

**WORKING PAPERS**  
**IN**  
**LINGUISTICS**

The notes and articles in this series are progress reports on work being carried on by students and faculty in the Department. Because these papers are not finished products, readers are asked not to cite from them without noting their preliminary nature. The authors welcome any comments and suggestions that readers might offer.

Volume 39(1)

2008  
(January)

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS  
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I AT MĀNOA  
HONOLULU 96822

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution

DEPARTMENT OF LINGUISTICS FACULTY

2008

Victoria B. Anderson  
Byron W. Bender (Emeritus)  
Benjamin Bergen  
Derek Bickerton (Emeritus)  
Robert A. Blust (Chair)  
Robert L. Cheng (Adjunct)  
Kenneth W. Cook (Adjunct)  
Kamil Deen (Co-Graduate Chair)  
Patricia J. Donegan  
Emanuel J. Drechsel (Adjunct)  
Michael L. Forman  
George W. Grace (Emeritus)  
John H. Haig (Adjunct)  
Roderick A. Jacobs (Emeritus)  
Paul Lassette  
P. Gregory Lee  
Patricia A. Lee  
Howard P. McKaughan (Emeritus)  
William O’Grady  
Yuko Otsuka  
Ann Marie Peters (Emeritus, Co-Graduate Chair)  
Kenneth L. Rehg  
Lawrence A. Reid (Emeritus)  
Amy J. Schafer  
Albert J. Schütz, (Emeritus, Editor)  
Ho Min Sohn (Adjunct)  
David L. Stampe  
Nicholas Thieberger  
Laurence C. Thompson (Emeritus)

# A COMPARISON OF ERGATIVITY IN UMA, PADOE, AND SELAYARESE<sup>1</sup>

JASON A. J. JACKSON

Within languages that are located in Sulawesi, the use of comparative syntax has been limited primarily to subgrouping hypotheses and historical reconstruction. As a result, many interesting lines of research have not yet been explored. This paper uses comparison to investigate ergative syntactic characteristics in the grammatical systems of three widespread languages of Sulawesi—Uma, Padoe, and Selayarese. Descriptions of the basic syntax of clause structure for each language are provided. Overall, the comparative data suggest that ergativity and split-ergativity are reified by voice distinctions, such as active versus nonactive, and syntactic fronting.

**1. INTRODUCTION.** This paper surveys case-marking in three languages of Sulawesi that have been, or can be, analyzed as ergative-absolutive (henceforth, ergative): Uma (Martens 1988c), Padoe (Karhunen 1994, Vuorinen 1994), and Selayarese (Basri 1999, Ceria 1993). Case-marking systems as well as agreement systems, which are both evident in the pronominal clitic elements of the three languages, frequently typify the ergative pattern, whereby the thematic patient of a transitive clause is marked in the same way as the sole argument in an intransitive clause as opposed to the marking for the agent of a transitive. Evidence for ergative case-marking analyses of the languages is drawn from active-voice intransitive and transitive clauses, nonactive voices such as antipassive and passive, and syntactic fronting.

Uma (subgroup within Austronesian languages of Sulawesi: Kaili-Pamona, Location: Central Sulawesi), Padoe (Bungku-Tolaki, South-central Sulawesi), and Selayarese (South Sulawesi, Selayar) have been selected because they are well dispersed and represent three of ten linguistic subgroups in the Sulawesi area (the others are Sangiric, Minahasan, Gorontalo-Mongondowic, Tomini-Tolitoli, Saluan-Banggai, Muna-Buton, and Wotu-Wolio). Uma and Padoe were selected because they have played distinct roles in the formation of subgrouping hypotheses and linguistic classification for Sulawesi languages (Mead 2002; Himmelmann 1996; van den Berg 1996; Noorduyn 1991a, 1991b; Friberg and Laskowski 1989; Grimes and Grimes 1987; Kaseng et al. 1979; Barr, Barr and Salombe 1979; and Anceaux 1978). Himmelmann (1996) and van den Berg (1996) have each presented brief comparisons of the grammars of languages such as Uma and Padoe, but they have both expressed the need for a South Sulawesi language to be included in the ongoing discussion. Selayarese has been included in the present comparison to address that concern.

**2. THE STRUCTURE OF BASIC CLAUSES, ERGATIVITY, AND VOICE.** This section presents the fundamental structural means of distinguishing between intransitive and transitive clauses in Uma, Padoe, and Selayarese. These properties allow the case-marking resources, i.e., ergative, absolutive, possessive, topic, nominative, accusative, and so forth, to be determined (see O’Grady 2007 or Givón 1990 for similar approaches to syntactic description).

**2.1 CLAUSE STRUCTURE.** All three languages are canonically verb initial. Full noun phrase (NP) arguments are not accompanied by case-marking morphology, nor are they required to occur in a strict order. Furthermore, full NP arguments frequently tend to be omitted because they are understood from context under certain conditions of definiteness and specificity; but whether an argument of the verb is present or absent, the fact that it is in a grammatical relationship with the verb is indicated by a morpheme—usually a pronominal clitic—that attaches to the verb (cf. a type of grammatical linking in the sense of Kiparsky 1987). The presence of morphology (in boldface) that grammatically links one NP and indexes one NP is the most striking structural property of intransitive clauses in Uma (example 1), Padoe (2), and Selayarese (3). For example, in (1) the **-a** first person singular pronominal clitic is grammatically linked to an argu-

---

<sup>1</sup> For their invaluable assistance, I would like to thank Professor William O’Grady, Professor Gregory Lee, Professor Albert J. Schütz, and Mrs. Kyuseek Hwang Jackson. The author is responsible for any remaining errors.



There are two more sets of pronominal elements in all three languages, set (P) and set (F). Set (P) pronouns are possessive suffixes. Set (F) pronouns are independent, that is, free, pronouns. They are not bound to a verb stem or other host.

**2.2 ERGATIVITY IN UMA, PADOE, AND SELAYARESE.** Not only do the pairs of sentences from each of the three languages (Uma 1, 4, Padoe 2, 5, and Selayarese 3, 6) show how similar intransitive clauses in the languages are and how similar transitive clauses in the languages are, but these examples also illustrate that the three languages have ergative case-marking in the following sense. The sole argument NP of each intransitive clause (1–3) is marked in the same way as the argument NP that is the thematic patient of a transitive clause (4–6), i.e., as a suffix on the verb that is selected from pronoun set B. This arrangement is emblematic of the absolutive case (cf. Dixon 1994 and Manning 1996) and in this section is indexed with subscript  $k$ . In (4–6), the argument that is the agent of a transitive clause is case-marked in a way that contrasts it with the absolutive—that is, the agent occurs as a prefix on the verb and is selected from pronoun set A, in further support of the ergative analysis. Ergative elements are indexed in (4–6) with subscript  $j$ .

**2.3 VOICE SYSTEMS.** There is another important property shared by examples (1–6) that is directly related to the analysis of ergative systems. All examples are in the active voice. As for voice systems in ergative languages, active voice can contrast with passive on the one hand, and active can also contrast with antipassive on the other. Whereas passivization is considered to be a strategy that demotes the thematic agent of the corresponding transitive clause in the active voice, antipassivization is a strategy that demotes the thematic patient of the corresponding active voice transitive clause. Cross-linguistically, not all ergative languages show both of these contrasts (Givón 1990). This is true of Uma, Padoe, and Selayarese. Uma does not have a structural passive, but it does have an antipassive voice (Martens 1988c). Padoe and Selayarese both have passive and antipassive voices. Padoe also has many nominative properties. Passivization and antipassivization are less well suited for direct comparison, so they are better presented with more context; see §§ 3–5.

**2.4 SUMMARY.** Due to the close similarity of ergative constructions in active voice clauses among Uma, Padoe, and Selayarese, it will be tentatively concluded that comparison of grammatical systems is possible. For active voice constructions, intransitive clauses involve grammatical linking for only one argument NP, the predicate agrees with only one argument NP, and special intransitive verbal morphology may be present (see figure 1). By contrast, active voice transitive clauses do not have special verbal morphology, but rather include grammatical linking for two arguments. A transitive verb also agrees with two argument NPs.

FIGURE 1. Schemata for intransitive and transitive clause types in Uma, Padoe, and Selayarese.

INTR:	VM-V-SET B <sub>k</sub> (-PFT)	(NP) <sub>k</sub>		(1–3)
TRN:	SET A <sub>j</sub> -V-SET B <sub>k</sub>	(NP) <sub>k</sub>	(NP) <sub>j</sub>	(4–6)
		[+PAT]	[+AGT]	

Some basic clause types in Uma, Padoe, and Selayarese are very similar. The ergative pattern is identified by the use of set (B) to grammatically link the only argument of an intransitive clause as well as the patient of a transitive clause (NP)<sub>k</sub> the verb, but set (A) to do so for the agent of a transitive clause (NP)<sub>j</sub>.

It remains to be seen the extent to which nonactive voice systems in Uma, Padoe, and Selayarese are appropriate for comparison. Therefore, each discussion of a grammatical system in §§3–5 (Uma, §3, Padoe, §4, and Selayarese, §5) reviews the evidence for ergativity in more detail, in particular, the salient features of clauses in nonactive voices as well as syntactic fronting.

**3. UMA.** The Uma language is part of the Kaili-Pamona microgroup and has been described by Esser (1964) and more recently by Martens (1988a–c). Uma is spoken in an area near the vertex of the four-

tinied island of Sulawesi in a mountainous terrain that is traversed by the Lariang river. *Ethnologue* (Gordon 2005) reports that there are perhaps six smaller groups of speakers spread through north central and west central Sulawesi. Based on Martens 1990, the *Ethnologue* estimates that Uma has 20,000 speakers, of whom 15,000 live in the region, 5,000 live outside the region, and about 500 speakers live in Benggaulu, which is located in the South Sulawesi linguistic area. Folk stories say that Uma speakers originated at a place called *Pipikoro* ‘banks of the Koro’. *Koro* is the Uma word for the Lariang River. Alternate names for Uma are Oema and Pipikoro.

**3.1 ERGATIVITY IN UMA.** It was suggested by Martens (1988c) that Uma has an ergative case-marking system. Evidence for the ergative analysis comes from the patterning of morphology on the verb in active voice intransitive clauses and active voice transitive clauses. Table 1 illustrates the abstract structure of the Uma verb as it occurs in intransitive and transitive active clauses, as well as antipassive clauses. Martens (1988c) argued that the use of set (B) to grammatically link the thematic patient NP to the transitive verb (see table 1, row 3), as well as to link either an agent or a patient to the intransitive verb (see table 1, row 2), strongly suggests that the system follows an ergative pattern. Table 1 also suggests that set (B) is linked to the more privileged argument NP in Uma clause structure because it is also used to link the single argument NP of the antipassive to the verb (see table 1, row 4). There is structural evidence that favors this analysis, and hence also favors the ergative analysis, but there is also some evidence to the contrary.

