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1 Introduction

Background

• Balinese has clauses with the bound morpheme \(-a\), as in (1).

• This construction is known by names such as ‘Ø-construction’ (Artawa 1998), ‘object voice’ (Arka 2003) and ‘bare verb construction’ (Artawa 2013).

• It is a transitive clause.

• The agent follows the verb, and is expressed by the third person enclitic \(-a\).

(1) Nasi-ne jemak-\(a\).
rice-DEF take-3SG
‘S/he took the rice.’

(Artawa 1998:10)

• The (apparently) same construction can be accompanied by an agentive PP, as in (2).

(2) Nasi-ne ajeng-\(a\) teken anak-e ento.
rice-DEF eat-3SG/pass by person-DEF that
‘That person ate the rice.’

(Artawa 1998:10)

• Traditionally, both constructions have been described as passives (e.g. Kersten 1984).

• However, different views exist in recent analyses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artawa (1998)</td>
<td>Ø-CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>-(a): 3rd person enclitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arka (2003, 2008)</td>
<td>OBJECT VOICE OF PASSIVE</td>
<td>-(a): 3rd person enclitic or passive marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artawa (2013)</td>
<td>BARE VERB CONSTRUCTION</td>
<td>-(a): 3rd person enclitic, but can “be interpreted as”/”shift to” a passive marker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• \(-A\) is used as a passive marker, and very likely has become a passive marker.

• Arka (2008): “the bound form has changed to become a passive-like suffix” because the low register lacks the equivalent of the \(ka\)-passive in the high register.

This paper

• compares this change in Balinese with a similar change that took place in Malay;

• offers a hypothesis about how the enclitic \(-a\) became a passive marker and why such a change is possible at all.

Organization
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§2. Definitions: voice categories and voice markers. Illustration with Standard Malay and Balinese.

§3. Classical Malay as support for Artawa’s view—“hybrid type” agent expression.

§4. Hypothesis about the historical development of different passive types.

§5. Theoretical discussion on the “hybrid type.”

§6. Conclusion: summary, implications for the analysis of Balinese/Malay and the structure of passive in general.
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2 Voice categories and markers (Nomoto to appear-b)

(3) Definitions

a. **Voice categories** represent different ways of argument licensing.
   (i) Active-passive (actor-undergoer) voice distinction is concerned with the licensing of *internal* argument.
   (ii) Unlike traditional definitions, how *external* argument is licensed/encoded does not concern the active-passive distinction, but classifies the passive/undergoer voice into subtypes.

b. **Voice markers** are grammatical formatives that either determine or select a particular voice category.

### Standard Malay

(4) Voice markers and categories in Standard Malay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Voice marker</th>
<th>vP selection</th>
<th>DP&lt;sub&gt;int&lt;/sub&gt; licensing by v</th>
<th>Voice category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>meN- active</td>
<td>meN- active</td>
<td>active</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>di- passive</td>
<td>di- passive</td>
<td>passive</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bare passive</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>either</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(5) a. *MeN-* active

Mereka sudah **meny-**[s]emak dokumen itu.
they already **ACT-check** document that

b. *Di-* passive

Dokumen itu sudah **di-**semak oleh mereka.
document that already **PASS-check** by them

c. Bare passive

Dokumen itu sudah *(merekas)* semak.
document that already they check

d. Bare active

Mereka sudah semak dokumen itu.
they already check document that

‘They have already checked the document./The document has already been checked by them.’

(6) Subtypes of the *di-* passive

a. *Pro* type: implicit

Surat itu sudah **di-poskan pro**.
letter that already **PASS-post**

### Balinese

- ‘Ø-construction/object voice/bare verb construction’ corresponds to ‘bare passive’.

(7) Voice markers and categories in Balinese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>Voice marker</th>
<th>vP selection</th>
<th>DP&lt;sub&gt;int&lt;/sub&gt; licensing by v</th>
<th>Voice category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N- active</td>
<td>N- active</td>
<td>active</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a passive</td>
<td>-a passive</td>
<td>passive</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bare passive</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>passive</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>passive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8) a. *N-* active

Tiang **ny-[s]**pak cicing-e.
1sg **ACT-kick** dog-DEF

‘I kicked the dog.’

b. *-A passive

Nasi-ne ajeng-a teken-anak-e ento. (= (2))
rice-DEF eat-PASS by person-DEF that

‘That person ate the rice.’

c. Bare passive

Cicing-e sepak tiang.
dog-DEF kick 1sg

‘I kicked the dog.’

