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Ergative extraction is generally disallowed in Western Austronesian languages.

Tagalog (under an ergative analysis)

    IPFV∼write-TR ERG Jojo ABS book
    ‘Jojo will write the book.’

b. *Nino ang sú∼sulát-in ___ ang libro?
    who.ERG ABS IPFV∼write-TR ABS book
   (For: ‘Who will write the book?’)

(adapted from Kaufman 2017: (35))
Malay morphological passive (under ‘passive as ergative’ analysis; Nomoto 2021)

(2) a. Surat ini perlu di-tandatangani mereka.
   letter this need PASS-sign.on 3PL
   ‘This letter needs to be signed by them.’

b. *Siapa yang surat ini perlu di-tandatangani ___ ?
   who REL letter this need PASS-sign.on
   (For: ‘By whom does this letter need to be signed?’)
Malay bare passive (under ‘passive as ergative’ analysis; Nomoto 2021)

(3)  
  a.  Surat ini perlu *merek*a tandatangani.  
      ‘They need to sign this letter.’
  b.  *Siapa* yang surat ini perlu ___ tandatangani?  
      (For: ‘By whom does this letter need to be signed?’)
Kaufman (2017) points out two exceptions to this widespread restriction on ergative extraction:

1. Sumbawa (Sumbawa Besar dialect; Indonesia)
2. Selayarese (Indonesia)

This study shows that Sumbawa is in fact not an exception by providing an alternative analysis of his Sumbawa data.
The Sumbawa language and the construction in question

Kaufman’s (2017) analysis

Alternative analysis:
- Ergative + case-agreement → Passive + clitic doubling
- Topicalization of ergative → Bare active

Implications:
- Support for clitic doubling analyses of passives (Baker et al. 1989; Nomoto 2016)
- Another instance of covert active-passive alternation
- A different view on the Sumbawa voice system, implying the diachronic change into the canonical Indonesian-type voice system
Conjecture: The development of the canonical Indonesian-type voice system

Bare passive
[= ergative/bare patient voice]

Bare active

Morphological passive

Morphological active

Antipassive
[N-]

(Red: available in Sumbawa)
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The Sumbawa language

- Spoken in the western part of Sumbawa Island, Indonesia
- The Sumbawa Besar dialect as described by Asako Shiohara

(Map data © 2021 Google)
‘Basic construction’ (Shiohara 2013: 148)

(4)  ka=ku=inóm  kawa=nan  [PP ling aku].
PST=1SG=drink coffee=that  by  1SG
‘I drank the coffee.’
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Kaufman’s (2017) analysis

Kaufman

(5) ka=ku-inóm kawa=nan [DP ling aku].
    PST=Agr.1SG-drink coffee=that ERG 1SG
    ‘I drank the coffee.’ (adapted from Kaufman 2017, citing Shiohara 2013)

- ling = ergative case marker
- ku- = agreement marker agreeing with the ergative DP
Assuming this analysis, Kaufman claims that the ergative argument is extracted in (6)–(7).

**Relative clause**

(6) \textit{sai} adè ka=Ø-tumpan’ jangan=ta ___?
who REL PST=Agr.3SG-get fish=this
‘Who caught the fish?’

(adapted from Kaufman 2017, citing Shiohara 2013)

**Topicalization**

(7) \textit{aku} (ku-)inóm kawa=nan ___.
1SG Agr.1SG-drink coffee=that
‘I drink the coffee.’

(adapted from Kaufman 2017, citing Shiohara 2013)
| 1 | Introduction                        |
| 2 | The Sumbawa language and the construction in question |
| 3 | Kaufman’s (2017) analysis          |
| 4 | Alternative analysis               |
| 5 | Implications                       |
Alternative analysis

I argue that Shiohara’s (2013) original view is more plausible.

