

The 14th International Symposium on Malay/Indonesian Linguistics
(ISMIL)
30 April - 2 May 2010, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA

Kena Passives and Unvoiced Voiced Alternations

Kartini Abd.Wahab
kartini@ukm.my
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

Hiroki Nomoto
nomoto@tufs.ac.jp
University of Minnesota/Tokyo
University of Foreign Studies

1 Introduction

Background

- Most previous studies on voice in Malay have focussed on the morphological passive (1) and the bare passive (2) (e.g. Saddy 1991; Soh 1998; Cole and Hermon 1998; Voskuil 2000; Nomoto and Shoho 2007; Sato 2008).¹

(1) Dokumen itu sudah *di-semak* oleh saya.²
document that already PASS-check by me
'The document has already been checked by me.'

¹ These two passives are referred to variously in the literature. 'Morphological passive' is also called 'canonical passive' (Chung 1976; Guilfoyle et al. 1992), 'pasif jati' [genuine passive] (Asmah 2009) etc. 'Bare passive' is also known as the object-preposing construction (Chung 1976; Willett 1993), Passive Type 2 (Dardjowidjojo 1978; Sneddon 1996), 'pasif semu' [pseudo passive] (Asmah 2009) etc. See Nomoto (2006) for a summary of the various existing terms.

² Most descriptions of the morphological passive in Malay state that its agent is restricted to the third person and its distribution is complementary to the bare passive, whose agent is restricted to the first and second persons according to these grammars. Although prescriptive grammars dictate this rule, such descriptions are not adequate from a descriptive perspective (Chung (1976) makes a similar remark on Indonesian). Morphological passive sentences with a first or second person agent are actually used in appropriate contexts. For example, if a document has to be examined by three people before it is sent to the client and only the speaker, but not the other two people, has examined it, the speaker can express the contrast "me, but not the other two" better by (1) than by (2).

(2) Dokumen itu sudah saya semak.
document that already I check
'I have already checked the document.'

- However, other types of passives have been also recognised in the literature (Nik Safiah 1978; Arbak 1981; Asmah and Subbiah 1983; Abdul Hamid 1992): (i) *ter-* passives, (ii) *ber-* passives, (iii) *ke-...-an* passives and (iv) *kena* passives.
- The term 'passive' is simply a label. Malay grammars use the label 'passive' for any constructions whose *semantic and pragmatic functions* resemble those of prototypical passives, e.g. foregrounding the patient/theme, backgrounding the agent and increased affectedness (Shibatani 1985; Keenan 1985; cf. Koh 1990:169).

A big question

Are these other passives related to the morphological and bare passives *syntactically*? Do their common "passive meanings" stem from common syntactic mechanisms?

- In this paper, we examine one of these other passives, namely the *kena* passive as in (3) below, which is often used in Colloquial Malay (cf. Chung 2005).

(3) Pencuri itu *kena* tangkap oleh polis.
thief that KENA arrest by police
'The thief got arrested by the police.'

Specific questions

1. How are *kena* passive sentences like (3) related to morphological and bare passives?
2. How are *kena* passive sentences related to sentences with *kena* meaning 'have to' as in (4)?^{3,4}

³ Chung (2005:209) regards this use of *kena* as a modal verb and distinguishes it from *kena* in *kena* passives.

⁴ In this paper, we are concerned with the synchronic aspects of *kena*. We will not discuss how each present-day use of the word has developed historically.

(4) Polis *kena* tangkap penyetuk saku itu.
police KENA arrest pickpocket that
'The police have to arrest the pickpocket.'

3. What is the structure of *kena* passive sentences?

Our answers to these questions

1. *Kena* in *kena* passives is orthogonal to morphological and bare passives. *Kena* only adds an adversity flavour and is not the source of passive syntax. The passive syntax is due either to the latter two types of voices or to "unvoiced voices."
2. We analyse sentences like (4) as the active counterpart of *kena* passive sentences.
3. *Kena* is a 'funny predicate', which takes a reduced clause (vP) as its complement.

Organisation of the paper

Section 1: Introduction

Section 2: Basic facts about the three kinds of passives

Section 3: Relationship between *kena* passives and sentences with *kena* meaning 'have to'

Section 4: *Kena* sentences and funny control

Section 5: Unvoiced voice alternation

Section 6: Conclusion

2 Basic facts about the three kinds of passives

2.1 Morphological passives

- (5) Defining characteristics of morphological passives:
 - a. The verb is prefixed by *di-*.
 - b. The theme/patient DP rather than the agent DP is the subject.
 - c. The canonical word order is 'Theme/Patient V (*oleh* Agent)'
- (6) Buku itu *di-baca* oleh Siti.
book that PASS-read by Siti
'The book was read by Siti.'

- Corresponding to morphological passives are morphological active sentences with the prefix *meN-*.

(7) Siti *mem-baca* buku itu.
Siti ACT-read book that
'Siti read the book.'

