

【論文】

Variation of Case OCP Effects in Odia

Junji YAMABE¹

要旨 (Abstract)

This article presents a varied picture in Odia of how two (or more) identically case-marked argument NPs (“same-case pair”) can and cannot occur in a sentence. Regarding this, three types of situations obtain in this language: in one type, which we will call “free occurrence”, a same-case pair can occur in immediate succession; in another type, “limited occurrence”, a same-case pair is allowed only if the NPs of the pair are linearly detached; and in still another type, “excluded occurrence”, a same-case pair is not allowed, irrespective of whether the NPs of the pair are adjacent to, or detached from, each other.

The distribution of these three situation types can be described in terms of two formal criteria: (i) the syntactic *context* in which a same-case pair is situated (roughly speaking, whether it is found in a simple clause or in a certain species of complex clause); (ii) the *items* constituting the same-case pair (whether the heads of the NPs of the pair are full nouns or pronouns; whether the case marker on the NP of the pair is an affix or a postposition). Viewed in totality, the distribution of the three situation types follows implicational hierarchies that are motivated by the following two criteria: (i) the more reduced structurally the syntactic *context* is, the more restrictive it is for the occurrence of same-case pair; (ii) the more perceptually prominent the case marker is, due to the features of constituent *items*, the more strictly restricted it is for the occurrence of same case pair.

The data reported for Odia in this article helps broaden and elaborate the descriptive and theoretical research space of Case OCP phenomena.

キーワード (Keywords) : South Asian language, syntax-morphology interface, case marking, postposition, subject, agent, full-noun vs pronoun distinction, case-suffix vs postposition distinction

1. Overview

Language has a tendency against two (or more) identically case-marked argument NPs (henceforth, “same-case pair”) occurring in a sentence. Reflecting this tendency, different languages prohibit the occurrences of two (or more) argument NPs of the same case, under various conditions: the Japanese accusative *-o* (Shibatani 1978, among many others), the Hindi *-ko* (T. Mohanan 1993, 1994; Saksena 1983), the Russian dative (Pereltsvaig 2008: 118-119), and the Choctaw oblique (Tyler 2022). Many, though not all, instances of such prohibitions can be characterized to be quite “surface” dissimilations rather than to be something “deep”-syntactic, and their underlying mechanism is termed “Case OCP” in the theoretical literature (since T. Mohanan 1994). Odia is another language that instantiates this kind of prohibition, and for that matter in novel varieties, and accordingly it helps contribute to the study of Case OCP. The present article provides detailed descriptions of, and also rudimentary accounts for, the facts concerning how same-case pairs can and cannot occur in Odia.

Three types of situations obtain in this language: in one type, which we call “free occurrence”, a same-case

¹ ✉ jjyamabe@kumamoto-u.ac.jp

Department of Communication and Information Studies, Faculty of Letters, Kumamoto University,
2-40-1 Kurokami, Chuo-ku, Kumamoto-shi 860-8555, Japan

pair can occur in immediate succession; in another type, “limited occurrence”, a same-case pair is allowed only if the NPs of the pair are linearly detached; and in still another type, “excluded occurrence”, a same-case pair is not allowed, irrespective of whether the NPs of the pair are adjacent to, or detached from, each other.

The distribution of these three situation types can be described in terms of two formal criteria: (i) the syntactic *context* in which a same-case pair is situated (e.g., whether it is found in a simple clause or in a certain species of complex clause); (ii) the *items* constituting the same-case pair (e.g., whether the heads of the NPs of the pair are full nouns or pronouns; whether the case marker on the NP of the pair is an affix or a postposition).

The *context* criterion concerns the structural features of the environments in which the same-case pair occurs. Contexts can be characterized approximately as follows.

Context: The same-case pair is

- (O) across separate clauses;
- (A) in an ordinary clause;
- (B) in a clause lacking either subject or agent;
- (C) in a clause lacking both subject and agent.

Contexts (O) to (C) line up from fully-fledged to progressively degenerated structure.

The *item* criterion concerns the lexical characteristics of the constituents (in bold below) of the same-case pair.

Item: The case marker is

- a. a case suffix, ex., *pisi-Taa-ku* ‘PC-CLA-OBJ’, *baabulaa-ku* ‘Babula-OBJ’;
- b. a case suffix (specifically) attached on a pronoun, ex., ***taa-ku*** ‘it/him-OBJ’, ***aama-ku*** ‘us-OBJ’;
- c. a postposition, ex., *ghaNtaa-e-paai-* ‘hour-one-for’, *baabulaa-paai-* ‘Babula-for’.

Items (a) to (c) line up from smaller to greater degrees of perceptual distinctness of case markers.

With the two criteria combined, the observations concerning the possibility of the occurrence of a same-case pair are summarized in Table 1. Symbols: ✓ = “free occurrence”; ! = “limited occurrence”; * = “excluded occurrence”.

The totality of the observations aligns along clines of acceptability, which can be stated in terms of one of two criteria. As for the *context* criterion, context (O) is the most tolerant, being the readiest to accommodate a same-case pair. Contexts (A) to (C) are so to descending degrees. As for the *item* criterion, items of class (a) are the most tolerable, availing themselves of more chance to be allowed to make a same-case pair, when compared

context	(O)	(A)	(B)	(C)
item				
a. full noun-OBJ	✓	✓	!	*
b. pronoun-OBJ	✓	!	*	*
c. -postposition	*	*	*	*

Table 1.

to those of (b), and in turn, those of (c).

These clines are motivated. (i) The more reduced structurally the syntactic context is, the more strictly the occurrence of same-case pair is restricted. (ii) The more perceptually prominent the case marker is, due to the features of constituent items, the more strictly the occurrence of same-case pair is restricted.

Part of the patterning of Table 1 (that which is indicated by shading) has been reported for Hindi, though not quite identically. First, the type of Case OCP effect that we are calling “limited occurrence” is in evidence for the items corresponding to (a) class, i.e., for objective case markers on nouns generally (T. Mohanan 1993, 1994; Saksena 1983) (as illustrated in ex. (7)), rather than exclusively for the items of (b) class, i.e., for objective case markers on pronouns. Second, the split between Contexts (O) and (A) regarding the susceptibility to Case OCP, as indicated by the shading in Table 1, has also been observed. The findings of this article contribute to broadening and detailing the descriptive and theoretical horizon for research on Case OCP phenomena in two directions. First, it demonstrates that for some speakers of some languages the whole range of patterns can be far more elaborated than has been anticipated, by bringing into consideration a variety of new patterns, i.e., those indicated by the cells left unshaded in the same table. Second, it shows that the same distributional patterns recur in different languages, but notably, this may happen with different items in different languages.

The remaining part of this article is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces the objective case suffix *-ku*, specifically, two of its usages are to be featured. Sections 3 to 5 deal with Item (a) “full noun-*ku*” [Please see Table 1.]; specifically, Sections 3, 4 and 5, respectively, look into Item (a) in Contexts (A), (B) and (C). Section 6 deals with Item (b) “pronoun-*ku*”, looking into Context (O) as well as other contexts. Section 7 touches on Item (c) postposition. Section 8 concludes the paper.

Unless otherwise specified, the data presented in this article come from my consultants.

2. Usages of the objective case marker *-ku*

Of a variety of usages of the objective case marker *-ku*, Section 2 reviews two that are going to come into play in this article; one in which *-ku* is attached on an object NP (2.1); another in which it is attached on a recipient NP (2.2). These two usages have been described commonly in pedagogical grammar such as N. Mahapatra and S. Das (1962: 45-47). Thorough accounts of *-ku*'s usages are found in B.P. Mahapatra (2007: 121-126) and B. Lahiri (2021: 62-82).

