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1 Introduction

There is a cross-linguistically robust generalisation that accusative is generally found in transitive contexts, i.e. in the presence of an external argument (EA).

(1) Burzio’s Generalisation (BG): Only verbs that assign an external theta-role may assign accusative case (Burzio, 1986).

A classic example of BG are unaccusatives. Under a raising analysis of unaccusatives (Perlmutter, 1978), the subject originates as an internal argument. It is not assigned ACC in its base position due to the lack of an external theta-role. It raises to subject position where it is assigned NOM.

(2) a. He/*him fell.
   b. Vo/ *us=ko  gira.
      3.SG.NOM/ *3.SG.OBL=ACC fell.PFV.M.SG

‘He fell.’

Another classic example of BG are passives. In old Government and Binding approaches, the external theta-role is “absorbed” by passive morphology preventing ACC case assignment. The object moves to the empty subject position and is assigned NOM (Baker et al., 1989; Chomsky, 1981).

(3) He/*him was caught.

(Hindi-)Urdu is often given as an exception to BG because of the accusative-preserving passive construction shown in (4).

(4) Vo/ Us=ko  pakRa  gya.
    He.NOM/ He.OBL=ACC caught.PFV.M.SG PASS.M.SG

‘He was caught.’

I will argue that Urdu is not an exception to BG. The accusative-preserving “passive” construction in Urdu is an impersonal construction with active syntax and a pro subject - similar to Polish (Maling, 1993) and Icelandic (Maling and Sigurjónsdóttir, 2002, 2015). So the presence of ACC is unsurprising and in fact expected. Therefore, the Urdu passive is not an exception to BG and the correlation between the presence of ACC and the EA holds in the language.

Structure:

1. Background on accusative case, subject tests and passives in Urdu
2. The passive is a passive
3. The accusative-preserving structure is not a passive
4. Conclusion and open questions
1.1 Voice and v:

I adopt a framework in which Voice and v are two distinct functional heads. Voice introduces the EA and encodes the active/passive voice distinction. Little v is the locus of causative semantics (Alexiadou et al., 2006; Harley, 2009, 2017; Legate, 2014; Pylkkänen, 2002).

ACC is assigned by active Voice. The fact that passive Voice can introduce an EA but not assign ACC is not a problem in BG terms as the correlation is one way. Attributing ACC to an EA-introducing functional head (active Voice) derives BG.

(5) BG modified: ACC is only found where there is an EA introduced by active Voice.

This is of course is pure stipulation without the appropriate evidence. My goal in this presentation, however, is not to explain BG but simply show that it holds in Urdu.

2 Background

2.1 Accusative case

ACC is found on direct objects (DOs) with both ERG and NOM subjects. It alternates with NOM due to differential object marking (DOM).

(6) Omar=ne seb / seb=ko khaya.  
Omar=ERG apple.NOM / apple=ACC eat.PFV.M.SG  
‘Omar ate an/the apple.’

DOM in Urdu is conditioned by animacy and definiteness/specificity (Aissen, 2003; Butt and King, 2004; Mohanan, 1994).

Animacy: (Figure 1)

- Marking is obligatory on humans (7a).
- Marking is optional on non-human animates (7b) and inanimates (7c).

\[
\text{human} \quad > \quad \text{animate} \quad > \quad \text{inanimate}
\]

\[
\text{always marked} \quad > \quad \text{sometimes marked}
\]

Figure 1: Animacy scale and DOM in Urdu

(7) a. Sana=ne Omar=ko / *Omar dekha.  
Sana=ERG Omar=ACC / *Omar.NOM see.PFV.M.SG  
‘Sana saw Omar.’

b. Sana=ne kuthe=ko / kutha dekha.  
Sana=ERG dog.OBL=ACC / dog.NOM see.PFV.M.SG  
‘Sana saw a/the dog.’

c. Sana=ne ghar=ko / ghar dekha.  
Sana=ERG house=ACC / house.NOM see.PFV.M.SG  
‘Sana saw a/the house.’

