1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Two-fold Objective

The present study is neither a fresh proposal in the plethora of modern linguistic theories nor an innovation in the methods of teaching English as a second language in the State of Jammu and Kashmir; it is an attempt to look at English, a European language, and Kashmiri, a South Asian language, in order to find out some significant and interesting agreements and disagreements in a few syntactic patterns of sentence combinations in the two languages. The study, stimulated by various cross-linguistic studies, is an attempt to make a small contribution to the growing repertoire of language data available to the experts in Universal Grammar, against which they test various generalisations relating to as many as four thousand known languages of the present world. It is, at the same time, an attempt to describe some interesting analogical and contrastive syntactic features of the two languages which would be useful to one involved in teaching Kashmiri to students.
with a background of English and English to the native
speakers of Kashmiri. The study is the first of its
kind in that the two languages have not so far been
studied contrastively at any level of structure.¹

¹ This is not to ignore the significance of several
works in English in which there is some kind of linguistic
description of the various aspects of Kashmiri. The
earliest and most remarkable of such works are: George A.
Grierson, Standard Manual of the Kashmiri Language
(Oxford, 1911); George A. Grierson, A Dictionary of the
Kashmiri Language (Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal,
1916-32). In the last twenty years, a number of
linguistic studies in Kashmiri have appeared. Mention
must be made of Braj B. Kachru, A Reference Grammar of
Kashmiri (Urbana: University of Illinois, 1969),
Braj B. Kachru, An Introduction to Spoken Kashmiri
(Urbana: University of Illinois, 1973); Omkar N. Koul,
Linguistic Studies in Kashmiri (New Delhi: Bahri
Publications, 1977); Badri Nath Kaul, On Communicative
Values and Syntactico-Semantic Contrastive Analysis
(Post-Graduate Dissertation. University of Reading,
1978); Syed M. Inayatullah Andrabi, Reference and
Conference in Kashmiri - A syntactic-semantic Study
(Ph.D. Dissertation, Centre of Advanced Study in
Linguistics, Deccan College, Pune. 1983); Peter Edwin
Hook and Omkar N. Kaul, Aspects of Kashmiri Linguistics.
(Forthcoming).
1.2. Why the level of syntax

The choice of comparison/contrast at the syntactic level in this study has been well thought. The view that learning of language should begin with the sentence is widely accepted because a language is not a heap of words but a system of systems, a system of context-bound sentences and rules of forming infinite and ever new sentences. The meaning of words in isolation from their particular syntactic functions is highly nebulous and inaccessible for any kind of analysis. Though the study of meaning of words is the oldest linguistic activity known, linguists have finally arrived at the conclusion so neatly stated by Langendoen:

The semantic representation of lexical items cannot be effectively studied by examining words only in isolation; they must be studied also in terms of the relationships they enter into sentences.2

In a particular sentence the words don't have their meaning ossified; they interanimate one another and enter into various syntagmatic relationships (the linear order of words to form a larger unit) and paradigmatic

relationships (the vertical order of words by virtue of which the words can be substituted one for another in a certain context). The inaccessibility of the semantic basis of words arises also from the fact that, as I.A. Richards rightly points out, "... language is a social fact as well as a part of personal experience." The use of a particular word by a particular person is not only conditioned by the context, it also carries the user's intention, motive, attitude towards the thing for which the word stands and, in most cases, the user's predilection for that word and not for any other. Flexibility of word-meanings is an essential quality of language. If words do not shift their meanings, "language, losing its subtlety with its suppleness, will also lose its power to serve us." Words preserve their "suppleness" even in particular syntactic combinations. If it were not so, there would have been an accurate, one-to-one correspondence between the sentences of various languages — but linguistic structures of various languages


4 Ibid., p. 73.
related to similar contexts differ widely in their deep and surface meanings, their purport and their efficiency to inform, to persuade and to move.

Though there are always some well-defined styles of writing and sometimes of speaking in every language, a language, if it is a living one, is never circumscribed by these styles; the language proteus has infinite forms in infinite situations that arise in man’s day-to-day intercourse with others, his interaction with the encompassing reality and his intellectual and emotional life. The sentence in a language is determined by all these situations and also by an individual’s idiosyncratic use of it. Each individual of a linguistic community thus speaks in his own dialect, what is generally known as ‘idiolect.’ We notice individual peculiarities at the sentence level in terms of syntax too; let us consider just one bit of discourse from Kashmiri translatable as “Sultan, Rahman’s elder son, who had fled away from his home ten years ago, returned yesterday, but again left his home for some unknown place.” Some of the forms this sentence can assume are:

i) Sultan, rahma:num z'u:th ne:cu; yus dahi vuhir' gari o:s a:mut ra:th tsol beyi khabar kot (highly formal style)
The sentence can be inverted in a number of ways for purposes of emphasis according to the focus, theme and intention of the speaker and the position, status and need of the listener. It is only the native speaker of a language who possesses the competence of generating an enormous number of sentences meaning nearly the same but presenting different points of view. This competence essentially constitutes the real knowledge of a language about which Chomsky's famous remark is that it "is free and creative ... in that one can instantaneously interpret an indefinitely large range of utterances, with no feeling of unfamiliarity or strangeness."

In spite of the bewildering variety of sentence structure, "syntactic typology is regarded as an optimum basis for theoretical contrastive studies." Here one has to bear in mind that this kind of typology is quite different from the 19th century Comparative Philology for being essentially nongenetic and nonareal in nature. Comparative Philology was diachronic in nature as it studied the development of languages through time and also developed a general theory of genetic relationship between languages. Modern typological syntax is least concerned with the evolutionary development of linguistic relationship between languages on the basis of genealogy. English and Kashmiri, the two epical branches of the Indo-European family so remote from each other that they are considered two unrelated languages can be compared and contrasted not to find any genealogical kinship but to see how and where they show agreements and disagreements as two SVO languages. This kind of typology differs from the traditional typology of the 19th century in terms of its method also. Traditional linguistic typology was based

on analysis. It analysed individual and particular linguistic structures with a view to reach at generalizations about the genealogy of languages. Modern typology, on the other hand, starts from generalizations proposed on the basis of earlier analyses and returns to the individual languages through synthesis to test and verify the generalizations, and, if needed, modify them in accordance with the new insights. This typology did not simply reject the results of the 19th century typology but inherited them for its own purposes.