(Artawa 1998:9–10)

(9) Subtypes of the *-a passive

a. *Pro* type: implicit

Mangkin ambilang-a **pro** ja surat Gusti Kompyang Sususra-ne.
now take-PASS PART letter Gusti Kompyang Sususra-poss

‘Now I am taking Gusti Kompyang Sususra’s letter (for you).’

(Srawana:36, cited in Artawa 2013:17)
b. *TeKen* type: optional adjunct/oblique
   Nasi-ne ajeng-a teken anak-e ento. (= (2))
   rice-DEF eat-PASS by person-DEF that
   ‘That person ate the rice.’

   (Artawa 1998:10)

   c. DP type: post-verbal overt DP
   Apa goreng-a *(I Narti) di paon?*
   what fry-PASS ART Narti in kitchen
   ‘What was fried by Narti in the kitchen?’

   (Artawa 2013:22)

Arka’s analysis with two homophonous -a morphemes (= 3rd person enclitic & passive suffix) can not only handle all available patterns, but also enables an easy cross-linguistic comparison.

Q. Is it wrong to analyse -a in the *teken* type passive as the third person enclitic along the line of Artawa (1998, 2013)?

A. No! Such an analysis can and should be adopted to account for the historical development of the -a passive.

3 Classical Malay

- The third person enclitic and passive suffix are difficult to tease apart on the surface. Both occur immediately after the verb.
- In a theory in which the adjunct/oblique status of the agent is part of the definition of the passive, if a *teken* ‘by’ PP occurs, -a cannot be an agent expression.
  \[ \rightarrow -a = \text{passive marker}. \]
- If the passive is only defined in terms of internal argument (cf. (3)), one can think of a passive subtype where the agent is expressed by both a post-verbal pronoun (argument) and a ‘by’ phrase (adjunct).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passive subtype</th>
<th>Agent expression</th>
<th>Modern Malay</th>
<th>Bali nese</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) <em>pro</em> type</td>
<td><em>pro</em></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) ‘by’ type</td>
<td><em>(pro) oleheken/ by + DP</em></td>
<td>*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) hybrid type</td>
<td>overt pronoun</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>(?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) DP type</td>
<td>DP (incl. pronoun)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(v) bare passive</td>
<td>DP (incl. pronoun)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 It is notable that the implicit agent in this example is first person. See section 5.2 for more on this point.

- The hybrid type was available in Classical Malay *di- passives!*

(10) Setelah sudah surat itu *(a) *di-perbuat-nya*, ..., maka lalu *(b) *di-baca-nya oleh baginda surat itu. Setelah sudah *(c) *di-baca oleh baginda surat itu, ..., lalu him letter that after already PASS-read by him letter that then *(d) *di-berikan surat itu kepada ...
PASS-give letter that to ‘After *(a) he [= the regent] made the letter, ..., and then the letter *(b) was read by *(him) the king. After the letter *(c) was read by the king, ..., and then the letter *(d) was given to ...’

(Hikayat Maharaja Marakarma 139b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claims</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>DP type (third person enclitic -nya)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>hybrid type (-nya + oleh PP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>oleh ‘by’ type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td><em>pro</em> type</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The hybrid ‘-nya oleh DP’ pattern is comparable to Balinese ‘-a *teken* DP’ pattern.
- Unlike -a in Balinese, -nya in Malay is clearly not a passive marker but a third person enclitic. Passive marker = *di-.*
- This corroborates Artawa’s analysis of -a as a third person enclitic even in the presence of an agentive PP.

4 A hypothesis about the historical development of passives

(11) Claims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Claims</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| a.     | Common change
The role played by the third person enclitic (Balinese -a, Malay -nya) was taken over by the null unspecified pronoun pro, which simply asserts the existence of an agent with no person specification.
| b.     | Additional change in Balinese
The third person enclitic -a was reanalysed as a passive marker.

