

**A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF
INFLECTIONAL MORPHEMES IN PUNJABI
AND ENGLISH**

BY

M. MUNAWAR HUSSAIN



NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF MODERN LANGUAGES

ISLAMABAD

APRIL, 2024

A Comparative Study of Inflectional Morphemes in Punjabi and English

By

M. MUNAWAR HUSSAIN

M. A., National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad, 2010

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF PHILOSOPHY

In English

To

FACULTY OF ARTS & HUMANITIES



NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF MODERN LANGUAGES, ISLAMABAD

© M. Munawar Hussain, 2024



THESIS AND DEFENSE APPROVAL FORM

The undersigned certify that they have read the following thesis, examined the defense, are satisfied with the overall exam performance, and recommend the thesis to the Faculty of Arts & Humanities for acceptance.

Thesis Title: A Comparative Study of Inflectional Morphemes in Punjabi and English

Submitted by: M. Munawar Hussain
Ling/F20

Registration #: 61 MPhil/Eng

Master of Philosophy
Degree name in full

English Linguistics
Name of Discipline

Dr. Ghazala Kausar
Name of Research Supervisor

Signature of Research Supervisor

Dr. Muhammad Safeer Awan
Name of Dean (FAH)

Signature of Dean (FAH)

Date

AUTHOR'S DECLARATION

I **M. Munawar Hussain**

Son of **Sultan Mehmood**

Registration # **61 MPhil/Eng Ling/F20**

Discipline **English Linguistics**

Candidate of **Master of Philosophy** at the National University of Modern Languages do hereby declare that the thesis **A Comparative Study of Inflectional Morphemes in Punjabi and English** submitted by me in partial fulfillment of MPhil degree, is my original work, and has not been submitted or published earlier. I also solemnly declare that it shall not, in future, be submitted by me for obtaining any other degree from this or any other university or institution.

I also understand that if evidence of plagiarism is found in my thesis/dissertation at any stage, even after the award of a degree, the work may be cancelled and the degree revoked.

Signature of Candidate

M. Munawar Hussain

Name of Candidate

Date

ABSTRACT

Title: A Comparative Study of Inflectional Morphemes in Punjabi and English

The present study aims to highlight and compare the nominal and verbal morphological differences and similarities in the Punjabi and English languages. It also describes the variety in its form, function, and meaning. The study uses morphological analysis method to analyse the data, and contributes to the field of canonical typology, as typology is a testing ground for theories to be proven right or wrong (Audring & Masini, 2019). The study analyses the data with the help of Canonical Morphosyntactic Feature Values Theory presented by Greville G. Corbett, along with its three principles and ten criteria (Arkadiev, 2010). These principles and criteria not only shape the data collection method but maneuver the data analysis procedure as well. The examples from both Punjabi and English are taken against these principles and criteria and analysed to check if the data matches the principles and criteria presented in the theoretical framework. The data is collected from two sources, i.e., Bhatia (1993) and Shah (2015). The major differences found in Punjabi and English morphemes are striking. Punjabi nouns are inflected either by prepositional marking or postpositional ergativity. Punjabi verbs pose ambiguity with the rule of split ergativity in the form of causative, conjunct, and compound verbs. However, these features are nowhere to be found in English. The findings of the study revealed that nouns and verbs in Punjabi vary tremendously from their English counterparts, and their behaviours do not line up perfectly simple morphologically, syntactically, and semantically. The Punjabi morphosyntactic features and their values transcend the simple syntactic and semantic rules. For instance, the ergatives or case markers do not admit to the syntactic rules, i.e., inanimate nouns in Punjabi usually do not take the accusative postposition *nu*, whereas animate objects require it. This study is not only going to help language learners and translators from Punjabi and English origins but also assist researchers with the concept of morphological analysis and classification of inflectional differences and similarities in both origins.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
THESIS AND DEFENSE APPROVAL FORM.....	ii
AUTHOR’S DECLARATION	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	ix
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	x
DEDICATION.....	xi
1. INTRODUCTION.....	12
1.1 The Statement of the Problem	14
1.2 Objectives of the Study	15
1.3 Research Questions	15
1.4 Morphological Analysis Method	15
1.5 Significance of the Study	16
1.6 Chapter Breakdown	16
2. LITERATURE REVIEW	17
2.1 Introduction.....	17
2.1.1 Morphology and Inflectional Morphemes	17
2.2 Punjabi and English Typology: Differences and Similarities.....	20
2.2.1 Construction of Light Verbs	20
2.2.2 A Universal Grammar (UG) Approach to Punjabi	21
2.3 Punjabi a Regional Language of Pakistan	22
2.3.2 Punjabi: A Split Ergative Language.....	24
2.3.3 Pronominal Suffixation or Cliticization.....	24
2.3.4 Complex Predicates and Linking in Punjabi	25
2.3.5 Characteristics of Punjabi Infixes	26
2.3.6 Reduplication of Words in Punjabi.....	26

