

SOME NON-NOMINATIVE SUBJECT CONSTRUCTIONS IN ORIYA
B N PATNAIK
DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY KANPUR

DEPARTMENT OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY KANPUR
KANPUR-208016
INDIA
E-MAIL: patnaik@iitk.ac.in

SOME NON-NOMINATIVE SUBJECT CONSTRUCTIONS IN ORIYA

B.N.Patnaik
Indian Institute of Technology Kanpur

This paper is about some constructions of Oriya with non-nominative subjects.¹ As far as I know, neither the traditional nor the modern grammars of Oriya have paid due attention to these constructions, with the possible exception of the so-called “dative subject” construction, which has received some attention in the generative linguistic studies of the language.² From a study of the relevant literature one gets the impression that the only construction in Oriya that has a non-nominative subject is the dative subject construction. The present paper lists some Oriya constructions that have non-nominative subjects and provides information about some of their syntactic properties. It is divided into three sections: the first lists some constructions which have non-nominative subjects, and provides some basic information about them, using the terminology of generative grammar, the second is about how the subjects of the nominative and the non-nominative subject constructions compare with respects to some of the well known “subject” features and the third deals with two non-nominative subject constructions which appear to have some unexpected features.

I

Consider the following:

- (1) raamaku mithaai bhala laage
Ram-dat --- sweetmeat-nom --- good --- feel-agr-pr
(Ram likes sweets.)
- (2) raamaku raati adhara bhoka laage
Ram-dat --- night middle-in --- hunger-nom --- feel-agr-pr
(Ram feels hungry at midnight.)
- (3) raamaku jibaaku heba / padiba
Ram-dat --- go (compulsion) -non fin-acc(?) --- be-fut / fall-fut
(Ram will have to go.)

The subject in each case is *raama*, which carries the dative postposition and following the familiar terminology, this construction is called here the “dative subject” construction. The verb agrees with the nominative nominal; in Oriya verbal agreement is with the nominative nominal, with (6) providing possibly the sole exception to it. The predicates in the first two are predicates of experience, and the predicate of the main clause of (3) is one of compulsion. The subject of each of these is “experiencer” in some sense of the term.

Consider now the following examples:

- (4) taara tike jara heici
 he-gen --- a little --- fever --- be-perf-pr
 (He has a little fever.)
- (5) mora taara apada
 I-gen --- he-gen --- not in talking terms
 (I and he are not in talking terms.)
- (6) tamara taara kuaade jaaithila?
 you-gen --- he-gen --- where --- go-agr-perf-pst
 (Where had you and he gone?)

In (5) and (6) each the subject is a conjoined NP and in (4) – (6) each the subject is in the genitive. The occurrence of the genitive marker in both the NPs *mora taara* in (5) and *tumara taara* in (6) performs the function of conjunction. Languages such as Sanskrit and Tamil also use this device of conjoining: Tamil: *avalum avanum* she-conj he-conj “she and he”; Sanskrit: *saca saaca* he-conj she-conj “he and she.” Oriya has alternative devices for conjoining too, for example, the use of a lexical conjunction between the relevant entities. The sentence (4) has an experiencer subject, and the same could perhaps be said of the constitutive NPs of the subject of (5). The constitutive NPs in the subject expression in (6) are agentive. The construction (4) has a variant in which the subject is in the dative form --- *taaku* --- with the rest of the construction remaining unchanged. In informal Oriya, (5) seems to have a version in which the constitutive NPs are in the nominative: *mu sie apada* (I-nom --- he-nom --- ...) (or, perhaps, better, *sie mu apada*). With respect to (6), it indeed has a version in which the constitutive NPs are in the nominative and are conjoined by the lexical conjunction *aa* (and): *tume aa sie kuaade jaaithila?* (you-nom --- and --- he-nom --- ...). Even the explicit marker of conjunction need not occur: *tume sie kuaade jaaithila* is grammatical and is more likely occur in semi-formal discourse than formal. Incidentally it must be clarified that the verb form here is not a frozen one, not a case of the so-called “neutral” agreement, which fact is evident from the verb form in the following, which has a different subject: *taara taara kuaade jaaithile* (“where did he and he go?”).

Turning to a different set of examples, we invite attention to the following:

- (7) semaane raamaku budhdhimaan (boli) manekaranti
 they-nom --- Ram-acc --- intelligent --- (comp) --- consider-agr-pr
 (They consider Ram intelligent.)
- (8) semaane (sei) patharaku debata (boli) manekaranti
 they-nom --- (that) --- stone-acc --- god --- (comp) --- consider-agr-pr
 (They consider (the) stone to be a god.)

