1 Experiencer Subjects

1.1 The Basic Schema

- typically marked dative (= case on the goal argument of a ditransitive)
- sentence initial
- does not trigger agreement

(1) a. Marathi (from Pandharipande (1990))
   ti-l¯a r¯ag al¯a
   she-dat. anger came
   ‘She got angry.’ (lit. Anger came to her)
b. Hindi
   Ram-ko niind aa gay-ii
   Ram-Dat sleep.f come GO-Pfv.f
   ‘Ram fell asleep.’ (lit. Sleep came to Ram.)

Argument is triggered by the other argument, which is non-overtly case marked.

Unlike most IA languages, Bhojpuri (and a dialect of Magahi) assign different cases to the experiencer subject and to the goal argument of a ditransitive.

(2) Bhojpuri (from Verma (1990))
   hamraa ii naa miilil
   I-Gen.Obl this not find
   ‘I did not find it.’ (Lit. It did not become found to me.)
b. Goal: hamraa ke ‘I.Gen.Obl Dat’
   hamraa ke da
   I-Gen.Obl Dat give
   ‘Give it to me.’

1.2 A classification of psych-verbs

(3) (from Belletti and Rizzi (1988), via Landau (2002))
a. Class I: Nominative experiencer, accusative theme
   John loves Mary.
b. Class II: Nominative theme, accusative experiencer
   The show amused Bill.
c. Class III: Nominative theme, dative experiencer
   The idea appealed to Julie.

Most Class II verbs are ambiguous between an agentive and a stative reading.

(4) (=Landau (2002):ex. 9)
a. The noise is scaring Mary right now.
b. John embarrassed Maggie (on purpose/unintentionally).

Hindi-internal diagnostic (potentially) ergative subject, dative/accusative experiencer

(5) Ram-ne/ havaa-ke jhoke-ne Mona-ko daraa di-yaa
   Ram-Erg air-Gen.Obl gust.Obl-Erg Mona-Acc/Dat scare GIVE-Pfv
   ‘Ram/a gust of wind scared Mona.’

Class III verbs can only be stative.

(6) (=Landau (2002):ex. 8)
a. The solution is occurring to Mary right now.
b. Bob (*deliberately) mattered to his boss.

Class III verbs in Indo-Aryan constitute the Experiencer subject construction.

(7) Sanjana-ko uttar suujh gayaa
   Sanja-Dat answer strike GO-Pfv
   ‘The answer occurred to Sanjana.’

The Indo-Aryan languages also have predicates from Class I.

(8) Samiir Kashmiri jaan-taa hai
    Samiir.m Kashmiri.f know-Hab.MSg be.Prs
    ‘Samiir knows Kashmiri.’
1.3 Landau (2002)’s Proposal

(9) Experiencers are mental locations i.e. locatives.

(10) a. All object experiencers are oblique (or dative).
    b. Experiencers undergo ‘locative inversion.’

Class III verbs are unaccusative.
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T/SM = Target/Subject Matter

2 Predicate Types

Only a limited class of verbs license dative subjects.

- certain modals: chaahiye ‘should/want’, paraa ‘compelled to’
- certain unaccusatives: dikh ‘appear’, mil ‘be found’
- certain nouns or adjectives alongwith a ‘light’ verb like ho ‘be’, aa ‘come’, lag ‘contact’.

2.1 ‘Possessive’ Structures

Schema: ‘NP-Dat N be’

These cases resemble structures that are used to mark possession.

(12) a. States of bodily condition
    Uma-ko sirdard hai  
    Uma-Dat headache be.Prs.Sg
    ‘Uma has a headache.’ (Lit. to Uma is a headache.)

b. Emotional States
    mujhe is baat-kaa bahut dukh hai  
    I.Dat this.Gen thing-gen great sadness be.Prs.Sg
    ‘I am very sad about this thing.’ (Lit. to me is great sadness about this thing.)

Other possessive structures in Hindi:

(13) a. Ordinary Possession
    Mona-ke-paas do scooter he  
    Mona-near two scooter be.Prs.Pl
    ‘Mona has two scooters.’

b. Inalienable Possession
    Mona-ke/-kaa ek larkaa hai  
    Mona-Gen.Obl/-Gen.MSg one boy be.Prs.Sg
    ‘Mona has a boy.’

