John Benjamins Publishing Company

Is Kashmiri passive really a passive?

Richa Srishti & Shahid Bhat
Central Institute of Indian Languages Mysore

The present paper explores passives in Kashmiri, a Northwestern Dardic language of the Indo-Aryan family. Though Kashmiri has some special features like V-2 phenomenon, pronominal clitics etc. it has an analytic passive construction like its Indo-Aryan counterparts. The internal argument surfaces as the subject of the passive, where the participial/infinitival verbal form -*nI* is added to the verb root followed by a periphrastic auxiliary *yun* 'to come' in perfective form. The agent of the action is in the form of *athi* or *zaryi* (*by/through*) and is preferably omitted. This optionality casts a doubt on its status – whether it is an adjunct or an argument. The promotion of the internal argument to the subject position is another key issue. The present paper investigates the above issues and claims that the Kashmiri passive construction is also a kind of ACTIVE-Passive and not really passive as in English. It is argued that in Kashmiri passives, the underlying subject remains an active subject and the underlying object does not become the surface subject. To prove this claim, some tests based on anaphora binding, pronominal co-reference, control, etc. are applied.

Keywords: passivization; underlying subject; promotion; demotion; detransitivization

1.   Introduction

Kashmiri is a Northwestern Dardic language of the Indo-Aryan family. It is spoken in the state of Jammu & Kashmir in India. It has several unique features making it quite different from other Indo-Aryan languages, e.g. presence of V-2 phenomenon, pronominal clitics, central vowels, palatalization etc. As in most modern Indo-Aryan languages (Gujarati, Punjabi, Hindi, Bengali, Assamese etc.), Kashmiri also has an analytic passive construction where the basic components are – a participial/infinitival verbal form and an auxiliary verb. First, let us consider the following examples from other modern Indo-Aryan languages.

- Perfective Participle and an Auxiliary Verb *go*:

(1)   i.   (*sashaa dwaaraa*) *kaam ki-yaa ga-yaa*   (Hindi)
     Sasha   by   work do-PRF go-PRF
     'The work was done (by Sasha).'

    ii.   (*majdooraan vallon kamma ki:-taa ga-yaa*   (Punjabi)
      workers   by   work   do-PRF go-PRF
      'The work was done (by the workers)

- Infinitival form (ablative/locative) and an Auxiliary Verb *come*:

(2)   (*raam waDe*) *kaam karawaa-maa aave   che*   (Gujarati)
    Ram by   work do.INF-LOC   come be-PRS
    'The work is done (by Ram).'

Returning to Kashmiri passive construction, there is an infinitival oblique verbal form *-nI* and a periphrastic auxiliary *yun* 'to come' in perfective form. The internal argument of the transitive verb surfaces as the subject of the sentence in the passive. For example,

(3)   i.   *faarooq-an khuul   kuluf*   Active
     Farooq-ERG open-PRF lock
     'Farooq opened the lock.'

    ii.   *kuluf aav   khol-nI*   Passive
      lock   came   open-INF.OBL
      'The lock was opened.'

The agent of the action is not overtly realized and preferably omitted. Therefore, the agent phrase is optional. However, if the agent is realized, it is either in the form of *-zaryi* or *-athi* phrase (a kind of *by* phrase).

(4)   i.   *farooq-ni   zaryi aav   kuluf khol-nI*
     Farooq-GEN by   came lock open-INF.OBL
     'The lock was opened by Farooq.'

    ii.   *farooq-as   athi aav   kuluf khol-nI*
      Farooq-DAT by   came lock open-INF.OBL
      'The lock was opened by Farooq.'

    iii.   *reyaaz-ni zaryi aav   (farooq-as   athi) kuluf*
      Reyaz-GEN by   came Farooq-DAT by   lock

      khol-na:v-nI   (Causative Passive)
      open-CAUS-INF.OBL

      'Farooq was made to open the lock by Reyaz.'

This optionality casts a doubt on the status of the agent phrase – whether it is an adjunct or an argument (as it seems to be similar to *by* phrase in the English

passive that is a PP). Another related issue is regarding the internal argument in Kashmiri passive. Is the internal argument actually promoted to the subject position or does it behave as it does in the active constructions? There is existing literature on Hindi-Urdu passives (cf. Mahajan (1994) and Richa (2011)) that attests the absence of canonical (English) passives in Hindi-Urdu. The claim is that this language has constructions which are only passive-like and not actually passives. Mahajan (1994) terms them ACTIVE Passive as he claims that the underlying object does not become the surface object and at the same time, the underlying subject remains an active subject. The present paper explores the aforementioned issues and compares the Kashmiri passive with canonical passives as well as with SAL passive constructions.

The paper is organized in seven sections. In section two, we discuss the features of canonical passives in the earlier literature. The behaviour of Kashmiri passives in different environments is looked at in section three. Section four examines the status of subject and object in Kashmiri passive constructions. The next section, i.e. section five, explores the status of the Implicit/Optional Agent in Kashmiri passive. Section six evaluates canonical passives, Kashmiri passive and other South Asian Languages' passive constructions. Section seven, the final one, presents the final remarks.

2. What is a passive construction?

Active and passive voices are kinds of grammatical voices (diathesis). When the subject is the agent or the doer of the action, the verb is in the active voice (5 i). On the other hand, when the subject is the patient, target or the undergoer, the verb is in the passive voice (5 ii).

(5) i. The man did the work
ii. The work was done by the man

2.1 Approaches to passivization

Now let us look at structural, lexical and functional approaches to passivization. In the Generative Grammar framework, Chomsky (1957) postulated in the early transformational theory that active and passive were derived from the same structure, but later it was thought to be derived from two independent structures. But the passive transformational rule remained the main argument, a kind of nounphrase movement. Bach (1980) regarded passive as a prototype of transformational relations. Chomsky (1965) argues that there does exist a difference between the underlying structures of actives and passives. This view was supported by other

linguists (Ziff 1966; Robson 1972; Lakoff 1974). Hasegawa (1968) proposed that passivization is triggered by a structure that is a direct complement of the verb be. Jackendoff (1969) argues that both deep as well as surface structure contribute to the meaning in the transformation. Recent Minimalist Program (MP 1995) recognises that all movements are locality constraints and either active or passive voice is spelled out as required.

