In this assignment, you will consider Case marking in Hindi(-Urdu). Case in Hindi is marked by particles (clitics) which follow the NP. Note the Case clitics on the subjects in each of the following sentences. [NOTE: Some nouns in Hindi have a different morphological form when they are marked by a Case clitic than when they are not.]

(1) a. Ravi banana eat PROG be.PST 'Ravi was eating a banana.'
   Case marking: Ø

   b. Ravi NE banana eat.PERF 'Ravi ate the banana.'
   Case marking: ne

   c. Ravi KO banana eat.INF be.PST 'Ravi was obliged to / needed to eat the banana.'
   Case marking: ko

   d. Ravi SE banana eat.PERF not go.PERF 'Ravi couldn’t eat the banana.'
   Case marking: se

   e. Ravi KE four children be.PST 'Ravi had four children.'
   Case marking: ke

   f. Ravi ME at.all mercy not be.PST 'Ravi had no mercy at all.'
   Case marking: mē

We will only look at the first three of these. The other Case markings are Instrumental (se), Genitive (ke), and Locative (mē and others).

NE

A.
Consider the following contrast between subjects marked with ne and subjects marked with Ø.

(2) ne subjects

   a. Ravi NE banana eat.PERF 'Ravi ate the banana.'
      (= 1b)

   b. Ram NE mirror break.PERF 'Ram broke the mirror.'
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(3) \( \emptyset \) subjects
   a. Raam giraa.
      Ram fall.PERF
      ‘Ram fell.’
   b. Raam joor-se cillaayaa.
      Ram loudly shout.PERF
      ‘Ram shouted loudly.’

Data of this kind are generally taken to be representative of the distribution of these two Cases in Hindi. How would you characterize the distribution of \( ne \) subjects? Of \( \emptyset \) subjects? What would be an appropriate name for the \( ne \) Case?

B.
Contrast the following. What additional factor conditions the appearance of \( ne \)? Given what we know about ergative Case, is this expected? Explain.

(4) a. Raam ne Ravi ko pīṭaa.
      Ram NE Ravi KO beat.PERF
      ‘Ram beat Ravi.’
   b. Raam ne Ravi ko pīṭaa hai.
      Ram NE Ravi KO beat.PERF be.PRES
      ‘Ram has beaten Ravi.’

(5) a. Raam Ravi ko pīṭaa hai.
      Ram Ravi KO beat.IMPERF be.PRES
      ‘Ram beats Ravi.’
   b. Raam Ravi ko pīṭegaa.
      Ram Ravi KO beat.FUT
      ‘Ram will beat Ravi.’

C.
Now consider the following data:

(6) a. Raam ne jor-se cillaayaa.
      Ram NE loudly shout.PERF
      ‘Ram (intentionally) shouted loudly.’
   b. Raam ne jaanaa ki Siitaa bahut bimaar hai.
      Ram NE know.PERF that Sita very ill be.PRES
      ‘Ram found out that Sita was very ill.’
   c. Ravii davaaii pī gayaa.
      Ravi medicine drink go.PERF
      ‘Ravi (impulsively) drank up the medicine.’
The examples in this section should contradict your observations in section A concerning the distribution of \( ne \) Case and \( \emptyset \) Case. How would you characterize the distribution of these two Cases in light of the new data? Are the data in this section expected based on your conclusions in section A as to the identity of the \( ne \) Case? Why or why not?

KO

D.
The textbook glosses \( ko \) as accusative Case (on p. 133), but other studies of Hindi have identified it as dative. Which identification do the following examples support?

(7) a. \( Ilaa \ ne \ ek \ bacce \ ko \ u\text{\^{t}}aayaa. \)
   \( Ila \ NE \ one \ child \ KO \ lift.PERF \)
   ‘Ila lifted a child.’

b. \( Ilaa \ ne \ ek \ haar \ u\text{\^{t}}aayaa. \)
   \( Ila \ NE \ one \ necklace \ lift.PERF \)
   ‘Ila lifted a necklace.’

(8) a. \( Ilaa \ ne \ bacce \ ko \ u\text{\^{t}}aayaa. \)
   \( Ila \ NE \ child \ KO \ lift.PERF \)
   ‘Ila lifted the/a child.’

b. \( Ilaa \ ne \ haar \ u\text{\^{t}}aayaa. \)
   \( Ila \ NE \ necklace \ lift.PERF \)
   ‘Ila lifted a/the necklace.’

c. \( Ilaa \ ne \ haar \ ko \ u\text{\^{t}}aayaa. \)
   \( Ila \ NE \ necklace \ KO \ lift.PERF \)
   ‘Ila lifted the/*a necklace.’

