

Passive Imperatives in Indonesian

I Nyoman Udayana

Faculty of Humanities, Udayana University
nyoman_uyayana@unud.ac.id

Published: 24/10/2022

How to cite (in APA style):

Udayana, I. N. (2022). Passive Imperatives in Indonesian. *Retorika: Jurnal Ilmu Bahasa*, 8(2), 183-191.

Abstract- An imperative clause is understood as a construction in which the subject is commonly filled by a second person but it is licitly dropped and the verb that co-occurs with it is commonly realized by a basic form in Indonesian. An active clause, on the other hand, contains an obligatory subject, the verb inflected with *meN* verbal prefix, and an object that makes the sentence readily transformed into its passive clause counterpart. Given the characteristic contrasts between an imperative clause and an active clause in Indonesian, it seems to be impossible to derive a passive imperative. However, imperative passives are available in Indonesian. The present study aims to uncover the issues of imperative passives in Indonesian. The study employs a descriptive qualitative method. Most of the data for the study were obtained from Leipzig Corpora and the remaining data were elicited from other speakers of Indonesian. Adopting the theory of a speaker commitment hypothesis for the analysis, the findings show that Indonesian has a passive imperative. This support can be evidenced by the fact that an imperative passive can be associated with a complex sentence construction in which the subject of the passive imperative clause can be recovered from the main clause thereby corroborating the idea that passive imperatives operate on a par with negative imperatives which possess prototypical passive constructions.

Keywords: Passive imperatives, Complex sentence, Inflected verbal form, Speaker commitment hypothesis

I. INTRODUCTION

The passive construction is derived from an active clause, in which the object of an active clause is promoted to be the subject of the passive clause counterpart whereas the subject of an active clause is demoted to an oblique adjunct. The illustrated example in English is given in (1).

- (1) a. John bought a book (active)
b. A book was bought (by John) (passive)

The transformation of the active clause into the passive one, as shown in (1b) is a valence-decrease operation in which the active clause

shown by its verb is divalent. The verb realizing the passive construction, on the other hand, is therefore monovalent, shown by the fact that the only argument of the passive verb 'be bought' is the subject entity but the erstwhile subject of the active clause which now occupies the object of the preposition by is rendered as optional.

Passivization in Indonesian undergoes the same operation. Authors such as Cole et al. (2008), Arka (1998, 2003) take the Indonesian passive as English style passive. However, (2c) example is also viewed as belonging to a passive construction. Arka (1998) opposes this claim. According to him, a construction such as (2c) shows that the entities that bear the semantic roles of agent and patient still participate in the

event denoted by the verb *beli*. To put it differently, the agent argument of (2c) is still available which runs counter to (2b), in which the agent is no longer available in syntax. That said, (2c) is thus taken as symmetrical to the AV clause in (2a) as exhibiting a transitive clause (Himmelmann et al., 2013; Riesberg, 2014; Riesberg & Primus, 2015).

- (2) a. *John mem-beli buku*
 John AV-buy book
 'John bought a book'
 b. *Buku di-beli oleh John*
 book PAS-buy by John
 'A book was bought by John'
 c. *Buku John beli*
 book name OV-buy
 'John bought a book'

There is the other form of passive construction in Indonesian which is flagged with *ter*-prefix. This passive is often termed unintentional passive in the literature or passive type 2 by Sneddon et al (2008) (the *di*-passive being called passive type 1). In some analyses, it is often attributed to non-canonical passive.

- (3) a. *Ani meng-ambil buku itu*
 Ani AV-take book that
 'Ani took the book'
 b. *Buku itu ter-ambil oleh Ani*
 book that PAS-take by Ani
 'The book got taken by Ani'

Turning to passivization in imperatives, like passive declaratives English passive imperatives are also available. Consider the following examples:

- (3) a. Carry it home
 b. Open the door
 c. Throw the ball
 (4) a. Let it be carried home
 b. Let the door be opened
 c. Let the ball be thrown
 (English grammar.org)

Sentences in (3) are imperative sentences in English and sentences in (4) are the passive imperative counterparts. A question arises as to whether Indonesian also possesses passive imperatives, the issue that will be addressed in the Findings and Discussion section. The goal of the article, next to finding out the fact that the

Indonesian imperative passives are available in Indonesian, we are particularly concerned with how the imperative passives in Indonesian are constructed and their similar and different properties from the English passive imperatives associated with the so-called speaker commitment hypothesis.

