THE EFFECT OF DEFINITENESS ON THE BALINESE CONSTITUENT WORD ORDER IN TRANSITIVE CONSTRUCTIONS WITH THE FULL NPs

I Wayan Sidha Karya [1] Putu Devi Maharani [2]
STIBA Saraswati Denpasar

ABSTRAK

Penulisan artikel ini dimaksudkan untuk mengetahui bagaimana pengaruh markah definit dalam bahasa Bali terhadap pola sususan kata-kerja dan argumennya atau konstituen kalimat transitif.Bahasa Bali memiliki sususan konstituen (subject/agen, kata-kerja, objek/pasien) yang lentur.Kelenturan susunan konstituen ini disebabkan oleh penanda frase benda berupa markah definit –e atau pengidentifikasian.Suatu frasa benda yang memiliki markah definit –e bisa diartikan bahwa frasa ini sudah dipahami sebagai suatu hal yang sudah tentu atau diharapkan dan bisa mengambil tempat di awal kalimat atau di akhir kalimat. Sebagai ganti istilah 'subjek' dan 'objek' untuk peran sintaksis dalam sebuah kalimat transitif, kami menggunakan istilah ENP (External Noun Phrase) dan INP (Internal Noun Phrase) yang masing-masingnya bisa mengambil peran semantic agen atau pasien, bergantung pada bentuk pemicu dalam kata-kerja. Sebuah kata-kerja dengan awalan suara nasal memicu agen sebagai ENP, sehingga konstruksinya +AT; begitu juga sebaliknya, sebuah kata-kerja tanpa awal suara nasal memicu non-agen sebagai ENP, sehingga menjadi, konstruksi -AT. Dalam tulisan ini menelaah variasi susunan konstituen dalam bahasa Bali dan motivasinya. Dari sudut kelinearan, susunan yang kanonikal dalam bahasa Bali adalah ENP [V INP].Namun ada faktor-faktor pragmatik yang menyebabkan susunan tersebut menjadi berubah, khususnya karena pengidentifikasian terhadap argumen-argumen NP dalam klausa-klausa dengan kata-kerja transitif. Tulisan ini menelaah variasi susunan konstituen dalam bahasa Bali dan motivasinya. Dari sudut kelinearan, susunan yang kanonikal dalam bahasa Bali adalah ENP [V INP].Namun ada faktor-faktor pragmatik yang menyebabkan susunan tersebut menjadi berubah, khususnya karena pengidentifikasian terhadap argumen-argumen NP dalam klausa-klausa dengan kata-kerja transitif.Data yang dipakai bersumberkan pada empat buah cerita rakyat. Pola-pola sususan kalimat tersebut dikumpulkan dengan cara mencatat pada saat membaca masing-masing cerita tersebut. Masing-masing pola kemudian dianalisa menurut bentuk logika P > (Q > R) yang terinspirasi oleh model universal sususan berimplikasi 'implicational order universal' yang diperkenalkan oleh Hawkins.Hasilnya berupa penemuan beberapa pola 'implicational order universals' dalam bahasa Bali.

Kata Kunci: constituent order, markah definit, implicational universal, ENP, INP, +AT, -AT

I.Introduction

First thing first, we would like to make it clear that this writing focuses on major constituents of the Balinese language. As part of our linguistic study we intend to get more and better perspective on how languages work. By working on this particular aspect of word order in Balinese we are in a better position to understanding word order universals and word orders in a particular language. Word order is one of the major distinguisher of a language identity. Some languages have the major constituent orders of VOS, SVO, and SOV; and some others have the constituent orders of VOS, OSV, and OVS. In some languages these constituent orders are very rigid and in some are quite flexible.