To be noted about the above, which are instances of the so-called ECM construction, are the following: firstly, there is a version of each of these sentences which contains, at the first approximation, the complementizer, *boli*, which ordinarily selects a tensed complement clause. This would suggest that the subject of the embedded clause can be assigned accusative Case even when there is a lexical subordinator present. Secondly, the

embedded clause is without copula, which feature is characteristic of the predicative constructions of the language: when the tense is simple present, the copula is not present, and naturally, there is no morphological realization of tense, which receives the interpretation assigned to simple present tense by the relevant rule of interpretation. As far as the present constructions are concerned, in which the copula-less clause is embedded, the tense of the embedded construction receives the same interpretation as does the tense of the main clause --- if the main clause tense was past, then the tense of the embedded clause would have been interpreted as past, in which case the meaning of this version of (7) --- *semaane raamaku buddhimaan (boli) manekaruthile* --- would have been that once upon a time (before, say, Ram's accident) they thought Ram was intelligent, but they do not regard him as such now. Thirdly, the postposition *ku* must always occur with the subject of the embedded clause, irrespective of whether the subject is definite and specific, or generic. Contrary to the generally held view that the accusative Case in Oriya must be spelt out (and spelt out as *ku*), when the direct object is definite and specific, there is K.B.Tripathy's view that the accusative Case has no morphological realization, the postposition *ku* being unrelated to Case and being only the definiteness and specificity marker. Consider (9) in this regard:

- (9) *semaane raastaru pathara uthaauthile*
 they-nom --- road-loc --- stone-acc --- pick up- prog-agr-pst
 (They were picking up stones from the road.)
- (10) *semaane jhia dekhuchanti*
 they-nom --- girl-acc --- see-prog-agr-pr
 (They are seeing girls (for matrimonial alliance).)
- (11) *semaane jhiaku dekhile*
 they-nom --- girl-acc --- see-agr-pst
 (They saw the girl.)

The object *pathara*, which is indefinite, receives accusative Case and there is no morphological realization of the same in (9). The same is true of the indefinite nominal *jhia*, which is the direct object, in (10). Since the direct object is definite in (11), it occurs with *ku*. The construction (8), then, is interesting because the embedded subject is generic, and yet it has the accusative postposition / definiteness marker.

Consider now the following examples:

- (12) *semaanankara sethaaku jibaa uchit*
 they-gen --- there-loc---go-nominalizer --- desirable
 (Their going there is desirable.)
- (13) *taara jara heithibaa khabara micha*
 he-gen --- fever --- be-nominalizer --- news --- false
 (The news of his suffering from fever is false.)

The genitive marker is attached to the subject of the nominalized clausal complement in each case. However each of these embedded clauses has a variant in which there is no genitive marker with the subject. The (agentive) subject of the embedded clause,

semaane, of this variant of (12), namely, *semaane sethaaku jibaa uchit*, is in the nominative, with the rest of the sentence unchanged.³ Similarly, the (experiencer) subject, *taaku*, of the embedded clause of the variant of (13), namely, *taaku jara heithibaa khabara micha*, is in the dative, with, again, the rest of the sentence being the same as (13).⁴

Consider now the following:

- (14) *taankara mantra uccaarana*
he-gen --- mantra --- chanting
(his chanting (of) the mantras)
- (15) *satrura nidhana*
enemy-gen --- death
(enemy's death)

Each of these nominal expressions has a derived nominal as its head, and each has a subject --- the subject (14) is agentive, and that of the next is experiencer. The presence of the genitive marker is obligatory; substitution of *se* (he-nom) for *taankara* in (14) and of *satru* (enemy-nom) in (15) would yield ungrammatical expressions.

Attention may be drawn to the fact that of all the non-nominative subject constructions listed above, (7) and (8), the ECM constructions, without the complementizer *boli*, appear to have come into the language on account of its contact with English; there seem to be no instances of such constructions in the language prior to its contact with English --- it is not that ECM constructions did not occur, all the ECM constructions one finds contain the complementizer *boli*. What Oriya, in all probability, did not have, prior to its contact with English, and came to have, after the contact, is (7i), and what it had, and continues to have is (7ii):

- (7i) *semaane raamaku budhdhimaan manekaranti*
(7ii) *semaane raamaku budhdhimaan boli manekaranti*

II

This section is concerned with the ways the nominative and the non-nominative subjects in Oriya differ with respect to agreement, anaphor-antecedent relation, control, etc., which are generally considered to be subject properties.

