

## ABSTRACT

### THE SYNTAX OF RESPECT: AGREEMENT AND ANAPHORA IN KHMER

The purpose of this study is to examine the syntax of anaphora and non-canonical agreement in Khmer. The Binding Conditions A, B, and C (Chomsky, 1981; Lasnik, 1989; Reuland, 2011) will be investigated in relation to the Khmer anaphoric system, which exhibits a non-canonical form of morphological agreement in a language where inflectional morphology such as gender, person, number and case, is otherwise absent. Condition A states that an anaphor must be bound by an antecedent. Condition B requires that a pronoun be free within its domain. Principle C states that an R-expression must be free (Chomsky, 1981). Seeming violations of these principles in Khmer will be shown to be the result of variations in surface form triggered by agreement. I will show that Khmer has a system of agreement between binder and bindee through a respect affix attached to the reflexive root. I posit that Khmer has grammatical phi-features which denote respect in relation to a syntactic binder. This non-canonical phi-feature triggers the appearance of unique surface properties not observed in languages without this agreement. The grammatical system licenses a copy, particularly with sloppy identity under ellipsis; the repetition of an R-expression is forced, in apparent violation of Condition C. This ‘name repetition’ is shown to be a proxy anaphor and not a true R-expression, since the copy is actually subject to Condition A (via Fiengo and May’s (1994) “vehicle change”; cf. Lasnik, 1989).

Mayaprimavera Flores  
August 2015



THE SYNTAX OF RESPECT: AGREEMENT AND ANAPHORA  
IN KHMER

by  
Mayaprimavera Flores

A thesis  
submitted in partial  
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Master of Arts in Linguistics  
in the College of Arts and Humanities  
California State University, Fresno  
August 2015

APPROVED

For the Department of Linguistics:

We, the undersigned, certify that the thesis of the following student meets the required standards of scholarship, format, and style of the university and the student's graduate degree program for the awarding of the master's degree.

---

Mayaprimavera Flores  
Thesis Author

---

Brian Agbayani (Chair) Linguistics

---

John P. Boyle Linguistics

---

Michael Shepherd Linguistics

For the University Graduate Committee:

---

Dean, Division of Graduate Studies

AUTHORIZATION FOR REPRODUCTION  
OF MASTER'S THESIS

    X     I grant permission for the reproduction of this thesis in part or in its entirety without further authorization from me, on the condition that the person or agency requesting reproduction absorbs the cost and provides proper acknowledgment of authorship.

           Permission to reproduce this thesis in part or in its entirety must be obtained from me.

Signature of thesis author: \_\_\_\_\_

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am indebted to my friend and Khmer speaker, Channary Tith, for providing the data over the period of a year. Her patience and ability to clarify Khmer was crucial, and I could not have begun this thesis without Channary Tith.

I need to acknowledge my thesis advisor, Dr. Brian Agbayani, for his encouragement and for suggesting I look at anaphora. He has been a wonderful source of knowledge and I have the utmost respect for him as a professor and thesis advisor.

I would also like to acknowledge the contributions made by the members of my committee, Dr. Michael Shepherd and Dr. John P. Boyle. Dr. Michael Shepherd has always been enthusiastic discussing sociolinguistics with me and I respect his research. He did the impossible and got Cornell to send him Karen Fisher's original MA thesis for my research! Dr. John P. Boyle provided invaluable help on how to conduct excellent field work in languages with kinship terms and social registers, and I am glad that he took a chance on a student whom he just met this past semester.

Lastly, I send a huge thank you to my mother, Victoria Flores, for supporting me throughout my academic journey and for being a wonderful and loyal mother. I extend a thank you to all my cousins, especially those connected to me via Facebook, for taking the time to read my endless status updates on my thesis. To my *guelita* and *guelito*: *gracias!* *Ustedes son second parents to me.*

I would like to send a final thank you to Dr. Sean Fulop, my graduate coordinator for signing numerous academic petitions on my behalf, and for believing in my commitment to my studies. Without him, I would not be in the program.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION .....	1
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW .....	3
2.1 On Binding Theory .....	3
2.2 On Fisher (1985) .....	4
2.3 On Huffman's Outline of Cambodian Grammar .....	6
2.4 On Vietnamese and Thai Anaphora .....	6
2.5 Hinton (2005) .....	9
CHAPTER 3: DATA .....	10
3.1 Single Clause Anaphora .....	10
3.2 Short and Long-Distance Anaphora .....	13
3.3 Strict Versus Sloppy Identity .....	16
3.4 On Repetition of R-Expressions and Condition C .....	19
CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSIONS .....	22
REFERENCES .....	23

## CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Khmer is the official language spoken in Cambodia. Khmer is a member of the Austroasiatic language family, in particular the Mon-Khmer language family. Khmer is spoken by “approximately 14 million people” (Haiman, 2011, p. xv).

