

# The Role of Pronominal Suffixes in Punjabi

Miriam Butt

Universität Konstanz

miriam.butt@uni-konstanz.de

DGfS Workshop *Evolution syntaktischer Relationen*

Mainz, February 25–27, 2004

## 1 Preliminaries on Syntactic Relations

The theoretical assumptions of this talk are grounded in Lexical-Functional Grammar (LFG).

LFG assumes that *grammatical functions* (GF) are part of the basic inventory of human languages: SUBJECT, OBJECT, OBJECT <sub>$\theta$</sub> , OBLIQUE <sub>$\theta$</sub> , ADJUNCT.

As such, one cannot really speak of the “evolution of syntactic relations” in an LFG setting.

However, discourse functions (DF) interact with grammatical relations and languages may place more or less importance on GFs vs. DFs (pick one or the other as syntactic “pivot”). **My belief:** this makes it look like some languages may not have grammatical functions in place, when in fact they do (if one looks closely).

### Discourse Functions in LFG

- One school of thought integrates discourse functions such as topic and focus with the grammatical functions at the same level of representation (e.g., Bresnan 2001).
- Another school of thought seeks to represent them at an independent level (e.g., King 1997), modeling the interactions in a more complex way.

This talk follows the latter position (King 1997) and furthermore assumes that discourse considerations have a profound effect on the morphosyntax of a language. Though grammatical relations are not taken to evolve over time, valency and discourse clearly interact in a manner that as yet remains to be properly understood.

**Topic of this talk:** Pronominal incorporation in interaction with valency and discourse.

## 2 Language Background

Punjabi is an Indo-Aryan language spoken in South Asia. There are several different dialects within Punjabi, so the situation is quite complicated.

South Asian languages include Indo-Aryan, Dravidian and Tibeto-Burman.

These languages are genetically unrelated but have entered into a regional Sprachbund or linguistic area (Masica 1976).

Some (relevant) well known areal characteristics are: non-nominative subjects, ergative case, object agreement, rampant pro-drop.

Punjabi is a tone language (however, only some of the examples including tonal markings, this is due to differing transcription practices in the sources).

### 3 Argument “Replacing” Morphemes in Punjabi

Akhtar (1997, 1999) describes a number of “argument-replacing morphemes” as in (1).

- (1) a. xat                      lik<sup>h</sup>ia=i?  
 letter.M.Sg.Nom write.Past=2.Sg  
 ‘Have you written the letter?’ (Akhtar 1999:282)
- b. jandra                    k<sup>h</sup>ul gi-a=je?  
 lock.M.Sg.Nom open go-Past.3.Sg-2.Pl  
 ‘Has the lock been opened by you?’ (Akhtar 1999:284)
- c. pūtar=ne    koṭiā                      pejiā=je  
 son.M=Erg jumper.M.Pl.Nom send-Past.M.Pl=2.Pl  
 ‘(Your) son has sent jumpers for you (plural).’ (Akhtar 1999:284)
- d. fawad=ne                ditti=s(u)  
 Fawad.M.Sg=Erg give.Past.F.Sg=3.Sg  
 ‘Fawad gave this to her.’ (Akhtar 1997:3)
- d. xqt                      lik<sup>h</sup>ia=ne  
 letter.M.Sg.Nom write.Past=3.Pl  
 ‘They wrote a letter.’ (Akhtar 1999:283)

- These morphemes are not restricted to core arguments, but can also refer to adjuncts ((1b)) or beneficiaries not specified by the subcategorization frame of the verb ((1c)).
- They do not account for all of the arguments that are dropped ((1d)).
- They appear to be clitics (positional interactions with auxiliaries).
- The closely related language Urdu/Hindi does not display this phenomenon.
- These affixes have gone unreported in modern descriptions of Punjabi (e.g., Bhatia’s 1993 reference grammar or Masica’s 1991 overview of the Indo-Aryan languages, but Bailey (1925:349–356) does contain a discussion).
- **Question:** What are these morphemes and what is their function?

