Objecthood and specificity in Gujarati

P. J. Mistry

1. Introduction

Agreement has become one of the major concerns in contemporary linguistics. Its universal design and relationship with case marking is receiving increased attention. This descriptive study presents specifics from one language, and addresses the issue of verbs agreeing with morphologically-marked objects. It presents a set of arguments along with synchronic and diachronic data that differentiate an object marker from a specificity marker. It is shown also that in Gujarati a nominal with an object marker does not control verb agreement. The language thus has a cross-linguistically widespread schema in its agreement pattern. The proposed differentiation leads to a clearer account of the agreement phenomenon and at the same time discloses the system at work in the marking of object nominals in the language.[1]

Gujarati has sentences[2] such as:

(1) *pelo   ūco   chokro   moḍo   aav.y.o*
    that.M-S tall.M-S boy-M-S late.M-S come.P.M-S
    'That tall boy came late.'

(2) *aa   tofaani   chokro   tarat   aav.y.o*
    this mischievous boy-M-S immediately come.P.M-S
    'This mischievous boy came immediately.'

In sentence (1), the occurrence of -*o* in the demonstrative *pelo* 'that', the adjective *ūco* 'tall', the adverb *moḍo* 'late', and the verb *aavyo* 'came' exhibits the pervasive nature of the agreement process. The morphologically coded agreement of (1) could be examined in terms of targets (Verb, Adjective, Demonstrative, Adverb), controllers (Subject, Object) and properties (Gender, Person, Number). A comparison of (1) and (2), however, shows that not all adjectives, demonstratives, or adverbs show agreement morphology, but all verbs do. Additionally, the question of controller[3] arises mainly with verbs, and only verbs show agreement in Person. This paper restricts itself to examining the nature and interaction of morphological markings on controllers and targets, particularly, verbs.

Like several Indo-Aryan and other languages, Gujarati exhibits what has been referred to as Nominative-Accusative and Ergative-Absolutive agreement patterns. Sentences (3)–(6) exemplify the nominative-accusative pattern. These sentences have a caseless subject that controls verb agreement.

(3) *Kišor kaagaḷ vāāc.š.e*
   (III-S) letter   read.Fut.III-S
   'Kishor will read the letter.'

(4) *Kišor Raaj.ne pajav.š.e*
   (III-S)   *.ne* harass.Fut.III-S
   'Kishor will harass Raj.'

(5) *Kišor chemistry bhaṇ.š.e*
   (III-S)   study.Fut.III-S
   'Kishor will study chemistry.'

(6) *Kišor kaagaḷ.ne aḍ.š.e*
   (III-S) letter.*ne*   touch.Fut.III-S
   'Kishor will touch the letter.'

Sentence (3a) instantiates the ergative-absolutive pattern: the subject noun *Kišor* is marked with the ergative *-e* and the verb agrees with *kaagaḷ* 'a letter', an unmarked object nominal.

(3a) *Kišor.e   kaagaḷ   vāāc.y.o*
   .E   letter-M-S read.P.M-S
   'Kishor read the letter.'

The aspectually split ergativity exemplified in (3) and (3a) is a well-recognized property also of Hindi and other related and neighboring languages. What is special about Gujarati is that it has sentences with a suffixed nominal functioning as an object and controlling the verb agreement, as in the following:

(4a) *Kišor.e Raaj.ne   pajav.y.o*
   .E (M-S).*ne* harass.P.M-S
   'Kishor harassed Raj.'

In this perfective sentence, the subject *Kišor* has the expected ergative marker. The object *Raaj* is marked with *-ne*, and still controls the verb agreement. The property exhibited by this type of sentence has drawn the attention of scholars with typological as well as theoretical interests (Comrie 1984, DeLancey 1981, Falk 1991, Saksena 1985). Contrasting with Hindi where only the unmarked nominals control verb agreement, Comrie (1984: 862) observes:

Under no circumstances do verbs in Gujarati agree with a subject noun phrase with the ergative postposition. Thus in Gujarati the presence versus

absence of overt a
ment: for subject
objects it has no

Scholars with theore
and verb agreement
INFL and the NP
exhibited by (4a) i
marked nature of t
Falk (1991: 227) cc

This [agreement w
not an insuperable
Case-marked NPs
must await furthe
[Gujarati] does, h
that I have looked

This paper presen
of a type not previc
has a marker *-ne* an
ent from the *-ne* in c
The realization of t
earlier observations
On the basis of
between an object m
such a distinction re
accounts for the ma
establishing the hom
we examine some d
the object marker -ʌ
a discussion of the s
The concluding sect
shows a striking co
found in a fifteenth

2. The difference

Traditionally, the pe
tive case on the su
noun. This has led
absolutive pattern. T

absence of overt case marking does not have a uniform effect on verb agree-
ment: for subjects overt case marking blocks agreement, while for direct
objects it has no effect.

Scholars with theoretical interests view assignment of nominative case by INFL
and verb agreement with a nominative NP as instances of feature sharing between
INFL and the NP (Gair—Wali 1989, Mahajan 1990). For them, the property
exhibited by (4a) is counter to the general agreement pattern and reflects the
marked nature of the language. After citing sentences similar to (3a) and (4a),
Falk (1991: 227) comments:

This [agreement with a marked object] poses a problem for our analysis, but
not an insuperable one. What is needed is some way to allow agreement with
Case-marked NPs in marked languages. The exact nature of this exemption
must await further study of the conditions under which it takes place. It
[Gujarati] does, however, seem to be highly marked, based on the languages
that I have looked at.

the subject noun *Kišor*
aga! 'a letter', an un-

This paper presents data pertaining to verb agreement that focus on sentences
of a type not previously looked into. In sentences of this type, the object noun
has a marker *-ne* and never controls the verb agreement. Thus, this *-ne* is differ-
ent from the *-ne* in (4a) where the object so marked controls the verb agreement.
The realization of this key distinction necessitates a reappraisal and revision of
earlier observations concerning object-controlled agreement in Gujarati.