The Khmer language has an intricate pattern of agreement in the anaphoric system. The respect marker is a mandatory agreement feature in the Khmer grammar and can be seen under anaphora where it surfaces as the respect marker attached to the lexical item [klɔn] (literally “body” in Khmer) which I analyze as an anaphoric root, rather than as an isolated reflexive marker (cf. Fisher, 1985). The respect marker appears as either the respectful variant [kəθ̌], or the non-respectful marker, [viə] or [ʔɑjn] and they act as obligatory indicators of agreement features for third-person referents. The anaphor thus has agreement with the antecedent, not in number or gender, but in degree of perceived respect. This feature will be referred to as plus or minus respect (+r/-r), and I propose that this feature should be added to the set of phi-features that drive grammatical processes in the syntax of Khmer. This suggests an interesting perspective for phenomena that we have known about in other languages, such as Japanese honorifics (Kishimoto, 2010): certain languages incorporate sociolinguistic features inside their formal grammars.

What has not been fully studied is the agreement marking that exists in Khmer anaphora, where it is impossible to refer to a third person anaphorically without using a morphological marker that signals levels of respect. Unlike other languages where the verb agrees with the subject in person, number, or gender features, the verb does not undergo morphological changes at all in Khmer, which is a typologically analytic or isolating language. However, agreement still surfaces



through the presence of morphemes attached to the anaphoric root [klɔn]. Three suffixed morphemes are used, [viə], [ʔɑjn], and [kɔθ̃]. Further, I propose here that the morphemes act as agreement markers exclusively in Khmer anaphora, agreement which indexes the binding relationship between antecedent and anaphor.

As every third party reference has the perceived social status of both the speaker and the third party (and potentially the audience as well) present within the anaphors, this presents a unique opportunity to address certain gaps in previous research concerning the Binding Theory, and why it appears that certain languages violate one or more of the Binding Principles. I will show that Khmer does not actually violate the Binding Principles, but rather that Khmer has surface variations triggered by ‘non-canonical’ agreement between the antecedent and the anaphor through the features +r or –r.

## CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 On Binding Theory

Binding Theory has been the focus of extensive work since the early days of Principles and Parameters (see Chomsky, 1981; Lasnik 1989; Reuland, 2011). The property of binding satisfies two requirements: (a) coindexation (intended co-reference) between one syntactic object and another and (b) the structural property in which one syntactic object (the binder) c-commands the other (the bindee). The conditions of the Binding Theory are that a reflexive or reciprocal anaphor must be bound within its clause (Condition A), that a pronoun must be free in its clause (Condition B), and that an R-expression (usually descriptive NPs or proper names) must be free everywhere (Condition C) (Chomsky, 1981). Condition C most certainly applies to Khmer and there are no exceptions to Condition C. Therefore, constructions such as *via d̂ʒod̂ʒet sok*, or *he likes Sok*, is ungrammatical when ‘he’ refers to ‘Sok,’ according to my data.

Below are examples that illustrate the Binding Conditions. Example (1) illustrates that a reflexive anaphor must be bound in its own clause, as required by Condition A (bracketing indicates an embedded clause).

- (1) a. \*Tom<sub>i</sub> said [that himself<sub>i</sub> would not eat all the appetizers].  
b. Tom<sub>i</sub> told himself<sub>i</sub> [that he would not eat all the appetizers].

Example (2) illustrates that a pronoun must be free in its own clause though it can be bound across a clause boundary, and example (3) shows that an R-expression must be free.

- (2) a. Tom<sub>i</sub> said [that he<sub>i</sub> would not eat all the appetizers].  
 b. \*Tom<sub>i</sub> told him<sub>i</sub> [that he that he would not eat all the appetizers].
- (3) a. \*Tom<sub>i</sub>/He<sub>i</sub> told Tom<sub>i</sub> [that he would not eat all the appetizers].  
 b. \*Tom<sub>i</sub>/He<sub>i</sub> said [that Tom<sub>i</sub> would not eat all the appetizers].

The bracketed portion constitutes the *binding domain* relevant for the Binding Conditions (Lasnik, 1989). According to Fisher (1985), long distance anaphora is allowable in the Khmer language. In fact, Fisher states that long distance anaphora in Khmer is a direct consequence of a “lack of agreement” in Khmer clauses (Fisher, 1985, p. 56). This claim will be reexamined in the data section.

## 2.2 On Fisher (1985)

Fisher’s (1985) thesis focused on the anaphoric expression [kluən] (‘self’) in Khmer. Fisher posits that the absence of agreement is what prompts [kluən] to accept embedded anaphoric expressions within a separate clause as the antecedent. In many other languages, the anaphor is not allowed to exist in an embedded clause, bound by an antecedent in the matrix clause. Fisher states this was possible in Khmer because of a “lack of agreement” (Fisher, 1985, p. 56).