TABLE 1. Uma verb morphology.

	Verb Structure	Example predicate
1. Intransitive (NC)	<i>te-</i> V -SET B	<i>te'-unce-mi</i> (23)
2. Intransitive	<i>mo-</i> V -SET B <i>ma-</i> V -SET B <i>me-</i> V -SET B V -SET B	<i>mo-keno-a</i> (1)
3. Transitive	SET A-( <i>pa-</i> ) V -SET B	<i>na-weba-'a</i> (4)
4. Antipassive	<i>N-(po-)</i> V -SET B	<i>m-po-hilo-i</i> (19)

Overview of verbal morphology in Uma, adapted from van den Berg 1996. Set A and set B refer to pronouns illustrated in table 2. *Po-* and *pa-* have idiosyncratic distributions.

TABLE 2. Uma pronouns.

	SET A	SET B	SET P	SET F
1S	<i>ku-</i>	<i>-a</i>	<i>-ku</i>	<i>aku'</i>
2S	<i>nu-</i>	<i>-ko</i>	<i>-nu</i>	<i>iko</i>
3S	<i>na-</i>	<i>-i</i>	<i>-na</i>	<i>hi'a</i>
1PN	<i>ta-</i>	<i>-ta</i>	<i>-ta</i>	<i>kita'</i>
1PX	<i>ki-</i>	<i>-kai</i>	<i>-kai</i>	<i>kai'</i>
2P	<i>ni-</i>	<i>-koi</i>	<i>-ni</i>	<i>koi'</i>
3P	<i>ra-</i>	<i>-ra</i>	<i>-ra</i>	<i>hira'</i>

There are four series of pronouns in Uma, sets (A), (B), (P), and (F). Set (A) are prefixes that represent the agent in a transitive clause, set (B) are enclitics that represent other arguments, set (P) are possessive enclitics, and set (F) are independent pronouns.

Support for the ergative analysis comes from two notable properties associated with set (B) elements in active-voice clauses. First, for transitive clauses where the theme is an overt patient NP (e.g., (7) *loka'na* ‘his bananas, or (18) *pae toe* ‘the rice’), there is no set (B) pronoun to link this argument to the verb. This property is not captured in table 1 (see row 3). On the other hand, example (8) shows that the agent does co-occur with the set (A) element that grammatically links the agent to the verb. In (8), the third person singular, set (A) *na-* ‘she’ occurs with the NP it indexes, *tobine-na* ‘his wife’; but the third

person singular set (B) element *-i* ‘it’, which one may expect to cross-reference *pae toe* ‘the rice’ based on tables 1–2, is absent.

- (7) **Ku**-koni’ \_\_ loka’-na  
 1S-eat banana-3S.POS  
 ‘I eat her/his bananas.’ (Martens 1988a)

- (8) **Na**-manyu\_\_ tobine-na pae toe.  
 3S-pound woman-3S.POS rice DEM  
 ‘His wife pounded the rice.’ (Martens 1988a)

Examples (7–8) suggest that the argument NP that is grammatically linked to the verb by a set (B) element represents the privileged argument because a set (B) element can be deleted.

The second notable property of set (B) elements in active clauses is observed when there is a grammatically linked agent and an overt indefinite patient. In these constructions, (9–11), the verb is structurally intransitive. That is, there is no set (A) pronoun, which one would expect if the verb were structurally transitive. Moreover, the verb has special morphology, which is a sign of an intransitive clause. Set (B) occurs after a verb-plus-indefinite-patient predicate complex. The patient can be nonspecific (9) or specific (10). Example (11) shows that set (B) can even follow a relativized NP that is headed by an indefinite noun. In this case, a relative clause functions to establish specificity.

- (9) Mo-tapi once-**a**  
 INT-winnow rice-1S  
 ‘I am winnowing rice.’ (Martens 1988a)

- (10) M-pali’ poturua-ku-**a**  
 VM-search bed-1S.POS-1S  
 ‘I am searching for a sleeping-place for me.’ (Martens 1988a)

- (11) M-po-’oli tomi to bo’u-**a**  
 VM-TRN-buy house RM new-1S  
 ‘I (will) buy a new house.’ (Martens 1988a)

Based on structures such as those in (9–11), Mead (2002) and others have proposed a noun-incorporation analysis, and that noun incorporation is highly productive in Uma. If we follow the noun-incorporation analysis, examples (10–11) suggests that *m(po)-* (especially *mpo-*) is intransitive verb morphology, which supplements table 1, where *mpo-* defines the antipassive clause. In van den Berg’s (1996) system, only (9) would be considered intransitive, while (10–11) have antipassive morphology.

Another important fact about Uma that must be appended to table 1 is that there is a participle, or gerund, in Uma that occurs in dependent clauses—such as for the complement of verbs of knowing (12–13, emphasis in the original), seeing, deciding, and saying; or with certain conjunctions; or for a locative prepositional phrase predicate; or to provide tense, mood, aspect information about an independent clause—as well as to mark heightened action in matrix clauses during discourse (14b); see Martens 1988c for additional discussion. The participle is identified by either the verbal morphology *ka-* or *po-/pe-/pa-*. In addition, the argument that would otherwise be linked to the verb by an absolutive case, set (B) element is linked to the verb by a possessive pronoun from set (P). The agent of a transitive clause is linked to a gerund-form predicate by a set (A), ergative case element, such as *ka-na-’epe-na* literally ‘its being heard of by **him**’ (12) or *ka-nu-pakawa’-ku* ‘my being tricked by **you**’ (13). Other active-voice arguments are linked by a set (P) element, rather than a set (B) element. That is, the single argument of an intransitive, e.g., *ka-geo’-na-mi*, literally ‘**his** crying happened’ (12) and the patient of a transitive clause, e.g., *ka-na-’epe-na* literally ‘**its** being heard of by him’ (12) and *ka-nu-pakawa’-ku* ‘**my** being tricked by you’ (13) are represented by set (P) elements.

- (12) **Ka-na**’epe-**na** bengka hi’a-mi to **ra**-koni’ ka-geo’-**na**-mi  
 DP-3S-hear-3S.POS buffalo 3S-PFT RM 3P-eat DP-cry-3S.POS-PFT  
 ‘When the buffalo heard that he was the one to be eaten, HE CRIED.’ (Martens 1988c)
- (13) **Ku**’inca-mi ka-**nu**-pakawa’-**ku**  
 1S-know-PFT DP-2S-trick-1S.POS  
 ‘I know that you tricked me!’ or  
 ‘I know about your tricking of me.’ or  
 ‘I know about my being tricked by you.’ (Martens 1988c)
- (14)a. **Ka-ra**-bahaka-**na**-mi baru-ra,  
 DP-3P-release-3S.POS-PFT palm.wine-3P.POS  
 ‘(And so,) they abandoned their palm wine,’  
 b. po-keno-**ra**-mi hilou hi tomi.  
 DP-run-3P.POS-PFT go to house  
 ‘and ran back to the house.’ (Martens 1988c)

The *po-/pe-/pa-* morphology correlates with intransitive verbs that take *mo-/me-/ma-*; other predicates, such as a stative (12) or an transitive verb (14), are formed with the morpheme *ka-*. However, data show that *ka-* can in fact attach to a verb with *mo-* (15), but *ka-* does not co-occur with *po-* (14b, above).

- (15) **Ria-i** pidi we’i hi pongko ka-mo-keno-**ku** tumai.  
 is-3S still earlier at tower DP-INT-run-1S.POS here  
 ‘He was still there earlier at the tower when I ran here.’ (Martens 1988c)

To sum up, Uma has a number of ergative characteristics, which are apparent in the case-marking patterns of active-voice intransitive and transitive arguments (1, 4, 7–8). Although formal properties of gerunds (which Martens 1988c called “dependent verbs”) suggest that Uma has a split ergative system for case-marking in dependent clauses (12–15), because the argument that is otherwise expected to be represented by an absolutive (set B) element occurs as a possessive (set P) element, in fact, the grammatical relations that set (P) indicates in gerunds support an ergative analysis. The difference between set (B) and set (P) is primarily a distinction of tense-mood-aspect that categorizes gerunds differently from non-gerunds. It must be noted that more research on gerunds in Uma is needed.

**3.2 THE ANTIPASSIVE IN UMA.** Support for the ergative analysis comes from evidence about the antipassive voice, where the thematic patient is suppressed in relation to a corresponding active voice construction. Table 1 illustrates that an antipassive predicate has a prefix *N-*, and that by the use of a pronoun from set (B), only one argument NP is grammatically linked to the antipassive predicate. Martens (1988a) analyzed *N-* as an agent marker; but, Mead (2002)—following van den Berg 1996—analyzed *N-* as a transitivizer. *N-* combines with an element *po-*, which Martens analyzed as a transitivizer and Mead analyzed as a phonologically conditioned ligature, to form a morpheme with an initial prenasalized stop, *mpo-*. Both Martens’s and Mead’s analyses propose that there is special transitive VM, but only a single grammatically linked NP is marked on the verb. From a formal perspective, the general template (*mpo*-V-SET B) makes the antipassive clause (16) look similar to an intransitive clause, possibly even a participle of some kind.

- (16) **M-po-hilo-i** romeha’ sakaea  
 VM-TRN-see-3S two boats  
 ‘He saw two boats.’ (Martens 1988c)

When compared with the verb from a corresponding transitive clause (see table 1), the thematic patient in an antipassive clause has been suppressed in two general ways. The patient has been indirectly demoted by special verbal morphology (*mpo-*). In addition, the patient is not linked to the verb. Unfortunately, previous analyses have provided no solutions to account for the distinction between incorporated



(indefinite but specific) thematic patient constructions and antipassive constructions, which also have indefinite thematic patients (compare, for example, 11 and 16). Martens (1988a) reports that antipassive structures such as (16) occur in backgrounding clauses, relative clauses, and verbal complements, but he does not offer any further information on incorporated thematic patient structures, such as (11).

A cross-linguistic tendency of antipassive constructions is to demote the thematic patient by limiting it to indefinite status (Givón 1990). Martens (1988c) argues by using examples such as (17–18) that the definiteness of a thematic patient is not marked on the NP itself, but rather that definiteness is (indirectly) signified by correlation with transitive morphology. In particular, he suggests that the presence of a set (A) item indicates the patient is definite. This could be used as a third piece of evidence that the thematic patient in (16) has been demoted.

(17) **Na**-hilo romeha' sakaea  
 3S-see two boats  
 'He saw the two boats.' (Martens 1988a)

(18) **Na**-hilo romeha' sakaea toe  
 3S-see two boats DEM  
 'He saw the/those two boats.' (Martens 1988a)

Martens also suggests that the use of a demonstrative element, such as *toe* in (18), helps indicate definiteness but is not necessary.

