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1. CASE AND AGREEMENT

Goals:
- Case and agreement not two-sides of same coin [ = head/dependent ]
- Case is not feature-sharing/AGREE with a functional head
- Dependent Case Theory (Marantz, McFadden, Baker)
- New prediction about alignment types
- Consideration of problematic cases

Plan (sort of)
- Background
- Typological observation I: agreement depends on (dependent) case
- Responses to counter examples
- Typological observation II: alignment typology (case ≠ agreement)

“2 SIDES OF THE SAME COIN” = agreement/case as head/dependent marking (Nichols 1986):

(1) Two sides of the same coin:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{SUBJECT} \\
\text{TP}
\end{array}
\quad \quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{v}
\end{array}
\quad \quad
\begin{array}{c}
\text{OBJECT}
\end{array}
\]

\text{Subject} \Leftrightarrow \text{T NOM, AGRS} \\
\text{Object} \Leftrightarrow \text{v OBJ, AGR0}

DEPENDENT CASE THEORY


(2) a. If NP: c-commands NP; and both are contained in the same domain (clause, phase):
   i. Mark NP1 [ = ERGATIVE ]
   ii. Mark NP2 [ = ACCUSATIVE ]
   b. Otherwise NP is NOMINATIVE/ABSOLUTIVE (possibly unmarked/caseless)

(3) DEFAULT < UNMARKED < DEPENDENT < LEXICAL/OBLIQUE

NOM=ABS ACC/ERG DAT ETC...


• Senaya progressives (Kalin 2014) specific object \(\rightarrow\) agreement (L-)morpheme

L-morpheme need not agree with object

(7) a. Aana oo ksuuta kaw-an [li~] I that book

write.IMPF.S.1FS =AUX.3FS

I am writing that book.

b. Aana ksuuta kaw-an [yan] I book

write.IMPF.S.1FS =AUX.1FS

I am writing a book.

2.2 Ergative Splits — A Typological Gap? (Bobaljik 2008, also Baker 2008)

(8) Moravcsik (1974)

Universals: (cf. revisions Moravcsik 1978)

If in a language the verb agrees with anything, it agrees with some or all (1978 transitive) subjects.

If the verb agrees with anything other than subjects, it agrees with some or all direct objects.

If the verb agrees with anything other than S, DO, it agrees with some or all indirect objects.

• Stated over languages, not sentences.

(9) Gilligan’s Survey (100 languages, Gilligan 1987)

No Agreement: 23 IO only 0

S only: 20 DO only 0

S: 31 IO, DO only 0

S – IO – DO: 25 S-I0, not DO (1)

10) The Agreement Hierarchy and Ergative languages:

a. no agreement Dyrbyl, Lezgian e. * ERG only\(^1\)

b. ABS only Tsez, Hindi f. * ERG DAT, no ABS

c. ABS ERG Inuit, Mayan g. * DAT only

d. ABS ERG DAT Basque, Abkhaz h. *(ABS DAT, w/o ERG) [inferred]


(11) a. ziya b-ik’-s [Tsez]

cow.III.ABS III-go-pst.EVID

‘The cow left.’

b. eniyy ziya b-iser-si

mother-ERG cow.III.ABS III-feed-pst.EVID

‘The mother fed the cow.’

(Polinsky and Potsdam 2001)

(12) a. Juuna-p miqaq-t atuakka-mik nassip-p-a-i [W. Greenlandic]

Juuna.ERG child-PL book-INS send-IND-TR-3SG=3PL

‘Juuna sent the children a book.’

b. Juuna-p atuagaq miqaq-nut nasi-up-p-a-a

Juuna.ERG book.ABS child-PL.DAT send-APPL-IND-TR-3SG=3SG

(Jaffé 1994:20)

\(^1\)caveat: there appear to be languages with ERG agreement and abs clitics (Mayan, Coast Tsimshian); Woolford, Baker treat these as instantiating (25e), thus rejecting (23a). Baker also includes Semelai, a language with ergative clitics (Kruspe 2004; 87f) but no absolute clitics or agreement.

---

The Agreement-Case Hierarchy of Accessibility (ACHA)


a. ABSOLUTIVE < ERGATIVE < DATIVE / OBLIQUE

b. SUBJECT < OBJECT < INDIRECT OBJECT

The two hierarchies can be collapsed, if we adopt a dependent case model:

(14) UNMARKED < DEPENDENT < LEXICAL/OBLIQUE

Icelandic: Only nominative NPs agree, and agreeing nominatives need not be subjects

(15) * Morgum studentum lika verðið Dative subject doesn’t agree

many students.Đ like-pl. job.N

‘Many students like the job.’

