

Case Variation in Guarani

Jeong-Seok Yang*

Yonsei University

Jeong-Seok Yang. 2010. Case Variation in Guarani. *Language and Information 14.1*, 93–111. This article is a description of the case variation in Guarani Language, which is a relatively, rarely studied language, and more so about case phenomena. Guarani has two remarkable facts about case. First, it has two overt accusative case markers, which are differentiated by the semantic notion of boundedness as in Jackendoff(1990, 1991). The existence of accusative case markers in Guarani is attested by their behavior in the typical transitive verb sentences, the ability to occur in ECM constructions, and the interpretation of specificity which is parallel to Turkish accusative case marker realization reported in Enc(1991). Second, accusative case forms occur in adjunct positions as well as object positions in Guarani. To capture these peculiar case phenomena, an account based on some recent Minimalist ideas about case checking from Legate(2008), Bowers(2010) is shown to be available. (Yonsei University)

Key words: Guarani Language, case, two accusative case markers, accusative case in adjuncts, case checking, boundedness, specificity

1. Introduction

This article describes the case variation in Guarani Language with partial comparison to Korean.¹ Guarani has two remarkable phenomena about case. First, it has two kinds of overt accusative case markers. Second, the accusative case markers occur in adjunct positions as well as in object positions.

Guarani has been studied relatively rarely in modern linguistics. Notable previous works about the language are Gregores and Suarez(1967), which is a Descriptive Linguistic research, and Tonhauser(2006), which is largely a Generative Linguistic research, focusing on the description of the temporal interpretation of

* Dept. of Korean Language & Literature, College of Humanities & Arts, Yonsei University 234 Maeji, Heungeop, Wonju, Gangwon-do 220-710. Email: yjsyang@yonsei.ac.kr

¹ Guarani is one of two official languages, along with Spanish, in Paraguay. The analysis of Guarani grammar here is based on the data elicited from a Guarani native speaker, Victor Burgos Rolon('the consultant', henceforth), in the 2010 spring Field Methods in Linguistics course, Cornell University. I thank Professor John Whitman for providing me with the opportunity to attend the course, and commenting on the previous manuscript. Thanks also go to three anonymous reviewers who helped the argument of this article get more organized. But all the errors that may be found are on my responsibility.

the language in terms of Discourse Representation Theory. With regard to the case phenomena, just a few previous work can be found. In this article Mithun(1991) and Tonhauser(2006) will be considered as important previous treatments.

In what follows, facts about Guarani case variation will be presented in sections 2-6, in the following order.

- (1) a. Guarani pronouns have five case forms.
- b. Guarani has postposition phrases headed by various postpositions.
- c. Guarani has accusative case markers, whose existence is proved crucially by the existence of so-called 'ECM constructions'.
- d. Guarani has two forms of accusative case markers, and they are differentiated by the semantic notion of 'boundeness'.
- e. Objects with and without the two accusative makers are differentiated by the semantic notion of 'specificity'

Surrounding these discoveries, things related to the case variation in Guarani will be sketched. And then, it will be discussed how the semantic notions of boundedness and specificity are involved in the case variation in Guarani, in order to prove the existence of, and the distinction between, the two accusative case markers.

The theoretical framework which is assumed in this article is, broadly, the recent Minimalist syntax(Chomsky 2000, 2001). And, to account for the peculiar case phenomena in Guarani, the notion of 'default morphological realization of abstract case' in Legate(2006, 2008), and the ideas about functional categories(Cinque 1999, Bowers 2010) will be adopted. This will be discussed in Section 7.

2. Case Forms of Personal Pronouns

In Guarani, the entire case marker realization can only be seen in personal pronouns. In nouns, case markers, accusative case markers in particular, can be attached rather optionally, depending on the notion of 'specificity'.² The case form variation shown in personal pronouns is as follows:³

² See Section 6.

³ NOM=Nominative case, ACC=Accusative case, ABL=Ablative case, OBL=Oblique case. I will use these abbreviated terms in the text that follows.

In transcribing the Guarani data, the official orthography for Guarani Language used in Paraguay is adopted. Prominent differences from the IPA symbols are '=[ʔ], y=[i], j=[ɕ]/[ʒ], and ch=[ʃ], to name a few. And, ã, õ are nasalized vowels of a, o, respectively, whereas ñ is palatalized 'n', i.e. [ɲ]. 'mb' and 'nd' are coarticulations of [m] and [b], [n] and [d], respectively.

(2) Case Forms of Personal Pronouns

	NOM	ACC1	ACC2	ABL	OBL
1sg	che	chebe	cherehe	chegui	che
2sg	nde	ndebe	nderehe	ndegui	nde
3sg	ha'e	chupe	ha'erehe/ hese	chugui	ha'e
1pl.excl	ore	orebe	ore(re)he	oregui	ore
1pl.incl	ñande	ñandebe	ñanderehe	ñandegui	ñande
2pl	pěẽ	pěẽme	pěẽrehe	pěẽgui	pěẽ
3pl	ha'ekuera / hikua'i	chupekue ra	ha'ekuerare(he)	chuguiku era	ha'ekuera

The above table shows that nominative and oblique case are in null form, and most interestingly, accusative case has two forms. Guarani also has ablative case that has a parallel paradigm, as it stands.

For completeness, it should be added that Guarani has no genitive case marker. Instead, the 'genitive' constructional meaning is expressed by a relative word order: the 'possessor' pronoun and noun occur in front of the 'possessed' noun in an NP construction. Nominal modifiers including numerals are positioned before the modified noun, and 'adjectival' modifiers, after that.