## 4 Case and Agreement

Case and Agreement in Punjabi appear to work much as in Urdu/Hindi (see Butt and King 2002a,b, Akhtar 1999, Bhatia 1993), though an in-depth research into the case system remains to be done.

**Agreement** is with unmarked (nominative) direct arguments, both subjects and objects. If the subject is not available for agreement, the verb agrees with the object. If that is not available, default masculine singular agreement is used.

(2)

Case Clitic	Name	Grammatical Function
∅	nominative	subject object
ne	ergative	subject
nũ	accusative	object
	dative	subject
	dative	indirect object
kolõ	instrumental	argument/adjunct subject
d-	genitive	subject (infinitives), agrees with head noun specifier, agrees with head noun
te	locative (from)	argument/adjunct
∅	locative	argument/adjunct

Punjabi exhibits **split-ergativity**, but the split differs slightly from what one finds in Urdu/Hindi.

- The major split is according to tense/aspect: as in Urdu/Hindi the ergative only appears on subjects of past tense sentences (“perfect” in Urdu/Hindi).

(3) a. ó=ne kam kitta  
s/he=Erg work.M.Sg.Nom do.Past.M.Sg  
‘S/he did some work.’

b. ó kam kardi ε  
she work.M.Sg.Nom do.Pres be.Pres.3.Sg  
‘S/he does work (she works).’

- However, only 3rd person subjects appear in the ergative.

(4) mẽ=\*ne kam kitta  
s/he=Erg work.M.Sg.Nom do.Past.M.Sg  
‘I did some work.’

- A look at the origin of the pronouns shows that *mẽ*, for example, descends from an instrumental and hence oblique form of the pronoun. The 3rd person pronouns descend from demonstratives.

- It thus seems that the Punjabi split functions just like the Urdu one, except that the pronouns have not been reanalyzed as “direct”, but rather have kept their original “oblique” status and thus no extra ergative marking is necessary.

## 5 Pronominal Suffixes

Akhtar (1997, 1999) describes four “argument replacing” suffixes/clitics for Punjabi ((1)).

The dialect he describes is spoken in the Gujrat District in the Punjab in Pakistan. His data are confirmed by 3 native speakers from Lahore, Pakistan where standard Punjabi is spoken (the *su* form is used in Lahore).

(5)

Form	Person	Marking	Tense
=i	2.Sg		
=je	2.Pl		
=s(u)	3.Sg		
=ne	3.Pl		Past

The clitics have some further distributional restrictions.

### 5.1 Nominative Arguments

The clitics cannot stand for a nominative (unmarked) argument.

- (6) a. fawad=ne            katab            paṛi  
 Fawad.M.Sg=Erg book.F.Sg.Nom read.Past.F.Sg  
 ‘Fawad read the/a book.’ (based on Akhtar 1997:5)
- b. fawad=ne            paṛi=s(u)  
 Fawad.M.Sg=Erg read.Past.F.Sg=3.Sg  
 ‘Fawad read (his/her something).’  
 but not ‘Fawad read it.’ (where it=book, based on Akhtar 1997:5)

### 5.2 Wh-Questions

The clitics cannot stand for a wh-word.

- (7) a. fawad=ne            kīs=nū            maria  
 Fawad.M.Sg=Erg who.Obl=Acc beat.Past  
 ‘Whom did Fawad beat?’ (based on Akhtar 1997:5)
- b. fawad=ne            maria=s(u)  
 Fawad.M.Sg=Erg beat.Past=3.Sg  
 ‘Fawad beat him/her.’  
 but not ‘Whom did Fawad beat?’ (based on Akhtar 1997:6)

- (8) a. *kis=ne munde=nũ maria?*  
 who.Obl=Erg boy.Obl=Acc beat.Past.M.Sg  
 ‘Who beat the boy?’ (based on Akhtar 1997:5)
- b. *munde=nũ maria=s(u)*  
 boy.Obl=Acc beat.Past.M.Sg=3.Sg  
 ‘S/he beat the boy’, not ‘Who beat the boy?’ (based on Akhtar 1997:5)

### 5.3 Genitives

The clitic (*s(u)*) can be used to replace genitive specifiers.