On the basis of various phenomena in Gujarati, we argue for a distinction

a) is a well-recognized
ıg languages. What is
ed nominal functioning
e following:

between an object marker *-ne* and a specificity marker *-ne*. An analysis based on
such a distinction reveals a very general pattern for the agreement process and
accounts for the marking of object nominals more systematically. We begin by
establishing the homophonous nature of *-ne* in the next section. In section three
we examine some differentiating characteristics of the specificity marker *-ne* vs.
the object marker *-NE* in particular, and of case markers in general, followed by
a discussion of the semantic import of the specificity marker *-ne* in section four.
The concluding section presents another homophony with similar properties, and

)ected ergative marker.
ıe verb agreement. The
he attention of scholars
1984, DeLancey 1981,
ere only the unmarked
bserves:

shows a striking correspondence between the proposed distinction and features
found in a fifteenth century text.

2. The difference between *-ne* and *-NE*

with a subject noun
ı the presence versus

Traditionally, the perfective aspect on verbs has been viewed as assigning erga-
tive case on the subject noun, and triggering verb-agreement with the object
noun. This has led to the recognition of the nominative-accusative vs. ergative-
absolutive pattern. The facts, however, show that the occurrence of case-marked

subjects in perfective is neither fully inclusive nor entirely exclusive. First, there
is a subset of verbs[4] in the language that exhibit only the nominative-accusative
pattern, as in:

(5a) *Kišor chemistry bhaṇ.y.o*
      (M-S)   study.P.M-S
      'Kishor studied chemistry.'

(6a) *Kišor kaagaḷ.ne aḍ.y.o*
      (M-S) letter.*ne*   touch.P.M-S
      'Kishor touched the letter.'

In these perfective sentences, the subject noun *Kišor* is nominative and controls
the agreement with *bhaṇ-* 'study' in (5a) and with *aḍ-* 'touch' in (6a). Secondly,
subjects in Gujarati are also affixed with a case marker when they occur in
certain constructions or cooccur with certain predicates. Instances of object-con-
trolled agreement are offered in Mistry (1976, 1978) where the verb has some-
thing other than perfective aspect, or the subject noun contains a marker other
than ergative. Thus the verb in Gujarati not only does not agree with an ergative
subject; it does not agree with any nonnominative subject, nor is the pattern
restricted to perfective aspect.

The split ergativity reveals conditions when the subject does and does not
control verb agreement. It, however, does not show the agreement pattern where
the object nominal is the sole controller in the sentence. There are several
constructions in Gujarati where the subject is invariably marked. Sentences (3b)–
(6b) are instances of Passive or Abilitative constructions that require the subject
be marked with *-thi*. (3c)–(6c) have the subject affixed with regionally varying
-e or *-ne* and exemplify the Desiderative construction.[5]

(3b) *Kišor.thi kaagaḷ   naa vāc.aa.y.o*
      .INS letter-M-S not   read.PAS.P.M-S
      'Kishor couldn't read the letter.'

(4b) *Kišor.thi Raaj.ne naa pajav.aa.y.o*
      .INS (M-S).*ne* not harass.PAS.P.M-S
      'Kishor couldn't harass Raj.'

(5b) *Kišor.thi chemistry naa bhaṇ.aa.y.i.*
      .INS F-S   not   study.PAS.P.F-S
      'Kishor couldn't study chemistry.'

(6b) *Kišor.thi kɑ*
      .INS le
      'Kishor coul

(3c) *Kišor.(n)e k*
      .Ag l
      'Kishor wish

(4c) *Kišor.(n)e F*
      .Ag (
      'Kishor wish

(5c) *Kišor.(n)e cɪ*
      .Ag (
      'Kishor wish

(6c) *Kišor.(n)e kɑ*
      .Ag le
      'Kishor wishɪ

These constructiɪ
opportunity to exaɪ
(3b)–(3c) and (5b)–
Notice however th
(4b)–(4c) vs. (6b)–
(4c) it controls th
agreement. What tl
observation that its
whether or not this

What we find in
Gujarati that invariɑ
of "default" agreen

(7) *karaḍ* 'to bite
     maḷ   'to mee
     vadh   'to rebɪ
     coṭ   'to clin
     bheṭ   'to emb
     cum   'to kiss

On the basis of this
-ne of (4) is differeɪ

left column fragments:

:clusive. First, there
ominative-accusative

inative and controls
' in (6a). Secondly,
vhen they occur in
inces of object-con-
the verb has some-
ains a marker other
ree with an ergative
nor is the pattern

does and does not
ement pattern where
There are several
ed. Sentences (3b)–
require the subject
i regiònally varying

(6b) *Kišor.thi kaagaḷ.ne naa aḍ.aa.y.ū*
.INS letter.*ne* not touch.PAS.P.gn
'Kishor couldn't touch the letter.'

(3c) *Kišor.(n)e kaagaḷ vāānc.v.o ha.t.o*
.Ag letter-M-S read.D.M-S be.P.M-S
'Kishor wished to read the letter.'

(4c) *Kišor.(n)e Raaj.ne pajav.v.o ha.t.o*
.Ag (M-S).*ne* harass.D.M-S be.P.M-S
'Kishor wished to harass Raj.'

(5c) *Kišor.(n)e chemistry bhaṇ.v.i ha.t.i*
.Ag (F-S) study.D.M-S be.P.F-S
'Kishor wished to study chemistry.'

(6c) *Kišor.(n)e kaagaḷ.ne aḍ.v.ū ha.t.ū*
.Ag letter.OM.*ne* touch.D.gn be.P.gn
'Kishor wished to touch the letter.'

