THE SIMPLE SENTENCE

The simple sentence or phrastic unit is an autonomous linguistic expression conveying information. The minimal or elementary sentence corresponds to the least constrained statement and itself serves as a basis for transformations (Greenberg 1966, Creissels 1995). Patterns other than the basic sentence such as relative, infinitival or participial clauses, focalized, topicalized, negated or interrogative sentences, will be described in the next two chapters.

A one-clause sentence usually consists in a predicate and one or more arguments[1], although exclamations as well as elliptic questions and answers may be nominal: *kitnā pyārā baccā!* "what a nice child!", *bahut acchā*, "very well". Apart from these expected cases, Hindi does not allow the verbless sentence, unlike Dravidian languages and Indo-Aryan languages influenced by Dravidian like Bengali and Oriya. The omission of the copula in negative present sentences can in no way be considered as a nominal sentence since a similar omission may be observed in other predicates (cf. MII-3.2.1.1), both being accounted for by a historical fusion of the negation and the verb *be* within the negative particle[2].

The category of arguments consists of the nominal phrases corresponding to participants (themselves correlated with a more or less concrete semantic role) required by the semantic structure of the predicate: I exclude from the category those nouns which convey the semantics of the predicative notion in verbo-nominal predicates like (*kā*) *intazār karnā*, lit. of waiting do, "to wait for" (cf. MII-2.3). *Intazār karnā*, like its English counterpart, and like *pasand karnā*, "to like, appreciate" (taste do), will be treated as a two place predicate, even if grammatically the noun *intazār* is not devoid of all argumental properties, and may be considered as object of the verb *karnā* "do", whereas *pasand* is devoid of such properties. What is to be taken into account is not the verb but the predicate, and there are convincing reasons to consider these verbo-nominal compounds as complex predicates rather than a sequence of noun + verb (Butt 1993 for Urdu, Karimi 1997 and Karimi Doostan 1997 for Persian).

---

[1] In Hindi, verb and nominal are two clearly distinct categories (defined in MI-1. and M II-1).

[2] But the negation *nahĩ* is synchronically a particle, whereas Bengali has maintained, from the same origin (*na* + "be") both an invariable particle and an inflected negative particle used in equative and attributive sentences.

1. SINGLE ARGUMENT SENTENCE

1.1. Equative and attributive sentences

1.1.1. "Be" verb

Another typical feature of non-dravidianized Indo-Aryan languages is the absence of distinction between equative or attributive structures and locational or existential structures. This is a crucial difference with all Dravidian languages, and some Indo-Aryan languages influenced by Dravidian, which have different verbs for copula and existential functions, and different negative verbs (Lakshmi Bai 1986).

1a *vah ḍākṭar hai*
3s doctor is — he is a doctor

1b *uskā nām sudhīr hai*
3s-gen[3] name Sudhir is — his name is Sudhir

1c *vah bahut lambī hai*
3s very tall-f is — she is very tall

2a *niśā ghar mẽ hai*
Nisha house in is — Nisha is at home

2b *kamre mẽ ek mez hai*
room in one table is — there is a table in the room

2c *iśvar hai*
God is — God exists

1.1.2. Other stative verbs

Attributive sentences are also found with other verbs such as *ho jānā* "to become" ("be" + vector "go") and "seem" verbs[4]: *lagnā* "to seem" or *dīkhnā* (*dikhnā*) "to appear", complex predicates like *jān paṛnā* or *mālūm honā*[5] "to seem", *nazar ānā* "appear", *dikhāī denā* "appear (to sight)":

3a *vah bahut kamzor ho gayā thā*
3s very weak be go ppft-ms — he had become very weak

3b *gā̃v ke log baṛe sīdhe dikhte haĩ* (MA)
village of people much straightforward appear pres-3mp
villagers look quite simple (straightforward)

---

[3] The genitive postposition agrees in GN and case with head noun), cf. MI-2.4.2.1.
[4] Such sentences as (3b-c) can also be analysed as two clauses in generative grammar (cf. SII-1).
[5] *Mālūm honā* may also be used as a cognitive predicate meaning "to know", with the simple verb *honā.* But the "full" or "long" form of the verb "be" (cf. MII-Appendix) is always used for the meaning "to seem".

3c laṛkī bīmār jān paṛtī hai / mālūm hotī hai
girl sick seem pres / seem pres the girl seems sick

1.2. Other single argument sentences

Single participant sentences involving simple verbs other than "be" encode this participant in the unmarked case (nominative), irrespective of its semantic role as well as of the verbal semantics or aspectual features (dynamic or static, perfect of imperfect) :

4 laṛkī so rahī hai / ā rahī hai / jānbūjhkar āge baṛhī
girl sleep prog pres / come prog pres / deliberately ahead advance-aor
the girl is sleeping / is coming / deliberately stepped ahead

However such a case, where the main participant is represented as the unmarked agreement and controls verbal agreement, therefore fully behaving as a grammatical and syntactical subject, is not so frequent even in single argument clauses, given the number of verbo-nominal predicates which often involve oblique case marking of the main participant (cf. sections 3 to 7).

1.3. Sentences involving more than the obligatory NP

Apart from subject and attribute, necessarily required by the argumental structure of the one-place predicate, other NPs may be expressed in the sentence, in the form of "circumstantial" oblique arguments. Such NPs have been mentioned in the description of postpositions, which provide for cause, source, manner, commitative, instrument, goal, anteriority, posteriority, etc. complements, but not all of them are marked by postpositions. The ordering depends on the function, sentential or topic adverbial specifications preceding the subject, whereas unmarked complements precede the verb but follow the subject (and the objects if the predicate is transitive). The more distant the oblique complement and peripheric its relation with the predicate, the more initial its position, after the subject.

5a vah hamāre pās bahut dinõ ke bād āyā hai
3s 1p-gen[6] at many days after come pft-3ms
he has come to (visit) us after a long time

5b vah sālõ se is śahar mẽ rahtā hai
3s years abl this town in stay pres-3ms
he lives in this city since many years now

[6] Most complex postpositions require the genitive form of N (cf. MI-2.4.2.3).

5c ve usī vaqt baġīce mẽ apne dostõ ke sāth ghūm rahe the
3p same time garden in refl friends with walk prog impft-mp
they were taking a walk with their friends in the garden at that time

Time and place complements may consist in a bare nominal in the oblique form if they indicate duration or allation:

6b vah hamāre ghar āyā
3s our house came he came to our house[7]

But they are usually marked with the postposition corresponding to the meaning (ablative *se* "from" marking the starting point, *tak* "till" marking the reaching point, *mẽ* "in" marking the span of space or time: *akṭūbar mẽ* "in October", *din mẽ* "during the day", *baġīce mẽ* "in the garden"). Datation is marked by *ko* "to", optionally followed by the noun *tārīkh* "date" (*tīs akṭūbar ko* "on October thirty", *tīs ko /tīs tārīkh ko* "on the thirtieth"), concomitance by *par* "on" (*samay par* "on time", *uske āne par* "on his arrival").

REMARKS

1. The expected oblique case is however lacking in expressions of duration like *sārā din*, 'the whole day", *do mahīne* "during/for two months", *das sāl* "ten years". But the oblique is used for locating an event (*us rāt* "on that night", *usī din* "on that very day", *pahle mahīne* "the first month"). However, with a numeral, nouns of time when locating an event do not show oblique plural mark : *sālõ pahle* "years before", but *das sāl pahle* "ten years before", *do hāfte bād* "two weeks later".

The usually postpositional time complement *śām ko* "in the evening" loses its postposition when specified (*us śām* "that evening", *āj kī śām* "to-night"). Similarly *rāt ko* "at night", but *us rāt* "that night". In contrast, *sāvere/ sūbah* "morning" and *dopahar* "afternoon" do not require the postposition even if not specified.

2. Sentences involving fewer NPs than required by the argumental structure of the predicate can be considered as examples of recessive diathesis (cf. 2.5.3). For example, *intazār ho rahā thā,* waiting be prog impft, "waiting was going on", *jãc ho cukī thī*, checking be term ppft,

[7] The same meaning is expressed by *ke pās* (governing the genitive case), or by the adverb *yahā̃* "here" (*hamāre yahā̃ āyā*). The goal here may be considered as an obligatory locational argument and *jānā* "go", as a two place predicate. Yet sentences as *jā* "go", *ve gae the* "they had gone" display a one-place predicate.

"checking was over", actualise the complex (intransitive) predicate without any external argument, a discursive equivalent of the so-called impersonal passive in German or Roman languages. In the absence of any context, it is not possible to determine if the nominal *intazār* and *jā̃c* are hosts or independent nouns. Cf. (29) infra.

2. MULTIPLE ARGUMENTS SENTENCE: THE NOMINATIVE PATTERN

Simple transitive predicates in the imperfect aspect usually take unmarked arguments and, if required by the semantic structure of the predicate (three place predicates), an indirect object marked with the dative postposition *ko*, and/or an intermediate agent marked in the instrumental case (causative predicates). In all such cases, the agent is unmarked (nominative case) and the verb agrees with it. This pattern, similar to the English as well as to the Latin-Greek-Sanskrit one, is commonly referred to as the "nominative pattern", after the formal marking of the head noun.

2.1. The elementary transitive sentence in the non-perfect aspect

The basic transitive sentence has unmarked object and subject. However the first argument, which has precedence in unmarked sentences, is also the highest in the hierarchy and displays all subject properties. The verb agrees with the subject (7a), which is the main participant and argument and controls equi-NP deletion (7b-c), reflexivation (8) and conjunctive participle reduction (9):

7a *laṛkā sabzī khā rahā hai*
boy-ms vegetable-fs eat prog-ms pres-3s
the boy is eating vegetable

7b *laṛkā sabzī khānā cāhtā hai*
boy-ms vegetable eat want-ms pres-3s
the boy wants to eat vegetable

7c *cuhī billī khānā cāhtī hai*
mouse-fs cat-fs eat-inf want-fs pres-3s
the mouse wants to eat the cat

8 *vah uske lie mā̃s, apne lie sabzī mā̃gtā hai*
3s 3s-gen for meat, refl for vegetable order pres
he (usually) orders meat for him/her, vegetable for himself

9 *maĩ cāy banākar piyū̃gī*
1s tea make-CP drink-fut-1s I will make tea and drink it

In presence of a coordinating conjunction too (*aur* "and", *magar/lekin* "but") the subject appears as the highest argument, similar to the

subject of intransitive verbs in all respects: when two transitive and intransitive clauses are coordinate, the first subject needs no overt anaphor to be interpreted as subject of the second clause (10a), whereas the object has to be anaphorized by a full pronoun (10b):

10a *billī cuhī khāegī aur [ø] mar jāegī*
cat-fs mouse-fs eat-fut-fs and [ø] die go-fut-fs
the cat will eat the mouse and die

10b *billī cuhī dekh cukī thī par vah calī gaī*
cat-fs mouse-fs see term ppft-fs but 3s walked went-fs
the cat had seen the mouse but she/?he left

In such sentences, the category of subject is clearly identifiable, both at the morpho-syntactical level (unmarkedness, agreement control) and syntactic level (referential control), as well as the category of object, which can be promoted as the grammatical subject of a passive corresponding sentence:

11 *cuī khāī gayī*
mouse-fs eat-fs P-fs the mouse got eaten

2.2.The 'marked object'

2.2.1. The marked patient, a pan-indian feature, is consequently no longer a direct object (yet semantically a patient): in Hindi it is in the oblique case with the dative postposition (*ko*), when it refers to a human being (12a) or a specific inanimate entity (12b):

12a *Ramū ko / naukar ko bulāo*
Ramu acc /servant acc call-imper call Ramu / the servant

12b *is film ko dekhnā cāhtā hữ̃*
this-obl film acc see-inf want prest-1s
I want to see this (particular) film

12c *maĩ yah film dekh cukā hữ̃*
1s this film see term pres-1s
I have already seen this film

Both strategies for identifying a "direct patient" -- hence Masica's (1982) coining of "identifying object marking"-- are widely used, mostly separately, like in Spanish (*a* N) for the first and Persian (N *râ*) for the second (Aissen 2003). Both in their own way suggest that such marked patients are not typical patients, if we admit that the typical patient (Wierzbiecka 1998: 158), being symetrically opposed to the typical agent in a binary opposition, is devoid of agentive control and will, hence prototypically non-human and non-definite (a definite single entity is more likely to initiate an action than an indefinite

plural). As languages that mark human patients, Hindi emphasizes the fact that the agent is typically human and willful whereas patients are not. As languages that mark inanimate specific patients, Hindi also emphasizes the specificity implicitely correlated with the agent role. Definiteness alone is not enough to make a non-typical patient, as seen in (12b), and (12c) means not only "this film" but "this particular film both hearer and speaker have in mind", suggesting a shared knowledge. This shared knowledge may be contextual (12c), but may also refer to general facts of the world such as "moon", "sun", "time", which are not specific but specified as unique objects that everybody is supposed to know:

13 *mṛtyu ko, samay ko kaun rok saktā hai?*
death acc, time acc who stop can pres-3s
who can stop death, time?

Conversely, the human feature is not enough to make a patient atypical and marked: if this feature is subordinate to the abstract role played by the patient, which no longer appears as a human entity but rather as a general function, it is unmarked: *naukar rakhnā* "to keep a servant" (contrast with 12c), *cuṛail rakhnā*, "keep a concubine", or *laṛkā dekhnā* "to look for a suitable boy" (lit. look/see the boy) for marrying a girl.