2.4 Morphosyntactic Feature Values in Punjabi and Sister Languages.....	27
2.4.1 Acquisition of Nominal Inflections in Punjabi and Urdu	29
2.4.2 Analyzing Gender and Number Marking Processes	30
2.4.3 Morphosyntactic Features of Urdu Language.....	30
2.4.4 Pluralization Processes of Rangri Language.....	32
2.5 Mixing up Morphological, Syntactic or Semantic Features	33
2.6 Canonical Typology: A New Phenomena	33
2.7 Conclusion	37
3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	38
3.1 Introduction.....	38
3.2 Morphological Analysis Method	38
3.3 Theoretical Framework.....	39
3.4 Relevance of the Theory to the Study.....	43
3.5 Research Design	45
3.5.1 Sample.....	45
3.5.2 Data Analysis Procedure.....	46
3.6 Conclusion	47
4. DATA ANALYSIS-I.....	48
4.1 Introduction.....	48
4.2 Number	48
4.3 Case.....	51
4.4 Gender.....	55
4.4.1 Masculine Nouns	55
4.4.2 Feminine Nouns	57
4.5 Declension	61
4.6 Syntax	62
4.7 Proverbs	64
4.8 Morphosyntactic Features	68
4.8.1 Case.....	69

4.8.2 Number	69
4.8.3 Gender	72
4.9 Pseudo-Nouns	73
4.10 Semantic Functions	74
4.11 Dative/Genitive Precedence.....	75
4.12 Conclusion	84
5. DATA ANALYSIS-II.....	86
5.1 Introduction.....	86
5.2 Case.....	87
5.2.1 Intransitive or Transitive Verbs	87
5.3 Tense.....	88
5.4 Number	90
5.5 Person	91
5.6 Gender.....	92
5.6.1 Grammatical Gender	93
5.7 Conjunct Verbs	94
5.8 Person	95
5.9 Tense.....	96
5.10 Compound Verbs	97
5.11 Proverbs	99
5.12 Topicalization	102
5.13 Syntactic Functions.....	105
5.14 Dative/Genitive Precedence.....	107
5.15 Semantic Function	108
5.16 Copular Verbs	110
5.17 Objects Governed by Verbs	114
5.18 Conclusion	120
6. CONCLUSION	122

6.1 Findings: What are the similar and variant nominal and verbal inflections in Punjabi and English languages?	122
6.1.1 Noun.....	122
6.1.2 Noun.....	123
6.2 Findings: How does morphology of Punjabi and English behave while considering the nominal and verbal morphosyntactic features?.....	124
6.2.1 Noun.....	125
6.2.2 Verb.....	126
6.3 Findings: How do the behaviours of canonical nouns and verbs in Punjabi and English line up perfectly in their morphological, syntactic, and semantic structures?.....	128
6.3.1 Morphology.....	128
6.3.2 Syntax	129
6.3.3 Semantics	130
6.4 Recommendations.....	131
6.5 Conclusion	131
REFERENCES.....	133

