<1$>5 Non-nominative subjects</1$>

Non-nominative subject constructions in the languages of the South Asian subcontinent include ergative, dative, genitive, locative, instrumental (*by*- passive) and accusative subjects. Dative subjects are a feature of the South Asian linguistic area (Emeneau 1956**,** Masica 1976). They are the most widespread in Dravidian and in some Indo-Aryan languages. Some Tibeto-Burman and Munda languages too share this feature. The ergative construction is found only in some Indo-Aryan and some Tibeto-Burman languages, and is absent in Dravidian and Austro-Asiatic languages.

(i) The nature of case marking — lexical/inherent vs. structural, the choice of case on the subject and object in non-nominative subject (hereafter, NNS) constructions,

(ii) the *notion of subject*. We shall then discuss some subject properties of NNSs.

(iii) the predicate in a dative subject construction (DSC) is *[-transitive] and unaccusative*; (ii) all NNSs except the ergative are *inherently case-marked*; (iii) such inherent case marking cannot be done by an intransitive verb alone, but by *the whole predicate compositionally*

consisting of a theme or an adjective along with the [-transitive] verb; and

(iv) information concerning agreement should be available vP-internally (in the lower thematic S) for proper assignment of inherent case to the NNS.

(v) the accusative/dative case marking of the theme in dative/genitive subject constructions in Bangla, Tamil and Malayalam does not count as counter-evidence to treating the predicate in NNS constructions [-transitive].

2$> 5.2 NNS constructions in SALs </2$>

<3$> 5.2.1 The matrix or embedded subject ergative case-marked </3$>

The split ergative-absolutive construction: Only in perfect aspect in Indo-Aryan

Marathi and Punjabi: Dependent on *person* too.

Tibeto-Burman: Not sensitive to aspect, but to person (object is in 1 and 2 persons, and not in the 3 person in Kuki-Chin languages).

Austro-Asiatic (Mon-Khmer and Munda) and Dravidian: No ergativity

An ergative subject exhibits all the properties of the subject, for example, as a local antecedent in (1) in Hindi-Urdu and in (2) in Kashmiri (IA), or a long-distance antecedent in (3) to an anaphor in Hindi-Urdu, and controller of PRO (4) in Marathi (IA) and Mizo (TB) in (5).

AS A LOCAL ANTECEDENT

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

1.	baccõ$_i$	ne	apnī$_{i/*j}$	billī$_j$		dek h-	ī$_j$	
	childre n	er g	self's	cat nom	f, s	see- perf	f,	s

'The children$_i$ saw/looked at self's$_{i/*j}$ cat.'
(Davison 2004: 145)

Kashmiri (IA)

2.	moha	an	vuc	panu	pā	ə̃nas	man
	n$_i$-		h	n	n$_i$		z
	Mohan	er	saw	self-	sel	mirro	in
	-	g		s	f	r	

'Mohan saw himself in the mirror.'
(Wali and Koul 1997:125)

LONG-DISTANCE ANTECEDENT

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

3	ašok$_i$	ne	lalit	se	[PR	apne	cā	banā	n	ko]	kah
.			ā$_j$		O$_i$	lie$_{i/j}$	y	-	e		ā
	Asho	er	Lalit	wit		self for	te	mak	i	in	sai
	k	g	a	h			a	e-	n	order	d
									f		

‘Ashok asked Lalita to make tea for self.’
(Subbarao 1971: 191) [The glosses have been slightly modified]

As the controller of PRO

Marathi (IA)

4	mini$_i$ -	ni	ravi$_j$	lā	[PR	paka	āyc
.			-		O$_i$	ḍ-	ā]
	Mini-	erg	Ravi	ac		catch	inf
			-	c		-	
	prayatna		ke-	l-	ā		
	try		do-	pst	3s,		
				-	m		

‘Mini tried to catch Ravi.’
(Wali 2004: 226)

Mizo (TB)

5	lali$_i$	n	[PR	min	hm	a$_i$-	duʔ
.	-		O$_i$	-	u]		
	Lali	er		1s-	me	3s	wan
	-	g			et	-	ts

‘Lali wants to meet me.’
(Subbarao and Lalitha Murthy, ms)

<3$> 5.2.2 The matrix subject or embedded subject may be dative or genitive case-marked </3$>

All the Dravidian and IA languages such as Hindi-Urdu, Punjabi, Kashmiri, Marathi, Nepali, Gujarati and Sinhala have the **dative subject construction**, while Assamese and Bangla (IA) have the **genitive construction** with psychological predicates. Oriya (IA) has both the dative and genitive subject construction. The predicates for example, include intransitive verbs such as: *honā* ‘to be’; *ānā* ‘come’; *lagnā* ‘to appear, to feel’; *sūjhnā* ‘to strike’; *honā* ‘to happen’ in Hindi-Urdu; transitive verbs *vēyu* ‘drop’; *tōyu* ‘push’; *paṭṭu* ‘catch’; *pōyu* ‘pour’; *peṭṭu* ‘to put’, ‘serve’*; tappu* ‘miss’; *tippu* ‘turn’ and intransitive verbs such as: *vaccu* ‘come’; *paḍu* ‘fall’; *unḍu* ‘be’; *agu* ‘happen’ in Telugu (DR); *uth* ‘rise’ in Assamese, and *lag* ‘feel’ in Bangla, just to mention a few.

Verb *be* and *have:* All Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages: No. Hence, in NNS construction, only verb *be* is found. Many Tibeto-Burman languages such as Mizo, Hmar, Thadou have two distinct verbs for *be* and *have,* and most of the Tibeto-

Burman languages except Bodo, Kokbodok and Manipuri do not have any NNS construction (other than the ergative) at all. Khasi (Mon-Khmer) too has two different verbs for *be* and *have* and it too does not have any NNS construction at all. We shall demonstrate later that it is the verb coupled with a noun or an adjective in the verb phrase that is instrumental in assigning the non-nominative case to the subject.

<4$>* 5.2.2.1 Dative case-marked subject *</4$>

ALIENABLE POSSESSION

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

6.	murlī$_i$	ko	dūkān	m ẽ	kaī	acc hī	kitābẽ$_j$	milī$_j$	thī̃$_{*i,j}$
	Murali m,s	da t	shop	in	sever al	goo d	booksf ,p	foun d f,p	be+pst, f,p

‘Murali found many several books in the shop.’

Telugu (DR)

7.	mādhuri$_i$	ki	koṭ-	lō	cālā	manci	pustakālu$_j$	dorikēyi$_{*i,j}$

Madhuri da shop in man good books,p,n found,p,n

t - y h h

‘Madhuri found many good books in the store.’

In Manipuri (TB), there is no subject-verb agreement.

Manipuri (TB)

8. mano də layri əm lə
ŋ- k- ə y
he- da book on b
t - e e

‘To him there is a book.’

(Chelliah 1990: 201)

Inalienable possession

In Marathi (IA), inalienable possession as well as “existential possession of relatives (kinship terms), friends, or body parts (including mental faculties such as intelligence, ignorance and so on) are expressed only through dative possessives and not through postpositional possessives…” (Pandharipande 1997:231). In Dravidian languages too, a similar situation obtains (see Amritavalli 2004 for Kannada, Jayaseelan 2004 for Malayalam, and Subbarao and Bhaskararao 2004 for Telugu).

Marathi (IA)

9. mal do hāt$_{j}$ āhet$_{*}$

a$_{i}$ n $_{i,j}$

I- tw hands, are,

dat o p p

‘I have two hands.’

1 mal do bhāū$_{j}$ āhet$_{*}$

0. a$_{i}$ n $_{i,j}$

I- tw brothe are

dat o rs

‘I have two brothers.’

(Pandharipande 1997: 231)

<4$>* 5.2.2.2 Genitive case-marked subject *</4$>

When the subject is dative or genitive case-marked, the theme in most of the cases carries the nominative marker, and the verb agrees with the theme.

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

1 raghu$_{i}$ kī tīn bahn thī̃$_{*i,j}$

1. ẽ$_{j}$

Raghu, ge thre siste be + pst

m n e rs f, p

‘Raghu had three sisters.’

In Kokbodok, Manipuri (TB), there is no agreement manifested, as these languages lack agreement.

Kokbodok (TB)

1	kɔrma	ni	bɔkhɔr	sā-	ɔ
2.	ti		ɔk		
	Korma	ge	head	pain	pre
	ti	n		(verb)-	s

‘Kormati has a headache.’

In Bangla (IA), the subject as an experiencer is generally genitive case-marked. However, it is *dative case-marked* in obligative constructions, just as in Hindi-Urdu and Punjabi.

Bangla (IA)

1	rina	*k*	aj	pã	ṭ	dokane	jete	hol
5.	-	*e*		c	a			o
	Rin	*d*	toda	fiv	c	shops.l	go.i	wa
	a-	*at*	y	e	l	oc	nf	s

‘Rina had to go to five shops today.’

(Dasgupta 2004: 130)

<*4$*> 5.2.2.3 Locative case-marked matrix or embedded subject <*/4$*>

The subject may be locative case-marked (16). Such marking indicates Temporary possession vs. Permanent possession

Telugu (DR)

1 prastuta pratā *dagg* ḍabbulu$_{j}$ lē- vu$_{*i,j}$

6. m p$_{i}$ *ara*

at.prese Prata near money.3p, be.no 3p,n

nt p nm t- m

‘At present Pratap does not have any money.’

1 pratā ki$_{i}$ (*prastuta ḍabbu$_{j}$ lē- du$_{*i,j}$

7. p m)

Prata da at present money3s, be.no 3s,n

p t nm t- m

‘Pratap does not have any money (*at present).’

Bodo (TB) has a locative postposition with the experiencer, when a physical ailment is expressed.

Bodo (TB)

1 khamph nao lɯmja- na dɔŋ ɔ

8. a- i -

Khamph a-	gen.loc (near)	sick (verb)-	inf	be-	pres

‘Khampha has fever.’

Non-nominative marker in Hindi-Urdu, Punjabi and Marathi depends on the **nature of the object possessed.** In Hindi-Urdu, the **genitive postposition** occurs with inalienable possession of body parts, kinship and friends, while the locative *ke pās* ‘near’ occurs with concrete possession. The locative *mẽ* ‘in’ occurs with inherent physical qualities in Hindi-Urdu while in Bangla the genitive occurs in such cases. According to Dasgupta (2004: 132), genitive/locative case marker *–r* occurs with the experiencer in Bangla (IA).

Bangla (IA)

1	tomar	jɔtheš	šahoš	ach
9.	you.indirect	ṭo enough	coura ge	e is

‘Do you have enough courage?’
(Dasgupta 2004: 132)

Bodo (TB): a locative with the subject. Adjectives are verbs in TB and Munda.

Bodo (TB)

2	bibar-	a	muja	*mudɨm-*	na	dɔn
0.		o	ng		i	g
	flowe	in	good	fragrance	inf	be
	r-			(verb)-		

‘The flower has good fragrance.’

(Literally: ‘To fragrance (as verb) well is (there) in the flower.’)

<4$> 5.2.2.4 Accusative case-marked subject </4$>

Sinhala (IA), Manipuri and Rabha (TB) are the only SALs we know of, where the subject is accusative case-marked. Such predicates are non-volitional.

Sinhala (IA)

2	māw	yanta	bēruna
1.	ə	ŋ	
	I.acc	*barel*	escape.
		y	pst

‘I barely escaped.’

(Gair 2003: ibid)

<3$> 5.2.3 Subject in *by*-passive </3$>

The may be nominative or accusative case-marked in Hindi-Urdu (IA)

22	polīs	ke.dvā	cor_j	$pakṛe_j$	na	$gaye_{*i,j}$
a.	$_i$	rā			hɱ̃	
	polic	by	thieves	catch.perf,	not	pass.pst,
	e		m,p	m,p		m,p

‘The $thieves_i$ $were_j$ not caught by the $police_j$.’

22	polīs	ke.dvā	$corõ_j$	*ko*	$pakṛā_{*i,*j}$	na	$gayā_{*i,*j}$
b.	$_i$	rā				hɱ̃	
	polic	by	thiev	ac	catch.p	not	pass.pst.def
	e		es	c	erf		ault

‘The $thieves_i$ were not caught by the $police_j$.’

In Assamese and Bangla (IA) in contrast the patient/theme is accusative case-marked and it cannot be nominative case-marked.

2	rava	ak	ram	ɔr	morua
3.	ṇ-		-	dwara	hol
	Rava	*ac*	*Ra*	*by*	*was*
	n-	*c*	*m-*		*killed*

‘Ravan was killed by Ram.’

(Kakoli Das)

In Kashmiri and Sinhala (IA) too, the patient/theme may be dative case-marked.

Khasi (Mon-Khmer)

2	ya-	ki	sʔia	ø-		la-	bā	da	u-	ksɔ
7.		-	r				m	-		w
	ac	f-	fow	defaul		pst	eat	by	m	dog
	c-		l	t-		-		-	-	

'The hen was eaten by the dog.'

(Temsen and Subbarao, ms)

In Dravidian languages, the theme/patient in the passive is invariably nominative case-marked, and it *cannot* be accusative case-marked.

In Indo-Aryan languages, the passive has capability interpretation.

Marathi (IA)

2	mādz	kaḍūn	kā	kela	gela	nā
8.	yā	/*dwārā	m			hī
	I-obl	by	wor	do-pst-	go-pst-3s	ne
			k	3s	(passive)	g

'This work was not done by me.' ('I was unable to do the work.')

(Pandharipande 1997: 302)

When the agent is not overtly present, the capabilitative meaning is not imparted.

3	is	ḍhābe		m	acc	roṭī$_j$	bant	nah
2.				ẽ	hī		ī$_j$	̃ĩ
	thi s	roadside hotel		in	goo d	Indian bread	mad e	not

‘Good Indian bread is/*cannot not made in this roadside hotel.’

Telugu (DR)

3	ām	valla	ilāṭi	panul	ceyya	baḍ-	a	vu$_j$
3.	e$_i$			u$_j$	-			
	she	by	suc h	thing s	do-	pass -	neg-	nm,p

‘Such things cannot be done by her.’

3	ilāṭi	panul	ām	valla	jarag-a-	vu$_j$/	kā-	vu$_j$
4.		u$_j$	e$_i$					
	suc h	thing s	She	by	happen-not- 3p,nm		happen.not- 3p,nm	

‘Such things cannot be done by her.’

