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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.

Gujarati has sentences such as:

(1) pelo ùco chokro modo aav.y.o
    '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 ùco 'tall', the adverb modo '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 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-Abative agreement patterns. Sentences (3)–(6) exemplify the nominative-accusative pattern. These sentences have a caseless subject that controls verb agreement.
(3) Kiṣor kaagāl vāāc.ē
(III-S) letter read.Fut.III-S
'Kishor will read the letter.'

(4) Kiṣor Raaj.ne pajāv.īē
(III-S) .ne harass.Fut.III-S
'Kishor will harass Raj.'

(5) Kiṣor chemistry bhan.śē
ingas.śī study.Fut.III-S
'Kishor will study chemistry.'

(6) Kiṣor kaagāl.ne ad.ēē
(III-S) letter.ne touch.Fut.III-S
'Kishor will touch the letter.'

Sentence (3a) instantiates the ergative-absolutive pattern: the subject noun Kiṣor is marked with the ergative -ē and the verb agrees with kaagāl ‘a letter’, an unmarked object nominal.

(3a) Kiṣor.e kaagāl wāāc.yo
.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) Kiṣor.e Raaj.ne pajāv.yo
.E [M-S].ne harass.P.M-S
'Kishor harassed Raj.'

In this perfective sentence, the subject Kiṣor 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 case for subject objects it has no
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absence of overt case marking does not have a uniform effect on verb agreement: 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 insurmountable 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.

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

2. The difference between -ne and -NE

Traditionally, the perfective aspect on verbs has been viewed as assigning ergative 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 in the language that exhibit only the nominative-accusative pattern, as in:

(5a) Kisor chemistry bhan.y.o
    (M-S) study.P.M-S
    'Kishor studied chemistry.'

(6a) Kisor kaaga.ni ne ad.y.o
    (M-S) letter.ne touch.P.M-S
    'Kishor touched the letter.'

In these perfective sentences, the subject noun Kisor is nominative and controls the agreement with bhan- 'study' in (5a) and with ad- '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-controlled agreement are offered in Mistry (1976, 1978) where the verb has something 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 Abilitate 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) Kisor.thi kaaga.ni naa vaacaa.y.o
    .INS letter-M-S not read.PAS.P.M-S
    'Kishor couldn't read the letter.'

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

(5b) Kisor.thi chemistry naa bhan.aa.y.t
    .INS F-S not study.PAS.P.F-S
    'Kishor couldn't study chemistry.'
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(6b) Kilor.thi kaagal ne raa ad.an.yu
       INS letter,ne not touch.PAS.P.gn
      'Kishor couldn't touch the letter.'

(3c) Kilor.(n)e kaagal vaan,v.o ha.i.o
       Ag letter-M-S read.D.M-S be.P.M-S
      'Kishor wished to read the letter.'

(4c) Kilor.(n)e Raaj.ne pajav,v.o ha.i.o
       Ag (M-S),ne harass,D.M-S be.P.M-S
      'Kishor wished to harass Raj.'

(5c) Kilor.(n)e chemistry bhan,v.i ha.i.i
       Ag (F-S) study,D.M-S be.P.F-S
      'Kishor wished to study chemistry.'

(6c) Kilor.(n)e kaagal ne ad.vu ha.i.i
       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 (5) 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) karad ‘to bite’  nam ‘to bow’
mal ‘to meet’  paren ‘to marry’
vadh ‘to rebuke’  valag ‘to cling’
cut ‘to cling’  adak ‘to touch’
bhet ‘to embrace’  pranam ‘to bow’
cun ‘to kiss’  dis ‘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 differential 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) Šeela pāc maanas.o mokal.Š.e
    (III-S) five man.Pl send.Fut.III-S
    'Sheela will send five men.'

(8b) Šeela pāc maanas.o ne mokal.Š.e
    (III-S) five man.Pl.ne send.Fut.III-S
    'Sheela will send the five men.'

(9a) *Šeela pāc maanas.o mał.Š.e
    (III-S) five man.Pl meet.Fut.III-S

(9b) Šeela pāc maanas.o NE mał.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., (9a), is grammatical. (9b), 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.'
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(11) chokra \ chokri.\NE \ paran.\s.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 paran-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 \ paran.\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 ungrammatical. 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 \ uco \ chokro \ vahelo \ uav.y.o
\ that.M-S \ tall.M-S \ boy.M-S \ early.M-S \ come.F.M-S
'Tall boy came early.'

