# A cross-linguistic study of case and switch-reference in unrelated languages

Rafael Nonato* and Livia Souza**

March 21, 2014

**Abstract**

The growing body of information on the world's languages has revealed typological similarities among languages which can hardly be said to be historically or geographically related, corroborating the hypothesis that linguistic variation is limited. In this talk we illustrate this claim with two case studies where we compare Amerindian languages with Australian, Trans New Guinean, and Austronesian languages with respect to clause-combining and argument-marking phenomena.

In the first case study we compare on the one side Kĩsêdjê (Jê, Brazil) and Panoan languages, and on the other side Austronesian, Trans New Guinean and Pama-Nyungan languages. The languages compared display a mechanism to disambiguate sentences such as "He saw him and he ran away". Morphology between the clauses indicates whether their subjects are identical or different in reference, a kind of morphology that has been labeled "switch-reference marking" by Jacobsen (1967). We will look at details of the construction across the language groups and identify similarities and parametrized differences in its instantiations.

In our second case study we compare on the one side Panoan languages and on the other side Pama-Nyungan languages. The languages compared have in common the fact that their ergative case systems are split according to a person hierarchy. Authors such as Goddard (1982), Comrie (1991), Legate (2008, 2012) and Baker (in press) have proposed that the latter languages have tripartite case systems in which ergative is assigned to subjects of transitive clauses, accusative to objects, and nominative to subjects of intransitive clauses. We will show that a number of Panoan languages also display such a system and analyse similarities and contrasts among the specific constructions.



*UFRJ [rafaeln@gmail.com]
**UFRJ [livia.camargo.rj@gmail.com]

# 1 Switch-reference marking

(1) Switch-reference marking in Kĩsêdjê (Jê, Brazil, Nonato's field notes)

a. Different subject:
Hẽn [ wa ngátyrejê thõ mã khon kande ] =**nhy** [ ∅ mbra. ]
FACT [ $1_{nom}$ child a to $3_{abs}$.knee treat ] =**and.DS** [ $3_{nom}$ walk. ]
'I treated the child's knee and he walked.'

b. Same subject:
∅ [ Khupyt=ta sukande py ] =**n** [ ∅ tho ∅-khra kande. ]
FACT [ K.=NOM medicine get ] =**and.ss** [ $3_{nom}$ $3_{abs}$.with $3_{abs}$-son treat ]
'K. got this medicine and *pro* treated his son with it.'

## 1.1 Types of distinction encoded

In the tables below *S* stands for *subject*, whether of transitive or intransitive verbs. We propose that switch-reference marking is sensitive to argument case rather than to verb transitivity. The latter proposal has been defended, among others, by Valenzuela (2003) and Camacho (2010).

Though in most situations the proposals can't be distinguished, in section 2.4 we discuss situations where ergative is assigned to the subject of *intransitive* verbs. In those situations, we can unambiguously detect that switch-reference is sensitive to the *case* rather than to transitivity.

Additionally, in the Warlpiri switch-reference system, the *O=S* marker is unambiguously sensitive to the case of the object. This provides an additional argument that switch-reference is sensitive to case. It extends to the tracking of subjects given a desideratum of parsimonious grammars.

Table 1: SR markers in Shipibo (Panoan, Peru)

| function of the coreferent arguments | | tense of the clause on the left with respect to the clause on the right | |
|---|---|---|---|
| in the clause on the left | in the clause on the right | simultaneous | anterior |
| S | S (ABS) | *-i* | *-ax* |
| S | S (ERG) | *-kin* | *-xon* |
| S | S | *-anan* | *-taanan* |
| O | S | *-a* | |
| subjects not coreferential: | | *-n/-tian* | |

[ adapted from Camacho (2010) ]

Table 2: SR markers in Warlpiri (Pama-Nyungan, Australia)

| function of the coreferent arguments | | tense of the clause on the left with respect to the clause on the right | |
|---|---|---|---|
| in the clause on the left | in the clause on the right | simultaneous or anterior | anterior |
| S (ABS) | S | *-karra* | *-ngaka/-rla* |
| S (ERG) | S | *-karra-rlu* | |
| O (ACC) | S | *-kurra* | |
| O (DAT) | S | *-kurra-ku* | |
| subjects not coreferential: | | *-ngkarni/-rlarni* | |

[ adapted from Austin (1981b) (citing Hale, 1976),
with a refinement from Simpson (1991, p. 318, fn. 9) ]

(2) **O=S** marker in Shipibo (Panoan, Peru, Valenzuela 2003, p. 424, ex. 25)
[ Ja-n e-a rao-n ] **-a** -ra [ e-n nonti bená-wan-ke ]
[ 3-ERG 1-ABS medicine-TRNZ ] **-O=S** -EV [ 1-ERG canoe:ABS look.for-PST1-CMPL ]
'(S)he treated me with plant medicine and I looked for a canoe.'

(3) **O=S** marker in Warlpiri (Pama-Nyungan, Australia, Austin 1981b, p. 325, ex. 55)
[ Ngajulu-rlu rna yankirri-∅ pantu-rnu, ] [ *pro* ngapa nga-rninja**-kurra**. ]
[ I-ERG AUX emu-ABS spear-PAST ] [ *emu* water-ABS drink-INF-**S=O** ]
'I speared the emu while it was drinking water.'

## 1.2 Agreement with subject of reference clause

(4) In Kĩsêdjê (Jê, Brazil) SR-marking conjunctions agree in person/case with the *following* subject
[ atha=n ka khu-ˈpy ] **=wa** [ ˈnhũm=na **wa** tho ∅-kande mã? ]
[ that=INFL $2_{nom}$ $3_{acc}$-get ] =and.DS.$\mathbf{1_{nom}}$ [ who=INFL $\mathbf{1_{nom}}$ $3_{abs}$.with $3_{acc}$-treat FUT ]
'You got that and who will I treat with it for you?' (Nonato's field notes)

(5) In Yawanawa (Panoan, Brazil) SS-marking conjunctions agree in case with the *following* subject
[ Tuĩ Kuru-nẽ Tamakãyã anu peshe xarakapa wa ] **-she** [ ***pro*** ik-a. ]
[ Tuĩ Kuru-ERG Tamakaya LOC house pretty make ] -and.SS.**ABS** [ he.**ABS** AUX.INTR-PRF ]
'Tuĩ Kuru made a pretty house by the Tamakayã creek and lives there.' (Souza's field notes)

(6) In Warlpiri (Pama-Nyungan) SS-marking conjunctions agree in case with the *preceding* subject
[ Ngarrka-**ngku** karnta paka-rnu ] [ ngarrka-kariyinyanu-ku rdanpa-rninja-karra-**rlu**. ]
[ Man-**ERG** woman hit-PST ] [ man-OTH.SELF-DAT accompany-INF-SS-**ERG** ]
'While accompanying another man, the man hit the woman. (Simpson, 1991, ex. 162b)

## 1.3 Partial coreference

There are 3 types of situations in which referential expressions are neither completely coreferent nor have completely disjoint reference.