Marked (14) as well as unmarked (11), the patient is allowed to behave as the main argument of the passive corresponding sentence, but the marked patient is devoid of morphological control properties (masculine singular or "default agreement", in the absence of a neutral gender, neither the patient nor the agent controlling agreement):

14 *kyā mṛtyu ko, samay ko rokā jā saktā hai?*
Q death-fs acc time acc stop-ms P-ms can-ms pres
can death and time be stopped /can anyone stop death?

2.2.2. History of the object marking

The fact that the marking is not morphologically specific in Indo-Aryan languages, unlike in Dravidian languages (tamil *-ai*) or Iranian languages (Persian *-râ*), suggests that such a marking is not original but has been acquired, by contact either with Iranian languages (Masica 1982) or with Dravidian languages, where human object marking is also required along with definite object marking also limited to specified objects (Lehmann 1989: 180).

Dialects give ample evidence for the secondary (acquired) nature of such a marking, none of them exhibiting specific forms for identifying the

object: the dative postpositon is used in all of them (*lā* in Pahārī languages, *no/nõ/nữ* in Rajasthani speeches, *ke*/*kā* in Bihari languages).

2.3. Ditransitive sentences: the beneficiary or indirect object

Three-place predicates have their patient (direct object, usually inanimate) unmarked and the attributive entity (usually human) marked in the dative by the postposition *ko* "to". Verbs like *denā* "to give", *likhnā* "to write", *bhejnā* "to send", as well as a number of derived transitives or causative verbs (feed, teach, etc.) fall in that category, providing sentences where the verb agrees with the unmarked main argument. This unmarked argument, controlling agreement, as well as reflexivation and conjunctive participle, behaves as a subject, as in transitive imperfective sentences:

15a *maĩ ghar ākar apne dost ko ciṭṭhī likhne lagā*
1s home come-CP refl friend dat letter write started
back home, I started writing a letter to my friend

15b *mã̃ cāval pakākar baccõ ko khilā rahī hai*
mother rice cook-CP child-mp dat eat-caus prog-fs pres-3s
the mother after cooking the rice is feeding (it) to the children

Passive corresponding sentences promote the direct object and not the beneficiary of basically transitive verbs, which tends to show that Hindi has a hierarchy DO > IO (patient> beneficiary) unlike African languages or English for instance ("he was given the book"):

16 *kitāb rām ko dī gaī / *rām kitāb diyā gayā*
book-fs Ram dat give P-aor-fs / *Ram book give P-aor-ms
the book was given to Ram / Ram was given a book

However, derived transitive and causative verbs allow their beneficiary (indirect or identified object?) to become subject of passives (17a), but not if a direct object is expressed, in which case only the direct object can (17b):

17a *baccõ ko khilāyā gayā /bacce khilāe gae*
children dat feed P-aor-ms / children feed P-aor-mp
the babies were fed (given to drink)

17b *baccõ ko dūdh pilāyā gayā / *bacce dūdh pilāe gae*
children dat milk drink-caus P-aor /* children mild drink-caus P-aor-mp
the babies were given milk to drink

Such pairs suggest that the higher object is the unmarked patient, the marked object ranking high only if no direct object is present.

REMARKS

1. A pronominalized object is more often marked than a nominal one:

*yah kitāb mez par rakh do / ise (*yah) mez par rakh do*
this book table on put do / it-acc (*it-D) table on put do
put this book on the table / put it on the table

The immediate sequence of two nouns marked with *ko* is generally avoided.

2. Many predicates requiring a bare dative in English require in Hindi the postpositive locution *ke lie* "for": I will buy you a sweet, *maĩ tumhāre lie tāfī kharīdũgī* (lif. I will buy for you a sweet), *uske lie kitāb lāo*, "bring him the book" (lit. bring for him).

2.4. Double causative and causative sentences

Double causative predicates (derived bases with the *-vā* suffixe, cf. MII-2.2) are said to require one more argument corresponding to the semantic role of the intermediate agent and morphology encoded with an instrumental argument (+ *se*):

18a *maĩ naukar se apnā sāmān uṭhvātā hũ̃*
1s servant instr refl luggage lift-caus pres
I have my luggage taken (lifted) by the servant, I have the servant take my luggage

18b *mã̃ baṛī laṛkī se bacce ko dūdh pilvā rahī hai*
mother elder girl instr child acc milk drink-caus2 prog pres
the mother is having the child fed milk by the elder sister, the mother is having the elder sister give the child milk to drink

In contrast, causative predicates, if derived (+*ā*) from a transitive base (*khilānā* "feed" < *khānā* "eat", *dikhānā* "show" < *dekhnā* "see") are supposed to add their extra argument in the marked accusative form (+ *ko*), and, if derived from an intransitive base (*uṭhānā* "lift" < *uṭhnā* "be lifted"), are supposed to require their extra argument in the unmarked accusative form.

However, verbs involving an affected patient ("ingestive" verbs like "to feed", "to make drink", "to make taste", or "psychological" verbs like "to make learn", "to make hear/tell") always have this patient represented with a dative/accusative mark, with both a double causative (*-vā*) or causative (*-ā*) predicate. With the same number of arguments, such a predicate may then involve either an intermediate agent in the instrumental (*se*) or an affected patient which is also the

intermediate agent in the dative/accusative (*ko*) along with the unmarked patient (examples after Saxena 1985):

19a *mɑ̃* *bacce ko* *māsālā* *cakh(v)ā rahī hai*
mother child acc/dat sauce taste-caus prog pres
the mother is having the child taste the sauce (for his benefit)

20a *māsṭar* *bacce ko* *pāṭh* *paṛh(v)ā rahe haĩ*
master child acc/dat lesson read-caus prog pres-H
the master has the child read the lesson (for his benefit)

The same extra argument in the instrumental would necessarily convey the meaning that the action is not performed for the agent's benefit but for others benefit (the mother's or the class benefit):

19b *mɑ̃* *bacce se* *masālā cakhvā rahī hai*
mother child *se* sauce taste-caus prog pres
the mother is having the child taste the sauce, is having the sauce tasted by the child (in order to check the sauce)

20b *māsṭar* *bacce se pāṭh* *paṛhvā rahe haĩ*
master child *se* lesson read-caus prog pres-H
the master has the child read the lesson (for others to listen), the master has the lesson read by the child

Some speakers do not allow the *-vā* derivation in the non instrumental reading of such sentences, Saxena allows *-vā* in the the (a) series, most speakers interpret the *ko* V-*vā* pattern in the "helping" meaning (Bahl 1967, Verma 1875), but all agree on the instrumental reading of the N-*se* and the non instrumental reading of the N-*ko* sentences with the same number of arguments, which means that case-marking is semantically relevant, even when the *-(v)ā* verbal derivation is not (see the synonymy of *karānā/karvānā* "to cause to do, make do").

2.5. Construction of the patient of verbo-nominal predicates : non-argumental status of the nominal entity

Complex predicates formed with a nominal, usually grouped within two categories, are of three kinds (cf. MII-2.3), which behave differently regarding the external patient role, but all of them share the common feature of not allowing their nominal the full NP status. Such a combination is adequately analysed as a single complex predicate with light verb (Butt 1993, Mohanan 1993) merging the arguments of the noun and the verb in a single argument structure (Davison, to appear, a). The noun which conveys most of the semantic features of the predicate is called the "host" in Mohanan (1993), allowing isomorphy with the stem which hosts the affixes, while the light verb completes the host as voice/tense affixes complete the stem.

This noun can never be identified by the accusative marker nor can it be specified by a qualifying adjective or adjectival participle[8] nor can it be relativized or questioned or vary in number as can regular objects NPs, whereas the external noun can (21a-c):

21a *maĩ lālvālī sāṛī bahut pasand [*ko] kartī hũ̃, isko lũ̃gī*
1s red-*vālā* sari much liking [*acc] do pres-1s, this-acc take-fut-1s
I like the red sari very much, I will take it

21b *maĩ rām kā intazār [*ko] kar rahī thī*
1s Ram gen waiting [*acc] do prog impft
I was waiting for Ram

21c *maĩ rām se [*lambī] bāt [*ko] kar rahā hũ̃*
1s Ram with [*long] talk [*acc] do prog pres-1s
I am speaking to Ram

21d **sāṛī jo pasand kartī hũ̃ /*ram kā jo intazār kar rahī hũ̃*
sari rel liking do-1s / Ram gen rel waiting do prog pres-1s

21e *jo sāṛī pasand kartī hũ̃ /jiskā intazār kar rahī hũ̃ vah...*
rel sari liking do-1s / rel-gen waiting do prog pres-1s 3s
the sari I like / the one whom I am waiting for…

Such nouns, never individualised, always refer to abstract notions of action or state conveying the semantic feature of the predicative notion as a kind of nouns of action. Unlike incorporating predicates, they do not combine with generic/indefinite nouns to describe routine activities as opposed to individuated specific actions (Mithun 1984, 1986) such as 'pick-up berries', 'apple-collect', 'fish-catch'. Hindi is more like 'collecting do', 'fishing do'.

2.5.1. The coalescent type

The first type almost behaves as a simple verb, its nominal as well as non-nominal component being quasi incorporated in such complex predicates as for example *khatm karnā* "to finish", or *band karnā* "to close", which involve a participle, or *khālī karnā* "to empty" which involves an adjective. The solidarity of both elements can only be broken by such particles (*hī, to, bhī*) which also can occur between a host and a light verb in unmarked order (*pasand to kar rahī hũ* "I am liking", *band to kar cukī hũ̃* "I have (made) closed"),and between a verbal base and auxiliaries with simple verbs like *ronā* "to cry" *(ro to*

[8] The only adjective allowed in the unmarked statement is "big" (*baṛā*), often used in the meaning of *bahut* "much, very" (*baṛā acchā* "very good"), and similar adverbialized adjectives like *itnā, kitnā* "so much").

rahī hũ̃ "I am crying"). Exceptionally, the host may be extraposed (*kar cukī hũ̃ band* "I have made, closed") whereas a verbal simple base cannot be extraposed to the auxiliary[9]. The major sign of the strong coalescence between both elements is the possibility for the external object to freely allow the accusative marking, an indication that the object cannot be the internal nominal since this argumental function is attached to the external noun:

22 maĩ isko zyādā pasand kartī hũ̃
1s this-acc more liking do pres-1s
I prefer this one

In the ergative (cf. 2) as in the passive sentence, the external noun and not the internal nominal controls agreement, as with simple verbs:

23a maĩne lālvālī sāṛī pasand kī
1s-erg red-*vālā* sari-fs liking do-aor-fs I chose the red sari

23b yah zamīn kāfī samay tak istemāl kī gaī thī
this land-fs enough time till use-ms do P ppft-fs
this land had been used for quite a long time[10]

23c is tarah kī bātẽ samjhī nahĩ̃, anubhav kī jā saktī haĩ
this manner of things understood neg, feeling do-f P can-f pres-p
these things cannot be understood, they can (only) be felt

2.5.2. The non-coalescent type 1

The second type (N *kā* V) differs from type 1 by the fact that no external object can be marked as such, since the patient is nominally related (genitive case) to the inner nominal of the predicate and that agreement is with the inner nominal and not with the external noun in the ergative and passive constructions:

24a maĩne sītā kā intazār kiyā
1s-erg Sita-fs gen waiting-ms do-sp-ms
I waited for Sita

24b mīṭĩg kā udghāṭan kiyā gayā
meeting-fs gen inauguration-ms do P-aor-ms
the meeting was inaugurated

Still, the semantic patient role remains attached to the genitive (external) noun, which alone can be specified (25a) and relativised (25b), although it cannot be accusatively marked:

---

[9] It can only be factorized (auxiliary can head more than one verbal base).
[10] *Istemāl,* with *anubhav, yād, patā,* are some of the very few nouns allowing the two constructions (coalescent and non-coalescent: see MII-2.3).

25a *ānevāle logõ kā /apne aur apne pati ke dostõ kā intazār kar rahī thī*
come-*vālā* people of /refl and refl husband of friends of waiting do prog impft
(I) was waiting for the people coming / my friends and my husband's friends

25b *jin logõ kā intazār kar rahī thī, ve āe nahĩ*
rel people of waiting was doing, they came neg
the people I was waiting for did not come

In the last three types, the real status of the nominal is strongly ambiguous, neither object nor fully integrated to the predicate.

2.5.3. Non-coalescent type 2

A few nouns can be used to form complex predicates, ruling out accusative marking while retaining the control of agreement in the ergative as well as passive construction (like type 1 non-coalescent), without involving nominal rection of the external NP (unlike type 1):

26a *maĩ rām se prem/nafrat [*ko] kartī hũ̃*
1s Ram with love/hatred [*acc] do pres I love /hate Ram

26b *maĩne rām se bāt [*ko] kī*
1s-erg Ram with talk-fs [*acc] do-aor-fs I talked to Ram

26c *maĩne rām par viśvās [*ko] kiyā*
1s-erg Ram on trust-ms [*acc] do-aor-ms I trusted Ram

Analysing the external NP as a third role and oblique argument added to the patient (direct object argument: host) is ruled out by the fact that overt accusative/dative marking may appear on the external argument. (27a), although deemed by the purist as a substandard variant of (26a), behaves exactly like the simple verb *cāhnā* "to want/to like":

27a *maĩ rām ko pyār/prem kartī hũ̃ /maĩ rām ko cāhtī hũ̃*
1s Ram acc love do pres-1s /1s Ram acc want/like pres-1s
I love/like Ram

27b *Sītā ne use dhyān nahĩ diyā*
Sita erg 3s-dat attention neg give-aor-ms
Sita did not pay attention to him

In the same way, in (26b) *rām se bāt karnā* is isomorphic to *rām se kahnā* "say to Ram" and to *rām se bolnā* "tell Ram", with the only difference that the host, not 'Ram', controls the agreement in the ergative and passive constructions. This feature radically distinguishes them from the coalescent type. What distinguishes them from the first non-coalescent type, along with the nominal rection, is that the host itself provides for a verbal valency mapped into full NP arguments.