1.3. Contrastive Study

1.3.1 History

The idea of oneness of the bewilderingly diverse languages of the world was recognised and rejected a number of times during the course of the development of linguistics. It was the main preoccupation of the early Greek philosophers when they indulged in their fierce controversy of 'nature' versus 'convention'. And, we read in Genesis: "Now the whole earth had one language..." And, the scholars of medieval times were much worried to strengthen their belief that Hebrew was the primordial language since it is the language of the Old Testament. Similar was the assumption of the followers of other religions. Then suddenly a hope of finding the protoform of all languages was created in the second half of the
18th century when Sir William Jones made his famous declaration about the existence of Indo-European family of languages sprung from the same common ancestor language. This declaration, made in 1786, heralded a new era of enthusiasm and speculation when linguists began to compare and contrast various languages having some kind of genealogical or geographical relationship. Languages were described, compared and then classified into families and sub-families. This new enthusiasm was, among other things, chiefly supported by German scholars, especially Herder (1744-1803) and Humboldt (1767-1835). Herder believed that language and national character were interdependent and Humboldt emphasized the relationship between the inner structure of a language and the mental life of a nation. "In his view language is," says Dezso, "primarily an activity..." It is an activity involving creation of sentences and simultaneously thoughts. Herder believed, says M. Levoy, "that the inner form of language is a fundamental constituent of the human mind and that each form of language can therefore be considered as a characterisation of the community that speaks it." Humboldt stressed the need of comparing


languages in order to know the difference between them. By knowing the difference, we know the character of individual languages. On the basis of this knowledge, we can determine the general features of language. In this way, the general principle of Humboldtian linguistics is "primarily of a typological nature." 9

Comparative philology, in spite of its great contribution to linguistics, failed to account for the peculiar characteristics of numerous languages discovered in various parts of the world. The hope of total comparison and classification of languages of the world was finally given up in the early years of the 20th century with the growth of a new school commonly known as 'structuralism.'

The publication of Saussure's *Cours de Linguistique Générale* signalled the Structural Revolution. Saussure maintained that "language is form and not substance." 10 and that every language has its own form different from


the forms of all other languages of the world. The one and only true object of linguistics is, says he, "language envisaged in and for itself." According to his famous analogy language is like a game of chess in which we have before us a system of values, and we observe the ways in which these are modified. Language, like chess, is a system in which the significance of each unit is its structural position at a particular moment and the speaker like the player of chess, is never bothered about its phylogeny or ontogeny while using it for his particular purpose at that moment. The structuralists, following Saussure, recognised the fact that spoken language is the real language which is the proper subject of study and therefore they gave priority to synchronic description. After recognising these facts and giving description of a large number of languages, they came to the conclusion that the languages of the world differ from one another in infinite and unpredictable ways at the level of form or structure.

Even during the days when structuralism enjoyed prestige and popularity, there were some eminent linguists

like Charles C. Fries, Charles F. Hockett who did not ignore the importance of meaning. Thus although Bloomfield believed that every truly "scientific statement is made in physical terms," and that "the statement of meanings is therefore the weak point in language study...", he was not unaware of the inevitability of consideration of meanings in linguistic description. "To study this coordination of certain sounds with certain meanings is to study language." At another place, he said, "phonology involves the consideration of meaning." Such linguists were of the opinion that languages differ in their physical signals or phonetic articulation, that is, what appears at the surface, but all languages are cut to the same pattern at the level of meaning or consciousness, that is, what is lying deep. Hence, each language has its two levels


13 Ibid., p. 140.

14 Ibid., p. 27.

15 Ibid., p. 28.
of structure: 'surface structure' and 'deep structure.' The two levels of language were in fact recognised by Saussure when he distinguished between langue, the underlying structure in terms of which we produce particular utterances and understand each other, and parole, particular utterances with unique form. This distinction of the two structures of a language was later on accepted by all linguists; it was, however, Chomsky who widened the meaning and scope of the two important terms by stressing a distinction between competence and performance and also between surface structure and deep structure. What is quite revolutionary in his ideas about the two levels of language is that at the surface level, a language has an unbounded variety of utterances or sentences that a native speaker can produce or understand, but at the level of deep structure it constitutes the sum of a small number of 'kernel sentences' from which all the surface sentences are generated by the application of various transformational rules. Chomsky has summarised his position in the following words:

A person who knows a language has mastered a set of rules and principles that determine an infinite discrete set of sentences each of which has a fixed form and a fixed meaning or meaning potential. Even at the lowest levels of intelligence, the characteristic use of this knowledge is free and creative ... in that one can instantaneously interpret an indefinitely large range of utterances, with no feeling of unfamiliarity or strangeness.\(^\text{17}\)

According to Chomsky, all languages of mankind possess the same structure at the deep level and hence the existence of Universal Grammar. Though the concept of Universal Grammar is very old and the term was used as far back as the 17th century by Port Royal Grammarians,\(^\text{18}\) but Chomsky's interpretation and approach, marked by scientific rigour and originality of ideas, made the

\(^{17}\) Oxford Locke Lecture. Quoted in George Steiner, Extraterritorial p. 112.

\(^{18}\) James Beattie, for example, wrote in 1788 "Those things that all languages have in common, or that are necessary to every language, are treated of in a science, which some have called UNIVERSAL or PHILOSOPHICAL grammar." Quoted by Paul M. Postal, "The Method of Universal Grammar" in Method and Theory in linguistics, ed. Paul L. Gravin (The Hague: Mouton, 1970), p. 113.
concept immediately widespread and generated a lot of controversy and enthusiastic research activity throughout the world. In 1961, an epoch-making conference was held in Dobbs Ferry (New York) in which eleven papers on the topic of "Universals of Language" were read out. The papers were later on published in a single volume entitled *Universals of Language*, which was edited by Joseph H. Greenberg. The Memorandum for the Conference prepared by J.H. Greenberg, J.J. Jenkins and C.E. Osgood begins with the lines:

Underlying the endless and fascinating idiosyncrasies of the world's languages there are uniformities of universal scope. Amid infinite diversity, all languages are, as it were, cut from the same pattern. Language universals are by their very nature summary statements about characteristics or tendencies shared by all human speakers.  

