Grammatical Relations and Voice System in Balinese

Ketut Artawa

Fakultas Sastra Universitas Udayana

`artawa56@yahoo.com`

1. Introduction

Balinese has two different structures for encoding a transitive proposition. One of these structures occurs with a morphologically unmarked transitive verb, while the verb in the other construction is prefixed by a nasal. In this article the former construction in which the verb appears in its basic form is called a zero (Ø-) construction, while the latter will be referred to as a nasal (N-) construction. In distinguishing the arguments of two place-verbs used in these two transitive constructions, the labels Agent and Patient with capital letters will be used. The Agent encompasses not only the agent of kicking, breaking, etc., but also the perceiver of verbs of seeing, hearing and so on. The Patient is to be understood as embracing not only the affected patient of verbs of impingement but also the neutral or unaffected patient of verbs of perception. In this case I follow the common practice in typological work using S for the sole argument of intransitive verb, A for the agent argument, and P for the patient argument. As shown in the following examples. ''

   (1) Made (S) ulung
        Made   fall
        'Made fell'

   (2) Made (P) lempag   tiang (A) ((Ø-) construction)
        Made   hit   1SG
        'I hit Made'

The sentence in (2) is a Patient-Verb-Agent sequence rather than Agent-Verb-Patient. There is a way to encode the agent as the preverbal noun phrase, but that involves marking on the verb with a nasal prefix.

   (3) Tiang (A) nglempag   Made (P) (N-construction)
        1SG   N- hit   Made
        'I hit Made'

Examples (2) and (3) show that there is a clear difference in morphological markedness between the two-place constructions. The **N**-construction, as in (3), has been traditionally described as active and the zero construction, as in (2), has been taken to be passive (see, for example, Bawa and Jendra 1981, Kersten 1984).

Two-place constructions noted above in Balinese have alternative orderings, the preverbal argument NP may be moved to the final position, but there is no alternative position for postverbal phrases that represent arguments. This is illustrated for intransitive clause, the zero construction, and the nasal construction.

   (4) a. Karta majalan   ke peken
          Karta walk   to   market

'Karta walks to the market'
b. *Majalan ke peken Karta*

(5) a. Kata   lempag   cai
    Karta   hit   2nd
    'You hit Karta'
b. *Lempag cai Karta*

(6) a. Cai   nglempang   Karta
    2nd   N-hit   Karta
b. *Nglempang Karta Cai*

In addition to this alternative ordering, in a slow speech, an intonation break can be inserted after the preverbal argument, but not between the verb and the postverbal argument. The grammatical characteristics of the Patient of the zero construction in (5) and the Agent argument of the nasal construction also show similar characteristics in terms of the insertion of the aspects markers and the sentence adverbs. The aspect markers and the sentence adverb can be inserted after the preverbal argument. This is also true for the intransitive clause. So in this case the S, and the Patient of the zero construction and the Agent of the Nasal construction show similar grammatical characteristics.

2. The Preverbal NP: the subject?

It has been shown that for a number of syntactic processes, the preverbal argument (NP) of the zero and nasal construction behave in the same way. This preverbal argument (NP) has the following exclusive properties: (a) it can float a quantifier and (b) it is the pivot of a number of grammatical processes. The detailed description of these properties was discussed in Artawa (1994) and in Arka (1988).

If Balinese has the subject relation, then the S, the sole argument of a one-place verb, must hold this relation by default and this argument is in the preverbal argument and we would assume that the preverbal position is the subject position. In section we have shown that the preverbal argument of the zero and nasal construction shows a number of grammatical privileges such as being able to float a quantifier, being able to be relativised, being able to be raised and being able to be a covert argument in a coordinated clause, in a complement clause and in a purpose clause. These characteristics, where they are restricted in other languages, they are restricted to subject. At this point it seems obvious that the preverbal argument is the subject, but there might be two possible objections. The first is the possibility that the preverbal argument is a topic rather than a subject. Artawa (1994) has shown that the preverbal argument is not always a topic, but it can express a focus, that is a new information, however this possibility need to be further explored for Balinese. The second stems from the fact that the preverbal argument does not have a monopoly of subject properties. For instance, the controller of the reflexive is always the Agent irrespective of the type of construction used.

3. Balinese Voice Types

It has been shown that Balinese has two alternative structures for transitive verb: the zero construction and nasal construction. The characteristics of these constructions are described below. In addition to these constructions, the other constructions described here are the *ka-*construction and the *ma*-construction

3.1 The Zero and Nasal Construction

Since the Patient in the zero construction is treated in the same way as the single argument of a one-place predicate, the question arises as to whether this construction is passive or not. The Agent of the zero construction can be a pronoun, a kin term, or a non-specific noun. The following examples occur with a pronoun as the Agent.

(6) Baju-ne   jemak   tiang
    Shirt-def   take   1SG
    'I took the shirt'

(7) Baju-ne   jemak   nyai?
    Shirt-def   take   2SG
    'Did you take the shirt?'

