

CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS AND SYNTACTIC CHANGE*

HARBIR ARORA AND K. V. SUBBARAO

University of Delhi

1. The purpose of this paper is to bring out a valuable contribution that contrastive analysis can make towards the study of syntactic change. Though it is generally agreed that there are two approaches to contrastive studies — theoretical and applied (Fisiak, 1981), studies in theoretical contrastive linguistics have been far less in comparison to the number of articles and papers written in applied contrastive linguistics. According to Fisiak, theoretical contrastive studies are “language independent” and they look for the realization of a universal category in languages to be contrasted (ibid p. 2). This paper aims to bring out a valuable contribution contrastive analysis can make to the study of syntactic change thus providing a new dimension to the contribution of theoretical contrastive linguistics. Taking into consideration the syntax of the dative and genitive constructions in Dakkhini¹, we shall demonstrate that

* This is a slightly revised version of the paper presented at the seminar on *contrastive analysis and Indian languages* Central Institute of English and Foreign Languages, Hyderabad, 1986. Thanks are due to Dr. R. K. Agnihotri for his valuable comments. Abbreviations used in this paper are: ADJR-Adjectivalizer, COMP-complementizer, DAT-dative, EMPH-emphatic, ERG-ergative, GEN-genitive, INF-infinitive, NEG-negative, PERF-perfect, PPLE-participle, PST-past.

¹ According to Chatterji (1963 : 142) North Indian Muslims with Hindu allies and associates speaking dialects of western Hindi (Indo-Aryan), and Punjabi (Indo-Aryan) went to central and south India and carved out Muslim kingdoms for themselves settling down among Marathas (Indo-Aryan) Kannadigas (Dravidian) and Telugus (Dravidian). The dialects they took with them supplied the basis of a literary speech they developed from the fifteenth century. It was known as Dakkhini or the southern speech. According to Shirani (1928), the spoken language of Delhi freely absorbed elements from Punjabi when king Ghauri with his army recruited from Punjab entered the city as conquerer. Punjabi words thus incorporated into the spoken as well as the written language of Delhi travelled to southern India with Khilji and Tuglaq and were absorbed into the spoken as well as written language of the people there. According to him Dakkhini speakers hailed from Punjab, Bangru and the vernacular Hindustani dialect area of north, whereas Zore (1960) is of the opinion that Dakkhini Urdu is derived neither from Punjabi nor from Khari boli Hindi but from a source common to both.

contrastive analysis is the ONLY viable tool for studying change in language contact situations.

Dakkhini is a language which resulted due to intimate contact for more than five centuries between the speakers of Dravidian languages such as Telugu and Kannada and Indo-Aryan languages such as Hindi and its dialects and Punjabi. We shall show that unless we contrast structures containing the dative and genitive case markers in Dakkhini², with parallel constructions in Hindi-Urdu and Telugu, we will not be able to provide an explanation for the syntactic changes that took place in Dakkhini dative and genitive constructions. The genitive of Hindi-Urdu is lost in several parallel constructions in Dakkhini. We shall label this process as 'degenitivation'. We shall present data which show that Dakkhini has been proceeding towards 'dativization' as a result of which the dative occurs in more constructions in Dakkhini in comparison to Hindi – Urdu. In support of our claim that contrastive analysis provides valuable insights towards the study of syntactic change, we shall discuss both types of constructions: those where the Hindi – Urdu genitive *kA*:³ of Hindi – Urdu is replaced by the dative *ku* of Dakkhini in some other cases.

2. We shall first discuss those cases where Hindi – Urdu has the genitive *kA*: and Dakkhini: has either a null form or the dative.

2.1. In participial constructions in Hindi – Urdu, the genitive occurs with the subject of the status⁴ of an underlying finite sentence to that of a phrase (cf. sentence (1) below. The genitive is underscored) just as the poss. does in the poss. ing complement constructions in English. Such occurrence of the genitive as a status reducer is not present in Dakkhini (cf. sentence (3) below). It is interesting to note that Telugu too does not have the genitive with the embedded subject in such sentences (cf. sentence (2) below). The absence of the genitive is indicated by \emptyset . The following examples are illustrative⁵:

- 1 H-U: ra:m ka: kiya: hua: ka:m accha: hai
 Ram GEN done (PERF PPLE) work good is
 'The work which Ram did is good.'

² Dakkhini data presented in this paper were collected from native speakers belonging to Karim Nagar, Warangal, Mahboob Nagar towns now settled in Hyderabad. In all these areas, there is a large amount of Muslim population which constantly interacts with speakers of Telugu, a Dravidian language.