Exceptionally Case-marked Embedded subject: It is accusative case-marked

Mizo (TB)

4 zovi n [amah *cu* lāmthia a- inti

1. - - m]

Zov er she.se ac dancer 3s conside

i- g lf- c - rs

‘Zovi considers self a dancer.’

(Lalitha Murthy and Subbarao 2000: 803)

The derived object in an Exceptional Case Marking (ECM) construction may however be nominative case-marked in Kashmiri (IA), Dumi, Tiwa (TB) and Telugu (DR).

Tiwa is a Tibeto-Burman language spoken in Assam in the northeastern part of India. The following examples are illustrative.

Embedded subject is accusative case-marked:

(i ā pe.go sine ni- wā nugā

) ŋ mā ŋ

I him(a film se no saw

cc) e- zr

‘I saw him watching a film.’

Embedded subject is nominative case-marked:

(ii ā pe sine ni- wā- g nugā

) ŋ mā a ŋ

I he film se noz cl saw

(nom) e- -r

‘I saw him watching a film.’

(Nath 2009)

<2$> 5.3 Domains of occurrence of NNSs in SALs and their nature </2$>

Domains of occurrence of the dative subject: (adapted from Subbarao and Bhaskararao 2004)

a. Psychological states and emotions

b. Physiological and mental ailments

c. Natural phenomena pertaining to body

d. Perceiver of visual and auditory actions

e. To express possession and kinship

f. Subject of predicates expressing obligation and necessity (desideratives)

g. To denote a recipient

h. Acquisition of knowledge or a skill

i. Part-whole relationship (single and double dative marking)

(i) *Psychological states and emotions***:** The dative/genitive subject occurs in sentences with psychological predicates.

Hindi**-**Urdu (IA)

4	palla	ko	bah	khušī$_j$	huī$_{*i,j}$
6.	vi$_i$		ut		
	Palla	da	very	happine	happen
	vi	t		ss	ed

‘Pallavi felt very happy.’

The predicate in Telugu (DR) in (47) contains verb *uṇḍ* ‘be’, when the psychological predicate is an adjective, and the verb exhibits default agreement.

Telugu (DR)

4	ī	pā-	ki	san-	gā	$undi_{*i/*j}$
7.		$pala_{i}$-		$tōṣam_{j}$ -		
	thes	ba-	da	happi-	adj	is
	e	bies-	t	ness-	r	(default)

‘These babies are happy.’

Bodo (TB) has a genitive subject construction with psychological predicates.

Bodo (TB)

4	bi-	ha	jɯbɯr	raga	jɯng-	nai	dɔng-	ɔ
8.	he-	gen	very	anger	set fire-	inf	be-	pres

‘He is very angry.’ (lit., ‘to him a lot of anger is to set fire/ to ignite.’)

(ii) *Physiological and mental ailments*: The subject is dative or genitive case-marked when the subject possesses physiological or mental ailments. The verb agrees with the theme in Hindi-Urdu (IA) and Telugu (DR).

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

49.	pratimā$_i$	*ko*	[khā̃sī	aur	zukām]$_j$	ho	gaye	hā̃ĩ$_{*i,j}$
	Pratima,f,s	da t	[cough	and	cold]m, p	happen	went	pst,m, p

‘Pratima caught a cough and cold.’

Telugu (DR)

50.	pratima$_i$	*ki*	[daggu-	u	jalubu-	u	
	Pratima f,s$_i$	dat	[cough-	conjn mkr	cold-	conjn mkr	
	renḍu-	u[1]$_j$	unnāyi p$_{*i,,j}$				
	both-	emph]$_j$	are				

‘Pratima caught both cough and cold.’

Kokbodok (TB) and Bangla (IA) have a genitive subject in such sentences.

Kokbodok (TB)

[1]In Telugu (DR) *-u* is a bound morpheme (a clitic) that performs the function of a conjunction marker as well as an emphatic. The occurrence of -u is phonologically conditioned, and its form depends on the preceding vowel of the host.

5 a *ni* kɔngr tɔn ɔ

1. - ai g-
I- ge cold be- pre
n s

‘I have a cold.’

Bangla (IA)

5 *am* ṭhan leg ch

2. *ar* ḍa e- e
I.ge cold feel pre
n - s

‘I have a cold.’

(iii) *Natural phenomena pertaining to the body***:** The subject is genitive case-marked in Hindi-Urdu (IA) and dative case-marked in Telugu (DR), when any event or occurrence that pertains to the body takes place.

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

5 us ādm *ke* sār bāl jha gay

3. $\bar{\text{ı}}_{\text{i}}$ e $_{\text{j}}$ ṛ e_{j}
tha man *g* all hai fall we
t *e* r nt
n

‘That man lost all his hair.’

Telugu (DR)

5	ā	maniṣ	*ki*	anta	juttu$_j$	u[2]
4.		i$_i$			-	
	tha	man	*da*	so	hair-	quantifier
	t		*t*	much		mkr
	ūḍ-	i	pō	yindi$_j$		
			-			
	fall-	cpm	go	pst		
			-			
	‘That	man	lost	all	his	
	hair.’					

(iv) *Visual and auditory perceptions***:** The subject of a predicate denoting visual and auditory perceptions is dative case-marked. In Hindi-Urdu, the predicates *sunāī denā* ‘to be audible’ and *dikhāī denā* ‘to be visible’ require a dative subject, whereas the verbs *sun-nā* ‘to hear’ and *dekh-nā* ‘to see’ require a nominative or ergative subject depending on the aspect of the verb.

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

5	rāt	k	mahi	*k*	ṭhī	dikh	na	det
5.		o	mā	*o*	k	āī	hɛ̃	ā

[2] In Telugu (DR) *-u* also functions as a marker to impart quantificational interpretation.

nigh	a	Mahi	*d*	wel	visibl	not	giv
t	t	ma	*at*	l	e		e

‘Mahima cannot see well at nights.’

Verbs such as *sun-nā* ‘to hear’, *bhūlnā* ‘forget’ take a nominative case-marked subject. In current day Hindi-Urdu, a few speakers started using such verbs with a dative case-marked subject as in (56).

5	jor	se	boliye	*mer*	*k*	ũcā	sunt	hai
6.				*e*	*o*[3]		ā	
	loud	wit	speak	I	da	hig	hea	pre
	-	h	(polite)	(obl)	t	h	r	s

Literally: ‘Please talk loudly, I hear high (loud).’

‘I can’t hear well.’

(Rama Kant Agnihotri, p.c.)

Peter Hook (p.c.) informs me that in Shina (IA) too a verb such as *forget* which takes a nominative subject permits a dative subject to occur, just as in Hindi-Urdu (IA).

[3]In colloquial Hindi the expression *mere ko* ‘I (obl)-dat’ is often heard, though the formal expression cited in grammatical descriptions is *mujh ko/mujhe* ‘I (obl)-dat’. Since this sentence is a verbatim quote from a native speaker of Hindi, we did not make any alteration in the sentence. Such usage of *mere ko* ‘I (obl)-dat’ in place of the expression *mujh ko/mujhe* ‘I (obl)-dat’ indicates that there is a syntactic change in progress. (56) was reattested by Ramakant Agnihotri and several other native speakers.

The verb *kanipincu* ‘be visible’ takes a dative subject in Telugu.

Telugu (DR)

5	pramo	*ki*	rātruḷḷ	sariggā	kanipin	a-	du_{*i}
7.	d_i		u		c-		
	Pramo	*d*	nights	properl	visible-	not	3s,nm
	d	*at*		y		-	(default)

‘Pramod cannot see well at night.’

(v) *Possession and kinship:* The subject is genitive case-marked when kinship relationship is expressed in Hindi-Urdu, Punjabi, Bangla (IA) and Kokbodok (TB); dative case-marked in Dravidian languages and in Kashmiri (IA). In IA languages, the case marking of the subject depends on the nature of the object possessed. In Dravidian languages, except in cases involving temporary possession, the possessor is always dative case-marked. In sentences expressing possession, all SALs of the subcontinent have *be* as the only verb*,* and do not have the verb *have,* except a few Tibeto-Burman languages such as Mizo, Hmar and Paite, and the Mon-Khmer language Khasi, which have both *be* and *have.* Mahajan (2004) labels *have* as an oblique case incorporator, as languages that have the *have*- construction do not have a genitive/dative case-marked subject. Jayaseelan

(2007:37) in a similar vein argues: “…when the dative Case incorporates into ‘be’, we get ‘have’…”

The verb agrees in phi features with the theme possessed.

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

5	rādhā$_i$	*kī*	tīn	bahnẽ$_j$	thĩ$_{*i,j}$
8.	Radha	ge	thre	sisters	were
	f,s	n	e	f,p	f,p

‘Radha had three sisters.’

Kashmiri (IA)

5	moha	*as*	chu$_j$		dukānɨ	bōy$_j$
9.	n$_i$-				$_j$/	
	Mohan	da	has	[is—	shop	broth
		t	KVS]			er

‘Mohan has a shop / brother.’

(Wali and Koul 1997: 139)

Kannada (DR)

6	nana	*g*	mūva	heṇṇ	makkaḷ	iddāre$_{*i,j}$
0.	-$_i$	*e*	ru	u	u$_j$	

I- da three fema childre be.nonpst.3

t le n p.hum

‘I have three daughters.’

(Sridhar 1990: 133)

In Kokbodok (TB), too the genitive occurs with the logical subject, just as in Hindi-Urdu, and the occurrence of the verb *be* depends on the presence of the classifier with the possessed. If the classifier is not present with the possessed entity, the verb *tɔng* ‘be’ must be overtly present as in (61), and if the [+ human] classifier is present, then the occurrence of the verb *tɔng* ‘be’ is optional as in (62).

Kokbodok (TB)

6 ni- *ni* thakhu bɨ.sɨk tɔn

1. k g

you ge brothe how be

\- n rs many

‘How many brothers do you have?’

6 ni- *ni* thakhu *khɔrɔk* bɨ.sɨk *(tɔn*

2. k *g)*

you ge brothe cl [+ how be

\- n rs human] many

‘How many brothers do you have?’

In Hindi-Urdu (IA), the locative *ke pās* ‘near’ is used to indicate concrete possession as in (63), except with time expressions as in (64).

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

6 un logõ̃$_i$ *ke* bahut paisā$_j$ thā$_{*i/j}$

3. *pās*

thos peopl near a lot of money was m,s

e e m,s

‘Those people had a lot of money.’

6 un logõ̃$_i$ *ke* utnā ṭāim$_j$ bilkul nah thā$_{*i/j}$

4. *pās* ̃ī

thos peopl near that time at all not was,m

e e much m,s (npi) ,s

‘Those people did not have that much time at all.’

In Telugu (DR), the locative marker *daggara* ‘near’ occurs with the subject to indicate temporary possession. Recall that *ki*, the dative case marker, too occurs in sentences denoting possession as in (17) above. However, there is a difference; “… (W)hile the occurrence of the dative [case marker] denotes ‘permanent or

long-term possession', the occurrence of the locative [case marker] denotes 'temporary possession'" (Subbarao and Bhaskararao 2004: 172).

Telugu (DR)

65.	mā.*ku* $_i$	mugguru	panivāḷḷu $_j$	unnāru $_j$	kān ī	prastuta m	
	we (excl).dat	three	servants	are	but	right now	
	mā $_i$	*dagga ra*	iddare	e	unnāru $_{*i,j}$		
	our (excl)	near	two-	emph	are		

'We've three servants but right now we've only two.'

Manipuri (TB) has the locative postposition occurring with the subject in the non-nominative subject construction. The subject is in the non-nominative case and is marked by the postposition *manak-ta* 'near at'. The occurrence of non-nominative subjects in Tibeto-Burman languages is rather infrequent. Most of the languages do not have the non-nominative subject construction at all, in contrast to Indo-Aryan and Dravidian languages, where the of non-nominative subject construction is a dominant one.

Manipuri (TB) also makes a distinction in terms of the occurrence of the postpositions for temporary and permanent possession just as Telugu (DR).

(vi) *Need or necessity*: The dative subject also occurs in sentences denoting need or necessity in Hindi-Urdu, Punjabi (IA), Bodo, Garo (TB), Telugu and Kannada (DR).

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

6 ramy *k* ek kitā cāhiy

6. ā *o* b e
Ram *d* on boo need
ya *at* e k ed
'Ramya wants a book.'

Bodo (TB)

6 kham *nɨ* gəikh naŋɯ

7. pa er u
Kham da milk want
pa t
'Khampa wants some
milk.'

Garo (TB)

6 aŋ na i- ko naŋ- no a

8. - -
I- da this ac nee fut ?
t - c d- -
‘I will need this.’
(Burling 2004: 122)

Kannada (DR)

6 nan ge idu iṣṭa illa

9. a-
I- da thi likin ne
t s g g
‘I don’t like this.’
(Sridhar 1979: 101)

Obligation is expressed with a non-nominative case-marked subject in IA languages [see (15) from Bangla (IA)]. In contrast, in Dravidian languages, the subject is nominative case-marked in such cases.

Malayalam (DR)

7 nī pōyē tīrū
0. yo go- mu
u emph st
‘You really must
go.’

(Asher and Kumari 1997: 307)

(vii) *To denote a recipient*: The dative subject also denotes a recipient.

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

7	mujh	yah	*ek*	ciṭṭī$_{j}$	milī$_{*i,j}$
1.	e$_{i}$	ə̃			
	I.dat	her	on	letter	found
		e	e	f,s	f,s

‘I got a letter.’

(Montaut 2004: 193)

Telugu (DR)

7	ā	ābbyil	*ki*	rōḍḍ	mīd	ok	pustaka	dorikin-
2.		a$_{i}$-		u	a	a	m$_{j}$	di$_{*i/j}$
	thos	boys-	da	road	on	a	book	got-nm,s
	e		t				nm,s	

‘Those boys found a book on the road.’

(viii) *Acquisition of knowledge or a skill***:** A dative subject also denotes acquisition/knowledge of a skill or talent by the possessor, and the verb in such cases is *ā* ‘come’ in Hindi-Urdu (IA) and *vac* ‘come’ in Telugu (DR).

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

7 is panjā laṛk *ko* bharat nāṭyam$_j$ ātā$_{*i}$ thā$_{*i}$

3. bī ī$_i$,j ,j

thi Punja girl da classical Indian com was

s bi t dance e

‘This Punjabi girl used to know the classical Indian dance.’

