

Non-Canonical Objects in South Asian languages

Tafseer Ahmed¹, Universitaet Konstanz

Workshop on Case Marking and Alignment in Indo-European
December 10-11, 2008, Bergen

1. Introduction

- In this talk, I present classes of non-canonical objects in eight South Asian languages.
- The non-canonical objects are the second argument of bivalent predicates. They are marked by oblique case markers.
- We briefly present non-canonical objects found in other languages and the semantic reasons for this phenomenon.
- We present semantic reasons for non-canonical marking in South Asian languages, and discuss the similarities and differences in the marking strategies among these languages.

2. Non-Canonical Object marking

2.1. Canonical Marking in South Asian languages

- In Urdu/Hindi, Nepali and many other South Asian languages,
 - Canonical subject is marked with nominative or ergative.
 - Canonical object is marked with nominative or accusative.
- Examples of canonical subject and object are:

- | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------|------------|
| (1) | vo | film | dekh | rahaa | hai |
| | 3SG.NOM | film.NOM.F.SG | see | PROG.M.SG | be.PRES.SG |
| | 'He saw the film.' | | <Urdu/Hindi> | | |
| (2) | us=ne | film | dekh-ii | | |
| | 3SG.OBL=ERG | film.NOM.F.SG | see-PERF.F.SG | | |
| | 'He saw the film.' | | <Urdu/Hindi> | | |
| (3) | vo | jamiil=ko | dekh | rahaa | thaa |
| | 3SG.NOM | Jameel.M.SG=ACC | see | PROG.M.SG | be.PRES.SG |
| | 'He saw Jameel.' | | <Urdu/Hindi> | | |
| (4) | us=ne | Jameel=ko | dekhaa | | |
| | 3SG.OBL=ERG | Jameel.M.SG=ACC | see-PERF.F.SG | | |
| | 'He saw the Jameel.' | | <Urdu/Hindi> | | |

2.2. Non Canonical Subject Marking in South Asian languages

- The subject can also be marked by other case markers due to semantic reasons.
- In the Urdu examples (1-4), the subject is marked either by nominative or ergative, but the subject can also be marked by dative, genitive, ablative and locative.

¹ This research is supported by the DFG (Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft) via the SFB 471, Project A24. The author is thankful to Miriam Butt for the help in the analysis of data and pointing the mistakes.

- In “inability constructions” the subject is marked with ablative/instrument marker (Mohanan 1994).

(5) zaahid=se calaa nahiiN jaa-taa
 Zahid=ABL walk not go-IMPF
 ‘Zahid is not able to walk.’ <Urdu/Hindi>

- Subjects of experience verbs are marked with dative marker.

(6) zaahid=ko buxaar hai
 Zahid=DAT fever be.Pres
 ‘Zahid has fever.’ <Urdu/Hindi>

- The subject is marked with locative to express inalienable possession.

(7) us=meN himmat hai
 3SG=LOC-in courage be.PRES
 ‘He has courage.’ <Urdu/Hindi>

- Other south Asian languages have similar examples of non-canonical subject marking.

2.3. Non Canonical Object Marking in South Asian languages

- After introducing canonical marking and non-canonical subjects, we discuss non-canonical “objects” or the oblique second argument of the bivalent predicate.
- Some examples of non-canonically marked arguments are given in (8-10).

(8) jamiil=ko zaahid=par bharosaa hai
 Jameel.M.SG=DAT Zahid.M.SG=LOC-on trust.M.SG be.PRES
 ‘Jameel trusts Zahid.’ <Urdu/Hindi>

(9) jamiil=ne zaahid naal gal ki-tii
 Jameel.M.SG=ERG Zahid.M.SG COM talk do-PERF.F.SG
 ‘Jameel talked with Zahid.’ <Punjabi>

(10) un=le mohan=sanga bihaa gar-in
 3SG=ERG Mohan.M.SG=COM marriage do-PST.M.SG
 ‘She married Mohan.’ <Nepali>

(11) jamiil saaNp=se dar-taa hai
 Jameel.M.SG snake.M.SG=ABL fear-IMPF.M.SG be.PRES
 ‘Jameel fears snake.’ <Urdu/Hindi>

- In the above sentences, the second argument of the predicate is either marked by locative or comitative marker.
- Most of the verbs having non-canonical object arguments are psych verbs, but non-psych verbs also appear with non-canonical arguments.

