

A DESCRIPTION OF BASIC CLAUSE STRUCTURE IN BUGIS

Chris Hanson
La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia

1. The Bugis language and the south Sulawesi language family

Bugis is a member of the Western Malayo-Polynesian branch of the Austronesian family of languages (Blust 1978), spoken by about 3.2 million speakers on the south-west peninsula of Sulawesi (formerly known as 'The Celebes'). Bugis, Torajan, Konjo, Mandar and Makassarese make up a family (one of nine putatively identified on the island of Sulawesi (Noorduyn 1991: 137)) known as 'South Sulawesi Languages'. A further distinction is made between the languages of central and south-eastern Sulawesi and those of south Sulawesi. The former, comprising the Tomini-Tolitoli, Kaili-Pamona, Saluan, Bungku-Mori-Tolaki and Muna-Buton subgroups, have been classified by Van Den Berg (1996: 90–4) as 'Celebic' languages, and according to him they are the most 'indigenous' to Sulawesi.

What distinguishes the six subgroups which are found in central, south and south-east Sulawesi is the presence of 'conjugated' verb forms.¹ By 'conjugated' verb forms is meant the marking of person and case on the verb by means of clitic pronominal elements. Common to all these languages is the organisation of these clitic pronominals into sets of ergative proclitics and absolutive enclitics, with the ergative proclitics being used only in transitive constructions with a definite patient. The phonological shape of these clitics is similar in languages from all six subgroups,² as are the shapes of the free pronouns.

The few descriptions available of languages belonging to these subgroups tend to use the terminology of Philippine linguistics, distinguishing actor focus and object focus (for example Barr 1988 on Da'a and Martens 1988 on Uma). These two-way focus systems have different realisations in the realis and irrealis modes. These languages also possess an inflectional prefix marking tense. The South Sulawesi languages, on the other hand, have no grammaticalised distinction between realis and irrealis mode, nor do they display inflectional tense forms.

The notion of a South Sulawesi language group was first introduced by Esser (1938) and also appears in the *Language Atlas of the Pacific Area* (Wurm and Hattori 1983). Mills (1975a, 1975b) worked out his proto-language construction for the same group. The South Sulawesi stock established by Grimes and Grimes (1987) on lexicostatistic data also matches Esser's grouping. Friberg (1990) has also shown the similarities across the case marking systems of the languages ascribed to this group. For the exclusively shared innovations that characterise the South Sulawesi group the reader is referred to Hanson (1998).

2. Basic clause structure in Bugis

2.1 Pronominal clitics

The notion of ergativity frequently appears in discussions of western Malayo-Polynesian languages and often proves problematic (see the various contributions to this volume). However, in Bugis it is clear that there is an ergative-absolutive pronominal system in that there are two series of clitic pronouns; a set of proclitics for the Agent of a transitive verb (A),

¹From the Dutch *vervoegde vormen*, used in the older literature on Sulawesi languages.

²For the sake of brevity in this overview I make some rather broad generalisations. Data from the Bungku-Mori-Tolaki and Muna-Buton groups is limited. In addition, not all the languages included in the above subgroups (for instance Kaili) have full paradigms for the clitic pronouns, while others show some formal variance in their paradigms.

and a set of enclitics for the subject of an intransitive predicate (S) and the Patient of a transitive verb (P).

The absolutive enclitics

	Singular	Plural
1st person	<i>-kaq</i>	<i>-manəŋ-ŋi</i>
2nd person	<i>-ko / ki</i>	<i>-manək-ko</i>
3rd person	<i>-i</i>	<i>-manəŋ-ŋi</i>

The ergative proclitics

	Singular	Plural
1st person	<i>u -</i>	<i>i -</i>
2nd person	<i>mu - / ta -</i>	<i>ta -</i>
3rd person	<i>na -</i>	<i>na -</i>

(*-ki* is a polite 2nd person form while *-□□* is the more formal)

2.2 Intransitive and transitive clauses

In an intransitive clause S is cross-referenced by an enclitic from the absolutive series as in (1).

