TOPICALITY OF OBJECT AND GROUNDING
IN BALINESE NARRATIVE DISCOURSE

I Wayan Pastika
Udayana University, Bali
<Pastika59@yahoo.com>

1 Introduction

In this paper, I will discuss how the topicality of O(bject) relates to grounded information (see also Hopper 1979; Myhill 1992:59-80; Cumming 1991: 175--186). There are three questions which need to be asked here. First, does a highly topical O correlate with foregrounded information, while a non topical one correlates with background information? Second, if it does, then why should there be such a correlation? Third, is grounding an independent factor which influences voice selection or is any correlation between grounding and voice selection a consequence of the typical characteristics of the arguments found in Foregrounding (FG) and Backgrounding (BG)?

2 The Concept of Grounding Information and Topicality

2.1 *Grounding Information*

The definition of 'grounding' is adopted from Hopper's (1979:213-214) framework. According to Hopper, narrative texts can be divided into two major components i.e. 'the language of the actual story line and the language of supportive material which does not itself narrate the main events'. His examples from Swahili show that the difference between clauses conveying main events (which he terms 'foregrounded events') and clauses in non-main events (which he terms 'backgrounded events') has something to do with sequentiality: the main events mostly occur sequentially (i.e. one event succeeds another on time line) while the non-main events are not in sequence with the main events but amplify them.

2.2 *Topicality*

According to Givón (1994:9), topicality of nominal referents has two components which are both 'cognitively significant' and 'methodologically measurable':

(a)   "Anaphoric accessibility: Whether the current referent has prior text antecedence, and if so how far back and how cognitively accessible that antecedence is."

(b)   "Cataphoric persistence: Whether the current referent recurs in the following text, and if so how frequently, and thus presumably how thematically important or attentionally activated it is."

To measure topicality, Givón (1979, 1983, 1984) proposes three types of quantitative measurements. Those types are (i) referential distance ('look back'), (ii) potential interference ('ambiguity') and (iii) persistence ('decay'). In my study, only R(eferential) D(istance) and T(opik) P(ersistence) are applied because these two methods 'are based on an assumption that more topical (thematically important) referents tend to be both more anaphorically accessible ('continuous') and more cataphorically persistent ('recurrent') (Givón 1994:10). These are also easier to measure than 'potential interference.'

3 A Sketch of the Balinese Voice System

I will use the terms A, O and S, which were introduced by Dixon (1972) to refer to the 'universal syntactic-semantic primitives'. For Dixon (1972, 1979 and 1994), S='intransitive subject', A='transitive subject' and O='transitive object'. I will follow Andrews' (1985) more formal definitions of these notions.

The term 'voice' is used here to refer to different ways of linking arguments to A, S and O functions. These linkings of arguments in Balinese are represented by three different constructions: two transitive voices (e.g. N(asal) T(ransitive) and Z(ero) T(ransitive) as well as a passive voice (e.g. the intransitive *ka-* passive). These three voices are illustrated in examples (1), (2) and (3):

(1)   Nglaut ia   ngojog   dagang   bebek (BLG 33)
        then3   NT-approach   seller   duck
        Then he (= Belog) approaches a duck seller.

(2)   Nglaut   dagang   bebek   ojog-a.
        Then   seller   duck   ZT approach-3Agt
        Then he (= Belog) approaches a duck seller (then a duck seller, he approaches).

(3)   Nglaut dagang bebek-e   ka-ojog   (baan ia)
        Then   seller   duck-DEF   PSV-approach by   3
        Then the duck seller is approached by him.

Artawa (1994), Roberts (1995) and Artawa and Blake (1997) show that these three voices differ in which argument is assigned to the 'pivot' role. A syntactic pivot of a construction is defined by van Valin (1993:56) as a privileged syntactic function with respect to that construction. Balinese has clear syntactic pivots with respect to which NP can be raised, relativised, etc. For a summary, see Roberts (1995:204-208).

The Nasal Transitive is a transitive construction which is morphologically marked by a nasal prefix and has A as pivot, as in example (1). Zero Transitive, on the other hand, is a transitive construction which is morphologically unmarked and has O as pivot, as in example (2). The *ka-* passive has the prefix *ka-* to mark the passive construction, as in example (3). In the *ka-* passive, the pivot is S as it is the only core argument. My use of the term 'pivot' here is equivalent to Arka's (1998:9-10) 'grammatical function subject.'

