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Topics addressed:

Rare phenomena in case-marking:

- case marking which is exceptional in terms of distribution or function
- explanation for rare vs. common patterns: functional and diachronic factors

Not addressed:

- Formal aspects, where formal encoding is unusual or rare (“tonal case”, case by mutation, prefixal case, etc)
Distribution unusual I: double case marking

A better known phenomenon: double case marking (Plank (ed.) 1995).

- NB double case marking apparently violates an iconically motivated bi-unique mapping between roles and NPs assumed in many approaches (Fillmore, GB, etc)

- Three common patterns of double case-marking:
    
    `thabuju-karra-nguni mijil-nguni`
    
    brother-GEN-INSTR net-INSTR
    
    ‘with brother’s net’
    
    - Co-occurrence not surprising - may be two different categories: governed vs. concordial case (Mel’čuk 1986)
double case marking

b) Compound cases
- “Daghestanian case hoax” (Comrie & Polinsky 1998): 53 cases (mostly spatial) in Tsez are composed of 7 cases + 8 orientation markers. Agul (Daniel & Ganenkov 2008)

xul-a-q-as
house-obl-post-el
from behind the house

Again two different categories: “orientation” (Kibrik’s ‘localization’) + case

c) Case “layering”. Cf. OBL + POSTP in Hindi:

bacce=ne  bacce=ko
child.OBL=ERG  child.OBL=ACC

Explanation: residual + emergent case
Double case marking

- Less usual is multiple case-stacking:
  Kayardild (Evans 1995, 115)
  Maku yalawu-yarra yakuri-na dangka-karra-nguni-na mijil-nguni-na
  woman catch-PST fish-mABL man-GEN-INSTR-mABL net-INSTR-mABL
  ‘The woman caught some fish with the man’s net’

- Partial explanation:
Distribution unusual II: “distributed case”

- In Koasati, the order of syntactic and spatial cases is different, importantly both can co-occur (Kimball 1984):
  
  Koasati (Kimball 1984, 348, ex. (57))
  liyá:li-fa-kitt-on (hí:ca-l)
  stepping-LOC-ART-ACC.FOC (see.1SG)
  ‘I see its footprints (lit. place where he stepped)’

- NB order: N-LOC-ART vs. N-ART-NOM
  - Explanation: syntactic cases have discourse-related functions
    - NB They have special focus forms, and are incompatible with other discourse markers)
Distribution unusual III: head-marking case

- **Common:** dependent-marking (case) vs. head-marking (AGR); Nichols 1986.
  - NB functional equivalence is imperfect though.

- **Less usual:**
  - Head-marking case in Sumerian and Abkhaz, where same case markers appear alternatively on N (as case) and V (in an applicative-like fashion)
Head-marking case: Abkhaz

In Abkhaz some (oblique) case markers (benefactive -zə, instrumental –la) can appear as either postpositions or “intraverbal relational particles”:

<<Abkhaz>>>(Hewitt 1979: 113)
Axra yə-zə  yə-qá-s-c’e-yt’
Axra him-for it-PREV-I-do-FIN
‘I did it for Axra’

Axra ø-yə-zə-qá-s-c’e-yt’
Axra (it)-him-for-PREV-I-do-FIN
‘I did it for Axra’
Head-marking case: Sumerian

- In Sumerian, same or similar (adverbial) case markers function as case suffixes (enclitics) or verbal “dimensional” prefixes:

<<Sumerian>> (Hayes 1997: 22)
mu-na-ra-ni-e-eš
CP-DAT-ABL-LOC-go-PL
‘They came out from there for him’

NB. Unlike in Abkhaz bound pronouns “hosting” case-markers are (usually) missing.
Head-marking case

- Explanation:
  - In both Sumerian and Abkhaz loose morphology with unclear distinction between clitics and affixes; as well as free and bound pronouns;
  - In both languages, head-marking case developed from case-markers on incorporated bound pronouns, with subsequent partial reanalysis to applicatives;
  - reanalysis is more advanced in Sumerian, where “dimensional” prefixes can stand on their own (without a pronominal host).
Distribution unusual IV: “misplaced” case

