LOGOPHORICITY IN BALINESE AND A-STRUCTURE BINDING

I Nyoman Udayana*

I Nyoman Sedeng*

Abstract

Logophoric pronouns, commonly found in West African languages, were pronouns used for encoding a concept whereby such pronouns refer to persons whose ideas, speech, thoughts, or state of consciousness were being reported/talked about (Hagège 1974; Clements 1975; Culy 1994, 1997; Sells 1987; Huang 2000; Trask 1993; Bresnan 2001; among others). These pronouns occur in the clausal argument of verbs of communication and perception.

Although Balinese did not have pure logophoric pronouns like those found in West African languages, we saw that the complex reflexives in Balinese are parallel with logophoric pronouns in West African languages. (Complex) reflexive pronouns and logophoric pronouns have distinct distributional properties in Balinese. (Complex) reflexive pronoun forms must have clause-mate antecedent but the same forms tied to logophoric pronouns must have their targeted antecedents outside the clause they are in. We particularly saw that Balinese logophoric pronouns were bound anaphors (items that must be bound) and they respect the binding theory.

Keywords: logophoric pronoun, clausal argument, complex reflexive, binding theory

* Faculty of Letters and Culture, Udayana University

I. Introduction

Logophoric pronouns occur in a clausal complement of verbs of saying and verbs denoting communication and perceptions (Hagège 1974; Clements 1975; Culy 1994, 1997; Sells 1987; Huang 2000; Trask 1993; Bresnan 2001; among others). The antecedent of a logophoric pronoun, is called the logophoric trigger, always occurs in a matrix clause, while the logophoric pronoun in a subordinate/embedded clause. The logophoric trigger here is understood as the person whose ideas, speech, thoughts, or state of consciousness is being talked about or represented in the embedded clause of the verbs licensing logophoricity.

In Ewe, logophoric pronouns have different forms from regular pronouns. In Gokana, however, a logophoric pronoun is not distinguished from a regular pronoun, but the pronoun, which appears in a clause whose verb is logophorically-marked, is interpreted as a logophoric pronoun.

Ewe (Clements 1975: 142):

(1) a. Kofi be yè-dzo.
Kofi say Log-leave
'Kofi$_i$ said that he$_i$ left.' → (Kofi = he)

b. Kofi be e-dzo.
Kofi say Pro-leave
'Kofi$_i$ said that he$_j$ left.' → (Kofi ≠ he)

Gokana (Hyman and Comrie, 1981: 20):

(2) a. aè kɔ aè dɔ̀.
Pro said Pro fell
'He$_i$ said he$_j$ fell.'

b. aè kɔ aè dɔ̀-è.
Pro said Pro fell-Log
'He$_i$ said that he$_i$ fell.'

Gokana allows any person value (first, second, and third) to be a logophoric pronoun (Hyman and Comrie 1981). Given these facts, when the matrix clause is realized with a subject (the logophoric trigger) of third person value and there is more than one lexical item in the embedded clause also having third person value, the sentence in (3) thus yields more than one (logophoric) reading.

(3) Lébàreé kɔ aè d-è a gí á.
Lebare said Pro ate-Log Pro yams
(i) Lebare$_i$ said he$_i$ ate his$_i$ yams.'
(ii) Lebare$_i$ said he$_j$ ate his$_i$ yams.'

(iii) Lebare$_i$ said he$_i$ ate his$_j$ yams.' (Hyman and Comrie 1981: 24)

Based on the data above a logophoric pronoun must have its antecedent in the matrix clause, a regular pronoun however shows a disjoint reference. Before talking about logophoricity in Balinese, in what follows, we first deal with reflexive pronouns from which the Balinese logophoric pronouns stem.

II. Simple versus complex reflexives

There are two forms of reflexive anaphors in Balinese: simple reflexive and complex reflexives. The simple reflexive anaphors like the name suggests are only expressed by a single (free) morpheme *awak* derived from a word meaning 'body' while the complex reflexives are poly-morphemic, i.e. the simple reflexive plus a possessive morpheme whose person and number features agree with those of the targeted antecedent with which the (reflexive) anaphor co-occurs. The distinction of the type of reflexives is triggered by syntactic and semantic constraints.

2.1 Syntactic Constraint

Transitive clauses in Balinese are divided by two markings: agentive-marked verbs objective marked verbs. The former is indicated by a subject which is filled by an agent whereas in the latter case, its subject is realized by non-actors (Arka 1998). The former is glossed as AV whereas the latter as OV. OV verbs cannot take simple reflexives whereas AV verbs can.

