Passive agents in Malay: The binding properties and discourse functions of agentive *=nya*

Paul KROEGER

Graduate Institute of Applied Linguistics & SIL Intl.
paul_kroeger@gial.edu

Influential work by Arka & Manning (1998) argues that the prefix *di-* marks a passive, unless the agent is expressed by the pronominal clitic *=nya* attaching to the verb. They analyze *=nya* in such cases as a core argument, meaning that the *di-V=nya* construction involves ergative or inverse alignment, rather than passivization. Their crucial evidence for this claim is an apparent contrast in binding properties between agentive *=nya* and the agentive PP. I argue that this contrast is due to pragmatic factors, including the high inherent topicality of clitic pronouns, rather than any difference in syntactic status, and that the prefix *di-* always marks a true passive.

1. Introduction[1]

This paper reviews a variety of evidence concerning grammatical relations in Malay, with special attention to the passive agent. I argue, contra Arka & Manning (1998), that the agent of the *di-V=nya* construction is not a core argument, and thus (contra Hopper (1979, 1983) and Verhaar (1984, 1988)) that the *di-V* form is always passive.

I begin in section 2 with an overview of the Malay voice system and a discussion of symmetric voice. Sections 3–4 discuss various syntactic tests for identifying grammatical subjects, and for distinguishing core arguments from oblique arguments and adjuncts.[2] While a number of good subjecthood tests have been identified for Malay, it turns out to be a bit more difficult to distinguish core from oblique. However, this is the crucial difference between passive and Objective Voice: the Objective Voice is transitive (two core arguments) whereas the passive is intransitive (only one core argument). This difference in transitivity follows from the fact that the Objective Voice agent is a core argument while the passive agent is an oblique argument or adjunct.

Section 5 discusses the use of reflexive binding as a way of distinguishing core vs. oblique arguments, focusing in particular on the status of the agentive clitic in the *di-V=nya* construction. The binding evidence has played a very important role in recent discussions of Malay voice, partly because some of the most useful tests for distinguishing core from oblique cannot be applied to clitics. I argue that, contrary to the claim by Arka & Manning (1998), the binding facts do not prove that the agentive *=nya* is a core argument. I suggest that the data they cite are best explained by discourse rather than syntactic properties, specifically the inherent topicality of clitic pronouns. If this is correct, then there is no syntactic basis for treating *di-* as a polysemous prefix; it always marks a passive.

---

[1] I would like to thank my principal Indonesian consultant, Mrs. Nahla Nurhidayah; I Wayan Arka, Ashrafiqin Ahmad, and Regina Yanti for their native-speaker judgments and helpful discussion of the issues discussed here; and Peter Cole and two anonymous reviewers for helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

[2] I follow Ross (2002), Andrews (2007), Arka (2005), and many other authors in using the label "core argument" to refer to non-oblique arguments of the verb, also called "terms" or "direct arguments." In the terminology of Role and Reference Grammar, these would be called "direct core arguments."

Section 6 challenges another kind of argument that has been made for the polysemy of *di-*, based on its discourse functions. Hopper (1979, 1983) and Verhaar (1984, 1988) identify the *di-* form as an "ergative" construction when it encodes main-line events in narrative, and as a "passive" in most other contexts. I argue that only a syntactic definition of the passive can provide a natural explanation for the correlation between voice morphology and syntactic properties that is demonstrated in sections 3–4.

In this paper I deal primarily with the standard forms of the language, Bahasa Malaysia and Bahasa Indonesia. I am aware of some differences between these two varieties with respect to the issues under discussion here, but overall I believe that the same basic analysis will work for the voice systems of both. Where the distinction between the two is not crucial, I use the term "Malay" as a cover term for both of them. Cole, Hermon & Yanti (2008) point out that more significant differences are found in various non-standard vernacular dialects (see also Nomoto 2006), but I will not attempt to address these differences in the present paper.

2. Overview of voice in Malay

Some recent work in Malay/Indonesian syntax, including Arka & Manning (1998), Musgrave (2001), and Cole, Hermon & Yanti (2008), argues for or assumes the voice system shown in (1a–c).[3] This voice system is partially "symmetrical" in the sense of Foley (1998) and Ross (2002) because there are two distinct transitive clause types.[4] One of these (*meN-V*) selects the agent as subject, the other (*Ø-V*) selects the patient as subject, but both are syntactically transitive because they contain two core arguments. We might also refer to this pattern as a "non-demoting" voice alternation, in contrast to the passive and antipassive in which a core argument is demoted to oblique status (or adjunct, under Chomsky's 1981 analysis). (I have included the Antipassive in (1d) for comparison, but this construction is not attested in Malay.)

(1)   a. *meN-V* <   agent,   patient   >   **Active Voice**
                          | |
                        SUBJ   OBJ

      b. *Ø-V* <   agent,   patient   >   **Objective Voice**
                          | | (= Ergative/Inverse)
                     Core/OBJ   SUBJ

      c. *di-V* <   agent,   patient   >   **Passive**
                          | |
                      (OBL)   SUBJ

      d. *** <   agent,   patient   >   **(Antipassive – not attested)**
                          | |
                        SUBJ   (OBL)

The three voices are illustrated in (2). The bare stem form illustrated in (2b) has often been referred to as the "zero passive" or "passive type two"; I follow Arka & Manning (1998) and Cole, Hermon & Yanti (2008) in using the term OBJECTIVE VOICE. This construction is not a passive, for reasons to be discussed below.

---

[3] Chung (1976a) proposes essentially the same analysis, but seems to say that the agent of the Objective Voice construction is neither oblique nor a true core argument.

[4] Himmelmann (2005) uses the term "symmetrical voice" in a slightly different sense, to indicate that two or more voice categories are equally basic or (un)marked in the language.

(2) a. *Kamu   harus   mem-baca   buku   ini.*
    2SG   must   AV-read   book   this

    'You must read this book.'

  b. *Buku   ini   harus   kau=Ø-baca.*
    book   this   must   2SG=OV-read

    'You must read this book.'   (Sneddon 1996:249)

  c. *Buku   ini   harus   di-baca   oleh   setiap   orang   Melayu.*
    book   this   must   PASS-read   by   every   person   Malay

    'This book must/should be read by every Malay person.'

There are several important differences between the *di-* passive and the Objective Voice (OV) construction. First, the agent phrase in the *di-* passive may optionally be omitted, whether it is understood from context or simply unspecified. When the agent is expressed it appears as a PP, introduced by the preposition *oleh* as seen in (2c); but *oleh* may optionally be dropped if the agent immediately follows the verb. In Objective Voice, however, the agent phrase is obligatory and must appear immediately before the verb stem; it must follow all auxiliaries (as illustrated in (2b) and (3a–c)), negation markers, etc.

Second, the agent of the *di-* passive cannot normally be a first or second person pronoun. The Objective Voice agent must be expressed as a pronoun, but (in the modern standard languages) there is no restriction as to person. So if the agent is a third person pronoun, both of the non-active voices are possible (Sneddon 1996:249–50). Sneddon shows that the OV agent may be a clitic pronoun as in (2b), a free pronoun form as in (3a), or a "pronoun substitute" (e.g. a kinship term or proper name used with first or second person reference) as in (3b–c).

(3) a. *Mobil   itu   dapat   <u>kita</u>   Ø-perbaiki.*
    car   that   get   1PL.INCL OV-repair.

    'We can repair the car.'   (Chung 1976a: 60)

  b. *Surat   ini   harus   <u>adik</u>   Ø-tandatangani.*
    letter this must younger.sibling OV-sign

    'You (younger sibling) must sign this letter.'   (Dalrymple & Mofu 2009)

  c. *Buku   itu   sudah   <u>Tini</u>   Ø-kembalikan.*
    book   that already (speaker's name) OV-return

    'I (Tini) have already returned the book.'   (Sneddon 1996:250)

Another important difference between the two non-active voices is the status of the agent. As indicated in (1b–c), the agent of the *di-* passive is an oblique argument, while the Objective Voice agent is a core argument.

In this paper I want to re-examine the empirical evidence which has commonly been cited in support of the analysis outlined above. The empirical basis for the analysis is important, because the concept of symmetric voice is still somewhat controversial.[5]

Symmetric voice poses descriptive, typological, and theoretical challenges to standard ways of thinking about voice. As recently as 20 years ago, a common objection to

---

[5] I will refer to "symmetric voice" rather than "symmetrical voice," but do not intend any difference in meaning.

symmetric analyses of Philippine-type voice systems was that no language had been clearly proven to work that way. Before the appearance of Guilfoyle, Hung & Travis (1992, earlier version 1989), most formal theories of syntax provided no mechanism for deriving a symmetric voice alternation. Thus Schachter (1984), having presented clear evidence for a symmetric voice alternation in Toba Batak, pointed out that no available theory of syntax allowed such an alternation. He concluded that syntactic functions such as "subject" and "object" were simply not part of Toba Batak grammar, and therefore not universal. More recently, Pearson (2005) argued that apparent "symmetric voice" alternations in Malagasy and Tagalog are actually instances of A-bar movement, rather than voice (which would involve A movement).