(7) Subtypes of partial coreference
a. **Growing Subject**: $S_1 \subset S_2$ $(S_1 = \{i\}\,; S_2 = \{i, j\})$
$\underline{\text{I}_i}$ built the house by myself and $\underline{\text{we}_i + j}$ all live in it.
b. **Shrinking Subject**: $S_1 \supset S_2$ $(S_1 = \{i, j\}\,; S_2 = \{i\})$
$\underline{\text{We}_i + j}$ built the house together and only $\underline{\text{I}_i}$ live in it.
c. **Strictly-Intersecting Subjects**:
$S_1 \cap S_2 \neq \emptyset$, $S_1 \not\subset S_2$, $S_1 \not\supset S_2$ $(S_1 = \{i, j\}\,; S_2 = \{i, k\})$
$\underline{\text{He}_i \text{ and his father-in-law}_j}$ built the house and $\underline{\text{he}_i \text{ and his wife }_k}$ live in it.

A survey of the literature on switch-reference releaved no language with special morphology for marking partial coreference between subjects (no data was found on partial coreference between objects). Languages extend the use of same-subject and different-subject markers to cover situations of partial coreference.

The symbols used on the table are: ✓, to indicate that a language allows same-subject marking in a specific situation; $*$, to indicate that a language disallows same-subject marking in a specific situation; and $=p$, to indicate that a language allows same-subject marking in a specific situation only in case the subjects under comparison are of the same grammatical person. Cells left empty indicate that no information was found in the literature about how a language behaves in certain situation.

Table 3: How languages mark partial coreference

| Language | Family | marked as SS | | | marked as DS | | | Reference |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | $1 \subset 2$ | $1 \supset 2$ | $1 \cap 2$ | $1 \subset 2$ | $1 \supset 2$ | $1 \cap 2$ | |
| Udihe | Altaic | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | Nikolaeva and Tolskaya (2001) |
| Lenakel | Austronesian | ✓ | * | * | | | | Lynch (1978); Lynch (1983) |
| Seri | Hokan | * | | | ✓ | | | Moser (1978) |
| Washo | Hokan | ✓ | ✓ | * | | | | Finer (1984, p. 85) |
| Zuni | Isolate | * | ✓ | | ✓ | | | Nichols (2000) |
| Kĩsêdjê | Jê | p= | * | * | p≠ | ✓ | ✓ | Nonato (2014) |
| Gokana | Niger-Congo | ✓ | * | * | | | | Comrie (1983) |
| Usan | Numugenan | p= | ✓ | | p≠ | p≠ | | Reesnik (1983) |
| Mian | Ok (TNG) | ✓ | ✓ | | | ✓ | | Fedden (2011) |
| Telefol | Ok (TNG) | | ✓ | | | | | Healey (1966) |
| Diyari | Pama–Nyungan | ✓ | * | | * | ✓ | | Austin (1981b) |
| Arabana | Pama–Nyungan | ✓ | | | | | | Austin (1981b) |
| Kanyara | Pama–Nyungan | ✓ | | | | | | Austin (1981b) |
| Pitjantjatjara | Pama–Nyungan | ✓ | * | | | | | Eckert and Hudson (1988) |
| Yawanawa | Panoan | | =p | | ✓ | ≠p | | *Souza's field notes* |
| Savosavo | Papuan | ✓ | | | | | | Wegener (2012) |
| Kashaya | Pomoan | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | Oswalt (1961) |
| Tauya | TNG | | ✓ | | ✓ | | | MacDonald (1990) |
| Kobon | TNG | p= | ✓ | p | p≠ | * | p≠ | Comrie (1983) |
| Kewa | TNG | p= | p= | | ✓ | ✓ | | Reesnik (1983) |
| Pima | Uzo-Aztecan | * | | | | | | Langdon and Munro (1979) |
| Huichol | Uzo-Aztecan | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | | | Comrie (1983) |
| Jamul | Yuman | ✓ | * | | ✓ | ✓ | | Miller (2001) |
| Mojave | Yuman | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | Finer (1984, p. 88) |
| *general* | Yuman | ✓ | ✓ | | | | | Langdon and Munro (1979) |

(8) Partial coreference in Pitjantjatjara (Eckert and Hudson, 1988, pp. 258–9)

a. Growing switch marked as same subject
[ Tjitji kutjara tjanala tjunguringu ] **munu** [ -ya ma-pakaṇu. ]
[ child two them.with joined ] **and.ss** [ -they away-started.off ]
'The two children joined them and they all started off.'

b. Shrinking switch marked as different subject
[ Tjitji tjuṭa anu ] **ka** [ kutjara kunyu ngururpa watjilaringnu. ]
[ child many went ] **and.DS** [ two reportedly in.the.middle got.homesick ]
'Many children went but two of them reportedly got homesick along the way.'

(9) Partial coreference is found more generally in control structures

a. I want to meet at 7. ≈ I want us to meet at 7. ($S_1 \subset S_2$)

b. Note that the subject of *meet* can't be singular
(i) *I met at 7.
(ii) We met at 7.

## 1.4 Symmetric vs. Asymmetric Coordination

(10) *Symmetric* vs. *asymmetric* clausal coordination

a. Symmetric Coordination (SC)
(i) Matthew dates a veterinarian and hopes to date a surgeon.
(ii) = Matthew hopes to date a surgeon and dates a veterinarian .

b. Asymmetric Coordination (AC)
(i) You can use this magic herb and get cured of cancer.
(ii) ≠ You can get cured of cancer and use this magic herb.

(11) Switch-reference in *asymmetric* coordination in Pitjantjatjara (Eckert and Hudson, 1988, p. 258)
**Munu** [ -la kuka panya pitjala mantjinu ] **munu** [ -la paura ngalkuningi ] **ka**
**and.ss** [ -we meat that.known coming got ] **and.ss** [ -we cooking were-eating ] **and.DS**
[ -lanya mala-kutju nyangu. ]
[ -us afterwards-only saw. ]
'So we came and got the meat and we cooked and ate it and only after that did they see us.'

