Aspectual Complex Predicates, Passives and Disposition/Ability

Miriam Butt
University of Konstanz
mutt@csli.stanford.edu

Linguistics Association of Great Britain
Spring Meeting, April 9, 1997
Edinburgh

1 The Problem — Unexpected Readings

• Imperfects in Urdu generally have a habitual reading.

(1)

naadyaa	caai	**pii-tii**	hai/t^{h}ii
Nadya.F.Sg.Nom	tea.F.Sg.Nom	drink-Impf.F.Sg	be.Sg.Pres/be.F.Sg.Past

'Nadya drinks/drank tea.'

(2)

naadyaa	kiiriiãã=ko	**maar**	**de-tii**	hai
Nadya.F.Sg.Nom	ant.F.Pl=Acc	hit	give-Impf.M.Sg	be.Pres.Sg

'Nadya kills ants.'

• But — in some complex predicates a funny "dispositional" reading emerges

(3)

naadyaa	gaarii	**calaa**	**le-tii**	(hai)
Nadya.F.Sg.Nom	car.F.Sg.Nom	drive	take-Impf.F.Sg	be.Pres.Sg

'Nadya does/will drive a car.'

• Even worse — what is this form of the passive up to?

(4)

naadyaa=se	gaarii	**cala-yii**	**jaa-tii**	(hai)
Nadya.F.Sg=Inst	car.F.Sg.Nom	drive-Perf.F.Sg	go-Impf.F.Sg	be.Pres.Sg

'Nadya has the ability to drive a car.'
'A car gets driven by Nadya.'

(5)

naadyaa=se	ye	urduu=k-ii	ciṭṭ^{h}ii	nahĩĩ	**paṛ^h-ii**	**jaa-tii**	(hai)
Nadya.F.Sg=Inst	this	Urdu=Gen-F.Sg	letter.F.Sg.Nom	not	read-Impf.F.Sg	go-Impf.F.Sg	be.Pres.Sg

'Nadya does not have the ability to read this Urdu letter.'
'This Urdu letter does not get read by Nadya.'

Questions

• How can the readings in the "passive" and the aspectual imperfective complex predicates be characterized/analyzed?

• How do they differ from habituals (imperfects)?

• How do they differ from simple modals?

2 Background on Urdu

2.1 Basics

• Modern colloquial Urdu is basically the same as modern Hindi.
• SOV default, but "free" Word Order (scrambling).
• Either subject or object agreement, depending on case-marking.

2.2 Complex Predicates

• **Syntactic Properties**: A *light verb* combines with the stem form of a main verb to form a single syntactic predicate (no embedded subject).

• **Lexical Semantics**: The light verb and the main verb each contribute lexically encoded semantic information to the semantics of the construction. (see Butt 1995 for details).

• In *Aspectual Complex Predicates*, the *light verb* conveys aspectual information. In the past tense (perfective morphology), as in (6), the light verbs generally perform a similar role to particles like *auf* in the German *auf-essen* 'to eat up', i.e., they signal completion.

(6) a.

naadyaa=ne	gaarii	**calaa**	**l-ii**	(hai)
Nadya.F.Sg=Erg	car.F.Sg.Nom	drive	take-Perf.F.Sg	be.Pres.Sg

'Nadya has driven a/the car.'

b.

naadyaa=ne	k^{h}aanaa	**k^{h}aa**	**li-yaa**
Nadya.F.Sg=Erg	food.M.Sg.Nom	eat	take-Perf.M.Sg

'Nadya has eaten (completely).'

• **Question:** How does the "dispositional" reading in (7) relate to these?

(7)

naadyaa	gaarii	calaa	le-tii	(hai)
Nadya.F.Sg.Nom	car.F.Sg.Nom	drive	take-Impf.F.Sg	be.Pres.Sg

'Nadya does/will drive a car.'

Distributional Note: The dispositional reading only occurs productively with *le* 'take' ((7)) and in individual, almost lexicalized forms such as (8).

(8)	nadyaa	baccõ=ko	ṭofii	de	de-tii
	Nadya.F.Sg.Nom	child.Pl.Obl=Dat	toffee.F.Sg.Nom	give	give-Impf.F.Sg
	hai				
	be.Pres.Sg				

'Nadya will/does give toffee to children.'

