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1. Introduction

This paper examines the absolutive/genitive alternation in Selayarese, an Austronesian language spoken on the island of Selayar in the Indonesian province of Sulawesi Selatan, and attempts to elucidate the mechanism that licenses the genitive marker in the language. In this paper, based on the data we collected, we will argue (i) that the genitive marker is licensed by the adnominal form of a predicate, or a nominalized predicate, in Selayarese, (ii) that not only XP movement, but also clitic movement, deletes intermediate Comps in Selayarese, and (iii) that clitic movement is not restricted to control structure, and can be long distance in Selayarese, unlike...
in Romance languages.

The organization of this paper is as follows. Section 2 reviews some basic syntactic properties of Selayarese as the background to subsequent sections. Section 3 provides data related to the absolutive/genitive alternation in Selayarese. Section 4 discusses what the newly found data might suggest for the theory of (Selayarese) syntax. Section 5 points out a remaining question arising from a comparison between Selayarese and Chamorro. Finally, Section 6 concludes the paper.

2. Background

This section reviews some basic syntactic properties of Selayarese. First, Selayarese is a head-initial language. Thus, a possessor genitive NP follows the noun it modifies, as shown in (1).\(^1\)

\begin{equation}(1) \text{ doeʔ-na} \text{ money-3G} \text{ ‘his money’} \end{equation}

Second, in Selayarese, an ergative language, the 3rd person absolutive marker \(i\) is obligatory on a verb that takes a complement, and the ergative marker is also present on the initial position of the verb, as shown in (2).\(^2\)

\begin{equation}(2) \text{ la-alle-i kanre-njo i Baso} \text{ 3E-take-3A food-the h Baso} \text{ ‘Baso took the food.’} \end{equation}

In (2), \(la\) on the verb is the 3rd person ergative marker, and \(i\) is the 3rd person absolutive marker. When the object is indefinite, however, the ergative marker is replaced by what Basri and Finer (1987) call an intransitivizer, as shown in (3). The intransitivizer also appears with an intransitive

---

\(^1\) The abbreviations used in this paper are as follows: 1 = first person, 2 = second person, 3 = third person, A = absolutive marker, Acc = accusative case, Adj = adjunct, C/Comp = complementizer, Cont = continuous form, D = determiner, E = ergative marker, Fut = future tense, G = genitive marker, Gen = genitive case, h = [+human] marker, Imp = imperative form, IN = infix, Int = intransitivizer, L = linker, Loc = locative, N = noun, Nmlz = nominalization, Nom = nominative case, Obl = oblique case, Past = past, Pl = plural, Pref = prefix, Prep = preposition, Pres = present, Rel = relative pronoun, Sg = singular, Subj = subjunctive, Suf = suffix, Top = topic, Unm = unmarked case and WH = wh-agreement form.

\(^2\) Selayarese does not mark tense explicitly, and the tense of the sentence is contextually determined. Therefore, the glosses of the predicates in the examples do not refer to time.
verb, as shown in (4).  

(3) (a)ng-alle-i kanre i Baso  
    Int-take-3A food h Baso  
    ‘Baso took (some) food.’

(4) ak-kelong-i i Baso  
    Int-sing-3A h Baso  
    ‘Baso sang.’

Third, the 3rd person absolutive marker $i$ is also obligatory on a verb that takes a clausal complement, as shown in (5).

(5) ku-isseɁ-i kuko la-jañjang-i i Ali i Baso  
    1E-know-3A that 3E-see-3A h Ali h Baso  
    ‘I know that Baso saw Ali.’

(Finer (1997: 687, ex. 6a) with slight editing)

Note here that as Maki and Basri (2013) point out, the complementizer is optional, as shown in (6).

(6) ku-isseɁ-i la-jañjang-i i Ali i Baso  
    1E-know-3A 3E-see-3A h Ali h Baso  
    ‘I know that Baso saw Ali.’ (Maki and Basri (2013: 589, ex. 3))

Fourth, the 3rd person absolutive marker $i$ disappears when a wh-phrase is moved across it. Thus, in (7), it is dropped.

(7) apa la-alle i Baso  
    what 3E-take h Baso  
    ‘What did Baso take?’

When long distance wh-movement takes place, the absolutive marker $i$ disappears from any verb crossed by the wh-phrase, namely, both the matrix as well as embedded verbs, and at the same time, the Comp(s) across which the wh-phrase moves must disappear, as shown in (8).