These constructions rule out the subject controlled agreement and provide the opportunity to examine the role of the object—unmarked as well as marked. In (3b)–(3c) and (5b)–(5c) the unmarked object controls the agreement as expected. Notice however the similarity in structure and the difference in agreement in (4b)–(4c) vs. (6b)–(6c). In all these cases, the object is marked, but in (4b) and (4c) it controls the agreement whereas in (6b) and (6c) we have a default agreement. What these facts demonstrate is that Gujarati does not support the observation that its "transitive verbs agree with their direct object irrespective of whether or not this is case marked overtly" (Comrie 1984: 862).

What we find in (6) is not an isolated occurrence. There is a set of verbs in Gujarati that invariably require -*ne* on the object noun and show the same pattern of "default" agreement. They include additional verbs such as the following:

(7) karaḍ 'to bite' nam 'to bow'
maḷ 'to meet' paraṇ 'to marry'
vaḍh 'to rebuke' vaḷag 'to cling'
coṭ 'to cling' aḍak 'to touch'
bheṭ 'to embrace' praṇam 'to bow'
cum 'to kiss' ḍās 'to sting'

On the basis of this difference in agreement there can surely be little doubt that -*ne* of (4) is different from -*ne* of (6). We will differentiate them as -*ne* and -*NE*

respectively. The object marker *-NE* acts as a barrier to verb agreement but the specificity marker *-ne* does not.

3. Properties of case markers

In this section we will show that the difference in verb agreement is not the sole difference between the objects marked with *-NE* vs. *-ne* and will present additional contrasts between the two. Their behavior in agreement along with these additional contrasts will confirm our assumption that they are different entities, and at the same time will manifest the differentiating characteristics of the categories they belong to.

Another difference is the optionality vs. obligatoriness of *-ne* vs. *-NE*. This difference is illustrated in (8) and (9):

(8a) *Šeelaa pāāc maaṇas.o mokal.š.e*
    (III-S) five   man.Pl   send.Fut.III-S
    'Sheela will send five men.'

(8b) *Šeelaa pāāc maaṇas.o.ne mokal.š.e*
    (III-S) five   man.Pl.*ne*   send.Fut.III-S
    'Sheela will send the five men.'

(9a) **Šeelaa pāāc maaṇas.o maḷ.š.e*
    (III-S) five   man.Pl   meet.Fut.III-S

(9b) *Šeelaa pāāc maaṇas.o.NE maḷ.š.e*
    (III-S) five   man.Pl.*NE*   meet.Fut.III-S
    'Sheela will meet the five men.'

Sentences (8a) and (8b) are grammatical with or without *-ne* on the object. A similar sentence with the *-NE*, i.e., (9b), is grammatical. (9a), without *-NE*, is ungrammatical. The difference displayed in these sentences show that *-NE* is never optional, but *-ne* is.

A third difference is evidenced in the externalization of an argument with the *-el* forms of verbs. These participle forms occur as adjectival with either the agent or the theme as a head of a noun phrase.

(10) *chokro   chokri.ne pajav.š.e*
    boy-III-S girl.*ne*   harass.Fut.III-S
    'The boy will harass the girl.'

(11) *chokro   ᵤ
    boy-III-S ᵤ
    'The boy ᵥ

Sentences with *pₑ*
-NE on their objeᵤ
adjectival functioₙ

(10a) *chokraa.e*
    boy.E
    '...boy-harₐ

(11a) **chokraa.e*
    boy.E
    '...boy-maᵣ

Sentence (10)
instantiates the exᵢ
marked object anᵢ
matical. We thus
can be externalizₑ

Another such ᵤ
adjunct agreemeₙ
appears on adveᵣ
agreement with tᵢ
in such cases, as

(12a) *pelo*
    that.M-S
    'That tall ᵢ

(12b) *pelaa   ū*
    that.FX tₐ
    'That tall ᵢ

Sentence (12a) shᵢ
and adjective agᵣ
demonstrates the
agreement and otᵢ
(12a) and (12b).
contrasting effect
the agreement mₑ

(11) *chokro   chokri.NE paraṇ.š.e*
      boy-III-S girl.*NE*   marry.Fut.III-S
      'The boy will marry the girl.'

Sentences with *pajav*-type verbs take *-ne* and those with *paraṇ*-type verbs take
-NE on their objects as in (10) and (11) above. The *-el* forms of these verbs in
adjectival function appear in the following noun phrases:

(10a) *chokraa.e pajav.el.i   chokri*
       boy.E   harass.*el*.F-S girl-F-S
       '...boy-harassed girl...'

(11a) **chokraa.e paraṇ.el.i   chokri*
       boy.E   marry.*el*.F-S girl-F-S
       '...boy-married girl...'

Sentence (10) has its object nouns marked with *-ne*. The phrase in (10a)
instantiates the externalized theme and is grammatical. Sentence (11) has the *-NE*-
marked object and the corresponding (11a) with externalized theme is ungram-
matical. We thus find that in the *-el*-participle constructions *-ne*-marked nominals
can be externalized, but not the *-NE*-marked ones.

Another such difference concerns a phenomenon which we shall refer to as
adjunct agreement. This difference shows up in the agreement morphology that
appears on adverbs when the controller is case marked. One finds a default
agreement with the verb and fixed forms for the adverb and other constituents
in such cases, as in (12b) vs. (12a):

(12a) *pelo   ūco   chokro   vahelo   aav.y.o*
       that.M-S tall.M-S boy.M-S early.M-S come.P.M-S
       'That tall boy came early.'

(12b) *pelaa   ūcaa   chokraa.thi vahelaa   naa   av.aa.y.ū*
       that.FX tall.FX boy.INS   early.FX not come.PAS.P.gn
       'That tall boy could not come early.'

Sentence (12a) shows agreement with the caseless noun *chokro:* the demonstrative
and adjective agree internally and the verb and adverb agree externally. (12b)
demonstrates the dramatic effect of a case marker: now, the verb has a default
agreement and other constituents—internal and external—are in their fixed forms.[6]
(12a) and (12b), though intransitive, in these instances primarily exhibit the
contrasting effects of caseless vs. case-marked controllers. The adverb contains
the agreement morphology in (12a) and has a fixed form in (12b).

