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INTRODUCTION
Chapter One

1.1 The Background of the Study

Indonesia is the world's largest archipelago which extends over 4,500 kilometres along the equator with a population of over 180 million people. As a nation, Indonesia is made up of a plurality of ethnic groups, cultures and languages. These languages are not all the same in size, or in sociocultural importance, but they are equal under the Indonesian constitution.

The most important and uniquely placed language is Indonesian, which was declared the state language by the 1945 Constitution, Section XV, Article 36. It is the national and only official language throughout the Republic of Indonesia.

As the national language, Indonesian functions as an invaluable and effective tool in integrating the heterogeneous peoples of Indonesia within the framework of establishing and developing a strong Indonesian nationalism. Indonesian has enabled the people to carry out intercultural communication. The status of Indonesian as the national language commenced when Malay was adopted and promulgated as Indonesian by the Youth Congress held in Jakarta on October 28, 1928. As the official language Indonesian functions as a means of communication in which legislative, executive, and judicial affairs are administered. Instruction in schools both state and private, from elementary to university levels, is carried out in Indonesian.

In addition to Indonesian, there are more than three hundred 'regional' languages in Indonesia. Five out of these regional languages are regarded as 'major' regional languages because they have a large number of speakers, a writing system, and a literary tradition. One of these five languages is Balinese, which is spoken mainly by Balinese people on the island of Bali and in the western part of Lombok Island. Balinese is a member of the Western Malayo-Polynesian family, a subgroup of Austronesian languages (see, for instance, Ruhlen 1987).

Balinese is often noted as a language which has different speech levels. These speech levels are mostly coded lexically. In terms of the grammar of the language they do not play a major role (Braithwaite 1992). Balinese has a rich morphological system for marking the valency of the verb. Noun phrases in core grammatical relations are unmarked, while noun phrases in peripheral relations are marked by prepositions. There is no marking on the verb for tense nor is there any agreement system. Besides verbal sentences, Balinese also has sentences in which the predicate is a noun phrase, adjectival phrase, prepositional phrase or numerative phrase.

The linguistic and sociolinguistic aspects of Balinese have been described by a number of writers. However, a satisfactory grammatical description of the language is still lacking. Some of the previous studies, particularly those dealing with grammatical aspects of the language, will be reviewed briefly below.

The earliest description of Balinese was produced by Van Eck in 1874 followed by Kersten in 1948. These works were written in Dutch. Kersten refined his work and then published it in Indonesian in 1970. In 1984 this book was published again with a Balinese-Indonesian dictionary as a supplement. This book deals with grammatical description and also contains a brief description of the sociolinguistic aspects of the language. Although the grammatical treatment is sketchy, Kersten's introduction to the Balinese morphological system is useful and well organised. He is the first writer who classifies Balinese 'passives' into three: first, second, and third passive. His classification will be discussed and refined in this thesis.
Discussion of basic Balinese morphology and syntax can be found in a number of books, for example, *The Structure of Balinese* by Bawa and Jendra (1981). This book was published in Jakarta by The National Centre for Language Development and Cultivation, Department of Education and Culture. The book is the outcome of the Indonesian and Regional language project funded by this centre. Bawa and Jendra take a 'structuralist' view, by mainly describing syntactic constructions at phrasal level and by differentiating between 'endocentric' and 'exocentric' constructions. However, the clausal or sentential level is not discussed in depth. A description of simple sentences in Balinese is only given in terms of their predicate fillers. Bawa and Jendra note that in addition to verbal predicates, Balinese also has non-verbal predicates.

*A Grammar of Balinese Language* by Oka Granoka et al. (1984) covers all aspects of grammatical description. This grammar is a research report funded by the National Centre for Language Development and Cultivation and has not been published yet. Granoka et al. (1984) describe all grammatical aspects of the language. However, their analysis of the clausal level is very sketchy. Grammatical relations like subject and object are assumed and the authors do not attempt to justify them.

A specialist study was a thesis completed by Hunter in 1988, entitled *Balinese Language: Historical Background and Contemporary State*. This thesis deals with the historical background of the language. He compares the morphosyntax of Old Javanese, Old Malay, Old Balinese and Modern Balinese. Hunter covers a number of syntactic aspects of Balinese such as the structure of noun phrases and equational sentences, and he also treats 'function' words such as adverbs, conjunctions, etc. In presenting his discussion of 'passive' constructions, Hunter follows Kersten's classification of Balinese 'passives'.

A more recent study on *The Evolution of Balinese Verbal Morphology* is Beratha's (1992). Her thesis covers the phonology, morphology and the syntax of Old and Modern Balinese as well as the speech levels. This is an important study in the sense that it is the first comprehensive study of the morphological evolution of Balinese. She concludes that a number of affixes of Old Balinese are lost in modern Balinese, others are preserved and reanalysed (see Beratha 1992 for details).

She also discusses modern Balinese verbal constructions in terms of the notions of Actor and Undergoer developed by Foley and Van Valin (1984). The use of Actor-Undergoer is combined with the pragmatic notions, Topic and Focus. For example, a nasal verb construction in Balinese is analysed as having the following argument structure: Actor-Topic + N-verb + Undergoer-Focus, while a basic verb construction in which the verb is not marked by a nasal prefix (N-) is considered as having a structure like: Undergoer-Topic + verb + Actor-Focus. However, the combining of the pragmatic terms Topic and Focus with Actor and Undergoer is not well motivated.

Since Hunter's and Beratha's theses cover various aspects of the language, such as historical, sociolinguistic, and grammatical aspects, it cannot be expected that all these aspects are analysed in depth. A number of observations made by Hunter and Beratha need to be refined. For instance, when Hunter discusses Balinese adverbs, he does not try to relate them to the verb form of the sentence. In this thesis the morphology of the verb and the adverb and their interaction will be discussed and explained. An example from Beratha's study which reveals incorrect observation is the claim that in modern Balinese perception verbs cannot be used in a 0-construction (that is, a transitive construction in which the verb used is morphologically unmarked).

Clynes (1989) produced a comparative study of Balinese and Javanese speech levels. The study shows that the development of Balinese speech levels has been influenced by Javanese. The
borrowing took place not only in terms of lexicon but also in syntax. Clynes (1989) has convincingly shown that the 'patient focus' (the 'passive') construction in which the verb is prefixed by *ka* in Balinese (which is commonly used in a high style) is borrowed from Javanese due to extensive contact between the two languages. The agent of this 'patient focus' construction, which may be 1st, 2nd or 3rd person, is optionally expressed in an oblique prepositional phrase.

The most significant feature that will differentiate the present study from previous ones is that it will provide a detailed typological discussion of Balinese syntax.

1. 2 The Scope and Aims of the Study

This study will mainly focus on the problems facing linguists when they study Austronesian languages in general, that is, whether these languages should be analysed as accusative languages, ergative languages, or something else.10

Having stated the background of the study, I will now specify the aims and scope of the present study. The main aim of this study is to discuss and explain the typological characteristics of Balinese. The core topics that will be discussed include:

(a) grammatical relations
(b) valency-changing mechanisms
(c) pragmatic typology
(d) syntactic typology

In addition to the above objectives, this study is also expected to make some contribution to the existing body of descriptions of Balinese and to provide more information about Balinese for those interested in doing research on this language or on Austronesian languages in general.

In order to achieve the above ends, this study will cover various aspects of Balinese syntax, which can be specified as follows:

(a) Grammatical relations - this section will be concerned with establishing grammatical relations in Balinese. Grammatical relations such as subject and object are often assumed to be universal. This generally means that they can be identified in every natural language.

(b) Valency-changing mechanisms - this section will be concerned with a detailed discussion of verbal affixation that marks changes in valency. The formal coding of differences in valency in Balinese can indicate either valency-increase or valency-decrease.

(c) Pragmatic typology - the central issue discussed in this section is the notions of subject and topic. Is Balinese a subject prominent language? This question will be addressed in terms of Li and Thompson's (1976) classic typology.

---

1 Gibson and Starosta (1990) point out that the traditional characterisation of ergativity and accusativity cannot be applied directly to Austronesian languages because these languages commonly have more than one two-place clause pattern.
(d) Complex sentences - this section will be concerned with relative clause formation, purposive clauses, complement clauses and raising constructions.

(e) The interaction between the verb form, adverb form and particles - this section will explain the morphology of adverbs in Balinese. The adverb form in Balinese can be changed depending on the meaning the speaker wants to express. This change will closely relate to the verb form of the sentence in which the adverb is used. A number of particles that mark aspectual distinction are also discussed in this section.

(f) The syntax of nominal structures and nominalisation - this section will cover the 'syntactic bondedness' between the head noun and the adjunct in a noun phrase, alienable and inalienable constructions, and nominalisation.

(g) Syntactic typology - the identification of grammatical relations will enable us to decide whether Balinese can be typed as an accusative language, an ergative language, a mixture of the two or neither.

(h) Ergativity and syntactic theory - most syntactic theories are developed from English. This means that they work well for languages that are typologically like English. This section will be concerned with how syntactic theories, in particular Relational Grammar and Government and Binding Theory, can handle languages that have ergative syntax.

1.3 Data Analyzed

Balinese is one of the languages in Indonesia which has speech levels. These levels can be distinguished into high and low levels. Many writers argue that the high level is due to the influence of the neighbouring language, Javanese (see, for examples, Clynes 1989 and Beratha 1992). This language not only influenced Balinese but also Sundanese, which is spoken in West Java. The so-called high level in contemporary Sundanese is borrowed from Javanese, while the low level Sundanese is a 'true' Sundanese language (Rabin Hardjadibrata, personal communication). A similar situation is true for Balinese in that the low level Balinese is a 'true' Balinese language. Thus the Balinese language analysed in this thesis is of the low level variety ('true' Balinese) unless otherwise indicated.

The language data analysed in this work are primarily the personal speech repertoire of the writer, who was born, bred, and educated in Bali. This speech is verified against the speech of Balinese informants. The material for the analysis is supplemented with written texts and recorded data.

I believe this kind of data gathering for descriptive morphosyntax analysis of a given language is acceptable, since it is generally assumed that native speakers have the ability to make judgements about whether a given sentence is well-formed or not in their language. This linguistic ability enables them to speak and understand their language. Chomsky termed this linguistic ability the competence of the native speaker and distinguishes two types of competence: (i) grammatical competence and (ii) pragmatic competence (1977:40). The former relates to the theory of language structure and the latter to the theory of language use. Native speakers' grammatical competence is reflected in their ability to make intuitive judgements about whether a given sentence is well-formed

---

2 The recording was made among Balinese students at La Trobe in 1991.
or not, while native speakers' pragmatic competence enables them to make use of non-linguistic information in the interpretation of sentences. However, this does not mean that native speakers can always tell us why a certain construction is acceptable or not. When one asks native speakers about the acceptability of a particular construction, the answer that one is likely to get is either 'okay' or not 'okay'. It is the analyst's task to discover the reasons.

Hawkins (1978) also points out that there are basically two types of semantic judgements which native speakers can make about the sentences that they judge grammatical. They can give information on when they would use particular sentences or constructions, and on what they understand them to mean when they do use them.\(^3\)

1.4 Orientation of the Analysis

This thesis is primarily concerned with analysing Balinese in terms of language typology. Therefore, I would like to comment briefly on the overall theoretical perspectives I adopt in this study. In particular, I want to make it clear from the outset that my general approach is based on two interrelated models of analysis.

Firstly, I state my findings in terms of a descriptive-typological approach. This is in line with the main purpose of my study, that is, to establish some typological characteristics of Balinese. This kind of approach has been practised in the majority of recent typologist and universalist studies. With respect to the significance of the typological approach to language study, Hammond et al. (1988) write:

> language typology lies at the very centre of linguistics in that it serves directly the goals of the discipline itself: to explain, as well as describe, the fact of natural language structure. Language typology not only provides a description of the range of variation among natural language, but also addresses itself to the explanatory task.

Secondly, I will discuss Balinese clause structures in terms of Relational Grammar. Relational Grammar is a multistratal syntactic theory which was developed mainly by David Perlmutter and Paul Postal in the early 1970s. This theory is used as a tool to bring an understanding of the inner workings of Balinese grammar. A brief comparison of Relational Grammar and Government and Binding Theory will also be made.

From a theoretical point of view, it is often argued that typological studies do not lead to theoretical progress, since the only way to achieve this is by means of testing the theories. However, I am not arguing that typological studies should be opposed to the formulation of theories. In fact, I believe that a typological approach should go hand in hand with syntactic theories.

Thus the finding of this study is expected to be accessible to those doing research on language typology and universals. Also to those interested in applying a particular grammatical model to a particular language.

---

\(^3\) The importance of native speakers' judgement in linguistic analysis is noted by a number of linguists (see, for example, Foley and Van Valin 1984:28).
1.5 The Organisation of the Thesis

Chapter one describes the background, scope and aims of the present study, the data analysed, and the model of analysis adopted.

Chapter two deals with the basic structure of Balinese. The description in this chapter includes the notion of subject and transitivity as well as the problems involved in interpreting the typology of Balinese.

Chapter three is concerned with valency-changing mechanisms which includes causativisation, applicativisation, resultatives and other verbal constructions. These two chapters serve as the basis for the discussion of the succeeding chapters.

Chapter four is a study of the pragmatic functions in Balinese. The typology of Balinese in terms of Li and Thompson's language typology is addressed. The discussion in this chapter will also focus on the notion of topic in Balinese in terms of whether it can be considered as a grammaticalised topic or not.

Chapter five discusses complex sentences in Balinese, which includes relativisation, purpose clauses, complement clauses and raising constructions. Chapter six discusses the interaction between the verb form and adverb form and particles. Chapter seven presents a description of nominals including nominal structures and nominalisation.

Chapter eight looks at syntactic typology. Chapter nine is concerned with the discussion of Balinese sentence structures in terms of theoretical syntax. Chapter ten, the final chapter, provides the conclusions of the study.
THE BASIC STRUCTURE OF BALINESE

Chapter Two

2. 1 Introduction

Balinese, like many Austronesian languages, has two different structures for encoding a transitive proposition. One of these structures occurs with a morphologically unmarked transitive verb, while the verb in the other construction is prefixed by a nasal. For the purpose of this study the former construction in which the verb appears in its basic form is called a zero (Ø-) construction, while the latter will be referred to as a nasal (N-) construction.

The main concern of this chapter is to look at the notions of subject and transitivity in Balinese. In searching for subject properties, the arguments of the Ø-construction will be compared with the sole argument of a one-place verb as well as with the agent of the N-construction. It is commonly accepted that the argument of a one-place verb is taken to be the subject of the sentence. It is also true that the agent of a basic transitive sentence in a language such as English is also taken to be the subject.

In order to facilitate the description of these constructions, the allomorphs of the prefix (N) when attached to transitive verbs will be provided. This prefix can also be used to derive an intransitive verb from a precategorial base. However, that function of the prefix does not concern us here. It will be discussed in section 3.6. The morphophonemics of the nasal (N-) prefix can be summarised as follows.

a) N- is realised as a homorganic nasal before a voiced or voiceless stop, and the stop is dropped, e.g.

