

ERGATIVITY AND BALINESE SYNTAX
PART II

NUSA

**Linguistic Studies of Indonesian
and Other Languages in Indonesia**

Volume 43, 1998

EDITORS:

**Soenjono Dardjowidjojo, Jakarta
Anton M. Moeliono, Jakarta
Soepomo Poedjosoedarmo, Yogyakarta
Bambang Kaswanti Purwo, Jakarta
John W.M. Verhaar, The Hague, The Netherlands**

ASSISTANT EDITOR:

Yassir Nasanius

ADDRESS:

**NUSA
Pusat Kajian Bahasa dan Budaya
Jalan Jenderal Sudirman 51
Jakarta 12930, Indonesia
Fax: (021) 571-9560
E-mail : pkbb@atmajaya.ac.id**

**All rights reserved
(see also information on page iii)
ISSN 0126 – 2874**

INFORMATION ABOUT *NUSA*

Series *NUSA* volume 1 (1975) through volume 11 (1981) appeared nonperiodically, but from volume 12 (1982) to volume 29 (1987) *NUSA* was issued three times a year at a fixed rate per year. Beginning volume 30 (1988) *NUSA* has been published nonperiodically and subscribers are charged in advance for every three volumes. Beginning with Vol. 45, individuals residing in Indonesia are to make a three-volume-prepayment of Rp 50.000,00; those residing abroad are to pay US\$ 45.00 (inclusive seamail postage).

Payments from foreign countries are to be made by

- (a) bank transfer to Lippo Bank, Lippo Plaza Branch, Jalan Jenderal Sudirman kav. 25, Jakarta 12930, Indonesia, to the order of Yayasan Atma Jaya (*NUSA*), acc. No. 540-30-33010-7
- or (b) bank draft payable to Yayasan Atma Jaya (*NUSA*), sent directly to Pusat Kajian Bahasa dan Budaya, Universitas Katolik Atma Jaya, Jalan Jenderal Sudirman 51, Jakarta 12930, Indonesia.

Subscribers residing in Indonesia are to send money orders to Yayasan Atma Jaya (*NUSA*), Pusat Kajian Bahasa dan Budaya, Unika Atma Jaya, Jalan Jenderal Sudirman 51, Jakarta 12930.

Back volumes are available at different costs.

Manuscripts for publication, including reviews, should be sent to the Editorial Board, *NUSA*, Pusat Kajian Bahasa dan Budaya, Universitas Katolik Atma Jaya, Jalan Jenderal Sudirman 51, Jakarta 12930, Indonesia.

Contributors are to follow the format of the Linguistic Society of America with the exception that in the footnote and bibliography articles are to be put in quotation marks and books or journals italicized. Content words in the bibliography (nouns, verbs, adjectives) in a title of a book or article must be capitalized.

Non-native speakers of English are requested to have their manuscripts checked by a native English speaker.

All rights are reserved

ERGATIVITY AND BALINESE SYNTAX PART II

Dear Subscribers,

NUSA, Vol. 42, 43, 44

We very much regret that the title page and the table of contents have been put on the wrong pages. They should have been page-numbered *v* and *vi* respectively.

The Editors

I Ketut Artawa
Udayana University

1998
Badan Penyelenggara Seri *NUSA*
Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya
Jakarta

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART II

Information about NUSA	iii
Table of Contents	v
Chapter 4: Pragmatic Functions	65
4.1 Introduction	65
4.2 Approaches to Topic-comment Structures	65
4.3 Left Dislocation and Topicalisation	68
4.4 Is Balinese a Subject Prominent Language?	71
4.5 The Term ‘focus’	73
4.5.1 Malay	74
4.5.2 Balinese	77
4.6 Summary	82
Chapter 5: Complex Sentences	83
5.1 Introduction	83
5.2 Relativisation	83
5.3 Purposive clauses	90
5.4 Complement clauses	92
5.5 Raising	94
5.5 Summary	95
Chapter 6: The Adverbs and Particles	97
6.1 Introduction	97
6.2 Types of Adverbs	97
6.2.1 Time Adverbs	97
6.2.2 Manner Adverbs	101
6.2.3 Place Adverbs	102
6.2.4 Frequency Adverbs	103
6.3 Particles	105
6.3.1 Aspect Markers	105
6.3.2 Negative Markers	110
6.4 Summary	111

PRAGMATIC FUNCTIONS

Chapter Four

4. 1 Introduction

The main concern of this chapter is to discuss whether Balinese is a subject prominent language or a topic prominent language. The discussion will centre around the common differences between a subject prominent language and a topic prominent language based mainly on Li and Thompson's (1976) classic language typology. Building on the description of subjecthood in chapter two and of applicativisation in chapter three) I will argue that Balinese is not a topic prominent language, but it is a subject-prominent language.

It seems quite clear that the notion of 'topic' is far from being a settled issue in linguistics. The definition of topic which is generally adopted in this thesis is essentially based on 'aboutness', that is the topic of the sentence is what the sentence is about.¹ For instance, Blake (1994:206) defines 'topic' as what is spoken about as opposed to the 'comment', which is what is said about the topic. He further notes that the topic is normally 'given information' and typically expressed as the subject. It is also noted that there can be a topic that stands outside the clause proper, set off by an intonation break. There are also discourse topics, topics that are established at some point and hold over some subsequent stretch of discourse. The following example is from Blake (1994: 206)

(1) The English too, they admired her

It is noted that *the English* represents the clause external topic; *they*, the subject, represents given information (given by the clause-external topic) and provides the clause-internal topic, and *her*, which is part of the comment, represents the discourse topic of the passage.

4. 2 Approaches to Topic-comment Structures

In this section the relevant literature, that is, those works dealing with a cross-linguistic study of topic-comment structure will be reviewed briefly. This kind of study is clearly reflected, for examples, in the works of Li and Thompson (1976) and Gundel (1988).

Li and Thompson (1976) introduce a typology of languages based on the 'degree of prominence' that the subject or topic relation exhibits in the grammar. A language is said to be 'subject-prominent' if its basic sentences are best described as having a 'subject-predicate' structure, while in a topic-prominent language a topic-comment structure is 'basic sentence structure' (This is not to deny that subject prominent languages also have topics and topic prominent languages also have subjects). From this, Li and Thompson propose a classification of languages into four groups:

- (a) subject-prominent (for example English, German)
- (b) topic-prominent (for example Chinese, Lahu)
- (c) both subject-prominent and topic-prominent (for example Japanese, Korean)

¹ Topic is a commonly used term for a variety of functional concepts. For instance, topic is equated with a point of departure (Halliday 1985) or it is considered as the basis of communicative dynamism (Firbas 1964).

(d) neither subject-prominent nor topic-prominent (for example Tagalog, Ilocano)

Their typological claim in relation to this classification is that some languages can be more insightfully described by taking the concept of topic to be basic, while others can be more insightfully described by taking the notion of subject to be basic (1976:460).

It is suggested that subject and topic are not unrelated notions. Subjects are essentially grammaticalised topics that are integrated into the case frame of the verb (cf Givón 1976, 1979). This is why many of the topic properties in a number of languages are shared by subjects; for instance, some subject-prominent languages do not allow indefinite subjects (Li and Thompson 1976:484).

Li and Thompson (1976) list a number of features of topic prominent languages, for instance, topics in topic prominent languages are coded in the surface structure and they tend to control coreferentiality; subject-creating rules such as the passive are rare and the topic-oriented 'double subject' construction is a basic sentence structure. It seems that the so-called double subject constructions have special status in topic-prominent languages. The hallmark of these constructions is that in one sentence there are two adjacent NPs occur to the left of the predicate - one NP bearing 'topic' function, the other the 'subject' function, thus giving the appearance of a double subject construction. Consider the following examples (adapted from Li and Thompson (1976:468).

- (2) a Nèiki shù yèzi dà [Chinese]
that tree leaves big
'That tree (topic), the leaves are big'
- b. Sakana wa tai ga oisili [Japanese]
fish top red snapper subj delicious
'Fish (topic), red snapper is delicious'

In these examples both topic and subject occur. Li and Thompson claim that the noun phrase (*nèike shù*) in (2a) is the topic, while the noun phrase (*yèzi*) is the subject of the sentence. The topic can be set off from the sentence by pause. In (2b) the topic is marked by the particle *wa* and the subject is marked by *ga*. The topic in these examples are in sentence initial position. In this respect, the topic-comment construction in topic-prominent languages is an unmarked construction, while it is a marked construction in subject-prominent languages.

Gundel (1988) points out that disagreement concerning the notion of topic seems to centre around its various pragmatic and syntactic properties. Pragmatically the notion of topic is correlated with properties such as 'shared knowledge' or 'known information'. As a result of this correlation the notion of topic is equated with the terms such as 'given' or 'old' information. The syntactic properties include whether the topic is always sentence initial or whether it occurs with a (morphological) marker or not.

Gundel (1988: 211-213) argues that the given-new distinction has been used at least in three different ways in relation to the topic.: (a) in a relational sense and (b) in two referential senses. In a relational sense topic is taken to be given in relation to comment and comment is taken to be new in relation to topic. In the first referential sense, it is argued that the referent of an expression is taken to be given if the addressee has previous knowledge of or familiarity with that referent. The second referential sense describes an entity which the speaker and addressee are not only familiar

with, but are actually attending to (thinking of) at the time of utterance, i.e. something the speaker and addressee's attention is already focussed on. This givenness is comparable to the term 'given' used by Chafe (1976). In Chafe's words, given information is "that knowledge which the speaker assumes to be in the consciousness of the addressee at the time of utterance" (1976:28).

Since a primary function of a topic is to relate a sentence to the discourse context in which it occurs, shared familiarity appears to be a necessary precondition for felicitous topichood. This is stated as the topic-familiarity condition by Gundel (1988:212).

Topic-familiarity condition:

An entity, E, can successfully serve as a topic, T, iff both speaker and addressee have previous knowledge of or familiarity with E.

It is also noted that topic is correlated with definite expressions (including generic expressions). A number of researchers (e. g. Li and Thompson (1976), Schachter (1976), Gundel (1985), etc.) have observed that in various languages expressions referring to topics are necessarily definite. Thus, according to Gundel (1988:214), it is reasonable to assume that the addressee could not appropriately assess and store information relative to the topic unless he or she could uniquely identify it. Gundel (1988:214) states this assumed correlation between topic and identifiability as the topic-identifiability condition.

Topic-identifiability condition:

An expression, E, can successfully refer to a topic T, iff E is of a form that allows the addressee to uniquely identify T.

Gundel (1988:214) points out that the definiteness of expressions referring to topics would follow naturally from the topic-identifiability condition since what distinguishes definite noun phrases from indefinite ones is the 'assumed identifiability' of the referent. Furthermore, since 'assumed familiarity', that is, referential givenness, is a common basis for identifiability, a noun phrase whose referent is already known is marked definite. Gundel (1988) believes that there is good motivation for two conditions on the pragmatic properties of topic in natural language to be maintained - the topic-familiarity condition, which posits a correlation between topic and givenness and topic-identifiability, this in turn posits a correlation between topic and definiteness/ identifiability.

Now we turn to the structural properties of the topic and comment structure. Gundel (1988) suggests that a set of common devices for coding the topic-comment relation includes morphological marking, sentence structure, and intonation.