Another major structural approach was in the Relational Grammar framework where Perlmutter & Postal (1984) argue that in the passive construction, the agent has been demoted from the subject function and they termed it as *chômeur*.

In the framework of Lexical Decomposition Grammar (LDG), Kiparsky (2012) uses constraint-based theories which eliminate NP-movement and rely instead on argument structure representation. For him, the basic difference between the active and its passive is only that in the passive counterpart the logical subject is implicit and demoted, which can be expressed by an agent phrase, and, even if not so expressed, is visible to certain processes (e.g. construal and anaphora) in the same way as other demoted logical subjects.

Many linguists considered the structural approach to be inadequate as far as explaining passives was concerned. Freidin (1975) and Bresnan (1982) relate the active and the passive in the lexicon by means of a lexical rule. Both active and passive verbs are listed in the lexicon independently, i.e. both are base-generated and entail alternative mapping of the participants to grammatical functions. There is no transformational rule in this approach.

Functional approach to passivization focuses on information-structure/ pragmatics. Shibatani (1985) states that passives may delete the agent for contextual reasons (first three reasons) – bring topical non-agents into subject position (fourth reason), or create a syntactic pivot for reasons such as co-referential deletion (fifth reason). In other words, the primary function of passive is 'agent defocusing' and not 'topicalizing'. He argues that this is the reason why passives generally do not have overt agents. It is further strengthened by the fact that passivization does not usually apply to non-agentive intransitive. According to him, 'true passives' are semantically transitive and syntactically intransitive, i.e. the agent is in the semantic frame but defocused at the level of syntactic encoding. Hence, he considers this the minimal condition for passives.

Siewierska (1988) argues that they are synonymous with regard to truth conditions, but they vary in other ways, e.g. passives are often stative, have scope and modal differences, and have differences of conversational implicature. She, too, regards passives as one of the topicalizing constructions where the object of the active sentence gets 'topicalized' in the passive one. In agentive passive like 'The book was bought by John,' two functions are fulfilled – (a) Topicalizing and,

(b) Focusing. 'The book' being 'the entity about which the predication predicates' becomes the topic and 'by John' being 'relatively the most important information between the speaker and the addressee' is the focus of the sentence. Keenan & Dryer (2007) consider passive as a foregrounding and backgrounding operation. For example,

(6)   The cat ate the rat.

(7)   The rat was eaten.

In sentence (6), 'rat' has been actually 'foregrounded' or in other words 'topicalized' towards which 'the attention has been drawn.' That is why, topic-prominent languages like Mandarin don't make use of passive as often as other languages. Hence, basic passives, according to Kennan & Dryer (2007) are defined as the ones which lack agent phrases and are formed from the transitive verbs denoting events.

Haspelmath (1990) claims that the basic function of the passive is to modify the event described by the verb through expressing inactivisation. Givon (1994) considers the agents in the passive to be the pragmatically suppressed arguments. All these linguists take the demotional approach to passivization.

Some linguists like Klaiman (1991) consider both promotional as well as demotional approaches suitable. She defines voice in terms of affectedness and control. She argues that the Patient nominal (of the active) does not actually acquire the agent role (in the passive) but the nominal linked to the Patient role assumes the grammatical relation basic to the nominal linked to the Agent role, i.e. a kind of subject relation. Croft (1994) states that the construal of events is represented in three ways: cause-become state, become-state, and state. Passive is a state, in other words it is the resultative view of an event with minimal control.

Based on the above approaches, we focus on some of the basic properties of passives. In World Atlas of Language Structures Online (April 2008), Siewierska classifies a construction as passive if it displays the following five properties:

i.   it contrasts with another construction, the **active**;
ii.   the subject of the active corresponds to a non-obligatory oblique phrase of the passive or is not overtly expressed;
iii. the subject of the passive, if there is one, corresponds to the direct object of the active;
iv.   the construction is pragmatically restricted relative to the active;
v.   the construction displays some special morphological marking of the verb.

Siewierska (1984) extensively review passives cross-linguistically and shows that passives cannot be defined universally in terms of word order, case-marking, verbal morphology or agentlessness. The only basis that is unquestionable is the relation between active and passive, i.e. the subject of a passive vs. non-subject in active and overt/implied agent of passive vs. non-subject of passive. Hence, it can serve as a basis for definition. It could either be through promotion of object or demotion of subject. Languages may have passives which have either subject promotion or object demotion or both.

The next section looks at the behavior of Kashmiri passives with light verb and modals, transitivity factor, choice between instrumental markers *-sI:t'* and *zaryi/athi* and (in)abilitative passives.

3.   Kashmiri passives

3.1   Passive with light verb & modals

In Kashmiri complex predicates of VM + LV nature, the main verb appears in its participialized form and the light verb appears with the perfective marker. For example,

(8)   *tam'   os   ni-mut   su   tsuunth khey-th*
      He-ERG be-PST take-PRF that apple   eat-PTCP
      'He had eaten that apple (abruptly).'

In the passive counterpart of the above construction, too, the main verb is in its participialized form. It is the light verb that takes the infinitival verbal form (used for marking passive) *-nI*. For example,

(9)   *farooq-ni   zaryi os   aa-mut   su   tsuunth*
      Farooq-GEN by   be-PST   come-PRF   that apple

      khey-th   ni-nI
      eat-PTCP   take-INF.OBL
      'That apple had been eaten by Farooq (abruptly).'

In Kashmiri, unlike Hindi, we cannot have passive construction with modals. For example,

(10) *farooq dwaaraa yeh seb   khaayaa jaa saktaa   hai*   (Hindi)
      farooq by   this apple eat-PRF go   can-HAB be-PRS
      'This apple can be eaten by Farooq.'

