

Ergative is not inherent: Appendix

Stanislao Zompì
Massachusetts Institute of
Technology
zompì@mit.edu

Potential ABA counterexamples are boldfaced.

From Baerman, Brown & Corbett 2005

Languages where case marking is never partially syncretic (34)

Bawm, Brahui, Cahuilla, Copainala Zoque, Dongolese Nubian, Epena Pedee, Evenki, Garo, Hausa, Hungarian, Hunzib, Ika, Imonda, Kannada, Ket, Khal-kha, Koasati, Ladakhi, Lepcha, Maricopa, Meithei, Nez Perce,¹ Nivkh, Nung-gubuyu, Paiwan, Imbabura Quechua, Sierra Miwok, South-Eastern Po-mo, Trumai, Turkish, Una, Wardaman, Witoto, Yoruba.

Languages where case marking is syncretic (40)

Araona: ERG-GEN

Eastern Armenian: GEN-DAT²

Basque: ABS-ERG

Bouma Fijian: NOM-ACC

Burushaski: ERG-GEN

Chukchi: LOC-{ERG/INSTR}

Comanche: NOM-ACC³

English: NOM-{ACC/OBL} except for animate pronouns

Finnish: NOM-ACC; ACC-GEN⁴

¹ Nez Perce has tripartite case marking everywhere but in participant pronouns, which seem to follow a nominative-accusative pattern. This could at first be analyzed in terms of NOM-ERG syncretism (cf. [Blake 1977](#); [Goddard 1982](#); [Legate 2008](#); [2014](#)). [Deal \(2016\)](#), however, offers interesting evidence that the split may actually be syntactic. Nothing crucial hinges on this for the purposes of the current proposal.

² Possibly also NOM-ACC and ACC-DAT, depending on one's analysis of DOM.

³ Not ACC-GEN or NOM-GEN, *pace* [Baerman, Brown & Corbett \(2005: 225\)](#).

⁴ Though see [Kiparsky \(2001\)](#) for a non-syncretic analysis.

French: ACC-DAT in clitics; no case outside pronouns

Georgian: **ABS-INSTR-GEN**; DAT-ADV⁵; ERG-GEN-DAT; ERG-GEN-DAT-INSTR-ADV

Modern High German: NOM-ACC; NOM-ACC-GEN; NOM-ACC-DAT; NOM-ACC-GEN-DAT; ACC-GEN; ACC-DAT; ACC-GEN-DAT; GEN-DAT.

Modern Greek: NOM-ACC; ACC-GEN

Hindi: NOM-OBL⁶

Ingush: ABS-GEN; ERG-GEN; ERG-GEN-DAT-INSTR-LAT-ALL-CMPR

Irish: {NOM/ACC}-GEN

Kayardild: NOM-LOC⁷

Krongo: NOM-{ACC/DAT}

Lak: ABS-ERG; ERG-GEN

Latvian: NOM-ACC; NOM-GEN

Lezgian: ERG-INESS

Martuthunira: ACC-GEN

Nenets: NOM-ACC; ACC-GEN; NOM-ACC-GEN

Ngiyambaa: NOM-ACC; NOM-ERG; ERG-DAT

Harar Oromo: NOM-ACC

Mangarayi: NOM-ACC; ERG-INSTR; NOM-ERG; NOM-ACC-ERG

Murle: NOM-ACC

Paumari: probably phonological conflation between NOM and ERG

Pitjantjatjara: NOM-ACC; NOM-ERG

Russian: (NOM-ACC-)GEN-LOC-DAT-INSTR; ACC-GEN-LOC; GEN-LOC-DAT; NOM-ACC-LOC; ACC-GEN; GEN-LOC; LOC-DAT; NOM-ACC⁸

Spanish: ACC-PREP; NOM-ACC

Suena: NOM-ACC

Wambaya: NOM-ACC; NOM-ERG

Warao: NOM-ACC

West Greenlandic: ABS-{ERG/GEN}

Yaqui: NOM-{ACC/POSS}

Yidiny: NOM-ACC; NOM-ERG

Yukaghir: nominative-predicative⁹

⁵ The adverbial (ADV) “is the least common of the Georgian cases. Its main function is to form adverbs from adjectives” (Aronson 1989: 69).

