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My previous research on Malay passives (and beyond) I

Nomoto and Kartini (2014) (Standard Formal and Colloquial Malay)

- Identified three \textit{di}- passive subtypes: \textit{pro}, \textit{oleh}, DP.
- \textit{Di}- passive agents are not restricted to 3rd person.
- They tend to be 3rd person for information structural reasons.

Nomoto (2015)

- The relevant factor is the low givenness of the eventuality described by a \textit{di}- verb phrase.
- \textit{Di}- lexically encodes low givenness (i.e., \textit{di}- is not a pure grammatical marker).
Nomoto (2016) (Classical Malay)

- Identified an additional subtype: *hybrid*.
- *Di*- passive agents are never suppressed.
- *Di*- passives are a clitic doubling construction, where the agent, overt (=*nya*) or covert (*pro*), is doubled by an *oleh* phrase.

Nomoto and Kartini (2016)

- The four *di*- passive subtypes and bare passives are connected both synchronically and diachronically.
- Cautioned against the passive- “object(ive) voice” dichotomy.
Nomoto (2018a)

- Extended the clitic doubling analysis to Balinese -a constructions.
- Typology of passives
  1. Agent expression: overt or covert
  2. Doubling: yes or no
Malay is rich in passive subtypes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument DP</th>
<th>Doubling ('by')</th>
<th>Balinese</th>
<th>Classical Malay</th>
<th>Modern Malay</th>
<th>Tagalog</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>overt</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>DP type (bare &amp; -a)</td>
<td>DP type (bare &amp; <code>di-</code>)</td>
<td>DP type (bare &amp; <code>di-</code>)</td>
<td>PV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overt</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>hybrid type (bare)</td>
<td>hybrid type (<code>di-</code>)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>covert</td>
<td>no</td>
<td><code>pro</code> type (-a)</td>
<td><code>pro</code> type (<code>di-</code>)</td>
<td><code>pro</code> type (<code>di-</code>)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>short</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>covert</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td><code>teken</code> type (-a)</td>
<td><code>oleh</code> type (<code>di-</code>)</td>
<td><code>oleh</code> type (<code>di-</code>)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>long</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Frequency studies for the different *di*- passive subtypes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Reported in</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Folktale <em>(cerita rakyat)</em></td>
<td>Standard, formal~colloquial</td>
<td>Nomoto and Kartini (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hikayat Marakarma</em></td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>Nomoto and Kartini (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hikayat Abdullah</em></td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>Nomoto and Kartini (2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The goals of this study

1. Examine the presence/absence and the frequencies of the different *di*- passive subtypes in Sarawak Malay (*Dialek Melayu Sarawak*)
2. Describe notable features of passives in Sarawak Malay
The definition of passives and its consequences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A construction in which the **internal argument** of a transitive verb is not licensed by default  
**External argument is irrelevant.** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consequences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Special ways of licensing the internal argument  
(case, word order, intonation)  
→ External argument is also influenced  
(special ways of licensing, phonological/semantic bleaching) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria for subclassification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| [1] verbal morphology  
[2] how the external argument is expressed |
Passive subtypes in Malay: Verbal morphology

1. *di-* passive
2. bare passive
Passive subtypes in Malay: How the external argument (agent) is expressed

1. **Pro** (implicit) type: No overt agent
2. **DP** (adjacent) type: Agent noun phrase immediately after the verb
3. **Oleh** type: Agent introduced by *oleh* (or its equivalent)
4. **Hybrid** type: Two concurring agent expressions
   1. 3rd person pronoun immediately after the verb
   2. *oleh* agentive phrase
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtype</th>
<th><em>di-</em> passive</th>
<th>bare passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Pro</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Oleh</em></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td></td>
<td>(lost)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples (*di-* passive)

(1) a. *Pro* type
   Dokumen itu sudah *di-semak* pro. (*pro*: null pronoun)

b. *DP* type
   Dokumen itu sudah *di-semak* mereka.

