

Anaphora in the African Languages

Questionnaire Response for Urhobo, Agbarho dialect – Version 2.1

The dialect reported is the Agbarho dialect of Urhobo, spoken in Southwestern Nigeria (Ethnologue Code URH).

The consultant, Rose Oro Aziza, is a professor of linguistics with some background in syntax, formal semantics, and a background in phonology. Her parents spoke Urhobo at home, and they are native speakers of the language. She was schooled in English, but has spoken Urhobo since she was a child. She is reporting on her own judgments.

Contact Information: roaziza12@yahoo.com

Rose Oro Aziza
Department of Language and Linguistics
Delta State University
Abraka, Nigeria

Preliminary Phonological Remarks.

A. Consonants

- (a) *ch* pronounced as /c/ :voiceless palatal plosive as in *cho* /col/ ‘steal’
- (b) *dj* pronounced as /ǰ/: voiced palatal plosive as in *dje* /ǰe/ ‘show’
- (c) *kp* pronounced as /kp̠/: voiceless labial velar plosive as in *kp̠en* / kp̠ɛ̃/ ‘peel’
- (d) *gb* pronounced as /gb̠/: voiced labial velar plosive as in *gb̠en* /gb̠ɛ̃/ ‘clear’
- (e) *j* pronounced as /ɜ/ in English.
- (f) *gh* pronounced as /ɣ/ : voiced velar fricative as in *gha* /ɣa/ ‘forbid’

- (g) *ny* pronounced as /ɲ/: palatal nasal as in *nyo* /ɲo/ ‘hear’
- (h) *mw* pronounced as /ɱm/: labial velar nasal as in *amwa* /aɱma/ ‘cloth’
- (i) *vw* pronounced as /vʷ/: voiced labiodental approximant as in *vwo* /vʷo/ ‘have’

B. Vowels

ɸ pronounced as /ɛ/ as in *dɸ* /dɛ/ ‘buy’

ɔ̣ pronounced as /ɔ/ as in *fɔ̣* /fɔ/ ‘be still’

C. Please note the following:

1. The forms represented here are underlying forms, not surface phonetic forms. Urhobo prohibits vowel sequences at the phonetic level and so whenever they occur at morpheme or word boundaries, one of the two (vowels) usually the first is either elided if it is [-high] or becomes a corresponding glide if it is [+high]. As at now, the writing system has not really been standardized and so writers use any one of these methods:

write the forms in full as I have done here generally.

mark elision with an apostrophe or

join two words together as in the phonetic output.

2. Urhobo makes an extensive use of ‘*rɸ*’ which is really an associative marker (AM) which occurs between associative constructions e.g. Noun + Noun, Noun + Pronoun, and Adjective + Noun. Also, it introduces relative clauses. Where ‘*rɸ*’ occurs between a Noun and a Pronoun, it usually indicates possession.

Oma	<i>rɸ</i>	oyen	→	omaroyen
Body	AM	him		his body/ himself

Oma	<i>rɸ</i>	avware	→	omaravware
-----	-----------	--------	---	------------

Body AM us our body/ourselves

but when *rɛ* occurs between two nouns or adjective + noun, it usually indicates association.

evun rɛ eki na → evun reki na
belly AM market the 'inside the market'

(for details on this, please see Aziza 2002: "Tonal Alternations in the Urhobo Noun Phrase" Paper read at the 33rd ACAL)

3. Tense is marked mainly through tones. Verbs are underlyingly toneless while other lexical categories bear tones. A high tone on the final vowel of the subject NP indicates the present tense while a high tone on the first vowel of the verb marks the past tense. The future tense is marked by a HLH sequence distributed as follows: the first H is realized on the final vowel of the subject NP; the L is marked on the future tense particle 'che ~ cha' and the second H is borne by the verb.

PART 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 are only attempting to get a brief overview of the strategies and so we only want from you a few exemplars of each strategy. The properties of each strategy will be investigated in more detail in the following sections.

2.1 Co-reference 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.

ljɔni mrɛ omarɔyen

ljɔni mrɛ oma-rɛ-ɔyen

John see-PST body of him

‘John saw himself’

Strategy: “OMA-X” or Strategy A

No

Other verb types

Strategy A: It cannot appear in subject positions. The following are not permissible:

*Omarɔyen rhere

‘himself/herself came’

*omarɔyen bru imeri

‘herself cut Mary’

A2 (a) “John bathes (himself)”

ljɔnĩi hɔ

ljɔni-í hɔ

John-PRS bathe

Strategy E: Object Null

(b) Imeri brú omarøyen
Imeri brú oma-rẹ-øyen
Mary cut-PST herself Strategy A: Oma -X
“Mary Cut herself”

(c) Omarobroyen vuẹ lịoni
Oma-rẹ-obọ-roye-én vuẹ lịoni
Body-of-hand-of-his-PRS ashamed John
“John is ashamed of himself”

Answer: Verbs for which this strategy succeeds

Họnre - “fight”
guọghọ “destroy”
rhuẹroma “take care of (oneself)”
vwerotoma “take care of (oneself)”
jiri “praise”

Comments: If one makes a word that has the right meaning it will permit Strategy E.

Strategy B: ‘Omarobo-X’ strategy

(d) lịoni guọghọ omarøyen
lịoni guọghọ oma-rẹ-øyen
John destroy-PST himself StrategyA: Oma -X
‘John destroyed himself’

(e) aware vwo eguọnọ kẹ omarawaree
aware vwo eguọnọ kẹ oma-rẹ-aware-e
We have love for body-of-ours-NEG

‘We hate ourselves’

- (f) *ljɔni hɔre*
 ljɔni hɔ-re
 John bathe-PST TM (Strategy E: obj. null)
 John bathed himself

Comment: There are three verbs in Urhobo that can be said to be equivalent to ‘bathe’ in English. These are:

- (a) *hɔ* ‘bathe’ e.g. *ljɔni hɔre*, ‘John washed (bathed) himself’

(b) *hworhɛ* ‘wash’ e.g. plates *ljɔni hworhere* ‘John washed (x)’

(c) *fɔrhɔn* ‘wash’ e.g. clothes *ljɔni fɔrhɔnre* ‘John washed (x)’

The forms for (b) and (c) are not reflexives.

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). The following examples are models only and may not have the desired syntax in your language - in which case, please do your best to design appropriate sentences reflecting the relations in parentheses. Once again, translate them only if they involve a strategy that you have not yet identified.

Ikali vwerosue omarɔyen

Ikali vwẹ-ero-sue oma-rẹ-ọyen

Karl put-eye-trust himself Strategy A

“Karl counted on himself”

Isali mrẹ ọrodeko kere omarọyen

Isali mrẹ ọrodeko kere omarọyen

Sally see-PST snake near herself Strategy A

‘Sally saw a snake near her’

- A3. (a) Ijoni ta ota (vwọ) kẹ Imeri (kpaḥẹ omarọyen)
Ijoni tá ota (vwọ)kẹ Imeri (kpaḥẹ oma-rẹ-ọyen)
John say-PST word give to Mary (about herself)
‘John spoke to Mary Strategy A
- (b) Ijoni tá ota kpaḥẹ omarọyen (vwo)kẹ Imeri
Ijoni tá ota kpaḥẹ oma-rẹ-ọyen (vwo)kẹ Imeri
John say-PST word about himself (give to Mary)
“John spoke to Mary about himself”
- (c) Ijoni vúẹ Imeri kpaḥẹ omarọyen
Ijoni vúẹ Imeri kpaḥẹ oma-rẹ-ọyen
John tell-PST Mary about himself
“John told Mary about himself”
- (d) Ijoni vúẹ avware kpaḥẹ omaravware
Ijoni vúẹ avware kpaḥẹ oma-rẹ-avware
John tell-PST we about ourselves
“John told us about ourselves”

Comments: A3 (d). The antecedent of the reflexive form can be a direct object.

- (e) Imeri ké ememọ na (ọne)
 Imeri ké emọ-emọ na (ọne)
 Mary give-PST only children the (yam) **Strategy G - reduplication**
 ‘Mary gave the children themselves (yam)’

Comments: Reduplication may not be a reflexivization strategy so much as focus. The object given is not Δthe children@ but some null argument. It may be possible to put the sentence differently as:

Imeri ke emo na omomarayen (ọne)
 Imeri ke emo na oma-oma-re-ayen (ọne)
 Mary give-PST children the they-themselves (yam)
 ΔMary gave the children themselves (yam)@

Even here, although the strategy may be said to be reflexive, the actual object given is still not Δthe children@.

- (f) Imeri mrẹ ọbe vwẹ obuko ọyen
 Imeri mrẹ ọbe vwẹ obuko re-ọyen
 Mary see-PST book at (LOC) at-back of hers
 ‘Mary saw a book behind her’

Strategy H locative + body part OMA-X

Comments:

Ken: - Locative+body part Oma-X (Strategy H) (productive)

Is this just a pronominal strategy with a locatively interpreted body part? Is it like "Mary looked to her rear?"

Rose: No, it is not like ΔMary looked to her rear@ which will be translated as

Imeri ni obuko royen
Mary look PST at-back hers

Comments from Ken: This is probably not an independent strategy given the gloss of (A3f). It appears as though the pronoun is associated with a locatively-interpreted body part. I do not see how the Oma-X strategy is part of this, since there is no "oma", just the specific body part interpreted locatively. If you do not agree, please explain. Is it possible for the r-oyen to combine with omo to get omoroyen (or romoroyen) while otherwise keeping the sentence the same? Whether this is possible or not, the result will be interesting for theories of how far the anaphor is allowed to be from its antecedent. Also, how would this sentence look if it was "Mary saw a book behind John"? This is designed to see if r-oyen is a pronominal substitute for a name in this environment.

Rose: I agree that the Oma- X strategy is not part of this. The sentence as it is ambiguous: the pronoun can refer to either Mary or some third person not identified here. If the sentence were:

Imeri mre ɔbe vwe obuko ravware
Imeri mre ɔbe vwe obuko rɛ-avware
Mary see-PST book at at-back of us
ΔMary saw a book behind us@

It is obvious that the structure remains the same but the pronoun has a referent not located in the sentence.

It is possible for royen to combine with oma and we get romaroyen. The sentence would then be:

Imeri mre ọbe vwe obuko romarọyen
Imeri mre ọbe vwe obuko rẹ-oma-rẹ-ọyen
Mary see-PST book at at-back of herself
ΔMary saw a book behind her(self)@

Imeri mre ọbe vwe obuko royen (rẹ Ijọni)
Mary saw book at at-back of his (John@s)
ΔMary saw a book behind him (John)”

- (g) Ijọni dé ọbe na vwọkẹ omobọroyen
Ijọni dé ọbe na vwoke oma-obọ-rẹ-ọyen
John buy-PST book the give to himself (benefactive) **Strategy**

B

“John bought the book for himself”

- A4. (a) Etta vwo ẹguọno vwọkẹ omarọyen
Etta vwo ẹguọno vwọkẹ oma-rẹ-ọyen
Etta has love for herself **Strategy A**
“Etta loves herself”

- (b) Etta djoshọ ke omobọroyen
Etta djẹ-oshọ ke oma-obọ-rẹ-ọyen
Etta fears/is scared for herself **Strategy B**
“Etta is afraid for her own self”

- (c) Etta kpokpo omarọyen
Etta kpokpo oma-rẹ-ọyen
Etta worries herself **Strategy A**

Comments: For (A4) Strategies A and C can be used equally well for all three verbs.

2.1.5 Person and number - Some languages use different strategies depending on person or number. For example, in Dutch, the special reflexive pronoun zich used with certain verbs is only used in the third person; first and second person coreference for these verbs is expressed with ordinary pronouns (pronouns that do not normally have to have an antecedent), which should therefore be considered a distinct local coreference strategy.

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). Some of you may speak a language that distinguishes singulars, plurals and duals, and if so, please check for the dual reading.