- (9) a. *o=de munde kam karde ne*  
 Pron.3.Sg=Gen.Pl boy.M.Pl.Nom work.M.Sg.Nom do.Pres.M.Pl be.Pres.3.Pl  
 ‘His/her sons work.’ (based on Akhtar 1997:4)
- b. *munde kam karde=s(u)*  
 boy.M.Pl.Nom work.M.Sg.Nom do.Pres.M.Pl=3.Sg  
 ‘His/her sons work.’ (based on Akhtar 1997:4)

This property will not be addressed further in this talk. It is known that genitive specifiers are able to scramble independently (Mohanani 1994) and have unexpected properties in Hindi.

## 6 Pronominal Suffixes in South Asian Languages

### 6.1 Kashmiri

It is well known that Kashmiri uses pronominal clitics as part of its verbal morphology (e.g., Grierson 1895a, Hook and Kaul 1987, Wali and Koul 1994, 1997, Bhatt 1999), often in alternation with free pronouns.

- (10) a. *tsi chu-kh su vucha:n*  
 you-NOM be-2.SG.NOM Pron-3.SG.ACC see-PRES.PPL  
 ‘You are looking at it.’ (Sharma 2001:226, with corrections by Peter Hook)
- b. *tsi chu-h-an vucha:n*  
 you-NOM be-2.SG.NOM-3.SG.ACC see-PRES.PPL  
 ‘You are looking at it.’ (Sharma 2001:226, with correction by Peter Hook)

Kashmiri also shows a split ergative distribution with respect to these pronominal clitics (Sharma 2001).

## 6.2 A Possible Connection to Pro-drop?

Pro-drop is generally assumed to be licensed by verbal agreement, pronominal incorporation and/or case assignment (see Appendix for details).

Given current assumptions about the licensing of pro-drop, Kashmiri is thus a language in which pro-drop would be expected and is indeed found ((11)).

- (11) raath      vuch-n-ay  
 yesterday saw-3sg-2sg  
 ‘He searched for you yesterday.’ (Bhatt 1999:48, with correction by Peter Hook)

However, Hook (p.c., June 2003) points out that true “argument replacement” only holds for the dative clitics, not for the others.

## 6.3 Other Languages

Emeneau (1965) provides a survey of languages he was aware of that showed pronominal suffixes. They include Pashtu, Balochi, Brahui (a Dravidian language pocket in an otherwise Indo-Aryan area), Sindhi, Lahanda, Kashmiri, Shina, Shumashti, Pasahi, Bashgali (Kati), Waigali, Ashkun. Emeneau concludes that this is in fact an areal characteristic.

Hook (1987) details the pronominal suffix system for Poguli (spoken in Jammu and Kashmir), which displays a very complete paradigm (it makes Kashmiri look poor in comparison).

Maithili sports a very complex (agreement) system, but the paradigm is not as complete and Bickel, Bisang and Yādava (1999) suggest that the neutralization patterns have emerged due to the politeness system inherent to Maithili (South Asian languages in general).

### Taking Stock:

- Standard Punjabi is not mentioned in any of these accounts.
- **Question:** Do the “argument replacing” clitics fall into the same category?

## 7 Historical Origin — Pronominal Incorporation

Emeneau (1965) sees the origin of pronominal suffixation as being due to language contact with neighboring Iranian languages.

However, he believes that the ground for this ready borrowing must already have been structurally inherent in the languages.

## 7.1 Kashmiri, Lahanda and Sindhi

Grierson (1895a) starts with Kashmiri and compares it with evidence from other languages (in particular, Lahanda and Sindhi).

