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Demise of the focus morphology in Austronesian languages

PAn focus morphology: <*um> Actor, *-an Patient, *-an Location, *SF Referential

4-way morph. contrast 3-way
Formosan
Kavalan
Malay/Indonesian
AF, PF
AF, PF / LF
AF, PF, LF
AF, PF, IF

Philippine
Thao
Javanese, Balinese
Sasak
Sumbawa

Lun Dayeh (Sawarak)
Sasak
Sumbawa

Central MP lgs

2-way
Kavalan
Thao
Lun Dayeh (Sawarak)

Malay/Indonesian
Javanese, Balinese
AF, PF / LF (-an)
AF, PF, LF (Thao)
AF, PF, IF (Lun Dayeh; Clayre 2005)

Rukai
Sasak
Sumbawa

AF, PF, IF

1. Structural contrast (i.e., Topic alignment pattern)
2. Syntactic constraints, e.g.,

“in a PAN Relative clause the (deleted) noun phrase coreferential with its head noun had to be its pivot[/Topic]...” (Ross 1995:730)

Tagalog (4-way morphological focus contrast 4-way structural contrast)

a. H<*um>i-hiwa ang=lalaki ng=karne. (AF)
RED<AF>-cut TOP=man GEN=meat
'The man is cutting meat.'

b. Hi-hiwa-in ng=lalaki ang=karne. (PF)
RED-cut-PF GEN=man TOP=meat
'The man is cutting the meat.'

c. K<in>ain-an ng=lalaki ang=restaurant. (LF)
eat<PRFV>-LF GEN=man TOP=restaurant
'The man ate at the restaurant.'

d. I-b<in>ili ng=lalaki ng=relo ang=babae. (RF)
CF-buy<PRFV> GEN=man GEN=watch TOP=woman
'The man bought the woman a watch.'
Kavalan (3-way morphological contrast, 4-way structural contrast; Li and Tsuchida 2006:26-27)

a. q-<m>aRat saku 'nay 'tu mutun. (AF)
   ‘That cat bit a rat.’

b. qaRat-an na saku mutun 'nay. (PF)
   ‘That rat was bitten by a cat.’

b'. Ribaut-an-na ya iRuR a zau. (LF)
   ‘This stream is where he fishes.’

c. ti-tabu na tina-ku tu baut ya biRi. (RF)
   ‘My mother wrapped fish with the leaf.’

In Thao and Lun Dayeh (Sawarak), RF or LF has dropped out of the system; e.g., Instrumental or Location cannot be directly aligned with Topic in these languages.

Bahasa Melayu/Indonesia, Balinese (2-way nasal/∅ contrast)

a. Saya mem-beli rumah baru (Bahasa Melayu/Indonesia AF)
   ‘I bought a new house.’

b. Rumah baru itu saya beli. (Bahasa Melayu/Indonesia PF)
   ‘I bought the new house.’

a’. Tiang meli umah anyar (Balinese AF)
   ‘I bought a new house.’

b’. Umah anyar=entong beli tiang (Balinese PF)
   ‘I bought the new house.’

Sasak (Lombok Island)

Pancor ngeno-ngené Sasak

a. Oku kenyengka-ng=ku mbace buku ini (N-AF)
   ‘I am reading this book.’

b. Buku ini kenyengka-ng=ku bace (∅-PF)
   ‘I am reading this book.’

Puyung meno-mené Sasak

a. Aku nyengke bace buku=ni (AF?)
   ‘I read this book.’

b. Buku=ni nyengke=k bace (PF?)
   ‘I read this book.’

Morphological contrast has been lost in Puyung; is there still structural contrast? I.e. do the Puyung (a) and (b) forms above parallel Pancor AF (a) and PF (b) forms in respectively aligning Actor and Patient with a Topic?

Same question can be asked about other AN lgs of the region farther to the east.

Sumbawa (Sumbawa Besar)

a. aku baca buku=ta (AF?)
   ‘I read this book.’

b. buku=ta ku=baca (PF?)
   ‘I read this book.’

Sikka (eastern Flores Island—Central MP)

a. Petrus piru Siti (AF?)
   ‘Petrus kisses Siti.’

b. Siti Petrus piru (PF?)
   ‘Petrus kisses Siti.’

