

## Voice Determines Anaphora in W. Austronesian

In Toba Batak, Malagasy, Tagalog, and Balinese, DP-anaphors in nuclear Ss (ones built just from a single verb + required arguments) often asymmetrically c-command their binders. We review these data, [1], with supporting evidence from Toba and Malagasy, and then – our main point – define a direct, compositional interpretation of such Ss with no recourse to (co)-indexing or to structures at any level in which the binder c-commands the anaphor, [2]. The critical innovations are: (1), semantically interpreting the overt argument structure (“voice”) morphology on the verb, and (2), directly interpreting anaphors (not just co-indexing them or mapping them to LFs with bound variables). Crucially the denotation SELF of a DP-anaphor does not vary across expressions differing by voice. (In fact we claim that SELF is universal – denotable by DP-anaphors in all languages which have them). Following Keenan (2008) we contrast our analysis with Cole & Hermon (C&H:2008), the most explicit and thorough Minimalist analysis. (C&H instantiate Chung’s (2006) VP movement account of the “subjects only” constraint). Our analyses do share two important properties however: (1), the Agent Phrase in what C&H (atheoretically) call passive Ss is an argument, not an adjunct. And (2), both analyses are defined on morphosyntactic structure, not just theta roles as in Schachter (1984b) and Sugamoto (1984). Merits of our proposal compared with C&H:

1. It is vastly simpler: no A movement or reconstruction are used. C&H need both. (We capture “subjects only” as in Keenan 2008).

2. It shows how functional morphemes (here, voice affixes) may be semantically interpreted and syntactically invariant (Keenan 2008). Thus our analysis supports the universality of

### **The Regular Anaphora Law**

The distribution and interpretation of DP-anaphors in nuclear Ss is a function of the audible structure of these Ss.

What varies across languages is the overt structure of nuclear Ss. In W. Austronesian we predict the distribution and interpretation of anaphors mainly from voice morphology; in Korean mainly from nominal case marking (we claim), and in English mainly from constituency (Merge order).

3. It is semantically explicit: our analysis entails that “active” and “passive” predicates build logically equivalent Ss when one of the two arguments is individual denoting. The other may denote any generalized quantifier or be anaphoric (below).

4. It defines *anaphoric function* in general; SELF is but a special case. Other examples are the denotations of the underlined expressions in *No worker criticized everyone but himself* and *No student praised both himself and his teacher*. We do not analyze complex anaphors here, we just show that there are many expressible anaphoric functions distinct from SELF.

[1] Supporting Data: Toba Batak (1) and (2); Malagasy (3)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <p>1. a. [Mang-ida si Ria] si Torus<br/> mang-see art Ria art Torus<br/> <i>Torus saw Ria</i></p>                 | <p>b. [Mang-ida dirina] si Torus<br/> mang-see self art Torus<br/> <i>Torus saw himself</i></p>  |
| <p>2. a. [Di-ida si Torus] si Ria<br/> di-see art Torus art Ria<br/> <i>Torus saw Ria</i></p>                     | <p>b. [Di-ida si Torus] dirina<br/> di-see art Torus self<br/> <i>Torus saw himself</i></p>  |
| <p>(3) a. [[novonoin-dRabe] ny tenany]<br/> [[pst+kill+Rabe.gen] the self+his<br/> <i>Rabe killed himself</i></p> | <p>b. [ny taranatsika no [[amonoantsika] tena]]<br/> [the offspring-our Foc [[kill+1.incl.gen] self]]<br/> <i>It is for our offspring that we kill ourselves</i></p> |

Schachter (1984a) supports convincingly the constituency in (1) and (2), Keenan (2008, 2000) that in (3). (2b) and (3a,b) are the crucial data, even given the richer data in C&H.

[2] Compositional Interpretation (Toba Batak)

1.  $\llbracket \text{dirina} \rrbracket^M = \text{SELF}$ , which maps binary to unary relations:  $\text{SELF}(\text{R})(\text{x}) =_{\text{def}} \text{R}(\text{x})(\text{x})$
2.  $\text{MANG}(\text{R})(\text{y})(\text{x}) \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{R}(\text{y})(\text{x}) \wedge \text{THEME}(\text{y},\text{R}) \wedge \text{AGENT}(\text{x},\text{R})$   
 $\text{MANG}(\text{R})(\text{SELF})(\text{x}) \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{SELF}(\text{R})(\text{x}) \wedge \text{THEME}(\text{x},\text{R}) \wedge \text{AGENT}(\text{x},\text{R})$
3.  $\text{DI}(\text{R})(\text{x})(\text{y}) \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{R}(\text{y})(\text{x}) \wedge \text{AGENT}(\text{x},\text{R}) \wedge \text{THEME}(\text{y},\text{R})$   
 $\text{DI}(\text{R})(\text{x})(\text{SELF}) \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{SELF}(\text{R})(\text{x}) \wedge \text{AGENT}(\text{x},\text{R}) \wedge \text{THEME}(\text{x},\text{R})$   
 $\text{DI}(\text{R})(\text{SELF})(\text{x}) \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{SELF}(\text{R})(\text{x}) \wedge \text{AGENT}(\text{x},\text{R}) \wedge \text{THEME}(\text{x},\text{R})$

(x and y range over individuals; SELF we prove not to be a generalized quantifier, so we can stipulate the values that *mang-* and *di-* predicates assign it.).

## References

- Chung, S. 2006. Properties of VOS languages. *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*. M. Everaert & H. Van Riemsdijk. Oxford.
- Cole, P. and G. Hermon. 2008. VP Raising in a VOS Language. *Syntax* **11.2** pp. 144 – 197.
- Keenan, E.L. 2000. Morphology is structure. In I. Paul, V. Phillips, and L. Travis (editors) *Formal Issues in Austronesian Linguistics*. Pp.27 – 49.
- Keenan, E.L. 2008. Voice and relativization without movement in Malagasy. In *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* **26.3**:467 – 497.
- Schachter, P. (Ed) 1984a. *Studies in the Structure of Toba Batak* UCLA Occasional Papers 5
- Schachter, P. 1984b. Semantic-Role-Based Syntax in Toba Batak. Schachter 1984a:122 – 49.
- Sugamoto, N. 1984. Reflexives in Toba Batak. In Schachter 1984a:150 – 71.