Arka (1998/2003) proved beyond question that Balinese has a symmetric voice alternation, in addition to a true passive (essentially the same inventory proposed in (1a–c)). This was an important milestone. Since that work appeared, if we want to propose a symmetric analysis for some other language (such as Malay), we no longer need to prove that symmetric voice is possible; that has been established. We face only the normal standard of evidence in linguistics — does the symmetric analysis provide the best possible account for the observed data?

The voice system described above (AV, OV, and passive) is not unique to Malay; a number of other Western Malayo-Polynesian languages appear to have the same inventory. Balinese is probably the best documented example of such a language (Arka 2003). West Coast Bajau has a similar system (Miller 2007), as do at least some of the other Sama-Bajau languages (Walton 1986; Kroeger 2004:301–305; Miller 2013). Legate (2012) has recently made a convincing case that Acehnese also has the same three voice categories.

Tjia (2007) describes the same system for Mualang, a Malayic language of western Borneo: *N-V* active, *da-V* passive, *Ø-V* inverse. However, it is not the case that all Malayic languages have these three voice categories. Cole, Hermon & Yanti (2008) show that some Malay varieties in southern Sumatra, including Mudung Darat Malay (Jambi Province), have lost the OV category.

The voice system of Maanyan (a Barito language of Central Kalimantan) appears to be very similar to that of Mualang: *N-V* active, *na-V* passive, *Ø-V* inverse (Gudai 1985, cited in Siewierska & Bakker 2013:171). Toba Batak has a two-voice symmetric system (AV vs. OV), but it does not seem to have a passive voice (Schachter 1984). Goudswaard (2005) describes a similar two-voice symmetric system in Ida'an-Begak (northeastern Borneo).[6]

What this means is that a clearer understanding of the Malay voice system is likely to help us make progress in the analysis of a number of other languages in the region as well.

3. Subjecthood and transitivity of the *di-* passive

A standard definition of passive clauses (Perlmutter & Postal 1977; Keenan 1985) involves three essential features: (a) the main verb is semantically transitive (two or more arguments); (b) the agent is not a core/direct argument — it may be omitted

---

[6] Another language which may have a voice system similar to that of Malay is Melanau (northwestern Borneo). Chou (1999), working with the description in Clayre (1972), identifies three voice categories: Actor Focus, Object Focus, and "Verb Focus." More research is needed to determine the syntactic properties of these categories.

entirely or expressed as an oblique argument or adjunct; (c) the patient is normally expressed as the grammatical subject, although some languages allow an "impersonal passive" in which there is no grammatical subject. Because the agent is not a core argument, a passive clause is syntactically intransitive (only one core argument).

A variety of evidence shows that the *di-V* construction is a true passive under this definition. The two key questions are these: (a) Is the patient really the grammatical subject? (b) Is the agent a core argument? There is clear evidence which shows that the answer to the first question is "yes," while the answer to the second question is "no."

Sandra Chung (1976a) and Marit Kana Vamarasi (1999) have identified a number of subjecthood properties in Indonesian. One of the most widely cited properties is the fact that only grammatical subjects can be relativized, clefted or questioned using the *yang* + gap strategy. Examples (4a–b) show that subjects can be clefted, while direct objects cannot. Example (4c) shows that the patient of the *di-V* construction can be clefted, providing evidence that it is the grammatical subject.

(4) a. *Orang   itu=lah   yang   men-curi   dompet saya.*
     person   that=FOC   REL   AV-steal   wallet   my

     'It was that person who stole my wallet.'   (Sneddon 1996:282)

  b. **Dompet saya=lah yang   orang   itu   men-curi.*
     wallet   my=FOC   REL   person   that   AV-steal

     (for: 'It was my wallet that that person stole.')

  c. *Dompet   saya=lah   yang   di-curi   oleh   orang   itu.*
     wallet   my=FOC   REL   PASS-steal   by   person   that

     'It was my wallet that was stolen by that person.'

  d. *Dompet   saya=lah   yang   mereka   telah   curi.*
     wallet   my=FOC   REL   3PL   PERF   steal

     'It is my wallet that they have stolen.'

As a number of authors have pointed out,[7] direct objects in active sentences can be extracted when the AV prefix *meN-* is omitted, as shown in (4d). This is a fascinating issue, but one which is not directly relevant to voice alternations. The lack of prefix in such sentences is not due to a voice alternation, in contrast to the OV construction in (3a–c); Chung (1978) showed that "stem sentences" like those in (4d) are in fact active. (The position of the auxiliary relative to the agent pronoun is a crucial diagnostic for distinguishing the OV construction from an AV stem sentence.) I will have nothing more to say about stem sentences in the remainder of this paper.

A second subjecthood property is that only grammatical subjects can be controlled. Examples (5a–b) show that complement subjects can be controlled, while complement direct objects cannot. Example (5c) shows that the patient of the *di-V* construction can be controlled, providing further evidence that it is the grammatical subject.

(5) (adapted from Sneddon 1996:295–296)
  a. *Pemerintah   mengizinkan   dia   (untuk)   [__   meng-hadiri   sidang].*
     government   permit   3SG   COMP   AV-attend   session

     'The government permitted him to attend the session.'

---

[7] See Chung (1976b), Saddy (1991), Voskuil (1996, 2000), Soh (1998), and Cole & Hermon (2005b), among others.

b. *Dia   menolak   untuk   [polis   mem-(p)eriksa   __].
   3SG   refuse   COMP   police   AV-investigate

   (for: 'He refused for the police to investigate him.')

c. Dia   menolak   untuk   [__   di-periksa   oleh   polis].
   3SG   refuse   COMP   PASS-investigate   by   police

   'He refused to be investigated by the police.'

The same restrictions apply to the controllee in purpose clauses introduced by *untuk*. Examples (6a–b) show that subjects can be controlled in purpose clauses, while direct objects cannot. Example (6c) shows that the patient of the *di-V* construction can be controlled in purpose clauses.

(6) (adapted from Chung 1976a:89)

a. Kami   mem-buka   senjata itu   untuk   [__ mem-perbaiki=nya].
   1PL.EXCL   AV-open   rifle   that COMP   AV-repair=3

   'We took the rifle apart in order to repair it.'

b. *Kami   mem-buka   senjata itu   untuk [tukang   mem-perbaiki   __].
   1PL.EXCL   AV-open   rifle   that COMP   smith   AV-repair

   (for: 'We took the rifle apart for the gunsmith to repair.')

c. Kami   mem-bawa   senjata itu   ke   toko   untuk [__ di-perbaiki].
   1PL.EXCL   AV-take   rifle   that to   shop   COMP   PASS-repair

   'We took the rifle to the shop to be repaired.'

A third subjecthood test is that the pronoun form *ia* '3SG' can only function as a grammatical subject. Examples (7a–b) show that *ia* can be a subject, but not a direct object. Example (7c) shows that *ia* can occur as the patient of the *di-V* construction, again confirming that the patient is the grammatical subject.

(7) a. Ia   telah   men-curi   wang   itu.
      3SG   PERF   AV-steal   money   that

      'He/she stole the money.'

   b. Harimau itu   telah   mem-bunuh dia/*ia.
      tiger   that   PERF   AV-kill   3SG

      'The tiger killed him/her.'

   c. Ia   telah   di-bunuh   (oleh) harimau.
      3SG   PERF   PASS-steal by   tiger

      'He/she was killed by a tiger.'   (adapted from Vamarasi 1999:53)

Based on this evidence, there can be no doubt that the patient of the *di-V* construction is the grammatical subject. The second question we need to address (is the agent of the *di-V* construction a core argument?) is potentially more difficult. In many Western Austronesian languages, it is difficult to identify properties which reliably distinguish core from oblique arguments. Several properties have been identified which can help us to make this distinction in Malay. However, several of these tests are difficult to apply to clitic pronouns. We will begin by examining the properties of non-clitic arguments.

First, core arguments in Malay are always expressed as NPs, never PPs. Since the agent of the *di-V* construction can always be preceded by the preposition *oleh*, this provides evidence that it is not a core argument.[8]

Second, Verhaar (1984:36ff) states that adverbials and oblique arguments can be "scrambled" into clause-initial position, whereas this is not possible for core arguments. Sentence (8b), in which the oblique argument is fronted, is grammatical; sentence (8c), in which the direct object is fronted, is ungrammatical. (Direct objects can be topicalized with a resumptive pronoun as in (8d), at least in Indonesian; but this is a different construction.) The fact that the agent of the *di-V* construction can be fronted, as in (9), indicates that it is an oblique argument.