- In Iraqw, case enclitics attach to the noun in preverbal position.
- Strikingly, the noun “is not necessarily the object of case relation” (Mous 1992, 102, 246):

Iraqw (Mous 1992, 246)

\[ \text{inós i hhar-tá hhawat}=i \text{ hanmiis} \]
\[ 3SG \text{ S.3 stick-F.CON man}=\text{DIR give} \]

‘He is giving a stick to the man’

\[ \text{inós i hhawatú hhart}=i \text{ hanmiis} \]
\[ 3SG \text{ S.3 man.CON stick}=\text{DIR give} \]

‘He is giving a stick to the man’
“Misplaced” case in Iraqw

- The pattern is unusual because it yields an iconicity violation: mark a feature/relation on the constituent to which the feature pertains
  - In OT terms: iconicity violation is incurred by a phonetic constraint Align(Clitic) outranking the Relevance/Iconicity constraint.
- Explanation: conspiracy of 3 factors:
  - cases are clitics
  - clitics appear in a dedicated (preverbal) position
  - word order of arguments pragmatically determined.
Function unusual I: pragmatic cases

- "Presentational" case in Samoan
  - In Samoan, among 15 prepositional case-markers the "presentational" case in 'o:

    <<Samoan>>( Mosel & Hovdhaugen 1992, 143, 772)
    'O le maile saa fasi e le teine
    PRES ART dog PAST hit ERG ART girl

    'The dog was hit by the girl’

  - Semantic/syntactic function not clear: PRES used to introduce a clause, with nominal predicates, or with fronted NPs (then contrastive/new topics).

  - NB basic function is pragmatic, even though it is paradigmatic with other cases.
Function unusual II: “old” cases

- The functions of OBLique case in Kayardild (Evans 1995, 149):
  - OBL has some dative-like uses (purpose, object of middle verbs), but otherwise semantically disparate, and the semantic core/general meaning is not clear.
  - Explanation (Evans 1995: 148-9): OBL is an old DATive case (preserved in Yukulta), but replaced in central (BEN, ADR) functions by other (“verbal”) cases.
- NB diachronic explanation: residual function non-transparent
Function unusual III: “modal case”

In Kayardild case marking on nouns can express TAM features (“modal case”):

<<Kayardild>> (Evans 1995: 108)
ngada warra-ja ngarn-kiring-ku
I.NOM go-ACT beach-ALL-mPROP
‘I will go to the beach’
ngada warra-ja ngarn-kiring-kina
I.NOM go-ACT beach-ALL-mABL
‘I went to the beach’

Here ‘modal proprietive’ expresses future, and ‘modal ablative’ expresses past.
Modal case in Kayardild

- **Diachronic scenario for the rise of modal cases (Dench & Evans 1988; Evans 1995):**
  - originally case marked subordinate forms in complement function;
  - percolation of case from the subordinate verb head to its arguments;
  - “insubordination”, use of erstwhile subordinates as main clauses;
  - grammaticalization of case forms on the verb -> (potential) disagreement between case forms on NPs and the verb.
- **NB** apart from consistent percolation of case from head to its dependents (conditioned by the rule of “total concord”), other processes commonplace.
Restricted use of genitive in Yakut

- In Yakut, unlike other Turkic languages, GEN in (-\text{TIN}) is restricted to stacked possessors:

\[
\text{<<Yakut>>} \text{ (Stachovskiy & Menz 1998: 428)}
\]

\begin{verbatim}
učuutal jie-te
teacher house-3SG.POS
‘teacher’s house’
\end{verbatim}

\[
kini aya-tïn \ xara- yïn uuta
s/he father- \text{tin} \ eye- \text{tin} \ water-3SG.POS
‘his/her father’s tears’
\]
Restricted use of genitive in Yakut

