Morpho-Syntactic Variation in a range, of New Indo –Iranian Language.

Mahinnaz Mirdehghan[1]*

Abstract:

The aim of this article is to provide detailed descriptions of the morpho-syntyavti variation of grammatical relations within the nominal and verbal paradigms in three south Asian Languages. The sample includes the Indic Hindi/Urdu, the Eastern Iranian Pashto and the Western Iranian Balochi Languages, which are selected in the ranged of new Indo-Iranian Languages, To explore the variations and invariants in a cross linguist from. The Main Patterns in concern include: case relators, In demonstrating the linguistic case markings, case system classification, syntactic? Morphological ergativity opposition, split ergative systems, integrative accusative distinction, as well as quirky subjects, in the languages sketched within the paper.

 Key words: Typological variation, Case Marking , Case Patterns, Intransitive Division ,Non-Nominative Subjects

Introduction

This research is aimed to provide some introductory remarks to the determined aspects of case and variation within the grammatical relation of the three linguistic systems, which are selected among the indo Iranian language family . Subsequent section are to explore the relevant patterns of the languages sketched here, to help , to help the reader in placing the patterns in the larger typological picture of more detailed analyses.

Considering the fertile area of morho-syntactic variation of grammatical relation requires the evidence to be gathered from a sufficiently large number of variation and from a sufficiently wide range of different language, which are to be viewed at a distance (Lazard 1998:1) .On this basis we have chosen our sample among the indo- Iranian languages , including Hind/Urdu1[1](from the indic branch) and Pashto[2] and Balochi[3](from the Iranian Branch)[4]. The sample is small enough to allow an in-depth study and is yet varied enough to achieve the goals of the research.

We are concerned here, mainly, with the relation in the simple sentence, a focus that excludes question of subordination.

In the procedure we adopt we proceed from the particulars of the arrangement of forms within the sample (In a comparative fashion in most

---

[1] Assistant Professor of linguistic Shahid Beheshti University , Tehran ,Iran

cases), from which we can not only register the variation , but also perceive the invariants to gauge their linguistic degree of diversity and identity .

2. Case Relators.

In this section we are about to describe our definition of case and the devices by which the relation between arguments and verb are marked in the nominal and verbal systems under investigation. We are concerned here with the facts relating to the grammatical and sematic relation established between the verb predicate and the noun phrases dependent on it ,or more generally between dependents(arguments) and a head (butt2005: 105), which is understood as the core notion of case throughout this research .This core notion describes the verb –dependent relation through several devices. Referred to as "relation''(Lazard 1998) to show the case marking that often are used simultaneously in languages. The relators may be in the form of 5(i) nominal relators , in other words case morphemes or (ii) verbal relators(lazard1998:2)6 . In many languages word order also plays a crucial role in determining the verb argument relations.

2.1 Nominal Relations

2.1.1 Affixed morphemes

Relators are most often indicated in the form of morphemes suffixed to the noun , known as declension traditionally (lazard 1998:2) as exemplified in agent marking in Pashto and Balochi sentences Below.7

(1) Pashto

sæR-æy	MæN-æ	xwor-i
Man-M.DIR.SG	apple-D D IR SG eat .PRES.#SG	

The man is eating the apple (Tegery and Robson 1996:182)

(2) Balochi

Mæn –Ø	tæ-raa	jæn-AA
PN.ISG-DIR	PN,2SG-OBL	hit .PRES –ISG

I will hit you(Farrell 1989:19)

The ending . æy in ex(1) indicates that sæRæy is the subject and designaties the person eating and the ending -æ shows mæN -æ is the object and the apple is the thing eaten . In the same manner , in ex(2) the ending Ø shows that man is the subject and the person who is hitting ,and ta-raa is the object and the one being hit.

Suffixed relators are to be found in many other world languages as well.

2.1.2 Adoptions

Non-affixed morpheme relators or Ad position(preposition and postposition) are also used by many languages , generally in the form of proclitic which depends on their occurrence to process or follow the noun phrase (Lazard 1998:2) Hindi.Urdu, among our sample languages, is considered as a language with postpositional case relators , as exemplified in (3) :

(3)**Hindu/Urdu**

  Minaa.ne   raam –ko   dekh-aa

  Mina.F.ERG   Ram<-ACC   saw.Past.M3SG

Mina saw ram.

