d) Pragmatics or discourse analysis
- (e) Other relevant subfield:

1.3 Identify your language consultant(s)

By this we mean the source of the *original linguistic knowledge* being reported here, i.e., a speaker of the language. Please complete a copy of this section for each language consultant you rely on.

If you are relying on your own intuitions, complete this section about yourself (leave blank the questions repeated from the previous section). If you are working with a consultant, complete it about him or her. If you are relying on a printed source, leave this section blank.

The identity of language consultants will not be revealed to users of the database.

1. Name: _____
2. Age:
3. Your level of education; what languages were you educated in?
4. Your level of training *in linguistics*:
Ph. D. / (post-)graduate student / undergraduate linguistics / philology or other related discipline.
5. Short language biography: Indicate your major places of residence and languages used or learned at each.

Age (From-To)	Residence	Languages spoken (in order of dominance)

6. How familiar are you with the language being reported
Native speaker / near-native / fluent / some knowledge
7. How old were you when you learned this language?
8. Do you speak an identifiable subdialect of this language? What is it called?
9. Do you speak other dialects of the same language? Which ones?

2 An inventory of reflexive and reciprocal strategies

In this section, we compile an inventory of strategies for coreference in your language. At this point we will only solicit **a single** use of each strategy. The properties of each strategy will be investigated in the following sections.

Important: Pay special attention to parts of a strategy that *appear* to be optional. In such cases you should list **two** strategies, one with and one without the “optional” element.⁷

By the end of the section you should have a small number of sentences, each of which uses a different way to express a reflexive relationship.⁸

2.1 Coreference in a single clause

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.

(2.1) John saw himself.

Choose a short name (label) for this strategy. It will be used to refer to this strategy in the remainder of the questionnaire. You can label it *Strategy A*, or you may choose a more descriptive name.⁹ Whatever label you choose, please use it consistently.

Strategy label: _____

2. Is there another way, or ways, to express coreference in the above sentence? If so, give examples of their use now, and label them (use *Strategy B*, *C*, or choose your own labels).
3. **Other verb types** Some languages use a special reflexive strategy with certain verbs, especially “commonly reflexive” verbs of grooming *wash*, *shave*, *bathe*, *dress*, etc. For example, in English one can say “John washes” rather than “John washes himself.”

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).

- (2.2) John washes himself
- (2.3) Mary cut herself [accidentally]
- (2.4) John is ashamed of himself
- (2.5) John destroyed himself
- (2.6) We hate ourselves

Don’t worry about the behavior of earlier strategies (A, B, ...) with these sentences: The earlier strategies will be examined in detail in the coming sections. At this point, we are just making an inventory of strategies. In other words, do not provide translations of the above sentences at this point unless the translation uses a *new* coreference strategy.

⁷**Example:** Javanese has two reflexive constructions, *awak*+pronoun+*dewe* and *awak*+pronoun. It would be incorrect to treat them as a single construction in which *dewe* is optional: the two forms have very different binding properties.

Hence, any “optional” elements in your language should be studied under the assumption that we are dealing with different strategies.

⁸**Example:** For English we might get “John saw himself”, “John washes,” and the reciprocal strategy “The children like each other.”

⁹**Example:** In Dutch, one might use the label “zichzelf” instead of “Strategy A”.

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, and finally prepositional adjuncts. If any of them allow a strategy you have not identified above, give an example here.

The following are examples only (and may not have the desired syntax in your language!) Once again, translate them only if they involve a strategy that you have not yet identified.

- (2.7) John spoke to Mary
- (2.8) John spoke about himself (subject/PP argument)
- (2.9) John told Mary about himself (same, with intervening NP)
- (2.10) Bill told us about ourselves (object/argument)
- (2.11) Mary gave the children themselves (ind.object/object)
- (2.12) Mary saw a book behind her. (subject/locative)
- (2.13) John bought the book for himself. (benefactive)

Also consider things like experiencer-subject verbs, non-nominative subjects, etc., which have unusual argument structures in many languages. One candidate:

- (2.14) John likes himself.

5. Pronouns, Person and number

Some languages use different strategies depending on person or number.¹⁰

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). Do any of these allow the use of a strategy we have *not* yet seen? If so, name each new strategy and give an example here.

- (2.15) I saw myself.
- (2.16) You cut yourself [accidentally].
- (2.17) We will wash ourselves.
- (2.18) You must help yourselves.

6. Strategies for other 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.

Take a few minutes to consider other variations on the sentence types which *might* involve a special strategy. Some possibilities:

- (a) Is there any strategy which is only possible with some special aspectual class of a verb?
Some examples:
 - (2.19) John knows himself.
 - (2.20) John (habitually) criticizes himself.
 - (2.21) John is likely to praise himself.
- (b) Do quantificational constructions involve a separate strategy?
 - (2.22) Every boy looked at himself.
 - (2.23) All the women described John to themselves.

¹⁰**Example:** In Dutch, the special reflexive pronouns are only used in the third person; first and second person coreference is expressed with ordinary pronouns, which should therefore be considered a distinct local coreference strategy.

- (2.24) Every teacher introduced himself to Bob.
 (2.25) 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?
- (d) The above were all tensed main clauses. Experiment with placing *both* coreferring arguments in various types of subordinate clauses, as your language allows. For example, consider tensed complements, subjunctives, infinitivals, purpose clauses, or any other embedding construction your language provides. (But keep both coreferent arguments in the same clause). If you discover a new strategy, list it now.

