TOPICS
IN
KASHMIRI LINGUISTICS

TOPICS
IN
KASHMIRI LINGUISTICS

Edited by
Omkar N Koul
Kashi Wali

Creative Books
New Delhi

Contents

Preface

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. Grrierson 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.

June 2002   **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]   kyaazyi suuzu-kh   **tsi**   yoor ?
      they.Erg[2]   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   kyaazyi looyu-y   **tsye** ?   [cf (1k)]
      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   **tsye**   [cf (2k)]
      we.Nom   'hit'-Fut1pl-2sD-Neg   you.Dat

(4h) ham   **tujhe**   nahII   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) **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) **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 *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)   **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)   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 *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)[3]. 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 *laay* stand out as a striking exception to Siddheshwar Varma's observation. In this note, however, we show that *laay* is not an exception after all. Rather, the common elision of *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 *dyi* 'give', *haav* 'show', *thaph kar* 'seize', *tsop hye* 'bite' (see fn 4), *pen(d)y kaD* 'cause grief to', etc:

(10) jelyis   ees   pyeceny tyi   pendy   kaD-aan.
      Jol.Dat   wasAunt.Nom toogriefs.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 *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 *luur laayiny* "to strike a cudgel, to cudgel" and *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 *luur laayiny* (in which *laayiny* agrees in gender and number with *luur* 'stick, cudgel'), it is clear that the instrument of striking is the lexical patient of *laay*. The person hit gets the dative case because that person is the recipient in a **trivalent** predicate argument structure. In other words the predicate *laay* is not to be compared with the English *hit x (with y)* or *beat x* nor with the Hindi-Urdu *x ko (y se) maar* 'strike x (with y)' but with the English *give y to x* or *apply y to x* or Hindi-Urdu *x ko y lagaa*:

(11k) laDkan   leey   temyis   capaath[4]
      boy.Erg   applied.Fsg   him.Dat   slap(Fsg)
(11h) laRke-ne   use   thappaR   lagaa-ii
      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*[5] 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[6] .'   (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)   **tsye** ?
     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[7] 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.Nom   danced.Mpl   and   she.Nom   laughed.Fsg
      '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), *asyi* (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[8]) bivalents whose patients get the dative case whether in active or passive voice:

(18) **naavyi**   aav   beThyis   kun   lam-ini   [compare (15)]
      boat.Dat came.Def shore.Dat toward pull-Abl.Inf
      'The boat was pulled to shore.'

(19) **daanas**   aav-ni   pyev-ini   / sandaar-ini   [compare (16)]
      stove.Dat came-not light-Abl.Inf / light-Abl.Inf
      'The stove was not lit.' or 'The stove could not be lit.'

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[6] :

(20) *laay*: X [(forcefully) CAUSE [Y BECOME Z_{DAT} (or Adv_{PLACE})]]

                                        where either [7] 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 *laay* is used as in (6) and (7)] or necessarily [when *laay* is used 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) yi   zanaan aayi   (*X-nyi zeryiyi) bAATi pyeThi   bwan   laay-ni.
      this   woman   came.Fsg   (X-Gen by)   bonnet from   down   apply-Abl.Inf
      '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) … pathar hyot-n-as   (*X-nyi zeryiyi) (bi)
      laay-ini y-un
              down   began-3sE-1sN   (X-Gen by)   (I.Nom)
      apply-Abl.Inf come-Msg
      '(I felt dizzy and I) 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 *laayini yun* as 'to fall' suggests that it is appropriate to posit two separate lexical items *laay-* 'apply' and *laayini yi-* 'fall'. The first of these would have a regular passive counterpart *laayini yi-* 'be applied' 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) *laay* 'apply' X [(forcefully) CAUSE [y BECOME Z_{Dat} (or Adv place)]]   (y is [-human])
      laayini yi 'fall': [Y BECOME Z_{Dat} (or Adv_{Place})]]   (y 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 a *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:

Abl......................ablative	Obl.........................oblique		
Acc......................accusative	Fut................future tense		
PP..................past participle	(at)...........................dative	Inf.....................infinitive	
p(l)............................plural			
Def...........................default	M...................masculine	Pres.................present tense	
(rg)........................ergative	Neg...................negative	Pst......................past tense	
F.............................feminine	N(om)............nominative	s(g)..........................singular	

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 buth.
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.'   (ditto)
   (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.

REFERENCES

Akhtar, Bashir. 1985. yi naar chu tyeezaan (This fire is growing). In *Sheeraza* 22:88-91.

Andrabi, S.M.I. 1983. *Reference and coreference in Kashmiri.* Deccan College PhD dissertation.

Aziz, Afaq. 1998. hwanar (Art). In Omkar Koul, Ed. Pp. 85-86.

Bhatt, R. 1994. *Word Order and Case in Kashmiri.* University of Illinois PhD dissertation.