"Sometimes *ka* joins two sentences with (apparently) the same subject. *Ka* is then really contrasting two situations or topics and functions like 'but'. Though the subject of the two sentences are the same, the occasions or situations are distinctive. In the sentence that follow, the *ka* divides and contrasts the two time periods being talked about: the first long ago and the second today." (Eckert and Hudson, 1988, p. 262)

(12) No switch-reference in *symmetric* coordination in Pitjantjajara (Eckert and Hudson, 1988, p. 262)
[ Ngananana anangu tjuta iriti para-nyinarinangi ngura tjutangka, *munu*-la pukulpa pika
[ we people many long.ago around-were.living place many.at *and.*SS-we content sick
wiya ngarangi. ] **Ka** [ -la nganana kuwari utulu kutju nyinanyi ngura kutjungka
not were-being ] **and.DS** [ -we we now group one are-living place one.at
*munu*-la putu pukularinyi. ]
*and.*SS-we unable being.content ]
'[ We (aboriginal) people long ago lived in many different places. We were content and didn't get sick. ] [ But now we all live together in one place and we seem unable to be content. ]'

(13) In Kĩsêdjê (Jê, Brazil), switch-reference isn't marked in *symmetric* coordination
[ Hwĩsôsôk tá khãm hwysysôm=nda khêt ]$_1$ **=ne** [ kê i-khá=ra thyktxi ]$_2$
[ school in mosquito=NOM be.not ] **=and.ss** [ also 1$_{abs}$-shirt=NOM be.dirty ]
=wa [ s-atárá khêrê ]$_3$
=and.DS.1$_{NOM}$ [ 3$_{abs}$-put$_{emb}$ be.not ]
'At the school there are no mosquitoes and my shirt was dirty and then I didn't put it on.'

## 1.5 Other clause-combining structures that can host switch-reference

### 1.5.1 Complement clauses

(14) Switch-reference marked complement clauses in Hopi (Hale, 1992, exs. 1 & 5)
a. Nu' 'as [ EC kweewa-t tu'i-ni-qa-**y** ] naawakna.
I PRT [ belt-ACC buy-FUT-NC-**ACC:SS** ] want
'I want to buy a belt.'
b. Nu' [ 'i pava 'inu-ngam kweewa-t yuku-ni-qa-**t** ] naawakna.
I [ my bro me-for belt-ACC make-FUT-NC-**ACC:DS** ] want
'I want my brother to make me a belt.'

### 1.5.2 Adjoined clauses

Often it is hard to determine the difference between asymmetric coordination and adverbial subordination, but the latter also seems to be a possible host for switch-reference morphology.

Accepting the following differences between asymmetric coordination and adverbial subordination will lead us to the provisory conclude that switch-refernece in Diyari and Warlpiri is only instantiated in *adverbial subordination*, as opposed to Pitjantjatjara, where it is clearly *also* instanced in asymmetric coordination.

(15) Properties that differentiate asymmetric coordination from adverbial subordination
(A) In asymmetric coordination clauses are asserted and advance the timeline of the discourse;
(B) The number of clauses in a coordination isn't limited.
(D) Constituents can be fronted in a non-ATB fashion from asymmetric coordination

In asymmetric coordination clauses are asserted and advance the timeline of the discourse

The first part of this property –*each clause is individually asserted*— stands for the fact no clause in a chain merely serves as the presupposition for another.

(16) Asymmetric coordination: asserted
I gave him orders and he went to Canarana.

(17) Adverbial subordination: presupposed
When I gave him orders he went to Canarana.

(18) Testing assertion
It is not true that I gave him orders and he went to Canarana
... because I didn't give him orders.

(19) Testing presupposition
It is not true that when I gave him orders he went to Canarana
... * because I didn't give him orders.

(20) Clauses asserted in *asymmetric* coordination in Pitjantjatjara —*copy of (11)*
**Munu** [ -la kuka panya pitjala mantjinu ] **munu** [ -la paura ngalkuningi ] **ka**
**and.ss** [ -we meat that.known coming got ] **and.ss** [ -we cooking were-eating ] **and.ds**
[ -lanya mala-kutju nyangu. ]
[ -us afterwards-only saw. ]
'So we came and got the meat and we cooked and ate it and only after that did they see us.'

Sometimes free translations don't clearly translate assertion and presupposition

(21) Translating 'X told Y to fish' in Kĩsêdjê (Jê, Brazil, *Nonato's field notes*)
a. Asymmetric coordination: asserted
Hẽn [ wa i-khra mã ne ] =nhy [ ∅ thep j-ariri ]
FACT [ $1_{nom}$ $1_{abs}$-son to talk ] =and.DS [ $3_{nom}$ fish.ACC LNK-wait ]
'I told my son to go fish' (lit. 'I talked to son and he fished')
b. If assertion isn't desired, enters *adverbial subordination* (which in Kĩsêdjê doesn't bear SR)
Hwararo=n i-pãm=nda [ *thep jarit mã* ] i-mã ne.
Yesterday=FACT $1_{abs}$-father=NOM [ fish.ABS wait to ] $1_{abs}$-to talk.
Tã wa ∅-mbaj khêt =ne i-thẽm khêrê.
But $1_{nom}$ $3_{abs}$-forget =and.SS $1_{abs}$-$go_{emb}$ be.not.
'Yesterday my father told me to fish. But I forgot and didn't go.'

The number of clauses in a coordination isn't limited

(22) Many clauses in *asymmetric* coordination in Pitjantjatjara —*copy of (11)*
**Munu** [ -la kuka panya pitjala mantjinu ] **munu** [ -la paura ngalkuningi ] **ka**
**and.ss** [ -we meat that.known coming got ] **and.ss** [ -we cooking were-eating ] **and.ds**
[ -lanya mala-kutju nyangu. ]
[ -us afterwards-only saw. ]
'So we came and got the meat and we cooked and ate it and only after that did they see us.'

(23) Hard to add adverbial clauses to adverbial clauses
*When when it rained I came to the department it was closed.

(24) We didn't find adverbial clauses adjoined to adverbial clauses in *Pama-Nyungan relative clauses*
[ Yini nhakalda nhingkirda wakara-rnanhi, ] [ nganhi mindi-lha ] [ nganayi, yulya
[ you-NOM again here come-REL(DS) ] [ I-NOM run-FUT ] [ AUX police-ABS
mani-lha. ]
get-IMPL(SS) ]
'If you come here again, I'll run to get the police.' (Austin, 1981b, p. 318, ex. 25)

| Constituents can be dislocated from asymmetric coordination |
|---|

(25) Dislocation from asymmetric coordination in Mbyá (Dooley, 2010, p. 106, ex. 32)

Mava'e tu [ nha-vaẽ ramo ] [∅ nhane-mo-ngaru 'rã? ]
who brusqueness [ 1+2-arrive and.DS ] [3 1+2-CAUS-eat FUT ]
'Who$_i$ is such that we arrive and he$_i$ will feed us?'

(26) Dislocation from asymmetric coordination in Choctaw (Broadwell, 1997, p. 11, ex. 13)

Katah-oosh$_i$ John-at taloowa-nah t$_i$ hilhah?
who-foc:nm John-nm sing:l-DS dance
'Who$_i$ is such that John$_j$ sang and t$_i$ danced?'

(27) Dislocation from asymmetric coordination in English (Postal, 1998, p. 66, ex. 50a)

[Which$_i$ student] did Nora go to the store, come home and talk to $t_i$ for one hour?