As far as subject-verb agreement is concerned, the verb does not show agreement with a non-nominative subject:

- (16) *mu / aame taaku bhala paae / paau*
I-nom / we-nom --- he/she -acc --- like-1ps / 1pl
(I / We like him / her.)
- (17) *mote / aamaku se bhala laage*
I-dat / we-dat / he / she-nom --- feel-good-3ps -pr

(I / we like him / her.)

Barring the so-called dative subject construction, where agreement is with the non-subject nominative NP, finite clauses alone in this language show agreement and have nominative subjects, although the converse is not true, that is, the nominative subject is not restricted to the finite clause. As already noted, (12) has a version, (12i), which does not have a finite verb, but has a nominative subject. (13) has a semantically analogous version, (13i), which has a nominative subject, but has a non-finite verb.

(12i) *semaane sethaaku jibaa uchit*

(13i) *se jarare padithibaa khabara micha*

he-nom --- fever-loc --- fall-perf-nominalizer --- news --- false

The nominalizing participle assigns (or checks --- the present paper does not concern itself with the question of choice between the two, and uses these as though these are non-distinct) nominative Case in the above. At least some participles, such as the nominalizing and the conditional, assign nominative Case to the subject. Although not in modern Oriya, there are instances of non-finite --- the verb is without agreement morphology, as a consequence ---matrix clauses which contain nominative subjects in this language. Such instances of non-finite participles assigning nominative Case can be found in texts belonging to as late as the sixteenth century at least (with very little information available regarding the diachronic syntax of Oriya, one is not certain as to until what time non-finite matrix clauses had nominative subjects). Consider the following (Kar (1986,p.76) from *Rudra Sudhaanidhi*, presumably a sixteenth century text, in which the subject *jyotieka* is in the nominative, and the verb is non-finite (the finite form is *hela* --- be-past tense- agreement).

(18) ... *jyotieka prakaasha hoi*

(... illumination-SG numeral-nom --- manifest --- be-part)

(An illumination was (became) manifest.)

If there are elements other than AGR that assign nominative Case, there is at least one instance where AGR does not assign nominative Case. It is an interesting one in which the subject NP is in the non-nominative Case (Oriya has just two Cases, if one is looking at its case system from the point of view of the *Principles and Parameters* grammars: nominative and non-nominative, or oblique), but the verb shows agreement --- sentence (6) above. In *tumara taara*, *ra* is the (genitive) postposition that has assigned oblique Case to *tume* and *se* respectively, which accounts for the morphological form that these entities have. It is as though assignment of Case to *tume* and *se* is delayed till the agreement process is over.⁵

With respect to antecedenthood, non-nominative subjects in Oriya can be antecedents of anaphors as can be the nominative subjects.

- (19) *se nijaku darpanare dekhilaa*
 he-nom --- self-acc --- mirror-pp --- see-agr-pst
 (He saw himself in the mirror.)
- (20) *semaane nijaku / nija(ku) nija ku / parasparaku darpanare dekhile*
 they-nom --- self-acc / self (acc) self-acc / each other-acc --- see-agr-pst
 (They saw themselves / each other in the mirror.)
- (21) *se nija asaabadhanataaru jara bhoguci*
 he-nom --- self-gen --- carelessness-pp --- fever --- suffer-agr-prog-pr
 (He is suffering from fever for his carelessness.)

In (19) and (20), the subject has the agentive theta role, and in (21), the experiencer. The subject is in the nominative in each, and is the antecedent of the anaphor in each case. (The sentence (20) in its second option of the direct object translates better into “each of them saw himself in the mirror”--- this is one of the interpretations of the sentence, which is ambiguous, at least for some. The use of the so-called accusative postposition *ku* with the first occurrence of the reflexive element is dialectal, and this anaphor is reminiscent of its close counterpart *oruvarai oruvarai* --- one-acc- one-acc in Tamil.)

Consider the following:

- (22) *semaananku nija(ra) / nija(ra) nija(ra) / parasparara lekhaa bhala laage*
 they-dat --- self(gen) / self(gen) self(gen) / each other-gen --- writings good feel-agr-pr
 (They like their / Each of them likes his own / They like each others’ writings.)
- (23) *se / taara nija gaadire ete dura jibaa thik heba ki?*
 He-nom / he-gen --- self-gen --- vehicle-pp --- this --- distance --- go-nominalizer --- correct --- be-pr --- Q-morpheme)
 (Will his going that distance in his own vehicle be right?)
- (24) *nija gunaru taara / taaku baarambaara jara heuci*
 self --- fault-pp --- he-gen / he-dat --- very often --- fever --- be-agr-prog-pr
 (He is falling sick very frequently because of his own fault.)
- (25) *taankara taankara nija nija strimananka hetu sabubele apada*
 he-honf-gen --- he-honf-gen --- self-gen self-gen ---wife-pl-gen-pp --- always --- not-in-talking terms
 (They (he and he) are never in talking terms because of their respective wives.)
- (26) *semaanankara parasparaprati ghruna*
 they-gen --- each other-pp --- hatred
 (their hatred towards each other)