2.2 ‘Canonical’ Structures

Schema: ‘NP-Dat NP-Nom Pred’

Based on the category of the Predicate, we can further subdivide the canonical structures.

(14) Pred = N

a. Mona-ko mE pasand hU:  
   Mona-Dat I like be.Prs.1Sg
   ‘Mona likes me.’ (Lit. to Mona, I am pleasing.)

b. Mona-ko sab baat thI:  
   Mona-Dat all things f memory be.Pst.FPl
   ‘Mona remembered everything.’

(15) Pred of unknown non-verbal category

Mona-ko yeh baat pataa thI:  
Mona-Dat this.things f known be.Pst.f that Sita f upset be.Prs.Sg
   ‘Mona knew that Sita is upset.’
a. **dikh-naa** ‘appear’
   mujhe Rina bazaar-me dikh-ii
   I.Dat Rina.f market-in see-Pfv.f
   ‘I saw Rina in the market.’ (Lit. Rina appeared to me in the market.)

b. **mil-naa** ‘be-found’
   mujhe park-me yeh gharii mil-ii
   I.dat park-in this watch.f find-Pfv.f
   ‘I found this watch in the park.’

c. **chaahiye** ‘want’
   mujhe khuub-saaraa paisaa chaahiye
   I.dat lots money want
   ‘I want lots of money.’

d. **lag-naa** ‘feel/find’, small clause complement
   mujhe [Laila mehnatii] lag-tii hai
   I.Dat Laila.f hardworking.f find-Hab.f be.Prs.Sg
   ‘I find/consider Laila hardworking.’

e. **lag-naa** ‘feel/find’, finite clause complement
   mujhe [Laila mehnatii] lag-taa hai [ki Laila mehnatii hai]
   I.Dat this find-Hab.MSg be.Prs.Sg that Laila.f hardworking.f be.Prs.Sg
   ‘I feel that Laila is hardworking.’

Other verbs in this class: **bhaa-naa** ‘please’, **suujh-naa** ‘strike’, ....

1 Also related are cases like *pasand aa-naa* ‘like come’, which means ‘come to like’, *yad aa-naa* ‘memory come’, which means ‘come to mind’, and *dikhai de-naa-par-naa* ‘be-visible give/fall’, which means ‘to see (involuntarily)’.  

i. a. Ramesh-ko Sita pasand nahii: aa-ii
   Ramesh-Dat Sita.f like Neg come.Pfv.f
   ‘Ramesh didn’t (come to) like Sita.’

b. achaanak Anoop-ko ek chhaayaar dikhai dii/paas-ii
   suddenly Anoop-Dat one shadow.f ‘visible’ give-Pfv.f/fell-Pfv.f
   ‘Suddenly, Anoop saw a shadow’ (Lit. Suddenly a shadow appeared to Anoop)

To this list could be added **aa** ‘come’, which takes both NP and infinitival complements.

**NP-Dat + N/Infinitive + aa ‘come’: ‘to know’**

a. N + aa ‘come’, where N denotes a body of knowledge
   Nina-ko mathematics/angrezii aa-tii hai
   Nina-Dat math.f/English.f come-Hab.f be.Prs.Sg
   ‘Nina knows mathematics/English.’

b. Infinitival clause + aa ‘come’
   Nina-ko [saikil chalaan-nii] aa-tii hai
   Nina-Dat cycle.f ride-Inf.f come-Hab.f be.Prs.Sg
   ‘Nina know how to ride a bicycle./Nina knows bicycle-riding.’

2.3 Modal Structures

Certain modal verbs also involve dative subjects. The relevant modals take infinitival complements and the dative marked subject seems to be the raised subject of the infinitival complement.

**NP-aa ‘come’**

1. infinital + *ho* ‘be’: ‘have to’
   Vikram-ko is saal do kitaabii likh-nii hii
   Vikram-Dat this.Obi year two books.f write-Inf.f be.Prs.Pl
   ‘Vikram has to write two books this year.’

b. infintiva + *chaahiye* ‘should’: ‘should’
   Vikram-ko is saal do kitaabii likh-nii chaahiyii
   Vikram-Dat this.Obi year two books.f write-Inf.f should.Pl
   ‘Vikram should write two books this year.’

c. infinital + *par* ‘fall’: ‘be compelled to’
   Vikram-ko is saal do kitaabii likh-nii par-i
   Vikram-Dat this.Obi year two books.f write-Inf.f fell-Pfv.FPl
   ‘Vikram had to/was compelled to write two books this year.’
The dative on the subject of these modal constructions seems to have a different character from other dative subject constructions. (cf. Masica (1990), Bhatt (1997)).