2 Data obtained from the Malay Concordance Project of the Australian National University (http://mcp.anu.edu.au). Date: 1844 or 1848.
(12) Possible reasons for the second change (11b)
a. The passive voice marker is phonologically null. 
   VoiceP
   Voice marker vP
   Agent DP v
   VP
b. Syntactically, the voice marker and agent DP positions are next to each other. Assuming the underlying structure of passives of Collins (2005),

   VoiceP
   Voice marker vP
   Agent DP v
   vP

(13) Possible course of diachronic changes
1. \[ [\text{VoiceP} \ v-V-Ø \ [\text{vP} \ -a \ldots]] \] bare passive, DP type (1)
2. \[ [\text{VoiceP} \ v-V-Ø \ [\text{vP} \ -a \ldots \ \text{teken} \ \text{DP}]] \] bare passive, hybrid type (2)
3. \[ [\text{VoiceP} \ v-V-a \ [\text{vP pro} \ldots \ \text{teken} \ \text{DP}]] \] -a passive, teken ‘by’ type (2)
4. \[ [\text{VoiceP} \ v-V-a \ [\text{vP pro} \ldots \]] \] -a passive, pro type (9a)
5. \[ [\text{VoiceP} \ v-V-a \ [\text{vP DP} \ldots]] \] -a passive, DP type (9c)

   • It is possible that not all speakers/dialects have reached stage 5 (and stage 4).

(14) *Nyoman tusing tingalin-a [ia/ Wayan].
Nyoman not see-PASS 3 Wayan
For: ‘(S)he/Wayan did not see Nyoman.’
   (Arka 2008:78)

5 On the hybrid type

• Balinese ‘-a teken DP’ and Malay ‘-nya oleh DP’ patterns show that passives can have two agent expressions: a pronoun (argument/core) and an agentive PP (adjunct/oblique).

• Artawa (2013) claims that the agentive PP specifies the agent:

   If there is no clear identifiable antecedent to help its interpretation, the 3rd person can be made explicit by adding a prepositional phrase indicating the referent of the -a form. (9)

   → Intuitively, makes sense. But can pronouns be interpreted in such a manner?

5.1 “Plastic” use of pronouns

• The agent pronoun in the hybrid type is not a bound pronoun. The DP in the ‘by’ agentive phrase cannot bind it, prevented by the PP layer.

• The agent pronoun is a free pronoun.

• Normally, a free pronoun carries an index and its value/referent is fixed by linguistic and extra-linguistic context.

(15) Context: John is talking with Mary about their mutual friend Ali.

   I you he
   Lexical meaning: speaker addressee others
   ↓ ↓ ↓
   (restriction)
   ↓ ↓ ↓
   Observed interpretation: John Mary Ali

   • In certain limited contexts, pronouns can be “plastic” in that their referentiality is weakened or suspended. The primary role of “plastic” pronouns is to provide descriptive contents. 

   • In other words, “plastic” pronouns function like common nouns, denoting properties. Hence, they allow restrictive modification.

(16) He who controls the past controls the future.
   (George Orwell, 1984)

(17) Interpretation of the enclitic pronoun -a/-nya

   (i) hybrid type (ii) pro type
   Lexical meaning: 3rd person 3rd person
   ↓ ↓
   (restriction)
   ↓ ↓
   Observed interpretation: x specific 3rd person referent

4Referentiality is turned over to the general interpretation mechanism.

3In Balinese, the verb moves to Voice by default. By contrast, Malay signals the verb movement by the morphology in Voice. The movement occurs when Voice is occupied by di- (di- passives) but not when Voice is phonologically null (bare passives).
Once the unspecified pronoun pro is introduced in the language (stage 3 in (13)), the hybrid type becomes redundant.

Moreover, the unspecified nature of pro gives rise to an additional reading that only asserts the existence of an agent, but not its specific properties.\(^5\)

Besides passive agents, “plastic” pronouns are also found in anaphoric expressions in Malay (e.g. diri-nya ‘himself/herself’ (Nomoto to appear-a) → Appendix).