II. METHOD

This study was conducted based on the structural paradigm. Referring to the paradigm, qualitative methods were selected and used to describe the object of study. Following this paradigmatic basis, this study focused on identifying and classifying Indonesian passive imperative and its interface between syntax and semantics. This research is organized into two working steps which include data collection and data analysis. The data gathered for the study were based on naturally occurring expressions that were obtained from online sources. Some of the data were elicited from other speakers of Indonesian. The data analysis employed a comparative study with similar issues in English to obtain the universal and language-internal properties of the Indonesian passive imperative.

III. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Subjects of Indonesian Imperatives

Before embarking on the issue of passive imperatives in Indonesian, as a point of departure, it is advisable to have a look at the subject realizing an imperative in Indonesian. Indonesian operates similarly to English. Let us first have a look at the NP Subject of an imperative clause in English. English that possesses an imperative mood has a subject element associated with an item that is not targeted for a second person. In other words, a subject with a third person value and the item can be quantificational in nature can participate in English imperatives (see Jensen, 2003; Rupp, 2003; Wurff, 2007; Aikhenvald, 2010; Kaufmann, 2012; Alcázar & Saltarelli, 2014; Isac, 2015; Postdam, 2017). The same state of affairs is also true in Indonesian. Consider the following examples:

- (5) a. *Tolong baca surat ini dan*
 please OV-read letter this and
datang-lah ke mimpi=ku
 OV-come-PART to dream=1SGPOSS
 'Please read this letter and come to my dream!'
 (Leipzig Corpora)

- b. *Jika kalian mau, makan-lah*
 if 2 OV-want, OV-eat-PART
makanan=nya
 food-DEF
 'If you want to, please eat the food!'
 (Leipzig Corpora)
- (6) a. *Kamu tunggu di sini*
 2 OV-wait at here
 'You wait here!'
 b. *Saudara pulang-lah sekarang*
 2 OV-go.home-PART now
 'You please go home now!'
- (7) a. *Anita jemput anak itu*
 Anita OV-pick.up child that
 'Anita pick up the child!'
 b. *Tina ambil buku itu*
 Tina OV-take book that
 'Tina pick.up the book!'
- (8) a. *Semuanya angkat tangan*
 everyone OV-raise hand
 'Everyone stay here'
 (<https://soundcloud.com/user-974838118/semuanya-angkat-tangan>)
 b. *Semuanya lari cepat*
 everyone OV-run quickly
 'Everyone run quickly!'

The examples above show that the imperative constructions show some degree of flexibility/variation. The subject of the imperatives can be filled by a second person (explicitly as in (6) or implicitly as in (5)), the third person as in (7), and the quantifier as in (8). There is one principle in common that can be drawn; the addressees associated with the sentences above are manifest. Although the subject does not coincide with the addressee, Universal Grammar postulates that an imperative subject must refer to, or quantify over, an addressee, a group of addressees, or a group containing the addressee(s) (Mauck & Zanuttini, 2005). In (7), given the correct intonation of the imperatives here, Tina, Anita, and *semuanya* can serve as vocatives, with the interpretation that they refer to their respective addressees. This might suggest, as we will show shortly, that the resultant sentences indicate an indirect order which might ultimately extend to exhibiting politeness. Sentences in (8) may depict a situation such that they quantify over the addressees or a group of addressees. In addition to this (8a), for example, the object of

the verbal predicate may refer to the second person, as illustrated in (9).

- (9) *Semuanya angkat tangan=mu!*
 everyone OV-raise hand=2POSS
 'Everyone raise your hands!'

The possibility of (9) together with the example sentences in (5-8) provides us with evidence that the addressee of an imperative may occupy either the subject position or the object position. The characteristics of the subject that occupies the imperatives and also the evidence that the verb realizing the imperative may take a lexical item associated with an object function strongly explain that imperatives share similar characteristics to a declarative. However, the two have a clear position concerning the VP's external properties. In imperatives, the subject is vocative. It is a matter of course then that it is exclusively related to the addressee while, in a declarative, the subject is not associated with vocative and it triggers agreement with the verb that it occurs with. The agreement that we highlight here is exemplified in English sentence (10) and the Indonesian examples in (11) and for the ease of exposure in highlighting the comparison between a declarative and an imperative in Indonesian, sentence (9) is rewritten here as (11b).

- (10) a. Everyone raises your hand
 b. Everyone raise your hand
- (11) a. *Semuanya meng-angkat tangan=mu*
 everyone AV-raise hand=2POSS
 'Everyone raises your hands'
 b. *Semuanya angkat tangan=mu*
 Everyone OV-raise hand=2POSS
 'Everyone raise your hands.'

Comparing the English sentences in (10), sentence (10a) cannot be linked to an imperative because the subject which is taken as a singular entity must be made to agree in the number feature with the verb which is then based on the English morphosyntactic principle the associated verb must be inflected, thereby needless to say that (10a) is a purely declarative clause. Sentence (10b), on the other hand, the verb *raise* is not inflected which makes it automatically construed as belonging to an imperative. The subject everyone in (10b) is understood as a vocative that quantifies over

several addresses and in spoken language as noted above it is marked by a proper intonation contour and there is a pause between the subject and the verb. Similar characteristics are shown by Indonesian in (11). (11a) is declarative. The co-occurrence of the verb and the subject requires that the verb must be AV-marked to show that the subject is the agent of the event denoted by the verb. However, in informal sentences, the verb may be expressed without the AV marker. However, even though the verb in (11a) is taken as a bare form, the resulting sentence maintains to be interpreted as a declarative. If that is the case, (11a) and (11b) are still distinguishable from each other in that the bare form of the verb is interpreted as a declarative the subject item is not taken as a vocative, and therefore in uttering the sentence there is no pause between the subject and the verb and the subject is not assigned a (rising) intonation, otherwise, it is interpreted as an imperative in the same way as (11b).

This characterization has to do with the imperative at the same time equips us with an explanation together with the so-called Speaker Commitment hypothesis developed by Takahashi (1994, 2012) to handle passive imperatives, which we are now turning to in the subsection.

Speaker Commitment Hypothesis

As indicated above, the imperatives associated with the constructions without any connection to passive structures; let us refer to this construction as active imperatives, it has been shown that the subjects (the addressees) of the associated imperatives can be realized not only by the second person but also the third person.

- (12) “Speaker commitment: the degree of directive force that the speaker is applying (at the utterance time of an imperative) toward the addressee performing the action”.

Takahashi resorts to this hypothesis in accounting for the (un)acceptability of English passive imperatives as illustrated in (13) and (14).

Takahashi (1998, p. 33)

- (13) a. *George, be taken to church by your sister.
b. *Be helped by Jill.
(14) a. Be checked over by a doctor, then

you'll be sure there's nothing wrong.

- b. Be flattered by what he says, it'll make his day.

Takahashi points out that in early generative work sentences (13a) and (13b) are taken to be ungrammatical. The ungrammaticality of (13) shows us the insight that the English passive imperative can handle the treatment that the imperative has the passive structure straightforwardly such as *Be taken*, *Be helped*, *Be trusted rather than feared*. What makes (13a) and (13b) ungrammatical seems to be the fact that they are taken as incomplete. (This situation works similarly to the Indonesian passive imperatives, as we will shortly show). However, given context support, they turn out to be perfectly grammatical as illustrated in (14a-b). In other words, the English passive imperatives exist in English in a context where the addressee is not expressed indirectly, more importantly, suggesting that English passive imperatives run parallel with the active imperatives in allowing the third person subject as illustrated in (14b).