Gujarati verbs do not show agreement with indirect objects since such objects are always case marked; nor do they agree with case marked subjects. For verb agreement one would expect transitive sentences with case marked subjects to pattern like intransitive sentences. Only one nominal would be eligible as a controller in both instances. If that nominal is case marked, agreeing adverbs have a fixed form as in (12b) above. One would expect the same pattern in (13) and (14) below:

(13a) *Šeelaa.thi Kišor.ne ekdhaaro   naa dhamkaav.aa.y.o*
          .INS (M-S).ne continuously.M-S not scold.PAS.P.M-S
      'Sheela could not scold Kishor continuously.'

(13b) *Šeelaa.thi Kišor.NE ekdhaaraa   naa vadh.aa.y.ū*
          .INS   .NE continuously.FX not rubuke.PAS.P.gn
      'Sheela could not rebuke Kishor continuously.'

(14a) *Šeelaa.e Kišor.ne aaṭlo   badho   dhamkaav.vaa.māā bhul   kari*
          .E (M-S).ne so.M-S much:M-S scold.Nom.in.   mistake did
      'Sheela made a mistake in scolding Kishor so much.'

(14b) *Šeelaa.e Kišor.NE moḍaa   maḷ.vaa.māā bhul   kari*
          .E   .NE late.FX meet.Nom.in   mistake did
      'Sheela made a mistake in meeting Kishor late.'

Both monoclausal (13) and biclausal (14) seem to have case-marked subjects and marked objects. But only the (b) sentences meet our expectation of fixed forms for adverbs and only (b) sentences have their objects with -NE. In the (a) sentences, on the other hand, we find adverbials exhibiting agreement with the -ne-marked object. This, then, is the fourth case where the marker -ne does not exhibit the same properties as -NE.

However, the properties -NE displays are identical to those of the casemarker -thi. In the sentences that we have examined the controller is marked with -thi in (12b) and with -NE in (13b), and in both cases we get default agreement on verbs and fixed forms for adverbs. -NE and -thi also share the properties of obligatoriness and non-externalization as evidenced in (9) and (11) above and in (15) below.

(15a) *maaṇas.thi saamaan   ūcak.aa.y.o*
       man.INS   luggage-M-S carry.PAS.P.M-S
      'The man could carry the luggage.'

cts since such objects
ed subjects. For verb
e marked subjects to
l be eligible as a con-
greeing adverbs have
e pattern in (13) and

aav.aa.y.o
PAS.P.M-S

ıa.y.ũ
ʒ.PAS.P.gn

a.māā bhul kari
ı. mistake did
ı.'

kari
ke did

: case-marked subjects
ır expectation of fixed
ts with -NE. In the (a)
ng agreement with the
ie marker -ne does not

ıose of the casemarker
ler is marked with -thi
t default agreement on
hare the properties of
and (11) above and in

(15b) *maaṇas saamaan ūcak.aa.y.o
     man   luggage-M-S carry.PAS.P.M-S

(15c) *saamaan ūcak.aa.y.el.o   maaṇas
     luggage   carry.PAS.P.*el*.M-S man-M-S
     '...luggage-carried man...'

Sentence (15b) differs from (15a) in not having -*thi* on the subject and conse-
quently is ungrammatical, demonstrating the obligatoriness of -*thi*. Similarly (15c)
externalizes the -*thi*-marked nominal and is ill-formed, since it externalizes a
case-marked argument. These properties that -*NE* and -*thi* manifest in verb
agreement, obligatoriness, non-externalization and adjunct agreement are also
present with other case-marked controllers such as Dative subjects or subjects of
Desiderative constructions. These, then, are the properties that differentiate case
markers from other markers in the language.

If, on the basis of the absence of these properties, we considered the marker
-*ne* as something other than a case-marker, we would have a more general
characterization of the grammar of Gujarati: case-marked nominals do not con-
trol, but result in default agreement on verbs and fixed forms for other constitu-
ents. Such a characterization will also show Gujarati to exemplify the universal
schema. It demonstrates, contra Falk (1991), that there is nothing unusual or
marked about the language.

4. -*ne:* Its semantic import

Thus far we have presented evidence to show that -*ne* is different from case
markers. In this section we will examine some properties of -*ne* to determine
what it is, if not a case marker.

In (8) we already noted the marker -*ne* is optional. This optionality does not
mean that sentences (8a) and (8b) are in free variation; they are in fact different
in meaning. The construction without -*ne* in (8a) carries the meaning of 'any five
men' but one with -*ne* implies 'five specific men'. A similar distinction exists
between (16a) and (16b):

(16a) *principal caar šikšak.o   nim.š.e*
     (III-S)   four teacher.Pl appoint.Fut.III-S
     'The principal will appoint four teachers.'

(16b) *principal caar šikšak.o.ne nim.š.e*
     (III-S)   four teacher.Pl.*ne* appoint.Fut.III-S

'The principal will select four teachers.'

In (16a), it is understood that *šikšako* 'teachers' is being introduced into the discourse for the first time, whereas (16b) carries the slightly different meaning of 'selecting' or 'reappointing'. The reason for this shift in meaning seems to be that *-ne* adds the meaning of specificity. It is this specificity reference associated with *-ne* that also accounts for the grammaticality judgment in sentences such as:

(17a) **Šeelaa   darek   maaṇas   mokal.š.e*
     (III-S)   every   man   send.Fut.III-S

(17b) *Šeelaa   darek   maaṇas.ne   mokal.š.e*
     (III-S)   every   man.*ne*   send.Fut.III-S
     'Sheela will send every man (somewhere).'

Due to the quantifier *darek* 'every' the object noun automatically receives the interpretation of specificity and hence the acceptability of (17b) and unacceptability of (17a).