2.2 Less-local coreference

1. “Subordinate reflexives”

The preceding questions concerned coreference within a single clause. Some languages have special strategies which are used for bound coreference only *across* clauses.¹¹ If you are aware of such a strategy in your language, name it as a new strategy, and give an example of it here.¹²

2. Ordinary pronouns

Even if pronouns are never used as reflexives, we want to apply the tests of this questionnaire to them as well. Therefore you should now name them as a strategy, even if they fail all the local coreference tests. (You should only do so if you have *not* already named ordinary pronouns as a strategy).¹³

Use one of the following example sentences, or construct your own.

(2.26) I spoke with John yesterday. *He* saw Mary.

(2.27) Where is Bill? I saw *him* in the market.

3. **More pronouns** If your language has more than one type of pronouns (e.g., clitic and non-clitic, for visible vs. distant referents, etc.), list each type as a separate strategy.
4. **Null arguments** If your language allows argument drop (null pronouns, or *pro-drop*) as a pronominalization strategy, then name it here as a “strategy.” (Unless you have already listed argument-drop as a reflexivization strategy). Provide an example.

2.3 Other types of local coreference (investigated in less detail)

Because they are less well understood, we have decided to collect information on such types at less than saturation level. Since the questionnaire that follows is specific to coreference between arguments or adjuncts of verbs, the “strategies” identified here must have their own sections in the questionnaire (non-existent at this point).

¹¹**Example:** Lakota uses the special pronominal form *iye* for the embedded subject in sentence (i):

(i) John_i told Bill_j that *iye*_{i/*j} must go to Berkeley.

¹²**Explanation:** The subsequent sections will examine how the already-named strategies behave in such embedding environments. At the moment, we are merely compiling an inventory of strategies.

¹³**Explanation:** Many languages use ordinary pronouns for one or more of the constructions considered in section 2.1. If this is the case for your language, you have already listed the use of a pronoun as a “local coreference strategy,” and you do not need to list it as a strategy again.

2.3.1 Reciprocal coreference

The previous sections asked about strategies for reflexive coreference. We now consider reciprocals. Please keep in mind that we are still compiling an inventory of strategies. As before, remember to treat “optional” morphemes as evidence of distinct strategies.

If you have already listed a reflexive strategy that can also have reciprocal meaning, you do not need to list it again here.

1. **Canonical constructions** How would your language express the reciprocal meaning of the following English sentences? If a new strategy is involved, name it and give an example.

- (2.28) The women see each other.
- (2.29) The boys washed each other.
- (2.30) The men combed each other's hair.
- (2.31) They argued with each other.
- (2.32) The boys kicked each other.
- (2.33) They hate each other.

2. **Obliques** Continue looking for *new* reciprocal strategies with the following sentences:

- (2.34) The men introduced Bill to each other.
- (2.35) The travellers spoke to each other.
- (2.36) The priests heard stories about each other.
- (2.37) They left presents in front of each other.

Also consider other verbs that have unusual argument structures in your language.

3. **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.

- (2.38) We saw each other.
- (2.39) You(pl.) must help each other.
- (2.40) We will wash ourselves.
- (2.41) They always criticize each other.
- (2.42) Many boys kicked each other.

4. **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. Also consider if there may be a reciprocal strategy not identified by the preceding questions.

2.3.2 Possessives, alienable and inalienable

- (2.43) John lost his shoes.
- (2.44) John placed his hand on the table.
- (2.45) John cut his hand.

2.3.3 Picture NPs

- (2.46) Mary showed Bill a picture of her/himself.
- (2.47) John's analysis of himself took a long time.

2.3.4 Nominal reflexives

Identify any strategies that can apply to nouns rather than verbs.

(2.48) John's self-confidence annoyed Mary.

(2.49) John's introduction of himself impressed the teacher.

(Other possibilities: self-destruction, self-help, etc.)

Complete The Following Sections For *All* Strategies:

You should now have a list of several different “strategies” for coreference, each represented by one example. The following sections will study the properties of each of these strategies.

For each question, you should give a separate answer for each of the strategies you have identified. Be sure to clearly label each answer with the name of the strategy used (A, B, “zich”, etc.). Even you feel that it is obvious which strategy is used, labeling all your answers will help us process them efficiently and avoid errors.

If you prefer, you may complete the questionnaire for one strategy at a time. Begin with the first strategy you have identified (Strategy A, for example), and answer all questions as they apply to it. Then return to this point and do the same with strategy B, etc.

Some questions refer to the *current strategy*, meaning whichever strategy you are providing an answer for at that moment.

3 General description

1. Some strategies are manifested as a special NP or pronoun (“NP reflexives”); others by means of a morpheme that attaches to the verb or auxiliary; yet others by a change in verb form without an identifiable “reflexive” morpheme, e.g., by passivization (“verbal reflexives”). Occasionally, a strategy will even involve both a special NP *and* marking on the verb. For this reason, the following question allows you to select more than one option for a single strategy:

Which parts of the sentence does the current strategy involve? Check all that apply.¹⁴
Make sure to give a separate, clearly labeled answer for each strategy you are reporting on.

- (a) One or both of the coindexed NPs. (**NP reflexive**).^{15,16}

¹⁴**Explanation:** Because it is difficult to make a principled distinction between pronominal clitics and “true” verbal affixes, the questionnaire does not ask you to differentiate at this point: both are considered forms of marking the verb.

¹⁵**Example:** The English reflexive *himself* marks one of the coindexed NPs, prototypically the object in subject-object coreference.

¹⁶Note for readers familiar with Faltz's typology of reflexives: this category combines what he classifies as *head*, *adjunct*, and *pronominal* reflexives.