But, we cannot have the counterpart for the above sentence. We can only have the active sentence in Kashmiri. For example,

(11) *farooq   chu   su   tsuunth hekaan   khey-th*   (Kashmiri)
      farooq be-PRS that apple   can-HAB eat-PTCP
      'Farooq can eat that apple.'

3.2   Choice between *-sI:t'* & *zaryi/athi*

The instrumental marker *-sI:t'* is exclusively used to mark instruments in Kashmiri. For example,

(12) *farooq   chu   shrapch-i sI:t'   tsuunth tsaTaan*
      farooq be-PRS knife-OBL with apple   cut-HAB
      'Farooq cuts the apple with the knife.'

The other instrumental marker *zaryi/athi* cannot be used in the above example. It is exclusively used for animate agents. For example,

(13) i.   **farooq   chu   shrapch-i zaryi/ shrapch-as athi tsuunth tsaTaan*
            farooq be-PRS knife-OBL by/   knife-DAT by apple   cut-HAB
            '*Farooq cuts the apple by the knife.'

      ii. *farooq-an   karI-nA:v reyaz-ni   zaryi/reyaz-as athi kA:m*
           Farooq-ERG do-CAUS   reyaz-GEN by/reyaz-DAT by   work
           'Farooq made Reyaz do the work/Farooq did the work through Reyaz (literal).'

But in passives of causatives, the causee agent is marked by *athi* and the matrix subject is marked by *zaryi*.

(14) *reyaaz-ni   zaryi aav   (farooq-as   athi) kuluf*
      Reyaz-GEN by   came Farooq-DAT by   lock

      khol-na:v-nI   Causative Passive
      open-CAUS-INF.OBL
      'The lock was made to open by Reyaz through Farooq.'

We cannot have,

(15) **reyaaz-ni   zaryi aav   (farooq-ni   zaryi) kuluf*
      Reyaz-GEN by   came Farooq-GEN by   lock

      khol-na:v-nI   Causative Passive
      open-CAUS-INF.OBL
      'The lock was made to open by Reyaz through Farooq.'

Similarly, we cannot have,

(16)   *reyaaz-as   athi   aav   (farooq-as   athi)   kuluf
        Reyaz-DAT by   came Farooq-DAT by   lock

       khol-na:v-nI   Causative Passive
       open-CAUS-INF.OBL

       'The lock was made to open by Reyaz through Farooq.'

It should be noted here that the *zaryi* phrase is always the matrix subject and the *athi* phrase is the causee.

(17)   *reyaaz-as   athi   aav   (farooq-ni   zaryi)   kuluf
        Reyaz-DAT by   came Farooq-GEN by   lock

       khol-na:v-nI   Causative Passive
       open-CAUS-INF.OBL

       'The lock was made to open by Reyaz through Farooq.'

3.3   Transitivity & passive

Unlike English where intransitives cannot be passivized (only transitives can be), Kashmiri intransitives as well as transitives can be passivized like most of the Indo-Aryan languages. But, only unergatives can be passivized not unaccusatives. For example,

(18)   i.   Ilya jumped over the fence.   (English)
       ii.   *Ilya was jumped over the fence.
       iii. The cat ate the rat.
       iv.   The rat was eaten by the cat.

(19)   i.   farooq-an   dits   deyvaar-I peth'   voth   (Kashmiri)
             Farooq-ERG give-PRF wall-OBL   above jump
             'Farooq jumped over the wall.'

       ii.   tati   aayi   di-nI   voth
             there came give-INF.OBL jump
             'There was jumped.'

       iii. *tati   aav   fIT-nI
              there   came   break-INF.OBL
              '*There was broken.'

       iv.   braari   kheyov   gagur
             cat   eat-PRF rat
             'The cat ate the rat.'

       v.   braari hind zaryi aav   gagur khey-nI
             cat   GEN by   came rat   eat-INF.OBL
             'The rat was eaten by the cat.'

It should be noted here that though unegratives *can* be passivized in Kashmiri, the passive construction of unergatives is acceptable without specifying the agent, (see above Example (19ii)). Like in most of the Indo-Aryan languages, specification of the agent makes the construction slightly odd. For example,

(20) *??tati aayi farooq-ni   zaryi voth   di-nI*
       there came Farooq-GEN by   jump give-INF.OBL
       '??There was jumped by Farooq.'

Dative subject constructions in Kashmiri cannot be passivized, similar to most of the Indo-Aryan languages. For example,

(21) i.   *farooq-as   aav   mushuq*
           Farooq-DAT came smell
           'Farooq smelled/To Farooq, the smell came (literal).'

      ii. **farooq-ni   zaryi aav   mushuq yi-nI*
           Farooq-GEN by   came smell   come-INF.OBL
           '*This is smelled by Farooq.'

3.4   (In)abilitative[1] passives

(In)abilitative passive is another kind of passive construction that has been widely attested in the literature. It has other terms too, like, capabilitative passive (Balachandran 1973), passive of incapacity (Hook 1979), inability passive (Davison 1982) and capacity passive (Rosen & Wali 1989). It conveys the inability of an agent/initiator to initiate the event denoted by the predicate, hence it is called the inabilitative passive (Pandharipande 1981).

In Kashmiri, like other SALs, the (in)abilitative passives can be formed on eventive predicates intransitives and transitives both. For example:

(22) *farooq-ni   zaryi aav-nI   shong-nI*
       Farooq-GEN by   came-not sleep-INF.OBL
       'Farooq was not able to sleep.'

(23) *faroo-ni   zaryi aav-nI   khey-nI*
       Farooq-GEN by   came-not eat-INF.OBL
       'Farooq was not able to eat'

---

1.   It should be noted here that we have deliberately used '(in)abilitative' instead of 'inabilitative' in this paper as in Kashmiri, it denotes both ability as well as inability, unlike other Indo-Aryan languages.

