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1 Introduction

The point of the paper: explain the subject case marking on constructions from Urdu/Hindi such as the following:1

(1) a. nina=ko bʰ hay hē
   Nina.Fem.Sg.Obl=Dat fear.Masc.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg
   ‘Nina is afraid.’ Mohanan (1994, p. 172)

   b. nina=mē bʰ hay hē
   Nina.Fem.Sg.Obl=Loc₁ in fear.Masc.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg
   ‘Nina is fearful.’ (lit. ‘There is fear in Nina.’) Mohanan (1994, p. 172)

(2) a. nina=ko pyar hē
   Nina.Fem.Sg.Obl=Dat love.Fem.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg
   ‘Nina is in love.’

   b. nina=mē pyar hē
   Nina.Fem.Sg.Obl=Loc₁ in love.Fem.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg
   ‘Nina is full of love.’ (lit. ‘There is love in Nina.’)

(3) a. nina=ko bʰ oḥt kʰ āsi hē
   Nina.Fem.Sg.Obl=Dat much cough.Fem.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg
   ‘Nina has a severe cough.’ Mohanan (1994, p. 172)

   b. *nina=mē bʰ oḥt kʰ āsi hē
   Nina.Fem.Sg.Obl=Loc₁ in much cough.Fem.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg
   Mohanan (1994, p. 172)

Observations:

- oblique subjects: either dative or locative case marking;
- verb ho ‘be’;
- abstract relational nouns: pyar ‘love’, bʰ ay ‘fear’, nafrat ‘hate’ etc.;
- illnesses: kʰ āsi ‘cough’, bʰ oxhr ‘fever’ etc.;
- for abstract relational nouns, case marking alternates between locative and dative;
- for illnesses, dative case is obligatory.

---

1I would like to thank my informants Qaiser Abbas, Tafseer Ahmed, Rajesh Bhatt, Miriam Butt, Asad Mustafa and Ghulam Raza for their valuable comments and grammaticality judgments. Their linguistic backgrounds differ; yet each of the data were confirmed by several of them.
Mohanan (1994), citing Kachru (1970) and Pandharipande (1981), was the first to acknowledge these patterns of case marking and gave the following explanation:

While -ko encodes the abstract location of a temporary state, such as happiness or worry, or a temporary fear [...] -mê expresses the location of a characteristic attribute that is relatively permanent, such as a fearful disposition, [...] When the state is inherently temporary, as in the event of a cough or a fever, the use of -mê is disallowed, perhaps because abstract containment cannot be extended to temporary states [...] Mohanan (1994)

→ the semantics of the case markers involved account for the different readings
→ dative =ko encodes temporary properties, locative =mê encodes permanent properties

1.1 Problems with Mohanan’s (1994) Explanation

• the explanation does not predict the ungrammaticality of (4b) over (4a)
• if the only difference were in the choice of the case marker, we would simply predict a different interpretation (something along the lines of (4b) expressing a more permanent state of “being in search” than (4a)), but not ungrammaticality of (4b)

(4) a. nina=ko tulaš hε
   Nina.Fem.Sg.Obl=Dat search.Fem.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg
   ‘Nina is searching.’

   b. *nina=mê tulaš hε
     Nina.Fem.Sg.Obl=Loc search.Fem.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg

• the explanation does not predict the ungrammaticality of (5b) over (5a)
• if the only difference were in the choice of the case marker, we would simply predict a different interpretation (something along the lines of (5b) expressing a more permanent love relation towards yasin than (5a)), but not ungrammaticality of (5b)

(5) a. nina=ko yasin=se buhut pyar hε
   Nina.Fem.Sg.Obl=Dat Yassin.Masc.Sg.Obl=Inst much love.Fem.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg
   ‘Nina carries much love (in her) for Yassin.’ ~ ‘Nina is in love with Yassin.’

   b. *nina=mên yasin=se buhut pyar hε

2 A New Proposal

I suggest a novel explanation of the data based on a difference in the argument structure of the nominals involved.