- (3) a. nde huguy 'your blood', huan huguy 'Huan's blood'
 b. petẽĩ kuña 'one woman'
 c. enterovea nde inukuera 'all of your friends'
 d. nde inukuera mimi 'some of your friends'
 e. inu porã 'good friend, beautiful friend'

In correlation with the pronoun system, there are agreement systems. Guarani has two types of predicates: one is a type of predicates which is formed from rather regular verbs, and the other is a type of predicates which is formed based on word classes like adjectives, non-conjugating verbs, and even, nouns. Tonhauser(2006: 130-139) presents the two predicate classes, called, in her terms, 'dynamic predicates' for the former(4), and 'stative predicates' for the latter(5).

(4) Dynamic predicates

a. Regular predicate forms:

a-guata 'I walk', (r)e-guata 'You_{sg} walk', o-guata 'He/She walk', ro-guata 'We_{excl} walk', ja-guata 'We_{incl} walk',⁴ pe-guata 'You_{pl} walk', ha'ekuera o-guata 'They walk'

b. Complex predicate forms:⁵

che-hecha 'He/She sees me', nde-hecha 'He/She sees you_{sg}', ore-hecha

⁴ 'ja-' and 'ña-' alternate depending on the verb.

⁵ Only first and second person pronouns can be added in front of the verb for this type of predicates. It is the same with (5a).

'He/She sees us_{excl}', ñande-hecha 'He/She sees us_{incl}', pende-hecha 'He/She sees you_{pl}'

- c. Predicate forms with 'portmanteau prefixes':⁶
ro-hai'u 'I love you_{sg}', po-hai'u 'I love you_{pl}'

(5) Stative predicates

- a. che-kane'o 'I am/was tired', nde-kane'o 'You are/were tired', ore-kane'o 'We_{excl} are/were tired', ñande-kane'o 'We_{incl} are/were tired', pende-kane'o 'You_{pl} are/were tired'
- b. i-kane'o 'She/He is/was tired'⁷
- c. h-asê 'She/He cries'

To establish (2) as a solid pronoun system of Guarani, some careful considerations about a different view on the matter as in Mithun(1991) are in order. Mithun(1991), in examining case marking system in the subject of intransitive verbs crosslinguistically, treats the agreement prefixes like the elements 'a-, (r)e-, o-, ro-, ja-/ña-, pe-, o-' in (4a), as 'case forms' of pronouns. And, similarly, Tonhauser(2006), which is a semantically oriented work, calls all the prefixed elements in (4) and (5), 'crossreference markers', intended to treat all of them in a uniform way. So, it seems to turn out that main previous treatments on this matter differ from that in this article, which assumes that the elements in (4a, c) and (5b, c) are syntactic agreement markers but those in (4b) and (5a) are not.

However, first, the elements 'a-, (r)e-, o-, ro-, ja-/ña-, pe-, o-' in (4a) can not be identified with the case forms of pronouns. Even if we treat them as case forms, we still need to distinguish them according to the difference in agreement relation.

Second, new pronoun subjects can be added to the predicate forms in (4) and (5):

- (4') a. che a-guata 'I walk', nde (r)e-guata 'You_{sg} walk', ha'e o-guata 'He/She walk', ore ro-guata 'We_{excl} walk', ñande ja-guata 'We_{incl} walk', pẽẽ pe-guata 'You_{pl} walk', ha'ekuera o-guata 'They walk'
- b. ha'e che-hecha 'He/She sees me', ha'e nde-hecha 'He/She sees you_{sg}', ha'e ore-hecha 'He/She sees us_{excl}', ha'e ñande-hecha 'He/She sees us_{incl}', ha'e pende-hecha 'He/She sees you_{pl}'
- c. che ro-hai'u 'I love you_{sg}', che po-hai'u 'I love you_{pl}'
- (5') a. che che-kane'o 'I am/was tired', nde nde-kane'o 'You are/were tired', ore ore-kane'o 'We_{excl} are/were tired', ñande ñande-kane'o 'We_{incl} are/were tired', pẽẽ pende-kane'o 'You_{pl} are/were tired'

⁶ 'ro-' is a frozen agreement marker for first person singular and second person singular, and 'po-', for first person singular and second person plural.

⁷ 'i' and 'h' in (5b, c) are agreement markers of stative predicates for third person subjects.

- b. ha'e i-kane'o 'She/He is tired'
 c. ha'e h-asẽ 'She/He cries'

These show that, especially in (4'a), the functions of pronouns are performed by the new subjects, not by the agreement elements. Note, in contrast, that, in (4'b), two pronouns both perform the functions.

Considering the facts, the predicate forms with pronouns in (4b) and (5a) can be treated as instances of 'noun incorporation' in terms of Baker(1988). Then, all the case forms of Guarani pronouns are collected in the table (2). And, what is more in need of investigation, next, is about case forms of nouns. In Guarani, the nominative and oblique cases of nouns are in null form in any environment. Ablative case marker '-gui' realizes obligatorily. But two forms of accusative case markers realize depending on semantic reasons.

Before proceeding further, some brief remarks about the assumption in stating the nominal and postpositional units in the lexicon would be needed. A problem in the table above is that about two accusative case forms, e.g. 'chupekuera' and 'ha'ekuerare(he)'.⁸ On the surface forms, 'chu-pe-kuera' observes the normal variation pattern in the case form realization, as can be seen in the comparison with the third person plural pronominal form of ablative, 'chu-gui-kuera'; whereas 'ha'e-kuera-re(he)' seems peculiar. So, the entire pronoun like 'chupekuera', 'ha'ekuerarehe' can be posited to have case features as a whole unit.

