

NOUN PHRASES (NPs)-MOVEMENT IN SASAK

PERGESERAN FRASA NOMINA (FN) DALAM BAHASA SASAK

Lalu Erwan Husnan

Kantor Bahasa Provinsi NTB

Jalan Dr. Sujono, Sekarbela, Kota Mataram 83116, Nusa Tenggara Barat, Indonesia

Pos-el: laluhusnan@gmail.com

Naskah diterima: 1 September 2014; direvisi: 10 November 2014; disetujui: 20 November 2014

Abstract

Sasak is spoken language used by Sasak speakers in Lombok, West Nusa Tenggara. This language is included into Bali-Sasak-Samawa subgroup. Most of the linguists and researchers constructed this language using SVO, but they do not explore the possible movement of the Noun Phrases (NPs) as the basis of constructing its structure. So, it is a need to have the possibility of the NPs movement whether the predicates in Sasak require one or two argument. Data used in this writing are taken through documentary method. They are analyzed using case theory proposed by Chomsky. The analysis shows that both raising verbs and raising adjective involve phrases case. They do not allow structural case movement. In addition, both induce raising. However, they are different in selecting source of NP movement; raising verbs finite or non finite clause, and raising adjective finite clause. Passivization also induces NP-movement in Sasak. Moreover, passive verbs in Sasak can be followed by preposition of locative or not depend on the notion of the verbs used. It has the same analogy with unaccusativity verbs. They lack of internal argument and cannot assign accusative case.

Key Words: *NPs-movement, case theory, predicate, passive, unaccusativity*

Abstrak

Sasak adalah bahasa lisan yang digunakan oleh penutur bahasa Sasak di Lombok, Nusa Tenggara Barat. Bahasa Sasak masuk dalam subkelompok bahasa Bali-Sasak-Samawa. Kebanyakan ahli bahasa dan peneliti bahasa mengonstruksi bahasa Sasak menggunakan pola standar SVO, tetapi mereka tidak mengeksplorasi adanya pergerakan FN (frasa nomina) sebagai dasar untuk mengonstruksi strukturnya. Dengan demikian, dibutuhkan suatu kajian pergerakan *NPs* apakah predikat dalam bahasa Sasak membutuhkan satu atau dua argumen. Data yang digunakan dalam tulisan ini diperoleh menggunakan metode dokumentasi. Data tersebut dianalisis menggunakan teori kasus yang diusulkan oleh Chomsky. Analisis data menunjukkan bahwa baik *raising verb* atau pun *raising adjective* melibatkan kasus frasa. Keduanya tidak membolehkan adanya pergerakan struktur. Keduanya menyebabkan peningkatan. Meskipun begitu, keduanya berbeda dalam hal memilih asal pergerakan FN; *raising verbs* dan klausa *definite* atau *non-definite*, dan *raising adjective* dan anak kalimat yang *definite*. Pasivisasi juga menyebabkan adanya pergerakan FN. Lebih jauh, kata kerja pasif bisa diikuti oleh preposisi lokatif atau tidak tergantung pada verba (*notion*) yang digunakan. Analogi yang sama juga dapat digunakan untuk kasus nonakusatif dalam bahasa Sasak, tidak adanya argumen internal dan tidak bisa menetapkan kasus akusatif.

Kata Kunci: pergeseran FN, teori kasus, predikat, pasif, nonakusatif

BACKGROUND

Noun Phrases (NPs)-Movement is the movement of arguments (NPs) (Mark and Chris, 2001) to subject position or called derived subject which are induced by raising verbs, passive verbs, raising adjectives, and unaccusativity. They are about transformations; NP-movement and verbs.

First of all, it is a need to clarify the standpoint of this writing. Verb in this writing means any ideas of verb regarding to NP-movement. The verbs in this case are passive verbs and raising verbs. On the other hand, raising adjective refers to any ideas on raising, adjective predicate. Both of them are related to D-structure and S-structure and will be discussed respectively. Unaccusativity is one place argument (Norbert, 2009), which has the same analogy with passive in which verbs cannot assign accusative case. They can be analysed using X-bar theory (Carnie, 2006) and Case-Theory proposed by Chomsky (Haegeman, 1994), the position of NPs and verbs at D-structure (Bittner, 1994) and S-structure.