(16) a. lóni likðu þessir sokkar (=Error! Bookmark not defined.a), also (Error! Bookmark not defined.c) and below)

Jon.D like-pl. these socks.N

‘Jon likes these socks.’ (IGJ:143)

b. bað likðu einhverjun þessir sokkar

expl. liked.pl. someone.D these socks.N

‘Someone liked these socks.’ (IGJ:153)

c. Úm veturinum voru konunginum gefnir ambættur

in thewinter were-pl. theking.D given slaves.N

‘In the winter, the king was given (female) slaves.’ (ZMT:112)

b&c show agreement with the NOM object in the presence of subject-diagnostics picking out the dative ([b] Expletive-associate-pairing and [c] inversion / pre-participle position)

There are additional constraints on agreement with non-subject nominatives.

(17) When case and GP diverge, it is morphological case, and not GP, that is the correct predictor of agreement in Icelandic. (Sigrunðsson 1993, et seq., also Falk 1997)

• Agreement is with the f-highest accessible NP.

‘f-highest’ = highest, ignoring scrambling, A’-movement etc.

= in NP-structure (v. Riemslag/Williams), f-structure (LFG)

(18) -ne \(\neq\) “ERG” (subject of transitive [& some unergatives]) in the perfective

-ko \(\neq\) “DAT” (experiencers, goals)

and animate/specific OBJECT (whether “ABS” or “ACC”)

-Ø \(\neq\) elsewhere “NOM”

(19) Perfective: a. SUBJ-ne OBJ-Ø V
default

b. SUBJ-ne OBJ-ko V

d. SUBJ-Ø Obj-ko V

e. SUBJ-ko OBJ-Ø V

Psych: a. SUBJ-ne OBJ-Ø V

d. SUBJ-Ø Obj-ko V

e. SUBJ-ko OBJ-Ø V
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(20) a. Raam-ne RoTii khaaīi thii
R-ERG (m) bread-O (f) eat.PERF.FEM be.PAST.FEM
‘Ram had eaten bread.’

b. siita-aa ne lāRkii ko dekhaa
S-ERG (f) girl-ACC (f) see.PERF.MASC
‘Sita saw the girl.’

c. siitaa kela-aa khaaīi thii
S.-DAT (f) banana-O (m) eat.IMPERF.FEM be.PAST.FEM
‘Sita (habitually) ate bananas.’

d. nīnā bāce-ko u’taayegii
N.-O (f) child-ACC listen.FUT.FEM
‘Nina will pick the child up.’

e. siita-ko lārke pasand the
S.-DAT (f) boys-O like
‘Sita likes the boys.’ (Examples from Mahajan, Mohanan cited in Woolford 1999)

* qualification: differences between subject ABS and object ABS agreement emerge in certain circumstances, notably conjunct agreement (Bhatt and Walkow 2013)

(21) Nepali (Bickel and Yādava 2000, 347)

‘Where there are two nominative NPs in a Nepali clause, agreement is with the higher argument, just as in Hindi. Unlike in Hindi, however, there is no agreement with nominative objects. Instead, the verb agrees with the ergative A-argument.’

(22) a. ma yas pasal-mā patrikā kin-ch-u.
1sNOM DEM:OBL newspaper:NOM buy-PST-1s
‘I buy the newspaper in this store.’

b. maile yas pasal-mā patrikā kin-ē.
1sERG DEM:OBL newspaper:NOM buy-PST.MASC.PL
‘I bought the newspaper in this store.’

But NOM objects do agree when the subject is DATive (hence inaccessible)—B&Y offer this example to show that DAT subjects do not agree (p. 348):

(23) mālī̄ timī man par-ch-au.
1sDAT 2mhNOM liking occur-PST-2mh occur-PST-1s
‘I like you.’

(24) Unmarked Case > Dependent Case > Lexical/Oblique Case

| Type 1 (Hindi) | Type 2 (Nepali) |

Both languages: Highest accessible NP governs agreement.

