

# THE SEMANTICS OF NEWARI CASE-MARKING DISTINCTIONS<sup>1</sup>

Kenneth William Cook

## 0. Introduction

In this paper I will briefly describe how Newari uses its six morphological cases (given in (1)) to mark nominals in simple clauses. Sections 1-4 describe the basic uses of the cases. Section 4 also contains an informal analysis of how the cases are used with respect to location and possession. Section 5 discusses the conditions under which animate direct objects are marked with dative (rather than absolutive) case. Section 6 contrasts ergative and dative subject constructions and section 7 concludes the paper by addressing the question of whether or not Newari is an "ergative language." This last section shows that Newari case marking of transitive clauses departs from the "normal" pattern (of ergative subject and absolutive object) in clauses which describe situations that deviate from the prototypical transitive event of a human agent operating on an inanimate patient. Here, as elsewhere in the language, semantic distinctions in what is portrayed in a clause can be correlated with choices in nominal case marking.

(1) CASE	INFLECTION ON NOUNS	INFLECTION ON PRONOUNS
ERGATIVE	-(a)n	-(a)n
ABSOLUTIVE	Ø	Ø
GENITIVE	-yaa	Ø
DATIVE	-yaata	-ta
COMITATIVE	-yaaake	-ke
LOCATIVE	-e/i:	--

## 1. Ergative Case

The ergative case marks transitive subjects that are agents or natural forces. It also marks instruments, inanimate sources and means:<sup>2</sup>

- (2) a. Raam-an cakku-n laa taal-a<sup>3</sup>  
       R-erg knife-erg meat cut-PD  
       'Raam cut the meat with a knife.'
- b. phas-an parjaa san-k-ala  
       wind-erg curtain move-caus-PD  
       'The wind moved the curtain.'

- c. ji-n baakas-an dhibaa kay-aa  
I-erg box-erg money take-PC  
'I took the money from the box.'
- d. ji-n hawaaijahaaj-an pau choy-aa  
I-erg airplane-erg letter send-PC  
'I sent the letter by airplane.'

Agentive subjects of transitive verbs are in the ergative case whether or not an object is linguistically encoded:

- (3) Raam-an nal-a / ton-a / col-a / bon-a  
R-erg eat-PD / drink-PD / write-PD / read-PD  
'Raam ate / drank / wrote / read.'

Ergative case marking is optional on the subjects of the following predicates:<sup>4</sup>

- (4) a. wa(n) tenis / phutbal mhital-a  
he(erg) tennis / football play-PD  
'He played tennis / football.'
- b. Gitaa(n) pyaakhan lhul-a  
G(erg) dance perform-PD  
'Gitaa danced (lit. performed a dance).'
- c. ji(n) mhiga jyaa yaan-aa  
I(erg) yesterday work do-PC  
'I worked (lit. did work) yesterday.'
- d. Raam(an) nhila hal-a  
R(erg) smile bring-PD  
'Raam smiled (lit. brought a smile).'

From (4), one might be led to believe that the subjects of predicates involving "cognate objects" (such as "song" in "sing a song") are optionally in the ergative case. Although this is true for the predicates in (4), it is generally not the case. (5) is more typical of predicates with "cognate objects":

- (5) Gitaa\*(n) me haal-a  
G(erg) song shout-PD  
'Gitaa sang (lit. shouted) a song.'

## 2. Absolutive Case

Subjects of intransitive verbs and inanimate objects of transitive verbs (cf.(2) above) are in the (unmarked) absolutive case. An intransitive subject is in the absolutive case whether or not the entity it refers to is capable of acting on its own:

- (6) a. Gitaa Nepaal-an wal-a  
G Nepal-erg come-PD  
'Gitaa came from Nepal.'

- d. wa manu tinnhul-a / sit-a / dyan-a  
the man jump-PD / die-PD / sleep-PD  
'The man jumped / died / slept.'

- c. parjaa san-a  
curtain move-PD  
'The curtain moved.'

Subjects of predicate nominals and adjectivals are also in the absolutive, as are predicate nominals themselves:

- (7) a. wi: khaa ta:rhi  
his chicken big  
'His chicken is big.'
- b. jimi ke:n bidhyarthi  
my/our sister student  
'My sister is a student.'