The above (22-26) show that non-nominative subjects can also be antecedents of anaphors, and the sentences (19)-(26) show that irrespective of whether the subject is nominative or non-nominative, the binding of the anaphor by the antecedent must satisfy the same structural requirements, namely, c-command and locality. As regards the familiar fact of possessive reflexive-possessive pronoun alternation, the alternation is unrelated to whether the antecedent subject is nominative (27) or non-nominative (28)-

(30). (28) is a dative subject construction, the embedded clause of (29) is the complement clause of the head noun *kathaa*, and (30) is an NP with a derived nominal as its head.

(27) *samaya aasilaa, jetebele raajaa satyabrata nija / taanka uparu biswaasa haraai basile*
time --- came ---, when --- king --- Satyabrata-nom --- self-gen / he-honf-gen-pp ---
confidence ---

lose-non-finite --- sit-agr-pst

(Time came, when the king Satyabrata lost faith on himself.)

(28) *samaya aasilaa, jetebele raajaa satyabratanku nija / taanka raja praasaada aswastikara laagilaa*

(-----) Satyabrata-honf-dat --- self-gen / he-honf-gen --- royal ---

palace --- uncomfortable --- feel-agr-pst

(Time came, when the king Satyabrata felt uncomfortable in his royal palace.)

(29) *satyabratankara dhire dhire nija / taanka maanasika santolana haraai basuthibaa kathaa raani bujhi paaruthile*

Satyabrata-honf-gen --- slowly --- slowly --- self-gen / he-gen --- mental --- balance

--- lose-non-finite --- sit-prog-nominalizer --- fact --- queen --- understand- non-

finite --- can-prog-pst

(The queen could realize Satyabrata's losing his mental balance slowly.)

(30) *taara nija / taa lekhaa bishayare cintaa*

he-gen --- self-gen / he-gen --- writing -pp --- anxieties

(his anxieties about his writing)

Incidentally, the language allows the co-occurrence of the possessive pronoun and the possessive reflexive both. Each of the above has a grammatical version in which the possessive pronoun and the possessive reflexive can both be used in that sequence (*taanka nija* in (28) and (29), and *taa(ra) nija* in (30), this last being somewhat inelegant because of the contiguity of two almost identical words *taara taa(ra) nija*. But being a matter of language use rather than of language structure, it need not concern us here.) in the place of the possessive reflexive or the possessive pronoun.

Turning to the control constructions, both nominative and non-nominative subjects can be antecedents of PRO, which is as expected, given the binding facts already mentioned. Consider the following:

(31) *se pratidina naire gaadhoibaaku jaae.*

he-nom --- everyday --- river-pp --- bathe-nominalizer-pp (purp) --- go-agr-pr

(Everyday he goes to the river to bathe.)

(32) *taaku pratidina naire gaadhoibaaku pade*

he-dat --- everyday --- river-pp --- bathe-nominalizer-acc --- have-to-pr

(He has to bathe in the river everyday.)

(33) *taara pratidina naire gaadhoibaaru jara heuci*

he-gen --- everyday --- river-pp --- bathe-nominalizer-pp (causal) --- fever --- be-

prog-pr

(He has fever everyday on account of bathing in the river.)

(34) *taara gangaa snaana karibaa(ra) ichchaa*

he-gen --- Ganga- bathing --- do-nominalizer-(gen) --- desire
(his desire to bathe in the Ganga)

The PRO subject of the embedded clause in each of (31)-(33) has the matrix subject as its antecedent. The matrix subject of (31) is in the nominative, whereas the matrix subjects of the remaining two are in the non-nominative. (34) is an NP, the head of which is the derived nominal *ichcha* and the PRO subject of the clause in the complement position has the subject of the NP, namely, *taara*, which is non-nominative, as its antecedent.

