

SUBJECT AND PREVERBAL NOMINALS IN SASAK NGENO-NGENE PANCOR

Nur Ahmady
Universitas Mataram

Abstract

This paper deals with the description and analysis of the preverbal nominals in basic intransitive and transitive clause in Sasak. Regarding to the variation found between syntactically accusative and ergative clauses in Sasak, this paper makes use of the LFG's model of distinguishing the grammatical subject (subject for short) from the argument subject, the relation determined by semantic hierarchy at the D-structure (A-subject). This distinction allows us to explain the status of postverbal agent argument of objective voice (OV) in patient focus construction (PF). It is argued then that the preverbal arguments in OV and AV hold subject function. Its subjecthood is testified further by applying raising, equi NP deletion (PRO), and relativization. The tests prove that preverbal NPs constitute the subject and this makes us conclude that Sasak is syntactically ergative.

Abstrak

Tulisan ini menoba menjabarkan dan menganalisis subjek bahasa Sasak dengan membandingkan perilaku nominal preverbal yang terdapat pada klausa transitif dan intransitive. Tulisan ini memanfaatkan model kerja LFG yang membedakan subjek gramatikal (disingkat S) dengan subjek argument (subjek-A). Perbedaan ini bermanfaat untuk memformulasikan variasi yang ditemukan antara klausa yang secara sintaktis ergative dan akusatif, Terkait dengan fenomena bahasa Sasak, perbedaan jenis subjek model LFG mampu menjelaskan status gramatikal argument agen praverbal dalam konstruksi transitif dengan diatesis objektif (OV) di mana pasien alih-alih agent mendapat posisi focus. Atas dasar model LFG, tulisan ini menetapkan bahwa argument preverbal dalam konstruksi OV dan AV berfungsi sebagai subjek grammatical. Kesubjekkan argument preverbal tersebut dibuktikan dalam konstruksi raising, pelepasan NP (PRO), dan perelatifan. Pengujian dengan ketiga jenis proses sintaksis ini membuktikan bahwa NP praverbal berperilaku sebagai subjek and bahasa Sasak tergolong sebagai bahasa yang secara sintaksis berpola ergative.

Kata kunci: subjek, subjek argument, diatesis objektif,, Ergativiti, Akusatif.

1. Overview

The category of subject has long been controversial issues in contemporary linguistics. This centers on explaining subjects and their properties. For functionalist approaches, it is not clear what the functional properties of subjects are that set them apart from other function (i.e. object). From a typological perspective, the mystery of subjects is even deeper, as different language types appear to deploy subject properties in different (but systematic) ways (Falk, 2001). As a result of the discoveries of ergative languages (Dixon) , Philippine-type languages (Schachter; Kroeger) , active languages (Durie 1987), and the like, interesting questions have been raised about the properties of subjects, the representation of subjects, and even the cross-linguistic validity of “subject” as an element of linguistic description.

Problems have arisen because the concept “subject” originates in traditional studies of classical Indo-European languages such as English, Greek and Latin, languages which are closely related genetically, areally, and typologically. In the languages like Dyirbal (ergative), it is the lower function which behaves syntactically as subject. The ‘subject’ behavior of this nominal accord the syntactic test for subject such relativisation, raising and equi-control. For this language, a term pivot is proposed in addition to subject to refer to purely syntactic operation which is with no D-structure and maintains subject for semantic-syntactic category (Dixon 1994; Falk 2001). In Acehnese (active language) the nominal characteristics which comprises subject splits and is much determined by semantic-pragmatic nature of the nominal. This motivates Siewierska and Baker (2004) to avoid subject analysis for active language and proposes macro-roles (actor-undergoer) instead.

There are approaches practiced in relation to the description on subject. Keenan offered empirical behavior of nominals showing subject properties and published list of subject properties. Unfortunately, the lists confuse syntactic properties with both semantic and pragmatic aspects. A more systematic approach is proposed by Dixon who proposed syntactic based properties as pivot and the semantic-syntactic properties as universal subject. This paper doesn’t uses the function pivot, however, because the nominal properties being studied cover both the local and non local behavior of subject. Instead, as it is explained below, category subject is used to cover the purely syntactic properties, and adopts a-structure for the one derived from semantic representation in argument structure.

Another approach worth mentioning here is the one practiced among Chomskyan model for configurational languages but has been testified for non-configurational by Marantz (in Visser 2006). In Chomskyan tradition, the subject is taken as external constituent in relation to VP and object function is interpreted as being internal to the VP. However, this approach should be modified, because what makes external relation to the VP in transitive construction is not the A but the O. The fact has been exposed widely in relation to Ergative and Philippine type (Austronesian) languages.

Finally, the last approach and this is the widely accommodated approach is an LFG model under Inverse Mapping Theory conducted by Arka, Arka and Manning, Arka and Weschler (1998). This practice serves double function in relation to the issues raised in this paper. In one, the object of study (Balinese) is closely related to language observed (Sasak), in the second, the category distinction as subject and a-subject is assumed to be readily workable for the alternate basic transitive constructions in Sasak.