(9) a. \( Raam \ ne \ kutte \ ko \ becaa. \)
   \( Ram \ NE \ dog \ KO \ sell.PERF \)
   ‘Ram sold the/*a dog.’

b. \( Raam \ ne \ kuttaa \ becaa. \)
   \( Ram \ NE \ dog \ sell.PERF \)
   ‘Ram sold the/a dog.’

(10) a. \( Raam \ Anil \ ko \ u\text{\^{t}}aegaa. \)
    \( Ram \ Anil \ KO \ carry.FUT \)
    ‘Ram will carry Anil.’

b. \( Anil \ u\text{\^{t}}aayaa \ jaaegaa. \)
   \( Anil \ carry.PERF \ go.FUT \)
   ‘Anil will be carried.’

Explain your answer.
E.
Now consider \textit{ko} in the following examples.

(11) a. Raam ne kutte ko k\textsuperscript{ha}aanaa diyaa.
    ‘Ram gave food to the/a dog.’

b. *Raam ne kutt\textsuperscript{aa} k\textsuperscript{ha}aanaa diyaa.
    ‘Ram gave food to the/a dog.’

c. Raam se kutte ko k\textsuperscript{ha}aanaa gayaa.
    ‘The dog was given food by Ram.’

(12) a. Raam ne Anil ko haar b\textsuperscript{ha}ejaa.
    ‘Ram sent Anil a/the necklace.’

b. Anil ko haar b\textsuperscript{ha}ejaa gayaa.
    ‘The necklace was sent to Anil.’

Is this the same use of \textit{ko} (i.e. accusative or dative) as in D? If yes, show how. If not, explain and propose an analysis.

F.
\textit{Ko} can also mark subjects. There is such a sentence in (1c) on p. 1, and additional examples below. (It can be shown that these are all subjects, but the data will not be presented here.)

(13) a. Tu\textsuperscript{sha}ar ko caand dik\textsuperscript{ha}aa.
    ‘Tushar saw the moon.’

b. Tu\textsuperscript{sha}ar ko kitaab milii.
    ‘Tushar received a book.’

c. Tu\textsuperscript{sha}ar ko k\textsuperscript{hu}\textsuperscript{shii} huii.
    ‘Tushar became happy.’

d. Tu\textsuperscript{sha}ar ko m\textsuperscript{hi}aaii k\textsuperscript{ha}aaii hai.
    ‘Tushar wants to eat sweets.’ / ‘Tushar has the urge to eat sweets.’

What is your analysis of \textit{ko} as a subject-marking Case: accusative or dative?
We see in the above that subjects and objects can sometimes be marked with an overt Case (in the regular case, ne for subjects and ko for objects), and sometimes left unmarked. There are two ways one could analyze such a situation.

1. There is a mismatch (discrepancy) between the syntax and the morphology. In the syntax, all (regularly-marked) subjects are marked with ne Case and all direct objects with ko Case. But this syntactically relevant Case is “abstract Case”: in the morphological realization, ne Case is realized as /ne/ for some nouns and unpronounced for others; similarly, ko Case is realized as /ko/ for some nouns and unpronounced for others. As far as the syntactic Case-marking rules are concerned, there is no separate $\emptyset$ Case.

2. The morphology faithfully reflects the syntactic situation: some subjects are syntactically marked with ne Case and others are not, some objects are syntactically marked with ko Case and others are not. $\emptyset$ is the unmarked Case, which we could call either nominative or absolutive. (In analyses of Hindi that adopt this view, the name “nominative” is usually used for the unmarked Case.) Under this analysis, there is a syntactic difference between NPs with overt Case and those without overt Case.

In this context, consider the verb agreement pattern in Hindi, exemplified in (13)–(16). (Note: Despite what you may think, there are no typos in these examples.)

(14) a. Ravii kelaa kʰaayaa.
Ravi(M) banana(M) eat.FUT.MSG
‘Ravi will eat a banana.’
b. Ravii roṭii kʰaayaa.
Ravi(M) bread(F) eat.FUT.MSG
‘Ravi will eat bread.’
c. Niinaa roṭii kʰaayii.
Nina(F) bread(F) eat.FUT.FSG
‘Nina will eat bread.’
d. Niinaa kelaa kʰaayii.
Nina(F) banana(M) eat.FUT.FSG
‘Nina will eat a banana.’

(15) a. Ravii baalak ko uṭʰaayaa.
Ravi(M) boy(M) KO lift.FUT.MSG
‘Ravi will lift up the boy.’
b. Ravii baalikaa ko uṭʰaayaa.
Ravi(M) girl(F) KO lift.FUT.MSG
‘Ravi will lift up the girl.’
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What is the agreement rule in Hindi-Urdu? Does this help us decide between ① and ②? What do other data on this handout and what you know about Case typology tell us about ① vs. ②?