With respect to morphological marking, Gundel (1988) notes that some languages have topic markers (such as Korean, Japanese) and a few languages are noted to have focus markers (such as Quechua, Marathi). Topic markers are always postpositional and are typically follow a sentence initial constituent (see the Japanese example in 2b). They seem to mark the major constituent boundary between topic and comment. Languages that have topic markers all have other structural properties, which Li and Thompson (1976) cite as characteristics of topic-prominent languages: they have no dummy subjects, passive constructions are marginal, zero NP anaphora is not syntactically restricted and basic sentence structure is determined by topic-comment relations rather than grammatical relations such as subject and object.

- c Cicing-e, anak suba baang tiang tulang²
 dog-DEF person already give 1SG bone
 'As for the dog, I have given him/her bones'

These examples show that the left dislocated NP is definite and it is followed by a full sentence in which the the subject of the sentence refers to the left dislocated NP using a pronominal form. A generic noun can also be used in this way. Consider the following examples.

- (5) Anak cenik, ia mula nakal
 person small 3SG already naughty
 'As for the children, they are naturally naughty'

- (6) Macan, anak mula galak
 tiger person already fierce
 'As for the the tigers, they are naturally fierce'

In addition to the examples provided above, another common construction which can be found in Balinese is one which indicates a possessor-possessee relationship between the left dislocated NP and the subject of the following clause. Consider the following examples.

- (7) a. Umah-e ento, // jelanan-ne siteng.
 house-DEF that door-POSS solid
 'As for the house, the door is solid'

- b. Jelanne siteng, umahe ento

The symbol (//) in (7a) is used to indicate that the pause is obligatory and the absence of this pause will result in an unacceptable sentence. The pause can be replaced by a raising intonation. This example shows that the NP *jelanne* in (7) is inalienably possessed by the referent of the NP *umahe ento*. Since the NP can precede or follow the clause, it is not always appropriate to call the NP *umahe ento* a left dislocated NP. However, the ordering in (7a) is more common than (7b). In Balinese inalienability and alienability are marked in the same way. The following sentence illustrates the possessed NP alienably possessed by the referent of the possessor NP.

- (8) a. Murid-e ento, gurun-ne ramah.
 student-DEF that teacher-3SGPOSS friendly
 'As for the student, her/his teacher is friendly'

- b. Gurunne ramah, muride ento

The examples of left-dislocated possessor-possessee constructions that have been provided are non-verbal constructions in which the predicate is an adjective. The following examples have verbal predicates.

² The form *anak* which basically means 'person' is also used for non-human noun

- (9) Sari, panak-ne ngeling
Sari child-3SGPOSS cry
'As for Sari, her child is crying'
- (10) Anak-e ento, timpal-ne ejuk polisi
person-DEF that friend-3SGPOSS catch police
'As for that person, the police arrested his friend'
- (11) Anak-e ento, bapan-ne ngae umah
person-DEF that father-3SGPOSS ACT. make house
'As for that person, his father is building a house'

The sentence in (9) is an intransitive clause, in (10) a \emptyset -verb construction and the sentence in (11) is a nasal construction.

Topicalisation is often understood as a syntactic-pragmatic process that turns a nontopic constituent into a topic as shown in (3b). The topicalised constituent is a core argument, not an oblique relation, that is, a phrase expressing locative or instrument. If this phrase is placed at the beginning of the sentence, it is not considered as a topic as the term used in this thesis. It will be referred to as fronting.

- (12) a. Fred sliced the chicken with a very sharp knife
b. With a very sharp knife Fred sliced the chicken
- (13) a. ohn bought some fruit in the market
b. In the market John bought some fruit

The obliques in (12) and (13) are the instrument and locative, *with a very sharp knife* and *in the market*. In (b) sentences they are fronted, they can occur in the clause initial position. In (12b) the instrumental oblique is fronted. It is placed at the beginning of the sentence. In (13b) the locative oblique is placed at the beginning of the sentence.

In Balinese the core arguments are unmarked, while the obliques are marked by a preposition, examples:

- (14) a. Cicing-e lempag cai aji tungked
dog-DEF hit 2SG with stick
'You hit the dog by a stick'
- b. **Aji tungked** cicinge lempag cai
- (15) a. Ia tepukin tiang di peken
3SG meet 1SG in market
'I met her/him in the market'
- b. **Di peken** ia tepukin tiang

- (16) a. Tiang ngaba buku-ne ento
 1SG ACT. bring book-DEF that
 'I brought that book'

b. **Bukune ento tiang ngaba**

The instrumental constituent (*aji tungked*) in and the locative constituent (*di peken*) are fronted in (14b) and (15b). These are obliques, while in (16b), the initial constituent is a core argument. In this particular example, it can be said that the patient complement is topicalised. The left-dislocation and fronting are marked structures in Balinese.

4. 4 Is Balinese a Subject Prominent Language?

Gundel (1988) points out that subject-creating rules are most common in 'subject prominent' (non-topic prominent) languages like English where topic-comment structures do not uniquely determine syntactic structures and the tendency for expressions referring to topics to occur in sentence initial position is accomplished primarily by close association between subject and topic. However, the subject-creating rules are considerably more restricted, if they occur at all, in highly topic prominent languages such as Lisu and Mandarin.

It has been demonstrated in chapter two of this thesis that the preverbal argument is the grammatical subject of the sentence. Subjectivisation, that is, turning a non-subject argument to subject has been discussed in chapter three. For convenience sake, some examples are repeated below.

- (17) a. Cai singgah sig anak-e ento.
 2SG visit at person-DEF that
 'You visited that man'
- b. Anak-e ento singgah-in cai³
 person-DEF that visit-APPL 2SG
 'You visited than man'
- c. Cai nyinggah-in anak-e ento.
 2SG ACT. visit-APPL person-DEF that
 'You visited that man'

The sentence in (17a) is an intransitive sentence. The grammatical subject is *cai* 'you'. The oblique argument *sig anake ento* is semantically locative. This locative can be turned into the subject of the sentence as in (17b). The verb is marked by a transitive marker *-in*. It has been shown that in this kind of construction only the subject (*anake ento*) is accessible to syntactic processes such as relativisation, raising etc., while the agent complement (*cai*) is not accessible. Balinese has a syntactic derivation which can turn this agent complement into the subject, as shown in (17c) (see chapters two and three). In this case Balinese has 'subject creating rules'. The

³ The APPL stands for applicative, see chapter three.

following example is a transitive sentence. This example also shows a similar pattern in which a locative oblique can be turned into the subject of the sentence.

- (18) a. Buku beli tiang di toko ento.
 book buy 1SG at shop that
 'I bought the book in that shop'
- b. Toko ento beli-in tiang buku.
 shop that buy-APPL 1SG book
 'I bought the book in that shop'
- c. Tiang meli-in toko ento buku.
 1SG ACT. buy-APPL shop that book
 'I bought the book in that shop'

The locative (*di toko ento*) in (18a) becomes the subject in (18b) and this syntactic process is marked on the verb by *-in*. In (18c) the agent complement is now the subject and the verb is marked by nasal prefix

The following example shows that an instrument oblique can also be turned into the subject of the sentence. In (19a) the subject is *tatune* 'the wound', the agent complement is *tiang* 'I', and the instrument oblique is realised by the prepositional phrase, *aji kain putih* 'with white material'. In (19b) this oblique becomes the subject of the sentence and the verb is marked by *-ang*. The sentence in (19c) also reflects a subject creating rule, that is, the agent complement becomes the subject of the sentence. This is marked by the presence of the nasal prefix (N) on the verb.

- (19) 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 di tatu-ne.
 material white tie-APPL 1SG at wound-DEF
 'I tied the wound with white material'
- c. Tiang medbedang kain putih di tatune
 3SG ACT. tie-APPL material white at wound-DEF
 'I tied the wound with white material'

Another type of subject-creating rule which can be found in Balinese is shown in the following examples. The sentence in (20a) can be analysed as consisting of a higher predicate (*ngenah*) with a clause *ia demen taken cai* as its argument. The propositional content of such clause can be expressed as a single clause as in (20b).

- (20) a. Ngenah ia demen taken cai
 seem 3SG like with 2SG
 'It seems that s/he likes you'

a.	Ia	ngenah	demen	teken	cai
	3SG	seem	like	with	2SG
	'It seems that s/he likes you'				

In (20a) the subject of the embedded clause is raised to become the subject of *ngenah* in (20b).

Based on this fact, it could be argued that Balinese is more like a subject prominent language than a topic prominent language. Balinese has a productive subject-creating rule, which is noted as an important characteristic of a subject prominent language. Balinese has a number of subject creating rules and left dislocated constructions are marked in that they are low in frequency and require a special intonation pattern. This fact also supports that Balinese is a subject-prominent language. Gundel (1988) notes that the more topic-prominent a language is, the fewer subject-creating constructions it will have.

4.5 The Term 'focus'

In addition to the term 'topic', there is another pragmatic term called 'focus'. The term 'focus' is used to refer to the essential piece of new information that is carried by a sentence (Comrie 1981). Blake (1983) also uses the term 'focus' to refer to 'the most important part of the comment, the essential part, the part that resists ellipsis'. The use of question and answer sequences is a useful means of illustrating focus or topic. Consider the following example.

(21) John phoned Mary
FOCUS

If the sentence in (21) is used as the answer to the question: *Who phoned Mary?*, the subject NP (*John*) in (21) is a focused entity. If (21) is used as the response to the question: *Who did John phone?*, the object NP (*Mary*) is the focus. The focus information is generally identifiable as the intonationally prominent element in the sentence: i.e. that which is signified by either higher pitch, greater audibility, or heavier stress, while in contrast, as given information, the topic of a sentence has no such intonational prominence, and carries low stress (see Chafe 1976).

Bresnan and Mchombo (1987) also propose the notions of grammaticalised pragmatic roles. They use the terms 'topic' and 'focus' to designate grammaticalised pragmatic functions in a synchronic sense.⁴ Topic and focus encode different types of information, and are therefore mutually incompatible categories, since the same bit of information cannot be both old and new at the same point in discourse. This means that the same element cannot bear both the topic and focus functions in the same clause (Kroeger 1993:61).

Kroeger (1993:61), in his analysis of Tagalog, argues that if a subject is a grammaticalised topic (in a synchronic sense) in a given language, it should not be able to bear pragmatic focus. Kroeger suggests that one way to test the grammaticalised topic hypothesis is to investigate whether or not an argument designated topic is incompatible with pragmatic focus. In this respect, Kroeger proposes two types of test:

(i) content (wh-) question

⁴ The notion of grammaticalised topic used in this study is different from the term 'grammaticalised topic' (in which a topic becomes a subject historically) proposed by Givón (1976, 1979).

(ii) selective contrast

It is noted that in the answer of to a wh-question, the phrase which corresponds to the wh-word provides the new crucial new information, and thus carries pragmatic focus.

Similarly, selective contrast sentences of the form " I want X, not Y" involve the denial of a presupposition (i.e. that the speaker wants Y) and a minimally contrasting proposition which is asserted to be true ("I want X"). In this case the X is the crucial new information, i.e. the element which bears pragmatic focus. These tests have been applied to Malay by Alsagoff (1992).

4. 5. 1 Malay

Malay is a language spoken in the South East Asian countries of Malaysia, Brunei, Singapore and Indonesia. Although they have different names, Malay and Indonesian are effectively the same language spoken in different areas, with resulting differences primarily in vocabulary.