2.2 Bare passives

- (8) Defining characteristics of bare passives:⁵
 - a. The verb appears in its stem form.
 - b. The theme/patient DP rather than the agent DP is the subject.
 - c. The agent is obligatory and often cliticises to the verb.
 - d. Aux/Adv/Neg precedes the agent and the verb.
 - e. The canonical word order is 'Theme/Patient (Aux/Adv/Neg) Agent V'.

(9) Surat itu sudah Ali baca.
letter that already Ali read
'Ali has already read the letter.'

- Corresponding to bare passives are bare active sentences, in which the agent precedes Aux/Adv/Neg as in (10).

(10) Ali sudah baca surat itu.
Ali already read letter that
'Ali has already read the letter.'

⁵ See Chung (1976) for evidence that this construction is a passive, but not a topicalisation construction. Nomoto and Shoho (2007) claim that the bare passive does not exist in Colloquial Malay grammar and that occurrences of it in casual discourse are due to code-mixing with Formal Malay (called 'Written Malay' by them). Similarly, Cole, Hermon and Tjung (2006) argue that the same construction (called 'pasif semu/P2' by them) does not exist in Jakarta Indonesian, the language spoken in casual situations by the natives of Jakarta.

2.3 Kena passives

- ‘Kena passives’ have been mentioned/discussed by a number of researchers (e.g. Nik Safiah 1978; Asmah and Subbiah 1983; Abdul Hamid 1992; Koh 1990; Nik Safiah et al. 1993; Bao and Wee 1999; Chung 2005). They are reported to have the following properties:

Property 1: The subject must be adversely affected (Koh 1990; Bao and Wee 1999; Chung 2005).

- (11) Aminah kena tampar.
Aminah KENA slap
‘Aminah got slapped.’

Property 2: The agentive *oleh* ‘by’ phrase is optional (Nik Safiah et al. 1993; Bao and Wee 1999; Chung 2005).

- (12) Amin kena tangkap (*oleh*) polis.
Amin KENA catch (by) police
‘Amin got arrested *(by) the police.’

Property 3: Stative verbs cannot appear in *kena* passive sentences (Bao and Wee 1999).

- (13) a. *Perkara itu kena tahu.
thing that KENA know
b. *Buku itu kena punya.
book that KENA have

(Bao and Wee 1999:5)

Property 4: The verb does not take the suffix *-kan* (Chung 2005)

- (14) *Dia kena tipu-kan oleh pemuda itu.
s/he KENA cheat-KAN by youth that
For: ‘She/he got cheated by the man.’

(Chung 2005:197)

Property 5: The verb is affixless (Nik Safiah et al. 1993; Bao and Wee 1999). We will show that this is not true in section 4.2 (cf. footnote13).

- (15) Abu kena denda oleh cikgu.
Abu KENA punish by teacher
‘Abu was punished by the teacher.’

3 Kena passives and their active counterparts

- Unlike morphological and bare passives, *kena* passive sentences have never been discussed in relation to corresponding active sentences.
- As the category of ‘passive’ is defined based on semantic and pragmatic functions (section 1), it is possible that there is no active counterpart for *kena* passives.⁶ But is that true?

3.1 Proposal

- There are active counterparts to *kena* passives, namely sentences with *kena* meaning ‘have to’ as in (4), repeated below as (16).

- (16) Polis kena tangkap penyeluk saku itu.
police KENA catch pickpocket that
‘The police have to arrest the pickpocket.’

- This use of *kena* has been considered unrelated to *kena* passive sentences (Chung 2005).
- We relate the two uses of *kena* because they both involve a common meaning, i.e. ‘regardless of the agent/subject/speaker’s own will’⁷, ‘pressed by external circumstances’ or ‘destined to’.
- The active and passive *kena* sentences can be paraphrased, e.g., by *terpaksa ... (walaupun tak nak)* ‘forced to ... (though not want to)’.

⁶ Koh (1990:168) states that *ber-* and *ke-...-an* passives do not have corresponding active sentences, but is not explicit about whether or not the same is the case with *kena* passives and *ter-* passives.

⁷ The possessor of the will is the speaker when the speaker has empathy with the subject (usually inanimate) as in *Dompot aku kena curi* ‘My purse was stolen’ and *Rumah adik aku kena rompak* ‘My sister’s house was broken into’.

- (17) a. Polis *kena* tangkap pencuri itu.
 police KENA catch thief that
 ‘The police have to arrest the thief.’
Paraphrase: Polis *terpaksa* men-(t)angkap pencuri itu
 police forced ACT-catch thief that
 (, tiada pilihan untuk tidak mahu, kerana itu sudah arahan dan tanggungjawab).
 ‘The police were forced to arrest the thief (, with no choice to refuse to do so, as it is what they are ordered and responsible to do).’
External circumstance: It is the police’s obligation to arrest thieves.
- b. Pencuri itu *kena* tangkap oleh polis.
 thief that KENA catch by police
 ‘The thief got arrested by the police.’
Paraphrase: Pencuri itu *terpaksa* di-tangkap
 thief that forced PASS-arrest
 (walaupun tak nak).
 ‘The thief was forced to be arrested (though he did not want to).’
External circumstance: The thief had his/her escape cut off.

