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36.1 Formal varieties of the accusative

The core function of the accusative case is to encode the affected participant in a transitive clause. Examples of this are found below.

Finnish

(1) henkilö tappo-i karhu-n (*karhu-a)
    person.nom kill.past-3sg bear.acc (*bear-part)
    'The person killed a bear'

(2) henkilö ajattel-i karhu-a (*karhu-n)
    person.nom think-3sg.past bear-part (*bear.acc)
    'The person was thinking about the bear'

(3) henkilö jo-i maito-n/maito-a
    person.nom drink-3sg.past milk.acc/milk-part
    'The person drank the milk (acc)/some milk (part)'

Finnish is representative of nominative–accusative languages in that it shows that Patient objects of canonical transitive clauses as in (1) will be eligible for ACC
case-marking. Note that those objects that are not affected (as in (2)) or affected only partially (as in (3)), take partitive rather than accusative case in Finnish. In many languages ACC marking extends beyond semantically transitive clauses taking Agent and Patient arguments (such as 'kill' or 'break'), and therefore ACC is sometimes regarded as a purely structural case (especially in the generative tradition). Yet, a more balanced view, advocated by Blake (2001) among others, is to regard accusative as a syntactic case with encoding of Patients as its semantic core. Of course, affectedness, which is a defining property of a patient, is not the only feature that determines (ACC) marking of Os. We shall return to the role of other features such as animacy for object marking in section 36.1.3 below (see Kittilä, Chapter 23 and Malchukov and de Swart, Chapter 22, for further discussion of features contributing to semantic transitivity).

### 36.1.2 Formal varieties of the accusative

In (1)–(3) examples from Finnish were illustrated in which the accusative is expressed by attaching the suffix -n to the noun. This is the typical way of expressing the accusative in Finnish for nouns. However, the form of the accusative marker varies according to whether the element it attaches to is a noun or a pronoun. Thus in Finnish the accusative is formed with the suffix -n in the case of nouns (see (1)), while pronouns bear the suffix -t (e.g. minu-t 1sg-ACC 'me'). This variation is mandatory and the markers are not in free variation. The status of these affixes is also different, which means, for example, that -n is eliminated in passivization, while -t is not. These kinds of formal differences in the expression of the accusative (or direct object) are attested in many other languages, as Germanic languages such as English and Swedish, in which only pronouns have a distinct accusative form, illustrate. A somewhat similar case is illustrated in (4–5) from the Australian (Pama-Nyungan) language Bidjara:

**Bidjara (Blake 1976: 282)**

(4) òura-òu munda bada-la
dog-erg snake bite-past

'A dog bit a snake'

(5) òaya nuòu-na bada-la
1.nom he-acc bite-past

'I bit him'

Bidjara is a language with split ergativity dependent on the nature of arguments: the marking pattern is absolutive-ergative for nouns and nominative-acusative for pronouns. This has the consequence that the direct object can be marked in two ways; it either bears an overt accusative marking (pronouns) or it bears no
overt marking (nouns). The variation is between an overtly marked accusative and a zero-marked 'accusative'. Generally, it is true that if a dedicated ACC case is found on nouns, it will be also found on pronouns, although exceptions to this do exist (Iggesen 2005b; see Iggesen, Chapter 16 for more discussion of 'case asymmetries' between different classes of nominals).

36.1.3 Restrictions on the use of the accusative

Given that pronominals frequently display idiosyncratic behaviour as compared to nouns, differential marking of pronominal and nominal Os discussed above may seem a merely morphological matter. Yet, as repeatedly observed in the typological literature (Silverstein 1976; Moravcsik 1978; Comrie 1981a; Bossong 1985a), this split is in fact a part of a more general cross-linguistic pattern, where overt accusative marking is restricted to animate (human) nouns, while inanimate nouns bear zero marking. This phenomenon known as 'Differential Object Marking' (Bossong 1985a) is illustrated below for Korku and Awa Pit:

Korku (Nagaraja 1999: 46)

