Case and agreement alignment in Uralic ditransitives

András Bárány, barany.andras@nytud.mta.hu
Research Institute for Linguistics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences

The Ob-Ugric languages Khanty and Mansi have different types of ditransitive constructions (Virtanen 2012, 2014, Nikolaeva 1999, Dalrymple & Nikolaeva 2011). Both languages exhibit so-called *indirective* as well as *secundative* alignment (Haspelmath 2005, Dryer 1986), in both case-marking and agreement.

In this paper, I sketch a typology of case and agreement alignment in ditransitives inside and outside the Uralic family and present an analysis that predicts exactly and only the attested patterns of case and agreement alignment.

**Indirective and secundative alignment** Indirective and secundative alignment differ in whether the single object in a transitive construction (p) patterns with the theme-like object (t) or with the recipient-like object (r) of a ditransitive. In indirective alignment, (1a), p and t pattern together, and in secundative alignment, (1b), p and r pattern together.

(1) a. **Indirective alignment**

   P

   T

   R

   b. **Secundative alignment**

   P

   T

   R

Both types of alignment can affect *case-marking and agreement*. Examples are given in (2) and (3) with agreement controllers **bold**. Both languages show agreement in person and number with the subject (glossed as *sbj*) and number agreement only with the object (glossed as *obj*).

(2) a. **Indirective case and agreement**

   *ma aːn Petra eːlti ma-s-eːm* / *ma-s-əm.*

   I cup Peter to give-pst-SG.OBJ<1SG.SBJ give-pst-SG.SBJ

   ‘I gave a/the cup to Peter.’

   b. **Secundative case and agreement**

   *ma Petra aːn-ːa ma-s-eːm* / *ma-s-əm.*

   I Peter cup-LOC give-pst-SG.OBJ<1SG.SBJ give-pst-SG.SBJ

   ‘I gave a/the cup to Peter.’

   (Dalrymple & Nikolaeva 2011: 148)

(3) a. **Indirective case and agreement**

   *moot sōːn-iɔːɡəl keeɭoːp-mɔ wɛ-ːtBtn, kooɭ-poʊsɐm-ʊt*

   other bowl-full blood-ACC take-pst-OBJ.SG<3SG.SBJ boat- stern-LOC

   *pʊw-ʊtəːn tɔw-ːmʊ-ːtBtn.*

   tow-ACC<3SG.SBJ

   ‘He took the other bowl full of blood and gave it to his son …’

   b. **Secundative case and agreement**

   *am nǔː-ːn tat-ʊs-lɔm nɛe-l.*

   1SG 2SG-SG.2SG bring-pst-SG.OBJ<1SG.SBJ WOMAN-INS

   ‘I brought you a wife.’, lit. ‘I brought you with a wife.’

   (Virtanen 2012: 125f.)
**Analysis**
There are four logical possibilities of combining secundative and indirective alignment in case and agreement, but only three of these are attested: there are no languages with secundative case alignment, but indirective agreement alignment (cf. Haspelmath 2005).

This pattern can be explained as follows. Bobaljik (2008) proposes that in a given language, case-marking determines which arguments can trigger agreement, following a hierarchy:

(4) unmarked case \((\text{nom/abs})\) > dependent case \((\text{acc/erg})\) > lexical case \((\text{dat})\) > oblique case \((\text{lat/ins})\)

If a language allows agreement with a case on this hierarchy, it will also allow agreement with cases higher on the hierarchy. In secundative case and agreement alignment in (2) and (3), the \(r\) argument is unmarked and the \(t\) argument is oblique \((\text{ins})\) or has a postposition. In indirective case and agreement alignment, \(t\) is unmarked and \(r\) is oblique \((\text{lat})\) or has a postposition.

(5)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{verb} \\
\text{ApplIP} \\
\text{IO-acc} \quad \text{V} \\
\text{IO-acc} \quad \text{V} \\
\text{DO-obl} \quad \text{T} \\
\text{IO-acc} \quad \text{V} \\
\text{DO-obl} \quad \text{T} \\
\text{IO-acc} \quad \text{V} \\
\text{DO-obl} \quad \text{T} \\
\text{IO-acc} \quad \text{V} \\
\text{DO-obl} \quad \text{T} \\
\end{array}
\]

\(\checkmark\) Agreement with \(r\) possible

\(\times\) Agreement with \(t\) impossible

If case alignment is secundative, \(r\) *must* be able to agree, since it patterns with \(p\), the single object of a monotransitive — in languages with object agreement, \(p\) can agree. In ditransitive structures, (5), where the verb is higher than both the indirect object \(r\) and the direct object \(t\), it is therefore impossible that agreement skips the \(r\) argument to agree with \(t\), which is more oblique (lower on (4)). The Uralic family thus represents two of the four logical alignment types:

(6) a. Indirective case and agreement: Hungarian, Khanty, Mansi, Mordvin, Nenets

b. Secundative case and agreement: Khanty, Mansi

The lack of indirective case and secundative agreement is due to the lack of agreement with \(\text{dat}\) arguments in Uralic languages: in Hungarian, Mordvin, and Nenets, object agreement only targets direct objects (this alignment type is found, e.g., in the Chukotko-Kamchatkan languages Chukchi and Itelmen, Dunn 1999, Bobaljik & Wurmbrand 2002). Agreement with recipient objects in Khanty and Mansi always correlates with secundative case alignment as well, and therefore generally targets unmarked (or \(\text{acc}\)) arguments.
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