

South Sulawesi pronominal clitics: form, function and position

Daniel Kaufman
Cornell University

The present article offers the most comprehensive overview to date of pronominal clitic syntax in the South Sulawesi (SSul) family (Malayo-Polynesian, Austronesian). The fundamental aspects of SSul morphosyntax are explained with special attention given to case and agreement phenomena. The SSul system is then compared to Philippine-type languages, which are known to be more morphosyntactically conservative, and thus may represent the type of system from which Proto-SSul descended. A full array of syntactic environments are investigated in relation to clitic placement and the results are summarized in the conclusion. The positioning properties of the set A pronouns are of particular interest in that they are similar to Philippine clitics in being second-position elements but dissimilar to them in respecting the contiguity of a potentially large verbal constituent, often resulting in placement several words away from the left edge of their domain. Finally, notes on the form of modern SSul pronoun sets and the reconstruction of Proto-SSul pronouns are presented in the appendix.

1. Background

The languages of the South Sulawesi (henceforth SSul) family are spoken on the southwestern peninsula of Sulawesi. Selayar island marks the southern boundary of the SSul area, while the northern boundary is marked by Mamuju on Sulawesi's west coast, the Sa'dan area further inland, and the environs of Luwuk on the northeastern edge. Outside of Sulawesi, the Tamanic languages of western Kalimantan have been identified as outliers of the SSul family.¹ Several other SSul languages have significant numbers of speakers outside of Sulawesi due to more recent migrations. Bugis and Makassarese, in particular, have large numbers of speakers throughout the Indonesian archipelago and long traditions of inter-island migration.

The phylogenetic unity of the SSul family has been discussed by Sirk (1989) and a reconstruction with subgrouping arguments was presented by Mills (1975a, 1975b). Mills (1975a) represents the sole attempt at a reconstruction of Proto-SSul. An important language survey including wordlists was undertaken by Grimes & Grimes (1987) and this

1 Adelaar (1994) argues for grouping the Tamanic languages under the Bugis branch of SSul. However, the phylogenetic relations of this language have only begun to be studied in earnest. Because of the limited data available for Tamanic, it will not be included here. Other SSul languages which could not be included are Lemolang, a family level isolate, for lack of data, and the Seko languages. Although several very informative articles on Seko Padang by Tom and Kathy Laskowske have been made available, person marking in Seko is so divergent from the rest of SSul that it deserves to be handled separately (see Kaufman in progress).

work was later updated and refined by Friberg & Laskowske (1989). Although articles and monographs have been published on the majority of SSul languages, very few thorough grammars exist for any of them.² The grammars of the Dutch period, most notably the works of Matthes (1858) on Bugis and Makassarese, although containing much valuable information, are far from complete and suffer from several misanalyses.

The purpose of the present article is to examine the principles of pronominal morphosyntax in SSul languages from a comparative-descriptive perspective. This work thus builds directly on Friberg (1988), the first attempt at a comparison of pronominal clitics across the SSul family. In order to understand the possible origins of the SSul clitic system, a comparison will be made to Philippine languages, which, while obviously not representing the Proto-Malayo-Polynesian (henceforth PMP) system directly, are thought to be more conservative in the relevant respects (Ross 2002).

The data presented here is partly the result of my own fieldwork during 2006 and partly a synthesis of the published materials including texts and literature.³

2. The form and history of South Sulawesi pronominals

SSul languages possess four sets of person markers which will be referred to here as set A, set B, the genitive set and the free pronouns. Mills' (1975a) reconstruction of these pronominals can be refined to the one shown in Table 1. (Full paradigms of the major SSul languages and notes on the reconstruction can be found in the appendix.)

Table 1. Proto-South Sulawesi person markers

	A	B	Genitive	Free
1sg.	= <i>ak</i>	<i>ku</i> =	= <i>ku</i>	<i>aku</i>
1pl.excl	= <i>kang</i>	<i>ki</i> =	= <i>mang</i>	<i>kami</i>
1pl.incl	= <i>ki'</i>	<i>ta</i> =	= <i>ta</i>	<i>kita</i>
2sg.	= <i>ko</i>	<i>mu</i> = / <i>nu</i> =	= <i>mu</i>	<i>iko</i>
2pl.		<i>mi</i> =	= <i>mi</i>	<i>kamu</i>
3sg./pl.	= <i>i</i>	<i>na</i> =	= <i>na</i>	<i>ia</i>

2 Notable exceptions include Sirk's (1996) Bugis grammar, Campbell's (1989) dissertation on Pitu Ulunna Salu, Basri's (1999) dissertation on Selayarese and Jukes' (2006) dissertation on Makassarese. See Noorduyn (1991) for a good annotated bibliography of work on SSul languages.

3 All examples from my own notes unless otherwise indicated. I thank the following native speakers for their very generous assistance: Ferry Rita and Markus Salombe (Sa'dan Toraja), Hasan Basri (Selayarese), Anshari and Lukman Suni (Duri), Abdul-Kadir Mubarak (Mandar), Hanafi Sulaiman (Makassarese), Askhaludin I Gusti (Makassarese, Buginese), Zabaniah Saniang (Seko Padang), Nadrun, Muslim (Buginese). I especially acknowledge the assistance of Hasan Basri, Anshari, Effendi and Ferry Rita of Universitas Tadulako whose help made possible much of the fieldwork presented here. Thanks also to Loren Billings for comments and corrections. All data cited from other sources has been glossed according to a single convention for consistency.

Set B is cognate with the PMP genitive enclitics and strong phonological similarities between these two sets persist in all present day SSul languages. Set A, on the other hand, clearly descends from the PMP nominative/absolute pronominals and shares more similarities with the free pronouns, both diachronically and synchronically.⁴ The genitive set is relatively conservative in form and does not show many notable innovations from PMP to Proto-SSul. In several languages, there are minor differences in form between the genitive set and set B, most obviously in the first person plural exclusive. In many languages, however, they are only differentiated by the leftward dependency of the genitive set and the rightward dependency of set B.⁵ The free forms as reconstructed in Table 1 are also very conservative, although many languages have made innovations to this set.

One striking feature of this paradigm is the complete absence of distinct third person plural forms.⁶ As it turns out, this absence is common to all SSul languages except the Tamanic languages (Taman and Embaloh) located in western Borneo (Adelaar 1994). This sets the SSul group apart from the neighboring Kaili-Pamona languages, which all possess a singular/plural distinction in the third person.⁷ Several languages in the northwestern portion of the language group including Mamuju, Mamasa, Mandar and Seko Padang, have recreated a plural set with the combination of singular pronominals and a separate plural marker (Mamuju = *ii*, Mamasa = *a*, Mandar and Seko Padang = *se*) but this is clearly a secondary development.⁸ The plural forms of the first and second person also seem to be giving way to the singular forms. Bugis, the Makassar subgroup, Seko Padang, Bambam and Mandar do not have any traces of the historical second person plural forms. Rather, these languages optionally employ a universal quantifier or plural marker in combination with (historically) singular forms to indicate plurality, as in (1).

4 It remains unclear for what historical stage the set A enclitics should be reconstructed. Mills (1975a:224) comments:

‘Their phonological forms are also relatable to the free forms – usually to the initial syllable; comparable forms exist in other AN languages, so that these enclitics, like the possessives, are probably reconstructable for pre-PSS stages (though perhaps not with precisely the same functions).’ (emphasis mine)

Interestingly, the way in which the free pronominals have been reduced in fact suggests that the set A clitics of Proto-SSul were not inherited from a single set of Western Malayo-Polynesian clitics. Specifically, the SSul forms were reduced from the right of the free pronominals, while the more common strategy in Western Malayo-Polynesian languages is reduction from the left edge.

5 The genitive enclitic also triggers morphophonological alternations on its host which are not found with the set B proclitic. These include, most notably, the appearance of a nasal coda with certain stems (Sirk 1988) and in certain languages, gemination of the clitic’s first consonant.

6 Mills tentatively reconstructs the second person plural based on Bugis but he suggests the possibility that this form is perhaps a Malay loan. Information not available to Mills at the time, however, supports the reconstruction of a second person plural form for all sets except set A.

7 Exceptionally, Rampi, a Kaili-Pamona language, has lost the third person plural free form. The agreement systems of the Muna-Buton languages (southeast Sulawesi) except for Muna, have also lost the inherited number distinction in the third person (van den Berg 2003:99–100). Outside of these two groups I am not aware of any other languages in Sulawesi which have lost this distinction.

8 There is evidence that the plural markers of Mamuju and Mamasa descend from a singular affix. According to Phillip Campbell’s wordlists cited in Smith (1993), the Mehalaan, Minanga and Rantepalado dialects of Pitu Ulunna Salu have a second person plural free pronoun of the shape *iko-aki*. This appears to be comprised of the inherited second person singular free form *iko* with a suffix *-aki*. This affix can account for both the Mamuju and Mamasa forms through vowel deletion. The Seko and Mandar plural marker, on the other hand, resembles the third person plural of neighboring Kaili-Pamona languages (e.g., Bada, Besoa, Napu = *he*, Rampi = *hi*). The position and usage of this marker in Mandar and Seko make clear that it is not part of the regular person marking paradigm (see appendix) which suggests borrowing.

- (1) *Makassar* Sa'bara' = ngaseng = ko ikau = ngaseng!
 patience = all = 2s.A 2s.F = all

'All of you, be patient!'

(Hakim 2001:96)

The apparent loss of the number distinction was probably part of a more general shift to reinterpret number as social distance. This change took place in the third person before the break-up of Proto-SSul, erasing any trace of the historical plural form. It then proceeded to the second and first persons which has clearly eroded in most languages but is still reconstructable on the basis of the Northern subgroup. Finally, the change has begun to affect the inclusive/exclusive distinction which has been lost in a few languages and has been showing signs of attrition in others.⁹

As mentioned above, social distance is a crucial feature of SSul pronominal systems. A commonality found among all SSul languages is the strict avoidance of the historical second person singular form in reference to an addressee who is older or of a perceived higher status than the speaker. Most languages employ the historical first person plural inclusive form in this function but some languages, like Sa'dan Toraja, are also reported to allow the second person plural.¹⁰ The use of the first person plural inclusive as a polite form differentiates SSul languages from many languages of the Kaili-Pamona group, which prefer the second person plural.¹¹

All languages possess portmanteau forms which represent the combination of the set A with second position adverbial clitics such as =*mo* 'already', =*pa* 'still', =*ja* limitative (Makassarese), =*ra* limitative (Northern subgroup). The combinations =*mo*/=*pa* + =*i* (3.A) are generally expressed by the portmanteau forms =*mi*/=*pi*. Similar reductions are often made with the first person singular, e.g., Sa'dan Toraja =*mo*/=*pa* + =*na*' (1s.A) > =*mo*'/=*pa*'. Less frequently, the second and first person may also possess portmanteau forms such as Bugis =*na* 'already'/=*pa* 'still' + =*ko* 2s.A > =*no*/=*po*. Other set A pronominals simply follow the adverbial clitics in their normal form.¹²

3. Clitic function

Despite some dramatic differences between the morphosyntax of the SSul languages and that of Philippine languages, the various pronominal sets are quite similar in function. Divergences between the two groups are more likely to represent innovations which took place in the former group (or a higher subgroup of PMP which excludes Philippine languages)

9 Sirk (1996:92) states, "The category of 'exclusiveness-inclusiveness' is faintly developed in the language of Buginese traditional literature. Among the 1st person pronouns the meaning of exclusiveness is expressed (though it is unclear whether always or not) by *ikeng* and *ia*'." See also Donohue & Smith (1998) on the loss of the clusivity distinction in Malay dialects.

10 In the following, I gloss the historical first person plural inclusive forms according to their etymology. It should be understood that in actual usage this category also commonly refers to the second person.

11 Outside of Kaili-Pamona, Donohue (1999:114) notes that the second person plural in *Tukang Besi* is used as a polite form for an addressee but that the first person plural forms are also used in order to signal an even higher degree of respect.

12 Interestingly, these portmanteau forms are found not only in the SSul languages but also in the Kaili-Pamona group. Several adverbial clitics and portmanteau forms appear to have spread areally across family boundaries but this is a topic which awaits further research.

rather than in the latter one. In the following, I compare several SSul languages with Tagalog and other Philippine languages in order to illustrate some similarities and differences.

