I. Introduction.

This questionnaire is designed to explore where Determiner Phrases (DPs) are permitted to appear in a string (i.e., where they can be pronounced), where they must appear, and where they must not appear.

In many of the tasks that follow, you will be asked not only for a translation of a model sentence, but for judgments about the scenarios in which the sentence can be appropriately uttered. Please be sure to indicate as clearly as possible which reading for any given sentence is the one you find acceptable and if you find that some examples are more acceptable than others, please use our acceptability scale to give graded judgments, if you feel that such gradations accurately capture your intuitions. The scale is as follows:

* Unacceptable either at all or at least under the interpretation that you have been asked about.
*? Very marginally possible, perhaps only by comparison with an example or interpretation that is clearly *
?? Very odd. You probably would not say this sentence this way or would not say it this way for the interpretation you have been asked about.
? Just a little off. Something not quite right about it.
OK This sounds like a natural sentence and is an appropriate sentence to use for the interpretation that you have been asked about.

When providing a sentence in your language, whether it is based on a model sentence or is one that you formulate or add in a comment about the sentence you are eliciting, always use the following format (example from Lubukusu).

1. Yoháná éésɔnyá ómwèènè
   Yoháná á-á-i-sòñi-á ó-mù-éènè
   Yohana SM.c1-PST-RFM-shame-fv c1-c1-own
   John shamed himself.

The first line is a rendering in the latinate alphabet that is typically used for your language with tone marked accordingly. If your language has no latinate representation or certain diglosses are used for certain sounds (e.g., -kh- for the voiceless velar fricative, or -sh- for the voiceless palatal fricative) then please indicate this information in some explanatory commentary provided with your answers to the questionnaire. The glossing conventions we want you to use are available on the Afranaph site: Look at the lefthand margin of the homepage and click on glossing conventions.

Unless you are explicitly asked to use a particular word order or manner of translation, provide more than one translation if you think the sentence is ambiguous or might be said more than one way. Your comments about what you think might be factors in making the judgment that you do are always welcome and are very frequently useful, if you will be kind enough to provide them.

After we receive your responses to our questionnaire, we will think about the data you have given us and we will be contacting you again both to insure that we have everything we need and that the responses are clear and complete, as well as to ask follow-up questions, questions that involve asking you for new data,
especially when an empirical pattern seems to be of particular rarity or serves a particular theoretical interest.

II. **Base line questions.**

This section is designed to give us an overview of how sentences are constructed in your language. Please translate them using the glossing conventions described above.

1. A spider spun a web in the tree.
2. The women showed the children the baskets.
3. The sun has warmed the water.
4. We asked the men to plant the maize.
5. Please translate the sentence below. If your language has multiple complementizers (ways of saying ‘that’) please give us multiple translations. If there are varying shades of meaning associated with complementizer choice, please give us whatever information comes to mind about their usage and meanings.

   Mary said that these girls will be working tomorrow.

   In subsequent sections of the questionnaire we will be interested to learn whether complementizer choices are available and what shades of meaning are associated with the choices. It does not seem realistic for us to ask you to provide multiple translations of every single sentence containing an embedded clause, but we would appreciate your keeping complementizer options in mind and provide some representative samples and commentary where choices are available.

III. **Checking for DP subjects of infinitives.**

Please translate the following items literally, taking care to use the finite verb forms for the finite verb forms in the bracketed clauses, or infinitive verb forms for infinitive verb forms in the bracketed clauses (all the (b) examples below). The term ‘infinitive’ may not directly translate to your language, but we are particularly interested in verb forms that do not show agreement morphology and are not clearly associated with present, past or future tense. If you think there is more than one candidate verb form that meets this description, then please provide examples of both. Is the result well-formed? For these examples and throughout the questionnaire, please be sure to provide full translations and glosses etc. even for sentences we ask for that are not acceptable,

1. a. It is believed [that John likes Mary].
   b. It is believed [John to like Mary].

2. a. It is possible [that Mary sees John].
   b. It is possible [Mary to see John].