(8) (adapted from Verhaar 1984)

  a. *Ali menyembelih ayam besar ini untuk saya.*
     Ali AV.slaughter chicken big this for 1SG

    'Ali slaughtered this big chicken for me.'

  b. *Untuk saya Ali menyembelih ayam besar ini.*
     for   1SG Ali AV.slaughter chicken big this

    'For me Ali slaughtered this big chicken.'

  c. **Ayam besar ini Ali menyembelih untuk saya.*
     chicken big this Ali AV.slaughter for 1SG

  d. *Ayam besar ini, Ali menyembelih=nya untuk saya.*
     chicken big this Ali AV.slaughter=3 for 1SG

    'This big chicken, Ali slaughtered it for me.'

(9) (adapted from Sneddon 1996:259)

  Oleh seorang jururawat Pak Hena di-suruh ke rumah.sakit.
  by one   nurse   Mr. Hena PASS-send to hospital

  'Mr. Hena was sent to the hospital by a nurse.'

A third test, which seems to work better in Indonesian than in Malaysian, is that only core arguments can launch "floating quantifiers."[9] Musgrave (2001) states that when the quantifier *semua(nya)* 'all' occurs at the end of the sentence, it can be understood as modifying any core argument, but not an oblique argument or adjunct. In example (10a), the sentence-final quantifier can be understood as modifying either the subject ('all the children') or direct object ('all the sweets'). In example (10b), the sentence-final quantifier can be understood as modifying the subject ('all the Sasak people') but not the oblique argument (*'with all their children'). The fact that the sentence-final quantifier cannot be understood as modifying the agent of the *di-V* construction in (10c) provides further evidence that the agent is an oblique argument.

---

[8] As noted above, *oleh* is optional if the agent immediately follows the verb. One might wonder whether the agent actually is a core argument when the preposition is omitted, but other criteria suggest that this is not the case.

[9] Many Malaysians find sentences like those in (10) to be highly unnatural; and to the extent that they can be accepted at all, only the subject can be interpreted as "launching" the quantifier (Ashrafiqin Ahmad, p.c.).

(10) (adapted from Musgrave 2001)

    a. *Anak-anak   itu   suka gula-gula itu   semuanya.*
       child.RED   that   like sugar.RED that   all

      'All the children like the sweets.' OR: 'The children like all the sweets.'

    b. *Orang-orang Sasak   datang dengan anak-anak=nya semuanya.*
       person.RED   Sasak   come   with   children=3   all

      'All the Sasak people came with their children.'
      NOT: *'The Sasak people came with all their children.'

    c. *Oleh   orang   Sasak itu   kanak-kanak itu   di-pukul semuanya.*
       by   person Sasak that children   that PASS-hit all

      'The Sasak people beat all those children.'
      NOT: *'All the Sasak people beat those children.'

4. Subjecthood and transitivity of the OV construction

Now let us compare the syntactic properties of the *di-V* construction with those of the OV construction. The subjecthood tests discussed above show that the patient of the OV construction is the grammatical subject, just as we found for the *di-V* construction. The OV patient can be clefted (11a), can be controlled (11b–c), and can be expressed by the pronoun *ia* (11d):

(11) a. *Wayang.kulit=lah   yang   paling kami   Ø-gemari.*
       shadow.puppet=FOC REL   most   1PL.EXCL OV-admire

      'It is the shadow puppets that we most admire/enjoy.' (Sneddon 1996:282)

    b. *Sabriyya…   menolak   untuk [__   saya Ø-peluk].*
       (name)   refuse   for   2SG   OV-hug

      'Sabriyya (the author's baby daughter) … refused for me to hug (her).'
      (http:// sittyasiah.wordpress.com/2013/05/10/my-breastfeeding-drama-part-2/)

    c. *Saya mem-bawa surat itu   untuk [__ (dapat) kau=Ø-baca].*
       1SG AV-take   letter that   to   able   2SG=OV-read

      'I brought the letter for you to (be able to) read.'   (Arka & Manning 2008)

    d. … *ia   telah saya kenal   sejak   masih sama-sama kuliah di Yogya.*
       3SG PERF 1SG acquainted since   still   together   lecture in (name)

      'I have known him since the time we were university students together in Yogyakarta.'   (https://pakitongbumen.wordpress.com/tag/imakta/)

While the subjecthood properties are clear, it is somewhat harder to demonstrate that the agent of the OV construction is a core argument, as claimed in (1b). Of course, the fact that it cannot be marked with a preposition supports this claim. However, because the agent of the OV construction must always occur immediately before the verb, the "scrambling" test illustrated in (8)–(9) cannot really be applied. (In any case, if the OV agent is a core argument we would not expect it to undergo that type of scrambling.) Moreover, Musgrave (2001:84) shows that the OV agent (which he treats as a core argument) cannot launch floating quantifiers, for reasons which remain unclear. So we must look for other evidence to confirm its core status.

Arka & Manning (1998) and Arka (2005) suggest that the fixed position of the OV agent, adjacent to the verb, and the fact that it is obligatorily expressed, support

analyzing it as a core argument. This interpretation of the facts seems reasonable. Strict adjacency to the verb is a property of objects in English and a number of other languages, and it seems that oblique arguments are more likely to be optional than core arguments in many languages. Of course, it is not the case that all oblique arguments are optional; verbs like *put* in English select an obligatory oblique argument: *John put the money *(on the table/in his pocket/under his pillow)*. However, when a certain argument position is required to be filled in a particular construction, regardless of the lexical properties of the verb, this seems like a plausible candidate for a core property.

The OV agent is also obligatory in many of the other Western Malayo-Polynesian languages mentioned in section 1 above, including Balinese (Arka 2003), Acehnese (Legate 2012), and all of the Sama-Bajau languages discussed by Miller (2013).[10] Tjia (2007) states that the OV agent in Mualang is generally obligatory, but can sometimes be omitted under a non-specific interpretation (not for zero anaphora). The OV agent is obligatorily adjacent to the verb in these same languages.[11]

Some authors have suggested that only core arguments can function as the "controller" (antecedent of PRO) in Malay control constructions. Arka & Manning (1998) state that control predicates like *coba* 'try' require that their controller be a core argument. They contrast grammatical examples (12a–b), where the controllers are AV subject and OV agent respectively, with (12c) where the controller is the PP agent of a *di*-V passive, which they mark as being ungrammatical. However, Arka (2000) reports that most Indonesian speakers find sentences like (12c) just as acceptable as sentences like (12a–b), and my own preliminary inquiry supports this finding.

(12) a. *Mereka sudah men-coba* [*mencari kerja di kota*].
   3PL already AV-try search.for work in city
   'They have already tried to look for work in the city.'

   b. [*Mencari kerja di kota*] *yang sudah mereka coba*.
   search.for work in city REL already 3PL try
   'To look for work in the city is what they have already tried.'

   c. (?*)[*Mencari kerja di kota*] *sudah di-coba oleh mereka*.
   search.for work in city already PASS-try by 3PL
   'To look for work in the city is what has already been tried by them.'

It is not clear whether the examples in (12) actually involve control or not. Both Indonesian *coba* 'try' and its Malaysian variant *cuba* can take noun phrase objects, as illustrated in (13a–b), as well as controlled complement clauses. Moreover, verb phrases in the active voice have a gerund-like use in which they can occupy noun phrase positions, as illustrated in (13c). In order to be sure that the examples in (12) do involve control, we would need to find a way to rule out the possibility that their clausal constituent is simply a nominalized (gerund-like) VP occupying a noun phrase position.

(13) a. *Sebenarnya doa ini telah saya cuba*,
   actually prayer this PERF 1SG try

---

[10] Walton (1986) states that the OV agent in Pangutaran can only be omitted via zero anaphora to a definite antecedent.

[11] The OV agent can only be expressed as a clitic pronoun in Sama Bangingi', Central Sama, and Southern Sama; so in these languages, it must not only be adjacent but also phonologically bound.

> *maka   saya   mendapati=nya sangat   bermanfaat*
> CONJ   1SG   find=3SG   very   beneficial

(Imam Nawawi, discussing a prayer to find lost objects) 'Actually I have tried this prayer, and I have found it very effective.' (http://www.scribd.com/doc/54436336/DOA-Mencari-Barang-Hilang)

b. *Pekerjaan   pertama   yang di-cuba   oleh H. dan Q.   ialah   menjadi polis.*
   work   first   REL PASS-try   by   — and — COP   become police

   'The first work that was tried by Hasya and Qistina was becoming policewomen.'
                          (http://emiliaputeri.blogspot.com/2013_11_01_archive.html)

c. [*Mencari   kerja   di   kota*] *tidak begitu   mudah.*
   search.for work   in   city   NEG   like.that easy

   'To look for work in the city is not so easy.'   (Sneddon 1996:307)

Chung (1976a) uses control into adverbial purpose clauses marked with *untuk* as a test for core vs. oblique status, stating that only core arguments can be controllers in that construction, but Vamarasi (1999:154) challenges this claim. She does not actually present any examples in which the controller is marked with *oleh*, but natural examples like that in (14) are attested. A control-based test for core argument status would be extremely valuable if it could be proven to be reliable, because it could be applied equally to clitics, free pronouns, full noun phrases, and pro-dropped arguments. But it seems that so far, all the tests of this type which have been proposed remain controversial at best.