In the lexicon, the whole unit of a pronoun or noun may have the word structure as in (6) or (7). And such a convention as (8) in the lexicon is needed.

(6) a. [_N [_N [_N chu][_P pe]] [_N kuera]]

b. [_N [_N [_N ha'e][_N kuera]] [_P rehe]]

(7) a. [_N [_N kuña][_P pe]]

b. [_N [_N kuña] [_P rehe]]

(8) The set of syntactic features of a noun which has the constituent structure [_NN N/P] is the union of the (sets of) features of N and the features of N/P.

For ACC1, ACC2, and ABL markers in (2), such conventions as (6), (7), and (8) should be postulated. But for other postpositions, which will be presented in the

⁸ Paradigms of the pronouns with other postpositions presented in Section 3 are as follows. They all follow the pattern of ACC2, i.e. '-rehe' form.

	-ndive	-ramo	-rupi	-hotygo	-hegui
1sg	chendive	cheramo	cherupi	chhotygo	chehegui
2sg	ndendive	nderamo	nderupi	ndehotygo	ndehogui
3sg	ha'endive	ha'enramo	ha'erupi	ha'ehotygo	ha'ehogui
1pl.excl	orendive	oreramo	orerupi	orehotygo	orehegui
2pl.incl	ñandendive	ñanderamo	ñanderupi	ñandehotygo	ñandehogui
2pl	pẽendive	pẽeramo	pẽerupi	pẽehotygo	pẽehogui
3pl	ha'ekuerandive	ha'ekueraramo	ha'ekuerarupi	ha'ekuerahotygo	ha'ekuerahegui

next section, more usual syntactic process can be assumed. A postposition can act as a head forming a postposition phrase. In such examples as (9), the features of a head(in this case, '-ramo') are percolated onto the whole phrase.

- (9) [*PP* [*NP* mboehara][*P* ramo]] 'as a teacher'

It seems to be unavoidable to postulate some language-particular operation like (6) or (7) in a part of the grammar.⁹ We shall discuss some theoretical implications of this treatment to the case theory, in Section 7, after going through case-related facts in Guarani in sections 3-6.

3. Case Markers and Postpositions

In what follows, a tentative list for the whole case markers and postpositions will be presented with comments for some examples. The list shall reveal the peculiarities of Guarani case variation with regard to postposition phrases. First of all, the language has two ACC case markers.

- (10) Accusative: i) -pe ii) -rehe

a. ha'e o-pypoi che-rehe
3s.pron 3s-kick 1s-Acc
'He/She kicked me.'

b. ha'e o-pypoi che-be¹⁰
3s.pron 3s-kick 1s.pron-Acc
'He/She kicked at me, but didn't really kicked me.'

Considering the different patterns between 'chu-gui-kuera' and 'ha'e-kuera-rehe' in the table (2), one possibility might be to treat only '-rehe' as an accusative marker, and '-pe' as a postposition, as the gloss in (10b) might suggest. And in fact '-pe' is used in other positions than in objects:

- (11) a. huan o-guata hoga-pe
3s-walk 3s.pron.house-pe (hoga← ha'e oga)
'Huan walked to home.'
- b. che a-mõĩ kyse yby-be
1s.pron 1s-put knife earth-Acc
'I put the knife on the ground.'

But this possibility would be denied by the existence of the data as the following.

⁹ Every language seems to need such a rule as 'X Y → X', though it has not been widely admitted as an underlying structure formation operation in Principles and Parameters and Minimalist traditions. Choi(1991) argues that it is a general syntactic process, but constrained by 'X0-subcategorizations', which are posited in the lexicon.

¹⁰ '-be' is a variant of the Acc1 marker '-pe'.

- (12) a. ha'ekuera o-hecha che-be
 3pl.pron 3pl-see 1s.pron-Acc
 'They see me.'
- b. che ndo-ro-hai'ui nde-be¹¹
 1s.pron Neg-12s-like 2s.pron-Acc
 'I don't like you.'

It seems to be a universal phenomenon that the verbal meaning of 'see' and 'like' are expressed in a transitive structure. If so, (12) constitutes an evidence for treating '-pe' as an accusative case marker.

And regarding (12), one should not regard '-pe' marker as restricted to [+human] objects, since the following would be a counterexample to that possibility.¹²

- (13) che a-hai'u mokõĩ pira-pe
 1s.pron 1s-eat two fish-Acc
 'I like two fish of them.'

Therefore we can not attribute the facts like (12) to some phenomena limited to personal pronouns.

Guarani has ablative case. The marker is '-gui'.

- (14) Ablative: '-gui'
- a. pe aña õsẽ ba'yru-gui
 Dem devil 3s-come.out box-Abl (Dem=demonstrative)
 'The devil came out of the box.'
- b. pe kymba'e õsẽ oga-gui
 Dem boy 3s-come.out house-Abl
 'The boy came out of the house.'
- c. ha o-japo chuguikuera ka'i
 and 3s-make 3pl.pron.Abl monkey
 'And he made them monkeys.'
- d. che a-ju-kuri paraguay-gui petẽĩ ary
 1s.pron 1s-come-Past Paraguay-Abl one year
 'I came from Paraguay last year.'

It is not a simple matter to provide a criterion that cuts between the four case forms (NOM, ACC1, ACC2, ABL) above and others that follow. For now, a tentative criterion here is, with the former, the nominal phrase gets some selectional restriction from a verb. The followings are various kinds of postposition instances. They show similar patterns as in the accusative and ablative forms, but don't have selectional restriction from the verb.

¹¹ The form '-ro-' glossed as '12s' is an instance of 'portmanteau prefixes' in (4c).

