ERGATIVE AND ANTIPASSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN MINANGKABAUNESE: ARE THERE?

Jufrizal[1], Lely Refnita[2], M. Affandi Arianto[3]
English Department of FBS Universitas Negeri Padang[1,3]
English Department of FKIP Universitas Bung Hatta[2]
juf_ely@fbs.unp.ac.id[1]; lelyrefnita@bunghatta.ac.id[2]; affandia@fbs.unp.ac.id[3]

Abstract

That Minangkabunese has active-passive dichotomy is not questioned anymore since it has been treated as an accusative language. Further typological analysis toward grammatical constructions of this language leads to a claim that it may be treated as an ergative language in which the ergative and antipassive constructions exist. That Minangkabaunese has ergative and antipassive construction is still questioned in some matters. Therefore, further grammatical-typological data, analysis, and discussion are needed. This paper, which is based on and developed from a part of results of research conducted in 2021-2022, particularly analyses whether Minangkabaunese has ergative and/or antipassive constructions. Two questions are raised, namely: (i) are there ergative and antipassive constructions in Minangkabaunese? and (ii) what is the linguistic implication of such claim toward grammatical typology of Minangkabaunese? This descriptive-qualitative study was practically operated as a linguistic field research and supported by a library study. Native speakers as represented by selected informants and written texts of Minangkabaunese were the sources of data. The data are in the form of clause constructions of Minangkabunese identified as the standard ones and were analyzed based on related theories of grammatical typology. The result of data analysis reveals that Minangkabaunese has ergative and antipassive constructions. Implicationally, this language may be typologically treated as an ergative language at the syntactic level beside as an accusative language.

Key words: Minangkabaunese, grammatical typology, ergative, antipassive

Abstrak

Bahwa bahasa Minangkabau mempunyai dikotomi aktif-pasif sudah tidak dipertanyakan lagi karena bahasa ini diperlakukan sebagai bahasa akusatif. Analisis lebih jauh terhadap konstruksi gramatikal bahasa ini juga memungkinkan untuk memperlakukannya sebagai bahasa ergatif yang di dalamnya ada konstruksi ergatif dan antipasif. Bahwa bahasa Minangkabau mempunyai konstruksi ergatif dan antipasif masih dipertanyakan pada beberapa hal, sehingga data, analisis, dan pembahasan lebih jauh diperlukan. Makalah yang didasarkan dan dikembangkan dari sebagian hasil penelitian tahun 2021-2022, mengkaji apakah bahasa Minangkabau mempunyai konstruksi ergatif dan antipasif. Dua pertanyaan yang diajukan adalah: (i) apakah ada konstruksi ergatif dan antipasif dalam bahasa Minangkabau?, dan (ii) apa implikasi linguistik dari jawaban (i) terhadap tipologi gramatikal bahasa Minangkabau? Penelitian deskriptif-kualitatif ini dilaksanakan sebagai penelitian linguistik lapangan dan didukung oleh penelitian kepustakaan. Penutur asli yang diwakili oleh informan terpilih dan teks tertulis bahasa Minangkabau adalah sumber data penelitian. Data adalah dalam bentuk konstruksi klausa dasar ragam baku bahasa Minangkabau dan dianalisis berdasarkan teori tipologi gramatikal terkait. Hasil analisis data menunjukkan bahwa bahasa Minangkabau mempunyai konstruksi ergatif dan

antipasif. Temuan ini secara implikatif membuktikan bahwa bahasa ini boleh diperlakukan sebagai bahasa ergatif pada tataran sintaktis selain sebagai bahasa akusatif.

Kata Kunci: *bahasa Minangkabau, tipologi gramatikal, ergatif, antipasif*

INTRODUCTION

It is generally known that human languages have both universal and unique properties in all aspects and uses. Such universal and unique properties attract linguists' attention to study the characteristics of universality and uniqueness of languages cross-linguistically as in the studies of Linguistic Typology. Linguistic typologists, in particular, study cross-linguistic variations in order to understand the nature of human languages. Accordingly, the best way to gain access to the cross-linguistic variations of a grammatical phenomenon is to study as wide a range of human languages as possible. As a result, by having a lot of cross-linguistic data and certain comparison, typologists may classify and group human languages in the world by having certain parameters and classification (see Comrie, 1989; Song, 2001; Daniel in Song (ed.), 2012).

Ergative and antipassive constructions are grammatical (morpho-syntactic) categories resulted from grammatical processes naturally found in many languages. In grammatical-typological studies, an active clause is regarded as the underlying voice in a nominative-accusative language in which S = A, $\neq$ P; a clause in passive voice is the derived one in this type of language. Meanwhile, in an ergative-absolutive language (in which S = P, $\neq$ A), an ergative clause is the underlying voice, and antipassive is the derived one. The concepts and characteristics of active-passive voice are universal in a nominative-accusative language, while ergative-antipassive ones are also universal in an ergative-absolutive language. In traditional linguistic typology, an ergative construction is common in ergative languages as the basic voice. But in some languages with neutral typology, the dichotomy of active-passive and ergative-antipassive are possibly found with certain characteristics and unique properties. In Minangkabaunese, a local language naturally spoken in the main land of West-Sumatera, the active voice is morpho-syntactacally marked by the prefix *ma-,* and the passive one is marked by the prefix *di-* and *ba-*. Interestingly, an ergative construction in this local language is also morpho-syntactically marked by the prefix *ba-* (see further Comrie, 1989; Artawa, 2005; Artawa and Jufrizal, 2018, 2021; Jufrizal and Refnita, 2022).

According to Shibatani (in Shibatani (ed.), 1988), voice phenomena, especially between the active and the passive, have played important roles in the development of modern linguistics. Apart from the development of formal syntax, voice phenomena have figured prominently in the field of linguistic typology, as well. One major area in which problems arose was in the ergative languages, in which the basic transitive clause resembles the passive form of English and other non-ergative languages in that the patient occurs in the unmarked absolutive (or nominative) case, while the agent takes a special ergative case-marker. Whether or not the ergative construction should be identified as a passive construction has long been a controversial issue. As a classical view, Shibatani (in Shibatani (ed.), 1988: 3) explains that voice is understood as a mechanism that selects a grammatically prominent syntactic constituent – subject – from the underlying semantic functions (case or thematic roles) of a clause. The majority of languages provide a basic voice strategy. In nominative-accusative languages (where S=A, $\neq$ P), the basic strategy is to select an agent as a subject, and the active voice refers to the form resulting from an agent as a subject; the active voice in accusative languages is the

unmarked voice, which denies the agent the subject role. In almost all languages, a patient has a subject role in this marked voice. This marked voice, contrasted to the basic, active voice, is the passive voice. It may be added that ergative clause (construction) is the basic clause in ergative languages, and the antipassive is its derived clause. In accusative languages, a clause (construction) in active voice is the underlying clause, while the derived one is antipassive.