Shiohara/Nomoto analysis

\[(4) \text{ka=}ku=\text{inóm} \quad \text{kawa=}nan \quad [\text{PP ling aku}].\]
\[\text{PST=}1\text{SG=}\text{drink coffee=}that \quad \text{by} \quad 1\text{SG}\]
‘I drank the coffee.’

(Shiohara 2013: 148)

- Shiohara’s analysis differs from Kaufman’s in two respects:
  - \text{ku-} = ergative agreement the verb’s argument clitic
  - \text{ling} = ergative case marker agentive preposition (‘by’)
  → The \text{ling} phrase is not the verb’s argument DP but an adjunct PP.
- I argue that clitic doubling is involved, i.e. \text{ling} PP doubles the pronominal clitic argument DP \text{ku=} on the verb.
Bare passive + clitic doubling

Shiohara’s ‘basic construction’ is in fact bare passive.

Shiohara/Nomoto analysis

(4) ka=ku=inóm kawa=nan [PP ling aku].
    PST=1SG=drink coffee=that by 1SG
    ‘I drank the coffee.’

Properties of bare passives:

1. Patient = subject
2. Bare V
3. Agent adjacent to V:
   Tense=Agent=V but *Agent=Tense=V

Notes:

1. Bare passives are transitive. (In fact, all passives are.)
2. No assumption that passives can only exist together with a (basic) active construction.
(head movement and object shift omitted)
Clitic doubling


(8)   Lo=vimos a Juan.
     3SG=saw.1PL A Juan
     ‘We saw Juan.’

- Clitic doubling in Romance involves internal arguments.
- Clitic doubling in passives involves external arguments.
Properties of clitic doubling

According to Anagnostopoulou (2017), clitic doubling:
- is optional $\rightarrow (9)-(11)$;
- involves a special marker $\rightarrow ling$;
- requires high referentiality of the referent $\rightarrow$ future work;
- has a clausemate condition on the clitic and its double $\rightarrow$ future work.

**Clitic doubling**

(9) ka=ya=inóm kawa=nan ling nya Amin.
    PST=3SG=drink coffee=that by Mr. Amin
    ‘Amin drank the coffee.’

(Shiohara 2016: 259)
Optionality of clitic doubling in Sumbawa

No clitic

(10) ka=Ø=bèang lamóng=nan lakó tódé=ta ling ina’.  
PST=Ø=give clothes=that to child=this by mother  
‘The mother gave this child the clothes.’  
(adapted from Shiohara 2013: 153)

No double

(11) ka mò suda ku=tuja’ padé=ta.  
PST MOD finish 1SG=polish rice=this  
‘I have pounded the rice.’  
(Shiohara 2013: 150)
### Bare passive + clitic doubling in other Indonesian languages

**Besemah (Malayic, southwestern Sumatera)**

(12) Telepun-i=nye [PP li Bubi].
    telephone-APPL=3 by Bubi

    ‘Bubi called (the hospital in Lahat),’

(McDonnell 2016: 79)

**Balinese (Nomoto 2018)**

(13) Nasi-ne ajeng=a [PP teken anak-e ento].
    rice-DEF eat=3SG by person-DEF that

    ‘That person ate the rice.’

(adapted from Artawa 1998: 10)
Under the proposed analysis, the constructions discussed by Kaufman do not involve ergative extraction.

**Relative clause**

(6) sai adè ka=Ø-tumpan’ jangan=ta?
who REL PST=Agr.3SG-get fish=this
‘Who caught the fish?’ (adapted from Kaufman 2017, citing Shiohara 2013)

**Topicalization**

(7) aku (ku-)inóm kawa=nan.
1SG Agr.1SG-drink coffee=that
‘I drink the coffee.’ (adapted from Kaufman 2017, citing Shiohara 2013)
Problems of the case-agreement analysis (1)

Kaufman (2017: n. 38)

Shiohara (2013) in fact glosses leng [= ling] as ‘by’ but because leng seems obligatory on external arguments of transitive verbs, I re-gloss leng as ERG.