Instead of using the terminology of 'subject', 'verb' and 'object', we think that these syntactic roles in Balinese are best expressed in terms of ENP (external noun phrase) and INP (internal noun phrase) (Sidhakarya: 1995) in that each of them may coincide with the semantic roles of either the agent or the patient, depending on the trigger form of the verb. A verb with a nasalized initial is an actor trigger form, meaning that the ENP of the clause construction is an agent; and a verb with a non-nasalized initial is a non-actor trigger form, meaning that the ENP of the clause construction is a non-agent. We looked at constituent order variations in Balinese and its motivations. In terms of linear order, the most neutral sentence in Balinese is ENP [V INP]. Further, in either a +AT or a -AT construction, the INP is most likely an indefinite full-NP. However, there are pragmatic

factors which bring about changes in order. The pragmatic factors explored here are primarily concerned with the identifiability of the NP arguments in clauses with semantically transitive verbs. We also considered contrastive focus phenomena.

II Materials and Method
2.1.Typology of Constituent Order Universals

According to Greenberg (1966), whose work on the basic order typology has aroused interest in the field, "the vast majority of languages have several variant orders but a single dominant one (p.76)." This presumes that in general, a single basic order may stand out. He further mentions that there are six possible constituent orders in terms of grammatical relations, three of which are common types. They are VOS, SVO, and SOV. The other three, which he terms "excessively rare," are VOS, OSV, and OVS. This manner of typologizing languages, however, is found to be unhelpful for many investigators who are faced with languages whose constituent orders seem to be pragmatically based. Payne (1992: 1), points out that for those languages "... it is not particularly insightful to brand a particular order of grammatical relation as basic ..." She further mentions that Thompson (1978) took a new step by suggesting that "the first typological division should be made between those languages in which main clause word order primarily correlates with pragmatic factors, and those in which word order primarily correlates with grammatical relations or other syntactic factors" (p.1). Similarly, Mithun (1992: 58) argues for similar typological distinction. She contends that a distinction must be made between languages with syntactically defined word order which exhibit pragmatic reordering, such as right and left dislocation, and those with pragmatically based one. She mentions that "discourse data from a number of genetically and areally distinct languages indicate that syntactic ordering and pragmatic reordering processes may not in fact be universal" (p.15).

Given the current state of the art, it is a valid question to ask if Balinese has a syntactically-defined basic constituent order, or how sensitive to pragmatic factors constituent order in Balinese is. In accounting for the various constituent orders in Balinese, we consider the identifiability of the INP and ENP syntactic roles in both +AT and -AT constructions to be the main motivation for order variation. The +AT construction can be formulated as A[VP] and the -AT construction as P[VA], resulting in opposite orders of actor and patient. The INP is closely attached to the verb in both forms. Normally when the ENP in either +AT or -AT form is definite, it may undergo pragmatic reordering, and take a final position. However, under some circumstances it may interrupt the bond between the INP and the verb, especially in the +AT construction. It is my contention that both A[VP] and P[VA] are basic orders which may syntactically be formulated just as ENP + VERB + INP. Yet other configurations may result from syntactic re-orderings in various discourse situations. As mentioned above, the variations are due to the identifiability of the ENP and INP.

2.2. Identifiability of Noun Phrases

We distinguish the following types of NPs: pronouns (1st, 2nd, 3rd), definite (DEF) full-NPs, indefinite (INDEF) full-NPs, generic (non-referential) NPs or non-anaphoric NPs. The constituent order of an -AT construction with two unmarked (indefinite) NP arguments is that of P[VA]. When the initial of the verb, on the other hand, undergoes a nasalization process, and the NP arguments are unmarked (indefinite), the order is that of A[VP]. Since both of these are specific subcases of the syntactic generalization of ENP [V INP], the constituent and syntactic role order does not really change. Only in semantic terms do constituent orders seem to vary. As long as the NP arguments are indefinite, these orders are rigid.

Once the external NP is identified as being definite, we no longer can count on the rigidity of the ENP [V INP] order. A definite ENP may move to the right under the pressure of some pragmatic reordering processes, so as to result in [V INP] ENP. In particular, constituent order is sensitive to the identifiability of the NP, and especially of the ENP.

2.3 Research Method

The data used for the analysis of the word order were taken from folktales (see, appendix B at the end of this article) and the researchers' personal knowledge, as they are native speakers of Balinese themselves. The first step taken was reading several books of folktales in Balinese meant for school children. As they went through the reading and found different types of word orders the

researchers wrote them down. For efficiency reasons we only used the transitive constructions with full NPs.