Telugu (DR)

7 vāḷḷ ammāyi- *ki* sangīta vacc

4. a m u

thei daughte da music come

r r- t s

‘Their daughter has the knowledge of music.’

(ix) *Part-whole relationship (single and double dative case marking)*: In sentences with a DP consisting of ‘part-whole’ relationship either a dative as in (75) or a locative as in (76) occurs in Hindi-Urdu (IA). The whole *prasād* and part *man* ‘mind’ and *sar* ‘head’ are invariably linked by the *genitive* postposition.

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

GENITIVE-DATIVE

7 [prasād *ke* man *ko* gah coṭ$_j$ pahuncī

5.]$_i$ rī $_{*i/j}$

Prasad, ge min da dee wound reached

m n d t p , f , f

‘Prasad’s mind got hurt badly.’ (literal)

‘Prasad’s feelings were hurt (deeply).’

(Om Arora, p.c.)

GENITIVE-LOCATIVE

7 [prasād *ke* sar] *m* gah coṭ$_j$ āī$_{*i/j}$

6. $_i$ *ẽ* rī

Prasad, ge hea *in* dee wound cam

m n d p , f e f

‘Prasad got hurt badly in the head.’

(Om Arora, p.c.)

In contrast, in Kannada, Malayalam, Tamil and Telugu (DR), a dative predicate may assign a *single or double dative case marking.* Double dative-case marking is permitted in these languages in dative subject constructions expressing inalienable possession and part-whole relationship (Subbarao and Bhaskararao 2004). This is a feature found only in Dravidian languages but not elsewhere in the subcontinent. Thus, the following two types of case marking of the subject DP are

permitted: *genitive-dative* as in (77) and *dative-dative* as in (78). The possessor is genitive case-marked and the possessed – the body part – is dative case-marked.

Kannada (DR)

7	avan	*a*	kaṇṇ$_j$	*ig*	gāya	āgi-	de
7.	$_i$-		-	*e*	$_k$		*i*j,k
	he-	ge	eye-	da	injur	happe	agr
		n		t	y	n-	

‘He got hurt in his eye.’

In Kannada and Telugu (DR), the possessor, as well as the possessed are *both dative case-marked.*

Kannada (DR)

7	avan	*ig*	kaṇṇ$_j$	*ig*	gāya	āgi-	de
8.	$_i$-	*e*	-	*e*	$_k$		*i*j,k
	he-	da	eye-	da	injur	happe	be
		t		t	y	n-	

‘He got hurt in his eye.’

See 5.8 for further details. The double dative subject construction in Dravidian is similar to the double subject construction discussed in Japanese (Shibatani and Pardeshi 2001).

<2$> 5.4 Some subject and non-subject properties of the NNS construction </2$>

<3$> 5.4.1 Some Subject properties of NNSs in SALs </3$>

We have shown earlier in the subject properties of ergative subjects. We shall now consider the other non-nominative subjects, and demonstrate that though they are case-marked with a postposition, they exhibit some properties of subject, and some of non-subject.

There are several tests that can be used as diagnostics to test the subjecthood of NNSs (see Sigurdsson 2004). We discuss four tests here:

1. NNSs as antecedents to anaphors
2. NNSs as controllers of PRO
3. NNSs and subject oriented Verbs
4. Phonological evidence from the FC COMP in Marathi

<4$> 5.4.1.1 NNSs as antecedents to anaphors </4$>

Perhaps there is not a single study on NNSs that does not include a discussion of NNSs as antecedents to anaphors. In Hindi-Urdu, for example, the dative subject is an antecedent to an anaphor (Davison 2004). In (79), *kamzor insān* is a dative case-marked subject, and it c-commands the anaphor *apne āp par* ‘sef’s self

on’.

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

7	kamz	insān$_{i}$	ko	apne-	āp
9.	or				
	weak	human	dat	self+g	self
		being		en-	
	par	gussā$_{j}$	ā-	tā$_{*i,j}$	hai$_{*i,j}$
	on	anger	com	imperf	pre
			e-		s

‘A weak human being gets angry at himself.’

In Telugu (DR), the dative subject is an antecedent to an anaphor. The verbal reflexive cannot occur in such cases.

Telugu (DR)

8	kāvya$_{i}$-	ki	tana	mīd	*(tana-	jāli$_{j}$
0.				a	ki$_{i}$)	
	Kavya-	dat	self	on	self-dat	pit
						y

puṭṭin-	$di_{*i,j}$	*puṭṭu	*kon*	$di_{*i,j}$
	/	-	-	
was	3s,n	be	vr-	3s,nh
born-	h	born-		

‘Kavya pitied herself.’

In Hindi-Urdu (IA), Saxena (1985) first pointed out that in the DSC the possessive anaphor *alternates* with a simple possessive pronoun (see Gurtu 1992, too).

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

8	$mohan_i$	*ko*	apne	*uske*$_{i/j}$	mã̃-	bāp	
1.			$_i$/				
	Mohan.	dat	self’s	his	(3s	mothe	fath
	ms			gen)		r-	er
	kī	yād	ā-	yī			
	gen	memory	com	pst.f,s			
		f,s	e-				

‘$Mohan_i$ remembered self’s$_{i/*j}$ /$his_{i/j}$ parents.’

(Saxena 1985)

Thus, dative subjects bind a pronoun and anaphor, or just an anaphor, while nominative subjects bind an anaphor.

Mohanan and Mohanan (1994: 175) provide an example to show that the possessive pronoun in a DSC refers to the nominative

NP, and not to the dative subject.[4]

82.	anu$_i$	ko	nīnā$_j$	uskī$_{*i,j}$	bastī	m ẽ	dikhī
	Anu	da t	Nina.nom.f, s	her	neighborhood	in	apear.perf.f ,s

'Anu$_i$ saw Nina$_j$ in her$_{*i, j}$ neighborhood'
(Mohanan and Mohanan, ibid).

Further, examples similar to (82) from Hindi-Urdu include (83), where the possessive pronoun refers to a discourse antecedent, and not to the dative subject.[5]

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

8	us	laṛk	ko	us	bare	socnā	cāhiy	th
3.		ī$_i$		ke$_{*i, j}$	mẽ		e	ā
	tha	girl	da t	her	about	to think	need ed	wa s

'That girl should have thought about her/*herself.'

In contrast, to a possessive pronoun, a *nominal anaphor cannot alternate* with a personal pronoun in the DSC.

[4] The verb exhibits agreement in number and gender with the nominative case-marked noun phrase *nīnā* 'Nina'.

[5] The verb exhibits default agreement as there is no nominative case-marked noun phrase in (83).

8	us	laṛke$_{i/*}$	ko	apne	āp	par$_{i/*j}$	us
4.		$_{j}$				/	par$_{*i/j}$
	that	boy	da	self-	sel	on	on
			t	gen	f		him
	bah	bharo	ha				
	ut	sā	i				
	very	trust	is				

‘That boy$_{i/*j}$ has confidence in himself$_{i/*j}$/him$_{*i/j}$.’

Bangla (IA) has the possessive reflexive *nije-r* ‘self’s’ which requires a c-commanding antecedent. In Bangla, the possessive pronoun *tar* ‘his/her’ is coindexed with the genitive subject just as the possessive reflexive *nije-r* ‘self’s’ in specific contexts.

Bangla (IA)

8	bou.ṭi$_{i}$	r	nijer$_{i}$/	tar$_{i}$	bap-	er
5.	-					
	bride.	ge	self’s	her	fathe	ge
	cl	n			r-	n
	baṛi-	r	kɔtha	mone	poṛlo	
	house	ge	thoug	remembra	fell	
	-	n	ht	nce		

‘The bride remembered self’s/her parents’ home.’

Just as in Hindi-Urdu and in Bangla too, it is not the case that a

possessive pronoun co-refers with the non-nominative subject in all contexts. It has a discourse antecedent alone as the only choice in some specific contexts. The subscript *j* in (86) refers to a discourse antecedent. The possessive anaphor *nijer*, in contrast, uniquely refers to the genitive subject (Shukla Basu, p.c.). The subscript $_{j}$ refers to discourse antecedent.

8	oi	chel	ṭa	r	nije	opor	or$_{*i,j}$	khu
6.		e$_{i}$-	-		r$_{i}$	/	opor	b
	that	boy-	cl	ge	self	on/	him on	ver
				n				y
	bhɔrš	ache						
	a							
	trust	is						

‘That boy has a lot of confidence in himself$_{i,}$ $_{*j}$/him$_{*i, j}$.’

In Telugu (DR) too, a possessive pronoun cannot co-refer with a non-nominative subject for most of the speakers.

Telugu (DR)

8	kāmini$_{i}$	ki	tana$_{i, *j}$/	āme$_{*i, j}$	samasyalu
7.	Kamini	dat	self’s/	her	problems
	ardham	avv-	a-	vu	
	understanding	happen-	neg-	nm,p	

‘Kamini does not understand her (own)/her (someone else’s) problems.’

Based on the data presented above, it is evident that a dative/genitive subject can antecede a possessive anaphor, or a possessive pronoun in Hindi-Urdu and Bangla and Telugu in most of the cases. In contrast, to a possessive pronoun, a nominal anaphor cannot alternate with a personal pronoun in the DSC. The reason for this is that a possessive pronoun is *not* a subcategorized argument, while the nominal anaphor in the cases we discussed above is. Further, when an anaphor occurs in a subcategorized position in Kannada and Telugu (DR), “…the VR is required” (Lust *et al.* 2000: 30). These facts show that *subcategorization* does play an important role in anaphoric binding.

The next question is: how does one account for the occurrence of the possessive pronoun for the other set of speakers? Let us consider the case of Hindi-Urdu. We briefly present Davison’s (Davison 2004: 155) argument: A DP which is a subject can bind only a reflexive or reciprocal and not a pronoun. Since the dative DP “locally binds a pronoun” in (81) above, “it is not a subject.” Thus, the dative DP in (81) is “either a subject binding a reflexive

or not a subject, binding a pronoun.” In the Minimalist Program, the subject moves to the Spec position of a Tense Phrase (TP) due to the requirement of the EPP (Extended Projection Principle). The EPP in simple terms means: Every sentence must have a subject. Hence, Davison (ibid) argues that a dative DP may or may not move to Spec/TP depending upon whether it is an antecedent to an anaphor, or a pronoun.

<4$> 5.4.1.2 NNSs as controllers of PRO </4$>

Just as nominative subjects can be controllers of PRO, NNSs too can be. PRO is a null element that occurs in subject position, and according to standard assumptions, it is uncase-marked and ungoverned. In (88), the infinitival complement and in (89), the conjunctive participle have PRO as their embedded subject. PRO is coindexed with the matrix subject, which is a dative subject in (88) and a locative subject in (89).

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

8	hare	bacc	ko	[PR	tair-	acc	lagt	hai
8.	k	e_i		O_i	nā]	hā	ā	
	ever	child	da		swim-	goo	feel	pre
	y		t		to	d		s

‘Every child likes to swim.’

8	hare	bacc	m	[PR	yah	bāt	sun
9.	k	e_i	ẽ	O_i			
	ever	child	in		this	new	hea
	y					s	r
	kar]	jān	m	jān	ā	gay*ī*	
			ẽ				
	cpm	life	in	life	come	wen	
						t	

‘On hearing the news every child became cheerful.’

In Bangla (IA) too, the genitive subject is the controller of PRO.

Bangla (IA)

9	šɔ	bacc	r-	i	[PR	sãtar	kaṭ	te]	bhal	lage
0.	b	a_i-			O_i		-		o	
	all	child-	ge	emp		to	*cu*	*imperf*	goo	strik
			n-	h		swim	*t-*	*pple*	d	es

‘All children like to swim.’

According to Yoon (2004: 266), NNS can control PRO in a subject-oriented adjunct clause in Korean. In SALs too, a similar situation obtains in a nominative subject or non-nominative subject construction.

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

9	[PRO$_i$	is	bāt	kā	patā	cal	te hī]
1.						-	
	dat	thi	news	gen	knowled	go	right
		s			ge	-	after
	laṛkiy	*ko*	ghabṛāha	huī			
	õ$_i$		ṭ				
	girls	da	panickine	happen			
		t	ss	ed			

‘As soon as PRO$_i$ (the girls) came to know of this, the girls$_i$ got panicky.’

Telugu (DR)

9	[PRO$_i$	ī	sangati	teliya-	gānē]
2.	dat	this	news	know-	right after
	ammayili-$_i$	*ki*	kangāru	puṭṭindi	
	girls-	dat	panickiness	was borne	

‘As soon as PRO$_i$ (the girls) came to know of this, the girls$_i$ got panicky.’

A significant feature of Dravidian languages is that an NNS in an adjunct clause can be the controller of a null subject in the matrix clause. The null element in the matrix clause is denoted by ∀ (see Chapter 8 for more details). The matrix predicate in (93) takes a nominative subject. Hence, we have glossed the null element ∀ as nom (see chapter 8 for a discussion of this kind of coindexing of a null matrix subject with an embedded subject,

which we labeled as ‘backward control).

Telugu (DR)

9	[[ammāyila$_i$	ki	ī	sanga	teliy-	a gānē]	
3.	-			ti			
	girls-	dat	this	news	know	as	soon
					-	as	
	∀$_i$	kangār	paḍḍār				
		u	u				
	nom	panick	fell				
		y					

‘As soon as PRO$_i$ (the girls) came to know of this, the girls$_i$ got panicky.’

In contrast, in IA languages that we know of, such sentences are not permitted.

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

9	*[laṛkiyõ$_i$	ko	is	bāt	kā	patā
4.	girls	dat	this	news	gen	knowledg
						e
	cal-	te hī]	∀$_i$	ghabṛ	gayī̃	
				ā		
	go	as soon	nom	panick	went	
		as		y		

‘As soon as PRO_i (the girls) came to know of this, the $girls_i$ got panicky.’

Bangla (IA)

9	*[bacca	r	jɔr	aša	matro-		i]
5.	$_i$ -						
	child-	ge	fev	com	as	soon	emp
		n	er	e	as-		h
	$∀_i$	šu-	e	poṛl			
				o			
		lay	cp	fell			
		-	m				

‘As soon as the child had fever, he lay down.’

