The Fifth International Symposium On The Languages of Java

Title: The passive voice in dialectal and standard Javanese

Noor Malihah*

*State Institute of Islamic Studies Salatiga, Java, Indonesia

noormalihah_itah@yahoo.com

The passive voice in dialectal and standard Javanese

This paper presents a quantitative descriptive analysis of passive voice construction in Javanese, specifically the non-standard Kudus dialect. To the author's knowledge, this is the first ever corpus-based study of the Javanese dialect of Kudus. The corpus was constructed in the course of fieldwork in Kudus, sampling three genres: spontaneous conversation, elicited spoken narratives, and newspaper articles. This corpus was then exhaustively annotated for several syntactic/semantic features, including transitivity, voice and verb argument animacy/humanness and semantic role. Using this annotated corpus, an extensive investigation was undertaken into the di- affix in the Kudus dialect which encodes the passive function as compared to the Standard Javanese.

The results indicate the existence of an abbreviated agentive passive – an agentive passive in which the oblique is not marked by a preposition. This abbreviated agentive passive occurs more frequently than the agentive passive but less frequently than the agentless passive; it prefers not to co-occur with the causative. On this point, this finding fits the pattern that Siewierska (1984) has argued for, in which the agentless passive is the most common variant of the passive.

This paper also demonstrates the semantic features of the two main noun phrases in the passive i.e. the subject (promoted patient) and the oblique (demoted agent), looking at their animacy and humanness. On this point, the results do not fit what Croft's (2003: 174) argument that animate noun phrases are used more frequently in the subject position of the passive. The passives of Kudus dialect are in fact likely to have inanimate subjects. This part of analysis also shows that all the passives in this study have only animate demoted agent. However, human demoted agents appear more frequently than animal agents.

Finally, a somewhat unusual point regarding to the passive of Kudus dialect is that the *unmarked passive*, a variant of the di- passive construction in which the di- is dropped. The absence of the active marker in this construction marks the verb as passive. The results also show that there is a tendency that the unmarked passive is most likely to be used as an agentless passive. The results suggest that the less colloquial the genre, the less likely the unmarked passive is to occur.

Data

Type of	FS		SS		WR	
passive	N of tokens	% (out of 533)	N of tokens	% (out of 149)	N of tokens	% (out of 77)
PASS1 (Agentive)	88	16.5	4	2.7	7	7.2
PASS2 (Abbreviated)	113	21.2	16	10.7	13	13.4
PASS3 (Agentless)	332	62.3	129	86.6	77	79.4
Total	533	100.0	149	100.0	97	100.0

Table 1. The distribution of the Kudus dialect passive types in each corpus

Example (1a) is a passive clause from the spontaneous speech corpus. The patient aku '1S' is a subject and the agent *dokter* 'doctor' is an oblique. (1b) is the active clause corresponding to the passive in (1a). In (2b), the agent *dokter* is the subject and the recipient *aku* is the indirect object. This example is ditransitive with an unstated patient. The *recipient* is the object – the only object, because the other object, the patient, is not present. This active clause contains the nasal prefixed verb *mesen* 'order'. *mesen* corresponds to *dipesen* in the passive. The subject of the active clause is demoted to an oblique in the passive. However, the oblique is not marked by a preposition. Therefore, this is an example of the abbreviated agentive passive.

(1) a. SS:02:F:A:C: 235 (Spontaneous speech)

Akundung di-pesendokter1SthenPASS-orderdoctor'Then, I was asked by the doctor (to do something).

b. Active (manipulated)

ndung	dokter	mesen	aku
then	doctor	ACT.order	1 S

'Then, the doctor asked me (to do something).'