Answer: Yes, the (a) and (b) forms above are all AF and PF constructions, respectively, equivalent to the morphologically marked AF and PF constructions in other Austronesian languages. I.e., there are AF and PF constructions in Austronesian languages that do not involve focus morphology — a case of focus constructions without focus morphology.

In fact, the AF/PF contrast is much more robust than the Active/Passive opposition seen in many AN languages in Indonesia.
Sasak: its importance in Austronesian research

1. Robust focus constructions—AF and PF (w/ or w/o focus morphology)

2. Clear morphological and structural contrast between PF constructions and robust Passive constructions

3. Clear distinctions between two types of GRs—Subject and Topic

4. Argument alignment patterns

   AF (Actor-focus) construction: $\langle A=\text{SUB}=\text{TOP}; P=\text{OBJ} \rangle$

   PF (Patient-focus) construction: $\langle A=\text{SUB}; P=\text{OBJ}=\text{TOP} \rangle$

Passive: $\langle A=\text{OBL}; P=\text{SUB}=\text{TOP} \rangle$

---

Sasak dialects: Lombok Island

Pancor ngeno-ngené

a. Oku kenyengka-ng=ku mbace buku ini (N-AF)

   I PROG-LIN=1 N.read book this  
   ‘I am reading this book.’

b. Buku ini kenyengka-ng=ku bace (Ø-PF)

   book this PROG-LIN=1 Ø.read
   ‘I am reading this book.’

Nasal/∅ morphological contrast in transitive constructions in Sasak dialects

This is generally (i.e. in a fairly large number of transitive verbs) maintained in certain eastern dialects:

Pancor ngeno-ngené

a. Oku kenyengka-ng=ku mbace buku ini (N-AF)

   I PROG-LIN=1 N.read book this
   ‘I am reading this book.’

b. Buku ini kenyengka-ng=ku bace (Ø-PF)

   book this PROG-LIN=1 Ø.read
   ‘I am reading this book.’

Suralaga ngeto-ngeté

a. Aku mantok epe (N-AF)

   I N.hit you
   ‘I hit you.’

b. Epe pantok=ku (Ø-PF)

   you Ø.hit=1SG
   ‘I hit you.’
Ganti meno-mené  

a. Aku jeng=ke bace/*mbace buku=ni (AF; bace preferred)  
I PROG=1SG Ø.read/N.read book=this  
'I am reading this book.'  

Pancor ngeno-ngené  

a. dengan mame ino mantok log Ali (AF)  
person male that N.hit ART Ali  
'That man hit Ali.'

Even in those dialects/constructions where the focus morphology is lost

Puyung meno-mené  

a. Inaq mu=n kelor sebie odaq  
mother PAST=3 eat chili green  
'Mother ate green chili.'  

Relativization in Sasak dialects—the PAn constraint is maintained; only topic NPs can be relativized

Puyung meno-mené

a. Aku jengke-ng=ku bace/mbace buku=ni (AF; bace preferred)  
I PROG-LIN=1SG Ø.read/N.read book=this  
'I am reading this book.'  

b. Buku=ni jengke-ng=ku bace/mbace (PF; bace preferred)  
book=PROG=1SG Ø.read/N.read book=this  
'I am reading this book.'

Narmada ngeno-ngené  

a. Aku jengke-ng=ku bace/mbace buku=ni (AF; bace preferred)  
I PROG=1SG Ø.read/N.read book=this  
'I am reading this book.'  

b. Buku=ni jengke-ng=ku bace/*mbace (PF; mbace preferred)  
book=PROG=1SG Ø.read/N.read book=this  
'I am reading this book.'

Even in those dialects/constructions where the focus morphology is lost

Puyung meno-mené  

a. Aku nyengke bace/*mbaca buku=ni (AF?)  
I PROG Ø.read/N.read book=this  
'I am reading this book.'  

b. Buku=ni nyengke=k bace/*mbace (PF?)  
book=PROG=1SG Ø.read/N.read book=this  
'I am reading this book.'

Interim conclusions-1

1. The PAn constraint on relativization that only Topic NPs can be relativized (Wh-questioned, and clefted) is maintained even in the Sasak dialects in which the Austronesian focus morphology has been lost.  

2. This conclusion is contrary to the recent studies on Sasak by Peter Austin and his students.

    Department of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, University of Melbourne.

    Department of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, University of Melbourne.