Definiteness/specificity: (Figure 2)

- Pronouns (8a) and proper names (7a) are always marked.
- Definite (8b) and indefinite specific objects (7b, c) are sometimes marked.
- Non-specific objects are never marked (9).
pronoun > proper name > definite > specific > non-specific
always marked > sometimes marked > never marked

Figure 2: Definiteness scale and DOM in Urdu

(8) a. Sana=ne *tum* tumhein / *tum* tum dekha.
    Sana=ERG you.ACC / *you.NOM see.PFV.M.SG
    ‘Sana saw you.’

b. Sana=ne *us* us ghar=ko / vo ghar dekha.
    Sana=ERG that.OBL house=ACC / that house.NOM see.PFV.M.SG
    ‘Sana saw that house.’

(9) Context: Adnan wanted chicken for tonight’s curry.

a. Us=ke khaansaame=ne bazaar=se murghi kharidi.
   3.SG.OBL=GEN.OBL cook.OBL=ERG market.LOC=INS chicken.NOM buy.PFV.F.SG
   ‘His cook bought a chicken from the market.’

b. Us=ke khaansaame=ne bazaar=se murghi ko kharidi.
   3.SG.OBL=GEN.OBL cook.OBL=ERG market.LOC=INS chicken=ACC buy.PFV.F.SG
   ‘His cook bought a (specific) chicken from the market.’ (Butt, 1993:97)

2.2 Subject tests

There are three subject tests used in Urdu.

- Anaphor binding

(10) Sana=ne Omarj=ko apni/*j kitaab bheji.
    Sana=ERG Omarj=DAT refl.F.SG.OBL/*j book.NOM send.PFV.F.SG
    ‘Sana sent Omarj her/*his book.’

- Inability to bind pronouns

(11) Sana=ne Omarj=ko us/*j/*k kitaab bheji.
    Sana=ERG Omarj=DAT 3.SG.OBL/*j/*k=GEN.F.SG book.NOM send.PFV.F.SG
    ‘Sana sent Omarj her/his/*his book.’

- Control into participial clauses

    Sana=ERG Omarj=ACC [PRO/*j laugh.IPFPV happen.PFV.OBL] hit.PFV.M.SG
    ‘Sana hit Omar while [she/*he was] laughing.’

b. Sana=ne Omarj=ko [PRO/*j kamre=mein jaa kar] maara.
    Sana=ERG Omarj=ACC [PRO/*j room.OBL=LOC go do] hit.PFV.M.SG
    ‘Sana went to the room and hit Omar.’

    ≠ ‘Sana hit Omar when he went to the room.’

However, these tests don’t seem to be associated with a single subject position, SpecTP. Instead, they seem to be associated with “prominent” DPs (e.g. highest structural argument, highest logical argument/agent) (Mohanan, 1994), and indicate relative positioning rather than a specific position.
2.3 Passives

Urdu has analytic passives formed by using the morpheme, *jaa*. This passive morpheme is inflected for tense/aspect and the main verb is in perfective form. The agent is optional and has instrumental case when overt.

(13)  a. *Sana=ne Omar=ko pakRa.*
    Sana=ERG Omar=ACC catch.PFV.M.SG
    ‘Sana caught Omar.’

    b. *Omar (Sana=se) pakRa gya.*
    Omar.NOM (Sana=INS) catch.PFV.M.SG PASS.M.SG
    ‘Omar was caught (by Sana).’

As in many other languages, the *jaa* morpheme is not unique to passives. It is also used as a main verb ‘go’ and light verb (LV).

(14)  a. *Sana jaa-rahi he.*
    Sana.NOM go-PROG.F.SG be.PRES.3.SG
    ‘Sana is going.’

    b. *Sana uth gaii.*
    Sana.NOM wake go.PFV.F.SG
    ‘Sana woke up.’

    c. *Sana seb kha gaii.*
    Sana.NOM apple.NOM eat go.PFV.F.SG
    ‘Sana ate up an/the apple.’

Moreover, the surface structure used for passives is itself not unique to passives. The same surface structure is used in (in)abilitative constructions and a similar structure is used for necessity/prohibition readings. There are differences in the deep structure but I won’t go into those here.