- (1) *Jokka-i* *Ali*
 go-3ABS Ali
 'Ali went.'

In a transitive clause P is cross-referenced by an enclitic of the absolutive series and A is cross-referenced by an ergative proclitic:

- (2) *U-nasu-i* *nanre-e*
 1E-cook-3ABS rice-ART
 'I cook the rice.'

Only clauses with definite Patients are encoded as transitive sentences in Bugis. Where the Patient is indefinite, it is not cross-referenced and the so-called 'nasal construction' is used. The verb is marked with the nasal prefix *ma(C)-*, glossed as (A)ctor F(ocus), and the Actor is cross-referenced by an absolutive enclitic.³ This means that the clause is formally intransitive. Compare the transitive clause in (3) with the intransitive clause in (4).

- (3) *Na-baca-i* *boq-e*
 3E-read-3ABS book-ART
 'He is reading the book.'
- (4) *Mab-baca-i* *boq*
 AF-read-3ABS book
 'He is reading a book.'

It is also possible to omit the Patient in a nasal construction such as (4) altogether.

- (5) *Mab-baca-i*
 AF-read-3ABS
 'He is reading.'

The nasal prefix also occurs on most one-place verbs, as in (6):

³ The bracketed *C* in *ma(C)-* indicates a gemination in the initial consonant of the root. For vowel-initial roots, this prefix may be realised as *maN-*, *mar-* or *m-* depending on the morphological class of the verb.

- (6) *Ma-tinro-i* *Nasmilla*
 AF-sleep-3ABS Nasmilla
 ‘Nasmilla is sleeping.’

The few intransitive verbs that do not take *ma(C)-* are mostly verbs of motion and stance including *lokka* ‘go’, *jokka* ‘walk’, *pole* ‘come’, *lao* ‘go’, *lari* ‘run’ and *tudaN* ‘sit’.

The fact that an indefinite patient cannot be cross-referenced by an absolutive enclitic plays a part in the interpretation of the following pair:

- (7) a. *Na-anre-i* *makunrai-e*
 3E-eat-3ABS woman-ART
 ‘Something ate the woman.’
- b. *Na-anre-i* *makunrai*
 3E-eat-3ABS woman
 ‘A woman ate it.’

In Bugis the absolutive set of enclitics generally cross-reference definite Patients in a two-place predicate. In (7a) *makunrai-e* is a definite NP and is therefore cross-referenced as the Patient. In (7b) *makunrai* is indefinite and cannot be taken to be the Patient, and the enclitic represents an anaphorically definite entity as the Patient. *Makunrai* is now interpreted as the Agent.

It should be noted that where an argument is placed before the verb it is not cross-referenced.

- (8) *Ali ma-tinro*
 ‘Ali is sleeping’

2.3 The passive construction

There is also a passive construction formed by prefixing *ri-* to a bare verb root. In all but the most careful speech or when prefixed to a root beginning with /i/ where vowel coalescence occurs, the passive prefix is pronounced as [i]. The following three examples show the contrast between the basic transitive construction, the nasal construction and the passive construction.

Active transitive construction:

- (9) *Na-anre-i* *Basra* *bale-e*
 3E-eat -3ABS Basra fish-ART
 ‘Basra ate the fish.’

Nasal construction:

- (10) *M-anre -i* *Basra* *bale*
 AF-eat-3ABS Basra fish
 ‘Basra ate fish.’

Passive construction:

- (11) *Ri-anre-i* *bale-e* (*ri Basra*)
 PASS-eat-3ABS fish-ART (PREP Basra)
 ‘The fish was eaten (by Basra).’