The different types of word orders were then analyzed according to certain formula introduced by John Hawkin (1983). Since this study was a qualitative one we did not pay attention to how many times a particular type of word order happened. So, findings were expressed in terms of implicational order universals.The logic of implicational universals is that if a language has property x, then it has property y.This means that if a language has voiced stops, it has the corresponding voiceless stops; then, it can be predicted that no language has b/d/g without p/t/k.

The possible orders in Balinese are easily formulated in the logical formula of the type P>(Q>R), meaning that if there is a certain form or construction, either +AT or -AT (P), and if the NP is identified as definite vs. indefinite (Q), then the possible constituent orders can be predicted (R). This logical form of P > (Q > R) is inspired by Hawkins's (1983: 65) model of implicational order universals. Here I cite his first implicational universal: "if a language has SOV word order, then if the adjective precedes the noun, the genitive follows the noun, i.e., SOV > (AN > NG)."

III. Result and Discussion

Each type of constituent order was identified and analyzed as to what motivate its occurrence. Then a statement was made in the form of a formula called implicational universal as the main finding for each construction type.

3.1 Constituent Order in the +AT Construction

In a +AT construction with a semantically transitive verb and two indefinite full-NP arguments, the agent must be in clause initial position as the ENP. When the NP is identifiable this canonical position of the ENP agent is not rigid, nor is rigidity true for the patient's (INP) position immediately following the verb. These positions of agent and patient are subject to change for pragmatic factors such as the identifiability of the NP, contrastive focus, and heaviness of the NP.

When both NPs are indefinite, the constituent order is a rigid A[VP], or ENP [V INP], as in example (1). Since both NPs are indefinite, this may just be an existential type of expression, meaning that there exists some event in which some indefinite horse gores some indefinite dog. The construction may or may not be preceded by an existential verb ***ada*** 'exist.'

(1)   A   V   P
        (Ada) jaran ŋapér   ciciŋ.
        EXIS horse +AT-kick dog
        'A horse kicked a dog.' Or,
        'There was a horse that kicked a dog.'

Thus, we have the first implicational order generalization for the +AT construction:

     (i)   **+AT > (A.indef + P.indef > A[VP])**

The order is not rigid, however, if either one of the NPs is marked definite. A definite agent ENP may take either an initial or a final position. This is in accordance with the versatility of the ENP. The INP which is closely attached to the verb tends to—though does not necessarily have to—be indefinite, as exemplified in (2a-b).

(2)   A   V   P
    a. *Jaran-**e** ŋaper   ciciŋ*
       horse-DEF +AT-kick dog
       'The horse kicked a dog.'

        V   P   A
b.   *ŋaper   ciciŋ jaran-**e**.*
      +AT-kick dog jaran-DEF
      'The horse kicked the dog.'

Thus, a second implicational statement for the +AT construction may be formulated as follows:

(ii)   +AT > (A.def + P.indef > A[VP] or [VP]A)

The expression in (2a) may just be reporting an event, telling that the bull has gored a buffalo, whereas the expression in (2b) raises a different nuance in that an unexpected event has occurred, which was not supposed to happen, or the speaker wishes that it did not happen. In the canonical form in (2a) the ENP *jaran-e* 'the horse' may have the resemblance of what Lambrecht (1983) called topic NP for French; but the fronting of the predicate in (2b) brings the ENP *jaran-e* 'the horse' into the final position, so that the ENP resembles what he called anti-topic NP (p. 231). This is possible in the pragmatic situation where the speaker is putting the "focus on the predicate"(Dik, 1981:56) by inverting the constituent order.

A further possibility is for the patient to be marked definite in the +AT form, as in (3). This can co-occur with the agent being either indefinite or definite. In either case, the normal INP and ENP relationship—in which the ENP has greater syntactic "independence" and "versatility" (Schachter 1984: 126)—may be violated, with the INP patient taking an initial position as the contrastively focused element of the clause, thus, creating an anomaly to the relationship, as in (4b).

	A	V	P
(3)	*Jaran*	*ŋaper*	*ciciŋ-e*.
	horse	+AT-kick	dog-DEF

'It is a horse that kicked the dog.'