(15)  a. *Sana=se Omar (nahi) pakRa gya.*
    Sana=INS Omar.NOM (not) catch.PFV.M.SG go.PFV.M.SG
    ‘Sana was (not) able to catch Omar.’

    b. *BaRon=se is tarah zor=se nahi bola jaa-ta.*
    Elders.OBL=INS this.OBL way force=INS not talk.PFV.M.SG go-IPFV.M.SG
    ‘One does not talk loudly with elders like this.’ (Davison, 1982:159)

Passives can be formed with both transitives and intransitives (unergatives but not unaccusatives) in Urdu (Bhatt, 2003; Davison, 1982; Mahajan, 1995).

(16)  a. *Kal naacha gya.*
    Yesterday dance.PFV.M.SG PASS.M.SG
    ‘Yesterday [it] was danced.’

    b. *Kal giru gya.*
    Yesterday fall.PFV.M.SG PASS.M.SG
    ‘Yesterday [it] was fallen.’

We can identify that this is not a LV use of *jaa* because the main verb is in perfective form, *naacha*, rather than bare stem form, *naach*, as intransitive verbs generally are with LVS. We can also see that some kind of modifier is needed at the beginning of the sentence when passivising unergatives, similar to the need for modifiers in English-type middles.

Finally, Urdu does not allow passives of passives (Bhatt, 2003).
(17) a. Party=mein khub kebab khaey jaacin-ge.  
   Party=LOC lots kebab.NOM eat.PFV.M.PL PASS.M.PL-FUT.M.PL  
   ‘Lots of kebabs will be eaten at the party.’

   Party=LOC eat.PFV.M.PL PASS.M.PL PASS.M.PL-FUT.M.PL  
   (Bhatt, 2003:5)

3 Passives are passives

Mahajan (1995): ACTIVE passives

- The agent in Urdu passives is not demoted.
- The object in Urdu passives is not promoted.
- Therefore, these are not actual passives.
- The differences between ACTIVE passives and actives are INS vs ERG/NOM on the agent and the presence of the jaa morpheme.

I will show that in a canonical passive, the agent is a low subject and that the object is promoted to SpecTP. So Urdu does have real passives.

3.1 Object promotion

Mahajan (1995) notes that objects in passives seem to have the same case options as objects in active clauses (ex.4 repeated).

(4) Vo / Us=ko pakRa gya.  
    He.NOM / He.OBL=ACC caught.PFV.M.SG PASS.M.SG  
    ‘He was caught.’

However, this is not entirely correct. Objects which are obligatorily marked (e.g. human proper names) in active clauses (ex.7a repeated) can be bare in passives (ex.13b repeated).

(7a) Sana=ne Omar=ko / *Omar dekha.  
    Sana=ERG Omar=ACC / *Omar.NOM see.PFV.M.SG  
    ‘Sana saw Omar.’

(13b) Omar (Sana=se) pakRa gya.  
    Omar.NOM (Sana=INS) catch.PFV.M.SG PASS.M.SG  
    ‘Omar was caught (by Sana).’

Objects in passives cannot control into object control constructions (cf. Mahajan, 1995).

(18) a. Ram_i=ne Mohan_j=ko [PRO_i/j ghar jaa-ne] =ko kaha.  
    Ram_i=ERG Mohan_j=ACC [PRO_i/j home.LOC go-INF.OBL] =ACC say.PFV.M.SG  
    ‘Ram_i told Mohan_j to go home.’  
    ≠ ‘Ram_i told Mohan_j that he[Ram_i] was going home.’

b. *Ram_i=se Mohan_j [PRO_i/j ghar jaa-ne] =ko kaha gya.  
    Ram_i=INS Mohan_j.NOM [PRO_i/j home.LOC go-INF.OBL] =ACC say.PFV.M.SG PASS.M.SG  
    ≠ ‘Mohan was told to go home by Ram_i.’  
    (adapted from Mahajan, 1995:294-295)

Furthermore, objects in passives can pass prominence tests (anaphor binding and control into participial clauses). Objects in active clauses cannot, as we saw in section 2.2.
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(19) a. *Omar, apne ghar=mein pakRa gya.
Omar, NOM REFL.F.SG.OBL house=LOC catch.PFV.M.SG PASS.M.SG
‘Omar was caught in his house.’

b. *Omar, [PRO, ghar ja kar] pakRa gya.
Omar, NOM [PRO house.LOC go do] catch.PFV.M.SG PASS.M.SG
‘Omar was caught when he went home.’