However, with stative predicates, we cannot have (in)abilitative passives as shown below:

(24)   *farooq-ni   zaryi aayi-nI   bochi lag-nI
        Farooq-GEN by   come-PRF-NEG hunger happen-INF.OBL
        'Farooq was not able to be hungry.'

As various linguists (Pandharipande 1981; Kachru 1980; Davison 1982) have observed, despite similarities with the regular passive, the (in)abilitative passive differs significantly from it. We will examine this in the light of Kashmiri (in)abilitative passive construction.

Kashmiri, too, has (in)abilitative passives but it does not have any restrictions on the availability of the (in)ability reading, unlike other Indo-Aryan languages. In other words, Kashmiri (in)abilitative passives do not need affected environment (i.e. negation, conditional, question etc). For example,

(25)   i.   ??mujh-se   ye   kaam kiyaa   jaaegaa   Hindi
              I.OBL-INST this work do-PRF go-FUT
              'I will be able to do this work.'

       ii.   mujh-se   ye   kaam nahin kiyaa   jaaegaa   Hindi
              I.OBL-INST this work not   do-PRF go-FUT
              'I will not be able to do this work.'

       iii. myani zaryi yi-yi   yi   kA:m kar-nI   Kashmiri
              I-GEN by   come-FUT this work do-INF.OBL
              'I will be able to do this work.'

       iv.   myani zaryi yi-yi-nI   yi   kA:m kar-nI   Kashmiri
              I-GEN by   come-FUT-NEG this work do-INF.OBL
              'I will not be able to do this work.'

As we have seen above, modals cannot appear in passive constructions in Kashmiri but we can have light verb with (in)abilitative passives in Kashmiri (unlike in Hindi). For example,

(26)   i.   farooq-ni   zaryi yiyi-nI   su   tsuunth
              Farooq-GEN by   be-FUT-NEG   that apple

              khey-th   ni-nI   Kashmiri
              eat-PTCP   take-INF.OBL

              'That apple could not be eaten by Farooq (abruptly).'

       ii.   *farooq-se   ye   seb   khaa liyaa   nahin jaega   Hindi
              Farooq-INST this apple eat   take-PFV   not   pass-FUT
              'This apple could not be eaten by Farooq (completely).'

Another difference is in the choice of *zaryi* vs. *athi* phrase in (in)abilitative passives in Kashmiri. Unlike Hindi where the agentive phrase in inabilitative passives

is marked by either the instrumental case marker *-se* or *-ke dwaaraa '-gen through/ by',* Kashmiri agentive phrase in (in)abilitative passive can only be marked by the instrumental case marker *-zaryi.* As seen in above examples, the matrix subject is always marked by *zaryi* and the causee agent is marked by *athi,* the agentive phrase of the (in)abilitative passives is also marked by *zaryi* and not *athi.* For example,

(27)　**farooq-as　athi yiyi-nI　　su　tsuunth khey-th　ni-nI*
　　　　Farooq-DAT　by　be-FUT-NEG　that apple　eat-PTCP take-INF.OBL
　　　　'That apple could not be eaten by Farooq (abruptly).'

To sum up, we have observed that Kashmiri intransitives (unergatives) as well as transitives can be passivized. Dative subject constructions in Kashmiri cannot be passivized. In Kashmiri, the (in)abilitative passives can be formed on eventive predicates intransitives and transitives both. Kashmiri (in)abilitative passives do not need affected environment (i.e. negation, conditional, question etc). Modals cannot appear in Kashmiri passives though we can have light verb with (in)abilitative passives. Kashmiri agentive phrase in (in)abilitative passive can only be marked by the instrumental case marker *-zaryi* and the causee agent is marked by *-athi.*

　　　Now we will examine the status of subject and object in Kashmiri passive construction.

4.　Status of the subject and the object in Kashmiri passive

It has been shown in many South Asian Languages (SALs) passives like Hindi (Mahajan 1994; Richa 2011), Oriya, Malayalam, Khariya, Meitei and Ao (Chandra & Sahoo 2013) that there is no object to subject promotion. Besides this, the subject retains its subject properties and the object its object properties.

　　　The question is whether the subject and the object in the Kashmiri passive actually behave like other SALs passive subjects and objects? To attest this, some tests can be applied like anaphor binding, pronominal co-reference, control etc. (mostly based on Keenan 1976).

Subject in Kashmiri Passive:

Anaphor Binding:
Possessive reflexives in Kashmiri must be bound by the matrix subject. For example,

(28)　*arshid$_i$ kari　[pann-is$_i$ gar-as]　　mA:yinI*
　　　　arshid　do-FUT　self-GEN home-DAT　examination
　　　　'Arshid$_i$ will examine self's$_i$ home.

Similarly, the *-zaryi* agentive phrase can bind the possessive reflexive.

(29)   farooq-ni*ᵢ*   zaryi aav   pann-is*ᵢ*   gar-as   mA:yinI   kar-nI
       farooq-GEN by   came self-GEN home-DAT examination do-INF.OBL
       'Self's*ᵢ* house was examined by Farooq*ᵢ*.'

In passive of causative, we find that the agentive phrase as well as the causee agent can bind the possessive reflexive.

(30)   farooq-ni*ᵢ*   zaryi aav   reyaaz-as*ⱼ*   athi pann-is*ᵢ*   gar-as
       farooq-GEN by   came Reyaz-DAT by   self-GEN home-DAT

       mA:yinI   kar-na:v-nI
       examination do-CAUS-INF.OBL

       'Reyaaz*ⱼ* was made to examine self's*ᵢ/ⱼ* house by Farooq*ᵢ.*'

Antisubject Orientation of Pronouns:

(31)   farooq-an*ᵢ*   kor   tam-sInd-is*ᵢ*   gar-as   mA:yinI
       farooq-ERG do-FUT   he-GEN-GEN home-DAT   examination
       'Farooq*ᵢ* will examine his*₊ᵢ* home.'

