

# On the Distribution of Reflexive Anaphors and Logophoric Anaphors in Balinese

I Nyoman Udayana

Department of English Language, Udayana University, Bali, Indonesia

**Abstract**—The central claim of this paper is that reflexive anaphors and logophoric anaphors in Balinese share the same forms. It is shown that Balinese possesses simple and complex reflexives. Only complex reflexives participate in the logophoric environment. Importantly it is claimed that the logophoric use of the reflexive anaphor occurs in a clausal complement of the verbs of communication and other verbs denoting a general state of consciousness. The logophor can appear in the subject or object position of the embedded clause while the reflexive use of the anaphor is only limited to occurring in a single clause and is restricted to occupying the object position, either the object of a verb or the object of a preposition. The characteristic differences in the distribution between the two are reflected in a syntactic domain having to do with passivization in that logophoric constructions allow it while reflexive constructions completely ban it. In addition, logophoricity may characterize an operation where there is a mismatch in the agreement between the logophor and its targeted antecedent whereas in reflexivity there must be an agreement in the phi-features between the binder and the bindee.

**Index Terms**—reflexive pronoun, logophoricity, state of consciousness, passivization, phi-features

## I. INTRODUCTION

Logophoric pronouns are special types of pronouns that commonly occur in clausal complements of verbs of communication, mental state, or perception. They are distinct from regular pronouns in that they always refer to the person whose perspectives, thoughts, or feelings are being reported (Clements, 1975, p. 141). The term was initially introduced by Hag ège (1974) to describe pronouns that are commonly found in African languages such as (Huang, 2000, p. 173). Observe logophoric pronoun in Ewe:

Ewe (Clements, 1975, p.142):

- (1) a. Kofi be yè-dzo.  
Kofi say Log-leave  
'Kofi<sub>i</sub> said that he<sub>i</sub> left.'
- b. Kofi be e-dzo.  
Kofi say Pro-leave  
'Kofi<sub>i</sub> said that he<sub>j</sub> left.'

The logophoric pronoun in Ewe is cliticized to a verb. Sentence (1a), the logophoric pronoun *yè* shows the perspective of Kofi, its antecedent, found in the main clause. The antecedent of a logophoric pronoun is called a logophoric/logocentric trigger (Culy, 1994; Huang, 2000). The pronoun *e-* in (1b), on the other hand, is a regular pronoun that cannot refer to Kofi. Hence, they are not co-indexed. At the same time, needless to say, this state of affairs relates to the fact that Kofi does not serve as the logophoric trigger guaranteeing that (1b) does not constitute a logophoric construction.

In languages outside Africa, some languages do not have special pronouns for indicating logophoricity. However, they have the same properties to encode indirect discourse. The pronouns used for indicating logophoric context are the ones derived from reflexive anaphors (Sells, 1987; Huang, 2000). The languages that belong to this type are called mixed logophoric languages (Culy, 1994). And the reflexives used for logophoric context are called indirect reflexives (Culy, 1997). Indeed reflexive anaphor to encode logophoricity was recognized to have occurred in Latin much earlier than the time the term logophoric pronoun was initially introduced by Hag ège (Kuno, 1987, p. 105). The languages that use indirect reflexives are languages mostly found in Asia such as Japanese, some languages found in Europe such as Icelandic (Sells, 1987) and also Archi, the East Caucasian language of the Lezgian family (Daniel, 2015). In what follows, we are taking a brief look at the Japanese and Icelandic logophoricity.

In (2) the reflexive anaphor in Japanese is expressed by the *zibun* 'self'. The same form is used for logophoric anaphor, as illustrated in (3). In (3a), the matrix clause is passive whose subject serves as the antecedent of the logophor *zibun* and the logophor itself is found as the object of the verb in the embedded clause. In (3b) *zibun* finds its antecedent in the matrix clause and it serves as the oblique argument of the verb *kita* 'hear'.

Japanese (Faltz, 1985, p. 29)

- (2) Taroo wa zibun o mamotta  
Taroo TOP self ACC defend+PAST

‘Taroo defended himself’

Japanese (Kameyama, 1985, cited in Sells, 1987, pp. 453-454):

- (3) a. Taroo<sub>i</sub> wa [Yosiko ga zibun<sub>i</sub> ni aitagatteiru to] iwareta.  
 Taroo<sub>i</sub> Top [Yosiko Subj self<sub>i</sub> Obj2 visit-was-wanting Comp] was-told  
 ‘Taroo<sub>i</sub> was told that Yosiko wanted to visit him<sub>i</sub>.’  
 b. Taroo wa Takasi<sub>i</sub> kara [Yosiko ga zibun<sub>i</sub> o nikundeiro to] kita.  
 Taroo TOP Takasi<sub>i</sub> from [Yosiko Subj self<sub>i</sub> Obj be-hating Comp] heard  
 ‘Taroo heard from Takasi<sub>i</sub> that Yosiko hated him<sub>i</sub>.’

In sentence (4), the reflexive anaphor *sig* ‘self’ is bound by both the subject and the object of the verb *syndic* ‘show’. The logophoric use of the same form is found in (5a) and (5b). What sets the difference between the logophoric anaphor in Japanese and that in Icelandic is that the latter is sensitive to logical subject conditions while the former is not. Thus, if the logophor in (5b) is made to co-refer with the antecedent which is not realized by the logical subject of the matrix clause, it automatically causes (5b) to be ungrammatical.