(6) \textit{iň} \text{g}a:Dí(-ke) \text{sege-pa}
   \text{I cart(-obj) bring-NONPAST}
   'I will bring a/the cart'

(7) \textit{iň} si\text{Ta}-ku-ke saya-ku-ba
   \text{I dog-PL-OBJ take-PERS-NONPAST}
   'I will take the dogs'

Awa Pit (Curnow 1997: 72ff)

(8) ishu=\text{na} \text{pítikku ku-m}
   \text{tiger=TOP sloth eat-ADJZR}
   'Tigers eat sloths'

(9) santos=\text{ta}=\text{na} mvza p\text{yan-a-ma-t}
   \text{Santos=ACC=TOP almost hit-PL:SUBJ-COMP-PF.PTCP}
   'They almost beat up Santos'

In Korku, the affix -ke is mandatory with animate nouns, while it is only optional with inanimate nouns. In Awa Pit the ACC marker is possible only for human objects, as illustrated in (8)–(9). DOM displays a great deal of variation cross-linguistically in terms of what classes of nominals can (viz. should/must) be marked explicitly as (direct) objects, what are the features involved (animacy, person, definiteness), but availability of overt accusative marking is invariably restricted to the nouns occupying higher positions on the Animacy Hierarchy (see Malchukov and de Swart, Chapter 22 for discussion). In other languages ACC marking is sensitive to
relative prominence of subject and object on the animacy hierarchy. For example, in Yukaghir (Maslova 2003), ACC marking is absent if the subject is the first/second person, while it is obligatory if the subject is in the third person (i.e. when it is not higher than O on the person hierarchy). Ik is another language of this type (see König, Chapter 50).

Object marking may be further restricted if one looks (beyond monotransitive) at ditransitive constructions. Notably, some languages extend DOM to ditransitive clauses with animate objects (themes), while other languages do not. That is, in the languages of the former type animate Ts of ditransitives are marked in the same way as animate Ps of monotransitives, while in the languages of the latter type T is left unmarked even if animate. The former case is illustrated by Korku (in (10)), while the latter is illustrated by Awa Pit (in (11)):

Korku (Nagaraja 1999: 46)

(10) ra:ja ra:na-ke sita-ke ji-khe-nc
    king.nom ram-do Sita-do give-past-pers
    ‘The king gave Sita to Ram’

Awa Pit (Curnow 1997: 72ff)

(11) na=na santos=ta pashu mvla-ta-w
    1sg:nom=top Santos=acc daughter give-past-locut:subj
    ‘I gave my daughter to Santos’

In Korku, DOM is found both in monotransitive clauses (see (6)–(7) above) and in ditransitive clauses (in (10)). Note that marking of animate themes in the ditransitive clause (10) results in an identical marking of theme and recipient, a situation which is avoided in many languages for reasons of ambiguity. This also provides an explanation why in other languages (like Awa Pit in (11)) DOM is suspended in ditransitive clauses. Note that in Awa Pit, the O marker =na, which is obligatory on animate Os of monotransitives (see (9)), is not found on animate themes of ditransitives. (See Kittilä 2006a, b for further discussion of ambiguity resolution in ditransitives, and Malchukov 2008a for animacy effects in differential case marking, in general.)

36.1.4 Distribution of the accusative: accusative on non-typical hosts

The examples above where accusative markers attach to a direct object illustrate the canonical function of accusative case. In addition, accusative markers may also attach to other elements of clauses. For example, in many languages ACC
case is found on adverials of distance and duration; cf. Finnish *juoks-i tunni-n/kilometri-n* [run-3SG.PAST hour-ACC/kilometre-ACC] ‘ran for an hour/a kilometre’. Even though accusative marks an adjunct rather than a direct complement, in terms of case-marking (only) the two constructions are similar. This similarity also carries over to accusative/partitive alternations (as in (3)), which is also attested for adverials (see Maling, Chapter 5, for further discussion and exemplification). In some languages the accusative marker appears beyond time/duration adverials. For example, in Arabic ACC is found on manner adverbs (cf. e.g. forms like *jiddiy-an* ‘seriously’ (ACC) in Standard Arabic), and in Ge’ez it additionally marks nominal predicates (cf. *wa-kon=a nad¯afe* [and-be.PRF=3SG archer-ACC] ‘and he became an archer’; Weninger 1999: 39). A related pattern represents ‘accusative of respect’ as found in (Ancient) Greek; cf. examples like *diaphérein phúsín* ‘to be different in nature’ (ACC)’ (see Luraghi, Chapter 9).

