

Ablative, Sociative and Instrument Markers in Urdu, Punjabi and Sindhi

Tafseer Ahmed
Universitaet Konstanz
tafseer@gmail.com

Abstract

The paper discusses different semantic usages of sociative, instrument and ablative case markers in Urdu, Sindhi and Punjabi. The analyzed semantic usages include adjunct and adverbial usages too. It identifies source and accompaniment as the core meaning of ablative and sociative-instrument case markers respectively. It explains the adverbial usages as the metaphorical extension of the core meaning of the markers. It lists the contrast in different usages of these case markers within and between languages and explains the semantic reasons for the contrast. The fine-grained list and contrast of the usages can be used in modeling grammar for the computational linguistics applications.

1. Introduction

Case is a system of marking dependent nouns for the type of relationship they bear with their heads [1] e.g. subject and object of a verb can be marked by a case system. Languages use different ways for the case system. Old Indo-European languages used morphological inflections to express case. For example, Sanskrit had eight cases whose names, in Latin grammatical terms, are: Nominative, Accusative, Dative, Ablative, Instrument, Genitive, Locative and Vocative [1]. The following Latin example shows nominative and accusative inflections on subject and object respectively.

(1) puell-a mens-am dat.
Girl-Nom¹ table-Acc give
'A girl gives a table.' (Latin)

¹ Glosses used in this paper are: Acc=Accusative, Caus=Causative, Dat=Dative, Erg=Ergative, F=Feminine, Gen=Genitive, Inf=Infinitive, Inst=Instrument, Loc=Locative, M=Masculine, Obl=Oblique, Perc=Percative, Perf=Perfective, Pl=Plural, Pres=Present, Sg=Singular. For Urdu transcription, 'a', 'i' and 'u' are used for short vowels and 'aa', 'ii' and 'uu' are used for the long ones. 'ai' is used for open mid front unrounded vowel and 'ui' are for open mid back rounded vowel. Capital letters are used for retroflex consonants except capital 'S' which is used for voiceless palatal fricative. Capital 'N' used after a vowel shows nasalization. Small 'c' is used for voiceless alveolar affricate.

In English, a fixed order language, the subject and object are distinguished by their position. South Asian languages, specially New Indo-Aryan (NIA) languages (1000 AD - present) devised a new method to mark cases. Along with few morphological inflections that are remains of Old and Middle Indo-Aryan languages, these languages use clitics and postpositions to mark the case. Butt and King [2] discussed case system of Urdu and difference between inflection, clitic and postposition.

List of case markers in Urdu, Sindhi and Punjabi are given in table 1:

Table 1: Case Markers in Urdu, Punjabi and Sindhi

Case	Urdu	Punjabi	Sindhi
Nominative	φ	φ	φ
Ergative	ne	ne	oblique
Accusative	ko	nuuN	k ^h e
Dative	ko	nuuN	k ^h e
Instrument	se	naal	saaN
Ablative	se	-oN, toN	-aaN, k ^h aaN
Locative	meN, par,..	-ic, vic, ..	meN, te, ...

Example examples of case marker usage are:

(2) Sikaarii=ne banduuq=se Ser
hunter.M.Sg=Erg gun.F.Sg=Inst lion.M.Sg
maar-aa
kill-Perf.M.Sg
'The hunter killed the lion with the gun.' (Urdu)

(3) maiN=ne Sikaarii=ko banduuq
1P.Sg=Erg hunter.M.Sg=Dat gun.F.Sg
d-ii
give-Perf.F.Sg
'I gave the gun to the hunter.' (Urdu)

The subject in (2) and (3) is marked with ergative marker *ne*, object is marked with nominative. The instrument in (2) is marked with instrument/ablative marker *se* and the recipient in (3) is marked with dative marker *ko*.

The list of case markers is not as small as in Table 1. Masica [3] identified three layers of case marking in

NIA: (I) inflection (II) clitics (III) postpositions. Punjabi ablative *oN* is an inflection (I), accusative/dative *nuuN* is a clitic (II) and instrument *naal* is a postposition.

Different case can have a common case marker. For example, Nepali and Marathi have common marker for ergative and instrument. Urdu, Punjabi and Sindhi have common marker for accusative and dative. In Indo-Aryan, case markers do not only mark arguments of a verb, but they also mark adjunct and adverbial usages. Ahmed [4] discussed different semantic usages of Urdu accusative/dative marker *ko* and proposed that it has core meaning of goal or endpoint.