(8) apa₁ mu-isseɁ (*muko) la-ʔalle $t₁$ i Baso  
    what 2E-know that 3E-take h Baso  
    ‘What did you know that Baso took?’

(Finer (1997: 696, ex. 18a) with slight editing)

---

3 Note that not all intransitive verbs take an intransitivizer. Intransitive verbs such as rieɁ ‘come or exist,’ tinro ‘sleep’ and mate ‘die’ do not take an intransitivizer, while intransitive verbs such tallasa ‘live’ do.
3. Data

Having established some relevant background, let us now consider some data with the absolutive/genitive alternation. First, in adjunct clauses that express time, the absolutive marker is replaced with the genitive marker, as shown in (9)–(11). In (9a), in the time adjunct clause, the subject must be marked genitive, not absolutive. On the other hand, in (9b), which is an independent clause, the subject must be marked absolutive, not genitive.

(9) a. tinro-ɪ ri ?-lampa-mu/*-ko
   sleep-3A Prep Int-leave-2G/-2A
   ‘He was sleeping at the time you left.’

   b. a?-lampa-ko/*-mu tetteʔ tallu ngesala
      Int-leave-2A/-2G clock 3 morning
      ‘You left at 3 o’clock in the morning.’

In (10a), in the time adjunct clause, the subject is marked genitive, not absolutive. Note here that Selayarese has a rule on the position of clitics, which puts a clitic in the second position of the clause. Therefore, the genitive subject is on the preposition sangge ‘until’ in (10a). On the other hand, in (10b), which is an independent clause, the subject must be marked absolutive, not genitive.

(10) a. ri kantoro-na-i i Baso sangge-na/*-i rieʔ
      Prep office-3G-3A h Baso until-3G/-3A come
      ‘Baso was in his office until she came.’

   b. rieʔ-i/*-na
      come-3A/-3G
      ‘She came.’

In (11a), in the time adjunct clause, the subject is marked genitive, not absolutive. Due to the aforementioned rule on clitics, the genitive subject is on the preposition maing ‘after’ in (11a). On the other hand, in (11b), an independent clause, the subject must be marked absolutive, not genitive.

(11) a. am-baung-a ri maing-na/*-i ng-anre loka i Baso
      Int-wake.up-1A Prep after-3G/-3A Int-eat banana h Baso
      ‘I woke up after Baso had eaten a banana.’

   b. Ng-anre-i/*-na loka i Baso
      Int-eat-3A/-3G banana h Baso
      ‘Baso ate a banana.’

Second, in adjunct clauses that express reason, the absolutive marker is replaced with the genitive marker, as shown in (12). In (12a), in the reason adjunct clause, the subject must be marked genitive, not absolutive.
On the other hand, in (12b), an independent clause, the subject must be marked absolutive, not genitive.

(12) a. ngarrang-i pa mu-lappa?-na/*-i
cry-3A because 2E-slap-3G/-3A
‘He cried because you slapped him.’

b. mu-lappa?-i/*-na
2E-slap-3A/-3G
‘You slapped him.’

Third, in conditional clauses, the absolutive marker is not replaced with the genitive marker, as shown in (13).

(13) rannu-i ampa ric?-ko/*-mu
glad-3A if come-2A/-2G
‘He will be glad if you come.’

Fourth, in relative clauses, the absolutive marker is not replaced with the genitive marker, as shown in (14)–(16). In (14), the predicate in the relative clause is a transitive verb that takes one internal argument, and in (15) and (16), the predicate in the relative clause is a ditransitive verb that takes two internal arguments. Note that in (15), the subject is relativized, just as in (14), and in (16), the indirect object is relativized.4

(14) inni (tau) to-la-erang-injo-i/*-na kanre-njo.
this person person-3E-brought-the-3A/-3G food-the
‘This is the person who brought the food.’

(15) inni to-la-sare-ang-injo-i/*-na i Baso doi/*-injo
this person-3E-give-Suf-the-3A/-3G h Baso money-the
‘This is the person who gave the money to Baso.’

(16) inni to-la-sare-ang-injo-i/*-na doi/*-injo i Baso
this person-3E-give-Suf-the-3A/-3G money-the h Baso
‘This is the person to whom Baso gave the money.’

Fifth, the absolutive marker is not replaced with the genitive marker in an embedded clause within a time adjunct clause, as shown in (17).

