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The distribution of the absolutive clitic in Selayarese and other languages from southwestern Sulawesi appears to be governed by spellout constraints that yield a second position (2P) effect. There is, however, evidence suggesting that the 2P spellout constraints are enforced prior to some cases of overt movement. I argue for a cyclic solution to this apparent paradox, in line with Chomsky's (1998) notion of "phase".

I discuss here the absolutive marker in some related Austronesian languages from South Sulawesi, Indonesia, and I suggest that a proper characterization of its distribution involves at least three propositions: (i) it is a clitic attracted to "second position" (2P), but 2P is not tied to a particular category or place in the syntactic structure (i.e., the structural location of second position may vary from sentence to sentence); (ii) the overt syntax of these languages has access to the output of the constraints that enforce 2P; and (iii) in some of these languages, the exact phonological shape of the clitic cannot be determined until after its 2P placement has been decided by the grammar. To the degree that 2P is a spellout condition, an implication of (ii) is that aspects of the syntax derivationally follow aspects of spellout. I suggest below that this conclusion can be accommodated within current derivational models of grammar by placing spellout within the cycle. The 2P clitics in these languages thus differ from those in, for example, Tagalog, for which Anderson (1999) argues that 2P is essentially a set of post-syntactic phonological constraints defined in part over syntactic categories.

The clitic itself, I will argue, is introduced as the head of a functional projection in which the feature [definite] of the absolutive argument is checked. This is essentially an Austronesian implementation of some ideas from Sportiche (1993), who takes such an approach to Romance clitics. Data in the first part of the paper are drawn primarily from Selayarese, and examples from the closely related languages Makassarese, Koi'ljo, and Bugis are introduced later. In general, remarks concerning Selayarese are applicable to these languages, except where noted.

---
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1.0 Word order and verbal morphology

Selayarese has an ergative agreement system, although subjects and objects show typical binding and crossover asymmetries that indicate that the subject c-commands the object at the relevant level of representation (cf. Finer 1994, 1997). Subjects and objects are cross-referenced by markers attached to the verb, and they are illustrated below in table (1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selayarese agreement markers</th>
<th>1SG</th>
<th>2FAM</th>
<th>2HON, 1PL (inc)</th>
<th>1PL (EXC)</th>
<th>3SG/PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ergative</td>
<td>ku-</td>
<td>mu-</td>
<td>ri-</td>
<td>to-</td>
<td>la-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absolute</td>
<td>-a</td>
<td>-ko</td>
<td>-ki</td>
<td>-kag</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the typical case, the absolute clitic attaches to the right periphery of the verb, as shown in the data in (1). I will indicate the boundary between the absolute clitic and its host with an equals sign ("=").

1. a. ku-alle=i doet-i\-i\-ho 1SG.ERG=take=3ABS money-DEF 'I took the money.'
    b. la-alle=i doet-i\-i\-ho i Baso? 3ERG=take=3ABS money-DEF CLASS 'Baso took the money.'
    c. la-alle=i i Baso? doet-i\-i\-ho 3ERG=take=3ABS CLASS money-DEF 'Baso took the money.'
    d. la-keo?=a i Baso? 3ERG=call=1SG.ABS CLASS 'Baso called me.'
    e. ku-keo?=ko 1SG.ERG=call=2FAM.ABS 'I called you.'

The ergative agreement element is prefixed, though in sentences with an intransitive main verb or an indefinite direct object, a prefix (INT=intransitive marker) displaces the ergative marker.

2. a. ak-kelop=kog INT=ing=2FAM.ABS 'You sang.'
2.0 Phonological and syntactic clitic properties of the absolutive marker

There are two primary reasons for classifying the absolutive element as a clitic instead of a verbal suffix. First, as will be discussed more fully below, it is fairly mobile syntactically; it may appear as an enclitic on elements other than the verb, depending upon the structure of the sentence. Second, even when it remains attached to the verb, its phonological behavior is quite different from that of other suffixal elements. These facts point to the conclusion that it is not attached as an agreement suffix as part of the verbal morphology. Another fact that supports this claim is that the absolutive clitic is always on the periphery of verbal affixation.

I will first review some of the phonological contrasts before addressing the syntactic distribution of the clitic. As shown in work by Hasan Basri (1998, 1999, see also Mithun and Basri 1985), attachment of the absolutive clitic does not trigger a recalculation of penultimate stress as does the affixation of, for example, the plural marker and the transitivizer. This fact is especially convincing since the three elements are homophonous. Monomorphic words showing penultimate stress are in (3), while the examples in (4) contain morphologically complex elements.