ACC marking is common on nominalized complement clauses; cf. the following example from Even (Tungusic): *asi muchu-ri-va-n haram* [woman return-part-ACC-3SG.POS know.I] ‘I know that the woman returned’ (Malchukov 1995). In some languages ACC appears on infinitives as well (e.g. in Quechua; see Spencer, Chapter 12, ex. 3). A more exotic example is provided by Koasati where variation between NOM and ACC on non-finite forms serves as means of switch-reference: the former is used as a same subject marker, the latter as a different subject marker (Kimball 1991: 226). Sometimes, deviant distribution of an ACC marker reflects its morphological status as a clitic rather than an affix. Thus in Samelai (Kruspe 1999: 262), an ACC marker is used as a proclitic on the postverbal object (which is reminiscent of the prefixal ACC marking), but is encliticized to the verb if the object is omitted.

### 36.1.5 Alternative strategies

In this chapter we shall use the term ACC (case) in a broad sense which will include, apart from case proper, also other forms of ‘dependent-marking’ including clitics (cf. enclitic =*ra* in Persian), particles (e.g. ACC postpositional particle *o* in Japanese), and adpositions (e.g. ACC postposition =*ko* in Hindi). The reason for grouping them together is that the distinctions between these categories and case proper are not clear-cut, and may depend on theoretical analysis. For example, the ACC marker =*ko* in Hindi can be analysed either as a postposition attaching to the oblique form of a noun, or as a case attaching to the oblique stem.

An alternative strategy for object marking is achieved through ‘head-marking’ (agreement/cross-referencing), which is opposed to different forms of dependent-marking (Haspelmath 2005a speaks of ‘flagging’ vs. ‘indexing’ of grammatical relations). Radically ‘head-marking’ languages, e.g. many Amerindian, lack case
distinction on (core) arguments altogether; here (object) agreement can indeed be conceived as an alternative strategy to (accusative) case. In other languages, which have both case and agreement, the two strategies may be used in combination, as exemplified for Amharic:

Amharic (Gasser 1983: 110)

(12) girma  bet-u-n  gàzza-Ø(-w)
Pronoun house-DEF-ACC buy/PAST-3SG.I(-3SG.II)

’Girma bought the house’

(13) girma  bet  gàzza-Ø
PN house buy/PAST-3SG.1

’Girma bought a house’

Amharic is another language with a typical DOM system determined by definiteness distinctions: definite direct objects bear explicit accusative marking, while indefinite direct objects are zero-marked (see Amberber, Chapter 51). In addition to being overtly marked accusative, definite objects differ from indefinite ones in that only definite objects may be cross-referenced in the verb.

While verb agreement need not be complementary to case, word order is indeed an alternative strategy for differentiating between (Agent and Patient) arguments, which takes over when there are no formal differences between subjects and objects. Most illustrative in this respect is the phenomenon of ‘word order freezing’, that is, a change from a variable order of subjects and objects to invariable in cases when NOM and ACC happen to be non-distinct (cf. Neeleman and Weerman, Chapter 18). For example, in Finnish, nominative and accusative are morphologically distinct case forms in the singular (cf. -ø vs. -n), but this distinction is neutralized in the plural (both are marked by -t). The order of the arguments in these cases is invariably subject–object when both are in the plural, even though the order of arguments is free (pragmatically determined) elsewhere. Similarly in Russian, if the form of the subject and object happens to be identical (as is the case in certain declensional types), it cannot be changed without a concomitant change in interpretation. (cf. Jakobson’s famous example Matj ljubit doˇcj ‘Mother (NOM=ACC) loves the daughter (NOM=ACC)’). The relation between word order and case is also typologically confirmed by the correlation between the absence of case and the SVO word order (see Siewierska and Bakker, Chapter 19).