4 Note that relativization of a direct object results in deleting the absolutive marker, as shown in (i).

(i) inni kanre, (nu) la-erang-injo(*-i) t₁ i Baso.
this food Rel 3E-brought-the-3A h Baso
‘This is the food which Baso brought.’

Therefore, no absolutive/genitive alternation will be expected in this case.
(17) aʔ-pallu-i ri la-isseeʔ-na lako ku-janjang-i/*-na saʔ-a-njo
Int-cook-3A Prep 3E-know-3G that 1E-see-3A/-3G snake-the
‘He was cooking at the time he knew that I saw the snake.’

Note that in the higher clause within the time adjunct clause, the absolutive marker is replaced with the genitive marker na ‘3G,’ as in la-isseeʔ-na ‘3E-know-3G.’ Note further that (17) with na ‘3G’ in the embedded clause is ungrammatical due to the fact that the clitic raising rule has not applied to the genitive marker, so that it has not moved to the position right after the higher na, which is the subject of the higher clause. However, even though the clitic moves to that position in (17), the resulting structure is ungrammatical, as shown in (18).

(18) *aʔ-pallu-i ri la-isseeʔ-na-na lako ku-janjang saʔ-a-njo
Int-cook-3A Prep 3E-know-3G-3G that 1E-see snake-the
‘He was cooking at the time he knew that I saw the snake.’

Note that it does not matter whether the 3rd person absolutive marker is on the embedded predicate, as shown in (19).

(19) *aʔ-pallu-i ri la-isseeʔ-na-na lako ku-janjang-i saʔ-a-njo
Int-cook-3A Prep 3E-know-3G-3G that 1E-see-3A snake-the
‘He was cooking at the time he knew that I saw the snake.’

Sixth, movement of an object wh-phrase, which results in deleting the absolutive marker, does not lead to it being replaced with the genitive marker, as shown in (20b).

(20) a. apa laʔ-alle(*-i) i Baso
what 3E-take-3A h Baso
‘What did Baso take?’

b. *apa laʔ-alle-na i Baso
what 3E-take-3G h Baso
‘What did Baso take?’

Note in passing that a subject wh-question, which requires the absolutive marker on the predicate, as shown in (21a), does not make us replace the absolutive marker with the genitive marker, as shown in (21b).

(21) a. inai laʔ-alle-i kanre-njo
who 3E-take-3A food-the
‘Who took the food?’

b. *inai laʔ-alle-na kanre-njo
who 3E-take-3G food-the
‘Who took the food?’
4. Discussion

Let us now consider what the above data might suggest for the theory of (Selayarese) syntax. First, the examples in (22) and (23) show that an overt noun may co-occur with the preposition that seems to be involved in genitive marker licensing.

(22) tinro-i ri allo ʔ-lampa-mu
sleep-3A Prep day Int-leave-2G
‘He was sleeping on the day you left.’

(23) ngarrang-i saba? pa mu-lappaʔ-na
cry-3A reason because 3E-slap-3G
‘He cried because you slapped him.’

This is also seen in relative clause formation in general, as shown in (24) and (25).

(24) hattu la-alle-na kanre-njo i Baso tetteʔ kaʔassa.
time 3E-take-3G food-the h Baso clock 9
‘The time when Baso took the food was 9 o’clock.’

(25) sabaʔ pa-la-alle-na kanre-njo i Baso gele-i aʔ-nassa
reason Pref-3E-take-3G food-the h Baso not-3A Int-clear
‘The reason why Baso took the food was not clear.’

In (24), the time nominal expression hattu ‘time’ is the head of the relative clause, and in (25), the reason nominal expression sabaʔ ‘reason’ is the head of the relative clause. In each of these examples, the logical subject of the relative clause is realized as the genitive marker na ‘3G.’ For the first approximation, then, let us assume the condition on genitive marker licensing in (26).

(26) Condition on Genitive Marker Licensing in Selayarese (First Approximation)
The genitive marker must be c-commanded by a nominal element.

To see if Condition (26) is correct, let us consider the example in (27).

Note that -i ‘3A’ in gele-i aʔ-nassa ‘not-3A Int-clear’ refers to the whole NP that precedes it, namely, sabaʔ pa-la-alle-na kanre-njo i Baso ‘reason Pref-3E-take-3G food-the h Baso.’
In (27), the genitive marker na ‘3G’ is on the embedded predicate, and in this case, the example is ungrammatical. Condition (26), however, will incorrectly predict that (27) is grammatical, because the nominal element hattu ‘time’ c-commands the genitive subject in the embedded clause. The crucial difference between (22) and (27) is the fact that the genitive marker involves local c-commanding in (22), and long distance c-commanding in (27). Therefore, we revise (26) to (28).