In 1967, another significant event in the development of Universal Grammar took place; it was a symposium on 'Universals in Linguistic Theory.' The papers read out at the symposium were later on published under the title

The two events mentioned above, and Chomsky's persistent emphasis on Universal Grammar, have induced a large number of linguists throughout the world to investigate various major and minor languages of the world and to propose generalisations about human language. One of the immediate results of this was the development of language typology, that is, "the nongenetic, nonareal classification of languages as a valuable means to the discovery of universals."\(^\text{20}\)

1.3.2 Method

Chomsky expressed his dissatisfaction with the earlier type of comparative analysis and called it "superficial" and "hopelessly elementary." He stressed the need for a

...serious comparative work that tries to operate in the only logically appropriate way, namely, by constructing descriptively adequate grammars of a variety of languages.

and then proceeding to determine what universal principles constrain them, what universal principles can serve to explain the particular form that they have.  

The suggestion for "serious comparative work" was unanimously accepted by all typologists but the method proposed by Chomsky did not receive attention. The inductive method proposed as early as 1933 by Bloomfield, who said, "The only useful generalizations about languages are inductive generalizations," was accepted in principle and modified by the adherents of Universal Grammar. Greenberg, for example, says:

... However, it seems also to be generally agreed that the method of science is both inductive and deductive. The formulation of generalizations attained by inductive examination leads to higher level hypotheses from which, in turn, further generalizations may be deduced. The later must then be put to the test of empirical validation.  


23 *Universals of Language* p. xii.
Contemporary contrastive linguistics is essentially synthetical. The Leningrad group of linguists, in particular, developed an adequate theory of a synthetic approach to languages. Some individual languages, chosen on the basis of their typological characteristics, are subjected to rigorous analysis to deduce various typological generalizations. From these generalizations, the investigator has to return to the facts of individual languages through synthesis. However, one should not consider the second step of synthesis as a reversion of the preceding analysis. It reveals new aspects of individual languages thereby making the investigation as thorough as possible.

Chomsky maintains that it is the syntactic base of a language which is generative while the semantic base is interpretive. The syntactic component comprises two things: the base component that generates the deep structures, and the transformational component that converts the deep structure into surface structures. The semantic component derives meaning from the deep structure which is essentially syntactic. Chomsky has, however, made a significant remark in his Aspects:

... it should not be taken for granted, necessarily, that syntactic and semantic considerations can be sharply distinguished.24

Aspects of the Theory of Syntax, p. 72.
Soon after the publication of *Aspects*, several linguists expressed sharp deviation from Chomskian generative linguistics and advocated a semantically based transformational grammar. Anderson (1968), Chafe (1967), McCawley (1968) and others, with minor differences among themselves, are of the opinion that it is the semantic component which is generative in nature and which operates before the rules of the syntactic component which is interpretive. In spite of Chomsky's opposition to generative semantics, labelling it as "vacuous" and a "notational variant" of the transformational grammar outlined in his *Aspects*, attempts are consistently being made to formulise the semantic basis of language. Theories of Universal Grammar have thus been considerably influenced by the developments in generative semantics. There are several linguists who are in favour of searching for semantic universals instead of syntactic universals. Fillmore's 'roles' or 'cases' (like source, patient, recipient, locative, etc.) and Halliday's 'functions' (like agentive, instrumental, locative, dative, causative, etc.) have a universal semantic basis because they reflect the most obvious attributes of the phenomenal world which is similar in every country. Fillmore summarises his position in his famous paper "Lexical Entries for Verbs":

I believe that human languages are constrained in such a way that the relations between
arguments and predicates fall into a small number of types. In particular, I believe that these role types can be identified with certain quite elementary judgements about the things that go on around us: judgements about who does something, who experiences something, where something happens, what it is that changes, what it is that moves, where it starts out, and where it ends up. Since judgements like these are very much like the kinds of things grammarians have associated for centuries with the use of grammatical 'cases', I have been referring to these roles as case relationships, or simply cases.  

Since all languages handle their physical ambience in almost similar ways, a human being can learn as many languages as he likes. Keenan says:

We manage to learn other languages without totally revising our logical apprehension of the world. We conclude, therefore, that what can be said, and how people understand what they say, varies less across languages than the means used for expression.  


According to generative semantics of the model proposed especially by Fillmore, it is the predicate which is the basis of a sentence and on which the semantic roles of other items of a sentence depend. For example, in the sentence 'You hit him on the head with a stick yesterday.', the predicate is 'hit', in relation to which 'you' is AGENT, 'him' is PATIENT, 'on the head' is LOCATION, 'with a stick' is INSTRUMENT, and 'yesterday' is TIME. These roles remain the same even if the surface structure undergoes drastic changes, for example:

He was hit on the head by you with a stick yesterday.

or

Yesterday, he was hit on the head by you with a stick.