	Subject animacy					
Passive type	Anin	nate	Inanimate			
	N of tokens	% of tokens	N of tokens	% of tokens		
PASS1 (Agentive)	52	52.5	47	47.5		
PASS2 (Abbreviated)	78	54.5	65	45.5		
PASS3 (Agentless)	290	54.0	247	46.0		
All passives	420	53.9	359	46.1		
Baseline	3,392	78.3	940	21.7		

	Demoted agent humanness					
Passive type	Hui	man	Non-human			
	N of tokens	% of tokens	N of tokens	% of tokens		
PASS1	40	40.8	58	59.2		
(Agentive)						
PASS2	63	44.4	79	55.6		
(Abbreviated)						
PASS3	471	87.4	68	12.6		
(Agentless)						
All passives	574	73.7	205	26.3		

(2) a. FS:08:M:A:C: 007 (example of PASS1)

Asu-ne	kan	terus	di-cokot	karo	bulus-e
Dog-DEM	EMPH	I then	PASS-bite	by	turtle-DEM

'The dog was then bitten by the turtle.'

Table 4. The distribution of the *di*- passive and the unmarked passive across the three

passive types

The presence of the $di-$ marker in the	PAS (Agen			PASS3 (Agentless)		All passives		
di- marker in the $di-$ passive	N of tokens	% of tokens	N of tokens	% of tokens	N of tokens	% of tokens	N of tokens	% of tokens
with <i>di</i> -	94	13.0	134	18.4	499	68.6	727	100.0
without <i>di</i> – (unmarked passive)	5	9.6	8	15.4	39	75.0	52	100.0
All passives	99	12.7	142	18.2	538	69.1	779	100.0

(3) a. FS:19:M:C:R: 052

Sikil sing kengen cokot kuro-kuro

Leg that right bite turtle

'The right leg was bitten by a turtle.'

References

- Arka, IW and Kosmas J. 2002. Passive without passive morphology? Evidence from Manggarai. In Arka, IW and Ross, M (eds.). *The many faces of Austronesian voice system: some new empirical studies.* Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- Chung, S. 1976b. On the subject of two passives in Indonesian. In Li, C (ed.). Subject and Topic. New York: Academic Press.
- Cole, P and Hermon, G. 2005. Subject and non-subject relativization in Indonesian. *Journal* of East Asian Linguistics 14(1): 59-88.
- Cole, P, Jonczyk, E and Lilley, J. 1999. A note on extraction from object position in Javanese and other Javanic languages. In Smallwood, S and Kitto, C (eds.). *Proceedings of AFLA VI*, 87-93. Toronto: University of Toronto.
- Conners, T. 2008. Javanese Tengger. PhD dissertation: Yale University.
- Croft, W. 2003. *Typology and Universals*. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dardjowidjojo, S. 1974. The role of overt markers in some Indonesian and passive sentences. *Oceanic Linguistics* 13(1): 371-389.
- Davies, W. 1995. Javanese Adversatives, Passives, and Mapping. *Journal of Linguistics* 31(1): 15-51.
- Davies, W. 1999. Madurese and Javanese as strict word-order languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 38(1): 152-167.
- Dixon, RMW. 2000. A typology of causatives: form, syntax and meaning. In Dixon, RMW and Aikhenvald, A (eds.). 2000. *Changing valency. Case studies in transitivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keenan, EL and Dryer, MS. 2007. Passive in the worlds' languages. In Shopen, T (eds.). Language typology and syntactic description. Clause structure. Volume 1. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Luján, ER. 2010. Semantic maps and word formation: Agents, Instruments and Related semantic roles. *Linguistic Discovery* 8(1): 162-175.
- Robson, S. 2002. Javanese grammar for students. Revised edition. Clyton: Monash Asia Institute.
- Shibatani, M. 1985. Passives and related constructions: a prototype analysis. *Language* 61(4): 821-848.
- Siewierska, A. 1984. The Passive: a comparative linguistic analysis. London: Croom Helm.

- Siewierska, A. 2005. Passive constructions. In Haspelmath, M, Dryer, M, Gil, D, and Comrie, B (eds.). *The World Atlas of Language Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Siewierska, A. and Bakker, D. 2012. Passive agents: prototypical vs. canonical passives. In Brown, DP, Chumakina, M and Corbett, GG (eds.) *Canonical Morphology and Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sofwan, A. 2010. Applicative Constructions in Javanese. Language Circle Journal of Language and Literature 5 (1): 1-26.