Icelandic (Thr ánnsson, 1979, p. 291), cited in Oshima (2004, p. 2).

- (4) J áni syndic Harald<sub>j</sub> fót á sig<sub>ij</sub>  
 ‘John<sub>i</sub> showed Harold<sub>j</sub> clothes for himself<sub>ij</sub>’  
 Icelandic (Sigurðsson 1986, cited in Sells 1987: 450):

- (5) a. Hann<sub>i</sub> sagð [að sig<sub>i</sub> vantað hæfileika].  
 he<sub>i</sub> said [that self<sub>i</sub> lacked ability]  
 ‘He<sub>i</sub> said that he<sub>i</sub> lacked ability.’  
 b. \*Honum<sub>i</sub> var sagt [að sig<sub>i</sub> vantað hæfileika].  
 he<sub>i</sub> was told [that self<sub>i</sub> lacked ability]  
 ‘He<sub>i</sub> was told that he<sub>i</sub> lacked ability.’

Balinese does not have logophoric pronouns either. As expected, however, reflexive pronouns also fill the gap. What reflexive anaphors are used for logophoric context and how they are employed will be discussed in the following sections. The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 is devoted to talking about the reflexive anaphors in Balinese and which type of reflexive anaphors are used for logophoricity. Section 3 talks about the phi-feature agreement between the reflexive anaphors and the logophoric anaphors and their respective antecedents. Section 4 deals with the syntactic distribution of the two anaphors pertaining to passivization. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper.

## II. COMPLEX REFLEXIVES AND LOGOPHORIC MARKER

### A. Simple Versus Complex Reflexives

Reflexive anaphors in Balinese are coded by the word meaning body. To construct reflexive constructions, Balinese possesses simple and complex reflexives. Before exemplifying the reflexive anaphors in Balinese, it has to be noted that Balinese has a speech level system in which the different levels are shown by different lexicons which are generally divided into high and low speech levels. The word meaning body is *awak* for low register and *raga* for the high register. For ease of exposure, only the low speech style system is employed here. The chief use of simple reflexive in Balinese is for action verbs in which the object of the verb is seen as being acted upon by the action named by the predicate (Arka, 2003; Udayana, 2013).

- (6) a. Ia<sub>i</sub> nyimpit awak<sub>i</sub>  
 3 AV.pinch self  
 ‘(S)he pinched himself/herself’  
 b. Wayan Sari<sub>i</sub> ngengkebang awak<sub>i</sub> di kamare  
 name AV.hide self in room.DEF  
 ‘Wayan Sari hid herself in the room’  
 c. Nyoman Sada<sub>i</sub> ngayehang awak<sub>i</sub> ibi di tukade  
 name AV.bathe self yesterday in river.DEF  
 ‘Nyoman Sada bathed himself yesterday in the river’

Complex reflexive is made up of the base, the reflexive element, plus the possessor formative showing the person feature of the intended reflexive anaphor. Thus, for the third person, the reflexive element *awak* is combined with the third person possessor's formative realizing *awak iane* which is shortened into *awakne*. For the second person, there are two-second person features, male second person ‘cai’ and female second person ‘nyai’ deriving the complex reflexive anaphors *awak caine* ‘yourself’ and *awak nyaine* ‘yourself’ respectively. Finally, for the first reflexive anaphor, the reflexive element *awak* co-occurs with the first person possessor yielding the form *awak cange*. Unlike the simple reflexives which only fare well with action verbs, the exclusive use for the complex reflexives is that they only occur in clauses containing stative verbs in which the object is characterized as not being able to be acted upon by the action of the associated predicate.

- (7) a. Ia<sub>i</sub> nepukin awakne<sub>i</sub> di kacane  
 3 AV.see self.3POSS in mirror.DEF  
 ‘(S)he saw herself/himself in the mirror’

- b. Made Sara<sub>i</sub> nemenin awakne<sub>i</sub>  
 name AV.like self.3POSS  
 'Made Sara likes himself'
- c. I meme<sub>i</sub> ningeh awakne<sub>i</sub> magending di radione  
 ART mother AV.hear self.3POSS MV.sing on radio.DEF  
 'Mother heard herself singing on the radio'
- (8) a. Cai<sub>i</sub> nepukin awak caine<sub>i</sub> di kacane  
 2M AV.see self 2MPOSS in mirror.DEF  
 'You saw yourself in the mirror'
- b. Cang<sub>i</sub> mercayain awak cange<sub>i</sub>  
 1 AV.believe self 1POSS  
 'I believe in myself'

An attempt to make the respective clauses combined with simple reflexive predictably results in the ungrammaticality of each clause, as illustrated by the following examples taken from (7) and (8) rewritten here as (9) and (10).