• main argument: the constructions in (1a) vs. (1b) and (2a) vs. (2b) are not the same syntactically — they differ in their argument structure
• by consequence, they differ in their status as complex predicates (CPs): will argue that while (1a) and (2a) constitute CPs, (1b) and (2b) do not form CPs, but are copula constructions
• (1a) and (2a): relational nouns (bʰay ‘fear’ and pyar ‘love’), taking two semantic arguments – an experiencer and an instrumental
• instrumental does not surface in (1a) and (2a), but does surface in e.g. (5a)

→ will refer to these as dative experiencer constructions in this talk
• (1b) and (2b): not relational nouns; abstract nouns such as b₃hay ‘fear’ and pyar ‘love’ seem to be ambiguous in Hindi/Urdu between an argument-taking version and a non-argument-taking version (Grimshaw, 1990)²

• (1b) and (2b): essentially existential locative constructions in the sense of Freeze (1992); can be derived from predicate locatives via locative inversion (Freeze, 1992, Bresnan and Kanerva, 1989, Landau, 2010) → will refer to these as locative experiencer constructions in this talk

2.1 Further Details

• Consider (6a) vs. (6b): I argue that syntactically, they are identical. The case marking and argument structure evidence supports this assumption. The only difference is that in (6a), the location is an abstract one in a sense, thus requiring a sentient subject.

\[
\begin{align*}
(6) \text{ a. } & \text{nina}=mē \quad b₃hay \quad hɛ\; \text{Nina.Fem.Sg.Obl=Locin fear.Masc.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg}\; \text{‘Nina is fearful.’ (lit.: ‘There is fear in Nina.’)} \quad \text{Mohanan (1994, p. 172)} \\
& \text{b. } \text{kumre}=mē \quad \text{admi} \quad hɛ\; \text{room.Masc.Sg.Obl=Locin man.Masc.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg}\; \text{‘There is a man in the room.’} \quad \text{Freeze (1992, p. 555)}
\end{align*}
\]

• (1b), (2b), (6a) not analyzed as CPs in the sense of Butt (1995): their argument structure is not complex (the noun does not contribute any arguments).

• Consider (7a) vs. (7b). (7a) is a dative experiencer construction, (7b) a locative experiencer construction.

\[
\begin{align*}
(7) \text{ a. } & \text{nina}=\text{ko} \quad \text{yasin}=\text{se} \quad \text{b₃hut pyar} \quad hɛ\; \text{Nina.Fem.Sg.Obl=Dat Yassin.Masc.Sg.Obl=Inst much love.Fem.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg}\; \text{‘Nina is in love with Yassin.’} \\
& \text{b. } \text{nina}=mē \quad \text{yasin}=\text{ke liye} \quad \text{b₃hut pyar} \quad hɛ\; \text{Nina.Fem.Sg.Obl=Locin Yassin.Masc.Sg.Obl=for much love.Fem.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg}\; \text{‘Nina carries much love (in her) for Yassin.’} \sim \text{‘Nina is in love with Yassin.’}
\end{align*}
\]

• (7a) is considered a CP, since the relational noun pyar licenses a se-marked argument. (7b) is not considered a CP, since the non-relational noun pyar does not contribute any arguments; the phrase marked by the complex postposition ke liye ‘for’ is a sentence-level adjunct — ke liye generally marks adjuncts in Urdu/Hindi.

• Further arguments for this separation below.

3 Complex Predicates

• complex predicates are pervasive in Urdu/Hindi — the language has about 700 simple verbs, almost all other verbal predication is achieved via complex predication

• complex predicates in Urdu/Hindi have been thoroughly analyzed in e.g. Butt (1995, 2003, 2010), Ahmed and Butt (2011), Mohanan (1994) and references in all of these

• a major step in analyzing the data in (1)–(7) is to determine their status (i.e. whether they are CPs or not)

• the definition of a complex predicate, given in Butt (1995, p. 2), is repeated below; based on this definition, we will examine the present data

²There are other nouns which are not ambiguous: some nouns never take arguments, other nouns obligatorily take arguments; more in Section 5.
3.1 Definition of a Complex Predicate

Due to Butt (1995, p. 2):

- The argument structure is complex (two or more semantic heads contribute arguments).
- The grammatical functional structure is that of a simple predicate. It is flat: there is only a single predicate (a nuclear pred) and a single subject.
- The phrase structure may be either simple or complex. It does not necessarily determine the status of the complex predicate.