Alsagoff (1992) is primarily concerned with three verbal constructions in Malay: (i) the *meng*-construction, (ii) the *di*- construction, and the \emptyset -construction. The following examples are adapted from Alsagoff (1992).

- (22) Mariam **mencubit** dokter itu.
 Mariam ACT. pinch doctor that
 'Mariam pinched the doctor.'

- (23) Dokter itu **dicubit** oleh Mariam
 doctor that PASS-pinch by Mariam
 'The doctor was pinched by Mariam.'

- (24) Dokter itu Mariam \emptyset -cubit
 doctor that Mariam pinch
 'Mariam pinched the doctor.'

The sentence in (22) is considered as an active sentence. Its corresponding passive form is in (23). In this passive construction, the object (*dokter itu*) of the active sentence in (12) is now the subject of the sentence, while the subject of the active sentence (*Mariam*) is expressed as an adjunct, which can be optionally omitted. This passive is marked on the verb by the presence of prefix *di*-. The sentence in (24) in which the verb is unmarked is called a \emptyset -construction.

Alsagoff (1992) argued that the initial argument of the three constructions noted above is a topic. Being a topic, the initial argument cannot function as the answer to questions. This statement is confusing because in a question-answer pair, it is very common to have a one word response in a language like Malay/Indonesian.⁵ The question that arises is how do we know that the answer is not an initial argument. Consider the following examples (adapted from Alsagoff (1992)).

⁵ Malay (Bahasa Malaysia) and Indonesian (Bahasa Indonesia) are essentially the same language though they appear to differ with respect to Alsagoff's claim (see (32)).

- (25) a. **Siapa** yang mencubit dokter itu?
 who REL ACT. pinch doctor that
 'Who pinched the doctor?'
- b. ***Mariam** mencubit dokter itu
Mariam ACT. pinch doctor that
TOPIC
 'Mariam pinched the doctor'
- c. Dokter itu **Mariam** Ø- cubit.
 doctor that *Mariam* Ø- pinch
NON-TOPIC
 'Mariam pinched the doctor.'
- d. Dokter itu dicubit oleh **Mariam.**
 doctor that PASS-pinch by *Mariam*
NON-TOPIC
 'The doctor was pinched by Mariam.'

Alsagoff (1992:95) argued that the responses to the question in (25a) will be acceptable if those responses are not in the initial position of the sentence, whether it is a *meng-*, *di-* or *Ø-*construction. (25b) is therefore unacceptable because the answer occupies the initial position in the *meng-* clause, which a topic position. (25c) and (25d) on the other hand are acceptable because in both these examples, the answers appear in non-topic positions, as indicated by the glosses. The problem will arise if the response to the question in (25a) is not a complete sentence. Suppose the response to the question in (25a) is *Mariam* only (a single word response). How do we know that *Mariam* is an element of the sentence in (25c) or (25d) or is not an initial argument of (25b)? The following examples also illustrate a similar point, but the verb form used in (26a) is the *di-* form, while in (25a) is the *meng-* form.

- (26) a. Siapa yang dicubit oleh Mariam?
 who REL PASS-pinch by Mariam
 'Who was pinched by Mariam?'
- b. ***Dokter** itu dicubit oleh **Mariam.**
Doctor *that* PASS-pinch by *Mariam*
TOPIC
 'The doctor was pinched by Mariam.'
- c. **Mariam** mencubit **dokter** itu.
Mariam ACT. pinch *doctor* *that*
NON-TOPIC
 'Mariam pinched the doctor.'

- d. ***Dokter** **itu** Mariam Ø-cubit.
 doctor *that* Mariam Ø-pinch
TOPIC
 'Mariam pinched the doctor.'

Alsagoff (1922) notes that (26b) is not an appropriate response to (26a) because the answer lies in the initial topic position of the *di-* clause. Likewise (26d) is unacceptable because the answer is in the initial topic position, this time of the Ø-construction. (26c) is the appropriate answer because here, the answer occupies the non-topic position.

Alsagoff (1992) argued that the test involving question and answer pairs for *meng-* and *di-* constructions indicates that the Malay question cannot be answered by the initial arguments in the two constructions (25) and (26), indicating they are topic. In contrast, the initial arguments of the active and passive constructions in English are possible answers to questions, as demonstrated by the acceptability of the answers in the following examples (adapted from Alsagoff 1992:97).

- (27) a. **Who** pinched the doctor?
 b. *Mariam* pinched the doctor.
FOCUS

- (28) a. **Who** was pinched by the doctor?
 b. *The doctor* was pinched by Mariam.
FOCUS

Alsagoff (1922) claims that the initial argument of a Malay clause must be a topic. Thus the notion of topic is tied up with the morphology of the verb. The initial argument (the logical subject) of the *meng-* construction, the initial argument of the *di-* construction, and the initial argument (the logical object) of the Ø-construction are grammaticalised topics. These topics are subcategorised by the verb. They are not compatible with new information, the focus information.

However, Alsagoff's analysis on Malay cannot be extended to Indonesian. This will be described below. One important aspect that differentiates Malay/Indonesian from English is the formation of 'wh-question'. In Malay/Indonesian the question should be in an 'equational construction' as shown in (30) below, while the non-equational construction is not acceptable in standard Indonesian. The subject of the sentence in (30) is *siapa* and the predicate is *yang membeli mobil itu* (a headless relative clause functions as a nominal predicate). However, in non-standard Indonesian, the non-equational construction as in (31) can be also heard.

- (29) **Who** bought this car?

- (30) **Siapa** **yang** membeli mobil ini?
 who REL ACT. buy car this
 'Who bought this car'

- (31) **?Siapa** membeli mobil ini?
 who ACT. buy car this
 'Who bought this car?'

The acceptability of (31) in a non-standard Indonesian is supported by the acceptability of the following question-answer pairs, which are cited from a standard grammar of Indonesian.

- (32) a. **Siapa** yang memenangkan pertandingan itu?
 who REL ACT. win game the
 'Who won the game?'
 b. **Icuk** memenangkan pertandingan itu.
 Icuk ACT. win game that
 'Icuk won the game'
 (Moeliono and Dardjowidjoyo, 1988:292)

Given the fact that the sentence in (32b) is a perfect answer to the question in (32a). The conclusion drawn by Alsagoff for Malay that the initial argument of the *meng-* construction cannot be used as a response as shown in (25b) cannot be extended to Indonesian. Thus the notion of 'lexically subcategorised' topic is not appropriate for Indonesian although it may be so for Malay (?).

4. 5. 2 Balinese

In her interpretation of Balinese, Beratha (1992) also treats the notion of 'topic or 'focus' as 'a lexically subcategorised' pragmatic function in the sense of the term used by Alsagoff (1992). In presenting her argumentation, Beratha (1992) makes use of the notions of macroroles *actor* and *undergoer* developed by Foley and van Valin (1984). These notions are 'combined' with pragmatic roles *topic* and *focus*. An actor is the argument 'which performs, effects, instigates, or controls the situation denoted by the predicate', and the undergoer is the argument 'which expresses the participant which does not perform, initiate, or control any situation but rather is affected by it in some way' (Foley and Van Valin 1984:29). The concepts of actor and undergoer can be illustrated in the following examples (adapted from Foley and Van Valin 1984:29).

- (33) a. The hunter shot the bear
 actor undergoer
 b. The bear was shot by the hunter
 undergoer actor

The sentence in (33a) is an active sentence in English and (33b) is its corresponding passive form. Using actor and undergoer, one can describe a passive sentence as in (33b) in terms of the undergoer as syntactic subject and the actor as the object of *by*. Actor and undergoer are generalised semantic relations between a predicate and its arguments, which basically means that actor is not necessarily an agent and undergoer is not a patient as shown in the following examples.

- (34) a. John loves Mary
 actor undergoer

- b. Mary is loved by John
actor undergoer

This generalised semantic relation is applied to Balinese by Beratha (1992: 136-145). In her study, she classifies verbal constructions into two types: (i) transitive actor-topic (AT) or transitive undergoer topic (UT) and (ii) intransitive actor-topic (AT) or intransitive undergoer-topic (UT), depending on the semantics of the verb. Beratha's description can be summarised schematically as follows:

Intransitive verbs

- (35) a. **NP** **VERB**
Actor-topic (AT) or
Actor -focus (AF)

Example:

Anak-e ento makecos
person-DEF that jump
AT/AF
'That person jumped'

- b. **NP** **VERB**
Undergoer-topic (UT)
Undergoer-focus (UF)

Example:

Anak-e ento ulung
person-DEF that fall
UT/UF
'That person fell'

Transitive verbs

- (36) a. **NP** **N-VERB** **NP**
Actor-topic (AT) Undergoer-focus (UF)

Example:

Ia ngaba jaja [N-aba]
3SG ACT. bring cake
AT UF
'S/he brought some cakes'

- b. **NP** **Ø-VERB** **NP**
Undergoer-topic (UT) Actor-focus (AF)

Example:
 Emeng-e uber cicing
cat-DEF chase dog
UT AF
 'The dog chased the cat'

There are two points which can be deduced from this schema:

- (i) With a one-place predicate the preverbal NP can be actor or undergoer, topic or focus (four possible combinations)
- (ii) The initial argument of the transitive verb or two-place verb in Balinese, regardless of the verb form used as predicate, is always a topic. The post verbal NP in the transitive construction is always a focus position.

The identification of topic as an initial argument of a transitive verb in Balinese will run into the same problem as in Indonesian noted in the preceding section. In order to identify whether the term 'topic' or 'focus' in Balinese can be considered as a grammaticalised (or a lexically sub-categorised) function as proposed by Beratha (1992), the tests proposed by Kroeger (1993) will be applied. Kroeger (1993) argues that if a subject is a grammaticalised topic (in a synchronic sense) in a given language, it should not be able to bear pragmatic focus as noted earlier. The tests proposed by Kroeger (1993) are:

- (i) content (wh-) question
- (ii) selective contrast

These tests will be applied to Balinese in order to see whether the initial argument of transitive clauses in Balinese are always topics. Consider the following examples.

Wh-question-answer pairs.

Ø-construction

(37) A: **Nyen** tepukin cai ditu
 who see 2SG there
 'Who did you see there'

B: **I Darta** tepukin tiang ditu
 art Darta see 1SG there
 'I saw Darta there'

N-construction

(38) A: **Nyen** nepukincai ditu
 who ACT. see 2SG there
 'Who saw you there'

B: **I** **Karta** nepukin tiang ditu
 art Karta ACT. see 2SG there
 'Karta saw me there'

The elements which bear pragmatic focus in these examples are *I Darta*, *I Karta* and the question word *nyen*. Thus in the Ø-construction the basic subject of the sentence bears new information, while in the N-construction it is the '(derived)' subject that is the answer to the question. The subject is the focus. Thus the notion of 'grammaticalised topic' as proposed for Balinese by Beratha (1992) is not appropriate because the preverbal argument NP is not always the topic of the sentence. It can be questioned and assigned a pragmatic focus.

A question sentence in Balinese can also be formed by an equational construction, which can be translated into a cleft-sentence in English. Consider the following examples.

Wh-question-answer pairs

Ø-construction

(39) A: **Apa** ane beli cai?
 what REL buy 2SG
 'What is it that you bought?'

B: **Baju-ne** ene beli tiang
 shirt-DEF this buy 1SG
 'I bought this shirt'

C: **Baju-ne** ene ane beli tiang
 shirt-DEF this REL buy 1SG
 'It is this shirt that I bought'

N- construction

(40) A: **Nyen** ane ngaba ene mai?
 who REL ACT. bring this here
 'Who brought this here?'