The Bugis passive is no more morphologically marked than an intransitive nasal construction — in the passive construction *ri-* simply substitutes for the nasal prefix. However, the passive construction can be considered to be a marked construction in terms of its text frequency and specialised functions. Bugis is a morphologically ergative language, encoding both the Patient and the intransitive Subject similarly in contradistinction to the Agent. Thus the Patient in an

ergative construction is encoded the same way as it would be if it were to occur as the single core argument in a passive construction. In (10) the absolutive 3rd person clitic cross-references the semantic agent which, in the nasal construction, is encoded as an intransitive Subject (an absolutive). In (11) it is the Patient which is cross-referenced by the absolutive, and the agent is encoded optionally by a prepositional phrase. That it is the Patient that is cross-referenced is demonstrated by the following examples, with 1st and 2nd person Patients being encoded as absolutive intransitive subjects in passive constructions:

- (12) *Ri-suro-kaq ri polisi-e*
 PASS-order-1ABS PREP police-ART
 'I was ordered by the police.'
- (13) *R-ita-ko ri Agus*
 PASS-see-2ABS PREP Agus
 'You were seen by Agus.'

Word order and cross-reference patterns in passive constructions follow the same principles as those found in one-place nasal constructions. Thus when an NP is fronted, it is not cross-referenced on the verb:

- (14) *Basra ri-tikk'ŋ Basra* PASS-catch
 'Basra was caught.'
- (15) *Ri-tikk'ŋ-ŋi Basra*
 PASS-catch-3ABS Basra
 'Basra was caught.'

The subject of a passive cannot be indefinite:

- (16) **Anaq ri-okko (ri) asu*
 child PASS-bite (PREP) dog
 'A child was bitten by a dog.'

The passive can only be formed with non-stative semantically transitive verbs. Thus a verb like *punna* 'to have', which is grammatically transitive in that it takes both ergative and absolutive clitics, can not be passivised in Bugis.

3. Semantic transitivity and the formal marking of clauses

3.1 Transitive clauses

In general, there is a cross-linguistic correlation between semantic transitivity and formal transitivity as pointed out in Hopper and Thompson (1980). However, in Bugis we find that factors such as whether the verbal aspect is telic versus atelic, or punctual versus non-punctual, are not relevant to transitivity. The only relevant factor is the definiteness of the patient. The term 'definite' is in fact not accurate; nor is it 'specific'. The transitive construction is used where the Patient is a proper name, a pronoun, or a noun marked as definite as in (17) and (18), which illustrate definite marking with abstract nouns.

- (17) *na-poji-i apabelay -ŋ e*
 3E-love-3ABS glory-ART
 'He loves glory.'
- (18) *napitay-ŋ i kessiy-ŋ e*
 3E-show-3ABS sympathy-ART
 'She showed sympathy.'

Now consider the following pair:

- (19) *U-poji-i* *bir-e* *tasis'η-sis'η*
 1E-like-3ABS beer-ART occasionally
 'I like (a) beer occasionally.'
- (20) *ma-tajek-kaq* *anaq* *sikola*
 AF-wait-1ABS PREP student
 'I'm waiting for a student.'

It is assumed that the Patient argument in (19) (*bir*) is referentially identifiable to the hearer although no specific manifestation is referred to, so it is treated as P and cross-referenced by an absolutive clitic in a transitive construction. In (20) the context is that the awaited student is specific and known to the speaker, but not identifiable to the addressee. It is encoded as a prepositional phrase in an intransitive construction.

3.2 The split in marking of intransitive clauses

The borderline between the use of the transitive and intransitive constructions would appear to be somewhat unclear in light of the following:

- (21) *Na-caca-i* *asu-e*
 3E-hate-3ABS dog-ART
 'He hates dogs.'

Here we have the transitive construction; in contrast, the intransitive nasal construction is used for 'cook rice', 'eat fish' and 'like apples' as in (22), where the patient is incorporated in the verb.

- (22) *Map-poji-appel-kaq*
 AF-like-apple-1ABS
 'I like apples.'