3. a. sápo  ‘house’
   b. balála  ‘greedy’
   c. pólála  ‘eggplant’
   d. tirére  ‘thirsty’

Now consider the examples below from Basri (1998):

4. a. la-kámrei =i  pao-iño jarañ-ifijo
   3ERG-eat-3ABS mango-DEF horse-DEF
   ‘The horse ate the mango.’

   b. la-kámre-i =ri  pao-iño jarañ-ifijo
   3ERG-eat-PL=3ABS mango-DEF horse-DEF
   ‘The horses ate the mango.’
In (4a), note that the main stress falls on the penultimate syllable of the verb root *kanre*. The typical penultimate stress pattern is unaffected by the presence of the absolutive clitic. In (4b), however, the presence of the plural marker on the verb (*-i*) causes stress to shift to the second syllable of the root, maintaining the penultimate pattern if the plural is included in the domain of stress (the glottal stop is inserted between sequences of identical vowels). The *i* absolutive and the *i* plural thus induce different reactions to stress placement, the former acting as though it is outside the relevant domain, the latter acting as though it is inside.

In (5a) below, note that the stem final glottal stop remains, but it shifts to [k] in (5b). In other word-level environments, there are no glottal stop-vowel sequences, and so this contrast suggests that the absolutive clitic is outside the word level while the transitivizer is inside. Note that this distinction correlates with the stress patterns shown in (5a-c), from Basri (1998). Stress shifts once the transitivizer and plural are added to the stem, but the absolutive element is ignored for stress placement.

5. a. a?¡dáppe?¡ =i pao-ñjo  
   INT-fall=3ABS mango-DEF  
   ‘The mango fell.’

b. la-dappék-i=hí jarañ-iñjo pao-ñjo  
   3ERG-fall-TRN=3ABS horse-DEF mango-DEF  
   ‘The mango fell on the horse.’

c. la-dappék-f=hí jaraññiñjo pao-ñjo  
   3ERG-fall-TRN-PL=3ABS horse-DEF mango-DEF  
   ‘The mango fell on the horses.’

Other phonological environments that distinguish between affixes and clitics are words ending in [r], [l], or [s], which require an echo vowel to close out the word, these consonants being impermissible codas in the language. (6a) and (6b) thus differ with respect to the extra vowel, and as expected, with respect to stress placement, since the echo vowels are not counted in the stress calculation.

6. a. true suffix: kümbla / kumbålaq (kumbal+aq)  
   ‘naughty /naughtier’

b. clitic: kümbla / kumbålaqa (kumbala=a)  
   ‘naughty /I am naughty’

The same distinction between affixes and clitics arises in contexts of reduplication. When the base is bisyllabic, the reduplicative morpheme (RED) consists of

---

1 The glottal stop that occurs in the affixation zones of the verbs is introduced to separate identical vowels, and it does not change to [k]
a full copy of the base, but when the base contains more than two syllables, RED is still bisyllabic, but a glottal stop is the coda of the second syllable.

7. a. bahi 'pig' bahi-bahi ‘toy pig’
    b. golla ‘sugar’ golla-golla ‘candy’
    c. karuŋ ‘sack’ karuŋ-karuŋ ‘small sack’

8. a. palola ‘eggplant’ paloʔ-palolo ‘eggplant-like object’
    b. balala ‘greedy’ baloʔ-balala ‘rather greedy’
    c. kalammanną ‘dark’ kalaʔ-kalammanną ‘rather dark’

This pattern recurs when a bisyllabic base affixed with a true affix undergoes reduplication. The additional syllable created by this affixation counts in the reduplication calculation, and so the glottal stop closes the final syllable of RED. The situation is different, however, where the clitic is concerned. Here, the clitic is outside the domain of reduplication, and so RED is identical to the (bisyllabic) base (see variously, Aronoff, Arsyad, Basri & Broselow 1987, McCarthy and Prince 1994, Basri 1999, Basri and Chen 1999 for discussion of reduplication in Selayarese and Makassarese).

9. a. bambaną ‘heat’ bambaną-i ‘to heat’
    bambaʔ-bambaną-i ‘to heat a little’
    b. gassiq ‘strong’ gassin-i ‘to strengthen’
    gassিʔ-gassin-i ‘to make rather strong’

10. a. bamban=i ‘it is hot’
    bamban-bamban=i ‘it is rather hot’
    b. gassín=i ‘it is strong’
    gassin-gassín=i ‘it is rather strong’

The above considerations, among others, lead Basri (op cit), Basri, Broselow Finer (1997), and Basri, Broselow, Finer, and Selkirk (1997) to conclude that the absolutive element does not combine with its host as part of the lexical morphology of the language. Selayarese and Makassarese dependent elements are argued to fall into three general classes: true suffixes, affixal clitics, and free clitics, based on Selkirk’s (1995) typology. The transitivizer, comparative, and plural markers, for example, count as true suffixes, and they are constituents of the minimal morphological word. Determiners and possessive pronouns are classified as affixal clitics, and they acquire their hosts via syntactic head movement (see Finer to appear). The absolutive clitic falls into the latter class, and it is not attached to its phonological host by any syntactic or morphological
process, but adjoined to its host in the phonology.² The account of the diverse phonological behavior of these elements, some of which was illustrated above, is tied to the ways in which they combine with their hosts to form prosodic units (see the works cited for further details).