First, however, a note on terminology is in order. The case-neutral terms Agent and Patient refer to the two arguments of a transitive (i.e., patient voice) verb, while Subject refers to the sole argument of an intransitive (i.e., actor voice or non-verbal) predicate. In instances where a typically intransitive verb takes an object, the object will be referred to as the actor voice Patient. This is shown schematically in (2).

- (2) **Non-verbal:** (i) Subject
 Actor voice: (i) Subject (ii) Actor voice Patient
 Patient voice: (i) Agent (ii) Patient

In referring to morphological case, I again employ neutral labels; A, B and Genitive. Thus, set A, set B, etc. refer to the person markers, while case A, case B, etc., refer to the morphological case of an argument, even if not expressed overtly, as with non-pronominal arguments. The goal of this section is to compare how these morphological case categories are aligned with the different kinds of arguments in (2) across several SSul and Philippine languages.

Deciding which sets of person markers are commensurate with each other in the two language groups is the first step in this comparison. Both etymology and function must be taken into account here. Table 2 shows how the Naga dialect of Bikolano (Bicol, Meso-Philippine, Greater Central Philippine) may be compared with Duri (Masenrempulu, Northern subgroup, SSul) based on form and function.

Table 2. Functional comparison of Duri and Bikol (Naga) person markers

		A	B	Genitive	Free pronouns
1sg.	Duri	= <i>na'</i>	<i>ku</i> =	= <i>ku'</i>	<i>aku'</i>
	Bikol	= <i>ako</i>	(= <i>ko</i>)	= <i>ko</i>	<i>ako</i>
1pl.excl	Duri	= <i>kan</i>	<i>ki</i> =	= <i>ki'</i>	<i>kami'</i>
	Bikol	= <i>kami</i>	(= <i>mi</i>)	= <i>mi</i>	<i>kami</i>
1pl.incl	Duri	= <i>ki'</i>	<i>ta</i> =	= <i>ta'</i>	<i>kita'</i>
	Bikol	= <i>kita</i>	(= <i>ta</i>)	= <i>ta</i>	<i>kita</i>
2fam.	Duri	= <i>ko</i>	<i>mu</i> =	= <i>mu</i>	<i>iko</i>
	Bikol	= <i>ka</i>	(= <i>mo</i>)	= <i>mo</i>	<i>ika</i>
2pl.	Duri		<i>mi</i> =	= <i>mi</i>	<i>kamu' ~ komu'</i>
	Bikol	= <i>kamo</i>	(= <i>nindo</i>)	= <i>nindo</i>	<i>kamo</i>
3sg./pl.	Duri	= <i>i</i>	<i>na</i> =	= <i>na</i>	<i>ia</i>
	Bikol	= <i>siya</i>	(= <i>niya</i>)	= <i>niya</i>	<i>siya</i>

The historical derivation of the proclitic B set from the genitive set is an innovation not found in Philippine languages (Wolff 1996; van den Berg 1996; Mead 2002; Zobel 2002; Kikusawa 2003). This is the result of a historical split of the PMP genitive set into two different sets of person markers: (i) a set of genitive forms which inherited the enclitic

property of their PMP ancestors but whose function was narrowed down to only marking possessors (3a), (4a) or arguments of non-finite verbs (3b), (4b).

- | | | | | |
|-----|--------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|
| (3) | <i>Duri</i> | a. rara = na
blood = 3.G

'His blood' | b. apa ratu = nna ...
but arrive = 3.G

'After arriving...' | (K. Valkama 1995:70) |
| (4) | <i>Bikol</i> | a. dugo' = niya
blood = 3s.G

'His blood' | b. pag-abot = niya ...
GER-arrive = 3s.G

'After his arriving/upon his arrival' | |

And (ii), a set of proclitics used exclusively for the verbal functions of the old PMP set, which, as we will see in more detail below, mark Agents of non-actor voice verbs (5)–(6).

- | | | |
|-----|--------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| (5) | <i>Duri</i> | Na = ratu-i = na'
3.B = arrive-LOC = 1s.A

'He arrived to me.' |
| (6) | <i>Bikol</i> | Pig-abut-an = niya = ako
PRF-arrive-LV = 3s.B = 1s.A

'He reached me.' |

Because this split did not occur in Philippine languages, the Bikolano forms in the set B column are identical to those in the genitive set and are thus put in parenthesis. So while there is no set B in the Philippines from a strictly etymological point of view, we may still speak of the Philippine genitive set as functionally commensurate with both the SSul genitive set and set B. For the sake of uniformity, I will use the term set B to refer to the Philippine forms and will reserve the term genitive to refer to the SSul person markers which strictly mark possessors and arguments of non-finite verbs.

The free forms will not be discussed at any length here because they pose additional problems in the SSul languages. In most Philippine languages they can simply be considered non-clitic case A pronominals but in SSul languages the free pronominals appear to index arguments of any case. Because of this and other complications, a full treatment of SSul free forms must await further work.

3.1. The case and voice system of Philippine languages

Because the use of the various voices in the Philippine voice system have been widely discussed in the literature (Wolff 1973; Ross 1995, 2002; Blust 2002; Himmelmann 2002; Reid & Liao 2004; *inter alia*) we will concentrate here on some differences between actor voice and patient voice clauses. The locative, instrumental and conveyance voices which are typical of Philippine languages disappear as one moves southwards into Indonesia but the majority of Western Malayo-Polynesian

- (10) *Isnag* Nag-putad ya lalaki ka kayu
 AV.PRF-cut A man OBL wood

‘The man cut up some wood.’

(Barlaan 1999:15, ex.13c)

Non-actor voice verbs in Philippine languages take an Agent in case B. Unlike case B Patients of actor voice verbs, case B Agents have no inherent semantic restrictions, i.e., they may be definite/pronominal. As usual, the pivot receives case A and has no semantic restrictions. In (11) we see a typical patient voice clause with two pronominal arguments.

- (11) *Tagalog* B <in> ili = niya = ako
 <PV.PRF> buy = 3s.B = 1s.A

‘She bought me.’

In Philippine languages, case A arguments and oblique directional arguments can always be extracted through question formation, focalization and topicalization. This contrasts with case B arguments which are only extractable under marked circumstances. In (12) and (13) we find the patient voice and actor voice versions of similar sentences in Tagalog. Topicalization of the Patient can only occur with a patient voice verb (12a) and topicalization of the Agent only with the actor voice verb (13b).

- (12) *Tagalog* a. Ako ay b <in> ili = niya
 1s.A TOP <PV.PRF> buy = 3s.B

‘As for me, she bought me.’

- b. *Niya ay b <in> ili = ako
 3s.B TOP <PV.PRF> buy = 1s.A

(for, ‘As for her, she bought me.’)

- (13) *Tagalog* a. Siya ay b <um> ili nang = pusa
 3s.A TOP <PV.PRF> buy DET.B = cat

‘As for her, she bought a cat.’

- b. *Nang = pusa ay b <um> ili = siya
 DET.B = cat TOP <PV.PRF> buy = 3s.A

(for, ‘As for a cat, she bought one’)

Thus, extraction can be seen to dictate voice morphology. But this may come into conflict with the previously mentioned semantic restriction on actor voice Patients which demands that they be indefinite, or at least non-specific. The conflict occurs when an Agent is extracted from a clause with a definite/pronominal Patient. In such circumstances the extracted argument still dictates the voice of the verb so that it must be in the actor

voice. But the definite/pronominal Patient must now appear in the oblique case as shown in (14). Interestingly, a (non-partitive) Patient in the oblique case *without* extraction is considered ungrammatical (or at best highly awkward), as seen in (15) (see also Adams & Manaster-Ramer 1988; McFarland 1978).

- (14) *Tagalog* Sino ang b <um> ili *niya / *siya / sa = kanya?
 who DET.A <AV.PRF> buy 3s.B / 3s.A / OBL = 3s

‘Who bought him?’

- (15) *Tagalog* ?*B <um> ili = siya sa = kanya
 <AV.PRF> buy = 3s.A OBL = 3s

(For, ‘She bought him.’)

Another environment which licenses oblique actor voice Patients in Tagalog (but does not necessarily require them) is that containing an actor voice or stative control predicate. Because the pivot is the preferred null argument in the embedded clause of this type of construction (Kroeger 1993), actor voice can be forced on the second verb despite the presence of a definite Patient. This licenses the presence of an oblique Patient as seen in (16).

- (16) *Tagalog* Takot = sila-ng p <um> atay sa = kanya
 scared = 3p.A-LNK <AV> kill OBL = 3s

‘They’re scared to kill him.’

The final aspect of the voice system to be mentioned here is its function in discourse anaphora. As has been noted previously by Naylor (1975), only the pivot can function anaphorically as a null argument (or “zero anaphor”). For instance, (17a) is only felicitous in a context where the addressee can positively identify the implicit Patient to the exclusion of other possible candidates, equivalent to the English *eat it*. (17b) on the other hand is simply a command to eat, without specifying what is to be eaten.

- (17) *Tagalog* a. Kain-in = mo! b. K <um> ain = ka!
 eat-PV = 2s.B <AV> eat = 2s.A

‘Eat (it)!’

‘Eat!’

3.2. Clitics and case in SSul languages

We now shift our attention to the SSul clitics in a simple sentential context. (18a) shows the actor voice and (18b) shows a non-verbal predicate. Similar to Philippine languages, both take case A subjects.

- (18) *Duri* a. Male = ko b. Tongguru = i
 go = 2s.A teacher = 3.A

‘You went.’

‘She’s a teacher.’

The arguments of a patient voice verb also agree with their Philippine counterparts in case. The Agents of patient voice verbs are in case B while Patients are in case A. In (19) these arguments are represented by a set B proclitic and set A enclitic.

- (19) *Duri* Na = tulung = ko
 3.B = help = 2s.A
 ‘She helped you.’

The argument which receives case A is also the pivot of the clause in SSul languages. As such, it is the only (non-oblique) argument which can be fronted or extracted freely. As we saw for Tagalog above, topicalization of the case B argument is also ungrammatical in Sa’dan Toraja. In (20a) we find a typical patient voice clause with a proclitic Agent and a noun phrase Patient. (20b) shows that topicalization of the Patient is grammatical in such a clause. However, topicalizing the same Patient in the actor voice version (21a) results in ungrammaticality (21b).¹⁴

- (20) *Sa’dan* a. Mu = tiro = i burung b. Burung, mu = tiro
 2s.B = see = 3.A bird bird 2s.B = see
 ‘You see a/the bird’ ‘The bird, you saw.’
- (21) *Sa’dan* a. Un-tiro = ko burung b. *Burung, un-tiro = ko
 AV-see = 2s.A bird bird AV-see = 2s.A
 ‘You see a bird.’

Also similar to Philippine languages, the Patients of actor voice verbs in SSul are often semantically restricted. In Bugis and the Makassar subgroup such Patients tend strongly to be interpreted as indefinite and addition of a definite article is often ungrammatical (Basri 1999) (22).¹⁵

- (22) *Makassar* Ammali = a’ balla’
 AV-buy = 1s.A house
 ‘I bought a house.’ (not ‘I bought the house’)

A major difference which sets apart the SSul languages from their Philippine relatives is the use of set A to indicate actor voice Patients under special circumstances (van den Berg 1996; Himmelmann 1996, 2002; Zobel 2002). This is unattested among Philippine languages but is common to most languages of Sulawesi (among other language groups

14 When it is fronted, as in (20b), the clitic is no longer present on the verb. There is a strong crosslinguistic tendency for focus fronted elements to disallow clitic doubling, in contrast to fronted topics. This is also the common pattern in the SSul group, see Finer (1994) for a generative treatment of the facts in Selayarese.