Analyzing using X-bar theory is focused on head and governor (Black, 1999) related to phrases structure and clauses structure. The head and governor refer to constituent at a sentence which will assign case to NP as a phrase constituent (Carnie, 2010) at subject position and which will assign case to NP as a phrase constituent at object position. There must be a head to construct clause as the maximal projection. All lexical categories (N, V, P, A) can be head (Radford, 1997). They can be represented in term of layer, X stand for (N, V, P, A). Moreover, according to X-bar theory, all phrases are headed by one head. A complement is combined with X to form X' (X-bar) projection and specifier is combined with the top most X' to form the maximal projection XP. So, NPs-movement (Radford, 1988) is about the movement (Buring, 2005)

of a constituent. The NP-movement can be induced by passive verbs, raising verbs, raising adjectives, and unaccusativity. In order to give a clear understanding on the topic, they will be preceded and compared by some instances in English. It is useful to know whether the theories can be applied to Sasak language. Data of Sasak instances were taken through library research.

PASSIVIZATION

Features of passive have a close relation to case theory (Carnie, 2006). According to case filter, all overt NPs, example (1a), must be assigned case. In (1a), case filter is satisfied. Passivization (1b) affects the morphology of the verb. The verb *believe* turns up in its participial form and preceded by the auxiliary *be*. Moreover, passivization causes the agent of the activity is not expressed by an NP (*the villagers*) in an A-position. In order to refer to the agent of the action, it is a need to use an adjunct PP which is headed by the preposition *by*, which itself carries the notion of agentivity. (1c) *by* assigns the theta role agent to the NP *the villagers*.

In this case, theta criterion requiring that each theta role associated with a predicate be assigned to some argument (an NP or a clausal complement). The main predicate in (1c) is the verb *believe* whose argument structure requires two place arguments. In (1a), the sentence satisfies the theta criterion and the projection principle. The NP *the villagers* is assigned the external theta role (1) –agent— and the direct object NP *the story* is assigned the internal theta role (2) –patient. (1c) has only one argument to be theta marked, the NP *this story*, the subject of the sentence. It is wrong to assign the external agent role to the NP *this story*. The NP *this story* does not refer to the agent of *believe*, the entity that initiates the activity, but rather to the one that undergoes it. This NP is assigned

Patient role. It means that the agent role (1) is not assigned to an NP in an A-position. In short, passive verbs fail to assign the external theta role to an NP in an A-position. Agent in passive sentence is not absence, it is absorbed by passive morphology of the verb. The external theta role cannot be assigned to an NP in an A-position because it is absorbed by the passive ending. When the agent needs to be expressed overtly, it is expressed by means of an adjunct PP with *by*. In (1b), the object NP *this story* will not be able to receive accusative case from the verb *believed*. So, it violates the case filter, the object NP fails to be case-marked. In order to pass case filter the NP *this story* must be moved (1c) to the [spec, IP] position where it can be assigned accusative case by verb *believe*.

- 1'a. The villagers believe the story.
 1b. was believed this story by the villagers.
 1c. This story was believed by the villagers.

Argumentatively, the verb *believe* at (1a) takes two place arguments and satisfies case filter. The verb *believe* is the predicate. It is the head for VP. The verb *believe* combined with object NP, internal argument of the verb, to construct V'. The external argument of the verb is headed by I (INFL). In this case, INFL is not a barrier for outside governor, so the verb *believe* governs its external argument. The INFL combined with VP construct I'. The subject NP (Spec), external argument, combined with I' to construct IP, maximal projection. The tree structure can be seen below.

The next examples are in Sasak. They are presented in order to know whether X-bar theory along with case theory can be applied in Sasak. If they can be applied in Sasak, the most important question to be answered is why X-bar theory exist in Sasak.

- 2a. Amaq Junet adas sampi-n Amaq Amit.
 Father Junet organize cow-3sgl father Amit
 Junet's father organizes cows of Amit's father.
 2b. teadas sampi-n Amaq Amit isiq Amaq Junet.
 Organized cow-3sgl father Amit by father Junet
 Junet's father organizes cows of Amit's father.
 2c. Sampi-n Amaq Amit te-adas isiq Amaq Junet.
 cow-3sgl father Amit organized by father Junet
 The cow's of Amit's father is organized by Junet's father.

