ERGATIVE CONTROL OF SYNTACTIC PROCESSES IN SAMA SOUTHERN

DOUGLAS TRICK
Summer Institute of Linguistics - Philippines

This paper documents the exclusive ergative control of five syntactic processes in Sama Southern (south-western Philippines). It begins with an explanation of ergativity in reference to morphology (with data from Sama Southern which illustrates morphological ergativity). It then introduces and explains each of the following syntactic operations, demonstrating that they exhibit an ergative-absolutive pattern in Sama Southern: relativization, clefting, WH-question formation, equi-NP deletion, and second-position cliticization. That is, it is the O argument of a transitive clause which controls these syntactic processes. This contrasts with most other Philippine languages in which control of these syntactic processes is distributed more or less evenly between the A argument and the O argument.

1. Introduction

In recent years, Philippine languages have been analyzed as being morphologically ergative.[1] Although most of the world's languages which display morphological ergativity display a strong nominative pattern of syntactic control, this does not appear to be the case with Philippine languages. Available studies of syntactic processes in Philippine languages indicate that in transitive clauses, control is more or less evenly distributed between the two syntactically required arguments, exhibiting neither a

[1] For theoretical discussions, see Payne 1982, de Guzman 1988, Gerdtz 1988, Kroeger 1993, Mithun 1994, Brainard 1994, and others. For ergative analyses of Philippine languages, see Walton 1986 for Sama Pangutaran, Hodder 1999 for Mayoyao Ifugao, Pebley and Brainard 1999 for Kagayanen, Gault 1999 for Sama Bangingi', and Brainard and Behrens 2002 for Yakan.

dominant nominative pattern nor a dominant ergative pattern of syntactic control.[2] Southern Sinama,[3] however, appears to be an exception to this general pattern for Philippine languages in that it displays a high degree of syntactic ergativity.[4] In this paper, we will show that the majority of syntactic processes occurring in Southern Sinama are controlled exclusively by S, the single argument of an intransitive clause[5], and O, the more patient-like argument of a transitive clause.

The paper will begin with a general explanation of ergativity, followed by a description of case marking morphology in Sinama. Five major syntactic processes will

---

[2] See Schachter 1976, 1977, and Kroeger 1993 for Tagalog, and Brainard 1994, 1996 for Karao.

[3] Southern Sinama is spoken by the Sama people of the province of Tawi-Tawi in the Sulu archipelago of the south-west Philippines. It is estimated that there are about 100,000 speakers of Southern Sinama in Tawi-Tawi, and an additional 100,000 on the north and east coasts of Sabah, Malaysia.

There are about 11 distinct Sama groups. Southern Sinama is most closely related to Central Sinama and Pangutaran Sinama; these and other Sinama languages are closely related to Southern Mindanao languages. The term 'Sama' can refer to the Sama people or to their language; 'Sinama' refers specifically to the language, and will be used in the remainder of this paper.

Research in Sinama was carried out by the author under the auspices of the Summer Institute of Linguistics during the period of September 1987 to January 2006. Approximately four years of that time were spent resident in the village of Tubig Sallang, Bongao, Tawi-Tawi. About 100 texts of various genre were collected, paradigms were elicited, and a dictionary of some 3300 entries was compiled. These data are the basis for the results presented here.

I would like to express sincere appreciation to my primary Sama language research associates, Mr. Himpun Pallong (deceased) of Bongao, and Mr. Nasaruddin Sambas of Simunul; also to Dr. Sherri Brainard for her helpful comments on earlier versions of this paper.

[4] Other research suggests that the Sama language family as a whole, including Yakan (Brainard and Behrens 2002), Sama Pangutaran (Walton 1986), and Sama Bangingi' (Gault 1999), exhibits a high degree of syntactic ergativity.

[5] See Appendix 1 for list of abbreviations.

then be investigated, establishing that each of them has an ergative pattern of control.

2. Explanation of Ergativity

Every language has ways of expressing states or events, some which involve only one argument (e.g., *She is sleeping*) and others which involve two or more arguments (e.g., *She helped me*). Generally, an intransitive clause is used to express the single-argument state or event; other events are expressed by means of transitive clauses. For this discussion, arguments are assumed to be NPs that bear a grammatical relation to the verb and thus are grammatical relations. Following Dixon (1979, 1994), these arguments are labeled as:

(1) 'S', the single argument of an intransitive clause;

(2) 'A', the more agent-like argument (in general, the one initiating the action) of a transitive clause;

(3) and 'O', the more patient-like argument (in general, the one affected by the action) of a transitive clause.