15 Sa’dan and Duri seem to allow definite noun phrases as actor voice Patients more freely (although restrictions do exist with the actor voice affix *meN-/maN-*). Seko Padang possesses an actor voice prefix which strictly limits the valency of the verb by not allowing a Patient at all. This is the work of a derivational prefix *miN-* which Payne & Laskowske (1997) term “super-anti-passive”.

in Indonesia). Set A actor voice Patients are found in roughly the same environments as oblique Patients in Tagalog, in particular, environments where the Agent is extracted through clefting, topicalization or question formation. Because extraction of the Agent is only possible with actor voice verbs, a pronominal Patient will be forced to surface as a non-pivot argument. In Philippine languages this conflict is handled by putting such pronominal Patients in the oblique case, as seen above in (14). In SSul languages, however, such Patients surface in case A as in (23).¹⁶

- (23) *Duri* a. Inda = ra ng-kita = ko? b. Iko ng-kita = na'
 who = QM AV-see = 2s.A 2s.F AV-see = 1s.A
 ‘Who saw you?’ ‘You saw me.’

And again similar to Philippine languages, pronominal actor voice Patients are conditioned by extraction of the Agent. For instance, (24a) is similar to (23b) except that the free pronominal Agent remains in the post-verbal position and is thus ungrammatical. In (24b) the Agent encliticizes as a set A pronominal while the Patient tries unsuccessfully to appear as a second set A clitic.

- (24) *Duri* a. *?Ng-kita = na' iko b. *Ng-kita = na' = ko
 AV-see = 1s.A 2s.F AV-see = 1s.A = 2s.A
 (For ‘I saw you.’)

Interestingly, the requirement that the Agent must be extracted for the pattern in (23) to be possible is not limited to syntactic extraction. As will be shown in more detail in §4, set A clitics are placed in second position, meaning they attach to the leftmost possible host within their positioning domain. When the set A Subject of an actor voice verb attaches to a pre-verbal element, the post-verbal position is made available for a set A Patient, just as we saw in the cases of syntactic extraction in (23) (see also Quakenbush & Ruch 2006 for a very similar set of facts in Kalamianic). In (25), a set A Agent of an actor voice verb encliticizes to an aspectual adverb in a pre-verbal position while another set A clitic, representing the Patient, attaches to the right edge of the verb. Morphophonology can thus be seen to also play a role in licensing set A actor voice Patients.

- (25) *Sa'dan* Mangka = na' un-tiro = i
 already = 1s.A AV-see = 3.A
 ‘I've already seen him.’

16 Languages of the Makassar group require special verbal morphology when an actor voice verb hosts a set A Patient. In Konjo and Makassarese, the actor voice prefix *aN-* normally substitutes the first consonant of a consonant initial stem (as commonly found in so-called Austronesian nasal substitution) but when an actor voice verb takes a definite/pronominal Patient this substitution does not occur (Friberg 1988, 1996, Jukes 2006). In Selayarese the picture is more complicated as the actor voice cannot take definite Patients at all (Basri 1999). Rather, when an Agent is extracted from a verb containing a pronominal Patient, Selayarese employs the patient voice, thus violating the historical constraint against extracting case B arguments in order to obey the constraint against definite actor voice Patients.

Actor voice and stative control predicates also license pronominal Patients of actor voice verbs in SSul languages. In Duri and Sa'dan Toraja there is a strong preference (if not a requirement) that the controllee in a control construction be the pivot of the lower clause. As seen earlier in (16) for Tagalog, this constraint can force a verb in the lower clause to take the actor voice. Consequently, a pronominal Patient must then take case A, as in (26a). The ungrammaticality of a non-pivot (case B) controllee is shown in (26b).¹⁷

- (26) *Duri*
- a. Ma-doangng = i n-tolong = na'
 STA-want = 3.A AV-help = 1s.A
 'He wants to help me.'
- b. ?*Ma-doangng = i na = tolong = na'
 STA-want = 3.A 3.B = help = 1s.A
 (for, 'He wants to help me.')

Another functional difference between the clitics of Philippine and SSul languages is their use with subjectless predicates, such as meteorological verbs. As we saw in (7b), Philippine languages do not require a pleonastic subject for such verbs. SSul languages on the other hand, regularly employ the third person set A clitic in these contexts. In (27a) the set A clitic represents the pleonastic subject of the meteorological verb *uran* 'to rain'. In (27b), the patient voice (plus locative suffix) version of the same verb takes a set B clitic as a pleonastic Agent.¹⁸

- (27) *Sa'dan*
- a. Urann = i
 rain = 3.A
 'It's raining.'
- b. Na = urann-i = na' nina'
 3.B = rain-LOC = 1s.A earlier
 'I got rained on earlier.'

Another domain for pleonastic clitics is in marking embedded clauses. Patient voice verbs which take clausal complements (e.g., 'know', 'say', 'try'), can take a third person set A clitic which appears to coindex the embedded clause as a whole (28).

- (28) *Mandar* Na-tungga = i = mi ak-kala
 3.B-intend-LOC = CMP.3.A AV-lose
 'He intended to lose.'

Outside their pleonastic functions, the use of Set B proclitics in SSul languages correlates closely with their use in Philippine verbal predications. In both groups of languages they mark Agents of patient voice verbs (or more precisely for Philippine

17 See also Matti (1994:75) for Mamasa. Bugis and Makassarese are more liberal in allowing non-pivot controllees as in (26b).

18 The third person set A clitic happens to be of the same shape as the locative suffix. However, they are differentiated in all SSul languages by the fact that only the locative suffix forms a prosodic unit with the verb stem for the calculation of stress.

Clitic doubling with set A clitics is one of the morphosyntactic features which distinguish the SSul languages from their Northern neighbors, the Kaili-Pamona languages, which allow set B clitics to double full NPs but typically avoid such doubling by set A clitics. Among Philippine languages, clitic doubling with any clitic set is quite rare. Philippine languages among which it is attested are Batanic, Kapampangan (Forman 1971, Kitano 2006) and to a lesser degree Ilokano (Reid & Liao 2004). In (38), the second position set B and set A clitics double the following full noun phrases in Yami, a Batanic language.

- (38) *Yami* I-ka-rilaw = na_i = siraj_j [no = ina = da]_i [o = an~anak = na]_j
 BV-STA-pity = 3s.B = 3p.A DET.B = mother = 3p.B DET.A = PL~child = 3s.B
 ‘Mother pitied her children.’ (Rau & Dong 2006:95, ex.32)

Similar to Duri, Kapampangan also shows conditions on doubling involving specificity. Kitano (2006) explains the different interpretations in (39), “The absolutive *ing danum* is crossreferenced when a ‘particular’ water is referred to [39a]...but it is not when ‘all’ the water that one can find at the moment is referred to [39b]...”.

- (39) *Kapam* a. Marimla = ya ing = danum.
 cold = 3s.A DET.S.A = water
 ‘The water is cold.’ (Kitano 2006:3, ex.2a)
- b. Marimla ing = danum.
 cold DET.S.A = water
 ‘The water is cold.’ (Kitano 2006:4, ex.2b)

Finally, it is interesting to note that even Philippine languages such as Kapampangan which possess clitic doubling do not employ set A clitics in a pleonastic function, as seen earlier for SSul languages. Subjectless verbs in Kapampangan, as in other Philippine languages, lack a case A argument altogether, as in (40).

- (40) *Kapam* Mu~muran
 PROG~rain
 ‘It’s raining.’ (Forman 1971:126)

3.3. Summary

The functions of the two clitic sets is summarized in Tables 3 and 4. For clitic doubling, the majority pattern is taken to be representative of Philippine languages.

Table 3. Functions of set A clitics

Environment	Phil	SSul
Subject of actor voice verbs	✓	✓
Subject of non-verbal predicates	✓	✓
Pleonastic subject	*	✓
Patient of actor voice verbs	*	✓
Patient of patient voice verb	✓	✓
Doubling full NP argument	*	✓

Table 4. Functions of set B clitics

Environment	Phil	SSul
Agent of a patient voice verb	✓	✓
Agent of actor-voice/non-verbal predicate under 'case shift'	*	✓
Pleonastic Agent	*	✓
Doubling full NP argument	*	✓

It should be clear from the above that the SSul languages have expanded the use of both set B and set A clitics to environments in which they are not found in Philippine languages. Some of these developments can be seen as the result of a grammaticalization process which effected pronominals (Cysouw 2003). Whereas PMP appears to have treated pronominals as arguments, grammaticalization has turned them into agreement-like elements in SSul. As agreement markers, they double arguments, are obligatory in a larger number of environments and do not require actual referents (as with pleonastic arguments). This development is found to a more advanced degree in other languages of Sulawesi such as *Tukang Besi* (Donohue 1999) and *Muna* (van den Berg 1989) where the presence of person marking is obligatory in a yet wider range of contexts. Although the issue of deciding between a pronominal versus agreement marker analysis of SSul clitics cannot be addressed fully here, the variation found in the SSul languages and other language groups of Sulawesi appears to militate against the notion of discrete morphosyntactic categories of “agreement marker” and “pronominal clitic”. What we find, rather, is a set of features, both morphosyntactic and morphophonological, which may change in tandem diachronically, but crucially not in lockstep. Thus, just as in the history of so many other discrete categories in linguistics, the behavior of pronominals in Sulawesi languages seems to require us to decompose what was often taken to be a binary opposition into several syntactic and phonological parameters.

4. Clitic Positioning

The SSul languages differ considerably from most Philippine languages in the positioning of clitics. The SSul set B clitics are head-adjacent proclitics while their

- (44) *Sa'dan* Buntu iato bela **ku** = teka'-i (cf. *Buntu iato **ku** = bela teka'-i)
 mountain that can 1s.B = climb = LOC

'That mountain, I can climb.'

This is not to be confused with constructions in which an auxiliary functions as a main verb and takes the set B clitic itself. These are easily distinguished by the fact that the verbal complement has voice marking of its own, as in (45), where the embedded verb takes the actor voice prefix.

- (45) *Sa'dan* Tae' = mo **ku** = bela un-tiro = i
 NEG = CMP 1s.B = can AV-see = 3.A

'I can't see him anymore.'

Case shift, the unexpected use of a set B clitic in place of a set A clitic in negative and other contexts, was mentioned earlier (see (29) above). It must be noted that the set B clitic which results from case shift appears in a different position from the regular, unshifted set B clitics. Although this cannot be discussed fully here, the difference stems from the fact that, in case shift, the set B clitic is not associated with the verb directly but is rather generated as part of the complementizer *an/na* and thus appears further to the left of the verb, preceding elements such as *la* = FUT and *tang* = NEG, as in (46) (see Kaufman in progress).

- (46) *Sa'dan* Da' **na** = tang = k < um > ande!
 PROB 3.B = NEG = < AV > eat

'Don't let him not eat!'

4.2. Set A clitics I: the left edge of the positioning domain

SSul languages are often described as possessing an unmarked predicate initial word order but all languages make liberal use of topic and focus positions in the left periphery of the clause. Adjuncts, prepositional phrases and noun phrase arguments can all be found in these left-peripheral positions. Section 4.2 examines what elements host set A clitics when they occur in pre-verbal position.

4.2.1. Temporal versus locative adjuncts

In many SSul languages, temporal adjuncts and locational adjuncts behave differently from each other when fronted to a focus position. In languages which show an asymmetry it is always locative adjuncts which can host set A clitics and temporal adjuncts which are prevented from doing so. This is discussed by Basri (1999) for Selayarese, which follows

-
- (ii) *Indonesian* Harus **ku** = coba
 must 1s.B = try

'I must try.'

the asymmetric pattern. Observe the clitic positioning with the fronted locative adjunct in (47) and the temporal one in (48).

- (47) *Selayar* a. Tinro = **ko** ri kadera b. Ri kadera = **ko** tinro
 sleep = 2.A OBL chair OBL chair = 2.A sleep
 ‘You slept on a chair.’ ‘You slept on a chair.’
 (Basri 1999:250, ex.16a,b)

- (48) *Selayar* a. La-’-lampa = **ko** mintara b. Mintara la-’-lampa = **ko**
 FUT-AV-leave = 2.A tomorrow tomorrow FUT-AV-leave = 2.A
 ‘You will leave tomorrow.’ ‘You will leave tomorrow.’
 c. *Mintara = **ko** la-’-lampa
 tomorrow = 2.A FUT-AV-leave
 (Basri 1999:254, ex.20a,b,c)

Mandar is similar to Selayarese in not allowing set A enclisis to temporal adjuncts (49).

