

ERGATIVE EXTRACTION AND THE EMERGENCE OF THE ACTIVE VOICE IN SUMBAWA*

Hiroki Nomoto
Tokyo University of Foreign Studies
nomoto@tufs.ac.jp

Ergative extraction is generally disallowed in Western Austronesian languages. Kaufman (2017) points out two exceptions to this restriction: Sumbawa and Selayarese. Providing an alternative analysis of his Sumbawa data, this study shows that Sumbawa is not an exception, but rather corroborates the tenacity of the ergative extraction restriction. In the proposed analysis, what Kaufman considers as (i) an ergative case marker, (ii) ergative agreement markers and (iii) ergative extraction are respectively (i) a preposition meaning ‘by’ in a passive clause, (ii) pronominal argument clitics doubled by the prepositional phrase and (iii) subject extraction from an active clause. Sumbawa thus lends further support to clitic doubling analyses of passives (Baker, Johnson, and Roberts 1989; Nomoto 2016) alongside other languages such as Balinese, Besemah and Classical Malay. I argue that the active voice has emerged from the passive as a strategy to extract the agent while circumventing illegitimate ergative extraction. The presence of the active voice makes Sumbawa more similar to its neighbours than previously thought. Moreover, Sumbawa provides another example of covert active-passive alternation, in which neither the active nor the passive is morphologically marked.

1. 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). The DP *nino* ‘who’ cannot be extracted, as shown in (1b). This DP is in the ergative case according to the ergative analysis of Tagalog.¹

- (1) a. *Sú~sulát-in ni Jojo ang libro.*² Tagalog
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
(Intended: ‘Who will write the book?’) (Kaufman 2017)

The restriction on ergative extraction is also observed in Indonesian-type languages and perhaps other languages with similar passive constructions. In Nomoto 2021, I proposed an analysis whereby the passive agent is assigned an inherent ergative case in its initially merged position, as depicted in (2).

*This study was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP18K00568. Many thanks to Asako Shiohara for discussing Sumbawa facts with me. I would also like to thank the audience at AFLA 28 for their comments and questions. All remaining errors are mine.

¹ It is in the genitive case according to the accusative analysis.

² The following abbreviation not found in the Leipzig Glossing Rules is used in this paper: MOD = modality.

- (2) [VoiceP Voice [_{VP} Agent [_{v'} v_{pass} [_{VP} V Theme]]]]
[Erg]

This analysis is an extension of Aldridge's (2008) analysis of bare passives to passives in general. According to this generalized passive-as-ergative analysis, passive agent DPs (but not PPs!) are ergative.

Passive agent DPs cannot be extracted in both of the two types of Malay passives, i.e. morphological and bare passives. (3) shows examples of morphological passives, in which the verb is prefixed by the passive marker *di-* and the agent may be expressed as a DP immediately following the verb.³ The agent DP *mereka* cannot be extracted.

- (3) a. Surat ini perlu di-tandatangani *mereka*. Malay
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
(Intended: 'By whom does this letter need to be signed?')

As shown in (4), the agent DP cannot be extracted from the bare passive either. In bare passives, the agent immediately precedes the verb, which occurs in its stem form.

- (4) a. Surat ini perlu *mereka* tandatangani. Malay
letter this need 3PL sign.on
'They need to sign this letter.'
b.**Siapa* yang surat ini perlu ____ tandatangani?
who REL letter this need sign.on
(Intended: 'By whom does this letter need to be signed?')

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

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, I will briefly introduce the Sumbawa language and the construction in question. Then, in section 3, I review Kaufman's analysis of that construction. I propose an alternative analysis in section 4. I argue that what Kaufman analyses as 'ergative + case-agreement' and topicalisation of an ergative DP should be analysed as 'passive + clitic doubling' and the bare active voice, respectively. Section 5 concludes the paper, discussing

³ The agent can be expressed using an *oleh* 'by' PP, as in English long passives. I assume that such cases involve a null agent DP (*pro*) postadjacent to the verb and that the covert DP is doubled by the 'by' phrase (Nomoto 2016, 2018).

- (i) Surat ini perlu di-tandatangani *oleh mereka*.
letter this need PASS-sign.on by 3PL
'This letter needs to be signed by them.'



