

# Incongruencies between Indonesian and Korean Passive Voice Sentences

**Hwang Who Young**

Universitas Gadjah Mada

Korea Foundation, South-Korea

E-mail: hwangwy@ugm.ac.id

Submitted: 28/02/2022

Revised: 29/03/2022

Accepted: 15/04/2022

E-ISSN : 2579-4574 P-ISSN : 2549-7359

**Abstract.** Korean passive sentences are considered difficult to understand by Indonesians. Due to Indonesian language interference, ungrammatical Korean sentences are often produced by Indonesian. This study is aimed at analyzing the factors causing incongruity between Indonesian and Korean passive sentences. This research is a descriptive qualitative study and the data are Indonesian passive sentences and equivalent forms in Korean. Both languages were analyzed using the theory of voice, passive prototype, and language typology by applying contrastive and comparative methods. The finding results indicate that the causal factors can be traced back to differences between Indonesian and Korean passive voice systems generated by the attributes both languages maintain, covering argument marking system, construction controller, subject selection criteria, agency coding, how the event is described, and sensitivity to animacy. Indonesian, which marks its core argument using word order, is a subject prominent language that prioritizes the argument's syntactic function. The sentence constructions are controlled by the argument's syntactic functions coded in the verb. Meanwhile, Korean, which indicates all arguments with case markers, is a topic and subject prominent language that emphasizes the argument's inherent attribute. Korean sentence constructions are controlled by the argument's inherent attributes, namely ANIMACY, and CONTROL. Consequently, Indonesian passive sentences that do not align with Korean principles of Animacy Hierarchy and Control Degree are incongruent when translated into Korean passive sentences. The results of this study infer that the passive voice issue is not limited to the morpho-syntactic, but involves various levels of language, and views of the world.

**Keywords:** *Indonesian and Korean passive sentences, voice modulation, language typology, Animacy, Degree of Control*

<https://ojs.unm.ac.id/eralingua>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

## INTRODUCTION

Voice is a grammatical element that describes how a participant is involved in an event, and consequently all languages have voice ([Whaley, 1997](#); [Shibatani, 2006](#)). However, each language manifests its voice in a distinct manner, which correlates with its linguistic typological attributes. One of the voices that are most discussed in books on grammar is the passive voice. The passive construction is vital as it easily integrates in grammar, like the creation of relative clauses, question form, and nominalization are applicable on passive structure ([Keenan & Dryer, 2007:360](#)). In terms of usage, passive and active sentences are considered pragmatic variations because either active or passive constructions are chosen based on context ([Givon, 2001](#); [Shibatani, 2006](#)). Therefore, an event that is described using a passive sentence in a particular language is expected to be expressible by using another language's passive sentence, just like a translation with the same contexts. Yet, in reality, modulations of voice constructions are often applied on account of grammatical and pragmatic factors.

Indonesian and Korean are nominative-accusative languages that use active and passive voices. However, passive voice is more significantly used in Indonesian than Korean. This is apparent in the comparative results between Indonesian and Korean corpus data (see [Avila, 2019](#); [Wahyuningsih, 2020](#)). This phenomenon has two implications, suggesting that there is a difference between the Indonesian and Korean passive voice system, and that some Indonesian passive sentences are incongruent when translated into Korean passive sentences. As a consequence, Korean passive sentences are considered a difficult grammatical element for Indonesian learners of Korean to understand ([Horatianus, 2008](#); [Avila, 2009](#); [Wahyuningsih, 2020](#)) and Indonesian learners of Korean often produce ungrammatical sentences as a result of Indonesian language interference ([Im Young Ho, 2006](#)).

It may be due to several factors that make Korean passive sentences difficult for Indonesians. One of the reasons is that the explanation in Korean textbooks and grammar books only focuses on how to make passive sentences as verb marking, argument marking, and sentence construction. To reduce errors made by Indonesians, it is necessary to study in some cases whether Indonesian passive sentences cannot be translated into Korean passive sentences and what causes them. Concerning Indonesian and Korean passive sentences, contrastive studies have been done by [Im Young Ho \(2006, 2020\)](#), [Horatianus \(2008\)](#), [Avila \(2019\)](#), and [Wahyuningsih \(2020\)](#). Although the scope of each study differs, all five define passive sentences according to the traditional perspective, i.e., the predicate's form and a subject that performs no action. Sentences with predicates that are marked by *di-*, *ter-*, *ke-an*, *kena*, and sentences with predicates that have no markers and pronoun agents (also known as pronoun passive) are categorized as Indonesian passive sentences. Korean passive sentences are also indicated by predicates with the affix markers *-i/-hi/-li/-gi-*, auxiliary verb *-aji/-eoji-*, and the lexical forms *N-doeda*, *N-danghada*, *N-badda*, et cetera. Subsequently, passive sentences are described as a derivative form of active sentences, but even sentences that have no active pairs are categorized as passive sentences. This is on account of the fact that the five studies did not pay any attention to the polysemic

phenomenon observed in Indonesian and Korean voice markers. As such, the spontaneous voice marked by the prefix *ter-* in examples (1a) and (1b), the excessive aspect marked by *ke-an* in (1c), and the word *kena* used as an intransitive verb in (1d) are also considered as Indonesian passive sentences.

(1a) Saya ter-jatuh di jalan. (Horatianus, 2008:49)  
I SPONTAN-fell on road.  
'I fell on the road.'

(1b) Dada-nya te-rasa pengap. (Wahyuningsih, 2020:60)  
chest-his SPONTAN-feel stuffy  
'His chest felt stuffy.'

(1c) Saya ke-panas-an. (Horatianus, 2008:38)  
I EXCESSIVE-hot  
'I'm overheating.'

(1d) Yanto kena pisau. (Im Young Ho, 2006: 221)  
Yanto strike knife  
'Yanto was struck by a knife.'

The four sentences in (1) cannot be considered passive sentences derived from active sentences as there are no agents, either implicitly or explicitly, that function as the subject of the active sentence. All four of the sample sentences above cannot congruently be translated into Korean passive sentences.