In next sections, we will analyze the sociative, instrument and ablative case markers of Urdu, Sindhi, and Punjabi. We will list the relevant case markers in these languages. We get the data (analyzed in following sections) and the list of case markers from [3], [5], [6] and by reading newspapers and books, but the list of postpositions presented here is not complete but only representative.

We will propose core meaning of each of these markers and the reasons why a common form is used to mark more than one cases, e.g. Punjabi *naal* is used for both sociative and instrument marker. We will also discuss the similarities and differences in semantic usages of these case markers among these languages.

This analysis can help in computational applications e.g. It can be used in machine translation system to find which case marker of the target language corresponds to a particular marker of the source language. If more than one case markers of the target language exists corresponding to one case marker of a source language, then what are the semantic conditions for choice of the appropriate marker.

2. Ablative Case

2.1. Case Markers

Ablative case is associated with motion away from a source. We find examples of all of the Masica's layers of case marking in ablative case markers of these languages. Punjabi uses *oN* (layer I) and *toN* (layer II) for ablative. Sindhi uses layer I morpheme *aaN* (in uttarradi dialect *aoN*) for ablatives. Urdu uses *se* (layer II) that marks instrument case too. Punjabi use layer III construct (*ke*) *kaaran* for marking ablative.

Masica has also discussed some complex constructions/postpositions/clitics that can either be considered as layer IV or special sub-layers of layer II and III. For example, Sindhi use three compound case markers for ablative. These are composed of layer II case marker and layer I *aaN* morpheme. i.e.

maaN = *meN* (locative marker 'in') + *aaN*

taaN = *te* (locative marker 'on') + *aaN*

k^haaN = *k^he* (accusative and dative marker 'to') + *aaN*.

Punjabi has ablative markers that are composed of a layer III postposition and layer I morpheme *oN*. Examples of Punjabi compound markers are: *vicoN* = *vic* (inside) + *oN*, *koloN* = *kol* (near) + *oN* and *naaloN* = *naal* (with) + *oN*.

Sindhi has a similar example (*je*) *sababaaN*, that is composed of noun *sabab* (reason) and layer I *aaN*. Urdu uses *meN se* and *par se* having two layer II markers. It also uses (*ki*) *vaja se* that has a noun *vaja* (reason) and a layer II clitic *se*.

2.2. Semantic Usages

Urdu has a common case marker *se* for sociative, instrument and ablative cases. But Punjabi and Sindhi have different markers for sociative-instrument and ablative cases. The examples of different semantic usages of ablative show that its core meaning is of source point of motion. The other usages are its extensions that can be inferred by following discussion on different semantic usages.

2.2.1. Spatial Usage. Punjabi and Sindhi use morphological inflection *oN* and *aaN* respectively to mark the starting location of the motion. Following examples show this usage:

(4) main g^har-oN aa-yaa
3P.M.Sg house.M.Sg-abl come-Perf.M.Sg
'He came from the house.' (Punjabi)

(5) ho g^har-aN aa-yo
3.M.Sg house.M.Sg.abl come-Perf.M.Sg
'He came from the house.' (Sindhi)

Morphological inflection used by Sindhi is non-productive as it can be used with only few words like house etc. Other words needs marker *k^haaN*. For example,

(6) ho kaalij-aN*/=k^haaN aayo
3.M.Sg college.abl*/college=abl come.Perf.M.Sg
'He came from the college.' (Sindhi)

Urdu does not have a morphological inflection (layer I), and uses case marker clitics (layer II) *se* for this usage. Punjabi uses clitics in addition to the morphology. It can be seen in the following example.

(7) o g^har=toN aa-yaa
3.M.Sg house.abl come-Perf.M.Sg
'He came from the house.' (Punjabi)

It is the primary usage of ablative i.e. to mark the

location from which an object/person starts its motion.

2.2.2.Source of Object, Extended Usage. Ablative markers are used to mark the argument (of the verb) from which an object (physical or abstract) moves or transferred to the other argument. For example, ablative marker is used to mark the source of the direct object in the sentences involving verb ‘take’ or ‘buy’. For example,

- (8) o=ne nadya=toN kitaab
3P.M.Sg Nadya.F.Sg=abl book.F.Sg.nom
lii
take.Perf.F.Sg
‘He took the book from Nadya.’ (Punjabi)

In this example, Nadya was the location or source from which the book starts its motion. Another similar extended usage is the source of experience in the dative subject sentences. See the following example:

- (9) menuuN saaNp=toN Dar
1P.M.Sg.dat snake.M.Sg=abl fear.noun
lag-yaa
stick.M.Sg.perf
‘I feared the a/the snake.’ (Punjabi)

The dative subject in Indo Aryan acts as the location of the experience [7]. Similarly, the source of the experience (the location from which the abstract object is coming) is also an abstract location that is marked with ablative case marker.