(12) us=ne mulk=par hamlaa ki-yaa
 3SG=ERG country.M.SG=LOC-on attack.M.SG do-PERF.M.SG
 ‘He attacked the country.’ <Urdu/Hindi>

- We collected data from eight South Asian languages and found similar classes in all of these languages. The languages studied are Urdu/Hindi, Sindhi, Punjabi, Siraiki, Nepali (Indo-Aryan), Balochi, Pashto (Iranian) and Malayalam (Dravidian).

- The data fall into six classes of Non-Canonical Object (NCO) verbs depending upon their case marking.

Table 1: Classes of NCO verbs in South Asian languages

Class	Subject Marking	Object Marking	Examples
I	NOM/ERG, DAT	ABL	fear
II	NOM/ERG	ABL	ask, beg
III	NOM/ERG	LOC-on/DAT	bless, capture, govern, attack, sign, blame, monitor
IV	NOM/ERG, DAT	LOC-on/DAT	trust, doubt, suspect, believe
V	NOM/ERG	COM/DAT	talk, meet, marry
VI	NOM/ERG, DAT	COM	love, hate

- It is important to note that the NCO marking on verbs in above classes are similar but not identical cross-linguistically. For example, the object of the verb ‘meet’ uses oblique (used for dative) marking in Balochi, but uses comitative marker *saaN* in Sindhi.
- Similarly the object of ‘trust’ is always marked by locative *par* in Urdu/Hindi, but it is marked either by locative *maa* or dative *laai* in Nepali
- We discuss these differences in detail in section 4.

Question: What is the reason of NCO marking?

- Examples (8-13) have complex predicates. It can be argued that having noun/adjective + light verb construction in place of simple verb is responsible for non-canonical object marking.
- In Appendix A, we show that noun/adjective + light verb construction is not responsible for non-canonical marking.
- In the following sections, we claim that semantic reasons are responsible for non-canonical object marking.

2.4. Non Canonical Object marking cross-linguistically

Question: Are South Asian languages unique in having NCO verbs? Or is this phenomenon found cross-linguistically?

- The presence of non-canonical markers for the second argument of the verb is noted for many other languages.
- Tiriyo and other Cariban languages have mental state postpositions for Desiderative (‘want, like’), Cognoscitive (‘know’), Ignorative (‘not know’), Protective (‘pity, jealous’), Apprehensive (‘afraid of ’), Superioritive (‘more’), Irascitive (‘angry, wild’), Odiative (‘hate’), Appreciative (‘admire’), Difficultative (‘hard’), Fidelitive (‘trust, believe’), Satisfactive (‘enough’) etc. (Meria 2004)
- Finnish verbs for ‘love’, ‘admire’, ‘hate’, ‘enjoy’ need obligatory partitive marking. (Kratzer 2002)
- The verbs for ‘beat’, ‘bite’, ‘expect’, ‘harm’, ‘help’, ‘kiss’, ‘look at’, ‘meet’, ‘push’, ‘read’, ‘stab’, ‘wait for’ occur in N.W. Caucasian in the nominative construction. (Catford 1975:44).
- In Hungarian, *felel* ‘answer’, *gratulal* ‘congratulate’, *integet* ‘greet’ have dative

complements. (Blume 1998)

- The Russian verbs of authority, ruling, or disposition e.g. *rukovodit* 'rule/direct/manage', *upravljat* 'govern' takes instrumental complement while the verbs of same class in Lithuanian takes dative second argument (Nichols 1975)
- Michaelis (1993) has analyzed non-canonical case marking in Latin and suggested that most of these verbs are cognitive and hence low in transitivity.
- English has transitive verbs whose near synonyms are intransitive. *ask* is a near-synonym of *demand* and *request*, *look at* and *watch*, *go across* and *cross* are near-synonymous. (Levin 1999)

(13) a. He demanded the book.

b. He asked for the book.