### 3. Locative, Comitative, and Genitive

The locative case marks inanimate goals of motion and locations of three types: (1) locations of entities at rest (2) sites of activities and (3) loci of contact:

- (8) a. Gitaa-n Jaapaan-e kitaab chol-a  
G-erg Japan-loc book send-PD  
'Gitaa sent the book to Japan.'
- b. Raam Nepaal-e wan-a  
R Nepal-loc go-PD  
'Raam went to Nepal.'
- c. wa kalam tebal-e du  
the pen table-loc be  
'The pen is on the table.'
- d. wa macaa bari: bwae:n wan-a  
the child garden-loc run go-PD  
'The child ran in/into the garden.'
- e. wa-n laasaa / laasaa-e daal-a  
he-erg mattress / mattress-loc beat-PD  
'He beat the mattress / on the mattress.'  
(Hale and Manandhar (1973:9))

The existential/location/possessive verb du:gu in (8c) appears not only in the locational construction in (8c) but also in the existential construction in (9). If a locative is expressed in this construction, it precedes the absolutive:

- (9) a. dya du  
god be  
'There is a god.'



- b. wa tebal-e kalam cha-pu du  
the table-loc pen 1-CL be  
'There is a pen on the table.'

The comitative case marks clause-level possessors — as opposed to the genitive, which marks possessors that are NP modifiers:

- (10) a. wa-n ji-ke dhibaa khan-a  
he-erg I-com money see-PD  
'He saw some money in my possession.'  
(Hale and Manandhar (1973:8))
- b. ji-n Gitaa-yaa maa khan-aa  
I-erg G-gen mother see-PC  
'I saw Gitaa's mother.'

The comitative case also marks possessors in the possessive construction with *du:gu*. The "possession" involved here can be a matter of association (as in (11a)), availability, or ownership. In (11b), Gitaa may be the owner of the car, or she may simply have a car at her disposal.<sup>5</sup>

- (11) a. wa khicaa-yaa ke bhugin du  
the dog-com fly have  
'The dog has flies.'
- b. Gitaa-yaa ke motar du  
G-com car have  
'Gitaa has a car.'

The possession in (11) is alienable in that the objects of possession can be transferred to a new owner. If, however, the relationship is an inalienable one, such as one of kinship or a part-whole relationship, the genitive is used rather than the comitative:<sup>6</sup>

- (12) a. Raam-yaa daaju cha-ma du  
R-gen brother 1-CL have  
'Raam has a brother.'
- b. tho tebal-yaa so-pu tuti du  
this table-gen 3-CL leg have  
'This table has three legs.'

Animate sources that are possessors are also in the comitative case. Compare (13) and (2c):

- (13) ji-n Gitaa-yaa ke dhibaa kay-aa  
I-erg G-com money take-PC  
'I took the money from Gitaa.'
- (2c) ji-n baakas-an dhibaa kay-aa  
I-erg box-erg money take-PC  
'I took the money from the box.'

#### 4. Dative Case

The dative case marks recipients. Compare (14a) with (13) and (14b) with (8a):

(14) a. ji-n Gitaa-yaata dhibaa biy-aa  
I-erg G-dat money give-PC  
'I gave the money to Gitaa.'

b. Gitaa-n Raam-yaata kitaab chol-a  
G-erg R-dat book send-PD  
'Gitaa sent the book to Raam.'

(8a) Gitaa-n Jaapaan-e kitaab chol-a  
G-erg Japan-loc book send-PD  
'Gitaa sent the book to Japan.'

Chart (15) offers an informal analysis of how the cases are used with respect to location and possession. Distinctions are made depending on whether an entity moves (or is moved) out of or into (or resides in) a location or someone's possession. (The numbers in the cells refer to the relevant example sentences.) Thus, for example, a goal of motion is in the locative case because it involves an entity moving (or being moved) to a location. A recipient, in contrast, is in the dative case since it involves an entity moving (or being moved) into someone's possession. With respect to location, the "in" and "into" relations are both in the locative case; whereas with respect to possession, the "in" and "out of" relations are both marked comitative.