¹² This example will be discussed in more detail in Section 6.

- (15) Comitative/Instrumental ‘-ndive’
- a. huan a-ikovai(-kuri) hendive (hendive←ha’e-ndive)
3s-fight(-Past) 3s.pron-Com
‘Huan fights(fought) him.’
 - b. che a-guata oga-pe huandive (huandive ← huan-ndive)
1s.pron 1s-walk house-Acc Huan-Com
‘I walked to home with Huan.’
 - c. che a-mondo jebe chupe hogape ‘i-ta’yra-ndive¹³
1s.pron 1s-send back 3s.pron he-house-Acc 3s.pron-son-Com
‘I sent him back to his house with his son.’
 - d. che a-inupã tapi ambaha-ndive
1s.pron 1s-hit wall hammer-Com
‘I hit the wall with a hammer.’
- (16) Predicative: ‘-ramo’
- a. ha’e o-mba’apo ape mboehara-ramo
3s.pron 3s-see here teacher-Pred
‘He works here as a teacher.’
 - b. che a-japo chupe itavymba-ramo
1s.pron 1s-consider 3s.pron-Acc fool-Pred
‘I consider him as a fool.’

Interestingly, comitative and instrumental postpositions share one form ‘-ndive’.

Other postpositions meaning path and location should be included in the list of postpositions.

- (17) Prolative: ‘-rupi’
- a. che a-ju-kuri tape’i-rupi
1s.pron 1s-come-Past trail-Prol (tape’i: small road/trail)
‘I came here via a small road/trail.’
 - b. che a-ju-kuri tapeuasuru-pi
1s.pron 1s-come-Past highway-Prol (tapeuasuru: big road/highway)
‘I came here via a highway.’
 - c. che mba’yruata o-hasa ybykua-rupi
1s.pron car 1s-pass tunnel-Prol (ybykua: hole in ground)
‘My car ran through the tunnel.’
- (18) On/Over: ‘-airi’¹⁴

¹³ In this example, ‘chupe’, ‘hoga’, ‘ita’yra’ are abbreviated forms of ‘ha’epe’, ‘ha’e oga’, ‘ha’e ta’yra’, respectively.

¹⁴ The following contrast shows that ‘-airi’ is a postposition, whereas ‘-uy’, which has a pair meaning with ‘-airi’, is a full-fledged noun.

- a. che a-jupi kauaju-airi
1s.pron 1s-ride horse-on
'I ride on a horse.'
- (19) From: . . .To: '-guibe. . .-pebe'
- a. ha'e o-'u paraguai-gui US-pe
3s.pron 3s-go Paraguay-Abl US-Acc
'He went/traveled from Paraguay to the US.'
- b. ha'e o-ke petẽĩ aravo(-guibe) porundy-pebe
3s.pron 3s-sleep one hour(-from) nine-to
'He slept from 1:00 to 9:00.'

In (19a), the aforementioned '-gui' and '-pe' are used; whereas, in (19b), '-guibe' comes from ABL '-gui' and ACC '-be', but acts as an inseparable unit. The same is true with '-pebe', which is the reduplicated form of the same accusative markers '-pe' and '-be'.

- (20) Toward: '-hotygo'
- a. huan o-guata hoga-hotygo
3s-walk 3s.pron-house-toward
'Huan walked toward home.'
- b. o-'u che-hotygo
3s-come 1s.pron-toward
'He came toward me.'
- (21) Around: '-jere'
- a. che a-guata taba'i-jere-rehe
1s.pron 1s-walk village-around-Acc
'I went around the village for a walk.'
- (22) Comparative: -hegui
- a. ha'e tuja-be che-hegui
3s.pron old-CA 1s.pron-Cmpr¹⁵
'He is older than I.'

-
- a. *re-hecha airi!
2s-look.at on/over
'Look at the upper part/the top!'
- b. re-hecha uy!
2s-look.at under/below
'Look at the lower part/below!'

¹⁵ CA and Cmpr stand for 'Comparative adjectivizer' and 'Comparative Postposition', respectively. CA forms alternate as '-be' and '-ve'.

- b. ha'e o-ñani hātā-be/pue'e-be che-hegui
 3s.pron 3s.run fast-CA/fast-CA 1s.pron-Cmpr
 'He runs faster than I.'

The examples above can hardly be said to be a complete list of postpositions in Guarani, but may be regarded as an overall sketch about them.

4. ECM Constructions as Evidence for ACC2

Again, considering the different patterns between 'chu-gui-kuera' and 'ha'e-kuera-rehe' in the table (2) in Section 2, one might try to treat only '-pe' as an accusative marker, and '-rehe' as a postposition. But this would not work.

That '-rehe' is an accusative case marker is confirmed by the following pair, where pronouns can occur in the position in a so-called 'ECM construction', which is marked accusative case. In Guarani, of the two accusative forms, only '-rehe' form can be realized in this position.

- (23) a. che a-pensa/a-malisia ha'e 'ijapy'yua(-ha)
 1s.pron 1s-think 3s.pron honest(-CTM)¹⁶
 'I think that he is honest.'
- b. che a-pensa/a-malisia hese 'ijapy'yua(-ha) (hese← ha'erehe)
 1s.pron 1s-think 3s.pron-Acc honest(-CTM)
 'I think him to be honest.'
- c. *che a-pensa/a-malisia chupe 'ijapy'yua(-ha) (chupe← ha'epe)
 1s.pron 1s-think 3s.pron-Acc honest(-CTM)
 'I think him to be honest.'
- (24) che a-pensa/a-malisia pe kymba'e-rehe 'ijapy'yua(-ha)
 1s.pron 1s-think Dem man-Acc honest(-CTM)
 'I think the man to be honest.'

