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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 Dakhkini\(^1\), 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 Dakhkini 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 Tughlaq and were absorbed into the spoken as well as written language of the people there. According to him Dakhkini speakers hailed from Punjab, Bangru and the vernacular Hindustani dialect area of north, whereas Zore (1960) is of the opinion that Dakhkini 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 genitive and genitive case markers in Dakkhini, 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 'degeminization'. 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 status 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 φ. The following examples are illustrative:

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 T: ra:mu:du φ cEs:in- a pani ba:ga: undi
   Ram done ADJR work good is

3 D: ra:m φ 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 ku ghar se nikalte hi: ba:ri:š hui:
   Ram GEN home from right after rain occurred starting
   ‘Right after Ram started from home, it rained.’

   Ram home from right after rain fell starting

6 D: ra:m φ ghar se nikalte sa:th ich pa:n: 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 infinitival markers are underscored.

7 H–U: ra:m ka: ya:ba: a:−na:
   Ram GEN here come+INF
   ‘Ram’s coming here’

Let us consider the corresponding Telugu and Dakkhini sentences.

8 T: ra:mu:du φ ikkadi ki ra:−wa:dam
   Ram here+DAT come+INF
   ‘Ram’s coming here’

9 D: ra:m φ 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 Dakhkini can again be attributed to convergence with Telugu. Thus, we see that the genitive as a STATUS REDUCER is not present in Dakhkini 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 Dakhkini 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”.


‘The servant who is gone since morning’

11 T: podduna ø wellina panimanişi morning gone servant

12 D: subbø ø gaye so nokar morning having gone servant

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


14 T: ra:muţi ki inţi: ki wella:li ari undi Ram DAT home DAT go COMP feels like

15 D: rə:m ku ghar ku (ja:na: bolke ai) Ram DAT home DAT (go+INF COMP is ja:ne ku ø dil bolra: (go+INF DAT)

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

16 H–U: mujhe ghar ja:ne kî jaldi: hai to me home go+INF+GEN hurry is ‘I am in a hurry to go home.’

17 T: na:ku inţi ki povað:ni kî to me home DAT to go DAT tondaraga: undi hurry is

18 D: mere ku gaye (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 Dakhkini where the occurrence of the linker is optional when the matrix verb is a conjunct verb such as a:dat karna:, a:dat da:ma: ‘to pick up a habit’. The following examples from Hindi – Urdu and Dakhkini are illustrative:

19 H–U: raju ne biyar pi:ne kî Raju ERG beer drink+INF GEN a:dat da:lli:hai habit picked up ‘Raju picked up the habit of drinking beer’.

20 D: raju 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 Dakhkini in most of the cases 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 Dakhkini 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 ‘degenevization’

There are a few cases when the genitive of Hindi-Urdi is retained in Dakhkini. For a discussion of these cases, see Arora (1987).
is taking place whose effect is to make Dakhkhini more in conformity with the pattern found in Dravidian languages. The degentinivization 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 Dakhkhini.

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, Dakhkhini follows the Dravidian pattern and not the Hindi – Urdu pattern. That Dakhkhini favours ‘degentinivization’ and is proceeding towards ‘dativisation’ is further supported by the possessive construction in Dakhkhini 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 Dakhkhini as well as in Telugu.

Ram she GEN what related is
‘How is Ram related to her?’
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 baccë hai
Sita GEN four children are
‘Sita has four children’
25. T: si:ta ki naluguru pillalu
Sita DAT four children
26. D: sì:ta ku ca:r baccë ai
Sita DAT four children are
27. H–U us ka: is dùniyà: më koi: nahi: hai
he GEN this word in anyone not is
‘He has no one in this world.’
he DAT this world in anyone not
he DAT this world in anyone EMPH NEG is

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

dog GEN four feet are
‘A dog has four feet’
31. T: kukka ki na:lu: ka:lu un:ai
dog DAT four feet are
32. D: kutte ku ca:r pà:vâ raitë
Dog DAT four feet are

3.3 It is worth mentioning that in the case of concrete as well as abstract possession, Dakhkhini 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 bahu:t paisa: hai
she near lots of money is
‘She has alot of money’.
34. T: a:me ki ca:la dabbu undi
she DAT lots of money is
35. D: us ku bhot paisa: ai
she DAT lots of money is
Radha GEN holidays are
Radha DAT holidays
38. D: ra:da: ku chu:ttiyà ai
Radha DAT holidays are

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

39. D: kà ku ja:re?
where DAT are going
‘Where are you going?’
40. T: ya:di ki bo:tunna:u?
where .DAT are going
41. D: và: ku gaye talka thak jà:te
there DAT went till then get tired
‘By the time you reach there, you will get tired’
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.
In contrast, Hindi-Urdu does not have a dative in such sentences.

49A. H–U: ye medisin this medicine &la;ye ho?
kisliye why
la:ye ho? brought
*kis ko who+DAT

49B. klinik ke liye clinic for
klinik ko clinic+DAT

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

50A. T: i: medisinu enduku this medicine ti:skoni why+DAT ooca:wu? having brought came
50B. klinik ki clinic
clinic+DAT

3.6 Yet another instance of the occurrence of the dative in Dakhkhini is the construction in which difference between two objects is measured. The following examples from Dakhkhini 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: yä: 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 Dakhkhini are illustrative:

unda?
54. T: iddī ki a:ddī ki farak undi here+DAT there+DAT a lot of difference is
ca:na: farak undi
Hindi-Urdu, on the other hand, does not permit the dative in such constructions. For example:

55. H–U: tum mē aur us mē kita: farak hai you in and ha in how much difference is *ku *ku DAT DAT

56. H–U: yahā mē aur vahā mē kitna: farak hai? here in and there in how much difference is *ko *ko DAT DAT

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

4. We have discussed cases in Dakhkini 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 Dakhkini (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 Dakhkini 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 Dakhkini 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 Dakhkini 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 Dakhkini in this case) or areally connected (Telugu and Dakhkini in his case) is the only method available for the study of syntactic change in such cases.
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