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
baca & '\text{to read}' & maca & 'to read' \\
borbor & '\text{to burn}' & morbor & 'to burn' \\
pacok & '\text{to stab}' & macok & 'to stab' \\
pacak & '\text{to nail}' & macek & 'to nail' \\
dakep & '\text{to catch}' & nakep & 'to catch' \\
daar & '\text{to eat}' & naar & 'to eat' \\
tamplak & '\text{to smash}' & namlak & 'to smash' \\
tumbak & '\text{to spear}' & numbak & 'to spear'
\end{array}
\]

b) N- is realised as /ny/ before /c/, /j/, and /s/ and these consonants are dropped, e.g.

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
cacah & '\text{to cut}' & nyacah & 'to cut' \\
colek & '\text{to touch}' & nyolek & 'to touch' \\
jagur & '\text{to punch}' & nyagur & 'to punch' \\
jemak & '\text{to take}' & nyemak & 'to take'
\end{array}
\]
\[ \text{sereg} \quad \text{'to lock'} \quad \text{nyereg} \quad \text{'to lock'} \]
\[ \text{samgh} \quad \text{'to sharpen'} \quad \text{nyanggh} \quad \text{'to sharpen'} \]

c) N- is realised as /ng/ before bases that begin with /l/ or /r/, and before words beginning with vowels or semi-vowels, e.g.

\[ \text{lempag} \quad \text{'to hit'} \quad \text{nglempag} \quad \text{'to hit'} \]
\[ \text{lambet} \quad \text{'to hit'} \quad \text{nglambet} \quad \text{'to hit'} \]
\[ \text{racun} \quad \text{'to poison'} \quad \text{ngracun} \quad \text{'to poison'} \]
\[ \text{racik} \quad \text{'to prepare'} \quad \text{ngracik} \quad \text{'to prepare'} \]
\[ \text{orahin} \quad \text{'to tell'} \quad \text{ngorahin} \quad \text{'to tell'} \]
\[ \text{omongin} \quad \text{'to talk'} \quad \text{ngomongin} \quad \text{'to talk'} \]
\[ \text{yeihin} \quad \text{'to water'} \quad \text{ngyeihin} \quad \text{'to water'} \]
\[ \text{waliang} \quad \text{'to return'} \quad \text{ngwaliang} \quad \text{'to return'} \]

2. 2 The Basic Structure of Balinese

In Balinese the single argument of a one-place verb or of a non-verbal predicate precedes,

(1) \[ \text{la} \quad \text{guru} \]
\[ 3SG \quad \text{teacher} \]
\[ 'S/he is a teacher' \]

(2) \[ \text{Cicing-e} \quad \text{teka} \]
\[ \text{dog-DEF} \quad \text{come} \]
\[ 'The dog came' \]

With most two-place verbs, roughly the translational equivalents of the transitive verbs in English, there are two alternative constructions as shown in the following examples.

(3) \[ \text{Cicing-e} \quad \text{sepak} \quad \text{tiang}\]
\[ \text{dog-DEF} \quad \text{kick} \quad 1SG \]
\[ 'I kicked the dog' \]

(4) \[ \text{Tiang} \quad \text{nyepak} \quad \text{cicing-e} \quad [N-sepak] \]
\[ 1SG \quad \text{ACT. kick} \quad \text{dog-DEF} \]
\[ 'I kicked the dog' \]

\[ ^1 \text{The form } \text{tiang} \text{ can be considered as a neutral form for a first person pronoun in Balinese. It can be used in high or low level sociolect. It is the shortened form of } \text{titiang}, \text{ which is used in high style only.} \]
The example in (3) is a Ø-construction and the example in (4) is a N-construction (with N-glossed as ACTor). These two constructions differ in terms of the verb form and word order. The word order in (3) is patient-verb-agent (PVA), while the order in (4) is agent-verb-patient (AVP). Note that the terms 'agent' and 'patient' are not used to refer to strict semantic roles: they are used simply to label the argument NPs of a two-place verb regardless of the 'degree' of the transitivity of the verb.

The N-construction, as in (4), has been traditionally described as active and the zero construction, as in (3), has been taken to be passive (see, for example, Bawa and Jendra 1981, Kersten 1984). There are, however, some serious objections that can be raised to this analysis on the basis of what is known about the genuine active-passive opposition in other languages.

2.3 Is the Ø-construction Passive?

Since the patient in the Ø-construction is treated in the same way as the single argument of a one-place predicate, the question arises as to whether this construction is passive or whether it is ergative. This will be discussed after presenting the basic facts of the Ø-construction.

The agent of the Ø-construction can be a pronoun, a kin term, or a non-specific noun. The following examples occur with a pronoun as the agent.

(5) Buku-ne jemak tiang  
book-DEF take 1SG  
'I took the book'

(6) Buku-ne jemak nyai³  
book-DEF take 2SG  
'Did you take the book?'

(7) Buku-ne jemak=a  
book-DEF take=3SG  
'S/he took the book'

The patient NP in (5) is bukune, and the agent is a first person pronoun, tiang. In (6) the agent is a second person pronoun nyai. Note that in (7) the third person pronoun ia is encliticised as =a. The free form ia cannot be used.

In addition to the use of a pronominal agent, kin terms such as bapa 'father', meme 'mother', beli 'elder brother', etc can be used pronominally. If these terms are used as an agent, they can only refer to the speaker (first person) or the addressee (second person). The context will clarify whether they act as a first or second person deictic.

² Heratha (1992:131) points out that perception verbs or verbs with unaffected patients cannot be used in the Ø-construction. This is incorrect. Verbs like 'see', 'love', etc can be used. There is no restriction on the degree of the transitivity of the verb for the Ø-construction.
³ Balinese does not have gender differences for third person pronouns, but it has gender differences for second person pronouns: cai 'you' is used for male, while nyai for female.
The Ø-construction also occurs with a nonspecific noun in (10), a generic noun in (11) and with nouns denoting natural forces as an agent in (12) and (13).

(10) Ia cotot lelipi
3SG bite snake
'A snake bit her/him'

(11) Ia ejuk polisi
3SG catch police
'The police caught her/him'

(12) Padi-ne uyak angin
rice plant-DEF destroy wind
'The wind destroyed the rice plants'

(13) Umah-e anyudang belabar
house-DEF wash away flood
'The flood washed away the house'

Now the question that needs to be asked is how a proper name or a definite/specific noun agent is expressed in the Ø-construction. The following examples illustrate this point.

(14) Nasi-ne jemak=a
rice-DEF take=3SG
'S/he took the rice'

(15) Nasi-ne ajeng=a teken anak-e ento
rice-DEF eat=3SG by person-DEF that
'That person ate the rice'

The sentence in (15) shows that Balinese has the option of specifying the agent. This construction looks like a passive but =a is clearly a third person enclitic not a passive marker. It cannot be accompanied a teken phrase referring to first or second person.

It is worth emphasising that this construction is not passive; that is, it is not a derived intransitive. It is a transitive clause. In Balinese grammar books, the Ø-construction is considered as passive. This would mean that Balinese has an unusual passive construction in which the verb occurs in its basic form and it also commonly occurs with a first and second person pronoun agent as well as with kin terms which are used deictically.
Sierwieska (1984) notes that a prototypical passive construction has the following characteristics:

a) the subject of the passive clause is a direct object in the corresponding active clause;
b) the subject of an active clause is expressed in the passive in the form of an adjunct phrase or is left unexpressed;
c) the verb is marked passive.

In addition to the structural characteristics above, one could say that passive constructions tend not to favour first and second person agents. However, the Ø-construction has the following characteristics:

a) In addition to a third person agent, this construction also commonly occurs with a first person pronoun and second person pronoun, and with kin terms that are used deictically; (see examples 8 and 9)
b) The agent is not deletable;
c) The verb is not marked passive.

Thus there are good reasons for believing that the Ø-construction in Balinese is not a passive construction. If the Ø-construction is not passive, then an alternative term is needed. With respect to this problem a comment made by Stephen Anderson is worth taking into consideration. Anderson (1976:7) notes that (in comparison to a transitive clause in an accusative language):

The clause in an ergative language is (if transitive) A passive@ in nature. The structural position of subject and object are distinct on this view, but in a transitive clause the NP occupying the subject position is the one corresponding to an accusative object, while the NP corresponding to a (nominative) subject is in oblique relation of some sort. This structure is, of course, exactly that which is produced by the operation of a passive rule in languages like English, the claim here is that in an ergative language it is basic.

The nature of the Ø-construction in Balinese accords with this comment. If this view is adopted, the Ø-construction can be termed an 'ergative' construction. Under this analysis this construction is not a challenge to our understanding of the nature of the passive.

To claim that the Ø-construction is an ergative construction is not the same as claiming that the language is ergative. In the generally accepted notion of ergativity, a language is ergative if the patient complement of a transitive verb is treated like the sole argument (S) of an intransitive verb. This definition is based on the assumption that there is only one transitive construction. However, as noted by Gibson and Starosta (1990), Austronesian languages often have more than one way of expressing a transitive proposition. In order to claim that Balinese is ergative we would have to show either that the N-construction is not transitive or that the Ø-construction has some claim to being more basic (see section 2.6).

2.4 The Notion of 'Subject'

Subject is a grammatical relation, so its identification should be based primarily on grammatical properties. The description that follows will concentrate on establishing which NP has grammatical subject properties in the Ø-construction in Balinese. The behaviour of the pre-verbal NP of this construction will be compared with the sole argument of the intransitive verb as well as with the pre-verbal NP of the nasal verb.
The notion of subject will be looked at in terms of raising, quantifier float. PRO, relativisation, and reflexivisation.

(a) Subject Raising

A sentence like (16a) can be analysed as consisting of an adjective (keweh) with a clause (ia pules) as its argument. The propositional content of such a clause can be expressed as a single clause as in (16b). This can be related to (16a) via a rule of raising (Postal 1974). We can say that ia has been raised from the complement clause ia pules to become the subject of keweh. The same relation hold between (17a) and (17b).

(16) a. Keweh ia pules.
    difficult 3SG sleep
    'It is difficult for her/him to sleep'

    b. Ia keweh pules
    3SG difficult pules
    'It is difficult for her/him to sleep'

(17) a. Pelih ia teka mai
    wrong 3SG come here
    'It is wrong for her/him to come here'

    b. Ia pelih teka mai
    3SG wrong come here
    'It is wrong for her/him to come here'

The examples below are transitive clauses. These sentences are used to show that only the pre-verbal NP can be raised. If the postverbal NP is raised to become the subject of the adjectival predicate, the sentence becomes ungrammatical as shown in (18c) and (19c). The sentence in (19) contains a nasal verb, while (18) contains a basic verb. Thus regardless of the verb form used in each sentence, only the pre-verbal NP can be raised. This indicates that the preverbal NP is a grammatical subject.

(18) a. Aluh montor-e benahin tiang
    easy car-DEF fix 1SG
    'The car is easy for me to fix'

    b. Montor-e aluh benahin tiang
    car-DEF easy fix 1SG
    'The car is easy for me to fix'

    c. *Tiang aluh montor-e benahin
    1SG easy car-DEF fix

\[1\] See Chung (1976) for the description of a similar phenomenon in Indonesian
(19) a. Enggal tiang ngadep umah [N-adep]
quick 1SG ACT. sell house
'It is quick for me to sell a house'

b. Tiang enggal ngadep umah
1SG quick ACT. sell house
'It is quick for me to sell a house'

c. *Umah enggal tiang ngadep.
house quick 1SG ACT. sell

(b) Quantifier Float

A quantifier normally occurs with the noun phrase it modifies. However, it may 'float' away and occupy another position in the clause. The following quantifiers in Balinese can float:

(a) onya 'all'
(b) makejang 'all'
(c) sami 'all'

The form *onya in (a) and makejang in (b) are used in low style, while sami in (c) is used in high style. Regardless of the position of the quantifier in the sentence, it should always be construed with the preverbal argument NP of the sentence. This is illustrated in the following examples.

(20) Cerik-cerik-e onya ngeling
child:PL-DEF all cry
'All the children cried'

(21) a Cerik-cerik-e onya tepukin beli
child:PL-DEF all see elder brother
'I saw all the children

b. Onya cerik-cerike tepukin beli.
c. Cerik-cerike tepukin beli onya.

The example in (20) is an intransitive clause: there is no ambiguity in this clause in terms of the use of the quantifier onya. In (21) the quantifier onya can only be interpreted as quantifying the patient argument, that is, the preverbal NP regardless of where the quantifier occurs. The example in (22) below is a nasal construction.

(22) a Cerik-cerik-e onya meli jaja [N-beli]
child:PL-DEF all ACT. buy cake
'All the children bought some cakes'
b. *Onya cerik-cerike meli jaja*
   'All the children bought some cakes'

c. Cerik-cerike meli jaja *onya*
   'All the children bought some cakes'

A similar situation can be found in (22). The position of the quantifier is not important for its interpretation since it has to be construed with the agent of the clause. Thus the patient in (21), the agent in (22) and the sole argument of an intransitive verb in (20) are treated in the same way, that is, the interpretation of the quantifier should be associated with these arguments. Since it is uncontroversial that the sole argument of an intransitive verb is the subject of the sentence, then we can say that the agent in (22) and the patient (21) are also the grammatical subjects of their clauses.

(c) PRO

In English, and in Indo-European languages generally, a distinction is made between finite and non-finite verbs. A finite verb requires a subject whether this be expressed as person/number cross-referencing agreement on the verb, by a noun phrase, or by both agreement and a noun phrase. A non-finite verb on the other hand normally lacks a subject whether morphological or syntactic. In Balinese there is no person/number agreement, but the distinction between finite and non-finite verbs still shows up syntactically.

In Chomsky's Government and Binding Theory (Haegeman 1991) the subject of a non-finite clause is held to be non-overt NP and is represented as PRO. The following is a set of English examples. English is an example of an accusative language. The non-overt NP (PRO) is coreferential with the subject of the higher clause in (23) and (24). The agent of a lexically transitive verb like *examine* is the unmarked choice for the subject in English. If the patient is to be the subject, the verb is passivised as shown in (25). PRO occurs only in subject position. One cannot have *I want the doctor to examine PRO* with the meaning 'I want the doctor to examine me'.

(23) I want [PRO to come]

(24) I want [PRO to examine a doctor]

(25) I want [PRO to be examined by a doctor]

If we translate these sentences into Balinese and represent the non-overt NP as PRO the following pattern emerges. In Balinese the patient of a transitive verb like *periksa* is the unmarked choice for subject as shown in (28), but the agent is the marked choice for the subject as in (27). In this example the verb *periksa* is nasalised.

(26) Tiang edot [PRO teka]
    1SG want [PRO come]
    'I want to come'
(27) Tiang edot [PRO meriksa dokter]
    ISG want [PRO ACT. examine doctor]
'I want to examine a doctor'

(28) Tiang edot [PRO periksa dokter]
    ISG want [PRO examine dokter]
'I want to be examined by a doctor'

PRO occurs in preverbal position and can occur only in this position. In other words we can say that the pre-verbal NP position shares with the subject in English the property that it alone can be filled by PRO. Thus a comparison of the two sets of sentences also reveals that for a lexically transitive verb like examine it is the agent that serves as subject in the unmarked construction, whereas for periksa, the translational equivalent in Balinese, it is the patient that seems to be the subject in the unmarked construction.

