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This paper proposes a new theory for the voice agreement in three Formosan languages: Atayal, Paiwan and Bunun. The analysis includes the following proposals. (A) VoiceP is a phase. (B) Voice probes a relevant thematic feature (actor/agent, theme, instrument, beneficiary, etc.) and has its own feature valued; the Case of the goal is also determined (nominative). (C) The need for probing and feature valuation of Voice triggers the merger of an applicative head into the structure, which introduces the relevant oblique argument. This theory is superior to other proposals in the following respects. First, it does not sacrifice any argument in the derivation. Second, it provides a far more straightforward way than previous proposals in linking the nominative argument (i.e., the subject) and the value of Voice.

1. Introduction

This paper proposes a probe-based analysis for the voice agreement and the selection of subject in three Formosan languages: Squilq Atayal, Central Paiwan and Isbukun Bunun. These languages, like many other Austronesian languages, exhibit four types of voice agreement: Agent Voice (AV), Patient Voice (PV), Locative Voice (LV), and Instrument Voice (IV):

(1) Central Paiwan: (Tai 2011)
   a. q<em>aljup ti pali ta vavuy. (AV)
      hunt<AV> NOM Pali OBL boar
      ‘Pali hunted a boar’
   b. qaljup-en ni pali a vavuy. (PV)
      hunt-PV GEN Pali NOM boar
      ‘Pali hunted the boar.’
   c. qa-qaljup-an ni pali ta vavuya a ‘icu a gadu. (LV)
      RED-hunt-LV GEN Pali OBL boar NOM this LNK mountain
      ‘Pali usually hunts boars in this mountain.’

* Our gratitude goes to the Isbukun Bunun consultants, Haisul Soqluman and Laniah Soqluman from Takanua village in Namasia, Kaohsiung, and the Central Paiwan consultant, Milingan Tjuleng from Wene village in Laiyi, Pintung, and the Squilq Atayal consultants, Kagaw Pitay, from Bo’ai village in Hoping, Taichung. All errors in facts and interpretation are our own.

Abbreviations used in the glosses are: 1PE/I = 1 Person Exclusive/Inclusive, 1/2/3P = 1/2/3 person Plural, 1/2/3S = 1/2/3 person Singular, AV = Actor Voice, ACC = Accusative, CAUS = Causative, COMP = Complementizer, DEM = Demonstrative, DET = Determiner, FUT = Future tense, GEN = Genitive, INCH = Inchoative, IV = Instrumental Voice, IMP = Imperative, INCH = Inchoative, LNK = Linker, LOC = Locative, LV = Locative voice, NEG = Negator, NOM = Nominative, OBL = Oblique, P = Preposition, PRF = Perfect, PST = Past tense, PV = Patient Voice, RED = Reduplication, STAT = Stative, TOP = Topic marker, VCL = Verbal classifier.
(IV)  
\[ \text{IV-hunt GEN Pali OBL boar NOM gun} \]
‘Pali hunts boars with the gun.’

(2) Squliq Atayal: (Liu 2004: 27)

a. \( \text{m-aniq qulih } \text{qu’} \text{tali’} \).
\[ \text{AV-eat fish NOM Tali} \]
‘Tali eats fish.’

b. \( \text{niq-un na’ tali qu’ qulih qasa} \).
\[ \text{eat-PV GEN Tali NOM fish that} \]
‘That fish is eaten by Tali.’

c. \( \text{niq-an na’ tali’ qulih qu’ ngasal qasa} \).
\[ \text{eat-LV GEN Tali fish NOM house that} \]
‘The house is the place where Tali eats fish.’

d. \( \text{s-qaqiq na’ tali’ qulih qu’ qway} \).
\[ \text{IV-eat GEN Tali fish NOM chopsticks} \]
‘The chopsticks were used by Tali to eat fish.’

(3) Bunun

a. \( \text{ma-ludah a tama mas ’uvaaz} \).
\[ \text{AV-beat NOM father ACC child} \]
‘The father is beating a child.’

b. \( \text{ludah-un mas tama-tia a ’uvaaz} \).
\[ \text{beat-PV GEN father-DET.GEN NOM child} \]
‘The child is being beaten by that father.’

c. \( \text{ha<in>an mas tama-tia a ludun-a} \).
\[ \text{hunt<PST>LV GEN father-DET.GEN NOM mountain-DET.NOM} \]
‘The father hunted at that mountain.’

d. \( \text{na-’is-ludah tama-tia lukis-a (mas ’uvaaz)} \).
\[ \text{FUT-IV-beat father-DET.GEN stick-DET.NOM ACC child} \]
‘The father will beat a child with the stick.’