Similarly,

(32)   farooq-ni*ᵢ*   zaryi aav   tam-sInd-is*ᵢ*   gar-as
       farooq-GEN by   came he-GEN-GEN home-DAT

       mA:yinI   kar-nI
       examination do-INF.OBL

       'His*₊ᵢ* home was examined by Farooq*ᵢ*.'

With passive of causative, we get the same result.

(33)   farooq-ni*ᵢ*   zaryi aav   reyaaz-as   athi tam-sInd-is*ᵢ*   gar-as
       farooq-GEN by   came Reyaz-DAT by   he-GEN-GEN home-DAT

       mA:yinI   kar-na:v-nI
       examination do-CAUS-INF.OBL

       'Reyaz made to examine his*₊ᵢ* home was by Farooq*ᵢ*.'

Control into Argument Clauses:
The agentive phrase in passive behaves as the subject does in the subject control constructions.

(34)   i.   farooq*ᵢ* os   [PRO*ᵢ* garI   gatsun] yatsaan
            farooq be-PST   home-OBL go-INF   want-HAB
            'Farooq wanted to go home.'

       ii. farooq-an*ᵢ*   yotsh   [PRO*ᵢ* garI   gatsun]
            farooq-ERG want-PERF   home-OBL go-INF
            'Farooq wanted to go home.'

iii. *farooq-ni$_i$*   *zaryi*   *aav*   [PRO$_i$ *garI*   *gatsun*] *yats-nI*
     farooq-GEN by   came   home-OBL   go-INF   want-INF.OBL
     'It was wanted by Farooq to go home.'

Control into Adverbial Clauses:

The agentive phrase in passive behaves similar to the subject as far as the control into adverbial clauses is concerned:

(35)   i.   *farooq$_i$* *kari*   [PRO$_i$ *garI*   *gatsith*]
         farooq   do-FUT   home-OBL   go-CNJN PRTCP

         reyaaz-as   *bevA:rii*
         reyaaz-DAT   scolding

         'Farooq will scold Reyaaz after going home.'

    ii.   *farooq-an$_i$*   *kAr*   *bevA:rii* *reyaaz-as*
         farooq-ERG do-PERF scolding reyaaz-DAT

         [PRO$_i$ *garI*   *gatsith*]
             home-OBL   go-CNJN PRTCP

         'Farooq scolded Reyaaz after going home.'

Similarly,

(36) *nowsheen-ni$_i$*   *zaryi*   *aayi*   [PRO$_i$ *garI*   *gatsith*]
     nawsheen-GEN by   come-PERF home-OBL go-CNJn prtcp

     farooq-as   *bevA:rii* *kar-nI*
     farooq-DAT   scolding   do-INF.OBL

     'Farooq was scolded by Nowsheen$_i$ after she$_i$ went home.

In passive of causative too, only the martix subject controls into adeverbial clause.

(37) *nowsheen-ni$_i$*   *zaryi*   *aayi*   [PRO$_i$ *garI*   *gatsith*]
     nawsheen-GEN by   come-PERF home-OBL go-CNJn PTCP

     reyaaz-as   *farooq-as*   *athi bevA:rii* *kar-na:v-nI*
     reyaaz-DAT   Farooq-DAT by   scolding   do-CAUS-INF.OBL

     'Farooq was made to scold Reyaz by Nawsheen$_i$ after she$_i$ went home.

Object in Kashmiri Passive:

In Kashmiri, the accusative case is unmarked in constructions with ergative subject but can be marked in constructions with nominative subject.[2] In passives, the object is never marked for accusative case. For example,

---

2.   Some linguists like Wali & Koul (1994, 1997) have mentioned about unmarked objects receiving nominative case in Kashmiri, in this paper, we have considered the nominative and the accusative both as structural cases, where the nominative is associated with subject

(38) i.   *baadsha-an mA:r' jangal-as manz sA:riy sIh*
          king-ERG kill-PERF forest-DAT in   all   lion
          'The king killed all the lions in the forest.'

      ii. *baadsha chu sIh-an maaraan*
          king   Aux lion-acc kill-HAB
          'The king kills lions.'

      iii. *raam-an mO:r su*
          Ram-ERG kill-PERF him
          'Ram killed him.'

      iv. *raam-ni zaryi aav su maar-nI*
          Ram-GEN by   come-PERF him kill-INF.OBL
          'He was killed by Ram.'

      v.   *baadsha-ni zaryi A:y jangal-as manz sA:riy*
          king-GEN   by   come-PERF forest-DAT in   all

          sIh maar-nI
          lion kill-INF.OBL

          'All the lions in the forest were killed by the king.'

      vi. *John-an mO:r bill*
          John-ERG kill-PERF Bill
          'John killed Bill.'

      vii. *John-ni zaryi aav bill maar-nI*
          John-GEN by   come-PERF bill kill-INF.OBL
          'Bill was killed by John.'

As the Examples (38 iii & iv) show, with pronouns too, in both the actives and passives, the accusative marking does not appear. Neither does it appear with the [+human] objects as (38 vi & vii) demonstrate. 'Bill' has accusative case neither in active nor in passive.[3]

Pronominal Coreference:

Kashmiri pronouns can corefer with the objects.

---

agreement and assigned/checked by the functional head T and the accusative is associated with object agreement and assigned/checked by the lexical head V.

3. A reviewer mentions object case as a counter-argument against our analysis. If passive objects are unmarked like nominative DPs, that should be counted as evidence for object promotion to subject position. However, note that object or accusative case is also unmarked in most cases, even for animate DPs. There is no object agreement observed, only the gender and number agreement (not person) on the auxiliary verb changes in the passive; the main verb that is in infinitival oblique form does not change – aav (sg.mas.), A:i (pl.mas.), aayi (sg. fem), aayi (pl.fem.).