However,

1. P in passive agentive PPs is also obligatory (e.g. by, oleh).
2. If the person marking on V is agreement, the putative ergative agreement is optional...
(14) a. ka=ya-inóm kawa=nan ling nya Amin.  
PST=Agr.3SG-drink coffee=that ERG Mr. Amin  
‘Amin drank the coffee.’  
(adapted from Shiohara 2016: 259)  
b. ka=Ø-bèang lamóng=nan lakó tódé=ta ling ina’.  
PST=Agr.3SG-give clothes=that to child=this ERG mother  
‘The mother gave this child the clothes.’  
(adapted from Shiohara 2013: 153)

- Kaufman: Optionality of case-agreement
- Shiohara/Nomoto: Optionality of clitic doubling
Problems of the case-agreement analysis (2)

When the agent occurs preverbally, the putative ergative case marker *ling* is disallowed.

(15)  

a. (*ling) *aku* (ku-)inóm kawa=nan. [= (7)]  
   \[
   \text{ERG 1SG Agr.1SG-drink coffee=that}
   \]
   ‘I drink the coffee.’ (adapted from Kaufman 2017, citing Shiohara 2013)

b. (*ling) *sai* adè ka=Ø-tumpan’ jangan=ta? [= (6)]  
   \[
   \text{ERG who REL PST=Agr.3SG-get fish=this}
   \]
   ‘Who caught the fish?’ (adapted from Kaufman 2017, citing Shiohara 2013)

This is a perplexing puzzle in Kaufman’s analysis.
Loss of *ling ‘by’ due to topicalization?

Agent topicalization

(7) (*ling) aku (ku=)inóm kawa=nan ___.
   by 1SG 1SG=drink coffee=that
   ‘I drink the coffee.’

Shiohara (adapted from 2013: 153)

Theme topicalization

(16) kawa=nan ku=inom ___ ling aku.
    coffee=that 1SG=drink by 1SG
    ‘As for the coffee, I drink it.’

(Shiohara 2013: 153)

Does topicalization cause the loss of the preposition *ling?

---

1 I thank Asako Shiohara for pointing out this possibility.
Does topicalization cause the loss of *ling*?

No. Agentive P and topicalization are compatible.

**Japanese**

(17) dansei *niyotte=wa*, sukunakutomo 75 ka koku, 4 tairiku de male by=TOP at.least 75 CLF country 4 continent at

[...] okonaw-are-teiru kyoogi

*do-PASS-IPFV* sport

‘sports that are played by males at least in 75 countries in 4 continents and [...]’ (BCCWJ)

I claim that

- the fronted *ling* PP = clitic left dislocation;
- Sumbawa does not have clitic left dislocation.
Some languages have both clitic doubling and clitic left dislocation while others only have the latter (Anagnostopoulou 2017).

|---------------------------------------------------------------|
|(18) a. Lo=vimos  a Juan.  
3SG=saw.1PL  a Juan       |
| b. A Juan, lo=vimos   ayer.  
A Juan  3SG=saw.1PL  yesterday       |
| ‘We saw Juan yesterday.’ |
Italian (Anagnostopoulou 2017, citing Cinque 1990: 71)

(19) a. *Lo=vedrò domani **Gianni.**
    3SG=will.see.1SG tomorrow Gianni

b. **Gianni, lo=vedrò domani.**
    Gianni 3SG=will.see.1SG tomorrow
    ‘I will see Gianni tomorrow.’
Sumbawa has clitic doubling, but lacks clitic left dislocation

Clitic doubling

(4) ka=ku=inóm kawa=nan ling aku.  
PST=1SG=drink coffee=that by 1SG  
‘I drank the coffee.’  
(Shiohara 2013: 148)

Clitic left dislocation

(20) *ling aku ku=inóm kawa=nan.  
by 1SG 1SG=drink coffee=that  
‘I drink the coffee.’  
(Shiohara 2013)

What is the grammatical counterpart without ling in (20)?
Sumbawa has developed an English-type active voice construction with an SVO order.