(15)

	LOCATION	POSSESSION
out of	ergative (2c) (6a)	comitative (13)
in	locative (8d) (8c)	comitative (10a) (11a)
(in)to	locative (8a,b,d)	dative (14a,b)

If an entity moves from or to an animate entity and possession is not involved, Newari uses periphrastic constructions to indicate the endpoints of the trajectory. Compare (16) with (13) and (14a,b):<sup>7</sup>

(16) a. wa bal Ken-yaa thaas-an Toni-yaa tha-e wan-a  
the ball K-gen place-erg T-gen place-loc go-PD  
'The ball went from Ken to Tony.'  
(lit. from Ken's place to Tony's place)

b. wa bal wa misaa-yaa paakhe wan-a  
the ball the woman-gen toward go-PD  
'The ball went to the woman.'

- c. wa bal wa misaa-yaa paakhen wal-a  
the ball the woman-gen from come-PD  
'The ball came from the woman.'

The dative case is really the workhorse of the Newari case system. In addition to marking recipients, it also marks experiencers, benefactives (both animate and inanimate), what I will call "sources of opinion," and the indirect objects of dhaagu 'tell', hekigu 'flatter', and senigu 'instruct'.

- (17) a. Raam-yaata cikul-a / tyannul-a  
R-dat cold-PD / tired-PD  
'Raam is cold / tired.'
- b. ji-ta la: gaa:  
I-dat water sufficient  
'The water is sufficient for me.'  
(Hale and Manandhar (1973:5))
- c. Gitaa-n Raam-yaata jaa thuk-a  
G-erg R-dat rice cook-PD  
'Gitaa cooked rice for Raam.'
- d. ji-n mec-yaata khol cha-gu daek-aa  
I-erg chair-dat cover 1-CL make-PC  
'I made a cover for the chair.'
- e. ji-ta wa baanlaa  
I-dat she beautiful  
'She is beautiful to me (i.e. in my opinion).'
- f. Raam-an Gitaa-yaata dhaal-a  
R-erg G-dat tell-PD  
'Raam told Gitaa (something).'
- g. Gitaa-n wa manu-yaata hekal-a  
G-erg that man-dat flatter-PD  
'Gitaa flattered that man.'
- h. wa-n Gitaa-yaata sen-a  
he-erg G-dat instruct-PD  
'He instructed Gitaa.'

The indirect object of nyanigu 'ask' can be in either the dative or comitative. I suspect that both these cases are possible because the indirect object is construed as either the recipient of the question or the source of the answer.

- (18) Raam-an Gitaa-yaata / Gitaa-yaake nyan-a  
R-erg G-dat G-com ask-PD  
'Raam asked Gitaa.'



## 5. Dative-marked Direct Objects

The dative case also marks animate direct objects but the conditions under which it does are not easy to capture.<sup>8</sup> Verbs of physical contact like daaegu 'beat', penkigu 'kick', thi:gu 'touch', suligu 'stab', and kekigu 'hit (with a projectile)' that entail a path of motion leading to the object require their animate objects to be in the dative (whether definite/specific or indefinite/non-specific):

- (19) a. Raam-an wa macaa-yaata / macaa chamesita daal-a  
           R-erg the child-dat child 1-CL-dat beat-PD  
           'Raam beat the / a child.'
- b. Raam-an jimi sala-yaata / sala chamesita penkal-a  
           R-erg my/our horse-dat horse 1-CL-dat kick-PD  
           'Raam kicked my / a horse.'
- c. Raam-an wa manu-yaata / manu chamesita thil-a  
           R-erg the man-dat man 1-CL-dat touch-PD  
           'Raam touched the / a man.'
- d. Raam-an wa manu-yaata / manu chamesita chakku-n sul-a  
           R-erg the man-dat man 1-CL-dat knife-erg stab-PD  
           'Raam stabbed the / a man with a knife.'
- e. Raam-an jimi duku-yaata / duku chamesita appaa-n kekal-a  
           R-erg my/our goat-dat goat 1-CL-dat stone-erg hit-PD  
           'Raam hit my / a goat with a stone.'  
           (i.e. he threw a stone at my / a goat)

Among the verbs that tolerate both absolutive and dative animate objects, the general rule is that the more definite/specific an animate object is, the more likely it is to be in the dative case:<sup>9</sup>

- ←dative most likely—————least likely→
- (20) Raam-an Gitaa-yaata / wa macaa-yaata / macaa cha-ma...  
           R-erg G-dat the child-dat child 1-CL
- ...maal-aa con-a / bul-a / lan-a / lhon-a / jon-a...  
       look-for-PP be-PD carry-PD weigh-PD lift-PD capture-PD
- ...hal-a / chol-a / mhasyu / loman-k-ala  
       bring-PD send-PD know forget-caus-PD
- 'Raam is looking for / carried / weighed / lifted /  
   captured / brought / sent / knows / (purposely) forgot...  
   Gitaa / the child / a (=some) child.'