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ms.	Masculine singular
mp	Masculine plural
pst.	Past tense
sm.	Singular masculine
m.	Masculine
pl.	Plural
pp	Postposition
Adj.	Adjective
s.	Singular
f.	Feminine
Pro.	Pronoun
acc.	Accusative case
fs.	Feminine/singular
erg.	Ergative
dat.	Dative case
gen.	Genitive case
obl.	Oblique case
inst.	Instrumental case
ms.	Male/singular
suf.	Suffix
prst.	Present tense
aux.	Auxiliary
Dir.	Direct case
dat.	Dative case

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the Name of Allah, the Most Merciful, the Most Compassionate, Alhamdulillah all praises belongs to Almighty Allah, the Lord of the worlds and prayers and peace be upon Muhammad (SAW) His messenger.

I owe thanks to Prof. Dr Muhammad Safeer Awan, Dean Faculty of Languages, Prof. Dr. Inayat Ullah, Head Department of English for their cooperation in the entire process.

I would like to express my deepest thanks and love to my Mother who has always inspired and encouraged my pursuit of this degree and to my brothers, sister, wife and kids who have supported me in all my years of academic study. I also express my special thanks and gratitude to my supervisor Dr. Ghazala Kausar who has consistently helped me in the entire process. In spite of my inconsistencies in the work, she has always given worthwhile and valuable counselling and has been extremely helpful in times of need, I am genuinely thankful for this. Thanks to the English Department of NUML for offering me the academic and creative space, to bring this thesis to life.

Thank you all.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to my Mother, who stood by me even when the circumstances were hard. Mom, thank you! You sacrificed your desires for my future.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The English language belongs to the West Germanic family, whereas Punjabi is the language that belongs to the Indo-Aryan family. This language is mainly spoken in two South Asian countries: Pakistan and India (Khan & Kausar 2019). The number of its native speakers surpasses the 100 million figure. Punjabi is considered the 10th largest language in the world (Lewis, Simons & Fennig 2016). In Pakistan, it is spoken by the majority of the people as their second language in their day-to-day routine, and 60% of the population of Pakistan uses Punjabi as its first language. According to Campbell, Punjabi is divided into three dialects: Majhi, Dogri and Lahnda, among which Majhi is the most common dialect and is spoken in Lahore. It is also the language of literature (Campbell, 1991). The Majhi dialect of Punjabi is the focus of this study. The languages of the world may vary in the way their words are analyzed into their constituent parts. English is an analytic language, in which morphology plays a relatively modest role (Hussain, Abbas, and Bashir, 2024). The Majhi dialect of Punjabi, however, is rich in its morphology, so it can be considered a polysynthetic language. English, being the West Germanic language, is different in morphology as compared to the other European languages. For instance, Booij (2012) is of the opinion that English is very less inflected in comparison with French, Italian, and Spanish. However, it is still unclear how the inflectional morphemes of the Punjabi language differ from or relate to those of English.

Punjabi is comprised of concatenative inflectional morphology, as it mostly uses pre-fixes and suffixes for its inflections to work (Humayoun & Ranta, 2010). The focus of this study is comparing two altogether different languages with entirely different morphological systems in order to highlight the Punjabi language. As many scholars claim, Punjabi is a less researched language pertaining to this special area (Hussain, 2018; Bansal, Ahuja, Pal, and Sharma, 2011). There is a dire need to explore the regional languages of Pakistan, as all the other languages of the world are being explored, promoted, and documented, but the regional languages of Pakistan are lagging behind in this respect. There are a few studies on the phonological system of Punjabi, but the morphological process of the language is not explored much (Naseem, 1992).