Theoretically speaking, the possibility of the availability of passive imperatives, in general, is supported by cognitive linguistics (Takahashi, 1994, 2012). Here the term force (in the hypothesis) is used in the sense of 'force dynamics' developed in Talmy (1988). The idea of (12) is to show that the speaker exerts psychological, the interpersonal force toward the addressee's doing an action and that this force should be taken as a flexible concept about imperatives. Takahashi goes on to explain that speaker commitment thus allows the following imperative constructions.

Takahashi (1994, pp. 375-376)

- (15) a. Sleep until noon.
b. Sleep until noon; you're tired.
c. Sleep until noon, and you'll miss lunch.

The flexibility of the imperative construction can be noticed to occur in (15c), it does not only indicate an imperative as shown in the remaining two constructions but it is also semantically predicted as a condition.

Canonical Passive Imperative

With the speaker commitment hypothesis in mind, we are now in a position to handle the passive imperatives in Indonesian. First of all, to

put into evidence that Takahasi's hypothesis also works in Indonesian, we are looking at the canonical passive. That is, the *di-* passive which is often referred to as canonical passive. Takahashi claims that the notion of speaker commitment is devised to allow into several cases of imperatives starting from the actual imperatives to showing pseudo-imperatives. We have noted that Sentences (15a) and (15b) show command or order while the same form in (15c) indicates a condition or warning suggesting a pseudo imperative. In Indonesian, on the other hand, the hypothesis is not only concerned with the possible type of imperatives but also permitting the passive imperative to take the *di-* marker which seems to be impossible since the positive imperative lacks the AV maker.

Among other differences, the situation is different from the negative imperative which, in its standard form, invariably takes the AV form which makes it readily derives a passive construction. That is, it works similarly to a declarative in that there is an obvious change of marker from the active marker on the verbs (taking the AV form) into the active marker (taking the *di-* form) as witnessed in the following illustration.

- (16) a. *Jangan mem-buka pintu itu*
 NEG AV-open door that
 'Do not open the door!'
 b. *Jangan pintu itu di-buka*
 NEG door that PAS-open
 'Don't let the door be opened!'

The case is clear with the negative imperative in that again the derivation is made obvious from the change of the verb morphology, i.e. the *meN-* form of the verb in the negative imperative which is turned into *di-* form (passive morphology) in the negative passive imperative. Now consider the following examples:

- (17) a. *Tunggu*
 wait
 'Wait'
 b. *Ditunggu*
 PAS.wait
 'Wait'
- (18) a. *Bungkus itu*
 OV-wrap that
 'Wrap it up'
 b. *Di-bungkus*
 PAS-wrap

'Let it be wrapped up!'

In sentences (17) and (18), the addressee, the agentive entity, occupies the object position and the verb can get a passive marker although 'its active counterpart' lacks the active marker (AV-marker). More examples can be given in (19) which can be inserted with the magic word meaning 'please' *mohon* and *tolong*.

- (19) a. *Mohon di-tunggu*
 please PAS-wait
 'Let it be awaited!'
 b. *Tolong di-bungkus*
 please PAS-wrap
 'Let it be wrapped up!'

What is worthy of note is that not all languages can have a structure like those in (17b) and (18b). Although Balinese originates from the same family of languages as Indonesian, a passive imperative like the style that we have in (17b) (18b) is not commonly available (see Udayana, 2013), as shown in the following example.

- (20) a. **?Antiang-a*
 wait-PAS
 'Be awaited'
 b. **Jang-a*
 take-PAS
 'Be taken'

Turning to Indonesian, the same properties, as shown in the examples (16), concern the absences of the AV-marker. Thus, (21a) can be paraphrased as *Mohon diperhatikan oleh saudara, kantor buka jam 11* 'please be noted by you, the office is open at 11' and needless to say the active counterpart of the imperative also lacks the AV marker, as in *Tolong perhatikan, kantor buka jam 11* 'Please note, the office is open at 11'.

