PASSIVE AGREEMENT IN ACEHNSE
JULIE ANNE LEGATE
UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Problem: Lawler (1977) argued that Acehnese exhibits a passive in which the agent in the by-
phrase triggers subject agreement, (1a). Durie’s (1988) reply revealed errors in Lawler’s data, and
proposed instead that the construction consisted of a topicalized object and ergative-marked agent. In this
talk, we present new data demonstrating that, despite Lawler’s errors, his analysis was correct: the
construction is indeed a passive. We present an analysis of the agentive agreement in terms of
semantically interpretable features on the external argument introducing head.

The Passive: On a Lawler-style analysis of the construction in (1a) the thematic object occupies an A-
position and the lé morpheme preceding the agent is a preposition comparable to by. On a Durie-style
analysis, the thematic object occupies an A-bar position and lé is an ergative case marker that only
appears when the agent is post-verbal. Several phenomena argue for a Lawler-style analysis on both
counts. The theme behaves as though it occupies an A-position. First, pronominal binding: a raised
quantificational theme may bind a pronoun in the lé-phrase but not vice versa, (2); if the theme had
occupied an A-bar position, this binding would be ruled out as a Weak Crossover violation. Second,
Condition C: a raised R-expression theme may be coindexed with a pronominal agent, (3); if the theme
had undergone A-bar movement from a position below the agent, this should be impossible (see e.g.
Lebeaux 1994, Fox 1999, on Condition C reconstruction effects). Third, control: under select matrix
verbs, a raised theme may be controlled PRO, (4) (contra Durie 1988). Fourth, locality: in the double
object construction, raising of the theme is blocked by the goal, which occupies a closer A-position, (5).
In addition, the lé+DP behaves as a prepositional phrase. First, the lé+DP can appear before the subject,
like PPs but unlike DPs, (6). Second, the lé+DP shows freedom of ordering with other PPs, while DPs do
not. Third, the lé+DP patterns like PPs for wh-questions: like PPs but unlike DPs, lé+DP cannot be
questioned with the complementizer yang, (7). We conclude that the construction is indeed a passive with
the agent in a by-phrase PP.

Agreement: Given that the construction is a passive, how does the verb agree with the DP in the by-
phrase rather than the raised theme? We propose that the apparent agreement is in fact the morphological
reflex of semantically interpretable features on the little v that introduces the external argument. These
features, including person, relative position in the social hierarchy, and inclusiveness, restrict the possible
external arguments (adapting the Restrict operation of Chung & Ladusaw 2004). For example, the little v
ji- in (3b) expresses not only that the DP in its specifier is an agent, but also that this DP is a low-ranking
third person. This analysis explains the characteristics of this agreement in Acehnese. The agreement is
found in passives, because passives include the external argument introducing little v (e.g. Marantz 2000,
Embick 2004), and hence exhibit implicit agent effects. Since the features are interpretable features of
little v, not uninterpretable features that require checking, we correctly predict that the agreement is
present in passives even when the by-phrase is absent. Furthermore, we explain the oft-mentioned split-S
(aka active-stative) property of the agreement (e.g. Durie 1988): it is present on transitive and unergative
predicates, which combine with an external argument introducing little v, but is not present on
unaccusatives, which do not. Finally, we correctly predict the position of the agreement low in the
syntactic structure, below negation and aspecual markers, prefixed to the verb root.

Extensions: We discuss a related construction in which the thematic object is again raised to subject
position, but the external argument appears in the specifier of vP instead of in a by-phrase, (8). Building
on Cole & Hermon 1998 (on the Indonesian analogue) and Travis 2000 (on Tagalog), we show that the
construction supports our analysis of the agreement morpheme as the realization of v – when the external
argument remains in the specifier of vP, the agreement morpheme is obligatorily absent. This is explained
through Sportiche’s 1992 Doubly Filled Voice Filter (as adapted by Travis 2000 for related phenomena in
Tagalog): the head and specifier of vP cannot both be overtly realized in this construction.
(1) a. Lôn ka di-kap lé asee.  
b. *Lôn ka lón-kap lé asee.  
c. cf: Asee ka di-kap lôn
1sg Perf 3Fam-bite by dog 1sg Perf 1sg-bite by dog dog Perf 3Fam-bite 1sg 
“I was bitten by the dog”  “I was bitten by the dog”  “The dog bit me”

(2) a. Tieptiep aneuk geu-lindong lé mak droe-jih  
every child 3Pol-protect by mother self-3Fam 
“Every child is protected by his/her mother”  COINDEXED
b. Aneuk geuh geu-lindong lé tieptiep mak  
child 3Pol-protect by every mother 
“His/her child is protected by every mother”  COINDEXED

(3) a. Mie aneuk aneuk miet nyan ji-
child small that 3Fam-hit by person that 
“*The children’s cat was hit by them”  COINDEXED
b. cf: Awaq nyan ji-
person Dem 3Fam-hit cat child-child small Dem 
“They hit the children’s cat”  COINDEXED

(4) Aneuq miet nyan di-tém geu-pue-ubat lé dokto  
child small that 3Fam-want 3Pol-Cause-medicine by doctor 
“The child wants to be treated by the doctor”

(5) a. *Boh mamplam geu-jôk Fatima lé Ibrahim  
fruit mango 3Pol-give Fatima by Ibrahim 
Lit: “The mango was given Fatima by Ibrahim”  “Fatima was given the mango by Ibrahim”
b. cf: Boh mamplam geu-jôk keu Fatima lé Ibrahim 
fruit mango 3Pol-give to Fatima by Ibrahim 
“The mango was given to Fatima by Ibrahim”

(6) a. Lé uleue nyan aneuk miet nyan di-kap  
by snake that child small that 3Fam-bite 
“By the snake, that child was bitten”
b. cf: Dari blang lôn ka lón-gisa 
c. cf: *Ibrahim dokto ka geu-pue-ubat from field 1sg Perf 1sg-return Ibrahim doctor Perf 3Pol-Cause-medicine 
“Ibrahim, the doctor treated”

(7) a. Lé soe (*yang) aneuk miet nyan geu-jôk keu ureueng inong nyan?  
by who C child small Dem 3Pol-give to person female that 
“By whom was the baby given to the woman?”
b. cf: Soe (yang) geu-pue-ubat lé dokto?  
who C 3Pol-Caus-medicine by doctor 
“Who was treated by the doctor?”
c. cf: Keu soe (*yang) geu-jôk lé ureueng agam nyan aneuk miet nyan?  
to who C 3Pol-give by person male that child small that 
“To whom was the child given by the man?”

(8) Ibrahim ka dokto (*geu)-pue-ubat  
Ibrahim Perf doctor 3Pol-Cause-medicine 
“The doctor treated Ibrahim”