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Balinese -a passive (1) is thought to have developed from its bare passive (2).

-A passive

(1) Nasi-ne ajeng-a teken anak-e ento.
    rice-DEF eat-PASS by person-DEF that
    ‘That person ate the rice.’

    (Artawa 1998: 10)

Bare passive

(2) Cicing-e sepak tiang.
    dog-DEF kick 1SG
    ‘I kicked the dog.’

    (Artawa 1998: 9–10)
Nomoto’s (2018) hypothesis about the developmental path

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Formulation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bare passive</td>
<td>v-V-Ø [DP_{Agent} . . .]         Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>clitic doubling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bare passive</td>
<td>v-V-Ø [≡a . . .] teken DP         Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(=a: 3SG; teken ‘by’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-A passive</td>
<td>v-V-a [pro . . .] teken DP        -a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support from Classical Malay

*Di-* passives in Malay also underwent a clitic doubling stage in the past.

**Di- passive, no doubling**

(3) **Serta di-lihat=nya nakhoda itu**
and **PASS-look=3 captain that**

‘And he [= my father] looked at the captain’

(4) **oleh ibu bapa=ku di-jemputkan=nya=lah segala adik kakak**
by **mother father=1SG PASS-invite=3=PART all sibling**
**dalam Melaka**
in **Malacca**

‘my parents invited all their siblings in Malacca’
This study

- Provides further support for Nomoto's hypothesis from Sumbawa (the Sumbawa Besar dialect), a close relative of Balinese.
- Clitic doubling is also observed with bare passives in Sumbawa.
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)
The construction in question

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

Called ‘basic construction’ by Shiohara (2013).

Properties of bare passives:
- Patient = subject
- Bare V
- Agent (clitic) adjacent to V:
  \( \text{Tense=Agent=V but *Agent=Tense=V} \)

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.
Relation between the agent clitic and the *ling* PP

(5) \text{ka=ku=inôm kawa=nan \text{[PP ling aku].}}  \\	ext{PST=1SG=drink coffee=that by 1SG}  \\	ext{‘I drank the coffee.’}  \\	ext{(Shiohara 2013: 148)}

- Shiohara does not explicitly state what the relation is.
- I argue that clitic doubling is involved.
Besides Classical Malay, Sumbawa bare passives also instantiate a developmental stage hypothesized for Balinese by Nomoto (2018).

### Sumbawa (attested)

(5) ka=ku=inóm kawa=nan [PP ling aku].

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{PST} = & \text{1SG} = \text{drink} \quad \text{coffee=that} \\
\text{by} \quad & \text{1SG}
\end{align*}
\]

‘I drank the coffee.’

(Shiohara 2013: 148)

### Balinese (hypothetical)

(6) Nasi-ne ajeng=a [PP teken anak-e ento].

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{rice-DEF} \quad \text{eat}=3SG \\
\text{by} \quad & \text{person-DEF that}
\end{align*}
\]

‘That person ate the rice.’
Nomoto’s (2018) hypothesis about the developmental path

Stage 1. Bare passive $v$-$V$-$\emptyset$ [ $\text{DP}_{\text{Agent}}$ ] $\emptyset$
- clitic doubling

Stage 2. Bare passive $v$-$V$-$\emptyset$ [ $=a$ $\ldots$ ] teken $\text{DP}$
( =a: 3SG; teken ‘by’)
- introduction of $\text{pro}$
- reanalysis of $=a$ as Voice

Stage 3. -A passive $v$-$V$-$a$ [ $\text{pro}$ $\ldots$ ] teken $\text{DP}$ $-a$
This is not the end of the story...
Kaufman’s (2017) alternative analysis

Kaufman

(7)  
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

Nomoto/Shiohara

(5)  
ka=ku=inóm  kawa=nan  [PP ling aku].  
PST=1SG=drink coffee=that  by 1SG  
‘I drank the coffee.’  
(Shiohara 2013: 148)
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...
Optionality of the person marking on V

(8) 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=Ø-give clothes=that to child=this ERG mother
‘The mother gave this child the clothes.’ (adapted from Shiohara 2013: 153)
Problems of the case-agreement analysis (2)

When the agent occurs preverbally,

3. the putative ergative case marker *ling* is disallowed (9);
4. the putative 3SG ergative agreement is ungrammatical (10).

(9) (*ling) *aku* (ku-)inóm kawa=nan.
   ERG 1SG Agr.1SG-drink coffee=that
   ‘I drink the coffee.’ (adapted from Kaufman 2017, citing Shiohara 2013)

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

According to Anagnostopoulou (2017), clitic doubling

- is optional → (11)–(13);
- involves a special marker → ling;
- requires high referentiality of the referent → future work;
- has a clausemate condition on the clitic and its double → future work.

Clitic doubling

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

(Shiohara 2016: 259)
No clitic

(12) 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

(13) ka mò suda ku=tuja’ padé=ta.
PST MOD finish 1SG=polish rice=this
‘I have pounded the rice.’ (Shiohara 2013: 150)
Some languages have both clitic doubling and clitic left dislocation, but others only have the latter (Anagnostopoulou 2017).


(14) a. \textit{Lo=vimos a Juan.}
\begin{tabular}{l}
3SG=saw.1PL a Juan
\end{tabular}

b. \textit{A Juan, lo=vimos ayer.}
\begin{tabular}{l}
A Juan 3SG=saw.1PL yesterday
\end{tabular}

‘We saw Juan yesterday.’
   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**

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

(Shiohara 2013: 148)

**Clitic left dislocation**

(16) \[*ling\ aku\ ku=in\instant\ kawa=nan.\]
\[\text{by} \ 1\text{SG} \ 1\text{SG}=\text{drink} \ \text{coffee}=\text{that}\]
‘I drink the coffee.’

(Shiohara 2013)
Alternative account for *ling ‘by’: Topicalization

### Theme topicalization

(17) \[ \text{kawa=nan ku=inom } \_\_\_ \text{ling aku} \]
\[
\text{coffee=that 1SG=drink } \text{by } 1SG
\]

‘As for the coffee, I drink it.’

(Shiohara 2013: 153)

### Agent topicalization

(9) \[ (*\text{ling}) \text{aku (ku=} \text{inóm kawa=nan } \_\_\_.} \]
\[
\text{by } 1SG 1SG=\text{drink coffee=that}
\]

‘I drink the coffee.’

Shiohara (adapted from 2013: 153)

Does topicalization cause the loss of the preposition ling?

---

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

No. Agentive P and topicalization are compatible.

Japanese

(18) 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)
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: $ku= \rightarrow ku-\sim\emptyset$; 2SG: $sia= \rightarrow sia-\sim\emptyset$; 3SG: $ya= \rightarrow \emptyset$

**Bare active**

(19) **aku** (ku-)inóm kawa=nan.
1SG Agr.1SG-drink coffee=that
‘I drink the coffee.’

(10) **nya Amin** (*ya-)inóm kawa=nan.
Mr. Amin Agr.3SG-drink coffee=that
‘Amin drinks the coffee.’

(adapted from Shiohara 2013: 149)
Subject agreement in other voices (1)

1sg: $ku= \rightarrow ku-\sim\emptyset$; 2sg: $sia= \rightarrow sia-\sim\emptyset$; 3sg: $ya= \rightarrow \emptyset$

Intransitive

(20) $ka=ku$-tunông $aku$.  
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

(21)

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>ka=</td>
<td>ku-\text{-\text{ng-inón}}</td>
<td>aku.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PST=</td>
<td>Agr.1SG-\text{ANTIPASS-drink}</td>
<td>1SG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘I drank (something).’</td>
<td>(adapted from Shiohara 2013: 148)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>*ka=</td>
<td>ya=\text{-ng-inón}</td>
<td>nya=Amén.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PST=</td>
<td>3SG=\text{ANTIPASS-drink}</td>
<td>TITLE=Amin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>ka=</td>
<td>\emptyset-\text{-ng-inón}</td>
<td>nya=Amén.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PST=</td>
<td>Agr.3SG-\text{ANTIPASS-drink}</td>
<td>TITLE=Amin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Amin drank (something).’</td>
<td>(adapted from Shiohara 2013: 149)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1SG: $ku= \rightarrow ku-\sim\emptyset$; 2SG: $sia= \rightarrow sia-\sim\emptyset$; 3SG: $ya= \rightarrow \emptyset$

**Indefinite theme incorporation**

(22) ka=ku-inóm=kawa **aku**.

PST=Agr.1SG-drink=coffee 1SG

‘I drank coffee.’ (adapted from Shiohara 2013: 152)

- *ling aku.*
- Case otherwise assigned to theme is assinged to agent.
Unlike indefinite theme, definite theme cannot be incorporated. (Object shift takes place instead.)

**Definite theme incorporation**

(23) *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

- Sumbawa provides further support for Nomoto’s (2018) hypothesis about the development of the English-type -a passive in Balinese.
  - Balinese (hypothetical) $V-\emptyset=a \ldots teken\ DP$
  - Sumbawa $ku/sia/ya=V-\emptyset \ldots ling\ DP$
  - Classical Malay $di-V=nya \ldots oleh\ DP$

- McDonnell (2016: 79) reports similar facts in Besemah.

**Besemah (Malayic, southwestern Sumatera)**

(24) a. Telepun-i=nye li Bubi.
   telephone-APPL=3 by Bubi
   ‘Bubi called (the hospital in Lahat),’

b. Aku masih di-batak-i=nye li enduk.
   1SG still PASS-bring-APPL=3 by mother
   ‘I was still brought by mother.’ (McDonnell 2016: 79)
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>

- Bare active in Sumbawa resembles *meN*- active in Malay/Indonesian rather than its bare active (Shibatani 2008).
- 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).
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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