(4) a. Ia$_i$ ngugut awak$_i$
3 AV.bite self
'(S)he bit himself/herself'

b. *Awak$_i$ gugut=a$_i$
self OV.bite=3
'(S)he bit himself/herself'

c. Awakne$_i$ gugut=a$_i$
self.3POSS OV.bite=.3

2.2 Semantic Constraint

A simple reflexive only fares well with a class of verbs known as high transitivity verbs such as *nendang* 'kick' and *nyimpit* 'pinch', as shown in (5a-b). Note that this constraint is only applicable with AV constructions.

(5) a. Nyoman$_i$ nendang awak$_i$[1]
name AV.kick self
'Nyoman kicked himself'
b. Made$_i$ nyimpit awak$_i$
name AV.pinch self
'Made pinched himself'

The attachment of a possessive morpheme to the simple reflexive appearing with high transitivity verbs does not predictably change the grammaticality of the associated sentences. Thus, in this context, it can be said that the possessive morpheme here serves only to emphasize the meaning of the antecedent–anaphor relation.

(6) a Nyoman$_i$ nendang awakne$_i$
name AV.kick self.3POSS
b. Made$_i$ nyimpit awakne$_i$
name AV.pinch self.3POSS

Unlike high transitivity verbs, low transitivity verbs such as *nepukin* 'see' and *nemenin* 'like' cannot combine with a simple reflexive. This is shown by the ungrammaticality of (7a-b).

(7) a. *Cang$_i$ nepukin awak$_i$ di kaca-e
1 AV.see self in mirror-DEF
'I saw myself in the mirror'
b. *Cai$_i$ nemenin awak$_i$
2 AV.like self
'You like yourself'

However, as predicted, when a low transitivity verb is made to appear with a complex reflexive, the resulting sentences are perfectly acceptable.

(8) a. Cang$_i$ nepukin awak cange$_i$ di kaca-e
1 AV.see self.1POSS in mirror-DEF

b. Cai$_i$ nemenin awak caie$_i$
2 AV.like self.2POSS

Semantic constraint related to the choice of simple and complex reflexives is exhibited by double object constructions, which can be illustrated by the verb *maang* 'give'. When the two objects are filled by human NPs, the primary object (i.e. the object that occurs adjacent to the

[1] Balinese has speech levels (Arka 1998, 2003; Udayana 2013). Naturally, reflexives in Balinese have their forms based on the register context. *Iba* 'self' is the low register, *awak* 'self' mid register level, and *raga* 'self' high register level. In this paper the reflexive belonging to mid register level is commonly used.

verb) bears the benefactive role while the secondary object receives the patient role. However, the benefactive is commonly viewed as being more affected than the patient, making the primary object be realized by a simple reflexive which is shown by the contrast between (9b) and (10).

(9) a. *Cai$_i$ maang cang awak$_i$
2 AV.give 1 self
'You gave me yourself'

b. Cai$_i$ maang cang awakcaie$_i$
2 AV.give 1 self.2POSS

(10) Ia$_i$ maang awak$_i$ pakeweh
3 AV.give self trouble
'(S) he gave himself/herself troubles'

Another constraint that is associated with the occurrence of a complex reflexive has to do with long-distance binding. This phenomenon may occur with a construction involving a prepositional phrase serving as an adverbial of place as in (11). The reflexive appears in a domain headed by the preposition *di samping* 'beside', the domain which is not complete (without subjective function). Therefore, for the antecedent-anaphor relation to occur, the reflexive is long-distance bound (Dalrymple 1993; Sells 1985), which is here anteceded by the subject of the predicate headed by the verb *ngebatang* 'spread'.

(11) a. *Ni Sari$_i$ ngebatang tikeh di samping awak$_i$
name AV.spread mat at side self
'Ni Sari spread a mat beside herself'

b. Ni Sari$_i$ ngebatang tikeh di samping awakne$_i$
name AV.spread mat at side self.3POSS

To conclude, a simple reflexive only occurs in AV clauses in which the reflexive is strongly acted upon by the action named by the predicate and it must appear adjacent to AV verbs. A predicate forming an incomplete domain/nucleus and OV verbs cannot appear with simple reflexives.