Ablative marker is also used to mark the argument that will or can be the source of an action in response. For example,

- (10) ohaaN xudaa=k^haaN
3P.M.Sg.obl God.M.Sg=abl
maangyo
request.Perf.M.Sg
‘He begged from God.’ (Sindhi)

- (11) us=ne muj^h=se
3P.M.Sg=erg 1P.M.Sg.obl=abl
savaal puuchaa
question.M.Sg ask.Perf.M.Sg
‘He asked me a question.’ (Urdu)

In (10) and (11), the potential source is marked with ablative marker.

2.2.3.Temporal Usage. Spatial usage can usually be extended to the temporal usage. The ablative marker is used to mark start time of any event. Hence it marks the source or origin on temporal scale or time line from which the event originated or started. See the following example:

- (12) Nadya subh=k^haaN
Nadya.F.Sg.Obl morning.F.Sg=abl
Saam=taaiiN paR^h-yaa
evening.F.Sg=loc read.Perf.M.Sg
‘Nadya studied from morning to evening.’ (Sindhi)

Similarly Urdu uses *se* marker and Punjabi uses *toN* marker with the starting point i.e. source in time.

2.2.4.Source of action. Another usage of ablative marker is the source of action. The agent causing an action can be marked with ablative. For example, the causee or intermediate agent in causative is marked with the ablative case marker.

- (13) o=ne mazduraaN=toN
3P.Sg.M.Sg=erg laborer.M.Pl=abl
ghar ban-vaa-yaa
house.M.Sg read-caus-Perf.F.Pl
‘He caused the laborers to make the house.’ (Punjabi)

- (14) anjum=ne saddaf=se xabraiN
anjum.F.Sg=erg saddaf.F.Sg=abl news.F.Pl
paR^h-vaa-iiN
read-caus-Perf.F.Pl
‘Anjum caused Saddaf to read the news (on tv)’. (Urdu)

In both of the above examples, the causee is the source of action, hence it is marked with the source marker. If the causee is the recipient of the action, the affected agent described by Saksena [8], then it is marked with the dative case marker. For example,

- (15) anjum=ne saddaf=ko/se*
anjum.F.Sg=erg saddaf.F.Sg=dat/abl
sabaq paR^hvaayaa
lesson.M.Pl read.caus.Perf.M.Sg
‘Anjum caused Saddaf to learn the lesson.’ (Urdu)

Ablative is also used in the sentences having inabilities and accidental actions [9]. Similarly in passive sentence, subject of the corresponding active sentence is marked with the ablative case marker. See the following example,

- (16) gilaas anjum=toN toRa
glass.M.Sg anjum.F.Sg=abl break.Perf.M.Sg
gayaa
go.Perf.M.Sg
‘The glass is broken by Anjum.’ (Punjabi)

In all of the above examples, ablative marker marks the argument from which action is originating i.e. action moves away from it.

2.2.5. Relative reference/Comparison. Ablative case marker is used to mark a location from/relative to which a comparison is made. For example

- (17) mera ghar daryaa=toN
 1P.M.Sg.Gen house.M.Sg river.M.Sg=abl
 duur ae
 away be.pres
 ‘My house is away from the river.’ (Punjabi)

This extended usage is the static version of the primary dynamic usage in which a body moves away from a location. Like the temporal usage, the argument marked with *toN* (‘river’) is treated as the origin. The other argument (‘away’) is the nature of the scale, in this case ‘awayness’. These two arguments, that constitute adverbial phrase *daryaa toN duur*, gives meaning of an (physical or abstract) object that is at distance from the origin on ‘awayness’ scale.

The same syntax is used to express comparison of adjective to show comparative and superlative degrees. These uses ablative marker like:

- (18) sadiq omair=se lambaa hai
 Sadiq.M.Sg Omair.M.Sg=abl tall.M.Sg
 be.pres ‘Sadiq is taller than Omair.’ (Urdu)
- (19) sadiq sab=se lambaa hai
 Sadiq.M.Sg all=abl tall.M.Sg be.pres
 ‘Sadiq is the tallest of the all’ (Urdu)

Here the argument having ablative marker acts as origin from which the quality ‘tallness’ is measured on the abstract adjective scale.