Sentences (94) and (95) are grammatical, only if the matrix subject is present and the embedded subject is not present. That is, Hindi-Urdu and Bangla permit only Forward Control, and not Backward Control (see chapter 8 for more discussion).

In conjunctive participial clauses too, the dative subject can be a controller of PRO.

In Telugu (DR) and Kharia (Munda), the dative subject controls PRO.

Telugu (DR)

9	[sīt	ku]	[PR	ā	māṭa	vin-	*i]*	kōpa	vaccindi
6.	a	$_{i}$	O_{i}					m	
	Sit	dat		tha	matt	hea	cp	ange	came
	a			t	er	r-	m	r	3s,nm

'Having heard that matter, Sita got angry.'
(Lalitha Murthy 1994)

Kharia (Munda)

9	[etw	te]$_{i}$	[PRO	u-ki	ya?	haleit	yo-	kon]
7.	a-		$_{i}$					
	Etwa	oblique		thes	of	conditi	see-	cpm
	-			e		on		
	lebui	la?-	ki					
	love	epm-	pst					

'Etwa, seeing their condition, felt compassion' (John Peterson, p.c.).

[PRO in (97) was added for ease in exposition. KVS]

Tibeto-Burman languages such as Bodo, Rabha, Kokbodok that have been in intense contact with Indo-Aryan languages have a non-nominative subject construction. The only language that we know of that has no contact with an Indo-Aryan langue but has a non-nominative construction is Manpuri. Evidence from Khasi

(Mon-Khmer) cannot be adduced, as Khasi does not have constructions involving an NNS.

We shall now consider passive sentences. The subject of a passive sentence is the controller of PRO in Hindi-Urdu (IA) in (98).

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

9	baccõ$_i$	se	[PRO$_i$	yah	bāt	sun	kar]
8.	childre n	by	nom	this	news	hea r	cp m
	cup	rah-	ā	nahĩ	gayā		
	quiet	be-	perf	not	go+p st		

‘The children could not keep quiet on hearing the news.’

Davison (2004:146) points out that Hindi-Urdu “does not allow a new grammatical subject to be created by a process like passive…” as the ungrammaticality of (99) indicates.

9	*[PRO$_{*i/*j}$	ghar	badal	kar]	us$_i$-	ko	apnī$_{i/*j}$
9.		home	change[-tr]	cp m	he/she-	da t	self’s

ḍāk	pahũc-ā-	yī	na	ga-yī
			hī̃	
mail	arrive-	perf.f,s	not	go-
	cause-			perf.f,s

[PRO$_{*i/*j}$ having moved], he/she$_i$ couldn't be forwarded self's$_{*i/*j}$ mail.'

(Grammatical as 'Because I moved, *I couldn't forward him/her/my mail*.')* [emphasis in the original] (Davison, ibid).

Just as a nominative subject can occur in the position of PRO, so can an NNS in a conjunctive participle. The embedded predicate *kōpam vacc* 'anger come' in Telugu and the other Dravidian languages, *cāhi-era* 'needed' in Nepali and *tsakh khas* 'anger climb' in Kashmiri requires a dative subject. PRO is glossed here with the case marker that would normally occur with a lexical subject.

Telugu (DR)

10	mama	[PR	kōpa	vacc	i]	veḷḷi
0.	ta$_i$	O$_i$	m	-		pōyindi
	Mamat	dat	ange	com	cp	left
	a		r	e-	m	

'Having gotten angry, Mamata left.'

Nepali (IA)

10	[PR	pāni	cāhi	era	u_i	nad	tira	ga	yo
1.	O_i		-	]		i		-	
	dat	wat	nee	cp	h	rive	towar	go	ps
		er	d-	m	e	r	d	-	t

'Needing water, he went to the river.'
(Ichihashi-Nakayama 1994 as quoted in Bickel 2004: 81)

Kashmiri (IA)

10	[PR	tsak	khas	ith]	tul	laṛka	šor
2.	O_i	h	-			n_i	
	dat	ang	clim	cp	lifte	boy.e	nois
		er	b-	m	d	rg	e

'After the boy_i got angry, he_i raised hell.'
(Bhatt 1999: 196)

In Kashmiri (IA) and Telugu (DR), the matrix subject (controller) can be a dative subject too.

Kashmiri (IA)

10	[*PR*	tsak	khas	ith]	āv	sali	*as*	vadu
3.	*O_i*	h	-			m-		n
	dat	ang	clim	cp	cam	Sali	*d*	cryin
		er	b-	m	e	m-	*at*	g

Literally: 'Having become angry, crying came to Salim.'
(Aadil Kak, p.c.)

Telugu (DR)

10	[PR	kōpa	vacc	i]	šānti	ki	ēḍup	vaccin
4.	O_i	m	-			u	di	
	dat	ange	com	cp	Shan	da	cryin	came
		r	e-	m	ti	t	g	

‘Having become angry, crying came to Shanti.’

(literal)

‘Having become angry, Shanti began to cry.’

The fact that PRO occurs in a case-marked position in (104) and (105) shows that PRO is case-marked (see Chapter 7 for details). In contrast, in Hindi-Urdu (Davison 2004), Oriya (Beermann & Hellan 2002:45) and Punjabi, PRO cannot occur in the subject position of an embedded conjunctive participial clause, which has a predicate that takes a dative subject.

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

10	*rādh	[$_{S2}$PR	guss	ā	kar	bāhar	cal-	ī	ga	ī
5.	a	O	ā		$_{S2}$]				-	
	Radh	dat	ang	com	cpm	outsi	wal	ps	go	ps
	a		er	e		de	k-	t	-	t

‘Having felt angry, Radha went outside.’ (intended meaning)

Punjabi (IA)

10 *bacc [$_{S2}$PRO pu'kk lag ke ro ríā ai

6. ā h $_{S2}$]

dat hunge feel cp cry pro pre

r m g s

'Having felt hungry, the child was crying.'

(intended meaning)

(Sandeep Gupta, p.c.)

Oriya (IA)

10 *mot jara ho- i ousad khā il- i

7. e ha -

I.dat fev happ cp medici eat ps 1

er en- m ne - t- ,s

'Having had fever I took medicine.'

(Beermann & Hellan 2002:45)

In Bangla (IA) PRO cannot occur in a position where the genitive subject occurs. Bayer (2004:56) observes: "In perfective participial clauses in which a PRO subject is required, the nominative is replaced by PRO [as in (108) –KVS], but the genitive cannot be [as in (109) –KVS]."

Bangla (IA)

10 [PR hẽše- hẽše] ra ama bolchil je --

8. O m ke o -

	NOM	laughi	laughing	Ra	me	told	tha	--
		ng		m			t	-

‘Constantly laughing, Ram told me that …’

10	*[PR	hãši	peye]	ra	ama	bolchil	je	--
9.	O			m	ke	o		-
	GEN	laugh	having.gott	Ra	me	told	tha	--
			en	m			t	-

Intended meaning: ‘Constantly laughing, Ram told me that …’

(Bayer ibid)

However, as Probal Dasgupta (p.c.) points out: “PRO can occur in subject position of an (embedded) conjunctive participial clause provided that both that clause and the main clause have a genitive/dative subject.”

Bangla (IA)

11	[$_{S2}$PR	hɔṭat	rege	giy-	e $_{S2}$]	
0.	O					
	gen	sudden-ly	angry	become-	cpm	
	amar	khub	math	dhore	gæl	
			a		o	
	I.gen	very	head	hold.cp	wen	
				m	t	

‘Having become suddenly angry, I got a headache.’

A *dative subject* can be a *controllee* in an infinitival clause in Telugu (DR) (Subbarao and Bhaskararao 2004: 176), while it cannot be in Hindi-Urdu, Kashmiri and Bangla (IA).

In Telugu (DR), the predicate *jvaram rāvaḍam* ‘getting fever’ requires a dative subject in embedded subject position and PRO occurs in that position.

Telugu (DR)

11	mallik	[$_{S2}$PR	krindaṭ	nela	ī	ṭaim	lō
1.	a	O	i			u	
	Mallik	dat	last	month	thi	time	in
	a				s		
	jvara	rā-	vaḍam	gurtu	cēs	kon-	di
	m		$_{S2}$]		u		
	fever	com	inf	rememb	do	vr-	3sn
		e-		er			m

‘Mallika remembered getting fever last month.’
(Subbarao and Bhaskararao 2004: ibid)

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

11	*mallik	ne	[$_{S2}$*PRO*	pichl	mahīn	is	vaq	bukh
2.	ā			e	e		t	ār
	Mallika	erg	dat	last	mont	thi	tim	fever
					h	s	e	
	ā-	nā	yād	kiyā				
		$_{S2}$]						
	come-	Inf	memo	did				
			ry					

Intended meaning: ‘Mallika remembered getting fever last month.’

Jayaseelan (2004: 235) demonstrates that a dative subject in Malayalam too can control PRO, but points out: “…PRO can be controlled also by a non-subject; therefore, control of PRO is not a good test of ‘subjecthood’.” He prefers to have a test where “…the dative NP can be a PRO” (Jayaseelan 2004: 235). Sentences (101)–(103) above from Telugu, Nepali and Kashmiri qualify Jayaseelan’s criterion and hence, we conclude that a dative subject qualifies the subjecthood test.

<4$> 5.4.1.3 Subject-oriented verbs </4$>

Compound verbs in SALs are a verb + verb combination in which the first verb is the main verb and the second verb is a vector or

an auxiliary verb (Hook 1973). Vector verbs are *'subject-oriented'*. Thus, vector verbs are permitted with "both ergative and dative subjects, as well as nominative subjects" (Davison 2004: 147). Davison uses the occurrence of vector verbs in the non-nominative subject construction as a piece of evidence to demonstrate that non-nominative subjects behave like nominative subjects for a set of subject-oriented vector verbs. The thrust of her argument is the following: A vector verb occurs in sentences with a nominative subject as well as a non-nominative subject. Hence, non-nominative subjects behave like nominative subjects in sharing this specific property. She draws her evidence [sentence (114 a)] from Hindi-Urdu (IA) to substantiate her claim. We provide additional evidence from Hindi-Urdu [sentence (114 b)], Bangla (IA) and Telugu (DR). Such evidences can be adduced from other SALs too.

The vector verb *baiṭhnā* 'to sit' with a *nominative* subject:

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

113	kuch	rištedār	subah-	subah	ghar	ā	*baiṭh*
a.							*e*
	some	relatives	morning-	morning	house	come	sat

‘Some relatives came to our place early in the morning.’

(The speaker is expressing his unhappiness by using the vector verb *baiṭhnā* ‘to sit’.)

The vector verb *jānā* ‘to go’ with a *nominative* subject:

113	kuch	rištedār	subah-	subah	ghar	ā	*gaye*	
b.	some	relatives	morning-	morning	house	come	went	

‘Some relatives came to our place early in the morning.’

(The speaker is expressing his unhappiness by using the vector verb *jānā* ‘to go’.)

The vector verb *baiṭhnā* ‘to sit’ with a *non-nominative* subject:

114	mujh	us	pa	krod	ā	*baiṭ*	ā
a.	e	-	r	h		*h-*	
	I.dat	he	on	ang	com	sit-	perfe
		-		er	e		ct

‘I couldn’t help getting angry at him/her.’

(Davison 2004: 147)

The vector verb *baiṭhnā* ‘to sit’ suggests something was done which had bad consequences, perhaps unintended, not done on purpose.

The vector verb *jānā* ‘to go’ with a *non-nominative* subject:

114	mujh	acānak	coṭ	*lag*	*ga*	ī
b.	e				*y-*	
	I.dat	sudden	injur	strik	go-	perfe
		ly	y	e		ct

‘I got hurt suddenly.’

Davison (ibid) comments: “For the speakers who accept sentences such as (21) [sentence (114a)—KVS], these auxiliaries cut across subject case possibilities.” A similar comment holds for (114b) too.

In Telugu (DR) too, vector verbs such as *kūrconu* ‘sit’, *cāvu* ‘die’, *pō* ‘go’ are nominative subject-oriented, but they may freely occur with a non-nominative (dative and locative) subject too.

The vector verb caccu ‘to die’ with a nominative subject:

Telugu (DR)

11	proddunna-	proddunna	appulavāḷḷu	inṭi	mundu
5.	morning-	morning	lenders (nom)	house	in fron of
	vacc-	i	*caccēru/*	*kūrconnāru*	
	come-	cpm	died (vector verb)	sat (vector verb)	

‘The moneylenders are sitting in front of the house early in the morning.’ (The speaker is expressing his anger by using the vector verbs *caccu* ‘to die’/*kūrconu* ‘sit’.)

The vector verb caccu ‘to die’ /kūrconu ‘sit’ with a non-nominative subject:

WITH A DATIVE SUBJECT:

Telugu (DR)

11 6.	panimaniṣi servant vacc- come-	*ki* *dat* i cpm	proddunn(a)- in the morning- *caccindi/* died (vector verb)	ē emph *kūrcondi* sat (vector verb)	jvaram fever

‘The servant got fever right in the morning’ (the speaker is unhappy about it).

WITH A LOCATIVE SUBJECT:

11 7.	vāḍi-	*dagg ara*	inta	ḍabb u	unḍ-	i	*cacc-*
	he.ob	near	so	mon	be-	cp	die (vector
	l- *i*	evari-	much ki	ey ēmi	m lābha m		verb)
	cpm	who-	dat	what	profit		

‘Who gets benefited in spite of the fact that he has so much money?’

In Bangla (IA) too, a similar phenomenon is observed. The vector

verb in (118) and (119) is *ja* ‘go’, and it is nominative subject-oriented in (118), and genitive subject-oriented in (119).

Bangla (IA)

The verb ja ‘go’ with a nominative subject

11	proji	baṛi-	t	col	e	*gæl*
8.	t		e	-		*o*
	Proji	hous	t	go	cp	we
	t	e-	o	-	m	nt

‘Projit went home.’

The verb ja ‘go’ with a genitive subject

11	projit	er	ɔšuk	kor	*e*	*g*
9.	-		h	-		*ælo*
	Projit	ge	ill	do-	cp	we
		n			m	nt

‘Projit fell ill.’

(Probal Dasgupta, p.c.)

The evidence presented above clearly demonstrates that there is a set of vector verbs that are nominative as well as non-nominative subject-oriented.