c. *Oleh* type
   Dokumen itu sudah *di-semak* oleh mereka.

d. Hybrid type (hypothetical)
   Dokumen itu sudah *di-semak*=nya oleh kerani itu.
   ‘The document has already been checked (by them/the clerk).’
Examples (bare passive)

(2) a. *Pro* type (hypothetical)
Dokumen itu sudah *pro* semak. (*pro*: null pronoun)

b. *DP* type
Dokumen itu sudah mereka semak.

c. *Oleh* type (hypothetical)
Dokumen itu sudah semak oleh mereka.

d. Hybrid type (hypothetical)
Dokumen itu sudah *dia* semak oleh kerani itu.
‘The document has already been checked (by them/the clerk).’
Cf. Classical Malay (Nomoto 2016, 2018a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtype</th>
<th>$di$- passive</th>
<th>bare passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oleh</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cf. English (Nomoto 2018a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtype</th>
<th>$di$- passive</th>
<th>bare passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$Pro$</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Oleh$</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cf. Tagalog (Nomoto 2018a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtype</th>
<th>\textit{di-} passive</th>
<th>bare passive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textit{Pro}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{Oleh}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data

1. *Korpus Variasi Bahasa Melayu: Sarawak* (Nomoto 2019a) — monologues including Jackal and Crow stories
   https://github.com/matbahasa/Melayu_Sarawak


Both will be added to MALINDO Conc (Nomoto et al. 2018).
https://malindo.aa-ken.jp/conc/
(Thanks to Mohd. Ali Salim for the permission.)
Methodology

- Both texts are morphologically annotated and formatted as XML files.
- The annotated data for *Korpus Variasi Bahasa Melayu* is publicly available: https://github.com/matbahasa/Melayu_Sarawak/blob/master/var_sarawak.xml
- Manually added annotations for the passive agent.
  - Attribute: `pa`
  - Values: `pro`, `DP`, `oleh`, `hybrid`
Result: Subtypes of *di*-passives (*Korpus Variasi Bahasa Melayu*)

**Subtype Frequency (%)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtype</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pro</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>(34.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(41.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oleh</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(23.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>55</strong></td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DP > pro > oleh
Result: Subtypes of *di-* passives (Mohd. Ali 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtype</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pro</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oleh</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

pro > DP > oleh
Mohd. Ali (2015) without *cerpen*

The *cerpen* data is a translation from Standard Malay.

DP > pro > oleh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtype</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>(%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pro</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(43.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(50.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oleh</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(5.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td>(100.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety</td>
<td>Frequency ranking</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard (speech)</td>
<td>pro &gt; oleh &gt; DP</td>
<td>Nomoto and Kartini (2014), Nomoto (2019b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard (writing)</td>
<td>pro &gt; DP &gt; oleh</td>
<td>Nomoto and Kartini (2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarawak</td>
<td>DP &gt; pro &gt; oleh</td>
<td>This study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical (Hikayat Abdullah)</td>
<td>DP &gt; pro &gt; oleh &gt; hybrid</td>
<td>Nomoto and Kartini (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical (Hikayat Marakarma)</td>
<td>DP &gt; oleh &gt; pro &gt; hybrid</td>
<td>Nomoto and Kartini (2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunei</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Future work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Examples: DP type


(3) Apabila tek burong makan ikan, di-embak nya terbang.
   when PART bird eat fish PASS-bring 3SG fly
   ‘When the bird ate the fish, it carried away the fish up in the sky.’
   (Sarawak201812)

(4) Semah sik ny-[s]ingo di-tunggah emak nya.
   Semah not N-look.around PASS-call mother 3SG
   ‘Semah did not look around when called by his mother.’
   (Mohd. Ali 2015:47)
**Di- passives with a second person agent**

(5) Bukan kaki kamek tuk bemban di-gigit kita tuk. not foot 1SG this shrub? PASS-bite 2SG this ‘My foot isn’t a shrub, you’re biting it.’ (Sarawak201811)


