1. Introduction

Bare passive (a.k.a. passive type 2, pasif semu, zero passive, object(ive) voice)

(1) The defining properties of bare passives
   a. No overt voice morphology on V.
   b. The internal argument behaves as a subject.
   c. The external argument (hereafter “agent”) is adjacent to V.

(2) Standard Indonesian

   [IA Suart ini] harus [EA saya] [V tandatangani].
   letter this must I sign.on

   ‘I must sign this letter.’

(3) Verbal inflection in Standard Indonesian

   a. Bare: tandatangani ‘to sign on; to be signed on’
   b. MeN-active: men[t]andatangani ‘to sign on’
   c. Di-passive: ditandatangani ‘to be signed on’

Background

* A common reaction when I talk about bare passives in Standard Malay, a closely related language:

*This study is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 18K00568.
1. The stem-initial voiceless obstruent undergoes deletion. The deleted consonant is indicated by the brackets here.
People: “Only pronouns are allowed as the agent, right?”
Me: “Not necessarily.”
(in heart) “Why do people keep saying this??”

- I know it’s obviously from their knowledge about Standard Indonesian.
- In Standard Indonesian, bare passive agents are restricted to pronouns and pronoun substitutes (= non-pronominals with 1st/2nd person reference) (Sneddon et al. 2010:257).

(4) Standard Indonesian (Sneddon et al. 2010:259)
   Suart ini harus bapak tandatangani.
   letter this must father sign.on
   ‘{You/*Father} must sign this letter.’

- However, no such restriction exists in Standard Malay.

(5) The question: Which is the norm among the languages having bare passives?
   a. Standard Indonesian type: The agent is restricted to pronouns and pronoun substitutes. ← Many people seem to believe this.
   b. Standard Malay type: The agent is not so restricted.

This study

1. Shows that the Standard Malay type is the norm based on a cross-linguistic survey. (§2)
2. Proposes an implicational hierarchy of possible bare passive agents. (§3)
3. Presents an analysis of bare passives and their cross-linguistic variations. (§4)

2. A cross-linguistics survey

- Languages surveyed:
  - mainly in Malaysia and Indonesia
  - no systematic sampling
  - languages for which grammar descriptions are readily available (e.g. no pay-wall)
Not all grammar descriptions explicitly state the restriction on possible bare passive agents.

→ Examples were examined to find out possible ones.

BUT what is impossible often remain unclear.

2.1. Bare active vs. bare passive

To identify bare passives, one must first check whether a language has bare actives.

(6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Bare passive</th>
<th>Bare active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No overt voice morphology on V?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal argument = subject?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agent adjacent to V?</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes/no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For language with bare actives, bare passives need to be distinguished from bare actives.

The distinction is easy when Aux/Adv/Neg is present.

(7) Standard Indonesian

a. Bare active

Sejak 2001 aku sudah habiskan [ratusan juta rupiah]....

since 2001 I already finish hundreds million rupiah

‘Since 2001, I’ve spent hundreds of millions of rupiah . . . .’

b. (7a) + topicalization


since 2001 hundreds million rupiah I already finish

‘Since 2001, hundreds of millions of rupiah, I’ve spent.’

c. Bare passive corresponding to (7a)


since 2001 hundreds million rupiah already I finish

‘Since 2001, I’ve spent hundreds of millions of rupiah.’

2. This sentence was taken from the IND MXD2012 subcorpus of the Leipzig Corpus
• Without Aux/Adv/Neg, the distinction is difficult.

(8) Standard Indonesian

a. . . ., [pembicaraan indah itu] aku akhiri dengan ucapan salam khas . . . .

‘. . ., I ended the beautiful discussion with a special greeting . . . .’


‘I rode the motorcycle at a moderate speed.’

• Unfortunately, most grammar descriptions lack information about bare actives.
  → Need to figure it out from the available examples.

2.2. Philippine-type languages

• Basically outside the scope of this study, though some sentences resemble bare passives.

(9) Tagalog (Theme Voice in perfective) (adapted from Kroeger 1993:13)

B(in)ili-Ø ng lalake [ang isda] sa tindahan.

