# Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Ball</td>
<td><em>Hili-Clauses: Insights into Tongan Nominalizations</em></td>
<td>1-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William D. Davies and Eri Kurniawan</td>
<td><em>Movement and Locality in Sundanese Wh-Questions</em></td>
<td>17-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catherine Fortin</td>
<td><em>On the Left Periphery in Indonesian</em></td>
<td>29-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincent Homer</td>
<td><em>Backward Control in Samoan</em></td>
<td>45-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Kalin</td>
<td><em>News about the No-Phrase: Specificalitional Pseudoclefs in Malagasy</em></td>
<td>61-75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward L. Keenan</td>
<td><em>Voice Determines Co-Argument Anaphora in W. Austronesian</em></td>
<td>77-91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seongyeon Ko</td>
<td><em>Two Types of Anticausatives in Acehnese</em></td>
<td>93-107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chao-Lin Li</td>
<td><em>Voice, Agree and Locality in Paiwan</em></td>
<td>109-123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Massam</td>
<td><em>The Structure of (Un)ergatives</em></td>
<td>125-135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Nuger</td>
<td><em>On Downward-Entailing Existentials and Differential Object Marking in Palauan</em></td>
<td>137-151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ileana Paul</td>
<td><em>Bare Nouns, Incorporation, and Scope</em></td>
<td>153-164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Pearson</td>
<td><em>Another Look at No: Pseudo-Clefts and Temporal Clauses in Malagasy</em></td>
<td>165-179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norvin Richards</td>
<td><em>The Tagalog Copula</em></td>
<td>181-195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yosuke Sato</td>
<td><em>Radical Underspecification, General Number and Nominal Mapping in Indonesian</em></td>
<td>197-209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jozina Vander Klok</td>
<td><em>Direct Adjectival Modification in Javanese</em></td>
<td>211-225</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREFACE

Although the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association (AFLA) has been holding annual meetings since 1994, until now it has had no consistent approach to the publication of its Proceedings. Papers from AFLA 2 and AFLA 14 were published as edited volumes; in other years the local organizers published the Proceedings in their Department’s Working Papers series; in still other years no Proceedings was published. The 16th annual meeting of AFLA was held May 1-3, 2009, at the University of California, Santa Cruz. During the business meeting, the idea was floated that the Proceedings henceforth be published electronically, in a consistent format, at the AFLA website (http://ling.uwo.ca/afla/), which is generously hosted by the University of Western Ontario. The initial result is this volume, which has emerged very quickly indeed—less than six months after AFLA 16 was held. Our hope is that on-line publication of this and future volumes of the Proceedings of AFLA will enable research on the formal linguistics of Austronesian languages to reach as wide a readership as possible.

We want to thank UCSC’s Linguistics Department and its Linguistics Research Center for hosting AFLA 16, the authors for submitting their papers so efficiently, and the University of Western Ontario for hosting the website at which this volume is posted. We also wish to acknowledge the precedent set by the Proceedings of AFLA 12, which was published on-line as UCLA Working Papers in Linguistics No. 12, and whose stylesheet heavily influenced the stylesheet we constructed for the Proceedings of AFLA.
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Daniel Finer
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Eric Potsdam
We review data from Toba Batak and Malagasy in which anaphors in nuclear sentences asymmetrically c-command their antecedents. We provide a language independent, semantic, definition of anaphor and show how to directly interpret expressions with c-commanding anaphors. Crucial here is the semantic interpretation of voice affixes. So for purposes of semantic interpretation it is not necessary for anaphors to be c-commanded by their antecedents. Abandoning Principle A we offer a mathematically precise definition of structural invariant of a grammar (based on Keenan & Stabler 2003) and claim as universals that both anaphors and the anaphor-antecedent relation are structural invariants of human language. We suggest, but lack the space to pursue, that the interpretative role of voice morphology in W. Austronesian is analogous to that of case morphology in languages like Korean and Greek. We conclude with a summary of the advantages of the approach we take.

1. Core Anaphora Patterns in Toba Batak and Malagasy

1.1. Toba Batak (N. Sumatra)

The data below come from the papers in Schachter 1984a, Cole & Hermon 2008, and some modest consultant work. We see in (1) and (2) that for verbs built by prefixing mang- to a root, anaphors are c-commanded by the following Agent antecedent. But for verbs built from di-prefixed roots it is the Agent which forms a constituent with the verb, its anaphor c-commanding it, (2b).

(1)a. [Mang+ida si Ria] si Torus mang-see art Ria art Torus ‘Torus sees Ria’

(1)b. [Mang+ida dirina] si Torus mang-see self art Torus ‘Torus sees himself’

(2)a. [Di-ida si Torus] si Ria di-see art Torus art Ria ‘Torus saw Ria’

(2)b. [Di-ida si Torus] dirina di-see art Torus self ‘Torus saw himself’

We ignore the internal structure of proper nouns (DPs) like [si Ria] where si functions as a proper noun article. In all four Ss above the immediate postverbal DP is tightly bound to the verb. Schachter (1984b) shows that adverbs, like ‘yesterday’ cannot separate them, but they do occur naturally between the two DPs. And more importantly, only the clause final DPs above can be relativized or wh-questioned by movement.
The well known “Subjects Only” phenomenon in (3e-f) is characteristic of W. Austronesian languages (Tagalog, Malagasy). Judgments on (3e-f) are strong and immediate. They reflect the basic interpretative mechanisms of nuclear clauses, not just an arbitrary constraint on what can be extracted. (3f) for example could only mean the teacher that a book read, which is nonsense.