(14) *Beberapa regulasi ditetapkan oleh Pemerintah* [*untuk meningkatkan cakupan pemberian ASI eksklusif di Indonesia*].

'Many regulations were drawn up by the government in order to increase the number of mothers in Indonesia who feed their babies exclusively with mother's milk (during the first six months of life).' (http://eprints.undip.ac.id/32667/2/dini_2. pdf)

Another test proposed by Arka & Manning (1998) is that only core arguments can be left-dislocated (topicalized with a resumptive pronoun). They provide examples showing that this is possible for subjects (15a) and OV agents (15b) but not PP agents (15c). Sneddon (1996:280–281) states that this construction is also possible for object NPs (16a–b) and for possessors of subject NPs (16c–d).

(15) (from Arka & Manning 1998)
  a. *Orang   itu,   dia   tidak   mau   datang.*
     person that   3SG   NEG   want arrive
     'That person, he refused to come.'

  b. *Orang   itu,   saya yang   dia   cari-cari.*
     person that   1SG   REL   3SG   seek
     'As for that person, I am the one who he is looking for.'

  c. (?*)*Orang   itu,   saya yang   di-cari-cari oleh dia.*
        person that   1SG   REL   PASS-seek   by   3SG
     'As for that person, I am the one who is being looked for by him.'

(16) (from Sneddon 1996)
    a. *Surat itu, saya belum terima=nya.*
       letter that 1SG not.yet receive=3
       'Concerning that letter, I haven't received it yet.'

    b. *Apa yang terjadi kemudian, anda sendiri mungkin pernah mengalami=nya.*
       what REL happen next 2 self possibly EXPER experience=3
       'What happened next you yourself have possibly experienced.'

    c. *Mahasiswa itu, rambut=nya tidak pernah di-sisir.*
       student that hair=3 not ever PASS-comb
       'That student, his hair is never combed.'

    d. *Pak Ali, istri=nya di-operasi.*
       Mr. (name) wife=3 PASS-operate
       'Mr. Ali, his wife was operated on.'

However, some Indonesian speakers find (15c) fully acceptable, and the same is true for left-dislocation of the objects of other prepositions as well (17).

(17) a. *Mahasiswa itu, Pak Ali memberi 20.000 rupiah kepada=nya.*
      student that Mr. Ali give — — to=3
      'That student, Mr. Ali gave 20,000 rupiah to him.'

    b. *Mahasiswa itu, Pak Ali membeli baju baru untuk=nya.*
      student that Mr. Ali buy shirt new for=3
      'That student, Mr. Ali bought a new shirt for him.'

More investigation is needed into the restrictions on left-dislocation; but even the undisputed fact that it is possible for certain possessors to undergo left-dislocation means that it cannot be restricted solely to core arguments. Given the current state of our understanding, left-dislocation does not seem to provide a reliable test for core status in Malay.

At the current time, the fixed position of the OV agent, its obligatory adjacency to the verb, and the fact that it is obligatorily expressed, seem to provide the best available evidence for analyzing it as a core argument. These three features are shared by OV agents in Balinese, whose core status is confirmed by a number of other good tests. The evidence in Malay is not as overwhelming, but given the evidence currently available, the most plausible analysis seems to be that the OV agent is a core argument. We turn now to the status of the agentive clitic in the *di-V=nya* construction.

5. Binding evidence and the status of agentive *=nya*

Arka & Manning (1998) argue that the agent of the *di-V* construction is an oblique argument except when it is expressed by the pronoun *=nya* cliticized to the verb. They analyze the agentive *=nya* as a core argument, meaning that the *di-V=nya* construction is not a passive, but a kind of ergative/inverse clause (like the OV). Their primary evidence for this claim is the contrast in binding properties illustrated in (18). Based on the theory of reflexive binding proposed by Manning (1996), Arka & Manning argue that the agent expressed by the clitic pronoun *=nya* in (18b) must be a core argument, because it can bind a reflexive which is a core argument. The prepositional agent in (18a) is unable to bind a reflexive in the same position, because this PP is not a core argument.

The fact that the OV agent can bind a reflexive which is a core argument, as seen in (18c), is cited as evidence that the OV agent is also core.

(18) (from Arka & Manning 1998)
   a. ?*Diri=nya   di-serahkan   ke polisi   oleh Amir.
       self=3   PASS-surrender   to police   by   (name)

      (for: 'Himself was surrendered to the police by Amir.')

   b. Diri=nya   selalu   di-utamakan=nya.
       self=3   always   PASS-prioritize=3

      'Himself is always prioritized by him.' (i.e. 'He always gives priority to himself.')

   c. Diri=nya   mesti   dia   Ø-serahkan   ke   polisi.
       self=3   must   3SG   OV-surrender to   police

      'He must surrender himself to the police.'

One complicating factor in assessing the significance of these examples is that the contrast between (18a) vs. (18b) does not constitute a true minimal pair. If we try to replace the PP in (18a) with the agentive clitic =nya, the result is not fully acceptable, as illustrated in (19).

(19) ??Diri=nya di-serahkan=nya   ke polisi.
         self=3   PASS-surrender=3   to police

      'Himself$_i$ was surrendered to the police by him$_{i/j}$.'

It is not clear to me why (19) should be worse than (18b), but this question is beyond the scope of the present paper. The crucial question for present purposes is whether or not the examples in (18a–b) involve real syntactic binding. I suggest that they do not.

Cole & Hermon (2005a) state that the short reflexive form (diri + pronoun) may either be syntactically bound, like a true reflexive, or take a discourse antecedent like a plain (non-reflexive) pronoun. A similar point is made by Kartono (2013), who refers to the short reflexive form as a "half-reflexive". He illustrates this variable interpretation of the short reflexive with examples like those in (20).

(20) (from Kartono 2013)
   a. Andi$_i$ mem-(p)ukul   diri=nya$_{i/j}$.
       Andi   AV-hit   self=3

      'Andi hit himself/him/her.'

   b. [Mertua=nya   Rita$_j$]$_i$ sangat meny-(s)ayangi   diri=nya$_{i/j}$.
       mother-in-law=3   Rita   really AV-love   self=3

      'Rita's mother-in-law really loves herself/her.'

   c. Diri=ku   tergila-gila   pada=mu.
       self=1SG   be.crazy   to=2SG

      'I am crazy about you.' (lit: 'Myself is crazy about you.')

Example (21) also illustrates the potential for the short reflexive to take a discourse antecedent; such examples are quite common in natural text. Examples (22)–(25) seem to require a LOGOPHORIC interpretation, meaning that the reflexive form is interpreted as referring to the participant whose thoughts, words, or feelings are being reported. The example in (24) is especially interesting in this regard; here the context (a trial for bribery) makes it clear that the logophoric interpretation ('self' = Nisa) wins out over

the syntactic binding interpretation ('self' = Hambit). This logophoric use is also quite common in natural text.

(21) *Adalah   amat susah   bagi lelaki   untuk pulang   ke   rumah*
    EXIST   very   difficult for   man   COMP return   to   house

    yang   mana diri=nya tidak di-hormati.
    REL   where self=3   NEG   PASS-respect

    'It is very difficult for a man to return to a home where he (lit: 'himself') is not respected.'   (http://alhafiz.net/search/masa+solat+malaysia/feed/rss2/)

(22) *Di-akui   oleh=nya, bahwa diri=nya sedang belajar mengendarai mobil.*
    PASS-admit by=3   COMP self=3   CONT   learn   drive   car

    'It was admitted by him$_i$ that self$_i$ was just learning to drive a car.'   (http://infojambi.com/topik-utama/5334-kantor-bupati-kerinci-dihantam-avanza.html)

(23) *beberapa   orang   di-akui   oleh=nya telah   mempengaruhi diri=nya*
    several   person PASS-admit by=3   PERF   influence   self=3

    dalam   urusan berakting.
    in   matter   acting

    'Several people are admitted by her$_i$ [actress Ine Febriyanti] to have influenced herself$_i$ in the matter of acting.' (i.e. helped to train her or influenced her method of acting)   (http://portal.cbn.net.id/cbprtl/cyberwoman/detail.aspx?x=Smart+Woman&y=cyberwoman|0|0|4|13)