(28) Condition on Genitive Marker Licensing in Selayarese (Second Approximation)

The genitive marker must be locally c-commanded by a nominal element.

To see if the revised condition in (28) is correct, let us reconsider the example in (14), reproduced as (29), which involves subject relativization. (29) is ungrammatical when the genitive marker is on the predicate.

(29) inni (tau) to-la-erang-injo-i/*-na kanre-njo.

‘This is the person who brought the food.’ (= (14))

In (29), the relative head to ‘person’ is obviously a nominal element, and c-commands the genitive marker na ‘3G,’ yet the example is ungrammatical. Condition (28), which crucially relies on a c-commanding nominal element, would incorrectly predict that (29) is grammatical. Therefore, as long as we assume that what licenses the genitive marker in Selayarese is a nominal element, there will be no way to exclude examples such as (29). What will be then an alternative candidate for the genitive marker licensor? Here, it is worthwhile reviewing two major approaches to genitive subject licensing in Japanese.\(^6\) Miyagawa (1993, 2011) and Ochi (2001),

---

\(^6\) There are three more important proposals with respect to genitive subject licensing in Japanese. Harada (2002) proposes the modified linear Case marking approach, which crucially relies on the two default Case rules in (i), where KP is a phrase containing a Case feature to be activated in PF, and “#” indicates the boundary of a Case-marking domain.

(i) a. \(\emptyset \rightarrow \text{ga} /KP \_ (XP^*) \ T (C) \ # \) (clausal)
b. \(\emptyset \rightarrow \text{no} /KP \_ (XP^*) \ N \ # \) (nominal)
among others, propose that what licenses genitive subjects in Japanese is N/D. On the other hand, Watanabe (1996) and Hiraiwa (2001), among others, propose that what licenses genitive subjects in Japanese is the ad-

According to (ib), the genitive marker may appear on the subject when the predicate immediately precedes a noun. Then, (ib), when applied to Selayarese, would incorrectly predict (29) to be grammatical.

Miyagawa (2012, 2013) proposes the *v*-licensing approach to the genitive that appears in a clause whose tense is controlled by the tense of the higher clause, such as (ii), on the basis of its similarity in distribution to the genitive of negation in Slavic.

(ii) John-wa [ame-ga/-no yam-u made] ofisu-ni ita.
   ‘John was at his office until it stopped raining.’

In (ii), the tense of the predicate in the *made*-clause is determined by the tense of the predicate in the matrix clause, and the predicate in the *made*-clause is unaccusative. Miyagawa (2012, 2013) calls this type of genitive a genitive of dependent tense (GDT), and argues that the genitive subject *ame-no* ‘rain-Gen’ is licensed by *v* and dependent tense. If Selayarese exclusively relied on this mechanism, examples such as (11a), where the predicate *ng-anre* ‘Int-eat’ is accusative, would be incorrectly ruled out. Therefore, Selayarese should make use of another mechanism, even if it does make use of this mechanism in certain circumstances.

Kobayashi (2013), based on examples such as (iii), claims that Hiraiwa’s (2001) adnominal form approach is faced with a problem, and proposes a new approach based on [+/−Tense] in (iv), which crucially depends on the tense of the predicate that appears with a genitive subject. Note that in (iii), the predicate in the adjunct clause is in the continuous form, not the adnominal form.

(iii) [Hannin-ga/-no tsukamari-shidai], renraku-o kure.
    ‘Give me a call, as soon as the criminal is captured.’

(iv) An NP cannot be marked with (a) *-ga* in a [−Tense] domain or (b) with *-no* in a [+Tense] domain.

Assuming that the head C of an adjunct clause such as (iii) is defective, and [+Tense] on a defective C is inherited by T, Kobayashi (2013) proposes that in this configuration, TP Spec is outside of a [+Tense] domain or a [−Tense] domain, so that either a nominative or a genitive subject may appear in TP Spec in examples such as (iii). See Kobayashi (2013) for the exact mechanism of Case licensing. Examples such as Kobayashi’s (2013) (iii) are extremely important, as they clearly indicate that the adnominal form licensing approach cannot handle some cases in Japanese. However, Kobayashi’s (2013) approach cannot directly apply to genitive marker licensing in Selayarese, as it would incorrectly allow both the absolutive and genitive markers in adjunct clauses such as (12a).

