

## Anaphoric Expressions in Kavalan

This paper aims to examine two types of anaphoric expressions in Kavalan: (i) pronouns, e.g. *ayzipna* ‘3.SG’ (ii) complex forms, e.g. *izip*(‘body’)+ pronoun.

We will first argue that *ayzipna* as exemplified in (1) has been misanalyzed as a true pronoun in the literature (e.g. Chang 2000). Examples (2-3) show that its distribution is peculiar in that it can take either a local or a non-local (long-distance) antecedent. This doesn’t follow from Principle B of the Binding Theory in that pronouns cannot have a local c-commanding antecedent. We will present some evidence in this paper concluding that *ayzipna* is unspecified with respect to the features [+/- pronominal]/[+/- anaphor]. This analysis brings this form in line with the analysis proposed for Malay *dirinya* in Cole and Hermon (2004). A similar distribution has been reported by Keenan (1976, 2000) for pronouns in Old English and Middle English. Following Reinhart and Reuland (1993), we consider reflexivity in Kavalan as the property of predicates. When *ayzipna* in (2) is randomly specified as a [+anaphor], the predicate is syntactically reflexive-marked and thus is construed as a semantically reflexive predicate. On the other hand, when *ayzipna* is specified as a [+pronominal] as in (1) and (3), the predicate is not reflexive-marked and thus receives a pronominal interpretation.

We will then examine the complex form *izip*+pronoun which behaves differently from an NP with a pronominal possessor, as shown in (4-5), in which *izip*+pronoun must have a local c-commanding antecedent whereas NP+pronoun can either take a local or a non-local one. This suggests that *izip*+pronoun is not treated by the syntax as a complex possessive DP, but rather as a unitary lexical entry. In addition, arguments based on VP ellipsis in (6-7) further show that *izip*+pronoun can only receive a sloppy interpretation while NP+pronoun can have either a strict or a sloppy reading. This argues that the complex form *izip*+pronoun is a true local reflexive, differing from an NP+pronoun in which there is a pronominal possessor.

(1) Chang (2000: 91)

me-rizaq	tu	sunis	ayzipna
AV-like	Acc	child	3Sg.Nom

‘He likes children.’

(2) *ayzipna* taking a local antecedent

a.	me-lizaq	ci	buya	ti	mayzipna
	AV-like	Ncm	Buya	Ncm	3Sg.Acc

‘Buya likes himself.’

b. supaR-an ni abas tu m-ipes ci upa ti mayzipna  
 know-PV Gen Abas Comp AV-dislike Ncm Upa Ncm 3Sg.Acc  
 ‘Abas<sub>i</sub> knows that Upa<sub>j</sub> doesn’t like her<sub>i/j</sub>.’

(3) *ayzipna* taking a non-local antecedent

supaR-an ni abas tu m-ipes ci upa ti mayzipna  
 know-PV Gen Abas Comp AV-dislike Ncm Upa Ncm 3Sg.Acc  
 ‘Abas<sub>i</sub> knows that Upa<sub>j</sub> doesn’t like her<sub>i</sub>.’

(4) supaR-an ni abas tu m-ipes ci upa tu izip-na  
 know-PV Gen Abas Comp AV-dislike Ncm Upa Acc body-3.Gen  
 ‘Abas<sub>i</sub> knows that Upa<sub>j</sub> doesn’t like herself<sub>j</sub>.’

(5) supaR-an ni abas sibat ci upa tu qulus-na  
 know-PV Gen Abas tear Ncm Upa Acc clothes-3.Gen  
 ‘Abas<sub>i</sub> knows that Upa<sub>j</sub> tore her<sub>i/j</sub> clothes.’

(6) m-ipes ci upa tu izip-na, ci angaw qaya  
 AV-dislike NcmUpa Acc body-3.Gen Ncm Angaw also  
 ‘Upa<sub>i</sub> doesn’t like herself<sub>i</sub>. Angaw<sub>j</sub> also (doesn’t like himself<sub>j</sub>).’

(7) sait-an ni buya qulus-na, ci abas qaya  
 cut-PV Gen Buya clothes-3.Gen Ncm Abas also  
 a. ‘Buya<sub>i</sub> cut his<sub>i</sub> clothes. Abas<sub>j</sub> also cut her<sub>j</sub> clothes.’  
 b. ‘Buya<sub>i</sub> cut his<sub>i</sub> clothes. Abas<sub>j</sub> also cut his<sub>i</sub> clothes.’

### Abbreviations

AV: Agent voice; Ncm: Non-common noun marker; PV: Patient Voice

### References

- Chang, Yung-li. 2000. A reference grammar of Kavalan (in Chinese). Series on Formosan languages, 12. Taipei: Yuan-liou Publishing.
- Cole, Peter and Gabriella Hermon. 2004. The typology of Malay reflexives, manuscript, University of Delaware.
- Keenan, E.L. 1976. Logical expressive power and syntactic variation in natural language. In: Keenan, E.L. (ed), *Formal Semantics for Natural Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keenan, E.L. 2000. An historical explanation of English Binding Theory. In *Studies in the History of the English Language*, vol. 1, UCLA.
- Reinhart, Tanya and Eric Reuland. 1993. Reflexivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24:4. 657-720.