2 Conceptual Operation

2.1 The category of ‘subject’ and Voice marking

The problem in identifying of the category ‘subject’ arose controversies especially after the presentation of syntactic phenomena of nominals in ergative languages. This struck the well-established formulation of this category which evolved in the context of accusative languages. The ‘subject’ of a sentence Accusative system is that NP whose referent could be the ‘agent’ that initiates and controls an activity, the subject NP is normally obligatory in a sentence, receives the unmarked case, may be cross-referenced in the verb, and *is the pivot for operations of coordination and subordination*. In Contrary, for ergative system it is the internal argument (patient) which behaves as the subject. This motivates Trubetzkoy (1939) to conclude:” that if O received the same case marking as S, then it must be subject”. Keenan (1976) followed a similar line of argumentation in taking ‘absolute NP’ as subject for Dyrbal it bears unmarked case, is obligatory, is the pivot for most syntactic operations. In Dyrbal, this ‘subject’ relates to S and O, not S and A functions.

In line with Dixon, Trubetsky, but with different theoretical model, lexical functional Grammar, Arka and Wechsler (1998) analyse the Preverbal Nominal of transitive in objective voice verb (OV) as grammatical subject while maintaining the semantic relation of postverbal agent as A-SUBJECT. This terminological distinction is crucial to avoid the confusion between the so called OV verb and the Passive construction. OV verb is indicated by the absence of prefix, and AV verb is marked by voice marking agent N-. OV is distinguished from Passive by the fact that the agent is not marked morphologically by passive marker (te- in Sasak passive) and the agent is obligatory and hold core argument to the predicate. This contrast with the canonical passive which specifically marks the verb and ousted the agent to chomeur status (see Siewierska 1987).

Such demoted role of agentive relation cannot be observed in Sasak transitive constructions.ⁱ (see Ahmadi 1997; 2000).

2.2 Privilege syntactic argument and neutralization

A subject is a grammatical relation as a result of unification of *semantic roles* such agent (A), patient (P) that are neutralized for syntactic purposes”. The syntax of a language selects the verbal argument as a *privileged syntactic argument* (PSA), the SUBJECT. The roles patients and agent expressed by *John* in the following sentences are said to be neutralized for privilege argument (subject) such as in *John fell* and *John kicked the ball*. Both the undergoer and agentive John is neutralized for the sake of privileging the argument to be SUBJECT. The contrasting situation is found in Acehnese, in which the argument mapping is not neutralized in the syntax, but is dominated by the semantic role of the argument.

() Acehnese (Austronesian; from Durie 1985)

a. Gopnyan geu-tém *jak*/*geu-jak.

3SG 3-want go/*3-go

‘He wants to go.’

b. Gopnyan geu-tém *hët/*geu-hët*.

3SG 3-want *fall/3-fall

‘He wants to fall.’

In Acehnese, the decision on the expression of the argument crucially depends on the semantic function of the argument of the embedded verb: Agents of the lower clause (italicized) get no

expression (Unergative), and Patients are expressed via a clitic (unaccusative). What we can note here is that agreement rule is based on individual semantic functions rather than on a neutralized set of them.

2.3 Subject properties

There have been properties proposed to identify the subject in a cross-linguistic studies. **The identification covers the coding (morphological) and behavioral properties (syntactic).** Morphologically, subject is case unmarked (nominative for A and S of intransitive verb) and the object is marked **accusative**, it triggers agreement to the predicate. Configurationally, subject is preverbal and constitutes the external constituent in relation to the predicate. In European languages, the subject is privilege function for highest semantic argument (Highest GF), the agent.

In complex sentences, the subject is the relation that constitutes the target for syntactic operation like raising (both for subject-to-subject and subject to object raising), equi deletion, target of deletion in coordinate structures and the control of reflexives. And in many languages, the languages in Indonesia, the subject is identified by means of relativization, because it is only subject which can be the gap in relative clause (Keenan and Comrie 1976).

However, the properties are commonly based on European languages (nominative-accusative). This make them problematic for ergative languages, and Austronesian languages. In languages like Sasak and Balinese, the nominal holding lower role (objective) seems to behave like subject in the OV verb construction.

2.4 Ergative-Absolutive and Accusative-Nominative

When in Nominative-accusative languages, the S of intransitive is treated in the same way (morphologically or syntactically) with the A of transitive, in ergative system, it is the S and the O/P which are unmarked (absolutive) while the A is marked ergative. The problem then is which nominals are to be taken for subject in ergative languages. Below, a comparison between English (nominative-accusative system) is compared with Basque (Ergative-Absolutive):

English	<i>He</i>	<i>called</i>	<i>him.</i>
	3:NOM	call:PAST	3:Acc

<i>He</i>	<i>died</i>
3:NOM	die:PAST

Ergative-Absolutive language: Basque?