Concerning English passive sentences that have to be translated into Korean active sentences so as to make it congruent, Jo In-Jeung (2005) suggests three Korean features as the cause, namely: 1) more flexible word order; 2) non-subject participants can be present at the beginning of sentences; and 3) subjects are easily omissible. Some examples of English passive sentences that must be translated into Korean active sentences to make them congruent because of features 1) and 2) are presented as follows (Jo In-Jeung, 2005:124).

(2a) Minsoo brought a book home. It was given as a birthday present  
by Soomi.

(2b) Minsoo-neun jib-e chaeg-eul han geun gajyeowadda.  
Minsoo-TOPIC home-LOC book-ACC one volum brought

Geu chaeg-eun saengil seonmul-lo Soomi-ga jueossda.  
that book-TOPIC birthday present-as Soomi-NOM gave

To describe the object 'a book' in (2a), English has to use a passive sentence that promotes 'book' to a subject, while Korean is able to position the object *chaeg* 'book' as the TOPIC of the active sentence.

Korean's third feature, which is the omittability of the subject, is not the cause of the English agentless passive, shown in (3a), having to be translated congruently into a Korean active sentence as presented in (3b), because (3a) can be made congruent with an agentless passive in Korean as indicated in sentence (4) below.

(3a) English is spoken in Australia. (Jo In-Jeung, 2005:126)

(3b) Australia-eseo-neun yeongeo-leul sayong-ha-n-da.  
 Australia-LOC-TOPIC English-ACC use-ACT-PRS-DEC

(4) Yeongeo-neun Australia-eseo sayong-doe-n-da.  
 English-TOPIC Australia-LOC use-PASS-PRS-DEC

I disagree with the arguments Jo In-Jeung (2005) asserted, since the three Korean language attributes specified above are not the direct causes of having to modulate the voice, they are consequences brought about by differences in the argument marking system of the two languages instead. Furthermore, voice modulation caused by grammatical differences should be examined by looking at the sentence construction controller system of the languages compared because Korean sentences and their constituents are controlled by the Animacy Hierarchy principle, which is unlike the animacy and controller systems found in English.

The relation between Korean sentence construction and Animacy Hierarchy has not been given much attention except by Ho-min Sohn (1999:369-370), who mentions that inanimate subjects are avoided in Korean due to pragmatic barriers. Klaiman (1984; 1988; 1991), who discusses animacy by conducting cross-language research, even did not adequately identify the effect of animacy in Korean, which led to the Korean voice system being included in the direct-inverse category. But, Knoob (2008), who criticizes Klaiman's analysis on the Korean voice system, pays attention to the effect of animacy in Korean. The effects of animacy in Korean sentences he proposed are: 1) arguments are distinguished by their animacy; 2) active transitive verbs are used with animate subjects; and 3) an animate argument is made into an agent when the other core argument is inanimate. Similarly, the Animate First Principle was presented by Williamson & Kim (2013) based on the English to Korean translation results produced by Korean students. The two latter studies emphasized the effect of animacy on Korean construction, which differs from English. However, they did not discuss other distinct Korean attributes that affect Korean sentence construction in their study. Kim Eunil (2015) also discusses voice modulation from English passive to active voice in Korean from the perspective of Korean's attribute as a high-context language and a BECOME-language.

As previously mentioned, the explanation of passive voice sentences in the Korean textbooks and the previous contrastive studies of Indonesian and Korean passive sentences focused on how to derive passive sentences from active sentence pairs by changing the markers in verbs, markers in arguments, and sentence construction. Nonetheless, there has been no research on Indonesian passive

sentences that are incongruent with their Korean passive sentences and the factors that cause them.

Thus, this study aims to discuss the incongruence between Indonesian and Korean passive sentences based on the Indonesian and Korean characteristics that underlie the passive sentence, including the constraints. This study implies that determining the voice of a sentence just only based on markers on verbs, arguments, and sentence construction can be inaccurate due to the grammatical devices used in polysemy. That is the markers in passive voice sentences are used to realize other voices as well. The findings of this study imply that the passive voice system is related to various language levels, namely semantics, pragmatics, cognitive, and language community perspectives on the world, besides the morpho-syntactic level. In addition, the results of this study contribute to the field of Korean language teaching and learning study, to the field of Indonesian-Korean translation studies. Also, this study can be used as a reference for the contrastive study and error analysis of Korean by Indonesian as well.

## RESEARCH METHOD

Methodologically, this research is a qualitative descriptive study. The subject of the current study is the incongruities of translating Indonesian passive sentences to Korean passive sentences and their causal factors, while the object of the study is Indonesian passive sentences and equivalent forms in Korean. The research method used in this article is contrastive and comparative analysis. The data of this study, Indonesian passive sentences is introspective-intuitive, namely self-produced data by the author as a Korean native speaker and active Indonesian speaker. Nevertheless, the Indonesian data the author made have been confirmed by native Indonesian speakers. For the purpose of *tertium comparationis*, the Indonesian and Korean passive sentences in this research were determined using the passive prototype criteria (see [Shibatani, 2006](#); [Siewierska, 2005](#); [Dixon, 2012](#)). Data collection techniques used are relevant data collected, arranged, analyzed, and concluded.

Descriptively, this study describes Indonesian passive sentences and their counterparts in Korean based on the respective factors. The description includes analyses of the semantic structure and verb morphology. Next, the Indonesian passive sentences and their corresponding sentences in Korean were analyzed using the voice system. For that, the theory on semantic role or thematic role introduced by [Dowty \(1991\)](#), [Van Valin Jr. & Lapolla \(1999\)](#), and [Dixon \(2012\)](#) was used. Differences in syntactic structure associated with features of language typology and animacy are elaborated based on the arguments proposed by [Li & Thompson \(1976\)](#), [Comrie \(1989\)](#), [Croft \(1995\)](#), [Whaley \(1997\)](#), [Yamamoto \(1999\)](#), etc.

## RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The linguistic features associated with differences in the Indonesian and Korean passive voice system include the argument marking system, sentence construction controller, agency coding system and agent marker, how a phenomenon is described, and sensitivity to animacy, which are all mutually

interconnected. Indonesian passive sentences that cannot be congruently translated into Korean passive sentences are sentences with constituents that do not align with the Korean language principles of Animacy Hierarchy and Degree of Control. These sentences are characterized as: 1) the inanimate subject followed by an animate agent (marked by *-ege/-hanthe/-ke*); 2) the subject takes on the role of Actor, Experiencer, Causer, Instrumental, Temporal, or Locative; 3) the inanimate subject has a greater degree of control than the inanimate agent; 4) the inanimate agent can not be considered to have abilities such as animate or its members are not human; and 5) the predicate that are derived from ditransitive verbs and applicative verbs.