2.1 Object NP

In a transitive clause, the object NP is marked approximately as follows: if its referent is human, as in (1), it is suffixed with the objective case marker *-ku* (glossed OBJ); if its referent is inanimate, as in (2), it can either be suffixed with *-ku* or remain bare (the latter option is transcribed and glossed by \varnothing).² Items, possibly lack thereof as in (1), causing ill-formedness will be ***highlighted**.

² **Pronunciation of Odia examples:** *a* [ɔ], *aa* [a], *D*, *L*, *T* = retroflex, *~* = nasalized vowel.

Abbreviations: CAUS = causative, CLA = classifier, CP = conjunctive participle, EMP = emphasis, FUT = future, GEN = genitive, GER = gerund, INF = infinitive, LOC = locative, N = noun, NOM = nominative, NP = noun phrase, OBJ = objective, PAST = past, PERF = perfect, PL = plural, PROG = progressive, SG = singular, S = clause, V = verb.

- (1) *dokaani-jaNaka pilaa-Ti-{-ku | *-φ} piT-il-e.*
shopkeeper-CLA kid-CLA- **-OBJ** -φ beat-PAST-3PL
‘The shopkeeper beat the clerk(-ku).’
- (2) *saar khaataa-Taa-{-ku | -φ} dekh-il-e.*
sir notebook-CLA **-OBJ** -φ look-PAST-3PL
‘Sir looked over the notebook(-ku/-φ).’

Regarding the terminology in this article, “case” is meant for morphological/surface case, but not semantic/deep case. Accordingly, “objective case” refers to the case ending *-ku*, along with its allomorph *-te* (which appears only on pronouns *mo-* ‘me’ and *to-* ‘you’), regardless of whether it occurs on a recipient NP or on an object NP. On the other hand, it does not refer to zero-marking, even when it occurs as an alternate to *-ku* on an object NP, as in (2).

In presenting examples, I will keep the grammatical features of the object NPs constant throughout this article. Thus, the object NPs will always be like that in (2), that is, inanimate and specific. This approach allows us to abstract away from effects potentially arising from the variation of the object NPs themselves, and to directly probe the interactions of the object NPs and their contexts.

2.2 Recipient NP

In a ditransitive clause, the recipient NP is marked with objective case marker *-ku*, regardless of whether it is human, as in (3), or inanimate, as in (4).

- (3) *semaane se abhinetaan-{-ku | *-φ} prathama puraskaara de-ith-il-e.*
they that actor-CLA **-OBJ** -φ first prize give-PERF-PAST-3PL
‘They gave the first prize to that actor(-ku).’
- (4) *semaane se Draamaa-Ti {-ku | *-φ} prathama puraskaara de-ith-il-e.*
they that drama-CLA **-OBJ** -φ first prize give-PERF-PAST-3PL
‘They gave the first prize to that drama(-ku).’

We will concentrate on human rather than inanimate recipients.

Distinct from but related to the recipient usage of *-ku* is the marking of a variety of so-called “dative subjects”. Many of them, for example, the one occurring with the verb *aas-* ‘understand’ as in (5), can be analyzed as metaphorical extension of *ku*’s recipient usage (cf. K.P. Mohanan & T. Mohanan 1990).

- (5) *aama-ku se bhaasaa aas-e ni.*
we-**OBJ** that language come-3SG not
‘We(-ku) don’t understand that language.’

3. Context (A), where *ku*-succession is possible

We will now see what happens in a sentence in which the rules mentioned in 2.1 and 2.2 both can potentially apply to mark two NPs with the case marker *-ku*. We will particularly be concerned in Sections 3 and 4 with *ku*-marked NPs in immediate succession (henceforth “*ku*-succession”), before going on to ones decoupled by a separate word in Section 5. In the following examples we examine for whether the theme can be suffixed with *-ku*, on top of the recipient being suffixed with *-ku*. Incidentally, zero-marking of the theme is a possible option in all the examples, except (1) and (7b).

In a group of syntactic environments, which we will call **Context (A)**, *ku*-succession is possible. This includes ditransitive simple sentences, like (6a), along with certain other constructions, such as (6b). The rules mentioned in 2.1 and 2.2 attach the objective *-ku* on the object and the recipient, respectively (Yamabe 1995: 66-67).

- (6) a. (A) *mu~ atithin-ku rum-Taa- { -ku | -φ } dekhe-il-i.*
 I.NOM guest-**OBJ** room-cla **-OBJ** show-PAST-1SG
 ‘I showed the guest(-ku) the room(-ku).’
- b. (A) *aaji saaran-ku khataa-Taa- { -ku | -φ } dekh-ibaaku paD-ib-a.*
 today sir-**OBJ** notebook-CLA **-OBJ** look-INF fall-FUT-3SG
 ‘Sir(-ku) will have to look over the notebook(-ku) today.’

Thus, Case OCP effect is not in evidence here. This can be made clear by contrasting the Odia sentences in (6) with the parallelly-structured sentences in Hindi, in which Case OCP effect has been reported to be observable. While the Odia sentences in (6) are fine, the corresponding Hindi sentences in (7) are degraded if the object and the recipient are both marked with the objective case marker *-ko* (T. Mohanan 1993, 1994; Saksena 1983).

- (7) Hindi
- a. *ilaa-ne maa~-ko { *is paudhe-ko | yah paudhaa-φ } diyaa.*
 Ilaa-ERG mother-**OBJ** this plant-**OBJ** this plant-φ gave
 ‘Ila gave Mother(-ko) this plant(*-ko).’ (T. Mohanan 1993: 27, adapted)
- b. ?? *raam-ko bacco~-ko samhaal-naa paDaa.*
 Ram-**OBJ** children-**OBJ** take.care.of-INF fell
 ‘Ram(-ko) had to take care of children(-ko).’ (T. Mohanan 1994: 186, adapted)

4. Context (B): where *ku*-succession is prohibited

In Section 4, a transitive clause like (2) or a ditransitive clause like (6a) will be embedded in a variety of matrix sentences, resulting in a *ku*-succession. Matrix sentences diverge then: some of them accommodate a *ku*-succession, thus they belong to Context (A) in our terms; others do not, and we will henceforth call their group **Context (B)**. We will give examples that make contrasting pairs that differ minimally in structure and concomitantly differ in allowing and not allowing a *-ku* succession.

4.1 Permissive

On the semantic side, the permissive construction means ‘let somebody do; allow somebody to do’. On the formal side, its constitution is as schematically shown in (8). Its predicate is the verb *de-* ‘give,’ and the verb of the complement clause is either the infinitive (INF) of the base verb, or alternatively the conjunctive participle (CP) of the causative (CAUS) of the base verb. The complement clause is a restructuring clause (in the sense of both Burzio 1986 and Wurmbrand 2000): it is missing the subject position in syntactic structure (in the sense to be specified in Section 6), as it is signaled by the ☒ mark in the schematic representations in (8) and to follow. For some speakers its use is circumscribed to the negative version, which is reflected by the fact that all the examples to follow have the ‘give’-verb in the negative. Concerning the terms used in (8) and below, a “permissor” is someone who gives others permission to act, and a “permissee” is someone who receives permission to act.

(8) NP(permissor) NP-*ku*(permissee) [☒ V-INF] *de-* ‘give’
 V-CAUS-CP

Taking the ditransitive clause (6a) as the base and embedding it in the matrix permissive clause (8), we obtain examples (9) and (10). The two differ in the agency/animacy of the permissor, namely, the subject of the matrix permissive. In (9), it is a human agent; in (10), it is an inanimate cause. Whereas the former example accommodates a *ku*-succession (so, the permissive matrix is a member of Context (A)), the latter rejects a *ku*-succession (so, the permissive matrix belongs to Context (B)).