According to Fisher (1985), [kəθ̌] is a mere pronoun. However, as I will show in the data chapter, [kəθ̌] and [viə] are not simple pronouns, but serve as agreement markers. According to the speakers I have consulted, [kluən] cannot be used in isolation, in direct contrast with the data presented in Fisher (1985). In this context, [kluən] would literally mean ‘body’, and it would cease to work as a reflexive.

The example below from Huffman (1970) cited in Fisher (1985), shows the long distance binding property of the anaphor.

(4) mit teəŋ neəq kit thaa  
friend both class. think comp.

[ kluən ciə kounsəh ]

Self be student

haəy min səw miən luy phaəŋ

and negative hardly have money too

“The two friends reasoned that they are students and they hardly have any money, either”

(Fisher, 1985, p. 57, as cited in Huffman 1970, p. 231)<sup>1</sup>

An interesting facet of Fisher’s work is her acknowledgement that there is a respect parameter on epithets (mostly kinship and occupational titles), which she refers to as +/-deference (1985). However, while she further subdivides these features into “+/- deference, +/- familiarity, and +/- intimacy”, this paper is concerned specifically with the +/- respect feature, which will be used as an umbrella term to cover all the sociolinguistic elements as defined by Fisher (1985, p. 159). I posit that, not only is there a respect parameter, but that it also triggers variations in the surface forms of anaphora that result in apparent violations of the binding conditions.

---

<sup>1</sup> This transcription is Fisher’s, which will not be used in this study.

### 2.3 On Huffman's Outline of Cambodian Grammar

Fisher (1985) drew heavily on Huffman's work in the grammar of Khmer (see Huffman, 1968, 1970). Huffman has a number of examples to illustrate the Khmer grammatical system. (5) below shows the basic SVO word order of Khmer.

(5) knõm tiñ qwəy haey trəlɔp tow ptěeh  
 I buy something perfective return go house.

“After I buy something, [I'm] going back home.” (Huffman, 1968, p. 153)

In example (6) below, the element of emphasis is designated here through an independent particle [tee]. As I will show, sociolinguistic elements such as this emphatic particle, serve as syntactical structures in Khmer. Example (6) illustrates the manifestation of sociolinguistic properties through lexical items. The expression of topical emphasis is realized as /tee/, and as I will show, sociolinguistic elements such as emphatic particles and sociolinguistic agreement in anaphora are all embedded features in Khmer.

(6) knõm ɿmin tiñ qwey tee  
 I negative buy anything emphatic particle

“I didn't buy anything!” (Huffman, 1968, p. 153)

### 2.4 On Vietnamese and Thai Anaphora

Aside from Fisher (1985), there is relatively little on the anaphoric system of Khmer in the published literature. There are, however, similarities cross-

linguistically between what manifests in Khmer anaphora and what manifests in Vietnamese and Thai anaphora.

Hoonchamlong's (1991) work on Thai anaphora splits R-expressions into two categories: "pure" and "not pure," where the "pure" type of R-expression must be free, thus allowing for the "not pure" R-expressions to apparently violate Binding Condition C. Hoonchamlong states that a "pure R-expression exists when the antecedent is not the title name" (Hoonchamlong 1991, p. 43). Below, (7) shows Hoonchamlong's example of titles / "not pure" R-expressions which can be bound (Hoonchamlong 1991). Below is the example from Hoonchamlong (1991, p. 39), reproduced exactly from his work.

- (7) [ <sub>S1</sub> khruul<sub>i</sub> b@@k<sub>2</sub> waa<sub>3</sub> [ <sub>S2</sub> khruul<sub>i</sub> may<sub>3</sub> waaN<sub>3</sub> phruN<sub>3</sub>nii<sub>4</sub> ] ]  
 teacher say COMP teacher not free tomorrow  
 (Hoonchamlong, 1991, p. 39)

Lasnik (1989) gives examples of what appear to be violations of Condition C in Vietnamese and Thai. Below is an example of an apparent violation of Condition C in Thai and Vietnamese. Example (8) is Thai and example (9) shows Vietnamese (Lasnik, 1989, p. 153).

- (8) cɔɔn khít wâa cɔɔn chàlààt  
 John think that John smart  
 "John thinks that John is smart."

- (9) John tin      John sẽ thắng  
 John thinks   John will win  
 “John thinks that John will win” (Lasnik, 1989, p. 153)

Lasnik’s data show that Vietnamese, unlike Thai, cannot have an R-expression repeated within the same clause. Thai not only has R-expression repetition, it also has the ability to repeat the R-expression within the same clause, such as in example (10), (Lasnik, 1989, p. 153). Compare this to example (11), where the same sentence is ungrammatical in Vietnamese (Lasnik, 1989, p. 154).