A5 (a) me mrɛ omamɛ
me mrɛ oma-mɛ
I see-PST myself
'I saw myself'

Strategy A

Note: The object pronouns *me* 'me' and *we* 'you (sg.)' begin with consonants and therefore do not have the associative pronoun *rɛ* between OMA and these pronouns when they are used in the possessive. The other pronouns – *oyen* 'him, her, it', *avware* 'us' *owavwa* 'you (pl.)' and *ayen* 'them' are preceded by *rɛ* whenever they are used as possessives; because they all begin with vowels. In other words, A5 (a) and (b) also belong to Strategy A: OMA-X

(b) wo brú omawɛ

wo brú oma-wẹ
you (sg.) cut-PST yourself
“you cut yourself”

(c) avware cha họ oma-rẹ-avware
avware cha họ oma-rẹ-avware
we will wash ourselves
“we will wash ourselves”

(i) owavwa me vwe ukecha vwoke omarowavwa
owavwa me vwe uko-ẹcha vwoke oma-rẹ-owavwa
you (pl.) should/must give help give to yourselves
“you should/must give help to yourselves”

(ii) owavwa me cha omarowavwa uko
owavwa me cha oma-rẹ-owavwa uko
you (pl.) should/must wedge yourselves back
“you should/must help/support yourselves”

(iii) owavwa me vwe ukecha vwoke ohwohwo
owavwa me vwe uko-echa vwoke ohwo-ohwo
you (pl.) should give help give to each other
“you should help/support each other”

Strategy D- OHWOHWO strategy

(iv) owavwa me cha ohwohwo uko
owavwa me cha ohwohwo uko
you (pl.) must wedge each other back

‘You must help yourselves’ **Strategy D- OHWOHWO strategy**

Comment: Strategy D is not marked for person.

Comment: *ohwohwo* can permit reciprocal reading as in
Ayen mre ohwohwo vwe omomarayen
Ayen mre ohwo-ohwo vwe oma-oma-rẹ-ayen
They saw each other LOC themselves
“They saw each other in themselves”

Question (ii): Could this form be used for “together” as in “I saw John and Mary together”?

Answer: No, this form cannot be used for “together”.

Me mre Ijoni vẹ Imeri kugbe
I saw John and Mary together

Comment: It is possible to use *ohwohwo* in the subject position, as in:

Ohwohwo rhua nẹ ohwo
Ohwo-ohwo rhua nẹ ohwo
Each grow big more than person
“each one can be bigger than the other”

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.

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?

I do not know

A6 (a) Ipita rien omarøyen

Ipita rien oma-rë-øyen

Peter knows himself

“Peter knows himself”

(b) Ipita gbon omarøyen

Ipitã gbon oma-rë-øyen

Peter PRS. smell/criticize himself

“Peter (habitually) criticizes himself”

(c) Ipita che jiri omarøyen

Ipita che jiri omarøyen

Peter will praise himself

“Peter will/ is likely to praise himself”

(b) some how

A7 (a) Emeshare na øvuøvo ni omarøyen

Emeshare na øvuøvo ni oma-rë-øyen

boys the each one looked himself

“Every/each boy looked at himself”

(b) Eya na ejobi dje kpahe ljonni vwø ke omarøyen

Eya na ejobi dje kpahe ljonni vwø ke oma-rë-ayen

women the all describe about John take give themselves

“All the women described John to themselves”

(c) Itisha na ɔvuɔvo dje omaroyen vwɔ kɛ Ibɔbu
Itisha na ɔvuɔvo dje oma-rɛ-oyen vwɔ kɛ Ibɔbu
Teacher the each one show himself take give Bob
“Every teacher introduced himself to Bob”

(d) Emo evo vwɛ ukɛcha kɛ omarayen ɔvo
Emo evo vwɛ uko-ɛcha kɛ oma-rɛ-ayen ɔvo
children some give help give themselves only
“Some children only help themselves”

This language has no syntactic honorifics

A8 (i) Ayen mrɛ omarayen
Ayen mrɛ oma-rɛ-ayen
They see-PST themselves
‘They saw themselves’

(ii) Ayen mrɛ *ohwohwo*
Ayen mrɛ *ohwo-ohwo*
They see-PST each other
‘They saw themselves’ / They saw each other’

(iii) Ayen mrɛ omomarayen
Ayen mrɛ oma-oma-rɛ-ayen
They see-PST themselves
‘The saw themselves’ (reciprocal) **Strategy C: OMA + OMA- X**

Comments: Strategy C, or "Oma+Oma-X" - This strategy with a reduplicated body morpheme requires a plural antecedent, favors reciprocal interpretations but can be reflexive under certain circumstances. (It may be a related fact that the word for "each" is the word meaning "one" reduplicated, i.e. *ovuovo*, one-one="each"). When used as a subject *ovuovo* means ‘only one’ as in

Ovuovo (yen) sa ra
Ovuovo (that) sa ra
Only one (that) can go
“Only one can go”

Comment: ‘I see myself in you’ is impossible with this strategy because the antecedent must be plural. To express ‘I see myself in you’, one can use Strategy A, Oma-X.

Me mre omame vwe omawen
Me mre oma-mẹ vwe oma-wen
I see myself LOC yourself
“I see myself in you”

The difference between Strategy B and Strategy D as I reason is that Strategy B is more commonly used when the antecedent is more than two persons whereas Strategy D is more frequently used if the antecedent is two persons or a small pair or group. They can, however, be used interchangeably.

Comment: Strategy C is more typically reciprocal, but can be used as a reflexive. For example, When two persons are standing in front of a mirror and each sees the other and himself or when one can see his behavior in the other person.

More Comments:

Ken: Your response to (A8) permits me to phrase several questions I have been wondering about. You give three translations for this using strategies A,C, and D, but you only translate strategies C and D as reciprocal.

Question (i): - Can strategy E (Object Null) be used here?

Answer: No, strategy E cannot be used here.

Question (ii): Can all of the strategies can have both reciprocal and reflexive readings here? If not, what are the limits? (see also (A11))

Answer: It is possible for strategies A, C and D to have both reciprocal and reflexive readings here.

Comment: Strategy D is translated as reciprocal depending on whether or not *they* is a pair or a larger group, but the restriction to small, perhaps dual pluralities extends to reflexive readings.

A9 (a) Isolu tare ne Alisi vweḡuḡoḡo ke omaroyen

Isolu ta-re ne Alisi vwo-ḡuḡoḡo ke oma-re-oyen

Sol say-PST that Alice has-love give herself

“Sol says that Alice loves herself”

(b) Isolu guḡoḡo-re ne Alisi jiri omaroyen

Isolu guḡoḡo-re ne Alisi jiri oma-re-oyen

Sol require/want-PST that Alice praise herself

“Sol required/wanted that Alice praise herself”

(c) Isolu rorori ne ofori tane Alisi jiri omaroyen

Isolu roro-ri ne o-fo-ri ta-ne Alisi jiri oma-re-oyen

Sol think-PST that it be good say that Alice praise herself
'Sol thought Alice should praise herself'

(d) Isolu vue Alisi ne o jiri omaroyen

Isolu vue Alisi ne o jiri omaroyen
Sol tell/ask-PST Alice that she praise herself
'Sol asked Alice to praise herself'

(e) Isolu guonon jiri omaroyen

Isolu guonon jiri oma-re-oyen
Sol want-PRS. praise herself
'Sol wants to praise himself'

Note: Strategy C: OMA + OMA –X involves reduplication of OMA. Although it can have a reflexive sense, it is used more commonly as a reciprocal pronoun. There are no syntactic honorifics.

(f) Isolu vweroso ne Alisi jiri omaroyen

Isolu vwe-ero-so ne Alisi jiri oma-re-oyen
Sol expect that Alice praise herself
'Sol expects Alice to praise herself'

(g) Isolu nyori oke re Alisi vwo jiri omaroyen

Isolu nyo-ri oke re Alisi vwo jiri oma-re-oyen
Sol hear-PST time that Alice doing praise herself
'Sol heard Alice praising herself'

Comment: Strategy A examples here are not acceptable with Sol as the antecedent in (A9). (This needs to be followed up).

E.g., Isolu tare ne Alisi vwo eguonon ke oyen

Isolu ta-re nẹ Alisl vwo ẹguṣọṣọ kẹ ọyen
Sol say-PST that Alice has love for him
'Sol said that Alice loves him'

Comments:

Ken: - For 2.1.6 you give all the examples with Strategy A, but could any of the other strategies be used for the sentences in A6 and those with quantified antecedents in A7?

Rose: It is possible, in A6(b), for the omoba Strategy to also be used:

Ipitã gbon omoboroyen
Ipitã gbon oma-rẹ-obo-rẹ-oyen
Peter-PST criticize himself
ΔPeter criticizes himself.@

To my knowledge, there are no strategies that can appear with plural names that cannot appear with plural quantified antecedents.

Verbs are not required to agree for number, only the noun phrase and the adjectival complement (if there is one).

2.2. Ordinary (potentially independent) pronouns

Even if pronouns are never used as reflexives, we want to apply the tests of this questionnaire to them as well, since knowing what is not possible is also useful to us. Please test them now in all the local environments, even if they fail, unless you have already named them as a strategy because they succeed in local

coreference environments. For this section, please translate all the sentences, indicating the acceptability of the results.

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). If it is more convenient for you to construct your own sentences, feel free to do so.

A10 (a) Me vẹ Abrahamu tota ođẹwanrenà. Ọ mre llela
Me vẹ Abrahamu ta-ota ođẹ-re-ọ-wanre-nà. Ọ mre llela
I and Abraham spoke yesterday He see-PST Lela
'I spoke with Abraham yesterday.' 'He saw Lela'

(b) Abrahamu rhọ? OR Tivọ Abrahamu ephan?
Abrahamu rhọ? OR Tivọ Abrahamu ephan?
Abraham where? Where Abraham be present
'Where is Abraham'

Me mrẹ ren vwe obevun re eki
Me mrẹ ren vwe obe-evun re eki
I see-PST him at in of market
'I saw him in the market'

(c) avware mrẹ wen / avware mrẹ owavwa
avware mrẹ wen / avware mrẹ owavwa
we see-PST you(sg.) we see-PST you (pl.)
'We saw you'

Wọ mrẹ vwen / avware?

Wọ mrẹ vwen / avware?

You (sg.) see-PST me us

‘Did you see me/us?’

owavwa mrẹ vwen / avware ?

owavwa mrẹ vwen / avware ?

You (pl.) see-PST me / us

‘Did you (pl.) see me/us?’

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

Strategy F, the pronominal strategy - This is the use of an otherwise independent pronoun to form anaphoric readings. Pronouns appear in argument positions in Urhobo, that is, the same positions in the clause that a full name or description would.

(a) to represent coconstrual with a nonlocal antecedent (e.g., an antecedent outside the clause containing the pronoun),

(b) when the pronoun is possessive and construed with any antecedent (clausemate or not),

(c) and, in certain circumstances, coconstrual with a clausemate antecedent when the pronoun is embedded in a prepositional phrase.

Independent pronouns cannot be used to create coargument reflexive or reciprocal readings. For examples like "He saw him", "He spoke to him", "They praised them", these are not possible with coreference at all. These are not possible patterns, unless "he" and "him" are different people and "they" and "them" are different sets of people. It is possible to drop a direct object pronoun with many verbs (see 2.2.3), but these missing objects are not part of strategy E and cannot be interpreted reflexively. They appear to pattern with the independent pronoun strategy.

Notice that the possessive pronouns are mostly just the associative marker (AM) followed by the object pronoun. The AM is phonetically absent if the pronoun starts with a consonant (as in the case of first and second person singular, see (a,b) at the beginning of 4.4.2 and remark in 2.1.5), but it is morphologically integrated into pronouns beginning with vowels that follow it. The pronominal paradigm is as follows, most of the subject/object paradigm is exemplified in (A10).