(20) a. yeh per kal kat-ne hE
   this tree.m tomorrow cut-INF.MPl be.Prs.Pl
   ‘These trees are to be cut tomorrow.’

b. is saal baarish ho-nii chaahiye thi
   this.Obl year rain.f be-INF.f should be.Pst.f
   ‘It should have rained this year.’

The option of not receiving dative marking is only available if the embedded infinitival predicate is an unaccusative.

2.4 Other Ways

While the dative subject is typically an experiencer, not all experiencers have to be marked dative.

(21) a. N + aa ‘come’, where N denotes a body of knowledge
   Ravi-ko mathematics/angrezii/*Lila aa-tii hai
   Ravi-Dat math.f/English.f/Lila.f come-Hab.f be.Prs.Sg
   ‘Tony knows mathematics/English/*Lila.’

b. jaan ‘know’
   Ravi Nina-ko/mathematics/angrezii jaan-taa hai
   Ravi.M Nina-Acc/math.f/English.f know-Hab.MSg be.Prs.Sg
   ‘Ravi knows Nina/English/mathematics.’

3 Subjecthood and Licensing

Let us now focus on dative subject constructions like the following.

(22) Schema: NP-Dat NP-Nom Predicate

a. Mona-ko mE pasand hu:
   Mona-Dat I like.MPl be.Prs.1Sg
   ‘Mona likes me.’ (Lit. to Mona, I am pleasing.)

b. mujhe Rina bazaar-me dikh-ii
   I.Dat Rina.f market-in see-Pfv-f be.Prs.2Pl
   ‘I saw Rina in the market.’ (Lit. Rina appeared to me in the market.)

● Where is the dative argument licensed?

● Is the dative argument a subject?

● Is the non-dative argument a subject or a direct object?

Unlike direct objects, the non-dative argument cannot take the overt accusative marker ko.

(23) a. Dative Subject construction:
   *Mona-ko mujhe pasand hai
   Mona-Dat I-Dat like.MPl be.Prs.Sg
   ‘Mona likes me.’

b. Transitive verb:
   Mona-ko mujhe/*mE dekh-aa hai/*hu:
   Mona-Erg I.Dat/I see-Pfv be.Prs.Sg/*be.Prs.1Sg
   ‘Mona has seen me.’

Unlike direct objects, the non-dative argument also triggers person agreement.
   → hence the label ‘Nominative’.

3.1 The Question of Licensing

Unlike ergative case, which is licensed only in the presence of perfective aspect, dative subjects are compatible with any tense-aspect combination.

(24) Different Tense-Aspect Combinations

a. Past, Past and Present Perfective
   Sita-ko tum pasand aa-ye the/ho
   Sita-Dat you.Pl like come-Pfv.MPl be.Pst.MPl/be.Prs.2Pl
   ‘Sita liked/had liked/has liked you.’

b. Past and Present Habitual
   Sita-ko tum pasand aa-te the/ho
   Sita-Dat you.Pl like come-Hab.MPl be.Pst.MPl/be.Prs.2Pl
   ‘Sita used to like/likes you.’

c. Future
   Sita-ko tum pasand aa-oge
   Sita-Dat you.2Pl like come-Fut.2Pl
   ‘Sita will like you.’
They can also appear in infinitival clauses.

(25) (from Hook (1990))
   a. [tumhaaraa har-kisi-ko pasand aa-naa] nishchit nahì: you-Gen everyone-Dat like come-Inf definite Neg
      ‘It is not definite that everyone will like you.’
   b. mÊ [un-logbagai ko pasand aa-naa] nah: chaah-taa you.Dat everyone-Dat like come-Inf want Hab.MSg
      ‘I don’t want those people to like me.’

The above facts motivate the proposal in Davison (2003) that dative case on experiencers is a Lexical case.

