Chapter -4
Theta Theory
and Case Theory
4.0 Relation Between Theta Theory and Case Theory

In chapter 2, we have discussed how theta roles are assigned to arguments based on the nature of a predicate. In chapter 3, we have discussed sentences which do not have all the arguments overtly mentioned that their predicates normally need; it is because the covert argument is either a member of the empty category (e.g. trace, pro or PRO) or it is θ-absorbed. In this chapter, we are going to discuss how the case theory helps the arguments in the derivation of a grammatical sentence. The assignment of theta-roles to the required number of argument is not enough to produce a well-formed sentence because all lexically realized NPs need Case. It is Case which represents the grammatical relationship between a verb and its arguments. The case theory works as a complement of the theta-theory to regulate a syntactic structure. The theta-theory accounts for the selection of arguments for a predicate and assign them theta roles and the case theory accounts for the distribution of overt NPs such that they are assigned proper case.

In the Minimalist Program case is not assigned but checked. It is so because all the functional elements (e.g. case markers, tense and Agr features) are already present when a constituent is spelt out. However, we must check whether a case feature attached to an NP is justified in being where it is under proper grammatical condition posed by the case theory. For instance, the verb *hit* needs two arguments, which must have the θ-roles of agent and patient, which are realized as subject and object.
respectively and are assigned nominative and accusative case respectively. The case theory checks where Agrs and Agr0 are there in proper configurations as governors to assign these cases. In short, knowing the thematic structure of a given verb is akin to knowing everything that is there to know about the sort of construction where this verb can appear. For instance: *hit* will appear in a basic syntactic structure <Subject, Verb, Object>. In configural languages, the ordering of the elements in a syntactic structure depends on the way in which case features can be checked. The case is realized in languages either morphologically or syntactically by adding preposition or postposition to the NPs. Though θ-roles are language universal phenomena, the case is parameterized according to the case features needed in a specific type of language. They differ in their domain. For example, the θ- grid of the verb *ma:rna:* ‘to hit’ is:

1a. *ma:rna:* ‘to hit’: <Agent, Patient>: θ-roles

which will normally have the cases, as in (1b):

b. <nominative, accusative>

It is the lexical property of the verb that provides the information regarding the types of θ-roles of the arguments. This lexical information is projected via structural relation, which is established by the functional categories, such as tense, aspect, agreement and also case. θ-roles are not checked\(^{49}\); they do not license movement as they only account for the semantic relation between a predicate and its arguments whereas case and agreement can be checked in their functional domains VP and PP or PoP. A sentence is well-formed if it has all the required number of arguments.

---

\(^{49}\) Faneslow (2001) argues that the θ-roles of argument DP\(_k\) can be checked through θ- features between the argument DP\(_k\) and certain kinds of head. We have not followed his suggestions.
with the right type of case and agreement features. The case features have their structural requirement, i.e. the government and adjacency conditions. The government requirement says that the governor and governed should be under the same maximal projection in order to assign case whereas adjacency requirement emphasizes that the case assigner and the element to which case is assigned should be adjacent. The *Case Filter*, the basic component of case theory, emphasizes that every lexically realized NP must be assigned a case. If a lexical NP is in a caseless position, the case filter forces it to move to position in which a proper case is assigned. The verb (V) assigns case to the NP which is adjacent to it because they are under the same maximal projection, i.e. VP but [NP V] cannot assign case to the Spec NP of VP; it has to be adjacent to AGRs in order to get the nominative case\(^{50}\).

We may illustrate the points with the following examples.

2a. Asma kutte ko ma:\_r\_i: hai

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Asma} & \text{dog} & \text{beat} & \text{53 fem. Sg. PR} \\
\text{agent} & \text{theme} & \text{NOM} & \text{ACC} \\
\end{array}
\]

\(^{50}\) Lasnik (1999: 25-29) claims that accusative case is also a spec-head relation, i.e., for checking the accusative case V moves to Agr, and object NP moves to the spec of the Agr,P.
In (2b), the accusative case is assigned to the NP *kutta*: ‘dog’ which is adjacent to the verb i.e. *ma:rti: hai* ‘beats’. We may note that both the governor (V) and governed NP *kutte ko* are under the maximal projection of VP. The NP *kutta*: ‘dog’ is a complement to the verb *ma:rti: hai* ‘beats’ to which the θ-role of patient is already assigned. The verb assigns
the accusative case to *kutte ko*. It has already assigned the θ-role of agent to its specifier *Asma* but it cannot assign the nominative case to it. For this reason, the specifier *Asma* has to move to the AGRs, i.e., the head of the AGRsP for the subject agreement, as in (2c).
In (2c), the tense marker *hai* ‘is’ starts out as T but then moves up to AGRs, the head of AGRsP, for the purpose of subject agreement. The specifier of VP i.e. *Asma* is successively raised to the specifier of AGRsP where the *agrs* assigns the nominative case to it. So *Asma* is correctly analysed as a nominative subject which shows verbal agreement. The object *kutte ko* ‘dog’ does not have to move because it has already been assigned the accusative case by the verb. It is complement to the verb
ma:rti: hai ‘beats’, when it is the head of the VP ma:rti: hai ‘beats’. Under the Minimalist Program this movement takes place at LF\(^5\)

Urdu is a language with a fairly rich case-marking system and has few positional constraints whereas English has only a little verbal morphology and relies on positional clue. However, if there is no case assigner, the case cannot be checked and configuration is ill-formed both in Urdu and English. For instance:

\[
\begin{align*}
3a. & \quad \text{ye Tren} \quad \text{dehli: se kolka:ta: ja:ti: hai} \\
& \quad \text{this train} \quad \text{Delhi from Kolkata: go -3 fem. sg. PR} \\
& \quad \text{theme} \quad \text{source} \quad \text{goal} \\
& \quad \text{NOM} \quad \text{ABL} \quad \text{DAT} \\
& \quad \text{‘This train goes from Delhi to Kolkata.’} \\
& \quad \text{theme} \quad \text{source} \quad \text{goal} \\
& \quad \text{NOM} \quad \text{ABL} \quad \text{DAT} \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
b. & \quad \text{*ye Tren} \quad \text{dehli: kolka:ta: ja:ti: hai} \\
& \quad \text{this train} \quad \text{Kolkata: go -3 fem. sg. PR} \\
& \quad \text{theme} \quad \text{source} \quad \text{goal} \\
& \quad \text{NOM} \quad \text{ABL} \quad \text{DAT} \\
& \quad \text{‘*This train goes Delhi to Kolkata.’} \\
& \quad \text{theme} \quad \text{source} \quad \text{goal} \\
& \quad \text{NOM} \quad \text{ABL} \quad \text{DAT} \\
\end{align*}
\]

(3a) and its English counterpart are well-formed but in (3b) both Urdu and its English counterpart are bad even though they have all three arguments <Theme, Source, Goal>. It is because there is no case assigner to the NP dehli: ‘Delhi’ either in Urdu or in English in (3b).

\(^5\) The tree diagrams (2b) and (2c) are gross representation of the data. Since our focus is on the thematic structure and what happens to the members of the structure (i.e. NP, with θ-roles) when case is assigned, we have not gone into the relative merits of case-assignment vs case-checking.

\(^5\) Unless, Delhi has – se in Urdu and from in English, the ablative case marker in these languages, the sentence cannot be well-formed.
A sentence may not be grammatical only because all the required number of cases and case assigners are available; the features of case and case assigner must match. The mismatch of features cancels the derivation. For instance, the absolutive case feature mismatches the nominative case assigner and such a configuration with mismatched features is not a legitimate syntactic structure, as is clear from (4b).

(4a) is well-formed in the sense that all the requirements are met in order to make it acceptable. The sentence has the correct cases assigned to both the NP But (4b) and its English counterpart are bad because the feature of \textit{maĩ} in Urdu and ‘I’ in English need nominative case but the verb \textit{ma:f} \textit{kar deta: hai} ‘to forgives’ can assign only the accusative case. The derivation crashes because the case assigner cancels the nominative form of the NP \textit{maĩ}. In short, the derivation may crash if (a) either a case is missing (b) or a wrong case has been assigned.

It is plausible to say that there is an interaction between the case theory and movement but not between θ-theory and movement. It is so because the assignment of a θ-role is a property of the predicate and all θ-roles are
assigned prior to movement. An argument moves from θ-position to the position where it can get a case, in case it is in a position where there is no case assigner. For instance:

5a. John seems to be clever.

b. ___seems [John to be clever.]

c. John, seems [t; to be clever].

In (5b) John is an argument in the embedded clause, but it moves to the subject position of the verb seem in (5c) because it cannot get case from the infinitive in the embedded clause as the Infinitive is tenseless and cannot assign case to the NP. If we compare the Urdu equivalent of (5a,b), we get (6a) respectively.

6a. [___John ča:la:k] lagta: hai.]

John clever seem 3 mas. sg. PR
agent
NOM

‘John seems to be clever’

It seems that the structural pattern of (6a) is different from that of (5a). In (5a), t i.e. the trace or copy of John is the subject of the embedded clause whereas in (6a) John is the subject of the small clause which is embedded in the main clause. There is a similarity between the English and Urdu structures in the sense that in both the embedded clause is the theme. The exact equivalent of (5a) is (6b), which is ungrammatical in Urdu.

6b. *[John ča:la:k hona:] lagta: hai

John clever be seem – 3 mas. sg. PR
agent

In short, Urdu does not permit an embedded clause with an infinitive in such a configuration. We may now look at (6c) which is an exact equivalent of (5d).

5d. It seems [that [John is clever]]
6c. aisa: lagta: hai \([\text{CP ke [IP John ča:la:k hai.]}]\)
   It seem–3 sg. PR that John clever is
\(\varphi\) theme
NOM

In both the sentences the embedded clause has a finite verb, the
inflectional feature of which (i.e. AGRs / T) assigns the nominative case
to the subject. Since Urdu is a pro-drop language, (6c) can be expressed
as (6d) but (5e), its English equivalent, is ill-formed because the sentence
has no subject.

5e. *__ seems [that[ John is clever.]]

6d. pro lagta: hai \([\text{CP ke [John ča:la:k hai.]}]\)

As noted above, Urdu is a pro-drop language, lagna: ‘seem’ type verbs
need not take an expletive subject, such as aisa: ‘such’, ye ‘it’. As
English is not a pro-drop language, it must have an overt subject in every
sentence with a finite verb. Such a subject will obviously be in the
nominative case but it will be without a \(\theta\)-role if it is an expletive.
Another difference is that English is a uniformly nominative – accusative
language whereas Urdu presents a “split ergative-absolutive”\(^{53}\) phenomenon. In other words, in some cases, when the verb is not perfective and transitive, it works like English i.e. like a nominative-accusative language, as is obvious from (2a, 3a, 4a) but in some cases, when it is like an ergative-absolutive language, the AGRo assigns the absolutive case to the object NP and the subject NP gets the ergative case, as is clear from (7).

\[
\begin{array}{lllll}
7a. & \text{Asad} & \text{ne} & \text{Habeeb} & \text{ko kita:b} & \text{di:} \\
& \text{Asad} & \text{Habeeb} & \text{book-3 fem.sg.} & \text{give-PERF 3 fem. sg.} \\
& \text{agent} & \text{beneficiary} & \text{theme} & \\
& \text{ERG} & \text{ABS} & \text{ACC} & \\
& \text{‘Asad gave a book to Habeeb.’} \\
& \text{agent} & \text{theme} & \text{patient} & \\
& \text{NOM} & \text{ACC} & \text{DAT} & \\
\end{array}
\]

\(^{53}\) In a nominative-accusative language, the subject of the transitive verb is expressed the same way as that of an intransitive verb. For instance, both are zero-marked in so far as their case is concerned, as in (i) and (ii).

i. John broke the glass.

ii. The glass broke.

Urdu works the same way (i.e., like a nominative-accusative language), so long as the verb is in the imperfective present, future or past tense, as in (iii) and (iv).

iii. Asad patthar toRta: hai.

iv. patthar Tu:Tta: hai.

In an ergative-absolutive language, the transitive object is expressed the same way as the intransitive subject. The case-marking associated with them is “zero”-marked.\(^{53}\) (see Croft 1990: 102-105). The subject of a transitive Urdu verb in the perfective form takes an ergative marker ne but the transitive object is expressed the same way as the intransitive subject, i.e. both are zero marked. Since compared to a typical ergative-absolutive languages such as Basque or Greenlandic Eskimo, Urdu is not uniformly ergative-absolutive, it is called a split-ergative language.
In (7a), the subject takes an ergative case marker and there is agreement between verb and object\textsuperscript{54}. The case marker *ko* assigns the dative case to the NP *Habeeb* and *to* assigns dative case to *Habeeb* in Urdu and English respectively. The postposition *ko* is the head of the PoP *Habeeb ko* and *to* is the head of the PP *to Habeeb*, as it is clear from (7b). Hence, the relation between *ko* and *Habeeb* is the same as between *to* and *Habeeb* in English i.e. it is a head-comp relation.

### 4.1 Parallelism Between θ-roles and Cases.

As mentioned earlier, English is a nominative-accusative language, where the nominative case is assigned to the subjects of both intransitive and transitive verbs and the accusative case is assigned to the objects of the transitive verb. However, Urdu has both a nominative-accusative and ergative-absolutive case system under different circumstances\textsuperscript{55}. In the ergative-absolutive case system, the ergative case is assigned to the subject of a transitive verb and the absolutive case is assigned to the

\textsuperscript{54} As has been explained in footnote 5, in an ergative-absolutive language, the direct object is unmarked. The Urdu verb agrees with the subject only when it is unmarked but when it is marked by *ne*, the verb agrees with the unmarked direct object.

\textsuperscript{55} See footnote 5 for details.
object of the transitive. In nominative-accusative pattern, the verb agrees with the subject, whereas in ergative-absolutive pattern the verb agrees with the object of the transitive verb and the subject of the intransitive verb. When both the subject and the object have overt case markings, the verb agrees with neither. In such a situation, it is always third person masculine and singular (i.e., unmarked).

In 4.1, we have seen how NPs with θ-roles receive case and found that there is strong relation between the two. As our topic is the comparison of the languages i.e. Urdu and English, we would like to find out whether an NP with a specific θ-role (e.g., agent) is assigned a specific case (e.g., nominative) uniformly or it is assigned a specific case in one situation and another case in a different situation. The θ-roles which are going to be discussed are agent, theme, experiencer, source, goal, instrument and location.

4.1.1. Agent- The argument that initiates or accomplishes an action is called an agent. The agent NP in Urdu is realized by the nominative case when it occurs in the subject position and the verb agrees with the head of the NP. The agent NP in subject position gets the ergative case when it is marked by ne and the verb is perfective. (8a) and (8b) respectively illustrate the point.

8a. Asma kha:na: paka: rahi: hai
Asma- 3 fem. sg. food cook-PR PROG 3 fem. sg. is
agent theme
NOM ACC

‘Asma is cooking food.’
agent theme
NOM ACC
b. Asma ne kha:na: paka:ya: hai /tha: / hoga:
Asma food cook-PERF has / had / might have
agent theme
ERG ABS
‘Asma has / had / might have cooked food.
agent theme NOM ACC

In both, (8a) and its English counterpart, the agent NP Asma is assigned the nominative case whereas in (8b) the agent NP Asma is assigned the ergative case in Urdu which is marked by ne. The English counterpart of (8b), is assigned a nominative case and is unmarked. The θ-role of agent can be indicated by a PP adjunct if the verb is in the passive form.

The agent NP in subject position is said to have the dative case when it is marked by ko and the verb requires a goal as an argument, as it is clear from (9).

9. Asma ko iskuul ja:na: hai
Asma school go-PRI has
agent goal
DAT LOC
‘Asma has to go to school.
agent goal NOM LOC

In (9), the NP Asma is the agent which is assigned dative case and is marked by ko, whereas the agent Asma in its English counterpart takes nominative case and has no overt case marking.

The agent is also realized by the instrumental case and is marked by se in Urdu. For instance:

10a. Asma se ye ka:m nahi: kiya: gaya:
Asma by this work not do-PERF
agent theme
INST NOM
‘Asma could not do this work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>agent</th>
<th>theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>ACC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(10a) shows that the agent *Asma* is in the instrumental case and is marked by *se*. In English, it is realized by the nominative case. We may note that PoP *Asma se* in Urdu and NP *Asma* in English are structurally different. If we represent the English equivalent of (10a) as (10b) then in English as well, the agent will be a PP adjunct and the preposition *by* will precede the NP agent of the active form.

10b. This work could not be done by Asma.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>theme</th>
<th>agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>INST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In short, when the agent NP occurs in a passive sentence, it is PoP in Urdu and PP in English and is marked for the instrumental case.

4.1.2. Theme- As discussed earlier, the theme is an argument that undergoes a change of state or is affected by an action indicated by the verb. In Urdu, it might correspond either to the nominative case, when the NP in question occurs as the subject of an intransitive, as in (11a) or the accusative case when the NP occurs as the object complement of a transitive verb and the verb is in non-perfective form, as in (11b).

11a. peR\(^{56}\) gir gaya:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tree</th>
<th>fall down-PERF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>theme</td>
<td>NOM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘The tree fell down.’

| theme | NOM |

b. mazdu:r peR ka:T rahe: haĩ.

| labourers tree | cut- PR PROG are |

\(^{56}\) It may be reiterated that the Urdu sentence in (11a) is an example of a nominative-accusative type whereas that in (12), it is of an ergative-absolutive type.
In both (11a) and its English equivalent, the NP peR ‘tree’ is the theme and it is assigned the nominative case; it has no overt case marker. Both in Urdu and English, the theme NP peR ‘tree’ has the accusative case when the sentence has an agent, as is clear from (11b) and its English counterpart.

While following the ergative-absolutive pattern, the theme NP in Urdu takes absolutive case when it occurs as the object complement of transitive verbs, as in (12).

12. Asad ne sabziyã: ka:Ti: haĩ
Asad vegetables- fem. sg cut- PERF fem. sg has
agent theme
ERG ABS

‘Asad has cut the vegetables.’

In (12), the theme argument sabziyã:‘vegetables’ is represented by the absolutive case but in its English counterpart the theme vegetables is assigned the accusative case.

4.1.3. Patient- As mentioned earlier, some linguists treat patient as a special type of theme. The patient argument is an entity which undergoes action. In nominative-accusative pattern, it is realized by nominative case when the patient NP occurs as the subject of an intransitive verb and by an accusative case when occurs as the object complement of the transitive verb. We may look at the following sentence to make the point clear.
13a. Asad mar gaya:
    patient 3 mas. sg die -3 mas. sg PERF
    NOM

‘Asad died.’
    patient
    NOM

b. Anees Asad ko pi:Tta: hai
    Anees-3 mas. sg Asad beat- 3 mas. sg. PR
    agent patient
    NOM ACC

‘Anees beats Asad.’
    agent patient
    NOM ACC

In (13a) and its English equivalent, the patient *Asad* is assigned the nominative case. The patient *Asad* is realized in the accusative case and marked by *ko* in (13b). The patient NP *Asad* has taken an accusative case in its English counterpart as well. In either case, the absolutive has no case marker.

As Urdu has the split ergative-absolutive pattern, the patient argument gets the dative case in (14) as the object complement of a transitive verb and is marked by –*ko*. The verb is neutral / unmarked in regard to agreement. But the patient argument in its English equivalent carries accusative case. The contrast between Urdu and English is clearly suggested below.

14. Asad ne Anees ko ma:ra:
    Asad Anees kill-PERF
    agent patient
    ERG (DAT)

‘Asad killed Anees’
    agent patient
    NOM ACC

57 The dative case marker -*ko* is attached to the NP if the object is human or specific. A non-human, non-specific object is unmarked and it may claimed that it is in the absolutive case.
(14) shows that the agent NP *Asad* is ergative and is marked by –*ne*. As the patient *Anees* is marked by –*ko* it is difficult to claim that it has the absolutive case. In its English counterpart, the agent NP is nominative and the patient NP is accusative.

4.1.4. Experiencer- The experiencer is an argument that experiences some physical or psychological state. The experiencer NP in Urdu has the same case as in English when it occurs as the subject of an intransitive verb that indicates a mental or physical state, as in (15a). If the experiencer argument voluntarily coughs for some purpose, then it is an agent rather than an experiencer and takes an ergative case in Urdu if the verb is perfective. In English the θ-role is that of an agent and the case is nominative, as in (15b).

15a. Asad        khã:sa:
   experiencer cough- PERF
   NOM
   ‘Asad coughed.’
   experiencer
   NOM

15b. Asad ne    khã:sa:
   agent            cough- PERF
   ERG
   ‘Asad coughed (purposefully).’
   agent            cough- PERF
   NOM

The experiencer NP *Asad* in both (15a) and in its English counterpart, has the nominative case. In (15b), the NP *Asad* is in the ergative case in Urdu and it is its agent rather than experiencer; in the English counterpart of

58 We have called it the dative case tentatively because such constructions are considered to have “dative subject”. Alternatively, -*ko* may be called the absolutive marker just as *ne* called the ergative marker.
(15b), it has the nominative case. In Urdu, the experiencer NP takes the dative case in the subject position of intransitive verb and is overtly marked by *ko*, as in (16).

16. Asad ko bhu:k lagi: hai
   Experiencer  Hunger  Feel-PR
   DAT
   ‘Asad is hungry.’

In (16), we may notice that the experiencer NP *Asad* has taken the dative case in Urdu and is marked by *ko*. It is not like English where it takes nominative case, as in the English counterpart of (16). In Urdu, the experiencer argument is assigned the absolutive case, when it appears in the object position and in English it is assigned the accusative case as (17) is clarifies the point.

17. Asad ne Aziz ko na:ummi:d kiya:
   Agent  Experiencer  Disappoint-PRF
   ERG  ABS
   ‘Asad disappointed Aziz.’

In (17), the experiencer *Aziz* with case marker – *ko* is assigned the absolutive case and in its English counterpart, it is assigned the accusative case.

The experiencer NP may get a locative case when it appears as the indirect object of the verb in both Urdu and English. This case is indicated by –*par* and –*upon* in Urdu and English respectively. (18) and its English counterpart illustrate the point.
18. Asad ne apni: Galti: mujh par mâDh di:
   Asad his fault me upon impose – PERF
   agent theme experiencer
   ERG ABS LOC
   ‘Asad imposed his fault upon me.’
   agent theme experiencer
   NOM ACC LOC

(19) reinforces the same point.

19. Asad ne sa:ra: Gussa: mujh par uta:ra:
   Asad all anger me on expressed- PERF
   Agent theme experiencer
   ERG ABS LOC
   ‘Asad expressed / poured all his anger on me.’
   agent theme location
   ERG ACC LOC

4.1.5. Instrument- The argument which is used to bring about something is the instrument. It normally takes an instrumental case and becomes a PoP / PP adjunct if the agent is overt. In Urdu, it is generally indicated by –se and in English by the preposition with is used. (20) exemplifies the point.

20. Asad ne Aziz ko čhaRi: se ma:ra:
   Asad Aziz stick with hit- PERF
   agent patient instrument
   ERG ABS INST
   ‘Asad hit Aziz with a stick.’
   agent patient instrument
   NOM ACC INST

An instrument argument takes an absolutive case when it occurs as the direct object in Urdu. For instance:

21. usne mujhe su:i: čubho:i:
   he me needle-3 fem. sg. pierce- 3 mas. sg. PERF
   agent experiencer instrument
   ERG DAT ABS
   ‘He pierced me the needle.’
   agent experiencer instrument
   NOM DAT ACC
We may see in (21) that the instrument has the ab- solutive case in Urdu and in its English equivalent; instrument is unmarked for the accusative case.

4.1.6. Source- It is an argument from which something moves out or originates. Generally it is realized in the ablative case that specifies movement from a physical location in both Urdu and English. We may look at (22).

\[
\begin{align*}
22. & \text{naukar} & \text{ba:za:r se} & \text{sabziyã:} & \text{la:ya:}^59 \\
& \text{servant-3 mas. sg} & \text{market from vegetables bring-3 mas. sg. PERF} \\
& \text{agent NOM} & \text{source ABL} & \text{theme ACC}
\end{align*}
\]

‘The servant brought vegetables from the market.’

In (22), the PoP baza:r se ‘from the market’ has the θ-role of source. The complement NP baza:r ‘market’ is in ablative case, it is marked by the postposition se. The source argument in the English equivalent of (22) is also assigned ablative case by the preposition from. Urdu and English seem to behave alike in this respect.

4.1.7. Goal- The argument towards which something moves is called goal. It is represented by a dative case. In Urdu, this case is marked by the postposition –ko and in English by the preposition to, as shown in (23) and (24):

\[
\begin{align*}
23. & \text{Asad ne Asma ko kita:b} & \text{di:} \\
& \text{Asad Asma book- 3 fem. sg. give- 3 fem. sg. PERF} \\
& \text{agent goal theme} \\
& \text{ERG DAT ABS}
\end{align*}
\]

\(59\) laanaa ‘to bring’ does not have the absolutive form in Urdu even when it is in the perfective form (e.g. laayaa ‘brought’
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‘Asad gave a book to Asma.’

agent  theme  goal
NOM   ACC  DAT

24. maǐ Asad ko mubaːrak baːd detiː hũ:
I-fem.sg. Asad congratulate- fem. sg.PR
agent  goal
NOM   ACC

uskiː kaːmyaːbiː ke liye
his success on
theme

‘I congratulate Asad on his success.’

agent  goal  theme
NOM  DAT  ACC

4.1.8. Location- It is defined as an argument which indicates the location of the event. The locative NP is assigned the locative case. We may consider the following examples:

25. Asma iskuːl mẽ hai
Asma school at is-PERF
agent  location
NOM  LOC

‘Asma is at school.’

agent  location
NOM  LOC

In (25) the locative case is not overtly marked but there are postpositions in Urdu which indicate a temporal or spatial location. They are mẽ ‘in’,par ‘on, at’, andar ‘inside’, baːhar ‘outside’, biːč mẽ ‘between’, piːche ‘behind’, baGal mẽ ‘beside’, saːmne ‘in front of’. (26) Indicates spatial location and (27) temporal location.

26. maːni kitiː baːtel par rakhiː hai
I book table on put-PERF
agent  theme location
ERG  ABS  LOC

‘I have put the book on the table.’

agent  theme location
NOM  ACC  LOC
In (26), the PoP *Tebal par* ‘on the table’ has the \( \theta \)-role of location in Urdu. *Tebal* ‘table’ is assigned the locative case by the postposition *par* in Urdu.

\[
27. \text{maĩ subah mẽ ghar ja:ũ:gi:} \\
I \text{ morning in home go-fem. sg.FUT} \\
\text{agent location goal} \\
\text{NOM LOC ACC} \\
\text{‘I will go home in the morning.’} \\
\text{agent goal location} \\
\text{NOM LOC}
\]

In Urdu, *subah mẽ* and in English, ‘in the morning’ are temporal locations. However, the \( \theta \)-role of location may not always be spatial or temporal: it may be abstract, as in (28).

\[
28. \text{duniya: ke har mazhab mẽ insa:niyat ko tarji:h di: gayi: hai} \\
\text{world of every religion in humanity preference give-PERF has been} \\
\text{location theme} \\
\text{LOC ACC} \\
\text{‘Humanity has been given preference in every religion of the world.} \\
\text{theme location} \\
\text{ACC LOC}
\]

(28) clearly shows that the PP *duniya: ke har mazhab mẽ* ‘every religion of the world’ is the locative argument; the locative case is assigned by the postposition *mẽ* and preposition ‘in’ in both, Urdu and English respectively.

Likewise, the complex NP *in every religion of the world* is locative in English. One significant difference between English and Urdu is that in English an NP with almost any \( \theta \)-role can be used as the subject of a sentence and have a nominative case.

\[
29a. \text{one hundred persons can be accommodated in this hall.} \\
\text{agent location} \\
\text{NOM LOC}
\]
b. This hall can accommodate one hundred person

The Urdu counterpart of (29b) is the exact equivalent of the English sentence, but it is not well-formed because the locative θ-role has been realized in the nominative case. However, the Urdu sentence in (29a) is well-formed because the locative θ-role is marked by the locative case.

To sum up, it cannot be claimed that in all instances there is one to one correspondence between a θ-role and a case in Urdu or English. For instance, though the locative case indicates the θ-role of location and the instrumental case that of the instrument, the seemingly instrumental case marker –se is used for the agent in a passive sentence in Urdu and by in English. The difference between a nominative–accusative structure and an ergative-absolutive structure accounts for some crucial differences in the realization of ‘agent’ and theme/patient in Urdu. The contrast between Urdu and English is there only when the Urdu sentences have transitive verbs in the perfective aspect. In other cases, English and Urdu behave almost alike in so far as case assignment is concerned. In short, there is a sort of parallelism between θ-role assignment and case-marking in Urdu as well as English.