- (9) a. \*Ia<sub>i</sub> nepukin awak<sub>i</sub> di kacane  
 '(S)he saw himself/herself in the mirror'
- b. \*Made Sara<sub>i</sub> nemenin awak<sub>i</sub>  
 'Made Sara likes himself'
- c. \*I meme<sub>i</sub> ningeh awak<sub>i</sub> magending di radione  
 'Mother heard herself singing on the radio'
- (10) a. \*Cai<sub>i</sub> nepukin awak<sub>i</sub> di kacane  
 'You saw yourself in the mirror'
- b. \*Cang<sub>i</sub> mercayain awak<sub>i</sub>  
 'I believe in myself'

However, the possessor forming complex reflexive serves as giving featural specification to the simple reflexive anaphor, making the associated reflexive anaphor completely marked with the information of person, number, or gender features, suggesting that it can co-occur with action verbs. Therefore, if it were made to co-occur with the action verbs, it would not pose any problem. Based on this fact, sentences in (6) rewritten here as (11) remain grammatical.

- (11) a. Ia<sub>i</sub> nyimpitawakne<sub>i</sub>  
 3 AV.pinch self.3POSS  
 '(S)he pinched himself/herself'
- b. Wayan Sari<sub>i</sub> ngengkebang awakne<sub>i</sub> di kamare  
 name AV.hide self.3POSS in room.DEF  
 'Wayan Sari hid herself in the room'.
- c. Nyoman Sada<sub>i</sub> ngayehang awakne<sub>i</sub> ibi di tukade  
 name AV.bathe self.3POSS yesterday in river.DEF  
 'Nyoman Sada bathed himself yesterday in the river'

However, the simple reflexive *awak* has a clitic-like property. This is evidenced by two main cross-linguistic characteristics of a clitic related to movement and coordination (Spencer & Lu ́, 2012). First, it must have a fixed syntactic position thus it cannot be preposed, as shown in (12). Second, it cannot be coordinated, as illustrated by the ungrammaticality of (13).

- (12) a. \*Awak<sub>i</sub> jimpat=a<sub>i</sub>  
 self OV.pinch=3  
 '(S)he pinched himself/herself'
- b. \*Awak<sub>i</sub> engkebang Wayan Sari<sub>i</sub>  
 self OV.hide name  
 'Wayan Sari hid herself'
- c. \*Awak<sub>i</sub> kayehan Nyoman Sada<sub>i</sub>  
 Self OV.bathe name  
 'Wayan Sada bathed himself'
- (13) a. \*Ia<sub>i</sub> nyimpit awak<sub>i</sub> tekenI Made  
 3 AV.pinch self with name  
 '(S)he pinched himself/herself and I Made'
- b. \*Wayan Sari<sub>i</sub> ngengkebang awak<sub>i</sub> teken cang  
 name AV.hide self with 1  
 'Wayan Sari hid herself and me'
- c. \*Nyoman Sada<sub>i</sub> ngayehan awak<sub>i</sub> teken Wayan Sari  
 name AV.bathe self with name  
 'Nyoman Sad bathed herself and Wayan Sari'

The simple reflexive that possesses clitic-like property only works in an environment in which it must be attached only to its host, the object of an action verb, suggesting that it does not share the same property when it assumes a position as the object of a preposition. This state of affairs is borne out, as witnessed in the following examples.

- (14) a.  $Ia_i$  meli buku sig \* $awak_i$ /  $awakne_i$   
 3 AV.buy book at self/ self.3POSS  
 (i) '(S)he bought a book in himself/herself' (lit.)  
 (ii) '(S)he bought a book for himself/herself'  
 b.  $I$   $meme_i$  ngomong ajak \* $awak_i$ / $awakne_i$ .  
 Art mother AV.talk with self/self.3POSS  
 'Mother talked to herself'

It is worth noting that Balinese, like other Austronesian families of languages, possesses what is called a symmetrical voice system (Arka, 1998, 2003; Udayana, 2013; Himmelmann & Riesberg, 2013; Riesberg & Primus, 2015). That is, a verb of a transitive clause can either be AV-marked (the subject of a clause is agentive-focus) or OV-marked (the subject of a clause is objective-focus). In line with this characterization, reflexivization can operate as in (15) in which the verb is AV-marked and the reflexive anaphor appears right adjacent to the action verb or high transitivity verb. In addition to this, the associated verbs of the clause can take OV-marker. However, turning the transitive clause in (15) into the OV-clause results in the ungrammaticality of (16). To make it well-formed, the reflexive element of the resultant clauses must be expressed in the complex reflexive, as illustrated in (17).

- (15) a.  $Ia_i$  ninjak  $awak_i$   
 3 AV.kick self  
 '(S)he kicked herself/himself'  
 b.  $Cai_i$  nigtig  $awak_i$   
 2M AV.hit self  
 'You hit yourself with a stick'  
 (16) a. \* $Awak_i$  tinjak= $a_i$   
 self OV.kick=3  
 '(S)he kicked himself/herself'  
 b. \* $Awak_i$  tigtig  $cai_i$   
 self OV.hit 2  
 'You hit yourself with a stick'  
 (17) a.  $Awakne_i$  tinjak= $a_i$   
 self.3POSS OV.kick=3  
 '(S)he kicked himself/herself'  
 b.  $Awak$   $caine_i$  tigtig  $cai_i$   
 self 2M.POSS OV.kick 2M  
 'You hit yourself with a stick'

To conclude, the nature of the operations of the simple reflexive *awak* manifests itself as a strictly local anaphor that never participates in long-distance binding, which eventually strongly predicts that it cannot serve as a logophoric pronoun. The related use of simple versus complex reflexives can be depicted in the following table.