³ Capital *A*: indicates that the vowel in the genitive changes according to the number and gender of the noun with which it agrees.

⁴ In nonfinite complement constructions in Hindi, the genitive is attached to the subject of the embedded sentence and the infinitival marker is attached to the verb stem of the embedded sentence after the deletion of the tense marker. According to the analysis proposed in Subbarao (1983), these devices together reduce the status of a finite complement to a nonfinite phrase. Hence, the genitive as well as the infinitival marker can be labelled as status reducers.

⁵ H-U stands for Hindi-Urdu, D for Dakkhini and T for Telugu.

- 2 T: ra:mudu \emptyset ce:sin- a pani ba:ga: undi
 Ram done ADJR work good is
 3 D: ra:m \emptyset kare so ka:m accha: hai
 Ram done ADJR work good is

2.2. Let us now consider sentence adverbials in Hindi – Urdu where the genitive occurs with the embedded subject. In such sentences too, the genitive functions as a status reducer. Unlike Hindi-Urdu, Dakkhini and Telugu do not have a genitive marker with the embedded subject in sentence adverbials.

- 4 H-U: ra:m ke ghar se nikalte hi: ba:riš hui:
 Ram GEN home from right after rain occurred
 starting
 'Right after Ram started from home, it rained.'
 5 T: ra:mudu \emptyset inči nuci bayalude:raga:ne wa:na paḍindi
 Ram home from right after rain fell
 starting
 6 D: ra:m \emptyset ghar se nikalte sa:th ich pa:ni:para:
 Ram home from right after EMPH rained
 starting

2.3 In Hindi-Urdu, in nonfinite complement constructions too the genitive, among other things, is attached to the subject of the embedded sentence which consequently reduces the status of the subject as well as that of the embedded sentence to a status which is less sentence like. The genitive here too functions as a status reducer just as it does in participial constructions as in sentence (1) and in sentence adverbials as in sentence (4) above. Consider for example sentence (7) from Hindi – Urdu. The genitive and the infinitive markers are underscored.

- 7 H-U: ra:m ka: yahā: a:-na:
 Ram GEN here come+INF
 'Ram's coming here'

Let us consider the corresponding Telugu and Dakkhini sentences.

- 8 T: ra:mudu \emptyset ikkadi ki ra:-wadam
 Ram here+DAT come+INF
 'Ram's coming here'
 9 D: ram \emptyset yā: ku a:-ne ka:⁶
 Ram here+DAT come+INF GEN

⁶ This *kA*: whose function is to link two constituents is a linker and should be treated differently from the status reducer *kA*: (for details see Arora, (1987)).

The absence of the genitive in the subject position of the phrase in (9) in Dakkhini can again be attributed to convergence with Telugu. Thus, we see that the genitive as a STATUS REDUCER is not present in Dakkhini just as in Telugu in the nonfinite complement constructions.

2.4 It is also interesting to note that the genitive which occurs with time adverbials in participial constructions in Hindi – Urdu is absent in Dakkhini just as in Dravidian languages. The function of the genitive in sentences such as (10) in Hindi – Urdu is purely to link the adverb *subah* ‘morning’ with “the NP *gaya: hua: naukar* the servant who is gone”.

- 10 H-U: *subah ka: gaya: hua: naukar*
 morning GEN having gone servant.
 ‘The servant who is gone since morning’
- 11 T: *poddunna ø wellina panimaniši*
 morning gone servant
- 12 D: *subbō ø gaye so nokar*
 morning having gone servant

2.5 The genitive in conjunct verb⁷ constructions in Hindi – Urdu is replaced by the dative *ku* or the complementizer *bolke*⁸ as the following examples illustrate (The conjunct verb, the genitive, the dative and the COMP are underscored).

- 13 H-U: *ra:m ka: ghar ja:ne ka: dil kar raha: hai*
 Ram GEN home go+INF GEN feels like
 ‘Ram feels like going home.’
- 14 T: *ra:muḍi ki inṭi ki wella:li ani undi*
 Ram DAT home DAT go COMP feels like
- 15 D: *ra:m ku ghar ku { ja:na: bloke ai }
 Ram DAT home DAT { go+INF COMP is }
 { ja:ne ku⁹ dil bolra: }
 { go+INF DAT }*

2.6 The genitive of Hindi – Urdu linking an infinitive with nouns such as *jaldi:* ‘quickness’ *khwaṣ* ‘desire’ is either replaced by the dative marker *ku* or the complementizer *bolke* in Dakkhini. In parallel constructions in Telugu too either the dative or the complementizer occurs. The following examples from Hindi – Urdu, Telugu and Dakkhini are illustrative:

⁷ The term conjunct verb is due to Burton Page (1957) Conjunct verb constructions are a combination of a noun or an adjective with a verb. Some examples are: *koṣiṣ karna:* literally ‘attempt to do’ which means ‘to try’, *madad karna:* literally ‘help to do’ which means ‘to help’

⁸ *bolke*, which is, verb *say*+the conjunctive participial marker functions as a postsentential complementizer in Dakkhini. For a detailed discussion, see Arora (1987) and Subbarao and Arora (1989).

⁹ We shall discuss the occurrence of the dative *ku* later.

- 16 H-U: *mujhe ghar ja:ne ki: jaldi: hai*
 to me home go+INF+GEN hurry is
 ‘I am in a hurry to go home.’
- 17 T: *na:ku inṭi ki povada:ni ki*
 to me home DAT to go DAT
tondaraga: undi
 hurry is
- 18 D: *mere ku ghar { ja:ne ku } jaldi: hori:
 I DAT home { go+INF DAT } hurry is
 { ja:na: bolke }
 { go+INF COMP }*

However, there is an exception in Dakkhini where the occurrence of the linker is optional when the matrix verb is a conjunct verb such as *a:dat karna:*, *a:dat ḍa:lina:* ‘to pick up a habit’. The following examples from Hindi – Urdu and Dakkhini are illustrative:

- 19 H-U: *ra:ju ne biyar pi:ne ki*
 Raju ERG beer drink+INF GEN
a:dat ḍa://i:hai
 habit picked up
 ‘Raju picked up the habit of drinking beer’.
- 20 D: *ra:ju biyar pi:na: ø a:dat kar liya:*
 Raju beer drink+ habit picked up
 INF

The question that arises now is: How does one account for the Hindi – Urdu genitive in Dakkhini in most of the cases¹⁰ and the presence of the dative *ku* or a finite complementizer such as *bolke* in a few other cases? The absence of the genitive as a STATUS REDUCER can be explained by hypothesizing that it is due to convergence with Telugu. As we shall show later, the presence of the dative in Dakkhini is due to a syntactic process which we shall label as DATIVIZATION (see 3 below) which again is due to convergence with Telugu. The replacement of the genitive by the complementizer *bolke* is also due to influence of Telugu because in the above examples, Telugu, too, has a complementizer in such sentences.

3. We shall now discuss the implications of the nonoccurrence of the genitive as a status reducer and the presence of the dative or the finite complementizer. In our opinion, this phenomenon indicates that the change towards ‘degenivization’

¹⁰ There are a few cases when the genitive of Hindi-Urdu is retained in Dakkhini. For a discussion of these cases, see Arora (1987).

is taking place whose effect is to make Dakkhini more in conformity with the pattern found in Dravidian languages. The degenitivization process, it appears, is almost complete except for the one example containing the conjunct verb *a:dat karna*: 'to pick up a habit'. Our guess is that in course of time this genitive too which functions as a linker, would obligatorily be replaced by the complementizer *bolke* or the dative *ku* construction in Dakkhini.

Dravidian languages in most places have a dative where Hindi – Urdu has a genitive construction. As shown in Subbarao (1983), Dravidian languages are 'dative preferring languages' and Hindi – Urdu is a 'genitive preferring language'. As one might predict from the foregoing discussion, Dakkhini follows the Dravidian pattern and not the Hindi – Urdu pattern. That Dakkhini favours 'degenitivization' and is proceeding towards 'dativisation' is further supported by the possessive construction in Dakkhini which we shall discuss below.

3.1 Let us now consider possessive constructions expressing kinship relation and inalienable possession in the three languages under consideration. Possessive constructions including kinship relationship and a person to person relationship are expressed by the genitive in Hindi – Urdu and in contrast by the dative in Dakkhini as well as in Telugu.