- (b) The verb or an auxiliary (via a special form of the verb, a modifier, affix or clitic, or a change in the verb's argument structure) (**Verbal reflexive**)¹⁷
 - (c) None: one argument is simply dropped. We will also consider this strategy a **verbal reflexive**, and treat it as if it involves a morphologically null change in the verb's argument structure.¹⁸
 - (d) A sentence element that is *not* part of the verb or one of the coindexed NPs. E.g., a prepositional phrase or oblique NP.¹⁹
2. How productive is this strategy, with respect to which verbs or predicates allow it?
Extremely productive / Fairly productive / Restricted to a specific class / I am not sure²⁰
 3. If the strategy is restricted in its use, can you state a general criterion for its use? (e.g., "used only with verbs of motion").

This criterion: Has (almost) no exceptions / Has few exceptions / Is only a general tendency / Can't tell
 4. How marked or natural is this strategy?
 5. Is special intonation or emphasis necessary, and where?
 6. Is a particular discourse context (e.g., contradicting) necessary?²¹
 7. Do you have any other comments on the use or meaning of this strategy, or on how it differs from other strategies you have identified? (Before you answer, take a look at the questions asked in the following sections).

4 Morphology

4.1 About the entire reflexive element

Complete this section for all strategies for which the questions make sense.²²

1. Does the reflexive element, *in its entirety*, have a stateable lexical translation?²³ What is it?
2. Can the whole reflexive element be used, non-reflexively, as an ordinary open-class expression (i.e., as an ordinary NP or PP?) What does it mean then?
3. *If* the reflexive element has clear syntactic and part-of-speech sub-structure (e.g., head and modifiers, determiners, possessives) show it here:²⁴
4. What is the head of the reflexive element? (Do not answer if the answer is not clear).

¹⁷**Example:** In a construction like *John self-destructed*, reflexivization is marked on the verb.

¹⁸**Example:** This strategy is used in the English *John washes*.

¹⁹**Example:** Finnish reflexives are indicated by the addition of a certain locative expression.

²⁰**Explanation:** A strategy is "extremely productive" if it can be applied to nearly every verb you can think of. It is "fairly productive" if there are many exceptions, but you could still find a potentially unlimited number of verbs that allow it. (Could you name twenty verbs that allow it without too much difficulty?) A strategy is "restricted to a specific class" if you are aware of some class of verbs which are the only ones, or nearly the only ones, that allow its use.

²¹**Explanation:** Recall that we are only interested in cases where the sameness of the two arguments is not in question: We cannot pursue examples like "This man must be John because he is wearing John's coat".

²²**Explanation:** For example, the strategy used for English *John washed* contains no overt morpheme that the questions could ask about.

²³**Explanation:** Many languages use a reflexive based on a word like *head*.

²⁴**Explanation:** This question can be very hard to answer in some cases. If you do not know the answer, leave it blank.

4.2 Complete this for *each* morpheme in the strategy:

If a morpheme (e.g., a determiner) has already been described elsewhere, just say so and reference the section that describes it.

1. Provide a morpheme-by-morpheme gloss for the visible elements of the strategy, giving the following information about each morpheme:
 - (a) Agreement features etc.
 - (b) Does this morpheme have a lexical meaning? Is it clearly or plausibly related to a lexically contentful word or morpheme? Give details as necessary.
 - i. No lexical meaning.
 - ii. Probably related to lexical item:
 - iii. Closely related to a lexical item (some forms may be grammatically reduced, etc., in idiosyncratic ways).
 - iv. It is a lexical morpheme, with the meaning:

4.3 The agreement paradigm

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).

For each morphological feature, what determines its value? (For example, agreement with the antecedent, etc.) 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.²⁵

For any features in the (b) category, provide an example and perhaps an explanation.

4.4 Interaction with verb morphology

Reflexives, especially those that are attached to the verb rather than occupying an argument position, are frequently incompatible with other morphological operations that can be applied to the verb. In this section we ask you to look for such *morphological* incompatibilities between the reflexive strategy and other morphological elements, especially *Grammatical-Function Changing* (“GF-changing”) morphemes.

4.4.1 (IF KNOWN:) Known restrictions

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.

²⁵**Example:** The Modern Greek reflexive *o eaftos tou* is morphologically an NP that is always grammatically masculine, but contains a possessive that agrees in person, gender and number with the antecedent. The reflexive NP is also marked for case, according to its syntactic position. Finally, the reflexive NP as a whole may be either singular or plural, the plural form being possible (but not required) when the antecedent NP is plural. This interacts with interpretation (distributivity etc.), in ways that are not immediately obvious.

All forms of the above features should be given. However, since case and number on the NP are independent (morphologically) from person, gender and number on the possessive, it is enough to provide paradigms for the two subgroups of features.

4.4.2 Exploration: Potential incompatibilities

1. Tense, Mood, Aspect

Make an inventory of the tense, mood and aspect system of your language. Check whether the various forms are compatible with the current coreference strategy. Check with at least the following verbs.

(4.1) *see, praise, help, like, know, wash*

2. GF-changing

Make a list of transformations in your language that affect the argument structure of a verb, adding, promoting, or demoting arguments. For example, passive, antipassive, stative, benefactive, applicative, etc.

Check whether each transformation is compatible with application of the current strategy. Also consider combinations of transformations.

Consider the verbs listed in (4.1), and also:

(4.2) *cook, give, visit, kill*

If the interaction is too unclear, or too dependent on syntactic details, you may postpone it until section 7.3, where its syntactic aspects are examined in more detail.

