

Register and voice differences in Madurese

Helen Jeoung

University of Pennsylvania

In this talk I examine the voice system of a western variety of Madurese, using novel data. I refine previous accounts of a two-voice system in the language by showing that in the polite register, there exist three voices. The talk further demonstrates that polite Madurese exhibits a pattern similar to varieties of Indonesian which allow object extraction when the verb bears a null prefix; however, familiar Madurese does not allow object extraction at all.

REGISTER AND VOICE. Madurese is an SVO language with three registers or speech levels: familiar speech, polite speech, and a less productive middle level (Davies 2010). Only the polite and familiar registers are discussed here.

In (1) the verb *tembhal* ‘call’ is used in polite speech. Polite Madurese exhibits three voices, each with distinct voice morphology on the verb: active voice (1a) is marked with either the prefix *a-* or a homorganic nasal prefix; a canonical or western-style passive voice (1b) is marked with *e-*; and an object voice in which the verb bears a null prefix (1c). Similar to object voice in Indonesian, the Agent DP must be adjacent to the object voice verb and cannot undergo movement or pro-drop (Chung 1976, Cole et al 2008, Sneddon et al 2012). The object voice Agent is restricted to certain DPs in Madurese: personal pronouns and a limited set of kinship terms such as *ramah* ‘father.’

- | | |
|--|--|
| (1) Polite register | (2) Familiar register |
| a. <i>Ramah n-embhal-ih potra-epon.</i>
father AV-call-Appl son-Def.Pol
‘Father called his son.’ | a. <i>Pak Ali ng-ato-eh ana’-eng.</i>
Mr Ali AV-call-Appl child-Def
‘Mr. Ali called his child.’ |
| b. <i>Potra-epon e-tembhal-ih sareng ramah.</i>
son-Def.Pol PV-call-Appl by.Pol father
‘His son was called by father.’ | b. <i>Ana’-eng e-kato-eh bi’ Pak Ali.</i>
child-Def PV-call-Appl by Mr Ali
‘His child was called by Mr Ali.’ |
| c. <i>Potra-epon ampon ramah ∅-tembhal-ih.</i>
son-Def.Pol Perf.Pol father OV-call-Appl
‘Father called his son.’ | c. <i>*Ana’eng la kaulah ∅-kato-eh.</i>
child-Def Perf 1s.Fam OV-call-Appl
‘I called the child.’ |

The existence of the object voice in the polite register has not previously been described of Madurese, which has been observed to have only active and passive verbal morphology (Killiaan 1897, Stevens 1968, Davies 2010). Indeed in the familiar register, active and passive are the only two voice possibilities, as shown in (2) with the familiar verb *kato* ‘call.’ Familiar voice morphology is identical to that of polite verbs, as shown in the active clause in (2a) and the passive clause in (2b). An object voice construction (with null verbal prefix and pronominal Agent) is ill-formed in familiar speech (2c); this object voice-type clause is also not possible with active or passive verbal prefixes. Therefore, the polite register of Madurese exhibits three voices, while the familiar register exhibits two voices only.

Note that in basic active or passive clauses, bare verbs cannot occur, as shown in (3) and (4). (A few intransitive verbs like *mole* ‘go home,’ are exceptions in that they never take active voice prefixes.)

- | | |
|--|--|
| (3) Polite register | (4) Familiar register |
| a. <i>*Ramah ∅-tembhal-ih potra-epon.</i>
father call-Appl son-Def.Pol
‘Father called his son.’ | a. <i>*Pak Ali ∅-kato-eh ana’-eng.</i>
Mr Ali call-Appl child-Def
‘Mr. Ali called his child.’ |
| b. <i>*Potra-epon ∅-tembhal-ih sareng ramah.</i>
son-Def.Pol call-Appl by.Pol father
‘His son was called by father.’ | b. <i>*Ana’-eng ∅-kato-eh bi’ Pak Ali.</i>
child-Def call-Appl by Mr Ali
‘His child was called by Mr Ali.’ |

REGISTER AND OBJECT EXTRACTION. In polite active clauses, both subjects and objects can be extracted in a pseudo-cleft. While subject extraction is allowed with active voice morphology (5a), object extraction is ungrammatical with the same prefix (5b). Only when the verb appears bare (i.e. without overt

voice morphology) can the object be extracted (5c). This bare active voice verb morphologically resembles the verb in object voice clauses (compare (5c) and (6a)). Cole et al (2008) show that for several varieties of Malay and Indonesian in which a similar object extraction restriction obtains, obligatory word order serves as a diagnostic: the Agent must appear before auxiliaries in active voice (5c), but after auxiliaries in object voice (6a).

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(5) Polite AV - Subject and object extraction</p> <p>a. Ramah se ampon m-acah buku jiyah.
father C Perf.Pol AV-read book that
'It was Father who read that book.'</p> <p>b. *Buku jiyah se ramah ampon m-acah.
book that C father Perf.Pol AV-read
'It was that book which father read.'</p> <p>c. Buku jiyah se ramah ampon bacah.
book that C father Perf.Pol read
'It was that book which father read.'</p> | <p>(7) Familiar AV - Subject extraction only</p> <p>a. Daud se la m-acah buku jiyah.
Daud C la AV.read book that
'It was David who read that book.'</p> <p>b. *Buku jiyah se Daud la m-acah.
book that C Daud Perf AV.read
'It was that book which David read.'</p> <p>c. *Buku jiyah se Daud la bacah.
book that C Daud Perf read
'It was that book which David read.'</p> |
| <p>(6) Polite OV - Subject extraction</p> <p>a. Buku jiyah se ampon ramah Ø-bacah.
book that C Perf.Pol father OV-read
'It was that book which father read.'</p> | |

Turning to familiar speech, this register patterns with other languages that allow only subjects to be extracted. Subject extraction in a familiar clause is shown in (7a). Object extraction is impossible in familiar register (7b), even when the verb is bare (7c). The pseudo-cleft strategy is also employed for relatives and WH-questions, and the contrast between (5c) and (7c) also obtains in those constructions.

Since some verbs such as *bacah* 'read' may be used in both polite and familiar speech, the contrast between (5c) and (7c) is not determined by the verb root. I consider several analyses that have been proposed for the impossibility of object extraction, including a blocking or deletion analysis (e.g. Saddy 1991, Voskuil 1996) in which an active voice prefix must be deleted for objects to extract; and the feature agreement analysis proposed by Cole et al (2008).

SELECTED REFERENCES

- Chung, Sandra. 1976. On the subject of two passives in Indonesian. In *Subject and Topic*, C.N. Li (ed.) New York: Academic Press.
- Cole, Peter, Gabriela Hermon and Yanti. 2008. Voice in Malay/Indonesian. *Lingua* 118:10.
- Davies, William D. 2010. *A Grammar of Madurese*. New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Killiaan, H. N. 1897. *Madoereesche Spraakkunst*. Batavia: Landsdrukkerij.
- Saddy, Douglas. 1991. WH scope mechanisms in Bahasa Indonesia. In *More papers on WH movement*, L. Cheng and H. Demirdache (eds.) 183-218. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 15, Cambridge, Mass: MIT, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy.
- Sneddon, James, K. A. Adelaar, D. N. Djenar and M. Ewing. 2012. *Indonesian: A Comprehensive Grammar*, 2nd ed. New York: Routledge.
- Voskuil, Jan. 1996. *Comparative Morphology: Verb Taxonomy in Indonesian, Tagalog and Dutch*. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.