(8) Adek, sakit kaki aku di-tinjak kau! ouch hurt foor 1SG PASS-step.on 2SG ‘Ouch, my foot hurts because you’re stepping on it!’ (Mohd. Ali 2015:68)
Examples: *Pro* type

(9) Musang dah kenyang, burong di-tipu tek. civet already full bird PASS-cheat PART ‘The civent was already full; the bird was cheated.’ (Sarawak201808)

(10) Sidak ya ndak alah di-padah, ntingai. 3PL that won’t lose PASS-tell stubborn ‘They don’t listen; they are stubborn.’ (Mohd. Ali 2015:32)
Examples: *Oleh* type

(11) Tiba-tiba dekat pokok tetangga ikan di-embak leh
suddenly at tree neighbour fish PASS-carry by
bird
‘Suddenly at the neighbour’s tree, a fish was by carried
away by a bird.’  
(Sarawak201803)

(12) Dah yo tek, alu di-buang oleh burong tek lalu
already that PART then PASS-discard by bird PART then
nyey maken tek lalu Ø-embak ya dalam babas.
3SG eat PART then carry that in shrub
‘After that, (the fish) was discarded by the bird, and then
it (= the civet) ate (the fish) and carried it into the
shrubs.’  
(Sarawak201819)

[Note: bare active (followed by the object)]
Di- passives in describing sequential events

(13) Makan ikan, ikan di-gugok atas yo tek, di-ambik nyo
    eat fish fish PASS-drop on that PART PASS-take 3SG
tek, di-embak nya lari.
    PART PASS-carry 3SG run
‘Ate the fish, the fish was dropped on it, taken by it,
carried away by it.’ (Sarawak201825)
‘V Ag’ rather than ‘Ag V’

(14) Ni eh kunci Ø-padah kau tek?

which key tell 2SG just.now

‘Which one is the key that you mentioned just now?’ (Mohd. Ali 2015:31)

(15) Ø-Pake kau jamban s-igek gik nun.

use 2SG toilet one-CLF more there

‘(You) Use the other toilet there.’ (Mohd. Ali 2015:32)

(16) Ndak cukup nasi se-besen pake Ø-makan Bujang nak won’t enough rice one-basin for eat Bujang REL rangkak gilak yo.

gluttonous very that

‘A basin of rice won’t be enough for that gluttonous Bujang to eat.’ (Mohd. Ali 2015:60)
Bare passives II

(17) Baju nak Ø-pake Azlan agik sembab, yo bebau.
clothes REL use Azlan still damp that stink
‘The shirt that Azlan wears is still damp; it stinks.’
(Mohd. Ali 2015:60)

(18) Yorabbi, kacak nak Ø-drow kau!
ITJ beautiful REL draw 2SG
‘Wow, your drawing (lit. what you drew) is beautiful!’
(Mohd. Ali 2015:68)

(19) Nang bена nak Ø-padah kau marek.
indeed true REL tell 2SG yesterday
‘What you told yesterday is indeed true.’
(Mohd. Ali 2015:69)
Implications: Historical development of various passive subtypes I

Hyypothesis 1 (Nomoto and Kartini 2014; Nomoto 2019c):
Clitic doubling & null unspecified pronoun (pro)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{di-baca}=\text{nya} & \quad \text{di-.DP} \quad \downarrow \\
\text{di-baca}=\text{nya oleh Ali} & \quad \text{di-.hybrid} \quad \quad (\text{clitic doubling with } =\text{nya}) \quad \downarrow \\
\text{di-baca pro oleh Ali} & \quad \text{di-.oleh} \quad (\text{doubling with } \text{pro}) \quad \downarrow \\
\text{di-baca pro} & \quad \text{di-.pro} \quad (\text{no doubling})
\end{align*}
\]
Implications: Historical development of various passive subtypes II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis 2 (Yanti et al. 2018): Reanalysis &amp; optionality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( di-\emptyset-baca=nya ) AGR-bare.DP ( (di-:\text{3rd person AGR}) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( di-\emptyset-baca=nya ) ( \text{AGR-bare.hybrid} ) ( (\text{“clarificatory phrase”}) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( di-baca(-nya) ) ( oleh ) Ali ( \text{AGR-bare.hybrid/oleh} ) ( (-nya: \text{optional linker}) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( di-baca ) ( (Ali) ) ( di-.DP/pro ) ( (\text{post-adjacent DP: optional}) )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Did *di-* passives arise from bare passives?
2. Are agent agreement prefixes inherited or an innovation?
3. Is the passive marker *di-* related to the pronominal *di-*/*dia*?
Q1. Did *di-* passives arise from bare passives?