Here the surface subject 'he' is not the same as the underlying subject 'you' which is the surface object but 'you' and 'he' do not change their roles as AGENT and PATIENT respectively. Thus in the light of case relationships we can explain such syntactic problems as could not be explained by the syntax-based generative grammar. The following sentences mean, for example, alike because of the unchanging relation between various constituents to the predicate:
As the above examples show, the conventional transformational grammar cannot account for the cognitive synonymy of the above sentences, particularly in a language like Kashmiri in which word order can be inverted in a number of ways. On the other hand, it is the case grammar that satisfactorily explains the role structure of the above sentences.27

In view of the inevitability of semantic constraints on syntactic features, a new approach to the study of individual languages and a new methodology of studying languages are day by day gaining ground. In terms of this new approach and methodology, a viable contrastive study has to be a semantico-syntactic one. One of the significant

27 In languages like Kashmiri which have a totally or partially free word order, the roles are, however, generally realized at the surface structure by various inflectional endings.
proposals in this context is from Keenan, who believes that the principal goal of linguistic theory is to define the notion of "Possible Human Language," i.e., a language that may not be actually spoken but is permissible under the syntactic and semantic inventories of a particular language. Keenan does not conceive of language universals as common properties of Possible Human Languages, but as "characterisation of the regularities in the ways languages differ from one another. Structures which vary from language to language, as surface structures do, are among the primary objects of study in Universal Grammar." According to him, a Universal Grammar covers four areas:

i) Syntactic inventory, i.e., the set of possible grammatical categories and lexical items which are essential to construct a possible human language.

Keenan's proposal is, in fact, a conclusion arrived at by him after studying a number of languages in comparison. It cannot be fully appreciated in isolation from his works. However, for a brief summary of his insights see E.L. Keenan, "Language Variation of the Logical Structure of Universal Grammar," in Language Universals, ed. H. Seiler (Tübingen: Narr, 1978), p. 301.

Ibid., p. 126.
ii) Semantic inventory, i.e., possible interpretation of items in the syntactic inventory.

iii) Choice constraints, i.e., all those constraints under which one makes a choice of items from syntactic and semantic inventories.

iv) Principles of variation, i.e., the principles which become the basis of predicting different variations across languages.

It is not possible here to discuss any more theories of Universal Grammar. It will suffice here to say that the latest trend in Universal Grammar is to bridge the gap between meaning and form and to emphasise the reciprocity and mutual dependence of the two aspects of language. Further, any universal generalization is simultaneously an end as well as a beginning in a cross-language investigation. The work of typological investigation is now available to all those researchers who want to use it as a basis for further investigations to add to the repertoire of facts about human language. Dezso observes:

Contrastive grammars are based upon descriptive grammars, and knowledge of the system of the languages is assumed. However, the focus of attention in such grammar is transferred to a comparison of two language systems. The mere fact that different types and sub-types are
probably reflected in the system of two languages requires a broader and more detailed presentation of typological information than the characteristics of one language only. In addition, attention must be paid to the individual properties of contrasted languages. A contrastive grammar is not the amalgamation of two individual grammars.  

A contrastive study is always a bifocal study and not unidirectional. The motives behind a contrastive study are chiefly two:

a) To see how a universal U realized in language $L_1$ as $U_1$ is realized in language $L_2$.

b) To see how an agreement or disagreement between two languages $L_1$ and $L_2$ causes a positive or negative interference in learning each of the languages.

The result of these two investigations does not only provide a better and more analytical understanding of the two languages but also a deeper understanding of human language, of those "innate presettings" which in the words

of Noam Chomsky "are embedded or imprinted in the human mind."31

1.3.3 Utility in Pedagogy

Parallel to the development of Contrastive Linguistics, there has been consistent theorising about its applicability in the classroom and preparation of supplementary teaching material for teaching and learning foreign languages. It has, however, been argued, sometimes diffidently, that dissimilarities as well as deceptive similarities between the native and non-native languages cause serious interferences in the acquisition of the non-native language. A contrastive study of two languages enables us to predict such interferences and propose some ways to rectify them.

This type of pedagogical importance of contrastive studies was realized by the Structuralists. C.C. Fries, for instance, said:

... the most effective materials are those that are based upon a scientific description of the language to be learned, carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learner.32


With the growth of Generative Grammar, the utility of contrastive studies was recognised and several proposals regarding its applicability were put forth. However, a general scepticism prevails among the linguists about the utility of Contrastive Study on the black-board and in the text-books. Chomsky too is doubtful:

I am, frankly, rather sceptical about the significance of such insights and understanding as have been attained in linguistics or psychology. 33

In spite of these doubts, in Russia and some East-European countries a remarkable progress has been made in utilizing the insights of modern linguistics in practical language teaching. However, the major problem of applied contrastive linguistics is that it cannot be used as such in the class room, but at a high level of training courses for teachers. This does not, reflect any intrinsic flaw of contrastive linguistics, but it necessitates a national level programme of utilizing the insights gained from contrastive linguistics at school level. In order to attain this goal, supplementary applied teaching materials

need to be prepared carefully in the light of the findings of research in the field of contrastive linguistics. Dezso is of the opinion that the materials thus prepared should be carefully graded according to the requirements of various levels of foreign language teaching. Without a proper systematization, volumes of contrastive studies will proliferate without improving the standards of foreign language teaching.

The essential task prior to a contrastive study is a systematised typological characterization of the native language. This task demands the talent and services of native scholars mainly. The studies of non-native scholars may have aimed at a very high standard but these are not always found dependable because of being inadequate. It is now a well-established fact that a foreign language cannot be learnt in its organic and total form. A non-native scholar has, in any case, to depend on written works or information gained from literate native speakers who generally provide him unreliable data for they are not aware of the requirements of the researcher and tend to be very formal while providing the information. Thus Sir George A. Grierson, who engaged himself for years in describing the structure of Kashmiri, was at a number of places led astray by his informants. To cite only one example at random, he pointed out some crucial structural differences between Hindu and Musalman dialects of Kashmiri
which are not really there. While making a contrastive study of the two versions of a tale he confused stylistic variation with dialectal variation. A contrastive study would be unreliable without a thorough, independent and methodological study of the native language.

1.4 A Brief Typological Characterisation of Kashmiri (in Relation to that of English)

1.4.1 Word Order

It was Grierson, who for the first time observed a similarity between English and Kashmiri in their basic word order. "... in a Kashmiri direct sentence the order nearly approaches that of English." However, this

See George A. Grierson, Standard Manual of the Kashmiri Language, vol. 1 (1911. Light and Life Publishers, Rohtak, 1973), p. 65. This is not to ignore the existence of the two dialects, but the difference is only at the level of lexis. Even at the level of lexis, the option of 'lokiṭ' for 'kiːs', for example, is stylistic rather than dialectal. (See also pages 35-37).