Contrary to the analysis of indefiniteness as an indication that an argument has been demoted, examples such as (19) present a problem for analyzing *mpo*- as special antipassive morphology that demotes thematic patients by restricting their interpretation to indefinite. In (19), the thematic patient appears to be definite, *tomi-na* 'his house', because of the possessive pronoun – although this NP may also be specific.

(19) M-po-wangu\_\_ (Ntinapu) tomi-na hi Bulu'  
 VM-TRN-build (Ntinapu) house-3S.POS at Bulu'  
 'Ntinapu built his house at Bulu' (Martens 1988a)

This section reviewed evidence that suggests that the antipassive in Uma is superficially sensitive to definiteness but profoundly sensitive to specificity.

**3.3 PASSIVIZATION IN UMA.** Although there is no morphological passive in Uma, there are devices that can achieve a passive meaning. Syntactic fronting is a term for the occurrence of some element in the initial position in a clause instead of in its canonical position. This device can achieve a passive-like interpretation and is used to promote the interpretive prominence of an element in a clause. A clause with a fronted patient, *manu'-na* 'his chickens', is shown in (20).

(20) Manu'-na **na**-pa-nako (tuaka-na).  
 chicken-3S.POS 3S-TRN-steal bother-3S.POS  
 'His chickens had been stolen by his brother.' (Martens 1988a)

In relation to previous analyses of antipassive *mpo*-, example (20) implies that set (A) pronouns and submorphemic *m*- from *mpo*- (i.e., *N*- + *po*-) are in complementary distribution. This conclusion supports Martens's (1988c) analysis, where *pa*-/*po*- is transitivity morphology that allow verbs, which would otherwise be grammatically linked to only a single argument, to be grammatically linked to two arguments.

An alternative strategy that can achieve a passive interpretation is the use of the third person plural pronoun as a generalized agent, which could be translated as either (21a) 'by them' or as (21b) 'by people in general'.

(21) Kumpe toe **ra**-babehi ngkai kuluma kaju [to **ra**-hanga' nunu'].  
 barkcloth DEM 3P-make from skin tree [RM 3P-name nunu']  
 a. 'This barkcloth **they** make from the bark of a tree [that **they** call *nunu*].'  
 b. 'This barkcloth is made from the bark of a tree [called *nunu*].' (Martens 1988a)

It is worth mentioning a third construction that formally resembles the semantic-based passivization strategy. Examples (22) and (23) look like parallel constructions. Whereas (22) allows for passive interpretation by using a semantically demoted, generalized agent, in (23) the prefix on the verb indicates that it is not possible to include an agent NP in the clause. Furthermore, the action or state denoted by the verb is not under the control (abbreviated NC) of an agent. In this respect, and with respect to the special status of the *te-* verbal morphology, NC clauses are structurally intransitive.

(22) **Ra-**’unce-mi wobo’.  
3P-close-PFT door  
‘They closed the door/The door was closed (by somebody).’ (Martens 1988a)

(23) **Te-**’unce-mi wobo’.  
NC-close-PFT door  
‘The door was closed (not open).’ (Martens 1988a)

Although there is no structural passive, fronting and pronoun choice (especially the generalized third person) can effectively downplay an agent in a clause.

**3.4 SYNTACTIC FRONTING IN UMA.** In addition to voice systems, another factor that has a bearing on the analysis of ergativity in any language is topicalization (Givón 1990). As mentioned in §3.3 above, topicalization refers to the ability for an NP to be emphasized and to participate in certain syntactic operations, such as fronting in a clause or raising from a relative clause.

In an antipassive construction such as (24), the absolutive agent *Ntinapu* occurs in clause-initial position because it has been fronted (compare also 19). The reason why it can be fronted is because it is both grammatically linked to the verb and emphatic. A demoted NP cannot participate in fronting.

(24) *Ntinapu* m-po-wangu\_\_ tomi-na hi Bulu’  
*Ntinapu* VM-TRN-build house-3S.POS at Bulu’  
‘*Ntinapu* built his house at Bulu.’ (Martens 1988a)

In regard to the analysis of the antipassive, the topicalized structure in (24) seems to suggest that the property that correlates most closely with the distribution and use of antipassive *mpo-* is the ability to restrict a demoted NP from participating in certain topicalization operations such as syntactic fronting. However, this generalization is problematic, because it assumes that in structures such as (24), the agent is indexed by a grammatically linked (but deleted) set (B) element on the verb. Yet, the patient is definite, which means that if it were grammatically linked to the verb by a set (B) element instead of the agent being marked in this way, then the set (B) element that is linked to the patient would be deleted.

This possibility is made more tangible by examples of relativization such as (25), where a definite patient of a supposedly antipassive verb is linked to the verb by a set (B) pronoun rather than occurring as a demoted element. This is a problem for the antipassive analysis and hence the ergative analysis because it appears that at least some *mpo-* verb constructions may qualify as transitive, though by grounds other than those proposed in §2, above.

(25) *Hi’a* to m-po-weba’-a.  
3S RM VM-TRN-hit-1S  
‘He’s the one who hit me.’ (Martens 1988a)

The agent NP in this special class of *mpo-* verb constructions originates in a position after the verb (19), can alternatively occur before the verb in initial position (24), and serves as the head that is modified by a relative clause (25). This range of behavior suggests that the agent in this category of *mpo-* constructions is a grammatical topic, which—for the purposes of case-marking—allows the patient to be grammatically linked to the verb by a set (B) pronoun. An agent that is a topic does not co-occur with a set (A) element on the verb.

In order for a grammatically linked patient NP to be fronted (see, for example, 20–21) or relativized, as in (26), the agent must be marked in the ergative case and cannot be a topic.

- (26) Wori' to-peda'<sub>i</sub> to **na**-pa-ka-'uri' \_\_\_<sub>i</sub>.  
 many people-sick RM 3S-TRN-VM-well  
 'He healed (caused to become well) many sick people.' (Martens 1988a)

Data on case marking and topicalization reveal the existence of two patterns for fronting. The first allows a topicalized agent that is accompanied by the morpheme *m-* on the verb to be fronted (see examples 24–25). The second pattern allows only the patient of a transitive structure to be fronted (see 26). In Uma, arguments that co-occur with ergative set (A) pronouns cannot be relativized.

**3.5 SUMMARY.** To provide an overview of basic clauses in Uma, figure 2 presents some simplistic schematizations.

FIGURE 2. Schemata for basic clauses in Uma.

INT:	{ <i>te'</i> / <i>mo</i> / <i>me</i> / <i>ma</i> /∅}-V-SET B <sub>k</sub>	NP <sub>k</sub>	
AP 1:	<i>N</i> -( <i>po</i> -)V-SET B <sub>k</sub>	NP <sub>k</sub> [+AGT]	NP [+PAT] [-DEF]
AP 2: (‘TRN 2’)	<i>N</i> -( <i>po</i> -)V-(SET B) <sub>k</sub>	(NP) [+AGT]	NP <sub>k</sub> [+PAT] [+TOP]
TRN:	SET A <sub>j</sub> -( <i>po</i> -)V-(SET B) <sub>k</sub>	(NP <sub>k</sub> ) [+PAT] [+DEF]	(NP) <sub>i</sub> [+AGT]

Uma clause types include intransitives (INT), two types of antipassives (AP 1 and AP 2), and a canonical transitive (TRN). Parentheses indicate optionality. See table 1 to identify sets (A) and (B). In clause type AP 2, a topicalized agent optionally appears in clause-initial position.

Figure 2 shows that Uma has a number of ergative characteristics, particularly the use of set (A) elements to grammatically link the agent of a transitive clause to the verb in contrast with the patient of a transitive and with the sole argument of an intransitive clause, which both are realized by set (B) elements. The overlapping use of set (B) to mark the agent of an antipassive type-1 verb and the patient of an antipassive type-2 verb supports an important argument made above: that antipassive type 2 may be better analyzed as a transitive clause with a topicalized agent and an absolutive patient rather than as part of a generic antipassive, which is a detransitivized construction with an absolutive agent and a demoted patient.

**4. PADOE.** Padoe has been classified in various ways. For example, it has been classified as a dialect of Mori (Esser 1927–33), and more recently as a member of the Bungku-Mori-Tolaki group (van den Berg 1996), and the refined Bungku-Tolaki group (Mead 2002, Gordon 2005). Padoe is spoken in an area near the vertex of Sulawesi’s four peninsulas but towards the coast on the south side of the base of the south-east peninsula. Based on Anderson 1991, *Ethnologue* suggests that there are approximately 6,000 speakers of Padoe, who are spread across South Sulawesi, in the eastern Luwu District and in Central Sulawesi, in the Banggai District, including two villages in the Mori Atas subdistrict and one village in the Pamona Utara subdistrict (Gordon 2005). Other names for Padoe are South Mori, Padoé, and Alalao (Gordon 2005). Recent analyses by Karhunen (1994) and Vuorinen (1994) present data that suggest Padoe has a number of ergative characteristics.

**4.1 ERGATIVITY IN PADOE.** Van den Berg (1996) and Mead (2002) have noted that, in general, analyses of Padoe (e.g., Vuorinen 1994, Karhunen 1994, Magnetti-Barsel 1984, and Esser 1927–33) vary greatly and

that conclusions drawn by comparing analyses are tentative at best. Padoe verbal morphology is presented in table 3, whereas pronominal elements are presented in table 4 (data from Vuorinen 1994, which analyzes Padoe as a nominative case-marking language). The evidence for ergative case-marking in Padoe is as follows. Set (B) functions to link agents and patients in realis intransitive clauses to the verb (see table 3, row 2, second column), as well as to link the patient of a transitive clause to the verb (see table 3, rows 3–4, third column). The agent of a transitive clause is linked to the verb with a set (A) item, which contrasts with the form, position, and function of the set (B) items. However, the ergative pattern only surfaces in certain combinations of mood, verb form (M-form versus C-form), and voice.

TABLE 3. Padoe verb morphology.

	M-form	C-form
1. STAT	<i>mo-</i> V (29)	SET A + <i>mo-</i> V
2. INT	<i>mo-</i> V+SET Br (34) <i>me-</i> V+SET Br (27) <i>ma-</i> V+SET Br (2)	SET A + <i>po-</i> V (49) SET A + <i>pe-</i> V SET A + <i>pa-</i> V
3. TRN, DEF PAT	SET Fi < <i>um</i> >- V+SET Br (32)	SET A + V + SET Br (30)
4. TRN, INDEF PAT	<i>moN-</i> V (40)	SET A + <i>poN-</i> V + SET Bi (46)
5. PASS	< <i>in</i> >- V (37)	

Padoe has two classes of verbs. M-forms are accompanied by *mo-*, *me-*, *ma-*, *or-*, <*um*>. C-forms are conjugated with a set (A) element (see table 4). In addition to the M-form versus C-form contrast for three active voice predicate structures, i.e., stative (1), intransitive (2), and transitive (3–4), there is also a passive voice (5). Passive, <*in*>-verbs can occur with sets (A, 47), (Br, 37), (Fi, 38) and (P, 43).