- *Get* in Singapore English is similar to *kena* in Malay both in its meaning and distribution (occurring in both active and passive sentences).⁸

- (18) a. The police (have) *got* *(to) arrest the thief.
 b. The thief *got* arrested by the police.

3.2 Potential counterarguments to this analysis

Problem 1: The passive *kena* takes DPs, but the active *kena* seems not to take DPs.

⁸ Chung (2005:198) notes that *kena* passives are similar to a construction in English represented by sentences such as *The fax will get sent tomorrow* and *Things got mixed up*, which she distinguishes from the *get* passive. However, she does not discuss in what respects they are similar.

- (19) Passive
- a. Salmah *kena* [demam panas] sejak se-minggu yang
 Salmah KENA fever since one-week that
 lalu.
 pass
 ‘Salmah has had a fever since last week.’
- b. Kaki Abu *kena* [ekzos motosikal].
 leg Abu KENA exhaust.pipe motorcycle
 ‘Abu burned his leg on a motorcycle exhaust pipe.’
- (20) Active⁹
- a. *Mereka *kena* [perceraian].
 they KENA divorce
 For: ‘They have to divorce.’
- cf. Mereka *kena* [_{VP} (ber-)cerai].
 they KENA (BER-)divorce

⁹ There are cases where the active *kena* appears to take a DP as its complement as in (i).

- (i) a. Kita *kena* [pakaian kemas] semasa bekerja.
 we KENA clothes neat when work
 ‘You must dress neatly when at work.’
- b. Kamu *kena* [motivasi] sikit.
 you KENA motivation bit
 ‘You have to get yourself motivated a bit.’

These cases may have resulted from prefix drop common in Colloquial Malay. Thus, *pakaian kemas* ‘neat dress’ and *motivasi* ‘motivation’ in (i) can be attached to by the verbal prefix *ber-* as in *berpakaian kemas* ‘to dress neatly’ and *bermotivasi* ‘to be motivated’. When the apparent DP does not take any verbal affix, the sentence is ungrammatical, as is the case with *perceraian* ‘divorce’ (**berperceraian*, **mempenceraian*) and *pembelian*... (**berpembelian*, **mem(p)embelian*) in (20).

- b. *Kita kena [pembelian barangan buatan
we KENA purchase goods product
Malaysia].
Malaysia
For: 'We have to buy Malaysian goods.'
cf. Kita kena [_{VP} (mem-)beli barangan buatan
we KENA (ACT-)buy goods product
Malaysia].
Malaysia

Solution: We analyse *kena* taking DPs as a transitive verb meaning 'suffer from; get'. This use of *kena* does not necessarily entail adversity, unlike *kena* taking VPs (cf. Bao and Wee 1999).

- (21) a. Felix kena [loteri sebanyak RM50 000] semalam.
Felix KENA lottery as.much.as RM50 000 yesterday
'Felix won a lottery worth RM50 000 yesterday.'
b. Abu kena [hadiah tempat pertama] dalam
Abu KENA prize place first in
pertandingan itu.
competition that
'Abu won first prize in the competition.'

Problem 2: While the verb does not take the suffix *-kan* in *kena* passives (Chung 2005), there is not such a restriction with active *kena* sentences.

- (22) a. *Dia kena tipu-kan oleh pe-muda itu.
3S.NOM KENA cheat-KAN by PE-being.young that
b. Dia kena tipu-kan pe-muda itu.
3S.NOM KENA cheat-KAN PE-being.young that
'He/she has to cheat that young man.'
(Chung 2005:197)

Solution:

- Chung's (2005) account for this restriction: "The use of *-kan* with the *kena* adversative passive is probably ungrammatical here because *-kan* carries with it a benefactive meaning when added to a transitive verb" (197).

- Prediction: *Kena* and *-kan* can co-occur if *-kan* does not convey a benefactive meaning, i.e. if the function of *kena* is to make causatives, goal-PP constructions, inherent ditransitives.¹⁰ This prediction is borne out.

- (23) a. Causative
Kuku Aminah kena merah(-kan) oleh Siti.
nail Aminah KENA red(-KAN) by Siti
'Aminah's finger nails were coloured red by Siti.'
cf. Siti me-merah*(-kan) kuku Aminah.
Siti ACT-red(-KAN) nail Aminah
'Siti coloured Aminah's finger nail red.'
- b. Goal-PP construction
Bola adik-ku itu kena lempar(-kan) ke
ball younger.sibling-my that KENA throw(-KAN) to
dalam tong sampah oleh Ali.
in dustbin by Ali
'My brother's ball was thrown into the dustbin by Ali.'
cf. Hasnah me-lempar(-kan) bola adik-ku
Hasnah ACT-throw(-KAN) ball younger.sibling-my
itu ke dalam tong sampah.
that to in dustbin
'Hasnah threw my younger brother's ball into the
dustbin.'
- c. Inherent ditransitive
Tugas penting itu kena serah(-kan) kepada
task important that KENA entrust(-KAN) to
Abu yang pemalas itu oleh dia.
Abu that lazy that by him/her
'The important task was entrusted to that lazy Abu by her.'