As shown in (1–3), the AV-marked verbs typically select Agent/Actor as the subject; the PV-marked verbs typically select Patient/Theme as the subject; the LV-marked verbs select Location as the subject; and the IV-marked verbs agree with Instrument or Beneficiary.

Furthermore, following Chen (2007) and Chang (2008), a binary distinction for voice morphology is made: AV versus NAV. Moreover, NAV can be further divided into PV, LV and IV. NAV sentences, especially LV and IV, involve applicative constructions, headed by -an and ‘-is, respectively. See (1c–d), (2c–d), (3c–d) above. Besides, like many Western Austronesian languages, voice-sensitivity or “subject-only” restriction on A’-extraction is attested (Chang 1997, Pearson 2005); that is, only the nominative DP can undergo A’-extraction.

As for the case-marking system, it is binary and straightforward in Bunun; a for subject DP and \( \text{mas} \) for non-subject DP. The case-marking systems in Atayal and Paiwan are more complicated; there are independent case markers for Actor/Possessor DP and/or Locative DP.
Note that in these languages the non-subject external argument (EA) is not demoted, because it can serve as the controller in the NAV context, as in (4):

(4)   'asa-un tina-tia,  'uvaaz-a  [ ma-p-un-sia PRO
      want-PV  mother-DET Gen  child-DET Nom  AV-CAUS toward-P
      pasnanavaan ].

      school
      ‘The mother wants to send her child to school.’

There has been much work on the voice agreement of Austronesian languages in the generative literature (Guilfoyle, Hung and Lisa 1992, Pearson 2005, inter alia). Here we briefly review the Case agreement approach of Rackowski (2002) and Rackowski & Richards (2005) and the Ergativity approach of Aldridge 2004, 2008. We look at these two approaches because of the following reasons: (i) both of them are based on the minimalist framework and phase theory proposed in Chomsky 2000, 2001; and (ii) Tagalog and Bunun share a lot of (morpho-)syntactic characteristics in common such as word order, rich voice morphology, voice-sensitive restriction on A’-extraction, and so forth.

After reviewing these two approaches in Section 2, we presents the probe-based analysis for voice agreement in Section 3. Section 4 is the conclusion.

2. Two Recent Proposals

In this section we review and compare the Case Agreement approach and the Ergativity approach, and further pose our research questions.

2.1. Case Agreement Analysis

According to Rackowski (2002) and Rackowski & Richards (2005), voice morphology is the reflex of the Case of the subject DP. More specifically, in AV, the agent argument receives the Nominative Case (Nom) from T, and the patient argument receives the Accusative Case (Acc) from v. What is traditionally called the Voice is the nominative case morphology. See (5a). Thus, the AV construction is derived as follows: (i) the internal argument (O) agrees with v without [EPP] and remains within VP, receiving non-specific interpretation; (ii) T probes the closest DP, the external argument (EA), and the features of EA is copied into T and spelled out as voice morphology, as shown in (6a).

On the other hand, in NAV, again the agent and the patient receive Nom and Acc, but the raised patient or applicative DP has its Acc or Dative case (Dat) realized on T, which is what is called Voice. See (5b–d). For example, the PV construction is derived as follows: (i) O agrees with v and is shifted to the edge of vP via [EPP] to receive a semantic interpretation (specificity); (ii) T probes the closest DP, the shifted object, and the feature of the object is copied into T and spelled out as voice morphology; (iii) T enters into a second Agree relation with EA to value its case feature as NOM, as shown in (6b).
(5) Tagalog: (Rackowski & Richards 2005: 566)
\[-\text{NOM} \text{ASP} \text{-buy} \text{ ANG} \text{ child} \text{ CS} \text{ cloth} \text{ DAT} \text{ market} \text{ for} \text{ DAT} \text{ Mother} \]
‘The child bought cloth at the market for Mother.’
\[-\text{ASP} \text{-buy-ACC} \text{ ANG} \text{ child} \text{ CS} \text{ cloth} \text{ DAT} \text{ market} \text{ for} \text{ DAT} \text{ Mother} \]
‘The child bought the cloth at the market for Mother.’
\[-\text{ASP} \text{-buy-DAT} \text{ ANG} \text{ child} \text{ CS} \text{ cloth} \text{ ANG} \text{ market} \text{ for} \text{ DAT} \text{ Mother} \]
‘The child bought (the) cloth at the market for Mother.’
d. I-b-in-ili ng bata ng tela sa palengke ang nanay.
\[-\text{OBL} \text{-ASP} \text{-buy} \text{ ANG} \text{ child} \text{ CS} \text{ cloth} \text{ DAT} \text{ market} \text{ ANG} \text{ Mother} \]
‘The child bought (the) cloth at the market for Mother.’