3. Semantic Factors for NCO marking

Questions: What is the explanation of NCO verbs found cross-linguistically? Can we have a theory to explain NCOs in South Asian languages and cross-linguistically?

- Hopper and Thompson (1980), Tsunoda (1981, 1985, 1999), Blume (1998), and Testelec (1998) have shown that certain predicates are more likely to be transitive than others depending on the semantic factors.
- Hopper and Thomson (1980) listed presence of 2 participants, kinesic, aspect, punctuality, volitionality, affirmation etc. as features affecting on transitivity.
- Tsunoda (1981, 1985) identifies the following cline of transitivity for predicates with transitive at left and intransitive at right:

direct effect (*kill, write*), perception (*see*), pursuit (*search*), knowledge (*know*), feeling (*love*), possession (*possess*)

- It is important to note that the predicates that are highly transitive (according to the above cline and semantic factors) have more chances to be realized as syntactically transitive verb (having a subject and a canonical object).
- The predicates that are less transitive have more chances to be realized as syntactically intransitive verb that has subject and an oblique syntactic argument for the second participant.
- According to Kratzer (2002) verbs like 'love', 'admire', 'hate', 'enjoy' are atelic. Those verbs describe processes or states that do not affect the referents of their direct objects directly. Hence in Finnish, these atelic verbs take partitive objects.
- Beavers (2007a) introduced a hierarchy of affectedness that shows that all objects are not affected in similar manner.

quant.

break, load, build >

non-quant.

slice, cut

impinged

> *hit, slice at*

unspec.

> *caress?, wipe?*

- Beavers (2007b) proposed eight classes of two arguments verbs based on CAUSE and AFFected features.

Sample Verbs	Arg1	arg2	Comment
<i>wipe, see, resemble</i> (coerced)	[(+cause)]	[]	psych/statives
<i>walk(to), traverse, search</i>	[+cause,+aff]	[]	Directed motion
<i>make, kill, break</i>	[+cause]	[+aff]	Core Transitive
<i>Pull, take</i>	[+cause,+aff]	[+aff]	Transitive?
<i>speak to, ask</i>	[+cause]	[+cause]	Interactional
<i>depend(on)</i>	[+cause,+aff]	[+cause]	Interactional
<i>Help, aid</i>	[+cause]	[+cause,+aff]	Interactional
<i>Fight, quarrel with</i>	[+cause,+aff]	[+cause,+aff]	Reciprocal

- Levin (1999) distinguished between core transitive verbs (CTVs) and non-core transitive verbs (NCTVs).
- According to Levin, NCTVs have a simple event structure associated with two participants, a structure participant and a pure constant participant, and their event structure is similar to the activity event structure and different from two-argument accomplishment verb structure.
- Levin suggested that it is difficult to identify the semantic role of these objects because of stems from their lack of an event structure template characterization.
- Levin suggested that languages vary as to which and how many semantic subclasses of the NCTVs come under oblique linking rules, and thus they differ as to the number and nature of the oblique rules they have available.

Result:

- NCO verbs are semantically different from the verbs with canonical arguments. These verbs are less in transitivity and have only structure participant in their logical structures.
- We cannot find a single model to predict the boundary line between NCO and other verbs. There are language specific oblique rules that override default subject-object linking rules.
- Even, we cannot guarantee that near-synonymous verbs have identical case marking as shown in (13).

4. Analyzing Non Canonical “Objects” in South Asian languages

- We have established that there are language specific oblique rules for non-canonical object marking.
- A careful look at the verbs in Table 1 makes it clear that South Asian languages have NCO marking for similar semantic reasons.
- The unique aspect of NCO in South Asian languages is that the six identified classes have not been found or predicted in previous work. So we need a model that explains the verb classed of NCO in South Asian languages.