Emmorey (1984) provides evidence of a different sort for the constituency in (1) and (2). She shows spectographically that the verb + its following DP form an intonation group in which the nuclear pitch accent falls on the stressed syllable of the last lexical item in the Predicate Phrase (PredP). Pitch accent placement identifies the immediate post-verbal DP in mang- and di- verbs as the last lexical item in their PredP’s. In conjoined PredP’s both conjuncts receive this accent (Emmorey op.cit.):

(4)a. [[Manuhor baoang] jala [mangolompa mangga]] halak an
buy onions and cook mangos man Det
‘The man buys onions and cooks mangos’

b. [[Dituhor si Ore] jala [dilompa si Ruli]] mangga
di-buy art Ore and di-cook art Ruli mangos
‘Ore buys and Ruli cooks mangos’

More could be said here, but all generative grammarians, despite theoretical differences, agree on the major constituency break in Ss like (1a-b) and (2a-b).

1.2. Malagasy (Madagascar)


(5)a. [Namono azy] Rabe
past+maN+kill him.acc Rabe.nom
‘Rabe was killing him’

b. [Novonoin-dRabe] izy
past+kill+ina+Rabe.gen he.nom
‘Rabe was killing him’
We choose the cumbersome progressive aspect in translating (5a-b) to acknowledge that the simple past tense in English is telic in a way in which the simple past in Malagasy is not (Travis 2005, Rasolofo 2006). The transitive verbs in (5a-b) are both built by affixing the root vono ‘kill’. That in (5a) is prefixed with -aN-, N a homorganic nasal which may trigger (as here) the loss of the initial consonant in a root, or its mutation to an affricate. This prefix is usually noted man in traditional Malagasy grammars (Malzac 1926; Rahajarizafy 1960). All verbs mark past tense with n (or no- = /nu/ if consonant initial) and future with h (or ho). Verbs built with aN take an m prefix in present tense and imperatives as do many other prefixes: the semantically neutral i-, reciprocal if- and causative amp-. Such verbs will be called m-class verbs.

In contrast the verb in (5b) is built by suffixing ina to the root vono yielding vonoina (with stress shift from the first syllable of vono = /VU.nu/ to the second: /vu.NU.i/na/). Then the agent phrase Rabe in (5b) combines with vono+ina in the morphophonemically complex way that possessors bind to their possessum (see Keenan & Polinsky 1998). We note that the n-dR in (5b) is standard orthography and represents a single phoneme—a prenasalized post-alveolar affricate. In distinction to Toba Batak, Malagasy distinguishes three cases in the pronoun system – nominative, accusative and genitive. Toba has distinct genitive forms, but does not distinguish nominative and accusative pronouns. Without exception, verbs built by suffixing a root are unmarked in present tense, and so are not m-class verbs.

Despite these morphological differences the alternation in (6a-b) behaves like that between mang and di verbs in Toba, and essentially the same interpretative mechanisms can be used to interpret the structurally variable position of anaphors:


Of interest however is a morphosyntactically more complicated verb form which also allows object anaphors to c-command their antecedents. M-class verbs can be suffixed with -ana adding an argument to the theta grid of the predicate. The new argument is presented PredP externally and bears an oblique role to the predicate, such as Instrument (7b) or Benefactive (8b).

(7)a. Manao (m+aN+tao(v)) tranO amin’ny birikiny Rabe Pres+aN+make house with’the bricks+our Rabe ‘Rabe is building a house with our bricks’

b. Anaovan-dRabe (aN+tao(v)+ana+Rabe) tranO ny birikiny [[aN+make]+ana]+Rabe.gen house the bricks.our ‘Our bricks are being used by Rabe to build a house’

(8)a. Manao (m+aN+tao(v)) tranO ho an-dRasoa Rabe Pres+aN+make house for-Rasoa Rabe ‘Rabe is building a house for Rasoa’
b. Anaovan-dRabe (aN+tao(v)+ana+Rabe) trano Rasoa
   [[aN+make]+ana]+Rabe.gen house Rasoa
   ‘Rabe is building a house for Rasoa’

Semantically there are two important points to notice about ana verbs. Most obvious is that in (7a) and (8a), built with m-class verbs, the theta role of the oblique constituent is marked with a Preposition–amina in (7a) and ho an- in (7b). (Ho an- is treated as a single Preposition despite being written as two morphemes). These PPs are not at all obligatory and are naturally regarded as adjuncts, not arguments of the verb. But in the corresponding sentences (7b) and (8b) the PredP-external DP is nominative and is required, so it is an argument, though its theta role is not specifically specified. We just know that it is an oblique. In typical cases it is inerrable from context, as the kinds of objects that can be instruments are not those that can be benefactees, manners, etc. Sometimes though ambiguity or vagueness does arise. In (8b) Rasoa might be a proximate cause, having nagged Rabe so much that he built the house for Rasoa’s parents.