5 Non-coreference uses

The body of the questionnaire investigates uses of the identified strategies as **coreference strategies**, meaning that they express coreference or overlap between two logical arguments (or adjuncts) of a clause. Are there **other** uses of this strategy, in which it does not express coreference between two arguments or adjuncts? 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:

1. **Idiosyncratic.** Some languages have verbs that lexically require a reflexive, which does not appear to correspond to an argument. Are there such uses for the current strategy? If so, give examples of as many as possible.²⁶
2. **Emphatic or intensifier.** As in the English, *The president himself answered the phone.*
3. **Middle.** The argument structure of the verb is changed into a form that has an explicit patient, but no agent is present or implied.²⁷
4. **Distributive, sociative, etc.** Some strategies (reciprocal markers most frequently) can be used to mean that some action was performed separately, or jointly, or repeatedly, etc. You should only report uses that do *not* involve coreference between two logical arguments.
5. **Other.** Are there other ways to use the strategy that do not express coreference (including reciprocal coreference) between two arguments? If so, give examples and a brief explanation here.

²⁶**Example:** English has a few such verbs, for example *enjoy oneself*. German has many more, such as *sich erinnern* ‘to remember’.

²⁷**Example:** Middles are associated with reflexivization in many languages. Greek uses passive morphology for middles, and as a reflexivization strategy.

Syntactic conditions

6 Directions for the syntax sections

Soliciting examples for all possible combinations of factors would be a prohibitive task (the variables are supposed to vary *independently* of each other!) We present selected combinations of values and ask you be on the lookout for any significant interactions between these factors.

Please read these instructions carefully, and return to them if unclear about how to handle a question.

In each of the following examples, an NP has been replaced with the symbol *X*. For instance,

(6.1) John saw *X*.

(6.2) Mary told John about *X*'s mother. (*X* = John)

From each such example, construct **one non-reflexive sentence** plus **one reflexive sentence per strategy**, as follows:

1. Construct a **grammatical non-reflexive** (transitive) sentence. Replace *X* with some third person NP (e.g., *Bill*, or *the boys*), and provide a translation of this sentence in your language. This translation should have the desired syntactic structure (we count on your knowledge of linguistics to recognize what this is), and should be **grammatical**. For example, from sentence (6.2) we construct:

Non-coref: John saw Bill's mother.

If for some example this is not possible, substitute another verb with the desired syntactic properties if you can; otherwise, go on to the next example.²⁸

2. Now use each coreference strategy in your list to change the sentence you constructed into a **reflexive**: Let *X* be coreferent with the appropriate antecedent NP (if there is more than one possibility, the intended antecedent will be indicated in parentheses), and translate into your language using the current reflexivization strategy. **Do so if at all possible even if this use of the strategy is ungrammatical**. Indicate the grammaticality status of each sentence.

Special cases:

(a) Once it has been established that a strategy is lexically restricted to a class of verbs (e.g., verbs of grooming etc.), later examples of this strategy should always use verbs of the appropriate class. Provide a corresponding non-reflexive example, as well.

(b) For strategies that have only reciprocal meaning, substitute a plural subject as necessary.

For example, suppose that for English we have identified three coreference strategies called *himself*, *implicit*, and *each-other*; for the *himself* strategy we would get:

<i>himself</i> :	* John saw himself's mother.
<i>implicit</i> :	* John washed mother. (Lexically compatible verb substituted)
<i>each-other</i> :	John and Bill saw each other's mother.

Because the example for the *implicit* strategy used the verb *wash*, we also give a non-reflexive example of it:

²⁸**Explanation:** This ensures that the non-reflexive version is well-formed, so that any ungrammaticality of the reflexive version is entirely due to properties of the reflexive strategy.

Non-coref: John washed Mary's mother.

3. For each reflexive sentence that was ungrammatical: Can you see how to construct an **analogous** reflexive example that is grammatical, by choosing, e.g., a different verb? If so, give that example too, in reflexive and non-reflexive versions (but do give the ungrammatical example first).

With example (6.2), it is *not* possible to give a grammatical example of the *himself* or *implicit* strategies: They cannot be used for coreference with the possessor of an object.

If a question can be answered by a sentence you have already provided, just refer us to it: you do not need to enter any sentence more than once.

Use the following symbols for grammaticality judgements. You do not have to employ all of them.

ok = Perfect
? = A bit odd, but acceptable
?* = Pretty bad
* = Ungrammatical
** = Word salad

7 Binding in a single clause

7.1 Clause types

The following questions will provide a broad outline of the types of predicates that allow the use of each strategy. If the examples provided do not match the kinds of predicates that a strategy is used for, be sure to provide several grammatical examples of your own.

1. **Canonical** Can this strategy be used with ordinary transitive verbs, such as *see*? Give some examples, including the following.

- (7.1) John saw X.
(7.2) The women described X.
(7.3) You(pl.) kicked X.

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.

- (7.4) John washed X.
(7.5) Mary cut X's hair. (X = Mary).
(7.6) The girl cut X [accidentally] (X = the girl)

3. **Other verb types**

- (7.7) John hates X
(7.8) John is ashamed of X
(7.9) The women will destroy X
(7.10) The farmers built X (X = the farmers)

If this strategy **cannot** be used with the predicates of examples (7.1)–(7.10), provide three to five examples of predicates which it **can** be used.

From here on, **use only predicates that can be used** with the current strategy, if this is at all possible.²⁹

7.2 Argument positions

1. Subject-indirect object

The preceding questions asked 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.