2.3 Ergative Splits — A Typological Gap?

(25) Case-Agreement Splits (Dixon 1994)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Alignment</th>
<th>Agreement Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERG-ABS</td>
<td>ABS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG-ABS</td>
<td>Basque, Inuit, Tsez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warlpiri, Chukchi, Nepali</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM-ACC</td>
<td>* unattested **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian, Icelandic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(NO CASE)</td>
<td>Chol, …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Itelem, Bantu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

➢ For languages with Ergative-Absolutive Case systems, the most common Agreement pattern is Nominative-Accusative [-Subject-Object] Una (Indonesia) Warlpiri (Australia), Zoque (MesoAmerica), Hunzib (Caucasus) …

(26) Agreement: Siewierska WALS (380) x NP Case: Comrie WALS (190) = 181.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Alignment</th>
<th>Agreement Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERG-ABS (19)</td>
<td>ACTIVE (26) NOM-ACC (212) OTHER (39) SPLIT NONE (84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERG-ABS (32)</td>
<td>5 2 12 6 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVE (4)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM-ACC (52)</td>
<td>2 34 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRIPARTITE (4)</td>
<td>1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO CASE (98)</td>
<td>5 9 52 5 21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(27) a. Transitive: Subject-NOM … Object-ACC … V
b. Intransitive: Subject-NOM V

Only 1 case accessible, it must be NOM → Nom = Subj agreement (English etc.)
2 cases accessible = NOM and ACC = “highest accessible” still picks out “subject”

(28) a. Transitive: Subject-ERG … Object-ABS … V
b. Intransitive: Subject-ABS V

Only one case accessible = must be ABS → ABS agreement Hindi, Tsez
Two cases accessible = ERG and ABS = “highest accessible” picks out “subject” = subject-oriented (“Nom”) agreement (Nepali, Chuukiki)

➢ Under the accessibility hierarchy, only the attested case v. agreement “split” is possible.

(29) Predicted Agreement Alignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accessible case(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Alignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erg-Abs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom-Acc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

➢ Is the universal universal? Deal 2013: no.
2.3.1 Nominative-Absolutive Alignment? (Gildea & Castro Alves 2010)

Jê and Carib languages “are both counter to the expected universal patterns identified in the typological literature: no other cases have been identified in which case-marking is nominative while verbal cross-referencing is absolutive.”

Carib: “nominative” is marked by word order and agreement on auxiliaries, there is no nominal case marking. “Case marking” ≠ variation in the form of a nominal.

Jê (Canela): “nominative” is marked by word order and case on pronouns – by case, what is understood is that free pronouns can occur only as subjects (i.e., nominative); objects always bound. (Popjes and Poppies)

(30) a. wa ha curi apê Intrans
    1 FUT there work
    ‘I will work there.’

    b. po, wa î-te ih-curum Trans subj (fronted obj)
    deer 1-î-PAST 3-kill
    ‘It was a deer that I killed.’ Deer – I killed it.

    c. wapo te î-exec Trans obj (prefix only)
    knife 1-PAST 1-cut
    ‘The knife cut me.’

➢ All the data in these papers is consistent with saying there is no case, but grammatical processes sensitive to ‘subject’ (we knew that.) [nearby Tupian languages may provide a more interesting challenge, and solution – ongoing work by Adam Singerman, Chicago]

2.3.2 Kuichi Gujarati (Pate < Patel-Grosz)?

Variation in Indo-Aryan (Deo & Sharma 2006, Wunderlich 2012) –40-100 varieties; 6 types

• Hindi-Urdu (above) split ERG case, highest ABS agreement
• Nepali (above) split ERG case, "subject" agreement
• Bengali lost ERG case (still has DOM), “subject” agreement
• Marathi ‘losing’ ERG (neutralized in 1/2 pronouns), highest ABS agreement

(5) a. mî sita-lî bagh-tô
    1SG.M.ABS=ERG  see-PRES.M.SG
    ‘I see Sita.’

    b. mî ek chinnî baghit-lî
    1SG.M.ABS=ERG one see-PERF.F.SG
    ‘I saw a sparrow.’

    c. mî sita-lî baghit-la
    1SG.M.ABS=ERG  see-PERF.N.SG
    ‘I saw Sita.’

➢ Underlying ERG vs. ABS/NOM contrast need not be overtly marked. (we knew that)
(35) a. Kua hala e ia e là akau.  
PERF cut ERG he ABS branch tree  
‘He cut down the branch.’

b. Kua ha-hala e ia e tau là akau.  
PERF PL-cut ERG he ABS PL branch tree  
(Seiter 1980:64)

ERG PLURAL: ‘sleep; sit/stay’: ERG subject + ABS location: ERG is plausibly internal.