While agreement (viz. cross-referencing) and word order have been traditionally recognized as alternatives to case-marking of grammatical functions, other strategies should be mentioned as well. A number of languages (e.g. Chukchi) make liberal use of object incorporation (see Mithun 1984 for a general discussion). Tungusic languages illustrate the use of a lesser known ‘reflexive’ strategy of marking direct objects (Malchukov 1995; cf. Benzing 1955). Note that unlike other ‘Altaic’
languages (e.g. Turkic), unmarked objects are generally not found in (North) Tungusic, unless the object takes a reflexive possessive marker. For example, in Even, direct objects usually take the accusative case in -w/-u/-m; however, in the presence of the reflexive-possessive marker -j/-i/-mi (in sg ~ -vur/-ur/-bur in pl) the accusative marker is lacking (Malchukov 1995); cf.: oro-m d’avran [reindeer-acc caught] ‘he caught the reindeer’ vs. or-mi d’avran [reindeer-refl.pos caught] ‘he caught his own reindeer’. The reflexive strategy makes sense functionally: since the noun in the reflexive-possessive form cannot be construed as a subject, reflexive marking helps to disambiguate subject from object (see Malchukov and Spencer, Chapter 45 for further discussion). A more exotic case of object marking is found in Gazi (Iranian), where pronominal markers (‘agreement enclitics’) consistently attach to the direct object and thus can be regarded as an unconventional ACC marking (Stilo, Chapter 48).

### 36.2 Functional varieties and polysemy patterns

#### 36.2.1 Functional varieties of ACC

Some languages distinguish between definite and indefinite ACC cases. One option would be to use a Partitive case in the function of indefinite ACC, of the type we observed for Finnish in (3), or some other case expressing a partitive function, such as genitive in Russian: cf. On vypil vodu/vody [he drank water-acc/gen] ‘He drank the water/some water’. Evenki (Tungusic), has indefinite accusative in -(j)A (with allomorph -o) contrasted with the definite ACC in -w(A) (with allomorph -mo):

\[\text{Evenki (Nedjalkov 1997: 193)}\]

\[(14) \quad \text{Oron-mo/Oron-o d’ava-kal}\]

\[\text{reindeer-acc/reindeer-accin catch-impr.2sg}\]

‘Catch the/a reindeer’

The indefinite ACC can be also used in a partitive function (cf. mokar-ve genne= ‘bring (some) firewood’; Nedjalkov 1997: 193), which highlights functional similarities between the two cases. Note, however, that while the Finnish partitive can be used to render (in)definiteness distinctions only in the case of plural objects (cf. näin poiki-a [saw boy.pl-part] ‘saw (some) boys’), the use of the indefinite accusative in Evenki shows no such restrictions. Another interesting use of the
indefinite accusative case is ‘designative’: if indefinite ACC appears in combination with a possessive marker, the object is understood as destined for a certain person (to which the possessive marker refers):

Evenki (Nedjalkov 1997: 147)

(15) D’av-ja-v oo-kal
    boat-ACC in-1SG.Poss make-IMP.2SG
‘Make a boat for me’

Designative cases in Tungusic are further discussed in Malchukov, Chapter 44.