5.2 Restrictive φ-features?

- Legate (2014) analyses -a in -a passives as carrying third person restrictive φ-features, extending her analysis of Acehnese and Chamorro passives to Balinese.

- Restrictive φ-features modify the external argument position, but do not saturate it (Legate 2010, 2012, 2014).

Acehnese (Legate 2014:39–40)

- Active
  Uleue nyan di-kap lôn. snake that 3FAM-bite 1SG ‘The snake bit me.’

- Passive: pro type\(^6\)
  Lôn di-kap.
  1SG 3FAM-bite ‘I was bitten.’

- Passive: l’é ‘by’ type
  Lôn di-kap l’é uleue nyan.
  1SG 3FAM-bite by snake that ‘I was bitten by the snake.’

---

\(^5\) An unspecified agent cannot be referred back to by a specific pronoun such as ia/dia ‘s/he’. Collins (2005) proposes the same idea, though he employs PRO\(_{arb}\) instead of pro.

\(^6\) Legate does not posit pro. I use this label here for ease of cross-linguistic comparison.

---

\(^7\) Legate assumes that the external argument is introduced by Voice rather than v.
[VoiceP]

a. Active (by Function Application)
\[ \lambda e. \text{Agent}(e, \text{the snake}) \land \text{3FAM}(\text{the snake}) \land \text{Biting}(e) \land \text{Theme}(e, \text{me}) \]
b. Passive: pro type (by Existential Closure)
\[ \lambda e. \exists x[\text{Agent}(e, x) \land \text{3FAM}(x) \land \text{Biting}(e) \land \text{Theme}(e, \text{me})] \]
c. Passive: l’e type (by Function Application & Existential Closure)
\[ \lambda e. \exists x[\text{Agent}(e, x) \land \text{3FAM}(x) \land \text{Biting}(e) \land \text{Theme}(e, \text{me})\land x = \text{the snake}] \]

Problems of a restrictive \( \phi \)-features analysis

- “Plastic” pronouns function similarly to restrictive \( \phi \)-features in that they restrict the external argument position in passives.
- While a restrictive \( \phi \)-features analysis captures Acehnese data elegantly, it is not so adequate for Balinese.\(^8\)

Problem 1: No person restriction on passive agents.

- Legate’s analysis is based on Arka’s (2008) description: the agent of -a passives are restricted to third person.

(23) *Bli Man nyidaang masih tepuk-a teken tiang.
brother Man can still see-pass by 1
For: ‘Brother Man can still be seen by me.’

(Arka 2008:81)

- However, Artawa (2013) explicitly denies the presence of such a person restriction. Evidence: Frequencies of non-third person agents in a novel (Srawana 1978), (9a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types</th>
<th>Undeleted</th>
<th>Deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First person</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second person</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third person</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- A similar situation holds in Standard Malay (Nomoto and Kartini 2014). Following Nomoto and Kartini, I assume that what Arka describes as a syntactic fact is in fact governed by information structure.
- Thus, unlike di- and other verbal prefixes in Acehnese, -a imposes no syntactic restriction on the external argument in terms of \( \phi \)-features.
- Moreover, unlike Acehnese, -a only occurs in the passive, but not in the active.

\(^8\)The same problems also apply to Malay. I thus abandon my previous analysis of Malay passives in terms of restrictive \( \phi \)-features proposed in Kartini and Nomoto (2012).

Problem 2: Pronominal interpretation.

- Legate (2014:38) rules out the pronominal analysis of the verbal prefixes in Acehnese, because the prefixes do not function as pronouns in the absence of the agentive PP, as in (24).

(24) Kalon uleue nyan_i!
look snake that
‘Look at the snake!’

a. *Aneuk miet nyan i-kap.
child small that 3FAM-bite
For: ‘The child was bitten by it.’
b. Aneuk miet nyan i-kap l’e jih,
child small that 3FAM-bite by 3FAM
‘The child was bitten by it.’