21. H-U: ra:m us ka: kya: lagta: hai?
Ram she GEN what related is
'How is Ram related to her?'
22. T: ra:muḍu a:me ki ye:mi avuta:ḍu?
Ram she DAT what related
23. D: ra:m us ku kon hona?
Ram she DAT who related
24. H-U: si:ta ke ca:r bacce haĩ
Sita GEN four children are
'Sita has four children'
25. T: si:ta ki naluguru pillalu
Sita DAT four children
26. D: si:ta ku ca:r bacce ai
Sita DAT four children are
27. H-U us ka: is duniyā: mē koi: nahĩ: hai
he GEN this word in anyone not is
'He has no one in this world.'
28. T. a:yana ki i: prapancam lo: ewaru: le:ru
he DAT this world in anyone not
29. D: us ku ye duniya: mē koi: bi: nāi: ai
he DAT this world in anyone EMPH NEG is

3.2 In case of inalienable possession too, where Hindi-Urdu has the genitive, Dakkhini and Telugu have the dative.

30. H.U: kutte ke ca:r pā:v hote hāi
dog GEN four feet are
'A dog has four feet'
31. T: kukka ki na:lugu ka:ḷḷu unṭa:i
dog DAT four feet are
32. D: kutte ku ca:r pā:vā raite
Dog DAT four feet are

3.3 It is worth mentioning that in the case of concrete as well as abstract possession, Dakkhini follows the Telugu pattern. That is, it has the dative with the logical subject whereas Hindi-Urdu has the compound postposition *ke pa:s* 'near'.

33. H-U: us ke pa:s bahut paisa: hai
she near lots of money is
'She has alot of money'.
34. T: a:me ki ca:la ḍabbu undi
she DAT lots of money is
35. D: us ku bhot paisa: ai
she DAT lots of money is
36. H-U: ra:dha: ki chuṭṭiya: hāi
Radha GEN holidays are
37. T: ra:dha: ki selawalu
Radha DAT holidays
38. D: ra:da: ku chuṭṭiyā ai
Radha DAT holidays are

3.4 Further, the dative is used to express DIRECTIONALITY in Dakkhini just as in Telugu.

39. D: kã ku ja:re?
where DAT are going
'Where are you going?'
40. T: ya:ḍi ki bo:tunna:u?
where DAT are going
41. D: vā: ku gaye talka thak ja:te
there DAT went till then get tired
'By the time you reach there, you will get tired'
42. T: a:ḍi ki poyye da:ka alisi po:ta:u
there DAT reach till then get tired

Observe the parallel Hindi-Urdu sentences where there is no corresponding dative. The absence of the dative is indicated by Ø.

43. H-U: kahā: Ø ja: rahe ho?
where are going
'Where are you going?'
44. H-U: vahā: tak ja:ne mē thak ja:ogi:
there upto go+INF in will get tired
'By the time you reach there, you will get tired'.

3.5 Another instance which clearly indicates that Dakkhini is also a 'dative preferring' language similar to Telugu and not a 'genitive preferring' language is that the dative marker extends its domain to the purposive function where it replaces the purposive marker *ke liye* 'for' 'in order to' or the durative marker *mē* of Hindi-Urdu, showing a structural similarity with Telugu. The following examples from Dakkhini, Telugu and Hindi-Urdu are illustrative:

45. D: $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{tum}^{11} \\ \text{you} \\ \text{tum ku} \\ \text{you+DAT} \end{array} \right\}$ kha:na bana:ne *ku* kitti: der hona:?
food to make DAT how much time is needed
'How long do you need to make food'
46. T: $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{nuvvu} \\ \text{you} \\ \text{ni:ku} \\ \text{you+DAT} \end{array} \right\}$ annam jeyya:ḍa:ni *ki* enta se:pu ga:va:le?
food to make+ DAT how much time is needed
47. H-U: tumhē kha:na bana:ne *ke liye* / *bana:ne mē*
you+DAT food to make in order to to make in
kitni: der lagegi:?
how much time will take

To a question as in (48A) in Dakkhini where the dative occurs with the question word *ka:ye ku* 'why+DAT', the answer too contains a dative as (48B) illustrates:

- 48A. D: ye medisn ka:ye-*ku* la:ye?
this medicine why+DAT brought
'Why did you bring this medicine?'
- 48B. klinik *ku*
clinic for
'For the clinic'

¹¹ The absence of the dative in such sentences as (45) in Dakkhini is due to the influence of Telugu as the corresponding Telugu sentence in (46) illustrates where the dative is optional.

In contrast, Hindi-Urdu does not have a dative in such sentences.

- 49A. H-U: ye medisn $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{*kisliye*} \\ \text{why} \\ \text{**kis ko*} \\ \text{who+DAT} \end{array} \right\}$ la:ye ho?
this medicine brought

- 49B. $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{*klinik ke liye*} \\ \text{clinic for} \\ \text{*klinik ko*} \\ \text{clinic+DAT} \end{array} \right\}$

In contrast, consider sentences (50A) and (50B) in Telugu which contain a dative:

- 50A. T: i: medisnu enduku ti:skoni occa:wu?
this medicine why+DAT having brought came
- 50B. klinik *ki*
clinic+DAT

3.6 Yet another instance of the occurrence of the dative in Dakkhini is the construction in which difference between two objects is measured. The following examples from Dakkhini are illustrative where the dative is attached to the standard of comparison as well as object of comparison.