(39) i. *reyaaz-an$_i$ suuz farooq$_j$ tohand$_{*i/j}$ garI*
     reyaz-ERG send-PERF farooq his   house
     'Reyaz$_i$ sent Farooq$_j$ to his$_{*i/j}$ house.'

    ii. *reyaaz$_i$ sozi farooq-as$_j$ tohand$_{*i/j}$ garI*
     reyaz-ERG send-FUT farooq-DAT his   house
     'Reyaz$_i$ will send Farooq$_j$ to his$_{*i/j}$ house.'

Similarly, the pronoun in the passive also corefers with the object. For example,

(40) *reyaaz-ni$_i$ zaryi aav farooq$_j$ tohand$_{*i/j}$ garI soz-nI*
    reyaaz-GEN by   came farooq his   house send-INF.OBL
    'Farooq$_j$ was sent to his$_{*i/j}$ house by Reyaaz$_i$.'

In passive of CAUSative, we get the same result.

(41) *reyaaz-ni$_i$ zaryi aav farooq$_j$ nowsheen-as athi tohand$_{*i/j}$*
    reyaaz-GEN by   came farooz Nowsheen-DAT by his

    garI soz-Ina:v-nI
    house send-CAUS-INF.OBL

    'Nowsheen was made to send Farooq$_j$ to his$_{*i/j}$ house by Reyaaz$_i$.'

Two relevant features of Kashmiri passives appear here – one is that the agentive phrase, though surfacing as a PP 'NP….zaryi' retains its subject properties and second, the object does not get promoted, it too retains its object properties. Though the case-less nature of the passive object casts a doubt whether it has moved to the specifier of the TP of not, we have shown above that it has not and control facts provide evidence that they raise high enough to c-command other arguments.

5. Status of the implicit/optional agent in passive

In canonical passives, the subject of the active corresponds to a non-obligatory oblique phrase of the passive or is not overtly expressed. It has been shown that the external argument in the passive is syntactically expressed, though in an alternative manner (Baker et al. (1989); Emonds (2000)). In other words, this syntactically suppressed argument is present in the argument structure (Roeper 1987; Grimshaw 1990), showing that passives do have an implicit argument. Now, the debate narrows down to whether this optional agent of the passive corresponds to the object of the active or not. We will argue that in canonical passives, this optional agent does and in Active-Passives it does not.[4]

---

4. Note here that the Active-Passive is different than the two other kinds of non-canonical passive constructions – one with only object promotion and the other with only subject demotion (See Ura 2000).

Let us examine the status of the implicit agentive phrase in Kashmiri passive. As it is marked by the preposition 'zaryi' or 'athi', it appears to be an adjunct but as we have provided evidences in the above section, it is actually an argument. Like other passive implicit agents (See Bhatt & Pancheva 2006), Kashmiri passive agent too is present in the structure as an implicit argument because (a) it is licensed by the 'zaryi/athi' phrase (b) has the ability to control and (c) its compatibility with adverbs like *deliberately*. First, we will see how the implicit agent is responsible for the licensing. For example,

(42) *zamrood-ni   zaryi aav   kul tsaTI-nI*
      zamrood-GEN by   came tree cut-INF.OBL
      'The tree was cut by Zamrood.'

This implicit agent has the ability to control too. For example,

(43) *na:v aayi inshornIs ropyav khA:trI Duba:v-nI*
      boat come insurance money for   sink-INF.OBL
      'The boat was sunk for insurance money' (to take insurance money)

Adverbs like 'deliberately' are taken to be agent-oriented and hence, the presence of an implicit agent can be attested. For example,

(44) *zA:nith   mA:nith   aayi   na:v Duba:v-nI*
      know-CNJPTCP accept-CNJPTCP came boat sink-INF.OBL
      'The boat was sunk deliberately.'

In passive of causative too, it is the implicit agent that attests the presence of the implicit agent.

(45) *zA:nith   mA:nith   aav   reyaz-as   athi*
      know-CNJPTCP accept-CNJPTCP came Reyaz-DAT by

      kul   tsaTI-na:v-nI
      tree cut-CAUS-INF.OBL
      'Reyaz was made to cut the tree was cut deliberately.'

The same phenomenon, i.e. implicit agent is noticed in causatives constructions too, where instrumental marked causee agents can also be implicit. For example,

(46) *reyaz-an   ma:rI-na:vI-nov farooq (suhan-ni   zaryi)*
      reyaz-ERG kill-CAUS-PRF   farooq sohan-GEN by
      'Reyaz made Sohan kill Farooq.'

In the above Example (46), the instrumental marked causee, i.e. *suhan-ni zaryi* can be implicit.

Hence, we can predict that in passive of causative, both the matrix subject as well as the causee agent must be implicit. And that prediction is found to be true. For example,

(47) *farooq aav ma:rI-na:vI-nI (reyaaz-ni zaryi) (sohan-as athi)*
Farooq came kill-CAUS-pass Reyaz-GEN by Sohan-DAT by
'Farooq was made to be killed (by Reyaz through Sohan).'

This is not unique to Kashmiri. In other SALs too, like Hindi, the causative causee agents show this property. Due to this optionality, the causee agent has often been analysed as an adjunct (Mohanan 1994; Ramchand 2008, 2011) but Richa (2011) argues that it is an argument, quite different from *-se* adjuncts as the causee can easily control into the participial clauses (a property of arguments).

In Kashmiri too, the causee agent can control into the participial clauses. For example,

(48) *ma:shTar-an_i vIRna:vI-nov* [PRO_{i/j} *asa:n asa:n*] *shur-is_j*
master-ERG fly-CAUS-PRF laugh-HAB laugh-HAB child-DAT

athi patang
by kite

'The master_i made the child_j fly the kite while PRO_{i/j} smiling.'

Furthermore, if we passivize the above sentence, the implicit agent can be the controller and also the implicit causee:

(49) *patang aav* [PRO_{i/j} *asa:n asa:n*] *vIRI-na:v-nI*
kite came laugh-HAB laugh-HAB fly-CAUS-INF.OBL
'The kite was made to fly while PRO_{i/j} smiling.'