(9) (A) *myaanejar-jaNaka mo-te adou atithin-ku rum-Taa-{-ku | -φ}*
 manager-CLA me-OBJ absolutely guest-OBJ room-CLA -OBJ
dekhe-ibaaku de-l-e ni.
 show-INF give-PAST-3PL not
 ‘The manager never allowed me to show the guest(-*ku*) the room(-*ku*).’

(10) (B) *samaya-ra abhaaba mo-te adou atithin-ku rum-Taa-{*ku | -φ}*
 time-GEN lack me-OBJ absolutely guest-OBJ room-CLA -OBJ
dekhe-ibaaku de-l-aa ni.
 show-INF give-PAST-3SG not
 ‘The lack of time never allowed me to show the guest(-*ku*) the room(*-*ku*).’

Those contexts which make an originally possible *ku*-succession impossible, also preclude a *ku*-succession arising from their introducing one instance of *-ku*. And, those which don’t, don’t. If the transitive clause (11) is embedded in the context of the permissive (8), we have two instances of *-ku*, one originating from the base transitive and another from the context permissive. In (12), the permissor is *inanimate*, and *ku*-succession is out, just as it was in (10). In contrast, in (11) where the permissor is *animate*, *ku*-succession is acceptable, just as it was in (9).

- (11) *swaami haara-Taa- { -ku | -φ } bik-il-e.*
 husband necklace-CLA -OBJ sell-PAST-3PL
 ‘The husband sold the necklace(-ku).’
- (12) (A) *stri saaran-ku haara-Taa- { -ku | -φ } bik-e-i de-l-e ni.*
 wife sir-OBJ necklace-CLA -OBJ sell-CAUS-CP give-PAST-3PL not
 ‘His wife didn’t let Sir(-ku) sell the necklace(-ku).’
- (13) (B) *strinka-ra jor aapatti saaran-ku haara-Taa- { *-ku | -φ }*
 wife-GEN strong objection sir-OBJ necklace-CLA -OBJ
bik-e-i de-l-aa ni.
 sell-CAUS-CP give-PAST-3SG not
 ‘His wife’s strong objection didn’t let Sir(-ku) sell the necklace(*-ku).’

Those contexts that allow for *two* instances of *ku*-marked NPs, such as those of (9) and (12), also allow for *three* instances of them, as in (14). The succession of three *ku*-marked NPs in (14) is distinctly better than the ill-formed cases of the succession of two as in (10) and (13).

- (14) (A) *stri saaran-ku kaahaa-ku haara-Taa- { -ku | -φ }*
 wife sir-OBJ anybody-OBJ necklace-CLA -OBJ
bik-e-i de-l-e ni.
 sell-CAUS-CP give-PAST-3PL not
 ‘His wife didn’t let Sir(-ku) sell anybody(-ku) the necklace(-ku).’

4.2 Passive

Odia has, broadly speaking, two kinds of passives based on a transitive verb: the *non-promotional* passive, and additionally for some speakers the *promotional* passive. In this article, we will be concerned exclusively with the non-promotional kind. For useful observations concerning the promotional species, see B.N. Patnaik (nd) and A. Sahoo (2010).

Converting the active (6a) into (non-promotional) passive, we have (21). The originally *unproblematic* *-ku* succession becomes problematic. So, the passive construction is a member of Context (B), while the active construction, (6a), is a member of Context (A).

- (15) (B) *ethara atithin-ku rum-Taa- { *-ku | -φ } dekh-aa he-l-aa.*
 this.time guest-OBJ room-CLA -OBJ show-GER become-PAST-3SG
 ‘They showed the guest(-ku) the room(*-ku) now.’

4.3 Dative-subject constructions ‘can’ and ‘have to’

A few verbs mark their subject with the objective case and take a complement clause. We will take up two of them. First, as in (16a), the verb *paD-* ‘fall’ requires an infinitive, and the resulting construction means ‘have to

do'. Second, as shown in (16b) schematically, the verb *aas-* 'come' requires a conjunctive participle as the verb of the complement clause, and the result means 'can do, know how to do.'

- (16) a. (A) NP-*ku*(experiencer) [V-INF] *paD-* 'fall'
 b. (B) NP-*ku*(experiencer) [V-CP] *aas-* 'come'

When embedded in the *paD-* 'have to' construction (16a), an originally unproblematic *ku*-succession in the ditransitive clause (6a) remains as unproblematic, as shown in (17). In contrast, when embedded in the *aas-* 'can' construction, it becomes degenerated, as in (18). Thus, the *paD-* 'have to' construction is a member of Context (A), whereas the *aas-* 'can' construction belongs to Context (B).

- (17) (A) *mo-te ethara gunu-ku gaaDi-Taa-{-ku | -φ}*
 me-OBJ this time Gunu-OBJ car-CLA -OBJ
bik-ibaaku paD-ib-a.
 sell-INF fall-FUT-3SG
 'I will now have to sell Gunu(-ku) the car(-ku).'
- (18) (B) *mo-te (adou) atithin-ku rum-Taa-{* -ku | -φ}*
 I-OBJ at all guest-OBJ room-CLA -OBJ
dekhe-i aas-u ni.
 show-CP come-PROG not.3SG
 'I don't know how to show the guest(-ku) the room(*-ku).'

Those syntactic contexts which degenerate an originally decent *ku*- succession also preclude a *ku*-succession arising from the *-ku* they introduce. And those which don't, don't. In sentences (20) and (21), the matrix verbs ((A) *paD-* lit. 'fall', and (B) *aas-* lit. 'come') contribute the occurrence of *-ku* on the experiencer, on the one hand; and the complement verb *jhaaD-* 'sweep' contributes the *-ku* on the object, on the other. Object-marking with *-ku*, originally possible as in (19), is accommodated in (20), parallel to (17) and (6b). And in (21), it is out, parallel to (18).

- (19) *maTNu rum-Taa-{-ku | -φ} jhaaD-il-aa.*
 Montu room-CLA -OBJ sweep-PAST-3SG
 'Montu swept the room(-ku).'
- (20) (A) *maTNu-ku rum-Taa-{-ku | -φ} jhaaD-ibaaku paD-ib-a.*
 Montu-OBJ room-CLA -OBJ sweep-INF fall-FUT-3SG
 'Montu(-ku) will have to sweep the room(-ku).'
- (21) (B) *maTNu-ku rum-Taa-{* -ku | -φ} jhaaD-i aas-u ni.*
 Montu-OBJ room-CLA -OBJ sweep-CP come-PROG not. 3SG
 'Montu(-ku) doesn't understand how to sweep the room(*-ku).'

4.4 Causative

Odia has, broadly, two species of synthetic/morphological causative constructions based on ordinary (namely, non-ingestive) transitive verbs, such as *jhaaD-* ‘sweep’, *TheI-* ‘push’: the one, as in (22a), that case-marks the causee with the suffix *-ku* ‘OBJ’³; the other, as in (15b), with the causee marked with the postposition *dvaaraa* ‘by’, (22b). The verb assumes the same form in both species, namely, the causative of the base verb (V-CAUS-). Relevant for the present discussion is the (22a) type, because it brings an instance of *ku*-marked NP into the sentence.⁴

- (22) a. (B) NP(causer) NP-*ku*(causee) [☒ V]-CAUS-
 b. NP(causer) NP-*dvaaraa*(causee) [☒ V]-CAUS-

(23) is the base transitive clause, where the object as usual can optionally be marked with *-ku*. (24) is its causative, where the *ku*-marked causee brought in by the causative context suppresses the *ku*-marking on the object NP. *Ku*-succession is blocked when the subject (causer) is a human agent (as well as when it is an inanimate cause, as is to be seen in Section 6). Recall from 4.1 that in contrast to the causative, in the

³ A causative construction like (22a), composed of a synthetic (rather than periphrastic) verbal form and an objective-case marked causee (rather than ‘by’-marked causee), is reported among Indo-Aryan languages, besides Odia, for Kashmiri (See Hook & Koul 2006; Manetta 2014). Kashmiri also has a (22b)-type causative.