Since negative polarity is less semantically transitive than positive polarity, one might expect transitive verbs to appear in intransitive constructions in negative clauses. What we find in negated clauses in Bugis is not an alternation in construction type, but an alternation in marking. Curiously, it is not in the expected direction. Ergative proclitics are used in all negative clauses, including those with one-place intransitive predicates. The following contrasting pairs illustrate this:

- (23) *Deq* *na-bunu-i* *asu-e* *Ali*
 NEG 3E-kill-3ABS dog-ART Ali
 'Ali didn't kill the dog.'
- (24) *Jokka-i* *Ali*
 go-3ABS Ali
 'Ali went.'
- (25) *Deq* *na-jokka* *Ali*
 NEG 3E-go Ali
 'Ali didn't go.'
- (26) *Lao-kaq* *ri* *Cabbenge*
 go-1ABS PREP Cabbenge
 'I went to Cabbenge.'
- (27) *Deq* *u-lao* *ri* *Cabbenge*
 NEG 1E-go PREP Cabbenge
 'I didn't go to Cabbenge.'

(28) *Map-poji-appel-kaq*
AF-like-apple-1ABS
'I like apples.'

(29) *Deq u-poji-appel*
NEG 1E-like-apple
'I don't like apples.'

The same pattern appears with adjectival predicates:

(30) *Deq na-ma-doko*
NEG 3E-sick
'He's not sick.'

The ergative proclitics are also used with the negative aspectual marker *deq pa* meaning 'not yet', as in:

(31) *Idi riolo deq pa na-tingka-tingka*
1PL before not yet 3E-layer-layer
'Before us it didn't yet have any stories.' (i.e. as in a multi-storied building)

(32) *Deq pa na-lao*
not yet 3E-go
'He hasn't gone yet.'

The same pattern also occurs with an adjectival predicate:

(33) *Deq pa u-ma-tekko*
not yet 1E-tired
'I'm not tired yet.'

The ergative proclitics are also used in prohibitives:

(34) *Aja sapa mu-aja iyaku deq pa na-genne*
don't before 2E-pay if not yet 3E-enough
'Don't pay if you don't yet have enough (money)!'

(35) *Aja mu-jokka*
don't 2E-go
'Don't go!'

These contrast with positive imperatives, which take an absolutive enclitic:

(36) *Jokka-koq* (or more politely *Jokka-kiq!*)
go-2ABS
'Go!'

(37) *Anre-i iyaro bale*
eat-3ABS that fish
'Eat that fish.'

However, in the polite form of the imperative, the Agent is overt and cross-referenced by the polite form of the 2nd person ergative proclitic in both intransitive and transitive commands:

(38) *Ta-jokka-na*
2E-go (-NA)
'(Please) go!'

(39) *T-ala-ni otto-ku*
2E-take(-NI) car-1POS
'(Please) take my car.'

The ergative proclitics are also used in content questions.

- (40) *Magi nappa mu-ʻyka*
why then 2E-be.present
'Why then are you here?'

4. Word order and cross-referencing

In an intransitive sentence with a definite S, the following word orders may occur:

- (41) *Ma-tinro-i (Ali)*
(42) *Ali ma-tinro (=8)*
'Ali is sleeping.'

Example (41) answers the question *Tegai Ali ?* 'Where's Ali?'. The ordering of the constituents here can be characterised as Focus-Topic, *Ali* being the topic. Note that *Ali*, having already been introduced as a full, independent topic NP, would under normal circumstances not be reiterated as in (41), and would be represented solely by the absolutive enclitic. Reiteration here is only for emphasis. For added emphasis or for the purposes of expressing additional pragmatic intent the following sentence might be uttered: *Ali, ma-tinro-i*, with an intonation break between the NP and the predicate. This sentence might have a similar performative intent as the English response 'Ali, the lazy sod, he's sleeping'. The sentence (42) may be uttered as a response to the question *Niga ma-tinro?* 'Who is sleeping?'. Here new information is being introduced, and this information is fronted. Note that there is no absolutive cross-referencing on the verb, absolutive cross-referencing as a rule being constrained to already established (and hence referentially definite) discourse topics. In the case of indefinite intransitive subjects, (which in fact only arose in elicitation contexts), the ordering is always SV as in *anaq ma-tinro* 'A child is sleeping'.

The above word orders can be explained by Cooreman's claim that in 'free word order languages', the placing of S before V correlates highly with referential discontinuity:

SV order marks a disruption in referential continuity in the sense that this pattern commonly refers to either a new person or object, or to one that has not been mentioned recently...VS order on the other hand marks referential continuity (Cooreman 1992: 243).

