

TWO TRANSITIVE CONSTRUCTIONS IN BALINESE

Ketut Artawa*

ABSTRACT

in focus are two major transitive sentence structures in Balinese, which differ not only in the verb form but also in terms of word order. One occurs with a morphologically unmarked 'basic' verb form, the other with a 'nasal' verb. Word order of the first construction is Patient-Verb-Agent, while the second is Agent-Verb-Patient. The main concern of this paper is to assign a grammatical relation to the argument NPs of these two transitive constructions in Balinese.

1. Introduction

This paper deals with two major transitive sentence structures in Balinese. These two structures can be used as a means of expressing the same pragmatic information, but they differ not only in the verb form but also in terms of word order. One of these constructions occurs with a morphologically unmarked 'basic' verb form, the other one with a 'nasal' verb (i.e. a verb bearing a nasal prefix which will be symbolised with N-).¹ The word order of the first construction is Patient-Verb-Agent, while the order in the second one is Agent-Verb-Patient.

In addition to these two types of basic structure, Balinese also has morphological affixation that effects transitivity such as causativisation and detransitivisation. However, the main concern of this paper is to assign a grammatical relation to the argument NPs of the two transitive constructions in Balinese. In order to facilitate the description of these constructions, a brief overview of verbal morphology is provided below.

2. Verbal Affixation

At the outset we can say that there are two types of root in Balinese which are used as bases for forming verbs: (1) those to which syntactic categories and independent meaning can be assigned without having to add an affix and (2) those whose syntactic category and independent meaning can be identified only after certain affixes have been added. The first group may be referred to as stems, whereas the second group can be called a precategorial, that is, no categorial membership can be assigned to this precategorial form. One problem that may arise in the description of precategorials that should be mentioned is that it is impossible to say, in certain instances, on which side a particular form is bound (either to the left or to the right). For example, the precategorial **takon** in Balinese can be symbolised as either **-takon** or **takon-**. Since either the addition of a prefix or suffix will make this precategorial a free form, as in **matakon** 'to ask', **takonang** 'to ask about someone'.²

* I wish to thank Barry Blake for reading earlier drafts of this paper and offering insightful comments. Needless to say, the way I make use of his comments and the remaining errors in this paper are my own responsibility.

¹ The term 'basic' verb is used to refer to a verb which occurs without nasal prefix, e.g. **jemak** 'take', **aba** 'bring'.

² Affixes **ma-** and **-ang** are verbalising affixes.

Verbal forming affixes in Balinese can be either prefixes or suffixes. There are three prefixes and two suffixes. The prefix which is relevant to the present study is the nasal prefix (N-). This prefix can be used to derive a verb from a noun, an adjective, and a precategorial base. The morphophonemics of this prefix can be summarised as follows. Note that the forms without glosses are precategorial:

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

bobog	‘lie’	mogbog	‘to lie’
bobot	‘heavy’	mobot	‘to be pregnant’
pondok	‘hut’	mondok	‘to live in a hut’
pandus		mandus	‘take a bath’
delok		nelok	‘to visit’
dadua	‘two’	nadua	‘to hesitate’
tongos	‘place’	nongos	‘to stay’
tutur	‘advice’	nutur	‘to chat’
kebus	‘warm’	ngebus	‘to become sick’
kalah	‘defeated’	ngalah	‘to give in’
gender		ngender	‘to chase’
gilgil		ngilgil	‘to tremble’

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

cakal		nyakal	‘to bark for a long time’
carik		nyarik	‘to eat the left over’
jagjag		nyagjag	‘to come closer’
jengking		nyengking	‘to scold’
sereg	‘key’	nyereg	‘to lock or open with a key’
silem		nyilem	‘to dive’

- c) N- becomes /ng/ before bases that begin with /l/, /r/, /w/, and before words beginning with vowels, e.g.

layang		nglayang	‘to fly’
lawar	‘food’	nglawar	‘to make food’
racun	‘poison’	ngracun	‘to poison’
racik	‘prepare’	ngracik	‘to prepare’
wel		ngwel	‘to be angry with’
wet		ngwet	‘to reserve’
orahin	‘tell’	ngorahin	‘to tell’
eling	‘cry’	ngeling	‘to cry’

3. Agent and Patient

The terms ‘Agent’ and ‘Patient’ are not used to refer to strict semantic roles in this paper, they are simply used to label the argument NPs of a two-place verb regardless of the ‘degree’ of the transitivity of the verb. For initial characterisation consider the following sentences:

- (1) a. **Cicinge sepak tiang.**
 dog:def kick 1st
 'I kick the dog'
- b. **Tiang nyepak cicinge.**
 1st N-kick dog:def
 'I kick the dog'
- (2) **Cicinge malaib.**
 dog:def run
 'The dog runs'

The verb in (1a) is a basic verb, while in (1b) the verb is a nasal. The word order in (1a) is Patient-Verb-Agent, while in (1b) Agent-Verb-Patient. An intransitive sentence is given in (2) for comparison. As can be seen the sole argument precedes the verb. The following section will describe the basic verb construction in terms of the 'nature' of the Agent.

