TOPICS IN KASHMIRI LINGUISTICS
TOPICS IN KASHMIRI LINGUISTICS

Edited by
Omkar N Koul
Kashi Wali

Creative Books
New Delhi
# Contents

*Preface*  
**vii**  

WH Questions in Marathi and Kashmiri  
*Kashi Wali*  
**1**  

Kashmiri Clitics: The role of Case and CASE  
*Kashi Wali and Ashok K Koul*  
**17**  

Long Shadows of Ergativity in Kashmiri and Marathi  
*Kashi Wali and Omkar N Koul*  
**43**  

Multiple Case Marking in Kashmiri Possessive:  
Traditional and Modern Perspective  
*Kashi Wali, Omkar N. Koul and Ashok K Koul*  
**63**  

The Significance of Topic in a V2 Language: Evidence from Kashmiri  
*Kashi Wali, Omkar N Koul and Ashok K Koul*  
**87**  

Under the Surface of the South Asian Linguistic Area: More on the Syntax of Derived Transitives and Causatives in Kashmiri  
*Peter Edwin Hook and Ashok K Koul*  
**103**  

The Verb Second Phenomenon in Kashmiri  
*Achla Misri Raina*  
**113**  

Personal Inflexions and Order of Clitics in Kashmiri  
*Estella Del Bon*  
**129**  

The verb laayun is not an exception  
*Peter Edwin Hook and Omkar N Koul*  
**143**  

*Contributors*  
**153**
Grammatical works in Kashmiri began as early as mid of the 19th century with Edgworth (1841) and Leech (1844) followed by Ishvar Koul’s monumental work *Kashmirshabdamritam*, written in Sanskrit in 1879, edited by George A Grierson, and published by Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal in 1889. Grierson calls it ‘an excellent grammar of Kashmiri’ and based his quite a few works on this grammar. Grierson published his *Standard manual of Kashmiri language* in 1911, and also provides a sketch of Kashmiri grammar in his *Linguistic Survey of India*, vol. 8, part 2 (1919).

Though the tradition of presenting grammatical sketches and descriptions continued till the mid of the 20th century, modern works on the subject commenced from the sixties following the models of grammars prepared in other languages. Kachru provides first detailed grammatical description of Kashmiri in his *A Reference Grammar of Kashmiri* (1969). His another work *An Introduction to Spoken Kashmiri* (1973) provides additional notes on Kashmiri grammar and culture. He has also described certain grammatical aspects of the Kashmiri language in his other papers.

Koul (1977) has dealt with some syntactic aspects. Similarly, a few doctoral dissertations have described morphology and syntax. Peter Hook and Omkar Koul jointly worked on various syntactic aspects like word order, pronominal suffixes, ergativity, transitivity, causatives, modal verbs etc. at length. They co-edited *Aspects of Kashmiri Linguistics* (1984) which include papers dealing with some important grammatical aspects of Kashmiri contributed by various scholars.

The period after 1990 is significant for the study of various aspects of morphology, syntax and semantics in detail. Scholars in India and abroad, and also in collaboration have undertaken some important research work. It is available in the form of dissertations, papers and books.

Kashi Wali and Omkar N Koul in their *Kashmiri: A Descriptive-Cognitive Grammar* published by Routledge in 1997, provide a detailed description of Kashmiri grammar covering morphology and syntax. It deals with most of the issues modern grammarians are interested in. This grammar has stimulated a number of linguists to take up further research in Kashmiri. Peter Hook and Omkar N Koul deal with the grammatical structure of Kashmiri in detail in their *Kashmiri: a study in comparative Indo-Aryan* (to be published by the Institute of Asian Languages and Cultures, Tokyo).

In recent years, quite a few papers on Kashmiri contributed by various scholars have appeared in journals and other reputed publications in India and abroad. (Please refer to Koul, Omkar N (2000) *Kashmiri Language, Linguistics and Culture: An Annotated Bibliography*. Mysore: CIIL for details).