Subject Pronouns	Object Pronouns	Possessive Pronouns
mi ~ me A _I @	vwe ~ vwẹ A _{me} @	mẹ A _{mine} A
wo ~ wọ A _{you (sg.)} @	we ~ wẹ A _{you} @	wẹn A _{yours} @
o ~ ọ A _{he / she / it} @	o ~ ọ ~ Ø A _{him / her / it} @	royen A _{his/hers/its} @
avware A _{we} @	avware A _{us} @	ravware A _{ours} @
owavwa A _{you (pl.)} @	owavwa A _{you} @	rowavwa A _{yours} @
ayen A _{they} @	ayen A _{them} @	rayen A _{theirs} @

Please note: “~” means that both forms alternate with each other depending on the vowel harmony requirements of the verb. The vowels of this language pattern into two based on the feature “Advanced Tongue Root” [ATR], so that a vowel may [+ATR] or [-ATR]. If the verb stem vowel is [+ATR], it co-occurs with the forms on the left, but if it is [-ATR], it co-occurs with those on the right. The plural

forms are not marked for vowel harmony. Prepositional object pronouns are the same as direct object pronouns.

o guonovwe
o guono-ovwe
he/she wants-me
'he/she wants me'

o vwo eguono kpahovwe
o vwo eguono kpahe-ovwe
he/she has likeness/love on me
'He she loves me'

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. This kind of argument drop does not have to be interpreted as reflexive (as in the case of English John washed), but rather it is the sort of argument drop that could be used where there is not necessarily an antecedent in the sentence, but the interpretation is like that of an independent pronoun.

Comment: Null pronoun is possible if the object is a third person singular pronoun with certain verb types. E.g.

ke - give (him/her)
Se - call (him/her) / read (it)
Da - drink (it)
torhe - burn (it)

But: Gharo 'share it' → ghare + o (share + pronoun)

Comments: Null subject and object (Strategy H)

This is not a reflexive strategy - independently interpreted pronouns can appear here, but these do not allow reflexive readings.

2.3. Reciprocal coreference

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

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.

(a) Ayen mrẹ omomarayen / Ayen mrẹ ohwohwo
Ayen mrẹ oma-oma-rẹ-ayen / Ayen mrẹ ohwo-ohwo
They see-PST themselves They see-PST each
one
'The saw themselves'

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.

A11 (a) Eya nă mrẹ ohwohwo
Eya nă mrẹ ohwo-ohwo
Women the-PST see each other
'The women see each other'

- (b) Emeshare na h_o ohwohwo
 Em_o-eshare na h_o ohwo-ohwo
 Boys the bathe each other
 ‘The boys bathed/washed each other’
- (c) Eshare na f_eton r_e ohwohwo
 Eshare na fa-_eton r_e ohwo-ohwo
 men the combed of each other
 ‘The men combed each other’s hair’
- (c) Ayen nene ohwohwo phraphro
 Ayen nene ohwo-ohwo phro-aphro
 they follow each other argue
 ‘They argued with each other’
- (e) Emeshare na sare ohwohwo / omomarayen
 Em_o-eshare na sa-re ohwo-ohwo / omomarayen
 boys the kick-PST each other / among themselves
 ‘The boys kicked each other’
- (f) Ayen vwo ẹgu_on_o k_e ohwohwo / omomarayeen
 Ayen vwo ẹgu_on_o k_e ohwo-ohwo-o / oma-oma-r_e-aye- en
 they have love for each other NEG among themselves NEG
 ‘They hate each other’

Notes:

(i) ohwohwo is usually used when the subjects are few e.g. two

(ii) *omomarayen* is usually used with multiple subjects

Question: A11) You give translations with strategies C and D here, but given that you have said that strategies A and B can be reciprocal, why don't you use them here? Are they dispreferred or just not permitted to have reciprocal readings here? Or are they as acceptable as strategies C and D.

Answer: Strategies A and B can also be used here but Strategy E is the least acceptable.

Comments: A 11. (a) and (c) are possible with Oma + Oma-X but the interpretation would then be Δ see one another@, not Δ see each other@.

Question:

(a) All the couples praised themselves

Under interpretation i., the couples as a group (maybe 20 people in all) praise the group as a whole, and under interpretation ii., each couple praises that couple. Does this distinguish between the two possible reciprocals?

Answer: (a) Δ All the couples praised themselves@

Interpretation (i)

Epha na ejobi jiri omomarayen (Oma+ Oma - X Strategy)

Epha na ejobi jiri oma-oma-re-ayen

Couples the all praise-PST themselves

Δ All the couples as a group praised the group as a whole@

interpretation (ii)

Epha na ovuovo jiri ohwohwo (Ohwohwo Strategy)

Epha na ovuovo jiri ohwo-ohwo
Couples the each one praise-PST each other
ΔEach couple praised that couple@

2.3.3. Oblique arguments - Continue looking for new reciprocal strategies with the following sentences:

- A12 (a) Eshare na dje Ibili vwọkẹ ohwohwo
Eshare na dje Ibili vwọ-kẹ ohwo-ohwo
Men the introduce-PST Bill give to each other
'The men introduced Bill to each other'
- (b) Iyugboshesheri na tota vwọkẹ ohwohwo
I-ya-ugbo-oshesheri na ta-ota vwọ-kẹ ohwo-ohwo
travelers the spoke give to each other
'The travelers spoke to each other'
- (c) ẹwaran na nyo ikuegbe kpahẹ ohwohwo
ẹwaran na nyo iku-egbe kpahẹ ohwo-ohwo
priests the heard stories about each other
'The priests heard stories about each other'
- (d) Ayen yanjẹ ekẹ phiyọ obaro rẹ ohwohwo
Ayen yan-jẹ ekẹ phiyọ obaro rẹ ohwo-ohwo
they left gifts LOC front of each other
'they left presents in front of each other'

Comments: For A12) For (a) and (d), is omomarayen is also possible.

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.

- A13 (a) avware mrẹ ohwohwo
avware mrẹ ohwo-ohwo
We see-PST each other
'We saw each other'
- (b) owavwan me cha ohwohwo uko
owavwan me cha ohwo-ohwo uko
you (pl.) must support each other back
'you must help each other'
- (c) avware cha họ omomaravware
avware cha họ omomaravware
we will bathe ourselves
'we will wash ourselves'
- (d) Ayěń gbon ohwohwo kọkekọke
Ayěń gbon ohwohwo kọkekọke
They-PRS. search each other always
'they always criticize each other'
- (e) Emeshare buebun sare ohwohwo
Emeshare buebun sare ohwohwo
boys many kicked each other
'Many boys kicked each other'

Comments: Both forms are possible for the examples in (A13)

2.3.5 Other clause types, and other strategies: Briefly consider various types of reciprocal embedded clauses...

No new Strategy

2.4 Other types of local coreference

2.4.1. Possessives, alienable and inalienable -

A15 (a) Ipọlu kuẹ isabatu rọyen kufia
Ipọlu kuẹ isabatu rọyen kufia (kukufia = 'lose')
Paul threw shoes of his away
'Paul lost his shoes'

(b) Ipọlu kpare obọ rọyen kpenu
Ipọlu kpare obọ rọyen kpenu vwe ikrasi
Paul raised hand of his LOC-up at classroom
'Paul raised his hand in the classroom'

(c) Ipọlu bru obọ rọyen (kpregede)
Ipọlu bru obọ rọyen (kpregede)
Paul cut hand his (suddenly)
'Paul cut his hand suddenly'
(Note: I cannot find a word for "accidentally")

(d) Ipọlu nabọ ni obọ rọyen so
Ipọlu nabọ ni obọ rọyen so (niso = 'examine')
Paul very well looked hand of his closely

‘Paul examined his hand’

2.4.2 Reflexives 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 Uduogagan rẹ Ejiro ọ miovwẹ Imeri evun
Udu-ogagan rẹ Ejiro ọ miovwẹ Imeri evun
Heart strong of Ejiro it spoil Mary belly
‘Ejiro’s stubbornness is annoying Mary’

A17 obo rẹ Ejiro dje omarọyen wan vwerhẹ itisha na oma
obo rẹ Ejiro dje oma-rẹ-ọyen wan vwerhẹ itisha na oma
Manner that Ejiro show himself pass glad teacher the body
‘Andrew’s introduction of himself impressed the teacher’ / ‘The manner in which Ejiro introduced himself impressed the teacher’

There is nothing that I can remember for now

Comments:

Ken: A16-17) I was hoping to elicit examples "Ejiro's high opinion of himself bothers Mary", or "Mary admired Ejiro's pictures of himself ". You have given in (16) a nominal that is not reflexive, and in (A17) a relative clause, which creates a clausal domain like the ones we already know about. It may be too unnatural to do this in Urhobo, but please try to formulate sentences with nominals such that the antecedent and anaphor are both internal to a nominal that is not a relative clause.

Rose: Omephuo rẹ Ejlro kpokpo Imeri ẹwẹn
Omephuo rẹ Ejlro kpokpo Imeri ẹwẹn
pride of Ejiro worry Mary mind
'Ejiro's pride/high opinion of herself bothers Mary'.

More Comments:

Ken: 2.4.2. Reflexives in nominals

Urhobo nominals remind me of Chinese, which has an associative marker that can relate another noun to the head noun, but the same marker also introduces relative clauses. Chinese lacks structures like "John's defense of himself" and instead concocts a relative clause. Perhaps Urhobo is like Chinese in this respect.

Rose: Your assessment here is very correct. Urhobo has an associative marker which relates two nouns and also introduces relative clauses.

Part 3 **General details about the strategies**

You should now have a list of several different "strategies" for coreference, each represented by one or more examples. The following sections will study the properties of each of these strategies.

3.1 Marking

3.1.1 Some strategies are manifested as involving special nominal (NP) form (an "anaphor" if it must have a configurational antecedent) or a (potentially independent) pronoun; 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. We would like to focus for part of this section on the way strategies are marked.

Strategy A: OMA-X e.g.

ljɔni mrɛ omarɔyen
ljɔni mrɛ oma-rɛ-ɔyen
John saw himself
'John saw himself'

This strategy involves a special NP comprising of body + associative marker (AM) + object pronoun.

Strategy E: Null Object e.g.

ljɔni hɔ kɛ omobɔɔyen
ljɔni hɔ kɛ omobɔɔyen
John-PRS. bathe for himself
"John bathes (himself)"

This strategy involves co-referencing the subject NP.

Strategy B: OMAROBQ-X e.g.

Omarobɔ rɛ ljɔni vuɔ
Oma-rɛ-obɔ rɛ ljɔni vu-ɔ
himself of John shame-him
"John is ashamed of himself"

This strategy involves a special NP consisting of body +AM + hand+ AM + object pronoun. It can have both reflexive and reciprocal meanings. The AM occurring between the first and the second nouns can be deleted e.g. OMOB₀-X

Strategy G: Reduplication - not clearly an anaphor strategy

Imeri kẹ emem₀ na komob₀rayen
Imeri kẹ emem₀ na kẹ oma-ob₀-rẹ-ayen
Mary gave only children the for themselves
'Mary gave the children themselves'

This strategy involves a special NP in which the noun is reduplicated. When an animate noun is involved, it can have an intensive meaning, otherwise it generally means "only X"

Strategy D: OHWOHWO

This also involves the reduplication of *ohwo* 'person'. It can have both reflexive and reciprocal meanings but is usually used when the subjects involved in the action are few.

Ayen mrẹ ohwohwo
Ayen mrẹ ohwo-ohwo
They saw each other
'They saw each other'

owavwa me vwẹ ukecha vw₀kẹ ohwohwo
owavwa me vwẹ uko-ẹcha vw₀-kẹ ohwohwo
you (pl.) should give help for each other
'You (pl.) should help each other /yourselves'

Strategy C: OMOMA-X

This also involves the reduplication of OMA 'body' It usually has reciprocal sense and mainly used when the subjects are many.

Ayen mr̥ omomarayen
Ayen mr̥ oma-oma-r̥-ayen
They saw themselves
'The saw themselves' (reciprocal)

Strategy H: Null Subject and Object

The strategy involves the use of only the verb and is possible only with the third person singular pronoun with certain verbs. It is used as an imperative and has the sense:

X₁ acts on X₂

K̥ - give (him/her)
Se - call (him/her) / read (it)
Da - drink (it)
Torh̥ - burn (it)

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*.

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.