As already mentioned in §36.1.3. above, in many languages (e.g. in most Uralic and Altaic) an object can be left unmarked if it is indefinite/non-specific, in a classical DOM pattern. Interpretation of these cases is controversial (see Iggesen, Chapter 16, and Baerman, Chapter 14, for somewhat different analyses of this pattern). Some grammars of Turkic and Mongolian languages qualify these forms as ‘zero accusatives’, while others qualify them as nominative. Yet another approach will distinguish between nominative forms with a zero exponent and nouns unmarked for case involved in a DOM pattern. The latter approach stands to reason given the similarity of constructions with unmarked Os to noun incorporation in other languages (see Malchukov and Spencer, Chapter 45, for further discussion). This is also consistent with the fact that ‘zero accusatives’ can appear in many languages only when adjacent to the verb. For example, in Turkic languages unmarked objects normally appear only in the preverbal position (see Johanson 2006 et passim).

36.2.2 Polysemy patterns

36.2.2.1 Polysemy involving core cases

Expression of O in the same form as S is of course very common, as witnessed by ergative languages, where the absolutive form is used in both functions. Yet, in most cases the absolutive argument is unmarked, so it is less appropriate to speak of polysemy here. Yet in other languages, an (overt) ACC spreads to some intransitive predicates resulting in a kind of split intransitive (alias active/stative) system. Although split intransitivity is more frequently manifested through cross-referencing, in some languages it is manifested through case-markers as well. Consider the case of Quechua where experiencer subjects of some intransitives (desiderative and stative predicates) appear in the ACC:

1 The polysemy of the accusative case markers has been recently discussed in Henkelmann (2006). This study came to our attention too late to be taken into account in the present chapter.
varieties of accusative (Cole 1982: 107)

(16) Juzi-ta punu-naya-n
Jose-ACC sleep-DESC-3
‘Jose wants to sleep/is sleepy’

In Quechua accusative experiencers qualify as subjects by the standard syntactic tests (switch-reference, raising, etc.), and therefore can count as ‘non-canonical’ (i.e. non-canonically marked) subjects (Hermon 2001). The origin of such ‘extended accusative’ systems is assumed to be either analogical extension motivated by functional similarity between P arguments and subjects of unaccusative intransitives (Plank 1985; Harris and Campbell 1995) or direct reanalysis of the transitive (‘transimpersonal’) pattern (Malchukov 2008a; cf. Mithun 2008; Donohue 2007).

Another case of polysemy involving ACC markers relates to the much discussed issue of the alignment strategies in ditransitive clauses as compared to monotransitive (Blansitt 1973; Dryer 1986; Siewierska 2004; Haspelmath 2004). As is well known, either theme (T) or recipient (R) of a ditransitive construction can pattern like the object-patient (P) of monotransitives. In the former case (‘indirective’ marking) the distinction is between direct (P = T) and indirect objects (R), while in the latter case (‘secundative’ marking) the distinction is between primary (P = R) and secondary (T) objects (Dryer 1986; see Chapter 33 for the terms ‘indirective’ and ‘secundative’).

Note that in the latter case, the same case (ACC = DAT) marks both Ps and Rs, provided that the language makes use of dependent marking. Generally, it has been noted (Siewierska 2004; Haspelmath 2004) that case (or ‘flagging’ in general) favours indirective alignment, while agreement (‘indexing’) favours secundative alignment. This is obvious from the existence of ‘mixed’ patterns where alignment is indirective in terms of case-marking but secundative in terms of (object) agreement (see Haspelmath 2005a on Bawm). For example, in Ostyak (Khanty), object agreement is invariably with the recipient (i.e. secundative), while alignment is invariably with the recipient (i.e. secundative), while case-marking may be either indirective (as in (17) where R is introduced by a preposition), or secundative (as in (18) where T appears in the oblique case combining locative and instrumental functions):

Ostyak (Nikolaeva 1999: 40)

(17) Ma a:n juwan elti ma-s-e:m
I cup John to give-PAST-SG/O+1SG
‘I gave the cup to John’

