

Relativization in Sasak and Sumbawa, Eastern Indonesia^{*}

Masayoshi Shibatani

Rice University

On the basis of a detailed study of the relativization phenomena in the dialects of Sasak and Sumbawa in eastern Indonesia, this paper shows that the two crucial assumptions made by Keenan & Comrie on Western Malayo-Polynesian languages are untenable. That is, the Topic in these languages cannot be reinterpreted as Subject and that Austronesian non-Actor focus constructions cannot be considered passive. Both Sasak and Sumbawa, just like Standard Indonesian and other Western Malayo-Polynesian and Formosan languages, have two privileged but distinct grammatical relations Topic and Subject, and the fact that the Topic is most accessible to relativization in these languages falsifies Comrie & Keenan's claim that "in absolute terms Subjects are the most relativizable of NP's" (Comrie & Keenan 1979:653). The pronoun-retention strategy in Sasak and Sumbawa also falsifies their other universal: "All RC strategies must operate on a continuous segment of the AH" (p.661). The paper concludes with the suggestion that relativization in Western Malayo-Polynesian (and Formosan languages and many other non-Austronesian languages) involves nominalized clauses juxtaposed to a head noun in appositive syntagm; and this possibility renders moot the question of grammatical relations in relativization.

Key words: Topic, Subject, Western Malayo-Polynesian languages, relativization strategies, nominalization

1. Introduction

Austronesian languages, especially the so-called Philippine-type Western Malayo-Polynesian languages, have played no small role in typological studies of relative clauses. For example, Keenan & Comrie (1977), one of the most celebrated achievements in modern syntactic typology, and their closely related works (Comrie & Keenan 1979, Keenan 1985, Comrie 1998:ch.7) almost exclusively rely on the data from Austronesian

^{*} The research reported here was supported by the National Science Foundation grant BCS-0617198 for the project "Austronesian voice systems: an eastern Indonesian perspective" headed by the author. I am grateful to many of the speakers of Sasak and Sumbawa who helped my research on their languages. I might note that my language consultants in Lombok include Dr. Herman Suheri, a Puyung Meno-Mené speaker, upon whose speech the contributions to Austin (1998)

in establishing the higher end of the hierarchy of grammatical relations known as the Accessibility Hierarchy. Philippine-type languages are characterized in terms of what is known as the focus morphology that marks in the verb the grammatical role of a nominal element selected as the primary argument of a clause. With the crucial assumption that this primary argument is Subject in these languages, Keenan & Comrie observe that these languages obey the “Subjects-only” constraint representing languages that relativize only on Subjects, and draw the universal: “in absolute terms Subjects are the most relativizable of NP’s” (Comrie & Keenan 1979:653).

Philippine-type languages, where the more faithful reflexes of the Proto Austronesian (PAN) focus opposition are seen, are found in Taiwan and Madagascar, besides the Philippines. The PAN focus system is generally believed to have had three or possibly four categories of AF (Actor-focus), PF (Patient-focus), LF (Location-focus), and IF (Instrumental-focus); e.g. the indicative neutral series: Actor *-<um>, Patient *-<an>, Location *-<an>, Instrumental/Circumstantial *-<Si> (cf. Ross 2002:33). The four-way PAN focus morphological opposition has been reduced to a three- or two-way system in many of the languages of Indonesia (and elsewhere), where the two-way morphological opposition is seen in Standard Indonesian (Bahasa Indonesia), Javanese, Balinese, and others in terms of a nasal prefix (for the AF) and a zero prefix or oral form (for the PF). Keenan & Comrie’s Subjects-only constraint on relativization, which Ross (1995:730) believes to have obtained in PAN, is clearly seen in those languages with the two-way morphological focus opposition. The Actor nominal in an AF construction with a nasal verbal prefix and the Patient nominal in a PF construction with a zero prefix—both of which Keenan & Comrie would consider to be Subjects—are the only directly relativizable arguments in these languages. The two-way morphological focus opposition seen in major Indonesian languages, as well as in Standard Malay (Bahasa Melayu), is being gradually lost in Sasak and Sumbawa in eastern Indonesia. It is an interesting question whether the Subjects-only constraint on relativization has also been lost in the languages that have lost the morphological focus contrast, as in many dialects of Sasak and Sumbawa, and this is one of the questions addressed in this paper.

The paper consists of a descriptive and a theoretical component. It offers a detailed description of the relativization phenomena seen in various Sasak dialects and primarily two Sumbawan dialects. While typological studies such as Keenan & Comrie (1977) and others by necessity heavily rely on descriptive grammars of various languages, it is true

were almost exclusively based. This work will be critically reviewed below. My special thanks go to Nur Ahmadi for his assistance in gathering and interpreting the relevant data. I am indebted to Fay Wouk and I Wayan Arka, Co-PIs of the NSF project mentioned above, who have provided me with comments very helpful in improving this paper. I also thank Naonori Nagaya for expertly drawing the three maps in this article.

that most available grammars spend at most several pages on relativization. This study shows that describing the whole picture on relativization phenomena even in a single language requires the space of more than a few pages, and that facts crucial in drawing important generalizations are often not available in a short sketch found in many descriptive grammars. Another problem in relying on secondary source is that available descriptions may be incomplete or totally incorrect. Additionally, examination of more than one dialect of a language brings to light interesting variations that will not be available in a study of a single dialect. Below we shall demonstrate this to be the case in the currently available descriptions of relativization in Sasak and Sumbawa.

There is also a methodological issue involved in describing individual languages. While the American structuralist doctrine of analyzing each language in its own right without being influenced by the established grammatical traditions of Europe and elsewhere or by the structures of other languages is venerable, one cannot deny the fact that languages are a historical product showing continuity with their parent languages and similarities with their sister languages. Most Indonesian languages, for example, are Austronesian languages sharing their ancestors with the languages in the Philippines, Taiwan, Madagascar, and others that are more remotely connected genetically. The methodological stance taken in this paper is that we profit a great deal by viewing individual languages in a larger perspective that takes into account historical continuity with sister languages. We shall demonstrate that in describing Indonesian languages it is useful to keep in mind that the focus constructions and associated phenomena have the history of perhaps more than 6,000 years and may constitute an indelible Austronesian trait that may lurk in every grammar. In particular, we hold Actor-focus (AF) and Patient-focus (PF) constructions as construction types seen across Western Malayo-Polynesian and Formosan languages sharing crucial syntactic properties to be explicated in this study.¹

On the theoretical front, we make the following points. First, we show that Keenan & Comrie's two key assumptions regarding Austronesian languages are untenable. That is, the primary argument in Philippine-type languages, or more broadly Western Malayo-Polynesian and Formosan languages, is not Subject, and PF and other non-Actor focus constructions are not passive. We argue that these Austronesian languages have two distinct grammatical relations Topic and Subject, and that it is Topic that is relevant to relativization

¹ Here I have in mind recent studies on Indonesian languages such as Durie (1985), Klammer (1998), Donohue (1999), and Arka (2003), which would have been much more informative as far as their Austronesian characters are concerned, had they taken the stance advocated here. My recent fieldwork on a number of Central Malayo-Polynesian, including isolating languages of Flores Island, in the Nusa Tenggara region of eastern Indonesia does indicate that the Austronesian AF/PF **structural** (not morphological) contrast is far more widespread than has hitherto been assumed. Here and below, "Indonesian languages" refers to the Austronesian languages of Indonesia.

phenomena. These languages, in other words, do not fit in with the Keenan-Comrie framework of treating relativization in terms of the hierarchy of grammatical relations such as Subject, Direct Object, Indirect Object, etc.

Schachter's (1976) seminal paper on grammatical relations in Tagalog should have been presented by him and understood by others in a much more straightforward manner. Namely, Schachter's Actor category, embracing the S of an intransitive clause and the A of a transitive clause, could have been considered Subject in the first place, as this grouping of S and A is what constitutes the Subject category in English and others in which this is a well-established grammatical relation. Schachter's (and traditional Philippinists') Topic could have been recognized as a grammatical relation distinct from Subject. Languages possessing two privileged grammatical relations of Topic and Subject are seen in East Asia, in Japanese, Korean, and Chinese, where the former two have distinct particles (*wa* and *ga* in Japanese) marking a Topic and a Subject. A major difference between the Philippine and the East Asian situation is that Topic, in the former, is a much more grammaticalized category than in the latter in the sense that it is an integral and indispensable argument that plays many syntactic roles associated with Subject in those languages that have not grammaticalized a distinct Topic relation (see Shibatani 1991 on this point). This paper underscores this point delineating crucial distinctions between these two grammatical relations, which we claim to obtain in Indonesian (and Malagasy as well as Formosan) languages.


Indonesian languages, unlike their relatives in the Philippines, Taiwan, or Madagascar, are endowed with passive constructions that are useful in explicating the nature of PF constructions, though this advantageous situation has not been fully exploited in past studies of Indonesian languages. For example, Chung (1976), like many traditional Indonesian or Malay grammarians, incorrectly analyzes Indonesian PF constructions as passive. We show below that PF and passive constructions have distinct grammatical properties. Moreover, explication of the differences between them requires two separate grammatical relations of Topic and Subject, as suggested above.

Finally, we shall briefly examine the relationship between relativization and nominalization and shed some light on the nature of so-called headless relative clauses with the suggestion that they are better treated as nominalized clauses than relative clauses. We conclude this paper with the suggestion that relativization in Indonesian languages (and in many others) involves nominalized clauses juxtaposed with a head noun in appositive syntagm, rather than a full clause or sentence whose NP coreferential with the head undergoes movement/extraction or deletion. The suggested analysis, as it turns out, renders the question of grammatical relations in relativization rather moot.


2. Sasak and Sumbawa

Sasak is spoken on Lombok Island and Sumbawa in the western half of Sumbawa Island. These two islands lie immediately east of Bali in the province of Nusa Tenggara Barat. According to the recent study by Adelaar (2005), the Balinese-Sasak-Sumbawa group, together with Malayic and Chamic, forms a branch of the newly proposed Malayo-Sumbawan subgroup of the Western Malayo-Polynesian languages. From the point of view of genetic grouping and geographic distribution, Balinese, Sasak, and Sumbawa should ideally be studied together. (See Maps 1 and 2.)

Map 1: Map of Indonesia




Map 2: Map of Nusa Tenggara



This paper concentrates on Sasak and Sumbawa, which are likely to be genetically closer to each other than to Balinese. While Balinese maintains a two-way morphological focus contrast between AF and PF, the morphological focus opposition in transitive clauses has been lost in the majority of Sasak and Sumbawan dialects. There is a great deal of dialectal variation in Sasak, but the main division we are interested in here is between those that maintain the morphological contrast in transitive clauses and those that have lost it.² The dialects spoken in and around the town of Selong in the east generally appear to maintain the nasal/Ø morphological opposition similar to the focus system in other major Indonesian languages, including Balinese. Three dialects (Selong and Pancor Ngeno-Ngené and Suralaga Ngeto-Ngeté) studied to date by the author maintain the morphological focus opposition for most transitive verbs. The dialects that have lost the morphological opposition in the transitive use of verbs may still retain nasal forms, which may be used as an alternate to an oral form in a transitive construction, or may be used as intransitive verbs, as illustrated by the Narmada and Sumbawan nasal intransitive use in (4) and (6) below. Still, speakers of different dialects are likely to vary in terms of which nasal verbs have dropped out from their speech entirely. For example, my principal consultant of the Bagu Meno-Mené dialect has single oral forms *bace* ‘to read’ and *beli* ‘to buy’ in both transitive and intransitive use as in (5) below. She, however, retains both oral and nasal forms for *beng/ngebeng* ‘to give’ and *tulis/nulis* ‘to write’ used in the manner of Selong Ngeno-Ngené forms (4). The complex patterns like this are expected in an on-going change in the lexicon. As the transition from (4) to (5) suggests, the pattern of change at the construction level is that oral forms are gradually spreading across different construction types. The locations of the dialects sampled for this study are marked in Map 3 below:

² As shown below, dialect divisions with regard to the maintenance or loss of the focus morphology are actually not clear-cut. Sasak dialects have been named after their forms for the expression “like this-like that”. Four or five dialects so identified are *Ngeno-Ngené*, *Ngeto-Ngeté*, *Meno-Mené*, *Meriq-Meriku*, and *Kuto-Kuté*. There is, however, little linguistic evidence so far supporting this kind of dialect grouping (see Jacq 1998 for the relevant discussion). Indeed, the two dialects using the *Ngeno-Ngené* form that I have studied are different in the aspect crucial to our discussion. The Pancor *Ngeno-Ngené* near Selong in the east maintains the morphological focus opposition, while the Narmada *Ngeno-Ngené* near the provincial capital of Mataram in the west does not with many verbs. Because of such variation, I identify each dialect with a town name followed by the form for the expression “like this-like that”, as done here. It must be noted, however, that the number of speakers from each town that I have worked with to date is very limited and that much more in-depth work with a larger number of speakers needs to be done for a thorough characterization of each Sasak and Sumbawan dialect.