In this adverbial usage, the adverb can be marked by the genitive marker too. For example,

- (20) g^har=ke/se baahar
 house.M.Sg=Gen/Abl outside
 ‘Outside the house’ (Urdu)

- (21) takalluf=ke/se* biGair
 formality.F.Sg=Gen/Abl* without
 ‘without formality’ (Urdu)

- (22) takalluf=toN biGair
 formality.F.Sg=Abl without
 ‘without formality’ (Punjabi)

As ‘formality’ is being excluded, or someone is moved away from it (metaphorically), it is marked with ablative in Punjabi (and Sindhi). Urdu seems to show irregular behavior, and prefers the semantically neutral genitive marker in this context.

2.2.6. Coming from Inside/maaN. As discussed in 2.1, Sindhi has three compound markers for ablative. In 2.2.2 - 2.2.5, all the usages involve *k^haaN* which marks

the movement from a point. As the usages are abstract, and the source is considered as an abstract point, the usages are marked with *k^haaN*.

maaN (composed of *meN* ‘in’ and ablative *aaN*) is used in the context, when an object come from the inside of an area or object. It is also used to mark a person/object passing through a location.

- (23) aaoN ii Seher=maaN guzr-aa
 1.M.Sg this city.M.Sg=abl pass-Perf.M.Sg
 ‘I passed through this city.’ (Sindhi)

It is also used in the context when someone or something is coming from a collection. For Example,

- (24) ohaaN unhan manhan=maaN aahiiyo
 3P.M.Sg those man.M.Pl=Abl be
 jin te.....
 whom on
 ‘He is among those people on whom’
 (Sindhi)

But *maaN* is also used with abstract nouns. For example,

- (25) ohaaN taariix=maaN sabaq na
 3P.M.Sg.Obl history.F.Sg=abl lesson not
 siikh-yo
 learn-Perf.M.Sg
 ‘He did not learn lesson from history. (Sindhi)

Sindhi uses ablative marker *maaN* for marking the material usage in which the resulting product is coming from the material.

- (26) ohaaN iiTaaN=maaN ghar
 3P.M.Sg.Obl brick.F.M=Abl house
 banaayo
 make.Perf.M.Sg
 ‘He built the house with bricks.’ (Sindhi)

2.2.7. Coming from top/taaN. Sindhi *taaN* is composed of *te* ‘on’ and ablative *aaN*. The marker *taaN* is used when something A was attached with another thing B and it was not part of it, and then A moves away from B.

It is used with the nouns that have shape of the surface. For these, we can use the marker that literally means ‘from on’, ‘from over’ or ‘from the surface of’. For example,

- (27) moN mez=taaN kitaab
 1P.M.Sg table.F.Sg=Abl book.F.Sg
 uTaar-o
 take.perf.F.Sg
 ‘I took the book from the table.’ (Sindhi)

The abstract extended meaning of attachment to (and not part of) an object can be seen in the following example.

- (28) Gizaai jinsan=taaN teksan=jo xaatmoN
 food item=Abl tax=Gen end
 ‘removal of tax from food items’ (Sindhi)

Here, taxes were not the part of the food item. In an abstract way, taxes are just attached or lying on the food items. Hence moving taxes away from the food items is marked with *taaN* ablative marker.

The discussion in above sections is summarized as:

Table 2: Comparison of case markers for different ablative usages in Urdu, Punjabi and Sindhi

	Urdu	Punjabi	Sindhi
source of motion	se	-oN, toN	-aaN, khaaN
source (buy, take)	se	toN	khaaN
stimulus (fear)	se	toN	khaaN
potential source	se	toN	khaaN
temporal	se	toN	khaaN
Agent	se	toN	khaaN
comparison/adverb	se	toN	khaaN
from inside	meN se	vicoN	maaN
from surface	par se	toN	taaN

3. Sociative-Instrument Case

Sociative case is associated with accompaniment. Punjabi uses *naal*, Sindhi uses *saaN*, and Urdu uses *saat^h* and *se* to mark it. Except Urdu *se* (a layer II clitic), all the others are layer III postpositions. In Sindhi and Punjabi instrument usages are also marked with the sociative marker *naal* and *saaN* respectively. Urdu clitic *se* is used for instrument, sociative and ablative usages.