There are several good reasons for not making the following assumptions made by Keenan and Comrie (and a few others):

- There are subject and object relations apart from the Topic relation in Sasak.
  - Cliticization of subjects (and objects)
  - Passive exists apart from PF — Patient of a passive clause behaves like a subject; Patient of PF does not.
  - Control phenomena — Some are controlled by Topic, some by Subject=Topic.
  - Relativizer selection in Bagu meno-mené.

**Basic argument alignment patterns in Sasak**

- **AF-construction**
  - *Ali bace buku=ni* (A=SUB=TOP; P=OBJ)
  - *Ali read book=this* 'Ali read this book.'

- **PF-construction**
  - *Buku=ni mu=n bace siq Ali* (A=SUB; P=OBJ=TOP)
  - *book=this PERF-3 read by Ali* 'Ali read this book.'

- **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.'
Control phenomena

1. “Want”*-type: takes a non-controllable SOA complement

   I want [Ø to leave]
   I want [John to leave]
   I want [it to rain]
   I want [Ø to be tall]

Selong ngeno-ngené

a. Mele-ng=ku [anta ngiduk Siti] (AF complement)
   want-LIN=1 you N.kiss Siti
   ‘I want you to kiss Siti.’

b. Mele-ng=ku [Siti meq=iduk] (PF complement)
   want-LIN=1 Siti 2=Ø.kiss
   ‘I want you to kiss Siti.’

2. “Try”*/“Order”-type: requires a controllable SOA complement with a “like-subject” coreferential with either the matrix subject or the matrix object

Selong ngeno-ngené

a. Mele-ng=ku [Ø ngiduk Siti] (Ø=A=SUBJECT=TOPIC)
   want-LIN=1 N.kiss Siti
   ‘I want to kiss Siti.’

   a’. [eku ngiduk Siti] (AF)
       I N.kiss Siti
       ‘I kiss Siti.’

b. Meleng=ku [ne=iduk Ø isiq Siti] (Ø=P=OBJECT=TOPIC)
   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. Meleng=ku [Ø te=iduk isiq Siti] (Ø=P=SUBJECT=TOPIC)
   want-LIN=1 PASS=kiss by Siti
   ‘I want to be kissed by Siti.’

c’. [eku te=iduk isiq Siti] (Passive)
   I PASS=kiss by Siti
   ‘I was kissed by Siti.’

a. *Mele-ng=ku [Siti iduk Ø] (Ø=A=SUBJECT=NON-TOPIC)
   want-LIN=1 Siti Ø.kiss
   ‘I want to kiss Siti.’

   a’. [Siti iduk eku] (PF)
       Siti Ø.kiss I
       ‘I kiss Siti.’

b. *Mele-ng=ku [Siti ngiduk Ø] (Ø=P=OBJECT=NON-TOPIC)
   want-LIN=1 Siti N.kiss
   ‘I want Siti to kiss (me).’

   b’. [Siti ngiduk eku] (AF)
       Siti N.kiss I
       ‘Siti kisses me.’

2. “Try”*/“Order”-type: requires a controllable SOA complement with a “like-subject” coreferential with either the matrix subject or the matrix object

   *?I tried [ to be tall] (cf. I tried to be kind.)

   *I ordered Mary [to be tall] (cf. I ordered Mary to be kind.)

   *I tried [for John to kiss Mary]

   *I ordered Mary [for John to kiss her]

   I tried to [Ø to kiss Mary]

   I ordered Mary, [Ø, to kiss John]

   I tried to [Ø, to be kissed by Mary]

   I ordered Mary, [Ø, to be kissed by John]
Selong ngeno-ngené

a. *Ali nyobaq [Ø ngiduk Siti] (Ø=A=SUBJECT=TOPIC)
   I 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 le Siti] (Ø=P=SUBJECT=TOPIC)
   Ali N.try PASS-kiss by ART 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.'

c. *Ali nyobaq [Ø na-iduk isiq Siti] (Ø=P=OBJ=TOPIC)
   I N.try 3=Ø.kiss by Siti
   (lit.) 'Ali tried Siti to kiss (me).'

c'. [Ali na-iduk isiq Siti] (PF)
   3=Ø.kiss by Siti
   'Siti kisses Ali.'

Contrasting pair

b. *Ali nyobaq [Ø te-iduk isiq Siti] (Ø=P=SUBJECT=TOPIC)
   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.'

c. *Ali nyobaq [Ø na-iduk isiq Siti] (Ø=P=OBJ=TOPIC)
   I N.try 3=Ø.kiss by Siti
   (lit.) 'Ali tried Siti to kiss (me).'

c'. [Ali na-iduk isiq Siti] (PF)
   3=Ø.kiss by Siti
   'Siti kisses Ali.'