B: **Tiang** ngaba ene mai
 1SG ACT. bring this here
 'I brought this here'

C: **Tiang** ane ngaba ene mai
 1SG REL ACT. bring this here
 'It is I who brought this here'

The elements bought is the focus in (39B and 39C). In (40B and 40C) the element *tiang* is the focus. Although both the responses are acceptable, it seems that the response in (C) is preferred because the structure of the question sentence and the response are the same, that is, they are both equational constructions.

Now we turn to the selective contrast test. In this exchange, the speaker (A) asks a question based on a false presupposition. The contrastive element in the reply bears the pragmatic focus:

- (41) A: Apa I Karta alih cai mai?
 what ART Karta look for 2SG here
 'Are you looking for Karta here'
- B: I Darta (alih tiang), sing I Karta
 ART Darta (look for 1SG) not ART Karta
 'I am looking for Darta, not Karta'
- (42) A: Apa I Ketut nunden cai mai
 what ART Ketut ACT. ask 2SG here
 'Did Ketut ask you to come here'
- B: Sing, I Wayan (nunden tiang mai)
 no ART Wayan (ACT. ask SG here)
 'No, Wayan asked me to come here'

One way of forming a 'yes-no question' in Balinese is by using the word *apa* 'what', but this word is not a direct argument of the verb, as it is used in (41A) and (42A). It marks a yes-no question.

The response in (41B) shows that the new information (the focus) is the subject (*I Darta*). In (42B) it is the subject (*I Wayan*) which is the focus information. In this case, the subject is not incompatible with the new information. This leads to the conclusion that the subject in Balinese is not at all a grammaticalised topic in the sense of the term 'topic' used by Alsagoff for Malay.

It should not be thought from these examples that the preverbal NP always encodes a focus. Examples where the preverbal NP is a topic can be found in (43) and (44). In (43B) *ia* is the preverbal NP and this NP is a topic. In (44B) preverbal NP *gambarane ene* is the topic.

- (43) A: Apa ia teka ibi
 what 3SG come yesterday
 'Did s/he come yesterday'
- B: Sing, ia sing teka ibi
 no 3SG not come yesterday
 'No, s/he did not come yesterday'
- (44) A: Apa gambaran-e ene aba cai?
 what picture-DEF this bring 2SG
 'Did you bring this picture?'
- B: Oo, gambaran-e ene aba tiang
 yes, picture-DEF this bring 1SG
 'Yes, I brought this picture'

It is not proposed to discuss the pragmatics of Balinese in this thesis. That would be a complex task that I am reserving for further study. The material discussed in this chapter is selected to show the status of Balinese with respect to the Li and Thompson typology and to show that the way pragmatic functions are handled by Alsagoff for Malay and by Beratha for Balinese.

4.6 Summary

A significant feature that differentiates a subject prominent language from a topic prominent language, as noted by Gundel (1988), is that the first type has a productive 'subject-creating rule', that is, a rule promoting the non-subject argument into a grammatical subject.

In this chapter the typological status of Balinese in terms of Li and Thompson's (1976) language typology has been discussed. It is evident that Balinese can be typed as a subject prominent language. The grammatical subject figures in several grammatical processes. For instance, only subjects can be relativised and can be raised in Balinese (see chapter eight).

The other significant point discussed in this chapter is that the notions of topic and focus in Balinese must be maintained as pragmatic functions not as grammaticalised pragmatic functions.

It has been demonstrated that the topic and the focus is a pragmatic function. Its 'topicness or 'focusness' is relative to a discourse context, it cannot be determined syntactically as proposed by Beratha (1992).

COMPLEX SENTENCES

Chapter Five

5. 1 Introduction

Four types of complex sentence will be described in this chapter: relative clauses, purposive clauses, complement clauses, and raising constructions. Not all languages treat these syntactic constructions in the same way; it depends on the type of the language concerned. In an accusative language A and S are identified by a number of characteristics such as case, control of agreement on the verb, and word order, and they are not normally expressed with non-finite verb forms. However, in a syntactically ergative language the P and S relation plays a significant role in a number of grammatical processes. For instance, only P and S can be relativised and P and S remain covert with non-finite verb forms.

In an accusative language the SA combination is described as bearing the subject relation. Since in an ergative language S and P are treated morphologically in the same way the question arises of whether they should be identified as bearing the subject relation. Note that in the literature a distinction is often made between a morphologically ergative language and languages that have ergative syntax. Anderson (1976) shows that most morphologically ergative languages do not have ergative syntax. The syntactic processes in this type of language are like those in an accusative language. The SP combination in ergative languages is often referred to as absolutive, while the A of a transitive clause in this type of language is said to bear an ergative relation, the case label being used for a grammatical relation (see also 9. 3 on Relational Grammar).

It is argued in chapter two that Balinese is an analytic ergative language. The patient argument (P) of the unmarked two-place predicate is treated in the same way as the sole argument (S) of a one-place predicate. So it can be expected that the SP combination plays a major role in the complex sentences that will be described in this chapter. The description will start off with relativisation, then followed by purposive clauses, complement clauses and raising constructions. Further description of complex sentences will be given in chapter eight. That chapter deals with a syntactic comparison between Dyirbal, Balinese and Indonesian in terms of coreferential deletion in coordination and subordination.

5. 2 Relativisation

This section is concerned with relativisation strategies in Balinese. The description will be based on the pioneering work of Keenan and Comrie (1977). In order to capture the availability of noun phrase argument positions for relative clause formation, Keenan and Comrie (1977) suggest the following hierarchy, where the positions at the top are universally more accessible for relativisation:

Accessibility Hierarchy (henceforth AH)

subject (SU) > direct object DO > indirect object (IO) > oblique (OBL) > genitive (GEN)
> object of comparison (OCOMP)

The hierarchy defines ease of accessibility to relative clause formation. If an NP on the accessibility hierarchy is accessible to relativisation in a language, then all NPs higher on the hierarchy

are also accessible to relativisation. Note that Keenan and Comrie (1977) also include NPs that are not directly related to the verb, such as the possessor of the subject, in their hierarchy. Keenan and Comrie (1977:67) propose in relation to the AH a set of Hierarchy Constraints:

1. A language must be able to relativise subjects
2. Any RC-forming strategy must apply to a continuous segment of the AH
3. Strategies that apply at one point of the AH may in principle cease to apply at lower point

According to these 'Hierarchy Constraints' it is possible for a language to relativise only subjects, but it is impossible for a language to have a strategy that can relativise only direct objects or only locatives. A language is free to treat adjacent positions on the AH as the same, but it cannot skip positions in terms of relative clause formation.

Keenan and Comrie (1977:69) note that in many Western Malayo-Polynesian languages only subjects can be relativised. This can be found in languages such as Malagasy, Javanese, Minangkabau, Iban, etc.

The accessibility hierarchy is subject to qualification and it has some exceptions. This is generally related to the problem of subject identification cross-linguistically. Particularly the identification of the notion of subject in syntactically ergative languages.

With respect to most morphologically ergative languages, Anderson (1976) shows that the sole argument (S) of an intransitive predicate and the agent argument (A) of a transitive predicate behave in the same way in many syntactic processes. However, the notion of subject in a syntactically ergative language is still a controversial matter. Is the absolutive (SP) or SA the subject of the clause? Keenan and Comrie (1977) suggest that the absolutive in a language like Dyirbal, which is a syntactically ergative language, is the subject. They also suggest that a number of pieces of syntactic evidence support the fact that the absolutive is the subject in this language. With respect to the argument NPs of intransitive and transitive verbs, Comrie (1981:109) notes :

"While the assignment of the subject is clear in most intransitive constructions, especially those that are literally one-place predicate constructions, in transitive constructions we find subject properties assigned either to the A, in which case we have nominative-accusative syntax, or to the P, in which case we have ergative-absolutive syntax"

If the notion subject is taken as a grammatical subject or surface subject, it can be argued that subject is applicable to either accusative or ergative language. But semantically the grammatical subject of a transitive clause in accusative languages is an agent, which may 'control' an activity denoted by the verb, but the subject of a transitive clause in syntactically ergative languages is affected by the action.¹

In a syntactically ergative language like Kalkatungu only the absolutive can be relativised. The following examples are adapted from Blake (1994:57). Each example contains a subordinate clause with a participial form of the verb. In (1) the relativised function in the subordinate clause is S which is not expressed and is represented as []. In (2) the P function is relativised and this P is not expressed overtly in the subordinate clause.

¹ See also section 8. 5 chapter eight.

- (1) Ngulurmayi-nha nga-thu yurru [] ngartathati-nyin
 grab-PAST I-ERG man. NOM sit-PART
 'I grabbed the man [as he was/who was] sitting down'
- (2) Ngulurmayi-nha nga-thu yurru [] thuku-yu itya-nyin
 grab-PAST I-ERG man. NOM dog-ERG bite-PART
 'I grabbed the man [as he was/who was] being bitten by a dog'

Blake (1994) points out that if any role that is not normally coded as absolutive is to be relativised, a derived construction must be used. In order to say 'I grabbed the man as he was hitting the dog', the subordinate clause should be detransitivised. In this way the agent which is normally coded as A is now expressed as absolutive relation and the P is marked as dative. This is shown in (3) below.

- (3) Ngulurmayi-nha nga-thu yurru [] thuku-u itya-yi-nyin
 grab-PAST I-ERG man. NOM dog-DAT bite-AP-PART
 'I grabbed the man [as he was/who was] being bitten by a dog'

These sentences show that only the absolutive can be relativised in Kalkatungu.

Now we turn to Balinese. In Balinese it is the patient of the unmarked transitive construction is the unmarked choice for subject, not the the agent complement. Balinese also has syntactic mechanisms that can turn non-subjects into subjects. Since only subjects can be relativised, this section will focus on the strategies Balinese has for relativising other roles, we may start by looking at Ø-constructions. Note also that most of the examples used in this section are the repetition of those used in previous chapters. Consider the following examples:

- (4) a. Emeng-e gugut cicing
 cat-DEF bite dog
 'The dog bit the cat'
- b. Emeng-e [ane gugut cicing] gelem
 cat-DF [REL bite dog] sick
 'The cat [which the dog bit] is sick'
- c. *Cicing [ane emeng-e gugut] galak
 dog [REL cat-DEF bite] fierce
 'The dog [which bit the cat] is fierce'

The sentence in (4a) is a basic verb construction. The preverbal NP is a patient and the post verbal NP is an agent. The relative clause in (4b) shows that the patient can be relativised, while the agent is not relativisable as shown in (4c). This relativisation confirms that the pre-verbal NP in (4a) is a grammatical subject of the clause. The agent complement (*cicing*) is not accessible for relativisation. Note that the relativised NP is covert in Balinese.

Since the agent in the Ø-construction is not accessible for relativisation, it seems that Balinese lacks the way to express information such as 'The dog which bit the cat is fierce' as in (4c). However, it can be argued that agents in Balinese can be relativised 'indirectly' by the use of

'derived voice' strategy so that the possibility of conveying this information is not lacking. Givón (1990) suggests that there are a number of different relative clause formation strategies which can be found across languages. One of the strategies identified by Givón is 'verb-coding strategy', that is, the interaction between relativisation and promotion rules. In chapter two it has been shown that the agent complement can be promoted to subject. This promotion is marked on the verb by the nasal prefix (*N-*). Nasalisation is an obligatory feeder to relativisation if we want to relativise the agent complement of a two-place predicate. This promotion may be called subjectivisation. The sentence (4) above is nasalised as (5b) below.