TABLE 4. Padoe pronouns.

	SET A	SET Bi	SET Br	SET P	SET Fi	SET F
1S	<i>ku-</i>	<i>-aku</i>	<i>-aku</i>	<i>-nggu</i>	<i>aku</i>	<i>iaku</i>
2S	( <i>a</i> ) <i>u-</i>	<i>-ko</i>	<i>-iko</i>	<i>-mu</i>	<i>iko</i>	<i>iiko</i>
3S	<i>no-</i>	<i>-o</i>	<i>-o(to), -lo’o</i>	<i>-no</i>	<i>o(no), lo’o</i>	<i>umono</i>
1PN	<i>to-</i>	<i>-kito</i>	<i>-kito</i>	<i>-ndo</i>	<i>kito</i>	<i>ikito</i>
1PX	<i>ki-</i>	<i>-kami</i>	<i>-kami</i>	<i>-mami</i>	<i>kami</i>	<i>ikami</i>
2P	( <i>a</i> ) <i>i-</i>	<i>-komiu</i>	<i>-komiu</i>	<i>-miu</i>	<i>komiu</i>	<i>ikomiu</i>
3P	<i>ro-</i>	<i>-iro</i>	<i>-iro, -lo’rio</i>	<i>-ro</i>	<i>iro, lo’iro</i>	<i>umboro</i>

There are more than six sets of pronouns in Padoe (see Vuorinen 1995). Set (A) pronouns represent non-topical actors; set (Bi) represent all other arguments in irrealis constructions; set (Br) elements occur in realis constructions; set (P) are possessive; set (Fi) items are free-standing, preverbal alternates for set (Br); and set (F) are full form, independent pronouns. The perfective aspect marker *-to* can attach to set (Br). Some set (Br) and (Fi) third person forms contain a grammaticized irrealis marker *lo’* (Mead 2002).

The ergative case-marking pattern in Padoe is found in the absolutive use of set (B), that is, the sole argument of a realis intransitive clause is linked to the verb by a set (B) element (2 and 27, emphasis in the original).

(27) Me-wuni-**o**-to umono ai te’olo  
 INT-hide-3S-PFT 3S in woods  
 ‘HE hid in the woods.’

(Vuorinen 1994)

Pronouns in Padoe encode the mood distinction of the clause: realis, irrealis, or unmarked. (27) is in the realis mood, because of the presence of the perfective (sub)morpheme *-to*. Furthermore, the third person singular agent is prominent, since it is represented twice in the clause, by both *-o* 3SG ‘he’ and *umono* ‘he’.

As opposed to a realis intransitive clause (27), which is distinguished by the presence of a set (Br) element, in an irrealis intransitive clause (28), the sole argument is represented by a set (Fi) element, e.g.,

*iro* 2PL. Nothing can intervene between a set (Fi) pronoun and the verb, which suggests that the distribution of set (Fi) is confined to the verb phrase, reminiscent of a bound morpheme (such as a prefix or a proclitic), rather than an independent NP. The infix <um> cannot co-occur with a set (A) element, but it can co-occur with set (F) or (Fi). On the other hand, set (Fi) pronouns, especially those that occur with *lo'*, are considered to be independent words that immediately precede the verb.

- (28) **Iro** k<um>eko ai Tomata  
 3P <VM>-go to Tomata  
 'They will go to Tomata.'  
 (Vuorinen 1994)

An example of a clause with unmarked mood, but a prominent argument, is given in (29).

- (29) Umono mo-turi  
 3S INT-sleep  
 'he sleeps/he is sleeping/he slept/he was sleeping.'  
 (Vuorinen 1994)

There are three different structures for transitive clauses. For example, there are two different structures for realis clauses: one for those that contain a definite patient, and another for those that contain an indefinite patient (see §4.2 for further discussion of the transitive clause with an indefinite patient). There is also a separate pattern for irrealis clauses. The ergative pattern surfaces in constructions that contain a definite patient. In these types of clauses, a set (A) pronoun functions to link the agent to the verb, while a set (Br) element is used to link the definite patient to the verb, see examples (30–31). Mood is unmarked in these types of constructions.

- (30) **Ku-nahu-o** inehu la'a  
 1S-cook-3S vegetables DEM  
 'I cooked those vegetables.'  
 (Vuorinen 1994)

- (31) **Ki-angga-'o** io galu la'a  
 1PX-work-3S CLS rice.field DEM  
 'We are working that rice field.'  
 (Vuorinen 1994)

A formal property distinguishes set (Br) from (Bi). That is, only set (Br) elements, e.g., *-o* 3S in (30) and *-'o* 3S in (31), have four forms in complementary distribution that begin with *'*, *h-*, *N-*, and  $\emptyset$ -. For example, the first person singular set (Br) pronouns are *-'aku*, *-haku*, *-nganggu*, and *-aku*; on the other hand, the corresponding set (Bi) form is just *-aku*. These forms are conditioned by the retention of historically stem-final consonants as the onset of the set (Br) pronominal elements (van den Berg 1996).

For an irrealis transitive clause that contains a definite patient, set (Br) *-ngo* third singular is used to link the patient to the verb in (32), while the agent is marked on the verb by a set (Fi) element *ono* 3S. The predicate contains a special verbal morpheme <um>.

- (32) **Ono** k<um>aa-ngo uma-no kalamboro sie.  
 3S <VM>eat-3S father-3SPOS giant DEM  
 'That giant will eat his father.'  
 (Vuorinen 1994)

There is an additional property of Padoe grammar that is not captured in table 3. Set (A) elements do co-occur with otherwise intransitive M-form verbs (33). The data imply that the C-form verb system is in some sense an addition to the M-form verb system, because the C-form morphology can be applied to a verb stem that is formed with M-form morphology.

- (33) **Ki-me-hawe-'o** pu'u-no balo  
 1PX-INT-get-3S CLS-3S.POS bamboo  
 'We found bamboo.'  
 (Karhunen 1994)

Data about intransitive and transitive active voice clauses show that Padoe has nominative properties (such as in 28) and ergative properties.

**4.2 ANTIPASSIVE IN PADOE.** The structure for a transitive clause with an indefinite patient has some remarkable properties that support a split-ergative analysis of Padoe. If we consider the M-form verb constructions that have an indefinite patient (e.g., 34), the verbal morphology indicates the clause is intransitive (see table 3, row 4, second column). There can be special morphology (*moN-*) on the verb, which closely resembles the intransitive verbal morphology (*mo-*, *me-*, *ma-*), but neither the agent nor the indefinite patient is linked to the verb (see also 40, below). The C-forms pattern in a similar way with intransitives, but are slightly different, because whereas there is a special morpheme *poN-* that closely resembles the intransitive morphology for C-form verbs (*po-*, *pe-*, *pa-*), both the agent and the indefinite patient can be linked on the verb. In both M- and C- form verbs, the submorphemic nasal *N-* is realized only before voiceless obstruents (see Karhunen 1991).

- (34) Mo-nahu-**aku**-to inehu  
 INT-cook-1S-PFT vegetables  
 ‘I cooked vegetables.’ (Vuorinen 1994)

Because of the special verbal morphology and the requirement that the patient be indefinite, it seems that these structures can be analyzed as antipassives. The main problem for this analysis is that according to table 3, two arguments are supposed to be linked to the C-form verb. This suggests that the C-form verb constructions, which tend to be used in dependent clauses, are full-fledged transitives. On the other hand, there is no set (A) argument linked to the M-form verb. This supports an antipassive analysis for this type of structure in a matrix clause.

There is sufficient evidence to suggest that in addition to the patterns describe in table 3, there is a special intransitive *mpe-/mpo-* morpheme in Padoe (35–36). Some features of this construction support the split ergative analysis of Padoe—e.g., intransitive VM and the presence of two arguments, of which only the agent is linked on the verb. The fact that the agent is marked by a set (A) element, as in (36), suggests an accusative pattern is possible for third person plural agents.

- (35) Umono mompe-ue aso-etu pu’u-no benu  
 3S VM-lord one-hundred CLS-3S.POS coconut  
 ‘He owns one hundred coconut palms.’ (Karhunen 1994)

- (36) Sombo **ro**-mpo-sampa ambau  
 each 3P-VM.P-slaughter buffalo  
 ‘Each of them slaughtered a water buffalo.’ (Karhunen 1994)

Evidence from clauses with indefinite patients suggest there are two patterns: an antipassive one for M-form verbs and a nominative one for C-form verbs.

**4.3 PASSIVIZATION IN PADOE.** Table 3 above showed that Padoe has a structural passive, in which the verb is infixed with the morpheme <*in*>. The resulting structure is interpreted as an agentless passive.

In the passive, case-marking is most sensitive to mood distinction. Unmarked and realis clauses follow an ergative pattern, whereas irrealis clauses follow a nominative-accusative pattern. A clause that is not specifically marked for irrealis mood, can be treated as realis (37) or as unmarked for mood. The patient in a realis or unmarked clause is represented by a set (Br) element and follows the ergative pattern.

- (37) T<*in*>anu-**o**-to  
 <PASS>-bury-3S-PFT  
 ‘He has (already) been buried.’ (Vuorinen 1994)

On the other hand, a passive clause can be marked for irrealis mood by the presence of a preverbal set (Fi) element, such as *ono* 3S ‘he’ in (38).

- (38) **Ono** t<*in*>anu owundu-olo  
 3S <PASS>-bury short-day  
 ‘He will be buried in the afternoon.’ (Vuorinen 1994)

Evidence from the passive suggests Padoe has a split-ergative system that is divided by realis and unmarked versus irrealis mood.

**4.4 SYNTACTIC FRONTING.** This subsection looks at relativization as it relates to syntactic fronting. Set (F) pronouns and full NPs can be fronted in a clause, but set (Fi), and arguably set (A), are fronted only within the verb phrase.

Karhunen (1994) identifies two major varieties of relativization—that is, headless (39) and headed (40) relative clauses. Headless relatives always contain the relative marker (RM), headed relatives do not.

(39) Henu me-lulu la'a, ai Yuli kaa hae-no  
 RM INT-run DEM CLS Yuli and younger.sibling-3S.POS  
 'Those running are Yuli and his little brother.' (Karhunen 1994)

(40) Piso (henu) mon-tasu la'a te-tadi  
 knife RM VM-sharp DEM NC-disappear  
 'That sharp knife has disappeared.' or  
 'That knife which is sharp has disappeared.' (Karhunen 1994)

Example (41), with emphasis in the original, shows a passive clause with a topicalized (i.e., prominent) patient. Because the patient is accessible to fronting in the passive, this example suggests that one function of fronting in Padoe is for contrast.