  The enclitic *.ne* Indicates the agent and *–ko* the direct object. If we keep the same words ,but change the case critic, as in (4) the grammatical function of the noun phrases are transformed and the sentence no longer has the same meaning .

(4)**Hindi/Urdu**

  Mina-ko   raam-ne   dekh-aa

  Mina.F ACC   Ram .M-ERG saw-PAST .M 3SG

Mina saw Ram .

  In certain languages as in Pashto among our sample , nominal case marking is also possible via both prepaid post position ,together forming "circumlocution , as exemplified in (5) ,edited from Lazard)1998:3) where the circumspection is also combined with an oblique case.

(5) **Pashto**

 sæR-æy   Pa wa-e pore æ tæR-i

man-M.DIR,SG REP tree-OBL SG POSTP horse.DIR.SG tie.Tres 3SG

the man ties the horse to the tree.

  Lazard(Ibid) also adds that the absence of a relator morpheme-affixes or ad positions, by contrast may mark a function . Thus in (5) the unmarkedness of sæRæy and its not being accompanied by any preposition is an indicator of its being subject of the verb tæTRi.

  Typologically, a huge variety is observed in languages in accordance to displaying case marking through affixed relators and apposition .Accordingly. with our sample the Iranian Pashto and specifically Balochi are remarkable for their case marking via affixed morphemes . while Hindi/Urdu , in contrast , Possesses a wide range of adoption (post positional case markesr).8

2.2 Verbal Relators

  Conjugation or verbal related is the term used to show the matter when the verb includes an affix to indicate its relation to the arguments (Lazard:1998:4).

  The reference of this affix with a noun phrase in the sentence is an indication of verbal agreement. This process is seen in all the three systems under consideration by the use of suffixes. As seen in the example below:

(6) **Hindu/Urdu**

laRke-ne. Ketaab. Parh-II

Boy.M-ERG. Book.F.NOM. read-PERF.F.SG

The boy read book(Kachru 1966:42)

(7)**Pashto**

Man-M.OBL.SG. apple.F.DIRSG.   eat-PAST-F3SG
The man was eating the apples(Tegey and Robson1996:182)
(8) **Balochi**
Mæn   xæ-Ø   likit.AA
PN.ISG-DIR.   Letter.DIR. write.PAST-3PL
I Wrote letter.(Farrell 1989:40)

     The nation convened by the verbal relations of agreement in language are usually number and/or gender and/or person. Accordingly, the Number of these verbal relation (co)references by affixed index to the verb form, is consider as a criterion in classifying language. The language under consideration show variations in this regard. With a main concentration on past and perspective tense, Pashto, as exemplified in (7), indexes all three categories of number, gender and person, Hindi/Urdu, indexes number and gender[9] , as seen in (6). While Balochi just indexes the (9) number on the verb, illustrated in (8).

     As far as person is concerned , Lazard1998: 7) notes the need to distinguish between 1st and 2nd person , as the ones involved in the speech –act , and 3rd person , as any other person , place , place , or thing in the world; the difference often reflected in the nature and behavior of the verbal indexes. On this basis , zero verbal indexation for 3rd persons is seen in different languages , as in Balochi10 , as (10) represented in (9).
(9) **Balochi**

Kucik.aa   jinik- Ø   dist- Ø
Dog-OBL.SG   girl.DIR   see.PAST. 3SG
The dog saw the girl (Farrell1995:224)

     It's to be noted that the zero marked 3rd singular in Balochi is the default agreement form with the unmarked verb; thus according to mere number indexation on the verb in this language, verbs may only be marked for agreement with a 3rd person plural objects(11) ,as seen in (10).
(10) **Balochi**
Jink-AA   Bæcik-Ø   jæt-AA
Girl-OBL.PL   boy.DIR   hit,past .3PL
The girl hit the boy(Farrell 1989:19)