- Preverbal agent = DP with an unmarked case (No ling deletion or silent P!)
- Person marking on V = subject agreement (emerging or disappearing):
  1sg: ku= → ku-Ø; 2sg: sia= → sia-Ø; 3sg: ya= → Ø

**Bare active**

(21) **aku** (ku-)inóm kawa=nan.  
1sg Agr.1sg-drink coffee=that  
‘I drink the coffee.’  
(adapted from Shiohara 2013)

(23) **nya Amin** (*ya-)inóm kawa=nan.  
Mr. Amin Agr.3sg-drink coffee=that  
‘Amin drinks the coffee.’  
(adapted from Shiohara 2013: 149)
Shibatani (2008) reports that Sumbawa bare active disallows object extraction.
(Note: Shibatani’s Sumbawa Besar dialect is slightly different from Shiohara’s.)

Object extraction (Shibatani 2008: 881)

(22) a. \(\text{tau}=\text{lokaq} \quad \text{beri} \quad \text{tòdè}=\text{nan}\)
    person=old love child=that
    ‘The parents love the child.’

b. \(*\text{tòdè} \quad [\text{adé} \quad \text{tau}=\text{lokaq} \quad \text{beri} \quad ___] \)
    child REL person=old love
    ‘the child whom the parents love’

Hence, it is more like \textit{meN}- active in Malay/Indonesian rather than its bare active. The former but not the latter disallows object extraction.
Problems of the case-agreement analysis (3)

The putative 3\textsubscript{SG} ergative agreement is ungrammatical

1. when the agent occurs preverbally;
2. in intransitive clauses

### Perverbal agent

(23) nya Amin (*ya-)inôm kawa=nan.
Mr. Amin Agr.3SG-drink coffee=that
‘Amin drinks the coffee.’ (adapted from Shiohara 2013: 149)

### Intransitive

(24) tódé=nan ka=(*ya-)teri’. / ka=(*ya-)teri’ tódé=nan.
child=that PST=Agr.3SG-fall PST=Agr.3SG-fall child=that
‘That child fell.’ (adapted from Shiohara 2016: 259)

These facts also remain puzzling in Kaufman’s analysis, but fall out naturally in our analysis.
Subject agreement in other voices (1)

1sg  ku= → ku-~Ø
2sg  sia= → sia-~Ø
3sg  ya= → Ø

Intransitive

(25)  ka=ku-tunōng  aku.
PST=Agr.1sg-sleep 1sg
‘I slept.’  (adapted from Shiohara 2013: 148)
Subject agreement in other voices (2)

1sg  \( ku= \rightarrow ku-\sim\emptyset \)
2sg  \( sia= \rightarrow sia-\sim\emptyset \)
3sg  \( ya= \rightarrow \emptyset \)

Antipassive

(26) a. \( ka=ku-ng-in\acute{om} \quad \text{aku.} \)
\( \text{PST=Agr.1SG-ANTIPASS-drink 1SG} \)
‘I drank (something).’
(adapted from Shiohara 2013: 148)

b. *\( ka=ya-ng-in\acute{om} \quad \text{nya=Amén.} \)
\( \text{PST=Agr.3SG-ANTIPASS-drink TITLE=Amin} \)

c. \( ka=\emptyset-ng-in\acute{om} \quad \text{nya=Amén.} \)
\( \text{PST=Agr.3SG-ANTIPASS-drink TITLE=Amin} \)
‘Amin drank (something).’
(adapted from Shiohara 2013: 149)
Subject agreement in other voices (3)

1sg  ku= → ku-Ø
2sg  sia= → sia-Ø
3sg  ya= → Ø

Indefinite theme incorporation

(27)  ka=ku-inóm=kawa  aku.
PST=Agr.1sg-drink=coffee 1sg
‘I drank coffee.’  (adapted from Shiohara 2013: 152)

*ling aku.