Shibatani (in Shibatani (ed.), 1988: 4) adds that the voice opposition observed in a fair number of ergative languages involves a different matter in the treatment of patient nominal. In ergative languages, in nature, the basic voice strategy selects a patient as a grammatically prominent constituent; an ergative construction is the underlying voice in an ergative language. However, the ergative construction cannot be equated with the passive construction for a number of reasons, despite the similarity the grammatical prominent, exhibited by the patient nominal. It should be pointed out that an independent voice "ergative" should be recognized, which is in contrast to the antipassive and the passive voice. The antipassive voice denies grammatical prominence to the patient nominal by either encoding it as an oblique constituent or not syntactically encoding it at all. It is also necessary to note that some ergative languages, as in Mayan languages for instance, show a three-way contrast involving the ergative, the antipassive, and the passive. In relation to this, the ergative and the passive are not mutually exclusive.

Shibatani (1988) and others (see Arka and Manning, 1998; Billings, 2010; Aldridge, 2012; Naonori, 2012; Chen and McDonnell, 2018) argue that the Philippine voice system differs from both the active-passive opposition and the ergative-antipassive (-passive) opposition in that the basic voice is difficult to determine, especially because both the actor (agent)-topic form and the goal (patient)-topic construction have comparable morphological complexity and text frequency. Thus, while the Philippine topicalization is recognized as a voice system, it should be distinguished from the other voice system. It is argued that Philippine languages, including perhaps a number of other languages of the Western branch of Austronesia (such as Malay, Minangkabaunese, Javanese, etc.) constitute a typological group of its own and is characterizable in terms of its voice system, which is neutral in orientation as opposed to agent-oriented system of accusative languages and the patient-oriented system of ergative languages.

In relation to passivity and ergativity, many writers have been unclear about the criteria for considering a construction to be ergative or passive. A classical idea of ergative (-absolutive) and (nominative-) accusative alignment is proposed by Plank (in Plank (ed.), 1979: 4). According to him:

(a) A grammatical pattern of process show ergative alignment if it identifies intransitive subject (S) and transitive direct object as opposed to transitive subject (A): (S = O/P, ≠ A);

(b) It shows accusative alignment if it identifies subject of intransitive clause (S) and agent of transitive clause (A) in the same way as opposed to patient of transitive clause (S = A, ≠ O/P).

Similarly, Dixon (1994: 1) states that the term ergativity is used to describe a grammatical pattern in which the subject of an intransitive clause is treated in the same way as the object of a transitive clause, and differently from a transitive subject. Comrie (in Lehmann (ed.), 1978) mentions that ergativity refers to a system of marking grammatical relations in which intransitive subject pattern together with transitive object ("absolutive"), and differently from transitive subject ("ergative"). This ergative alignment pattern may be manifested, for

example, in terms of morphological case marking on nominals, or patterns of agreement on the predicate.

A recent contribution to the types of ergativity as well as a renewed view to ergative constructions in grammatical typology was declared by Legate (2011), who argues that there are two main contributions to the understanding of ergativity. First, it supports the main claim that ergative is an inherent case through a study of the Warlpiri lexicon: no ergative-marked subjects are derived, in accordance with Marantz's generalization. Second, it reanalyzes syntactical ergativity in Dyirbal. It demonstrates that the language underlyingly has an ergative – nominative – accusative case system, with imperfect morphological realization of the cases. It further shows that syntactic ergativity in Dyirbal is not sensitive to the absolutive, but rather underlying nominative and accusative, regardless of morphological realization. In addition, Deal (2016) states that syntactic ergativity shows how the factors behind morphological ergativity interact with other components of the grammar. In some languages, the interaction underlies a ban on agent extraction of ergatives.

In a more concise idea, Comrie (in Sibatani (ed.), 1988: 9) proposes three criteria in identifying ergative and passive as they are similar in same aspects. According to him:

(i)   passive and ergative are alike in that both involve assignment of at least some subject properties to the patient rather than the agent;
(ii)   passive and ergative differ in that the ergative typically involves greater integration of the agent phrase to into the syntax of the clause;
(iii)   passive and ergative differ in the term of markedness – the passive is a marked construction, whereas the ergative is typically an unmarked construction.

As a derived construction, it is necessary to know prototypical concepts of passive and antipassive cross-linguistically. Passive and antipassive are constructions that can be formed to reduce the valency of a verb. According to Dixon (2010: 166) (see also Dixon & Aikhenvald, 2000; Sanso, 2018; Jerono, 2018), there are four basic characteristics for prototypical passive and antipassive.

Prototypical Passive derivation (applying to a transitive clause):
(i)   applying to an underlying transitive clause and forms a derived intransitive;
(ii)   the underlying O becomes S of the passive;
(iii)   the underlying A goes into a peripheral function, being marked by a non-core case, adposition, etc.; this argument can be omitted, although there is always the option of including it;
(iv)   there is some explicit (that is non zero) formal marking of a passive construction; this can be morpho-syntactic process applying to the verb, or a peripheral verbal construction.

Prototypical Antipassive derivation (applying to a transitive clause):
(i)   applying to an underlying transitive clause and forms a derived intransitive;
(ii)   The underlying A becomes S of the antipassive;
(iii)   The underlying O goes into a pheriperal function, being marked by a non-core case, adposition, etc.; this argument can be omitted, although there is always the option of including it;
(iv)   There is some explicit formal marking of an antipassive construction (similar possibilities as for passive).

Sanso (2018) states that the four characteristics of antipassive can be referred to as 'narrow definition'. Quoting Polinsky (2017), Sanso (2018) mentions a broad definition of antipassive as a clause with a transitive predicate whose logical object is demoted to a non-core argument or non-argument (subject > object > non-core argument > non argument).

According to Heaton (2020), the term antipassive has been used and referred to various meanings. It has been a "well-established meaning" since in the middle of 1970s when it is used by Smith-Stark (1978) and Dixon (1979). To date, most definitions of antipassives have focused on structural characteristics. For instance, the logical object is either removed or expressed in an oblique phrase, and the construction is intransitive. The antipassive is generally considered to be a voice, on par with the passive. If it is required that the antipassive corresponds only to a transitive event type, and not to a morphologically less-marked transitive structure, then various types of alternative marking patterns for two-participant verbs could also be labeled antipassive. Letuchiy (in Heaton, 2020) describes Adyghe (Abkhaz-Adyghean) as having antipassive, where the verb is clearly intransitive, the agent is absolutive, and the patient is oblique, and this shift is marked by an internal vowel change.

Heaton (2020) further explains that the observation that antipassives tend to appear in ergative languages has been repeated time and again in the typological literature. While there have long been voices claiming that antipassives do indeed exist in non-ergative languages, by and large the examples are not prototypical antipassives. However, with the information collected in large targeted typological studies, there is now general consensus in recent studies on antipassives that antipassive constructions are not limited to ergative languages. In some nominative-accusative languages, the antipassive appears to be an innovation, where an existing morpheme gains an additional sense. While marked antipassives clearly exist in nominative-accusative languages, they are not nearly as frequent in those languages as they are in ergative languages. In other words, the antipassive constructions are natural in ergative languages.

