

Finiteness in Sundanese

Eri Kurniawan and William D. Davies

UNIVERSITAS PENDIDIKAN INDONESIA AND UNIVERSITY OF IOWA

The topic of finiteness is rarely broached in the closely related Indonesian-type languages, in which verbs have no morphological tense marking, nouns have no overt case marking, and there is only limited morphological agreement. As they are the typical morphological manifestations, the relevance of finiteness is difficult to discern. Sundanese is no exception to this. There is evidence, however, that finiteness is critical to the licensing of subjects in Sundanese. What distinguishes Sundanese from many other languages is that finiteness is covert rather than being overtly marked, just as has been proposed for Chinese, Lao, Slave, and others.

1. INTRODUCTION.¹ One aspect of Indonesian-type languages² that has received scant attention in the literature is the question of finiteness. Despite there being a relatively rich literature describing tense, aspect, and mood in Indonesian languages (Adelaar 2013; Arka 2013; Austin 2013; Grangé 2006, 2013; Purwo 1989; Yanti 2013; and others), few have attempted to relate such marking to finiteness. The reasons for this are fairly obvious: tense and, for the most part, agreement are not overtly marked on verbs, and nominals take no overt case-marking. Thus, for example, the Sundanese sentences in (1) can refer to past, present, or future time, depending on the discourse context in which they are uttered.³

- (1) a. Ujang neunggeul kuring.
Ujang AV.hit 1SG
‘Ujang hit/hits/will hit me.’
b. Kuring neunggeul Ujang.
1SG AV.hit Ujang
‘I hit/will hit Ujang.’

1. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 1123769 to the University of Iowa. We would like to thank two anonymous referees for comments on this work. Errors and omissions are ours alone.
2. The term “Indonesian-type languages” is intended to refer to the languages closely related to Indonesian/Malay (and colloquial varieties) that generally have a two- or three-way voice system (actor voice, passive voice, and/or object voice): languages such as Balinese, Javanese, Madurese, Sundanese, and others.
3. The following abbreviations are used in the presentation of data: APPL, applicative; AV, actor voice; COMP, complementizer; DEF, definite; FUT, future; IRR, irrealis; IT, iterative; NEG, negative; NMLZ, nominalizer; PART, particle; PRF, perfect; PL, plural; PROG, progressive; PV, passive voice; QUANT, quantifier; RED, reduplication; REL, relativizer; SG, singular; STAT, stative.

Additionally, *Ujang* occurs in exactly the same form when it is the subject (1a) as it does when it is the object (1b). The same is true of *kuring* ‘I’, the object in (1a) and subject in (1b). The verb shows no agreement with the subject, occurring as *neunggeul* ‘hit’ regardless of whether the subject is 3rd person or 1st person. In the absence of any overt tense, agreement, or case, the question of finiteness seems to lack much relevance.

Although the concept of finiteness was originally associated with person and number marking on verbs, much modern linguistics has taken both tense and agreement to be hallmarks of a finiteness distinction in language.⁴ This is clear in works by Chomsky (for example, Chomsky 1981, the TNS and AGR components of INFL in Government and Binding Theory) as well as others, such as Huddleston (1988), where the finite verb is defined as one “limited by properties of person, number and tense” (1988:44), and Hogg (1992), in which finiteness characterizes “a verb which is marked for tense and number” (1992:541). Givón (1990) goes so far as to claim that a finite/nonfinite asymmetry can only be instantiated in languages where grammatical categories such as tense, aspect, and number are obligatorily marked. Given this, one is hard-pressed to see how finiteness can play a role in Sundanese (and other Indonesian languages).

Despite this, we argue here that finiteness does indeed play a role in Sundanese. And just as in European languages and others that are replete with morphological manifestations, finiteness is critical to the licensing of subjects. What distinguishes Sundanese from many other languages is that finiteness is covert rather than being overtly marked. We will propose an analysis that makes use of the notion of “abstract finiteness” as argued for Chinese (Huang 1984), Slave (Rice 1989), and others.

First, however, as overt markers of finiteness have been proposed for Indonesian by Kana (1986) and Arka (2000, 2013), it is incumbent on us to show that there are no overt manifestations of finiteness in Sundanese, a point that we take up in section 2. In section 3, we motivate the role of finiteness in Sundanese. Section 4 concludes.

2. WHAT DOESN’T MARK FINITENESS IN SUNDANESE. Notable exceptions to the basic silence on finiteness in Indonesian languages are Kana (1986) and Arka (2000, 2013). Both propose a finiteness distinction in Indonesian based on what are generally analyzed as temporal auxiliaries. We review Arka’s proposal here, as it is the most detailed discussion, showing that it is not applicable to Sundanese. In addition, we explore the limited number and person agreement that Sundanese presents, and demonstrate that neither can be taken as indicating a difference between finite and nonfinite clauses.

2.1 TEMPORAL AUXILIARIES, MODALS, NOMINALIZATIONS, AND FINITENESS. Although the tense of a clause is discourse-dependent, auxiliaries (and temporal adverbs) can be used to indicate temporal and aspectual features in Indonesian languages, as illustrated in (2)–(4) for Indonesian.

4. There was a debate in the Principles and Parameters literature during the 1980s regarding whether tense or agreement was the critical element in determining finiteness (George and Kornfilt 1981; Harbert 1982), but that controversy went unresolved, in the end both being taken as contributing to the determination of finiteness.

