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Introduction

- Recent Proposal:
  - Oblique Subjects (particularly Dative Subjects) are a common Indo-European inheritance.
  - Moreover, particular **Constructions** in which case frames, grammatical relations and thematic information are associated with one another in a fixed manner are inherited by the Indo-European daughters.

- Problem:
  - Data from Indo-Aryan does not support this hypothesis.
  - Rather — a complex interaction of factors.
Indo-Aryan and Oblique Subjects

- Next to no (or weak) evidence for Oblique Subjects in Old Indo-Aryan (OIA)
- Loss of original case forms from OIA to Middle Indo-Aryan (MIA)
- Followed by development of a robust (split) ergative system from MIA to New Indo-Aryan (NIA)
- With a current robust use of oblique subjects in NIA, including dative subjects.
- No evidence for a direct link between OIA dative “subjects” or “subject-like” constructions and modern ones.
The LFG Perspective

The data is consonant with the modular LFG perspective in which it is assumed that various parts of a grammar are changing and realigning.

Separate specification of:

- lexical thematic content of a verb
- inventory of grammatical relations
- inventory of case markers (with lexical semantic approach to case, Butt and King 1991, 2004)
- complex and variable relationship between the three
This Talk

- Summary/Overview of the Construction Grammar Perspective
- Data from Indo-Aryan with special focus on Marathi
- Alternative LFG-based Analysis

1. No direct continuation of an old pattern or Construction.
2. Sanskrit verbs receive new meanings as part of historical change.
3. Meaning change goes hand in hand with change in case and subcategorization frame.
4. New object case marking drawn into the system.
5. Rise of oblique subjects in analogy with (split) ergative pattern.
6. Former nominative experiencers become dative
Historical Reconstruction in Construction Grammar

- Barðdal (2013) lays out a program of historical reconstruction based on the notion of constructions and constructicons in Construction Grammar.
- Concrete examples come from Dative Subjects.
- Starting from the observation that Dative Subjects in Icelandic appear to be an old part of the language, Barðdal and Eythórsson (2009), Barðdal and Smitherman (2012), Barðdal and Eythórsson (2012), a.o., argue that the Dative Subject Construction can be reconstructed for Proto Indo-European (PIE).

⇒ Oblique Subject/Semantic Alignment Hypothesis
Historical Reconstruction in Construction Grammar

- There are several problems with this line of research.
- Here we focus on just a few:
  - Type of Constructions that are Reconstructed
  - Assumption that case marking is uniform across the millenia (there is a “dative” that is handed down over the millenia)
  - The particular data from Indo-Aryan that does not support the hypothesis.

- Our Alternative:
  - Oblique Subjects in Indo-Aryan become possible after the establishment of ergative subjects.
  - Oblique Subjects are part of a larger, semantic-based Differential Case Marking (DCM) system that is a Middle/New Indo-Aryan innovation – not an older inheritance.
Reconstructed Constructions

* \[
\text{Predicate-specific cxn}
\]

\[
\text{FORM} \quad \langle */H1/es-g’neh3-no/-to-\rangle
\]

\[
\text{SYN} \quad \langle \text{NP-Dat}_i, \text{NP-Nom}_j \rangle
\]

\[
\text{SEM} \quad \langle \text{FRAMEs} \quad \langle \text{awareness-fr} \quad \text{KNOWER}_i \quad \text{KNOWEE}_j \rangle \rangle
\]

**Figure 2. A reconstruction of the predicate-specific DAT-NOM-*is-known* construction in Proto-Indo-European**

(Barðdal and Smitherman 2012)
Barðdal and Smitherman (2012) look for a number of cognates across Indo-European that are likely to have had dative subjects: *know, shine* (Skt. *roc*) *luck/fortune, be in need, be sweet, woe.*

(Their claim: few number of cognates means it is an old pattern)

Note on Dat-Subj-know Construction just seen:

- No specific encoding of grammatical relations.
- However, the leftmost argument in the subcategorization frame is considered to be the subject.
- No separation of case and grammatical relations.
- No generalization over semantic roles (e.g., thematic roles, Proto-Roles, ...).
In comparison, a sample Construction from Goldberg (2005).