Hence, Kashmiri passive agent is similar to the causee agent, both are syntactically real arguments present in the syntax, though not phonetically expressed sometimes.

6. Canonical passive vs Kashmiri passive vs SALs passive

If we compare a canonical passive with the Kashmiri one, we find that though there is a non-obligatory oblique agentive phrase in Kashmiri passive that may or may not be overtly expressed and though, on surface, it seems to correspond to the subject of the active; unlike canonical passive constructions, the subject of Kashmiri passive does not correspond to the direct object of the active as anaphor binding, pronominal co-reference and control tests above have confirmed that

the oblique agentive phrase in Kashmiri passive remains a surface subject and the object too does not move to the subject position. In other words, there is no promotion of object or demotion of subject in Kashmiri passive. Interestingly, if we consider 'foregrounding', 'defocusing' or 'agent suppression' as the crucial property of passivization, Kashmiri passive does have this property.

As far as passive constructions in other SALs are concerned, we find mostly similarities and slight dissimilarities too. Chandra & Sahoo (2013) have considered languages from four different language families – Oriya (Indo-Aryan), Malayalam (Dravidian), Kharia (Austro-Asiatic), Ao & Manipuri (Tibeto-Burman). They find that unlike English-type passives, passives in all these languages (except Tibeto-Burman) are similar in preserving subject properties for their logical subjects and object properties for their logical objects.[5]

Tibeto-Burman passives are not similar to other SALs as they have no separate verbal morphology or 'by' agentive phrase but Chandra & Sahoo provide ample evidence that actives in Manipuri and Ao have passive counterparts with topicalized objects as well as dropped agents. Further, the topicalized object can control into the complement clause. Moreover, agent-oriented adverbials can also be used with the optional agent-sentences, proving that the agents in Ao and Manipuri are syntactically active (though phonetically absent).

Further, if we compare Kashmiri passive construction with SALs passives, we find that it also maintains subject properties for its logical subject and object properties for its logical object as observed in the above section. The only difference is that unlike Hindi, Oriya and Kharia passives, the object in Kashmiri passives is not overtly marked like its active object. In this regard, it is similar to Malayalam passive.

By examining the phenomenon of passivization cross linguistically, it is seen as a function of four linguistic features – (1) Optional Subject Suppression (OSS) (2) Object to Subject Movement (OSMv) (3) Separate Verbal Morphology (SVM) (4) Overt Marking on Object (OMO). (Note that the last feature OMO is not applicable for English as it is not morphologically rich like SALs; this feature has been considered to distinguish within the SAL group). We can contrast the presence or absence of these features in different SALs with canonical active and passive i.e. English active (A.) and English passive (P.), as done in the following table:

---

5.   A reviewer comments that Malayalam passive objects are unmarked with nominative case and occupy sentence-initial positions. While further data is needed to substantiate this claim, it is also equally important to find out explanations for why agentive by-phrases and not objects show subject like properties in the language.

Table 1. Passive continuum

Language	OSS	OSMv	SVM	OMO	Feature value	Passiveness % age
English P.	+	+	+	*	3/3	100
Hindi	+	_	+	+	3/4	75
Urdu	+	_	+	+	3/4	75
Kashmiri	+	_	+	_	2/4	50
Malayalam	+	_	+	_	2/4	50
Kharia	+	_	+	_	2/4	50
Manipuri	+	_	_	_	1/4	25
Ao	+	_	_	_	1/4	25
English A.	_	_	_	*	0/4	0

On the basis of percentage of the defining features of the canonical passives, as shown in the above table, one can estimate the passiveness for each language in terms of numbers and there by a clear cut passive continuum can be traced & represented from canonical active to canonical passive (from 0% passiveness to 100% passiveness). By this way of estimation & representation, one can not only account for the differences between canonical passives and South Asian Languages' (SALs) passives but also the differences within SAL passives. Moreover, positing a passive continuum on the basis of numbers is a more empirical way rather than branding them collectively as complete passives, ACTIVE passives or half-passives.

6.1   Is passivization a Detransitivization/Intransitivization process?

Detransitivization is an operation that removes a complement DP from the selection features of the verb, suppresses that DP's theta role and neutralizes the verb's Case features. Therefore, the concept of passive as a valency-decreasing rule is also expressed as detransitivization, i.e. an argument suppression process, or a resultant state which removes a participant from the actual action (Siewierska 1984; Givón 1990; Thompson 1994).

The comparison of SALs passives and canonical passives also questions some basic aspects regarding the process of passivization. In canonical passives, as the external argument becomes an adjunct, i.e. it can be optionally represented and it goes to a different argument – the object, passivization has also been called as a detransitivization process. For Shibatani (1985), detransitivization and passivization are two different processes, though both involve valency decrease. In detransitivization, there is no agent conceived but in passivization, an agent is present in

the semantic frame, though not in the syntactic frame. He argues that passivised transitives are detransitivised but passivised ditransitives are not – they must remain transitive to make sense of the clause. For example,

(50) The food was put on the shelf.

Klaiman (1991), too, considers passivization as a detransitivization process but distinguishes between two types of detransitivization – one that allows for the expression of the agent and one that does not. Kiparsky (2012) does not consider passivization as intransitivization and argues that it is the property of demotion to reduce the valency of a predicate (i.e. the number of its direct arguments) by one, hence, passives of ditransitives are transitive and passives of intransitives are subjectless/impersonal. Wunderlich (2012) considers passive as an affix that demotes/existentially binds the most prominent Theta-role which is not already demoted.

Hence, if we look at the passives in SALs, this very notion of passivization as a detransitivization operation fails to apply here. Moreover, in SAL passives, the agent is syntactically present too (though it may be not phonetically represented), unlike as claimed by Shibatani (1985) that it is only semantically present.

