

Ergative extraction in Sumbawa

Introduction. Ergative extraction is generally disallowed in Western Austronesian languages. This restriction is well-known in Philippine-type languages, as illustrated by the Tagalog examples in (1) (under an ergative analysis).

- (1) a. Sú~sulát-in ni Jojo ang libro.
 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))

Kaufman (2017) points out two exceptions to this widespread restriction on ergative extraction: Sumbawa (Sumbawa Besar dialect) and Selayarese (Indonesia). This study shows that Sumbawa is in fact not an exception by providing an alternative analysis of his Sumbawa data.

Core data: Kaufman’s analysis. (2) shows Kaufman’s analysis of a type of transitive clause called ‘basic construction’ by Shiohara (2013). In his analysis, *ling* is an ergative case marker and the first-person *ku-* on the verb agrees with the ergative DP.

- (2) 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)

Assuming this analysis, Kaufman claims that the ergative argument is extracted in (3)–(4).

- (3) (*ling) sai adè ka=Ø-tumpan’ jangan=ta?
 ERG who REL PST=Agr.3SG-get fish=this
 ‘Who caught the fish?’ (adapted from Kaufman 2017, citing Shiohara 2013)
 (4) (*ling) aku (ku-)inóm kawa=nan.
 ERG 1SG Agr.1SG-drink coffee=that
 ‘I drink the coffee.’ (adapted from Kaufman 2017, citing Shiohara 2013)

Alternative analysis. We argue that Shiohara’s (2013) original view, as shown in (5), is more plausible. Her analysis differs from Kaufman’s in two respects. First, the first-person *ku* is not an ergative agreement prefix but the verb’s argument clitic. Second, *ling* is not an ergative case marker but an agentive preposition (‘by’). Hence, the *ling* phrase is not the verb’s argument DP but an adjunct PP which doubles the pronominal clitic argument DP *ku=* on the verb.

- (5) ka=**ku**=inóm kawa=nan [PP *ling* aku].
 PST=1SG=drink coffee=that by 1SG
 ‘I drank the coffee.’ (Shiohara 2013: 148)

Kaufman (2017: n. 38) rejects Shiohara’s analysis of *ling* as a preposition because it “seems obligatory on external arguments of transitive verbs.” However, it is actually not obligatory. (6) is a transitive clause but lacks a *ling* phrase. The clitic is not obligatory either, as shown in (7).

- (6) ka mò suda ku=tuja’ padé=ta.
 PST MOD finish 1SG=polish rice=this
 ‘I have pounded the rice.’ (Shiohara 2013: 150)
 (7) a. ka=**ya**=inóm kawa=nan *ling* nya Amin.
 PST=3SG=drink coffee=that by Mr. Amin

- ‘Amin drank the coffee.’ (Shiohara 2016: 259)
- b. ka=Ø=bèang lamóng=nan lakó tódé=ta ling ina’.
 PST=3SG=give clothes=that to child=this by mother
 ‘The mother gave this child the clothes.’ (adapted from Shiohara 2013: 153)

This kind of distribution is typical of clitic doubling, but not agreement. Because the *ling* phrase is not an ergative argument, its extraction cannot be an instance of ergative extraction.

Active voice as a strategy for agent extraction. One might wonder if (3) results from the extraction of a clitic null operator (who [Op=REL PST=<Op=>get fish=this]). Such an extraction counts as ergative extraction when Nomoto’s (to appear) analysis of passives as transitive ergative clauses is applied to Sumbawa basic constructions. A passive agent is an ergative argument in his analysis. However, we argue that ergative extraction is totally banned in Sumbawa.

We propose that Sumbawa has developed an English-type active voice construction as a strategy for agent extraction. Sumbawa can achieve agent extraction by intransitivizing the verb by noun incorporation. However, this strategy is only available when the object is indefinite. Active voice is thought to have emerged to enable agent extraction when the object is definite. (4) is a familiar type of active clause of the SVO word order. Agent extraction in (3) is based on such an active clause, exactly in the same manner as in subject relativization in English.

The following three facts support the proposed analysis. First, *ling* cannot occur when the agent occurs preverbally (3)–(4). This is a perplexing puzzle in Kaufman’s analysis, but falls out naturally as reflecting the unmarked case (associated with T) in our analysis. Second, the third-person *ya* in (7a) causes ungrammaticality when the agent occurs preverbally (8a) or in intransitive clauses (8b). In our analysis, this means that third-person agreement is unmarked (Ø-), whereas first- and second-person agreement is still under development, hence its optionality (4). This second fact also remains a puzzle in Kaufman’s analysis.

- (8) a. nya Amin (*ya=)inóm kawa=nan.
 Mr. Amin 3SG=drink coffee=that
 ‘Amin drinks the coffee.’ (adapted from Shiohara 2013: 149)
- b. tódé=nan ka=(*ya=)teri’ / ka=(*ya=)teri’ tódé=nan.
 child=that PST=3SG=fall PST=3SG=fall child=that
 ‘That child fell.’ (adapted from Shiohara 2016: 259)

Third, only one DP can occur preverbally (Shiohara 2000). This constraint suggests that the preverbal position is a subject position (Spec,(C)T), but not a topic position, which is iterable.

Implications. Sumbawa is not an exception to the ergative extraction restriction, but rather corroborates its tenacity. The language developed an active voice construction to avoid ergative extraction. Our analysis of the basic construction (5) as passive reveals more similarities between Sumbawa and its neighbours, and lends further support to clitic doubling analyses of passives (Baker et al. 1989; Nomoto 2016). Balinese also has a morphologically unmarked passive whose agent clitic is doubled by a ‘by’ PP; similar clitic doubling occurs in morphologically marked passives in Classical Malay (Nomoto 2018). The fact that active voice is also morphologically unmarked presents another example of covert active-passive voice alternation, which has also been reported in related languages (e.g. Arka and Kosmas 2005; Legate 2012).

Selected references. KAUFMAN, D. 2017. Lexical category and alignment in Austronesian. In *The Oxford Handbook of Ergativity*, ed. Coon et al., 589–628. OUP. • NOMOTO, H. 2018. The development of the English-type passive in Balinese. *Wacana* 19: 122–148. • NOMOTO, H. to appear. Bare passive agent hierarchy. In *Proceedings of the 27th Meeting of the AFLA*. • SHIOHARA, A. 2013. Voice in the Sumbawa Besar dialect of Sumbawa. *NUSA* 54: 145–158.