Semantics: CAUSE-MOTION (source theme direction)
           |       |       |
           contribute | contributor | contribution | goal |

Syntax: Subj Ø Oblique

Figure 3: The Implicit Theme Construction with *contribute*

- Separate encoding of grammatical relations.
- Case not associated in one-to-one manner with grammatical relations.
- Representation of semantic roles.
Other types of things posited for historical reconstruction.

- Raising-to-Object (Barðdal and Eythórsson 2012)
- Control (Barðdal and Eythórsson 2012)
Figure 4. A reconstruction of raising-to-object for Proto-Germanic

Figure 6. A reconstruction of control constructions for Proto-Germanic
Case in OIA

Old Indo-Aryan (Vedic and Sanskrit) had an inflectional case marking system much like the sister language Latin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Declension</th>
<th>Western Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>devas</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>devam</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>devena</td>
<td>instrumental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>devāya</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>devāt</td>
<td>ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>devasya</td>
<td>genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>deve</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Declension of Sanskrit deva- ‘god’
Case in OIA

- The standard case marking pattern is nominative–accusative.
- Some verbs lexically specify non-accusative objects (e.g., ‘sacrifice’).
- Differential Object Marking (DOM) exists.

(1) a.

\[
\text{pibā somam} \\
\text{drink.Imp soma.Acc} \\
\text{‘Drink soma.’} \\
\text{Sanskrit} \\
\text{(Rgveda VIII.36.1, from Jamison 1976)}
\]

b.

\[
\text{pibā somasya} \\
\text{drink.Imp soma.Gen} \\
\text{‘Drink (of) soma.’} \\
\text{Sanskrit} \\
\text{(Rgveda VIII.37.1, from Jamison 1976)}
\]
Subject Tests

- Keenan (1976) discusses a number of tests across languages for the establishment of subjecthood (cf. also Cole et al. 1980).
- The applicability of these tests depends on the overall structure of the individual languages.
- For the Indo-Aryan languages, the following tests are usually assumed across different stages of the language (Hook, p.c., April 2012)

1. Antecedency of the possessive reflexive.
2. Control of a gerundial phrase/clause.
3. Realization of genitive case in nominalizations.
4. Agreement with the finite verb (not always applicable).
5. Position in clause (very seldom applicable, more a weak indication than a test).
Oblique Subjects in NIA I

- NIA languages tend to have a range of oblique subjects (ergatives, datives, locatives, genitives, instrumentals).
- The examples below are from Urdu/Hindi (cf. Mohanan 1994).

(2) a. 
\[ \text{Amra}=\text{ne} \quad \text{kela} \quad k^h_a-\text{ya} \]
Amra.F=Erg banana.M.Sg.Nom eat-Perf.M.Sg
‘Amra ate a/the banana.’

b. 
\[ \text{Amra}=\text{ko} \quad \text{kela} \quad k^h_a-\text{na} \quad t^h-\text{a} \]
Amra.F=Dat banana.M.Sg.Nom eat-Inf.M.Sg be.Past-M.Sg
‘Amra had to eat a banana.’

c. 
\[ \text{Amra}=\text{ko} \quad \text{kahani} \quad yad \quad a-\text{yi} \]
Amra.F=Dat story.F.Sg.Nom memory come-Perf.F.Sg
‘Amra remembered a/the story.’
Oblique Subjects in NIA II

d. 
\[ \text{Amra}=\text{se kela k^h}a-ya \text{ nah} \text{\textbar{i} g}a-ya \]
‘Amra could not eat the banana.’

Urdu/Hindi

e. 
\[ \text{Amra}=\text{ke car bacce t}^h-e \]
‘Amra had four children.’

