

The Indonesian *Di*- Passive and Discourse Contexts

I Nyoman Udayana

Department of English Language, Udayana University, Bali, Indonesia

Abstract—The syntactic analysis of the formation of an Indonesian active clause into a passive one has been much done in the literature. However, the research of the Indonesian passive into its discourse contexts has been understudied. The present study seeks to fill the lacuna. The findings show that an active clause and its passive clause counterpart change in the topic-comment relation, characterized by a change of definiteness status in the NP subject of the passive clause (NP patient) which serves to maintain the semantic interdependence between the NP object of the active clause and the NP subject (of the passive clause). The prohibition of passive clauses with the first and second person agent by-phrases is dependent upon the type of verbs that the *di*-passive co-occur with. NP agent by-phrases is also affected by discourse contexts tied to (im)politeness. It is also shown that the definiteness status of NP patients in agentless *di*-passive is affected by that of the NP agent. In addition to this, the omission of the NP agent by-phrase is made to avoid attributing direct responsibility for the action to the agent itself.

Index Terms—*di*-passive clause, agent by-phrase, definiteness, cohesive relation

I. INTRODUCTION

The standard syntactic operation that is related to the formation of an active clause into a passive clause is that the object of the active clause occupies the subject position and the subject of the erstwhile active clause is turned into a peripheral function (Quirk et al., 1985; Lingfelt & Solstad, 2006). In Indonesian, passivization is seen as a process whereby the verb of the active clause is AV-marked (agentive-focus verb) while the corresponding passive clause is marked with the prefix *di*-which is attached to the verb base, yielding *di*-passive.

- (1) a. Dia membeli buku itu
3SG AV.buy book that
'(S)he bought the book'
b. Buku itu dibeli oleh dia
book that PAS.buy by 3SG
'The book was bought (by him/her)'

There is another form of a passive clause in Indonesian in which the preverbal prefix is instead filled by the *ter*-prefix, as in (2).

- (2) Buku itu terbeli oleh dia
book that PAS.buy by 3SG
'the book got bought by him/her'.

The passive that is marked with the *di*- prefix is called canonical passive while the *ter*-passive is termed the non-canonical passive. The *ter*-passive and the *di*-passive exhibit volitionality contrast. The former is associated with non-volitional passive while the latter is the volitional passive. The *ter*-passive has the same property as the get passive in English (which is categorized as non-canonical passives) (Reed, 2011; Alexiadou, 2012; Alexiadou & Schäfer, 2013).

A construction which is also claimed as belonging to passive in Indonesian is the preposed construction (Sneddon et al., 2010; Voskuil, 2000).

- (3) Buku itu dia beli
book that 3SG OV.buy
'(S)he bought the book'

This form has been rejected to be classified as passive by Arka (1998, 2003) for the reason that the argument structure having to do with the construction still bears its agent argument. Under this view, the construction in (3) remains transitive and the associated verbal predicate does not undergo a decrease in valence. This construction might have a passive meaning because it resembles the standard *di*-passive in that the subject equally bears the patient role; however, syntactically, it is referred to as "passive semu" (non-canonical passive) (Cole et al., 2006).

Research into Indonesian passivization has largely been conducted merely from the perspective of syntax. The present study is especially devoted to filling in this lacuna by examining the interface of syntax and discourse contexts in the *di*-passive. The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 2 focuses on the NP patient and its (in)definiteness. Section 3 talks about the NP agent by-phrase and (im)politeness. Section 4 discusses the omission of NP agent by-phrase and (in)definiteness, and section 5 is the conclusion.

II. NP PATIENT AND (IN)DEFINITENESS

Information packaging related to the active-passive relationship, as has been noted, holds that an NP object of the active clause is promoted into subject function in the passive clause counterpart. The change of grammatical function status is not accompanied by semantic information status. That is, the subject of the passive clause which bears the patient role in the active clause remains a patient in the passive clause, ensuring that the two clauses are not isolated clauses but rather are connected.¹ The connectedness between them is shown by the change in the topic-comment structure. The object of an active clause which used to constitute the comment is changed into the topic in the passive clause. The change of topic-comment relation requires a change in the definiteness status (Halliday & Hassan, 1976; Simpson et al., 2011). That is the definiteness of the NP subject of the passive clause changes to guarantee that there is a texture between the active clause and the passive clause. In what follows, we are looking at the definiteness of the NP subject of the agentive passive clause.

The agentive passive here is seen as a passive which contains the agent by-phrase. Let us consider the active clause in (4a) which is turned into its passive counterpart in (4b).