The syncretism i.e. of usage of common marker of sociative (or comitative) and instrument marker is a known phenomenon. Lakoff and Johnson [10] pointed out that instrument is metaphorically treated as companion of the agent. As there is no sociative case in traditional Latin and Sanskrit grammar, usually semantic usages of sociative case are treated as example of instrument case. But we have reasons for using it differently from instrument case. Many Dravidian languages e.g. Tamil [11] have two separate markers for instrument and sociative case. Masica [3] has listed sociative case markers of Indo Aryan languages.

3.1. Sociative Semantic Usages

The fundamental usage of sociative marker is accompaniment with another object. For example,

- (29) meN kampiutar=de naal kitaab
 1P.Sg computer.M.Sg=Gen Soc book.F.Sg
 rak^h-ii
 put.Perf.F.Sg
 ‘I put the book alongwith/near the computer.’
 (Punjabi)

In this usage, *kitaab* ‘book’ has semantic feature of accompaniment, and it accompanies the object ‘computer’. When accompaniment is extended to agentive/action domain, we get examples like following sentence.

- (30) meN o=de naal gal kiit-ii
 1P.Sg 3P.Sg=Gen Soc talk do.Perf.F.Sg
 ‘I talked with him.’ (Punjabi)
- (31) meN o=de naal mil-yaa
 1P.Sg 3P.Sg=Gen Soc meet.Perf.F.Sg
 ‘I met him.’ (Punjabi)

Here the object marked with *naal* is accompanying in the action of talking/discussion and meeting. It is accompanying the action with the subject argument. This accompaniment is in action, not in space.

In the above two example, the agent is sentient and volitional. But generally, the sociative markers Punjabi *naal*/ Sindhi *saaN* is underspecified for volition and sentience, as the first example does not have sentience and volition. Also we will see in the next section that sociative marker is used with involitional instrument.

In equivalent sentences of (30) and (31), Urdu uses *se* in place of Punjabi *naal* (and Sindhi *saaN*). But, in co-agent usage Urdu uses a different marker, while Punjabi and Sindhi uses the same marker *naal/saaN* respectively.

- (32) meN us=ke saat^h baazaar
 1P.Sg 3P.Sg=Gen soc market.M.Sg
 gayaa
 go.Perf.M.Sg
 ‘I went to the market with him.’

3.2. Instrument Semantic Usages

The core instrument usage is the device or mean by which an agent perform an action.

- (33) o=ne caabi naal buhaa
 3P.Sg=Erg key.F.Sg soc-inst door.M.Sg
 k^hol-iaa
 open.Perf.M.Sg
 ‘He opened the door with the key.’ (Punjabi)

Here *caabi* ‘key’ is the mean by which the action of opening the door is performed. The agent affected the

instrument, and the instrument caused the action. The instrument is accompanying the agent in the action. This accompaniment is the reason for the use of sociative marker in instrumental usage. It is why we claim that sociative marker having core meaning of accompaniment subsumes instrument usages, and we term the marker as sociative-instrument marker or simply sociative marker.

The sociative-instrument marker is also used with adverbial manner.

- (34) o cetii=naal b^hagya
 3P.Sg fast=soc-inst run.perf
 ‘He runs fastly.’ (Punjabi)

Here, the the adverb describes an elaboration of the event. ‘Fast’ is considered as a mean/instrument of performing the action. We propose that manner is a component of event description. The action/verb ‘run’ is accompanied by the adverb ‘fastly’ as the agent in previous sentence is accompanied by the instrument ‘key’. Again, the accompaniment is marked by the sociative-instrument marker.

The instrument thematic role is described as a path (through which action flows) that acts as both goal and source. Ostler [12] pointed out that it is difficult to reconcile the path and accompaniment semantics, but sentences like (31) and (33) are marked by the same form in many languages.

4. Choice among the cases

The languages we are analyzing, specially Sindhi and Punjabi, have almost similar distribution of semantic usages of the ablative, sociative-instrument and ergative marker². But there are few semantic usages in which these languages differ with each other. We are pointing out these differences and giving explanation for the choice of different case markers.

4.1. Sociative-Instrument vs. Ablative

The sociative-instrument and ablative markers compete with each other in two manners. Firstly, there are two different mental pictures of same usage in two different languages. See following examples.