Figure 1: The location of Sumbawa Island (Map data © 2021 Google)

three implications of this study. First, my analysis of the Sumbawa construction in question supports clitic doubling analyses of passives (Baker, Johnson, and Roberts 1989; Nomoto 2016; cf. footnote 3). Second, Sumbawa provides another instance of covert active-passive alternation, in which neither of the corresponding active and passive sentences involve overt voice morphology. Third, this study offers a new view of the Sumbawa voice system with three voices: bare passive, antipassive and an emergent bare active voice. I conjecture that this three-voice system constitutes a stage in the diachronic change from a patient/undergoer prominent voice system into the Malay-type voice system, consisting of four voices: morphological active and passive, and bare active and passive. More specifically, the antipassive has changed into the morphological active, facilitated by increasing use of the bare active. The morphological passive is generally thought to have emerged from the bare passive (see, for example, Adelaar 2005).

2. The Sumbawa language and the construction in question

The Sumbawa language is spoken in the western part of Sumbawa Island, Indonesia (Figure 1). *Ethnologue* (Eberhard, Simons, and Fennig 2021) reports that the language's user population in 1989 was 300,000. Sumbawa is closely related to Sasak and Balinese spoken in the neighbouring islands of Lombok and Bali. The Bima language spoken in the eastern part of Sumbawa Island belongs to Central Malayo-Polynesian. Sumbawa is thus a Western Malayo-Polynesian language located on the edge of the Western Malayo-Polynesian area.

Sumbawa has four main dialects: the Sumbawa Besar dialect, the Taliwang dialect, the Jereweh dialect and the Tongo dialect (Mahsun 1999). Of these four dialects, the Sumbawa Besar dialect serves the role of a lingua franca among different dialect speakers (Shiohara 2006: 3). The dialect discussed in this study is the Sumbawa Besar dialect as described by Asako Shiohara (Shiohara 2006, 2013, 2016).

(5) shows the construction discussed in this study. Shiohara (2013) refers to it as the 'basic construction'.

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

In this construction, the verb is morphologically unmarked. Shiohara (2013) describes the construction as the only transitive construction in the language. In what follows, I will cast doubt on this description, claiming that the language in fact has another transitive construction. According to Shiohara, in (5), the proclitic *ku=* ‘I’ is the verb’s external argument DP and the *ling* is a preposition meaning ‘by’. However, Kaufman (2017) analyses these items differently, as detailed in the next section.

3. Kaufman’s (2017) analysis

Kaufman (2017) analyses the sentence in (5) above as shown in (6).

- (6) ka=*ku*-inóm kawa=nan [_{DP} *ling* aku].
 PST=Agr.1SG-drink coffee=that ERG 1SG
 ‘I drank the coffee.’

He analyses *ling* as an ergative case marker, but not as a preposition meaning ‘by’. On the other hand, the bound morpheme *ku* is analysed as an agreement marker that agrees with the ergative DP marked by *ling*.

Assuming this analysis, Kaufman claims that the ergative argument is extracted in (7)–(8). (7) is an example of relativization, whereas Kaufman regards (8) as involving topicalization.

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

If this analysis is on the right track, Sumbawa offers a rare exception to the widespread restriction on ergative extraction introduced in section 1 above. However, Kaufman’s analysis faces empirical problems when inspected closely and a better alternative is conceivable that does not suffer from them.

4. Alternative analysis

4.1. Analysis

I argue that Shiohara’s (2013) original view is more plausible. Her analysis is shown in (9).

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

Shiohara’s analysis differs from Kaufman’s in two respects. First, the person marker *ku* on the verb is not an ergative agreement marker, but the verb’s argument clitic. Second, *ling* is not an ergative case marker, but an agentive preposition meaning ‘by’. Hence, the *ling* phrase is not the verb’s argument DP but an adjunct PP. Shiohara does not explicitly state what the relation between the person marker *ku* and the *ling* PP is. I argue that they are linked to each other by clitic doubling. Specifically, the *ling* PP doubles the pronominal clitic argument DP *ku*= on the verb.

Shiohara’s ‘basic construction’ is in fact bare passive.⁴ It shows properties of bare passives. First, the theme (*kawa=*nan** ‘the coffee’ in (9)) is the subject. Second, the verb occurs in its bare stem form, which is *inóm* in (9).⁵ Third, the agent occurs adjacent to the verb. The agent thus cannot occur in front of the tense marker: **ku=*ka*=inóm* [1SG=PST=drink]. Note that bare passives (in fact, all passives, for that matter) are transitive clauses. I do not assume that passives are intransitive. Furthermore, I do not assume that passives can only exist together with a corresponding active construction either. Although I claim below that Sumbawa actually has an active voice, it is totally acceptable if it does not.