Sanso (2015) notes that the sources of antipassives have attracted less attention than the sources of passives for some reasons: (i) antipassives are rarer than passives cross-linguistically; (ii) there is generally no sufficient historical documentation to reconstruct the diachrony of grammaticallized antipassives; and (iii) there are constructions performing the same functions as antipassives that are usually labeled with a different terminology in grammars, especially in languages with non-ergative alignment. Sanso (2015) delivers a broad definition of antipassives as formally intransitive constructions involving verbs that also occur in a transitive construction, in which the agent of the transitive construction is encoded as the unique argument, while the patient (or the object of the transitive construction) is either encoded as an oblique, or it is suppressed. Based on cross-linguistic studies, Sanso (2015) identifies the sources of antipassives, namely:

(i)   APs from agentive nominalizations; in some languages, AP morphemes are identical or similar to agentive nominalizers, i.e. markers that derive an agent noun (such as *sing-er*) from verb *sing*;

(ii)   APs from indefinite elements in object position (generic nouns, indefinite pronouns); in some languages, AP morphemes can be traced back to generic/indefinite nouns filling the object position (such as *person* for animate object, *(some)thing* for inanimate objects);

(iii)   APs from action/result nominalizations; in some languages, APs appear to be etymologically connected with action nominalizations, either alone or accompanied by a light verb like *'do'* (such as *do the washing*);

(iv)   APs from reflexive/reciprocal constructions; in some languages, the morpheme encoding reflexive and/or reciprocal actions is also used when there is a (suppressed) unimportant patient; and

(v)   Dubious cases; Siouan languages have an AP morphemes *wa-* that also functions as a nominalizer. When it is used to derive nouns from verbs, however, the resulting nominal may be either an agent nominal or an action/fresult nominal. Given that both kinds of nominalizations happen to be possible sources of AP constructions, it is impossible to determine which of the two attested nominalizing functions of *wa-* has given rise to an AP reinterpretation.

Quite many typological studies on voice phenomena, especially those related to ergatives and antipassives, have been conducted cross-linguistically in many languages. For example, Arka & Manning (1998) studied the phenomena of voice and grammatical relation in Indonesian under the title "Voice and Grammatical Relations in Indonesian: A New Perspective". They came to the conclusion that Indonesian passive should be divided between constructions that are genuinely comparable to an English passive and ergative constructions which are not. In the ergative construction, it was found that term-complement *a-subjects* can bind *gr-subject,* as in Toba Batak and Balinese. Within the passive constructions, an *a-subject* and *gr-subject* can bind another oblique construction. Further, Arifin (2006) studied new ergative constructions in Nusantara languages. According to him, Indonesian and Sundanese also have passive voice that is antiactive (cannot be changed into active) and active voice that is antipassive (cannot be changed into passive). Accordingly, those forms are suspected to be "new ergative" form. Billings (2010) proposed DIATHESIS instead of VOICE as a blanket term for the type of morphosyntax found in Austronesian languages of the Philippines, such as the phenomena in Maranao. According to Billings (2010), Austronesian languages tend to express many properties of the predicate-argument structure in the verbal morphology. It is seen in Maranao that voice is expressed in this way; other operations that change the predicate-argument structure include causative and reciprocal morphology.

The study on ergative/absolute and active/stative alignment in West Africa, the case of Southwestern Mande, was conducted by Vydrin (2011). As it is usually believed that non-accusative alignment systems are very rare in Africa, Vydrin argues that a thorough study on the verbal systems of the Southwestern Mande languages (Looma, Mande, Kpelle) has shown that this group is an exception. The ergative/absolute types of argument coding and semantic alignment observed in these languages are mainly in the personal marking on the verbs. In the study, Vydrin states that in the Liberian dialects of Looma, only stative verbs (belonging to a closed class) show non-accusative encoding, which can be interpreted as an S-split. In Mande, an active/stative type of argument indexing is attested on the verbs of an open class. All the verbs in the stative/resultative/perfect construction in Northern Looma and in the stative/ resultative/intensive construction in Kpelle display ergative/absolute alignment.

Antipassive and ergativity in Tagalog were observed by Aldridge (2012). According to Aldridge, there is a long-standing controversy in Austronesian linguistics over whether the so-called 'actor focus' clause type is transitive or antipassive. Aldridge argues that 'actor focus' clauses do in fact pattern with antipassive in ergative languages, and then he concludes that Tagalog is an ergative language. Transitive verb in ergative clauses values structural absolutive case with the object determiner phrase and assigns inherent ergative case to the external

argument in its specifier. In intransitive (including antipassive) clauses, a verb phrase values an absolutive case with tense, and the object in an antipassive is dependent on the lexical verb for inherent case. In addition, Naonori (2012), who studied the syntactic transitivity of Tagalog actor-focus constructions, delivers the conclusion that Tagalog Actor Focus constructions are best analyzed as syntactically intransitive.

Kusuma (2018) wrote an article which deals with passive and antipassive voice ergative type of Nusantara languages. In the study, Kusuma described the correlation between voices: passive, antipassive, and ergative of languages in Nusantara. The findings of the study are: (a) passive and ergative equally involve at least the property S equals to P rather than to A; (b) passive and ergative are different in that ergative typologically involves greater integration of the agent phrase into the syntax of clauses; (c) passive and ergative are different in terms of marker; and (d) passive construction in Nusantara languages has two types; they all focus on the patient argument. Meanwhile, antipassives are intransitive; the agent can be downgraded to prepositional phrase for antipassive, and an indefinite agent is nonreferential.

The voice of Western Austronesian was investigated by Chen & McDonnell (2018). As the nature of western Austronesian voice – typically subcategorized as Philippine-type and Indonesian-type – has triggered considerable debate in the typological and syntactical literature, it is argued that the voice systems in those languages in the area are unique. For some reasons, favor a valency-neutral approach to western Austronesian voice and evidence sometimes is problematic against a valency-changing and/or ergative approach to the analysis of the languages. Jerono (2018), who did a study on passive and antipassive in Tugen, a southern Nilotic language of Kenya, argues that passive and antipassive in Tugen are both syntactically detransitivising constructions; the constructions remain semantically transitive. Both constructions are reflected in the verb by affixes; the passive is by means of a prefix while the antipassive is by means of a suffix. In these constructions, the passive blocks the agreement feature from projecting the subject syntactically, while the antipassive blocks the object from being projected syntactically. The antipassive and the passive in Tugen are used to focus on the action, while being vague on respective arguments.