Bagu meno-mené (also for some Ganti speakers)

relativizer selection

Ø=A=SUBJECT=TOPIC

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.'

b. 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.'

c. Dengan nine [saq-siq=n gitaq Ø siq dengan nine]=ne inaq=k (PF)
   person female REL pass see by person male=this mother=1
   'This woman whom the man sees is my mother.'
1. There exist both Topic and Subject/Object grammatical relations in Sasak (and Sumbawa)

2. Subjects: involved in (a) cliticization (b) Bagu meno-mené REL selection (c) Reflexive binding (not discussed today)

3. Objects: involved in (a) Object cliticization (in some dialects) (b) P focusing (not discussed today) (c) Passivization (not discussed today)

4. “Try/order”-type predicates control a Subject=Topic gap in complements

5. Topics: involved in (a) the “want”-type control phenomenon (b) Relativization (and related phenomena attributable to nominalization) (c) Raising (Not discussed today) (d) Coordinate deletion, etc. (not discussed today)

---

**Reinterpreting Topic as Subject?**

- **“Topic”** → Subject → 話題・話題 → Spec, IP → Spec, P
- **“Subject”** → “$$%&$$” → 主語・主語 → Spec, VP → Spec, IP

---


---

AF, PF and Passive in the languages farther east

- **Sumbawa Besar**
  a. Ali ka-baca buku=ta
     - Ali PERF-read book=this
     - ‘Ali has read this book.’
  b. Buku=ta ka-baca leng Ali
     - book-this PERF-read by Ali
     - ‘Ali has read this book.’
  c. Buku=ta ka-ya-baca leng Ali (Passive)
     - book=this PERF-PASS-read by Ali
     - ‘This book was read by Ali.’

- **Sumbawa (Taliwang)**
  a. Ali ka-baca/maca buku=sa
     - Ali PERF-read book=this
     - ‘Ali read this book.’
  b. Buku=sa ka-baca/maca ning Ali (PF)
     - book=this PERF-read by Ali
     - ‘Ali read this book.’
  c. Buku=sa ka-i-baca ning Ali (Passive)
     - book=this PERF-PASS-read by Ali
     - ‘This book was read by Ali.’
Bima (Sila dialect; Eastern Sumbawa)

a. Nggomi ra tu'ba=mu nahu (AF)
   You PERF hit=2 I
   ‘You have hit me.’

b. Nahu ra tu'ba 'ba nggomi (PF)
   I PERF hit by you
   ‘You have hit me.’

c. Nahu 'di tu'ba 'ba nggomi (Passive; only in the irrealis mood)
   I PASS hit by you
   ‘I will be hit by you.’

AF/PF in RCs

d. Nahu ku-bade ana dou mone [ma nduku ana dou siwe aka]
   I 1-know child person male (A.)NMZ hit child person female that
   ‘I know the boy who hit that girl.’

e. Nahu ku=bade ana dou siwe [ra nduku 'ba ana dou mone aka]
   I 1=knoe child person female P.NMZ hit by child person male that
   ‘I know the girl whom that boy hit.’

Sumbawa Island (No passive; Morph. AF/PF contrast only in the relativization context)

Kodi (Western Sumba)

a. A=toyo [na=ndaruku=ghu] bapa=na Tjanggu
   ART=person 3=stab=you(OBJ) father=3 Tjanggu
   ‘The person who stabbed you is Tjanggu’s father.’

b. A=toyo [pa=ndakuru=mu] bapa=na Tjanggu (yoyyo=2TOP)
   ART=person P.NMZ=stab=2GEN father-3 Tjanggu
   ‘The person whom you stabbed is Tjanggu’s father.’

Kambera (Eastern Sumba)

a. Domu tau na=tau nina [na=hunju=ka nyungga]
   Domu know ART=person male 3=stab=1 I
   ‘Domu knows the man who stabbed me.’

b. Domu tau na=tau nina [pa=hunju=nggu]
   Domu know ART=person male P.NMZ=stab=1GEN
   ‘Domu knows the man whom I strabbed.’