- (2) INDONESIAN
 Ujang *akan* mem-beli buah~buahan.
 Ujang FUT AV-buy fruits
 ‘Ujang will buy some fruit.’

- (3) INDONESIAN
 Ujang *sedang* mem-beli buah~buahan.
 Ujang PROG AV-buy fruits
 ‘Ujang is buying some fruit.’

- (4) INDONESIAN
 Ujang *sudah* mem-beli buah~buahan.
 Ujang PRF AV-buy fruits
 ‘Ujang has bought some fruit.’

In (2), *akan* indicates future time while *sedang* and *sudah* mark aspectual distinctions in (3) and (4), respectively.

All of these forms can occur in clausal complements.

- (5) INDONESIAN
 Imas berkata bahwa Ujang *akan* mem-beli buah~buahan.
 Imas say COMP Ujang FUT AV-buy fruits
 ‘Imas said that Ujang would buy some fruit.’

- (6) INDONESIAN
 Imas berkata bahwa Ujang *sedang* mem-beli buah~buahan.
 Imas say COMP Ujang PROG AV-buy fruits
 ‘Imas said that Ujang would be buying some fruit.’

- (7) INDONESIAN
 Imas berkata bahwa Ujang *sudah* mem-beli buah~buahan.
 Imas say COMP Ujang PRF AV-buy fruits
 ‘Imas said that Ujang had bought some fruit.’

The complement clauses in (5)–(7) are “standard” complementation structures, that is, analogues of English *that*-complements. The fact that the temporal auxiliaries can occur in these complements is entirely consistent with the hypothesis that temporal auxiliaries indicate finiteness in Indonesian.

Arka (2000, 2013) bases his analysis, in part, on the fact that the occurrence of the temporal auxiliaries is unacceptable in the complements of what are standardly taken to be control verbs. The presence of *akan* in the complement of the control verb *ingin* ‘want’ (8b) and *akan*, *sedang*, or *sudah* in the complement of the control verb *menyuruh* ‘ask’ (9b) results in ungrammaticality.

- (8) INDONESIAN
 a. Para ibu juga ingin [meng-ubah penampilan-nya].
 QUANT mother also want AV-change appearance-DEF
 ‘Mothers also want to change their appearance.’ (Arka 2000:4)
 b. *Para ibu ingin [*akan* men-gubah penampilan-nya].
 QUANT mother want FUT AV-change appearance-DEF

(9) INDONESIAN

a. Saya menyuruh dia [makan].

1SG AV.ask 3SG AV eat

'I asked him to eat.'

(Arka 2013:26)

b. *Saya menyuruh dia [akan/sedang/sudah makan].

1SG AV.ask 3SG FUT/PROG/PRF AV.eat

Possible translation: *'I asked him to will/still/already eat.'

In most languages in which finiteness is overtly marked on verbs, complements of control verbs must be nonfinite. Therefore, the ungrammaticality of (8b) and (9b) is consistent with the hypothesis that temporal auxiliaries, while optional, are an indication of finiteness in Indonesian.

Unlike control complements, however, the complements in Indonesian raising structures freely admit *akan* and other temporal auxiliaries.

(10) INDONESIAN

Penonton tanpa tiket di-perkirakan [akan mem-banjir-i Belanda].

spectator without ticket PV-think FUT AV-flood-APPL Netherlands

'The Netherlands is believed to be flooded by (football) supporters without tickets.'

(Arka 2000:4)

(11) INDONESIAN

Ujang di-percaya [sedang men-cari beasiswa].

Ujang PV-believe PROG AV-search scholarship

'Ujang is believed to be looking for a scholarship.'

(12) INDONESIAN

Ujang di-anggap [sudah men-dapat-kan beasiswa].

Ujang PV-consider PRF AV-get-APPL scholarship

'Ujang is believed to have obtained a scholarship.'

Data such as these require an analysis in which raising takes place out of a finite complement. While rarer than raising from nonfinite complements, raising from finite complements has been proposed for a number of languages (Joseph 1976; Kuno 1976; Deprez 1992; Motapanyane 1995; Tanaka 2002; Yoon 2007). Indonesian could then be taken as another instantiation of this.

Arka (2013) further proposes that, as in English, some modal verbs in Indonesian (including *bisa* 'can') are inherently tensed. Arka shows that prototypically nonfinite clauses, as in (13b), disallow *bisa*.

(13) INDONESIAN

a. Saya belajar [agar bisa menembak].

1SG study so.that can AV.shoot

'I am studying so that I can shoot.'

b. Saya belajar [*bisa menembak].

1SG study can AV.shoot

'I'm studying to be able to shoot.'

(Arka 2013:26)

The presumably finite purpose clause in (13a) is fully grammatical with the modal *bisa* 'can'. In (13b), however, its occurrence in the absence of the purpose conjunction *agar* 'so that' renders the sentence ungrammatical. If *bisa* does not occur, the sentence is

perfectly acceptable. It should be noted further that modality has been hypothesized to mark finiteness in some languages, as in Korean (Lee 2009).

So, although verbs in Indonesian are unmarked for either tense or agreement, the finiteness distinction may be manifested in the system of temporal auxiliaries and modals. The same might therefore be true of Sundanese. However, Sundanese presents a different set of facts from those reported for Indonesian.

First, the future auxiliary *rék* ‘will’ can occur in complements of subject control predicates with no degradation of grammaticality.⁵

- (14) Ujang ng-usaha-keun [(*rék*) indit ka dayeuh].