Thus, in the example *She is sleeping*, *she* is the S argument. In the example *She helped me*, *she* is the A argument, and *me* is the O argument.

Languages have certain ways of encoding these different arguments, or grammatical relations, typically using one or more of the following three formal

devices:

(1) word order (e.g., English; cf. *Ben helped Tim* and *Tim helped Ben.* In this basic transitive English clause, the A argument precedes the verb and the O argument follows the verb.)

(2) case marking (e.g., English; cf. *She helped me* and *I helped her.* English has one set of pronouns used to refer to the A argument (often called the Subject pronouns), and a separate set to refer to the O argument (often called the Object pronouns)[6].)

(3) agreement (e.g., English present tense; cf. *He helps us* and *We help him.* Note the verbal suffix, indicated here by *-s*, on English present tense verbs when A is 3rd person singular (as in *He helps us*). When O is 3rd person singular (as in *We help him*), the *-s* suffix does not occur. Thus, we can say that in this (somewhat restricted) environment, the form of the verb 'agrees with' the number of A (but it is unaffected by the number of the O).)

Now, for many of the world's languages, the formal device used (in a given language) to encode an S is the same as that used (in that language) to encode A, but not O. Many of these languages have a 'case' system, in which the 'nominative' case is

---

[6] English no longer has a complete set of personal pronouns to distinguish A from O; the A set includes *I, you, he, she, we, you, they*, while the O set includes *me, you, him, her, us, you, them*. That is,

used for S and A, and the 'accusative' case is used for O. For example, we can refer to the English pronoun set *I, he, she, we, they* as nominative, and the set *me, him, her, us, them* as accusative; the nominative set is used for S (e.g., *She is sleeping.*) and A (e.g., *She helped me.*), and the accusative set is used for O (e.g. *She helped me.*) By convention, a language in which the same formal device is used to encode S and A, but not O, is said to be 'nominative-accusative' (or its shortened term, 'nominative'); a language in which the same formal device is used to encode S and O, in contrast to A, is said to be 'ergative-absolutive' (or its shortened term, 'ergative')[7]. In a nominative language, S and A are said to be nominative, while O is accusative. In an ergative language, S and O are said to be absolutive, while A is ergative.

3. Ergativity in Sinama Morphology

The encoding of S, A, and O in Sinama is seen most clearly when pronoun referents occur. Sinama has three pronoun sets: absolutive, ergative, and oblique[8]. As

---

you (2nd person singular or plural) is used both for A and O.

[7] It is considerably more precise to speak of a nominative vs. ergative 'system' within a given language, rather than referring in a general way to the language itself as being nominative or ergative. A language may exhibit a nominative-accusative pattern in some features, but an ergative-absolutive pattern in others.

[8] See Appendix 2 for the pronoun chart. See Trick 1997:126-7 for data demonstrating morphological ergativity in Sinama.

illustrated in examples (1) through (7), S and O are absolutive, and A is ergative.[9]

```
(1) Tuli  akú     gana-gana.
    tuli  akú     gana-gana
    sleep 1SG.ABS later
          S
    I (S) will sleep later.

(2) Tabangan-na[10]         akú.
    tabang -an  -na      akú
    help   -PAT -3SG.ERG 1SG.ABS
                 A       O
    She (A) will help me (O).

(3) Tabangan-ku          iyá.
    tabang -an  -ku      iyá
    help   -PAT -1SG.ERG 3SG.ABS
                 A       O
    I (A) will help him/her (O).
```

When S or O is encoded by a full NP (whether a common noun or a proper noun), it has no case marking:

---

[9] The orthography of Sinama consists of 17 consonants and 5 vowels: *b* [b], *d* [d], *g* [g], *h* [h], *j* [dʒ], *k* [k], *l* [l], *m* [m], *n* [n], *ng* [ŋ], *p* [p], *r* [ɾ], *s* [s], *t* [t], *w* [w], *y* [j], *a* [ə][ɐ], *e* [e][ɛ], *i* [i][ɪ], *o* [o], *u* [u]. Glottal stop is a phoneme, and is represented by *h* when it occurs syllable-finally (e.g., *lumah-na* [luˈmɐʔ.nə] 'his/her house'), hyphen when it occurs syllable-initially between morphemes (e.g., *mag-adjal* [məgˈʔɐd.dʒəl] 'to cook'), and is not represented when it occurs intervocalically (e.g., *piitu* [pɪˈʔi.tu] 'come here') or word-initially (e.g., *eroh* [ˈʔɛ.ɾoʔ] 'dog').