(8) Baju-ne   jemak=a
    Shir-def   take=3SG
    'S/he took the book'

In addition to the use of a pronominal Agent, kin-terms such as **bapa** 'father', **meme** 'mother', **beli** 'elder brother', etc can be used pronominally. If these terms are used as an agent, they can only refer to the speaker (first person) or the addressee (second person). The context will clarify whether they act as a first or second person deictic.

(9) Bubuh   gai   meme
    porridge   make   mother
    'I made some porridge' [spoken by **meme**]

(10) Ia   orahin   beli?
     3SG   tell   older brother
     'Did you tell her/him' [spoken to **beli**]

The zero construction also occurs with a nonspecific noun in (11), and with nouns denoting natural forces as an Agent in (12) and (13) shows that if the Agent is a definite third person, a special third person Agent clitic form =**a** is used and if further specification is required, it is supplied by means of a prepositional adjunct phrase specifying the Agent. In this particular example, the phrase *teken anake ento* can be deleted.

(11) Ia   cotot   lelipi
     3SG   bite   snake
     'A snake bit her/him'

(12) Padi-ne   uyak   angin
     rice plant-def   destroy   wind
     'The wind destroyed the rice plants'

(13) Nasi-ne   ajeng=a   (teken   anak-e   ento)
     rice-def   eat=3SG   (by   person-def   that)
     'That person ate the rice'

This construction looks like a passive, but =**a** is clearly a third person enclitic representing an argument, not a passive marker. The zero construction has the basic order Patient-Verb-

Agent while the Nasal construction has the basic order Agent-Verb-Patient as shown in (39) below.

(14) Tiang   meli   baju
     1SG   N-buy   shirt
     'I bought a shirt'

The Patient-subject construction or the zero construction is not a passive. A review of passives in other languages reveals that passives are marked structure, almost always marked morphologically. According to Siewierska (2005) a canonical passive construction has the following characteristics:

a. it contrasts with another construction, the active;
b. the subject of the active correspond to a non-obligatory oblique phrase of the passive or is not overtly expressed(but not implied);
c. the subject of the passive, if there is one, corresponds to the direct object of the active;
d. the construction is pragmatically restricted relative to the active;
e. the construction displays some special morphological marking of the verb

The zero construction has the following characteristics:

a. the construction is unmarked,
b. the Agent remains an argument
c. the Agent is frequently pronominal
d. the zero construction is of high frequency.

The presence of the zero and nasal construction raises interesting questions about the syntactic type of language. Is the language typologically unusual having two transitive constructions? If we take the zero construction to be transitive and since the Patient is the subject, we have an ergative construction. It does not follow from that the language is ergative. For that to be true the nasal construction has to be an antipassive construction. Can the nasal construction to be considered as an active or an antipassive construction? The active construction is considered as a basic construction in an accusative language, whereas the antipassive is a derived construction in an ergative language. It is usually taken to be the analogue of passive construction. In a passive construction it is the agent of a transitive verb which is expressed as an adjunct. This adjunct can be omitted. In an antipassive construction it is the patient of a transitive construction which can be omitted from the clause. It seems that the nasal construction cannot be an active or an antipassive construction. The nasal construction is not an active voice because this construction is a marked construction compared to the zero construction. That the nasal construction is not antipassive because the Patient is still an argument. This has been shown not to behave like an antipassive (Arka, 1988:405). It seems that Balinese two construction that might be reasonably called transitive, the zero construction and the nasal construction. This might be taken to indicate that the language is neither accusative nor ergative. My conclusion is that there are two transitive constructions and that the language is neither ergative nor accusative. The zero construction might be identified as 'undergoer-voice', whereas the nasal construction can be called an 'actor-voice'

3.2 The *ka-* construction

Balinese has another construction with the Patient subject and the verb is marked by a *ka-*prefix. This construction is known as a passive construction. It is not clear on how Balinese developed this construction. It is believed that this passive is borrowed from Javanese. Javanese has four types of passive constructions: the *di-*passive, *ka-*passive, the *–in-* passive, and the *ke-*passive (Sofwan, 2001). The *ka-*passive is used when people are using high speech level whereas *di-*passive is used by people using low speech level. In Balinese *the* ka-passive is mainly used for the high speech level, while in the low speech level, the zero construction is used. However, in modern Balinese this is not always the case. The *ka-* construction in Balinese has the following characteristics:

a. The verb is marked by the *ka-*prefix
b. The agent is frequently first and second pronoun
c. When the Agent is a third person pronoun the enclitic –(n)a cannot be used
d. When the Agent is a third person, the Agent is expressed as an adjunct marked by a preposition

(15) Jinah-e   puniki   ka-tunas   titiang (high style)
     Money-e   this   ka-take   I
     'I took the money'
(16) Napi   ka-bakta   jero   meriki? (high style)
     What   ka-bring   you   here
     'What did you bring here?'
(17) Napi   ka-tumbas   biang   ring   pasar (high style)
     What   ka-buy   mother   in   market
     'What did you buy in the market?'
(18) Cicing-e   ka-mati-ang   teken   I Karta (low style)
     dog-def   ka-die-cause   by   I Karta
     'The dog was killed by Karta'

It is interesting to note whether the *ka-* construction is canonical passive construction or not. If we look at the agent especially when the agent is the first person or second person or a noun being used deictically as in (17), the preposition *teken/baan/antuk* 'by' cannot be inserted between the verb and the Agent, thus syntactically it behaves like a zero construction. Is this just another undergoer-voice? However the prepositional phase, the agent, in (18) can be deleted. This behaves like a passive. This means that in terms of marking, the active (which is considered the unmarked construction in accusative languages), is marked in Balinese, it is marked by a nasal prefix. Thus both the active and passive are equally marked. The passive is marked by a *ka-*prefix.