So, it is actually just one light verb out of a larger possible set (Table (9)).

(9)

Common Light Verbs	
Based on (di)transitives (Ergative Subject)	Based on Intransitives (Nominative Subject)
le 'take'	aa 'come'
de 'give'	jaa 'go'
ḍaal 'put'	paṛ 'fall'
maar 'hit'	mar 'die'
nikaal 'pry out'	nikal 'emerge'
	cuk 'finish'
	baiṭ^h 'sit'
	uṭ^h 'rise

The light verb *le* is in fact the semantically most unmarked in its group, so it would make sense that it most easily lends itself to a shift in semantic interpretation.

2.3 Passives

• Standard passives are formed with the verb *jaa* 'go' (in all tenses) in combination with perfective morphology on the main verb.

• Though standard passives are a part of Urdu/Hindi, speakers tend to avoid using them and they sound stilted.

Adapted from T. Mohanan (1994:183)

(10)	cor	(pulis=se)	pakṛ-aa	ga-yaa
	thief.M.Sg.Nom	police=Inst	catch-Perf.M.Sg	go-Perf.M.Sg

'The thief was caught by the police.'

(11)	cor	(pulis=se)	pakṛ-aa	jaa-taa
	thief.M.Sg.Nom	police=Inst	catch-Perf.M.Sg	go-Impf.M.Sg

'The thief gets caught by the police.'

• **Question:** How does the passive in (12) acquire the "ability" reading?

(12)	naadyaa=se	gaarii	cala-yii	jaa-tii	(hai)
	Nadya.F.Sg=Inst	car.F.Sg.Nom	drive-Perf.F.Sg	go-Impf.F.Sg	be.Pres.Sg

'Nadya has the ability to drive a car.'
'A car gets driven by Nadya.'

2.4 Ability Modal (*can*)

• The standard modal corresponding to the English *can* is *sak*. It requires that the embedded verb be in its stem/base form.

(13)	naadyaa	caai	pii	sak-tii	hai
	Nadya.F.Sg.Nom	tea.F.Sg.Nom	drink	can-Impf.F.Sg	be.Sg.Pres

'Nadya can drink tea.'

• **Question:** How does this modal differ from the "ability" passive and the "dispositional" Aspectual Complex Predicate?

3 Dispositional Complex Predicates

(14)	naadyaa	gaarii	calaa	le-tii	(hai)
	Nadya.F.Sg.Nom	car.F.Sg.Nom	drive	take-Impf.F.Sg	be.Pres.Sg

'Nadya does/will drive a car.'

3.1 Semantics

• The "dispositional" reading of the *le* complex predicate appears to be very hard to explain to speakers of English.

• The closest analogs in the literature come from Lawler (1973a,b).

3.1.1 Lawler

Existential(=dispositional) Generic:
Example in (16).
Possible paraphrase/reading of the generic in (15).
(Lawler 1973b)

(15) My pet toad eats flies. (generic)

(16) My pet toad will eat flies. (existential)
(The toad will eat flies, perhaps in addition to other things)

This reading has not been discussed very much in the literature, which has focused instead on the universal paraphrasing of (15) in (17a,b).

(17) a. My pet toad only eats flies. (universal)

b. My pet toad always eats flies.

• Universal readings do not reflect the interpretation of the *le* construction.
• The bulk of the literature on generics is thus not helpful.

Potential Generic:
Example in (18)–(19).
Can be paraphrased with a modal of possibility (*can, will*).
(Lawler 1973a:97)

(18) Frank speaks German.

(19) Bill's car goes 150 miles an hour.

3.1.2 Language Internal Evidence

Common context:
People are surprised that one might speak Urdu and inquire about it.

(20) a. acc^{h}aa, urduu b^{h}ii bol-tii hai?
yes Urdu.F.Sg.Nom also speak-Impf.F.Sg be.Pres.Sg
'So, she also speaks Urdu?'

b. hãã, hãã, bol le-tii hai. kyũ na bo-le?
yes yes speak take-Impf.F.Sg be.Pres.Sg why not speak-Subj
'Yes, yes, she (does) speak Urdu. Why shouldn't she?'