Morphological and syntactical constructions play a significant role in describing a language. Morphology is concerned with the internal structures of words. For instance, the word *disagreement* consists of base *disagree*, root *agree*, preposition *dis*, and postposition *-ment* (Aronoff & Fudeman, 2022). Morphemes are the smallest grammatical units studied by linguists. Both inflectional and derivational morphemes are related to morphology. A set of cases or numbers falls into the category of inflections, whereas derivational morphemes do not represent the variants of the same paradigm, but the incidental formation of a new category, i.e., read (verb), is changed into readable (adjective) via derivational morphology (Lieber & Štekauer, 2014). Inflectional morphemes are part of the process of adding an affix to a word or varying it in some other way according to the rules of grammar in a language. Language experts tend to use the term inflection to indicate the endings that are added to words to express grammatical function and relationship in different contexts, like phrases or sentences.

The study describes the Punjabi nouns' classification on the basis of their cases, like nominative, ergative, accusative, dative, or genitive, and considers their number, gender, and case in comparison with their English counterparts. It also takes the Punjabi verbs and their classification into account, classifying them on the basis of tense, person, number, and gender. The study aims to describe noun and verb structures in Punjabi and English and how they are similar or different from each other. It explores the nouns and verbs of both the languages in detail to see how they are morphologically, syntactically and semantically similar or different, and points out the characteristics of the nouns and verbs, marking them as morphosyntactic features and their values.

Most importantly, the inflectional morphemes of Punjabi create hurdles for language learners and translators (Khan & Kausar, 2021). Therefore, a comparative study on structural similarities and differences in Punjabi and English inflectional morphemes was needed. This study attempts to treat the Punjabi language as a special agglutinating language and raise the curtain on its complex noun and verb system. The study explores the differences between noun cases, keeping in view their indication of number, gender and declension; however, verb cases, as they not only indicate the tense, i.e., present, past and future, but also differ according to their number, gender and person. These constituents increase the complexity of Punjabi morphology and require a morphological analysis to be conducted.

Language learners and translators from Punjabi and English origins face many problems while comparing the structures of both languages, as typological distance is claimed to correlate with difficulty of learning (Gast, 2013). Particularly, the inflectional morphemes and phenomenon of split ergativity in Punjabi leave language learners and translators vulnerable. Hence, this study attempts to uncover the phenomenon of ergativity while employing the Canonical Morphosyntactic Feature Values Theory as the theoretical framework of the study presented by Corbett, along with its three principles and ten criteria (Arkadiev, 2010).

Morphological analysis and classification of differences and similarities can be of remarkable utility in not only predicting but also diagnosing and facilitating such errors to be taken into account by the learners, teachers, text book writers, and syllabus designers in the selection of the actual teaching material on the basis of several criteria, such as frequency of occurrence and ability to learn (Kazemian & Hashemi, 2014). The text book writer, for instance, divides the language course into time segments, allocating more teaching and learning time to items with a high degree of difficulty. Consequently, the ordering of teaching units can be most fruitful based on the results of the comparison of both languages (Ziahosseiny, 1999). This study also provides the basis for the researchers to carry out research on a major level to find out the structural similarities and differences between other aspects of Punjabi and English morphology.

1.1 The Statement of the Problem

The necessity of inflectional morphemes in learning English and Punjabi requires explaining the ambiguities in the two very differently constructed languages. Thus, a comparison between the structural similarities and differences between inflectional morphemes in Punjabi and English was mandatory. The goal of the study is to use a canonical approach to highlight the morphosyntactic properties of inflectional morphemes in Punjabi and English, thus clearing up any confusion that may exist. The study presents a framework of categorization that concerns the grammatical component in which features like morphology, syntax and semantics operate. This study attempts to bridge this research gap by treating the Punjabi language as a special agglutinating language and raising the curtain on its complex noun and verb system through a canonical approach. The focus of this study is comparing two altogether different languages with entirely different morphological systems in order to highlight the Punjabi language. This study aims to investigate the ways in which the noun and verb cases of Punjabi and English

differ from one another, keeping in view their indication of gender, number, or person, and verbal inflections, as they not only indicate the tense, i.e., present, past and future, but also differ according to their number, gender and person.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

The aims of the study are:

1. To explore if there are any differences and similarities in English and Punjabi nominal and verbal inflections.
2. To describe the morphosyntactic features and their values of Punjabi and English nouns and verbs using canonical approach.
3. To find out whether behaviours of canonical nouns and verbs in Punjabi and English line up perfectly in their semantic, syntactic and morphological structures.