51. D: tum *ku* us *ku* kitta: farak ai?
you DAT he DAT how much difference is
'What is the difference between you and him?'
52. D: yā: *ku* vā: *ku* bhot farak ai
here DAT there DAT a lot of difference is
'There is a lot of difference between here and there'.

Telugu too has a similar construction where the dative *ku* occurs with both the objects. Sentences (53) and (54) of Telugu corresponding to sentences (51) and (52) respectively of Dakkhini are illustrative:

53. T: mi:*ku*: a:yanaku: enta te:ḍa: undi?
you+DAT he+DAT how much differences is
54. T: i:ḍi *ki* a:ḍi *ki* ca:na: farak undi
here+DAT there+DAT a lot of difference is

Hindi-Urdu, on the other hand, does not permit the dative in such constructions. For example:

55. H-U: tum $\left(\begin{array}{c} m\bar{e} \\ \text{in} \\ *ku \\ \text{DAT} \end{array} \right)$ aur us $\left(\begin{array}{c} m\bar{e} \\ \text{in} \\ *ku \\ \text{DAT} \end{array} \right)$ kita: farak hai
 you and ha how much difference is

56. H-U: yahā: $\left(\begin{array}{c} m\bar{e} \\ \text{in} \\ *ko \\ \text{DAT} \end{array} \right)$ aur vahā: $\left(\begin{array}{c} m\bar{e} \\ \text{in} \\ *ko \\ \text{DAT} \end{array} \right)$ kitna: farak hai?
 here and there how much difference is

The above examples clearly indicate that Dakkhini, like Telugu is a dative preferring language whereas Hindu-Urdu is genitive preferring.

4. We have discussed cases in Dakkhini which clearly demonstrate that the genitive *kA:* of Hindi-Urdu occurring with the embedded subject in participial constructions (as in sentence (1)) and with the subject in sentence daverbials (as in sentence (4)) is deleted in Dakkhini (as in sentences (3) and (6) respectively). In both these constructions, the function of the genitive is that of a status reducer. The genitive is also absent in Dakkhini with time adverbials in participial constructions (as in sentence (12)) where it functions as a linker in Hindi-Urdu. Another case of absence of the genitive in Dakkhini is the nonfinite complement construction (as in sentence (9)). In contrast, in Hindi-Urdu the genitive in such sentences functions as a status reducer. We have also shown that the genitive of Hindi-Urdu is replaced either by *bolke* or by the dative *ku* in Dakkhini in those constructions where it links the infinitival complement with conjunct verbs as in sentences such as (15) and in the constructions where it links an infinitive verb with nouns as in sentence (18).

It appears that syntactic change noticed in language contact situations cannot be explained in purely synchronic or diachronic terms. It is only by contrasting parallel structures in different languages in contact that we can arrive at an adequate characterization of these changes. Contrasting parallel structures in languages which are genetically related (Hindi-Urdu and Dakkhini in this case) or areally connected (Telugu and Dakkhini in his case) is the only method available for the study of syntactic change in such cases.

REFERENCES

- Arora, H. 1987. *Some aspects of Dakkhini Hindi-Urdu syntax with special reference to convergence*. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Delhi.
 Burton-Page, J. G. 1957. "Compound and conjunct verbs in Hindi". *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies XIX*.

- Chatterji, S. K. 1963. *Languages and literatures of modern India*, Calcutta, Bengal Publishers.
 Fisiak, J. (ed.) 1981. *Contrastive linguistics and the language teacher*. Pergamon Institute of English. Oxford, Pergamon Press.
 Shirani, M. 1928. *Punjab mē Urdu*. Anjuman Taraqqi-e-Urdu, Lahore (Reprint 1975, Lucknow)
 Subbarao, K. V. 1983. *The study of linguistic typology, language contact and areal universals in the Indian Subcontinent*. Dept. of Linguistics, University of Delhi.
 Subbarao, K. V., Arora, H. 1989. "On extreme convergence: the case of Dakkhini Hindi-Urdu". *Indian Linguistics 49*.
 Zore, S. M. Qadri. 1960. *Hindustani Lisaniyat*. Lucknow, Naseem Book Depot.