TABLE 1  
 THE USE OF SIMPLE VERSUS COMPLEX REFLEXIVE

Type of anaphor	Reflexive use	Logophoric use
Simple: <i>awak</i>	Yes	No
Complex reflexive: <i>awak cange</i> 'myself' <i>awak caine</i> '(2M)yourself', <i>awak nyaine</i> '(2F) yourself, and <i>awakne</i> 'himself/herself'	Yes	Yes

### B. Logophors in Balinese

Given the situation that the logophoric domain is not found in a single clause coupled with the characterization that simple reflexive attributes to their clitic-like property in its reflexive use. This situation directly provides us with an explanation that it is not in a position for a logophor to be realized by the simple reflexive. In other words, the simple reflexive anaphor never participates in logophoric constructions in Balinese. This, as has been noted, goes with the cross-linguistic phenomenon associated with logophoric pronouns in that it commonly occurs in a clausal complement of verbs of communication which manifests them as what is called a long-distance anaphora (see Koster & Reuland, 1991)<sup>1</sup>.

Another important aspect that relates to logophoricity is that the verbs that motivate its occurrence. The verbs that enter into logophoric constructions involve three main types (cf. Huang, 2000; Sells, 1987).

<sup>1</sup>The fact that the (logophoric) anaphor is not found in the same clause, i.e. the binding relation does not characterize the one such as reflexive anaphors, the phenomenon is called exempt anaphors (Büring, 2005, Reuland, 2011)

Types of verbs licensing logophoric pronouns:<sup>2</sup>

- (18) a. Communication verbs: say, tell, ask  
 b. Perception verbs: hear, listen  
 c. Mental state verbs: believe, think, know

The following are examples sentences whose matrix clause contains verbs that license logophoricity.

- (19) a. Arik<sub>i</sub> ngorahan awakne<sub>i</sub>/\*awak<sub>i</sub> suba nganten  
 name AV.say self.3POSS/self PERF married  
 ‘Arik said that she had been married’  
 b. Meme<sub>i</sub> matakon apa awakne<sub>i</sub> dadi kema  
 mother ask whether self.3POSS AUX go.there  
 ‘Mother asked whether she could go there’
- (20) a. I Made<sub>i</sub> ngorahan I Nyoman nemenin awakne<sub>i</sub>  
 name AV.say name AV.like self.3POSS  
 ‘I Made said that I Nyoman liked himself’  
 b. Ketut<sub>i</sub> percaya cang nemenin awakne<sub>i</sub>  
 name believe 1 AV.like self.3POSS  
 ‘Ketut believes that I like her’
- (21) a. Ia<sub>i</sub> ngorahin I meme awakne<sub>i</sub> suba meli baju  
 3 AV.tell ART mother self.3POSS PERF AV.buy shirt  
 ‘(S)he told mother that she had bought a shirt;  
 b. Ia ningeh awakne<sub>i</sub> lakar maan hadiah  
 3 AV.hear self.3POSS FUT AV.get present  
 ‘(S)he heard that (s)he would get a prize’  
 c. Cai<sub>i</sub> nawang awak caine<sub>i</sub> suba kelih  
 2M AV.know self 2MPOSS PERF grown.up  
 ‘You know that you have been grown up (lit.)/You know that you are already mature’

The types of verbs other than the verb of communication predictably disallow logophoricity. In what follows we give more examples of verbs that license logophoricity. Interestingly, Balinese verb which has the same morphological base can appear or cannot appear in a logophoric context. Sentence (22a), the verb *enah* ‘seem’ does not belong to the type of verb that licenses logophoricity; hence it is ungrammatical. The same is true for (22c), the verb *enahang* ‘show’ is also a verb uncategorizable as denoting logophoricity. However, the verb *enahang* in (22b) motivates logophoricity. The difference, in interpretation between (22b) and (22c), lies in the fact that in (22b) the logophor occurs in a clausal complement. Note that Balinese does not have a complementizer ‘that’ which, in a spoken language, is marked by a pause before uttering the clausal complement. In (22c) the form *awak* appears as the object of the verb *enahang*. In other words, the anaphor and its antecedent occur in a single clause. Therefore (22c) is judged as ungrammatical because it does not occur in a logophoric environment.

- (22) a. \*Ia<sub>i</sub> ngenah awakne<sub>i</sub> suba nganten  
 3 AV.seem self.3POSS PERF married  
 ‘She seems to have got married’  
 b. Ia<sub>i</sub> ngenahang \*awak<sub>i</sub>/awakne<sub>i</sub> suba nganten  
 3 AV.show self/self.3POSS PERF married  
 ‘She showed that she would get married (i.e. introduced and told people that she would get married)’  
 c. \*Ia<sub>i</sub> ngenahang awak<sub>i</sub>/awakne<sub>i</sub> dadi dokter  
 3 AV.show self /self.3POSS as doctor  
 ‘She showed herself as a doctor’

### III. PHI-FEATURE AGREEMENT

It is a well-known fact that antecedent-anaphor relation that involves reflexivity or logophoricity must relate to what is called phi-features. That is the grammatical features of person, gender, and number which are used for identifying the anaphor and its targeted antecedent. In other words, the features can naturally be used for determining the agreement between them.

