

### Clause truncation in South Sulawesi: restructuring and nominalization

This paper investigates a syntactic pattern from three South Sulawesi languages (Makassar, Selayarese, and Bugis) that superficially resembles raising-to-object and/or clitic-climbing constructions familiar from English and Romance. But there are some differences. The differences, we argue, can be traced back to the fact that these languages have an ergative agreement pattern. The way that the case-related agreement relations play out are responsible for the ways in which this construction diverges the more familiar type patterns seen in the English example in (1) and the Italian example in (2).

- |    |    |  |    |    |                                   |
|----|----|--|----|----|-----------------------------------|
| 1. | a. | John expects that Mary will buy this book. | 2. | a. | Gianni vuole darceli.             |
|    | b. | John expects Mary to buy this book.        |    |    | Gianni wants to-give-usDAT-them   |
|    |    |  |    | b. | Gianni ce li vuole dare.          |
|    |    |  |    |    | 'Gianni wants to give them to us' |
|    |    |  |    |    | (Kayne 1991, ex 40-41)            |

The ergative agreement pattern is illustrated below for Makassar (facts from Selayarese and Bugis are similar). The preverbal marker in (3a) agrees with the transitive subject, and the postverbal clitic agrees with the direct object, or the intransitive subject as in (3b) (examples not otherwise attributed are from Authors n.d.). Word order is VOS.

#### Makassarese

- |    |    |                                 |                       |
|----|----|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 3. | a, | ku-cinik=ko    i-Baco           |                       |
|    |    | <i>1S.ER-see=3AB class-Baco</i> |                       |
|    |    | 'You saw Baco'                  |                       |
|    | b. | A'-jappa=i    Balandayya        | (Jukes 2015, ex. (1)) |
|    |    | aC- jappa =i   balanda -a       |                       |
|    |    | INTR- walk =3ABS Dutch -DEF     |                       |
|    |    | 'The Dutchman is walking'       |                       |

Clausal complementation, along the lines of (1a), is shown in (4a) for Bugis, and the restructured construction is shown in (4b) (facts are similar in Makassar and Selayarese). Note that the absolutive clitic on the upper verb in this example links to the absolutive argument of the lower verb in the absence of the complementizer. It is thus the absolutive argument that "raises" or "climbs", rather than the ergative one.

#### Bugis

- |    |    |  |
|----|----|--|
| 4. | a. | u-isse -i    makkadae   na-ita-ko    i-Baso?               |
|    |    | 1ER-know-3AB    that            3ER-see-2AB    class-Baso? |
|    |    | 'I know that Baso? saw you.'                               |
|    | b. | u-issek-ko   na-ita   i-Baso?                              |
|    |    | 1ER-know-2AB   3ER-see   class-Baso?                       |
|    |    | 'I know Baso? saw you.'                                    |

We argue that the clause structure of these Sulawesi languages involves two functional projections that are responsible for the appearance of the agreement markers on the verb, with Absolutive superordinate to the Ergative.

5.  $[_{ABS} \dots [_{VP-ERG} DP_i [_{VP} V DP_j]]]$

Ergative Case is locally determined on the subject,  $DP_i$  in Spec vP (cf. Woolford 1997, Legate 2002, Aldridge 2004, among others). We further assume that Case valuation for absolutive by the higher projection can skip to the direct object,  $DP_j$ ,  $DP_i$  no longer being Case-active. We further suggest that in examples such as (4b), the complement clause is truncated (cf. Wurmbrand 2001); it lacks the higher Abs projection, and vP is selected.

6.  $[_{ABS} \dots [_{VP-ERG} DP_k [_{VP} know \dots [_{VP-ERG} DP_i [_{VP} see DP_j]]] j]]]$

Ergative case-valuation proceeds in the complement and main clauses of (4b) as above, but since the Abs projection is lacking in the lower clause, the upper Abs is the closest head that can value the Case feature on the remaining argument,  $DP_j$ , in the lower clause (Accusative Case is analogously valued on the lower subject of the example in (1b) in the absence of a closer element that values Nominative).

A similar analysis will be proposed for clausal nominalizations in these languages. Here the Abs projection is lacking in the nominalized clause (vP is recruited as a complement to D in this construction), and so Genitive, associated with higher DP structure, is valued on the absolutive argument by D. As above,  $v$  values Ergative on the argument (second-person *pro*) in its Spec. (6) is from SL.

**Selayarese** (Maki and Basri 2015)

7. a.  $\eta arra\eta =i \quad pa \quad mu-lappa? -na \quad (*-i)$   
*cry-3ABS because 2ERG-slap-3GEN(\*3ABS)*  
 'He cried because you slapped him' ('He cried because of your slapping him')
- b.  $[_{DP} \dots D[gen] [_{VP-ERG} DP [_{VP} V DP ] ] ]$

---

**references** Authors, n.d. "Notes on Bugis, Makassar, and Selayarese" Aldridge, E. 2004, *Ergativity and word order in Austronesian languages*. Doctoral Dissertation, Cornell. Jukes, A. 2015 Focus and argument indexing in Makassar. *Proceedings of the second international workshop on information structure of Austronesian languages*. Tokyo Institute of Foreign Studies, pp. 53-63. Kayne, R. 1991. Romance clitics, verb movement, and PRO. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22.4: 647-686. Legate, Julie Anne 2002. *Warlpiri: theoretical implications*. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT. Maki, H. and Hasan Basri 2015, "The absolutive/genitive alternation in Selayarese, *English Linguistics* 32.2:327-345. Woolford, Ellen. 1997 Four-way case systems: Ergative, nominative, objective and accusative. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 15:181–227. Wurmbrand, S. 2001 *Infinitives: Restructuring and clause structure*. Berlin: Mouton.