(18) Ma juwan a:n-na ma-s-e:m
I John cup-OBL give-PAST-SG/O+1SG
‘I gave the cup to John’
In the Vakh dialect of Khanty (Tereshkin 1961: 65), a special oblique case (tvoritel’nyj-objektnyj) is used for T, while P and R remain unmarked (if nominal). Generally, languages like Vakh Khanty which are consistently secundative in terms of case are rare. More common are situations when the same case that is used for R is also found on some Ps, yielding a familiar DOM pattern. Differential object marking prevents a neat distinction between the indirective and secundative alignment patterns, yielding a kind of a ‘split’ (or ‘dual’; Siewierska 2004) marking. A further complication, also noted above, relates to the fact that languages displaying DOM may either restrict it to Ts of monotransitive clauses or extend it to Ts of ditransitives as well. Polysemies involved in different patterns of ditransitive alignment are further discussed in Malchukov and Narrog, Chapter 34.

36.2.2.2 Polysemy beyond core arguments

Turning to other cases of polyfunctionality involving ACC markers, we may note that some languages use the same case for encoding of O and Possessors. Of course, this pattern is frequent when both Ps and possessor are zero-marked (e.g. in consistently head-marking languages), but is found also elsewhere. For example, ACC/GEN polysemy is widespread in Uto-Aztecan; cf. (Derdrick and Casad 1999: 129) from (Sonora) Yaqui: Maria=ta kuúna [Maria-ACC husband] ‘Mary’s husband’. GEN is frequently involved in patterns of differential object marking (Moravcsik 1978). On the one hand, it can be used in a partitive sense to mark indefinite/partitive Os; cf. Russian: On vypil vody [he drank water-GEN] ‘He drank some water’. Less usual is the opposite situation found in Finnish, where GEN=ACC marking of definite Os is opposed to the partitive (as in (3) above). Similarly the use of Instrumental is restricted as an O marker, either as a marker of T-arguments (as in some languages with secundative alignment), or as a marker of indefinite objects involved in a DOM pattern, as reported for Yukaghir and Eskimo.

36.2.2.3 Polyfunctionality with locative cases

We have already illustrated examples of accusative–dative polysemy, which is common in languages with DOM. This polysemy is attested in many language families (cf. Bossong 1985a), including Romance languages (cf. preposition a in Spanish), Indo-Aryan (the enclitic =ko in Hindi), Tibeto-Burman (cf. object suffix =wa in Kham), Afro-Asiatic (cf. preposition lil in Maltese Arabic), and in some South-American languages (e.g. –ta in Awa Pit in (9) and (11)). In many of these languages polyfunctionality extends beyond core cases when dative has additionally an allative function (cf. Naess, Chapter 38). Accusative–allative polysemy that is not mediated by the recipient function does exist (Creissels, Chapter 42), but in most cases seems to be lexically restricted (e.g. few motion verbs in Korean allow the Goal in the
accusative). Perhaps, more surprisingly, P can share the same marking with the Source as well. Thus in Iranian languages some ACC markers are arguably of ablative origin; cf. the accusative marker =de of the locative–ablative origin in Sangesari (Stilo, Chapter 48). Some other accusative markers of spatial origin have been reported for a number of languages: thus in Rumanian, the preposition pe ‘on’ is used to introduce animate objects, while in Quechua the accusative enclitic =ta also has a prolicative function (‘through X, past X’).

Still other polysemy patterns are attested, but they seem to be more rare or restricted in different ways. Of course, in languages with an impoverished case system, polyfunctionality of the ACC (better characterized as an oblique) can extend to further functions, but then it is likely to include one or several of the functions mentioned above (see Arkadiev, Chapter 47).

36.2.2.4 *Diachronic dimension of polysemy patterns*

As is clear from the discussion above, in many cases polysemy patterns can be best viewed diachronically as gradual extensions from one function into another. Thus, allative–dative–accusative polysemy represents a well established grammaticalization chain (cf. Lehman 1995; Aristar 1996; Heine and Kuteva 2002: 103; see also Heine, Chapter 29). The origin of the accusative–genitive polysemy is functionally less transparent, except for the cases when gen is used in a partitive function (cf. Lander, Chapter 39). In fact, in some instances (as in Finno-Ugrian) their identity is due to a phonologically conditioned syncretism. In some other cases the accusative–genitive polysemy seems to be mediated through the dative function. This holds for Uto-Aztecan languages, which have a secundative alignment in ditransitives, that is, use the same case for P and R arguments.