     Also in accordance to default agreement forms, the systems under consideration represent some minor differences. As indicated in (9) in Balochi this language obtains the 3 person singular as 3rd its default from. Similar , Balochi,Hindi/Urdu illustrates its default agreement in 3rd person singular(Masculine) form as shown in example(4) .This is while Pashto 3rd person plural is the default verbal form agreement.
(11) **Pashto**
SæRi   Xænd-al
Man.OBL   Laugh.PAST.M.3PL

The Man laughed)Lazard1989:137)

In all three above examples in representing the default agreement in sample systems(4) ,(9) (11) – the verb does not agree with the oblique marked arguments in the sentence and rather carries the default form with no NP to make it explicit: that is the verbal agreement Pattern Follows "agreement with the highest argument associated with the unmarked case''.(Mahanan 1994:105)12

In gendered languages as Pashto and Hindi/Urdu in our sample, the grammatical gender may also cause the variation in verbal relator indexing. In Pashto , for instance there is an opposition between xwaat. Æ ate feminine and xwaaR-a,ate- masculine, also illustrated in Hindi/Urdu, xaa-yii,ate- feminine" and xaa-yaa,ate-masculine.

2.3 **word order**

When the language lacks affixed morphemes (nominal relators) , the function is indicated via the place of occurrence of the arguments in the sentence, which result in a quite rigid word order and limited stylistic variation (Lazard 1998:9) On the other hand in our sample language with case markers for almost all words , a more free word order in observed.

Typological word order classification mainly demonstrates the position of the verb(V).Subject(S) and Object(O) as the distinguishing factor in classifying language, in general (Greenberg 1963,Hawkins 1983,cf Lazard1998) . Accordingly our three sample language are all among the SOV type systems which is considered as a quite numerous language type.

3. **Case systems**

The purpose of this section is to offer some main consideration on case patterns in the sample , and to provide an overview of the centrally relevant issues.

3.1 **Accuse Vs Ergative system**

Classification of languages via case systems, and specifically opposing accusative and ergative type languages has been considered as a central issue in 20th century13. To demonstrate the opposition the language is said to show ergative characteristics if the intrusive subject (SI) is treated in the same way as the transitive direct object (DO) ,and differently from the transitive subject (St) (Dixon 1994, Trask 1979) which is summarized as follows, by plank (1979:12)

- A grammatical pattern or process shows ergative alignment if it identifies Si and Do as opposed to St.
- It shows accusative alignment if it identifies Si and St as opposed to DO .Using the above terminology ,a language is morphologically *ergative14* if it assigns a special case 14 to St (called Ergative case) in Marking it , while grouping Si and Do together by demonstrating them with the same unmarked case (often a phonologically null case,

called absolute case). This case marking pattern is seen in all three languages in this research, discussed in detail in 3.3.

In contrast , an accusative language, as a more familiar case system among the world languages, is one in which St and Si are grouped together by receiving the same unmarked case(Nominative case) and DO is differentiated by receiving the marked case(Accusative case). Modern Persian and English are grouped among this type.

The phenomena results in two main and common type case. Marking patterns across languages.I.e nominative accusative versus ergative absolitive, schematized in (12):

(13)

Nominative-Accusative				Ergative-Absolutive	
St nom		Do ACC	StERG		DO abs
				Si ABS	
	Si Nom				

3.2 **Syntactic vs Morphological Ergative**

An important discussion in the study of case systems is that languages may be either syntactically or morphologically ergative. The difference between the two types of languages has been articulated in terms of syntactic pivots by Dixon (1979,1994) who defines the syntactic pivot as the relation to which syntactic phenomena such as coordination or subordination are sensitive.

The standard test developed by Doxon 1994 for the identification of these types involves reduced coordination based on which all the three systems under investigation here are morphologically ergative languages as will be illustrated in the following , examples .In thses examples two cluases are coordinated the first of which is transitive and the second intransitive (note that the subject of the first clause is a St and the (unexpressed) subject of the second clause a Si).