⁴ It remains unclear whether, in syntactic structure, the causative with the *dvaaraa*-marked causee, (22b), is a complex sentence as depicted by the use of the presence of a missing subject position ☒ and a clausal boundary []. Alternatively, and quite plausibly, and as suggested by facts below in this footnote, it might be an instance of a simple sentence without these materials, as schematically depicted in (ib).

- (i) b. NP(causer) NP-*dvaaraa*(causee) { V- CAUS- | V-φ- }

This is hinted at by the fact that with the causative with a *dvaaraa*-marked causee, causative morph *-aa* ‘CAUS’ on the verb can be omitted to convey the same state of affairs, as in (iii) below, while the same is not possible with the causative with a *ku*-marked causee, as in (ii).

- (ii) (B) *maalika baabulaa-ku rum-Ti* { *jhaD-e-il-e* | **jhaaD-il-le* }. (< (24))
 owner Babula-**OBJ** room-CLA sweep-CAUS-PAST-3PL sweep-PAST-3PL
 With the *non*-causative verb form, literally: ‘The owner swept Babula(-ku) the room.’

- (iii) *maalika baabulaa-dvaaraa rum-Ti* { *jhaD-e-il-e.* | *jhaaD-il-le* }. (< (25))
 owner Babula-**by** room-CLA sweep-CAUS-PAST-3PL sweep-PAST-3PL
 Literally: ‘The owner swept the room **by** Babula(-dvaaraa).’

Concurring with this fact, there is an indication that the causative with the *dvaaraa*-marked causee is Context (A), allowing consecutive *ku*-marked NPs, as in (iv).

- (iv) (A) *maalika, mo-dvaaraa saaran-ku haara-Taa-{-ku | -φ} bik-e-il-e.*
 owner mer-**by** sir-**OBJ** necklace-CLA -**OBJ** sell-CAUS-PAST-3PL
 ‘Owner had the necklace(-ku) sold to Sir(-ku) **by** me.’

Anyway, this point of uncertainty about the causative with the *dvaaraa*-marked causee does not affect our discussion here in Section 4.4 and elsewhere, because we are exclusively concerned with the one with the *ku*-marked causee.

permissive, *ku*-succession is allowed when the subject (permissor) is a human agent, and it is blocked only with an inanimate cause.

- (23) *baabulaa rum-Ti-{-ku | -φ} jhaaD-il-aa.*
 Babula room-CLA **-OBJ** sweep-PAST-3SG
 ‘Babula swept the room(-ku).’

- (24) (B) *maalika baabulaa-ku rum-Ti- {*-ku | -φ} jhaD-e-il-e.*
 owner Babula-**OBJ** room-CLA **-OBJ** sweep-CAUS-PAST-3PL
 ‘The owner made Babula(-ku) sweep the room(*-ku).’

Incidentally, in the (22b)-type causative, no blocking arises because the sentence contains a single instance of a *ku*-marked NP.

- (25) *maalika baabulaa dvaaraa rum-Ti-{-ku | -φ} jhaD-e-il-e.*
 owner Babula by room-CLA **-OBJ** sweep-CAUS-PAST-3PL
 ‘The owner had the room(-ku) swept by Babula(-dvaaraa).’

5. Context (C): where *ku*-doubling is prohibited

Those preceding examples that are out, are out because the *ku*-marked pair of nouns are contiguous. They are all repaired if *ku*-marked NPs are linearly separated by a single word, as in (23)-(26). We apply the term “*ku*-doubling” to the occurrence of two *ku*-marked NP irrespective of whether they are linearly consecutive or not. Thus, Context (B) accommodates *ku*-doubling, though it rejects *ku*-succession.

- (26) (B) *strinka-ra jor aapatti saaran-ku adou*
 wife-GEN strong objection sir-**OBJ** absolutely
haara-Taa-{-ku | -φ} bik-e-i de-l-aa ni.
 necklace-CLA **-OBJ** sell-CAUS-CP give-PAST-3SG not
 ‘The wife’s strong objection never let Sir(-ku) sell the necklace(-ku).’ <(12)

- (27) (B) *atithin-ku ethara rum-Taa- {-ku | -φ} dekh-aa he-l-aa.*
 guest-**OBJ** this.time room-CLA **-OBJ** show-GER become-PAST-3SG
 ‘They now showed the guest(-ku) the room(-ku).’ <(15)

- (28) (B) *maTNU-ku kintu rum-Taa- {-ku | -φ} jhaaD-i aas-u ni.*
 Montu-**OBJ** however room-CLA **-OBJ** sweep-CP come-PROG not.3SG
 ‘However, Montu(-ku) doesn’t understand how to sweep the room(-ku).’ <(21)

- (29) (B) *maalika Baabulaa-ku raati-re rum-Ti- {-ku | -φ} jhaD-e-il-e.*
 owner Babula-**OBJ** night-LOC room-CLA **-OBJ** sweep-CAUS-PAST-3PL
 ‘The owner made Babula(-ku) sweep the room(-ku) at night.’ <(24)

Still, there are situations in which *ku*-doubling is excluded. I refer to such situations as “Context (C)”. A notable instance of it is the causative construction with an inanimate cause, as in (30). Here, the two occurrences of *ku*-marked NPs are not allowed even if they are decoupled by a separate word.

- (30) (C) *maalikanaka-ra nirddesa hi~ baabulaa-ku raati-re rum-Ti- { *-ku | -φ }*
 owner-GEN direction EMP kid-**OBJ** night-LOC room-CLA **-OBJ**
jhaD-e-il-aa.
 sweep-CAUS-PAST-3SG
 ‘It is the owner’s direction that made Babula(-ku) sweep the room (*-ku) at night.’

What is wrong with the *ku*-marked object in sentence (30) is the doubling of *ku*-morph, a “surface” feature of the sentence. The doubling of the objective case (OBJ), a “deeper” feature, is unproblematic here. This is confirmed by the fact shown in (31) that the replacement of one instance of *-ku* with a distinct allomorph *-te*, as contained in *mo-te* ‘me-OBJ’, makes the other instance of *-ku* possible.⁵

- (31) *maalikanaka-ra nirddesa hi~ mo-te raati-re*
 owner-GEN direction EMP me-**OBJ** night-LOC
rum-Ti- { -ku | -φ } jhaD-e-il-aa.
 room-CLA **-OBJ** sweep-CAUS-PAST-3SG
 ‘It is the owner’s direction that made me(-te) sweep the room(-ku) at night.’

To summarize the observations in Sections 3 and 5, Contexts (A)-(C) have correlations with syntactic-structural features, and can be characterized approximately as follows (repeated).

- Context:* The same-case pair is
- (A) in an ordinary clause;
 - (B) in a clause lacking either subject or agent;
 - (C) in a clause lacking both subject and agent.

The constructions belonging to Context (B) do so due to either of two features. On the one hand, the permissive with an inanimate permissor (ex. (10) and (13)) and the experiencer subject construction (16b) lack an *agent*. On the other hand, the (non-promotional) passive (4.3) and the causative with an animate causer (ex. (24)) lack the syntactic *subject* (which corresponds to the subject of the base verb). Construction (C) is where these two features both hold, and the restriction becomes stricter correlatively. For instance, the causative with an inanimate cause (ex. (30)) lacks both an agent and a subject, and correlatively belongs to Context (C).