- (4) a. Tono membeli buku
 name AV.buy book
 'Tono bought a book/books'
 b. #Buku dibeli oleh Tono
 book PAS.buy by name
 'A book was bought by Tono'

The formation of an active clause into a passive one is not merely done by applying the rules of passivization (i.e., the attachment of the preverbal prefix *di-* to the verb base and the patient is made to occupy the subject position and the definiteness status of the promoted subject is simply retained or made unchanged). In a stretch of clauses, if the noun in the second mention remains indefinite as shown in (4b), the NP book is considered new information. Thus, semantically speaking, the book in (4b) does not belong to Tono because there is no cohesive relationship that holds between (4a) and (4b) in a discourse context, either in a spoken or written (discourse) context. The change of definiteness status here ensures that (4b) is taken as having an infelicitous reading in its relationship to the active counterpart. Importantly, it is correctly predicted that the NP subject in (4a) is best turned into a DP to guarantee that the object of the active clause and the subject of its corresponding passive clause are the same entity, as shown in (5).

- (5) Buku itu dibeli oleh Tono
 book that PAS.buy by name
 'The book was bought by Tono'

Sentence (4a) has its indefinite singular NP object of an active clause. Now, we wish to look at the indefinite plural NP object of an active clause. This bare plural NP object is rarely found; instead, the occurrence of the singular bare NP object predominates.

- (6) a. Mereka memperbaiki rumah/?rumah-rumah
 3PL AV.repair house/houses
 'They repaired a house/houses'
 b. Rumah-rumah/?rumah bagus
 house-RED/ house beautiful
 (i) Houses are beautiful
 (ii) ?A house is beautiful
 c. Rumah-rumah itu/ #rumah-rumah diperbaiki oleh mereka
 house-RED that/ house-RED PAS.repair by 3PL
 'The houses/# houses were repaired by them'

There is some kind of subject-object asymmetry in the active-passive relationship shown in (6). The asymmetry shows that the plural bare NP fares well in the subject position in the active/passive or declarative clause but not in the object position. The idea is that the bare NP is interpreted as being generic (Wijaya, 2012). The genericness of the bare NP *rumah* indicates that it can either have a singular or plural interpretation in Indonesian (Loewen, 2011). However, there is a tendency (in discourse context) that such genericness interpretation does not apply to an NP occupying the subject position as shown in (6c).

Indefiniteness, instead of bare NP, can also be expressed with a classifier in Indonesian such as *sebuah*, *seekor*, and *seorang*. However, unlike the bare nouns, the nouns that combine with a classifier receive a singular interpretation as indicated by the morpheme *se-* meaning 'one' attached to the word *buah*, *ekor*, and *orang* which means 'fruit', 'tail', and 'person' respectively. Thus, *sebuah* as a classifier is generally associated with talking about fruits, *seekor* with animals, and *seorang* with persons/human beings. However, a motorcycle, for example, is an object that certainly cannot be linked to a human being or an entity having a tail. So in this respect, the classifier *sebuah* can be used; thereby qualifying *sebuah* as an unmarked classifier.

¹ For ease of exposition, the subject NP of the passive clause is called NP patient while the subject NP of the active clause or the object NP of the PP (by phrase) of the passive clause is called NP agent.

- (7) a. Dia membeli sebuah sepeda
3SG AV.buy a bicycle
'S(he) bought a bicycle'
- b. Sepeda itu dibeli oleh dia
bike that PAS.buy by 3SG
'The bike was bought by him/her'
- (8) a. Mereka memiliki seekor kucing
3PL AV.own a cat
'They own a cat'
- b. Kucing itu dimiliki oleh mereka
cat that PAS.own by 3PL
'The cat was owned by them'
- (9) a. Ali memanggil seorang teman
name AV.call a friend
'Ali called a friend'
- b. Teman itu dipanggil oleh Ali
friend that PAS.call by name
'The friend was called by Ali'

If the NP object of the active clause is already definite, the discourse process does not affect its status. In other words, the definiteness status of the NP subject of the corresponding passive remains the same, as shown in (10). However what is interesting here is that, next to demonstrative article *itu*, definiteness in Indonesian can be expressed with the bound definite marker *-nya* and the modifier *tersebut* 'already mentioned'. It has to be noted that the modifier *tersebut* indeed shows evidence in itself that a passive utterance/clause cannot commonly stand in isolation, i.e., without being derived from its active clause counterpart.