Sawu (Sabu): No PASS; AF/PF structural contrast maintained in main clauses as well

Sawu

a. Kale tabbo ya. (AF)
   Kale stab I
   ‘Kale stabs me.’

b. Ya tabbo ri Kale (PF)
   I stab by Kale
   ‘Kale stabs me.’

How do we know that (b) is a PF, and not a passive?

A passive Subject=Topic gap can be controlled by the main clause subject in the try-type control construction; A PF Object=Topic gap cannot—see earlier discussion on this and also below.
Western Flores

Riung (at least in some dialect/speaker; PF/PASS distinction likely to be inconsistent)

‘Ali stabbed me.’

a. Ali ndwa(=i) aku. (AF)
   ‘I stab you.’

b. Aku le=Ali ndwa=i (PF)
   ‘You stab by=I’

c. Aku ndwa=k le=Ali (Passive)
   ‘I stab you.’

Manggarai (Ruteng)

a. Siti omo aku (AF)
   ‘Siti kisses me.’

b. Aku le=Siti omo. (PF/?Passive?)
   ‘Siti kisses me.’

c. Aku omo le=Siti (Passive/?PF)
   ‘Siti kisses me.’

Central Flores (Not even an agent marker is seen)

Ngadha (Fay Wouk)

a. kau da bhore ja'o
   you PART stab I
   ‘You stabbed me.’

b. ja'o kau da bhore
   I you PART stab
   ‘You stabbed me.’

Kéo (Baird 2002)

a. Nus bhobha Arno.
   Nus hit Arno
   ‘Nus hit Arno.’

b. Arno Nus bhobha.
   Arno Nus hit
   ‘Nus hit Arno.’

Lio (Fay Wouk)

a. kau sә ka aku
   you stab I
   ‘You stab me.’

b. aku kau sә ka
   I you stab
   ‘You stab me.’

What are these PAV forms in these isolating Flores languages?


Palu’e (Donohue 2005:60)

a. Ia cube vavi va?a. (AVP: Active)
   3SG shoot pig that
   ‘He shot that pig.’

b. Vavi va?a ia cube. (PAV: Passive)
   pig that 3SG shoot
   ‘That pig, he shot (it).’ OR ‘That pig was shot by him.’
PAV constructions—three possibilities

1. Topicalization à la English-style topic
2. Passive
3. PF constructions

Donohue considers only the first two possibilities and concludes that the PAV construction in Palu’ee is passive for the reason that P in the PAV construction exhibits some “subject” properties, unlike the fronted Objects in English; cf.

Those guys Bill hates.

Ignoring the third possibility is a curious omission in view of the following possible word order patterns of PF constructions in other Indonesian languages; e.g.,

Bahasa Indonesia (/Melayu)

a. Saya mem-beli rumah baru (AVP: AF)
   "I bought a new house."

b. Rumah baru itu saya beli. (PAV: PF)
   "I bought the new house."

Balinese

a. Tiang meli umah anyar (AVP: AF)
   "I bought a new house."

b. Umah anyar=entu beli tiang (PVA: PF)
   "I bought the new house."

Pancor ngeno-ngeno-ngéné Sasak

a. (Oku)kenyengka-ng=ku mbace buku ini (AVP: AF)
   "I am reading this book."

b. Buku ini kenyengka-ng=ku bace (PAV?: PF)
   "I am reading this book."

Importance of looking at the neighboring languages

Remnant of Subject cliticization in Eastern Flores

Sikka (Krowe dialect)

A’u teri e’i kadéra
‘I sit on the chair.’

Nimu deri d’i kadéra.
‘He sits on the chair.’

you (SG ‘au/PL miu),
we (EXCL ami), he/she (nimu),
deri ‘sit’
dola ‘hit’
etc.

I (a’u), We (INCL ite), they (rimu)= teri ‘sit’
tola ‘hit’
etc.