The syntactic distribution of the clitic further reinforces the idea that it finds its host postlexically. Its typical host is a verb, as illustrated above, but the clitic will attach to certain preposed adverbial expressions (manner and location, though not, for example, temporal adverbs):

11. a. mu-pallu=i jukuʔ-iʔjo ri koron
   2fam.erg-cook=3abs fish-def in pan

b. ri koron=i mu-pallu jukuʔ-iʔjo
   in pan=3abs 2fam.erg-cook fish-def
   ‘You cooked the fish in the pan.’

12. a. la-jaʔjaq=kan i Basoʔ ri paraŋ
    3erg-seg=1pl.abs class in field

b. Ri paraŋ=kan la-jaʔjaq i Basoʔ
   in field=1pl.abs 3erg-seg class
   ‘Baso saw us in a field.’

13. a. al-lari=ko lassiri
    int-run=2fam.abs fast

b. lassiri=ko al-lari
    fast=2fam.abs int-lari
    ‘You run fast.’

The absolutive clitic also attaches to negation.

14. a. la-keoʔ=ko i Basoʔ
    3erg-call-2fam.abs class
    ‘Baso called you.’

b. gele=ko la-keoʔ i Basoʔ
    neg-2fam.abs 3erg-call class
    ‘Baso didn’t call you.’

If the clitic were attached as part of the verbal morphology (i.e., below the level at which the syntax operates), it would be necessary to peel it off and place it elsewhere by syntactic rule, and this would violate any formulation of the lexicalist hypothesis. The adverbial placement is also completely at odds with a lexical attachment. Its host

² As we will see below, the free clitic may undergo syntactic adjunction, but the category it adjoins to is not its phonological host.
is the last element of a DP, but the DP must be embedded in a PP, the PP itself must designate a location or a manner, and it must be in preverbal position.

Further evidence against a lexical analysis comes from relative clauses. As discussed in Finer (to appear), the verb of a relative clause combines with the determiner of the overall DP, and here, note that the absolutive clitic attaches to the right of the determiner, an unlikely place if the clitic were attached lexically.

15. a. La-pallu-i juku?-iňjo i Ali
   3ERG-cook=3ABS fish-DEF CLASS
   ‘Ali cooked the fish.’

   b. to-la-pallu-iňjo=i juku?-iňjo ri koro?
   REL-3ERG-cook-DEF=3ABS fish-DEF in pa
   ‘the one who cooked the fish in a pan’

16. a. la-la.Ignore=kaŋ palopi-iňjo ri koko.
   3ERG-see=1PLABS sailor-DEF in field
   ‘The sailor saw us in a field.’

   b. palopi to-la Ignore=kaŋ ri koko
   sailor REL-3ERG-see-DEF=1PLABS in field
   ‘the sailor who saw us in a field’

To summarize, phonological and syntactic evidence against a lexical analysis of the clitic has been presented. The presence of the clitic does not induce phonological alternations typical of straightforward affixation, and it attaches to a wide range of hosts: syntactic heads, adverbial phrases, and head-adjunction structures, all somewhat problematic hosts from the point of view of the lexicon.

### 3.0 Second position

The task is now to provide an analysis of the properties of the clitic. To begin, let us first observe that it occurs in general in second position.⁸ The first element in the

---

⁸This list of clitic hosts, however, does not exhaust the list of items that may occur in first position in a Selayaense sentence. The examples given below show DPs preposed to focus position, but they cannot serve as clitic hosts. Further, the absolutive clitic cannot surface when the absolutive argument occupies the focus position, in contrast to the ergative prefix.
sentence may be a verb or a negation, or the first element may be an adverb of location or manner. As noted above, temporal adverbs do not host the absolutive clitic.

17. a. la-mu-tambah=i tedoq-ifjo mintara
    FUT-2FAM.ERG-tether=3ABS buffalo-DEF tomorrow
    ‘You will tether the buffalo tomorrow.’

b. *mintara=i la-mu-tambah tedoq-ifjo
    tomorrow=3ABS FUT-2FAM.ERG-tether buffalo-DEF

c. mintara la-mu-tambah=i tedoq-ifjo
    tomorrow FUT-2FAM.ERG-tether=3ABS buffalo-DEF

Negative sentences, however, show that there are at least two landing sites that fronted adverbs are apportioned to.

18. a. gele=i mu-pallu jukuq-ifjo ri korog
    NEG=3ABS 2fam.erg-cook fish-DEF in pan

b. gele=i ri korog mu-pallu jukuq-ifjo
    NEG=3ABS in pan 2FAM.ERG-cook fish-DEF

c. *ri korog=i gele mu-pallu jukuq ifjo

19. a. gele=i la-mu-tambah tedoq-ifjo mintara
    NEG=3ABS FUT-2FAM.ERG-tether=3ABS buffalo-DEF tomorrow

b. mintara gele=i la-mu-tambah tedoq-ifjo
    tomorrow NEG=3ABS FUT-2FAM.ERG-tether buffalo-DEF
    ‘You will not tether the buffalo tomorrow.’

c. *gele=i mintara la-mu-tambah tedoq-ifjo
    NEG=3ABS tomorrow FUT-2FAM.ERG-tether=3ABS buffalo-DEF
    ‘You will not tether the buffalo tomorrow.’