III. Logophoricity in Balinese

Balinese does not have a dedicated logophoric pronoun as exhibited by West African languages. Long distance binding may exhibit logophoricity (Sells 1987). However, the syntactic distribution still respects the logophoricity system in that the logophoric use of a reflexive

pronoun occurs in a clausal complement of a verb that licenses logophoricity while the antecedent or the logophoric triggers appears in the matrix clause, as shown by Icelandic in (12). Sentence (12a) shows that the reflexive *sig* 'self' is long distance-bound the subject of the matrix clause. In this context, the form *sig* is interpreted as a logophoric pronoun (rendered as *him* not *himself* in the translation).

Icelandic (Sigurðson 1986, cited in Sells 1987: 450):

(12) a. Hann$_i$ sagði [að sig$_i$ vantaði hæfileika].
he$_i$ said [that self$_i$ lacked ability]
'He$_i$ said that he$_i$ lacked ability.'

b. *Honum$_i$ var sagt [að sig$_i$ vantaði hæfileika].
he$_i$ was told [that self$_i$ lacked ability]
'He$_i$ was told that he$_i$ lacked ability.'

Logophoricity in Icelandic is subject to subject condition, in which the logophoric pronoun must be bound the logical subject of the matrix clause. Thus (12b) is ruled out. However, such a condition does not apply to the logohoporic system in Japanese. Thus, both (13a) and (13b) are fine.

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

(13) a. Takasi$_i$ wa Taroo ni [Yosiko ga zibun$_i$ o
Takasi$_i$ Top Taroo Dat [Yosiko Subj self$_i$ Obj
nikundeiru koto] o hanasita.
be-hating Comp] Obj told
'Takasi$_i$ told Taroo that Yosiko hated him$_i$.'

b. Taroo$_i$ wa [Yosiko ga zibun$_i$ ni aitagatteiru to]
Taroo$_i$ Top [Yosiko Subj self$_i$ Obj2 visit-was-wanting Comp]
Iwareta.
was-told
'Taroo$_i$ was told that Yosiko wanted to visit him$_i$.'

Like Icelandic and Japanese, Balinese also has logophoricity exhibited by long distance binding. However, Balinese is different from them in that the logophoricity is expressed by a complex reflexive, as shown in (14).

(14) a. I Nyoman$_i$ ngorahan awakne$_i$ lakar teka
name AV.say self.3POSS FUT come
'I Nyoman said that he would come

b. I Made$_i$ ningeh awakne$_i$ lakar ejuk-a
name AV.hear self.3POSS FUT catch-PAS
'I Made heard that he would be caught'

Thus, long-distance binding (i.e. binding in which the antecedent and its potential anaphor occur in a different domain) in Balinese must have its anaphor expressed in a complex reflexive regardless of whether or not the binding relation occurs in a logophoric context. This certainly would rule out sentences in (15), if the logophoric were expressed in a simple reflexive. This situation runs counter to Faltz's (1985) claim that simple reflexives are universally taken as long distance anaphor while (morphologically) complex reflexives are taken as short distance anaphors. This generalization does not certainly hold for the Balinese reflexivization in general and Balinese logophoricity in particular.

(15) a. *I Nyoman$_i$ ngorahan awak$_i$ lakar teka
name AV.say self. FUT come
'I Nyoman said that he would come

b. *I Made$_i$ nakonang apa awak$_i$ dadi kema
name AV.ask COMP self AUX go.there
'I Made asked if he could go there'

The same is true in the environment where the antecedent occupies the object position which must be filled by a complex reflexive.

(16) a. Ia$_i$ ngorahan cang nyimpit awakne$_i$
3 AV.say 1 AV.pinch self.3POSS
'(S) He said that I pinched himself/herself

b. Ia$_i$ ngorahan cang nyimpit awakne$_i$
3 AV.say 1 AV.pinch self.3POSS
'(S) He said that I pinched him/her'

Unlike Icelandic, Balinese logophoricity is not subject to subject condition. That is a logophoric trigger can be realized by non-logical subject. The verb of each matrix clause in (17a-b) is filled by a transitive verb which takes an object. Thus, (17a-b) clauses can have their passive counterparts, as shown in (18a-b) and each logophoric trigger in the matrix clause which used to be the erstwhile object of the corresponding active clauses is still capable of binding the logophoric anaphor *awakne* and the resulting sentences remain grammatical.