¹⁰ We adopt Son and Cole's (2008) classification of the functions of *-kan* and their terminologies.

cf. Dia meny-(s)erah*(-kan) tugas penting itu
 s/he ACT-entrust(-KAN) task important that
 kepada Abu yang pemalas itu.
 to Abu that lazy that
 ‘She entrusted the important task to that lazy Abu.’

- Thus, the contrast in (22) stems from the semantics of *-kan*, but not from the existence of two distinct *kena* morphemes.

Problem 3: Some authors even say that the verb must be affixless (e.g. Nik Safiah et al. 1993; Bao and Wee 1999).

Solution:

- This is not true. The verb can take the suffix *-kan* (23). It can also take the morphological voice markers *di-* (passive) and *meN-* (active) (see (26) below).
- The observation that the verb is affixless would be due to the casual register in which the construction is used. Affixless verbs are very common in Colloquial Malay.

Problem 4: *Kena* is a passive voice marker in *kena* passives. It is contradictory that a passive marker occurs in active sentences.

Solution: We will argue that *kena* is not a voice marker but a ‘funny predicate’ (cf. Nomoto 2008, to appear), contra Nik Safiah et al. (1993:493) and Bao and Wee (1999), who claim that *kena* is an auxiliary verb and a passive voice marker respectively.

4 Kena sentences and funny control

4.1 Funny control and funny predicates (Nomoto 2008, to appear)

- ‘Funny control’ refers to a phenomenon where the (external θ -role of the) matrix predicate is associated with either the internal argument or the external argument of the embedded passive verb (Gil 2002).¹¹

¹¹ Some speakers told us that the construction did not involve the kind of ambiguity as we point out here. Nevertheless, it seems to us that the conclusion that the construction is

(24) Pencuri itu mahu [___ di-tangkap polis].¹²
 thief that want PASS-catch police
 (i) ‘The thief wants to be arrested by the police.’ (normal control reading)
 catch: police <thief>

|
 “wanter”

(ii) ‘The police want to arrest the thief.’ (crossed reading)
 catch: police <thief>

|
 “wanter”

(25) Polis mahu [___ men-(t)angkap pencuri itu].
 police want ACT-catch thief that
 (i) ‘The police want to arrest the thief.’ (normal control reading)
 catch: police <thief>

|
 “wanter”

(ii) *‘The police wants to be arrested the thief.’ (crossed reading)
 catch: police <thief>

|
 “wanter”

- The matrix predicates are restricted to a certain class of predicates (= ‘funny predicates’) which express (i) psychological attitudes (e.g. *ingin*

in principle ambiguous is inevitable because we find in naturally occurring texts many instances of the same predicate being associated with both readings (see the examples in Appendix in Nomoto, to appear). Such native speakers’ reactions are reasonable, given that in most cases only one reading is compatible with the context. See also footnote 12.
¹² In ordinary situations, where the police want to arrest thieves and thieves try to escape from the police, only interpretation (ii) makes sense. Interpretation (i) requires some special contexts: e.g. the thief is fatigued with having run away from the police for years; but s/he cannot stop repeating crimes by himself/herself, though s/he wish to; s/he does not have courage to surrender himself/herself to the police; s/he just hopes that s/he will get arrested someday.

‘to want’) or (ii) external circumstances that affect the realisation of a situation (e.g. *layak* ‘qualified’) (Nomoto 2008, to appear).

- Following Polinsky and Potsdom (2008), Nomoto (2008, to appear) assumes that funny predicates take a reduced clause (vP) rather than a full-fledged clause (CP).

4.2 Evidence that *kena* is a funny predicate

Evidence 1: Co-occurrence with basic voices

- *Kena* can co-occur with verbs in the morphological voices. This is expected if *kena* is not a passive voice marker (cf. Bao and Wee 1999), but a funny predicate.

- (26) a. Penyeluk saku itu *kena* *di-tangkap* oleh polis.¹³
pickpocket that KENA PASS-catch by police
‘The pickpocket got arrested by the police.’
- b. Polis *kena* *men-(t)angkap* penyeluk saku itu.
police KENA ACT-catch pickpocket that
‘The police got to arrest the pickpocket.’

- *Kena* may co-occur with bare voices only if there is no Aux/Adv/Neg. This is compatible with our assumption that *kena* takes a vP, which does not have a position for Aux/Adv/Neg.

- (27) a. Penyeluk saku itu *kena* [vP aku tangkap].
pickpocket that KENA I catch
(i) ‘The pickpocket got arrested by me.’ (passive)
(ii) ‘I have to arrest the pickpocket.’ (active)
- b. *Penyeluk saku itu *kena* [TP akan [vP aku tangkap].
pickpocket that KENA will I catch

¹³ This sentence seems to sound unnatural to some speakers while it is totally grammatical for others and similar examples are easily found in naturally occurring texts.

- (i) Tiada se-orang BN UMNO yang *kena* *di-tangkap* oleh ISA pun?
there.isn’t one-CLF BN UMNO that KENA PASS-catch by ISA too
‘There is not a single BN UMNO member who got arrested by ISA?’
(*Harapan Baru Untuk Malaysia*,
<http://anwaribrahimblog.com/2009/03/05/perbicaraan-anwar-hakim-terima-permohonan-pendakwaraya/comment-page-2/>, accessed 24/03/2010).