- (10) a. Mereka sudah mengirim sepedanya
3PL PERF AV.send bicycle.DEF
'They have sent their bicycles'
- b. John mengirim sepeda-sepedanya
name AV.send bicycle-RED.POSS
'John sent his bicycles'
- c. Ali menjual buah-buah tersebut
name AV.sell fruit-RED that
'Ali has sold the fruits that have been mentioned (lit.)/Ali has sold those fruits'
- (11) a. Sepedanya sudah dikirim
bicycle.DEF PERF PAS.send
'The bike has been sent'
- b. Sepeda-sepedanya dikirim
bicycle-RED.DEF PAS.send
'The bicycles have been sent'
- c. Buah-buah tersebut dijual
fruit-RED that PAS.sell
'The fruits have been sold'

The evidence that the change in definiteness status associated with an NP patient of an agentive passive comes from a narrative text /discourse talking about an object, as illustrated in (12).

- (12) Wanita itu mengambil sebuah buku. Kemudian buku itu dibuka dan dilihat oleh wanita itu. Lalu, wanita menulis dalam buku itu. Setelah itu, wanita tersebut membaca dan melihat-lihat isi buku tersebut. Kemudian buku itu ditutup dan ditinggalkan oleh wanita tersebut di atas meja. Tak berapa lama kemudian, datang seorang laki-laki. Laki-laki itu menghampiri buku tersebut. Kemudian, buku itu dibaca oleh lelaki tersebut.
(The woman took a book. Then the book was opened and seen by the woman. Then she wrote something on it. After that, she read and looked at the contents of the book. Then it was closed and left by the woman on the table. Shortly thereafter, a man came. The man approached it. Then, it was read by the man)

It is clear from the texts above that the active clauses containing an indefinite NP patient are turned into definite NP in the subject of the passive clause, written in the bold type in the texts. Importantly, this sample text constitutes a thematic paragraph in which the same NP topic mentioned in the middle or final position of a paragraph must be definite (Givón, 1983, p. 10). This phenomenon is also in support of the fact that passives are taken as a strategy for topic continuity in discourse. That is, the known part bearing the topic function (in the discourse) occupies the clause-initial position (Guijarro, 2006).

Definiteness, as mentioned above, is the salient factor that determines the NP subject of passive constructions (more specifically in the agentive passive). This rule is universal. The claim is supported by Huddleston and Pullum (2005) by the English data. Sentence (13b) is acceptable because the subject NP (NP patient) is old information. However,

sentence (14b) is judged as marginally acceptable because the NP patient which used to be new information (marked by indefinite NP) in the active clause which now turns out to be the topic remains to be treated as new information in the passive clause.

Huddleston and Pullum (2005, pp. 242-243)

- (13) a. A dog attacked me in the park
- b. I was attacked by a dog in the park
- (14) a. I bought a tie
- b. ?A tie is bought by me

In conclusion, the change of the definiteness status is only applied to the NP Patient. However, the NP agent is not sensitive to the discourse as depicted in the following tables.

TABLE 1
THE NP PATIENT

Active	Passive
Indefinite	Definite
Definite	Definite

TABLE 2
THE NP PATIENT

Active	Passive
Indefinite	Indefinite
Definite	Definite

III. NP AGENT BY-PHRASE AND (IM)POLITENESS

As has been indicated in the foregoing discussion, there are cases where the agent by-phrase is intently expressed in a discourse context. What is surprising here is that the explicit presence of the agent by-phrase in Indonesian is only limited to the third-person agent. In other words, the long passive (the name which is commonly associated with the passive with the agent by-phrase in the literature) with a person value other than the third person is taken as being prohibited (Sneddon et al., 2010) Let us first deal with the appearance of the first and second NP agent by- phrase.

The prohibition of a first and second agent by-phrase is compensated by a preposed construction, as illustrated in (15b).

- (15) a. Baju itu dibeli oleh *saya/ *kamu/*kami
 shirt that PAS.buy by 1SG/ 2/ 1PL
 ‘The shirt was bought by me/ you/ us’
- b. Baju itu saya/ kamu/ kami beli ²
 shirt that 1SG/ 2/ 1PL OV.buy
 ‘I/you/we bought the shirt.’

Both sentence (15a) and sentence (15b) are an instance of passive constructions (Sneddon et al., 2010). The former is categorized as passive type one while the latter as passive type two. However, sentence (18b), as has been previously explained, is categorized as an active clause because the agent *saya* and *kamu* are obligatorily present which shows that they are not a passive construction. What is more is that this preposed construction is, predictably, not only restricted to the first and second NP by-phrases but is also acceptable with the third-person agent. Conclusively, this suggests that the construction works similarly to the canonical active construction because there are no agent constraints. Alternatively, if one judges that sentence (15a) containing first and second person by- phrase as being prohibited, sentences in (15b) must be equally taken as being unacceptable.