Urdu/Hindi

f. 
\[ \text{Amra}=\text{m\textbar{e} b}l\text{k}u\text{l daya nah} \text{\textbar{i} t}^h-i \]
Amra.F=Loc\text{ in} at all mercy.F.Nom not be.Past-F.Sg
‘Amra had no mercy at all.’

Urdu/Hindi
Non-nominative experiencers in OIA

A class of OIA intransitive verbs may optionally appear with genitive experiencers – e.g. *ruc* ‘shine’ (non-psych) or ‘please’ (psych).

(1) sumukh-o bhava-taḥ paurt-o
    beautiful-faced-NOM.SG you-GEN.SG grandson-NOM.SG
    roca-te
    shine-PRES.3.SG
    Your beautiful-faced grandson shines (Mbh. 5.102.6c)

(2) vākya-ṃ na me roca-te yat
    utterance-NOM.N.SG NEG I-GEN.SG please-PRES.3.SG which
    tva-yā uktaṃ
    you-INS.SG say-PERF.N.SG
    The utterance which was spoken by you does not please me.
    (Mbh. 2.51.14a)
Non-nominative experiencers in OIA

Non-verbal predicates expressing emotions may appear with genitive experiencers.

(3) na me bhaya-ṁ vidya-te rākṣas-ebhyaḥ
    NEG I.GEN.SG fear-NOM.N.SG be-PRES.3.SG demonABL.PL
I have no fear of demons (Mbh. 12.78.25c)

(4) ma-yi ced asti te prīti-r
    I-LOC.SG if be-PRES.3.SG you.GEN.SG affection-NOM.SG
If you have love for me... (Mbh. 1.161.14c)
OIA does not have oblique subjects

- No evidence that these genitive expressions are lexically specified arguments of predicates – much less subjects.

- Hock (1990, 1991) concludes that genitives as below can indeed be considered subjects.

\[(3) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{mama ekaḥ putro} \quad \text{(vartate/asti)} \\
& \quad \text{my one.Nom boy.Nom is} \\
& \quad \text{‘I have one boy.’ (Hock 1991, 57) Sanskrit}
\end{align*}
\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{mer-a ek lāṛka hē} \\
& \quad \text{my-M.Sg one boy.M.Sg.Nom be.Pres.3.Sg} \\
& \quad \text{‘I have one boy.’ Urdu/Hindi}
\end{align*}\]
Upshot

- OIA has no dedicated verbal predicates with experiencer roles linked to subject via dative case.
- Subjects are generally nominative.
- So no ancient Dative/Oblique-Subject Construction can be reconstructed as ancestor for the modern Oblique Subjects.

So what did happen?

[**NB:** This is part of on-going work....]
Change over Time

- The inflectional case endings of OIA erode away and collapse into one another in the course of Middle Indo-Aryan (MIA).
- Crucially, structural case marking fails to be evidence for subjecthood in MIA.

**Hypothesis:** This opens the path for non-nominative subjects in Indo-Aryan (IA).
Rough Time Line

A. Old Indo-Aryan
   1200 BCE — 600 BCE (Vedic)
   600 BCE — 200 BCE (Epic and Classical Sanskrit)

B. Middle Indo-Aryan (Aśokan inscriptions, Pāli, Prākrits,
   Apabhraṃśa—Avahattha)
   200 BCE — 1100 CE

C. New Indo-Aryan (Bengali, Hindi/Urdu, Punjabi, Nepali,
   Marathi, Gujarati and other modern North Indian languages)
   1100 CE — Present
## The Chronology and sources for Marathi and Gujarati