(24) *Kemudian, diakui Nisa, Hambit meminta dirinya menemani Cornelis menyerahkan uang tersebut…*

    'Then, it was admitted by Nisa, Hambit asked <u>self</u> (= Nisa) to accompany Cornelis to deliver the aforementioned money…'   (https://koran-indonesia.com/2014/01/terima-rp-75-juta-chairun-nisa-naik-haji/)

(25) *Irianti pun mengaku <u>dirinya</u> sama sekali tak diberitahu sang suami jika <u>dirinya</u> diajukan Presiden SBY sebagai calon Kapolri pengganti BHD.*

    'Irianti also swore that <u>she</u> (lit: 'herself') was not by any means informed by her husband when <u>he</u> (lit: 'himself') was nominated by President SBY (Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono) as candidate for Chief of National Police of Indonesia, replacing BHD (Bambang Hendarso Danuri).'   (http://www.tribunnews.com/nasional/2010/10/14/irianti-tak-pernah-berharap-timur-jadi-kapolri)

I suggest that the contrast illustrated in (18a–b) is due to discourse or pragmatic factors, rather than the syntactic status of the arguments. I suggest that the greater acceptability of (18b) is due to the high inherent topicality of the clitic pronoun *=nya*. Givón (1983:18) proposes several principles of iconicity to help explain the syntactic encoding of topics. One of these is: "The more disruptive, surprising, discontinuous or hard to process a topic is, the more *coding material* must be assigned to it" (emphasis in the original). He states that the effects of this principle are observed in the following "scale of phonological size":

(26) Full NP   > stressed/independent   > unstressed/bound   > zero
                       pronoun   pronoun   anaphora
       [more discontinuous/   *[more continuous/*
        inaccessible topics]   *accessible topics]*

The use of a clitic pronoun for the agent in (18b) implies reference to a highly topical participant, and this topical participant would be available to function as a discourse antecedent for *diri=nya*, creating the observed co-referential interpretation. The agentive PP in (18a), in contrast, is a form that would not normally be selected if the agent is highly topical. This fact makes it unnatural for the hearer to assume that there is a discourse antecedent for *diri=nya* which is co-referential with the agentive PP.

If this interpretation of the binding evidence is correct, it becomes possible to view all uses of the *di-V* construction as true passives. In other words, I am proposing that the agent of the *di-V* construction is always an oblique argument, whether it is expressed as a PP, post-verbal NP, or clitic pronoun *=nya*. In all three cases, the agent functions syntactically as an oblique argument. The difference in interpretation with respect to the short reflexive form follows from the discourse properties of *=nya* rather than its syntactic status.

Whereas Arka & Manning (1998) identify the agentive *=nya* as a core argument, Arka (2005) refers to it as "semi-core". Aside from the binding facts cited above, it has very few of the diagnostic properties that Arka uses to identify core arguments.[12] Arka notes that this "semi-core" classification is awkward: it seems to imply that the *di-V=nya* construction is neither passive nor ergative, but some intermediate voice category. However, if the binding evidence is not in this case directly relevant to the core-oblique distinction, then there is no reason not to analyze *di-V=nya* as a true passive.

Before we accept this conclusion, however, it seems natural to ask whether there is other binding evidence that might support Arka & Manning's analysis of agentive *=nya*. Cole & Hermon (2005a) and Kartono (2013) both state that long reflexive forms like *diri=nya sendiri* are true anaphors, requiring "a c-commanding antecedent in a local domain" (Kartono 2013:30). What happens if we replace the short form *diri* in examples like (18) with the long reflexive? It turns out that the same contrast emerges: most speakers still find the form where the reflexive is co-referential with agentive *=nya* (27b) more acceptable than the form where the reflexive is co-referential with an agentive PP (27a). In addition, speakers report that sentences like (27b) have a contrastive or emphatic feel, which is not present in (18b). This may be due to the emphatic function of *sendiri*.

(27)   a. ?**Diri=nya   sendiri   di-serahkan   ke   polisi   oleh   Amir.*
         self=3   self   PASS-surrender to   police   by   (name)

         (for: 'Himself was surrendered to the police by Amir.')

       b. *Diri=nya   sendiri   selalu   di-utamakan=nya.*
          self=3   self   always   PASS-prioritize=3

          'Himself is always prioritized by him.' (i.e. 'He always gives priority to himself.')

If Cole & Hermon (2005a) and Kartono (2013) are correct that *diri=nya sendiri* must always be syntactically bound within its minimal clause, then the contrast in (27) seems to provide evidence for a difference in syntactic status between agentive *=nya* vs. agentive PP. However, corpus evidence clearly shows that the long reflexive *diri=nya*

---

[12] Arka examines a number of tests for core vs. oblique status. He concludes that an immediately post-verbal agent NP is an oblique, but classifies the agentive clitic pronoun *=nya* as "semi-core." However, the only syntactic property which distinguishes these two argument types is the apparent "binding" of the short reflexive. Chung (1976a) seems to adopt a very similar analysis of agentive *=nya*.

sendiri can take a discourse antecedent when there is no local antecedent available. Some examples are presented in (28).

(28) a. *Padahal dirinya.sendiri di-hormati   oleh raja-raja.*
       actually self   PASS-honored by   kings

       'In fact he himself (Gautama Buddha) was honored by kings.'
       (Huston Smith, *The Religions of Man*, translated by Saafroedin Bahar. 2001. *Agama-agama Manusia*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia, p. 115 (Google books))

   b. *kesombongan=nya itu   hanya merugikan   dirinya.sendiri.*
      pride=3   that only   cheat/harm   self

      'That pride of his$_i$ only harmed himself$_i$ (= Pharaoh).'   (*Doa Mengharapkan Anak Saleh* by Hendri Kusuma Wahyudi (2010), books.google.com/ books?isbn= 6028236578)

   c. *Lagu ini   hanya cocok   di-nyanyikan oleh=nya.*
      song this   only   suitable   PASS-sing   by=3

      Lagu ini   mencerminkan dirinya.sendiri.
      song this   reflect   self

      'This song is only suitable to be sung by him$_i$ (= Korean singer Park Jae-Sang). This song reflects himself$_i$.'   (http://wapannuri.com/a.karakter/menjadi-diri-sendiri-sukses-psy.html)

Since long reflexives can take discourse antecedents, the greater acceptability of the agentive clitic as compared to an agentive PP as a potential antecedent for these reflexives may again be due to pragmatic factors rather than syntactic status, specifically the high inherent topicality of the clitic pronoun *=nya*.[13] If this is correct, we would predict that unacceptable examples like (18a) and (27a) should become much better if the agentive PP contained a pronoun (*oleh=nya*) rather than a proper name (*oleh Amir*); and in fact, this does seem to be the case, as illustrated by the minimal pair in (29).

(29) a. **Diri=nya sendiri selalu   di-utamakan   oleh Amir.*
        self=3   self   always PASS-prioritize by   (name)

       (for: 'Himself is always prioritized by Amir.')

   b. *Diri=nya sendiri selalu   di-utamakan   oleh=nya.*
      self=3   self   always PASS-prioritize by=3

      'Himself is always prioritized by him.' (i.e. 'He always gives priority to himself.')

Example (29b) might be interpreted as showing that it is possible for the agentive PP of a passive verb to bind a long reflexive in subject position. Similar examples are not uncommon in natural text; a sample of these is presented in (30b–d).[14] But since the agentive PP in these examples contains a pronoun, rather than a proper name or lexical

---

[13] Regina Yanti (p.c.) informs me that some speakers find sentences (27a) and (27b) equally acceptable, suggesting that the difference perceived by other speakers may be pragmatic rather than syntactic in nature.

[14] Note that example (30d) involves a *ter-* passive rather than a *di-* passive; but the agent is marked with the same preposition, and is clearly oblique.

NP, it seems likely that the intended interpretation arises through coreference with a discourse antecedent, rather than from syntactic binding by a local antecedent.

(30) a. *Rio   di-manfaatkan oleh=nya   untuk   kepentingan   dirinya.sendiri...*
       (name) PASS-exploit   by=3SG   for   importance   self

   'Rio was being exploited by her$_i$ (= his girlfriend) for her$_i$ own (lit: self's) advantage.'   (http://www.hutanta.com/ebooks/bypass/EB000005JK)

   b. *Dirinya.sendiri   tak   tampak*[15]   *oleh=nya…*
      self   NEG   PASS.seen   by=3

   'Himself$_i$ is not seen by him$_i$ (because he only looks at other people).'(http://thoriqohalfisbuqi.wordpress.com/2010/01/26/suluk-wragul-sunan-bonang-2/)

   c. *Yang di-pikirkan   oleh=nya   hanya=lah   kepentingan dirinya.sendiri...*
      REL   PASS-think.about   by=3SG   for=FOC   importance self

   'What he$_i$ thinks about is only his$_i$ own (lit: self's) self-interest…'   (http://archiveofourown.org/works/513076)

   d. *… lalu turunlah ruh pada kedua mata maka terlihatlah oleh=nya* <u>*dirinya sendiri*</u>.