Interfering with this major principle is another factor which is that formal independence of the constituents of the complex predicate forms can relax restrictions to a certain degree. For instance, the permissive with an animate permissor (ex. (9), (12)) belongs to Context (A), deviating from the (assumed) major principle,

⁵ The fact that using different allomorphs of a case circumvents the effects of Case OCP is pointed out by T. Mohanan (1994) regarding the Hindi objective case marker. It is worth mentioning for Odia that the same fact holds in any type of Contexts (mentioned in table 1) that are subject to the Case OCP effect.

while the causative with an animate causer (ex. (24)) falls in Context (B), conforming to the principle. The predicate of the former construction is periphrastic, namely, made of two words, while that of the latter is synthetic, namely, made of one word. For another instance, the experiencer-subject ‘have-to’ construction (ex. (17), (18)) is a member of Context (A), which is unexpectedly contradicting the (assumed) principle, while the experiencer-subject ‘can’ construction (ex. (18), (21)) belongs to (B), expectedly. In the former, the base verb appears in the infinitive form (the more independent), while in the latter, in the gerund form (quite dependent).

6. *ku*-marking on pronouns

Looking into the distribution of *-ku*, we have been dealing with examples in which *-ku* is suffixed to full nouns. In Section 6, we treat examples in which *-ku* is suffixed to pronouns. Thus, we are shifting from Line (a) to Line (b) of Table 1. It will turn out that the occurrence of *-ku* is more narrowly restricted when it is suffixed to pronouns than when it is suffixed to full nouns. Stating in terms of the stages made of Contexts (A) to (C), ‘Pronoun-*ku*’ is “one step” more strictly restricted than ‘Full noun-*ku*’.

In Context (A), as we saw in Sections 2 and 3, two instances of ‘Full noun-*ku*’ can occur in succession. As shown in (32)-(34), two instances of ‘Pronoun-*ku*’ cannot do so. Note that this stricter restriction applies only when the two *ku*-marked NPs are *both* pronouns: a pair of ‘Pronoun-*ku* + Full noun-*ku*’, such as the alternatives not in bold in the example sentences, behaves as freely as a pair of two instances of ‘Full noun-*ku*’. To be more specific, ‘Pronoun’ means a non-complex pronoun: first, as shown in (32b) and elsewhere, *se-Taa-ku* ‘that-CLA-OBJ’ is immune to this restriction, whereas near synonymous *taa-ku* ‘it-OBJ’ is subject to it; second, as in (32a), *aama-maanan-ku* ‘us-PL-OBJ’, containing a plural suffix *maan-* (underlined), is immune, whereas, as in (32a), the bare *aama-ku* ‘us-OBJ’ falls victim. Also note that even when both members of the pair are pronouns, the allomorph *-te*, contained in *to-te* ‘you-OBJ’ in (32a), eschews restrictions, parallelly to what happens in (31) (Also see footnote 5.).

- (32) (A) a. *nars-jaNaka aama-ku*
 nurse-CLA **us-OBJ**
 { **taa-ku* | **tuma-ku* | *maani-ku* | *to-te* } *dekhe-ith-il-e*.
her-OBJ you-OBJ Mani-OBJ you-OBJ show-PERF-PAST-3PL
 ‘The nurse showed { **her(-ku)* | **you(-ku)* | *Mani(-ku)* | *you(-te)* } to us(-ku).’
- a'. *nars-jaNaka aama-maanan-ku* { *taa-ku* | *tuma-ku* } *dekhe-ith-il-e*.
 nurse-CLA us-PL-OBJ **her-OBJ you-OBJ** show-PERF-PAST-3PL
 ‘The nurse showed { *her(-ku)* | *you(-ku)* } to us-PL(-ku).’
- b There is a PC in our office.
maalika aama-ku { **taa-ku* | *sei-Taa-ku* }
 owner **us-OBJ it-OBJ** that-CLA-OBJ
kaama paai~ de-ich-anti.
 work(N) for give-PERF-3PL
 ‘The owner gave { *it(*-ku)* | *that one(-ku)* } to us(-ku) for work.’ (cf. (6a))

- (33) (A) There is an idol placed at the place. But ...
seemaane tuma-ku { **taa-ku* | *sei-Taa-ku* | *se murtti-Taa-ku* }
 they you-OBJ it-OBJ that-CLA-OBJ that idol-CLA-OBJ
chu-e~i de-b-e ni.
 touch-CAUS-CP give-FUT-3PL not
 ‘They won’t allow you(-ku) to touch { it(*-ku) | that one(-ku) | that idol(-ku) }.’ (cf. (12))
- (34) (A) *aaji-Thu aama-ku* { **taa-ku* | *sei-Taa-ku* | *se pisi-Taa-ku* }
 today-from us-OBJ it-OBJ that-CLA-OBJ that PC-CLA-OBJ
cale-ibaaku paD-ib-a.
 operate-INF fall-FUT-3SG
 ‘We(-ku) will have to operate { it(*-ku) | that one(-ku) | that PC(-ku) } from today.’ (cf. (20))

What is prohibited is *ku*’s succession, though its doubling is allowed. Modifying (32)-(34) we have (35)-(37), respectively. These are fine thanks to a single phrase (underlined) decoupling the two *ku*-marked pronouns.

- (35) (A) a. *nars-jaNaka aama-ku se jaagaa-re*
 nurse-CLA us-OBJ that place-LOC
 { *taa-ku* | *tuma-ku* | *maani-ku* } *dekhe-ith-il-e.*
 her-OBJ you-OBJ Mani-OBJ show-PERF-PAST-3PL
 ‘The nurse showed { her(-ku) | you(-ku) } to us(-ku) at that place.’
 b. There is a PC in our office.
maalika aama-ku kaama paai~ { taa-ku | sei-Taa-ku } de-ich-anti.
 owner us-OBJ work(N) for it-OBJ that-CLA-OBJ give-PERF-3PL
 ‘The owner gave { it(-ku) | that one(-ku) } to us(-ku) for work.’
- (36) (A) There is an idol placed at the place. But . . .
semaane tuma-ku adou { taa-ku | sei-Taa-ku }
 they you-OBJ absolutely it-OBJ that-CLA-OBJ
chu-e~i de-b-e ni.
 touch-CAUS-CP give-FUT-3PL not
 ‘They won’t allow you to touch it(-ku).’
- (37) (A) *aama-ku aaji-Thu { taa-ku | sei-Taa-ku | se pisi-Taa-ku }*
 us-OBJ today-from it-OBJ that-CLA-OBJ that PC-CLA-OBJ
cale-ibaaku paD-ib-a.
 operate-INF fall-FUT-3SG
 ‘We(-ku) will have to operate it(-ku) from today.’

Let us now go on to Context (B), which, as we saw in Section 4, accommodates linearly-detached double occurrences of ‘Full noun-*ku*’. This context, however, excludes ones of ‘Pronoun-*ku*’. In (38)-(40), two instances

of *ku*-marked pronouns are not allowed even if they are decoupled by a phrase. For repair, we may resort to a near synonymous word made of Demonstrative+Classifier ‘that one’, as shown below, or alternatively, we could zero-mark the theme pronoun, not exemplified here.