(14) **Hindi/Urdu**15

 A. { Nadyaa St sabiinaa-ko   skul   chor –egii} aur nadya,F.SG NOM Sabina, F.ACC   school leave-SUT.F.3SG and Si phir næhaa-yegii}
Then bathe-FUT.F.3SG
Nadya will leave Sabina at school and {Nadya} will then bathe.
B.{Nadyaa.ne St   Sabina -ko   skul   chor.aa} aur Nadya.F.SG-ERG sabinaF.ACC   school leave PERF-M.DG and Si phir næ –Yaa}
The bath –PERF.M.SG
Nadya left Sabina at school and Nadya the bathed.(Butt 2005:168)
(15) Baochi
{aa- ØSi   Su- Ø
He/She-SIR   go.PAST-3SG
St   e   d æmaan -Ø-e   gitt-Ø   aart-aa}

6

This medicine –DIR.CLUIT.3SG.buy .PAST-Ø Bring.PAST.3PL
He went and (he) bought these medicines and brought them(Farrell 1995:225)

The coordination test exemplified above , shows that Hindi/Urdu and Balochi group St and Si together as pivots which is seen via the coreferentiality of St and Si in (14) and (15) . The point of grouping the same St/Si is also observed in accusative languages as Persian, evident in (16).

(16) **Persian**

[nadya St   sabina –ra be madrese mi-barad] va Nadya-SG-NOM Sabina-ACC to school and [Nadya] will then return.

Accordingly in regard to the syntactic behavior of Si , St and DO, the ergative languages under investigation in this study behave just like accusative language. Indeed   the pattern is independent from the appearance of ergative case (to be discussed in 3.3) It is therefore assumed that languages like Hindu/Urdu ,Baloch and Pashto are morphologically eragative but syntactivally accusative .These language do not differentiate Si/DO as opposed to St on a (deep) syntactic level , but distinguish them in terms of (surface) morphology.

A syntactically ergative language, in contrast , group Si/Do together at the deep syntactic level as well. The only example of such a language to date is Dyirbal (cf.Butt,2005:169)

(17) **Dyirbal**

a. Uma do yabu, St   Buran] Si banaganyu
father-ABS mother-ERG
Mother saw father and [father] returned.

b. [Bayi burrbula do bargul gubi-gu st bara] si baji gu]
DEM.ABS burrbula-ABS DEM-ERG gubi –ERG punch,non FUT fall down , PURP

The gubi punched Burrbula(i) and [he(i)]fell down.(Manning 1996:6)

In the above example.(17) coordination test shows that the Do consistently gropes with the Si, which stands in marked contrast to syntactically accusative languages of our sample.

3.3 **Split Ergativity**

The following paragraphs are aimed to introduce another complication in the study of ergativity referred to as split ergativity . The term is used to show variation occurring in ergative construction ,in the form of being accusative in one part of the verbal system and ergative in the other ; as seen in our sample system (as well as, various other Indo-Iranian Languages) Illustrated below:

(18) **Pashto**

a. sæR-æy   mæN-æ   xwr-i

man M-DIR.SG   apple.F.DIG.SG.eat.PRES.3SG
the man is eating the apple.
b. sæR-I mæN-æ   xwr-al-æ
man .M-OBL.SG apple.F.DIR.SG   eat-PAST.F.3SG
The man was eating the apple(Tegey and Robson 1996:182)
(19) **Balochi**
a. mæø   tæ-raa   jæ-AA
PN.ISG-DIR PN2SG-OBL HIT.PRES-ISG
I will hit you.
b. kucik—aa   jinik. Ø   diist- Ø
dog.OBL   girl-DIR   saw.PAST-3SG
The dog saw the girl (Farrell 1995:224)
(20) **Hindi/Urdu**
 a. siitaa   raam-ko   piiT-tii   hai
Sita.F.NOM   Ram.M-ACC   Hitt.1MPERF-FSG aux-eSG
PRES sita hits ram
b. siitaa.ne   raadhaa-ko   piiT.aa
Sita F.ERG   Radha-F.ACC   hit PERF.M.SG
Sita hit Radha (Deo and Sharma 2006:8)

As indicated in above examples the ergative case in sample systems is mainly limited to transitive verbs with perfect/past morphology) ex.(18b) 19b)(20b) while accusative being limited to imperfective/present one (ex)(18a) 19a) 20)i.e the verbal categories frequently vary with tense/or aspect . This property as a common cross linguistic characteristic, is referred to as tens/ aspect split, which fits into typological patterns observed in allow three surveyed Indo-Iranian languages . The split can be explained through a typological universal suggested by trask (1979:385) according to which if the ergative is restricted to some tense(s) or aspect(s) ergative construction occur in the past tense or perfective aspect . while nominative construction appears in the remaining tense(s) The Phenomenon is known as split ergativity .