Peter Hook does not accept S-Aux_V-O order in Kashmiri. His conclusions are, however, based on various stylistically bizarre sentences from Grierson (1911) like "sombiroːv baːdːaːhan z'um beːʃumaːr."
observation should not lead us to the conclusion that the two languages always coincide in their word-order. Unlike English, all types of inversions are possible in a Kashmiri sentence and the word order usually depends on the situation and on the need for emphasis on particular items; it also depends on individual styles. Nevertheless, the underlying order in all cases remains: S-Aux-V-O; likewise, at any rate, the second element in the sentence is the finite component of the verb phrase. But, unlike English, fronting of any element other than the subject leads to the permutation of the subject to a position after the verb:-

Normal order: \textit{\texttt{tam' vu\c{c}h akh ha:puth tati}} \\
\hspace*{1cm} he+ERG saw a bear there \\
\hspace*{1cm} (He saw a bear there)

Inversions: \textit{\texttt{akh ha:puth vu\c{c}h tam' tati}} \\
\hspace*{1cm} tati vu\c{c}h tam' akh ha:puth

However, in all types of independent and complement clauses, the verb takes position 2, and therefore, Kashmiri is a V/2 language like English, and type A language as

36 Variations on the basic word order in Kashmiri indicate some change in topic and focus. Moreover, these variations are accompanied with distinctive intonation contours.
Perlmutter uses the term. According to Haiman, type A languages

i) allow no deletion of unstressed personal pronoun subjects,

ii) must have subjects for impersonal verbs,

iii) have special indefinite pronoun subjects like one and man,

iv) have dummy subjects to replace extraposed sentences,

v) have a dummy pronoun 'there' (or some equivalent) to stand in the place of logical subjects that have been displaced from sentence initial position.

Kashmiri exhibits most of the characteristics of type A languages as discussed by Haiman.

i) Deletion of subject pronoun in Kashmiri renders a sentence ungrammatical or incomplete, e.g.,


However, deletion of subject pronoun from the initial position is sometimes necessary for emphasizing the action, when it is converted into a pronominal suffix '-um' to the verb, as in the sentence:

\[\text{vonum tamis told+I him} \]
\[(I \text{ told him})\]

Peter Hook cites the following examples in support of his argument that Kashmiri does not possess the first characteristic of type A languages:

a) \[\text{pa:ni kh'om} \]
\[\text{self ate+I} \]
\[(I \text{ myself ate,})\]

b) \[\text{me kor a:sm:nuk } \text{co:n gónah} \]
\[(\text{I+ERG did sky+GEN your sin})\]
\[\text{von' chus ni yath la:yakh zi} \]
\[\text{now am not this+DAT worthy that} \]
\[\text{beyi yiyam } \text{co:n nečuv vanini} \]
\[\text{again come+me your son to be called} \]
(I have sinned against you and against heaven; now
I am not worthy to be called your son again.)

In both these examples the personal pronoun is not altogether deleted, it is optionally converted into a pronominal suffix to the verb: '-m' in 'kh'0:m' (example 'a'), '-am' in 'yiyam' (example 'b'). In my view, the first sentence cited as an example by Peter Hook is an incomplete sentence; it requires a coordination after it:

pa:ni kh'0:m tì t'amis d'utum nì kēh
self ate+I and he+DAT gave+I not anything
(I myself ate and did not give him anything.)

The second example is the translation of a Biblical sentence and I, as a native speaker, cannot recognize it as a natural sentence. In the second clause of this sentence, an adverbial element is fronted which dislocates the subject pronoun that is deleted but optionally. This is not, therefore, the basic word order. A native speaker would say:

v'0n' ßhus nì ßi yath la:yakh....
now am not I this+DAT worthy
(Now I am not worthy of this...)

ii) In all Kashmiri sentences with impersonal subjects, the subject cannot be deleted:

ru:d ßhu p'ava:n
rain is fall+PROG
(It is raining.)
tsūg chu dazām
lamp is burn+PROG
(The lamp is burning.)

Against this generalization Hook cites an ungrammatical sentence from Grierson's data:

\[ \text{vən' čhe s'aṭhah vuzmali} \]
\[ \text{now are much lightning} \]
\[ \text{(There are many lightnings now.)} \]

Semantically, it is not an equivalent of 'Now it is lightning much,' and is further ungrammatical. In fact, it is a variant of

\[ \text{vuzmali čhe s'aṭhah vən' (gatsha:n)} \]
\[ \text{lightnings are much now go+PROG} \]
\[ \text{(There are enough lightnings now.)} \]

This type of construction implies satisfaction with the sufficiency of a thing:

\[ \text{rōpiyi čhe s'aṭhah vən'} \]
\[ \text{money is much now} \]
\[ \text{(We have enough money now.)} \]

iv) Kashmiri, like English, has dummy subjects to replace extraposed sentences:

\[ \text{yi chuni bana:n zi tsi va:takh} \]
\[ \text{it is not possible that you arrive+Fut+you} \]
\[ \text{to:r az} \]
\[ \text{there today} \]
\[ \text{(It is not possible for you to get there today.)} \]
So we see that only two properties i.e. (iii) and (v) of type A languages are wanting in Kashmiri while in English they are there:

**Property iii:**
One does not know what will happen tomorrow.
They say that he is hiding here.
No parallel sentences, beginning with items equivalent to 'one', etc., are available in Kashmiri.

**Property v:**
There is no light.
There are fools everywhere.
Here too, we do not have corresponding costruction types in Kashmiri.