3. a. [That Mary saw John ] surprises me.
   b. [Mary to see John] would surprise me.

4. a. [That our friends heard this] is embarrassing.
   b. [Our friends to hear this] would be embarrassing.

5. a. There is a rumor [that Mary likes beer].
   b. There is a rumor [Mary to like beer].
IV. Testing for NP-movement from embedded clauses.
IV. A. Raising.

Please translate the following items literally, taking care to use a tensed or infinitival verb form in the bracketed clauses to match the sentences you are translating. Are the results well-formed in the scenarios described? It may be possible in these instances to have a sentence that is well-formed, but seems odd to say in these circumstances. Please also tell us this, if the sentence is acceptable but if it seems inappropriate in some way in these particular circumstances. And if there are options vis-à-vis the complementizer involved, please indicate this and any correlating differences in grammaticality.

A. You are a detective investigating a crime scene. You know that Mary wears shoes that leave a specific pattern on the ground. Upon seeing footprints with this pattern, can you say the following?

1. It seems [that Mary fell here].
2. Mary seems [fell here].
3. Mary seems [that fell here].
4. Mary seems [to have fallen here].

B. You are reading tomorrow’s weather forecast in the newspaper. Can you say:

1. Rain will fall tomorrow.
2. It seems that rain will fall tomorrow.
3. Rain seems [will fall tomorrow].
4. Rain seems [that will fall tomorrow].
5. Rain seems [to be going to fall tomorrow].

C. You find that the watering hole the cows usually drink from is dry. Without seeing the cattle, can you say:

1. It seems [that the cows have drunk all the water].
2. The cows seem [to have drunk all the water].
3. The cows seem [have drunk all the water].
4. The cows seem [that have drunk all the water].

In English, seem is the verb most often used to illustrate raising constructions, but you might also try verbs like appear, your closest equivalent to English be likely, if there is no easy translation for seem. If any of these verbs take something other than what you would normally think of as an infinitive, but permit the paradigm in (B) or (C), then please provide the paradigm for that verb (i.e., provide sentences with the verb in question corresponding to each of the examples in B). If there are complementizer options (with or without differences in meaning) please provide some representative examples.

D. Below we test verbs that indicate inception/duration/cessation of events. This test only works if these semantic notions are represented in your language as separate verbs (some languages just treat them as affixes). Compare the translation of the paradigm below to otherwise identical sentences with other such verbs, particularly translations of verbs like begin, and continue. See if they take the same sort of complement as your start translation. (In English, stop takes a gerundive complement, but still acts like a raising predicate, e.g., ‘John stopped eating/*to eat’, and we are interested in knowing about cases like these, if you language has them).

You are looking out of the window at the weather. Can you say:

1a. It is starting to rain now
   b. It has stopped raining now

2a. It is starting (that) it rains.
b. It has stopped (that) it rains.

3a. The cow is starting to eat the grass.
b. The cow has stopped eating the grass.

E. Can you think of expressions with idiomatic subjects? English has a few listed below:

1. The cat is out of the bag (meaning the secret has been revealed).
2. All hell broke loose (meaning suddenly there was a big commotion or chaos ensured).
3. The shit hit the fan (meaning there was trouble)
If you can think of expressions like this, we would be very interested to know if they can participate in raising constructions. Please try to insert them in the paradigms in above, such as “All hell seemed to break lose,” and “all hell started to break lose,” “The cat seems to be out of the bag”, etc. Do they retain their idiomatic meaning, or has it changed in some way?

Part IV.B Passive raising.

Please provide literal translations and grammaticality judgments. As above, please consider whether choice of complementizer is significant and indicate this where relevant.

1. It is known that Mary likes coffee.
2. Mary is known [likes coffee].
3. Mary is known that [likes coffee].
4. Mary is known [to like coffee]
5. We know that Mary likes coffee

1. It is known that John will leave.
2. John is known [will leave].
3. John is known [that will leave].
4. John is known [to be going to leave].
5. We know that John will leave.