3.4.NP Split

A further common split observed in studied systems is the NP-split. Many language as well as Balochi within our sample 16. Confine the ergative case to a subject of pronouns or Nps(differential case marking variation) Silverstein(1976) shows the regularity and tend of these splits to follow a person hierarchy in which factors such a number , intimacy , and Humanness play a role . The hierarchy, further developed by Aissen (1999,2000) is implicational and makes complex prediction about the kinds of split ergativity that may occur . A typical NP split is one is which 3rd person pronoun and NP subject are ergative, but 1st and 2nd person pronouns are nominative even in the ergative domain. The examples in (21)

from Balochi illustrate this typical pattern where first and second person pronouns show direct case in all.

(21) Balochi

a. m-Ø   t æ-raa   gitt. Ø

PN.ISF.DIR. Pn 2SG-OBL catch.PAST- Ø

I caught you

b.   maa- Ø   summa-raa   taac-en-t- Ø

PN.IPL-DIR   PN.2PL-OBL run –CAUS-PAST- Ø

We chased you off.(Farrell 1989:15)

c.   jinik –aa   bæcik- Ø   jaa-Ø

girl –OBL.SG   boy-DIR   hit.PAST.3SG

The girl hit the boy(Farrell1989:13)

4. Unergatives vs Accusative

This distinction has been a main focus in studying the typological variation in case marking patterns. According to which intransitive verbs are divided into two major classes cross linguistically.

Fillmore(1968)suggests two version of intransitives in one the single argument is an agent and the subject is there fore more active in the other the argument is objective and therefore less active(cf.Butt 2005:41) (22)

 a.V+ A [intransitive active subject(agentive subjects,unergative)]

b. V+O[intransitive inactive subject (non-agentive subjects accusative] .In our sample allow the three languages. Hindi/Urdu , Balochi,and Pashto ,do include the au ergative class of verbs.

In example(23) adapted from Butt(2005:43) in Hindi/Urdu , it is precisely the integrative class of verbs , which shows the overset ergative case marker.

(23) **Hindi /Urdu**

a.   naadya-ne   khaaas-aa

Nadya.F-ERG   cough.INTR-PERF.M.SG

Nadyacoughed.

b.   Naadyaa.ne   nahaa-yaa

Nadya.F.ERG   bathe INTER>PERF.M.SG

Nadya Bathed.(Butt 2005,43)

In Pashto as well Roberts(200:23) indicates small classed of intransitive verbs which select an ergative marked (oblique) subject in past tense, exacly as the verb being transitive .This case Marking is illustrated in (24) with the unergative verb **Khæendel(x æendel)Laugh:**

(24) Pashto

a.(za)   xaaad.am

PN.ISG   Laugh INTR.ISG PRES

A am laughing

B. Maa   ænd.al(a)

PN.ISG.ERG laugh INTR.M .pl PAST

I was laughing (Roberts200:23)

In the above present form(24) the integrative verbs selects a subject in unmarked direct case ,with which the verbal agreement is represented while in the past tense form (24b) the verb selects an ergative subject and shows default agreement(masculine 3rd plural) since agreement is blocked with ergative argument.

The same alteration of Pasto is further noted by Roberts(200: 126) for its full noun phrase subjects that have distinct case forms for direct and oblique cases as wruna /wruno , brothers

(DIR/OBL) and æR æy man below:

(25) Pashto

a. wuna   xand.

Brother PL m dir laugh,inter pres ,

The brother are lauging

 b.wruno   xæ-al

c. sæRi   xæ-al

man SG.M.OBL   laugh.INTR.PAST 3rd PL

 the man laughed (Lazard 1998:137

 as seen in example(25b) and (25c) there is no verbal agreement with the oblique marked subject in the sentence and the in trasitive verb shows the third person plural default form instead.

The literal translation of these sentence would be: to/by the brother/ man were laughed. Instead of saying the brother or man laughed, as in English (Lazard1998:137)

 As another example of unergative verbs in Pashto Gæpel(æpel) bark is presented in (26) in which the intransitive verbs in past tense form , and according the subject as its only argument appears in its oblique form spi, rather than in its form which would be spæy.

(26) **Pashto**

Bagaa,spæ   dee   æhmæh   spi dar   wa
          æal

Last night poss ahmed dir dog very..PERF bark, INTR.PAST,3PL

Ahmad dog barked a lot last nint , (Tegey and Robson1996:189)

The same pattern also holds in Baloch as seen in example(27) and (28), adapted , from Farrell(1995:232)

(27) **Balochi**

Kaangi-aa   baal ku. Ø

Crow.OBL   flying   do-PAST.3ST

The crow flew

)28)

Mor-aa   der   ku-Ø

Ant-OBL   late   doPAST3SG

The ant wast late

In the above Balochi example and in verbs being compound with kanag, the subject are agentive (active) and are thus marked ergatively.

5. Quirky Subjects

Non-nominative or quirky subject are usually seen among languages with a rich case system. In the languages under consideration here psych-predicates(belleti and Razzi1988) select quirky subject, as seen in example below in Hindi/Urdu and Pashto ,In (29) exemplified in Hindi/Urdu by the psych-predicate like , quirky subject is marked with a dative.

(29) **Hindi/Urdu**

a. adnaan-ko (bijlii –kaa   arak –na)   accha lag –taa
adnan M.Datlightning F.GEN cracle IN F goo MSG Seem
adnan likes the crackling of lighting.

b.adnaan-ko bijlii   karak-ni   acchii lag-tii
adnan M.DAT lightning crackling(BUTT 2005:9)

In pastto Tegey and Robson(1996:184 188) note the selection of possessive preposition dee/de and their oblique. Marked complement by psych predicates: they present example as dislike , feel hot/cold, and have a fever , as predicate with this property .In accordance , Robert(2000:22) claims other predicates which require their subjects to appear as complement of locative. Dative or ablative ad position although the subject themselves still appear in oblique case 17.He(ibid) adds the influence of subject degree of volition as a factor often indicated by varying ways of marking the subject as exemplified in the following sentences:

(31) **Pashto**

a. da ælaa   datæ pinza kaalæ   ter   sw-al
poss layal .-obl-f.five year spend PAST fo Layal spent five years here
daltæ pinza kaalæ te

b.Loc layal obl on here five year DIR spend PAST .M 3PL Layala without any choive spent five year here(Babrakzai1999:180)

c.Lælaa   daltæ inza kaalæ ter   sw-al
Layla OBLE here five year DIR spend

The subject, Layla receives the same oblique case marking in all above example which share the same literal meaning in spite of the subjects appearing in per position phrases in the first two sentences. Still the possessive marked subject in (31a) receives the most neutral interpretation of the three examples(31b) is an instance of the subject being surrounded by the locative ambiposition pa baande , which suggests that Layla had no possibility of choosing for her stay.

This is while (31c) shows a transitive verb with a bare subject which is yet marked obliquely (due to the ergative structure(past tense) of the sentence) in this example Layla is interpreted as using her own will for they stay and deliberately spent the years three(Roberts2000:22)

6. Conclusion

This section ends the paper with a brief recapitulation of its content. In sum the paper has indicated the characteristic patterns of morph syntactic variation of grammatical relation within the nominal and verbal paradigms in a range of new Indo-Iranian Languages. Exploration of these variation in the cross-linguistic frame helps gauging the linguistic degree of diversity and identity of languages in its accordance . Accordingly ,the sample has been chosen from the Indie and Iranian Branches, which include Hindi/Urdu and Pashto and Balochi language respectively .

The study takes the following course of progress. It consists of six section s together with the introductory part , which provides a preliminary introduction to it. Part 2 describes the definition of case and devices by which the relation between arguments and verb are marked in nominal and verbal systems under investigation . which are referred to as relators here in showing the case marking3 defines the main consideration on case pattern and provides an overview of the centrally relevant issues in the sample including discussion on accusative ergative systems, syntactic/ morphological ergative verbs: Accusative and unergatives. Quirky Subjects are presented in the subsequent section and finally this last section present a summary of the paper with some general notes

To summarize as a main result emerged in the Couse of the study though each language show its own set of variation viewing them at a distance illustrates their correlation that are controlled by the choice of morpho syntactic decice with some general tendencies. Certain matters related to our discussion include:

- The usage of nominal relators for case marking purposes in all three languages: Though provided in different forms , as affixed morphemes in Pashto and Balochi) and adposition (Hindi/Urdu ef 2.1.
- Verbal relators as indicators of verbal agreement seen in all the three systems by the use of suffixes with the difference of the number of these relators indexed to the verb.

Accordingly Pashto indexes all three categories of number , gender and person , Hindi/Urdu indexes number and gender , and Balochi merely indxes number on the verb;

- The opposition of accusative and ergative language types classifies all our sample languages in the group of ergative case marking systems with morphological (Surface) ergativitych3.1and 3.2
- Split ergativity in the form of tense/aspect split fits as well into the typological patterns observed in all surveyed languagesch3.3
- The typical NP split as the one in which 3 person pronoun and NP subject are ergative,3rd but 1st and 2nd person pronouns are nominative even in the ergative domain is seen in Balochi in our sample cf 3.4.

- According to the integrative vs accusative classification of intransitive verbs all three Hindi/Urdu Balochi and Pashto do in ude the Unergative class of verbs cf,4.
- Non –nominative or quirky subject , as a property of languages with a rich case system is exemplified in Hind/Urdu and Pashto in the study cf,5. Generally by gathering the relevant morphosyntacitc patterns of the languages Sketched here. The paper helps the reader in placing the patterns in the larger typological picture of more detailed analyses.

Abbreviation :

1/2/3 First/second/third person
ABS Absolute case
ACC Accusative case
AUX Auxiliary
DAT dative case
DO direct object
ERG ergative case
F feminine gender
FUT future
GEN genitive case
IMPERF imperfective aspect
INDEF indefinite
INF infinitive
INTR intransitive
LOC locative case
M masculine gender
NEG negative
NOM nominative
NONFUT no future tense
NP noun phrase
OBJ object
OBL oblique past tense
PAST perfective
PERF perfective aspect
PL plural
POSTP postposition
PREP preposition
PRES present tense
PRES-PERF present perfective aspect
PN pronoun
POSS possessive
PURP singular
SG singular
SI intransitive subject
ST transitive subject

Notes:
1. Hindi and Urdu language . are consider by most linguist to show the same grammatical structure , the difference being that hindi is writtern in Devanagari and draws vocabulary from Sanskrit while urdu is writer in Arabic script and drwas vocabulary from Persian and Arabic.
2. Pashto belongs to the southeastern group within the Iranian branch of indo Iranian ,and is a major language of aghaistan and Pakistan basically this research is centred on the dialiect of khandahar , Afghanistan .
3. Balochi , is the principal language of Balochistan and a northwestern Iranian language of the Iranian branck of indo Iranian (belongin to the indo European language supe family) which is situated in the south eastern corner of the Iranina language group . This study has been focused on the southern Balochi dialect which shows a quite consistent use of ergative stricter (see,3 for a disc ission of ergative case patterns)
4. The inventory of vowel phonems of the sample language that can also cesve as key to the tranccrption in the paper are presentbelow.

Hindi/Urdu vowel   Pashto vowels   Balochi vowels

	front	center	back	front	center	back	front	center	back	
High	ii uu			Ii uu			Ii uu			
	I u			A u			A u			
Mid high	E o			W o			E o			
Mid low	Ai a au			A						
Low	aa			A aa			A aa			

In the above table the sounds in brackets are phonoems that are limited to elegant and formal styles in Pashto (penzl1955,14)

Throughtout the paper capital letters are used to show nasal vowels and eretroflex consonats and bold forms to show agreement.