Map 3: Map of Lombok Island



- (1) Standard Indonesian (Bahasa Indonesia)³
- a. Saya **membaca** buku ini (N-AF)
 I N.read book this
 'I read this book.'
- b. Buku ini saya baca (Ø-PF)
 book this I Ø.read
 'I read this book.'
- (2) Balinese
- a. Tiang **mamaca** buku=ne (N-AF)
 I N.read book=DEF
 'I read the book.'

³ Abbreviations used in this paper are as follows: Ø: place where a relevant item is missing or a zero morpheme; 1: 1st person; 2: 2nd person; 3: 3rd person; A: transitive agentive participant; AF: actor focus construction; APPL: applicative; ART: article; CONS: consequence; COP: copula; DEF: definite; DO: direct object; FUT: future; GEN: genitive; IO: indirect object; LIN: linker; LOC: locative; LOW: low register; MASC: masculine; N: nasal AF prefix; NMZ: nominalizer/nominalization marker; NOM: nominative; NON-TOP: non-topic; OBJ: object; OBL: oblique object; OCOMP: object of comparison; P: transitive patientive participant; PASS: passive; PAST: past tense; PERF: perfective; PF: patient focus construction; PROG: progressive; REL: relativizer/relative clause marker; S: single participant of an intransitive clause; SG: singular; SU: subject; SUB: subject; TOP: topic.

- b. Buku=ne baca tiang (Ø-PF)
 book=DEF read I
 'I read the book.'
- (3) Selong Ngeno-Ngené Sasak
- a. Eku mbace buku ino (N-AF)
 I N.read book this
 'I read this book.'
- b. Buku ino ku=bace (Ø-PF)
 book this I=read
 'I read this book.'
- (4) Narmada Ngeno-Ngené Sasak
- a. Aku jengke-ng=ku bace/mbace buku=ni (Ø-/N-Transitive)
 I PROG-LIN=1 Ø.read/N.read book=this
 'I am reading this book.'
- b. Aku jengke-ng=ku mbace (N-Intransitive)
 I PROG-LIN=1 N.read
 'I am reading.'
- (5) Bagu Meno-Mené Sasak
- a. Aku nyenke-ng=k bace buku=ne (Ø-Transitive)
 I PROG-LIN=1 read book=this
 'I am reading this book.'
- b. Aku nyenke-ng=k bace (Ø-Intransitive)
 I PROG-LIN=1 read
 'I am reading.'
- (6) Sumbawa
- Sumbawa Taliwang
- a. Buku=sa ku=baca/macaca (N-/Ø-Transitive)
 book=this I=read/read
 'I read this book.'
- b. Sa' muntu ku=baca/macaca (N-/Ø-Intransitive)
 now I=read/read
 'I am reading now.'
- Sumbawa Besar
- a. Aku baca buku ta (Ø-Transitive)
 I read book this
 'I read this book.'
- b. Ta muntu ku=baca/macaca (Ø-/N-Intransitive; *baca* preferred)
 now I=read/read
 'I am reading now.'

3. Subject and Object in Sasak and Sumbawa

Subjects and Objects are both robust syntactic relations in Sasak and Sumbawa. The clearest indications for these categories come from patterns of cliticization. Whereas the pattern of cliticization of Subjects to main verbs varies somewhat from one dialect to another, cliticization of Subjects to auxiliaries is more consistent across Sasak dialects. All of them allow a Subject to cliticize to an auxiliary, although the cliticization may be optional or strongly disfavored by some speakers because of redundancy when a full pronoun occurs. Only Subjects can cliticize to auxiliaries.

(7) Puyung Meno-Mené

Intransitive Subjects

- a. (Aku) mu=**k** lalo jok peken⁴
I PAST=1 go to market
'I went to the market.'
- b. Mu=**m** lalo jok peken
PAST=2 go to market
'You went to the market.'
- c. Inaq mu=**n** lalo jok peken
mother PAST=3 go to market
'Mother went to the market.'
- d. Mu=**n** lalo jok peken
PAST=3 go to market
'S/he went to the market.'

Transitive Subjects

- e. Mu=**k** empuk Ali
PAST=1 hit Ali
'I hit Ali.'
- f. Inaq mu=**n** empuk Ali
mother PAST=3 hit Ali
'Mother hit Ali.'
- g. Mun=**n** empuk Ali.
PAST=3 hit Ali
'S/he hit Ali.'

⁴ Precise characterizations of the auxiliaries glossed as PROG, PAST, FUT, and PERF here and elsewhere require further studies.

The phenomenon of cliticization seen here is Subject-centered and includes not only intransitive S's and transitive A's, but also the P of a passive clause, while it excludes the A of a passive, as in exactly the same way the English Subject category does.

(8) Puyung Meno-Mené

Passive Subjects

- a. (Aku) wah=**k** te-empuk isiq Ali
I PERF=1 PASS-hit by Ali
'I have been hit by Ali.'
- b. Te-empuk=**m** isiq Ali
PASS-hit=2 by Ali
'You were hit by Ali.'
- c. Te-empuk=**n** isiq Ali
PASS-hit=3 by Ali
'S/he was hit by Ali.'

Some dialects, e.g. Puyung Meno-Mené, have a richer and fuller set of Object enclitics than some others with a more impoverished system, like Selong and Pancor Ngeno-Ngené, which have only a third person Object enclitic. Notice in the following examples from Puyung Meno-Mené that Object clitic doubling is also possible in this dialect. There is a clear boundary between an Object argument and an adjunct such that the latter can cliticize to the verb only after becoming an Object via applicativization as in (9h) below.

(9) Puyung Meno-Mené

- a. Ali empuk=**k**
Ali hit=1
'Ali hit me.'
- b. Mu=**k** empuk-e=**m**
PAST=1 hit-LIN=2
'I hit you.'
- c. Aku wah=**k** gitaq=**n** Ali
I PERF=1 see=3 Ali
'I have seen Ali.'
- d. Mu=**k** beng inaq kelambi
PAST=1 give mother shirt
'I gave mother a shirt.'

- e. Mu=k beng=**n** kelambi
PAST=1 give=3 shirt
'I gave him/her a shirt.'
- f. Yaq=k jauq buku=no jok **Siti**
FUT=1 take book=the to Siti
'I will take the book to Siti.'
- g. Yaq=k jauq-ang **Siti** buku=no (Applicative)
FUT=1 take-APPL Siti book=the
'I will take the book to Siti.'
- h. Yaq=k jauq-ang=**n** buku=no
FUT=1 take-APPL=3 book=the
'I will take the book to him/her.'

The Sumbawan cliticization pattern appears similar to the Sasak pattern, except that there is no third person clitic form (cf. (10e') below). Note that subject markers are proclitics, whereas object markers are enclitics.

(10) Sumbawa Besar

- a. Ka=**ku**=nanéng' aku (Shiohara 2006:57)
PERF=1SG.LOW.AFFIX=take.a.shower 1SG.LOW
'I have taken a shower.'
- b. Ka=**ku**=pukil=**mu**
PERF=1SG=hit=2SG
'I've hit you.'
- c. ...ada tau ka-ingo=**ku**, teris angkat=**ku**... (Wouk 2002:302)
exist person PERF-see=1SG then lift=1SG
'...there was someone who saw me, then lifted me...'
- d. Surat=nan **mu**=tulis
letter=that 2SG=write
'You wrote the letter.'
- e. Nya ka=alo ko amat
s/he PERF=go to market
'S/he went to the market.'
- e'. *ka=**nya**=alo ko amat (cf. (10a-b) above)
PERF=3SG=go to market
'S/he went to the market.'
- f. Aku na=i=pukul=**ku** ning Ali (Sumbawa Taliwang passive)
I FUT=PASS=hit=1SG by Ali
'I will be hit by Ali.'

Besides the cliticization of Subjects and Objects, there are a number of phenomena sensitive to the relational categories of Subject and Object in these languages. Postponing our discussion of the phenomena in which the Subject category plays a crucial role until a later section, let us examine the robustness of the Object category in Sasak. While basic Objects can be passivized, objects of prepositions cannot be. In order for such Objects to be passivized, they must first become Objects via applicativization—in the same way that these prepositional objects must first become applicative Objects before cliticizing to verbs. As examples (11b-c) below show, both Objects of a Double Object Construction can be passivized in Sasak.

- (11) Pancor Ngeno-Ngené
- a. **Loq Ali ngembeng** kanak=no buku ino (AF construction)
 ART Ali N.give child=that book that
 ‘Ali gave the child that book.’
 - b. **Kanak=no** te-embeng buku ino siq loq Ali (Passive)
 child=that PASS-give book that by ART Ali
 ‘The child was given that book by Ali.’
 - c. **Buku ino** te-embeng kanak=no siq loq Ali (Passive)
 book that PASS-given child=that by ART Ali
 ‘That book was given (to) the child by Ali.’
 - d. **Loq Ali ngirim** surat timpaq batur=ku (AF)
 ART Ali N.send letter to friend=1
 ‘Ali sent a letter to my friend.’
 - e. **Loq Ali ngirim-ang** batur=ku surat (Applicative AF)
 ART Ali N.send-APPL friend=1 letter
 ‘Ali sent my friend a letter.’
 - f. **Batur=ku** te-kirim-ang surat siq loq Ali (Passive)
 friend=1 PASS-send-APPL letter by ART Ali
 ‘My friend was sent a letter to by Ali.’

Finally, all these Objects (basic and derived applicative Objects in Sasak and basic Objects in Sumbawa—Sumbawa appears to have no applicatives), but not the Objects of prepositions, can be Patient focused, i.e. become the Topics of PF constructions. Remember that Pancor Ngeno-Ngené has a nasal/oral morphological contrast indicating the AF/PF structural contrast—the nasal AF construction has an A Topic, and the oral PF construction a P Topic.

(12) Pancor Ngeno-Ngené PF constructions

- a. **Kanak=no** embeng=na buku ino siq loq Ali⁵ (cf. AF form 11a)
 child=that Ø.give=3 book that by ART Ali
 ‘Ali gave the child that book.’
- b. **Buku ino** embeng=na kanak=no siq loq Ali (cf. AF form 11a)
 book that Ø.give=3 child=that by ART Ali
 ‘Ali gave the child that book.’
- c. **Batur=ku** kirim-ang=na surat siq loq Ali. (cf. AF form 11e)
 friend=1 Ø.send-APPL=3 letter by ART Ali
 ‘Ali sent my friend a letter.’

Notice that in these PF constructions it is still the agentive **Subjects**—not the Topics—that cliticize to auxiliaries, despite the fact that these postposed agentive Subjects, just like the passive agents, are preceded by a preposition *siq* being translated as ‘by’ here. Compare the following two sets of sentences:⁶

(13) Pancor Ngeno-Ngené

- a. **Loq Ali_i** wah=ne_i ngirim=ang oku surat (AF)
 ART Ali PERF=3 N.send=APPL I letter
 ‘Ali sent me a letter.’
- a’. **Oku** wah=ne_i kirim-ang surat siq loq Ali_i (PF)
 I PERF=3 Ø.send-APPL letter by ART Ali
 ‘Ali sent me a letter.’
- b. **Oku_i** wah=ku_i ngirim-ang loq Ali surat (AF)
 I PERF=1 N.send-APPL ART Ali letter
 ‘I sent Ali a letter.’

⁵ The form *siq* and its equivalent *isiq* in other dialects found in these constructions marking the agentive nominal is apparently the same form used in marking the agent of a passive clause. These two constructions, however, are different in that passive clauses have a passive morphology in the verb—see the passive forms in (11). The two also differ structurally in a crucial way as shown in the subsequent sections.

⁶ Translation of PF forms into English is problematic. Many Austronesian specialists translate PF forms into English passive sentences, but they are not really like the English passive in that the postposed agents of PF constructions, unlike the passive agents in English and in these Indonesian languages, retain high discourse relevance, as reflected in their syntactic status as Subject. Voice functions of PF constructions must be explicated in assessing the total grammatical properties of PF constructions. Awaiting further studies, English glosses for PF constructions are given in the active form.

- b'. **Loq** **Ali** wah=ku kirim-ang surat (PF)
 ART Ali PERF=1 Ø.send-APPL letter
 'I sent Ali a letter.'