(8) nadya=ko hatʰi=se ḏʰar log-a
‘Nadya was frightened by the elephant.’

- noun-verb complex predicate;
- complex argument structure: light verb log ‘attach’ selects two arguments (“attachee” and “thing attached”) , ḏʰar ‘fear’ one argument (“thing being feared”);
- simple grammatical functional structure: no embeddings;
- light verb log ‘attach’ assigns case to the subject, carries aspectual features, agrees.

![F-Structure for (8)](image)

3.2 Polyclausal vs. Monoclausal Structures

- Butt (1995): provides tests based on agreement, control, anaphora;
- problem: the tests are designed so as to distinguish monoclusal, non-embedding, CP structures from polyclausal, embedding, non-CP structures;

→ the constructions in (1)–(7) are unmistakably monoclausal in nature (only a single verbal element)
→ the open question is whether they constitute copula constructions (XCOMP/PREDLINK) as in (9) or CPs as in (10)³

(9) ho < SUBJ, XCOMP/PREDLINK >

(10) ho < SUBJ, %PRED2 < ... > >

³The notation here is inspired by the XLE implementation of copula clauses and complex predicates. In (9), ho is a copula encoded to select for a SUBJ and either an XCOMP or a PREDLINK, depending on how you think about copula predication (see also Tibor Laczko’s talk on Sunday). In (10), ho is a light verb selecting for a SUBJ and another predicate, which in turn provides argument(s) to the clause.
3.3 Copula vs. CP Analysis

- Raza (2011): lists several uses of the verb *ho* ‘be’; mentions that *ho* may also be used as a light verb in noun-verb CPs
- in these cases, the noun is in itself a predicator that introduces an argument
- according to Raza (2011), the nominal predicators may **not** be coordinated, see (11); crucially, coordination is also not allowed in (11c), which is a dative experiencer construction
- coordination is possible in copula constructions, see (12); crucially, coordination is also possible in (12c), which is a locative experiencer construction

(11) a. ali=xobar  he:  [ kh ...  
   Ali.Masc.Sg.Obl=Dat news.Masc.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg  Comp ...  
   ‘Ali knows that ...’

b. *ali=xobar  or  xasa  he:  [ kh ...  
   Ali.Masc.Sg.Obl=Dat news.Masc.Sg.Nom and anger.Masc.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg  Comp ...  

c. *nina=ko  yasin=se  pyar or  izzat  he:  [ kh ...  
   be.Pres.3PSg

(12) a. nina  ghbar=mē  he:  
   Nina.Fem.Sg.Nom house.Masc.Sg.Obl=Loc1n  be.Pres.3PSg  
   ‘Nina is in the house.’

b. nina  ghbar=mē  ya bag=mē  he:  
   Nina.Fem.Sg.Nom house.Masc.Sg.Obl=Loc1n or garden.Masc.Sg.Obl=Loc1n  be.Pres.3PSg  
   ‘Nina is in the house or in the garden.’

c. ghbar=mē  cuha  ya koṭṭa  he:  
   house.Masc.Sg.Obl=Loc1n rat.Masc.Sg.Nom or dog.Masc.Sg.Nom  be.Pres.3PSg  
   ‘A rat or a dog is in the house.’ (lit. ‘There is a rat or a dog in the house.’)

d. nina=mē  pyar  or  bṭay  he:  
   Nina=Loc1n love.Fem.Sg.Nom and fear.Masc.Sg.Nom  be.Pres.3PSg  
   ‘Nina is full of love and fear.’ (lit.: ‘There is love and fear in Nina.’)

→ these facts from coordination already point to a structural difference between the constructions examined
→ a CP analysis seems right for the part of the data that exhibits complex argument structures
→ **BUT: do all of the data exhibit complex argument structures?**

4 Locatives in Urdu/Hindi

- locative predication in Hindi/Urdu is achieved via the following frame:

(13) ho < th  loc >

(14) nina  ghbar=mē  he:  
   Nina.Fem.Sg.Nom house.Masc.Sg.Obl=Loc1n  be.Pres.3PSg  
   ‘Nina is in the house.’