3.2 Tests for Subjecthood

Subjecthood is a problematic concept in the Indo-Aryan languages. Many subjecthood tests seem to actually target agethood and/or nominative case.

3.2.1 Some non-tests
   * sentence initiality - putatively for treating the Dative NP as a subject, against treating the Nominative NP as a subject.
   * agreement - putatively against treating the Dative NP as a subject, for treating the Nominative NP as a subject.
   * nominative case - putatively against treating the Dative NP as a subject, for treating the Nominative NP as a subject.
     - the points concerning agreement and nominative case are really the same.

3.2.2 Control into Adjuncts

The agent controls the subject of an adjunct (conjunctive participial) clause.

(26) a. Vinod-ne, Sita-ko [PRO/aa, khirkii khol-kar] bulaa-yaayaa
       Vinod-Erg Sita-Acc window.f open-PART call-Pfv
       ‘Having opened the window, Vinod called Sita.’
       (NOT: Vinod called Sita after she had opened the window.)
   b. Non-overt Passive agent can control:
       Sita-ko [PRO/aa, khirkii khol-kar] bulaa-yaayaa gayaa
       Sita-Acc window open-PART call-Pfv Pass-Pfv

   3See Cardona (1976) for a statement of the problematic aspects of the notion ‘subject’ in the context of Sanskrit.

   ‘Sita was called (by x) after x had opened the window.’

The Dative NP can control the subject of the adjunct.

(27) (from Hook (1990))
   a. Finite transitive clause:
      Ravi-ne Billu-ko piit-aa
      Ravi-Erg Billu-Acc beat-Pfv
      ‘Ravi beat Billu.’
   b. Infinitive:
      [Ravi-kaa Billu-ko piit-naa] aascharyajanak hai
      Ravi-Gen Billu-Acc beat Inf surprising be.Prs.Sg
      ‘Ravi’s beating Billu is surprising.’

In fact, only the Dative NP can control the subject of the adjunct.

(28) mujhe, Sita, [PRO/aa, khirkii khol-kar] yaad aa-ii
    I.Dat Sita.f window.f open-PART memory come-Pfv.f
    ‘After I had opened the window, Sita came to my mind.’
    (NOT: After she has opened the window, Sita came to my mind.)

These results are curious given that the Dative argument isn’t particularly agentive.

3.2.3 Behaviour in Infinitival Clauses: Infinitival Subjects

Typically it is the subject that receives genitive case in infinitival clauses.

(29) a. Finite transitive clause:
       Ravi-ne Billu-ko piit-aa
       Ravi-Erg Billu-Acc beat-Pfv
       ‘Ravi beat Billu.’
   b. Infinitive:
       [Ravi-kaa Billu-ko piit-naa] aascharyajanak hai
       Ravi-Gen Billu-Acc beat Inf surprising be.Prs.Sg
       ‘Ravi’s beating Billu is surprising.’

In Dative Subject constructions, it is the nominative argument that appears in the genitive.

(30) (from Hook (1990))
   a. Finite:
      tum har-kisi-ko pasand nahì: aa-ye
      you.PI everyone-Dat like Neg come-Pfv.MPI
      ‘Everyone didn’t like you.’
   b. Infinitival:
      [tumhaaraa har-kisi-ko pasand aa-naa] nishchit nahì:
      you-Gen everyone-Dat like come-Inf definite Neg
      ‘It is not definite that everyone will like you.’
3.2.4 Behaviour in Infinitival Clauses: Control into the Clause

Typically it is the subject that becomes the null ‘PRO’ subject in infinitival clauses, irrespective of whether the predicate is transitive or unaccusative.

(31) a. Finite transitive clause:
   Ravi-ne Billu-ko piīt-aa
   Ravi-Erg Billu-Acc beat-Pfv
   ‘Ravi beat Billu.’

   b. Control into infinitival transitive clause:
   Ravi-ne [PRO, Billu-ko piīt-naa] chaah-aa
   Ravi-Erg Billu-Acc beat-Inf want-Pfv
   ‘Ravi wanted to beat Billu.’

   c. Finite unaccusative clause:
   Ravi m Billu-se Billu-Instr pit. beat
   ‘Ravi was beaten by Billu.’
   (Note: this is not a passive, despite the translation.)

   d. Control into infinitival unaccusative clause:
   Ravi [PRO, Billu-se piīt-naa] chaah-taa hai
   Ravi.m Billu-Instr beat-Inf want-Hab.MSG be.Prs.Sg
   ‘Ravi wants to be beaten by Billu.’