‘The man bought the fish at the store.’

http://asmakmalaikat.com/asmak_malaikat.htm
5. Some treat bare actives as derived from morphological actives through the “omission” of the overt active voice marker. The indeterminacy still arises, as long as “omission” occurs.
6. Kroeger calls the theme focus construction the “Objective Voice”. He also uses the same term for the bare passive construction (Kroeger 2014). This seems to be a coincidence, as he states: “I follow Arka & Manning (1998) and Cole, Hermon & Yanti (2008) in using the term OBJECTIVE VOICE” (p. 6).
2.3. The result

- The Standard Indonesian type is in fact not the norm.

(10)a. **Only pronouns and pronoun substitutes**: Standard Javanese (Conners 2008), Sama Bangingi’ (Gault 2002), Standard Indonesian (Sneddon et al. 2010)


3. Implicational hierarchy

- Looking closely into possible bare passive agents, I propose the implicational hierarchy in (11).

- If a language allows the items in a slot as bare passive agents, it will also allow the items to the left of that slot.

(11) **The bare passive hierarchy**

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{Clitic pronouns} & & \text{Free pronouns} & \\
1\text{st}/2\text{nd} & > & 3\text{rd} & > & \text{pronouns} & > & \text{pronoun} & \text{substitutes} \\
A & & B & & C & & D \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{Noun phrases} & & \text{Covert} & \\
> & \text{kin} & > & \text{proper} & > & \text{indefinites} & > & \text{definites} & > & \text{covert} \\
E & & F & & G & & H & & I \\
\end{array}
\]

(12)A. Standard Javanese (Conners 2008)

B. Sama Bangingi’ (Gault 2002)

D. Standard Indonesian (Sneddon et al. 2010)

E. Madurese (Jeoung 2017)

F. Malay (Guilfoyle et al.’s (1992) variety)

G. Balinese (monotransitive; Artawa 1998)
H. Balinese (ditransitive; Udayana 2012), Sasak (Asikin-Garmager 2017), Kendal Javanese (Sato 2010), Colloquial Indonesian, Standard Malay, Jambi Malay (Yanti 2010), Sarawak Malay (Mohd. Ali 2015), Minangkabau (Crouch 2009), Acehnese (Legate 2014), Sama Pangutar (Walton 1986)

I. Mualang (Tjia 2007)

- Clearly, the norm is the system of group H, where the requirement on bare passive agents is simply that they must be overt.
- While items toward the left side on the hierarchy may be preferred, DPs consisting of multiple words are also possible.

**Group A: Standard Javanese**

(11)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clitic pronouns</th>
<th>Free pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd &gt; 3rd &gt; pronouns &gt; pronoun substitutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noun phrases</th>
<th>Covert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&gt; kin terms</td>
<td>&gt; proper names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- A clear person-based split between bare and morphological passives (Conners 2008:171–172).
  - 1st/2nd agent: bare passive
  - 3rd agent: morphological passive (*di-*)

(13) Standard Javanese (Conners 2008:172)

a. Buku iku **tak=jupuk**.
   book that I=take
   ‘That book was taken by me.’

b. Buku iku **kok=jupuk**.
   book that you=take
   ‘That book was taken by you.’
Group B: Sama Bangingi’

(11) **Clitic pronouns** | **Free pronouns**
--- | ---
1st/2nd | 3rd | pronouns | pronoun substitutes
A | B | C | D

**Noun phrases**

| kin terms | proper names | indefinites | definites | covert |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
E | F | G | H | I

(14) Sama Bangingi’, bare passive (Gault 2002:372)

a. Bay na bowa=ku palauk-in pe’ ma=iya.
PST CP bring=1SG.ERG viand-the there OBL-3SG

‘I have already taken the viand there to her.’

b.*Bay na bowa e’ si Inah palauk-in pe’ ma=iya.
PST CP bring ERG PM mother viand-the there OBL-3SG

For: ‘Mother has already taken the viand there to her.’