Geminate consonants occur and are represented as a sequence of two identical segments (e.g., *addat* [ˈʔɐd.dət] 'custom'). Geminate vowels also occur, though with relatively low frequency. In general, the orthography does not represent geminate vowels; however, in a few cases where there may be ambiguity, an acute accent indicates geminate vowels (e.g., *pasód* [pəˈso.od] 'to enter').

[10] Word order in Sinama tends to be VS and VOA; however, when an ERG pronoun occurs with a verb which is not prefixed with *ni-*, the ERG pronoun is bound to the right side of the verb and thus must precede O.

```
(4) Tuli  si Ben[11]       gana-gana.
    tuli  si Ben          gana-gana
    sleep PM name.person later
          S
```
Ben (S) will sleep later.

```
(5) Tuli  anak-anak  gana-gana.
    tuli  DUP- anak  gana-gana
    sleep DIM- child later
          S
```
The child (S) will sleep later.

```
(6) Tabangan-ku          si Ben.
    tabang -an  -ku      si Ben
    help   -PAT -1SG.ERG PM name.person
                 A       O
```
I (A) will help Ben (O).

```
(7) Tabangan-ku          anak-anak.
    tabang -an  -ku      DUP- anak
    help   -PAT -1SG.ERG DIM- child
                 A       O
```
I (A) will help the child (O).

When A is encoded by a full NP (whether a common noun or a proper noun), it is preceded by *leh*, and the verb is obligatorily affixed with the agreement[12] affix *ni-*:

```
(8) Nitabangan       anak-anak  leh mastal.
    ni-  tabang -an  DUP- anak  leh mastal
    AGR- help   -PAT DIM- child ERG teacher
                     O          A
```
The teacher (A) will help the child (O).

---

[11] In Sinama, all personal names are preceded by the personal marker *si* (regardless of the grammatical relation or semantic role).

[12] Traditionally 'verb agreement' refers to an affix on the verb that indicates number, gender, case, person, or tense; furthermore, agreement usually occurs on verbs in both intransitive and transitive clauses. In Sinama, it appears that when A is a *leh-* phrase (which is obligatory when A is not a pronoun, and optional when it is a pronoun), the verb is prefixed with *ni-*. For want of a better term, we are currently calling *ni-* an agreement affix because of this co-occurrence with *leh-*.

```
(9) Nitabangan       akú     leh si Ben.
    ni-  tabang -an  akú     leh si Ben
    AGR- help   -PAT 1SG.ABS ERG PM name.person
                     O       A
```
Ben (A) will help me (O).

```
(10) Nitabangan       anak-anak  leh si Ben.
     ni-  tabang -an  DUP- anak  leh si Ben
     AGR- help   -PAT DIM- child ERG PM name.person
                      O          A
```
Ben (A) will help the child (O).

```
(11) Nisampak    si Ben         leh si Wahid.
     ni-  sampak si Ben         leh si Wahid
     AGR- slap   PM name.person ERG PM name.person
                 O              A
```
Wahid (A) will slap Ben (O).

The marker *leh* marks A only; it never marks S or O, as in *Tuli *leh si Ben* 'Ben (S) will sleep' or *Tabangan-ku *leh si Ben* 'I (A) will help Ben (O)'.

4. Syntactic Processes and Patterns of Control in Sinama

The previous section shows that in Sinama, case marking of S, A, and O follows a consistently ergative pattern. This section will demonstrate that syntactic control in Sinama also displays a high degree of syntactic ergativity. Specifically, it will show that S and O, and only S and O, are the syntactic control for relativization, clefting, WH-question formation, equi-NP deletion, and second-position cliticization.