## 1.6 Conclusions

- Types of distinction encoded
- Agreement with subject of reference clause
- Partial coreference
- Only appears in asymmetric structures

# 2 Tripartite case systems

- Languages with person based split-ergativity have tripartite case systems.
- Expanding analysis of Pama-Nyungan languages to Panoan family.
- Focus on 'core cases' only —ERG, NOM, ACC — also 'structural cases'.
- Agreement on SR markers is independent evidence for underlying tripartite case systems (2.3.3)

## 2.1 Nominals with tripartite morphology

**Pitta-Pitta** (Pama-Nyungan, Blake 1977): all nouns and pronouns show distinct forms for ergative *-lu*, accusative *-na*, and nominative ∅, except in future tense and imperative.

Table 4: Pitta-Pitta's case system (Pama Nyungan, Blake, 1977, p. 18)

| | ERG | NOM | ACC |
|---|---|---|---|
| pronouns | -lu | -∅ | -na |
| nouns | -lu | -∅ | -na |

(28) Three-way case system of Pitta-Pitta

a. Transitive subject and object (Blake, 1979, p. 210)
T$^{y}$ira-**na** ŋa-**tu** ŋui$^{y}$akuri-ya paya-**na** tuwa-liŋa.
boomerang-**ACC** 1S-**ERG** make-pres bird-**ACC** hit.with.missile-PURP
'I'm making a boomerang to kill birds.'

b. Intransitive subject (Blake, 1977, p. 18, ex. 3.15)
Kaṇa-**∅** kaṇṭa-ya.
man-**NOM** go-PRES
'The man goes.'

**Kashibo-Kakataibo**, (Panoan, Zariquiey 2011): Tripartite pronoun system

Table 5: Kashibo's case system (Panoan, Zariquiey, 2011, p. 221)

| | ERG | NOM | ACC |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1sg | 'ë**n** | 'ë**x** | 'ë |
| 2sg | mi**n** | mi**x** | mi |
| 3sg | a**n** | a**x** | a |
| 1du.incl | nu**n** | nu**x** | nu |
| 2du | mitsu**n** | mitsu**x** | mitsu |
| 3du/pauc | atu**n** | atu**x** | atu |
| 1pl.incl | nukama**n** | nukama**x** | nukama |
| 1pl.excl | 'ëkama**n** | 'ëkama**x** | 'ëkama |
| 2pl | mikama**n** | mikama**x** | mikama |
| 3pl | akama**n** | akama**x** | akama |
| 'who' | =**n** | =**x** | **-∅** |
| nouns | =**n** | **-∅** | **–∅** |

(29) Tripartite case marking on interrogative pronoun 'who' in Kashibo (Panoan): (Zariquiey, 2011, pp. 222–3)

a. Transitive object
Ui-**Ø** kara is-a-x-a.
WHO-**ACC** NAR.INT.3 see-PERF-3-NON.PROX
'Whom did he look at?'

b. Transitive subject
Ui=**n** kara Emilio is-a-x-a
WHO=**ERG** NAR.INT.3p Emilio.ABS see-PERF-3-NON.PROX
'Who looked at Emilio?'

c. Intransitive subject
Ui=**x** kara abat-a-x-a
WHO=**NOM** NAR.INT.3 run-PERF-3-NON.PROX
'Who ran?'

(30) Kashibo-Kakataibo nouns: ERG-ABS morphology

a. Transitive subject and object
Xanu=**n** chaxu-**Ø** rakan-akë-x-ín
woman=**ERG** deer-**ABS** lay.down-REM.PAST-3P-PROX
'The woman laid down the deer.' (Zariquiey, 2011, p. 313)

b. Intransitive subject
Ënë xanu-**Ø** ka upí 'i'
this WOMAN-**ABS** NAR.3P beautiful be (shortened.form)
'This woman is beautiful.' (Zariquiey, 2011, p. 556)

**Diyari**, (Pama Nyungan Austin 1981b): tripartite case marking on 1SG, 2SG, all third persons, non-singular common nouns, female proper nouns.

Table 6: Diyari's case system (Pama Nyungan Goddard, 1982, pp. 170–1)

| | ERG | NOM | ACC |
|---|---|---|---|
| non sg. 1 & 2 | Ø | Ø | -na |
| other pronouns | -li | Ø | -na |
| non sg. common N | -li | Ø | -na |
| female names | -ndu | -ni | -na |
| male names | -li | -na | -na |
| sg. common N | -li, -yali | Ø | Ø |

(31) Diyari tripartite morphology

a. Case syncretisms create ambiguities in certain nominal classes (Goddard, 1982, p. 171)
Yula-**Ø** kin̲tala-**Ø** ṇanda-ṇa wara-yi.
2DU-**ERG/NOM** dog-**ACC/NOM** hit-PART AUX-PRES
'You two hit the dog.'

b. Ambiguity solved by tripartite morphology
**Yundu** /kin̲tala-wula-**n̲a** ṇanda-ṇa wara-yi.
2SG.**ERG** dog-DU-**ACC** hit-PART AUX-PRES
'You hit the two dogs.'

**Yawanawa**, (Panoan Souza 2013): tripartite case marking on 3PL

Table 7: Yawanawa's case system (Panoan Souza, 2013, pp. 113–7)

| | ERG | NOM | ACC |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1sg | ẽ | ẽ | **ea** |
| 2sg | mĩ | mĩ | **mia** |
| 1pl | nũ | nũ | **nuke** |
| 2pl | mã | mã | **matu** |
| 3sg | **atũ** | a | a |
| nouns | **-nẽ, -n** | ∅ | ∅ |
| 3pl | ahãu | ahu | atu |

(32) Tripartite case marking on Yawanawa's 3PL (Souza, 2013, p. 117) :
a. Transitive subject
**Ahaũ** epe shewa-kãn-i.
3P.**ERG** straw weave-PL-PROG
'They are weaving straw.'
b. Intransitive subject
**Ahu** ve-kãn-i.
3P.**NOM** come-PL-PROG
'They are coming.'
c. Transitive object
Ẽ **atu** kux-a.
1S.ERG 3P.**ACC** hit-PRF
'I hit them.'

(33) Ambiguity with Yawanawa's participant pronouns as subjects
a. Participant pronoun as transitive subject
**Ẽ/Mĩ** yawa rete-a.
**1S.ERG/2S.ERG** wild.boar kill-PRF
'I/You killed a wild boar.'
b. Participant pronoun as intransitive subject
**Ẽ/Mĩ** itxu-a.
**1S.NOM/2S.NOM** run-PRF
'I/You ran.'

(34) Ambiguity solved with 3SG subjects
a. 3SG pronoun as transitive subject
**Atũ** yawa rete-a.
**3S.ERG** wild.boar kill-PRF
'(S)he killed a wild boar.'
b. 3SG pronoun as intransitive subject
**A** itxu-a.
**3S.NOM** run-PRF
'(S)he ran.'