- I assume the copula *ho* may select a theme and a location; this is a cross-linguistically valid assumption (Bresnan and Kanerva, 1989, Curnow, 1999, Pustet, 2003)
- linking analysis provided in Table 1
4.1 Locative Inversion in Hindi/Urdu

- Proposal: Urdu/Hindi has locative inversion, cf. Bresnan and Kanerva (1989): in cases of locative inversion, the locative role is optionally classified as unrestricted, thus rendering the locative as a subject and the theme as an object.

- Bresnan and Kanerva (1989) motivate this optional assignment in terms of discourse functions: inverted locatives have a presentational function whereby the theme is focussed (What is in the house? – There is a rat in the house.), thus theme must be realized as object in this context.

- Kibort (2007): theme receives [+o], is realized as object (‘demotion of subject to an object’); see Table 2.

- Seems more intuitive to further specify the theme argument, as this is the one being focussed (compared to the solution put forward by Bresnan and Kanerva (1989)).

Table 1: Linking analysis for predicative locatives

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ho</td>
<td>th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>loc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| intrinsic | [-r] |
|           | [-o] |
| defaults  |     |
|           | [+o] |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>well-formedness</th>
<th>OBJ/SUBJ</th>
<th>OBL_{Loc}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>OBL_{Loc}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom</td>
<td>loc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Optional classification for locative inversion (Kibort, 2007)

(15) g̃hr=mē  koṭṭa  ho  
  house.Masc.Sg.Obl=Loc_{in}  dog.Masc.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg  
  ‘A dog is in the house.’ (lit. ‘There is a dog in the house.’)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ho</td>
<td>th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>loc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| intrinsic | [-r] |
|           | [-o] |
| defaults  |     |
|           | [+o] |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>well-formedness</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>OBL/SUBJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBJ</td>
<td></td>
<td>SUBJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom</td>
<td>loc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Linking analysis for inverted locatives

- Predictions by Bresnan and Kanerva (1989) w.r.t. discourse borne out by Urdu/Hindi data.

- Focus position generally immediately preverbal (Butt and King, 1997).

- Linking analysis provided in Table 3.
• similarities between e.g. (1b) and (2b) and (15):

1. locative (not dative) case marking;
2. simple argument structure;
3. copula verb.

→ My argument is that they in fact constitute the same construction.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{PRED } '\text{ho}<\left(\uparrow \text{SUBJ}\right)(\uparrow \text{OBJ})>' \\
\text{SUBJ } \left[\begin{array}{c}
\text{PRED } 'g'h\text{ur}' \\
\text{CASE loc}
\end{array}\right] \\
\text{OBJ } \left[\begin{array}{c}
\text{PRED } 'ku\text{t}\text{t}\text{a}' \\
\text{CASE nom}
\end{array}\right]
\end{array}
\]

Figure 2: F-Structure for (15)

5 Nominal Argument Structure

• it has long been known that nouns across languages may take arguments (Chomsky, 1970, Higginbotham, 1983, Grimshaw, 1990, among others)

• crucial point for our purposes: Grimshaw (1990): many nouns are in fact ambiguous between interpretations in which they take arguments and other interpretations in which they do not

• other nouns are not ambiguous in this respect; some nouns never allow arguments, while some nouns always require arguments

• Urdu/Hindi has all of these!

5.1 Ambiguous Nouns

5.1.1 Argument-Taking Uses

• In certain contexts, abstract relational nouns such as nafrat ‘hate’ and pyar ‘love’ allow (facultative) oblique arguments marked by the instrumental case marker =se.

(16) mujhe (roma log=se) nafrat he:
∼ ‘I hate (the Roma people).’

(17) nina=ko (yasin=se) pyar he:
Nina.Fem.Sg.Obl=Dat Yassin.Masc.Sg.Obl=Inst love.Fem.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3P.Sg
‘Nina is in love (with Yassin).’

→ Native speakers inform me that in (16a)/(17a), it is always understood that Nina’s love/hate is directed at someone/something specific.