Among the exceptions to the above rule are certain verbs of cognition and perception. To begin with, the perception verb taa:gu 'hear' and the cognition verb Thugu 'understand' do not even tolerate animate objects:

- (21) a. Raam-an sa: / \*Gitaa(-yaata) taal-a  
           R-erg sound           G-dat           hear-PD  
           'Raam heard a sound / Gitaa.'

- b. ji-n kitaab / \*guru(-yaata) Thu  
      I-erg book       teacher-dat understand  
      'I understand the book / the teacher.'

An animate object of the verb soegu 'look at' is obligatorily definite/specific and in the dative case. An animate object of the verb khangu 'see' is acceptable in either the absolutive or the dative — even if the object is definite/specific:

- (22) a. Raam-an Gitaa\*(-yaata) / manu\*(-yaata) sol-a  
           R-erg           G-dat           man-dat look-at-PD  
           'Raam looked at Gitaa / the man.'

- b. Raam-an Gitaa(-yaata) / manu(-yaata) khan-a  
      R-erg           G-dat           man-dat           see-PD  
      'Raam saw Gitaa / the man.'

The relevant contrast here is possibly one of whether the perceiver purposely directs his vision towards an entity (as in (22a)) or the entity spontaneously appears in the perceiver's field of vision (as in (22b)).

Clauses which describe unusual, extraordinary events are more likely to have animate objects in the dative case than those which describe normal, everyday events. For example, in the culture of the Newars, it is an ordinary event to kill a goat (for food) or a bothersome fly, but it is unusual to kill a dog; thus the object of (23a) (and not those of (23b)) would normally be in the dative case:

- (23) a. Raam-an khicaa-yaata syaat-a  
           R-erg       dog-dat       kill-PD  
           'Raam killed a dog.'

- b. Raam-an duku / bhugin syaat-a  
      R-erg goat fly       kill-PD  
      'Raam killed a goat / fly.'

If an animate direct object co-occurs with a recipient (in the dative case) or an animate possessor as source (in the comitative case), the direct object cannot be in the dative case:

- (24) a. Raam-an Gitaa-yaata macaa(\*-yaata) bil-a  
           R-erg           G-dat       child-dat       give-PD  
           'Raam gave the child to Gitaa.'

- b. Raam-an Gitaa-yaake macaa(\*-yaata) kaal-a  
      R-erg           G-com       child-dat       take-PD  
      'Raam took the child from Gitaa.'

For the most part, inanimate direct objects do not occur in the dative case, but there are a few exceptions. The "second object" in questions of the type "What did x do to y?" is in the dative case whether



it is animate or inanimate:

- (25) Raam-an Gitaa-yaata / tebal-yaata chu yaat-a  
 R-erg G-dat table-dat what do-PD  
 'What did Raam do to Gitaa / to the table?'

Also, inanimate objects that have animate characteristics such as "the car" in "the police caught the car" and "rule" in "obey the rule" are optionally dative. (In the first, "the car" has the animate characteristic of moving, and in the second, "the rule" can be conceived of as a "voice of authority.")

- (26) a. pulis-an motar(-yaata) jon-a  
 police-erg car-dat catch-PD  
 'The police caught the car.'
- b. jhis-an niyam(-yaata) maaney-a e maa:  
 we-erg rule-dat obey-inf need  
 'We need to obey the rule.'

In sum, animate objects of verbs of contact that entail a path of motion leading to the object are obligatorily in the dative case. Otherwise animate objects are likely to be in the dative if they are definite/specific or if they are in clauses which express unusual, extraordinary events. An animate object of soegu 'look at' is obligatorily definite/specific and in the dative. An animate object of khangu 'see' is acceptable in either the absolutive or the dative — even if the object is definite/specific. The "second object" in "What did x do to y?" is obligatorily in the dative (whether animate or inanimate) and "honorary animate objects" such as moving cars and rules that "tell us what to do" are optionally in the dative case.