The above tells us that objects in passives are in a higher position than objects in actives. We can pinpoint that this position is SpecTP by looking at non-finite passive clauses.

(20) *Rina=ka bazaar=mein dekha jaa-na sharam=ki baat
[Rina=GEN.M.SG market=LOC see.PFV.M.SG PASS-INF shame=GEN.F.SG talk]
be.PRES.3.SG
‘For Rina to be seen in the market is a matter of shame.’ (adapted from Bhatt, 2007:9)

- Let’s take a DP that is always marked in object position, e.g. human proper name. For this DP to be grammatical when unmarked, it cannot be in object position.
- This is crucial because bare/NOM objects are grammatical in non-finite clauses in Urdu, in contrast to NOM subjects (Bhatt, 2007; Mahajan, 2017; McFadden and Sundaresan, 2011).
- DPs that are obligatorily marked in actives are ungrammatical as bare objects in non-finite passive clauses.
- This shows that the position of bare objects in passives depends on finite T for licensing → SpecTP.

3.2 Agent demotion

Mahajan (1995) shows that INS agents behave like arguments and not adjuncts. Based on this he concludes that they are not demoted.

- They incur weak island violations when extracted out of rightward moved clauses. Adjuncts incur strong island violations.

(21) a. *Salma yeh sochthi thi [keh *Mohan=ne Ram=ko
Salma,NOM it think.IPFV.F.SG be.PST.F.SG [that Mohan=ERG Ram=ACC
maara,]
hit.PFV.M.SG]

Literally: ‘Salma thinks it that (he) hit Ram.’

b. Mohan=ne, *Salma yeh sochthi thi [keh t1 Ram=ko
Mohan=ERG, Salma,NOM it think.IPFV.F.SG be.PST.F.SG [that t1 Ram=ACC
maara,]
hit.PFV.M.SG]

Literally: ‘Mohan, Salma thinks it that (he) hit Ram.’

(22) a. *Salma yeh sochthi thi [keh Mohan=ne Ram=ko
Salma,NOM it think.IPFV.F.SG be.PST.F.SG [that Mohan=ERG Ram=ACC
ghar=mein maara,]
house=LOC hit.PFV.M.SG]

Literally: ‘Salma thinks it that Mohan hit Ram at home.’
b. * Ghar=mein₁ Salma yeh schothi thi [keh Mohan=ne t₁
House=LOC₁ Salma.NOM it think.IPFV.F.SG be.PST.F.SG [that Mohan=ERG t₁
Ram=ko maara.]
Ram=ACC hit.PFV.M.SG]

Literally: ‘At home, Salma thinks it that Mohan hit Ram.’
(Mohanan, 1994:291-292)

(23) a. Salma yeh schothi thi [keh Mohan=se Ram
Salma.NOM it think.IPFV.F.SG be.PST.F.SG [that Mohan=INS Ram.NOM
maara gya.]
hit.PFV.M.SG PASS.M.SG]

Literally: ‘Salma thinks it that Ram was hit by Mohan.’

b?? Mohan=se₁ Salma yeh schothi thi [keh t₁ Ram
Mohan=INS₁ Salma.NOM it think.IPFV.F.SG be.PST.F.SG [that t₁ Ram.NOM
maara gya.]
hit.PFV.M.SG]

Literally: ‘By Mohan, Salma thinks it that Ram was hit.’
(adapted from Mohanan, 1994:293)

• They pass prominence tests (anaphor binding and control into participial clauses). Adjuncts never
pass these tests.

(24) a. Sana₁=ko apna₁=ka bhai pasand he.
Sana₁=DAT apna₁=GEN.M.SG brother.NOM like be.PRES.3.SG

‘Sana₁ likes her₁ brother.’