2. Basic Verb Construction

The basic verb construction in Balinese commonly occurs with first and second person pronouns as the Agent. This, however, does not rule out the possibility of a third person Agent or with certain types of nouns which I will discuss below. Consider the sentences below.

- (3) **Bukune jemak tiang.**
 book:def take 1st
 'I take the book'
- (4) **Pipise jeniak nyai?**
 money:def take 2nd
 'Do you take the money?'
- (5) **Ajengan ambil dane.**
 rice take 3rd
 'S/he takes some rice'

The Patient NP in (3) is **bukune**, the Agent is a first person pronoun **tiang**. In (4) the Patient is the NP **pipise**, the Agent is a second person **nyai** and in (5) the Patient is the NP **Ajengan** and the Agent is a third person pronoun **dane**. The word order is Patient-Verb-Agent. As far as a third person pronoun is concerned, there is a constraint on the possibility of using this pronoun as the Agent of the basic verb construction. Example (5) could be regarded as belonging to a high style. When the sentence is in a low style the pronoun **ia** is used. Note the following sentences.

- (6) ***Nasine jemak ia.**
 rice:def take 3rd
 'S/he takes the rice'
- (7) **Nasine jemaka.**
 rice:def take:3rd
 'S/he takes the rice'

The sentence in (7) is acceptable, while the sentence in (6) is not. Example (7) as it stands it could be ambiguous: it could be regarded as a passive sentence in which the agent is omitted or it could also be interpreted as a basic verb construction in which the

agent **ia** is cliticised to the verb. If the second interpretation is adopted it means that the free form **ia** cannot be used with a basic verb. It seems either interpretation is plausible.

In addition to the use of a pronominal agent, the kin terms such as **bapa** ‘father’, **meme** ‘mother’, **beli** ‘older brother’, etc. are also commonly used. When these terms are used pronominally, they can refer either to the first or second person but they will never have a third person referent. The context will clarify whether they refer to the first or second person pronoun, e.g.

- (8) **Bubuh** **gai** **meme.**
 porridge make mother
- (9) **Ia** **orahin** **beli.**
 3rd tell older brother

The English translation of (8) could be ‘I/you make some porridge’. The sentence in (9) could be translated as ‘I/you tell her/him’ depending on who the speaker is.

If the agent is not a pronoun, it must be non-specific. If not, the sentence becomes ungrammatical. This is illustrated by the following sentences.

- (10) **Ia** **jagur** **anak** **buduh.**
 3rd hit person crazy
 ‘A crazy person hits her/him’
- (11) **Ia** **cotot** **lelipi.**
 3rd bite snake
 ‘A snake bites her/him (S/he is bitten by a snake)’
- (12) **Cicinge** **lilig** **montor.**
 dog:def run over car
 ‘A car runs over the dog (The dog is run over by a car)’

The Agent in (10) is the NP **anak buduh**, in (11) the NP **lelipi**, and in (12) is the NP **montor**. These NPs are not specified, that is, they do not occur with a definite marker. It appears that the basic verb construction in Balinese does not allow a definite NP (except for pronouns) to function as an Agent. This is shown in the following sentences in which the Agent is ‘definitised’ by the addition of the suffix -e and/or the demonstratives **ene/ento** ‘this/that’. The sentences in (10), (11), and (12) will be written as follows.

- (13) ***Ia** **jagur** **anake** **buduh** **ento.**
 3rd hit person:def crazy that
- (14) ***Ia** **cotot** **lelipine.**
 3rd bite snake:def
- (15) ***cicinge** **hug** **rnontore.**
 dog:def run over car:def

These sentences are not acceptable. These sentences are acceptable, however, if the verb is passivised.

If the Agent is an inanimate noun, for example, ‘natural force’ such as **wind**, **lightning**, this kind of Agent normally occurs with a basic verb and the other possible alternative is with a passive verb, but it is unlikely to co-occur with a nasal verb.

In Balinese grammar books, the basic verb construction described above is considered as a passive sentence. If we agree to call it passive, it means that Balinese has an

“unusual” passive construction in which the verb occurs in its basic form and commonly occurs with a first and second person pronoun agent as well as with kin terms which are used deictically.

A similar phenomenon can also be found in Indonesian . In her celebrated article, Chung (1976) demonstrates that Indonesian has two types of passive: a) Canonical passive and b) Object preposing. These two passives are illustrated by the following sentences (my examples):

- (16) **Rumah itu dibeli oleh Nina.**
house that pass:buy by Nina
‘That house was bought by Nina’
- (17) **Rumah itu saya beli.**
house that 1st buy
‘I bought that house’

Chung (1976) has shown that the example (17) does not behave like a ‘true’ passive construction while the example (16) does behave like a ‘true’ passive. Although the example (17) has the appearance of an object preposing construction, Chung considers it as a passive sentence because the NP **rumah itu** in this example has been shown not to behave like a preposed object but it behaves like a grammatical subject. Based on this argument, Chung calls the example (17) passive. This type of passive is considered to offer a challenge to Relational Grammar. The agent in this example is not in a chômeur relation to the verb and the verb is not a marked passive. The question that we may ask is whether the sentence in (17) is a passive or not. If it is a passive, Indonesian is like Balinese in having an unusual passive construction, since this passive does not have the characteristics of what is commonly known as a passive construction. According to Sierwieska (1984), the most widely accepted definition of the passive construction, has the following characteristics.