1. It is believed that the rabbit is hiding in the forest.
2. The rabbit is believed is hiding in the forest.
3. The rabbit is believed that is hiding in the forest.
4. We believe that the rabbit is hiding in the forest.

Part V. Objects of passive verbs.

Are these sentences licit? Please translate and comment. It is possible that your language will not have any overt ‘dummy subject’ like “there” – if it does have a ‘dummy subject’, please include the data and discuss, but if not, are there possible analogous sentences with no overt subject?

1a. (There) was seen a car here yesterday.
b. Mary saw a car here yesterday

2a. (There) was built a house in the field.
b. We built a new house in the field.

3a. (There) will be given the students a test tomorrow.
b. We will give the students a test tomorrow.

4a. (There) fell a tree.
b. A tree fell

5a. (There) spoke two women at the conference.
    b. Two women spoke at the conference.

Part VI. Multiple subject agreement

1. The farmers will be harvesting the maize tomorrow.
2. The farmer will be harvesting the maize tomorrow.
3. The bird was singing in the tree yesterday.
4. The birds were singing in the tree yesterday.
5. We will have eaten already when you get home.
6. She had been working for 2 hours.

Part VII. Looking for Exceptional Case Marking (ECM)/Raising to Object.

Please translate as many of these as possible, even if they are very unacceptable. If your language has a subjunctive, try it in these embedded clauses. If there are complementizer option please give us some representative examples.

1a. I want John to leave
2a. I want that John to leave.
3a. I want that John should leave.
4a. I want very much John to leave
5b. I want very much to leave.
6a. I want very much that John should leave.
7a. I want John very much (that) should leave.
8a. I want very much that John to leave
9a. I want John very much that to leave [where it is understood that John is the leaver]
10a. I want-him to leave [OM on matrix verb]
11a. I want-him that to leave [OM on matrix verb]
12a. I want-him very much that to leave [OM on matrix verb]
13a. I want-him very much that should leave. [OM on matrix verb, subordinate verb SM=him]
14a. I want him that he should leave
15. John wants to leave

1b. I saw John to leave
2b. I saw that John to leave.
3b. I saw that John would leave.
4b. I saw clearly John to leave
5b. I saw John clearly to leave
6b. I saw clearly that John would leave.
7b. I saw John clearly (that) would leave.
8b. I saw clearly that John to leave
9b. I saw John clearly that to leave [where it is understood that John is the leaver]
10b. I saw-him to leave [OM on matrix verb]
11b. I saw-him that to leave [OM on matrix verb]
12b. I saw-him clearly that to leave [OM on matrix verb]
13b. I saw-him clearly that would leave. [OM on matrix verb, subordinate verb SM=him]
14b. I saw him that he would leave

Part IX. Wh-agreement in source clause of subject raising.

Consider first the form of subject agreement on the verb in 1 versus 2 below, and 3 versus 4.
1. John cooked the chicken.
2. Who cooked the chicken?
3. The student read the book.
4. Who read the book?

Is there any special subject agreement form that appears in 2 and 4 that does not appear in 1 and 3? If not, move on to the next section.

If there is a special form of subject agreement that appears in the ‘who’ questions above, please consider these additional questions. Recall the questions from section VI.A 2 and 3 above:

IV. A. 2. Mary seems [fell here].
IV.A.3. Mary seems [that fell here].

Is it possible to form the sentences which you gave for the examples listed above but using on ‘fell’ the special agreement forms that appear on the verbs ‘cooked’ and ‘read’ in your translations of *Who cooked the chicken* and *Who read the book*? If so, please translate the examples above using this special agreement form, and please also provide translations of (5) and (6).

5. Who seems fell here?
6. Who seems that fell here?

If there is special agreement for (2) ‘Who cooked the chicken’ and (4) ‘Who read the book’ of this section, then please translate the following sentences.

7. Who was arrested?
8. Who did the police arrest?
9. Who did you see leaving?
10. Who made the children eat fish?
11. Which children did John make eat fish?