(6) a. \[AV = \text{NOM} \]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{EA} \\
\text{[EPP]} \\
\text{NOM}
\end{array}
\]

b. \[PV = \text{ACC} \]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{O} \\
\text{EA} \\
\text{[EPP]} \\
\text{ACC}
\end{array}
\]

However, there are problems with the Case agreement analysis. First, Aldridge (2006) argues against the assumption that T always enters into Agree relation with the ang-marked DPs in Tagalog by showing that a verb can agree with a plural ang-marked DP in AV context, as shown in (7a–b) and (8a–b):

(7) a. Nag-si-basa ang mga bata ng liham.
\[-\text{Nom.Asp-Pl-read} \text{ ANG} \text{ Pl} \text{ child} \text{ CS} \text{ letter} \]
‘The children read a letter.’
b. Nag-(*si-)basa ang bata ng mga liham.
\[-\text{Nom.Asp-Pl-read} \text{ ANG} \text{ child} \text{ CS} \text{ Pl} \text{ letter} \]
‘The child read some letters.’
Besides, according to the Case agreement analysis, a NAV subject receives Case from v (Acc) or the applicative head (Dat). Furthermore, according to R&R, what is traditionally called the voice, in T in R&R’s system, is a reflex of Case of the subject. Then the NAV subject enters into two Case relations, with v and with T. This seems dubious in view of the current theoretical assumptions on Case.

Third, in Formosan languages, Nom is directly associated with the voice agreement; e.g., the Nom a (or ti in some specific cases) in Central Paiwan goes to whatever element agrees with the voice. According to the Case agreement analysis, however, the element that takes a could in fact receive different Cases, such as Nom, Acc, and Dat. This seems to be counterintuitive.

R&R contend that the voice agreement in fact does not really show theta-role affiliation; namely the same voice morphology could be associated with different theta-roles. Such mismatch is also attested in Formosan languages. Take Bunun, for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Voice Markers</th>
<th>Theta-roles of Nominative Subject NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pref Inf Suf</td>
<td>Act Pat Them Exp Loc Time Ben Inst Rec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV m(a)/ø</td>
<td>+       +     +       +       +       +       +       +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV in Un</td>
<td>+       +     +       +       +       +       +       +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV An</td>
<td>+       +     +       +       +       +       +       +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RV ‘is’</td>
<td>+       +     +       +       +       +       +       +</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(10)a. **m**-a-zima a dahu mas tina. (Experiencer)
  AV-STAT-like NOM Dahu ACC mother
  ‘Dahu loves his mother.’

b. **m**-a-davus a bunbun-in. (Theme)
  AV-STAT-sweet NOM banana-DET.NOM
  ‘This banana is sweet.’

(11)a. sadu-**an**=ku a dahu-a. (Theme)
  see-LV=1S.GEN NOM Dahu-DET.NOM
  ‘I saw Dahu.’

b. ‘is-hanimulmul-**an**=iktu m-a-laspus nas-tina. (Experiencer)
  1A-sad-LV=1S.NOM COMP AV-STAT-miss late-mother
  ‘I feel sad whenever I think of my late mother.’
However, if we take a closer look at the table in (9), we find that the divergence is not unpredictable and, in fact, several analyses from syntactic, cognitive or semantic perspective can be adopted to account for such thematic mismatch. For example, Newman (1996) points out that a transferred theme and an instrument share certain common elements in their interpretation – both are the entity which the agent handles in carrying out an act; Huang (2005) proposes that in Formosan languages, the nominative NP of LV clauses actually encodes an abstract location, while that of IV encodes a transported theme; also see Chang and Yeh 2008. Landau (2010) argues that experiencers are “mental locatives” by showing that experiencers and locatives share many similarities: semantically both the experiencer and the locative denote a location (in the mental space or in the physical world), morphologically they both take oblique case, and syntactically they all undergo locative inversion. Similar phenomenon is also observed in Mandarin Chinese by Lin (2009).