The corresponding passive sentences are also available, confirming even more that '-rehe' forms are ACC case forms:

- (25) a. ha'e o-ñe-pensa/o-ñe-malisia haeha 'ijapy'yua
 3s.pron 3s-Ref-think/3s-Ref-think 3s.pron honest¹⁷
 'He is thought to be honest.'
- b. pe kymba'e o-ñe-pensa/o-ñe-malisia haeha 'ijapy'yua
 Dem man 3s-Ref-think/3s-Ref-think 3s.pron honest
 'The man is thought to be honest.'

¹⁶ CTM stands for 'Clause Type Marker'. In this case, '-ha' marks the VP Complement clause.

¹⁷ '-ñe-' glossed 'Ref' in (25a, b) is a reflexive pronominal affix. Here it is used as a passivizing element, as found in Romance languages. And 'haeha' glossed '3s.pron' seems to be a variant of 3rd person nominative pronoun 'ha'e'.

In Guarani, there seems to be a semantic restriction on the predicates of the embedded clauses, according to what I have been observing with the consultant.¹⁸ It is an interesting parallelism with the Korean ECM sentences, where the predicates of the embedded clause should have some kind of ‘generic’ meaning. (26’), (27’) show the corresponding Korean data.¹⁹

- (26) a. che a-pensa/a-malisia ha’e ikane’o(-ha)
 1s.pron 1s-think 3s.pron.Nom be.tired(-CTM)
 ‘I think that he is tired.’
- b. ??che a-pensa/a-malisia hese ikane’o(-ha)
 1s.pron 1s-think 3s.pron.Acc be.tired(-CTM)
 ‘I think him to be tired.’
- (27) a. che a-pensa Huan o-pypoi-ha Feliciano-rehe.
 1s 1s-think Huan.Nom 3s-kick-CTM Feliciano-Acc
 ‘I think that Huan kicked Feliciano.’
- b. ??che a-pensa Huan-rehe o-pypoi-ha Feliciano-rehe.
 1s 1s-think Huan-Acc 3s-kick-CTM Feliciano-Acc
- (26’) a. na-nun ku-ka phikonha-tako sayngkakha-nta
 1s.pron-Top 3s.pron-Nom be.tired-CTM think-CTM
 ‘I think that he is tired.’
- b. ??na-nun ku-lul phikonha-tako sayngkakha-nta
 1s.pron-Top 3s.pron-Acc be.tired-CTM think-CTM
 ‘I think him to be tired.’
- (27’) a. na-nun Chelswu-ka Inho-lul chy-ess-tako
 1s.pron-Top Chelswu-Nom Inho-Acc hit-Perfective-CTM
 sayngkakha-nta
 think-CTM
- b. ??na-nun Chelswu-lul Inho-lul chy-ess-tako
 1s.pron-Top Chelswu-Nom Inho-Acc hit-Perfective-CTM
 sayngkakha-nta
 think-CTM

In Yang(2002), I proposed that the Korean ECM construction is characterized as a type-judgement about the individual referred to by the object, where ‘type’

¹⁸ At the early stage of his consultation about Guarani, the consultant judged that (b) sentences below were ‘perfect Guarani sentences’. But in his recent email reply to my questions, the consultant said that, although both (a) and (b) sentences are understandable, (a) sentences sound much better, compared to (b) sentences. And he admitted the ‘typical, or general’ meaning in (b) sentences. This kind of grammatical judgement problem is something very familiar when I ask Korean native speakers about the corresponding (a) and (b) sentences in Korean.

¹⁹ Yale Romanization is adopted in transcribing Korean data (26’) and (27’).

is a notion in opposition with ‘token’, as in Jackendoff(1990, 1991). Here ‘type’ can be translated into ‘genericity’. Compare the NOM-ACC pairs between the two languages. In each pair, (b) sentences are unnatural because their embedded clauses are of stage-level predicates, which are normally considered to create non-generic meaning.²⁰

The parallelism about the ECM sentences between unrelated languages ensure that the ‘-rehe’ marked NP is the normal object, and ‘-rehe’ is not other than an accusative case marker.

5. Two Accusative Case Markers and Boundedness

According to Jackendoff(1990, 1991), there is a semantic notion ‘boundedness’ that is orthogonal to any other semantic distinctions, like all kinds of functional distinctions, definite vs. indefinite, or to the distinction of generic vs. non-generic, etc.

The distinction can be attested in English prepositions ‘to’ vs. ‘toward’ (Jackendoff 1991), and in various Finnish case markers(Nikkanne 1990). Also in Korean, the same distinction can be shown, as in location postposition ‘-ey’ and path postposition ‘-lo’, though the distinction also accompany the distinction of ‘location’ vs. ‘path’(Yang 2004).

The distinction that works in the two accusative case forms in Guarani is the same notion ‘boundedness’, in my view.

- (28) a. ha’e o-pypoi che-rehe
 ‘He kicks me.’
 b. ha’e o-pypoi che-be
 ‘He kicked at me, but didn’t really kicked me.’

In the examples above, the object positions are occupied by the ‘-rehe’ and ‘-pe’ marked pronouns. Relating to the usage of ‘-pe’ in (28b), the consultant explained that ‘-pe’ form can appropriately be used in a situation like ‘the boss kicked him out of the company’, and the verbs meaning some aspect of ‘contact’ cooccur with ‘-rehe’ forms. On the basis of the observation as such, I propose that the difference is due to the semantic notion of ‘boundedness’.