(35) Ambiguity with Yawanawa's 3SG pronouns as 'absolutive' arguments
a. 3SG pronoun as intransitive subject
**A** itxu-a.
**3S.NOM** run-PRF
'(S)he ran.'
b. 3SG pronoun as transitive object
Tika-nẽ **a** kux-a.
Tika-ERG 3S.**ACC** hit-PRF
'Tika hit me/you.'

(36) Ambiguity solved with participant pronouns as 'absolutive' arguments
a. Participant pronoun as intransitive subject
**Ẽ/Mĩ** itxu-a.
**1S.NOM/2S.NOM** run-PRF
'I/You ran.'
b. Participant pronoun as transitive object
Tika-nẽ **ea/mia** kux-a.
Tika-ERG 1S.**ACC**/2S.**ACC** hit-PRF
'Tika hit me/you.'

## 2.2 Nominals with underlying tripartite case

**Pitjantjatjara**, (Eckert and Hudson 1988, Pama-Nyungan):

Table 8: Pitjantjatjara's case system (Eckert and Hudson, 1988, pp. 104,109,145,148)

| | ERG | | NOM | | ACC | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | *long* | *short* | *long* | *short* | *long* | *short* |
| 1sg | ngayulu | -na | ngayulu | -na | ngayu**nya** | ni |
| 2sg | nyuntu | -n | nyuntu | -n | nyuntu**nya** | -nta |
| 3sg | paluru | ∅ | paluru | ∅ | palu**nya** | -∅ |
| 1du | ngali | -li | ngali | -li | ngali**nya** | -linya |
| 2du | nyupali | -n | nyupali | -n | nyupali**nya** | -nta |
| 3du | pula | -pula | pula | -pula | pula**nya** | -∅ |
| 1pl | nganana | -la | nganana | -la | ngananan**ya** | -lanya |
| 2pl | nyura | -n | nyura | -n | nyura**nya** | -nta |
| 3pl | tjana | -ya | tjana | -ya | tjana**nya** | -∅ |
| common nouns | -ngku, -tju, -tu, -tu | | -∅ | | -∅ | |
| proper nouns | -lu, -tju, -tu, -tu | | -nya, -nga | | -nya, -nga | |

(37) Pitjantjatjara's question words: ERG-ABS morphology (Eckert and Hudson, 1988, pp. 119,120)
a. Transitive subject
**Nganalu** ngayuku tjitji pungu?
who.**ERG** my child hit
'Who hit my child?'
b. Intransitive subject
**Ngananya** punungka nyinanyi?
who.**NOM** tree.in is.sitting
'Who is sitting in the tree?'
c. Transitive object
**Ngananya** nyuntu katingu?
who.**ACC** you bring
'Whom did you bring?'

**Shanenawa** (Panoan, Cândido 2004): nouns and 3rd person pronouns - ERG-ABS, 1st and 2nd person pronouns - NOM-ACC

Table 9: Shanenawa's case system (Panoan, Cândido, 2004, p. 89)

| | ERG | NOM | ACC |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1sg | ɨn | ɨn | ɨa |
| 2sg | min | min | mia |
| 3sg | atun/ahun | a/∅ | a/∅ |
| 1pl | nun | nun | nuku |
| 2pl | man | man | matu |
| 3pl | atun/ahun | atu/ahu | atu/ahu |
| nouns | -n, -ni, -na, -nu | -∅ | ∅ |

(38) Shanenawa's nouns: syncretism between NOM and ACC (Cândido, 2004, p. 89)
a. Transitive subject
**Runu-n** takaɾa-∅ naka-a-ki
snake-**ERG** chicken-NOM/ACC bite-PAST-DECL
'The snake bit the chicken.'
b. Intransitive subject
**Runu-∅** na-a-ki
snake-**NOM**/ACC die-PAST-DECL
'The snake died.'
c. Transitive object
d. Mário-nu ɾunu-**∅** pi-a-ki
Mário-ERG snake-**ACC**/NOM eat-PAST-DECL
'Mário ate the snake.'

(39) Shanenawa's participant pronouns: syncretism between NOM and ERG (Cândido, 2004, pp. 128,129)
a. Transitive subject
**Nun** jumaj-∅ ɾiti-a-ki
1PL.**ERG**/NOM jaguar-ACC kill-PAST-DECL
'We killed the jaguar.'
b. Intransitive subject
**Nun** ini-kiɾi u-a-ki
1PL.**ERG**/NOM river-LOC come-PAST-DECL
'We came from the river'
c. Object (recipient)
Militão-nu **nuku** iʂkin-∅ inan-a-ki
Militão-ERG 1PL.**ACC** fish-ACC give-PAST-DECL
'Militão gave us fish.'

### 2.2.1 Two co-existing core case systems?

- Split ergativity, (Silverstein, 1976) hierarchy.
- Goddard (1982), Comrie (1991) : Split case MARKING vs. split case SYSTEM. A distinction is drawn between case and case form: some subclasses of nouns are said to have homonymous case forms, but different cases. The case of any nominal can be determined by substituting for it a nominal from the subclass with tripartite marking, therefore such languages must be regarded as having three core cases: ergative, accusative, and nominative.
- Baker (in press) follows Legate (2008) points out that nominative-accusative pronouns have the same word order and binding properties as ergative-absolutive NPs. It is most easily understood if the syntactic rules of case assignment are tripartite across the board and then case is spelled out differently after different lexical items. Thus, 'absolutive' is not a core, structural case. It is a morphological default that substitutes for more specific nominative and accusative marking, when in lack.

## 2.3 Agreement as evidence for abstract case

Case agreement is independent evidence for underlying tripartite case systems.

### 2.3.1 Agreement within the NP

This type of evidence is not available in the Panoan family, since case is marked only once in an NP, as an enclitic.

**Diyari**, (Pama-Nyungan, Austin 1981a, p. 94)
Case marked only on a pronominal determiner (if any) and on the last noun in a complex nominal. In (40-a), pronoun and nominal agree in ERG case. However, pronouns have tripartite marking and singular common nouns do not, so apparent mismatches arise, as in (40-b) and (40-c):

(40) Case agreement in Diyari's NPs

a. Elements within transitive subject NP agree in ERG case
[ Na-**ndu** pala-kaɲti-**yali** ] mada kampa-yi. (p. 39)
[ 3.SG.F-**ERG** sexual.desire-excess-**ERG** ] stone.ACC collect-PRES
'The sex maniac collects money.'

b. Elements within intransitive subject NP agree in NOM case despite ambiguity
[ Nawu-**Ø** kanku-**Ø** ] dalki-yi ŋandi-ni
[ 3.SG.**NOM** boy.**NOM**/ACC ] disobey-PRES mother-LOC
'The boy disobeyed (his) mother.'

c. Elements within transitive object NP agree in ACC case despite ambiguity
Nali [ ni-**na**-ya kanku-**Ø** ] mani-yi.
1.DU.ERG [ 3.SG-**ACC**-NEAR boy.**ACC**/NOM ] get-PRES
'We get the boy.'

**Djapu**, (Morphy 1983, Pama-Nyungan cited by Legate 2008): all elements of an NP, whether continuous or discontinuous, must be marked for case and match in case. It is possible to combine a demonstrative, which has ERG-ABS surface morphology and a human noun, which has tripartite ERG-NOM-ACC surface morphology, giving rise to apparent case mismatches.

(41) Apparent case mismatches in Djapu's NPs:
a. Elements within recipient argument NP agree in ACC case despite ambiguity
Wungay' marrtji-nya [ **ngunhi**-ny-dhi yolngu-**n**
honey go-PAST.NONINDIC [ that.**ACC**/NOM-PRO-ANAPH person-**ACC**
wapirti-warrtju-na-puyngu-**nha**-ny ] weka-nha.
stingray-spear.PL-NMLZR-INHAB-**ACC**-PRO ] give-PAST.NONINDIC
'We would go and give honey to those people who were spearing stingrays (lit. 'to those stingray-spearing people').' (Morphy, 1983, p. 110)
b. Elements within intransitive subject NP agree in NOM case despite ambiguity
[ Dhuwa.**Ø** nhe.**Ø** ] yurru lili dha:parng rongiyi-rr.
[ this.**NOM**/ACC you.**NOM** ] FUT HITHER unsuccessful return-UNM
'YOU will return empty handed [but not I].' (Morphy, 1983, p. 84)

**Pitjantjatjara**, (Pama-Nyungan Eckert and Hudson 1988, p. 146): pronouns have NOM-ACC case morphology and nouns have ERG-ABS case morphology.

(42) Elements within Pitjantjatjara 's intransitive subject NP agree in NOM case despite ambiguities
a. 3DU pronoun + noun as intransitive subject
Kuwari-**pula** tjitji-**Ø** kutjara pitjangu.
now-3DU.ERG/**NOM** child-**NOM**/ACC two came.
The two children came back today.
b. 1SG pronoun + proper noun as intransitive subject
(...) munu-na chairman-**Ø** nyinangi munu-na
and-1SG.SHORT.ERG/**NOM** chairman-**NOM**/ACC was.sitting and-1SG.SHORT.ERG/**NOM**
pulkara mulapa waakaringi
intensely very was.working
'(...) I was chairman. I really worked hard.'
c. 3PL pronoun + noun as intransitive subject
Wati-**Ø** tjuta-**ya** anu ngura nyara Fregontakutu.
man-**NOM**/ACC many-3PL.**NOM**/ERG went place yonder Fregon.to
'The men went to that place (called) Fregon.'

### 2.3.2 Agreement on adjuncts

Case agreement on adjuncts shows underlying tripartite case system on pronouns, which have surface NOM-ACC morphology. In Margany (Pama-Nyungan) and Jaminawa (Pano) the NOM form of pronouns conveys both underlying NOM and ERG cases.

**Margany** (Breen 1983, Pama-Nyungan cited by Goddard 1982):

(43) Case syncretism on Margany's pronouns disambiguated by argument-adjunct agreement:
a. Matya **ngaya** balga-nnganda-la yurdi, nhanga-**nggu**.
before 1SG.**ERG**/NOM hit-HAB-PAST meat/animal.ABS young-**ERG**
'I used to kill a lot of kangaroos when I was young.' (Breen, 1983, pp. 307,336)
b. Gurruny-dyu ngaya dhumba-:nhi.
alone-**ERG** 1SG.**ERG**/NOM build-REC.PAST
'I built it on my own.' (Breen, 1983, p. 342)
c. Nhula waba-nhi gurrunyu-**Ø**.
3SG.**NOM**/ERG go-REC.PAST alone-**NOM**
'He would go on his own.' (Breen, 1983, p. 349)

**Jaminawa/Yaminahua** (Panoan, Faust and Loos, 2002, p. 55):

(44) Case syncretism on Jaminawa's pronouns disambiguated by argument-adjunct agreement:
a. **Ẽ** naetapa-**xõ** koma rete-ni.
1SG.**ERG**/NOM young-when.**ERG** pheasant hunt-PAST.REM
'When I was young, I hunted a pheasant.'
b. Yome pishta-**xõ** **ẽ** pari oĩ-pao-ni.
boy small-when.**ERG** 1SG.**ERG**/NOM father see-PAST.PROG-PAS.REM
When I was little, I used to see the priest.'
c. Yome-**ax** **ẽ** niri o-ni.
boy-when.**NOM** 1SG.ERG/**NOM** here come-PAST.REM
'When I was a boy, I came here.'
d. Yome pisht-**ax** **ẽ** na-kera-ni.
boy small-when.**NOM** 1SG.ERG/**NOM** die-INCEPT-PAST.REM
'When I was a boy, I almost died.'

### 2.3.3 Agreement on switch-reference markers

**Pitjantjatjara** (Austin 1981a, Pama-Nyungan citing Glass and Hackett 1970, pp. 39,99): Purpose clauses are marked by *kija* if subject is the same, (SS), and *jaku* if subjects are different, (DS). The SS marker is followed by an ERG marker if the subject of the main clause is ERG, as in (45-a). There is no such case agreement on DS markers, as in (45-c).

(45) Pitjantjatjara's agreement on switch-reference markers
a. Ergative agreement with transitive subject
[ wati nyarra ]-**lu** kupurlu-∅ manyji-nu, jiji-∅ pungku-kija-**lu**.
[ man that ]-**ERG** club-ABS get-PAST child-ABS hit-PURP(SS)-**ERG**
'That man got a club to hit the child.'
b. Nominative agreement with intransitive subject
**palunyanya** kutipija-ngu, lankurru palyal-kija-**∅**.
he-**NOM** goaway-PAST spearthrower.ABS make-PURP(SS)-**NOM**
'He went away to make a spear thrower.'
c. No agreement with DS marker
paarlparniya-∅ ninti-la, mirru mukul junku-jaku.
sinew-ABS give-IMP spear.thrower hook put-PURP(DS)
'Give (me) sinew so (I) can put the hook on the spear thrower.'

Pronouns have NOM-ACC surface morphology, but the agreement marker on the same-subject switch reference marker is ERG, which is evidence for the tripartite case system.

(46) Pitjantjatjara's pronouns agree with ergative SS marker despite ambiguities
a. katima, mungarrji-**lin** ngalku-kija-**lu**
bring.FUT afternoon-1DU.INCL.**ERG**/NOM eat-PURP(SS)-**ERG**
'(I) will bring(it) back for us two to eat in the afternoon.'
b. pampuny-jamaal-**tu** wanti
touch-REL(SS)-**ERG** leave-IMP
'Leave (it) without touching (it)!'

