

BALINESE GRAMMAR AND DISCOURSE

Ketut Artawa (Udayana University), Putu Artini (STKIP, Singaraja)
and Barry J. Blake (La Trobe University)¹

Introduction

This study builds on earlier work by Artawa (1994) and Artawa and Blake (1997). It differs from the earlier work in that it is based on text and it seeks to identify factors that influence the choice of one construction rather than another; in particular, it seeks to find the principles that underlie the choice between the two major constructions for transitive verbs, an unmarked one in which the Patient is chosen as subject, and a construction with a nasal-prefixed verb where the Agent is chosen as subject. The corpus consists of 250 pages of contemporary conversational material plus 30 pages of traditional narrative. Balinese is well known for its speech levels which differ greatly in lexicon, including function words, but little in morpho-syntax. Most of the conversational material used here is low level, but some of it is high. The predominantly high material comes from impromptu plays where actors are given parts and an outline story but no text. The stories contain both low and high level forms. No account is taken of level in this paper.

1. Grammar

1.1 Basic constructions

The majority of two-place verbs can appear in any of four constructions, the choice being marked by a system of verbal prefixes. Two constructions predominate. In one the verb is unmarked and the Patient is chosen as subject; in the other the verb is marked by a nasal prefix and the Agent (or Actor) is chosen as subject. Patient and Agent are macroroles. Patient covers not only the affected patient of verbs like *break* and *smash*, but also the neutral or unaffected entity found with verbs like *love* or *see*. Agent covers not only the agent of *break* and *smash*, but also the experiencer of *love* and the perceiver of *see*.

We shall deal with the two major constructions first. The unmarked construction, which we will refer to as the 0-construction is illustrated in (1). The Patient precedes the verb and the Agent follows, though, as we shall see later, the order Verb-Agent-Patient is also common. The construction with the nasal prefix, which we shall refer to as the N-construction, is illustrated in (2). The Agent precedes the verb and the Patient follows. For most stems the nasal appears as **ng** before a vowel or other sonorant. With obstruent-initial stems a homorganic nasal replaces the obstruent.²

- (1) *Ida Dalem sengkalen cai*
Ida Dalem harm you
'You are destroying Ida Dalem.' (C62)

¹ This paper derives from work supported by an ARC grant to P. Austin, B. Blake and M. Florey. K. Artawa and P. Artini were associate investigators. The authors would like to thank Wayan Puja Astawa, Putu Sukmaantara and Nurachman Hanafi for their help with data; also the following for their useful comments: Wayan Arka, Peter Austin, Gede Budiassa, Adrian Clynes, Dieter Wunderlich and Jae Jung Song. Some data was also supplied by Wayan Suarnajaya, who acted as consultant for the field methods class at La Trobe during first semester 1999.

None of these should be held responsible for the interpretation offered here nor for any errors that remain undetected.

² In presenting examples we shall give the reference to where the example is to be found in our corpus at the right of the translation. In these references C stands for 'conversation' and S for 'story'. Examples without such a reference are made up, albeit by native speakers, unless attributed to another source in the text.

- (2) *I rage nyengkalen Ida Dalem*
 we n-harm³ Ida Dalem
 ‘We are destroying Ida Dalem.’ (C62)

There is also an alternation between 0- and N- with one-place verbs. This is lexically determined. Verbs with a Patient subject, in common with non-verbal predicates, take no prefix, while verbs with an Agent subject take the nasal prefix. This generalisation holds for over 90% of one-place verbs. However, there are a few unmarked verbs that appear to have Agent subjects. These include **kayeh** ‘to bathe’ and also **mai** ‘to come’ and some other verbs of motion, which can take an Agent or Patient argument and which some languages treat as belonging with the Patient group. Conversely there are a few nasal intransitives that seem to have Patient subjects. Examples include **nglenting** ‘to dangle’ and **ngetel** (<**ketel**) ‘to drip’.⁴ This suggests that the language shows evidence of what would be described as an unaccusative-unergative split in some of the recent theoretical literature, where unaccusatives are described as having underlying object arguments and unergatives as having underlying subject arguments (Perlmutter and Postal 1983). However, this split does not appear in the grammar except in the distribution of the nasal prefix. An unmarked intransitive verb is illustrated in (3) and a nasal intransitive verb in (4).

- (3) *...lantas ia budal*
 ...then 3 go.home
 ‘...then he goes home.’ (S10)
- (4) *Gelah jani lakar ngapuriang⁵ malu*
 I now will N-palace.enter first
 ‘Now I’ll go into the palace.’ (C79)

The three-place verb, *baang* ‘to give’ may appear in the 0-construction (5) (6) or the N-construction (7). In the 0-construction either the Patient (5) or the Recipient (6) may appear before the verb in what we take to be the subject relation (see below).

- (5) *Apa baang bapa cening*
 what give father you
 ‘What [shall] I give you?’ (father speaking) (S23)
- (6) *Cening baang bapa manik*
 you give father magic.stone
 ‘I [will] give you magic stones.’
- (7) *Bapa maang cening manik*
 father N-give you magic.stone
 ‘I [will] give you magic stones.’ (S6)

For most two- or three-place verbs arguments are not marked to show the grammatical relation they bear (see (1), (2), (5), (6) and (7)). We shall refer to these verbs as transitive,

³ The nasal prefix is shown as N- in the gloss. Derivational suffixes are not glossed separately from the root where this is not relevant.

⁴ Clynes 1995, chapter 12, suggests that some verbs such as **ketel** ‘to drip’ are conceptualised as involving an entity that initiates the action, but he lists a few verbs such as **ng-ilis** ‘to be clearly visible’ where an actor interpretation is unlikely. Arka 1998 and pers. comm. argues that the split is ‘fairly systematic’, and he points out that **nglenting** and **ngetel** are manner of motion predicates and as such can be expected to be unergative.

⁵ The root **puri** is ‘palace’, **mapuri** is ‘to live in a palace’ and **mapuriang** ‘to take up residence in a palace’.

though, as appears below, this is not beyond challenge. There are also two-place verbs with one argument encoded by a prepositional phrase. We shall call these two-place intransitives. They include **tresna** ‘to love’, **inget** ‘to remember’ and **demen** ‘to like’, which is illustrated in (8).

- (8) *Cerik-cerik jani lebih sing demen teken jaja roti*
 children now more NEG like with cake
 ‘Children today more and more do not like cakes.’ (C4)

Some three-place verbs take a prepositional complement (9). The verb **aturang** in (9) means something like ‘to present’ and in conjunction with **puri** ‘palace’ means ‘take and present to the king’.

- (9) *Buin maninne semengan I Rareangon ka puri*
 next morning early Rareangon to palace
ngaturang I Lubangkuri
 N-take Lubangkuri
 ‘Early next morning Rareangon takes Lubangkuri to the palace.’ (S9)

Some three-place verbs behave like English give and allow the recipient to be encoded in a prepositional phrase or as a noun phrase. In our material baang does not allow a prepositional complement, but for some speakers such a complement is possible. Hunter (1988: 340) gives *I bapa maang pipis teken Made* ‘Father gives money to Made’ where the preposition *teken* ‘to’ marks the recipient. There are also numerous derived three-place verbs. Some examples are given in section 1.3. We should add that in general arguments are encoded as noun phrases and non-arguments as prepositional phrases.