Sana₁=DAT [PRO₁ Cambridge.LOC go do] Rami.NOM like come.PFV.M.SG

‘Sana₁ liked Rami when she₁ went to Cambridge.’

c. Sana₁=ko us₁/j=ka bhai pasand he.
Sana₁=DAT 3.SG₁/j=GEN.M.SG brother.NOM like be.PRES.3.SG

‘Sana₁ likes her₁/j brother.’

We have already seen that INS agents can bind anaphors and control into participial clauses. They also
bind pronouns. So they behave like low subjects.
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(26) $\text{Omar}_i \quad \text{San}_j = \text{se} \quad \text{us}_n / / j / / k = \text{ke} \quad \text{ghar} \quad \text{bheja} \quad \text{gya}$.  
$\text{Omar}_r$ Nom San$_3$=INS 3.SG$_n / / j / / k = \text{GEN.M.SG.OBL}$ house LOC send PFV M SG PASS M SG  
‘Omar$_i$ was sent to his/her$_n / / j / / k$ house by San$_j$. 

Moreover, the object can bind reflexives in the by-phrase illustrating that it c-commands the INS agent in passives.

(27) $\text{Omar}_i \quad \text{apni}_i \quad \text{behen}=\text{se} \quad \text{pakRa} \quad \text{gya}$.  
$\text{Omar}_r$ Nom REFL.F.SG.OBL$_i$ sister=INS catch PFV M SG PASS M SG  
‘Omar$_i$ was caught by his$_i$ sister.’

So INS agents are arguments, and they behave like low subjects (similarity to DAT subjects, pronoun binding, c-commanded by object). We can assume that they are in SpecVoice$_{[-ACT]}$P where they are assigned the external/agent theta-role.

4 Impersonals are not passives

I will show that the ACC-preserving “passive” construction has active syntax:

- The object is not promoted.
- There is a syntactic subject in the same position as active subjects.

4.1 No object promotion

Marked objects are grammatical in non-finite passive clauses (ex.20 repeated). This shows they are not in SpecTP.

(20) $\{\text{Rina}=\text{ka} \quad / \quad ^*\text{Rina} \quad / \quad \text{Rina}=\text{ko} \quad \text{bazaar}=\text{mein} \quad \text{dekha} \quad \text{jaa-na}\}$  
$\{\text{Rina}=\text{GEN.M.SG} \quad / \quad ^*\text{Rina}.\text{Nom} \quad / \quad \text{Rina}=\text{ACC} \quad \text{market}=\text{LOC} \quad \text{see PFV M SG PASS INF}\}$  
$\text{sharam}=\text{ki} \quad \text{baat} \quad \text{he}$.  
shame=GEN.F.SG talk be PRES 3 SG  
‘For Rina to be seen in the market is a matter of shame.’ (adapted from Bhatt, 2007:9)

Marked objects cannot control into participial clauses. This shows they are not in a higher position than objects in actives.

(28) $\text{San}_j = \text{ko} \quad [\text{PRO}_n / / j \quad \text{darthe} \quad \text{hue}] \quad \text{pakRa} \quad \text{gya}$.  
$\text{San}_3$=ACC [PRO$_n / / j$ scare PFV OBL happen PFV OBL] catch PFV M SG PASS M SG  
‘Sana was caught while the catcher was scared.’  
$\neq$ ‘Sana was caught while she was scared.’

Marked objects can control into object control constructions (ex.18 repeated). This shows they are in the same position as objects in actives.

---

1Marked objects can bind reflexive anaphors. This is probably because the silent argument is not prominent enough to bind anaphors. Anaphor binding requires an overt antecedent (Schäfer, 2012). Implicit by-phrases in passives cannot bind reflexive anaphors either. It seems that anaphor binding has stricter conditions on what is “prominent enough” than control into participial clauses.
(18) a. Ram\_i=ne Mohan\_i=ko [PRO\_i/j ghar jaa-ne] =ko kaha. Ram\_i=erg Mohan\_i=acc [PRO\_i/j home.LOC go-INF.OBL] =acc say.PFV.M.SG
   ‘Ram\_i told Mohan\_i to go to his\_i/j house.’

b. *Ram\_i=se Mohan\_i [PRO\_i/j ghar jaa-ne] =ko kaha gya. Ram\_i=erg Mohan\_i.nom [PRO\_i/j home.LOC go-INF.OBL] =acc say.PFV.M.SG PASS.M.SG
   ≠ ‘Mohan was told by Ram to go to his house.’

   ‘Mohan\_i was told to go to his\_i house.’ (adapted from Mahajan, 1995:294-295)

All the data Mahajan (1995) gives to show lack of object promotion in passives contains marked objects.

4.2 Syntactic subject

The INS agent is ungrammatical when the object is marked. Maling (1993) gives the availability of a by-phrase as a diagnostic for active syntax.

(29) a. Omar (Sana=se) pakRa gya. Omar.nom (Sana=ins) catch.PFV.M.SG PASS.M.SG
   ‘Omar was caught (by Sana).’

b. Omar=ko (*Sana=se) pakRa gya. Omar=acc (*Sana=ins) catch.PFV.M.SG PASS.M.SG
   ‘Omar was caught (*by Sana).’

Yet, there is a syntactic subject present because it can control into participial clauses (ex.28 repeated).

(28) Sana\_i=ko [PRO\_i/j darthe hue] pakRa gya. Sana\_i=acc [PRO\_i/j scare.IPFV.OBL happen.PFV.OBL] catch.PFV.M.SG PASS.M.SG
   ‘Sana was caught while the catcher was scared.’
   ≠ ‘Sana was caught while she was scared.’

Moreover, this syntactic subject is in the same position as ERG/NOM subjects, i.e. SpecTP, because it cannot bind pronouns.

(30) Sana\_i=ko us\_i/j=ke ghar=mein pakRa gya. Sana\_i=acc 3.SG\_i/j=gen.M.SG.OBL house=LOC catch.PFV.M.SG PASS.M.SG
   ‘Sana\_i was caught in his/her\_i/j house.
   ≠ ‘Sana was caught in the catcher’s house.’

5 Conclusion

Urdu has two constructions:

1. Canonical passive: bare object; object promotion; optional by-phrase; subject in lower position than in actives

2. Active impersonal: marked objects; no object promotion; silent pro in high subject position like active subjects

\footnote{Anaphor binding cannot be used as a test since it requires an overt antecedent (see footnote 1).}
So ACC is not found in passives in Urdu. It is only found when an EA has been introduced by active Voice. Urdu is not an exception to BG.

Previous analyses of Urdu passives have noted the differences between marked and unmarked objects, and proposed that there is optional object promotion (Bhatt, 2003; Davison, 1982; Mohanan, 1994). However, they have not commented when promotion is possible and when it is not. We can now say that it is the presence of active or passive syntax that is responsible for the difference in promotion of marked and unmarked objects.

The same DOM conditions apply to objects in active impersonals as to objects in other actives. Although there is a strong tendency to use the canonical passive structure where possible, i.e. wherever there is a bare object, we do find bare objects when we force an active impersonal structure.

\[(31)\]

\textit{Kavon} = ko \; [\text{PRO} \; \text{uRaa-ne}] \quad = ka \quad \text{socha} \quad \text{gya.} \\
\text{Crows. OBL} = \text{ACC} \; [\text{PRO} \; \text{cause-to-fly-INF.OBL}] = \text{GEN.M.SG} \; \text{think.PFV.M.SG \, PASS.M.SG} \\
\text{‘It was thought to shoo away the crows.’} \\

\textit{Kavey} \quad [\text{PRO} \; \text{uRaa-ne}] \quad = ka \quad \text{socha} \quad \text{gya.} \\
\text{Crows. NOM} \; [\text{PRO} \; \text{cause-to-fly-INF.OBL}] = \text{GEN.M.SG} \; \text{think.PFV.M.SG \, PASS.M.SG} \\
\text{‘It was thought to shoo away (the) crows.’}

The Urdu active impersonal is similar to the Icelandic new impersonal: same morphology as passives, no object promotion, ACC on object (Maling and Sigurjónsdóttir, 2002, 2015). One key difference is the possibility of an overt expletive in place of pro in Icelandic versus its complete absence in Urdu. This is presumably because Urdu does not have an overt expletive or impersonal pronoun.

