Argument possibilities in the object voice in East Javanese Indonesian

Introduction. Indonesian is recognized to have three morphosyntactic voice configurations: active, typically marked by the verbal prefix *meN-*; passive, marked by *di-*; and object, also called passive type two or bare passive, with a null prefix (Sneddon 1996; Cole, Hermon & Yanti 2008). Chung (1976), Sneddon (1996), and many others have noted that the agent in a Standard Indonesian object-voice construction such as (1a) is restricted to a pronoun that obligatorily follows the auxiliary. Sentences like (1b) with inverted agent-auxiliary order are more contentious in status, with classification ranging from active-voice topicalization (Musgrave 2001) to object voice (Chung 1976) to ungrammatical (Arka & Manning 1998).

(1) a. Buku itu   bisa kamu baca   b. Buku itu   kamu bisa   baca
        book DEM   can   2.SG   read   book DEM   2.SG   can   read
        "You can read that book"   "You can read that book"

   Drawing on new data from native speakers of Indonesian near Malang, East Java, we present a variety of Indonesian in which the object voice appears more flexible in its morphosyntactic criteria than those ascribed to the Standard Indonesian object voice. In particular, we argue that (i) the auxiliary-agent word-order restriction is a necessary but not sufficient condition for this variety's object voice, and (ii) the acceptability of an object-voice agent argument depends not on a categorical status of (non-)pronoun but rather on a prosodic condition.

Data. We identify two potential axes of flexibility in this object voice. First, speakers accept (1a) and (1b): either permutation of agent and auxiliary. Second, speakers accept all sentences in (2), in which the agent is a full DP. On close inspection, we find that (1b), (2a), and (2b) are not object-voice sentences but rather active-voice sentences subject to information-structural operations. Crucially, however, (2c) is object voice with a non-pronoun agent.

(2) a. Buku itu   sudah perempuan   tersebut   beli
        book DEM   PRF   girl   DEM   buy
        "That girl has bought that book"
     b. Buku itu   perempuan   tersebut   sudah beli
        book DEM   girl   DEM   PRF   buy
        "That girl has bought that book"
     c. Sebuah   buku   akan   guru-ku/adik-ku   beli
        CL   book   will   teacher-1.SG/younger.sibling-1.SG   buy
        "My teacher/younger sibling will buy a book"

Analysis. Analytical diagnostics include control constructions and indefinite themes. First, we apply an adaptation of Chung's (1976) control construction to embed (1a) and (1b) as (3a) and (3b), respectively. While both permutations in (1) of agent and auxiliary are acceptable, only (1a) permits a control reading when embedded. The relevant structures are schematized as follows:

(3) a. Saya   mem-beli [buku itu]$_i$ [$_{CP}$ untuk [$_{TP}$ PRO$_i$ bisa   kamu baca   t$_i$]]
        1.SG   *MEN*-buy book DEM   COMP   can   2.SG   read
        "I buy that book for you to be able to read it"
     b. Saya   mem-beli [buku itu]$_i$ [$_{CP}$ untuk [$_{TP}$ kamu (*PRO$_i$) bisa   baca (*PRO$_i$)]]
        1.SG   *MEN*-buy book DEM   COMP   2.SG   can   read
        "I buy that book for you to be able to read (*it)"

   The availability of the control reading in (3a) falls out from the accessibility of the Spec,TP position in the embedded clause, which is crucially already filled in (3b), rendering a control reading of (3b) inaccessible. While (1a) is an instance of the object voice, (1b) requires further

diagnostics. To classify sentences with agent-auxiliary ordering like (1b) and (2b), we observe the degradation of (2b) when the fronted theme becomes indefinite: a sensitivity to definiteness that is a hallmark of topicalized DPs (Gundel & Fretheim 2004).

(4)   ?Sebuah   buku   perempuan   tersebut   sudah   beli
        CL   book   girl   DEM   PRF   buy
        "A book, that girl has bought"

Sentences like (2a) also degrade with an indefinite theme (i.e. with *Sebuah buku* replacing *Buku itu*), pointing to their underlying active-voice topicalization despite the constituent ordering matching that of the object voice. However, (2c) - itself already containing an indefinite theme, *Sebuah buku* - resists such classification. The diagnosis of (2c) as object voice motivates our view that the categorical restriction against non-pronoun agents fails to characterize the object voice in East Javanese Indonesian. A purely syntactic account fails to capture, for example, why judgments degrade when the possessive clitic *-ku* in (2c) is replaced by its full-word counterpart *saya*. The morphologically complex agent DP in (2c) also resists a clitic-based account of the object-voice agent as a determiner head (Guilfoyle, Hung & Travis 1992). Instead, we consider a more gradient approach to object-voice agents according to prosody.

We propose that the agent must constitute a sufficiently small phonological domain. Our prosodic evidence recalls phonologically based distributions of object-voice agents observed in Balinese (Arka 2003) and Acehnese (Legate 2014). Present data suggest that the agent is limited to being one phonological word, composed of one stem and any suffixes (Cohn 1989), though a generalized condition set to a larger phonological domain might alternatively apply to the agent-verb complex rather than the agent itself in the phase-based derivation.

We extend the left-peripheral machinery of Fortin (2009) to account for sentences like (1b), (2a), and (2b) as active-voice sentences. For instance, we schematize (2a) in (5) as a dual instance of auxiliary fronting (to Focus projection) and theme topicalization, a paired occurrence observed in Indonesian by Fortin (2009) in interrogatives and one we consider in declaratives. This analysis is bolstered by additional evidence that a brief pause after *Buku itu* strengthens speakers' positive judgments of (2a), a prosodic trait of topicalization (Musgrave 2001).

(5)   [$_{TopP}$ [Buku   itu]$_i$ [$_{FocP}$ sudah$_j$ [$_{TP}$ perempuan tersebut   t$_j$ beli   t$_i$]]]

Implications. We situate our findings in relation to the implicational hierarchy of object-voice agents advanced in Nomoto (to appear). Our project enriches this typology with a variety that may be in transition along this hierarchy via contact with surrounding Javanese communities, particularly given Javanese's greater flexibility in permissible agent DPs in its object voice (Davies 1999). The prosodic sensitivities documented here also lend the findings to novel comparisons with N-bonding in Malagasy (Travis 2005) and syntax-phonology frameworks like Contiguity Theory (Richards 2016). In the vein of Cole, Hermon & Yanti (2008), the current study continues the program of mapping the ways in which the rich interplay among Indonesia's languages shapes each variety's grammatical restrictions and possibilities.

Selected references. Chung, S. 1976. An object-creating rule in Bahasa Indonesia. *Linguistic Inquiry* 7(1): 41-87. • Cole, P., G. Hermon & Yanti. 2008. Voice in Malay/Indonesian. *Lingua* 118: 1500-1553. • Davies, W. 1999. Madurese and Javanese as strict word-order languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 38 (1): 152-167. • Fortin, C. 2009. On the left periphery in Indonesian. In *AFLA 16*. • Guilfoyle, E., H. Hung & and L. Travis. Spec of IP and Spec of VP: Two Subject in Austronesian Languages. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*: 10(3), 375-414. • Nomoto, H. To appear. Bare passive agent hierarchy. In *AFLA 27*.