

Pronoun-Noun Constructions in Malagasy across time and space

Ileana Paul, Western University & Lisa deMena Travis, McGill University

Introduction. In English, only 1st and 2nd plural pronouns appear in Pronoun-Noun Constructions (PNCs) (e.g. **I linguist*, **they linguists* – Jespersen (1949), Postal (1969)). Höhn (2017) has demonstrated, however, that some languages extend PNCs to other person/number pronouns. In this context, though, he points out two generalizations: (i) if a language has singular PNCs, it also has non-singular PNCs, and (ii) if a language has 3rd person PNCs, then it has 1st and 2nd person PNCs. In this paper we show how the PNC in Malagasy both varies language internally and has changed over time. At one point Malagasy allowed PNCs with all person/number combinations in NOMinative and ACCusative case, while GENitive case had a complex pattern that depended on phonological strength (see e.g. Zribi-Hertz and Mbolatianavalona (1999)). Through three stages of development, however, we see a gradual shift to an English-like system. Throughout the changes in data, the language always abides by both of Höhn’s generalizations, and each step provides insight into the details both of the Malagasy pronominal system and the characteristics of the PNC.

Stage 1 (S1 in table below): Traditional grammars (e.g. Rajaona 1972) describe a system where independent pronouns (NOM, ACC) license PNC, but suffixal pronouns (GEN) only license PNC if they bear stress (see also Keenan & Polinsky 2001, Pearson to appear)– the HIGH pattern of GEN (see (1a)). In this stage of the grammar, the two GEN suffixes that cannot bear stress, 1SG (-*ko*) and 3SG (-*ny*), use different rescue strategies to allow PNC. 1SG must have a NOM double for the pronoun – the DOUBLE pattern of GEN (see (1b)). 3SG cannot have the suffix at all, but rather replaces the suffix with the NOM form – the IN SITU form of GEN (see (1c)). (we leave aside 3PL throughout for independent reasons.)

- (1) a. Vitanáo/Vitanáy/Vitantsíka/Vitanaréo [*vehivavy*] [io
done-2SG.GEN/1PL.EXCL.GEN/1PL.INCL.GEN/2PL.GEN [woman] [DEM
raharaha io]
work DEM]
'**You(sg)/We(excl)/We(incl)/You(pl)** woman/women did this work.' HIGH
- b. Vítako [**izaho** *vehivavy*] [io raharaha io]
done-1SG.GEN [1ST.SG.NOM woman] [DEM work DEM]
'**I** woman did this work.' DOUBLE
- c. Vítan' [**izy** *vehivavy*] [io raharaha io]
done [3.SG.NOM woman] [DEM work DEM]
'**She** woman did this work.' IN SITU

We propose that the suffixal GEN is created by movement of the pronoun to a higher functional head that contains a moved V (see Baker & Hale 1990 for this movement in Breton). The higher copy may license the PNC only if the suffix is phonologically strong, otherwise the IN SITU copy must be spelled out in the NOM form. The difference in rescue strategies shows that while 1GEN and 2GEN undergo movement, 3GEN does not. Since 3GEN doesn't move, there is no HIGH position, just the IN SITU position. This hypothesis is supported by morphophonological processes that distinguish the realization of the 3GEN pronoun from 1GEN and 2GEN (movement of 1/2 vs. 3 is not unusual crosslinguistically, see e.g. Kaufman (2014)). With a certain group of verbs, those ending in *ka*, *tra*, and *na*, the final /a/ of the verb and the first consonant of the 1.SG.GEN and 2.SG.GEN are not realized (see (2a) and (2b)). However, with 3.SG.GEN, it is the final consonant of the verb that is not realized, and the first consonant of the pronoun is kept (see (2c)), mirroring the phonological pattern of compounding (see (2d)).

- (2) a. *fantatra* 'know' + *ko* 1SG.GEN → *fantatro* 'I know' 1SG moves
b. *fantatra* 'know' + *nao* 2SG.GEN → *fantatrao* 'you know' 2SG moves
c. *fantatra* 'know' + *ny* 1SG.GEN → *fantany* 'he/she knows' 3SG doesn't move
d. *sokitra* 'carving' + *nendra* 'smallpox' → *soki-nendra* 'pock-mark' Compounding

Stage 2 (S2 in table below): Currently, however, speakers do not share Rajaona’s judgments. In the most similar dialect, the only difference is that 3GEN uses the same rescue strategy of doubling as 1GEN. The pronominal features appear both as a GEN suffix and as an IN SITU NOM, indicating that the 3SG pronoun has undergone movement.