1.3 Research Questions

1. What are the similar and variant nominal and verbal inflections in Punjabi and English languages?
2. How does morphology of Punjabi and English behave while considering the nominal and verbal morphosyntactic features?
3. How do the behaviours of canonical nouns and verbs in Punjabi and English line up perfectly in their morphological, syntactic, and semantic structures?

1.4 Morphological Analysis Method

The study highlighted and compared the nominal and verbal morphological differences and similarities in the English and Punjabi languages. It also described the variety in its form, function, and meaning and used a canonical approach for determining the morphosyntactic features. The required data is taken from the two books, i.e., *Punjabi: a cognitive-descriptive grammar* produced by Bhatia (1993) and *Punjabi Grammar* by Shah (2015). Important and repeated nouns and verbs in Punjabi are chosen and analyzed morphologically in comparison with their English counterparts. The data is analyzed qualitatively using the morphological analysis method while employing an exploratory and descriptive research design.

The study raised the issue of the inflectional morphology of Punjabi in comparison with English and investigated the problems posed by the complexity of the Punjabi language's inflectional morphemes while translating one language into another. While considering the rationale and assumptions of the study, the researcher opted for this

topic in order to highlight certain characteristics of Punjabi in comparison with English. However, the study used inductive reasoning as this study aims at developing a theory instead of testing an existing one.

1.5 Significance of the Study

The contribution of this research is that it adds to the existing basis of knowledge in the field of inflectional morphology. It provides the possibility for the translator to translate the nouns and verbs of both languages in a more intelligible way and without any errors. The curricula and education programmes used for training the Punjabi and English language skills could then be controlled. Moreover, advanced learners can profit from a direct comparison of their native language with the language to be learned, thus making their implicit knowledge of the differences explicit. Based on the information and analysis this research supplied, future researchers are going to help language learners and translators by looking into other contrasts and similarities between Punjabi and English. This study is necessary to be conducted as it helps language learners, teachers, text book writers and syllabus designers to identify the distinct morphological behaviour of the nominal and verbal morphosyntactic features in Punjabi and English. The focus of this study is comparing two altogether different languages with an entirely different morphological system and inflectional morphemes in order to highlight Punjabi language. The study also adds to the domain of Canonical Typology as it is crucial for the typologist to compare "like with like" (Corbett, 2008).

1.6 Chapter Breakdown

The Chapter I introduces the study. The Chapter II provides a review of related literature. The Chapter III presents the methodology and theoretical framework. The Chapter IV includes the Analysis of Nominal Inflections and the Chapter V comprises of the Analysis of Verbal Inflections. The Chapter VI concludes the dissertation.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

In order to fully understand the nominal and verbal inflectional morphemes of Punjabi in comparison with English, a review of the relevant literature is undertaken. This chapter provides an overall picture of what is known about the topic and reveals the existing knowledge gaps as well. The chapter presents a review of literature on the theories and development of Punjabi morphological typology. It goes on to present the previous literature on morphology and inflectional morphemes, which comprises differences and similarities in the typology of Punjabi and English. The next section of the chapter reviews literature on Punjabi as a regional language of Pakistan, morphosyntactic feature values in Punjabi, and Punjabi as a split ergative language. The chapter also reviews literature on morphosyntactic feature values in Punjabi and its sister languages, mixing up morphological, syntactic, or semantic features, and last but not least, canonical typology as a new phenomenon.