Second, ana verbs contain the m-class verb as a constituent. By Compositionality then we expect the interpretation of an ana verb to be dependent on the interpretation of the m-class verb it contains. Contrast now:

(9)a. Mamono tena ho an’ny taranatsika isika
    Pres+[aN+kill] self for’the descendents.our we.incl
    ‘We kill ourselves (work hard) for our descendents’

b. [[Amonoantsika] ([aN+vono+ana]+tsika) tena] ny taranatsika
   [[pres+[aN+kill+ana]+1.incl.gen] self] the offspring+1.incl.gen
   ‘Our offspring is the reason we kill ourselves (work hard)’

In (9b), from Rajemis-Raolison 1971:113, the relevant c-command relations are those between the agent phrase -tsika, the first plural inclusive genitive pronoun, bound to the verb amonoana and the c-commanding direct object tena ‘self’. So the reflexive tena ‘self’ c-commands its antecedent. Keenan 2008 provides compositional interpretations for the types of verbs in (9b) in which -ana suffixes to an already prefixed form -aN+vono = -amono.

Evidence for the gross constituent boundary is readily available in the literature. For example Subjects Only holds: only the PredP-external position can be relativized, and it is replaceable by nominative case pronouns. Also various particles, such as the polar question particle ve? (Pearson 2005), are placed at the right PredP boundary in all cases above. So in (9a) it would occur between taranatsika and isika; in (9b) between tena and ny taranatsika.

We turn now to a language-independent definition of anaphor and then to our direct compositional interpretation of Ss with anaphors that c-command their antecedent.

2. Defining Co-argument Anaphors

Given a domain E of (possibly abstract) objects, we treat n-ary predicates (Pn’s) as denoting n-ary relations over E (subsets of E^n). DPs of any sort denote partial functions of type-1, the set of
functions that map \(n+1\)-ary relations to \(n\)-ary relations. So they are the functions that reduce arity by one. For simplicity we limit ourselves here to \(P_n\)'s, \(0 \leq n \leq 2\). \(P_2\)s, such as transitive verb phrases, determine the smallest environment in which non-eliminable binding occurs.

Among DPs, \(R\)-expressions (in the Binding Theory sense) denote type-1 functions \(F\) whose values at binary relations \(R\) satisfy (10):

\[
F(R) = \{a \in E \mid F(aR) = 1\}, \quad \text{where } aR =_{\text{def}} \{b \in E \mid (a,b) \in R\}.
\]

So the values \(F\) takes at binary relations are determined by its values at unary relations (subsets of \(E\)). So \textit{admires all poets} denotes \((\text{ALL POET})(\text{ADMIRE}) = \{x \in E \mid (\text{ALL POET})(x\text{ADMIRE}) = 1\}\), the set of objects \(x\) such that \((\text{ALL POET})\) is true of the set of things \(x\) admires. The \(F\) which satisfy (10) are provably just those satisfying the AEC below (Keenan 1987):

**Accusative Extensions Condition (AEC)**

For all \(x,y \in E\), all binary relations \(R,S\) over \(E\), if \(xR = yS\) then \(x \in F(R)\) iff \(y \in F(S)\)

For example, Keenan 1996 identifies many classes of DPs which satisfy the AEC and are thus \(R\)-expressions. They include proper names, quantified DPs of the form \(\text{Det}+\text{NP} (\text{some}/\text{no student, most students John knows}), \text{partitives (most of John’s friends, less than five of the students}),\) and many others. To check that \textit{most of John’s friends} is an \(R\)-expression, imagine a model in which Mary praised just the people Sue distrusts. Then \textit{Mary praised most of John’s friends} and \textit{Sue distrusts most of John’s friends} have the same truth value. The \(F\) which satisfy (10) are provably just those satisfying the AEC below (Keenan 1987):

**Accusative Anaphor Condition (AAC)**

If \(xR = xS\) then \(x \in F(R)\) iff \(x \in F(S)\)

For example, if Mary praised just the people she admires then \textit{Mary praised herself (only herself, etc)} and \textit{Mary admires herself (only herself, etc)} have the same truth value.

---

1 We assume for simplicity that \(R\) is binary. When \(R\) is \(n+1\)-ary take \(x\) to be an \(n\)-tuple. Then \(xR = \{y \in E \mid <x,y> \in R\}\) and \(F(R) = \{x \in E^n \mid F(xR) = 1\}\).
Def 1. An expression is an *accusative anaphor* iff in all models all its denotations satisfy the AAC but in some model it fails the AEC.