Basque.	<i>Edalontzi-a</i>	<i>apurtu</i>	<i>da</i>
	Glass:Abs	broken	AUX-A3SG
	‘The glass has broken.’		

<i>Jon-ek</i>	<i>edalontzi-a</i>	<i>apurtu du</i>
Jon:Erg	glass:Abs	broken AUX-A3SG-E3SG
	‘Jon has broken the glass.’	

In English, the Agent and the argument of intransitive are similarly treated. Both are nominatively marked for case, sentence initial position. The O is marked accusative (him). While the reverse if observed in Basque. In this language, it is the S of intransitive is marked for absolutive (-a) and the agent is marked ergative (-ek).

3. Tests for subjecthood for Sasak

We assume that in Sasak, the subject can be distinguished from non-subject in term of structural position the NP holds. The subject in Sasak is held by the preverbal NP. To prove the assumptions, the paper proposes widely applied cross-linguistic tests of subjects such as controlee in equi deletion, raising (subject to subject and subject to object raising), equi-deletion, relativization.

3.1 Data presentation

3.1.1 The basic transitive clauses

Sasak has two basic transitive constructions. In one the agent nominal resides initial position and the patient is postverbal. This construction is called Agent Focus construction (AF). In addition, Sasak has two voices: Agent Voice (AV) and objective Voice (OV). The AV verb is marked byⁱⁱ N- prefix, which indicates the argument selected as the grammatical subject (hereafter subject). In the second, the OV verb, the preverbal nominal is patient argument and agent is placed postverbally. The verb is zero-marked for voice.

Example (1) is an AV verb and (2) an O V verb. The voice marking on the verb (in combination with the word order) indicates that the preverbal nominal argument is the subject. The subject of an A V verb is the agent argument (A) and the subject of the OV verb is the thematic argument (patient).

(1) Loq Pian m-jual empaq leq peken.

Pian AV-sell fish LOC shop

‘Pian sells fish in the market.’

(2) empaq jual Loq Pian leq peken.

Fish OV-sell Pian LOC market

‘Pian sold fish in the market.’

3.1.2 The basic intransitive clause

The following example (3) illustrate intransitive verbs. In intransitive clause, the sole argument functions as the subject. The verb is in OV verb:

(3) Loq Udin tokol leq kursi

Udin OV-sit LOC chair

‘Udin sit on the chair.’

The object is the argument of a transitive verb that is not the subject; for instance the object of (1) is empaq ‘fish’. On the contrary, the postverbal agent nominal of OV verb can’t be proven as object. Semantically, it holds the highest function in the hierarchy of argument structure (highest GF) (Comrie, 1976; Dixon, 1994). Therefore, the agent NP loq Pian in (2) is to be taken as the a-subject (a-structure subject), the subject on the level of argument structure representation (Arka (1998); Yehuda, N. Falk; Dalrymple (2000)). The postverbal A is not an adjunct either, because it is not a prepositional phrase or an adverb, it constitutes core argument to the predicate. The comparison of the sentences 1-3 indicates that the S of

intransitive (1) and the Thematic argument (objective) are treated in the same syntactic system (both are preverbal and the verb are in OV verb).

In the following section, the claim of preverbal nominal as subject will be testified in relativisation, raising and equi-control construction.

4. The Sasak preverbal Nominals

As mentioned earlier, the term subject unambiguously denotes, in this paper, the ‘surface’ or ‘grammatical’ subject. This includes an argument structure with no D-structure: the argument picked out by relativization, raising, and other ‘subject-oriented’ properties. This subject is distinguished from *the most prominent argument in argument structure, the A-SUBJECT*. In this section we show that the preverbal arguments of OV AV, and intransitive verbs group together as (surface, grammatical) subjects.

4.1. Relativization.

A widely attested framework to analyse nominal behaviour as subject is relativization. In the light of Keenan and Comrie (1977) Accessibility Hierarchy there exists a ranking on grammatical functions that constrains relative clause formation by restricting the grammatical function of the argument in the relative clause that is interpreted as coreferent with the modified noun. Different languages can set the border at different places on the hierarchy:

(2) Keenan-Comrie Hierarchy:

SUBJ > DO > IO > OBL > GEN > OCOMP

In some languages, the ones which allows only relativization for subject, the hierarchy can be used to distinguish subjects from all other grammatical functions: only the subject of a relative clause can be relativized. The latter is typical of the Phillipines type languages, and other Western Austronesian families.

In the hierarchy presented by Keenan and Comrie, Subject holds the highest rank. It follows from the hierarchy that if a language allows relativization at all, it allows subjects to relativize (Keenan and Comrie 1977). The most common strategy for nominal relativization in Sasak is by the gap strategy. In Sasak OV and AV verb construction, it is only the purported subjects that can be relativized¹, as shown in (4)a and (5)a. Objects as in (4)b and (5)b, and obliques, as in (6)b, cannot be relativized.