In the province of Punjab as well as in other provinces of Pakistan, however, English is incrementally becoming popular and essential due to educational and social events and circumstances, and it has become a compulsory subject in schools and, for families in society (Kazemian & Hashemi, 2014). As English teachers, the paramount importance of learning and teaching English morphology should be recognized. The ability to acknowledge the components of words, i.e., affixes, roots, word families, etc., is believed to be an important skill in language learning and teaching (Yarmohammadi, 2002).

2.1.1 Morphology and Inflectional Morphemes

Morphology and inflectional morphemes have become the focus of many experts in the field of linguistics and language teaching (Kazemian & Hashemi, 2014). Punjabi learners of the English language are to master explicitly or implicitly morphemes and inflections, respectively, and vice versa. The complexity of learning English inflectional morphemes, which Punjabi students are likely to encounter, seems to arise from different linguistic systems as well as different linguistic affiliations. The importance and necessity of inflectional morphemes in learning English and vice versa requires explaining these

ambiguities in the two languages, which are very differently constructed. The idea appears even more complicated when these languages come into contact with each other and when speakers of both Punjabi and English origins struggle to learn various types of inflectional morphemes.

Sounds, constructions, meanings, and word forms all play a significant role in describing a language. In linguistics, morphology is concerned with the internal structures of words. For instance, the word *disagreement* consists of base *disagree*, root *agree*, preposition *dis* and postposition *-ment* (Aronoff & Fudeman, 2022). Morphemes are the smallest grammatical units studied by linguists. Both inflectional and derivational morphemes are related to morphology. A set of cases or numbers falls into the category of inflections, whereas derivational morphemes do not represent the variants of the same paradigm, but the incidental formation of a new category, i.e., read (verb), is changed into readable (adjective) via derivational morphology (Lieber & Štekauer, 2014). Inflectional morphemes are part of the process of adding an affix to a word or varying it in some other way according to the rules of grammar in a language. Language experts tend to use the term inflection to indicate the endings that are added to words to express grammatical function and relationship in different contexts, like phrases or sentences.

There are only a countable number of grammatical inflections in present-day English. Yule (2006) is of the view that there are only eight inflections in present-day English. Francis (1967) remarks that inflectional affixes are all suffixes in English and are capable of marking grammatical functions in the language. Generally, inflectional suffixes are regarded as additive morphemes, which serve as variants of the same word rather than separate words, as in: boy – boys – boy's – boys' (Josiah & Udoudom, 2012). In English, nouns are inflected to mark pluralization and the genitive case; verbs are inflected to mark person, number, tense, mood, voice and aspect (Pink and Thomas, 1970; Lamberts, 1972; Tomori, 1977). These inflections are utilized to display aspects of the grammatical function of a word. For instance, they are used to indicate if a word is plural or singular, if it is past tense or not, and if it is a comparative or possessive form. Kazemian & Hashemi (2014) hold that verbs in English are inflected for 3rd-person singular as in 'she ponders', and for past tense as for instance, 'she spelled'. Most nouns may be inflected for plural i.e., lions, clouds etc. The focus of the present study is comparing two altogether different languages with entirely different morphological systems in order to highlight the Punjabi language.

Inflectional morphology, expressed through morphosyntactic or grammatical categories, is universal, but its use is described as language-specific. Each language has a distinctive blend of these categories to reveal grammatical information via inflection and lexical information through separate lexical items (Santos, 2008; Tallerman, 2015), and this variation causes liveliness and meanings in human languages. For the last sixty years, inflectional morphology has been the core interest of researchers from almost all languages in the world (Clark, 2001). For instance, Booij (2012) is of the opinion that English is very less inflected in comparison with French, Italian, and Spanish. Kazemian & Hashemi (2014) hold that there are more varieties of inflections in the Azerbaijani language than in English, and they share some common properties as well as several dissimilarities.