## 6. Ergative Subjects vs. Dative Subjects

There are four verbs in Newari which can occur in either of the case-marking patterns in (27). I will refer to the construction with the case-marking pattern in (27a) as the "ergative subject construction" (ESC) and to that with the pattern in (27b) as the "dative subject construction" (DSC).<sup>10</sup>

- (27) a. ergative abs/dat verb  
 b. dative absolutive verb

The four verbs which occur in both of these patterns are 'need/look for', 'like', 'remember', and 'forget'. Compare the following (a) and (b) sentences:

(28) a. ji-n kitaab maal-aa con-aa

I-erg book look-for-PP be-PC

'I am looking for a book.'

b. ji-ta kitaab maa:

I-dat book need

'I need a book.'

(29) a. Raam-an Gitaa-yaata ye-k-ala

R-erg G-dat like-caus-PD

'Raam liked Gitaa.'

b. Raam-yaata Gitaa yal-a

R-dat G like-PD

'Raam has come to like Gitaa.'

(30) a. ji-n chan-ta luman-k-e

I-erg you-dat remember-caus-FC

'I will remember you.'

b. ji-ta cha luman

I-dat you remember

'I remember you.'

(31) a. ji-n Raam-yaata loman-k-ala

I-erg R-dat forget-caus-PC

'I (intentionally) forgot Raam.'

b. ji-ta Raam loman-a

I-dat R forget-PD

'I (accidentally) forgot Raam.'

The ESC and the DSC are different in that the verb forms in the ESC are "active" while those in the DSC are "stative." In (28a), the progressive form of the verb maaligu means '(actively) look for', while in (28b), the stative form of that verb, maa:, means simply 'need'.<sup>11</sup> In (29), (30) and (31), we see the "stative" verbs ya:gu 'like', luman-gu 'remember' and lomangu 'forget' in the (b) clauses and forms of those verbs with the causative affix -k- (see footnote 8) in the (a) clauses. Exactly what the causative -k- is doing in those forms is not clear (it may be indicating something like self-induced causation).<sup>12</sup> However, it is clear that the -k- form verbs of the ESCs in (29-31a) involve action on the part of the subject while those in the DSCs in the (b) clauses do not. (29a), for example, fits the context in which Raam, when presented with several candidates, chooses Gitaa to be his bride. (29b), in contrast, merely makes a statement about Raam's present state of emotions. In (30a) I am promising you that I will include your name in my will, for example, while in (30b) I am merely telling you that thoughts of you remain in my mind. I intentionally left Raam's name out of my will in (31a) while in (31b) I accidentally forgot Raam, i.e. the memory of Raam slipped from my mind without my actively doing anything. In sum, the ESC is used to describe volitional acts while the DSC is used to describe non-volitional experiences.



## 7. Is Newari an "Ergative Language"?

An "ergative language" is usually characterized as one in which intransitive subjects and direct objects are both in the same (absolutive) case and transitive subjects are in a special (ergative) case. If we only look at sentences like (32a,b), Newari seems to qualify as an "ergative language."

(32) a. Raam-an laa taal-a (erg abs verb)  
           R-erg meat cut-PD  
           'Raam cut the meat.'

b. Raam dyan-a (abs verb)  
       R sleep-PD  
       'Raam slept.'

However, as we have seen above, there are departures from the prototypical case-marking patterns in (32). To conclude this brief sketch of Newari case marking, I will review the clause types in (33) (all of which I will informally refer to as "transitive") and discuss how their case-marking patterns depart from the prototypical pattern in (32a).<sup>13</sup>

(33) a. Raam-an Gitaa-yaata ghaepul-a  
           R-erg G-dat hug-PD  
           'Raam hugged Gitaa.'

b. Raam-yaata Gitaa ya:  
       R-dat G like  
       'Raam likes Gitaa.'

c. Raam-yaake motar du  
       R-com car have  
       'Raam has a car.'

d. Raam-yaa daaju cha-ma du  
       R-gen brother 1-CL have  
       'Raam has a brother.'