- (35) hu moN=k^haaN naaraaz aahe
 3P.M.Sg 1P.Sg=Abl angry be.pres
 ‘He is angry with me.’ (Sindhi)

² The data of Siraiki, Balochi and Old-Urdu show a similar distribution of semantic usages among different case markers, but we do not include those in detailed analysis due to the limitation of space and avoidance of repetition.

- (36) o mere naal naraaz ae
 3P.Sg 1P.Sg.Gen Abl angry be.pres
 ‘He is angry with me.’ (Punjabi)

In Sindhi example, the argument marked with ablative is the source of anger like the source of fear in ‘I feared snake.’ sentence. In Punjabi, the argument is just a participant that is accompanying the subject in action domain and hence marked with sociative-instrument.

Similarly for material of a product, Punjabi deal material as the mean/instrument in accompaniment of which a product is obtained. Hence, it is marked with sociative-instrumental marker. It can be seen in the following example,

- (37) meN iitaaN naal makaan
 1P.Sg brick.F.PI soc-inst house.M.S
 ban-aa-yaa
 make-caus-Perf.M.Sg
 ‘I made the house with bricks.’ (Punjabi)

While in Sindhi, the material is the thing from which the product is extracted. The product comes from the material which is marked by ablative *maan* (‘from within’), as shown in (26).

The second competition of instrument and ablative is in the same language. Different semantic features or syntactical constraints require use of different markers. The sentient and non-sentient means of action are distinguished in Punjabi and Sindhi by use of different case markers. The sentient intermediate agent of causative e.g. ‘laborers building a house’ is marked with ablative marker as shown in (13), but the insentient instrument e.g. ‘key opening the door’ is marked with sociative-instrument marker, as in (33).

4.2. Ablative vs. Ergative

Another example of the competition/alternation of different case markers in the same language is agentive use of ergative and ablative. Intermediate agent in causative has all the semantic properties of agent. They are marked by ergative case in the base (transitive) form of the verb.

- (38) Mazdur.oN=ne g^har
 laborer.M.PI=Erg house.M.Sg
 ban-aa-yaa
 make-caus-Perf.M.Sg
 ‘The laborers built the house.’ (Urdu)

But in causative, these are marked by ablative. See the following sentence that is similar to (13).

- (39) us=ne mazdur.oN=se
 3P.Sg.M.Sg=erg laborer.M.Pl=abl
 g^har ban-vaa-yaa
 house.M.Sg read-caus-Perf.F.Pl
 ‘He caused the laborers to make the house.’ (Urdu)

The causative sentence has two sources of action: the primary causer who initiates and controls the action and the intermediate agent. Both of these arguments have sentience and volition. Butt and King [13] proposed that ergative marker *ne* of Urdu have semantic feature of volition. On the other hand syntactical constraints in Urdu allow the ergative marker to only mark the subject. Among these two volitional agents, the causer has initiation and control (that are related to volition). Hence, the causer takes the more agentive ergative marker, while the intermediate agent is marked by the other available source of action maker i.e. ablative. Ergative and oblique subject of Punjabi and Sindhi respectively and ablative intermediate agent (in causative constructions) have similar explanation.

Similarly in passive sentences, syntactic constraint does not allow the source of action to be realized as subject, hence it cannot be marked by subject-only ergative marker. Therefore the volitional source of action is marked with the ablative marker in the passive sentence as in (16). Ablative marker is also used in inability and accident sentences. See the following sentence,

- (40) anjum=se gilaas TuuT
 anjum.F.Sg=Abl glass.M.Sg break
 gayaa
 go.Perf.M.Sg
 ‘Anjum broke the glass (accidentally).’ (Urdu)

In this sentences, the agent is involitional. Hence, we propose that ablative marker is underspecified for volition. This claim is strengthened by the primary core usage of ablative marker which is motion of a body from a source. The spatial source marked by the ablative marker is insentient, hence cannot have volition.

4.3. Accusative vs. Oblique arguments

The object is marked either by accusative marker or nominative. But there are verbs whose mandatory argument/participant (other than subject) is marked with ablative or sociative-instrument marker. Karamat [14] provided a list of the English verbs whose object is marked by an oblique marker in Urdu. In Punjabi and Sindhi, we find two classes of such verb that are either marked with ablative or socioative-instrument

marker.