7. Final remarks

Adding to the passive controversy, the above investigation on Kashmiri passives shows that we cannot have a clear cut distinction between what is a passive or not, in terms of one specific set of features. Therefore, we have tried to illustrate the similarities as well as differences between the canonical passives and Kashmiri passive construction. In Kashmiri passive, the agent is encoded in an oblique case, i.e. it has been defocused to some extent, not complete, unlike the canonical passive where the agent is not syntactically encoded at all. Contrary to Keenan & Dryer (2007), we argued that the agent phrase, though in the form of an oblique NP, is an integral part of the passive construction and is the syntactic subject of the verb.

Therefore, in line with Shibatani (1985)'s view of passives forming as continuum with actives, we too consider that Kashmiri passive lies on the active/passive continuum – but slightly more towards the active side where though the subject is defocused to some extent, it retains its subject properties and object too retains its object properties.

Finally, we argue that despite lacking some of the features of canonical passives, Kashmiri has the passive voice that is one of the language universals.

References

Bach, Emmon. 1980. In defense of passive. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 3: 297–341.

Baker, Mark, Kyle Johnson & Ian Roberts. 1989. Passive arguments raised. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20: 219–252.

Bhatt, Rajesh & Pancheva, Roumanya. 2006. Implicit arguments. In *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax,* vol. II, 554–584. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Bresnan, Joan. 1982. The passive in lexical theory. In J. Bresnan (Ed.), *The mental representation of grammatical relations* (pp. 3–86). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chandra, Pritha & Sahoo, Anindita. 2013. Passives in south asian languages. *Acta Linguistica Asiatica* 3: 9–27.

Chomsky, Noam. 1957. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton.

Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*. The MIT Press: Cambridge, Mass.

Croft, Willam. 1994. Voice: Beyond control and affectedness. In P. J. Hopper & B. A. Fox (Eds.), *Voice: Form and function* (pp. 89–117). Amsterdam: John Benjamin

Davison, Alice. 1982. On the form and meaning of Hindi passive sentences. *Lingua* 58(1–2): 149–179.

Freidin, Robert. 1975. The analysis of passives, *Language* 51: 384–405.

Givón, Talmy. 1990. *Syntax. A Functional Typological Introduction-II*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Givón, Talmy (ed.). 1994. *Voice and Inversion*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Grimshaw, Jane, 1990. *Argument Structure*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1990. The grammaticalization of passive morphology. *Studies in Language* 14: 25–72.

Hasegawa, Kinsuke. 1968. The passive construction in English. *Language* 44: 230–243.

Hook, Peter Edwin. 1979. *Hindi Structures: Intermediate Level.* Michigan Papers on South and South-East Asia 16, Center for South and South-East Asian Studies, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.

Jackendoff, Ray, S. 1969. An Interpretive Theory of Negation. *Foundation of Language* 5(2): 218–241.

Kachru, Yamuna. 1980. *Aspects of Hindi-Grammar*. New Delhi: Manohar Publications.

Keenan, Edward. 1976. Towards a universal definition of 'subject.' In *Subject and Topic*, Charles N. Li (ed.), 303–34. New York: Academic Press.

Keenan, Edward L. & Dryer, Matthew S. 2007. Passive in the world's languages. In *Language Typology and Syntactic Description. Vol. I: Clause Structure*, Timothy Shopen (ed.), 325–361. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Kiparsky, Paul. 2012. Towards a null theory of passives. *Lingua*. Nov. 2012.

Klaiman, Miriam. H. 1991. *Grammatical Voice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lakoff, George. 1974. Interview in H. Parret (Ed.), *Discussing language*, pp. 178–179. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton.

Mahajan, Anoop. 1994. Active passives. In *Proceedings of the Thirteenth West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, R. Aronovich, W. Byrne, S. Preuss & M. Senturia (eds). Stanford University: CSLI Publications.

Mohanan, Tara. 1994. Argument Structure in Hindi. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Pandharipande, Rajeshwari. 1981. *Transitivity in Hindi*. 11(2): 161–179. University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Perlmutter, David M. & Postal, Paul M. 1984. The I-advancement exclusiveness law. In *Studies in Relational Grammar* 2, David M. Perlmutter & Carol Rosen (eds), 81–125. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ramchand, Gillian. 2008. Verb Meaning and the Lexicon: A First Phase Syntax. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ramchand, Gillian. 2011. Licensing of instrumental case in Hindi/Urdu in Causatives. Working Papers on Language & Linguistics 38. Tromsø University: Septentrio Acdemic Publishing.

Richa. 2011. *Hindi Verb Classes and Their Argument Structure Alternations*. UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishers.

Robson, Roy Anthony. 1972. On the generation of passive constructions in English. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Texas, Austin, USA.

Roeper, Thomas. 1987. Implicit Arguments and the Head-Complement Relation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18(2): 267–310.

Rosen, Carol & Wali, Kashi.1989. Twin passives, inversion, and multistratalism in Marathi. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 7(1): 1–50.

Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1985. Passives and related constructions: A prototype analysis. *Language* 61: 821–848.

Siewierska, Anna. 1984. *Passive: A Comparative Linguistic Analysis*. Croom Helm: New Hampshire.

Siewierska, Anna. 1988. The passive in Slavic languages. In M. Shibatani (Ed.), *Passive and voice* (pp. 243–289). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Thompson, Chand. 1994. Passives and inverse constructions. In *Voice and Inversion*, T. Givón (ed.). 47–63. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Ura, Hiroyuki. 2000. *Checking Theory and Grammatical Functions in Universal Grammar*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Wali, Kashi. & Koul, Omkar Nath. 1994. Kashmiri clitics: The role of the case and CASE. *Linguistics* 32: 969–994.

Wali, Kashi & Koul, Omkar Nath. 1997. *Kashmiri: A Cognitive-Descriptive Grammar*. London: Routledge.

Wunderlich, Dieter. 2012. Operations on argument structure. In *Handbook of Semantics*, Claudia Maienborn et al. (ed.), Vol. 3. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Ziff, Paul. 1966. The Nonsynonymy of Active and Passive Sentences. *The Philosophical Review* 75: 226–232.