Consider now the conjunctive participial construction. The embedded clause is non-finite and the subject of the embedded clause is either PRO or the nominative subject, the former being the clearly preferred case, and the subject of the matrix clause, which is coindexed with the subject of the embedded clause, can be nominative or non-nominative. Consider the following:

- (35) khaai saari / kari se soilaa
eat-non-finite --- complete-non-finite / do-non-fin --- he-nom --- sleep-agr-pst
(Finishing eating, he slept.)
- (36) barsaare kheli taara jara hela
rains-pp --- play-non-fin --- he-gen --- fever --- be-agr-pst
(Playing in the rains, he got fever.)
- (37) paani pii taaku tiki bhala laagilaa
(water --- drink-non-fin --- he-dat --- somewhat --- good --- feel-pst
(Drinking some water, he felt somewhat comfortable.)
- (38) aakhi buji taara raastaare calibaa gotae abhyaasa hoi galaani
eyes --- close-non-fin --- he-gen --- road-pp --- walk-nominalizer --- one --- habit
--- become-non-fin --- go-perf-prs
(Closing eyes, his walking on the road, has become a habit =
It has become a habit with him to walk with eyes closed.)
- (39) aakhi buji taara raastaare calibaara abhyaasa
eyes --- close-non-fin --- he-gen --- road-pp --- walk-nominalizer-gen --- habit
(his habit of walking on the road with eyes closed)
- (40) mu dina saaraa barsaare buli mate / mora tiki jara hei jaaici
I-nom --- day --- whole --- rain-pp --- walk-non-finite --- I-dat / I-gen --- little ---
fever --- be-non-fin --- go-perf-prs
(Walking in the rains throughout the day, I have got some fever.)

The conjunctive participle clause precedes the embedding one in each of the above, and the subject of the former in (35) – (39) each is PRO, and that of (40) is lexical, although it can be substituted by PRO. In fact, as already noted, this substitution would yield an elegant version of (40). The subject of the embedding clause is nominative in (35) and non-nominative in the rest.

Turning to the conjoined structures, it is well known that conjoined sentences constitute conjuncts of the same syntactic type, and when both the conjuncts have the same subject,

the subject of the second one is phonologically null in the elegant version of the conjoined sentence. Consider the following:

- (41) se gita gaaibaaku o gita sunibaaku bhala paae
 he-nom --- song-acc --- sing-non-fin-acc --- conj --- song-acc --- hear-
 non-fin-acc --- good --- get-agr-prs
 (He likes to sing songs and listen to songs.)
- (42) taaku gita gaaibaaku o gita sunibaaku bhala laage
 he-dat --- song-acc --- sing-non-fin-acc --- conj --- song-acc --- hear-
 non-fin-acc --- good --- feel-agr-prs
 (He likes to sing songs and listen to songs.)
- (43)*se gita gaaibaaku bhala paae o gita sunibaaku bhala laage
 he-nom --- song-acc --- sing-non-fin-acc --- good --- get-agr-prs --- conj ---
 song-acc --- sing-non-fin-acc --- good --- feel-agr-prs
 (He likes to sing and singing appeals to him.)

In each of these three sentences each conjunct is a complex clause containing an embedded clause with PRO as subject, the antecedent of which is the subject of the embedding clause --- a matter that is of no direct relevance to the present discussion and as such merits no further mention here. What is to be noted is that in the second conjunct in each instance there is an empty element in the subject position, PRO, whose antecedent is the subject of the first conjunct. In (42), both the conjuncts are the so-called dative subject constructions, as evident from their verbs, which is not the case with (41) and (43). In the latter, the second of the conjuncts is the dative subject construction, whereas the first is not; in other words, the two conjuncts are not of the same syntactic type. This is why (43) is ungrammatical --- it is not ungrammatical because a non-nominative subject cannot have an antecedent in a nominative subject; if it appears to be so, it is merely a consequence of the dissimilar nature of the conjuncts involved. If it were not so, then the version of (43) with the lexical dative subject in the second conjunct would have been grammatical, but as far as my judgement at least is concerned, it is not merely inelegant, it is ungrammatical too.⁶ The conjunct clauses of (41) are clauses of the same syntactic type and the sentence is grammatical as expected.⁷

III

There are several interesting questions involving the non-nominative subject constructions in Oriya, some of which are as follows: what explains the subject verb agreement in (6), where the subject is non-nominative, and which is the only construction in this language that has this rather unexpected feature? In the ECM construction how can the subject of the embedded clause be in the accusative Case when the complementizer is present? Why must the embedded subject occur with the postposition *ku* irrespective of whether the subject is specific, definite, human or generic in superseding the usual rule governing the same? In this section we propose to deal with only the second of the above (for some discussion of the first, see Patnaik (1996)). In addition we bring into discussion yet another construction in Oriya with a non-nominative subject, which we deliberately did not mention in the first section because we wanted to situate it in a different issue.