Def 2. Here we define some properly anaphoric functions which map binary to unary relations. Expressions which denote these functions are provably accusative anaphors as defined above.

\[
\text{SELF}(R) = \{a \in E | (a,a) \in R\}; \quad \text{(ONLY SELF)}(R) = \{a | aR = \{a\}\}
\]
\[
\text{(EVERY BOY BUT HIMSELF)}(R) = \{a \in E | aR \cap \text{BOY} = \text{BOY} - \{a\}\}
\]

3. **Compositional Interpretation**

Classically we think of proper names, like *Bob*, as denoting an object \(b\) in the domain \(E\) of objects under consideration. P1s, like *laugh, cry*, etc. are interpreted as subsets of \(E\), and a sentence like *Bob laughed* is interpreted as True iff \(b \in \text{LAUGH}\), that is, if and only if the object *Bob* denotes is an element of the set of things that *laugh* denotes. Here we treat proper names equivalently, as those type-1 functions we call *individuals*. Namely, for each \(b \in E\), \(I_b\), the *individual generated by* \(b\), is that type-1 function which maps each set \(A\) to True iff \(b \in A\). And by the accusative extension mentioned earlier, \(I_b\) maps a binary relation \(R\) to \(\{a \in E | (a,b) \in R\}\).

So for example *knows Mary* denotes the set of people who know Mary.

3.1. Interpreting Toba Batak

3.1.1. *Dirina* denotes SELF.

3.1.2. *Mang-* and *di-* denote the type lifting functions MANG and DI taking binary relations as arguments yielding as values functions taking type-1 functions as arguments, as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(11)a. MANG}(R)(H)(F) &= F(H(R)) & \text{R any binary relation, F,H partial type-1 functions} \\
\text{b. DI}(R)(F)(H) &= F(H(R)) & \text{R any binary relation, F,H partial type-1 functions}
\end{align*}
\]

*Mang* and *di* predicates are independently generated and interpreted. Neither contains the other as a constituent. So the roots that *mang* and *di* can prefix might not be exactly the same. Consider now the interpretation of Ss like (1b) and (2b), the latter with a c-commanding reflexive *dirina*. We interpret the root *ida* of the transitive verbs *mangida* and *diida* as a binary relation and we interpret just the constituents of (12a-b).

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(12)a. } &[[\text{Mang - ida} \quad \text{dirina}][\text{si Torus}]] \\
\text{MANG} & \quad \text{IDA} & \quad \text{SELF} & \quad I_b \\
& = ((\text{MANG(IDA)})(\text{SELF}))(I_b) & \text{Compositional interpretation} \\
& = I_b(\text{SELF(IDA)}) & \text{Def MANG} \\
& = \text{True iff } b \in \text{SELF(IDA)} & \text{Def individual} \\
& = \text{True iff } (b,b) \in \text{IDA} & \text{(i.e. iff } b \text{ sees } b) & \text{Def SELF}
\end{align*}
\]
b. \[\{[\text{Di - ida}][\text{si Torus}]]\ dirina\]

\[
\text{DI} \quad \text{IDA} \quad \text{I}_b \quad \text{SELF} \\
= \quad ((\text{DI}(\text{IDA}))(\text{I}_b))(\text{SELF}) \quad \text{Compositional interpretation} \\
= \quad \text{I}_b(\text{SELF}(\text{IDA})) \quad \text{Def DI} \\
= \quad \text{True iff } b \in \text{SELF}(\text{IDA}) \quad \text{Def individual} \\
= \quad \text{True iff } (b,b) \in \text{IDA} \quad \text{(i.e. iff } b \text{ sees } b) \quad \text{Def SELF}
\]

Note that \text{ida}, \text{si Torus}, and \text{dirina} have the same denotation in both Ss. Their interpretative difference lies in the differing interpretations of \text{mang} and \text{di}. So on the view of grammar presented here grammatical morphology is semantically interpreted (not “uninterpretable”). (It is also typically \textit{structurally invariant}, defined in section 4.)

3.1.3. Theta Roles

The analyses of Schachter 1984b and Sugamoto 1984 are built on theta role assignment, which we have so far ignored. So let us add it in, since it is clearly part of the semantic relation between \text{mang} and \text{di} predicates we want to capture. We treat theta roles like AGENT and THEME as relations between entities and the n-ary relations denoted by predicates in the language (Keenan 2008). We require for example, that for all binary relations \text{R}, all \(a,b \in E\),

(13) a. \text{MANG}(\text{R})(\text{I}_b)(\text{I}_a) = \text{True } \Rightarrow \text{THEME}(b,R) \text{ and } \text{AGENT}(a,R)

b. \text{DI}(\text{R})(\text{I}_b)(\text{I}_a) = \text{True } \Rightarrow \text{AGENT}(b,R) \text{ and } \text{THEME}(a,R)

So we interpret \text{mang} as the function in (12a) which meets the condition in (13a). Similarly \text{di} denotes the function in (12b) satisfying (13b). Of course a thorough study would discriminate among different roots according to the theta roles they assign to their arguments. And it would treat roots with different numbers of theta roles. Here we simply illustrate how theta role interpretation can be integrated into semantic interpretation.