Grierson, Sir George A., Pandit Ishvara Kaula, Pandit Mukundaram Shastri. 1985. *A Dictionary of the Kashmiri Language.* 4 vols. Delhi: B.R. Publishing Corp. (reprint)

Hewitt, B.G. 1995. *Georgian: A structural reference grammar.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hook, Peter E., and Omkar N. Koul. Forthcoming. *Kashmiri: a study in comparative Indo-Aryan.* Tokyo: Institute for Study of Languages and Cultures of Asia and Africa.

Kachru, Braj B. 1969. *A reference grammar of Kashmiri.* Urbana: Dept of Linguistics, UIUC.

Kachru, Yamuna, and Rajeshwari Pandharipande. 1979. On ergativity in selected South Asian languages. In *South Asian Language Analysis.* Urbana: Dept of Linguistics, UIUC. 193-209.

Kaul, Harikrishen. 1998. phoTuu (Photo). In Omkar Koul, Ed. Pp. 29-33.

Koul, Omkar, Ed. 1998. *gyilyi Tuury - afsaani sombran (Little blossoms – A collection of stories).* Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.

_____. 1997. tas maa lej myeeny nazar. In *setyiisar* 1:101-104. Jammu: Sampreti.

_____ and P. Umarani. 2000. Kashmiri grammar: a computational analysis. In *Vartavaha* 5:45-84. Mysore: Central Institute of Indian Languages.

Levin, Beth, and Malka Rappaport Hovav. 1996. *Unaccusativity: At the syntax-lexical semantics interface.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Malmohi, Amar. 1998. kEDy ti Tuury. In Omkar N. Koul, Ed. Pp. 67-70.

Raina, Achala M. 1991. *An S-selectional approach to grammar: some issues in Kashmiri syntax.* Doctoral dissertation, Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur.

Varma, Siddheshwar. 1938. The dialects of the Khasali group. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal* 4:1-65.

Wali, Kashi, and Omkar Koul. 1997. *Kashmiri: A cognitive-descriptive grammar.* London and New York: Routledge.

Contributors

Estella Del Bon, 73, rue de Reuilly, 75012, Paris, France.

Peter Edwin Hook, Program in Linguistics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor , MI   48109-1285, USA.

Ashok K Koul, Center for Language Studies, Brown University, Box E Providence, RI 02912, USA.

Omkar N Koul, C-13, Greenview Apartments, 33, Sector 9, Rohini, Delhi – 110085, India.

Achla Misri Raina, Dept of Humanities and Social Sciences, Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur , UP, India.

Kashi Wali, 7518 Spectrum Way, Fayetteville, New York 13066, USA.

Dr Omkar N Koul is Chairman of the Indian Institute of Language Studies. He has held the positions of Director, and Professor-cum-Deputy Director of the Central Institute of Indian Languages, Mysore, Professor of LBS National Academy of Administration, Mussoorie, and Principal of Northern Regional Language Centre, Patiala.His publications related to Kashmiri language and linguistics include *Linguistic Studies in Kashmiri* (1977), *Kashmiri:A Sociolinguistic Survey* (co-author, 1983), *An Intensive Course in Kashmiri* (1985), *Spoken Kashmiri: A Language Course* (1987), *An Intermediate Course in Kashmiri* (1995), *Kashmiri:A Descriptive-Cognitive Grammar* (co-author, 1997), *Kashmiri Language Linguistics and Culture: An Annotated Bibliography* (2000), *Kashmiri: A Study in Comparative Indo-Aryan* (co-author, in press) and a large number of papers.

Dr. Kashi Wali is a visiting Professor at the Cornell and Syracuse Universities. She has been working on Kashmiri for last two decades and has published extensively in the fields of linguistics and South Asian languages. Her publications include *Marathi Syntax : A Study of Reflexives* (1989), *Kashmiri: A Descriptive-Cognitive Grammar* (co-author 1997), *Lexical Anaphora and pronouns in Selected South Asian Languages* (co-editor 2000) and a large number of papers.

Topics in Kashmiri Linguistics include papers related to Hindi Syntax and Semantics. The papers are contributed by Kashi Wali (WH Questions in Marathi and Kashmiri), Kashi Wali and Ashok K Koul (Kashmiri Clitics: The Role of Case and CASE), Kashi Wali, Omkar N Koul (Long shadows of Ergativity in Kashmiri and Marathi), Kashi Wali,Omkar N Koul and Ashok K Koul (Multiple Case Marking in Kashmiri Possessive: Traditional and Modern Perspective), Kashi Wali, Omkar N Koul and Ashok K Koul (The Significance of Topic in a V2 Language: Evidence from Kashmiri), Peter Edwin Hook and Ashok K Koul (Under the Surface of the South Asian Linguistics Area: More on the Syntax of Derived Transitives and Causatives in Kashmiri), Achla Misri Raina (The Verb Second Phenomenon in Kashmiri), estella Del Bon (Personal Inflexions and Order of Clitics in Kashmiri), and Peter Edwin Hook and Omkar N Koul (The verb laayun is not an Exception).

Linguists, language teachers and students interested in Kashmiri language and linguistics will find this volume quite useful.