A paper dealing with the constructions of passive and antipassive in Sasak was written by Azizah (2020). In the paper, it is stated that the syntactic passive marker in Sasak Kuto-Kute dialect is very productive and more common compared to the morphological markers. As for antipassive, it was formed only through morphological markings, which involved the use of nasal prefixes such as *meny-* and *me-*, and confix *ng- ... -ang* as the antipassive markers. Then, the phenomena of antipassive constructions in Oceanic languages were studied by Moyse-Faurie (2021). Different constructions were analyzed identifying as antipassives in Oceanic languages. Throughout the presentation of all the different constructions, it was found that some aspects of prototypical antipassive constructions, some semantic, pragmatic, or syntactic features have appeared to be more recurrent than others. The case of antipassive in Ainu, a nearly extinct language which used to be spoken in Northern Japan and the Far East of Russia, was investigated by Bugaeva (2021). In the study, Bugaeva describes that there are two synchronically distinct *i-* markers, viz., the derivational antipassive *i-* and inflectional 'fourth' person object *i-* with the functions of 1 PL., INCL., 2HON, and LOG. It is also confirmed that antipassives in Ainu are much less frequent than applicatives or causatives.

The brief reviews of related studies above show that various types of grammatical constructions are available cross-linguistically in presenting ergatives and antipassives. The

previous studies also confirm that antipassives are not only found in ergative-absolutive languages, but they also probably exist in nominative-accusative languages and neutral languages. Once Minangkabaunese has been confirmed as a neutral language (see Artawa & Jufrizal, 2018; Jufrizal & Refnita, 2022), it may be claimed that ergative and antipassive constructions are naturally found. However, the typological analysis and discussion on grammatical properties of ergatives and antipassives in Minangkabaunese have not been a particular focus yet, as ergative and antipassive constructions in this language are still questioned in some matters and thus it needs further grammatical-typological data, analysis, and discussion. This article, which is based on and developed from a part of research conducted in 2021-2022, particularly analyses and discusses whether Minangkabaunese has ergative and/or antipassive constructions. Two questions are raised in this paper, namely: (i) are there ergative and antipassive constructions in Minangkabaunese?, and (ii) what is the linguistic implication of such claim toward grammatical typology of Minangkabaunese? This study has significant contributions to grammatical-typological studies in general based on grammatical data of Minangkabaunese.

RESEARCH METHOD

This descriptive-qualitative study was operationally executed as a field research and supported by a library study. As a field research, this study took place in fourteen main towns/regions in the mainland of West-Sumatera where native speakers of Minangkabaunese socially and culturally live. The data were in the forms of clause-syntactical constructions grammatically categorized as the formal-grammatical constructions in basic clause constructions of Minangkabaunese. The data are intuitively and linguistically assumed as the standard ones. Practically, the data were simultaneously collected by means of participant observation, in-depth interview, administrating questionnaires, and quoting/selecting data from written manuscripts and texts. The instruments of research were field-notes, observation sheets, recorder tools, interview guideline, and questionnaire sheets. The sources of data were the native speakers of Minangkabaunese intentionally selected as informants and respondents, and the manuscripts/ texts of Minangkabaunese. As the researchers are native speakers of Minangkabaunese, they were also possible to be the sources of data, but the intuitive data were systematically cross-checked and consulted with the selected informants in order to have valid and reliable data. Then the data obtained were classified into clausal-syntactical categories in order to decide whether they were appropriate and ready to analyze. The data were linguistically analyzed based on relevant theoretical foundation of ergative and antipassive constructions.

DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

Ergatives in Minangkabaunese

Based on the data collected, it is argued that the ergative constructions in Minangkabaunese may be morphologically marked by the prefix *ba-*. The analysis presented in this paper is only limited to the ergative construction morphologically marked by the prefix *ba-*. It has not been questioned anymore that the basic active clause in Minangkabaunese is morphologically marked by the prefix *maN-* and its passive is morphologically marked by the prefix *di-* on the verb in the verbal predicate. Then, the prefix *ba-* attached to the base form of the verb is to form an ergative

construction. The following data present examples of active, passive, and ergative constructions in Minangkabaunese.

(1) a. *Urang tu   man -jua lado.*
     man   ART ACT-sell chilly
     'The man sold chilly'

   b. *Lado di-   jua (dek) urang tu.*
      chilly PAS-sell by   man   ART
      'Chilly was sold by the man'

   c. *Lado ba-   jua dek urang tu.*
      chilly ERG-sell by man   ART
      'Chilly was sold by the man'

(2) a. *Abak   ma- ulang carito lamo.*
      father ACT-repeat story old
      'Father repeated the old story'

   b. *Carito lamo di-   ulang (dek) abak.*
       story old   PAS-repeat by   father
      'The old story was repeated by father'

   c. *Carito lamo ba-   ulang dek abak.*
       story old   ERG-repeat by father
       'The old story was repeated by father'

(3) a. *Uda   ma- abuih   aia   kutiko itu.*
      brother ACT-boil   water time   that
      'Brother was boiling water at that time'

   b. *Aia   di- abuih (dek) uda   kutiko itu.*
      water PAS-boil   by   brother time   that
      'Water was being boiled by brother at that time'

   c. *Aia   ba- abuih dek uda   kutiko itu.*
      water ERG-boil   by brother time   that
      'Water was being boiled by brother at that time'

Examples (1a), (2a), and (3a) are the basic clause constructions in active voice; they are morphologically marked by the prefix *maN-* and the grammatical subjects are the agents (A). In contrast, data (1b), (2b), and (3b) are the passives, the derived constructions of their related actives by means of passivization. In passives, the verbs are morphologically marked by the prefix *di-* and the agents (A) are demoted to oblique arguments. As in many languages, the argument oblique is optional. Data (1c), (2c), and (3c) cannot be assigned as actives or passives. They are different in the sense that grammatical-semantic properties of such kind of constructions are unique and specific.

Referring to Comrie's (in Shibatani (ed.), 1988), the grammatical constructions morphologically marked by *ba-* in Minangkabaunese as in (1c), (2c), and (3c) may be claimed as an ergative construction. The grammatical subject in such clauses is neither a "pure" agent nor a "pure" patient, even though it is more as patient (close to passive) rather than as an agent.

This is one of the main criteria of ergative construction and how to differentiate it from passives.

In the data claimed as ergative constructions in Minangkabaunese above, the agent (A) – prepositional NP – is obligatory. Thus, omitting a preposition in a prepositional phrase as an oblique relation is not grammatical. This grammatical property makes it different from passive in which the oblique argument (demoted agent) is optional. Thus, the following ergative constructions are not grammatical in Minangkabaunese.

(4) * *Lado ba- jua urang tu.*
(5) * *Carito lamo ba-ulang abak.*
(6) * *Aia ba-abuih uda kutiko itu.*

The analysis and discussion above lead to an essential thing that the prefix *ba-* in Minangkabaunese is a morphological marker for ergative constructions. In addition, it is proved that Minangkabaunese has grammatical-typological properties as an ergative(-absolutive) language, beside as a (nominative-)accusative one. Thus, assigning Minangkabaunese only as a nominative-accusative language and neglecting ergativity analysis is not a correct decision in nature. It is therefore time to have a grammatical-typological discussion about ergativity in Minangkabaunese. This analysis and discussion are necessary in order to have data and information whether this language has a certain degree of capacity of ergativity. This is also helpful to formulate typological claims and conclusion concerning with the degree of ergativity cross-linguistically. And of course, the ideas and data brought in this article are only limited to the prefix *ba-* which morphologically marks the ergative constructions.