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

In addition to the structural characteristics above, one could add that passive constructions tend not to favour first and second person agents. And it is also often noted that semantically a passive construction is stative (see Givón 1990). If we believe in the stativity of the passive, it could be easily noticed that the basic verb construction in Balinese does not have the these characteristics. However, this construction has the following characteristics:

- a) The agent is commonly a first and second person pronoun and kin terms which are deictically used;
- b) The agent is not deletable;
- c) The verb is not marked passive.

18 KETUTARTAWA

Thus there are good reasons for believing that the basic verb construction in Balinese or perhaps the so-called object preposing construction in Indonesian are not passive constructions. If we decide not to call it passive, should we call it active or just another

variant of a transitive clause? Perhaps an analogy could be made to Acehnese. This language was analysed by Lawler (1975) as having a passive construction in which the verb agrees with the agent but not with the patient. This construction is also considered to offer a challenge to Relational Grammar in handling passivisation. But a more recent analysis by Dune (1989) shows that there is not enough strong evidence to call it passive. It is regarded as another variant of a transitive clause.

As noted at the beginning of this paper, the basic verb and the nasal verb construction can be regarded as a means of expressing the same pragmatic information. The nasal verb construction is comparable to the active clause in English, but there is no English sentence structure that matches the basic verb construction in Balinese. Presumably the closest sentence structure that one might find is the passive clause in English. Thus it is not surprising to find that the basic verb construction in Balinese is called ‘passive’. However, Balinese has two ‘true’ passive constructions formed with the affixes *ka-* and *-a* which behave like the English passive. Thus a comparison between Balinese and English in this respect can be presented as follows

	Balinese	English
a)	basic verb construction	—
b)	active construction	active construction
c)	passive construction	passive construction

If we decided not to call the basic verb construction passive, we need to find an alternative name for this construction. With respect to this problem a comment made by Stephen Anderson is worth taking into consideration. Anderson (1976:7) notes (in comparison to a transitive clause in an accusative language):

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

The nature of the basic verb construction in Balinese is in line with the comment quoted above if this structure is compared to the nasal verb construction. If we adopt this view, the basic verb construction can be termed an “ergative” construction. Thus this construction is not a challenge to our understanding of the nature of the passive sentence and furthermore this type of structure is not a challenge to the Relational Grammar approach towards passivisation.

3. Grammatical Relations

The nasal verb construction could be regarded as an active sentence since the postverba NP (the object) can be used as the subject of the corresponding passive as shown in the examples below.

(18) **Ia** **meli** **montore.**
 3rd N-buy car:def
 ‘S/he bought the car’

(19) **Montore** **belina** **teken** **ia.**
 car:def buy:pass by 3rd
 ‘The car was bought by her/him’

The sentence in (18) is an active sentence and the sentence in (19) is its corresponding passive. The object **montore** is turned into the subject of the passive sentence in (19) and the subject is in a *chômeur* relation marked by the preposition **teken** and the verb is marked by the suffix **-a**. This is one of the passive constructions in Balinese. Thus passivisation can be regarded as one of the syntactic tests showing that the postverbal NP in (18) is an object and the preverbal one is a subject.

The description that follows will concentrate on establishing which NP has grammatical subject properties in a basic verb construction in Balinese. In doing so the behaviour of the preverbal NP of this construction will be compared with the preverbal NP of the nasal verb as well as the subject of the intransitive verb.

The syntactic tests that will be used are ‘subject-to-object raising’, ‘equi NP deletion’, ‘derived subject raising’, relativisation, and reflexivisation. The first three tests are adopted from Chung (1976).

a) SUBJECT-TO-OBJECT RAISING

Chung (1976) states that this syntactic rule only operates on NPs which are the syntactic subject of their clause. Thus when the upstairs verbs in a complement structure allows raising, the downstairs NP which is a grammatical subject may be raised to the object position in the upper clause. Note that the complement clause in Balinese is not introduced by a complementiser, examples.

- (20) **I bapa ngaden tiang malaib.**
 art father N-believe 1st run
 ‘Father believed that I ran away’
- (21) **I bapa ngaden tiang ngadep umah.**
 art father N-believe 1st N-sell house
 ‘Father believed that I sold a house’
- (22) **I bapa ngaden I Karta jagur tiang.**
 art father N-believe art Karta beat 1st
 ‘Father believed that I beat Karta’

The lower clause (20) is intransitive while the lower clauses in (21) and (22) are transitive. The verb in (21) is a nasal verb, whereas the verb in (22) is basic verb form. Since this lower clause is not introduced by a complementiser, we cannot show explicitly that the raising has occurred in these sentences. Perhaps we can say that the preverbal NP (**tiang**) of the lower clause in (20) and (21) and the preverbal NP (**I Karta**) in (22) are understood as the object of the upper clause. The object status of the argument **tiang** in (20) and (21) and **I Karta** in (22) can however be shown through passivisation. Both these NPs can be turned into the subject of the corresponding passive of the upper clause.

- (23) a. **Tiang kadena (teken I bapa) malaib.**
 1st believe:pass by art father run
 ‘I was believed by father to have run away’
- b. **Tiang kadena (teken I bapa) ngadep umah.**
 1st believe:pass by art father N-sell house
 ‘I was believed (by father) to have sold the house’
- (24) **I Karta kadena (teken I bapa) jagur tiang.**
 Art Karta believe:pass by art father beat 1st
 ‘Karta was believed (by father) to have been beaten by me’

These examples show that the raised preverbal NP of the lower clause has been used as the subject of the corresponding passive of the upper clause.

If the postverbal NP of the lower clause in (21) and (22) is raised to the object position of the upper clause, the sentences become unacceptable.

- (a) ***I bapa ngaden tiang I Karta jagur.**
 art father N-believe 1st art Karta beat
- (b) ***I bapa ngaden umah tiang ngadep.**
 art father N-believe house 1st N-sell

These sentences show that only the preverbal NP of the lower clause can be raised. Thus the preverbal NPs in sentences in (20), (21), and (22) behave like a grammatical subject.

b) ZERO NP

This particular equi NP syntactic rule is applicable to purposive complement clauses in which the complement clause is introduced by the complementiser **apang/mangda** ‘so that’; e.g.

- (26) **Cai singgah dini apang Ø bisa ngorta.**
 2nd come here so that can N-chat
 ‘You come here so that you can have a chat’
- (27) **Cai meli buku apang Ø bisa ngajahin tiang.**
 2nd N-buy book so that teach N-teach 1st
 ‘You bought a book so that you can teach me’
- (28) **Ia ajak cai rnai apang Ø ajahin tiang.**
 3rd bring 2nd here so that teach 1st
 ‘You brought her/him here so that I can teach her/him’

The complement clause in (26) is an intransitive clause and the complement clauses in (27) and (28) are transitive clauses. The verb form in (27) is a nasal verb while the verb in (28) is a basic verb. The preverbal NP in each of this complement clause is omitted and is marked by zero (Ø). The omitted NP is coreferential with the preverbal NP of the main clause, that is, the grammatical subject of the main clause. Syntactically the omitted preverbal NP in the complement clause is also a subject. If the postverbal NP of the main clause, that is, the object of the main clause is coreferential with the postverbal NP (the object) of the complement clause, this NP cannot be omitted syntactically as shown in the following example.

- (29) **Cai ngajak ia mai apang I Karta bisa ngajahin ia.**
 2nd N-bring 3rd here so that art Karta can N-teach 3rd
 ‘You brought her/him here so that Karta can teach her/him’

The postverbal NP (the object) **ia** in the complement clause in (29) cannot be deleted. This object may be deleted if the complement clause is passivised, that is, turning the object into the subject of the clause.

- (30) **Cai ngajak ia mai apang Ø bisa ajahina teken I Karta.**
 2nd N-bring 3rd here so that can teach:pass by art Karta
 ‘You brought her/him here so that s/he can be taught by Karta’

c) “DERIVED” SUBJECT RAISING

This rule operates on complex sentences of the following type:

- (31) a. **Keweh ia ngomong.**
 difficult 3rd speak
 ‘It is difficult for her/him to speak’
- b. **Ia keweh ngomong.**
 3rd difficult speak
 ‘It is difficult for her/him to speak’
- (32) a. **Enggal ia majalan.**
 quick 3rd walk
 ‘It is quick for her/him to walk’
- b. **Ia enggal majalan.**
 3rd quick walk
 ‘It is quick for her/him to walk’

The subject of the intransitive clause (the embedded clause) in (31a) and (32a) can be raised to become the subject of the adjectival predicate as shown in (31b) and (32b). The examples below are transitive clauses.

- (33) a. **Enggal tiang ngadep umah.**
 quick 1st N-sell house
 ‘It is quick for me to sell a house’
- b. **Tiang enggal ngadep umah.**
 1st quick N-sell house
 ‘It is quick for me to sell a house’
- c. ***Uniah enggal tiang ngadep.**
 house quick 1st N-sell
- (34) a. **Aluh montore benahin tiang.**
 easy car:def fix 1st
 ‘The car is easy for me to fix’
- b. **Montore aluh benahin tiang.**
 car:def easy fix 1st
 ‘The car is easy for me to fix’
- c. ***Tiang aluh montore benahin.**
 1st easy car:def fix

These sentences show that only the preverbal NP can be raised. If the postverbal NP is raised to become the subject of the adjectival predicate, the sentence becomes unacceptable shown in (33c) and (34c) above. The sentence in (33) occurs with a nasal verb, while (34) occurs with a basic verb. Thus regardless of the verb form used in each sentence, only the preverbal NP can be raised. This further indicates that the preverbal NP is a grammatical subject.

d) RELATIVISATION

It is often noted in the literature that there are a number of different relative clause formations that can be found across languages. With respect to relativisation strategies, English is noted as a language which can relativise all grammatical relations, as opposed to languages which relativise only subjects. It seems that Balinese belongs to the

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

- (35) a. **Tiang gugut cicing.**
 1st bite dog
 ‘A dog bites me’
- b. **Tiang ane gugut cicing.**
 1st rel bite dog
 ‘It is me who the dog bites’
- c. ***Cicing ane tiang gugut.**
 dog rel 1st bite

The verb in (35a) is a basic verb. With a basic verb construction only the preverbal NP (the Patient) can be relativised as shown in (35b) above. The postverbal NP (the Agent) is not accessible to relativisation as shown in (35c). The example in (36a) is a nasal verb construction.

- (36) a. **I Warta maca korane.**
 art Warta N-read newspaper:def
 ‘Warta reads the newspaper’
- b. **I Warta ane maca korane.**
 art Wana rel N-read newspaper:def
 ‘Warta who reads the newspaper’
- c. ***Korane ane I Warta maca.**
 newspaper:def rel art Warta N-read

In (36a) the NP **I Warta** is the preverbal NP (the Agent) and the preverbal NP **korane** is the Patient. In (36b) the Agent is relativised, but in (36c) the Patient is relativised, but this relative clause is not acceptable. If we take the Agent as a grammatical subject in (36a) and the Patient as the Object, then we can say that only the subject can be relativised in Balinese. In this case, it seems that Balinese lacks the way to express information such as ‘the newspaper that Warta reads’ since the object cannot be relativised. However, it could be argued that objects in Balinese can be relativised “indirectly”, that is, through passivisation so that the possibility of conveying this information is available. Thus passivisation is an obligatory feeder to relativisation. The example (36) can be passivised as follows:

- (37) **Korane bacana baan I Warta.**
 newspaper:def read:pass by art Warta
 ‘The newspaper is read by Warta’

This passive sentence can be relativised. In this way Balinese can express the information: ‘the newspaper that Warta reads’. This is shown below.

- (38) **Korane ane bacana baan I Warta.**
 newspaper:def rel read:pass by art Warta
 ‘The newspaper that Warta reads’

This relativisation shows that either the Agent or the Patient can be relativised depending on the form of the verb. If the sentence occurs with a basic verb, only the Patient can be relativised. But if the sentence occurs with a nasal verb, only the Agent can be relativised. Thus the Agent in a nasal verb construction behaves like a subject, while the Patient in the basic verb cons behaves like a subject.

e) REFLEXIVISATION

In a language like English we could distinguish (at least) two grammatical relations (subject and object) which are basic to the clause structure in which the reflexive form is often coded as an object. In Balinese the reflexive form is expressed by the form **awak/raga** which is translatable into the English self. Consider the following examples

- (39) **Ia nebek awak.**
 3rd N-stab self
 'S/he stabbed her/him self
- (40) **Tiang lakar ngantung awak.**
 1st will N-hang self
 'I will hang myself

Since the verb in these sentences is a nasal verb, the reflexive form could be regarded as functioning as the object of the clause. If the Patient NP in a basic verb is regarded as an object, we would expect the following sentences to be acceptable.

- (41) ***Awak lakar gantung tiang.**
 self will hang 1st
 'I will hang myself
- (42) ***Awak Jakar tebek tiang.**
 self will stab 1st
 'I will stab myself

The unacceptability of these sentences suggests that the Patient NP in basic verb construction is not an object. The literal meaning of the reflexive form in Balinese is 'body'. In addition to the reflexive form used in the above sentences Balinese also has a reflexive form which is marked by a possessive marker. Consider the sentences below.

- (43) **Cai nebek awak caine.**
 2nd N-stab self 2nd:poss
 'You stabbed yourself
- (44) **Tiang melihang awak tiange.** -
 1st N-blame self 1st:poss
 'I blamed myself
- (45) **Ia nebek awakne.**
 3rd N-stab self:poss
 'S/he stabbed her/him self

Note that the possessive marker for a third person pronoun is **-ne** as shown in (45), while for the first and second person pronoun it is **-e**. The morpheme **-e** has the allomorph **-ne** when the word it attaches to ends in a vowel as shown in (43). These two morphemes are structurally different. The reflexive form used in (41) and (42) could be regarded as a "simple" reflexive form and the one use in (43), (44), and (45) as "derived" or complex form. Note that syntactically the two types of reflexive behave differently. This is illustrated in the following sentences.

- (46) a. **I Karta melihang awakne.**
 art Karta N-blame self:poss
 'Karta blamed himself
- b. **Awakne pelihanga baan I Karta.**
 self:poss blame:pass by art Karta

The example in (46b) is the corresponding passive of the sentence in (46a). The derived reflexive form can be used as the subject of the passive sentence. If the derived reflexive form is used with a basic verb construction the sentence is acceptable as shown in the following sentence.

- (47) **Awak caine pelihang cai.**
 self 2nd:poss blame 2nd
 ‘You blame yourself

The example (47) further indicates that the Patient NP in a basic verb construction is not an object, but it is a subject.

So far we have been dealing with a two-place verb. With regard to a three-place verb, an important cross-linguistic study has been done by Dixon (1989). He reported that there are three alternative syntactic frames available for coding semantic roles:

- a) there may be two or more lexemes, with almost identical semantic content but different semantic role/syntactic identification;
- b) there may be a syntactic process that alters the syntactic mapping of semantic roles, with a specific morpheme marking this;
- c) There may be alternative syntactic frames available involving exactly the same lexeme, without any derivational marking on the verb.

Based on his study on the verbs of ‘giving’, ‘telling’, and ‘showing’, from a number of languages, Dixon (1989) suggests that most languages treat the ‘gift’, ‘news’, or ‘thing shown’ as O, with the person to whom it is given, told, or shown marked by dative case, or a preposition, or something similar. It is noted that this applies to Thai, Burmese, Russian, Telugu, Abkhaz, as well as Austronesian languages Acehnese, Fijian, and Paamese, and Australian languages such as Warlpiri (Dixon, 1989:110). In these languages there is only one syntactic frame available for verbs like ‘give’, ‘tell’, and ‘show’. But he also points out that there is a fairly small number of languages that have two syntactic frames for the three verbs: ‘give’, ‘tell’, and ‘show’, allowing the non-A roles to be O. English and Dyirbal are noted as having two syntactic frames. The following examples are taken from Dixon (1989:108).

- (48) a. John gave the book to Mary.
 b. John gave Mary the book.

It is noted that the book in (48a) is O NP with **Mary** being marked by preposition to while **Mary** in (48b) is in O slot, with **the book** being now a post-object NP without any prepositional marking. It seems that only the NP **Mary** in (48b) can be turned to be the subject of the corresponding passive. A different situation could be found in Kinyarwanda (a Bantu language) in which the two unmarked NPs following the verb have object properties, both can be used as the subject of the corresponding passive construction (see Gary & Keenan, 1977 and Blake, 1990).

Balinese has two syntactic frames for the three verbs mentioned above. The way the ‘gift’, ‘news’, or ‘the thing shown’ is mapped onto syntactic relations will depend on the morpheme that marks the alternation. There are two suffixes which can be used to code this alternation: **-ang** and **-in**. Note that most of these verbs are derived from roots. Consider the following examples.

- (49) a. **Ia ngenjuh-ang bukune ento ka timpalne.**
 3rd N-give book:def that to friend:poss
 ‘S/he gave the book to her/his friend’
- b. **Ia ngenjuh-in timpaliie bukune ento.**
 3rd N-give friend:poss book:def that
 ‘S/he gave her/his friend the book’
- (50) a. **Ia ngorah-ang unduke ento ka timpalne.**
 3rd N-tell matter:def that to friend:poss
 ‘S/he told the problem to her/ his friend’
- b. **Ia ngorah-in timpalne unduke ento.**
 3rd N-tell friend:def problem:def that
 ‘S/he told her/his friend the problem’
- (51) a. **Ia ngedeng-ang gambarane ka gurunne.**
 3rd N-show picture:def to teacher:poss
 ‘S/he showed the picture to her/his teacher’
- b. **Ia ngedeng-in gurunne ganibarane.**
 3rd N-show teacher:poss picture:def
 ‘S/he showed her/his teacher the picture’

The base form of the verb in (49) is the root **enjuh**, in (50) it is **orah**, and in (51) it is **edeng**.

These examples show that if the suffix **-ang** is used to derive a verb, the ‘gift’, ‘news’, and ‘the thing shown’ will be coded as O and the person to whom it is given, told, or shown will be marked by a preposition such as **ka-** ‘to’. But if the suffix **-in** is used, the person to whom it is given, told, shown is mapped onto O. Thus with **-ang** there is only one object, but with **-in** marking on the verb there are two unmarked NPs following the verb. Thus the sentences in which the verb is marked by **-in** are ‘double object’ constructions since either of these objects can be used as the subject of the corresponding passive constructions. This is shown below.

- (52) a. **Timpalne enjuhina bukune ento taken ia.**
 friend:poss give:pass book:def that by 3rd
 ‘His friend was given the book by her/him’
- b. **Bukune ento enjuhina timpalne taken ia.**
 book:def that give:pass friend:possby 3rd
 ‘The book was given to her/him by her/him’

In (52a) the object **timpalne** (the recipient) is used as the subject of the passive sentence, while in (52b) the object **bukune ento** (the patient) is used as the subject of the passive sentence. The verb is marked by the suffix **-a** and the nasal prefix is dropped. The sentences in (49b) and (51b) can be turned into passives in a similar way. Thus it is justifiable to call the sentences in (49b), (50b), and (51c) double object constructions.

It seems that there are no problems with the nasal verb construction if we want to assign grammatical relations. But the difficulty may arise with the basic verb construction. Consider the following examples.

- (53) a. **I Karta enjuhin tiang pipise.**
 art Karta give 1st money:def
 ‘I gave Karta the money’

- b. **Pipise enjuhin tiang I Karta.**
 money:def give 1st art Karta
 'I gave the money to Karta'

The 'recipient' NP **I Karta** (53a) has grammatical subject properties. Thus it is a grammatical subject, while the 'agent' NP is an oblique. The argument NP to which a grammatical relation has not been assigned is the 'patient' NP **pipise** in this example. The same problem also arises if a grammatical relation is to be assigned to the 'recipient' NP **I Karta** in (53b).

7. Conclusion

It has been shown in the previous discussions that the preverbal NP of the following constructions behave like a grammatical subject.

- (54) a. **Ia ngeling.**
 3rd cry
 'S/he cried'
- b. **Cicinge beli tiang.**
 dog:def buy 1st
 'I bought the dog'
- c. **Ia ngematiang emenge.**
 3rd N-kill cat :def
 'S/he killed the cat'
- d. **Emenge matianga baan ia.**
 cat:def kill:pass by 3rd
 'The cat was killed by her/him'

The sentence in (54a) is an intransitive sentence, while in (54b) and (54c), it is a transitive one. The verb form in (54b) is a basic verb, while in (54c) it is a nasal verb. The word order in (54b) is Patient-Verb Agent, whereas the word order in (54c) is Agent-Verb-Patient. In this case Balinese has two types of subject : 'patient' subject as in (54b) and 'agent' subject as in (54c). The sentence in (54d) is the corresponding passive construction of the sentence in (54c). This explanation suggests that it is justifiable to talk about the notion of (surface) subject in Balinese.

In addition to the traditional terms 'subject' and 'object', one may find in the literature the following symbols:

- S** intransitive subject
A transitive subject
P transitive object

With respect to the exploitation of these three symbols for syntactic purposes, English is claimed to treat S and A alike, and differently from P, thus 'subject' in English means S or A. But a different situation could be found in Dyirbal. In this language S and P (or 0 in Dixon's terms) are treated alike in case marking, for certain rules of co-reference and in relativisation. Thus Dyirbal treats S and P alike, as opposed to A, so that in this language the appropriate grammatical relation is one that groups S and P together. Thus 'subject' in Dyirbal means S or P (see Comrie 1981:100-107).

If the relations S, A, and 0 are applied to Balinese sentence structures, we obtain the following description.

- (55) **Ia malaib.**
 3rd run
 ‘S/he runs’
- (56) **I Karta jagur cai.**
 art Karta hit 2nd
 ‘You hit Karta’
- (57) **I Karta maca buku.**
 art Karta N-read book
 ‘Karta read a book’

The sentence in (55) is an intransitive construction, while the sentences in (56) and (57) are transitive sentences. The verb form in the sentence (56) is basic verb, while the verb in (57) is a nasal verb. If these sentences are to be analysed in terms of S, A, and O, we obtain the following comparison.

- | | | | |
|------|----------------|-------------|----------------|
| (58) | S | Verb | |
| (59) | <u>Patient</u> | Verb | <u>Agent</u> |
| | O | Verb | A |
| (60) | <u>Agent</u> | Verb | <u>Patient</u> |
| | A | Verb | O |

This comparison shows that Balinese has two different treatments of O and A. The O in (59) has been shown to have grammatical subject properties, and the O in (60) does not have these subject properties, but it behaves like a direct object. The A in (60) has ‘semantic’ and grammatical subject properties, but the A in (59) only has a ‘semantic’ subject property. This NP argument behaves like an oblique.

With respect to the argument NPs of intransitive and transitive verbs, Comrie (1981:109) notes as follows:

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.

Looking at the two Balinese transitive constructions in terms of this point of view, it could be identified that this language could group S and A, as well as S and P(O) together.

With respect to the possibility of combining two clauses in Balinese, it is possible to say that any two clauses can be combined in this language. However, there may be some constraints on the possibility of deleting two coreferential NPs. This depends on the syntactic function of the two coreferential NPs. In addition to the two types of transitive construction that Balinese has: nasal and basic verb transitive construction, this language also has a derived intransitive construction (passive). The examples below (61-65) illustrates the possibility of the combination of the three types of clause: intransitive, nasal transitive, and passive and the grouping of S and A.

- (61) **Ia teka mai lantasi ngeling.**
 3rd come here then cry
 ‘S/he came here and cried’

- (62) **Ia teka mai lantas Ø tundunga baan memenne.**
 3rd come here then chase away:pass by mother:poss
 ‘S/he came here and was chased away by her mother’
- (63) **Ia teka rnai lantas memene nundung ia.**
 3rd come here then mother:poss N-chase away 3rd
 ‘S/he came here and her mother chased her/him away’
- (64) **Ia teka mai lantas Ø nundung memenne.**
 3rd come here then N-chase away mother:poss
 ‘S/he came here and chased her mother away’
- (65) **Tiang meli buku lantas Ø opaka teken ia.**
 1st N-buy book then scold:pass by 3rd
 ‘I bought a book and (I) was scolded by her/him’

The above examples show that the omission of the coreferential NPs is straightforward, that is, no syntactic derivation is required if the two common NPs are in S or A function in each clause as in (61), and (64). But when the common NP is in O function in one clause, that clause must be passivised for NP omission to be allowed as in (62), and (65). Thus passivisation is needed as a feeding pivot for coreferential deletion.

The following examples show the combination of intransitive, nasal transitive clause and basic verb constructions in which the S and O are grouped together.