Observe that the adverbs that front to the position to the right of negation (locative) are those that bear the clitic in the absence of negation. Those that front to the left of negation (temporal) do not bear the clitic in the absence of negation. Following earlier work, I will assume that the preposed temporal adverbs are adjoined to the highest maximal projection below CP, and that the preposed locative adverbs

(ii) a. *i Baso=i la-aile dotq-ifjo
    CLASS B=3ABS 3ERO-take money-DEF

b. *Josq-ifjo=i la-taro i Baso ri lamari
    money-DEF=3ABS 3ERG-put CLASS in cupboard

There is some evidence that the absolutive clitic, when present, marks scope of the absolutive argument; a weak crossover violation can be triggered with a preposed locative adverb plus absolutive clitic while the absolutive argument remains in situ. Given this, perhaps the object that would be created by combining the (operator-like) pronominal clitic with the (operator-like) focused DP would be uninterpretable by the LF component. This further complicates the organization of the grammar, however, if the 2P spillover position of the clitic is relevant to LF.
occupy Spec of FP. PolP (polarity phrase) may intervene between FP and CP if negation is present. Second position is calculated from the lowest segment of the XP sister to C: PolP if it occurs, otherwise FP. The adjoined temporal adverb is outside the domain of cliticization, and so it will not count for purposes of determining second position. An abbreviated structure of the sort that I am assuming is shown below in (20). I will assume that the negative element originates lower in the structure and raises to PolP. I will not discuss negation further, so FP will be the relevant category for the remainder of the discussion.

![Diagram](image)

The placement of the clitic can be accounted for with two assumptions. The first is that there is a 2P requirement on the clitic. It must be in second position within the syntactic category FP (modulo earlier discussion, see also note 4). The second assumption is that if the clitic is not already in second position within FP at a certain point (see below for discussion), it will move and adjoin to the element that is in first position, positioning itself as the second element. In order to account for the 2P generalization, I will adopt for the present modified versions of the constraints proposed by Anderson (1999) in his Optimality Theoretic analysis of 2P clitics in Tagalog. The analysis involves balancing two constraints, non-Initial vs. Leftmost, where the former outranks the latter. Non-Initial constrains the absolutive clitic to non-initial position within FP, while Leftmost constrains it to leftmost position within FP.


(21) allows structures in which the absolutive clitic is non-initial within FP as long as it is as far to the left as otherwise possible. An absolutive clitic in first

---

4 There are two constructions that involve preposed DPs in the language, focus and another construction that is more or less equivalent to dislocation, and here the positions of the two fronted phrases differ with respect to negation as well. Focus is to the right, and dislocation is to the left, coexisting with the two adverb positions. In Finer (1994) it was argued that the focus position is the highest Spec position in the clause below CP while the dislocated phrase was adjoined to this category. See also Finer (1997) for further distinctions.
position obeys the leftmost constraint, but violates non-initiality, while a clitic in third position obeys non-initiality, but is farther to the right than a clitic in second position.

Before returning to discussion of 2P in Selayarese, let us turn briefly to structural matters. Following the treatment of Selayarese VOS word order in Finer (1997), let us assume that both the verb and the direct object undergo overt movement from an SVO base while the subject remains in place. I depart from that analysis here in placing the Abs clitic in functional head position, and I will further claim, following Sportiche (1993), that the projection headed by the clitic is distinct from the projection in which Case is checked. Absolutive Case is checked in the outer Spec of vP and the definiteness of the absolutive argument is checked covertly by Abs. After V-raising and object raising, we have a structure resembling (22).

![Diagram](image)

> The V-Abs structure obeys constraints on head movement, and the agreement between the clitic and the absolutive argument will be checked via the Spec-head relation once DPI moves to Spec of AbsP. This structure, however, embodies the claim that the verb and the clitic form a constituent, and this is at odds with earlier remarks. Furthermore, at various points in the derivations of the above sentences, the verb and the absolutive clitic are dissociated. In (15b) and (16b), for example, it appears as if the verb has excorporated from the adjoined position in (22) and moved to a higher head position, stranding Abs. In (11a) and (12a), on the other hand, it appears as if the Abs clitic has itself excorporated from its position in (22) and moved and adjoined to a higher Spec position. Instead of arguing for a series of excorporation and/or skipping analyses, however, I will instead adopt an idea from Roberts (1997), Sola (1997), and McSwan (1999) that will yield some of the effects of excorporation without violating the spirit of head-movement. Let us begin with (23a-c) from Roberts (1997):

23. a. Head movement is copying
   b. *[f_{W_1, W_2}, W_3] where W are morphological words
   c. A head is spelled out in the highest position of its chain, subject to (b).
   (Roberts 1997)

A guiding assumption behind (23) is that head movement checks features; it does not necessarily assemble syntactic constituents out of independent elements. I will assume that the Sulawesi absolutive clitics count as ‘morphological words’ for the
purposes of (23a), although they are phonologically light and prosodically dependent. The overall effect of (23) on the derivation of sentences containing absolutive clitics is that the verb and the clitic will have phonological realization at separate points in the structure.