- c. *Penyeluk saku itu *kena* [TP aku akan [vP tangkap].
pickpocket that KENA I will catch

Evidence 2: Fronting

- When there are two or more auxiliaries in a clause, all of them must be fronted together; otherwise the sentence becomes ungrammatical (Ramli 1995:104).

- (28) a. *Sudah boleh-kah* rumah itu ___ ___ *di-jual*?
already can-Q house that PASS-sell
‘Can the house already be sold?’
- b. **Sudah-kah* rumah itu ___ *boleh* *di-jual*?
already-Q house that can PASS-sell
- c. **Boleh-kah* rumah itu *sudah* ___ *di-jual*?
can-Q house that already PASS-sell

- *Kena* does not behave like auxiliaries in this respect. Fronting an auxiliary plus *kena* leads to ungrammaticality.

- (29) a. **Sudah kena-kah* rumah itu ___ ___ *di-jual*?
already KENA-Q house that PASS-sell
- b. *Sudah-kah* rumah itu ___ *kena* *di-jual*?
already-Q house that KENA PASS-sell
‘Had the house already been sold?’
- c. **Kena-kah* rumah itu *sudah* ___ *di-jual*?
KENA-Q house that already PASS-sell

- Thus, *kena* is not an auxiliary, contra Nik Safiah et al. (1993).
- (29a) is ungrammatical because *sudah* and *kena* do not form a constituent on our analysis.

- (30) [CP -kah [TP rumah itu [TP sudah [vP kena] dijual]].
-

- *Cuba* ‘to try’, a funny predicate, exhibits the same pattern as *kena*.

- (31) a. **Sudah cuba*-kah rumah itu ___ ___ di-jual?
 already try-Q house that PASS-sell
- b. *Sudahkah* rumah itu ___ *cuba* di-jual?
 already-Q house that try PASS-sell
 ‘Had they already tried to sell the house?’
- c. **Cuba*-kah rumah itu *sudah* ___ di-jual?
 try-Q house that already PASS-sell

Evidence 3: Ambiguity

- The sentence is ambiguous when *kena* is followed by a passive clause in the same manner as funny control sentences. This confirms our claim that *kena* is a funny predicate.
- (32) *Penyeluk saku itu kena* [___ *di-tangkap* *polis*]. (cf. (24))
 pickpocket that KENA PASS-catch police
 (i) ‘The pickpocket got (i.e. had to be) arrested by the police.’
 (normal control reading)
 (ii) ‘The pickpocket has to be arrested by the police.’ (crossed
 reading)
 = ‘The police have to arrest the pickpocket.’
- (33) *Polis kena* [___ *men-(t)angkap* *penyeluk saku itu*]. (cf. (25))
 police KENA ACT-catch pickpocket that
 (i) ‘The police have to arrest the pickpocket.’ (normal control
 reading)
 (ii) *‘The pickpocket got (i.e. had to be) arrested by the police.’
 (crossed reading)
- This contrast cannot be accounted for if one regards there are two distinct *kena* morphemes or *kena* involves “lexical” ambiguity. If such an analysis were correct, one of the following should hold true:

- (a) If double voice marking is allowed, i.e. adversative passive (*kena*) + neutral active/passive (*meN-/di-*),¹⁴ interpretation (ii) in (33) should be available.
- (b) If such double voice marking is not allowed, interpretation (i) in (32) should be unavailable.

4.3 Interim summary

- Kena* passives have an active counterpart, namely sentences in which *kena* means ‘have to’.
- Kena* is not a passive marker but a funny predicate.

Q: If kena is not a passive marker, how is the voice marked?

5 Unvoiced Voice Alternation

5.1 Proposal

- We argue that no overt voice morphology is involved in the alternation between *kena* active and passive sentences. We dub this kind of voice alternation “unvoiced voice alternation.”
- We hypothesise the presence of the null voice morphemes \emptyset_{ACT} and \emptyset_{PASS} and that they head the same syntactic position as *meN-* and *di-* in morphological voices. The relevant position is usually thought to be *v* (or Voice) (Aldridge 2008; Cole et al. 2008; Tjung 2006; Sato 2008; Son and Cole 2008; Nomoto, to appear).¹⁵

¹⁴ This type of double voice marking is found in Japanese (probably not all speakers). We searched Google for “rare-rare-ta” [PASS-PASS-PAST] and got 739 hits (25/04/2010). Most instances only contain one overt subject like the Malay sentences we are concerned with, and do not seem to convey meanings very different from “rare-ta” [PASS-PAST], with a single passive morpheme. Of course, there are also cases where one or both of the two *rare*’s is/are in other uses, e.g. honorifics.