The prohibition (of the first person and second person agent by-phrase) does not seem to have a strong ground. The obvious counterexample has to do with the passive imperative. Imperatives are clauses whose subject NP is commonly directed/ targeted to a second person (Rupp, 2003; Wurff, 2007; Alcázar & Saltarelli, 2014; Jary & Kissine, 2014). Imperatives in Indonesian may take a passive form as shown in (16). Like imperatives in other languages the agent, precisely the agent by-phrase, does not appear explicit. However, Balinese, which also possesses passive imperatives, can allow its presence (see Udayana, 2013). In Indonesian, given that we are committed to applying the rule of long passives that only makes it possible for the third person agent by-phrase, passive imperatives should be unavailable.

- (16) a. Mohon ditunggu!
 please PAS.wait
 ‘Let it be awaited!’
- b. Tolong dikirim hari ini!
 please PAS.send today

²The view in support of the claim that the OV construction (the construction containing the object-focus verb) here has active not passive interpretation comes from the notion of symmetrical voice system in which the OV construction is taken to encode the same function as the AV construction (the construction containing the agentive-focus verb), i.e. they are equally transitive. For more information on symmetrical voice system, see Arka (2002, 2003), Himmelmann & Riesberg (2013), Riesberg & Primus (2015).

‘Let it be sent today!’

It has to be noted that the use of passive imperative in (16a) and (16b) relates to politeness for the reason that although the addressee associated with the imperative does not appear overtly in surface syntax, passivization has the effect such that the addressee concerned is taken to be indirectly expressed resulting in the fact that the expression is used for indirect instruction. Therefore, it serves as a strategy for exhibiting a polite expression in Indonesian. On the other hand, a declarative passive whose agent by-phrase is filled by the first or second person is associated with impoliteness. Consider the following examples:

- (17) a. Saya/ kamu mencuri buku
1'SG 2 AV.steal book
‘I/you stole a book’
b. Saya/kamu memarahi orang itu
1SG/2 AV.anger person that
‘I/you angered the man’
- (18) a. Buku itu dicuri oleh *saya /*kamu
book that PAS.steal by 1SG /2
‘The book was stolen by me/you’
b. Orang itu telah dimarahi oleh *saya/ *kamu
person that PERF PAS.anger by 1SG /2
‘The man was angered by me/you’

Comparing (17) with (18), an interesting result emerges. The use of the first and second-person NP agent in the active clause, in (17a-b), does not pose any problem. However, their occurrence in the passive clause, in (18a-b), turns out to be ungrammatical. The reason for this is that the active clause is canonical construction in which there are no constraints associated with the use of any type of person. We have noted that a passive clause is a derived construction. This is manifested by the fact that, in an utterance, the active clause comes first the passive clause comes later. The co-occurrence of the two clauses enters into a discourse relation. As noted above, the book becomes definite in the passive clause to maintain the semantic interdependence, i.e. ‘the book’ being talked about in an active clause refers to the same referent in the passive clause. The NP agent of the active clause is turned into an NP agent by-phrase. The NP agents of the first and second person remain to become old information in the discourse. Recall that both the first person and second person are old information because they participate jointly in a speech event suggesting that they need to save each other’s face. The second mention of the first and second-person pronouns (in the passive clause) relates to directness which is evaluated as an impolite utterance (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Ogiermann, 2009; Leech, 2014; Culpeper et al., 2017).

Not all types of verbs used are sensitive to signaling politeness along the lines of (18). A case in point is shown by the verb such as *tandatangan* ‘sign’ and *terima* ‘receive’. The co-occurrence of the first and second person by-phrase with these verbs in this (discourse) context indeed constitutes a welcome sort of action that does not ultimately lead to a face-threatening act. That is, it can be said that the interactants involved satisfy each other’s face wants which of course does not engender any offense at all.

- (19) a. Dokumen ini ditandatangani oleh saya/ saudara
document this PAS.sign by 1SG/ 2
‘This document was signed by me/you’
b. Buku ini diterima oleh saya/ kamu/ tadi pagi
book this PAS.receive by 1SG/ 2 this morning
‘This book was received by me/you this morning’

A clause such as (19a) is often found in a legal document in which there are several stipulations for the document to be implemented. The parties entering into a contract, for example, must agree to the same terms and the mark of approval in the form of a signature that must be made by them. Given the implementation of this sort of agreement, the use of the first person and second-person by-phrase (i.e. between the sender and the sendee) in (19b) also achieves the same purpose, i.e. it does not cause a face-threatening act.

Turning to the third person in the NP agent by- phrase, quite different from (15a), only the NP third-person by phrase is compatible with *di*-passive (Sneddon et al., 2010), as shown in (20).