As mentioned above, sentences with two independent NPs rarely occur in Bugis discourse. The fact that they may possibly occur, and that these types of sentences can be elicited, suggests that they should in some way be accounted for. Brotche (1993) provides the following information, in an Honours thesis based on data obtained through elicitation sessions with a native Bugis speaker resident in Melbourne. Using as her independent variable the definiteness of either NP in exhaustive combinations, she found there were twenty-two permutations available to express the proposition 'Farmer kills butcher'. To express the negation of this proposition, seven permutations were possible. The only constraint she found was that in a sentence with two indefinite NPs, the verb must occur in the medial position. Some of her conclusions regarding the structural features in her data were: fronted NPs are not generally cross-referenced on the verb (cf. (42) above); an immediately post-verbal A NP may trigger cross-referencing, regardless of the definiteness of this NP; and, unlike in affirmative sentences, pre-verbal Patients in negative clauses must trigger cross-referencing irrespective of definiteness. Although her findings were generally confirmed by my own elicited data, some of her elicited types never occur in actual texts. It is difficult to ascertain how many of these construction types were an artificial result of elicitation techniques. However, the fact that it is possible to elicit tokens of various types

points to the logical possibility (in terms of lack of grammatical constraints) of a multitude of word-order types occurring in Bugis.

A typological distinction can be made between those languages in which word order primarily correlates with pragmatic factors, and those in which word order primarily correlates with grammatical functions or other factors deriving from the language's syntax. Bugis clearly belongs to the former category.

With two indefinite NPs, neither NP is cross-referenced on the verb, and an AVP word order disambiguates semantic roles:

- (43) *Pagaluj peppe pajala*
farmer hit fisherman
'A farmer hit a fisherman.'

It is noted that constructions like (46) do not appear in my textual data and could possibly be solely the result of persistent elicitation techniques. It is also noted that a small minority of speakers gave this type of construction in a PVA form.

As previously mentioned, clauses with two independent NPs occur extremely rarely in the data. It would seem that there must be a way in this language of disambiguating two definite NPs of equal 'topicality', where the semantics of the verb and contextual considerations do not provide the means for disambiguation. The fact that the preverbal NP in Bugis is not cross-referenced on the verb does provide such a means, as a comparison of the following pair of sentences reveals:

- (44) *Basra pepp-i Baco*

- (45) *Basra na-peppe Baco*

In both (44) and (45) *Basra* is the preverbal NP. In (44) the absolutive enclitic indicates that it is the Agent that is not cross-referenced; therefore *Basra* will be taken to be the Agent. In (45) it is the Patient that is not cross-referenced, as indicated by the absence of an absolutive enclitic on the verb. Therefore *Basra* will be taken to be the Patient. Thus Bugis does have a means by which to disambiguate two definite NPs, but this means is not based on word order.

It is worth noting that I have found no instance in my data where the fronting of an NP, along with the use of either of the cross-referencing patterns described above, could be considered to be primarily motivated by the need to disambiguate semantic roles. Rather, these patterns seem to be motivated primarily by discourse considerations, where new information tends to be fronted.

5. Clitic-taking words other than lexical verbs

The account given so far does not cover every detail of independent clauses. For instance, the exemplification has been confined to sentences where the clitics appear on the lexical verb. In fact clitics tend to gravitate to the first word in the clause. For example, where there is an auxiliary, and the auxiliary precedes the verb, it will host the clitics as in (46):

- (46) *Harusu-kaq lao ri Bone*
must-1ABS go to Bone
'I must go to Bone.'

The clitics may also appear on other words, usually function words in the first position in the clause. For example:

- (47) *Okko-ka maj-jama*
here-1ABS AF-work
'I work here.'

In the following example the clitic *-kaq* appears on *nacedde* ‘nearly’, the first word in the second clause.

- (48) Namassun-na ri laleʔ loppo-e nacedde-kaq
 go.out-1PF. PREP road big-ART nearly-1ABS
ma-luluq oto loppo.
 AF-crash.into car big
 ‘I had gone out onto the main road and nearly crashed into a big car.’