I hit that man.’

a. A’u tola la’i ia (AF: A=SUB controls inflection/cliticization)
   "I hit man that"

b. La’i ia a’u tola. (PF: A=SUB controls inflection: cannot be passive)
   "man that I hit"

‘He hits me.’

a. Nimu dola a’u (AF: A=SUB controls inflection)
   "he hit me"

b. A’u nimu dola (PF: A=SUB controls inflection; cannot be passive)
   "he hit"
Lamaholot (Nurabelen dialect; Naonori Nagaya)

1. a. go k-oi teʔe. (AF)  
   'I know this.'
   1SG 1SG-know this
b. teʔe go k-oi. (PF; cannot be Passive)  
   'This, I know.'
   1SG 1SG-know this

2. a. Ra r-enu tua? (AF)  
   'They drink tuak.'
   3PL 3PL-drink tuak
b. Tua? ra r-enu (PF; cannot be Passive)  
   'Tuak, they drink.'
   tuak 3PL 3PL-drink

Try-type control construction

Many speakers of Indonesian languages clearly distinguish between PF and Passive constructions in Bahasa Indonesian of the following type:

a. Mata men-cium saya (AF)  
   Mata AF-kiss I
   'Mata kisses me.'

b. Saya Mata cium (PF)  
   Saya I 3PL-drink by Mata  
   'I tried to be kissed by Mata.'

While a passive can be embedded under "try" with the expected reading,

d. Saya (men-)coba [Ø di-cium oleh Mata] (based on Passive c)  
   I AF-try PASS-kiss by Mata  
   'I tried to be kissed by Mata.'

A PF construction cannot be easily embedded under "try":

e. Saya (men-)coba [Ø Mata cium] (based on PF b)  
   Saya I 3PL-drink by Mata  
   'I tried to be kissed by Mata.'

This form is either outright rejected or is given the unintended "crossed" reading of 'Mata tries to be kissed by me.' (Cf. Polinsky and Potsdam 2007 on the "crossed" reading.)

Sikka

a. Mata piru a’u.  
   'Mata kisses me.'
   Mata kiss I
b. A’u Mata piru. (PF, not Passive)  
   'Mata kisses me.'
   A’u 3PL-drink by Mata
   3PL 3PL-drink by Mata

c. *A’u soba [Ø Mata piru] (If Passive, this would have been accepted)  
   'I try to be kissed by Mata.'
   I try Mata kiss
   try I 3PL-drink by Mata

The same speaker accepts the BI form,

Bahasa Indonesia

a. Saya coba [Ø di-cium oleh Mata] (Based on Passive; Saya di-cium oleh Mata)  
   'I try to be kissed by Mata.'
   I try PASS-kiss by Mata
   try I 3PL-drink by Mata
But he rejects:

b. *Saya coba [Ø Mata cium] (based on PF; Saya Mata cium)  
   'Mata kisses me.'
   I try Mata kiss

Donohue’s (2005:77) Palu'e argument properties list

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AVP construction</th>
<th>PAV construction</th>
<th>S V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A P OBL</td>
<td>A P OBL</td>
<td>S OBL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Floated quantifiers: I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floated quantifiers: I</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>OBL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>OBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floated quantifiers: II</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction reduction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purposive clauses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Relativization)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflexives: antecedent?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Argument alignment patterns:

- Floated Q I: TOP and OBL
- Floated Q II: Non-TOP
- Conjunction reduction: TOP
- Purposive clauses: TOP
- Relativization: TOP
- Clitics/Reflexives: SUB
Conclusions:

1. Structural contrast between Actor-focus and Patient-focus constructions obtains throughout the Nusa Tenggara region despite the loss of the Austronesian focus morphology in the languages to the east of region.

2. Nature of the Austronesian focus system: How does it differ from the familiar voice mechanisms?

Active/Passive, Active/Antipassive, applicatives, etc. involve changes in, or realignment of, the clause-level grammatical relations of Subject, Object, Ergative, Absolutive, and Oblique: Linking between thematic roles & syntactic relations of (mac) Subject, object, ergative, and oblique:

The focus system does not change the clause-level grammatical relations; it links the clause-level grammatical relations (as peripheral roles) to the sentence-level grammatical relation of Topic: AF (SUB=TOP); PF (OBJ=TOP)

Active (A=SUB; P=OBJ)
Pass (A=OBL; P=SUB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Puyung meno-mené Sasak</th>
<th>Active: Ali bace buku=ni (A=SUB; P=OBJ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'Ali read book=this'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Passive: Buku=ni te-bace isiq Ali (A=OBL; P=SUB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'This book was read by Ali.'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Active (A=SUB; P=OBJ)
Pass (A=OBL; P=SUB)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active/AF: Ali bace buku=ni (A=SUB=TOP; P=OBJ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active/PF: Buku=ni bace isiq Ali (A=SUB; P=OBJ=TOP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive/AF: Buku=ni te-bace isiq Ali (A=OBL; P=SUB=TOP)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>