Therefore, the additional three approaches illustrated in this footnote do not seem to be able to properly handle genitive marker licensing in Selayarese. Since the N/D licensing approach is also faced with a problem, it seems plausible at the present stage of our understanding that the adnominal form approach is the most promising, although the adnominal form of a predicate is not morphologically distinguished from the plain form of the predicate in Selayarese.
nominal form of a predicate. Since the N/D licensing approach cannot exclude (29), let us consider whether the adnominal form licensing approach can handle the case. The crucial difference between the ungrammatical example in (29) and the other grammatical examples is the fact that only (29) involves subject relativization, and the other examples involve non-subject relativization. It seems then that relativization in general abstractly nominalizes the predicate, or changes the form of the predicate to the abstract adnominal form, in Selayarese, but subject relativization cannot, although the exact mechanism behind this needs to be further investigated. If this line of reasoning is correct, and genitive marker licensing in Selayarese involves the abstract adnominal form of a predicate rather than a nominal element, the issue inherent in Condition (28) will be circumvented. Therefore, we propose (30) as the condition on genitive marker licensing in Selayarese.

(30) Condition on Genitive Marker Licensing in Selayarese (Final)
The genitive marker must be locally licensed by the adnominal form of a predicate.

We assume that the preposition or the head noun that co-occurs with the clause with the genitive marker nominalizes the predicate in the clause. We also assume that locality in (30) is defined as a minimal clause that contains the genitive marker. Although it is not clear that a minimal clause in the definition is an IP or CP, as it is not headed by an overt complementizer, whether it is an IP or CP will not affect the argument in this paper. Therefore, we will leave this question open here.

Second, in Selayarese, not only XP movement, but also clitic climbing, deletes intermediate Comps, as shown in (8), reproduced as (31), and (32).

(31) apa₁ mu-isseʔ (*muko) la-ʔalle t₁ i Baso
    what 2E-know that 3E-take h Baso
    ‘What did you know that Baso took?’ (= (8))

---

7 One of the referees points out that it is common crosslinguistically for languages to treat “higher” levels of relativization differently than “lower” levels of relativization, where “high” and “low” refer to the case-hierarchy with subject at the top, direct object and indirect object below, and so on, and that Givón (2001) provides a functional treatment of this phenomenon, which Selayarese exhibits.

8 Note that Chung (1982: 49) states that in Chamorro, a Malayo-Polynesian language just like Selayarese, wh-movement can nominalize the predicate in general, but subject wh-movement cannot, when the predicate is intransitive or in the irrealis form. It seems then correct that predicate nominalization is blocked in particular configurations in the two languages.
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(32) aʔ-pallu-i ri la-isseʔ-ku₁ (*lako) ang-janjang-t₁ saʔa
Int-cook-3A Prep 3E-know-1G that Int-see snake

‘He was cooking at the time he knew that I saw a snake.’

In (31), the wh-phrase generated in the embedded clause moves to the matrix clause, deleting the embedded Comp muko ‘that.’ In (32), the 1st person genitive marker ku undergoes movement from the verb in the embedded clause to the verb in the matrix clause, deleting the embedded Comp.

Note that when the embedded Comp is not deleted, the clitic on the verb in the embedded clause is realized as the 1st person absolutive marker a, and at the same time, the 3rd person genitive marker na is on the verb in the matrix clause, as shown in (33).

(33) aʔ-pallu-i ri la-isseʔ-na lako ang-janjang-a saʔa
Int-cook-3A Prep 3E-know-3G that Int-see-1A snake

‘He was cooking at the time he knew that I saw a snake.’

In (33), the 3rd person genitive maker na is required by the nominalized predicate in the matrix clause.

Let us now consider what (32) suggests. The base-structure of (32) is (34a), and the derived structure is (34b).

(34) a. V [CP C [IP V-ku₁…]]
     -1G
    b. V-ku₁ [CP C⁻t¹ [IP V-t₁…]]
     -1G

In (34), the 1st person genitive marker ku on the verb of the embedded clause moves to Comp of the embedded clause, and then, further moves to the verb in the matrix clause. Note that the embedded Comp should have been deleted by the fact that the marker adjoined to it in the course of the derivation. This is just like the Comp deletion under wh-movement involved in examples such as (31). The base-structure of (31) is (35a), and the derived structure is (35b).