- (12) a. kitu-s  
do.Part-3.Sg.Obl  
'It was done by him.' (Lahanda)
- a. kitō-vē  
do.Part-2.Obl  
'It was done by you.' (Lahanda)
- (13) a. chaḍḍiā-ĩ-se  
left-3.Sg.Obl-3.Sg  
'He gave him up.' (Sindhi)
- b. chaḍḍiā-ĩ-va  
left-3.Sg.Obl-2.Pl  
'He gave you up.' (Sindhi)

### Full set of forms as recorded by Grierson (1885a:345)

(as well as I can read them)

(14)

	Kashmiri		Lahanda		Sindhi	
	Full Pronoun	Suffix	Full Pronoun	Suffix	Full Pronoun	Suffix
1.Sg.Dir	<i>bo</i>	<i>m</i> or <i>s</i>	<i>mā:ĩ:</i>	<i>m</i> or <i>s</i>	<i>ā:ũ:</i>	<i>se</i> or <i>me</i>
1.Sg.Obl	<i>me</i>	<i>m</i>	<i>maĩ</i>	<i>m</i>	<i>mũhũ</i>	<i>me</i>
1.Pl.Dir	<i>asi</i>		<i>assā:</i>	<i>sē</i>	<i>asĩ:</i>	<i>sĩ:, sũ:</i>
1.Pl.Obl	<i>asi</i>		<i>assā</i>	<i>sē</i>	<i>asā:</i>	<i>ũ:, sũ:</i>
2.Sg.Dir	<i>tsa</i>	<i>h</i>	<i>tũ:</i>	<i>vē:</i> or <i>ō</i>	<i>tũ:</i>	<i>ē:, e</i>
2.Sg.Obl	<i>tse</i>	<i>t</i> (dat <i>y</i> )	<i>tai</i>	<i>ēĩ</i> (dat <i>ĩ</i> )	<i>tō</i>	<i>e, (ēĩ)</i>
2.Pl.Dir	<i>tohi</i>	<i>va</i>	<i>tussā:</i>	<i>vē</i>	<i>tavhĩ:</i>	<i>u, va</i>
2.Pl.Obl	<i>tohi</i>	<i>va</i>	<i>tussā:</i>	<i>vē</i> or <i>o</i>	<i>tavhā:</i>	<i>va</i>
3.Sg.Dir.M	<i>su</i>	<i>u</i>	<i>ũ, sō</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>ũ, sō</i>	( <i>se</i> )
3.Sg.Obl.M	<i>tami</i> (inst) <i>tas</i> (dat)	<i>n</i> (dat <i>s</i> )	<i>ũ:, taĩ:</i>	<i>s</i>	<i>una, tãhẽ</i>	<i>se</i> (inst <i>ĩ:</i> )
3.Pl.Dir.M	<i>tim</i>	<i>h</i>	<i>ũ, sō</i>		<i>hũ, sē</i>	( <i>ne</i> )
3.Pl.Obl.M	<i>timau</i> (inst)	<i>h</i>	<i>ũ:hã:, tinhã:</i>	<i>hẽ:</i> or <i>ni</i>	<i>hune, tane</i>	<i>ne</i> (inst <i>ũ:</i> )

Grierson traces the agreement clitics/suffixes back to the incorporation of Sanskrit enclitic pronouns and pronouns in Prākṛit.

- **First Person:** Sanskrit enclitic pronouns *mā* (acc, sg), *me* (dat/gen, sg) become Prākṛit *mā* and *me*. The *s* forms are traced to the oblique forms of full plural pronouns in Prākṛit which derive from Sanskrit *aṣmad* (e.g. \**assahũ*, \**assahĩ*).
- **Second Person:** The Sanskrit enclitics are *tvā* (acc, sg), *te* (dat/gen, sg), *vas* (acc/dat/gen, pl). The corresponding Prākṛit is *te* (sg), *vo* (pl). The forms in *t-* and some of the *v-* forms are derived from these.

The *h*, *ī*, *ēī* and some of the *v-* forms are traced back to the Prākṛit second person pronouns *bhē* and *uyhē*, which relate to old dual forms (see Pischel 1955:§420 for a complete list of second person pronouns in Prākṛit, Whitney 1889:§491 for Sanskrit).

- **Third Person:** The forms in *n* are derived from a defective Sanskrit pronominal which had *ena* as a stem. The forms in *s* are derived via Sanskrit *asya* (3sg, gen) and Prākṛit *sē*. The *u* forms may be associated with an instrumental version.