Syntactically, the external agreement in the coalescent type can be accounted for by the fact that the host plays no role by itself in valency attribution (rather than by the intransitivity of nouns such as *yād*, *pasand*, in Mohanan 1993). Besides, the coalescent type alone (28g, 28i) seems really awkward or inacceptable if the host is separated by scrambled heavy groups from the verb, whereas non-coalescent types are natural (28a even more than 28b):

28a *mausam par bharosā kaun kar saktā hai?*
weather on trust who do can pres-3s

28b *mausam par kaun bharosā kar saktā hai?*
weather on who trust do can pres-3s
who can rely on weather?

28c *un laṛkiyõ mẽ se kaun/ kaunsī bevaqūf laṛkī rām se pyār karegī?*
dem gil-fp in from who/ which stupid girl Ram with love do-fut-fs

28d *ram se pyar un laṛkiyõ mẽ se kaun/kaunsī bevaqūf laṛkī karegī?*
Ram with love those girls in from who/which stupid girl do-fut-fs
which of these girls/which stupid girl will love Ram?

28e *rām kā /āp logõ mẽ se kaun / kab tak intazār karegā?*
Ram gen /you people in from who / when till waiting do-fut-ms

28f *rām kā intazār āp logõ mẽ se /kab tak kaun karegā ?*
Ram gen waiting you people in from /when till who do-fut
who among you will /till when one will wait for Ram?

28g *?? yah sastī sāṛī pasand kaunsī bevaqūf laṛkī karegī?*
?? this cheap sari liking which stupid girl do-fut-fs

28h *yah sastī sāṛī kaunsī bevaqūf laṛkī pasand karegī?*
this cheap sari which stupid girl liking do-fut-fs
which stupid girl will like this cheap sari?

28i *??yah zamīn istemāl kāfī samay tak kī gaī*
?? this land use quite-long time till do P-aor-fs

28j *yah zamīn kāfī samay tak istemāl kī gaī*
this land-fs quite-long time till use do P-aor-fs
this land has been used for quite a time

All three patterns however show the fuzzyness of syntactical categories (object) as well as speech categories (verb / noun).

REMARK

This relative autonomy should not be confused with the behaviour of such nouns as fully independent nouns, sometimes with the same morphological verbal base (*prem karnā*) or with a different one (*bāt*

kahnā). But they are no longer hosts in complex predicates, hence they allow various specifications (adj, WH-questions, etc.):

29a *Ravi ne itnā gahrā pyār kisī dūsrī laṛkī se kabhī nahĩ kiyā thā*
Ravi erg such deep love indef other girl with never do-ppft
Ravi had never had such a deep love on any other girl before

29b *itnī lambī bāt tumne mujhse kahā̃ kahī thī ?*
such long talk you-erg 1s-with where say ppft
had you ever (where had you) had with me such a long talk?

29c *mujhse kaunsī bāt kahī tumne?*
1s-with which thing said 2-erg? what thing did you tell me?

3. THE ERGATIVE PATTERN: MARKED AGENT IN "SUBJECT" POSITION

3.1. Morpho-syntactic facts

3.1.1 Marked agent with unmarked patient

Such sentences as (30a) occur throughout the perfect system in all moods and tenses (cf. MII-3.2.1.3) whenever the predicate is transitive (with direct object). In other aspectual environment, the nominative alignment is retained (30b):

30a *laṛke ne gẽd phẽkī laṛke ne donõ ciṭṭhyiā̃ bhejĩ*
boy-ms erg ball-fs throw-fs boy-ms-obl erg two letter-fp send-fp
the boy threw the ball the boy sent both letters

30b *laṛkā gẽd phẽk rahā hai laṛkā donõ ciṭṭhiyā̃ bhejegā*
boy-ms ball-fs throw prog pres-ms3 boy-ms two letter-fp send-fut-ms3
the boy is throwing the ball the boy will send both letters

Hindi is thus a language with split ergativity. In ergative statements, the agent is in the oblique form, marked with the specific postposition *ne,* and the verb agrees with the unmarked patient in gender and number (no first or second person is allowed to be a direct patient: see above). Such patterns show a clear patient prominence at the level of case marking and agreement. The presence of a third argument in the form of a dative indirect object (31a) or any other oblique NP (31b) does not modify the pattern of agreement:

31a *rām ne naukrānī ko paise die*
Ram erg servant-fs dat money-mp give-mp
Ram gave money to the maid

31b *rām ne kuch sockar apne dostõ ko pūrī bāt batāī*
Ram erg somewhat think-CP refl friend-mp to entire thing-fs tell-fs
Ram having thought a little told the whole story to his friends

The masculine singular agreement mark is used for neutral patients like *kyā* "what", indefinites like *kuch* "something", *kuch nahĩ* "nothing", *sab kuch* "everything, all", *bahut* "much", or complement clauses introduced by *ki* "that":

32 *tumne kyā kahā? hamne kahā ki...*
2-erg what say-ms? 1p-erg say-ms that…
what did you say? we said that…

A zero anaphor of the patient does not prevent the NP (contextually recoverable) from controlling agreement:

33 *mujhe cābī do! tumne kahã rakhī?*
1s-dat key-fs give-imper! 2-erg where put-fs
give me the key! Where did you put it?

In the absence of a recoverable patient, the predicate remains formally transitive, retains its marked agent and agrees in the neutral form, "default" agreement mark which in Hindi is in the masculine singular (for lack of a specific neutral gender mark)[11]:

34 *hamne jaldī khāyā*
1p-erg quickly eat-ms we ate quickly

3.1.2. Marked agent and marked patient

If the direct patient is marked, the verb no longer agrees with it but does not agree with the marked agent and takes the default agreement mark (ms: *ā*). Such sentences present no asymmetry, making it impossible to hierarchize both arguments at the level of agreement and case marking:

34 *ātãkvādiyõ ne do mahilāõ ko mār diyā*
terrorist-mp-obl erg two woman-fp-obl acc kill give-ms
the terrorists killed two women

3.1.3. The so-called exceptions

3.1.3.1. Transitive verbs never allowing ergative marking for agent
Lānā "to bring", *le ānā* "to bring/take in", *le jānā* "to bring/take out", *bhūlnā* "to forget", although requiring patients in the marked or unmarked accusative, retain the unmarked agent and nominative pattern of agreement in the perfect system: *rām roṭī lāyā*, Ram-ms bread-fs bring-ms, "Ram brought the bread", *maĩ apnī cābī bhūl gayā hũ̃*, I refl key forget go pft-1s "I have forgotten my key". The intransitivity of the last verb is frequently given as an explanation: *ānā*

[11] Unlike three genders languages like Marathi which uses the neutral marker.

"come" and *jānā* "go" behave as heads in the pair of compound predicates, and *lānā* may result from the compacting of such a compound. As for *bhūlnā*, it is systematically used with the vector *jānā* in the affirmative form and the non ergative pattern generalized in the negative vectorless form also. Similarly *jītnā* "to win", *hārnā* "to lose" are most often *ne*-less verbs.

3.1.3.2. Intransitive verbs requiring ergative marking

Chı̃knā "to sneeze", *khə̃snā* "to cough", *mūtnā* "to urinate", *mitlānā* "to vomite, nauseate", *dakārnā* "to belch", belong to the well-known group of "anti-impersonnal" ergative verbs across languages (Lazard 1994), referring to physiological instant processes that cannot be controlled. Still not well explained, such exceptions are regular in ergative languages (Dixon 1994). Also found (not systematically) with ergative: *kə̃pnā* "to quiver", *bhaũknā* "to bark".

3.1.3.3. Mixed combinations of vectors and main verbs

The intransitive vector, and not the main verb, is relevant for the ergative patterning (cf. MII-3.2.3.5):

35a *mahilā ek hī sə̃s mẽ pānī pī gaī*
woman one just breath in water-ms drink go-fs
the woman gulped all the water in a single breath.

But *cal denā* (go give) usually retains its unmarked subject, selected by the main verb, as well as *ro lenā* (cry take) or *cillā denā* (shriek give):

35b *maı̃ beqābū ho ro dī,*
1s uncontrolled be-CP cry give-fs
out of control, I started crying

35c *tum cillā die*
2 shout gave-mp you shouted

Although the process is often more deliberate with *denā* than with the simple verb, intensity here (35b) is emphasized rather than volition.

3.1.3.4. Verbs allowing both ergative and nominative agents

Quite a few verbs like *samajhnā* "to understand", occur with both constructions, or more rarely *cīkhnā*, "to shriek", *mānnā*, "to admit":

35d *logõ ne pahle hī mānā thā*
people erg before just admit ppft people had already admitted

35e *vah is bāt ko mānā ki uskā vyāpār ghāṭ mẽ cal rahā hai*
he this thing acc admitted that his business ruin in walk prog pres
he admitted (the fact) that his business was doing badly

3.2. Control properties

3.2.1. Equi-NP deletion

Although the patient is prominent at the moprho-syntactic level (case, agreement), the syntactico-semantic level (reference and control) makes it clear that the agent remains the highest entity in the hierarchy. It systematically controls co-reference, which is not the case in canonically ergative languages like Dyirbal (Dixon 1979, 1994): equi-NP deletion (36a), conjunctive reduction[12] and reflexivation (31, 36b), whatever the sequential order (36c-d). It also behaves as an intransitive subject in coordinate clauses, whereas the patient, if becoming the subject of a following clause, has to be anaphorized by a pronoun (36e-f):

36a *laṛkiyõ ne bāhar jānā cāhā*
girl-fp erg outside go want-ms the girls wanted to go outside

36b *larke ne pen lekar apnī kahānī likh ḍālī*
boy erg pen take-CP refl story-fs write throw-aor-fs
the boy took a pen and dashed off his story

36c *pen lekar laṛke ne apnī kahānī likh ḍalī*
pen take-CP boy erg refl story-fs write throw-aor-fs
the boy took a pen and dashed off his story

36d *apnī kahānī unhõne gāndhījī ko yād karke likhī*
refl story-fs 3H-erg Gandhi acc remember-CP wrote-fs
his story, he wrote it invoking/ thinking of Gandhi

36e *laṛke ne pen liyā aur ġāyab ho gayā*
boy erg pen-ms take-aor and ost be go-aor-ms
the boy took the pen and disappeared

36f *laṛke ne pen bahut ḍhũḍhā lekin vah (*Ø) ġāyab ho gayā thā*
boy erg pen much search-aor but 3s (*Ø) lost be go ppft
the boy thoroughly looked for the pen but it had disappeared

The agent relativizes as easily as the unmarked main argument (Montaut 1991), but the topic continuity (Kachru 1987) seems to indicate that ergative agents do less well than nominative subjects, and patients of ergative statements do better than other patients.
These facts point to the syntactic ambivalence of the argument marked in the ergative case. Agreement assigns subjecthood to the patient, reference control and equi-NP deletion to the agent, which is equally

[12] Ergative marked arguments not only control, but also undergo conjunctive reduction (36b).

endowed with the sequential properties of subjects in Hindi. To sum up, subject properties are split between both arguments -- a split which questions the very categories of subject and object (cf. 8). The ergative pattern is not a mirror image of the transitive pattern, as often noted (Comrie 1978, 1979, Delancey 1981, Langacker 1990, 1999), since it no longer correlates with a source-goal alignment with binary symmetry and clear hierarchy, with all subjectal properties attached to the first unmarked term. This invalidates former assumptions that ergative structure parallels passive in promoting the patient (and antipassive parallels active in promoting the agent) in "purely" ergative languages (Schuchart 1905). However, such a symmetry is obviously fallacious, since many languages, including Hindi, allow both passive and ergative structures.

3.2.2. Embedded infinitive

When the direct object is an infinitive or verbal noun[13], the verb regularly agrees with the verbal noun in the masculine singular if the infinitive is itself intransitive (36a). If the infinitive is transitive, its object controls the agreement both on the infinitive, which varies like an adjective, and on the main verb -- a possible Punjabi influence:

37a *tumne merī jān lenī cāhī* (AAA)
2-erg my-fs life-fs take-fs want-fs
you wanted to take my life (to kill me)

37b *sītā ne ek ek karke sabhī <u>kh</u>at paṛhne śurū kiye the*
Sita erg one one do-CP all letter-mp read-mp begin ppft-mp
Sita had begun to read all the letters one by one

However, frequent alternations in the agreement pattern occur with expressions like "drink tea", "buy vegetables", "drive a car" where the feminine object does not necessarily control the agreement:

38a *maĩne cāy pīnā cāhā / (?) pīnī cāhī*
1s-erg tea-fs drink-ms want-ms / drink-fs want-fs
I wanted to drink tea

38b *maĩne gāṛī calānā sīkhā* — *maĩne gāṛī calānī sīkhī*
1s-erg car-fs drive-ms learn-ms — 1s-erg car-fs drive-fs learn-fs
I learnt car driving — I learnt how to drive a car

[13] Verbs with direct infinitive object: *jānnā* "to know", *sīkhnā* "to learn", *śurū karnā* "to begin", *<u>kh</u>atm karnā* "to finish", *cāhnā* "to want", *bhūlnā* "to forget".