(4)a. Kanak beciq [si kekeq acong] ino.

person-DEF small [REL OV (OV (PF)).bite dog] that
the child whom the dog bit

b. *acong [si kanak beciq ino kekeq].

dog [REL person-DEF small that OV (PF).bite]
the dog that bit the child

¹ In addition to this, Shibatani (2008) shows convincingly that for the nominal to accessible for relativization, it must also hold topic relation in addition to being subject. In Sasak, the preverbal positioning of nominals is the strategy to make the nominal topic. In this way, the postverbal agent, although it is an A-subject, it fails to be the gap because it is not a topic. Thus the following is unacceptable: *Kanak beciq [si kanak ino kekeq____. In a similar way, the post verbal NP cannot be the gap if it is not a topic: *Kanak beciq [si Acong no ngekeq____. However, to avoid pragmatic discussion this issue is not to be elaborated.

- (5)a. Loq Udin [si mbaca koran].
 Art Udin [REL AV (AF).read newspaper]
 Udin who read the newspaper
- b. *koran [si loq Udin mbaca].
 Newspaper [REL Art Udin AV (AF).read]
 the newspaper that Udin read
- (6)a. Ia noloq kepeng=ne leq pawon
 3 AV (AF).put money-3POSS at kitchen
 'He put his money in the kitchen.'
- b. *Leq pawon si ia noloq kepeng=ne
 at kitchen REL 3 AV (AF).put money-3POSS
 'in the kitchen, where he put his money'

The gaps in RC can be perfectly acceptable if it constitutes preverbal arguments (the purported subject). The samples 4a shows that the gap in the RC is the patient nominal, and in 5a the gap is resided by the preverbal agent nominal. Thus, in Sasak it is the subject which can be the gap in RC.

4.2. Subject-to-subject raising.

Subject raising is characterized by the fact that the main clause predicate has one theta role (to the proposition) with no external (subject) theta role. The absence of external argument (theta) give access for the DP movement of embedded subject to move to the specifier of TP. This movement is intended, in English, for the sake of EPP (extended projection) and to get case (nominative Case). The predicate *is likely* in the followings only takes one argument: a proposition *that Jean left* as the predicate's subject. This embedded clause as a complement, and has an expletive *it* in subject position

- 7) a) [That Jean left] is likely. clausal subject
 b) It is likely [that Jean left]. extraposition

The expletives are not marked in the theta grid, as they don't get a thematic (theta) role or it's not external argument. In the clausal subject construction, the embedded CP moves to the specifier of TP, presumably to satisfy the EPP requirement that every clause has a subject. Predicate *is likely* does not have an external (subject) theta role, but does have a nominative Case feature to check. This means that the specifier of the higher TP is available for Case feature checking. *So there is a need to insert an expletive it* or move the CP [Jean to leave] *for EPP reasons*

- 8) ____ is likely [Jean to leave].

The sentence indicates that Jean gets its theta role from *leave*, not from *is likely*. Jean is going to leave, she isn't likely. What is likely is the whole proposition of Jean leaving. In short, there is nothing about Jean that is likely, what is likely is her leaving.

Raising to subject is known to be restricted to embedded subjects cross-linguistically (Dalrymple, 2001). On the other hand there do not seem to be any languages where raising is restricted to Topics only. In Balinese study, Artawa notes that the language has many raising predicates which allow raising only of the purported subject argument (1994). The same situation can be observed in Sasak. In Sasak intransitive verb example below, the subject *ia* '(s)he' can be raised to the position to the left of the matrix predicate *senggitan* 'seem':

- (9)a. *senggitan ia tindoq.*

seem 3 lie (a nap)

It seems that (s)he is lying.

b. Ia senggitan tindoq.

3 seem lie

(s)he seems to be lying.

Now consider embedded transitive verbs, first an OV verb (10) and then an AV verb (11):

(10) a. senggitan gati [kesalahan=ne seboq= meq].

seem much mistake-3POSS OV hide 2

It is very apparent that you are hiding his/her wrongdoing.

b. kesalahan-ne senggitan gati seboq meq.

mistake-3POSS seem much OV hide 2

c. ?*anta senggitan gati kesalahan=ne seboq.

2 seem much mistake-3POSS OV hide

In example (10)a the bracketed clause is complement of the predicate *senggitan* ‘seem’/‘apparent’. Since the embedded verb *seboq* ‘hide’ is in OV form, its theme *kesalahan=ne* ‘his/her mistake’ is the subject and its agent *meq/anta* ‘you’ is object. Being the embedded subject, the theme *kesalahan=ne* can be raised, as shown in (10)b, while the embedded agent *anta*, being a non-subject, cannot raise, as shown in (10)c. In (11)a the embedded verb *nyeboq* (N-*seboq* ‘hide’ appears in its AV form, so the arguments are reversed from (10)a: now the agent *anta* is the embedded subject and theme *kesalahan=ne* is the object.