The present volume includes papers devoted to various syntactic aspects of Kashmiri. Most of these papers have appeared in a special issue of *South Asian Language Review* (vol. X, 2000). The topics covered are related to some important linguistic characteristics of Kashmiri such as word-order, wh-questions, clitics or pronominal suffixes, significance of topic in a V2 language, case marking, ergativity, transitives and causatives, semantico-syntactic aspects of certain verbs etc. These papers are contributed by Kashi Wali, Peter Hook, Ashok Koul, Achla Misri Raina, Estella Del Bon, and Omkar N Koul. We are sure that these papers will stimulate further research interest in Kashmiri language and linguistics. Linguists, language teachers of Kashmiri, and researchers in South Asian languages particularly in Kashmiri will find this book quite useful.
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Omkar N Koul
Kashi Wali
The verb *laayun* is not an exception

Peter Edwin Hook
Omkar N. Koul

As Siddheshwar Varma pointed out long ago (1938:45) Kashmiri is among the handful of New Indo-Aryan languages that do not require the dative case for direct object personal pronouns in the simple past and perfect tenses. Compare the nominative-(absolutive) form of the object pronoun *tsi* ‘you’ in Kashmiri (1k) with the Hindi-Urdu dative form *tujhe* ‘you’ in (1h):

(1k) tyimav\(^1\) kyaazysuu-zkh *tsi* yoor ?
they.Erg why sent.Msg-2sN you.Nom here

(1h) unhO-ne *tujhe* yahAA kyO bhej-aa ?
they-Erg you.Dat here why send-Pst.Def
‘Why did they send you here?’

In non-ergative tenses, too, if the subject outranks the object on the Person Hierarchy, Kashmiri differs from Hindi-Urdu in licensing the nominative case for direct object personal pronouns:

(2k) esy sooz-oo-th *tsi* vaapas
we send-Fut1pl-2sAcc you.Nom back

(2h) ham *tujhe* vaapas bhej-Ege
we you.Dat back send-Fut1pl
‘We will send you back.’

However, there is at least one predicate which, in its apparent adherence to the Indo-Aryan norm, seems to be an exception in Kashmiri. That predicate is *laay* commonly translated as ‘hit’ or ‘beat’:

(3k) tyimav kyaazysuu-y0 tyse ?
they.Erg why ‘hit’.Def-2sD you.Dat

(3h) unhO-ne *tujhe* kyO maar-aa ?
they.Erg you.Dat why hit-Pst.Def
‘Why did they hit you?’

(4k) esy laay-oo-y-ni tyse
we.Nom ‘hit’-Fut1pl-2sD-Neg you.Dat

(4h) ham *tujhe* nahll maar-Ege
we.Nom you.Dat not hit-Fut1plM
‘We will not hit you.’

It is a general rule in Kashmiri that the nominative is used obligatorily for the human patient-subjects of passives:

(5) *avtaar* aav ni ath mukaabalas-manz S’eemyil kar-ni
Avatar.Nom was not this contest.Dat-in include do-Abl.Inf
‘Avatar was not included in this contest.’ (Aziz 1998:85)

But the predicate *laay* seems to differ from other predicates in the passive voice, too, in requiring the dative case in nouns denoting the person struck. Compare the case of the subject in (5) and (6):

(6) *mohnas* aav aslam-nyi zeryiyi laay-ni
Mohan.Dat came Aslam-Gen.Obl by ‘beat’-Abl.Inf
‘Mohan was beaten by Aslam.’ (Wali and Koul 1997:154)
In this, too, Kashmiri laay seems to follow the Hindi-Urdu rule. Compare (7k) with (7h):

(7k) \textit{tas kooryi aav paninyis kamras-manz laay-ni} (Bhatt 1994:219)
that.Dat girl.Dat came.Def self’s room-in ‘beat’-Abl.Inf

(7h) \textit{us laRkii-ko apne kamre-mE maar-aa gay-aa}
that.Obl girl-Dat self’s room-in hit-PP.Def went-Def
‘That girl was beaten in her room.’

However, it is not the case that \textit{laay} always requires the dative case in the subject of a passive. In other instances it reverts to the Kashmiri norm in requiring the nominative for passive subjects:

(8) \textit{yi zanaan aayi bAATi pyeThi bwan laay-ni.}
this.Nom woman.Nom came bonnet.Abl from.Abl down ‘hit’-Abl.Inf
‘The woman was thrown down from the bonnet.’ (Koul 1997, line 35)

(9) \textit{mye aav cakar ti pathar hyot-n-as (bi) laay-ini y-un me.Dat came dizziness and down began-3sE-1sN (I.Nom) ‘hit’-Abl.Inf come-Msg}
‘(As soon as I saw her) I felt dizzy and started to keel over.’