We discuss below another kind of evidence for the subject property of the dative subjects from Marathi, in which the complementizer can be reduced

<4$> 5.4.1.4 Phonological evidence from the FC (Final Complementizer) COMP in Marathi </4$>

Another kind of evidence for the subject property of dative subjects comes from Marathi, in which the complementizer can be reduced due to the process of the phonological attrition of the first vowel –*a* of the complementizer *asə*.

The post-sentential COMP in Marathi (IA) has two alternative forms: *asə* and -*sə*. The latter, a result of the elision of the initial vowel, occurs only when the subjects of the matrix and embedded sentence are *identical.* In (120a), the subject of the matrix clause is a dative subject and the notional subject of the embedded complement is a nominative subject. Phonological attrition of *a*- in the complementizer *asə* takes place in (120a), which demonstrates that both the dative subject and nominative subject, have identical properties of a subject.

Subject of the matrix and embedded clause identical: *sə* occurs

120	ma	$lā_i$	[$_{CP}$	mumb	l	dz	wa-$_{S2}$]	*sə* $_{CP}$]
a.	-		[$_{S2}$*PRO*$_i$	ai-	ā	ā-		
	I-	*da*	*nom*	Mumb	t	go-	subjuncti	COM
		t		ai	o		ve-	P

wāṭate/wāṭa

ta

feel.pres,s

‘I feel like going to Mumbai.’

Note that such deletion of the vowel is *not* permitted, if the subjects are non-identical. In (120b) the subject of the matrix clause is *ma-lā* ‘I-dat’ and of the embedded clause is *tyā-ne* ‘he-erg’ and they are not identical.

Subject of the matrix and embedded clause *not* identical:

120 ma- *lā*$_i$ [$_{CP}$ ne$_j$ mumbai- lā dzā- wa-$_{S2}$]

b. [$_{S2}$*tyā-*

I- dat he- erg Mumbai- to go- subjunctive-

ase/ *sə$_{CP}$] wāṭate/wāṭata

COMP COMP feel.pres,s

‘I think he should go to Mumbai.’

(Kashi Wali in personal communication to Prashant Pardeshi)

To summarize the above discussion, non-nominative subjects behave like nominative subjects as antecedents to: (i) an anaphor, (ii) controller of PRO, and (iii) as subjects for a set of subject-oriented verbs. Finally, phonological evidence from the FC COMP in Marathi provides further support to our claim.

<3$> 5.4.2 Some non-subject properties of NNSs in SALs </3$>

There are some non-subject properties of the non-nominative subjects that we shall present now.

<4$> 5.4.2.1 Agreement </4$>

It is a well attested fact that in most of the SALs, except in Manda (DR) (Ramakrishna Reddy 1992b) and Maithili (IA) (Subbarao 2001), the NNS does not trigger agreement on the verb. Further, agreement cannot be considered as a viable test for subjecthood, as verbs in SALs agree with non-subjects too (see Chapter 4).

<4$> 5.4.2.2 The case of modals </4$>

We now provide evidence from Telugu (DR) (Subbarao and Bhaskararao 2004) which shows that non-nominative subjects lack some properties that nominative subjects possess. The modal *gala* 'can, might' in Telugu permits epistemic and deontic meaning, when the subject is in the nominative case. However, when the subject is dative case-marked, the *capabilitative meaning* is absent, and only the *possibility interpretation* is permitted. (Subbarao and Bhaskararao 2004: 179). We reproduce the argument below from Subbarao and Bhaskararao 2004

omitting some minor details.

The modal *gala* has a capability/possibility interpretation in nominative-accusative constructions (120), and there is no corresponding capability interpretation in the dative subject construction (121). Thus, in (121) the dative subject construction *gala* has the interpretation of only *possibility*, and *not of capability.*

Telugu (DR)

Modal with a nominative subject: *possibility*, and *capability*

12	vāḍu	ī	sangatul	rēpu	telusu	kō	*galaḍu*$_{i, *j}$
1.	$_{i}$		u$_{j}$		-	-	
	he	thi	news	tomorro	know-	vr-	can/migh
		s		w			t

‘He might/can might find out this news tomorrow.’

Modal with a non-nominative subject: *possibility*, and *not of capability*

12	vāḍi-	*ki* $_{i}$	ī	sangatul	rēpu	teliya-
2.				u$_{j}$		
	he.obl-	dat	thi	news (p)	tomorro	know
			s		w	n-
	gala-	*vu*$_{*i ,j}$				

might/*coul d- 3,p,n h

‘He will/might get to know this news tomorrow.’

*‘He can get to know this news tomorrow.’

While the modal *gala* with capability meaning in (121) has a corresponding negative form (123a), the modal with possibility interpretation does not have a corresponding negative form (123b).

123 a.	vāḍu	ī	sanga ti	rēpu	telus u-	kō-	lē. ḍu
	he.no m	thi s	news	tomorro w	know -	vr-	not.3s, m

‘He cannot find out this news tomorrow.’

123b.	*vāḍi-		ki	ī	sangatu lu	rēpu	teliya-
	he.obl-		dat	this	news (p)	tomorro w	know n-
	lē.vu neg.could.3p, nh						

Intended meaning: ‘He cannot find out this news tomorrow.’

Further, in the passive voice too, the modal *gala* ‘can’ behaves differently from the sentence in active voice. For (124) in active

voice with the modal *gala* ‘can’, there is no corresponding passive sentence with modal interpretation, as the ungrammaticality of (125) shows.

12	vāḍ	ilāṭi	cetta	panul	cey	lēḍu
4.	u			u	ya	
	he	such	useless	deed	do	cannot.do-3s,m

‘He can’t do such useless things.’

12	vāḍi-	cēta/val	ilāṭi		cetta	panul	*cey
5.		la				u	ya
	he.obl	by	such		useless	deed	do
	-					s	
	paḍa-	lē.vu/	paḍa-vu				
	pass-	not.3p, nh	will	not be done-3p,nh			

‘*Such useless things *cannot be* done by him.’

‘Such useless things *will not be done* by him.’

Telugu uses a lexical passive in such cases (126). A lexical passive does not carry the overt morphology that a passive predicate carries; it imparts the meaning of a passive, as the verb in such cases is [-transitive]. Thus, in syntactic and lexical passives, the predicate is invariably [-transitive].

12	vāḍi-	valla	ilāṭi	cetta	panul	kā-
6.					u	
	he.ob	by	such	usele	deed	cannot.happ
	l-			ss	s	en-
	vu/	jaraga-	vu			
	3,p.n	will.not.happ	3,p.n			
	h	en-	h			

‘Such useless things cannot be/will not be done by him.’

Evidence similar to Telugu (DR) can be adduced from Hindi-Urdu (IA) too, from the difference exhibited by the modal *sak-nā* ‘can’. Just as the modal *gala* ‘can, might’ in Telugu, *saknā* ‘can, might’ in Hindi-Urdu (IA) has a *capability* and a *possibility* interpretation in nominative-accusative constructions (127); there is no corresponding capability interpretation in the dative subject construction (128). It has only the *possibility* meaning.

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

12	reṇ	ya	bāt	kal	malū	ka	sak	hai
7.	u	h			m	r	tī	

	Ren	thi	thing	tomorro	learn	do	can	pre
	u	s		w				s

‘Renu can (capability) /might (possibility) find out this tomorrow.’

12	reṇ	ko	ya	bāt	kal	malū	ho	sak	hai
8.	u		h			m		tī	
	Ren	dat	thi	thin	tomorro	learn	be	can	pre
	u		s	g	w				s

‘Renu might get to know this tomorrow.’ (possibility)

*‘Renu can find out this tomorrow.’ (capability)

From a semantic point of view too, the dative subject construction differs from the nominative subject construction with regard to the feature of *volitionality*. It is generally agreed that the predicate in the dative/genitive subject constructions is [-volitional].

Krishnamurti (1975), McAlpin (1976), Klaiman (1979) and Pandharipande (1990) point out that the predicate in the dative/genitive subject construction is [-volitional]. Hence, adverbs such as *kāvāli ani* ‘deliberately’, *kōru-koni* ‘desirously’, *išṭam gā* ‘willingly’, *kutūhalam gā* ‘anxiously’, *ātruta gā* ‘eagerly’, *anu kōkunḍā* ‘unintentionally’ in Telugu (DR) and *jān bujh kar* ‘deliberately’, *cāh kar* ‘desirously’, *utsuktā se* ‘eagerly’, *samhal kar* ‘carefully’ in Hindi-Urdu (IA), *icche kore* ‘deliberately’ in Bangla (IA), *jāṇ ke* ‘intentionally’ in Punjabi (Bhatia 1993: 87)

cannot occur in a dative, genitive or locative subject construction (see papers in Verma and Mohanan 1991 for a discussion on the non-volitional nature of DSCs).[6]

Evidence from Telugu (DR) and Hindi-Urdu (IA) clearly shows that while nominative subjects and dative subjects *do share* many structural properties, they differ with regard to the semantic feature of *volitionality*.

<4$> 5.4.2.3 Coordinate reduction </4$>

The issue with regard to NNS constructions and coordinate reduction is whether it is the morphological identity in terms of case marking on the conjuncts that counts or it is the grammatical function that is crucial. In Icelandic, the subject of the second conjunct can be elided, though it might be differently case-marked from the subject of the first conjunct. We shall demonstrate that three out of fours SALs we checked permit differently case-marked subjects in the two conjuncts. Thus, our data supports the view that "it is not the morphological identity that counts, it is the grammatical function" (Zaenen, Maling and

[6]Masica (1991) prefers the terms neutral (unmarked)/non-volitional (marked) to the terms volitional and non-volitional that are generally used. Alice Davison (p.c.) agrees with Masica (ibid) and points out that ergative is neutral between the features [+/-volitional] while dative is invariably [-volitional].

H. Thra'insson 1985).

Bayer (2004: 57–58) shows that in German and Bangla (IA) conjunction reduction is not permitted when the subjects of the conjuncts are *not* identically case-marked as in (129). Sentence (129) is ungrammatical because "...nominative and genitive subjects cannot mix in deletion contexts" (Bayer 2004: 57–58).

Bangla (IA)

12	*am	baṛi	thek	gela	ar	*(ama	kann	peyech
9.	i		e	m		r)	a	e
	I	hom	from	went	an	I.gen	cryin	came
		e			d		g	

'I left the house and I felt like crying.'
(Bayer 2004: 57)[7]

Probal Dasgupta (p.c.) provides an example to show conjunction reduction *is permitted* in Bangla (IA) though the subjects are not identical. The genitive subject of the second conjunct is elided.

[7]Bayer's sentence has been slightly modified. Our language consultant pronounces the word for 'went' as *gelam*, and not as *gƐlam* as Bayer transcribes it. Bayer crosses the word *amar* in (129). We have used the more familiar convention of the parentheses marked by * to show that *amar* cannot be deleted.

13	ami	chobi-	ṭa	dekhla	kint	koi,
0.				m	u,	
	I	picture-	cl	watch	but	where
				ed		(what)
	kanna	pelo	na	to?		
	weepi	light	no	particl		
	ng	verb	t	e		

‘I did watch the movie but, well, didn’t burst into tears.’

Sentence (130) shows that the nominative subject of the first conjunct and the genitive subject of the second conjunct can mix in deletion contexts in Bangla (IA) and hence, the genitive subject can be elided.

Mohanan (1994:131) demonstrates that “(I)n coordination constructions in Hindi, the gapped element in a coordinate constituent must be identical to the gapper in case.” In (131) the gapper and gapped elements are both ergative case-marked, and hence, it is grammatical, while in (132) the gapper is nominative case-marked and the gapped element is ergative case-marked; hence, the grammaticality.

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

13	rav	ne	khān	khāy	au	ø	pikca	dekhī
1.	ī		ā	ā	r		r	
	Ra	er	meal	ate	an	er	movi	watch
	vi	g			d	g	e	ed

'Ravi ate his meal and watched a movie.'

13	rav	ghar	gay	au	*--	khān	khāy
2.	ī		ā	r	-	ā	ā
	Ra	hom	wen	an	er	meal	ate
	vi	e	t	d	g		

'Ravi went home and he ate his meal'

(Mohanan ibid)

Thus, Hindi-Urdu requires strict case identity of the subjects in both conjuncts.

In contrast, in Nepali (IA), sentences of the type (133) in which the first conjunct has a dative subject, and the second a nominative subject are permitted.

Nepali (IA)

13	us.lāī$_i$	jyādai	tirkhā	lāg-yo	ra	ɵ$_i$
3.	he.da	much:foc	thirsty	perceptible-	an	no
	t	us		pst.3s	d	m

gāū- eu-ṭā pas-yo
villag one-cl *enter-*

e- *pst.3sm*

‘He was thirsty and went into a village.’
(Ichihashi-Nakayama 1994, as quoted in Bickel 2004: 81)

Telugu (DR) too is similar to Nepali and permits sentences of the type (134) just as in Nepali (IA).

Telugu (DR)

13 āviḍ ki ēḍup rānu u vaccin pro$_i$ kaṣṭam

4. a u - di
she da cryin com conj came she.no difficult
t g e- n m y
mīd āpukonu- u āpukondi
a
on stop- conjn stopped
‘She was about to cry (but) she controlled herself with difficulty.’

Literally: Crying came to her, but she even controlled it with difficulty.
Based on the fact that Bangla, Nepali (IA) and Telugu (DR) permit non-identical case-marked subjects in two conjuncts, we can tentatively conclude that coordination can be used as a piece of evidence to demonstrate that NNSs behave like nominative subjects.

<2$> 5.5 Nature of the predicate in DSC </2$>

We shall discuss the stative-nonstative nature of the DSC in *5.5.*1 and the

[-transitive] nature of the DSC in 5.5.2.

<3$> 5.5.1 [+/-Stative] nature of the verb in NNS constructions </3$>

In NNS constructions, the verb may be either be stative [(135) and (136)], or non-stative [(79) and (137)]. Krishnamurti (1975) proposes the term ‘en-stative’ (‘entering into a state’, as in ‘I came to know that’) for a set of predicates (Sridhar 1979).

[+STATIVE]

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

13	un	baccõ	ko	ya	bāt	mālū	thī
5.				h		m	
	thos	childre	da	thi	matt	know	wa
	e	n	t	s	er	n	s

‘Those children knew of this.’

Telugu (DR)

13	ā	pillala-	ki	ī	sang	telusu	aṭa
6.					ati	-	

thos childre da thi matt know ev

e n- t s er n- mkr

‘It seems that those children knew this thing.’