(i) Strategies A, B, C and D are extremely productive (Note – more follow up on strategy E)

(ii) Strategy C alternates with strategy D except that with strategy C, X usually acts on Y and Y on X but not necessarily X acts on X and Y on. (Although it is not prohibited.) I think that it is also extremely productive.

(iii) Strategy H is used only when the subject NP countable.

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

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. If the strategy is restricted in its use, please describe, if you can, what you think the restriction is. Please give a few examples where it is possible to use it, and a few examples where it is not possible to use it. (e.g., "used only with verbs of motion"). Use the following scale: (a) Has (almost) no exceptions, (b) Has few exceptions, (c) Is only a general tendency, (d) Can't tell.

I need guidance here. (Follow-up work to be done)

3.3 Context of Use

3.3.1. How marked or natural is this strategy? For example, is this strategy typical of a particular social style or literary style, or does it sound old-fashioned? Is it considered formal or casual or is it used in any of these contexts?

All of the strategies are natural

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).

Special intonation (high tone) is necessary with strategy (reduplication of the verb stem to indicate emphasis – not an anaphoric strategy – KS) and it is carried by the verb stem

3.3.3 Is a particular discourse context (e.g., contradicting) necessary? For example, it is possible to get coconstrual of subject and object in English with an object pronoun in special circumstances, as in B1.

Strategy C requires a particular discourse context (i.e. contradicting)

P. 43 If Marsha admires just one person, then I suspect that she admires just HER

Qda dia ne evun re ohwo ovuovo vwerha Imasha, mi rori ne ohwo yena oyen.
Qda dia ne evun re ohwo ovuovo vwerha Imasha, mi rori ne ohwo yena oyen

If be that belly of person only one sweet Marsha, I think that person that her

‘If Marsha admires just one person, then I suspect that she admires just her’

Here there is a special emphasis on *oyen* as a result of the construction type.

3.3.4 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).

In the sentence above, a noun would be expected in the place of HER *oyen*. When the pronoun is used instead, an intonational strategy, which slightly raises the high tone of the initial vowel is employed to show emphasis.

3.4 Morphology

In this section we explore the internal structure or lexical properties of the form that supports a reflexive or reciprocal reading or any other form that is involved in the strategy (so, for example, if a given strategy involves both an affix on the verb and a special form of NP argument, answer for both parts). Complete this section for all strategies for which the questions make sense. (The strategy used for English John washed contains no overt morpheme, so that would be a case where it appears that there is nothing to say).

3.4.1 Does the reflexive element, in its entirety, have a stateable lexical translation? For example, many languages use a reflexive consisting of a pronoun and a body part term, e.g., "his-head" or "him-face", whereas others use a term meaning "own" or "same", etc. Reciprocals often involve the term "other", but some languages also use a body part or some other 'meaning atom'. In some languages, it is not obvious that there is any translation of the term at all.

The reflexive consists of the term for body 'oma' and an associative marker *rê* which links two nouns (the vowel 'e' of the associative marker is usually elided in speech and the consonant 'r' is very often written as part of the following pronoun). So, the structure is actually body - AM – person or body – pronoun.

Reciprocals consist of the following

Body + hand + pronoun e.g. omaroboroyen or person + person e.g. ohwohwo

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? Is it some form of prepositional phrase or adjective? Is there anything further to say about its meaning in such cases?

The terms for reflexive and reciprocal can often be interchanged but are not usually used with other meanings.

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. Provide a morpheme-by-morpheme gloss for the visible elements of the strategy, giving the following information about each morpheme. (This question can be very hard to answer for some parts or altogether. Provide as much information as you can, but if you do not see how to answer, say so and move on).

Both the reflexive and reciprocal have the structure: head + AM + modifier

(a) There are no agreement features, the head 'oma' is constant whether the modifying pronoun is singular or plural.

(b) *This is difficult to answer*

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).

B2)

myself	- omame
yourself	- omawe
himself/herself/itself	- omaroyen
	(oma (body) + re (ASSOC) + oyen (3 rd person sg. pron.))
ourselves	- omaravware
yourselves	- omarowavwa
themselves	- omarayen

Remarks: (i) The ‘oma’ portion can be singular or plural.

(ii) Both parts are not marked for gender.

(iii) The forms *me*, *we*, *royen*, *ravware*, *rowavwa* and *rayen* are homophonous with possessive pronouns in Urhobo.

Subject Pronouns	Object Pronouns	Possessive Pronouns
Mi ~ me A _I @	vwe ~ me A _{me} @	me A _{mine} A
Wo ~ wo A _{you} (sg.)@	we ~ we A _{you} @	we A _{yours} @
o ~ o A _{he / she / it} @	o ~ o A _{him / her / it} @	royen A _{his/hers/its} @
avware A _{we} @	avware A _{us} @	ravware A _{ours} @
owavwa A _{you} (pl.)@	owavwa A _{you} @	r owavwa A _{yours} @
ayen A _{they} @	ayen A _{them} @	rayen A _{theirs} ”

(Note: ~ means ‘alternates with’ depending on [ATR] vowel harmony requirements.)

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.

Agreement with the antecedent: This is obligatory in terms of person and number.

3.6. Interaction with verb morphology - Incompatibilities

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. Sometimes Case combinations are impossible or phonological or prosodic restrictions.

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*.

I do not know

3.7 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 (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:

To the best of my knowledge, reflexive morphology in Urhobo is not used for other purposes.

3.7.1 Idiosyncratic NO

Some languages have verbs that lexically require a reflexive which does not appear to correspond to an argument. The uses are typically special idioms. [Example: English has a few such verbs, for example, perjure oneself. For this verb, *John perjured Bill is not possible. German has many more, such as sich erinneren, "to remember", as does French, such as s'évanouir, "to faint"] Are there such uses for the current strategy? If so, give examples of as many as possible. It may turn out that not all reflexive idioms you find make use of the same strategy. Martin Everaert has noted that most idiosyncratic (sometimes called 'inherent') reflexives in Dutch are formed with zich, but a small set of others are formed with zichzelf. Please be on the look-out for such contrasts.

Preliminary answer from Rose – no such contrasts or idiosyncratic uses.

Question: It seems that all the anaphors can be anteceded by subjects, but can they all be anteceded by direct objects? For (9b) of section 4.1.2.2, you say (in follow-up) that strategy A favors John as the antecedent and that Mary as the antecedent is very odd. Could you please check this for strategies A-D with the children in place of Mary. Please tell me if there are reciprocal readings or plural

reflexive readings or neither (keep the subject, John, constant). Also, please try some other verbs besides "tell", such as "John asked the children about themselves", or "John introduced/presented/showed the children to each other". Make sure to try the independent pronoun strategy for the position of the reflexive/reciprocal in all of these.

Rose: I can't think of any now.

3.7.2 Emphatic or intensifier. As in the English, The president himself answered the phone.

Omobọmẹ - oma-obo-mẹ
body hand mine 'me myself/my own self'

omobọroyen - oma-obo- rẹ-oyen
body hand of his 'he himself'

omoboraware - oma-obo- rẹ-aware
body hand of our 'we ourselves' etc.

Question: In this section what I was asking was whether any of the argument reflexives, e.g. strategies A, B, C, D, can appear where they have no antecedent in the sentence, but can be understood as an emphatic or focused referent to someone understood in the context (particularly some third person referent). In Standard English, this is rare, but it is apparently possible in Irish English, e.g. "It was himself she was speaking to." This is what I would like you to test please.

Rose: Emphatic or Intensifier E.G.

Onini na ke omoboroyen oyen rhan ota na

Onini na ke oma-obo-rẹ-oyen oyen rhan enanọ na

Leader the for himself he answered question the

ⒶThe President himself answered the questionⓂ

But we can have the following in which the antecedent is not present in the sentence but the sentence is understood as an emphatic referent to someone understood in the context:

Okpuyovwiroyen rhan enan_o na ke omoboroyen
Okpu-uyovwi-rẹ-oyen rhan enan_o na ke oma-obo-rẹ-oyen
He himself answered question the for himself
⊆He himself answered the question⊆

⊆It was himself she was speaking to⊆ would be possible in Urhobo but the interpretations would be ambiguous because Urhobo pronouns do not differentiate gender.

Okpuyovwiroyen oyen _o ta ota ke
Okpu-uyovwi-rẹ-oyen oyen _o ta ota ke
He himself that she spoke word to
⊆It was himself she was speaking to”

“Okpuyovwiroyen⊆ would be understood as an emphatic or focused referent to someone whose antecedent is not in the sentence.

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.

I have no idea. No reflexives

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 coreference between two logical arguments.

NO

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).

Each strategy can be used whether or not the antecedent is physically present

B5 (a) Ibili mrẹ rẹn-ẹn
Ibili mrẹ rẹn-ẹn
Bill saw him-Neg
“Bill did not see him”

(b) Imeri vwo eguonọ kẹ?
Imeri vwo eguonọ kẹ?
Mary have love for him
‘Does Mary like him?’

(c) O kpẹ uwewwin rẹ igho oderowanrena
O kpẹ uwewwin rẹ igho ode-rẹ-ọ-wanre-na
He go house of money yesterday
‘He went to the bank yesterday’

These forms can be used to refer to one of the participants in the conversation who is not otherwise mentioned in the sentence.

B6 (a) Ibili hanrho vwe
Ibili hanrho vwe

Bill insulted me

“Bill insulted me”

- (b) Ẹvwě jen ihwo buebun-un ẹkẹvuovo i jen vwe
Ẹvwě jen ihwo buebun-un ẹkẹvuovo ǐ jen vwe
Kolanut-PRS like people many-NEG but they-PRS like me
“Many people do not like kolanuts but I like them.”

I am not sure of their generic usage

- B7 (a) obo rẹ ọ ta ota kẹ ohwo wan, ǒ jen vwee
obo rẹ ọ ta ota kẹ ohwo wan, ǒ jen vwe-e
Manner that he speak word to person pass, it-PRS like me-EG
‘I don’t like the way he speaks to one’

- (b) A sa nabọ kẹnoma ree
A sa nabọ kẹnẹ-oma ree
One-PRS can very well careful finish-NEG
‘One cannot be too careful’

- (c) Ibilí hanrhẹ ohwo nẹ a ke sa ta ota
Ibilí hanrhẹ ohwo nẹ a ke sa ta ota
Bill-PRS insult person complete one will able speak word
‘Bill insults one before one can say a word’

3.7.6. 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.

I do not know

3.8 Proxy Readings

These are difficult to get. However, we can say that “X saw/recognizes himself in a picture or statue” but not that he/she did something to that picture or statue to represent himself.

Comments: It is difficult for me to provide a translation of B10 in the sense required here. We could have something like this for B10a):

lgrishamu tare ne unu royen ghwoṭṭ vwe Isuwahini ne ephere efa
lgrishamu ta-re ne unu rē-oyen muoṭṭ vwe Isuwahini ne ephere
efa
Grisham sa-PST that mouth his firm in Swahili than language
others
AGrisham said that he sounds better in Swahili@

And for B10b), something like:

lkasitiro rori ne oyen yovwiri
lkasitiro roro-ri ne oyen yovwi-ri
Castro think-PST that he handsome
ACastro thought that he looked handsome@

However, these senses are really not what you require. In Urhobo, the pronoun will not represent the statue or the writing but the person himself.

ṛ mre oma-rē-ṛyen kasa-kasa
ṛ mre oma-rē-ṛyen kasa-kasa
He saw himself everywhere

ΔHe saw himself everywhere@

Ayen mre omarayen (ohwohwo) kasakasa

Ayen mre oma-re-ayen (ohwohwo) kasa-kasa

They see-PRS themselves (each other) everywhere

ΔThey saw themselves (each other) everywhere@

In Urhobo, it is not possible for Δhimself@ to be interpreted as Δa statue of himself@. Thus, ΔHe washed himself@ and ΔHe washed@ can only mean that the agent washed the agent.