(35) a. …[CP C [IP…apa…]]
     what
    b. [CP apa₁ C…[CP t’₁ C [IP…t₁…]]
     what

In (35), the wh-phrase base-generated in the embedded clause moves to the matrix CP Spec by way of the embedded CP Spec, where it deletes the Comp. Therefore, the data in (32) and (31) suggest a generalization on Comp deletion in Selayarese, as stated in (36).
Comp Deletion in Selayarese

A Comp is deleted by an element that moves into its minimal domain.

Minimal domain in Chomsky (1995) is roughly defined as follows. In (37), the minimal domain of X is \{a, b, c, d\}.

\[(XP \ a \ [XP \ b \ [X^c \ c-X \ d]]\]

Let us consider what mechanism lies behind the generalization on Comp deletion in Selayarese. Comp deletion or Comp alternation is a widely observed phenomenon in human language. For example, English shows the that-trace effect, as shown in (38), and Irish shows the go/aL alternation, as shown in (39). To our knowledge, Perlmutter (1971) first pointed out the that-trace effect in English, and McCloskey (1979) first examined the go/aL alternation in Irish.

(38) a. *Who do you think [CP that [IP t left]]?
   b. Who do you think [CP ø [IP t left]]?

(39) a. Creideann Seán [CP gur [IP cheannaigh Máire an carr]].
   ‘John believes that Mary bought the car.’
   b. *Cad é a chreideann tú [CP gur [IP cheannaigh Seán t]]?
   ‘What do you believe that John bought?’
   c. Cad é a chreideann tú [CP a [IP cheannaigh Seán t]]?
   ‘What do you believe that John bought?’

The contrast in (38) shows that English disallows wh-movement of a subject across the Comp that that immediately precedes it, but allows it when the preceding Comp is null. The examples in (39) show that the embedded clause of a declarative sentence is headed by the [−Q] Comp gur ‘that,’ but when the sentence involves wh-interrogative clause formation, the embedded Comp must change to the direct relative marker aL, and at the same time, another Comp aL must be inserted right after the wh-phrase. These data, along with the wh-movement data in Selayarese reported in Finer (1997), indicate that some languages overtly express Comp alternation, which includes Comp deletion, as it is a sort of alteration between an overt Comp and a phonetically null element.

Rizzi (1990: 52) proposes that Comp is realized either as that or Agr in English, and if Agr is selected for the head of Comp, it must be co-indexed with its Spec. This means that there is an agreement relation between Agr in Comp and a wh-operator that moves into its Spec position. McCloskey
(2002: 203) proposes that in Irish, Comp which bears both the $Op$-feature and the EPP-feature is realized as $aL$, under the assumption that the $Op$-feature enters into an agreement relation with a wh-phrase in IP/TP, and the EPP-feature forces overt movement of the wh-phrase into CP Spec. These two proposals both suggest that Comp alternation takes place when there is an agreement relation between the element in Comp and an element that is to be in agreement with it, and when the latter element moves into CP Spec. Note here that CP Spec is within the minimal domain of the element in Comp. In the case of (32), the 1st person genitive marker $ku$ on the verb of the embedded clause moves to Comp of the embedded clause, which is within the minimal domain of the phonetically null element in Comp, and then, further moves to the verb in the matrix clause for a phonological reason. If a head X can be in agreement with its corresponding element not only in its Spec, but also within its minimal domain, the agreement at issue in (32) is just an instance of general agreement, and Comp alternation (in this case, Comp deletion) is naturally expected.

Third, in Selayarese, unlike Romance languages, clitic climbing/movement is not restricted to control structure, and can apply at a long distance. As seen in (32), clitic climbing in Selayarese may move across a clause (CP). It is observed that clitic climbing across a clause is possible only in control structure in Romance languages, as shown by the examples in (40) from Italian and the examples in (41) from Spanish.

\[(40)\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{ Mario } \underline{lo} \text{ vuole leggere.} \\
& \text{Mario it want read} \\
& \text{‘Mario wants to read it.’} \\
& \text{(Burzio (1986: 322, ex. 1a) with slight editing) (Italian)} \\
\text{b. } & \text{ Mario vuole legger}\underline{lo}. \\
& \text{Mario want read.it} \\
& \text{(Burzio (1986: 323, ex. 4a) with slight editing) (Italian)}
\end{align*}\]

\[(41)\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{ Luis } \underline{las} \text{ quiere comer.} \\
& \text{Luis them want eat} \\
& \text{‘Luis wants to eat them.’} \\
& \text{(Aissen and Perlmutter (1983: 363, ex. 12a, ex. 10a) with slight editing) (Spanish)} \\
\text{b. } & \text{ Luis quiere comer}\underline{las}. \\
& \text{Luis want eat.them} \\
& \text{(Aissen and Perlmutter (1983: 363, ex. 12a, ex. 10a) with slight editing) (Spanish)}
\end{align*}\]