(36) a. Ai là nofo ia e ia e nofoa nei.  
not yet sit yet ERG he ABS chair this.  
‘He has never sat in this chair.’

b. Ai là no-nofo ia e laua e nofoa nei.  
not yet PL-sit yet ERG they ABS chair this.  
‘They have never sat in this chair.’  
(Seiter 1980: 63-64)

➢ Pace Legate, I’m not aware of an Ergative language in which (all and) only intransitive subjects agree. On participant-number governed suppletion and reduplication, see Bobaljik and Harley (to appear), Thornton (2015)

3. ANOTHER CASE AGREEMENT MISMATCH: ACTIVE ALIGNMENT

joint work with Mark Baker

(37) A typological gap for dependent-marking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOM/ACC</th>
<th>‘active’</th>
<th>‘Split-S’</th>
<th>not generated by (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERG/ABS</td>
<td>Case in DCT is a relation among NPs</td>
<td>not a relation between NPs and funct heads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(38) Choctaw agreement (Baker 2015 < Broadwell 2006)

a. chi-pisa-li-h   transitive: II-obj. I-subj
   2S1I-see-I4s-TNS
   ‘I see you’

b. unerg: lya-li-took   unacc: sa-niya-h
   go=1s-DFAST 1s3I-fat-TNS
   ‘I went’ ‘I am fat’

➢ Since DCT is about a relation among NPs, there is no easy way to describe an active system of case (as opposed to agreement)

cf. Mithun (1991): 5 “active” languages, only one (C. Pomo) has case-marking.

3.1 An alternative? Ergative as “inherent” case?

(39) Ergative as inherent (θ) case


contra: Baker & Bobaljik 2015

a. T … [NP NOM …  

b. T … [NP NOM y [ … NP ACC …  

c. T … [NP ERG y [ … NP NOM …  

3.2 Case Alternations – a transitivity restriction

Inherent (theta-related, lexical) case is normally preserved in case alternations (Ice. Dative)  
Ergative case generally alternates productively.

Antipassive:

(40) a. ? naïček-a kimir?-en ne-nf?etet-an [Chukchi]  
youth-ERG load-ABS 3.5SUB(ner)?-carry-3SG.OBJ  
‘(The) young men carried away the load.’

b. ? naïček-kt 0-ine-nf?etet-ʔêt kimir?-e  
youth-PL-ABS 3.5SUB(ner)?-AP-carry-3PL.SUB(ner)  
‘(The) young men carried away a load.’  
(Kozinsky et al. 1988: 652)

Causative:

(41) a. Jaani-up ipuittuq angmag-aa pilauti-mut [Inuit]  
John-ERG can.(ABS) open.3s>3s  
‘John opened the can with a snow knife.’

b. Jaani-up Miuri-mut ipuittuq angmaq-ti-taa  
John-ERG Mary-ALL can.(ABS) open-CAUS-3s>3s  
‘John made Mary open the can with a knife.’  
(Johns 1987:12-13)

ECM in Basque:

(17) a. Katu-ek sagu-ak harrapa-tu dituze-la ikusi dut  
Cat-PL.ERG mouse-PL.ABS catch AUX that see AUX  
‘I saw that the cats caught the mice.’

b. Katu-ak sagu-ak harrapa-tzén ikusit zu  
Cat-PL.ABS mouse-PL.ABS catch-ING  
seen AUX.1SG>3PL  
‘I saw the cats catch mice.’  
(Rezac et al.: 8)

(42) Even when ergative case may go on the subject of an intransitive clause, ergative case will not appear on a derived subject. (Marantz 1991)
3.2.1 Nisean: Instrumental advancement

(43) a. Ne tohitohi a Sione aki e pene [AGENT]
PST writing ABS Sione with ABS pen
‘Sione was writing with a pen.’
b. Ne tohitohi aki e*a Sione e pene
PST writing with ERG-abs Sione pen
‘Sione was writing with a pen.’

(44) Ne faka-kofu aki e vaka e tau lauka [~AGENT]
PST CAUS-cover with ABS canoe ABS PL leaf
‘The canoe was covered with leaves.’

but...

3.2.2 Chukchi: spray/load; experiencers

(45) a. ɬɪıt̠ə̊ vət̠ə̊ jə̊r̠ə̊t̠-q̠i mɪm̠-e
boat-ABS fill-3SG water-INSTR
‘The boat filled with water.’

(46) a. stlag-e jə̊r̠ə̊n-ni mɪm̠-e
father-ERG fill-3SG>3.5G boat-ABS water-ERG
‘Father filled the boat with water.’