Nominative Case otherwise assigned to theme is assigned to agent.
Active as a strategy to make agent a subject

Unlike indefinite theme, definite theme cannot be incorporated. (Object shift takes place instead.)

**Definite theme incorporation**

(28) "ka=ku-inóm=kawa=nan aku.
PST=Agr.1SG-drink=coffee=that 1SG
(For: ‘I drank the coffee.’) (adapted from Shiohara 2006: 156)

- Hence, agent cannot be a subject when the theme is definite.
- Active voice is thought to have emerged to fill this gap.
Conclusion: Not ergative but subject extraction

- What Kaufman regards as ergative extraction is subject extraction from bare active clauses.
- No ergative extraction in Sumbawa. [ergative = bare passive agent]

### Relative clause

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>sai</th>
<th>adè ___ ka=Ø-tumpan’</th>
<th>jangan=ta?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>who</td>
<td>REL</td>
<td>PST=Agr.3SG-get fish=this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Who caught the fish?’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(adapted from Kaufman 2017, citing Shiohara 2013)

### Topicalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>aku ___ (ku-)inóm</th>
<th>kawa=nan.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>Agr.1SG-drink coffee=that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘I drink the coffee.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(adapted from Kaufman 2017, citing Shiohara 2013)
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Clitic doubling analyses of passives (Baker et al. 1989; Nomoto 2016)

My analysis of the basic construction (4) as passive + clitic doubling lends further support to clitic doubling analyses of passives (Baker et al. 1989; Nomoto 2016).

‘Basic construction’ (Shiohara 2013: 148)

(4) ka=ku=inóm kawa=nan [PP ling aku].
   PST=1SG=drink coffee=that by 1SG
   ‘I drank the coffee.’

Other languages with passive + clitic doubling (with overt clitics):

- Balinese (Nomoto 2018)
- Besemah (McDonnell 2016)
- Classical Malay (Nomoto 2016)
Covert active-passive alternation

Basic construction = Bare passive (VS; Voice = Ø)

(4) 
\[
[TP \text{ ka=} \ [\text{VoiceP} \ Ø \ [\text{VP} \ ku=\text{inóm} \ kawa=\text{nan}] \ [\text{PP} \ ling \ aku]]].
\]
\[
PST=1SG=\text{drink coffee=that} \quad \text{by} \quad 1SG
\]
‘I drank the coffee.’

(adapted from Shiohara 2013: 148)

Agent topicalization = Bare active (SVO; Voice = Ø)

(21) 
\[
[TP \text{ aku} \ [\text{VoiceP} \ Ø \ [\text{VP} \ (ku-)\text{inóm} \ kawa=\text{nan}]].
\]
\[
1SG \quad \text{Agr.1SG-drink coffee=that}
\]
‘I drink the coffee.’

(adapted from Shiohara 2013)

Both active and passive are morphologically unmarked.

→ Another example of covert active-passive voice alternation, which has also been reported in related languages (e.g. Arka and Kosmas 2005; Legate 2012; Nomoto and Kartini 2012).
## Sumbawa voice system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Shiohara (2013)</th>
<th>This study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pro-V Th ling Ag</td>
<td>sole transitive construction</td>
<td>bare passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pro = clitic</td>
<td>pro = clitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag pro-V Th</td>
<td>topicalization</td>
<td>bare active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pro = clitic</td>
<td>pro = agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pro-N-V Ag</td>
<td>antipassive</td>
<td>antipassive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pro = clitic</td>
<td>pro = agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conjecture: The development of the canonical Indonesian-type voice system

Bare passive
[= ergative/bare patient voice]

→

Antipassive
[N-]

Morphological passive

Morphological active

(Red: available in Sumbawa)
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