The data indicate that the degree of ergativity in Minangkabaunese is significant and higher than that of bahasa Indonesia, for instance. The term ***higher*** here may refer to qualitative and quantitative measurement. Qualitative measurement refers to the sense and the nature of ergative constructions in the grammar of the languages, while quantitative measurement refers to frequency and capacity of uses. For the time being, the degree of ergativity is only based on the case of prefix *ba-* in Minangkabaunese as a morphological marker of ergative constructions.

Qualitatively, the degree of ergativity in Minangkabaunese is higher than that of bahasa Indonesia. It means that almost all verbal grammatical constructions in the form of clause with the prefix *ba-* are grammatical in Minangkabaunese. However, in bahasa Indonesia, not all verbal clause constructions with the prefix *ber-* are grammatical, or at least they are not natural. The following data are the verbal clause constructions assigned as ergatives that are grammatical and natural in Minangkabaunese.

(7) *Parumahan ba- bangun dek pamerintah dakek pasa.*
　　houses　　ERG-build　by government near　market
　　'The houses are built by government near the market'

(8) *Karambia ba- tabang dek Anas.*
　　coconuts ERG-cut　　by name
　　'Coconuts were cut by Anas'

(9) *Guru-guru ba- uji baliak dek pamerintah kota.*
　　teachers　ERG-test back　by official　　city
　　'Teachers were retested by city officials'

(10) *Wali Nagari ba-   piliah dek urang kampuang.*
     local leader ERG-elect   by people kampong
     'The local leader was elected by villagers'

The data presented above prove that ergative constructions, which are morphologically marked by the prefix *ba-,* exist in Minangkabaunese. The data also indicate that the use of *ba-* is productive in this language. Almost all types of verbs may receive this prefix in order to convey various semantic meanings; one of them is to grammatically construct ergative constructions and/or ergative meaning. Referring to related theories of ergativity, an ergative construction with the prefix *ba-* in Minangkabaunese is similar to passive, but an ergative construction may have certain differences compared to passive. The differences coincide to similarities and differences of passive and ergative characteristics as proposed by Shibatani (1988).

In addition to the data above, data (11) – (15) are also identified as ergative constructions in Minangkabaunese. They are also morphologically marked by the prefix *ba-*. In these examples, the agent is not in the form of a prepositional phrase like those in (1) – (10). However, they are considered as ergative constructions as they fulfill the criteria of universal ergative based on cross-linguistic studies.

(11) *Urang kampuang ka   ba- tagak pangulu   bulan muko.*
     people kampong   FUT ERG-declare kinship leader next   month
     'The villagers will declare kinship leader next month'

(12) *Sudah rayo,   kami   ka   ba- tagak kudo-kudo rumah sikola.*
      after   holyday PRO2PL FUT ERG-build roof frame house school
     'After the holyday, we will build roof frame of school building'

(13) *Sajak itu, inyo   acok ba- urai aia mato.*
     since then, PRO3SG often ERG-expel tear
     'Since then, she often expels tear'

(14) *Dari ketek, ambo   ba- utang   budi   ka inyo.*
     since small, PRO1SG ERG-have debt morality to him
     'Since small child, I have had debt morality to him'

(15) *Malam tu, lampu ba- salai   agak   talambek.*
      night   that, lamp ERG-turn on rather late
     'At that night, the lamp was turned on rather late'

The data above show that the grammatical subject is not the agent of a transitive construction, but it is not a patient as in passive construction, either. This is the main criteria of an ergative construction, the underlying clause in ergative languages.

Antipassives in Minangkabaunese

For the basis of analysis and discussion, it is necessary to note again what Heaton (2020: 133) states about delimiting antipassives. According to her, to date, most definitions of antipassives focus on structural characteristics. For instance, the logical object is either removed or expressed in an oblique phrase and the construction is intransitive. However, those who write on this topic seem to agree that there is no single structural feature which is diagnostic of the antipassive, nor is there a single functional property which all antipassive constructions share to

the exclusion of other constructions. As such, one must necessarily take a range of semantic and structural attributes into account. In relation to antipassives in Minangkabaunese, morphological markers and morpho-syntactic processes are involved together with semantic views.

The first form and source of antipassives in Minangkabaunese is the agentive nominalizations. The following data show this type of antipassive.

(16) a. *Inyo   ma- ngaji ilmu   tauhid.*
PRO3SG ACT-learn science theology
'He learns theology'

b. *Pa- ngaji-an- nyo   sadang ba-jalan.*
AP-learn-AP-POS3SG being   run
'His learning is running'

(17) a. *Guru   man- jaleh- an   jalan agamo.*
teacher ACT-explain-SUF ways   religion
'The teacher is explaining ways of religion'

b. *Pan- jaleh- an guru   tantang jalan agamo.*
AP- explain-AP teacher about   ways religion
'Teacher's explanation is about ways of religion'

(18) a. *Abak   ma- marun jarami di sawah.*
father ACT-burn   straw   in rice field
'Father burn the straw down in the rice field'

b. *Pa- marun-an abak salasai.*
AP-burn-   AP father end
'Father's burning ended'

Data (16a), (17a), and (18a) are transitive clauses in which there are two core arguments, S(ubject)/A(gent) and O(bject)/P(atient). In (16a), *inyo* 'he' is a subject and an agent as well, and *ilmu tauhid* 'theology' is an object/a patient. The constructions in (16b), (17b), and (18b) are intransitives derived from (16a), (17a), and (18a) by means of antipassivization. In this grammatical process, the agentive nominalization occurs and it is morphologically marked by the confix *pa- ...-an* as a nominalizer in Minangkabaunese. In data (16b), (17b), and (18b), *pa-gajian-an* 'learning', *pan-jaleh-an* 'explanation', and *pa-marun-an* 'burning' are agentive nominalization and become the subjects of derived intransitives. The intransitives as in (16b), (17b), and (18b) are derived from the basic transitives as in (16a), (17a), and (18a) in which the objects/patients are deleted. The grammatical process produces new grammatical constructions which are called antipassives (henceforth, AP). Thus, the confix *pa-...-an* plays a fundamental role in antipassivization in Minangkabaunese.

The second form and source of antipassive constructions in Minangkabaunese is action/result nominalizations. In this case, antipassives appear to be etymologically connected with action nominalizations, either alone or accompanied by a light verb like *do*, as *do the washing*, in English. The following data show such kind of antipassive in Minangkabaunese. Again, similar to the first type, the nominalizer confix *ka-...-an* in (19b) and the prefix *maN-* in (20b) and (21b) function in the grammatical process in order to have antipassive constructions.