(d) Relativisation

With respect to relativisation strategies, English is noted as a language which can relativise virtually all grammatical relations, as opposed to languages which relativise only subjects (Keenan and Comrie 1977). Balinese belongs to the latter category.

The relative clause in Balinese is marked by the use of the particle ane/sane. For a start consider the following examples.

(33) a. Anak-e cenik ento gugut cicing
    person-DEF small that bite dog
'A dog bit the child'

    b. Anak-e cenik ento [ane gugut cicing] gelem
    person-DEF small that [REL bite dog] sick

'The child whom the dog bit was sick'

    c. *Cicing [ane anak-e cenik ento gugut] mokoh
    dog [REL person-DEF small that bite] fat
'The dog that bit the child was fat'

The verb in (33) is a basic verb. With a basic verb construction only the preverbal NP (the patient) can be relativised as shown in (33b) above. The postverbal NP (the agent) is not accessible to relativisation as shown in (33c). The example in (34a) below is a nasal verb construction.

(34) a. I Warta maca koran
    Art Warta ACT. read newspaper
'Warta read the newspaper'
b. I Warta [ane maca koran] timpal-ne Art Warta [REL ACT. read newspaper] friend-3SGPOSS
   'Warta who read the newspaper is his/her friend'

c. *Koran [ane I Warta maca] korantiang-e newspaper [REL Art Warta ACT. read] newspaper1ST-POSS
   'The newspaper that Warta read is mine (my newspaper)'

In (34a) the NP I Warta is the preverbal NP (the agent) and the postverbal NP koran is the patient. In (34b) it is the agent which is relativised, but in (34c) it is the patient that is relativised, but this relative clause formation is not grammatical.

This relativisation shows that either the agent or the patient can be relativised depending on the form of the verb. If the sentence occurs with a basic verb, only the patient can be relativised.

But if the sentence occurs with a nasal verb, only the agent can be relativised. Thus the agent in a nasal verb construction behaves like a subject, while in the basic verb construction it is the patient which behaves like a subject. They behave in the same way as the subject of an intransitive clause in terms of relativisation. The following is an intransitive clause and its subject is always relativisable.

(35) a. Anak-e ento ngeling peron-DEF that cry
   'That person cried'

   b. Anak-e ento [ane ngeling] pisagan cai-ne person-DEF that [REL cry] neigbour 2SG-POSS
   'The person who cried is my neighbour'

(c) Reflexivisation

In many languages it is the agent that controls reflexivisation. In English the agent is the unmarked choice for subject. In Balinese the agent is the marked choice for subject. However, reflexivisation in Balinese is controlled by the agent of a transitive verb regardless of the verb form used in the sentence. Thus the agent argument of $\emptyset$-construction in Balinese behaves like a subject. It controls reflexivisation.\footnote{A similar phenomenon is noted in Tagalog by Schachter (1976, 1977). He points out that the agent (actor) is always the controller of the reflexive form in Tagalog regardless of its grammatical function.}

Perhaps it is universally true that the agent argument in a clause is always a possible antecedent of a reflexive form within that clause. The reflexive form in Balinese is expressed by the form awak/raga which is translatable into the English -self. Consider the following examples

(36) Cai nebek awak [N-tebek] 2SG ACT. stab self
   'You stabbed yourself'

   \footnote{A similar phenomenon is noted in Tagalog by Schachter (1976, 1977). He points out that the agent (actor) is always the controller of the reflexive form in Tagalog regardless of its grammatical function.}
In addition to the reflexive form used in the above sentence, Balinese also has a reflexive form which is marked by a possessive marker. Consider the sentences below.

(38) Tiang melihang awak tiang-e [N-pelihang]
    1SG  ACT. blame   self   1SG-POSS
    'I blamed myself'

(39) Ia nebek awak-ne [N-tebek]
    3SG  ACT. stab    self-3SGPOSS
    'S/he stabbed her/him self'

Note that the possessive marker for a third person pronoun is -ne as shown in (39), while for the first and second person pronoun it is -e. The morpheme -e has the allomorph -ne when the word it attaches to ends in a vowel. The reflexive form used in (36) and (37) could be regarded as a 'simple' reflexive form and the one use in (38), and (39) as a 'complex' form.

The following examples show that the complex reflexive form can occur in preverbal position and be controlled by the post-verbal agent complement.

(40) Awak cai-ne pelihang cai
    self  2SG-POSS  blame  2SG
    'You blamed yourself'

(41) Awak-ne pelihang=a
    self-3SGPOSS blame=3SG
    'S/he blamed herself/himself'

(42) *Awak pelihang cai
    self  blame  2SG
    'You blamed yourself'

However, the sentence in (42) is not acceptable although the verb used is the same as the one in (40) and (41). The difference between (42) and the other two sentences is the 'nature' of the reflexive. In (40) and (41) it is marked by a possessive marker (thus it is specific), while in (42) it is non-specific. These examples illustrate two points. The first is that the pre-verbal NP does not exhibit all the properties commonly associated with subjects, since an agent complement (whether a subject or not) can control a reflexive. The second is that for a reflexive to occur as subject it must be specific. It is generally true of subjects that they tend to be specific and in some languages they must be specific. Balinese is of the latter type.
2. 5 Word Order

This section will look at the word order of imperative, declarative and interrogative sentences in Balinese.

(a) Imperatives

As far as the verb form is concerned, Balinese has two different ways of forming imperative constructions. One of these imperatives occurs with a morphologically unmarked verb and the other one occurs with a nasalised verb. The basic verb is used when the patient is specific, whereas the nasal verb is used when the patient is non-specific. The choice of the Ø-construction or the N-construction in Balinese is comparable to typical ergative languages in which the ergative construction is used when the patient is specific and a detransitivised construction is used when the patient is non-specific  (Blake 1990:154-155)

Barber (1977:258) points out that the basic verb (which he calls the simple form) in Balinese is used when the patient argument (Barber uses the term object) is expressed and specific. Consider the following examples.

(43) Tiuk-e  emak!
     knife-DEF    take
      'Take the knife!'

(44) Tali-ne  getep!
     rope-DEF    cut
    'Cut the rope'

The imperative sentences in (43) and (44) are formed with a basic verb and the patient argument is expressed by a specific NP.

Imperatives cross-linguistically have a second person pronoun as the understood agent NP who the speaker intends to get to perform an action. However, the agent in Balinese cannot be expressed. The agent of the Ø-construction is the addressee.

The word order of the imperative sentences in (43) and (44) is: patient-verb. This word order can be reversed as follows.

(45) a. Jemak tiuke!
     b. Getep tali-ne!

Besides the use of the basic verb in imperatives, the nasal verb can also be used. This verb is used when the patient is non-specific. Consider the following examples.

(46) Nyemak  tiuk!   [N-jemak]
     ACT. take    knife
          'Take a knife!'

(47) *Nyemak  tiuk-e!
     ACT. take   knife-DEF
Thus Balinese has two ways of expressing imperatives. If the patient is specific, the basic verb should be used. But if the patient is non-specific, the nasal verb should be used.

(b) Declaratives

In this section we will look at the possibility of putting the subject in sentence-final position. The word order of the Ø-construction described so far in this chapter is patient-verb-agent (PVA). This order can be changed into verb-agent-patient (VAP). The sentence in (48) is an intransitive clause and the sentence in (49) is a transitive one. The symbol (//) is used to indicate a pause.

(48) a. Ia // malaib ke jalan-e
   3SG // run to street-DEF
   'S/he ran to the street'

   b. Malaib ke jalan ia

In (48a) the subject precedes the verb while in (48b) the subject is now the final constituent. It is placed after the prepositional phrase. The following examples also illustrate a similar phenomenon in which the subject is placed as a final constituent in the Ø-construction.

(49) a. Siap-e // uber cicing ke jalan-e [P-V-A-]
   chicken-DEF // chase dog to street-DEF
   'A/the dog chased the chicken to the street'

   b. Uber cicing // ke jalan siape [V-A-P]

   c. *Uber siape cicing ke jalan [V-P-A]

   d. *Siape uber ke jalan cicing

The variant order as in (49b) is acceptable. The word order in (49c) is Verb-Patient-Agent. This sentence is unacceptable. This shows that the Verb-Agent order is fixed. It is bound syntactically in that no syntactic element can be inserted between the verb and the agent in the Ø-construction. This is also shown in (49).

The following examples are N-constructions.

(50) a. Tiang // ngae umah [A-V-P] [N-gae]
   1SG // ACT. build house
   'I built a house'

   b. Ngae umah // tiang [V-P-A]

   c. Ngae // tiang umah [V-A-P]

The sentences in (50) show that three alternatives of word order with a N-construction are possible. One of the functions of a pause is to indicate an intonation-group boundary. In terms of intonation group, the verb and the agent of the Ø-construction are grouped together, while for the N-construction the verb and the patient are bound together as one intonation unit. However, there
is a 'marked' intonation group for a N-construction as shown in (50c). (50c) is acceptable if it is pronounced with a long pause after the verb. This sentence implies a contrastive meaning in the sense that the speaker who utters this sentence wants to tell us that the agent of the sentence is really building a house, not, for instance, buying it.

(c) Interrogatives

Here we discuss interrogatives in which a core argument is questioned. The word order in interrogative sentences is more rigid than in a declarative sentence. Consider the following sentences.

(51) a. Apa aba cai [P-V-A]
    what bring 2SG
    'What did you bring?'

b. *Aba cai apa? [V-A-P]
    bring 2SG what
    'What did you bring?'

The sentence in (51b) is not grammatical because the constituent questioned is placed in final position. Thus the word order of the question sentence with the Ø-construction is fixed. However, the word order of a N-construction is more flexible. This is shown in (52) below.

(52) a. Nyen ngaba jaja? [A-V-P] [N-aba]
    who ACT. bring cakes
    'Who brought cakes?'

b. Ngaba jaja nyen? [V-P-A]
    ACT. bring cake who
    'Who brought cakes'

c. *Ngaba nyen jaja? [V-A-P]
    ACT. bring who cake
    'Who brought cakes?'

The question in (52c) is not grammatical. With respect to an interrogative sentence there are two possibilities of word order as in (52a) and (52b). If the word order of the declarative sentence is compared with the interrogative sentence, we can see that in the Ø-construction in Balinese the word order of an interrogative sentence is fixed, while the word order of the declarative sentence is more flexible. It allows the patient constituent (the subject) to be the final constituent.

2.6 Ergativity and Transitivity

The term 'ergativity' is used to describe a grammatical pattern in which the patient argument (P) of a transitive predicate is treated in the same way as the sole argument (S) of an intransitive predicate, with the agent argument (A) of a transitive predicate being treated differently.
Ergativity is complementary to accusativity, which is a more familiar grammatical pattern. In an accusative system the agent argument (A) of a transitive verb is treated in the same manner as the sole argument (S) of an intransitive predicate with different treatment for P.\(^6\) English is characterised as an accusative language because the A is treated like S in terms of case, subject-verb agreement and position.

(53)  
\begin{align*}
  a. & \text{ He swims every week} \\
  & S \\
  b. & \text{ He hits the dog every day} \\
  & A \quad P
\end{align*}

In addition to the transitive clause in (53b), English also has a passive construction, which can be considered as a another way of expressing the semantic content of the transitive clause. However, the passive clause is regarded as a derived intransitive construction in which the agent is expressed as an adjunct (54).

(54)  
\text{The dog is hit by him every day}

In ergative languages the P is treated in the same way the S. In an ergative system of marking it is P and S that are not normally marked. The following examples are from Kalkatungu, an Australian Aboriginal language (Blake 1988).

(55)  
\begin{align*}
  a. & \text{ Kalpin } \text{ingka} \\
  & \text{man } \text{go} \\
  & >\text{The man goes'} \\
  b. & \text{ Marapai-thu } \text{nanya } \text{kalpin} \\
  & \text{woman-ERG } \text{see } \text{man} \\
  & >\text{The woman saw the man'}
\end{align*}

These examples show that the P of the transitive clause in (55b) is treated in the same way the S of the intransitive clause. They both occur without marking, while the agent (A) is marked by the suffix \text{-thu}.

The notions of accusative and ergative are fairly simple but they are proved to be difficult when they are applied to Western Austronesian languages. For instance, studies in Austronesian languages of Philippines languages in recent years have raised at least two general theoretical issues for typologists or syntacticians. One issue relates to the notion of 'subject', that is, how the subject is to be understood in these languages. The other issue is concerned with the analysis of what is commonly referred to as the 'voice' or 'focus' system. One of the better known examples of the Philippine languages is Tagalog. In terms of typological perspective, Tagalog has been analysed in three different ways:

(a) as an accusative language

\(^6\) See Comrie (1978) and Blake (1994:122-125)
(b) as an ergative language  
(c) as neither an accusative nor an ergative language

Tagalog is described as having a 'focus' system. This focus system is expressed by nominal marking and verbal affixation. To differentiate between grammatical relations held by the nominal dependents, Tagalog makes use of a set of prepositions: ng, which marks actor and patient; sa, which marks locative, and para sa, which marks benefactive. In a typical clause one nominal will chosen as focus and its 'expected preposition' will be replaced by a focus marking preposition ang and the relevant semantic role of the focused argument is coded on the verb by means of an affix. The following is a set of examples from Tagalog, which includes an intransitive clause (56), a patient focus construction (57) and an actor focus construction (58). Note that when the patient is in focus here is no marking on the verb but when the actor is in focus it is marked on the verb by affix -um-, at least in the perfective and imperfective aspect (see Foley and Van Valin 1984:63-64)

(56) Interesante ang libro  
interesting book
'The book is interesting'

(57) Binasa ng propesor ang libro  
perf:PF:read professor book
'A/the professor read the book'

(58) Bumasa ang libro ang propesor  
perf:AF:read book professor
'The professor read a/the book'

Those who analyse Tagalog as having an active-passive distinction will take the actor focus construction in (58) as an active construction and the patient-focus construction (57) as a passive sentence. This analysis is reflected in the works of Bloomfield (1917), and F. Blake (1925) as well as in more recent studies including Wolfenden (1961) and Llamzon (1968).

Recognising Tagalog as an ergative language means that taking the patient focus construction to be the normal, transitive construction and the actor focus construction to be a derived intransitive construction. For instance, Payne (1982) claims that "Tagalog is ergative in a traditional sense". This characterisation is based on the comparison of the marking of the sole argument of an intransitive predicate with the marking of the patient of the (unmarked) patient focus construction. In Tagalog they are marked in the same way by the preposition ang. Looking at the sentences in (56) and (57), we can see that the preposition ang is used to mark the patient in (57) and the sole argument of the intransitive clause, while the actor is marked by ng. The ergative interpretation is also to be found in Cena (1979), de Guzman (1983, 1988), Cooreman et al. (1984), Starosta (1986, 1987), and B. Blake (1988). Using a Lexicase framework, Starosta (1986, 1987) claims that Tagalog is a pure ergative language. Gibson and Starosta (1990) also suggest that the ergative analysis is the best analysis for other languages of the Philippines.