- (5)
- | | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|--------|
| a. | Emeng-e | gugut | cicing | | |
| | cat-DEF | bite | dog | | |
| | 'The dog bit the cat' | | | | |
| b. | Cicing-DEF | ngugut | emeng-e | [N-gugut] | |
| | dog-DEF | ACT. bite | cat-DEF | | |
| | 'The dog bit the cat' | | | | |
| c. | Cicing-DEF | [ane | ngugut | emeng-e] | galak |
| | dog-DEF | [REL | ACT. bite | cat-DEF] | fierce |
| | 'The dog which bit the cat is fierce' | | | | |

In (5b) the agent complement (*cicinge*) is expressed as the subject. This subject can be relativised as shown in (5c). A comparison of (4b), (4c), and (5c) shows that only the subject can be relativised in Balinese.

The following sections will deal with the strategies used to relativise: local relations (locative (at), destination (to), source (from)), instrumental, recipient and beneficiary. As noted in chapter three, these obliques can be promoted to subject.

(a) Locative

A locative can be marked by a preposition *di* 'at' or *sig* 'at'. This oblique relation is not accessible to relativisation. In the following examples, the locative phrase, *di tegale*, cannot be relativised. This locative oblique should be turned into a subject as shown in (6b). This advancement is registered on the verb by suffix *-in*. Example (6c) is the alternative order to (6b) in which the subject is a final constituent.

- (6)
- | | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------------|------------|-----|--------|------------|
| a. | Biyu | pula | cai | di | tegal-e |
| | banana | plant | 2SG | at | garden-DEF |
| | 'You planted bananas in the garden' | | | | |
| b. | Tegal-e | pula-in | cai | biyu | |
| | garden-DEF | plant-APPL | 2SG | banana | |
| | 'You planted the garden with bananas' | | | | |
| c. | Pulain cai biyu tegale | | | | |

- d. Tingalin tiang tegal-e [] [ane pula-in cai biyu]
 see 1SG garden-DEF [REL plant-APPL 2SG banana]
 'I saw the garden which you planted with bananas'

(6d) is complex sentence in which the derived subject of the subordinate clause is relativised. This subject is covert.

(b) Destination

The destination in Balinese is marked by the preposition *ka* 'to'. In (7b) the destination is expressed as the subject and the verb is marked by *-in*. This subject can be relativised as in the subordinate clause in (7c).

- (7a) a. Ia lakar singgah ka kota-ne ento
 3SG will visit to city-DEF that
 'S/he will visit the city'
- b. Kota-ne ento lakar singgah-in=a
 city-DEF that will visit-APPL=3SG
 'S/he will visit the city'
- c. Tawang tiang kota-ne ento [] [ane lakar singgah-in=a
 know 1SG city-DEF that [REL will visit-APPL=3SG]
 'I know the city that s/he will visit'

(c) Source

The source relation is expressed by a prepositional phrase in (8a) and this is expressed as a subject in (8b). This advancement is registered on the verb by *-in*. In (8c) the source subject of the subordinate clause is relativised. This subject is not expressed overtly.

- (8) a. Sepeda beli cai uli ia
 bike buy 2SG from 3SG
 'You bought a bike from her/him'
- b. Ia beli-in cai sepeda
 3SG buy-APPL 2SG bike
 'You bought a bike from her/him'
- c. Ia tepukin tiang [] ane beli-in cai sepeda
 3SG see 1SG REL buy-APPL 2SG bike
 'I saw her/him who you were buying a bike from'

(d) Instrumental

The instrumental in Balinese is marked with the preposition *aji* 'with'. The sentence in (9a) has an instrumental oblique relation. This instrumental can be turned into a subject (9b). This promotion is marked on the verb by *-ang*. The instrumental subject is now accessible to

relativisation as shown in the subordinate clause in (9c). This subject is covert in the subordinate clause in (9c).

- (9) a. Cicing-e lempag=a aji sampat-e
dog-DEF hit=3SG with broom-DEF
'S/he hit the dog with the broom'
- b. Sampat-e lempag-ang=a ka cicing-e
broom-DEF hit-APPL=3SG to dog-DEF
'S/he hit the dog with the broom'
- c. Sampat-e jemak tiang [] ane lempag-ang=a ka cicing-e
broom-DEF grab 1SG REL hit-APPL=3SG to dog-DEF
'I grabbed the broom [which was] being used by her/him to hit the dog'

(e) Recipient

As noted in chapter three, the 'giving', 'telling' and 'showing' verbs in Balinese are derived from precategoryals. However, there is one verb which seems not to be derived from a pre-categoryal. This verb is *baang* 'give'. With this verb there are two choices for subject: the gift as in (10a) or the recipient as in (10b). There is no overt derivation involved. Both the gift subject and the recipient subject can be relativised as shown in (10c) and (10d).

- (10) a. Baju-ne baang cai Made
shirt-DEF give 2SG Made
'You gave the shirt to Made'
- b. Made baang cai baju-ne
Made give 2SG shirt-DEF
'You gave Made the shirt'
- c. Baju-ne tepukin tiang [] ane baang cai Made
shirt-DEF see 1SG REL give 2SG Made
'I saw the shirt which you gave Made'
- d. Made tepukin tiang [] ane baang cai baju-ne
Made see 1SG REL give 2SG shirt-DEF
'I saw Made to whom you gave the shirt'

There are two suffixes which can be used to derive a 'giving' verb from a precategoryal: *-ang* and *-in*. The verb in the following examples is derived with the suffix *-ang*. The gift is encoded as the subject and the recipient is encoded by a prepositional phrase. In (11b) the 'gift' subject of the subordinate clause is relativised.

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

- b. Tawang tiang buke-ne [] [ane enjuhang=a
 know 1SG book-DEF [REL give=3SG
 ka timpal-ne]
 to friend-3SGPOSS'
 'I know the book that s/he gave to her/his friend'

In (12) the giving verb is derived by the suffix *-in*. If the giving verb is derived by the suffix *-in*, there are two choices for subject: the recipient as in (12a) or the gift as in (12 b). Both the recipient and the gift subject can be relativised as in (12c) and (12d). The subject is covert.

- (12) a. Timpal-ne enjuh-in=a buku-ne
 friend-POSS give-APPL=3SG book-DEF
 'S/he gave the book to her/his friend'
- b. Buku-ne enjuh-in=a timpal-ne
 book-DEF give-APPL=3SG friend-3SGPOSS
 'S/he gave the book to her/his friend'
- c. Tepukin tiang timpal-ne [] [ane enjuh-in=a
 see 1SG friend-3SGPOSS [] [REL give=3SG
 buku-ne]
 book-DEF]
 'I saw her/his friend who she/he gave the book to'
- d. Tawang tiang buku-ne [] [ane enjuhin=a
 know 1SG book-DEF [REL give=3SG
 timpal-ne]
 friend-3SGPOSS]
 'I know the book that s/he gave to her/his friend'

(f) Benefactive

The presence of benefactive argument is marked by suffix *-ang* on a transitive verb. This advancement can be considered as 'obligatory advancement' because a beneficiary NP is never expressed as an oblique relation. Consider the following examples.

- (13) a. Ketut beli-ang cai buku-e
 Ketut buy-APPL 2SG book-DEF
 'You bought Ketut the book'
- b. Buku-e beli-ang cai Ketut
 book-DEF buy-APPL 2SG Ketut
 'You bought Ketut the book'

As with *baang* there is a choice of subject and no overt derivation to mark the choice. In (13a) the beneficiary is the subject; in (13b) the patient is the subject. Both types of subject can be relativised as in (13c) and (13d).

- c. Ketut tepukin tiang [] ane beli-ang cai buku-e
 2SG see 1SG REL buy-APPL 2SG book-DEF
 'I saw Ketut for whom you bought the book'
- d. Buku-ne tepukin tiang [] ane beli-ang cai Ketut
 book-DEF see 1SG REL buy-APPL 2SG Ketut
 'I saw the book which you bought for Ketut'

It is evident that Balinese can relativise subjects only. However, this language has valency changing mechanisms that can turn the non-subjects into subjects so a wide variety of roles can be relativised.

As noted earlier that Keenan and Comrie (1977) also include possessors in their hierarchy. One of the languages noted in relation to the relativising of possessor is Malay. The following example is adapted from Comrie (1989:157)

- (14) Orang [yang abang-nya memukul saya] itu
 person [REL elder-brother-his ACT. hit 1SG] the
 'The person whose elder brother hit me '

Here the strategy is a pronoun retention strategy as opposed to the deletion strategy used in relativising the subject. The construction in (14) has a direct parallel in Balinese. The following are two examples:

- (15) Anak [ane bapan-ne tepukin cai] gelem
 person [REL father-3SGPOSS see 2SG] sick
 'The person whose father you saw is sick'
- (16) Anak [ane bapan-ne nepukin cai] gelem
 person [REL father-3SGPOSS ACT. see 2SG] sick
 'The person whose father saw you is sick'

In (15) and (16), the possessor is relativised. In (15) the verb used is a basic verb, while in (16) the verb is nasalised.

5.3 Purposive clauses

The term 'purposive' clause in this section is used to refer to dependent clauses like those underlined in (17).

- (17) a. John went out *to buy some milk*
 b. John went home *so that he could see his mother*

The examples in (18) show purposive clauses that are adjuncts to intransitive clauses.

- (18) a. Ia pesu [] meli gula
 3SG go ACT. buy sugar
 'S/he went out to buy some sugar'
- b. Ia malaib [] ningalin meme-ne
 3SG run ACT. see mother-3SGPOSS
 'S/he ran to see her/his mother'
- c. Ia teka [] ngorahin cai kema
 3SG come ACT. tell 2SG there
 'S/he came to tell you to go there'

The agent of the purposive clauses in (18) is coreferential with the subject of the governing clause. It is not expressed overtly. The verb is nasalised. In addition to intransitive clauses like those given above, a non-verbal intransitive clause can be followed by a purposive clause. This is shown in the following example:

- (19) Wayan ka peken [] meli jukut-jukutan
 Wayan to market ACT. buy vegetables
 'Wayan went to the market to buy vegetables'

In all these examples the A of the purposive clause is coreferential with the S of the higher clause and the verb used in these dependent clause is nasalised. The following is different type of purposive clause. This clause is introduced by a conjunction (*apang*). Consider the following examples:

- (20) a. Cai teka mai apang [] bisa malajah
 2SG come here so that can study
 'You came here so that you could study'
- b. Cai teka mai apang [] bisa tulungin tiang
 2SG come here so that can help 1SG
 'You came here so that I could help you'
- c. Cai teka mai apang [] bisa nulungin tiang
 2SG come here so that can ACT. help 1SG
 'You came here so that you could help me'

In (20a) the sole argument (S) of the governing clause is coreferential with the S of the purposive clause and the S of this clause can be omitted. In (20b) the S of the governing clause is coreferential with the patient argument (P) of the subordinate clause. This P can be omitted and the transitive verb in this clause is an unmarked verb (\emptyset -construction) but when the S is coreferential with the agent argument of the subordinate clause, the verb is nasalised. In this way the agent becomes a grammatical subject as in (20c).