### **Argument marking system and passive construction**

In terms of morpho-syntactic typology, Indonesian with an SVO structure and Korean with an SOV structure are nominative-accusative languages, i.e., languages that mark their core arguments explicitly by using active and passive voices. The core arguments in Indonesian are marked by a strict word order, while Korean marks all its arguments using morphological case markers. The way the two languages mark their core arguments correlates with the frequency of passive sentence usage.

The argument positioned at the beginning of a sentence, namely the subject, is the focused argument. Thus, active sentences are used to put focus on or emphasize the agent functioning as the subject, while passive sentences are used when the agent is defocused or when emphasis or focus is meant to be put on the non-agentive argument. The subject of Indonesian sentences, that is the core argument referred to by the predicate and indicated by word order, is a sentence constituent that is difficult to omit. Accordingly, Indonesian is characterized as a subject prominent language that uses numerous passive sentences (see [Li & Thompson, 1976](#)).

Meanwhile, Korean marks all of its arguments with case markers, so this is why word order in its sentences is relatively flexible. The focal argument is indicated by the TOPIC marker *-eun/-neun*, which differs with the subject (nominative) marker *-i/-ga*. Therefore, Korean may be categorized as a topic and subject prominent language. Generally, the topic is presented at the beginning of a sentence, but the argument, wherever it is located, can be made as the focus of the sentence by using the TOPIC marker. As such, the passive voice function, either agent defocusing or non-agent focusing, can be manifested by having an active sentence with TOPIC. Moreover, the subject of Korean sentences may be omitted when it is understood through the context, hence agentless Indonesian passive sentences can be congruently translated into Korean active sentences that have a topic without a subject or into subjectless active sentences.

- (6a) Kucing-ku      di-beri-kan      kue.  
       cat-my          PASS-give-BNF    cookie  
       ‘My cat is given a cookie.’



(6b) Nae      goyangi-neun      gwaja-leul      ju-eoss-da.  
       my      cat-TOPIC      cookie-ACC      give-PST-DEC  
       ‘My cat, (S=Ø) gave a cookie.’

(6c) Gwaja-leul      nae      goyangi-ege      ju-eoss-da.  
       cookie-ACC      my      cat- RCPT      give-PST-DEC  
       ‘A cookie, (S=Ø) gave to my cat.’

### **Sentence construction controller in Indonesian and Korean**

Korean sentence construction and its constituents are controlled by an inherent feature of the argument, which is ANIMACY, whereas in Indonesian they are controlled by the argument’s syntactic function coded in the verb. The difference in sentence construction controller found between the two languages has an influence on their passive voice system and the incongruency of Indonesian passive sentences being translated to Korean passive sentences.

The concept of animacy is based on the human cognitive aspect hence it is universal in nature. The term animacy in linguistics is used to refer to the inherent feature of an argument, which covers animate and inanimate. The animacy hierarchy in the real world, i.e., Human > (others) Animate > Inanimate > Abstract, is an essential feature in linguistic phenomena and it has an influence on various fields of linguistics (Comrie, 1989; Croft, 1995). Animacy is commonly coded in the form of the noun, verb, word order, and subject selection with grammatical manifestations like case, number, agreement, and word order (see Comrie, 1989; Croft, 1990; Whaley, 1997; Yamamoto, 1999). Although the concept of animacy holds a crucial role as a broad linguistic phenomenon, its manifestation in each language differs and the variations depend on the language’s distinct characteristic. Indonesian and Korean are no exception in the coding of animacy, but the two languages have their respective means and sensitivity, as found in their 1) word order, 2) subject selection, and 3) case markers or semantic role, which are mutually interconnected.

### **Subject selection and hierarchy animacy**

Animacy is a criterion used to select a subject in Korean sentences. The subject of an active sentence presented by the transitive verb, that is the agent, must be characterized as having physical and mental abilities to initiate an event. An agent may thus be characterized by VOLITION and CONTROL. The criteria of the subject of the active sentence correlate with animacy on account of the concept of animacy and animacy hierarchy in the real world, i.e., human > animate > inanimate, being directly applied on Korean sentence construction. Human and animate that have higher animacy hierarchy have a greater volition than inanimate, which has lower animacy hierarchy. Thus, it is common for humans, who possess higher animacy hierarchy, to be the subject of transitive verbs, while inanimate objects characterized by [-volition] and [-control] are considered the object. Furthermore, the influence that animacy has on the subject of active sentences in Indonesian correlates with the verb’s degree of transitivity. Transitive verbs with high transitivity level present human or animate as the subject, but verbs with low level of transitivity can be used with inanimate subjects as shown in the sentences below.

- (7a) Jimin / Majalah itu meng-(k)atakan 'No'.  
 Jimin / magazine that ACT- say 'No'  
 'Jimin /That magazine says 'No'.
- (7b) Jimin / \*Majalah itu makan roti itu.  
 Jimin / \* Magazine that eat bread that  
 'Jimin / \* That magazine eats the bread'.
- (8a) Jimin-i / \*Geu jabji-ga 'No'lago malha-n-da.  
 Jimin-NOM/ \*that magazine-NOM 'No' say-PRS-DEC  
 'Jimin / \*That magazine says 'No'.
- (8b) Jimin-i / \* Geu jabji-ga geo pang-eul meog-neun-da.  
 Jimin-NOM/\*that magazine-NOM that bread-ACC eat-PRS-DEC  
 'Jimin / \* That magazine eats the bread'.