- (49) *Mandar* Dionging an[n]a me-akke = **a**
 yesterday CONJ AV-go = 1s.A
 ‘I went yesterday.’ (Friberg 1988:122, ex.M7a)

Fronted temporal adjuncts are separated from the clause by *anna* in Mandar. Friberg (1988) refers to this as a ‘temporal marker’ but this is simply the regular conjunction ‘and’. Comparative evidence makes clear that the construction [TEMP.ADJUNCT] [CONJ] [CLAUSE] can be reconstructed to Proto-SSul. Several languages, including Selayarese, optionally drop the conjunction but overt conjunctions are found as well (50).²²

- (50) *Selayarese* Mintara = mo na la-’-lampa = **ko**
 tomorrow = CMP CONJ FUT-AV-go = 2.A
 ‘You’ll go tomorrow.’ (Basri 1999:277, ex.33b)

Sa’dan Toraja, Mandar and others further distinguish between future and past temporal adjuncts. Future temporal adjuncts may optionally host set A clitics (51a) just as fronted locative adjuncts do, but past temporal adjuncts may not (51b).

22 Some Kaili-Pamona languages, such as Kulawi, have cognate bi-clausal structures for focused temporal adverbs. Similarly, the set A clitic cannot cross-over into the left conjunct and attach to the adverb (i).

- (i) *Kulawi* Iwengi pade rau = **i** (cf. *Iwengi = **i** pade rau)
 yesterday CONJ go = 3s.A
 ‘It was yesterday that he left.’

- (51) *Sa'dan* a. Masawa = **na'** male tomorrow = 1s.A go
 'I will go tomorrow.'
 b. *Yongi' = **na'** male yesterday = 1s.A go
 (for, 'I went yesterday.')

Person marking in the presence of a fronted temporal adjunct differs between languages like Selayarese and Mandar on the one hand, and languages like Sa'dan Toraja, Duri, Makassarese, Bugis and Konjo, on the other. In the former, the adjunct is simply outside of the positioning domain and the set A clitic still attaches to the leftmost possible host, which in the case of (50) is the verb. In the latter group, a different pattern emerges. Temporal adjuncts (especially those referring to the past) employ a set B clitic following the conjunction which introduces the main clause, as in (52). This is the same case shift construction seen earlier in negative contexts.

- (52) *Sa'dan* Yongi' (an =)ku = male
 yesterday CONJ = 1s.B = go
 'I left yesterday.'

In contrast to punctual temporal adjuncts, all languages seem to allow enclisis to fronted aspectual adverbs (53)–(54), temporal subordinators (55), and durative adjuncts (56)–(57).

- (53) *Sa'dan* Tontong = **na'** male mas-sikola
 always = 1s.A go AV-school
 'I always go to school.'

- (54) *Mandar* Pura = **i** ma'-ande loka i Kaco'
 already-3.A AV-eat banana PM Kaco
 'Kaco already ate a banana.' (Ba'dudu 1990)

- (55) *Mamasa* Mangka = **ko** ku = pamoloi...
 after-2s.A 1s.B-help
 'After I helped you...' (Matti 1996)

- (56) *Enrekang* Kore allo = mo = **kan** r < um > angngan na tae = ppa
 two day = CMP = 1p.ex.A < AV > hunt CONJ NEG = IMP
 jonga ki = tikkan
 deer 1p.ex.B = catch
 'Two days already we've been hunting and we haven't yet caught a deer.'
 (Sikki et al. 1997:214, ex. 83)

- (57) *Bugis* Tellu taungng = a' ma-musu' tuli cappu' tentara = ku,
 three year = 1s.A AV-war always finish army = 1s.G

kappala = kku
 ship = 1s.G

'For three years I have been at war, my army and ships always being finished off.'
 (Said et al. 1979:121)

Concerning locative adjuncts, we also find complex prepositional phrases which contain multiple potential hosts. SSul languages are rich in deictic elements which may either stand alone or introduce prepositional phrases that further specify a location. The prepositional phrase is headed by the oblique/prepositional marker *di/ri*. In such cases, the set A clitic always attaches to the leftmost of these hosts, i.e., the deictic, as seen in (58).²³

- (58) *Makassar* Anjoreng = ko ri pasarak-a a'-balanja.
 there = 2s.A OBL market-DEF AV-shop

'Go shopping there at there market.' (MMN 1996:135 ex. 48)

4.2.2. Interrogative elements

In any given language, interrogatives typically correspond to their non-interrogative counterparts, i.e., if a fronted temporal adjunct can host a type A clitic then its corresponding interrogative 'when' will be able to do the same. Thus, we see the Selayarese adjunct pattern above repeated with the corresponding interrogatives in (59).

23 SSul languages treat such deictic + PP complexes uniformly whether they are prepositional predicates (ia) or whether they are adjuncts in the pre-verbal focus position (ib). In both cases, the set A clitic follows the leftmost deictic host.

- (i) *Mandar* a. Dio = a' di UNTAD b. Dio = a' di UNTAD ma'-jama.
 there = 1s.A OBL UNTAD there = 1s.A OBL UNTAD AV-work
 'I am there in UNTAD.' 'I am working there in UNTAD.'

This contrasts with Tagalog where focused locative adjuncts are treated as an impermeable unit for the placement of set A clitics. In (iia), the set A clitic attaches to the leftmost host in the prepositional phrase predicate but in (iib), in which the clitic originates with the verb, it must be positioned at the right edge of the entire prepositional phrase (cf. Kroeger 1998, Schachter & Otanes 1972:190).

- (ii) *Tagalog* a. Galing = sila sa = Maynila b. Galing sa = Maynila = sila nag-lakad
 from = 3p.A OBL = Maynila from OBL = Maynila = 3p.A AV.PRF-walk
 'They're from Manila.' 'They walked from Manila.'

When SSul languages do allow the ‘why’ interrogative to host set A clitics, it is clear that these clitics do not originate from the main clause. Rather, they are arguments of the interrogative itself which, as in many Austronesian languages, is morphologically the verb ‘to do what’. This can be demonstrated by two facts. Firstly, the set A clitic can be doubled, appearing on both the interrogative and the predicate (64a). Such doubling is generally impossible with other interrogatives, as shown for ‘how’ (64b).

- (64) *Mandar* a. Mangappa = **o** na ma’-jama = **o**
 why = 2.A CONJ AV-work = 2.A
 ‘Why are you working.’
- b. Me’apa = **o** ma’-jama
 how = 2s.A AV-work
 ‘How do you work?’ (cf. *Me’apa = **o** ma’jama = **o**)

Secondly, in contrast with other pre-verbal clitic hosts, the set A clitic which attaches to ‘why’ need not correspond with the case A argument of the main verb. It can correspond with any argument in the main clause, as Friberg has shown for Konjo (65).

- (65) *Konjo* a. Angngura = **ki** ki = peppe = ‘a
 why = 1p.in.A 1p.in.B = hit = 1s.A
 ‘Why are you hitting me?’ (Friberg 1996:154, ex.61b)
- b. Angngura = **a** ki = peppe = ‘a
 why = 1s.A 1p.in.B = hit = 1s.A
 ‘Why are you hitting me?’ (Friberg 1996:154, ex.61c)

Such sentences are probably best analyzed as biclausal, being roughly translatable as, ‘Why am I such that you are hitting me?’ and ‘Why are you such that you are hitting me?’, respectively. Under this analysis, both set A clitics take second position within their respective clauses.

Some interrogatives, such as ‘how many’, are often phrasal, containing a noun phrase. These types of complex interrogatives can never be broken up by clitics, as exemplified by (66)–(67).

- (66) *Duri* Pirang taun = **mi** = **ra** mas-sikola? (cf. *Pirang = **mi** = **ra** taun)
 how.many year = CMP.3 = CTR AV-school
 ‘How many years has she been going to school?’
- (67) *Bugis* Ikki siaga = **i** mak-kutana?
 how.many times = 3.A AV-ask
 ‘How many times did he ask?’

- (74) *Bambam* Tää' = ä' ma-sihha' mem-lao.
NEG = 1s.A ADJ-quick AV-go

'I'm not going quickly.' (Campbell 1989:49, ex.1a)

- (75) *Selayar* Gele = i minang rinni la = taro loka = ñjo
NEG = 3.A used.to here 3.B = put banana = DEF

'He never put bananas here.' (Basri 1999, Finer 2002)

Languages which do allow set A enclisis to negation often also allow set A enclisis to prohibitives (76).

- (76) *Mandar* Da = mo = 'o lamba
PROB = CMP = 2.A go

'Don't go!'

Enclisis to prohibitives is also allowed by some languages which disallow enclisis to sentential negation. Makassarese, for instance, disallows enclisis to the sentential negator *tena* (77a), but allows enclisis to the prohibitive *tea* (77b).²⁶

- (77) *Makassar* a. Tena ku =cini = ko (cf. *Tena = ko ku =cini)
NEG 1s.B = see = 2s.A

'I didn't see you'

- b. Tea = ko cini = ki
PROB = 2s.A see = 3.A

'Don't look at him!'

On the other hand, Bugis allows set A enclisis neither to sentential negation (78a) nor to prohibitives (78b).

- (78) *Bugis* a. De'na u = ita = ko (cf. *De'na = ka u = ita)
NEG 1s.B = see = 1s.A

'I didn't see you.'

26 Note though that the clitic which attaches to the prohibitive does not come from the verb directly as it is the Agent and is expressed by a set A clitic. If the source of the clitic was the verb we would expect (i). Thus, the different behavior of Makassarese should thus be attributed to a difference in prohibitive formation, not a difference in clitic placement *per se*.

(i) *Makassar* *Tea = ki nu =cini!
PROB = 3.A 2s.B = see

(For, 'Don't look at him!')

- b. Aja' mu = anre = i! (cf. *Aja' = i mu = anre!)
 PROB 2s.B = eat = 3.A
 'Don't eat it!'

SSul languages employ different negators for verbal and non-verbal predicates (similar to Malay/Indonesian *tidak* versus *bukan*). The non-verbal negator is able to host set A clitics across all languages examined here.

- (79) *Makassar* Teya = i balla' = na guru = nna na = mange-i
 NOM.NEG = 3.A house = 3.G teacher = 3.G 3.B = arrive-LOC
 'It wasn't his teacher's house that he went to.' (MMN 1996:106)

4.2.5. Fronted noun phrases

It is rare that fronted noun phrases can serve as hosts for set A clitics. In Selayarese and the majority of SSul languages fronted noun phrases are either in a topic or focus position which is outside the domain of clitic pronominal placement (Basri 1999). Neither a fronted Agent or Patient can host the set A clitic in Selayarese (80).

- (80) *Selayar* a. *Pakoko-ñjo = i la-pallu berasa-ñjo
 farmer-DET = 3.A 3.B-cook rice-DET
 'The farmer cooked the rice.' (Basri 1999:253, ex.19b)
- b. *Berasa-ñjo = i la-pallu pakoko-ñjo
 rice-DET = 3.A 3.B-cook farmer-DET
 'The farmer cooked the rice.' (Basri 1999:253, ex.19e)

But examples of fronted noun phrase hosts do exist in other languages such as Konjo (81)–(82) and Old Buginese (83). It is not yet clear how general this pattern is in these languages.²⁷

- (81) *Konjo* Lamejaha = ji na = kanre ri ele' = na
 sweet.potato = LIM.3.A 3.B = eat OBL morning = 3.G
 'He just eats sweet potatoes in the morning.' (Friberg 1996:146)
- (82) *Konjo* I Haking = ji ni-suro a'-kammi' balla'
 PM H = LIM.3.A PASS-COMMAND AV-guard house
 'Only Haking was told to guard the house.' (Friberg 1996:165)

27 Concerning the Bugis, Sirk (1996:130) states, "One may venture the following hypothesis... the subject has been given the formal features of the predicate". But this seems to be a strained explanation as such a structure should yield a very different interpretation.

- (83) *Bugis* Lilí' = na = **ni** Wájo' ia tən = na = onro-i = em = múa
 vassal = 3.G = CMP.3.A Wajo 3.F NEG = 3.B = place-LOC = DEF = EMPH
 'He should not find refuge at Wajo's Vassals.' (Sirk 1996:130)

Mamuju and Seko Padang are the only languages in which a pre-verbal free pronoun is attested to host a set A enclitic. Stromme (1994:98) claims that this is a rare construction in Mamuju (84).²⁸

- (84) *Mamuju* a. Yaku' = **ii** man-jampangng-i b. Ia = **a'** mang-alli-ang
 1s.F = 3p.A AV-care.for-APPL 3s.F = 1s.A AV-buy-APPL
 'I took care of them.' 'HE bought it for me.'