¹⁵ Alternatively, one can also hypothesise a semantic operation of passivisation (and/or activation) that applies freely and is not indicated by any overt morphology. Such a hypothesis is likely as Malay grammar seems to utilise other phonologically deficient semantic operations, e.g. INST(antiation) giving rise to the object reading of NPs (Nomoto 2010) and S(ingular)-summing giving rise to atelicity of events (Rothstein 2008a, b; Soh and Nomoto, under review). cf. association operator (Gil 2004)

(34) Unvoiced voice alternation in *kena* sentences

- a. Active
DP_{ext} kena [_{VP} Ø_{ACT} [_{VP} V DP_{int}]]
- b. Passive
DP_{int} kena [_{VP} Ø_{PASS} [_{VP} V]] (oleh) DP_{ext}

- Without *oleh* ‘by’, the surface word order of ‘DP kena V DP’ can be parsed as either (34a) (= active) or (34b) (= passive), giving rise to (structural) ambiguity.
- Most native speakers do not notice this ambiguity as it is normally resolved by pragmatics (cf. funny control).
- However, the ambiguity is real. The same sentence can be either active or passive depending on the context.

(35) Abu kena tipu perempuan itu.
Abu KENA cheat woman that

- a. ‘Abu had to deceive the woman.’ (active)
Paraphrase: Abu kena men-(t)ipu perempuan itu.
Abu KENA ACT-cheat woman that
Context: Abu is a member of a fraud syndicate and has to sell five fake diamond rings every day. If he cannot meet his sales quota, he will get beaten up by gangsters.
- b. ‘Abu was deceived by the woman.’ (passive)
Paraphrase: Abu kena di-tipu oleh perempuan itu.
Abu KENA PASS-cheat by woman that
Context: Abu had bought many presents for the woman, believing that her words that she loved him were true. But after he bought her a BMW car, he has not been able to contact her. The woman turned out to be a “pisau cukur” or a gold digger.

5.2 Other examples of unvoiced voice alternation

Ter-

- It is probable that unvoiced voice alternation is also responsible for constructions with *ter-* because *ter-* may also occur in both active and

passive sentences with no overt morphosyntactic clue to distinguish between the active and the passive.¹⁶

- (36) a. Active
Polis *ter*-tangkap lelaki itu.
police TER-arrest man that
‘The police arrested the man by mistake.’
- b. Passive
Lelaki itu *ter*-tangkap (oleh) polis.
man that TER-catch (by) police
‘The man was mistakenly arrested by the police.’

(37) Unvoiced voice alternation in *ter-* sentences

- a. Active
DP_{ext} [_{VP} Ø_{ACT} [_{FP} *ter-* [_{VP} V DP_{int}]]]
- b. Passive
DP_{int} [_{VP} Ø_{PASS} [_{FP} *ter-* [_{VP} V]]] (oleh) DP_{ext}

Passive in Thai

- Thai passive with *dooy* ‘by’ exhibits essentially the same pattern, i.e. the active and the passive differ only in the relative order of the theme and the agent DPs, and the presence of the word meaning ‘by’.

- (38) a. Nákkhian mii hö khian rōng nán
writer have name write story that
‘A famous writer writes that story.’
- b. Rōng nán khian *dooy* nákkhian mii chö
story that write by writer have name
‘The story is written by a famous writer.’

(Sudmuk 2003:406)

¹⁶ The prefix *ter-* conveys multiple meanings. See Soh (1994a, b) for a description and an analysis of them. Kartini (in preparation) discusses unvoiced voice alternation in *ter-* sentences in more detail, paying attention to different functions of the prefix.

6 Conclusion

6.1 Summary

- *Kena* passives have an active counterpart, namely sentences with *kena* meaning ‘have to’.
- *Kena* is not a passive marker but a funny predicate.
- In previous studies, the ambiguity of *kena* (adversative passive and ‘have to’) is a lexical ambiguity: either there are two *kena* morphemes or *kena* is polysemous. However, the two findings above led us to a novel analysis: the ambiguity is a structural one, with *kena* sentences being a funny control construction (see Nomoto 2008, to appear for an analysis of why funny control sentences are ambiguous).
- There is no overt voice marker in *kena* sentences when *kena* is not followed by morphological or bare voice sentences (unvoiced voices).

6.2 Implications

6.2.1 Passive without passive morphology

- Haspelmath (1990) claims that given the definition of passives in (39), “in general passive constructions without passive morphology do not exist” (27).

- (39) a. The active subject corresponds either a non-obligatory oblique phrase or to nothing; and
b. the active direct object (if any) corresponds to the subject of the passive; and
c. the construction is somehow restricted vis-à-vis another unrestricted construction (the active), e.g. less frequent, functionally specialized, not fully productive.

- We are uncertain whether the third point in (39) is essential. If it is not, unvoiced voice alternation in Malay (and Thai) provides a counter example to Haspelmath’s claim.

6.2.2 Riau Indonesian

- According to Gil’s (2002) description of Riau Indonesian, the language does not indicate thematic roles either by word order or verbal

morphology.¹⁷ (In (40)-(42), the external and the internal argument of the predicate are indicated by italics and boldface respectively.)