**Part XI. Super-raising.**

**A. Subject of deeply embedded clause.**

Please translate the sentences in (1) and (2) below. If you had to use a different verb for section IVA in place of *seem*, then use that verb here. Additional question: If you can say a sentence like (2), can you use this in a context where you are not actually looking at the teacher, for example, if you have deduced from what the students say that they know the teacher is sick? Or is it only appropriate if you are actually looking at the teacher and observing his remarks and behavior?

1. It seems like the students know that the teacher is sick.
2. The teacher seems like the students know he is sick.

Additional question, like above: If you can say a sentence such as (4), can you use this in all the same contexts as (3)? Could you use it where you are simply reporting what you have gathered from or about the husband? Or is it only appropriate in reaction to the woman or evidence of her behavior?

3. It seems like her husband wants the woman to leave.
4. The woman seems like her husband wants her to go.

**B. Object super-raising**

Please translate (1) (with and without an object marker. Indicate whether or not each result is acceptable.
1. The food seems that Mary cooked (it).

If you have judged (1) to be acceptable, please consider what would be a felicitous context for this utterance. For the situations described in A-C below, answer for each one (Yes or No) whether or not (1) could be uttered in that context.

A. You taste the food and recognize her favorite ingredient.
B. You see Mary in an apron and deduce from this that she did the cooking.
C. Mary is an incredibly messy cook, and from the state of the kitchen you can’t imagine anyone else being responsible.

Part XII. DP/CP Contrasts. Are DPs licit in the same range of positions as CPs? Please translate and provide judgments. Does it make a difference what complementizer you use in the CPs?

1. The people believed that John left.
2. The people believed John’s story.
3. It is believed that John left.
4. It is believed John’s story.
5. John’s story was believed (by the people).
6. That John left was believed (by the people).
7. John ate the banana.
8. The banana was eaten.
9. (there) was eaten a banana. (with or without overt ‘dummy subject’)
10. John said that the farmers harvested the maize
11. That the farmers harvested the maize was said.
12. John told Mary that the farmers harvested the maize yesterday.
13. Mary was told that the farmers harvested the maize.
14. That the farmers harvested the maize was told Mary.
15. That Lewis left seems.
16. It seems that Lewis left.
17. Lewis seems that (he) left.
18. That Lewis left is possible
19. It is possible that Lewis left
20. The people discovered/found out that Lewis left
21. The people discovered/found out the truth
22. It was discovered/found out the truth
23. That Lewis left was discovered/found out.

Part XIII. Inversion Constructions.

A. Locative Inversion. In addition to the canonical neutral word orders that would translate to the (a) examples, are the (b) examples well-formed? Please translate and evaluate.

1a. A tree fell in the forest.
   b. In the forest fell a tree.
2a. A child jumped into the field
   b. Into the field jumped a child.
3a. A bird sang on the tree.
   b. On the tree sang a bird.
4a. Elephants trampled the crops in the field.
   b. In the field trampled elephants the crops (perhaps as opposed to COWS trampling them).
5. There taught the teacher English
6. There taught English the teacher.
7. There taught the students the teacher.
8. There taught the teacher the students.
9. There taught the teacher the children English.
10. The child is eating with a spoon.
11. The spoon is eating the child.

(Try 9-11 with and without an applicative morpheme).
(For all of these inversions, can the verb subject-agree with the fronted locative or expletive? Can it subject-agree with the postverbal logical subject?)

B. Subject-Object Inversion (OVS). Does your language permit the word orders in the (b) sentences? Please translate the questions below and give judgments on them.

1.   a. Children drank the milk.
       b. The milk drank the children (not the parents).

2.   a. John read the books.
       b. The books read John (not Peter).

3.   a. The children read John the books, (not Peter; i.e. it was John who read the children books, not Peter)
       b. The children read the books John (not Peter; as above)
       c. The books read John the children (not Peter) i.e. It was John who read the children books, not Peter.
       d. The books read the children John, (not Peter; as above).