(Legate 2014:37)

- The same argument is valid in Balinese if the hybrid type does not exist, as Arka claims, but not necessarily if the hybrid type exists, as Artawa and Classical Malay data suggest.
- Fact:
  - The verbal prefixes in Acehnese correspond to -a in Balinese.
  - However, unlike Acehnese, -a functions like a pronoun in the absence of an agentive PP. The relevant construction is a bare passive with the third person enclitic -a.
- If the hybrid type does not exist, the enclitic -a is not comparable to Acehnese verbal prefixes.\(^9\) Also see (17).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bare passive</th>
<th>-A passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-a</td>
<td>enclitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a</td>
<td>passive marker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| DP\text{int} V-a. (cf. (24a)) | pronominal | non-pronominal |
| DP\text{int} V-a teken DP. (cf. (24b)) | non-pronominal |

- If the hybrid type exists, the enclitic -a is comparable to Acehnese verbal prefixes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bare passive</th>
<th>-A passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-a</td>
<td>enclitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-a</td>
<td>passive marker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| DP\text{int} V-a. (cf. (24a)) | prononominal | non-pronominal |
| DP\text{int} V-a teken DP. (cf. (24b)) | non-pronominal |

\(^9\)The passive marker -a is, thought it imposes no \( \phi \)-feature restriction and does not occur in the active.
• “[A] clitic in the absence of an associated DP would be interpreted as pronominal” (Legate 2014:38).

• In this respect, “plastic” pronouns are more similar to clitics in the clitic-doubling construction insofar as passives are concerned (cf. Roberts 1987).

6 Conclusion

Summary

• The morpheme -a in Balinese can be analysed as an enclitic pronoun even in the presence of a teken ‘by’ agentive phrase.

• The ‘di-V-nya oleh DP’ pattern in Classical Malay supports such an analysis.

• This hybrid type agent expression is one of the stages in the development of the English-type passive with an implicit agent (pro) from the bare passive construction.

• The pronoun in the hybrid type is “plastic” in that its main role is to provide the descriptive content like common nouns.

Implications

• The passive agent can be encoded by both argument and adjunct simultaneously. 
  → Showing the argument status of an agentive phrase does not warrant the non-passive status of a construction.

• To the degree that different passive types in Balinese and Malay form a continuum (bare passive > DP type > hybrid type > ‘by’ type > pro type),
  – the tradition of referring to all these constructions as “passive” is not very problematic;
  – terms like “object(ive) voice” should be used with care, so as not to miss this continuity;
  – it is plausible that passives in general contain a pronoun as the external argument (cf. Collins 2005); some languages allow overt ones (Balinese, Malay) while others don’t (English).

Appendix: “Plastic” pronouns in anaphoric expressions

• Aside from passive agents, “plastic” pronouns are also found in anaphoric expressions in Malay such as diri pro/-nya sendiri ‘oneself/himself’ (Nomoto to appear-a).

• The reflexive-like form diri-nya ‘himself’ exhibits behaviours of the union of reflexives and non-reflexives, allowing both local and non-local antecedents, as in (25a).

• However, adding sendiri ‘own’ makes it a true reflexive, which only takes a local antecedent, as in (25b).

(25) a. Ali, kata Siti, selalu memuji diri-nya,i/j/k.
   Ali says Siti always praises self-3
   ‘Ali says Siti always praises him/herself/herse.’

   (reflexive & non-reflexive)

   b. Ali, kata Siti, selalu memuji diri-nya sendiri,i/j/s,k.
   Ali says Siti always praise self-3 own
   ‘Ali says Siti always praises herself.’

   (reflexive only)

Nomoto’s account

• The reflexive-like form diri-nya can be either reflexive or non-reflexive. This is like possessive pronouns in English.

(26) Ali, says Bill always praises his,i/j/k teacher.

• Malay diri-nya contains the possessive pronoun -nya, and diri is semantically an identity function.

• In (25b), the set of third person referents denoted by (diri)-nya is restricted to the local antecedent by sendiri ‘own’, which requires a local antecedent (in object position) (Alsagoff 1992).

(27) Interpretation of diri-nya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lexical meaning:</th>
<th>3rd person</th>
<th>3rd person</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(restriction)</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTEXT</td>
<td>↓</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sendiri = local DP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observed interpretation: any salient 3rd person referent local 3rd person referent
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