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

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

For comparison, also provide judgements for the following:

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

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

2. Oblique arguments

Give some examples with oblique arguments, in whatever forms your language allows. Choose verbs that take oblique arguments in your language.³⁰

(7.15) Bill talked to X.

(7.16) John told Mary about X (X = John)

3. Subject-adjunct

Provide some examples of coreference between a subject and an adjunct, e.g., a locative PP.

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

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

(7.19) John offended Mary because of X (X = John)

(7.20) We laughed in spite of X

4. Ditransitives

Can the strategy be used to indicate coreference between the two objects of a ditransitive verb? Give examples with the reflexive replacing each of the two objects.

If there is more than one way to express the arguments of a ditransitive such as *give*, give examples for each type of construction.³¹

(7.21) Mary showed John to X (X = John)

(7.22) Mary showed X to John (X = John)

(7.23) Bill gave John X (X = John)

(7.24) Bill gave X John (X = John)

5. Two internal arguments or adjuncts

Consider coreference between two argument of adjunct NPs *in the same clause*, neither of which is a subject.

(7.25) Bill talked about John to X (X = John)

(7.26) Mary talked about X to John (X = John)

²⁹**Example:** If the current strategy cannot be used with the verb *see*, there is no need to show that, for example, reverse binding with *see* is ungrammatical; instead, start with a predicate that is compatible with the current strategy.

³⁰**Explanation:** If your language has morphological case, look for arguments that are not in the normal case for objects (e.g., not in the Accusative). Also consider arguments introduced by a preposition, as in *talk to X*.

³¹**Example:** For English, we want examples both of the type “show John the book” and “show the book to John.”

6. **Possessives** Give examples based on the following sentences, and/or by constructing analogous examples from reflexive sentences from the previous sections.

- (7.27) John telephoned X's mother.
- (7.28) John combed X's hair.
- (7.29) John spoke to X's boss.
- (7.30) John put X's book on the table.
- (7.31) The king gave John a prize in X's village. (X = John)
- (7.32) The boys washed X's face.

With the possessive in subject position:

- (7.33) John's father admires X (X = John)
- (7.34) John's ambition destroyed X
- (7.35) John's mother sold X's car (X = John)

7.3 Passives etc.

Refer back to the list of GF-changing transformations that you constructed for section 4.4. For each one, construct some representative non-reflexive examples. Then apply each coreference strategy to them and report their grammaticality status.

Consider coreference between various pairs of arguments or adjuncts in each example.

Example: The following sentences have been passivized. Construct reflexive and non-reflexive versions of each one as above.

- (7.36) John was praised by X
- (7.37) John was helped by X
- (7.38) Little is known by John about X (X = John)

7.4 Variation in the NP types

1. Pronouns, Person and number

Consider all possible person/number combinations for the subject of the following sentence.³² If there is any **variation** in judgements, provide examples for the entire paradigm. Otherwise, provide a couple of representative examples.

- (7.39) I saw X.
- (7.40) You saw X.
- (etc.)

Repeat with the following sentences, or other suitable examples from section 7.1.

- (7.41) I washed X.
- (7.42) I hate X.
- (7.43) I told John about X (X = myself)
- (7.44) I saw a snake near X (X = myself)
- (7.45) I am liked by X.
- (7.46) I telephoned X's mother (X = myself)
- (7.47) My father admires X (X = myself)

³²**Explanation:** Once again, start with a predicate that **allows** use of the current strategy, if the verb *see* does not.

2. More pronouns

If your language has more than one type 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.

3. Quantifiers

Provide judgements for the following sentences.

- (7.48) Every woman saw X.
- (7.49) Every child washed X.
- (7.50) Every student hates X.
- (7.51) Every child saw a snake near X.
- (7.52) Every child telephoned X's mother.
- (7.53) Every child's father admires X.

Repeat, replacing the quantifier *Every N* with *No N*.

Repeat, for any quantifiers that have interesting behavior in your language.

4. Questions

X is coreferent with the wh-word in all of the following:

- (7.54) Who saw X?
- (7.55) Who washed X?
- (7.56) Who saw a snake near X?
- (7.57) Who telephoned X's mother?
- (7.58) Whose father admires X?

7.5 Reverse binding

In the following examples, the full NP appears in the lower (prototypically, object) position. Try to translate these into your language. Also do the same for any examples you have provided for which the c-command relation between antecedent and reflexive is not unquestionably obvious.³³

- (7.59) X saw John.
- (7.60) X saw us.
- (7.61) X washed Mary.
- (7.62) X gave John the prize. (X = John)
- (7.63) Bill spoke to X about John. (X = John)
- (7.64) X saw a snake behind Mary. (X = Mary)
- (7.65) X was praised by John.
- (7.66) X telephoned John's mother.
- (7.67) X washed me.
- (7.68) X is liked by you. (X = you)

8 Cross-clausal binding

Cases of coreference across clause boundaries fall into two major categories: in some cases, the coreference strategy is a genuine “long-distance” coreference strategy. In other cases, the relationship between the clauses is such that they form an extended binding domain, allowing

³³**Explanation:** It is expected that most sentences constructed in this section will be ungrammatical. Naturally, any examples which are *not* ungrammatical are of particular interest.

use of strategies that are in principle local. Exceptional Case Marking (ECM) constructions are a typical example.

Binding across tensed embedded clauses provides us with information about genuine “long-distance” reflexives. Such reflexives frequently show certain properties that are investigated below. Reflexives that are *not* long-distance reflexives, on the other hand, can be used across certain embedding constructions that create *extended binding domains*. Section 9 looks into the locality conditions (binding domains) created by various clause embedding constructions.