- (10)    គ្រូ            ច្បាប់            គ្រូ  
           John           likes            John  
 (11)    \*John        គូរ                John  
           John           likes            John

Lasnik essentially claims that Condition C is suspended in these languages in those cases where the name is repeated. I claim below that such behavior in Khmer arises from the properties of the agreement system in anaphora, and that what looks like an R-expression on the surface is actually a proxy anaphor.

According to Griffith’s fieldwork in Khmer, R-expression repetition is grammatical in both short and long distance contexts (Griffith, personal communication, 2015). In chapter 3 I will examine this and find that, under certain circumstances, R-expression repetition is grammatical.

- (12)    suk      ដ្បូនដ្បូន      suk  
           Sok      like            refl-(-r)  
           ‘Sok    likes            Sok.’

Lastly, Huang (2013) suggests that certain languages may use pragmatic information in the syntax as a licenser, whereas others use formal agreement for this purpose. Huang, in particular, notes that languages that mark “class” can have their own “discourse anaphora” (2013, p. 101). Huang notes that these types of anaphora appear when there is only one subject (2013) a fact which will be seen in Khmer as well.

### 2.5 Hinton (2005)

The pronominal system in Khmer is heavily encoded with the status of the speaker, audience, and the third person, as noted by Hinton (2005). Prior to the Khmer Rouge, the Khmer language had stratified pronouns for people of royalty, monks, and the elderly. During the Khmer Rouge regime, enforced language policies forbade the use of status-embedded pronouns and instead replaced all addresses with the word “comrade,” or [mit] (Hinton, 2005, p. 189). The Khmer Rouge also reversed the age-respect dichotomy. The marker [viə] for children was replaced with the honorary [kəθ̃] marker. The use of [viə] was used to refer to those older and more educated or higher in status than the “proletariat,” and anyone who opposed the regime (Hinton, 2005, p. 189). In this sense, it was used as a derogatory comment on the person (Hinton, 2005).

A fuller discussion of the enforced language changes, though pertinent to the field of sociolinguistics and to the pronominal system of Khmer, is beyond the scope of this paper (see Hinton, 2005). It is important to note, though, that the markers were not dropped from the language, but were simply reversed in their conventionalized reference by the Khmer Rouge, suggesting that they are syntactically regulated devices whose presence is required by the grammar; in other words, they are mandatory agreement markers (Hinton, 2005).



## CHAPTER 3: DATA

The data were collected over a period of a year and a half. The speaker is a Cambodian-American Khmer-English bilingual, a first-generation American who was born in the United States after her parents fled the Khmer Rouge regime. Her older sister, older brother, and a younger cousin also contributed to the discussion.

My findings show that these markers--either the disrespectful [ʔɑjn] and [viə], or the respectful [kəθ̌<sup>7</sup>]<sup>7</sup>-- are the agreement affixes that reflect the coindexation relationship between the anaphor with the antecedent. It should be noted that the only difference across the cluster of sentences is the marker attached to the reflexive root [klun].

I also show that when long-distance anaphora creates a conflict when two subjects are used (i.e. strict versus sloppy identity), the sloppy or strict identity meaning is signaled by name repetition. With other languages, long-distance anaphora is not allowed and thus the pertinent antecedent would locally bind the anaphor. Khmer allows long-distance anaphora, which can cause ambiguity in such cases. Thus, apparent Condition C violations result. Also, it will be shown that, in extreme social situations, a title R-expression such as “Teacher” will be repeated in order to avoid the use of a specific marker. This functions as a proxy anaphor and not a true R-expression.

For simplicity’s sake, the references towards a polite and impolite referent will be noted here as being minus respect (-r) or plus respect (+r). This distinction is binary and there is no neutral respect marker, grammatically.

### 3.1 Single Clause Anaphora

In this section, I examine single clause anaphora. Also, I will examine the ungrammaticality of an absent pronominal respect affix in this subsection.

- (1) a) suk d̄ʒodʒɛt klɔn-viə  
 Sok like refl-(-r)  
 ‘Sok likes himself’
- b) suk d̄ʒodʒɛt klɔn-ʔɑjn  
 Sok like refl-(-r)  
 ‘Sok likes himself’
- c) suk d̄ʒodʒɛt klɔn-kəθ̄  
 Sok like refl-(+r)  
 ‘Sok likes himself’
- d) \*suk d̄ʒodʒɛt klɔn  
 Sok like body (literal meaning only)

Example (1) shows the three variants of anaphora that can appear in discourse. ‘Sok’ is an R-expression that acts as the antecedent. The word [klɔn] literally means ‘body’ in Khmer, on its own, and is used as the reflexive root in anaphora. In example (1a), the following [viə] does not mark gender or case. Rather, this marker is an agreement marker that is mandatory in anaphora. [klɔn-viə] indicates that the third party, himself/herself, does not require respect, thus [viə] appears. Example (1d) illustrates what occurs when there is no respect marker affixed to the reflexive. This statement, “Sok like body” means, literally, “Sok likes a body.” Sentence (1d) is not an anaphoric sentence. It is only through the presence of the affixes to denote level of respect that bind the anaphor to the antecedent.