In presenting examples up to this point we have referred to the preverbal NP as the subject. This is on the assumption that there is a subject and that the sole argument of an intransitive predicate bears the subject relation. The identification of an argument of a two- or three-place verb as subject would appear to be based on preverbal position. However, word order is not always as in the examples given so far. The order Verb-Agent-Patient is common in the 0-construction and it is particularly common in traditional narrative.⁶ However, the Patient (P) of the 0-construction and the Agent (A) of the N-construction can be identified with one another and with the sole argument (S) of an intransitive predicate in terms of constituency.⁷ The 0-construction has the constituency shown in (11) and the N-construction has the constituency shown in (12).

- (10) S V
 (11) P [V A], [V A] P
 (12) A [V P]

The principal evidence is that the V A sequence in the 0-construction is inviolable, while modal and other particles may be freely inserted between the P and the V A sequence (see

⁶ Details appear in section 2.5 below. See also (38).

⁷ The entities S, A and O were introduced in Dixon 1972 as pre-theoretical and have become widely used, often with the substitution of P for O. Recently they have come in for some criticism because S conflates an Agent-like entity that can be identified with A and a Patient-like identity that can be identified with O/P. There is another problem in that Dixon’s original definitions and most others assume transitivity, but transitivity is not something that can be assumed and this is nowhere clearer than in languages like Balinese. In this paper we begin with Agent and Patient used irrespective of transitivity and then introduce S, A and P where A and P refer both to the 0-construction and N-construction, constructions with two (in some cases three) NP arguments, constructions which we ultimately take to be transitive.

(13) below). Essentially the same applies to the nasal construction, though some particles and adverbs can be inserted between the verb and P provided P is definite (see below).

Given that S, P (in the 0-construction) and A (in the N-construction) can be identified, what justification is there for taking them to be subject? Besides the obvious fact that we would expect S to be subject by default, we find the putative subject has a number of grammatical privileges usually associated with subject. It alone can be raised to a higher predicate. Only the putative subject can be a zero whose reference is controlled by the argument of a higher predicate as in a sentence like *I want to come* where the missing subject of *come* is controlled by the subject of *want* (see section 2.2). Only the putative subject can be relativised (see section 2.3 below).⁸

The presence of the 0-construction and the N-construction raises interesting questions about the syntactic type of the language. Is the language typologically unusual in having two transitive constructions? Or is the 0-construction with its Patient subject a passive? Or is the N-construction some kind of two-place intransitive, an antipassive, for instance?

If the 0-construction is passive (and the N-construction transitive), then the language is an accusative one in which the Agent of a transitive verb is identified with the sole argument of an intransitive predicate. However, we can fairly easily dismiss any idea that the 0-construction as illustrated in (1) is passive. First of all, it is unmarked, and secondly, the Agent is represented as core (NP) not as non-core (PP). From the discourse point of view a passive interpretation would be suspicious since the 0-construction has high frequency, the Agent is often pronominal, and the Agent is often 'given' as opposed to 'new'. Most telling is the grammatical requirement that the Agent argument be present. It need not be overt, but it must be present. If it is not overt, it will be interpreted as first or second person, since a third person agent must be overt (see (18), (19) and (20) below).⁹ The A of the 0-construction is a complement and could be identified structurally with the P complement of the N-construction as an object.

We take the 0-construction to be transitive and since the Patient is the subject, we have an ergative construction. It does not follow from this that the language is ergative. For that to be true the N-construction would have to be intransitive. One of the functions of the N-construction is to express an indefinite Patient. With an indefinite Patient there is less semantic transitivity (in the sense of Hopper and Thompson 1980) than with a definite Patient, so this raises the possibility that the construction is intransitive, some kind of detransitivised construction. However, the nasal construction is used for a definite Patient (as in (2)) and it is difficult to find evidence that the construction is in fact intransitive. Significantly the Patient is represented as core (NP) not as peripheral (PP). Arka 1998 and Arka and Wechsler 1988 show that the Patient behaves syntactically like a term or core argument. For instance, Wechsler and Arka point out that only terms can launch a quantifier and that the Patient in the nasal construction can float a quantifier. This is evidence that the nasal construction is not antipassive (1998: 405).

Our conclusion is that there are two transitive constructions and that the language is neither ergative nor accusative. However, the high frequency of the 0-construction with its Patient subject and obligatory Agent give the language a decidedly ergative character as we shall see below. It is significant that the Patient-subject construction is unmarked. One could take the

⁸ See Artawa 1994:18ff and Arka 1998 for details. Locations can be relativised too but only by a different strategy, namely that of using **tongos** 'place' (Clynes p.c.)

⁹ Besides in complement clauses where the subject must be overt the subject can be covert in any construction as can an object (see (38)). The only core argument that must be overt is the third person Agent in the 0-construction.

language to be ergative under an amended definition of an ergative language along the lines of ‘an ergative language is one in which the Patient of the unmarked transitive construction is aligned with the sole argument of a transitive verb.’

Up to this point we have argued that the P in the 0-construction and the A in the N-construction are subjects because they are identified with S and share a number of properties frequently associated with subjects. We also argued that there are two transitive constructions. This is problematic for the notion of subject for the following reason: in the classical languages where the notion of subject originated and in modern European languages like English A and S share a number of properties exclusively such as nominative case and control of agreement. In some languages such as the north-east Caucasian language Avar P and S share these grammatical properties. One could take the view that subject is a grammatical concept and that P rather than A is the subject of a transitive verb in Avar. However, there are languages like the Australian language Warlpiri where S and A share a common representation in the agreement system but where P and S are united in the case system (They appear unmarked while A bears the ergative case). Mixtures like this make it impossible to take subject to be simply based on whatever is united with S. Most linguists take the term ‘subject’ to refer to any conjunction of S plus A in a particular morpho-syntactic system, and many use the term ‘absolutive’ for a conjunction of P and S. This is our practice too, but note that in Bali the entity we are calling subject embraces P in one transitive construction (the 0-construction) and A in the other transitive construction (the N-construction).

Clynes (1995) presents a somewhat different analysis of Balinese from ours. The construction illustrated in (1) is used only where the Agent is a pronoun (13), a kinship noun referring to the speaker (14) or addressee, a generic noun (15) (16) or an indefinite noun (17).

- (13) *Ida Dalem lakar sengkalen cai*
 Ida Dalem will destroy you
 ‘Are you going to destroy Ida Dalem?’ (C61)
- (14) *Apa baang dadong cening*
 what give grandmother you
 ‘What [shall] I give you?’ (grandmother speaking) (S23)
- (15) *Ia ejuk polisi*
 3 catch police
 ‘S/he was caught by the police.’ (Artawa 1994:15)
- (16) *Nyama-ne mati sander krebek*
 sibling-3POSS die strike lightning
 ‘His/her brother/sister is dead, struck by lightning.’
- (17) *I meme gugut lelipi-gadang*
 Mother bite snake-green
 ‘Mother was bitten by a green snake.’

If the Agent is a definite third person, a special third person Agent clitic form =(n)a is used and if further specification is required, it is supplied by means of a prepositional adjunct phrase specifying the Agent (18), (19) and (20).¹⁰

¹⁰ The form =na is used after a vowel-final stem and =a after a consonant-final stem. On comparative grounds it is likely the basic form is na. See, for instance, Hunter 1988:230.