Recall that Balinese has a simple reflexive anaphor which occurs in an action verb, as illustrated again in (6a-c). In isolation, the reflexive anaphor *awak* does not carry the feature of person and number. However, the anaphor and its antecedent can be co-indexed. I argue that the anaphor *awak* shares the same phi-features as its antecedent for the reason that, as has been noted, the anaphor bears the patient role which is acted upon by the verb *ngengkebang* ‘hide’. In this connection, the anaphor copies all the features associated with its antecedent. Thus the phi-features associated

<sup>2</sup>Another linguistic phenomenon called switch reference also works similarly to logophoricity what makes them distinct from each other is that switch reference phenomena apply to any verbal predicate of the main clause while logophoric phenomena are limited to a set of semantically specified logocentric predicates (See Stirling (1993) for more information).

with *awak* found in (23a-c) can be specified in (24a-c), to distinguish them from each other I label them as *awak* 1, *awak* 2, and *awak* 3 respectively.

- (23) a. Cang<sub>i</sub> ngengkebang awak<sub>i</sub>  
 1 AV.hide self  
 'I hid myself'
- b. Cai<sub>i</sub> sing ngrunguang awak<sub>i</sub>  
 2M NEG AV.care.for self  
 'You do not care for yourself'
- c. Ia<sub>i</sub> ninjak awak<sub>i</sub>  
 3 AV.kick self  
 '(S)he kicked himself/herself'
- (24) a. awak 1  $\left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{1st person} \\ + \text{singular} \end{array} \right]$
- b. awak 2  $\left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{2nd person} \\ + \text{singular} \\ \text{masculin} \end{array} \right]$
- c. awak 3  $\left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{3rd person} \\ + \text{singular} \end{array} \right]$

Complex reflexives, unlike the simple reflexive, are specified with the features of its targeted antecedents. Therefore it does not come as a surprise that the features of the reflexive anaphors for the corresponding antecedents in (25a-c) represented in (26a-c) are the same as the ones found in (24a-c).

- (25) a. Cang<sub>i</sub> nepukin awak cange<sub>i</sub> di kacane  
 1 AV.see self 1POSS in mirror.LINK.DEF  
 'I saw myself in the mirror;
- b. Cai<sub>i</sub> nemenin awak caine<sub>i</sub>  
 2M AV.like self 2MPOSS  
 'You like yourself'
- c. Ia<sub>i</sub> mercayain awakne<sub>i</sub>  
 3 AV.believe self.3POSS  
 '(S)he believes in himself/herself'
- (26) a. awak cange  $\left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{1st person} \\ + \text{singular} \end{array} \right]$
- b. awak caine  $\left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{2nd person} \\ + \text{singular} \\ \text{masculin} \end{array} \right]$
- c. awakne  $\left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{3rd person} \\ + \text{singular} \end{array} \right]$

Looking at the agreement between the reflexive anaphor and its targeted antecedent, the same characterization can be noticed to occur and the relationship that holds between the logophoric anaphor and its antecedent. Consider the following examples:

- (27) a. Cang<sub>i</sub> ngorahang awak cange<sub>i</sub> suba kema  
 1 AV.say self 1POSS PERF go.there  
 'I said that I had gone there'
- b. Cai<sub>i</sub> ngorahang awak caine<sub>i</sub> sing dadi milu  
 2M AV.say self 2MPOSS NEG AUX come.along  
 'You said that you could not come along'
- c. Ia<sub>i</sub> ngorahan awakne<sub>i</sub> lakar meli baju  
 3 AV.say self.3POSS FUT AV.buy shirt  
 '(S)he said that (s)he would buy a shirt'

Notice that the logophoric use of the complex reflexive is identical to the reflexive anaphor. They are only different in the binding domain. The phi-features of the logophor in each sentence in (27) are the same as those in (26), as shown in (28).

- (28) a. awak cange  $\left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{1st person} \\ + \text{ singular} \end{array} \right]$   
 b. awak caine  $\left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{2nd person} \\ + \text{ singular} \\ \text{masculin} \end{array} \right]$   
 c. awakne  $\left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{3rd person} \\ + \text{ singular} \end{array} \right]$

However, a mismatch in a phi-feature agreement between the logophor and its respective antecedent can occur logophorically.<sup>3</sup> This particularly involves perspective discourse in which a set of individuals denoting the logophor can be anteceded by only one individual giving rise to the mismatch in the phi-features between the two. This is illustrated in (30). The phi-features of the antecedent and the logophor, unlike the representation in (24), (26), and (28), are given here to show the mismatch.