(12b) pelaa \ ucau \ chokraa.thi \ vahelaas \ nza \ av.av.y.i
\ 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) Šéela.ti Kišor.ne êkhaaro nac drhmaav.aa.y.o
     .INS (M-S).ne continually,M-S not scold.PAS.P.M-S
     'Sheela could not scold Kishor continually.'

(13b) Šéela.ti Kišor.ÈE êkhaaraa nac vadh.aa.y.r
     .INS .ÈE continually,FX not rebuke.PAS.P.gn
     'Sheela could not rebuke Kishor continually.'

(14a) Šéela.e Kišor.ne aat.lo budho drhmaav.vaa.mâã bhul kari
     'Sheela made a mistake in scolding Kishor so much.'

(14b) Šéela.e Kišor.ÈE modaa nac.vaa.mâã bhul kari
     .E .ÈE 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 casemaker -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) *maanaas thi soamaan úcak.au.y.o
       man.INS luggage-M-S carry.PAS.P.M-S
       'The man could carry the luggage.'

(15b) *maanaas man

(15c) *soamaan luggage
     '...luggage
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(15c) *saamaan ñak.aa.y.e.l.o maanas
  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 consequently 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 control, but result in default agreement on verbs and fixed forms for other constituents. 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 ñikšak.o nim.s.e
      (III-S) four teacher.PI appoint.Fut. III-S
      'The principal will appoint four teachers.'

(16b) principal caar ñikšak.o.ne nim.s.e
      (III-S) four teacher.PI,ne appoint.Fut. III-S
'The principal will select four teachers.'

In (16a), it is understood that सिक्षको '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) शीला दारेक मान्यजी मोकल.शे
(III-S) every man send.Fut.III-S

(17b) शीला दारेक मान्यजी मोकल.शे
(III-S) every man send.Fut.III-S
'Sheela will send every man (somewhere).'

Due to the quantifier दारेक '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 
hand
ap 
give
'to help'

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

c. lohi 
blood
cus 
suck
'to harass'

d. raasto 
road
pakad 
catch
'to go away'

e. modhu 
face
sitaad 
hide
'to feel ashamed'

f. mitru 
salt
bhabharaav 
'to exaggerate'

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:

(21a) Raaj.e vaagh
.E tiger-
'the tiger'

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

(22a) darji.e khram
 tailor,E shirt-
'the tailor"

(22b) darji.e khram
 tailor,E shirt-
'the tailor"
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(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 ṱokā 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 ṱokā 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 (Naya Padhokar, June 21, 1991), chosen because they typically involve reports about specific individuals, places, entities, etc., yielded the following examples:

(23) bhaasen.maa niishnaat.o.ne / niishnaat.o.naa hevaal.o.ne taa.k.i.ne...
lecture.in expert.Pl.-ne/expert.Pl.GEN report.Pl.-ne quote.GERUND
'Quoting the experts/experts’ reports in the lecture....'

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

(25) aa paribaal.o bhaarati.ni lokshaahi.ne dagmagaav.i.e.
this force-III.Pl India.GEN democracy.ne shake.Pat.III.Pl
'These forces will shake up the Indian democracy.'

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

(27) teni seva.o.ne birdaav.taa...
he.GEN service.PI.-ne praise.PARTICIPLE
'Praising his services....'

(28) ugaata kavi.ni kavita.o.naa sambhalaaav.i.ne...
growing poet.GEN poem.ne recite.GERUND
'Reciting the budding poet’s poem....'

(29) bomb.ne battery saathe jog.i.ne...
.ne with join.GERUND
'Having joined the bomb with the battery....'

Sentence (23) collapses two phrases where -ne occurs with a human niishnaat ‘an expert’, as well as with an inanimate hevaal ‘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), lokshaahi ‘democracy’ (25), tritium (26), seva.
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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) Raj.e aa varše vahelaa keri aani
     .E this year early.FX mango-F-S bring.P-F-S
     'Raj brought mangoes early this year.'

(30b) Raj.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 Raj 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 Raj 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 Kahmadade Prabandhe,9 an old Gujarati work written by Padmanabha in 1466 (cf. Vyas 1953):

(31) (poatasaahi) vaac.i.au lekha sajaati kiidhii
ted.aav.i.aa sonaara kar.aav.i.uii mandidra (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 aani.i.aa (KP1: 17b)
'E foreigners-M-Pl bring.P.M-Pl
'Madhava brought foreigners.'