(41) Umono t<in>anu hiewi  
 3S <PASS>-bury yesterday  
 a. 'HE was buried yesterday.' b. 'It was he that was buried yesterday.' (Vuorinen 1994)

In (41), mood is unmarked, as indicated by the mood-marking function of the set (F) element, *umono* 3S 'he'. The adverbial *hiewi* 'yesterday' serves to provide the relevant temporal information.

Another function of fronting for C-form verbs is to achieve a passive-like interpretation without the morpheme <in>. This is a discourse strategy that backgrounds nominal and pronominal agents in main clauses. Compare interpretation (42a) and (42b).

(42) Manu nie **no-nako-'o** kaka-nggu  
 chicken DEM 3S-catch-3S brother-1S.POS  
 a. 'This chicken was caught by my brother.'  
 b. 'My brother caught this chicken.' (Vuorinen 1994)

Fronting is structurally different from passivization because only in a relativized passive does the agent occur as a set (P) pronoun (43). However, according to van den Berg's (1996) reading of Esser 1927, clauses with agents expressed by a set (P) element function to give contrastive emphasis, such as (43) 'The house that I bought [rather than the one that someone else bought] is very nice.'

(43) Raha henu in-oli-nggu moiko ngako.  
 house RM PASS-buy-1S.POS nice very  
 'The house that I bought is very nice.' (Vuorinen 1994)

An alternative strategy for expressing the agent of a relativized clause is achieved by a C-form verb. In relativized clauses, the <in>-passive (43) and fronted patient C-form verb constructions (44) are both structures that can promote the patient of a clause, although only the passive demotes the agent.

(44) Raha henu **ku-oli-'o** moiko ngako  
 House RM 1S-buy-3S nice very  
 'The house that I bought is very nice.' (Vuorinen 1994)

A mood distinction between these two types of relative clauses is difficult to ascertain. The passive morpheme <in> can be used with perfective *-to*, but it is not clear that <in> on its own indicates realis

mood. Set (A) pronouns indicate unmarked mood. Set (Br) pronouns indicate realis mood. In example (30–31) above, the co-occurrence of a set (A) and a set (Br) element results in unmarked mood.

Another sort of fronting that is important in Padoe concerns adjuncts. An adjunct can gain prominence by being fronted in the clause. This strategy requires that the argument of an intransitive be represented by a set (A) element, as in example (45). Mood is unmarked.

- (45) Inderio **ro**-po-turi?  
 where 3P-VM-sleep  
 ‘Where will they sleep?’ (Vuorinen 1994)

This regulation also operates on a transitive clause with an indefinite patient and prominent (i.e., fronted) adjunct (46). Vuorinen (1994) suggests that the verbal morpheme *poN*- correlates with the presence of an indefinite patient. Mood is unmarked.

- (46) Ai pamutu la’a **ku**-po-nahu inehu  
 in wok DEM 1S-VM-cook vegetables.  
 ‘In that wok I cook vegetables.’ (Vuorinen 1994)

In the passive, the presence of a prominent adjunct requires that the sole argument of a passive be represented by a set (A) form. There is no co-occurrence restriction between a set (A) element that links the patient to the verb and the passivizer *<in>* (47).

- (47) Inderio **ai**-h<in>enu?  
 where 2P-<PASS>-hit  
 ‘Where were you hit?’ (Vuorinen 1994)

If an indefinite, but specific, patient is initial in a clause (48), the passivized agent is marked by a set (A) pronoun, not the set (Br) series, as might be expected due to verb-initial constructions that have an indefinite (plural) patient, as in (34): ‘I cooked vegetables’.

- (48) Inehu mbio **au**-po-nahu?  
 vegetables what 2S-VM-cook  
 ‘What vegetables are you cooking?’ (Vuorinen 1994)

This particular use of set (A) to link the agent to the verb conforms to the general pattern of C-form verbs pointed out by van den Berg (1996); see table 3. The data on syntactic fronting in Padoe fall in line with the split-ergative analysis. In addition to definite and indefinite, realis and irrealis, and M- and C-form verb contrasts, the ergative pattern is sensitive syntactic fronting. Clauses with a fronted adjunct follow a nominative-accusative pattern (48). The situation is less clear for dependent verb forms, which follow both the nominative, C-form pattern *no-po-tae* in (49) and an ergative-looking, M-form pattern *po-lao-no* in (50).

- (49) **No**-po-tae helinie.  
 3S-VM-say this.way  
 ‘He said like this.’ (Vuorinen 1994)

- (50) Po-lao-no ai eluelu ro-lulu-’o  
 VM-flee-3SPOS CLS orphan 3P-chase-3S  
 ‘The orphan, having fled, they chased him.’ (Vuorinen 1994)

The usage patterns of M- and C-form predicates deserve further research. Example (50), for example, is difficult to classify using the van den Berg style table 3.

**4.5 SUMMARY.** To contrast the basic clause structures of Padoe, figure 3 shows schematizations of basic active clauses.



FIGURE 3. Schemata for Padoe basic clauses.

INT (realis 1):	{ <i>mo-/ma-/me-</i> }(N)-	V +SET Br	NP <sub>k</sub>	
INT (realis 2):	< <i>um</i> >-	V +SET Br <sub>k</sub>	NP <sub>k</sub>	
INT (irrealis):	SET Fi <sub>k</sub> + < <i>um</i> >-	V	NP <sub>k</sub>	
AP:	(PP)	SET A <sub>k</sub> + <i>po-</i>	V	NP <sub>k</sub> NP
				[+AGT] [+PAT]
				[+DEF] [-DEF]
PASS:	< <i>in</i> >-	V	NP	
			[+PAT]	
TRN 1 (realis):	SET A <sub>j</sub> + ( <i>me-</i> )	V +SET Bi <sub>k</sub>	NP <sub>k</sub> NP <sub>j</sub>	
			[+PAT] [+AGT]	
			[+DEF] [+DEF]	
TRN 2:	SET Fi <sub>j</sub>	< <i>um</i> >- V +SET Br <sub>k</sub>	NP <sub>k</sub> NP <sub>j</sub>	

Comparative schemata for basic Padoe clauses. There are three kinds of intransitive clauses (e.g., *mo-/ma-/me-* versus <*um*>), a possible antipassive, a passive, and two kinds of transitives (realis versus irrealis).

Padoe has a split for marking the argument of realis and unmarked mood intransitive clauses the same as the patient of a realis transitive clause, but marks the argument of an irrealis clause the same as the agent of a realis transitive clause; see figure 3. Padoe also shows an alternation between a preverbal pronoun from set (Fi) and a postverbal pronominal clitic from set (Br), which is insensitive to mood. Furthermore, split ergative case-marking characteristics in Padoe are connected with an indefinite patient, irrealis mood, C- form verbs, and topicalization. The data suggests that nonactive voices modulate the ability of the two possible arguments in a clause to take absolutive (or nominative) case. The split ergative analysis is also supported by possessive marking in relativized passives.

**5. SELAYARESE.** Selayarese belongs to the rather large South Sulawesi subgroup within Sulawesi (Mills 1975). In recent years, Selayarese has rapidly become one of the most well studied languages of Sulawesi (for phonology, see Piggott 2004; Mellander 2003; Basri 1999; Ceria 1993; Mithun and Basri 1986; for syntax, in particular, the behavior of pronominal elements, see Kaufman 2007; finer 2002, 2000, 1997, 1994; Woolford 2000; Basri and finer 1987; Mithun 1991; and for socio-political history, see Heersink 1995). The island of Selayar is just south of Sulawesi's southwestern peninsula. The language of Selayar is spoken on the northern two-thirds of Selayar island and also on some smaller satellite islands, south of Selayar island. *Ethnologue* (Gordon 2005) estimates that there are about 90,000 speakers of Selayarese (based on 1983 SIL figures). Alternative names for the language are Salayar, Salajar, Salayer, Silajara, Siladja, and Saleier. Lexical similarity with Makassarrese is 69% (Gordon 2005).

**5.1 ERGATIVITY IN SELAYARESE.** Mithun and Basri 1986 is the first publication to analyze Selayarese as an ergative case-marking language. The pattern of verbal morphology that illustrates the ergative system is provided in table 5. The inventory of pronominal elements is presented in table 6. The format for these tables is meant to parallel the van den Berg 1996 treatment of Uma and Padoe. Set (B) elements are used to link the argument of an intransitive clause (table 5, rows 1 and 2) and the patient of a transitive to the verb (table 5, row 5). The agent of a transitive is linked to the verb by a set (A) element, as in table 5, row 5, strongly suggesting Selayarese is an ergative case-marking language.

TABLE 5. Selayarese verb morphology.

	Verb Structure	Example Predicate
1. STAT	V + SET B	<i>tinro-i</i> (51)
2. a. INT – unergative (NC)	<i>ta’-V</i> + SET B	<i>ta’-úru’-i</i> (52)
b. INT – unaccusative	<i>a’-V</i> + SET B	<i>a’-bótoro-a</i> (3)
3. AP	<i>aŋ-V</i> + SET B	<i>aŋ-úru’-a</i> (54)
4. TRN, INDEF PAT	( <i>pa</i> )- <i>aŋ-V</i> + (SET B)	<i>la-pa-ínuŋ-i</i> (56)
5. TRN, DEF PAT	SET A + V + SET B	<i>la-ra:buŋ-a</i> (6)
6. PASS	<i>ri-V</i>	<i>ri-úru’-i</i> (63)

There are three types of intransitivizing prefixes, *ta’-*, *a’-*, *aŋ-*, and two transitivity morphemes *aŋ-* and *pa-* in Selayarese. The glottal stop in *a’-* assimilates in place to an obstruent that it precedes (see Basri 1999). Set (A) and set (B) refer to pronouns in table 6.

TABLE 6. Selayarese pronouns.

	SET A	SET B	SET P	SET F
1S	<i>ku-</i>	<i>-a</i>	<i>-ku</i>	<i>nakke</i>
2S	<i>mu-</i>	<i>-ko</i>	<i>-mu</i>	<i>kau</i>
3	<i>la-</i>	<i>-i</i>	<i>-na</i>	<i>ia</i>
1PN	<i>ri-</i>	<i>-ki</i>	<i>-ta</i>	<i>ditte</i>
1PX	<i>to-</i>	<i>-kaŋ</i>	<i>-ba</i>	<i>kambe</i>

Selayarese has four sets of pronouns, set (A) are used for the agent in a transitive clause, set (B) are used for other arguments, set (P) are for possessives, and set (F) are full form, independent pronouns. The first person plural inclusive (1PN) ‘we’ is used to address a second person singular (2S) honorific referent, ‘you’. There is no number distinction for the third person ‘she/he/it’ and ‘they’.