- **Explanation again diachronic:**
  - remnant of a Turkic GEN, elsewhere GEN in Yakut is lost (under influence of language contact with Tungusic?)
  - NB GEN is retained where it is non-redundant (not supported by POS marking on the head)

- **Restricted uses of cases may be indicative of incipient/residual cases**
Function unusual V: function-form mismatches

- “Designative” case in Even (Tungusic)
  - Performs a double function (in violation of the “θ-criterion”): marks P, simultaneously assigning BEN to its possessor:

Bej turki-*ga*-n emurem
man slade-DES-3SG brought
‘I brought the slade for the man’

Cf.
Bej turki-*va*-n emurem
man slade-ACC-3SG brought
‘I brought the man’s slade (slade from the man?)’

- Possible explanation: DES –*ga*- originates from *ga*- ‘take’, inheriting its argument structure?
Function unusual V: “quirky” case

- Common motivation for the rise of idiosyncratic (“quirky”) cases: pattern inheritance/pattern unification
  - Ingush ‘listen’ takes exceptionally the ERG-Obl pattern; since historically *ladieG* ← *la+dieG* ‘ear+put’ (Nichols 1994: 119).
  - ‘Look’-verbs can exceptionally take an inverse inverse (DAT-NOM/ABS) pattern if polysemous with ‘see’ cf. (Malchukov 2005) on Lezgian.
Case in a word class changing function

- **Common: case as a nominalizer-complementizer:**
  
  \[
  \text{<<Nahali>> (Kuiper 1962: 34)}
  \]

  Ara-ye-kon

  see-PAST-ABL

  ‘from having seen’

  - NB any nominal category can be a nominalizer (cf. Malchukov 2004): CLASS in Bantu, DET in many Amerindian, etc

- **Uncommon: Case as a verbalizer**
Case as a verbalizer

- “Verbal case” with a verbalizing function is exceptional: found only in Kayardild (and some other Tangkic languages).
- Verbal cases in Kayardild (Evans 1995) are like case
  - in function (allative, dative, ablative, etc)
  - syntactically (percolate as normal cases),
  - but have a verbalizing effect (take verbal inflections):
Verbal cases in Kayardild

Kayardild (Evans 1995, 163)
Ngada warra-jarra dathin-kiiwa-tharra ngilirr-iiwa-tharr
I.NOM go-PST that-vAll-PST cave-vALL-PST
‘I went to that cave’,
Ngada warra-ju dathin-kiiwa-thu ngilirr-iiwa-thu
I.NOM go-POT that-vAll-POT cave-vALL-POT
‘I will go to that cave’

- NB verbal cases mostly have verbal origin (verbal dative ← marutha ‘put’, verbal ablative ← bula.tha ‘remove’, etc); (Evans 1995: 166-8; 182-3).
Verbal cases in Kayardild

  - extensive case-percolation ("total concord")
  - old cases increasingly acquire modal function ("modal cases")
  - recruitment of new cases from of N-V compounds/serial-verb construction (hence verb inflecting)
  - analogical processes modeling verbal case on nominal.

- NB all processes in isolation (apart from the two first) are widespread cross-linguistically.
- Also usual morphology (verbal inflections retained) lags after functional reanalysis
Unusual alignment patterns I: marked NOM and ABS

In Koasati, marked NOM (and also ACC) contrast with the unmarked “autonomous” case for DAT, GEN functions.

<<Koasati>> (Kimball 1985, 331)

ifá-k          ifá-n          ifá-ø
dog-NOM        dog-ACC        dog-AUT

- **Explanation:** NOM has a discourse-pragmatic functions.
- **NB. topic/definiteness markers are usual sources of marked NOM elsewhere (Cushitic, Berber); C. König (2005).**
Unusual patterns II: Pronominal ergatives

- Languages where only pronouns have ergative case are exceptional: counterexamples to Silverstein’s generalization.