- (21) a. *Mohon di-perhatikan, kantor*
 please PAS-note, office
buka jam 11
 OV- open hour 11
 'Let it be noted, the office opens at 11!'
 b. *Tolong di-catat, dia telah*
 please PAS.note, 3SG PERF
me-menang-kan kontes
 AV-win-CAUS contest
 'Let it be noted, (s)he has won the contest!'

c. *Sat pol PP be-rantas otak..*

Municipal Police BER-eradicate brain
dari sindikat ini. Mohon ini
of syndicate this. Please this
di-tindaklanjuti
PAS-follow.up
PAS.follow up
‘The Municipal Police eradicate the
mastermind of this syndicate. Let it
be followed up!’

(https://pengaduan.denpasarkota.go.id/?page=Detail&id&domain=&peng_id=15108-)

In sentences (22), on the other hand, the addresses are analyzed as occupying the subject position. It has to be noted here that (22a) is ambiguous between a plain complex sentence (containing the main clause and the dependent clause) and a complex clause containing a passive imperative. The similarity between the two is that the subject of the first clause can be recovered from the main clause, i.e. *kamu*. To disambiguate (22a), the insertion of ‘a magic word’ for indicating imperative such as *mohon* ‘please’ is very instrumental. In sentence (22b), the word *coba* also functions as a magic word, thus it is better translated into *let* in the English translation.

- (22) a. *Di-periksa oleh dokter, kamu akan sembuh dengan cepat*
PAS-examine by doctor, 2 FUT
recovered with soon
‘Be examined by a doctor, you will get better soon’
b. *Ehm ...coba di-periksa-kan deh, Bu*
ehmm. OV-try PAS-examine-CAUS,
PART mother
‘Ehmm, let it be examined, Mam!’
(Avieni et.al, 2020, p. 30)

The passive imperative such as (17b) and (18b) are common passive imperative expressions used in a conversation that is often taken as exhibiting polite expressions. The idea for connecting this to politeness is that the passive imperative of this sort does not overtly express the agent (by-phrase) and coupled with the fact that passive structures/constructions also licitly avoid expressing the agent role which points to the implication that the speaker motivates indirectness, thus suggesting that this kind of correlation between a structure and pragmatic

motivation creates nuance of politeness style and strategy (Geyer, 2008; Leech, 1983).

The conveyance of politeness and its correlation to indirectness does not reside in the level of parsimony of the expression used in discourse. Leech (2014, p. 30) claims that indirect expression and expression conveyed in a beating about the bush manner exhibit a matter of degree when relating them to politeness. It has to be noted that in other languages such as Old English, the subject of its imperatives is overt (Milward, 1971). If we take this to be correct it can be said that it is only a tendency to leave out the subject of the imperatives when it comes to politeness. This suggests that when involving expressions tied to passive imperatives such as the ones in (23a) and (23b), they are not only ungrammatical but also may convey impoliteness. Consider the similar expressions in Indonesian:

- (23) a. * *Tono, di-tunggu oleh saudara=mu*
Tono, PAS-wait by brother=2POSS
*‘Tono, be awaited by your brother’
b. * *Di-bantu oleh Tini*
PAS-help by Tini
*‘Be helped by Tini’

Giving context support or making the expression wordier, naturally makes the associated clauses grammatical.

- (24) a. *Di-tunggu oleh saudara=mu, kamu akan meny-(s)ukai liburan=mu*
PAS-wait by brother=2POSS, 2
FUT AV-enjoy holiday=2POSS
‘Be awaited by your brother, you will enjoy your holiday’
b. *Di-bantu oleh Tini, dia pasti bahagia!*
PAS-help by Tini, 3SG AUX happy
‘Be helped by Tini, she must be happy’

While in the context of (24a), the subject of the imperative is a second person. Sentence (24b), however, is interpreted as an order given to the addressee, who should see to it that somebody else (a third person) must be helped, suggesting that indirectness in this context support which is not straightforwardly intended for the second person may relate to conveying politeness. That is, giving a clear context to (23b) which is now re-expressed as (24b) provides more pragmatic clarity combined with the fact that the speaker uses the third person which helps to minimize the threat to face (of the addressee). This

situation can be translated into an implication of politeness tied to the resulting expression or illocutionary force used (see Blum-Kulka (1987) for a detailed study on the interaction of pragmatic clarity to politeness).

Non-canonical Passive Imperative

English has two passives, *be*-passive and *get* passive (Reed, 2011; Alexiadou, 2012, Alexiadou & Schäfer, 2013). The *be*-passive is called canonical passive while the *get*-passive is categorized as non-canonical passive. The latter also participates in the passive imperatives, as shown in (25).

- (25) Get vaccinated before your holiday.
 (<https://www.englishclub.com/grammar/sentence/type-imperative.htm>)

Indonesian also possesses two passives, *di*-passive and *ter*-passive. Like English, the *di*-passive is canonical passive. However, the *ter*-passive is referred to as non-canonical passive. Before applying it to the imperative construction, let us first have a look at the characteristics of the *ter*-passive in Indonesian. Consider the following contrast:

- (26) a. *Buku itu di-ambil (oleh John)*
 book that PAS-take by John
 ‘The book was taken (by John)’
 b. *Buku itu terambil (oleh John)*
 book that PAS.take (by John)
 ‘The book was (unintentionally) taken (by John)’

The passive construction in (26a) still preserves its verbal predicate as an action verb even though the passive verb *diambil* now turns into a monovalent verb. However, the verbal predicate *terambil* in (26b) is taken as having an inchoative reading (see Udayana, 2014 on the inchoative interpretation with the *ter*-form in Indonesian). The evidence for the status of the two forms, the *di*-form and the *ter*- form, can be shown in its (in)ability to control into a purposive clause.

- (27) a. *[Buku itu]_i di-ambil [PRO*_{i/j} untuk*
 book that PAS-take to
men-cari informasi tentang
 AV-look.for information about
obat itu]
 medicine that
 ‘The book was taken away to get the

- information about the medicine’
 b. *[Buku itu]_i ter-ambil [PRO*_{i/j} untuk*
 book that PAS-take to
men-cari informasi tentang
 AV-look.for information
obat itu
 medicine that
 ‘The book got taken away to get the information about the medicine’

The ability for the *di*-passive to control into a purposive clause ensures that the verb remains an action verb while the inability for the *ter*-passive to control into a purposive clause shows that the verbal predicate is not an action verb any longer suggesting that *ter*-verb favors its inchoative construal, more importantly, its status changes into a stative verbal predicate.

Turning to the non-canonical passive verb such as vaccinate, in (25), using it as an example for instantiating the Indonesian passive imperative associated with non-canonical passives, there are three ways for expressing the verb in the Indonesian counterpart, they are *memvaksin*, *memvaksinasi*, and *memvaksinasikan*. The three verbs used to illustrate the Indonesian example are to show whether they have interpretative differences. The third type seems to be different from the remaining two because it has the formative *-kan* to show causation. We expect that it can be construed as indicating an action verb. However this expectation is not borne out. It remains to be interpreted as an inchoative, as shown in the following examples:

- (28) a. *Dia mem-vaksin Jack minggu depan*
 3SG AV-vaccinate Jack week next
 ‘(S)he vaccinated Jack next week’
 b. *Dia mem-vaksinasi Jack minggu depan*
 3SG AV-vaccinate Jack week next
 c. *Dia mem-vaksinasi-kan Jack minggu depan*
 3SG AV-vaccinate-CAUS Jack week next
 week next
 (29) a. *Mohon ter-vaksin minggu depan*
 Please PAS-vaccinate next week
 ‘Please get vaccinated next week’
 b. *Mohon di-vaksin minggu depan*
 please PAS-vaccinate next week
 ‘Please be vaccinated next week’
 (30) a. *Mohon ter-vaksinasi minggu depan*
 please PAS-vaccinate week next

- ‘Please get vaccinated nextweek!’
 b. *Mohon di-vaksinasi minggu depan*
 please PAS.vaccinateweeknext
 ‘Please be vaccinated before holiday’
- (31) a. *Mohon ter-vaksinasi-kan minggu depan*
 please PAS.vaccinate-CAUS week
 depan
 next
 b. *Mohon di-vaksinasi-kan minggu depan*
 please PAS.vaccinate-CAUS week
 depan
 next

Each of the three verbs in Indonesian retains its status as a stative verb rather than an action verb in the passive imperative context. The *di*-passive imperatives, on the other hand, in all the three verbs in (29b), (30b), and (31b) remain their status as action verbs. Such a situation suggests that the *ter*- form operates on a par with a stative predicate in general, which can be used in active imperative construction, as illustrated in the examples in (32). Thus (29a) can be expressed as (33a).

- (32) a. *Ber-senang-lah!*
 BER-happy-PART
 ‘Be happy’
 b. *Tenang-lah*
 calm-PART
 ‘Be calm’
- (33) a. *Ter-vaksin-lah*
 PAS.vaccinate.PART
 ‘Get vaccinated’
 b. *Ter-periksa-lah*
 PAS-test-PART
 ‘Get tested’
- (34) a. [x <STATE>]
 b. [BECOME [x <STATE>]]

States are the basic building block in the word formation process. So there is a close relation holding between (32) and (33). (32) indicates a basic state (33), on the other hand, indicates that there is a change of state between the predicate such as (32) and (33). (33) shows a predicate with an interpretative feature tied to what is called a non-causative change of state (Koontz-Garboden, 2005, p. 100; Rappaport Hovav & Levin, 1988, p. 108).

To conclude, given the characterization of the *ter*- form as formalized in the event structure

representation in (34), we are committed to claiming that the *ter*-form used in the imperative passive is a non-canonical passive. Crucially, the contrast characterized by the canonical and the non-canonical passive is manifest. In the former case, the associated predicate remains an action while in the latter case the predicate is not an action but rather it is clearly a state (resulting from an action).

IV. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

This small paper deals with imperative passives in Indonesian. The possibility of making them possible is supported by the speaker commitment hypothesis developed by Takahashi (1994). Importantly the hypothesis allows for the availability of (the positive) imperative passives in two respects. First, the addressee is associated with the occurrence of the hypothetical agentive entities both in the subject and the object positions. The hypothesis constitutes a principle that permits the verbal predicate to combine with the *di*- passive marker making it operate in the same transformational structure as what takes place in negative imperatives, in Indonesian, which always takes the AV marker before being derived into its passive counterparts. The present study is preliminary in nature. The future study on the Indonesian passive imperatives needs to have more evidence to establish a more robust study on the issues (of the Indonesian passive imperative) in the hope that the study will be of more benefit in the inquiry of both theoretical and pedagogical domains.

REFERENCES

- Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2010). *Imperatives and Commands*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Alcázar, A. & Saltarelli, M. (2014). *The Syntax of Imperatives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511794391>.
- Alexiadou, A. & Schäfer, F. (eds). (2013). *Non-canonical passives*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Alexiadou, A. (2012). ‘Noncanonical passives revisited: Parameters of Nonactive Voice’. *Linguistics*: 50 (6) 1079-1110. DOI: [10.1515/ling-2012-0036](https://doi.org/10.1515/ling-2012-0036).
- Arka, I W. & Manning, C.D. (1998). ‘Voice and Grammatical Relations in Indonesian: A new perspective’. In M. Butt and T H. King, eds. *The Proceedings of the LFG '98 conference*. Stanford: CSLI (<http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/3/lfg98-toc.html>)

- Arka, I W. (2003). *Balinese Morphosyntax: A Lexical-Functional Approach*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics. Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, the Australian National University.
- Arka, I W. (2008). "Voice and the syntax of =a/-a verbs in Balinese", in Musgrave, Simon and Peter Austin (eds), *Voice and grammatical relations in Austronesian languages*, pp. 70–89. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Cole, P., Hermon G., & Yanti. (2008). Voice in Malay/Indonesian in *Lingua*. 118(10): 1500 – 1553. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2007.08.008>.
- Geyer, N. (2008). *Discourse and Politeness: Ambivalent Face in Japanese*. New York: Continuum.
- Himmelman, N. P. & Riesberg, S. (2013). Symmetrical Voice and Applicative Alternations: Evidence from Totoli. *Oceanic Linguistics*. 52 (2): 396-422. DOI: [10.1353/ol.2013.0021](https://doi.org/10.1353/ol.2013.0021)
- Isac, D. (2015). *The Morphosyntax of Imperatives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Jensen, B. (2003). Syntax and Semantics of Imperative Subjects. Proceeding of the 19th Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics 31(1): 150-164.
- Kaufmann, M. (2012). *Interpreting Imperatives*. London: Springer.
- Koontz-Garboden, A. (2005). On the typology of state/change of state alternations. In G. Booij and J. Marle, eds., *Yearbook of Morphology*, pages 83–117. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.
- Leech, G. (2014). *Pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mauck, S. & Zanuttini R. (2005). The subjects of English imperatives. In: *Georgetown University Working Papers in theoretical linguistics*, Department of Linguistics, Georgetown University, Washington, DC, pp 53–85.
- Milward, M. C. (1971). *Imperative Constructions in Old English*. Paris: Mouton the Hague.
- Postdam, E. (2017). *Syntactic Issues in the English Imperative*. London: Routledge.
- Rappaport Hovav, M. & Levin, B. (1988). Building Verb Meanings. In Butt, M. & Geuder, W. (eds.). *The Projections of Arguments: Lexical and Compositional Factors*. Stanford, CA: CSLI, 97-134.
- Reed, L. A. (2011). Get-passives in *The Linguistic Review* (28): 41-78. DOI: [10.1515/tlir.2011.022](https://doi.org/10.1515/tlir.2011.022)
- Riesberg, Sonja. 2014. *Symmetrical voice and linking in Western Austronesian languages*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Riesberg, S. & Primus, B. (2015). Agent Prominence in Symmetrical Voice Language. *STUF - Language Typology and Universals* 68 (4): 551-564. <https://doi.org/10.1515/stuf-2015-0023>
- Rupp, L. (2003). *The Syntax of Imperatives in English and Germanic: Word Order Variation in Minimalist Framework*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Takahashi, H. (1994). English Imperatives and Speaker Commitment. *Language Sciences*. 16(3/4): 371-385.
- Takahashi, H. (1998). On Passive Imperatives. *HUSCAP* 47 (3): 33-51
- Talmy, L. (1988). Force Dynamics in Language and Cognition in *Cognitive Science* 12. 49-100.
- Udayana, I N. (2013). Voice and Reflexives in Balinese. Ph.D Dissertation. The University of Texas at Austin.
- Udayana, I N. (2014). Inchoative Verbs in Indonesian. *Proceeding of the 4th International Seminar on Language Maintenance and Shift*: pp 271-275
- Wurff, W. V. d. (2007). *Imperative Clauses in Generative Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Source Materials

https://corpora.unileipzig.de/en?corpusId=ind_mixed_2013

https://pengaduan.denpasarkota.go.id/?page=DetailPengaduan&language=id&domain=&peng_id=15108

Avieni, Nini et al. 2020. *Bangkit I: Perepuan Bangkit dari Keterpurukan*. Sukabumi: CV Jejak

English.grammar.org

<https://www.englishclub.com/grammar/sentence/type-imperative.htm>

<https://soundcloud.com/user-974838118/semuanya-angkat-tangan>

http://www.english-for-students.com/the_imperative-passive.html