→ Hindi/Urdu makes use of pro-drop (all arguments may in principle be dropped), which explains why the =se-marked nominal may be absent

→ Notice that we have dative case marking on the subject in all these cases; since the copula usually does not license dative case, we can assume the dative (experiencer) case is licensed by the noun
5.2 Unambiguous Nouns

5.1.2 Non-Argument-Taking Uses

- In other contexts, the same abstract relational nouns never allow any oblique arguments.

\[(18)\] a. mujh=mē nafrat hr
   I.Obl=Loc in hate.Fem.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg
   ∼ ‘I hate.’

b. *mujh=mē Roma logō=se nafrat hr
   I.Obl=Loc in Roma people.Pl.Obl=Inst hate.Fem.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg

\[(19)\] a. nina=mē pyar hr
   Nina.Fem.Sg.Obl=Loc in love.Fem.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg
   ‘Nina is full of love.’

b. *nina=mēn yasin=se pyar hr

→ Native speakers inform me that in (18a)/(19a), the focus is not on the object of Nina’s love/hate, but rather on the feeling by itself

- Rajesh Bhatt (p.c.): these are utterances which you expect from e.g. a psychotherapist or a medical doctor monitoring an MRI scan
- detached, externalised, and somewhat more concrete reading of pyar ‘love’

→ I conclude that these nouns have a concrete reading where they do not contribute arguments (neither semantic nor syntactic).

→ These are exactly the cases where we have locative case marking on the subject.

5.2 Unambiguous Nouns

5.2.1 Obligatorily Argument-Taking Nouns

- Nouns such as talaś ‘search’ seem to obligatorily select arguments. They are not allowed to appear with locative subjects as in (20b), but only with dative subjects as in (20a). They seem to be inherently relational, selecting for an experiencer and an (optionally expressed) instrumental.\(^4\)

\[(20)\] a. nina=ko (yasin=se) talaś hr
   Nina.Fem.Sg.Obl=Dat Yassin.Masc.Sg.Obl=Inst search.Fem.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg
   ‘Nina is searching (for Yassin).’

b. *nina=mē talaś hr
   Nina.Fem.Sg.Obl=Loc in search.Fem.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg

- in Hindi/Urdu, a search is not a search without being experienced by someone and directed at something

→ this explains the ungrammaticality of (20c): the experiencer argument licensed by the nominal talaś ‘search’ cannot be assigned locative case, since there is no locative role (pointing to a distinction between locatives and experimenters)

\(^4\)”Illness” nouns constitute a subclass of these; they obligatorily select only a single experiencer argument.”
5.2.2 Obligatorily Non-Argument-Taking Nouns

- Other nouns such as \( \text{acc}^{\text{b}} \text{ai} \) ‘goodness’ never appear with dative subjects as in (21b), and subjects are only allowed to bear locative case as in (21a).

(21) a. \( \text{nina}=\text{mē} \quad \text{acc}^{\text{b}} \text{hi} \quad \text{he} \)
    \( \text{Nina.Fem.Sg.Obl}=\text{Loc in goodness.Fem.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg} \)
    ‘Nina is good/a good person.’ (lit. ‘There is goodness in Nina.’)

b. \( *\text{nina}=\text{ko} \quad \text{acc}^{\text{b}} \text{hi} \quad \text{he} \)
    \( \text{Nina.Fem.Sg.Obl}=\text{Dat goodness.Fem.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg} \)

→ I assume that inherently non-relational nouns such as \( \text{acc}^{\text{b}} \text{ai} \) ‘goodness’ do not select for arguments, since they are not directed at anyone.

5.3 Intermediate Summary

We have identified four different classes of nouns wrt. argument selection for Urdu/Hindi:

![Figure 3: Noun classes wrt. argument selection](image)

We also have identified two different patterns of experiencer constructions:

- dative experiencer constructions:
  - the subject is dative marked;
  - the noun is relational, licensing an experiencer and an instrumental;
  - complex argument structure: \( \text{ho} \) ‘be’ is a light verb, forming a CP with the noun

- locative experiencer constructions:
  - the subject is locative marked;
  - the theme is nominative;
  - the construction is essentially an inverted locative;
  - simple argument structure: \( \text{ho} \) ‘be’ is a copula, selecting for a theme and a location

6 A Novel Analysis Using Mapping Theory

- Mapping Theory as described in e.g. Bresnan and Kanerva (1989), Bresnan and Zaenen (1990), Butt et al. (1997), Butt (1998)

- amendments to original Lexical Mapping Theory:
  - reformulated as Mapping Theory by e.g. Butt (1995), Alsina (1996) to account for CPs
  - argument fusion
6.1 Predicative Locatives