## 7.2 Possible Origin for the Standard Punjabi Forms

**Question:** Do the clitics found in Standard Punjabi fit in with the above historical scenario?

(15)

	Full Pronoun	Suffix
1.Sg.Dir	mē	
1.Sg.Obl	mē	
1.Pl.Dir	asī	
1.Pl.Obl	sa	
2.Sg.Dir	tū	
2.Sg.Obl	tē	i
2.Pl.Dir	tusī	
2.Pl.Obl	tva	je
3.Sg.Dir.Prox	é	
3.Sg.Obl.Prox	é(s)	
3.Pl.Dir.Prox	é	
3.Pl.Obl.Prox	énā	
3.Sg.Dir.Rem	ó	
3.Sg.Obl.Rem	ó(s)	s(u)
3.Pl.Dir.Rem	ó	
3.Pl.Obl.Rem	ónā	ne

**Answer:** Quite possibly.

- **Second Person:** In analogy to the Lahanda *ī*, *ēī* forms, the Punjabi *i* and *je* forms could be traced back to the Prākṛit second person pronouns *bhē* or *uyhē*.
- **Third Person:** The *ne* and *s(u)* could be derived from the forms Grierson proposes: defective *ena* and a locative form in *-u*.

- **First Person:** Bickel, Bisang and Yādava (1999) note that there are no first person pronominal suffixes in Maithili and attribute this to the pressure on self-effacement in the social context. The same hypothesis could hold for Punjabi (and possibly other South Asian languages).

### 7.3 Summary

- The Punjabi “argument replacing” clitics are an instance of the wider areal phenomenon of pronominal suffixation.
- Given the rather defective nature of the Punjabi paradigm, what are these pronominal clitics good for?
- One possible answer suggested by common assumptions about the role of incorporated pronouns and agreement (e.g., Jelinek 1984, Rizzi 1986): help license pro-drop by satisfying the argument slots of a predicate.

## 8 Pronominal Incorporation and Pro-Drop

- Grierson (1895b) reconstructs pronominal incorporation of the same type for Nepali, Maithili, Assamese, Bengali, Oṛiya and Marathi.
- Hindi/Urdu and Punjabi are not mentioned in this analysis.
- But Bengali, Punjabi, Marathi and Hindi/Urdu do not differ in their ability to pro-drop (even though they also differ in verbal agreement, cf. Bengali).

### Urdu/Hindi

- (16) a. tum=ne nadya=ko k<sup>h</sup>ana di-ya?  
 you=Erg Nadya.F=Dat food.M.Sg.Nom give-Perf.M.Sg  
 ‘Did you give Nadya (some) food?’
- ji, di-ya  
 yes.Polite give-Perf.M.Sg  
 ‘Yes, gave.’

### Punjabi

- (17) ji, dit<sup>t</sup>a  
 yes.Polite give.Perf.M.Sg  
 ‘Yes, gave.’

## Bengali

- (18) a. hã, di-e-tʃ<sup>h</sup>-e  
 yes give-Part-Perf-3  
 ‘Yes, (he) gave.’
- b. hã, di-e-tʃ<sup>h</sup>-i  
 yes give-Part-Perf-1  
 ‘Yes, (I) gave.’

**Therefore:** Pronominal incorporation is not related to pro-drop in South Asian languages.

## Agreement and Case

As demonstrated by the Hindi facts below, agreement and case are also orthogonal to the possibility of pro-drop.

- In (19) (from a Hindi movie), the current topic is nominative ‘they’(=some pigeons).
- The overt realization of ‘they’(=pigeons) would be **ergative** in (19b) (no verb agreement), but **nominative** in (19c) (verb agreement).

- (19) a. [ye]<sub>T</sub>      b<sup>h</sup>i mer-i=ki                      tərã hẽ  
 Pron.3.Sg also I.Gen-F.Sg=Gen.F.Sg like be.Pres.Pl  
 ‘They<sub>topic</sub> are also like me.’ (Dilwale Dulhania Le Jayenge)
- b. jahã    **dana**                      dek<sup>h</sup>-a  
 where seed.M.Sg.Nom see-Perf.M.Sg  
 ‘where (they<sub>cont.topic</sub>) see a seed’
- c. ʊdar ga-ye              or    peṭ                      bar kar    ʊṛ ga-ye  
 there go-Perf.M.Pl and stomach.M.Sg.Nom fill    having rise go-Perf.M.Pl  
 ‘there (they<sub>cont.topic</sub>) go and having filled (their) stomach (they<sub>cont.topic</sub>) fly away.’