Table 5 illustrates that intransitive (and stative) predicates are distinguished by a special verb morphology (VM) prefix, Ø-, *ta’-*, *a’-*, or *aŋ-*. There are few verb stems that can occur without any prefix. One example is *tinro* ‘sleep’ (51).

- (51) *Tinro-i i-Denji’*  
 sleep-3S CLS-Denji’  
 ‘Denji sleeps.’ (Ceria 1993)

The argument of an intransitive is linked on the verb with a set (B) pronoun, no matter what its semantic role. The morpheme *ta’-* is used to link the patient to the verb for all noncontrolled states or events (52). Ceria (1993) analyzed *ta’-* as a passivizer; however, because it is agent-less, and the sole argument of a *ta’-* verb construction must be definite, it seems better to follow Mithun 1991, in which *ta’-* verbs are classified as noncontrol (involuntary) intransitives.

- (52) *Ta’-úru’-i baŋkéŋ-ku*  
 NC-massage-1S leg-1S.POS  
 ‘My leg gets massaged.’ (Ceria 1993)

It is possible, but infrequent, for a patient to be linked to the verb stem and to co-occur with the morphology *a’-* (53). However, no verb with just the morpheme *aŋ-* is linked with a patient argument. A few verb stems can take both *a’-* and *aŋ-*, such as *úru’* ‘massage’ (53–54). These two morphemes, *a’-* and *aŋ-*, cause the argument that is linked to the verb to be interpreted as either patient (*a’-*) or agent (*aŋ-*) for verbs that can take either. The distribution of *a’-* and *aŋ-* on other stems is idiosyncratic (Ceria 1993).

- (53) *A’-úru’-a*  
 VM-massage-1S  
 ‘I was massaged (by someone).’ (Basri 1999)

- (54) Aŋ-úru'-a  
 VM-massage-1S  
 'I have massaged (somebody).' (Basri 1999)

This datum suggests that *aŋ*- verbs are conjugated exclusively for an agent.

Clauses with incorporated patients occur, but they are infrequent. When an incorporated structure does occur, the patient is always indefinite and must be adjacent to the verb. There is special intransitive verbal morphology. The agent is linked to the verb by a set (B) clitic that occurs after the incorporated predicate, such as *attoloŋ kadera* 'chair-sat' (55). The structure of the incorporated-patient clause supports the ergative analysis because it patterns like an intransitive, such as (53).

- (55) At-toloŋ kadera-ko  
 VM-sit chair-2S  
 'You sat on a chair.' (lit. chair-sat) (Basri 1999)

Clauses that contain verbs with the causative morpheme *pa-/paka-* also support the ergative analysis, because they show that the absolutive argument (linked to the verb by a set (B) element) is the more privileged argument in the sense that the set (B) element links both the patient of the causative structure *pa-* '(so-and-so) made (X do such-and-such)' and the agent of the verb *ínuŋ* 'drink'. That is, *jarán-na* seems to function as both the agent of *ínuŋ* 'drink' and the patient of *pa-ínuŋ* 'caused \_\_ to drink' in (56). Both semantic roles are marked in the absolutive.

- (56) La-pa-ínuŋ-i jarán-na i-Báso' ri bálaŋ  
 3S-VM-drink-3S horse-3S.POS CLS-Baso' to river  
 'Baso' takes his horse to drink to the river.' (i. e., helps it drink) (Ceria 1993)

Set (B) elements are accessible to more operations than set (A) elements. For instance, if two set (B) pronouns have an identical referent across two complement clauses (*-a* 'I'), the structurally second set (B) pronoun is omitted (57). Deletion of the structurally second grammatical linker is not possible if the case-marking is different, e.g., set (B) *-a* in the matrix and set (A) *ku-* in the complement (58).

- (57) A'-jáŋji-a la-mináhaŋ  
 INT-promise-1S FUT-INT.follow  
 'I promise to follow you.' (Mithun 1991)

- (58) A'-jáŋji-a la-ku-pináhaŋ-ko  
 INT-promise-1S FUT-1S-follow-2S  
 'I promise to follow you.' (Mithun 1991)

Correlations between case-marking and the definiteness of a patient can be noted for Selayarese. A clause that contains a definite patient that is linked to the verb with a set (B) pronoun will also contain a set (A) pronoun to link the agent to the verb. Paired with the data from intransitives (examples 51–54), transitive constructions with definite patients (59) contribute the strongest evidence for an ergative pattern in Selayarese.

- (59) La-'áji'-i bukú-njo i-Báso'  
 3S-read-3S book-DET CLS-Baso'  
 'Baso' reads the book.' (Ceria 1993)

Some evidence for a split ergative case-marking system in Selayarese is revealed by the structure of clauses with an indefinite patient (see §5.2).

**5.2 ANTIPASSIVIZATION IN SELAYARESE.** Clauses that contain an indefinite patient can be analyzed as antipassive constructions in Selayarese. Antipassives include a special VM prefix—either *a'*- (60) or *aŋ*- (61), a set (B) element that can represent the agent, and an indefinite patient (56–57). Because of the special VM, and linking for a single argument, antipassive clauses appear to be very similar to intransitives; however, the presence and properties of the indefinite patient suggest that these structures really are anti-

passives. In the antipassive, the agent is linked to the verb by a set (B), not a set (A), element; and, the indefinite patient is not grammatically linked to the verb.

(60) A'-muno-a a:su  
 INT-kill-1S dog  
 'I kill dogs.'  
 (Mithun and Basri 1986)

(61) Aŋ-'áji'-i búku i-Báso'  
 INT-read-3S book CLS-Baso'  
 'Baso' reads a book.'  
 (Ceria 1993)

The formal distinction between an incorporated-patient clause (e.g., 55) and an antipassive clause (e.g., 60) is the location of the set (B) element, either on the verb (60) or on the verb+patient complex predicate (55).

In the causative construction (62), the indefinite patient of *ŋínunŋ* 'drink (something)', i.e., *pa-t-taríle* 'medicine', can (and, for communicative purposes, must) be expressed, but it is not linked to the verb. This further reinforces the antipassive analysis. In some sense, "the child" is the absolutive argument of the verb "drink" and the predicate "caused to drink."

(62) La-paka-ŋ-ínunŋ-i pa-t-taríle ana'-ínjo i-Báso'  
 3S-VM-INT-drink-3S NR-INT-cure child-DET CLS-Baso'  
 'Baso' makes his child drink some medicine.'  
 (Ceria 1993)

The data on clauses with indefinite patients support the split ergative analysis; however, there is no account for the differences between antipassive and incorporated-patient clauses.

**5.3 PASSIVIZATION IN SELAYARESE.** According to Basri (1999) and Ceria (1993), there is a structural passive in Selayarese. Both authors agree that there is a passive construction that is formally distinguished by the special verbal morpheme *ri-*. A set (B) element *-i* 'it' links the patient to the verb in (63). If the agent is expressed, which is optional, it occurs as a prepositional phrase.

(63) Ri-úru'-i banŋken-na i-Sítiti (ri i-Dénji').  
 PASS-massage-3S leg-3S.POS CLS-Sitti (by CLS-Denji)  
 'Sitti's leg got massaged (by Denji).'  
 (Ceria 1993)

However, the *ri-* passive is not a typical one, because it seems only to demote the agent and does not promote the patient, in comparison with a canonical transitive.

**5.4 SYNTACTIC FRONTING.** Mithun (1991) reports two functions of fronting. One is contrast (64).

(64) Óto la-lúpuru-a  
 car 3S-hit-1S  
 'A car hit me.' (not some other vehicle)  
 (Mithun 1991)

A second function of fronting that has been reported is to give a formal (i.e., polite) command (65).

(65) Bérasa mu-pállu-i  
 rice 2S-cook-3S  
 'Please cook the rice.'  
 (Mithun 1991)

A restriction on fronting coincides with grammatical linking on the verb. Only NPs that are linked to the verb by an ergative case (set A) element or an absolutive case (set B) element can be fronted. This applies to both antipassive (66) and active structures (67).

(66) I-Baso' ŋ-alle-i doe'  
 CLS-Baso INT-take-3S money  
 'Baso took (some) money.'  
 (Basri and Finer 1987)

- (67) I-Baso' **la**-alle-**i** doe'injo  
 CLS-Baso 3S-take-3S money-DET  
 'Baso took the money' (Basri and Finer 1987)

Frequently, when a patient is fronted, the set (B) element that links it to the verb is absent; however, Mithun and Basri (1986) relay phonological evidence that shows that certain derivations do contain a set (B) element at some level of representation. Both definite (68) and indefinite patients (69) can be fronted in active structures. This suggests that the ability for a patient to be linked to the verb by a set (B) element is sensitive to some factor other than definiteness. In other words, it is not the quality "indefinite" that prevents a patient from being linked to the verb by a set (B) element.

- (68) Doe'-injo **la**-alle i-Baso'  
 money-DET 3S-take CLS-Baso'  
 'Baso took the money.' (Basri and Finer 1987)

- (69) Doe' **la**-alle i-Baso'.  
 money 3S-take CLS-Baso'  
 'Baso took (some) money.' (Basri and Finer 1987)

However, an indefinite patient cannot be fronted in the putative antipassive construction (70). This is predicted by the split ergative analysis, because the patient in an antipassive construction lacks grammatical linking on the verb, whereas the agent is linked by a set (B) element.

- (70) \*Doe' ŋ-alle-**i** i-Baso'.  
 money VM-take-3S CLS-Baso' (Basri and Finer 1987)

From a formal point of view, it can be said that the special intransitive VM *aŋ*- prevents a patient—if it is present—from being fronted. Because of the idiosyncratic distribution of *aŋ*- and *a'*-, this restriction applies to *a'*- as well.

Unexpected behavior occurs when there is a fronted adjunct. Set (B) elements follow the verb (71) except when a locative prepositional phrase is fronted in the clause. In this case, the set (B) element, e.g., *-ko* 2S 'you (familiar)' in (72), occurs after the fronted prepositional phrase .

- (71) Tinro-**ko** ri kadera  
 sleep-2S on chair  
 'You slept on a chair.' (Basri 1999)

- (72) Ri kadera-**ko** tinro  
 on chair-2S sleep  
 'you slept on a chair' (Basri 1999)

In a number of ways, clauses with a syntactically fronted argument are similar to relative clauses. The relative clause marker (*nu*-, which is used for relative clauses with nonhuman head nouns, and *to*- for relatives with human heads) is optional in Selayarese, enhancing the similarity of the two structures. For example, compare (69) and the relative clause in (73). The verb in (73) is derived from *pa*- + *N*- + *taro*, where *pa*- is a causativizer, *N*- is special verbal morphology, and *taro* is the verb stem. The embedded clause may be a gerund. Brackets have been added to clarify the examples.