Although both constructions freely alternate in certain contexts, there is a semantic difference which accounts for the obligatory agreement in (37) and usual non-agreement in (38a): if the object noun is definite, specific or otherwise qualified, or simply perceived by the speaker as a distinct referencial entity, it will control agreement. If perceived as a generic non referential entity, it does not prevent the infinitive to behave as an intransitive (masculine agreement pattern), which means that it incorporates with it to form a single intransitive like unit. Such facts also show that the categories of speech (N/V), although generally well marked in Hindi, may get reshaped in conformity with the attitude of the speaker in the process of utterance (regarding the representation of the object).

3.5. Semantics of the ergative alignment

The relevance of ergativity in the language, long denied at the "deep level" (Kachru 1980), started attracting interest in late eighties (Kachru 1987), leading to a considerable amount of work in the field of formal syntax (Mahajan 1990, 1991, Davison 1991, 2002). Semantics have comparatively been far less investigated. However, since ergativity is linked to transitivity, the semantic features triggering transitivity in Hindi have been correlated to the ergative alignment, namely control and volitionality (Kachru 1981). Besides, aspect, which is the other triggering factor in Hindi, has its own specific semantics.

3.5.1. Aspectual semantics

Even if the simple past form now refers to a past event and not to the resultant state of an anterior process (perfect), its origin as a past participle behaving as a perfect is still responsible for certain constructions, in conformity with the general semantics of the perfect. In the accomplished aspect, the linguistic viewpoint (Delancey 1981) is related to the patient, starting point of the "linguistic attention flow" and not to the source as it is in the non-accomplished system (present, imperfect or future). Such a disjunction between the "natural attention flow" (from source to goal) is reflected in the oblique marking of the source in the ergative pattern, which primarily predicates something about the patient and not about the agent. In Hindi, the stative orientation of the structure, which is formally nominal, is reflected, not only by the morphology of the verbal form (participle-like), but also by the retention of nominal rection for adverbial specifications

and the possible occurrence of *huā* ("having been") occurring as a second auxiliary in the perfect predicate:

39a *ãkhẽ mũd lo ! maĩne to (ãkhẽ) kab kī mũdī huī haĩ !*
eye-fp close take 1s-erg ptcl (eyes-fs) when gen -fs close *huā* pft
close your eyes! I have them closed since ages (since how long)

39b *maĩne yah kavitā pahle kī likhī huī hai*
1s-erg this poem before gen-fs written-fs *huā* is
I have written this poem before

Both facts are ruled out in the unaccomplished aspect (40a) and in the passive voice (40b), which is often taken to pattern like ergative:

40a *vah kavītāẽ pahle [*kī/*kā] likhtā [*huā] thā*
3s poems before [gen-fs/ms] writing [**huā*] past-impft
he wrote poems before

40b *uske dvārā bahut kavitāẽ pahle [*kī] likhī gaī [*huī] thĩ̃*
3s by-P many poems before [*gen] written P [**huā*] were
many poems had been written by him before

Another difference between passive and ergative is the contruction of the agent when the predicate is participialized, the passive participle retaining the agent marker *ke dvārā* whereas the active accomplished participle requires the agent to be in the genitive, as a nominal expansion of the verbal form:

41a *mohan kī likhī (huī) kahānī*
Mohan gen written-fs (*huā*) story-fs
the story written by Mohan (Mohan's written story)

41b *mohan ke dvārā (*kī) likhī gaī (*huī) kāhnī*
Mohan by-P (*gen-fs) written-fs P (**huā*) story-fs
the story written by Mohan

This confirms the nominal orientation of the pattern and the stative specific semantics of the perfect, which is its historical origin (cf. 3.6).

3.5.2. Volition and consciousness

Volitionality and control are features usually associated with transitivity in Hindi, and hence do not discriminate ergative from non ergative patterns in transitive verbs. However some of the exceptions mentionned above show that the ergative structure correlates with a higher degree of volition or at least what Butt (1993) calls "conscious choice": according to her, the use of a transitive vector for an intransitive verb requires the ergative pattern if the meaning involves

conscious choice (*usne ro ḍālā* "he started crying" mightfully, on purpose), whereas the use of an intransitive vector rules out such a feature (*vah ro uṭhā*). Simple verbs also may exhibite a similar difference : *vah cīkhā* "he screamed despite himself" vs *usne cīkhā* "he screamed on purpose".
However there is no volitionality nor even conscious choice involved in non intentional uses of *dekhnā* "to see", *sunnā* "to hear, hear it say" or in any of the meanings of *pānā* "to find", or complex structures like *anubhav karnā* "to experience", always requiring the ergative structure:

42a *maĩne sunā ki vah ānevālā hai*
1s-erg hear-aor that he come-*vālā* is
I hear that he will be coming

42b *maĩne sītā ko rote hue pāyā / dekhā*
1s-erg Sita acc crying *huā* find-aor-ms / see-aor-ms
I found /saw Sita crying

The discriminating feature here, in contrast with other non-intentional structures (cf. 4.1.2), is the degree of reflexive consciousness of the main argument, whether in the nominative or in the ergative (Montaut 1991, 2001, 2004b). Similar non-deliberate structures are frequently found with verbo-nominal predicates such as *mahasūs karnā* "to feel". Even when the process may not result from the participant's volition or conscious choice, it is always the object of a conscious assumption (never inadvertent). Conscious awareness appears as the minimal feature of agentivity (volition > intention > choice > conscious awareness) triggering transitivity and ergativity.

3. 6. History of the structure in regional Indo-Aryan speeches

The ergative pattern orginated from the generalization of the nominal sentence with a past passive participle (ppp) in classical Sanskrit as predicate, a very common pattern in Indo-Iranian, throroughly commented by Cardona (1970) and Bloch (1906), Trask (1978) for Sanskrit, Benveniste (1952) and Kurylovicz (1953, 1965) for Iranian, and by Peterson (1998) for Indo-Aryan:

43 *mayā tat* *kṛtam* *(Sanskrit)*
mana tat *kardam* *(Old Persian)*
1s-instr this-ns-nom do-ppp-ns-nom I have done that

3.6.1. Grammaticization of the canonical pattern

The contrast of the pattern in (43) with the vedic system (finite predicate in the aorist, perfect, pluperfect and nominative subject) involved, at first, a marked stylistic insistance on the resulting state, which treats the patient as the topic and subject of the sentence (litt. 'by me this done'). The predicative participle agrees with the patient in the nominative case, and the agent is marked in the instrumental (or genitive) case.

The first step in the grammaticization occurred when such expressions generalized for all transitive predications in the past (Breunis 1990: 141), ruling out the choice of finite verbs, and lost their expressive meaning. Then they started expressing both the resulting state and the anterior event. When a new form with copula came to grammaticize as the expression of the resulting state, the simple form retained only the meaning of anterior. A parallel process extended to intransitive. In languages with relatively free word order, the first position expresses the topic, in classical Sanskrit and later in Prakrit (ex. from Bloch 1906, Breunis 1990):

44a *mayāyam vr̥ta* *upādhyāyaḥ*
1s-instr chose-ppp-ms-nom master-ms-masc
I have chosen the master

44b *sarvavedā* *akṣaraśo me* *dhittāḥ*
all-Veda-mp-nom by-letter 1s-dat/gen know-ppp-mp-nom
I know all the Vedas by heart

This contrasts as early as Kalidas's times with the present system using nominative agent (examples from Prakrit songs in *Vikramorvaśiya*, with already oblique syncretic cases):

45 *hau* *pai* *pucchimi*
1s-nom you-O ask-pres-1s
diṭṭhī *pia* *pai* *sāmuha* *jantī*
seen-fs-nom beloved-fs-nom 2-O front going-fs-nom
I ask you… did you see my beloved passing here

The modern form of first person pronoun *maĩ* is clearly drawn from the Sanskrit instrumental, the only significant recent change being the addition of the marker *ne* to the oblique form, as an overcharacterization. But oblique forms without ergative markers were current in Old Braj (*susai yah bāt kahī,* the hare (obl) said-fs this thing-fs), and are still found in Western dialects.

3.6.2. Regional variations

3.6.2.1. A distinctively western pattern

Marwari presents an ergative pattern of agreement with no specific agentive marker (and, as other Rajasthani dialects as shown in Khokhlova 1992, agreement with marked object):

46a choriyɜ̃ ambā khāyā
girl-fp-O mango-mp eat-mp the girls ate mangoes

46b voh ghoṛanai maryau
3ms horse-ms-acc hit-ms he hit the horse

46c chorai chorī nai dekhī
boy-ms-O girl-fs acc look-fs the boy looked at the girl

Kanauji, Bundeli, Garhwali/Kumaoni (47) have various ergative markers (cf. MI-2.4.2.2) but similar agreement patterns:

47 beṭā na/la vai sai bolyau
son erg 3s with say-ms the son told him

The line separating both +/- ergative isoglosses seems to cut Bihar off from the western regions, with Bhojpuri on the borderline: modern Bhojpuri has no ergative structure (48a), and even Avadhi does not clearly mark it. As for Dakkhini, it too has no ergative structure (48b), due to the Dravidian contact, which has always ignored ergativity:

48a tā balakā uṭhāvele
he-nom child lift-past-3s he took the child

48b rām roṭī khāyā
Ram-ms bread-slice-fs eat-ms Ram ate the bread

Eastern Bihari languages (Magahi, Maithili) present no ergative pattern. Their verbal system is said to have been influenced by Munda languages (Verma 1991), because the predicate is suffixed with clitic marks refering to both agent and animate patient or agent and beneficiary, irrespective of aspect, a typical feature of the Munda family:

49a ham to.ra kitab de.l.auk
1 2NH-acc/dat book give-past-1+2NH I gave you the book

49b ahan sab am kha le.l.ahũ
2-H all mango eat take-past-2H you ate up all the mangoes

49c ham un.kā piṭ.al.iainh
1 3H-acc/dat beat-pres-1+3H I beat him

49d ham toh.ar bhauji ch.iauk?
1s 3NH-gen brother's wife be-I+2NH am I your brother's wife?

Whereas (49a), agrees with animate subject and indirect object, (49b) agrees with subject only, none agreeing with the inanimate patient; (49c), agrees with both animate participants and (49d), with a honorific genitive complement[14]. Kurmali however marks distinctively its transitive subjects (*e/i*: Mahto 1989, Davison 2002).

3.6.2.2. Historical evolution of Eastern speeches

Modern Bengali, a language close to Maithili, today only agrees with the agent/subject (*tui boitā porli* you book-def read-ps-2s "you read the book"). However, in an earlier stage of language, Eastern Indo-Aryan languages too presented a pre- or quasi ergative structure, as evidenced by the following examples from a 15th c. epic song in Bengali borrowed from Chatterji, (50a) with a patient-predicate agreement, (50b) with an oblique agent.

50a *kona purāne sunilī kāhanī ?*
which myth-loc hear-sp-fs story-fs
in which myth did you hear this story?

50b *ebẽ maï bujhila*
now 1s-obl understand-sp now I understood

Gender marks soon disappeared in Bengali and Oriya, along with the agreement pattern, and a new pattern of agreement emerged by suffixation of subject suffixes, when the oblique marking of the agent converted to the unmarked form. As for the *-l-* mark which is presently analysed as a past tense marker for Eastern languages, its origin as a nominal diminutive or enlarging suffix is an evidence of the nominal basis of the structure.

Eastern Indo-Aryan languages then seem to have followed the same drift towards ergativity (emphasis shift on the patient and aspectual semantics) as the Western languages, but they started to lose it around the XVth c. whereas Western languages on the contrary re-inforced the the patient-oriented pattern with external markers. Both are clear examples of the cyclicity of the structure.

3.6.3. A similar evolution in the future

The syntax of the *-b-* future of the Eastern speeches (from Awadhi to Maithili) is strikingly similar to the syntax of the perfect. The more obvious evidence for it is again Bengali since the set of personnal affixes used now is the same for future and simple past, except for 1st person, distinct from the present suffixes. Besides, both innovations

[14] (49a-d) are from Yadav (1996: 282, 321, 392).