Owing to the differing system of the sources transcription and glossing of the examples are puit to a unified system

Its to be noted that the rela tors here are used to describe the cas patterns of the language under incestigation

5. There are also addition classtication to be condedered in other language such as those indicate by morphemes incorporated in the

verb form (e.g in totonac langauges(mexico) cflazard1998.2) for a detail discussion on relator(actancy) instrument,seelazard1998

6. This classification is also referred to as head vs dependent marking (butt,2006,5)
7. In the language studied ere the contrast can be summarized as that of direct vsOblique cased the ddirect case representing the unmarked nominative and absolutive sases while the oblique case indexes the marked ergative and accusative one.
8. There are seven cases in hidi/urdu as indicated in the following table adapted from butt and king 2004:157) eac indicated by certain postpositon.

Case	Nominatic	Ergative	Accusative	dative	instrumental	genitive	locative
postpostion	O	ne	ko		Se	Kaa(m) Kii(f0 E(obl)	Me Par tak

9. Mohanan(1994:10) states that in future tenses Hindi/Urdu verb exhibis agreement for all three categories of number gender as well as person as seen in the example below .however for the non futer tense(past and perfective , considered mainly here) just number and gender are indexed with the verb .

Raam   kitaaba   khariideg-aa

Ram   m sgnom   bookf.pl.nmm   bu,fut mssg

Reference:

Aissen ,Judith,1990 , Markedness and subject choice in optimality t heory in natioral language and linguisti theory 19,673,711(reprintened in Geraldine legendre et al (eds(

Aissen , Judith,2000,Differetial object marking Iconicity vs economy dragt online university of California ,santa cruz

Babrakzai ,Farooq 1999,topks in Pashto syntax ph.b thesis unierstity of hawai at manoa.

Bellti, Adriana, and luigi rizi, 1988 psych , verbs and theory natural language and linguist theory 6.291,352

Butt , Miriam2005 , theories of case Cambridge, Cambridge university press.

Butt , Miriam and tracy H.King 2004 the status of case in veneeta Dayal anoop Mahajan (eds) clause structure in south Asian langauged (studies in Natural language and linguistic theor 61) boston ets Kluwer pp,152,198

Deo , ashwani and Devyani sharma ,2006 , typological variation in the ergative morphology of indo Aryan language linguist typoly 10,pp 369,419

Dixon , Robert 1994,Ergativity camrdge, cambrige university press

Dixon ,Robert , 1979 , egartivety language 55,pp59 , 138

Farrell,tim,1989: A study of ergativity in Balochi Ma thesis soas London

Farrell ,tim,1989: fading ergatici? A study of ergative in Balochi in :Davi Bennett , Theodora bynon , B George Hewitt(ed) subject voice and ergativity selected essays London , sosas pp 218.243

Fillmore , Charles , j1968 the case for case in universsals of linguistic theory, ed Emmon bach and Robert th harms 1-88 new York Holt Rinehart and Winston . Greenber jh 1963 universals of language 2nd cambrife mass the mit press

Kachro ,Yamuna , and rajeshwari , pandharipande,1979 , onergagative in selecte south Asian languages in south Asian language analysis , Urbana Dept of linguistc UIUC 193 , 209

Lazard Gilbert , 1998 Actancy, berlin new your mouton de fruiter gmb and co

Mannin Christopher 1996 Ergativity argument structure and grammaticla relation Stanford

Mohanan ,tara,1994 argument structur in hindi , stanfor,scli publication

Penzl ,Herbert 1955 , a grammar of Pashto adescripticestudy of the dialect of khandahar , afghan washinton American council of learned societies .

Plank , fran 1998 , ergativity syntactiv typology and unicersal gramm some past and present.

Trask Robert 1979 , On the origin of ergativity in frans Plank , Ergativitly toward a theory of grammatical relation new youkAcademic press pp385