## 9 A Discourse Structure Analysis

- The pronominal clitics in Punjabi are not used to licence pro-drop.
- **Alternative Analysis:** They allow the referent to be *backgrounded* in the discourse.

### 9.1 Discourse Functions and Word Order

- Butt and King (1996, 1997) propose that Urdu/Hindi word order is governed primarily by discourse considerations (see Gambhir 1981, Kidwai 2000 for similar ideas, but in different frameworks, also cf. King 1995 for Russian).

- Butt and King formulate their approach within LFG and assume a four-way distinction for discourse functions that is based on two features:  $[\pm\text{New}]$  and  $[\pm\text{Prom}(\text{inent})]$  (adapted from Choi 1999).

(20) **Discourse Functions**

$[\text{+New}] =$	<b>focus</b> $[\text{+Prom}]$
	<b>completive information</b> $[\text{−Prom}]$
$[\text{−New}] =$	<b>topic</b> $[\text{+Prom}]$
	<b>background information</b> $[\text{−Prom}]$

**Positional Correlations:**

- **Topic** is sentence initial
- **Focus** is immediately preverbal
- **Completive Information** occurs between the topic and the focus (preverbally)
- **Background Information** occurs postverbally.

**An Example**

- (21)  $[\text{nadya}]_T$  (to)  $[\text{ab}^h\text{i}]_{CI}$   $[\text{t}\text{ɔ}^h\text{fi}]_{CI}$   $[\text{bazar}=\text{se}]_F$  xarid  
 Nadya.F.Nom indeed just now toffee.F.Nom market.M=from buy  
 rah-i  $\text{t}^h\text{-i}$   $[\text{mere}=\text{liye}]_B$   
 stay-Perf.F.Sg be.Past-F.Sg I.Gen.Obl=for  
 ‘Nadya was just buying toffee at the market for me.’ (Urdu)

## 9.2 The Punjabi Clitics

**Proposal:** The Punjabi pronominal clitics represent backgrounded information.

- (22)  $[\text{s}\text{u}\text{m}\text{b}\text{al}=\text{n}\text{u}]_T$   $[\text{k}\text{a}\text{t}\text{a}\text{b}]_F$   $\text{d}\text{i}\text{t}\text{t}\text{i}=[\text{s}(\text{u})]_B$   
 Sumbal.M.Sg=Dat book.F.Sg.Nom give.Past.F.Sg=3.Sg  
 ‘S/he gave the book to Sumbal.’ (Akhtar 1997:2)

### 9.2.1 Supporting Synchronic Evidence

- Akhtar (1997:6) notes that the arguments  $s(u)$  stands for are unstressed and not the focal part of the sentences.
- The clitics cannot stand for wh-words (section 5.2). This makes sense since wh-words tend to be in focus and are therefore not candidates for backgrounding.
- The clitics cannot stand for nominative arguments (section 5.1). Butt and King (1997) note that nominative arguments tend to be semantically incorporated or focused (see Mohanan 1995, Dayal 2003 for further discussion and motivation), both of which makes them unavailable for discourse backgrounding.

### 9.2.2 Supporting Diachronic Evidence

- The Sanskrit enclitic pronouns were accentless.
- Whitney 1889:§500 “There is a defective pronominal stem, *ena*, which is accentless, and hence used only in situations where no emphasis falls upon it.”
- This indicates that the pronouns the modern Punjabi clitics were derived from already served a deemphasizing (non-focal) function.