(loss of ergativity of the past system and shift to the active pattern in the future) happened at the same time. Old Bengali (Chatterji 1926: 967) has oblique agents (51b) as well as ancient Awadhi (Saxena 1931: 158) and sometimes marks of agreement with the direct patient:

51a *maï* *dibi* *piricha*
1s-instr give-*b*-fs question-f s I will ask a question

51b *karaba* *maï* *sevā*
do-b.future 1s-instr service I will do service, I will serve

Such patterns also originate from Sanskrit nominal sentences with a predicative passive participle (ppp), the obligative adjective or passive future participle (fpp) in *-tavya*, which display instrumental marking of the agent if expressed and agreement with the patient (examples from Bubenik 1992 and Bloch 1906 respectively):

52a *na* *kṣeptavyā* *brahma-vādinā*
neg contempt-fpp-mp-nom brahma-speaker-mp-nom
you will (should) not contempt those who speak the vedic truth

52b *tribhir* *yātavyam*
three-instr go-fpp-ns-nom we must/will go all the three

This ancient modal future, which became the *-b-* future tense, was prevailing from West to East as early as Ashoka (third c. BC), symetrically with the past nominal sentence. Example (53) shows the parallel between the Western (Girnar: a) and Eastern varieties (Jaugada: b), with almost only phonetic differences, from Bloch (1950):

53a *iyaṃ dhammalipī devānaṃpriyena priyadassina rāññā lekhāpitā*
b *iyaṃ dhammalipī devānaṃpiyena piyadassina lājinā lekhapitā*
this law-writing god-dear dear-looking king write
fs-nom fs-nom ms-instr ms-instr ms-instr caus-ppp-fs-nom
this law-scripture (has been) made written by the friendly looking king dear to the gods = the friendly looking king dear to the gods had this law-edict written

a *idha na kiṃci jīvam arābhitpā prajuhitavyam na ca samājo kattavyo*
b *hida no kiṃci jive alabhitu pajohitavye no pi ca samāje kattavye*
here neg indef living kill sacrifice neg ptcl and meeting do
ns-nom CP ns-nom ms-nom ms-nom
(you) should not sacrifice by killing a living being nor hold assembly

3.6.4. The Indo-European parallel: have and have not

The Indo-Aryan evolution is paralleled by the Latin formation of perfect and future. Like Sanskrit, Latin initially had simple forms to

express perfect and future. As in classical Sanskrit, in late Latin both simple forms underwent a periphrastic rephrasing, originally expressive and later fully grammaticized, involving oblique marking of the agent (dative) and agreement of the participle with the patient:

54a *mihi id* *factum*
1s-dat this-ns-nom do-ppp-ns-nom I have done this

54b *mihi id* *faciendum (est)*
1s-dat this-ns-nom do-fpp-ns-nom (be-pres-3s I should do that

The further evolution of both patterns consisted in shifting the agent from the dative to the nominative case and using the verb "have" (*habere*) in the present as an auxiliary, which it still is in Romance languages:

55a *ego* *id* *factum* *habeo*
1s-nom this-ns-acc do-ppp-ns-acc have-1s
I have done this (I have this done) French: j'ai fait ceci[15]

55b *ego* *id* *fieri* *habeo*
1s-nom this-ns-acc do-infP have-1s
I will have to do this (I have this to be done)
French 'je ferai' (fer-ai : do-inf-have-pres)

This new periphrastic expression, emphazing the similarity with the possessive pattern, also with a dative possessor in Latin, led Benveniste (1952) to insist on the "possessive meaning of the perfect" rather than representing an action. One may view it more generally as a locational predication (Montaut 1996, 1998): both the result and the aim are viewed from the present of utterance as something (a state) reached or aimed at by the subject. The subject is simply a localizer of the predication, and have, a locational predication ("il y a", "there is"). In this regard, Indo-Aryan too, in earlier stages of its evolution for the future and in the present stage for the perfect in ergative speeches, has the same type of representation. But since it has no verb "have" to help restructure the sentence with nominative subjects, locational predications still retain their oblique marking of the agents.

The following patterns, which I name after the case of the main argument, all fall under a similar locational pattern, most of them allowing translations with the verb "have" in French.

---

[15] The well-known agreement of the participle with a preposed object (*les lettres que j'ai écrites,* "the letters-fp that I have written-fp") is a remnant of that evolution, along with the possible placement of the object before it, until middle French (*il a la ville attaquée*, "he has the city-fs attacked-fs").

4. THE DATIVE PATTERN

Unlike the ergative, the dative pattern cuts across both aspect and transitivity and is a pan-indian feature (Verma 1976, Verma & Mohanan 1991). Sentences in every tense-aspect-mood and with single or several participants are represented with their first participant in the dative (*ko*) if the predicate is not an action predicate. Physiological, psychological or cognitive predicates, with their main participant experiencing a state rather than performing an action, require the dative pattern, and so do obligative modalities.

4.1. The experiential sentence

This pattern is largely triggered by the semantics of the predicate, which always ranks lower in transitivity than those in section 2 and 3, and sometimes requires a single participant:

56a *mujhe ṭhaṇḍ* *lag rahī hai*
1s-dat cold-fs touch prog-fs pres-3s I am cold

56b *baccī ko ḍar lagā / hamẽ khuśī hai*
girl dat fear-ms touched / 1p-dat happiness-fs is
the girl was afraid / we are happy

The following type of predicative notions (cf. MII-2.3) require the dative construction: physiological processes (*bhūkh/ pyās/ ṭhaṇḍ honā* "be hungry/ thirsty/ cold"), feelings and emotions (*khuśī/ cintā/ pareśān/ prem/ pyār /nafrat honā* "to be happy/ worried/ troubled /to love/ to hate", *krodh /khīj ānā* "to be angry/irritated", *śauq honā* "to have a taste for", *becainī honā* "to be unpleased"), wish (*icchā honā* "to wish", *ummīd honā* "to hope"), surprise (*āścārya/ hairānī* "to be surprised"), perception (*dikhāī denā* "to appear", *sunāī denā* "to be audible"), cognition (*patā or mālūm honā* "to know", *yād honā* "to remember", *rucī* or *dilcasp honā* "to be interested", *śak honā* "to doubt"), as well as more stative predicates if transient (*ādat* "have the habit", *fursat honā* "have the leisure", *kamī honā* "to lack", *zarūrat honā* "to need"). In a semantic and scalar view of transitivity (Tsunoda 1981, 1985) they rank between the typically transitive action predicates, formally transitive in Hindi (sections 2 and 3) and states, formally adjectival in Hindi (*bhūkī honā* "to be hungry") or otherwise marked (intransitive simple verbs in section 1, other oblique case for main participant in sections 5 to 7). Neither semantically active nor passive, they correspond to the range of meanings of the middle voice (Montaut 2001, 2004), with the formal correlate that they cannot

undergo passivation. Part of them of them are indeed translated by middle "*se*" in Roman languages ("s'inquiéter", "se faire du souci", "se réjouir", "se mettre en colère"), others by the "have" verb, a stative predicate ("avoir faim, envie, mal, peur").

4.1.1. Morpho-syntactic pattern

Many verbo-nominal predicates and a few simple verbs require an experiencer (necessarily a sentient non agentive entity). The experiencer or oft called 'dative subject' never controls agreement[16].

4.1.1.1. Simple verbs

Verbs like *ānā* "to come" used in the meaning of "to come to knowledge" then "to know", or *lagnā* "to touch" used in the meaning of "seem"and *milnā* "to find, to get", *dikhnā* "be visible":

57a *mujhe hindī ātī hai / āpko to hãsī ātī hai*
1s-dat hindi-fs come pres-3s/ 2H-dat prtcl laugh comes pres-3s
I know Hindi / you feel like laughing

57b *mujhe yahã̃ ek ciṭṭhī milī / ek ādmī milā*
1s-dat here one letter-fs find-aor-fs /one man-ms find-aor-ms
I got a letter / I found (met) a man

57c *hamẽ jhõpṛiyã̃ dīkh rahī thī̃*
1p-dat hut-fp be-visible prog impft-fp we could see huts

57d *mujhe (aisā /yah) lagā ki...*
1s-dat (so / this) seem-aor-ms that it seemed to me that…

The argument in the first sequential position never controls the agreement, which is always controlled by the unmarked second argument, a pattern reminding of the ergative pattern. Null agreement occurs when the second participant is the following proposition (57d: *lagā*). As in the ergative pattern, the verb agrees either with the embedded transitive verbal noun in *-ā* (58a-b) or with the embedded object (58c) as evicenced by Davison (1991). Non-agreement with the object evidences incorporation (Mohanan 1992, 1994: 111-7) or "predicate modification" (Butt 1995: 83-85) when the object is not singled out as a specific entity:

58a *mujhe tairnā ātā hai śahar jānā hai*
1s-dat swim-ms come-ms pres-3s town go-ms be-3s
I know how to swim (I can swim) (I) must go to the city

58b *mujhe gāṛī calānī ātī hai*
1s-dat car-fs drive-fs come-fs pres I know how to drive a car

[16] Which disqualifies it as a subject according to Moore & Perlmutter (2000).

58c *mujhe gāṛī calānā ātā hai*
1s-dat car-fs drive-ms come-ms pres I know car-driving

58d *mujhe hindī bolnā ātā hai / (?) bolnī ātī hai*
1s-dat hindi-fs speak-ms come-ms comes/ ? speak-fs come-fs pres
I know to speak English

Both participants here are not those required by the semantic structure of a transitive predicate since the verb is basically intransitive. The asymmetry subject-object is even more problematic than in the ergative pattern, as shown by the controlling facts (4.1.1.3).

4.1.1.2. Complex predicates

Verbal predicates formed with an adjectival host and a light verb display similar agreement pattern as series (57), except that the adjective agrees with the unmarked noun (59):

59 *mujhe yah film bahut acchī lagī*
1s-dat this film-fs much good-fs seem-fs I liked this film very much

Similarly verbo-nominal predicates of the coalescent type with light intransitive verb agree with the external noun:

60a *mujhe yah film bahut pasand āī*
1s-dat this film-fs much liking came-fs I liked this film very much

60b *tumhẽ bacce yād āte haĩ ?* (L)
2-dat children-mp memory-fs come pres-3mp
do you remember the children?

In contrast, both types of non-coalescent complex predicates display the agreement pattern observed in 2.5.2, the light verb agreeing with the nominal host, whether it governs genitive like a noun (61a), oblique complements like a verb (*se*: 61b, *par*: 61c) or has a single unmarked participant 61d:

61a *laṛkī ko bāhar jāne kī icchā thī*
girl dat outside go gen-fs desire-fs be-impft
the girl wished to go outside

61b *donõ ko anītā se pyār hone lagā thā*
both dat Anita with love-ms be-inf incept ppft-ms
both had begun falling in love with Anita

61c *mujhe is laṛkī par bharosā nahĩ thā*
1s-dat this girl on trust-ms neg was-ms I did not trust this girl

61d *mujhe bhūkh / pyās / ṭhaṇḍ lag rahī hai*
1s-dat hunger-fs/thirst-fs/cold-fs touch prog-fs pres-3
I am feeling hungry/thirsty/cold

The grammatical category of subject is then quite disparate in these patterns. The invariant fact is the basic intransitivity, correlated with the morphological category of the verb or light verb which is the head, except for the atypical locutions with *denā* "give", a normally transitive, yet *ne*-less verb (*dikhāī denā* "be visible", *sunāī denā* "be audible": 66b).

4.1.1.3. Control properties

The unmarked argument (internal or external) alone behaves as the grammatical subject, but the dative argument controls coreference with embedded infinitives involving equi-NP deletion (58), conjunctive reduction (62a), reflexive pronouns or adjectives (62b-c), even when it is omitted (62d):

62a *mujhe tumse milkar baṛī khuśī huī*
1s-dat you-with meet-CP great happiness-fs was-fs
I was very pleased to meet you

62b *mujhe apne par khīj uṭhī* (AKH)
1s-dat refl on irritation-fs rose-fs I suddenly felt angry

62c *mujhe apnī jān kī fikr nahĩ, uskī jān kī fikr hai*
1s-dat refl life of worry neg, his life of worry is
I do not fear for my life but for his

62d *apne bāre mẽ yah bāt sunkar bahut hairānī huī*
refl about this thing hear-CP much surprise-fs was-fs
hearing this about myself (I) was very surprise

However, if such a dative argument controls CP reduction as do ergative arguments and intransitive subjects, it never undergoes it as they do:

63 *vah [*bhūkh lagkar] khāne lagā*
3s [hunger touch-CP] eat started feeling hungry he started eating

Besides, the asymmetry regarding coreference between the dative and the unmarked noun is not as clear as it is in the ergative pattern, since the unmarked term too may (exceptionally) be a possible antecedent for the reflexive (64a), and the marked term may be anaphorized by a pronoun or a reflexive in case of backward pronominalization (64b):

64a *fārsī apnī lipi ke kāraṇ mujhe kabhī nahĩ ā pāī*
Persian refl script because 1s-dat never come could
I could never learn Persian because of its script

64b *hamārī cāzī hamko mil gaī hai* (BHS)
our Chazi 1p-dat find go pft
we have found (gotten back) our Chazi

In (64b) the main argument is probably Chazi and not "we", but the primary interest of such a debate is to show how weak is the asymmetry between both participants, since order shift can modify the behaviour in control (cf. SIII-4.2.1), wheras it cannot in the ergative pattern. The reason is that the semantic role of experiencer, neither agent (source) nor patient (goal), involves no clear saliency over the unmarked noun (stimulus, theme).