- (29) a. Cang<sub>i</sub> percaya [awak cange ajak makejang]<sub>i+j</sub> lakar menang  
 1 believe self 1POSS with all FUT win  
 'I believe that we will win'  
 b. Cai<sub>i</sub> ngorahan [awak caine ajak makejang]<sub>i+j</sub> nemenin anak ento  
 2M AV.say self 2MPOSS with all AV.like person that  
 'You said you all liked the man'  
 c. Ia<sub>i</sub> matakon apa [awakne ajak makejang]<sub>i+j</sub> suba maan wangsit ento  
 3 AV.ask COMP self.3POSS with all PERF AV.get message that  
 '(S)he asked whether thet had got the message'

- (30) a. cang  $\left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{1st person} \\ + \text{ singular} \end{array} \right]$  cang ajak makejang  $\left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{1st person} \\ - \text{ singular} \end{array} \right]$   
 b. cai  $\left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{2nd person} \\ + \text{ singular} \\ \text{masculin} \end{array} \right]$  cai ajak makejang  $\left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{2nd person} \\ - \text{ singular} \\ \text{masculin} \end{array} \right]$   
 c. ia  $\left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{3rd person} \\ + \text{ singular} \end{array} \right]$  ia ajak makejang  $\left[ \begin{array}{l} \text{3rd person} \\ - \text{ singular} \end{array} \right]$

The asymmetry in phi-features associated with the antecedent-logophor relation only occurs in a situation where the logophor is plural while the logocentric trigger has the singular feature value. The reverse is not true. Thus the logophoric binding in (31) fails.

- (31) a. \* [Cang ajak makejang]<sub>i+j</sub> percaya [awak cange]<sub>i</sub> lakar menang  
 1 with all believe self 1POSS FUT win  
 'I believe that we will win'  
 b. \* [Cai ajak makejang]<sub>i+j</sub> ngorahan [awak caine]<sub>i</sub> nemenin anak ento  
 2M with all AV.say self 2MPOSS AV.like person that  
 'You said you all liked the man'  
 c. \* [Ia ajak makejang]<sub>i+j</sub> matakon apa awakne<sub>i</sub> suba maan wangsit ento  
 3 with all AV.ask COMP self.3POSS PERF AV.get message that  
 '(S)he asked whether thet had got the message'.

However, as predicted, if the logophor and its antecedent are in agreement particularly in this case with number specification. The resulting constructions are perfectly acceptable.

- (32) a. [Cang ajak makejang]<sub>i+j</sub> percaya [awak cange ajak makejang]<sub>i+j</sub> lakar menang  
 1 with all believe self 1POSS with all FUT win  
 'We believe that we will win'  
 b. [Cai ajak makejang]<sub>i+j</sub> ngorahan [awak caine ajak makejang]<sub>i+j</sub> nemenin  
 2M with all AV.say self 2MPOSS with all AV.like

<sup>3</sup>This reminds us of a phenomenon in discourse grammar called synecdoche. Consider the following examples:

- (i) a. Jakarta declared that Indonesia would attend the conference.  
 b. Indonesia declared that Jakarta would attend the conference.

Only (ia) has 'a logophoric context' in which Jakarta and Indonesia can be co-indexed. Jakarta in the main clause also stands for Indonesia. In sentence (ib), however, Jakarta and Indonesia cannot be co-indexed because Jakarta cannot stand for Indonesia.

- anak ento  
 person that  
 ‘You said you all liked the man’
- c. [Ia ajak makejang]<sub>i+j</sub> nakonang apa [awakne ajak makejang]<sub>i+j</sub>  
 3 with all AV.ask COMP self.3POSS with all  
 suba maan wangsit ento  
 PERF AV.get message that  
 ‘(S)he asked whether thet had got the message’

#### IV. PASSIVE AND LOGOPHORIC ENVIRONMENT

Another phenomenon that motivates the difference distribution between logophoric constructions and reflexive constructions relates to the passivization process. The former predictably works similarly to regular declarative clauses thus allowing passivization. However, the reflexive constructions specify that the performer and the undergoer are co-referential, suggesting that they cannot enter into a passivization process. How is this possible? In what follows, the nature of passivization is first made clear and the discussion goes on with passivization in logophoricity.

A standard operation of a passive construction is to show that the object of an active clause is promoted to the subject in the passive clause counterpart while the subject of the active clause is demoted to an oblique function and assumes the adjunct function, not taken as an argument (Lingfelt & Solstad, 2006). Importantly for an active clause to be transformed into a passive clause there is a transfer of action from the performer of action to the undergoer of that action (Quirk et al., 1985).

- (33) a. John hit the man  
 b. The man was hit by John  
 c. The man loves Jane  
 d. Jane is loved by the man

Given the characteristics of passivization, reflexives naturally disallow passivization because there is no transfer of action. To put it differently, a reflexive construction stipulates that the agent and the patient are of the same entity. The co-reference nature of the entities is commonly shown in the literature by the semantic roles associated with the argument of the verbal predicate (see Reinhart & Siloni, 2004, 2005). The verb *love* in (34a), for example, requires two arguments bearing the roles of experiencer and stimulus respectively. (34 ai) shows that the verb *love* subcategorizes for two arguments and these two arguments are of different entities, the NP subject John is linked to the experience role and the NP object Jane to stimulus role. Needless to say, the sentences (34a) can be passivized. The same is true for the verb *pinch* (35a), the arguments subcategorized by the verb *pinch* are distinct. Therefore, sentence (35a) can be turned into a passive construction. However, the verb *love* in (34b) and the verb *pinch* in (35b) occur in a reflexive construction. Since the arguments are the same entities (and each of these verbs appears in reflexive constructions) the sentence therefore cannot undergo passivization, as shown in (34c) and (35c) respectively. (The co-indexation of the semantic role ( $\theta$ ) indicates the situation that the participants/arguments of the predicate are of the same entity).