(19) a. *Kami   man- datang-i   kapalo karajo.*
  PRO2JM ACT-come- APL head   work
  'We came to the head of work'

  b. *Ka- datang-an   kami   ka kapalo karajo.*
  AP-come- AP POS2JM to head   work
  'Our coming to the head of work'

(20) a. *Amak   mam-basuah galeh gadang.*
   mother ACT-wash   glass big
  'Mother is washing the big glass'

  b. *Amak   alah   mam-basuah (galeh gadang).*
  mother PERF AP- wash   (glass big)
   'Mother has washed (the big glass)'

(21) a. *Angku Labai   mam-bao   kitab kuniang.*
   honorific name ACT-bring book yellow
   'Angku Labai brought the yellow-religion book'

  b. *Angku Labai   mam-bao   ka dalam surau.*
   nonorific name AP-   bring into   mushalla
   'Angku Labai brought (it) into mushalla'

Data (19a), (20a), and (21a) are basic-transitive constructions with two core-arguments, subject/agent and object/patient. Then, through a grammatical process named action/result nominalization, data (19b), (20b), and (21b) become antipassive constructions. The action/result nominalization is clearly seen in (19b), while in (20b) and (21b) the prefix *maN-* is used to show the antipassive constructions. In the last two data, the use of *maN-* still belongs to the action/result nominalization in which the derived intransitive clauses semantically refer to such kind of meaning conveyed. Related to the data analyzed, an antipassive construction in Minangkabaunese may be constructed by means of a nominalizer confix and a verbal prefix. It proves again that as an agglutinative language, the semantic-grammatical functions of affixes in Minangkabaunese are highly significant in morphosyntactic processes.

The antipassives morphologically marked by the verbal prefix *maN-* as shown in the examples above may lead to a controversial understanding because it has the same morphological marker for active constructions. In accordance with this point, semantic roles and pragmatic functions are needed to differentiate whether one construction is an antipassive or not. Grammarians are frequently in serious problems in analyzing grammatical behaviours and properties when they face data from Austronesian languages and Malay. For the time being, a temporary answer for the overlapping markers is by using semantic and pragmatic values as a way to explain it.

The third form in Minangkabaunese is the use of *maN-* or *ba-* attached to a basic form of a verb or by means of using a verb without any prefix (zero verb). Observe the following data.

(22) a. *Malin ma- ningga-an   rumah di ari rayo.*
   name ACT-leave- APL house at holyday
   'Malin left the house at holiday'

b. *Malin ma-ningga di ari rayo.*
 name AP-leave at holiday
 'Malin leaft/dead'

(23) a. *Anak sikola ma- ulang palajaran di surau.*
  children school ACT-review learning at mushalla
  'The school children review learning at the mushalla'

 b. *Anak sikola sadang ma-ulang   di surau.*
  children school being AP-review at mushalla
  'The school children are reviewing at the mushalla'

(24) a. *Apak gaek tu ma- mintak-mintak sidakah di jalan.*
  man old   ART ACT-beg alms on road
  'The old man begged alms on the road'

 b. *Apak gaek tu suko ma-mintak-mintak di jalan.*
  man old   ART like A P-beg on road
  'The old man like begging on road'

(25) a. *Wakia rakyat ma- nanyo masalah ekonomi.*
  representative people ACT-ask problem economy
  'The legislator asked for economic problems'

 b. *Wakia rakyat ba-tanyo tantang masalah ekonomi*'
  representative people AP-ask   about problem economy
  'The legislator ask about economic problems'

(26) a. *Urang tu ma- minum aia putiah.*
  man   ART ACT-drink   water white
  'The man drank plain water'

 b. *Urang tu 0-minum.*
  man ART   drink
  'The man drank'

This third form of antipassives in Minangkabaunese is hard to differentiate from other clause constructions such as active, passive, and intransitive. In this case, semantic roles and pragmatic functions are slightly involved in order to decide whether it is an antipassive or not. The semantic and pragmatic values are common in many languages, especially those that belong to the Austronesian and Malay family. This special condition is due to the fact that it is hard to grammatically typologize some languages of (Western) Austronesian or Malay without semantic and pragmatic properties in some grammatical features. Antipassive constructions are naturally available in Minangkabaunese with certain grammatical behaviours. It may be argued that these antipassive phenomena are relevant to Sanso's (2018), Naonori's (2012), Moyse-Faurie's (2021), Jerono's (2018), and Heaton's (2020), who claim that cross-linguistic studies on antipassives lead to grammatical complexity and various constructions. Antipassive is also similar to passive and it may be found in accusative, ergative, and also in neutral languages,

such as Minangkabaunese. In addition, thee are high semantic features and pragmatic views in some cases of certain languages.

The last form and source of antipassive in Minangakabaunese is reflexsive and/or reciprocal. The data below indicate this type.

(27) a. *Ali   man- cukua jangguik.*
      name ACT-shave beard
      'Ali shaved beard'

    b. *Ali   ba- cukua.*
       name AP-shave
      'Ali shaved'

(28) a. *Urang tu   ma- ngameh-i   barang-barang.*
      man   ART ACT-pack-   KAU goods
      'The man packed the goods up'

    b. *Inyo   ba- kameh-kameh.*
      PRO3SG AP-dress up
      'He is dressing up'

(29) a. *Urang-urang tu   ma- ngareh-an   pandapek surang-surang.*
      men   ART ACT-claim-KAU ideas   own
      'The men claimed their own ideas'

    b. *Urang-urang tu   basi-kareh.*
      men   ART AP- claim
      'The man claimed each other'

(30) a. *Polisi   ma- arak   parampok.*
      Policeman ACT-arrack robber'
      'Policeman arracked robber'

    b. *Polisi   jo parampok basi-arak.*
      policeman and robber   AP- arrack
      'Policeman and robber arracked each other'

Data (27a) and (28a) are transitive clauses with two core-arguments where *Ali* 'name' and *urang tu* 'the man' are the subjects/agents in each clause. Data (27b) and (28b) are intransitive derived from (27a) and (28a) in the form of reflexive clauses. The derived intransitives are antipassives (APs) in which the prefix *ba-* is the morphological marker. Data (29a) and (30a) are transitive clauses with two-arguments in which *urang-urang tu* 'the men' and *polisi* 'policeman' are the subjects/agents, while *pandapek surang-surang* 'own ideas' and *parampok* 'robber' are the objects/patients in each clause. The constructions in (29b) and (30b) are the intransitive clauses derived from (29a) and (30a); the prefix *basi-* is used to have 'reciprocal meaning' in Minangkabaunese. These are the constructions of antipassives in Minangkabaunese. The prefix *basi-* in this language belongs to a unique morpheme because it is assumed that it consists of two roots, *ba-* and *si-*. However, the assumption that *basi-* is a real prefix is still in question. It seems that a diachronic study is needed for a valid and reliable answer.