4.1.2. Semantics of the experiential clause

4.1.2.1. Volitional contrast with nominative/ergative patterns

Experiential clauses, ruling out volitionality, do not allow imperative modality whereas transitive clauses do. Easy contrasts can be found with complex predicates, which usually present a causative / mediopassive alternation, except for physiological states, which allow only experiential dative pattern:

*65 tum cintā mat karo! *tumhẽ cintā mat ho*
2 worry neg do-imper! *2-dat worry neg be-imper do not worry

The prescriptive intransitive infinitive is only acceptable with a nominative subject, and not with "be": *(*tumhẽ) yād rakhnā! * yād honā* "remember".
Similarly, in a final complement (infinitive + *ke lie*) or as a complement of verb *cāhnā* "to want", only transitive complex predicates are allowed (*fikr karnā (*honā) nahĩ cāhtā* 'he does not want to worry"). The experiencer role also rules out deliberateness and intentionality (66, from Kachru 1981):

66a maĩne jānbūjhkar tasvīr kī or dekhā
1s-dat deliberately picture of direction looked
I deliberately looked at the picture

*66b mujhe *jānbūjhkar ek baṛī achī tasvīr dikhāī dī*
1s-dat deliberately a very beautiful image was visible

The meaning of the same verb changes with the construction: *milnā* with unmarked subject (and instrumental second human participant) means "to meet" (67a) whereas with a dative experiencer (and unmarked second participant, animate or inanimate) it means "to encounter, find, come across, get" (67b):

67a āj merī bahan rām se milī
today my sister Ram with met
today my sister met Ram (went to see Ram)

67b *āj* *merī bahan ko* *rām milā /* *tumhārā patr* *milā*
today my sister dat Ram found/ your letter got
today my sister met (came across) Ram / got your letter

These facts radically contrast the experiencer with nominative / ergative agents in a way which evokes the so-called "active" (Klimov 1974) or "dual" (Lazard 1994) languages: in such languages structural oppositions are mainly semantic and the action pattern ('he beat her': unmarked or ergative agent) sharply contrasts with the non action pattern ('he fell', 'he likes her': oblique patient or experiencer). In Hindi indeed, many pairs of complex transitive/intransitive predicates are quite sharply opposed: *pasand karnā* (Ag) "like, choose" / *pasand honā* (Exp) "like", *dhyān denā* or *rakhnā* (Ag) "pay attention"/ *dhyān ānā* (Exp) "come to mind", *zimmedārī lenā* (Ag) "take the responsibility" / *zimmedārī honā* (Exp) "be responsible, have the responsibility", *socnā* "think" / *sūjhnā* "get an idea", *svīkār karnā* (Ag) "accept, agree" /*svīkār honā* (Exp) "be agreed".

4.1.2.2. Objectivation and conscious assumption

The feature 'deliberateness' may account for the use of the transitive structure if the process is represented as external (objective visibility) in contrast with the inner feelings since, in order to pretend and give outward signs of a state not intimately felt, it requires some intention (68a); but visible signs of anger may correspond either to a fake or to an authentic anger (68b):

68a *maĩne majbūran svīkār kiyā lekin asal mẽ (mujhe) svīkār nahĩ huā*
1s-erg by-force agreement did but truth in (1s-dat) agreement neg was
I accepted under constraint but did not agree in fact

68b *mā̃* *ne baṛā ġussā kiyā*
mother erg great anger did
Mother displayed a great anger / was very angry

However, simple intransitive verbs with a nominative subject do not always display similarly contrast with the parallel experiential complex predicate: *maĩ ḍar rahā thā* "I was afraid" for instance is hardly more deliberate or evidential than *mujhe ḍar lag rahā thā*, nor *maĩ bhūl gayā* "I forgot" than *mujhe yād nahĩ hai* "I don't remember", *khījnā* "be irritated" than *khīj uṭhnā*.[17]

[17] Nor do the alternate (substandard) constructions of some simple verbs: *apne bacpan kī bātẽ mujhe bhūl gaī haĩ* (ND), "1s-dat have forgotten the memories of my childhood", vs standard *maĩ bhūl gayā* "I-nom forgot", or *tab mujhe pūrī bāt*

Even some transitive verbs do not display in this type of contrasting pattern the expected feature of deliberateness with experiential predicates: *vah jāntā hai* "he knows", is usually no more deliberate than *use patā hai*, or *use mālūm hai*. Similarly, *dekhnā* or *sunnā* may have an intentional meaning ("to look, to listen"), they may also have non intentional interpretations (cf. 3.5.2). But whereas such transitive verbs can be considered as unmarked in this respect, the experiential sentence is always marked (- intention).

However the two patterns, although both display unintentionnal meanings, contrast by the feature of conscious assumption (Montaut 1991, 1999), as is particularly clear with predicates involving primary emotions when they are not fake: *nafrat karnā* "hate, dislike" (Ag) for instance is very often used in the same context as *nafrat honā* (Exp) as well as *mahsūs karnā* "feel, experience" (Ag) and *mahsūs honā* (Exp). But there are contexts where the alternation is not possible. A Nom-Erg argument contrasts with a dative experiencer in displaying awareness of the state experienced and ability to take it into account:

69a *us vaqt tumhẽ mujhse irṣyā thī magar (tumhẽ) iskā bodh nahĩ thā*
that time 2-dat 1s-with jealousy was but (2-dat) its awareness neg was

69b *us vaqt tum mujhse irṣyā kartī thĩ *magar iskā bodh nahĩ thā*
that time 2 1s-with jealousy did *but its awareness neg was
at that time you were jealous of me but you were not aware of it[18]

The sequence in (70), from a modern dialogue between a man (M) and a woman (F) in Mohan Rakesh's play *Ādhe adhūre,* alternates the woman's complaint about solitude (transitive) and the man's objection regarding her present awareness and past non awareness:

70 W. *maĩ to itnī begāni mahsūs kartī hũ̃ is ghar mẽ ki*… M. *pahle nahĩ kartī thĩ?*
W.1s but such loneliness feel do-pres this house in that… M. before neg did?
W. *pahle? pahle to...* M. *mahsūs karnā hī mahsūs nahĩ hotā thā, aur -*
W. before? before but… M. feeling do-inf just feeling neg was, and
kuch-kuch mahsūs śurū huā jab to pahlā mauqā milte hī, ghar se calī gaĩ.
vaguely feeling start was when then first occasion finding just home from went
W. I feel (trans) so lonely in this house that… M. and you did not (trans) before? W. Before? But before… M. You had no feeling

---

samajh āyī "1s-dat understood the whole thing" vs standard *maĩ samajh gayā* "1s-nom understood".

[18] Note that the transitive pattern may also rule out expressive manifestation but not awareness: *yah anubhav samjhā nahĩ jā saktā hai, batāyā nahĩ jā saktā, sirf mahsūs kiyā jā saktā hai* "this feeling cannot be understood nor told, it can only be felt" (all verbs in the transitive passive).

(intr) of being aware (trans), you started feeling (intr) it somewhat when at the first occasion you left home (= now you are aware of this feeling and before you were not)

To sum up, experiential sentences necessarily involve a semantic role (single or higher than the stimulus) with the features '-volition /control /deliberate choice/ conscient awareness', a sentient rather than an intellectual experiencer of a state. Experiencers with the feature 'conscious awareness' are treated like Agents in Hindi. This is why "find somebody (doing something)" may be alternately expressed by the transitive *pānā* (42b) or the intransitive *milnā* (57b). But "find oneself doing something", which requires self awareness, can only be expressed by the transitive *pānā*:

70b *maĩne apne ko khoe hue pāyā /* mujhe apne ko/apnā khoe hue milā*
1s-erg refl acc lost being found/* I-dat refl lost being found
I found myself lost in my thoughts, I realized I was lost

For other case alternations (genitive and locative), cf. 5 and 6 below.

4.2. The obligative sentence

The obligation modality transforms the unmarked subject of a verb into a dative experiencer, with one of the three auxiliaries used for that purpose after the main verb in the infinitive (cf. MII-3.2.3.6.3), *cāhie* for general directives, *honā* for punctual obligation, *paṛnā* for strict external obligation.

71 *hamẽ jānā hai* 1p-dat go be-pres-3s we must go

This pattern strongly evokes the old modal future pattern (cf. 3.6.3 above) although the Hindi auxiliaries do not derive from it as does the Marathi obligative[19]. The agreement pattern is similar to the ergative agreement pattern whenever the main verb is transitive, since it is controlled by the object of the embedded verb:

72a *mujhe ye ciṭṭhiyẽ̃ bhejnī hõgī*
1s-dat these letter-fp send-f be-fut-fp
I will have to /must send the letters

72b *mujhe apne purāne jūte phẽkne paṛe*
1s-dat refl-mp old-mp shoe-mp throw-mp fall-sp-mp
I had to throw away my old shoes

[19] Obligative in *-va* < *tavya*. Significantly, the case marker used in Marathi for the main argument of such sentences is the ergative *ne*: *tyāne gharī yāva* (3ms-*ne* home-loc go-ava) "he should go home". This marker alternates with the dative in the obligative pattern: *tyāne /tyālā patra lihili pāhidzet* (he-erg/he-dat letter-np write-np oblig) "he should write letters" (from Pandharipande 1997).

72c *baccõ ko kaī bhāṣāẽ sīkhnī cāhie*
child-mp dat several language-fp learn-fp should
children should learn several languages

Agreement is marked on the modal auxiliary (except *cāhie*) as well as on the verbal noun, as it is in (58). In sentences similar to (58b-c), with quasi-incorporation of the object, the same alternation is found, object agreement being preferred for specific individualized objects:

73a *mujhe cāy banānā (?banānī) hai*
1s-dat tea-fs make-ms (?make-fs) is I must make tea

73b *naukar ko sabzī kharīdnā thā / kharīdnī thī*
servant dat vegetable buy-ms was-ms / buy-fs was-fs
the servant had to buy vegetable

73c *naukar ko ek ek cunkar santre kharīdne hõge/*kharīdnā hogā*
servant dat one one chose-CP orange-mp buy-mp be-fut-mp /*ms
the servant will have to buy oranges selected one by one

4.3. History of the structure and regional variations

There has been a progressive development of the dative pattern, which was marginal in Sanskrit (Hock 1991), as it was in ancient Tamil (Murugaiyan 1999). It seems to have developed by convergence in all modern Indian vernaculars. All varieties of Hindi and related speeches have it, with various morphological casual marks (cf. MI-2.3.3 and 2.4.2.2). The dative in Bihari languages is not specific and represents experiencers and possessors too: *hamrā khuśi aich* (I-acc/dat happyness is) "I am happy", *unkā dutā beṭī chainh* (3H-acc/dat two-class daughter be-pres-3NH+3H) "he has three daughters", *ahan ke bahut kitāb aich* "you have many books" (Maithili, Yadav 1996:223).

5. THE GENITIVE PATTERN

One of the pecularities of Hindi-Urdu (along with Panjabi) is that it displays various markers for the main participant of static predicates, distinct from the dative, which is then restricted to experiential and obligation statements. Genitive is used for non-contingent possession and extended to the first argument of various complex predicates.

5.1. Inalienable (non-contingent) possession

The typical genitive pattern is used for kinship relations and body parts. The first may display an adverbial form (*ke*) of the genitive marker, otherwise agreeing like an adjectival suffix (cf. and 2.4.2) with its head NP, here the possessed entity:

74a *is laṛke ke / kī ek bahan thī*
this-obl boy gen-inv /gen-f one sister-fs be-impft-fs
this boy had one sister

74b *ādmī kī do tãgẽ hotī haĩ*
man-ms gen-f two leg-fp be pres-3fp men have two legs

The possessor in such constructions is represented as a part of the predicative relation.

5.2. Extension of the pattern to weakly transitive predicates

A number of complex predicates also require their main argument in the genitive: such intransitive counterparts (verb *honā*) of active predicates (verb *karnā*) do not have an experiencer as the main role. The genitive main argument rather corresponds to the localization of the state than to an agent, although it exhibits, like the dative experiencer, a few control properties in equi-NP deletion (75a), reflexivation (75b) and to a lesser degree control conjunctive reduction (75c)[20].

75a *merā kal jāne kā irādā thā*
1s-gen to-morrow go-inf gen intention was
I intended to leave to-morrow

75b *apnī or faislā karne kī merī sāmarthya nahĩ hai*
refl side decision do-inf gen 1s-gen competence neg is
I have not the capacity to decide on my own

75c *merā āpse hāth joṛkar nivedan hai ki…*
1s-gen 2H-to hands join-CP request is that…
I implore you humbly (hands joined together) that…

5.2.1. Semantic type of predicate

Some of the predicates refer to psychological states (*kā dil / man honā* "to feel like, to wish", *kā irādā honā* "to have the intention") or to aptitudes (*kī sāmarthya honā* "to have the capacity, be able", *kā ādhikār honā* "to have the right", *kā abhyās honā* "have the practice"): they overlap with the less transitive (more static) of experiencers (76); many of them (77) are relational: Y *se X kī śādī honā* "X to marry Y", Y *se X*

[20] Whereas canonical possessors do not control conjunctive reduction (?? *sārkārī bāt mānkar unke keval do bacce hue* "respecting official orders, they had only two children") and never undergo it (**keval do bacce hokar ve sārkārī bāt mānte haĩ*, "having only two children they abide official orders").

kā sampark honā “X to be in contact with Y”, *Y se X kā riśtā honā* “X to be related with Y”, *Y se X kī bhẽṭ / mulāqāt honā* “to meet”, *Y se X kā sambandh honā* “be linked”, *Y se X kā nivedan honā* “to request”, *Y se X kī bāt honā* “to speak”, *Y se X kī bahas honā* “to discuss”.