In Seko Padang we also find an attestation of a set A enclitic attaching to a pronominal but here it is the Subject and thus coreferent with its pronominal host.

- (85) *Seko Padang* I = koi: = **ka'** mang-keki' tu-lino...
 COND = 1s.F = 1s.A AV-bite person-world...
 'If I bite a person ...' (Laskowske & Laskowske 1995:23, ex.185)

The asymmetry between fronted noun phrases and fronted locative/prepositional phrases in SSul languages is also found in many Philippine languages. The reason appears to be the same for both language groups. In these structures, focused noun phrases are in the predicate position while the verb is relativized and occupies the subject position. Observe how the verb and the oblique phrase constitute the case A argument when the Patient is fronted in the cleft-like structure in (86).

- (86) *Tagalog* Tsokolate ang = i-b <in> igay = **ko** sa = kanya
 chocolate DET.A = CV- <PRF> give = 1s.B OBL = 3s
 'Chocolate is what I gave her.'

Because pronominal clitics do not cross determiner phrase boundaries (marked by brackets), the second position set B clitic cannot be positioned after the focused noun phrase as shown in (87).

28 What makes this construction even more unusual is that, based on comparative evidence, we expect this to be a cleft-like structure, i.e., 'I was the one who took care of them.' and 'He was the one who bought it for me.' Clausal boundaries as the ones found in cleft structures are usually barriers for pronominal clitic placement and as such, we wouldn't expect an A set clitic associated with a verb in the right hand clause to appear in the left hand clause.

- (87) *Tagalog* *Tsokolate = **ko** [ang = i-b < in > igay sa = kanya]
 chocolate = 1s.B DET.A = CV- < PRF > give OBL = 3s

(for, ‘Chocolate is what I gave her’, but OK for,
 ‘My chocolate is what was given to her.’)

This is not the case, however, when an oblique argument is fronted to a focus position. Because relativization of the predicate is not necessary here—and thus there is no determiner phrase boundary intervening between the verb and the left edge of the clause—a second position clitic must surface after the oblique phrase (cf. Kroeger 1998).

- (88) *Tagalog* Sa = kanya = **ko** i-b < in > igay ang = tsokolate
 OBL = 3s = 1s.B CV- < PRF > give DET.A = chocolate

‘It was to her that I gave chocolate.’

The same positioning factors appear to be operative in the SSul languages although this is not as apparent as in languages like Tagalog since the determiner/relativizer is not always overt.

4.2.6. Auxiliaries

In the more common pattern, auxiliary modals such as ‘want’, ‘dislike’, ‘need’ host set A clitics but do not assign case in the presence of a main verb. The agent/experiencer role of the auxiliary is generally assigned to the Agent of a following patient voice verb (89)–(91) or the Subject of a following actor voice verb (92).

- (89) *Bugis* Elo = **ka’** mu = tulung?
 want = 1s.A 2.B = help

‘Do you want to help me?’

- (90) *Sa’dan* Morai = **na’** mu = tundu-i?
 want = 1s.A 2s.B = help-LOC

‘Do you want to help me?’

- (91) *Selayar* A’ra’ = **a** mu = tulung?
 want = 1s.A 2s.B = help

‘Do you want to help me?’

- (92) *Bugis* Elo = **ko** m-anre?
 want = 2s.A AV-eat

‘Do you want to eat?’

In several languages a secondary pattern can be found in which the agent/experiencer of the auxiliary is expressed by a set A clitic on the auxiliary and the Patient of the patient voice verb is expressed by a set A clitic on the verb (93)–(95).

- (93) *Selayar* A'ra' = **ko** **mu** = tulung = a?
 want = 2s.A 2s.B = help = 1s.A

'Do you want to help me?'

- (94) *Bambam* Melo = **ä'** la = **ku** = pem-kilala-i
 want = 1s.A FUT = 1s.B = TR-remember-LOC

'I want to commit (it) to memory.' (Campbell 1989:114, ex.105)

- (95) *Mamasa* ...moka = **ko** **mu** = ben = na' nande = mu
 refuse = 2s.A 2s.B = give = 1s.A food-2s.G

'...you refused to give me some of your food.' (Matti 1994:76, ex.45)

As mentioned earlier, when the Subject of an actor voice verb encliticizes to an auxiliary it can make room for a set A Patient on the verb. Such constructions are more common in languages of the Northern subgroup (96) than in the Bugis and Makassarese subgroups, although they are attested in the latter groups as well (97).

- (96) *Sa'dan* Morai = **ko** un-tundu-i = **na'**?
 want = 2s.A AV-help-LOC = 1s.A

'Do you want to help me?'

- (97) *Konjo* A'ra' = **a** ang-huno = **i**
 want = 1s.A AF-kill = 3.A

'I want to kill it.' (Friberg 1988:119, ex.42)

4.2.7. *Beyond the left edge*

When multiple possible hosts occur in the left edge, it is always the leftmost constituent which hosts the set A clitic, as seen in (98) for Selayarese.

- (98) *Selayar* Rinte'e = pa = **ko** gele ng-anre (cf. *Rinte'e gele = pa = **ko** nganre)
 where = INC = 2s.A NEG AV-eat

'Where have you not eaten yet?'

4.3. Set A clitics II: The right edge of the positioning domain

In the absence of a pre-predicate host, the set A clitic does not always directly follow the predicate head. Rather, it is often positioned at the right edge of other elements which follow the predicate head. These include, among others, incorporated objects, prepositional phrases, and certain adverbs. In some cases, as with the Makassarese V + V compounding to be discussed below, there is evidence for a morphosyntactic process which unites two elements which may otherwise stand alone. In other cases, however, there is no external evidence for compounding or incorporation and it must be concluded that the right edge of the positioning domain is not the predicate head but rather a larger syntactic phrase to which certain adjuncts may be adjoined.³⁰

4.3.1. Object incorporation and V + V compounding

Object incorporation affects clitic placement such that clitics always appear to the right of the object. Not all SSul languages seem to have a productive process of object incorporation and many languages allow incorporation only with certain actor voice forms. For instance, Sa'dan Toraja and Duri show incorporation (in some cases obligatory) with verbs taking the *maN-* prefix (cf. Friberg 1988:111, S. Valkama 1995:33) but not with the *un-* prefix. Incorporated objects are typically indefinite bare nouns. Sa'dan Toraja allows incorporation of nouns modified by an adjective (103a), but not by a demonstrative (103b) or relative clause (103c).

- (103) *Sa'dan* a. Mang-iru' sakke malassu = **na'**
 AV-drink water hot = 1s.A
 'I drink hot water.'
- b. *Mang-iru' sakke iato = **na'**
 AV-drink water that = 1s.A

30 In addition to the aforementioned adjuncts, all SSul languages also possess second position clitic adverbs which regularly intervene between the clitic host and the set A clitics like *pole* 'again' in (i).

- (i) *Duri* Ku = passan = pole = **mi**
 1s.B-carry = again = **CMP.3.A**
 'I lifted it up again.'

(K. Valkama 1995:64, ex.65)

SSul languages have a roughly similar inventory of adverbial clitics which express meanings such as 'again', 'all', 'ever', 'already', 'still', 'only', 'also'. These are strictly ordered in regard to the set A clitic and to each other—the set A clitic being positioned near the right edge of the clitic cluster—but generally preceding the question marker =*ka* (Bugis =*ga*). These are discussed for Bugis by Sirk (1996) but much work remains to be done on the properties of the clitic cluster in other languages. Unfortunately, discussion of the relative ordering of second position clitics must be postponed to later work. In what follows, we restrict our scope to the ordering relations between set A clitics and non-clitic material.

- c. *Mang-iru' sakke ku-pe-lassu-i = na'
 AV-drink water 1s.B-CAU-hot-LOC = 1s.A

(for, 'I drink water which I heat up.')

Bugis, Maiwa and Mamuju also show optional incorporation when the object is indefinite and unfocused. But Bugis, and probably other languages as well, disallow incorporation of a modified noun, as was seen above for Sa'dan Toraja (104).

- (104) Bugis M-inung = ka' kopi pella (cf. *M-inung kopi pella = ka)
 AV-drink = 1s.A coffee hot

'I'm drinking hot coffee.'

On the other hand, Mandar (105), Selayarese (106) and Makassarese³¹ (107) generally do not allow such clitic placement with actor voice Patients.

- (105) Mandar Map-polo = na' ayu (cf. *Map-polo ayu = na')
 AV-chop = 1s.A wood

'I chop wood'

31 Makassarese exceptionally allows incorporation in idioms such as (i), interrogative indefinites (ii) and objects of *a'jari* 'to become' (iii).

- (i) Makassar An-na'bang kayu = a'
 AV-chop wood = 1s.A

'I forced (someone) to step down.'

- (ii) Makassar A'-balu apa = i i Ali? (cf. A'-baluk = i apa i Ali?)
 AV-sell what = 3.A PM Ali

'What does Ali sell?'

(MMN 1996:137 ex.56)

- (iii) Makassar A'-jari tau = mi
 AV-become person = CMP.3.A

'He became a person.'

The apparent actor voice Patient in (i) may not be a bona fide argument, as is suggested by the existence of a patient voice version of the idiom which takes the undergoer as Patient.

- (iv) Makassar Ku = ta'bang kayu = i
 1s.B = chop wood = 3.A

'I forced him to step down' (Lit. 'I wood-chopped him')

Grammaticality judgments conflict here, which may reflect dialectal variation. The judgments here are those of a speaker from Jene'ponto. Speakers from Makassar seem to accept incorporation more freely.

- (106) *Selayar* Am-mali = a loka (cf. *Am-mali loka = a)
 AV-buy = 1s.A banana

‘I bought a banana.’

- (107) *Makassar* Ang-nginung = a’ kopi (cf. *Ang-nginung kopi = a’)
 AV-drink = 1s.A coffee

‘I drink coffee.’

In contrast to actor voice Patients, certain locative type complements may be expressed as incorporated objects in Konjo (108) and Selayarese (109).

- (108) *Konjo* A’-cidong kadera = a
 AV-sit chair = 1s.A

‘I chair-sit’

(Friberg 1988:114)

- (109) *Selayar* At-tolong kadera = ko (cf. *At-tolong = ko kadera)
 AV-sit chair = 2s.A

‘You sat on a chair (lit. chair-sat)’

(Basri 1999:252, ex.18a–b)

In Buginese, certain nominal adjuncts (non-arguments) may be incorporated into the verbal constituent. In (110) and (111) the nominal is an adjunct of comparison.

- (110) *Bugis* Tən = na = sampe-ang sampu’ = ko Bone
 NEG = 3.B = hang-APPL sarong = 2s.A Bone

‘Bone will not hang you up like a Sarong.’

(Sirk 1996:117)

- (111) *Bugis* Ri-sərring bacubacu = i ri Dewata = e
 PASS-sweep gravel = 3.A OBL God = DEF

‘God will sweep them off like gravel.’

(Sirk 1996:117)

Makassarese has a productive process of V-V compounding which takes two intransitive verbs with similar semantics and gives an intensive meaning. **Clitic position follows the second verb and cannot intrude upon the compound as shown in (112).**³²

32 It is worth noting that the second verb in these compounds retains the historical initial *m-* in the actor voice prefixes which is lost elsewhere. A grammar of Makassarese states, “Besides the prefix *aK-*, the prefix *maK-* also exists, whose morphophonemic processes are the same as with *aK-*. The *maK-* prefix is no longer commonly found except in old manuscripts or Makassarese literary works.” (MMN 1996:49, translation mine). This suggests that the operation which brings these two verb stems together is more morphological than syntactic in nature. It also seems to favor certain pairs of stems, although some productivity has been noted.

- (112) *Makassar* Lari ma'-lumpak = a' (cf. *Lari = a' ma'lumpa')
 run AV-jump = 1s.A

'I ran and jumped intensely/with joy'

Basri (1999) shows another type of verbal compounding in Selayarese where the second verb acts as a kind of manner modifier of the first verb, as shown in (113). Again, the set A clitics must follow the entire compound and cannot intervene between the two verbs. This compounding also exists in Makassarese (114).