4 Topicality of O and Grounding

In this section, I present data concerning the correlation between grounding and topicality and the interaction of grounding, topicality and voice. A correlation between a highly topical O and FG is proven by the statistics presented in Table 1.

Table 1: *Overall frequency of combinations of topicality and grounding*

Topicality	FG	BG	Total
Topical O	273 (64%)	152 (33%)	425 (48%)
Non-topical O	154 (36%)	302 (67%)	456 (52%)
Total	427 (100%)	454 (100%)	881 (100%)

Table 2 below shows that a topical O usually occurs with FG, while a non-topical O usually occurs with BG. Hopper (1979: 215-227) has observed that FG clauses typically have a few, usually highly topical, participants (see also Myhill, 1992:59). In BG, on the other hand, there is a greater likelihood of having non-topical participants because new mentions are introduced and described in BG clauses. O participants in FG are usually topical because FG clauses usually maintain the same participants for a while before new participants are introduced in BG clauses. On the other hand, BG clauses carry descriptions, amplifications, expansions and collateral information, and are therefore likely to contain a good deal of new information. This means that BG clauses are more likely to get non-topical participants. From the data I have seen so far, it would appear that A must still usually be topical in BG clauses while O is more likely to be non-topical.

Now that I have established the correlation between grounding and the topicality of O, I can turn to the question of the interaction of grounding, topicality and voice. Specifically, is the high frequency of ZT with FG simply an automatic consequence of the fact that O is usually topical in FG? Or is FG an independent factor, enhancing the already strong tendency of ZT to be used when O is highly topical and perhaps reducing the tendency of BG being used when O is not highly topical? Some relevant statistics are given in Table 2.

Table 2: *Overall frequency of topicality of O, grounding and voice*

Transitive Clause Types	Topical O		Non-topical O	
	FG	BG	FG	BG
ZT	255 (93%)	99 (65%)	57 (37%)	36 (12%)
NT	18 (7%)	53 (35%)	97 (63%)	266 (88%)
Total	273 (100%)	152 (100%)	154 (100%)	302 (100%)

It is clear from Table 2 that if grounding does play a role in voice selection, it is much less important than the topicality of O. Rather than grounding, topicality is the more important factor in determining voice selection because there is strong statistical evidence that ZT is usually chosen if O is highly topical, whether in FG or BG. NT is normally selected if O is not topical in either in FG or BG.

However, Table 2 also shows clearly that the combination of topicality and grounding is a strong predictor of voice selection. In particular, the combination of FG with a highly topical O almost guarantees ZT while the combination of BG with an O having non-topicality is a very good predictor of NT.

Example (4) below shows how the ZT clauses in (b), (c) and (d) are used to convey foregrounded events. Only the ZT clause in (c) has a highly topical O in two dimensions, while the ZT clause in (b) has a highly topical O in terms of TP, but not RD. The ZT clause in (d) has a highly topical O in RD. (The N(oun) P(hrase) *padi* 'rice (in its husk)' is mentioned before in the fourth preceding clause but the NP *pepetan* 'husks' is first mentioned in (b) below.

(4)a.   Kenten   satuan I   Dedari   Sang Sungpraba
        that   story ART.   angel   Sang Sungpraba

   b.   raris kenten *pepetan*   padi-n-e
        then that   husks   rice (in its husk)-LIG-DEF

        nika   kaat-a
        that   ZT cut off-3Agt

   c.   Ø   jang-a   samping jineng-e
        (husks)   ZT put-3Agt   side   paddy's store-DEF

   d.   nika   tunjel-a   *pepetan-n-e*   *nika*
        that   ZT burn-3Agt   husks-LIG-DEF   that

   e.   sampun   *ia*   ma-tunjel
        after   3   MAI-burn

   f.   andus-*ne*   nika   nika   kenten saluk-a
        smoke-3POSS'R that that like that ZT put on-3Agt
        baju-n   ipun-e
        dress-LIG 3-DEF

   g.   lantas ipun nutut-ang   andus   menek
        then   3   NT-follow-APPL smoke   upward