Ujang AV-attempt-APPL FUT go to town

‘Ujang attempted to go to town.’

- (15) Kuring geus janji ka pamajikan [(*rék*) nyoba-an masak-an

1SG PRF promise to wife FUT AV.try-IT food-NMLZ

Jepang].

Japan

‘I promised my wife to try Japanese food.’

The future auxiliary *rék* optionally occurs in the complement of *usahakeun* ‘attempt’ in (14) and of *janji* ‘promise’ in (15).⁶

Modals such as *bisa* ‘can’ and *kudu* ‘must’ can also occur in the complements of control predicates.

- (16) Asih haying di-ajar [(*bisa*) ba-bantu ka kolot-na].

Asih want STAT-learn can RED-help to parent-DEF

‘Asih learns to help out her parents.’⁷

- (17) Manéhna di-paksa [(*kudu*) ng-injeum-keun duit ka ba-batur-an-na].

3SG PV-force must AV-lend-APP money to RED-other-NMLZ-DEF

‘She was forced to lend some money to her friend.’

In (16), *bisa* ‘can’—which is impossible in the Indonesian sentence in (13b)—is fully grammatical in the control complement, and in (17), *kudu* ‘must’ may optionally occur.

Finally, both temporal auxiliaries and modals can occur in Sundanese nominalizations:

5. The grammaticality of the future marker in the complement of a control construction brings to mind the analyses of Bresnan (1972) and Stowell (1982), who hypothesized that many control complements are tensed—what Bresnan referred to as “unrealized future.”

6. It should be noted that the future auxiliary is disallowed in the complements of object control predicates, as shown in (i).

(i) Kuring ng-olo pamajikan [(**rék*) nyoba-an masak-an Jepang].

1SG AV-persuade wife will AV.try-IT food-NMLZ Japan

‘I persuaded my wife to try Japanese food.’

As discussed in Kurniawan (2013), the prohibition of the future auxiliary in object control complements is plausibly a semantic restriction on what types of auxiliaries can occur in the complements of manipulative predicates. Note that although in the end this may just be a stipulative account, to take the impossibility of the future auxiliary in object control complements as an indication of nonfiniteness would result in an analysis in which object control complements are nonfinite and subject control complements finite, which itself is a rather odd state of affairs.

7. The prefix *di-* in (16) has a syntactic function distinct from that of *di-* in (17). While sentence (17) exemplifies a passive voice construction, (16) is a stative construction.

- (18) Bapa masih teu panuju ngeunaan [*rék* di-kirim-na Ujang
 father still NEG agree about FUT PV-send-NMLZ Ujang
 ka Suriah].
 to Syria
 'Father does not agree yet about (the fact that) Ujang will be sent to Syria.'
- (19) Masarakat teu satuju ngeunaan [*perlu* di-cabut-na subsidi
 community NEG agree about need PV-lift-NMLZ subsidy
 BBM ku pa-maréntah].
 gasoline by NOM-AV.order
 'The people do not agree about (the fact that) oil subsidy needs to be
 revoked by the government.'

In (18) and (19), the dependent verbs are nominalized by means of the definite suffix *-na*, yet in both instances auxiliaries occur in the nominalized complements.

2.2 AGREEMENT. Unlike in most Indonesian-type languages, in Sundanese there is some limited agreement that is optionally marked on predicates: plural agreement and 3rd person subject agreement. These two types of agreement operate independently. Neither marks predicates as finite.

Plural actors (agents) can optionally trigger the infix *-ar/-al* on predicates. The affix occurs after the first consonant of a word (20) or word-initially in the absence of an initial consonant (21).

- (20) Masarakat keur *naréang-an* kapal nu ragrag téa.
 community PROG AV-*seek*.PL-IT plane REL fall PART
 'The people are searching for the fallen plane.'
- (21) Barudak keur *ar-ulin* di buruan.
 children PROG PL-*play* in yard
 'The kids are playing in the yard.'

As the passive examples in (22) show, agreement is not triggered by the subject but by the actor.

- (22) a. Kapal ragrag téa téh keur di-*taréang-an* ku masarakat.
 plane fall PART PART PROG PV-*seek*.PL-IT by community
 'The fallen plane was being searched for by the people.'
- b. *Ujang jeung Amung keur di-*taréang-an* ku indung-na.
 Ujang and Amung PROG PV-*seek*.PL-IT by mother-DEF
 Intended: 'Ujang and Amung were being searched for by their mother.'

As with temporal auxiliaries and modals, plural agreement can occur in standard complement clauses (23), as well as in complements of both subject (24) and object (25) control, complements of raising predicates (26), and nominalizations (27).

- (23) Amung teu apal-eun [*yén* barudak keur *ar-ulin* di masjid].
 Amung NEG know-3 COMP children PROG PL-*play* in mosque
 'Amung does not realize that the kids are playing in the mosque.'
- (24) Barudak boga rencana [*rék ar-indit* ka Bali].
 children have plan FUT PL-*go* to Bali
 'The kids planned to go to Bali.'

- (25) Barudak di-titah [sangkan geura baralik ka imah-na].
 children PV-order COMP soon return.PL to house-DEF
 ‘The kids were asked to go home soon.’
- (26) Barudak di-sangka [kalabur ti sakola].
 children PV-suspect escape.PL from school
 ‘The kids were suspected of skipping school.’
- (27) [Kalabur-na barudak ti sakola-na téh] masih di-talungtik
 escape.PL-NMLZ children from school-DEF PART still PV-research
 ku kepala sakola.
 by head school
 ‘The principal is still investigating students skipping school.’

