

Locatives and the argument-adjunct distinction in Balinese

I Wayan Arka

Australian National University/Udayana University

<wayan.arka@anu.edu.au>

Focussing on the realisation of locatives in Balinese, I show that there is no clear-cut distinction between arguments and adjuncts, supporting the gradient nature of grammatical functions (cf., Croft 2001; Langacker 1987; Aarts 2007). I argue that argumenthood is not wholly a property of a lexical head predicate and that a purely lexically based projectionist approach to syntactic argument structures cannot be maintained.

While the relevant properties (see (i)-(iii) below, and others, such as affectedness) have been noted in the literature (cf., Kittilä 2007, 2008; Peterson 2007, and the references therein), the interplay among the properties has not been explored in considerable depth. This paper addresses this.

In addition, I propose a novel argument-index analysis, an extension of the idea of core-index analysis discussed in Arka (2005) as a means to distinguish adjuncts from arguments. The analysis makes use of a battery of morphosyntactic and morphosemantic tests. The morphosyntactic tests include general and language-specific items such as subcategorisation, obligatoriness, categorical expressions and verbal-voice marking. The values of argument indices range between 1.00 (absolutely a core argument) and 0.00 (absolutely an adjunct). It is shown that typical obliques in Balinese have argument indices of 0.26-0.34.

An in-depth investigation of the realisations of locatives reported in this paper reveal the following important properties that determine their status in the argument-adjunct continuum, as evidence from marking, possible grammatical alternations and argument index analysis:

- i. Thematicity (i.e. whether or not the locative meaning is required by the head predicate): thematic locatives are argument-like whereas non-thematic semantic locatives are adjunct;
- ii. Individuation and generality: individuated specific locatives are argument-like whereas general deictic locatives are adjunct;
- iii. Animacy: animate locatives are argument-like whereas inanimate general locatives are adjunct-like.

Examples (1) illustrate the interplay between properties (i) and (ii). The verb *pules* 'sleep' needs no locative. Certain locatives that come with it, such as *di dampare/di umahe* in (1), are construable as 'thematic' (with indices of 0.15 and 0.07 respectively as shown in the brackets). While categorized as adjuncts, they are readily recruitable as arguments, e.g. becoming objects in the applicative structure (1b). The general locative *di*

alase ‘in the forest’ is absolutely an adjunct (with an index of 0.00) and cannot participate in the applicativisation.

Examples (2) illustrate the interplay between (i) and (iii). While both the animate and inanimate goal/locatives are thematic, they behave differently. They are marked differently: *sig* (2a) (animate) vs. *ka* (2b) (inanimate). In addition, only the animate locative is readily recruitable as an argument (2c).

- (1). a. *Tiang pules (di dampar-e / di umah-ne / di alas-e)*
 1 sleep at bench-DEF at house-3POSS in forest-DEF
 (0.15) (0.07) (0.00)
 ‘I slept on the bench / at his/her house / in the forest’
- b. *Tiang mules-in dampar-e / umah-ne / ?*alas-e*
 1 AV.sleep-APPL bench-DEF house-3POSS forest-DEF
 (0.84) (0.84) (0.00)
 ‘I slept on the bench / at his/her house / ?* in the forest’
- (2). a. *Sogok plangkan-e sig/*ka anak-e nto!* (animate goal/loc)
 push bench-DEF LOC person-DEF that
 ‘Push the bench towards the person.’
- b. *Sogok plangkan-e ka/*sig tembok-e!* (inanimate goal/loc)
 push bench-DEF LOC wall-DEF
 ‘Push the bench towards the wall.’
- c. *Sogok-in anak-e nto /?* tembok-e plangkan-e!*
 push-APPL 1 that wall-DEF bench-DEF
 ‘push the bench towards me/the wall.’

References

- Aarts, Bas. 2007. *Syntactic gradience*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Arka, I Wayan. 2005. The core-oblique distinction and core index in some Austronesian languages of Indonesia Paper read at Paper presented at International ALT VI (Association of Linguistic Typology conference, Padang Indonesia, July 2005)
- Croft, William. 2001. *Radical Construction Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kittilä, Seppo. 2007. On the encoding of transitivity-related features on the indirect object. *Functions of Language* 14 (1):149–164.
- . 2008. Differential Object Marking revisited: Concerning the animacy effects on the encoding of Goals. *Linguistic Typology. Linguistic Typology* 12 (2):245-268.
- Langacker, Ronald. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Vol. 1: Theoretical Prerequisites*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.