

## Supplementary File 1

Kaiser, Elsi. *Do perspective-sensitive anaphors and subjective adjectives exhibit perspectival uniformity? An experimental investigation.* Glossa.

### **Further examples of the relation between perspective-sensitive anaphors and subjective expressions**

(Subscripts on subjective expressions indicate the attitude-holder)

Oshima (2004) reports that in examples like (a), when *zibun* refers to Takashi, the attitude-holder of expressions like *fool* and *beloved* is also interpreted as Takashi (via Giorgi 2006).

(a) Japanese

Takashi wa Taro ni baka-no/itosii Yoshiko ga zibun no musuko o  
Takashi TOP Taro DAT fool/beloved Yoshiko nom self gen son ACC

oikakemawasite-i-ru to it-ta  
chase around-asp-pres Comp say-past

‘Takashi told Taro that that fool<sub>Takashi</sub>/beloved<sub>Takashi</sub> Yoshiko was following SELF<sub>Takashi</sub>’s son.’ [Japanese]

Data from Korean (e.g. Park 2018) shows the same kind of pattern with the reflexive *caki* referring to John, and the adjective *beloved* expressing John’s attitude:

(b) Korean

John-un [salanghanun Mary-ka caki-eykey phyenci-lul cwe-se] kippessta.  
John-TOP beloved Mary-NOM self-DAT letter-ACC gave-because was.happy  
‘John was happy because the beloved<sub>John</sub> Mary gave a letter to SELF<sub>John</sub>.’

For Swedish, Hellberg (1980:41, via Strahan 2001:125) reports that use of a reflexive possessive *sitt* (c1) signals that the adjective *beloved* expresses the opinion of the reflexive’s antecedent, whereas the pronominal possessive *deras* (c2) (which does not have to be, but can be, coreferential with the couple) leaves the attitude-holder of *beloved* ambiguous.

(c1) Swedish

Boken skildrar makarnas liv på sitt älskade Charlottendal.  
book describes couple’s life on SELF’s beloved Charlotte-Valley  
‘The book describes the couple’s life in their beloved Charlotte Valley.’

(c2) Swedish

Boken skildrar makarnas liv på deras älskade Charlottendal.  
book describes couple’s life on their beloved Charlotte-Valley  
‘The book describes the couple’s life in their beloved Charlotte Valley.’

Similarly, for English, Gast (2004:76) reports that when a reflexive is used in a sentence like (d1) to refer to Jack, *fool* is interpreted as reflecting the opinion of the reflexive’s antecedent (Jack), but when a pronoun is used (d2), the attitude-holder is more ambiguous.

(d1)

Jack thought that this fool<sub>Jack</sub> was richer than himself.

(d2)

Jack thought that this fool<sub>Jack/speaker</sub> was richer than him.

---

## Supplementary File 2

**Kaiser, Elsi.** *Do perspective-sensitive anaphors and subjective adjectives exhibit perspectival uniformity? An experimental investigation.* Glossa.

### Predicates used in the experiments

amazing, amusing, annoying, attractive, boring, confusing, cool, dangerous, disgusting, dreadful, elegant, enjoyable, exciting, exhilarating, foolish, frightening, fun, funny, hilarious, important, insipid, inspiring, interesting, intimidating, irritating, lovely, nauseating, outstanding, pleasant, pleasing, scary, shocking, stellar, surprising, tedious, unimportant

---

## Supplementary File 3

**Kaiser, Elsi.** *Do perspective-sensitive anaphors and subjective adjectives exhibit perspectival uniformity? An experimental investigation.* Glossa.

### Statistical models

In some cases, inclusion of by-subject or by-item intercepts yielded a singular fit; in such cases singular fit was avoided, whenever possible, by dropping the relevant subject or item intercept. (In case of singular fit, dropping of item effects was prioritized over dropping of subject effects, following the reasoning in Jaeger 2009<sup>1</sup> and elsewhere). These simplified models yielded the same significance patterns for the fixed effects (verb type, anaphor type) as did models with both by-subject and by-item intercepts included that resulted in a singular fit. Thus, this choice does not impact the interpretation of the data.

The data are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

(† indicates that a model with both by-subject and by-item intercepts failed to converge.)

## Experiment 1

### Who shown

```
glmer(subjectshown ~ anaphor*verb + (1|subject), data=exp1data, family=binomial)
```

### Planned comparisons

#### Pronouns

```
glmer(subjectshown ~ verb + (1+verb|subject) + (1|item), data=exp1pro, family=binomial)
```

#### Reflexives<sup>†</sup>

```
glmer(subjectshown ~ verb + (1|item), data=exp1ref, family=binomial)
```

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://hlplab.wordpress.com/2009/05/14/random-effect-structure/>

## Whose opinion

### Subject opinion

```
glmer(subjectopinion ~ condition + (1|subject) + (1|item), data=exp1opinion, family=binomial)
```

### Object opinion<sup>†</sup>

```
glmer(objectopinion ~ condition + (1|subject), data=exp1opinion, family=binomial)
```

### Narrator opinion

```
glmer(narratoropinion ~ condition + (1|subject) + (1|item), data=exp1opinion, family=binomial)
```

### Source opinion

```
glmer(sourceopinion ~ condition + (1|subject) + (1|item), data=exp1opinion, family=binomial)
```

## Experiment 2

### Who shown

```
glmer(subjectshown ~ anaphor*verb + (1+verb|subject) + (1|item), data=exp2data, family=binomial)
```

### Planned comparisons

#### Pronouns

```
glmer(subjectshown ~ verb + (1|subject), data=exp2pro, family=binomial)
```

#### Reflexives

```
glmer(subjectshown ~ verb + (1+verb|subject) + (1+verb|item), data=exp2ref, family=binomial)
```

## Whose opinion

### Subject opinion

```
glmer(subjectopinion ~ condition + (1|subject) + (1|item), data=exp2opinion, family=binomial)
```

### Object opinion<sup>†</sup>

```
glmer(objectopinion ~ condition + (1|item), data=exp2opinion, family=binomial)
```

### Narrator opinion<sup>†</sup>

```
glmer(narratoropinion ~ condition + (1|subject), data=exp2opinion, family=binomial)
```

### Subject and narrator opinion

```
glmer(subjandnarropinion ~ condition + (1|subject) + (1|item), data=exp2opinion, family=binomial)
```

### Object and narrator opinion

```
glmer(objandnarropinion ~ condition + (1|subject) + (1|item), data=exp2opinion, family=binomial)
```

### Subject and object opinion

```
glmer(subjandobjopinion ~ condition + (1|subject), data=exp2opinion, family=binomial)
```

### Source opinion

```
glmer(sourceopinion ~ condition + (1|subject), data=exp2opinion, family=binomial)
```

## Experiment 3

### Who shown

```
glmer(subjectshown ~ anaphor*verb + (1|subject) + (1|item), data=exp3data, family=binomial)
```

### Planned comparisons

#### Pronouns

```
glmer(subjectshown ~ verb + (1|subject), data=exp3pro, family=binomial)
```

#### Reflexives

```
glmer(subjectshown ~ verb + (1+verb|subject) + (1|item), data=exp3ref, family=binomial)
```

**Whose opinion**

**Subject opinion<sup>†</sup>**

```
glmer(subjectopinion ~ condition + (1|subject), data=exp3opinion, family=binomial)
```

**Object opinion**

```
glmer(objectopinion ~ condition + (1|subject) + (1|item), data=exp3opinion, family=binomial)
```

**Source opinion**

```
glmer(sourceopinion ~ condition + (1|subject) + (1|item), data=exp3opinion, family=binomial)
```