- According to Gault (2002:372), the passive-like marker ni-/in- is preferred but not required when the agent is a third person pronoun.
- I consider the absence of ni-/in- not as its omission, but as the presence of bare passives.7

(15) Sama Bangingi’, morphological passive (Gault 2002:372)

a. Bay na b(in)owa e’=na palauk-in pe’ ma=iya.
PST CP (PASS)bring ERG=3SG.ERG viand-the there OBL-3SG

‘I have already taken the viand there to her.’

b. Without -in- (constructed) = bare passive
Bay na bowa e’=na palauk-in pe’ ma=iya.
PST CP bring ERG=3SG.ERG viand-the there OBL-3SG

‘I have already taken the viand there to her.’

**Group C** Not attested yet.

7. Gault refers to bare passives as “Patient Focus.”
**Group D: Standard Indonesian**

**Group E: Madurese**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clitic pronouns</th>
<th>Free pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Noun phrases**

- Kin terms
- Proper names
- Indefinites
- Definites
- Covert terms

**Covert**

- Names

- Madurese differs from Standard Indonesian in that it allows kin terms.\(^8\)

**Group F: Malay (Guilfoyle et al.’s (1992) variety)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clitic pronouns</th>
<th>Free pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Noun phrases**

- Kin terms
- Proper names
- Indefinites
- Definites
- Covert terms

**Covert**

- Names

- The Malay variety discussed by Guilfoyle, Hung & Travis (1992) allows proper name agents.

---

8. According to Jeoung (2017:fn. 14), Madurese does not have a pronoun substitute use of kin terms.
(17) Malay (Guilfoyle et al.’s (1992) variety)⁹

a. Anjing itu {Ali / saya / ku=} pukul.
dog the Ali I I hit
‘The dog was hit by me.’

b.*Anjing itu lelaki itu pukul.
dog the boy the hit
‘The dog was hit by the boy.’

---

**Group G vs. Group H: Construction-based split in Balinese**

(11) | *Clitic pronouns* | *Free pronouns* |
---|---|---|
| 1st/2nd | 3rd | pronouns | pronoun substitutes |
| A | B | C | D |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>Noun phrases</em></th>
<th><em>Covert</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kin terms</td>
<td>proper names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- A monotransitive clause cannot have a definite agent (18) (Group G), whereas a ditransitive one can (19) (Group H).

(18) Balinese, monotransitive (Artawa 2013:10)

a.*Nasi-n oke-ne amah bangkung-e.
rice-LINK 1SG-POSS eat pig-DEF
For: ‘The pig ate my rice.’

b. Nasi-n oke-ne amah bangkung.
rice-LINK 1SG-POSS eat pig
‘A pig ate my rice.’

---

⁹. Since no Aux/Adv/Neg is present, these sentence may be bare active sentences as well.
(19) Balinese, ditransitive (Udayana 2012:108–109)

Anak ento beli-nin *sabilang anak* baju ento.

person that buy-APPL every person shirt that

‘Everybody bought that shirt from the man.’

**Group H**  Balinese (ditransitive; Udayana 2012), Sasak (Asikin-Garmager 2017), Kendal Javanese (Sato 2010), Colloquial Indonesian, Standard Malay, Jambi Malay (Yanti 2010), Sarawak Malay (Mohd. Ali 2015), Minangkabau (Crouch 2009), Acehnese (Legate 2014), Sama Pangutaran (Walton 1986)

(11) **Clitic pronouns**  **Free pronouns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st/2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>pronouns</th>
<th>pronoun substitutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Noun phrases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>kin terms</th>
<th>proper names</th>
<th>indefinites</th>
<th>defines</th>
<th>covert</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(20) Colloquial Indonesian

Gw ga akan men-jelaskan apa yang terjadi sebelum gw tau apa

I not will ACT-explain what REL happen before I know what

yang sudah *orang itu* katakan.

REL already person that say

‘I won’t explain what happened before I know what the person already said.’