- (40) a. *Aku* pasang **dua ribu**, Rip.
1SG attach two thousand FAM-Arip
[Playing cards and betting]
‘I’ll place two thousand, Arip.’
b. **Bom** pasang *dia*.
bomb attach 3
[Watching a movie on TV.]
‘They’re going to set off a bomb.’
(Gil 2002:247)
- (41) *Saya* di-cari **sepuluh** lagi.
1SG DI-see ten CNJ.OP
[Playing Mario, trying to get additional bonus points]
‘I’m trying to get ten more.’
(Gil 2002:250)
- (42) **Eddy Tansil** tak bisa nangkap *orang*.
Eddy Tansil NEG can N-catch person
[About an infamous criminal who escaped Indonesia to China]
‘Nobody can catch Eddy Tansil.’
(Gil 2002:260)

- One can analyse this flexibility of Riau Indonesian in terms of unvoiced voices.

¹⁷ Gil (2007) further claims that prosody does not help either. Incidentally, similar sentences are also found in Malay (Standard Colloquial and Sabah Malay), and speakers report the intuition that the two meanings for sentence (i) below are distinguished by the presence/absence of a pause.

- (i) Buaya tengok aku tadi.
alligator see 1SG just.now
(a) ‘An alligator was watching me just now.’ (neutral intonation)
(b) ‘As for alligators, I saw one just now.’ (a pause between *buaya* and *tengok*)

Note that such an intuition does not necessarily have to be reflected in the actual acoustics of the sentence, as it may be an “illusion” that the speakers have reflecting a particular kind of syntactic or informational structure.

- Unvoiced voice alternation is found in at least two constructions in Malay: sentence with *kena* and sentences with *ter-*.
- Then, it becomes possible to capture differences between Malay and Riau Indonesian by means of the degree of productivity of unvoiced voices—Riau Indonesian is as ordinary/extraordinary a language as Malay.

6.3 Remaining problems

1. What is the identity of null voice morphemes in unvoiced voice sentences?

Possibility 1: Unpronounced version of morphological voice markers, i.e. *meN-* and *di-*.

Possibility 2: The same morphemes as involved in bare voices.

Possibility 3: A third type of voice, which cannot be reduced to the two basic voices.

(43) Morphological voices

- a. Active: Ali [_{VP} **mem-** [_{VP} baca surat itu]].
- b. Passive: Surat itu [_{VP} **di-** [_{VP} baca] oleh Ali].

(44) Bare voices

- a. Active: Ali sudah [_{VP} Ø [_{VP} baca surat itu]].
- b. Passive: Surat itu sudah [_{VP} Ali Ø [_{VP} baca]].

(45) Unvoiced voices (with *kena*)

- a. Active: Ali kena [_{VP} Ø [_{VP} baca surat itu]].
- b. Passive: Surat itu kena [_{VP} Ø [_{VP} baca] oleh Ali].

2. What are the licensing conditions of unvoiced voices?
3. Indonesian does not seem to have the active use of *kena* ('have to'). How could one explain this dialectal difference between Malay and Indonesian?

Tentative answer: *Kena* is a funny predicate in Malay, but not in Indonesian (then, what is it?).

References

Abdul Hamid Mahmood. 1992. *Ayat Pasif Bahasa Melayu*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.

- Aldridge, Edith. 2008. Phase-based account of extraction in Indonesian. *Lingua* 118: 1440-1469.
- Arbak Othman. 1981. *Tatabahasa Bahasa Malaysia*. Kuala Lumpur: Sarjana Enterprise.
- Asmah Hj. Omar and Rama Subbiah. 1985. *An Introduction to Malay Grammar*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Asmah Hj. Omar. 2009. *Nahu Melayu Mutakhir (Edisi Kelima)*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Bao, Zhiming and Lionel Wee. 1999. The passives in Singapore English. *World Englishes* 18: 1-11.
- Chung, Sandra. 1976. On the subject of two passives in Indonesian. In C. N. Li (ed.) *Subject and Topic*, 57-99. New York: Academic Press.
- Chung, Siaw Fong. 2005. *Kena* as a third type of the Malay passive. *Oceanic Linguistics* 44: 194-214.
- Cole, Peter and Gabriella Hermon. 1998. The typology of wh-movement: Wh-questions in Malay. *Syntax* 1: 221-258.
- Cole, Peter, Gabriella Hermon and Yanti. 2008. Voice in Malay/Indonesian. *Lingua* 118: 1500-1553.
- Dardjowidjojo, Soenjono. 1978. *Sentence Patterns of Indonesian*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Gil, David. 2002. The prefixes *di-* and *N-* in Malay/Indonesian dialects. In F. Wouk and M. Ross (ed.) *The History and Typology of Western Austronesian Voice Systems*, 241-283. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Gil, David. 2004. Riau Indonesian *sama*: Explorations in macrofunctionality. In M. Haspelmath (ed.) *Coordinating Constructions*, 371-424. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Gil, David. 2007. Intonation and thematic roles in Riau Indonesian. In C. Lee et al. (eds.) *Topic and Focus: Cross-linguistic Perspectives on Meaning and Intonation*, 41-68. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Guillfoyle, Eithene, Henrietta Hung and Lisa Travis. 1992. Spec of IP and Spec of VP: Two subjects in Austronesian languages. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10: 375-414.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1990. The grammaticalization of passive morphology. *Studies in Language* 14: 25-72.
- Kartini Abd. Wahab. In preparation. *Struktur Pasif Bahasa Melayu*. Ph.D thesis, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.
- Keenan, Edward. 1985. Passive in the world's languages. In T. Shopen (ed.) *Language Typology and Syntactic Description*, 243-281. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