Interpretation of the Reading: The construction asserts that:

1. The subject/topic of predication has the ability to perform a certain action.
2. Over and above that the subject/topic of predication actually chooses (and has been observed to) to excercise that ability (is disposed to perform a certain action).
3. The construction is particularly appropriate in a situation the subject/topic of predication is not expected to have a particular ability — that the subject/topic does in fact actually excercise that ability serves to explicitly point out and override the negative expectation.

Differences to the Modal:

• The expectation/presupposition that the subject/topic of predication actually excercises a particular ability distinguishes the *le* dispositional construction from the modal.

(21) naadyaa gaarii calaa sak-tii hai, magar
Nadya.F.Sg.Nom car.F.Sg.Nom drive can-Impf.F.Sg be.Pres.Sg but
calaa-tii hii nahĩĩ
drive-Impf.F.Sg Emph not
'Nadya can drive a car, but doesn't.'

(22) ???naadyaa gaarii calaa le-tii hai, magar
Nadya.F.Sg.Nom car.F.Sg.Nom drive take-Impf.F.Sg be.Pres.Sg but
calaa-tii hii nahĩĩ
drive-Impf.F.Sg Emph not
'Nadya does/will drive a car, but doesn't.'

Presuppositions:

• The *le* construction appears to presuppose that certain conditions are met; the modal does not.

(23) agar raastaa pakaa ho, naadyaa saikal
if road.M.Sg.Nom baked.M.Sg be Nadya.F.Sg.Nom cycle.F.Sg.Nom
calaa le-gii
drive take-Fut.F.Sg
'If the road is good, Nadya will ride a bicycle.'

(24) ??agar raastaa pakaa ho, naadyaa saikal
if road.M.Sg.Nom baked.M.Sg be Nadya.F.Sg.Nom cycle.F.Sg.Nom
calaa sake-gii
drive can-Fut.F.Sg
'If the road is good, Nadya can ride a bicycle.'

3.2 Word Order Constraints

• The dispositional reading is not independent of word order.

(25) a. naadyaa gaarii calaa le-tii (hai)
Nadya.F.Sg.Nom car.F.Sg.Nom drive take-Impf.F.Sg be.Pres.Sg
'Nadya does/will drive a car.'

b. gaarii naadyaa calaa le-tii (hai)
car.F.Sg.Nom Nadya.F.Sg.Nom drive take-Impf.F.Sg be.Pres.Sg
??*'Nadya does/will drive a car.'
'?As for a/the car, Nadya drives it.'

• Topic is clause initial (Butt and King 1996).
• A change in word order (interaction with discourse functions) rules out the dispositional reading and marginally allows a habitual reading.

• The (ordinary) habitual reading is not affected by word order.

(26) a. naadyaa kiiriiãã=ko maar de-tii hai
Nadya.F.Sg.Nom ant.F.Pl=Acc hit give-Impf.M.Sg. be.Pres.Sg
'Nadya kills ants.'

b. kiiriiãã=ko naadyaa maar de-tii hai
ant.F.Pl=Acc Nadya.F.Sg.Nom hit give-Impf.M.Sg be.Pres.Sg
'Nadya kills ants.'

3.3 Conclusion:

• Dispositional Predication is over the topic.

• The dispositional reading found with *le* involves a different kind of aspectual semantics than the habitual reading found with the other aspectual light verbs.

4 Ability Passives

4.1 Semantics

Utter Inability:
In descriptive grammars of Hindi/Urdu (e.g., Glassman 1976, Van Olphen 1980) this form of the passive is usually cited as expressing utter inability or impossibility.

(27) naadyaa=se ye urduu=k-ii ciṭṭ^{h}ii paṛ^h-ii
Nadya.F.Sg=Inst this Urdu=Gen-F.Sg letter.F.Sg.Nom read-Impf.F.Sg
nahı̃ı̃ jaa-tii (hai)
not go-Impf.F.Sg be.Pres.Sg
'Nadya does not have the ability to read this Urdu letter.'
'This Urdu letter does not get read by Nadya.'

In the context of a broken leg (Glassman 1976:275):

(28) us=se cal-aa nahı̃ı̃ ja-egaa
Pron=Inst walk-Perf.M.Sg not go-Fut.M.Sg
'She/he can't possibly walk.'

• The negation of the modal *sak* can only parallel this reading with additional modification.