(17) a. Cang ngorahin I Nyoman$_i$ awakne$_i$ suba menang
1 AV.tell name self.3POSS PERF win
'I told I Nyoman that he had won'

b. Cai nakonin I Nyoman$_i$ apa awakne$_i$ lakar milu
3 AV.ask name COMP self.3POSS FUT come.along
'You asked I Nyoman whether he would come along'

(18) a. I Nyoman$_i$ orahin-a awakne$_i$ suba menang
name tell-PASS self.3POSS PERF win
'I Nyoman was told that he had won'

b. I Nyoman$_i$ takonin-a apa awakne$_i$ lakar milu
name ask-PASS COMP self.3POSS FUT come.along
'I Nyoman was asked whether he would come along'

Logophoric pronouns, as noted, have the same form as the reflexive pronouns, ambiguous reading naturally occurs in a certain context. Consider sentence (19a). The form *awakne* can be locally bound by the antecedent that appears in the same clause; thus *awakne* can serve as a reflexive anaphor. The same form *awakne* can get its targeted antecedent that occurs in a different clause, thus the form *awakne* has a logophoric interpretation. This is unavoidable because both *I Wayan* and and *I Nyoman* have the same feature of number, person, and gender. However, if either of them had different feature values ambiguous reading certainly did not obtain: where (19b) only has logophoric reading while (19c) reflexive reading.

(19) a. I Nyoman$_j$ ngorahan I Wayan$_i$ nemenin awakne$_{i/j}$
name AV.say name AV.like self.3POSS
(i) 'I Nyoman said that I Wayan liked himself'
(ii) 'I Nyoman said that I Wayan liked him'

b. I Nyoman$_i$ ngorahan cang nemenin awakne$_i$
name AV.say 1 AV.like self.3POSS
'I Nyoman said that I liked him'

c. Cang ngorahan I Nyoman$_i$ nemenin awakne$_i$
1 AV.say name AV.like self.3POSS
'I said that I Nyoman liked himself'

As far as passivation is concerned, another constraint occurs. A passive is possible in a situation where the subject and the object of a clause are of different entities (Quirk *et al.* 1985). That is, the entity which bears the agent role and the entity bearing the patient role, both of which are traditionally referred to as the doer and the sufferer respectively must not be co-referential. Thus, a clause such as *he shook his head* cannot be transformed into *his head was shaken by him*.

The same view thus holds for a reflexive construction. A reflexive construction cannot be passivized because the antecedent co-refers with the anaphor. This constraint does not apply in a logophoric environment. Consequently, sentence (19b) which has a reflexive reading cannot be passivized while the same sentence which has a logophoric reading is passivizable. This certainly makes (20) unambiguous.

(20) I Nyoman$_i$ ngorahan awakne$_i$ demenin-a
name AV.say self.3POSS like-PASS
(i) I Nyoman said that he was liked.
(ii) *I Nyoman said that himself was liked.

So far, we have seen that a logophoric trigger can occupy a subject or an object position in a matrix clause. In some cases, however, it can occupy the oblique position. Consider the following example:

(21) Cang ningeh uli ia$_i$ awakne$_i$ lakar mai
1 AV.hear from 3 self.3POSS FUT come.here
'I heard from him that he would come here'

Logophoric binding is possible in an environment in which the antecedent is the possessor of the matrix subject. In (22a) the possessor *Wayanne* can antecede the logophoric pronoun *awakne* which is contained in the clausal predicate. The antecedent can be transmitted to an NP referring to its mental state, as in (22b). It is worth noting that Balinese does not have copula to be and positive complementizer *that*, the adverbial *ibi* 'yesterday' here helps to segment the clause into its subject and predicate constituents. The syntactic schema of this logophoric construction is given in (22c).

(22) a. [Pa-takon [Wayanne$_i$]] ibi ngudiang cang nyimpit
[NMZ-ask Wayan.3POSS] yesterday why 1 AV.pinch
awakne$_i$.
self.3POSS
'Wayan's question yesterday was why I pinched him.'

b. [Kepercayan [Wayanne$_i$] ring Ida Sang Hyang Widhi Wasa]
belief Wayan.3POSS in God
nyelamat-ang awakne$_i$.
AV.safe-CAUS self.3POSS
'Wayan's belief in God saves him.'

c. [$_{NP}$ N + POSS] [$_S$ NP VP]]

Each head noun that appears in the bracketed NP of each clause is a noun that is derived from verbs that license logophoric relations and the associated possessor, as noted, serves as a subjective function (Sells 1985) which may serve as a logophoric trigger, which eventually satisfies the logophoric condition.