(Akhtar, B. 1985:88)

Over the past quarter century the supposed exceptionality of \textit{laay} has been remarked on by Kachru and Pandharipande (1979:202), by Andrabi (1983), by Raina (1991), by Bhatt (1994:38-40), and by Koul and Umarani (2000). It is true that if one were aiming for as general an account as possible of the predicate argument structures of Kashmiri, examples like (3k), (4k), and (7k) would make \textit{laay} stand out as a striking exception to Siddheshwar Varma’s observation. In this note, however, we show that \textit{laay} is not an exception after all. Rather, the common elision of \textit{laay}’s patient together with faulty translation of it into English as ‘hit’ or ‘strike’ has prevented its correct analysis as a normal Kashmiri trivalent predicate belonging to the same set as \	extit{dyi ‘give’, haav ‘show’, thaph kar ‘seize’, tsop hye ‘bite’} (see fn 4), \textit{pen(d)y kaD ‘cause grief to’}, etc:

(10) \textit{jelyis ees pyeceny tyi pendy kaD-aan.}
Jol.Dat wasAunt.Nom too griefs.Nom pull-ing
‘His Aunt was also giving Jol some grief.’ (Malmohi 1998:67)

In the second volume of Grierson and Kaula’s magisterial dictionary the predicate \textit{laay ‘strike, beat, hit’} is listed in about a dozen senses of which a subset of five are described as “with cognate acc.” These include \textit{luur laayiny “to strike a cudgel, to cudgel”} and \textit{makh laayun “to strike, or slay, with an axe”} both accompanied by a note: “with dative of person.” From the remark “with cognate acc.” and the feminine form of the infinitive in \textit{luur laayiny} (in which \textit{laayiny} agrees in gender and number with \textit{luur ‘stick, cudgel’}), it is clear that the instrument of striking is the lexical patient of \textit{laay}. The person hit gets the dative case because that person is the recipient in a \textbf{trivalent} predicate argument structure. In other words the predicate \textit{laay} is not to be compared with the English \textit{hit x (with y) or beat x} nor with the Hindi-Urdu \textit{x ko (y se) maar ‘strike x (with y)’} but with the English \textit{give y to x or apply y to x} or Hindi-Urdu \textit{x ko y lagaa}:

(11k) \textit{laDkan leey temyis capaath4 boy.Erg applied.Fsg him.Dat slap(Fsg)}

(11h) \textit{laRke-ne use thappaR lagaaii boy-Erg him.Dat slap(Fsg) apply-Pst.Fsg}

‘The boy / gave him a slap // slapped him /.’

In general when subcategorized by underived trivalent predicates of transfer or of giving, the entity that is moved is the patient and the entity to which that patient is moved is the recipient. If such a predicate is used to represent situations involving beating or hitting the entity that moves will be the instrument of the
beating and the entity to which that instrument is moved is the (oftentimes animate) victim or recipient of the beating.

Once seen in this way the two constructions of laay in the passive voice can be understood to be one: the girl in example (7) is the static entity, the one toward whom some instrument moves. Therefore, the noun denoting her gets the dative case, while the word for woman in (12) gets the nominative required of the patient-subject of the passive aayi laayini because she is the entity that moves, just as the rocks in another use of laay in the passive voice (13) are the entities that move:

(12) yi zanaan aayi bAATi pyeThi bwan laay-ni.  
this.Nom woman.Nom came.Fsg bonnet from down apply-Abl.Inf  
‘The woman was thrown down from the bonnet.’  (Koul 1997, line 35)

(13) basyi aayi bajyi bajyi kanyi laay-ni.  
bas.Dat came.Fpl big big rocks apply-Abl.Inf.  
‘… many large stones were thrown at the bus.’  (Koul 1997, line 32)

As the identity of the instrument may not be of interest or may be obvious, the predicate laay often appears without its instrument-patient, as in (3) [repeated here as (14)]:

(14) tyimav kyaazyi looyu-y (x) tsys?  
they.Erg why applied-2sD (x.Nom) you.Dat  
‘Why did they hit you (with x)?’ or ‘Why did they apply (x) to you?’

It is this frequent elision of the instrument that may have contributed to the misanalysis of laay as a bivalent predicate with the meaning ‘hit x’.

