

## The Representation of the Indonesian Passive with Bound Pronouns *ku* and *kau*

In this paper, I propose a single structure for the active and passive clauses in Indonesian which includes the representation of the Indonesian bound-pronoun agents, *ku*- and *kau*-. Indonesian has two passive constructions, the regular passive and the one with bound-pronoun agents *ku* and *kau* as follows:

- (1) *Buku ini sudah di-baca oleh Amir*  
Book this alreadyPass-read by Amir  
'The book has been read by Amir'
- (2) *Buku ini sudah ku/kau baca*  
Book that already 1st Sing/2nd Sing read  
'The book has been read by I/ you'

I treat the construction in (2) as a passive based on the evidence provided by Arka and Manning (1998) which proves that the subject of the bound-pronoun passive can be relativized, a trait exclusively belongs to the subjects in Indonesian.

To the best of my knowledge, there is no formal representation which can accommodate both the regular and the bound-pronoun passives. This is due to the fact that the agent of the active and the passive are usually represented with different structures and therefore cannot explain why a passive agent can be located before a verb. The agent of the active is widely believed to originate at the Spec of Voice Head following Kratzer (1996). The passive construction also contains a Voice head, but its agent is realized by a bundle of theta features on Voice and is physically spelled out as an adjunct in a by-phrase (Pylkkänen 1999, Embick 2004, Landau 2006). Unfortunately, this construction can only represent the regular passive and not the bound-pronoun passive.

Collins (2005) attempts to generate a single structure for the active and passive clauses. He proposes that the by-phrase can be derived from the same underlying position as the subject of the active by merging it at the Voice Pass head. The verb phrase is then smuggled from inside the vP past the external argument in the VoicePass to land at VoicePassP as a sister of VoicePass'. The theme DP inside the smuggled VP is then raised to the spec of T. Unfortunately, Collins (2005) construction also fails to explain the position of the bound-pronoun agents and can only explain the position of the by-phrase agent. Legate (2010) argues that Collins's (2005) solution cannot account for the bound-pronoun passive since the verb precedes the agent while a bound-pronoun agent should immediately precede the verb. To solve the problem, Legate (2010) offers leap-frogging with successive cyclic movement through the edge of the voice. The theme DP leapfrogs through the edges of the Voice to occupy the Spec of Voice. The agent DP is merged underneath the theme DP at Voice'. However, Legate's (2010) solution can only explain the bound-pronoun passive but not the regular by-phrase passive.

I propose a new representation of Indonesian passive based on Legate (2010), Merchant (2013), and Bowers' (2010) framework. First, I agree with Legate (2010) that the Voice Phrase should be originated high in the derivation above the vP. However, the agents of the passive in the current framework are not originally merged in the Voice P. On the contrary, they start from the same position low in the derivation. I provide evidence for the high position of the VoiceP with Merchant's (2010) framework on voice mismatches in ellipsis which occurs because the VoiceP is a separate head merged high in the derivation between TP and vP. On the other hand, I provide the evidence of the agents originated low in the derivation from the framework of Bowers (2010) which proposes an agent head at the base of the derivation.