In Dative Subject constructions, it is the nominative argument that is controlled in an infinitival clause.

(32) (from Hook (1990):322)

   a. Finite Dative Subject Clause:
      mē un-logū-ko pasand naḥt: aa-yaa
      I.Sg those-people-Dat like Neg come-Pfv.MSG
      ‘Those people did not like me.’

   b. Control into infinitival dative subject clause:
      mē [un-logū-ko pasand aa-naa] naḥt: chaah-taa
      I those-people-Dat like come-Inf Neg want-Hab.MSG
      ‘I don’t want those people to like me.’

   * These tests are really tests concerning case-licensing, in particular licensing of the nominative.

3.2.5 Binding: Coreference

Reflexive anaphors in Hindi are (for most speakers) subject oriented.

(33) (Subject and Agent are identical.)
   Mona-ne, Tina-ko [apnii, beṭii] di-i
   Mona-Erg Tona-Dat self’s.f book.f give-Pfv.f
   ‘Mona gave Tina her book.’

When the agent and ‘subject’ are distinct, they can both bind.

(34) (from Hook (1990):322)

   a. Passive Agent binds anaphor in Passive Subject
      pitaa-se [apnii, beṭii] sasuraal bhej-ii naḥt: gayii
      father-Instr self’s.f daughter in-laws-house send-Pfv.f Neg Pass-Pfv
      ‘Father cannot bring himself to send his daughter to her in-laws’ house.’

   b. Passive Subject binds anaphor in an object
      Balban-ko [apnii pad]-se haṭṭaa di-yaa gayaa
      Balban-Acc self’s.M.Obl post-from give-Pfv.MSG
      ‘Balban was removed from his post.’

   * These tests are really tests concerning case-licensing, in particular licensing of the nominative.

In Dative Subject constructions, both the dative NP and the nominative NP can bind into each other.

(35) (from Hook (1990):322)

   a. Dative binds into Nominative:
      mujhe [apnii, sab rishtedaar] pasand hē
      I.Dat self’s.MPI all relatives.M like be.Prs.Pl
      ‘I like all my relatives.’

   b. Nominative binds into Dative:
      lekin mē [apnii, sab rishtedaar]-ko pasand naḥt: hū:
      but I self’s.Obl all relatives-Dat like Neg be.Prs.1Sg
      ‘but I am not liked by all my relatives.’

      (word order does not change the binding relationships)

The Nominative argument can bind the Dative argument:

(36) (from Hook (1990):323)

   a. Nominative binds Dative:
      ham ek-duusre-ko, pasand hē
      we each-other-Dat like be.Prs.Pl
      ‘We like each other.’
b. Dative binds Nominative: (cited as grammatical by Hook, generally judged *)
   ‘ham-kochen ek-diusraa pasand hai
   we-Dat each-other like be.Prs
   ‘We like each other.’

(36b) is taken to be bad because Hindi lacks nominative anaphors. Kashmiri does not have such a restriction, and such bindings are possible there.

(37) (Kashmiri, from Wali and Koul (1997):12b)
   malaayi chu panun pan pasand
   Mala-dat is self’s self like
   ‘Mala likes herself.’

3.2.6 Binding: Disjoint Reference

Subjects in Hindi trigger obviation on pronominal possessors. (for similar facts in Danish see Vikner (1985), for Norwegian: Hestvik (1992), and for Russian: Avrutin (1994))

(39) a. Ram-ne [us-kii/sx] kitaab} parh-ii
   Ram-Erg s/he-Gen.f book.f read-Pfv.f
   ‘Ram, read his/sj book.’ [inside object]

   Malini, met Sanjana-with self’s Obl Dem.Obl-Gen.Obl home-in met-Pfv.f
   ‘Malini, met Sanjana at self’s/his/her home.’ [inside adjunct]

Saxena (1985) and Yamabe (1990) note that dative subjects do not trigger such effects.