5.4 Complement clauses

This section deals with non-finite clauses functioning as the complement of a higher predicate. Three kinds of complement clause will be described in this section: 'want' type, 'know type' and 'tell type'.

(a) 'Want' type verb

The verb that means 'want' in Balinese is the verb *edot*. This verb has been described in chapter two. The verb *demen* 'to like' in Balinese also shows a similar syntactic pattern.

- (21) a. Ia demen [] pesu
 3SG like go out
 'S/he likes to go out'
- b. Ia demen [] tunden cai mai
 3SG like ask 2SG here
 'S/he likes to be asked to come here by you'
- c. Ia demen [] nunden cai mai
 3SG like ACT. ask 2SG here
 'S/he likes to ask you to come here'

In (21a) the complement clause is an intransitive clause and the S of this complement clause is coreferential with the S of the governing clause. In (21b) the P of the complement clause is coreferential with the S of the governing clause. The verb used in this complement clause is morphologically unmarked. This shows that when the P and S of the complement clause is coreferential with the S of the governing clause, no derivation is needed. A passive construction is used in English in order to express the same propositional content as shown in the translation of (21b). However, a nasal construction (a derived construction) is used when the agent argument of the complement clause is coreferential with the S of the governing clause as in (21c). The verbs that belong to the 'want' type are:

<i>enyak</i>	'want'
<i>galak</i>	'like'
<i>engsap</i>	'forget'
<i>inget</i>	'remember'

The following is another example. The verb used in the higher clause is *engsap* 'forget'. In (22a) the S of the complement clause is coreferential with the S of the higher clause. In (22b) the P of the dependent clause is coreferential with the S of the higher clause, while (22c) shows that it is the agnt of the dependent clause that is coreferential with the S of the higher clause and the verb is nasalised.

- (22) a. Nengah engsap [] ka peken
 Nengah forget [] to market
 'Nengah forgot to go to the market'
- b. Nengah engap [] baang tiang buku
 Nengah forget give 1SG book
 'Nengah forgot that I gave her/him a book'
- c. Nengah engsap [] maang tiang buku
 Nengah forget ACT. give 1SG book
 'Nengah forgot to give me a book'

(b) 'Know' type

The verbs that belong to this category are:

<i>tawang</i>	'know'
<i>tepuhin</i>	'see'
<i>dingeh</i>	'hear'
<i>kaden</i>	'think'

The complement clause of this type of verb works as follows. When the patient argument of the complement clause is coreferential patient argument of the higher predicate, no derivation is needed. But when the agent argument of the complement clause is coreferential with the patient of the higher predicate, the complement clause should be nasalised. Consider the following examples:

- (23) a. Tiang tawang cai [] pedih
 1SG know 2SG angry
 'You know that I am angry'
- b. Tiang tawang cai [] pedihin guru
 1SG know 2SG scold teacher
 'You know that I was scolded by the teacher'
- c. Tiang tawang cai [] medihin guru
 1SG know 2SG ACT. scold teacher
 'You know that I scolded the teacher'
- (24) a. Ia dingeh tiang [] ngeling
 3SG hear 1SG cry
 'I heard that s/he was crying'
- b. Ia dingeh tiang [] gugut lelipi
 3SG hear 1SG bite snake
 'I heard that s/he was bitten by a snake'

- c. Ia dingeh tiang [] ngugut snake
 3SG hear 1SG ACT. bite snake
 'I heard that s/he bit a snake'

The S of the complement clause in (23a) is coreferential with the P of the higher clause. In (23b) the P of the complement clause is coreferential with the P of the higher clause. Both S and P of the complement clause are not expressed. In (23c) it is the agent argument of the complement that is coreferential with the P of the higher predicate. So the verb used in this dependent clause is nasalised. The same principle applies to (24).

(c) 'Tell' type

There are four verbs that belong to this type. These are *orahin* 'tell', *tunden* 'ask', *gai* 'make' and *paksa* 'force'. This type of verb works in the same way as the know type. Consider the following examples.

- (25) a. Cai orahin tiang [] pules dini
 2SG tell 1SG sleep here
 'I told you to sleep here'
- b. Cai orahin tiang [] ngaba tiuk
 2SG tell 1SG ACT. bring knife
 'I told you to bring a knife'
- (26) a. Ia paksa cai [] teka mai
 3SG force 2SG come here
 'You forced her/him to come here'
- b. Ia paksa cai [] ngedasin umah-e
 3SG force 2SG ACT. clean house-DEF
 'You forced her/him to clean the house'

In (25a) the S of the complement clause is coreferential with the P of the higher clause. In (25b) it is the agent argument of the complement clause that is coreferential with the S of the higher clause and the verb used in this dependent clause is a nasal verb. A similar situation is found in (26).

5. 5 Raising

A number of adjectives in Balinese take a clause as their complement and allow the subject of the complement to be raised to be the subject of the adjective.²

- (27) a. Luung ia teka mai
 good 3SG come here
 'It is good that s/he came here'

² A similar situation can be found in Acehnese (Durie 1985:247). See also section 2. 4 chapter two.

- b. Ia luung teka mai
 3SG good come here
 'It is good that s/he came here'
- (28) a. Pedih ia tunden tiang magai
 angry 3SG ask 1SG work
 'S/he was angry when I asked her/him to work'
- b. Ia pedih tunden tiang magai
 3SG angry ask 1SG work
 'S/he was angry when I asked her/him to work'

In (27b) the subject of the lower clause is raised to subject position of the higher predicate. In (28b) it is the subject of the transitive clause complement is raised to the subject of the higher predicate. This kind of syntactic process is very common in Balinese. There are a number of adjectives which can take a complement clause as their argument:

<i>jelek</i>	'bad'
<i>girang</i>	'happy'
<i>rena</i>	'happy'
<i>enggal</i>	'quick'
<i>becat</i>	'quick'
<i>gancang</i>	'quick'
<i>adeng</i>	'slow'
<i>kimud</i>	'shy'
<i>elek</i>	'shy'
<i>jengah</i>	'ashamed'
etc.	

In addition to these adjectives there is one verb meaning 'seem' or 'appear' in Balinese. This verb is *ngenah*. In (29a) the higher predicate is *ngenah* with its complement, *ia demen teken cai*. In (29b) the subject of the complement clause is raised to become the subject of the higher predicate.

- (29) a. Ngenah ia pedih teken cai
 seem 3SG angry with 2SG
 'It seems that s/he is angry with you'
- b. Ia ngenah pedih teken cai
 3SG seem angry with 2SG
 'S/he seems to be angry with you'

5. 5 Summary

In this chapter a number of complex constructions have been described, which include relativisation, purposive clauses, complement clauses and raising constructions.

It has been shown that the the patient argument (P) of the unmarked construction and the sole argument (S) of one-place predicate in Balinese are the unmarked choice for subjects. Only subjects can be relativised in Balinese. However, Balinese has syntactic rules that can turn non-subjects into subjects so that Balinese can relativise the roles: locative, destination, source, instrumental, recipient and beneficiary. It can also relativise a possessor by using a pronoun retention strategy.

The treatment of the coreferential NP in purposive clauses in syntactically ergative languages is different from what we find in accusative languages. In syntactically ergative languages syntactic processes are based on the the absolutive relation (SP), while in accusative languages syntactic processes are based on a subject comprising S and A. Purposive clauses in Balinese also show that when S and P are coreferential with the S of the higher clause, no derivation is needed. But if the agent of the dependent clause is coreferential with the S of the higher clause, the verb is nasalised. A purposive complement clause is often marked by a conjunction (*apang*). If the sole argument (S) of the governing clause is coreferential with the S of the purposive clause, the S of this dependent clause can be omitted. It is also true when the S of the governing clause is coreferential with the patient argument (P) of the subordinate clause, that the P can be omitted. But when the S is coreferential with the agent argument of the subordinate clause, the subordinate clause is nasalised. In this way the agent becomes a grammatical subject.

Complementation in Balinese also shows a similar characteristics. When the S or P of the complement clause is coreferential with the P of the higher clause, no derivation is required. They are not expressed overtly. But when the agent of the complement is coreferential with the P of the higher clause, the agent in the complement clause is nasalised.

There are a number of adjectives in Balinese which can have a clause as their argument. Normally this type of adjective allows raising. The preverbal argument of the complement clause can be raised to become the subject of the higher predicate.

THE ADVERBS AND PARTICLES

Chapter Six

6. 1 Introduction

In the present chapter the terms *adverb* and *adverbial* will be used. The first term will be used to refer to part of speech represented in English by words like *there*, *quickly*, *strongly*, etc., whereas the second term will be used to refer to the syntactic function fulfilled by the adverb. In addition to the description of adverbs, this chapter also presents the description of particles. Particles normally have different characteristics from other words. Particles are like adverbs but they are a closed class and tend to have grammatical functions rather than lexical meanings. Probably a particle can be seen as occupying a position between a bound morpheme and a word. The adverbs and particles are described together because broadly speaking they are relevant to the meaning of the verb.

The adverb forms in Balinese can be monomorphemic or polymorphemic. The polymorphemic can be formed by reduplication or affixation, e.g.

reduplication:	<i>enggal</i>	‘quick’	<i>enggal-enggal</i>	‘quickly’
affixation:	<i>enggal</i>	‘quick’	<i>enggalang</i>	‘quickly’

The position of the adverbs in Balinese varies depending on their type and form. Their semantic scope can be classified into: (a) phrasal scope and (b) sentential scope:

Phrasal scope:	<i>jegeg</i> beautiful 'very beautiful'	<i>gati</i> very		
Sentential scope:	<i>Ibi</i> yesterday 'S/he came here yesterday'	<i>ia</i> 3SG	<i>teka</i> come	<i>mai.</i> here

The degree adverb *gati* modifies the adjective *jegeg* and the time adverb *ibi* has the whole sentence under its scope.

6. 2 Types of Adverb

The adverbs that will be described in this chapter include *time*, *manner*, *place*, and *frequency* adverbs. These adverbs will be looked at in terms of their syntactic position, their morphological forms and the different meanings that they may have due to their different morphological forms.

6. 2. 1 Time Adverbs

To begin with, it is useful to differentiate time expressions in Balinese that express present, past, and future time reference before going on to describe the meaning of these time expressions in terms of their morphological form.

a. Past Time

Past time is expressed by a time expression that has a past time reference, such as *ibi* 'yesterday', *tuni* 'this morning', etc.:

- (1) a. Baju-ne ene beli tiang ibi.
 shirt-DEF this buy 1SG yesterday
 'I bought this shirt yesterday'

The position of the adverb in (1a) can be varied as shown below

- b. Ibi bajune ene beli tiang
 c. Bajune ene ibi beli tiang
 d. *Bajune ene beli ibi tiang

With a basic verb construction the position of the adverb can be in initial, final or between the subject and the verb. But this adverb cannot be inserted between the verb and the agent complement as in (1d). This sentence is not acceptable. The example below is a nasal verb construction.

- (2) a. Ia meli kamus ibi
 3SG ACT. buy dictionary yesterday
 'S/he bought a dictionary yesterday'

The position of the time adverb with a nasal verb as in (2a) also varies. It can be in initial position, or final, but it cannot be placed between the verb and the patient as it is shown in the following example.