Another path of grammaticalization concerns ACC markers of verbal origin (cf. Blake 2001; Heine and Kuteva 2002: 289–90). Consider this example from Fongbe, where the object (theme) is introduced by the ‘light’ verb meaning ‘take’:

Fongbe (Lefebvre and Brousseau 2002: 445)

(19) kòkù só àson ó ná àsíbá
    PN  take crab def give PN
    ‘Koku gave the crab to Asiba’

Similar examples of the use of take verbs in a serial verb construction to introduce the object are attested elsewhere; in particular, they are common in isolating languages of Africa and South East Asia (Lord 1982; Heine and Kuteva 2002: 289–90). As such a ‘disposal’ verb grammaticalizes it can eventually give rise to an object (‘accusative’) marker. A well-known example is (Mandarin) Chinese where the coverb/preposition bá historically derives from a verb meaning ‘grasp’ (Li and Thompson 1981; see also Enfield, Chapter 57, for discussion of a similar
‘disposal’ construction in Lao). Note that ‘take’ verbs in a disposal construction can independently develop into the instrumental marker (that is, a serial verb construction of the general form ‘X take Y (and) (X) V-s Z’ can be reanalysed as ‘X with Y V-s Z’) (Heine and Kuteva 2002: 290; Blake 2001). This can ultimately result in a secundative alignment with T being marked identically to Instruments.

Sometimes accusative case has its origin in pragmatic markers (cf. König, Chapter 35, on the pragmatic origin of ‘marked nominatives’). Thus case prefixes in Berber arguably originate from prefixed determiners marking definite-topical NPs (Sasse 1984: 122; see Kulikov, Chapter 28). This grammaticalization path can be naturally explained under the assumption that direct objects are secondary topics (Givón 1984). On the other hand, we also find cases where ACC markers develop from reanalysis of the focus construction as suggested by Tosco (1994) for Cushitic (see also König, Chapter 35; Heine, Chapter 29). The case of Gazi (an Iranian language), where direct object is marked by ‘agreement enclitics’ seems to be a related pattern (see Stilo, Chapter 48, for discussion and exemplification). The possible motivation behind this path of reanalysis, which is in a way opposite to the one proposed by Givón, is that Os usually constitute a rhematic part of a transitive construction.

36.2.3 Use of case in complex (adpositional, etc.) structures

The range of functions of the ACC increases further if one takes into account its use in complex constructions. A pattern with an ACC used in adpositional phrases in a Goal function is familiar from Indo-European languages: here ACC contrasts with DAT in encoding of Goal as opposed to static location; cf. German and Russian: geht in die Schule [goes in the ACC school] R. idet v školu [goes in school]. In some South-Slavic languages ACC has generalized its use giving rise to a General Oblique Case used in prepositional cases ousting other cases from this function (see Sobolev, Chapter 49). Altaic languages provide examples of the use of ACC with postpositions; usually this is due to the origin of the postpositional markers from (transitive) verbs; cf. Even: d’uu-v erel [house-ACC around] ‘around the house’ (erel ← erel ‘circle; turn round’). Similar cases are attested in Dravidian languages; cf. Tamil: viiTT-ai viiTTu [house-ACC from] ‘from the house’ (viiTTu ← viTu ‘leave’). A somewhat similar pattern is found in languages where accusative form is identical to the oblique stem, and other cases are derived from it; cf. multiple case marking in Maale (Cushitic) where the emergent ablative locative case attaches to the ‘accusative stem’ (Amha 2001): mdär-ō-idda.ppa [house-ACC-LOC-ABL] ‘from the house’). This is parallel to a situation found in many ergative languages, where
the ergative case serves as a base for further case inflection (Palancar, Chapter 37; Daniel and Ganenkov, Chapter 46).
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