In a prototypical transitive event, a human agent operates on an inanimate patient (Langacker (this vol.)). (32a) illustrates the case marking used to encode such an event in Newari. The agentive subject is in the ergative and the object which is a patient is in the absolutive.<sup>14</sup> If, however, the patient is animate (as it is in (33a)), it will be in the dative case if certain conditions (mentioned in section 5) are met.

As we saw in the previous section, the DSC in (33b) is used to describe the non-volitional experiences of needing, liking, (unintentionally) remembering and forgetting. In this clause type, the subject is an experiencer (rather than an agent) and it is in the dative (rather than in the ergative).

The subject of the verb du:gu (when this verb is used to mean 'have') is a possessor and not a prototypical agent. Thus rather than the ergative, the comitative and genitive (cases which indicate possession) are used to mark the subject in the possessive construction in (33c,d). As pointed out in section 3, the subject is in the comitative



if the possession involved is alienable (as in (33c)); it is in the genitive if the possession is inalienable as in (33d).<sup>15</sup>

Thus, with respect to transitive clauses, we can say that Newari is "ergative" to the extent that clauses that describe prototypical transitive events in which a human agent operates on an inanimate patient (i.e. clauses like (32a)) have their subjects in the ergative and their objects in the absolutive. However, certain transitive clauses that describe situations that are not prototypical transitive events indicate with "special" case marking the manner in which their participants are different from those of prototypical transitive events: animate objects (under certain conditions) are in the dative, experiencer subjects of particular predicates are also in the dative and possessor subjects are in the comitative or genitive, depending on the type of possession involved.<sup>16</sup>

The departures in (33) from the prototypical transitive-clause case marking illustrated in (32a), are representative of other Newari case-marking contrasts. Here, as elsewhere in the language, semantic distinctions in what is portrayed in a clause can be correlated with choices in nominal case marking.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. Fieldwork for this paper was funded by grants from the Academic Senate of UC San Diego. Our consultant was Narendra Suwal of Kathmandu, to whom we are very grateful for his patience and insights. All errors in this paper, of course, are my own. For more on the cases of Newari, see Hale and Manandhar (1973), Hung (this volume), and Malla (1981).

2. It is tempting to call this case "ablative" rather than "ergative" since what unites its uses is some abstract sense of 'source' (especially if one thinks of an agent as the source of energy of an action). However, I have decided to call this case "ergative" because that is what it is called in the literature (written in English) on Newari and because "ablative" is usually thought of as a case used to mark oblique relations (rather than central relations like transitive subjects).

3. Some of the less obvious abbreviations used in the glosses are as follows:

- PC: past conjunct (verb agrees with 1st person in statements and in Wh-questions and with non-1st person in yes/no questions)
- PD: past disjunct (verb agrees with non-1st person in statements and in Wh-questions and with 1st person in yes/no questions)  
If this tense is used with a stative verb, it indicates arrival into a state.
- FC: future conjunct (same agreement pattern as for PC)
- PD: future disjunct (same agreement pattern as for PD)
- PP: present participle
- CL: classifier

4. As pointed out by Givón (1984:154-158), the ergative marking on a subject is not obligatory if the aspect of the verb is progressive and focus is not on the subject (as in (i)):

- (i) a. wa manu(-an) chu yaan-aa con-a  
 the man-erg what do-PP be-PD  
 'What is the man doing?'  
 b. wa(-n) jhyaa tachyaan-aa con-a  
 he-erg window break-PP be-PD  
 'He is breaking the window.'

Givón also observes that ergative marking is optional in clauses with certain verbs in the future tense. This is not the case with our consultant. There is, very likely, a dialectal difference here. Our consultant is of the jyaapu (farmer) caste and is from Kathmandu. 5. (11a) can also be understood as 'There are flies on the dog' but (11b) cannot be understood as 'There is a car on Gitaa.' That is to say, animals in the comitative case can be construed as either possessors or locations; humans in this case cannot be construed as locations except in the possessive uses of 'with' or 'on' as in 'Gitaa has a car with her' (One of the readings of (11b)) or 'I have money with/on me' (as in (i)):

- (i) ji-ke dhibaa du  
 I-com money have  
 'I have money (with/on me).'

The traditional label "comitative" for this case is misleading. It is only in clauses like (i) and (11b) that it can be translated with the English preposition with. The more conventional comitative meaning of '(along) with' is expressed by the postposition naapa(n) 'with':

- (ii) wa macaa wi: paasaa naapa(n) bwae:n wan-a  
 the child his friend with run go-PD  
 'The child ran with his friend.'

The optional n in naapa(n) indicates that the people or items involved go together to form a cohesive group. 6. In the Manandhar dialect described by Hale and Manandhar (1973), the genitive has a wider use on the clause level than it does in our consultant's dialect. See footnote 4. 7. One exception is the fact that animals that are sources but not possessors can be encoded with the ergative case, but this is not true of humans. Compare footnote 5.

- (i) a. Raam sala-n kuthuwal-a  
 R horse-erg fall-PD  
 'Raam fell from the horse.'  
 b. \*wa macaa Raam-an kuthuwal-a  
 the child R-erg fall-PD  
 (The child fell from Raam.)

8. Animate causees in causative clauses are also generally in the dative case:



- (i)       Gitaa-n   Raam-yaata   jaa   na-k-ala  
               G-erg         R-dat     rice eat-caus-PD  
               'Gitaa fed rice to Raam.'  
               (lit. Gitaa caused Raam to eat rice.)

See Poteet (this volume) and DeLancey (1983 & 1984) for more on causatives in Newari.

9. A phenomenon similar to that illustrated in (20) exists in Spanish; here definite/specific animate direct objects are preceded by the personal object marker a 'to':

- (i)       Busco a Ricardo / a mi amigo / a un amigo / un amigo.  
               'I'm looking for Ricardo / my friend / a (specific)  
               friend / a (=any) friend.'

10. I will use the term "subject" to refer to the ergative in the ESC and the dative in the DSC without giving any syntactic arguments for their subjecthood.

11. If an inanimate entity "needs" something, then it is in the locative rather than the dative:

- (i)       tho   laa-e   ci   maa:  
               this meat-loc salt need  
               'This meat needs salt.'

12. Samoan exhibits a similar phenomenon with the causative prefix fa'a-. For example, galo means 'forget' but in the sense of 'to slip from one's mind' while fa'agalo also means 'forget' but in the sense of 'to drive something from one's mind.'

13. Of course there are also the departures which involve the omission of ergative case on transitive subjects mentioned in section 1 and footnote 4. In addition, one might consider the dative NPs in (17a,b,e) as subjects that deviate from the prototypical ergative/absolutive case marking of transitive/intransitive subjects exhibited in (32). I will (somewhat arbitrarily) limit the discussion here to the patterns in (33).

14. The statement at the beginning of the section on the ergative case (section 1) might lead one to believe that agent-like transitive subjects are in the ergative case whether or not they are human. Natural forces qualify as agentive subjects, as illustrated by (2b), but the inverted word order of (i) seems to indicate that entities that are normally thought of as instruments do not fully qualify as transitive subjects even if they are "held accountable" for the occurrence of an event:

- (i)       wa   manu-yaata   bikh-an   syaat-a  
               the   man-dat   poison-erg   kill-PD  
               'The man was killed by poison.'

15. Evidence that Raam-yaa is a clause-level participant in (33d) (and not just a dependent modifier of daaju cha-ma) is provided by the fact that Raam-yaa and daaju cha-ma can be separated by a locative expression:



- (i) { Nepaal-e Raam-yaa }  
 { Raam-yaa Nepaal-e } daaju cha-ma du  
 R-gen Nepal-loc brother 1-CL have  
 'Raam has a brother in Nepal.'

16. Note that not all experiencer subjects are in the dative. As witnessed by (21a) and (22b), the experiencer subjects of khangu 'see', and taa:gu 'hear', for example, are in the ergative and not in the dative.

#### REFERENCES

- DeLancey, Scott. 1983. Agentivity and causation: data from Newari. Berkeley Linguistics Society 9.54-63.  
 ---. 1984. Notes on agentivity and causation. Studies in Language. 8.2.181-213.  
 Givón, Talmy. 1984. Syntax: a functional-typological introduction. vol.1. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.  
 Hale, Austin and Thakurlal Manandhar. 1973. Case and role in Newari. MS. Reprinted in Ronald L. Trail et al. (eds.). 1980. Papers in Southeast Asian Linguistics. Canberra: Australian National University. 7:79-93.  
 Malla, Kamal P. 1981. Contemporary Newari: a working outline. MS. University of California, Berkeley.