Passive features in Sasak have a close relation to case theory. It has the same analogy with the previous examples of passive in English. If the examples analyzed using case filter, all overt NPs, example (2a), must be assigned case. In the case of (2a), case filter is satisfied. Passivization (2b) affects the morphology of the verb. The verb *adas* turns up in its participial form. The different to English is Sasak, like Indonesian, does not need *be* to help the verb. However, the two languages (Sasak and Indonesian) are morphologically rich. Moreover, passivization causes the Agent of the activity is not expressed by an NP (*Amaq junet*) in an A-position. In order to refer to the Agent of the action, it is a need to use an adjunct PP which is headed by the preposition *isiq*, which itself carries the notion of Agentivity. In (2c) *isiq* assigns the theta role Agent to the NP *Amaq Junet*.

It is clear that theta criterion requires each theta role associated with a predicate to be assigned to some argument (an NP or a clausal complement). The main predicate in (1c) is the verb *adas* whose argument structure requires two place arguments. In (1a), the sentence satisfies the theta criterion and the

1 Cited from Haegeman, 1994 p.295

projection principle. The NP *Amaq Junet* is assigned the external theta role (1) –Agent— and the direct object NP *sampi-n Amaq Amit* is assigned the internal theta role (2) –Patient. In (1c), there is only one argument to theta mark, the NP *sampi-n Amaq Amit*, the subject of the sentence. It is wrong to assign the external Agent role to the NP *sampi-n Amaq Amit*. The NP *sampi-n Amaq Amit* does not refer to the Agent of *adas*, the entity that initiates the activity, but rather to the one that undergoes it. This NP is assigned Patient role. It means that the Agent role (1) is not assigned to an NP in an A-position. In short, passive verbs fail to assign the external theta role to an NP in an A-position. Agent in passive sentence is not absence, it is absorbed by passive morphology of the verb. The external theta role cannot be assigned to an NP in an A-position because it is absorbed by the passive ending. When the Agent needs to be expressed overtly, it is expressed by means of an adjunct PP with *isiq*. In (1b), the object NP *sampi-n Amaq Amit* will not be able to receive Accusative case from the verb *adas*. So, it violates the case filter, the object NP fails to be case-marked. In order to pass case filter the NP *sampi-n Amaq Amit* must be moved (1c) to the [spec, IP] position where it can be assigned accusative case by verb *adas*.

Argumentatively, the verb *adas* at (1a) takes two place arguments and satisfies case filter. The verb *adas* is the predicate. It is the head for VP. The verb *adas* combined with object NP, internal argument of the verb, to construct V' (V-bar). The external argument of the verb is headed by I (I, in this case, is morphological initiating). This assumption on the basis that Indonesian and Sasak are rich of morphological cases. In those languages, the morphological-initiating can be attached in active and passive verbs. Unfortunately, in (1a) the morphological-initiating non-overt. In this case, I' is not a barrier for outside

governor, so the verb *adas* governs its external argument. The I combined with VP construct I'. The subject NP (Spec), external argument, combined with I' to construct IP, maximal projection. The tree structure can be seen below.

RAISING VERBS

Some instances of raising verbs will initiate this discussion. It is a need to describe general concept of raising verbs in English cited from Haegeman (1994) before going further on raising verbs in Sasak. Moreover, raising verbs discussed using X-bar has a close relation to case theory. The description will guide this writing to some ideas of raising verb in Sasak.

Verb plays a central roles in X-bar theory and case theory. The verb is the head and governor of NP'; internal and external argument of the verbs. In this case, raising verbs can also trigger NP-movement. It has the same analogy with passive verbs. These raising verbs cannot give accusative case to the object NP. So, raising verbs cannot assign an internal theta role. The internal argument of the clause moved to subject position and case-marked by the finite inflection. This theory applied to small clause.

In more complex sentences, a sentence with expletive *it* as the subject of the main clause and the verb takes infinitival clause as external theta role. The subject of the lower clause does not has any thematic relation with the predicate of main clause. It is clear that the subject of lower clause is assigned external theta role and case-marked by verb of lower clause. However, the expletive *it* is omitted for it cannot be case-marked. The subject of lower clause moved to subject position, derived subject. Derived subject is case-marked by I. So, it can be concluded that the subject of lower clause is derived subject and base-generated as the subject NP of the

infinitival clause.

It is important to take a look at passive verbs (1a—1c) because both passive verbs and raising verbs induce the object NP-movement. The first sentence is active sentence or source of (1b and 1c). In this case, the verb *adas* cannot theta-mark the external argument. Examples of verbs which induce NP-movement in English can be found at raising verbs (3a—3b) in which verbs take complement clause.

- 3²a. seems Poirot to have destroyed the evidence.
3b. Poirot seems to have destroyed the evidence.

In (3a) the verb *seem* does not theta-mark NP *Poirot* and it does not have thematic relation to subject of lower clause. Apart from passive sentence in (1c), the predicate (verb) cannot assign structural case. In (3a) *Poirot* is the subject of lower clause or external argument of *destroy*. In (3b) it is subject of higher clause (*seem*). It does not receive theta role (empty).

It is important to take a note that the external argument of the verb *destroy* is caseless. It is a need to be theta-marked by *destroy*. To do that, the NP must be visible. In order to be visible, *Poirot* needs to be case-marked. It can be done by movement to the subject position of the main clause brings rescue. So, in (3b) the subject of lower clause moved, derived subject, it case-marked by I. So, it is concluded that NP-movement induced by raising verbs or passive verbs.

After getting clear description of raising verbs which induce NP-movement in English, this writing would like to go further on Sasak instances. Now, it is time to go on analysis using X-bar theory. To get clear analysis, it is a need to see why subject NP *poirot* of lower clause (3a) is caseless and the tree structure of sentence (3b).

In (3a) the sentence consists of two

clauses. The verb *seem* of the main clause takes clausal complement. The subject position of the main clause is empty. Of course, the verb of the main clause cannot give case to subject *Poirot* of lower because it will violate case filter and the subject *Poirot* is not headed and governed by verb of the main clause. However, it should be headed and governed by verb *destroyed*. The fact, there are two potential head *to* and *have* which violate case filter. In short, subject *Poirot* of lower clause is caseless.

To rescue this, the subject *Poirot* of lower clause must be moved, derived subject to A-position where it can be case-marked by INFL. In (3b), the verb *seem* case-marks the subject at A-position. It take one place argument and has clausal complement. The clausal complement is headed by the verb *destroyed* which have its internal argument *the evidence* and bare of NP at subject position. So, raising verbs, like passive verb, induce NP-movement.

- 4a. *Saget meken inaq belian amaq tangkong.*
maybe shop mother buy father's shirt
Mother maybe go shopping to buy father's shirt.
4b. *Meken-n inaq belian amaq tangkong.*
shop-3sgl clitic mother buy father's shirt
Mother goes shopping to buy father's shirt.
4c. *Inaq meken belian amaq tangkong.*
mother shop to buy father's tangkong
Mother goes shopping to buy father's shirt.

It is important to take a note that Sasak is spoken language and only few of the literatures written. Indeed, the utterances are mostly topical ones, non-overt NPs. However, in some cases, the utterances need overt NPs at subject position. Sentences (4a—4c) take IP complement. The sentence (4a) starts with modal-*saget*. The subject position after modal is empty. In (4a) the verb cannot assign internal theta role to the subject NP of lower clause, *inaq*. The NP-*inaq* is theta-

² Cited from Haegeman, 1994 p.308

marked by verb-*belian* of lower clauses. This verb can also assign its internal theta role, *amaq tangkong*. In (4b) modal is omitted. In addition, the verb must be attached with the third singular person clitic (-*n*) so that this sentence is grammatically accepted. This clitic is coindexed to NP-*inaq*, not *amaq*. In (4c) the NP-*inaq* is moved to subject position, derived subject. It can be concluded that the verb-*meken* induces the NP-movement, it is raising verb.

It is clear that (4a) is an active sentence, topical one. The verb is the head for IP complement as its internal argument. This verb cannot case-mark subject NP of lower clause. The subject NP *inaq* is headed and governed by the verb *belian* of lower clause. The verb does not have overt NP as the external argument. The most possible subject is PRO which has matrix [+pronominal]. It, PRO, is coindexed with subject NP *inaq*. Moreover, it is preceded by modal *saget*. The modal rescues the sentence so that it is grammatically accepted. Sentence (4b) is also acceptable even though the modal *saget* is omitted. The verb *meken* is a head. It is a head for IP complement and NP-clitic which attached to this verb. So, sentence (4b) satisfies case filter, the verb takes two place arguments; one (external argument) is subject NP-clitic which attached to the verb, and the internal argument is IP complement. The NP-clitic is coindexed with the subject NP *inaq* of lower clause. Interestingly, when the NP-clitic is omitted, the sentence is ungrammatical and is not accepted. To rescue the sentence, there is only one way to do that. The subject NP *inaq* of lower clause must be moved to subject position of main clause where it can be case-marked at A-position (4c).

- 5a. *Iniq-n panu amaq gitaq kedit leq bangket.*
 possible-3sgl clitic go father sees birds at the
 rice field
 It is possible that father goes to see birds at the

rice field.

- 5b. *Panu-n amaq gitaq kedit leq bangket.*
 go-3sgl clitic father sees birds at the rice field
 father goes to see birds at the rice field.
- 5c. *Amaq panu gitaq kedit leq bangket.*
 father go see birds at rice field
 Father goes to see birds at the rice field.

Sentences (5a—5c) are identical to (4a—4c). In (5a) the sentence starts with modal *iniq-n*. This modal may be interpreted into *can* which means possibility. It is directly followed by NP-clitic and the verb *panu* of main clause. This verb cannot assign internal theta role to *amaq*. This verb cannot also assign accusative case. It is due to the verb of main clause take IP complement. The only different to (4a) is, (5a) has the third singular person clitic which is coindexed with NP-*amaq*. In (5b), the modal is omitted, but the clitic is not. It is moved to the next word, verb-*panu*. It is end clitic, so it must be attached at the end of the word. Nevertheless, it is still coindexed with NP-*amaq*. In (5c) the NP-*amaq* moved to subject position of higher clause, derived subject. Therefore, the verb-*panu* induce NP-movement to subject position of higher clauses. So, it is raising verb.

(5a) is an active sentence which starts with modal *iniq* followed by NP-clitic (-*n*). The sentence consists of two clauses: main clause and subordinate clause. The verb *panu* of the main clause takes IP complement. The verb *panu* of the main clause is the head for the IP complement, internal argument, and it is also the head for the NP-clitic which is attached to the modal *iniq*. The verb or the head of lower clause is *gitaq*. It takes two place arguments. The verb *gitaq* case marks its internal argument *kedit*, and its external argument *amaq*. It means that the verb *gitaq* govern the object NP and subject NP locally. The problem is the subject NP of lower clause cannot be case-marked by the verb of the main clause. Moreover, the verb of the main

clause does not have any thematic relation to the subject NP of lower clause because the verb takes clausal complement, so this verb cannot give case to subject of lower clause. In (5b) the modal *iniq* is omitted but not the NP-clitic. This NP-clitic cannot be omitted otherwise the sentence will be ungrammatical and unacceptable. So, the NP-clitic moved to the verb *panu*. In (5b) the verb *panu* takes IP complement as the internal argument. The verb also takes its external argument, NP-clitic (-n). The same analogy is also applied to (5b), the verb *panu* of the main clause cannot case-mark the subject of lower clause, so it is not the head for subject NP of lower clause and violates case filter. The verb *panu* does not have any thematic relation to the subject NP of lower clause. In (5c) the subject NP of lower clause moved, derived subject, to subject position of higher clause. This is the only way to rescue the sentence. By moving the subject NP of lower clause, the NP-clitic does not need anymore.

In (5c) the verb *panu* is the head for the main clause. The verb is governor. It is a head for its internal argument, IP complement, to construct VP. The subject NP *amaq* is governed by non-overt I, it is not a barrier for outside governor. So, the verb *panu* can give case to subject NP to construct I', this I' combined with NP at Spec position to construct IP, maximal projection. The verb *gitaq* of lower clause is also a head locally, small clause. It is the head for its internal argument, theta-marks the internal argument and combined to construct VP. The space between the verb of higher clause and the verb of lower clause, as stated at Haegeman's book, occupied by PRO which reference is pronominal [+pronominal]. The PRO is coindexed with subject NP at higher clause. So, it is non-overt NP. This PRO is case-marked by non-overt I. This non-overt I combined with VP to construct I'. Later, I' combined with NP at Spec position to

construct IP, maximal projection.

RAISING ADJECTIVES

Raising Adjectives may also induce NP-movement (Radford, 1988). It is identical to raising verbs or passive verbs. Subject of lower clause is assigned a theta role by lower clause verb. The subject of lower clause does not have thematic relation with the adjective (predicate) of main clause. Examples below will describe it in detail.

- 6³a. It is likely [that John will leave].
 6b. John is likely to leave.
 6a. [is likely [John to leave]].
 6b. [Johni is likely [to leave]].

In (6a) adjective predicate takes CP complement as its internal argument. The verb of lower clause is *leave*. The verb *leave* case-marks the external argument *John*. The subject NP of higher clause position is occupied by expletive *it*. It means that adjective predicate *likely* take one argument, internal argument. The predicate *likely* does not have any thematic relation to the subject NP of lower clause. (6b) is paraphrase of (6a). Again, the adjective predicate cannot give case to external argument. This subject NP *John* is case-marked by the verb *leave*.

(6c) is a construction in which subject NP *John* has not moved yet. In (6c) *John* is an external argument of *leave*. It does not have thematic relation with adjective *likely*. In order to be case-marked, subject of lower clause *John* moved to subject position of higher clause. So, *John* is in a derived subject position (6d). Its base position is the subject position of lower clause. It means that adjective *likely* is in exactly the same way as the raising verb *seem*, raising adjective.

Sentences (7a–7c) are examples of raising adjective in Sasak. In (7a) the subject

³ Cited from Haegeman, 1994 p.319

position of main clause is not occupied. The predicate is *lelah*. The predicate takes object complement as the internal argument. The subject of lower clause does not have thematic relation to the predicate of higher clause. So, to make it to be case-marked, it must be moved to subject position of higher clause (7c). It means that the raising adjective induces NP-movement to subject position, derived subject. Logically, if the NP-clitic (-n) is omitted, then the sentence will be ungrammatical and unaccepted. So, it can be said that the NP-clitic is the subject NP of the main clause which is attached to the predicate *lelah* of main clause. It is a need to refresh the idea that only a constituent that can be moved to any places in a sentence. So, the movement of subject NP to be attached to the predicate of main clause as NP-clitic brings the constituent.

- 7a. [*lelah-n* [*inaq lalo panu*]].
tired-3sgl good mother go field
Mother is tired going to the field.
- 7b. *[*lelah* [*inaq lalo panu*]].
tired 1 good mother go field
Mother is tired going to the field.
- 7c. [*Inaq lelah* [*lalo panu*]].
mother tired go field
Mother is tired going to the rice field.

If these examples seen using X-bar, (7a) and (7c) are grammatically accepted. So, the X-bar theory should be able to be applied. In (7a) the NP-clitic must be treated as INFL. Schematically, it is at subject position, so there are subject NP as a constituent. The subject NP will be under Spec position, and the I combined with VP will construct I'. Later, Spec and I' are combined to construct IP, maximal projection. The lower clause is adjunct for the predicate *lelah*. This predicate is a head. It takes two places argument. Its internal argument is object complement, and its external argument is NP-clitic. (7c) is paraphrase of (7a). When the NP-clitic

is omitted, the sentence is ungrammatical. In order to rescue the sentence, the subject NP of lower clause must be moved, derived subject, to subject position. Derived subject becomes external argument of the predicate *lelah*. This predicate is a head. It takes two place arguments; complement is its internal argument, and subject NP *inaq* is its external argument. Derived subject is under Spec position. The VP combined with I to construct I'. Later, Spec and I' will construct IP, maximal projection. The verb *lalo* of lower clause is a head. This verb takes two place arguments. Its internal argument is adjective *panu*, and its external argument is non-overt (PRO) subject NP of lower clause which reference is pronominal [+pronominal]. This pronominal is coindexed with subject NP of higher clause, derived subject.

UNACCUSATIVITY

Before go further to unaccusativity in Sasak. An unaccusative verbs (Haegeman, 1994) are verbs which lack of an external argument and cannot assign accusative case to complement-NP. Later, we can see that these verbs belong to passive verbs. Moreover, one place predicates can be divided into two: verb which has only one argument (external argument) and accusative verb which has only internal argument. In short, unaccusative verbs fail to assign case and lack an external theta role.

First of all, examples in English proposed to clear the ground on unaccusative verbs.

- 8⁴a. [sink the boat].
8b. [The boat sink].

In (8a) the NP-*boat* is base-generated as the object of *sink*. On the other hand, in (8b), the NP-*the boat* becomes a derived subject. In according with Haegeman, the

⁴ Cited from Haegeman, 1994 p.335

unaccusativity verbs are transitive perdant which does not assign accusative. Sasak also has unaccusativity, but it is different to English. First of all, some examples are presented, and the explanation of the processes follow.

9a. [Amaq Adi adas sampi-n eleq Amaq Amat].

N3sgl V cow-clit.3sgl Prep.=at N3sgl
 Amaq Adi gives his cow (in order to be bred) to
 Amaq Amat.

adas means giving (usually animals) cow in order to be bred at (someone, in this case) Amaq Amat’s house. The cow still belongs to Amaq Adi. Later, be based on the agreement made early, for example, the first young cow will belong to Amaq Adi, and the second will belong to Amaq Amat, and so on. *Eleq* in Sasak is preposition of locative, while *isiq* is marker for passive sentence which meaning and function the same as *by*.