However, in narrative styles the equivalent of 'there' is 'yi':

Eng. There was a thief
Kash. Yi o:s akh tsu:r

1.4.2 Marked vs. Unmarked

Kashmiri is a partially free word order SVO language as compared to English which is a rigid word order SVO language, that is, in English the positions of subject, verb and object are fixed, while in Kashmiri these constituents can change their position; but the following constraints are there:
i) the verb cannot occur at the clause initial position:

* l'okh tarn' khat
  wrote he letter

ii) in any variation of the basic word order, the verb immediately precedes the subject:

me d'ut tarn' nov kalam
I+DAT gave+CONC he+ERG new pen
(He gave me a new pen.)

nov kalam d'ut tarn' me
(new pen gave+CONC he+ERG I+DAT)
(He gave me a new pen.)

* nov kalam tarn' d'ut me
* d'ut nov kalam tarn' me

iii) the subject and object cannot be juxtaposed:

* me khat l'okh
* nov kalam tarn' d'ut me

iv) the auxiliary verb cannot be permuted to clause final position:

s> čhe g'ava:n ba:th
(she is singing a song.)
* s> g'ava:n ba:th čhe

An important corollary of this typological disagreement between the two languages is that English is without case
inflections while Kashmiri has case inflections. A noun in a Kashmiri sentence usually bears some kind of morpheme which is indicative of its role in the sentence. It is marked for the subject in the agentive case or in the ergative form:

a) '-an' is added to a masculine noun:

\[
\text{salij\textsuperscript{man} vu\textsuperscript{\textcircled{\textsc{c}}}h \text{akh nov te\textsuperscript{\textcircled{\textsc{c}}}liv\textsuperscript{\textcircled{\textsc{c}}}jan}} \\
\text{Salim\textsuperscript{\textcircled{\textsc{c}}}ERG see\textsuperscript{\textcircled{\textsc{c}}}past a new television} \\
(\text{Salim saw a new television.})
\]

b) '-i' is added to a feminine noun:

\[
\text{ka\textsuperscript{i}\textsuperscript{\textcircled{\textsc{c}}}ri vu\textsuperscript{\textcircled{\textsc{c}}}h yuhus kr\textsuperscript{\textcircled{\textsc{c}}}u\textsuperscript{\textcircled{\textsc{c}}}th v\textsuperscript{\textcircled{\textsc{c}}}\text{\textsuperscript{\textcircled{\textsc{c}}}d\textsuperscript{\textcircled{\textsc{c}}}i}} \\
\text{Kashmir\textsuperscript{\textcircled{\textsc{c}}}ERG see\textsuperscript{\textcircled{\textsc{c}}}PAST this year difficult winter} \\
(\text{Kashmir experienced a severe winter this year.})
\]

c) Personal pronouns are inflected as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Ist person singular} & : \text{me} \\
\text{Ist person plural} & : \text{asi} \\
\text{2nd person singular} & : \text{tse} \\
\text{2nd person plural} & : \text{t\textsuperscript{\textcircled{\textsc{c}}}hi} \\
\text{3rd person singular masculine} & : \text{t\textsuperscript{\textcircled{\textsc{c}}}m\textsuperscript{\textcircled{\textsc{c}}}} \\
\text{3rd person singular feminine} & : \text{tami} \\
\text{3rd person plural} & : \text{tim\textsuperscript{\textcircled{\textsc{c}}}v}
\end{align*}
\]

The subject noun in the dative case is marked:

a) '-as' is added to most of the masculine nouns (singular):
tsu:ras  kar  me  thaph
thief+DAT  did  I+ERG  catch
(ër  caught  hold  of  the  thief.)

Similarly 'sali:mas' (Salim+DAT), 'ka:vas' (crow+DAT),
'sahras' (city+DAT), 'vakhtas' (time+DAT), etc.

b) '-is' is added to some masculine nouns (singular) in
which the final consonant is preceded by a rounded
vowel: in the original word, e.g., 'nečuv+DAT'→'nečvis'

tm'  lo:yi  nečvis
he+ERG  beat+PAST  son+DAT
(He  beat  his  son.)

Similarly, 'guris' (horse+DAT), 'šuris' (baby+DAT), 'haitis'
(throat+DAT), etc.

c) '-an' or '-en' is added to masculine nouns (plural):

    tsu:ran  d'utukh  saza:
thieves+DAT  give+past  punishment
(The  thieves  were  punished.)

    me  dits  šurenn  miθa:y
I+ERG  give+past  children+DAT  sweets
(I  gave  the  children  sweets.)

d) '-i' is added to a feminine noun (singular):

    tm'  lo:iy  ko:ri
he+ERG  beat+Past  girl+DAT
(He  beat  the  girl.)
e) 'en' is added to a feminine noun (plural):

\[ \text{tam}^* \text{ lo:gy koren} \]
he+ERG beat+Past girls+DAT
(He beat the girls.)

Personal pronouns are declined for dative case as follows:

1st person singular : me
1st person plural : asi
2nd person singular : tse
2nd person plural : t>hi
3rd person singular : tamin or tas
3rd person plural : timan

In the present tense, neither the subject nor the direct object is marked but the indirect object is marked for the dative case:

\[ \text{bi 'thus diva:n tas kita:bi} \]
I am giving he+DAT books
(I am giving him books.)

or
(I give him books.)

Similarly in the future tense, only the indirect object is marked for the dative case:

\[ \text{bi dimi tas kita:bi} \]
I give+fut. he+DAT books
(I will give him books.)
Besides the case markings of the subject and object, there is an intricate system of agreement between the verb and the subject and object nouns. It is beyond the scope of this study to discuss verbal agreement; a hint of some interesting phenomena should suffice here:

a) In simple past, a derived transitive verb agrees with the object in number, gender and person.

i) asi vučukh tsi
we+ERG saw+CONC you
(We saw you.)

ii) tse vučthas bi
you+ERG saw+OONC I
(You saw me.)

iii) t̶mрус̶ vučhis bi
he+ERG saw+OONC I
(He saw me.)

b) In simple past, a causative verb agrees with the patient.

i) t̶mрус̶ parina:v l̶d̶kas
he read+CONC boy+instrument hand letter
(He had the letter read by the boy.)

ii) t̶s̶e̶ phitrovuth d̶k̶iri s̶i̶:t̶' p'̶a̶:li
you+ERG broke+CONC hammer with cup

The verb may also agree with the causee.
He made the boy read the letter.