3.1.4. Interim Conclusion

It is straightforward to base generate and interpret nuclear Ss in Toba Batak with anaphors c-commanding their antecedents (or not). This is made possible by the type lifting interpretation of the verbal affixes \text{mang} and \text{di}. Further our analysis is linguistically highly valued since we only interpret overtly present constituents, yielding a better account of why speakers speak the way they do. On the Minimalist analysis in Cole & Hermon 2008 the important c-command condition relating anaphors and their antecedents can be overridden in surface. But how can c-command, part of UG and so genetically determined, be both necessary and ignored? Why don’t speakers speak in underlying forms (or LFs) which do satisfy the c-command condition?
3.2. Interpreting Malagasy

The Malagasy verbs in (6) behave like mang/di ones in Toba, but the binding in (9b) is new.

3.2.1. Predicate Modifiers (Pmods)

Pmods like with our bricks or for Rasoa combine with Pn’s (n > 0) to form Pn’s. They denote restricting functions F mapping n-ary relations to n-ary relations, that is, F(R) ⊆ R. The set of objects denoted by build a house with our bricks is a subset of that denoted by build a house. If Rabe is building a house with our bricks we can infer that Rabe is building a house. Similarly the denotation of build a house for Rasoa is a subset of that of build a house. Prepositions then denote functions from type-1 functions into the set of restricting modifiers. Compare:

(14) a. [[Man+ttao(v) [ilay trano]] Rabe  ‘Rabe is building that house’
\[ \text{AN(R)}(F)(G) = G(F(R)) \text{ from the denotation of aN} \]

b. [[Man+ttao(v) [ilay trano]] [ho an-dRasoa]] Rabe  ‘Rabe builds that house for Rasoa’
\[ \text{AN(R)}(F)(q(H))(G) = G((q(H))(F(R))) \text{ AN(R)(F) is a unary relation, q(H) maps n-ary relations to n-ary relations} \]

c. Anaovan- dRabe ilay trano Rasoa  “For some function p from individuals to restricting functions, Rabe is making that house p Rasoa”
\[ \text{ANA(AN(R)) = } \exists p(G((p(H)(\text{AN(R)}(F)))) \]
\[ = \exists p(G((p(H)(\text{SELF}(R)))) \]

d. [[amonoan+ tsika] tena] ny taranatsika  ‘Rabe builds that house for Rasoa’
\[ \text{ANA(AN(R)) = } \exists p(G((p(H)(\text{AN(R)}(\text{SELF})))) \]
\[ = \exists p(G((p(H)(\text{SELF}(R)))) \]

One checks that (14b) entails (14c), which entails (14a). (14b) and (14c) differ only in that (14b) specifies the theta relation of Rasoa, Benefactee. (14c) just quantifies over such relations. And (14d) is the interpretation for (9b) showing that SELF is within the scope of the Agent phrase G. It instantiates the same interpretative pattern in (14c). Again it is the verbal morphology that type lifts the transitive predicate yielding the correct result. For deeper discussion of the semantics of the Malagasy voice system see Travis 2005, Rasolofo 2006, and Keenan 2008.
4. How does English Differ from W. Austronesian?²

Cole & Hermon (2008:145) claim that Passive Agents in English can’t antecede subject anaphors because they have not c-commanded them at any stage of the derivation, whereas Agents of di-verbs in Toba can antecede them on the grounds that they c-commanded them at an intermediate stage in the derivation. Their analysis posits many movement operations which change c-command relations and which they acknowledge lack independent motivation. Moreover, as we have shown, binding of reflexives simply does not require c-command.

For us the crucial difference is that Toba and Malagasy present verbal type lifting expressions (mang, di, aN, etc.) which determine the composition and theta roles of two or more argument functions. English lacks such type lifting morphology, punkt. Nuclear clauses in English differ in structure from those in Toba and Malagasy. And in English passives, the closest English gets to di/inalana verbs, Agent phrases are not arguments but optional adjuncts absent 80% to 96% of the time (Keenan & Manorohanta 2004). We have tried treating the passive en morphology in English as a type lifter, along the lines of (15), but without success.

\[ (15) \quad \text{EN}(R)(F) = 1 \text{ iff for some individual } y, y \in F(R) \]

For \( F = \text{SELF} \) this would say that (16) holds.

\[ (16) \quad \text{Himself was criticized} \text{ is True iff for some } y, y \text{ criticized himself.} \]

We cannot assess (16) since \text{Himself was criticized} is not used meaningfully in standard English. But we get more clearly incorrect results when \text{himself} is replaced with a mere quantified DP:

\[ \begin{align*}
(17a) \quad \text{No worker was criticized} & \text{ is True iff for some } x, x \text{ criticized no worker.} \\
(17b) \quad \text{Just one worker was criticized} & \text{ is True iff for some } x, x \text{ criticized just one worker}
\end{align*} \]

(17a-b) are clearly false, as they get the scope wrong. \text{No worker was criticized} means for no worker was there an \( x \) who criticized him (not \text{someone didn’t criticize any worker}). But we can’t put the existential quantification inside the scope of EN in (15) since that would eliminate an argument so neither passive nor reflexive could apply.