(40) (from Davison (2003))
   Mohan-Dat self’s.Pl/he-Gen.f.Pl mother-father memory come-Pfv.MPl
   ‘Mohan, remembered his/oj parents.’

A similar point can be made for the relevant nominative argument.

(41) Ram, [apne, rishtedaaro-ko] [apnii/oj, us-kiii, harkaat-o-ki-vajah-se pasand
   Ram self’s.Obl relatives-Dat self’s/he-Gen.f activities-Gen.f.due-to like nahii hai
   Neg be.Prs.Sg
   ‘Ram is not liked by his relatives because of his activities.’

3.2.7 Weak Crossover

Scrambling is known to amnesty weak crossover violations. (for Hindi cf. Mahajan (1990), Gurttu (1992), Srivastav (1994), Kidwai (2000) a.o.)

(42) a. *[us-kii, behin]-ne [har/kis] larkel-ko, dekh-aa he-Gen.f sister-Dat every/which Obl boy.Obl-Acc see-Pfv
   ‘His, sister saw every boy,’
   ‘Which boy, did his, sister see t?’

b. [har/kis larkel]-ko, [us-kii/sx] behin]-ne dekh-aa every/which Obl boy.Obl-Acc he-Gen.f sister-Dat see-Pfv
   ‘Every boy, was seen by his sister.’
   ‘Which boy was seen by his sister?’

Scrambling of the nominative argument over the dative argument does not seem to have a similar effect.

(43) (from Reese (2002))
   a. *[us-kii, behin]-ko [har/kaun-saat aadmi]-ne pasand hai
      he-Gen.f sister-Dat every/which man.m like be.Prs.Sg
      ‘His, sister likes every man,’
      ‘Which man, does his, sister like t?’

b. ???/*)[har/kaun-saat aadmi], [us-kii, behin]-ko pasand hai every/which man.m he-Gen.f sister-Dat like be.Prs.Sg
   ‘Every man, is liked by his sister.’
   ‘Which man, is liked by his sister?’

The relevant meaning would be conveyed by using an anaphor instead of a pronoun:

(44) [har/kaun-saat aadmi], [apnii/oj] behin]-ko pasand hai every/which man.m self’s/he-Gen.f.sister-Dat like be.Prs.Sg
   ‘Every man, is liked by his sister.’
   ‘Which man, is liked by his sister?’

3.2.8 Binding: Coreference vs. Binding

Pronominal possessors may corefer with the dative subject. However, binding seems dispreferred.

(45) (from Reese (2002))
   a. Pronoun: free, strict, *sloppy
      sif Ram-kochen, us-kii/oj behin]-ne pasand hai
      only Ram-Dat Dem.Obl-Gen.f sister.f like be.Prs
      Reading 1: Only Ram, likes his, sister. (free)
      Reading 2: Only Ram is such that he likes Ram’s sister. (strict)
      Unavailable Reading 3: Only Ram has the self-sister liking property. (sloppy)

sirfRam-ko, apni/sister.f like be.Prs

Reading 1: Only Ram has the self-sister liking property. (sloppy)

Unavailable Reading 2: Only Ram, likes his, sister. (free)

Unavailable Reading 3: Only Ram is such that he likes Ram’s sister. (strict)

(46) Binding by QP/Wh-XPs (from Reese (2002))

a. pronominal possessors:

[har/kis aadmii-ko] us-ki/sister.f like be.Prs

‘Every/which man, loves his/sister(?)’

b. anaphoric possessors:

[har/kis aadmii-ko] apni/sister.f like be.Prs

‘Every/which man, loves his/sister(?)’

4 Steps towards an analysis

Davison (2003)’s proposal: both the dative and the nominative arguments are equidistant from [Spec,TP], and so either can be raised there. The raised argument behaves like a subject i.e. binds reflexives, obviates pronouns.

Some problems:

- Ability to simultaneously bind an anaphor and a pronoun. (cf. 41).
- Nothing said about the ability of the dative argument to control into adjuncts. [and the corresponding inability of the nominative]3

What an alternate proposal should capture:

Dative argument (but not the nominative argument) controls. Both can bind anaphors in the other. Both can corefer with pronominal possessors inside the other. Neither can bind pronominal possessors in the other.
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