Recall that the V-initial order is derived from the SVO base by V-raising: let us assume that the verb raises as high as T, and let us further assume that a lexical item is pronounced either in its base position, or if it has moved, in its highest position, at least as high as its highest checking position, subject to (23). Since V checks features on T, it will be pronounced at least that high, and Abs must therefore be pronounced lower. The phonological effect of syntactic excorporation is thus achieved; V and the clitic will have phonological realization in separate positions. Let us take the following sentence to illustrate the analysis so far.

24. la-jaʃjaq=i tedoŋ-injo i Baso?
   3ERG-see=3 ABS buffalo-DEF CLASS
   'Baso saw the buffalo.'

After V raises to T, the representation showing spellout position resembles (25) where the silent copies are indicated in script typeface:

25.

Observe that the position of the phonologically realized copy is in second position with respect to the first phonologically realized item (the verb). The clitic is as leftmost within FP as it can be without being initial. (23) is satisfied by the representation in (25) with relevant elements as they stand in situ. On the PF side of the grammar, the absolutive clitic is grouped with the preceding prosodic word (the verb in this case) by stray adjunction.

The pair of examples repeated in (26) present a slightly different analytical problem.

26. a. la-jaʃjaq=i tedoŋ-injo i Baso? ri koko-njo
   3ERG-see=3ABS buffalo-DEF CLASS in garden-DEF
b. ri koko-ojo=i  la-jatjaq  tedoa-ojo  i Baso?
in garden-DEF=3ABS  3ERG-see  buffalo-DEF  CLASS
‘Baso saw the buffalo in the garden.’

In (26b), the clitic is again in second position, but its host is a prepositional phrase rather than a simple verb as before. This illustrates that the X-bar theoretic size of the host can vary; it is not simply a choice between X-0 or XP for the host, but apparently simply X-n. I will assume that the structure is built up as before, and that the PP is then preposed to initial focus position. A structure is offered below that illustrates the derivation so far. The clitic is in boldface.

27.

The absolutive clitic is not in second position in (27); the preposing of PP has complicated matters. There are at least two ways to rectify the situation. The first is to simply realize the phonology in places other than (27) indicates: that is, realize Abs in TP and V in AbsP (or perhaps the T complex has moved independently to F, and then Abs is realized in FP). This is perhaps the simplest, given current mechanisms, but facts to be discussed below suggest empirical motivation for another approach, to adjoin Abs to PP. A structure showing this result is given below:
I provisionally suggest that the structure is lexicalized according to (27), and then the 2P constraint is met by moving Abs to PP as shown above. Since the clitic is structurally distant from kokoniə, the two will not constitute a phonological word, and the free clitic phonology will be derived.

Up to this point we have seen that the 2P constraint can be met in either of two ways. First, if the clitic is in second position in situ, no syntactic adjunction or movement takes place. If the clitic is not in second position at the point at which the verbal clusters are spelled out, it moves and adjoins to the first element.

4.0 Constituency and the cycle

I will now address the apparent mismatch in constituency shown in (25) and (28). In the former, the analysis embodies the claim that the verb and the absolutive clitic do not form a constituent at the spellout phase of the derivation, whereas the PP and the clitic in (28) do form a constituent at such a point. This distinction can be motivated by other examples from the language. First consider the constituency in (25); the verb and the absolutive clitic are merely adjacent, not attached. A process that affects verbs should therefore leave the clitic unaffected. Let us reconsider the relative clause data mentioned briefly above. Consider the following example:

29. to-la-pellu-fjo-i juku?-fjo ri koron
   REL-3ERG-3COOK-DEF=3ABS fish-DEF in pan
   'the one who cooked the fish in a pan'

---

5 The status of this movement rule in the overall theory is quite unclear. It is not structure-preserving in the usual sense, nor does it appear to fit into the typology of movement discussed by Noyer (1998) within Distributed Morphology.
It is important to note that here, the determiner of the overall relative clause intervenes between the verb and the clitic. An analysis of these relative clause constructions is offered in Finer (to appear), and there it is argued that the verb undergoes successive head-movement to D. Note that if the clitic were attached to the verb prior to the movement to C and on to D, the wrong result would emerge:

30. *to-la-pallu-i-ño juku'-iño ri korog
   REL-3ERG-cook-3ABS-DEF fish-DEF in pan

In the grammatical example (29), the verb moves to C and then to D, and it strands the clitic in these moves, as illustrated in (31). In the phonological component, Abs is grouped leftward, and it becomes part of the phonological realization of the V+D complex.  