6. Reflexive Constructions

Reflexive propositions are encoded as transitives with a reflexive pronoun *ale* ‘self’, to which possessor enclitics are added for the different arguments. For example:

- (49) *Na-rʔte-i ale-na*
 3E-cut-3ABS him/herself
 ‘He/she cut him/herself.’
- (50) *U-sʔsse-i ale-ku*
 1E-blame-3ABS myself
 ‘I blame myself.’

7. Advancements

As in other western Malayo-Polynesian languages, in Bugis there are derivational means by which a beneficiary or location may be encoded in the same way as the Patient of a basic transitive verb. In (51a) the beneficiary is encoded in a prepositional phrase. In (51b) the verb is suffixed with *-N-* and *Ali* is cross-referenced by the absolutive enclitic. Note that the Patient in (51a) is not cross-referenced since it is indefinite, and note too that the Agent is not cross-referenced in either example since it occurs before the verb.

- (51)a. *Mila tiwi bale ku Ali*
 Mila bring fish PREP Ali
 ‘Mila brought fish for Ali.’
- b. *Mila tiwir-ʔ-ʔ i Ali bale*
 Mila bring-BEN-3ABS Ali fish
 ‘Mila brought Ali fish.’

The next pair illustrate locative advancement. In (52a) the locative is marked by *ri-asen-na* and *Ali* is cross-referenced by an absolutive enclitic. In (52b) the locative has been advanced to direct object and the clause is transitive. *Ali* is now cross-referenced by the ergative proclitic and the bench by the absolutive enclitic.

- (52)a. *Tuda - i Ali ri-asen-na ba ko-e*
 sit-3ABS Ali on bench-ART
 ‘Ali sits on the bench.’
- b. *Na-tuda - i Ali ba ko-e*
 3E-sit-3ABS Ali bench-ART
 ‘Ali occupies the bench.’

8. Conclusion

Givón (1984: 164) has claimed that the morphosyntactic encoding of transitivity relations is a salient feature of ergative languages. As Givón expresses it, such a system “abides neither by the pragmatics of the ‘subject’ nor by the semantics of agent/non-agent. Rather, it abides roughly by the transitivity of the clause” (1984: 151). As has been demonstrated above, it is

only the definiteness of the patient argument that triggers a (transitive) ergative construction, and while this may be construed as a function of clausal transitivity in the sense of Hopper and Thompson (1980), there is another possible analysis. Naylor has claimed that:

focus...(rather than)...subject, transitivity, or case is the organising principle that underlies verbal predication not only in the Philippine-type languages, but in other Austronesian languages as well...focus appears to be a family trait in Austronesian languages and it is this principle that underlies the various manifestations described as voice, transitivity or aspect (1978: 395).

Naylor also claims that "...although dealing with the same phenomena, transitivity has focussed on traditional subject-object relations, focus as an analytic perspective has taken more into account the referential properties of the NPs involved" (1978: 432).

It would seem that the property that triggers an ergative construction in Bugis (i.e. the definiteness of the Patient) is also the property which is most integral to focus — that is, referential identifiability.

Thus there are two accounts for the Bugis data: an 'ergative' analysis or a 'focus' analysis. If Bugis is viewed as having an ergative system, then those clauses which have an inherently transitive verb prefixed with *ma(C)*- with the Agent encoded by an absolutive enclitic could be classed as antipassive. On the other hand, Bugis may be viewed as operating on a 'focus' system; the unmarked focus being 'Patient focus', the *ma(C)*- construction indicating 'Agent focus' and the benefactive and locative suffixes (-əŋ and -i) representing 'Benefactive' and 'Locative' focus respectively. Thus the constraint on the *ma(C)*- construction occurring with a definite Patient can be accounted for by the maxim 'one clause — one focus', with the grammar requiring that the focus be the definite Patient which is encoded as an absolutive. The Agent can only occur as an absolutive (in a *ma(C)*- or 'Actor Focus' construction) when the Patient is indefinite.