	A	V	P
(4)a	*. ... titiaŋ nenten nunas*		*sane kenten,*
	1SG NEG +AT-ask.for		REL like.that

I don't ask for something like that,

	P		A	V
b.	*kuda-n-e*	*sane berag punika*	*titiaŋ*	*nunas.*
	horse-LK-DEF	REL skinny that	1SG	+AT-ask.for

I [JUST] ask for that skinny horse.   (SNB&IB/SBKB: 9)

The suggestion is that, in a way, contrastive focus as marked in the nominal phrase by the relativizer *sane* 'the one which' is strong enough to override the otherwise normal syntactic rules. Thus, the third implicational relation may be formulated as follows:

(iii)   +AT > (A + P.def > A[VP] or P$_i$ A [Ve$_i$])

Unlike the expression in (1) in which the two NPs are indefinite, when the patient is definite, as in (3), the speaker is presupposing that the hearer has some prior knowledge of the patient; the speaker assumes that the hearer knows that something has happened to the patient. The speaker tries to assert, however, that the indefinite agent is contrastively focused. This contrastive focus also happen in (4b) as the result the movement of the patient.

According to the implication in (ii), a definite NP agent in a +AT construction is supposed to be either in clause initial position or clause final position. However, a pronominal agent *ia* 's/he,' presumably an ENP, violates this placement principle by optionally occurring between the +AT verb and the indefinite full NP, as in (5) and (6).

(5)   *Gelisiŋ satua suba kone liŋsir sañja,*
          Quickening the story, it is already dusk time,

	V	A	P
	nepuk-in	*ia*	*padukuhan ....*

+AT-see-TR2 3SG hermitage
[and] he saw a hermitage ...   (RA/2B: 25)

        V   A   P

(6)   *Di jalan nepuk-in   ia   anak ŋ-aŋon   bebek.*
LOC road +AT-see-TR2 3SG person +AT-herd duck
'On the road, he saw someone herding ducks.'   (IKM/1B: 13)

In Balinese, pronouns seem to have special proclivity to be close to the verb, as Chung (1978:13) mentions in her study of the Polynesian languages, "Pronouns tends to be attracted to the verb, regardless of their syntactic function". Actually, by the pronoun occurring immediately after the +AT verb and the patient following that, the whole sentence seems to be in accord with Hawkins' (1983) heaviness principle. Basically, this principle says that heavier constituents have a rightward preference placement.

> The rightward preference for a heavy constituent can also be seen in rules such   as English Complex/Heavy NP shift (*Joe gave to Bertha a book that was about   the skinning of a cats in Alberta between 1898 and 1901*; see Ross 1967, Kimball   1973, Postal 1974). And it is evident in the frequent clause-final position of sentential complements across languages ... (p.91).

He continues further, saying that, "the different orderings of adjectives and adjective phrase modifiers in English (*the yellow book/the book yellow with age*; see C. Smith 1961) are also in accordance with our "heaviness to the right" principles ..." (p.91). Thus, the fourth implicational may be formulated as follows

   (iv)   +AT > (A.pro + P.indef and heavy > VAP)

3.2 Constituent Order in the -AT Construction

In order to begin this section of my study, we present some of my most intriguing findings, the idea that a semantically transitive verb stem (the non-nasalized initial or -AT verb) must occur in a constituent with the agent rather than with the patient. Cross-linguistically, this phenomenon seems to be odd because in most of the world's known languages quite the opposite is true if the verb forms a constituent with any NP at all. For example, in English a semantically transitive stem occurs in a constituent with the patient, as in *carry books*. The same is true in Indonesian, a language which is genetically related to Balinese, as in, *bawa buku* 'carry books'. In order to test my intuition that the -AT verb occurs in a constituent with the agent, one of the researchers talked to a Balinese friend. The one word stem he had in mind was *sadug* 'gore.' He asked him to give him a straightforward answer as to what word came next into his mind when he heard the word *sadug* 'gore.' He answered *sampi* 'cow.' The researcher then asked him what word came next. He answered that the next word would be *barak* 'red.' Then, the researcher asked him to say the three words. The friend said: ***Sadug sampi barak.*** After that he asked him if there is a fourth word he would like to add. He told him that there must be a 'subject' like *caŋ* 'I' which precedes the other three words he mentioned previously, so that the order of the words looks like this: ***caŋsadugsampibarak,*** which he translated into Indonesian in the passive form ***saya diseruduk oleh sapi merah*** 'I was gored by a red cow'. For my purpose, what is interesting here is that the NP which immediately follows the verb is interpreted as an "object," although my friend did not say that overtly; but by saying that the NP ***caŋ*** 'I' was the "subject," it might follow that the agent NP *sampi* 'cow' was the "object." Of course I did not pursue further the discussion of what a subject is with him; the relevant point here is that he presented the agent as somehow forming a unit with the verb.