- (3) Vitany [**izy** vehivavy] [io raharaho io]
 done.3SG.GEN [3.SG.NOM woman] [DEM work DEM]
 ‘She woman did this work.’ DOUBLE

We demonstrate how the processes that once showed that 3GEN did not move have been reanalyzed (see (4)) creating a more general system of movement for all GEN pronouns.

- (4) a. *fantatra* ‘know’ + *ko* 1SG.GEN → *fantako* ‘I know’ 1SG moves
 b. *fantatra* ‘know’ + *nao* 2SG.GEN → *fantanao* ‘you know’ 2SG moves
 c. *fantatra* ‘know’ + *ny* 1SG.GEN → *fantany* ‘he/she knows’ 3SG moves

This innovation in the language then accounts for the appearance of the doubling strategy for both 1GEN and 3GEN at this stage of language change.

Stage 3 (S3 in table below): In a further step in language change, the phonological requirement is lost. A set of speakers now require the doubling (rescue) strategy for all singular GEN forms of the pronoun independent of phonological strength, while still allowing PNC for all NOM and ACC forms of the pronoun. At this point, the GEN paradigm has an English flavor to it. Plural GEN forms need no rescue, while singular GEN forms must be doubled. It remains unlike English, however, since all forms (all persons in both singular and plural) *can* allow PNC. NOM and ACC require nothing special, but GEN must have doubling.

- (5) Vitanao [**iana** vehivavy] [io raharaho io]
 done.2SG.GEN [2.SG.NOM woman] [DEM work DEM]
 ‘You woman did this work.’ DOUBLE

Stage 4 (S4 in table below): Most speakers now have English type judgements. Doubling cases (GEN.SG – see (1b)), are treated as appositional structures (*I, as a woman, did the work.*) and NOM and ACC allow PNC only in the plural. We argue that this final stage in the distribution of PNC was triggered by the reanalysis of doubling as appositional in the GEN.SG form. This SG/PL distinction then spread to the NOM and ACC paradigms – creating an English pattern.

S1	NOM/ACC.SG/PL	GEN.SG	GEN.PL	S2	NOM/ACC.SG/PL	GEN.SG	GEN.PL
1	IN SITU	DBL	HIGH	1	IN SITU	DBL	HIGH
2	IN SITU	HIGH	HIGH	2	IN SITU	HIGH	HIGH
3	IN SITU	IN SITU	N/A	3	IN SITU	DBL	N/A
S3	NOM/ACC.SG/PL	GEN.SG	GEN.PL	S4	SG – NOM.ACC/GEN	PL – NOM.ACC/GEN	
1	IN SITU	DBL	HIGH	1	*	IN SITU/HIGH	
2	IN SITU	DBL	HIGH	2	*	IN SITU/HIGH	
3	IN SITU	DBL	N/A	3	*	N/A	

References

- Baker, M. and Hale, K. (1990). Relativized Minimality and pronoun incorporation. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 21(2):289–297.
- Höhn, G. (2017). Towards a typology of adnominal person. paper presented at Manitoba Workshop on Person, University of Manitoba.
- Jespersen, O. (1949). *A Modern English Grammar*. Munksgaard, Copenhagen.
- Kaufman, D. (2014). The syntax of Indonesian imposters. In Collins, C., editor, *Cross-Linguistic Studies of Imposters and Pronominal Agreement*. Oxford University Press.
- Keenan, E. L. and Polinsky, M. (2001). Malagasy morphology. In Zwicky, A. and Spencer, A., editors, *Handbook of Morphology*, pages 563–623. Blackwell Publishers, Cambridge, MA.
- Pearson, M. (to appear). Predicate raising and perception verb complements in Malagasy. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*.
- Postal, P. M. (1969). On so-called ‘pronouns’ in English. In Reibel, D. and Schane, S., editors, *Modern Studies in English*, pages 201–244. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey.
- Rajaona, S. (1972). Structure du malgache: étude des formes prédicatives. Librairie Ambozontany, Fianarantsoa.
- Zribi-Hertz, A. and Mbolatianaavalona, L. (1999). Towards a modular theory of linguistic deficiency: Evidence from Malagasy personal pronouns. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 17(1):161–218.