[-STATIVE]

Sentence (137) is an example with a [-stative] predicate[8].

Telugu (DR)

137. šānti ki eppuḍ ū kōpa m vastūn.ē unṭundi h

Shanti dat always anger coming.emp keeps

‘Shanti keeps getting angry all the time’

Kachru (1990: 67) discussing experiencer and other oblique subjects in Hindi (IA) points out that the dative subject occurs in transient psychological states. She further points out that transient psychological states, beliefs, knowledge, want, need, etcetra can be expressed with active [nominative subject—KVS] constructions too. To summarize, the predicates that take non-nominative subjects may be either stative or non-stative.

<3$> 5.5.2 [-transitive] nature of the verb in NNS

[8] Sentence (79) is a similar example from Hindi-Urdu (IA).

constructions </3$>

Pandharipande (1990), Jayaseelan (1990), Shibatani and Pardeshi (2001) and Subbarao (2001) and Subbarao and Bhaskararao (2004) claim that the predicate in NNS constructions is [-transitive]. Sigurdsson (2000) and Amritavalli (2004) claim that the predicate in NNS constructions is unaccusative.

In this section, we provide evidence from Hindi-Urdu (IA) and Telugu (DR), first in support of the claim that the predicate in NNS constructions is [- *transitive*]. We also show that the predicate in a DSC or passive is *non-subject-oriented*. We shall then examine the putative evidence from Bangla (IA), Tamil and Malayalam (DR), where the theme is accusative/dative case-marked, and demonstrate that the predicate in the DSC in those three languages too is [- *transitive*], and the accusative marker that occurs with the theme/patient is a specificity marker.

In support of our hypothesis that the predicate in NNS constructions is [- *transitive*], we provide three pieces of evidence: (i) no accusative case marking of the theme in Exceptional Case Marking cases in DSCs, (ii) the non-occurrence of complex anaphors in DSCs, and (iii) the non-availability of the passive in a DSC.

<4$> 5.5.2.1 Case marking </4$>

In sentences involving Exceptional Case Marking in SALs, the matrix verb assigns accusative case to the embedded subject and hence, it carries the accusative case marker.

(i) The case of Hindi-Urdu (IA):

In Hindi-Urdu, the verb *mān-nā* 'to consider' is [+ transitive], and hence, Sharmila, the derived direct object, in (138) carries the accusative case marker *ko,* while the dative predicate *lagnā* 'to appear' is [-transitive], and hence, accusative case marker *ko* in (139) is not permitted**.**

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

13	ham	sa	šarmilā	*ko*	īmāndār	mānte	rah
8.		b					e
	we.no	all	Sharmil	ac	trustworth	conside	kep
	m		a	c	y	r	t

'We all had been considering Sharmila trustworthy.'

13	ha	sa	*ko*	šarmilā	(*ko	īmāndār	lagī
9.	m	b			)		
	we	all	da	Sharmi	acc	trustwort	appear
			t	la		hy	ed

‘Sharmila appeared to be trustworthy to all of us.’

Sentence (138) is a case of Exceptional Case Marking and the verb *mānnā* ‘consider’ is [+transitive]. Hence, the predicate assigns accusative case to the patient *šarmilā* ‘Sharmila.’ In contrast, the dative predicate *lagnā* ‘appear’ in (139) is [-transitive]. So, it cannot assign accusative case to the theme/patient *šarmilā* ‘Sharmila’. The derived subject *šarmilā* does not permit the accusative case marker *ko* to occur in (139).

Further, evidence comes from the non-occurrence of complex/simplex anaphors in Hindi-Urdu (see Davison 2000 for a detailed discussion). An anaphor in an argument position subcategorized by the predicate requires it to be case-marked accusative or dative. Hence, if our hypothesis that dative predicates are [-transitive] is correct, a lexical anaphor (either complex or simplex) cannot be permitted, when the dative predicate is the case assigner. Sentence (140) proves the point.

14	*ha	sa	*ko*	apne	āp	(ko)	īmāndār	lage
0.	m	b						
	we	all	da	self+gen	self	acc	trustworthy	appeared
			t					

‘We all appeared to be trustworthy to ourselves.’

(Intended meaning)

Imperfect and perfect participial constructions in Hindi-Urdu too support our contention that the dative predicate is [-transitive] (Subbarao and Bhaskararao 2004). Sentence (141) with an imperfect participle is the result of exceptional case marking (accusative) of the embedded subject by the matrix verb *dekhnā* ‘to see’, a transitive verb.

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

14	surbhī	ne	*krit*	*ko*	nācte.h	dekh
1.			*i*		ue	ā
	Surab	er	Krit	ac	dancing	saw
	hi	g	i	c		

‘Surabhi saw Kriti dancing.’

If the matrix sentence has a dative predicate, the embedded subject cannot be case-marked accusative (142) as the dative predcate is [-transitive].

14	*surbhī	ko	*kriti*	*ko*	nācte.hue	dikhāyī.paṛ.ī
2.	Surabhi	dat	*Kriti*	*ac*	dancing	came visible
				c		

‘Kriti appeared to Surabhi to be dancing.’

(Intended meaning)

kriti ‘Kriti’ has to be in the nominative case because the dative

predicate *dikhāyī paṛnā* ‘to appear’, which is unaccusative, cannot accusative case-mark the embedded subject in (142). Hence, it is nominative case-marked in (143).

14	surbhī	ko	*kriti*	nācte.h	dikhāyī.pa
3.				ue	ṛ.ī
	Surab	da	*Kriti.*	dancing	came
	hi	t	*nom*		visible

‘Surabhi saw Kriti dancing.’

Similar evidence can be adduced with perfect participles too.

(ii) The case of Telugu (DR):

In the case of Telugu (DR), a similar phenomenon is seen (Subbarao and Bhaskararao 2004). The verb *bhāvincu* ‘consider’ is transitive, and can exceptionally case-mark the embedded subject *prasād* ‘Prasad’ accusative in (144).

Telugu (DR)

WITH A NOMINATIVE PREDICATE

14	nēn	*pras*	*ni*	nammakastu	gā	bhāvistunnā
4.	u	*ād*		ḍu-		-nu
	I.no	Pras	ac	trustworthy-	adj	consider-1 s
	m	ad	c		r	

‘I consider Prasad trustworthy.’

In contrast, the verb *anipincu* ‘feel’ is a dative predicate, and it

too permits exceptional case marking. If our hypothesis that dative predicates are [-transitive] is correct, then the embedded subject cannot be accusative case-marked by a dative predicate. If the embedded subject is nominative case-marked, the sentence is grammatical. Our prediction turns out to be correct in (145).

EXCEPTIONAL CASE MARKING WITH A DATIVE PREDICATE

145.	nā-ku	*prasād*	*(*ni*)	nammakastuḍu-	gā	anipistunnāḍu
	I-dat	Prasad	acc	trustworthy-	adjr	appears.2s,m

‘Prasad appears trustworthy to me.’

Thus, the evidence from case marking in Telugu (DR) and Hindi-Urdu (IA) shows that the predicate in NNS constructions is [-transitive]. There appears to be some putative counterevidence to our claim regarding the [-transitive] nature of dative predicates. In Tamil, Malayalam (DR), and Bangla (IA), a dative predicate and in Bodo (TB), a genitive predicate appears to assign a non-nominative case to the theme.

(iii) The case of Bangla (IA):

The theme which is [+animate] in Bangla (IA) carries the dative

case marker as in (146).

14	tomar[9]	kake	cai
6.	you.indire	who.a	wa
	ct	cc	nt

‘Whom do you want?

(Dasgupta 2004:135)

Creative errors made by Bangla learners/speakers of Hindi-Urdu show that the phenomenon of assigning accusative case marker to the theme is transferred to Hindi-Urdu as in (147).

Hindi-Urdu spoken by a Bangla learner/speaker

14	*āp	ko	kis	ko	cāhiye
7.	you	dat	who	acc	needed

‘Who do you want?’ (intended meaning)

In standard Hindi-Urdu (IA), in such cases the theme *kaun* ‘who’ is in the nominative case, as *cāhiye* ‘needed’ is [-transitive].

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

14	āp	ko	kaun	cāhiy
8.				e

[9] Dasgupta (2004:131) points out that *toma.r* which is generally glossed as ‘you.gen’ should be treated as an indirect case form. For a discussion on this, see Dasgupta, Ford and Singh (2000).

yo da who. need

u t nom ed

‘Who do you want?’

Let us first examine the Bangla (IA) data further. In Bangla, the features *animacy* and *specificity* play an important role in the assignment of the accusative case marker *ke* to the theme, just as in many Indo-Aryan languages, for example, in Hindi-Urdu (Mahajan 1990), and in Marwari (IA) (Magier 1987, 1990). The accusative case marker *ke* does not occur, when the theme is [-definite] and [-animate].

Bangla (IA)

14 rina r kichu bhal lage na

9. -

Rin ge any goo appear ne

a- n thing d g

‘Rina does not like any thing.’

15 rina r kono jiniš bhal lage na

0. -

Rin ge any thin goo appe ne

a- n g d ar g

‘Rina does not like any thing.’

(Probal Dasgupta, p.c.).

Note that the marker *ke* is not present with the theme *kichu* ‘any

thing’ and *kono jiniš* ‘any thing’ which clearly shows that *ke* is a marker that does not occur when the theme is [-definite] and [-animate]. If the theme is under focus or contrastive stress, the marker *ke* occurs in (151), as Probal Dasgupta (p.c.) points out.

THEME UNDER CONTRASTIVE FOCUS

15	rina-	r	kono	jiniš	*ke*-	i
1.	Rina-	gen	any	thin	ac	emp
				g	c-	h
	šotti-	bhal	lage	na		
	šotti[10]	o				
	really	goo	appe	neg		
		d	ar			

‘Rina does not like really any thing at all.’

Dasgupta further points out that the correlation between the behavior of the patient in the experiencer subject sentences [see (149) and (150)] and in the agent (nominative subject) sentences [see (152) and (153)] is exact. There is an interaction with *animacy* and *specificity*, but that interaction is identical in the two clause types. Note that the marker *ke* is not present in (152) and (153), while it is present in (154), when the theme is under

[10] *šotti- šotti* is a reduplicated form.

contrastive focus.

THEME (IN ITALICS) UNDER NEUTRAL FOCUS

15	rin	*kichu*	pɔchondo	kɔre	na
2.	a				
	Rin	any	liking	does	no
	a	thing			t

‘Rina does not like any thing.’

15	rin	*kono*	*jiniš*	pɔchon	kɔr	na
3.	a			do	e	
	Rin	any	thing	liking	doe	no
	a				s	t

‘Rina does not like any thing.’

THEME (IN ITALICS) UNDER CONTRASTIVE FOCUS

15	rin	*ko*	*jiniš*	*ke-*	*i*	šotti-	pɔchon	kɔr	na
4.	a	*no*				šotti	do	e	
	Rin	an	thin	ac	emp	really	liking	doe	no
	a	y	g	c-	h			s	t

‘Rina does not like really any thing at all.’

(Probal Dasgupta, p.c.)

Hence, we can conclude that the marker *ke* in Bangla in the nominative-accusative construction and the genitive-accusative construction is a *specificity marker,* and not an accusative marker, just as the marker *ko* in Hindi-Urdu (IA) which is treated

as a specificity marker (Mahajan 1990) and (Magier1987, 1990).

In the case of Malayalam and Tamil (DR) too, a similar fact is observed.

(iv) The case of Malayalam (DR):

We now provide evidence to show that the accusative marker *-ye* in Malayalam functions as a specificity marker. Sentence (155) is a DSC, and the accusative marker *ye* occurs with the theme *āna* 'elephant'.

Malayalam (DR)

15	*kuṭṭi*	*k'k*	āna-	*ye*	išṭa	āyi
5.	-	'ə			m	
	child	dat	elepha	ac	likin	beca
			nt-	c	g	me

'The child liked the elephant.'
(Jayaseelan 2004: 229)

Interestingly, this construction alternates with a nominative subject construction (156a). The accusative marker *ye* occurs with the theme.

Malayalam (DR)

156	*kuṭ*	āna-	*ye*	iṣṭa-	ppeṭ	u
a.	*ṭi*				ṭ-	
	chil	elepha	ac	liking	?-	ps
	d	nt-	c	-		t

‘The child liked the elephant.’
(Jayaseelan, ibid)

When the theme is [-animate] and [-definite], the accusative marker *ye* does not occur (156b).

156	*e*	*ik’k*	or	māŋŋa	vēṇa
b.	*n-*	*’ə*	u		m
	I-	dat	on	mango.n	want
			e	om	

‘I want a mango.’
(Jayaseelan 2004: 234)

Thus, the features *animacy and definiteness* explicate the occurrence of the accusative marker *ye,* and it is *not* the transitive nature of the predicate that is instrumental in its presence.

(v) The case of Tamil (DR):

Tamil (DR) permits an accusative case-marked theme in a DSC (Paramasivam 1979: 65–66, Lehmann 1989: 184, Schiffman 2000: 37). Lehmann (1989: ibid) labels such DSCs as the DAT-ACC pattern. According to him, the predicates that require this pattern are:

a) verbs of mental experience such as *teri* 'know', *puri* 'understand';

b) verbs of emotional experience such as *piṭi* 'like'; and

c) verbs of physical and biological experience such as *paci* 'be hungry', *vali* 'full pain'*, ari* 'itch', *kūcu* 'feel ticklish'.

Lehmann (ibid) treats these predicates as morphologically defective, as they exhibit agreement in the neuter. This, of course, is expected as there is no nominative case-marked subject to agree with. Hence, it should be treated as *default case* like in many other SALs such as Hindi-Urdu, Punjabi (IA) and Telugu (DR).

Tamil (DR)

15	kumā	ukk	int	ūr-	*ai.*	teri.y-	um
7.	r-	u	a		*t*		

Kuma dat thi plac ac know.fu 3s,neut

r- s e- c t- er

‘Kumar knows this place.’

(Lehmann ibid)

15 enikk ava *e* vēṇam

8. u n-

I.dat he- ac need(e

c d)

‘I need him.’

(Agesthialingom 1972: 8) as quoted in Sridhar (1979)

Note that in Tamil (DR) too, the features [+animacy] and [+ specificity] play a crucial role in the occurrence of the specificity marker as (159) and (160) indicate. In (159) and (160), the theme *inta eḍam* ‘this place’ is [+specific] and [-animate] and no accusative marker occurs with the theme.