(11) a. senggitan gati [anta nyeboq kesalahan=ne].

seem much 2 AV hide mistake-3POSS

It is very apparent that you are hiding his/her wrongdoing.

b. anta senggitan gati nyeboq kesalahan=ne.

2 seem much AV hide mistake-3POSS

c. ?* kesalahan=ne senggitan gati anta nyeboq.

mistake-3POSS seem much 2 AV.hide

As expected, the embedded agent *anta*, being the subject, can raise (as in (11)b), while the theme *kesalahan=ne*, being a non-subject, cannot raise (as in (11)c). In short, raising picks the subject of the embedded proposition, regardless of thematic role. To take another example, the predicate *becat* ‘quick’ has all the same raising properties shown above for *senggitan* ‘seem’. (12 a) gives the unraised version; in (12 b) the embedded subject has been raised, while (12 c) shows a failed attempt to raise the embedded object:

(12) a. becat tiang njual bale.

quick 1 AV sell house

b. Tiang becat ___ njual bale.

1 quick AV sell house

It is quick for me to sell a house.

c. *bale becat tiang njual ___.

house quick 1 AV sell

The raising predicate *sekat* ‘difficult’ provides a third example:

(13) Kelem ino loq Amat sekat medemang mata=ne

night-DEF that loq Amat difficult AV close eyes

That night, it was difficult for loq Amat to close (his) eyes.

In (13) the embedded subject loq Amat is raised. The sentence becomes bad if the object mata ‘eyes’ is raised instead:

- (13) *kelem ino matane sekat loq Amat medemang
night-DEF that eyes difficult loq Amat AV close

That night, it was difficult for loq Amat to close (his) eyes.

An anonymous reviewer has raised the possibility that our purported raising predicates are really adverbs. While we cannot absolutely eliminate this as a possible analysis, there are two reasons for believing that they are predicates and not adverbs.

First, they can appear in only three positions: sentence-initial (14)a, sentence-final (14)b, and immediately following the subject (14)c. Other positions are impossible, as shown in (14)d.

- (14) a. senggitan gati [ia meta-ang loq Amat pegawean leq Jakarta]
seem much [3 AV find.APPL loq Amat job in Jakarta]
b. [Ia meta-ang loq Amat pegawean leq Jakarta] ngenah sajan.
[3 AV find.APPL Loq Amat job in Jakarta] seem much
c. Ia senggitan gati metaang loq Amat pewean leq Jakarta.
3. seem much AV find.APPL loq Amat job in Jakarta
d. Ia metaang (*senggitan gati) loq Amat (*senggitan gati) pegawean leq Jakarta
3 AV find.APPL loq Amat job (*senggitan gati) di Jakarta.

It is very apparent that (s)he found loq Amat a job in Jakarta.

This distribution suggests a predicate, which can take a clausal complement (14)a, clausal subject (14)b, or appear in the raising configuration (14)c. This parallels raising predicates English:

- (15) a. It is likely [that she will find loq Amat a job in Jakarta].
b. [That she will find loq Amat a job in Jakarta] is likely.
c. She is likely to find loq Amat a job in Jakarta.

The raising predicate sekat ‘difficult’ has the same distribution:

- (15) a. Sekat [ia metaang loq Amat pegawean leq Jakarta]
difficult 3 AV (AF).find-APPL loq Amat job in Jakarta
b. [Ia metaang loq Amat pegawean leq Jakarta] sekat.
c. Ia sekat metaang loq Amat pegawean leq Jakarta.
d. Ia metaang (*sekat) loq Amat (*sekat) pegawean (*sekat) leq Jakarta

It is difficult for him/her to find a job for loq AMat in Jakarta.

In contrast, the placement of uncontroversial adverbial expressions like laeq ‘past’ is considerably freer:

- (16) a. (laeq) ia metaang loq Amat pegawean leq Jakarta..
past 3 AV find-APPL loq Amat job in Jakarta
b. Ia (laeq) metaang loq Amat pegawean leq Jakarta.
c. Ia metaang (laeq) loq Amat pegawean leq Jakarta.
d. Ia metaang loq Amat (laeq) pegawean leq Jakarta.
e. Ia metaang loq Amat pegawean (laeq) leq Jakarta.
f. Ia metaang loq Amat pegawean leq Jakarta (laeq).
‘(S)he found a job for loq Amat in Jakarta a while ago.’

Similarly, the manner adverb *tetu-tetu* ‘in a very hard manner’/‘with great effort’ (lit. ‘very-very’) can intervene between a verb and its object.

- (17) a. *(tetu-tetu) ia mantok gending no.*
 very-very 3 AV hit gending -DEF
 b. *Ia (tetu-tetu) mantok gending.*
 c. *Ia mantok (tetu-tetu) gending.*
 d. *Ia mantok gending (tetu-tetu).*
 ‘(S)he was hitting the gending really hard.’