- (18) *I raga lakar pisuhin=a tekening odah-odah I raga-ne*
 we will curse=3 with ancestors we-POSS
 ‘Our ancestors will curse us.’ (C60)
- (19) *Tunden=a magedi teken pak lurah*
 order=3 go.away with PAK chief
 ‘He was ordered to leave by the village chief.’ (C11)
- (20) *Tigtig=a lantas I Bawang teken meme-ne*
 beat=3 then Bawang by mother-3POSS
 ‘Then Bawang was beaten by her mother.’ (S20)

Clynes points out that sequences of verb and Agent (as in (13) to (17)) are pronounced as a single phonological word (Clynes 1995: 191). He claims that the Agent is a clitic or that it is incorporated in the verb.¹¹ This leads him to interpret the 0-construction as formally intransitive, although he recognises that it is semantically transitive. Under Clynes’ interpretation it is still true that the Agent of a transitive verb is singled out for special treatment, but the interpretation he offers makes it difficult to characterise the 0-construction as ergative since an ergative interpretation depends on there being a transitive construction. We do not accept this interpretation. We do not see that the Agent is incorporated, certainly not in the sense that it is in English adjectives such as moth-eaten or fly-blown; rather we see the expression of the Agent as analogous to subject clitics in French.¹²

Examples of the 0-construction containing an adjunct prepositional phrase are interesting with respect to the ergative-passive distinction. Obviously the optional nature of the prepositional phrase representing the A is reminiscent of a passive; on the other hand the A is obligatory in the sense that if the prepositional phrase is omitted, the bound pronominal form =(n)a must remain. The A of the 0-construction can bind a reflexive anaphor, but Arka (1998: 374ff) and Wechsler and Arka (1998: 431-4) argue that this is not possible if a prepositional Agent phrase is included. This is illustrated in the following example (Arka 1998: 375).

- (21) *Anak-e cenik ento edengin=a awakne di*
 person-DEF small that show=3 self at
- kaca-ne (teken ia)*
 mirror-DEF (by him)
- ‘He showed the child himself in the mirror.’

Consider first the version where the **teken**-phrase is not present. The enclitic =(n)a can control the reflexive anaphor to give a reading, ‘The person_i showed the child his_i/her_i self in the mirror’ alongside a reading where the Patient controls the reflexive, ‘The person showed the child the child’s self in the mirror.’ However, if the **teken**-phrase is included, only the latter reading is possible. Since only a core argument can control a core reflexive form, the failure of the control would suggest that the prepositional phrase rather than the bound pronominal form represents the argument and that the control is not possible because the Agent is not a core argument. It would mean that the bound pronominal form is an agreement marker only and that the construction

¹¹ Clynes uses the term ‘clitic’ in his dissertation, but in personal communication suggests ‘incorporation’.

¹² Wechsler and Arka (1998: 401) reject Clynes’ analysis pointing out that the Agent can be complex. Barber claims that where the Agent is ‘short’ it may be represented by an NP (in addition to =(n)a) rather than a PP (1977: 206, 221).

should be interpreted as a passive. The passive would be unusual in that it is the Agent phrase that controls agreement. Such a phenomenon is not unknown in Western Malayo-Polynesian languages. It occurs in Sundanese, for instance.¹³

With the N-construction Clynes 1995 takes those with a definite Patient to be transitive, and to be the only surface transitive construction in the language, and those with indefinite Patients to be intransitive. When the Patient is indefinite it is more strongly bonded to the verb than when it is definite in that no particles or adverbs can be inserted between the verb and Patient, and, according to Clynes, the sequence of verb and indefinite Patient is pronounced as one phonological word. This suggests to Clynes that the Patient is incorporated into the verb. Compare the following imperatives where the emphatic clitic *ja* comes between the verb and a definite Patient (22a), but cannot interrupt the sequence of verb and indefinite Patient (22b) (Clynes 1995: 195f).

- (22) a. *Baca ja buku-ne*
 read EMPH book-DEF
 'Read the book!'
- b. ??*Maca ja buku*
 N-read EMPH book
 'Read books!'
- c. *Maca buku*
 N-read book
 'Read books!'¹⁴

Arka 1998 also notes the closer bond between an indefinite Patient and a nasal verb by demonstrating that the sequence resists the insertion of a sentence adverb (Arka 1998:122):

- (23)a. *Tiang sane sampun numbas dibi montor ipun-e*
 I REL already N-buy yesterday motor-bike 3-DEF
 'It is I who bought his/her motor-bike yesterday.'
- b. ?**Tiang sane sampun numbas dibi montor*
 I REL already N-buy yesterday motor-bike
 'It is I who bought a motor-bike yesterday.'

¹³ In our corpus and in the material used by Hunter (1988) $=(\mathbf{n})\mathbf{a}$ occurs only with the third person Agent, but in archaic and literary Balinese examples can be found where $=(\mathbf{n})\mathbf{a}$ is used with a preposed first or second person Agent. Barber (1977: 219, 269) gives the following:

- (i) *Tiang upah-in-a pipis siu.*
 I pay-AD-? money 1000
 'I will pay him a thousand.'

Without further information it is difficult to ascertain the grammatical status of the preposed Agent and to interpret the construction. In the speech of Wayan Suarnajaya $=(\mathbf{n})\mathbf{a}$ can be used with a first or second person Agent:

- (ii) *Buku-ne ento suba baca=na teken tiang.*
 book-DEF that PERF read=? by I
 'The book has been read by me.'

Here $=\mathbf{na}$ appears to be a passive marker. It remains for future research to determine who exhibits the usage illustrated in (ii) and to see if it represents an innovation.

¹⁴ In the imperative the unmarked verb is used with a definite P and the nasal verb with an indefinite P. The unmarked verb is also used with applicative verbs (see section 1.3) where a definite recipient or beneficiary is advanced to subject: **Alihang gelahe macan** 'Find me a tiger!' (S10).

However, Arka does not relate the difference to a difference in transitivity, but to a difference in structure. He takes the sequence of verb and indefinite Patient to be a VP, but not the sequence of verb and definite Patient. Without agreeing with this particular analysis we might compare English sentences such as *He washes dishes* where the verb-Patient sequence cannot be interrupted, though this is normally possible with verbs and their objects: *She missed forever the smell of the highlands in summer.*¹⁵ We take the N-construction to be transitive and we recognise that an indefinite Patient may be more tightly bonded to the verb than a definite one.

1.2 Other constructions

To complete the picture it must be added there are two other constructions in which a basically transitive verb can appear. The verb may appear with a Patient subject and be marked by a *ka-* prefix. In this construction the Agent may be represented by an NP (24), a prepositional phrase (25), (26), or it may be covert (27), (28). The Agent may also be absent (29), (30), i.e. removed altogether from the valency or argument structure. The special clitic =*(n)a*, which appears with the 0-construction, cannot be used with the *ka-*construction.