Another argument for associating specificity with *-ne* comes from some idiomatic expressions. Gujarati has a class of expressions consisting of an unmarked noun and a verb like those listed in (18) that convey idiomatic meaning:

(18) a. *haath*   *aap*   'to help'
     hand   give

    b. *vaagh*   *maar*   'to do a brave deed'
      tiger   kill

    c. *lohi*   *cus*   'to harass'
      blood   suck

    d. *rasto*   *pakaḍ*   'to go away'
      road   catch

    e. *modhu*   *sātaaḍ*   'to feel ashamed'
      face   hide

    f. *miṭhu*   *bhabharaav* 'to exaggerate'
      salt   add

    g. *mag*   *bharaḍ*   'to speak thoughtlessly'
      mung beans   grind

In such expressions, unmarked nouns are incorporated into the verbs yielding a nonspecific noncompositional reading. It is possible to have *-ne* with some of these nominals but the resultant sentences cease to be idiomatic and acquire a specific interpretation, as in the following:

(19a) *Kišor.e vaa*
     .E tige
     'Kishor did

(19b) *Kišor.e vaaᵢ*
     .E tigeᵢ
     'Kishor kille

(20a) *Kišor.e ma*
     .E mu
     'Kishor talke

(20b) *Kišor.e maᵢ*
     .E muᵢ
     'Kishor grou

The glosses provi
clearly understood
have only literal an
presence of *-ne* and
The same semanti

(21a) *Raaj.e vaagh*
     .E tiger-
     'Raj saw a ti

(21b) *Raaj.e vaagh*
     .E tiger-
     'Raj saw the

(22a) *darji.e kham*
     tailor.E shirt-
     'The tailor m

(22b) *darji.e kham*
     tailor.E shirt-
     'The tailor sh

Sentence (21a) with
generic tiger in that
specific tiger. Simila
made turned out to b

(19a) *Kišor.e vaagh   maar.y.o*
    .E tiger-M-S kill.P.M-S
    'Kishor did a brave deed.'

(19b) *Kišor.e vaagh.ne   maar.y.o*
    .E tiger-M-S.*ne* kill.P.M-S
    'Kishor killed the tiger.'

(20a) *Kišor.e   mag   bharad.y.aa*
    .E mung beans-M-Pl grind.P.M-Pl
    'Kishor talked foolishly.'

(20b) *Kišor.e   mag.ne   bharad.y.aa*
    .E mung beans-M-Pl.*ne* grind.P.M-Pl
    'Kishor ground mung beans.'

   The glosses provided for these sentences substantiate that the (a) sentences are clearly understood in an idiomatic sense. Their counterparts, the (b) sentences, have only literal and specific readings. This contrast is related to the absence vs. presence of -*ne* and thereby reveals the semantic contribution of -*ne*.
   The same semantic import is exemplified in the following sentences:

(21a) *Raaj.e vaagh   jo.y.o*
    .E tiger-M-S see.P.M-S
    'Raj saw a tiger.'

(21b) *Raaj.e vaagh.ne   jo.y.o*
    .E tiger-M-S.*ne* see.P.M-S
    'Raj saw the tiger.'

(22a) *darji.e khamis   ṭūkū   kar.y.ū*
    tailor.E shirt-N-S short-N-S make.P.N-S
    'The tailor made the shirt short.'

(22b) *darji.e khamis.ne   ṭūkū kar.y.ū*
    tailor.E shirt-N-S.*ne* short make.P.N-S
    'The tailor shortened the shirt.'

Sentence (21a) with an unmarked *vaagh* as an object is understood to mean a generic tiger in that Raj saw a tiger for the first time. (21b) means that Raj saw specific tiger. Similarly, (22a) is interpreted to mean that the shirt that the tailor made turned out to be short, whereas (22b) is understood to mean that the tailor

shortened a specific (previously existing) shirt.

If indeed -ne is a specificity marker, then it seems clear that its occurrence would be more frequent in certain types of writing and in certain grammatical constructions than in others. A very simplistic (but still informative) survey of a couple of newspaper stories (*Nayaa Padakaar*, June 21, 1991), chosen because they typically involve reports about specific individuals, places, entities, etc., yielded the following examples:

(23) *bhaašaṇ.māā nišṇaat.o.ne / nišṇaat.o.naa hevaal.o.ne ṭāāk.ine...*
lecture-in   expert.Pl.-*ne*/expert.Pl.GEN   report.Pl.*ne* quote.GERUND
'Quoting the experts/experts' reports in the lecture...'

(24) *ugravaadi.o.e police.ni   car.ne   atkaav.i.*
militant.Pl.E   .GEN   car-F-S.*ne* stop.P.F-S
'The militants stopped the police car.'

(25) *aa paribaḷ.o bhaarat.ni lokšaahi.ne   ḍagmagaav.š.e.*
this force-III.Pl India.GEN democracy.*ne* shake.Fut.III-Pl
'These forces will shake up the Indian democracy.'

(26) *tritium alag   paaḍ.y.ũ...tritium.ne alag   paaḍ.vaa.naa prayatn.o...*
(N-S) separate fall.P.N-S   .*ne* separate fall.Nom.GEN effort.Pl
'Tritium was separated...the efforts to separate tritium...'

(27) *teni   sevaa.o.ne   birdaav.taa...*
he.GEN service.Pl.*ne* praise.PARTICIPLE
'Praising his services...'

(28) *ugataa kavi.ni   kavitaa.ne sambhaḷaav.ine...*
growing poet.GEN poem.*ne* recite.GERUND
'Reciting the budding poet's poem...'

(29) *bomb.ne battery saathe joḍ.ine...*
.*ne*   with   join.GERUND
'Having joined the bomb with the battery...'