- (20) Buku itu di-ambil oleh *saya/ *kamu/ dia
book that PAS-take by 1SG/2/3SG
‘The book was taken away by me/you/him/her’

However, if compared with *ter*- passive, the situation turns out to be different. That is, all types of person are permitted, ensuring the fact that the first, second, and third-person by-phrases can co-occur with the *ter*- passive and the resulting sentence is perfectly acceptable.

- (21) Buku itu terambil oleh saya/ kamu/ dia
book that PAS.take by 1SG/2/3
‘The book got taken away by me/you/him/her’

The characteristic difference between the two passives is triggered by the lexical semantics of the passive form. The *di*-passive is an instance of agentive passive while the *ter*-passive is accidental passive. Thus the insertion of agent-oriented adverbial *sengaja* ‘intentionally’ to a clause containing *di*-passive makes the status of the *di*-passive clear and the same is true with the *ter*-passive, the insertion of the adverb *tidak sengaja* ‘unintentionally’ corroborates its status as non-agentive/ accidental passive.

- (22) a. Buku itu sengaja diambil oleh *saya/ *kamu/ dia
 book that intentionally PAS.take by 1SG 2 3SG
 ‘The book was intentionally taken away by me/you/him/her’
 b. Buku itu tidak sengaja terambil oleh saya /kamu/dia
 book that NEG intentionally PAS.take by 1SG/2/3SG
 ‘The book was unintentionally taken away by me/you/him/her’

Another piece of evidence to show the compatibility of the two passives, the *di*-passive and the *ter*-passive, to combine with the appropriate person-type in the NP agent by-phrase can be linked to the apology test. Apologizing is as an act whose purpose is to maintain the harmonious relationship between a speaker and a hearer (Ogiermann, 2009, p. 45). If one takes away someone’s book is taken as an offense, expressing an apology can thus help to maintain the relationship. For our purposes, we wish to show that combining apologizing with the lexical semantics of the *di*- passive and *ter*- passive results in the obvious (in)compatibility of the type of person in the NP agent by-phrase that can co-occur with the two passives.

- (23) a. Saya/kamu/dia minta maaf buku itu sengaja diambil oleh *saya/ *kamu/ dia
 1SG/2/3SG ask apology book that intentionally PAS.take by 1SG/2/3SG
 ‘I/you/(s)he apologized that this book was intentionally taken by me/you/him/her’
 b. Saya/ kamu/ dia minta maaf buku ini tidak sengaja terambil oleh saya/kamu/dia
 1SG/ kamu/ 3SG ask apology book this NEG intentionally PAS.take by 1SG/2/3SG
 ‘I/you/(s)he apologized that this book was unintentionally taken by me/you/him/her’

(23a) shows that the co-occurrence of apology expression and the associated interpretation of the *di*-passive still hold that the first and second person agent by-phrase remains to be incompatible. This indicates that the act threatens the speaker and the hearer’s face. The speaker and the hearer need to value each other but combining an apology with an intentional action of this sort does not match to repair the relationship between the interactants it is quite in the opposite direction in that they harm each other’s face instead. On the other hand, we expect that the third person must undergo the same effect as the first person and second person but as also predicted, the third person by-phrase here seems to be unaffected because they are not involved or not co-present in the speech event, ensuring that the third-person’ face here does not get affected. The case with (23b) is contrary to (23a) the expression of apology matches with the unintentional eventuality involved, allowing for the situation that the apology is successful, and expressing apology here leads to showing all the persons’ intention of expressing politeness.

IV. OMISSION OF NP AGENT BY-PHRASE AND (IN)DEFINITENESS

Passive constructions undergo a decrease in valence or participant (Blevins, 2003; Lyngfelt & Solstad, 2006). That is, if an active clause is divalent (having two participants), its corresponding passive construction will be monovalent (having one participant) and if an active clause is trivalent (having three participants), its passive construction counterpart will be divalent.

- (24) a. John menjual buku (active = divalent)
 name AV.sell book
 ‘John sold a book’
 b. Buku itu dijual oleh John (passive = monovalent)
 book that PAS.sell by name
 ‘The book was sold by John’
 (25) a. Tini memberikan dia buku (active = trivalent)
 name AV. give.APPL3SG book
 ‘Tini gave him/her a book’
 b. Dia diberikan buku oleh Tini (passive = divalent)
 3SG PAS.give.APPL book by name
 ‘(S)he was given a book by Tini’

Valence here is then exclusively related to syntax. Thus, it can be said that the presence of the agent by the phrase is required for a discourse process. That is, discourse allows the expansion of a clause more than just required by syntax. As a clause indicating the valence-decreasing phenomenon, the agent by-phrase is, therefore, generally omitted without affecting the grammaticality of the resultant clause. In other words, the NP agent of a passive clause is relegated to a peripheral function, or the agent is deemed to constitute a non-core function, leading to a situation that is no longer important in syntax.