- (24) ...*lantas ia ngipi ka-turunan betara*
 ...then 3 N-dream KA-visit betara
 '...then he dreamt that a god visited him.' (S3)
- (25) *Bapan awake ka-mati-ang baan bapane I Tangkas*
 father I KA-die-cause by father-3POSS I Tangkas
 'My father was killed by Tangkas' father.' (C63)
- (26) *I Rareangon k(a)-adegang agung baan panjak-e*
 I Rareangon KA-enthroned king by people-DEF
 'I Rareangon was enthroned as king by the people.' (C14)
- (27) *Ake ngelah. Ia ka-baang ngidih*
 I N-have 3SG KA-give get
 'It was mine. I gave it to her'. (C27)
- (28) *Tiang tunden toh. Ka-tunden ngejang celana-n-ne*
 I ask ? KA-ask N-put pants-LIG-3POSS

dogen di wang
 only at outside
 'Don't ask me! [I'm] asked to put his pants outside.' (C5)
- (29) *Dumun dusta durjanane ka-banggayang kewanten*
 in.the.past thief criminal KA-allow only
 'In the past criminals were allowed [to live].' (C70)
- (30) *Yan tiang tuara nyidaang, tiang pacang ka-pademang*
 if I not succeed I will KA-kill
 'If I don't succeed, I will be killed.' (S5)

The **ka**-construction in which the Agent is represented by a noun phrase, as in (24) is rare (Clynes p.c.). On the other hand it occurs frequently with first and second person Agents,

¹⁵ This example is quoted from an autobiographical sketch by La Trobe history professor John Salmond. In English where the Patient is indefinite, more so where it is non-specific or where the proposition refers to characteristic activity the bond between verb and Patient is progressively stronger.

though these are often covert. The other **ka**-construction, where the Agent is represented by an adjunct prepositional phrase or where no Agent is present, not even covertly, is intransitive and should be considered passive.

There is also a **ma**-construction derived from transitive verbs (not to be confused with the use of **ma**- with other classes of stem) in which the Patient appears as subject and the Agent is deleted from the argument structure. This is a derived one-place stative passive.

- (31) *Ma-kancing jelanan-ne*
 pass-lock door-DEF
 'The door is locked.' (C7)

Summing up the Patient-subject constructions we have the following:

- 0-construction: Agent obligatory (a) ergative construction with NP Agent
 (b) passive construction with PP Agent
- ka**-construction: Agent optional (a) ergative construction with NP Agent
 (b) passive with optional PP Agent
- ma**-construction: Agent eliminated passive with no provision for Agent

1.3 Advancements

Like other western Malayo-Polynesian languages Balinese allows for some non-core participants to find alternative expression with the same status as a Patient of a transitive verb. These 'advancements', as they are called in Relational Grammar (Perlmutter and Postal 1983), or applicative constructions are marked by verbal suffixes, **-ang** for beneficiaries and **-in** for locatives and the prepositional complement of verbs such as **demen** 'to like'. The suffix **-ang** also functions as a causative, as does **-in** to some extent. In Relational Grammar these derivations would be classified as 'advancements to direct object', but in light of the fact that the Patient appears as the subject in the unmarked two-place construction, this is not appropriate. These advancements to core status are compatible with the 0-, N-, **ka**- and **ma**- (passive) constructions, hence our description of them as finding alternative expression with the same status as Patient. In other words the advancee can appear as a subject of a 0-construction or a **ka**- or **ma**-construction, or as the object of a N-construction.

In (32a) the verb **demen** 'to like' is illustrated. It is a two-place intransitive that takes a complement marked by a preposition such as **ajak**, as in (32a), or **teken**. In (32b) we have a derived transitive verb with the object of affection treated like a Patient and encoded as subject in the 0-construction. The derivation is marked by **-in** glossed as AD(vancement).

- (32)a. *Tiang demen gati ajak rok-e*
 I like much with dress-DEF
 'I like the dress.' (C29)
- b. *Rok-e demen-in tiang.*
 dress-DEF like-AD I
 'I like the dress.'

In some cases the advancement involves an extra sense of affectedness. For example, the root **tegak** 'sit' can appear as an intransitive nasal verb with a prepositional complement marked by the locative preposition **di**, but **tegak-in** can mean 'to ride' as in **tegak-in=a macan-e** 'He rode the tiger.' (S11).

The suffix **-ang** used as a causative is illustrated in (33) (Artawa 1994: 62).

- (33) a. *Ia tegak-ang tiang*
 3 sit-CAUS I
 'I made him/her sit down.'
- b. *Tiang negak-ang ia*
 I N-sit-CAUS 3
 'I made him/her sit down.'

The applicative use is illustrated in (34b) and (34c). The base verb is *beli*, a two-place transitive. This is illustrated in (34a). In (34b) the beneficiary has been introduced into the valency and encoded as subject. The Patient is represented by zero. In (34c) the grammatical relations are the same, but the beneficiary subject is covert and the Patient expressed as a postverbal complement. This derivation is obligatory for beneficiaries. They cannot be expressed via a prepositional phrase.

- (34) a. *Jaja wafer ento beli=na*
 cake wafer that buy=3
 'They buy those wafer cakes.' (C5)
- b. *Panak-e beli-ang=a*
 child-DEF buy-AD=3
 'They buy the child [cakes].' (C9)
- c. *Beli-ang=a baas*
 buy-AD=3 rice
 'They buy [him] rice.' (C2)

The following example combines the derivations illustrated in (32) and (34). The main verb is *beli-ang=a*. Both the Patient and beneficiary are overt. The Patient has been encoded as subject. It consists of a noun plus modifying relative clause. Only subjects can be relativised in Balinese and the *-in* derivation serves to make the otherwise prepositional complement a subject in a 0-construction and therefore available for relativisation (see also section 2.3).

- (35) *Dedaaran-e [ane sing demen-in=a] dogen beli-ang=a panak-ne*
 food-DEF REL not like-AD=3 only buy-AD=3 child-3POSS
 'Only the food that he does not like they buy for their child.' (C5)

2. Discourse

2.1 Clauses in isolation

Given that there are two apparently transitive constructions, the question arises of what factors determine or at least influence the choice. Let us begin by considering indicative clauses in isolation. The principal determinant is the identifiability of the Patient. If the Patient is non-specific or generic or just indefinite, the N-construction is used. In (36) the Patient, **timpal**, is specific (=Soraya), but indefinite. It is not identifiable at the time it is mentioned. It is only after the next sentence that it becomes clear that the Patient is specific.

- (36) *Iyang ngelah timpal. Kenal ajak Soraya*
 I N-have friend know with Soraya
 'I have a friend. Do you know Soraya?' (C24)

Other examples include **meli baas** 'buy rice' (C2), **ngalih pembantu** 'to look for a helper' (C6), **meli lumpia** 'buy spring rolls' (C8), **ngelah dedaaran** 'to have food' (C9), **ngalih utang** 'borrow money' (C14), **ngalih pengalaman** 'to look for experience' (C21), **ngelah baju** 'to

have clothes' (C27), **ngaba baju ketat** (bring tight clothes) 'to have tight clothes [to sell]' (C29, **sing ngalih bati** 'not looking for profit' (C30) and **ngajin agama** 'to teach religion' (C192).

In the following example the nasal construction is used in the first clause where the Patient is indefinite, but the 0-construction is used in the second clause where the same Patient is now definite, represented by an anaphoric zero.

- (37) ...*lantas ia nyalud yeh aba=na mulih*
 ...then 3 N-scoop water bring=3 go.home
 '...then she scoops up some water and takes it home.' (S19)

The following is an extended example illustrating the alternation based on the definiteness of the Patient. In each of three parallel instances, the hero, Rareangon, sees something new and therefore indefinite ('tiger', 'snake', 'giant'). This is expressed in a nasal construction. On each occasion he then throws some form of magic at the subsequently definite entity. This is expressed in an 0-construction.