What is pertinent to note (but out of the scope of this paper) is that [ʔɑjn] in example (1b) is not a pronoun that means ‘s/he’, whereas [viə] and [kəθ̄] can both be used potentially as pronominals as well as respect markers attached to the

reflexive [klɔn]. The distribution of [ʔajɲ] is unknown, however it shares the feature [-r] with [viə].

- (2) a.    viə    gɛtɑ:h̄t̄    klɔn-ʔajɲ    tʃlæt  
           He (-r) think-of    refl-(-r)    smart  
           ‘He thinks of himself as smart’
- b.    viə    gɛtɑ:h̄t̄    klɔn-viə    tʃlæt  
           He (-r) think-of    refl-(-r)    smart  
           ‘He thinks of himself as smart’
- c.    kɔθ̄    gɛtɑ:h̄t̄    klɔn-kɔθ̄    tʃlæt  
           He (+r) think-of    refl-(+r)    smart  
           ‘He thinks of himself as smart’
- d.    \*kɔθ̄    gɛtɑ:h̄t̄    klɔn-ʔajɲ    tʃlæt  
           He(+r) think-of    refl-(-r)    smart
- e.    \*kɔθ̄    gɛtɑ:h̄t̄    klɔn-viə    tʃlæt  
           He(+r) think-of    refl-(-r)    smart

Example (2a) uses the non-respectful variant of ‘self,’ [viə]. [viə] also works as a pronoun, unlike [ʔajɲ], which has no corresponding pronoun which would indicate a third-party referent (except [viə], and only [viə]). When compared to examples (2b) and (2c), we can see that there is no agreement in this

sentence except for the respect parameter under anaphora. There is no subject-verb agreement, and no agreement between the antecedent and the anaphor in terms of gender or number. Without the appropriate agreement marker, the string is ill-formed. In (2d) and (2e), the featural mismatch between the bindee and the binder results in ungrammaticality. This mandatory respect phi-feature system in Khmer anaphora has not been fully documented in the previous binding literature.

The simple sentences shown in (2a), (2b), and (2c) illustrate the lack of finiteness, gender, and number agreement. Agreement *is* present, however, and appears in anaphora through ‘non-canonical’ phi-features. I argue that [respect] can be a genuine phi-feature in certain languages where the agreement feature on the antecedent triggers the appropriate phonological form in the anaphor.

### 3.2 Short and Long-Distance Anaphora

Short distance anaphora will be examined in this section, as more evidence that +/-r is a genuine phi-feature. After this, long distance anaphora will be analyzed as grammatical constructs, as per the findings of Fisher (1985).

- |     |    |                      |                      |            |
|-----|----|----------------------|----------------------|------------|
| (3) | a) | kəθ̃                 | k <sup>h</sup> ɛha:h | klɔn-kəθ̃  |
|     |    | He (+r)              | to-lie               | refl-(+r)  |
|     |    | “He lies to himself” |                      |            |
|     | b) | viə                  | k <sup>h</sup> ɛha:h | klɔn-viə   |
|     |    | He (-r)              | to-lie               | refl-(-r)  |
|     |    | “He lies to himself” |                      |            |
|     | c) | viə                  | k <sup>h</sup> ɛha:h | klɔn-ʔaj̃n |
|     |    | He (-r)              | to-lie               | refl-(-r)  |
|     |    | “He lies to himself” |                      |            |

In sentence (3), the honorary pronoun [kɔθ̃] does not show agreement in the verb “to lie to,” but in the anaphor affix, [kɔθ̃], where it serves to bind the anaphor to the antecedent. As is apparent by the fact that the same verb form manifests for all pronouns, the verb does not show agreement for person, gender, or number.

Continuing in the vein of Fisher’s work (1985) on long distance anaphora, examples (4a), (4b), and (4c) illustrates the anaphor in the embedded clause bound by the antecedent in the matrix clause. Similar to Fisher’s findings, I found that long-distance anaphora is present in this speaker’s dialect of Khmer as well.