The so-called passive construction in Oriya has been of some interest for the Oriya linguists, and sometimes the opinion has been expressed that this language does not have the passive construction, although it has hardly been made clear as to what precisely this assertion means.⁸ Another opinion that has been expressed either directly or indirectly is that what indeed is meant by the assertion that Oriya does not have the passive construction is merely that it does not have the so-called “English-type” passive construction; it is again an assertion difficult to evaluate, in the absence of a clear mention as to in which specific respects the Oriya passive construction differs from the English one. In sum, the discussion has not been very illuminating.

In the discussions of the passive construction in Oriya, one construction has never figured, and that is the following:

- (44) *taaku desaru baahaara kari diaa galaa*
 he-acc --- country-pp --- out --- do-non-fin --- give-non-fin --- go-pass-pst
 (He was turned out of the country.)

Because of the occurrence of the passive auxiliary in the sentence, it is unlikely that one would dispute that it is indeed an example of the passive construction, provided of course that one accepts the usefulness of the relevant voice system (the active-passive distinction of the western grammars) for the grammar of Oriya. The subject of (44) is the non-nominative *taaku* and the verb does not agree with the subject. This is the only instance of the so-called default agreement that Oriya has.⁹ There is no room for scepticism that *taaku* is the subject of the sentence; if *pro* were the subject (nothing else can be conceived to be so), and *taaku*, a non-subject argument, it wouldn't get a theta role because there is no theta role that could be assigned to it. Besides, *taaku* is the antecedent of the reflexive *nija* in (45) and of PRO in (46), which constructions are similar to (44) in the relevant respects.

- (45) *taaku nija kaama paain baahaara kari diaa galaa*
 he-acc --- refl-gen --- work-pp ---- out --- do-non-fin --- give-non-fin --- go-pass-pst
 (He was turned out because of his own doings.)
 (46) *taaku desadroha kari thibaa jogun baahaara kari diaa galaa*
 he-acc --- against-country --- do-non-fin --- be-perf-non-fin --- because of --- out ---
 do-non-fin --- give-non-fin --- go-pass-pst
 (He was turned out because of his having worked against his country.)

In (46), the embedded clause that has PRO as its subject is *desadroha karithibaa*. In sum, the subject of the passive construction under discussion is non-nominative --- yet another example of a non-native subject construction in Oriya.

The sentences (44) – (46) are part of Oriya, and there is the element of naturalness of use to these. The same is not true of the following version of (44), namely (44i) for example, which has a nominative subject:

(44i) se desaru baahaara kari diaa galaa

Many outright reject it as ungrammatical. But sentences like this do occur, although certainly infrequently, in written discourse, the following being an example:

(47) semaane beshyaabruti paain prastuta karaa heuthile
they-nom --- prostitution-pp --- preparation --- do-non-fin --- be-pass-prog-agr-pst
(They were being prepared (=trained) for prostitution.) (*Desa, Kaala, Paatra*, p.159)

Despite its occurrence in the written discourse, it would still generally be regarded as either ungrammatical or at best being on the periphery of acceptability. It would be regarded as an instance of Anglicized Oriya. This shows that one crucial feature of the Anglicized passive construction of Oriya is that its subject must be nominative.¹⁰

In short, the above discussion brings into focus the construction (44), so far neglected in the discussion of the syntax of Oriya, whether diachronic or synchronic, and the relevance of the construction for the present study is that it constitutes yet another instance of a non-nominative subject construction in Oriya.

We conclude this section with a discussion of one of the questions concerning the ECM construction in Oriya, namely, the assignment of Case to the embedded subject in the presence of the complementizer *boli*, which is subcategorized for taking a full clausal complement. Below we repeat (7), which is an instance of the ECM construction:

(7) semaane raamaku buddhimaan (boli) manekaranti

As already mentioned, the construction with the complementizer *boli* is the traditional one and is certainly the more natural one. The one without the complementizer might even be due to the contact of Oriya with English, but no one today would regard it as somewhat artificial and call it an Anglicized Oriya sentence. There are other uses of *boli* than the complementizer use, but there seems to be no reason to suspect that here it is not being used as a complementizer, just as there is no reason to suspect that the embedded clause is indeed sentential, an IP, (and not an AP) since it contains tense, which is (e), and which receives interpretation in association with the tense of the main clause. There is no instance, in either ancient or modern Oriya, of an ECM construction in which the copula is explicitly present, when the complementizer *boli* occurs. Consider now the following:

(48) semaane raama buddhimaan boli manekaranti.
they-nom --- Ram-nom --- intelligent --- comp --- consider-agr-prs
(They think that Ram is intelligent.)

