

Disentangling *aba'* pronouns and reflexives in Madurese

Helen Jeoung (University of Pennsylvania)

Overview. Madurese pronouns and reflexives that contain the morpheme *aba'* 'body' have an unusual distribution (e.g. see 1-2). I first investigate whether these are binding-exempt anaphors (as described in Cole et al. 2008). I find that these are not binding-exempt, but rather that 2-to-1 relationships between function and form account for their unexpected distribution: *aba'* functions as common noun or 1sg pronoun, while *aba'eng* is 3sg pronoun only; *aba' dhibi'* and *aba'eng dhibi'* are ambiguous between reflexive and intensified pronoun. Additionally, 1sg *aba'* is licensed under LOGOPHORIC conditions. I discuss the morphology of these forms with respect to a typology of pronouns and reflexives (Cardinaletti & Starke 1994, Dechaine & Wiltschko 2002a, 2002b).

Initial puzzles. 1sg *aba' dhibi'* and 3sg *aba'eng dhibi'* are called reflexives in Madurese dictionaries and grammars. Yet *aba' dhibi'* can occur as subject, without a local binder (1):

- (1) Amina areh riyah keng tedung teros, seddheng aba' dhibi' molaeh lagghuh sampe'
Amina day this only sleep continue while body self start morning until
malem lo' bu-ambu alakoh.
night Neg Red-stop work

'Amina only slept all day, while myself didn't stop working from morning until night.'

In other clauses, 3sg *aba'eng dhibi'* can take either a local or non-local binder (2):

- (2) Rika₁ taoh jha' Siti₂ ajhelling aba'eng dhibi'_{1/2/3} neng TV.

Rika know that Siti see body-Def self at TV

'Rika knows that Siti saw herself_{Rita/} herself_{Siti/} himself on TV.'

Background. In related languages such as Peranakan Javanese and Jambi Malay, reflexives that are cognate with *aba'* have been cited to support the claim that anaphors can be binding-exempt (cf. Cole et al. 2008, Cole et al. 2015 *inter alia*). Conflicting analyses for Madurese (e.g. disagreement among Stevens 1968, Davies 2010 and dictionaries) leave open the question of whether *aba'* forms are anaphoric, especially in the case of *aba'eng*, which has very low frequency (e.g. it typically does not occur in 3 person narratives; the language has been reported to lack 3 pronouns).

***Aba'* = common N or pronoun.** To begin, the base form *aba'* can occur as either (i) a common noun 'body' (3), or (ii) 1sg pronoun. From a c-commanding position, the quantified 1sg pronoun *engko'* binds 1sg *aba'* in (4), i.e. *aba'* must covary with *engko'*:

- (3) *aba'* se kene' (4) Keng *engko'* to' se ngera jha' *aba'* se mennang.
body Rel small Only 1sg only who think that 1sg who win
'a small body' 'Only I think that it is I who won.' (cf. Kratzer 1998)

However, the distribution of *aba'* is constrained by two factors (note that 1sg pronouns *kaulah* and *engko'* are not subject to the same constraints). First, *aba'* cannot occur in object position; but can occur as prepositional object (5) or subject (7). Second, *aba'* must be pragmatically licensed by strong emotion or "protest" (5, 7), contrastive focus (4) or other emphasis on the self (6).

- (5) Tina ghighir da' *engko'/kaulah/ aba'*. (6) Me' ce' aman-na *aba'*.
Tina anger to 1sg Emph very safe-Def body
'Tina was angry at me!' 'I have a feeling of well-being.' (Davies 2010:497)
(7) *Engko'/kaulah/aba'* tedung. (lit. 'So very safe, am I.')

1sg sleep
'I'm sleeping!'

These pragmatic conditions are reminiscent of logophors, but *aba'* does not require a verbal trigger or reported discourse context. I propose that (unlike 1sg *engko'* and *kaulah*) 1sg *aba'* is a LOGOPHOR that must be licensed by the conditions SELF or POINT OF VIEW (cf. Sells 1987).

***Aba'eng* = pronoun only.** Although *aba'eng* is composed of *aba'* and the definite suffix *-eng*, this form occurs only as 3sg pronoun, not as a common noun, even though it retains this compositional meaning. *Aba'eng* also has a different distribution than *aba'*: it may occur in any position, and does not require logophoric licensing. The low frequency of *aba'eng* is surprising, as it does not compete with any other 3sg pronouns. I account for this by noting several language-specific properties that make 3sg pronouns unnecessary in most discourse contexts.

