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ABSTRACT

The aim of the present study is to describe the predicate argument structure in Pashto (an East-Iranian language) from morpho-syntactic perspective and compare it with English. The data was collected from the standard (i.e., Yousafzai) dialect of the Pakistani variety of Pashto and was analysed using the morpho-syntactic processes such as conflation, incorporation, arguments’ hierarchy and argument structure alternation. The study shows that in Pashto there are quite few words which are derived by incorporation. Majority of words are derived from adjective root by conflation. Similarly, majority of the verbs are also derived through conflation; its argument structure alternates quite freely. Moreover, alternations such as causativization of unergative, ergative, middle and transitive verbs are very commonly found in Pashto. In case of resultatives, Pashto does not allow incorporation of N in resulative constructions unlike English where it is very common.

Relating the findings of the study with English Language Teaching (ELT), the study compares the argument structure of Pashto with English. This comparative analysis shows that the argument structure types depicted by Pashto such as unaccusative, unergative, and adjective passives are quite different from that of English. A generalization drawn from the data is that with few exceptions all the argument structure differences can be traced back to the fact that PP conflation is allowed in English while in Pashto it is not. On the other hand, the free alternation between causative and inchohative/transitive-intransitive; and transitive-ditransitive can also be traced back to the fact that such alternations are common in Pashto because adjective conflates into V quite freely while in English it does not. Thus the Pashto alternates of English resultatives depict a very different type of argument structure. Contrary to what is true about English, Pashto allows small pro as a subject while English does not. English has subject control PRO which is not allowed in Pashto. The non-availability of PRO can be directly related to the non-existence of infinitive verb in Pashto.

The existence of zero argument predicates in English was traced back to the fact that through incorporation of internal argument to empty V position the zero argument verbs were derived in English. However, in case of Pashto, the internal argument of the verb does not get incorporated. So the basic structure of the predicates in both of the languages is the same. The differences in the derived form are due to the fact that one language (English) allows incorporation of the internal argument while the other (Pashto) does not. Similarly, Pashto allows conflations into overt v while English derives most of causative alternates by zero derivation. So, consequently, the argument
structure differences found in both languages were traced back to the availability of option for PP to conflate into V.
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Chapter One

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the study

1.1.1 Statement of the Problem

Part of the knowledge we possess about certain linguistic expressions is that they may appear with certain other expressions (their arguments) in order to be interpreted semantically and to produce a syntactically well-formed phrase/sentence. In this regard, exploration of argument structure of a language is of central importance before investigating its learning, acquisition and other related phenomena. Pashto, being one of the major languages spoken in Pakistan and Afghanistan, needs to be explored with reference to its argument structure. There is no sufficient account of argument structure of Pashto available in the existing literature. So, it appears mandatory to conduct a study on the nature of argument structure in Pashto.

The entry of verb in the lexicon means semantic representation that contains the number and hierarchy of its syntactic argument. Due to the identification of thematic roles with lambda abstractors, thematic relations need not be licensed in the syntax. The syntactic structure of the verb phrase may be projected directly from the lexicon depending on the argument hierarchy (Grimshaw, 1990).

Lexical processes affecting the Argument Structure (AS) of predicates can lead to non-canonical argument realizations such as (i) participial passive - verbal stem and participial suffix, which are combined in the lexicon (cf. Zimmermann, 1988). This
results in two major effects: firstly, the external argument (agent) gets blocked so it cannot be realized in the canonical way as a nominative Determiner Phrase (DP) and the internal argument (patient) surfaces with nominative case (Junghanns, 2008).

The AS of a verb means the number of core arguments a verb takes and the hierarchy of the arguments. The traditional terms subject and object (both direct and indirect) refers to the arguments of a verb. It is useful to distinguish between core and peripheral arguments. The number and nature of core arguments is determined by the choice of verb which heads the predicate. The core arguments must be stated (or else be understood) for the clause to be acceptable and have sense. Peripheral arguments (sometimes called ‘adjuncts’) are less dependent on the nature of the verb; they may optionally be included to indicate place, time, cause, purpose and the like. In the following English sentences, peripheral and core arguments are enclosed in round and square brackets respectively (Aĭkhenval’d, 2000).

(1)

a. (On Monday morning, ) (in the garden, ) [John] danced (around the fountain)

b. (On Monday morning, ) (in the garden, ) [the monkey] bit [John] (on the finger)

c. (On Monday morning, ) (in the garden, ) [John] gave [Mary] [a book] (for her birthday)

(Excerpts from Aĭkhenval’d, 2000)
The peripheral Noun Phrases (NPs) can be omitted and we still get full sentences, *John danced, The monkey bit John* and *John gave Mary a book*. However, core arguments may not be omitted for example, *The monkey bit* or *John gave* (see Aikhenval'd, 2000 for detail). One of the concerns of this chapter is to identify the core and peripheral arguments of the head verb in Pashto.

According to (Hale & Keyser, 1998, 1993, 2002), AS refers to a system of structural relations holding between heads and their arguments within the syntactic structures projected by the head. AS of a lexical item is determined by properties, in particular, by the syntactic configurations in which they must appear. There are just two syntactic relations, complement and specifier, defined so as to preclude iteration and to permit only binary branching. The core syntactic structure of a sentence is projected from and exhaustively determined by the AS of the main verb whose skeletal form is universal. Language diversity is said to be thus due to syntactic parameter setting (e.g. the head parameter); the language specific properties of the set of affixes that have their own AS and compose with the AS of the lexical verb stem V e.g., the Turkish causative suffix has its own external argument. In Pashto too, the causative alternation is idiosyncratic. AS encodes language specific morpho-syntactic information much of which is unpredictable. The function of the AS is thus to encode idiosyncratic information (e.g., quirky case and subjectlessness) in a universal form for projection to core syntactic structure, which accounts for the fact that core syntactic structures are cross linguistically uniform (Duguine, 2010).
Besides, there are some arguments which are incorporated and others which are conflated and results in change in the AS of the verb. The incorporation operation has been claimed to account for the formation of de-nominal verbs like *dance* (see Hale & Keyser, 1993 for detail). Incorporation involves copying the full phonological matrix of the nominal root like *dance* into the empty verb. The same operation has been claimed to be involved in transitive location verbs like *shelve* or transitive locatum verbs like *saddle*. Applying the incorporation operation in this case involves copying the full phonological matrix of the nominal root *shelve/saddle* into the empty one corresponding to preposition (P) and then to the null verb (V) position.

The same operation of incorporation can also be claimed to account for the formation of causative de-adjectival verbs. Applying the incorporation operation involves copying the full phonological matrix of the adjectival root *clear* into the empty one corresponding to the inner (change) V to the external (causative) V. According to Hale and Keyser (2002), the unaccusative/anticausative variant corresponds to the inner verbal configuration.

### 1.1.2 Introduction to the focus language

Pashto is spoken largely in Afghanistan and Pakistan. It is spoken by the population mounting to half of the population of the former country (Afghanistan). In Pakistan, it is spoken primarily in Khyber-Pakhtunkhwa, Balochestan and FATA. It is also spoken by almost fifty thousand people as a native language in Iran as well (Tegey,
Pashto has been divided into three dialects: eastern dialect, southwestern dialect and central dialect (see Pezil, 1955; MacKenzie, 1987; Tegey, 1996; Roberts, 2000). The Yousafzai dialect which is considered the standard dialect in Pakistan is the focus in this study.

The Tegey (1996) account of Pashto includes discussion of the structure of simple and complex clause and the word order variations available in the language. He also investigates question formation and the conditions under which some of the elements of the clause are deleted. In addition to that, his work describes noun phrase, including nouns, pronouns, and adjective and prepositional phrase modifiers. Further, he describes the order of words in positive and negative verb phrases and the Pashto particles/clitics, along with their placement in a clause. He also investigates phenomena such as agreement and ergativity and specifically the conditions under which ergative case is assigned in the language.

As it is spoken in underdeveloped countries such as Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iran and India, literature produced on Pashto language is quite minimum in comparison to those languages that are spoken in the developed countries. There are numerous books on Pashto grammar which focuses on the basic grammatical categories like noun, pronoun, adjective etc. The literature so far produced on Pashto grammar concerns the basic concepts of grammar in Pashto. Tegey (1996) and Roberts (2000) study the agreement and some other grammar related phenomena of Pashto.
The impetus behind the efforts to conduct this study was that Pashto, being one of the major languages of the region has not been studied in detail as far as its argument structure is concerned. The lack of research work on the language urged the researcher to conduct this study.

This study provides an insight into the syntax of Pashto, specifically the argument structure of Pashto verbs. In addition, the comparison of argument structure in Pashto with the one in English can benefit those interested in research on the subject languages. More specifically, this study can help those who are interested in exploring the argument structure differences between the two languages as a cause of errors committed by Pashtun L2 learners of English and vice versa. Apart from Tegey (1996), whose focus is on the instructional and referential aspects of the material, and Roberts (2000), whose study is restricted to the second position clitics in Pashto, there is no formal up to the mark analysis of the core syntactic aspects of the language carried out by scholars. Thus, the phenomenon undertaken in this study has not been studied so far (see Pezil, 1955; MacKenzie, 1987; Tegey, 1996; Roberts, 2000).

Pashto is taught in almost every public school in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa as a subject and almost in over ninety percent of the public schools as a medium of instructions in the province (Iqbal et al. 2013) It is one of the major languages spoken in Pakistan. Besides, this language is the locus of international attention as well (Rehman, 1995). Dewa Radio telecasts news and other entertainments in Pashto from Washington DC 12 hours a day and seven days a week. It is taught as a second language in some of the universities in USA also. Based on its importance both at national and
international level, the formal analysis of its argument structure needs to be undertaken. This study is also expected to facilitate researchers interested in syntax and L2 learning and acquisition. Moreover, this study will also facilitate researchers interested in translation studies because the argument structure differences have strong bearings on the translation and re-translation.

This thesis aims to discuss in detail the argument structure in Pashto specifically focusing on important facets of the languages pertaining to, among other things, conflation, incorporation, different types of argument structure and argument realization. More specifically a comparative analysis of the bearings of incorporation and conflation on the argument structure of both Pashto and English is the point of focus in this study.

1.2 Objectives:

The present study aims to:

1.2.1 Find the extent to which Pashto allows the argument structure alternation,
1.2.2 Compare the argument structure of Pashto with that of English.
1.2.3 Explore the extent to which the Pashto and English argument hierarchy and argument structure alternation is affected by conflation and incorporation.
1.3 Research Questions

The study plans to answer to following research questions:

1.3.1 What is the nature of the argument structure alternation in Pashto?

1.3.2 Whether or not the argument structure of Pashto is similar to that of English?

1.3.3. What is the effect of conflation and incorporation on the argument structure of both the languages (Pashto and English) in terms of argument hierarchy and argument structure alternation?

1.4 Theoretical Framework

The present study is descriptive and comparative in nature. It focuses on the argument structure of Pashto and its comparison with the argument structure of English. While analyzing the argument structure of Pashto, the assumptions of Hale and Keyser (1998) have been adopted to consider the limits and range of the study. Thus, the study has been conducted within the framework, called ‘syntactic theory of basic argument structure types’, proposed by Hale and Keyser (1998). The benefits of adopting the said framework, was that it could provide an account for the basic as well as the alternate argument structure of a verb in both of the focus languages. The basic constructs of the framework have been defined in the following sections.
1.4.1 LP Monadic:

LP stands for Lexical Projection while monadic means carrying one argument. A structure is lp monadic if its head projects a specifier only. According to Hale and Keyser (1998), vP depicts lp-monadic argument structure because the said projects only a specifier while its PP complement (if there is one) has got its own argument structure. So owing to the fact that the verb projects only one argument, it is called lp. monadic argument structure type. So, the transitivity is formed by embedding the intransitive lexical structure (basic lp-Dyadic) in the complement position of the lp-monadic structure.

(2)

a.

```
  h
 /\   
 h  comp
```

In (2a) the head (h) projects only a complement. The head does not project a specifier.

1.4.2 Basic LP-Dyadic

Dyadic means to consist of two elements. In Basic lp-dyadic argument structure type, the head carries two arguments. In this type of argument structure, the verb projects both a specifier and a complement. The structure of basic lp-dyadic cannot be further decomposed into parts like composite dyadic which can be decomposed into lp-
monadic and basic lp-dyadic structures. The English PP depicts basic lp-dyadic structure because according to Hale and Keyser (1998, 1993, 2002 etc.) it projects both a specifier and a complement and its complement cannot have an argument structure of its own like PP complement.

b.

```
   h
  /   \
Spec h' comp
```

In (b) the head (h) projects both a specifier and a complement. This is the second type of argument structure proposed by Hale and Keyser (1998).

### 1.4.3 Composite Dyadic:

Composite dyadic structure, on the other hand is the structure which is formed by embedding the basic lp-dyadic as a complement of lp-monadic vP. It is called composite because it is made of two structures namely, lp-monadic and lp-dyadic. Owing to the fact that the said structure projects specifier and complement it is called dyadic.
The (c) presents the third type of argument structure proposed by Hale and Keyser (1998). In this type of argument structure, head (h) is phonologically null which projects both a specifier and a complement. This type of argument structure is different from that of (b) in so far as the head is concerned. The head of (c) is phonologically null.

### 1.4.4 Atomic/ Simple Argument Structure

The atomic argument structure type is depicted by a head which does not project either specifier nor complement.

In this type of argument structure, the head neither projects a specifier, nor a complement. The head alone makes up the AS of the word because neither a specifier nor a complement is among the requirements of the head word.
1.5 Derivation and Argument Structure

The following are the derivational processes that affect the AS structure of the word. The reason for putting them here is that they are relevant to the AS of the word as they are different from the root - a word from which the latter has been derived.

1.5.1 Conflation

Conflation is the process in which the phonological matrix of the head of a complement (C) is introduced into the empty phonological matrix of the head which selects (and is accordingly sister to) C. This is depicted by the causative counterpart of the (2a) as given in (2b). In the latter, the phonological matrix of the V2 has been introduced into the phonological matrix of V1 which is empty and selects the V2 as its complement and is sister to it.

1.

a. The leaves turned red.

b. The cold turned the leaves red.

Conflation is also involved in the zero derivation of verb from its adjectival root. It is a specific kind of incorporation, conforming to a version of the Head Movement Constraint (Travis, 1984; Baker, 1988).
1.5.2 Incorporation

Incorporation is a derivation in which the phonological matrix of N complement into the empty V head position. It is involved in the derivation of de-nominal verbs. English does not permit incorporation of a noun into preposition, nor does it permit incorporation of bare preposition into an empty verb.

1.5.3 PP as a small clause

The English PP according to Hale and Keyser (1998) depicts like that of a small clause. The latter has been called a clause because its head projects a specifier and a complement in the same fashion as the verbal predicates do.

1.6 Organization of the Study

Chapter Two is purely descriptive which focuses on clause structure in Pashto. It focuses on derivation of Pashto clauses and other related phenomena such as case and agreement. Chapter Three explores the complex verb formation in Pashto by comparing the complex verb forms found in Pashto with other languages of the region namely, Gojri, Urdu and Punjabi. Besides, the syntactic functions of the light verb have been highlighted. Chapter Four is, again, purely descriptive in nature. In this chapter the argument structure of different types of predicates found in Pashto have been described. This chapter also provides a brief background to the description of the syntax of argument structure in Pashto. Moreover, the chapter gives a comparison of the predicate
argument structure found in Pashto and English. Chapter Five is the main chapter of this dissertation which focuses on the comparison of the predicate argument structure in Pashto with the one found in English. The concepts of conflation and incorporation have been specifically concentrated in the comparison of the two languages in terms of argument structures. Chapter Six summarizes the dissertation and highlights ways for future research in the area.
Chapter Two

CASE, AGREEMENT AND DERIVATION OF PASHTO CLAUSE

The focus of this chapter is the clause structure of Pashto. The Minimalist Programme (Chomsky, 1993, 1995, 1998, 2001 and 2005) is used as the framework for the analysis of the data in this chapter. The main areas covered in this chapter are different types of derivation found in the clause structure of Pashto. In addition to derivation, case, agreement and structure related to the study are also analyzed.

Before presenting Pashto data, the major facets of the framework of the study are briefly introduced here.

2.1. Theoretical Framework

The phase theory of Chomsky (1999, 2000, 2002) holds that derivation of a sentence proceeds step-wise through a series of multiple merge, move, and spellout operations. These operations are organized into “phases”. The output of each phase is a partial LF and partial PF, which are then assembled into structures that are fed to the Articulatory/Perceptual and Conceptual/Intensional components. Chomsky defines phases in terms of “complete propositions”. This translates for him into a strong lexical phase of the VP and vP, followed by a strong functional phase consisting of TP and CP (Carnie & Brass, 2006).
2.1.1 Case theory

The case of the NPs and its agreement with the verb together determine the type of clause in which an NP is found.

2.1.2. Structural versus Inherent Case

Chomsky distinguishes between two types of cases namely structural and inherent. Structural case is assigned by a case assigner which c-commands the assignee. Nominative and accusative are the examples of structural case. Nominative is assigned to subject in the specifier/T position; accusative is assigned to object in the specifier/v position. These two cases are related to the agreement pattern inside the clause. Inherent case, on the other hand, is related to the theta role and thematic relation between case assigner and case assignee (Chomsky, 2001, 2005).

2.1.3. Case assignment in Minimalist Programme

Case is checked in the specifier position of certain functional heads (Chomsky, 1993, 1995). However, recently it has been assumed that the case is to be a part of agreement and that it is valued by matching its features with the corresponding functional heads that bear the same unvalued uninterpretable features. Once the features of functional heads are valued and as a result the uninterpretable features are erased the derivation converges at LF.
2.1.4. Case under Government and Binding theory

Government and Binding (GB) model imposes some restrictions on case assignment. In this model, the head is assumed to assign case to an NP either in head-specifier or head-complement configuration. The structure in (1) illustrates the configuration.

1. 

```
XP
  \-----
     specifier
  \-----
     \-----
        X'
  \-----
     \-----
        X
          \-----
            complement
```

In (1) X assigns case to specifier and complement. It assigns nominative case to its specifier in head-specifier configuration; and to its complement it assigns accusative case, in head-complement configuration. X is a variable which can represent any head of a phrase.

2.1.5. Case Checking Model

The later stage of GB (Chomsky & Lasnik. 1993) and the early stage of Minimalist Programme mark a considerable change in approach towards case. During this time, it was assumed that case is checked, not assigned. It was argued that case is predetermined which needs checking during the course of derivation (Chomsky,
Following Pollock’s split inflection Hypothesis\textsuperscript{1}, Chomsky (1993) argues that there exist two functional projections; namely, AgrOP and AgrSP. AgrSP, which is dominated by TP, dominates AgrO which in turn dominates VP. The case of subject is checked in specifier AgrS position while the case of object is checked in specifier-AgrO configuration (Chomsky, 1993; Kayne, 1989). Chomsky (1993) eliminates Agr projections. However, case is still checked in head-specifier configuration. He further assumes that vP is immediately dominated by a light verb which projects two specifier projections, namely inner specifier position where the external argument, subject, originates and outer specifier position where the object checks its accusative case. The case of subject is checked in specifier position as structure in (02) illustrates:

---

\textsuperscript{1} The possibility to represent Inflection as a number of separate projections, each headed by one/some of the features which carry tense, mood, aspect, and agreement information
V merges with Obj to form VP which subsequently merges with V to v. Then v merges with its external argument, subject, to form vP. Next, vP merges with its specifier thus forming another vP. Obj moves to the outer specifier position of v to check its accusative case. vP merges with I to form I bar. Finally I bar merges with its specifier DP forming TP. The subject DP is moved to specifier T position to check its nominative case.

2.1.6. Features Matching Model

Chomsky (1993, 1995, 1998, 2001, 2005) assumes that case is an uninterpretable feature which needs to be valued and checked in order to be
eliminated. Its valued and uninterpretable features are eliminated prior to LP through
agree operation. Accusative case is valued through agree operation between v and
the object whereas nominative case is valued through agree operation between
subject and T in accusative languages.

2.1.7 Case in Pashto

Structural cases like nominative and accusative are available in Pashto. In
addition to ergative-nominative construction, nominative-accusative is another
available construction in Pashto. Structures like (3) are very common in Pashto. In
this kind of construction, the subject NP is marked for ergative case while the object
is nominative.

(3)

a.  
    Aslam  badrang  waxwarhal
    Aslam (ERG) cucumber (NOM) eat(PL.PST)
    Aslam ate the cucumbers.

b.  
    subedara, ma  tê  da rotai dapara legale  wi
    Subedar, I (ERG) you (NOM) for meal send (PF) be(2.M.S.PST)
    Subedar, I had sent you for meal.

c.  
    haghê  mata  kitab  rakare  de
    He (ERG) to me book give (PF) be(S.M.PRS)
    He has given me the book.

In Pashto, as it is the case with Gojri (Bukhari, 2008) non- nominative DP
cannot enter into agreement with verb. Davison (2003) argues the same about Urdu.
In case of ergative subject, verb agrees with the object. In Pashto, default case does not exist. One of the two, subject or object, must be in nominative case so that agreement with verb could be established and thus the uninterpretable and unvalued features on T head be valued before LF. At LF the presence of uninterpretable features crashes the derivation. Besides, more than two nominative arguments are also not allowed in Pashto.

Before going into the analysis of the clause structure in Pashto, the discussion of ergativity in Pashto is given in section 2.2.

2.2. ERGATIVITY

There are three potential obligatory arguments of the verb, i.e. subject of the intransitive verb (S), subject with agent role (A) and object of the transitive verb (O). One way to differentiate these arguments would be to obligate different cases for each of them. The obligation of having different cases for the S, A and O is not shared cross-linguistically. A more common case system is the one in which two cases are offered, namely, the case of subject of both transitive and intransitive verbs and the case of the object of transitive verb. This type of case system is called nominative/accusative which is typically found in European languages (Tallerman, 2005, p. 161). English, being one of the languages of European family exhibits nominative/accusative case system. Examples in (4) illustrate Nom/Acc pattern in English.
(4)

a. He (S) smiles.
b. You (A) call him (O).
c. He (S) dances.
d. He (O) is hit by you (A).

In (4a) the subject of the intransitive verb is *he*, while in (4b) *you* is the subject of the transitive verb *call*. However, the case of both the subjects’ viz., the subject of the transitive verb and the subject of the intransitive is isomorphic. On the other hand, the object of the transitive verb *him* in (4b) *bears* a case which is contrasting with the case of the subject of an intransitive verb in (4c) and with the case borne by the subject of transitive verb in (4d).

Another type of case marking is the one which marks (A) differently from (S) and (O). This type of system is known as ergative/absolutive system of case marking. The case of an agent subject (traditionally called the subject of a transitive verb) is called ergative case while the case of unagentive subject is called absolutive case. The aforementioned two types of systems of case marking are illustrated here as (5):

(5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accusative System</th>
<th>Ergative System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.S</td>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>Accusative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Accusative system of case marking is more common in European languages like English, Latin, German etc. while ergative system of case marking is generally
seen in Australian languages such as Basque and Lezgein. Ergative system is not found in European languages (Germanic, Roman, Greek, Celtic etc.). It is very rare in African languages too. However, in Australian languages, ergativity is a shared feature in most of the languages. As far as South Asian (SA) languages are concerned, split ergativity is more common in them. Indo-Aryan family of languages is famous for split ergativity. Further, Indo-Iranian family of languages also exhibits split ergativity system of case marking. Pashto also belongs to Indo-Iranian family of languages which is the focus of this thesis. The following section will discuss split ergativity in detail.

2.2.1 Split System

A language may not follow either accusative or ergative exclusively. There exists a system of case marking which shares features of both accusative and ergative languages. Such types of languages are classified as split ergative languages. There are a number of factors that determine the split on ergativity such as the semantic property of DPs, the tense or aspect of the verb and the type of clause, whether main or embedded one.

According to Tallerman (2005, p. 165), split is determined by the property of DPs in Dyirbal, an Australian language. Only full DPs and third person pronouns take ergative case while other subjects carry nominative case. Pitta-Pitta, another Australian language, exhibits split on tense of the verb in case marking. In non-future tense, the subject bears ergative case while in future tense it bears nominative case.
In Gojri, on the other hand, the ergativity maker -ne is affixed to an (A) subject in simple past tense and perfective aspects (Sharma, 1982; Bukhari, 2009). Moreover, in the aforementioned language, the ergative maker –ne cannot co-occur with clause that contains a verb in habitual and progressive aspect (Akhtar & Bukhari, 2007). Other Indo-Aryan languages such as Punjabi (Akhtar, 2000), Urdu (Butt, 1995) and Hindi (Mahajan, 1989) exhibit the same pattern. Examples in (6) demonstrate split on ergativity in Dyirbal and some Indo-Aryan languages.

(6)

a. nguma yabu-nggu buran
carry(ABS) mother(ERG) saw (PST)
Mother (A) saw father (O).

(Dyirbal. Tallerman, 2005)

b. kajal-ne Xat likhyo e
Kajal(ERG) letter(NOM) write (PF) be (PRES.3.SG)
Kajal has written the book.

(Gojri. Akhtar & Bukhari, 2007)

c. daaktar-ne mariiz-nuũ vekhi-aa
Doctor(ERG) patient(ACC) see(PST)
The doctor examined the patient.

(Punjabi. Akhtar, 2000)

d. Ram-ne rotti khaayii thii
Ram(ERG) bread(ACC) eat(PF-F) be(PST.F.3.SG)
Ram had eaten bread.

(Hindi. Mahajan, 1989)

In every example given in (6), one of the arguments of the verb carries ergative case. In (6a), the Dyirbal subject yabu carries nggu as an ergative case marker. In Gojri as in (6b), the subject Kajul is marked by ‘ne’ as an ergative marker. In Panjabi and Hindi the same ‘ne’ is used to mark the subject of the verb as ergative.
2.2.2 Syntactic and Morphological Ergativity

According to Dixon (1994) and Hale (1996), ergativity can be divided into two types; syntactic ergativity and morphological ergativity. Syntactic ergativity is the one in which certain syntactic and grammatical rules necessitate that the subject of intransitive verb (S) and object of transitive verb (O) be distinguished from the subject of transitive verb (A). Dyirbal demonstrates syntactic ergativity which can be seen in the following examples:(7)

\( a. \) yabu \( \text{banaga-n'yu} \)
\( \text{mother(ABS) return(NFUT)} \)
Mother returned.

\( b. \) numa \( \text{yabu-Ngu bura-n} \)
\( \text{father(ABS) mother(ERG) see(NFUT)} \)
Mother saw father.

(Dixon 1994)

Illustrations in (7) show ergative-absolutive pattern since the syntactic requirement of ergativity, 3rd person pronoun, is met. However, in (8) nominative-accusative pattern is demonstrated as implicated by the fulfillment of the syntactic requirement, 3rd person pronoun.