Furthermore, clitic climbing out of finite clauses is impossible in either Italian or Spanish, as the examples in (42) illustrate.
(42) a. *Gianni li vuole che (Maria) veda.
   Gianni 3Pl.Acc wants that Maria see.Subj.3Sg
   ‘Gianni wants Maria to see them.’
   (Kayne (1989: 243, ex. 15) with slight editing) (Italian)

b. *Juan los quiere que (María) vea.
   Juan 3Pl.Acc wants that María see.Subj.3Sg
   ‘Juan wants María to see them.’
   (Terzi (1994: 102, ex. 6) with slight editing) (Spanish)

Terzi (1994), however, shows that clitic climbing may take place from finite subordinate clauses in Salentino, a dialect of Italian spoken in the southern Italian provinces of Lecce, Brindisi and Taranto, as (43b) illustrates.

(43) a. We lu kkani.
   want-2Sg 3Sg.Acc buy.2Sg
   ‘You want to buy it.’

b. Lu we kkatti.
   3Sg.Acc want-2Sg buy.2Sg
   (Terzi (1994: 107–108, ex. 19a, ex. 19b) with slight editing)
   (Salentino)

However, (43b) is also characterized as a control structure.

On the other hand, the structure of the Selayarese example in (32), reproduced as (44), is not characterized as a control structure, as the verb that takes a subordinate clause is isseʔ ‘know.’

(44) aʔ- pallu-i ri la-isseʔ-ku₁ (*lako) ang-janjang-t₁ saʔa
   Int-cook-3A Prep 3E-know-1G that Int-see snake
   ‘He was cooking at the time he knew that I saw a snake.’
   (= (32))

As noted in footnote 2, Selayarese does not mark tense explicitly, and the tense of the sentence is contextually determined. In the context in which the sentence is uttered, the subordinate clause in the adjunct clause in (44) seems to refer to the past. If this is true, the nature of clitic climbing in Selayarese is different from the nature of clitic climbing in Romance languages to the effect that it is not restricted to control structure. This suggests that Selayarese genuinely allows long distance clitic climbing, which is actually allowed by the principles of UG. At the same time, this movement raises the interesting question as to what factor is involved in distinguishing clitic climbing in Selayarese from clitic climbing in the other languages. This is beyond the scope of the present study, and we will leave this question for future research.
5. A Remaining Question

In this paper, we have seen examples from Selayarese, and reached the conclusion that the genitive marker in Selayarese must be locally licensed by the adnominal form of a predicate, or a nominalized predicate. In the discussion, we saw that in Selayarese, wh-movement does not contribute to licensing the genitive marker, and specifically, does not nominalize the predicate, as illustrated by the examples in (20), reproduced as (45).

(45)  
   a. apa  la-ʔalle(*-i) i Baso  
       what  3E-take-3A h Baso  
       ‘What did Baso take?’
   b. *apa  la-ʔalle-na i Baso  
       what  3E-take-3G h Baso  
       ‘What did Baso take?’  (= (20))

However, according to Chung (1982, 1998) and Watanabe (1996), in Chamorro, which belongs to the Malayo-Polynesian branch of the Austronesian language family, just like Selayarese, wh-agreement induced by wh-movement licenses the genitive marker in the language. Chamorro is a Malayo-Polynesian language spoken in Guam. According to Chung (1982: 40), Chamorro “is a verb-initial language with a system of proclitic case markers and a split ergative system of verb agreement.” Chung (1982) provides the data in (46)–(48). (46) is a declarative sentence, and (47) and (48) are wh-interrogative sentences, involving overt wh-movement.