4.1. Relativization

Relativization is a process by which a NP is modified by a subordinate clause. The subordinate clause is the relative clause, and the NP that it modifies is its head noun. In Sinama, relativization follows an ergative pattern of syntactic control in that only S and

O may be the head of a relative clause. Examples (12) and (13) are independent clauses; in example (14), the sentence in (13) functions as a relative clause. Note that in the clause which is relativized in example (14), the O argument (referring to the rope) has been deleted (being co-referential with the head noun of the main clause).[13] Example (15) demonstrates that the A argument cannot be the head of a relative clause. Example (16) may appear on the surface to illustrate that an A argument may be deleted; however, note that in this case, the relativized clause is an antipassive construction (that is, it has been detransitivized[14] – the deleted referent is S, the single required argument of an intransitive clause). As such, the structure of (16) is very similar to that of (18) (which is derived from the clearly intransitive clause of example (17)).

```
(12) Bey  tandah-ku            lubid.
     bey  ta-    ndah -ku      lubid                (independent clause)
     PPFV NCTRL- see  -1SG.ERG rope
                       A       O
     I saw the rope.

(13) Bey  nikottob    lubid itu    leh anak-anak.
     bey  ni-  kottob lubid itu    leh DUP- anak    (independent clause)
     PPFV AGR- cut    rope  D1.ABS ERG DIM- child
                      O            A
     A/The child cut this rope.
```

[13] In the examples throughout sections 4.1 through 4.4, notations are made to indicate which argument is deleted in the various syntactic processes.

[14] Note the *ngaN-* intransitive prefix on the verb.

```
(14) Bey  tandah-ku            lubid ya  bey  nikottob
     bey  ta-    ndah -ku      lubid ya  bey  ni-  kottob
     PPFV NCTRL- see  -1SG.ERG rope  NMZ PPFV AGR- cut

     Ø   leh anak-anak.
         leh DUP- anak
         ERG DIM- child
     O=Ø A
```

I saw the rope which a/the child cut.

(15) *Bey tandah-ku anak-anak ya bey nikottob(-na)[15] lubid Ø.

I saw the child who cut the rope.

```
(16) Bey  tandah-ku            anak-anak  ya  bey  ngottob     Ø   lubid.
     bey  ta-    ndah -ku      DUP- anak  ya  bey  ngaN- kottob    lubid
     PPFV NCTRL- see  -1SG.ERG DIM- child NMZ PPFV INTR- cut       rope
                                                                 S=Ø
```

I saw the child who cut a/the rope.

```
(17) Bey  nengge       anak-anak.
     bey  ngaN- tengge DUP- anak
     PPFV INTR- stand  DIM- child
                       S
```

The child stood.

```
(18) Bey  tandah-ku            anak-anak ya bey nengge          Ø.
     bey  ta-    ndah -ku      DUP- anak  ya  bey  ngaN- tengge
     PPFV NCTRL- see  -1SG.ERG DIM- child NMZ PPFV INTR- stand
                                                                 S=Ø
```

I saw the child who stood.

4.2. Clefting

A cleft construction is one in which a NP is extracted from the main clause and appears as a fronted head noun; in Sinama, this head noun is cross-referenced on the nominalized verb. Cross-linguistically the structure of relative clauses and cleft constructions tends to be similar.

---

[15] The parentheses here indicate that this example is ungrammatical with or without the ergative pronoun.

Cleft constructions in Sinama follow an ergative pattern of syntactic control in that only S and O[16] may be the head noun. The head noun precedes the nominalized clause. The argument in the nominalized clause that is co-referential with the head noun is obligatorily absent. If the head noun is a pronoun, the pronoun is from the oblique class[17].

```
(19) Bey  nengge       si Ben.
     bey  ngaN- tengge si Ben
     PPFV INTR- stand  PM name.person
                       S
```
Ben stood.

```
(20) Si Ben         ya  na bey  nengge       Ø.
     si Ben         ya  na bey  ngaN- tengge
     PM name.person NMZ LK PPFV INTR- stand
                                              S=Ø
```
Ben is who stood.

```
(21) Bey  nikottob    lubid itu    leh anak-anak.
     bey  ni-  kottob lubid itu    leh DUP- anak
     PPFV AGR- cut    rope  D1.ABS ERG DIM- child
                      O            A
```
A/the child cut this rope.

```
(22) Lubid itu    ya  bey  nikottob     Ø  leh anak-anak.
     lubid itu    ya  bey  ni-  kottob     leh DUP- anak
     rope  D1.ABS NMZ PPFV AGR- cut        ERG DIM- child
                                          O=Ø
```
This rope is what a/the child cut.

```
(23) *Anak-anak ya bey nikottob(-na) lubid itu.
```
A/The child is who cut this rope.