PART 4: Exploration of syntactic domains

Ijoni fa Ibili

Ijoni fá Ibili

John flog-PST Bill

“John flogged Bill”

a) Ijoni fá omaroyen **Strategy A**

Ijoni fá oma-re-oyen

John flog-PST himself

‘John flogged himself’

b) * Ijoni fare **Strategy E**

John flogged

It is unacceptable because of the nature of the verb, which always demands an object. But it is acceptable to say *Ijoni hore* “John bathed”

- c) Ijoni ho ke omoboroyen
 Ijoni ho ke oma-re-obo-re-oyen
 John bathed for himself
 “John washed/bathed himself”

The sense here is not really reflexive although that may be acceptable, but emphasis is on “John’s own body” However, *omaroboroyen ho Ijoni* as in strategy B is completely unacceptable.

d) The reduplication strategies, i.e., strategies C, and D, completely unacceptable with a singular subject. However, the following are acceptable:

- (i) Ijoni ve Ibili fa ohwohwo
 Ijoni ve Ibili fa ohwo-ohwo
 John and Bill flog-PST each other
 ‘John and Bill flogged each other’
- (ii) Emọ na fa ohwohwo
 Emọ na fa ohwohwo
 children the flog-PST each other
 “The children flogged each other”
- (iii) Emọ na fa omomarayen (reflexive + reciprocal)
 Emọ na fa oma-oma-re-ayen
 children the flog-PST themselves
 ‘The children flogged themselves’
- (iv) Ijoni ve Ibili fa omomarayen
 Ijoni ve Ibili fa oma-oma-re-ayen
 John and Bill flog-PST one another
 “John and Bill flogged one another” (reciprocal)

e) * Ijoni họ ọyen
John bathed him

This example is completely unacceptable. The word for ‘him’ in this position is royen and it has no reference to John.

f) Ijoni họ omarọyen fon
Ijoni họ oma-re-ọyen fon
John wash-PST himself clean
‘John washed himself clean’

g) Ijoni họ fon
Ijoni họ fon
John wash-PST clean
‘John washed clean’

Note: both (f) and (g) are acceptable and refer to John.

X 3a and b are unacceptable.

X 3c Ijoni vẹ Ibili mrẹ oni rẹ ohwohwo
Ijoni vẹ Ibili mrẹ oni rẹ ohwo-ohwo
John and Bill see-PST mother of each other

This is accepted to mean that John saw Bill’s mother and Bill saw John’s mother (usually in different places).

X3 d * Ijoni vẹ Ibili mrẹ oni rẹ omarọyen
John and Bill saw mother AM each other
“John and Bill saw one another’s mother”

X3 e lɔni vɛ lbili mɾɛ oni rɛ ohwohwo
 lɔni vɛ lbili mɾɛ oni rɛ ohwo-ohwo
 John and Bill see-PST mother of each other
 ‘John and Bill saw each other’s mother’

This is acceptable to mean that John saw Bill’s also saw his own mother as well as John’s.

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.

OMA-X strategy can be used with ordinary transitive verbs e.g.

(1a) lɔni mɾɛ omarɔyen
 lɔni mɾɛ oma-rɛ-ɔyen
 John saw himself
 ‘John saw himself’

(1b) Eya na dje kpahe X
 eya na djé kpahe X
 women the describe-PST about X
 “the women described X”

(c) wọ saré X
wọ sare X
you kicked X
'you kicked X'

(d) ayen jírí X
ayen jírí X
they praise-PST X
'they praised X'

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.

Yes. The strategy A can be used with verbs of grooming, inalienable possession objects.

E.g. Ijọni nene omarọyen họnran
Ijọńi nene oma-rẹ-ọyen họnran
John-PRS follow himself fight
'John is fighting with himself'

(3a) Ijọni họ omarọyen
Ijọni họ oma-rẹ-ọyen
John wash-PST himself
'John washed hin[mself']

(b) Ijọni brú ẹton rọyen

ljɔni brú ɛton rɛ-ɔyen
John cut-PST hair his
“John cut his hair”

Note: This sentence is ambiguous – it could refer to John’s hair or to someone else’s hair. It is the context that can explain the particular sense in which it is used.

(c) ɔmɔtɛ na brú omarɔyen
ɔmɔtɛ na brú oma-rɛ-ɔyen
girl the cut-PST herself
‘the girl cut herself’

4.1.1.3 Psychological Predicates

C4a) ljɔni vwo ɛguɔnɔ vwɔkɛ omarɔyeen
ljɔni vwo ɛguɔnɔ vwɔ-kɛ oma-rɛ-ɔyen -en
John has love/likeness give to himself NEG.
‘John hates himself’ / ‘John doesn’t like himself’

b) omarobɔ rɛ ljɔnii vuɔ
oma-rɛ-obɔ rɛ ljɔni-í vu-ɔ
himself of John-PRS shame-him
‘John is ashamed of himself’

This is the only way I know that this expression is possible.

c) udu roma rɛ ljɔnii bro
udu rɛ-oma rɛ ljɔni-í br-o
heart of John-PRS cut-him
“John is worried about himself”

- d) Ijoni kpare omaroyen kpenu
 Ijoni-í kpare omaroyen kpenu
 John-PRS lift himself locative up
 ‘John is proud’

However, this expression is different from saying that ‘John is proud of himself’ (because he has done something marvelous). For this latter sense, the expression is synonymous with ‘John admires himself’ or ‘X is happy with himself’

- e) Omarobọ rẹ Ijoni vwerhon
 Oma-rẹ-obọ rẹ Ijoni-í vwerh-on
 His body of John-PRS sweet-him
 ‘John is proud of /pleased with himself’

- f) Ijoni brudu vwọkẹ omoboroyen
 Ijoni-í brudu vwọkẹ oma-rẹ-obọ-rẹ-oyen
 John-PRES worry for himself
 ‘John worries himself’

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").

- (5a) eya na che hwe omarayen
 eya na cha hwe oma-rẹ-ayen
 women the will kill/destroy themselves
 ‘the women will destroy themselves’

- b) eya na rhuere omarayen phiyo
 eya na rhuere oma-re-ayen phiyo
 women the repair themselves ??
 ‘the women organized themselves’

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.

- (6a) Emeshare na mudia ke omarayen
 Emeshare na mudia ke oma-re-ayen
 boys the stand for themselves
 ‘the boys represented themselves’

- b) Ijoni ta ota vwoke omaroyen
 Ijoni ta ota vwok-e oma-re-oyen
 John spoke word for himself
 ‘John spoke for himself’

Note: This is ambiguous ; it could mean:

- ‘John spoke to himself’ and
 ‘John spoke for himself’

Again, the context determines the one to be used

- c) Okpuyovwiruyen mre Ijoni
 Okp-uyovwi-re-oyen mre Ijoni
 He himself saw John
 ‘he himself saw John’

This is a strategy I haven't mentioned earlier, i.e. okpuyovwi -X I do not know what the prefix okp- represents but uyovwi= 'head' and it is then followed by any object pronoun. So, we can have okpuyovwi - me = me myself, okpuyovwi wen = you yourself, okpuyovwi rayen = they themselves etc. It can also co-occur with the OMA-X strategy. e.g.

okpuyovwi rẹ lḡni mrẹ omarọyen vwe evun rẹ ifoto na
okp-uyovwi rẹ lḡni mrẹ oma-rẹ-ọyen vwe evun rẹ ifoto na
he himself of John saw himself LOC inside of photograph the
'John saw himself in the photograph' (Emphatic)

Comments: Following up on (6c), The Okpuyovwi strategy - is this emphatic without being necessarily reflexive? Is it possible here for okpuyovwi royen to refer to someone other than John?

Rose: (6c) The Okpuyovwi Strategy can be both emphatic and reflexive. In fact, sentence 6c):

Okpuyovwiroyen mre ljo
Okp-uyovwi-rẹ-ọyen mre ljo
he himself saw Joe
ΔHe himself saw Joe@

ΔOkpuyovwiroyen@ refers to someone other than Joe. The reverse binding where Δhimself@ refers to Joe is not acceptable.

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.

(7a) Imeri reyọ okẹ ọvo vwọkẹ omarọyen
Imeri reyọ okẹ ọvo vwọ-kẹ oma-rẹ-ọyen
Mary took gift one give to herself
'Mary took a gift for herself'

b) Ijọni dje uwevwi na vwọkẹ omarọyen
Ijọni dje uwevwi na vwọ-kẹ oma-rẹ-ọyen
John showed house the give to himself
'John showed the house to himself'

c) okpuyovwi rẹ Ijọni mrẹ uwevwi na
okp-uyovwi rẹ Ijọni mrẹ uwevwi na
he himself of John saw house the
'John himself saw the house'

(8a) * (is not acceptable)

b) Ijọni dje omarọyen vwọkẹ emọ na
Ijọni dje oma-rẹ-ọyen vwọkẹ emọ na
John showed himself give to children the
'John showed himself to the children'

4.1.2.2 Oblique arguments

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

This language has no apparent case system.

(9a) * Ijoni ta omaroyen
John told himself

Ijoni ta ota kpahe omaroyen
Ijoni ta ota kpahe oma-re-oyen
John spoke word about himself
'John spoke about himself'

b) Ijoni vuę Imeri kpahe omaroyen
Ijoni vuę Imeri kpahe oma-re-oyen
John told Mary about himself
'John told Mary about himself'

c) eya na mre ohwohwo kpahe Ijoni
eya na mre ohwo-ohwo kpahe Ijoni
women the saw each other about John
'the women contacted each other about John'

Additions

4.1.2.2 Ijoni vuę emo na kpahe omaroyen

Ijoni vuę emo na kpahe omaroyen
John told children the about himself (John as antecedent, reflexive)
'John told the children about himself'

Ijoni vuę emo na kpahe omarayen
Ijoni vuę emo na kpahe oma-re-ayen
John told children the about themselves (the children as antecedent,
reflexive)

‘John told the children about themselves’

* Ijoni vuẹ emọ na kpahe omoborayen

John told children the about body AM hand theirs

Ijoni vuẹ emọ na kpahe omomarayen

Ijoni vuẹ emọ na kpahe oma-oma-re-ayen

John told children the about themselves (the children as antecedent)

‘John told the children about themselves’

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.

(10a) Imeri mre oredeko vwe obuko royen

Imeri mre oredeko vwe obuko re-oyen

Mary saw snake LOC behind of her

‘Mary saw a snake behind her’

b) Imeri se vwe ifoke re obo re si kpahe

Imeri se vwe ifoke re obo re-e si kpahe-o

Mary called me because of thing that-they wrote about her

‘Mary called me because of something that was written about her’

For (c) and (d), I cannot get similar structures.

Comments: In (10b) The pronoun is the “a” attached to the adverb. On its own, the adverb is “kpahe”.

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.

C11 These are not possible in the language.

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.

(12) is not possible in the language.

Question: When you say that (12) is not possible, do you mean that in (9b), Oma-X cannot refer to Mary? Please clarify, with more examples like (9b). Part of what I am trying to determine for all of these strategies is whether or not the antecedent of the reflexive or reciprocal form can ever be a non-subject. This is possible for possessive pronouns, for example, as you show in 4.1.2.6.

Rose: In the case of (9b) the usual meaning is for Oma-X to refer to John and not Mary. Although it is possible for it to refer to Mary, it is quite odd.

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.

(13a) Iniki se oni røyen

Iniki se oni rə-øyen

Nick called mother his

‘Nick called his mother’

b) Iniki fəton røyen

Iniki fa-əton røyen

Nick combed-hair his

‘Nick combed his hair’

c) Iniki ta ota kə onini røyen

Iniki ta ota kə onini rə-øyen

Nick spoke word to boss his

‘Nick spoke to his boss’

c) Iniki phiə ɔbe røyen phiyo enu re imejə na

Iniki phiə ɔbe røyen phiyo enu re imejə na

Nick put book his LOC. top of table the

‘Nick put his book on the table’

d) ovie na vwe okə vwokə Iniki vwe orere røyen

ovie na vwe okə vwə-kə Iniki vwe orere rə-øyen

king the gave gift give to Nick LOC village his

This is ambiguous. It could be either of:

‘The king gave Nick a prize in Nick’s village’ or
‘The king gave Nick a prize in the King’s village’

The context helps to disambiguate the sentence.

f) This is unacceptable.