4. Relativization

Having established the grammatical relations Subject and Object in Sasak and Sumbawa, we are now in a position to examine the relativization patterns in these languages. The two works most immediately relevant to our discussions are Eades (1998) and Shiohara (2000). The former describes Puyung Meno-Mené Sasak relativization in terms of the Accessibility Hierarchy (given below), and the latter Sumbawa Besar relativization in reference to the Dixonian S, A, and P. Both these languages have lost the morphological focus contrast in the majority of transitive verbs, with existing nasal verbs typically occurring as intransitive verbs.

- (14) Accessibility Hierarchy (Keenan & Comrie 1977:66)
 SU > DO > IO > OBL > GEN > OCOMP

After examining the relative clauses contained in examples like the ones below, Eades (1998:128-129) concludes his work on Puyung Meno-Mené relativization by noting that "[a]ll of the categories in Keenan & Comrie's accessibility hierarchy are accessible to relativization in Sasak, except for the Object of comparison" and that "[t]he process of relativization in Sasak is quite different from that in other Western-Austronesian languages, many of which can only relativize a syntactic Subject, and require some other form of promotion of the non-Subject to Subject in order for it to be accessible to relativization."⁷

- (15) Puyung Meno-Mené
 a. Mu=k gitaq acong [saq kakoq=em wiq]=no (SU; Eades 1998:124)
 PAST=1 see dog REL bite=2 yesterday=that
 'I saw the dog that bit you yesterday.'
 b. inaq kelor sebie [saq mu=n beli wiq] (DO; Eades 1998:124)
 mother eat chili REL PAST=3 buy yesterday
 'Mother ate the chili that she bought yesterday.'

⁷ Apparently Peter Austin, Yusuf Eades' teacher, has a paper entitled "Relativization in Sasak, eastern Indonesia", which he read at the Australian Linguistic Society conference in Brisbane in 1998, and in which he talked about the relativization phenomena in different Sasak dialects. To the best of my knowledge, this paper has not been published. It was not available to me.

- c. dengan mame [saq mu=k béng nasiq]=no (IO; Eades 1998:125)
 person male REL PAST=1 give rice =that
 tokol léq méje
 sit at table
 'The man who I gave the rice to sits at the table.'
- d. tunjang [saq isiq=n empuk acong isiq (OBL; Eades 1998:127)
 stick REL by=3 hit dog by
 kanak]=no léq atas méja
 child =that at top table
 'The stick which the child hit the dog with is on the table.'
- e. mu=k gitag dengan [saq acong=en (GEN; Eades 1998:128)
 PAST=1 see person REL dog=3
 kakoq Ali]=no
 bite Ali=the
 'I saw the man whose dog bit Ali.'

Eades believes that (15b) is a case of Direct Object relativization, (15c) a case of Indirect Object relativization, (15d) a case of Oblique relativization, and (15e) a case of Genitive relativization. Except for the Subject relativization case (15a) above, all the analyses proposed by Eades in (15b-e) are problematic. Indeed, further investigation shows that it is not the case that Objects and Oblique objects are straightforwardly relativizable, as indicated by the ungrammatical forms below.

(16) Puyung Meno-Mené

- a. inaq mu=n beli **sebie** wiq. (Eades 1988:123)
 mother PAST=3 buy chili yesterday
 'Mother bought the chili yesterday.'
- b. *Anak=no kelor sabie [saq inaq mu=n beli Ø wiq]
 child=that eat chili REL mother PAST=3 buy yesterday
 'That child ate the chili which mother bought yesterday.'

(16a), taken from Eades, is the transitive clause that he believes to be the basis for (15b). However, (16b) shows that Object relativization is not acceptable, in contrast with (15b). Note that in (16b), unlike in (15b), the actor is doubly marked by a full noun and a clitic on the auxiliary, rather than just by a clitic.

(17a) below illustrates a typical transitive clause with an oblique, in this case an instrumental NP marked by the preposition *isiq*. As shown in (17b), the oblique Object cannot be relativized in a straightforward manner, in contrast with (15d), which actually

is related to a more elaborate construction (see (55c) below) than to the simple transitive construction in (17a).

(17) Puyung Meno-Mené

- a. Anak=no empuk acong isiq **tunjang**
 child=DEF hit dog by stick
 ‘The child hit the dog with a stick.’
- b. *Tunjang [saq anak=no empuk acong (isiq) Ø]=no léq atas méja
 stick REL child=that hit dog by =the on top table
 ‘The stick with which the child hit the dog is on the table.’

What is identified by Eades as an Indirect Object in (15c) is actually the Object of a double object construction seen earlier (see (11)). Neither of the double objects of such a construction can be relativized straightforwardly, as shown by examples (18b-c) below. Again, note that in the ungrammatical examples (18b-c), A within the relative clause is doubly marked as a full noun and a clitic, while in (15c) A is only represented by a clitic.

(18) Puyung Meno-Mené

- a. Ali mu=n ebéng **dengan mame=no nasiq**
 Ali PAST=3 give person male=that rice
 ‘Ali gave the man rice.’
- b. *Dengan mame [saq Ali mu=n ebéng Ø nasiq]=no batur=k
 person male REL Ali PAST=3 give rice=that friend=1
 ‘The person whom Ali gave rice is my friend.’
- c. *Nasiq [saq Ali mu=n ebéng dengan mame Ø]=no potéq
 rice REL Ali PAST=3 give person male=that white
 ‘The rice that Ali gave to the man was white.’

Postponing our discussion of the relativization of the Genitive for now, we turn to Shiohara’s (2000) treatment of the Sumbawan relativization, which has problems similar to Eades’. Based on the following kind of examples, Shiohara implies that S, A, and P roles are all relativizable.

(19) Sumbawa Besar

- a. tentara=nan datang kalis=anosiup (Shiohara 2000:87)
 army=that come from=east
 ‘The army came from the east.’

- b. tentara [adé=datang kalis=anosiup] (S-rel; Shiohara 2000:87)
 army REL=come from=east
 ta=basingin pasukanan Bala Cucuk
 this=be named troop troop front line
 ‘The army which comes from the east is named “Bala cucuk.”’
- (20) Sumbawa Besar
- a. ya=beri tòdé=nan ling=tau=lokaq (Shiohara 2000:87)
 3=like child=that by=person=old
 ‘The parents love the child.’
- b. tau=lokaq [dé=beri=tòdé=nan] (A-rel; Shiohara 2000:88)
 person=old REL=love=child=that
 ‘the parents who love their children’
- c. tòdé [adé ya=beri ling=tau=lokaq] (P-rel; Shiohara 2000:88)
 child REL 3=like by=person=old
 ‘the child who is loved by his/her parents’

Shiohara (2000), however, leaves out the important fact that an A in clauses such as (20a), repeated as (21a) below, and a straightforward Object P in sentences such as the one in (22a) cannot be relativized.

- (21) Sumbawa Besar
- a. ya=beri tòdé=nan ling=tau=lokaq
 3=like child=that by=person=old
 ‘The parents love the child.’
- b. *tau=lokaq [adé ya=beri tòdé=nan (ling) Ø]
 person=old REL 3=like child=that by
 ‘the parents who love the child’
- (22) Sumbawa Besar
- a. tau=lokaq beri tòdé=nan
 person=old love child=that
 ‘The parents love the child.’
- b. *tòdé [adé tau=lokaq beri Ø] (cf. (20c) above)
 child REL person=old love
 ‘the child whom the parents love’

Thus, contrary to the explicit claim made by Eades (1998) and to what is implied in the description by Shiohara (2000), both Sasak and Sumbawa place severe restrictions on relative clause formation. Eades’ problem was that he failed to identify correctly the

structures underlying his relative clauses, whereas Shiohara did not examine all logically possible structures to see whether or not they all yield grammatical relative clauses. Upon closer examination of what is and what is not relativizable in these languages, it becomes clear that the relativization process in these languages is not very different from that found in other Austronesian languages with the focus morphology.

5. Focus constructions without focus morphology

It is a curious fact that neither Austin (2000) nor any of his fellow contributors to the two volumes on Sasak he edited (Austin 1998, 2000) has recognized the significance of the distinction between two types of transitive constructions and its relevance to relativization and related phenomena. They all clearly acknowledge the existence of two types of transitive constructions, as shown below.

(23) Puyung Meno-Mené (Musgrave 1998:92)

- a. inaq mu=n kelor sebie odaq
 mother PAST=3 eat chili green
 ‘Mother ate green chili.’
- b. mu=n kelor sebie odaq isiq inaq
 PAST=3 eat chili green by mother
 ‘Mother ate green chili.’

(24) Puyung Meno-Mené (Kroon 1998:111)

- a. Herman wa=n ebéng inaq klambi
 Herman PERF=3 give mother shirt
 ‘Herman has given mother a shirt.’
- b. Wa=n ebéng inaq klambi isiq Herman
 PERF=3 give mother shirt by Herman
 ‘Herman has given mother a shirt.’

- (25) Mataram (Austin 2000:6)⁸
- a. Aku mbeli balé
I N.buy house
'I buy a house.'
- b. Balé beli isiq lóq Ali
house buy by ART Ali
'Ali bought a house.'
- (26) Sumbawa Besar (Shiohara 2006:142, 143)
- a. Aku ya=kakan' tepóng=ta
1SG.LOW CONS=eat cake=this
'I will eat this cake.'
- b. tepóng=ta ya=ku=kakan' léng aku
cake=this CONS=1SG.LOW=eat by 1SG.LOW
'I will eat this cake.'

⁸ In fairness to Austin, we must point out that Austin (2000) does recognize the importance of the nasal/oral contrast in Ngeno-Ngené verbs and notes that this dialect "resembles Balinese ... in picking out the Agent for a two- or three-place zero verb for special treatment. Topicalization, question formation, relative clause formation, and purpose clause construction in Mataram and Selong Sasak are not possible when the pivot is a zero verb Agent." (14) But then he goes on to say that "[i]n the Menó-Mené varieties [which have lost the nasal/oral opposition in most transitive verbs] this restriction does not apply and any argument of a verb may be directly questioned" (16) and that "[i]n Menó-Mené Sasak [relativizations] a contrast is made between *arguments* of verbs...and *non-arguments*..." (17). It appears that Austin recognizes the AF/PF structural contrast for Ngeno-Ngené dialects, which preserve the nasal/oral morphological focus contrast in the verb, but not for other dialects that have lost the morphological focus contrast. Our point below is that the AF/PF structural contrast obtains even in those languages that have lost the morphological focus contrast and that it is not true, contrary to the claims in the quotes above, that in the Meno-Mené dialects "any argument of a verb may be directly questioned" or that the only contrast these dialects make for the relativization purpose is between arguments and non-arguments of verbs. As for the former claim, consider the form **Sai kamu empuk* (who you hit) 'Whom did you hit?', based on the AF construction *Kamu empuk Ali* (you hit Ali) 'You hit Ali'. This question form, which directly questions the Object of the verb *empuk* 'hit', was rejected by Dr. Herman Suheri, Austin's principal consultant for the Puyung Meno-Mené dialect. The correct form for this question would be *Sai mu=m empuk* (who PAST=2 hit) 'Whom did you hit', which is based on such PF constructions as *Mu=m empuk Ali* (PAST=2 hit Ali) or *Ali mu=m empuk* (Ali PAST=2 hit) 'You hit Ali'. Similarly, the form **Ape kanak=no wah=n kaken* (what child=that PERF=3 eat) 'What has the child eaten?', which directly questions the Object of *kaken* 'eat' was rejected by another Puyung Meno-Mené speaking consultant. The correct form would be the one based on a PF construction; namely, *Ape wah=n kaken kanak=no* (what PERF=3 eat child=that) 'What has the child eaten?' Notice that in these the verb forms remain the same whether they occur in an AF or a PF construction.

The (b) constructions above have been called “the *isiq* construction” by Kroon (1998) and “postposed agent constructions” by Musgrave (2000). These constructions strike Kroon (1998:105) as “a peculiar pattern that distinguishes the Sasak language from all other Western Malayo-Polynesian languages.” The fact that the neighboring Western Malayo-Polynesian language Sumbawa shows the parallel pattern of transitive alternation, as in (26), aside, a glance at Austin’s examples in (25) from Mataram—a Ngeno-Ngené variety, I believe—clearly indicates that what we observe here is the AF/PF structural contrast seen in Formosan languages and across many Western Malayo-Polynesian languages, including Standard Indonesian and Balinese. Notice that (25a) has a nasal verb form and (25b) the oral version. Observe the pattern of correspondence between the sets of AF and PF constructions here and those given for Standard Indonesian, Balinese, and Selong Ngeno-Ngené in (1)–(3) earlier. In other words, what we are observing here is the AF/PF structural contrast without focus morphology—except for (25), where we see the widespread morphological N/Ø contrast preserved. That is, in the (a) forms in (23)–(26) above the agent nominals function as Topics, while in (b) forms there it is the patient/goal nominals that have been selected as Topics. It is this pattern of Topic selection that qualifies these constructions as AF or PF, despite their lack of focus morphology, which signals such Topic choice in other Western Malayo-Polynesian and Formosan languages.