76a *uskā jāne kā dil thā*
3s-gen go-inf heart was he felt like leaving

76b *mujhe caṛhne kā abhyās nahĩ*
1s-dat climb-inf gen training neg
I am not trained for/used to climbing

77a *rameś kī śādī kisī āmīr laṛkī se huī thī*
Ramesh gen marriage some rich girl with be-ppft
Ramesh had married some rich girl

77b *āj dākṭar se merī bāt huī* today I spoke to the doctor
today doctor with 1s-gen talk was

77c *merā unse koī sampark nahĩ hai*
1s-gen 3p-with indef contact neg is
I have no contact with them

REMARKS

- *Man, dil, jī* also form complex predicates with the transitive verbs *cāhnā* “want” or *karnā* “do”(*merā dil cāhtā hai* “I feel like”, “I want”, *man kartā hai, jī cāhtā hai* “(I) want”), while still ruling out ergative (*dil cāhā, man cāhā, *man ne/ *dil ne cahā/ kiyā*).

78 *āpko to hãsī ātī hai, merā to rone kā man kartā hai*
2H-dat ptcl laugh-fs comes, 1s-gen ptcl cry-inf gen mind-ms does-ms
you, you feel like laughing, I myself feel like crying

The construction of the second argument is optional (*ko, kā, ke lie*).

- The predicate *man lagnā* is lexicalised with the meaning “be pleased, be happy”: *yahã̃ (merā) man nahĩ lagtā*, “I don’t like it here”.

- Apart from aspectual features conveyed by the verb selection (cf. MII-2.3.4), the choice of a negative verb like *chūṭnā* “leave” may invert the meaning: *merā abhyās chūṭ gayā* “I lost my practise”, *merī kām karne kī ādat chūṭ gaī* “I lost the habit of working”.

5.2.2. Alternations of patterns

5.2.2.1. Transitive/Genitive pattern

The difference between the corresponding active pattern when it exists may be semantic, since the transitive only (79a) can convey volition

and allow imperative, and no genitive clause can be embedded as a final non-finite clause or constituant (79b):

79a *āp sampark rakhie / *āpkā sampark rahie* keep in touch
2H contact place-imper/ *2H-gen contact stay-imper

79b *vah ḍākṭar se bāt karne /*hone/ ke lie aspaṭāl gaī*
3s doctor with talk do-inf /*be-inf/ for hospital went
she went to the hospital to speak to the doctor

Similarly, the predicative notion of "meeting" when expressed in the genitive pattern with the complex predicate rules out the expression of finality and volition (79c), whereas the simple verb in the nominative pattern allows it (79d):

79c **merā unse mulāqāt/bhẽṭ honā cāhtā hũ̃/hai*
1s-gen 3H-with meeting be-inf want pres-1s/3s

79d *maĩ unse milnā cāhtā hũ̃*
1s-nom 3H-with meet want pres-1s I want to meet him

But the genitive pattern often mainly helps the speaker present his statement without emphasizing the agent role: for a speaker to discuss or speak under normal circumstances, some volition, control, or awareness is needed, but the selection of the genitive pattern fits the description of a state of affairs where the participant is simply part of it rather than source of an action process (Durie 1988). As a nominal extension of the predicate, it grammatically appears as one of its determiners.

5.2.2.2. Dative/Genitive pattern

Although usually there is no variation in the construction of a given predicate, a few experiential predicates listed in 4, usually very low ranking in transitivity, allow optional expression of their main participant, such as (*kī*) *icchā honā* "to feel like, to wish", (*kī*) *ummīd / āśā honā* "to hope", (*kī*) *ādat honā* "to have the habit", (*kī*) *zimmedārī honā* "to have the responsibility". The meaning does not vary, but only the experiential pattern, not the genitive, allows the vector *ānā* "come", to occur: (80) from Montaut (1999b) suggests that in (b) the transient state "he wished to write a letter", with a determiner-like genitive, cannot be represented as a dynamic stimulus, whereas (a) with a dative experiencer-like allows the coming-towards of the process:

80a *usko ciṭṭhī likhne kī icchā huī / ho āī*
3s-dat letter write-inf gen wish was /*be came

80b *uskī ciṭṭhī likhne kī icchā huī / *ho āī*
3s-gen letter write-inf gen wish was /*be came

5.3. Other main arguments in the genitive

A very common way in Hindi to represent the experiencer of a state affecting body parts is to raise the body part in the subject position, while the genitive pronoun referring to the experiencer retains control of coreference in conjunctive reduction and reflexivation (81b):

81a *mere rõgte khaṛe ho gae the, merā galā bhar gayā thā*
1s-gen body-hair stand-up ppft 1s-gen throat fill go ppft
the hair on my body had stood up, I had a lump in my throat

81b *apnī mā̃ ko dekhkar merī ā̃khẽ dab āī̃*
refl Mother acc see-CP 1s-gen eyes wet came
seeing my mother I felt my eyes become wet

Similarly numerous periphrases are used to refer to self as a genitive complement of locative expressions:

82 *sītā kī ā̃khõ mẽ ãsū bhar gae*
Sita gen eyes loc tears fill went Sita felt tears in her eyes

82b *apne bāre mẽ yah sunkar uske dil mẽ baṛī <u>kh</u>uśī huī*
refl about this hear-CP 3s-gen heart loc great happiness was
hearing this about himself, he felt very happy

5.4. Recessive diathesis with complex predicates

When transitive predicates such as (*kā*) *intazām karnā* "to organize" or *istemāl karnā* "to use" (cf. 2.5.) convert to their intransitive correlate, (*kā*) *intazām honā* "to be organised" or *istemāl honā* "to be used", they lose the argument in the agent role (cf. MII-2.3) and assume a passive meaning with the patient in the single role, unlike those which convert with no argument-loss but shift the main role from agent to experiencer (4.1.1.2). A coalescent predicate will display its main argument as a nominative subject, corresponding to the single role of patient (83). Non-coalescent predicates of the first subtype display it as a genitive main argument, which behaves as the unmarked noun of (83) except that it does not control the agreement (84):

83a *kām śurū huā thā*
work beginning-fs be ppft-ms the work had begun

83b *yah zamīn istemāl nahī̃ ho saktī*
this land-fs use-ms neg be can-fs this land cannot be used

84a *unkā intazār ho rahā hai*
3p-gen waiting be prog pres (we) are waiting for them

84b *mīṭĩg kā intazām ho cukā hai*
meeting gen organization be term pft the meeting is organized

6. THE LOCATIVE PATTERN

6.1. Contingent and non-contingent possession

Possessors of acquired objects are respresented by locative arguments headed by the postposition *ke pās* ("near/close to", "at", static or dynamic, with the genitive of the pronoun instead of *ke*), whose semantics (adjacency) suits the feature 'non-intrinsic':

85a *us becāre ke pās sirf do kamīzẽ thĩ̃*
this miserable near only two shirt-fp be-impft-fp
this poor fellow had only two shirts

85b *mere pās sab kuch* hai
1s near everything is I have everything

The owner of non-contingent qualities such as virtue, strength, cowardice, are represented by a locative (*mẽ* "in", always static):

86a *is laṛke mẽ kāfī kharābiyā̃ bhī haĩ, acchāiyā̃ bhī haĩ*
this boy loc enough defects too are, goodness too are
this boy has many defects, and qualities too

86b *usmẽ sāhas nahĩ̃ hai*
3s-loc courage neg is he has no courage

Such inessive patterns are static, and represent the possessed quality as an intrinsic, defining property of the noun, and the possessor as the localizer of the static predication. They are semantically closer to the adjectival predication (*vah sāhsī nahĩ̃ hai*: "he his not courageous") than to the dative pattern.

6.2. Alternations and extension of the locative pattern

Some complex predicates usually requiring an experiencer may optionally allow also a locative construction (adjacency) like *kī fursat honā*, "to have leisure/time". Some usually requiring a genitive first argument may optionnally allow a locative, like *kī sāmarthya honā* "to have the capacity of"' instead of the genitive in (75c). Some always require a locative like (*kā abhāv* "lack") although close synonyms like *kī kamī honā* require a dative experiencer:

87a *mere pās bakbak karne kī fursat nahĩ̃ / mujhe fursat nahĩ̃ hai*
1s-near fool do gen leisure neg / 1s-dat leisure neg is
I don't have time to chatter uselessly / I don't have time

87b *tumhāre pās ādeś dene kī sāmarthya thī*
2 near order give gen ability was
you had the authority to give orders

87c *mere pās paise kā abhāv hai /mujhe paise kī kamī hai*
1s near money gen lack is / 1s-dat money gen lack is
I lack money, I have no money

If no semantic difference is observable in (87c), the use of both patterns with a notion like courage (*sāhas* or *himmat*) clearly shows the basic meaningfulness of case marking (transient with the dative, intrinsic with the genitive):

88a *ab kī bār use sac bolne kī himmat huī…*
now of time 3s-dat truth speak gen courage was
this time he had the courage of speaking truth

88b *…hālā̃ki usmẽ baṛī himmat nahī̃ hai*
although 3s-loc great courage neg is
although he (usually) has not much courage

7. THE INSTRUMENTAL PATTERN

The postposition *se* is highly polysemic, covering several semantic roles such as ablative (for space and time), manner, sociative, relation, instrument, secondary agent in causative constructions, passive agent and inanimate cause. The label 'instrumental' is chosen here because it often conflates the four last roles.

7.1. Passive

Although the passive sentence in its ordinary behaviour is a syntactic transformation aiming at backgrounding the patient of a transitive verb, its role in Hindi is less clear since the intransitive modal passives seem to precede non modal passives in history (Gaeffke 1967). Besides, its description helps understanding other instrumental patterns.

7.1.1. The "standard" passive

7.1.1.1. Morpho-syntactic features

As seen in MII-3.3.1, passive backgrounds the agent, optionally represented with a specific case (*ke dvārā*), without necessarily promoting the patient, which may retain its accusative marking if it is human or definite specific (89b). It patterns as in the ergative alignment, with default agreement in the same conditions (89b).

89a *pulis ke dvārā kitne cor pakṛe gae?*
police by-Ag how-many thief-mp take P-mp?
how many thieves were caught by the police?

89b *in donõ ko hī pakṛā gayā*
these two acc just take P-ms
only these two were caught

This passive is mainly a pragmatic device used for backgrounding the agent (Shibatani 1985) or making it indefinite: *kahā jātā hai* "it is said/one says", as does the omission of the agent in ergative structures (*sunā hai* "I (we) have heard", both verbs agreeing in the neutral *-ā*, since their grammatical subject is the clause which follows.

7.1.1.2. Semantics and control properties

Although backgrounded and even omitted, the agent retains the control of coreference in conjunctive reduction and reflexivation:

90 *śarīr ko dabākar apne par vijay pāī jā saktī hai*
body acc repress-CP refl on victory obtain P can pres
one can triumph over oneself by submitting one's body

It is also the agent, and not the patient, that triggers the verbal vectors in (91a), the same as in the active sentence (91b): the first vector *le* "take" reflects the orientation of the process towards self with self benefit (for the hunters), and similarly the second *de* "give" reflects a process directed outwards from the hunters :

91a *bandar pakaṛ lie gae aur gãv se haṭā die gae* (RD)
monkeys catch take P and village from turn-off give P
monkeys were captured and taken away from the village

91b *unhõne bandar pakaṛ lie aur gãv se haṭā die*
3p-erg monkeys catch took and village from turn-off gave
they captured the monkeys and took them away from the village

This is consistent with the semantics, that convey the agentive control, since passive can never represent spontaneous processes, unlike intransitive verbs: (92) shows the opposition of transitive (effective) and intransitive (affected) as seen in MII-2.1, as well as (93a-b), from Pandharipande (1979), which contrasts agentive transitive passive with non agentive intransitive, and (93c) with complex predicates:

92 *ḍālī apne āp nahĩ ṭūṭī, toṛī gaī*
branch refl-emph neg break-aor, break P-aor
the branch did not break, it was broken (by X)

93a *kām kiyā gayā* *(* par kisīne nahĩ kiyā)*
work do P-aor work was done (*but someone-erg neg did)

93b *kām huā, par kisīne nahĩ kiyā*
work be-aor, but someone-erg neg did
work was done, but nobody did it

93c *prem kiyā nahĩ jātā, ho jātā hai*
love do neg P, be go pres
love is not done (one does not command love), it just happens

7.1.2. Modal passive: the reluctant actor

Intransitive verbs can passivize with various modal meanings (cf. MII-3.3.1), among which the capabilitative meaning (Davison 1980, 1985), such as in (94). In this use, restricted to negative (94a-b) or paranegative (94c) environments, the agent is always in the instrumental and is rarely omitted. This modal intransitive passive, historically initial, was soon extended to transitive verbs

94a *mujhse yahã baiṭhā nahĩ gayā* (JK)
1s-instr here sit neg P-aor
I could not bring myself (was unable) to sit there

94b *usse merā ġam nahĩ dekhā gayā*
3s-instr my sorrow neg see P-aor
he could not bear to see my sorrow

94c *tumhārā dukh kisse dekhā jātā?*
your unhappiness who-instr see P-irr
who could bear to see your pain?

Although the instrumental argument controls conjunctive reduction and reflexivation (94d), it is obviously not a canonical agent since it is devoid of efficiency and free will.

94d *mujhse apne kamre kā darvāzā kholā nahĩ gayā*
1s-instr refl room of door open neg P-aor
I could not bring myself (was unable) to open the door of my room

The lack of efficiency and failure of volition is not due to external resistance but to some inner resistance, as shown by the contrast with (95a) below. The modal passive, in contrast with the canonical passive, rather recent and specially frequent in official Hindi, is oft-used in the colloquial and occurs in many idiomatic expressions such as *mujhse rahā nahĩ gayā* (1s-instr stay negP) "I could not stand it".