The way that Indonesian and Korean make passive prototypes is the same. But there is another principle controlling Korean sentence construction, i.e., Animacy Hierarchy. The hierarchy of the subject needs to be greater or equal to the agent of the passive sentence. If the inanimate subject is followed by an animate agent with a higher hierarchy (indicated by *-ege/ -hanthe/ -ke*), the sentence is considered unacceptable. However, if the animate agent with a higher hierarchy is omitted, the sentence is acceptable as an agentless passive sentence format. But, agentless passive in Korean can only be produced using verbs with low transitivity level. Meanwhile, Indonesian sentence construction is not controlled by animacy but by the argument's syntactic function, which is coded within the verb format. Hence, whatever the animacy may be, the object of the transitive verb *meN-* can always be promoted to the subject of the passive sentence *di-*. This difference in the criteria of the subject of passive sentences in Indonesian and Korean has led to incongruence when translating typical Indonesian passive sentences into typical Korean passive sentences, but they can actually be congruently translated using active sentences or agentless passive.

- (9a) Nasi itu di-makan (oleh) Ana.  
 rice that PASS-eat (by) Ana  
 'The rice is eaten by Ana.'
- (9b) \*Geu bab-i (Ana-ege) meog-hi-n-da.  
 that rice-NOM (Ana-AGT) eat-PASS-PRS-DEC
- (9c) Ana-ga geu bab-eul meog-n-da.  
 Ana-NOM that rice-ACC eat-PRS-DEC  
 'Ana eats the rice.'



(10a) Kardus-kardus      di-tumpuk      oleh      Ana.  
          boxes                PASS-piled up      by      Ana  
          ‘The boxes are piled up by Ana.’

(10b) Sangja-deul-i                ssah-i-n-da.  
          box-PL-NOM                pile up-PASS-PRS-DEC  
          ‘The boxes are piled up.’

(10c) Ana-ga                sangaja-deul-eul      ssah-neun-da.  
          Ana-NOM      box-PL-ACC                pile up-PRS-DEC  
          ‘Ana piles up the boxes.’

Although the agent is omitted, verbs with high degree of transitivity like *meog*- ‘eat’ in (9b) cannot be generated using an inanimate subject except as a metaphor, whereas *ssah*- ‘pile up’, which has a low level of transitivity, can be generated using an inanimate subject given that the animate agent be omitted as shown in (10b).

### The subject of passive sentence and degree of control

Another criterion used to select the subject of a sentence in Korean is the semantic attribute CONTROL. If both core arguments are inanimate, the argument considered to have the greater DEGREE OF CONTROL becomes the subject (agent) of an active sentence. Thus, naturally, the argument with a lesser degree of control becomes the subject of Korean passive sentences. Meanwhile, Indonesian sentence construction is unaffected by the semantic attribute DEGREE OF CONTROL because the object of active transitive sentences always can be promoted to become the subject of passive sentences. Therefore, Indonesian passive sentences with subjects that have a greater degree of control than the agent would be considered odd or incongruent when translated into Korean passive sentences, and that is why they should be translated into Korean active sentences to make them congruent.

(11a) Sepeda anak-ku      di-tabrak      oleh      tank itu. (UNDERGOER < AGT)  
          bike      child-my      PASS-hit      by      tank that  
          ‘My child’s bike was hit by that tank.’

(11b) Tank itu      di-tabrak      oleh      sepeda anak-ku. (UNDERGOER > AGT)  
          tank that      PASS-hit      by      bike      child-my  
          ‘That tank was hit by my child’s bike.’

(12a) Nae ai      jajeongeo-ga      jeo      thaengkheu-e      bad-hi-n-da  
          my child      bike-NOM      that      tank-AGT                hit-PASS-PRS-DEC  
          ‘My child’s bike was hit by that tank.’                (UNDERGOER < AGT)

(12b) ?Jeo      thaengkheu-ga      nae ai      jajeongeo-e      bad-hi-n-da  
          that      tank-NOM                my child      bike-AGT                hit-PASS-PRS-DEC  
          ‘?That tank was hit by my child’s bike.’                (UNDERGOER > AGT)

The semantic feature CONTROL is prioritized over ANIMACY in Korean when the inanimate argument, which can be considered having greater control feature than the animate argument, is used jointly with the animate argument. Inanimate objects that can be considered having control feature, among others, include: 1) sophisticated machines or equipment that have the ability to control, such as automobile, motorcycle, robot, computer, smartphone, etc.; and 2) names of state, institution, organization, company, etc. consisting of human members. These kinds of inanimate arguments may be used as action-performing animate.

- (13a) Huin cha-ga geu namja-leul bad-n-da.  
white car-NOM that man-ACC hit-PRS-DEC  
'A white car hits the man.'

- (13b) Geu namja-ga huin cha-e bad-hi-n-da.  
that man-NOM white car-AGT hit-PASS-PRS-DEC  
'The man is hit by a white car.'

ANIMACY and CONTROL as criteria for selecting the subject of Korean sentences are limited to events that an agent can control, which are active and passive voices. Hence, passive-like that have the same construction and constituents as passive can be distinguished using the ANIMACY and CONTROL features. Since the construction format and constituents are the same, Korean passive-like have been treated as 'unique passive sentences' by previous studies. Events described by passive-like are not controlled by the agent, hence the Animacy Hierarchy principle has no influence on the sentence construction. Therefore, the inanimate subject can be followed by an animate argument attached with *-ege/ -hanthe/ -ke* (polysemy with agentive marker).

ANIMACY and CONTROL function as criteria for selecting the subject of sentences in Indonesian as well, but not as strict as in Korean. Thus, action transitive verbs with a high transitivity feature do not present an inanimate subject, but transitive verbs that have lower level of transitivity feature can be produced using an inanimate subject. In addition, the argument's syntactic function is coded in the Indonesian verb format. The transitive verb *meN-* codes the subject as the Actor (agent) and the argument to the right as the object, while the verb *di-* codes the subject as the Undergoer that is promoted from the object of the transitive verb. This principle applies without exception. Passive-like in Indonesian is coded within the verb using an affix that differs with the passive marker *di-*. For example, the spontaneous voice, which describes an unintended event, is indicated by the prefix *ter-* attached to the verb. The spontaneous voice that contains an agent [-intention] is manifested by using the transitive verb with the affix *ter-*, while the spontaneous voice that unintentionally occurs, which is an event [-agent] is manifested by using the intransitive verb with the affix *ter-*. Moreover, the syntactic behavior of the adposition *oleh* as the agent marker of passive sentences differ with the non-agentive marker of Indonesian passive-like sentences. The use of *oleh* as agent [+intention] marker is optional if the agent directly follows the verb *di-*, but it cannot be substituted by other adpositions. Conversely, the adposition *oleh* as a

non-agentive marker in passive-like sentences is mandatory and can be substituted by the adposition *pada*.