5. Grammatical Invariants

Having lost the c-command constraint relating anaphors and antecedents we seek some new structural regularities. We propose two, slightly different in character than standard Binding Theory. We define the notion structural \textit{invariant} and claim that both anaphors, as defined, and the anaphor-antecedent relation, are universal invariants of natural language. Invariants are defined in terms of structure preserving substitutions (Keenan & Stabler 2003).

² Thanks to Matt Pearson for pushing me on this point.
5.1. A grammar $G$ is given by a finite set of categorized expressions $\text{Lex}_G$, the lexicon of $G$, and a set of structure building partial functions called rules. $L(G)$, the set of expressions generated by $G$, is the closure of the lexicon under the rules; that is, all expressions derivable from the lexical items by finitely many applications of the rules. A structure (preserving) map for $G$ (see K&S 2003:20) is a bijection from $L(G)$ to $L(G)$ which does not change how expressions are derived. If $z$ is derived by applying a rule $F$ to some $x$ and $y$, that is, $z = F(x,y)$, then $h(z)$, the expression $h$ maps $z$ to, is $F(h(x),h(y))$. So $z$ and $h(z)$ are derived in exactly the same way. Structure maps are standardly called automorphisms. Expressions $x$ and $y$ are isomorphic iff some automorphism maps one to the other. And an invariant of $G$ is a linguistic object that is mapped to itself (is invariant) by all the automorphisms (auts). A linguistic object is an expression, a property (set) of expressions, a relation between expressions, a (partial) function on expressions, etc. So to say that an expression $d$ in $L(G)$ is invariant just says that $h(d) = d$, all auts $h$ of $G$. In general we expect that expressions we call grammatical morphemes, heads of functional projections, etc. are automorphism invariant. They are the expressions you cannot replace by any others without changing how expressions are derived.

A set $P$ of expressions is invariant iff $h(P) = P$, all auts $h$, where $h(P)$ is $\{h(d) | d \in P\}$. So for $P$ invariant, an automorphism just permutes members of $P$ with themselves, but does not map anything out of $P$ or map anything into $P$ that was not already there. Similarly for $R$ a (binary) relation among expressions, $h(R)$ is just $\{<h(c),h(d)> | all <c,d> \in R\}$. This just says that, for $R$ invariant, $c$ is related by $R$ to $d$ iff for all auts $h$, $h(c)$ is related by $R$ to $h(d)$.

These definitions may be unfamiliar but the linguistic objects they identify are not. As linguists we largely agree on the expressions in a language we call “functional”. Automorphism invariance just gives a formal characterization of that common intuition. To see this explicitly here is a “mini-grammar” for Toba to illustrating these definitions.

5.2. TB, a Mini-Grammar of Toba Batak

We treat a possible expression as a pair $(s,C)$, for $s$ is a string of vocabulary items, and $C$ a category name. This is similar to the use of labeled bracketings $[DP \text{ John’s doctor}]$. It is helpful when defining the rules of $G$ and it eliminates some ambiguities. Thus $(\text{love},N)$ and $(\text{love},V)$ are distinct expressions since their second coordinates differ. The vocabulary of TB is the set of strings that appear as left hand coordinates in lexical items or are introduced in the values of any of the structure building functions below.

\begin{align*}
\text{Cat}_{TB} & \quad P2, P2a, P2n, P1a, P1n, P0, Vaf, Vpf, NP, NPrefl, CJ \\
\text{Lex}_{TB} & \begin{align*}
P2: & \quad \text{saw, praised, flattered} \\
P1n: & \quad \text{laughed, cried, sneezed} \\
Vaf: & \quad \text{mang-} \\
NP: & \quad \text{John, Bill, Sam} \\
\end{align*} \\
\text{CJ}: & \quad \text{and, or} \\
\text{Vpf}: & \quad \text{di-} \\
\text{NPrefl}: & \quad \text{self} \\
\end{align*}
Rule_{TB} There are three structure building functions: VM (Voice marking), PA (Predicate Argument), and COORD (Coordination)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{VM} & \quad (\text{mang}, \text{Vaf}), \ (t, \text{P2}) \rightarrow (\text{mang}+t, \text{P2a}) \\
& \quad (\text{di}, \text{Vpf}), \ (t, \text{P2}) \rightarrow (\text{di}+t, \text{P2n})
\end{align*}
\]