2.2. Ergativity Analysis

According to Aldridge (2004, 2008), the voice morphology reflects the transitivity of the predicate. Under this analysis, Tagalog is an ergative language. More specifically, AV sentences are intransitive and anti-passive; NAV sentences are transitive. See (13a–b).

(13) Tagalog: (Aldridge 2008)
      -Intr.Perf-arrive  Abs woman
      ‘The woman arrived.’
      -Tr.Perf-buy    Erg woman Abs fish
      ‘The woman bought the fish.’

The intransitive \(v\) lacks [EPP] and cannot assign and value cases on the EA and the object; \(T\) enters into Agree relation with EA and values Absolutive Case (Abs) on the EA. Therefore, the AV construction is derived as follows: (i) the intransitive \(v\) lacks [EPP] and cannot assign and value cases on the EA and the object; (ii) \(T\) enters into Agree relation with EA and values Abs on the EA; (iii) the O receives inherent Oblique Case (Obl) from the lexical verb and remains within VP until LF, receiving a presuppositional interpretation at LF. See (14a).

On the other hand, the transitive \(v\) values Abs on the internal argument and assigns inherent Ergative Case to EA in its Spec. Therefore, the PV construction is derived as follows: (i) the transitive \(v\) values Abs on the O and assigns inherent Ergative case to EA in its Spec; (ii) the Absolutive object raises to \(v\)P phase edge to check [EPP] on \(v\) and receives a presuppositional interpretation at LF. See (14b).
However, Richards (2001) and Kroeger (1993) argue that the AV clauses in Tagalog can be transitive. They show that the object DP can control the PRO subject of an adjunct clause, as in (15):

(15) Tagalog: (Kroeger 1993: 47)
Nanghuli ng=magnanakaw_i ang=polis [ nang pumapasok PRO_i AV.PERF-catch GEN=thief NOM=police ADV AV.IMPERF-enter sa=bangko].
DAT=bank
‘The police caught a/the thief when entering the bank.’

The AV clauses in Formosan languages can be transitive, too. The theme DP in the following AV sentences can serve as the controller:

(16) Bunun
a. masnanava hai, O-tupa subali-tia_i [ tu ma-sipul-a PRO_i ].
teacher TOP AV-say Subali-DET.ACC COMP AV-read-IMP.AV
‘The teacher asked Subali to read it out.’

b. ma<i>saiv saikin ma=saitia mas sui_i [ 'is-baliv PRO_i mas ’ahil ].
AV<PST>give 1S.NOM OBL=3S.OBL ACC money IA-buy ACC book
‘I gave him money to buy a book.’
Moreover, in Paiwan, the AV markers <en> and ma- mark transitive and intransitive predicates respectively, as in (17a–b):

(17) a. dj<em>ameq ti pali ta vavuy
   shoot<AV> NOM Pali ACC boar
   ‘Pali shot a boar.’

   b. ma-djameq a vavuy ta uwang
      AV-shoot NOM boar OBL gun
      ‘The boar was shot with the gun.’

Aldridge (to appear) contends that under her analysis the object is not demoted in the anti-passives and still serves as the internal argument of the verb. Remember, however, that under the Ergativity analysis the object in the anti-passives receives Obl. According to Landau (2010), oblique bare DPs pattern with PP adjuncts rather than the object argument, as shown in (18a–c):

(18) (Landau 2010: 29)
   a. ??Who did you agree with the sister of?   (Prepositional object)
   b. ??Who did your behavior bother the sister of?   (Oblique experiencer)
   c. Who did you tease the sister of?   (Object)

The same phenomenon is attested in Formosan languages. For example, in Bunun, quantifier floating is licit within arguments but not in oblique adjuncts and oblique bare DPs, as shown in (19a–b):

(19) a. ma<i>baliv a tahai [mas tau tu ’ahil] / [tu tau mas ‘ahil].
   AV<PST>buy NOM Tahai ACC three LNK book TU three ACC book
   ‘Tahai bought three books.’

   b. ma<i>baliv a tahai mas ’ahil sia [dusa tu babalivan] /
      AV<PST>buy NOM Tahai ACC book P two LNK store
      *[tu dusa mas babalivan].
      TU two OBL store
   ‘Tahai bought books at two stores.’

Therefore, the voice morphology does not reflect the transitivity of the predicate.