Therefore, Indonesian passive sentences do not align with the Animacy Hierarchy principle and it is incongruent when translated into Korean passive sentences, hence the need to be translated into active sentences to be congruent, as shown in (14). However, spontaneous sentences in Indonesian that do not align with Animacy Hierarchy can be congruently translated into spontaneous sentences in Korean that have the same markers and construction as passive sentences, as shown in (15). Active and passive sentences, describing an event prompted by an agent, can be generated using an adverbial phrase that means ‘on purpose’, while spontaneous voice that does not implicate the volitional agent cannot use it. So, determining sentence voice by merely relying on the predicate form or markers may result in error.

(14a) Sengaja lagu ini di-dengarkan (oleh) Ana.  
on purpose song this PASS-listen to (by) Ana  
‘This song is listened to (by) Ana on purpose.’

(14b) Ilbuleo Ana-ga i nole-leul del-eoss-da.  
on purpose Ana-NOM this song-ACC listen-PST-DEC  
‘Ana listened to this song on purpose.’

(15a) (\*Sengaja) suara teriakan ter-dengar oleh/pada Ana.  
(\*on purpose) voice scream SPONTAN-hear by/ on Ana  
‘Ana heard the screaming voice (\*on purpose).’

(15b) (\*Ilbuleo) bimyeong soli-ga Ana-ege del-li-n-da.  
(on purpose) scream voice-NOM Ana-LOC hear-PASS-PRS-DEC  
‘Ana heard the screaming voice (\*on purpose).’

### The subject of passive sentence and patienthood

The semantic feature of the subject of passive sentences, i.e., Patienthood, is also one of the reasons that Indonesian passive sentences are incongruent with Korean passive sentences. Whatever the semantic role may be, the object of the transitive verb *meN-* can be made into the subject of Indonesian passive sentences, thus the object’s semantic role is not considered an obstacle or subject criteria of Indonesian passive sentences. Therefore, the subject of Indonesian passive sentences can be occupied by arguments with the semantic role of Experiencer, Goal, Direction, Instrumental, Temporal, Locative, Theme, and Benefactive. Meanwhile, objects that can be promoted to become the subject of Korean passive sentences are limited to ‘objects affected by action performed by the agent’, hence the subject of Korean passive sentences holds a Patient or Theme. However, Theme is inanimate, so if it is made into the subject of a passive sentence, the subsequent animate agent is omitted due to the issue of Animacy Hierarchy. Consequently, Indonesian passive sentences with subjects that have no semantic role of Patient or

Theme are incongruent with Korean passive sentences, but they are congruent with other voices.

- (16a) Ana di-lirik laki-laki itu.  
 Ana PASS-glance at man that  
 ‘Ana is glanced at by that man.’
- (16b) \*Ana-ga geu namja-ege humcheobo-i-n-da.  
 Ana-NOM that man-AGT glance at-PASS-PRS-DEC
- (16c) Geu namja-ga Ana-leul humcheobo-n-da.  
 that man-NOM Ana-ACC glance at-PRS-DEC  
 ‘The man glances at Ana.’
- (17a) Pohon itu di-dekat-i oleh Yuni.  
 tree that PASS-close-LOC by Yuni  
 ‘The tree is approached by Yuni.’
- (17b) Yuni-ga geu namu-e dagaga-n-da. (MEDIAL)  
 Yuni-NOM that tree-DIR/LOC move closer-PRS-DEC  
 ‘Yuni moves closer to the tree.’
- (18a) Piano itu di-main-kan oleh Ana.  
 piano that PASS-play-CAU by Ana  
 ‘The piano is played by Ana.’
- (18b) Ana-ga geu piano-leul chi-n-da.  
 Ana-NOM itu piano-ACC hit-PRS-DEC  
 ‘Ana plays the piano.’
- (19a) Hari Natal di-tunggu-tunggu oleh Ana.  
 day Christmas PASS-wait for by Ana  
 ‘Christmas day was long-awaited by Ana.’
- (19b) Ana-ga Christmas-leul gidali-go gidali-n-da.  
 Ana-NOM Christma-ACC wait-and wait-PRS-DEC  
 ‘Ana is waiting and waiting for Christmas.’
- (20a) 20 desa Sleman di-lewat-l Tol Jogja-Solo.  
 20 village Sleman PASS-cross-LOC toll Jogja-Solo  
 ‘20 Sleman villages are passed by the Jogja-Solo toll road.’
- (20b) Jogja-Solo tol-i 20 gae Sleman bulag-eul jina-n-da.  
 Jogja-Solo toll-NOM 20 unit Sleman village-ACC cross-PRS-DEC  
 ‘Toll Jogja-Solo passes through 20 Sleman villages.’

Ditransitive verbs and applicative verbs are three valencies, namely subject, object (Beneficiary, Locative. Instrumental), and complement (Theme), which are indicated by the suffix *-kan* or *-i* in Indonesian. The object and complement of Indonesian ditransitive and applicative verbs can be promoted to become the subject of passive sentences. If a complement is promoted to become the subject of a passive sentence, the object is positioned to the right of the verb and marked by the prepositions *untuk*, *kepada*, *di*, and others of similar kind. Indonesian passive sentences with ditransitive verbs cannot be translated congruently into Korean passive sentences due to the issue of the subject's semantic role, but they can be translated into Korean active voice presenting Beneficiary and Theme as the Topic.

(21a) Ana di-kirim-kan/-i Hera sebuah buku.  
 Ana PASS-send-BNF/-LOC Hera one book  
 'Ana was sent a book by Hera.'

(21b) Sebuah buku di-kirim-kan Hera untuk/kepada Ana.  
 one book PASS-send-BNF Hera for/ to Ana  
 'A book was sent by Hera for/to Ana.'

(21c) Ana di-kirim-i Hera sebuah buku.  
 Ana PASS-send-LOC Hera one book  
 'Ana was sent a book by Hera.'