1.4.3 Tenses

The major tense distinction in English is between the past and the present, e.g., I write/I wrote. The future tense is realized by means of the auxiliary verbs: will and shall. In Kashmiri, on the other hand, the major tense distinction is between the past and the future: me l'okh (I wrote) and bi l'akhi (I will write). The present tense is realized by means of auxiliary verbs: a:s and its various forms. The tense system of the two languages differs in several other respects. One of the most obvious differences is that while in English the semantic distinction between the present continuous and the simple present is realised, in Kashmiri, this distinction is not realized:

\[
\text{tsi} \ \text{čhukh} \ g'avan} \begin{cases} 
\text{You are singing.} \\
\text{You sing.}
\end{cases}
\]

1.4.4 Passivization

Passivization is extremely rare in Kashmiri and wherever it is used, it is quite different from English passivization. The semantic constraints of passives in Kashmiri are mainly two, i.e., worthiness and ability.
When we say,

\[
\text{ča:y yiyi čen}i \\
\text{(The tea can be taken.)}
\]

we either mean, "the tea is worth taking," or "we can take tea." When we say,

\[
\text{dušman yin ča:n}i \text{ dæ } ga:lini \\
\text{(The enemies will be destroyed by you.)}
\]

we mean "you are able to destroy the enemies."

Generally the function of passivization is performed by some other means, e.g., inversions, contrastive stress and by the introduction of various emphatic words. The most common situation demanding passivization is a state of inability:

\[
yi kæ:m yiyi \text{ ni m}a:n\text{i }dæ:\text{ karini} \\
or\]
\[
m\text{a:n}i \text{ dæ: } yiyi \text{ ra karini yi kæ:m} \\
\text{(This job cannot be done by me.)}
\]

The active correspondent to the three passive sentences is

\[
\text{bi h'akî ni yi kæ:m karith} \\
\text{(I cannot do this job.)}
\]

As the above examples reveal, the promotion of the object to the subject position is not a distinguishing
feature of the passive sentences in Kashmiri as it is in English. The only feature common to all forms of the passive sentences is that the verb is inflected by '-ini.' However, the promotion of the object to the subject position is a regular feature only when it is an indirect object.

Hook and Koul have made an important observation that a true indirect object (+HUMAN) can never be the subject in Kashmiri while in English it can be.

Kash. * bi chus kita:b dini yiva:n
Eng. I am being given the book

See Peter E. Hook and O.N. Koul, "On the Grammar of Derived Transitives and Causatives in Kashmiri" — Paper read in 3rd International Conference of Asian languages and linguistics, Mysore, 1982. However, they have overlooked sentences like these:

me čhe kita:b dini yiva:n
(I am being given the book.)

Aslamas čhe rɔpiyi dini yiva:n
(Aslam is being given money.)

In these Kashmiri sentences a true indirect object (+HUMAN) becomes the surface subject as in English though the noun retains its dative inflection.
The children cannot be taught the lesson by me.
(The children cannot be taught the lesson by me.)

The officer cannot be given money by me.
(The officer cannot be given money by me.)

1.4.5 Determination

Though Kashmiri, like English, makes use of the indefinite and definite determiners, the semantic constraints governing the use of a determiner in the two languages are very different. The indefinite article in Kashmiri is 'akh' (=a) which takes the prenominal position when the nominal is a common noun. Instead of a separate definite article, Kashmiri uses a suitable demonstrative pronoun to mark the definite reference: su, ti, timi, yi, yim, etc. In English, the use of the definite article is essential when there is an anaphoric or cataphoric reference, while in Kashmiri, it is conditioned by a cataphoric reference only as in a relative clause structure:

In English, too, the definite article 'the' has developed from what was originally a demonstrative pronoun. See John Lyons, *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics* (1968; Cambridge University Press, 1971), p. 279.
Anaphoric reference:

Eng. John bought a copy, a pencil and a pen, but returned the copy.
Kash. ja:nan h'ats akh ka:pi:, akh pensal, tâ akh pen, magar ka:pi: karin va:pas

Cataphoric reference:

Eng. The novel which John read is very famous.
Kash. g> na:val y'^si ja:nan par ëche s'äthah ma'ã:u:r

However, 'the' is also used in English when there is a situational reference, that is, when the existence of an object is taken for granted.

I went home. After reading the newspaper, I turned on the radio and slept on the bed.

Kashmiri nominals do not need articles for situational reference.

* bi go:s gari / Su akhba:r porith tro:vum re:ðiyo
ti șöãüs tath b'adas p'ath

The use of the indefinite article is more or less similar in the two languages. However, in Kashmiri, unlike English, it is optional in a given situation, when the object is explicitly solitary:

bi o:sus (aki) ʒägilî mōz' pakai:n
I was+CONC a jungle+ABL through walk+PROG
me vuçh (akh) ha:put
I+ERG saw+CONC a bear

(I was walking through a jungle, I saw a bear.)
The indefinite article in Kashmiri cannot be deleted when in a given situation the referent is one specific person or entity among several persons or entities.

Akh lāḏkī a:v me niš ti dopnam me
a boy came I+DAT near and told me I+DAT
ha:v ti akh sava:l
show+CONC IMP a question
(A boy came to me and asked me to solve a question for him.)

Akh tičar gatshi pa:nī gōḍā parun
a teacher should self first read+Inf.
(A teacher should first read himself.)

1.4.6 Postpositions

Kashmiri, like Hindi, has a system of postpositions instead of prepositions. The relation between entities as expressed by postpositions of Kashmiri and prepositions of English is not in certain cases identical, although various relational meanings — prominent prepositions of time, place, direction, instrument and cause — are not generally much different across languages. Location expressed by on and in in English is generally similar to p'ath and māz respectively in Kashmiri, but still the relational meaning in English between 'a bird' and 'a tree', for example, is , expressed by in, while in Kashmir, it is , expressed by p'ath

It is customary to use only one term, viz., 'prepositions' for both prepositions and postpositions.
Eng. A bird is singing in a tree.

akh jaːnivar čhu g'awaːn kulis p'ath

Besides, in Kashmiri, the function of prepositions is also expressed by various case endings, and prepositions are not used as such.