As (23) shows, the A argument cannot be the head of a cleft construction;

---

[16] In addition to patient, this may include a location, an instrument, or a beneficiary that has been promoted to O.

[17] For example, (20) would be: *Íya ya na bey nengge.* 'He/She is who stood.'

however, if the transitive clause is changed to an antipassive construction, in which the A argument becomes an S argument, then the argument can be the head of a cleft (24). In (25) the patient is O and so is eligible to be the head of a cleft construction (26). When the oblique recipient in (25) is promoted to O (27), it is also eligible to be the head of a cleft construction (28)[18]. In (29), the oblique NP is a beneficiary. When the beneficiary is promoted to O (31), it too is eligible to be the head of a cleft construction (32).

```
(24) Anak-anak  ya  bey  ngottob      lubid  Ø.
     DUP- anak  ya  bey  ngaN- kottob lubid
     DIM- child NMZ PPFV INTR- cut    rope
                                             S=Ø
```

A child is who cut (or cut at) a rope.

```
(25) Nipamuwan          búk  leh mastal  ni anak-anak.
     ni-  pangaN- buwan búk  leh mastal  ni DUP- anak
     AGR- PAT-    give  book ERG teacher to DIM- child
                        O    A           OBL
```

A/The teacher will give the book to a/the child.

```
(26) Búk  itu    ya  na  nipamuwan         Ø   leh mastal  ni anak-anak.
     búk  itu    ya  na  ni-  pangaN- buwan    leh mastal  ni DUP- anak
     book D1.ABS NMZ LK  AGR- PAT-    give     ERG teacher to DIM- child
                                           O=Ø A           OBL
```

This book is what a/the teacher will give to a/the child.

```
(27) Nibuwanan      anak-anak  búk  leh mastal.
     ni-  buwan -an DUP- anak  búk  leh mastal
     AGR- give  -VI DIM- child book ERG teacher
                    O(promoted LOC) A
```

A/The teacher will give the child a book.

[18] If an OBL NP is to become a head noun, it must first be promoted to O (i.e. direct object), in which case it is cross-referenced on the verb by an appropriate affix.

```
(28) Anak-anak  ya  na nibuwanan      búk    Ø    leh mastal.
     DUP- anak  ya  na ni-  buwan -an búk         leh mastal
     DIM- child NMZ LK AGR- give  -VI book         ERG teacher
                                     promoted LOC=Ø
```

A/The child is whom a/the teacher will give a book.

```
(29) Adjal-na       keyk itu    ma  kau.
     adjal -na      keyk itu    ma  kau
     cook  -3SG.ERG cake D1.ABS LOC 2SG.OBL
           A        O           OBL
```

She will bake this cake for you.

```
(30) Keyk itu    ya  adjal-na       Ø    ma  kau.
     keyk itu    ya  adjal -na           ma  kau
     cake D1.ABS NMZ cook  -3SG.ERG      LOC 2SG.OBL
                         A        O=Ø    OBL
```

This cake is what she will bake for you.

```
(31) Adjalan-na         kow[19]         keyk.
     adjal -an -na      kow              keyk
     cook  -VI -3SG.ERG 2SG.ABS          cake
               A        O(promoted BEN)
```

She will bake you a cake.

```
(32) Kau     ya  adjalan-na         Ø             keyk.
     kau     ya  adjal -an -na                    keyk
     2SG.OBL NMZ cook  -VI -3SG.ERG               cake
                         A        promoted BEN=Ø
```

You are for whom she will bake a cake.

4.3. WH-question formation

A WH-question (also called "information question" or "content question") is one which contains a pro-form (e.g., English "who", "what", "where", "why", "when"). In many languages, this pro-form occurs in clause-initial position, resulting in a "gap" at the position where the questioned argument occurs in the non-question form. (E.g., *He will give the book to you.* cf. *What will he give Ø to you?*)

---

[19] In examples (31) and (32), we use a pronoun to further exemplify that this argument in a