Sentence (23) collapses two phrases where -ne occurs with a human *nišṇaat* 'an expert', as well as with an inanimate *hevaalo* 'reports'. Gujarati pronouns and personal names invariably —and animates with a high frequency— have -ne in their occurrence as objects, but, in the sentences above, the occurrence of -ne is not restricted either to humans or to animates. Its widespread occurrence even with inanimates such as *car* (24), *lokšaahi* 'democracy' (25), *tritium* (26), *sevaa,*

'contribution' (27
telling support fo
are nonfinite clau
entities with speci

5. Concluding

The observations
a noun is suffixed
it: the noun with -
ing the specificity
consistently where
objects with a sim
agreement in a co
to. We have obse
Because of the ob
the agreement, we
sider them as disti

There is reason t
an isolated instance
So, for example, w

(30a) *Raaj.e aa*
.E this
'Raj brought

(30b) *Raaj.e aa*
(M-S) this
'Raj also bro

Though in both (
subject still controls
between -e in (30a
expected, the adver
form *vahelaa* 'early'
-e, but (30a) is gram
is a case of -*E:* vs.
whereas the -e, just
whereas -*E* is an erg
An interesting con

ar that its occurrence
n certain grammatical
nformative) survey of
1991), chosen because
places, entities, etc.,

ɔ.ne ṭāāk.ine...
ʾl.ne quote.GERUND
..'

gaav.š.e.
Fut.III-Pl

l.vaa.naa prayatn.o...
Nom.GEN effort.Pl
um...'

ith a human *nišnaat* 'an
Gujarati pronouns and
requency— have -ne in
, the occurrence of -ne
spread occurrence even
25), *tritium* (26), *sevaa*,

'contribution' (27), *kavitaa*, 'poem' (28), and *bomb* (29) in newspaper writing is telling support for its role as a specificity marker. Six out of these eight phrases are nonfinite clauses, again a natural structural context for the occurrence of entities with specific reference.

5. Concluding remarks

The observations based on examples (15)–(29) can be summarized as follows. If a noun is suffixed with -*ne*, it has a different interpretation from a noun without it: the noun with -*ne* is interpreted as specific. Additionally, the way of identifying the specificity marker -*ne* turns out to be predictable, since the properties are consistently where one would expect them to be. We have presented instances of objects with a similar marker in (6), (13b), and (14b) that do not control verb agreement in a context where, on the basis of previous observations, they ought to. We have observed that this marker invariably occurs with a set of verbs. Because of the obvious differences in their semantic import and in their role in the agreement, we ignore the phonetic similarity of these two markers and consider them as distinct entities.

There is reason to believe that the homophony we have discussed above is not an isolated instance. An analogous marker is found with the subject noun as well. So, for example, we find sentences such as:

(30a) *Raaj.e aa varše vahelaa keri   aan.i*
 .E this year early.FX mango-F-S bring.P-F-S
'Raj brought mangoes early this year.'

(30b) *Raaj.e aa varše vahelo   keri laav.y.o*
 (M-S) this year early.M-S mango bring.P.M-S
'Raj also brought mangoes early this year.'

Though in both (30a) and (30b), the subject noun *Raaj* is marked with -*e*, the subject still controls verb agreement in (30b), but not in (30a). This difference between -*e* in (30a) vs. in (30b) is confirmed by the adjunct agreement: as expected, the adverb *vahelo* 'early' agrees with *Raaj* in (30b) but has a fixed form *vahelaa* 'early' in (30a). Additionally, (30b) is grammatical with or without -*e*, but (30a) is grammatical only with -*e*. Like the -*NE:* -*ne* distinction, this then is a case of -*E:* vs. -*e*.[7] The -*E*, just like -*NE*, fulfills a syntactic requirement whereas the -*e*, just like -*ne*, has a lexical meaning: it is an inclusive marker, whereas -*E* is an ergative case.[8]

An interesting correlation of the -*ne : -NE* distinction is evident in an earlier

stage of the language. The following examples were obtained from *Kahnaḍade Prabandha*,[9] an old Gujarati work written by Padmanabh in 1456 (cf. Vyas 1953):

(31) *(paatasaahi) vāāc.i.au   lekha   sajaaii   kiidhii*
    emperor.E   read.P.M-S document-M-S preparation-F-S make.P.F-S
    teḍ.aav.i.aa   sonaara   kar.aav.i.ū   mãndira (KP2: 80)
    call.CAUS.P.M-Pl goldsmith-M-Pl make.CAUS.P.N-S temple-N-S
    '(The emperor) read the document, made the preparations, called for the
    goldsmiths, got the temple built...'

(32) *Maadhavi mleccha   aan.i.aa   (KP1: 17b)*
            .E foreigners-M-Pl bring.P.M-Pl
    'Madhava brought foreigners.'

(33) *Raami raakšasa   han.i.aa   (KP1: 234b)*
            .E demons-M-Pl kill.P.M-Pl
    'Ram killed the demons.'

The text in (31) is a part of a couplet and reports four events. It thus has four objects: *lekha* 'document' inanimate, masculine; *sajaaii* 'preparation' inanimate, feminine; *mãndira* 'temple' inanimate, neuter; and *sonaara* 'goldsmith' animate, masculine. The verb morphology shows agreement with these objects, and all of the objects are unmarked nouns. The same pattern is attested in (32) and (33); even the animate object nouns—*mleccha* 'foreigners', *raakšasa* 'demons'—have no marking on them.

The text also contains examples such as (34) and (35):

(34) *tini   ... avagan.i.au Maadhava (KP 1: 13b)*
    he.E   ignore.P.M-S (M-S)
    'He ignored Madhava.'

(35) *raai   hūū   avagan.i.au, maahrau bāādhavau Kešava han.i.au* (KP 1:
    king.E I-M-S ignore.P.M-S my   brother   (M-S) kill.P.M-S [13b]
    'The king ignored me, (and) killed my brother Keshava.'