7.2. The inefficient actor

7.2.1. With medio-passive intransitive negative predicates

An intransitive verb like *ṭūṭnā* "be broken", *khulnā* "be open", *uṭhnā* "get up, be lifted", usually allowing only one (patient) participant and optionally an inanimate cause in the instrumental, can also display a

non-canonical agent in the instrumental. If the sentence is negative or paranegative (hypothetical, counterfactual, virtual, interrogative), the meaning produced is incapacity, including with "be" verb, a very common device to mean incapacity:

95a *darvāzā khĩckar rakho, sãkal mujhse nahĩ khul rahī hai*
door pull-CP hold, chain 1s-instr neg open-intr prog pres
keep the door pulled, I can't manage to unhook the chain (NKK)

95b *mujhse jo kuch banā maĩne kiyā, ab mujhse nahĩ hogā*
1s-instr whatever be-done-aor 1s-erg did, now 1s-instr neg be-fut
whatever I could do, (I) did, now I won't be able to (do it) (SA)

95c *bībī terī gaṭhrī maĩ uṭhā lũgā, is gũge se nahĩ uṭhegī* (GHZ)
Wife, your bag 1s lift take-fut, this mute instr neg get-lifted-fut
lady, your bag, I will pick it up, this dumb boy won't manage it

The meaning is modal in a similar way as x, since it produces the reading of incapacity. Similarly the unmarked patient controls agreement but not coreference[21] .

7.2.2. Difference with the capabilitive passive

Example (95a) differs from (94d) by the presence of disabling conditions (external: the door resists, or physical: he is not strong enough) prevents the actor to perform the job in spite of his free will, whereas in (94d) 'I' is a non initiator, prevented to act by an inner reluctance[22]: (94d) requires a context where the actor, for instance, fears the prospect of finding his wife with a lover, or a burglar. Similarly, (95c), taken from a scene in a train, emphasizes the weakness of the boy, whereas the same verb in the incapabilitive passive (95e), in the same context, emphasizes the reluctance of the boy wishing to change compartment but frightened by his neighbour:

95e *mujhse apnā ṭrãk nahĩ uṭhāyā jāegā, na hī ghī kā ṭīn*
1s-instr refl trunk neg lift P-fut, neg just ghee of tin
I won't (bring myself to) take my suitcase, not even the box of ghee (which weighs half a pound) (GHZ)

Similarly, the passive in *mujhse yah kām nahĩ kiyā jāegā* means "I am reluctant to do such a (lowly, unworthy) job", whereas the intransitive

---

[21] For instance adverbial participles, which must share the main subject if no different subject is specified (in the genitive, cf. SII-2): *ḍabal calāte mujhse banegā nahĩ* (double driving I-instr be.done-fut neg) "I won't be able to drive for two" I am fat, I have hernia, diabet, all (NKK).

[22] Which the agent can eventually overcome (*usse calā nahĩ gayā, phir bhī vah calā*, "he was not able to walk, but he walked", from Davison 1980).

in *mujhse yah kām nahĩ hogā* simply means "I am unable to perform this job, I can't do it" (you can't ask that from me).

REMARK

This semantic difference corresponds to the argumental structure of the predicates (Van Valin 1990): passivable verbs, whether transitive as *dekhnā, kholnā, uṭhānā*, or intransitive as *calnā*, always contain an agent in their argument structure as the major role. All intransitives do not passivize, only those with an agent (in the wider meaning mentioned above) as their single role may passivize[23]. In contrast, intransitive medio-passive verbs like *ṭūṭnā* or *khulnā* contain a patient as the major or single role. The negation in the first bears on the relation agent-verb (agentivity), in the second on the relation patient-verb (efficient result of the process). This contrast is captured by the opposition of inaccusative *vs* inergative verbs in the generative syntax.

7. 3. THE INADVERTENT ACTORS

Intransitive verbs can also add to the main patient role an instrumental human extra argument in a non negative context. Without negation, the instrumental pattern is not interpreted as ability but as involving an inadvertent actor, somebody who acts unconsciously, by mistake.

96 *mujhse gilās ṭūṭ gayā /* *mujhse gilās gir gayā*
1s-instr glass break-intr went/ 1s-instr glass fall went
I broke the glass by mistake / let the glass fall by mistake

For that reason, such patterns are often used by speakers to disown any personal responsibility in an action, such as a man who has stolen a fruit (97a), or even a murderer in a trial (97b):

97a *yah daftar kā kaṭahal kai. Mujhse ġaltī huī.*
this office of jackfruit is. 1s-instr mistake be-aor
daftar ke ahāte mẽ lagā thā, mujhse ṭūṭ gayā (NKK)
office of yard in planted was, 1s-instr break P-aor
this is a jackfruit from the office. It was my mistake. It was planted in the courtyard, I plucked it (inadvertently)

[23] Including verbs like "fall", which is said to rule out passivation. However, suppose a game where all have to fall deliberately, then some player may say *mujhse girā nahĩ gayā* "I could not fall, I could not make it". On the other hand, a verb like *uṭhnā* "to get up" can passivize with a human subject (*mujhse uṭhā nahĩ gayā* "I could not manage to get up"), but not with inanimate subjects: the argument structure is not totally inherent to the verbal base, although it is to a large extent predictable from the morphological structure of the verb (cf. MII-2).

97b tumhĩ ne uskā khūn kiyā
2-foc erg his blood did it's you who murdered him
Sāhab! maĩne uskā khūn nahĩ kiyā, mujhse ho gayā
Sir! 1s-erg his blood neg did, 1s-instr be go-aor (A)
Sir, I did not kill him, it happened by myself, I did it unconsciously

The agentive construction (ergative with transitive predicate) here contrasts as a responsible and punishable act with the intransitive instrumental pattern of the accused, playing non guilty.

8. CONCLUDING REMARKS: A ROLE-DOMINATED LANGUAGE

8.1. The categories of subject and object

From the preceding sections, it clearly appears that in Hindi such notions as subject and object are weakly operational: they associate with one term only for statements patterning as nominative alignments (sections 1 and 2). The dissociation between subject properties, some of which are attached to an oblique term such as in sections 3-7 whereas morphological properties are attached to the unmarked term, echoes Hopper & Thompson's (1980) and Tsunoda's (1981, 1985) hierarchy of transitivity. The closest the predicate is to a canonical transitive predicate (action process), the more subjectal properties are attached to the agent in the unmarked form or in the ergative.

The split between agent and patient prominent pattern may be deemed as strictly grammatical, one mirroring the other, but, as shown by Langacker (1990, 1999), the mental scenario encoded by an ergative language is distinctly closer to the intransitive pattern: it displays a thematic predication (patient-predicate), only secundarily related to its source, which is not profiled as the primary figure and starting point as it is in the transitive model (ice melted, (X oblique) melted ice vs X melted → ice). Main oblique arguments in Hindi all pattern as locational patterns (Montaut 1998, 2001, 2004) and are all semantically constrained, which suggests that even the ergative pattern, although formally constrained (transitive + accomplished aspect), reflects the aspectual semantics, more similar to a description than to an action, in the morphological coding. Most of the basic patterns (3-7) are descriptive in Hagège's meaning (1984), ie, represent a state of affairs and not actions, even if action is at the origin of this state of affairs.

The very restricted class of statements -- patients and agents of intransitive processes, agents of transitive non-accomplished processes -- in which subject properties are attached to the unmarked

term (a subject in every respect) corresponds to a coding strategy where the higher term of the sentence, morphologically marked as such, cumulates various properties of various levels, semantic, deictic and communicational. Such a strategy is favored by the modern European so-called nominative languages, some ergative languages, and more generally by subject prominent languages, like English or French. Kibrik (1997) calls this strategy "cumulative"[24]: the coding of all dimensions cumulates on one term, the subject of a typical transitive clause, which is the higher semantic role, the source of information flow and the topic (communicative satus), as well as the more likely to associate with speech act prominent participants (deictic dimension). As Kibrik puts it, "the syntactic relation of subject only ensues from the cumulative principle of coding, when one marker syntagmatically co-expresses several relevant features of NPs" (1997: 295).

Subject oriented languages then highlight one or two specific positions, subject (in nominative patterns) and object (ergative patterns). The subject there is the core argument without any specific role attached to it -- almost any argument can be promoted to the subject position. Such languages usually have a fixed word-order and a partly flexional morphology. Subjectless languages on the contrary tend to prefer agglutinative morphology and free word-order and to exhibit no hierarchy or arguments. They generally correspond to languages which have a "separatist" strategy for coding the main dimensions of language, for instance the semantic roles, the more commonly encoded as such, irrespective of the other dimensions. Hindi seems to belong to such "separatist" subjectless languages, which strictly encode semantic roles, and which are better analysed by describing the casual morphology than forcing on it syntactic relations (Tsunoda 2003). In a different frame-work, Butt's (1995: 21) conclusion too, as well as Mohanan's (1994), is that Hindi/Urdu is better analysed as a non configurational language (with no dominating VP node): a flat structure with a simple chain of NPs arguments headed by V (NP -> V). Although most of the relevant literature assumes that Hindi is a configurational language with subject and strong binding relations, including the most insightful such as Mahajan (1990) or Davison (2001), it is fairly clear that its preference for marking semantic roles over syntactic relations should be correlated with the other properties of subjectless languages, such as a relatively free word-order (cf SIII-4).

[24] "Dovetailing" in Langacker's terms.

As for the distinctively marked semantic roles, the particularity of Hindi in this regard is the delimitation of the agent role, marked both with ergative and nominative, since it can be devoid of the volitional control feature, provided it retains the feature conscious assumption.

8.2. Role domination and subjecthood

Now, assuming that the various case markers are meaningful in Hindi, there are 6 basic patterns, correlating a semantic class of predicate with a given case marking of the main argument : 1) the nominative accusative pattern represents action processes, 2) the ergative pattern represents action processes but viewed from the viewpoint of the result (aspectual split), and not as actions, 3) the dative pattern describes experiential processes, 4) the instrumental pattern describes non-volitional actions in the affirmative and unfeasible actions in the negative, centered on actors lacking some of the features of the agent, 5) the locative and 6) the genitive patterns describe states. Only the first one really represents action (as an action chain fully profiled, from source to goal): the action model is clearly marginal. All other predications, with the main argument dissociated from the predication, profile thematic relations and represent autonomous predications in what Langacker (1999) calls "absolute construals" : the profiled segment always leaves the cognitively more salient entity in a secondary position, so that the less salient entity is the starting point from the linguistic viewpoint. Hindi indeed shows a clear preference for profiling less salient entities as starting points in asymmetric relations : a patient is less salient than an agent, a stimulus has less cognitive salience than an experiencer. And even a marked patient is no longer a possible starting point in the ergative sentence because it is salient : human or specific patients, that is, atypical patients not clearly opposed to typical agents, require the accusative/ dative marking, which rules out verb agreement.

Full subjecthood is restricted in Hindi/Urdu to action phrases and single arguments of simple verbs and one class of complex predicates. The category of subject, an amalgamation of properties (coding, topicality, control) attached to a single term, is a historical result in languages which favor it, more of a coincidence than a universal category. If various properties, of distinct levels, came to be attached to the same term, a topic tending to acquire coding and syntactic properties and to become a subject, reversely those properties may drift apart, a topic becoming autonomous from the grammatical subject: such a cyclic evolution is described by Li (1976). Hindi is far less subject prominent than was Sanskrit, and the emergence of the

ergative pattern out of a passive topicalizing the patient (agent often in the second position) is a good example of this cyclicity, with the drifting apart of coding and topic properties. The modern language presents a stage where subjects are marginal in front of the variety of oblique markings for main participants. The oblique NPs which occupy the first sequential position of unmarked statements are coded according to their semantic role, their position encoding their rank in the information-flow. Here two distinct strategies are used to encode both dimensions (semantic role, information-flow): no wonder the identification of a subject NP is problematic here, since in "separatist" languages the notion of subject is irrelevant. But Hindi is not a "pure" language although the "separatist" coding of semantic roles is largely prevailing. There is a class of statements (nominative main argument) for which the category of subject is relevant, not only because of the morphological coding, but because for such nominative NPs the nominative (unmarked case) does not encode any specific role (it can refer to agents, patients, experiencers: several features are co-expressed, particularly the position in the information-flow (communicative status) and the grammatical function, in a "cumulative" strategy. But other types of statements, which strictly encode semantic roles, depend on a more "separatist" strategy, which allows for a relatively free position in the sequence: marked orders do not require any additional device than the positional shift and that too is characteristic of "separatist" subjectless languages.

The mixed state of modern Hindi probably reflects a transitional phase of its evolution: the role domination (and subjectless feature) has been a gradual process, still very much alive, whereas the ergative structure got largely grammaticized, losing its semantic motivation and acquiring more subject properties than other oblique arguments. What is semantically motivated is transitivity and not the ergative marking of agents, which surface in the nominative in the non perfect system -- a structural case and not a semantic one in this regard as shown by Davison (to appear).

In the remaining section, the use of subject/object will only be retained for the type of statements where it is not controversial (cf. sections 1 and 2 here above), for the sake of simplicity.