We have seen that in the object positions of ECM constructions, only ‘-rehe’ form is used. For now, the reason may be explained as this: to the Guarani native speakers, the object and the embedded clause are recognized as inseparable one, so the object should be marked as ‘bounded’. In any event, the notion seems to be independent of genericity, specificity or definiteness.

‘-pe’ and ‘-rehe’ also occur in positions other than object positions.

- (29) a. mba’echa pa ’ajupita ybyrarākame?²¹
 ‘How will I climb toward the tree branch?’

²⁰ But stage-level predicates can also appear in sentences conveying genericity. So the Korean and Guarani sentences marked ‘??’ are not totally excluded, but can be used in some coerced contexts.

²¹ ‘-me’ is another variant of ‘-pe’.

- b. . . . hogayuakuera ohogui omymbajuka ka'aguype
 ' . . . because all the family went out for hunting in the forest.'

- (30) ohechavo ybyrarākarehe mitāguera ho'uhina yba'aju, tujami ojerure chu-
 pekueru 'ome'e hāūa chupe tembi'u.
 'Seeing that on the tree branch children were eating ripe fruits, the little
 old man asked for them to give him some food.'

In this case also, the relevant distinction is boundedness. The sentence (29a), as can be seen from the gloss using the English preposition 'toward', conveys the non-contact with the tree branch; whereas the sentence (30) shows a contact of the children with the tree branch. The sentence (29b), with '-pe', also has non-contact meaning: in this case, 'all the family' is not necessarily in contact with the forest.

But, here, the problem is how the same accusative case markers are used in adjunct positions such as these. I will discuss this point in Section 7.

6. Specificity in Object Positions

The notion 'specificity' also plays a role in Guarani case variation. It realizes in accusative case for nouns: if a noun phrase in the object position has accusative case marker, '-rehe' or '-pe', it conveys the specificity, that is a presuppositional meaning as in Diesing(1992); whereas, a noun phrase without an accusative marker is interpreted to be existential: it is interpreted in the underlying position within VP.²² In Diesing's(1992) account, generic reading is also interpreted as a presuppositional meaning.

Examples that show the point are as follows: in (31), neither '-pe' nor '-rehe' is available, whereas in (32), an imaginable situation as in a Greek myth, ACC marker '-pe' can be used.

- (31) a. nde re'u arasa
 2s.pron 2s.eat guava
 'You ate/eat guava.'
- b. *nde re'u arasa-pe
- c. *nde re'u arasa-rehe.
- (32) a. pora ho'u mokõĩ tapicha-pe
 devil 3s-eat two people-Acc
 'The devil ate two people (out of them).'

²² "All existential, nongeneric indefinite NPs that have no quantificational force of their own must be within the VP after tree splitting applies." (Diesing 1992: 57) Here, 'tree splitting' means an operation mapping a syntactic structure to a logical representation which consists of 'quantifier', 'restrictor', and 'nuclear scope' as in Heim(1982). In this article, assuming the recent Minimalist conventions, we reinterpret the 'underlying constituent VP' as 'vP', where 'v' is a light verb that attracts an NP with an ACC feature from the lower VP. And the NP can move further to Spec of C, or Spec of an additional functional category like Focus, after Spell-Out, thereby transfers to a logical interpretation with specificity or genericity. But a full account of the interaction between the case and the clause structure of Guarani is a project that deserves an independent research.

- b. pora ho'u mokōĩ tapicha
 devil 3s-eat two people
 'The devil ate two people.'

In the pair in (32), 'tapichape' in (a), compared with 'tapicha' in (b), has a sense of specificity: a certain, 'known' people from the antecedent utterance or the context. The consultant's intuition is that, in order to refer to 'unknown' people, (b) is better. This is a piece of evidence that '-rehe' form conveys the meaning of specificity.

Take imaginable situations for further examples. There are several fish in a bucket, full of water.

- (33) a. che a-hai'u mokōĩ pira-pe
 1s.pron 1s-like two fish-Acc
 'I like two fish of them.'
- b. ??che a-hai'u mokōĩ pira
 1s.pron 1s-like two fish
 'I like two fish.'

Imagining the situation, the consultant observed that, compared to (33b), (33a) is far better with the intended 'specific' meaning: though 'fish' in (33b) could be interpreted as a nonspecific fish, it is quite awkward. And in the same situation, (34a) and (34b) are observed to be available.

- (34) a. che a-mbochryry mokōĩ pira kova-gui.
 1s.pron 1s-fry two fish that-Abl
 'I fried two fish from/out of them.'
- b. ha'u-se mokōĩ pira
 1s-eat-want two fish
 'I want to eat two fish.'

For another example, as a generic statement, the sentence without ACC marker is appropriate, which is a natural result, for according to Diesing (1992), generic reading is one possibility along with existential reading when an indefinite NP can not get specific reading.

- (35) ndai-porāĩ ja'u so'o(*-pe)
 Neg-good 1pl.inc-eat meat(*Acc)
 'It is not good to eat meat.'

Now, let's take sentences with the verb '-heka' meaning 'look for' for examples. The accusative case marker that is expected in the object position of these sentences is '-pe'. '-rehe' can not be used in this context, because it should imply some notion of 'contact' or 'boundedness' but the meaning of 'looking for' is contradictory to that. And then, what if '-pe' is omitted?

- (36) a. che ahekahina petēĩ kuñape
 'I am looking for (a known, specific, a certain) woman.'

- b. che ahekahina petẽĩ kuña
'I am looking for an unknown, nonspecific woman.'

Interestingly again, (36a) and (36b) contrast in meaning. According to the consultant, in the former, the object 'petẽĩ kuñape' with an accusative marker refers to a certain, known woman; whereas in the latter, the object without that, 'petẽĩ kuña', refers to some 'unknown, nonspecific' woman.