⁶ The so-called oblique is the form to which the ergative, the differential object-marker, and other postpositions attach.

⁷ The language does not have an accusative case (cf. Evans 1995: 2), but marks direct objects with so-called modal suffixes. Whatever the right analysis of these, the syncretism only targets one exponent, -ya, in only one of Kayardild’s six declensions (cf. Evans 1995: 125).

⁸ But see Pesetsky (2013: Ch. 7) for arguments that some apparent NOM-ACC syncretisms are actually the result of failed assignment of ACC in the syntax.

⁹ The so-called predicative case marks either the nominal predicate or S/O under focus.

Yup'ik: ABS-{ERG/GEN}

Yurok: NOM-ACC

From Plank 1991 (13 + Russian and Modern German)

Classical Arabic: NOM-GEN; GEN-ACC; NOM-GEN-ACC

Czech: NOM-ACC; ACC-INSTR; ACC-GEN; GEN-DAT; GEN-LOC; LOC-DAT; LOC-INSTR; INSTR-DAT; NOM-GEN; **NOM-INSTR**; ACC-GEN-LOC; ACC-DAT-LOC; GEN-DAT-LOC; GEN-DAT-INSTR; NOM-ACC-GEN; NOM-ACC-INSTR; ACC-GEN-DAT-INSTR; (ACC-)GEN-DAT-INSTR-LOC; NOM-ACC-GEN-DAT-LOC(-INSTR).

Old English: NOM-ACC; NOM-GEN; ACC-DAT; GEN-DAT; NOM-ACC-GEN; NOM-ACC-DAT; ACC-GEN-DAT; NOM-ACC-GEN-DAT

Old Frisian: NOM-ACC; ACC-DAT; DAT-GEN; NOM-ACC-DAT; NOM-ACC-GEN; ACC-DAT-GEN; NOM-ACC-DAT-GEN

Old High German: NOM-ACC; ACC-GEN; GEN-DAT; DAT-INSTR; NOM-ACC-GEN; NOM-ACC-INSTR; ACC-GEN-DAT; NOM-ACC-GEN-DAT

Gothic: NOM-ACC; ACC-DAT; NOM-GEN; NOM-ACC-DAT

Ancient Greek: NOM-ACC; GEN-DAT; **NOM-DAT**¹⁰

Modern Icelandic: NOM-ACC; NOM-GEN; ACC-DAT; ACC-GEN; NOM-ACC-DAT; NOM-ACC-GEN; ACC-DAT-GEN; NOM-ACC-DAT-GEN

Latin: NOM-ACC; ACC-INSTR; DAT-INSTR; NOM-GEN; GEN-DAT; NOM-ACC-INSTR; GEN-DAT-INSTR; NOM-ACC-DAT-INSTR; **NOM-INSTR**

Lithuanian: **NOM-INSTR**; NOM-ACC; INSTR-DAT

Old Norse: NOM-ACC; ACC-DAT; ACC-GEN; NOM-ACC-DAT; NOM-ACC-GEN; ACC-GEN-DAT; NOM-ACC-GEN-DAT

Polish: NOM-ACC; ACC-GEN; ACC-INSTR; GEN-LOC; LOC-DAT; GEN-LOC-DAT; NOM-ACC-GEN; **NOM-GEN-LOC-DAT**; GEN-LOC-INSTR-DAT; ACC-LOC; GEN-DAT; LOC-INSTR; ACC-GEN-LOC; ACC-GEN-LOC-DAT; NOM-ACC-GEN-LOC-INSTR-DAT.

Sanskrit: NOM-ACC; DAT-ABL; GEN-ABL; GEN-LOC; INSTR-DAT-ABL

¹⁰ Assuming conflation of \bar{o} and $\bar{o}i$, the plural of the so-called Attic declension would also instantiate ACC-DAT.