(10) shows the structure of (9).

⁴ Examples of bare passives in Malay are available in (4).

⁵ Besides the stem form, the verb has an antipassive form marked by *N-*. The antipassive form of *inóm* is *ngióm*. The Sumbawa Besar dialect discussed in this study does not possess a morphological passive voice corresponding to *di-* passives in Malay (cf. (3)). Incidentally, the Taliwang dialect seems to have a morphological passive construction marked by *i=*.

- (i) Aku na=*i*=pukul=*ku* ning Ali. Taliwang dialect
 1SG FUT=PASS=hit=1SG by Ali
 ‘I will be hit by Ali.’ (Shibatani 2008: 875)

In this example, the phrase introduced by the special marker *a* doubles the proclitic *lo=* on the verb. Clitic doubling here involves the internal argument. Clitic doubling in passives differs from clitic doubling in Romance languages in that it involves external arguments as opposed to internal arguments.

According to Anagnostopoulou (2017), clitic doubling exhibits the following properties:

- (12) Properties of clitic doubling
- a. Doubling is optional.
 - b. The double involves a special marker.
 - c. The double's referent is high in referentiality.
 - d. The clitic and its double are clausemates.

Among these, the property shared by all clitic doubling languages is optionality (12a).

The clitic doubling that I claim exists in Sumbawa bare passives is indeed optional. (13) has both a clitic and its double.

- (13) *ka=ya=inóm kawa=nan ling nya Amin.*
PST=3SG=drink coffee=that by Mr. Amin
'Amin drank the coffee.'
(Shiohara 2016: 259)

However, clitics do not always occur, as illustrated by (14). Notice the absence of the third person proclitic *ya=* in the verb.

- (14) *ka=bèang lamóng=nan lakó tódé=ta ling ina'.*
PST=give clothes=that to child=this by mother
'The mother gave this child the clothes.'
(Shiohara 2013: 153)

Moreover, a clitic is not always doubled, as shown in (15). Notice that the sentence has the first person proclitic *ku=*, but not *ling aku* 'by me'.

- (15) *ka=mò suda ku=tuja' padé=ta.*
PST=MOD finish 1SG=polish rice=this
'I have pounded the rice.'
(Shiohara 2013: 150)

Regarding the properties of clitic doubling other than optionality—properties which are not necessarily shared by all clitic doubling languages—the presence of the special marker (12b) holds true with Sumbawa. The preposition *ling* 'by' can be considered such a marker. At present, it is not clear whether (12c) and (12d) also hold in Sumbawa. More investigation is necessary.

Clitic doubling in bare passives is also found in other Indonesian languages such as Besemah (Malayic, southwestern Sumatra) (16) and Balinese (17), although the researchers of these languages have not described the relevant phenomena as clitic doubling. The clitics and their doubles are respectively indicated by **boldface** and *italics* in the examples below.

- (16) Telepun-i=**nye** *li Bubi.* Besemah
 telephone-APPL=3 by Bubi
 ‘Bubi called (the hospital in Lahat),’ (McDonnell 2016: 79)
- (17) Nasi-ne ajeng=**a** *teken anak-e ento.* Balinese
 rice-DEF eat=3SG by person-DEF that
 ‘That person ate the rice.’ (Artawa 1998: 10)

These facts support my clitic doubling analysis of Sumbawa bare passives.

4.3. Problems of case-agreement analysis

In this section, I point out three problems of Kaufman’s case-agreement analysis.

4.3.1. Problem 1: Optional agreement

First, Kaufman rejects Shiohara’s analysis of *ling* as a preposition meaning ‘by’ and instead regards it as an ergative case marker, stating as follows:

Shiohara (2013) in fact glosses *leng* [= *ling*—HN] as ‘by’ but because *leng* seems obligatory on external arguments of transitive verbs, I re-gloss *leng* as ERG. (Kaufman 2017: n. 38)

However, the P in a passive agentive PP is also obligatory, as is the case with English *by* or Malay/Indonesian *oleh*.⁷

Kaufman analyses the person marking on the verb as an agreement marker that agrees with an ergative case DP, which in his analysis is the *ling* phrase. If the person marking on the verb is a reflex of agreement, the putative ergative agreement is optional. In both (18a) and (18b), the agent introduced by *ling* is in the third person. However, only the former has an overt agreement marker.