(46)  Ha-fahan si Maria i sanhilo’-ña gi tenda.  
      3E.Sg-buy Unm Maria the blouse-her Loc store  
      ‘Maria bought her blouse at the store.’  
      (Chung (1982: 50, ex. 34b) with slight editing)) (Chamorro)

(47)  Hafa f-in-ahan-ña si Maria gi tenda?  
      what IN-buy-her Unm Maria Loc store  
      ‘What did Maria buy at the store?’  
      (Chung (1982: 50, ex. 34a) with slight editing)) (Chamorro)

(48)  Hafa ha-fahan si Maria gi tenda?  
      what 3E.Sg-buy Unm Maria Loc store  
      ‘What did Maria buy at the store?’  
      (Chung (1982: 51, ex. 36a) with slight editing)) (Chamorro)

In (46), the subject ha ‘3E.Sg’ is ergative, and corresponds to the NP si Maria with an unmarked case, but in (47), where the object is wh-fronted, the verb is nominalized, as indicated by insertion of the infix in into the predicate, and the genitive marker na ‘her’ is attached to the nominalized predi-
cate. Watanabe (1996) argues that the genitive marker appears as a result of wh-agreement. Note that predicate nominalization by wh-movement is optional. Therefore, when this operation does not take place, the genitive marker does not appear, as shown in (48).

Note here that predicate nominalization may take place not only with an argument wh-phrase, as shown in (47), but also with an adjunct wh-phrase, as shown in (49).

(49) \[ \text{Taimänu malago’-} \text{mu si Pedro pärau-arekla lareta?} \]
\[ \text{how want.WH.Obl-your Unm Pedro Fut he-fix.WH.Adj the car?} \]

‘How do you want Pedro to fix the car?’

(Chung (1998: 211, ex. 9b) with slight editing) (Chamorro)

In (49), what is fronted is the adjunct wh-phrase taimänu ‘how,’ and the predicate is nominalized, as indicated by the wh-agreement form of the predicate malago’ ‘want.WH.Obl,’ which licenses the genitive marker mu ‘your.’

The above facts about the two related languages Selayarese and Chamorro indicate that while wh-movement does not contribute to nominalizing predicates in Selayarese, so that it does not license the genitive marker, wh-movement nominalizes predicates in Chamorro, licensing the genitive marker. The question remains why the two languages have come to possess different properties with respect to wh-movement and the consequences of this difference in predicate nominalization. At the present stage of our understanding, it is beyond our ability to provide an adequate answer to this question. However, what we learned from the facts from the two languages is clear. That is, in either language, the genitive marker is licensed by the adnominal form of a predicate, or a nominalized predicate.

Let us then examine whether the genitive marker must be locally licensed by the adnominal form of a predicate in Chamorro, just as in Selayarese. To do so, consider the examples in (50) and (51), where (51) is derived from (50) by long distance wh-movement of hafa ‘what.’

(50) \[ \text{Ha-sangan si Juan [na pära ta-goddi i chiba ni esti 3E-say Unm Juan C Fut we-tie the goat Obl this na tali].} \]
\[ \text{L rope} \]

‘Juan said that we should tie up the goat with this rope.’

(Chung (1982: 54, ex. 46c) with slight editing) (Chamorro)
(51) Hafa s-in-angan-ña si Juan [pära godde-tta ni what IN-say.Nmlz-his Unm Juan Fut tie.Nmlz-our Obl chiba t]? goat
‘What did Juan say that we should tie up the goat with?’

(Chung (1982: 54, ex. 45c) with slight editing) (Chamorro) In (51), the predicate in the embedded clause is nominalized, and the predicate in the matrix clause is also nominalized. In each clause, the subject is in the genitive form. Chung (1982), based on this and the other data, claims that wh-movement in Chamorro is successive cyclic, because every verb on the path between the wh-phrase and its original trace exhibits wh-agreement. Therefore, it can be said that in each clause in (51), the genitive marker is licensed by the adnominal form of the predicate, or the nominalized predicate. This indicates that the genitive marker in Chamorro must be locally licensed by the adnominal form of a predicate, just as in Selayarese. Therefore, the condition on genitive marker licensing in Selayarese in (30) also holds in Chamorro.

6. Conclusion

This paper investigated the distribution of the genitive marker in Selayarese, and attempted to elucidate the mechanism that licenses it. Based on newly elicited data, we argued (i) that the genitive marker in Selayarese must be locally licensed by the adnominal form of a predicate, (ii) that not only XP movement, but also clitic movement, deletes intermediate Comps in Selayarese, and (iii) that the nature of clitic climbing in Selayarese is different from that of clitic climbing in Romance languages to the effect that it is not restricted to control structure. We also showed that the genitive marker must be locally licensed by the adnominal form of a predicate both in Selayarese and Chamorro, although wh-movement nominalizes predicates in Chamorro, while wh-movement does not contribute to nominalizing predicates in Selayarese.
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