Eades’ findings are thus now easily explained. His DO and IO relativizations (15b–c) are actually cases of relativization of the Topic of a PF clause with a morphologically unmarked verb. Puyung Meno-Mené behaves in a manner exactly parallel to dialects of Sasak that have retained the oral/nasal morphological contrast in transitive verbs.

It appears that across Sasak dialects and in Sumbawa, PF constructions are preferred over their AF counterparts especially in a narrative or reporting of an event. This could simply be mirroring the Austronesian preference for PF constructions. AF constructions, however, are fully functional in these languages and could be used in answering questions like “Who ate the chili?” or “Who bought the house?”.⁹

⁹ Austin (2000:6) tells us that in the Praya dialect—a variety of Meno-Mené—“[w]hen the Agent NP is inanimate it must be expressed in an *isiq* phrase after the verb ...” and gives the following example in (a). He goes on to say that “[w]hen the agent is third person animate and the Patient is also third person ... then the *isiq* construction must be used ...” and gives example (b):

- (a) Mu=n léóp kalambi=nó isiq angin
foc=3 blow shirt=that by wind
‘The wind blew the shirt away.’
(b) Mu=n jelóq kelambi= nó isiq inaq
foc=3 dry.in.sun shirt=that by mother
‘Mother dried the shirt in the sun.’

All the consultants that I worked with including Dr. Herman Suheri, Austin’s principal consultant of the dialect of Puyung next to the town of Praya, report that while these PF constructions are

More crucial to our discussion of the relativization phenomena in Sasak and Sumbawa is the very fact that only the A nominals in the (a)-type sentence in (23)-(26) and only the P nominals in the (b)-type sentence in (23)-(26) are relativizable, and this is what was shown in (16), (18), (21), and (22) above. Just to make the same point, if we take (23a) and (23b) above, and try to relativize the P nominal in the former and the A nominal in the latter, ungrammatical forms result, as shown by the (c) forms below.

(27) Puyung Meno-Mené

- a. (=23a) **inaq** mu=n kelor sebie odaq (AF)
 mother PAST=3 eat chili green
 ‘Mother ate green chili.’
- b. dengan nine [saq Ø kelor sebie odaq]=no (Topic A relativized)
 person female REL eat chili green=that
 inaq=k
 mother=l
 ‘The woman who ate green chili is my mother.’
- c. *Sebie odaq [saq inaq mu=n (Non-Topic P relativized)
 chili green REL mother PAST=3
 kelor Ø] besar
 eat big
 ‘The green chili which mother ate was big.’

preferred in reporting the events, the following AF constructions are perfectly grammatical, and would answer questions such as “What did the wind do to the shirt?” or “What did mother do?”.

- (a') Angin mu=n léóp kalambi=nó
 wind PAST=3 blow shirt=that
 ‘The wind blew the shirt away.’
- (b') inaq mu=n jelóq kelambi=nó
 mother PAST=3 dry.in.sun shirt=that
 ‘Mother dried the shirt in the sun.’

Similarly, Musgrave (2000:50) reports that “when the actor is not a speech act participant ... and the undergoer is, then only a passive clause is possible” and gives the following example in (c) from Puyung Meno-Mené.

- (c) Aku te-gitaq isiq Ali.
 I PASS-see by Ali
 ‘I was seen by Ali.’

Again, AF form (c'), which Musgrave marks as ungrammatical, was found perfectly grammatical by Dr. Herman Suheri, Musgrave's chief consultant of Puyung Meno-Mené, who told me that such a form would be needed in answering the question “Who sees you?”.

- (c') Ali gitaq aku.
 Ali see I
 ‘Ali sees me.’

(28) Puyung Meno-Mené

- a. (=24b) Mu=n kelor **sebie** **odaq** isiq inaq (PF)
 PAST=3 eat chili green by mother
 ‘Mother ate green chili.’
- b. Sebie odaq [saq mu=n kelor Ø isiq (Topic P relativized)
 chili green REL PAST=3 eat by
 inaq] besar
 mother big
 ‘The green chili which mother ate was big.’
- c. *dengan nine [saq mu=n kelor (Non-Topic A relativized)
 person female REL PAST=3 eat
 sebie odaq (isiq) Ø]=no inaq=ku
 chili green by=that mother=1
 ‘The woman who ate green chili is my mother.’

The above pattern parallels exactly the ones observed in those languages where the AF/PF structural contrast is expressed morphologically as in Standard Indonesian, Balinese and Salong/Pancor Ngeno-Ngené Sasak. From nasal AF constructions, only the A Topic can be relativized, and from oral PF constructions, only the P Topic can be relativized. In the interest of space, only the parallel Standard Indonesian and Pancor Ngeno-Ngené Sasak patterns are shown below.

(29) Standard Indonesian

- a. Saya **membeli** rumah ini. (N-AF)
 I N.buy house this
 ‘I bought this house.’
- a’. Orang [yang Ø membeli rumah] (A-Topic relativized)
 person REL N.buy house
 itu teman saya
 that friend I
 ‘The person who bought the house is my friend.’
- a”. *Rumah [yang saya membeli Ø] (Non-Topic P relativized)
 house REL I N.buy
 itu baru
 that new
 ‘The house which I bought is new.’
- b. Rumah ini saya beli. (Ø-PF)
 house this I Ø.buy
 ‘I bought this house.’

- b'. rumah [yang Ø saya beli] itu baru (P-Topic relativized)
 house REL I Ø.buy that new
 'The house which I bought is new.'
- b''. *Saya [yang rumah ini Ø beli] pintar (Non-Topic A relativized)
 I REL house this Ø.buy smart
 'I, who bought this house, am smart.'
- (30) Pancor Ngeno-Ngené
- a. Dengan mame=no mbeli balé ino (N-AF)
 person male=that N.buy house that
 'The man bought that house.'
- a'. Dengan mame [si Ø mbeli balé] ino (A-Topic relativized)
 person male REL N.buy house that
 batur=ku
 friend-1
 'The man who bought a house is my friend.'
- a''. *balé [si degnan mame=no mbeli Ø] (Non-Topic P relativized)
 house REL person male=that N.buy
 ino baru
 that new
 'The house which the man bought is new.'
- b. Balé ino beli=ne siq dengan mame=no (Ø-PF)
 house that Ø.buy=3 by person male=that
 'The man bought that house.'
- b'. Balé [si Ø beli=ne siq dengan mame] (P-Topic relativized)
 house REL Ø.buy=3 by person male
 ino baru
 that new
 'The house which the man bought is new.'
- b''. *Dengan mame [si balé ino (Non-Topic A relativized)
 person male REL house that
 beli=ne (siq) Ø] ino batur=ku
 Ø.buy=3 by that friend=1
 'The man who bought that house is my friend.'

These parallel patterns conclusively show that both Sasak and Sumbawan dialects that have lost the morphological focus contrast in the majority of transitive verbs still maintain the AF/PF structural contrast seen in other Austronesian languages with the focus morphology. More significantly for our present discussion, the relativization process in both these types of languages still obeys the Austronesian syntactic constraint that only

Topics can be relativized, despite their loss of the morphological focus contrast. If Ross (1995) is correct about his conjecture that Proto Austronesian had this constraint, the constraint has a history of more than 6,000 years. It makes sense that a constraint of a long history would persist even among those languages that have lost or that are losing the focus morphology in very recent years, as appears to be the case with the Sasak and Sumbawan dialects.

6. Subject or Topic?

The conclusion reached above that the Topic relation is crucially involved in the relativization process in Sasak and Sumbawa is clearly problematic to the approach to relativization based on the Accessibility Hierarchy given in (14), which in turn is defined in terms of the grammatical relations Subject, Object, and others. There is thus good reason for Keenan & Comrie to consider Austronesian Topics to be Subjects. We do not want, however, to make this move for Sasak and possibly Sumbawa for several reasons.

First, as demonstrated above and below, there are robust Subject and Object categories in addition to the Topic category in Sasak and Sumbawa. If the latter were to be considered Subject, we would need a separate relational category for the group of nominals that control cliticization and other phenomena (see below). But the problem is that this group of nominals—S, A, and P of a passive—is exactly what constitutes Subjects in those languages, e.g. English, where Subject is a well-established syntactic category. The basic alignment patterns of participant roles (A and P), Subject/Object, and Topic in the three relevant constructions in Sasak (and Sumbawa) are as follows regardless of the presence or absence of the focus morphological contrast:

(31) Puyung Meno-Mené

a. AF-construction

Ali	bace	buku=ni			(A=SUB=TOP; P=OBJ)
Ali	read	book=this			
'Ali reads this book.'					

b. PF-construction

Buku=ni	mu=n	bace	siq	Ali	(A=SUB; P=OBJ=TOP)
book=this	PAST=3	read	by	Ali	
'Ali reads this book.'					

c. Passive construction

Buku=ni	te-bace	siq	Ali	(A=OBL; P=SUB=TOP)
book=this	pass-read	by	Ali	
'This book is read by Ali.'				

- Secondly, there are several phenomena besides relativization which require a clear distinction between the Topic and the Subject category. As in many languages, Sasak makes a distinction between two Equi-type control phenomena. The main predicate *mele* ‘want’, which permits an “unlike-Subject” in the complement clause, allows both AF and PF complement clauses, and the control pattern is based on the Topic category. On the other hand, main predicates such as *cobaq* ‘try’ and *suruq* ‘order’, which require a “like-Subject” in the complement clause coreferential with either the main Subject or Object, allow only AF and passive complements, and here the control pattern operates in terms of the Subject=Topic alignment.¹⁰ Let us first look at the former case with *mele* ‘want’ as a main predicate.

- ¹⁰ A small minority of speakers fail to make this contrast between the equivalents of 'want' and 'try'. Also beware of the fact that realis PF forms cannot be embedded under these predicates.

When this construction contains an “Equi nominal” in either A or P position of a complement clause, AF, PF, and passive clauses may occur provided that the gaps (marked Ø in the examples below) controlled by the main-clause Subject bear the Topic relation within the complement clause. In the examples below, the relevant full complement clauses are separately provided as (a’), (b’) etc. for ease of comprehension.

- (34) Selong Ngeno-Ngené
- a. Mele-ng=ku [Ø ngiduk Siti] (Ø=A=SUB=TOP)
 want-LIN=1 N.kiss Siti
 ‘I want to kiss Siti.’
- a’. [**Eku** ngiduk Siti] (AF)
 I N.kiss Siti
 ‘I kiss Siti.’
- b. Mele-ng=ku [ne=iduk Ø isiq Siti] (Ø=P=OBJ=TOP)
 want-LIN=1 3=Ø.kiss by Siti
 ‘I want Siti to kiss (me).’
- b’. [ne=iduk **eku** isiq Siti] (PF)
 3=Ø.kiss I by Siti
 ‘Siti kisses me.’
- c. Mele-ng=ku [Ø te=iduk isiq Siti] (Ø=P=SUB=TOP)
 want-LIN=1 PASS=kiss by Siti
 ‘I want to be kissed by Siti.’
- c’. [**eku** te=iduk isiq Siti]
 I PASS=kiss by Siti
 ‘I was kissed by Siti.’

When the “Equi nominal” of the complement does not bear the Topic relation as in the following examples, it cannot occur as a gap.

- (35) Pancor Ngeno-Ngené
- a. *Mele-ng=ku [Siti iduk] (Ø=A=SUB=NON-TOP)
 want-LIN=1 Siti Ø.kiss
 ‘I want to kiss Siti.’
- a’. [**Siti** ku=iduk] (PF)
 Siti 1=Ø.kiss
 ‘I kiss Siti.’
- b. *Mele-ng=ku [Siti ngiduk Ø] (Ø=P=OBJ=NON-TOP)
 want-LIN=1 Siti N.kiss
 ‘I want Siti to kiss (me).’

b'. [**Siti** ngiduk eku] (AF)

Siti N.kiss I

'Siti kisses me.'

The control pattern is different when the main verb requires a "like-Subject" in the complement that is coreferential with either the main-clause Subject or Object. Here, the gap in the complement must hold the Subject and Topic relations simultaneously as shown in the alignment pattern below.