- (18)a. ka=*ya*-inóm kawa=*nan* *ling nya Amin.*
 PST=Agr.3SG-drink coffee=that ERG Mr. Amin
 ‘Amin drank the coffee.’ (Shiohara 2016: 259)
- b. ka= \emptyset -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.’ (Shiohara 2013: 153)

By contrast, in the proposed analysis, this fact simply shows the optionality of clitic doubling (cf. (13)–(14)). As seen in section 4.2 above, optionality is a property common in all languages with clitic doubling. Indeed, in recent discussions of object agreement, optionality is an important diagnostic to discern object clitic doubling from genuine object agreement: clitic doubling is optional, whereas agreement is obligatory (see Anagnostopoulou 2017 and the references therein).

⁷ I do not consider a passive agent DP immediately following the verb in Malay/Indonesian morphological passives as in (3a) to result from the omission of *oleh*.

4.3.2. Problem 2: Mysterious loss of *ling*

The second problem has to do with the position of the agent. When the agent occurs preverbally, the putative ergative case marker *ling* is disallowed, as shown in (19).

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

These sentences are grammatical only when *ling* is absent, as shown in (20).

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

This obligatory absence of *ling* is a perplexing puzzle in Kaufman’s analysis, all the more because it is a case marker in his analysis.

Asako Shiohara (p.c.) suggested to me the possibility that topicalization causes the loss of *ling*, which she analyses as a preposition meaning ‘by’. Sumbawa has a topicalization construction, in which the topicalized phrase is fronted to occur preverbally. (21) shows an example of theme topicalization.

- (21) *kawa=nan* ku=inom _____ *ling* aku.
 coffee=that 1SG=drink by 1SG
 ‘As for the coffee, I drink it.’ (Shiohara 2013: 153)

Does topicalization really cause the loss of *ling*? The answer seems negative. The Japanese example in (22) indicates that agentive adpositions and topicalization are not incompatible. Notice that in this example the agentive postposition *niyotte* ‘by’ co-occurs the topic marker *wa*.

- (22) *dansei niyotte=wa, sukunakutomo 75 ka koku, 4 tairiku de* Japanese
 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 [...]’
 (Yahoo! Blog 2008)⁸

⁸ The sentence was obtained from the Balanced Corpus of Contemporary Written Japanese (Maekawa et al. 2014).

I claim that the fronted *ling* PPs are ungrammatical because they instantiate a construction that is unavailable in Sumbawa, i.e. clitic left dislocation. Clitic left dislocation is distinct from clitic doubling. Some languages have both clitic doubling and clitic left dislocation, while others only have the latter (Anagnostopoulou 2017). Rioplatense Spanish has both clitic doubling (23a) and clitic left dislocation (23b).

- (23)a. Lo=vimos a Juan. Rioplatense Spanish
 3SG=saw.1PL A Juan
 ‘We saw Juan’
 b. A Juan, lo=vimos ayer.
 A Juan 3SG=saw.1PL yesterday
 ‘We saw Juan yesterday.’ (Anagnostopoulou 2017, citing Jaeggli 1986: 32)

Italian, on the other hand, only has clitic left dislocation.

- (24)a. *Lo=vedrò domani Gianni. Italian
 3SG=will.see.1SG tomorrow Gianni
 b. Gianni, lo=vedrò domani.
 Gianni 3SG=will.see.1SG tomorrow
 ‘I will see Gianni tomorrow.’ (Anagnostopoulou 2017, citing Cinque 1990: 71)

Sumbawa is the reverse of Italian. It has clitic doubling (25a), but lacks clitic left dislocation (25b).

- (25)a. ka=ku=inóm kawa=nan ling aku. [= (5)]
 PST=1SG=drink coffee=that by 1SG
 ‘I drank the coffee.’ (Shiohara 2013: 148)
 b. *ling aku ku=inóm kawa=nan.
 by 1SG 1SG=drink coffee=that
 ‘I drink the coffee.’ (Shiohara 2013: 153)

Note that topicalization is possible as long as it does not involve a clitic cross-referencing the topic, as seen in the theme topicalization example in (21) above.