These sentences depict the same pattern as the modern Gujarati: an ergative marker on the subject and verb agreement with the object. The object *Madhava* in (34) is a personal name, and in (35) a personal name *Kešava*, and a pronoun *hūū* 'I'. Proper nouns and pronouns, when they occur as objects, invariably have the specificity marker *-ne* in modern Gujarati, but the historical antecedent of that marker is consistently absent in the sentences from the Old Gujarati text.

The Old Guj

(36) *punyavar*
    meritoric
    'Everyor

The *-nai* mark
required with t
correspondence
correspondence
of the distinctic

The proposed
general and syst
controlled and
surfaces in con
case marked. V
verb and fixed
ment with the c

(4b) *Kišor.thi*
        .INS
    'Kishor cc

(6b) *Kišor.thi*
        .INS
    'Kishor co

Our analysis w
marked controll
here is case-ma
clarification it p
Conventional gr
etc. of the objec
mon to what app
earlier attempts
counterexamples
This study offer:
marking is due
determined for a
these considerati
the language.

ned from *Kahnaḍade*
h in 1456 (cf. Vyas

    kiidhii
ꟻ-S make.P.F-S
   māndira (KP2: 80)
-S temple-N-S
ations, called for the

b)

vents. It thus has four
preparation' inanimate,
a 'goldsmith' animate,
iese objects, and all of
sted in (32) and (33);
kšasa 'demons'—have

šava haṇ.i.au (KP 1:
-S) kill.P.M-S [13b]
hava.'

i Gujarati: an ergative
t. The object *Madhava*
Kešava, and a pronoun
objects, invariably have
orical antecedent of that
Old Gujarati text.

The Old Gujarati text does have instances such as (36):

(36) *punyavanta.nai sahu namai* (KP 1: 225b)
    meritorious   all   salute
    'Everyone salutes the meritorious ones.'

The *-nai* marker on the object in (36) corresponds to the modern Gujarati *-NE* required with the verb *nam-* 'to salute', one of the verbs listed in (7). This correspondence of Old Gujarati *-nai* with *-NE*, and the systematic absence of correspondences in Old Gujarati for *-ne* is an additional and striking confirmation of the distinction alluded to.

The proposed bifurcation of *-ne* occurring with object nouns leads to a more general and systematic account of the agreement process. The language has object controlled and subject controlled agreement: the object controlled agreement surfaces in constructions with an (overt or covert) object where the subject is case marked. With a case-marked controller, there is default agreement on the verb and fixed forms for other constituents.[10] Returning to the puzzling agreement with the object in (4b) and the default agreement in (6b):

(4b) *Kišor.thi Raaj.ne   naa pajav.aa.y.o*
           .INS (M-S).*ne* not harass.PAS.P.M-S
    'Kishor couldn't harass Raj.'

(6b) *Kišor.thi kaagaḷ.ne naa aḍ.aa.y.ū*
           .INS letter.*ne* not touch.PAS.P.gn
    'Kishor couldn't touch the letter.'

Our analysis would expect the agreement to be this way: with the specificity marked controller in (4b), and a default agreement in (6b) since the controller here is case-marked. Another important outcome of this investigation is the clarification it provides about the conditions for the marker on object nouns. Conventional grammars attempt to correlate one factor—animacy, definiteness, etc. of the object noun—with its occurrence. Since there is no single factor common to what appears to be a single but are in reality two homophonous markers, earlier attempts have remained confusing. There are always a multitude of counterexamples for any single factor shown to be determining its occurrence. This study offers considerable evidence to show that the elusive nature of object marking is due to its dependence on two different conditions: it is structurally determined for a subset of verbs and semantically determined for others. It is these considerations that are transparently reflected in the agreement pattern of the language.

Notes

1. I am deeply thankful to Fred Brengelman, Bernard Comrie, Peter Hook, Bharati Modi, and Graham Thurgood for their comments and suggestions on earlier versions of this paper.

2. The following abbreviations are used in the glosses: Ag: Agentive; CAUS: Causative; D: Desiderative; E: Ergative; F: Feminine; Fut: Future; FX: Fixed form; GEN: Genitive; gn: Default Gender-Number Agreement; INS: Instrumental; M: Masculine; N: Neuter; Nom: Nominalizer; P: Perfective; PAS: Passive; Pl: Plural; S: Singular; III: Third Person.

3. The question of controller also arises for adjunct agreement. For details and discussion, see Hook—Joshi (1991).

4. Such verbs are reported in other Indo-Aryan languages too, and are referred to as "anomalous"—two argument predicates patterning like one argument predicates, and vice versa. Gujarati only has two argument "anomalous" verbs. Mistry (1987) argues for the frequently discussed *laav* 'bring' (see 30b) as a special case of historical residue and shows others to fall into three classes: Equative (e.g., *ban* 'become'), Cognitive (*bhan* 'study' in 5), and Contact (*ad* 'touch' in 6 and others listed in 7).

5. In this construction, the subject carries a case marker -*e* in southern Gujarati, and -*ne* in other varieties. The details of this variation are complex and unrelated to the main thesis of the paper. The term Agentive for this -*(n)e* is just an ad hoc label.

6. What are referred to as fixed forms (FX) are different from instances of default agreement. Thus, sentences (i)–(iii) exhibit a three-way distinction in the forms of *aav-* 'come'.

   (i) *Kišor aav.y.o*
      (M-S) come.P.M-S
      'Kishor came...'

   (ii) *Kišor.thi av.aa.y.ū*
               come.PAS.P.gn
      'Kishor could come...'

   (iii) *Kišor.naa aav.y.aa.thi*
          GEN come.P.FX.INS
      'By Kishor's coming...'

aavyo in (i) represents a Gender-Number agreement, *avaayū* in (ii) is a case of default agreement whereas *aavyaa* in (iii) is an example of a fixed form. This study merely reports the fixed form without any consideration of the system associated with it.