The root of the verb in (57) and (58) is basa and it would appear from comparison of binasa in (57) and bumasa in (58) that the patient focus is marked by an infix -in-. However, this infix is also found in the locative focus, benefactive focus, etc., so it cannot be marking patient focus. It
might be also added that the Philippinist use of 'focus' is idiosyncratic. If the argumentation presented here for Balinese is accepted for Tagalog, then ang marks the grammatical subject.

Shibatani (1988) suggests that it is not easy to typologise the languages of the Philippines. Shibatani (1988) argues that the patient focus construction should be viewed neither as a passive construction nor as an ergative construction and by the same token the actor focus construction should not be equated with the antipassive construction. Shibatani points out that the patient focus construction is the preferred one and that the preference for the patient subject is reminiscent of ergativetype language. He points out that the main difference between Philippine languages and accusative languages lies in the fact that in Philippine languages, the patient is a preferred subject in the patient focus construction and the agent argument still has a number of subject properties, while in accusative languages, the agent is a preferred subject, and in the passive construction, in which the patient is chosen as a subject, an agent nominal loses its subject properties. Furthermore, while in accusative languages, the active construction is the principle construction type that conveys semantically transitive messages, Philippine languages divide such a task between the actor-focus construction and the patient-focus construction. According to Shibatani Philippine languages are neither accusative nor ergative. This kind of view can be found in the much earlier description of Tagalog by Schachter (1976, 1977). Schachter shows that properties of subject in accusative languages divide up into two distinct sets when applied to Tagalog. One set, which he refers to as 'reference-related properties', applies to the referentially prominent nominal category, that is, the noun phrase marked by ang in Tagalog. The other set, which he refers to as 'role-related properties', applies to the notional agent of one-place predicate and two-place predicate. This agent can be the controller of a reflexive and the addresses of an imperative.

Foley (1991) also argues that Tagalog is neither accusative nor ergative. Foley's argument against an accusative analysis runs along the following lines. The accusative analysis involves taking the agent focus (as in 58) to be the unmarked focus and the patient focus (as in 57) to be a passive construction. This analysis cannot be accepted because the agent of the patient focus construction is still an argument. The agent of the patient focus construction can control a reflexive or it can be the addressee of imperative. Foley's argument against the ergative analysis is analogous. The ergative analysis involves taking the patient focus construction as an ergative and the agent focus as an antipassive. He claims that this analysis cannot be sustained because the patient of the agent focus construction is still an argument. This means that the agent focus construction is not an antipassive.

The term antipassive was first coined by Silverstein (1976). Silverstein uses the term antipassive to refer to a derived intransitive construction in ergative languages, which is the analogue of the passive constructions in accusative languages. The term antipassive is also adopted in Relational Grammar. According to Blake (1994) in Relational Grammar the term 'antipassive' is not confined to ergative languages, but a distinction is made between two types of detransitivisation according to the fate of the demoted patient. If the patient is demoted to indirect object, this is called direct-to-indirect object retreat. If the patient is not demoted to indirect object then it considered to have been demoted to chômeur status and the construction is referred to as antipassive.

Blake (1993) suggests that it is important to recognise the possibility of a derived intransitive construction where the patient remains as a complement, whether we call that complement an indirect object or not. Postal (1977) suggests that the term antipassive should be used to cover the Indonesian example in (59b).
(59)  

a. Dia menanam padi itu [meN-tanam]  
    3SG plant rice that  
    'S/he plants the rice'

b. Dia bertanam padi  
    3SG plant rise  
    'S/he plants rice'

c. *Dia bertanam  
    3SG plant

The sentence in (59a) can be considered to be the normal transitive construction with a subject, a nasalised verb and a direct object. When the patient is non-specific, the construction shown in (59b) is used. Postal takes this to be a derived intransitive construction in which the patient has become a direct object chômeur, i.e. a nominal that has lost its direct object properties. Certainly the verb appears to be intransitive (the use of ber- which otherwise is confined to what are clearly intransitive verbs suggests intransitivity), but the patient is still an argument. *Padi is a complement and cannot be deleted (59c).

Foley (1991) argues that it is relatively easy to show that the agent is an argument in the patient focus construction in Tagalog, but it is not so easy with the patient of the actor focus construction. Foley tries to show that it is implausible to claim that the patient is no longer an argument in the agent focus construction. He illustrates this further by drawing on data from Sama. This language has an unmarked patient focus construction and a marked actor focus construction just like Balinese. The actor focus construction is marked by a nasal prefix on the verb.

(60) Bi'ili ku taumpa ma si Andi  
    PF buy I shoe(s) OBL Andy  
    'I bought the shoes for Andy'

(61) M-b'ili aku taumpa ma si Andi  
    AF-buy I shoe(s) OBL Andy  
    'I bought some shoes for Andy'

It is common for Western Austronesian languages to have verb derivations which allow certain roles to be introduced as core arguments. In (62) the beneficiary, which is expressed as an oblique in (60) and (61), is expressed as a patient. In Relational Grammar this would be described as benefactive advancement to direct object (see chapter nine). This advancement is marked on the verb by the suffix -an.

(62) Bi'ili-an ku si Andi taumpa  
    PF buy-ADV I Andy shoe(s)  
    'I bought Andy some shoes'

The reason Foley turns to Sama is that this language, unlike Tagalog, allows a verb with a benefactive argument [sic] to appear in the actor focus construction.
(63) M-b'ili-an aku si Andi taumpa
AF-buy-ADV I Andy shoe(s)
'I bought Andy some shoes'

Foley claims that (63) cannot be accounted for under the ergative analysis since this construction would have be assigned an antipassive interpretation, which means taking the beneficiary to be removed from the argument structure when there is a clear process of oblique advancement (1991:15). In other words, it does not make sense to have a derivation that adds an argument (benefactive advancement) feeding a derivation that removes the additional argument. However, Blake (1993) points out that it is possible to have a detransitivisation without removing arguments from the valency of the verb. He notes, for instance, in Kalkatungu it is not uncommon to detransitivise clauses that involve an advancement. The following examples illustrate a one-place predicate (64a), a derived transitive construction where -nti marks the addition of the argument to the valency (64b), and the detransitivised version of the transitive clause in (64c).

(64) a. Pirla-pirla wani
   child play
   'The child is playing'

b. Pirla-pirla-thu thuku wani-nti
   child-ERG dog play-ADV
   'The child is playing with the dog'

c. Pirla-pirla thuku-u wani-nti-yi
   child dog-DAT play-ADV-AP
   'The child is playing with the dog'

Now we return to Tagalog. The controversy over the typology of Tagalog generally centres around the interpretation of the voice systems in that language. As noted earlier, some linguists claim that Tagalog is as an accusative language. This means that taking the actor focus construction to be active and the patient focus construction to be passive. Some linguists claim that Tagalog is ergative. This means that the patient focus construction is taken to be an ergative construction while the actor focus construction is taken to be an antipassive construction. The choice of the patient focus as an unmarked construction is supported by a number of pieces of evidence. For instance, Kroeger (1993:56) claims that the patient is the unmarked choice for subject in a transitive construction in Tagalog. Providing the patient is specific, the patient focus is normally chosen. This makes that the patient focus construction must be compared with an intransitive construction in order to determine the core type of the language.

Those who analyse Tagalog as neither accusative not ergative consider that the agent of the patient focus construction is still a complement and the patient of the actor focus construction is also still a complement. This means that there is more than one transitive construction.

Now the question remains of whether a language can be characterised as accusative or ergative if there is more than one transitive construction each with different argument treated like the S of an intransitive construction. I think we can argue that a language can be accusative or ergative even though that language has more than one transitive construction on the grounds that
we can decide that one of the transitive constructions is more basic than the other. This basic transitive construction should be compared with the intransitive clause in order to determine the core type of the language.

Now we return to Balinese. Consider (65) with a one-place verb and (66) a two-place verb.

(65) Made ulung
     Made fall
     'Made fell'

(66) Made' Made lempag tiang
     Made hit 1SG
     'I hit

The sentence in (66) is a patient-verb-agent sequence rather than agent-verb-patient. There is a way to encode the agent as the preverbal noun phrase, but that involves marking on the verb with a nasal prefix as described in section 2.2.

(67) Tiang nglempag Made [N-lempag]
     1SG ACT. hit Made
     'I hit Made'

Examples (66) and (67) show that there is a clear difference in morphological markedness between the two-place constructions. On this basis one would have to take (66) to represent the construction that should be compared with the one-place construction. This would mean that Balinese is an analytic ergative language, since the P of a transitive clause is treated in the same way as the S of the intransitive clause in terms of position. The question now remains of whether the N-construction in (67) is a derived intransitive or not. Consider the difference between the N-construction and a two-place intransitive. The following example is a two-place intransitive.

(68) la tresna teken cai
     3SG love with 2SG
     'S/he loves you'

The verb tresna 'love' belongs to a smaller class of verb in Balinese which take a prepositional complement. If the verb like nglempag in (67) were a derived intransitive, we might expect it to have a prepositional complement. Since it does not have such a complement, then there is no reason to take it to be intransitive. Thus Balinese has two transitive constructions.

Now if we are to take Balinese to be ergative then it must be on the grounds that it is the unmarked transitive construction that shows an alignment of P and S. The morphological markedness is also reflected in discourse. A survey of discourse reveals that the O-construction has the highest frequency. Note also that it is unlikely to have a nasal forces as agents. For instance, to express the proposition The house was blown away by the wind, the O-construction will be used: Umahe ampehang angin 'The house was bown away by the wind'.
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2. 7 Core Grammatical Relations

It is not uncontroversial to consider that a verb is the head of a clause. This head will be accompanied by one or more dependents. Some of these dependents are arguments of the verb. The noun phrases representing these dependents will be referred to as complements. An intransitive verb requires one complement or two complements and a transitive verb requires two complements. The relations held by complements of one-place intransitive verbs and two-place transitive verbs are referred to as core grammatical relations.7

A prototypical transitive verb will require an agent and patient complement. In a language like English the agent complement will be identified as the subject and the patient as the object of the clause. A number of grammatical properties support the recognition of these core grammatical relations in English.

It has been demonstrated in this chapter that in Balinese it is the patient of the unmarked transitive construction (the Ø-construction), not the agent that has grammatical subject properties. For the purposes of the present study, grammatical relations like subject, agent complement (AC), patient complement (PC), recipient complement (RC) and benefactive complement (BC) are introduced.

In the Ø-construction in Balinese it is the patient that is the unmarked choice for the subject of the clause, not the agent. This fact differentiates Balinese from English. Before illustrating the core grammatical relations for transitive verbs, let us look at some examples of two-place intransitive verbs in Balinese.

(6) 
Tiang tresna teken ia.
1SG like with 3SG
'I like her/him'

(7) 
Ia inget teken utang-ne.
3SG remember with debt-3SGPOSS
'S/he remembered her/his debt'

(7) 
Tiang ngon teken kajegegan-ne8
1SG admire with beauty-3SGPOSS
'I was taken with her beauty'

(72) 
Ia kendel teken tekan panak-ne
3SG rejoice with coming child-3SGPOSS
'S/he rejoiced with her/his child's coming'

These examples show that the oblique complement of intransitive verb constructions is marked by a preposition. The following are two-place transitive constructions.

---

7 Complement is used here, as in Huddleston 1984:180, to refer to any dependent realising an argument including the subject.

8 The word 'kajegegan' is used only for female.
(73) Ia telpun tiang
   3SG ring 1SG
   (patient) (agent)
   S(subject) A(gent) C(omplement)
   'I rang her/him'

(74) Tiang nelpun ia
   1SG ACT. ring 3SG
   (agent) (patient)
   S(subject) P(atient) C(omplement)
   'I rang her/him'

The sentence in (73) is a Ø-construction, while the one in (74) is a N-construction in which the verb is prefixed by a nasal (N-). It has been shown previously that in the Ø-construction it is the patient which behaves as a grammatical subject, not the agent. The unmarked choice for subject in Balinese is very different from a language like English. In English it is the agent which is the unmarked choice for the subject of the clause. In a passive sentence in English the patient is the subject. The opposite is found in Balinese. In the N-construction in Balinese the agent is the subject.

The grammatical relations recognised for (73) are Subject and Agent Complement (AC), while for (74) Subject and Patient Complement (PC). For a three-place transitive other grammatical relations are required. These include Benefactive Complement (BC) and Recipient Complement (RC).

Balinese also has a passive construction. This passive is marked on the verb by the prefix ka- and the agent is expressed by an adjunct phrase. The presence of this passive morpheme in Balinese is due to the influence of the neighbouring language, Javanese (see, for instance, Clynès 1989). This passive form is commonly used in high style of Balinese. Most grammar books on Balinese written by Balinese do not include the ka- morpheme as a passive morpheme in Balinese (see, for example, Bawa and Jendra 1981, Granoka 1989, Anom 1975). They only discuss the Ø-constructions as a passive construction. Probably they are well aware that this morpheme is borrowed from Javanese. The following is an example of a passive sentence in Balinese.

(76) Ida ka-iring[antuk Wayan](high level)
   3SG PASS-accompany [by Wayan]
   'S/he was accompanied by Wayan'

The adjunct in (76) can be deleted. There is a restriction on the use of the morpheme ka- in low level. The morpheme ka- can be used in the low level if the adjunct is a first or second person pronoun. The third person pronoun cannot be used. This distribution is contrary to expectation (compare the remarks in section 2. 2); however, the ka- construction will not be discussed further here since it is marginal in the low level sociolect that is the focus of this thesis.

---

9 Examples of these grammatical relations will be provided in chapter three.
2.8 Summary

In a classic work on subjecthood, namely Keenan (1976), it is suggested that that the prototypical subject can be viewed as the intersection of the properties of agent and topic. Note that this does not mean that all subjects are both agent and topic. For instance, Kroeger (1993:56) claims that the patient is a grammatical subject in Tagalog. Then he suggests that Tagalog belongs to a rare class of languages in which the patient is the grammatical subject of a basic transitive clause.

The basic structure and the notion of grammatical subject in Balinese have been discussed. Since the verb used in the Ø-construction is morphologically unmarked, this means this construction can be justifiably compared with the intransitive construction. It has been shown that in Balinese it is the patient of the Ø-construction (the basic transitive clause), not the agent, that behaves in the same way grammatically as the sole argument of an intransitive clause. In order to make the agent of a transitive accessible to grammatical processes such as relativisation, the nasal construction should be used. In this construction the agent behaves grammatically in the same way as the sole argument of the intransitive clause. Based on the comparison of the Ø-construction and the intransitive construction, it is argued that Balinese is an analytic ergative language (see also chapter eight).
3.1 Introduction

This chapter will be concerned with verbal constructions in Balinese. The constructions discussed include: causatives, applicatives, resultatives and intransitive verb formations.

Before discussing each of these constructions, it is necessary to note briefly the notion of subject and the nature of lexemes in Balinese. In this thesis the term 'subject' will be frequently used. Therefore I need to make it clear that whenever I use the term 'subject', I use it for a grammatical function as discussed in chapter two, not as a semantic notion. A large number of roots in Balinese and Austronesian languages generally are 'precategorial', that is, a root or base typically belongs to a word class only after undergoing processes of lexical derivation. The base form in (a) below is an adjective, while the base form in (b) is a precategorial.