(36) Selong Ngeno-Ngené

a. Ali nyobaq [Ø ngiduk Siti] (Ø=A=SUB=TOP)

Ali N.try N.kiss Siti

'Ali tried to kiss Siti.'

a'. [**Ali** ngiduk Siti] (AF)

Ali N.kiss Siti

'Ali kisses Siti.'

b. Ali nyobaq [Ø te-iduk isiq Siti] (Ø=P=SUB=TOP)

Ali N.try PASS-kiss by Siti

'Ali tried to be kissed by Siti.'

b'. [**Ali** te-iduk isiq Siti] (Passive)

Ali PASS-kiss by Siti

'Ali was kissed by Siti.'

The contrasting form to observe is (37c) below. Unlike (34b) above, in which the Topic relation is the sole relevant factor for the control phenomenon, it is ungrammatical. Notice that the P gap of a passive clause is possible, as in (36b) above. The contrast between the passive complement pattern in (36b) and the PF complement pattern in (37c) cannot be easily explained without recognizing the Subject relation in addition to the Topic relation, for the Topic of a passive clause and that of a PF construction would have the identical alignment pattern of <P=TOP> without the intermediary Subject/Object relations.¹¹

¹¹ Exactly the same PF/Passive contrast holds in Standard Indonesian (Bahasa Indonesia) and Standard Malay (Bahasa Melayu), indicating that PF constructions in these languages are not passive and that the PF topic is not a grammatical Subject contrary to the widely-held belief that they are. Observe:

Standard Indonesian/Malay

a. Anda/Awak men-cium saya. (AF)

You/you AF-kiss me

'You kiss me.'

- (37) Selong Ngeno-Ngené
- a. *Ali nyobaq [na-iduk Siti Ø] (Ø=A=SUB=NON-TOP)
 Ali N.try 3=Ø.kiss Siti
 ‘Ali tried to kiss Siti.’
- a'. [na-iduk **Siti** siq Ali (PF)
 3=Ø.kiss Siti by Ali
 ‘Ali kisses Siti.’
- b. *Ali nyobaq [Siti ngiduk Ø] (Ø=P=OBJ=NON-TOP)
 Ali N.try Siti N.kiss
 Lit.: ‘Ali tried Siti to kiss (him).’
- b'. [**Siti** ngiduk Ali] (AF)
 Siti N.kiss Ali
 ‘Siti kisses Ali.’
- c. *Ali nyobaq [Ø na=iduk isiq Siti] (Ø=P=OBJ=TOP)
 Ali N.try 3=Ø.kiss by Siti
 Lit.: ‘Ali tried Siti to kiss (him).’
- c'. [**Ali** na=iduk isiq Siti] (PF)
 Ali 3=Ø.kiss by Siti
 ‘Siti kisses Ali.’

Object-controlled Equi-constructions are similar to the Subject-controlled ones in that the deleted Equi nominals must hold both Subject and Topic relations.

-
- b. Saya anda/awak cium. (PF)
 I you/you kiss
 ‘You kiss me.’
- c. Saya di-cium (oleh) Siti. (Passive)
 I PASS-kiss (by) Siti
 ‘I was kissed by Siti.’
- a'. Anda/Awak coba [Ø men-cium saya] (Based on AF (a))
 you/you try AF-kiss I
 ‘You tried to kiss me.’
- b'. *Saya coba [Ø anda/awak cium] (Based on PF (b))
 I try you/you Ø.kiss
- c'. Saya coba [Ø di-cium (oleh) Siti] (Based on Passive (c))
 I try PASS-kiss (by) Siti
 ‘I tried to be kissed by Siti.’

(38) Selong Ngeno-Ngené

- a. ku=nyuruq le Siti [Ø ngiduk Ali] (Ø=A=SUB=TOP)
 I=N.order ART Siti N.kiss Ali
 'I ordered Siti to kiss Ali.'
- a'. [Siti ngiduk Ali] (AF)
 Siti N.kiss Ali
 'Siti kissed Ali.'
- b. Ku=nyuruq Siti [Ø te-iduq isiq Ali] (Ø=P=SUB=TOP)
 I=N.order Siti PASS-kiss by Ali
 'I ordered Siti to be kissed by Ali.'
- b'. [Siti te-iduq isiq Ali] (Passive)
 Siti PASS.kiss by Ali
 'Siti was kissed by Ali.'

If the gap in the complement clause does not bear both Subject and Topic relations, as in the following examples, the main-clause Object cannot control it.

(39) Selong Ngeno-Ngené

- a. *Ku=nyuruq Siti [Ali na=iduk] (Ø=A=SUB=NON-TOP)
 I=N.order Siti Ali 3=Ø.kiss
 'I ordered Siti to kiss Ali.'
- a'. [Ali na=iduk siq Siti] (PF)
 Ali 3=Ø.kiss by Siti
 'Siti kisses Siti.'
- b. *ku=nyuruq Siti [Ø na-iduq isiq Ali] (Ø=P=OBJ=TOP)
 I=N.order Siti 3=Ø.kiss by Ali
 Lit.: 'I ordered Siti (that) Ali kisses (her).' 'I ordered Siti to be kissed by Ali.'
- b'. [Siti na=iduq isiq Ali] (PF)
 Siti 3=Ø.kiss by Ali
 'Ali kissed Siti.'

The contrasting pair is the grammatical one containing a gap of a passive complement whose patient nominal has the alignment of <P=SUB=TOP> as in (38b) and the ungrammatical one containing a gap of a PF complement whose patient nominal is aligned in the manner of <P=OBJ=TOP>, as in (39b). Again, without the intermediary Subject and Object relations, which are separate from the Topic relation, these two nominals would be identical in displaying the alignment pattern of <P=TOP>, or <P=SUB> if the Topic were to be reinterpreted as a Subject. An analysis advocating such alignment patterns

would not be able to explain the observed contrast in a systematic manner.

Another phenomenon that requires the Subject/Object relations in addition to the Topic relation is relativizer selection in Bagu Meno-Mené, which demands a clear distinction between PF and passive constructions or between an Object-based Topic and a Subject-based Topic. If the PF construction were considered to be passive and its Topic were to be regarded as a Subject in Sasak, then there would be no distinction between (b) and (c) below as far as the role alignment goes:

(40) Bagu Meno-Mené

A=SUB

- a. **Dengan mame=no** gitaq dengan nine=ne (AF)
 person male=that see person female=this
 ‘That man sees this woman.’

P=SUB

- b. **Dengan nine=ne** gitaq=n siq dengan mame=no (PF)
 person female-this see=3 by person male=that
 ‘That man sees this woman.’

P=SUB

- c. **Dengan nine=ne** te-gitaq siq dengan mame=no (Passive)
 person female-this PASS-see by person male=that
 ‘This woman is seen by that man.’

This analysis would entail complications in accounting for the relativizer selection seen in Bagu Meno-Mené, where the distinction between the SUB=TOP and the OBJ=TOP alignment plays a crucial role—the former triggers *saq*, as the basic, non-derived SUB=TOP does, and the latter the *saq-siq* relativizer.¹²

(41) Bagu Meno-Mené

Ø=A=SUB=TOP

- a. Dengan mame [**saq** Ø gitaq dengan nine]=no amaq=k (AF)
 person male REL see person female=that father=1
 ‘That man who sees the woman is my father.’

¹² Besides Bagu Meno-Mené speakers, certain speakers of Ganti Meno-Mené make the same distinction between the Subject relativizer and the Object relativizer.

Ø=P=OBJ=TOP

- b. Dengan nine [saq-siq=n gitaq Ø siq dengan mame]=ne inaq=k (PF)
 person female REL=3 see by person male=this mother=1
 ‘This woman whom the man sees is my mother.’

Ø=P=SUB=TOP

- c. Dengan nine [saq Ø te-gitaq siq dengan mame]=ne inaq=k (Passive)
 person female REL PASS-see by person male=this mother-1
 ‘This woman who is seen by the man is my mother.’

Finally, describing Sasak relativization in terms of the AH has an unwelcome consequence for the following universal proposed by Comrie & Keenan (1979:661): “All RC strategies must operate on a continuous segment of the AH.”¹³

The relevant discussion revolves around the pronoun-retention relativization strategy in Sasak and Sumbawa. As widely recognized, many languages have more than one relativization strategy, such as a gap strategy—the one we have been following in this paper so far—and a pronoun-retention strategy, which leaves a pronominal copy in a relative clause. It is also widely acknowledged that the pronoun-retention strategy applies more readily in those positions in the AH where the recovery of the case relation of the gapped element is more difficult, namely at the lower end of the AH. Comrie & Keenan’s universal above requires that all available relativization strategies operate on a contiguous segment of the AH such that we would not expect a situation in which a pronominal copy is allowed in the OCOMP, GEN, and SUB positions but not in the OBL, IO and DO positions. But this is exactly what we find in Sasak, and possibly in Sumbawa.

As one might expect, the Sasak pronoun-retention strategy allows a pronominal copy to appear in the lower end of the AH, as the following examples of the relativization on OCOMP and GEN show.

(42) Pancor Ngeno-Ngené

OCOMP relativized

- a. Ganggasan ante isiq **dengan nine ino**
 tall you than person female that
 ‘You are taller than that woman.’
- b. dengan nine ino [si ganggasan ante isiq **iye**] ina-ng=ku
 person female that REL tall you than her mother-LIN=1
 ‘That woman whom you are taller than is my mother.’

¹³ Or the generalization stated by Keenan (1985:148) in the implicational term as: “If a given language presents NP_{rel} [a relativized NP] as a pronoun for any position in the Hierarchy then it presents NP_{rel} as a pronoun for all lower positions on the Hierarchy.”

(43) Bagu Meno-Mené

GEN relativized

- a. Otak **dengan mame=no** beleq
head person male=that big
'That man's head is big.'
- b. Dengan mame=no [saq otak=**n** beleq] batur amaq=k
person male=that REL head=3 big friend father=1
'That man whose head is big is my father's friend.'

The OBL position does not allow a pronominal copy, and neither do the two OBJ positions (see (64) below for an ungrammatical form with a pronominal Object clitic).

(44) Pancor Ngeno-Ngené

OBL relativized

- a. Oku ngirim surat timpaq **batur=ku/iye**
I sent letter to my friend/him
'I sent a letter to my friend/him.'
- b. *Batur [si ngirim=ku surat timpaq **iye**] pintar
friend REL N.send=1 letter to him smart
'The friend to whom I sent a letter is smart.'

(45) Bagu Meno-Mené

OBJ relativized

- a. Beng=k dengan **mame=no anak=k**
give=1 person male=that child=1
'I gave the man my child.'
- b. *Dengan mame [saq-siq beng=k **iye** anak=k] batur=k
person male REL give=1 him child=1 friend=1
'The man whom I gave my child is my friend.'
- c. *Anak=k [saq-siq beng=k dengan mame=no **iye**]
child=1 REL give=1 person male=that him
nyengke=n bace buku
PROG=3 read book
'My child whom I gave to that man is reading a book.'

Here one might point out that in Sasak only Subjects (our Topics) can be relativized, and argue that the above sentences are ungrammatical anyway because they relativize Objects. However, his argument does not resolve the problem, because we are here looking at a relativization strategy different from the Subjects-only gap strategy; and so there is no reason to assume that the Subjects-only constraint applies to the present one, the

pronoun-retention strategy. Also observe the grammatical forms in (42) and (43), where non-Subjects are relativized on.

Turning now to the SU position, we see that, while some Sasak dialects, e.g. Pancor Ngeno-Ngené, Narmada Ngeno-Ngené, resist retention of pronominal clitics for relativized Subjects, there are others that allow them to appear cliticized to auxiliaries.

- (46) Bagu Meno-Mené
 Dengan mame [saq mele=**n** gitaq kamu]=no amaq=m
 person male REL want=3 see you =that father=2
 ‘The man who wants to see you is your father.’
- (47) Darek Meriaq-Mereto
 Kemu [saq mele=**m** gitaq keku] iku batur keku
 you REL want=2 see me that friend my
 ‘You, who want to see me, is my friend.’
- (48) Pujut Meriaq-Meriku¹⁴
 Kanak siaq [ke=**n** bace buku=n] anak=k
 child this PROG=3 read book=3 child=1
 ‘This boy who is reading his book is my son.’
- (49) Sumbawa Jereweh
 a. Aku [adé ka=**ku** pukel bedus] sakit
 I REL PERF=1 hit goat sick
 ‘I, who have hit a goat, am sick.’
 b. Kau [adé ka=**m** pukel bedus] sakit
 you REL PERF=2 hit goat sick
 ‘You, who have hit a goat, are sick.’
 c. Ali [adé ka=**ya** pukel bedus] sakit
 Ali REL PERF=3 hit goat sick
 ‘Ali, who has hit a goat, is sick.’