- “Yes” for Yanti et al. (2018). I also used to think so.
- Alternatively, bare passives could have developed from the DP type *di-* passive or its predecessor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>di-/ni-V</em></th>
<th>DP</th>
<th>(<em>di-</em> passive, DP type)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Loss of <em>di-</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø-V</td>
<td>DP</td>
<td>(bare passive, DP type, post-verbal agent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↓</td>
<td>Loss of V-fronting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DP V</td>
<td>(bare passive, DP type, pre-verbal agent)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Sarawak Malay data supports this alternative view.
  - ‘V Ag’ order
  - No person restriction
Q2. Are agent agreement prefixes inherited or an innovation?

**Inherited**
- Yanti et al. (2018:fn. 12); bare passive $\rightarrow$ *di*- passive
- Perspective from Sumatran languages (e.g., Toba Batak, Acehnese)

**Innovation**
- Compatible with the alternative view (*di*- passive $\rightarrow$ bare passive)
- Perspective from Borneo (and the Philippines)
Q3. Is the passive marker \textit{di-} related to the pronominal \textit{di-/dia}?

\textbf{Yanti et al. (2018)}

There are a variety of proposals in the literature regarding the etymology of the modern-day prefix \textit{di-} (for an brief overview of these proposals see Adelaar 2005). We do not take any position on this issue, since we see the etymology of the prefix \textit{di-} as an issue which is orthogonal to our claim that the \textit{di-}passive originated from an object voice construction containing a 3rd person agent.

\textbf{Nomoto (2018a) ‘The development of the English-type passive in Balinese’}

bare.DP > bare.hybrid (strict person restriction) > -a.teken (person restriction relaxed) > -a.pro > -a.DP
Counterexample to the cline of susceptibility to nasal substitution I


When NS occurs with *g* in a language, it also occurs with *b, d* and voiceless obstruents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Languages</th>
<th>Consonants replaced by nasals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malay, Pangasinan</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sama Bajau, Bikol</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cebuano, Ilokano</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalinga, Bario Kelabit</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarawak Malay</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Counterexample to the cline of susceptibility to nasal substitution II

(20)  
a. \( \text{N-} + \text{b} \to \text{mb} \)
   \( \text{N-} + \text{basak} \to \text{mbasak} \)
   \( \text{N-} + \text{bukak} \to \text{mbukak} \)
   \( \text{N-} + \text{barak} \to \text{mbarak} \)

b. \( \text{N-} + \text{d} \to \text{nd} \)
   \( \text{N-} + \text{diat} \to \text{n diat} \)
   \( \text{N-} + \text{deik} \to \text{n deik} \)
   \( \text{N-} + \text{drow} \to \text{n drow} \)

c. \( \text{N-} + \text{g} \to \text{ŋ (*ŋg)} \)
   \( \text{N-} + \text{galik} \to \text{ŋalik} \)
   \( \text{N-} + \text{garuk} \to \text{ŋaruk} \)
   \( \text{N-} + \text{gedek} \to \text{ŋedek} \)

Note: *ngutik* [ŋutik] (Mohd. Ali 2015:8) is the only counterexample so far. But it may not actually involve *N*- because *gutik* has no meaning by itself.
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