(a) pedih
    pedih-ang
    pedih-in
    'angry' (an adjective)
    'to make someone angry'
    'to get angry with someone'

(b) eling
    eling-ang
    eling-in
    ng-eling
    (a precategorial base)
    'to make someone cry'
    'to cry for someone'
    'to cry'

These examples show that there are two types of base in Balinese used to form verbs: (a) those to which syntactic categories can be assigned without having to add an affix and (b) those whose syntactic categories can be identified only after a certain affix has been added.

This fact will challenge the 'standard' description of causative or applicative construction since the theoretical perspectives developed for these constructions are based on languages which have a clear-cut word classification.

3.2 Causativisation

Perhaps every language has some ways of expressing causativisation. One way of expressing causativisation which is probably common to all languages is to use a complex sentence in which the cause is coded in one clause and the resultant event in another. For instance, in Balinese the notion of causativisation is achieved by combining two clauses using a 'causative' conjunction, *kerana* 'because'. Consider the following example.

(1) Dana tusing teka mai kerana motor-ne usak
    Dana not come here because car-3SGPOSS break
    'Dana did not come here because his car was broken.'

The second clause in (1), *kerana motorne usak* functions as a cause and the first clause *I Dana tusing teka mai* functions as a result or an effect.
Comrie (1981:150) maintains that any causative situation involves two component situations (events), the cause and its effect (result). He refers to these situations as micro-situations. When combined together, they will constitute a macro situation, the causative situation. Thus a causative situation is a single complex situation consisting of two micro situations. Looking at the example in (1) from this point of view, the microsituations are 'the inability of Dana's coming here' and the 'breaking of his car'. These two microsituations make up the whole causative situation (the macrosituation).

Comrie (1981) proposed a three-way typology of causativisation, namely analytic, morphological, and lexical causatives. According to Comrie (1981), the analytical causative is where there are separate predicates expressing the cause and the effect, that is, the causing notion is realized by a word separate from the word denoting the caused activity. The morphological causative is where the relation between the noncausative predicate and the causative one is marked by morphological means, for instance, affixation. The third causative is where the corresponding verb in the noncausative predicate is not morphologically related to the causative one, that is, the relationship between the predicate expressing effect and the predicate expressing both cause and effect is not systematic, as with English *die* and *kill*. Such causative predicates are called lexical causatives.

One of the main syntactic differences between non-causative and causative constructions is the increased valency of the latter. In discussing valency changes brought about by causativisation, it is useful to work with a three-way valency distinction among the basic non-causative verbs: intransitive (no direct object), monotransitive (direct object - but no indirect object), and ditransitive (direct object and indirect object).

In order to explain the interrelationship between the non-causative and causative constructions, Comrie (1985) proposes a hierarchy of grammatical relations as follows: subject > direct object > indirect object > oblique object. Comrie (1985) points out that the grammatical encoding of the causee proceeds as follows: the causee occupies the highest (leftmost) position on the hierarchy that is not already filled. The valency change between basic and (derived) causative verbs can be represented schematically as follows.

```
           Basic          Causative

Intransitive

SUBJ        SUBJ
   DO

Mono-transitive

SUBJ        SUBJ
   DO     DO
   IO
```
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Since basically causative formation involves the addition of the agent to the valency, if the base clause is an intransitive clause, the subject will be expressed as a direct object. The subject of a montransitive verb will be expressed as an indirect object and the direct object remains as a direct object. If the basic sentence is a ditransitive one, the subject will be coded as an oblique, the direct object and the indirect one will remain as the same grammatical relations. This grammatical hierarchy is very useful. It can explain a number of grammatical phenomena across languages, in addition to causativisation. Comrie (1976, 1985) has shown that this hierarchy is applicable to a large number of languages from different genetic, geographical, and typological groups with only a very few exceptions. Probably this hierarchy is best regarded as a tendency cross-linguistically. For instance, this hierarchy is well illustrated by Turkish causativisation. The following examples are adapted from Comrie (1985:323-324).

Intransitive base

(2) a. Hasan öl-dü
     Hasan die-PAST
     'Hasan died'

     b. Ali Hasan-ı öl-dür-dü
        Ali Hasan-ACC die-CAUS-PAST
        'Ali caused Hasan to die, killed Hasan'

Transitive base

(3) a. Müdür mektub-u imzala-d1
     director letter-ACC sign-PAST
     'The director signed the letter'

     b. Ali mektub-u müdür -e imzala-t-t1
        Ali letter-ACC director-DAT sign-CAUS-PAST
        Ali got the director to sign the letter'

---

1 This grammatical hierarchy is also valid for a cross-linguistic study of relative clauses and determines the relative accessibility of noun phrase position to relativisation (see Keenan and Comrie 1977). See also chapter five of this thesis.
Ditransitive base

(4)  a. Müdür Hasan-a mektub-u göster-dı
director Hasan-DAT letter-ACC show-PAST
'The director showed the letter to Hasan'

b. Ali Hasan-a mektub-u müdür tarafından
Ali Hasan-DAT letter-ACC director by
göster-t-tı
show-CAUS-PAST
'Ali got the director to show the letter to Hasan'

The morphological causative exemplified in Turkish above can be explained as follows: when the non-causative base is an intransitive clause as in (2a), the subject appears as a direct object, as it is shown in (2b). When the base clause is a mono-transitive clause, the causee cannot appears as a direct object since this relation has been filled by the direct object of the base clause and Turkish does not allow two direct objects in one clause. It appears as an indirect object marked by the dative case. The base clause in (4a) is a ditransitive clause, so the causee cannot appear as an indirect object since this relation has been filled by the indirect object of the base clause. In this case the causee appears as an oblique relation, which is marked by a postposition as in (4b).

Alsina and Joshi (1991:1) argue that approaches to morphological causativisation which are based on purely 'syntactic principles' fail not only to recognise the full range of syntactic variation, but also to relate the syntactic variation to the semantic variation that underlies it. They note that some languages allow the base subject to be be realised either as an object or as an oblique of the causative predicate. This alternation relates to the semantic differences of the causative construction. The direct object realisation of the base subject implies a direct action of the causer on that argument in order to bring about the caused event, while the oblique realisation of the base subject indicates an indirect causation in that the causer brings about the caused event without acting on the base subject.

In order to capture cross-linguistic variation, Alsina and Joshi (1991) propose an argument structure approach to causativisation. They argue that their theory is not about grammatical functions, but about argument structures. In this theory, arguments are ordered according to the Universal Thematic Hierarchy, where an agent is higher than a recipient which is in turn higher that a patient or a theme (see Bresnan and Kanerva 1989). The mapping principles between the argument structure and grammatical function are represented informally in (5) below.

(5)  a. pt b. q c. else
OBJ SUBJ (OBL)

Principle (5a) maps patients onto an object function, (5b) maps the highest theta role, the agent (q) onto a subject, and principle (5c) specifies that arguments which are not mapped onto either the object or subject function are expressed as optional obliques. Alsina and Joshi (1991:2) claim that the mapping principles play a crucial role in deriving a correct morpho-syntactic realisation of the

---

2 This was known earlier. See Comrie (1976:262) and Gibson and Raposo (1986).
causee. They consider that morphological causatives are formed by the merger of the argument structure of two predicates - the base predicate and the causative morpheme - forming a monoclausal syntactic structure. They also propose that languages may have a three-place causative predicate containing an agent (agt), a patient (pt) and a caused event, as represented in (6). It is argued that the patient of the causative predicate is semantically identified with an argument of the base predicate.

(6) CAUSE < ag pt EVENT < ... q ... >>

In this approach the patient of the causative predicate fuses with an argument of the base predicate. This fusion is subject to two semantic variants:

Variant 1: The causer, in order to bring about an event, acts on an individual which is the participant most in control of that event.

Variant 2: The causer acts on an individual by causing an event which affects that individual.

Alsina and Joshi (1991) argue that variant 1 chooses the highest argument, variant 2 chooses an affected one, if there is one. The choice between these variants is determined by the following parameters. The patient of the causative predicate may fuse with:

1. the highest argument of the base predicate;
2. an affected argument

These parameters can have a positive or a negative setting. A positive setting for either or both of these parameters will determine whether the causative will have variant 1 or 2 or both. They use four languages to illustrate their approach. These languages are Chamorro, Marathi, Chichewa and Malayalam (see Alsina and Joshi (1991) for details). Causativisation in Chamorro and Chichewa will be summarised below.

Chamorro is noted as having a positive setting for parameter 1 and a negative setting for parameter 2. This means that the highest argument of the base verb always fuses with the patient of the causative predicte. The causee in this language is always expressed as the object of the causative predicate whether it is based on intransitive or transitive verbs. Examples:

(7) Hu na'-maipi i kafe
    1SG CAUS-hot the coffee
    'I heated the coffee'

(8) Hu na'-kanta si Pedro
    1SG CAUS-sing Pedro
    'I made Pedro sing'

(9) Ha na'-taitai hâm i ma'estrù ni estì na lebblu
    3SG CAUS-read 1PL the teacher OBL this book
    'The teacher made us read the book'
The subject of the sentence in (7) is the pronoun, hu and the object is the noun phrase, i kafe. The verb is marked by an affix na'. In (8) the subject is the pronoun hu and the object is si Pedro. In (9) the subject is the noun phrase i ma'stru, which is also represented by the pronoun ha. The object is the pronoun hâm and the book is represented as an oblique. The fusion of the argument structure of the base predicate with the causative argument of the sentence (9) is represented below.

(10) na'taitai 'cause' < ag pt 'read' < ag pt > >

CAUS-read

Alsina and Joshi (1991) note that Chichewa shows a split between transitive and intransitive verbs with respect to causativisation: causatives based on transitive verbs generally allow the causee to be expressed either as an object or as an optional oblique, while causative based on intransitives only allow object expression of the causee. (11a) is a transitive clause. The subject is the noun phrase, kadzizi, and it is cross-referenced on the verb by a- the object of this sentence is the noun phrase, maûngu. The sentence in (11a) is a base clause, while the sentences in (11b) and (11c) are their corresponding causative constructions. In (11b) the causee is coded as a direct object, while in (11c) it is expressed as an oblique marked by the morpheme kwa. (11) shows that a causative predicate based on a transitive verb phika 'cook' takes an object causee or an oblique causee.

(11) a. Kadzizi a-na-phiká maûngu
    owl SUBJ-PAST-cook pumpkins
    'The owl cooked pumpkins'

    b. Nûngu i-na-phik-itsa kadzizi maûngu
    porcupine SUBJ-PAST-cook-CAUS owl pumpkins
    The porcupine made the owl cook the pumpkins'

    c. Nûngu i-na-phik-itsa maûngu kwâ kadzizi
    porcupine SUBJ-PAST-cook-CAUS pumpkins by owl
    'The porcupine had the pumpkins cooked by the owl'

(12a) is an intransitive base. If the causative formed from an intransitive base, there is no option in that the causee is always expressed as an object. (12c) is not acceptable because the causee is coded as an oblique.

(12) a. Mwana a-ku-nâma
    child SUBJ-PRES-lie
    'The child is lying'

    b. Chatsalira a-ku-nâm-itsa mwâna
    Chatsalira SUBJ-PRES-lie-CAUS child
    'Chatsalira made the child lie'
This different pattern of causativisation between intransitive and transitive verbs can be described by assuming that Chichewa has a positive setting for both parameters in that the patient of the causative predicate in this language can fuse with the highest argument of the caused event or with its affected argument. This means that the causative predicate in Chichewa is alternatively the type in which the causer acts on an individual in order to bring about an event of which that individual is the participant most in control, or of the type in which the causer acts on an individual by causing an event which affects that individual. Thus the patient of the causative predicate has an option regarding fusion: (a) it can fuse either the agent (according to parameter 1) or with the patient (according to parameter 2). The argument structures for the causatives in (11b) and (11c) can be represented as follows:

(13) a. phik-itsa 'cause' < ag pt 'cook' < ag pt > > cook-CAUS

b. phik-itsa 'cause' < ag pt 'cook' < ag pt > >

Alsina and Joshi (1991) suggest that the patient component of meaning determines the assignment of the object function. In (13a) the causer (the base agent) is fused with the patient of the causative predicate and can thus surface as an object. In (13b) the agent is not fused with the patient of the causative predicate. Thus it is unable to surface as an object. It is realised as an optional oblique by the mapping principle (5c).

Languages like Turkish which follow the 'standard' pattern of causativisation (see (2) (3) (4) above) would be described as having a negative setting for parameter 1 and a positive setting for parameter 2.

Both the grammatical hierarchy approach and the argument structure approach will be applied to Balinese data in order to see which can best explain Balinese causatives.

3. 3 Balinese Causatives

Affixes that can be used to mark causativisation in Balinese are -ang, -in, pa-ang and pa-in.

3. 3. 1 The Causative -ang

The base of the causative verb marked by -ang in Balinese can be a verb, an adjective, or a precategorial.

(14) verbs
    ulung 'fall' ulungang 'to make something fall'
mulihi 'go home' mulihiang 'to send someone home'
Adjectives
 cenik 'small'  cenikang 'to make something small'
puthih 'white'  putihang 'to make something white'

Precategorials
tegak  tegakang 'to make someone sit'
celep  celepang 'to put in'

The non-causative clauses in the following examples are non-verbal clauses. The predicate is an adjective. When this adjective is marked by -ang, it will produce a transitive verb, which has a causative meaning. This is shown in (15b) and (16b) where the agent complement (the causer) is introduced, and the subject of the non-causative clause remains as a grammatical subject of the causativised one. Thus the causee is not coded as an object, but as a grammatical subject. The sentence in (15c) and (16c) are alternative constructions, where the verb is prefixed by N-. This alternation has been described in chapter two as a means of putting the agent complement in a privileged position. The presence of N- in a transitive clause suggests that the clause has undergone clause revaluation in which the agent complement is turned into a subject.

(15) a. Tembok-e putih
   wall-DEF white
   'The wall is white'

b. Tembok-e putih-ang tiang
   wall-DEF white-CAUS 1SG
   'I made the wall white'

c. Tiang mutih-ang tembok-e.
   1SG ACT. white-CAUS wall-DEF
   'I made the wall white'

(16) a. Raket tiang-e usak.
   racket 1SG-POSS broken
   'My racket was broken'

   racket 1SG-POSS broken-CAUS-3SG
   'S/he broke my racket'

c. Ia ngusak-ang raket tiang-e
   3SG ACT. broken-CAUS racket 1SG-POSS
   'S/he broke my racket'

The basic sentence in the following examples is a verbal clause. The predicate is an intransitive verb.
(17) a. Nuraga ulung
    Nuraga fall
    'Nuraga fell'

b. Nuraga ulung-ang tiang
    Nuraga fall-CAUS 1SG
    'I made Nuraga fall'

c. Tiang ngulung-ang Nuraga [N-ulung]
    1SG ACT. fall-CAUS Nuraga
    'I made Nuraga fall'

(18) a. Ia teka mai
    3SG come here
    'S/he came here'

b. Ia teka-ang tiang mai
    3SG come-CAUS 1SG here
    'I made her/him come here'

c. Tiang neka-ang ia mai [N-teka]
    1SG ACT. come-CAUS 3SG here
    'I made her/him come here'

The subject of the basic sentence in (17) is *Nurga* and in (18) *ia*. In the causative sentences (17b) and (18b), the subject of the basic sentence is still a grammatical subject and the causative verb is marked by -ang.