5Note that the V+D complex may be in violation of the condition on spellout given in (23). Two options suggest themselves. First, we could explore reasons why this derived X'' might be immune from (23), or, we could adopt an analysis of relative clauses that does not involve successive head adjunction. This second alternative is explored by Basri (1999), who suggests that DP is right-headed, and that IP extraposes around D, stranding a V that has raised to C. As it stands, however, this is incompatible with the morpho-syntax to phonology mapping that is proposed in Basri, Broselow, Finer (1997) and Basri, Broselow, Finer, and Selkirk (1998).
For the case illustrated in (28), the prediction would be that the clitic should move along with the PP if the PP itself moves. Evidence of attachment of this sort comes from examples such as (32), which show an absolutive clitic on a PP that originates in a subordinate clause and is then extracted. Note that the clitic in (32b,c) agrees with the absolutive argument of the lower clause.

32. a. to-kua toko ri-koko=ko la-jatjaŋ
   1PL.ERG-say COMP in garden=2FAM.ABS 3ERG-see
   ‘You said that, in a garden, he saw you.’

   b. ri inte=ŋa mu-kua la-jatjaŋ
      where=1SG.ABS 2FAM.ERG-say 3ERG-see
      ‘Where did you say he saw me?’

   c. ri-koko-ko to-kua la-jatjaŋ
      in garden=2FAM.ABS 1PL.ERG-say 3ERG-see
      ‘In a garden, we said he saw you.’

Stranding the absolutive clitic in the subordinate clause is impossible; it must accompany the extracted PP. Examples such as these indicate that the clitic must be attached to the PP prior to syntactic movement so that it may be carried along to the front of the clause with the PP as it moves. And now we appear to have a paradox: Properties of spellout (2P) are feeding syntactic movement. The situation is summarized in (33).

33. overt syntax
    second position (2P) is enforced at/after spellout.
      IF
        relative clause
          fronted PP adverbial
            THEN
              THEN
                2P is met in situ
                2P is not satisfied in situ. Clitic is adjoined to PP
                  overt syntax
                    clitic is stranded inside clitic moves with PP
                      FP by head movement
                        clitic integrated into preceding material by phrasal phonology

Syntactic movement applies both before and after the 2P constraint is enforced, and attachment of the clitic to a host applies before and after movement (though by different mechanisms). We have solved part of the problem by appeal to two notions of adjunction, one syntactic and one phonological, but we are still in the position where
a spellout condition (2P) feeds operations in the overt syntax. As a first step in resolving the ordering problem, let us first note that the point at which syntax reenters the picture is when the lower CP is being constructed, after FP (an arguably CP-like structure itself) has already been assembled. We thus glimpse a classic diagnostic for a notion familiar from earlier stages of grammatical theory: the cycle.

An important feature of this sketch of the derivation, of course, is that there is no unified point at which spell-out applies to the sentence. According to the present proposal, spell-out of a particular FP takes place once it is constructed, and the constraints ensuring are then checked. As we have seen in the case of adverbial extraction, the particular spellout properties of FP are crucial to the next cycle.

An approach somewhat along these lines appears in recent work by Chomsky (1998), where it is suggested that 'phases' of the derivation, CP and vP in his terms, receive spellout prior to further merge. The analysis of the cliticization data here is clearly in line with such a suggestion, although it is clear that FP is the relevant category rather than CP as Chomsky suggests. FP, unlike TP in English however, does have an A' Specifier (like CP), and the CP projection of Selayarese clearly seems to belong more to the extended projection of the upper VP domain than the lower FP domain in at least one respect that was noted in Finer (1997). That is, the overt complementizers show overt Φ-features that agree with the upper subject rather than any constituent of the lower FP.

34. a. mu-kua muko la-isse?=i lako la-tambah=?i tedyop-itjo
    2FAM.ERG-sayCOMP 3ERG-know=3ABS COMP 3ERG-tether=3ABS buffalo-DEF
    i Baso?
    CLASS
    ‘You said that he knows that Baso tethered the buffalo.’

b. ku-kua kuko to-isse?=i toko la-tambah=?i
    1SG.ERG-say COMP 1PL.ERG-know=3ABS COMP 3ERG-tether=3ABS
tedyop-itjo i Baso?
    buffalo-DEF CLASS
    ‘I said that we know that Baso tethered the buffalo.’

So, I conclude that spellout is cyclic in Selayarese, affecting the FP 'phase' of the derivation. Further, enforcement of the 2P constraint is a feature of the immediately post-spellout rule and constraint system. Further, the representations thereby licensed or derived are input to the next cycle of overt syntax.