- (38) (B) There is a PC in our office.
aama-ku kaama paai~ { **taa-ku* | *sei-Taa-ku* } *di-aa jaa-ich-i*.
 us-OBJ work(N) for it-OBJ that-CLA-OBJ give-GER go-PERF-3SG
 ‘They gave { it(*-ku) | that one(-ku) } to us(-ku) for work.’
- (39) (B) *aama-ku e-parjanta* { **taa-ku* | *sei-Taa-ku* | *se pisi-Taa-ku* }
 you-OBJ this-up.to it-OBJ that-CLA-OBJ that PC-CLA-OBJ
cale-i aas-u ni.
 drive-CP come-PROG not.3SG
 ‘We don’t yet understand how to operate { it(*-ku) | that one(-ku) | that PC(-ku) }.’
- (40) (B) There is an idol placed at the place. But . . .
jaguaaLinka najara tuma-ku adou { **taa-ku* | *sei-Taa-ku* | *se murti-Taa-ku* }
 guard’s eye you-OBJ absolutely it-OBJ that-CLA-OBJ that idol-CLA-OBJ
chu-e~i de-b-a ni.
 touch-CAUS-CP give-FUT-3SG not
 ‘The guard’s eye will never allow you(-ku) to touch { it(*-ku) | that one(-ku) | that idol(-ku) }.’

Looking at the opposite side of the strict Context (B) and the stricter (C), we find a context that is even more tolerant to same-case pairs than Context (A) is. Let us call it Context (O). It does somehow allow a successive occurrence of ‘Pronoun-*ku*’ (as indicated with the ?-mark in (41)),⁶ which Context (A) never does (as indicated with the *-mark in (42). Constructions belonging to Context (O) structurally straddle a clause boundary in which the embedded verb is a certain type of infinitive. A *non*-restructuring infinitive construction such as the *kah*- ‘tell’ sentence as in (41) is Context (O); and a restructuring infinitive construction is Context (A), for example, the *de*- ‘let’ sentence in (42) as well as (33) and (34). (Note that those complement clauses cited in Section 4 are all of the restructuring type.)

⁶ As for the choice of the inflectional category of the complement-clause verb, replacing the infinitive form with a finite form, if feasible, leads to further improvement. For instance, sentence (41a) in the main text contains the infinitive verb *chu-i-baaku* ‘touch-INF’ and in this sentence the infinitive can be replaced with the finite verb *chu-a~* ‘touch-2PL’, followed by the complementizer *boli* that is etymologically analyzable as *bol-i* ‘say-CP’. The result is sentence (i) below. In (41a), the sequence of pronouns *aama-ku taa-ku* ‘us-OBJ it-OBJ’ is halfway acceptable (as marked with ?); contrastively in (i), the same sequence is fully acceptable.

- (i) *Daaktar aama-ku taa-ku chu-a~ bol-i kah-il-e*.
 doctor us-OBJ it-OBJ touch-2PL say-CP say-PAST-3PL
 ‘Doctor said to us(-ku), “Touch it(-ku)”.’

Thus, the context like (i) involving finite complements is even more generous than Context (O) like (41), which a certain class of infinitive complements belong to. The former type of context might be dubbed “Super-(O)”, and placed to the left of (O) in table 1.

- (41) (O) a. ? *Daaktar aama-ku taa-ku chu-i~baaku kah-il-e.*
 doctor us-OBJ it-OBJ touch-INF say-PAST-3PL
 ‘Doctor told us(-ku) to touch it(-ku).’
- b. *maa kintu aama-ku {? taa-ku | sei-Taa-ku }*
 mothe however us-OBJ it-OBJ that-one-OBJ
chu-i~baaku manaa ka-l-e.
 touch-INF prohibit do-PAST-3PL
 ‘Mother, however, prohibited us(-ku) from touching { it(-ku) | that one(-ku) }.’
- (42) (A) *maa kintu aama-ku { *taa-ku | sei-Taa-ku }*
 mother however us-OBJ it-OBJ that-one-OBJ
chu-i~baaku de-l-e ni.
 touch-INF give-PAST-3PL
 ‘Mother, however, didn’t let us(-ku) touch { it(*-ku) | that one(-ku) }’

Non-restructuring and restructuring complement clauses differ in syntactic structure, as depicted in (43) and (44), respectively. The former contains a subject position and it is represented by a phonologically null pronoun (PRO), while the latter lack in subject position (as depicted with \boxtimes).

- (43) (O) Non-restructuring complement clause
 NP(orderer) NP(-ku)(orderee) [PRO V-INF] *kah- ‘say’*
manaa kar- ‘prohibit’
- (44) (A) Restructuring complement clause
 NP(permissor) NP(-ku)(permissée) [\boxtimes V-INF] *de- ‘give’* (=8) simplified

The difference can be brought into light, for one thing, by trying to add an instance of such adjunct as agrees in case with its antecedent, such as *samaste* ‘all’, and have the adjunct semantically refer to the agent of the complement clause. (On the distinction between the (43) and (44) structures in Hindi, see Butt (2014) and Butt & Ramchand (2005), where other diagnostics than this are employed.) In (45), a sentence with non-restructuring complement clause ‘all’ can appear either in the objective (as *samastan-ku* ‘all-OBJ’), agreeing with the controller NP in the matrix clause, or alternatively, in the nominative (as *samaste* ‘all-NOM’), agreeing with the PRO present in the complement clause, or alternatively as in (46), ‘all’ can only be in the objective, agreeing with the objective-marked NP in the matrix clause, but it cannot be in the nominative because there is no subject in the complement clause that might be in the nominative.

- (45) (O) *saar se chaatra maanan-ku [PRO { samastan-ku | samaste }*
 sir that student PL-OBJ all-OBJ all.NOM
ekaasaangare kaama kar-ibaaku] kah-il-e.
 together work(N) do-INF say-PAST-3PL
 ‘Sir told the students(-OBJ) [PRO(-NOM) to work all(-OBJ/-NOM) together].’

- (46) (A) *saar se chaatra maanan-ku* [☒ { *samastan-ku* | **samaste* }
 sir that student PL-OBJ all-OBJ all.NOM
ekaasaangare kaama kar-ibaaku] *de-l-e ni*.
 together work(N) do-INF give-PAST-3PL not
 ‘Sir didn’t allow the students(-OBJ) [☒ to work all(-OBJ/ *-NOM) together].’

On my analysis of the (O)-type syntactic structure, the obligatory-controlled null pronoun is case-marked (with the nominative). This analysis is at odds with the assumption that was once held widely in the literature of generativist literature that PROs cannot bear “Case” (Chomsky 1981). However, it has since been demonstrated, for several types of obligatory control structures in several languages, that obligatory-controlled subjects can be case-marked. Quite close to Odia (45) with respect to structural composition is Icelandic (47): in both sentences, the controller NP is in the non-nominative, and the controlled PRO is in the nominative, as is reflected by the nominative agreement on ‘all’. (In (47), the controller, the boys, is a variety of oblique-case subject: it plays an experiencer role and is marked with the accusative case. Gloss: (A)=accusative, dft=default agreement).

- (47) Icelandic
Strákana langaði til [*að komast allir i veisluna*].
 the boys(A) wanted(dft) for to get all(Npl.m.) to the party
 ‘The boys(-ACC) wanted [PRO(-NOM) to get all(-NOM) to the party].’
 (Sigurðsson 1991: 337, ex. (24), translation added)

Among Indian languages, Subbarao (2011) and works cited therein point to *adjunct* clauses in which the obligatory-controlled null subject is *oblique* case.

The fact that in Odia the objective *-ku* can be found on two *pronouns* is allowed only if those pronouns belong to two different clauses, and this is parallel to the fact that in Hindi the objective *-ko* can be found on a *noun in general, full or pronominal*, but can only be allowed under the same condition (according to what is generalized by T. Mohanan 1994:200).⁷ The two languages differ in the wider and narrower domains of constraint application: a restriction that applies generally to nouns in Hindi, and a parallel restriction that exclusively applies to pronouns in Odia.

⁷ In T. Mohanan’s (1994:200) Hindi examples, cited in (i) with modification, the embedded clauses are adjunct clauses, rather than complement clauses as they are in our Odia examples. The relevant generalization holds in Odia with the cases of adjunctive clauses (not illustrated) as well as complement clauses. In (i), the objective case marker *-ko* can unproblematically appear on two NPs, one in the main clause and the other in the adjunct clause.

- (i) a. *ilaa raam-ko baccoN-ko bulaane bhejegii*
 Ila Ram-OBJ children-OBJ call-NF send-FUT
 ‘Ila will send Ram(-ko) [to call the child(-ko).]’ (NF:nonfinite)
- b. *ilaa-ko baccoN-ko samhaalne sehelii-ke ghar jaanaa hai*.
 Ilaa-OBJ children-OBJ look.after-NF friend-GEN house go-NF be-PRES
 ‘Ila(-ko) has to go her friend’s house [to look after her friend(-ko)]’

Also note a difference between the observation in two languages. While the Hindi examples (i) are reportedly no-problem, the Odia examples are ameliorated by an intervening clause boundary only to certain extent to result in marginality.

7. Postpositions

In Section 7, we will look at the multiple occurrences of postpositions. Thus, we are moving to Line (c) of Table 1. By postposition I mean bound case-markers of two or more syllables such as *paai~* ‘for’, *dvaaraa-* ‘by’, *upare* ‘on’, *saha-* ‘together with’, and *jogu~* ‘because of’; the class of postpositions is opposed to the class of case suffixes like *-ku* ‘OBJ’, *-ru* ‘ABL’, namely, *monosyllabic* bound case-markers. I am going to exemplify with four members of the postposition class.

The first example is *paai~*. ‘for’. In (48), the context construction is a non-complex clause, an instance of the liberal Context (A), and the double occurrences of *paai~* are prohibited even if the two *paai~*-marked arguments are detached, while alternatives replacing one instance of *paai~* with a synonymous marker (underlined) are fine. In the less tolerant Contexts (B) and (C), they are excluded too (not illustrated).

(48) (A)	<i>mu~</i>	{	* <i>ghaNTaa-e-paai~</i>	<i>baahaare</i>	<i>saaranka-paai~</i>	
	I.NOM		hour-one- for	outside	sir- for	
			<i>ghanTaa-e-dhari</i>	<i>baahaare</i>	<i>saaranka</i>	<i>paai~</i>
			hour-one-for	outside	sir- for	
			<i>ghanTaa-e-paai~</i>	<i>baahaare</i>	<i>saaran-ku</i>	}
			hour-one- for	outside	sir-OBJ	
	<i>apekkhya</i>		<i>kar-ib-i</i> .			
	wait(N)		do-FUT-1SG			
			‘I will wait for Sir for an hour.’			

Secondly, in (49), the same-case pair involving *-dvaaraa* ‘by’ exhibits excluded occurrence.⁸ The pattern that obtains here is the same as above. The occurrence of two instances of *dvaaraa*-marked arguments is disallowed even if they are linearly separated, whereas replacement of one instance of *dvaaraa-* provides a repair.

(49)	<i>mu~</i>	{	* <i>pilaa-Ti-dvaaraa</i>	<i>kaapaDa-Ti-ku</i>	<i>kainci-dvaaraa~</i>	
	I.NOM		kid-CLA- by	cloth-CLA-OBJ	scissors- by	
			<i>pilaa-Ti-maadhyama-re</i>	<i>kaapaDa-Ti-ku</i>	<i>kainci-dvaaraa~</i>	
			kid-CLA-medium-LOC	cloth-CLA-OBJ	scissors- by	
			<i>pilaa-Ti-dvaaraa</i>	<i>kaapaDa-Ti-ku</i>	<i>kainci-re</i>	}
			kid-CLA- by	cloth-CLA-OBJ	scissors-LOC	
	<i>ka-T-e-il-i</i> .					
	cut-CAUS-PAST-1SG					
			‘I had the cloth cut by the boy with (lit. by) scissors.’			

⁸ Regarding the class of contexts which the causative with the *dvaaraa*-marked causee belongs to, there is an observation suggesting that it is Context (A) rather than (B): for this, see fn.3, particularly, ex. (4) and comments on it. If it actually belongs to Context (A), the facts in (46) makes the same point as convincingly as those in (45): the doubling of prepositions such as *-dvaaraa* and *-paai~* is excluded in any context, including the very tolerant context (A). However, if it turns out to not belong to Context (A), but some other class (say, Context (B)), the force of the fact shown in (48) is somewhat lessened: the facts in (48) are then showing as much as that the doubling preposition *-dvaaraa* is excluded in Context (B), leaving open the possibility that it might be allowed in the more tolerant Context (A). Anyway, there are no hints available so far that it might ever be allowed.

The third example is *upare* ‘on’. In one usage it is synonymous with *bisaya-re* ‘matter-LOC’, as in (50a). This usage of *upare* cannot go together with another usage of it, as in (50b).

- (50) Today I have to go all the way to Berhampur to attend a meeting.
- a. (A) *seThi taanka jibani { upaare | bisaya-re } kichi kah-ibaaku paD-ib-a.*
 there his life on matter-LOC something say-INF fall-FUT-3S
 ‘I have to give some talk **on** his life there.’
- b. (A) *taa upare se jaagaa-re taanka jibani { *upaare | bisaya-re }*
 that on that place-LOC his life on matter-LOC
kichi kah-ibaaku paD-ib-a.
 something say-INF fall-FUT-3S
 ‘**On** top of that, I have to give some talk **on** his life at that place.’

The class of prepositions, at least for the purpose of the Case OCP, subsumes the disyllabic allomorph of the ablative case-marker. The ablative case-marker comes in three allomorphs: *-ru*, *-Thu*, *-Thaarū*.⁹ In (50) we find the last two, which are almost the same in meaning and quite similar in distribution when occurring alone. *-Thaarū* cannot be doubled, as in the first line, while the combination of *-Thaarū* and *-Thu* is allowed, as in the second and third lines.¹⁰

- (51) (A) *mu~ { *aaji-Thaarū jinisa-guDaa se dokaani-Thaarū |*
 I.NOM today-ABL thing-CLA that shopkeeper-ABL
aaji-Thaarū jinisa-guDaa se dokaani-Thu |
 today-ABL thing-CLA that shopkeeper-ABL
aaji-Thaarū jinisa-guDaa se dokaani-Thaarū |
 today-ABL thing-CLA that shopkeeper-ABL
aaji-Thu jinisa-guDaa se dokaani-Thu } kiN-ib-i.
 today-ABL thing-CLA that shopkeeper-ABL buy-FUT-1SG
 ‘I will buy things **from** the shopkeeper **from** today.’

In contrast, the monosyllabic allomorph *-ru*, which is a case-suffix rather than a postposition in our classification, can unproblematically be doubled in a parallel environment, as in (52). Note lexical choices are altered here

⁹ The distribution of the three allomorphs is roughly as follows: (i) *-ru* is limited to inanimate nouns; (ii) animate nouns can assume either *-Thu* or *-Thaa-ru*; (iii) the use of the allomorphs *-Thu* and *-Thaa-ru* on inanimate nouns is possible depending on the usage of the case-marker itself and on the lexical identity of inanimate noun.

¹⁰ The last-mentioned choice in (51), doubled and separated *-Thu*, is acceptable. This is presumably because *-Thu* is monosyllabic and accordingly comes close to case markers, for that matter, to the ablative case *-ru*, illustrated in (52). Case markers are generally allowed to occur in succession in Context (A) such as the simple active clause (51), as we saw with the objective case marker *-ku*.

from (51) in order to conform to the selectional restriction of allomorphs (see footnote 8), but crucially, the roles of argument NPs are kept constant.

- (52) (A) *mu~ e maasa-ru jinisa guDaa se dokan-ru kiN-ib-i.*
 I.NOM this month-ABL thing CLA that shop-ABL buy-FUT-1SG
 ‘I will buy things **from** the shop **from** this month.’