- Diachronic explanation for this exceptional pattern.
  - In Wakhi (Iranian) (Filimonova 2005/Plank 1985), ERG retained on pronouns as they are more conservative under the ergative to accusative shift.
  - NB A frequency effect: pronominal inflection is more conservative as pronouns are more frequent than nouns (cf. Haspelmath 2006 on the role of frequency).
Pronominal ergatives

- In Mande languages pronominal ERG derive historically from portmanteau pronouns
  - (even though cannot be considered as contracted synchronically; Vydrin 2006):
    
    $\langle\langle$Guro$\rangle\rangle$(Vydrin 2006)
    
    maa blɛɛ Blañá
    
    1SG.ERG dog beat.PFV
    
    ‘I beat a dog’

  - NB only the most frequent “direct” pattern (1->3) of portmanteau pronouns has been grammaticalized (again a frequency effect!)
Unusual patterns III: double oblique

- Double-Oblique patterns as found in Iranian languages (Payne 1980; Bossong 1985; Arkadjev 2005):

\[ \langle \text{Vafsi} \rangle \ (\text{Stilo} \ 2004: \ 232) \]

\[ luas-i \quad kærge=s \quad bae-værdæ. \]

fox-obl.sg  chicken-obl.sg=3sg pfv-take.pst

‘The fox caught (the) chicken’

- NB. A → Obl in the past; O -> Obl if prominent
- NB. Unlike A and P, S is in DIRECT case
Double oblique pattern

- OBL-OBL is rare, as violates all functional principles behind case marking:
  - Distinguishability (of A and P arguments)
  - Economy
  - Indexing (encoding of semantic roles).

- NB Indexing is violated as well, results in a discontinuous pattern on Croft’s (2001) semantic map (OBL arguments marked)

A ——— S ——— P
Double oblique pattern

Explanation diachronic (Arkadjev 2005 -> Rastorgueva & Kerimova 1975):

- A/Obl – O/Obl pattern is a result of meaning extensions of the DAT/GEN case:
  - DAT/GEN → ERG (in past tense)
  - DAT/GEN → ACC’(prominent object)
Double oblique pattern

- This pattern is due to a polysemy chain, with individual polysemy patterns well-attested elsewhere:
  - If ERG=GEN, GEN = DAT, DAT = ACC, then ERG=ACC → A=P≠S
  - NB there is no contiguity violation of the semantic map; rather the "shortest link" violation.

Possessor  -----  Addressee
I
A  -----  S

A  -----  P
Asymmetries in DCM

- Explanation of asymmetry between DOM and DSM in terms of competing motivations/ conflicting constraints (de Hoop & Malchukov 2006)
  - in DOM Index and Diff converge → more cross-linguistic consistency;
  - in DSM Index and Diff are in conflict → less cross-linguistic consistency.
Iconicity violations and structural constraints

- Shipibo-Conibo (Valenzuela 1997): A must be marked by the ergative case only when P is referential:

  \[ e-n-ra \quad yapa-ø \quad pi-kas-ai \]
  I-ERG-AS fish-ABS eat-DES-INCOMPL
  ‘I want to eat fish (referential only)’

  \[ ea-ø-ra \quad yapa-ø \quad pi-kas-ai \]
  I-ABS-AS fish-ABS eat-DES-INCOMPL
  ‘I want to eat fish (referential or non-referential)’

- **Possible explanations:**
  - A side effect of object incorporation
  - A consequence of a higher ranking structural constraint Primary Argument Immunity Principle (Malchukov 2006).
Iconicity violations and diachronic factors

- In Chepang, O is case-marked, only if A is intentional (Næss 2004):
  Chepang>> (Caughley 1982, 68)
  hEw-kay pu?-nis-?I sat-?a-thEy
  brother-OBJ O.Brother-DL-AG kill-PT-AGRo
  ‘The two older brothers killed the younger brother’
  pu?-nis-?I sat-?a-c-u hEw
  O.Brother-DL-AG kill-PT-DL-AGRa Y.Brother
  ‘The two older brothers killed the younger brother
  (unintentionally)’

- Næss 2004: a violation of Maximal Semantic Distinguishability of A and P
Iconicity/Relevance violations

- Note that otherwise the DOM-pattern in Chepang is reminiscent of Hindi: ACC=DAT on prominent Os, but also on indirect objects.