   (The referent 'paddy husks' is not mentioned in any of the ten clauses following in (g)) That is the word of the Angel Sang Sungpraba. Then, that ... She cuts off those rice husks. She puts (them) next to the paddy's store. She burns those husks. She puts on her dress after the husks are burnt. Then, she follows the smoke upward.
   (GBN 425-432)

In (4b), the O participant, the full NP *pepetan padi-n-e nika* is highly topical in terms of TP. In (4c), the O participant, Zero Anaphora 'rice husks' is highly topical in both dimensions (RD and TP); and in (4d), the O participant, the reintroduced full NP *pepetan-n-e nika* 'that paddy's husks' is highly topical in respect of RD with some topicality in TP. The use of ZT in (4d) relates to an associative anaphoric referent and sequential events. In this clause, the referent 'her dress' is associated with 'the smoke of the husks.' Here the story is that the Angel can only fly to heaven, if she wears her own dress while being cov-

ered by the smoke of rice husks which is rising to the sky. Both the dress and the husks smoke function as tools to fly and a Balinese audience would be expected to know this. The non-topicality of O in ZT here goes against the usual pattern. This will be discussed later.

The definite full NP *andus-ne nika* 'that smoke', the NP in (4f) is not part of the ZT clause here. Neither it is part of an independent clause. The definite full NP *andus-ne nika* 'that smoke' is mentioned by accident by the narrator and he corrects it with the ZT clause *... saluk-a bajun ipune* 'She puts on her dress.' Since the NP *andusne nika* 'that smoke' in (4f) is an accidental expression which is not part of the clause or not an independent clause, it can only be considered as an associative anaphoric referent of the indefinite NP *andus* 'smoke' in (4g). Here the O of NT is treated as non-topical because no value of RD or value of TP is given to the NP. So, the non-topicality of O follows the expected pattern.

BG clauses with non-topical O's seem to strongly select NT clauses rather than ZT clauses. Out of 302 non-topical O's used in BG, 266 (88%) examples occur in NT clauses, and only 36 (12%) examples are in ZT clauses. Examples (5b) and (5c) show O participants of NT which are not topical in either dimension.

(5)a.   Sajan laut buin akejepne   sajan   teka
        true   then again moment   true   arrive

        lantas   ni   Bawang
        then   ART. Bawang

b. Ø   ngancul-ancul maberentengan   ngaba pepantingan
       stalkingly   fully   NT-carry washed clothes

c. Ø   tur ia nyuwun   jun   misi   yeh.
       and 3 NT carry (on head) clay pot contain water

(In the complete episode of my text, the referents 'washed clothes' and 'clay pot' are single mentions)
In a moment, Bawang really comes. (While she comes), she brings lots of washed clothes and she carries (on the head) a clay pot which contains water.   (CK 184-190)

The NT clauses in (5b) and (5c) above are BG and both have a non-topical O. Those NT clauses are backgrounded because they provide extra information about the foregrounded clause '*Bawang* comes' in (5a). The NT clause *ngancul-ancul maberentengan ngaba pepantingan* 'she (comes while) ... bringing washed clothes' in (5b) and the NT clause *tur ia nyuwun jun misi yeh* '(and she comes) while she is carrying (on the head) a clay pot which contains water' (5c) are used to amplify or comment on the main-event line in (5a). Neither the O participant *pepantingan* 'washed clothes' of the NT clause in (5b) nor the O participant *jun* 'a clay pot' in (5c) is topical since both are only mentioned once.

The NT clauses in (5b) and (5c) are used to demonstrate that the O participants are new mentions which are not topical and they amplify a main event line which is in the immediately preceding clause. If these NT clauses were replaced with the corresponding ZT clauses, then the O participant becomes a focus of contrast or in other words, is an unexpected topic. However, the corresponding ZT clauses would still denote a backgrounded

rather than of a foregrounded event. This is because what is expressed in (6b) and (5c) explains or amplifies the main event in (6a) (cf. Hopper 1979:223; Cooreman 1994: 69). It is therefore clear that it is the nature of the O rather than backgrounding *per se* that determines voice.