The distinction between specific and nonspecific meaning is not limited to '-pe' case forms. The same contrast in meaning can be captured in the pair like the following, with nonhuman objects. Imagine a situation where you walk in a street and you kick two stones:²³

- (37) a. ha'e oypoi mokõĩ 'itarehe 'He/She kicked two (specific) stones.'
b. ha'e oypoi mokõĩ 'ita 'He/She kicked two (nonspecific) stones.'

In that situation, (37a) with '-rehe' means that you kicked two specific stones, whether you know their respective names or not, whereas (37b) without '-rehe' means that you kicked some nonspecific stones, which is a more usual situation.

Lastly, what about the cases of pronouns and proper nouns? For pronouns, case markers can not be omitted, since pronoun by nature has specificity. The same is true with proper nouns: proper nouns also have specificity.

- (38) pora ho'u-ta che-be/huam-pe
devil 3s-eat-Future 1s.pron-Acc/Huan-Acc
'The devil will eat me/Huan.'

- (39) ha'e o-pypoi che-rehe/huan-rehe
3s.pron 3s-kick 1s-Acc/Huan-Acc
'He kicked me/Huan.'

This is an expected result, as Enc(1991) noted that, in Turkish, names, pronouns, definite descriptions, and demonstrative NPs must be marked accusative(p.9).²⁴

²³ The sentence with '-pe' is not available.

a. *ha'e oypoi mokõĩ 'itape.

²⁴ In Guarani, NPs with demonstratives don't have ACC marker '-pe'. I suspect that this is because ACC marker '-pe' originates from demonstrative 'pe'. However, the consultant judges that the sentence without '-rehe' is still available, though that with '-rehe' is better than that without '-rehe'

a. che a-hecha-ta pe kuñape(*-pe)
1s.pron 1s-see-Future Dem woman(*Acc1)
'I will meet that woman.'

b. ha'e o-pypoi pe kymba'e-rehe/?pe kymba'e
'I kicked that man.'

7. Case Licensing in Guarani

Now, in this section, we try to describe the procedure of case licensing, drawing on the observations so far. It has been discussed in previous sections that Guarani Language has two overt accusative case markers, and that the ACC marked forms occur not only in argument positions, but also in adjunct positions.

What the first fact means is we could not resort to the case assigning approach as in the GB theory (Chomsky 1981). Take the Guarani verb ‘-pypoi(kick)’ for an example. In GB framework, a verb must assign just one accusative case to the object NP that it governs at S-structure. The case marker realization at PF can proceed only on the basis of the abstract case assigned at S-structure, hence no two distinct case markers can be realized. Therefore, some kind of case checking approach is in order.

In the recent Minimalist framework (Chomsky 2000, 2001), a case feature is given to an NP from the first, and for a structural case, a case checker values an NP with a matching case feature, and deletes the feature, by ‘Agree’ operation. In this system, two NPs with different case markers checked by one case checker separately would raise no problem.

And, regarding the second fact, the problem is that we can not retain the association between the accusative case and the object position to the full. As were noted, Guarani ACC markers are attached not only to objects but also to adjuncts:

- (40) a. ha'ekuera o-hecha che-be (= (12a))
 3pl.pron 3pl-see 1s.pron-Acc
 ‘They see me.’
- b. che a-guata oga-pe huandive (= (15b))
 1s.pron 1s-walk house-Acc Huan-Com
 ‘I walked to home with Huan.’
- c. pe tujami o-pyta ha'eño hoga-pe
 Dem little.old.man 3s-stay himself 3s-pron-house-Acc
 ‘The little old man stayed at his house alone.’
- (41) a. hogayuakuera oho omymbajuka ka'aguype
 ‘All the family went out for hunting in the forest.’
- b. ybyrarākarehe mitāguera ho'uhina yba'aju
 ‘On the tree branch, children were eating ripe fruits.’

Since our approach recognizes ‘-pe’ in every context as accusative case marker, non-object positions in (40b, c) and (41a, b) should be treated as such.

Similar phenomena can be found in Korean, too. In the following examples, corresponding to the examples in (40), ACC markers may occur.

- (42) a. ku-tul-i na-lul po-nta
 3s.pron-Pl-Nom 1s.pron-Acc see-CTM
 ‘They see me.’

- b. na-nun cip-ey-lul ka-nta
 1s.pron-Top house-Loc-Acc go-CTM
 'I go to home.'
- c. ku-ka chinkwu cip-ey-lul memwull-ess-ta
 3s.pron-Nom friend house-Loc-Acc stay-Perfective-CTM
 'He has stayed in a friend's home.'

In Guarani data, ACC markers alone occur in object and non-object argument positions; whereas in Korean data, Locative postpositions along with ACC markers come in positions as such. However, Korean also has structures where ACC markers alone occur in adjunct positions:

- (43) a. ai-ka sey sikan-ul ca-nta
 Child-Nom three hour-Acc sleep-CTM
 'The child sleeps for three hours.'
- b. nalssi-ka yeset tal-ul chwuw-ess-ta
 weather-Nom six month-Acc cold-Perfective-CTM
 'It has been cold for six months.'

Note that these examples parallel the Guarani sentences (41a, b), in that the adjuncts have ACC markers.

As for the case checking process, I will show that some of the recent Minimalist ideas can be adopted successfully. To begin with, let's assume that case features are gotten from the postposition, i.e. the ACC marker, as was shown in Section 2. The case feature of the entire noun comes as in the following way:

- (44) a. $[_N [_N [_N \text{chu}]_{[P \text{pe}_{[+Acc]}]]] [_N \text{kuera}]]$ b. $[_N [_N \text{ka'aguy}]_{[P \text{pe}_{[+Acc]}]}]_{[+Acc]}$

With this case feature of the whole pronoun as in (44a), and noun as in (44b), the standard way of case checking process will proceed.