(29) a. vo cal nahı̃ı̃ sak-tii hai
Pron.Nom walk not can-Impf.F.Sg be.Pres.Sg
'She can't walk.'

b. vo bilkul cal nahı̃ı̃ sak-tii hai
Pron.Nom absolutely walk not can-Impf.F.Sg be.Pres.Sg
'She absolutely cannot walk.'

Positive Ability:
Speakers can, however, use this form of the passive positively as well.

(30) naadyaa=se ye urduu=k-ii ciṭṭ^{h}ii paṛ^h-ii
Nadya.F.Sg=Inst this Urdu=Gen-F.Sg letter.F.Sg.Nom read-Impf.F.Sg
jaa-tii (hai)
go-Impf.F.Sg be.Pres.Sg
'Nadya has the ability to read this Urdu letter.'
'This Urdu letter gets read by Nadya.'

• This positive form is almost indistinguishable from a positive use of the modal *sak* 'can'.

• A slight difference comes from the fact that the ability passive tends to denote (dis)abilities arising from factors within one own's mind/body rather than the outside world.

(31)

Type	Properties
sak 'can'	expresses (dis)ability
	factors governing (dis)ability can come from anywhere
	can be used to give permission, i.e., *I allow him to go.*
passive	expresses (dis)ability
	(dis)ability confined to state of one's own body/mind
	cannot be used to give permission

State of Body:

(32) mer-e dããtõ=mẽ aaj dard hai, muj^h=se
my-Pl.Obl tooth.M.Pl.Obl=in today pain be.Pres.Sg I.Obl=Inst
k^{h}aanaa nahı̃ı̃ k^{h}aa-yaa ja-egaa
food.M.Sg.Nom not eat-Perf.M.Sg go-Fut.M.Sg
'My teeth hurt today, I won't be able to eat food (at all).

4.2 Syntactic Properties

- Can occur in all tenses (not confined to the imperfect).
- Can combine with intransitives (unlike the "proper" passive).

4.2.1 Word Order Constraints

- The ability reading is independent of word order.
- However, the ability reading is more dominant when the instrumental is in clause initial position.

(33) a. naadyaa=se gaarii cala-yii jaa-tii hai
Nadya.F.Sg=Inst car.F.Sg.Nom drive-Perf.F.Sg go-Impf.F.Sg be.Pres.Sg
'Nadya has the ability to drive a/the car.'
'A/the car gets driven by Nadya.'

b. gaarii naadyaa=se cala-yii jaa-tii hai
Nadya.F.Sg=Inst car.F.Sg.Nom drive-Perf.F.Sg go-Impf.F.Sg be.Pres.Sg
'Nadya has the ability to drive the car.'
'The car gets driven by Nadya.'

- The same holds for the modal *sak*.

(34) a. naadyaa gaarii calaa sak-tii hai
Nadya.F.Sg.Nom car.F.Sg.Nom drive can-Impf.F.Sg be.Pres.Sg
'Nadya can drive a/the car.'

b. gaarii naadyaa calaa sak-tii hai
Nadya.F.Sg.Nom car.F.Sg.Nom drive can-Impf.F.Sg be.Pres.Sg
'Nadya can drive the car.'

Conclusion:
- There is no significant interaction with discourse.
- The semantics of the ability passive are very close to that of the modal

5 The Ability Passive as a Complex Predicate

- The (dis)ability reading in the context of a passive is very strange.
- Is an altnernative syntactic analysis possible?

5.1 Non-Optionality of the Instrumental NP

- The Instrumental NP is not optional in the ability passive (the reading drops out along with the NP).

(35) a. pulis=se cor pakṛ-aa jaa-taa
police=Inst thief.M.Sg.Nom catch-Perf.M.Sg go-Impf.M.Sg
'The police have the ability to catch a/the thief.'

b. cor pakṛ-aa jaa-taa
thief.M.Sg.Nom catch-Perf.M.Sg go-Impf.M.Sg
*'The police have the ability to catch a/the thief.'
'The thief was caught.'

5.2 Control

- The instrumental NP may control a participial with the ability passive.

(36) pulis=se cor [dukaan=tak baag kar] pakṛ-aa
police=Inst thief.M.Sg.Nom store.M.Sg=to run having catch-Perf.M.Sg
ga-yaa
go-Perf.M.Sg
'The police, having run to the store, were able to catch the thief.'