(49) semaane raama dine buddhimaan thilaa boli manekaranti
they-nom --- Ram-nom --- one day --- intelligent --- be-agr-pst --- comp ---
consider- agr-prs
(They think that Ram was intelligent once upon a time (say, before the accident).)

The embedded clause of (49) contains the copula, and the tense is morphologically realized, and its subject is in the nominative, which is as expected. The assignment (or checking) of the Case of the embedded subject is internal to its own clause. In (47) the embedded subject is nominative, and the embedded clause does not contain the copula and the tense is not morphologically realized.¹¹ Comparison between (7) and (48) shows that sometimes the embedded subject “gets Case”, using one terminology, from outside its own clause, and sometimes it gets Case within its clause. This calls for an explanation.

One could assume that the complementizer *boli* is subcategorized to take either an AP or an IP as its complement; thus the so-called embedded clause in (7) is indeed an AP, copula-less and also tense-less, time interpretation in this proposition being a matter of default case, and the one in (48) is an IP. Now *boli* doesn’t have the property of a complementizer in the former instance, and as such, does not count as barrier to the assignment of Case to the subject of the AP by the matrix verb. In (48) *boli* is a complementizer, and as such constitutes a barrier to Case assignment to the subject of the embedded IP by the matrix verb. It appears to be a plausible explanation of the question, given especially that there are more than one *boli* in the language --- if there is a complementizer *boli*, there is also a nominative Case assigner particle *boli* as exemplified in (50):

(50) *se taaku tu boli daake*
 he-nom --- he-gen-acc --- you-non-honf-nom --- part --- call-agr-prs
 (He calls him *tu*.)

Traditional grammars of Oriya maintain that the nominative morphology of *tu* is due to the indeclinable *boli*, which translates to the particle *boli* assigning nominative Case to its complement *tu*, in a different grammatical framework. If there are more than one *bolis* in the system, each with its distinct syntactic properties, it may not be misleading to propose that the *bolis* in (7) and (48) are different entities, and construct an explanation of the problem mentioned above based on this. All said, however, the problem is that at the moment the paper can provide no sound independent evidence for the relevant properties of *boli* in (7) and (48). Therefore the proposed explanation runs the danger of looking like a restatement of the issue in a different form.

In sum, the paper has attempted to list some of the non-nominative subject constructions in Oriya, and describe some of their syntactic behaviour. The attempt has justification in the fact that to the best of our knowledge non-nominative subject constructions in the language have not been studied at the desirable level of detail so far.

¹ I am grateful to P.Bhaskararao and K.V.Subbarao for giving me the opportunity to work on this little-studied area of Oriya syntax, and providing some relevant, valuable literature, and to Probal Dasgupta for his observations on the draft of the paper that was presented at the symposium.

² One might argue that the traditional grammars should not be faulted for this, for these are modelled after Paninian grammar, which does not have functional notions such as subject and object. This is true, but this does not explain why many of the constructions dealt with here are not discussed in such grammars.

However, this is not to suggest that the Paninian grammar is inherently handicapped to deal with such constructions.

³ It may be noted that although the subject is nominative, there is no verbal agreement, which is because the participialized verb, be it relative participle, conditional participle or nominalizing participle, in Oriya does not morphologically reflect tense and therefore agreement.

⁴ It may be noted that the postposition *ku* in (12) has been glossed as the locative marker, whereas in the language it is usually the accusative or the dative marker. Traditional grammars of Oriya, following the model of Sanskrit grammar, would explain this by saying that the locative nominal is indeed the direct object of the verb.

⁵ Such an approach that dissociates morphological form from syntactic processes is in consonance with the view of the traditional grammarians of Oriya with respect to the form of pronouns namely that a pronoun must assume its oblique form just in case the particle cliticized to it - the *vibhakti* (*kaaraka* or *upapada*) or the conjunction marker is morphologically realized. The agreement under reference might require a special device to be accounted for in a grammar that requires its computational system to accept already formed words alone, that accounts for the forms of nominals in terms of the theory of Case, and which does not recognize any morphology-syntax divide as far as the derivational mechanism is concerned.

⁶ However, it must be conceded that judgement about such cases isn't always very clear. The version of (43) with *kintu* ("but") in place of *o*, and the lexical dative subject in the second conjunct appears to be much less ungrammatical than the one with *o*. However this *kintu*-sentence is as ungrammatical as (43) if the subject of the second conjunct is PRO. This would show that the PRO in the subject position of the dative conjunct can not have the nominative subject of the preceding conjunct as antecedent.