Now, let us consider the grammatical sentences with fronted DPs but without *ling* in (20). What are they? I argue that they are based on an English-type active voice construction with an SVO order, as shown in (26). This active construction seems to be a recent development in the language and can be called ‘bare active’ because the verb occurs in its stem form with no overt voice morphology.

- (26)a. aku ____ (ku-)inóm kawa=nan.
 1SG Agr.1SG-drink coffee=that
 ‘I drink the coffee.’ (Shiohara 2013: 149)
 b. sai adè ____ ka=Ø-tumpan’ janggan=ta?
 who REL PST=Agr.3SG-get fish=this
 ‘Who caught the fish?’ (Shiohara 2013: 151)

The preverbal agents *aku* ‘I’ and *sai* ‘who’ are DPs with an unmarked nominative case. One should not posit a *ling* deletion operation or a silent preposition here. The person marking on the verb can be analysed as subject agreement. However, the subject agreement system is not very stable yet. The former agent clitics may evolve into full-fledged subject agreement markers, but they may also disappear in the active voice. At any rate, the current state can be summarized as in (27).

(27)	Agent clitic		Subject agreement
1SG:	<i>ku=</i>	→	<i>ku-~∅</i>
2SG (low):	<i>mu=</i>	→	<i>mu-~∅</i>
2SG (high):	<i>sia=</i>	→	<i>sia-~∅</i>
3SG:	<i>ya=</i>	→	∅

It is interesting to note that the 3SG agreement is unmarked. The form retaining its agent clitic origin leads to ungrammaticality.

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

Bare actives in Sumbawa seem to differ from bare actives in Malay/Indonesian in an interesting way. Shibatani (2008) reports that in his variety of the Sumbawa Besar dialect, which is slightly different from that of Shiohara’s (Asako Shiohara, p.c.), bare actives disallow object extraction, as shown in (29).

- (29)a. *tau=lokaq beri tòdé=nan*
 person=old love child=that
 ‘The parents love the child.’
 b. **tòdè [adé tau=lokaq beri _____]*
 child REL person=old love
 ‘the child whom the parents love’ (Shibatani 2008: 881)

Hence, Sumbawa bare active is more like *meN-* morphological active in Malay/Indonesian rather than its bare active, at least in Shibatani’s variety. Only the former disallows object extraction.

4.3.3. Problem 3: Inconsistent agreement paradigm

The third problem is concerned with the third person singular agreement. As seen in section 4.3.1 above, the person marking on the verb, which Kaufman analyses as ergative case agreement, is optional (cf. (18)). However, the putative third person singular ergative agreement is ungrammatical when the agent occurs preverbally. The example in (28) above shows this point. The obligatory absence of the person marking only occurs with third person singular (cf. (20a)). This fact also remains a puzzle in Kaufman’s analysis.

By contrast, the fact falls out naturally in my analysis. As argued in the previous section, sentences in which the agent occurs preverbally are not bare passive but bare active, in which the

person marking is subject agreement. The person marking *ya* in (28) is meant to serve as a subject agreement marker. However, according to the paradigm in (27), the relevant agreement marker is \emptyset , hence the ungrammaticality.

This analysis is supported by the fact that *ya* cannot occur in intransitives either, as shown in (30). Again, the third person subject agreement must be \emptyset , but not *ya*.

- (30)a. *tódé=nan ka=(*ya-)teri*’.
 child=that PST=Agr.3SG-fall
 ‘That child fell.’
 b. *ka=(*ya-)teri tódé=nan*.
 PST=Agr.3SG-fall child=that
 ‘That child fell.’ (Shiohara 2016: 259)

As expected from the subject agreement paradigm in (27), person markings can occur in intransitives if the subject is first or second person, as in (31).

- (31)a. *ka=ku-tunóng aku*.
 PST=Agr.1SG-sleep 1SG
 ‘I slept.’ (Shiohara 2013: 148)
 b. *mu-gera kau*.
 Agr.2SG-beautiful 2SG
 ‘You become beautiful.’ (Shiohara 2006: 138)

Furthermore, the same subject agreement pattern is observed in antipassives, in which the agent is the subject.