- pertinent characteristic of light verbs: transparent event evT triggering argument fusion; CP formation must take place if evT present (Butt, 1995)
- case: a separate system interacting with linking principles & clausal semantics, but not wholly determining them (Butt, 1998)

• analysis makes use of two different frames for the copula ho ‘be’: a locative frame and a frame used for CP formation

• assumptions about case:
  - transparent events never receive case marking, are always nominative (Butt, 1995)
  - relational nouns taking arguments may license case depending on their argument structure
  - experiencers receive dative case (Butt et al., 2006)
  - instrumentals take instrumental case
  - locations receive locative case; choice of the particular locative case marker seems to depend on aspect/lexical semantics of the noun (see also Section 8)

### 6.1 Predicative Locatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ho</th>
<th>&lt;</th>
<th>th</th>
<th>loc</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intrinsic</td>
<td>[-r]</td>
<td>[-o]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defaults</td>
<td>[+r]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>well-formedness</th>
<th>OBJ/SUBJ</th>
<th>SUBJ</th>
<th>OBL&lt;sub&gt;loc&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
<th>OBL&lt;sub&gt;loc&lt;/sub&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>case</td>
<td>nom</td>
<td>loc</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Linking analysis for predicative locatives

- This frame is used for predicate locatives such as (22).

(22) admi kümre=mē ho
    man.Masc.Sg.Nom room.Masc.Sg.Obl=Loc<sub>n</sub> be.Pres.3Psg
  ‘The man is in the room.’

### 6.2 Inverted Locatives, Locative Experiencer Constructions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ho</th>
<th>&lt;</th>
<th>th</th>
<th>loc</th>
<th>&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>intrinsic</td>
<td>[-r]</td>
<td>[-o]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>defaults</td>
<td>[+o]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>well-formedness</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>OBL/SUBJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>case</td>
<td>nom</td>
<td>loc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Linking analysis for inverted locatives
6.3 Dative Experiencer Constructions

This frame is used for inverted locatives such as (23). It is also the frame used for the locative experiencer constructions as in (24).

(23) \( \text{kamre=mē admi hē} \)
\text{room.Masc.Sg.Obl=Locin man.Masc.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg}
\text{‘There is a man in the room.’}

(24) \( \text{nina=mē bhāy hē} \)
\text{Nina.Fem.Sg.Obl=Locin fear.Masc.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg}
\text{‘Nina is fearful.’ (lit.: ‘There is fear in Nina.’)}
Mohanan (1994:172)

6.3 Dative Experiencer Constructions

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ho} \\
\text{pyar}
\end{array} <
\begin{array}{c}
\text{th} \\
\text{exp}
\end{array} \text{ev}_T
\begin{array}{c}
\text{inst}
\end{array} >
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ho} \\
\text{pyar}
\end{array} <
\begin{array}{c}
\text{th} \\
\text{exp}
\end{array} \text{inst}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{inst}
\end{array} > >
\]

intrinsic
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[-r]}
\end{array}

defaults
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[-r]} \\
\text{[-o]}
\end{array}

\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
\text{well-formedness} & \text{SUBJ} & \text{OBJ/SUBJ} & \text{OBJ}_0/\text{OBL}_0 \\
\hline
\text{SUBJ} & | & | \\
\text{OBJ} & | & | \\
\text{OBL}_0 & | & | \\
\text{inst} & | & | \\
\end{array}

Table 6: Linking analysis for experiencer complex predicate (I)

- relational nouns (e.g. \( \text{piyar} \) ‘love’) when plugged in supply two arguments: experiencer, instrumental
- This frame is used for a CP such as the one in (25), where the relational noun supplies two arguments.