There are, thus, several good reasons for not reinterpreting Sasak and Sumbawan Topics as Subjects and describing their relativization patterns in terms of the Accessibility Hierarchy. Indeed, analyzing the relativization processes in these languages in terms of Topics, apart from the grammatical relations Subject and Object, finds an easy answer to the puzzle of why many of these Austronesian languages readily allow GEN to be relativized when they do not allow Objects to be relativized unless they are made Topic. What has been analyzed as relativization of GEN in Indonesian/Malay and others is in fact not a relativization of the genitive nominal in a possessive construction of the form

¹⁴ In this and other dialects of Sasak, a relativizer is sometimes optional.

[John-GEN head]_{NP}, for example. Rather, what is relativized is a Topic which is interpreted as the possessor of the head noun (under the non-derivational analysis) or which is derived from the possessive NP construction (under the derivational analysis). For ease of exposition, I shall follow the latter analysis.

Indonesian/Malay and many other Austronesian languages allow a Topic construction of the following type (50b), where the initial Topic nominal is construed as the possessor of a typically body-part nominal within the following clause.

- (50) Bagu Meno-Mené
- a. [otak **dengan mame=no**]_{NP} beleq
 head person male=that big
 ‘That man’s head is big.’
 - b. **Dengan mane=no** [otak=n beleq]_s
 person male=that head=3 big
 Lit.: ‘That person, his head is big.’

Sentence (50a) contains a possessive NP construction as the Subject/Topic of the sentence, and here the meaning is equivalent to what is expressed by the English translation. Sentence (50b), on the other hand, has a Topic derived from the possessive NP construction outside the basic clause. This construction, which is difficult to translate into a natural English sentence, is similar to the equivalent topic constructions in Japanese and Korean, in which the Topics are clearly distinguished from Subjects by special topic markers. Notice that the Topic nominal in (50b) above is not a Subject in the ordinary sense. It is not lexically predicated by *beleq* ‘big’—the sentence does not say that the man is big. In this type of sentence, a clause predicates over the Topic. Moreover, the Topic here does not cliticize to the verb. What cliticizes is the lexically predicated Subject, as seen below:

- (51) Pancor Ngeno-Ngené
- a. [Anak-anak loq Ali] **na=pade-sakit**
 child-child ART Ali 3=PL-sick
 ‘Ali’s children are sick.’
 - b. Loq Ali [anak-anak=na **na=pade-sakit**]
 ART Ali child-child=3 3=PL-sick
 ‘Ali, his children are sick.’

The relative clause expression of the following type, which is usually considered to be the case of GEN relativization, is based on (50b) above, not on (50a).¹⁵

¹⁵ Sneddon (1996:288-289) offers a similar analysis based on the topic construction for the

(52) Bagu Meno-Mené

Dengan mame=no [siq [Ø [otak=n beleq]]] batur amaq=k
 person male=that REL head=3 big friend father=1
 ‘The man whose head is big is my father’s friend.’
 Lit.: ‘The man who his head is big is my father’s friend.’

This explains why it is so easy for many of these Austronesian languages to relativize on what looks like the GEN nominal of a possessive NP construction, while it is generally difficult to actually relativize such a nominal in other languages, as reflected in its low position in the Accessibility Hierarchy. There is even more compelling evidence for the Topic-based analysis of the relevant constructions in Bagu Meno-Mené. Recall that in this language if a Topic is aligned with an Object, it triggers the *saq-siq* relativizer. This also happens when a (possessor) Topic is “derived” from an Object nominal possessive construction and is subsequently relativized.

(53) Bagu Meno-Mené

- a. Aku empok [otak **dengan mame=no**]_{NP}
 I hit head person male=that
 ‘I hit that man’s head.’
- b. **Dengan mame=no** [aku empok [otak=n]]
 person male=that I hit head=3
 ‘That man, I hit his head.’
- c. Dengan mame=no [**saq-siq=k** empok otak=n] batur amaq=k
 person male=that REL=1 hit head=3 friend father=1
 ‘That man whose head I hit is my father’s friend.’

While there is a possibility of analyzing a Topic construction like (50b) as a double-Subject construction, or a Topic construction based on a double-Subject construction (see Shibatani 2001), such an analysis is hard to extend to a construction like (53b) because the Topic there “retains” the Object relation to the verb, thereby triggering the *saq-siq* relativizer.¹⁶ Notice further that if the GEN nominal of the possessive construction were

Indonesian relative clauses that are normally construed as a relativization of the possessor of a possessive construction (also see Comrie 1989:161, Schachter 1993/96).

¹⁶ The nature of the Japanese Topic also differs depending on whether it is Subject-based (e.g. *Taroo=wa Ziroo=o nagutta* ‘Taro=TOP hit Jiro’) or Object-based (e.g. *Ziroo=wa Taroo=ga nagutta* ‘Jiro=TOP Taro hit’). In the former, the Topic nominal possesses all the Subject properties of the nominative Subject, e.g. it triggers Subject honorification, whereas in the latter the Topic retains Object properties, e.g. it triggers Object honorification.

directly relativized, as in the analysis found in the literature, we would not expect there to be a difference in the relativizer choice, for the GEN relation is a relation between the genitive nominal and the head nominal, and this relation is constant whether the whole possessive construction functions as a Subject or as an Object.

Finally, other problematic cases of Sasak relativization find an answer in one Topic construction or another. The OCOMP relativization in Pancor Ngeno-Ngené, seen earlier and is repeated below in (54c), is based on the Topic construction in (54b), which leaves a pronominal copy in the OCOMP position.

(54) Pancor Ngeno-Ngené

- a. Ante ganggasan isiq **dengan nine ino**
you tall than person female that
‘You are taller than that woman.’
- b. **Dengan nine ino**, [ganggasan ante isiq **ie**]
person female that tall you than she
Lit.: ‘That woman, you are taller than her.’
- c. Dengan nine ino [si ganggasan ante isiq **ie**] ina-ng=ku
person female that REL tall you than she mother=1
‘The woman whom you are taller than is my mother.’

Eades (1998:126ff) discusses a number of cases that appear to relativize on oblique nominals. For example, the Object of the preposition *isiq* in (55a) below cannot be relativized (cf. earlier example (17b)). Instead, we have a form like (55b), where the instrumental phrase occurs before the “main” verb *empuk* ‘hit’. This relative clause expression, as correctly noted by Eades, comes from the PF construction in (55c), in which the instrumental nominal is a Topic.

(55) Puyung Meno-Mené

- a. Kanak=no empuk acong isiq tunjang=no
child=that hit dog with stick=that
‘That child hit the dog with that stick.’
- b. Tunjang [saq isiq=n empuk acong isiq kanak]=no léq atas méje
stick REL with=3 hit dog by child=that LOC top table
‘The stick with which the child hit the dog is on the table.’ (Eades 1998:127)
- c. Tunjang=no isiq=n empuk acong isiq kanak=no
stick=that with=3 hit dog by child=that
Lit.: ‘That stick, with it the child hit the dog.’

The PF construction in (55c) above parallels the serial verb PF construction in (56b) below, whose AF version is (56a). *Isiq* in (55c) above, however, does not seem to behave like a verb in other contexts.

(56) Puyung Meno-Mené

- a. mu=k kadu tunjang=no empuk acong (AF; Eades 1998:126)
 PAST=1 use stick=that hit dog
 ‘I use the stick to hit the dog.’
- b. tunjang=no kadu=k empuk acong¹⁷ (PF; Eades 1998:126)
 stick=that use=1 hit dog
 ‘I use the stick to hit the dog.’

In summary, we propose, on the basis of our analysis of Sasak (and secondarily on Sumbawa), that Austronesian AF and PF constructions (and passive constructions in Indonesian languages) have the following argument alignment patterns, here illustrated by Standard Indonesian forms paralleling our earlier illustrations of these constructions by Puyung Meno-Mené forms in (31). The PF Topic and the passive Topic are clearly distinguished in terms of the grammatical relations Subject and Object with which Patient aligns.

(57) Standard Indonesian

- a. AF construction
 Anda men-cium Saya. (A=SU=TOP; P=OBJ)¹⁸
 you N-kiss I
 ‘You kiss me.’
- b. PF construction
 Saya anda cium. (A=SU; P=OBJ=TOP)
 I you Ø.kiss
 ‘You kiss me.’

¹⁷ The Pancor Ngeno-Ngené forms paralleling (a) and (b) have the nasal AF form *ngadu* ‘to use’ and the oral PF form *kadu* respectively, while *isiq* in this dialect does not show the nasal/oral morphological contrast.

¹⁸ The status of the Object relation is not clear for those languages that have LF and CF constructions that directly select oblique nominals as Topics, and for AF constructions in some Philippine and Formosan languages that do not allow a definite patient in them. What is important for our consideration is the Subject=Topic alignment such that the Subject=Topic and the Non-Subject=Topic alignment pattern obtain in the AF (and passive) and the PF (and other non-AF) construction, respectively, throughout the relevant Austronesian languages.

c. Passive construction

Saya di-cium oleh Ali. (A=OBL; P=SU=TOP)

I PASS-kiss by Ali

‘I was kissed by Ali.’

In the AF construction, A holds both Subject and Topic relations, while P is aligned with the Object relation. PF and passive constructions differ in terms of both A and P alignments. In the PF construction A remains Subject, as in the AF construction, while the equivalent in the passive construction is an adjunct holding the Oblique relation. P in the PF construction, on the other hand, holds **Object** and Topic relations, whereas the equivalent in the passive construction bears the **Subject** relation (as in the P nominal of the prototypical passive elsewhere) and the Topic relation. We have seen above in terms of the data from eastern Indonesia that while all Topics in (57) share defining syntactic properties (as well as discourse properties such as definiteness) including involvement in relativization, they all differ in other respects reflecting differences in the participant roles and the Subject/Object relations that they bear simultaneously.

Our methodological stance, as discussed in the introduction, is that while there are obvious differences in the focus constructions across various Western Malayo-Polynesian and Formosan languages, they are considered comparable and can be identified profitably in that all share the crucial properties of the Topic relation that A, P, and others hold in respective focus constructions. In Philippine and Formosan languages, as well as Malagasy, Topics typically occur sentence finally, whereas in Indonesian languages they typically occur sentence initially. Philippine and Formosan languages, which maintain the V-initial word order, have a topic marker (e.g., Philippine *ang*), while Indonesian languages with the Topic-initial word order lack such a marker. In Ilocano and Puyuma both Topics and Subjects cliticize, while in Indonesian languages, Topics do not seem to cliticize. In Tagalog and Ilocano as well as Puyuma and certain other Formosan languages, AF constructions in independent clauses disfavor a definite Patient (with the possibility that they are all syntactically intransitive), while there is no such restriction in Cebuano, Atayal, and most Indonesian languages. Despite these differences, the fact that A and P bear the Topic relation in AF and PF constructions respectively across these languages figures importantly in understanding the similarity that they show with respect to various syntactic and discourse phenomena including relativization, raising, certain types of control construction, as well as the definiteness of the Topic nominal and the role it plays in reference tracking.

Returning to the issues of relativization, a reasonable conclusion to draw from the discussion above is that Sasak and Sumbawan relativizations are best analyzed in terms of the Austronesian Topic relation rather than the grammatical relations Subject and Object and the Accessibility Hierarchy. While this conclusion does not invalidate the weaker

version of the universal given in the original work by Keenan & Comrie (1977) cited as (58a) below, it does invalidate the stronger versions in Comrie & Keenan (1979) and Keenan (1985) cited as (58b-c) below:

(58) Subject Relative Universal

- a. “All languages can relativize Subjects.” (Comrie & Keenan 1979:652)
- b. “... in absolute terms Subjects are the most relativizable of NP’s.”
(Comrie & Keenan 1979:653)
- c. “Subjects are universally the most relativizable of NPs.” (Keenan 1985:158)

The weaker version of the “Subject Relative Universal” in (58a) is satisfied if some Subjects in a language are relativized, and this is the case in Sasak and Sumbawa since Subject-Topics do relativize. However, the stronger versions (58b-c) are falsified by these languages. In these languages Subjects only relativize when they also bear the Topic relation. On the other hand, Topics are most readily relativizable of NP’s in these languages since they relativize unconditionally.