- This is impossible in a "real" passive.

(37) cor (pulis=se) [dukaan=tak baag kar] pakṛ-aa
police=Inst thief.M.Sg.Nom store.M.Sg=to run having catch-Perf.M.Sg
ga-yaa
go-Perf.M.Sg
*'The thief was caught by the police, having run to the store.'
'The thief, having run to the store, was caught by the police.'

5.3 Conclusion:

The ability "passive" is actually a complex predicate.
It differs from the Aspectual Complex Predicates in that it imposes differing morpho-syntactic requirements on the main verb and contributes a differing semantics to the overall construction.

The light verb *jaa*, like *le*, is the most unmarked light verb in its class (see Table (9)), so its readiness to participate in a shift in interpretation may be justifiable.

6 Semantics

6.1 Generics

The literature on generics basically investigates two types of generics
(see Carlson and Pelletier (1995) for a detailed discussion):
1) reference to kinds ((38a))
2) propositions which express a general property, i.e., a regularity which summarizes groups of particular episodes or fact ((38b)).

(38) a. Lions are predatory cats.

b. Mary smokes cigars.

• The Urdu examples fall under Class 2 of generics.

• However, the bulk of the literature has concentrated on quantificational readings of generics (various partitionings/interpretations of a generic operator GEN).

6.2 Stage/Individual Level

Within an examination of generics, a distinction between two types of verbal predicates was proposed (Carlson 1977):

TYPE	PROPERTIES	EXAMPLE
individual-level predicates	stative predicates predicated of individuals	*Nadya knows French.*
stage-level predicates	non-stative or episodic	*Mary is smoking.*

• Carlson's original proposal was taken up and reformulated by Diesing (1988, 1990) and Kratzer (1995).

• **Question:** Can this distinction be used to account for the Urdu constructions?

• **Answer: No**

- The Urdu complex predicates and the "ability" passive appear to be predicating a certain property of an individual, while simultaneously making use of an episodic type of predicate.

- A thorough examination of further properties associated with individual-level predication reveal that the Urdu constructions cannot be aligned with individual-level predication (c.f. Chierchia 1995, for example).

6.3 Dispositions

• The readings most closely related to the Urdu dispositional complex predicate are Lawler's existential and potential readings.

(39) My pet toad will eat flies.

(40) Nadya speaks French.

• These readings are also sometimes referred to as *dispositional* (Krifka et al. 1995:41).

• Better known dispositional readings are as in (41).

(41) Sugar is soluble in water.

• These types of readings have a law-like flavor (this is the way the world is) and can be given a modal (necessity) interpretation (Kratzer 1981).

• Given that Lawler already argued for a modal interpretation of (39) and (40), this would appear to be the most promising avenue to explore.

6.4 Modality

6.4.1 Kratzer's (1977, 1979, 1981) Theory of Modality

- Possible World Semantics
- Three parameters of modal operators.
  - *Modal relation* (operators): $\Box$ (must) vs. $\Diamond$ (can)
  - *Modal base*: conversational background/context of utterance
  - *Ordering source*: conversational background context that is used to define a partial order upon the worlds that are defined by the modal base. The quantification ranges over the worlds that are most similar to the ideal defined by the ordering source (i.e., it imposes an order from "most normal" to "abnormal").

6.4.2 Sinhala Involitives

One possible use of Sinhala *involitives* produces a reading that is very close to the Urdu dispositional complex predicate: in each case a possible negative expectation by the speaker/hearer is overriden (Inman 1993).

(42) mahatuŋ atiŋ mee kææmə hoňdəṭə hædenəwa
Mahtun Erg this food well make.Inv.Pres
'Mahatun makes this food well (unexpectedly).'
'Mahatun happens to make this food well.'

(43) naadyaa acc^{h}aa k^{h}aanaa banaa le-tii
Nadya.F.Sg.Nom good.M.Sg. food.M.Sg.Nom make take-Impf.F.Sg
hai
be.Pres.Sg
'Nadya will make good food.'

• Inman (1993) analyzes Sinhala involitives in terms of a *happen to* modality within Kratzer's approach.

- Assumes a *doxastic* modal base (taking into account the speaker's expectations).
- Defines an Operator INV, which yields a true reading of a proposition in exactly the case when there exists a possible world w' compatible with the speaker's expectations in which the proposition is not true (i.e., Mahatun has been known to cook badly).