Given its generally unrestricted distribution, plural agreement does not appear to hold any promise for signaling a finiteness distinction in Sundanese.

In addition to number agreement, Sundanese also instantiates limited person agreement. The examples in (28) show that the suffix *-eun* may optionally occur on verbs with 3rd person subjects, regardless of number.⁸

- (28) a. Ujang teu nyaho-**eun** yén si Amung téh jéger terminal.
 Ujang NEG AV.know-3 COMP PART Amung PART thug terminal
 ‘Ujang does not know that Amung is a thug at the bus station.’
- b. Ujang jeung adi-na teu nyaraho-**eun** yén si Amung
 Ujang and brother-DEF NEG AV-know.PL-3 COMP PART Amung
 téh jéger terminal.
 PART thug terminal
 ‘Ujang and his little brother do not know that Amung is a thug at the bus station.’

The suffix identifies the subject as being 3rd person. Clauses in which it cooccurs with 1st or 2nd person subjects are ill-formed (29).

- (29) a. *Kuring teu nyaho-**eun** yén si Amung téh jéger terminal.
 1SG NEG AV.know-3 COMP PART Amung PART thug terminal
 Intended: ‘I don’t know that Amung is a thug at the bus station.’
- b. *Manéh daék-**eun** di-buruh-an sapuluh rébu pikeun
 2SG want-3 PV-pay-APPL ten thousand for
 ng-anter kuring ka dayeuh.
 AV-drop 1SG to town
 Intended: ‘You are willing to be paid ten thousand rupiahs to drop me off at the town.’

Person agreement is no better a candidate for signaling a finiteness distinction than is plural agreement. It can occur in canonical clausal complements (30), control complements (31), raising complements (32), and nominalizations (33).

8. It must be noted that the range of predicates that can take this person marker is quite limited; it includes stative predicates such as *nyaho* ‘know’, *salar* ‘realize’, *ngarti* ‘understand’, *boga* ‘have’, *haying* ‘want’, *poho* ‘forget’, *inget* ‘remember’, *resep* ‘like’, *keuheul* ‘angry’, *bisa* ‘capable’, *cicing* ‘still’, and others.

- (30) Ujang yakin [yén pamajikan-na bakal resep-**eun** kana dewegan].
 Ujang sure COMP wife-DEF FUT like-3 to young.coconut
 ‘Ujang is sure that his wife will love young coconuts.’
- (31) Ujang di-olo [sangkan daék-**eun** ng-ala dewegan].
 Ujang PV-persuade so.that will-3 AV-pick young coconut
 ‘Ujang was persuaded to be willing to pick young coconuts from the tree.’
- (32) Ujang di-anggap [geus nyaho-**eun** ka-jadi-an kamari].
 ujang PV-assume PRF AV.know-3 NMLZ-become-NMLZ yesterday
 ‘Ujang was assumed to have known about yesterday’s incident.’
- (33) Ujang masih kénéh teu percaya ngeunaan [daék-**eun**-na Imas
 Ujang still just NEG believe about will-3-NMLZ Imas
 di-kawinku Ohang].
 PV-marryby Ohang
 ‘Ujang still does not believe Imas’s willingness to marry Ohang.’

If a finiteness distinction exists in Sundanese, it is clear that none of the overt manifestations considered thus far provides the key to any such distinction. Note that if any of these elements were associated with finiteness, virtually all clauses in Sundanese would be finite. Therefore, all raising in Sundanese would be from finite clauses and all control would be into finite clauses (with the possible exception of object control, but then only if nonfinite clauses are characterized as those that do not allow temporal auxiliaries and modals). Raising out of finite clauses has been proposed for a number of languages (Joseph 1976; Kuno 1976; Deprez 1992; Motapanyane 1995; Tanaka 2002; Yoon 2007), as has control into finite clauses (Landau 2004; Alobiu 2007; Rodrigues 2007; Spyropoulos 2007). However, both are relatively rare, and Sundanese would have the even rarer distinction of instantiating both.

3. THE ROLE OF FINITENESS IN SUNDANESE. As just demonstrated, none of the types of morphology typically associated with finiteness can be claimed to identify finite domains in Sundanese. Thus, whether or not finiteness has a role in Sundanese grammar is a legitimate question. Outward appearances seem to indicate that it does not, putting Sundanese into a rare group of languages (if such languages actually exist—a point on which we remain agnostic).

However, one aspect of finiteness that we have studiously avoided up to now is the association of finiteness with nominative case and the licensing of subjects.⁹ Clearly, Sundanese nominals exhibit no overt case marking. Despite this, we claim here that, in the majority of cases, overt subjects in Sundanese are licensed by an abstract finiteness feature as has been proposed for Chinese (Huang 1984; Li 1990; Lin 2011) and other languages.

3.1 OVERT SUBJECTS IN SUNDANESE. Confounding the question of finiteness is the fact that Sundanese subject and object pronouns are freely omissible if the reference is clear from the discourse context.

9. The relationship of finiteness and nominative case was a critical ingredient of Bouchard’s (1984) account of the distribution of PRO.

- (34) a. *Imas keur naon?*
 Imas PROG what
 ‘What is Imas doing?’
 b. *Keur maréndé budak.*
 PROG AV.put.to.sleep child
 ‘(She) is putting her child to sleep.’
- (35) a. *Geus badami jeung Ujang téh?*
 PRF discuss with Ujang PART
 ‘Have (you) had a discussion with Ujang?’
 b. *Kamari geus ng-obrol.*
 yesterday PRF AV-talk
 ‘(I) talked to (him) yesterday.’

As (34) and (35) illustrate, in an appropriate context, subject (34b) and object (35b) pronouns can be, and usually are, dropped in casual speech. Of course, without a sufficiently rich context, both sentences would be unacceptable, and would be only accepted with an overt pronoun.

This optionality of pronouns in context is present in complements as well:

- (36) a. *Geus aya informasi isukan urang rék ka mana?*
 PRF exist information tomorrow we FUT to where
 ‘Is there any information about where we will go tomorrow?’
 b. *Cikénéh Pa Amung nelpon isukan rék di-bawa ka Lémbang.*
 just.now Mr. Amung AV.call tomorrow FUT PV-bring to Lembang
 ‘Mr. Amung just called (to say that we) will go to Lembang tomorrow.’
- (37) a. *Budak nu niron téh rék di-kumaha-keun cenah?*
 child REL AV.cheat PART FUT PV-how-APPL hearsay
 ‘Have you heard what would happen to the student who cheated?’
 b. *Tadi Pa Amung nga-béja-an minggu hareup rék di-sidang*
 just.now Mr. Amung AV-news-APPL week next FUT PV-court
di jurusan.
 in department
 ‘Mr. Amung just said (that he) would be questioned in the department next week.’

In both these examples, the embedded subject, whether overt or null, is naturally interpreted as *urang* ‘we’ in (36) and *budak nu niron téh* ‘the student who cheated’ in (37). With minimal context, (36b) and (37b) are still acceptable. While still acceptable, in this case the most natural interpretation is that the embedded null subject is coreferential with a matrix argument. The result is a structure that looks similar on the surface to control structures. However, as we show, (36b) and (37b) are not instances of control: in almost all cases of control, the pronoun is obligatorily absent, and coreference between the empty subject and some nominal in the matrix clause is required. In the cases currently under consideration, the pronouns may occur and coreference is not mandatory.

The optionality of the pronouns in (34)–(37) is clearly a discourse phenomenon and not a sentence-level syntactic phenomenon. In none of the cases is the inclusion of an

overt pronoun in these environments unacceptable. However, as the (b) sentences in (38)–(41) demonstrate, pronouns in these environments are perfectly acceptable.¹⁰

- (38) a. Imas keur naon?
 Imas PROG what
 ‘What is Imas doing?’
 b. **Manéhna** keur maréndé budak.
 3SG PROG AV.put.to.sleep child
 ‘She is putting her child to sleep.’
- (39) a. Geus badami jeung Ujang téh?
 PRF discuss with Ujang PART
 ‘Have (you) had a discussion with Ujang?’
 b. Kamari **kuring** geus ng-obrol jeung **manéhna**.
 yesterday 1SG PRF AV-talk with 3SG
 ‘I talked to him yesterday.’
- (40) a. Geus aya informasi isukan urang rék ka mana?
 PRF exist information tomorrow we FUT to where
 ‘Is there any information about where we will go tomorrow?’
 b. Cikénéh Pa Amung nelpon isukan **urang** rék di-bawa
 just.now Mr. Amung AV.call tomorrow 1PL FUT PV-bring
 ka Lémbang.
 to Lémbang
 ‘Mr. Amung just called (to say) we will go to Lémbang tomorrow.’
- (41) a. Budak nu niron téh rék di-kumaha-keun cenah?
 child REL AV.cheat PART FUT PV-how-APPL hearsay
 ‘Have you heard what would happen to the student who cheated?’
 b. Tadi Pa Amung nga-béja-an minggu hareup **manéhna**
 just.now Mr. Amung AV-news-APPL week next 3SG
 rék di-sidang di jurusan.
 FUT PV-court in department
 ‘Mr. Amung just said he would be questioned in the department next week.’

What is more, there is no coreference requirement between the pronoun and some element in the preceding sentence. To take just one example, *manéhna* in (41b) could be replaced with *manéh* with no loss in grammaticality:

- (42) Tadi Pa Amung nga-béja-an minggu hareup **manéh**
 just.now Mr. Amung AV-news-APPL week next 2SG
 rék di-sidang di jurusan.
 FUT PV-court in department
 ‘Mr. Amung just said you would be questioned in the department next week.’

This is not to say that all the sentences with noncoreferential pronouns would be perfectly felicitous, but they do not result in ungrammaticality, merely pragmatic inappropriateness.

10. Note that the (a) sentences in (38)–(41) repeat exactly the (a) sentences of (34)–(37).

However, there are environments in which overt pronouns are disallowed, where their occurrence results in ungrammaticality: control and raising structures. Consider the examples of control in (43) and (44):

- (43) a. Barudak₁ nyoba-nyoba [PRO_{1/*2} rék jarual-an sapatu di pasar].
 children AV.try-RED FUT sell.PL-IT shoes in market
 ‘The children tried to sell shoes in the (traditional) market.’
- b. *Barudak₁ nyoba-nyoba [**maranéhna**_{1/*2} rék jarual-an
 children AV.try-RED 3PL FUT sell.PL-IT
 sapatu di pasar].
 shoes in market
- (44) a. Amung nitah Ujang₁ [sina PRO_{1/*2} jual-an sapatu di pasar].
 Amung AV.order Ujang so.that sell-IT shoes in market
 ‘Amung ordered Ujang to sell shoes in the (traditional) market.’
- b. *Amung nitah Ujang₁ [sina **manéhna**_{1/*2} jual-an
 Amung AV.order Ujang so.that 3SG sell-IT
 sapatu di pasar].
 shoes in market

Note that, unlike the cases of complements of noncontrol structures in (36), (37), and (40)–(42), the presence of a 3rd person pronoun renders the subject control and object control sentences ungrammatical—*maranéhna* 3rd plural in (43b) and *manéhna* 3rd singular in (44b). Note also that control in these structures is obligatory. The sentences are likewise unacceptable if *manéhna* is interpreted as some other third person.

The same result obtains in raising structures:

- (45) a. Amung tangtu [rék jual-an sapatu di pasar].
 Amung certain FUT sell-IT shoes in market
 ‘Amung is certain to sell shoes in the (traditional) market.’
- b. *Amung₁ tangtu [**manéhna**₁ rék jual-an sapatu di pasar].
 Amung certain 3SG FUT sell-IT shoes in market
- (46) a. Barudak di-anggap [rék kalabur ti sakola].
 children PV-assume FUT escape.PL from school
 ‘The children were assumed to be skipping school.’
- b. *Barudak₁ di-anggap [**maranéhna**₁ rék kalabur ti sakola].
 children PV-assume 3PL FUT escape.PL from school

In the raising-to-subject structure, the subject of the embedded clause cannot be overt. Thus (45a) is acceptable and (45b) is not, solely due to the pronoun in complement subject position. Likewise, in the raising-to-object example, an overt subject pronoun in the complement renders the sentence unacceptable (46b).¹¹

There are, however, control structures in which an overt embedded subject pronoun is acceptable:

- (47) Ujang₁ di-titah ku abah [sangkan (manéhna)_{1/*2}
 Ujang PV-order by grandfather so.that 3SG
 meuncit domba].
 AV.slaughter sheep
 ‘Ujang was ordered by his grandfather so that he (would) slaughter a sheep.’

Kurniawan (2013) demonstrates that in structures such as (47), the complementizer *sangkan*¹² ‘so that’ licenses the occurrence of the pronoun in much the same way that *for* sanctions embedded subjects in English infinitival complements. The distinction is that in the Sundanese control examples, the reference of the pronoun is restricted to a controller in the matrix clause. (See Kurniawan 2013 for arguments that the pronoun in these structures is an overt manifestation of PRO.)

3.2 FINITENESS IN SUNDANESE. The question, then, is what restricts overt DPs from occurring in these environments. One could propose a Sundanese-specific constraint to account for the distribution—perhaps detailing a list of verbs for which complement subjects are disallowed or banning overt subject in sentential complements in Control and Raising structures, or some subset of them. However, such a language-particular stipulation offers no explanation for the distribution of overt subject DPs, and creates the impression that Sundanese is more unlike other languages than it may actually be. An analysis proposing a language-particular constraint misses an important cross-linguistic regularity: overt subjects are disallowed in nonfinite clauses.¹³

As was clear in the translations for the data in 3.1, an overt subject was impossible in Sundanese in the same environments as in English. The fact is that the distribution of overt subjects in Sundanese is precisely parallel to languages that morphologically mark finiteness. We propose, therefore, that the same property is at work in Sundanese; it is just that in Sundanese, finiteness is not overtly marked in the clause. This parallels the case in Chinese, for which Huang (1984), Li (1990), Tang (2000), Lin (2011), and others have argued for a finiteness distinction.¹⁴ Li (1990:17) states:

Although there is no clear morphological distinction between finite and nonfinite clauses in Chinese, it is necessary to distinguish tensed clauses from infinitives because the two constructions have distinct syntactic properties. I will

11. In the raising-to-object example in (46), the matrix verb is in the passive voice due to the ambiguity of structures in which the embedded subject occurs in matrix object position. The ambiguity is due to the optionality of the complementizer *yén* in a standard complement structure, as in (ii).

(ii) Amung ng-anggap [(yén) Ujang rék nga-baruntak pa-maréntah].
 Amung AV-assume COMP Ujang FUT AV-rebel NOM-AV.order
 ‘Amung assumed (that) Ujang rebelled against the government.’

In the absence of the complementizer, whether *Ujang* is a matrix or embedded dependent is indeterminate. The passive structure ensures against such ambiguity.

12. The complementizers *supaya* and *ngarah*, which can also both be translated as ‘so that’, have the same distribution and properties as *sangkan*.

13. There are, of course, language-particular exceptions to this, such as a prepositional complementizer like English *for* as in *I prefer for my children to sit quietly*.

14. Hu, Pan, and Xu (2001) contend that Mandarin does not distinguish finite and nonfinite domains because the evidence presented by other authors is not exceptionless. However, see Lin (2011) for a point-by-point rebuttal of this position.

show that finite clauses, but not nonfinite clauses, are barriers to certain syntactic processes and relations, such as the realization of aspect, the licensing of negative polarity items by negation, and the co-occurrence relation between certain time adverbials and aspect markers. The distinction between the two types of clauses is further manifested in the distribution of overt NPs and empty categories: *the subject position of finite clauses, but not infinitives, can have overt lexical NPs* (emphasis added).

A control structure is exemplified in (48) (from Huang 1984) and raising in (49) (from Li 1990).

- (48) CHINESE
 Zhangsan shefa bangmang wo.
 Zhangsan try help me
 'Zhangsan tried to help me.' (Huang 1984:556)

- (49) CHINESE
 Zhege yisheng kaishi jiancha Lisi le.
 this doctor begin examine Lisi ASP
 'This doctor began to examine Lisi.' (Li 1990:128)

As in the Sundanese examples in 3.1, overt pronouns are impossible in these environments:¹⁵

- (50) CHINESE
 *Zhangsan shefa **ta** bangmang wo.
 Zhangsan try he help me
 (51) CHINESE
 *Zhege yisheng kaishi **ta** jiancha Lisi le.
 this doctor begin he examine Lisi ASP

Both Huang (1984) and Li (1990) contend that any clause that can take an overt subject is a finite clause, regardless of the presence or absence of an aspectual morpheme.

In describing finiteness in Mandarin Chinese, Huang (1984:556) states that, "in Chinese, what is intuitively a finite clause may be distinguished from a nonfinite clause by the former's but not the latter's *potential* possibility of occurring with a marking for an aspect, say the perfective aspect *le* or a variant of it" (emphasis in original). Note that Huang's characterization is precisely what Arka (2000, 2013) proposes for Indonesian. Additionally, Huang (1982) also cites *hui* 'will' and other modals as overt indications of finiteness, making the parallel between Chinese and Indonesian nearly complete. Therefore, it seems that an abstract notion of finiteness should be recognized for Indonesian as well. The fact that *akan* 'will', *sedang* 'PROG' and *sudah* 'PERF' are possible in sentences does not carry the implication that any clause in which they are absent is nonfinite. And, of course, this is the majority of clauses. The fact that one of these elements could potentially occur is not explicitly marked in a clause, but the possibility is sanctioned by something. We submit that this "something" is an abstract finiteness feature, along the lines of [fin] (or [±fin]), which might be a feature on a Tense or Inflection node or signified in the representation in some other way.

15. We are indebted to Weilu Wang for the data in (50) and (51).

Another language that instantiates the same pattern is Lao.¹⁶ There is no overt tense marking in Lao, but again the finiteness/nonfiniteness distinction shows up in the (in)admissibility of overt subjects in complement clauses. In a standard complement clause, an overt subject, here the third person singular pronoun *laaw*, is fully grammatical (52).

- (52) LAO
 Nòj khít vaal **laaw** sì sa-naq.¹⁷
 Noy think COMP 3SG IRR win
 ‘Noy_i thinks that she_{ij} will win.’

However, inclusion of a pronoun in the complements in raising (53) and control (54) structures renders the sentences ungrammatical.

- (53) LAO
 Nòj khù-si (***laaw**) khaw-caj p̄c̄en.
 Noy seem 3SG understand plan
 ‘Noy seems to understand the plan.’
- (54) LAO
 Laaw bò jaak (***laaw**) caaj ngen.
 3SG not want 3SG pay money
 ‘S/he didn’t want to pay.’

Even though Sundanese lacks any obvious type of overt morphological manifestation of finiteness, recognizing a covert finiteness/nonfiniteness distinction as proposed for Chinese, which seems to be at work in languages such as Indonesian, Lao, Slave, and others, provides a coherent account of overt subjects in Sundanese that parallels those in other languages.

4. CONCLUSION. Despite the surface morphological differences, the distribution of overt subjects in Sundanese is remarkably similar to that in languages rich in morpho-syntax. In the majority of languages, obligatory control and raising structures typically disallow overt subjects; the same is true in Sundanese. In the majority of languages in the majority of cases, the admissibility of overt subjects (generally in the nominative case in accusative languages that have morphological case systems) is correlated with the overt manifestation of finiteness (a finiteness feature), be it tense, agreement, modality, or some other property. We propose that Sundanese has the same finiteness feature as these other languages, but that it is just lacking in overt morphology of any kind. This captures the fact that Sundanese exhibits the same distribution of overt and covert subjects as Chinese (Huang 1984; Li 1990), Slave (Rice 1989), Lao, and likely other languages. This takes Sundanese out of the realm of the remarkable and squarely in the realm of the expected. And as all root clauses in Sundanese admit overt subjects, it poses no challenge to Hornstein’s (1990) assertion that “root clauses must be finite.”

16. We are indebted to Douglas Cole for discussion of Lao and the data presented here. Example (53) is based on data from Enfield (2007).

17. Although each word in Lao has one of five tones (or no tone) associated with it, we have omitted the numbers that designate tones from the transcription for ease of exposition.