8.1 Tensed clausal complement

Translate the following examples, first as non-reflexives and then using each strategy to express coreference *across* clauses.

If the strategy involves marking on the verb (“verbal reflexive”), take care to apply it to the *embedded* clause. We try it out on the main verb in the next section. In other words, the reflexive should be in the embedded clause, its antecedent in the matrix clause.³⁴

Again, you should always start with a grammatical non-reflexive sentence, and use lexically-compatible verbs only.

- (8.1) John said that X is smart.
- (8.2) Bill knows that George likes X (X = Bill).
- (8.3) John knows that Bill said that X is smart (X = John)
- (8.4) Sarah thinks that Lisa knows that Wendy likes X (X = Sarah)

If any of the above examples, or any analogous examples you provide, are **grammatical** using a particular coreference strategy, we consider this strategy to be a **long-distance** coreference strategy. Some subsequent questions depend on whether or not we are dealing with a long-distance strategy.³⁵

8.1.1 Climbing

This test applies particularly to verbal reflexives, i.e., strategies that involve a part (clitic, affix, or other) that is associated with the verb or auxiliary.

Change the examples in the previous section so that the *higher* verb is marked (but the sentence still expresses coreference with an argument of the embedded clause).³⁶

8.2 Reverse binding

If it makes sense for this strategy, switch the positions of the antecedent and the anaphoric marker in each example of section 8. (E.g., try *himself wanted to improve John*). Give judgements for each translated example.

³⁴**Example:** Imagine a reflexive verbal prefix SELF. In this section you should convert example (i) into (ii).

- (i) John knows that Bill likes X (X = John)
- (ii) John_j knows that Bill SELF_j-likes.

In section 8.1.1, you are asked to construct the following, still with the meaning in (i).

- (iii) John_j SELF_j-knows that Bill likes.

³⁵**Explanation:** Recall that in this questionnaire, the term “long-distance strategy” includes ordinary pronouns (as well as long-distance reflexives).

³⁶**Example:** This sort of climbing is possible with small clauses in French, as in *John se croit intelligent*, interpreted as “John believes [himself intelligent.]”

You do not need to translate all examples (there are too many); but make sure to translate any for which both orders are grammatical, and any others for which the c-command relationship between the coindexed arguments is not unquestionably clear.

9 Extended binding domains

Binding into some types of embedded predicates may be possible even with strategies that cannot be applied across tensed clause boundaries. (For example, binding into ECM complements in English).³⁷

The tests in this section will help establish the existence and properties of any “extended binding domains” in your language.

9.1 Inventory of embedding types

Make a list of major clause embedding types in your language. Provide one simple (non-reflexive) example for each.³⁸

Naturally, we are especially interested in embedding constructions that *allow* coreference between clauses. Consider at least the following embedding types:

tensed clausal complement	John thinks that [X VP]
subjunctive	John wants that [X VP]
infinitival (ECM subject)	John wants [X to VP]
infinitival (no overt subject)	X hopes to VP
finite adjunct	John left after [X VP]
non-finite adjunct	John spoke without VP (or S)
small clause	John considers X intelligent
causative	John caused [X to VP]
serial verbs	
(etc).	

9.2 Test each type

Now test each embedding type with each of the coreference strategies. First construct a grammatical non-reflexive example, as usual. Then add coreference between arguments (or adjuncts) of the different NPs. Test each strategy for the following coreference types if the embedding construction allows it:

1. Matrix subject to embedded subject.
2. Matrix subject to embedded direct object.
3. Matrix subject to embedded indirect object or oblique.
4. Matrix non-subject to embedded subject.

If the strategy is a verbal reflexive (i.e., includes a morpheme attached to the verb or auxiliary; see section 3, question 2 (b) for definition): First apply the strategy to the *embedded* clause, as in section 34; then apply it to the matrix clause. Give judgements for both.

³⁷**Example:** As in *John believes [himself to have won the race]*.

³⁸**Explanation:** The list is based on the distinctions that *your* language makes. But if your language uses the same morphology for very different semantic types of embedding, consider a variety of examples in case their behavior with reciprocals differs. For example, in English we’d want to consider a factive and a non-factive complement.

Examples are given for some embedding types below. You must adapt them to predicates and embedding types suitable for your language.³⁹

9.2.1 Non-finite complements

- (9.1) John expects [X to win]. (X = John) (subject/subject)
- (9.2) John expects [Mary to visit X]. (X = John) (subject/object)
- (9.3) John expects [Mary to give the book to X] (X = John) (subject/oblique)
- (9.4) (No good tests for the other two with infinitival complements)

9.2.2 Subjunctive clauses, etc.

If your language has subjunctives, try the following examples with the embedded clause in the subjunctive (and using each coreference strategy in turn).

- (9.5) John wants that [X will see the film]. (subject/subject)
- (9.6) Mary hopes that [Ann will visit X]. (subject/object)
- (9.7) Bill hopes that [John will give the book to X] (X = Bill) (subject/oblique)
- (9.8) Mary told George that [X will win the contest] (X = George) (non-subject/subject)
- (9.9) Mary told George that [Bill will visit X]. (non-subject/object)

9.2.3 Small clauses

Small clauses are pretty limited in the argument positions they allow:

- (9.10) John believes [X lucky]. (subject/subject)
- (9.11) John considers [the winner X] (subject/“object”)
- (9.12) John considers [the captain a counterpart of X] (X = John) (subject/oblique)

9.2.4 Infinitival clauses without (overt) subjects

These sentences are treated by Government and binding as having a null (PRO) subject. Regardless of analysis, we want examples where X cannot be coreferent with the (missing or real) subject of the infinitive. For coreference with a matrix subject, we use the “object control” verb *ask*, while for coreference with a matrix object we use the “subject control” verb “promise.”