Comrie & Keenan (1979:659) note that “if there turn out to be languages for which the traditional notions of Subject etc. are inapplicable, then our generalizations make no claim about how relativization should pattern in those languages. The generalizations are not of course falsified thereby, but their domain of applicability is restricted.” What is significant about the Sasak and Sumbawa data is that “the traditional notions of Subject etc.” are applicable to these languages; yet they have an additional grammatical relation, Topic, that is more relativizable than Subject. Notice, further, that if the relativization processes of Western Malayo-Polynesian languages did not operate in terms of Subject and Object, which is our general claim, there would be quite a large number of languages (perhaps nearly 300) that are not covered by Keenan & Comrie’s generalization, though it is true that these languages all belong to the same language group. Formosan languages, which are normally classified as Austronesian but non-Malayo-Polynesian, have the same restriction in their relativization processes such that only Topics can be relativized. The extent to which other Austronesian languages obey the similar “Topics-only constraint” is not clear at this point. The recent study by the author on the Austronesian languages on the islands of Sumbawa, Sumba, Sabu, Palu’e, and Flores, classified as Central-Eastern Malayo-Polynesian, indicates that they generally maintain the structural AF/PF contrast and relativize only Topics despite the fact that they have lost the focus morphology as in many of the dialects in Sasak and Sumbawa. What this paper suggests is that all Austronesian languages, perhaps numbering over 1,200, are worth reconsidering in the light of the Austronesian AF/PF structural contrast argued for in this paper. For example, Samoan antipassive and ergative constructions may be understood as a continuation of the

Austronesian AF and PF constructions. Perhaps a more revealing understanding of the relativization phenomena in these languages obtains under such a perspective.

In addition to Western Malayo-Polynesian languages, Keenan & Comrie (1977) list Aoban (an Austronesian language) and Classical Arabic as Subjects-only languages for the Subject-gap strategy.¹⁹ They also mention that many European languages have participial RC-forming strategies that apply only to Subjects, e.g. the German form *der in seinem Büro arbeitende Mann* ‘the man working in his office’ or its English equivalent. I argue elsewhere (Shibatani (forthcoming) and Shibatani, Wouk & Nagaya (forthcoming)) that many relative clauses across languages are actually recycled nominalized clauses which lack an NP that is normally analyzed as a gapped NP in a relative clause. The participial clauses in the German example above and its English equivalent are analyzable along the same line. Indeed, the relevant participial forms have the following kind of usage outside the relative clause context: [*In seinem Büro arbeitend*], *wurde Peter krank* ‘[Working in his office], Peter got sick.’ In other words, relativizations in many languages, including Austronesian languages discussed in this paper and the types of modification constructions exemplified by Keenan & Comrie’s German example and its English equivalent, do not involve the relativization process (gapping of a coreferential NP) that is standardly assumed. Instead, they simply make use of nominalized clauses found in such expressions as [*Working in the office late at night*] *made Bill very tired* in English and Pancor Ngeno-Ngené *Beng oku* [*si lèq méje ino*] ‘Give me the one on the table’ as modifiers in noun modification constructions like *the man* [*working in the office late at night*] and relative clauses like *buku* [*si lèq méje ino*] ‘the book which is on the table’. In the final section below, we shall show that what is suggested here is a more plausible way of approaching the relativization phenomena in Austronesian and many other languages in which relative clauses turn out to be nominalized expressions, which function as nominal arguments and nominal predicates outside the relativization context.

¹⁹ It is not clear whether Classical Arabic has a gap RC strategy since subject relativization involves a person suffix indexing a relativized subject. Examine the following examples provided by Adrian Macelaru:

al=raju <u>l</u> -u	allaDHii	jaa'-a
DEF ART=man-NOM.SG	REL	come.PERF-SUB.3.MASC.SG
‘the man who came’		

Object relativization involves a suffixed pronoun as in,

al=raju <u>l</u> -u	allaDHii	ra'ay-tu=hu
DEF ART=man-NOM.SG	REL	see.PERF-SUB.1SG=3.MASC.SG
‘the man I saw’		

7. Relativization and nominalization

The final topic dealt with here is no less important than those discussed above in the context of our concern with relativization phenomena, as it has bearing on the nature of the gaps in relative clauses and on the broader question of the general typology of relative clauses (Comrie 1998). For expository purposes, I have been glossing the particles *si*, *siq*, *saq*, and *siq-saq* in Sasak dialects and *adé* in Sumbawa as REL as if they were relativizers. This labeling is actually a misnomer, and a better label for them is NMZ, i.e. nominalizer or nominalization marker, as they mark a wide range of elements turned into nominalized forms, whose grammatical functions range from simple referring expressions to adverbial subordination. Relativization is just one of the functions that nominalized clauses play in these languages as in many other languages of the world (Givón 2001).²⁰ In Sasak, as in other Indonesian languages, not only clauses but various other kinds of units can also be nominalized, including demonstratives, ordinal numbers, and stative predicates. Nominalized expressions behave like regular nominals in functioning both as a Subject and Object, and even as a nominal predicate.

(59) Puyung Meno-Mené

- a. [saq no] baru
NMZ that new
'That one is new.'
- b. [saq pertame] mame kance [saq kedue]
NMZ first male and NMZ second
nine (speaking of the children)
female
'The first one is male and the second one is female.'
- c. Beng=k [saq biru]=no
give=1 NMZ blue=that
'Give me the blue one.'

(60) Narmada Ngeno-Ngené

- a. Kamu [siq=ku empok]
you NMZ=1 hit
'You are the one I hit.'
- b. [siq=ku empok] kamu
NMZ=1 hit you
'The one I hit is you.'

²⁰ A similar point has been made by Englebretson (2008) regarding the Bahasa Indonesian *yang* expressions, which have often been characterized as relative clauses.

It is the equational expression of the type seen in (60b) that is often characterized as a cleft construction involving a headless relative clause. Analyzing a form like [siq=ku empok] ‘the one I hit’ as a headless relative clause is unmotivated since its function in a cleft construction is to refer to an entity presupposed in the discourse (e.g. X of the presupposition “I hit X”) rather than narrowing down the range of possible referents (Keenan 1985:142).²¹

Nominalized clauses in Sasak are used to modify another unit in a number of ways. They may be a complement of a noun or a verb, as in (61a-b), or modify both concrete and abstract nouns (61a, c, d, e). They also function as an adverbial subordinate clause (61f).

(61) Pancor Ngeno-Ngené

- a. berita [si angku=n loq Ali beruq merariq]
news NMZ way=3 ART Ali recently marry
‘the news that Ali recently got married’
- b. Aku lupa [si angku-n loq Ali wah mbilin kota=no]
I forget NMZ way=3 ART Ali PERF leave town=that
‘I forgot that Ali had left the town.’
- c. buku [si ne=bace isiq loq Ali]
book NMZ 3=Ø.read by ART Ali
‘the book that Ali read’
- d. suara [si ne=ngerontok lawang ino isiq loq Ali]
sound NMZ 3=knock door the by ART Ali
‘the sound of Ali knocking on the door’
- e. waktu [si ku=masih sekolah]=no...²²
time NMZ 1=still school=that
‘At the time when I was still going to school.../When I was going to school...’

²¹ Cf. Keenan & Comrie’s (1977) definition of relative clauses. Sneddon’s (1996:300, 367) suggestion that these nominalized expressions derive from headed relative clauses via ellipsis of the head nominal is totally unmotivated. The actual situation is the other way around, namely relative clause expressions obtain when nominalized clauses modify a noun, as suggested below.

²² Presumably it is this type of noun modification that has given rise to the locative and comitative relativizers of the following type:

- a. Restoran siq **taoq** Ali mangan mahal gati (Narmada Ngeno-Ngené)
restaurant NMZ place Ali eat expensive very
‘The restaurant where Ali eats is very expensive.’
- b. ta tau **dengan** ku=gita=sia (Sumbawa; Shiohara 2000:91)
this person companion 1SG=look.at=2SG
‘This is the person with whom I saw you.’

- f. Ali te-semateq [si=ne lekaq léq rurung]
 Ali PASS-kill NMZ=3 walk in street
 ‘Ali was killed when/while he was walking in the street.’

Among these modification patterns, the one containing a gap in the modifying clause, as in (61c), is what is normally identified as a relative clause. In other words, relativization in Sasak, as in other Indonesian languages, is just one pattern of noun modification involving a nominalized clause as a modifier.

Let us now turn to the question of the gap in relative clauses. In his 1998 paper, Comrie places Japanese relative clauses within the general noun modification pattern of the language, as we have suggested above for Sasak. Noting the parallel between gapped relative clauses and independent sentences with gaps, as in (62) below, Comrie, following Matsumoto’s (1988) lead, suggests that the relative gap is pronominal anaphor, or a zero pronoun, rather than a gap created by extraction of the relativized noun.

- (62) Japanese
 a. kore=ga [Ø kinoo Ø katta] hon desu.
 this=NOM yesterday bought book COP
 ‘This is the book that (I) bought Ø yesterday.’
 b. Ø kinoo Ø katta.

In Japanese, (62b) is a complete and perfect answer to a question such as “Have you bought the book already?” Comrie’s position is to assume that it is this elliptic sentence that functions as a modifying clause in the relative clause construction in (62a). While it is true that both full and truncated nominalized clauses occur as modifiers in Sasak and Sumbawa, the parallel between relative clauses with a gap and independent sentences with an anaphoric pronoun does not hold in these languages. This is because anaphoric pronouns in these languages are typically overt, whereas relative clauses, as we define them, contain a gap. For example, to the question in (63a) below, the appropriate answer in Pancor Ngeno-Ngené would be either (63b) with full pronouns or (63c) with pronominal clitics, while the Japanese answer would have gaps for “I” and “it”.²³

- (63) Pancor Ngeno-Ngené
 a. Kumbeq=meq buku=no?
 what.do=2 book=that
 ‘What did you do with that book.’

²³ See Wouk (2008) for a comparison of anaphoric pronouns between Sasak and Mandarin.

- b. **Aku** nulak-ang **ia** tipak perpustakaan
 I return-APPL it to library
 ‘I returned it to the library.’
- c. **Ku**=nulak-ang=**e** tipak perpustakaan
 I=return-APPL=3 to library
 ‘I returned it to the library.’

The corresponding relative clause, however, cannot contain the Object clitic, indicating that the relative gap here is an obligatory gap.

- (64) Pancor Ngeno-Ngené
 Buku [si ku=tulak-ang=*e tipak perpustakaan]=no bagus
 book NMZ I=return-APPL=3 to library=that interesting
 ‘The book that I returned to the library was interesting.’

Indeed, in a simple nominalized form used in the following kind of expression, (65), there is no antecedent that can establish an antecedent-anaphor relation with the gap within the nominalized form. Also the question of extraction of a relativized item does not arise here because there is nowhere the extracted item can go to.

- (65) Pancor Ngeno-Ngené
 Beng oku [si léq méje ino]
 give I NMZ on table that
 ‘Give me the one on that table!’

In other words, what looks like a relative gap is in fact a gap created by the nominalization process itself.

Comrie & Thompson (1985) recognize two types of lexical nominalization, namely the “name of activity/state” type (e.g., *create* → *creation*) and the “name of an argument” type (e.g. *employ* → *employer*, *employ* → *employee*). Clausal nominalization also yields these two types of nominal expressions, and the one we are interested in here is the one that turns a clause into a nominal form designating the participant of an event. Clausal nominalizations in Austronesian languages, as in many other languages, achieve argument nominalization by deleting the argument designating an event participant. Now, in Austronesian argument nominalization the focus morphology functions to profile the role of the nominalized argument. Thus, the Pancor Ngeno-Ngené AF nominalized form *si m-bace* ‘NMZ AF-read’ profiles the agentive role of the argument, namely “one who reads”, while the PF counterpart *si baca* ‘NMZ PF.read’ means “what is read”. This verb-level

nominalization can be expanded to include other arguments forming essentially clausal argument nominalization of the following form, just as the English nominalized expression *reading* can be expanded into *the reading of the book* and into *the reading of the book by John* or *John's reading of the book*.

- (66) Pancor Ngeno-Ngené
- a. si Ø **m**bace buku ino (AF)
 NMZ N.read book that
 'the one who reads the book'
- b. si Ø bace=ne isiq loq Ali (PF)
 NMZ Ø.read=3 by ART Ali
 'the one read by Ali'
- (67) Bagu Meno-Mené
- a. saq Ø bace buku ino (AF)
 NMZ read book that
 'the one who reads the book'
- b. saq Ø n=bace siq Ali (PF)
 NMZ 3=read by Ali
 'the one read by Ali'

The following Tagalog argument nominalization forms with the three types of focus affixes show varying degrees of lexicalization.