- (4) a.    kɔθ̃    præp    klɔn-kɔθ̃    tʰa: ai    klɔn-kɔθ̃  
           He (+r) tell    refl-(+r)    comp.    refl-(+r)...
- tʃop    lam̩    la baiŋ  
           stop    play    gamble
- “He told himself that he would stop gambling”
- b.    viə    præp    klɔn-viə    tʰa: ai    klɔn-viə  
           He (-r) tell    refl-(-r)    comp.    refl-(-r)
- tʃop    lam̩    la baiŋ  
           stop    play    gamble
- “He told himself that he would stop gambling”

c.    viə            præp klɔn-ʔajŋ      tʰɑ: ai      klɔn-ʔajŋ  
       He (-r)        tell    refl-(-r)        comp.      refl-(-r)  
       tʃɒp    laɪŋ    la baɪŋ  
       stop   play    gamble

“He told himself that he would stop gambling”

In example (5) below, another strict versus sloppy identity test is invoked, this time combining it with the repetition of an R-expression (“teacher”). The meaning of example (5) is that the teacher thinks of himself as a good teacher and his student also thinks that the teacher thinks of himself as a good teacher.

(5)    nɛtkru        gɛtah            klɔn-koθ̃            tʃiɑ    nɛtkru        leah  
       teacher    think-that        body-refl (+r)      that    teacher        good  
       hei    koŋsɛh-koθ̃                    gɛtah    dɑi  
       and    student-his (poss./+r)      think also.

“Teacher thinks that himself is a good teacher and his student thinks that, also.”

The elided verb phrase in example (5) carries the meaning that the student thinks that the teacher is a good teacher, as well. Compare this to example (6) below, which is translated as, “Teacher thinks that he is a good teacher and his student thinks that he [teacher] thinks that Teacher is a good teacher, also.” The meaning is conveyed through embedded complements and explicit use of the +r pronoun, [koθ̃].

(6)	nɛtkru	gɛtah	klɔn-kɔθ̄	tʃia nɛtkru	leah
	teacher	think-that	body-refl (+r)	that teacher	good
	hei	koŋsɛh-kɔθ̄	gɛtah	koθ̄	gɛtah
	and	student-his(poss/+r)	think-that	he(+r)	think-that
	nɛtkru	leah	d̄ai		
	Teacher	good	also.		

“Teacher thinks that he is a good teacher and his student thinks that he[teacher] thinks that Teacher is a good teacher, also.”

Example (6) is yet another piece of evidence that the agreement is seen through the respect markers (+r, -r). Due to the respect dynamic between teacher and his student, the only available pronoun to use is [kɔθ̄] for the teacher.

Even at a long distance, the subject is still clear due to the use of [kɔθ̄], which can only indicate the teacher in this sociolinguistic context. I have decided to explain some of the long-distance anaphora as discussed in Fisher (1985) as grammatical in certain environments due to the respect feature which allows the listener to establish each referent. The ability to be bound by the farthest subject could be attributed to the presence of +r or -r agreement, thus lending itself to an easy decoding process for speakers. Though I posit that long-distance anaphora is in part possible due to the sociolinguistic agreement suffixes, further research must be conducted to establish this hypothesis.

### 3.3 Strict Versus Sloppy Identity

Strict versus sloppy identity is examined here through ellipsis/VP anaphora (Fiengo & May, 1994).

- (7)  $\widehat{d}z\text{on } \widehat{d}z\text{od}z\text{et } \text{klon-}?\text{ajn } \text{hei } \text{M}\text{eri } \widehat{d}z\text{od}z\text{et } \text{po}\text{ŋ}$   
 John like refl-(-r) and Mary like also.

“John likes himself and Mary does, too.”

Example (7) is ambiguous for the Khmer speaker. To the speaker, this sentence can refer to either Mary as liking John also (an interpretation known as “strict identity”), or it could mean that *John likes himself* and *Mary likes herself*, too (an interpretation known as “sloppy identity”). Thus, ellipsis in these cases gives rise to ambiguity.

- (8)  $\widehat{d}z\text{on } \text{get-tah } \text{meri } \widehat{d}z\text{od}z\text{et } \text{klon-}?\text{ajn}$   
 John thinks -that Mary like refl-(-r)  
 $\text{hei } \text{meri } \text{get-tah } \text{dai}$   
 and Mary think-that also.

“John thinks that Mary likes herself and Mary does, too.”