(25) \( \text{nina=ko yasin=se bhāut pyar hē} \)
\text{Nina.Fem.Sg.Obl=Dat Yassin.Masc.Sg.Obl=Inst much love.Fem.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg}
\text{‘Nina carries much love (in her) for Yassin.’ ~ ‘Nina is in love with Yassin.’}

- The highest argument of the embedded predicate is fused with the lowest argument of the matrix predicate (Butt, 1995, 1998). So, the linked arguments are fused in complex predicate formation.
- matrix frame \( \text{ho} < \text{th} \text{ ev}_T > \) is also selected for the “illness” examples such as (26):

(26) a. \( \text{nina=ko bhāut kʰāsi hē} \)
\text{Nina.Fem.Sg.Obl=Dat much cough.Fem.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg}
\text{‘Nina has a severe cough.’}

b. \( \text{nina=ko boxar hē} \)
\text{Nina.Fem.Sg.Obl=Dat fever.Masc.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg}
\text{‘Nina has fever.’}
7 The Semantics of Sentient Locations

7.1 Comparison with Mohanan (1994) and Landau (2010)

- the present analysis: strict distinction between locations (abstract or concrete) vs. experiencers; while locations (whether sentient or not) get locative case, experiencers receive dative case
- (emotional) experiencers always also have an instrumental
- syntactic analysis gives rise to differing semantic interpretations: argument-taking version of nouns may specify an instrument argument, non-argument-taking version never does so, hence the reading is a rather neutral one
- individual-level vs. stage-level (or permanent vs. temporary) distinction as described by Mohanan (1994) suggests itself: the instrumental argument is missing, and hence the predicate seems to be a more general one
- the actual semantics of the locative construction are not that straightforward
- Landau (2010): all experiencers are nothing but syntactic locations — only partly true for Urdu/Hindi: experiencers are encoded using two separate syntactic constructions — a locative frame with locative case marking and a complex predicate frame with dative case marking

7.2 Some Scenarios

- Imagine a situation where a psychologist is ordering an MRI scan of a patient’s brain, and subsequently examines the scan. Although a brain scan is depicting a temporary state of the patient’s brain, it is appropriate for the psychologist to say something like (27a), while in that particular context, (27b) would not be appropriate.

(27) a. mərīz=mē bʰaɣ ʰe:
patient.Masc.Sg.Obl=Locĩn fear.Masc.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg
‘The patient is fearful.’ (lit.: ‘There is fear in the patient.’)

b. #mərīz=ko bʰaɣ ʰe:
patient.Masc.Sg.Obl=Locĩn fear.Masc.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg
‘The patient is afraid.’

It seems as if the locative here expresses an externalised, diagnostic description of states.
Another example. Imagine you were part of an experiment on racial stereotypes, and while you would not consider yourself prejudiced about the Roma people, the experimental setup would prove otherwise. The proposition expressed by (28a) would therefore be false, since by your internal judgment you are not prejudiced; the statement in (28b) would still be true as shown by the experiment.

(28) a. #mujhe roma logon=se nafarat he
   ‘I hate the Roma people.’

b. mujhe=me Roma logon=ke liye nafarat he
   I.Obl=Locin Roma people.Pl.Obl=for hate.Fem.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3PSg
   ‘I hate the Roma people.’ (lit. ‘There is hate in me against the Roma people.’)

The examples show that the locatives with sentient subjects do not necessarily express more permanent states than the dative experiencer cases, but rather more independent, objective and externalised descriptions of states.

8 Future Work: Other Locative Case Clitics Used

- Mohanan (1994) also gives examples of locative subjects marked with the case marker par ‘on’

(29) a. ravi=par bahut bada bojh he
   ‘Ravi has a very big (abstract) burden (to carry).’ Mohanan (1994, p. 173)

b. ravi=par aflat a-i
   ‘Ravi was the victim of mishaps.’ (lit.: ‘Mishaps came on Ravi.’) Mohanan (1994, p. 173)

- exactly what accounts for the alternation between locative case markers me ‘in’ and par ‘on’ is something that needs further investigation

- candidates for triggering the alternation: lexical semantics of the noun (along the lines of Ahmed and Butt (2011)), aspectual semantics of the light verb (along the lines of Butt (1998))

9 Summary

- data discovered and examined by Mohanan (1994) on first sight seem to be instances of differential subject marking

- in fact, there is a structural difference in the argument structure of the nominals involved in the construction — and thus in their status as CPs vs. straightforward copula constructions

- this difference is also mirrored by coordination possibilities

- Mapping Theory can account for all the data in a straightforward fashion

- the varying argument structure of locative copula constructions vs. experiencer CPs thus gives rise to the differences in the semantics
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