- d. *Ia meli ibi kamus

The form *ibi* belongs to a low style. This form will be replaced by *dibi* in a high style. As an adverb, this form is often preceded by the form *ane/sane* depending on the style of the language. *Ane*, the reduced form of *sane*, is used in a low style, whereas *sane* is used in a high style (this will be further described in chapter seven). Thus the example (2) can be rewritten as (3) below

- (3) Ia meli kamus Ø ane ibi.
 3rd ACT. buy dictionary REL yesterday
 'S/he bought a dictionary yesterday'

The expression *ane ibi* has the same function as the adverb *ibi*. They both function as an adverbial. This form can be regarded as a 'reduced' noun phrase in which the head noun *dina* 'day' is unexpressed. Thus the example (3) can be expressed as follows

- (4) Ia meli kamus dina ane ibi.

In (4) the head noun *dina* is overtly expressed. It occurs without a definite marker. If it is marked, it may have different pragmatic interpretation, as in (5) below.

- (5) Ia meli kamus dina-ne ane ibi.
 3SG ACT. buy dictionary day-DEF REL yesterday
 'S/he bought a dictionary yesterday'

The example (5) shows that the head noun *dina* is 'definitised' by the addition of the suffix *-e*, which has an allomorph *-ne* if the word it attaches to ends with a vowel. The example (5) can be interpreted as follows: the speaker who utters this sentence wants to tell the addressee that the agent (the subject of the sentence) has done a series (a number) of activities, one of them is buying a dictionary. This pragmatic interpretation is absent in (4). It only denotes a particular time.

b. Future Time

To express a future time reference, the word *buin* or *malih* is used together with a noun indicating time, e.g

buin *mani*
 next tomorrow
 'tomorrow'

buin *telun*
 next the day after tomorrow
 'the day after tomorrow'

Consider the following examples,

- (6) a. Ia luas ka kota buin mani.
 3SG go to city next tomorrow
 'S/he goes to the city tomorrow'
 b. Buin mani ia laku luas ka kota
 c. Ia buin mani laku luas ka kota

c. Present Time

Present time reference is expressed by the form *jani* or *mangkin*. Consider the following examples

- (7) Ia mabalih filem jani.
 3SG watch film now
 'S/he is watching a film now'

- (8) Ipun lunga ka kota mangkin.
 3SG go to city now
 'She is going to the city now'

The possessive marker *-ne* in Balinese can be used in expressions corresponding to *in the morning*, *in the afternoon*, etc. in English. One can see an analogy with English expressions such as 'of a morning' and 'of an afternoon' or 'nights' as in 'He works nights' where the *-s*, historically a genitive marker, is now reinterpreted as a plural marker (Barry Blake, personal communication). Consider the following expressions.

<i>petengne</i>	'at night'
<i>lemahne</i>	'at the day time'
<i>semengne</i>	'in the morning'
<i>sanjanne</i>	'in the evening'
<i>tengainne</i>	'in the afternoon'

Consider the examples below:

- (9) Ia teka mai peteng-ne.
 3SG come here night-POSS
 'S/he comes here at night'
- (10) Ia teka mai peteng-peteng-ne.
 3SG come here night-POSS
 'S/he come here every night'

The noun *peteng* in (10) is reduplicated. The meaning difference between the non-reduplicated and the reduplicated adverb is indicated in the English translation.

In addition to being able to be marked by a possessive marker, parts of the day in Balinese can also take the suffix *-ang*, which is a verbal suffix. The part of the day which has been suffixed by *-ang* will be nasalised when it is used in a declarative sentence.

- (11) a. Putu alih tiang metengang [N-peteng-ang]
 Putu look for 1SG ACT. night
 'I look for Putu at night'
- b. Metengang Putu alih tiang.
 c. Putu metengang alih tiang.
- (12) a. Tiang ngalih Putu metengang
 1SG ACT. look for Putu ACT. night
 'I look for Putu at night'
- b. Metengang tiang ngalih Putu.
 c. Tiang metengang ngalih Putu.

The verb form in (11) is a basic verb whereas the verb in (12) is nasalised. The base form of the adverb *metengang* is *peteng*. This form takes the suffix *-ang* and then it is nasalised, phoneme /p/ becoming /m/. If the affixation of the adverb and the verb is parallel, one would expect the adverb used in [12] to be *petengang*, because the verb in this example occurs without a nasal prefix. But the non-nasal form cannot be used in (12) because any kind of adverb in Balinese, which is marked by *-ang* indicates an agent oriented adverb.

6. 2. 2 Manner Adverbs

In many languages, manner adverbs are derivable from adjectives by means of fairly productive process of derivational morphology. For instance in English, the adverb is formed by the suffix *-ly*, e.g. the adverb *slowly* is derived from the adjective *slow* by the addition of the suffix *-ly*. In Balinese manner adverbs are also derivable from adjectives either by reduplication or affixation. In this section the syntactic behaviour of this adverb in relation to the form of the verb used in the sentence will be examined.

The syntactic behaviour of this manner adverb will be discussed in conjunction with a basic verb, and a nasal verb since the form that this adverb may take relates closely to the verb form. As has been noted in chapter two, the term 'Ø-construction' is used to refer to a construction that occurs with a basic verb as a predicate. Consider the following examples:

- (13) a. Buku-ne paca tiang adeng-adeng.
 book-DEF read 1SG slowly
 'I read the book slowly'
 b. Adeng-adeng bukune paca tiang
 c. Bukune adeng-adeng paca tiang

The adverb in (13) is *adeng-adeng*. The verb used in this examples is a basic verb form, *paca* 'read'. Syntactically the NP *bukune* is a subject and *tiang* is an agent complement. The order is patient-verb-agent. In (13b) the adverb is placed at the beginning of the sentence, while in (13c) is put between the subject and the verb.

As noted the previous section the adverb in Balinese can be suffixed with *-ang*. Thus *adeng-adeng* can be changed morphologically to become *adeng-adengang*. In this way it behaves like a verb. This is shown in (14) below.

- (14) a. *Buku-ne paca tiang adeng-adengang
 book-DEF read 1SG slowly
 'I read the book slowly'
 b. Buku-ne paca tiang ngadeng-adengang
 book-DEF read 1SG slowly
 'I read the book slowly'
 c. Bukune ngadeng-adengang paca tiang
 d. Ngadeng-adengang bukune paca tiang

The sentence in (14a) is not acceptable, while the sentence in (14b) is acceptable. As an agent oriented adverb, when it occurs with a Ø-construction this adverb should be nasalised.¹ Let us turn the Ø-construction in (14) to a N-construction.

¹ Adverbs that take verbal morphology are also found in Kalkatungu (Blake 1979:97) and Dyirbal (Dixon 1972:301), two syntactically ergative Australian languages.

- (15) a. *Tiang maca buku-ne adeng-adengang
 1SG ACT. read book-DEF slowly
 'I read the book slowly'
- b. Tiang maca buku-ne ngadeng-adengang
 1SG ACT. read book-DEF slowly
 'I read the book slowly'

The agent oriented adverb should be nasalised. The sentence in (15a) is not grammatical because the adverb is not nasalised.

6. 2. 3 Place Adverbs

As in many languages, place adverbial expressions in Balinese are expressed by prepositional phrases. This is illustrated in the following sentence.

- (16) Ia idup di desa.
 3SG live in village
 'S/he lives in the village'
- (17) Ipun malinngih ring kota (high style)
 3SG live in city
 'S/he lives in the city'

Both prepositions *di* and *ring* are used to indicate a location. The preposition *di* is used in a low style, while *ring* is used in a high style. To indicate a movement towards a certain place the preposition *ka* is used, e.g.

- (18) Ia majalan ka peken
 3SG walk to market
 'S/he walks to the market'

The adverbs of place *dini/deriki* or *ditu/derika* are also used in similar way as the adverbs *here* and *there* in English, e.g.

- (19) Tiang pules dini
 1SG sleep here
 'I sleep here'

Note that the form *dini* and *ditu* are used in a low style, whereas the forms *deriki* and *derika* are used in a high style.

In addition to the use of prepositional phrases, the words *kaja* 'north', *kangin* 'east', *kelod* 'south', *kauh* 'west' and their possible combination can be used as the bases of adverbs of place. When these words are used adverbially they will take the *-ang* suffix. The meaning of this adverb is moving towards the direction indicated by the base form. Consider the following examples:

- (20) a. Kedis-e makeber nganginang [N-kangin-ang]
 bird-DEF fly eastwards
 ‘The birds are flying eastwards’
- b. Nganginang kedise makeber
- c. Kedise nganginang makeber

The adverb in (25) *nganginang*. The basic form of this adverb is *kangin* ‘east’. This base is marked by *-ang*.

6. 2. 4 Frequency Adverbs

This term is used to label the adverb which indicates how often an event is performed. The main concern of this section is to describe what means are available in Balinese to express the notion of frequency.

Let us start with the form *pang/ping*. The use of this form is equivalent to the use of the English word ‘times’ as in once, twice, three times, four times, etc. The form *pang* is used in a low style, while the form *ping* is used in a high style. Consider the following sentences.

- (21) Ia ngajeng pang telu
 3rd eat time three
 ‘S/he eats three times.’

In (29) the adverb denoting frequency is realized by the expression *pang telu* ‘three times’.

To express the idea of ‘every’ such as in *every day*, *every night*, and so on, the form *sabilang* is used in Balinese. This word is followed by a noun, e.g

<i>sabilang</i>	<i>sanja</i>	‘every evening’
every	evening	

<i>sabilang</i>	<i>Soma</i>	‘every Monday’
every	Monday	

In addition to the use of the form *sabilang*, the alternative way of expressing this idea is by using the bound morpheme *nga-*. This form is attached to a noun indicating time, e.g

<i>bulan</i>	<i>ngabulan</i>	‘every month’
month		

<i>tiban</i>	<i>ngatiban</i>	‘every year’
year		

<i>limang dina</i>	<i>ngalimang dina</i>	‘every five days’
five day		

Consider the following examples.

- (22) a. Sabilang Soma ia teka mai.
 every Monday 3SG come here
 'S/he comes here every Monday'
- b. Ia nerima gaji-ne ngabulan.
 3SG ACT. get salary-POSS every month
 'S/he gets his salary every month.'

Frequency in (22a) is realized by the expression *sabilang Soma* and in (22b) by *ngabulan*.

The other forms which can be used in this way are

<i>sai/sesai/sai-sai/pepes</i>	'often'
<i>setata/pragat/begbeg</i>	'always'
<i>kapah/kapah-kapah</i>	'seldom'
<i>biasa</i>	'generally'

Consider the following example.

- (23) Ia sesai main tenis.
 3SG often play tennis
 'S/he often plays tennis'

The adverb *sesai* can be replaced by any of the above forms in accordance with the intended meaning. Some of these forms can take affixation. The forms which cannot take affixation are *setata*, *bebeg*, and *pragat*. The rest can take affixation. The affixes taken can be the *-ang* suffix or the *pa-in* confix. Whether these adverbs can be affixed or not is lexically determined. Thus we can have the following forms

basic form	suffixed by <i>-ang</i>	confixed by <i>pa-in</i>
<i>sai</i>	<i>sai(y)ang</i>	<i>pasai(n)in</i>
<i>pepes</i>	<i>pepesang</i>	<i>papepesin</i>
<i>kapah</i>	<i>kapahang</i>	<i>pakapahin</i>
<i>biasa</i>	<i>biasaang</i>	<i>pabiasain</i>

Let us take the adverb *kapah* as an illustration.