- (38) *Majalan lantas I Rareangon ngaba manik liu pesan*
 walk then Rareangon n-take magic lot very
Suba neked di bongkol gununge nepukin lantas ia
 after arrive at foot mountain-def n-see then 3
macan magereng entungin=alantas manik sesirep
 tiger roar throw.at then magic sleep
Pules lantas macan-e makejang buin majalan ia ngamenekang
 sleep then tiger-def all again walk 3 go.up
nepukin kone ia lelipi gede-gede, entungin=a lantas
 n-see it.is.said 3 snake big throw.at=3 then
manik sesirep
 magic sleep
Pules lelipi-ne makejang tau duur nepukin kone I Rareangon
 sleep snake-def all at top n-see it.is.said Rareangon
rangsasa dadua luh muani, entungin=a manik sesirep,
 giant two female male throw.at=3 magic sleep
pules lantas rangsasa-ne makadadua
 sleep then giant-def both

'Then Rareangon goes off taking various forms of magic. When he reaches the foot of the mountain, he sees tigers roaring. Then he throws the sleeping magic at them. Then the tigers fall asleep. Again he goes on up the mountain and he sees big snakes. Then he throws the sleeping magic at them. The snakes all fall asleep. At the top of the mountain he sees two giants, a female and a male. He throws the sleeping magic at them. Then the giants both fall asleep.'

In some cases the nasal construction is used where the Patient is accompanied by a definite marker and/or a demonstrative but the sense is generic: **meli jaja tanduktandukan-e ento** (N-buy cake horned-DEF that) 'to buy those horned [kind of] cakes' (C9), **ningah berita-ne ento** (N-hear news-DEF that) 'to hear the news' (C11). In other cases the referent is definite, but there is no formal marking of definiteness: **nyungjungang jaman penjajahan** (N-praise era colonial) 'to praise the colonial era' (C189) (see also (71) below). There are also a few cases where the Patient is definite and marked as such where the nasal construction is used. In

other words the nasal construction can be used as well as the 0-construction with a definite Patient, but the 0-construction is the normal choice.

- (39) *I raga tong nglangkungin wewenang-ne Tangkas*
 we not N-usurp authority-3POSS Tangkas
 ‘We don’t usurp Tangkas’ authority.’ (C77)

New participants are introduced as the postverbal argument of **ada** or **wenten** ‘to exist’:¹⁶

- (40) *Ada perlombaan di sekolah*
 exist contest at school
 ‘There’s a competition at school.’ (C189)

This presentational construction can be used to avoid an indefinite Agent in a transitive clause since the participant once introduced becomes definite. A common practice is to link a nasal construction to an existential/presentational clause as in the following:

- (41) *Ada cicing ngamah siap*
 exist dog N-eat chicken
 ‘There was a dog who ate a chicken.’

This is to be interpreted with *cicing* as an argument of *ada* and an anaphoric zero with *ngamah*. In the following text example there is no overt argument with *ada*.

- (42) *...apang tong ada nawang isi surat gelah totanan*
 ...so.that not exist N-know content letter I that
 ‘...so that there’s no one who knows the contents of my letter.’ (C79)

It is also possible to get sentences such as (43a), which appear to be simple nasal constructions with an indefinite Agent and a definite Patient, but it may be that they should be interpreted as consisting of an NP preposed to the clause proper with an anaphoric zero as subject (43b).

- (43)a. *Cicing ngamah siap-e*
 dog N-eat chicken-DEF
 ‘A dog ate the chicken.’
 b. [cicing [] n-eat chicken-def]]

In (41) the N-construction is used because the Agent is co-referent with the argument of *ada*. In (43), if our interpretation is correct, the N-construction is used because the Agent is coreferent with an extraposed noun phrase. This is part of the principle described in the next section whereby anaphoric Agents are encoded as subject of a nasal construction.

Where the Agent is non-specific the 0-construction is used with the special enclitic =(n)a (see section 1.1 above).

- (44) *Anak cara janine pengempu-ne nak baang=a bekel*
 ?¹⁷ way now baby.sitter-DEF NAK give=3 pocket money
 ‘Today baby sitters are given pocket money.’ (C6)

¹⁶ This sentence could be Indonesian or Balinese in its written form, but the pronunciation indicates it is Balinese.

¹⁷ **Anak** and the shortened form **nak**, which appears later in the sentence basically mean ‘person’, but have a range of pragmatic functions that are difficult to gloss.

In content questions the 0-construction is used to question a Patient (45) and the nasal construction is frequently used to question an Agent (46). In other words the questioned noun phrase is made subject.

(45) *Apa uyutang cening*
 what scream.about you
 'What are you screaming about?' (S22)

(46) *Nyen ngae gambar-e*
 who N-make picture-DEF
 'Who made the picture?' (S1)

Where another participant has been advanced to subject it can be questioned.

(47) *Nyen goreng-ang cai mie?*
 who fry-AD you noodle
 'Who are you frying noodles for?'

The choice of the ma-construction requires no special comment. It is a stative passive and is not in competition with the 0-construction and the N-construction. Ka-constructions are infrequent in our corpus and we cannot differentiate transitive ka-constructions from 0-constructions on the basis of our material. There are subtle distinctions. Some of these are adumbrated in chapter 13 of Clynes 1996. See also Pastika 1999.

2.2 Complement clauses

Complement clauses exhibit no special morphology to indicate subordination. They differ from independent clauses in that the subject is covert. The subject is what some call a pivot and is controlled by an argument of the governing predicate. Where the A of the complement clause is co-referent with an argument of the governing verb, the nasal construction is used to make the A the pivot. The two common patterns of co-reference with complement clauses are with an S controller and A pivot or a P controller and A pivot.

S=A

(48) *Angob Ida Anake Agung ngaksi gambar-e ento*
 surprised Anake Agung N-see picture-DEF that
 'The king was surprised to see that picture.' (S1)

S=A

(49) *Ake nyak tusing ngorahang rahasiane ajak keluarga-ne*
 I want not N-tell secret-DEF with family-POSS
 'I don't want to tell the secret to her family' (C24)

S=A

(50) *Soraya lakar nagih ngancurang keluarga cai-ne*
 Soraya will want N-destroy family you-POSS
 'Soraya will want to destroy your family.' (C25)

P (subject of 0-verb)=A

(51) *I Jambrong tunden=a ngatehin I Rika mulih*
 Jambrong ask=3 N-take Rika go.home
 'Jambrong was asked to take Rika home.' (C17)

P (object of N-verb)=A

(52) *I Wayan nunden I Putu ngatehin I Ketut mulih*
 Wayan N-ask Putu N-take Ketut go.home
 'Wayan asked Putu to take Ketut home.'

P (but subject of **ka**-passive)=A

- (53) *Ka-pangandikaang lantasi Rareangon*
KA-tell then Rareangon
nagediang naga-ne ento
N-take.away dragon-DEF that
'Rareangon is then told to take that dragon away.' (S12)

In the following example a Recipient is controller and A pivot.

- (54) *I Agung sing baang=a naar*
I Agung not give=3 N-eat
'I Agung is not given [the cakes] to eat.' (C5)

Other examples of nasal complements with an S=A pattern of co-reference include: *purun nebah* 'dare to steal [it]' (C72), *sareng ngejuk ipun* 'involved in catching him' (C73), *bani ngae* 'brave to make [it]' (C84), *jejeh...nyingakin* 'scared to see [it]' (S11), *nyak ngampikin* 'want to open [it]' (S24).

It is scarcely possible to illustrate other patterns of controller and pivot from the corpus since other patterns hardly occur, so at this point we will have to resort to elicited examples and examples from the native speaker authors.

Where verbs of perception take a clausal complement, a participant of the perceived activity appears to be raised and encoded as a Patient of the verb of perception. In (55a) this raised participant is a Patient of the verb of the complement clause, whereas in (55b) it is the Agent of the complement clause. This means that P is the pivot in the complement clause of (55a), whereas A is the pivot in (55b). Note the contrast in the complement clauses. In (55a) the 0-construction is used; in (55b) the nasal construction is used (cf. Artawa 1994: 146ff).

- (55)a. *Ia dingeh tiang gugut lelipi*
3 hear I bite snake
'I heard s/he was bitten by a snake.'
- b. *Ia dingeh tiang ngugut lelipi*
3 hear I N-bite snake
'I heard that s/he bit a snake.'

A similar contrast can be found in (56) but here there is no raising. In (56a) P in the first complement clause is co-referent with S in the governing clause and is chosen as pivot. In (56b) A in the complement clause is co-referent with S in the governing clause, so the nasal construction is used so that A can appear as pivot.

- (56)a. *Ia demen tunden cai mai*
I_{a_{ij}} demen 0_i tunden cai 0_i mai]]
3 like ask you come.here
'S/he likes you to ask her/him to come here.'
- b. *Ia demen nunden cai mai*
3 like N-ask you here
'S/he likes to ask you to come here.'

The following text example illustrates P in the complement clause chosen as pivot in a ka-construction.

- (57) *...lantasi ia ngipi ka-turunan betara*
...then 3 N-dream KA-visit BETARA
'...then he dreamt that a god visited him.' (S3)

2.3 Relative clauses

With relative clauses the choice of construction is determined grammatically in much the same way as in other Western Malayo-Polynesian languages. Relative clauses are introduced by a relative marker or simply remain without any indication of their function. There are two strategies for relativisation. The principal strategy applies only to subjects and the subject is represented by zero. In order to relativise P no special construction is used. To relativise A the nasal construction is used. In (58) we have a headless relative clause with a 0-construction where P is relativised, and in (59) we have an N-construction where A is relativised.

(58) *Ane beli=na teken mbok Tut lima belas ento, sepuluh nok*
 REL buy=3 by Tut five teen that ten EMPH
 ‘That one that Tut bought for fifteen is ten.’ (C28)

(59) *Awake dot pesan mesbes kulit I Tangkas-e*
 I want much n-tear skin I Tangkas-def
 ane megal dedemenan awake
 REL N-take fiancee I
 ‘I want to tear Tangkas’ skin, who ran away with my fiancee.’ (C61)

In order to relativise any other participant an appropriate derivation must be used to advance it to subject. In the following example the ‘likee’ of demen ‘to like’ has been relativised. To facilitate this the derived verb demenin has been used which allows the likee to be expressed as subject. A similar example appeared above as (37).

(60) *Ada ane demenina di Buk Anggane sing beli-ang=a*
 exist REL like-3 at Buk Anggane not buy-AD=3
 (lit. exist [something] that he likes at Buk Anggane’s [shop] [3] not buy)
 ‘If there’s something he likes at Anggane’s, she doesn’t buy it for him.’ (C5)

As is regularly found in Western Malayo-Polynesian languages, there is a second strategy for relativising possessors. The possessor of a subject may be relativised with a pronoun retention strategy. There are no examples in our corpus. The following examples are from Artawa (1994: 142f). Note that the appropriate construction must be used to make the possessed participant subject.

(61) a. *Anak ane bapa-n-ne tepukin cai gelem*
 person REL father-LIG-3POSS see you sick
 ‘The person whose father you saw is sick.’
 b. *Anak ane bapan-ne nepukin cai gelem*
 person REL father-3POSS N-see you sick
 ‘The person whose father saw you is sick.’

2.4 Adjunct clauses and co-ordination

As with complements there is no special morphology to indicate that a clause is a subordinate adjunct except for the use of subordinating conjunctions such as **apang** ‘in order to’ or ‘so that’, as in (62). Co-ordination is not regularly marked in any way other than by intonation.

Purpose clauses frequently exhibit a pivot and the most common patterns of co-reference are S=A and P=A. The examples in (62) show a contrast with the N-construction being used where A is coreferent with S (62a) and the 0-construction being used where this is not the case (62b). The Patient subject in (62b) is taken to be co-referential with S on pragmatic grounds. It is not controlled. One could interpret (62b) to mean, ‘You came so that I could help him/her’ (Artawa 1994: 145).

(62)a. *Cai teka mai apang Ó bisa nulungin tiang*
 You come here so.that can N-help I
 ‘You came here to help me.’

b. *Cai teka mai apang Ó bisa tulungin tiang*
 You come here so.that can help I
 ‘You came here so that I could help you.’

The following is a text example of the common pattern of S=A co-reference. A range of examples to show contrasting patterns of co-reference can be found in Artawa 1994.

(63) *Masaut I Bawang m-lawanang dewek-ne*
 answer Bawang n-defend self-3poss
nanging tuara gugu=na teken meme-ne
 but not believe=3 by mother-3POSS
 ‘Bawang replied in order to defend herself, but her mother did not believe her.’ (S19)

In the traditional narrative style the main action is carried on by 0-constructions. The Agent may be anaphoric or it may represent new information. Where necessary a third person Agent will be represented by a prepositional phrase in addition to the =(n)a clitic. In (64) and (65) the A is co-referent with S in the preceding clauses. In (66) A is coreferent with A in the preceding clause. Note that A is not encoded as the pivot as it would be in a complement clause. In (67) A in the second clause is new information and it is amplified by the prepositional phrase **teken meme-ne**.

(64) *Buin kone I Bawang ngatebenang, tepukin=(n)a lantas*
 again Bawang go.down see=3 then
Sang Nyalian
 Mr Fish
 ‘She goes further down and she sees Mr Fish.’ (S21)

(65) *Teka lantas meme-ne uli peken, dapetang=a*
 come then mother-3POSS from market find=3
I Kesuna monotan.
 Kesuna dirty
 ‘Then her mother returns from the market [and] she finds Kesuna dirty.’ (S18)

(66) *...lantas ia nyalud yeh aba=na mulih*
 ...then 3 N-take water bring=3 go.home
 ‘...then she got some water and brought it home.’ (S19)

(67) *Teked jumah-ne takonin=a kone teken meme-ne....*
 arrive home-3POSS ask=3 it.is.said by mother-3POSS
 ‘[He] arrives home [and he] is asked by his mother....’ (S3)

Compare the following example (68) with (66) above. In both we have a nasal construction followed by a 0-construction. In (66) the Agent of the 0-construction is taken as being the Agent of the preceding clause, given no indication to the contrary. In (68) the Agent of **maan** is known to be Bawang from the context, and, in the absence of any evidence to the contrary, the Agent of **celopin** would probably be taken to be Bawang. However, there is evidence to the contrary. The **teken**-phrase specifies that another character, Rangasasa, is the Agent. If the verb **celopin** is nasalised to **nyelopin** and no overt subject is supplied, then the covert subject would be interpreted as being the same as the Agent of the preceding verb.

- (68) *Sabilang maan kutu abesik celopin=a teken I Rangsasa*
 whenever get louse one eat=3 by giant
 'Whenever she_i found a louse, the giant_j ate it.' (S22)

Some writers have noted that the nasal construction is used for backgrounding in various western Malayo-Polynesian languages, for instance, Hopper and Thompson (1980) on Tagalog, Hopper (1983) and Cumming (1991) on Malay. There are some examples where this principle might apply in Balinese, but there is usually some motivation for the choice of the nasal construction other than just backgrounding. In the following example, for instance, someone 'sets off' and 'brings' something. These are not entirely separate in that bringing is dependent on there being a journey, and this may be the reason the nasal construction is used even though the Patient is definite, having been presented in a preceding clause. On the other hand the Patient is not marked as definite and this may have influenced the choice of construction.

- (69) *Nyurutcut lantas I.Bawang ka tukad ngaba taled telung bidang*
 go then Bawang to river N-bring nappy three piece
 'Then Bawang went to the river taking [the] three nappies.' (S19)

Example (69) contrasts with (64) above where there is clearly a sequence of separate actions. Other examples similar to (69) include the following. In each case the Patient is definite from the context, but not marked as such. In (70) the various forms of magic have been specified in preceding text. In (71) the Patient is the dragon that the hero has unsuccessfully attempted to present to the king (see (72)). It could not be more definite.

- (70) *Majalan lantas I Rareangon ngaba manik liu pesan*
 walk then Rareangon N-take magic lot very
 'Then Rareangon sets off taking the various forms of magic.' (S6)
- (71) *Budal lantas I Rareangon negakin naga*
 go.home then Rareangon N-ride dragon
 'Then Rareangon went home riding the dragon.' (S13)

2.5 Word order

The reader will have noticed that many of the text examples do not conform to the order shown in the illustrative examples in Part One. In the traditional narrative style the unmarked word order for the 0-construction is clearly [V A] P, except that where a third person Agent is definite, it is represented by both the form =(n)a and a prepositional phrase adjunct as in (72).

- (72) *Tegakin=a lantas naga-ne teken I Rareangon ka puri*
 ride=3 then dragon-DEF by I Rareangon to palace
 'Then Rareangon rides the dragon to the palace.' (S12)

The unmarked order for nasal constructions, on the other hand, is A [V P] as in the following:

- (73) *...nglantas kone ia nyemak jun luas ka kayehan*
 .then it.is.said 3 N-take container go to bathing-place
 '...she takes a container and goes to the bathing place.' (S18)

However, the nasal verb may be fronted. See, for instance, the extended example (38) given above.

With intransitive predicates we find both subject-predicate and predicate-subject.

In contemporary colloquial Balinese the dominant word order for the 0-construction is P [V A] though [V A] P is also quite common, and the dominant word order with intransitive

predicates is subject-predicate. The order with the nasal construction is A [V P], as in traditional narrative.

The following figures are based on thirty pages of traditional stories and ninety pages of colloquial conversation, which yields roughly comparable numbers of clauses with at least one overt argument. The arguments in brackets are covert. The body of text counted is not overly large and one can expect fluctuations between types of text, but the figures are sufficient to establish certain facts. They establish, for instance, that the 0-construction is a prominent construction and not a minor feature that can be dismissed.

Stories

<i>Intransitive</i>	<i>0-construction</i>	<i>N-construction</i>
SV 77	VAP 56	AVP 37
VS 60	VA 16	AV(P) 10
SAdj 8	V(A)P 4	(A)VP 56
AdjS 20	PVA 12	VPA 2
	PV(A) 2	VAP 4
	<i>ka-construction</i>	
	kaVP 3	
	PkaV 8	
	kaVA 1	
	<i>Imperatives</i>	
	VP 29	
	PV 2	

Conversation

<i>intransitive</i>	<i>0-construction</i>	<i>N-construction</i>
SV 110	VAP 8	AVP 44
VS 26	VA 15	AV(P) 9
SAdj 20	V(A)P 6	(A)VP 86
AdjS 13	PVA 23	VPA 1
S PP 9	PV(A) 7	VAP -
PP S 2		
	<i>ka-conversation</i>	
	kaVP 1	
	PkaV 5	
	PkaVA 2	
	kaVA 1	
	<i>imperatives</i>	
	VP 8	
	PV 2	

Given the small number of 0-constructions with overt A and P in the conversational material it is not obvious what the unmarked word order is, but the figures do suggest PVA is unmarked. This is supported by the observation that some of the VAP sentences have heavy P phrases, which one would expect to be late in the clause.

- (74) *Tolih-tolih tiang beli-beli sane lingsiran*
 look-at I people REL older
tan ngraos punapa-punapi
 not speak anything
 'I look at the older people who do not say anything.' (C83)

With the ka-construction the most common order is PV in both the stories and in the conversation texts.

With intransitive predicates both subject-predicate and predicate-subject orders occur, but it seems the subject-predicate order is the unmarked one, at least in the conversational material, as many of the clause-initial predicates are focused. Many are modified by an intensifier.

(75) *Dot pesan gelah ngweruhin kaanna-ne*
 want much I N-know situation-DEF
 ‘I really want to know the situation.’ (C69)

(76) *Ngatgat pisan I Pageh mamuatang pati-ne*
 want much Pageh have death-DEF
I Dolong mramangkin
 Dolong right.now
 ‘Pageh is very eager to have Dolong killed right now.’ (C85)

The clause-initial position is a site for focus. The questioned phrase in content questions is typically clause-initial (see(45) and (46)) and in yes-no questions the predicate is typically the focus and comes first. In the following example the prajurit (lit. ‘soldier’) ‘the rooster’ is given information in the context, a cockfight, and the focus of the question is its readiness.

(77) *Suba sregep prajurit-e*
 already ready soldier-DEF
 ‘Is the rooster ready?’ (C92)

In the following example the context suggests that the sense is, ‘Surely you remember the infamous Luh Gelgel!’.

(78) *Sing inget cai tekening Luh Gelgel*
 not remember you with Luh Gelgel
 ‘Don’t you remember Luh Gelgel?’ (C60)

3. Discussion

In our interpretation Balinese has two transitive constructions, the 0-construction in which the Patient is the subject and the N-construction in which the Agent is the subject.¹⁸ The 0-construction is formally unmarked and does appear to be the default.

The nasal construction is mainly used in the following circumstances:

- (a) to make A the pivot, e.g. in relative clauses
- (b) to focus A in a content question
- (c) where P is indefinite

The recognition of two transitive constructions requires some adjustment to a number of current theories. In Relational Grammar, for instance, the Agent of a transitive verb is normally the subject and the Patient can only become subject via a passive revaluation. This would not appear to be a plausible analysis for Balinese where the Patient-subject is unmarked and the Agent a core argument. The laws of Relational Grammar need to be relaxed to allow alternative mappings so that either the Patient can be an initial (underlying) subject and the A an object or vice versa.¹⁹ In some theories, such as Role and Reference Grammar (Van Valin and La Polla 1997: 172ff) and Lexicase (Starosta 1988), alternative mappings are allowed, but it is envisaged that there will be only one in a particular language: A as subject for accusative languages and P as subject for ergative languages.

¹⁸ Wechsler and Arka (1998: 403) and Arka 1998 offer a not dissimilar interpretation.

¹⁹ See papers in Perlmutter (ed.) 1983 and overview of the theory in Blake 1990.

There is, however, more than a simple opposition of two transitive constructions. We need to take into account unmarked constructions with third person prepositional Agents, which appear to be passive, and we need to take into account the *ka*-constructions, which are usually passive. There is also the *ma*-construction with a basically transitive verb, which provides a stative passive.

Balinese is ergative-like in that the Patient is chosen as subject in the unmarked construction and in that there is a form, namely the enclitic *=(n)a*, peculiar to A. It is very like Dyrirbal, the celebrated example of a language with ergative syntax (Dixon 1972), in that the nasal construction is chosen to make A the pivot. In Dyrirbal a de-transitivised construction, the antipassive, is used to show that A is co-referent with the underlying absolutive (S+P) of a higher clause. In Balinese, however, the nasal construction does not appear to be intransitive, at least not when the Patient is definite, and an A pivot need not be co-referent with the underlying absolutive (see (54) where it is co-referent with a recipient).

The subject in Balinese is not like the subject in European and many other languages in which the subject typically expresses given information and topic as opposed to comment, at least not in the 0-construction. Here the Agent is typically given and expressed either by the special clitic *=na* or by a noun phrase that is pronounced as one phonological word with the verb. The most significant feature of clause structure in Balinese is that it reflects the fact that A is more often given information than S or P or an oblique is (Du Bois 1987) in that the system provides special reduced expression for A. In the nasal construction there is an alignment of given information with subject.

Balinese is also an active language inasmuch as it aligns Agents of intransitive verbs with Agents of transitive verbs and Patients of intransitive predicates with the Patients of transitive verbs. It does this by using a nasal prefix wherever an Agent is subject, thereby showing that the Patient is the basic choice for subject with all predicates.

An alternation between an unmarked construction with a Patient subject and a nasal construction with an Agent subject is not confined to Balinese. It is found in the Austronesian languages of Taiwan and in the Western Malayo-Polynesian languages of Indonesia and the Philippines (see, for instance, Wouk 1986). The alternation in Tagalog has been much discussed in the literature (e.g. Schachter 1976). The alternation seems to go back to the proto-Austronesian (Starosta, Pawley and Reid 1982). Cumming (1991) compares Classical Malay narrative texts with modern Indonesian novels. She finds that in the old narratives the Patient-subject construction predominates while in Indonesian today the nasal construction with Agent-subject is dominant. The Agent-subject construction is also dominant in some other languages of Indonesia including Javanese and Sundanese. Our sample suggests that the nasal construction is the more frequent transitive construction, but not by a huge margin. Our figures include complement clauses where the bulk of the N-constructions are to be found. Pastika used a corpus of 1300 main clauses and found that 57.24 were nasal constructions and 42.76 zero constructions (Pastika 1999: 67).

Proto-Austronesian is reconstructed as verb-initial. Cumming (1991) reports that verb-initial order predominates with Patient-subject constructions in Classical Malay narratives, though the Agent-subject construction (the nasal construction) is consistently Subject-Verb-Object. In modern Malay-Indonesian, where the nasal construction has become the main transitive construction, the basic order is Subject-Verb-Object. As we saw above, the word order in Balinese is predominantly VAP with the 0-construction in traditional stories, but modern conversational texts show a mixture of VAP and PVA. The word order in nasal constructions in both types of text is AVP. This suggests there may have been some change in word order

from verb-initial to Subject-Verb-Objects (A or P), although the comparison involves different genres. Beratha (1992: 289) compares inscriptions in old Balinese dating from the period 882-1050 with a corpus of modern Balinese consisting of written and spoken material. She notes a rise in the frequency of the nasal construction and a concomitant decline in the use of the 0-construction. She also notes a decrease in verb-initial clauses. Once again there is a difference of genre, but if proto-Austronesian was verb-initial, as seems generally agreed, there must have been a shift to subject-initial not only in the nasal construction but also in the unmarked construction.

ABBREVIATIONS

1SG/2SG/3SG first/second/third person singular, 3 third person, A Agent argument of a transitive verb, AD advancement marker, APPL applicative, CAUS causative, DEF definite, EMPH emphatic, LIG ligature, N nasal prefix, NEG negative, NP noun phrase, P Patient argument of a transitive verb, PASS passive, POSS possessor (or genitive), 3POSS third person possessor: 'his', 'her', 'their', PRON pronoun, REL relative, S sole argument of a one-place predicate, V verb

REFERENCES

- Arka, Wayan. 1998. *From morphosyntax to pragmatics in Balinese*. Sydney: University of Sydney doctoral dissertation.
- Arka, Wayan and Wechsler, S. 1996. Argument structure and linear order in Balinese. Sydney: University of Sydney typescript.
- Artawa, Ketut. 1994. *Ergativity and Balinese syntax*. Melbourne: La Trobe University doctoral dissertation.
- Artawa, Ketut and Blake, Barry. 1997. Patient primacy in Balinese. *Studies in Language*, 483-508.
- Beratha, N.L.S. 1992. *Evolution of verbal morphology in Balinese*. Canberra: Australian National University doctoral dissertation.
- Barber, Charles C. 1977. *A grammar of the Balinese language*. (2 vols). Aberdeen: Aberdeen University.
- Blake, Barry J. 1990. *Relational Grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Clynes, Adrian. 1995. *Topics in the phonology and morphosyntax of Balinese based on the dialect of Singaraja, North Bali*. Canberra: Australian National University doctoral dissertation.
- Cumming, Susanna. 1991. *Functional change: the case of Malay constituent order*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Dixon, Robert M.W. 1972. *The Dyirbal language of North Queensland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hopper, Paul. 1983. Ergative, passive and active in Malay narrative. In F. Klein-Andrew (ed.), *Discourse perspectives on syntax*. New York: Academic Press, 67-88.
- Hopper, Paul and Thompson, Sandra. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56: 251-99.
- Hunter, Thomas M. *Balinese language: historical background and contemporary state*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan (PhD dissertation available from University Microfilm International).
- Pastika, Wayan. 1999. *Voice selection in Balinese narrative discourse*. Canberra: Australian National University doctoral dissertation.
- Perlmutter, David ed. 1983. *Studies in Relational Grammar 1*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Perlmutter, David and Postal, Paul. 1983. Some proposed laws of basic clause structure. In D. Perlmutter (ed.) 1983, 81-128.
- Schachter, Paul. 1976. The subject in Philippine languages: topic, actor-topic, none of the above. In Charles N. Li (ed.) *Subject and Topic*. New York: Academic Press, 491-518.
- Starosta, Stanley. 1988. *The case for Lexicase*. London: Pinter.
- Starosta, Stanley, Pawley, Andrew and Reid, Lawrence. 1982. The evolution of focus in Austronesian. In Amran Halim, Lois Carrington and S.A. Wurm (eds), *Papers from the third international conference on Austronesian linguistics*. Volume 2: *Tracking the travellers*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics, 145-170.
- Van Valin Jr, Robert and La Polla, Randy. 1997. *Syntax: structure, meaning and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wechsler, S. and Arka, W. 1998. Syntactic ergativity in Balinese: an argument-structure based theory. *Natural language and linguistic theory* 16: 387-441.
- Wouk, Fay. 1986. Transitivity in Proto-Malayo-Polynesian and Proto-Austronesian. In Paul Geraghty, Lois Carrington and Stephen Wurm (eds), *FOCAL 1: Papers from the fourth international congress on Austronesian linguistics*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics, 133-58.