In Sinama, WH-question formation follows an ergative pattern of syntactic control: S and O may be questioned; A may not. In the following examples, (33) and (34) show that S of an intransitive clause can be the questioned element of a WH-question. Examples (35) and (36) show that O of a transitive clause may be the questioned element, and (37) and (38) show that once an OBL NP is promoted to O (i.e. direct object), it also can be the questioned element. Finally, examples (40) and (41) show that in order for A of a transitive clause to be the questioned element, the transitive clause must change to an antipassive construction so that A becomes S, at which point the argument is then eligible to be the questioned element.

```
(33) Bey  nengge       anak-anak.
     bey  ngaN- tengge DUP- anak
     PPFV INTR- stand  DIM- child
     The child stood.

(34) Siyan bey  nengge        Ø?
     siyan bey  ngaN- tengge  Ø
     who   PPFV INTR- stand   Ø
                             S=Ø
     Who stood?

(35) Bey  pamuwan        búk  leh  danda  ni anak-anak.
     bey  pangaN-  buwan búk  leh  danda  ni DUP- anak
     PPFV PAT-     give  book ERG  female to DIM- child
                         O    A           OBL
     A/The woman gave the book to a/the child.
```

---

transitive clause is marked as ABS, and in a cleft construction, as OBL.

```
(36) Iyan  bey  pamuwan        Ø  leh danda  ni anak-anak?
     eyyan bey  pangaN-  buwan    leh danda  ni DUP- anak
     what  PPFV PAT-     give     ERG female to DIM- child
                                 O=Ø
```

What did a/the woman give to a/the child?

```
(37) Bey  nibuwanan      anak-anak       búk  leh  danda.
     bey  ni-  buwan -an DUP- anak       búk  leh  danda
     PPFV AGR- give  -VI DIM- child      book ERG  female
                         O(promoted LOC)      A
```

A/The woman gave the child a book. (*A/The woman gave the child the book.)

```
(38) Siyan bey  nibuwanan        Ø      búk  leh  danda?
     siyan bey  ni-  buwan -an          búk  leh  danda
     who   PPFV AGR- give  -VI          book ERG  female
                        promoted LOC=Ø
```

To whom did a/the woman give a book? (*To whom did a/the woman give the book?)

```
(39) *Siyan bey pamuwan buk  Ø    ni anak-anak?
                            *A=Ø
```

Who gave the book to a/the child?

```
(40) Bey  akú     muwan       búk  ni anak-anak.
     bey  akú     ngan- buwan búk  ni DUP- anak
     PPFV 1SG.ABS INTR- give  book to DIM- child
          S
```

I gave a book to a/the child.

```
(41) Siyan bey  Ø    muwan       búk  ni anak-anak?
     siyan bey       ngaN- buwan búk  ni DUP- anak
     who   PPFV      INTR- give  book to DIM- child
                S=Ø
```

Who gave a book to a/the child?

4.4. Equi-NP deletion[20]

Equi-NP deletion is a syntactic process involving a main clause and a complement clause, in which an argument in the main clause is co-referential with one in the complement clause, and one of the co-referential arguments is deleted (usually the co-referential argument of the complement clause). The process is illustrated in the

[20] For a fuller discussion of equi-NP deletion in Sinama, see Trick 1997.

following English examples.

```
(42) I want the book.

(43) I will sleep.
     S

(44) I want to sleep.
            S=Ø

(45) I will give the book to her.
     A           O

(46) I want to give the book to her.
            A=Ø
```

The verb *want* can take either a NP complement, as in (42), or a clause complement, as in (44) and (46). In (44), the one 'wanting' and the one 'sleeping' are co-referential. Similarly, in (46), the one 'wanting' and the one 'giving' are also co-referential. In both (44) and (46), the co-referential argument of the complement clause is deleted. Note that in (44), the deleted argument is S (the one sleeping) of the complement clause, and in (46), the deleted argument is A (the one giving) of the complement clause. Thus, in English, equi-NP deletion operates on a nominative pattern of syntactic control, since it is S or A (and not O) that is deleted.[21]

Although equi-NP deletion operates on a nominative pattern of control in most

---

[21] In English, it might appear that O or IO (indirect object) may also be deleted if the clause has first been made passive, as in *She wants to be given the book* (IO=Ø?) or *The puppy wants to be given to the little girl* (O=Ø?). In fact, though, a passive clause is a single-argument construction having only S. In the clause, *She was given the book*, the pronoun *she* is S. Likewise, *puppy* in *The puppy was given to the little girl* is S.