9b1. [teadas Sampi-n eleq Amaq Amat].

Cow-3sglr organized at Amaq Amat
 The cow is organized by Amaq Amat.

9b2. [Sampi-n teadas eleq Amaq Amat]].

Cow-3sglr organized at Amaq Amat
 The cow is organized by Amaq Amat.

9c. [Sampi-n te-adas (eleq Amaq Amat)].

Cow-3sglr organized (by Amaq Amat
 The cow is given.

9d. [Sampi-n te-adas (isiq Amaq Amat)]].

Cow organized (at Amaq Amat).
 The cow is organized (by Amaq Amat).

9e. [Amaq Adi peng-adas sampi-n].

Amaq Adi organizes his-cow
 Amaq Adi organizes his cow.

9f. [Amaq Amat peng-adas-n].

Amaq Amat organizes
 Amaq Amat gives someone (Amaq Amat) to
 organize the cow.

9g. [Amaq Adi meng-adas].

Amaq Adi organize
 Amaq Adi gives someone to run his horse cart.

The first group of examples presented starts with the basis of the sentence (9a). The sentence consists of subject = agent *Amaq Adi* (1), predicate, direct object *sampi* along with clitic which refers to agent, and preposition of locative, at *Amaq Amat*. In Sasak, first of all, sentences (7), and (9b, 9c, and 9g) are unaccusative ones.

Sentence (9b) is possible. In this case, NP *sampi-n* which cannot be case-marked by passive verb is moved to the subject position, derived subject. The verb marker for passive is *te-*. Derived subject is coindexed with trace left by NP *sampi-n*. Nevertheless, the sentence can take preposition of locative instead of passive marker *isiq* (Sasak or *by* in English). Locative for this sentence means theme or object pointed by the sentence. The most interesting point is the sentence is acceptable without preposition locative which in this example put in parenthesis (9c). Sentence (9d) is almost the same as previous one. Further, the preposition of locative changed by passive marker which cause *Amaq Amat* cannot be assigned accusative. So, regarding to the movement of the NPs, (9f) and (9g) are also unaccusative. This statement based on the rules stated early that it (*Amaq Amat*) is not the patient or the actor. It is derived subject, and it is the theme or topic of the sentence.

In (9a) the verb *adas* takes two places argument. This verb is a head for both of them. However, the internal argument *sampi-n* is case-marked by the head, and the external argument is headed by I which is not barrier for outside governor to give case to construct I’. The subject NP is under Spec position which is combined with I’ to construct IP, maximal projection. In (9b1) the subject NP is omitted

as the affect of morphological passive marker *te-*. However, the object NP *sampi-n* cannot be assigned accusative by the verb *teadas*, so it is caseless. In order to rescue the sentence, the object NP must be moved to subject position where it can be assigned a case, it is the theme (9b2). In (9b2) the verb *teadas* takes one argument, external argument, and it does not have any internal argument which is assigned accusative case. In (9c) the adjunct, PP, can be omitted. (9d) is clearly a passive sentence. The agent which can be overtly shown is optional. (9e) is the active sentence. The (9e) is paraphrase of (9a). In (9f) the object NP *sampi* is omitted, the NP-clitic moved to verb *pengadas*. In (9f) the sentence still takes two place arguments, while in (9g) the NP-clitic is also omitted so that the verb *pengadas* only take subject NP argument affected by the morphological marker {*me-*}. This verb cannot give accusative. So, the verb *adas* is one of verbs that cannot give accusative case to NP to object position.

- 10a. [Amaq Adi pe-lampaq jaran-n eleq Amaq Jum].
 Amaq Adi pass-run his horse (and cart) to Amaq Amat.
 Amaq Adi run his horse cast.

lampaq, in this case, means manage by giving the horse to be used by Amaq Jum to carry people or goods. The income (money) shared between Amaq Adi and Amaq Jum. All about the horse and cart is handle by Amaq Jum. Amaq Adi only bought or has the horse. In order to make it clear and to compare with example 9, sentences (10a1) and (10a2) are intentionally written as at 9. Two of them are not acceptable (10b2) and (10g). It is due to the choice and different notion convey by both of the verbs (*adas* > < *lampaq*).