It may be argued that the morphologically ergative character of Bugis in encoding a focus system is a coincidental consequence of its structural properties. Himmelman (1996) seems to arrive at this conclusion for other (Central) Sulawesi languages, claiming that to try to class Sulawesi languages in terms of either a focus system or an ergative system leaves a number of important issues unaccounted for from a typological perspective. Whatever the case, as Martens (1988) has demonstrated for the Celebic language Uma, both an 'ergative' and a 'focus' analysis are possible for Bugis transitive constructions.

ABBREVIATIONS

ABS	absolutive	AF	actor focus	ART	article
BEN	benefactive	ERG	ergative	PASS	passive
POSS	possessive	PREP	preposition		

REFERENCES

- Barr, D. F. 1988. Da'a verbal affixes and clitics. In H. Steinhauer (ed.), *Papers in Austronesian linguistics* No. 3. *Pacific Linguistics*, A-79.
- Blust, R. 1978. *Eastern Malayo-Polynesian: A subgrouping argument*. *Pacific Linguistics*, C-61.
- Brotche, A. 1993. *Word order in Bugis*. Honours Thesis. Melbourne: University of Melbourne.
- Cooreman, A. 1992. The pragmatics of word order variation in Chamorro narrative texts. In D. L. Payne (ed.), *Pragmatics of word order flexibility*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 243-65.
- Esser, S.J. 1938. *Atlas van Tropisch Nederland*, Sheet 9b. Amsterdam: Nederlandsch Aardrijkskundig Genootschap.
- Friberg, B. 1990. Ergativity, focus and verb morphology in several South Sulawesi languages. In R. Harlow and R. Clark (eds), *Vical 2, Western Austronesian and contact languages: papers from the fifth international conference on Austronesian linguistics, Auckland, New Zealand*. Auckland: University of Auckland Press, 103-30.
- Givón, T. 1984. *Syntax: a functional-typological introduction*. Vol. 1. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Grimes, C. and B. Grimes. 1987. *Languages of South Sulawesi*. *Pacific Linguistics*, D-78.
- Hanson, C. 1998. *A grammar of Bugis based on the Soppeng dialect*. PhD dissertation. Melbourne: La Trobe University.
- Himmelman, N. P. 1996. Person marking and grammatical relations in Sulawesi. In H. Steinhauer, (ed.), *Papers in Austronesian linguistics* No. 3. *Pacific Linguistics*, A-79, 115-36.
- Hopper, P. and S. Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in grammar and discourse. *Language* 56: 251-99.
- Martens, M. 1988. Notes on Uma verbs. In H. Steinhauer, (ed.). *Papers in Austronesian linguistics* No. 3. *Pacific Linguistics*, A-79, 167-237.
- Mills, R.F. 1975a. *Proto South Sulawesi and proto Austronesian phonology*. PhD dissertation. University of Michigan.
- _____. 1975b. The reconstruction of proto south Sulawesi. *Archipel* 10: 205-24.
- Naylor, P. B. 1978. Towards focus in Austronesian. In S. Wurm and L. Carrington, (eds), *Second international conference on Austronesian linguistics: Proceedings*. *Pacific Linguistics*, C-61, 395-442.
- Noorduyn, J. 1991. The languages of Sulawesi. In Steinhauer, H., (ed.), *Papers in Austronesian linguistics* No.1. *Pacific Linguistics*, A-81, 137-50.
- Van Den Berg, R. 1996. The demise of focus and the spread of conjugated verbs in Sulawesi. In H. Steinhauer, (ed.), *Papers in Austronesian linguistics* No. 3. *Pacific Linguistics*, A-79, 89-114.
- Wouk, F. 1984. Transitivity in Proto-Malayan-Polynesian and proto-Austronesian. *Focal 1: Papers from the fourth international conference on Austronesian linguistics*. *Pacific Linguistics*, C-93, 133-58.
- Wurm, S. and S. Hattori, (eds). 1983. *Language atlas of the Pacific area*, Part 2. *Pacific Linguistics*, C-67.