- (73) **Ku**-'úppa-mo-**i** [tási (nu-)**mu**-panaro-íñjo doe']  
 1S-find-PFT-3S bag RM-2S-put-DET money  
 'I found the bag in which you put money.' (Mithun 1991)

A feature of relative clauses that is not found in syntactic fronting in main clauses is the presence of a determiner *íñjo* immediately following the verb stem but preceding the set (B) element, as in (74).

- (74) **Ku**-’úppa-mo-**i** [ana’-ána’ (to-)**la**-lukka’-íñjo-**i** asúŋ-ku]  
 1S-find-PFT-3S child-REDUP RM-3S-steal-DET-3S dog-1S.POS  
 ‘I found the child that stole my dog.’ (Mithun 1991)

There is another split in the ergative Selayarese case-marking system. That is, instead of the absolutive set (B) element, a set (P) clitic pronoun is used in a subordinate clause to link the single argument to the intransitive verb. In (75), for example, set (P) *-ku* ‘my’ links the intransitive agent to the verb phrase headed by *mulíañ*.

- (75) Tájjan-**a** rí-nni [saŋgeŋ-**ku** mulíañ]  
 await-1S at-DEM until-1S.POS return  
 ‘Wait here until I return.’ (until my return) (Mithun 1991)

Clauses with fronted arguments demonstrate that the distribution of the absolutive case is not entirely dependent on definiteness (68–69). The function of these clauses for contrastive focus and polite requests, in addition to passive-like interpretation, suggests that specificity plays an important role in determining the ability of a patient to be fronted. Fronting in main clauses and relative clauses are somewhat similar but crucially different because of the presence and location of the determiner in the relative clauses (73–75). It appears that a verb in relative clause can take both a set (A) element and intransitive verbal morphology (73).

**5.5 SUMMARY.** Figure 4 illustrates the general schemata for clauses in Selayarese.

FIGURE 4. Schemata for Selayarese basic clauses.

INT:	{ <i>ta/a’añ/Ø</i> }-V-SET B <sub>k</sub>	NP <sub>k</sub>	
AP:	{ <i>a’añ</i> }-V-SET B <sub>k</sub>	NP <sub>k</sub>	NP [+PAT] [+AGT] [-DEF] [+DEF]
PASS:	<i>ri</i> -V-SET B <sub>k</sub>	NP <sub>k</sub>	( <i>ri</i> NP) [+PAT] [+AGT] [+DEF] [+/-DEF]
TRN:	SET A <sub>j</sub> - ( <i>añ</i> -) V-SET B <sub>k</sub>	NP <sub>k</sub>	NP <sub>j</sub> [+DEF] [+DEF]

Selayarese has intransitive, antipassive, passive and transitive clause types. There is also a verbalizing morpheme *pa(ka)*- that creates a (gerund) stem out of a verb. This verbal morphology can occur before or after the *añ*- antipassive verb morphology, or it can occur between set (A) and before the transitive verb.

To summarize, case-marking with set (A), (B), and (P) pronominal elements appears to be sensitive to definiteness and fronted locative phrases. The structure of the antipassive gives the impression that the Selayarese case-marking system is a split ergative system, especially if one considers that a strict correlation between indefinite patients and antipassive structures is weakened by fronted patient constructions (see 65), which show that an indefinite patient can be linked to the verb by an absolutive set (B) element. It was suggested that the ergative pattern is therefore sensitive to specificity. This generalization applies to raising and fronting, and may provide a way to account for the difference between antipassive and incorporated patient constructions. Further research on gerunds is also necessary.

**6. DISCUSSION.** There are several similarities between the grammar of basic clauses in Uma, Padoe, and Selayarese. For example, the properties of conjugated verbs and the function and marking of the parts of conjugated verbs, the correlation between indefiniteness/nonspecificity in patients and lack of linking on the verb, the properties of antipassive voice and passive voice, and the use of possessive pronouns for

grammatical linking in relative clauses. Clauses with definite and specific patients pattern in an ergative fashion, whereas clauses with indefinite and nonspecific patients tend to occur in antipassive patterns.

A factor that I have tried to background in the comparison so far is the historical relationship among Uma, Padoe, and Selayarese. However, because Uma, Padoe, and Selayarese are related, a detailed comparison of the languages is also a helpful contribution to the study of subgrouping in Sulawesi. Table 7 presents, side-by-side, the pronominals in Uma, Padoe, and Selayarese. The ergative patterns of verbal morphology in the three languages are presented in table 8.

TABLE 7. Side-by-side presentation of pronouns in Uma, Padoe and Selayarese.

		Set (A)	Set (P)	Set (Bi)	Set (Br)	Set (F)	Set (fi)
UMA	1S	<i>ku-</i>	<i>-ku</i>	<i>-a</i>		<i>aku'</i>	
PAD		<i>ku-</i>	<i>-nggu</i>	<i>-aku</i>	<i>-aku</i>	<i>iaku</i>	<i>aku</i>
SEL		<i>ku-</i>	<i>-ku</i>	<i>-a</i>		<i>nakke</i>	
UMA	2S	<i>nu-</i>	<i>-nu</i>	<i>-ko</i>		<i>iko</i>	
PAD		<i>(a)u-</i>	<i>-mu</i>	<i>-ko</i>	<i>-iko</i>	<i>iiko</i>	<i>iko</i>
SEL		<i>mu-</i>	<i>-mu</i>	<i>-ko</i>		<i>kau</i>	
UMA	3S	<i>na-</i>	<i>-na</i>	<i>-i</i>		<i>hi'a</i>	
PAD		<i>no-</i>	<i>-no</i>	<i>-o</i>	<i>-o(to), -lo'o</i>	<i>umono</i>	<i>o(no), lo'o</i>
SEL		<i>na-</i>	<i>-na</i>	<i>-i</i>		<i>ia</i>	
UMA	1PN	<i>ta-</i>	<i>-ta</i>	<i>-ta</i>		<i>kita'</i>	
PAD		<i>to-</i>	<i>-ndo</i>	<i>-kito</i>	<i>-kito</i>	<i>ikito</i>	<i>kito</i>
SEL		<i>ri-</i>	<i>-ta</i>	<i>-ki</i>		<i>ditte</i>	
UMA	1PX	<i>ki-</i>	<i>-kai</i>	<i>-kai</i>		<i>kai'</i>	
PAD		<i>ki-</i>	<i>-mami</i>	<i>-kami</i>	<i>-kami</i>	<i>ikami</i>	<i>kami</i>
SEL		<i>to-</i>	<i>-ba</i>	<i>-kaŋ</i>		<i>kambe</i>	
UMA	2P	<i>ni-</i>	<i>-ni</i>	<i>-koi</i>		<i>koi'</i>	
PAD		<i>(a)i-</i>	<i>-miu</i>	<i>-komiu</i>	<i>-komiu</i>	<i>ikomiu</i>	<i>komiu</i>
UMA	3P	<i>ra-</i>	<i>-ra</i>	<i>-ra</i>		<i>hira'</i>	
PAD		<i>ro-</i>	<i>-ro</i>	<i>-iro</i>	<i>-iro, -lo'rio</i>	<i>umboro</i>	<i>iro, lo'iro</i>
SEL		<i>la-</i>	<i>-na</i>	<i>-i</i>		<i>ia</i>	

Uma (UMA) and Selayarese (SEL) have four sets of pronouns, while Padoe (PAD) has six. Singular forms are less variegated than plural forms, especially in comparison with the first person plural (exclusive); however, third person plural forms are also, overall, less diversified.

In van den Berg 1996, it was suggested that set (A) pronouns are older than the set (B) pronouns because they seem to appear in more present-day Sulawesi languages. This conclusion implies that languages of the Sulawesi macrogroup were therefore at one time all mainly nominative case-marking languages. However, the data reviewed above are difficult to reconcile with van den Berg's 1996 view. Table 8, for example, supports the position that Uma, Padoe, and Selayarese have remarkably similar ergative case-marking properties. It follows that set (B) pronouns may in fact be as old as, if not older than, the set (A) pronominal elements. The growing body of evidence in support of this line of argumentation may make it necessary to revise a good portion of subgrouping theory in Sulawesi (see also Mead 2003 and Donohue 2002).

The greater diversity in the Padoe pronominals has been explained by Mead (2002), who argued that for Padoe, sets (Br), (Bi), and (Fi) once belonged to a single category, set (B). Mead also proposed that set (Fi) was an innovation in Padoe that cannot be reconstructed in Proto Bungku-Tolaki, although sets (Br) and (Bi) can (see Mead 1999). There are some problems that face the historical study of pronouns in Sulawesi languages. As we have seen, the four basic pronoun sets are not prototypical lexical items. Their function is more grammatical than that of a typical lexical or content item. Therefore, the task of reconstructing the distributional properties of even the simpler set (F) pronouns is better suited to a corpus

study, which can address the relative frequency of use plus distribution for pronouns in various types of constructions.

The comparison of ergativity presented above helps show what the ergative systems have in common, and how they differ. Table 8 summarizes elementary properties of case-marking in Uma, Padoe, and Selayarese.

TABLE 8. Comparison of case-marking strategies in Uma, Padoe, and Selayarese.

	Uma	Padoe	Selayar
INT AGT	SET B	SET A or SET Br or SET Fi	SET B
INT PAT	SET B	SET Br/i or SET F	SET B
TRN DEF PAT	SET B	SET Br or SET F	SET B
TRN INDEF PAT	(SET B)	SET Bi	(SET B)
TRN AGT (DEF PAT)	SET A	SET A	SET A
TRN AGT (INDEF PAT)	SET A or SET B	SET A or SET Bi	SET A or SET B

Case-marking patterns in main clauses are inseparable from pronominal elements in Uma, Padoe, and Selayarese. See table 7 for comparison of the pronominals in each language.

In table 8, a system is ergative if a set (B) pronoun is used to mark the argument of an intransitive clause, because set (B) is used—in some contexts in all three languages—to link the patient to the transitive verb. Ergativity in both Uma and Selayarese appears to be sensitive to the dimension of patienthood (as defined by Givón 1990), especially definiteness and specificity, in that nominative case-marking patterns are discernable when the patient is less than the prototypical patient, i.e., one that is definite and specific. In Padoe, patienthood is a less vital dimension for ergativity than mood is, in that a nominative pattern is encountered in irrealis clauses (set A is used for the argument of the intransitive). Referentiality/topicality plays an important role in all three languages, as shown by the discussions of syntactic fronting in §3.4, 4.4, and 5.4.

**7. CONCLUSION.** The comparison of basic clause structure in Uma, Padoe, and Selayarese revealed that the case-marking patterns in these three languages are strongly affected by the distributional constraints and semantic properties of case-bearing pronominal elements. It has been illustrated that all three languages possess ergative grammatical characteristics. In Uma and Selayarese, ergativity is apparently split by the divide of specificity in patients, and hence the antipassive pattern. In Padoe, ergativity is split by verb form and by syntactic fronting. The preceding comparison of ergative case-marking patterns indirectly supports a connection between nonactive voices and syntactic fronting.