So VM maps the string \textit{mang} of category Vaf and any string \textit{t} of category P2 to form \textit{mang}+\textit{t} of category P2a. Similarly VM builds strings of category P2n from \textit{di} of category Vaf and \textit{t} of category P2. The domains and actions of PA and COORD are understood similarly:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{PA} & \quad (s, \text{P2x}) \ (t, \text{NP}) \rightarrow (s+t, \text{P1y}) \quad \text{all } x \neq y \in \{n,a\} \\
& \quad (s, \text{P2a}) \ (t, \text{NPrefl}) \rightarrow (s+t, \text{P1n}) \quad \text{all } x \in \{n,a\} \\
& \quad (s, \text{P1x}) \ (t, \text{NP}) \rightarrow (s+t, \text{P0}) \quad \text{all } x \in \{n,a\} \\
& \quad (s, \text{P1a}) \ (t, \text{NPrefl}) \rightarrow (s+t, \text{P0})^3
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{COORD} & \quad (u, \text{CONJ}) \ (s, \text{C}) \ (t, \text{C}) \rightarrow (v++s+u+t, \text{C}) \quad \text{all } \textit{C} = \text{P2, P2a, P2n, P1a, P1n, P0, NP} \\
& \quad (u, \text{CONJ}) \ (s, \text{C}) \ (t, \text{C}^{'}) \rightarrow (v+s+u+t, \text{NPrefl}) \quad \text{all } \textit{C} \neq \textit{C}^{'}, \textit{C} \in \{\text{NP, NPrefl}\}, \text{v, u as above}
\end{align*}
\]

The trees below summarize proofs that their terminal strings of category P0 are in L(TB).

(18) a. 
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{P0} \\
\text{P1n} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{P2a} \\
\text{NPrefl} \\
\text{Vaf} \\
\text{P2} \\
\text{mang-} \\
\text{saw} \\
\text{self} \\
\text{Ed}
\end{array}
\]

b. 
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{P0} \\
\text{P1a} \\
\text{NPrefl} \\
\text{P2n} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{Vpf} \\
\text{P2} \\
\text{di} \\
\text{saw} \\
\text{Ed} \\
\text{self}
\end{array}
\]

(18a-b) are isomorphic as ordered labeled trees, but not isomorphic in TB: no aut can map one to the other since such an aut would have to map (Ed, NP) to (self, NPrefl), so that aut or a variant would map (Ed laughed, P0)) to (self laughed, P0), which is not in L(TB), a contradiction.

6. Some Empirical Invariants of Toba Batak

6.1. (mang-, Vaf) is invariant; as is (di-, Vpf) and (dirina, NPrefl).

The truth of 6.1 is a matter of proof (omitted here for reasons of space) not of intuition. We have
an explicit definition of invariant, so given a grammar $G$ and $d \in L(G)$, $d$ is either fixed (mapped to itself) by all automorphisms of $G$ or not. Intuition plays no role here.

6.2. $\text{Lex}_{TB}$ is invariant.

So lexical items are mapped to lexical items (not necessarily themselves) by all automorphisms. We can make up $G$ in which $\text{Lex}_G$ is not invariant, so 6.2 is empirical not definitional.

6.2.1. For all $C \in \text{CAT}_{TB}$, the property of having category $C$ is invariant.

That is, all auts map each $\text{PH}(C)$ to $\text{PH}(C)$, where $\text{PH}(C) \overset{\text{def}}{=} \{d \in L(TB) | \text{Cat}(d) = C\}$

6.2.2. The set of anaphors in $L(TB)$ is invariant.

For $d \in L(TB)$, $d$ is provably an anaphor iff $\text{Cat}(d) = \text{NPrefl}$. (either both himself and John or both himself and Bill, NPrefl) is an anaphor.

6.2.3. The AA (anaphor-antecedent) relation in TB is invariant, AA defined ad hocly by:

\[ \text{(19)} \quad \text{For } x,y,z \in L(TB), \text{ } x \text{ is a possible antecedent of an anaphor } y \text{ in } z \text{ iff } y \text{ is an anaphor and there is a constituent } z' \text{ of } z \text{ such that for some } u \text{ of category P2,} \]

\[ \text{Either } z' = \text{PA( PA(VM(mang-,u), y), x ) or } z' = \text{PA( PA(VM(di-,u),x),y) }^3 \]

The category coordinates of $\text{mang}$ and $\text{di}$ are omitted as predictable from the string coordinate. In fact for any $(s,C)$ and $(s,C') \in L(TB)$, $C = C'$. This isn’t true of English, with lexical items such as $(\text{respect},N)$ and $(\text{respect},V)$ or complex expressions such as $\text{Ma's home cooking}$, both a DP and an S. That the AA relation in TB as defined above is invariant is actually trivial as we defined it in purely syntactic terms. That this definition does capture our pretheoretical intuitions of binding in TB is not trivial, but an empirically significant fact about TB. We need (but do not quite have) a language general definition of the AA relation analogous to that of anaphor so we know that different syntactic characterizations of that relation in different grammars are actually characterizing the same relation.

In proving claims about invariants we can rely on universal invariants, linguistic objects that are uniformly definable for all $G$ and whose invariance follows just from the definition of invariant. Here are some useful examples, noting first two lemmas (K&S 2003:21).