In the case of example (7), since both arguments are indefinite, there is no feature of contrast and the interpretation is existential or presentational, meaning that there exists some event about which some bull gores some buffalo. The construction may or may not be preceded by the existential verb *ada* 'exist'.

(7)   P   V   A

(Ada) kebo   0-sadug   sampi.
EXIS buffalo -AT-gore bull
'A bull gores a buffalo.' Or,
'There is a buffalo that a bull gores.'

The first implicational statement for the -AT construction is formulated as in (v). This means that the constituent order is rigid.

(v)   -AT > (P.indef + A.indef > P[VA])

Generally an INP never gets individuated or takes a definite marker **-e** or a definite person marker **i;** however, when an INP is a 1st, 2nd, or 3rd person pronoun, then the definite marker may optionally be maintained. A common noun such as **ratu** 'king' or **jero** 'insider' (a form of respect used to address a foreigner/stranger), when used deictically to refer to a second person, may get an **i** or an **e**, respectively. Thus, these two common nouns when used pronominally will have the forms **I Ratu** and **jerone**.

In contrast to the bonding of the INP with respect to the verb which precedes it the ENP has flexibility. Once it is marked definite, it may either maintain its initial clause position, as in (8) and (9), or be pushed to the final position, as in (10) and (11).

(8)   *Keberaŋ malu icaŋ piŋ telu, apaŋ*   'Throw me up three times, so that

P   V   A
pait icaŋ-e   0-keber-aŋ aŋin.
bitter 1SG-DEF -AT-fly-TR1 wind
the wind blows my bitterness.' Or,
my bitterness is blown by the wind.' (ISS/1A: 31)

                  P   V   A
(9)   *lantas bebek-e ento 0-kutaŋ   icaŋ di   tukad-e.*
        then   duck-DEF that -AT-leave.behind 1SG LOC river-DEF
        'then I left the duck in the river.'   (IB/1A: 24)

        V   A   P
(10)   *0-Amah meoŋ nasi-n-e   ituni*
        -AT-eat cat   rice-LK-DEF a.little.while.ago
        'Some cat ate the rice a little while ago.'

(11)   *Ne ruruŋ ŋaja-kaŋinaŋ☐tuut, jeg pedas*
        'Follow this northeastward road, surely

        V   A   P
        0-tepuk-in   cai Ni   Lubaŋ Kuri.
        -AT-see-TR2 2SG PM/F Lubang Kuri
        you [will] see The Lubang Kuri.'   (RA/2B: 24)

So, the next implicational relation for the -AT construction may be formulated as follows:

(vi)   -AT > (P.def + A.indef/pro > either P[VA], or [VA]P)

To briefly summarize the entire chapter, identifiability and contrastive focus on the ENP are the two major pragmatic factors which affect the organization of constituent order in Balinese. The conditions on constituent order possibilities may be expressed in the logical form of P > (Q > R).

IV. Conclusion

Major generalizations about constituent order are best expressed in terms of the syntactic roles of ENP and INP, rather than in terms of semantic roles. The general tendency is that a definite

ENP is flexible; it is either placed at the beginning of a clause or in final position. Meanwhile the INP is closely attached to the preceding verb. Variations are allowable according to identifiability statuses and contrastive focus of the NPs. In this study I have described Balinese constituent order in terms of the logical relationship: P > (Q > R).