**Yawanawa** (Panoan, Souza's fieldnotes): SS marker *shũ* agrees with ergative subjects and *she* with nominative subjects. The same markers are used both for participant and non-participant pronouns. This is evidence that participant pronouns in transitive subject position are indeed ergative, despite having NOM-ACC surface morphology.

(47) Yawanawa's SS SR marker agrees in ergative case with participant and non-participant pronouns

a. A-**tũ** awa txatxi-**shũ** rete-a.
3S-**ERG** tapir stab-SS.PREV.**ERG** kill-PRF
'He stabbed and (then) killed the tapir.'

b. **Ẽ** kehuisã mutsa-**shũ** tua-i.
1SG.**ERG**/NOM bacaba squeeze-SS.PREV.**ERG** strain-PROG
'I squeezed the bacaba fruit and now I'm straining it.'

c. E-wẽ kuka-**Ø** niika-**she** iyã kesha-ki nuku-a runu-wã-nẽ
1S-POSS uncle-**NOM**/ACC hunt-SS.PREV.**NOM** lake edge-PPon arrive-PRF snake-AUM-ERG
she-a.
swallow-PRF
'My uncle went hunting and when he arrived at the edge of a lake, an anaconda swallowed him.'

d. Ẽ nia-**she** **ẽ** shaneihu
1SG.NOM/ERG stand-SS.PREV.**NOM** 1SG.**NOM**/ERG chief
i-pau-ni.
AUX.INTRS-PROG.PST-REM.PST
'When I was alive, I was the chief (said the ghost)'

### 2.3.4 Competing analyses

Possible analyses for adjunct and SR agreement:

- agreement with thematic role
- agreement with valence of reference verb
- **agreement with underlying case of reference argument**

## 2.4 Case alternations

Austin (1981a) states about Pitjantjatjara's SR agreement: "the SS marker is followed by the common noun ergative-case suffix (-lu or -ngku, depending upon dialect) when the main-clause subject is an A NP; such case agreement is a feature of the language." Even though the term 'case agreement' is employed, Austin also implies that agreement on SS markers in related to the thematic role 'A' of the subject.

### 2.4.1 Is agreement on SR markers related to the thematic role of the subject?

Evidence from Shipibo[1] (Panoan, Baker 2013 citing Valenzuela 2003):
In (48-a), 'monkey' is the theme argument of the intransitive verb 'die' and has absolutive case. An applicative morpheme in (48-b) introduces a malefactive argument. This introduced argument takes absolutive case and 'monkey' gets ergative case, even though the thematic role remains constant.

(48) Case alternation with theta role remaining constant in Shipibo:
a. Nokon shino-ra mawa-ke.
my.GEN monkey.ABS-PRT die-PRF
'My monkey died.'
b. Nokon shino-**n**-ra / (*shino-ra) e-a mawa-xon-ke.
my.GEN monkey-**ERG**-PRT / (*monkey.ABS-PRT) me-ABS die-APPL-PRF
'My monkey died on me.' (Baker, 2013, p. 35)

When a new clause marked with SR is introduced, the SS marker agrees with the ergative argument 'monkey', which is **not an agent**. This shows that agreement on Shipibo SR markers is not related to the thematic role of the reference subject.

(49) Agrement on SR markers not related to thematic role in Shipibo:
[ Yapa payot-a pi ] -**xon**-ra, nokon shino-**n** e-a mawa-xon-ke.
[ fish spoil-PTPL eat ] -SS.**ERG**-PRT my.GEN monkey-**ERG** me-ABS die-APPL-PRF
'Having eaten spoiled fish, my monkey died on me.' (Baker, 2013, p. 36)

### 2.4.2 But could the SS markers be agreeing with the valence of the reference verb?

Data from Shipibo shows that verbs in applicative constructions remain intransitive. There are two auxiliaries in the language that are used in short answers: *ik-* substitutes intransitive verbs and *ak-*, transitive. The use of *ik-* below shows that *mawa* 'die' remains intransitive despite applicativization.

(50) Intransitive verbs in applicative constructions remain intransitive:
Mi-n shino-n-ki mi-a mawa-xon-a? **Ik**-ama / (*ak-ama).
you-GEN monkey-ERG-Q you-ABS die-APPL-PTPL do.**INTR**-NEG / (*do.TR-NEG)
'Did your monkey die on you?' 'No.' (Baker, 2013, p. 41)

Therefore, these examples show that SR markers in Shipibo actually agree with the case of the reference subject and not with its thematic role, or with the transitivity of the reference verb.

### 2.4.3 Similar data in in SR-marking Pama-Nyungan languages?

This would depend on the existence of case alternations in the language. Below is one of the instances of case alternation we know of.

(51) Dative subjects in non-finite clauses in Warlpiri (Simpson, 1991, p. 249, ex. 213)
[ Ngarrka-ngku nya-ngu kurdu, ] [ karnta-**ku** watiya-kurlu wirriya paka-rninja-rlani. ]
[ man-ERG see-PST child ] [ woman-**DAT** stick-PROP boy hit-INF-DS ]
'The man saw the child while the woman was hitting the boy with a stick.'

(52) Kind of contituation we would like to know about (*italics*)
[ Ngarrka-ngku nya-ngu kurdu, ] [ karnta-**ku** watiya-kurlu wirriya paka-rninja-rlani ],
[ man-ERG see-PST child ] [ woman-**DAT** stick-PROP boy hit-INF-DS ]
[ *verbing-**ku*** ]
[ VERB-INF-SS-**DAT** ]
'The man saw the child while the woman was hitting the boy with a stick *while* VERB*ing*.'

[1] Shipibo is an ERG-ABS language with no splits.

## 2.5 Conclusions

- Ergative languages split along a person/animacy hierarchy *a la* Silverstein (1976) have a tripartite case system. Other unrelated languages with the same system are Nez Perce (Shahaptian, USA), Coast Tsimshian (Tsimshianic, Canada), Semelai (Austro-Asiatic, Malaysia) (Baker, in press).
- Tripartite languages may or may not have explicit three-way morphology in subsets of nominals. They often have ERG-ABS in some set and NOM-ACC in others.
- In tripartite languages, 'absolutive' is not a core case, but a label given to the syncretic form of certain nominals which do not have distinct morphology for NOM and ACC.
- The case systems of a number of tripartite Panoan languages have been mislabeled as 'ergative' in their descriptions. The analysis parallels that of Pama-Nyungan languanges.
- Case agreement and case alternations are important independent diagnostics for underlying three-way case systems.

## References


Austin, Peter (1981a). *A Grammar of Diyari, South Australia*. 32.