- (9.13) (Obviously, no examples involving an embedded subject are possible)
- (9.14) John asked Mary [to improve X] (X = John) (subject/object)
- (9.15) John asked Mary [to give the book to X] (X = John) (subject/oblique)
- (9.16) John promised Mary [to visit X] (X = Mary) (nonsubject/object)

9.2.5 Adjuncts, finite or non-finite

- (9.17) John returned home when/before/after X became tired (X = John)
- (9.18) When/before/after Mary wrote to X, John returned home (X = John)
- (9.19) John left without Mary seeing X (X = John)
- (9.20) John condemned Bill without meeting X (X = Bill)

³⁹**Explanation:** We recognize that there considerable uncertainty about the proper analysis of many of these examples. The questionnaire uses the terminology and standard assumptions of Government and Binding theory, but our focus is on the examples, not on the analyses. Please use the descriptions, understood to be from the GB viewpoint, as **an indication of the type of example we are looking for**, regardless of how it should be analyzed.

9.2.6 Do the same with other embedding types you have identified

10 Long-distance strategies

Reflexives that allow coreference across tensed clause boundaries are known as *long-distance* reflexives. In this section we test for known common properties of long-distance reflexives.

If you have found that some cross-clausal reflexives are possible, what factors affect their grammaticality?

The following examples involve tensed embedded clauses, but you should convert them to any type of embedding that has allowed cross-clausal reflexive binding (I.e., any embedding type that has given some grammatical reflexive sentences in section 8). Do so for each such embedding type.

Also review this section with other embedding constructions in mind, in case there is a combination of features that gives a grammatical example. (If so, go back and fill it in).

10.1 Position of 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 and give judgements for all indicated values of X.

- (10.1) Larry told Zeke that Mike does not like X (X = Larry, Zeke, Mike)
- (10.2) Larry knows that Zeke thinks that Mike does not like X (X = Larry, Zeke)
- (10.3) Larry's mother thinks that Mike does not like X (X = Larry, Larry's mother)
- (10.4) Larry gave to Zeke a book about X (X = Larry, Zeke)

Consider potential antecedents in other syntactic positions, as allowed by your language.

10.2 Blocking Effects

The agreement features of NPs intervening between reflexive and antecedent can affect the grammaticality of binding.

10.2.1 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.

- (10.5) Larry thinks that Zeke respects X (X = Larry)
- (10.6) Larry thinks that I respect X (X = Larry)
- (10.7) Larry thinks that Mary respects X (X = Larry)
- (10.8) Larry thinks that the boys respect X (X = Larry)

Same tests, with the blocker in an intermediate clause:

- (10.9) Larry thinks that Bill knows that Dave respects X (X = Larry)
- (10.10) Larry thinks that I know that Dave respects X (X = Larry)
- (10.11) Larry thinks that Mary knows that Dave respects X (X = Larry)

(10.12) Larry thinks that the boys know that Dave respects X (X = Larry)

And a test with the blocker *not* intervening:

(10.13) Larry knows Mike told X that you will leave. (X = Larry, Mike)

10.2.2 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. If you also found number or gender mismatches above, give some examples.

(10.14) Walter thinks that Bill told Harry that Dave respects X (X = Walter)

(10.15) Walter thinks that Bill told me that Dave respects X (X = Walter)

(10.16) Walter told me that Dave respects X (X = Walter)

(10.17) Walter said that Zeke gave me a book about X (X = Walter)

10.3 Islands

Do syntactic islands affect grammaticality of the strategy?

(10.18) John resents the fact that Mary hates X (X = John)

(10.19) John wonders whether Bill saw X (X = John)

(10.20) John did not realize that George followed X (X = John)

(10.21) John asked how Mike can save X (X = John)

11 Discourse binding etc.

11.1 In an earlier sentence

Translate the following segments, attempting to apply each strategy to the sentence containing X.

(11.1) John₁ talked with Bill₂. X was very proud of him₂ (X = John)

(11.2) Mary called Bill. A picture of X is in the paper. (X = Mary)

11.2 Deictically

Can this form be used when the antecedent is physically present or otherwise prominent, but has not been mentioned? (Suggest a context if necessary).

(11.3) Bill did not see X

(11.4) Does Mary like X?

(11.5) X went to the bank yesterday.

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

(11.6) Bill insulted X (X = speaker, X = addressee)

(11.7) Many people do not like anchovies, but X likes them (X = speaker, X = addressee)

11.3 Logophoricity etc.

Sometimes if a person is aware of a description or statement, this description or statement can contain a reflexive that has this person as its antecedent.

(11.8) John praised the people who gave X the award. (X = John)

(11.9) John praised the people who later murdered X. (X = John)

12 Properties of the antecedents

12.1 NP types

1. Review the examples of section 10, replacing (in your mind) the antecedent with *the children*. Report all examples that *differ* in grammaticality from the examples in the previous section. Otherwise, just provide a few representative translations.
2. Repeat, using in place of John the phrases *Every child* and *No students*.
3. Repeat, using each of the pronouns *I*, *you(singular)*, *we*, and *they*. Try overt and null pronouns if your language has both.

12.2 Split antecedents

Which of the following are grammatical? Use verbs that can be used with the current strategy.

In all cases, X = John and Mary (together).