- (32)a. *ka=ku-ng-inóm aku*.
 PST=Agr.1SG-ANTIP-drink 1SG
 ‘I drank (something).’ (Shiohara 2013: 148)
 b. *ka=mò mu-mangan*?⁹
 PST=MOD Arg.2SG-eat.ANTIP
 ‘Have you eaten yet?’ (Shiohara 2006: 218)
 c. *ka=(*ya-)ng-inóm nya=Amén*.
 PST=Agr.3SG-ANTIP-drink TITLE=Amin
 ‘Amin drank (something).’ (Shiohara 2013: 149)

To summarize, it is empirically more plausible to analyse the person markings as argument clitic DPs in bare passives and subject agreement markers elsewhere (e.g. bare actives, intransitives and antipassives) rather than as ergative case agreement markers throughout.

⁹ The subject *kau* ‘you’ is not expressed explicitly in this sentence. The antipassive form of *kakan* ‘to eat’ is not *ngakan* but a suppletive form, i.e. *mangan*.

5. Conclusion and implications

To conclude, what Kaufman (2017) regards as ergative extraction is in fact subject extraction from bare active clauses. Sumbawa never allows ergative extraction. Therefore, the language does not provide an exception to the widespread ergative extraction restriction, contrary to Kaufman's claim, but rather corroborates its tenacity. We have seen that many insights can be gained by treating the restriction as an unbreakable rule.

Lastly, I discuss three implications of the analysis presented in this paper. First, my analysis of the basic construction in Sumbawa (5) as 'passive + clitic doubling' lends further support to clitic doubling analyses of passives (Baker, Johnson, and Roberts 1989; Nomoto 2016), alongside other languages such as Balinese, Besemah and Classical Malay. These languages provide clear evidence that the 'by' phrase in passives doubles the agent clitic on the verb. This is difficult to prove in languages such as English and Modern Malay because no overt clitic pronoun occurs in any passive subtypes (English) or in passive subtypes with a 'by' phrase (Modern Malay).

Second, Sumbawa provides another instance of covert active-passive alternation. Notice that in (36) below, the voice is not overtly marked (captured by the \emptyset Voice head) in either the active (36a) or the passive (36b).

- (36)a. [TP aku ka= [VoiceP \emptyset [VP (ku-)inóm kawa=nan]]].
 1SG PST Agr.1SG-drink coffee=that
 'As for me, I drank the coffee.' (Shiohara 2013: 149)
- b. [TP ka= [VoiceP \emptyset [VP ku=inóm kawa=nan] [PP ling aku]]].
 PST 1SG=drink coffee=that by 1SG
 'I drank the coffee.' (Shiohara 2013: 148)

Covert active-passive voice alternation has also been reported in related languages in the region, such as Manggarai (Arka and Kosmas 2005), Acehnese (Legate 2012) and Malay (Nomoto and Kartini 2012). (37) shows examples from Malay.¹¹

- (37)a. Polis ter-tangkap lelaki itu. Malay
 police TER-catch man that
 'The police arrested the man by mistake.'
- b. Lelaki itu ter-tangkap (oleh) polis.
 man that TER-catch by police
 'The man was mistakenly arrested by the police.' (Nomoto and Kartini 2012: 377)

Third, this study offers a new view of the Sumbawa voice system. Shiohara (2013) describes that Sumbawa possesses only one transitive construction, which was identified as the bare passive in this study. However, I have shown that the language in fact has another transitive construction, the bare active. Shiohara does not regard the bare active as a distinct voice construction, but as derived from the bare passive by means of topicalization. However, her analysis faces the same problems as Kaufman's, such as the mysterious loss of the preposition *ling* 'by' and the third person marking *ya* on the verb (cf. sections 4.3.2–4.3.3).

¹¹ The prefix *ter-* is often described as a passive voice marker. However, this example clearly shows that it is not. The prefix also occurs in an active sentence, as in (37a).

used verbs such as *makan* ‘to eat’ and *minum* ‘to drink’ are used in their bare stem forms rather than morphologically active forms such as *me-makan* [ACT-eat] and *me-minum* [ACT-drink]. The antipassive was lost as a result of the convergence. Sumbawa has the three voice constructions indicated in **boldface**. Therefore, it can be said that Sumbawa represents an early stage of the change from an ergative system to the Indonesian-type voice system as we now know it.

