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This paper discusses manner expressions in Balinese, providing new empirical support for the typological and theoretical study of adverbials, voice-related alternative argument realisations, and the nature of syntactic dependency in semantics-syntax interrelation. Manners in Balinese can be expressed in three ways: lexically by a simple adverb modification as in (1a) (Type 1), morphologically by (causative) -ang as in (1b) (Type 2) and analytically by (causative) baan as in (1c) (Type 3).

(1). a. la malaib gencang.  
     3run fast 'He ran fast.'

b. Gencang-ang malaib!
     3run fast-CAUS run  
     i) 'Run quickly!'; ii) **Make him/her run quickly!'

c. gencang baan=a malaib
     fast CAUS=3 run
     i) 'He ran fast'; ii) 'He made him/her run fast.'

I will argue that a full account of possible manner expressions as illustrated in (1) requires an integrated analysis of the interplay between syntax, semantics and information structure. Any analysis must be able to account for the possible ambiguity contrast in (1b) and (1c): reading (ii) in (b) is not possible whereas reading (ii) in (1c) is. Following the analysis of a causative predicate as a three-place predicate (Alsina 1992), I will offer an argument structure (a-str)-based analysis within LFG (Bresnan 2001), arguing that the argument structures of the causative –ang and resultative baan manner predicates are similar, but not the same. They are informally represented in (2), with the crucial difference being referential identification of the patient causee:

(2). a. MANNER -ang:  ‘CAUSE < agt_i, (pt_i), 'MANNER.PRED< ‘PRED<__j ...;'>'

b. MANNER baan:  'CAUSE < agt_i, (pt_i/j), 'MANNER.PRED< ‘PRED<__j ...;'>'

The manner –ang causative (2a/1b) makes use of morphological mode, indicating a tight structure with the patient obligatorily identified with the agent causee (indexed by _i in (2a)). This is agent-oriented manner, with the causer in total control of the embedded mannered PRED; i.e. 'he acts upon himself to do something in a particular manner.' In contrast, the resultative baan manner (2b/1c) makes use of analytic mode, with possibly indirect causative/resultative meaning where the causer is not always in full control of the mannered embedded event; hence the patient/causee is not necessarily identical to the agent, indicated by index i/j. This kind of iconicity in causative expressions (morphological: direct causation vs. analytical: indirect causation) has been mentioned in the literature (e.g. Shibatani 2002 and the references therein). The a-structures in (2) capture this cross-linguistic iconicity. Further support for the analysis with causee-causer identity in (2a) comes from the test when it is made overt: it must show up as a reflexive pronoun in the –ang manner causative, as seen in (3a). In contrast, either a reflexive or an ordinary pronoun can be used in the resultative baan manner construction (3b).

(3). a. Gencang-ang awake malaib!
     quick-CAUS self.DEF run
     'Make yourself run fast.'

b. Genjang baan=a_i (awakne_i / ia._j) malaib
     quick CAUSE=3 self.3 3run
     'He made himself run fast.'
     'He made him/her run fast.'

The paper also provides further precise analysis for the morphosyntax of the causative –ang and resultative baan manner constructions, in particular their voice alternation constraints,
motivated by information structure. For example the manner causative –ang allows alternations as in (4). In (b) and (c), the patient of the second verb (yeh ‘water’) is focused, appearing as grammatical subject in sentence-initial position:

(4). a. Tiang ng-enggal-ang nyemak yeh. (loose VP)
   1 AV-quick-CAUS AV.take water
   ‘I took water quickly’ or ‘I hasten to take water.’

   b. Yeh ∅-enggal-ang tiang nyemak (loose VP)
      water UV-quick-CAUS 1 AV.take
      ‘I took WATER quickly.’

   c. Yeh ∅-enggal-ang ∅-jemak tiang (tight VP)
      water UV-quick-CAUS UV-take 1
      ‘I took WATER quickly.’

While the three structures in (4) are superficially similar, evidence suggests they are not syntactically of the same structural unity: (4a) and (4b) exhibit a loose VP, whereas (4c) has a tight VP. The tight manner VP in (4c) forms a complex predicate, having monoclausal properties, as evidenced by (morpho)syntactic tests such as reflexivisation, argument sharing/realisation, bare possessives, and double negation.

The full paper will discuss the Balinese manner expressions in larger typological context, showing how different/similar they are from those in other Austronesian languages; e.g. manner verbal predicates with voice alternations in Kavalan (Chang 2006). The significance of the alternative manner expressions in Balinese will be also highlighted in context of the typology of event/structural integration and the gradience nature of syntactic categories (Aarts 2007), and the challenge of formalising an analysis of the complex interplay between semantics, syntax and information structure.
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