The examples below illustrate the fact that in Balinese the causative clause is not always derived from a basic clause. This is when the base form from which the verb is formed is a precategorial:

(19) a. Ia tegak-ang tiang
    3SG sit-CAUS 1SG
    'I made her/him sit down'

b. Tiang negak-ang ia [N-tegak]
    1SG ACT. sit-CAUS 3SG
    'I made her/him sit down'

(20) a. Ia jujuk-ang cai
    3SG stand-CAUS 2SG
    'You made her/him stand up'

b. Cai nyujuk-ang ia [N-jujukang]
    2SG ACT. stand-CAUS 3SG
    'You made her/him stand up'
The precategorial base in (19) is *tegak* and in (20) is *jujuk*. These bases are transitivised by the -ang suffix. The verb produced is a causative one.

The *pa-ang* prefix is used to derive a causative verb from a transitive verb. However, there are only a few transitive verbs which can be causativised. The following examples illustrate this:

(21) a. Tanah-ne tandu tiang
    land-3SGPOSS cultivate 1SG
    'I cultivated her/his land'

b. Tanah-ne pa-tandu-ang=a [teken tiang]
    land-3SGPOSS cultivate-CAUS=3SG [with 1SG]
    'S/he had/let me cultivate her/his land'

c. Ia ma-tandu-ang tanah-ne [teken tiang]
    3SG ACT. cultivate-CAUS soil-3SGDEF [with 1SG]
    'S/he had/let me cultivate her/his land'

(22) a. Jaran-e kadas cai
    horse-DEF take care 2SG
    'You took care the horse'

b. Jaran-e pa-kadas-ang tiang [teken cai]
    horse-DEF take care-CAUS 1SG [with you]
    'I had/let you take care of the horse'

c. Tiang ma-kadas-ang jaran-e [teken cai]
    1SG ACT. take care-CAUS horse-DEF [with 2SG]
    'I had/let you take care of the horse'

(23) a. Umah-e sewa=a.
    house-DEF rent=3SG
    'S/he rented the house'

b. Umah-e pa-sewa-ang tiang [teken ia]
    house-DEF rent-CAUS 1SG [with 3SG]
    'I had/let her/him rent the house'

c. Tiang masewa-ang umah-e [teken ia]
    1SG ACT. rent-CAUS house-DEF [with 3SG]
    I had/let her/him rent the house'

(24) a. Montor-e silih=a
    car-DEF borrow=3SG
    'S/he borrowed the car'
b. Montor-e pa-silih-ang tiang [teken ia]
car-DEF borrow-CAUS 1SG [with 3SG]
'I had/let her/him borrow the car'

c. Tiang ma-silih-ang montor-e [teken ia]
1SG ACT. borrow-CAUS car-DEF [with 3SG]
'I had/let her/him borrow the car'

The (a) sentences above are non-causative transitive constructions, whereas the (b) and (c) sentences are causative ones in which the verb is marked by the pa-ang confix. The agent of the base predicate is realised as an optional oblique marked by a preposition. The oblique causee in these examples can be omitted. For instance, the sentences in (24b) and (24c) can be translated as 'I allowed the car to be borrowed'.

The function of the suffix -ang in marking causativisation can be considered productive in Balinese at least for 'stative verbs'. Thus Balinese can causativise intransitive predicates and a number of transitive verbs, but this language does not causativise ditransitive verbs. A number of languages do not causativise 'volitional' intransitive verbs. By volitional intransitive verbs I mean those intransitive verbs that require an agent-like subject. These verbs are not relevant to Balinese causativisation because they are derived from precategorials (this will be described further in 3. 6). It has been shown in examples (19) and (20) that causative verbs can be derived from precategorials.

3. 3. 2 The Causative -- in

The use of the suffix -in to derive causative verbs is not as productive as the suffix -ang. Consider the following examples.

(25) a. Jalan-e linggah
    street-DEF wide
    'The street is wide'

    b. Jalan-e linggah-in=a
    street-DEF wide-CAUS=3SG
    'S/he widened the street'

    c. Ia ngelingah-in jalan-e [N-linggah]
    3SG ACT. wide-CAUS street-DEF
    'S/he widened the street'

(26) a. Tembok-e putih.
    wall-DEF white
    'The wall is white'

3 Alsina and Joshi (1991) note that it is possible to delete an oblique causee in Chichewa. The oblique causee in Turkish can also be deleted (Mehmet Celik, personal communication).
b. Tembok-e putih-in=a
   wall-DEF white-CAUS=3SG
   'S/he made the wall white'

c. Ia mutih-in tembok-e [N-putihin]
   3SG ACT. white-CAUS wall-DEF
   'S/he made the wall white'

(27) a. I Nadi pedih.
    ART Nadi angry
    'Nadi is angry'

    Nadi angry-CAUS=3SG
    S/he scolded Nadi'

The examples in (25a) and (26a) are non-causative. The predicates of these non-causative sentences are adjectives. The sentences in (25b), (25c), (26b) and (26c) are causative, whereas the example in (27b) is not a causative sentence although the transitive verb in this example is derived by -in and the base is also an adjective. This sentence will have a causative meaning if the suffix -in is replaced by -ang. The suffix -in can have a causative meaning only if the base form is an adjective indicating either size or colour.

3.3.3 The Causative pa-in

The pa-in confix is used to derive a causative verb from an adjective. Consider the following examples:

(28) a. Jalan-e linggah
    street-DEF wide
    'The street is wide'

b. Jalan-e pa-linggah-in tiang
    street-DEF make:wider 1SG
    'I made the street wider'

c. Tiang malinggahin jalan-e [N-palinggahin]
    1SG ACT. make:wider street-DEF
    'S/he made the street wider'

The sentence (28a) is a non-causative sentence, whereas (28b) and (28c) are causative ones. The example in (28b) shows that the causative situation is achieved by the use of pa-in confixation. The causative in (28b) and (28c) implies a comparison as indicated by the English translation as opposed to the examples in (25) and (26).

In summary, the base of the causative predicate in Balinese can be: (i) intransitive predicates, (ii) transitive predicates and (iii) precategorials. The subject of the intransitive base
and the patient of the transitive base are fused with the patient of the causative predicate in terms of Alsina and Joshi's (1991) approach. Thus the argument structure of causativisation in Balinese can be described as follows.

**Intransitive base**

(29) \( \text{ulung-ang} \quad \text{'cause'} \quad \text{fall-CAUS} \)

\( < \text{ag} \quad \text{pt} \quad \text{'fall'} \quad \text{pt} > > \)

**Transitive base**

(30) \( \text{pa-tandu-ang} \quad \text{'cause'} \quad \text{cultivate-CAUS} \)

\( < \text{ag} \quad \text{pat} \quad \text{'cultivate'} \quad \text{pt} > > \)

In (29) the patient of the base verb fuses with the patient of the causative predicate and the same is true for (30). It is the patient of the base predicate which fuses with the patient of the causative predicate. In terms of its argument structure (30) is similar to one version of the transitive causative of Chichewa as in (13b) in which the patient fuses with the patient of the causative predicate. The old agent (the causee) is expressed as an optional oblique. However, the mapping principles in (5) cannot be applied to Balinese. In the \( \emptyset \)-construction it is the patient of this construction which is the grammatical subject (see chapter two). The mapping principles in (5) can be applied to 'accusative' languages in which the agent is mapped onto a subject function in a basic construction and the patient onto an object. The same seems to be true for the grammatical hierarchy approach, which also fails to explain the valency-change of causatives in Balinese in relational terms. It seems that this hierarchy can accommodate the valency-change of causatives in accusative languages. However, this hierarchy cannot be used to cover causative formation in Balinese because this language has an ergative construction as its basic transitive construction in which the patient of the transitive clause is treated in the same way as the subject of an intransitive clause. This patient has been shown to have grammatical subject properties. Thus the subject of the intransitive clause will remain as the grammatical subject of the causatived clause. The other problem with applying this approach to Balinese would be with causatives derived from precategorials (see examples (19) and (20)).

### 3.4 Applicativisation

The term 'applicativisation' is often used to refer to a derivational process involving a valency-increase in Bantu languages. For instance, Alsina and Mchombo (1988) note that Chichewa has this type of syntactic process. The applicative construction in this language is noted to have two important features: (a) A new thematic role is introduced into the argument structure and (b) the verb undergoes morphological modification, which consists of the suffixation of the applicative morpheme.

Trask (1993:18-19) defines the term 'applicative construction' as object-creating in which an underlying indirect object or oblique object is realised as a surface object.\(^4\) The verb in an applicative construction usually bears a distinctive inflection expressing the semantic relation

\(^4\) See also Comrie (1985:316-317).
borne by the surface object. The following examples from Chi-Mwi:ni, a Bantu language illustrate an intrumental applicative (adapted from Trask 1993:19).

    Nuru Subj-cut meat with knife
    'Nuru cut the meat with a knife'

    Nuru Subj-cut-APPL meat knife
    'Nuru cut the meat with a knife'

In (31b) the instrumental oblique (ka:chisu) is expressed as an direct object and this is coded on the verb by infix -il- and the morpheme marking the instrumental is omitted. This object can be used as the subject of the passive sentence in this language. The notion of an applicative construction as object creating can be maintained in accusative languages, but not in syntactically ergative languages. In chapter two it is argued that Balinese is an analytic ergative language so the term 'applicative construction' will be used to refer to a subject-creating construction.

The term 'applicativisation' is adopted by Austin (1993) for describing transitivity alternations in Australian languages. Austin (1993) notes that intransitive verbs in Australian languages can be converted into transitive verbs by regular lexical processes and two patterns of transitivity are recognised: causativisation and applicativisation. Causative verbs are derived from non-volitional intransitive verbs and applicative ones are derived from volitional intransitive verbs. In this case Australian languages do not causativise volitional intransitive verbs.5

Austin (1993) points out that the derivation of transitive verbs from intransitive roots is coded by the addition of a suffix to the verb. He further notes that the Australian languages he investigated fall into two groups with respect to the number of causative or applicative suffixes the languages have: (i) languages that have two or more suffixes and (ii) languages that have one suffix. For those languages that have more than two suffixes, one is used with non-volitional verbs to form causatives and the other with volitional verbs to form applicatives. For languages that have one suffix, this suffixation will form causatives or applicatives depending on the types of base. If it is added to a volitional base, it will produce an applicative verb. If it is attached to a non-volitional base, it will form a causative verb (see Austin 1993 for details).

What distinguishes Balinese from Australian languages is that Australian languages have a clear-cut word classification, while in Balinese a large number of verbs are derived from precategorials. The verbs derived from precategorials can be intransitive or transitive. Applicative verbs in Balinese can be formed from precategorials, intransitive verbs and transitive verbs. The affixes that can be used to derive applied verbs in Balinese are -in and -ang. The suffix -ang can only be used to derive applied verbs from transitive verbs.

(32) precategorials applied verbs
tegak tegak-in 'to sit on'
cling eling-in 'to cry for'

5 A contrary situation can be found in Halkomelem. In this language it is not possible to causativise unaccusative (non-volitional) verbs (see Gerdts 1980, see also Blake 1990:37-38).
kecos  kecos-in 'to jump on'

intransitives

teka  'to come'  teka-in 'to visit'
demen 'to like'  demen-in 'to like'
ulung 'to fall'  ulung-in 'to drop something on'

transitives

silih 'to borrow'  silih-in 'to borrow from'
jemak 'to take'  jemak-in 'to take from'
tagih 'to get'  tagih-in 'to get from'

The applicative verbs given above are all marked by the presence of the suffix -in. If the suffix -ang is used to derive transitive verbs from precategorials or intransitive verbs we will get causative verbs, not applied verbs. Note that with transitive verbs both suffixes can be used. However, the causative verbs that can be formed from transitive verbs are very restricted in number. For the purpose of the present study, a number of applicative constructions are recognised: locative, instrumental, benefactive, source and recipient.

3. 4. 1 Locative

(a) Intransitive constructions

(33)  

 a. Cai singgah sig anak-e ento
    2SG visit at person-DEF that
    'You visited that man'

 b. Anak-e ento singgah-in cai
    person-DEF that visit-APPL 2SG
    'You visited that man'

 c. Cai nyinggah-in anak-e ento [N-singgahin]
    2SG ACT.visit-APPL person-DEF that
    'You visited that man'

The verb in the sentence (33a) is an intransitive verb. The grammatical relations that can be identified from this sentence are subject (cai) and oblique (sig anak e ento). This verb is transitivityised in (33b), this derivation being marked by the suffix -in. The result of this process is a transitive construction in which the oblique becomes the subject and the subject of the intransitive sentence is now realised as an agent complement. As noted in chapter two, the preverbal position is a privileged position. The sentence in (33c) is an alternative construction that Balinese has for putting the agent in a privileged position, that is, turning the agent complement into a grammatical subject.
The locative oblique in (34a) has been advanced to become a subject. This advancement is marked on the verb by -in as shown in (34b). The sentences in (34c) can also be regarded as illustrating an advancement in which the agent complement is turned into a subject. This is marked by a nasal prefix on the verb.

Balinese can also advance a local relation indicating destination. In (35a) this relation is expressed by a prepositional phrase (see also section 3. 4. 3). This destination relation is expressed as a subject in (35b) and this advancement is marked by the suffix -in on the verb. In (35c) the agent is the subject of the clause and the verb is marked by a nasal prefix.

The suffix -ang can also be used to promote a locative oblique to a subject relation. However, this type of advancement is limited to a locative oblique indicating parts of the body. Consider the following sentences.

(36) a. Ia beseh di tundun-ne.
3SG swell at back-3SGPOSS
'S/he got swollen on her/his back'

b. Tundun-ne beseh-ang=a
back-3SGPOSS swell-APPL=3SG
'S/he got swollen on her/his back'
c. la mesch-ang tudun-ne [N-besehang]
   3SG ACT. swell-APPL back-3SGPOSS
   'S/he got swollen on her/his back'

(37) a. la genit di basang-ne.
   3SG itch at stomach-3SGPOSS
   'S/he got itch on her/his stomach'

b. Basang-ne genit-ang=a
   stomach-3SGPOSS itch-APPL=3SG
   'S/he got itch on her/his stomach'

c. la ngenit-ang basang-ne [N-genitang]
   3SG ACT. itch-APPL stomach-3SGPOSS
   'S/he got itch on her/his stomach'

The examples (36a) and (36b) have the same semantic information. The difference between the two is that in (36b) the locative oblique has been advanced to become a subject. This advancement is marked by the suffix -ang on the verb. A similar description can be applied to (37). The advancement described in this section produces a two-place transitive construction. In terms of the grammatical relations proposed in chapter two, this two place-transitive construction has a subject and an agent complement in the O-construction and a subject and a patient complement in the N-construction.