languages of the world, including Philippine languages, Sinama is an exception to this near universal pattern in that equi-NP deletion operates on an exclusive ergative pattern of control;[22] that is, only S of an intransitive clause (49) and O of a transitive clause (51) are deleted under co-reference, never A (52).

```
(47) Kabilahian-ku              búk.
     ka-  bilahi -an  -ku       búk
     INV- want   -PAT -1SG.ERG  book
     I want the book.

(48) Tuli  akú.
     tuli  akú
     sleep 1SG.ABS
           S
     I will sleep.

(49) Kabilahian-ku              tuli  Ø.
     ka-  bilahi -an  -ku       tuli
     INV- want   -PAT -1SG.ERG  sleep
                                      S=Ø
     I want to sleep.

(50) Nilinganan       akú     leh si Ben.
     ni-  lengan -an  akú     leh si Ben
     AGR- call   -PAT 1SG.ABS ERG PM name.person
                      O       A
     Ben will call me.

(51) Kabilahian-ku              nilinganan       Ø    leh si Ben.
     ka-  bilahi -an  -ku       ni-  lengan -an       leh si Ben
     INV- want   -PAT -1SG.ERG  AGR- call   -PAT      ERG PM name.person
                                                 O=Ø  A
     I want Ben to call [me].
```

[22] This has also been demonstrated for Yakan (Brainard and Behrens, 2002:161-3).

(52) *Kabilahian si Ben nilinganan akú Ø.
Ben wants to call me.[23]
O *A=Ø

4.5. Second-position cliticization

A clitic is a form which has some features of an independent word but which is bound to another word (known as the host).[24] For many Philippine languages, the arguments S, A, and O all behave like second-position clitics when they are coded as pronouns. In Sinama, however, only S and O function as second-position clitics, never A. Thus second-position cliticization in Sinama displays an ergative pattern of syntactic control. Specifically, when a host element such as *ley* PPFT, *bey* PPFV, or *maha* NEG occurs clause-initially, and S or O is also a pronoun, the pronoun will move to the left of the verb into the second position of the clause (as in (54) and (56)). This is not, however, the case with A (see (57) and (58)).[25]

(53) Nengge iyá.
ngaN- tengge iyá
INTR- stand 3SG.ABS
S
S/he will stand.

---

[23] Example (52) is grammatical with the meaning, 'Ben wants that I will be called (by someone else).' That is, the complement clause is passive, and not transitive. The deleted argument is not co-referential with *Ben*.

[24] Other features of clitics: they are phonologically unstressed, they usually attach to the edges of words (i.e. outside of derivational or inflectional affixes), they function at the phrase or clause level, often having grammatical rather than lexical meaning.

[25] This pattern of ergative control for second position clitics has also been noted for Sama Bangingi' (Gault 1999) and Yakan (Brainard and Behrens 2002:127-131).

```
(54) Bey  iyá     nengge.
     bey  iyá     ngaN- tengge
     PPFV 3SG.ABS INTR- stand
          S
```
S/he stood.

```
(55) Tabangan-na         akú.
     tabang -an  -na     akú
     help   -PAT -3S.ERG 1S.ABS
                 A       O
```
She will help me.

```
(56) Maha akú    tabangan-na.
     maha akú    tabang -an  -na
     NEG  1S.ABS help   -PAT -3S.ERG
          O                   A
```
She will not help me.

```
(57) *Maha-na akú tabangan.
           A  O
```
She will not help me.

```
(58) *Maha-na tabangan akú.
           A           O
```
She will not help me.

5. Conclusion

The data presented here demonstrate that in addition to morphological ergativity, Sinama exhibits a high degree of syntactic ergativity. Specifically S and O, and only S and O, control not only relativization, clefting, and WH-question formation, as in many Philippine languages, but also equi-NP deletion and second-position cliticization.[26] (That is, in each of these syntactic operations, S and O pattern alike, and A patterns

[26] Preliminary research indicates that imperatives, reflexivization, and reciprocalization operate on a nominative-accusative pattern of syntactic control, but these processes are beyond the scope of this paper.

differently.) To our knowledge, Sinama[27] is unique among Philippine languages in that syntactic control for equi-NP and second-position cliticization follows an exclusive ergative pattern. Although other Philippine languages demonstrate syntactic ergativity with respect to some of these processes, published results to date have not documented syntactic ergativity to this degree.