<<Chepang>> (de Lancey 1981)

Ngaa-?i waa? saag?-na-ng
I-ERG bird PRES-1SG
‘I hear a bird’

Ngaa-?i waa?-kaay? saag?-na-ng
I-ERG bird-OBJ PRES-1SG
‘I listen to a bird’

- Explanation of the case dependency in Chepang may be historical: intentionality is a left-over of the ‘attempted action’ use of DAT.
Rare patterns and language specific constraints

In Kambera (Klamer 1998), both (definite) O and IO are cross-referenced by bound pronouns;

- Unexpectedly, in ditransitives both O (theme) and IO are cross-referenced by DAT clitics:

  Kambera (Klamer 1998: 203)
  Na-wua-ngga-nya
  3sNOM-give-1sDAT-3sDAT
  ‘He gives it to me’

- Explanation: double DAT here is due to clitic cluster restrictions second clitic in a clitic cluster must be DAT (Klamer 1998): V-DAT-ACC $\rightarrow$ V-DAT-DAT.

- In OT terms: a morphological constraint (CL2/DAT_) outranking a FaithRole constraint.
Conclusions

1) Common vs. rare patterns: common patterns arise when several functional motivations converge, variation is found when they in conflict (cf. subject/object asymmetries in differential case marking)
   - NB competing motivations/functional OT approach

2) Rare patterns dependent on co-occurrence of several different factors (cf. Harris, this workshop), cf. conditions under which case displacement in Iraqw arises;

3) A rare pattern may result from interaction between a grammaticalization path and a conflicting functional constraint (cf. , e.g., grammaticalization of topics to subject in conflict with an economy constraint against marked NOM)
Conclusions

4) Rare patterns can arise from interaction of grammaticalization paths with a language specific rule (e.g. rise of modal and verbal cases in Kayardild, depends on extensive case-percolation)

5) An exceptional patterns may be due to interaction of general factors with a language specific constraint, especially on a cross-modular basis (cf. interaction of syntactic vs. phonological rules in Kambera); cf. Newmeyer 2008).

6) Functionally deviant cases frequently result from incomplete grammaticalization cycles (pragmatic cases, not fully reanalyzed, remnant or emergent cases).
General conclusions: functional typology and OT

- Preferential patterns in case-marking arise through functional motivations/ conflicting constraints.

- My approach combines functional-typological approach with the functional OT.
  - Like other work in the functional tradition the competing motivations are functional and general (eschewing language particular constraints as sometimes practiced in OT)
  - Like in OT, sets out to determine the outcome of interaction of the assumed constraints under the different constraint ranking (‘factorial typology’)
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General conclusions: functional typology and OT

- **Commonalities between functional typology and functional OT:**
  - Both regard grammatical patterns as arising from functional constraints
  - Different weighting/ranking of the constraints yields cross-linguistic variation

- **Conceptual differences:** are constraints linguistic or extralinguistic, do they belong to grammar or are usage based (Bresnan and Aissen vs. Haspelmath)
  - NB, however, that from an evolutionary perspective constraints arise through diachronic adaptation and may get conventionalized
General conclusions: functional typology and OT

- **Further convergent tendencies**
  - Increased role of statistic information and corpus studies in both fields; discussion of frequency effects in typology (Haspelmath) and stochastic OT (Bresnan, Jäger)
  - Evolutionary approaches; functional factors constraint diachronic processes (Haspemath’s diachronic adaptation scenario; Blevins’ evolutionary phonology; Jäger’s ‘evolutionary game theory’)
  - Increased appreciation of the functional basis of grammar beyond the functionalist tradition (‘Hard constraints mirror soft constraints’ (Bresnan); Performance-Grammar Correspondence Hypothesis (Hawkins))