***Aba' dhibi'* and *aba'eng dhibi'* = both reflexive and pronoun+intensifier.** Turning to reflexives, I observe that *aba'*-reflexives and *aba'*-pronouns do not appear to be in complementary distribution (examples not given due to space limitations). To determine whether there exists a contrast in variable binding, I use strict and sloppy readings under VP ellipsis:

- (8) Jimmy ajhelling *aba'eng dhibi'* neng kaca, Ali da'iyah kiyah. √ sloppy
 Jimmy look himself at glass Ali so too X strict
 'Jimmy looked at himself in the mirror, Ali did too.'
- (9) Tina ngoca'da' bapa'eng jha' *aba'eng* entarra da' pasar, Amina da'iyah kiyah. √ sloppy
 Tina say to father that she go.Irr to market Amina so too √ strict
 'Tina told her father that she would go to the market, Amina did too.'

Only the sloppy reading is available with *aba'eng dhibi'* in (8), whereas *aba'eng* allows both strict and sloppy readings in (9). These are taken as evidence that in Madurese, there exists a contrast between a locally-bound reflexive and a pronoun that is not obligatorily locally bound.

I argue that *aba' dhibi'* and *aba'eng dhibi'* are ambiguous between (i) a reflexive, and (ii) a pronoun modified by *dhibi'* 'self':

		reflexive	pronoun + intensifier
1 sg	<i>aba' dhibi'</i>	'myself'	'I myself'
3 sg	<i>aba'eng dhibi'</i>	'him/herself'	'he himself', 'she herself'

Independently, *dhibi'* occurs as either an adnominal intensifier or adverbial-exclusive intensifier (cf. König and Siemund 2000). When *dhibi'* modifies pronouns *aba'/aba'eng*, the result has the surface form of a reflexive, but behaves as a pronoun: in (1), *aba' dhibi'* is 1sg *aba'* intensified by *dhibi'*, with a reading akin to 'I myself.' In (2) the ambiguity results in two readings for *aba'eng dhibi'*: either a reflexive 'herself' or intensified pronoun 'her (=Rika) herself.'

An additional piece of evidence is that the embedded clause in (1) is not well-formed in isolation or at the beginning of a discourse (10). This is consistent if the logophor *aba'* is licensed by contrastive focus in (1), but logophoric conditions are lacking in (10).

- (10) **Aba' dhibi'* molaeh lagghuh sampe' malem lo' bu-ambu alakoh...
 body self start morning until night Neg Red-stop work
 'I didn't stop working from morning until night...'

If *aba' dhibi'* in (1) is an intensified 1sg pronoun, its ability to occur as subject, without a local binder, is unexceptional. This analysis also predicts that for a pronoun + intensifier, both strict and sloppy readings will be available under ellipsis, a prediction that is borne out (compare 11 with the unavailability of a strict reading in 8, where the pragmatic mirror context calls for a reflexive):

- (11) Tina ngoca' jha' *aba'eng dhibi'* entarra da' pasar, Amina da'iyah kiyah. √ sloppy
 Tina say that she Intens go.Irr to market Amina so too √ strict
 'Tina said that she herself would go to the market, Amina did too.'

Conclusion. Although the morphology of *aba'* pronouns and reflexives appears to be transparently composed, placing them in a typology is not straightforward, because there exist ambiguities in form, and because *aba'* requires LOGOPHORIC licensing. In this analysis, I show that despite prima facie deviations from expected patterns, the distribution of *aba'* pronouns and reflexives is consistent with traditional distinctions between the binding properties of pronouns and reflexives. The low frequency of *aba'eng* suggests the following hierarchy in Madurese: **pro** > **1, 2 pronoun** > **R-expression** > **3 pronoun**, where *pro* is preferred over 1 and 2 pronouns, which are preferred over R-expressions, and 3 pronouns are dispreferred, other things being equal.

References. Cardinaletti & Starke (1994) The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of the three classes of pronouns. Cole, Hermon & Yanti (2015) The grammar of binding in the languages of the world: Innate or learned? Cole, Hermon, Tjung, Sim & Kim (2008) A binding theory exempt anaphor. Davies (2010) *A Grammar of Madurese*. König & Siemund (2000) Intensifiers and reflexives: A typological perspective. Déchaine & Wiltschko (2002a) Decomposing pronouns. Déchaine & Wiltschko (2002b) Deriving reflexives. Kratzer (1998) More structural analogies between pronouns and tenses. Sells (1987) Aspects of Logophoricity. Stevens (1968) *Madurese Phonology and Morphology*.