⁷ Incidentally, and also trivially, the subjects of both the conjuncts in each case are experiencer subjects, although because of the lexical properties of the verbal element, only the second conjunct in each instance is the so-called dative subject construction. The semantic difference between *bhala paibaa* and *bhala laagibaa* is not analogous to the one between the active *pasanda karibaa* ("choose") and the stative *pasanda hebaa* ("appeal").

⁸ The closest to a clear opinion is that the voice system of the language is best described in terms of the *vacya* system of the ancient Indian grammatical framework and an attempt to describe it in terms of the voice systems of the western grammars --- traditional or generative --- yields only an unsatisfactory description.

⁹ The following is a possible explanation: as mentioned earlier, Oriya in earlier times had main clauses which could be non-finite or finite. Modern Oriya has main clauses which are finite alone. Idiomatic Oriya in the modern times allows copula-less sentences in the present tense, and tense does not have morphological realization in this construction because there is no verbal element in it. Other constructions have the verbal element, and as such tense must be realized in the main clause. In highly formal Oriya, there are sentences with the copula in the present tense, and in these, tense is indeed morphologically realized. In other words, when there is a verbal element in the main clause, tense must be morphologically realized. But morphological realization of tense is indeed agreement. But verbal agreement in this language is with the subject alone. Now (a) tense must be morphologically realized in the main clause if there is a verbal element, (b) except for the copula in present tense in idiomatic Oriya, there is no main clause in the language that is exempt from having an explicit verbal element in it, and (c) Oriya has only subject – verb agreement. If all these have to be satisfied, then Oriya has to have the provision for default agreement.

¹⁰ It is well known that Oriya does not allow a passive construction in which the recipient is the subject and is in the nominative: it doesn't have the equivalent of *she was given a book*. The reason, it has been suggested, is that there is no verb in the language that has the following subcategorization: V - NP – NP. In terms of an earlier version of generative grammar, Oriya does not have the rule of dative movement, which explains why it does not have the passive construction under reference, an explanation that cannot be

implemented elegantly within the framework of the more recent theories. In the view of the present paper, the postposition *ku* (or its equivalent) participates in the assignment of the recipient theta role in the case of the so-called double object --- *dwikarmak* --- constructions, which is why there can be no recipient in the nominative in constructions having such verbs.

¹¹ One might consider (48) rather semi-grammatical, but actually what is involved here is a stylistic issue and not a grammatical one. The version of (48) in which the embedded clause precedes the main clause, namely, *raama buddhimaan boli semaane manekaranti*, is stylistically a great deal better, and one would not judge this sentence as ungrammatical at all.

REFERENCES

- Chomsky, N. (1965) *Aspects of The Theory of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
----- (1977) *Essays on Form and Interpretation*. New York, North Holland.
----- (1981) *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht, Foris.
----- (1995) *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
- Lightfoot, D (1979) *Principles of Diachronic Syntax*. London, Oxford University Press.
- Mahanty, B (1978) *Odiaa Bhaasaara Utpatti O Krama Bikas*. Cuttack, Friends' Publishers (Second Edition)
- Mishra, B. (1972) *Odiaa Bhaasaara Puraatatwa*. Cuttack, Friends Publishers.
(Second Edition)
----- (1975) *Odiaa Bhaasaara Itihaasa*. Cuttack, Cuttack Students' Store.
(Revised Edition)
- Nanda Sharma, G. (1968). *Odiaa Bhaasaatatwa*. Cuttack, New Students' Store.
(Second Edition)
- Patnaik, B.N. (1998). "Conflict and Borrowing as Metaphors for Syntactic Borrowing: A Study of Some Borrowed Constructions in Oriya". In Gupta, R.S. et al., eds., *Studies in Indian Sociolinguistics*. New Delhi, Creative Books.
----- (2000) "The Oriya Passive from a Historical Perspective". In Gupta, R.S. ed. *Directions in Indian Sociolinguistics*. Shimla, IAS.
- Pattanayak, S. ed. (1972) *Sambaadapatraru Odisaara Kathaa*. Cuttack, Grantha Mandir.
- Raghunathan, V. (1993) *Some Marked Syntactic Constructions in Tamil and Their Implications for a Theory of Periphery*. IIT Kanpur, Unpublished Doctoral dissertation.
- Subbarao, K.V. (1999) "Agreement in South Asian Languages and the Minimalist Inquiries". In Bhaskararao, P. and K.V. Subbarao eds. *The Yearbook of South Asian Languages and Linguistics*. Delhi Thousand Oaks London, Sage.
- Tripathy, K.B. (1962). *The Evolution of Oriya Language and Script*. Cuttack, Utkal University.