   (When God blew the spirit into Adam's body) '… then the spirit descended to his two eyes and he saw himself.' (lit: … 'himself was seen by him.') (https:// groups.yahoo.com/neo/groups/tasawuf/conversations/messages/1480)

Kurniawan (2013:37–38) notes that agentive PPs can bind subject reflexives in Sundanese: "[A]n actor PP in a passive can bind a reflexive in subject position", even though "[t]he object cannot be the antecedent for a reflexive in subject position in active clauses." However, this does not appear to be the case in Malay, at least for the long reflexives. An apparent example of a non-pronominal passive agent binding a subject reflexive is presented in (31); but the agent in this example is a continuing topic from the previous paragraph. So even this example should probably be analyzed as a case of discourse antecedence rather than syntactic binding. Local binding of non-subject reflexives is possible, as illustrated in (32); but examples of this type do not directly bear on the Arka & Manning analysis.

(31) *Bukan   dirinya.sendiri yang   di-amat-amati   anak   itu.*
     NEG   self   REL   PASS-monitor   child   that

   'It was not himself that was watched so closely by the child.' (http://paskalina.wordpress.com/2009/04/30/cerita-anak-anak-dalam-cermin/)

(32) *Rio   di-manfaatkan oleh   Lala   untuk   kepentingan   dirinya.sendiri...*
     (name) PASS-exploit   by   (name) for   importance   self

   'Rio$_i$ was being exploited by Lala$_j$ for her$_j$ own (lit: self's) advantage.'

It appears that a non-pronominal passive agent cannot bind a long reflexive in subject position, as illustrated in (33a). However, this is possible with the short reflexive, as illustrated in (33b). The fact that the agent in these examples is indefinite rules out the possibility of a discourse antecedent.

---

[15] I take *tampak* to be an irregular passive form, corresponding to the AV form *nampak*. However, both of these forms can also be used as adjectives meaning 'visible'.

(33) a. ??*Bukan   dirinya.sendiri sahaja yang di-rugikan oleh se-orang pencandu.*
        NEG   self   only REL PASS-harm by one-CLS addict

        'It is not just himself that is harmed by an opium addict.'

    b. *Bukan dirinya sahaja yang   di-rugikan   oleh se-orang pencandu.*
        NEG   self   only   REL   PASS-harm by one-CLS addict

        'It is not just himself that is harmed by an opium addict.'

To summarize the conclusions of this section, I have argued that all uses of the *di-V* construction can be viewed as true passives. The strongest argument against this hypothesis has been based on the binding properties of agentive *=nya* when it attaches to the verb, but this evidence is best explained in terms of pragmatic rather than syntactic factors. In the absence of clear evidence to the contrary, it seems natural to assume that the prefix *di-* has a uniform syntactic function, regardless of how the agent is expressed. However, the polysemy of *di-* has also been argued on the basis of its discourse functions, an issue to which we now turn.

6. The functions of the *di-* passive

In addition to the syntactic evidence discussed above, the idea that the *di-V* construction is always a passive has been challenged on functional grounds as well. As many authors have pointed out, the *di-V* construction is used in ways not normally associated with passive voice in most other languages. Most notably, the *di-V* construction is used in narrative "to describe a series of chronologically ordered punctiliar actions by a single actor" (Kaswanti Purwo 1988:205).[16]

McCune (1979) coined the term "Passive of Narrative Sequence" to refer to this use of the *di-* passive for main-line events in Indonesian narrative. Some linguists regard this description as a contradiction in terms. They feel that if the *di-* form is used to express main-line events it cannot be a passive, because passives universally encode background information. This assumption motivated Hopper (1979, 1983) and Verhaar (1984, 1988) to identify the *di-* form as an "ergative" construction when it encodes main-line events in narrative, and as a "passive" in most other contexts.

Problems with the Hopper-Verhaar type of analysis have been pointed out by McCune (1979), Cumming & Wouk (1987), and Levinsohn (1991), among others. Here I would like to focus on the question of how the term PASSIVE should be defined. In sections 1–5 above I assumed a purely syntactic definition, but Hopper and Verhaar (among others) have assumed that discourse function (backgrounding) must also be part of the definition.

Another influential way of defining voice categories in terms of their discourse functions is proposed by Givón (1994). Building on Cooreman's work on Chamorro, Givón defines voice categories in terms of topicality as follows:

(34) **VOICE**   **RELATIVE TOPICALITY**
     active/direct   AGT > PAT
     inverse   AGT < PAT
     passive   AGT << PAT
     antipassive   AGT >> PAT

---

[16] The first event in the series is often presented in active voice (*meN-V*) with subsequent main-line events by the same actor expressed in the passive (Hopper 1983:79).

The degree of topicality for each argument is measured in terms of topic continuity: how recently that argument was previously mentioned in the discourse, how many successive clauses it continues to be referred to in, etc. (Givón 1983). The above definition of the active/direct voice states that in an active transitive clause, "the agent is more topical than the patient, but the patient retains considerable topicality" (Givón 1994:8). The definition of the passive voice states that in a passive clause, "the patient is more topical than the agent, and the agent is extremely non-topical" (Givón 1994:9). The crucial assumption in these definitions is that the hierarchy of grammatical relations (subject > direct object > indirect object > oblique) correlates with degrees of topicality, and in particular that syntactic demotion to oblique or adjunct status correlates with greatly reduced topicality.

Givón's definition reflects the widely-held assumption that passives universally topicalize the patient. If (as argued above) the *di-V* construction in Malay is a true passive, it provides a counter-example to this assumption. As noted above, the Malay "Passive of Narrative Sequence" is used most often for describing a series of actions by a single actor. In other words, this use of the passive is most common precisely when the agent, rather than the patient, is the discourse topic (highest in topic continuity). An example from a Malay short story is presented in (35).[17]

(35) *Tudung   botol   di-rentap   keluar,   kemudian…   di-jurus=nya   minyak*
     cover   bottle   PASS-pull   go.out   afterward   PASS-pour=3   oil

   tanah   itu   ke   atas   lantai…   Botol   itu   lalu   di-himbau=nya   ke
   earth   that   to   top   floor   bottle that   then   PASS-throw=3   to

   tengah   sungai.   Di-keluarkan=nya   mancis   dari   belitan   kain   di
   middle   river   PASS-take.out=3   match   from   fold   cloth at

   pinggan=nya,   lalu   di-nyalakan.   Di-campak=nya   ke   lantai   perahu.
   waist=3   then   PASS-light   PASS-throw=3   to   floor   boat

   'She <u>pulled</u> off the bottle cap, then… she <u>poured</u> the kerosene onto the floor (of the boat)… Then she <u>threw</u> the bottle to the middle of the river. She <u>took out</u> a match from the fold of the sarong at her waist, then <u>lit</u> it. She <u>threw</u> it onto the floor of the boat.'

Notice that all of these clauses involve the same actor (an impoverished widow with two children) who is already established as the current topic of discussion. The agent of the passive in each clause is either implicit (zero anaphora) or expressed by the clitic *=nya*. The patient/subject of the passive may be previously mentioned in the story, like the bottle and the kerosene that it contains; it may be inferable, like the bottle cap; or it may be brand new and unexpected, like the match. The information status of the patient is irrelevant to the choice of voice marker, though it may influence word order (pre-verbal vs. post-verbal position for the subject). Clearly the Malay passive does not (in general) topicalize the patient.

Topicality is also one of the criteria that Hopper and Verhaar use to distinguish "ergative" uses of the *di-V* construction, which correspond to Givón's "inverse" category, from those that they recognize as passive. Verhaar (1988:366) states that "ergative Agents cannot be new (e.g. contrastive) information … in the clause, whereas Agents of

---

[17] "Seorang Perempuan, Sungai Dan Senjakala" 'A woman, a river, and dusk' by Baharin Ramly, published in Abd. Samad Said et al. (eds.), 1980, *Sayembara*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka; cited in Levinsohn (1991).

passives definitely can." It is certainly true that agents tend to be highly topical in narrative, not just in Malay but probably in all languages. This fact alone would explain the preference for agents in foregrounded *di-V* clauses to be expressed as clitic pronouns or zero anaphora. Therefore the use of these anaphoric devices does not constitute evidence for distinguishing two different syntactic constructions marked by the prefix *di-*.

The discourse function of the passive is an interesting and significant research question. However, as the discussion by Cumming & Wouk (1987) indicates, this question cannot even be asked (in any non-circular way) if the passive is defined in terms of its discourse function; we need to start with a prior definition of the construction, like that stated in sections 2–3, and then ask how it is used.