P is the logical form for either +AT or -AT; Q is the logical form for either definite or indefinite NP; and, R is the logical form for possibilities of constituent order. In a P construction, if the Q is definite there is more than one possibility for constituent order. But, if the Q is indefinite, most probably there is only one constituent order option. Interestingly enough there are two types of constituent orders which seem to be aberrant relative to the normal order. Firstly, a definite agent may appear between the +AT verb and the patient. In this situation, the constituent order can be VAP instead of the expected VPA. Secondly, a definite patient in the +AT clause construction may be left-dislocated, creating a seemingly abnormal order of PAV, instead of AVP. The VAP constituent order occurs under a single intonation unit, which usually is just true of the VP; thus, hiding the fact that there is an agent constituent at all. The PAV constituent order has three intonation units.

The flexibility of the constituent order has to do with identifiability of the NPs, whereas its rigidity has to do with the contrastive focus. In Balinese, an indefinite ENP expresses contrastive focus. This correlate with placing a constituent in a clause initial position or in front of the verb because the speaker assumes that "certain information is explicitly contrary to the hearer's current expectation" (Payne 1995: 5).

V. Data Sources

Sources from which example sentences are taken (other than our own) are indicated in parentheses with the particular pages from which those sentences are cited. The following are the full titles of the sources with their authors:

IB   I Belog. I Belog is a folktale found in Satua Bali Jilid 1A, compiled by the
     Department of Elementary Education of Bali Province, 1988/1989.

IKM   I Ketimun Mas. I Ketimun Mas is a folktale found in Satua Bali Jilid 1B,
   compiled by the Department of Elementary Education of Bali Province,
   1988/1989.

RA   Rare Angon. Rare Angon is a folktale found in Satua Bali Jilid 2B,
   compiled by the Department of Elementary Education of Bali Province,
   1988/1989.

SNB&IB Satua Nang Bangsing teken I Belog.SatuaNangBangsing teken I Belog is a folktale
     found in Satua-satua sane Banyol ring Kasusastran Bali, compiled by I Gusti Ngurah
     Bagus, 1988/1989.

VI. References

Chung, Sandra. 1978. *Case marking & Grammatical Relations in Polynesia*. Austin& London: University of Texas Press.

Dik, Simon, et al. 1981. On the typology of focus phenomena.*Perspectives on Functional Grammar*,   Tenn Hoekstra, Harry van der Hulst, Michael Moortgat (eds), 41-74. Dordrecht: Foris   Publications.

Givon, T. 1984. *Syntax: a Functional Typological Introduction*, Volume 1.   Amsterdam/Philadelphia: JohnBenjamins.

_____ 1983.Topic continuity in spoken English.*Topic Continuity in Discourse: A   Quantitative Cross-Language Study, Vol. 3*, T.Givon (ed.), 343 - 364. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: JohnBenjamins.

Greenberg, JosephH. 1966. Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements.*Universals of language*, JosephH.Greenberg (ed.). 73 - 113. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.

Hawkins, JohnA. 1983. *Word Order Universals*.New York: Academic Press.

Lambrecht, Knud. 1987. On the status of SVO sentences in French discourse. *Coherence and grounding in discourse*, RussellTomlin (ed.), 217-262.   Amsterdam/Philadelphia: JohnBenjamins.

Mithun, Marianne. 1992. Is basic word order universal? *Pragmatics of Word Order Flexibility*, Doris L. Payne (ed.), 15-61. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Payne, DorisL. 1992. *Introduction.Pragmatics of Word Order Flexibility*, Doris L. Payne(ed.), 1 - 13. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: JohnBenjamins.

Schachter, Paul. 1984. *Semantic-Role-Based Syntax in Toba Batak. Studies in the Structure of Toba Batak*, Paul Schachter (ed.), 122-149. UCLA Occasional Papers in Linguistics, Number 5.

Wouk, Fay. 1984. *Scalar transitivity and trigger choice in Toba Batak. Studies in the structure of Toba Batak*, Paul Schachter (ed), 195-219. UCLA Occasional Papers   in   Linguistics, Number 5.