So our purported raising predicates differ from adverbs in distribution. Moreover, the raising-type distribution correlates with the possibility of verbal inflection. For example, (18) shows that the raising predicate *becat* ‘quick’ accepts the causative suffix *-ang* and participates in the OV /AV alternation. Notice how the voice marking on the matrix predicate (m)*becat-ang* ‘cause to be quick’ determines the position of the subject of the subordinate predicate *m-bait* ‘take’ (namely *tiang*, the first person pronoun):

- (18) a. *becat-ang tiang mbait kepeng no.*
 OV quick-CAUS 1 AV take money-3POSS
 ‘I quickly took his/her money.’
 (Lit. ‘I made it quick to take his/her money.’)
 b. *Tiang mbecat-ang mbait kepeng no*
 1 AV quick-CAUS AV take money-3POSS
 ‘I quickly took his/her money.’
 (Lit. ‘I made it quick to take his/her money.’)

The NP *tiang* clearly bears a grammatical relation to *becat* since that NP’s position is regulated by voice marking. More specifically, the observed alternation parallels what we have seen for transitive predicates, where the agent NP follows the OV verb but precedes the AV verb. In contrast to *becat*, true adverbs cannot be inflected in this way:

- (19) *laeq* ‘past’ -> **laeq-ang* ‘past-CAUS’
rubin ‘yesterday’ -> * *rubin -ang* /**ng rubin ang* ‘yesterday-CAUS’ (OV /AV)
jemaq ‘tomorrow’ -> * *jemaq-ang*/**njemaq-ang* ‘tomorrow-CAUS’ (OV /AV)

The following sentences illustrate the contrast between raising predicates and adverbials:

- (20) a. *Ia gelis ketoq*
 3 quick go.there
 (S)he went there quickly.
 b. *Ia nggelis-ang ketoq*
 3 AV (quick-CAUS go.there
 (S)he made it quick to go there.

- (21) a. *Ia rubin ketoq.*
 3 yesterday go.there
 (S)he went there yesterday.
 b. **Ia ngrubin-ang kema.*
 3 AV yesterday-CAUS go.there
 (S)he made yesterday be the day to go there.

In short, the correlation between distribution and inflection suggests that certain Sasak elements such as *gelis/becat* ‘quick’, *senggitan* ‘seem’, and *sekat* ‘difficult’ are true raising predicates.

To return to the main point of this section, raising predicates pick out the preverbal NP for raising, whether it is the agent (of an AV verb) or theme (of an OV verb). This lends support to our contention that this argument is the subject of its clause.

4.3. Subject-to-object raising.

In the Sasak subject-to-object raising (SOR) construction, the subject of an embedded predicate is syntactically dependent upon the superordinate predicate. Consider this example (from Artawa 1994, p. 148):

(22)a. *Loq Amat taoq tiang uleq.*

(name)OV know 1 go.home

I knew that loq Amat went home.

b. *Tiang naoq loq Amat uleq.*

1 AV know (name) go.home

I knew that loq Amat went home.

The SOR verb *taoq* ‘know’ takes the embedded subject *loq Amat* as a syntactic dependent, hence subject to the same alternations as semantic arguments. Specifically, this ‘raised’ NP appears in the subject position of an OV verb (as in (22)a) or object position of an AV SOR verb (as in (22)b). (Note that in this case there is no possibility of an adverb analysis.) When the downstairs predicate is transitive then only our purported downstairs subject can raise into the higher clause. (23) illustrates this fact for all four combinations of AV and OV on the matrix and embedded predicates (all four sentences have the same logical relations, indicated by the translation below):

(23)a. *Ia naoq angkun loq Amat gen tangkep pulisi.*

3 AV know Amat FUT OV arrest police

b. *Loq Amat taoq=ne gen tangkep pulisi.*

Amat OV know=3 FUT OV arrest police

c. *Ia naoq pulisi gen nangkep loq Amat.*

3 AV know police FUT AV arrest loq Amat

d. *pulisi taoq=ne gen nangkep loq Amat.*

police OV know=3 FUT AV arrest loq Amat

He knew that the police would arrest loq Amat.

In (24) we have attempted to raise the embedded object instead of the subject, again taking all four combinations. This systematically fails:

(24)a. **Ia naoq loq Amat gen tangkep ____.*

3 AV know police loq Amat FUT OV arrest

b. **pulisi taoq=ne loq Amat gen tangkep ____.*

police OV know=3 loq Amat FUT OV arrest

c. **Ia naoq loq Amat pulisi gen nangkep ____.*

3 AV know loq Amat police FUT AV arrest

d. **loq Amat taoq=ne pulisi gen nangkep ____.*

Loq Amat OV know=3 police FUT AV arrest

He knew that the police would arrest loq Amat.

In short, only our purported subject can be ‘raised’ in the S-to O-Raising construction.