- Koh, Ann Sweesun. 1990. *Topics in Colloquial Malay*. Ph.D thesis, University of Melbourne.
- Nik Safiah Karim. 1978. *Bahasa Malaysia Syntax: Some aspects of Its Standardization*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Nik Safiah Karim, Farid M. Onn, Hashim Haji Musa and Abdul Hamid Mahmood. 1993. *Tatabahasa Dewan Edisi Baharu*. Kuala Lumpur Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Nomoto, Hiroki. 2006. Voice in Colloquial Malay relatives. In Y. Tsuruga et al. (eds.) *Gengojouhougaku Kenkyuuhokoku 12*, 97-116. Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- Nomoto, Hiroki. 2008. A unified analysis of funny control. Paper presented at the 12th International Symposium on Malay/Indonesian Linguistics (ISMIL).
- Nomoto, Hiroki. 2010. Reference to subkinds and the role of classifiers. Paper presented at the 2010 annual meeting of Linguistic Society of America (LSA).
- Nomoto, Hiroki. To appear. Analisis seragam bagi kawalan lucu. In H. Nomoto, Anwar R. and Zaharani A. (eds.) *Kajian dan Pendidikan Bahasa: Tinta Kenangan bagi Profesor Isamu Shoho*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Nomoto, Hiroki and Isamu Shoho. 2007. Voice in relative clauses in Malay: A comparison of written and spoken language. In Y. Kawaguchi et al (eds.) *Corpus-Based Perspectives in Linguistics*, 353-370. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Polinsky, Maria and Eric Potsdom. 2008. The syntax and semantics of wanting in Indonesian. *Lingua* 118: 1617-1639.
- Ramli Haji Salleh. 1995. *Sintaksis Bahasa Melayu: Penerapan Teori Kuasaan dan Tambatan*. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka.
- Rothstein, Susan. 2008a. Two puzzles for a theory of lexical aspect: Semelfactives and degree achievements. In J. Dölling, T. Heyde-Zybatow and M. Schäfer (eds.) *Event Structures in Linguistic Form and Interpretation*, 75-197. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Rothstein, Susan. 2008b. Telicity, atomicity and the Vendler classification of verbs. In S. Rothstein (ed.) *Theoretical and Crosslinguistic Approaches to the Semantics of Aspects*, 43-78. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Saddy, Douglas. 1991. WH scope mechanism in bahasa Indonesia. In L. L. S. Cheng and H. Demirdash (eds.) *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 15: More Papers on Wh-Movement*, 183-218.
- Sato, Yosuke. 2008. *Minimalist Interfaces: Selected Issues in Indonesian and Javanese*. Ph.D thesis, University of Arizona.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1985. Passives and related constructions: A prototype analysis. *Language* 61: 821-848.
- Sneddon, James Neil. 1996. *Indonesian: A Comprehensive Grammar*. Canberra: Allen & Unwin.
- Soh, Hooi Ling. 1994a. External arguments and *ter-* in Malay. In P. Koskinen (ed.) *Proceeding of the 1994 Annual Conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association*, 535-546. Department of Linguistics, University of Toronto.
- Soh, Hooi Ling. 1994b. *Aspect and the Organization of Argument Structure and Phrase Structure: Evidence from Malay*. Master's thesis, University of Calgary.
- Soh, Hooi Ling. 1998. Certain restrictions on A-bar movement in Malay. In M. Pearson (ed.) *Proceedings of the Third and Fourth Meetings of Austronesian Linguistics Association 1996-1999*, 295-308. Department of Linguistics, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Soh, Hooi Ling and Hiroki Nomoto. 2009. Progressive aspect, the verbal prefix *meN-*, and the stative sentences in Malay. *Oceanic Linguistics* 48: 148-171.
- Soh, Hooi Ling and Hiroki Nomoto. Under review. The Malay verbal prefix *meN-* and the unergative/unaccusative distinction.
- Son, Minjeong and Peter Cole. 2008. An event-based account of *-kan* constructions in Standard Indonesian. *Language* 84: 120-160.
- Tjung, Yassir. 2006. *The Formation of Relative Clauses in Jakarta Indonesian: A Subject-Object Asymmetry*. Ph.D thesis, University of Delaware.
- Sudmuk, Cholthicha. 2003. The *thuuk* construction in Thai. In M. Butt and T. H. King (eds.) *Proceeding of the LFG03 Conference*, 402-423. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Voskuil, Jan E. 2000. Indonesian voice and A-bar movement. In I. Paul et al (eds.) *Formal Issues in Austronesian Linguistics*, 195-214. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Willett, Marie Louise. 1993. Object preposed constructions in Malay. Master's thesis, Memorial University of Newfoundland.