(33) Raami raaksasa 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; sajaati 'preparation' inanimate, feminine; mandidra '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', raaksasa 'demons'—have no marking on them.

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

(34) titti ... avagan.i.au Maadhava (KP 1: 13b)
h.e ignore.P.M-Pl (M-S)
'He ignored Madhava.'

(35) rati hattu avagan.i.au, maaahrau baadhayau Keavha han.i.au (KP 1: king.E 1.M-S ignore.P.M-Pl my brother (M-S) kill.P.M-Pl (13b)
'The king ignored me, (and) killed my brother Kesava.'

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 Kesava, and a pronoun hattu '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 Gujarati text does have instances such as (36):

(36) \textit{punyavanta.nai sohu nemai} \textsuperscript{(KP 1: 225b)}
\begin{center}
meritorious all salute
\end{center}
\begin{center}
‘Everyone salutes the meritorious ones.’
\end{center}

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

The proposed bifurcation of \textit{-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.\textsuperscript{10} Returning to the puzzling agreement with the object in (4b) and the default agreement in (6b):

(4b) \textit{Ki\text{	ext{\`{s}}}or.thi Ra\textit{\`{a}}j.ne n\textit{\`{a}}a p\textit{\`{a}}j\textit{\`{a}}v.a\textit{\`{a}}.y.o}
\begin{center}
.INS (M-S).ne not harass.PAS.P.M-S
\end{center}
\begin{center}
‘Kishor couldn’t harass Raj.’
\end{center}

(6b) \textit{Ki\text{	ext{\`{s}}}or.thi ka\text{\`{a}}g\text{\`{a}}l.ne n\textit{\`{a}}a od.na.y.\text{\`{a}}}
\begin{center}
.INS letter.ne not touch.PAS.P.gn
\end{center}
\begin{center}
‘Kishor couldn’t touch the letter.’
\end{center}

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 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 Bengelman, Bernard Comrie, Peter Hook, Bharati Modri, and Graham Thurgood for their comments and suggestions on earlier versions of this paper.

2. The following abbreviations are used in the glosses: Ag: Agentic; CAUS: Causative; D: Desiderative; E: Ergative; F: Feminine; Fu: 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 latav ‘bring’ (see 30b) as a special case of historical residue and shows others to fall into three classes: Equative (e.g., ban ‘become’), Cognitive (ban ‘study’ in 5), and Contact (af ‘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 -ene 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) Klíor aav.y.e
   (M-S) come.P.M-S
   ‘Kishor came...’

(ii) Klíor thi aav.a.y.na
   come.PAS.P.gn
   ‘Kishor could come...’

(iii) Klíor.naa aav.y.an.thi
   GEN come.P.FX.INS
   ‘By Kishor’s coming...’

aavyo in (i) represents a Gender-Number agreement, avaya in (ii) is a case of default agreement whereas aavac 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:
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(i)  
\[ Ra\_e \ chaap\_i \ kharid\_vaa.m\_t \ ha.t\_i \  
\]
\[ \text{E newspaper-N-S buy.Nom.GEN.N-S be.P.N-S} \]
\[ \text{"Raj had to buy the newspaper."} \]

(ii)  
\[ Ra\_e \ chaap\_i \ kharid\_vaa.no \ ha.t\_o \  
\]
\[ \text{(M-S) newspaper buy.Nom.GEN.M-S be.P.M-S} \]
\[ \text{"Raj also was going to buy the newspaper."} \]

In (i) the agreement is with the object chaap\_i ‘newspaper’ but in (ii) it is with the subject Ra\_i. The difference in agreement is correlated with the different nature of the marker on Ra\_i: 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 pan 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. Kaha\_a\_a Prabandha (KP) consists of four khanda (canto). The first two from which the examples are drawn consist of 255 and 168 couples. 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.
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In this paper, I will discuss the Garifuna language spoken in Belize, an island of St. Vincent, but its organization is different.

First, I will show how the Garifuna language uses canonical gender in a typology of gender.

1. The Garifuna

Garifuna distinguishes an animate noun, such as clothes, vehicles, animals, and fruits, and inanimate nouns, such as the sky.

According to Taylor, some gender categories like 

A. Child
B. Adult

c. Other categories like gender and number appear to be relevant.

Taylor acknowledges the following: