CHAPTER III

SUBJECT CASE AND THEMATIC ROLES
Chapter 3

Subject Case and Thematic Roles

3.0. Introduction

An overview of the argument marking in some of the Indo-Aryan languages in Chapter 2 shows that there is no one to one relationship between the case and the grammatical roles of the arguments. In AS, an Indo-Aryan language, similar characteristic is observed. The argument in the subject position takes the canonical nominative case and also various non-nominative cases like dative, genitive, and locative. The assignment of the nominative and the non-nominative subjects depends upon the two aspectual categories of verb, namely, dynamic and stative, respectively. Again, it is the predicate type that determines the thematic role of a particular argument that is manifested in the grammatical marking. The main focus in this chapter is to show how the assignment of the non-nominative subject cases and the correspondence with the thematic roles can actually be arranged in a hierarchy.

3.1. Nominative subjects

In AS, nominative subjects, of transitive clauses, usually receive the agent thematic role. The dynamic predicates like pit ‘beat’ as in (58) in Chapter 1, and similar action verbs like mar ‘hit’, bol ‘tell’ and so on entail proto-agent properties like volitionality, causation, independent existence. The verb perception like dekh can have both volitional interpretation of ‘look’; and non-volitional interpretation of ‘see’. The former involves property of sentience and thus may assign agent role to the subject; while the latter does not. Similarly, activities like ‘sleeping’ and ‘sitting’ can also have an agent in the subject position as they involve property of volition. However, there are psych verbs like dar ‘frighten’ and perception verb dekh ‘see’, sun ‘hear’ without the property of sentience, which assigns the thematic role of experiencer to the nominative subject case. This is exemplified in (87a-b).
87. (a) ॰  chori-thɔ ke   dekh-l− ̀ ̄ ०/ ʤan ɹhɔŋ ke   dekh-l− ̀ ̄ ०
3SG.NOM  girl-CL  ACC  see-PAST-1SG/deliberately  see-PAST-1SG

‘He saw the girl/ He saw the girl deliberately’

(b) *moi ॰ ke ʤan ɹhɔŋ ke  dar-qį  h− ̀ ̄ ०
I.NOM  3SG-ACC  deliberately fear-PROG AUX.PRES-1SG

‘I am afraid of him’

In (87a) the predicate dekh ‘see’ may occur with the adverb ʤan ɹhɔŋ ke if it implies volitional involvement of the subject in the act of seeing. Nevertheless, the same verb without deliberate perception will not occur with the adverb ‘deliberately’. Thus, dekh ‘see’ can be both an agent and an experiencer predicate. However, the psych verb dar is an experiencer predicate and hence, the use of adverb ‘deliberately’ will be ungrammatical.

In the copula construction, the subject normally takes the nominative case, whereas, the thematic role is not that of proto-agent.

88. moi  mastor  hɛk− ̀ ̄
I.NOM  teacher.NOM  COP.PRES-1SG

‘I am a teacher’

The copula verbs like hɛk− ‘COP.PRES’ are treated separately from the typical action verbs as they do not entail the proto-agent properties of volition and causation to the subject argument. They mostly refer to the notions of ‘being’ and ‘existence’. They can be grouped under the category of stative verbs. The thematic role of such nominative subjects can be that of themes, and the thematic role of the objects can be that of rhemes, using the terminology of Ramchand (2007:41). Thus, in AS, the thematic roles of nominative subject can be arranged in a hierarchy where the agent is higher than the experiencer followed by the themes.
The hierarchy of the thematic roles shows the degree of control or agentivity of the nominative subjects as a continuum between dynamic and stative, where the dynamic outranks perception followed by psych, and finally statives, in agentivity.

Besides the usual nominative case, the subject NP also receives various non-nominative case markers, such as dative, genitive, and locative. These subjects normally do not have the verbal agreement. They mostly bear the role of an experiencer, possessor or goal. The nominative case normally occurs with the dynamic verbs and the non-nominatives occur with the stative verbs. Unlike, the proto-agent, which imply control over the action; these subjects do not exert control over the action and are, therefore, in between both the roles in the case hierarchy. The following sub-sections discuss the non-nominative subjects with various types of predicates and their semantic differences.

3.2. Dative subject

Dative subjects are found cross-linguistically and are a standard part of South Asian languages (Verma and Mohanan, 1990). In AS, subjects can take the dative case marked by ke. The dative case marker ke is a free morpheme when it occurs with nominals, while, with pronominals, it occurs as a suffix. The following sub-section discusses the dative subject constructions with various verb types.

3.2.1. Stative vs dynamic

It is also observed that subject of stative verbs take dative case, whereas, the subjects of their dynamic counterparts take the nominative case. This is illustrated with the following example.
89. (a) mɔi phɔl bhal pa-‡ h–ô
   I.NOM flowers.NOM good get-PROG AUX.PRES-1SG
   ‘I like flowers.’

(b) mɔ-ke phɔl bhal lag–e-la
   I-DAT flowers.NOM good feel-3SG-IMPERF
   ‘I like flowers’

The subject of the dynamic verb bhal pa-‡ ‘good get-PROG’ ‘liking’ in (89a) is in nominative case. While, in (89b) the verb bhal lag–e-la ‘good feel-3SG-IMPERF’ ‘likes’ indicates a ‘state’, and requires the subject NP to be in the dative case. The former subject is an agent, and the latter is an experiencer.

In AS, the verb lag- has many implications like, equative attributive copula and feel, need, want, The verb lag- expressing ‘want’ or ‘need’ can have a dative subject. The dynamic counterpart of the verb lag- is khodʒ ‘want’. In AS, the verb khodʒ can also mean ‘search’. It takes the nominative subject. This is exemplified in (90a-b).

90. (a) mɔi dher poisa khodʒ-ä‡ h–ô
   I-DAT lot money want-PROG AUX.PRES-1SG
   ‘I am in want of lots of money’
   Lit: ‘I am wanting lots of money.’

(b) mɔ-ke dher poisa lag–e
   I-DAT lot money want.PRES-3SG
   ‘I want lots of money.’

In (90a), the dynamic verb khodʒ is followed by the progressive marker –ä‡ and the auxiliary in the present tense h–ô gets 1st person singular agreement marker –ô. The verb lag– ‘want’ in (90b) takes the default 3sg agreement marker –e and assigns dative case to the subject mɔ-ke ‘I-DAT’. According to Masica (1991:340),
the subject position, in Indo-Aryan languages, can be occupied by an agent and also by other non-agents, which normally do not have verbal agreement.\footnote{Keenan (1976:316) states that verb agreement ‘fails to be a necessary condition basic-subjecthood since in many languages verbs agree with no NP… in a very few case verbs may agree with object…particularly in Hindi’}

3.2.2. Volitional vs non-volitional

In AS, there are certain dynamic verbs denoting non-volitional action, which take dative subject. The difference is evident in the volitional counterparts, where the same dynamic verbs take the nominative subject. This is illustrated in the following sub-sections with examples from verbs of perception, and noun-verb conjuncts.

3.2.2.1. Verbs of perception

Experiencers are also marked by nominative in case of perception verbs like *dekh* ‘see’ *sən* ‘hear’ and so on.

91.(a) \(\sigma\) akas-\(ɛ\) γarigan dekh-\(l\)-\(ak\)
\[3SG.NOM\] sky-LOC stars see-PAST-3SG

‘He saw stars in the sky.’

(b) \(\sigma \,-kɛ\) akas-\(ɛ\) γarigan dekh-\(ai\) de-l-\(ak\)
\[3SG-DAT\] sky-LOC stars see-PERF give-PAST-3SG

Lit: ‘To him stars appeared in the sky.’

‘He saw stars in the sky.’

In (91a) the perception *dekh* ‘see’ has a nominative subject. Whereas, in (91b), the same verb of perception *dekh* with the perfective aspect –\(ai\), and followed by the light verb de ‘give’ takes a dative experiencer subject. Similarly, in (92b), the use of the light verb de ‘give’ with the perception verb *sən* ‘hear’ takes a dative subject.
92. (a) əɔi əɔn-əð
   I.NOM hear-PAST-1SG
   ‘I listened.’

(b) ɔɛ-kə əɔn-ai əd-ə-ak
   I-DAT hear-PERF give-PAST-3SG
   ‘I heard.’

This can be explained with the notion of ‘control’ or ‘agentivity’. Now, the perception verbs like dekh ‘see’ in (91a) and əɔn ‘hear’ in (92a) can be voluntary actions where the subjects have some control over the action, therefore, take the nominative case. On the other hand, subjects of the compound verb dekh-ai de ’see give’ əɔn-ai de ‘hear give’ in (91b) and (92b), respectively, are definitely experiencers, as they refer to an involuntary action where the subject does not have any control over the action. Experiencers are involuntary recipients of the action of the verb and hence are non-agentive (Cole 1983).

3.2.2.2. N+V conjunct

Predicates, which require a dative subject, can form an N+V conjunct with verbs like, aa ‘come’ preceded by a noun. The N+V conjunct here, mainly, indicates non-volitional action.

93. (a) əɔi ə-kə yaad kar-ət h-əð
   I.NOM 3SG-ACC remember do-PROG AUX.PRES-1SG
   Lit: ‘I am remembering him’

(b) ɔɛ-kə ə-kər yaad a-ə-ak
   I-DAT 3SG-GEN memory come-PAST-3SG
   ‘His memory came to my mind.’
   Lit: ‘To me his memory came.’
The light verb kar ‘do’ has nominative subject (93a) and aa ‘come’ has a dative subject (93b). The conjunct yaad kar ‘remember do’ refers to a volitional act and yaad aa ‘remember come’ implies non-volitional act.

3.2.3. Psych verbs

In AS, the dative subject can occur with the use of certain psych verbs as ‘to feel’, ‘to like’ or ‘to perceive’ or verbs expressing other mental of physical states like ‘hunger’, ‘fever’, ‘sleep’ and so on. These verbs appear in the progressive aspect, essentially having a stative reading. This is exemplified in (94-95) below.

94. mɔ-ke bɔkhar lag-ɑʔ h-ɛ
I-DAT fever feel-PROG AUX.PRES-3SG
‘I am feeling feverish.’
Lit: ‘I am feeling fever.’

95. mɔ-ke nind aa-ʔ h-ɛ
I-DAT sleep come-PROG AUX.PRES-3SG
‘I am feeling sleepy.’
Lit: To me sleep is coming.

In (94-95) the verb lag- ‘feel’ functions as a psych verb expressing physical states like bɔkhar lag-ɑʔ ‘fever feel’ and nind aa-ʔ ‘sleep come’, assigning the subject the thematic role of an experiencer.

3.2.4. Properties of dative subjects

An argument, in order to be subject in a clause structure, needs to fulfill certain syntactic properties. Keenan (1976) states certain properties of subjecthood like reflexivisation, deletion of co-referential NP and controlled participial tests and so on. The following sub-sections show the syntactic properties of dative subjects in the light of these three tests of subjecthood.
3.2.4.1. Reflexivisation

According to Keenan (1976:315), ‘basic subjects can control reflexive pronouns’ i.e., only subjects can be the antecedent of reflexives. The subjects and the controlled reflexives are co-indexed. The dative subjects in AS undergo reflexivisation, as can be seen in (96a-c).

96. (a) mɔ-kei nidei dher poisa lag–e
    I-DAT self lot money want.PRES-3SG
    Lit: ‘I myself want lots of money.’

(b) mɔ-kei nidei bokhe/bhok lag–aɪ h–e
    I-DAT self fever/hungry feel-PROG AUX.PRES-3SG
    Lit: ‘I am feeling fever/hungry’
    ‘I am myself feeling feverish / hungry.’

(c) mɔ-kei nidei sön-ai de-lak
    I-DAT self hear-PERF give-PAST-3SG
    Lit: ‘I myself heard.’

In (96a-c) the subjects act as antecedent of the reflexive nide ‘self’. The reflexive nide ‘self’ is a free word and normally occurs immediately after the subject. The co-indexation indicates that the subject controls the reflexives.

3.2.4.2. Deletion of co-referential NP

As per Keenan (1976), ‘basic subjects are the possible controller of co-referential deletion and pronominalisation’. In other words, only subjects can control the co-referential NP of non finite clause. The co-referential NP can thus be deleted. In AS dative subjects, with verbs having dynamic implication can undergo the deletion of co referential NP test.
97. (a) mɔ-kei, [__i dher pɔisa kama-ek] lag–ɛ
I-DAT lot money earn-NF need.PRES
‘I need to earn lots of money.’

(b) mɔ-kei, [__i ekhon bɔkharaw-ek] ni lag/*lag–ɛ
I-DAT now fever come-NF NEG want/*feel.PRES-3SG
Lit: ‘I do not want fever to come now’
‘I should not fall sick now.’

In (97a-b), the sentences consist of two clauses: the main clause, which is finite, and the embedded clause, which is non finite (shown in square brackets). The dative subjects control the non finite clause and the subjects (indicated by a gap and a subscript i) of the non finite clauses are deleted by virtue of being the co-referential NP. The dative subjects and the co-referential NP positions have the same indexation. In (97b), the dative subject with lag- ‘want’ can undergo deletion of co-referential NP, which is not possible with verb lag- ‘feel’ in the language. This illustrates that in AS lag verb can have different implication, that of ‘want’ and ‘feel’. In AS, such constructions as in (97a-b) usually imply ‘obligation’ with lag- ‘want’ as the default verb.

3.2.4.3. Controlled participial clause

As per Keenan (1976), subjects can control participial clause. In AS, the dative subjects control participle clauses as illustrated in (98a-c).

---

13 Here distinction can be made between structural case and inherent case. The dative subject of non finite construction is considered as an instance of structural case which is different from the inherent case that is dependent on theta-marking and the verb types. These two terms are central to generative framework and an elaborate discussion on structural and inherent case is beyond the focus of the thesis.
98. (a) [<_sahər dʒai ke] mɔ-ke j, dher poisa lag-i 
   city go CP 1SG-DAT much money need.FUT
   Lit: ‘After going to the city, I will need lots of money.’

(b) [<_ o-kɛ deik h ke] mɔ-ke j, baʃ-thɔ yaad
   3SG-DAT see CP 1SG-DAT matter-CL remember
   a-l-ak
   come.PAST-3SG
   ‘Having seen him, I remembered the matter.’

(c) [<_ baris mɛ bhidɔ ke] mɔ-ke j, bokhar
   rain POSP wet CP 1SG-DAT fever
   hɔ-l-ak/*lag-ɛ
   happen-PAST-3SG/*feel.PRES-3SG
   Lit: ‘Having drenched in rain, fever happened to me.’
   ‘Having drenched in the rain, I caught fever.’

In (98a-c), we see that the dative subjects control participial clause (shown in
square brackets). The subject position of the participial clause and the subject mɔ-
ke ‘1SG-DAT’ are co-indexed so as to illustrate the control. However, in (98c), the
dative subject mɔ-ke ‘1SG-DAT’ control participial clause with hɔ- ‘happen’, rather
than lag- ‘feel’. The former indicates perfective aspect while, the latter implies a
physical state.

The analysis of the above data shows that dative subjects, specifically those
occurring with verbs having dynamic implication or at least the progressive and
perfective aspects of states, have the syntactic properties of subjecthood. That is,
they control reflexives, co-referential NP deletion and participial clause. The verbs
take the default 3rd person singular agreement marker -ɛ. The dative subjects
occurring with verbs that imply physical state do not undergo these tests.
3.2.5. Aspectual properties of the dative subject in AS

In § 3.2.1, it is seen that the verbs that assign dative subjects can have both stative and dynamic implications. Figure 17 shows that dynamic verbs can have either telic or atelic property (see § 2.5.1 in Chapter 2). Now, it is important to note whether, the dynamic reading of the stative verbs have either one of these properties or not. In order to further ascertain the thematic role of the dative subjects and nature of the verb types, the two tests of aspectual properties suggested by Van Valin and LaPolla (1997:95) have been conducted. As per the first test in §3.2.5.1, the use of the ‘in phrase’ denotes telicity of the verb and the use of ‘for phrase’ denotes atelicity of the verb. The second test in §3.2.5.2, is the use of adverbs like deliberately, vigorously and so on that shows the volitionality of the action named by the verb.

3.2.5.1. The use of the phrase ek ghanta se/me ‘since in/an hour’

The phrase ‘for an hour’ does not indicate when the action began and ended and has the possibility of going on later. The phrase ‘in an hour’ denotes that the event began and ended in the space of one hour (Van Valin and LaPolla, 1997:96). This test reveals whether the verb can have a telicity or terminal end point or not. In AS, ek ghanta se/me ‘since/in an hour’ cannot occur with dative subject with lag- verb meaning ‘feel’ and ‘want’ as in (99a–b). Moreover, ek ghanta se/me ‘since/in an hour’ is not possible with the predicate yaad a-l-ak ‘memory came’ as in (99c).

99. (a) *mɔ-ke ek ghanta se/me phọl bhal lag–e-la
     I-DAT since/in an hour flowers.NOM good feel-1SG-IMPERF

(b) *mɔ-ke ek ghanta se/me dher poisa lag–e
    I-DAT since /in an hour lot money want.PRES-3SG

14 Here the synonym ‘since’ is also implied.
Similarly, *ek ghanta se/me* ‘since/in an hour’ is ungrammatical with the predicate *dekh-ai de-l-ak* ‘appeared’ denoting perfective aspect, as in (100a). While, in (100b), the same verb *dekh-ai de* ’see give’ in progressive aspect can co-occur with *ek ghanta se*, indicating that the action is ‘going on for a certain stretch of time’ (i.e., atelic). Such constructions, however, cannot denote terminal endpoint or telicity, where the action has a beginning and an end, and hence, cannot occur with *ek ghanta me*.

100. (a) **mɔ-ke**  
*ek ghanta se/me*  
\[3SG-DAT \text{ since/in an hour}\]  
\[\text{sky-LOC stars see-PERF give-PAST-3SG}\]

(b) **o-ke**  
*ek ghanta se/me*  
\[3SG-DAT \text{ since/in an hour}\]  
\[\text{sky-LOC stars see-PERF give-PROG}\]

Dative subjects with predicates expressing physical states in progressive aspect can occur with the phrase *ek ghanta se*. Here, the phrase indicates the durative nature of these predicates. They cannot imply telicity and, therefore, cannot occur with *ek ghanta me* shown with the asterisk (*) in (101a-b).

101. (a) **mɔ-ke**  
*ek ghanta se/me*  
\[3SG-DAT \text{ since/in an hour}\]  
\[\text{fever feel-PROG AUX.PRES-3SG}\]

Lit: ‘I am feeling fever since/*in an hour’  
‘I am feeling feverish since/*in an hour’.

(c) **mɔ-ke**  
*ek ghanta se/me*  
\[I-DAT \text{ since/in an hour}\]  
\[3SG-GEN memory come-PAST-3SG\]
3.2.5.2. The use of adverb ḍjan budh ke ‘deliberately’

The use of the adverb ‘deliberately’ is possible with dynamic action and is incompatible with stative verbs (Van Valin and LaPolla, 1997:95). Analysis of AS data shows that, along with stative verbs, the adverb ḍjan budh ke is also incompatible with dynamic non-volitional verbs. This is evident from the ungrammaticality of (102a-e).

102. (a) *mo-ke ḍjan budh ke phol bhal lag-ε-la
   I-DAT deliberately flowers.NOM good feel-1SG-IMPERF
(b) *mɔ-ke ḍjan budh ke dher poisā lag-ε
   I-DAT deliberately lot money want.PRES-3SG
(c) *mɔ-ke ḍjan budh ke sōn-ai de-l-ak
   I-DAT deliberately hear-PERF give-PAST-3SG
(d) *mɔ-ke ḍjan budh ke ō-ker yaad a-l-ak
   I-DAT deliberately 3SG-GEN memory come-PAST-3SG
(e) *mɔ-ke ḍjan budh ke nind aa-ṭ h-ε
   I-DAT deliberately sleep come-PROG AUX.PRES-3SG

The analysis of the syntactic properties of the dative subjects along with aspectual properties of the dative predicates helps in understanding the proto-properties of these subjects. In § 3.2.6, the proto-properties of dative subject in AS has been discussed in detail, as per the proto-agent properties put forward by Dowty (1991).
3.2.6. Proto-properties of the dative subject in AS

Dative subjects, in AS, do not occur with volitional action and cause change of state of other participants. Instead the dative subjects occur with non-volitional action. They are not the patient because even though non-volitional the action is still carried out by the subject arguments. Their incompatibility with the adverb ‘deliberately’ shows that the action performed by them is non-volitional. They are, therefore, the experiencer subjects. Experiencers are defined as sentiment arguments which are mentally affected. They are taken to occur mainly with psychological and perception predicates (Butt, Grimm and Ahmed 2006). Based on the analysis of the dative subjects in § 3.2.5.1 and § 3.2.5.2, I have come up with the certain proto-entailments that are associated with the dative predicates. The proto-properties of dative predicates, in AS, are illustrated in Table 9 below.

### Table 9 Proto-properties of dative predicates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Proto-properties of the verbs (Dative case)</th>
<th>Volitional involvement</th>
<th>Sentience</th>
<th>Change of state</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Independent existence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lag</td>
<td>‘want’</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lag</td>
<td>‘feel’</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>MENTAL</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dekh-ai</td>
<td>‘appear’</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yaad a-</td>
<td>‘remember’</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>MENTAL</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bukhar lag</td>
<td>fever feel</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>PHYSICAL</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nind aa-</td>
<td>sleep</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>PHYSICAL</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The predicates like yaad aa (93b) in § 3.2.2.2 can indicate some sort of change of mental state. Again, predicates like bukhar lag- (94) or nind aa (95) in §3.2.3 can denote physical state experienced on the part of the dative subject. Dative subjects with perception verbs like ‘heard’ and ‘see’ followed by the auxiliary de ‘give’, may indicate the absence of the property of sentience on the part of the subjects. This is exemplified in (91b) and (92b) in § 3.2.2.1. Again, with lag- verb
expressing ‘feel’, the experiencer dative subjects do not exist independently of the experiencer like ‘get a fever’ ‘catch a cold’ ‘feel hungry’ and so on. However, in case of the verb *lag-* ‘want’ the dative beneficiary subject can exist independent of the event ‘want money’ as illustrated in (90b) in § 3.2.1. Thus, in Table 9 the verb *lag-* ‘want’ is shown having the property of independent existence.

The analysis of the AS data shows that nominative subjects are basically agentive and dative subjects are non-agentive. From the discussion, it appears that we cannot have two distinct verbal categories of stative and dynamic that assigns dative and nominative case, respectively. The verbal categories are dynamic non-volitional, mental states that assign dative case to the subject. In other words, dative predicates belong to the in between position of the two extreme categories of dynamic and stative. This is illustrated in the hierarchy of the subject as per agentivity in figure 25. The nominative subject occurs with dynamic volitional action and has the proto-agent properties. Unlike nominative subjects, the dative subjects with the thematic role of experiencer do not have control over the action. Nevertheless, their involvement in the action or the experience can be shown as a degree of continuum between dynamic non-volitional followed by mental state and finally physical state.

![Figure 25](image-url)  
**Figure 25** Thematic hierarchy of dative subjects in AS
3.3. Genitive subjects

In the language, the subject takes the genitive case marker ‘–r and kɛr’, in case of predicates like ahe ‘have’ that implies possession or ‘to possess’. The implication can be of both concrete and abstract possession. Consider example (103a-b).

103.(a) Ṽ-ker bahọŋ saŋti ahe
       3SG-GEN many friend have.PRES
       ‘He has many friends.’

(b) Ṽ-ker bahọŋ sahəs ahe
       3SG-GEN much courage have.PRES
       ‘He has much courage.’

In (103a-b) the subjects take the genitive case marker –ker and occur with the verb ahe ‘have.PRES’ indicating concrete possession as saŋti ‘friend’ in (103a), and abstract possession as sahəs ‘courage’ in (103b). The genitive case marker kɛr is free morpheme when it occurs with the nominal but is affixed with pronominal.

3.3.1. Stative vs dynamic

The genitive case –r can also have non-possessive implication. These genitive subjects with the non-possessive implication mostly occur with stative verbs expressing mental state of ‘desire’ or ‘intention’. The dynamic counterparts of these verbs take the nominative case. This is illustrated in the following sub sections.

15 The genitive marker is –r in case of 1st and 2nd person singular pronominal as in mɔ-r and ʊo-r. kɛr is suffixed to the plural pronominals and 3rd person singular pronominal like hamni-ker
    tuhni-ker, Ṽ-ker and uman-ker
16 The verb ahe implying ‘have/exist’ takes the 3rd person agreement marker whereas, the attributive copula ah- agrees to the subject in person and number. Thus, where it has the former implication it has been shown as ahe and with the latter implication it is shown in the root form ah- (Dey, Barbora, 2012).
3.3.1.1. Verbs expressing mental state, desire or intension.

The genitive subject can occur with verbs expressing mental states like desire, liking or intension. The dynamic counterparts of these verbs take a nominative subject.

104. (a) ʊ bahuţ parh-aţ h–e
   3SG.NOM much study-PROG AUX.PRES-3SG
   Lit: ‘He is studying a lot.’

   (b) ʊ-ker parh- ek mon ahe
       3SG.GEN study-NF mind have/EXIST.PRES
       Lit: ‘He has mind/interest in studies.’

   (c) ʊ-ker parh- ek mon hɔ–ʃ/kar-aţ h–e
       3SG.GEN study-NF mind happen/do-PROG AUX.PRES
       Lit: ‘His interest in studies is happening /developing.’

       ‘He is developing interest in studies’

In (104a), the dynamic verb parh ‘study’ is in finite form and takes a nominative subject. In (104b) the verb parh-ek ‘study-NF’ is the nominalised form. Such nominalised verb in the language normally takes a genitive subject. Here, the N+V conjunct mon ahe ‘mind have/exist’ takes the genitive subject implying mental state of ‘desire’. It is noteworthy that the finite verb is not restricted to a stative meaning, as is evident in (104c). In (104c) genitive subject occurs with the progressive aspect of the mental state ‘desire’, where in place of ahe, verbs like hɔ–‘become/happen’ and kar ‘do’ are used. Unlike (103a-b) in § 3.3, example in (104b) do not have a possessive implication, though occurs with the verb ahe ‘have/exist’. One apparent similarity between the object in (103b) and (104b) is that both may be considered as abstract possessions. However, the reason behind regarding both as different is that mon ahe ‘mind have/exist’ can be treated as an N+V conjunct denoting ‘wish’ a mental state. In (103b), sahɔs ahe ‘courage have.PRES’ can not be taken as an N+V conjunct. However, sahɔs kar ‘courage
do.PRES’ can be considered as N+V conjunct, meaning ‘dare’, which normally occurs with nominative subject.

### 3.3.1.2. Verbs expressing physical ailment

Verbs expressing ‘physical ailment’ can have genitive subject as in (105). The physical ailment usually refers to the physical state of the subject argument.

105.(a) mɔ-r bimar lag–ɛ
   I-GEN ailment COP-PRES-3SG
   ‘I am ill.’

(b) mɔ-r bimar hɔ-i h–ɛ
   I-GEN ailment happen-PERF AUX-PRES-3SG
   Lit: ‘To me ailment has happened.’
   ‘I have ailment.’

(c) mɔ-r bimar hɔ-f h–ɛ
   I-GEN ailment happen-PROG AUX-PRES-3SG
   Lit: ‘To me ailment is happening.’
   ‘I am suffering from/having ailment’

In (105a-c), the subjects take the genitive case marker -r and have the semantic role of experiencer, undergoing physical ailments like ‘ailment’. The subject takes genitive case with the equative copula lag- (105a) indicating bimar ‘ailment’ as a state. Whereas, with perfective aspect of verb hɔ ‘happen’ in (105b), and with progressive aspect of hɔ ‘happen’ in (105c), it denotes an event.

### 3.3.2. Volitional vs non-volitional

The genitive subjects in AS occur normally with non-volitional actions whereas, the volitional counterparts of these actions take nominative case. The notion of volitional act and non-volitional act is illustrated with the use of light verbs or auxiliaries kar ‘do’ and hɔ- ‘become’. The former denotes ‘activity’ in (106a) and the latter denotes ‘achievement’ and ‘event’ in (106b) and (106c), respectively.
106. (a) $mɔi$ $s\text{-}kɛr$ $s\text{ay}$ $bheτ$ $kɛr\text{-}l\text{-}õ$
I.NOM 3SG-GEN ASSO meet do-PAST-1SG
Lit: ‘I met with him.’
‘I met him.’

(b) $mɔ\text{-}r$ $s\text{ay}$ $bheτ$ $hɔ\text{-}l\text{-}ak$
I-GEN 3SG-GEN ASSO meet happen-PAST-3SG
Lit: ‘My with him meeting happened.’
‘I happened to meet him.’

(c) $mɔ\text{-}r$ $s\text{ay}$ $bheτ$ $hɔ\text{-}l\text{-}ak$ $h\text{-}ɛ$
I-GEN 3SG-GEN ASSO meet happen-PROG AUX.PRES-3SG
Lit: ‘My with him meeting is happening.’
‘I happen to meet him.’

In (106b), the perfective aspect of $hɔ$ ‘happen’ implies achievement or event, while in (106c), the progressive aspect gives a habitual reading. Like (106a), in (107a), we find that the dynamic volitional action denoted by the auxiliary $kɛr$ ‘do’ assigns a nominative. Whereas, the non-volitional action/event denoted by the verb $hɔ$- ‘happen’, both in perfective (107b) and progressive aspect (107c), bears a genitive subject.

107.(a) $mɔi$ $dɛr$ $kɛr\text{-}l\text{-}õ$
I.NOM late do-PAST-1SG
Lit: ‘I did late.’
‘I delayed’

(b) $mɔ\text{-}r$ $dɛr$ $hɔ\text{-}l\text{-}ak$
I-GEN late happen-PAST-3SG
Lit: ‘My late has happened
‘I was late.’
In (106a) and (107a), the auxiliary verb kar ‘do’ assigns nominative subjects, in the thematic role of agent. The action of bhɛ kar ‘meet do’ and der kar ‘late do’ refer to volitional acts, where the subjects have control over the action. On the other hand, in (106b-c) and (107b-c), the actions indicated by the light verb hɔ- ‘happen’ are non-volitional acts, indicating the subjects’ lack of control over the action. The predicate hɔ- ‘happen’ takes a genitive subject in the semantic role of beneficiary.

3.3.3. Syntactic properties of genitive subjects

In (108-109), the reflexive nidɛ ‘self’ can have the genitive subjects as antecedents and are, therefore, co-indexed. The reflexives occur after the subject and take the genitive case marker –r.

108. mɔ-r  der  hɔ-t  h–ɛ
   I.GEN  late  happen-PROG  AUX.PRES-3SG
  Lit: ‘My late is happening.’
  ‘I am getting late.’

109. mɔ-r  niʤɛ-r  bahɔt  sahɔs  ahe
   I.GEN  self-GEN  much  courage  have.PRES
  Lit: ‘He himself has much courage.’

110. *mɔr  [_. sahɔs  ah–ek]  khodɔ-t  h–ɛ
    I GEN  courage have-NF  want-PROG  AUX.PRES-3SG

There are, however, some exceptions to this general rule. For instance, in (104b), in section § 3.3.1.1 repeated here as (111), the predicate ‘desire or liking’
indicating mental action, the genitive subjects control the deletion of co-referential NP. The same is true for predicate lag- ‘want’ as in (112). Interestingly enough, with equative copula lag- genitive subject, again fails to undergo deletion of co-referential NP (112).

111. ṭerk i [ tether ek]  mon ahe
    3SG-GEN study-NF mind have/EXIST.PRES

    ‘He wishes to study.’

112. mɔ r  [ bimar hɔ ek] ni lag-f*lag-e
    I-GEN illness happen-NF NEG want/COP.PRES-3SG

    Lit: ‘To me I do not want illness to happen.’

In AS, the genitive subject does not control participial clauses with stative verbs ahe ‘have.PRES’ but, with predicates implying desire and physical ailment, it undergoes the controlled participial clause test.

113. [* i ba mɔir ke] ṭer k i dher daĩva ahe
    father die CP 3SG-GEN much responsibility have.PRES

114. [ i sahɔr dʒai ke] mɔ r  parh-ek mon ahe
    town go CP 1SG-GEN study-NF mind have/EXIST.PRES

    ‘After going to town, I would like to study.’

115. [ i baris me bhidʒ ke] mɔ r  bimar
    rain POSP wet CP 1SG-GEN illness
    hɔ l-ak/ *lag-e

    happen-PAST-3SG/ *COP.PRES-3SG

    ‘Having drenched in the rain, I became ill.’

In (115), the genitive subject of the predicate daĩva ahe ‘responsibility have.PRES’, with the thematic role of a possessor, does not control the participial clause. This is evident in the ungrammaticality of the construction. While, the genitive subjects of mon ahe ‘mind have-PRES’ in (114), and bimar hɔ l-ak
‘illness happen-PAST-3SG’ in (115), having the thematic role of experiencer, control the participial clause. In (115), the genitive subject cannot control participial clause with equative copula lag- illustrated in its ungrammaticality.

3.3.4. Aspectual properties of the verbs that take genitive subject

Analysis of the verbs that take genitive subjects in AS, shows that, the nature of predicates cannot be divided into two distinct categories of stative and dynamic. The predicates can occur as state and also in progression. In order to reveal the aspectual properties of these predicates, I have conducted the test of atelicity and telicity with the phrase  ek ghanta se/ me ‘since/in an hour’, respectively.

3.3.4.1. The use of the phrase ek ghanta se/ me ‘since /in an hour’

The telicity test of the genitive predicates shows that they are essentially stative in nature hence, cannot occur with the  ek ghanta se/ me phrase. This is evident in the ungrammatical construction in (116).

116. *ə-ker  ek ghanta se/ me  bah̠e̠g  sah̠a̠s  ahe 3SG-GEN  since /in an hour  much  courage  have.PRES

The predicate mon ahe denotes state, which is evident from its incompatibility with the phrase ‘since/in an hour’. Whereas, the progressive aspect of the same verb can occur with  ek ghanta se, suggesting its durative nature.

117.(a) *ə-ker  ek ghanta se/ me  parh- ek  mon  ahe 3SG-GEN  since /in an hour  study-NF  mind  have/EXIST.PRES

(b) ō-ker  ek ghanta se/*me  parh-  ek  mon  h-ə/kar-qə 3SG-GEN  since /in an hour  study-NF  mind  happen/do-PROG  

AUX.PRES-3SG

‘He is developing interest in studies since /*in an hour.’
The predicate *bimar lag-*‘ailment COP.PRES-3SG’ indicates state, and as a result, do not occur with the phrase *ek ghanta se* (118a). However, predicate *bimar hɔ-i h-e* and *hɔ-t h-e* can occur with the phrase *ek ghanta se* suggesting the state to be durative (118b).

118. (a) *mɔ-r*  
I-GEN  
*ek ghanta se/* me  
ailment  
COP.PRES-3SG  

(b) *mɔ-r*  
I-GEN  
*ek ghanta se/* me  
ailment/cold  
happen-PROG  

AUX-PRES-3SG  
‘I happened to be ill since /*in an hour.’

Again, predicates expressing an event, both in perfective (119a) and progressive aspect (119b) do not occur with the phrase ‘for/in an hour.’

119. (a) *mɔ-r*  
I-GEN  
*ek ghanta se/* me  
3SG-GEN ASSO meet  
happen-PAST-3SG  

(b) *mɔ-r*  
I-GEN  
*ek ghanta se/* me  
3SG-GEN ASSO meet  
happen-PROG  

AUX-PRES-3SG  

3.3.4.2. The use of adverb *ʤan budʃ ke* ‘deliberately’

The volitionality test of the genitive predicates shows that they are incompatible with an adverb like *ʤan budʃ ke* ‘deliberately’. This is evident in the ungrammaticality of (120-123).

120. *ʤɔ-ker*  
3SG-GEN  
deliberately  
much courage  
have.PRES
The analysis shows that genitive subjects, with possessive and non-possessive implication, do not have the property of volitionality. An important point to note is that the predicate mon ahe ‘desire’, indicating mental state, is ungrammatical with the adverb ḍan budʒ kẽ ‘deliberately’ as shown in (124a). On the other hand, the progressive aspect of the state mon kar ‘desire do’ can occur with ḍan budʒ kẽ in negative construction (124b). Here, it denotes the subject’s lack of interest as some deliberate action.

Lit: ‘He deliberately does not intend to study’.
3.3.5. Proto-properties of genitive subjects

The proto-entailment of the predicates that take genitive subjects in AS is illustrated in Table 10. Semantically, the genitive subject occurs with non-volitional predicates. They can be both possessor and experiencer. As far the independent existence of genitive subject is concerned, the distinction can be made between concrete and abstract possession. In concrete possession, the possessor exists independent of the possession whereas, in inalienable possessions like sahas ‘courage’, the subject co-exist with the possession.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Proto-properties of the verbs (Genitive case)</th>
<th>Volitional /causation</th>
<th>Sentience</th>
<th>Change of state</th>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Independent existence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ahe</td>
<td>‘have’</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>CONCRETE /*ABSTRACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mon ahe</td>
<td>‘desire’</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bimar lag</td>
<td>‘illness happen’</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>der hɔ</td>
<td>‘Late happen’</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhet hɔ</td>
<td>Meet ‘happen’</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bimar hɔ</td>
<td>Illness happen</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>PHYSICAL</td>
<td>TEMPORAL</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mon kar/ hɔ</td>
<td>Desire do/happen</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES/NO</td>
<td>MENTAL</td>
<td>TEMPORAL</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of the AS data shows that predicates, expressing progressive state, can be durative in nature and, thus, are grammatically possible with an atelic entity. This is exemplified with mon kar ‘desire do’ in (117b) and bimar hɔ ‘illness happen’ (118b), in § 3.3.4.1. As per Dowty (1991), movement is an important proto-agent property. In case of genitive subject of the bimar hɔ- (117b) and mon kar (118b), a temporal movement is evident with the use of the for-phrase ek ghanta se. Thus, in Table 10, ahe ‘have’ has the property of independent existence, bimar hɔ has the property of change of mental state and movement. However, mon
kar/ hɔ has three proto-agent properties to its credit, that of change of mental state, movement and sentience.

To sum up, it can be said that the predicates that are essentially stative, do not have the proto-agent properties like volition, causation, movement and independent existence. Whereas, the predicates that can appear in progressive aspect can have some of the proto-agent properties like causing change of mental state, and sentience. The analysis of the predicates shows that, involvement or participation of genitive subjects in the action can be seen as a continuum between agent and patient roles. This is schematised in figure 26.

More Agentive  More Patientlike

Dynamic mental state > physical state > event > state / possession

Figure 26 Thematic hierarchy of genitive subjects in AS

From the analysis of the genitive subjects, it comes out that the predicates indicating dynamic mental states ensures more involvement of the subject followed by predicates denoting physical states, events and finally states or possessions.

3.4. Locative subjects

Locative subjects indicate abstract location of the property and is associated with the notion of space. In AS, the locative postpositions are ṕre and me. These subjects mostly have the semantic role of goal or possessor.

125. mɔ-r ṕre ḏer daɪva ah-ɛ
   I-GEN LOC many responsibilities EXIST-PRES-3SG
   ‘There are many responsibilities upon me.’

126. ɵ-ker me bahuṭ sakti ah-ɛ
   He-GEN LOC much strength EXIST-PRES-3SG
   ‘There is much strength in him.’
In (125-126), we find that the subject NPs takes compound post-positions as case markers. That is, genitive -r is the base followed by the locative postposition upre and me.

### 3.4.1. Syntactic properties of locative subjects

In AS, locative subjects control reflexivisation (127) and deletion of co-referential NP (128). However, they do not control participial clause.

127. ṣ-keri, me nṣe, bahṣa sakṣi ah-e
   3SG-GEN LOC self much courage EXIST.PRES.3SG
   Lit: ‘In himself there is much courage in him.’

In (127) the locative subjects can be the antecedents of the reflexives nṣe ‘self’.

128. mɔ-r me, dher [i, kam kar-ek] samṭa ah-e
   I-GEN LOC much work do-NF capability EXIST.PRES.3SG
   Lit: ‘There is much capability in me to work.’

In (128), the locative subjects control deletion of co-referential NP and are, therefore co-indexed.

129. *[i, likh-a porh-a kɔir ke] ṣ-ker me, bes
   write-NZ read-NZ do CP 3SG-GEN LOC much
   boddhi hɔ-1-ak/ah-e
   intelligence happen-PAST-3SG/ exist.PRES.3SG

In (129), the locative subject does not control participial clause in case of both hɔ- ‘happen’ and ah– ‘exist’, as is evident in the ungrammaticality of the construction.

### 3.4.2. Aspectual properties of the verbs that take locative subject

The analysis of locative subjects in §3.4.1 discusses the syntactic properties of subjecthood. In this section, I have looked into the aspectual properties of the
locative predicates that will determine whether, locative subject asserts any control over the action or not.

### 3.4.2.1. The use of the phrase  

The predicates that take locative subjects are mostly the copula *ah* in its existential function. Hence, it mainly refers to the abstract or concrete locations.

130.(a) $m\omega-r \; \varepsilon\rho\varepsilon \; ek \; ghanta \; s/e/me \; dher \; da\tilde{i}va \; ah-\varepsilon$

I-GEN LOC since/in an hour many responsibility EXIST.PRES-3SG

Lit: ‘There are lots of responsibilities on me since /*in an hour.’

(b) $*\sigma-ker \; me \; ek \; ghanta \; s/e/me \; bah\tilde{u}ṭ \; sak\tilde{t}i \; ah-\varepsilon$

I-GEN LOC since/in an hour much strength EXIST.PRES-3SG

In (130a-b), both the predicates refer to location abstract entities like *da\tilde{i}va* ‘responsibility’ and *sak\tilde{t}i* ‘strength’. It is remarkable to note that the former is compatible with the *ek ghanta se* phrase whereas, the latter is incompatible with both *ek ghanta se* and *me* phrase. The reason behind such a selection could be that *da\tilde{i}va* is relatively a less permanent attribute than *sak\tilde{t}i*, and is accordingly less stative.

### 3.4.2.2. The use of adverb *d\tilde{a}n bud\tilde{y} k\varepsilon* ‘deliberately’

In AS, the existential *ahe* do not occur with the phrase *d\tilde{a}n bud\tilde{y} k\varepsilon* ‘deliberately’, and thus, locative subject assigned by this predicate exerts no control. This is illustrated in the ungrammatical constructions in (131a-b).

131.(a) $*m\omega-r \; \varepsilon\rho\varepsilon \; d\tilde{a}n \; bud\tilde{y} k\varepsilon \; k\varepsilon \; dher \; da\tilde{i}va \; ah-\varepsilon$

I-GEN LOC deliberately many responsibility EXIST.PRES-3SG

(b) $*\sigma-ker \; me \; d\tilde{a}n \; bud\tilde{y} k\varepsilon \; k\varepsilon \; bah\tilde{u}ṭ \; sak\tilde{t}i \; ah-\varepsilon$

I-GEN LOC deliberately much strength EXIST.PRES-3SG

Locative subjects have the syntactic subject properties, although semantically, the predicates do not denote the proto-agent properties like volitional, sentience,
causation and independent existence to them. Locative subjects do not entail the property independent existence because they refer to location of inherent property, which is inalienable from the entity.

3.5. Thematic hierarchy of the subjects in AS

In argument selection, as Dowty (1991:578) states, ‘not only strong agent outranks strong patients, but both instruments and experiencers outrank any relatively patient like argument for subjecthood. Agent is volition + causation + sentence + movement or in some usage just volition + causation or just volition’ (Dowty 1979, 1991). As per the properties of proto-agent proposed by Dowty (1991), in AS (see Table 11), the nominative subject can be considered as the proto-agent as they have the properties like volition, sentience (deliberate perception) and cause change of state. They have an independent existence, in the sense, cannot be created or destroyed by the event named by the verb. The nominative subjects can have both proto-agent and non proto-agent role depending upon the nature of the verb. The experiencer nominative subjects are actors in the action, but their control over the action is less compared to that of the proto-agent.

In AS, the experiencer subjects are not proto-agents, but they do not belong to proto-patients either, as their involvement in the experience can be considered different from that of the patients who are affected arguments. Experiencers are neither volitional actor nor are they totally affected by the action named by the verb. Thus, they occur in between the proto-agent and proto-patient roles in the thematic hierarchy. In AS, we find that, the occurrence of dative and genitive subject case depends on volitional and non-volition verb types. Analysis of the AS data shows that the verbs indicating voluntary act have a nominative subject. Whereas, verbs indicating non-volition have dative or genitive subjects. Non-volitional verbs like psych verbs feel, need, remember, physical/mental states, inherent properties and the use of light verbs aā ‘come’ dغا ‘go’ hɔ- ‘happen’ take non-nominative subjects. The arguments in the subject position in AS show the degree of control as a continuum between proto-agent and proto-patient. The
difference in the semantic roles of those arguments with nominative and those with
dative or genitive case can be seen in a continuum between dynamic and stative
predicates. The dynamic verbs imply more agentive and stative verbs have the
tendency to take less agentive. This is illustrated in Table 11.

Table 11 The degree of control of subject arguments in AS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implication of the Predicates</th>
<th>Dynamic</th>
<th>Static</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>Dat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volition</td>
<td>Non-volitional</td>
<td>Non-volitional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deliberation</td>
<td>Obligation, Necessity</td>
<td>Desire/intension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intension</td>
<td>Psche verbs</td>
<td>Perception verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicate Types</td>
<td>Physical states</td>
<td>Mental states</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 shows the different predicate types and their implications that take
either nominative or non-nominative subjects case. The predicates that imply
volition, deliberation and intension, as shown in the list of verbs, take a nominative
subject with the thematic role of proto-agent. Whereas, the dative and genitive
subjects come next to the nominative as per degree of control over action. The dative subject that occurs with the list of predicates can be either a beneficiary or an experiencer. The genitive subject can be a possessor and also an experiencer depending upon the verb types. The locative subjects are not associated with the notion of control or involvement. They rather take the role of goal, and hence, occur next to the patient role. The proto-patient role is normally the object argument, which has not been dealt in this chapter. Hence, in Table 11, the cell indicating the object case below the proto-patient has been shown in a different shade.

Table 12 below gives the case hierarchy of the argument in the subject position, where nominative outranks the non-nominative. The mapping of the case and thematic role in AS can be schematized as given in Table 12.

Table 12 The mapping of the case and thematic hierarchy in AS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic Hierarchy</th>
<th>Case Hierarchy</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
<th>Experiencer</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Possessor</th>
<th>Patient</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 12, agent outranks the non-agentive thematic roles, like beneficiary experiencer, theme and possessor. Again, the case hierarchy shows that nominative is higher than the non-nominatives. The thematic roles assumed by each case features in the subject position is given in initials, A=agent, B=beneficiary, E=experiencer, T=theme, P=possessor and G=goal. The thematic hierarchy in AS is derived on the basis of the verbal properties which show that the degree of agentivity in subjects is a continuum between dynamic and stative.
Degree of agentivity

\begin{align*}
\text{Agents} & \quad \overset{>}{\longrightarrow} \quad \text{Non-agents} \\
\text{Dynamic} & \quad \longleftrightarrow \quad \text{Stative}
\end{align*}

\textbf{Figure 27} Degree of agentivity in AS

3.6. Conclusion

In AS nominative subjects can have the thematic roles of agent, experiencer and that of themes. Dative subjects can assume the role of experiencer and beneficiary. Genitive subjects, again, can have the thematic role of experiencer and possessor. In AS, there is no one to one correspondence between case marking and thematic roles. Nevertheless, if we consider the role of the predicates in assigning the thematic roles to these case marked arguments, we can definitely form a pattern. The predicates can be arranged in a hierarchy, where the dynamic outranks the non-dynamics. The analysis of the AS data brings forth the observation that there is no definite demarcation between dynamic and stative; instead, they are broken down into further categories showing the degree of control as a continuum between these verb types. The continuum of the predicate types runs parallel with the continuum of the arguments types. The different case marked arguments, namely nominative, dative and genitive can also be placed in a continuum between the proto-agent and proto-patient. Locative subjects indicate abstract location, having the semantic role goal and thus occurs after the patient role in the thematic hierarchy. Besides, each subject case when analysed separately reveals a number of sub-hierarchies. Each of the hierarchies shown in figure 24 in § 3.1, figure 25 in §3.2.6 and figure 26 in § 3.3.5, eventually follow the same pattern.