(8)

\( a. \) \( \text{Nana banaga-n'yu} \)
\( \text{We(NOM) return(NFUT)} \)
We returned.
The morphological ergativity is different from syntactic ergativity. In morphological ergativity, the syntactic relationship of S, O and A is morphologically realized (Dixon 1994).

Keeping in mind the above classifications of various types of ergativity found in different languages, let us now analyze the Pashto data in the next section.

### 2.3. ERGATIVITY IN PASHTO

Pashto also displays a split ergativity like some other Indo-Iranian languages. The same phenomenon of split ergativity can be found in Indo-Aryan languages such as Hindi, Punjabi, Gojri, Urdu etc. Generally, the split is conditioned on the semantic properties of the subject DP; and the aspect, tense and mood of the clause in the aforementioned family of languages. Ergative case marker -né marks a subject in past tense and perfective aspects in Gojri and the same is true for Urdu, Hindi, and Punjabi etc. (Bukhari, 2009; Akhtar, 2000). Similarly in Pashto, ergative case is assigned to a subject in both perfect aspect and past tense. The following examples illustrate ergative case in Past tense and perfect aspects in non-past tenses.

(9)

a. *za/ma ba kor jorh karhe wi
   I(ERG)(FUT) house(NOM) build do (PRF)
   I will have built the house.

b. n³urra banaga-n³u
   you(PL-NOM)return(NFUT)
   You all returned.
b. *za/ma kor jorh karhe de
I(ERG) house(NOM) build do (PRS PF)
I have built the house.

c. *za/ma kor jorh ko
I(ERG) house(NOM) build do (PST)
I built the house.

In Pashto, there are only two aspects i.e. perfect and imperfect while in Indo-Aryan languages there exist three aspects such as habitual, Progressive and prefect (Bukhari, 2009; Akhtar, 2000). Imperfect aspect in Pashto comprises both habitual and progressive which have been treated separately in Indo-Aryan family of languages. Thus, in Pashto ergative case is assigned in past (progressive aspect and perfect aspects) in addition to past simple and perfect aspect. In Indo-Aryan languages, however, ergative case is not assigned to (A) subject in progressive aspect even though the other requirements such as agentive role and volitionality of action are satisfied.

The Pashto examples in (10) demonstrate that ergative case can be assigned to the subject in past progressive in addition to the past simple and perfect aspect (all tenses).

(10)

a. ma halak waniso
I(ERG) boy(NOM) catch (PST M SG)
I caught the boy.
b. ma margha wakho
   I(ERG) crow(NOM) beat (PST M SG)
   I was beating the crow.

c. ma halwa kharsawala
   I(ERG) sweet(NOM) sell(PST M S)
   I was selling the pudding.

d. ma dodai pokh-karhe da
   I(ERG) meal(NOM) cook (PF) be(PRES F SG)
   I have cooked the meal.

e. ma ba dukan aghaste wi.
   I(ERG) (FUT) shop buy be(PST M 3SG)
   I will have bought the shop.

f. ma ba zmaka aghasta
   I(ERG) (FUT) property buy (PST F 3SG)
   I would have been buying the property.

g. ma gade aghaste wo
   I(ERG) car buy (PF) be( PST M 3SG)
   I had bought the car.

Examples in (10) illustrate that in Pashto a subject bears ergative case in past tense while in non-past tense, only those sentences which are in perfect aspect get ergative case assigned to its subject. Another conspicuous feature of ergativity in Pashto is that all the subjects bearing ergative case are obligated to be having agent theta role assigned to it prior to ergative case assignment. This entails that the action performed by subject is volitional. The same is true about Indo-Aryan languages as well (Butt, 1995; Akhtar & Bukhari, 2007; Bukhari & Akhtar, 2008). Illustrations in (11) exemplify a subject which does not get ergative case assigned because it does not carry agent theta role.
Otherwise, ergative case assignment to the subject results in the ungrammaticality of the sentence as in (12). Consider the following examples:

(12)

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
& \text{ma} & \text{pekhawar} & \text{khwax} & \text{de} \\
\text{I(DAT)} & \text{Peshawar(NOM)} & \text{like(PF)} & \text{be(PRES M 3SG)} \\
\end{array}
\]

I like Peshawar.

In Pashto, ergativity has been witnessed in past tense in addition to perfect aspects in non-past tenses. In past tense, both perfect and imperfect aspects exhibit ergativity while in non-past tenses the latter is restricted to perfect aspects. Examples in (13) demonstrate ergative case assignment to the subject in present imperfect result in ill-formed structure. However, in the given aspect, nominative case is assigned to the subject of the transitive structures. Contrastively, in present perfect ergative case is assigned to the subject. Nonetheless if nominative case is assigned to the subject in present perfect, the structure would become ill-formed. Consider the following examples:

(13)

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{a. } & \text{za} & \text{akhabar} & \text{goram} \\
\text{I-(NOM)} & \text{newspaper(ACC)} & \text{read(PRES 1 SG)} \\
\end{array}
\]

I read a newspaper/ I am reading a newspaper.
The action performed by ergative subject is volitional in most of the Indo-Aryan languages like Urdu (Butt, 1995, 1997), Punjabi (Akhtar, 2000) and Gojri (Bukhari & Akhtar, 2008). Wali (2005) argues that ergativity in Maharati is conditioned by subjunctive mood. He further assumes that in Maharati ergative case is assigned to the subject of those sentences which indicate obligation and necessity. In Pashto too, where ergative case is assigned to the subject of a sentence whose action is volitional as shown in (14):

(14)

a. *ma jag mat kare de
   I(NOM) jug(NOM) break do (PF) be (PRES M SG)
   I have broken the jug.
   (Volitional act)

b. zama na jag mat sho
   I(GEN) jug(NOM) break (PF) be (PST M SG)
   I have broken the glass
   (Non-volitional action)

c. *ma mekha kharsa krha
   I(NOM) buffalo(NOM) sell do (PST F SG)
   I sold the buffalo.
   (Volitional action)
The action performed by the subjects in (14f as in 14b and 14d) is non-volitional owing to the fact that the subject is not A in those constructions. The subjects bear genitive case which necessitates non-volitional action. However, if the case of the subject is ergative then the same sentence which gave none volitional reading would give volitional reading. The action is not intentional thus non-ergative case is implicated on the said subject. The subject is not assigned ergative case despite the fact that the structural requirements for the case assignment have been fulfilled. Thus, it is proved that the action performed by an ergative subject is always volitional. Non-volitional action on the part of the subject requires it to be in genitive case, as it happens in (14b, 14d and 14f). Consequently, a very close relation between volitionality and ergativity is obtained. However, there are some constructions which behave quite uniquely with respect to ergativity and transitivity of verb. Consider the following examples:
The action performed by subject in (15a-b) is volitional, but the verb looks like intransitive one. However, ergative case is assigned to the subject owing to the fact the subject DP carries agent theta role and the action is volitional. However, the examples in (15c-e) are fine with the nominative case because these verbs are un-accusative whose subjects do not carry agent theta role thus the action of the subject is un-volitional. So, if we assign nominative case to the subject the agent subjects in (15a-b) will result in ungrammaticality of the sentences as it is represented in (16a-b).
(16)

a. *za wakandal
   I(NOM) laugh(PST)
   I laughed.

b. *za wajaral
   I(NOM) weep(PST)
   I wept.

c. za khandam
   I(NOM) laugh(PRS)
   I laugh.

d. za jaram
   I(NOM) weep(PRS)
   I weep.

In (16a-b) the sentences are ill form due to the fact the action of khandal ‘laugh’ and jaral ‘weep’ is volitional. (16a) means that I intentionally laugh or that I pretend to laugh and similarly (16b) means that ‘I intentionally wept or that I pretend to weep.

Thus nominative case on the subject will result in the ungrammaticality of the sentence. However, in (16c-d) the khandal ‘laugh’ and jaral ‘weep’ are non-volitional actions without any pretension. So nominative case on the subject seems appropriate and thus the sentences are grammatical.

In the subsequent sections, ergativity in Pashto has been discussed, with special focus on the condition under which the subject of a predicate is assigned ergative case. The conditions consist of tense, aspect, the thematic properties of the subject DP and the thematic properties of the verb.
2.4. Morphological ergativity in Pashto

Pashto is a split ergative language where ergativity is both structural and morphological. Data in (17) show that subject of intransitive verb (S) and subject of transitive verb (A), regardless of having different forms, behave similarly under identical syntactic conditions.

2.4.1 Control

Data in (17) show that both nominative and ergative subject can be controlled in an embedded clause by the subject of the matrix clause. The typical example of such kind of control is non-finite subject PRO which is controlled by subject of the matrix clause.

(17)

a. ma da-nawi kor da aghasto irada kari da
   I(ERG) new house(DAT) to buy decide(F SG) do(F SG PRS)
   I have decided to buy a new house.

b. za da nawi kor da aghast irada kom.
   I(NOM) new house(DAT) to buy decide do (PRS 1 SG)
   I decide to buy a new house/ I am making my mind to buy a new house.

In both (17a) and (17b) the infinite subject of the embedded clause is controlled by the subject of the matrix clause regardless of the fact that in (17a) the subject is in ergative case while in (17b) it is in nominative case.

On the other hand, the ergative and nominative subjects cannot control an embedded subject in a finite clause. Data in (18) show that verb wai ‘say’ in the main clause demands an overt subject in the embedded clause in some situations.
Thus, it is concluded that ergativity in Pashto is both morphological and structural. Morphological in the sense that an ergative subject is morphologically marked in case the subject is a pronoun. In case of a noun, the case is not morphologically realized. However, the case of the subject noun is identified from the agreement pattern found within the clause. When the verb agrees with the object instead of a noun subject; the subject is assumed to bear ergative case. In Pashto, ergativity is structural in the sense that ergative case is assigned to subject in some specific syntactic configuration. In Pashto the structural requirements for ergative is perfect aspect and past tense.
2.4.2 Type of clause and ergativity

Type of clause makes no difference to the ergative pattern of a sentence. The same ergative pattern is followed both in matrix and embedded clause. As the subject of the transitive clause is assigned ergative case in past tense (both perfect and imperfect past) and perfect aspect in non-past tenses in the main clause, the subject of the embedded clause is also assigned ergative case if the requirements for assignment of ergative case are fulfilled. The conditions under which ergative case is assigned are the same in both matrix and embedded clause. Regardless of the semantic properties of a verb in a matrix clause, the (A) subject of the embedded clause is assigned ergative case in past and perfect aspects in non-past tenses. Data in (19) show that the type of clause makes no difference to the ergative pattern inside the clause. Once the conditions for ergative case are met, no matter what type of clause it is, ergative case is assigned to its subject.

(19)

a. hagha wai chi hagha ba kitab wakhli  
He(NOM) say (PRS 3 SG) (CP) he (NOM) (FUT) book (ACC) buy (3 SG)  
He says that he will buy a book.

b. ma wi chi za ba cherg pokh krham  
I(ERG) say (PST 3 SG) (CP) I(NOM) (FUT) chicken(NOM) cook do (PRS 1SG)  
I said that I will cook the chicken.

c. ma wi chi ma manda krha  
I(ERG) say (PST) (CP) I(ERG) run do (PST)  
I said that I ran.
d. za waim chi ma manda wowahala.
   I(NOM) say (PRS) (CP) I(ERG) run beat (PST)
   I say that I ran/run.

e. za waim chi ma cherg pokh kare de
   I(NOM) say (PRS) (CP) I(ERG) chicken (M SG) cook do be (PF MSG)
   I say that I have cooked the chicken.

In (19b) the subject of matrix clause is in ergative case while the subject of the embedded clause is in nominative case, in view of the fact that matrix clause is in past tense and the embedded clause in present tense. Similarly, the subject of the matrix clause in (19d) is in nominative case while the subject of the embedded clause is in ergative case in view of the fact that Asp head carries [-IMPF] features and subject is assigned agent theta role which require that the subject of the clause be in ergative case.

2.4.3 **Pashto ergative case** (inherent or structural?)

Bobaljik (1993) claims that ergativity in South Asian languages is structural. It is based on a particular structure of the clause i.e. perfect aspect, past tense. However, it is equally plausible to argue that the case is inherent in the languages including, Hindi, Urdu, Panjabi, Gojri etc. owing to the reason that only Agent (A) subject can bear ergative case marker. (Bukhari & Akhtar, 2008) (Akhtar & Bukhari, 2007). In Pashto, ergative case is inherent because it is assigned either by Asp or T head to only agentive subject. However, not all the agentive subject ergative case. Ergative case is only assigned to agentive subject if the tense is past [+PST] or the
aspect is perfect [-IMPF]. So, the case is also sensitive to the features of a lexical item other than the DP to which is attached such as the tense or the aspect.

The subject which takes experiencer role cannot take ergative case as represented in (20). In Gojri, experiencer subject bears -na which stands for dative and accusative case marker. Similarly, in Pashto too, Genitive case, a case other than ergative, is assigned to an experiencer subject.
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a. zama yakhni washwa  
I(GEN) cold be (PST)  
I felt cold.

b. *ma yakhni washwa  
I(ERG) cold be (PST)  
I felt cold.

c. zama pa sar dard wo.  
I(GEN) head(DAT) pain be (PST)  
I was feeling headache.

d. pa ma taba raghali wa.  
I-(DAT) fever come (PF) be (PST F SG)  
I was suffering from fever.

In Pashto, ergative case is not represented in form of a clitic like Gojri and other Indo-Aryan languages where it has a special marker. In Urdu, –na is an ergative case marker. In Pashto, however, if it is noun; there is no overt difference between the nominative and ergative noun. On the other hand, if it is pronoun then the base form is changed so as represented in the table below in table.2.1. Agreement pattern
found in the clause determines the case of the subject. If the verb agrees with subject, the latter bears nominative case whereas in case the verb establishes agree-relation with object, then the subject bears ergative case. The following table illustrates the ergative-nominative alternations of pronouns in Pashto.

Table 2.1: Ergative and Nominative Cases of Pronouns in Pashto

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominative Pronouns</th>
<th>Ergative Pronouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First person singular</td>
<td>za</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First person plural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second person singular</td>
<td>tɛ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>taso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second person plural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third person singular</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the above table, it is clear that the ergative form of first person singular pronoun is ma (I) while its nominative form is za (I). The ergative form of second person singular pronoun is taa (you), however, when marked for nominative case it is tɛ (you). The ergative and nominative forms of second person plural are isomorphic. The ergative form of third person singular masculine is haghɛ while its nominative form is hagha whereas its feminine alternate is haghi- depicting a slight difference in the last vowel. The ergative and nominative forms of third person plural are isomorphic. The data in table2.1 shows that there is a sort of case stacking situation on pronominal DP in Pashto. The first person singular Nominative za
becomes *ma when it is ergative. It seems as if the nominative *za has been blocked at PF because of either aspect or tense features as discussed before. Similarly *mong becomes *mong-a as *a has been added as an ergative case marker. The second person singular *tē becomes *taa when ergative case is assigned to it. Thus, it seems as if the ergative case marker *a has been added to the nominative case as in first person singular *mong-NOM while in case of third person singular feminine and masculine the nominative case marker *a seems to have been deleted or suppressed by the ergative case marker *ē and *ī. So, case stacking situation is clearly evident in the data. Deletion of the nominative case marker seems to have been caused by PF blocking of the said marker. Thus only the ergative marked is valued at PF.

Like Gojri, inanimate subject DP cannot be assigned ergative case in Pashto. This entails that ergative case is an inherent case in Pashto. Illustrations in (21) confirm that an inanimate subject DP cannot be assigned ergative case.

(21)

a. *kursai rotai waxwara  
   chair(ERG) meal(NOM) eat(SG F PST)  
   Chair ate the meal.

b. *laptop woba skali di  
   laptop(ERG) water(NOM) drink (PF) be(PRS PF F SG)  
   Laptop has drunk water.

The examples in (21) demonstrate that ergativity is closely associated with the agent role of the subject. Ergative case cannot be assigned to *kursai ‘chair’ since it is an inanimate entity and thus cannot perform the action of eating. Similarly, *laptop being inanimate object cannot perform a volitional action. Thus, *kursai and
*laptop* both are not eligible for ergative case marking despite the fact that all other requirements of ergative case namely, past tense or perfect aspect, are satisfied. The sole cause of ungrammaticality of constructions in (21) is that the subject is an inanimate entity.

Thus it is concluded that in Pashto, like Gojri and other Indo-Aryan languages, ergative case is both structural and inherent. Structural means that the subject takes ergative case when the structural prerequisites for ergative case i.e. past tense and/or perfect aspects are met. Further, it is essential to have subject with agent theta role. Experiencer subject cannot be assigned ergative case. Moreover, like Gojri, in Pashto too, ergative case is not allowed on an inanimate subject DP. However, there is a striking difference between Pashto and the Indo-Aryan Languages i.e. Pashto allows ergative case on the subject of un-ergative verbs which the other Indo-Aryan languages do not allow.

2.5 **ERGATIVE CASE ASSIGNMENT IN PASHTO**

Up till now, it has been established that in Pashto ergative case is both inherent and structural. The thematic requirement of ergativity is that only (A) subject can be assigned ergative case. The subject DP enters the derivation with uninterpretable and unvalued features that need to be valued and deleted in the course of time. For two reasons these uninterpretable features are checked and valued. Firstly, at PF, a DP cannot be pronounced unless the case that it bears is valued. Secondly, the deletion of the uninterpretable features at LF is possible only when the case features are valued. This phenomenon of case checking is in line with the claim
of Chomsky (1995) and Nunes (1995, p. 231) who argue that uninterpretable features are illegitimate at LF.

Following Chomsky (1995, 2000, 2001), it is assumed that T assigns nominative case to the closest DP it c-commands and which does not already have a case value. In nominative-accusative constructions subject is the closest available DP hence has a scope over other DPs to be assigned nominative case. On the other hand, little v assigns agent theta role to a subject and V assigns accusative case to an object in transitive constructions.

Conditions on ergativity in Pashto can be generalized as in (22).

(22)

Ergative case is assigned agent subject if that the Asp head carries [-IMPF], or otherwise T head is marked for [+PST].

Bukhari & Akhtar (2008) postulate the following generalization about ergativity in Gojri.

(23)

The ergative case is assigned to a subject when (a) the Asp head is marked for [-IMPF] and (b) v assigns agent theta role to the subject DP.

The given generalizations about ergativity in Pashto entail that ergativity in Pashto is relevant to tense, aspect and the semantic property of the subject DP. Moreover, in Pashto, ergativity is relevant to agentivity rather than transitivity. The subjects of unergative and accusative verbs have been treated differently in Pashto.
while in Gojri and other Indo-Aryan languages they are treated the same. In Pashto (A) is treated differently from other argument like (O) and (S) in past/perfect aspects. The rest of the possible conditions like type of clause and mood are irrelevant in this regard.

The aspectual system found in Pashto is not as rich as that of other Indo-Aryan languages. There are only two aspects in Pashto; namely, perfect and imperfect. The aspect head realizes it aspect as [-IMP] and imperfect as [+IMP]. So, it is very convenient to capture both the features as binary features [+/-IMP] as Bukhari & Akhtar (2008) propose for Gojri. When the aspect head has the value [-IMP], the subject DP in the spec/vP is assigned ergative case. So, perfect aspect is realized as [-IMP] while imperfect aspect is realized as [+IMP]. In this way, ergative case is assigned to subject in perfect aspect. However, if the aspect head carries [+IMP] features and (T) head carries [PST], the subject is assigned ergative case regardless of the features that the Asp head carries. In case the (T) head carries [PRS], then the aspect head needs to be having [-IMP] features, otherwise ergative case is not assigned to its subject. Thus, it implies that ergative case is assigned both in the past perfect and imperfect constructions.

In Pashto aspect morphology is always visible as a suffix on verb, as it happens in Gojri and Maharati. Consider the examples given in (24).

(24)

\[
\text{a. kaloo-ne ka kepyo}
\]

Kaloo(ERG) grass(NOM) cut (PST)

Kaloo cuts the grass

Gojri (Bukhari, 2008)
From the above discussion, it is concluded that in Pashto, ergative case is based on agentivity and tense. Perfect aspect is considered to be based in past tense. Thus aspect cannot be considered to have bearing on the ergativity pattern found in Pashto (Dixon, 1994). In Gojri, ergativity is based on agentivity and aspect only. Tense plays no role in this regard. Bukhari & Akhtar (2008) argue that past tense always combines with perfect aspect but in Pashto we cannot combine past imperfect with perfect since in Pashto imperfect aspect includes both progressive and habitual which are treated separately in Gojri. In Gojri, ergative case is assigned only in past habitual (not in past progressive) aspect in addition to perfect aspect in past and non-past tenses. However, in Pashto, ergative case is assigned in both habitual and progressive aspects in past tense in addition to perfect aspect in past and non-past tense. Consider the following examples:

(25)

a. ma biscat xwarhal.
   I(ERG) biscuit(NOM) eat (PST 3 SG)
   I was eating biscuits.

b. ma dodai wexwarha.
   I(ERG) meal(NOM) eat (PST F 3 SG)
   I ate biscuits.

c. ma rotai xwarhali wa.
   I(ERG) meal(NOM) eat (PF) be (PST F 3 SG)
   I had eaten meal.
In (25a-b), ergative case is assigned to the subject because the verb carries PST features though the aspect head carries (+IMPF). Similarly in (25c) the aspect head is marked for (–IMPF) as well as (+PST) so ergative case is assigned to the subject. In Pashto ergative is sensitive to tense. However, since perfect aspect is also categorized to have base in past tense, ergative case is also assigned in perfect aspects in non-past tense as in (25d).

The following structure illustrates the structure of (25d) in terms of ergative case assignment in Pashto:
First of all, the verb merges with object DP *xat*, forming VP. Next, the *v* merges with *vP*, to form *v’*. The latter then merges with its specifier subject DP to form *vP*. Then, *vP* merges with *Asp* to form *AspP*. *AspP*, subsequently merges with *T* to form *T’*. Then the *T’* merges with its specifier DP to form *TP*. Finally the *TP*
merges with C to CP. After the merge operation, movement of the maximal projection (DP) happens. In other words, the subject DP which enters the derivation with agent theta role and ergative case; is blocked to control agreement with T. The object DP, thus, moves to spec T position to value its uninterpretable features. The T head by default establishes agree relationship with the highest DP in the argument hierarchy. However, the subject DP (being the highest in the argument hierarchy) is blocked from establishing agree relationship with T, the objective DP moves to specifier T (following locality condition) to value the unvalued features of T. The ergative subject moves to spec-T position because of EPP features. In (25), as the Asp head bears [-IMPF] features, the subject DP (agentive) gets ergative value at PF.

wo and de represent past and present tense respectively. It is, therefore, plausible to argue that in Pashto tense is realized with a verbal clitic like de and wo in the same way as we have tense markers for present and past tense in English. In English the present and past tense have been distinguished by the use of different tense markers like is/do and was/did. In Pashto –wo is a verbal clitic positioned at the end of the clause as in (25c). However, in progressive aspect it behaves like a full verb deriving the de-adjectival verb from the root. The habitual aspect in past tense is shown with the clitic -wo attached to the verb as a prefix as in (26).

(26)

a. ma poster walagawalwo
   I(ERG) poster(NOM) paste (PST)
   I pasted the poster.
b.  *ma chat lagawal (wo)*

I(ERG) chart(NOM) paste (PF) be (PST)

I was pasting the chart.

c.  *ma pato lagawale wo*

I(ERG) picture(NOM) paste (PF) be (PST)

I had pasted the picture.

In (26), the clitic *wo/wa* is used for different functions. In (26), *wa-* is used as a prefix to marked habitual aspect of the verb. In (26b) give progressive reading because the verb is used without *wo-* prefix. However, in (26c), *wo* is used as a clitic to mark past tense.

### 2.6 CASE, AGREEMENT AND THE DERIVATION OF CLAUSE IN PASHTO

This section focuses on case, agreement and derivation of Pashto clause along with different patterns of case marking and their bearings on verbal agreement. Only a caseless DP is assigned nominative case by (T). In this regard, (Bukhari & Akhtar, 2008) maintain that nominative case has a special relation with agreement in many South Asian Languages. Accusative case is commonly realized by an overt case marking whereas the nominative DP does not exhibit any case marking.

Following Chomsky, it is anticipated that structural case is assigned to a DP by functional head such as T while lexical case is assigned to a DP by little v. Accusative case is assigned by V to a DP at its complement position while ergative case is assigned by Asp head when egative case is assigned in perfect aspec.
However, when it is assigned to DP in Past tense then it is assigned by T only. The prerequisites for ergative case in Pashto are those which holds for Brushaskib (Dixon, 1994) and different from those of Gojri (Bukhari & Akhtar, 2008). Ergative case is assigned to the subject DP if the asp head carries [-IMPF] features or else the T head carries [+PST] features as depicted by structure in (26) above.

On the basis of analysis provided in the above sections, the following rules for case and agreement in Pashto have been proposed:

a. Nominative DP values the phi-features of (T), irrespective of the grammatical function of the latter; it may be a subject or an object.

b. Following the economy principle, the verb agrees with the highest available nominative DP. The movement of a DP from VP internal position is triggered by locality condition for features checking.

c. If a clause does not have nominative DP at subject position which is the highest position in the clause then the verb agrees with nominative DP at an object position. In case of double objects, the verb agrees with the direct object which is always in nominative case in ergative constructions.

d. In Pashto, accusative case is assigned to an object by V and is covertly checked if the clause takes single object as also postulated by Chomsky (1995).

e. If a subject DP is assigned experiencer role instead, Genitive case is assigned to it concurrently.
f. If the little v assigns agent theta role to its external argument and the Asp head carries [-IMPF] features then the subject DP is valued for ergative case. However, if the T head is marked with [+PST] features then the case of subject is valued as ergative regardless of the features of Asp head.

g. Ergative case is assigned to the A subject regardless of the transitivity of the verb. Thus the subject DP of unergative predicates also requires ergative case.

In light of the data presented in the preceding sections 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 the above mentioned generalizations about Pashto are outlined within the framework of Minimalism. In Pashto all head final word order such as TP and VP are derived by linearization of their complements to their left similar to what Bukhari & Akhtar (2008) argued about Gojri. In inflection layer, all the complements are linearized on left. Same is the case with specifier. However, being a head final projection, complementizer is quite different from the rest as it linearizes its complement to its right.

2.6.1 Ergative- nominative constructions

In past tense, the agent (A) subject bears ergative case both in perfective and imperfective aspects since the split is on tense. Contrary to this, in Indo-Aryan languages the (A) subject bears ergative case only when the aspect is perfect. The following are examples of ergative case in past tense constructions.
In the given examples in (27), the ergative subject *ma is fine while the nominative subject *za render the construction ill-formed. Structure in (28) illustrates how ergative-nominative construction in past tense is derived in Pashto.

(28)

The head V merges with its complement DP, *dodai ‘meal’ to form VP. Subsequently, the little v merges with VP to form v’ projection. Then, the v’ merges
with its specifier DP to form vP. After that, vP merges with T that has [+PST] features, forming T’. In the next step, object merges with T; to form another T’ which in turn merges with subject DP to project TP. TP merges with C to form CP. The little v assigns agent theta role its specifier subject DP. One possibility is that agent role is assigned to the subject along with ergative case as the DP enters into the syntax. The other possibility is that the agent subject enters the derivation as an unmarked DP. However, since the structural requirements (such as Tense or Aspect) are fulfilled, ergative case is assigned to it by the respectively head (Asp or T). In this situation, ergative DP is blocked to value the formal features of T while the object DP (being the next candidate for nominative case assignment) values the features of T and as a result gets nominative case. The subject DP, however, moves up to satisfy the EPP feature since it has already been assigned ergative case. However, the object DP moves to specifier position (to satisfy locality condition) to value the phi-features of T. The nominative DP moves out of its original position to spec-T position, thus becoming the sister of T. After, it has moved to spec/T position, the moved DP can value the phi-features of T (and get nominative case from T) in specifier local position by following the locality condition on structural case assignment. Movement of the DP satisfies the last Resort condition because the case features cannot be separated from the DP. In other words, the percolation of the features is possible because they are strong features. The non-structural case can however, be checked in-situ. Once the ergative case is assign to the subject DP, it is blocked to have to value the phi-features of T. the agentive subject, (in combination with aspect [perfect] or Tense [past]) is valued as ergative at PF or otherwise nominative. One reason why ergative case is valued at PF is that it has been assigned
structurally after the semantic requirement of agent role has been fulfilled. It is not a pure semantic case otherwise, had that been the case then the PF valuation could have been skipped because the inherent case is legitimate/interpretable at LP.

### 2.6.2 Ergative-dative constructions

Constructions, in which subject is marked for ergative case and object is marked for dative case while T head carries default case marking are called ergative-dative constructions. The following examples illustrate Ergative-Accusative constructions in Pashto:

(29)

a. \[ \text{ma asman} \text{ ta wakatal.} \]
   I(ERG) sky(DAT) look(PST)
   I looked at the sky.

b. \[ \text{ma genai} \text{ ta wakatal.} \]
   I(ERG) girl(DAT) look(PST)
   I looked at the girl.

The given examples illustrate default case marking in Pashto. Since none of the arguments of the verb carries nominative case thus to be eligible for valuation of the features of T, verb carries default case marking (very common in Indo-Aryan languages). The subject and object DPs carry ergative and dative cases respectively thus they are not eligible for agree-relation with (T). Consequently, the (T) reflects only the tense; no other grammatical features are visible on the (T) head. In Gojri and other Indo-Aryan languages the default case on the (T) means something more than just tense features (Bukhari, 2008).
2.6.3 Nominative – accusative constructions

The construction, in which the subject DP is marked for nominative case while the object DP is marked for accusative case, is called nominative-accusative construction. This type of constructions is allowed in Pashto. Ergative-accusative and nominative-nominative constructions are not allowed in Pashto. Nominative-accusative type of construction is permissible only in imperfect non-past tenses, since in past tense and non-past perfective constructions the subject DP of the transitive clause bears ergative case. Examples in (30) illustrate nominative-accusative constructions.

(30)

a. mung manhi khro
   we(NOM) apple(ACC) eat(PRS 1 PL)
   We eat/are eating apples.

b. Shahid jami estri kai.
   Shahid(NOM) clothes(ACC) iron do (PRS 3 SG)
   Shahid irons/ is ironing clothes.

c. za dodai pakhom
   I(NOM) meal(ACC) cook(PRS 1 SG)
   I am cooking the meal.

d. haghoi moter rakagi
   They(NOM) car(ACC) drag(PRS 3 PL)
   They are dragging the car.

The presence of nominative argument at subject position implies that subject DP values the unvalued and uninterpretable features on (T) head namely, case, phi- and EPP features. Accordingly, an agree relation between subject and (T) head is established. Similarly, the uninterpretable features of (T) head are valued and the
subject DP gets nominative case from (T). The agree-relation between subject DP and (T) is morphologically reflected on the verb. The following illustration shows how this agreement is projected:

(31)

In (31), the V xoram merges with Object dodai to form VP. VP then merges with v to form V'bar. Then, V' merges with subject za to form vP. The vP then merges with Asp to form AspP. Then the AspP merges with obj (an empty slot to be filled by moved object later on). AspP then merges with (T) to form TP. Finally, TP then merges with its specifier to form another TP. The little v assigns agent role to its specifier za. The nominative subject za values the uninterpretable features of (T). As a result the object DP is blocked to value the uninterpretable features of (T). There
is a sort of competition between subject and object DP to get nominative case from (T). In this present structure, the subject has a scope over object DP because it stays higher than object DP in the argument hierarchy. After the case features of (T) are valued, they are carried off to PF to strip away the phonological features because these case features are uninterpretable at LF. Finally, the requirements for ergativity case assignment are not satisfied, as the Asp head is marked with [+IMPF] features while ergative case requires [-IMPF] features on Asp head. The tense head is marked with [-PST] while ergativity requires [+PST]. The little v assigns accusative case to the object DP. EPP features on (T) head triggers the movement of object DP out of vP to spec/Asp position by tucking under DP. Correspondingly, the subject DP moves out of spec/v to spec/T’ position by merging with T’, so that it could value the case and phi-features of T and fulfill the EPP requirement of C. So, consequent upon the valuation of the grammatical features on T head at PF, the derivation converges at LF.

2.7 INTERIM CONCLUSION

This chapter concludes that Pashto ergativity is subject to tense. All the past tense based constructions such as preterit, pluperfect, past participle etc. requires the subject to bear ergative case. Ergative case is assigned to the subject of an un-ergative verb too. This feature of the language is a striking contrast with Indo Aryan languages such as Gojri, Hindi, Punjabi etc.

Following the conventions of Minimalist Programme, it is proposed that in Pashto, nominative and accusative DPs are raised to specifier (T) position to check
its cases. Nominative DP checks its case against the corresponding (T) head. The
dislocation of accusative or ergative DP is triggered by EPP features, since EPP is
the only feature which triggers the dislocation of DP in ergative and accusative
constructions. The same (T) head checks the features of both subject and object DPs.
In case of nominative subject, the subject DP moves out of vP slot merging with TP,
tucking under (C). In this way, it values the phi-features of (T) head and satisfies the
EPP requirement. The accusative DP, on the other hand, is checked in-situ. However,
the EPP features on (T) head triggers its movement out of VP merging with AspP
under (T). The little v assigns agent theta role to the subject and accusative case to
the object. In past tense object gets absolutive case while subject gets ergative. In
ergative constructions, object is raised to spec/T position, tucking under TP. Once
the object checks it features against (T) and gets nominative case from the latter and
the subject DP in the specifier/v position is already assigned agent theta role, ergative
case is assigned to subject DP. In present tense, in case, the subject DP is assigned
agent theta role by little v and at the same time the Asp head carries [-IMPF] features,
the subject DP is assigned ergative case. Thus (T) head matches its features with
object DP and as a result assigns nominative case to the object.
Chapter Three

PASHTO COMPLEX VERB FORMATION

3.0. Overview of the Chapter

This chapter focuses upon the description of the Pashto verbs from morphosyntactic point of view. The first section discusses different classes of verbs based on morphology, followed by a detailed analysis of verb in the next section. Finally, the last section explores the structure of complex verb formation in Pashto. Indo-Iranian languages are well recognized to have complex verb form. Different phenomena exist to make the structures complex in these languages. A complex verb is made of a lexical word which is either a verb, a noun or an adjective joining with light verb to form complex verb structure. In order to explain various structures of complex verb, the following section introduces light verb which is followed by a discussion on different types of complex verb formation in Pashto.

3.1. Light verb

A light verb, a part of the complex verb formation, is either the verb kar ‘do’ or ho ‘become’ in Hindi (Mohanan, 1994); Akhtar, 2000; Singh, 1990) identified 8 and 10 light verbs respectively in Punjabi complex predicates. Butt (1995) introduces

\[ \text{light verb} \]

\[ \text{different types of complex verb formation in Pashto.} \]

1 I call it complex verb formation because of its complex structure but it is not complex predicate like the one found in Hindi, Urdu, Gojri and Punjabi.
13 light verbs in Urdu, while Bukhari (2009) introduces 17 in Gojri. Akhtar (2000), Butt (1995) and Mohanan (1994) argue that \( V_2 \) is a light verb in the \( V_1+V_2 \) construction. According to Akhtar (2000), \( V_1 \) in this \( V_1+V_2 \) complex is either a lexical verb or a complex predicate in itself while \( V_2 \) functions as a light verb. Such types of constructions are common in Indo-Aryan languages such as Urdu, Punjabi, Pahari, Kashmiri, Hindko, Maharathi and Hindi. These types of constructions are called aspectual complex predicates. They are found in Persian (Dabir-Moghaddam, 1997), Chinese, Korean, Japanese and Pashto as well.

Earlier, the light verb was termed as an explicator, (Bahl, 1964; van Olphen, 1970; Bhatia, 1993) and as an auxiliary by Barker (1967) and Bailey (1950). Earlier, Kachru (1966, 1968) used to call it ‘operator’, while Hook (1974) and Pray (1970) used terms like ‘vector’ or ‘vector verb’ to refer to it. The light verb is taken to be a weaker or ‘bleached’ form of the corresponding lexical verb, as it does not convey its full/lexical meanings.

Bukhari (2009), Akhtar (2000) and Butt (1995) noted that light verbs can be used as a main verb as well. In Pashto, the case is different. In Pashto, since light verbs function as a tense marker, so it does not have corresponding main verbs, however, there are a few exceptions.
3.2. Light verbs in complex verb formation in Pashto

3.2.1 Agreement and light verb

Light verbs and complex predicates are explored cross-linguistically. They have got different syntactic and semantic properties associated with them. In this section, the syntactic and semantic properties of light verb and complex predicates are highlighted in detail.

Jespersen (1965) introduces the term light verb for English V+NP constructions such as, *take a sneak, have a rest, give a sigh* etc. It is generally believed that light verbs like 'take' and 'give' etc. cannot predicate fully in such constructions. These types of ‘light’ verbs appear to be semantically light due to the fact that they contribute something to the joint predication. There has been a prevailing belief that light verbs are developed from main verbs by losing some of their semantic content; though they still look like verbs. Light verbs in Pashto, like Gojri (Bukhari, 2009), carry tense, gender, number and agreement morphology and case mark the subject. In Pashto, except few, light verbs do not contribute aspectual meaning like that of Punjabi and Gojri.

The number of light verbs in Indo-Aryan languages is controversial. According to Bhatia (1993), there are about a dozen explicators (light verbs) in Punjabi. On the other hand, Akhtar (2000, p. 126) introduces a slightly different list from Bhatia. He argues that his criterion for selection is productivity. According to Bukhari (2009), a few light verbs such as *de* ‘give’, *sut*, ‘throw’ and *chor*, ‘leave’ are interchangeable in many cases. In such cases, replacing one with the other does not cause any change in
meaning or cause intelligibility. Butt (1995, p. 92) argues that these items include *give, take, go, come, put, hit, and fall*. However, Bukhari (2009) maintains that Gojri has *do* and *leave* in addition to these common light verbs that contribute to complex predicate formation in other Indo-Aryan languages. Like other Indo-Aryan languages, this set of light verbs does have full or main verb equivalents in Gojri as well (Ibid). The following table exhibits light verbs in Pashto.

**Table 3.1: Light verbs in Pashto**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>de</em></td>
<td>be (present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>wo</em></td>
<td>be (past)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sho</em></td>
<td>do (intransitive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kigi</em></td>
<td>Transitive with implicit subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kai</em></td>
<td>do (transitive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(roja) <em>nisal</em></td>
<td>Hold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(khob) <em>raghlo</em></td>
<td>Come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(manda) <em>wahal</em></td>
<td>Beat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(badla) <em>akhli</em></td>
<td>Take</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Pashto, *de, wi, sho, kegi* and *kai* are not used as a main verb. The following examples illustrate how these verbs are used as part of complex verb formation exclusively but not as a main verb. The reason why they cannot be used as a main verb is that they have no semantic contents of their own. Their aspectual contribution is, therefore, minimum.
(32)

a.  \( ma \ xat \ likhale \ de \)
    I(ERG)letter (NOM) write PRF M 3 SG \( (V_1) \) do(PRS M 3 SG)
    I have written a letter.

b.  \( *za \ xat \ de \)
    I(NOM) letter (NOM) do (PRS M 3 SG) \( (V_1) \)
    I have written a letter.

In (32), it has been demonstrated that \( de \) cannot be used as a main verb. In (32a) \( de \) is used as a \( V_2 \) in the complex verb formation while in (32b) the same \( de \), when used as a main verb, results in an ill-formed structure. So, it has become clear that \( de \) has no semantic contents: it only contributes aspectual information. \( wi \) is also always used as \( V_2 \) in the complex verb formation. The following examples illustrate the mentioned phenomenon.

(33)

a.  \( ma \ ba \ rota\ i \ khwarali \ wi \)
    I(ERG) (FUT) meal(NOM) eat (PST F 3 SG) \( (V_1) \) do (PST F 3 SG) \( (V_2) \)
    I will have eaten the meal.

b.  \( *ma \ ba \ kar \ wi. \)
    I(ERG) (FUT) work(NOM) do(PST F 3 SG) \( (V_2) \)
    I am working at home.

Illustration in (33a) is grammatical due to the fact that \( wi \) is used as a \( V_2 \) while in (33b) \( wi \) is used as a \( V_1 \) that resulted in an ungrammatical structure. In simple
words, in the absence of $V_1$, the $V_2$ cannot stand alone as can be seen from the ungrammaticality of (33b) unless it functions as a copula.

Lexical items like the negative marker and emphatic markers cannot be inserted between the main verb and the light verb in Gojri since all different complex predicate sequences form a unit of some kind (Bukhari, 2009). However, in Pashto complex verb formation is not as tight a unit as it is in Gojri. In Pashto, the negative maker always precedes the light verb ($V_2$). Consider the following examples.

(34)

a. Asim golai agasti na di
   Asim(ERG) tablets buy(PRS PF F 3 SG) not do(PRS PF F 3 SG)
   Asim does not buy tablets.

b. Asim golai na di agasti.
   Asim (ERG) tablets not do buy (PRS PF F 3 PL)
   Asim has not bought the tablets.

c. kaloo-ne xat ni likh diyo.
   kaloo(ERG) letter(NOM) NEG write give(PF)
   ‘Kaloo did not write a letter (for someone else).’

d. *kaloo-ne xat likh ni diyo.
   kaloo(ERG) letter(NOM) write (NEG) give(PF)
   Kaloo did not write a letter (for someone else).’

   (Bukhari, 2009)

(34b) is ungrammatical in Gojri because the negative marker is inserted between the two verbs: the main and the light verb. (34a) is grammatical owing to the fact that the negative marker precedes the complex predicate; it does not intervene
between the two verbs, namely, the light and main verb. Another thing which is very remarkable about Pashto complex verb formation is that negative marker either modifies and precedes the complex verb formation as a whole, or only precedes the light verb in the complex verb formation. The same is demonstrated by the following examples.

(35)

a. \textit{ma kitab} \textit{na de} \textit{katale}.
   I(ERG) book(NOM) (NEG) do (PRS M 3 SG) read(PRSM3SG)
   I have not read the book.

b. \textit{ma kitab katale na de}.
   I(ERG) book(NOM) read(PRS PF M 3 SG) (NEG) do(PRS PF M 3 SG)
   I have not read the book.

In Pashto, all other light verbs except \textit{rakai} ‘take’ and \textit{warkai} ‘give’ do not contribute anything to the meaning of a sentence other than the aspectual meaning. In Gojri, however, the light verb contributes to the semantics of the sentence. It gives meaning of beneficiary as it is demonstrated by the following examples cited in Bukhari (2009, p. 67).

(36)

a. \textit{us-ne seb kəpyo}
   he(3 SG M) (ERG) apple(3 SG M) (NOM) cut(PF)
   ‘He cut an apple.’

b. \textit{us-ne seb kəp liyo}
   he(3 SG M) (ERG) apple(3 SG M) (NOM) cut take(PF)
   ‘He cut an apple (for himself).’
d.  *us-ne seb kəp diyo*

he.3.SG.M-ERG apple.3.SG.M-NOM cut give-PF

‘He cut an apple (for someone else).’

(Bukhari, 2009)

*le* and *de* in (36b) and (36c) convey the meaning of (cutting for himself) and (for someone else) respectively. However, in (36a) the beneficiary meaning is not explicitly conveyed by the light verb rather it can be inferred from the context. Conversely, Pashto light verb does not bear beneficiary meaning. The light verb only bear aspectual information as it is demonstrated by the following example:

(37)

```
 ma manra  kat    kra
I(ERG)apple(NOM) cut(PST F 3 SG) do (PST F 3 SG)
I have cut an apple.
```

In (37), the beneficiary of the action is not known. It can be determined from the context. Yet the beneficiary meaning can be conveyed by other means than light verb as it is illustrated in the following example:

(38)

```
a.  hagha  mala  manda  wara    kra
He(ERG) me(DAT) apple   cut (PST F 3 SG)do( PST F 3 SG)
He cut an apple for me.

b.  haghi  zanla  rotai  pakha     kra
she(ERG) her  bread(NOM) cook(PRS F 3 SG) do (PST F 3 SG)
She cooked the bread for herself.
```
c. \[ \text{I(ERG) for her clothes (NOM) buy(PST F 3 SG)} \]
I bought clothes for her.

In (38a) \textit{mala} ‘for me’ or \textit{zama dapra} ‘for me’ can be used to convey the meaning of beneficiary. However, the same cannot be done through the use of light verb in Pashto like English and European languages (Bukhari, 2009). Conversely, in Indo Aryan languages, the beneficiary meaning is conveyed through light \textit{de, le} etc.

### 3.2.2 Agreement and light verb

In Pashto, the light verb agrees with its argument in terms of gender and number. It carries the agreement inflection and occupies second position in the complex verb formation as it is the case with Gojri light verb.

(39)

\[ \text{(39)} \]

\begin{align*}
e. & \quad \text{ma charga rawari da} \\
& \quad \text{I(ERG) hen(NOMS F) bring (F SG) do (PRS PF F SG)} \\
& \quad \text{I have brought the hen.} \\
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
f. & \quad \text{ma chargi rawaree di} \\
& \quad \text{I(ERG) hen(NOMF P) bring (FP) do(PR S PF F.P) } \\
& \quad \text{I have brought the hens.} \\
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
g. & \quad \text{Shahid tebal aghaste de.} \\
& \quad \text{Shahid(ERG) table(NOM) buy (FP) do (PRS PF FP) } \quad \\
& \quad \text{Shahid has bought the table.} \\
\end{align*}
In (39a) the light verb *da* agrees with the argument, *charga*, the only argument in the clause which is marked for nominative case. The $V_1$ of the complex verb formation, namely the *rawari* also agrees with the argument in number and gender. In (39a) –*i* suffix stands for third person singular feminine while (39b) –*ee* suffix stands for plural feminine. Only the $V_2$ in a complex verb formation carries aspect and tense features. The $V_1$ agrees with the argument which bears nominative case features in number, gender and tense as it is evident from (39a-c).

### 3.3 Case marking and complex verb formation in Pashto

Light verbs in Pashto carry agreement with both the lexical verb and the nominative argument of the verb. If the $V_2$ is *wa*, *wo* or *wi*, then the verb does not agree with the verb, rather it establishes agreement with any other available nominative argument of the verb. The light verb is also sensitive to ergative case in present tense. If the $V_2$ is *de/dā*, then the subject of the verb is in ergative case while the object would carry nominative case because the verb would establish agree relationship with it. In all other cases the verb agrees with the subject. On the other hand, the intransitive $V_2$ *yam* ‘(I) am’, *shom* ‘(I) became’ and *kom* ‘(I) do’ are only compatible with the nominative subject. It cannot co-exist with the ergative subject in a clause.

Consider the following examples:
In (40a) $V_2$, *da* agrees with the nominative argument *charsada* in gender and number. Moreover, the $V_2$ is also case marked for present (PRS) and perfect aspect (PF); it requires the subject argument to be marked for ergative case. In (40b), the $V_2$ *da* ‘do’ agrees with *zanana* ‘lady’ in gender and number. In (40c), similarly, the verb $V_2$ agrees with its subject argument *za* ‘I’ in gender and number and at the same time requires the subject to be in nominative case because the verb carries PRS tense features. So now the role of $V_2$ is obvious in agreement and case marking.

Similarly, in (40b), $V_2$ is marked for singular, feminine gender since it agrees with the nominative argument *zanana* (woman/lady) which is feminine. The same $V_2$ is also marked for PF and PRS tense so the subject argument is required to be marked for ergativity.

Consider here some more examples:
(41)

a. ma  mungz  kare  wo
I(ERG) prayer(NOM) perform(M SG) do(PST PF M SG)
I have offered my prayer (Namaz).

b. ma  xat  likhale  wo
I(ERG) letter(M SG) write(M SG) do(PST PF M SG)
I had written the letter .

c. hagha  kambal  aghoste  wo.
He(ERG) blanket(M SG) wear(M SG) do(PST PF M SG)
He had worn the blanket.

d. *za  hagha  lidale  wa
I(NOM) she(OBL) see(M SG) do(PST PF 1 SG)
I had seen her.

In (41a-c) the V2, wo, requires the subject to be marked for ergative case since the V2 is marked for past tense. All the V2s illustrated here are transitive and are marked for past tense; thus they require the subject to be marked for ergative case. In (41d), however, the subject is marked for nominative case nonetheless the V2 is wa ‘PST’ as given in table.1 above. As there is a mismatch between the case of the subject and V2, the sentence is ill-formed. Thus, it is evident that there exists a relation between the case of the subject and V2 in complex verb formation.
3.4 Types of complex verb formation in Pashto

Complex verb formations found in Pashto can be divided into three types as far as its structure is concerned.

In Pashto, V₁+V₂ formation of complex predicate does not exist. Its functions are quite different from the one found in Gojri, Urdu and other Indo- Aryan languages (for details see Bukhari 2009). Pashto complex predicate is not as complex as the one found in Indo-Aryan languages. In Pashto, the complex predicate has very limited functions. The V₂ only shows the tense and agreement features except for warko, rako and wachao. The latter also shows the beneficiary of the action.

The V₂ perform the function of giving perfective meaning, if it is transitive. Otherwise, if the V₂ is intransitive then its perfective function is no longer present. However, when the V₂ is intransitive it functions as a state verb and takes adjective as a complement. The following examples illustrate it further:

(42)

a. Salma xat likhale wo
   Salma(ERG) letter (M SG) write (M SG) do (PST M SG)
   Salma has written the letter.

b. Shahid zainab ta khat warkawale sho
   Shahid(ERG) zainab(DAT) letter (M SG) give (M SG) can (PST MSG)
   Shahid gave a letter to Zainab.

c. Saira kitab gandale sho
   Saira(ERG) book9(M SG) bind (PST M SG) can (PST M SG)
   Saira could bind a book.
d. Saira kitab gandale de
Saira(ERG) book (M SG) bind (PST M SG) do(PST M SG)
Saira has bound a book.

e. ma da haghi laas lidale sho
I(ERG) she(OBL) hand (M SG) see(PST M SG) can(PST M SG)
I could see her hand.

f. ma gha kitab pranaste sho
I(ERG) that book (M SG) open (PST M SG) can(PST M SG)
I could open that book.

In (42a), the $V_2$ performs the function of conveying aspectual meaning. In (42a) the $V_2$ refers to the completion of actions on one hand and accomplishment of writing the letter on the other hand. The $V_2$ de (be $M$)/ da (be $F$) is the present tense version of wi (be $F$)/ wo (be $M$) which is marked for past tense. Moreover, the same $V_2$ in (42a) gives the meaning of accomplishment. According to Akhtar (2000), $V_1$ refers to activity while $V_2$ refers to tense and agreement features besides other meaning that it conveys. So the contribution of $V_2$ is aspectual but in a very limited sense as compared to Akhtar (2000).

3.4.1 [N, A] + V complex verb formation

Complex verb formation of [N, A] +V type is very common in Pashto- since most of the words that are used as nouns or adjectives in Pashto are also utilized as verb. This sort of construction is very productive in Pashto. Akhtar (2000, p. 280)
argues that the productivity of N+V complexes in South Asian languages with *kar* ‘do’ is due to the fact that most of the actions described by these N+V constructions are neutral to the direction of the benefit. However, the case of Gojri is different: the direction of the action is specified by the light verb in Gojri (Bukhari, 2009). In Pashto too, the light verbs *warkai* ‘give’ and *akhli* ‘take’ specify the direction of the benefit of the action described by the complex verb formation. Similarly, the use of these beneficiary light verbs is rare. Normally the light verb *kao* is used.

(43)

a. \(za\) \(kar\) \(kom\).
\(I\text{-}(\text{NOM})\) \( \text{work}(\text{ACC}) \text{ do}( \text{PRS 1 SG})\)
I am doing work.

b. \(za\) \(pate\) \(woba\) \(kom\).
\(I\text{-}(\text{NOM})\) \( \text{field}(\text{ACC}) \text{ water do}( \text{PRS 1 SG})\)
I am watering the field.

c. \(za\) \(isaa\text{ la} \text{ mashwara} \text{ warkom}\).
\(I\text{-}(\text{NOM})\) \( \text{Isaa}(\text{DAT}) \text{ counsel}(\text{F SG}) \text{ give}( \text{PRS 1 SG})\)
I give council to Isaa.

d. \(za\) \(da\) \(plar\) \(sara\) \(mashwara\) \(kom\).
\(I\text{-}(\text{NOM})\) \( \text{with father}(\text{OBL}) \text{ counsel}(\text{F SG}) \text{ do}( \text{PRS 1 SG})\)
I am counseling with my father.

e. \(ma\) \(da\) \(Isaa\text{-}na \text{ mashwara} \text{ aghasta}\).
\(I\text{-}(\text{ERG})\) \( \text{Isaa}(\text{OBL}) \text{ counsel}(\text{F SG}) \text{ take}(\text{PRS 1 SG})\)
I was taking council from Isaa.
f. hagha mala deka rakhra.
   He(ERG) I(DAT) push(F SG) give(PST 3SG)
   He pushed me.

g. ma hagha-la sapeera warkra.
   I(ERG) he(DAT) slap (F 3SG) give(PST F 3SG)
   I gave him a slap.

h. hagha mata neseehat kai.
   He(NOM) I(DAT) advice (PRS M 3SG) do PRES.3SG
   He is advising me.

i. Rehan da hawa na maza akhli.
   Rehman(NOM) wind(GEN) delight take(PRS 3SG)
   Rehan is enjoying the wind.

j. za roja nesam.
   I(NOM) fast(OBL) hold(PRS 3SG)
   I am keeping the fast.

k. za da haghi na badla akhlam.
   I(NOM) she(GEN) revenge (F 3SG) take (PRS 1SG)
   I am taking revenge from her.

In (43a-b and d), the beneficiary of the action is not known: since the light verb kom ‘do’ is neutral. warkom/warkra ‘give’ shows that the benefit of the action goes in the direction of the argument other than the subject (someone else than the subject) while akhli/aghasta shows the direction of the benefit towards the subject of the sentence.
Muhammad and Karimi (1992 p. 195) and Karimi and Doostan (1998) are of the view that Persian has a number of light verbs such as *kardan* ‘do’, *dardan* ‘give’, and *gerestan* ‘take’. However, the said language lacks benefactive light verbs. Contrary to Persian, Pashto has light verbs such as *akhlam* ‘take’ and *warkom* ‘give’ and they are used for benefactive meaning like Indo Aryan languages. The following examples illustrate this phenomenon:

(44)

a. Ó man raa aizzlyat kard [Persian]
    he(NOM) I(DAT/ACC) torture do(PST)
    He tortured me.

b. us-ne minnã øjiyat dii/*kii [Gojri]
    she(ERG) I(DAT) torture give/*do(PF)
    S/he tortured me.

c. haghi mata taklee‘f rako/ kao [Pashto]
    She(NOM) I(DAT) torture give/ *do(PF)
    She tortured me.

In (44b-c) the V2s which give benefactive readings are illustrated from Gojri and Pashto. In (44c) the use *rako* ‘give’ imply that the subject of the verb would be the beneficiary of the action. The same is true about Gojri as illustrated by *dii* ‘give’ in (44b). However, the Persian counterpart of Pashto and Gojri V2 does not give beneficieary meaning as it is given in (44a).
In (45a), the Persian light verb *kard* is used which does not give benefactive meaning while in (45b-c) its Gojri and Pashto counterparts give benefactive meaning by using *dii* and *rakao* respectively rather than *ki* and *kao* which are neutral to such sort of meaning. So in Pashto, like Gojri and other Indo Aryan languages, light verb gives beneficiary meaning of action described by the complex predicates. However, the use of neutral light such *kao/kai* is more common as compared to others in Pashto while its Urdu and Gojri counterparts use benefactive light verb. One of the reasons, why the benefactive light verb is not common in Pashto is that it prefers non-directional action expressed by the neutral light verb in compound verb. In comparison, in Gojri, Punjabi, Urdu and Hindi complex predicates and aspeical complex predicates are exploited to express the directional and benefactive action.
3.4.2 A+V_{2}/light verb complex verb formation

This type of verbal complex is equally common in Pashto. However, the meaning it conveys is of different type. It gives the meaning change of state such as the change from the state of being *najorha* ‘ill’ to *rogh* ‘healthy’. The V of (Adj + V) constructions is an auxiliary which generally refers to time or modality of the action described by the complex construction.

\[ (46) \]

\( \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{ma meekha} & \text{rhanda} & \text{kra.} \\
& \quad \text{I-ERG buffalo-NOM} & \text{blind.PST.F.3SG} & \text{do PST.PF.F.3S} \\
& \quad \text{I have made the buffalo blind.} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{ma jeenai} & \text{raza} & \text{kawala.} \\
& \quad \text{I(ERG)girl(NOM) assent (PST PF F 3S)} & \text{do (PST F 3S)} \\
& \quad \text{I was trying to pacify the girl.}
\end{align*} \]

In the above examples, the complex formations refer to change in the state of being: from *rogh* ‘not blind’ to *rhanda* ‘blind’ and *naraza* ‘angry’ to *raza* ‘pacified’. However, it does not refer to the end point of the activity. In Gojri, complex predicates is used to show the end point of an activity, but in Pashto, no complex predicate is used, rather the same function is performed by complex verb in both the main and subordinate clause- as exemplified by the following:
Contrary to what is true of Gojri (Bukhari, 2009) examples in (47a-b) demonstrate that in Pashto simple complex verb is used to show the end point of the action in Pashto. In (47) najorha shom and kha shom shows the end point of action. In Gojri, the wer type of clause obligatorily requires complex predicates which is not true about Pashto. The same meaning is conveyed by simple complex verb formation (not complex predicates).

3.4.3. N+V₁V₂ complex verb formation

A+V+V type form of verb is also very common in Pashto. This type of construction holds when the aspect is perfect. Consider the following examples:

(48)

a. ma lakhta mata karhi da
I(ERG) stick(OBL) break (PRS F 3SG) do (PRS F 3SG) be(PF)
I have broken the stick.
b. halqo sarhe raza karhe de
   people(ERG) man(OBL) resolve do (PRS M 3SG) be(PF)
   People have caused the man to resolve (issues).

c. haghi chabi wraka krhi da.
   She(ERG) key(OBL) lose do (PRS F 3SG) be(PF)
   She has lost the key.

d. mung mobil tek karhe de.
   We(ERG) mobile(OBL) repair do (PRS M 3SG) be(PF)
   We have repaired the mobile.

The examples in (48) show the A+V₁+V₂ type of structures. They are all in perfect aspect. So it means that the V₂ has been used as a token of perfect aspect. The same V₂ may be used as part of A+V complex verb formation but having different function. It functions as a stative and copula as can be seen in the following examples:

(49)

  a. da mobil gran de
     This mobile(NOM) expensive be(PRS M 3SG)
     This mobile is expensive.

  b. rotai pakha da
     Meal(NOM) cook (F 3SG) be(PRS F 3SG)
     The meal is ready.

  c. salan mizidar de
     Curry(NOM) tasty (M 3SG) be(PRS M 3SG)
     The curry is tasty.

  d. chorkai grana da
     knife (NOM) expensive be(PRS F 3SG)
     The knife is expensive.

  e. qisa wogda da.
     Story(NOM) long (PRS F 3SG) be(PRS F 3SG)
     The story is long.
In (49), the $V_2$ of the $A+V$ complex functions as copula with stative reading. 

$k_rha$ ‘do’ is the transitive counterpart of $da$ ‘be’. So, when the transitive $V_2$ is used then the sentence gives active reading as is illustrated in the following examples:

(50)

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{mung rotai paka k\(_h\)a}
\text{We(ERG) meal(NOM) cook (PST F 3SG) do (PST F 3SG)}
\text{We have cooked the meal.}
\item \textit{mung mobayel tek k\(_r\)ho}
\text{We(ERG) mobile(NOM) repair (PST M 3SG) do (PST M 3SG)}
\text{We repaired the mobile.}
\item \textit{ta shisha saf\(_a\) k\(_r\)ha.}
\text{You(ERG) mirror(NOM) clean(PSTF 3SG) do (PST F 3SG)}
\text{You have cleaned the mirror.}
\item \textit{Shahab kaprha sh\(_k\)ha k\(_r\)ha.}
\text{Shahab(ERG) clothes(NOM F 3SG) dirty(PST F 3SG) do(PST F 3SG)}
\text{Shahab made his clothes dirty.}
\end{itemize}

In (50) all the examples show the transitive structure. The transitive counterpart of transitive is derived just by replacing the ‘$de$’ part of verbal complex by ‘$k\(_r\)ha$’. In all the cases whether it is $de$ or $k\(_r\)ha$, the nominative argument of the verb agrees with the $V_2$ whether transitive or intransitive.

Sometimes both $k\(_r\)ha$ ‘do’ and $da$ are used in the same sentence. In case $da$ co-occurs with $k\(_r\)ha$, then $da$ functions as a perfect aspect marker. The same is evident in the following examples:
(51)

a. *ta garhai kharaba karhi da*
   You(ERG) watch(NOM) damage(F 3SG) do(PRS F 3SG) be(PF 3SG)
   You have damaged the watch.

b. *mung kaprhi ganda karhi di*
   We(ERG) clothes(NOM) dirty(PRS F. 3PL) do PRS F 3PL) be(PF)
   We have made the clothes dirty.

c. *ta laba wraka krhi da.*
   You(ERG) toy(NOM) lose(PRS F 3SG) do(PRS F 3SG) be(PF)
   You have lost the toy.

The co-occurrence of *krha* and *de/da* also follow transitive structure. Both of
the *V2s* cannot give stative reading.

*kigi* ‘do’ is another light verb which is quite different from the other light verbs
in its behavior in terms of agreement. The said light verb co-occurs with adjective only
in A+V verbal complex. The following examples illustrate the said light verb:

(52)

a. *da kamra zar safā kigi.*
   This room(NOM) soon clean becomes(PRS 3SG)
   This room becomes clean soon.

b. *da biza zar najorha kigi*
   This goat(NOM) soon sick become(PRS 3SG)
   This goat becomes sick soon.

c. *da oba zar ranhi kigi.*
   This water(NOM) soon transparent become(PRS 3SG)
   This water becomes transparent soon.

The examples cited in (52) show that the light verb *kigi* is a part of the A+V
complex verb formation. The V2 in these constructions requires the subject to be non-
agentive. In (52), all the subjects are non-agentive. The subject is actually the theme of the verb. *kigi* light verb cannot co-occur with agentive subject. The following examples show that the light verb *kigi* cannot co-occur with agentive and overt subject.

(53)

\[\text{a.} \quad *\text{mung} \quad \text{woba} \quad \text{ranrhi} \quad \text{kigi}.\]
\[\text{we(NOM) water transparent become (PRS 3SG)}\]
\[\text{We make the water transparent.}\]

\[\text{b.} \quad *\text{ma} \quad \text{karma} \quad \text{zar} \quad \text{safa} \quad \text{kigi}.\]
\[\text{I(ERG) room soon clean do (PRS 3SG)}\]
\[\text{I clean the room.}\]

\[\text{c.} \quad \text{karma} \quad \text{safa} \quad \text{kigi} \quad \text{pa asana}.\]
\[\text{Room(NOM) clean become (3SG PRS) easily}\]
\[\text{The room becomes clean easily.}\]

\[\text{d.} \quad \text{woba} \quad \text{ranrhi} \quad \text{kigi} \quad \text{pa asana}.\]
\[\text{Water(NOM) transparent becomes (PRS 3SG) easily}\]
\[\text{Water becomes transparent easily.}\]

In (53) the examples depict that *kigi* cannot co-occur with agent subject. However, the verb has an implicit subject which may be read as ‘anyone’. This entails that the subject of the light verb *kigi* is implicit and indefinite. In comparison, the subject of passive is read as ‘someone’ so all the light verbs have their own subcategorizations.
3.4.4. N+V complex verb formation

Bukhari (2009) argues that in Gojri (N+V) complex predicates are used to convey the meaning of ‘something that happens to you unexpectedly’. However, the same function is performed by the use of simple compound verb in Pashto as is evident from the following examples:

(54)

a. hagha mala doka rakrha.
   He(ERG) me(DAT) deceit (F 3SG NOM) give(PST F 3SG)
   He deceived me (unexpectedly)

b. *hagha mala doka kram.
   He(ERG) me(DAT) deceit(NOM) do(PST F 1SG)
   He deceived me.

c. hagha za doka kram.
   He(ERG) me(NOM) deceit do(PST 1SG)
   He deceived me.

d. *hagha za-la doka kram.
   He(ERG) me(DAT) deceit do(PST F 1SG)
   He deceived me.

e. *hagha za doka rakrha.
   He(ERG) me(NOM) deceit give(PST F 3SG)
   He deceived me.

*doka-rakra ‘deceit give’ means somebody deceived you by planning it well before hand. It demands the object NP to be in dative case since the same NP is
affected by the action denoted by the complex verb. However, *doka krho/krha* means that the subject deceived the entity denoted by object NP. The light verb of the compound verb does not show the beneficiary meaning found in the *doka rakrha* complex predicate. There are just two light verbs of compound verb which behave like light verb of complex predicate as found in Gojri, Punjabi, Hindi and Urdu. Those are N+*rakhra* ‘take’ and N+*warkhra* ‘give’.

The use of N+V complex is quite restrictive. It is used in quite limited context and at the same time the N part of the verb has got a very restricted subcategorization frame for the light verb. The N cannot be used with the light verb *de/wo* except for existential reading. The said is evident in the following examples:

(55)

\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{da } \text{dukan } \text{de} \\
& \text{This shop} \ (\text{NOM}) \ \text{be} \ (\text{PRS M 3SG}) \\
& \text{This is a shop.}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{da } \text{kor } \text{de} \\
& \text{This house} \ (\text{NOM}) \ \text{be} \ (\text{PRS M 3SG}) \\
& \text{This is a house.}
\end{align*}

The N part of N+V verbal complex can be used with *kra* ‘do’ transitive light verb. Consider the following examples:

(56)

\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{da } \text{doka } \text{da} \\
& \text{This deceit} \ (\text{NOM}) \ \text{be} \ (\text{PRS F3SG}) \\
& \text{This is deceit.}
\end{align*}
b. za ta doka kram
   I(NOM) you(OBL) deceit do (PRS PF 1SG)
   You have deceived me.

c. ta mala doka rakrha
   You(ERG) me(DAT) deceit(F 3SG) give (PST F 3SG)
   You have deceived me.

An interesting phenomenon about Pashto un-ergative is when the subject is already in ergative case and there is no other argument that the verb may agree with, then the verb agrees within the range of compound verb by agreeing with N as a part of the compound verb. In un-ergative constructions, the light verb agrees with the N part of the verbal complex in number and gender. This phenomenon can be seen in the following examples:

(57)

a. hagha [roja wanisala]
   He(ERG) fast (F 3SG) hold (PST F 3SG)
   He observed fast.

b. hagha [manda wakhra].
   He(ERG) run (F 3SG) beat (PST F 3SG)
   He ran.

c. hagha [manda rakrha].
   He(ERG) run(F 3SG) give to me (PST F 3SG)
   He forced me to run/ he caused me to run.

d. hagha [nashta wakrha].
   He(ERG) breakfast (F 3SG) do(PST F 3SG)
   He toke his breakfast.
In (57), the subject bears ergative case, since there is no other nominative argument to establish agree relation with the verb, the verb agrees with the N part of the compound verb.

However, if the subject is nominative then the light verb of N+V complex agrees with the nominative subject as it is evident in the following examples:

(58)

\begin{itemize}
  \item[a.] za \textit{roja} nisam
      I(NOM) fast(OBL) hold (PRS 1SG)
      I am fasting
  \item[b.] za \textit{manda} waham
      I(NOM) run(OBL) beat (PRS F 3SG)
      I am running.
  \item[c.] mung \textit{nashta} kao
      We(NOM) breakfast(OBL) do (PST F 3SG)
      We are having breakfast.
\end{itemize}

In (58), the light verb of the N+V complex agrees with subject, as the subject bears nominative case hence available for agreement. Now the light verb does not agree with N part of the compound verb.
3.4.5 V+V complex verb formation

3.4.5.1. V+sho complex verb formation

The light verb *sho/shi/shom* can co-occur with the main verb to function as a model verb. The following examples demonstrate the function of *sho* as a model auxiliary when used in conjunction with the main verb:

(59)

\[
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad za & khat & likhale & sham. \\
& \quad I(\text{NOM}) & \text{letter(ACC)} & \text{write} & \text{can (PRS 1SG)} \\
& \quad I \text{can write a letter.} \\
b. & \quad Shayan & khat & likhale & shi. \\
& \quad Shayan(\text{NOM}) & \text{letter(OBL)} & \text{write} & \text{can (PRS 3SG)} \\
& \quad Shayan \text{ can write a letter.} \\
c. & \quad ma & khat & likhale & sho. \\
& \quad I(\text{NOM}) & \text{letter(OBL)} & \text{write (PRS 1SG)} & \text{can (PST3SG)} \\
& \quad I \text{could write a letter.}
\end{align*}
\]

In (59), the examples depict *sho* exploited to give reading of a model auxiliary. However, since being inherently intransitive, the same cannot be used in passive structures. Moreover, *sho* when used as a complement of V can give the reading of a model. Otherwise, if used as part of A+V verbal complex, it gives the reading of change of state.
3.4.5.2. **V+de complex verb formation**

Sharma (1982, p. 156) cited in Bukhari (2009) discussed two classes of complex verbal sentences in Gojri, containing conjunct and VV formation which is also known as compound verbs in Indo-Aryan languages. According to him, simple sentences in Gojri contain only one verbal root or V+Aux. The following examples illustrate V+Aux and VV+Aux verbal complex in Pashto:

(60)

\[a. \text{mung ghal nisale de} \]
\[\text{We(NOM) thief(ERG) catch(PRS M 3SG) be(PRS PF)} \]
\[\text{We have caught the thief.} \]

\[b. \text{gade tabah shawe de} \]
\[\text{car(NOM) damage(M 3SG) do(M 3SG) be(PRS PF)} \]
\[\text{The car is damage.} \]

\[c. \text{gade tabah krhe shawe de} \]
\[\text{car(NOM) damage do (M 3SG PASS) be(PRS PF)} \]
\[\text{The car has been damaged.} \]

\[d. \text{hagha khat likhale de}. \]
\[\text{He(ERG) letter(NOM) write (PRS M 3SG) be (PRS PF)} \]
\[\text{He has written the letter.} \]

\[e. \text{khat likhale shawe de} \]
\[\text{Letter(NOM) write (PASS M 3SG) be(PRS PF)} \]
\[\text{The letter has been written.} \]

\[f. \text{mung ghal nisale de}. \]
\[\text{We(ERG) thief(NOM) catch(M 3SG) be(PRS PF)} \]
\[\text{We caught the thief.} \]
In (\(^0\text{a,b,d,F}\)) the examples illustrate V+Aux verbal complex in Pashto. In (d-f) examples of V+V+Aux verbal complex has been illustrated. In V+Aux as in (60a, b, d and f) both the verb and auxiliary part of the verbal complex agree with the nominative argument of the verb. However, in VV+Aux type of verbal complex all the Vs agree with the nominative argument, subject. However, if there is no nominative argument available, then the sentence turns out to be ungrammatical as can be seen in the following illustrations:

(61)

\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & *\text{ma } \text{nisa}\text{l}e \text{ shawi } \text{ di} \\
& \text{I(ERG) catch (PASS 3SG) be(PRS PF)} \\
& \text{I have been caught by someone.}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & *\text{hagha la } \text{nisi}\text{l}i \text{ shawi } \text{ di} \\
& \text{he(DAT) catch (PF 3SG) do (PASS M 3SG) be(PRS PF)} \\
& \text{He has been caught by someone.}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{c. } & *\text{zama na } \text{ nasale } \text{ shwe } \text{ de.} \\
& \text{I(GEN) catch (PF 3 SG) do (PASS M 3SG) be( PRS PF)} \\
& \text{I have been caught by someone.}
\end{align*}\]

Examples in (61) are ungrammatical owing to the fact that the subject is not nominative and there is no other nominative argument available for the auxiliary to establish agreement with. Even the last resort of establishing agree relation with N of the verbal complex is not available so the sentence turns out to be ungrammatical.
3.5. Interim conclusion

The generalization drawn from the discussion in this chapter shows that Pashto verb depicts a complex verb formation which is generally based on N+V, A+V, V+V and V+V+Aux type of combination. The light verb is also sensitive to the ergativity pattern of the language. So, the availability of nominative part of the verb is a must so that the light verb can agree with it. An interesting generalization drawn from the discussion of this chapter about Pashto un-ergativity is that when the subject is already in ergative case and there is no other argument that the verb may agree with, the verb agrees with its nominative N part of the compound verb. In un-ergative constructions, the light verb agrees with the N part of the verbal complex in number and gender. No serial verb construction is found in this language. The use of complex predicate has been kept to the bare minimum; there are just a couple of complex predicates formation in the language formed by warkrha ‘give’, rakrha/waghasta ‘take’ light verb.
Chapter Four

THE ARGUMENT STRUCTURE OF VERBS IN PASHTO

4.0 Overview of the chapter

This chapter focuses on the description and categorization of different argument structure of Pashto verbs, followed by a discussion on the concept of conflation and incorporation (Hale & Keyser, 1998) and its application in Pashto (which is the subject of the next chapter). The purpose of the current chapter is to present the argument structure of different predicate types available in Pashto so that in the next chapter the same is compared with the argument structure of the same type of verbs in English. What follows is a general introduction to arguments and argument structures. Besides, different types of arguments such as suppressed argument, deleted argument, internal versus external argument etc. are also discussed. The next section begins with a brief background to argument structure of different types of verbs in general.

4.1 Background to argument structure

According to Grimshwa (1990, pp. 1-4), the term argument structure refers to the lexical representation of grammatical information about a predicate. The argument structure of lexical item is thus part of its lexical entry. It represents the prominence relations among arguments. The said relations are jointly determined by
the thematic properties of the predicate via thematic hierarchy and by the aspectual properties of the predicate.

Bierwisch (1990, 1996, 1997) and Wunderlich (1997) maintain that the meanings of verb are decomposed into the basic predicates at the level of semantic form mediating between syntax and conceptual structure. This decomposition would yield the numbers as well as the hierarchy of the arguments in the lexicon. It is, therefore, plausible to say that argument structure is a part of verb’s lexical entry. He further claims that lexical entries are complex data structures whose organization and basic components are provided by the principles of Universal Grammar (UG) (Bierwisch, 1996, p. 129).

Hale and Keyser (1998) argue that argument structure is the systematic structural relations holding between heads and arguments linked to them in the roster of syntactic properties listed for individual items in the lexicon. It deals with the structure of arguments in the lexicon and its morpho-syntactic realization in a structure. The hierarchy of the arguments is related to the level of dominance of the argument. External argument is considered to be the most prominent argument while direct object is considered next in dominance to the external argument. The indirect argument is the lowest in this order.

In our discussion of argument structure, we turn now to examples starting from the intransitive verbs and its argument structure representation. The purpose is to present different types of intransitive verbs in Pashto which are distinct as far as their argument structure is concerned. The aforementioned verbs project different
types of arguments. Following are the illustrations of intransitive verbs in Pashto

(62)(62)

Un-ergative predicates

a. Sara kar kai.
Sara(NOM) work do (PRS F 3SG)
Sara is working.

b. Khalid garzi.
Khalid(NOM) walk (PRS M 3SG)
Khalid is walking.

Un-accusative predicates

c. Hameed rawaraseed.
Hameed(NOM) arrive(PRSC M 3SG)
Hameed has arrived/ Hameed arrived.

d. Shahid khandi
Shahid(NOM) laugh (PRS M 3SG)
Shahid is laughing.

Verbal passives formation

e. da kitaab likhale shawe de.
The book(NOM) write do(PASS) be(PRSC M 3SG PF)
The book has been written.

f. da assaymint likhae shawe de.
The assignment(NOM) write do(PASS) be(PRSC M 3SG PF)
This assignment has been written.

Adjectival passive formation

g. da elan tez wo.
This announcement(NOM) loud(M 3SG) be(PST M 3SG)
This announcement was unexpected.
**Middle foromation**

\[
h. \quad da \quad kalin \quad pa \quad asana \quad inzale \ kigi.
\]
This carpet (NOM) easily wash do (M 3SG)
This carpet washes easily/ this carpet get washed easily.

**Ergative predicate formation**

\[
i. \quad hagha \quad raza \quad sho.
\]
He (NOM) convince become (PST M 3SG)
He became convinced.

The examples in (62) illustrate different types of intransitive verbs in Pashto. A predicate describes an event in which different participants are involved. They are called arguments of the predicate. Such arguments are of different types. The following illustrates different types of arguments associated with intransitive as well as transitive verbs in Pashto. Transitive verbs have been discussed later in section 4.2.

### 4.1.1 External argument

The subject is an external argument as shown in the above examples in (62i). In the given example, *hagha* is the external argument since it is realized outside the maximal project of the predicate. Arguments are realized on a particular syntactic positions determined on the semantics of the argument structure of the verb and the thematic role of the argument. Some are realized as subjects while other are realized as theme, goal, source or location. Let us see the following examples and its structures:
In (63), *sara* is the external argument. It carries agent theta role which is assigned to it by the light *v* and there is no need of object DP since the verb *kar kai* is un-ergative verb. *Sara* is realized as subject occupying the sentence intial position. So subject argument is the only argument required by the verb 'kar kai'. The complex verb *kar kai* ‘work do’ merges with its external argument *sara* to form VP. The resulting VP is in turn merged with *v* to form *v’*. Finally, the *v’* merges with its specifier to form vP. *Sara*, being the only argument of the verb has been moved to specifier v position get the agent theta role assigned.
4.1.2 Internal argument

Internal argument is the type of argument which is required by an un-accusative predicate, the only obligatory argument of the predicate. External argument is not necessary in this type of predicates.

(64)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
vP \\
\mid \quad v' \\
\mid \quad \begin{array}{c}
\quad DP \\
\quad \mid \quad v \\
\quad \mid \quad \begin{array}{c}
\quad \begin{array}{c}
v \\
\quad \mid \quad \begin{array}{c}
\quad \begin{array}{c}
\quad V \\
\quad \mid \quad DP \\
\quad \mid \quad \begin{array}{c}
\quad \mid \quad hagha \\
\quad \mid \quad \text{walar-de}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\end{array}
\]

In (64) above, though there is no external argument (EO) subject. However *hagha* *(he)* which originates at the object position (internal argument) remains in-situ. In (63) above, the movement of the subject DP was triggered by agent theta role assignment. In (64) however, agent theta role is not assigned; the DP *hagha* ‘he’ does not move up to specifier v position. So in the given structure *hagha* is the internal argument of the verb *walar de* ‘stand’.

4.1.3 Optional versus obligatory argument

Optional argument is not a part of verb’s argument structure. If you remove it, it will not affect the grammaticality of the structure. However, if you remove the obligatory argument, the structure would become ungrammatical. See the following examples:
In (65a), the sentence is grammatical because both the obligatory arguments of the verb *khuram* are present. However, in (65b) and (65c) since the internal is missing; the structure is ungrammatical. See the following derivation that illustrates the phenomenon:

In (66) *za* (I) and *wriji* (rice) are the two obligatory arguments of the verb *khuram* (eat). In case, anyone of the two is removed, the structure will become ill-formed as illustrated in (67) below. Thus *za* (I) is optional while *wriji* ‘rice’ is
obligatory argument in the given sentence. The following examples illustrate the existence of implicit obligatory argument showed by the morphology of the verb.

(67)

a. *za khuram.
   I(NOM) eat (PRS 1SG)
   I am eating

b. wriji khuram.
   Rice (NOM) eat (PRS 1SG PROG)
   <I> am eating rice.

In (67a) the structure is ill-formed because wriji (rice) is theme, which is the obligatory argument of the verb khuram, is not present. However, in (67b) the sentence is well-formed even though the subject argument is not explicitly present. Here, the subject argument is implicit as it is expressed by the morphology of the verb (1=1st person, S= singular, Prs= present).

Further, the optional argument is present in (68) as well.

(68)

a. za pa chamcha wriji khuram.
   I(NOM) with spoon rice(ACC) eat(PRS 1SG)
   I am eating rice with spoon/with the help of spoon.

b. za wriji khuram.
   I(NOM) rice(ACC) eat(PRS 1SG)
   I am eating rice.

The following diagram depicts the structure of the sentence in (68):
In (69), the V *khuram* ‘eat’ merges with its internal argument DP *wriji* ‘rice’ to form V’ which in turn merges with its specifier DP *za* ‘I’ to form VP. Subsequently, VP merges with v to form v’. Then the v’ merges with PP to extend the projection by forming another v’. Finally the ‘v’ merges with its specifier DP *za* ‘I’ to form vP which has been moved up from specifier V for agent theta role assignment to specifier v position. In the diagram, it is shown that the PP *pa chamacha* is neither the internal nor the external argument of the verb thus not an obligatory argument of the verb *khuram* (eat); it is optional. If you remove it, the structure will still be grammatical as it is the case in (68b) in the previous example.

### 4.1.4 Direct versus indirect

The other types of arguments are direct and indirect arguments. In English, the indirect object argument can be recognized by the presence of preposition. However, if an argument is realized without preposition as an object, it is then the
direct argument (Marantz, 1984 cited in Chung, 1993). In Pashto the direct and indirect arguments distinction is illustrated by the following example:

(70)  
\[ za \quad haghi \quad la \quad tuhfa \quad warkom \]
\[ I-(NOM) \quad her(DAT) \quad gift(ACC) \quad give( \text{PRS} \ 1SG) \]
I give her a gift.

In (70), the verb \textit{warkom} (give) has two internal arguments: direct and indirect. \textit{Tuhfa} ‘gift’ is the direct argument while \textit{haghi la} ‘to her’ is the indirect argument. The latter is marked by a postposition \textit{la} ‘to’. In order to make a distinction between the two types of arguments, Marantz (1984), Zubizareeta (1987) and Rapaport and Levin (1988) used the following notations:

(71)  
\[ x < y \ z > \]

In (71) \( x \) stands for external argument while \( y \) and \( z \) (the internal arguments) represent the direct and indirect arguments respectively. \( x, y \) and \( z \) are the three arguments of the verb. The external argument is distinguished from the internal argument by putting it outside the brackets. However, the distinction between the direct and indirect internal arguments is made by underlining the direct argument. The underlined \( y \) is direct argument while \( z \) is the indirect argument. Though the external argument is also direct argument, there is no need to underline it since it is already been placed outside the brackets. The optional arguments are distinguished from the obligatory argument by enclosing it in parenthesis. The following is the argument structure of the verb \textit{khwaral}. 
In (72), the arguments of the verb *khwaral* ‘eat’ is given. In the given example, *x* since being placed out of the range (specified by angle bracket) of internal argument is considered external argument while *y* and *z* are the two internal arguments as they are placed within the square brackets. However, *z* is distinguished from *y* by enclosing it within parenthesis since the former is an optional argument.

The aforementioned arguments have some syntactic roles to play. However, there are some arguments which have lost its syntactic role owing to the fact that it has undergone some syntactic and morphological operations. The following examples exhibit the aforementioned arguments:

(73)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(j. ma) milmana} & \quad \text{rawabalal} \\
\text{I(ERG) guest(ACC) invite(PST 3PL)} \\
\text{I invited the guests.} \\
\text{x} & \quad \langle \text{y} \rangle \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(b. milmana) rawabalale} & \quad \text{sho.} \\
\text{Guests(NOM) invite} & \quad \text{(PASS PST 3PL)} \\
\text{The guests were invited (by them)} & \quad \langle \text{y}, \ (\ast \text{x}) \rangle \\
\end{align*}
\]

In (73), *x* is the external argument while *y* is the internal argument. However, in (73) external argument *x* of (72) has been suppressed which is marked with an asterisk. The suppressed argument does not play any syntactic role. It appears as if
the argument has been deleted. If you put the same argument alongside the internal, the sentence becomes anomalous. As you can see in the following examples:

(74)  
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
ma & khat & waliko \\
I(ERG) & letter(NOM) & write (PRS M 3SG) \\
I have written the letter
\end{array}
\]

(75)  
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
Pa & hagha, & khat & walikale & sho. \\
Though & him(ERG) & letter(NOM) & written(PASS) & be(PRS M 3SG) \\
The letter has been written.
\end{array}
\]

The difference between suppressed and deleted argument is highlighted by the fact that the former is still an argument but it has been suppressed. It means that it is not syntactically realized in sentential syntax. However, the deleted argument loses its existence altogether as it is shown by the following examples.

(76)  
\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\textit{a.} & \text{tander} & hagha & yarai \\
\text{Thunder(NOM)} & \text{he(ACC)} & \text{fright(PRSM 3SG)} \\
\text{Thunder frightens him.} \\
x, & < y > \\
\textit{k.} & \text{Sajid} & yarigi \\
\text{Sajid(NOM)} & \text{frighten(PRSM 3SG)} \\
\text{Sajid is getting frightened.}
\end{array}
\]

In (76a) the \textit{tander} ‘thunder’ is the external argument while \textit{hagha} (he) is the internal argument. However, the external argument \(x\), represented by \textit{tander} has been deleted in the course of derivation. In (76b) only the internal argument is
present; the external has been deleted so the argument structure of the given sentence
is given below:

(77) \[ y \leftrightarrow \]

The verb *yarigi* ‘fears/afraid of’ requires only one argument which is the internal
argument of the verb functioning as a theme. The external argument is not mandatory
here. The existence of the external argument renders the structure ungrammatical as
given in the following examples:

(78)

a. *khar \ Ashman \ yarigi*
   Donkey(ERG) \ Ashman(ACC) \ frighten(PRS 3SG)
   Donkey frightens Ashman.

b. Ashman \ pa asana \ yarigi.
   Ashman(NOM) \ easily \ frighten(PRS 3SG)
   Ashman frightens easily

l. Sajid \ da \ khar na \ yarigi
   Sajid(NOM) \ from \ donkey(DAT) \ frighten(PRS 3SG)
   Sajid gets frightened by donkey easily.

In (78a), the external argument renders the structure ungrammatical. However, in
(78b and c), the presence of optional/oblique arguments does not affect the
grammaticality of the structure.
4.1.5 Event argument

Now, I would like to discuss the event argument as discussed by Davidson (1967), reinforced by (Higginbotham, 1985; Kratzer, 1989; Parson, 1990). According to Davidson, every action sentence has an event argument in addition to the two (agent and theme) arguments. The verb *khwaral* (eat) has two arguments; the eater and the eaten. In (79a) *hagha* is one argument while *rotai* is another argument. However, in addition to those two, there is one more argument which is called event argument which refers to the event stated by the sentence.

(79)

```
hagha  rotai  khwari
He(NOM) meal(ACC) eat(PRS 3SG)
```

He is eating the meal.

In (79), there are three arguments: event argument, external argument and internal argument which can be represented as in the following example.

(80)

```
khwaral:  e, x <y>
```

In (80), *e* is the event argument besides *x* which is the external argument while *y* which is the internal argument of the verb *khwaral*.

So far, while being concerned with background, the cursory discussion of argument types found in Pashto has been focused. In the follow up sections I will concentrate on the argument structure type of different types of verbs.
4.2. Argument structure of verbs in Pashto

It is a general assumption that arguments have a hierarchical structure. They are structured such that their relative hierarchical status is clear. This concept of argument structure is called thematic hierarchy. The following presents variant views of thematic hierarchy.

(81)

a. <AGENT, EXPERIENCER, LOCATION/SOURCE/GOAL, THEME>
   (Grimshaw, 1990)

b. <AGENT, THEME, GOAL/BENEFACTIVE/LOCATION>
   (Baker, 1989)

c. <AGENT, THEME, GOAL, OBLIQUES>
   (Larson, 1988)

d. <AGENT, LOCATION/SOURCE/GOAL, THEME>
   (Jackendoff, 1972)

There is no uniformed theory of argument hierarchy. Researchers differ on the hierarchical status of arguments. For example, according to Larson (1988) and Baker (1989), theme is higher than goal while Jakendoff (1972) and Grimshaw (1990) believe that theme is lower than goal. The present study uses the notations given by Chung (1998) for argument hierarchy as illustrated in the following:

(82)

\textit{warko}: x, <y, z>
In (82), x is the external argument which is higher than both y and z. y and z are the two internal arguments of the verb *warko* ‘give’. Among the two internal arguments, y which is underlined is the direct argument while z is the indirect argument. The direct argument is higher than the indirect argument in the argument hierarchy. Based on the above mentioned theory, the argument structure of Pashto verbs is presented in the following section. To start with, the transitive verbs are in order.

**4.2.1 Transitive verbs**

Transitive verbs take two arguments: one internal and one external. These verbs also have an event argument. The following examples illustrate transitive verbs in Pashto with their argument structure presented in terms of notations.

(83)

a. *hagha*  *malta*  *khwari*

  She(NOM)  orange(ACC)  eat(PRS F 3SG)

  She is eating an orange.

b. *Salma*  *rotai*  *pakhai.*

  Salma(NOM)  bread(ACC)  cook(PRS F 3SG)

  Salma is cooking/cooks the meal/bread.

c. *Ahad*  *gade*  *chalai.*

  Ahad(NOM)  car/vehicle(ACC)  drive (PRS M 3SG)

  Ahad is driving/drives a car.

d. *Hameed*  *khat*  *likhi.*

  Hameed(ERG)  letter(ACC)  write(PRS M 3SG)

  Hameed is writing the letter.
e. *khat likhi
Letter(ACC) write(PRS M 3SG)
(he) writes a letter.

f. *hagha likhi
He(NOM) write(PRS M 3SG)
He writes (a letter).

Examples in (83) illustrate transitive verbs in Pashto. In (83a), hagha is the external argument while malta is the internal argument. The following structure illustrates the argument structure of transitive verbs given in (83a).

(84)

```
vP
   /\[hagha]a  v'
   \vP  v
      /\DP  V'
      \  mafia  khwri
```

In the given diagram, hagh is the external argument which was originated in the specifier position of v, it gets agent role from v. It is placed higher than the internal argument in the structure. In transitive verb both the internal and external arguments are obligatory. Example (83e) and (83f) are ill-formed, owing to the fact that one of the obligatory argument of the verb is missing in these examples. The following are the examples of the passive alternative of transitive verb.
Passive

(85)

a. woba waskale shwi
   water(NOM) drunk(PASS) be(PST F 3PL)
   The water was drunk.

b. wriji pakhi krhe shwi.
   Rice(NOM) cook do(PASS) be(PST F 3PL)
   Rice was cooked.

c. rotai wakhwarhe shwa.
   Meal(NOM) eat(PASS) be(PST F 3SG)
   Meal was eaten.

In the given examples the external argument has been suppressed while the internal argument has been externalized by raising it to subject position. The following illustrates the argument structure of the passive verb in (86).

(86)

a. sakali: e, x, <y> → Active
   sakale shwa: e, <y> x* Passive

b. pakhi kre: e, x, <y> → Active
   pakhi kre shwi: e, <y> x* Passives

d. khwari: e, x, <y> → Active
   khwarale shawe: e, <y> x* Passive
In (86a), the active structure has three arguments such as event, external and internal represented by $e$, $x$ and $<y>$ respectively. The internal argument has been enclosed in angel brackets which mean that it is the internal argument of the verb. The passive version of the argument structure shows $x$ marked with * which shows that the said argument has been suppressed. Similarly, (86b-c) are consistent with (86a) by showing suppression of the external argument $x$ in the passive version of the structure.

4.2.2 Ditransitive verbs in Pashto

Unlike transitives, ditransitive predicates require four arguments i.e., event argument, external argument and two internal arguments besides the event argument which is present in all the transitive constructions. The following illustrate ditransitive verbs in Pashto:

(87)

\begin{enumerate}
\item[a.] ma zahid barzar ta waligo.
\hfil I(ERG)Zahid(ACC) bazar(OBL) do(PST 3PL)
I hit Zahid/ I beat Zahid.

\item[b.] hagha zahid karachi ta waligalo
\hfil he(ERG) Zahid(NOM) to Karachi(OBL) send(PST F 3SG)
I sent Zahid to Karachi.

\item[c.] ma Zahid la paisi warkhi.
\hfil I(ERG) to Zahid(DAT) money(NOM) give(PST F 3PL)
I gave the money to Zahid.
\end{enumerate}
The examples in (87) illustrate ditransitive verbs in Pashto. In (87a) and (87b) ma ‘I’ and hagha ‘he’ are the external arguments. In (87b) Zahid ‘fine’ is the internal argument of the verb waligo ‘send’. Zahid is the direct internal argument while Karachi ta is the indirect/oblique argument of the verb. The following demonstrates the structure of argument structure in ditransitive Pashto verbs.

(88)

\[a. warkrhi e, x <y, z>\]

In (88), e stands for event argument. x represents external argument while y and z are the two internal arguments of which the former is direct while the latter is indirect argument. The following structure represents the hierarchy of arguments in ditransitive verb in Pashto

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{vP} & \rightarrow \\
\text{[hagha]}_x & \rightarrow \\
\text{v} & \rightarrow \\
\text{VP} & \rightarrow \\
\text{DP} & \rightarrow \\
\text{V'} & \rightarrow \\
\text{SC} & \rightarrow \\
\text{DP} & \rightarrow \\
\text{wakhwarawala} & \rightarrow \\
\text{DP} & \rightarrow \\
\text{PP} & \rightarrow \\
\text{rotaiy} & \rightarrow \\
\text{P} & \rightarrow \\
\text{DP} & \rightarrow \\
\text{pa} & \rightarrow \\
\text{Zahid}_z & \rightarrow 
\end{align*}
\]

(Adopted from Hale and Keyser, 1998)
Following Hale and Keyser (1998) and Evan (1972, 1976), I analyze PP the projection of P as a head like a verb. The said P projects both a specifier and a complement thus behaves very similar to a verb which projects both a specifier and a complement. The direct object functions as the specifier of P while the oblique object functions as the complement of head P. In (89), hagha ‘he/she’ is the external argument of the verb which has been generated at the specifier V position. Subsequently, the said argument is raised to the specifier v position for agent role assignment. Rotai ‘meal/ bread’ is the direct object of the verb originated at the specifier position of SC headed by P. Zahid is the indirect object which functions as the internal argument of the SC.

The external argument of the ditransitive like transitive verb can be suppressed in passive voice, as shown in the following examples.

(90)

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{paha Zahid rotai wakhwarwale shwa.}
\end{enumerate}

\begin{tabular}{l}
On Zahid(ERG) meal(NOM) eat(PASS PST F 3SG) \\
Meal has been served to Zahid.
\end{tabular}

The argument structure of the sentence presented in (91) would be as follows.

(91) \textit{wakhwarwale shwa: e, <y, z> x*}

The same can be represented in a tree diagram as give in the following:
In (92) the passive version of the sentence has been illustrated. The P, pa, merges with its complement DP Zahid to form PP which in turn merges with its specifier DP rotai ‘meal’ to form the small clause (SC henceforth). The small clause merges with V, the passivized ditransitive verb wakhwarala ‘eat’ to form VP. Then the VP merges with v to form v’ which finally merges with its specifier DP to form vP. Since (93) illustrates the structure of passivized verb in which the external argument has been suppressed while the internal argument has been externalized by raising it to specifier v position.
4.2.3 Intransitives

4.2.3.1 Unergatives

The following are examples of unergative and unaccusative verbs in Pashto.

(93)

a. Shahid kar kai.
   Shahid(NOM) work do(PRS M 3SG)
   Shahid is working.

b. hagha lambi
   She/he(NOM) bath(PRS M 3SG)
   She is taking bath.

c. haghwi garzi
   They(NOM) walk(PRS M 3PL)
   They are walking.

d. Salma darogh wai
   Salma(NOM) lie tell(PRS F 3SG)
   Salma tells lie.

In (93a-d) unergative verbs have been illustrated. Ergative verbs describe an agentive action which means that the action is initiated by the agent subject. In (93a) Shahid is the agentive subject who initiates the action of kar (work). Another striking thing about un-ergative verb is that it has an event argument as well. However, the only difference between un-ergative and ergative verbs is that ergative verbs take theme while the former do not. In (94) below, the subject is non agentive, thus the sentences are ill-formed. The following structure illustrates un-ergative verbs.
In the given example, the one and only argument of the un-ergative verb *lambi* ‘bath’ has been generated at the specifier position of V and is subsequently raised to specifier v position to get the agent role assigned from the little v. However, an unanimate entity cannot be the subject of an ergative verb as can be seen in the grammaticality of the constructions in (96)

(96)

a. *gelas*  
   glass (NOM)  bath(PR 3SG)  
   Glass is taking bath

b. *gade*  
   vehicle (NOM)  bath(PR 3SG)  
   Vehicle is taking bath

(96a-b) are ungrammatical owing to the fact that the subject of the verb cannot be assigned agent role since they are not animate. The verb, however, requires an agent subject argument.
4.2.3.2. Un-accusatives

Un-accusative verbs, on the other hand, describe a non-agentive action. The following (97) illustrates un-accusative verbs in Pashto. The subject of un-accusative verb is semantically a theme though syntactically it behaves like a subject as explained in (97) below. The subject of the un-accusative verb is actually the internal argument which has been moved to the subject position in the course of derivation².

(97)

a. gelas wartao sho
   glass(NOM) fall do/become(PST M 3SG)
   Glass fell down.

b. Jinai pranjigi.
   Girl(NOM) sneeze(PR S M 3SG)
   A girl is sneezing.

c. Humaid bemar sho
   Humaid (NOM) sick become(PST M 3SG)
   Humaid became sick.

In (97a), gelas ‘glass’ is the internal argument of the verb wartao sho but since there is no subject (external argument), the former surfaces as a sentential subject. The said is the internal argument of the verb as it is not involved in any

² Since there is no subject, the object has to be moved to specifier T position to check the grammatical features of the T head.
activity (agentive action). The following diagram illustrates argument structure of unaccusative verbs. In (97b) *jenai* ‘girl’ is the internal argument of the verb. The ungrammaticality of the structures in (98) arises from the fact that the un-accusative verbs cited in (97) cannot be causativised thus can have no external argument. The unaccusative verbs cited in (97) have been causativized in the following:

(98)

a. *ma* jinai wapranjawala
I(ERG) girl(NOM) sneeze (PRS M 3SG)
I sneezing.

b. *ma* Humaid bemar ko
I(ERG) Humaid sick become (PST M 3SG)
Humaid became sick.

The examples cited in (98) are ungrammatical since the verbs are un-accusative; the subject of the said verbs cannot be assigned agent theta role. In said examples, we attempted to assign agent theta role to the subject of the said verb but it resulted in the ungrammaticality of the structure.

(99)

a. wartao sho: <y>

b. pranjigi: <y>

c. bemar sho: <y>

The structure shows that the un-accusative verb, wartao sho ‘dropped down’ takes only one argument: the internal argument. The following diagram shows the structure of arguments of the verb.
In (100) the un-accusative verb has been illustrated. As given, the un-accusative *woda sho* 'slept' does not have any external argument but the internal is raised to the position of the external argument.

According to Chun (1990, p. 401) English de-verbal nominal are derived from un-ergative verb by –er suffix. In Pashto, the said is derived by adding –way suffixes to un-accusative. The following examples demonstrate the difference.

(101)

a. *kar kai* ‘work doing’ →
   
   *Kardar* ‘doer of work’

b. *garzi* ‘walking’ →
   
   *garzinda* ‘walker’

c. *lambi* ‘taking bath’ →
   
   *lambozan* ‘one who baths’
(102)

a. *woda sho* ‘slept’ →
   *woda shawey* ‘one who slept’

b. *wartao sho* ‘fall down’ →
   *wartao shawey* ‘one who fall down’

c. *wran sho* ‘demaged’ →
   *wran shawey* ‘the thing which became demaged’

d. *nilam sho* ‘bid’ →
   *nilam shawey* ‘the thing available for bid’.

In (101a-c) un-ergative verbs are demonstrated while in (102a-d) unaccusative verbs are demonstrated. An interesting thing that I noticed about deverbal nominals is that the said also show some traces of the meaning of the verb. The agentive and non-agentive meaning of the verb is also present there in the derived nominal. The following example demonstrates the difference:

(103)

a. *woda shawey* (the one who is asleep)

b. *wran shawey* (the one which is not in sound condition)

c. *lambozan* (the one swims/bath)

d. *kardar* (the one who works)
In (103a-b), the meaning of the de-verbal nominals is stative as it refers to the state of an entity while in (103c-d) the meaning of the nominal is agentive. The latter refers to the action of an agent while the former in (103a-b) refers to the state/non agentive attributes of the subject.

4.2.3.3. Verbal passive formation (VPF)

The verbal passive are formed by suppressing the external argument. The subject argument which carries agent role and functions as an external argument is suppressed while the internal argument is moved to the subject position (see Chung, 2000 for details about English VPF). Consider the following examples:

(104)

a. hagha khat likhale de
   he(ERG) letter(NOM) write(PRS M 3SG) be(PRS M 3SG)
   He has written the letter.

b. khat likhale shawe de
   Letter(NOM) write(PRS M 3SG) do(PASS be PRS M 3SG)
   Letter has been written.

In (104a) the external argument is present while in (104b) the said argument has been suppressed. In the former, the internal argument khat has been externalized. The argument structure of verbs in (104a) is as follows:
(105)

\[ a. \text{likhale: } e, x, <y> \rightarrow \]

\[ b. \text{likhale shawe } e, <y> \ x^* \]

In (105a) \( e \) is the event argument. \( x \) and \(<y>\) represent external and internal arguments respectively. The structure in (105a) is the argument structure representation of (104a).

In (104b) the external argument \( hagha \ ‘he’ \) has been suppressed. The internal argument is externalized subsequent to the suppression of the external argument as illustrated in 105b above.

### 4.2.3.4. Adjectival passive formation (APF)

APF does not have external argument. However, in the absence of the external argument the internal argument surface as a sentential subject. The following examples illustrate APF in Pashto.

(106)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{baran} & \text{deer} & \text{wo.} \\
\text{rain}(\text{NOM}) & \text{heavy (M 3SG)} & \text{be(PST)} \\
\end{array}
\]

Rain was heavy.

In (106) \( \text{baran} \ ‘rain’ \) is the only argument of the VPF functioning as an internal argument of the verb. However, it surfaces as subject of the sentence. The argument has been externalized. The said can be represented as the following:
(107) <y>

Another example of the same:

(108)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
kitabona & gran & wo. \\
Books(NOM) & expensive(M 3PL) & be(PST M 3PL)
\end{array}
\]

Books were expensive.

In (108) kitabona has been externalized since the verb does not have external argument of its own. The following demonstrates the externalization of the internal argument.

(109)

a. <y> → 

b. y < >

APF formation in Pashto like English does not allow bandi ‘by phrase’. It does not take rational clause or any agentive adverb too (as Chung 2000 argues the same about English APF). The following examples show how APF is different from its verbal passive counterpart.

(110)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
ma & khat & waliko \\
I(ERG) & letter(NOM) & write (PST M 3SG)
\end{array}
\]

I wrote a letter.
b. khat walikale sho
letter(NOM) written (PASS) be(PST M 3SG)
Letter was written.

c. khat (pa ma) walikhle sho.
Letter(NOM) (by me) write (PASS) be(PST M 3SG)
The letter was written by me.

d. kitab gran wo
Book(NOM) expensive be(PST M 3SG)
The book was expensive.

e. *kitab (pa ma) gran wo.
Book(NOM) (by me) expensive be(PST M 3SG)
The book was expensive for me.

In (110d) the sentence is active while the one in (110e) is its passive counterpart. The said VPF in (110b) is shown to allow bandi ‘by’ phrase in (110c). However, APF shown in (110d) does not allow bandi ‘by’ phrase as demonstrated by the ungrammaticality of (110e).

Furthermore, the said APF in Pashto neither allows rational clause nor agentive adverb. The following examples show the same.

(111)

a. *Kitab gran wo pa asana
Book(NOM) expensive be(PST M 3SG) easily
Book was expensive easily.

\[ b. \quad \text{Kitab} \quad \text{walikale} \quad \text{sho} \quad \text{pa asana}. \]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Book(NOM)} & \quad \text{written (PASS)} & \text{be(PST M 3SG)} & \text{easily.} \\
\text{Book was written easily.}
\end{align*}
\]

In (111a) the structure is ungrammatical merely due to the fact that agentive adverb has been used to modify the APF. However, the APF does not allow the agentive adverb to modify it. Conversely, the structure in (111b) is grammatical due to the fact that agentive adverb \textit{pa asana} ‘easily’ modifies the VPF; because VPF allows the co-occurrence of adverbial \textit{pa asana} ‘easily’ with it but APF does not allow the said adverb.

4.2.3.5. **Middle formation**

Middle verbs are considered to be a voice between active and passive (Chung, 2000). They are active but their meaning is like that of passive. Middle verbs are found in English too. Consider the following middle verb constructions in English.

(112)

\[
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{The bottle breaks easily.} \\
b. & \quad \text{The potato cuts easily.} \\
c. & \quad \text{The car drives nicely.} \\
d. & \quad \text{Joseph writes neatly.}
\end{align*}
\]

\quad (Chung, 2000)
Middles are active in their form but they are like passive in terms of meaning. They describe the property of a surface subject. The subject of middles does not bear agent theta role. Pashto exhibits this type of constructions.

(113)

\[ a. \text{frij} \quad \text{pa asana} \quad \text{kharabigi.} \]
Fridge(NOM) easily breaks down (3SG)
Fridge breaks down easily.

\[ b. \text{hagha} \quad \text{frij} \quad \text{khrabai} \]
He(NOM) fridge (ERG) damage (3SG/PL)
He damages the fridge.

\[ c. \text{da bojai deera} \quad \text{pa asana gandale} \quad \text{kigi.} \]
This sack(NOM) very easily stitched(PRSM 3SG) be (PRS)
This sack can be stitched very easily.

In (113) the verb \text{kharabigi} ‘break down’ is similar in meaning to those of English middles cited in (113a-d) thus exemplify the existence of middle verbs in Pashto. \text{Kharabigi} ‘break down’ in its form is isomorphic with the present form of verb. However, when modified by \text{pa asana} ‘easily’ then it gives the reading of middles just like English. The difference between the passive and middle verbs in Pashto can be captured in the following examples:

(114)

\[ a. \text{frij} \quad \text{pa asana} \quad \text{kharabigi.} \quad \text{(middle)} \]
Fridge(NOM) easily breaks down(PRSM 3SG)
Fridge breaks down easily.
b. \textit{frij kharab karhe sho.} (\textit{passive})
Fridge(NOM) damage do (PASS) be(PST M 3SG)
Fridge was damaged (by someone).

c. \textit{Hameed frij kharabai.}
Hameed(NOM)fridge damage (PRS M 3SG)
Hameed is damaging/damages the fridge.

In (114a) the verb is middle while the one in (114b) is VPF. In other words, in (114a) the verb expresses the attributes of the subject while in (114b), the verb represents the passive form of the active verb \textit{kharabai} as given in (114c).

The difference between the middle and passive is quiet simple to capture. Middles express attributes of the surface subject while passives have got agentive suppressed/implicit subject. Middles also have an implicit subject but the meaning of the two implicit subjects is different: implicit subject of the passive form means ‘someone’ while the implicit subject of the middle means ‘anyone, people, anybody’ as demonstrated in the following examples.

(115)

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{da kor pa asana wranigi.}
This house(NOM) easily collapse (PRS M 3SG)
This house collapses easily.
\item \textit{da kor wranigi}
This house(NOM) demolish (PASS) be (PRS M 3SG)
This house is being demolished.
\item \textit{mashum khandi pa asana.}
Child(NOM) laughs (PRS M 3SG) easily
The child laughs easily.
\end{enumerate}
(115a and 115c) demonstrates middles while (115b) illustrates passive verb in Pashto. In (115a), the verb wranigi ‘collapses’ is a middle verb which describes the property of the subject da kor ‘this house’ the meaning conveyed by the verb is that it can be damaged easily by anyone. The verb refers to a state rather than an action. The said verb is in present form and is modified by adverb of manner. According to Chung (1990), the middles in English are adorned with manner adverbs, modals, negation and focus. The implicit subject that gives the meaning of ‘anyone’, is different from the subject of passive verb which means ‘someone’ as illustrated in (115c). The form of the verb in both (115b) and (115c) is the same but the difference can be captured from the fact that the subject of the former is ‘someone’ while that of the latter is ‘anyone, people, anybody’.

According to Robert (1987) and Fagan (1988, 1992), middles can be categorized as stative as far as its aspect is concerned. This means that the said verb does not have an event argument. The latter has been either suppressed or deleted in the course of derivation. The following examples illustrate the suppression of event argument.

(116)

a. roja matigi pa asana.
   Fasting(NOM) break(PRS M 3SG) easily.
   Fasting breaks easily.

b. e, x,<&y> →
   y &<>, (*e)
The argument structure of (116a) is represented in (116b). The latter says that external argument has been deleted while the event argument has been suppressed in the course of derivation of middle from its transitive counterpart. The following examples justify whether the external argument has been deleted or suppressed.

(117)

a. Hagha mehnat kai chi kamyab shi.
   He(NOM) hard-work do (PRS M 3SG) so that succeed do (PRS 3SG/PL)
   He works hard so that he may succeed.

b. *mehnat kigi chi kamyab shi.
   hardwork(NOM) do(PRS 3SG) so that succeed do (PRS 3SG/PL)
   (Someone) works hard to succeed.

c. *kor wranigi chi nuqsan washi
   House (NOM) collapse (PRS 3SG so that damage do(PRS 3SG)
   The house collapses to cause damage (to someone).

In (117a), the subject of the matrix clause hagha controls the PRO of the embedded clause chi kamyab shi. PRO in the embedded clause encodes the meaning of hagha which is the subject of the matrix clause. Conversely, in (117b), there is no controller of the PRO in the matrix clause; the sentence is thus ill-formed. (117b) illustrates passive structure which does not allow controlled subject of the embedded clause when the external argument of the matrix clause is not given or that it means ‘someone’. The reason why (117b) is ill-formed is that the verb of the embedded clause agrees with a particular pronoun hagha, haghoi ‘he/she, they’ respectively’ while the implicit subject of the matrix is ‘someone’. However, whenever the
external argument is understood or given, the PRO of the embedded clause is controlled. Consider the following examples:

(118)

d. ta mehnat kawa chi kamyab shi
   you(NOM) hardwork(NOM) do (PRS 2SG) so that (PRO)succeed do(FUT 2SG)

   You work hard so that (you) may succeed.

e. ma ta farigh krhe chi mutalia waki.
   I(ERG)you(NOM) free do (PST 2SG) so that(PRO) study do(FUT 2SG)
   I let you go for study.

   In (118a), the subject of the matrix clause is given so there is no issue with the agreement of the verb of the embedded clause. However, sometimes, the subject of the matrix clause is in ergative case, but since the object is in nominative case as in (118b), the verb of the embedded clause agrees with the object of the matrix clause indirectly. The verb of the embedded clause agrees with PRO which is controlled by the subject of the matrix clause. However, sometimes the implicit subject argument of the passive verb in the matrix clause controls the PRO of the embedded clause. Consider the following examples:

(119)

c.

a. *kor nave kigi chi faida washi.
   house(NOM) renovate do (PASS) so that (PRO) benefit do(PRS 3SG)
   The house renovates PRO to get benefit.

b. *kor pa asana nave kigi chi faida washi.
   house(NOM) easily renovate do (PRS 3SG) so that benefit do(PRS 3SG)
   The house renovates easily so that benefit is taken.
c. \textit{rotai} \textit{khuram} \textit{chi kar} \textit{wakam}.

\textit{PRO(I) food(NOM) eat (PRS 1SG) so that work (I, PRO) do(PRS 1SG)}

I take food so that (I) work (after eating).

In (119a-b) the external argument of the passive verb is implicit/ suppressed but since the said is not definite pronoun rather it reads as ‘someone’, it cannot control the PRO subject of the embedded clause. So ‘someone’ being the implicit argument of the verb in the matrix clause cannot be duplicated into the subject position of the embedded clause. However, in (119c) the case is different. In this case, the subject of verb in the matrix clause is understood from the morphology of the verb in matrix clause. Similarly, the subject of the embedded clause is understood from the morphology of the verb but it is not a definite subject while the subject of middles as in (120) is indefinite which cannot be controlled by the subject of the matrix clause. Thus the sentence is ill-formed.

(120)

\textit{*imtihan pa asana pas kigi chi nawkari milao shi.}

\textit{exam (NOM)easily qualify do (PRS 3SG) so that job get be PRS 3SG/PL)}

Exams are easily qualified (by someone) to get a job.

Another important characteristic of Pashto middle is that it suppresses the external argument and externalizes its internal argument as can be seen in the following examples.

(121)

\textit{a. da kitab pa asana patigi.}

\textit{This book(NOM) easily steal(PRS 3SG)}

This book gets stolen easily.
4.2.3.6. Ergative Formation

This term was originally applied to languages like Basque in which the complement of a transitive verb and the subject of an intransitive verb are assigned the same case. However, by extension, it has come to be used to denote verbs like break which occur both in structures like Someone broke the window and in structures like The window broke, where the window seems to play the same thematic role in both types of sentences, in spite of being the complement of broke in one sentence and the subject of broke in the other. The ergative formation is distinguished by its ability to occur in transitive structure as well. The sentential subject originates as the object of the verb. The following examples illustrate ergative verbs in English:
Ergative verb has the following characteristics.

Firstly, it cannot be modified by an adverb. See the following examples.

(124)

a. *gilas  mat  sho pa asana
   Glass(NOM)  break  become (PRS M 3SG)  easily.
   The glass broke easily.

c.  gilas  mat  sho.
   Glass(NOM)  break  become (PST M 3SG)
   The glass broke.

The examples in (124) depict ergative formation in Pashto. (124a) and (124c) are grammatical because they are not modified by an adverb while (124b) is ungrammatical because it is modified by an adverb. Thus ergative in Pashto does not allow adverb to modify it. Secondly, models auxiliary can be used concurrently with Pashto ergative formations as can be seen in the following examples.
In (125) the examples depict that Pashto ergatives can be used concurrently with models.

Thirdly, Pashto ergatives describe an event and not a property of the subject. This property of the verb is evident from the following examples.

(126)

a. kamra safə shwa.

Room (NOM) clean become (PST F 3SG)

The room got cleaned.

b. e, < > y

In (126a), the verb expresses an event. It does not describe the property of the subject like APF. In (126b), the argument structure of ergative given in (126a) has been illustrated. The verb has got two arguments; one is event argument while the other is the internal argument of the verb.

Forthly, the tense of Pashto ergative verbs is not limited to present tense like middles. The verb can appear in any tense namely present, past and progressive form.
The examples in (127) depicts that ergatives can be used in different tenses. In (127a), the verb is ergative while in (127b) and (127c) its present and past tense alternates have been given.

Fifthly, it has got its corresponding transitive construction as given in below.

In (128a), the transitive counterpart of the ergative in (128b) has been given.

The transitive counterpart has been derived by replacing the verbal clitic *sho* by *ko*.
In Pashto the said verbs are quite unique as far as its syntactic sub-categorization is concerned. The said verb is made of adjective and auxiliary verb. The following represents the argument structure of the predicate:

(129)

\[ guzar sho: e, y < > x^* \]

In (129), e, y and x* represent event, internal argument externalized and suppressed external argument respectively.

### 4.3 Concluding remarks

In this chapter, the focus was on the argument structure of verbs in Pashto. Specifically those areas have been focused where the concept of argument has been central and instrumental for the comparison to follow in the next chapter. Firstly, the argument types have been discussed followed by the discussion of different types of predicates based on their argument structure. Unaccusative, middles, ergative, unergative, APF and VPF, besides the two and three place predicates, have been identified in Pashto and at the same time the AS of the predicates have been presented. On the basis of the data, it was concluded that the unaccusative verbs only project an internal argument. It does not require the event argument. However, the said verb can be causativised by adding external argument and at the same time the event argument gets included in the valency of the derived causative of the unaccusative root.
In ditransitive verbs, the external argument of the verb gets suppressed when verb is passivized and, as a result, the internal argument moves to the subject position while the event argument remains intact. Both the internal and external arguments are the obligatory arguments of the transitive verb. However, in passive structure, the external argument becomes optional, while the externalization of the internal argument becomes obligatory as it behaves in active structures.

The unergative, on the other hand, requires an external argument as an obligatory argument while the internal argument is not the obligatory argument of the verb. The event argument is also a part of the valency of the verb. The APFs require one argument which is the internal argument of the verb. However, since the external argument is not available, the internal argument of the verb gets realized as the subject of the verb. The verb does not project event argument. The ergative predicates are derived by the suppression of the external argument and by the externalization of the internal argument.
Chapter Five

THE SYNTAX OF ARGUMENT STRUCTURE: A COMPARISON OF PASHTO AND ENGLISH

5.0 Overview of the chapter

Argument Structure (AS) of a language largely depends upon the form and origin of its verb formation. In this regard, incorporation and conflation are the two processes which can account for the differences in the AS of different types of verbs. These two processes are exploited in the present chapter to describe the predicate AS types found in Pashto and compare them with English AS. AS as undertaken in this study means the syntactic configuration and its output after the application of various morpho-syntactic rules such as derivational affixes, conflation, incorporation, and merge. However, the scope of this chapter has been restricted to the discussion of AS within the framework of Hale and Keyser (1998), called ‘syntactic theory of basic argument structure types’ and also ‘merge and move’ of Chomsky (1994, 1995a, 2001) specifically targeting the aforementioned areas and its effect on the argument structure of a head verb in both of the focus languages. Semantics and all other related concerns are beyond the scope of this chapter. The model proposed by Hale and Keyser (1998) for the transitive-inchoative alternation and transitive-ditransitive alternations has been adopted for the description of the AS found in the subject languages. Finally, the conflation and incorporation adopted in this study are based on Hale and Keyser (1993, 1998) and Baker (2003).
5.1 Types of argument structures

Before embarking on the discussion of AS of Pashto verbs and its comparison with that of English, the AS types proposed by Hale and Keyser are given in this section. Although they (Hale & Keyser, ibid) propose these AS types for English yet they also claim its validity and application cross linguistically. It is, therefore, seems plausible to cite them and do the comparison of English and Pashto AS in the light of these AS types. The basically possible structures of AS are given here as 130a to 130d:

(130a) IP Monadic

\[
\text{h} \rightarrow \text{h comp}
\]

In (130a), the head (h) projects only a complement. The specifier DP is not required. (130b) is different from (130a) because the latter does not require a specifier.

(130b) IP Basic Dyadic

\[
\text{h} \rightarrow \text{Spec h'} \rightarrow \text{h comp}
\]

In (130b), the head requires both a specifier and a complement. (130b) is different from (130c) in the sense that the latter’s head is phonologically null.

(130c) Composite Dyadic
In (130c) the phonologically null head projects both a specifier and a complement. (130c) is different from (130d) because the latter does not project a specifier and a complement, and also its head is not phonologically null.

(130d) Atomic/Simple

\[
\begin{array}{c}
h^* \\
| \\
h \end{array}
\]

These four are the types of AS proposed by Hale and Keyser (1998). One of my concerns here in this chapter is to determine that which type of predicate falls into which type of AS type in Pashto. I will start my discussion with the AS of intransitive verbs found my data.

5.2 Intransitive Verbs

As the part of the intransitive verbs, the unaccusatives of Pashto are described first.

5.2.1 Unaccusatives

The subject of the unaccusative verbs is non-agentive. It originates as the object of the verb, but due to the non-availability of the subject [external argument],
it is raised to the subject position in the course of derivation. The subject of unaccusative verb is semantically a theme. ¹ The following examples in (131) illustrate unaccusative verbs.

(131)

a. Bashir woda sho
   Bashir(NOM) sleep be (PST M 3SG)
   Bashir slept.

b. gade wran sho
   Car(NOM) break become (PST M 3SG)
   The car broke down.

c. kitab wrak sho.
   Book(NOM) lose become (PST M 3SG)
   The book is lost.

Examples in (131) demonstrate unaccusative verbs in Pashto. In (131a) Bashir is the sole argument of the verb which functions as the internal argument of the verb. However, during the course of derivation the said argument is raised to the spec T position to get nominative case assigned by the T head.

¹ Since there is no subject, the object has been moved to specifier T position to check the grammatical features of the T head.
In (133) the internal argument *Bashir* has been raised to spec V and then to spec T position to check its nominative case by establishing agree relation with the T. The said argument originates as the internal argument of the verb (See Perlmutter (1978) and Burzio (1981) for details). The following example illustrates the causative alternate of unaccusative predicate in Pashto:

(133)
In (133) *woda ko* ‘asleep do’ is a compound verb which consists of *woda* and *ko*. The *ko* part of the compound verb is responsible for agent role assignment to DP at spec v position. So, *ko* is the transitive alternate of the intransitive *sho*. (130) and (131) show that we can have the transitive alternate of *woda sho* ‘asleep become’ which is *woda ko* ‘sleep do’ in Pashto. *ko* allows agent subject. However, *sho* does not allow agent role on its external argument.

Moreover, in Pashto *ko* (*a verbal clitic*) is used to derive the transitive alternate of *woda sho*. In English, though not all, some verbs are transitivised by zero morphology as discussed by Hale and Keyser (1993). In Miskitu (a language spoken in northeastern Nicaragua), transitivization is purely morphological. In the said language, transitive alternates are derived by verbal affixes. The following examples demonstrate transitive alternation and its comparison in both Pashto and English.

(134)

**English**

a.

i. The glass broke.

ii. He broke the glass.

b.

i. The milk froze.

ii. He froze the milk.
(135) Pashto

a.
i.  *Humaid oda sho.*
Humaid slept become.
Humaid slept/ Humaid become asleep.

ii.  *Ma Humaid oda ko.*
I Humaid sleep do.
I put Humaid asleep/I caused Humaid to sleep.

b.
i.  *Kitab wrak sho.*
Book lost become.
The book is lost.

ii.  *ma kitab wrak krho.*
I book lose do
I made the book lost.

c.
i.  *sabzi grana shwa.*
Vegetables expensive become.
Vegetable has become expensive.

ii.  *dukandar sabzi grana krha.*
Shopkeeper vegetable expensive made.
The shopkeeper has made vegetable expensive.

The English unaccusatives are quite different. They cannot be causativized or transitivised, neither morphologically nor syntactically (by cliticization as in Pashto). In Pashto, however, the unaccusative can be transitivized syntactically by attaching verbal clitic/light verb to it. The clitic/light verb *sho* ‘become’ when replaced by *ko* ‘do’, the structure becomes transitive.
Bashir originates as the internal argument of the verb. However, due to the unavailability of external argument, subsequently the internal argument surfaces as a subject. In English the transitive alternate of the unaccusative cannot be derived. See the following examples.

(137)

a. *She slept Bashir.

b. *She laughed Hameed.

(137a-b) are hypothetical causative alternates of unaccusative. They are ungrammatical only due to the fact that English does not allow morphological causativization of unaccusative verbs. So, the English unaccusative depict (130a) type of argument structure while the Pashto one depicts (130a) and (130c) type of argument structure mentioned in (5.1) above. The unaccusative verb found in Pashto can be further dissected into two parts: the adjective and the light verb. The adjective part of the compound verb conflates into V position by adjoining with the light verb. However, in English the verb head cannot be further dissected. Likewise to
causativize the unaccusatives, the argument structure type namely (130a) which is the basic argument structure of the verb is added to (130c) as a complement. The head of (130c) is phonologically null little v.

5.2.2 Passives

The unaccusative found in Pashto can be transitivized. Thus it can have passive alternate as well. The following are Pashto passive unaccusative:

(138)

a. Humaid woda krhe shawe de.
   Humaid sleep do become be
   Humaid has been put asleep.

b. sabzi grana krahe shwi da.
   Vegetable expensive do become be
   Vegetable has been made expensive.

c. kitab wrak krahe shwe de. (deliberatly done)
   Book lost do become be
   The book has been lost.

In (138) the transitivized unaccusative verbs in Pashto have been illustrated. The external argument is suppressed while the internal argument Humaid, sabzi and kitab in (130a), (130b) and (130c) respectively are raised to surface as a subject. The passive alternation adds another variation to the argument structure of unaccusative verbs in Pashto.
5.2.3 Unergatives

Unergative predicates have agentive subject but no complement or internal argument at all (Radford, 1997). In Basque, unaccusative and unergative have different auxiliaries: *izan* ‘to be’ is the unaccusative auxiliary while *edun* ‘to have’ is the unergative auxiliary. So it is easier to identify them from the auxiliaries (Perovic, 2008). The following are examples of unergative verbs in English:

(139)

a. He is swimming.
b. Shahid is bathing.
c. The girls are dancing.
d. The boys are running.

The following are examples of unergative predicates in Pashto:

(140)

a. *mashoom lambi.*

Child bath

The child is taking bath.

b. *jina gadi.*

Girls dance

The girls are dancing.

c. *halak manda wahi.* (Noun incorporation).

Boy run beat

The boy is running.
e. halak lambu wahi (Noun incorporation).
   Boy swim beat
   The boy is swimming.

Pashto allows the transitivization of the unergative verbs. Conversely, in English, the said transitive alternation of unergative predicate is not allowed. Radford (2009) argues that unergative verbs have implicit transitive structure; the complement of the verb has adjoined with phonologically null verb. The following examples illustrate unergative verbs in English:

(141)

a. He laughing.

b. She is dancing.

c. The structure based on the above examples:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{He} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{N} \\
\text{laugh} \\
\text{v} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{Ø}
\end{array}
\]

(Hale & Keyser, 1998)

In (141c) the structure of (141a) is presented. The abstract light verb merges with empty V to form v'. Subsequently, the v' merges with its complement N to form VP. Then the VP merges with T to form T'. Finally merges with its specifier DP to
form TP. *Laugh* originates as the complement of the empty verb. However, since the verb is phonologically null, it subsequently incorporates its complement into an abstract light verb (Radford, 1997). The abstract light verb position is filled with the laugh after it has been incorporated from the complement position. In this fashion, all the de-nominal verbs are derived.

In Pashto, on the other hand, an unergative can have transitive alternate. This may be due to the fact that unergative verbs in Pashto, unlike that of English do not have noun counterpart. Formation of an unergative verb in Pashto is based on incorporation of complement noun into abstract light verb. Thus unergative can be transitivized as given in the following examples.

(142)

\[
\begin{align*}
a. \quad & \text{ma mashom walambao.} \\
& \text{I child bath} \\
& \text{I bathed the child.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
b. \quad & \text{haghi jinai wagadwala.} \\
& \text{She girl dance.} \\
& \text{She made the girl danced / she forced the girl to dance.}
\end{align*}
\]

The verbs cited in (142) do not have noun counterpart as shown in (143). They rather have unergative base form which is transitivized morphologically by adding –wa prefix to the root verb. The following illustrates the structure of transitivised unergative predicates:
First of all, V and little v conflate and then the conflated verb _lambwo_ merges with _mashoom_ to form VP which subsequently merges with little v forming v’. Then v’ and its specifier DP _ma_ merge together to form vP. The diagram further shows that the transitive alternate of _lambi_ has been formed by conflation of V with its complement little v containing -wo. The little v slot contains –wo which causativises the verb _lambi_ when added to it as a suffix. Hale and Keyser (1998) and Radford (2009) have proposed similar account of transitive alternates in English.

All of the Pashto verbs cannot be transitivized. Those unergative verbs which cannot be transitivized behave like English unergatives. They involve incorporation of complement N into light verb modified by causative clitic _wahi_ as can be seen in the following examples. _Wahi_ carries the meaning of performative abstract verb in English. The following example shows that the complement N of empty verb has
been incorporated into the abstract light verb position in Pashto. The incorporated N is suffixed by verbal clitic –\textit{wahi}.

(144)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{DP} & \text{T} \\
\text{vP} & \text{T} \\
\text{DP} & \text{v'} \\
\text{Shahid} & \text{v'} \\
\text{VP} & \text{v'} \\
\text{manda} & \text{Ø} \\
\text{wahi}
\end{array}
\]

(Hale & Keyser, 1998)

In (144) \textit{manda} ‘run’ originates as complement of the little v. Subsequently, the said complement has been incorporated into the little v position to adjoin to \textit{wahi} (a verbal clitic). In this regard, the said unergative can also be called implicit transitive, thus it cannot be transitivised. The same is true about English unergatives as given in the following examples:

(145)

\begin{itemize}
\item[c.] \textit{*He laughed me}
\item[d.] \textit{*I swim him.}
\item[e.] \textit{*I bathed him}
\item[f.] \textit{*I danced him}
\end{itemize}
In (145), all the verbs are derived by incorporation of the complement noun thus cannot be transitivised. In (141) given above, it has been shown that the de-nominal verb like laugh has been derived by incorporation.

So there are two types of unergative verbs found in Pashto; the one which cannot be further causativised and second, those which can be causativised. The former behaves like English unergative in the sense that they are derived by incorporating the N complement of the phonologically null into verb head position. However, the little v head is empty in case of English while in case of Pashto, it is partially filled by ‘wahi’ verbal clitic. In Pashto, those unergative which can be causativised are not de-nominal verb.

So a general conclusion can be drawn from the data presented is that when a noun gets incorporated into the V head, the resulting de-nominal verb does not allow transitive alternation in both English and Pashto. The root cause of the lack of transitive alternates for dance, laugh and other unergative predicates is that they are de-nominal verbs derived by incorporation of the complement N.

5.2.4 Ergatives

Ergative predicates do not project external argument while the internal argument is only the obligatory argument of the verb. They have got their transitive alternates. They can occur in different tenses unlike middles which have restrictions in terms of tense. The middles can occur only in present tense and with an adverb. Ergative predicates, unlike middles, have eventive reading. The following are examples of ergative verbs in Pashto.
(146)

\( g. \ radio \ wran \ sho. \)

Radio break happen.
The radio broke down.

\( h. \ sabzi \ kharaba \ shwa. \)

Vegetable rotten happen.
The vegetable became rotten.

\( i. \ halak \ wartao \ sho. \)

Boy fall happen.
The boy fell down.

In (146a-c), all the subjects are basically the internal arguments of the verb, but in absence of the external argument, the internal argument is raised to occupy the subject position by movement. The same can be seen in the following structure:

(147)
In (147), the verb *shwa* ‘become’ and adjectives *grana* ‘expensive’ merge together in fashion of conflation (Hale & Keyser, 1997, 1998, 1999, 2002). *Sabzi* ‘vegetable’ originates as the internal argument of the verb. The internal argument then merges with verb to form VP. The verb is made of adjective *kharaba* ‘rotten’ and light verb *shwa* ‘happen’. The English examples of this type of AS is given below:

(148)

a. The glass broke.
b. The mobile damaged.
c. The issue settled.

The English ergative verbs have the same lexical argument structure as that of Pashto ergative verbs.

(149)

\[ \text{tp} \rightarrow \text{dp} \rightarrow \text{vp} \rightarrow \text{vp} \rightarrow \text{t} \rightarrow \text{t}^2 \]

\[ ^2 \text{t stand for trance which is the silent copy of the constituent moved. The moved constituent leaves behind the trace.} \]
In (149), firstly the verb and its internal argument merges together to form VP. Subsequently, the internal argument has been raised to spec T position to check its nominative case against the head verb which is moved to the head T position. Thus both Pashto and English ergative have the lexical argument structure type (130b) proposed by Hale and Keyser (1998). Both exhibit the same structure as illustrated in (149) above. Like English, the Pashto ergative has got its transitive alternative. The following examples demonstrate transitivization of English ergative predicates.

(150)

a. The boy broke the glass  
b. The boy damage the mobile  
c. The judge settled the issue.

Similarly, the following structure represents the argument structure of the transitivised ergative verbs in English.
Structure in (151) represents the transitive alternate of (150). The V has been raised to v position following head movement constrain (Matushansky, 2006). The little v assigns agent role to its specifier external argument. Thus the predicate’s valency has been changed and external argument has been added to it. The Pashto ergative predicate can be transitivised by raising the verb to little v position while the English verb cannot be transitivised. Therefore, the revised argument structure reflects (‘VP’) and (‘vP’) type of argument structure (Hale & Keyser, 1998). The following are transitive alternate of ergative verbs in Pashto:

(152)

\begin{align*}
a. \quad & t\text{a} \quad \text{radio} \quad w\text{ran} \quad k\text{o}. \\
& \text{You radio break do.} \\
& \text{You have broken down the radio.}
\end{align*}
b. *baran sabzi kharaba ko.*

Rain vegetables spoil happen.

Rain has spoiled the vegetable.

c. *ma kamra saf a krha.*

I room clean do.

I cleaned the room.

The following structure exemplifies the argument structure of transitive alternate of ergative verbs in Pashto.

(153)

In (153), the adjective part of the V 'safa' clean' conflates with null verb Θ to form V. The V merges with DP, *kamra* ‘room’ to form VP. Then VP merges with v to form v’ which in turn merges with its specifier DP *ma* ‘I’ to form vP.
Subsequently, vP merges with T to form T’ which in turn merges with its specifier DP to form TP. The complement of null V (which is A) gets conflated into the null V position which then conflates with verbal causative clitic krha ‘do’ at v position. Thus, the basic argument structure of the ergative verb cited in (130a) serves as the complement of the composite dyadic type. The vP is composite dyadic while VP depicts basic dyadic IP monadic as cited above.

The difference between the derived transitive verbs from its intransitive ergative base of the two languages lies in the fact that in Pashto the transitive is derived by conflating with null V and then with little v while in English the root verb is derived by conflating with complement A and subsequently the V (after the A is conflated into V) conflates with null light verb at v position. Thus the only difference between the two languages is that the causative light verb is null in case of English while in Pashto it is not. Otherwise, they have the same argument structure (AS) as well as the mechanism used to derive the transitive alternate is same in both the languages.

### 5.2.5 Middles

Middles are called middles because they are like transitive but there is no logical subject [external argument]. They give passive reading; however, the verb is in the active form. According to Feingo (1980) middles and passive behave the same as they have a subject either implied or stated. As given, the middle seems to have basic transitive structure. Thus those verb which are inherently intransitive, cannot have middle alternates. See the following examples of Middles in Pashto:
In (154), all the verbs are middle as they all have their internal argument externalized. Their external argument has been implicit. They have got their external argument in their lexical argument structure. Another evidence in support of this proposal is that the basic structure from which the middle has been derived is transitive. The verb form of middle requires two arguments but like passive one the external argument becomes implicit after derivation. According to Keyser and Roeper (1984), the derivation of middles is syntactic while that of ergatives is lexical. The ergative transitive and intransitive alternates are lexical because compounding applies to both the transitive and its intransitive alternate. The following structure represents the argument structure of ergative and middles.
The structure (155) represents the argument structure of middles in Pashto. The V merges with PP to form V’ and then the V’ merges with its complement DP to form VP. The VP merges with v to form v’. Subsequently, the v’ merges with DP to form vP. The vP, then, merges with T to form T’. Finally the T’ merges with DP to form TP. As per Keyser and Roeper (1984), the derivation of middles from transitive structure is syntactic; it is plausible to say that in the derivation of middles the external argument is suppressed as it is true for passive. Thus the internal argument has been externalized by raising it to the specifier v position. Pertaining to the question ‘why does not the internal move to the place of external argument (spec v), I would say that since the external has not been deleted rather it has been suppressed, the external argument slot should be considered filled/occupied. Thus in
English, as well as in Pashto, middles are derived as pure syntactic derivations owing to the fact that the derivation does not change argument structure of the verb. However, the ergative and its transitive counterpart have got different argument structure; so it might have been derived lexically from the base. Middles are transitive because they cannot prepose while those ergative which are basically intransitive can prepose as cited in Keyser and Roeper (1984).

The transitive alternate of middles carry the same structure as (151) except for one change; the external argument would surface as unsuppressed. The same structure would apply to middles in English. So the middle seems to have been derived from the transitive base by suppression of the external argument. In Pashto the middle verb is suffixed by –igi, a unique suffix (the suffix is unique because this suffix is used only in the derivation of middles from adjective root). So the Pashto middles are derived from the adjective root by conflation of adjective into V head position. The same is true of English. All the middles in Pashto are rooted in adjective base.

5.2.6 Adjective Passives

We have been familiarized with the distinction between adjectival and verbal passives through generative studies (Siegel, 1973; Warsaw, 1977; Williams, 1981; Bresnan, 1982). It has long been observed that passive participles somehow equate with adjectival properties and some linguists (for example, Freidin, 1975) have suggested that all passive participles are in fact adjectives. Warsaw (1977) distinguishes the two kinds of passives, one that exhibits adjectival properties: the
adjectival passive, and one that exhibits verbal properties: the verbal passive. Since the distinction between the two participles was established and the properties of the phrases they head are set forth, the task has been to formulate the rule of Adjectival Passive Formation (APF) relates APs headed by adjectival passive participles to their verbal counterparts (Levin & Rappaport. 1986). According to Hale and Keyser (2002) verbs like APF have been decomposed into adjective and light verb in which the latter is the head. The following examples illustrate the phenomenon of adjective passives in Pashto.

(156)

a. halak wozar de.
   Boy free is.
   The boy is free.

b. istri kharaba da.
   Iron out of order is.
   The iron is out of order.

c. kor khaista de.
   House beautiful is.
   The room is nice.

d. ustad masrof de.
   Teacher busy is.
   The teacher is busy.

e. kaprhi skha di.
   Clothes dirty are.
   The clothes are dirty.
The tea is sweet.

Illustrations in (156) exemplify APF in Pashto. Canonically, APFs require one obligatory argument which functions as internal argument of the verb. The following exemplify the structure of APF in Pashto.

(157)

In (157) Adjective grana‘expensive’ conflates with verb da ‘is’ to form complex verb form V’ adjective passive. Subsequently V merges with its specifier DP, sabzi‘ vegetable’ to form VP. The VP, then, merges with T to form T’. Finally the T’ merges with DP to form TP. Finally, sabzi is moved to spec/T position to get nominative from it. The only obligatory argument of the verb is sabzi which serves as the internal argument of the verb. The said argument originates as the complement of the compound verb. However, in order to check its nominative case, the said argument is raised to spec T position.
The Pashto APF can be transitivized and so its predicate argument structure gets changed. The following are derived transitive alternate of the AP predicates cited in (157):

(158)

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{mung halak farigh krho.}
\textit{We boy free do.}
\textit{We freed the boy.}
\item \textit{mashumano istri kharaba krha.}
\textit{Children iron damage do.}
\textit{Children have damaged the iron.}
\item \textit{ma kor safa krho.}
\textit{I house clean do.}
\textit{I made the house beautiful.}
\item \textit{bachi kapri skha krhi.}
\textit{Kid clothes dirty do.}
\textit{The kid has made his clothes dirty.}
\item \textit{ta chae khwaga krha.}
\textit{You tea sweet do.}
\textit{You sweetened the tea.}
\end{enumerate}

The transitive alternates of APF in (158) project external argument. So the following structure represents the argument structure of the APF predicate.
First of all, the adjective and V conflate because the head V is phonologically empty and the adjective functions as its complement. Hale and Keyser (1998, p. 14) argue that it is the property of phonologically empty head (wholly or partially) to conflate with its complement by attracting their phonological matrix. The conflated verb is then conflated with light verb *kraha*. Thus the specifier (*mashum*, ‘kid’) of little v has been licensed and consequently agent theta role is assigned to it. This conflation of the verb with little v, which has eventive reading, results in the transitivization of the AFP verb (Radford, 2009).

The intransitive adjective +verb complex has the argument structure type (130a). It means that the head projects a complement but not a specifier. However,
in order to check the nominative case of the internal argument, the said argument has been raised up to spec T position. The Pashto and English APFs have the same structure argument type as depicted in (130a) above.

The basic structure is the same in both of the languages; the predicate describes the internal argument as in (156). In both of the languages, the predicate is bipartite; it consists of the head and its complement. The predicate does not project specifier. The head also does not project an external argument. Thus the verb does not extend its projection up to vP. At the same time the Pashto APFs involve conflation of adjective into V position as in (159) while its English counterpart conflation is blocked thus it results in ungrammaticality of structure as given in (160b and 160d) below. However, the transitive counterpart of Pashto APF is distinctive in the sense that English does not have transitive counterpart of APF. The reason can be assigned to the fact that English has the syntactic causative counterpart of its intransitive APF as given below.

(160)

a. I made him happy.

b. *I happied him.

c. The shopkeeper made the vegetable expensive

d. *The shopkeeper expensived the vegetable.

(160b) and (160d) are ungrammatical owing to the reason that happy cannot be conflated into V head; at the same time, happy is not affixal in nature. Conversely,
red allows conflation into V and subsequent raising to be affixed to phonological null causative light verb. Consider the following.

(161)

a. The ball reddened

b. He reddened the ball

In (161), the English ergative verb and its transitive alternate are illustrated. The following is the structure of the transitive alternate of ergative verb derived through conflation of adjective into V and subsequent conflation of the said with v.

(162)

(Radford, 2008)
The structure in (162) demonstrates that A ‘red’ has been conflated into V position. Subsequently, the conflated verb is raised to be affixed to an abstract light verb marked by Θ. Thus the specifier little v is assigned agent role by its raising it from spec/V position. Finally, he, which functions as a specifier of v is moved to spec/T position get nominative case from T. The same structure cannot be assumed for English APF because the latter does allow morphological transitivisation. So the Pashto APFs gets transitivised in the same fashion as the English ergative gets causativised as depicted in (162). The English ergative causativised by conflating V head into the little v head position and as a result licenses external argument at specifier v position. Once again, the conflated verb gets transitivization. The next section describes the structure of the transitives in both of the languages.

5.3. Transitives

Verbs can be classified according to the clause types they may occur in. In languages, we have two types of verbs; intransitive verbs (occurring just in intransitive clauses) and transitive (occurring just in transitive clauses) (Dixon, 1994). What follows is a description of the AS of transitive verbs in Pashto and its comparison with English.

Transitive verbs require two arguments: external and internal. Canonically, the external argument surfaces as the subject of the verb while internal as the object. The following are examples of transitive verbs in Pashto.
(163)

a. **ta** za **khafa** krham.
You      I  angry  do.
You made me angry.

b. **jinai** rotai pakha **krha**.
Girl  bread    cook    do.
The girl has cooked the bread.

c. **sare** kor **jorhai**.
Man    house     build.
The man is building a house.

d. **ma** akhbar **kato**.
I      newspaper read.
I was reading the newspaper.

e. **ma** chae pokh **ko**.
I      tea       cook    do.
I made the tea.

In (163a-e) transitive verbs have been illustrated. All the sentences have got their external argument, occupying the sentence initial position. All the subjects/external arguments, occupying the sentence initial position, carry agent theta role. The external argument is followed by internal argument. Both the arguments are the core argument. The following diagram depicts the argument structure of transitive verb in Pashto.
In the structure (164), *khafa* gets conflated into V position and then from there gets raised up to adjoin to little v. DP *za* merges with V to form VP which subsequently merges with little v to form v'. Subsequently, the v’ bar merges with its specifier DP to form vP. The vP, then, merges with T to form T’. Finally the T’ merges with DP to form TP. The internal argument of the verb is then moved to spec/T to get nominative case from it. The specifier of little is the external argument which occupies the highest place among the arguments in terms of argument hierarchy. Both the arguments are the obligatory arguments of the verbs. If one of the arguments is deleted, the sentence becomes ill-formed as demonstrated by the ungrammaticality of the following examples:
In (165a and c) the internal argument is missing, thus the sentence is ill-formed. In (165b and d) the external argument, which is one of the core arguments of the verb, is missing. So now it is clear that both the internal and external arguments are obligatory/core arguments of the verb in transitive constructions. There can be some peripheral arguments called adjuncts in addition to the obligatory arguments. The following examples illustrate adjuncts in transitive constructions in Pashto.

(166)

a. dukandar pa mung sabzi grana krha.
  Shopkeeper on us vegetable expensive do.
  Shopkeeper made vegetable expensive for us.
b. dukundar sabzi grana krha.
   Shopkeeper vegetable expensive do.
   Shopkeeper made vegetable expensive.

c. Shahan mewa da dukan na akhli.
   Shahan fruit from shop NEG buy.
   Shahan is buying fruit from the shop.

d. Shahan mewa akhli.
   Shahan fruit buy.
   Shahan buy fruit.

In (166a), *pa mung* ‘on’ is an adjunct, not the core argument, that is why (166b) is well formed structure even though the argument *pa mung* is missing.

Similarly, in (166c) *da dukan* is an adjunct too as we can see in (166d) that the sentence is still well formed even though the said argument is missing here. Thus *pa mung* and *da dukan na* ‘from shop’ function as adjuncts (an optional/peripheral argument) in the given structures.
In (167), the adjective grana ‘expensive’ gets conflated into V to form grana
krha ‘expensive do’, V. The latter merges with PP to form V’ bar. PP is made as a
result of preposition pa ‘on’ merging with DP mung ‘us’. Then, V’ bar merges with
its complement DP to form VP. The VP in turn functions as a complement of v
by merging with the latter to form v’. The v’ bar merges with its specifier DP to form
vP. The vP, then, merges with T to form T’; which in turn merges with its specifier
DP to form TP. Thus, the specifier of v stands the highest in argument hierarchy.
Next to the external argument is the DP which serves as the complement to of v’. PP
occupies the lowest position in the hierarchy.
As far as the argument structure type of the verbs is concerned, VP depicts the (130a) type of argument structure. The said VP does not require a specifier; it only needs a complement. The vP depicts (130b) type argument structure since the head v projects both a specifier and a complement however, the head itself is phonologically null. The given diagram depicts the VP internal adjunct which is vP adjunct alternate.

(168)
In (168), the vP adjunct PP has been shown as an alternate of the VP internal adjunct PP in (167) In (167) the PP is shown to be sister of V and functioning as complement of V. However, in (168) is the PP is sister of v’ after it has been raised from adjunct V position where it has originated as a sister of V. The only difference between the two is that in one the adjunct PP adjoins to little v while in other the said adjoins to V internally within VP as in (167). Moreover, one of the distinguishing marks of the transitive verb in Pashto is that it derives its ditransitive alternate morphologically. The following examples illustrate Pashto derived ditransitive verbs with a different valency.

(169)

a. mung pa haghio rotai wakhwarawala.
   We on them meal eat.
   We served meal to them.

b. ma mashum ta jarsi waghustala.
   I child to sweater wear.
   I helped the child wear his sweater.

c. zaid da mashum na sweater wobaso/wobasalo.
   Zaid from child sweater take out.
   Zaid changed sweater to the child.

d. umar pa malgari chae waskawala.
   Umar on friends tea drink.
   Umar served tea to his friends.

e. ma mor kor ta warasawala.
   I mother home to reach.
   I helped my mother reach home.
In the above example (169), the derived ditransitive alternate of the transitive verb is derived by affixation of –wala/wal suffix to the transitive root. The following illustrates the derivation of ditransitive alternate from its transitive root.

(170)

In (170) wala ‘an affix’, when attached to the transitive roots like wakhwarha, modifies the valency of the transitive root by making it ditransitive.
Thus the derived verb then requires two internal arguments besides the external argument. The ungrammaticality of the following verbs can be accounted for straightforwardly by the fact that the obligatory argument of the verbs is missing, thus the sentences are ungrammatical.

(171)

\begin{align*}
a. & \quad ma \quad rotai \quad wakhwarawala. \\
& \quad I \quad meal \quad eat \ (on \ someone\ else). \\
& \quad I \ made \ (someone) \ eat. \\

b. & \quad ma \quad pa \ ta \quad wakhwarawala, \\
& \quad I \quad on \ you \quad eat \ (on \ someone\ else) \\
& \quad I \ made \ (you) \ eat. \\

c. & \quad *pa \ ta \quad rotai \quad wakhwarawala. \\
& \quad On \ you \quad rotai \quad eat \ (on \ someone\ else). \\
& \quad (I) \ made \ you \ eat. \\
\end{align*}

In (171a-b), one of the internal arguments is missing; thus the structure is ill formed. In (171c), however, the external argument is missing thus the structure is ill formed. Thus, it is proved that the wakhwarawala ‘eat on someone’ is morphologically derived ditransitive from its transitive root. The -wala affix triggers addition of the indirect argument to the valency of the verb.

However, this type of structure is not found in English. In English the ditransitive alternate of the transitive root are derived by addition of the external argument only as can be seen in the following structure.
In (172) the ditransitive alternate of the transitive sentence is derived by zero derivation. The derived verb and the root are isomorphic. The derivation is triggered by raising the V head into higher head position v to adjoin to phonologically null causative suffix. Thus the external argument is licensed in specifier little v position. The vP depicts the (130b) type of argument structure. The head of vP is phonologically null. ‘He’ is the specifier while the VP is the complement of v. The complement VP depicts the (130b) type of argument structure; the head V, rolled, projects both a specifier and a complement. However, the structure in (170) which is true for Pashto ditransitive verb depicts three types of argument structures namely (130a), (130b) and (130c). The vP depicts (130c) type of argument structure since the head of the phrase is partially empty. It projects both a specifier and a
complement: the subject DP and VP function as the specifier and complement of the head respectively. The VP depicts (130a) type of argument structure; it does not project a specifier. The head and complement positions are filled. Finally, the small clause which functions as the complement of the V depicts the (130b) type of argument structure. It has all the three slots namely specifier, head and complement filled. Thus the comparison is quite clear. On the one hand, the argument structure types depicted by Pashto is different from that of English. On the other hand, the Pashto ditransitive alternate adds a different type of argument to the valency of the verb from that of English. The English derived verb adds an external argument to the valency of the verb. However, the Pashto derived verb adds an internal argument to the valency of the root verb. The morphology of the verb of Pashto derived ditransitive verb is also different from that of English. The Pashto verb is derived by affixation of an overt suffix –wal to the root verb while the English one is derived by zero derivation.

5.3.1. Reduction of Valency of Transitive Verbs

In this section, the structure of Pashto transitive verbs is further highlighted with comparison from English. First, the features of derived passives are discussed.

5.3.1.1 Derived Passives

Passivisation involves suppression of the external argument and raising of the internal argument (direct) into the subject position. The following diagram illustrates the examples and structure of passives in Pashto:
The following is structure of passive in Pashto:

(174)

In (174), V’ is formed by V merging its adjunct PP. The former is formed by merging of P with its complement DP. V’ merges with its complement *khat ‘letter’ which is the direct internal argument of the verb to form VP. As a result of passivisation, the external argument comes down to adjoin to V’ as PP adjunct ‘pa
The VP, then, merges with T to form T’. Finally the T’ merges with DP to form TP. *khat* is moved to spec/T position to get nominative case from T. The given structure depicts the (130a) type of argument structure owing to the reason that the said verb only projects its complement: no specifier (external argument). The PP also depicts (130a) type of argument structure. As a result of passivisation, the internal argument surfaces higher than the internal PP adjunct. The English counterpart of the Pashto transitive sentence is passivised. The following structure represents the argument structure of passives in English.

(175)

In (175), P merges with N to form PP which in turn merges with DP to form PP. Finally, the PP merges with its head V to form VP. The DP at spec/P is move to spec/T position following head movement constraint to get nominative case from T. The DP occupies the higher position as compared to the adjunct PP in the argument hierarchy. The mention structure manifests two types of argument structures; the VP
and PP depict (130a) and (130b) type of argument structure. The head of PP also projects its complement as its obligatory argument.

5.3.1.2 Derived middles

Middles are derived from its transitive counterpart by changing the transitive root morphologically. The difference between the reading of the transitive and its middles alternate is that transitive verb carries agent subject while the middle has implicit agent (see Bhatt, 2006; Hoekstra, 1993 for details). The abstract agent of the middle is anyone/anything while in the transitive alternate of middle the subject is given. The middle verb projects only a complement while transitive alternate has both an external and internal arguments. The following are examples of middles in Pashto:

(176)

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{akhbar pa asana katekigi.} \\
\textit{Newspaper easily read.} \\
\textit{Newspaper is read easily}
\item \textit{chae pa asana pakhigi.} \\
\textit{Tea easily cook} \\
\textit{Tea is cooked easily.}
\item \textit{da ghwakha pa asana pakhigi.} \\
\textit{This meat easily cook} \\
\textit{This meat is cooked easily.}
\end{enumerate}

In (176a), 'akhbar' ‘newspaper’ is the only argument projected by the verb. In (176b) and (176c) chae and da ghwakha are arguments of the verbs. Adverbial PP
is the other distinguishing feature of middles. Middles do not occur in any other tense than present. I adopted the argument structure and argument hierarchy of passive for middles. However, the subject of passives is read as ‘someone’ while that of middles is ‘anyone’. The middles are distinguished in the sense that the PP adjunct of passives carries agentive reading while the one in middles has adverbial meaning (adverb of manner) as pa asana ‘easily’ given in (176). As far as the comparison of English and Pashto middles is concerned, in English only few verbs can undergo middle alternation while in Pashto all the de-adjectival roots can undergo middle alternation.

5.3.1.3 Derived Ergatives

Ergative verbs refer to change of state as far as its reading is concerned (Wright, 2002). In English the entire transitive verbs can have its ergative alternate but in Pashto only those verbs which are derived by conflation of A complement into the V head position can have its ergative alternates.

(177)

a. chae pakha shwa (change of state).
Tea cook (PST)
The tea got cooked.

b. rotai pakha shwa.
Meal cook (PST)
The meal got cooked.

c. akhbar wakate sho (passive)
Newspaper read (PST)
The newspaper is read.
Examples (177a) and (177b) are ergative structures while (177c) is passive. The
difference between Pashto ergative and Pashto passive can be accounted for
straightforwardly by the difference in reading of the two. The ergative in (177a-b)
refers to change of state while the passive in (177c) refers to an activity of reading
by an implicit agent (someone). On the other hand, the differences between the two
are rooted in the morphological difference between the two. The passive has been
derived from transitive root while the ergative has been derived from those verbs
derived by conflation of A into V which are basically intransitive. The difference
between English and Pashto ergative is rooted in the fact that English ergatives are
derived from the transitive root while Pashto ergative are derived by conflation of
the adjective into the V head position. The Pashto ergative is marked by the light
verb 'sho' ‘become’ which gets affixed to V. The English ergative form, on the other
hand, cannot be distinguished from the adjective root. Its ergativity is shown mainly
by the context in which it occurs. The verb, when used in past participle form with
its internal argument, raise to subject position gives ergative reading. Consider the
following examples:

(178)

a. The newspaper read.

b. The glass broke.

c. The wall painted.

d. They ranked six in the world.
In (178) the sentential subject is actually the object which functions as the internal argument of the verb. However, in absence of the external argument, the internal argument is raised to pre subject position to function as a subject. The following structure shows the raising of internal argument in ergative constructions.

(179)

In (179), DP the glass merges with it head broke to form VP. The VP, then, merges with its head T to form T’ which finally merges with its specifier DP to form TP. The Pashto ergatives predicates are formed by conflation adjective root and sho ‘be’ light verb. The following examples illustrate ergative predicates in Pashto:

(180)

a. gelas mat sho.  
Glass break be(PST M 3SG)  
The glass broke.

b. garhai wraka shwa.  
Watch lose be (PST F 3SG)  
The watch lost.
c. halak morh sho.

Boy stuff be(PST M 3SG)

The boy stuffed himself.

In (180) ergative verbs in Pashto have been illustrated. The verbs have been derived from adjective root. *mat* ‘broken’, *wrek* ‘lose’, and *morh* ‘stuffed’ are the three root adjectives forming base of the ergative verbs derived from it. The following structure shows the internal structure of the ergative verb and its derivation from adjective root:

(181)

In (181) the structure of ergative predicate in Pashto has been depicted. The adjective *mat* represented by *A* conflates into *V* to form *V* which merges with its complement *DP* to form *VP*. Subsequently, *VP* merges with *T* to form *T’* which finally merges with its specifier *DP* to form *TP*. The specifier *T* position is filled by
raising the internal argument *gelas* since there is no external argument of the verb.

So now it is obvious that ergative verbs are derived from adjective root by conflation as shown by the conflation of *mat* and *sho* in (180).

5.4. Ditransitives

Most of the Pashto ditransitive verbs are those derived from its transitive root morphologically. However, there are some ditransitive verbs which are basically ditransitive in nature (see Malchukov, 2010 for details on ditransitive). The following are examples of ditransitive verbs in Pashto:

(182)

a. *haghi kitab ustad ta warko.*
   She book teacher to give.
   She gave the book to the teacher.

b. *Salma mobail ma ta rako.*
   Salma mobile me to give.
   Salma gave the mobile to me.

c. *Azhar chawkidar bazar ta waligo.*
   Azhar security guard bazar to send.
   Azahar sent the security guard to bazar.

d. *darewar truck pa botal wakhijawalo.*
   Driver truck on bottle ride.
   The driver has crushed the bottle with his (wheel of) truck.
e. mor kambal pa halak wachawala.
   Mother blanket on boy put.
   The mother put the blanket on the boy.

f. darewar gadey pa diwal wasolao.
   Driver car on wall scratch.
   The driver scratched his car with the wall.

In (182), the ditransitive structures in Pashto have been illustrated. The verbs are not derived from the transitive base. They are inherently transitive. In Pashto the ditransitive verbs are quite few. The three arguments of the verbs occur in such a sequence that the external argument (mor and darawar in 182e–f) is the subject, the highest of all the argument in the argument hierarchy. Then follows the direct object (kambal and gadey in 182e-f) which is in turn followed by the indirect object (pa halak and pa diwal in 182e-f). The external argument carries ergative case in past tense and perfect aspect. In case of ergative subject, the direct object carries accusative case. However, if the subject carries ergative case, the direct object bears nominative case and thus the verb agrees with the nominative argument, the direct object. The indirect object always bears dative case.
In (183), the verbs is made of A and V, thus forming war-krho compound. The verb then merges with its complement PP to form VP. The specifier of PP gets accusative case assignment from verb because P as a head of a projection does not assign case to its specifier. The P merges with its complement DP to form PP. The complement of the P gets accusative case assigned from P. So the Small clause headed by P and the direct object and object of P occupy their specifier and complement position respectively. The VP then merges with little v to form v’ which in turn merges with its specifier to form vP. The specifier of v which is the external argument of the verb occupies the highest position in the argument hierarchy, while
the specifier of P which serves as the direct internal argument of the verb follows the external argument. The complement of P, the indirect object of the verb, stays the lowest in the argument hierarchy. Following (Hoekstra, 1988) it has been proposed that the verb in ditransitive structures projects small clause as its complement whose head is P. P assigns oblique case to its complement argument. The vP depicts the (130c) of argument structure; specifier and complement positions are filled while the head position is empty. The complement PP depicts the (130b) type of argument structure. All the slots namely, specifier, head and complement are filled.

The argument structure types depicted by the ditransitive verbs in Pashto are equivalent to (130b) and (130c) adopted from Hale and Keyser (1998) given in (130) above. The argument structure types depicted by both languages are the same. The only difference is that the ditransitive verb in Pashto has been derived from adjective root war ‘give’ and ra ‘give back’ by conflation of the latter into V head position to adjoin to krho ‘do’. The English ditransitive does not have roots in adjective.

5.5 Zero Argument

The zero argument verbs in English have got its counterpart in Pashto. However, this predicate in Pashto is quite different from the one found in English. The following examples demonstrate the Pashto counterpart of English zero argument predicates.

(184)

\begin{align*}
a. \quad \text{baran} & \quad \text{warigi.} \\
\text{Rain} & \quad \text{falling.} \\
\text{It is raining.}
\end{align*}
b. wawri warigi.
   Snow falling
   Snow is falling.

c. galai warigi.
   Hail falling.
   Hail is raining/ it is hailing.

d. sa warigi?
   what falling
   What is raining?

In (184), the Pashto counterpart of English zero argument predicates is presented. The verb takes a theme, the only argument of the verb. So, baran ‘rain’, wawra ‘snow’ and galai ‘hail’ are the arguments of (184a), (184b) and (184c) respectively. To prove that the aforementioned are the arguments of the verb in comparison to the expletive subject, the said arguments have been replaced by wh-operative in (184d). The grammaticality of the latter shows that the verbs take arguments while those in English do not take an argument thus all the subjects of zero argument verbs in English are expletive (without any semantic contents). In case of Pashto, the subject of the verb warigi ‘raining’ is basically the internal argument of the verb.

The expletive subject has been generated to fulfill the grammaticality requirement of the sentence. According to Chomsky (1995), the tense features of T must be checked against an appropriate specifier in order for the structure to converge or else the derivation will crash at LF. English is not a null subject language
thus it does not allow a subjectless sentence. Semantically the verb *rain* does not take any subject or theme that is why the predicate is called zero argument predicate. The following diagram illustrates the structure of zero argument predicate in English.

(185)

![Diagram of zero argument predicate in English]

In (185), raining merges with T to form T’. Subsequently, T’ merges with its specifier DP to form TP. If we look at the VP, it has got neither complement nor specifier. This V does not project specifier and complement. Thus the verb cited in (185) represents (130d) type of argument structure. The Pashto counterpart of the English verb has got a quite different argument structure. The following illustrates the structure of Pashto counterpart of English zero argument verb:
(186) demonstrates the structure of Pashto counterpart of English verb rain. The DP baran ‘rain’ and warigi ‘falling’ merges together to form VP. So VP is composed of just one argument and the verb itself. The VP then merges with T to form T’ which subsequently merges with its specifier DP which is raised from the complement position of V to specifier TP position. The argument structure of the Pashto verb is different from that of English structure. The English verb rain requires no argument. The expletive DP ‘it’ has been generated at specifier I position in order to check the tense features of the T head. It has got no semantic contents.

The Pashto verb warigi ‘raining’ on the other hand projects its complement which is then raised to specifier T position. The English and Pashto verbs are different as far as the argument structure type is concerned. The English verb depicts the (130d) type of argument structure while the Pashto verb depicts (130a) type of argument structure.

However, an interesting inference can be drawn from the data presented: the verbs derived by conflation can be further causativized, while those derived by
incorporation of N into the V head position do not allow further causativization. So it's plausible to argue that since the English zero argument verbs like rain, snow and hail etc. are derived by incorporation of the complement N into V position in the same fashion as the unergative verbs like dance, laugh etc. are derived. The unergatives do not allow causativization and the same is true about zero argument verbs like rain, hail and snow. It is plausible to argue that one of the arguments of the verb like rain has been incorporated into the head V positions thus the structure turns out to be without any argument. However, in case of Pashto, the verb projects one argument. The existence of the argument in Pashto counterpart of English zero argument predicates follows from the fact that the same argument exists in both the languages but in English it has been incorporated into V while in Pashto it is not. The following structure presents the structure of conflated zero argument verb in English.

(187)
In (187), it is shown that the N rain which is originated as the complement of V. However, since the verb is null, the complement N has been incorporated to V position. According to Hale and Keyser (1998), the verbs derived by incorporation cannot be further transitive. The verb rain, therefore, turns out to be a zero argument verb. The expletive subject is generated as specifier T position to check the case features of T while in the Pashto one the V head position is filled by warigi. So, there is no need for incorporation. Thus the sentence turns out to have an argument, the internal argument, baran.

5.6 pro subject as an argument in Pashto

Small pro is a covert nominative case pronoun; it is known informally as little pro, because it is written in lower-case letters. It represents the understood subject of finite clause for example, the Shakespearean sentence: Wilt pro come? (= ‘Will [you] come?’, Stephano, The Tempest, II.ii). The difference between PRO (called big pro because it is written in capital letters) and pro is that PRO bears case features while pro does not carry the said. PRO is also called controlled subject because it is always controlled by another DP; generally the subject in matrix clause of the sentence in which the subject position of the embedded clause is occupied by PRO. The covert DP pro bears nominative-case features. The DP checks its case features against T head. The following are examples of structures carrying pro subject in Pashto:
a. *rotai khuram.*
   Meal eat (PRS 1SG)
   I am eating meal.

b. *asainment likham.*
   Assignment write (PRS 1SG)
   I am writing the assignment.

c. *tiwi goram.*
   TV watch (PRS 1SG)
   I am watching TV.

d. *rotai khwrai.*
   Meal eat (PRS 2PL)
   You are eating the meal.

e. *kirkat kau.*
   Cricket do (PRS 1PL)
   We are playing cricket.

f. *melmana rokhsatau.*
   Guests farewell (PRS 1PL)
   We are seeing off the guests.

All the sentences in (188) carry pro subject. The subject is covert. However, since the morphology of the verb tells us about the number, person and gender of the subject the grammaticality of sentences in (188) can be accounted for straightforwardly. Inflectional morphology which show first person singular, second
person plural and first person plural in (188a-c), (188d) and (188e-f) respectively is enough to show the subject of these sentences. Chomsky (2000; 2001; 2008) argues that T as a functional category comes from the lexicon with a bundle of unvalued features that acts as a *pro* looking for matching goal in its c-commanding domain. So, unless and until the unvalued features on T head are valued by matching it with a DP in its c-commanding domain, the derivation does not converge at LF. So the grammaticality of the sentences in (188) can be accounted for simply by postulating that pro checks the unvalued features of T, thus the derivation converges at LF. The following structure represents the structure of sentences like those in (188).

(189)

In (189) the structure of the overt subjectless sentences is given in (189). The DP, *rotai* ‘meal’ merges with V *khuram* ‘eat’ to form VP. The VP then merges with
its head v to form v' which in turn merges with its pro specifier DP to form vP. The vP then merges with T to form TP which subsequently merges with its specifier DP, raised up from spec v position, to form TP. Thus it is clear that the T checks its case features with the pro DP at its specifier position against its head T. On the other hand, the v assigns agent role to the said pro, or else there is no other way of account for the agentive reading of the sentence. Thus it is clear that Pashto allows the realization of the subject argument as pro while English does not allow it.

5.7 Resultatives

According to Baker (2003, p. 221), “resultative constructions arise when a second adjective is adjoined to the adjectival component of the verb. The verb such as 'paint' in a sentence such as: 'John painted his house' 'pink' is said to be a resultative verb. As a result of the action of painting, the house becomes pink (see Baker, 2003 for details).

(190)

\[\begin{align*}
a. & \quad ma & shisha & pa & garawalo & kharaba ka. \\
& \quad I & glass & by & scratching & damage do.
& \quad I & damaged & the & glass & by & scratching & it.
\\
b. & \quad ma & gade & pa & inzalo & speen ko. \\
& \quad I & car & by & washing & white do.
& \quad I & whiten & the & car & by & washing & it.
& \quad (I & washed & the & car & clean.)
\\
c. & \quad ma & Shah & pa & garzido & starhe ko \\
& \quad I & Shah & by & walking & tired & do.
& \quad I & tired & Shah & by & walking.
\]
Resultatives constructions in Pashto as cited in (190) represents the structure of ditransitive verbs derived from transitive roots. In (190a), the car became clean as a result of the action of washing. Similarly, in (190e) the child is caused to become ill as a result of bathing. The following represents the structure of Pashto resultative as cited in (190b).
In (191), the adjective conflates into its head V ko to form speen-ko ‘white do’ V compound. The V then merges with its complement PP to form V’. Subsequently, the V’ merges with its specifier to form VP. VP, then, merges with v, occupied by the verb raised from V, to form v’. Subsequently, v’ merges with its specifier DP to form vP. Then vP merges with T to form T’ which finally merges with its specifier DP to form TP. Resultative in Pashto represents (130c), (130b) and (130b) type of argument structure types. vP, VP and PP represent (130c), (130b) and (130b) type of argument structure respectively.
The English resultative are quite different from those in Pashto structurally.

The structure of resultative in English is given below.

\[(192)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{T'} \\
\text{T} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{he} \\
\text{v'} \\
\text{vi} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{The house} \\
\text{V'} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{AP} \\
\text{painted,} \\
\text{AP} \\
\text{pink} \\
\text{P conflation} \\
\text{N} \\
\text{O paint} \\
\text{PP}
\end{array}
\]

(Modified from Hale & Keyser 1998; Radford, 2004, 2009)

Structure in (192) represents the argument structure of resultatives found in English. N merges with null P head by conflation to form PP which subsequently merges with A to form AP. Then, the AP merges with its null P head to form PP.
Subsequently PP merges with V to form VP. The latter merges with its head v to form v’ which finally merges with its specifier DP to form vP. vP, then, merges with T to form T’ which subsequently merges with DP to form TP. At the bottom of the structure the complement of the null P conflates into the head P position. The resulting P conflates with its head null head P which then conflates with the null V. Finally, the conflation V gets conflated with v. All the conflations processes follow the head movement constraint (Chomsky, 2005). The structure in (192) represents (130b) and (130c). VP depicts (130b) while vP depicts (130c) type of argument structure.

So, the difference between the argument structures of resultatives found in the two languages can be summed up as follow.

- The argument structure of Pashto resultative shows PP as the complement of V, the sister of V while the English VP consists of AP and V, the former being the complement of the latter.
- The Pashto resultative depicts (130a), (130b) and (130c) of argument structure while the one in English depicts only (130b) and (130c).
- Since Pashto does not allow conflation of PP into V. only A gets conflated into V. Thus the argument structure of resultative in both the languages is different.

5.8 Location

According to Clark and Clark (1979), conflation is involved in the derivation of English location and locatum verbs. Similarly, according to Hale and Keyser
(1998), these conflated verbs are the synthetic counterpart of the verb output. The following are examples of locatum and location verbs in English.

(193)

a. I shelved the book.

b. He saddled the horse.

(193a) exemplifies the location verbs in English while (193b) exemplifies the locatum verb. Hale and Keyser distinguish location verbs from locatum by referring to the former as of terminal coincidence while the latter of central coincidence (see Hale & Keyser, 2002 for detail). The distinction between the two is not relevant since the structure of both languages is the same. The following structure depicts the argument structure of English locatum and location verbs.
(194)

In (194) the structure of English location and locatum verbs has been represented. The complement DP of the P merges with its head P to form P’ which then merges with its specifier DP to form PP. The PP then merges with V to form VP. VP, then merges with v to form v’ which subsequently merges with the specifier DP to form vP. The complement of P conflates into the empty head P position. The empty head of VP conflates with the head of its complement PP which is P. P itself is product of conflation. So the complement of the V depicts (130c) type of argument structure.
The following structure represents the argument structure of Pashto location and locatum verbs. In English location and locatum verb, the basic structure is transitive while it does not allow the resultative to have its intransitive alternates while Pashto allows the intransitive alternate of the transitive and ditransitive.

(195)

a. ma dupatta pa sar karha.
I(ERG) scarf on head do (PST F 3SG)
I wore a scarf.

b. ma sadar pa sar krho.
I(ERG) sheet on head do(PST M/F 3SG)
I wore a sheet.

(196)
The complement DP of P merges with P to form P’ which in turn merges with its specifier DP to form PP. The PP complement of V merges with its empty head V to form VP. The VP merges with its head v to form v’ which in turn merges with its specifier DP to form vP. The vP, then, merges with T to form T’. Subsequently, the T’ merges with DP to form TP. Finally, sabzi is moved to spec/T position to get nominative from it.

The complement DP of P conflates into P to form conflated P from P pa ‘on’ and DP sar ‘head’. The conflated P then conflates into V head position; the ‘krha’ ‘do’ conflates with P, which itself is formed by conflation. So the complement of VP depicts (130b) type of argument structure, different from that of English which is (130c). Moreover, in English location and locatum verbs, the P head is generally empty while in Pashto it is filled by a preposition as in (195). Besides, Pashto allows conflation of complement DP into overt P position while the English counterpart does not allow it. In English, both the P and V heads are empty while in Pashto the P head is filled and the V head is not. However, the presence of a preposition at P does not bar the conflation of P with its complement. On the other hand, there exist location structures which do not allow conflation of PP into V position, because in that case the V head is occupied by a lexical verb.
5.9 Conclusion

On the basis of Pashto data it can be concluded that Pashto does not allow conflation of PP into V head position in resultative constructions thus the non-existence of resultative structure can be accounted for. The English data show that the resultative construction is derived by conflation of PP into null V and subsequently to v head position. So the striking contrast between the two languages in terms of argument structure in resultative constructions is that in Pashto PP gets conflated into null V and subsequently into light v to adjoin with krha. However, English does not allow conflation into overt PP. On the other hand, Pashto does not allow conflation of the covert PP with its complement and subsequently with the V head. Thus, the predicate AS of both of the languages is in striking contrast with each other.

Another noteworthy generalization drawn from the data is that a verb form derived by conflation allows causative –incoative alternation, while those derived by incorporation does not allow further causativization in both of the languages. The existence of zero argument predicates in English can be determined based on the fact that in English zero argument predicates are derived by incorporation, thus cannot be further causativized; the predicate turns out to be without any overt argument. However, the predicate possessed basically an argument which has been incorporated into the null head position. Conversely in Pashto, the unavailability of zero argument predicate can be attributed to the fact that the N complement of those predicates which are considered as zero argument in English are not incorporated into the head V position as the place of the latter is occupied by a lexical verb. Thus
the predicate turns out to be having an internal argument in the case of Pashto. These findings are concluded in the next chapter.
Chapter Six

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter summarizes the major issues raised and analyzed in each chapter of this dissertation. The aim of this study was to describe the argument structure of Pashto and compare it with that of English. As these were related phenomena, clause structure of Pashto and complex verb formation were among the other areas explored in the present study. To achieve its objectives, this thesis has been divided into six chapters. The nature of this study has been predominantly descriptive and theoretical as well as comparative.

Chapter 2 of this thesis explored the derivation of clause structure in Pashto. Following the assumption of Minimalist Programme, it was proposed that in Pashto nominative and accusative DPs are raised to specifier T position to check its cases. Nominative DP checks its case against the corresponding T head. The dislocation of accusative or ergative DP is triggered by EPP features, since EPP is the only feature which triggers the dislocation of DP in ergative and accusative constructions. The same T head checks the features of both subject and object DPs. In case of the nominative subject, the subject DP moves out of vP slot merging with TP, tucking under C. In this way, it values the phi-features of T head and satisfies the EPP requirement. The case of accusative DP, on the other hand, is checked in-situ. However, the EPP features on T head triggers its movement out of VP merging with AspP under T. Besides, the little v assigns agent theta role to the subject and accusative case to the object. In past tense object gets absolutive case while subject gets ergative case. In ergative constructions object is raised to spec/T position,
tucking under TP. Once the object has checked it features against T and gets nominative case from the latter and the subject DP in the specifier/v position is already assigned agent theta role, ergative case is assigned to subject DP. In present tense, the ergative case is assigned to the subject provided that the subject is assigned agent theta role by little v and that Asp head carries [-IMPF] features. Thus T head matches its features with object DP and as a result assigns nominative case to the object.

Chapter 3 focused on the description of the Pashto verbs from morphosyntactic point of view. It was concluded from the data that the complex verb is made of a lexical word which is either a verb or a noun or even an adjective compounded with the light verb. The light verbs de and wi cannot be used as a main verb because they have no semantic contents of their own. Contrary to what is true about Gojri the lexical items like the negative marker and emphatic markers can be inserted between the main verb and the light verb. In Pashto, except few, all the light verbs do not contribute anything to the meaning of a sentence other than the aspectual meaning. In Pashto, the light verb gives perfective reading only while in Punjabi (Akhtar, 2000) the verb gives a variety of reading as far as aspect is concern. Unlike Gojri (Bukhari, 2009) the Pashto light verb does not give any beneficiary reading. However, mala or zama dapra (pronominal clitics) can be used to convey the meaning of beneficiary.

Similarly, it was found that in Pashto, the light verb agrees with its argument in gender and number. It carries the agreement inflection and occupies second position in the complex verb formation as it is the case with Gojri. Light verb in Pashto carries agreement with both the lexical verb and the nominative argument of
the verb. However, if the nominative argument is not available then the verb agrees with N of N+V complex verb formation. Productivity of N+V complexes in South Asian languages with kar ‘do’ is due to that fact that most of the actions described by these N+V constructions are neutral to the direction of the benefit. However, there are some light verbs like rakhra ‘give me’ and warkrha ‘give someone’ when used with N to form a complex verb formation, the light verb gives beneficial reading. It is a common phenomenon of complex predicates as suggested by Bukhari (2009) and Akhtar (2000). However, these types of light verbs are quite few in Pashto.

Chapter 4 highlighted the argument structure types found in Pashto. This chapter provided a background to the following chapter (Chapter 5), which in turns focuses on the comparison of argument structure in Pashto and English. The findings of Chapter 4 are consistent with the findings of Chung (2000) in the sense that ditransitive verbs project three arguments besides the event argument. The external argument of the verb gets suppressed when verb is passivized and, as a result, the internal argument moves to the subject position. The event argument remains intact. Both the internal and external arguments are the obligatory arguments of the transitive verb. However, in passive structure, the external argument becomes optional, while the externalization of the internal argument becomes obligatory as it was in active structures.

The intransitive verbs have been categorized into different types, namely: unaccusatives, unergatives, ergative, middles, APFs, and VPFs. The unaccusative verb does not project external argument and projects only an internal argument. It does not require the event argument either. However, the said verb can be causativised by adding external argument and at the same time the event argument
gets included in the valency of the derived causative of the unaccusative root. The unergative, on the other hand, requires an external argument as an obligatory argument while the internal argument is not the obligatory argument of the verb. The event argument is also a part of the valency of this type of verb. The Pashto unergative can, however, be transitivized thus the externalized argument becomes internal while another external argument gets added to the argument structure of the verb. Similarly, the APFs require one argument which is the internal argument of the verb. However, since the external argument is not available, the internal argument of the verb gets realized as the subject of the verb. The verb does not project event argument. The ergative predicates are derived by suppression of the external argument and externalization of the internal argument. So the internal argument is the only obligatory argument of the verb. The event argument is also an obligatory argument of the head.

Chapter 5 concluded the discussion carried out in the previous chapters by comparing the argument structures of Pashto and English. It was summarized with the help of the data presented that English and Pashto unaccusatives are different as far as their argument structure is concerned. The Pashto counterpart of English unaccusative, e.g., ‘sleep’, can be causativized while in English it is not possible. Similarly, the unergative, though similar in its base form in both of the languages, the Pashto one allows causativization while its English counterpart does not. Thus the argument structure type depicted by unaccusative and unergative in both of the languages differs in its causative alternation.

The Pashto unergative verb base can be causativized by adding a suffix wo to the base unergative form of the verb. Similarly, the unaccusative can be
causativized by replacing the intransitive light verb *sho* by transitive light verb *ko*. The Pashto unaccusative when causativized can have its passive alternate as well while the English unaccusative does not allow passivization since it does not have transitive/causative alternation.

Another striking difference found is that English does not have the argument structure of the type depicted by Pashto causativized unergatives and unaccusatives. So, the English unaccusatives depict lp-monadic type of argument structure while the Pashto one depicts basic lp-dyadic type of argument structure. The unaccusative verbs found in Pashto can be further dissected into two parts: the adjective and the light verb. The adjective part of the compound verb conflates into V position by adjoining with the light verb. However, in English the unaccusative verb head cannot be further dissected. Similarly, to causativize the unaccusatives, basic lp-dyadic type of argument structure is added to the structure of the unaccusative verb as a complement. The head of the latter is phonologically null little v.

There are two types of unergative verbs found in Pashto: the one which cannot be further causativised and those which can be causativised. The former behaves like English unergative in the sense that they are derived by incorporating the N complement of the phonologically null verb into the head V position. The little v head is empty in case of English while in Pashto it is partially filled by ‘wahi’ verbal clitic. The latter can be causativised because it is not a de-nominal verb in Pashto.

The basic structure of APFs is the same in both the languages; the predicate describes the internal argument. In both of the languages, the predicate is bipartite; it consists of the head and its complement. It does not project a specifier. In addition
to this, head V also does not project an external argument. Thus the verb does not extend its projection up to vP. However, the Pashto APFs involve conflation of adjective into V position which cannot be seen in English. The Pashto APFs also get causativized as the English ergative gets causativised by raising the V head into the little v head position and as result licenses external argument at specifier v position.

So far as, the argument structure type of middles found in both of the languages is concerned, they are the same. Middles in both languages have an implicit external argument and have transitive alternate as well. So the middle seems to have been derived from the transitive base just by suppression of the external argument. In Pashto the middle verbs are suffixed by –igi, a unique suffix. However, in Pashto, middles are derived from an adjective root by conflation of adjective into V head position while the English middles do not involve conflation because it is derived from adjective root. All the middles in Pashto are rooted in adjective base.

The basic argument structure of Pashto and English ergative verbs is same except for the one difference that is of conflation through which the Pashto verbs are derived from its adjective root. Thus the basic argument structure of the ergative verb serves as a complement of the composite dyadic type of argument structure. vP is composite dyadic while VP is Ip monadic. The difference between the derived transitive verbs from its intransitive ergative base of the two languages lies in the fact that in Pashto the transitive is derived by simply replacing the light verb sho by krho/ko while in English the root verb is raised from V to little v head position.

As far as the argument structure type of the transitive verbs is concerned, VP depicts Ip-monadic type of argument structure. The said VP does not require a specifier; it only needs a complement. The vP depicts composite dyadic type of
argument structure since the head v projects both a specifier and a complement. However, the head itself is phonologically null. The VP which depicts lp-monadic type of AS serves as a complement of the vP which depicts composite dyadic type of argument structure. However, in Pashto, those verbs which are inherently transitive can be further causatifised while the English transitives cannot be causativized. The Pashto causative alternate of the transitive verb is derived by adding causative suffix to the verb.

The middles alternate of transitive verb is derived morphologically in Pashto while in English the said is derived by zero derivation. The inherent ditransitive verbs, like the inherent transitive verbs, are quite few in Pashto. The three arguments of the verb occur in such a sequence that the external argument is the highest of all the argument in the argument hierarchy. It is followed by the direct object. The latter is in turn followed by the indirect object syntactically realized as PP functioning as an oblique object. The PP is also called oblique object. The argument structure type depicted by the ditransitive verbs in Pashto is composite dyadic. The argument structure types depicted by ditransitive verbs are the same in both languages. The only difference is that the ditransitive verb has been derived from adjective root war ‘give (to someone)’ ra ‘give (me)’ by conflation of the latter into V head position to adjoin to krho ‘do’. The English ditransitives are derived from adjecitival roots.

The zero argument verbs in English like rain, snow, hail etc. are not found in Pashto. The Pashto verb warigi ‘falling’ projects its complement which is then raised to specifier T position. So zero argument verbs are not found in Pashto. The English and Pashto verbs are different as far as the argument structure type is concerned. The English verb depicts the argument structure type of atomic/simple type of argument...
structure while the Pashto one depicts the argument structure type of lp-monadic type of argument structure.

Another feature of the Pashto verb is that they allow small pro as a subject while English does not. The T head checks its case features with the pro DP at its specifier position. On the other hand, the v assigns agent role to the said pro, or else there is no other way to account for the agentive reading of the sentence.

Another interesting feature of Pashto AS, which is in striking contrast with English, is missing of PRO. One of the reasons why English has PRO subject rather than pro is that the PRO subject always occurs in infinite clause in which the case checking of nominative DP is not required because the verb is infinitive. PRO does not exist in Pashto owing to the fact that the latter does allow infinite verb. So PRO cannot co-occur with finite verb. The PRO subject is allowed only in infinite embedded clause. However, there are a few verbs which allows controlled subject in the embedded clause.

Resultatives in Pashto depict the argument structure of ditransitive verbs derived from transitive root. Structurally, the English resultative are quite different from those of Pashto. So, the difference between the AS of resultatives found in the two languages can be summed up as follows.

- The argument structure of Pashto resultative shows PP as the complement of V, the sister of V while the English VP consists of AP and V, the former being the complement of the latter.
- The Pashto resultative depicts lp-monadic and composite dyadic type of argument structure while the one in English depicts only basic lp-dyadic and composite dyadic.

To sum up the whole discussion briefly, it may be concluded that the complement of VP in Pashto depicts basic lp dyadic type of argument structure, different from that of English which is of composite dyadic type. Moreover, in English location and locatum verbs, the P head is generally empty while in Pashto it is filled by a preposition. Besides this, Pashto allows conflation of complement DP into overt P position while the English counterpart does not allow the said. In English both the P and V heads are empty while in Pashto both the heads are filled; however, the presence of a preposition and verb at P and V position respectively does not bar the conflation of P and V with its complements’ heads in Pashto.

The Pashto data depict that it does not allow conflation of PP into V head position in resultative constructions; thus the non-existence of resultative structure can be accounted for. The English data show that the resultative construction is derived by conflation of PP into null V and subsequently to v head position. So the striking contrast between the two languages can be traced back to the availability of option to conflate PP with its head V as it is the case in English resultatives. Thus, the argument structure of both of the languages is in striking contrast with each other in case of resulatatives.

Another noteworthy generalization drawn from the data is that a verb form derived by conflation allows causative –inchoative alternation while those derived by incorporation does not allow further causativization (in both of the languages).
The existence of zero argument predicates in English can also be traced back to the fact that, in English, zero argument predicates are derived by incorporation thus cannot be further causativized; while th(zero argument predicates) in Pashto are not derived by incorporation. The English zero argument structure turns out to be without any overt argument. However, basically the head possessed an argument which is incorporated into the null head position. The unavailability of zero argument verbs in Pashto can be attributed to the fact that the N complement of the head which are considered as zero argument in English, are not incorporated into the head V position because the latter has been occupied by a lexical verb. Thus the verb turns out to have an argument: the internal argument. The findings of the study are in accordance with findings of Hale and Keyser (1998?) who argue that in English with few exceptions, the de-nominal verbs do not undergo transitive alternation while those derived de-adjectival verb undergo transitive alternation quite freely. Pashto also allows transitive alternation of de-adjectival verbs, however, it does not allow transitive alternation of de-nominal verbs derived by incorporation of N into V head position, the same is true about English as well.

6.1 Implications of the study

Comparison of Pashto and English arguments structure yielded quite interesting results. Both the languages are almost totally different from each other which implicate important insight for experts from either language to take into account the findings of the present thesis. The study, therefore, is important for language teachers, course designers and the experts of language programming (working on projects such as machine translation) so that they may incorporate the findings of this study in their relevant fields. Types of verbs and its arguments differences.
6.3 Recommendations

The general conclusion of the study is that both of the languages are different in their argument structures. The results implicate further investigation into the implication of the argument structure differences for the learnability of Pashto by English learners and vice versa which I intend to undertake in my post-doc.
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