(14a) ọsẹ rẹ Iniki vwo ẹguṣọṣọ kpahon

ọsẹ rẹ Iniki vwo ẹguṣọṣọ kpah-on

father of Nick has love/likeness for him

‘Nick’s father likes him’

b) udubruvwe rẹ Iniki ọyen hwe re

udu-bru-vwe rẹ Iniki ọyen hwe re

ambition of Nick that killed him

‘Nick’s ambition destroyed him’ or

‘It is Nick’s ambition that destroyed him’ or

‘Nick’s ambition destroyed someone else’ (e.g. Nick’s father, mother or child)

The last translation is a possibility but the first two are the usual translations of (14 b).

d) Oni rẹ Iniki shẹ imoto ọyen

Oni rẹ Iniki shẹ imoto rẹ-ọyen

mother of Nick sold car hers

‘Nick’s mother sold Nick’s car’ **OR** ‘Nick’s mothers old her car’

To show that the car is Nick’s instead of *ọyen*, Nick is used so you get:

Oni rẹ Iniki shẹ imoto rẹ Iniki

‘Nick’s mother sold Nick’s car’

Comments: None of the reflexive forms can be anteceded by the possessor "Nick" in (14). (Note for follow-up – check plurals for Strategies C and D)

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.

(15) These are not possibilities in the language.

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.

(16a) Me mrę omame
Me mrę oma-me
I saw myself

b) Wọ mrẹ omawẹ

Wọ mrẹ oma-we
you (sg) saw yourself

c) Ọ mrẹ omarọyen

Ọ mrẹ oma-rẹ-ọyen
he/she saw himself/herself

d) Awware mrẹ omaravware

Awware mrẹ oma-rẹ-avware
we saw ourselves

e) Owavwan mrẹ omarowavwan

Owavwan mrẹ oma-rẹ-owavwan
you (pl) saw yourselves

e) Ayen mrẹ omarayen

Ayen mrẹ oma-rẹ-ayen
they saw themselves

(17a) Me họ omame

Me họ oma-me
I bathed/washed myself

b) Mi vwo ẹguṣọṣọ kẹ omamee

Mi vwo ẹguṣọṣọ kẹ oma-me-e
I have likeness for myself NEG
'I hate myself' / 'I don't like myself'

- c) Me vuẹ lịoni kpahe omame
 Me vuẹ lịoni kpahe oma-me
 I told John about myself
- d) Me mụẹ ọrọdekọ kẹrẹ omame
 Me mụẹ ọrọdekọ kẹrẹ oma-me
 I saw snake near myself
 ‘I saw a snake near me’
- e) mi vwo ẹguonọ kẹ omame
 mi vwo ẹguonọ kẹ oma-me
 I have likeness for myself
 ‘I like myself’

It is not possible to say: ‘I am liked by myself’

- f) Not possible
- g) Not possible

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.

OMA-X Strategy, of Okpuyovwi-X are used only with animate, human or metaphorically human entities. Thus, the forms in C18 are not possible.

Comments:

Ken: Omarabo-X (Strategy B) (also Omobo-X) (productive)

The 'backwards' anaphora pattern of this one is particularly interesting. I will be asking questions about the locality of this relation. It seems only to occur in subject position (and it is the only one that can, no?) uniquely with psychological predicates, and probably not all of these. Please comment. Also, when it appears in benefactive position, is there any other reflexive form that could also appear there? You characterize this strategy as used in contexts where it is contradicting some assertion (in section 3.3.3). Please provide a dialogue that shows this. Is this strategy ever used when there is not contradictory force?

- You do not say that this form is restricted to animates. Please say so if it is, but if it is or if it isn't, it would be useful to see an example where its antecedent is inanimate - put the examples in 4.1.3.2

Rose: I have only been able to identify it in subject position. As for its being used in contexts where it is contradicting some assertion, here is an example:

Speaker A thinks that John's behavior is unbecoming; he portrays someone who doesn't care what people think about him.

Speaker B thinks differently; believes that John is a very shy person, one who feels ashamed of himself if found wanting.

This form is restricted to animates.

For the forms in 4.1.3.2 we would have the following:

C18 a) Awanree vwarien omaroyen (Oma-X (Strategy A))

Awanre-e vwarien oma-re-oyen

Ancient (time)-PRS repeat X

‘History repeats itself’

b) oka rẹ erin nanaa ria omarọyen (Oma-X)

oka rẹ erin nana-a ria oma-rẹ-ọyen

type of fish this-PRS eat X

‘This type of fish cannibalizes X’

c) imashini nanaa guogho omarọyen (Oma-X)

imashini nana-a guogho oma-rẹ-ọyen

machine this-PRS destroy X

‘This machine destroys X’

It should be noted that although these forms are acceptable, they are unusual.

Examples with inanimate antecedents

C18a) Iku re awanree vwarien omarọyen

Iku re awanre-e vwarien oma-rẹ-ọyen

Story of ancient-PRS repeat itself

‘History repeats itself’

b) oka rẹ erin nana, oyen ọvoo ria omarọyen

oka rẹ erin nana, oyen ọvo-o ria oma-rẹ-ọyen

type of fish this, it alone-PRS eat itself

‘This type of fish cannibalizes itself’

d) imashini nana, oyen ọvoo guogho omarọyen

imashini nana, oyen ọvo-o guogho oma-rẹ-ọyen

machine this, it alone-PRS destroy itself

ⒶThis machine destroys itself@

It appears only Oma-X can have both animate and inanimate antecedent. Others have only animate antecedents.

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.

I do not know

4.1.3.4. Quantifiers

- (a) eya na ɔvuɔvɔ mɾɛ ohwohwo
eya na ɔvuɔvɔ mɾɛ ohwo-ohwo
women the each one saw each other
'every woman saw X'
- (b) emɔ na ɔvuɔvɔ hɔ ohwohwo
emɔ na ɔvuɔvɔ hɔ ohwo-ohwo
children the each one washed each other
'every child bathed X'
- (c) emɔ na ɔvuɔvɔ se oni rɛ ohwohwo
emɔ na ɔvuɔvɔ se oni rɛ ohwo-ohwo
children the each one called mother of each other
'every child called X's mother'
- (c) emɔ na ɔvuɔvɔ mɾɛ ɔɾɔdekɔ kɛɾɛ omarɔyen
emɔ na ɔvuɔvɔ mɾɛ ɔɾɔdekɔ kɛɾɛ oma-rɛ-ɔyen
children the each one saw a snake near himself
'every child saw a snake near X'

- (f) I cannot translate this but we can have:
 Eṣẹ rẹ emọ na ọvuovo vwo ẹguṇọ kẹ ọmọ rọyen
 Eṣẹ rẹ emọ na ọvuovo vwo ẹguṇọ kẹ ọmọ rẹ-ọyen
 fathers of children the each one has likeness for child his
 ‘every child’s father admires his child’

With “NON” the behavior is the same except that the final vowel in each sentence is doubled to mark NEG. Thus:

eya na ọvuovo mṛẹ ohwohwo
 eya na ọvuovo mṛẹ ohwohwo-o
 women the each one saw each other NEG
 ‘No woman saw X’

Comments: Ohwohwo-X is usually used for ‘every/each X@’ while Oma-Oma-X is used for ‘one another X@’. Where the antecedent is embedded, the bound reading is supported by a simple pronoun.

Note: ovuovo renders a definite nominal universal. It acts like an adverb.

4.1.3.5 Questioned antecedents - 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.

- (20a) Ono mṛẹ omarọyen?
 Ono mṛẹ oma-rẹ-ọyen?
 Who saw himself
 ‘who saw X?’

- (b) Ono h̄o omar̄oyen?
 Ono h̄o oma-r̄e-oyen?
 Who washed himself
 ‘Who washed X?’
- (c) ono mr̄e ɔ̄r̄dek̄o k̄er̄e omar̄oyen
 ono mr̄e ɔ̄r̄dek̄o k̄er̄e oma-r̄e-oyen
 who saw a snake near himself
 ‘Who saw a snake near X?’
- (d) Ono ɔ̄yen se oni r̄oyen
 ono ɔ̄yen se oni r̄e-oyen
 who it is he telephoned mother his
 ‘Who telephoned X’s mother?’

This could refer to:

‘who telephoned X’s mother?’ OR
 ‘who telephoned someone else’s mother’

- (e) ɔ̄s̄e r̄e ono oyen vwo ɛ̄gūon̄o kpahon
 ɔ̄s̄e r̄e ono oyen vwo ɛ̄gūon̄o kpah-on
 father of who it is he has likeness for him
 ‘whose father admires X?’ or
 ‘*whose father ...*

4.1.3.6. Reverse binding

In the following examples, the full NP ('antecedent') appears in the lower (prototypically, object) position. Try to translate these into your language. It is expected that many sentences constructed in this section, possibly all, will be unacceptable in many languages (as *Himself saw Fred is in English). Naturally,

any examples which are not ungrammatical are of particular interest. Assume X = Fred unless otherwise marked.

C21 * omaroyen mrẹ Ifrẹdi
Himself saw Fred

*omaravwaren mrẹ omaravwaren
ourselves saw ourselves

* omaroyen mrẹ orodeko vwe obuko rẹ Ifrẹdi
Himself saw snake loc. Back of Fred

C22 * o hwororo rẹ oni rẹ Ijoji
He/she called/telephoned to mother of George
“he/she telephoned George’s mother”
(Pronoun has no antecedent in the clause)

* oni royen guṅṅo nẹ Ijoji kparobọ
mother his wants that George succeed

* Imeri vwe oni royen kpahe Ijoji
Mary told mother hers about George
(Mary told HER mother, not George’s)

*Ifoto rẹ oni royen vwerhe Ijoji oma
picture AM mother his please George body

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).

(23) Eya na vwe ukecha vwoke omomarayen
Eya na vwe uko-echa vwo-ke oma-oma-re-ayen
women the give help give to X
'The women help X'

- (24a) No
b) Yes
c) Yes
d) No
e) Yes

C25a) Eya na jiri omarayen
Eya na jiri oma-re-ayen
women the praise themselves
'The women praised X'
OR
Eya na jiri omomarayen

(i) AAll the women as a group praised all the women as a group@

(ii) AThe woman in the group praised every other woman in the group including herself@

b) Eya na cha vwe ukecha vwoke omomarayen
Eya na cha vwe uko-echa vwo-ke oma-oma-re-ayen
women the will give help give to one another
'each woman will help all of the women including herself'

‘each woman will help at least some of the other women’
‘the women as a group will help the women together as a group’

c) Eya na reyọ ifoto rẹ ohwohwo

Eya na reyọ ifoto rẹ ohwo-ohwo
women the took photograph of each other

‘Each woman photographed all (or almost all) of the women excluding herself’

‘each woman photographed at least some of the other women’

Comment: For (C25c), because ohwohwo favors pairs, each pair will have to map X to Y, so no group to group reading is favored. TheOma + Oma- X strategy is possible for the reciprocal readings

d) Eya na tue ohwohwo phia

Eya na tue ohwo-ohwo phia
women the exposed each other out

‘each woman betrayed all (or almost all) of the women excluding herself’

‘each woman betrayed at least some of the other women’

In the light of these observations, omameṛ ‘myself’, omaweṛ ‘yourself’, omaroyen ‘him/herself’ i.e. OMA + singular object pronouns, as well as OKPUYOVWI + AM + Object pronoun e.g. okpuyovwiroyen ‘he himself’ permit only reflexive readings. Also in this group is OMAROBỌ- X

OHWOHWO, OMOMA –X and OMA + plural object pronouns e.g. omaravware ‘ourselves’ permit both reflexive and reciprocal readings.

None to the best of my knowledge permits only a reciprocal reading.

Emọ na mrẹ ohwohwo

Children the saw each other

This could refer to either:

‘the children saw each other’ or

‘the children saw one another’

Comments:

Ken: - Okpuyovwi-X (Strategy I)

This seems to be a form of emphatic. Do you include it by analogy with the English form he himself, or are there additional reasons to assume it is truly reflexive (necessarily dependent on some antecedent)? If you do not find it easy to answer this question, just tell me whatever you think might be relevant.

Rose: It was included by analogy with the English form.

Question: Please give an example to show how "the children saw *okpuyovwi* them" comes out.

Answer: "the children saw *okpuyovwi* them" is not possible. It would be:

*emọ na mrẹ okpuyovwi rayen”

Question : Please give an example to show that "the children saw children-children" does not mean "the children saw themselves".

Answer: "the children saw children-children" is

emọ na mrẹ ememọ “the children saw only children”

“the children saw themselves”

emọ na mrẹ omomarayen

4.1.4.2 Reciprocal readings - Complete this section only if your strategy allows a reciprocal reading (i.e., permits a reading like those in (C24a) or (C24f). If the strategy is ambiguous, make sure to use verbs that allow the reciprocal interpretation.

C26 No strategy to my knowledge is solely reciprocal.

Comments: The null object reciprocal strategy is permitted with verbs such as *Asee@* and *Afight@*. The verb *Ameet@* in Urhobo is *Amroma@* which usually permits the null strategy. With verbs like *Aspeak@* or *Atalk@*, Ohwohwo or *Oma+ Oma-X* strategy must be used: the null strategy gives the interpretation of noise making.

4.1.4.2 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

a) Which of the following verbs can the strategy be applied to?

C26) "meet", "see", "fight", "speak", "hit"

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.")

C27 Both "see" and "meet" are possible.

Ijoni vẹ Ibili mrẹ ohwohwo
Ijoni vẹ Ibili mrẹ ohwo-ohwo
'John and Bill saw each other'

Ijoni vẹ Ibili vwa ohwohwo
Ijoni vẹ Ibili vwa ohwohwo
'John and Bill met each other'

Comments:

Question: C27 - I am asking here whether there are sentences like John met/saw each other with Bill, which is permitted in some languages (not English) with the reading "John and Bill met/saw each other (in the market)"

Answer: Such sentences are not permitted.

c) Is there any difference in the reciprocal interpretations permitted for C28a as opposed to C28b, or any difference in reciprocal strategies that support these interpretations?

- C28a) John and Mary praised X.
- b) The women praised X.

Answer: No difference in the reciprocal readings permitted for both C28a and C28b.

C29e (i) Ibili vẹ Imeri rorori nẹ ayen vwo ẹguṣo kẹ ohwohwo
Ibili vẹ Imeri rorori nẹ ayen vwo ẹguṣo kẹ ohwo-ohwo
Bill and Mary think that they have likeness for each other
'Bill thinks that he likes Mary and Mary thinks that she likes Bill'

- (ii) Ibili vẹ Imeri rorori nẹ ayen vwo eguonọ kẹ omomarayen
 Ibili vẹ Imeri rorori nẹ ayen vwo eguonọ kẹ oma-oma-rẹ-ayen
 Bill and Mary think that they have likeness for themselves
 ‘Bill thinks he likes Mary and Mary thinks that she likes Bill’

C30 is expressed as in C29(i) and (ii)

- X8) Ijini tare nẹ okpuyovwi rọyen ọyen Imeri vwo eguonọ kẹ
 Ijini tare nẹ okpu-uyovwi rẹ-ọyen ọyen Imeri vwo eguonọ kẹ
 Jean said that head his that Mary has likeness for
 ‘Jean has said that it is him that Mary loves’
 ‘Jean has said that Mary loves him’

This sentence has a contrasting argument where the emphasis is on Mary loving Jean and not someone else. However, it is unacceptable to say::

* Ijini tare nẹ omarọyen Imeri vwo eguonọ kẹ
 Jean said that himself Mary has love for
 ‘Jean said that mary loves him’

- X9) Ijini tare nẹ Imeri vwo eguonọ kọyen
 Ijini tare nẹ Imeri vwo eguonọ kọyen
 Jean said that Mary has love for him
 ‘Jean said that Mary loves him’

* Ijini ta nẹ Imeri omarọyen vwo eguonọ kẹ
 Jean said that Mary himself has love for
 ‘Jean said that Mary loves him’ *This is unacceptable*

Ijini ta nure nẹ okpuyovwi roma rọyen vwo ẹguṣọṣọ vwọkẹ Imeri
Ijini ta nure nẹ okpu-uyovwi rẹ-oma rẹ-ọyen vwo ẹguṣọṣọ vwọ-kẹ Imeri
Jean say finish that he himself has love for

Mary

‘Jean has said that he loves Mary’

There is a falling tone on *Mary* because there is a pause at the end of *Mary* and the focus is now on Jean loving Mary and not Mary loving Jean.

D1a) Ijaki tare nẹ okpuyovwi rọyen sasare
Ijaki ta-re nẹ okpu-uyovwi rẹ-ọyen sasare
Jack said that himself smart
‘Jack said that he is smart’

b) Ijaki riẹnre nẹ Ijoni vwo ẹguṣọṣọ kẹ ọyen
Ijaki riẹn-re nẹ Ijoni vwo ẹguṣọṣọ kẹ ọyen
Jack knows that John has love for him
‘Jack knows that John likes him’

c) Ijaki riẹnre nẹ Ijoni tare nẹ ọyen sasare
Ijaki riẹn-re nẹ Ijoni ta-re nẹ ọyen sasa-re
Jack knows that John said that he smart
‘Jack knows that John said that Jack is smart’
‘Jack knows that John said that John is smart’

Thus the output is ambiguous.

c) Ijaki rori nẹ Ijoni riẹnre nẹ Iwendi vwo ẹguṣọṣọ kẹ ọyen
Ijaki roro-ri nẹ Ijoni riẹn-re nẹ Iwendi vwo ẹguṣọṣọ kẹ ọyen
Jack thinks that John knows that Wendy has likeness for him

‘Jack thinks that John knows that Wendy like Jack’

- d) Ijaki rori nẹ Ijoni riẹnre nẹ ọyen vwo ẹguṣọṣọ kẹ Alisi
Ijaki roro-ri nẹ Ijoni riẹn-re nẹ ọyen vwo ẹguṣọṣọ kẹ Alisi
Jack thinks that John knows that him has likeness for Alice
‘Jack thinks that John knows that Jack likes Alice’

- f) Iserha vuẹ Ijaki nẹ Inisa vwo ẹguṣọṣọ kẹ
Sarah told Jack that Lisa has likeness for him
‘Sarah told Jack that Lisa loves Jack’

- f) Iserha vuẹ Ijaki nẹ okpuyovwi rọyen vwo ẹguṣọṣọ kẹ Iwendi
Iserha vuẹ Ijaki nẹ okpu-uyovwi rẹ-ọyen vwo ẹguṣọṣọ kẹ Iwendi
Sarah told Jack that him/herself has likeness for Wendy
‘Sarah told Jack that Jack loves Wendy’

However, this may also refer to “Sarah told Jack that Sarah loves Wendy” where there is an argument and there is a need for emphasis on Sarah’s love for Wendy.

- D2a) Ijaki rhọvwere nẹ Imeri vwo ẹguṣọṣọ kẹ ọyen
Ijaki rhọvwe-re nẹ Imeri vwo ẹguṣọṣọ kẹ ọyen
Jack admitted that Mary has likeness for him
‘Jack admitted that Mary loved Jack’

- b) Ijaki rori nẹ Imeri vwo ẹguṣọṣọ kẹ ọyen
Ijaki roro-ri nẹ Imeri vwo ẹguṣọṣọ kẹ ọyen
Jack thought that Mary has love for him
‘Jack suspected that Mary loved Jack’

D3(a) – (e) Not reciprocal pronouns acceptable in these constructions.

4.2.1.2 Climbing from Tense Complements not acceptable to my knowledge.

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 [John leave]

c) I saw [someone leaving]

d) I require [that he speak softly]

e) I consider [John 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.

D4 (a) – (h) are not acceptable constructions in Urhobo. The infinitive and the gerundive forms are the same and are formed by adding a prefix vowel e ~ ẹ, o ~

ọ, only when the final vowel of the verb stem is [+ high]. It is usually used as an adjunct in pre-clausal position. E.g.

- (i) Ẹḍẹ ọyen avware guṛṛọ de
Ẹ-ḍẹ ọyen avware guṛṛọ de
To buy /buying that we want buy
'what we want to do is to buy' or 'buying is what we want to do'
- (ii) Esio ọyen o siẹ
E-si-o ọyen o si-ẹ
to write/writing that he/she write
'what he is doing is to write'

D5 (a – b), D6 (a – b) Infinitives are not used in any of these ways in Urhobo to the best of my knowledge.

The Edgar sentences are not possible

- D8a) Itṛmũ roro nẹ ọyen vwo iroro
Itṛmũ roro nẹ ọyen vwo iroro
Tom-PRS think that he has intelligence
'Tom considers himself intelligent'
- b) Itṛmũ roro nẹ Imeri vwo ẹguṛṛọ kẹ ọyen
Itṛmũ roro nẹ Imeri vwo ẹguṛṛọ kẹ ọyen
Tom-PRS think that Mary has likeness for him
'Tom considers Mary fond of Tom'
- c) Itṛmũ roro nẹ Imeri muophu kẹ ọyen
Itṛmũ roro nẹ Imeri mu-ophu kẹ ọyen

Tom-PRS think that Mary angry for him
'Tom considers Mary angry with Tom'

All of these use the ordinary object pronoun, reciprocal and reflexive strategies are unacceptable.

As for verb serialization, I am not aware.

4.2.3 Backwards anaphora

If your language permits sentential subjects like those in D9, please indicate if coreference succeeds where X is a pronoun or anaphor construed with Oliver. Your language may not have a verb like implicate, but if so, try a verb that seems close, if possible. *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.
- b) That X was late suggested that Oliver was guilty.
- c) That X was late made Oliver look guilty.
- d) That X was late implicated Oliver.

D9 no constructions like these

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.

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).

D11a) Ilari vuẹ Izeke nẹ Imaiki vwo ẹguṣṣọ kẹ

Ilari vuẹ Izeke nẹ Imaiki vwo ẹguṣṣọ kẹ-e

Larry told Zeke that Mike has likeness for him NEG

‘Larry told Zeke that Mike does not like him (Mike or Zeke)’

b) Izeke vuẹ Ilari nẹ Imaiki vwo ẹguṣṣọ kẹ okpuyovwi rọyeen

Izeke vuẹ Ilari nẹ Imaiki vwo ẹguṣṣọ kẹ okpu-uyovwi rẹ-ọyen-en

Zeke told Larry that Mike has likeness for himself NEG

‘Zeke told Larry that Mike does not like Zeke’

c) Izeke vuẹ Ilari nẹ ọyen vwo ẹguṣṣọ kẹ Imaikii

Izeke vuẹ Ilari nẹ ọyen vwo ẹguṣṣọ kẹ Imaiki-i

Zeke told Larry that he has likeness for Mike NEG

‘Zeke told Larry that Zeke does not like Mike’

d) Ilari vuẹ Izeke ne ọ vwo ẹguṣọ kẹ Imaikii

Ilari vuẹ Izeke ne ọ vwo ẹguṣọ kẹ Imaiki-i

Larry told Zeke that he (Zeke) has likeness for Mike NEG

‘Larry told Zeke that Zeke does not like Mike’

(e) and (f) become clumsy constructions.

D12a) Oni re Izeke rori ne Imaiki vwo ẹguṣọ kẹ ọmọ royeen

Oni re Izeke roro-ri ne Imaiki vwo ẹguṣọ kẹ ọmọ re-oyen-en

Mother of Zeke think that Mike has likeness for child hers NEG

‘Zeke’s mother thinks that Mike does not like her daughter’

D13a) Izeke tare ne oyen kuewun phiyo

Izeke ta-re ne oyen ku-ewun phiyo

Zeke said that Zeke wear cloth on (herself)

‘Zeke said that Zeke had dressed Zeke’

b) Izeke tare ne oyen wan oma

Izeke ta-re ne oyen wan oma

Zeke said that Zeke wound herself

‘Zeke said that Zeke wounded Zeke’

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.

a) me tare ne mi kuewun phiyo omame
me ta-re ne mi ku-ewun phiyo oma-ome
I said that I wear cloth on myself
'I said that I dressed myself'

b) wo tare ne wo bru omawe
wo ta-re ne wo bru oma-we
you said that you cut yourself
'you said that you cut yourself'

A reflexive pronoun is used only as the object of the embedded clause.