To summarize, Balinese logophoric system complies with the cross-linguistic hierarchy for determining the logophoric trigger. The most common logophoric trigger occupies the subject position while least common one appears in the POSS position.

(23) Grammatical Function Hierarchy

Subject >direct object > oblique > POSS

IV. A-Structure Binding Theory

In this section we are concerned with whether logophoric pronoun is anaphor, i.e. an item that has to be bound. It has been a long debate in the literature since the introduction of long-distance binding or logophoricity; logophoric binding has been considered as violating Principle A of Binding Theory (BT). However, there seems to be a consensus that the Principle A needs to be revised in order to account for the logophoric binding (Hellan 1991; Everaert 1991; Thráinsson 1991; and others).

A question now arises as how to handle the logophoric binding in Balinese. Before we come to this issue, first of all, we need to confirm that the logophoric use of complex reflexives in Balinese is an anaphor/logophor. Consider the sentences in (24). Sentence (24a) and sentence (24b) distinguish the binding status between ordinary pronouns and logophoric pronouns. The former shows that the ordinary pronoun *ia* '(s) he' in the clausal complement of the verb *ngorahan* is not bound by the NP in the matrix clause. In other words the two NPs have disjoint reference. In the latter case, on the other hand, the subject NP in the matrix clause and the subject NP of the embedded clause are co-referential. Needless to say that the form *awakne* in (24b) is like (24c) in that they are equally bound NPs (but in a different environment).

(24) a. Ia$_i$ ngorahan ia$_j$ lakar teka
3 AV.say 3 FUT come
'(S)he said that (s)he would come'

b. Ia$_i$ ngorahan awakne$_i$ lakar teka
3 AV.say self.3POSS FUT come
'(S)he said that (s)he would come'

c. Ia$_i$ nemenin awakne$_i$
3 AV.like self.3POSS
'(S)he likes himself/herself'

In Lexical Functional Grammar (LFG), binding which is associated with argument structure is called a-structure-based binding (Arka 1998, 2003; Wechsler and Arka 1996), which can be stated as in (25).

(25) Binding conditions
Principle A: An anaphor must be a-bound
Principle B: A personal pronoun must be a-free in its nucleus
Principle C: A referential expression must be a-free.
Definitions:
a. Nucleus is a predicate and its subcategorized arguments.
b. Given the a-structure 'pred' <x, y, ..> where x is more prominent than y, y is a-bound by x, x and y are co-indexed.
c. x is a-free means that x is not a-bound.

We saw that logophoric binding in Balinese operates in an intra-sentential environment. Although in some languages inter-sentential logophoric constructions also exist, the ones which operate intra-sententially, however, represent the standard structure of logophoricity. Under this view, we are readily capable of claiming that logophoric binding respect the binding principle in the same way as reflexive binding. The *gf-str* (grammatical function structure) of logophoric binding and *gf-str* of reflexive binding can be respectively schematized as in (26).

(26) a. *gf-str* 'PRED' < SUBJ, COMP>
b. *gf-str* 'PRED' < SUBJ, OBJ>

The representation in (26a) shows that COMP function which contains the logophoric pronoun is *gf*-bound by the SUBJ function while the *gf-str* in (26b) shows that OBJ function which is filled by the reflexive anaphor is *gf*-bound by the SUBJ function.

The a-*str* carries information about term hood (Arka 2003). In terms of the representation, the subject is a term and a clausal complement (COMP) is a non-term, which can be represented as in (27). If we incorporate the information of the *gf-str* and that of the *a-str*, we have the following representations.

(27) a. *gf-str* SUBJ COMPLEMENT

a-str 'PRED' < a-subj, PRED < , >>

term non-term

b. *gf-str* SUBJ OBJ

a-str 'PRED' < a-subj , a-obj >

term term

The *a-str* representation for logophoric binding in (27a) supports the idea that, like reflexives represented in (27b), logophoric pronouns are a-bound on the following ground. The notion of prominence and "incomplete nucleus" conspire to show the binding relation. The subject argument, which is a term, is more prominent than the non-term argument (the clausal complement), meaning that the term argument binds the non-term argument. The nucleus created by the matrix clause in which the logophoric trigger is found is "incomplete" (lacking an anaphor/logophor). However, the non-term argument is a clause containing the logophor. Naturally the logophoric trigger can bind the potential logophor in the (embedded) clause which can be of any grammatical function (SUBJ, OBJ, or OBL). This is a welcome result in logophoric binding, especially in a situation where an antecedent can bind an argument bearing the SUBJ function; the situation which sets the logophoric binding apart from the reflexive binding.

