

Untangling the Balinese Bind: Binding and Voice in Austronesian

Theodore Levin (MIT)

Voice alternations in Balinese interact with binding phenomena in a way that appears problematic for standard views of the A/A-bar distinction. In simple sentences, movement to Spec-TP *does not* create new antecedents for binding, suggesting that Spec-TP is an A-bar position. In raising constructions, however, movement to the higher Spec-TP *does* create new antecedents for binding, behavior expected of an A-position. This paradox is dubbed the *Balinese Bind* by Wechsler (1998), who uses the phenomenon to demonstrate the superiority of HPSG approaches. In this paper, I argue that the paradox is illusory, and that Balinese Spec-TP is an unambiguous A-position, if we adopt a new account of the Balinese voice system and the Agree-based theory of Binding advanced by Rooryck and Vanden Wyngaerd (2011; **R&V**).

Voice/Binding Interactions: Balinese transitive verbs appear in two voices: morphologically unmarked Objective Voice (OV) (1a); and Agentive Voice (AV) (1b), marked by a phonologically conditioned nasal prefix. Data from Wechsler and Arka (1998) demonstrate that the preverbal nominal occupies Spec-TP in both voices.

- | | |
|--|---|
| (1) a. Bawi adol ida.
pig OV.sell 3sg
‘(s)he sold a pig’ | b. Ida ng-adol bawi.
3sg AV.sell pig
‘(s)he sold a pig’ |
|--|---|

In an OV reflexive construction (2a), it is the internal argument (IA) in Spec-TP that must be reflexive, as if Spec-TP were an A'-position, invisible to Binding Theory — so it is the v P-internal θ -positions that count as the crucial A-positions for Binding (as argued by Guilfoyle, Hung, and Travis' (1992: GHT) for Malagasy). This conclusion is compatible with AV reflexives, in which it is once again the internal argument that is reflexive:

- | | |
|--|--|
| (2) a. Ragan idane cingakin ida
self OV.see 3sg
‘(s)he saw himself/herself’ | b. Ida n-yingakin ragan idane
3sg AV-see self
‘(s)he saw himself’ |
|--|--|

Raising/Binding Interactions: *Ngenah* ‘seem’ optionally takes an experiencer-PP complement. A raised NP subject can bind an anaphor embedded within that PP (3). This is completely unexpected if Spec-TP is an A-bar position:

- (3) Takonang tiang apa [ia_i ngenah sig awakne $_i$ jelek sajan].
 OV.ask 1st Q 3sg seem to self bad very
 ‘I asked (him) whether he seemed to himself to be very ugly.’

Analysis of OV/AV: Recall that OV is morphologically unmarked, like the English active voice. I argue that Balinese v never assigns Case, so the clause has one fewer case assigner than its English active counterpart. T (not v) assigns Case to the IA, which first raises to raises above the EA in Spec- v P and then to Spec-TP because it cannot receive case *in-situ* (Boskovic 2007). The EA is incorporated, exempting it from the Case Filter (Baker 1985, *passim*). Evidence for incorporation is provided in (4) and (5):

- (4) **In OV, EA is obligatorily indefinite**
 I Wayan gugut cicing/*cicing-e ento
 ART W. OV.bite dog dog-DEF that
 ‘A dog/*the dog bit Wayan’

(5) **In OV, EA and V must be adjacent**

- a. Siap-e uber cicing ke jalan-e
 chicken-DEF OV.chase dog into street-DEF
 ‘The dog chased the chicken into the street.’
- b. uber cicing ke jalan-e siape-e
- c. *uber siap-e cicing ke jalan-e
- d. *siap-e uber ke jalan-e cicing

AV morphology reflects a special additional Case-assigning head (Voc) merged above vP, which provides a new source of case for the IA, which raises to Spec-VocP. T then assigns case to EA, which raises to Spec-TP, much as in English active constructions.

Solving the Balinese Bind: R&V propose that *self*-anaphors have unvalued ϕ -features and raise to Spec-vP, where they probe the EA. If in OV, every Balinese IA raises above the EA, we expect anaphors to behave the same. Whether the anaphor continues to Spec-TP (2a) or Spec-VocP (2b) is determined by structure added after the anaphoric relationship has already been established. The behavior of raising (3) follows almost as straightforwardly. The experiencer anaphor covertly adjoins to Spec-vP, where it c-commands the embedded subject and values its ϕ -feature. The embedded subject raises to Spec-TP for case reasons. Similar examples from Wechsler and Wechsler & Arka in which the raising-to-subject verb is replaced by a raising-to-object verb whose own voice can be varied follow similarly.

Under the proposed analysis, *The Balinese Bind* dissolves allowing us to capture the facts without special stipulations about the A/A-bar distinction. This is an improvement over previous theories which cannot capture the Balinese Bind (GHT), or which do so via altering the distribution of A/A-bar positions (Travis 1998). Additionally, the account relies on, and thus supports, a novel proposal concerning the Austronesian voice system, which may be successfully applied to other Austronesian languages with some modification.

[745 words]

References

- Baker, Mark. (1985). *Incorporation: A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Boskovic, Zeljko. (2007). “On the Locality and Motivation of Move and Agree: An Even More Minimal Theory”. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39:589-644.
- Guilfoyle, Eithne, Henrietta Hung, and Lisa Travis.(1992). “SPEC of IP and SPEC of VP: Two Subjects in Austronesian Languages”. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10.3:375-414.
- Rooryck, Johan and Guido Vanden Wyngaerd. (2011). *Dissolving Binding Theory*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Travis, Lisa. (1998). “Theta-Positions and Binding in Balinese and Malagasy”. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 43(3/4):435-467.
- Wechsler, Stephen. (1998). “HPSG, GB, and the Balinese Bind”. In *Lexical And Constructional Aspects of Linguistic Explanation*, ed. G. Webelhuth, A. Kathol, and J.-P. Koenig. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications, 179-195
- Wechsler, Stephen and I. Wayan Arka. (1998). “Syntactic Ergativity in Balinese: An Argument Structure Based Theory”. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16:387-441.