Appendix 1 – Abbreviations

A	more agent-like argument in transitive clause
AGR	agreement affix
ASC	Associative
BEN	beneficiary
CAUS	causative
D1.ABS	demonstrative, near, absolutive
DIM	diminutive
DU	dual
DUP	reduplication affix
ERG	ergative
INS	instrument
INTR	intransitive
INV	involuntary
LK	linker
LOC	locative
MKR_I	impersonal marker
NCTRL	no-control
NMZ	nominalizer
O	more patient-like argument in transitive clause
OBL	oblique
PASS	passive
PAT	Patient
PM	personal marker
PPFT	past perfect
PPFV	past perfective
S	single argument of intransitive clause
VI	valence increaser

[27] This claim may also be true of other Sama languages, and has in fact been demonstrated for Yakan (Brainard and Behrens 2002).

Appendix 2 – Southern Sinama Personal Pronouns

person	number	Absolutive		Ergative		Oblique	
1	sing	*akú*	1SG.ABS	*-ku*	1SG.ERG	*áku*	1SG.OBL
	pl	*kamí*	1PL.ABS	*-kami*	1PL.ERG	*kami*	1PL.OBL
2	sing	*kow*	2SG.ABS	*-nu*	2SG.ERG	*kau*	2SG.OBL
	pl	*kam*	2PL.ABS	*-bi*	2PL.ERG	*kaam*	2PL.OBL
DU	sing	*kitá*	DU.SG.ABS	*-ta*	DU.SG.ERG	*kita*	DU.SG.OBL
	pl	*kitabí*	DU.PL.ABS	*-tabí*	DU.PL.ERG	*kitabí*	DU.PL.OBL
3	sing	*iyá*	3SG.ABS	*-na*	3SG.ERG	*iya*	3SG.OBL
	pl	*sigá*	3PL.ABS	*-sigá*	3PL.ERG	*sigá*	3PL.OBL

REFERENCES

Brainard, Sherri. 1994. Voice and ergativity in Karao. Eugene: University of Oregon dissertation.

_____. 1996. Why the 'focused NP' is not the subject in Philippine languages: Evidence from Karao. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 27 (1-2):1-47.

_____ and Dietlinde Behrens. 2002. A grammar of Yakan. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.

de Guzman, Videa P. 1988. Ergative analysis for Philippine languages: an analysis. In *Studies in Austronesian Linguistics*, ed. by Richard McGinn, 323-45. *[=Ohio University Monographs in International Studies*, Southeast Asia Series, No. 76.]

Dixon, R.M.W. 1979. Ergativity. *Language* 55.59-138.

_____. 1994. Ergativity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gault, JoAnn Marie. 1999. An ergative description of Sama Bangingi'. Linguistic Society of the Philippines, Special Monograph Issue, 46.

Gerdtz, Donna. 1988. Antipassives and causatives in Ilokano: evidence for an ergative analysis. In *Studies in Austronesian Linguistics*, ed. by Richard McGinn, 295-321. [=*Ohio University Monographs in International Studies*, Southeast Asia Series, No. 76.]

Hodder, Barbara M. 1999. Functions of cleft constructions in expository and hortatory discourse in Mayoyao Ifugao. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 30 (1-2): 31-74.

Kroeger, Paul R. 1993. Phrase structure and grammatical relations in Tagalog. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications (Center for the Study of Language and Information).

Mithun, Marianne. 1994. The implications of ergativity for a Philippine voice system. In *Voice: Form and Function*, ed. by Barbara Fox and Paul J. Hopper, 247-277. Typological Studies in Language 27. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Payne, Thomas. 1982. Role and reference related subject properties and ergativity in Yup'ik Eskimo and Tagalog. *Studies in Language* 6:75-106.

Pebley, Carol Jean, and Sherri Brainard. 1999. The functions of fronted noun phrases in Kagayanen expository discourse. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 30 (1-2): 75-121.

Schachter, Paul. 1976. The subject in Philippine languages: topic, actor, actor-topic, or none of the above? In *Subject and topic*, ed. by Charles N. Li, 493-518. New York: Academic Press.

_____. 1977. Reference-related and role-related properties of subjects. In *Syntax and semantics 8: Grammatical relations*, ed. by Peter Cole and Jerrold M. Sadock, 279-306. New York: Academic Press.

Trick, Douglas. 1997. Equi-NP deletion in Sama Southern. *Philippine Journal of Linguistics* 28.125-144.

Walton, Charles. 1986. Sama verbal semantics: classification, derivation and inflection. Manila: Linguistic Society of the Philippines.