V. Conclusion

In this paper we have investigated that complex reflexive pronouns in Balinese have a property tied to what is cross-linguistically called logophoricity. The syntactic distribution of Balinese logophoric pronouns is parallel with those found in West African languages. Logophoric pronouns, like complex reflexives, are bound anaphors. They respect the binding

theory. However, they operate in a different environment from complex reflexives, confirming that the form *awakne*, for example, must have two different lexical entries.

Acknowledgments

We would like express praise and gratitude to Ida Shang Hyang Widi Wasa, the Almighty God for His blessing that this study entitled ''*Logophoricity in Balinese and A-Structure Binding"* can be completed on time. In this occasion, we would like to thank those who have helped this research so that it runs well and smoothly including: our friends for their support, their contribution, their valuable input, and we expect this paper to be useful for all of us. Last but not least, we also thank to I Wayan Suryasa as advisor and editor in chief of IJMRA that has reviewed and approved to be published.

References

Arka, I Wayan. 1998. *From morphosyntax to pragmatics in Balinese*. Sydney, Australia: University of Sydney dissertation.

Arka, I Wayan. 2003. *Balinese morphosyntax: A lexical-functional approach*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics, School of Pacific and Asian Studies, the Australian National University.

Bresnan, Joan. 2001. *Lexical-Functional Syntax*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers.

Büring, Daniel. 2005. *Binding Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clements, George N. 1975. 'The logophoric pronouns in Ewe: Its role in discourse'. *Journal of West African Languages* 10.141-77

Culy, Christopher. 1994. 'Aspects of Logophoric Marking' in *Linguistics*, 32: 1055-1094.

Culy, Christopher. 1997. Logophoric Pronouns and Point of View' in *Linguistics*, 35: 845-859.

Dalrymple, Mary. 1993. *The syntax of anaphoric binding*. Stanford: CSLI Publication.

Everaert, Martin. 1991. 'Contextual determination of the anaphor pronominal distinction' in *Long-Distance Anaphora*. Koster, Jan and Eric Reuland (eds.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Faltz, Leonard M. 1985. *Reflexivization: A Study in Universal Syntax*. New York: Garland Publishing.

Frajzyngier, Zygmunt and Traci S. Curl (eds.). 2000. *Reflexives: Forms and Functions*. Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.

Hagège, Claude. 1974. Les pronomslogophoriques. *Bulletin de la société de le linguistique de Paris* 69.287-310

Hellan, Lars. 1991. 'Containment and Connectedness Anaphors' in *Long-Distance Anaphora*. Koster, Jan and Eric Reuland (eds.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Huang, Yan. 2000. *Anaphora: A Cross-linguistic Study*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hyman, Larry M and Bernard Comrie.1981. Logophoric Reference in Gokana.*Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 3.19-37

Koster, Jan and Eric Reuland (eds.). 1991. Long-distance anaphora. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kuno, Susumo. 1987. *Functional Syntax: Anaphora, Discourse, and Emphaty*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Manning, Christopher. 1999. *Ergativity: Argument Structure and Grammatical Relations*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Quirk, Randolph *et al*. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman

Reuland, Eric. 2011. *Anaphora and Language Design*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Safir, Ken. 2004. *The Syntax of Anaphora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sells, Peter. 1985. *Lectures on Contemporary Syntactic Theories: An Introduction to Government-Binding Theory, Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar, and Lexical Functional Grammar*. Stanford: CSLI

Sells, Peter. 1987. 'Aspects of Logophoricity' in *Linguistic Inquiry* 18 (3):445-479.

Thráinsson, Hoskuldur. 1991. 'Long-distance reflexives and the typology of NPs' in *Long-distance Anaphora*. Koster, Jan and Eric Reuland (eds.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Trask, R.L. 1993. *A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics*. London: Routledge.

Udayana, I Nyoman. 2013. *Voice and Reflexives in Balinese*. University of Texas at Austin PhD. Dissertation

Wechsler, Stephen and I Wayan Arka. 1998. Syntactic ergativity in Balinese: An argument-structure based theory'. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16.378-441.

Wiesemann, Ursula (ed.) 1986. *Pronominal Systems*. Tubingen: Gunter Narr VerlagTübingen.

Yoshima, David. 2004. University of Washington Working Papers in Linguistics Volume 23 (2004) pp. 175-190.