Three directions for future research that may help elaborate the relation of voice and fronting can be indicated. The most important task is to examine the use of possessive pronouns to perform a case-marking function in all three languages. A second task is to explore the distribution and function of intransitive VM, especially *N-* and *pa-/po-/pe-* as well as co-occurrence restrictions of these elements with set (A) elements. A third task, one that was largely ignored in this comparison—except possibly for the discussion of fronted locatives in Padoe where set (A) occurs when other things being equal one expects set (B), or in Selayarese where set (B) occurs in preverbal position, where one would otherwise expect set (A)—is to investigate the distributional properties of the pronominal clitic elements in relation to auxiliaries and logical operators.

Further examination of the tendency for a correlation between lack of definiteness and specificity in patients with antipassive voice on the one hand, and realis and unmarked mood distinctions with ergativity on the other, will inevitably lead to a more detailed understanding of the special intransitive verbal morphology and M- versus C- form verbs in Sulawesi languages. It is my hope that this comparison of ergativity in Sulawesi complements the study of ergativity in other regions of the Austronesian world (see, for example, Liao 2004 and Wang 2004), and human language more generally (van Valin 1981).



ABBREVIATIONS

AGT	agent	POS	possessive
AP	antipassive	REDUP	reduplication
CLS	classifier	RM	relative marker
DEF	definite	STAT	stative
DEM	demonstrative	TOP	topic
DET	determiner	TRN	transitivizer
DP	dependent verb/gerund	VM	verb morphology
FUT	future	1	first person
INDEF	indefinite	2	second person
INT	intransitivizer	3	third person
NC	noncontrol	S	singular
NR	nominalizer	P	plural
PASS	passivizer	X	exclusive
PAT	patient	N	inclusive
PFT	perfective		

REFERENCES

- ANCEAUX, J. C. 1978. The linguistic position of South-East Sulawesi: A preliminary outline. In *Second International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics: Proceedings, fascicle 1: Western Austronesian*, ed. by Stephen A. Wurm and Lois Carrington, 275–83. Series C-61. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- ANDERSEN, T. DAVID. 1991. Survei sosiolinguistik Bahasa Dondo (Sociolinguistic survey of the Dondo language). *Workpapers in Indonesian Languages and Cultures* 11:143–66.
- BARR, DONALD F., SHARON G. BARR, and C. SALOMBE. 1979. *Languages of Central Sulawesi: Checklist, preliminary classification, language maps, wordlists*. Ujung Pandang: Universitas Hassanuddin-Summer Institute of Linguistics (UNHAS-SIL).
- BASRI, HASAN. 1999. Phonological and syntactic reflections of the morphological structure of Selayarese. PhD dissertation, State University of New York at Stony Brook.
- BASRI, HASAN, and DANIEL FINER. 1987. The definiteness of trace. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18(1):141–7.
- CERIA, VERONICA. 1993. Verb morphology and valency change in Selayarese. *University of Pittsburgh Working Papers in Linguistics* 3:76–185.
- DIXON, R. M. W. 1994. *Ergativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- DONOHUE, MARK. 2002. Voice in Tukang Besi and the Austronesian focus system. In *The history and typology of Western Austronesian voice systems*, ed. by Fay Wouk and Malcolm Ross, 81–99. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- ESSER, S. J. 1927–33. *Klank- en Vormleer van het Morisch* (Phonology and morphology of Mori). 2 vols. Leiden: Verhandelingen van het Koninklijk Bataviaasch Genootschap van Kunsten en Wetenschappen 67/3 and 67/4. Leiden: Vros (1927); Bandoeng: Nix (1933).
- ESSER, S. J. 1964. *De Uma-taal (West Midden-Celebes): Spraakkunstige schets en teksten*. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- FINER, DANIEL. 1994. On the nature of two A'-positions in Selayarese. In *Studies on scrambling, Movement and non-movement approaches to free word-order phenomena*, ed. by Norbert Corver and Henk van Riemsdijk, 153–83. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- FINER, DANIEL. 1997. Contrasting A' dependencies in Selayarese. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15:677–728.

- FINER, DANIEL. 2000. Cyclic clitics in Selayarese. In *Proceedings of the Sixth Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association (AFLA VI)*, ed. by C. Kitto and C. Smallwood, 137–60. Toronto: University of Toronto.
- FINER, DANIEL. 2002. Phases and movement in Selayarese. *Massachusetts Institute of Technology Working Papers in Linguistics* 44 (*Proceedings of Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association* 8):157–70.
- FRIBERG, TIMOTHY, and THOMAS V. LASKOWSKE. 1989. South Sulawesi languages, 1989. In *Studies in Sulawesi languages*, part 1, 1–17. *NUSA: Linguistic Studies of Indonesian and Other Languages in Indonesia*, 31. Jakarta: Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya.
- GIVÓN, TALMY. 1990. *Syntax: A functional-typological perspective*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- GORDON, RAYMOND G., Jr., ed. 2005. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*, 15th edition. Dallas: Summer Institute of Linguistics International: <http://www.ethnologue.com>
- GRIMES, CHARLES E., and BARBARA D. GRIMES. 1987. *Languages of South Sulawesi*. Series D-78 (Materials in Languages of Indonesia, no. 38). Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- HEERSINK, CHRISTIAN GERARD. 1995. The green gold of Selayar: A socio-economic history of an Indonesian Coconut Island, circa 1600–1950: Perspectives from a periphery. PhD dissertation, University of Amsterdam.
- HIMMELMANN, NIKOLAUS. 1996. Person marking and grammatical relations in Sulawesi. In *Papers in Austronesian linguistics*, no. 3, ed. by Hein Steinhauer, 115–36. Pacific Linguistics, A-84.
- KARHUNEN, MARJO. 1991. Phonology of Padoe. In *Sulawesi phonologies*, ed. by René van den Berg, 179–96. *Workpapers in Indonesian Languages and Cultures* no. 12. Ujung Pandang: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- KARHUNEN, MARJO. 1994. The noun phrase in Padoe. In *Studies in Sulawesi linguistics*, part 3, ed. by René van den Berg, 17–47. *NUSA* 36.
- KASENG, SYAHRUDDIN, MASJHUDDIN MASJHUDA, ABDUL MUTHALIB, INDRA BANGSAWAN WUMBU, AMIR W. LUMENTUT, AMIR KADIR, and ABDUL LATIF ROZALI. 1979. *Bahasa-Bahasa di Sulawesi Tengah* (Languages of Central Sulawesi). Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- KAUFMAN, DANIEL. 2007. South Sulawesi pronominal clitics: Form, function and position. Unpublished ms. Ithaca: Cornell University.
- KIPARSKY, PAUL. 1987. Morphology and grammatical relations. Unpublished ms. Stanford: Stanford University.
- LIAO, HSIU-CHUAN. 2004. Transitivity and ergativity in Formosan and Philippine languages. PhD dissertation, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa.
- MAGNETTI-BARSEL, L. 1984. Verb morphology in Mori, an Austronesian language spoken in Central Sulawesi, Indonesia. PhD dissertation, Columbia University.
- MANNING, CHRISTOPHER D. 1996. *Ergativity, argument structure, and grammatical relations*. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- MARTENS, MICHAEL P. 1988a. Notes on Uma verbs. In *Papers in Western Austronesian linguistics*, no. 3, ed. Hein Steinhauer, 167–237. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- MARTENS, MICHAEL P. 1988b. Focus and discourse in Uma. In *Papers in Western Austronesian linguistics*, no. 3, ed. by Hein Steinhauer, 239–61. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- MARTENS, MICHAEL P. 1988c. Focus or ergativity? Pronoun sets in Uma. In *Papers in Western Austronesian linguistics*, no. 3, ed. by Hein Steinhauer, 263–77. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- MARTENS, MICHAEL P. 1990. Proto Kaili-Pamona: Reconstruction of the protolanguage of a language subgroup in Sulawesi. Unpublished ms.
- MEAD, DAVID E. 1999. *The Bungku-Tolaki languages of South-Eastern Sulawesi, Indonesia*. Series D-91. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.

- MEAD, DAVID E. 2002. Proto Celebic focus revisited. In *The history and typology of Western Austronesian voice systems*, ed. by Fay Wouk and Malcolm Ross, 143–77. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- MEAD, DAVID E. 2003. Evidence for a Celebic supergroup. In *Issues in Austronesian historical phonology*, ed. by John Lynch, 115–41. Series 550. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- MELLANDER, EVAN. 2003. On the interaction of stress, vowel epenthesis, and syllable weight in Mohawk and Selayarese. *McGill Working Papers in Linguistics* 17(2):121–32.
- MILLS, ROGER. 1975. Proto South Sulawesi and Proto Austronesian Phonology. PhD dissertation, University of Michigan.
- MITHUN, MARIANNE. 1991. The role of motivation in the emergence of grammatical categories: The grammaticization of subjects. In *Approaches to grammaticization*, vol. 2: *Focus and types of grammatical markers*, ed. by Elizabeth Traugott and Bernd Heine, 159–84. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- MITHUN, MARIANNE, and HASAN BASRI. 1986. The phonology of Selayarese. *Oceanic Linguistics* 25(1):210–55.
- NOORDUYN, J. 1991a. *A critical survey of studies on the languages of Sulawesi*. Bibliographical Series, no. 18. Leiden: Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde.
- NOORDUYN, J. 1991b. The languages of Sulawesi. In *Papers in Austronesian linguistics*, no. 1, ed. by Hein Steinhauer, 137–50. Series A-81. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- O'GRADY, WILLIAM. 2007. The syntax files: An introductory survey of basic syntactic concepts and phenomena. Honolulu: Department of Linguistics, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- PIGGOTT, GLYNE L. 2004. The representation of extrametricality. *McGill Working Papers in Linguistics* 18(2):45–88.
- VAN DEN BERG, RENÉ. 1996. The demise of focus and the spread of conjugated verbs in Sulawesi. In *Papers in Austronesian linguistics*, no. 3, ed. by Hein Steinhauer 89–114. Series A-84. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
- VAN VALIN, ROBERT. 1981. Grammatical relations in ergative languages. *Studies in Language* 5:361–94.
- VUORINEN, PAULA. 1994. Person marking in Padoe. In *Studies in Sulawesi linguistics*, part 4, ed. by René van den Berg, 97–121. *NUSA* 37.
- WANG, SHAN-SHAN. 2004. An ergative view of Thao syntax. PhD dissertation, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.
- WOOLFORD, ELLEN. 2000. Ergative agreement systems. *University of Maryland Working Papers in Linguistics* 10:157–91.

jajjacks@hawaii.edu