Question: What is the semantic explanation/model for these six classes of NCO in South Asian languages?

4.1. Semantic Features for Spatial Markers

- Ahmed (2008) gives a model comprising of underspecified semantic features to

explain locative-instrument (path) and ablative-instrument (path) syncretism found in some South Asian languages.

- The model proposes that spatial markers have two primary features: LOCATION and PATH.
- These features may have a set of features as the value.
- The feature LOC may have following features as value.
 - ON, AT, IN
- The path may have following features.
 - SOURCE : Starting point of the path
 - END : Endpoint of the path
 - VIA: The path that does not include either source or endpoint.
- The features of the path can have either plus or minus value or they can be underspecified.
- An overview of this model is given below.

```
[
  LOC { IN / ON / AT / BESIDE },
  PATH { +-SRC / +-VIA / +-END }
]
```

- Ahmed (2008) proposed that Instrument is visualized as metaphorical path in some of the South Asian languages. It means the feature +VIA is metaphorically mapped to instrument.
- It is important to know that this mapping is not always mandatory. We only suggest a high correlation between the two concepts.

Question: Can we explain the NCO marking in South Asian languages in the similar manner?

- For our detailed discussion on semantic model for NCO marking, we choose three languages Urdu/Hindi, Punjabi and Nepali. The case markings of these languages is given in table 3.

Table 3: The case markings of Urdu/Hindi, Punjabi and Nepali

	Nepali	Punjabi	Urdu
Ergative	le	ne	ne
Accusative	laai	nuun	ko
Dative	laai	nuun	ko
Ablative	baaTa/dekhi	toN	se
Instrument	le	naal	se
Comitative	sanga	naal	se, saath
Locative-on	maa	Te	par

- The lexical entries for the spatial markers of these languages are:

- As the recipient/experiencer are goal and marked by dative marker, by similar analogy the source/stimulus is marked by ablative marker.
- In (16), the experiencer is marked by dative (that marks goal) and the stimulus is marked with ablative (that marks source).

(16) zaahid=nuuN saaNp=toN Dar lag-daa ae
 Zahid=DAT sanke=ABL fear.M.SG strike-IMPF be.PRES
 ‘Zahid fears snake.’ <Punjabi>

- The source of motion should be a potential source too.
- In (17), Zahid is the intended source of the answer. In ‘asking’ no force or abstract entity is transferring from object to the subject. But there can be a transfer as a result of action.

(17) maiN zaahid=toN kitaab maang-ii
 1SG Zahid.M.SG=ABL book.F.SG beg/ask-PERF.F.SG
 ‘I asked/begged the book from Zahid.’ <Punjabi>

- Hence the potential source of ‘beg’ and ‘ask’ can be marked as the real source of ‘take’ and ‘buy’

Result: We conclude that the features {+SRC, +VIA} can be interpreted as the semantic roles ‘stimulus’ and ‘potential source’ along with its core semantics of ‘motion away from the source’.

4.3. Ablative Marked Objects in Nepali

- Nepali shows the difference in case marking for source and stimulus.
- There are two ablative markers in Nepali. The difference in usage of these ablative markers can be seen in the following examples.

(18) us=le dilli=dek^hi kathmandu=samma baaTo banaa-yo
 3SG=ERG Delhi=ABL Kathmandu=LOC-to street make.PST
 ‘He built a street from Delhi to Kathmandu.’ <Nepali>

(19) u dilli=baaTa kathmanDu=samma kud-yo
 3SG Delhi=ABL Kathmandu=LOC-to ran-PST
 ‘He ran from Delhi to Kathmandu.’ <Nepali>

- In (18), the starting point of (static) road is marked by point ablative *dekhi*. In (19), starting point of the (dynamic) runner is marked with path ablative *baaTa*.
- Currently, our proposed lexical entries of *baaTa* and *dekhi* (given in (4.1)) are identical. We need a semantic feature to distinguish the two entries.
- Based on the data given above, we propose another primary feature DYNAMIC that can have either plus or minus as value.
- The point ablative of (18) has the feature [DYN +], while the path ablative of (19) has the feature [DYN -].
- The new lexical entries of Nepali ablative markers are:
 baaTa: [PATH {+SRC,+VIA,-END}, DYN +]
 dekhi: [PATH {+SRC,+VIA,-END}, DYN -]
- We find this difference in ablative marked objects too.