- (113) *Selayar* Tinro t-tolong = ko ri kadera (cf. *Tinro = ko t-tolong ri kadera)
 sleep AV-sit = 2s.A OBL chair

'You slept while sitting on a chair.' (Basri 1999:252, ex.18c-d)

- (114) *Makassar* A'-lumpa' ak-kadang = ki' naung
 AV-jump AV-close.eyes = 1p.A down

'You jumped down with eyes closed' (Manyambeang et al. 1979:68)

4.3.2. Manner adverbs

In many languages, manner adverbs are part of the clitic host constituent when they follow the verb. In some languages a single adjective may be interpreted either as a manner adverb or as a temporal adverb solely based on the position of the set A clitic. For example, in Mamuju, when the adjective *ma-siga* 'fast' is employed as a temporal adverb it remains outside the clitic domain (115a) but when functioning as a manner adverb it falls within this domain (115b).

- (115) *Mamuju* a. Me(l)-lampa = a' ma-siga b. Me(l)-lampa ma-siga = a'
 AV-walk = 1.A ADJ-fast AV-walk ADJ-fast = 1.A

'I'll leave soon' 'I walk fast.' (Stromme 1994)

This is not so in Selayarese where a set A clitic cannot follow a postverbal manner adverb such as 'quickly' (116).

- (116) *Selayar* A'-rekeng = a lassiri (cf. *A'-rekeng lassiri = a)
 AV-count = 1s.A quick

'I counted quickly.'

Intensifiers and adjectives are always included with preceding material in the clitic host constituent and thus combinations of adjective + intensifier are never broken up by pronominal clitics, as seen in (117).

- (117) *Duri* Bo'jo' gaja = na' (cf. *Bo'jo' = na' gaja)
 tired very = 1s.A
 'I'm very tired.'

4.3.3. Deictic elements and prepositional phrases

Deictics and directional elements, which are obligatory in many languages of the Northern subgroup, are regularly incorporated into the host constituent (118–120).

- (118) *Bambam* Mam-tuwe dio = kia' litä'
 AV-build.fire down.there = 1p.inc.A ground
 'We'll build a fire down there.' (Campbell 1989:88, ex.27)
- (119) *Mamuju* ...ma'-jama jao = a' di pacceko
 AV-work there = 1s.A OBL kitchen
 'I work over there in the kitchen.' (Stromme 1994:101, ex.63)
- (120) *Mandar* Ma-jama dio = a' di UNTAD.
 AV-work there = 1s.A OBL UNTAD
 'I work over there at UNTAD.'

In Bugis, Makassarese and Selayarese, set A clitics cannot follow postverbal prepositional phrases.³³ Old Buginese, however, attested a common idiom which incorporated a prepositional adjunct marked with *ri* OBL (121). The unit marked in brackets represents the clitic host constituent (an example with an overt clitic is not provided by Sirk).

- (121) *Bugis* [Ala-ri-tengnga-padang]
 take-OBL-middle-field
 'to take in battle' (Sirk 1996:116)

In Sa'dan Toraja prepositional complements of the verb are commonly, and in some cases obligatorily, incorporated into the clitic host constituent. This is true for both *mang-* and *un-* actor voice verbs as shown by (122) and (123).

33 A borderline case of prepositional incorporation in Makassarese is shown in (i). This positioning might be contingent on the presence of an interrogative element which could attract pronominals independently. According to Jukes, the set A clitic is optionally positioned as in (ia) or (ib).

- (i) *Makassar* a. Battu kere = ki' mae? b. Battu kere mae = ki'
 come where = 1p.A be.at come where be.at = 1p.A
 'Where have you been?' 'Where have you been?' (Jukes 2006)

(122) *Sa'dan* Mang-ola ri buntu = **na'**
 AV-go OBL mountain = 1s.A

'I passed by a mountain.'

(123) *Sa'dan* Unn-ola ri buntu = **na'** (cf. *Unn-ola = **na'** ri buntu)
 AV-go OBL mountain = 1s.A

'I passed by a mountain.'

However, when an indirect object is promoted to a direct object by the use of the locative applicative *-i*, the set A clitics must be positioned before the object, as in (124).

(124) *Sa'dan* Unn-ola-i = **na'** buntu (cf. *Unn-ola-i buntu = **na'**)
 AV-go-LOC = 1s.A mountain

'I passed by a (the?) mountain.'

Several SSul languages attest a grammaticalized prepositional phrase headed by a derivative of PSSul **lako*, historically a verb meaning 'to go'. Interestingly, clitic placement seems to reflect a stage at which the combination of VERB + *lako* was treated like a verbal compound. Whereas a set A clitic can follow the verb directly as in (125a), the clitic may also follow *lako*. Note that this is impossible with bona fide prepositions such as *ri* (126).

(125) *Sa'dan* a. Male = **na'** lako pasa' b. Male lako = **na'** pasa'
 go = 1s.A to market go to = 1s.A market

'I'm going to the market.'

'I'm going to the market.'

(126) *Sa'dan* a. Mang-ola = **na'** ri buntu b. *Mang-ola ri = **na'** buntu
 AV-pass = 1s.A OBL mountain AV-pass OBL = 1s.A mountain

'I'm passing by the mountain.'

Incorporation of prepositional phrases headed by *lako* is impossible, as shown by the ungrammatical (127).

(127) *Sa'dan* *Male lako pasa' = **na'**
 go to market = 1s.A

[free translation???)

Adjectival modifiers almost always follow the head noun in SSul and are included with the head noun in the clitic placement domain (132).

- (132) *Mandar* Tongguru ma-cowa = a' (cf. *Tongguru = a' ma-cowa)
 teacher STA-good = 1s.A
 'I'm a good teacher.'

In a noun phrase with a following possessor, the set A clitic always follows the head of the noun phrase, thus intervening between the possessor and the possessee (133).

- (133) *Bugis* Ana'buwa = nna = ka' Ali (cf. *Ana' buwa = nna Ali = ka')
 apprentice = 3.G = 1s.A Ali
 'I am Ali's apprentice.'

The clitic position in (133) is not available to non-clitic pronominals or other noun phrases. Thus if the set A clitic in (133) is replaced with a free pronominal, the result is ungrammatical (134).

- (134) *Bugis* *Ana'buwa = nna ia' Ali
 apprentice = 3.G 1s.F Ali
 (for, 'I am Ali's apprentice')

This is the same pattern found in Tagalog and other Philippine languages as shown in (135) (see also Chung 2003:552 for Chamorro).³⁶

- (135) *Tagalog* a. Anak = siya nang = kaibigan = ko
 child = 3.A DET.B = friend = 1s.B
 'He's my friend's son.' (cf. *Anak nang = kaibigan = ko = siya)
- b. *Anak ang = pangulo nang = kaibigan = ko
 child DET.A = president DET.B = friend = 1s.B
 (for, 'The president is my friend's son.')

36 Kroeger (1998) implies that structures like (135b) should be grammatical under a non-configurational structure. However, his example (i) contains a proper noun and may thus be better analyzed as the result of the optional clitic behavior of proper names in Tagalog (Billings 2005).

(i) Anak si = Romy ni = Belen talaga
 child PM.A = Romy PM.B = Belen really
 'Romy is really Belen's son.'

Very little can be said at this point concerning the position of set A clitics in relative clauses. Although the position of the definite clitic in relatives has been discussed for Makassar (Jukes 2006), Selayarese (Basri 1999, Finan 2000) and Bugis (Sirk 1996), it is not clear if set A clitics follow the same pattern. If the sentence in (136) represents a relative structure, it would appear that relatives may be able to constitute part of the clitic placement domain in at least some SSul languages.

(136) *Makassar* Tau battu kere = **ko**
 person come where = 2s.A

‘Where are you from?’

(Jukes 2006:333, ex.514)

5. Summary and conclusion

This paper has offered a summary of the pronominal system and clitic positioning issues in SSul languages. To put these facts in a larger Austronesian perspective, the SSul person marking system has been compared with that typically found in Philippine languages. Clearly, the observed differences and similarities are fertile ground for further typological and historical studies. Indeed, Sulawesi, in particular, is a fantastic laboratory for those interested in understanding the evolution of person marking.

The basic patterns discussed above are summarized schematically below. Only generalities which are thought to hold across the family are included. Syntactic domains are presented according to the category of their head, which is underlined>. The left periphery which lies outside the domain of clitic positioning can be represented as in (137).³⁷ Negation is shown in parenthesis because it is excluded from the clitic domain in several languages.

(137) Left Periphery:

[TOPIC] [*why, when*] [(NP) FOCUS] [OUTER ADV] ([NEG])...

The positioning pattern in the verbal domain shown in (138) can be said to hold across the SSul family. Possible positions for the set A clitic are represented by =A. In the case of multiple potential hosts, the clitic appears on the leftmost one. INTRG represents those interrogative elements which were seen to host set A clitics throughout SSul languages in section 4.2.2 (e.g. ‘where’, ‘how’ etc.) and MNR represents manner adverbs. Because I have no evidence for the co-occurrence of manner and deictic/PP elements in the pre-verbal or post-verbal clitic domain, they are provisionally represented as mutually exclusive in those positions. Object incorporation and V + V compounding is excluded because of their ambiguous status as general features of SSul morphosyntax.

(138) a. Pre-verbal domain:

[INTRG] = A ([NEG] = A) [AUX] = A [MNR] = A [VERB...]
 [[DEIC] = A [PP] = A]

37 The relations between the phrases in (137) are of a very preliminary nature. Much more research in SSul comparative syntax is necessary before we attain a clear picture of this area of clause structure. Arguments for the relative ordering of the phrases in (137) cannot be given here because of space considerations.

b. Post-verbal domain:

$$\dots [\text{VERB-MNR}] = \mathbf{A} [\text{NP}_{\text{obj}}] [\text{PP}] [\text{TEMP}]$$

-DEIC

The adjectival and prepositional and nominal domains are shown in (139)–(141). Included in (139) is the construction discussed in section 4.2.3 where an adjective/manner adverb is followed by a verb phrase. The nominal domain in (141) still requires much fleshing out. For instance, the status of demonstratives as clitic hosts has yet to be ascertained.

(139) Adjectival domain:

$$[\text{ADJ-MODIFIER}] = \mathbf{A} [\text{VERB}]$$

(140) Prepositional domain:

$$[\text{DEIC}] = \mathbf{A} [\text{OBL-NP}] = \mathbf{A}$$

(141) Nominal domain:

$$[\text{NOM.NEG}] = \mathbf{A} [\text{NUMERAL}] = \mathbf{A} [\text{NOUN-ADJ-MODIFIER}] = \mathbf{A} [\text{NP}_{\text{POSSESSOR}}]$$

The definition of second position in SSul languages can now be seen as markedly different from its definition in the majority of Philippine languages, where minimal hosts are generally not found to include such elements as post-predicate objects, deictics, adjectives, etc. (Billings & Kaufman 2004). If we accept the received wisdom that grammaticalization is a unidirectional process together with the observation that the SSul set A clitics are less grammaticalized because of their looser attachment, we may infer that their positioning properties were not inherited from PMP but were rather innovated afresh after the loss of original (PMP) second position clitics. This should not be a surprising conclusion considering that second position clisis is not an uncommon phenomenon cross-linguistically and could therefore easily be the result of parallel developments within a single family.

A plausible synchronic explanation for the difference between the two language groups, although it cannot be explored here in any depth, would take the SSul set A clitics as attaching to initial phrasal (XP) constituents in the syntax and Philippine set A clitics as attaching to initial prosodic words (PWd). This is the most obvious way to account for why immediate constituents comprised of heads and modifiers are typically split up by clitics in Philippine languages but not in SSul languages.

In relation to this, a final curiosity will be mentioned here. As second position clitics are often only loosely attached to their hosts, we expect that they could fall outside the scope of verb and verb phrase conjunction. Surprisingly though, we find that for at least the languages in (142)–(145), omission of a set A clitic in either the left or right conjunct of a conjoined structure results in ungrammaticality.

(142) *Selayar* Ng-anre = a na ng-inung = a
 AV-eat = 1s.A CONJ AV-drink = 1s.A

‘I ate and drank.’