Here, the same ambiguity arises with long-distance anaphora. The fact that strict or sloppy identity can arise i.e., that the elided component could mean either *Sok likes himself* and *Mary likes himself, also* or *Sok likes himself* and *Mary likes herself, also* – suggests that either long distance or local anaphora is possible in the elided component. The result is that a speaker, in order to clarify the intended interpretation, would resort to repeating the phrase with a proxy anaphor in lieu of the similar respect form. Note that the full non-elided forms would contain the +/- respect forms of the anaphors which also give rise to the same ambiguity:



- (9) a. suk d̄ʒod̄ʒɛt klɔn- viə hei  
 R-exp like refl-(-r) and  
 mɛ.i d̄ʒod̄ʒɛt klɔn-viə d̄ɑi:  
 R-exp like refl-(-r) also  
 ‘Sok likes himself and Mary likes himself/herself also’
- b. suk d̄ʒod̄ʒɛt klɔn-ʔɑjn hei  
 R-exp like refl-(-r) and  
 mɛ.i d̄ʒod̄ʒɛt klɔn-ʔɑjn d̄ɑi:  
 R-exp like refl-(-r) also  
 ‘Sok likes himself and Mary likes himself/herself also’
- c. suk d̄ʒod̄ʒɛt klɔn-kəθ̄ hei  
 R-exp like refl-(+r) and  
 mɛ.i d̄ʒod̄ʒɛt klɔn-kəθ̄ d̄ɑi:  
 R-exp like refl-(+r) also  
 ‘Sok likes himself and Mary likes himself/herself also’

Below are samples from the strict versus sloppy identity test without the verb phrase ellipsis. These data are included to broaden the understanding of how pronominals and anaphors work in more explicit environments. In sentence (10a), the identities have been resolved by using the pronoun [kəθ̄] by itself, as opposed to sentence (10b) in which the speaker uses [klɔn-kəθ̄] to refer to both John and Mary. These data are unique in that the produced sentence of (10b) is ambiguous to another listener.

- (10) a.  $\widehat{d}z\text{on}$   $\widehat{d}z\text{od}z\text{et}$   $kl\text{on-k}\text{ə}\text{θ}^{\text{r}}$   $he\text{i}$   $M\text{eri}$   $\widehat{d}z\text{od}z\text{et}$   $k\text{ə}\text{θ}^{\text{r}}$   $p\text{ə}\eta$   
 John like refl-(+r) and Mary like him (+r) also
- b.  $\widehat{d}z\text{on}$   $\widehat{d}z\text{od}z\text{et}$   $kl\text{on-k}\text{ə}\text{θ}^{\text{r}}$   $he\text{i}$   $M\text{eri}$   $\widehat{d}z\text{od}z\text{et}$   $kl\text{on-k}\text{ə}\text{θ}^{\text{r}}$   $p\text{ə}\eta$   
 John like refl-(+r) and Mary like refl-(+r) also

### 3.4 On Repetition of R-Expressions and Condition C

R-expression repetition is used in Khmer to diminish ambiguity in strict versus sloppy identity contexts. Also, in regards to the sociolinguistic effect of having an elder who is clearly not respectable, there appears to be an escape hatch to avoid disrespecting an elder while simultaneously avoiding the respect pronoun and anaphor. Attempts to elicit speech from a picture-prompted narrative of an angry middle-aged man with an elderly man resulted in a total omission of pronouns and a complete replacement of all pronouns with the generic word for ‘that one’ in order to avoid using any respect marker for a picture of a middle-aged man yelling at his elderly father. ‘He’ was replaced by ‘that one,’ and when the speaker was asked to guess his occupation and elaborate, she began to refer to the angry, middle-aged man as ‘Teacher’ throughout the entire narrative to avoid the third person pronoun.

- (11)  $ni\text{?}\text{ə}\text{h}\text{e}\text{ə}$   $\text{ñj}\text{ə}\eta$   
 that one

Rather than list this as evidence that Principle C does not apply, I propose that Khmer follows Principle C, and that the repeated name is actually a proxy anaphor. I also propose that the anaphor surfaces phonologically in the same form as the antecedent through Fiengo and May’s process of vehicle change (Fiengo & May, 1997, 288). This form becomes a substitute anaphor, which is why it appears

to violate Principle C's ban on R-expression repetition. This form is less marked than using an inappropriate form that lacks the required level of respect.

More evidence of the existence of a grammatical repetition of R-expressions comes from Griffith's field notes which observe grammatical repetition of R-expressions in Khmer (Griffith, personal communication, 2015). I found that, similar to Griffith's independent findings, the repetition of an R-expression was accepted as grammatical, though the informant stated it was uncommon. This might be the case for most contexts, however, in certain contexts (such as the picture-prompted elicitation described above), the repetition of R-expressions is grammatical. R-expression repetition will be used to avoid pronouns/anaphors, thereby transforming such elements phonologically into an R-expression via vehicle change.

Therefore, in certain sociolinguistic situations, theoretical constructions such as sentences in (12a), (12b), and (12c) below, would be appropriate. Furthermore, such repetitions followed by a clause in which VP ellipsis has applied are predicted to yield a sloppy identity reading, given that the repeated R-expression in these cases functions as a proxy anaphor.

(12)

- |    |              |           |              |        |
|----|--------------|-----------|--------------|--------|
| a) | niʔoħeə ñjɔŋ | gɛtɑ:h̃t̃ | niʔoħeə ñjɔŋ | tʃlæt  |
|    | That-one     | think     | that-one     | smart. |

“That one [he] thinks that one [himself] is smart.”