Summarizing the observations in Sections 6 and 7, as well as those in the preceding sections, (also see table 1), we see the case markers line up from most ready (a) to least ready (c) to occur in two.

- Item:* The case marker is
- a case suffix (Section 3 to 5);
 - a case suffix on a pronoun (Section 6);
 - a postposition (Section 7).

Items (a) to (c) line up from smaller to greater degrees of perceptual distinctness of case markers. The more distinct an item is, the more difficult it is to appear in two. (c) is most distinct because it is composed phonologically of segmental content of two or three syllables, while the segmental content of (a) and (b) are of one syllable. (b) can be regarded more distinct than (a) on the following reasoning. There is an evidence indicating that for (b), the case suffix is parsed inseparably with the pronominal stem, while in with full nouns (a), the case suffix can be parsed separately from the full noun it is attached to. Thus, in NP coordination, as in (53), (b) in the second conjunct cannot easily “suspend” the case-suffix in the first conjunct, though (a) has no difficulty to do so. (Recall from (32a) that, *-ku* on *aama-maanan-ku*, a pronoun with the plural marker *-maan-*, belongs to item class (a), so in (53) it parallels with that on ‘Babula’ rather than with that on the simple ‘we’.) For (b), the suffix is constituted of the contours of the pronominal stem, though it is skeletal, in addition to the visible sequence of segments (like *ku*): items of class (b) can be depicted schematically as “(σ) σ *-ku*”. On the other hand, for (a), the same suffix only involves visible sequence of segments: “*-ku*”.

- (53) *saar se pilaa aau { baabulaa-ku | aama-maanan-ku | ?? aama-ku }*
 sir that kid and Babulaa-OBJ we-PL-OBJ we-OBJ
tuLanaa kar-uch-anti, kaahi-ki?
 comparison do-PROG-3PL why
 ‘Why is Sir comparing that guy(-φ) and { (a) Babula(-ku) | (a) us-PL(-ku) | (b) ?? us(-ku) }?’

8. Conclusion

The facts revealed in this article are summarized in Table 1 in Section 1. How identically case-marked NPs are allowed can be described in terms of two criteria: the *context* construction and the *item* to be repeated. The grouping of context constructions can be characterized approximately by the presence or absence of agent role and subject position.

It is worth directing attention to what was *not* mentioned anywhere in this article. Among potential criteria which one may well expect to be applicable is the semantic/syntactic *roles* of the NPs constituting the pair,

specifically, whether they are an argument or an adjunct. Viewed cross-linguistically, the relevance of the argument vs adjunct distinction to OCP phenomena has been reported for the Japanese accusative case marker *-o* (Shibatani 1978 among others) and for the Hindi instrumental marker *-se* (T. Mohanan 1994:200) and shows that the Case OCP effect is in evidence only with respect to a pair of argument NPs, whereas adjunct NPs are exempt from a comparable restriction. However, in Odia, the criterion of the semantic/syntactic role of NPs is not relevant, and in particular, the distinction between the argument and adjunct status of them is not relevant. A case marker, say the objective case marker *-ku*, is ruled to be either subject to, or exempt from, OCP effects depending on the context they are found in, and this decision is made without regard to the role they are playing. (See Yamabe 2021 for detailed descriptions supporting this generalization; further, it is argued there that this generalization holds not only with the objective case marker *-ku* but also with the locative case marker *-re* and the ablative case marker *-ru*.)

The present article, presenting and analyzing in a preliminary way the intricacy of Odia facts, extends the empirical and theoretical research domain of the Case OCP phenomena.

Acknowledgements

This article is a revision of my presentation at the 44th International Conference of Linguistic Society of India (ICOLSI-44), 2022 November. The feedback at the conference is gratefully acknowledged. I would like to thank two anonymous reviewers of this article for their helpful comments. My thanks also go to my Odia consultants for their judgments. My research was funded by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers 17K0270300 and 21K0054000.

References

- Burzio, Luigi. 1986. *Italian syntax: A Government-Binding approach*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Butt, Miriam. 2014. Control vs. complex predication. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 32: 165-190.
- Butt, Miriam, & Gillian Ramchand. 2005. Complex aspectual structure in Hindi/Urdu. N. Erteschik-Shir *et al.*, eds., *The syntax of aspect*, pp. 117-153. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Hook, Peter Edwin & Omkar N. Koul. 2006. Valency sets in Kashmiri. Tasaku Tsunoda & Taro Kageyama, eds., *Voice and grammatical relations*, pp. 43-84. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Lahiri, Bornini. 2021. *The case system of Eastern Indo-Aryan languages: A typological overview*. New Delhi: Routledge.
- Mahapatra, Bijayprasad. 2007. *A synchronic grammar of Oriya (Standard spoken and written)*. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.
- Mahapatra, Narayana & Sridhar Das. 1962. *Sarbasaara byaakaraNa*, enlarged edition. Cuttack: New Students' Store.
- Manetta, Emily. 2014. The shape of the causative verbal domain: Evidence from Kashmiri. *Syntax* 17: 235-268.
- Mohanan, K.P & Tara Mohanan. 1990. Dative subjects in Malayalam: Semantic information in syntax. Manindra K. Verma & K.P. Mohanan, eds., *Experiencer in South Asian languages*, pp. 43-57. Stanford: CSLI.

- Mohanan, Tara. 1993. Case alternation on objects in Hindi. *South Asian Language Review* 3: 1-30.
- Mohanan, Tara. 1994. Case OCP: A constraint on word order in Hindi. M. Butt et al., eds., *Theoretical perspectives on word order in South Asian languages*, pp. 185-216. CSLI.
- Patnaik, B.N. nd. Some non-nominative subject constructions in Oriya. ms., Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur. <http://home.iitk.ac.in/~patnaik/documents/nnom.pdf>
- Pereltsvaig, Asya. 2008. *Copular sentences in Russian: A theory of intra-clausal relations*. Springer.
- Sahoo, Anindita. 2010. Oriya Passives with Ditransitives. *Papers from the Lancaster University Postgraduate Conference in Linguistics & Language Teaching 2010*, pp. 173-200. <https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/events/laelpgconference/papers/v05/Sahoo.pdf>
- Saksena, Anuradha. 1983. A case marking constraint. *Lingua* 60: 41-52.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1978. *Nihongo no bunseki: Seisei bunpoo no hoofoo*. [An analysis of Japanese: A generative-grammatical approach] Tokyo: Taishukan.
- Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann. 1991. Icelandic case-marked PRO and the licensing of lexical arguments. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 9: 327–363.
- Subbarao, Karumuri Venkata, Upen Rabha Hakacham & Thokchom Sarju Devi. 2011. Case-marked PRO: Evidence from Rabha, Manipuri, Hindi-Urdu and Telugu. *Linguistics of the Himalayas and Beyond*, pp. 291-332. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/332709413_Case-marked_PRO_Evidence_from_Rabha_Manipuri_Hindi-Urdu_and_Telugu/link/5de5446592851c83645ce1e0/download
- Tyler, Matthew. 2022. The Case OCP in Choctaw. To appear in *Glossa*. <https://lingbuzz.net/lingbuzz/006431>
- Wurmbrand, Susanne. 2001. *Infinitives: Restructuring and clause structure*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Yamabe, Junji. 1995. The cases in the oblique case subject constructions in Oriya. *Journal of the Japanese Association for South Asian Studies* 7: 46-82.
- Yamabe, Junji. 2021. Odia constructions in which the effect of the identical case constraint is { absent | present | strong }. *The proceedings of the 162nd meeting of the Linguistic Society of Japan*, pp. 115-121. [in Japanese]