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.

Note: Try overt and null pronouns as the coreferent NP if your language has both.

a) omọ ovuovo tare ne oyen kuewun phiyo omarayen
omọ ovo-ovo ta-re ne oyen ku-ewun phiyo oma-re-oyen
child singly said that he wear cloth on himself
'each/every child said that he dressed himself'

b) emọ buebun tare ne ayen kuewun phiyo omarayen
emọ buebun ta-re ne ayen ku-ewun phiyo oma-re-ayen
children many said that they wear cloth on themselves
'many children said that they dressed themselves'

- c) ɔmɔ ovuɔvɔ tare nɛ ɔyen bru omarɔyen
 ɔmɔ ovo-ɔvɔ ta-re nɛ ɔyen bru oma-rɛ-ɔyen
 child singly said that he cut himself
 ‘each/every child said that he cut himself’
- d) emɔ buebun tare nɛ ayen bru omarayen
 emɔ buebun ta-re nɛ ayen bru oma-rɛ-ayen
 children many said that they cut themselves
 ‘many children said that they cut themselves’

There is no difference from the forms in 4.4.2.1 only in terms of number.

4.4.2.3 Split antecedents

D14d,e) are possible with simple plural pronouns in the position of X (with Harriet and Ozzie as split antecedents). D14(d) Ozzie vue Iharrieti tane Ibilli vwo eguana ke ayen-en

Ozzie told Harriet that Bill has likeness for them Neg.

⚠Ozzie told Harriet that Bill dislikes them(Ozzie and Harriet)@

A reflexive or reciprocal strategy is unacceptable with a split antecedent here, as in (D14a-b)

D14a) Mě vue we kpahe omaravware

Mè-é vue we kpahe oma-rɛ-avware

I-PRS tell you about ourselves

⚠I am telling you about ourselves@

This is unacceptable. Rather, we could have:

D14b) Mě vue we kpahe obo re oma re ohwo ephan

Mè-é vue wẹ kpahe obo rẹ oma re ohwo ephan

I-PRS tell you about how that we state

I am telling you about our status (the state of our health) (speaker inclusive)@

Split antecedents are not possible for the anaphors.

4.4.2.4 Discourse antecedents

Sometimes, LDA strategies do not have to have antecedents in the same sentence if the discourse connection 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). Suppose that in the following scenarios we are being told what was going on in Mark's mind.

D15. oshọ muẹ Imaki kpahe ọmọ rọyen

oshọ muẹ Imaki kpahe ọmọ rẹ-ọyen

Fear catch Mark about child his

‘Mark was afraid for his son’

omavorọ nẹ ọ sa cha ọmọ rọyen ukoo

oma-vo-rọ nẹ ọ sa cha-ọmọ-rẹ-ọyen-uko-o

he be ashamed that he can protect his child NEG

‘He was ashamed that he could not protect his child’

Die ọyen ihwo rọyen che roro kpahọn?

Die ọyen ihwo rẹ-ọyen che roro kpahọn?

What that people his will think about him

‘what will his people think of him?’

- D16. O gbe Imaki unu o vwọ mrẹ ifoto rọyen vwẹ evun rẹ ọbe na
O gbe-Imaki-unu o vwọ mrẹ ifoto rẹ-ọyen vwẹ evun rẹ ọbe na
It shocked-Mark he when saw picture his at inside of book the
‘Mark was shocked to see his picture in the paper’

Ihwo rọyen ejobi cha djẹ jovwo
Ihwo rẹ-ọyen ejobi cha djẹ jo-vwo
People his all will run away from him

Note: djẹ = run djẹ jovwo = run away from him
‘All his people will run away from him’

Mavo o cha vuẹ oni rọyen wan
Mavo o cha vuẹ oni rẹ-ọyen wan
How he will tell mother his way
‘how will he tell his mother’

- D17 Imorisi tare nẹ eravwọn na bra vwọkẹ imaki
Imorisi ta-re nẹ eravwọn na bra vwọkẹ imaki
Morris said that things the bad for Mark
‘Morris said that it was difficult for mark’

Oṛesosuọ, Imorisi vuẹrẹ nẹ e cho imoto rọyen
O-re-ṛesosuọ, Imorisi vuẹ rẹ nẹ e cho imoto rẹ-ọyen
First, Morris told him that indef. Pron stole car his
‘First Morris said/told him that his car was stolen’

Ovwonetiye, ke o ru e itazi ke iruo
 O-vwo-ne-etiye, ke o ru e itazi ke iruo
 after that, ? he entered taxi go work
 ‘after that/then he took a taxi to work’

Imorisi rori ne ophu che muo
 Imorisi roro-ri ne ophu che mu-o
 Morris thought that anger will catch him
 ‘Morris thought that he might be angry’

The pronouns roye, o and the –o attached to mu all refer to Mark.

- D18 (A) (i) Nighere, Imaki ye
 Nighere, Imaki oye
 Look, Mark it is him
 ‘Look, there is Mark’
- (B) (i) O vwo erhuvwu gagan
 O vwo erhuvwu gagan
 He has good looks much
 ‘he is so/very good looking/handsome’
- (A) (ii) me guonọ dia aye royeen
 me guonọ dia aye re-oyen-en
 I want be woman his NEG
 ‘I would not want to be his wife’
- (iii) Eya na ejobi de nene
 eya na ejobi de nene

women the all run follow him
'All the women are chasing /running after him'

- (B) (ii) mi ji roro ne ɔ̃ jiri omaroyen no
mi ji roro ne ɔ̃ jiri oma-re-oyen no .
I also think that he-PRS praise himself too much
'Also, I think that he praises himself too much'

Note: the pronoun that refers to Mark in (A(iii)) is only a high tone attached to the verb *nene* 'follow'. This happens only with the 3rd person singular object pronoun. If Mark is used instead of the pronoun, we would have:

eya na ejobi dje nene Imaki
eya na ejobi dje nene Imaki
women the all run follow Mark
'All the women are running after Mark'

In this sentence, *nene* has two low tones.

4.4.3 Blocking Effects

The agreement features of nominals intervening between an anaphor and its antecedent can sometimes affect the grammaticality of coconstruction 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.

- D19 (a) Ilari roro ne ljoni muoghọ vwọ ke ọyen
 Ilari roro ne ljoni mu-oghọ vwọ-ke ọyen
 Larry think that John respect for him
 ‘Larry thinks that John respects him Larry ‘
- (b) Ilari roro ne mi muoghọ ke ọyen
 Ilari roro ne mi mu-oghọ ke ọyen
 Larry think that I-PRS respect for him
 ‘Larry thinks that I respect him Larry ‘
- (d) Ilari roro ne Imeri muoghọ ke ọyen
 Ilari roro ne Imeri mu-oghọ ke ọyen
 Larry think that Mary respect for him
 ‘Larry thinks that Mary respects him Larry ‘
- (d) Ilari roro ne emeshare na muoghọ ke ọyen
 Ilari roro ne emọ-eshare na mu-oghọ ke ọyen
 Larry think that boys the respect for him
 ‘Larry thinks that the boys respect him Larry ‘
- (e) eshare na roro ne emeshare na muoghọ ke ayen
 eshare na roro ne emọ-eshare na mu-oghọ ke ayen
 men the think that boys the respect for them
 ‘The men think that the boys respect them the men ‘

Note: in examples a – d , it is possible for the third person pronoun in the final position to be deleted and the vowel of ke ‘for’ becomes high toned to signal the meaning ‘for him’

- D20 (a) Ilari roro ne İbili rienre ne İdevu muoĝho ke oyen
 Ilari roro ne İbili rien-re ne İdevu mu-oĝho ke oyen
 Larry think that Bill know that Dave respect for him
 ‘Larry thinks that Bill knows that Dave respects Larry’
- (b) Ilari roro ne me rienre ne İdevu muoĝho ke oyen
 Ilari roro ne me rien-re ne İdevu mu-oĝho ke oyen
 Larry think that I know that Dave respect for him
 ‘Larry thinks that I know that Dave respects Larry’
- (c) Ilari roro ne İmeri rienre ne İdevu muoĝho ke oyen
 Ilari roro ne İmeri rien-re ne İdevu muoĝho ke oyen
 Larry think that Mary know that Dave respect for him
 ‘Larry thinks that Mary knows that Dave respects Larry’
- (d) Ilari roro ne emeshare na rienre ne İdevu muoĝho ke oyen
 Ilari roro ne emo-eshare na rien-re ne İdevu mu-oĝho ke oyen
 Larry think that boys the know that Dave respect for him
 ‘Larry thinks that the boys know that Dave respects Larry’
- (e) Eshare na roro ne emeshare na rienre ne İdevu muoĝho ke ayen
 Eshare na roro ne emo-eshare na rien-re ne İdevu muoĝho ke ayen
 Men the think that boys the know that Dave respect for them
 ‘The men think that the boys know that Dave respects the men’

Note: in D20 (a – d), although it is acceptable to delete *oyen* ‘him’ in each of the sentences, the pronoun is usually retained because of another intervening subject which has made co-reference longer.

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.

(a) Iwalta roro nẹ Ibili vuẹ Ihari nẹ Idevu muoghọ kẹ ọyen
Iwalta roro nẹ Ibili vuẹ Ihari nẹ Idevu mu-oghọ kẹ ọyen
Walter think that Bill told Harry that Dave respect for him
'Walter thinks that Bill told Harry that Dave respects Walter'

(b) Iwalter roro nẹ Ibili vuẹ vwẹ nẹ Idevu muoghọ kẹ ọyen
Iwalter roro nẹ Ibili vuẹ vwẹ nẹ Idevu mu-oghọ kẹ ọyen
Walter think that Bill told me that Dave respect for him
'Walter thinks that Bill told me that Dave respects Walter'

(b) Iwalter vuẹ vwẹ nẹ Idevu muoghọ kẹ ọyen
Iwalter vuẹ vwẹ nẹ Idevu mu-oghọ kẹ ọyen
Walter told me that Dave respect for him
'Walter told me that Dave respects Walter'

(c) Iwalter tare nẹ Idevu vwẹ ọbe ọvo ro dje kpahe ọyen kẹ vwẹ
Iwalter tare nẹ Idevu vwẹ ọbe ọvo rẹ-o dje kpahe ọyen kẹ vwẹ
Walter said that Dave give book one that it show about him give me
'Walter said that Dave gave me a book about 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.

The structures in D22 (a) and (c) and (g) are clumsy in Urhobo.

D22 (b) Ira muoghọ kẹ ọshare ro vwo ẹguṅṅọ kẹ
Ira mu-oghọ kẹ ọshare rẹ-o vwo ẹguṅṅọ kẹ
Ira respect for man who has likeness for Ira
'Ira respects the man who likes Ira'

(d) Ira nọre sẹ Ibili mrẹ ọyen
Ira nọ-re sẹ Ibili mrẹ ọyen
Ira asked whether Bill saw him
'Ira asked whether Bill saw Ira'

Note: *ọyen* here can only refer to Ira.

(e) Ira nọ kpahe ọke rẹ Ibili vwọ mrẹ ọyen
Ira nọ kpahe ọke rẹ Ibili vwọ mrẹ ọyen
Ira asked about time that Bill use see him
'Ira asked when Bill saw him'

(f) Ira riẹnre nẹ ljoji nene ọyeen
Ira riẹn-re nẹ ljoji nene ọyen-en
Ira know that George follow him NEG
'Ira did not know that George followed Ira'

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.

Rose: The pronoun is the same for both de se and non- de se readings.

PART 5 Final Thoughts

5.1 No

5.2 I think the questionnaire was very detailed and flexible enough to cope with various types of languages