### 9.3 Differences between pro-drop and Backgrounding

- Based on a study of Hindi movie dialogs, Butt and King (1997) conclude that only old information such as a continuing topic or background information is dropped.
- This finding is generally confirmed by Prasad’s (2000) corpus study.
- **Question:** If pronominal clitics are used for backgrounding the referent, then what is the difference between pro-drop and the cliticization strategy?
- **Answer:**
  - One difference lies in the degree of (de)emphasis. Backgrounded information is still recoverable within the clause, pro-dropped information is wholly context-dependent.
  - Prasad (2000) shows that it is mainly subjects which are pro-dropped (though in principle anything is possible). Backgrounding is therefore a good strategy to deemphasize non-subjects. This also could explain why the pronominal suffixes are derived from oblique forms and why the first person is generally absent from the paradigms.

## 10 Conclusion

- Standard Punjabi shows pronominal suffixation as part of an areal phenomenon.
- The pronominal suffixes/clitics do not license pro-drop (e.g., by saturating the argument positions of the predicate).
- Pronominal suffixes have entered the languages either through borrowing or incorporation of Sanskrit/Prākṛit pronominal forms.
- Morphosyntactic change is driven by discourse considerations.
  - Pronominal suffixes/clitics are used for discourse backgrounding.
  - In languages like Maithili (Bickel, Bisang and Yādava 1999), the pronominal suffixes are on their way to being integrated as agreement morphemes.
  - **Hypothesis:** discourse backgrounding can feed the development of a verbal agreement system.

## Appendix: Current Assumptions on Pro-Drop

### • Pro-Drop and Agreement

- The ability to pro-drop is correlated with rich verb agreement (e.g., Rizzi 1986).
- This correlation was shown not to hold exactly, but the general idea can still be found. For example, Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998) link pro-drop to the feature [+D], which allows agreement affixes to have independent entries in the lexicon.
- The notion of independent entries for agreement affixes is correlated with the idea that these affixes stem from pronominal incorporation.

### • Pro-Drop and Pronominal Incorporation

- Pronominal incorporation into the agreement system gives rise to the ability of agreement morphology to satisfy a predicate's argument slots (e.g., Jelinek 1984).

### • Case and Agreement

- Rizzi 1986: licensing of *pro* is coextensive with nominative Case assignment.
- Structural Case and verbal agreement are intimately connected as structural Case can be assigned via Agr Positions (Mahajan 1989, 1992 for Hindi in particular).
- EPP checking parasitic on Case checking (Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998)

None of these hypothesis can be confirmed for South Asian languages (Butt 2001).

## References

- Akhtar, Raja Nasim. 1997. Affix-*s(uu)* Constructions in Punjabi. In *Essex Graduate Working Papers in Linguistics*, 1–18. Colchester. University of Essex.
- Akhtar, Raja Nasim. 1999. *Aspectual Complex Predicates in Punjabi*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Essex.
- Alexiadou, Artemis, and Elena Anagnostopoulou. 1998. Parametrizing AGR: Word Order, V-Movement and EPP-Checking. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16(3):491–539.
- Bailey, Thomas Grahame. 1925. *Panjabi Manual and Grammar: A guide to the Colloquial Panjabi of the Northern Panjab*. Calcutta.
- Bhatia, Tej. 1993. *Punjabi: A cognitive-descriptive grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Bhatt, Rakesh Mohan. 1999. *Verb Movement and the Syntax of Kashmiri*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Bickel, Balthasar, Walter Bisang, and Yogendra P. Yādava. 1999. Face vs. empathy: the social foundation of Maithili verb agreement. *Linguistics* 37(2):359–364.
- Butt, Miriam. 2001. Case, Agreement, Pronoun Incorporation and Pro-Drop in South Asian Languages. Talk held at the Workshop *The Role of Agreement in Argument Structure*, Utrecht, August. <http://ling.uni-konstanz.de/pages/home/butt>.
- Butt, Miriam, and Tracy Holloway King. 1996. Structural Topic and Focus without Movement. In *Proceedings of the First LFG Conference*. Stanford, California. CSLI Publications. Grenoble, <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/>.
- Butt, Miriam, and Tracy Holloway King. 1997. Null Elements in Discourse Structure. In *Papers from the NULLS Seminar*, ed. K.V. Subbarao. Delhi: Moti Lal Banarsi Das. To Appear.
- Butt, Miriam, and Tracy Holloway King. 2002a. The Status of Case. In *Clause Structure in South Asian Languages*, ed. Veneeta Dayal and Anoop Mahajan. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers. In Press.
- Butt, Miriam, and Tracy Holloway King. 2002b. Case Systems: Beyond Structural Distinctions. In *New Perspectives on Case Theory*, ed. Ellen Brandner and Heike Zinsmeister. 53–87. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.
- Choi, Hye-won. 1990. *Optimizing Structure in Context: Scrambling and Information Structure*. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.
- Dayal, Veneeta. 2003. Bare Nominals: Non-specific and Contrastive Readings under Scrambling. In *Word Order and Scrambling*, ed. Simin Karimi. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