15 kumā ukk int eḍa teriy m

9. r- u a m u-

Kuma dat thi plac know 3

r- s e - s

‘Kumar knows this place.’

16 kumā ukk int eḍa teri- yā- d

0. r- u a m u

Kuma dat thi plac kno ne 3

r- s e w- g- s

‘Kumar does not know this place.’

According to our language consultants P. Ananda Mohan, Vasanta Mohan and R. Nikhil (p.c.), even the [+human] patient *rāja* ‘Raja’ in (161) or *yār-um* ‘who-npi’ which is [-specific] and [+human] in (162) need not be case-marked by the accusative with the predicates *piṭik* ‘like’ in (161) and *teri* ‘know’ in (162).

16 kumār ukk rājā piṭi.kk- um

1. - u

Kumar dat Raja. like.fut- 3s neuter

- nom

‘Kumar likes Raja.’

16 kumār ukk yāru- m teri- yā- du[11]

2. - u

Kumar dat who. npi know- neg 3s

- nom- -

‘Kumar does not know anybody.’

In Bodo (TB), the adjective *mɯjaŋ* ‘good’ together with a tense

[11]Even when the patient or theme is in contrastive focus or under emphasis, the accusative marker is not needed as in (i).
Tamil (DR)

(i)kumār-ukkuyāru-m-eteri-yā-duKumardatwhonpialsoknowneg3s‘Kumar does not know anybody at all.’

marker imparts the meaning of ‘like’, and this predicate assigns genitive case *ha* ‘of’ to its subject. Recall that adjectives behave like verbs in many Tibeto-Burman languages (see Chapter 2 for details). The patient in such cases is accusative case-marked by *khɯu*.

Bodo (TB)

16	khamp	ha	laogi	khɯ	mɯja	mɯ
3.	ha		-	u	ŋ-	n
	Khamp	ge	Laog	acc	good-	pst
	ha	n	i-			

‘Khampha liked Laogi.’

We do not have further data to show that the accusative marker *khɯu* is a specificity marker in Bodo.

In conclusion, though the phenomenon of accusative/dative case marking of the theme in Bangla (IA), Malayalam and Tamil (DR) seems to suggest that the predicate in DSCs is [+transitive], we have demonstrated that the marker that occurs with the theme in such constructions is a marker of specificity and animacy as Magier (1987,[12] 1990) and Mahajan (1990) have shown for Mar-

[12]Magier (1987:192-93) clearly articulated that *ko* in Hindi does not “… convey relational information” when it occurs with "direct objects" but it “follows a semantic hierarchy of specificity and animacy that contributes to the overall salience of the marked object noun.”

wari and Hindi-Urdu (IA) respectively. Hence, predicates in NNS constructions are syntactically [-transitive]. We agree with Alice Davison (p.c.) who points out: “The issue of whether dative subject verbs are [+transitive] is complicated… the dative/ergative near minimal pairs in Hindi like *dekh-nā* ‘to see’ and *dikh-nā/dikhāī de-nā* ‘to be visible’ are both bivalent, i.e., transitive in argument structure, though the dative subject version does take intransitive vectors.” She points out the fact that dative subject predicates take small clauses and participial complement clauses shows their transitive nature. Hence, we feel that one may with reasonable certainty, conclude that dative predicates are *semantically transitive* but *syntactically intransitive*.

Since the object marker is not an accusative case marker, its occurrence does not count as counterevidence to the claim that the predicate in *non-nominative subject constructions is [-transitive]*.

Aissen (2003) discusses DOM, differential object marking, where some objects are case-marked, and some others are not depending upon the semantic and pragmatic features of object. Aissen points out that DOM depends on two features-*animacy and definiteness* and they compete with each other for dominance. While Persian prefers specificity, Hindi chooses

animacy. The case marking of theme in the DSC (dative/genitive subject constructon, to be very specific) in Bangla, Malayalam and Tamil for example by the accusative, we have observed, depends on animacy/specificity independent of transitivity in the [-NNS construction].

Recall that in nominative-accusative constructions too, the accusative marker is associated with *transitivity* and *animacy/specificity* and hence, should be treated as a specificity marker, as it denotes specificity (see, Magier 1987, 1990; Mahajan 1990).

Thus, with regard to differential object marking (DOM) in SALs, when the accusative case marker denoting specificity occurs, the predicate is [-transitive] in the DSC (dative/genitive subject constructon), and the predicate is [+transitive] in the nominative subject construction. Based on these facts, we propose the following parameter to account for this variation:

The Differential Object Marking (DOM) parameter: When the noun phrase is accusative case-marked, the object marker is either associated with transitivity and animacy/specificity in the [+ NNS construction][13], or purely animacy/specificity independent of

[13] Thanks to Alice Davison for the formulation of this parameter.

transitivity in the [-NNS construction].

Discussing accusative case in Kannada, Lidz (2006) notes that there are two kinds of specificity: positional and inherent. Inherent specificity means case-marked NPs independent of their position in a sentence get a specific interpretation. Non-case-marked NPs too can get specific interpretation depending on the position of occurrence, which he labels as positional specificity. The accusative marking in DSCs in Tamil, Malayalam (DR) and Bangla (IA) comes under inherent specificity.

<4$> 5.5.2.2 Anaphors </4$>

The second piece of evidence comes from anaphors in Telugu (DR) (Subbarao and Bhaskararao 2004).

When the matrix sentence has a nominative predicate and the embedded subject is co-indexed with the matrix subject and ECM takes place, a reduplicated anaphor can occur as in (164).

Telugu (DR)

16	mādhu	tan	ni	tan	andagat	gā	bhāvistundi
4.	ri	a-		u	te-		

Madhu	self-	ac	self	pretty-	adj	considers-3
ri		c			r	s.nm

‘Madhuri considers herself pretty.’
(Subbarao and Bhaskararao 2004: 178)

However, when the matrix sentence has a dative predicate, only the simplex form of the anaphor in nominative case can occur, and a reduplicated form in accusative case is not permitted as in (165).

16	pratī.vāḍi-	kī	tanu/	*tana	ni	tanu
5.				-		
	every.fello	dat	self	self-	ac	self.
	w-		nom		c	nom
	goppavāḍ	ani/	gā	anipistā		
	u			ḍu		
	great.pers	COM	COMP	appears		
	on	P				

‘Every fellow thinks that he is great.’

A complex anaphor is not permitted due to the fact that the matrix verb which is [-transitive] cannot assign accusative case to the embedded subject by Exceptional Case Markng (ECM) unless the verb is [+transitive] as in (164). That is, NNS predicates cannot exceptionally case-mark and hence, they are [-

transitive].

<4$> 5.5.2.3 Passivization </4$>

Bhatt (1999) demonstrates that sentences with a dative subject do not passivize in Kashmiri. This phenomenon is found in other SALs too.

Kashmiri (IA)

16	*rā	an	vuch	[hum	laṛk	as	yi	kūr
6.	m-			is	-			
	Ram	erg	saw	that	boy	da	thi	girl
	-				-	t	s	(nom)
	khar	ni	yiv-	ān]				
	-							
	hate	pa	com	impe				
	-	ss	e-	rf				

‘Ram saw the boy being hated by the girl.’

(Bhatt 1999: 201)

Dative/genitive predicates are similar to anti-causatives, as both are [-transitive] in nature. Alexiadou, Anagnostopolou and Schafer (2006) point out that anticausatives cannot be modified by “*by*- phrases, agent-oriented adverbs and allow control into

purpose clauses.” The passive sentence (166) from Kashmiri (IA) supports this hypothesis.

We present further evidence which shows that the predicate in the DSC behaves like an anticausative. These include: (i) The non-occurrence of agent-oriented adverbs in DSCs, and (ii) the dative subject as a controllee in purpose clauses.

<3$> 5.5.3 Agent-oriented adverbs </3$>

Agent-oriented adverbs (in *italics* in (167)) are *not* permitted in DSCs in SALs. This is due to the fact that the predicate in a DSC is non-volitional.

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

16	*mādhur	ko	is	bāt	pa	*jān būjh kar*	guss	ā	
7.	ī				r		ā	gayā	
	Madhuri	da	thi	new	on	intensionall	ange	*came*	
		t	s	s		y	r		
	‘Madhuri’s	anger	went	up	intensionally	at	this	news’	

(intended meaning)

In Telugu and the other Dravidian languages too such sentences are not permitted.

<3$> 5.5.4 The dative subject as a controllee </3$>

The dative subject cannot be a *controllee* in purpose clauses in

Hindi-Urdu and Kashmiri (IA).

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

16	*urmil	[PRO$_i$	bhūk	lagne	ke	rasoī	m	gay
8.	ā$_i$	dat	h		liye]		ẽ	ī
	Urmila	(controll	hung	feel.in	to	kitche	in	we
		ee)	er	order		n		nt

‘*Urmila went into the kitchen in order to feel hungry.’ (literal)

Kashmiri (IA) too does not permit such sentences.

In contrast, the dative subject can be a *controllee* in purpose clauses in Telugu (DR).

Telugu (DR)

16	ḍākṭaru	gāru$_i$	[PRO$_i$ dat	jvara	tagga-
9.				m	
	doctor	polite mkr	(controllee)	fever	become
					less-
	ḍāni ki]	mandu	tīsukonṭunnār		
			u		

in order *medicine* *is taking*

to

'The doctor$_i$ is taking some medicine in order to bring his$_i$ fever down.'

Further research into this phenomenon needs to be done.[14]

To summarize, we have provided several pieces of evidence to show that the predicate in NNS constructions is *[-transitive].* These include: (i) accusative case marking of the theme/patient, (ii) the non-occurrence of complex anaphors in NNS constructions, and (iii) the inability of NNS predicates to passivize. We have also discussed the non-occurrence of agent-oriented adverbs in DSCs and the dative subject as a controllee in purpose clauses.

<2$> 5.6 Inherent case assignment in DSCs </2$>

It is generally accepted that dative subjects are universally *inherently case-marked*, and it is the transitive verb that assigns inherent case. In this section we wish to argue that an intransitive verb together with theme or an adjective compositionally assigns non-nominative (dative or locative) case to the subject vP-

[14] See the papers in Bhaskararao and Subbarao (2004) for some discussion on this issue.

internally in the thematic (lower) S.

Jayaseelan (1991) argues that inherent case is assigned compositionally in the DSC. Davison (2004) too treats dative case assignment in DSCs as *inherent case*. According to her, "(D)ative lexical case does not require checking outside of VP" [as inherent case need not be checked—KVS] (Davison 2004: 153). We further argue that for such case assignment to take place, information concerning agreement too must be available vP-internally (in the lower thematic S).

We now provide evidence in support of our contention concerning inherent case assignment compositionally by the predicate.

<3$> 5.6.1 Default agreement and inherent case marking </3$>

Consider the following sentences from Telugu (DR) in which the (a) sentences have a nominative subject and the (b) sentences have a non-nominative subject. The predicate is *identical* in all sentences except for agreement. The verb is *un~unn* 'be' and the predicate adjective is *kōpam gā* 'angry' in all the sentences (Subbarao and Bhaskararao 2004).

170 a.	vāḍu$_i$	kōpam-	gā	unnā-	*ḍu$_i$*
	he	anger-	adjr	be-	3s, m
	‘He is angry.’				
170 b	vāḍi$_i$-	*ki*	kōpam-	gā	un-	*di$_{*i}$*
	he.gen -	da t	anger-	adjr	be-	3 s [default]
	‘He is angry.’					
171 a.	ām e$_i$	kōpam-	gā	un-	*di$_i$*	
	she	anger-	adjr	be-	3 s,nm [+animate]	
	‘She is angry.’					
171b.	āme$_i$ -	*ki*	kōpam-	gā	un-	*di$_{*i}$*
	she-	da t	anger-	adj r	be-	3 [default] s,nm
	‘She is angry.’					

In (170a), the verb agrees with the subject *vāḍu* ‘he’ in 3 singular, masculine. In (170b), the verb *does not agree* with the subject, as it is dative case-marked, and there is no other DP in the nominative case. *kōpam-gā* ‘angry’ is an adjective, and hence, no agreement of the verb with an adjective. The verb, therefore exhibits *default agreement,* which is *3 person singular non-masculine* in Telugu.

In (171a), the verb agrees with the subject *āme* ‘she’ in 3 singular non-masculine [+animate]. In (171b), the verb does not agree with the subject, as it is dative case-marked and hence, exhibits default agreement.

Our claim is: when there is a predicate adjective and the verb exhibits default agreement; the subject is inherently assigned *non-nominative case* (dative or locative) by the predicate compositionally. When the verb exhibits person agreement in masculine or non-masculine [+animate], the subject is in the nominative case. That is, the feature *[+/- animate]* plays a role in case assignment. Alice Davison (p.c.) suggests that default agreement in T should be the consequence of non-nominatve case, rather than the way it is suggested here.[15] We leave the issue open for further research.

We observe that the verb phrase in (a) and (b) sentences is identical. What really distinguishes (a) sentences from (b) sentences is *agreement*. While (a) sentences exhibit subject-verb agreement, (b) sentences exhibit default agreement. The verb *un* cannot alone assign inherent case to its subject. The adjective +

[15] Rajesh Bhatt (p.c.) supports Alice Davison’s contention.

verb *be* + default agreement together play a crucial role in assigning inherent case to the subject in (b) sentences. This implies that information concerning agreement should be available in the lower thematic S for the proper assignment of inherent case to the subject. Since the occurrence of the dative case on the subject in our approach is the result of the feature agreement found in the lower thematic S, it appears that it is *not* what bottom to top MERGE/checking would derive.

<3$> 5.6.2 Complex predicates and verb agreement </3$>

In Telugu (DR), there are several complex predicates that can take either a nominative subject or a dative subject. Such case assignment depends on the nature of the verbal agreement suffix. We shall demonstrate that the feature [+/- animate] plays a crucial role. These predicates include:

Telugu (DR)

	Noun	light verb	Meaning
1.	vaḷḷu ‘body’	cēyu ‘do’	‘to become fat’
2.	picci ‘craziness’	ekku ‘climb’	‘to go crazy’
3.	picci ‘craziness’	lēcu ‘wake up’	‘to go crazy’
4.	badili ‘transfer’	avvu ‘be-	‘to be tranfered’ or ‘to be

		come’	shifted’
5.	kovvu ‘fat’	ekku ‘climb’	‘to become arrogant’
6.	kovvu ‘fat’	baliyu ‘in-crease’	‘to become arrogant’
7.	ṭhār ‘panicki-ness’	etti pōvu ‘raise’	‘to become panicky’

While the verb in the nominative subject construction agrees with the subject, the verb in the non-nominative (dative subject) construction agrees with the theme.