From *Caha 2009: Part III (4 + Czech, Old English, Modern German, Latin)*

Classical Armenian: NOM-ACC; ACC-LOC; NOM-ACC-LOC; GEN-DAT; LOC-GEN-DAT; LOC-DAT; ACC-LOC-DAT; GEN-DAT-ABL; LOC-GEN-DAT-ABL; LOC-GEN-DAT-INSTR

Serbian: NOM-ACC; ACC-GEN; GEN-PREP-DAT; PREP-DAT(-INSTR)

Slovene: NOM-ACC(-GEN); ACC-GEN(-PREP); GEN-PREP(-DAT); PREP-DAT; DAT-INSTR; PREP-INSTR; ACC-INSTR; **NOM-INSTR**

Ukrainian: NOM-ACC(-GEN); ACC-GEN(-PREP); GEN-PREP(-DAT); PREP-DAT; GEN-PREP-DAT-INSTR; GEN-DAT; PREP-INSTR

From *Baerman, Brown & Corbett 2002*¹¹

Languages where case is never partially syncretic (2 + Ika and Nubian)

Macushi, Yimas.

Languages where case marking is syncretic (9 + Arabic, Araona, Classical Armenian, Burushaski, Georgian, Slovene, and Yup'ik)

Bao'an: ACC-GEN¹²

Diyari: NOM-ACC; NOM-ERG

Erzja Mordvin: DAT-ILLATIVE

Kashmiri: **ABS-ABL**; ERG-ABL; ERG-DAT; ABS-ERG

Koryak: {ERG/INSTR}-LOC

Limbu: ERG-GEN

Somali: ACC-GEN; GEN-ACC; ACC-NOM

Telugu: ACC-GEN; NOM-ACC; NOM-GEN

Tsakhur: ABS-ERG; ERG-DAT; ERG-ATTR¹³

¹¹ <http://www.smg.surrey.ac.uk/syncretism>

¹² Possibly also ACC-{LOC/DAT} in pronouns, depending on one's analysis of Differential Object Marking.

¹³ The so-called attributive case (ATTR) is a genitive/possessive that undergoes concord and case stacking with respect to its possessum.

Abbreviations

ABL = ablative; ABS = absolutive; ACC = accusative; ADV = adverbial; ALL = allative; ATTR = attributive; CMPR = standard of comparison; DAT = dative; ERG = ergative; GEN = genitive; INESS = inessive; INSTR = instrumental; LAT = lative; LOC = locative; NOM = nominative; OBL = oblique; POSS = possessive; PREP = prepositional.

Competing interests

The author has no competing interests to declare.

References

- Aronson, Howard I. 1989. *Georgian: A reading grammar*. Columbus, OH: Slavica.
- Baerman, Matthew, Dunstan Brown & Greville G. Corbett. 2002. Surrey Syncretisms Database. University of Surrey. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15126/SMG.10/1>.
- Baerman, Matthew, Dunstan Brown & Greville G. Corbett. 2005. *The syntax–morphology interface: A study of syncretism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blake, Barry J. 1977. *Case marking in Australian languages*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.
- Caha, Pavel. 2009. *The nanosyntax of case*. Tromsø: University of Tromsø dissertation.
- Deal, Amy Rose. 2016. Person-based split ergativity in Nez Perce is syntactic. *Journal of Linguistics* 52. 533–564. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226715000031>.
- Evans, Nicholas D. 1995. *A grammar of Kayardild*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Goddard, Cliff. 1982. Case systems and case marking in Australian languages: A new interpretation. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 2. 167–196.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 2001. Structural case in Finnish. *Lingua* 111. 315–376. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841\(00\)00035-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0024-3841(00)00035-8).
- Legate, Julie Anne. 2008. Morphological and abstract case. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39. 55–101. <https://doi.org/10.1162/ling.2008.39.1.55>.

- Legate, Julie Anne. 2014. Split ergativity based on nominal type. *Lingua* 148. 183–212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2014.06.002>.
- Pesetsky, David. 2013. *Russian case morphology and the syntactic categories*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Plank, Frans. 1991. Rasmus Rask's dilemma. In Frans Plank (ed.), *Paradigms: The economy of inflection*, 161–196. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.