(b) Transitive constructions

A locative oblique marked by a preposition di 'at' can be advanced to subject. This syntactic process is marked on the verb by -in. Consider the following examples.

(38) a. Biyu pula tiang di tegal-e
    banana plant 1SG at garden-DEF
    'I planted the banana in the garden'

b. Tiang mula biyu di tegal-e [N-pula]
   1SG ACT. plant banana at garden-DEF
   'I plant the banana in the garden'

c. Tegale pula-n-in tiang biyu
   garden-DEF plant-APPL 1SG banana
   'I planted the banana in the garden'

d. Tiang mula-n-in tegal-e biyu [N-pulanin]
   1SG ACT. plant-APPL garden-DEF banana
   'I planted the banana in the garden'
(29)  a. Buku beli tiang di toko ento
book buy 1SG at shop that
'I bought the book in that shop'

b. Tiang meli buku di toko ento [N-beli]
1SG ACT. buy book at shop that
'I bought the book in that shop'

c. Toko ento beli-in tiang buku
shop that buy-APPL 1SG book
'I bought the book in that shop'

d. Tiang meli-in toko ento buku [N-belinin]
1SG ACT. buy-APPL shop that book
'I bought the book in that shop'

(40)  a. Buku ejang tiang di lemari-ne
book put 1SG in cupboard-DEF
'I put the book in the cupboard'

b. Tiang ngejang buku di lemari-ne [N-ejang]
1SG ACT. put book at cupboard-DEF
'I put the book in the cupboard'

c. Lemari-ne ejang-in tiang buku
cupboard-DEF put-APPL 1SG book
'I put some books in the cupboard'

d. Tiang ngejang-in lemari-ne buku [N-ejangin]
1SG put-APPL cupboard-DEF book
'I put some books in the cupboard'

The locative phrase in (a) sentences above is in oblique relation to the verb. The (b) sentences are the N-construction counterparts of the (a) sentences. The sentences in (c) are derived from the corresponding (a) sentences by advancing the oblique NP to become a subject. This advancement is registered on the verb by -in. The (d) sentences are the N-construction counterparts of the (c) sentences.

Now we need to look at the grammatical relations of the argument noun phrases in these examples. Let us take (38) for illustration. In (38a) the noun phrase, biyu is the subject of the sentence. tiang is the agent complement and di tegale is the locative oblique. In (38b) tiang is the subject. biyu is the patient complement and di tegale is the locative oblique. Different grammatical relations can be found in (38c) and (38d). In (38c) the locative oblique is advanced to become a subject. This advancement is marked by the presence of the suffix -in on the verb. The grammatical relations of the argument noun phrases in (38c) are as follows: tegale is the subject of the sentence. tiang is the agent complement (AC) and biyu is the patient complement (PC). The N-construction in (38d) has the following grammatical relations: tiang is now a subject. tegale
becomes a locative complement and *biyu* is a PC. The same principles apply to the other examples. Note that I am not calling the NP that appears immediately after the verb in the N-construction a direct object, since these NPs do not figure in any morphological or syntactic rules.

3. 4. 2 Instrumental

The instrumental applicative is marked by the suffix *-ang*. The instrumental oblique in Balinese is marked with the preposition *aji* 'with'. Consider the following examples.

(41) a. Tatu-ne bedbed tiang aji kain putih
    wound-DEF tie 1SG with material white
    'I tied the wound with white material'

    b. Kain putih bedbed-ang tiang ka tatune
       material white tie-APPL 1SG to wound-DEF
       'I tied the wound with white material'

    c. Tiang medbed-ang kain putih ka tatu-ne
       1SG ACT. tie-APPL material white to wound-DEF
       'I tied the wound with white material'

(42) a. Natah-e sikut=a aji tungked
    yard-DEF measure=3SG with stick
    'S/he measured the yard with a stick'

    b. Tungked sikut-ang=a di natah-e
       stick measure-APPL=3SG at yard-DEF
       'S/he measured the yard with a stick'

    c. la nyikut-ang tungked di natah-e
       3SG ACT. measure-APPL stick at yard-DEF
       'S/he used a stick to measure the yard'

(43) a. Cicing-e lempag=a aji sampat
    dog-DEF hit=3SG with broom
    'S/he hit the dog with a broom'

    b. Sampat lempag-ang=a ka cicing-e
       broom hit-APPL=3SG to dog-DEF
       'S/he hit the dog with a broom'

    c. la nglempag-ang sampat ka cicing-e [N-lempagang]
       3SG ACT. hit-APPL broom to dog-DEF
       'S/he hit the dog with a broom'
The examples (41a), (41b) and (41c) all express the same semantic information. The difference between them can be stated as follows. The verb in (41a) is a basic verb, while the verb in (41b) is suffixed by -ang. The sentence in (41b) shows that the oblique instrumental has been promoted to a subject position. A similar interpretation can be given to the examples in (42) and (43). The grammatical relations in (41) can be given as follows:

a. Tatu-ne bedbed tiang aji kain putih.
   Subject Predicate AC Instrumental Oblique

b. Kain putih bedbedang tiang ka tatune
   Subject Predicate AC

c. Tiang medbedang kain putih ka tatune
   AC Predicate PC

In (41a) tatune is the subject of the sentence, tiang is the agent complement and aji kain putih is the instrumental oblique, while in (41b) the oblique becomes the subject and the agent complement remains as an agent complement. The patient is marked by the preposition ka. This preposition means 'to', but this meaning is not clearly applicable here. It seems rather that ka is simply being used to mark a demoted patient. A similar situation can be found in English sentences like She presented the winner with the prize where with has neither its instrumental meaning 'by means of' nor its comitative meaning 'in the company', but rather serves to mark a patient that has been displaced from direct object. In Relational Grammar a participant that is displaced from subject, direct object or indirect object is called a chômeur (see section 9.2 in chapter nine). (41c) is the N-construction equivalent of (41b). The agent complement is the subject and the former subject becomes an instrumental complement. The grammatical relations in (42) and (43) can be described in a similar way.

3. 4. 3 Benefactive

The presence of a benefactive argument is marked by the suffix -ang on the verb. This advancement can be considered 'obligatory advancement' because a beneficiary NP is never expressed as an oblique relation. It is not marked by a preposition as in many other languages.6

A contrary situation is found in Diyari, an Australian Aboriginal language. Austin (1981, 1993) notes that the affix -ipa- in Diyari can be added to a transitive verb to indicate that an action is done for the benefit of non-subject beneficiary, in addition to its function as a transitivising affix. However, when this affix is added to the verb it does not advance the dative benefactive NP. If the benefactive is expressed it remains in the dative case. The following example is adapted from Austin (1993)

(44) Karna-li wilha nandrra-ipa-yi ngakarni
     man-ERG woman hit-BEN-PRES I DAT
     'The man hit the woman for me'

---

6 Obligatory advancement is also reported in Tzotzil by Aissen 1979.
The following are Balinese examples:

(45)  a. Cai beli-ang tiang buku-ne ene
     2SG buy-APPL 1SG book-DEF this
     I bought you this book'

       b. Tiang meli-ang cai buku-ne ene [N-beliang]
          1SG ACT. buy-APPL 2SG book-DEF this
          'I bought you this book'

(46)  a. Ia jemak-ang tiang jaja
     3SG take-APPL 1SG cake
     'I took her/him some cakes'

       b. Tiang nyemak-ang ia jaja [N-jemakang]
          1SG ACT. take-APPL 3SG cake
          'I took her/him some cakes'

(47)  a. Ia silih-ang tiang buku
     3SG borrow-APPL 1SG book
     'I borrowed a book for her/him'

       b. Tiang nyilihang ia buku [N-siliharg]
          1SG ACT. borrow-APPL 3SG book
          'I borrowed her/him a book'

The grammatical relations in (45) can be presented as follows:

a. Cai beli-ang tiang bukune ene
   Subject Predicat AC PC

b. Tiang meli-ang cai bukune ene
   Subject Predicate BC PC

In (45a) cai functions as a subject, tiang as an agent complement (AC) and bukune ene as a patient complement (PC). (45b) is a N-construction. In this construction tiang functions as a subject, cai as a benefactive complement (BC) and bukune ene as a patient complement (PC). A similar description also applies to (46) and (47).

3. 4. 4 Source

The opposite semantic of the benefactive can be expressed in Balinese using certain transitive verbs marked by the suffix -in. The source relation is expressed by a prepositional phrase. If the source from which something is taken a sentient creature, this source can be expressed as subject as in the (b) sentences below
(48)  a. Pipis silih cai teken bapan-ne
      money borrow 2SG with father-3SGPOSS
      'You borrowed the money from her/his father'

    b. Bapan-ne silih-in cai pipis
       father-3SGPOSS borrow-APPL 2SG money
       'You borrowed the money from her/his father'

    c. Cai nyilih-in bapan-ne pipis [N-silihin]
       2SG ACT. borrow-APPL father-3SGPOSS money
       'You borrowed the money from her/his father'

(49)  a. Sepeda beli cai teken anak-e ento
       bike buy 2SG with person-DEF that
       'You bought a bike from that person'

    b. Anak-e ento beli-in cai sepeda
       person-DEF that buy-APPL 2SG bike
       'You bought a bike from that person'

    c. Cai meli-in anak-e ento sepeda [N-beliin]
       2SG ACT. buy-APPL person-DEF that bike
       'You bought a bike from that person'

The prepositional phrase in (a) sentences above is in oblique relation to the verb. The (b) sentences are derived from the corresponding (a) sentences by advancing the oblique NP to become a subject. This advancement is registered on the verb by -in. The sentences in (c) are alternative constructions in which the agent complement in (b) sentences is turned into a grammatical subject. Specifically he grammatical relations held by the noun phrases in (48b) and (48c) can be shown as follows:

b. Bapanne silihin cai pipis
   Subject Predicate AC PC

c. Cai nyilihin bapanne pipis
   Subject Predicate Source complement (SC) PC

3. 4. 5 Recipient

The 'giving', 'telling' and 'showing' verbs in Balinese are derived from pre-categorials. However, there is one verb which is not derived from a precategorial. This verb is baang 'give'. Consider the following examples:

(50)  a. Baju-ne baang tiang I Made
       shirt-DEF give 1SG ART Made
       'I gave the shirt to Made'
b. I Made baang tiang baju-ne
   ART Made give 1SG shirt-DEF
   'I gave Made the shirt'

(51) a. Tiang maang I Made baju-ne [N-baang]
   1SG ACT. give ART Made shirt-DEF
   'I gave Made the shirt'

b. *Tiang maang baju-ne I Made
   1SG ACT. give shirt ART Made
   'I gave the shirt to Made'

The examples in (50) are Ø-constructions. In (50a) the patient argument is the subject, while in (50b) the recipient argument is the subject. Note that the recipient complement in (50a) is not expressed as an oblique and the alternative construction (50b) requires no marking on the verb. The examples in (51) are N-constructions. Only the N-construction in (51a) is acceptable, while the N-construction in (51b) is not. The recipient complement (RC) must be placed before the patient complement (PC) as shown in (51a).

Probably Balinese can be considered as having two different ways of coding 'telling', 'giving' and 'showing' verbs. Thus the way the 'gift', 'news', or 'the thing shown' is mapped onto syntactic relations will depend on the morpheme used. There are two suffixes which can be used in this respect: -ang and -in. The verb in the following examples is derived from a pre-categorial with -ang and the recipient is coded by a prepositional phrase.

(52) a. Buku-ne enjuh-ang-a ka timpal-ne.
    book-DEF give-APPL-3SG to friend-3SGPOSS
    'S/he gave the book to her/his friend'

b. Ia ngenjuh-ang buku-ne ento ka timpal-ne
    3SG ACT. give-APPL book-DEF that to friend-3SGPOSS
    'S/he gave the book to her/his friend'

(53) a. Unduk-e ento orah-ang tiang ka bapan-ne
    matter-DEF that tell-APPL 1SG to father-3SGPOSS
    'I told her/his father the problem'

b. Tiang ngorah-ang unduk-e ento ka bapan-ne
    1SG ACT. tell-APPL matter-DEF that to father-3SGPOSS
    'I told her/his father the problem'

(54) a. Gambaran-e edeng-ang cai ka guru-ne
    picture-DEF show-APPL 2SG to teacher-DEF
    'You showed the picture to the teacher'
b. Cai ngedengang gambaran-e ka guru-ne
   2SG ACT. show-APPL picture-DEF to teacher-DEF
   'You showed the picture to the teacher'

These examples show that if the suffix -ang is used to derive a verb, the 'gift', 'news', or 'the thing shown' is coded as a subject and the person to whom it is given, told, or shown is marked by a preposition.

The verb in the following examples is derived by using the suffix -in and the recipient is an unmarked NP. Either the recipient or the patient can be expressed as a grammatical subject as shown in (a) and (b) sentences.

(55)  a. Timpal-ne enjuh-in=a buku
       friend-3GPOSS give-APPL=3SG book
       'She gave the book to her/his friend'

   b. Buku enjuh-in=a timpal-ne
      book give-APPL=3SG friend-3GPOSS
      'She gave the book to her/his friend'

   c. Ia ngenjuh-in timpal-ne buku [N-enjuh]
      3SG ACT. give-APPL friend-3GPOSS book
      'She gave the book to her/his friend'

   d. *Ia ngenjuhin buku timpalne

(56)  a. Bapan-ne orah-in tiang unduk-e ento
       father-3GPOSS tell-APPL 1SG matter-DEF that
       'I told her/his father the problem'

   b. Unduk-e ento orah-in tiang bapan-ne
      matter-DEF that tell-APPL 1SG father-3GPOSS
      'I told her/his father the problem'

   c. Tiang ngorah-in bapan-ne unduk-e ento
      1SG ACT. tell-APPL father-3GPOSS problem-DEF that
      'I told her/his father the problem'

   d. *Tiang ngorahin unduke ento bapanne

(57)  a. Guru-ne edeng-in cai gambaran-e.
       teacher-DEF show-APPL 2SG picture-DEF
       'You showed the teacher the picture'

   b. Gambaran-e edeng-in cai guru-ne
      picture-DEF show-APPL 2SG teacher-DEF
      'You showed the teacher the picture'
c. Cai ngedeng-in guru-ne gambaran-e [N-edengin]  
   2SG ACT. show-APPL teacher-DEF picture-DEF  
   'You showed the teacher the picture'  

d. *Cai ngedengin gambarane gurune  

Examples (55), (56) and (57) show that the recipient is an unmarked noun phrase, whereas in (52), (53) and (54) the recipient is expressed as an oblique because the verb is derived by the suffix -ang. The (d) sentences in (55), (56) and (57) are not acceptable. This indicates that in the N-constructions, the recipient complement precede the patient complement. The grammatical relations the verb 'tell', which derived by the suffix -ang and -in in Balinese can be represented as follows:  

The Ø-constructions:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>PREDICATE</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>OBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unduke ento</td>
<td>orah-ang</td>
<td>tiang</td>
<td>ka bapanne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>PREDICATE</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bapanne</td>
<td>orah-in</td>
<td>tiang</td>
<td>unduke ento</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The N-constructions:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>PREDICATE</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>OBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tiang</td>
<td>ngorah-ang</td>
<td>unduke ento</td>
<td>ka bapanne</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>PREDICATE</th>
<th>RC</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tiang</td>
<td>ngorah-in</td>
<td>bapanne</td>
<td>unduke ento</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Resultatives  

The term 'resultative' is generally applied to those verb forms that express a state implying a previous event. Thus, a resultative construction is different from a stative construction. The stative expresses a state of a thing without any implication of its origin, while resultative expresses both a state and the preceding action it has resulted from. Therefore the stative may denote natural, primary states which do not result from any previous event (Nedjalkov and Jaxontov 1988:6).  