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>STAGE</th>
<th>SAMPLE SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200 BCE-400 CE</td>
<td>Epic Sanskrit</td>
<td>Mahābhārata (Mbh.); ∼ 967,000 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>300 BCE-500 CE</td>
<td>Mahārāṣṭrī</td>
<td>Vasudevahimṣṭī (VH 609CE); ∼ 135,000 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 CE-1100 CE</td>
<td>Apabhraṃśa</td>
<td>Paumacariu (PC ∼ 880CE); ∼ 135,000 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old NIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000–1350 CE</td>
<td>Old Marathi</td>
<td>Dnyānesvarī (Dny 1287CE); ∼ 103,000 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Līlācaritra (LC 1278CE); ∼ 57,000 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Old Gujarati</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Loss of nominative–accusative contrast (880 CE)

(5) #kiṃ tamu haŋ-ai ṇa vālu
QUES darkness.NOM.SG destroy-IMPF.3.SG NEG young
ravi# #kiṃ vālu davaggi ṇa ḍah-ai
sun.NOM.SG QUES young fire.NOM.SG NEG burn-IMPF.3.SG
vanu# #kiṃ kari dal-ai
forest.NOM.SG QUES elephant.NOM.SG shatter-IMPF.3.SG
ṇa vālu hari# #kiṃ vālu ṇa ḍaīk-ai
NEG young lion.NOM.SG QUES young NEG bite-IMPF.3.SG
uragamaṇu#
snake.NOM.SG

Does the young (rising) sun not destroy darkness? Does the young fire (spark) not burn down the forest? Does a young lion (cub) not shatter the elephant? Does the young snake not bite? (PC 2.21.6.9)
Early Ergative Pattern with Agent Marking (609 CE)

(6)  
\[ \text{tiy-e vi avaloi-o di-ṭṭho ya} \]  
\[ \text{she-INS.SG also look-PERF.M.SG notice-PERF.M.SG and} \]  
\[ \text{ṇā-e so puriso cakkhuramaṇo} \]  
\[ \text{she-INS.SG that.NOM.SG man.NOM.SG eye-beautiful.NOM.SG} \]  

‘She (the maidservant) also *looked*, and she *noticed* that man, attractive to the eye.’ (VH:K:9.8)
Late Ergative Pattern without Agent Marking (Old Hindi)

masi kāgad chū-yo nahī kalam gahī nahi hāth ink.Nom paper.M.Nom touch-Perf.M.Sg not pen.F.Sg take.Perf.F.Sg not hand jāro juga māhātma jehi kabir jan-ā-yo nāth four.Pl age.Pl glory.Nom who.Sg.Acc Kabir.Obl know-Caus-Perf.M.Sg lord.Nom ‘Kabir touched not ink nor paper, he took not pen in hand; He made known the lord to whom is glory in the four ages.’ Old Hindi (Kabir, Sakhi 183; (Beames 1872–79, 269))
Development of New Case Inventory

- From around 1200 on, one finds new case markers being drawn into the system in New Indo-Aryan (NIA).
- In the modern languages, the case markers are mostly clitics, some markers are inflectional (these tend to reflect the old material).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Markers</th>
<th>Hindi/Urdu</th>
<th>Marathi</th>
<th>Gujarati</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ergative</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>∅/ne</td>
<td>-ē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>ko</td>
<td>lā</td>
<td>ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>ko</td>
<td>lā</td>
<td>ne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>se</td>
<td>ne</td>
<td>thi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>∅</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Taking Stock

- No evidence for Dative Subject Construction that has been inherited over the ages.
- Evidence for non-subject dative/genitive marking of experiencers in OIA.
- MIA showed dative/genitive syncretism.
- The modern languages tend to show a dative/accusative homonymy.
- The modern languages tend to mark experiencers with datives (e.g., Urdu/Hindi, Marathi, Gujarati) or genitives (e.g., Bengali).

**Question:** How did modern experiencer subjects arise?
Current Hypothesis

▶ Deo (2013) shows that accusative marking in New Indic (both the Nom-Acc and Erg-Acc pattern) developed on the basis of secondary object marking.

▶ That is, overt marking of goal/beneficiary/experiencers survived in the form of the syncretic dat/gen marking.

▶ By analogy, direct objects became to be overtly case marked.

▶ This new marking for direct objects was initially formally recruited from the syncretic dat/gen of MIA.

▶ Often, this was (eventually) realized in the form of a system of Differential Object Marking (DOM).

▶ On relevance of DCM for innovation of new case markers, also see Butt and Ahmed (2011) on an ergative/dative connection.
Getting Experiencer Subjects

Changes in experiencer verbs from Sanskrit to Modern Marathi reflect the following paths of change

- Nom-Acc change of state predicates in Sanskrit shift to a Dat-Nom pattern with experiencer semantics.
- A new class of experiencer verbs with dative subjects verbs evolves from Sanskrit intransitive (non-psych) verbs
- A change in the case marking of nominative experiencers to dative.
Sanskrit Change of State Predicates: Nom-Acc

(4) a.  
na=ena:m  
dahati  
pāvakaḥ  
NEG=this.MAS.ACC.SG burn-PRES.3.SG fire-MAS.NOM.G

‘The fire does not burn him (the soul)’. (Mbh. 6.24.23a)
(Sanskrit — non-psych)

b.  
haṃs-ānām  vacanam  yat=tu  
swan-MAS.GEN.PL word.NEU.NOM.SG which

tad  mām  dahati  pārthiva  
that.NEU.NOM.G I.ACC.SG burn-PRES-3-SG king.MAS.VOC.SG

‘O King, those words of the swans torment me.’
(Mbh. 3.53.3a)
(Sanskrit — psych)
Modern Indic: DAT-NOM pattern

(5) mulī-lā āī-ca rāgāvṇa ḍāj-ta
girl-DAT mother-GEN scolding-NOM.N.SG trouble-PRES.N.SG
‘The mother’s scolding torments the girl.’ (Marathi — Psych)
Sanskrit change of state predicates as Marathi dative experiencer verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SANSKRIT</th>
<th>MODERN MARATHI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROOT</td>
<td>ARG-ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jambh snap</td>
<td>&lt;cause, pt&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dah burn</td>
<td>&lt;cause, pt&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bādh pain</td>
<td>&lt;cause, pt&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sam-tap heat</td>
<td>&lt;cause, pt&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tud prick</td>
<td>&lt;cause, pt&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Change in meaning over time $\iff$ change in a-structure
- Further changes to conform with other changes in the language:
  - Experiencers generally linked to subject (old pattern).
Sanskrit intransitives as Marathi dative experiencer verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit Root</th>
<th>Modern Marathi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ruc shine, like</td>
<td>ruc like &lt;exp, th&gt; dat-nom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhas shine, appear</td>
<td>bhās appear &lt;exp, th&gt; dat-nom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vṛt be</td>
<td>vāṭ feel &lt;exp, th&gt; dat-nom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drś be seen</td>
<td>dis appear &lt;exp, th&gt; dat-nom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gam go</td>
<td>gam like &lt;exp, th&gt; dat-nom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pac mature</td>
<td>pac digest &lt;exp, th&gt; dat-nom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam-pad occur</td>
<td>sāpaḍ find &lt;go, th&gt; dat-nom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Intransitive predicates acquire a transitive psych verb reading.
- The experiencer is again associated with dative and with subjects.
### Sanskrit nom experiencers → Marathi dat experiencers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>Old Marathi</th>
<th>Modern Marathi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>smr直辖 call</td>
<td>smar recall</td>
<td>smar remember</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ut-kal dispel</td>
<td>ukal solve</td>
<td>ukal solve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sādh obtain</td>
<td>sādh obtain</td>
<td>sādh obtain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pra-ir propel</td>
<td>pel direct</td>
<td>pel bear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sam-jīnा know</td>
<td>samaj understand</td>
<td>samaj understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>budh perceive</td>
<td>bujh realize</td>
<td>bujh realize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sūc reveal</td>
<td>suc reveal</td>
<td>suc occur to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kal perceive</td>
<td>kal realize</td>
<td>kal realize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mānaya think</td>
<td>mānav suit</td>
<td>mānav suit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The historical data suggest an on-going change, verb class by verb class.