7. In the Southern variety of Gujarati one finds the following contrast:

   (i) *Raaj.e*
          .E
      'Raj had

   (ii) *Raaj.e*
       (M-S)
      'Raj also

In (i) the agr
subject *Raaj*.
the marker o
  A parallel
Burman lang

8. Two things
similarity bet
them. In fact
of grammatic
occurs with
is correlated
remain other

9. *Kahnaḍade F*
which the e
accompanying
number, the

10. This paper co
ment in Perso
Number agree
-*NE* as well a
marker, but F
This variation
neither Person
indication of
another unkn

References

Cardona, George
  1965 *A Gujara*
Chelliah, Shobhan
  1988 "Subject
        L. Thorn
        Fresno: (

(i) *Raaj.e chaapũ kharid.vaa.nũ ha.t.ũ*
 .E newspaper-N-S buy.Nom.GEN.N-S be.P.N-S
'Raj had to buy the newspaper.'

(ii) *Raaj.e chaapũ kharid.vaa.no ha.t.o*
 (M-S) newspaper buy.Nom.GEN.M-S be.P.M-S
'Raj also was going to buy the newspaper.'

In (i) the agreement is with the object *chaapũ* 'newspaper' but in (ii) it is with the subject *Raaj*. The difference in agreement is correlated with the different nature of the marker on *Raaj:* a case marker, *-E,* in (i), but an inclusive marker, *-e,* in (ii).

A parallel case of an agentive *-na* vs. a focus marker *-na* in Manipuri, a Tibeto-Burman language is discussed in Chelliah (1988).

8. Two things to note: (1) the inclusive *-e* varies with *paṇ* and (2) the alluded-to similarity between *-ne* and *-e* does not preclude the possibility of differences between them. In fact they do differ in their phonological behavior, distribution, and in terms of grammatical consequences. For example, *-ne* occurs only with objects, whereas *-e* occurs with any constituent. It could very well be that this distributional difference is correlated with their semantic differences—specificity vs. inclusiveness. There remain other differences in need of explanation.

9. *Kahnaḍade Prabandha* (KP) consists of four *khaṇḍa* (cantos). The first two from which the examples are drawn consist of 256 and 168 couplets. The notation accompanying the examples is composed of abbreviation for the text, the canto number, the couplet number, and either the first (a) or the second (b) line.

10. This paper concentrates on Gender-Number agreement. Gujarati also permits agreement in Person and Number. Only verbs are targeted for such agreement. Person-Number agreement differs from Gender-Number agreement by being blocked both by *-NE* as well as *-ne.* That is, Gender-Number agreement is blocked only by a case marker, but Person-Number agreement, by specificity or case marker on the object. This variation is further complicated by the fact that the inclusive marker *-e* blocks neither Person-Number agreement nor Gender-Number agreement. Whether this is an indication of three types of markers— *-NE, -ne,* and *-e* —or the consequence of another unknown factor is unclear at present.

References

Cardona, George
 1965 *A Gujarati reference grammar.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
Chelliah, Shobhana
 1988 "Subject marking in Manipuri", in: J. Emonds—P. J. Mistry—V. Samiian—
  L. Thornburg (eds.), *Proceedings of the Western Conference on Linguistics.*
  Fresno: California State University, 30–40.

---

rie, Peter Hook, Bharati
estions on earlier versions

entive; CAUS: Causative;
FX: Fixed form; GEN:
trumental; M: Masculine;
e; Pl: Plural; S: Singular;

ient. For details and dis-

o, and are referred to as
argument predicates, and
rbs. Mistry (1987) argues
special case of historical
ve (e.g., *ban* 'become'),
6 and others listed in 7).
southern Gujarati, and *-ne*
and unrelated to the main
ist an ad hoc label.
from instances of default
istinction in the forms of

aayũ in (ii) is a case of
a fixed form. This study
of the system associated

; contrast:

Comrie, Bernard
  1984 "Reflections on verb agreement in Hindi and related languages", *Linguistics* 22: 857–864.
Delancey, Scott
  1981 "An interpretation of split ergativity and related patterns", *Language* 57: 626–657.
Enç, Mürvet
  1991 "The semantics of specificity", *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 1–25.
Falk, Yehuda
  1991. "Case: Abstract and morphological", *Linguistics* 29: 197–230.
Gair, James—Kashi Wali
  1989 "Hindi agreement as anaphor", *Linguistics* 27: 45–70.
Hook, Peter—Dayashankar Joshi
  1991 "Concordant adverbs and postpositions in Gujarati", *Indian Linguistics* 52: 1–14.
Mahajan, Anoop
  1990 The A/A-bar distinction and movement theory. (Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Massachussetts Institute of Technology.)
Mistry, P. J.
  1976 "Subject in Gujarati: An examination of verb agreement phenomenon", in: Manindra Verma (ed.), *The notion of subject in South Asian languages*. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 240–268.
  1978 "Agreement: Spreading vs. changing of features", *Indian Linguistics* 39: 95–103.
  1987 "Semantics of split ergativity in Gujarati", paper presented at the Seventeenth Western Conference on Linguistics. Seattle: University of Washington.
Saksena, Anuradha
  1985 "Verb agreement in Hindi, Part II", *Linguistics* 23: 137–142.
Vyas, Kantilal (ed.)
  1953 *Kahnaḍade Prabandha*. Jaipur: Rajasthana Puratatva Mandira.

The Garifuna

Pamela Munro

In this paper, I w
American Island-C
spoken in Belize,
island of St. Vince
but its organizatio

First, I will sho
Then I will discuss
at canonical gender
in a typology of g

1. The Garifun

Garifuna distinguis
Corbett (1991) wc
Taylor, e.g., 1951
assignment, since g
but by its meaning
gender, and inanir
gender. (The speak
grammar, and rou
and "female" to re

According to Ta
tainers, vehicles, tr
and fruits, and gu
parts, body produc
crete inanimate nou
seems to imply a s
to follow a logic t
languages" (1977:
(f), while others ar
(or categories like
appear to be relev
Taylor acknowledg
the following: