What differentiates what? Differential Subject and Object Marking in Manang Gurung and Gyalsumdo

Oliver Bond, Kristine Hildebrandt and Dubi Nanda Dhakal
University of Surrey, SIUE and Tribhuvan University
Issue

- Case is a grammatical strategy for assigning and identifying the role of NPs through **morphological-marking of dependents**, such as core arguments and adjuncts.

- Sometimes case is **(probabilistically) determinable** based on variable characteristics of the **governer** and its **governee** rather than a more straightforward mapping between the argument structure/case frame of a verb and its dependent NPs.

- Conditioned variability in case-marking can give rise to **Differential Subject Marking (DSM)** (de Hoop & de Swart 2008, Malchukov 2008) and **Differential Object Marking (DOM)** (Bossong 1985, Aissen 2003, Dalrymple and Nikolaeva 2011).
DSM and DOM in (Manang) Gurung

(1) a. tela ɲa-i/*ɲa (po-ri/*po) hon ta-i
   yesterday 1SG-ERG/1SG (ground-LOC/ground) hole dig-PST
   ‘Yesterday I dug a hole in the ground.’

   b. nagai ɲa-i/nga (po-ri/*po) hon ta-mu
   tomorrow 1SG-ERG/1SG (ground-LOC/ground) hole dig-NPST
   ‘Tomorrow I will dig a hole in the ground.’

(2) a. tela aʤu nakju-i/*aʤu nakju *kai-ni/kai tsa-i
   yesterday that dog-ERG/that dog rice-DAT/rice eat-PST
   ‘Yesterday the dog ate the rice.’

   b. tela aʤu tseto-i/*tseto aʤu ra-ni/aʤu ra tsa-i
   yesterday that tiger-ERG/tiger that goat-DAT/that goat eat-PST
   ‘Yesterday the tiger ate the goat.’
What differentiates what?

- DSM-DOM potential is influenced by differences in referential density and case-inventory in the languages of Manang.
- However, the differentiating function of case is determined by the interplay between the animacy hierarchy, temporal characteristics and the information-structure of the clause.

Overview

- A snapshot of Manang District, Nepal
- Differential argument marking in Manang Gurung
- Differential argument marking in Gyalsumdo
- Comparison and conclusions
This research reports on a subset of results from ongoing work on Tamangic languages and one Tibetic language spoken within the Tibetan Plateau Buffer Zone between the more typologically consistent Indospheric and Sinospheric Tibeto-Burman languages of the region (Matisoff 1991, Bickel and Nichols 2003, Hildebrandt 2007).

Tamangic: Manange, Manang Gurung, Nar
Tibetan: Gyalsumdo
The study is both language comparative and context comparative.

We use data gathered from parallel elicitation and discourse collection.

This permits the exploration of linguistic variability, including consistencies and differences and allows for speaker judgment to place a role.
# DAM in discourse overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Manange</th>
<th>Gurung</th>
<th>Nar</th>
<th>Gyalsumdo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Verb forms</strong></td>
<td>129</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbs with overt A/S NPs</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With ERG A/S</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intransitive</strong></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With overt S</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With ERG S</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Complement-taking</strong></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With overt A</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With ERG A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With overt P</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With DAT P</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DSM and role differentiation in Tamangic

First, we examined whether the realisation of an A/S NP (±OVERT A/S) is a predictor of discontinuation of subject reference (±SAME REF). Significant in all three languages.

Second, we examined whether the realisation of a complement (±COMP) in clauses with (i) complement-taking verbs, and (ii) overt A NPs, is a predictor of ERG case-marking variable (±ERG). Not a significant predictor for Gurung.

### Continuity of reference in Gurung

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+ OVERT A/S</th>
<th>- OVERT A/S</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ SAME REF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SAME REF</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson’s chi-square - Significant: \( X^2 \) (1) = 8.55, \( p < .003 \)

### Complementation in Gurung

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+ ERG A</th>
<th>- ERG A</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ COMP</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- COMP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant relationship (Fisher’s Exact Test: \( p < 0.43 \))
DSM and role differentiation in Gyalsumdo

- First, we examined whether the realisation of an A/S NP (±OVERT A/S) is a predictor of discontinuation of subject reference (±SAME REF). Significant for Gyalsumdo.

- Second, we examined whether the presence of a complement (±COMP) in clauses with (i) complement-taking verbs, and (ii) overt A NPs, is a predictor of ERG case-marking variable (±ERG). Not a significant predictor in Gyalsumdo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuity of reference in Gyalsumdo</th>
<th>+ OVERT A/S</th>
<th>- OVERT A/S</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ SAME REF</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- SAME REF</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson’s chi-square - Significant: X² (1) = 6.13, p < .001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complementation in Gyalsumdo</th>
<th>+ ERG A</th>
<th>- ERG A</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ COMP</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- COMP</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No significant relationship (Fisher’s Exact Test: p = 1)
Differential ergative case

- Despite the low incidence of subject NPs in general (i.e. low referential density), and ERG marked NPs specifically, in the data examined, the presence of the case-marking is not strictly determined by the grammatical function of an NP, but also its information-structural properties.

- In the Tamangic languages, the use of ergative case is associated with primary topic, notably with switches between the discourse topic and other topical protagonists, as well as by restrictions imposed by lexically specified case frames.

- In Gyalsumdo, there is a higher incidence of case marked NPs in general (including DAT and ABL) and the presence of ERG is less clearly related to primary topic status (suggesting this may be more grammaticalised).
DAM splits in Gurung elicitation

(3) a. tela \(aḍu\) pjume-i/*\(aḍu\) pjume \(ŋe\)-i
   yesterday that boy-ERG/that boy jump-PST
   ‘Yesterday the boy jumped (once).’

   b. tela *\(aḍu\) ra-i/\(aḍu\) ra \(ŋe\)-i
   yesterday that goat-ERG/\(aḍu\) goat jump-PST
   ‘Yesterday the goat jumped (once).’

(4) a. \(ŋa\)-i/*\(ŋa\) *\(aḍu\) kju-ni/\(aḍu\) kju thun-i
   1SG-ERG/1SG that water/that water drink-PST
   ‘I drank the water.’

   b. nagai \(ŋa\)-i/\(ŋa\) \(aḍu\) kju thun-mu
   tomorrow 1SG-ERG/1SG that water drink-NPST
   ‘I will drink the water tomorrow.’

Some ‘unergative’ punctual intransitives can have an ergative subject, if it is high in animacy.

Definite objects denoting higher animates/humans usually require DOM with transitive past tense verbs, but inanimates do not.
DOM in Gurung

- Unmarked objects of monotransitives align in case with themes in ditransitives, and DOM forms align with goals, suggesting there may be a distinction between primary and non-primary objects in Gurung.

(5)  

a. adʒu rime-i adʒu pjume-ni/*adzu pjume phri-i  
   that girl-ERG that boy-DAT/that boy hit-PST  
   ‘The girl hit the boy.’

b. ṇa-i ṇa-e latshi-ri/ṇa-e latshi hamare-i tikhi phri-i  
   1SG-ERG 1SG-GEN nail-LOC/1SG-GEN nail  
   hammer-INSTR once hit-PST  
   ‘I hit my nail with the hammer once (i.e. one time).’

c. adʒu pjume-i the ro-ni/*the ro sjau kri pi-i  
   that boy-ERG 3SG.GEN friend-DAT/3SG.GEN friend  
   apple one give-PST  
   ‘The boy gave an apple to his friend.’
Could DOM also be topic marking?

- In addition to primary topics, Dalrymple and Nikolaeva (2011) present a range of evidence in favour of secondary topics.

- A secondary topic is “an entity such that the utterance is construed to be ABOUT the relationship between it and the primary topic” (Nikolaeva 2001:26)

- While focused objects provide new information, secondary topic objects are presupposed.

- In some languages, secondary topic status aligns with a distinction between primary (unrestricted) objects (OBJ), and secondary objects that are restricted to a more limited set of semantic roles (OBJ_θ). In such cases, OBJs are marked for case, but OBJ_θ only receive case if a secondary topic.
Dative marked object(!) in Gurung discourse

- Only one case-marked object appears in our discourse sample – it is the only instance of a pronominal object.
- Note that the reference of the subject of the dependent clause is **controlled by the object of the matrix clause** – a property associated with topical objects in systems that distinguish primary and non-primary objects in monotransitives (Dalrymple and Nikolaeva 2011: 147).

(6) [tikhi tikhi bə ja-mne] ŋjo-ne to-mu
sometimes forest go-CVB.SIM 1.PL-DAT meet-NPST
‘Sometimes when we go to forest, (the animals) meet us.’

- Further syntactic testing will be required to establish whether Gurung has a distinction between an OBJ and an OBJθ.
DAM splits in Gyalsumdo elicitation

(7) a. **di** mi-ki/**di** man phir-soŋ
    PROX man-ERG/PROX man fly-PST
    ‘The man flew.’

    b. *di* *ʤaʤ-ki/**di ʤaʤ(-ko)* phir-soŋ
    PROX plane-ERG/PROX plane(-DEF) fly-PST
    ‘The plane flew.’

(8) a. **Pema-ki/**Pema tsirinŋ-la thonŋ-sum
    Pema-ERG/Pema Tsiring-DAT see-PST
    ‘Pema saw Tsiring.’

    b. **Pema-ki/Pema tsirinŋ-la thonŋ-yonŋ
    Pema-ERG/Pema Tsiring-DAT see-NPST
    ‘Pema will see Tsiring.’

- High animates can be marked with ERG case in intransitives, but this is not possible with lower animates or inanimates.
- Gyalsumdo presents with a similar split in terms of tense with elicitation suggesting that ergative case marking **obligatory in past tense contexts.**
DOM in Gyalsumdo elicitation

- DOM in Gyalsumdo is (at least superficially) linked to a split in **definiteness**, with definite interpretations favouring Dative case-marking; this aligns with the observation that **definiteness** is a property associated with topics (and may ultimately spread to non-topical objects with this feature).

(9) a. Pema-ki kjubu thoŋ-sum  b. Pema-ki kjubu-la thoŋ-sum
    Pema-ERG dog see-PST    Pema-ERG dog-DAT see-PST
    ‘Pema saw a dog.’         ‘Pema saw the dog.’

(10) In answer to: To whom did the boy give the book?
    di piḍa-ki tshoe pomol-la ter-suŋ
    PROX boy-ERG book girl-DAT give-PST
    ‘The boy gave the book to the girl.’
Secondary topics in Gyalsumdo discourse

- In the discourse data from Gyalsumdo, the **object is always present** with ERG subjects, but may be differentially marked even given the same verb, subject, object and tense in consecutive clauses...

  (11) ȵa ama-ki soe-sunŋ
      1SG mother-ERG bring.up-PST.DIR
   ‘(My) mother brought me up.’

  Non-canonical fronted object

  (12) ama-ki tʃyма kaŋ-la ȵa-la soe-sunŋ
      mother-ERG small time-DAT 1SG-DAT bring.up-PST.DIR
   ‘(My) mother brought me up when I was small.’

Dative case occurs once new information about the relation between topics is established
Conclusion

- There is little evidence to suggest that case is required for the purposes of differentiating (semantic) roles.
- Rather, DSM and DOM have information structural functions (e.g. definiteness and topic marking) that permit the tracking of referents through discourse.
- Tamangic languages: ergative case in discourse is associated with primary topic function, while the Dative case marking of objects seems to align with (human) primary objects (OBJ) in secondary object function – and possibly definite themes.
- Gyalsumdo: subject case (ERG, DAT, ABL) is more grammaticalised, however topicality is still important in DOM as secondary topic status may account for Dative case alternations on monotransitive objects in discourse.
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