The omission of doer/performer of a passive clause yields an agentless passive (Quirk et al., 1985; Arka & Kosmas, 2005). In a syntactic operation, there are three main ways for leaving out the NP agent by-phrase. First, the appearance of the agent by-phrase is redundant (because it is readily understood in the discourse context), as shown in (26).

- (26) a. Tono melawan Amir bermain bulu tangkis dan Amir dikalahkan
 name AV.fight name MV.play badminton and name PAS.defeat
 'Tono fought Amir playing badminton and Amir was defeated'
- b. John dan Ali saling berpukulan. John memukul Ali kemudian Ali dirobohkan
 name and name REC MV.hit name AV.hit name then name PAS.knock.down
 'John and Ali hit each other. John hit Ali then Ali was knocked down'

Second, the agent is unknown or unidentified in the discourse. Consider the active clauses in (27), whose passive counterparts are respectively given in (28):

- (27) a. Ada yang mengatakan tudingan ini dilatari motif pergeseran dari sesama
 exist REL AV.say accusation this PAS.motivate motive shift from fellow
 negara eksportir
 country exporter
 'There was someone who said that this was motivated by a shift in motives from fellow exporting countries' / 'Someone said that this was motivated by a shift in motives from fellow exporting countries'.
- b. Dulu orang mengasuransikan pabrik dan bangunan rumah.
 formerly people AV.insure.CAUS factory and building house
 'People used to insure factories and houses'
- (28) a. Dikatakan tudingan ini dilatari motif pergeseran dari sesama negara eksportir
 PAS.say accusation this PAS.motivate motive shift from fellow country exporter
 'It was said that the accusation was motivated by a shift in motives from fellow exporting countries'
- b. Dulu pabrik dan bangunan rumah diasuransikan
 formerly factory and building house PAS.insure.CAUS
 'Factories and houses used to be insured'

It has to be noticed that the material that occupies the subject position in the active clause is indefinitely marked by existential clause *ada* 'there is (someone)' in (27a) and an indefinite NP *orang* 'people', in (27b). Rendering the active clause of the type in (27a) into passive is commonly done by the fact that the subject of the passive clause does not consequently materialize or empty in Indonesian because it has no semantic content. In English, however, it can be filled by the empty *it* as shown in the translation. Note that the construction in (27a) involves an object which is realized by a clause. However, quite contrary to (28a), the resulting passive clause as shown in (29a) is judged unacceptable. There is another form of the passive clause that can be generated from the active clause in (27a). The empty subject of the passive clause in (27a) can be filled by the subject of the clausal complement giving rise to a raising construction, as given in (29b).

- (29) a. ?*Bahwa tudingan ini dilatari motif pergeseran dari sesama negara eksportir
 that accusation this PAS.motivate motive shift from fellow country exporter
 dikatakan
 PAS.say
 'That this accusation was motivated by a shift in motives from fellow exporting countries was said'
- b. Tudingan ini dikatakan dilatari motif pergeseran dari sesama negara eksportir
 accusation this PAS.say PAS.motivate motive shift from fellow country exporter
 'This accusation was said to be motivated by a shift in motives from fellow exporting countries'

In a discourse context, a passive clause may lack its active clause counterpart because of the absence of the agent participant. This often occurs in an activity that requires a human agent.

- (30) a. Gencatan senjata/ #itu telah dicapai
 ceasefire that PERF PAS.achieve
 '#The/ ceasefire has been achieved'
- b. Pemerintah?/ Menteri itu?/ Jenderal Lee? telah mencapai gencatan senjata
 government/ minister that/ General name? PERF AV.achieve cease fire
 'The government?/the Minister?/ General Lee?/has achieved a cease fire'

Sentence (30a) shows that the agent is unknown, one cannot single out the agent as listed on the subject in (30b). It is not possible to get a unique active clause counterpart of (30a). The discourse context, in this state of affairs, then can be said to allow the choice of passive without prior exposure to the corresponding active clause. This, predictably, amounts to saying that, in contrast to agentive passive, the subject of the passive clause in question can therefore appear indefinite or without taking an indefinite marker. Notice that making the NP subject definite is judged here as infelicitous. This possibility is achieved because the passive clause in question is discourse-new information (Birner & Ward, 2004; Birner, 2006, 2012, 2013).