In these pages we have shown that laay is not “in a category by itself” nor does it belong to a class of bivalent predicates whose subjects take the ergative (when appropriate) and whose direct objects take the dative. If no class of such predicates exists in Kashmiri, showing that laay does not belong to it would represent a simplification of previous formulations of Kashmiri grammar. However, it seems that there are other predicates that are bivalent and take the ergative of subject (when appropriate) and the dative of direct object. Among them are lam ‘pull’, pyev and sandaar, both of which mean ‘light (a stove)’:

(15) tyimav lom naavyi beThyis kun  
they.Erg pulled boat.Dat shore.Dat toward  
‘They pulled the boat to shore.’

(16) shaamas hyotu-n daanas pyev-un / sandaar-un  
evening.Dat began-3sE stove.Dat light-Inf light-Inf  
‘She began to light the stove in the evening.’

Note that the form lom in (15) and the inceptive auxiliary hyotu-n in (16) are both in the masculine singular default form that is used when there is nothing for the finite verb to agree with. In this respect lam, pyev, and sandaar are like the predicates nats ‘dance’ and as ‘laugh’ which in the past tense also assume the masculine singular default forms nots and os since there is no noun phrase in the nominative with which they can agree:

(17) tyimav nots ti tamyi os  
they.Erg danced.Def and she.Erg laughed.Def

(17’) *tyim netsy ti swa es  
‘They danced and she laughed.’

The absence of preterite forms in the feminine and/or plural is a feature that lam, pyev, sandaar share with nats and as: *lemy (mpl), *lem (fsg), *lamyi (fpl); *esy (mpl), *es (fsg), *ayi (fpl) and reflects the absence of direct internal arguments in both sets of predicates.

However, nats and as are monovalent predicates while lam, pyev, and sandaar are (presently) bivalents whose patients get the dative case whether in active or passive voice:
We may conclude then that not only is laay not in a class by itself but the class of one to which it has been commonly (and mistakenly) assigned actually has more than one member anyway.

Or maybe we shouldn’t conclude that.

One of the things that formalist linguistics has taught us (if only by unintended example) is that simplification in one place may lead to complication somewhere else. While it is possible to show that the apparently divergent constructions headed by laay can be made to emerge from a single trivalent predicate argument structure, such an analysis may not be desirable from every point of view. In this instance we have devised a unified analysis of laay, one covering a wide swath of semantic ground [‘hit’ (6-7), ‘throw’ (13), ‘be knocked down’ (12), ‘keel over’ (9)], by deriving all of these senses from:

\[(20) \text{laay}: X[(\text{forcefully}) \text{CAUSE} \ Y \text{BECOME} Z_{\text{DAT}} \ (\text{or Adv}_{\text{PLACE}})]\]

where either \(Y\) or \(Z\) can be [+human]

The costs of doing this include: (a) the positing of a single, highly abstract predicate which may reflect a historical rather than a psychologically real grouping of meanings, and, (b) the deliberate ignoring of the fact that one or another of the three variables \(x, \ y,\) and \(z\) may be left empty, either conventionally [when \(\text{laay}\) is used as in (6) and (7)] or necessarily [when \(\text{laay}\) is used as in (9) and (12)]. The latter is particularly troubling in that the variable that is necessarily empty occupies the agent (= “logical subject”) slot \([X]\) in (20). See (12) [renumbered here as (21)]:

\[(21) \text{yi} \ zanaan \text{aayi} \ (\ast X-\text{nyi zeryiyi}) \ b\text{AATi pyeThi} \ bwan \text{ laay-}\text{ni.} \]

\('The woman was thrown down from the bonnet.’ (Koul 1997, line 35)\]

The problem is compounded by instances like (9) [renumbered here as (22)] where not only is a referent for \(X\) impossible but the sense of ‘forcefully’ is no longer pertinent:

\[(22) ... \text{pathar hyot-}\text{n-as} \ (\ast X-\text{nyi zeryiyi}) \ (\text{bi})\]

\(\text{laay-}\text{ni} \ y\text{-un}\)

\(\text{down} \ \text{began-3sE-1sN} \ (X-\text{Gen by}) \ (\text{I.Nom})\)

\(\text{apply-}\text{Abl.Inf} \ \text{come-}\text{Msg}\)

\(’(\text{I felt dizzy and I}) \text{ started to keel over.}’ \) (Akhtar, B. 1985:88)

The problem is the ancient and intractable one of deciding when a grammarian should abandon an analysis based on polysemy and posit instead the existence of independent lexical items. In this case, B. Kachru’s (1969:283) glossing of \(\text{laayini yun}\) as ‘to fall’ suggests that it is appropriate to posit two separate lexical items \(\text{laay-} \text{ ‘apply’ and laayini yi- ‘fall’}’.