(22a) \*Ana-ga Hera-ege chaeg-i bonae-eoju-eoji-eoss-da.  
 Ana-NOM Hera-AGT book-NOM send-BNF-PASS-PST-DEC

(22b) Chaeg-eun Hera-ga Ana-ege bonae-eoju-eoss-da.  
 book-TOPIC Hera-NOM Ana- RCPT send-BNF-PST-DEC  
 'A book, Hera sent to Ana.'

(22c) Ana-neun Hera-ga chaeg-eul bonae-eoju-eoss-da.  
 Ana-TOPIC Hera-NOM book-ACC send-BNF-PST-DEC  
 '(to) Ana, Hera send a book.'

### Agency coding in Indonesian and Korean passive sentence

Indonesian and Korean encode agency in verbs and arguments according to the respective language's characteristics in controlling its sentence construction and constituents. Agency is coded in Indonesian sentences by means of affixation in verbs and adposition of argument markers, wherein the former is more dominant. Meanwhile, the more dominant in Korean is coding the agency in the argument by using adpositions.

#### Agency coding in verbs

Agency or agent criteria refers to mental and physical abilities to initiate an event, which may be characterized by semantic features such as VOLITION, CONTROL, and INTENTION. Agency in Indonesian sentences is coded by affixes in

verbs. A verb with the affix *meN-* codes its subject as ACTOR, while affix *di-*, which can only be attached to transitive verbs, codes its argument to the right of the verb as the agent (oblique) of the passive sentence. Agent [-intention] is coded by using the prefix *ter-* in transitive verbs, while non-agentive events are coded by using *ter-* in intransitive verbs. Meanwhile, Korean verbs contain no information about the agent and voice type in a systematic manner due to the same markers, namely the affixes *-i/-hi/-li/-gi-* (allomorphs), *-doe-* and the auxiliary verbs *-aji/-eoji-* (allomorphs) which are used in intransitive verbs, transitive verbs, causative verbs, passive verbs (double passive), and adjectives that realize various voices and inchoative aspect.

(23a) Kelinci itu di-makan oleh harimau. (PASSIVE)  
 rabbit that PASS-eat by tiger  
 'The rabbit is eaten by the tiger.'

(23b) Rambut Ana ter-sangkut di ranting pohon.  
 Hair Ana SPONTAN-catch on branch tree  
 'Ana's hair is caught on a tree branch.' (SPONTANEOUS)

(23c) Buku-ku ter-bawa oleh Ana. (SPONTANEOUS)  
 book- my SPONTAN-carry by Ana (Unintentional Agent)  
 'My book is carried by Ana.'

(24a) Geu thoki-ga holangi-ege meog-hi-eoss-da. (PASSIVE)  
 that rabbit-NOM tiger-AGT eat-PASS-PST-DEC  
 'The rabbit was eaten by the tiger.'

(24b) Ana meolikhlag-i namugaji-e geol-li-eoss-da. (SPONTANEOUS)  
 Ana hair-NOM branch-LOC catch-PASS-PST-DEC  
 'Ana's hair is caught on a tree brach.'

(24c) Ana-ga jong-eul ul-li-eoss-da. (CAUSATIVE)  
 Ana-NOM bell-ACC ring-CAU-PST-DEC  
 'Ana rang the bell.'

(24d) I khal-i jal jal-li-eoss-da. (POTENTIAL)  
 this knife-NOM well cut-PASS-PST-DEC  
 'This knife was cut well.'

(25a) Bitcoin-I yeogi-eseo sayong-doe-eoji-eoss-da. (PASSIVE)  
 bitcoin-NOM here-LOC use-PASS-PASS-PST-DEC  
 'Bitcoin was used here.'

(25b) Haechbeoth-e tha-seo Ana phibu-ga beosgi-eoji-eoss-da  
 sun-LOC burn-cause Ana skin-NOM peel off-INCHOA-PST-DEK  
 'Ana's skin peeled off because of the sunburn.' (SPONTANEOUS)



- (25c) Haneul-I palge-eoji-eoss-da.  
 sky-NOM red-INCHOA-PST-DEC  
 'The sky turned red.' (INCHOATIVE)

### Agency coding in arguments

The main function of case marking is the indexing function and the discriminating function, for the purpose of coding semantic roles and distinguishing core arguments (see [Comrie, 1989](#); [Hopper and Thompson, 1980](#); [Kibrik, 1985](#); [Mallinson & Blake, 1981](#); [Malchukov, 2008](#)). Indonesian marks its cases in arguments by way of word order and adposition. Word order is used to mark core arguments, while adposition is used to indicate the arguments' semantic roles within the given context. However, the agent of Indonesian passive sentences can be indicated by word order and the adposition *oleh*. The use of *oleh* is optional if the agent directly follows the passive verb *di-*, but for long-form agents, agents that do not directly follow the passive verb, or agents that precede the verb as is the case for inverse sentences, the adposition *oleh* shall be used.

- (26a) Ana di-kejar (oleh) paman-nya/ motor hitam itu.  
 Ana PASS-chase (by) uncle-her/ motorbike black that  
 'Ana is chased (by) her uncle/ the black motorbike.'

- (26b) Ana di-kejar oleh Hera yang ber-sepeda warna merah  
 Ana PASS-chase by Hera who INTRAN-bike color red  
 dan teman-nya yang ber-sepeda warna putih.  
 and friend-her which INTRAN-bike color white

'Ana is chased by Hera who is riding a red bike and her friend who is riding a white bike.'

- (26c) Oleh paman-nya, Ana di-kejar.  
 by uncle-her Ana PASS-chase  
 'By her uncle, Ana is chased.'