- 10b1 [te-pe-lampaq Jaran-n eleq Amaq Amat].

run horse by Amaq Amat.
 Horse cart is being organized by Amaq Amat
 10b2 *[Jaran-n te-pe-lampaq eleq Amaq Amat].

horse run by Amaq Amat.
 Horse cart is being organized by Amaq Amat
 10c. [Jaran-n te-pe-lampaq isiq Amaq Amat].

Horse-cart run hy Amaq Amat
 The horse-cart is run by Amaq Amat.
 10d. [Jaran-n te-pe-lampaq].

Horse-cart run by Amaq Amat
 The horse-cart run by Amaq Amat.
 10e. [Amaq Amat pe-lampaq jaran-n].

Amaq Amat run the horse-cart
 Amaq Amat run the hores.
 10f. [Amaq Adi pe-lampaq-n].
 Amq Adi organized
 Amaq Adi organizes...

- 10g. *[Amaq Adi mence-lampaq].

Amaq adi run
 Amq Adi run something.

Examples (10a—10g) has the same idea with the (9a—9g) although two of the constructions (10b2) and (10g) are not acceptable. In short, it can be stated that sentences (10c, 10d, and 10g) are unaccusative. The only different between two verbs is (9b2) can be constructed using preposition *eleq* for passive verb, but it is not for (10b2).

After having a clear description on the examples of passive verbs, raising verbs, raising adjective, and unaccusative in Sasak using case theory and X-bar theory. It will be easy to answer why there is X-bar in Sasak. Examples (1-10) show that the four cases also exist in Sasak language. The case theory for the four cases is also clearly applied, and so does X-bar theory. By using case theory, it is known that each cases needs certain number of argument; internal and external argument. By using X-bar theory, it is known which of the lexical will be the head of certain phrases.

To conclude, X-bar theory is universal. It can be applied in other languages, such as Sasak. When there is different, it could be different in parameter. For example, in (7a) there is non-overt NP before the predicate *lelah*. However, there is NP clitic (-*n*) which is attached at the end of the predicate. This NP-clitic plays an NP function. It is coindexed with subject NP *inaq* of lower clause. So, in the tree diagram must be moved to subject position before I, under Spec position. Logically, because it is coindexed with the subject NP *inaq* of lower clause, it is a head which is under Spec position. It is due to movement to the predicate as clitic, using the same analogy with inflection, this NP-clitic position in tree diagram is under Spec. The I is combined with VP to construct I'. The head of VP is the predicate *lelah*.

CONCLUSION

Both raising verbs and raising adjective involve phrases case. They do not allow structural case movement. In addition, both induce raising, movement of NP to subject position of main clause, derived subject. However, they are different in selecting source of NP movement. Raising verbs allow NP or subject movement of lower clause from finite or non finite clause, while raising adjective only allow lower finite clause to be raised to the higher subject position.

Passivization also induces NP-movement in Sasak. Moreover, passive verbs in Sasak can be followed by preposition of locative or not depend on the notion of the verbs used. Nevertheless, passive marker {*te-*} is used for all instances of passive verbs. Interestingly, passive verbs in Sasak are complex. The agent (theme) can be omitted. It has the same analogy with unaccusativity verbs. They lack of internal argument and cannot assign accusative case.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Black Cheryl A. 1999. A Step-by-step introduction to the Government and Binding Theory of Syntax. *Summer Institute of Linguistics*. 76 pages.
- Buring, Daniel. 2005. *Binding Theory*. Cambridge University Press. 281 pages.
- Baltin, Mark and Collins, Chris. 2001. *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntax Theory*. Blackwell Publisher. 860 pages.
- Bittner, Maria. 1994. *Case, Scope, and Binding*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publisher. 202 pages.
- Carnie, Andrew. 2006. *Syntax: Generative Introduction*. UK: Blackwell Publishing. 479 pages.
- Carnie, Andrew. 2010. *Constituent Structure: Second Edition*. Oxford University Press. 302 pages.
- Honstein, Norbert. 2009. *A Theory of Syntac: Minimal Operations and Universal Grammar*. Cambridge University Press. 194 pages.
- Haegeman, Liliane. 1994. *Introduction to Government and Binding Theory*. Oxford UK: Blackwell. 701 pages.
- Radford, Andrew. 1988. *Transformational Grammar: a First Course*. Cambridge University Press. 625 pages.
- Radford, Andrew. 1997. *Syntax: Minimalist Introduction*. Cambridge University Press. 283 pages.