As in some languages, the morpheme encoding reflexive/reciprocal actions is also used when there is a (suppressed) unimportant patient. Minangkabaunese allows the reflexive/ reciprocal affixes to construct antipassives as shown in the data above. Sometimes, this type of antipassive is also hard to differentiate from ergative and passive since they are in high similarities in surface forms. At this point, semantic features and pragmatic functions should be involved in order to know whether one construction is an antipassive or not. In relation to this, it is also necessary to pay attention to Polinsky's idea as quoted by Sanso (2018). He argued that the most noticeable universal tendency of antipassives is their correlation with the imperfective aspect. If an antipassive construction can have a perfective (telic) interpretation, it must also have an imperfective (atelic) interpretation. On the other hand, antipassives differ from one another in various respects, as the following points:

(i)   Antipassive markers are generally syncretic with other markers: There are languages in which they are syncretic with other detransitivizing markers such as anticausative, reflexive/reciprocal, middle or passive, and languages in which they are syncretic with aspectual markers such as inchoative, iterative, or habiatual;

(ii)   In some languages, antipassives are impossible with highly individuated objects (e.g. 1st or 2nd –person objects), while in others, they are required with these objects;

(iii) In some languages, antipassives are possible with almost all transitive predicates given the appropriate conditions, while in others they are lexically restricted, i.e. they are possible with only a subset of transitive verbs;

(iv)   In some antipassive constructions the object is marked as an oblique, while other antipassives do not allow the overt expression of the object.

It seems that antipassives are formed in various grammatical constructions in human languages. Such kind of grammatical phenomena are also found in antipassive constructions of Minangkabaunese. In addition to grammatical properties, antipassives in Minangkabaunese need semantic and pragmatic views in addition to grammatical views as a whole. For a moderate idea concerning with antipassives cross-linguistically, it may be useful to relate it to the typologists' ideas as summarized by Sanso (2018). It is generally agreed that constraints on language variation have a different theoretical status in the two frameworks that share a primary interest in understanding and explaining linguistic diversity, namely, the formalist framework and the functional typology framework. For the formalists, diversity is constrained by grammatical representations residing in the speaker's mind, which determine to what extent languages can vary with respect to a given parameter and block logically possible structural configurations that are unattested across languages. In functional typological framework, patterns of variation and universal tendencies are explained in terms of competition among general aspects of language use such as frequency, economy, harmony, and ease of processing.

For additional consideration, it is useful to reconsider what Heaton (2020: 140) states about the phenomena of antipassives cross-linguistically. She states that it is important to mention more traditionally prototypical antipassives and how they appear in terms of both frequency and form. The most frequent types of antipassives that might be considered prototypical were those which are marked, valency-decreasing constructions in ergative languages with oblique patients and syntactic functions. These types of antipassives are highly restricted geographically and genetically since they appear only in a few languages from a few families, including in Austronesian languages such as Tagalog and Minangkabaunese.

The linguistic implication of grammatical typology of Minangkabaunese

In relation to the grammatical phenomena that Minangkabaunese has ergative and antipassive constructions in addition to active and passive ones, this language is grammatically unique. Typologists argue as a classical view that passive is the derived construction from active in nominative-accusative languages in which S = A, ≠ P. Meanwhile, in ergative-absolutive languages, ergative is treated as an underlying construction and its derived construction is antipasives (Artawa & Jufrizal, 2018). Based on previous studies, Minangkabaunese is grammatically typologized as a (nominative)-accusative language at the syntactic level. It is proved by the grammatical facts that this language has active and passive (voice) constructions. The dichotomy of active-passive voice in Minangkabaunese is clear-cut and coincides with the universal characteristics of active and passive. In many previous studies, Minangkabaunese was clearly treated as a nominative-accusative language.

In other previous studies and based on the present study, it may be critically argued that Minangkabaunese may also be treated as an ergative-(absolutive) since it has ergative and antipassive constructions. Such phenomena of grammatical properties lead us to claim that Minangkabaunese is a neutral language; a language which has both accusative and ergative properties. However, the claim to state that Minangkabaunese is a neutral language needs to be proven by having further relevant and related studies concerning with the grammatical typology of this language. As discussed previously, the analysis and discussion of ergative and antipassive constructions in Minangkabaunese may overlap with passives, resultatives, and other grammatical constructions as they involve the use of affixes in the complex systems of grammar. The data analysis and discussion presented in this paper, however, may be used as one basis to assign this local language into a certain typology of human languages in the world.

The result of data analysis on antipassive of Minangkabaunese presented above attracts a challenging attention to new views dealing with antipassive and alignment. The findings of this current study are related to what Heaton (2020) states that antipassives which tend to appear in ergative languages have been repeated time and again in the typological literature. Meanwhile, there have long been voices claiming that antipassives do indeed exist in non-ergative languages. However, with the information collected in largely targeted typological studies, there is now general consensus in a recent study on antipassives that these constructions are not limited to ergative languages. Heaton (2017) identified 41 nominative-accusative languages with morphologically marked antipassives. Heaton adds that in some nominative-accusative languages, the antipassive appears to be an innovation, where an existing morpheme gains an additional sense. The last point stated by Heaton was not examined yet in this study.

To typologize languages in Austronesian and Malay is not an easy job since in some categories and sides, the grammatical features of those languages are influenced by semantic-pragmatic values in certain capacities. In relation to this, it is also essential to comprehend what Sanso (2018) mentions that grammatical patterns and constructions have a history that is responsible for their structure and distribution, and taking diachrony seriously may lead to a different kind of explanation. By this reason, it is necessary to study the grammatical typology of a certain language by involving diachronic typology in order to lead historical aspects of language into grammatical studies of the language. In this study, it is also proved that antipassives are also probably found in non-ergative languages, such as in Minangkabaunese.

Further ideas concerning with antipassives need to be considered in the discussion of linguistic implication of grammatical typology of Minangkabaunese. According to Polinsky as quoted by Jerono (2018), antipassives are constructions in which the logical object of a transitive (two place) predicate is not realized as a direct object or it appears as a non-core argument or left unexpressed (but presupposed). The antipassive is similar to a passive construction. It has to be kept in mind that the difference is that the arguments are demoted or unexpressed; in the passive construction it is a subject and in the antipassive it is an object. In both constructions, the sentence is syntactically intransitive though semantically it is transitive. These criteria are found in the grammatical constructions which are identified as antipassives of Minangkabaunese.