5.0 Other Austronesian cliticization patterns

That part of the derivation that contains the post-syntactic 2P constraints is based on the system proposed in Anderson (1999), where an assessment of syntactic structure in
Tagalog takes place before much of the regular phrasal phonology, but after the syntax proper. The distinguishing feature of the Selayarese system, however, is that the partial PF of a particular PP is input to further syntactic manipulation. Tagalog, on the other hand, appears to offer evidence for a fully post-syntactic treatment of 2P. Let us examine some Tagalog examples from Kroeger (1993) that show the interaction of 2P cliticization with adjunct fronting and topicalization.\(^7\) When the sentence is V-initial, the pronominal elements cliticize to the verb, but when an adjunct is fronted to TP-initial initial position, the clitic appears in second position with respect to the adjunct, as shown in the first set of examples. The Tagalog examples in (35)-(36) are taken from Kroeger (1993).

35. a. [Para kay=Pedro] **ko** binili ang=laruan
   for DAT=Pedro 1.SG_GEN PERF-buy-OV NOM=toy
   ‘For Pedro, I bought a toy.’
   b. [Sa=akin] **nila** ibinigay ang=pemyo
   DAT=me they(1GEN) IV-PERF-give OM=prize
   ‘To me they gave the prize.’

When the adjunct undergoes movement out of its clause, however, the clitic pronouns are stranded, and they appear in second position with respect to the verb, replaying the order seen in the typical V-initial clause.

36. a. Para kanino sinabi ni=Pedro=ng [binili niya
   for whom PERF-say-OV GEN=Pedro=COMP PERF-buy-OV
   3.SG_GEN
   ang=laruan]
   NOM=toy
   ‘For whom did Pedro say he bought a toy?’
   b. Kanino sinabi ni=Pedro=ng [ibinigay niya
   to.whom PERF-say-OV GEN=Pedro=COMP PERF-IV-give 3.SG_GEN
   ang=hera]
   NOM=money
   ‘To whom did Pedro say he gave the money?’

Tagalog cliticization in this context thus differs markedly from that discussed above in Selayarese in two important respects. First, the clitic remains in the lower clause; it is not transported along with the adjunct as it moves. Second, the clitic is

---

\(^7\) Anderson does not discuss successive-cyclic movement, nor does he address the issue of how the pronominal clitics (the ‘inflectional’ clitics) come to agree with the appropriate arguments, although he does suggest that they are merged after ‘derivational’ clitics. See Anderson (1999) for the distinction between inflectional and derivational clitics.
resolutely in second position in the lower clause, out of which the adjunct has been extracted; it does not remain in the position after the trace of the adjunct, for example. From the perspective of the Selayarese analysis outlined above, these two facts indicate that in Tagalog, the clitics and their hosts are not combined in the syntactic cycle, and that the clitic is not stranded in first position, showing that 2P is not enforced in the syntactic cycle in Tagalog. 2P is apparently fully post-syntactic, providing input only to the phonology proper.

In summary at this point, I have presented some data from Selayarese and an analysis that involves cyclic spellout as well as constraints on clitic position that are satisfied cyclically. What is important for the overall characterization of second position phenomena is that there are at least two ways in which 2P is satisfied in Selayarese. The first is essentially by doing nothing and spelling out elements in a particular order, and the second is by actively affecting the structural position of a spelled-out clitic element (i.e., right-adjoin it to a first-position constituent). In the next section, I discuss some 2P data from languages closely related to Selayarese. The facts show a systematic difference that can be succinctly captured by a set of 2P constraints that are quite similar to those proposed for Selayarese, but that differ somewhat in the domain over which they apply. This difference in domain has a remarkable effect on the phonological realization of the clitic, indicating that while some aspects of spellout are comparatively early, the full instantiation of the phonological matrix of the clitic must be rather late, after its position is established.

To begin, Makassarese and Koñjo are both members of the Makassar group of languages alongside Selayarese, and they, along with Bugis, another South Sulawesi language, share many of the features that we have encountered above. All have a 2P constraint on the absolutive clitic that yields patterns similar to what we have seen. They differ somewhat, however, in the nature of what can be a host to the absolutive clitic. The negative element is a host for the clitic in Selayarese, but NEG+Abs sequences in these languages result in ungrammaticality.

Koñjo (cf. Friberg 1991)
37. a. a?-lampa=a b. *anre?i=a a?-lampa
    INT-go=1SG.ABS NEG=1SG.ABS INT-go
    ‘I'm going.’

Bugis (cf. Brochie 1992)
    kill=1SG.ABS farmer NEG=1SG.ABS kill farmer
    ‘I killed a farmer.’

Makassarese
39. a. ku-cinik=i bawi-a b. *tena=i ku-cinik? bawi-a
    1SG.ERG-see=3ABS pig-DEF NEG=3ABS 1SG.ERG-see pig-DEF
    ‘I see the pig.’
While the clitic cannot adjoin to the negative element, it appears as though the negative element can count as the first item with respect to the 2P constraint, however. While it is impossible for the phi-features of the absolutive argument to be realized as an enclitic on negation, these features can be realized as a proclitic on the verb and thereby 2P can be met. What is particularly striking about the proclitic version is that it takes the shape of the corresponding element from the ergative series. Transitive verbs in a negative context thus carry two ergative markers. The leftmost one corresponds to the absolutive argument, while the second in line agrees with the ergative argument. Intransitive verbs, which do not ordinarily display ergative agreement, show an ergative prefix preceding the intransitive marker in negative contexts. Data illustrating this is shown below.