- The object of the verb ‘fear’ is a stimulus and is marked by the point ablative in which force does not actually flow towards the subject.

(20) u sarpa=dek^{hi} DarauuN-cha
 3SG snake=ABL fear-NPST
 ‘He fears snake.’ <Nepali>

- One can get afraid of snake just by seeing it, the snake does not have to act upon him (actively scare him)
- On the other hand, the object of ‘resign’ is marked by the path ablative *baaTa* that shows movement away from the job.

(21) us=le jaagir=baaTa raajinaamaa di-yo
 3SG=ERG job=ABL resignation give-PST.3SG.M
 ‘He resigned from the job.’ <Nepali>

4.4. Locative marked Argument

- Locative-on marks the second argument of the verbs ‘trust’, ‘blame’ and ‘attack’ etc.
- We propose that following semantic structure is common for all locative marked objects i.e. the NCOs of class I and II.

[LOC ‘ON’]

- We propose that locative-on marked argument gets extended to semantic role ‘impinged’ (cf. Beavers 2007b)
- The difference between affected and impinged L-thematic role in English can be seen in the following examples.

(22) John hits the table. (affected object)

(23) a. John hits at the table. (impinged object)

b. John touched the table. (impinged object)

- In (22) the table is necessarily affected by the action, but when it is either not necessarily affected (32a) or only touched (23b), we call it an impinged argument.
- Our proposed semantic structure for the locative marked object is underspecified for END feature of PATH. So just like the impinged argument, it can mark a simple location or a goal (having [PATH {+END}]).
- Urdu/Hindi has similar (but not identical) alternation for dative and locative marked arguments.
- Locative-on alternates with dative indirect object for the verb ‘hit’.

(24) maiN=ne zaahid=ko chaaRii maar-ii
 1SG=ERG Zahid.M.SG=DAT stick.F.SG hit-PERF.M.SG
 ‘I hit a stick at Zahid.’ <Urdu/Hindi>

(25) maiN=ne mez=par chari maar-ii
 1SG=ERG table.F.SG=LOC-on stick.F.SG hit-PERF.M.SG
 ‘I hit a stick on the table.’ <Urdu/Hindi>

- We claim dative *ko* in Urdu marks an argument that gets some change by the action either physically or logically. It receives something and gets affected by the

- In Nepali, the construction with agentive subject (of class IV verb) has its object marked with *laai* that is used as dative/accusative marker. See the example (28).

(28) mai=le us=laai viswaas gar-eN
 1SG=ERG 3SG=DAT/ACC trust do-PST.1SG
 ‘I trusted him.’ <Nepali>

- When less transitive non-agentive experiencer subject is present in the construction, the object is marked with non-canonical locative marker.

(29) ma=laai us=maa viswaas thyo
 1SG-DAT 3SG-LOC trust be.PST
 ‘I trusted him.’ <Nepali>

- Appendix B explains the semantic difference between the two constructions.
- Comparison of (28) and (29) shows that the non-canonical locative marking in Nepali depends upon the agency of the subject.
- If the subject is agentive, then it must have affected the object. Hence, the dative marker that is related to the specialized role ‘affected’ appears in (21). While, the locative marker marks the less specialized role ‘impinged’.
- It is in accordance with the analysis presented in 4.4.
- But agency is not the only semantic feature responsible for dative/locative alternation.
- In Nepali, the animate object of class III and IV in ‘noun/adjective + do’ construction are always marked with dative/accusative marker.