(12.1) Mary talked about John to X

(12.2) Mary talked about X to John

(12.3) John told Mary that X should leave

(12.4) John told Mary that Bill dislikes X

(12.5) Mary praised X to John

(12.6) John warned Mary for X (benefactive)

12.3 Strict/sloppy identity

Translate these sentences using the current strategy and various ellipsis strategies. Only use examples for which a strategy can be grammatically applied to the antecedent clause.

For each example:

(a) Can the elided VP take the sloppy interpretation? (e.g., Bill thinks Bill is smart).

(b) Can the elided VP take the strict interpretation? (e.g., Bill thinks *John* is smart).

(12.7) John thinks that X is smart, and Bill does too.

(12.8) John praised X and Bill did too.

(12.9) John washed X and Bill did too.

(12.10) John scratched X's arm and Bill did too.

(12.11) John's father touched X's book and Bill did too.

13 Interpretation

13.1 Distribution and reciprocity

1. Select a simple example illustrating the use of the current strategy. Modify it (if necessary) so that the antecedent is the NP “the women.” For example:

(13.1) The women help X.

2. Which of the following meanings can this example have?
 - (a) Collective or distributive, e.g., each woman helps all (most?) of the women.
 - (b) Bound: Each woman helps herself.
 - (c) Reciprocal: Each woman helps some or all of the *other* women.
3. Translate each of the following examples, which are compatible with collective action, and state their interpretation as above.

(13.2) The women praised X

(13.3) The women will support X

(13.4) The women photographed X

(13.5) The women betrayed X

4. If the above examples were reflexive in interpretation: Can the strategy sometimes have a reciprocal meaning? If yes, give several examples.
5. If the above examples were reciprocal in interpretation: Can the strategy sometimes have a reflexive meaning? If yes, give several examples.
6. If this strategy can have both reflexive and reciprocal readings, can you think of some predicates in which it is *ambiguous*?⁴⁰

13.2 Reciprocal readings

Complete this section only if your strategy allows a reciprocal reading. If the strategy is ambiguous, make sure to use verbs that allow the reciprocal interpretation.

1. Which of the following verbs can the strategy be applied to?

meet

see

fight

speak

hit

2. Does the strategy allow the following constructions?

(13.6) John met X with Bill (Meaning: John and Bill met each other)

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

(13.7) John and Mary spoke to X

(13.8) John and Mary met with X

3. If yes, is an independent direct object possible with this strategy?

(13.9) John and Mary gave this book to X

⁴⁰**Example:** In German, *die kinderen wassen sich* can mean either “the children are washing themselves” or “the children are washing each other.”

13.3 Long-distance reciprocal readings

Can the following sentence have the meaning “Bill thinks he likes Mary, and Mary thinks she likes Bill”?

(13.10) Bill and Mary think that they like X

14 Other phenomena

If you are aware of any properties of the current strategy which have not been studied in this questionnaire, but which you consider important or interesting, provide some examples and an explanation.

15 Final questions

15.1 Comparison of the strategies

Having looked at the details of each strategy individually, do you have any general comments on differences in meaning between the various strategies, conditions that would cause one or another to be preferred or required, etc.?

16 Appendix: Syntactic conditions overview

This section presents a synopsis of the questions that sections 7 through 11 try to answer.

If you are already familiar with the binding properties of a strategy, you can use this section to organize your description of them. Refer to the corresponding sections (given after each question) for clarification of what we are after.

For each phenomenon, provide:

1. (a) a yes/no answer (where appropriate)
2. (b) a brief description
3. (c) a set of grammatical and/or ungrammatical examples illustrating it.

1. Binding in a single clause

- (a) What types of predicates can the reciprocal be used with? (ordinary transitive verbs? commonly reflexive predicates? other?) [§7.1]
- (b) Which pairs of syntactic positions can be made coreferent using the current strategy? (subject-object, object-oblique, etc.). [§7.2]
- (c) Is “reverse binding allowed,” and when? [§7.5]
- (d) How does this strategy interact with operations that alter the argument structure of the verb (passive, causativization, applicative, etc)? [§7.3]
- (e) Are there restrictions with respect to the types of antecedents the strategy allows? (Do particular person/number combinations, quantified or wh-question antecedents, animacy or discourse status affect the useability of this strategy?)⁴¹ [§7.4]

2. Cross-clausal binding

- (a) Does this strategy allow long-distance binding? I.e., is binding possible across tensed emdedded clauses? [§8]
- (b) Can the strategy be used across more than one level of embedding? [§8]
- (c) Can the exponent of the strategy “climb”?

3. What are the precise locality conditions on the use of this strategy?

Many languages allow binding across some types of embedding, but not others. [§9]

- (a) List embedding environments (“extended binding domains,” “exceptional case marking” constructions, serial verbs, etc.) across which it is possible to use the current strategy.
- (b) List embedding environments that block use of this strategy.

4. Conditions on (cross-clausal) binding

Long-distance binding is frequently subject to restrictions such as **subject orientation** or **blocking (intervener) effects**. If you know of any such restrictions on this strategy, describe the conditioning environments and give examples. [§10]

5. Conditions on discourse binding

Can the antecedent for the strategy occur in an earlier sentence (and not at all in the current sentence), or be deictic?⁴² What conditions apply to such binding? [§11.1,11.2]

6. Logophoricity Document any logophoricity effects that you are aware of for this language. [§11.3]

⁴¹**Explanation:** Discourse status refers to the difference between a familiar and a first-mentioned entity, etc. The antecedent should nevertheless appear in the same clause that the strategy is used.

⁴²**Explanation:** A deictic referent is physically present or otherwise prominent, and thus available for reference by the participants to a conversation, but has not yet been explicitly mentioned.