— (1981b). "Switch-Reference in Australia". In: *Language* 57.2, pp. 309–334.

Baker, Mark (2013). "On dependent ergative case (in Shipibo) and its derivation by phase". Manuscript, Rutgers University; revised version to appear in Linguistic Inquiry.

— (in press). "Book Draft". URL: http://www.rci.rutgers.edu/~mabaker/. Last access 16 March 2014.

Blake, Barry J. (1977). *Case marking in Australian languages*. Canberra, Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies.

— (1979). "Pitta-Pitta". In: *Handbook of Australian languages*. Ed. by R. M. W. Dixon and Barry J. Blake. Vol. 1. Canberra: ANU Press, pp. 183–242.

Breen, J. G. (1983). "Margany and Gunya". In: *Handbook of Australian languages*. Ed. by R. M. W. Dixon and Barry J. Blake. Vol. 2. John Benjamins: Amsterdam, pp. 274–394.

Broadwell, George A. (1997). "Binding theory and switch-reference". In: *Atomism and Binding*. Ed. by Hans Bennis, Pierre Pica, and Johan Rooryck. Dordrecht: Foris Publication, pp. 31–49.

Camacho, José (2010). "On case concord: the syntax of switch-reference clauses". In: *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 28.2, pp. 239–274.

Comrie, Bernard (1983). "Switch-reference in Huichol: a typological study". In: *Switch-reference and universal grammar*. Ed. by John Haiman and Pamela Munro. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 17–37.

— (1991). "Form and function in identifying cases". In: *The Economy of Inflection*. Ed. by F. Plank. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 41–56.

Cândido, Gláucia Vieira (2004). "Descrição Morfossintática da língua Shanenawa (Pano)". PhD thesis. Universidade Estadual de Campinas.

Dooley, Robert A. (2010). "Foreground and Background in Mbyá Guaraní Clause Chaining". In: *A mosaic of languages and cultures: studies celebrating the career of Karl J. Franklin*. SIL e-books 19.

Eckert, Paul and Joyce Hudson (1988). *Wangka Wiru: a handbook for the Pitjantjatjara language learner*. University of South Australia. Reprinted in 2005.

Faust, Norma and Eugene Loos (2002). "Gramática del idioma Yaminahua". In: *Instituto Linguistico de Verano*.

Fedden, Sebastian (2011). *A grammar of Mian*. Vol. 55. De Gruyter Mouton.

Finer, Daniel L. (1984). "The Formal Grammar of Switch-Reference". PhD thesis. UMass Amherst.

Glass, Amee and Dorothy Hackett (1970). *Pitjantjatjara grammar: A tagmemic view of the Ngaanyatjara (Warburton Ranges) dialect*. Canberra: AIAS.

Goddard, Cliff (1982). "Case systems and case marking in Australian languages: A new interpretation". In: *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 2, pp. 167–196.

Hale, Ken (1976). "The adjoined relative clause in Australia". In: *Grammatical categories in Australian languages*. Ed. by Robert M. Dixon. Canberra: AIAS, pp. 78–105.

— (1992). "Subject obviation, switch reference, and control". In: *Control and grammar*. Ed. by Richard K. Larson et al. Vol. 48. Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy. Springer, pp. 51–77.

Healey, Phyllis M (1966). *Levels and chaining in Telefol sentences*. 5. Australian National University.

Jacobsen, William (1967). "Switch-Reference in Hokan-Coahuiltec". In: *Studies in Southwestern Ethnolinguistics*. Ed. by Dell H. Hymes and William E. Bittle. Mouton, The Hague.

Langdon, Margaret and Pamela Munro (1979). "Subject and (Switch-)Reference in Yuman". In: *Folia Linguistica* 13.

Legate, Julie Anne (2008). "Morphological and abstract case". In: *Linguistic Inquiry* 39.1, pp. 55–101.

— (2012). "Types of ergativity". In: *Lingua* 122, pp. 181–191.

Lynch, John (1983). "Switch-reference in Lenakel". In: *Switch-reference and universal grammar*. Ed. by John Haiman and Pamela Munro. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 209–221.

Lynch, John Dominic (1978). *A grammar of Lenakel*. Department of Linguistics, Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.

MacDonald, Lorna (1990). *A grammar of Tauya*. Ed. by Georg Bossong and Wallace Chafe. Vol. 6. Mouton de Gruyter.

Miller, Amy (2001). *A grammar of Jamul Tiipay*. Ed. by Georg Bossong and Wallace Chafe. Vol. 23. Mouton Grammar Library. De Gruyter Mouton.

Morphy, Frances (1983). "Djapu, a Yolngu dialect". In: *Handbook of Australian languages*. Ed. by R. M. W. Dixon and Barry J. Blake. Vol. 3. John Benjamins: Amsterdam, pp. 1–188.

Moser, Mary B (1978). "Switch-reference in Seri". In: *International Journal of American Linguistics* 44.2, pp. 113–120.

Nichols, Lynn (2000). "Rethinking switch reference". In: *Papers in Honor of Ken Hale: Working Papers on Endangered and Less Familiar Languages*. Ed. by Andrew Carnie, Eloise Jelinek, and Mary Ann Willie.

Nikolaeva, Irina and Maria Tolskaya (2001). *A grammar of Udihe*. Ed. by Georg Bossong and Bernard Comrie. Vol. 22. De Gruyter Mouton.

Nonato, Rafael (2014). "Clause chaining, switch reference and coordination". PhD thesis. MIT. URL: rafaeln.github.io/papers/thesis.pdf.

Oswalt, Robert Louis (1961). "A Kashaya grammar (Southwestern Pomo)". PhD thesis. University of California, Berkeley.

Postal, Paul Martin (1998). *Three Investigations of Extraction*. The MIT Press.

Reesnik, Ger P. (1983). "Switch reference and topicality hierarchies". In: *Studies in Language* 2.7.

Silverstein, Michael (1976). "Hierarchy of features and ergativity". In: *Grammatical categories in Australian languages*. Ed. by R. M. W. Dixon. Linguistic series 22. Canberra: Australian Institute of Aboriginal Studies, pp. 112–171.

Simpson, Jane (1991). *Warlpiri morpho-syntax: a lexicalist approach*. Vol. 23. Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory.

Souza, Livia C. (2013). "Fonologia, Morfologia e Sintaxe das Expressões Nominais em Yawanawá (Pano)". MA thesis. UFRJ.

Valenzuela, Pilar M. (2003). "Transitivity in Shipibo-Konibo Gramar". PhD thesis. University of Oregon.

Wegener, Claudia (2012). *A Grammar of Savosavo*. Ed. by Georg Bossong, Bernard Comrie, and Matthew Dryer. Vol. 61. Mouton de Gruyter.

Zariquiey, Roberto (2011). "A grammar of Kashibo-Kakataibo". PhD thesis. La Trobe University.