The study of antipassives in other languages declares various-different findings and typological conclusions. Bugaeva (2021), for instance, summarizes some points of deriving antipassives based on her study on antipassive in Ainu. She states that antipassives can be derived from both inherent and derived monovalent transitives. The latter mentioned comprises causative and applicative verbs derived from intransitive. Such antipasivization involving causative applicative objects is relatively rare in Ainu, but in other languages it is common. Many other grammatical properties are possibly found in cross-linguistic studies. For those reasons, to conclude that Minangkabaunese is an ergative language needs further detailed study on the grammatical data and information of this language.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

That Minangkabaunese has ergative and antipassive constructions leads us to the conclusion that this language may be treated as an ergative language. In many previous studies, this language was also assigned as an accusative one. The claim was based on research findings that Minangkabaunese has active and passive construction. However, to treat Minangkabaunese as an ergative language still remains typological questions since in this language the active and passive constructions are productive as well. For the time being, however, it may be safe to state that Minangkabaunese is a neutral language at the syntactic level. The study on ergatives and antipassives in Minangkabaunese, at this time, was only limited at the syntactical level morphologically marked by affixes. The study on syntactical ergativity of Minangkabaunese needs further studies in order to have valid findings and claims related to the grammatical typology of this language.

In some cases of ergativity studies, syntactic ergativity shows how the factors behind morphological ergativity interact with other components of the grammar. In some languages, indeed, this interaction underlies a ban on agent extraction of ergatives. In a subset of these languages, the structure of nonfinite clauses is affected as well (see Deal, 2016). In relation to this, the study of ergativity in agglutinative languages needs serious attention to morphological and syntactic properties possessed by the learnt language, unless the typological categories may have unbelievable and problematic judgments. Therefore, the grammatical-typological studies toward Minangkabaunese need further works and additional data for better results of analysis. In accordance with this, the authors suggest that other researchers, especially those who are interested in grammatical typology, would criticize this paper and continue looking at certain aspects of grammar in this local language.

NOTE

REFERENCES

Aldridge, E. (2012). Antipassive and Ergativity in Tagalog. In *Lingua 122,* 192-203.

Arifin, Z. (2006). Konstruksi "Ergative Baru". In *Bahasa Nusantara. Kajian Lingusitik dan Sastra 18*(34), 79-87. http:journal.ums.ac.id/index.php/KLS/article/view/5139

Arka, I. W., & Manning, C.D. (1998). Voice and Grammatical Relations in Indonesian: A New Perspective. In *Proceedings of the LFG98 Conference*. Brisbane: The University of Queesland, CSLI Publications.

Artawa, I K. (2005). Tipologi Bahasa dan Komunikasi Lintas Budaya (scientific oration). Denpasar: Universitas Udayana.

Artawa, I K., & Jufrizal. (2018). *Tipologi Linguistik: Konsep Dasar dan Aplikasinya*. Denpasar: Pustaka Larasan.

Artawa, I K., & Jufrizal. (2021). *Tipologi Linguistik: Konsep Dasar dan Aplikasinya*. (Edisi Revisi). Denpasar: Pustaka Larasan.

Azizah, N. (2020). Passive and Antipassive in Sasak. In *e-Journal of Linguistics 14*(2), 300-306 https://ojs.unud.ac.id/index.php/eol/index

Billings, L. A. (2010). Maranao, Voice, and Diathesis. In Billings, L. A., and Goudswaard (eds.). Piakandatu ami Dr. Howard P. McKaughan, pp. 30-35, Manila: Linguistics Society of the Philippines and SIL Philippines.

Bugaeva, A. (2021). Unspecified Participant: A case of antipassive in Ainu. In Janic, K., and Witzlack-Makarevich (eds.). Antipassive, Typology Diachrony, and Related Constructions. https://doi.org/10.1075/tsl.130.07bug

Chen, V., & McDonnell, B. (2018). Western Austronesian Voice. In *Annual Review of Linguistics*. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-011718-011731

Comrie, B. (1989). *Linguistic Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Publisher Limited.

Deal, A. R. (2016). Syntactic Ergativity: Analysis and Identification. In *Annual Review of Linguistics*. doi:10.1146/annurev-linguistics-011415-040642

Dixon, R.M.W. (1979). Ergativity. In *Language 55*, 59-138

Dixon, R.M.W. (1994). *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dixon, R.M.W. (2010). *Basic Linguistic Theory: Volume 1 Methodology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dixon, R.M.W., & Aikhenvald, A. (2000). *Changing Valency: Case Studies in Transitivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Heaton, R. (2017). A typology of Antipassives, with special reference to Mayan (Ph.D Thesis). Manoa: University Hawai'i.

Heaton, R. (2020). Antipassives in Crosslinguistic Perspective. In *Annual Review of Linguistics*. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-011619-030412

Jerono, P. (2018). Passive and Antipassive in Tugen. In *International Journal of Language and Linguistics 5*(3). doi:10.30845/ijll.v5n3p19

Jufrizal. (2021/2022). Sistem Diatesis Bahasa Minangkabau: Telaah Tipologi Linguistik (*unpublished research report*). Padang: FBS Universitas Negeri Padang.

Jufrizal & Refnita, L. (2022). Ergativity in Bahasa Indonesia and Minangkabaunese: the Case of Prefix *ber-* and *ba-'*. Paper presented at the 11th ICLA. Padang: Fakultas Bahasa dan Seni Universitas Negeri Padang.

Kusuma, I. K. (2018). Passive and Antipassive voice Ergative Type of Nusantara Language. In *Proceedings of the Fourth Prasasti International Seminar on Linguistics (Prasasti 2018)*. https://doi.org./10.2991/prasasti-18.2018.27

Legate, J. A. (2012). Types of Ergativity. In Lingua 122 (2012), 181-191 doi:10.1016/j.lingua.2011.10.014 Elsevier B.V.

Lehman, W. P. (1978). *Ergativity in Syntactic Typology: Studies in the Phenomenology of Language*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Moyse-Fauri, C. (2021). Antipassive constructions in Oceanic Languages. In HAL open Science. https://hal.science/hal-02875110

Naonori, N. (2012). On the Syntactic Transitivity of Tagalog Actor-Focus Constructions. In NINJAL, Research Papers. 4: 49-76 ISSN: 2186-134X print/2186-1358 online

Plank F. (ed.). (1979). *Ergativity: Towards a Theory of Grammatical Relations*. London: Academic Press.

Sanso, A. (2015). Where do antipassive constructions come from? *22nd International Conference on Historical Linguistics*. Naples, 26-31 July 2015.

Sanso, A. (2018). Explaining the diversity of antipassives: Formal grammar vs. (diachronic) typology. In *Lang Linguist Compass*. https://doi.org/10.1111/Inc3.12277

Shibatani, M. (ed.). (1988). *Passive and Voice*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Smith-Stark, Th. C. (1978). The Mayan Antipassive: Some facts and fictions. In N. England (ed.). *Papers in Mayan Linguistics*. University of Missouri: Studies in Mayan.

Song, J. J. (2001). *Linguistic Typology: Morphology and Syntax*. Essex: Longman Linguistic Library.

Song, J. J. (ed.). (2012). *The Oxford Handbook of Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Song, J. J. (2018). *Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vydrin, V. (2011). Ergative/Absolutive and Active/Stative alignment in West Africa: The case of Southwestern Mande. In *Studies in Language* 35(2), 407-441. John Benjamins Publishing Company.