REFERENCES

- Adelaar, Alexander. 2013. Tense, aspect and mood in some west Indonesian languages. In *Tense, aspect, mood and evidentiality in languages of Indonesia*, ed. by John Bowden, 5–21. NUSA: Linguistic studies of languages in and around Indonesia, vol 55. Jakarta: Atma Jaya Catholic University.
- Alobiu, Gabriela. 2007. Moving forward with Romanian backward control and raising. In *New horizons in the analysis of control and raising*, ed. by William D. Davies and Stanley Dubinsky, 187–211. Dordrecht: Springer-Verlag.
- Arka, I Wayan. 2000. *Control theory and argument structure: Explaining control into subject in Indonesian*. Paper presented at the 4th International Malay and Indonesian Symposium, Jakarta.
- . 2013. On the typology and syntax of TAM in Indonesian. In *Tense, aspect, mood and evidentiality in languages of Indonesia*, ed. by John Bowden, 23–40. NUSA: Linguistic studies of languages in and around Indonesia, vol 55. Jakarta: Atma Jaya Catholic University.
- Austin, Peter K. 2013. Tense, aspect, mood and evidentiality in Sasak, eastern Indonesia. In *Tense, aspect, mood and evidentiality in languages of Indonesia*, ed. by John Bowden, 41–56. NUSA: Linguistic studies of languages in and around Indonesia, vol 55. Jakarta: Atma Jaya Catholic University.
- Bouchard, Denis. 1984. *PRO*, pronominal or anaphor. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16:471–77.
- Bresnan, Joan W. 1972. Theory of complementation in English syntax. PhD diss., MIT.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Deprez, Viviane. 1992. Raising constructions in Haitian Creole. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10:191–231.
- Enfield, Nick J. 2007. *A grammar of Lao*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- George, Leland M., and Jaklin Kornfilt. 1981. Finiteness and boundedness in Turkish. In *Binding and filtering*, ed. by Frank Heny, 105–28. London: Croom Helm Ltd.
- Givón, Talmy. 1990. *Syntax: A functional-typological introduction*, vol. 2. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Grangé, Philippe. 2006. *Temps et aspect en indonésien*. Poitiers: Université de Poitiers.
- . 2013. Aspect in Indonesian: Free markers vs bound markers. In *Tense, aspect, mood and evidentiality in languages of Indonesia*, ed. by John Bowden, 57–79. NUSA: Linguistic studies of languages in and around Indonesia, vol 55. Jakarta: Atma Jaya Catholic University.
- Harbert, Wayne. 1982. In defense of Tense. *Linguistic Analysis* 9.1–18.
- Hogg, Richard M., ed. 1992. *The Cambridge history of the English language*, vol. 1: *The beginnings to 1066*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hornstein, Norbert. 1990. *As time goes by*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hu, Jianhua, Haihua Pan, and Liejiong Xu. 2001. Is there a finite vs. nonfinite distinction in Chinese? *Linguistics* 39:1117–48.
- Huang, C.-T. James. 1982. Logical relations in Chinese and the theory of grammar. PhD diss., MIT.
- . 1984. On the distribution and reference of empty pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15:531–74.
- Huddleston, Rodney D. 1988. *English grammar: An outline*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Joseph, Brian. 1976. Raising in Modern Greek: A copying process? In *Harvard studies in syntax and semantics*, vol. 2, ed. by Judith Aissen and Jorge Hankamer, 241–78. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Kana, Marit. 1986. Grammatical relations in Bahasa Indonesia. PhD diss., Cornell University. (Published as Vamarasi, Marit Kana. 1999. *Grammatical relations in Bahasa Indonesia*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.)
- Kuno, Susumu. 1976. Subject raising. In *Syntax and Semantics 5: Japanese generative grammar*, ed. by Masayoshi Shibatani, 17–29. New York: Academic Press.
- Kurniawan, Eri. 2013. Sundanese complementation. PhD diss., University of Iowa.
- Landau, Idan. 2004. The scale of finiteness and the calculus of control. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 22:811–77.
- Lee, Kumyoung. 2009. Finite control in Korean. PhD diss., University of Iowa.
- Li Yen-hui Audrey. 1990. *Order and constituency in Mandarin Chinese*. Berlin: Springer.
- Lin, T. H. Jonah. 2011. Finiteness of clauses and raising of arguments in Mandarin Chinese. *Syntax* 14:48–73.
- Motapanyane, Virginia. 1995. *Theoretical implications of complementation in Romanian*. Padova: Unipress.
- Purwo, Bambang Kaswanti. 1989. Voice in Indonesian: A discourse study. In *Serpih-serpih telaah pasif Bahasa Indonesia*, ed. by B. K. Purwo, 195–241. Jogjakarta: Kanisius.
- Rice, Keren. 1989. *A grammar of Slave*. Berlin: Mouton.
- Rodrigues, Cilene. 2007. Agreement and flotation in partial and inverse partial control configurations. In *New horizons in the analysis of control and raising*, ed. by William D. Davies and Stanley Dubinsky, 213–29. Dordrecht: Springer-Verlag.
- Spyropoulos, Vassilios. 2007. Finiteness and control in Greek. In *New horizons in the analysis of control and raising*, ed. by William D. Davies and Stanley Dubinsky, 159–83. Dordrecht: Springer-Verlag.
- Stowell, Tim. 1982. The tense of infinitives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13:561–70.
- Tanaka, Hidekazu. 2002. Raising to object out of CP. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33:637–52.
- Tang, C. C. Jane. 2000. Finite and nonfinite clauses in Chinese. *Language and Linguistics* 1:191–214.
- Yanti. 2013. Tense and auxiliaries in Jambi Malay. In *Tense, aspect, mood and evidentiality in languages of Indonesia*, ed. by John Bowden, 239–57. NUSA: Linguistic studies of languages in and around Indonesia, vol 55. Jakarta: Atma Jaya Catholic University.
- Yoon, James. 2007. Raising of major arguments in Korean and Japanese. In *New horizons in the analysis of control and raising*, ed. by William D. Davies and Stanley Dubinsky, 71–107. Dordrecht: Springer-Verlag.