There is one test used for diagnosing active syntax in Icelandic which I have not used is the availability of unaccusatives in the construction in question. The prediction is that unaccusative verbs should be allowed in active impersonals as they are in other actives. However, it is difficult to apply this test as ACC, the biggest surface indicator of the construction, is unavailable with unaccusatives.

5.1 Open questions

⇒ Why can the INS agent bind pronominals in promoted objects, i.e. why can the INS agent sometimes c-command the promoted object?

\[(27)\] \textit{Omar} = i \; \text{apni} = i \; \text{ behen} = se \; \text{pakRa} \; \text{gya.} \\
\text{Omar. NOM \, REPL.F.SG.OBLi \, sister=INS \, catch.PFV.M.SG \, PASS.M.SG} \\
\text{‘Omar\textsubscript{i} was caught by his\textsubscript{i} sister.’}

\[(32)\] \textit{Sana} = se \; \text{apna} = i \; \text{bhai} \; \text{pakRa} \; \text{gya.} \\
\text{Sana\textsubscript{i}=INS \, REPL.M.SG\textsubscript{i} \, brother.NOM \, catch.PFV.M.SG \, PASS.M.SG} \\
\text{Literally: ‘Her\textsubscript{i} own brother was caught by Sana\textsubscript{i}.’}

This is similar to the interaction between DAT subjects and their NOM objects. DAT subjects can bind anaphors in their objects, showing that they c-command the object (ex.25a repeated). But when inverted, NOM objects can bind anaphors in DAT subjects.

\[(25a)\] \textit{Sana} = ko \; \text{apna} = ka \; \text{bhai} \; \text{pasand he.} \\
\text{Sana\textsubscript{i}=DAT \, REPL.M.SG\textsubscript{i}=GEN.M.SG \, brother.NOM \, like \, be.PRES.3.SG} \\
\text{‘Sana\textsubscript{i} likes her\textsubscript{i} brother.’}
(33) \[ Omar_i \quad sirf \quad apni_i \quad behen=ko \quad pasand \quad he. \]
\[ Omar_{NOM} \quad only \quad \text{REFL.F.SG} \quad \text{sister=DAT like} \quad \text{be.PRES.3SG} \]
‘Only his sister likes Omar.’

The interaction between DAT subjects and NOM objects has been explained through optional movement of either argument to SpecTP (Davison, 2004). So is promotion in passives optional after all?

When the INS agent c-commands the bare object and binds a reflexive anaphor in it, the object can no longer control into participial clauses. When the object is c-commanded by the INS agent, it no longer passes prominence tests.

(34) \[ Sana_i=se \quad apna_i \quad bhai_j \quad [\text{PRO}_{i/*j} \quad \text{ghar} \quad jaa \quad \text{kar}] \quad \text{pakRa} \quad gya. \]
\[ Sana_{i=INS} \quad \text{REFL.M.SG} \quad \text{brother.NOM} \quad [\text{PRO}_{i/*j} \quad \text{home.LOC go do}] \quad \text{catch.PFV.M.SG} \quad \text{PASS.M.SG} \]

Literally: ‘Her own brother was caught by Sana when she/*he went home.’

We have only discussed the (un)availability of ACC in passives. What about the NOM found on objects? If it is available in passives, does it play a role in making promotion optional?

⇒ What is jaa in this construction?

This is not problematic in itself, as we have already seen that the jaa morpheme and structure are not unique to passives (3), but we do want some explanation of where it comes from.

If it is a LV, then we expect it to interact with other LVs, i.e. restrictions on the number of LVs, restrictions on ordering of multiple LVs. If it is similar to the passive morpheme, then we expect more flexibility, i.e. no effect on number of LVs.

There is no comprehensive work on the exact position and ordering of the different LVs in Urdu yet.

⇒ How do the different constructions with jaa get different interpretations?

⇒ How does the active impersonal fit in with other Voice phenomena in Urdu?
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