In addition to the term resultative, one may also find the term 'anticausative'. Comrie (1985) uses this term to refer to a syntactic phenomenon in which an intransitive verb is derived from a transitive one. Thus it is a type of valency-change mechanism. Comrie (1985) points out that the anticausative is similar in many ways to the passive, in that the direct object of the basic verb appears as the subject of the anticausative. He illustrates the structures of anticausative and passive with the following English examples.  

---  
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(58) a. Anton opened the door.
b. The door opened
c. The door was opened

The example in (58a) is a basic sentence. (58b) is the anticausative and (58c) is the passive construction. The difference between the passive and anticausative, according to Comrie (1985), is that even when the passive does not have an agentive phrase, the existence of some person or thing that brings about the situation is implied and one can use an adverb related to the agent of the passive, whereas the anticausative is consistent with the situation coming about spontaneously. For instance, the passive sentence in (58c) can be modified with an agent oriented adverb as shown in (58d), but the anticausative construction cannot take an agent oriented adverb as shown in (58e) below. This sentence is not acceptable.

d. The door was opened cautiously
e. *The door opened cautiously

Comrie (1985) maintains that structurally the object of the basic verb becomes the subject of both the corresponding passive and anticausative. This is true in the above examples. It could be stated that the agent of the passive is optional, whereas the agent of the anticausative is never expressed. The term anticausative defined by Comrie is comparable with the term resultative as used by Nedjalkov and Jaxonov (1988).

The resultative construction in Balinese is marked by the prefix ma-. Note that the sentences in (a) below are normal transitive constructions while their corresponding resultatives are provided in (b). Consider the following examples:

(59) a. Kayu-ne   ebah=a
tree-DEF   cut=3SG
'S/he cut the tree'
b. Kayu-ne   ma-ebah
tree-DEF  RES-cut
'The tree was cut'
c. *Kayu-ne   ma-ebah   enggal-enggal
tree-DEF  RES-cut  quickly
'The tree was cut quickly'

(60) a. Umah-e   adep   tiang
house-DEF sell   1SG
'I sold the house'
b. Umah-e   ma-adep
house-DEF  RES-sell
'The house was sold'
The examples in (59a) and (60a) are transitive constructions (Ø-constructions), while (59b) and (60b) are their corresponding resultative sentences. This derivation is marked by the prefix ma-. This formation is very productive in Balinese in that virtually all transitive verbs can be turned into resultatives.

Example (59c) is marked with an asterisk to show that this sentence is not grammatical. Thus, this construction cannot take an agent oriented adverbial (enggal-enggal). This shows that a resultative construction is stative in nature. As noted above, a stative construction expresses the state of a thing without any implication of its origin, while a resultative expresses both a state and the preceding action it has resulted from. Therefore the stative may denote natural, primary states which do not result from any previous event. The primary stative and resultative stative are illustrated in the following examples. The (a) sentences express primary state, while the (b) sentences presuppose a previous action. This difference is indicated by the English translation. The resultative construction is marked by the suffix ma-an.

(61) a. Tembok-e putih  
    wall-DEF white  
    'The wall is white'

b. Tembok-e ma-putih-an  
    wall-DEF RES-white  
    'The wall was made white'

(62) a. Jalan-e linggah  
    street-DEF wide  
    'The street is wide'

b. Jalan-e ma-linggah-an  
    street-DEF RES-wide  
    'The street was made wider'

(63) a. Umah-e kedas  
    house-DEF clean  
    'The house is clean'

b. Umah-e ma-kedas-an  
    house-DEF RES-clean  
    'The house was made clean'

The suffix ma-an can also be used to derive a resultative verb from a pre-categorial, examples.

(64) Montor-e ma-tungging-an  
    car-DEF RES-turn over  
    The car was turned over
(65) Buku-ne ma-adur-an  
    book-DEF RES-unordered  
    'The book was unordered'

(66) Jelanan-e ma-ubet-an  
    door-DEF RES-close  
    'The door was closed'

(67) Jendela-ne ma-ampak-an  
    window-DEF RES-open  
    The window was opened'

3. 6 Intransitive Verb Formations

The resultative constructions described in the preceding section can be regarded as intransitive constructions. Intransitive verbs in Balinese can be derived from precategorials using a nasal prefix (N-) and the ma- prefix, examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>precategorials</th>
<th>intransitive verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tegak</td>
<td>negak 'to sit'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tambung</td>
<td>nambung 'to fly'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>telep</td>
<td>nelep 'to hide'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eling</td>
<td>ngeling 'to cry'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sirit</td>
<td>nyirit 'to roll'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>takon</td>
<td>matakon 'to ask'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tangi</td>
<td>matangi 'to get up'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kecos</td>
<td>makecos 'to jump'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laib</td>
<td>malaib 'to run'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suryak</td>
<td>masuryak 'to shout'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The nasal prefix (N-) and the ma- prefix are in a complementary distribution. They cannot be interchangeably used. Thus the the N- prefix cannot be used to derive intransitive verbs from the precategorials listed in (b). The ma- prefix cannot be used to form intransitive verbs from those precategorials in (a) either. It is not clear to me why this is so.

Warna et al. (1990) list about 614 precategorials in their most comprehensive Balinese dictionary. These precategorials can be verbalised (either transitivised using -ang or -in or intransitivised using ma- or N-). Of these precategorials 275 are intransitivised with the prefix ma- and 334 are turned into intransitive verbs using the nasal prefix (N-).

In terms of their morphological form, intransitive verbs in Balinese can be classified into: basic intransitive verbs and 'derived' intransitive verbs. The derived intransitives are marked by either prefix N- or ma- as noted above. The bases of these intransitive verbs are pre-categorials. What is the main difference between the two classes? The answer would be more likely semantic rather
than syntactic. The intransitive verbs marked by N- or ma- indicates an activity, while the basic ones denotes states. Both the N- intransitive verb and the ma- ones are volitional intransitive verbs.

In traditional grammar, all intransitive verbs take a subject. The split nature of intransitivity has been an important issue in syntactic theory since Perlmutter's postulation of the Unaccusative Hypothesis in Relational Grammar (Perlmutter 1978). According to the Unaccusative Hypothesis there are two types of intransitive verb. In Relational Grammar an intransitive verb that takes an initial 1 (an initial subject) is called an 'unergative verb', while an intransitive verb that takes an initial 2 (an initial direct object) is referred to as 'unaccusative verb'. However, languages differ as to which predicates they put into which category. Some studies have shown that classifications of verbs are not equivalent crosslinguistically (see for instance, Mithun 1991).

Balinese also makes this distinction. The unergative verb is marked by a nasal prefix (N-), while the unaccusative one is unmarked. The unmarked intransitive verbs and adjectives in Balinese can be categorised as showing unaccusative characteristics. A brief comparison between Balinese and Guarani (a South American Indian language) will be made. According to Mithun (1991) in Guarani predicates meaning 'go', 'walk', 'swim', 'fall' and 'die' take agent pronominal affixes, while the predicates meaning 'be sick', 'be weak', 'be dead' and 'be strong' take patient prefixes. Mithun (1991:513) states the distinction is primarily one of lexical aspect. Verbs in the agent group denote activities, accomplishments and achievements. They involve change over time. Verbs in patient group denotes states. This distinction seems to be true for Balinese as well. Since the unaccusative verbs in Guarani by Mithun are compatible with Balinese unaccusative verbs, only Guarani unergative verbs will be compared with Balinese. The comparison is based on the translational equivalent of those verbs in Balinese. The following English verbs are translation of some Guarani verbs adapted from Mithun (1991).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Guarani</th>
<th>Balinese</th>
<th>Verb form in Balinese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'go'</td>
<td>unergative</td>
<td>unergative</td>
<td>ma-gedi (ma-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'get up'</td>
<td></td>
<td>unaccusative</td>
<td>bangun (basic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'walk'</td>
<td></td>
<td>unergative</td>
<td>ma-jalan (ma-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'come'</td>
<td></td>
<td>unaccusative</td>
<td>teka (basic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'run'</td>
<td></td>
<td>unergative</td>
<td>ma-laib (ma-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'swim'</td>
<td></td>
<td>unergative</td>
<td>ng-langi (N-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'chat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>unergative</td>
<td>ngorta (N-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'fall'</td>
<td></td>
<td>unaccusative</td>
<td>ulung (basic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'sleep'</td>
<td></td>
<td>unaccusative</td>
<td>pules (basic)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This brief comparison shows that classifications of verbs are not equivalent cross-linguistically. Rosen (1984) also points out that the classification of verbs is not equivalent cross-linguistically: a verb may pattern one way in one language, but its translation may pattern the opposite way in another. From the above comparison, four out of the nine unergative verbs in Guarani are categorised as unaccusative verbs in Balinese.

It has been noted that the suffix -ang is used to derive a transitive verb. The following are some examples.

---

8 Kana (1986) takes the ber-intransitive verbs (which are equivalent with the ma- intransitive verbs in Balinese) and the N-intransitive verbs in Indonesian to be unergative.
tegeh 'tall'  tegeh-ang 'to make-tall'
gede 'big'  gede-ang 'to make-big'
pedih 'angry'  pedih-ang 'to make-angry'

etc.

These transitive verb can be used intransitively if they are nasalised. The intransitive form has a different meaning. The base form of this verb could be an adjective or a word denoting direction. Semantically the verb derived from the adjective has a meaning which expresses the increase of the quality denoted by the base form. Consider the following examples.

(68)  Ia ngelihang  [N-kelihang]
     3SG ACT. become big
     'S/he grew older'

(69)  Ia negehhang  [N-tegehhang]
     3SG ACT. become tall
     'S/he grew taller'

(70)  Ia nyugihang  [N-sugihang]
     3SG ACT. become rich
     'S/he become richer'

The base form in (68) is keli 'old', in (69) tegeh 'tall', and in (70) sugih 'rich'

With a word denoting a definite direction as the base form, the derived form expressing the meaning of moving toward a definite direction, examples:

(71)  Ia nganginang  [N-kanginang]
     3SG ACT. go east
     'S/he is going east'

(72)  Ia nuunang  [N-tuunang]
     3SG ACT. go down
     'S/he is going down'

(73)  Ia ngajanang  [N-kajanang]
     3SG ACT. go north
     'S/he is going north'

The base form in (71) is kangin 'east', in (72) penek 'climb', and in (73) kaja 'north'. In the examples above the suffix -ang together with the nasal prefix N- forms intransitive verbs.

Another prefix which can be used to derive an intransitive verb from a precategorical is the prefix par-, examples:
(74) Kedis-e pakeber
bird-DEF fly
‘The birds are flying’

(75) Cicing-e pakraung
dog-DEF bark
‘The dogs are barking

(76) Murid-e pakraik
student-DEF shout
‘The children are shouting’

The intransitive verb derived by prefix *pa-* requires that the agent should be plural.

3. 7 The Other ma- Constructions

The prefix *ma-* can be used to derive a verb from a noun or a precategorial form. With a noun base, the resultant verb has a number of meanings. In this case, this suffix is polysemic. The potential meanings this prefix may have will be described below.

a). To have something as indicated by the base.

(77) Patung-e ento malima [ma-lima]
statue-DEF that have:arm
‘The statue has arms.’

(78) Nyuh-e mabuah [ma-buah]
coconut-DEF have:fruit
‘The coconut tree has some fruits’

b). To call someone as indicated by the base form.

(79) Tiang mabapa teken ia [ma-bapa]
1SG call:father with 3SG
‘I call him father’

(80) Tiang maembok teken ia [ma-embok]
1SG call:sister with 3SG
‘I call her sister’

c). To express a reflexive meaning. The base form can be a noun as in (81) or a precategorial as in (82) below.

(81) Ia sedek mapupur [ma-pupur]
3SG ASP put on:powder
‘She is putting powder on her face’
The activity signified by the verb in each of the above examples has a reflexive meaning, that is, the subject of the sentence does something on himself/herself. These sentences are paraphrasable as follows respectively.

3.8 Summary

Causatives, applicatives, resultatives and other verbal constructions have been discussed in this chapter. It has been shown that Balinese can causativise stative intransitive verbs and a limited number of transitive verbs. In addition to distinct word classes such as verb and noun, Balinese also has a large number of pre-categorial. The term 'pre-categorial' is used to refer to a root whose word class membership cannot be assigned without adding an affix. It has been shown in this chapter that pre-categorial bases can be turned into transitive verbs by adding the suffix -ang or -in. They can also be turned into intransitive verbs by adding the prefix N- or ma-. Thus Balinese has the so-called unergative/unaccusative distinction.

Balinese also has another causative construction in which there is no base construction from which the causative one is formed. In this case, the causative verb is derived from a pre-categorial.

It is evident that grammatical hierarchy approach suggested by Comrie (1981, 1985) cannot handle Balinese causativisation well simply because the subject of the base clause (if there is one) remains as a grammatical subject.

Looking at Balinese causativisation from the argument structure approach proposed by Alsina and Joshi (1991), it can be specified that only the patient of the base predicate can fuse with the patient of the causative predicate. However, the mapping principles of this approach do not work well for Balinese causatives since the agent is not mapped onto a subject in an unmarked transitive construction (the $\emptyset$-construction).
Another valency-changing construction discussed in this chapter is the applicative construction. Applicatives discussed are locative, benefactive, instrumental, source and recipient. Balinese has two suffixes which can be used to mark either causatives or applicatives. These suffixes are -ang and -in.

As in other languages, Balinese also has a 'detransitivising' syntactic process. This process is called the resultative construction. Virtually all transitive verbs in Balinese can be turned into resultative verbs. This derivation is marked on the verb by prefix ma-. It has been shown that this prefix also has a number of meanings.

In this chapter the formation of intransitive verbs is also discussed. It is shown that intransitive verbs in Balinese can be derived from precategorial bases by the nasal prefix or the ma-prefix. All intransitive verbs derived from precategorials are volitional. Balinese also has stative intransitives. In this case Balinese has a distinction between unergative and unaccusative verbs. Unergative and unaccusative distinction can be covert and overt. The difference is syntactically relevant in a number of languages, such as Italian for example, where it affects choice of auxiliary verbs and the possibilities for cliticisation of the pronominal ne, and post verbal placement of subject noun phrase (see Burzio 1986, Blake 1990). However, the distribution of the unergative and unaccusative verbs in Balinese is not syntactically relevant. All sole arguments of intransitive constructions align with the patient (P) argument of transitive constructions.