---

3 We could replace the last disjunct by: $z' = \text{PA( PA(VM(di-,u),v),w), v \neq w \in \{x,y\} }$. This would take into account Cole & Hermon’s observation that $\text{dirina sandiri}$ may occur with reflexive meaning as the first argument of a $\text{di}$ verb (with reduced acceptability). So TB allows $\text{dirina}$ to be either argument of a $\text{P2a}$ (but not both at once). We haven’t added $\text{sandiri}$ itself to our grammar as we don’t know much about its syntax – but we could add it easily in a new category, say NPrefl/NPrefl, something which combines with NPrefls to form NPrefls.
Lemma 1: If $A \subseteq B \subseteq L(G)$ then for all automorphisms $h$, $h(A) \subseteq h(B)$

Lemma 2: For $A \subseteq L(G)$, $A$ is invariant iff for all automorphisms $h$, $h(A) \subseteq A$.

6.3. Some Invariants for Arbitrary Grammars $G$

1. Of course $L(G)$ itself is invariant: each automorphism $h$ maps $L(G)$ to $L(G)$ since $h$ is onto. This says that the property of being in $L(G)$, that is, of being grammatical in $G$, is invariant. (Were this not the case our definition of invariant would be flawed).

2. Again trivially each structure building function (thought of as a set of sequences of expressions) is invariant. By definition $h$ maps each such function to itself.

3. For each structure building function $F$, the set of tuples of expressions in $L(G)$ that constitute the domain of $F$ is invariant. This is an important source of invariants since the rules are virtually always properly partial functions, so they can’t “see” everything, and what they can see, those aspects of structure they are sensitive to, is structurally significant. Similarly the range of $F$, the set of its values at tuples of expressions in $L(G)$, is invariant.

4. The relations is an (immediate) (proper) constituent of are invariant. We define these relations more generally than usual as follows: The immediate constituents of a derived expression $F(d_1,\ldots,d_n)$ are just the $d_i$. $s$ is a proper constituent of $t$ iff there is a finite sequence of two or more expressions with $s$ the first, $t$ the last, and each non-final expression an immediate constituent of the next one. And finally, $s$ is a constituent of $t$ iff $s = t$ or $s$ is a proper constituent of $t$. $s$ is a sister of $t$ iff $s \neq t$ and for some $u$, $s$ and $t$ are immediate constituents of $u$. Finally, $s$ c-commands $t$ iff $t$ is a constituent of a sister of $s$.

5. The set of invariant subsets of $L(G)$, or for that matter of $L(G)^n$, is closed under set theoretical operations: $\cap$, $\cup$, $\neg$, $\times$, and power setting.

7. Conclusions

We propose (20) as universal for natural language grammars $G$:

(20) Binding Theoretic Invariants

1. The property of being an anaphor is invariant in $G$
2. The Anaphor-Antecedent relation in $G$ is invariant

Invariant 1 says that a natural language grammar $G$ morphosyntactically distinguishes anaphors in such a way that they cannot be replaced by non-anaphors preserving structure, that is, preserving how expressions are built up. Invariant 2 says that we can always identify the possible antecedents of an anaphor in terms of morphosyntactic structure. In the languages treated here identifying antecedents crucially uses the voice morphology on the verb (not something we would have been led to notice on the basis of English). In case marking languages such as Korean, Greek and Hindi we make crucial reference to case suffixes. (21a-b) from Korean are illustrative and suggestive.
The case₁ suffix -i takes the shape -ka when suffixing a vowel final nominal. Writing nom- to generalize over these phonologically conditioned shapes we see that this morphology can serve the same type lifting function that di-/ina affixes served in Toba and Malagasy:

\[
\begin{align*}
(a) & \text{nom(F)(R)(G) = F(G(R)), } R \text{ a binary relation, } G \text{ a type-1 function, } F \text{ a map from P1 denotations to P0 ones} \\
(b) & \text{nom(ALL STUDENT)(CRITICIZE)(SELF) = (ALL STUDENT)(SELF(CRITICIZE))}
\end{align*}
\]

This is essentially the same interpretation as for Ss built from di verbs with c-commanding reflexives in Toba. So we have a generalization: in head final Korean the lifting morphology is carried by Nouns, in head initial Toba and Malagasy it is carried by Verbs. How general is this pattern? It is certainly common that head final languages have extensive nominal case marking. But many also have voice marking on the verb, though we know of no pattern like that found in Toba or Malagasy. Similarly a few verb initial languages (not that common) have extensive nominal marking (Tagalog) though we do not know if they ever carry the type lifting load we have associated (implicitly) with nom marking in Korean. Lastly, we summarize what we see as merits of the analysis we have proposed:

(23) Merits of our direct interpretation analysis

1. Semantic interpretation is explicit and compositional; not mere syntactic regimentation.
2. Audible morphology is meaningful and a non-trivial part of structure.
3. Our analysis is simpler than the Minimalist alternative in Cole & Hermon 2008.
4. Our analysis resolves the c-command inconsistency: why is it needed if it can be easily overridden? Answer: it is not needed.
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