(30) mai=le raam=laai viswaas gar-eN
 1SG=ERG Ram=DAT trust do-PST.1SG
 ‘I trusted Ram.’ <Nepali>

(31) mai=le mohan=laai hamlaa gar-eN
 1SG=ERG Mohan=DAT attack do-PST.1SG
 ‘I attacked Mohan.’ <Nepali>

- On the other hand, the inanimate objects of the same verbs (and the same construction) are marked with locative.

(32) mai=le Tren=maa viswaas gar-eN
 1SG=ERG Train=LOC trust do-PST.1SG
 ‘I trusted the train.’ <Nepali>

(33) sena=le sahar=maa hamlaa gar-yo
 army=ERG city=LOC attack do-PST.3SG
 ‘The army attacked the city.’ <Nepali>

- Unlike Nepali, both animate and inanimate objects of the verb ‘trust’ etc. is marked with non-canonical locative marker in Urdu/Hindi and many other South Asian languages. (We have discussed semantic reasons for Urdu/Hindi locative and dative contrast in 4.4.)

(34) maiN=ne raam=par/ko* bharosaa kiyaa
 1SG=ERG Ram=LOC-on/DAT trust do-Past
 ‘I trusted Ram.’ <Urdu/Hindi>

(35) maiN=ne Tren=par bharosaa kiyaa
 1Sg=ERG Train=LOC-on trust do-Past
 ‘I trusted the train.’ <Urdu/Hindi>

- Even in other constructions, if we compare the usages of Urdu/Hindi dative *ko* and Nepali dative *laai*, we find that Nepali *laai* is associated with animate entities.
- Compare the following sentences of Nepali and Urdu/Hindi. Urdu allows both locative and dative in non-canonical subject, but Nepali does not allow dative with inanimate subject.

(36) a. draxt=meN/ko aag lag-ii
 tree.M.SG=Loc-in/DAT fire.F.SG stick- PERF.F.SG
 ‘The tree got fire.’ <Urdu/Hindi>

b. rukh=maa/laai* aago laag-yo
 tree.M.SG=LOC/DAT* fire stick-PST.3SG
 ‘The tree got fire.’ <Nepali>

Result: It shows that the Nepali dative marker *laai* is related to the semantic role ‘animate’. In the selection of case marker, the ‘affected’ vs. ‘impinged’ contrast is not the primary factor in Nepali, but the animacy of the endpoint is the primary factor.

4.6. Comitative marked Argument

- The second argument of ‘fight’, ‘marry’, ‘meet’ (class V) and ‘love’, ‘hate’ (class VI) is marked with comitative marker.

(37) u ma-sanga bazaar ga-yo
 3SG 1SG-COM market go-PST.M.SG
 ‘He went to the market with me.’ <Nepali>

- The second argument of reciprocal verbs like ‘fight’, ‘marry’, ‘meet’, ‘talk’ are marked with comitative marker.

(38) mai-le u-sanga kuraa gar-eN
 1SG-ERG 3SG-COM talk do-PST.1SG
 ‘I talked with him.’ <Nepali>

- Comitative marker also marks the oblique argument of psyche verbs ‘love’ and ‘hate’.

(39) ma u-sanga prem gar-chu
 1SG 3SG-COM love do-NPST.1SG
 ‘I love him.’ <Nepali>

- We propose that following semantic structure is common for all locative marked objects i.e. the NCOs of class I and II.

[LOC ‘BESIDE’]

- The semantic features of lexical entries of comitative markers of Urdu/Hindi, Nepali and Punjabi can be unified with the above structure that’s why those markers can be used to mark this concept.
- We propose that spatial feature BESIDE is interpreted as semantic role ‘attached’ or ‘involved’. As it is underspecified for the feature END, it can (or cannot) be the endpoint.

verbs similar to the verbs of class V in which the second argument is attached/involved in the action.