---

Group I: Mualang

(11)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clitic pronouns</th>
<th>Free pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st/2nd &gt; 3rd</td>
<td>pronouns &gt; pronoun substitutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noun phrases  
| kin terms > proper names > indefinites > definites > covert |
| E               | F             | G       | H       | I       |

(21) Mualang (Ibanic, Western Kalimantan) (Tjia 2007:177)  
Manuk pro pakay p-amis da pian.  
chicken eat CAUS-finished LOC bathing.place  

‘The chickens were eaten up at the bathing place.’ (pro = those who were attending the rite)

4. Analysis

4.1 The syntax of bare passives: The default case (Groups H–I)

- Passive voice syntax from \( v_{pass} \) (= Aldridge’s (2008) \( v_{Erg} \)).
- \( v_{pass} \) differs from \( v_{act} \) in its case-licensing property:
  1. No structural Acc case
  2. Inherent Erg case, assigned to Spec,vP
- Both \( v_{pass} \) and \( v_{act} \) project a specifier, hence transitive syntactically as well as semantically.

---

11. Mualang does not have bare actives. So, this is a bare passive sentence. Tjia refers to this construction as “inverse.”

(i) Ku *(N-)bunuh manuk.  
1SG ACT-kill chicken  
‘I killed a chicken.’ (Tjia 2007:147)
Voice signals the type of v projecting its complement (= selectional restriction) (Nomoto 2015).

Voice may contribute meanings (e.g. aspect, givenness) (Soh & Nomoto 2009, 2011, 2015; Nomoto 2015).

Bare active/passive: 

Morphological active: 

Morphological passive: 

Patient-Agent-V order

Standard Indonesian

a. Suart ini harus saya tandatangani.
letter this must I sign.on
‘I must sign this letter.’

b. Surat ini harus [VoiceP Ø [vP saya [v' vpass Ø + tandatangani] [vP <tandatangani> <surat ini> ]]]

Patient-V-Agent order

Balinese (Artawa 2013:10)

a. Nasi-n oke-ne amah bangkung.
rice-LINK 1SG-POSS eat pig
‘A pig ate my rice.’

b. Nasi-n oke-ne [VoiceP [Voice Ø + [vpass Ø + amah]] [vP bangkung [v' <vpass> [vP <amah> <nasi-n oke-ne> ]]]]
Sarawak Malay (inside relative clause) (Mohd. Ali 2015:60)

a. Baju nak pake Azlan agik sembab, yo bebau.
clothes REL wear Azlan still damp that stink
‘The shirt that Azlan wears is still damp; it stinks.’


Standard Indonesian, morphological passive (Sneddon et al. 2010:259)

a. Surat ini harus di-tandatangani bapak.13
c. letter this must PASS-sign.on father
‘This letter has to be signed by father.’

b. Surat ini harus [VoiceP [Voice di- + [vpass Ø + tandatangani]] [vP bapak [v’ <vpass>]
[VP <tandatangani> <bapak> ]]]

Classical Malay, morphological passive (hybrid type) (Nomoto 2016)

a. oleh ibu bapa=ku di-jemputkan=nya=lah segala adik kakak dalam by mother father=my PASS-invite=3=PART all sibling in
Melaka
‘my parents invited all their siblings in Malacca’ (Abd.H 32:4)

b. oleh ibu bapa=ku [VoiceP [Voice di- + [vpass Ø + jemputkan]] [vP =nya [v’ <vpass>]
[VP <jemputkan> <segala adik kakak dalam Melaka>]]] =lah segala adik kakak dalam Melaka

Accounting for the difference between Groups H and I

- Group I but not Group H allows a covert agent.
- Group I is very rare; Group H is very common.

13. See Nomoto (to appear) for evidence for the argument status of the post-adjacent agent DP.
(21) Mualang (Ibanic, Western Kalimantan) (Tjia 2007:177)

Manuk pro pakay p-amis da pian.  
chicken eat CAUS-finished LOC bathing.place

‘The chickens were eaten up at the bathing place.’ (pro = those who were attending the rite)

• **Claim:** Pro is exclusive to morphological passives in Group H.

• Classical Malay provides evidence for the agent-denoting pro in morphological passives (Nomoto 2016).

(31) Classical Malay, morphological passive (Nomoto 2016)

a. Maka duit itu di-ambil pro oleh ibu bapa=nya and money that PASS-take by mother father=3

‘And the money was taken by their parents’ (Abd.H 17:11)

b. oleh ibu bapa=ku di-jemputkan=nya=lah segala adik kakak dalam by mother father=my PASS-invite=3=PART all sibling in Malacca [= (30)]

‘my parents invited all their siblings in Malacca’ (Abd.H 32:4)

• W.r.t the phonological realization of Voice and Spec,vP, languages generally follow the pattern in (32).

(32) Voice-Agent realization reversal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passive type</th>
<th>Voice</th>
<th>Agent DP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bare</td>
<td>covert</td>
<td>overt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphological</td>
<td>overt</td>
<td>covert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Group I deviates from this general pattern (33).

→ rarely found
(33) Voice-Agent realization reversal: Deviation case 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passive type</th>
<th>Voice</th>
<th>Agent DP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bare</td>
<td>covert</td>
<td>overt/covert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphological</td>
<td>overt</td>
<td>covert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The hybrid type morphological passive in Classical Malay (30) also deviates from this pattern (34).

→ disappeared

(34) Voice-Agent realization reversal: Deviation case 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passive type</th>
<th>Voice</th>
<th>Agent DP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bare</td>
<td>covert</td>
<td>overt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphological</td>
<td>overt</td>
<td>overt/covert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The pattern in (32) probably has bearing on the following common views:
  1. Passives are intransitive ($v_{pass}$ does not project a specifier).
  2. Passive markers often develop from agent pronouns.

4.2. Special cases (Groups A–G)

(11) **Clinic pronouns**        **Free pronouns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st/2nd</th>
<th>3rd</th>
<th>pronouns</th>
<th>pronoun substitutes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

  **Noun phrases**

|   | kin terms | proper names | indefinites | definites | covert |
|---|-----------|--------------|-------------|-----------|
| E | F         | G            | H           | I         |

- For Groups A–G, the default mechanism does not work.

**Groups A–F: Anti-ergatives**

- The part of the hierarchy involving Groups A–F resembles Silverstein’s (1976) hierarchy of split ergativity:
AFLA 27 (20 August 2020, NUS)

Nominals higher in the hierarchy are less likely to be realized as ergative as opposed to nominative.

- Silverstein’s hierarchy could provide a functional motivation for the special behaviours of these groups.

- **Claim**: \( v_{\text{pass}} \) in Groups A–F lacks inherent Erg case.

\[(35) \quad [\text{VoiceP Voice} \ [v_P \ \text{Agent} \ [v' \ v_{\text{pass}} \ [v_P \ V \ Patient ]]]]\]

- Since the default case-licensing is unavailable, an alternative mechanism is called for.

\[(36) \quad \text{Licensing by adjacency (Levin 2015)}\]
Head-head adjacency is employed in place of case-licensing.

\[(37) \quad [\text{VoiceP Voice} \ [v_P \ \text{Agent} \ [v' \ v_{\text{pass}} \ [v_P \ V \ Patient ]]]]\]

Licensing by head-head adjacency

\[(38)\]

a. **A–D & F**: The agent consists only of a D head.

b. **E**: The three examples given by Jeoung (2017) are all single words: *ramah* ‘father’, *ebhu* ‘mother’, *ale* ‘younger sibling’

**Group G**

- The construction-based split remains a puzzle.

- No good reason for not assuming the default ergative case-licensing for this group.

- In fact, Levin (2015) proposes licensing by adjacency as one of the primary argument licensing mechanisms based on this group (in Balinese and Malagasy).

5. **Conclusion**

**Summary**

1. The majority of languages with bare passives are not like Standard Indonesian. The agent is not restricted to pronouns and pronoun substitutes.

3. The passive agent is licensed by inherent Erg case. This is the case not only with bare passives, as argued by Aldridge (2008), but also with morphological passives.

4. Bare passives in languages higher in the bare passive agent hierarchy (11) has a variant of $v_{pass}$ that lacks inherent Erg case. In such languages, bare passive agents are licensed by adjacency to $v$.

Implications

1. Mualang allows bare passives with a covert agent (21).
   → The overtness of the agent should not be included in the definition of bare passives. cf. (1)

2. To the extent that bare passives are related to English-type passives (e.g. Nomoto 2018), an ergative analysis of bare passives à la Aldridge (2008) is be valid for passives in general.
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