References

- Adelaar, Alexander. 2005. Much ado about *di-*. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 161:127–142.
- Aissen, Judith. 2017. Correlates of ergativity in Mayan. In *The Oxford handbook of ergativity*, ed. Jessica Coon, Diane Massam, and Lisa Demena Travis, 737–758. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aldridge, Edith. 2008. Phase-based account of extraction in Indonesian. *Lingua* 118:1440–1469.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2017. Clitic doubling. In *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, ed. Martin Everaert and Henk van Riemsdijk. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2nd edition.
- Arka, I Wayan, and Jeladu Kosmas. 2005. Passive without passive morphology? Evidence from Manggarai. In *The Many Faces of Austronesian Voice Systems: Some New Empirical Studies*, ed. I Wayan Arka and Malcolm Ross, 87–117. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Artawa, I Ketut. 1998. *Ergativity and Balinese Syntax*, volumes 42–44 of *NUSA*. Jakarta: Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya.
- Baker, Mark, Kyle Johnson, and Ian Roberts. 1989. Passive arguments raised. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20:219–251.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A'-Dependencies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Eberhard, David M., Gary F. Simons, and Charles D. Fennig, ed. 2021. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*. Dallas, TX: SIL International, 24th edition. URL <http://www.ethnologue.com>.
- Imanishi, Yusuke. 2020. Parameterizing split ergativity in Mayan. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 38:151–200.
- Jaeggli, Osvaldo A. 1986. Three issues in the theory of clitics: Case, doubled NPs, and extraction. In *The Syntax of Pronominal Clitics*, ed. Hagit Borer, 15–42. New York: Academic Press.
- Kaufman, Daniel. 2017. Lexical category and alignment in Austronesian. In *The Oxford Handbook of Ergativity*, ed. Jessica Coon, Diane Massam, and Lisa Demena Travis, 589–628. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Legate, Julie Anne. 2012. Subjects in Acehnese and the nature of the passive. *Language* 88:495–525.
- Maekawa, Kikuo, Makoto Yamazaki, Toshinobu Ogiso, Takehiko Maruyama, Hideki Ogura, Wakako Kashino, Hanae Koiso, Masaya Yamaguchi and Makiro Tanaka, and Yasuharu Den. 2014. Balanced corpus of contemporary written Japanese. *Language Resources and Evaluation* 48:345–371.
- Mahsun. 1999. Variasi dialektal bahasa Sumbawa—Kajian dialektologi diakronis [Dialect variation in Sumbawa—A study of diachronic dialectology]. MS.
- McDonnell, Bradley James. 2016. Symmetrical Voice Constructions in Besemah: A Usage-Based Approach. Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Santa Barbara.

- Nomoto, Hiroki. 2016. Passives and clitic doubling: A view from Classical Malay. In *AFLA 23: The Proceedings of the 23rd Meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association*, ed. Hiroki Nomoto, Takuya Miyauchi, and Asako Shiohara, 179–193. Canberra: Asia-Pacific Linguistics.
- Nomoto, Hiroki. 2018. The development of the English-type passive in Balinese. In *Language and Culture on Java and Its Environs*, ed. Jozina Vander Klok and Thomas J. Conners, volume 19 of *Wacana*, 122–148. Jakarta: Universitas Indonesia. URL http://www.tufts.ac.jp/ts/personal/nomoto/Passive_in_Balinese_reviewed-final.pdf.
- Nomoto, Hiroki. 2021. Bare passive agent hierarchy. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association*, ed. Henrison Hsieh and Keely New. Ontario: University of Western Ontario.
- Nomoto, Hiroki, and Kartini Abd. Wahab. 2012. *Kena* adversative passives in Malay, funny control, and covert voice alternation. *Oceanic Linguistics* 51:360–386.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 2008. Relativization in Sasak and Sumbawa, eastern Indonesia. *Language and Linguistics* 9:865–916.
- Shiohara, Asako. 2006. *Sumbawago no Bunpoo* [A Grammar of Sumbawa]. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Tokyo.
- Shiohara, Asako. 2013. Voice in the Sumbawa Besar dialect of Sumbawa. In *Voice Variation in Austronesian Languages of Indonesia*, ed. Alexander Adelaar, volume 54 of *NUSA*, 145–158. Jakarta and Tokyo: Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya and Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Shiohara, Asako. 2016. Pseudo-cleft constructions in the Sumbawa Besar dialect of Sumbawa. In *AFLA 23: The Proceedings of the 23rd Meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association*, ed. Hiroki Nomoto, Takuya Miyauchi, and Asako Shiohara, 258–272. Canberra: Asia-Pacific Linguistics.