In terms of Minimalist approaches as in Cinque(1999), Bowers(2010), the adjunct phrases with ACC markers will be accommodated in the Specifier position of an empty adjunct category.

- (45) $[_{\emptyset P} [_{NP} [_N \text{ka'aguy-pe}]]] [_{\emptyset} \emptyset [\dots]]$

The empty category will check an inherent case feature [+Acc].²⁵

For completeness, case licensing of the noun phrases which do not have overt case markers should be considered.

Legate(2006, 2008) proposed a Minimalist account for the case phenomena in a class of ergative languages, where ergative case is inherent case licensed by

²⁵ ' \emptyset ' marks an assumed empty adjunct category. (45) shows the structure for the adjunct in (41a). For 'oga-pe' or 'hoga-pe' in (40b, c), a similar empty category, or two, seems to be needed. If so postulated, the merging order among the syntactic categories would be regulated by the principle such as 'Universal Order of Merge(UOM)' in Bowers(2010).

the light verb that introduces the external argument. In her proposal, 'absolutive case' in this class of ergative languages is not an independent case at all, but just a morphological default realization of two different abstract cases, i.e. NOM on intransitive subject and ACC on transitive object. Take Hindi for an example:

- (46) Case realization pattern in Hindi finite clause:²⁶
 [ergative] ↔ -ne, [dative] ↔ -ko, [instrumental] ↔ -se, [genitive] ↔ -kaa,
 [locative1] ↔ -mē, [locative2] ↔ -par, [case] ↔ -∅ (= "absolutive")

Every noun phrase without an overt case marker enters the derivation process with the abstract case feature [case] specified.

The notion of morphological default can be applied to all noun phrases in Guarani which do not have overt case markers:

- (47) Case realization pattern in Guarani
 [accusative] ↔ -pe, [accusative] ↔ -rehe, [ablative] ↔ -gui, [oblique] ↔ -∅
 [case] ↔ -∅ (For noun phrases without any other abstract case)

Nominals carry their own case features from the first, and then get checked at an appropriate position. In Guarani, there are four abstract cases checked in syntax, i.e. [accusative], [ablative], [oblique], and [case]. They realize morphologically, according to the language-particular convention (47).

8. Conclusion

We have observed the facts related to the case variation in Guarani: five case forms of personal pronouns, agreement markers and incorporated pronouns that should be distinguished from case forms, oblique noun phrases in various postposition phrases, and accusative case markers. Main attention has been paid to the phenomena of Guarani having two forms of accusative case markers. The existence of ACC markers in Guarani has been attested by their behavior in the typical transitive verb sentences, the ability to occur in an ECM construction, and the interpretation of specificity. To capture the peculiar case phenomena in Guarani that it has two ACC markers and ACC forms occur in adjunct positions, a notion of morphological default realization of an abstract case from Legate(2006, 2008), and an idea of empty functional category from Cinque(1999), Bowers(2010) have been shown to be successfully adopted.

Two forms of accusative case markers are distinguished by the semantic notion of boundedness. And as expected from the work by Enc(1991), Diesing(1992), the semantic notion of specificity plays an important role in distinguishing between the objects with and without accusative case markers.

<References>

Baker, M. 1988. *Incorporation: A theory of grammatical function changing*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

²⁶ Legate(2008: 59).

- Bowers, J. 2002. Transitivity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33, 183–224.
- Bowers, J. 2010. *Arguments as Relations*. Ms. Cornell University.
- Choi, K. 1991. *A Theory of X₀-subcategorization*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Washington.
- Chomsky, N. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Foris, Dordrecht.
- Chomsky, N. 2000. Minimalist Inquiries. In D. Michaels et al. (eds.), *Step by Step*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Chomsky, N. 2001. Derivation by Phase. In M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Cinque, G. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-Linguistic Perspective*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Diesing, M. 1992. *Indefinites*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Enc, M. 1991. The semantics of specificity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22.1, 1–25.
- Gregores, E. and J. Suarez. 1967. *A Description of Colloquial Guarani*. Mouton de Gruyter, The Hague.
- Heim, I. 1982. *The Semantics of Definite and Indefinite Noun Phrases*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Jackendoff, R. 1990. *Semantic Structures*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Jackendoff, R. 1991. Parts and boundaries. *Cognition* 41, 9–45.
- Jackendoff, R. 2002. *Foundations of Language*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Legate, J. 2006. Split Absolute. In A. Johns (ed.), *Ergativity: Emerging Issues*. Kluwer, Dordrecht, pp. 143–171.
- Legate, J. 2008. Morphological and abstract case. *Linguistic Inquiry* 39.1, 55–101.
- Mithun, M. 1991. Active/agentive case marking and its motivations. *Language* 67.3, 510–546.
- Nikanne, U. 1990. *Zones and Tiers: A Study of Thematic Structure*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, Helsinki.
- Tonhauser, J. 2006. *The Temporal Semantics of Noun Phrases: Evidence from Guarani*. Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University.
- Yang, J. 2002. *Aspectuality and Argument Linking*. Taehaksa Publishing Co., Seoul. (written in Korean).
- Yang, J. 2004. A description of argument linking in Korean: based on Conceptual Semantics. *Korean Journal of Linguistics* 29.3, 329–357. (written in Korean).

Submitted on: May 18, 2010

Accepted on: June 14, 2010