Su oːs ni yeti aːthvaːri dɔhi
he was not here Sunday+ABL day+ABL
(He was not here on Sunday.)

tɔm von me ...
he+ERG say+Past I+DAT
(He said to me....).

Grierson has classified all Kashmiri postpositions into two types:43

43 a) Those which govern the dative case. Examples:

i) kitaːb čhe sōdíkas məz
book is+FEM box+DAT in
(The book is in the box.)

ii) tɔm on' mithɔːy pleːtas k'ath
he+ERG bring+CONC sweets plate+DAT in
(He got the sweets in a plate.)

iii) sɔ čhe kadlas niʃ
she is+CONC bridge+DAT near
(She is near the bridge.)
iv) šur chu dɔsi p'aṭh
child is+OONC wall+DAT on
(The child is on the wall.)

b) Those which govern the ablative case. Examples:

i) bi pokus ba:gi kin'
I walk+OONC garden+ABL nearby
(I walked nearby the garden.)

ii) čani kin' hek' ni as ni:rith
you+ABL because can+CON not we go+CONI PART.
(Because of you, we could not go.)

iii) šur p'av dɔsi p'āṭhī bon
child fall+OONC wall+ABL from down
(The child fell down from the wall.)

Some of the postpositions are inflected for the number, gender and case of the noun modified by it.

me van ədrim ra:z
me+DAT tell in+OONC secret
(Tell me the inner secret.)

me di peṭhim gila:si
me+DAT give on+OONC cherries
(Give me the cherries from the top)

1.5 Scope

A contrastive study of any two languages will always be very far from being complete, not only because no language
of the world has been or can be studied completely, but also because such a study has got to be restricted in scope to ensure good presentation of the material. A thorough contrastive study of English and Kashmiri is especially not possible because the latter language, like many other Indian languages, has not so far been described systematically and adequately in terms of a framework related to any particular school of modern linguistics. However, a contrastive study of the two languages is facilitated to a large extent by the immense literature available on the grammatical structure of English. A contrastive study, as one would legitimately expect, should start from the very beginning, that is from sound system, through a study of word formation and formation of primary sentences leading to sentence combination mechanisms, but such a study would, for practical purposes, be unwieldy and, as such, unmanageable.

In view of this, the present study is restricted to three major sentence combination mechanisms in the two languages, that is, embedding a sentence in the noun phrase of another sentence by relativization, embedding a sentence in the verb phrase of another sentence by complementation, linking together two sentences of the same level by coordination. For purposes of inevitable delimitation, the study does not deal with the rich diversity of sentence formation in the two languages. However, the treatment of
the three syntactic mechanisms mentioned aims at simplicity; explicitness and comprehensiveness and towards this end, it takes into account a lot of incidental and ancillary detail. An exclusive completeness for these analyses is not claimed; an attempt has been made to ensure that these analyses are consistent with the established linguistic principles and procedures and, accordingly, innovations in the methods of description have been avoided.

The study is essentially a syntactic study; nevertheless, semantic constraints of various syntactic phenomena are also discussed at relevant places, but this discussion is not thorough; it is offered as an ancillary aid. A detailed discussion of the semantic basis of syntactic patterns, it may be pointed out, would be bewilderingly complex.

A comprehensive syntactic analysis of the Kashmiri language has not yet been attempted or accomplished. Particularly, the three aspects of Kashmiri syntax, namely,

A contrastive study based on semantics is all the more difficult as it entails a thorough proficiency in the two languages to be contrasted. According to Slobin, semantic competence comprises four components: "i) a dictionary, ii) .... a set of rules to determine which combinations of word meanings would result in a meaningful non-anomalous sentence..., iii) The context of discourse, and iv) the non-linguistic context of objects, people and events." See D.I. Slobin, Psycholinguistics (Scott Foresman and Co, 1971), pp. 87-88. Evidently a contrastive study of semantics involves complexity of a high order.
relativization, complementation and coordination are almost untouched to date in the available studies. In this study these aspects are investigated and systematically analysed. However, no originality is claimed in relation to description of English syntax. The relevant data has been drawn eclectically from a wide range of English grammatical studies.

1.6 The Presentational Framework

The following presentational framework has been adopted in the study:

1. Relativization, complementation and coordination are assumed to be common syntactic features of English and Kashmiri as dominantly SVO languages and as related languages (though only remotely). These aspects have been studied synchronically.

2. Each of the three sections includes discussion of only such syntactic properties as are considered to be syntactic universals and have been selected on the basis of both agreement and disagreement between the two languages.

3. The notion of each syntactic universal is briefly discussed and the various semantic constraints conditioning its occurrence in each language are touched upon.

4. Agreements and disagreements between the two languages
in displaying a particular Syntactic Universal are discussed and illustrated by actual sentences along with their variations. A Grammar of Contemporary English by Quirk, Greenbaum, Leach and Svartvik (Longman Group Ltd., London, 1972) is used for checking the authenticity of English sentences.

5. In the case of parallel construction in the two languages, Kashmiri sentences are generally given below the English equivalents and, in order to make the contrast more explicit, the lexical correspondences have been shown by numbers below each word. Where there is no exact correspondence between the constituents of the sentences of the two languages, a literal meaning is given instead of numbers. The uniqueness of the case inflections of Kashmiri words is indicated in abbreviations (see the List of Abbreviations at page V).

6. For further elucidation, the help of diagrams is utilized wherever necessary.

7. The incidental details are briefly discussed in the footnotes.

8. The general findings are summed up towards the end of each section.

I am indebted here to Dr. B.N. Kaul, C.I.E. & F.L., Hyderabad, who has adopted this pattern in his dissertation entitled Communicative Values and Syntactico-Semantic Contrastive Analysis (mentioned earlier on page 1.)