- (66) **Ia teka rnai lantas Ø tundung cal.**
 3rd come here then chase away 2nd
 ‘S/he came here then you chased her/him away’
- (67) **Umahe ento beli cai lantas Ø adep cai bum.**
 house:def that buy 2nd then sell 2nd again
 ‘You bought the house then you sold it again’
- (68) **Nyai ngaba buku lantas Ø ejang nyal ditu.**
 2nd N-bring book then put 2nd there
 ‘You brought a book then you put it there’
- (69) **Cai ngaba be lantas Ø goreng tiang.**
 2nd N-bring fish then fry 1st
 ‘You brought some fish then I fried them’

Note that the first clause in (66) is intransitive and the second one is transitive with a basic verb. The S is coreferential with the O of the second clause. This O is omissible. In (67) both clauses are transitive and the O and A in both clauses are coreferential. Only the O in the second clause can be omitted, but the A is not omissible. In (68) both clauses are also transitive, but the first clause occurs with a nasal verb, while the second one with a basic verb. Both the A and O are coreferential. It is only possible to omit the O of the second clause. In (69) the first clause occurs with a nasal verb, while the second clause is basic verb construction. There is only one common NP in this combination, that is, the O of the first clause is coreferential with the O of the second clause. The O in the second clause is omissible. These examples show that no syntactic derivation is needed to allow the omission of the coreferential NP in the second clause. These also show the grouping of S and O together in terms of coreferential deletion. Balinese is thus neither ‘accusative’ nor ‘ergative’ since it has the characteristics of both the accusative and ergative syntax.

If a basic verb construction is compared with an intransitive one, it suggests an ergative pattern. But although the basic verb construction is morphologically unmarked, it is somewhat restricted in discourse or pragmatic terms. It is common with first and second person agents. Probably the nasal verb construction is unmarked from a discourse point of view. Thus, this language is ambivalent. This is in line with the comments made in the literature which suggest that it is rather misleading to speak of an accusative as opposed to an ergative language since there is no language which is fully accusative or ergative (see Comrie 1978:337 and Verhaar 1987).

REFERENCES

- Anderson, S. 1976. On the notion of Subject in Ergative languages. In Li, C.N. (ed.) *Subject and Topic*, 1-23. New York: Academic Press.
- Blake, B.J. 1976. On ergativity and the notion of Subject: some Australian cases. *Lingua* 39:281-300.
- Blake, B.J. 1990. *Relational Grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Chung, S. 1976. On the subject of two passives in Indonesian. In Li, C.N. (ed.) *Subject and Topic*, 57-98. New York: Academic Press.
- Comrie, B. 1978. Ergativity. In Lehman, W.D. (ed.) *Syntactic Typology: studies in the phenomenology of language*, 329-354. Austin: The University of Texas.
- Comrie, B. 1981. *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Cumming, S. & Wouk, F. 1987. Is there 'Discourse Ergativity' in Austronesian languages? *Lingua* 77:271-296.
- Dixon, R.M.W. 1979. Ergativity. *Language* 55: 59-138.
- Dixon, R.M.W. 1987. Studies in ergativity: introduction. *Lingua* 77:1-15.
- Dixon, R.M.W. 1989. Subject and Object in Universal Grammar. In Arnold, D., Atkinson M., Durand, J., Grover, C., & Sadler, L. (eds). *Essays on Grammatical Theory and Universal Grammar*, 91-118 Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dune, M. 1988. The So-called Passive of Acehnese. *Language* 64:104-113.
- Gary, J. & Keenan, E. 1977. On collapsing grammatical relations in Universal Grammar. In Cole, P. & Sadock, J. (eds). *Syntax and Semantics 8: Grammatical Relations*. New York Academic Press.
- Givón, T. 1990. *Syntax: afunctional-typological introduction Volume II*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins
- Kersten, J. 1984. *Bahasa Bali*. (Balinese Language), Ende: Nusa Indah.
- Mallinson, G. & Blake, B.J. 1981. *Language Typology: cross-linguistic studies on syntax*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Oka Granoka, I.W., Udara Naryana, I.B., Jendra, I.W., Medra, I.N., PutraYasa, I.G.N.
- Bawa, I.W. 1985. *Tata Bahasa Bali*. (a grammar of Balinese) Denpasar: Proyyek Pengembangan Bahasa dan Sastra Indonesia dan Daerah Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan (manuscript).
- Siewierska, A. 1984. *The Passive: a comparative linguistic analysis*. London: Crook Helm.
- Verhaar, J.W.M. 1978. Some notes on the verbal passive in Indonesian. NUSA, *Linguistic Studies of Indonesian and other Languages in Indonesia*. 19:11-19.
- Verhaar, J.W.M. (ed.) 1984. Towards a description of contemporary Indonesian: preliminary studies Part II. NUSA, *Linguistic Studies of Indonesian and other Languages in Indonesia*. Volume 19.
- Verhaar, J.W.M. 1987. Syntactic ergativity in contemporary Indonesian. In MacGinn, R. (ed.) *Proceedings of the Third Eastern Conference on Austronesian Languages*, 473-3 84. Athens: Ohio University.