- (34) a. John loves Jane  
 (i) John = experiencer, Jane = stimulus  
 (ii) love <  $\theta_1$ ,  $\theta_2$ >  
 b. John<sub>i</sub> loves himself<sub>i</sub>  
 (i) John = experiencer, Himself = stimulus  
 (ii) love <  $\theta_1$ ,  $\theta_1$ >  
 c. \*Himself is loved by John
- (35) a. The man pinched Jack  
 (i) The man = agent, Jack = patient  
 (ii) pinch <  $\theta_1$ ,  $\theta_2$ >  
 b. The man<sub>i</sub> pinched himself<sub>i</sub>  
 (i) The man = agent, himself = patient  
 (ii) pinch <  $\theta_1$ ,  $\theta_1$ >  
 c. \*Himself was pinched by the man

This notion of co-reference between two arguments extends to a situation shown by two entities having identical facial/body appearances which are commonly depicted by verbs denoting resemblance, as illustrated in (36). Note that the entities resembling each other can be taken as bearing the stimulus role. The arguments, then, can be analyzed as being co-referential yielding the argument structure given in (36eii) which, like the reflexive construction, Sentence (36a) and (36b) cannot be passivized, as shown in (36c) and (36d) respectively.

- (36) a. John resembles my father  
 b. My father resembles John  
 c. \*My father is resembled by John  
 d. \*John is resembled by my father



e. (i) John = stimulus, my father = stimulus

(ii) Resemble <  $\theta_1$ ,  $\theta_1$  >

Thus, in line with the concept of passivization proposed by Quirk et al. (1985), the situation amounts to saying that even though a clause contains an action verb in which the syntactic operation takes place; passivization fails since the agent and the patient arguments are the same although the entity bearing the patient role is only represented by body parts. Consider the following examples:

(37) a. John nodded his head

b. \*His head was nodded by John

c. They shook hands

d. \*Hands were shaken by them

Now, we are looking at the anaphor that operates in a logophoric construction. As has been observed, a logophoric construction is one whose antecedent appears in a matrix clause whereas the logophor is found in the clausal complement headed by the verb in the embedded clause. The clausal complement can be realized by an intransitive clause or a transitive clause. Since each entity (the one occupying the subject position and the one occupying the subject position) is different; naturally then the transitive clause can undergo passivization.

Sentence (38a), the form *awakne* that is contained in the clausal complement is a logophor which serves the subject of the clause headed by the verb *demen* 'like'. The experiencer argument and the stimulus argument are not the same entities. Therefore the clause can be passivized, as shown in (38b).

(38) a.  $Ia_i$  ngorahang awakne<sub>i</sub> nemenin Ni Sari  
3 AV.say self.3POSS AV.like name

'He said that he liked Ni Sari;

b.  $Ia_i$  ngorahan Ni Sari demenina tekenawakne<sub>i</sub> (experiencer  $\neq$  stimulus)  
3 AV.say name like.PAS by self.3POSS

'He said that Ni Sari was liked by him'

The same situation holds in (39a). Even though the logophor now occupies the object position, the resultant clause can still be passivized, as illustrated in (39b). However, passivization is blocked in (39c), in which the form *awakne* which is not bound by the subject of the matrix clause (they are not co-indexed), giving rise to the fact that it gets reflexive reading, not a logophoric reading. Hence the ungrammaticality of 39(b).

(39) a.  $Ia_i$  ngorahangNi Sari nemenin awakne<sub>i</sub>  
3 AV.say name AV.like self.3POSS

'He said that Ni Sari liked him'

b.  $Ia_i$  ngorahang awakne<sub>i</sub> demenina tekenNi Sari (experiencer  $\neq$  stimulus)  
3 AV.say self.3POSS like.PAS by name

'He said that he was loved by Ni Sari'

c. \* $Ia_i$  ngorahang awakne<sub>i</sub> demenina teken Ni Sari (experiencer = stimulus)  
3 AV.say self.3POSS like.PAS by name

Sentence (40a), is different from (39a) and (39b) in that it is not ambiguous between reflexive reading and logophoric reading. It only has a logophoric reading. It can be predicted that the embedded clause can be turned into a passive clause, as shown in (40b).

(40) a. I Wayan<sub>i</sub> nakonang apa awakne<sub>i</sub> dadi naar nasi  
name AV.ask COMP self.3POSS AUX AV.eat rice

'I Wayan asked whether he could eat rice'

b. I Wayan<sub>i</sub> nakonang apa nasi dadi daara teken awakne<sub>i</sub> (agent  $\neq$  patient)  
name AV.ask COMP rice AUX eat.PAS by self.3POSS

'I Wayan asked whether rice could be eaten by him'

The verb 'resemble', as shown in English in (36a) and (36b), is also available in Balinese. Again, what is interesting with this verb is that it has reflexive interpretation in the sense that the individuals appearing in the subject and object positions in the clausal complement of the logophoric predicate are different but identified as having the same appearance. The situation can be evidenced by the fact that the order of the two syntactic functions can be reversed, as demonstrated in (41a) and (41b). Given this situation, the respective sentence cannot be changed into a passive construction, as shown in the ungrammaticality of (41c) and (41d).