40. a. ane? ku-?lampa
    NEG 1SG.ERG-INT-go
    ‘I’m not going.’
    (Kojo)

        pa?galug
        1SG.ERG-(INT?)-kill farmer
        (Bugis)

    b. de u-wuno
        NEG 1SG.ERG-INT-go
        ‘I didn’t kill a farmer.’
        (Kojo)

    c. tera ku-na-cinik
        NEG 1SG.ERG-3ERG-see pig-DEF
        ‘The pig did not see me.’
        (Makassarese)

And even though the grammar of Selayarese does not allow preposed temporal adverbs to count as first position, data from Makassarese shows that they do count as first position elements, but not as clitic hosts. We therefore observe the ergative pattern of absolute spellout in Makassarese as one of the options:

41. a. ri subapi ku-na-sar-e ag doek-a
    at yesterday 1SG.ERG-3ERG-give-BEN money-DEF
    ‘Yesterday, he gave me money.’

        b. ri subapi na-sar-e ag a2 doek-a
        at yesterday 3ERG-give-BEN=1SG.ABS money-DEF
        ‘Yesterday, he gave me money.’

Similarly, the monosyllabic coordinating complementizer *na* can count as first position, but not as a host. Consider the following alternations.

42. a. na-pa-kanoe=a2
    3ERG-CAUS-eat=1SG.ABS and 3ERG-CAUS-drink=1SG.ABS
    ‘He fed me and he gave me a drink.’

        b. na-pa-kanoe=a2
        3ERG-CAUS-eat-1SG.ABS and 1SG.ERG-3ERG-CAUS-drink

        na
        ku-na-pa-ino
43. a. na-pa-kanre=ko  na  na-pa-inu=ko  
   \[3\text{ERG-CAUS-eat}=2\text{FAM.ABS} \quad \text{and} \quad 3\text{ERG-CAUS-drink}=2\text{FAM.ABS}\]
   'He fed you and he gave you a drink.'

b. na-pa-kanre=ko  na  nu-na-pa-inu
   \[3\text{ERG-CAUS-eat}=2\text{FAM.ABS} \quad \text{and} \quad 2\text{FAM.ERG-3ERG-CAUS-drink}\]

The picture thus has the following complicated structure. Some spellout information is necessary at the end of the syntactic cycle on a particular domain so that the 2P constraint can be satisfied. The final spellout position of the clitic must be visible so that the 2P constraints can properly identify the optimal candidate. On the other hand, the actual phonological form of the clitic cannot be determined until it is properly placed (see also Klamer 1997 for arguments for late spellout in Kambera). As a result, the sort of spellout that is required at the end of the cycle cannot be too literal, as it were. Perhaps all that is needed is some kind of marking that signals to the grammar that some items will be pronounced and others will not be. Then the particular conditions that determine the actual spellout shape will be enforced once the paradigm from which the clitic is chosen is established via its position.

The approach to the initial question of clitic placement in these languages that I will provisionally adopt involves a slight modification of the Selawarese 2P constraints. As we have seen, a particular lexicalization (absolutive vs. ergative in form) is dependent upon the position in which the grammar finds the clitic. The ranking in (44a) involves a redefinition of the domain for non-initiality, and (44b-c) define the conditions under which the clitic is lexicalized in Makassarese, Bugis, and Kofio.

44. a. Non-initial(abs, CP) >> Leftmost (abs, FP)
   b. Abs φ-features are lexicalized with respect to their position within FP.
   c. If Abs is non-initial within FP, it is lexicalized according to the absolutive paradigm. If initial, it follows the ergative paradigm

Consider example (41a) as an illustration. Following earlier discussion, let us assume that the temporal adverb is adjoined to a position outside the lowest segment of FP, but within CP. This is shown in the following schematic representation:

45. \[\text{[cp ... ADVP [fp ~ ABS ~ V ~ ... ]]}\]

If the clitic occurs non-initially with respect to the CP, it will follow the adverbial phrase, and if it occurs leftmost within FP, it will precede the V. (44b) is designed to
ensure that the upper context of CP does not figure in the realization of the clitic; only its position with respect to FP is considered.8

6.0 Conclusion

This paper examined the absolutive clitic in Selayarese and sketched its implications for the theory of grammar as outlined in, for example, Chomsky (1995, 1998, see also Epstein, et. al. 1998). One major conclusion is that, for some languages, second position may be defined within the syntactic cycle and that the result of this can feed the overt syntax. Further, second position was seen not to involve a designated syntactic position; rather, it was defined according to spellout linearity. Also, even within closely related languages, cliticization patterns were seen to vary, and the observed variation was accounted for through the establishment of different domains over which ordering constraints were defined.
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