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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.
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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

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 clause⁵,
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

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).)

(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 oblique8. 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 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 [r], s [s], t [t], w [w], y [j], a [a][ə], e [e][ɛ], i [i][ɨ], o [o], u [u]. Glottal stop is a phoneme, and is represented by h when it occurs syllable-finally (e.g., *lumah-na* [lu.'meɪ.na] ‘his/her house’), hyphen when it occurs syllable-initially between morphemes (e.g., *mag-adjal* [maŋ.'ʔad.dʒəl] ‘to cook’), and is not represented when it occurs intervocally (e.g., *piitu* [pi.'ʔi.tu] ‘come here’) or word-initially (e.g., *eroh* [ʔe.roʔ] ‘dog’).

Geminate consonants occur and are represented as a sequence of two identical segments (e.g., *addat* [ʔad.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* [pə.'so.ođ] ‘to enter’).

10 Word order in Sinama tends to be VS and VO; 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

Ben (S) will sleep later.

(5) **Tuli anak-anak gana-gana.**

- **Tuli** DUP- anak gana-gana
- **sleep** DIM- child later

The child (S) will sleep later.

(6) **Tabangan-ku si Ben.**

- **Tabangan** -an -ku
- **si Ben**
- **help** -PAT -1SG.ERG PM name.person

I (A) will help Ben (O).

(7) **Tabangan-ku anak-anak.**

- **Tabangan** -an -ku
- **anak-anak**
- **help** -PAT -1SG.ERG DIM- child

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) **Nitatangan anak-anak leh mastal.**

- **Nitatangan**
- **anak-anak**
- **leh mastal**
- **AGR- help** -PAT DIM- child ERG teacher

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.
ní- 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.
ní- 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.
ní- 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).  

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 – 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*.  
be⁰ ta-ndah -ku lubid  
PVF NCTRL- see -1SG.ERG rope  
A O

I saw the rope.

(13) Bey *nikottob lubid itu leh anak-anak*.  
be⁰ ni-kottob lubid itu leh DUP- anak  
PVF AGR- cut rope D1.ABS ERG DIM- child  
A 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.**
bev ta- ndah -ku lubid ya bev 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) lubid Ø.
I saw the child who cut the rope.

(16) **Bey tandah-ku anak-anak ya bey ngottob Ø lubid.**
bev ta- ndah -ku DUP- anak ya bev 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.**
bev ngaN- tengge DUP- anak
PPFV INTR- stand DIM- child

S
The child stood.

(18) **Bey tandah-ku anak-anak ya bey nengge Ø.**
bev ta- ndah -ku DUP- anak ya bev 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** $\emptyset$.

| si Ben | ya na bey ngaN- tengge |
| PM name.person | NMZ LK PPFV INTR- stand |

$S=\emptyset$

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 $\emptyset$ leh anak-anak.**

| lubid itu | ya bey ni- kottob | leh DUP- anak |
| rope | D1.ABS NMZ PPFV AGR- cut | ERG DIM- child |

O=$\emptyset$

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)\(^\text{18}\). 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

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

(25) Nipamuwan  búk leh mastal ni anak-anak.
    ni- pangang- 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- pangang- buwan leh mastal ni DUP- anak
    book DL. 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 bük Ø leh mastal.
DUP- anak ya na ni- buwan -an bük 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 kow¹⁹ 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.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>bey</em></th>
<th>ngaN- tengge</th>
<th>DUP- anak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPFV</td>
<td>INTR- stand</td>
<td>DIM- child</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The child stood.

(34) *Siyan bey nengge ?*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>siyan</em></th>
<th><em>bey</em></th>
<th>ngaN- tengge</th>
<th>Ø</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>who PPFV</td>
<td>INTR- stand</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S=Ø

Who stood?

(35) *Bey pumuwan buk leh danda ni anak-anak.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>bey</em></th>
<th>pangaN- buwan</th>
<th>buk leh</th>
<th>danda</th>
<th>ni DUP- anak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPFV</td>
<td>PAT- give</td>
<td>book</td>
<td>ERG female</td>
<td>to DIM- child</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A/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
  0(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

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 = ∅

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

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

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=∅?) or The puppy wants to be given to the little girl (O=∅?). 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) \textit{Kabilahan-ku} buk.
\begin{tabular}{l}
ka- bilahi -an -ku buk \\
INV- want -PAT -1SG.ERG book
\end{tabular}
I want the book.

(48) \textit{Tuli akú.}
\begin{tabular}{l}
tuli akú \\
sleep 1SG.ABS \\
S
\end{tabular}
I will sleep.

(49) \textit{Kabilahan-ku} tuli ø.
\begin{tabular}{l}
ka- bilahi -an -ku tuli \\
INV- want -PAT -1SG.ERG sleep
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
S=Ø
\end{tabular}
I want to sleep.

(50) \textit{Nilinganan} akú leh si Ben.
\begin{tabular}{l}
ni- lengan -an akú leh si Ben \\
AGR- call -PAT 1SG.ABS ERG PM name.person
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
O A
\end{tabular}
Ben will call me.

(51) \textit{Kabilahan-ku} nilinganan ø leh si Ben.
\begin{tabular}{l}
ka- bilahi -an -ku ni- lengan -an leh si Ben \\
INV- want -PAT -1SG.ERG AGR- call -PAT ERG PM name.person
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
O=Ø A
\end{tabular}
I want Ben to call [me].

---

\(^{22}\) This has also been demonstrated for Yakan (Brainard and Behrens, 2002:161-3).
(52) *Kabilahan si Ben nilinganan akú ø.
    Ben wants to call me.\textsuperscript{23}

\begin{tabular}{c}
 0 *A=Ø \\
\end{tabular}

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).\textsuperscript{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 \textit{ley} PPFT, \textit{bey} PPFV, or \textit{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)).\textsuperscript{25}

(53) Nengge iyá.
    stand 3SG.ABS

\begin{tabular}{l}
  ngaN- tengu
  INTR- stand
\end{tabular}

S/he will stand.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{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.\footnote{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.} (That is, in each of these syntactic operations, S and O pattern alike, and A patterns
differently.) To our knowledge, Sinama\textsuperscript{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**

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

\textsuperscript{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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>person</th>
<th>number</th>
<th>Absolutive</th>
<th>Ergative</th>
<th>Oblique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>sing</td>
<td>akū 1SG.ABS</td>
<td>-ku 1SG.ERG</td>
<td>áku 1SG.OBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl</td>
<td>kamí 1PL.ABS</td>
<td>-kamí 1PL.ERG</td>
<td>kami 1PL.OBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>sing</td>
<td>kow 2SG.ABS</td>
<td>-nu 2SG.ERG</td>
<td>kau 2SG.OBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl</td>
<td>kam 2PL.ABS</td>
<td>-bi 2PL.ERG</td>
<td>kaam 2PL.OBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>sing</td>
<td>kitá DU.SG.ABS</td>
<td>-ta DU.SG.ERG</td>
<td>kita DU.SG.OBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl</td>
<td>kitabí DU.PL.ABS</td>
<td>-tabí DU.PL.ERG</td>
<td>kitabí DU.PL.OBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>sing</td>
<td>iyá 3SG.ABS</td>
<td>-na 3SG.ERG</td>
<td>iya 3SG.OBL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl</td>
<td>sigá 3PL.ABS</td>
<td>-sigá 3PL.ERG</td>
<td>sigá 3PL.OBL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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