  $[[inv\ \alpha]]^{M,w,g} = 1 \leftrightarrow [[\alpha]]^{M,w,g} = 1 \wedge \exists w'[(w' \in \cap g(w)) \wedge [[\alpha]]^{M,w',g} = 0]$

• Given that the interpretation of the Sinhala involitive is close (but not identical) to the dispositional complex predicate, a similar analysis should extend to Urdu as well.

6.5 Beginnings of a Semantic Analysis

6.5.1 Dispositional Complex Predicate

Possibility 1 — An Analysis in terms of Ability

- *Modal relation*: $\Diamond$ (can)
- *Modal base*: The speaker's expectations and what we know or have observed about the subject/topic of predication in the past.

• The requirements for the modal relation (operator) and the modal base are introduced to the semantics through the lexical semantics of *le*.

Possibility 2 — Conditional Necessity

• The simple ability analysis does not reflect the data in (23), which seems to indicate that if a certain set conditions are met, then the action will be performed.

• Therefore an analysis in terms of conditional necessity (c.f. Kratzer (1979)) appears to be more promising.

- *Modal relation*: $\Box$ (must)
- *Modal base*: The speaker's expectations and the conditions under which the subject/topic of prediccation will perform the given action.

6.5.2 Ability Complex Predicate

- *Modal relation*: $\Diamond$ (can)
- *Modal base*: subject's capabilities, as pertaining to the state of his/her body and state of mind

• The requirements for the modal relation (operator) and the modal base are introduced to the semantics through the lexical semantics of *jaa*.

References

Butt, Miriam. 1995. *The Structure of Complex Predicates.* Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Butt, Miriam and Tracy H. King. 1996. Structural Topic and Focus without Movement. In *On-line Proceedings of the First LFG Conference*, Rank Xerox, Grenoble.

`http://www-csli.stanford.edu/publications/`

Carlson, Gregory. 1977. *Reference to Kinds in English.* Phd dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Published 1980 by Garland Press, New York.

Carlson, Gregory and Francis Pelletier (eds.). 1995. *The Generic Book.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Chierchia, Gennaro. 1995. Individual-level Predicates as inherent Generics. In Gregory Carlson and Francis Pelletier (eds.) *The Generic Book*, 176–223. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Diesing, Molly. 1988. Bare Plural Subjects and the Stage/Individual Contrast. In Manfred Krifka (ed.) *Genericity in Natural Language*, 107–154, SNS-Bericht 88-42, University of Tübingen.

Diesing, Molly. 1990. Verb Movement and the Subject Position in Yiddish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 8:41–81.

Glassman, Eugene. 1976. *Spoken Urdu.* Lahore: Nirali Kitaben.

Kratzer, Angelika. 1977. What 'must' and 'can' must and can mean. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1: 337–355.

Kratzer, Angelika. 1979. Conditional Necessity and Possibility. in Rainer Bäuerle, Urs Egli and Arnim von Stechow (eds.) *Semantics from Different Points of View.*

Kratzer, Angelika. 1981. The Notional Category of Modality. In H.-J. Eikmeyer and H. Rieser (eds.) *Words, Worlds, and Contexts: New Approaches to Word Semantics*, 38–74. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Kratzer, Angelika. 1995. Stage-level and Individual-level Predicates. In Gregory Carlson and Francis Pelletier (eds.) *The Generic Book*, 125–175. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Krifka, Manfred, Francis Pelletier, Gregory Carlson, Alice ter Meulen, Gennaro Chierchia, and Godehard Link. 1995. Genericity: An Introduction. In Gregory Carlson and Francis Pelletier (eds.) *The Generic Book*, 1–124. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Inman, Michael. 1993. *Semantics and Pragmatics of Colloquial Sinhala Involitive Verbs.* Phd thesis, Stanford University.

Lawler, John. 1973a. Studies in English Generics. *University of Michigan Papers in Linguistics I:1.*

Lawler, John. 1973b. Tracking the Generic Toad. In *Proceedings from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 320–331.

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

Van Olphen, Herman. 1980. *First-Year Hindi Course.* Texas: Department of Oriental and African Languages and Literatures, University of Texas, Austin.