(47) a. stlag-e jə̊r̠ə̊t̠-q̠i
father-poss boat-ABS
‘Father’s boat filled.’
b. stlag-en a ɬɪıt̠ə̊ vət̠ə̊ jə̊r̠ə̊t̠-q̠i
father-ABS
‘Father boat-filled = Father’s boat got filled.’

(48) a. stbyə̊n (pe̊r̠-e̊ta) kə̊ryav-ə̊r̠kə̊n
father-ABS food-DAT delight-in-PROG.3.5G
‘Father is happy about the food.’
b. stbyə̊n ɬiyə̊-n̠-n̠ kə̊ry-o bə̊s̠-ə̊r̠kə̊n-en
father-ERG food-abs AUX-proc=3.5G>3.5G
‘Father is happy about the food.’

3.2.3 Shipibo – applicatives of unaccusatives (Baker 2014)

(49) a. Maria-nin-ra ochiti noko-ke.
Maria-ERG-PRT dog find-PRT
‘Maria found the dog.’
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b. Maria-ra ka-ke.
Maria-PRT go-PRT
‘Maria went.’

(50) vP ApplP VP
High Applicative
VP happens for the benefit/detriment of Appl

(51) a. Nokon shino-n-ra e-a mawa-xon-ke. (*shino-ra)
my GEN monkey-ERG-PRT me-ABS die-APPL-PRF monkey.ABS-PRT
‘My monkey died on me.’
b. Bimi-n-ra Rosa joshin-xon-ke. (*bimi-ra)
fruit-ERG-PRT Rosa ripen-APPL-PRF (*fruit-PRT)
‘The fruit ripened for Rosa.’

(52) Waves

Baker: Benefactive/malefactive NP in Shipibo introduced by null P, n/a for EPP

Section conclusion: The Ergative Generalization is spurious, as expected under the DCT.

3.3 Putative active case systems I: Basque, Hindi (ergative unergatives)

(53) a. une-a etori da. [Basque]
kid-the.ABS arrive AUX.INTR.3A
‘The kid arrived.’

b. Nik hitz-egin dut
1SG.ERG "speak" AUX.TR.(3A).1E
‘I spoke.’

(54) a. kutte bhōke b. kuttō ne bhokka
dog.ABS barked.M.PL dogs ERG barked.M.SG (DFLT)
‘The dogs barked.’

(55) siitaa (*ne) ayyii
Stita.ABS (*ERG) arrived
‘Sita arrived.’

(Mahajan 1990:74)

• Lexical idiosyncracy (Hindi, Basque - even unaccusatives w/ ERG: LAST, BOIL)

(56) Euskararak noiz arte iraungo du?
Basque-ERG when until last AUX.3SG>3SG
‘How long will Basque last?’ (DeRijk p.265; our gloss)

Even idiosyncratic, intrans. ERG undergoes case alternations (unlike canonical inherent case):

(57) Norbaite-k eta zerbaite-k iraun-arazi dio.
Someone-ERG and something-ERG last-CAUSS AUX.3SG>3SG.3sD language-DAT
‘Someone and something has caused the language to last.’ (DeRijk p.380; our gloss)

(58) a. Urak-i irakin du.
water-ERG boil AUX
‘The water has boiled.’ (Preminger)

b. Esnea*esneak iraken ikusi nuen.
milk.ABS/milk.ERG boil see AUX
‘I saw the milk boil/boiling.’ (K. Arregi, Ikuska Anuska-Badiola p.c)

[ERG ➔ ABS in ECM, Rezac et al. 2014]

- Proposal: verbs may lexically select a null dummy internal argument.
- Preminger 2012: arguments against this – invisible object invisible to agreement.

- Imonda (Seiler 1985): only 8 known verbs take non-agentive case marker on subject

3.4 Putative active case systems II: (N.) Pomo Hale/Bittner’s “Accusative active”

(59) man mo:w-al čaxa
3SF.A 3SM-O cut
‘She cut him.’

(60) man k’otama. { mo:w / mo:w-al } is-i.
3SF.A swim 3SM.A / 3SM-O sneeze-PRES
‘She is swimming.’ ‘He sneezed.’ (O’Connor 1987:196)

(61) mo:w-al miboh.
3SM-O bloated
‘He bloated.’