- Emeneau, Murray. 1956. India and Linguistic Areas. In *India and Historical Grammar, Publication No. 5*. 25–75. Annamalai: Annamalai University, Department of Linguistics. Republished 1980 in Anwar S. Dil (ed.) *Language and Linguistic Area: Essays by Murray B. Emeneau*, pp. 126–166, Stanford University Press.
- Gambhir, Vijay. 1981. *Syntactic Restrictions and Discourse Functions of Word Order in Standard Hindi*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Grierson, G.A. 1895a. On Pronominal Suffixes in the Kāçmīrī Language. *Proceedings of the Royal Asiatic Society, Calcutta* 64(1):336–351.
- Grierson, G.A. 1895b. On the Radical and Participial Tenses of the Modern Indo-Aryan Languages. *Proceedings of the Royal Asiatic Society, Calcutta* 64(1):352–375.
- Hook, Peter Edwin. 1987. Poguli Syntax in the Light of Kashmiri: A Preliminary Report. *Studies in the Linguistic Sciences* 17:63–71.
- Hook, Peter Edwin, and Vijay K. Kaul. 1987. Case Alternation, Transitionality and the Adoption of Direct Objects in Kashmiri. *Indian Linguistics* 48:52–69.
- Jelinek, Eloise. 1984. Empty Categories, Case and Configurationality. *Natural Language and Linguistics Theory* 2(1):39–76.
- Kidwai, Ayesha. 2000. *XP-Adjunction in Universal Grammar: Scrambling and Binding in Hindi-Urdu*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- King, Tracy Holloway. 1995. *Configuring Topic and Focus in Russian*. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.
- King, Tracy Holloway. 1997. Focus Domains and Information Structure. In *Proceedings of the LFG97 Conference*. Stanford, California. CSLI Publications. San Diego, <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/>.
- Mahajan, Anoop. 1989. Agreement and Agreement Phrases. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 10:217–252.
- Mahajan, Anoop. 1992. The Specificity Condition and the CED. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23(3):510–516.
- Masica, Colin. 1976. *Defining a Linguistic Area: South Asia*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Masica, Colin. 1991. *The Indo-Aryan languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mohanan, Tara. 1994. *Argument Structure in Hindi*. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.
- Mohanan, Tara. 1995. Wordhood and lexicality: Noun incorporation in Hindi. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 13(1):75–134.

- Pischel, Richard. 1955. *A Grammar of the Prākṛit Languages*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. First published in German 1900, current edition was reprinted in 1981.
- Prasad, Rashmi. 2000. A Corpus Study of Zero Pronouns in Hindi: An Account Based on Centering Transition Preferences. In *Proceedings of DAARC 2000, Discourse Anaphora and Reference Resolution Conference*, 66–71. Lancaster University.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1986. Null Objects in Italian and Theory of *pro*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17(3):501–557.
- Sharma, Devyani. 2001. Kashmiri Case Clitics and Person Hierarchy Effects. In *Formal and Empirical Issues in Optimality Theoretic Syntax*, ed. Peter Sells. 225–256. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.
- Wali, Kashi, and Omkar N. Koul. 1994. Kashmiri Clitics: The Role of Case and CASE. *Linguistics* 32:969–994.
- Wali, Kashi, and Omkar N. Koul. 1997. *Kashmiri*. New York, New York: Routledge.
- Whitney, William D. 1889. *Sanskrit Grammar*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. Ninth Issue of the Second Edition (1960).