The Malay data provide another reason to prefer a purely syntactic definition of the passive: only a syntactic definition can reveal the correlation between voice category and verb morphology. Under either the Hopper-Verhaar or the Givónian approach, there is no way to identify the voice category of a Malay sentence simply by looking at it in isolation. It is necessary to look at the wider discourse context, measuring topic continuity or making judgments about foreground vs. background information, before one can distinguish passive from ergative/inverse. Under the syntactic definition proposed in sections 2–3, the morphology on the verb is a direct reflection of voice category, as in English and other familiar languages.

Interestingly, the discourse functions of the passive and OV are not uniform across the languages mentioned in section 2 which have the same voice system as Malay. In Mualang, as in Malay, the passive is the preferred form for encoding main-line events in narrative (Tjia 2007:159). The same is true for Sama Bangingi', which leads Gault (1999) to refer to the passive construction as "narrative mode."

However, the pattern of voice selection in Balinese is quite different. Pastika (1999) states that the passive is relatively infrequent in Balinese narrative discourse: passive forms account for only 6.4% percent of all transitive clauses in spoken narrative, and for 9.8% percent in written narrative. Setting aside the passive examples, Pastika found that in spoken narrative the ratio of AV to OV in main clauses was 50-50, whereas in written narrative the ratio was around 70% AV to 30% OV.

Miller (2007) shows that West Coast Bajau has a pattern of voice selection very similar to that of Balinese, providing a striking contrast with Sama Bangingi'. Both of these languages belong to the Sama-Bajau subgroup. Thus even between closely related languages whose voice systems seem to be very similar, the discourse functions of the voice categories, and of the passive construction in particular, can be quite different.[18] This shows us again the importance of distinguishing morpho-syntactic categories from discourse functions.

The preference for using passive voice to encode main-line events in Malay narrative appears to be a retention from an earlier stage of the language in which the passive was used even more widely. Cumming (1991:162) compares a sample of narrative material from Classical Malay texts with a sample of narrative material from two modern

---

[18] One difference between the two languages is that in Sama Bangingi' the OV agent can only be expressed as a pronominal clitic, and is most often first or second person rather than third person; in West Coast Bajau, the OV agent can be a full noun phrase. This would explain some of the difference in frequency between passive vs. OV, but not between active vs. non-active voices.

Indonesian novels. She reports that 73% of the transitive clauses in the Classical Malay sample were passive, compared to 31% for the modern Indonesian sample.[19]

This generalized preference for the passive in Classical Malay is preserved in some traditional Malay speech forms, including proverbs and *pantun* (a four-line rhyme). The proverbs in (36) illustrate how transitive verbs are very commonly expressed in the passive voice, even when the agent seems more topical, as in (36c–d).[20] Of course, this is not to say that transitive verbs in proverbs cannot appear in the active voice, only that this happens far less frequently than we would expect.

(36) a. *Marah   jangan   di-pukat, rezeki   jangan   di-tolak*
       anger   don't   PASS-net fortune   don't   PASS-push

   'Don't go looking for offense or reject good fortune/opportunity.'

   b. *Alah   di-beli,   menang   di-pakai*
      lose   PASS-buy   win   PASS-wear/use

   'Lose when you buy it, win when you use it.' (i.e. 'You get what you pay for.')

   c. *Buruk   muka,   cermin   di-pecah*
      bad   face   mirror   PASS-shatter

   'The face is ugly so the mirror gets smashed.' (i.e. 'Shifting the blame to someone else.')

   d. *Di-telan   mati emak,   di-luah   mati bapak*
      PASS-swallow   die mother PASS-spit.out die father

   'If you swallow it mother dies, if you spit it out father dies.' (i.e. 'Damned if you do and damned if you don't.')

One interesting feature of the passive in Classical Malay is that the agentive clitic *=nya* can occur together with a co-referential agentive PP marked with *oleh*. Two examples from the *Hikayat Hang Tuah* are presented in (37).[21]

(37) a. *Maka oleh Patih Gajah.Mada di-pegang=nya tangan Laksamana*
       PRTCL by   vizier (name)   PASS-hold=3   hand   admiral

      lalu   di-bawa=nya makan…
      then   PASS-bring=3 eat

   'So Vizier Gajah Mada took the Laksamana's hand and led him to dinner.'
                                                              (Tuah 156:34)

   b. *Maka di-lihat=nya oleh orang perahu Laksamana yang datang itu…*
      PRTCL PASS-see=3   by   person boat   admiral   REL arrive that

   'And the people saw the Laksamana's boat, which was approaching…'
                                                              (Tuah 414:27)

This kind of co-occurrence is not generally possible in modern Malay, but it is somewhat reminiscent of the passive construction in Acehnese. A transitive agent in

---

[19] In these calculations, Cumming apparently includes OV clauses together with *di-* passives, referring to both as "Patient Trigger" clauses. However, she states that OV clauses were relatively infrequent in her samples.

[20] These proverbs are taken from Hamilton (1955).

[21] Data obtained from the Malay Concordance Project of the Australian National University (http://mcp.anu.edu.au).

Acehnese obligatorily triggers a kind of agreement or clitic doubling on the verb in both active and passive clauses. Since the PP agent of a passive is not expected to trigger agreement on the verb, the analysis of the Acehnese construction as a passive has been controversial (Lawler 1977, 1988; Durie 1988). However, Legate (2012) uses evidence from extraction, quantifier float, and word order variation to show that the passive analysis is correct.

7. Conclusion

In this paper I have argued that the *di-V* construction is not polysemous but has a single use, namely to mark the passive. The main syntactic challenge to this claim involves clauses in which the agent is expressed by the clitic pronoun =*nya*. However, the main evidence which has been cited in support of analyzing the agentive =*nya* as a core argument comes from reflexive binding. We have seen that the contrasts in acceptability which form the basis for this argument actually seem to be driven by pragmatics rather than syntactic structure.

Functional arguments for the polysemy of *di-V* come from the fact that it is used to express the main-line events in a narrative sequence. If "passive" is defined in terms of backgrounding, or in terms of topicalizing the patient, then the *di-V* construction is not a passive. However, as we have seen, functionally defined voice categories would not correlate with either the morphological markers of voice or the syntactic patterns of the language. The strong correlation between verb morphology and syntactic properties discussed in sections 3–4 would be unexplained under such an approach.

As noted above, the evidence for the core argument status of the OV agent is less clear in Malay than in Balinese, but still sufficient to make this the most plausible analysis. Overall, then, this study supports the work of previous authors who posit a Balinese-type voice system for Malay: a symmetric alternation between two transitive voices, AV vs. OV, plus a detransitivizing passive. The existence of such languages has important implications not only for Malayo-Polynesian studies, but also for formal and typological theories of voice in general.

Abbreviations

1	first person	INCL	inclusive
2	second person	LOC	locative
3	third person	NEG	negator
AV	actor voice	OBJ	object
CLS	classifier	OBL	oblique argument
COMP	complementizer	OV	objective voice
CONJ	conjunction	PASS	passive
CONT	continuous	PERF	perfect
COP	copula	PL	plural
EMPH	emphatic particle	PRTCL	particle
EXCL	exclusive	RED	reduplication
EXIST	existential	REL	relativizer
EXPER	experiential perfect	SG	singular
FOC	focus	SUBJ	subject

References

Andrews, Avery. 2007. The major functions of the noun phrase. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description, vol. 1: Clause structure*, 2nd edn, 132–223. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Arka, I Wayan. 2000. Control and argument structure: Explaining control into subject in Indonesian. Paper presented at The Fourth International Symposium on Indonesian/Malay Linguistics, at Jakarta.

Arka, I Wayan. 2003. *Balinese morphosyntax: A lexical-functional approach*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics. (Revised version of 1998 dissertation)

Arka, I Wayan. 2005. On the distinction between Core and Obliques in the Austronesian languages of Indonesia. Paper presented at International ALT VI (Association of Linguistic Typology conference), Padang Indonesia, July 2005. (Revised version, 2009: "The core-oblique distinction and core index in some Austronesian languages of Indonesia")

Arka, I Wayan & Christopher Manning. 1998. Voice and grammatical relations in Indonesian: A new perspective. In Miriam Butt & Tracy King (eds.), *Proceedings of the 1998 International Lexical Functional Grammar conference*. Stanford CA: CSLI Publications. (Also in: Peter K. Austin & Simon Musgrave (eds). 2008. *Voice and grammatical functions in Austronesian*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.)

Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Chou Shu Hsiu. 1999. *Melanau and Indonesian: A comparative grammatical study*. Northern Territory University Grad. Dipl. thesis.

Chung, Sandra. 1976a. On the Subject of Two Passives in Indonesian. In C. N. Li (ed.), *Subject and topic*, 57–98. NewYork: Academic Press.