5 The Residue

The general tendencies just established are that a ZT clause is more likely to be chosen when there is a combination of FG with a highly topical O, while a NT clause is selected when there is a combination of BG with a non-topical O. Exceptions which go counter to this general tendency are distinguished into two types: (i) FG, highly topical O and NT, and (ii) BG, non-topical O and ZT. We do not expect FG with a highly topical O and NT, since FG favours ZT with a topical or accessible O. We do not expect BG with a non-topical O and ZT, since BG favours NT with a non-topical O.

5.1 *FG, Highly Topical O and NT*

Out of 273 transitive clause types which have the combination of a highly topical O and FG which were presented in Table 2, only 18 (7%) are NT, while 255 (93%) are ZT. Of the 18 NT clauses, 3 have an O which is highly topical in two dimensions, 14 examples have an O which is topical in TP alone, and 1 has an O which is topical in RD only. Most A's are overtly expressed in these NT clauses in order to focus on the actions of the Agent.

The typical use of the NT in the above combination is to signal 'here are the actions of the Agent.' The NT in this case is usually used at the beginning of an event sequence. The examples below illustrate how the narrator would want to give A more prominence, while O is still topical in this situation.

(6)a. "Ih jero *dagang bebek*, niki jinah,"
      hi you seller duck this money

  b. "Ø icen tiang bebek kekalih!"
     ZT give I duck two

  c. Ditu Pan Belog ngenju-in i *dagang bebek*
     there Pan Belog NT-give-APPL ART. seller duck

     ringgit a keteng
     ringgit one Quantifier.

  d. nanging ke Pan Belog tusing nawang
     but EMPH Pan Belog not NI-know
     yan ento madan ringgit.
     if that MAI-call ringgit

  e. I *dagang bebek* ngon ia teken
     ART. seller duck amazed 3 with
     tingkah anak-e ma-blanja buka keto,
     act person-DEF MAI-buy like that
(The referent 'duck seller' is highly persistent in the following clauses)

"Hi , you, <u>duck seller</u>, this is the money. Give me two ducks." There, Pan Belog gives the <u>duck seller</u> one Ringgit. However, Pan Belog does not know that   is called Ringgit. The <u>duck seller</u> is amazed by the act of the person who is shopping like that. (BLG 40-46)

The NT verbs *ngenjuin* 'give' in (6c) denotes foregrounded event. Here, an NT is selected instead of a ZT because the clause is about the action of A. But the O participant, namely the full NP *i dagang bebek* 'the duck seller' in (6c), is also topical because it is part of a small number of participants that are major protagonists in the story as a whole and in this episode in particular. The major generalization that can be drawn about this examples is that although O is highly topical, A is even more topical in ways which are not captured by our simple measurement. It is arguable that A has more prominence in the speaker's mind in these examples, making NT a possibility.

It is less usual for the combination of topical O, NT and FG not to have an overt A. The reason why A is not expressed overtly might be that O is inanimate hence there is no real confusion about who is doing what. There are only 3 examples of this type. One of them is presented below.

(7)   Ka-crita   jani   I   Belenjo
       PSV-tell   now   ART.   Belenjo

       nresded   bangun   uli   di   pedeman-e,
       hurry   ZI get up   from   at   bed-DEF

       <u>laut Ø ngintip Ø uli di bolongan   sombah-e,</u>
       then   NT-peep at from at hole   wall hole-DEF

       lantas ajinang-a   pratingkahan-ne
       then   ZT teach-3Agt   character-3POSSR

       I   Nyoman Jater
       ART.   Nyoman   Jater
       (Here I tell you the story) that Belenjo gets up quickly from her bed. She peeps (at Jater) from the wall hole. Jater shows off his ability (because he knows that he is being peeped at). *(JT 148-151)*

Nearly all the examples of NT clauses in FG with highly topical O involve an O which is topical in terms of TP. This fits with the idea that the typical use of NT in FG is at the beginning of an episode. In this situation, O is not topical in RD because the episode is a new one and so it has not yet been introduced, although it becomes topical once it is introduced. In all these examples, although O is topical, A is often more topical.