4.4. Control.

Control can be distinguished from raising in terms of the arguments it takes. In contrast to the is likely predicate in raising above, the predicate *is reluctant* takes two arguments: the person who is reluctant (the experiencer) and what they are reluctant about (the proposition). This means that *is reluctant* assigns a theta role to its subject. Because of this extraposition (expletive) constructions *is* impossible, and there is no need to insert an expletive or move the CP for EPP reasons. First, it is already marked for case (nominative) and further it is already an external argument to *is reluctant*. This explains why the following two sentences (an extraposition and a clausal subject example) are ill-formed with the predicate *is reluctant*:

- 25) a) *It is reluctant [that Jean left]. (where it is an expletive)
 b) *[that Jean left] is reluctant. (extraposition)

Both of these sentences seem to be “missing” the external experiencer role: the person who is reluctant.

The argument in control is called PRO (written in capital letters). PRO only appears in the subject positions of non-finite clauses, and the matrix predicate has already got subject. That's why there is no need to move argument. Control then is another classic subject test: in many languages only a subject can be controlled (Welchser and Arka 1998). Once again, in terms of Sasak only the pre-verbal argument, whether the Theme of an OV verb or the Agent of an AV verb, can be a controllee (the PRO):

- (26)a. Tiang melet [___ dateng].
 1 want come
 I want to come.
 b. Tiang melet [___ meriksaq dokter].
 1 want AV examine doctor
 I want to examine a doctor.
 c. Tiang melet [___ periksa dokter].
 1 want OV examine doctor
 I want to be examined by a doctor.

In contrast with the examples in (25), the agent in the following sentence is not the downstairs subject and cannot be therefore controlled:

- (27)a. *Tiang melet [dokter periksaq ___].
 1 want doctor OV examine
 (I want to examine a doctor.)
 b. ?*Tiang melet [dokter meriksaq ___].
 1 want doctor AV examine
 (I want to be examined by a doctor.)

Turning to *njanji* ‘promise’, in this type of commitment relation, the promise must have semantic control over the action promised (Farkas 1988, Kroeger 1993, Sag and Pollard 1991). The promiser should therefore be the actor of the downstairs verb. This semantic constraint interacts with the syntactic constraint

that the controllee must be the subject to predict that the controlled VP must be in AV voice, which places the Agent in subject role. This prediction is borne out:

- (28) a. Tiang njanji ngembeng loq Amat kepeng.

- 1 promise AV (AF).give loq Amat money
 b. *Tiang njanji loq Amat embeng ___ kepeng.
 1 promise loq Amat OV give money
 c. *Tiang njanji kepeng embeng ___ loq Amat.
 1 promise money OV give Nyoman
 I promised to give Nyoman money.

The same facts obtain for other control verbs such as paksaq ‘force’. In short, control also proves that the preverbal NP in Sasak is really a grammatical subject.

5. Conclusion

This paper has discussed the syntactic behavior of Sasak Preverbal nominals and arrives at a conclusion that the preverbal NP in Sasak constitutes the grammatical subject regardless of its semantic role. The voice marking on the verb selects the preverbal argument for subject. In AV verb, it is the A that functions as external argument (Subject) of the predicate and in OV the external argument of predicate is Objective argument and the A functions as argument structure subject (A-subject). In the absence of marking of adjunct (preposition), then both the AV and OV are considered to be basic. This is reflected by arguments’ core status in relation to predicate and thus ranks the highest position in semantic hierarchy. The subject status of preverbal NP and its external relation in the argument structure of the predicate is proven by its ability to fulfill syntactic test such as raising to subject, being the controllee in equi deletion, the argument which is the gap in relativization. This is true irrespective of the verb’s voice marking, which helps much in regulating subject selection.

References

- Ahmadi, Nur. (1997). *Tipology Sintaksis Bahasa Sasak Dialek Ngeno-ngene*. Denpasar: Udayana University. Unpublished Thesis.
- Ahmadi, Nur (2000). Meta-Split Bahasa Sasak Dialek Ngeno-Ngene. In Mahsun (ed) ‘*Prosiding Bahasa dan Budaya Melayu*. Jogjakarta: Penerbit ANDI.
- Arka, I. W. (1993). Morpholexical Aspects of the -kan Causative in Indonesian. Master’s thesis, University of Sydney.
- Arka, I. W. (1998). From Morphosyntax to Pragmatics in Balinese. Doctoral dissertation, University of Sydney.
- Arka, I.W. and Manning, C. D. (1998). On the three subjects in Indonesian: Evidence from binding. In On-line Proceedings of the LFG98 Conference (M. Butt and T. H. King, eds.). URL csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/3/lfg98.html.
- Arka, I. W. and Simpson, J. (1998). Control and complex arguments in Balinese. In On-line Proceedings of the LFG98 Conference (M. Butt and T. H. King, eds.). on line: URL csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/3/lfg98.html. Downloaded 20 October 2008.
- Artawa, K. (1994) Ergativity and Balinese syntax. La Trobe University.