Third, the agent NP by-phrase is purposefully omitted. What sets this third type different from the second type is that, in the second type, the agent is unknown but the agent of the third type is identified but avoided for a certain reason.

- (31) a. Tono menyerang gadis itu
 name AV.attack girl that
 'Tono attacked the girl'
 b. Mereka bahkan menentang suatu daftar indikatif.
 3PL even AV.oppose a list indicative
 'They even opposed an indicative list'
- (32) a. Gadis itu diserang
 girl that PAS.attack
 'The girl was attacked'
 b. Daftar indikatif itu bahkan ditentang
 list indicative that even PAS.oppose
 'The indicative list was even opposed'

The preference for passive voice, precisely agentless passive, as illustrated in (32a-b), plays a strategic role, for example, in journalistic writing. This phenomenon is observed in the Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework (Fairclough, 1995). The chief use of agentless passives is to intentionally leave the doer or performer of the action unspecified, thereby avoiding attributing direct responsibility for the action to the doer and more specifically "denying or minimizing" the possible involvement in violence associated with the doer (Van Dijk, 2008, p. 166). As in the case of (32a), for example, we have noticed the doer is Tono but for the speaker; the choice of passive, more importantly, the agentless passive, is preferred because the speaker wishes to conceal the responsibility of the doer.

V. CONCLUSION

This paper demonstrates the effect of a discourse context on the Indonesian canonical *di*-passive. Three main points emerge. First, there is a change in the definiteness status of the NP patient. What is important in a discourse context is that the definiteness status of the NP subject of the passive clause shows an asymmetric relationship with the NP subject of the corresponding active clause. While the former is sensitive to definiteness, the latter is not. This stands to reason that it is the NP object that undergoes a promotion to a higher position in discourse while the NP subject of the active clause undergoes a demotion. Thus, as far as the active-passive process is concerned, it is the NP subject of the active clause that plays a very important role in the topic-comment relation and its connection to definiteness status.

Second, the presence of the NP agent by-phrase (in a passive clause) is deemed unimportant; leading to its optionality in surface syntax. However, the obvious presence of the first and second-person NP agent by-phrase is prohibited in Indonesian. This suggests that it is supposedly connected to politeness which might be possible because Indonesian can be said to somewhat have a speech style system as evidenced by, for example, the fact that Indonesian has different forms of second-person pronouns ranging from second person denoting formal one such as *saudara* to the form indicating non-formal use such as *kamu/kau*. However, there is a small portion of the discourse context that might lend support to this claim. Dishonoring first and second persons in which the persons involved use lexically inappropriate verbal expressions associated with the phenomenon and the use of verbs having no socio-cultural contexts make it impossible to tie it up with politeness which ultimately causes the possibility of the NP agent to be related to all persons (first, second, and third persons).

Third, the agentless *di*-passive is also tied to discourse context. The agentless passive works similarly to the long passive in that the NP patient must be turned indefinite in the corresponding passive clause. In some cases, the definiteness status of the NP patient can be parallel to the definiteness status of the NP agent. However, the NP patient in an agentless passive may remain indefinite because it appears as new information in the discourse (context).

REFERENCES

- [1] Alcázar, Asier & Saltarelli, Mario. (2014). *The Syntax of Imperatives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511794391>.
- [2] Alexiadou, Artemis & Schäfer, Florian (eds). (2013). *Non-canonical Passives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- [3] Alexiadou, Artemis. 2012. 'Noncanonical passives revisited: Parameters of Nonactive Voice'. *Linguistics*: 50 (6), 1079-1110. DOI: 10.1515/ling-2012-0036
- [4] Arka, I Wayan. (2002). *Voice systems in the Austronesian languages of Nusantara: Typology, Symmetricality, and Undergoer orientation*. A paper presented at the 10th National Symposium of the Indonesian Linguistics Society, Bali-Indonesia
- [5] Arka, I Wayan. (2003). *Balinese Morphosyntax: A Lexical-Functional Approach*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics
- [6] Arka, I Wayan & Kosmas, Jeladu. (2005). Passive without Passive Morphology? Evidence from Manggarai in Arka, I W. & Ross, M (eds). *The Many Faces of Austronesian Voice System: Some New Empirical Studies*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics
- [7] Birner, B. & Ward, G. (2004). Information Structure and Non-canonical Syntax. In Horn, L. and G Ward (eds.). *The Handbook of Pragmatics*. London: Blackwell, 153-174.
- [8] Birner, Betty J. (2006). Inferential Relation and Noncanonical Word Order in Birner, Betty J. and Gregory Ward (eds.). *Drawing the Boundaries of Meaning: Neo-Gricean Studies in Pragmatics and Semantics in Honor of Laurence R. Horn*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- [9] Birner, Betty J. (2012). *The Discourse Function of Inversion in English*. New York: Routledge.