(41) a. Nyoman<sub>i</sub> ngorahan awakne<sub>i</sub> nyibin bapane  
name AV.say self.3POSS AV.resemble father.LK.DEF

'Nyoman said that he resembled his father'

b. Nyoman<sub>i</sub> ngorahan bapane nyibin awakne<sub>i</sub>  
name AV.say father.LK.DEF AV.resemble self.3POSS

c. \*Nyoman<sub>i</sub> ngorahan bapane sibina teken awakne<sub>i</sub> (stimulus = stimulus)  
name AV.say father.LK.DEF resemble.PAS by self.3POSS

'Nyoman said that his father was resembled by him'

d. \*Nyoman<sub>i</sub> ngorahan awakne<sub>i</sub> sibina teken bapane (stimulus = stimulus)

name AV.say self.3POSS resemble.PAS by father.LK.3POSS  
 'Nyoman said that he was resembled by his father'

## V. CONCLUSION

This paper discusses the distribution of reflexive anaphor and logophoric anaphor in Balinese. Balinese does not have a special pronoun denoting logophoricity, it is shown that logophoric marker has the same form as the reflexive anaphor. Reflexive anaphors are made up of simple and complex reflexive anaphors. Only the complex reflexive anaphor serves as the marker for denoting logophoricity. Given that they share the same forms, it is also shown that they are distinguished from their different uses by having different syntactic distributions. The same form used for denoting reflexive only assumes the position as an object, object of a verb, and object of a preposition while the same form employed for logophoric marking can occupy either the position as a subject or an object. Logophoric binding occurs in an environment in which the logophoric domain is the sentential complement of verbs of communication, verbs denoting perception, and verbs denoting mental states.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Arka, I W. (2003). *Balinese Morphosyntax: A Lexical-Functional Approach*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics, School of Pacific and Asian Studies, the Australian National University.
- [2] B üring, D. (2005). *Binding Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [3] Clements, G. N. (1975). The Logophoric Pronoun in Ewe: Its Role in Discourse. *Journal of West African Languages* 10.141-177
- [4] Culy, C. (1994). Aspects of Logophoric Marking. *Linguistics*, 32:1055-1094.
- [5] Culy, C. (1997). Logophoric Pronouns and Point of View. *Linguistics*, 35: 845-849
- [6] Daniel, M. (2015). Logophoric Reference in Archi. *Journal of Pragmatics* 88: 202-2019.
- [7] Faltz, L. M. (1985). *Reflexivization: A Study in Universal Syntax*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- [8] Hag ège, C. (1974). Les Pronoms Logophoriques. *Bulletin de la Soci é de Linguistique de Paris* 69.287-310.
- [9] Himmelmann, N. P. & Riesberg, S. (2013). Symmetrical Voice and Applicative Alternations: Evidence from Totoli. *Oceanic Linguistics*. 52 (2): 396-422. DOI: 10.1353/ol.2013.0021.
- [10] Huang, Y. (2000). *Anaphora: A Cross-linguistic Study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [11] Koster, J., & Reuland, E. (eds.). (1991). *Long-Distance Anaphora*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [12] Kuno, S. (1987). *Functional Syntax: Anaphora, Discourse, and Empathy*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- [13] Lingfelt, B., & Solstad, T. (eds.). (2006). *Demoting the Agent: Passive, Middle, and Other Voice Phenomena*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- [14] Oshima, D. Y. (2004). On Emphatic and Logophoric Binding. *Workshop on Semantic Approaches to Binding Theory*. Nancy, France August 2004
- [15] Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- [16] Reinhart, T. & Siloni, T. (2004). Against an Unaccusative Analysis of Reflexives in Alexiadou, Artemis, Anagnostopoulou, and Everaert, Martin (eds.) *The Unaccusativity Puzzle: Explorations of Syntax-Lexicon Interface*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [17] Reinhart, T. & Siloni, T. (2005). 'The Lexicon-syntax Parameter: Reflexivization and other arity operations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36.389-436.
- [18] Reuland, E. (2011). *Anaphora and Language Design*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- [19] Riesberg, S. & Primus, B. (2015). Agent Prominence in Symmetrical Voice Language. *STUF - Language Typology and Universals* 68 (4): 551-564. <https://doi.org/10.1515/stuf-2015-0023>.
- [20] Sells, P. (1987). Aspects of Logophoricity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18.445-479
- [21] Spencer, A. & Lu é, A. R. (2012). *Clitics: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [22] Stirling, L. (1993). *Switch-reference and Discourse Representation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [23] Udayana, I N. (2013). *Voice and Reflexives in Balinese*. Ph.D. Dissertation the University of Texas at Austin.



**I Nyoman Udayana** is a senior lecturer in linguistics at the Department of English Language, Faculty of Humanities Udayana University. He earned his Ph.D. from the University of Texas at Austin. His research interests are syntax, lexical semantics, and discourse grammar. He primarily focuses his research on verbs and argument realization and more specifically on the close relationship between verb-predicate's meaning and their argument(s) that lead to constructions related to reflexivization, logophoricity, and other similar constructions about valency-preserving or valency-changing phenomena. He is also interested in projects concentrating on the interface between syntax and discourse grammar in Indonesian and Balinese.