- Artawa, K. & B.J. Blake (1997). Patient primacy in Balinese. *Studies in Language* 21:3, 483-508.
- Comrie, B., 1989. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Dalrymple, Mary 2001 *Lexical Functional Grammar* Published by Academic Press, Syntax and Semantics Series, Volume 34
- Dixon, R.M.W. (1994) *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Durie, Mark (1985) *A Grammar of Acehnese*. Dordrecht :Foris
- FALK, YEHUDA N. SUBJECTS [Tentative title] To be published by Cambridge University Press. On-line downloaded: 7 October 2008.
- Kroeger, P.R. (1993) *Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog*. Stanford: CSLI.
- Kroeger, Paul R. 1993. "Another look at subjecthood in Tagalog." *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 24.2:1-16. (pre-publication draft)
- Mithun, M. (1992) Is basic word order universal? In: D.L. Payne (ed.), *Pragmatics of word order flexibility*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 15-61.
- Mithun, M. (1994) The implications of ergativity for a Philippine voice system. In: B. Fox & P.J. Hopper (eds.), *Voice: form and function*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 247-277.
- Schachter, P. 1977. Reference-related and role-related properties of subjects. In *Syntax and Semantics* 8. *Grammatical Relations*, P. Cole & J.M. Saddock (eds), 279-306. New York: Academic Press.
- Schachter, Paul. 1976. The subject in Philippine languages: Topic, actor, actor-topic, or none of the above. In Li, (ed).
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1988. Voice in Philippine languages. In *Passive and Voice*, ed. Masayoshi Shibatani. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins pp. 85–142.
- Shibatani, M. (1988) Introduction. In: M. Shibatani (ed.), *Passive and voice*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1-8.
- Siewierska, A. (1999) From anaphoric pronoun to grammatical agreement marker: why objects don't make it. *Folia Linguistica* 33:2, 225-251.
- Siewierska, A. and D. Bakker (2004). 'Three takes on grammatical relations: a view from the languages of Europe and North and Central Asia' . *Proceedings International*

Symposium on the Typology of Argument Structure and Grammatical Relations.
Kazan May 2004.

Siewierska, A. 1998. Languages with and without Objects: the Functional Grammar approach.
Languages in Contrast 1.2: 173-190.

Taverniers, Miriam (2005) Subjecthood and the notion of instantiation. *Language Sciences*
27(6): 651-678.

van de Visser, M.A. 2006. *The marked Status of Ergativity*. Utrecht: LOT. On-line
<http://www.lot.let.uu.nl/> (download 01 October 2008)

Wechsler, Stephen and I Wayan Arka. 1998. Syntactic Ergativity in Balinese: an Argument
Structure Based Theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, vol. 16, pp. 387-
441.

ⁱ Oku jagur loq Dah. Even in the coindexing of agent by verbal clitic as in Oku jagur=ne isiq loq Dah, the optional feature of by phrase isiq loq Dah is overtaken by the proleptic function of the clitic (which contains information about the agent). In the sentence, clitic ne= is triggered by the postposed agent isiq loq Dah. Moreover, in daily communication, its frequency of formal mentioning is high, and thus is highly required to exist for the sake of structural cohesion. This indicates strongly that the agent in the OV construction still holds core status. In another word, the construction cannot be claimed as passive as it is understood in an established theoretical stance. Sasak has a passive in which the optionality of the agent is syntactically motivated (equivalent with English passive) (see Ahmadi 1997; 2000).

ⁱⁱ Voice in Sasak determines the syntactic functions and semantic roles of the arguments of the verb. Sasak has two voices: Agent Voice and objective Voice. Voice affixes on the verb indicate the semantic role of the subject (the preverbal nominal): in the AV the actor is the subject and in the OV the undergoer is the subject.

The term voice in many West Austronesian languages differs from the classical 'passive' in several respects, see also Schachter (1976), Kroeger (1993) for Tagalog, Bell (1976, 1983) for Cebuano, Artawa and Blake (1997) and Arka (1998) for Balinese. First: in West Austronesian voice systems the actor does not appear as an oblique NP or adjunct, but is still a core-argument, i.e. a term. In West Austronesian languages, verbs in the Undergoer Voice are still transitive; the actor is still a term. All that has taken place is a realignment of syntactic functions and semantic roles of the verb. Secondly: in West Austronesian languages the objective Voice is even the basic form indicated by the absence of verbal morphology. Thirdly: in West Austronesian languages, OV is usually just as frequent or even more frequent than the AV. In describing the voice system in West Austronesian languages, Ross (2002) refers to voice systems where both AV and OV are transitive as 'symmetrical voice'. I will follow Ross (2002) in using the terms 'voice' instead of 'focus' or 'topic', because this paper deals with syntactic phenomena of subject.