- The case-marking pattern is different for the addressee of verb ‘ask’. Three languages mark this argument as dative and two languages mark it by comitative. We have explained semantic reasons of these marking in the above discussion.
- The important point is that the remaining three languages Pashto, Balochi and Sindhi mark the addressee with the ablative marker.
- Unlike the addressee of the verb ‘tell’, the addressee of the verb ‘ask’ is the potential source of reply.
- So the languages have the choice of either choosing the endpoint interpretation (dative marking) or the source interpretation (ablative marking). Hence, it can be marked by the source marker.

5. Summary and Conclusion

- We found that there are certain bivalent predicates whose 2nd argument is semantically less transitive and has only one structural participant in the logical structure. These “objects” can be marked non-canonically in different languages.
- The study of non-canonical object (NCO) marking in South Asian languages confirmed the claim that languages have their own oblique linking rules.
- There are six classes of verbs in South Asian languages on the basis of non-canonical object (NCO) marking.
- The unique thing about the study of South Asian NCO classes is that such classes are not found or predicated in previous work.
- Ahmed’s (2008) underspecified feature based model for the spatial markers was used to explain the NCO marking in South Asian languages.
- We propose that different spatial features are metaphorically interpreted as different semantic roles.
- Table 4 gives the NCO classes, the (metaphorical) spatial features for their objects and the semantic roles related to these spatial features of the objects.

Table 4: Classes of NCO verbs in South Asian languages

Class	Subject Marking	Object Marking	Examples
I	NOM/ERG, DAT	ABL [PATH {+SRC, +VIA}] <i>source/stimulus</i>	fear
II	NOM/ERG	ABL [PATH {+SRC, +VIA}] <i>source</i>	ask, beg
III	NOM/ERG	LOC-on [LOC ‘ON’] <i>impinged</i>	bless, govern, attack

- (43) a. us=ne ghar (ko) taamiir ki-yaa
 3SG=ERG house.M.SG (=ACC) construction.F.SG do-PERF.M.SG
 ‘He built a house.’ <Urdu/Hindi>
- b. us=ne [ghar=kii taamiir] kii
 3SG=ERG house.M.SG=GEN construction.F.SG do-PERF.F.SG
 ‘He built a house.’

- So there is no syntactic restriction that object cannot have canonical marking with complex predicates.
- On the other hand, we find examples of non-canonical object or an oblique second argument that do not have nominative, accusative or genitive marking like the above examples.
- Example (44) strengthens our claim that non-canonical object marking does not appear due to syntactic reasons.

- (44) a. jamiil=ne zaahid=toN puuc-yaa
 Jami.M.SG=ERG Zahid.M.SG=ABL ask-PERF.M.SG
 ‘Jameel asked Zahid.’ <Punjabi>
- b. jamiil=ne zaahid=toN savaal kiitaa
 Jamiil=ERG Zahid.=ABL question.M.SG do.PERF.M.SG
 ‘Jameel asked Zahid.’ <Punjabi>

- If we compare (44a) and (4b), both are synonymous. (44a) contains simple verb and (44b) contains complex predicate. The object marking in both sentences is same i.e. objects in both sentences are marked with ablative marker.
- Similarly, (45) is a bivalent predicate realized as a simple verb. Its second argument is marked by ablative marker that is a non-canonical marker.

- (45) jamiil saaNp=se dar-taa hai
 Jameel.M.SG snake.M.SG=ABL fear-IMPF.M.SG be.PRES
 ‘Jameel fears snake.’ <Urdu/Hindi>.

Appendix B: Dative Subjects and NCO Verb classes

- The dative subjects in South Asian and other languages are widely discussed. (Mohan 1994, Butt et al. 2006)
- Urdu has compound verbs using *hai* ‘be’, *hoa* ‘become’ and *karnaa* ‘do’ (appearing with same noun/adjective) due to difference in aspect.
- The subject of activity is realized by nominative/ergative. For state and achievement, the subject acquiring the state is marked with dative.
- The experiencer subject of verbs like ‘trust’, ‘love’ allow both ergative and dative marking.

