

The *-Ang* and *-In* Suffixes as Verbal Case Markings in Balinese

Wayan Sidhakarya
University of Oregon

1. Introduction

The analysis of *-ang* and *-in* in this study is seen from the perspectives of the affectedness of the patient and the spatial/perceptual distance between the agent and the goal in semantically transitive clause constructions. Gropen et al. (1991: 153-4) remark that, in order to predict the meaning of the syntax of a verb, traditional theories posit that syntactically relevant information about semantic arguments consists of a list of thematic roles like "agent," "theme," and "goal." Throughout the study I will refer to the doer of the verb action as agent, the affected entity as patient, i.e., when the verb is suffixed with *-ang*, and the entity toward which an action is directed as goal, i.e., when the verb is suffixed with *-in*.

Suffixes *-ang* and *-in* in Balinese have some parallelism with the Indonesian suffixes of *-kan* and *-i*, respectively. There is little work on both Balinese and Indonesian suffixes, so that I have to depend very much on my own examples. Hopper and Thompson (1980: 261), in their paper on transitivity, have mentioned about the distinction between *-kan* and *-i* in terms of degree of transitivity. A pair of examples they give is following: a) *Dia memanass-I air*, and b) *Dia memanass-KAN air*. Both (a) and (b) mean 'He heated the water.' They suggested that the difference between *-kan* and *-i* is related to the totality as opposed to the partiality of the effect on the patient/object. The verb root in each sentence is *panas* 'heat, hot.' They suggested that with *-i*, it is implied that the action of heating is gentler and more controlled; and, with *-kan*, the action of heating is more drastic, such as boiling water in the kitchen.

While it seems very convincing to say that **-kan** has a high degree of transitivity which signals a total effect of the verb's action on the patient/object, it is not necessarily true that it always has higher transitivity than the **-i** suffix. There are no definite criteria which can account for one to be higher in degree of transitivity than the other. Following Hopper's and Thompson's criteria, it is hard to say which of the following two Indonesian expressions is higher in transitivity: a) ***Dia melempar-kan mangga*** 'S/he threw a mango away,' b) and, ***Dia melempar-i mangga*** 'S/he threw at mangos [on the tree] repeatedly.' The verb root in each sentence is ***lempar*** 'throw at.' With the suffix **-kan** in (a), ***mangga*** 'mango' is the affected patient since it is the entity which is moved away by the agent's activity. In (b), the argument brought in by **-i** is a goal of throwing, and the **-i** indicates that the same activity is done repeatedly. Besides, an instrument is being implied as a means for throwing at the mango. However, Hopper and Thompson mention the characteristics of the two suffixes, which is very important in the study of Balinese **-ang** and **-in**, that "the suffix **-kan** further suggests that the water is placed over the heat, while **-i** suggests rather that the heat is brought to the water, or is kindled while the water is over it." (p. 261). I interpret this to mean that, with **-i** there is a goal toward which an activity is directed.

My attempt in this paper is to show that the difference between **-ang** and **-in** involves plus (+) and minus (-) perceptual distance. In order to determine the functions and meaning of **-ang** and **-in**, I tested two hypotheses. The first hypothesis is that **-ang** is assigned for minus perceptual distance, or in other words to code affectedness of the patient because of the more involved relationship between the agent and the patient; and, the second hypothesis is that **-in** is assigned to code perceptual distance between the agent and the goal.

The plus and minus perceptual distances that the two suffixes code may also convey various semantic functions such as causative, benefactive, and instrument. In order to test

my hypotheses I gathered a corpus of verb samples from different root word classes such as: intransitive verbs, adjectives, modals, prepositions, directions, transitive verbs, and nominals. From the data collected it seems that perceptual distance is the main semantic factor distinguishing the suffixes *-ang* and *-in*.

In order for the reader to be able to follow the argument I provide a list of abbreviations used in this paper.

ABL	= ablative
ALL	= allative
ASS	= associative
AT	= plus agent trigger
BEN	= benefactive
CAUS	= causative
DEF	= definite
INS	= instrument
INT	= intransitive
ITER	= iterative
M	= male
NEG	= negative
PM	= person marker
F	= female
LK	= linker
POS	= possessive
SG	= singular
TR	= transitive
3	= third person
1	= first person
+	= plus
-	= minus

2. Intransitive verb roots

When the *-ang* is suffixed to an intransitive verb *teka* 'come' as shown in (1a) it indicates that the agent has some control over the patient so that the patient comes over. The

patient is directly affected by the agent's activity. In this context, *I Putu*, in the example (1a), might have asked his friend to come or whatever he has done that makes his friend come. On the other hand, with the allative *-in* in (1b), *I Putu*'s friend is no longer the affected patient, rather s/he is a goal toward which the agent is moving.

- (1a) *I Putu neka-ang timpal -ne.*
 PM/M Putu +AT-come-CAUS timpal-3POS
 'I Putu caused/made his mother (to) come.'

- (1b) *I Putu neka-n-in timpal -ne.*
 PM/M Putu +AT-come-LK-ALL friend-3POS
 'I Putu came to his friend.'

Perceptually, the *-ang* allows no distance between the agent and the patient. This is further accounted for by the patient's ability to take a reflexive (see section 9. Reflexives, examples (19a) and (20a)). (2) is another example. As in (1a), with *-ang* in (2a) the patient is affected and made to sleep. The expression with *-in* in (2b), however, gives a sense of immobility in the part of the goal. The agent is perceived as moving toward the goal and sleeps on the item. When the item is animate as in (2b), the agent must not have done it on purpose. That an agent is supposed to act with volition and control gives rise to metaphorical expression with *-in*. Thus, a metaphorical meaning is better known than its prototypical counterpart, as in the second meaning of the expression in (2b).

- (2a) *I Putu mules-ang panak-ne.*
 PM/M Putu +AT-sleep-CAUS child-3POS
 'I Putu made/put to his child sleep.'

- (2b) *I Putu mules-in kurenan-ne.*
 PM/M Putu +AT-sleep-ALL spouse-3POS
 'I Putu slept on his spouse.'
 'I Putu had intercourse with his spouse.'