The first of these would have a regular passive counterpart \(\text{laayini yi- ‘be applied’} \text{ whose predicate argument structure would differ from that of the second in that (among other things) laayini yi- ‘fall’ is a bivalent predicate while laayini yi- ‘be applied’ is a trivalent one:} \)

\[(23) \text{laay ‘apply’ X [(forcefully) \text{CAUSE} [Y \text{BECOME} Z_{\text{DAT}} \ (\text{or Adv}_{\text{place}})] \ (y \text{ is [-human]})]}

\(\text{laayini yi ‘fall’: } [Y \text{ BECOME} Z_{\text{DAT}} \ (\text{or Adv}_{\text{place}})]] \ (y \text{ is [+human]})\]

Their phonological identity and schematic sub-similarity would then be no more than the fossils of a semantic relationship no longer alive in the minds of contemporary Kashmiri speakers.
NOTE

1. The transcription system for Kashmiri is based on one that is in general use in the Indo-Aryan linguistics literature. In it contrastive length in vowels is shown by doubling (not by macron or colon), nasality in vowels is shown by their capitalization (not by tilde or following capital N), the retroflexion of apical stops and flaps is shown by capitalization (not by a sublinear dot) and the palatal fricative is represented by a capital S (not by a digraph or a diacritic). Sounds specific to Kashmiri: The dental affricate is ts and palatalization of consonants is represented by y. This y fronts and raises a following i(i) and e(e) (otherwise high back unrounded and central mid unrounded vowels respectively).

2. Abbreviations used in this paper include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abl</td>
<td>ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fut</td>
<td>future tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>past participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(at)</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p(l)</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Def</td>
<td>default</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N(om)</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(rg)</td>
<td>ergative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pst</td>
<td>past tense</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. See Wali and Koul (1997) for some of this list. The remark there (p. 363, endnote 4) that reanalyzing laay as a trivalent predicate would put laay in a class “by itself” needs emendation and was one of the stimuli for this paper.

4. A textual example in context:

   (a) maaji prutsh-n-as tsi kyaazyi aa-kh sokuuli pyeThi sulyi. tas khyoo-n bath. mother.Erg asked-3sE-3sD you  why  came-2sN school from early her.Dat ate-3sE face
   ‘His mother asked him, “Why have you come home from school early?” He flew into a rage.
   tamyi leey-n-as capaath. munan hyot-n-as athas tsop she.Erg applied.Fsg-3sE-3sD slap(Fsg) Muni.Erg took.Msg-3sE-3sD hand.Dat bite(Msg)
   She slapped him. He bit her hand.’ (H.K. Kaul 1998:32)

5. The construction in (12) and (8) explains B. Kachru’s otherwise puzzling gloss of laayini yun as ‘to fall’ (1969:283).

6. This example contradicts Bhatt’s claim that laay’s “internal argument ... must always be [+human] ... “ (1994:38)

7. If linguists have misanalyzed laay can native speakers be far behind? In Georgian a predicate similar to laay is in the process of reanalysis. Note in (b) the dative prefix persists in the verb even though the coreferential noun is nominative:

   (a) deda-m Svil-s s-tsem-a => (b) deda-m Svil-i s-tsem-a
      mother-Erg child-Dat 3sD-hit-Aor.3sE mother-Erg child-Nom 3sD-hit-Aor.3sE
      ‘The mother hit the child.’
      (Hewitt 1995:120; transcription ours)

   It seems not unlikely that pyev and sandaar at one time might well have been trivalent predicates subcategorising a word for ‘flame’, ‘fire’, or ‘spark’ which was eventually elided. Compare contemporary medical slang where transplant has become a bivalent predicate: ‘We’re going to transplant him.’ < ‘We’re going to transplant (some organ into) him.’

9. The representation of the meaning of laay given in (20) is modeled on the decompositional structure used in Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1996:24) in their discussion of lexical semantic templates. The formula in (20) is presented as nothing more than an expositional convenience with no intention on our parts to make any kind of theoretical claim.
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