- (46) a. jamiil=ko zaahid=par bharosaa hai
 Jameel.M.SG=DAT Zahid.M.SG=LOC-on trust.M. be.Pres
 ‘Jameel trusts Zahid.’ <Urdu/Hindi>

State: *trust* (*Zahid*)

b. jamiil=ko zaahid=par bharosaa hoa(Achievement)
 Jameel.M.SG=DAT Zahid.M.SG=LOC-on trust.M. be.Perf
 ‘Jameel trusted Zahid.’ <Urdu/Hindi>

Achievement: *BECOME trust (Zahid)*

c. jamiil=ne zaahid=par bharosaa ki-yaa (Activity)
 Jameel.M.SG=ERG Zahid.M.SG=LOC-on trust.M. do-PERF.M.SG
 ‘Jameel trusted Zahid.’ <Urdu/Hindi>

Accomplishment: [*Zahid ACT*] *CAUSE [trust (Zahid)]*

- In (46a) and (46b), the subject is the possessor/recipient of the state.
- In (46c), the subject is both experiencer and agent at the same time. The subject causes himself to become the recipient.
- If the subject is not an experiencer/recipient, it cannot have the dative subject. This is the reason why the verbs of class II, III and V do not allow for dative subject.
- The dative subject cannot be used with the verb ‘fight’ of class III, as it is not an experiencer/recipient verb.

(47) a. fauj=ne Seher=par hamlaa kiyaa
 Army.F.SG=DAT city.M.SG=LOC-on attack.M.SG do.PERF.M.SG
 ‘The army attacked the city.’ <Urdu/Hindi>

b. *fauj=ko Seher=par hamlaa huua
 Army.F.SG=DAT city.M.SG=LOC-on attack be.PERF.M.SG
 ‘The army attacked the city.’ <Urdu/Hindi>

References:

- Ahmed, Tafseer. 2008. Instrument as Path: Reconciling the semantic usages. *Workshop on Case, Word Order and Prominence in Argument Structure*, Nijmegen.
- Beavers, John. 2007a. *Deconstructing Affectedness: A Hierarchical Approach*. Invited talk given at The University at Buffalo, State University of New York.
- Beavers, John. 2007b. The interaction of Causation and Affectedness in Transitivity. *Forces in Grammatical Structures*, Paris.
- Butt, Miriam. 1995. *The Structure of Complex Predicates in Urdu*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Butt, Miriam, Scott Grimm and Tafseer Ahmed. 2006. Dative Subjects. *NWO/DFG Workshop on Optimal Sentence Processing*, Nijmegen.
- Blume, Kerstin. 1998. A contrastive analysis of interaction verbs with dative complements. *Linguistics* 36:253-280.
- Catford, J.C. 1975. Ergativity in Caucasian languages. *NELS* 6:37-48.
- Hopper, Paul and Sandra Thompson. 1980. Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse. *Language* 56, No. 2: 251-299.
- Kratzer, A. 2002. *Telicity and the meaning of objective case*, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, MS.
- Levin, Beth. 1999. Objecthood: An Event Structure Perspective, *Proceedings of CLS 35, volume 1: The Main Session*, Chicago Linguistic Society, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL,

223-247.

Michaelis, Laura A. 1993. On Deviant Case-Marking in Latin . In R.D. Van Valin, ed., *Advances in Role and Reference Grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 311-373.

Meira, S. 2004. Mental state postpositions in Tiriyó and other Cariban languages. *Linguistic Typology*, 8, Wetensch publicatie, 213-241.

Mohanan, Tara. 1994. *Argument Structure in Hindi*. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Nichols, Johanna. 1975. Verbal semantics and sentence construction. *BLS 1*: 343- 353.

Testelec, Yakov G. 1998. On two parameters of transitivity. In L. Kulikov and H. Vater, eds., *Typology of Verbal Categories*, Tübingen: 29–45.

Tsunoda, Tasaku. 1981. Split case-marking in verb-types and tense/aspect/mood. *Linguistics 19*: 389–438.

Tsunoda, Tasaku. 1985. Remarks on transitivity. *Journal of Linguistics 21*: 385–396.