- |    |         |           |                   |
|----|---------|-----------|-------------------|
| b) | nɛtkru  | d̥ʒod̥ʒɛt | nɛtkru            |
|    | Teacher | like      | Teacher [himself] |

“Teacher likes Teacher [refl].”

c)    nɛtkru        gɛtah        nɛtkru        tʃlæt  
Teacher        think-that    Teacher        smart

“Teacher thinks that Teacher [refl] smart.”

## CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSIONS

I have shown in this paper that the Khmer language has built in agreement between antecedent and anaphor through a respect affix attached to-[klɔŋ], specifically one of these three: [klɔŋ-kəθ̄], [klɔŋ-viə], or [klɔŋ-ʔɑjn]. I have established that [klɔŋ] works as a reflexive marker only when accompanied by one of these three: [kəθ̄], [viə], or [ʔɑjn]. The data I presented show that Khmer has an agreement system which encodes respect, or the lack of respect, for a referent. For these reasons, I propose a new phi-feature [respect], with binary settings, denoted here as +r and -r. In Khmer, the pronominals, [kəθ̄] and [viə], act as both simple pronouns and also as an agreement affix attached to the reflexive root.

I have also presented new data in relation to local and long-distance anaphora in Khmer. Certain conditions pertaining to use were shown to override the ungrammaticality of R-expression repetition. I claim that this repetition is found to be a proxy anaphor and not a true R-expression under ellipsis with sloppy identity. Khmer does not violate the Binding Conditions, rather, Khmer shows agreement in +r and -r; the respect phi-feature, which yields surface effects the only apparently seem to violate the Binding Conditions.

## REFERENCES

- Chomsky, N. (1981). On binding. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 11(1), 1-46
- Fiengo, R., & May, R. (1994). *Indices and identity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Fisher, K. L. (1985). *The syntax and semantics of anaphora in Khmer*. Ithica, New York: Cornell.
- Griffith, T. (2015). *UCI Field Notes on Khmer*, 2015.
- Haiman, J. (2011). *Cambodian: Khmer*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Hinton, A. (2005). *Why did they kill?: Cambodia in the shadow of genocide*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hoonchamlong, Y. (1991). *Some issues in Thai anaphora: A government and binding approach*. ProQuest, UMI Dissertations Publishing.
- Huang, Y. (2013). Bayesian probabilistic model of discourse anaphoric comprehension, linguistic typology, and neo-gricean pragmatics. *Theoretical Linguistics*, 39(1), 95-108.
- Huffman, F. (1968). *An outline of Cambodian grammar*. Dissertation Abstracts: Section A. Humanities and Social Science, 28, 2664A-2665A.
- Huffman, F. (1970). *Cambodian system of writing and beginning reader*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Kishimoto, H. (2010). Honorific agreement in Japanese. *The Canadian Journal of Linguistics / La Revue Canadienne De Linguistique*, 55(3), 405-415.
- Lasnik, H. (1989). *Essays on Anaphora*. AA Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.
- Reuland, E. (2011). *Anaphora and language design*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

# Fresno State

## Non-Exclusive Distribution License

(to archive your thesis/dissertation electronically via the library's eCollections database)

By submitting this license, you (the author or copyright holder) grant to Fresno State Digital Scholar the non-exclusive right to reproduce, translate (as defined in the next paragraph), and/or distribute your submission (including the abstract) worldwide in print and electronic format and in any medium, including but not limited to audio or video.

You agree that Fresno State may, without changing the content, translate the submission to any medium or format for the purpose of preservation.

You also agree that the submission is your original work, and that you have the right to grant the rights contained in this license. You also represent that your submission does not, to the best of your knowledge, infringe upon anyone's copyright.

If the submission reproduces material for which you do not hold copyright and that would not be considered fair use outside the copyright law, you represent that you have obtained the unrestricted permission of the copyright owner to grant Fresno State the rights required by this license, and that such third-party material is clearly identified and acknowledged within the text or content of the submission.

If the submission is based upon work that has been sponsored or supported by an agency or organization other than Fresno State, you represent that you have fulfilled any right of review or other obligations required by such contract or agreement.

Fresno State will clearly identify your name as the author or owner of the submission and will not make any alteration, other than as allowed by this license, to your submission. **By typing your name and date in the fields below, you indicate your agreement to the terms of this distribution license.**

**Embargo options (fill box with an X).**

**Make my thesis or dissertation available to eCollections immediately upon submission.**

Embargo my thesis or dissertation for a period of 2 years from date of graduation.

Embargo my thesis or dissertation for a period of 5 years from date of graduation.

Mayaprimavera Flores

Type full name as it appears on submission

5/06/2015

Date