- (143) *Duri* K<um>ande = **na'** sola niso = to = **na'**
 <AV>eat = 1s.A CONJ drink-also = 1s.A
 'I ate and drank.'

- (144) *Seko Padang* Ha = manne = **ka'** pang ha = menung = **ka'**
 NEG = eat = 1s.A CONJ NEG = drink = 1s.A
 'I didn't eat or drink.'

- (145) *Mandar* Map-polong = **nga'** anna mat-tunu = **a'** ayu
 AV-chop = 1s.A CONJ AV-burn = 1s.A wood
 'I chop and burn wood.'

This contrasts with Tagalog, among other Philippine languages, which freely allows conjunction of a constituent including the verb but excluding the clitic.

- (146) *Tagalog* K<um>ain at u<um>inom = **kami** nang husto.
 <AV.PRF>eat CONJ <AV.PRF>drink = 1p.ex.A ADV enough
 'We ate and drank enough.'

This suggests that scope over conjunction may correlate with prosodic versus purely syntactic mechanisms of clitic placement and provides an additional vista for comparing the clitic syntax of these two Austronesian subgroups.³⁸ Ultimately, it is hoped that these divergent versions of second-position clisis could be reducible to a differing reliance on prosodic structure, although work in this direction has barely begun.

38 On the other hand, it is well known that the scope over conjunction can vary greatly across constructions and closely related languages. See Gerlach (2002:45–47) for a brief review of the situation in Romance.

Appendix: Pronoun sets and notes on their reconstruction

Bugis Subgroup

Bugis (Sirk 1996)

	A	B	Gen	Free
1sg	= (k)a' / = wa'	(k)u =	= (k)u	ia'
1pl.excl	= kkeng	ki =	= mmeng	ikeng
1pl.incl	= (k)i' / = wi'	ta =	= ta' / = ki'	idi'
2sg	= (k)o	mu =	= mu	i(k)o
3	= (w)i	na =	= na	ia

Makassar Subgroup

Makassarese (Jukes 2006)

	A	B	Gen	Free
1sg	= a'	ku =	= ku	(i)nakke
1pl.excl	= kang	∅	= mang	(i)kambe
1pl.incl	= ki'	ki =	= ta	(i)katte
2sg	= ko	nu =	= nu	(i)kau
3	= i	na =	= na	ia

Konjo (Friberg 1996)

	A	B	Gen	Free
1sg	= a	ku =	= ku	nakke
1pl.incl	= ki	ki =	= ta	gitte
2sg	= ko	nu =	= nu	kau
3	= i	na =	= na	ia

Selayarese (Basri 1999)

	A	B	Gen	Free
1sg	= <i>a</i>	<i>ku</i> =	= <i>ku</i>	<i>nakke</i>
1pl.excl	= <i>kang</i>	<i>to</i> =	= <i>ba</i>	<i>kambe</i>
1pl.incl	= <i>ki</i>	<i>ri</i> =	= <i>ta</i>	<i>ditte</i>
2sg	= <i>ko</i>	<i>mu</i> =	= <i>mu</i>	<i>kau</i>
3	= <i>i</i>	<i>la</i> =	= <i>na</i>	<i>ia</i>

Seko Subgroup

Seko Padang (Laskowske 1994)

	A	B	Veridical	Genitive	Free
1sg	= <i>ka'</i>	<i>ku</i> =	= <i>ko</i>	= <i>ku</i>	<i>koi:</i>
1pl.excl	= <i>kang</i>	<i>ki</i> =	= <i>ka</i>	= <i>ki</i>	<i>kami</i>
1pl.incl	= <i>ke</i>	<i>ta</i> =	= <i>da</i>	= <i>ta</i>	<i>ki(n)ta</i>
2fam	= <i>ko</i>	<i>u</i> = / <i>du</i>	= <i>do</i>	= <i>mu</i>	<i>dio</i>
3	= <i>i</i> / \emptyset	<i>na</i> = / <i>ni</i> =	= <i>da</i>	= <i>na</i>	<i>dea</i>

Northern Subgroup
Sa'dan

Sa'dan Toraja

	A	B	Gen	Free
1sg	= <i>na'</i>	<i>ku</i> =	= <i>ku</i>	<i>aku</i>
1pl.excl	= <i>kan</i> / = <i>kanni</i>	<i>ki</i> =	= <i>ki</i>	<i>kami</i>
1pl.incl	= <i>ki'</i>	<i>ta</i> =	= <i>ta</i>	<i>kita</i>
2sg	= <i>ko</i>	<i>mu</i> =	= <i>mu</i>	<i>iko</i>
2pl	= <i>kommi</i>	<i>mi</i> =	= <i>mi</i>	<i>kamu</i>
3	= <i>i</i>	<i>na</i> =	= <i>na</i>	<i>ia</i>

Mamasa (Matti 1994)

	A	B	Gen	Free
1sg	=na'	ku=	=ku	kao
1dual	=ki'	ta=	=ta	kita
1pl.excl	=kan	ki=	=ki	kami
1pl.incl	=kia'	ta= -a'	=taa'	kita
2sg.	=ko	mu=	=mu	iko
2pl.	=ko-a'	mu= -a	=mua'	iko-a'
3	=i / Ø	na=	=na	Ø

Masenrempulu

Duri (K. Valkama 1995)

	A	B	Gen	Free
1sg	=na'	ku=	=ku'	aku'
1pl.excl	=kan	ki=	=ki'	kami'
1pl.incl	=ki'	ta=	=ta'	kita'
2fam	=ko	mu=	=mu	iko
2pl		mi=	=mi	kamu' ~ komu'
3sg/pl	=i	na=	=na	ia

Mamuju

Mamuju (simplified from Stromme 1994 by omission of =ii_{PL} where redundant)

	A	B	Gen	Free
1sg	=a'	ku=	=ku'	yaku'
1pl.excl	Ø	ki=	=ki'	ingkai'
1pl.incl	Ø	ni= (=ii)	=ta'	ingkita'
2sg	=ko	mu=	=mu	ingko
2pl	(=ii)=ko'	mu= (=ii)	=mu (=ii)	ingkamia'
3	Ø	na=	=na	ia

Mandar

Mandar (Ermaida 1998)

	A	B	Gen	Free
1sg	= a'	u =	= u	yau
1pl	= mang	∅	= ta	yami
2	= o	mu =	= mu	i'o, ita'
3	= i, = di	na =	= na	ia
3pl	= ise'ia	na = -i	= nase'ia	se'ia

Pitu Ulunna Salu

Bambam (Campbell 1989)

	A	B	Gen	Free
1sg	= ä'	ku =	= ku	kao, kado'
1pl.excl	= kam	ki =	= ki	kami'
1pl.incl	= kia'	ta = -a'	= ta-a'	kita
1 + 2	= ki'	ta =	= ta	kita
2sg	= ko	mu =	= mu	iko
2pl	= koa'	mu = -a'	= mua'	iko-a'
3	∅/ = i	na = (-a')	= na	∅

There are two historical changes in the first person plural forms which deserve mention here. The first innovation replaced the first person plural exclusive genitive form and appears to have been based on analogy with the set B form as shown below:

Table A.

Proto-SSul		A	B	Genitive	Free
	1pl.excl	= kang	ki =	= mang	kami



Northern and Seko subgroups	1pl.excl	= kang	ki =	= ki	kami
-----------------------------	-----------------	--------	------	------	------

Crucially, * = *mang* must be reconstructed as the original form because it is easily relatable to PMP **mami* (Blust 1977, Ross 2002) and as such represents a retention. This is a natural analogy as it simply involves extending the already strong correspondences between the set B forms and the genitive set to a disharmonious pair. There is, however, an obvious paradox here. It is widely agreed upon that set B was derived historically from the genitive set by reanalysis (Wolff 1996). Thus, the reconstruction of Proto-SSul **ki* = 1pl.ex.B, which appears incontrovertible, implies the presence of an older genitive form * = *ki* as its historical source at some point prior to Proto-SSul. But as shown, this form is demonstrably a later innovation in SSul. Further complicating the problem is the fact that the form **ki* = 1pl.ex.B is also present in other language families of Sulawesi. Mead (2002:174) comments on its presence in the Kaili-Pamona (KP) and Bungku-Tolaki (BT) families in connection to the hypothesis that these families are part of a larger Celebic family:

“On the other hand, one possible link between the languages of central and southeastern Sulawesi—and which at the same time suggests that conjugated verbs were not separately innovated—concerns the form of the first person plural exclusive agent prefix. Although agent pronouns are in most cases identical to corresponding possessive pronouns, there is a discrepancy in the first person plural exclusive: in both KP and BT, the agent pronoun consistently shows up as *ki*-, regardless of the form of the corresponding possessive enclitic.”

Table B. First person plural exclusive forms in KP and BT languages (Mead 2002)

	B	Genitive
Kulawi	<i>ki</i> =	= <i>kami</i>
Da'a	∅	= <i>kami</i>
Uma	<i>ki</i> =	= <i>kai</i> / = <i>kami</i>
Pamona	<i>ka</i> = / <i>ki</i> =	= <i>mami</i>
Tolaki	<i>ki</i> =	= <i>mami</i>
Padoe	<i>ki</i> =	= <i>mami</i>
Mori Bawah	<i>ki</i> =	= <i>mami</i>
Bungku	<i>ki</i> =	= <i>mami</i>
Kulisusu	<i>ki</i> =	= <i>mai</i>
Moronene	<i>ko</i> =	= <i>mami</i>

The second innovation mentioned above is the conflation of the clusivity distinction in Makassarese, Bugis and Mandar. Modern Makassarese conflates the inclusive and exclusive paradigms by taking the set B form from the exclusive paradigm and the set A and genitive forms from the inclusive paradigms. Mandar loses the first person plural clitics entirely, expressing this category with the historical singular in combination with a plural marker,

and appears to take set A from the exclusive (nasality unexplained) and the genitive set from the inclusive. It is not clear what, if any, analogical motivations could have led to these changes.

Table C.

Proto-SSul		A	B	Genitive
	1pl.excl	= <i>kang</i>	<i>ki</i> =	= <i>mang</i>
	1pl.incl	= <i>ki'</i>	<i>ta</i> =	= <i>ta</i>

↓

Makassar	1pl	= <i>ki'</i>	<i>ki</i> =	= <i>ta</i>
----------	------------	--------------	-------------	-------------

Mandar	1pl	1pl	= <i>mang</i>	∅	= <i>ta</i>
--------	------------	------------	---------------	---	-------------

Finally, I note that the reconstruction here agrees with Mills in leaving out the set A clitic for the second person plural. Although we do find =*koggi* in Sa'dan Toraja (which Mills suspected to be an error in his sources), this has the hallmarks of a borrowing as it shows **a* > *o* in the first vowel and preserves the **i* of PMP **kamu-ihu* (Blust 1977, Ross 2002). These are two features which are characteristic of nearby Pamona-Kaili forms (cf. Uma dialects *komi'* 2p.F) but which are very unfamiliar in the SSul free forms (although Duri *komu'* 2p.F shows the same lowering in the first vowel).