According to Legate (2008), in typical ergative languages absolutive case is realized as a morphological default and thus can appear on more than one DP per clause, as shown in (20):

    Ne tohitohi a Sione [aki e pene].
    PST writing ABS Sione with ABS pen
    ‘Sione was writing with a pen.’
However, Nominative case in Formosan languages, or the so-called Absolutive Case in Tagalog, is limited to one DP per clause. Therefore, Tagalog and Formosan languages are not ergative languages.

3. The Proposed Analysis

In our analysis, Voice morphology reflects the agreement relation between the probe Voice, which bears an un-value morphological feature, and the closest DP, which bears an interpretable thematic feature. VoiceP is a phase and the head Voice probes the thematic features. For example, in the AV context Voice probes the closest active goal, i.e., EA with the actor/agent feature, and values its own morphological feature. The Case of the goal NP is also determined, namely Nominative, as shown in (21):

(21) VoiceP
    Voice’
    Voice [u-θ] vP
        EA ...
  [i-θ]

In the NA V context, on the other hand, Voice probes the relevant thematic features (Theme, Instrument, etc.), and has its own feature valued. Again, Case is determined along the way, and Nom is assigned to the direct object (O) or the applied object (AO), which has been raised by [EPP] to vP. It is the need for probing and feature valuation of Voice that triggers the raising of a NAV DP to vP and the merger of an applicative head into the structure, which introduces the relevant oblique argument, as shown in (22)–(23):

(22) VoiceP
    Voice’
    Voice [u-θ] vP
        O ...
  [i-θ]
    0 ...
  [i-θ]

[Diagram]

Probing Theme
Valuing PV
Determining NOM

Probing Agent
Valuing AV
Determining NOM
In our analysis, Voice heads an independent functional projection, and this can be supported by the following evidence. Morphosyntactically, the voice marker and the light verb are realized distinctly in Formosan languages, as shown in (24–26):

(24) Bunun
   a. **m-is-busuk**
      AV-INCH-drunk
      ‘get drunk’
   b. **ma-p-is-busuk**
      AV-CAUS-INCH-drunk
      ‘to cause (someone) to be drunk’
   c. **p-is-busuk-un**
      CAUS-INCH-drunk-PV
      ‘to cause (someone) to be drunk’

(25) Bunun
   a. **m-a-naskal**
      AV-STAT-happy
      ‘to be happy’
   b. **s<in>p-i-naskal**
      IV<PST>CAUS-INCH-happy
      ‘to have caused someone to be happy’
   c. **'is-ka-naskal**
      IV-STAT-happy
      ‘to be happy for (someone/something)’
(26) Paiwan
a. pa-a-ma-zeli
   CAUS-INCH-AV-tired
   ‘make someone become tired’
b. p<in>a-a-pelju’
   CAUS<PRF.PV>-INCH-full
   ‘filled something with’

Moreover, our proposal that the Nominative Case, which subject bears, comes from neither T nor \(v\) is supported in the Saisiyat example in (27):

(27) Saisiyat: (Cheng 2011)
    sia si-bahay ma’an ka kapapama’an.
    IS.ABS IV-wash 3S.ERG ACC car
    ‘I washed the car for him.’

(28) Cheng (2011)
    EA AO O
    a. ERG ABS ACC
    b. *ERG ABS ABS
    c. *ERG ACC ABS
    d. *ERG ACC ACC

There are four possible analyses for the valuation of the Abs and the Acc in (27). The first possibility is that both Abs and Acc are valued by the light verb. However, this analysis cannot account for the ungrammaticality of (28b–c). The second possibility is that Acc comes from the applicative head. However, the applicative head is not a structural case assigner and thus can only assign inherent case to the argument it selects, i.e., AO rather than O. The third possibility is that O receives Acc from V whereas AO receives Abs from \(v\). However, there is no sufficient evidence for Acc to be inherent, such as the A-movement test (Woolford 2006). The last possibility is that Acc is licensed by \(v\) whereas Abs is licensed by another functional head. This possibility fares better than the other three. Therefore, the above discussion shows that another functional head must be available that independently assigns Abs in Saisiyat. In our analysis, it is Voice. This renders support to our proposal that Voice is a head that probes and values features and determines Case.

4. Conclusion

The proposed probe-goal analysis for the voice agreement is superior to other proposals in the following respects. First, there is no sacrifice of any argument (esp. the object) in the derivation, unlike the Ergative approach. All the core arguments (subject and object) are preserved; in NAV an additional oblique argument is added. Second, unlike the Case agreement approach, it provides a straightforward account for the syntax-semantics link between the nominative argument and the voice morphology.
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