5.2 *BG, Non-topical O and ZT*
Table 2 showed that there are 36 ZT clauses (12%) out of 302 transitive clause types which have a non-topical O and occur in backgrounding. Non-topical O participants of ZT clause which are backgrounded are usually of three sorts: a non-specific O, an O which is a focus of contrast, or an O which occurs as the non-specific head of a relative clause. These ZT

clauses are usually used to comment on events which have been mentioned in a previous episode. They can be placed in the middle of an episode or in a concluding paragraph.

Table 3. *Factors involved in BG, non-topical O and ZT*

BG, non-topical O and ZT		
1. non-specific O	12	39%
2. focus of contrast	11	25%
3. the non-specific head of a relative clause	13	36%
Total	36	100%

(i) non-specific O
The quantifier *makejang/onya* 'all, everything' and the question word or the indefinite pronoun *apa* 'what, anything' do not usually refer to any specific referents in the texts. These non-specific NPs are usually used in clauses which describe habitual situations.

We will look first at the use of the quantifier *makejang*. A quantifier is usually used to modify the head of its NP, but the quantifier itself can also occur independently without any modified NP. When it occurs like this it functions as a core argument of a sentence.

In Balinese, if these quantifiers are used as a modified NP, they can be floated far away from the modified NP. Arka (1998:69-79) notes that the quantifier can appear in different positions: sentence-initially, next to on either side of the head noun or sentence-finally. The quantifier *makejang* in (8a) below (which is taken from my corpus) precedes the head noun. The quantifier could also either directly follow the head noun (8b) or be in sentence final position (8c). It can also occur in sentence initial position, far away from the NP (8d).

(8)a.   ...   <u>makejang</u>   payuk-ne   balihin-a
                all   clay pot-3Agt   ZT scrutiny-3Agt

   b.   payuk-ne   <u>makejang</u>   balihin-a
         clay pot-3POSS'R all   ZT scrutiny-3Agt

   c.   payuk-ne   balihin-a   <u>makejang</u>
         clay pot-3POSS'R ZT-scrutiny-3Agt   all

   d.   <u>makejang</u> balihin-a   payuk-ne
         all   ZT scrutiny-3Agt   clay-3POSS'R
         ... she (= Belenjo) scrutinises all her clay pots. (JT 94)

The quantifier *makejang* 'all' in example (8) is used as a modifier of the head of its NP *payuk-ne* 'her clay pot.' Here the quantifier floats to different positions. This quantifier can also be used independently, without any other head noun.

In (9b), the quantifier *makejang* 'all, everything' functions independently as O of a ZT clause. This quantifier does not refer to a specific referent but relates to the negative

characteristics of *Kesuna* which have been mentioned somewhere earlier. Thus, the clause here is used to describe *Kesuna*'s characteristics, and for this reason it is a BG clause.

(9)a.   ...   demen   tekening   pagelan   anak
            glad   with   possession person

   b.   Peh   *makejang* suba   aban-a   tekening
        wow   all   Particle ZT bring-3Agt   by

        ni   Kesuna.
        ART.   Kesuna

   c.   Nah mapan keto   ya   laksanan-ne
        so   because like that EMPHASIS   conduct-3POSS'R

   d.   pamuput   mati   <u>tepukin-a</u>,
           finally   death   ZT find-3Agt
        ... she (= Kesuna) likes other person's possession. Wow, she brings all (bad)
        things. Because her conduct is just like that, finally she finds death. (CK 693-
        694)

The NP *apa* 'what, anything' in (10c) functions as a questioned O in ZT. This NP does not refer to a specific referent in the text. The NP *apa* in (10c) seems to be a question word which refers to the O of a ZT. Because questions are a focus construction, ZT is always used if O is questioned.

(10)a. Ngidih   pis   ia   sing   taen
        NT-ask for   money   3   not   ever

   b.   wak   sing   bisa   nekang   pis
        person   not   can   NT-produce   money

   c.   *apa*   ya   <u>belanja-ang-a</u>
        what   EMPH   ZT spend-APPL-3Agt

   d.   akhirne   jeg   <u>dengeng-ang-a</u>
        finally   EMPH   ZT look at-APPL-3Agt
        She (= Sang Sungpraba) never asks for money, she does not make money.
        What does she spend. Finally, he looks at (her). (GBN 306-309)

It is possible for the construction in (9b) or (10c) to be replaced by NT but this clause would signal a shift in action. In this kind of situation, I did not find any occurrence of the non-specific O *makejang* or *apa* with NT in my corpus.

(ii) contrastive topic
The second type of ZT which is used in combination of BG with a non-topical O is a ZT with a contrastive topic. Chafe (1976:34) suggests three factors which are involved in a

'focus of contrast': 'awareness' (the consciousness which is shared by the speaker and the addressee), 'the set of possible candidates' (in one or more possible candidates, the speaker 'contradicts a belief of the addressee') and 'assertion of which candidate is the correct one'.

A contrastive topic in Balinese is usually marked by the particle (*a*)*nak* or *nget* or *jeg* which precedes the pivot (i.e. O in ZT, or A in NT). A contrastive topic can also be used in a sentence without any of the particles. In this case the sentence simply contrasts the proposition of the preceding sentence, as in (11b). ZT is used in these examples even though O is not topical because O is emphasised as contrastive. If NT is used here, on the other hand, then A is given more focus than O. The contrastive topic in BG is usually used to comment on a preceding event.

(11)a. Awake nagih   meli   bebek   maisi,
         I   NI-want NT-buy   duck   MAI-contain

   b. nget   *bulu*   dogen   awake   adep-in-a.
      EMPH   feathers just   I   ZT sell-APPL-3Agt
      (In the complete episode of my text, the referent 'feathers' is a single mention)
      I request (to buy) a solid duck, (but it is only) feathers which I was sold.
      (*BLG* 69-71)

In (11), the contrast between the two sentences is that a person requests a duck, but he gets feathers. As a contrastive topic, the writer uses the NP *bulu* 'feathers' as the centre of communicative interest. Here the writer contradicts a listener's belief which, might have predicted that the protagonist would receive a duck rather than the feathers s/he ended up with.

(iii) the non-specific head of a relative clause
A non-specific head of relative clause usually uses the non-specific NPs *asing-asing* 'whatever' or *apa* 'what, whatever' as its head as in examples (12a) and (13a). Such relative clauses can have the role of O.

(12)a. [Asing-asing ane   tagih-a]
         whatever   which   ZT request-3Agt

         tuukin-a   dogen
         ZT fulfil-3Agt   always

   b. tur apa   ja   pesadun-pesadu-n-ne
      and whatever   EMPH   complain-LIG-3POSS'R
      misuna-ang   ia   ni   Bawang.
      NT-slander-APPL she   ART.   Bawang
      Whatever she requests, (her parents) always fulfil it. And, whatever her com-
      plaint (which she uses) to slander her, Bawang. (CK 7-9)

(13)a. [*apa*   je   tagih-a]   kal   baang   tiyang
         whatever EMPH   ZT ask for-3Agt will   ZT give   I

   b. jeg   ten   ba   ada   tagih-a
      EMPH not   Particle exist ZT ask for-3Agt
      Whatever he asks for, I will fulfil it. Nothing does he ask for.(GBN 249-254)

The relative clause *ane tagih-a* 'which she requests' in (12a) and the relative clause (without a relative pronoun) *je tagih-a* 'which he requests' in (13a) have respectively the non-specific heads *asing-asing* 'whatever' and *apa* 'whatever, anything'. These non-specific NP's do not refer to a specific referent. The whole ZT clause in (12a) refers to a habitual activity which is used to comment on Kesuna's characteristics, while the one in (13a) is an irrealis proposition which is shown by the use of the future particle *kal* 'will.' Although NT would be grammatical, it seems not to be favoured because the context expects a clause with the focus on O.

6 Conclusion

Although the combination of topicality of O and the grounding type is a better predictor of voice than is the topicality of O on its own, a closer examination of the examples which run counter to the normal tendencies suggests that the nature of O is important in voice selection in a way which goes beyond topicality as measured by RD and TP. It appears that it is the nature of O which is the most important determinant of when ZT will be used, and that topicality as measured by RD and TP, although a very good predictor of voice selection, does not take into account all the characteristics of O which are involved in the decision to use ZT.

We also found that the 'unexpected' NT clauses which have a combination of highly topical O and FG fall into a small number of clearly identifiable types. Again, the nature of O is important. In the case of NT, it is not always the nature of O, but the wish to emphasise A that is decisive. NT is likely to be used at the beginning of an event sequence to focus on the actions of A, even though O may be topical because it is persistent through the episode. A may even be more topical than O.

It appears, then, that FG and BG *per se* do not play a significant role in voice selection, if we mean by this that ZT will be favoured when the clause advances the story line and NT will be favoured when it does not. However, FG and BG tend to correlate with other factors; for example, we have seen that there is a correlation between topical O and FG. If certain types of O's which are not topical according to the parameters used here to measure topicality (RD and TP) but which can be considered topical in some other sense are more characteristic of FG clauses than of BG, this will increase the number of FG clauses which have ZT and so create the impression that FG favours ZT. Finally, in the majority of FG sentences with topical O, the topicality of O is not in conflict with any other factors which would go against the usual tendency to use ZT when O is topical (such as the existence of an A which needs to be emphasised particularly for some reason). In this way the combination of FG and topicality of O becomes a very strong predictor of voice.

Notes

This paper is a modified version of one chapter of my Ph.D thesis entitled 'Voice Selection in Balinese Narrative Discourse' at the Australian National University. I would like to thank Nikolaus Himmelmann for his willingness to proof-read the final draft of my paper.

References

Andrews, Avery. 1985. 'The Major Functions of the Noun Phrase' in T. Shopen, ed., *Language Typology and Syntactic Description* Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 62-154.

Arka, I Wayan. 1998. 'From Morphosyntax to Pragmatics in Balinese: A Lexical-Functional Approach.' PhD thesis, University of Sydney.

Artawa, Ketut. 1994. 'Ergativity and Balinese Syntax.' PhD thesis, La Trobe University, Melbourne.

Artawa, Ketut and Barry J. Blake. 1997. 'Patient Primacy in Balinese.' *Studies in Language* 21: 3, 483-508.

Chafe, Wallace L. 1976. 'Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subjects, Topics, and Points of Piew' in Charles Li, ed., *Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press. 25-55.

Cooreman, A. M. 1994. 'A Functional Typology of Antipassives' in Barbara Fox and Paul J. Hopper, eds., *Voice: Form and Function*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins. 49-88.

Cumming, Susanna. 1991. *Functional Change: The Case of Malay Constituent Order*. New York, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1972. *The Dyirbal Language of North Queensland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1979. 'Ergativity.' *Language* 55, 59-138.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1994. *Ergativity* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 69). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 69.

Givón, T. 1979. 'From Discourse to Syntax: Grammar as a Processing Strategy' in Talmy Givón, ed., *Discourse and Syntax* (Syntax and Semantics Vol 12). New York: Academic Press. 81-109.

Givón, T. 1983. 'Topic Continuity in Discourse: an Introduction' in Talmy Givón, ed., *Topic Continuity in Discourse, A Quantitative Cross-language Study*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins. 5-37.

Givón, T. 1984. 'Universal of Discourse Structure and Second Language Acquisition' in W. E. Rutherford, ed., *Language Universals and Second Language Acquisition*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins. 49-131.

Givón, T. 1994. 'The Pragmatics of De-transitive Voice: Functional and Typological Aspects of Inversion' in Talmy Givón, ed., *Voice and Inversion* (Typological Studies in Language 28). Amsterdam; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins. 3-44.

Hopper, Paul J. 1979. 'Aspect and Foregrounding in Discourse' in Talmy Givón, ed., *Discourse and Syntax* (Syntax and Semantics 12). New York: Academic Press. 213 - 241.

Myhill, John. 1992. *Typological Discourse Analysis: Quantitative Approaches to the Study of Linguistic Function*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Roberts, Linda. 1995. 'Pivots, Voice and Macroroles: From Germanic to Universal Grammar.' *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 15: 157 – 214.

van Valin, R. D, Jr. 1993. 'A Synopsis of Role and Reference Grammar' in R.D. van Valin, Jr., ed., *Role and Reference Grammar.* Amsterdam; Philadelphia: J. Benjamins. 1 - 164.