The reason for oblique marking for the second argument of verb is discussed by Thompson and Hopper [15] and Levin [16]. For a prototypical verb, a volitional agent acts on non-volitional patient that gets affected. But for the verbs like ‘fear’, ‘resign’, ‘meet’, and ‘talk’, the agent and patient does not fit on this prototype. That is why the verb acts as syntactically intransitive.

We have seen ‘fear’ example in (9) where the source of fear ‘snake’ is marked with ablative marker. Similarly, in ‘resigning a job’, one goes away from the argument ‘job’. Hence this argument is marked with ablative the source of movement. Sociative-instrument marker appears with second argument of the verbs like ‘meet’ and ‘talk’, as in (30) and (31) respectively. Like ablative marked counterparts, the object of these verbs is not get affected, hence these are marked differently than the prototypical verbs. The sociative marker shows accompaniment of the second argument.

5. Conclusion

We have analyzed different inflections, clitics and postpositions and different semantic usages related to the ablative and sociative-instrument markers in Sindhi, Punjabi and Urdu. We found that the ablative marker of Sindhi and Punjabi has core meaning of spatial source that is extended to source of action and other metaphorical usages. Similarly, the core meaning of sociative marker is accompaniment. It subsumes the instrument usages.

We listed different contexts in which a particular case marker can be used. For example, Sindhi and Punjabi ablative inflections can be used only with motion away from the source usage and can not be used with extended usages, or Sindhi compound ablative markers encodes the semantic features of the object which (physically or metaphorically) acts like a source. Similarly, we found the fine grained difference in the usage of Urdu (*ke*) *saat*^h and *se*, both of which are usually classified as sociative case marker.

These differences can be used in computational linguistics applications like machine translation. The usage list and the contrast of case markers can also be helpful in analysis of usages in other (than our analyzed) languages. Such an analysis can give different case marker patterns, which may involve more or less number of case markers.

6. References

- [1] Blake, Barry, *Case*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.
 [2] Butt, Miriam and Tracy Holloway King, “The Status of

- Case”, In *Clause Structure in South Asian Languages*, ed. Veneeta Dayal & Anoop Mahajan, Springer Verlag, Berlin, 2005.
- [3] Masica., Colin P., *Indo Aryan Language*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1991.
- [4] Ahmed, Tafseer, “Spatial, Temporal and Structural Usages of Urdu ko”, In *Proceedings of the LFG06 Conference*, ed. Miriam Butt and Tracy Holloway King. CSLI Publications, Stanford, 2006.
- [5] Beames, John, *A Comparative Grammar of the Modern Aryan Languages of India*, Munshiram Manoharlal, Delhi, (republished) 1966.
- [6] Hussain, Fahmeeda, “sindhi grammar jaa maslaa” (Problems of Sindhi grammar), In *Proceedings of sindh mazi, haal aur mustaqbil (Sindhi Past, Present and Future)*, ed. Fahmeeda Hussain. Shah Abdul Latif Bhitai Chair, Karachi, 2006.
- [7] Butt, Miriam, Scott Grimm and Tafseer Ahmed, Dative Subjects, presentation at *NWO/DFG Workshop on Optimal Sentence Processing*, Nijmegen, 2006.
- [8] Saksena, Anuradaha, *Topics in the Analysis of Causatives with an Account of Hindi Paradigms*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1982.
- [9] Mohanan, Tara, *Argument Structure in Hindi.*, CSLI Publications, Stanford, 1994.
- [10] Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago University Press, University of Chicago, 1980.
- [11] Schiffman, Harold F., “The Tamil Case System”, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, 2001.
- [12] Ostler, Nicholas, *Case-linking: A theory of case and verb diathesis, applied to Classical Sanskrit*, MIT, Cambridge, 1979.
- [13] Butt, Miriam, and Tracy Holloway King, “Semantic Case in Urdu”, In *Papers from the 27th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, ed. Lisa Dobrin, Lynn Nichols, and Rosa M. Rodriguez, Chicago Linguistic Society, Chicago, 1991.
- [14] Karamat, Nayyara, *Verb transfer for English to Urdu Machine Translation*, MS Thesis, Lahore, 2006.
- [15] Hopper, Paul and Sandra Thompson, “Transitivity in Grammar and Discourse”, *Language*, Linguistic Society of America, Washington, 1980.
- [16] Levin, Beth, “Objecthood: An Event Structure Perspective”, *Proceedings of CLS 35, volume 1: The Main Session*, Chicago Linguistic Society, University of Chicago, 1999.