- (26d) \*Paman-nya Ana di-kejar.  
 uncle-her Ana PASS-chase

As for Korean, it marks all arguments using adpositions, which make word order relatively flexible. Arguments in Korean are distinguished by animacy using different adpositions except for the core arguments. Concerning languages that differentiate arguments by animacy using different case markers, it is said to be a linguistic phenomenon that is difficult to find ([Malchukov, 2008](#)) and is an uncommon phenomenon ([Fauconnier, 2011](#)). However, Korean has this uncommon language feature. The agent of Korean passive sentences is distinguished by

animacy, language variation (written or spoken), and honorifics by using varying different markers

- (27a) Dodug-i      gyeongchal-gwan-ege/-hanthe      choj-gi-eoss-da.  
 thief-NOM    police officer-AGT(Animate)    chase-PASS-PST-DEC  
 ‘The thief was chased by a police officer.’
- (27b) Dodug-l      seonsaeng-nim-ke      choj-gi-eoss-da.  
 thief-NOM    teacher-HON-AGT(HON)      chase-PASS-PST-DEC  
 ‘The thief was chased by the teacher.’
- (27c) Dodug-l      sunchal cha-e      choj-gi-eoss-da.  
 thief-NOM    patrol car-AGT(Inanimate)      chase-PASS-PST-DEC  
 ‘The thief was chased by a patrol car.’

The Korean speaker's view or assumption of an entity also has an influence on the agent marker feasible for use. An inanimate argument can be marked by an animate agent marker if it is considered animate like, hence certain inanimate arguments can be marked by both animate and inanimate agent markers depending on the context. Inanimate arguments that can be used as animate include sophisticated machines or equipment that can be considered having similar ability as humans do, and organizations with human members. For instance, *gyeongchal* ‘police’ is used to refer to police personnel and police institution. The types of animacy within the context can be identified by looking at the markers. To verify this, *gyeongchal* ‘police’ (animate) can be substituted by *gyeongchal-gwan* ‘police officer’ or it can be used along with a numeral phrase determiner, while *gyeongchal* ‘police’ (inanimate) cannot.

- (28a) Geu-ga      gyeongchal-ege/-e      gusog-doe-eoss-da.  
 he-NOM    polisi-AGT      arrest-PASS-PST-DEC  
 ‘He was arrested by the police.’
- (28b) Geu-ga      gyeongchal-gwan-ege/\*-e      gusog-doe-eoss-da.  
 he-NOM    police officer-AGT      arrest-PASS-PST-DEC  
 ‘He was arrested by a police officer.’
- (28c) Geu-ga      du    gyeongchal-ege/\*-e      gusog-doe-eoss-da.  
 he-NOM    two    police-AGT      arrest-PASS-PST-DEC  
 ‘He was arrested by two police officers.’

### Differences in the description of events in Indonesian and Korean

The different way that events are described in Indonesian and Korean is also the reason why Indonesian passive sentences cannot congruently be translated into Korean passive sentences. If we examine how events are described ([Ikegami, 1991](#)), Indonesian is characterized as a DO-language, which prioritizes constructions

implying relationship with the agent, whereas Korean is characterized as a BECOME-language, which prioritizes constructions that suppress the agent.

Indonesian active and passive sentences generated using transitive verbs attached by the affix *meN-* and *di-* imply the existence of a relationship with the agent. The transitive verb *meN-* presents the agent as the unomittable subject. Verbs with the affix *di-* attached imply the existence of an agent, although the agent may be omitted or not presented. Meanwhile, Korean prioritizes constructions that suppress the agent because the agent of active sentences tends to be omitted if it is known from the context. The agent animate of passive sentences that follows an inanimate subject is also omitted due to the issue of Animacy Hierarchy, which leads to the difficulty of distinguishing between passive sentences and resultative aspects that disregard the agent. In addition, Korean verb markers are polysemic, as discussed in the previous section, hence information about the agent and voice type cannot be identified by looking at the verb markers. As such, Indonesian agentless passive cannot necessarily be congruently translated to Korean passive because it would be quite odd, but can be translated into intransitive sentences or subjectless active sentences to make them congruent.

- (29) Uang saku –ku di-kurang-i.  
 money pocket-my PASS-reduce-CAU  
 ‘My pocket money is reduced.’

- (29a) Nae yongdon-i jul-eoss-da.  
 my pocket money-NOM decrease-PST-DEC  
 ‘My pocket money has decreased.’

- (29b) Nae yongdon -leul jul-i-eoss-da.  
 my pocket money-ACC reduce-CAU-PST-DEC  
 ‘(S=Ø) reduced my pocket money.’

## CONCLUSION

The various factors that lead to the incongruity of translating Indonesian passive sentences into Korean passive sentences correlate with differences in the passive voice system, which is caused by the distinct features the respective languages maintain in terms of argument marking, sentence construction controller, subject selection criteria, agentivity coding, how events are described, and sensitivity to animacy.

Indonesian, which marks its core arguments by using word order, is a language that emphasizes function. Sentence construction and its constituents are controlled by the arguments’ syntactic functions coded within the verbs. Indonesian verb formats contain information about the types of voice and the sentence agent. The significance of function in Indonesian is apparent in the subject criteria of passive sentences and the polysemic semantic role markers, while the argument’s semantic role and inherent feature have less influence on Indonesian sentence construction. As for Korean, which marks all its arguments by using case markers, it is a language that prioritizes the argument’s inherent features. Sentence

construction and its constituents are controlled by the argument's inherent feature, namely Animacy Hierarchy and Degree of Control. The significance of the argument's inherent feature in Korean is apparent in the subject criteria, the agent of passive sentences that is differentiated by animacy using different markers, and animacy as a criterion for polysemic semantic role markers. Furthermore, Korean verb format provides no accurate information about the types of voice and agent. However, the passive voice function, namely agent defocusing and non-agent focusing are manifested using TOPIC marking on arguments that are not referred to by the predicate. Conclusively, Indonesian passive sentences that cannot be congruently translated into Korean passive sentences are sentences with constituents that do not align with the Korean language principles of Animacy Hierarchy and Degree of Control. Indonesian passive sentences that cannot be congruently translated into Korean passive sentences characterized as: 1) inanimate subject followed by an animate agent (marked by *-ege/-hanthe/-ke*); 2) the subject takes on the role of Actor, Experiencer, Causer, Instrumental, Temporal, or Locative; 3) the inanimate subject has a greater degree of control than the inanimate agent; 4) the inanimate agent can not be considered to have abilities as animate or its members are not human; and 5) the predicate that are derived from ditransitive verbs and applicative verbs.

The results of this study can contribute to the field of teaching and learning Korean to reduce Korean language learner errors, to contrastive analysis of Korean, Indonesian, and other languages' passive sentences, and contribute to the study of error analysis of Korean sentences produced by Indonesians, as a reference. The findings can contribute to the field of translation of Indonesian and Korean. In addition, the results of this study contribute to showing various typologies of passive voice in the world.

## REFERENCES

- Avila, Rencidiptya Theresia. (2019). *A Contrastive Study of the Passive Forms of Korean and Indonesian Language* (Master's Thesis). Kookmin University, Seoul. Retrieved from <http://www.riss.kr/link?id=T15070635>
- Comrie, Bernard. (1989). *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Croft. William. (1990). *Typology and Universals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Croft. William. (1995). Modern Syntactic Typology, in M. Shibatani and T. Bynon (eds.). *Approaches to Language Typology*, 85–144. New York: Clarendon Press.
- Dixon, R. M. W. (2012). *Basic Linguistic Theory. Volume 3 Further Grammatical Topics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dowty, David. (1991). Thematic Proto-Roles and Argument Selection. *Language*, Vol. 67, No.3, 547-619. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.2307/415037>
- Fauconnier, Stefanie. (2011). Differential Agent Marking and animacy. *Lingua* 121, 533-547. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2010.10.014>
- Givon, Talmy. (2001). *Syntax- An Introduction* Vol. I. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

- Hopper, Paul. J. & Sandra. A. Thompson. (1980). Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse. *Language* 56, 251-299. *Linguistic Society of America*. <https://doi.org/413757>
- Horatianus, Carolus Florian. (2008) *A Comparative Study of Korean and Indonesian Language's Passive* (Master's Thesis). KyoungHee University, Seoul. Retrieved from <http://www.riss.kr/link?id=T11146529>.
- Ikegami, Y. (1991). Do-Language and Become-Language: Two Contrasting Types of Linguistic Representation. In Y. Ikegami (ed). *The Empire of Signs: Semiotic Essays on Japanese Culture*, 285-326. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Im, Young Ho. (2006). The structural and meaning of Indonesian passive voice: a comparative study with Korean. *KASEAS*. 16(2), 216-236. Retrieved from <https://www.kci.go.kr/kciportal/ci/sereArticleSearch/ciSereArtiView.kci?sereArticleSearchBean.artild=ART001028469>
- Im, Young Ho. (2020). Translation of Indonesian passive sentences into Korean. *KASEAS*. 30(2), 67-98. DOI : 10.21485/hufsea.2020.30.2.003
- Jo In-Jeung. (2005). English-Korean Translation: Passive Constructions. *The Journal of Translation Studies*, 6 (1), 121-142. Retrieved from <https://www.kci.go.kr/kciportal/ci/sereArticleSearch/ciSereArtiView.kci?sereArticleSearchBean.artild=ART001973496>
- Keenan, Edward. L. & Dryer, Matthew. S. (2007). Passive in the World's Languages, Shopen, T. (ed.). *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Volume I* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kibrik, A.E. (1985). Toward a typology of ergativity. In: Nichols, J., Woodbury, A. (Eds.), *Grammar Inside and Outside the Clause*. 268–324. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kim, Eunil. (2015). The Modulation of English Passive into Korean Actives in the Viewpoints of Typology and Lexicalization. *Studies in Modern Grammar* 83, 61-79. Retrieved from <https://www.kci.go.kr/kciportal/ci/sereArticleSearch/ciSereArtiView.kci?sereArticleSearchBean.artild=ART001973496>
- Klaiman, M. (1984). The Grammar of Doing and Undergoing in Korean. *Language Research*, 20 (4). 331-343. Seoul. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/10371/85717>
- Klaiman, M. (1988). Affectedness and control: a typology of voice system, in M. Shibatani (ed.) *Passive and Voice*. Amsterdam NL, Philadelphia US: John Benjamins Publishing Co. 25-89.
- Klaiman, M. (1991). *Grammatical Voice*. Cambridge UK, New York US etc: Cambridge University Press.
- Knoob, Stefan. (2008). On the Importance of Animacy and Agency Effects in the Korean Diathesis System. *SOAS-AKS Working Paper in Korean Studies*, 4. London: University of London. <https://www.soas.ac.uk/koreanstudies/soas-aks/soas-aks-papers/>
- Li, C. N. and S. A. Thompson. (1976). Subject and Topic: A New Typology of Language. In C. N. Li (ed.). *Subject and Topic*, 457-489. London: Academic

Press.

- Malchukov, Andrej L. (2008). Animacy and asymmetries in differential case marking. *Lingua* 118, 203-221. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2007.02.005>
- Mallinson, G., Blake, B. (1981). *Language Typology: Cross-Cultural Studies in Syntax*. North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. (1985). Passive and Related Construction: A Prototype Analysis. *Language*, 16(4), 821-848. <https://doi.org/10.2307/414491>
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. (1998). Voice Parameters. *Kobe Papers in Linguistics* 1:93-111.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. (2006). On the Conceptual Framework for Voice Phenomena. *Linguistics*, 44 (2), 217-269.
- Siewierska, A. (2005). Passive Constructions, in Martin Haspelmath, Matthew S. Dryer, David Gil, Bernard Comrie (eds.). *World Atlas of Language Structure*. Oxford University Press.
- Sohn, Ho-min (1999). *The Korean Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Valin, Robert D, Dan Randy J. Lapoli. (1999). *Syntax, Structure, Meaning, and Function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wahyuningsih, Sri. 2020. Contrastive Study on Passive Form in Korean and Indonesian: A Corpus-based Contrastive Study. (Master's Thesis). Kyungpook National University, Daegu. Retrieved from <http://www.riss.kr/link?id=T15655738>.
- Whaley, L. J. (1997). *Introduction to Typology: The Unity and Diversity of Language*. SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Williamson, John & Kim, Soo-Yeon. (2013). How Animacy and Agenthood Influence Argument Order in the Translation of English Passive Constructions to Korean. *The Journal of Translation Studies* 14(5), 263-283. Retrieved from <https://www.kci.go.kr/kciportal/ci/sereArticleSearch/ciSereArtiView.kci?sereArticleSearchBean.artid=ART001828304>
- Yamamoto, Mutsumi. (1999). *Animacy and Reference: Studies in Language Companion Series 46*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.