1. Verbs like *sūc* ‘reveal’ are leading the change.
2. Verbs like *smar* ‘recall’ and *samaj* ‘understand’ are in flux,
3. with verbs like *samaj* ‘understand’ having begun earlier.
Example of Change

- Sanskrit: transitive verbs with nominative-accusative
- Marathi: transitive verbs with dative-nominative

(6) a.

\[
\text{kanyā} \quad \text{pāṭham} \quad \text{sam}=\text{jānā}=\text{ti} \\
\text{girl}^{\text{FEM.SG.NOM}} \quad \text{lesson}^{\text{MASC.SG.ACC}} \quad \text{know-PRES.3.SG}
\]

‘The girl knows the lesson.’ (Sanskrit)

b.

\[
\text{mulī-lā} \quad \text{abhyās} \quad \text{samaj}=\text{to} \\
\text{girl}^{\text{FEM.SG.DAT}} \quad \text{lesson}^{\text{MASC.SG.NOM}} \quad \text{understand-PRES.MASC.SG}
\]

‘The girl understands the lesson.’ (Marathi)
Reorganization of Case System

Old Pattern (Sanskrit)

a-structure: \textit{verb} < \textit{experimenter/goal} \quad \textit{theme} \quad >

\[ [−o] \quad | \quad [−r] \]

f-structure: \textit{SUBJ} \quad \textit{OBJ}

\textit{case marking} \quad \textit{NOM} \quad \textit{ACC}

indicates subj \quad indicates default obj
Reorganization of Case System

Change in Progress

➤ A new case marker — let’s call it DAT — is recruited into the system.

➤ The lexical semantics of DAT are compatible with goal semantics (originally spatial semantics of ‘at, to’).

➤ DAT in general becomes associated with goal and experiencer arguments.

➤ The old accusative has eroded down to zero marking.

➤ This zero marking (let’s call it NOM) is now the default for indicating objects.

➤ Result: Two competing patterns.
Pattern 1 (inherited pattern)

a-structure: \( \text{verb} < \text{experiencer/goal theme} > \)

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

f-structure:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{SUBJ} & \text{OBJ} \\
\end{array}
\]

case marking

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{NOM} & \text{ACC} \\
\end{array}
\]

indicates subj \quad \text{indicates default obj}

Pattern 2 (new pattern)

a-structure: \( \text{verb} < \text{experiencer/goal theme} > \)

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

f-structure:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{SUBJ} & \text{OBJ} \\
\end{array}
\]

case marking

\[
\begin{array}{c|c}
\text{DAT} & \text{NOM} \\
\end{array}
\]

indicates goal/experiencer \quad \text{default case for subj/obj}

(semantic case) \quad \text{(default case)
Reorganization of Case System

- Eventually, the new pattern completely replaces the old pattern.
- This change is still in progress in Marathi.
Taking Stock Again

- Observed changes:
  - OIA case system eroded away.
  - New case markers came into the system.
  - These new case markers are almost all spatial in origin (cf. Butt and Ahmed 2011).

  - Case associated with particular semantics (agentivity, goal, specificity/telicity, etc.)
  - The case semantics interact with the general linking principles
  - Also have notions of default and configurational case (cf. Artoni and Magnani this conference, King 1995).
Summary and Conclusion

Marathi dative subjects arose in three ways:

1. Sanskrit change of state predicates become experiencer verbs, experiencer is marked with dative.

2. Originally intransitive verbs acquire a psych verb reading, experiencer is marked with dative.

3. Nominative experiencers of transitive predicates reanalyzed as dative experiencers.

No evidence at all for a Dat-Subj Construction that is inherited over the ages.

Rather: overall move towards newly innovated dative experiencer subjects.
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