Balinese has a zero construction with a third person agent. This agent (=a) is cliticised on the verb. The distribution of this clitic and the free pronoun are mutually exclusive. The clitic appears only on the verb if it is the agent of the zero construction. The corresponding non-clitic pronoun Agent *ia* is not possible. For the *ka-*construction, Balinese also has a construction with a third person agent, which is always in the form of a prepositional phase. Consider the following examples, the example (18) is repeated below

(19) Cicing-e   ka-mati-ang   (teken   I Karta)
     dog-def   ka-die-cause   by   I Karta
     'The dog was killed by Karta'

(20) Cicing-e   matiang=a   (teken   I Karta)
    dog-def   die-cause=a   by   I Karta
    'Karta kill the dog'

As noted previously the example in (19) is a passive voice. It is marked by the *ka*-prefix and the agent can be deleted. Is the example in (20) is an undergoer or a passive voice. Arka (1988) argued that the enclitic =**a** has a double function: as a pronominal clitic and also as grammatical marker functioning as a passive marker. It is a passive marker when there is a prepositional phrase agent presents, which is an oblique. But in the absence of the oblique, out of context, the construction can be ambiguous between undergoer voice and passive. The following is a comparison between the *ka-* construction and the zero construction in terms of controlling reflexive form

(21) *a. Awak-ne   ka-tebek   (tekan   I Karta)
          Self-poss   ka-stab   by   Karta
      b. Awak-ne   tebek=a   teken   I Karta
          'Karta stabbed himself'

The sentence (21a) is rejected by some speakers of Balinese, but (21b) is accepted. This means that the *ka*-construction tends to be a passive construction in that the adjunct can be deleted so it is unlikely to control a reflexive. And the sentence in (18b) is an undergoer-voice or is being in the stage of developing into a passive construction.

3.3 The *ma*-construction

The *ma*-construction Balinese is also traditionally classified as passive. This passive has the following properties:

    a. agent cannot be expressed;
    b. only appears with certain transitive verb;
    c. cannot be attached to the ditransitive verb;
    d. semantically implying a completed event.

The following examples show these characteristics:

(22) Umah-e   ma-adep
    House-def   ma-sell
    'The house was sold'
(23) *Umahe maadep baan Karta
(24) a. *Ia   ma-beli-ang   buku
        3rd   ma-buy-appl.   book
        'S/he was bought a book'
     b. Ia ka-beliang buku   (ka-passive)
     c. Ia beliang=a buku   (undergoer-voice)

In (24), the sentence (a) is not grammatical because the verb is a ditransitive verb, the sentence (b) and (c) are perfect.

4. Conclusion

The preverbal argument of the zero and nasal construction shows a number of grammatical privileges such as being able to float a quantifier, being able to be relativised,

being able to be raised and being able to be a covert argument in a coordinated clause, in a complement clause and in a purpose clause. The preverbal argument NP is grammatical subject in Balinese. With regard to the voice types in Balinese, I can make the following summary:

1. the zero construction: Agent obligaroty: (a) undergoer-voice with NP Agent
                                              (b) passive with PP Agent
2. the *ka*-construction: Agent optional: (a) undergoer-voice with NP Agent
                                              (b) passive with PP Agent
3. the *ma*-construction: Agent elimitated: resultative passive
4. the nasal construction: actor-voice

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.

Arka, Wayan. 1988. From morphosyntax to pragmatics in Balinese. Sydney: University of Sydney doctoral dissertation.

Arka, Wayan and Ross, Macolm (eds.).2005. The Many Many Faces of Austronesian Voice Systems. Canberra:Pacific Linguistics Research School o f Pasific and Asian Studies, ANU

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 21: 483-508

Artawa, Ketut, Artini, Putu and Blake, Barry. 2001. Balinese grammar and discourse. La Trobe papers in Linguistics 11: 11-46

Blake, B.J 1976. On ergativity and the notion of Subject: some Australian cases. *Lingua* 39:281-300.

Chung, 5. 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 5*5: 59-138.

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 Pendiddikan dan Kebudayaan (manuscript).

Siewierska, A. 1984. *The Passive: a comparative linguistic analysis*. London: Crook Helm.

Sierwierska, A. 2005. Passive constructions. In Haspelmath, M. et al (eds). *World Atlas of Linguistic Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sofwan, A. 2001. Javanese passives, ergatives and adversatives. La Trobe papers in Linguistics 11: 189-228

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. 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.