Abbreviations

A	case A	LOC	locative applicative
B	case B	LV	locative voice
F	free pronominal	NEG	negation
G	genitive pronominal	NOM.NEG	nominal/constituent negation
ADJ	adjectival prefix	OBL	oblique/directional
APPL	applicative	P	PLURAL
AV	actor voice	PASS	passive
CV	conveyance voice	PM	personal marker
CAU	causative	PL	plural marker
COND	conditional	PRF	perfective
CONJ	conjunction	PROB	prohibitive
CMP	completive	PROG	progressive
CTR	controlled	PV	patient voice
DEF	definite marker	QM	question marker
DEM	demonstrative	RCP	reciprocal
DET	determiner	RELT	relative marker
EMPH	emphatic	REPT	repetitive
EX	EXCLUSIVE	S	singular
FAM	familiar	STA	stative
FUT	future	TOP	topic marker
GER	gerund	TR	transitivity related
IMPF	imperfective	=	clitic boundary
IN	INCLUSIVE	~	reduplication
LIM	limitative	< >	infix
LNK	linker		

References

- (NUSA: Linguistic Studies of Indonesian and Other Languages in Indonesia. Jakarta: Universitas Katolik Indonesia Atma Jaya.)
- Adams, Karen, and Alexis Manaster-Ramer. 1988. Some questions of topic/focus choice in Tagalog. *Oceanic Linguistics* 27:79–101.
- Adelaar, K. A. 1994. The classification of the Tamanic languages (West Kalimantan). In T.E. Dutton and D. T. Tryon (eds.), *Language contact and change in the Austronesian world*, 1–41. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Ba'dulu, Abd. Muis. 1990. Frase verbal bahasa Mandar Majene. In Husan Abas and T. David Andersen (eds.), *Bahasa-bahasa daerah Sulawesi dalam konteks bahasa nasional*, 69–84. Ujung Pandang: Universitas Hasanuddin and Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Barlaan, Rodolfo R. 1999. *Aspects of focus in Isnag*. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

- Basri, Hasan. 1999. The syntactic and phonological reflections of morphological structure in Selayarese. Doctoral dissertation, SUNY at Stony Brook.
- Billings, Loren A. 2002. Phrasal clitics. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 10:53–104.
- Billings, Loren A. 2005. Ordering clitics and postverbal R expressions in Tagalog: A unified analysis? In Andrew Carnie, Heidi Harley, and Sheila Ann Dooley (eds.), *Verb First: On the Syntax of Verb-initial languages*, 303–339. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Billings, Loren A., and Daniel Kaufman. 2004. Towards a typology of Austronesian pronominal clitics. In Paul Law (ed.), *Proceedings of AFLA 11*, 15–29. Berlin: ZAS.
- Blust, Robert. 1977. The Proto-Austronesian pronouns and Austronesian subgrouping: a preliminary report. *Working papers in Linguistics of the University of Hawai'i*.
- Blust, Robert. 2002. Notes on the history of 'focus' in Austronesian languages. In Fay Wouk and Malcolm Ross, 17–62.
- Campbell, Philip J. 1989. Some aspects of Pitu Ulunna Salu grammar: a typological approach. Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Texas at Arlington.
- Chung, Sandra. 2003. The syntax and prosody of weak pronouns in Chamorro. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34(4):547–599.
- Cysouw, Michael 2003. From pronouns to agreement (and back again)—The Sulawesi case. handout from talk given at ZAS.
- Donohue, Mark. 1999. *A Grammar of Tukang Besi*. Mouton Grammar Library 20. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Donohue, Mark & John Charles Smith. 1998. What's happened to us? Some developments in the Malay pronoun system. *Oceanic Linguistics* 37(1):65–84.
- Ermaida. 1998. Pronomina Bahasa Mandar. In M. Sikki, H. Abdul Muthalib, Adnan Usmar, and Abdul Kadir Mulya (eds.), *Bunga Rampai II*, 226–319. Ujung Pandang: Balai Penelitian Bahasa.
- Finer, Daniel. 1994. In the nature of two A' positions in Selayarese. In N. Corver and H. C. Riemsdijk (eds.), *Studies on Scrambling*, 153–188. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Finer, Daniel. 2000. Cyclic clitics in Selayarese. In C. Smallwood and C. Kitto (eds.), *AFLA VI The proceedings of the sixth meeting of the Austronesian Formal Linguistics Association*, Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics, 137–160.
- Finer, Daniel. 2002. Phases and movement in Selayarese. In Andrea Rackowski and Norvin Richards (eds.), *AFLA VIII (MITWPL 44)*, 157–169. Boston: MIT.

- Finer, Daniel, and Hasan Basri. 2003. Clause reduction and agreement in Makassar. Presentation at AFLAX, University of Hawai'i.
- Forman, Michael. 1971. *Kapampangan grammar notes*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Friberg, Barbara. 1988. Ergativity, focus and verb morphology in several South Sulawesi languages. In Roy Harlow and Ross Clark (eds.), *VICAL 2: Western Austronesian and contact languages: papers from the Fifth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics*, 103–130. Auckland: Linguistic Society of New Zealand.
- Friberg, Barbara. 1996. Konjo's peripatetic person markers. In Hein Steinhauer (ed.), *Papers in Austronesian Linguistics 3*. Pacific Linguistics, 137–171. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Friberg, Timothy, and Tom Laskowske. 1989. South Sulawesi Languages. *NUSA* 31:1–17.
- Gerlach, Birgit. 2002. *Clitics between Syntax and Lexicon*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Grimes, Charles, and Barbara Grimes. 1987. *Languages of South Sulawesi*. Pacific Linguistics. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Hakim, Zainuddin. 2001. Nilai kepahlawanan dalam sinrilik Makassar. *Bunga Rampai I*. Makassar: Pusat Bahasa Departemen Pendidikan Nasional.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus. 1996. Person marking and grammatical relations in Sulawesi. In Hein Steinhauer (ed.), *Papers in Austronesian Linguistics 3*. Pacific Linguistics, 115–136. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Himmelman, Nikolaus. 2002. Voice in Western Austronesian, an update. In Fay Wouk and Malcolm Ross, 7–16.
- Jukes, Anthony. 2006. Makassarese (basa Mangkasara'): A description of an Austronesian language of South Sulawesi. Ph.D. dissertation, Dept. of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, University of Melbourne.
- Kaseng, Sjahrudin. 1982. *Bahasa Bugis Soppeng*. Jakarta: Penerbit Djambatan.
- Kaufman, Daniel. 2006. Rigidity and relativity in adverbial syntax: evidence from Tagalog. In Hans Martin Gartner, Paul Law and Joachim Sabel (eds.), *Clause structure and adjuncts in Austronesian languages*, 151–192. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kaufman, Daniel. In progress. Case shift in the South Sulawesi languages. Manuscript.
- Kikusawa, Ritsuko. 2003. The development of some Indonesian pronominal systems. In Barry J. Blake and Kate Burridge (eds.), *Historical linguistics 2001*, Current Issues in Linguistics Theory 237, 237–269. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

- Kitano, Hiroaki. 2006. Transitivity and pronominal clitic order in Kapampangan. Paper presented at Tenth International Conference on Austronesian Languages, Puerto Princesa City, Palawan, Philippines. 17–20 January 2006.
- Kroeger, Paul. 1993. *Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Kroeger, Paul. 1998. Clitics and clause structure in Tagalog. In Ma. Lourdes Bautista (ed.), *Pagtanaw: Essays on language in honor of Teodoro Llamzon*, 53–72. Manila: The Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Laskowske, Kathryn. 1994. Negation in Seko Padang. *NUSA* 36.
- Laskowske, Thomas, and Kathryn Laskowske. 1995. Person marking in Seko Padang. Manuscript.
- Matthes, B. F. 1858. *Makassaarsche spraakkunst*. Amsterdam: F. Muller.
- Matti, David. 1994. Mamasa pronoun sets. *NUSA* 36:65–88.
- Manyambeang, Abdul-Kadir, Abdul Azis Syarif, Abdul Rahim Hamid, Djirong Basang Daeng Ngewa, and Aburaerah Arief. 1979. *Morfologi dan sintaksis bahasa Makassar*. Jakarta: Pusat Bahasa.
- Manyambeang, Abdul-Kadir, Abdul Kadir Mulya, and Nasruddin (MMN). 1996. *Tatabahasa Makassar*. Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa, Jakarta.
- McFarland, Curtis. 1978. Definite objects and subject selection in Philippine languages. *Studies in Philippine Linguistics* 2:139–182
- McFarland, Curtis D. 2001. Filipino enclitics. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 32(1):1–15.
- Mead, David. 2002. Proto-Celebic focus revisited. In Fay Wouk and Malcolm, 143–77.
- Mills, Roger F. 1975a. Proto-South Sulawesi and Proto-Austronesian phonology. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Mills, Roger F. 1975b. The reconstruction of Proto South Sulawesi. *Archipel* 10:205–224.
- Naylor, Buenaventura-Paz. 1975. Topic, focus and emphasis in the Tagalog verbal clause. *Oceanic Linguistics* 14:12–79.
- Noorduyn, J. 1991. *A critical survey of studies on the languages of Sulawesi*. Leiden: KITLV.

- Payne, Thomas E., and Thomas Laskowske. 1997. Voice in Seko Padang. In Joan Bybee, John Haiman, and Sandra A. Thompson (eds.), *Essays on language function and language type, dedicated to T. Givón*, 423–436. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Quakenbush, Stephen J. and Edward Ruch. 2006. Pronoun ordering and marking in Kalamianic. Paper presented at Tenth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Puerto Princesa City, Palawan, Philippines. 17–20 January 2006. <http://www.sil.org/asia/philippines/ical/papers.html>
- Rau, V. D., and M. N. Dong. 2006. Yami Texts with Reference Grammar and Vocabulary. *Language and Linguistics* A–10.
- Reid, Laurence, and Hsiu-Chuan Liao. 2004. A brief syntactic typology of Philippine languages. *Language and Linguistics* 5(2):433–490.
- Ross, Malcolm D. 1995. Reconstructing Proto-Austronesian verbal morphology: evidence from Taiwan. In Paul Jen-kuei Li, Dah-an Ho, Ying-Kuei Huang and Cheng-hwa Tsang (eds.), *Austronesian studies relating to Taiwan*. Symposium Series of the Institute of History and Philology 4, 727–791. Taipei: Academia Sinica.
- Ross, Malcolm. 2002. The history and transitivity of western Austronesian voice and voice-marking. In Fay Wouk and Malcolm Ross, 17–62.
- Said, Ide, Rasdiana P., Tamin Chairan, Adnan Usmar, and Norma Sikki. 1979. *Morfologi dan Sintaksis Bahasa Bugis*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa.
- Schachter, Paul, and Fe T. Otanes. 1972. *Tagalog Reference Grammar*. Berkeley: California University Press.
- Sikki, Muhammad, Zainuddin Hakim, Abdul Kadir Mulya, and Syamsul Rijal. 1997. *Tatabahasa Massenrempulu*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa.
- Sirk, Ulo. 1988. Towards the historical grammar of the South Sulawesi languages: possessive enclitics in the postvocalic position. In Hein Steinhauer (ed.), *Papers in Western Austronesian linguistics 4*. Pacific Linguistics, 283–302. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Sirk, Ulo. 1989. On the evidential basis for the South Sulawesi language group. *NUSA* 31:55–82.
- Sirk, Ulo. 1996. *The Buginese language of traditional literature*. Self-published, Moscow.
- Smith, Beverly K. 1993. A phonological reconstruction of Proto-Pitu Uluna Salu. Masters thesis, The University of Texas at Arlington.
- Stromme, Kari. 1994. Person marking in the Mamuju language. *NUSA* 36:91–113.

- Valkama, Kari. 1995. Person marking in Duri. *NUSA* 37:47–93
- Valkama, Susanne. 1995. Notes on Duri transitivity. *NUSA* 37:2–45
- Van den Berg, René. 1989. *A grammar of the Muna language*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Van den Berg, René. 1996. The demise of focus and the spread of conjugated verbs in Sulawesi. In Hein Steinhauer (ed.), *Papers in Austronesian linguistics*. Pacific Linguistics A, 89–114. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Van den Berg, René. 2003. The place of Tukang Besi and the Muna-Buton languages. In John Lynch (ed.), *Issues in Austronesian historical phonology*. Pacific Linguistics 550, 87–113. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Wouk, Fay, and Malcolm Ross, eds. 2002. *The history and typology of western Austronesian voice systems*. Pacific Linguistics 518. Canberra: Australian National University.
- Wolff, John U. 1973. Verbal inflection in Proto-Austronesian. In Andrew B Gonzalez (ed.), *Parangal kay Cecilio Lopez: Essays in honor of Cecilio Lopez on his seventy-fifth birthday*. Philippine Journal of Linguistics Special Monograph Issue 4, 71–91. Quezon City: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.
- Wolff, John U. 1996. The development of the passive verb with pronominal prefix in Western Austronesian languages. In Bernd Nothofer (ed.), *Reconstruction, classification, description: Festschrift in honor of Isidore Dyen*, 15–40. Hamburg: Abera-Verlag.
- Zobel, Erik. 2002. The position of Chamorro and Palauan in the Austronesian family tree: evidence from verb morphosyntax. In Fay Wouk and Malcolm Ross, 405–434.