- (24) a. Ia kapah teka mai
 3SG rarely come here
 'S/he rarely comes here'
- b. Ia ngapahang teka mai [N-kapah-ang]
 3SG ACT. rarely come here
 'S/he rarely comes here'

- c. Ia makapahin teka mai [N-pa-kapah-in]
 3SG ACT. rarely come here
 'S/he rarely comes here'

6.3 Particles

In Balinese there are a number of words which belong to a closed class. The words relevant here are listed below. These words will be referred to as particles. These particles normally do not take affixation.

- a) *suba*
- b) *taen*
- c) *bakat*
- d) *sedeng*
- e) *enu*
- f) *mara*
- g) *lakar*
- h) *tusing*
- i) *tidong*
- j) *eda*

The functions of these particles are as follows: aspect (a-g), negative (h and i), and negative imperative (j). Each of these functions will be described below.

6.3.1 Aspect Markers

Cross-linguistic studies on aspect show that there are two main distinctions that can be drawn: perfective and imperfective aspect. Perfective aspect is often characterized as viewing the situation as a bounded unit. The imperfective aspect does not take the situation to be bounded, but rather views it as having some sort of internal structure. As noted by Comrie (1976:16) perfectivity indicates the view of a situation as a single unit, without distinguishing the various separate phases that make up that situation, while imperfectivity pays attention to the internal structure of the situation. The particles which can be used to mark aspect will be described below

a) Suba

When the particle *suba* modifies a verb, it encodes the completion of an action, event, or state of affair, examples

- (25) a. Ia suba meli aja.
 3SG ASP ACT. buy cake
 'S/he has bought some cake'

The particle *suba* in (25a) indicates that the action is completed. This particle is used in a low style. In the high style this form will be replaced by *sampun*. Thus the sentence in (25a) can be rewritten in its high style as (25b) below.

- b. Ipun sampun numbas sanganan.
 3SG ASP ACT. buy cake
 'S/he has bought some cake'

The example in (25) shows that the particle *suba* can be combined with a verb indicating an activity (or dynamic situation). This particle can be combined with an adjective as in (26) or stative verb as shown in (27).

- (26) Ia suba mokoh.
 3SG ASP fat
 'S/he is already fat'

- (27) Ia suba nawang unduk-e ento.
 3SG ASP know matter-DEF that
 'S/he already knew that matter'

The position of the aspect marker *suba* can be separated from the verb in that it can be placed at the beginning of the sentence. Thus examples (26) and (27) above have alternatives as shown in (28) and (29) below.

- (28) Suba ia mokoh

- (29) Suba ia nawang unduke ento.

It seems that there is a pragmatic difference in meaning between the initial position and the other position. In (28) and (29) the speaker wants to emphasise the completion of an action or an event.²

b. Taen

When this particle modifies a verb, it also encodes the completion of an action or event. It also implies that the agent of the verb has gained experience or knowledge of particular event through carrying it out, examples,

- (30) a. Ia taen nginem bir
 3SG ASP ACT. drink beer
 'S/he has drunk beer'

- b. Taen ia nginem bir

The sentence in (30) indicates that the subject has drunk some beer. So the action of drinking beer has been completed in the past. This particle can also be placed initially as in (30b). In addition to marking perfect aspect, the particle *taen* can also indicate an experiential aspect. This

² In every day conversation the particle *suba* is often pronounced *ba*, the syllable *su* being dropped. So instead of saying *suba meli*, the expression *ba meli* will be heard. The same situation is also true for the particle *sampun*. This particle is often shortened to become *pun*.

experiential aspect marker is combinable with the perfective aspect marker *suba*. The combination would be *suba taen*. This order is fixed, so we cannot have the order **taen suba*. This is illustrated in the following examples.

- (31) a. Ia suba taen ka Jakarta.
 3SG ASP ASP to Jakarta
 'S/he has been to Jakarta'
- b. Ia taen ka Jakarta.
 3SG ASP to Jakarta
 'S/he has been to Jakarta'

Both examples (31a) and (31b) express that the subject has been to Jakarta. In (31a) the aspect experiential aspect marker is combined with the perfective aspect marker *suba*. In this case the use of *suba* and *taen* can be compared to the use of the verbs *be* and *go* in English. The following English examples are from Comrie (1976:59).

- (32) a. Bill has been to Amerika.
 b. Bill has gone to Amerika.

Comrie (1976) points out that the example (32b) implies that Bill is now in America or on his way there, while the example (32a) does not imply this interpretation. (32a) can be expressed in Balinese by using the particle *taen* or by the combination of *suba* and *taen* and the example (32b) can be expressed by using the particle *suba*. Thus (32a) and (32b) can be translated as (33a) and (33b) below

- (33) a. Bill (suba) taen ka Amerika.
 b. Bill suba ka Amerika.

Apart from using *taen*, the experiential aspect can also be marked by using the aspect marker *maan*. In this case *maan* and *taen* can be interchangeably used. Note the following example.

- (34) Ia maan ka Amerika.
 3SG ASP to America
 'S/he has been to America'

To express experiential aspect, the particle *maan* can be combined with either the particle *taen* or *suba*. The combination would be: *taen maan* and *suba maan*.

c) Bakat

When this particle modifies a verb, it indicates perfective aspect. So this particle is similar to *suba*. However, the syntactic behaviour of these particles is different. The particle *suba* can modify a basic or a nasal verb, but the particle *bakat* has some constraint with respect to its combination with a nasal verb. This particle can be used to modify a nasal verb only if the agent is

a first person. Consider the following examples.

- (35) a. Tiang bakat nyilih buku ditu.
 1SG ASP ACT. borrow book there
 'I have borrowed the book there.'
- b. Buku bakat silih tiang ditu.
 book ASP borrow 1SG there
 'I have borrowed a book there'

The examples in (35) show that the aspect marker *bakat* can modify a nasal verb as in (35a) and a basic verb as in (35b) above. The agent in these examples is a first person. The following examples occur with a second person agent.

- (36) a. *Cai bakat naar nasi magoreng.
 2SG ASP eat rice fried
 'You have eaten somefried rice'
- b. Nasi magoreng bakat daar cai.
 rice fried ASP eat 2SG
 'You have eaten some fried rice'

Example (36a) is not acceptable because the agent is a second person pronoun. The following sentence is also unacceptable because the agent is a third person pronoun and the verb is a nasal verb.

- (37) a. *Ia bakat nyilh buku itu
 3SG ASP ACT. borrow book there
 'S/he has borrowed a book there'

The sentences in (36b) is perfectly acceptable because the verb form used is a basic verb. Thus the combination of the particle *bakat* and nasal verb can only have a first person agent.

Based on the examples provided above, it can be noted that the particle *bakat* is used to mark perfective aspect. As a perfective aspect marker, this particle can be combined with *suba*, *taen*, or *maan*. The combination can be: *suba bakat*, *taen bakat*, *maan bakat*.

d) Sedeng/sedek

When this particle modifies a verb, it indicates that the action is actively on-going. Consider the following example.

- (38) Ia sedeng nulis surat dugas tiang kemo.
 3SG ASP ACT. write letter when 1SG there
 'S/he was writing a letter when I went there'

The particle *sedeng* in (38) can be replaced by the particle *sedek*. Thus these two particles are used to encode progressive aspect in Balinese.

e) Enu

This particle is used to encode a continuative aspect, examples:

- (39) a. Ia enu main tenis.
 3SG ASP play tennis
 'S/he is still playing tennis'
- b. Ia enu gelem.
 3SG ASP sick
 'S/he is still sick'

In (39a) the use of *enu* indicates a situation where the subject of the sentence is still doing something as indicated by the base form of the verb. In (39b) the use of *enu* indicates that the subject of the sentence is still in the condition as signified by the stative predicate.

f) Mara

When this particle modifies a verb, it indicates an inchoative aspect or an ingressive meaning, that is, the beginning of a situation. Examples:

- (40) a. Ia mara malajah.
 3SG ASP study
 'S/he starts studying'
- b. Ia mara ngamokohang.
 3SG ASP becoming:fat
 'S/he is becoming fat'

In (40a) and (40b), the particle *mara* marks the beginning of a situation. Apart from indicating the beginning of a situation, this aspect marker can also be used to indicate a perfective meaning. This accords with Bybee's suggestion. Bybee (1985:21) points out that perfective aspects (inceptive, punctual and completive) view the situation as a bounded entity, and often put an emphasis on its beginning or end. This perspective meaning of the particle *mara* is illustrated in the following examples:

- (41) a. Ia mara teka.
 3SG ASP come
 'S/he has just come'
- b. Ia mara meli jaja.
 3SG ASP ACT. buy cake
 'S/he has just bought some cake'

The above examples show that the particle *mara* can be used to mark perfective aspect. As indicated by the English translation, this aspect meaning should be translated into English using: *have/has+just+past participle*. In this case this aspect marker is slightly different from the perfective aspect markers which have been described previously.

g) Lakar

When this particle is used to modify a verb, it expresses a prospective meaning. According to Comrie (1976) this aspect is used to express a meaning in which someone is in the state of being about to do something. Consider the following examples,

- (42) Ia laku mai.
 3SG ASP here
 'S/he will come here'

In expressing prospective meaning, this particle can be combined with the aspect marker *mara*. This combination is shown in (43) below.

- (43) Tiang mara laku nelpun ia.
 1SG ASP ASP ACT. telpon 3SG
 'I am about to ring her/him'

Sometimes the aspect marker *laku* is combined with the aspect marker *suba*. Consider the following example:

- (44) Ia suba laku ka umah nyai-ne
 3SG ASP ASP to house you-POSS
 'S/he is about to come to your house'

6. 3. 2 Negative Markers

Now we turn to the negative markers. The negative markers in Balinese can be presented as follows.

Negative marker	low	high
for verbals:	<i>tusing/sing</i> <i>tonden</i>	<i>nenten/ten</i> <i>durung / dereng</i>
for nominals:	<i>tidong</i>	<i>boya</i>
for prohibition:	<i>eda/da</i>	<i>sampunang</i>

The negative markers *tusing/sing* and *tonden /durung* are used to negate a verbal predicate, *tidong/boya* are used negate nominal predicate, and *eda/da* is used in negative imperative (prohibition). Note that the high level forms are used in the same way. One example of each of

this function is provided below.

- (45)

Ia

tusing

megai

dini.

3SG

NEG

work

here

'S/he does not work here'
- (46)

Ane

teka

mai

ibi

tidong

polisi.

REL

come

here

yesterday

NEG

police

'The one who came here yesterday is not the police'
- (47)

Eda

nyemak

ento!

NEG

take

that

'Don't take that'

6. 4 Summary

This chapter has dealt with adverbs and particles. Some Balinese adverbs can take verbal affixes in that they behave like verbs. The affixed adverb is an agent oriented adverb. This adverb can be used in a Ø-construction and in N-construction. This adverb is always nasalised in order to get a grammatical sentence.

A number of particles are also available in Balinese which can be distinguished into: (a) negative and (b) aspect markers. There are four negative markers which are used depending on the predicate fillers. The notion of aspect can be distinguished into: perfective and imperfective aspect. These aspect markers can be summarized in the following table.

Aspect	low	high
perfective:	<i>suba</i> <i>taen</i> <i>bakat</i> <i>maan</i>	<i>sampun</i> <i>polih</i> <i>polih</i> <i>polih</i>
Imperfective:	<i>sedek</i> <i>enu</i> <i>mara</i> <i>lakar</i>	- <i>kari/kantun</i> <i>wau</i> <i>jagi</i>