Chung, Sandra. 1976b. An object-creating rule in Bahasa Indonesia. *Linguistic Inquiry* 7(1). 41–87.

Chung, Sandra. 1978. Stem sentences in Indonesian. In S.A. Wurm & L. Carrington (eds.), *Second International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics: Proceedings*, 335–365. Pacific Linguistics, C-61. Canberra: Australian National University.

Clayre, Iain F. 1972. *The Melanau language*. University of Edinburgh Ph.D dissertation.

Cole, Peter, & Gabriella Hermon. 2005a. The typology of Malay reflexives. *Lingua* 115(5). 627–644.

Cole, Peter & Gabriella Hermon. 2005b. Subject and nonsubject relativization in Indonesian. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 14(1). 59–88

Cole, Peter, Gabriella Hermon & Yanti. 2008. Voice in Malay/Indonesian. *Lingua* 118(10). 1500–1553.

Cumming, Susanna. 1991. *Functional change: The case of Malay constituent order*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Cumming, Susanna & Fay Wouk. 1987. Is there 'discourse ergativity' in Austronesian languages? *Lingua* 71. 271–296.

Dalrymple, Mary & Suriel Mofu. 2009. Machine-readable grammatical resources for Indonesian. ESRC Project RES-000-22-3063. University of Oxford. URL http://users.ox.ac.uk/~cpgl0015/indonesian/index.html

Durie, Mark. 1988. The so-called passive of Acehnese. *Language* 64(1). 104–113.

Foley, William A. 1998. Symmetrical voice systems and precategoriality in Philippine languages. Paper presented at the workshop on Voice and Grammatical Functions in Austronesian Languages, LFG98, Brisbane, Australia.

Gault, JoAnn Marie. 1999. *An ergative description of Sama Bangingi'*. Philippine Journal of Linguistics special monograph issue no. 46. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

Givón, Talmy. 1983. Topic continuity in discourse: an Introduction. In Talmy Givón (ed.), *Topic continuity in discourse: A quantitative cross-language study*, 5–37. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamin.

Givón, Talmy. 1994. *Voice and inversion*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Goudswaard, Nelleke. 2005. *The Begak (Ida'an) language of Sabah*. Utrecht: LOT (Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics).

Gudai, D. H. 1985. *A grammar of Maanyan: A language of Central Kalimantan*. Australian National University Ph.D thesis.

Guilfoyle, Eithne, Henrietta Hung & Lisa Travis. 1992. SPEC of IP and SPEC of VP: Two subjects in Austronesian languages. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10(3). 375–414.

Hamilton, A. W. 1955. *Malay proverbs; Bidal Mĕlayu*. Malayan Heritage Series 6. Singapore: Published by Donald Moore for Eastern Universities Press, Ltd. (first published 1937)

Himmelmann, Nikolaus. 2005. The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar: typological characteristics. In Sander Adelaar & Nikolaus Himmelmann (eds.), *The Austronesian languages of Asia and Madagascar*, 110–181. London & New York: Routledge.

Hopper, Paul. 1979. Some observations on the typology of focus and aspect in narrative language. *Studies in Language* 3(1). 37–64.

Hopper, Paul. 1983. Ergative, passive, and active in Malay narrative. In F. Klein-Andreeu (ed.), *Discourse perspectives in syntax*, 67–88. New York: Academic Press.

Kartono, Bambang. 2013. *A puzzle in binding: Half reflexives and locally bound pronouns: A comparative study of anaphoric systems in Indonesian, Javanese, Palembangnese, City Jambi and Village Jambi*. Utrecht University M.Phil. thesis.

Kaswanti Purwo, Bambang. 1988. Voice in Indonesian: A discourse study. In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), *Passive and voice*, 195–241. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Keenan, Edward. 1985. Passive in the world's languages. In Timothy Shopen (ed.) *Language typology and syntactic description, Vol. 1: Clause structure*, 1st edn, 243–281. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kroeger, Paul R. 2004. *Analyzing syntax: A lexical-functional approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kurniawan, Eri. 2013. *Sundanese complementation*. University of Iowa Ph.D dissertation.

Lawler, John. 1977. A agrees with B in Achenese: A problem for Relational Grammar. In Peter Cole & Jerrold M. Sadock (eds.), *Grammatical relations*, 219–248. New York: Academic Press.

Lawler, John. 1988. On the questions of Acehnese 'passive'. *Language* 64(1). 114–117.

Legate, Julie Anne. 2012. Subjects in Acehnese and the nature of the passive. *Language* 88(3). 495–525.

Levinsohn, Stephen H. 1991. Constituent order in 'di' clauses in Malay narratives. In H. Steinhauer (ed.), *Papers in Austronesian Linguistics 1*, 125–135. Pacific Linguistics A-81. Canberra: Australian National University.

Manning, Christopher. 1996. *Ergativity: Argument structure and grammatical relations.* Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

McCune, Keith 1979. Passive function and the Indonesian passive. *Oceanic Linguistics* 18(2). 119–169.

Miller, Mark. 2007. *A grammar of West Coast Bajau*. The University of Texas at Arlington Ph.D dissertation.

Miller, Mark. 2013. A comparative look at the major voice oppositions in Sama-Bajaw languages and Indonesian/Malay. Paper presented at the 12th International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Denpasar, Bali.

Musgrave, Simon. 2001. *Non-subject arguments in Indonesian*. The University of Melbourne Ph.D dissertation.

Nomoto, Hiroki. 2006. Voice in Colloquial Malay relatives. In Yoichiro Tsuruga, Nobuyuki Miyake & Yuji Kawaguchi (eds.), *Gengojouhougaku Kenkyuuhoukoku* 12. 95–116. Tokyo: Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.

Pastika, I Wayan. 1999. *Voice selection in Balinese narrative discourse*. Australian National University Ph.D dissertation.

Pearson, Matthew. 2005. The Malagasy subject/topic as an A'-element. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 23(2). 381–457.

Perlmutter, David M. & Paul M. Postal. 1977. Toward a universal characterization of passivization. In *Proceedings of the Third Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Soceity*, 394–417. Berkeley, CA: University of California.

Ross, Malcolm D. 2002. The history and transitivity of Western Austronesian voice and voice marking. In Fay Wouk & Malcolm D. Ross (eds.), *The historical and typological development of Western Austronesian voice systems*, 17–62. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

Saddy, Douglas. 1991. WH scope mechanisms in Bahasa Indonesia. In Lisa Cheng & Hamida Demirdache (eds.), *More papers on wh- movement*, 183–218. Cambridge, MA: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.

Schachter, Paul. 1984. Semantic-role-based syntax in Toba Batak. *UCLA Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 5. 122–149.

Siewierska, Anna & Dik Bakker. 2013. Passive agents: Prototypical vs. canonical passives. In Dunstan Brown, Marina Chumakina & Greville G. Corbett (eds.), *Canonical morphology and syntax*, 151–189. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sneddon, James. 1996. *Indonesian reference grammar*. London & New York: Routledge; and St. Leonards NSW: Allen & Unwin.

Soh, Hooi Ling. 1998. Certain restrictions on A-bar movement in Malay. In Matt Pearson (ed.), *Proceedings of the Third and Fourth Meetings of Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association 1996-1998*, 295–308. Department of Linguistics, University of California, Los Angeles.

Tjia, Johnny. 2007. *A grammar of Mualang: An Ibanic language of Western Kalimantan, Indonesia*. Leiden: LOT (Netherlands Graduate School of Linguistics).

Vamarasi, Marit Kana. 1999. *Grammatical relations in Bahasa Indonesia*. Pacific Linguistics, Series D, v. 93. Canberra: Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, The Australian National University.

Verhaar, John. 1984. The categorial system in Indonesian: Verbs. In Bambang Kaswanti Purwo (ed.), *Towards a description of contemporary Indonesian: Preliminary studies part 1*, 27–63. NUSA 18. Jakarta: Badan Penyelenggara Seri NUSA.

Verhaar, John W. M. 1988. Syntactic ergativity in contemporary Indonesian. In R. McGinn (ed.), *Studies in Austronesian Linguistics*, 347–384. Ohio University Monographs in International Studies, Southeast Asia Series, No. 76. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.

Voskuil, Jan. 1996. *Comparative morphology: Verb taxonomy in Indonesian, Tagalog and Dutch*. Leiden University Ph.D thesis. HIL Dissertations 21. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.

Voskuil, Jan E. 2000. Indonesian voice and A-bar movement. In Ileana Paul, Vivianne Phillips & Lisa Travis (eds.), *Formal issues in Austronesian linguistics*, 195–213. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Walton, Charles. 1986. *Sama verbal semantics: Classification, derivation and inflection.* Linguistic Society of the Philippines, Special Monograph Issue, 25. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.