- (68) Tagalog
- a. AF: *mang* + *dup* + base (Schachter & Otnes 1972:103)
mam-ba-basa 'reader'
man-la-laro 'player'
mang-a-awit 'singer'
- b. PF: base + *-in* (Schachter & Otnes 1972:99)
 alaga-**in** 'something to take care of'
 aral-**in** 'something to study'
 awit-**in** 'song'
 bilih-**in** 'something to buy'
- c. LF: base + *-an* (Schachter & Otnes 1972:98)
 tagu-**an** 'hiding place' (tago 'hide')
 hiram-**an** 'place for borrowing' (hiram 'borrow')
 aklat-**an** 'library' (aklat 'book')
 gulay-**an** 'vegetable garden' (gulay 'vegetable')

The analysis advocated here is reminiscent of what was suggested by Starosta, Pawley & Reid (1982/83) for the proto-Austronesian focus morphology, which was considered to be argument nominalizations that gave rise to the verbal focus system via reanalysis of equational constructions. In modern Austronesian languages argument nominalization also appears best analyzed along the line suggested above. Thus, the gap in an argument nominalization clause necessarily appears to correspond to the Topic nominal in a full clause precisely because the focus morphology indicates the role of the argument profiled and elided through the nominalization process. Relativization is no more than modification of a noun by a juxtaposed nominalized clause, where the nominalized argument must share the identity with the head noun just as an appositive expression such as “John the butcher” requires the identity between the head and the appositive nominal. Indeed, an entailment relation obtains between the expressions containing the whole appositive construction (69a) and (69b) and those with just appositive modifiers (69a') and (69b'), which can stand on its own.

- (69) a. I saw John the butcher in the market.
 a'. I saw the butcher in the market.
 b. Loq Ali mbace buku [si beng=ku iye]=no (Pancor Ngeno-Ngené)
 ART Ali N.read book NMZ give=1 he=that
 ‘Ali read the book that I gave him.’
 b'. Loq Ali mbace [si beng=ku iye]=no.
 ART Ali N.read NMZ give=1 he=that
 ‘Ali read the one I gave him.’

The gap in a relative clause in Sasak (and other Indonesian languages including Sumbawa), in other words, is due to the nominalization process rather than to the relativization process, which simply juxtaposes a head noun and a nominalized clause to form an appositive construction. The two related constructions that are often discussed along with relative clauses, namely cleft constructions and Wh-questions, are equational sentences in which a nominalized clause functions either as a Subject or a predicate, as in the following examples. It is the involvement of nominalized clauses with a gap profiling the nominalized argument in these constructions that unifies these with relative clause expressions.

- (70) Pancor Ngeno-Ngené
 Cleft construction
 a. [Si mbace buku=ne] batur=ku (Based on AF)
 NMZ N.read book=this friend=1
 ‘The one who read this book is my friend.’

- b. [Si bace=ku] buku=ne (Based on PF)
NMZ Ø.read=1 book=this
'The one I read is this book/What I read is this book.'
- Wh-questions
- c. Sai [si mbace buku=ne] (Based on AF)
who NMZ N.read book=this
'Who is the one that read this book/Who read this book?'
- d. Ape [si bace=meq] (Based on PF)
what NMZ Ø.read=2
'What is the one that you read/What did you read?'

Formosan languages, which are associated with various particles normally glossed as nominative in the Formosan literature) are not really Subjects and that what are like Subjects in these languages are S and A, the so-called Actor nominals. In this regard, the recent formalist literature on Austronesian languages (e.g. Richards 2000, Pearson 2005) appears correct in analyzing Actor nominals as occupying the Subject position—SPEC of IP, and the Topic as occupying a (non-A) specifier position higher in the clause structure.

In the traditional framework for analyzing and typologizing relative clauses along the line of Keenan & Comrie (1977), we have found conclusive evidence that Subjects are not relevant to relativization in Sasak and Sumbawa, contrary to the claim by Keenan & Comrie that the Subjects-only constraint to relativization obtains in many Austronesian languages. Their practice of reinterpreting the Austronesian Topic as a Subject and the PF construction as passive was also found unmotivated in view of the fact that a robust Subject category and passive constructions exist independently and that they behave quite differently from the Topic and the PF construction, respectively.

While the traditional approach to relativization would lead to the analysis in which the Topic, instead of the Subject nominal, functions as the target of relativization in Sasak and Sumbawa, we have argued in the final section that such an analysis is misguided. In these and many languages of the world, relative clauses are in fact nominalized clauses that function independently outside the relativization context. In these languages, relativization is simply juxtaposition of a head nominal and a nominalized clause in appositive syntagm. Relativization in these languages accordingly involves no gapping or extraction of a coreferential NP in a relative clause as the traditional approach has it; the gap in a relative clause is created in the process of argument nominalization. This line of argument for the relativization in Austronesian and other languages has been more fully developed in Shibatani, Wouk & Nagaya (forthcoming), where the Subjects-only (or the Topics-only) constraint to Austronesian relativization recognized by Keenan & Comrie (1977) is an epiphenomenon engendered by the role of focus morphology in argument nominalization and in Austronesian predicate formation.

References

- Adelaar, Alexander. 2005. Malayo-Sumbawan. *Oceanic Linguistics* 44.2:357-388.
- Arka, I Wayan. 2003. *Balinese Morphosyntax: A Lexical-functional Approach*. Pacific Linguistics 547. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Austin, Peter K. (ed.) 1998. *Sasak*, Vol. 1. Parkville: Department of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, University of Melbourne.
- Austin, Peter K. 2000a. Verbs, voice and valence in Sasak. *Sasak*, Vol. 2, ed. by Peter K. Austin, 5-23. Parkville: Department of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, University of Melbourne.
- Austin, Peter K. (ed.) 2000b. *Sasak*, Vol. 2. Parkville: Department of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, University of Melbourne.
- Chung, Sandra. 1976. On the subject of two passives in Indonesian. *Subject and Topic*, ed. by Charles N. Li, 59-99. New York: Academic Press.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1989. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology: Syntax and Morphology* (2nd edition). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1998. Rethinking the typology of relative clauses. *Language Design* 1.1:59-86.
- Comrie, Bernard, and Kaoru Horie. 1995. Complement clauses versus relative clauses: some Khmer evidence. *Discourse Grammar and Typology: Papers in Honor of John W. M. Verhaar*, ed. by Werner Abraham, Talmy Givón & Sandra A. Thompson, 65-75. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Comrie, Bernard, and Edward L. Keenan. 1979. Noun phrase accessibility revisited. *Language* 55.3:649-664.
- Comrie, Bernard, and Sandra A. Thompson. 1985. Lexical nominalization. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Vol. 3: *Grammatical Categories and the Lexicon*, ed. by Timothy Shopen, 349-398. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Donohue, Mark. 1999. *A Grammar of Tukang Besi*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Durie, Mark. 1985. *A Grammar of Acehnese on the Basis of a Dialect of North Aceh*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Eades, Yusuf. 1998. Relativization. *Sasak*, Vol. 1, ed. by Peter K. Austin, 119-129. Parkville: Department of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, University of Melbourne.
- Englebretson, Robert. 2008. From subordinate clause to noun-phrase: *yang* constructions in colloquial Indonesian. *Crosslinguistic Studies of Clause Combining: The Multifunctionality of Conjunctions*, ed. by Ritva Laury, 1-33. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Givón, Talmy. 2001. *Syntax: An Introduction*, Vol. 2. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

- Jacq, Pascale. 1998. How many dialects are there? *Sasak*, Vol. 1, ed. by Peter K. Austin, 67-90. Parkville: Department of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, University of Melbourne.
- Keenan, Edward L. 1985. Relative clauses. *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, Vol. 2: *Complex Constructions*, ed. by Timothy Shopen, 141-170. Cambridge & New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Keenan, Edward L., and Bernard Comrie. 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8.1:63-99.
- Klamer, Marian. 1998. *A Grammar of Kambara*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kroon, Yosep B. 1998. The *isiq* construction and its grammatical relations. *Sasak*, Vol. 1, ed. by Peter K. Austin, 105-118. Parkville: Department of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, University of Melbourne.
- Matsumoto, Yoshiko. 1988. Semantic and pragmatics of noun-modifying constructions in Japanese. *Berkeley Linguistics Society (BLS)* 14:166-175.
- Musgrave, Simon. 2000. A note on animacy hierarchy effects in Sasak and Sumbawa. *Sasak*, Vol. 2, ed. by Peter K. Austin, 49-56. Parkville: Department of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, University of Melbourne.
- Pearson, Matthew. 2005. The Malagasy subject/topic as an A'-element. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 23.2:381-457.
- Richards, Norvin. 2000. Another look at Tagalog subjects. *Formal Issues in Austronesian Linguistics*, ed. by Ileana Paul, Vivianne Phillips & Lisa Travis, 105-116. Dordrecht & Boston: Kluwer.
- Ross, Malcolm. 1995. Reconstructing Proto-Austronesian verbal morphology: evidence from Taiwan. *Austronesian Studies Relating to Taiwan*, ed. by Paul Jen-kuei Li, Cheng-hwa Tsang, Ying-kuei Huang, Dah-an Ho & Chiu-yu Tseng, 727-791. Taipei: Institute of History and Philology, Academia Sinica.
- Ross, Malcolm. 2002. The history and transitivity of Western Austronesian voice and voice-marking. *The History and Typology of Western Austronesian Voice Systems*, ed. by Fay Wouk & Malcolm Ross, 17-62. Pacific Linguistics 518. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Schachter, Paul. 1976. The subject in Philippine languages: Topic, Actor, Actor-Topic of none of the above. *Subject and Topic*, ed. by Charles N. Li, 491-518. New York: Academic Press.
- Schachter, Paul. 1993/96. *The Subject in Tagalog: Still None of the Above*. UCLA Occasional Papers in Linguistics 15. Los Angeles: Department of Linguistics, University of California.
- Schachter, Paul, and Fe T. Otanes. 1972. *Tagalog Reference Grammar*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1991. Grammaticization of topic into subject. *Approaches to*

- Grammaticalization*, ed. by Elizabeth Closs Traugott & Bernd Heine, 93-133. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 2001. Non-canonical constructions in Japanese. *Non-canonical Marking of Subjects and Objects*, ed. by Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald, R. M. W. Dixon & Masayuki Onishi, 307-354. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. (forthcoming). Elements of complex structures, where recursion isn't.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi, Fay Wouk, and Naonori Nagaya. (forthcoming). Nominalization and relativization in Austronesian languages.
- Shiohara, Asako. 2000. Relativization in Sumbawan. *Sasak*, Vol. 2, ed. by Peter K. Austin, 85-98. Parkville: Department of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, University of Melbourne.
- Shiohara, Asako. 2006. *Sumbawa-go no Bunpō [A Grammar of Sumbawa]*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo dissertation.
- Sneddon, James Neil. 1996. *Indonesian: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Starosta, Stanley, Andrew K. Pawley, and Lawrence A. Reid. 1982/83. The evolution of focus in Austronesian. *Papers from the Third International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, Vol. 2: *Tracking the Travellers*, 145-170. Pacific Linguistics C-75. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Wouk, Fay. 2002. Voice in the languages of Nusa Tenggara Barat. *The History and Typology of Western Austronesian Voice Systems*, ed. by Fay Wouk & Malcolm Ross, 285-309. Pacific Linguistics 518. Canberra: The Australian National University.
- Wouk, Fay. 2008. The syntax of intonation units in Sasak. *Studies in Language* 32.1: 137-162.
- Wouk, Fay, and Malcolm Ross. (eds.) 2002. *The History and Typology of Western Austronesian Voice Systems*. Pacific Linguistics 518. Canberra: The Australian National University.

[Received 1 May 2008; revised 1 August 2008; accepted 1 September 2008]

Department of Linguistics
Rice University
6100 Main Street
Houston, Texas 77005
USA
matt.shibatani@gmail.com

東印尼 Sasak 與 Sumbawa 語的關係化現象

柴谷方良

美國萊斯大學

本文探討東印尼 Sasak 與 Sumbawa 方言中的關係化現象。根據研究結果，本文主張 Keenan 與 Comrie 對西馬來亞玻里尼西亞語群的兩項假定並不成立。在西馬來亞玻里尼西亞語群中，主題並不能視為主語。此外，南島語中的非主事焦點句並不能視為被動句。如同印尼語、其他西馬來亞玻里尼西亞語、及台灣南島語，在 Sasak 及 Sumbawa 方言中，主題與主語是兩種並存的語法關係。較之於主語，主題更易於關係化。此發現推翻 Comrie 與 Keenan 所謂「主語最易於關係化」的假設 (Comrie & Keenan 1979:653)。此外，Sasak 與 Sumbawa 方言中的人稱代詞使用機制也推翻了 Comrie 與 Keenan 的另一項假設，亦即「關係化機制必須依循關係化階層 (Accessibility Hierarchy) 中的順序來運作」(Comrie & Keenan 1979:661)。本文主張，西馬來亞玻里尼西亞語中，關係結構應視為名物化子句與主要語 (head noun) 的並列，與語法關係並無相干。台灣南島語及許多非南島語語言亦呈現類似現象。

關鍵詞：主題，主語，西馬來亞玻里尼西亞語，關係子句化策略，名物化