Nominative subject construction

17	āviḍ	picci$_j$	ekkipōyin-		di$_{i,*j}$
2.	a$_i$				
	she	crazine ss	climb-		3 s, nm [+animate]
	‘She went crazy.’				
17	āviḍ	ki$_i$	picci$_j$	ekkipōyi	di$_{*i,j}$
3.	a			n-	
	she	dat	crazine ss	climb-	3 s,nm [-animate]

‘She went crazy.’ (Lit: Craziness climbed on to her.’).

Sentences (172) and (173) differ in the feature *animacy* with regard to agreement.

If the agreement marker is coindexed with the subject as in (171), the case that is assigned to the subject is nominative. If the agreement marker is coindexed with the theme as in (172), the case that is assigned to the subject is non-nominative. Hence, for the proper assignment of case to the subject, the complex predicate plus information concerning *animacy* in the agr phrase are required[16].

We have shown earlier that the predicate in a DSC in Telugu is [-transitive]. There are verbs in Telugu which are transitive in the nominative-accusative construction, and are also used in the DSC. The set includes: *pōyu* ‘to pour’, ‘to serve’, ‘to pass some thing e.g., urine’; *oppu* ‘to agree’; *vēyu* ‘to put’, ‘to keep’, ‘to serve’, ‘to wear’, ‘to take some thing, e.g., medicine’; *peṭṭu* ‘to put’, ‘to keep’, ‘to insert’; *tappu* ‘to miss’; *tippu* ‘to turn’, ‘to take

[16] Though AGR-phrase is dispened with in Chomsky 1995, our analysis shows that agreement does play a role in dative case assignment. Further, the fact that quantifiers, emphatics, negative and negative polarity items are incorporated as a part of the auxiliary in Tibeto-Burman languages and Khasi (see chapter 4 for an elaborate discussion) shows that the notion of AGR phrase needs to be incorporated in the theory and it cannot be dispensed with, as Subbarao (1998) argued.

someone around’; *tōyu* ‘to push’; *paṭṭu* ‘to catch’; *āḍu* ‘to play’; *tagulu* ‘to touch’; *koṭṭu* ‘to hit’; *mottu* ‘to hit’; *kaṭṭu* ‘to tie’; *vācu* ‘to have a swelling’; *kalugu* ‘to have’; *ekku* ‘climb.’ The verb is used *transitively* in (174) in a nominative-accusative sentence and intransitively in (175).

17	āme$_i$	pillala-	ki	cokk	*vēs-*	in-	di$_{i,*j}$
4.				ā$_j$			
	she.no	childre	da	shirt	put.o	pst	3 s, nm
	m	n-	t		n-	-	[+animate]

‘She put the shirt on the children.’

In (175) the same verb is used in the DSC.

17	ām	*ki*	cali	*vēs-*	in-	di$_{*i,j}$
5.	e$_i$		$_j$			
	she	da	col	put.o	pst	3 s,nm [-
		t	d	n-	-	animate]

‘She felt cold.’

The theme *cokkā* ‘shirt’ in sentence (174) is structurally case-marked accusative, and the accusative marker is null. In contrast, the theme *cali* ‘cold’ in (175) is nominative case-marked and accusative case-marking on the theme is not permitted (176).

17 *ām ki cali ni vēsin- $di_{*i,j}$

6. e_{i} $_{j}$

she da col ac put.o 3 s,nm [-

t d c n- animate]

Intended meaning: ‘She felt cold.’

Further, the verb in (174) does not agree with the theme, whereas it invariably agrees with the theme in the nominative in (175). We have already shown that the theme and verb together assign theta role to the subject in the DSC. We now propose that the theme and the verb together assign inherent case to the subject *vP-internally* in the lower (thematic) clause in view of the following points.

If it is only the verb that assigns inherent case to the subject in (174), the question that needs to be answered is: Why doesn’t the same verb assign inherent case to the subject in (175)? It is because of the transitive nature of the verb in (174) that the theme is accusative case-marked, while it needs to be explained why the theme in (175) cannot be accusative case-marked, as the ungrammaticality of (176) shows.

One might say that there are two different sets of transitive verbs which are homophonous and a specific set (call it Set A) assigns inherent case while the other set (call it Set B) assigns

nominative case. Such an assertion is counter-intuitive, and it is not clear how such a stipulation can be formulated and implemented in the grammar of a language. Hence, we conclude that it is the theme/adjective together compositionally with the predicate that assigns dative case to the subject.

<3$> 5.6.3 The role of tense </3$>

The third piece of evidence concerning inherent case assignment comes from the role of *tense*. Jayaseelan (1999: 105) demonstrates that it is *not just the complex predicate alone* that is sufficient to assign an inherent non-nominative case, but a functional head such as *Tense* plays a crucial role. A predicate such as *iṣṭappeṭ* 'like' takes a *nominative subject* (177a)*,* when the tense marker is *present,* and it takes a *dative subject* in *past tense* (178a).

Malayalam (DR)

NOMINATIVE SUBJECT IN PRESENT TENSE – GRAMMATICAL

177 awaḷ awa e iṣṭappeṭuṉṉu

a. n-

she- he- ac like-pres

nom c indicative

‘She likes him.’

DATIVE SUBJECT IN PAST TENSE - GRAMMATICAL

178 awaḷ kk awa e iṣṭappeṭ

a. a- ə n- ṭu

she- da he- ac like-pst

t c

‘She liked him.’

(Jayaseelan, ibid)

Sentence (177b) with the dative subject in *present* tense is ungrammatical according to Jayaseelan.

Dative subject in *present* tense – ungrammatical

177 *awaḷ kk awa e iṣṭappeṭuṉṉu

b. a- ə n-

she- da he- ac like-pres

t c indicative

‘She liked him.’

When the predicate *iṣṭappeṭ* ‘like’ occurs in past tense, nomina-

tive *subject is* questionable.

Nominative subject in *past* tense - questionable

178	?	awa	e	iṣṭappeṭ
b.	awaḷ	n-		ṭu
	she	he-	ac	like-pst
			c	

'She liked him.'

According to Jayaseelan (ibid), the dative case marker is assigned to the subject "at the point where *iṣṭappeṭ* and the past tense marker are put together" [That is, MERGE — KVS][17].

<3$> 5.6.4 The role of aspect </3$>

In Malayalam (DR), the functional category *aspect* too plays a role in case assignment. In (179) and (180) the verb is the same, namely, *pō* 'go'. The aspect marker –*ām* signifies permission, and it requires a dative case marker with the subject in (179), while the subject in (180) is nominative marker, as the predicate is in present tense, and the aspect marker –*ām* is not present (Jayaseelan 1999: 103).

[17]Sobha Nair and Sreekumar (p.c.) inform me that they find (178b) grammatical, in which case *tense has no role to play* in their dialect in the assignment of dative case. They further point out that the nominative as well as the dative subject are both permitted in future tense too.
Dative subject in *future* tense- grammatical
(i)awaḷa-kkəawan-eiṣṭappeṭumshe-dathe-acclike.fut'She will like him.'*Nominative* subject in *future* tense- grammatical
(ii)awaḷawan-eiṣṭappeṭunnushehe-acclike.pres'She liked him.'

17	niŋaḷ-	kk	pōk	ām
9.		ə	-	
	you-	dat	go-	permissi
				on

‘You may go.’

18	awaḷ	pōk	unnu
0.		-	
	she	go-	prese
	(nom)		nt

‘She goes.’

(Jayaseelan 1999: ibid)

In Hindi-Urdu (IA) as well, modals play a role in the assignment of dative case. The modal *sak-nā* ‘to be able to’ takes a nominative subject, as in (181), while the modal *cāhiye* ‘must’ requires a dative subject as in (182).

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

18	bacce	ghar	jā	sakt	hãĩ
1.				e	
	children	hom	go	can	pres
	(nom)	e			

‘The children can go home.’

18	baccõ	ko	ghar	jā-	nā	cāhiy
2.						e

childre	da	hom	go	inf	must
n	t	e	-		

‘The children must go home.’

To summarize, different modals have lexical selection restrictions which are language specific.

<3$> 5.6.5 The role of the verb ‘come’ </3$>

In Telugu (DR) and many SALs, the verb ‘come’ is a verb of motion in the nominative case. It has an extended sense with a dative subject as a kind of reanalyzed end point/goal. It also denotes possession of knowledge or skill and the subject of possessor of knowledge or skill is case-marked dative/genitive.

Telugu (DR)

vac ‘come’ as a verb of motion

183.	peḷḷivāḷḷu	viḍidi	ki	vaccē	r(u)-	ā
	bridegroom’s.family.nom	guesthouse	*to*	*came-*	*3p,hy/nqmmkr*	

‘Has the bridegroom’s family arrived at the guesthouse?’

vac ‘come’ as a verb indicating knowledge

18 ām ki hind bāg vacc(

4. e ī ā u)
sh da Hin wel come

e t di l s
‘She knows Hindi well.’

vac ‘come’ as a verb indicating skill [(74) repeated here].

7 vāḷḷ ammāyi- *ki* sangīta vacc

4. a m u
thei daughte da music come

r r- t s
‘Their daughter has the knowledge

of music.’

Verb ‘come’ is used in Hindi-Urdu, Nepali (IA) and Newari (TB) (T.K. Kansakar, p.c.) too as a verb of motion, and to denote possession of knowledge and skill.

Hindi-Urdu (IA)

ā ‘come’ as a verb of motion

18 pratimā daftar se āyī
Pratima office from came

‘Pratima came back home

5. from office.’

ā ‘come’ as a verb indicating knowledge [sentence (73) repeated here].

7	is	panjā	laṛk	*ko*	bharat nāṭyam$_j$	ātā$_{*i}$	thā$_{*i}$
3.		bī	ī$_i$			,j	,j
	thi	Punja	girl	da	classical Indian	com	was
	s	bi		t	dance	e	

‘This Punjabi girl used to know the classical Indian dance.’

Note that the verb *ā* ‘come’ in Hindi-Urdu (IA) by itself cannot assign dative case inherently to its subject as the verb does not have any information about the nature of activity that it represents. Combined with the theme which involves knowledge or a skill, the verb *ā* ‘come’ forms a complex predicate and only then would it be able to assign dative case to its subject.

Thus, a predicate with subject and other constituents pro-dropped in Telugu (DR) or Hindi-Urdu (IA) is ambiguous between the nominative subject and dative subject readings. The following dialog from Telugu (DR) is illustrative.

Telugu (DR)

186 a.	mādhu ri	rātri	ki	vastund(i)-	ā
	Madhu	nigh	da	comes.3 s,nm	*pol*
	ri	t	t		*q*
	‘Will Madhuri come tonight?’				
186 b.	pro	pro	vastundi comes.3 s, nm		
	‘She’ll come.’				
187 a.	mādhu ri	ki	telugu	vastund(i)-	ā
	Madhu	dat	Telugu	comes.3	*pol*
	ri			s,nm-	*q*
	‘Does Madhuri know Telugu?’				
187 b.	pro	pro	vastundi comes.3 s, nm		
	‘She knows it.’				

A similar ambiguous reading obtains in Hindi-Urdu (IA) and many other SALs.

Thus, empirical facts from Telugu, Malayalam (DR) and Hindi-Urdu (IA) strongly support the view that it is not the verb alone that assigns inherent case to its subject, but it is the verb together with the theme/adjective, nature of the modal, or tense, and default agreement that play a crucial role in inherent case

assignment to the subject. And for such case assignment to take place, it is crucial that information concerning agreement be available vP-internally in the thematic S in some cases.

At this point we wish to summarize the discussion so far and present the salient features of the non-nominative subject constructions in SALs. As the ergative-absolutive construction stands apart, we exclude it in this summary.

(i) It is the dative/genitive subject construction that is quite predominant in occurrence with a variety of semantic predicates.

(ii) While IA languages have either the dative or the genitive with the subject depending on the nature of the predicate, in Dravidian languages, it is mostly the dative that occurs. In possession, the locative occurs in IA as well as Dravidian. Bangla and Assamese are the IA languages that have the genitive in most of its non-nominative constructions. Some Tibeto-Burman and Munda languages too have the non-nominative construction.

(iii) The occurrence of the case marker is language specific and it depends on the semantic nature of the predicate (Sridhar 1979, Masica 1976, 1993, Mohanan and Mohanan 1990). As Mahajan (2004: 290) puts it: “the shape of the non-nominative morpheme is lexically stipulated using lexical linking rules.” He further adds:

“notions such as GOAL, POSSESSION, CONSCIOUS CHOICE and INTERNAL ABILITY play a crucial role.” The use of capitals letters indicates that the notions are semantic predicates. To this we may add notions such as OBLIGATION, NECESSITY, EMOTIONS, DESIRE etcetra. It should be underscored that this is a limited set.

(iv) The non-nominative subject lacks agentive theta role, and hence, the predicates are [-volitional].

(v) The NNS construction is predominantly found in verb-final languages, though it is also found in some non-verb-final languages such as Icelandic, Russian and Finnish.

(vi) The predicate in a non-nominative construction is [-transitive], and hence, it does not have the capacity to mark the theme accusative. The apparent accusative marker that occurs in the dative and genitive subject constructions in some languages is a specificity marker, not an accusative case marker.

(vii) The theme in such cases gets nominative case from the Tense (INFL) of the clause.

(viii) It is the semantic nature of the predicate that determines what type of case marking the logical subject gets.

(ix) Agreement and features such as [+animate] play an important role in inherent case assignment.

(x) As Jayaseelan (1991) first argued, inherent case is *compositionally assigned*. It is assigned vP-internally in the thematic S, and it is the verb together with the theme/adjective, nature of the modal, or tense, or COMP and default agreement that play a crucial role in inherent case assignment to subject.

(xi) It is the [+/-finite] nature of the COMP together with the matrix verb *be* that is instrumental in assigning nominative or dative case to the matrix subject, and such assignment has to be done *compositionally.*