- O’ marks goals (Dative):

(62) ša dače nam mu:m al bóh khëmna
fish catch SPEC DEM 3SM.A 3SF-O give PUT
‘He will give her a fish he caught.’ (O’C 46)

- O’ marks some experiencer subjects (Dative):

(63) a. man kasili
3SF be.cold
‘She’s cold.’

b. ma:d-al kasili
3SF-O be.cold
‘She feels cold.’

- O’ in transitive clauses only marks human objects = DOM (Dative):

(64) tho?o-nam-(*yačul) ?a: bida.
acorn.much-SPEC(*O+) 1s.A dip
‘I ate/am eating the acorn mush.’ (O’C, p. 171)

- More challenging cases: Laz and Tsova-Tush/Batsbi (Baker and Bobaljik 2015), but even the most challenging examples are not ‘clean’ active case systems.

3.5 Active patterns without active case?

- Two ways in which an ergative case system could yield an active-looking pattern:

I. Concealed transitives again: a derivation that turns (a) into (b)?

(65) a. I washed.

b. I washed myself.

II. Layered Case (cf. agreeing DOM above):

(66) a. Case: Subj-ERG Obj-Ø
Agreement: --- AGREE
DOM: Subj-ERG Obj-ko
Agreeing ‘Dative’ (Rajasthan)

b. Case: Subj-Ø
Agreement: AGREE
DSM: Subj-ERG
Ergative unergative (volitional)

Batsbi/Tsova-Tush (best case of an active case language, Holisky 1987)

(68) a. bader dah daxp-dall. Intransitive
child-NOM PVB undress-AOR
‘The child got undressed.’

b. k’ot-ev bader dah daxp-diž. Transitive
boy-ERG child-NOM PVB undress-AOR
‘The boy undressed the child.’

c. surat ese qa’-á. Intransitive
picture-NOM here hang-PRES
‘The picture is hanging here.’

d. bader-ev surat qa’-iž. Transitive
child-ERG picture-NOM hang-AOR
‘The child hung the picture.’

(69) a. (as) dah jappx-jail-n-az.
1SG-ERG PVB undress-AOR-1SG-ERG
‘I got undressed.’

b. (so) xe-n-mak qa’-u-sö.
1SG NOM PRES-DAT-on hang-PRES-1SG-NOM
‘I’m hanging in a tree.’

(70) a. (as) vuž-n-az.
1SG-ERG fell-AOR-1SG-ERG
‘I fell down, on purpose.’

b. (so) vož-en-sö.
1SG-NOM fall-AOR-1SG-NOM
‘I fell down, by accident.’

Person agreement (1/2 only) is for subject & object (Harris 09) (not both, Harris pc)
But gender/CM (class marking) agreement is absolutive:

(71) tõi’ c’a dah d-ex-d-o-d-an-ës
old house(d/d)ABS PVB CM-destroy-CM-PRES-CM-ÆVID-2PL-ERG
‘Y’all are evidently tearing down the old house.’ (Dict, via Harris 2009)
(72) a. psare(h) oe'-v-al-in-es-
yesterday weigh.PFV-CM-INTR-AOR-TSG.ERG
'I (masculine) weighed yesterday [, and I had gained one kilo].'

b. sbi-ló xároš v-uš'-v-ay-o-s
PsAVs-ALL.II often CM -go-CM -come-PRES-T SG.ERG
'I (masculine) often come and go among the PsAVs.'

(36) mič-iv-h b-uš'-ayši k'nat-i
where-DIR-LOC CM-go-2PL.ERG boy(v/b)-PLABS
'Where are you going, boys?'  (Dict 493a via Harris 2009)

One other instance in which gender agreement with a (surface) non-absolute: ablativeative māk'ar: embedded subject expressed as DAT (Holisky and Gagua p.40)

(36) a. ag J-apx-č-Jal-in
grandmother CM-undress-INTR-AOR
'Grandmother undressed.'

b. ag-en co J-apx-č-Jal-mak'-e·r
grandmother-DAT not CM-undress-INTR-CAN-PRES-PAST
'Grandmother couldn't undress.'

3.6 Take-home points:

(73)

TP

F

SUBJECT

OBJECT

Dependent Case Theory: Case is a relation among NPs
Agreement is a relation between NPs and heads

Case ≠ Agreement – better typological coverage: universal gap
Predicts: no active case systems – strong trend, possible universal

Also: ‘Inherent’ ERG = popular attempt to reconcile ERG with LGB case theory
Problematic (see Baker & Bobaljik 2015)

Invitation to reconsider evidence/arguments for Case Theory in general
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