- [10] Birner, Betty J. (2013). *Introduction to Pragmatics*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- [11] Blevins, James P. (2003). Passives and Impersonals. *Journal of Linguistics* 39 (03), 473 – 520. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/4176832>.
- [12] Brown, Penelope & Levinson Stephen C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [13] Cole, Peter, Hermon, Gabriella, & Tjung, Yassir. (2006). Is there Pasif Semu in Jakarta Indonesian? *Oceanic Linguistics* 45 (1), 64-90. DOI:10.1353/ol.2006.0009
- [14] Culpeper, Jonathan, Haugh, Michael, & Kádár, Dániel Z. (eds). (2017). *The Palgrave Handbook of Linguistic (Im)politeness*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [15] Fairclough, Norman. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. London: Longman
- [16] Givón, Talmy (ed.) (1983) *Topic Continuity in Discourse: A quantitative Cross-language Study*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- [17] Guijarro, A. Jesús Moya. (2006). The Continuity of Topics in Journal and Travel Texts: A Discourse Functional Perspective. *Functions of Language* (13) 1, 37-76. DOI:10.1075/fo1.13.1.03moy
- [18] Halliday, MAK & Hassan, Ruqaiya. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- [19] Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. & Riesberg, Sonja. (2013). Symmetrical Voice and Applicative Alternations: Evidence from Totoli. *Oceanic Linguistics*. 52 (2), 396-422. DOI: 10.1353/ol.2013.0021
- [20] Huddleston, Rodney & Pullum, Geoffrey K. (2005). *A Student's Introduction to English Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [21] Jary, Mark & Kissine, Richie Mikhail. (2014). *Imperatives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- [22] Leech, Geoffrey. (2014). *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [23] Lingfelt, Benjamin & Solstad, Torgrim (eds.). (2006). *Demoting the Agent: Passive, Middle, and Other Voice Phenomena*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- [24] Loewen, Gina. (2011). *The Syntactic Structure of Noun Phrases in Indonesian*. The University of Manitoba Master Thesis.
- [25] Ogiermann, Eva. (2009). *On Apologising in Negative and Positive Politeness Cultures*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company
- [26] Quirk, Randolph et al. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- [27] Reed, Lisa A. (2011). Get-passives in *The Linguistic Review* (28), 41-78. DOI: 10.1515/tlir.2011.002
- [28] Riesberg, Sonja & Primus, Beatrice. (2015). Agent Prominence in Symmetrical Voice Language. *STUF - Language Typology and Universals* 68 (4), 551-564. <https://doi.org/10.1515/stuf-2015-0023>
- [29] Rupp, Laura. (2003). *The Syntax of Imperatives in English and Germanic: Word Order Variation in Minimalist Framework*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- [30] Simpson, Andrew et al. (2011). Bare Classifiers and Definiteness: A Cross-linguistic Investigation in *Studies in Language* 35(1), 168 – 193. DOI:10.1075/sl.35.1.10sim
- [31] Sneddon, James Neil, Adelaar, A., Djenar, D. N., & Ewing, Michael C. (2010). *Indonesian: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London: Routledge.
- [32] Udayana, I Nyoman. (2013). *Voice and Reflexives in Balinese*. Ph.D. Dissertation the University of Texas at Austin.
- [33] Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [34] Wijaya, David. (2012). Teaching English Generic Nouns: The Explorations of the Generic Idea in English and Indonesian and the Applications of Explicit Instruction in Classroom. *Indonesian Journal of English Language Teaching* Vol. 8. No.1, 93-107. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.25170%Fijelt.v8il.92>.
- [35] Voskuil, J.E. (2000). Indonesian Voice and A-Bar Movement. In Paul, Ileana, Phillips, V., & Travis, L. (eds.). *Formal Issues in Austronesian Linguistics*, 195-212. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- [36] Wurff, Wim van der. (2007). *Imperative Clauses in Generative Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.



I Nyoman Udayana is a senior lecturer in linguistics at the Department of English Language, Faculty of Humanities Udayana University. He earned his Ph.D. from the University of Texas at Austin. His research interests are syntax, lexical semantics, and discourse grammar. He primarily focuses his research on verbs and argument realization and more specifically on the close relationship between verb-predicate's meaning and their argument(s) that lead to constructions related to reflexivization, logophoricity, and other similar constructions about valency-preserving or valency-changing phenomena. He is also interested in projects concentrating on the interface between syntax and discourse grammar in Indonesian and Balinese.