Punjabi, on the other hand, is still to be determined whether it is similar to or different from English in its inflectional morphemes. The focus of this study is comparing two altogether different languages with an entirely different morphological system and inflectional morphemes in order to highlight Punjabi. As many scholars claim, Punjabi is a less researched language pertaining to this special area (Hussain, 2018; Bansal, Ahuja, Pal., and Sharma, 2011). For example, Akhtar (1997, 1999) worked in the domain of morphology. He holds that some of the characteristics of the Punjabi language are non-nominative subjects, split-ergativity, object agreement, rampant dropping of pronouns, investigating the nature of complex predicates and linking. Hussain (2018) deals with Punjabi nominal markers, which form or derive nouns from other nouns, verbs, adverbs, and adjectives. The study holds that we can bring out class maintaining- morphemes by using Derivational morphology as its theoretical framework (Yule, 1996). It is necessary to probe into the deviant morphological structures of Punjabi in order to assist language learners and translators. Most importantly, the inflectional morphemes of Punjabi create hurdles for language learners and translators (Khan & Kausar, 2021). Therefore, a comparative study on structural similarities and differences in Punjabi and English inflectional morphemes was needed. This study highlights the phenomenon of Punjabi nominal and verbal inflectional morphemes' similarities and differences with English.

2.2 Punjabi and English Typology: Differences and Similarities

The contrastive analysis in linguistics plays an important role in the creation of language awareness (James, 2005; Mair, 2005). A few studies were conducted on the phonemic and syntactic systems of Punjabi. For example, Roach (2009) conducted a study on the phonology of Punjabi and English and holds that every language has its own phonological system, which consists of its whole system of consonants and vowels. Ghani Rahman (2016) conducted a study on the Pashto and English languages where he compared the phonemic systems of both languages. He is of the opinion that there is similarity in the place and manner of articulation between the two languages. But these studies do not attempt to solve the issue of ambiguity across Punjabi and English languages regarding inflectional morphemes.

2.2.1 Construction of Light Verbs

In order to be able to learn and translate one language into another, the nominal and verbal inflections of both languages must be determined. Some syntax scholars, however, attempt to compare the constructions of light verbs in Punjabi and English. They recognize the light verb as a deviant verbal case due to two reasons: the one is their syntactic structure and the other is their semantic effects on the main verb. One study on the construction of light verbs in Punjabi drew the comparison that the light verbs indicate tense and mostly emerge at the end of a sentence (Butt and Geuder, 2001). The researchers conclude that the theories and frameworks related to syntax and semantics face difficulty coping with light verbs, and this is because of their dual role between lexical verb and auxiliary verb. Light verbs play a restricted part in the theme and meaning of the sentence, but they are different from the main verbs. This account establishes that the role of light verbs is much more complicated in Punjabi as compared to English.

The research by Ashraf, Arshad, and Ali (2020) draws a comparison between Punjabi and English light verbs in order to verify if there is variety in their semantic, syntactic, and phonological functions. The study states that the light verbs do not possess a central role in the meaning of a sentence; rather, they facilitate other parts of speech in doing so, i.e., a noun. The researchers hold that light verbs are also named as semantically weak verbs, as they hold the lesser part of meaning.

The researchers claim that light verbs in Punjabi are responsible for the tense in a sentence. They further explain that light verbs are usually visible at the end of a sentence. However, Bukhari (2009) does not agree with this view point and argues that a main verb can also be marked, indicating the tense at the end of a sentence. The light verb cannot express a complete meaning without the help of the main verb. In addition, it can also communicate a particular meaning if used with a noun. (Leech, 2006). The study concludes that Punjabi light verbs, i.e., '*ay, jay, gae, lia, gia, pae, ditte, ditti, pia*', are phonologically strained and uttered with stress; however, the English light verbs, i.e., '*do, give, have, make, get, and take*', are spoken without a force. The study wraps up the discussion with the fact that light verbs may be comparable to auxiliary verbs because of their similar function, though semantically they contribute differently to the content. This account demonstrates how differently the light verbs behave in comparison with English. Therefore, as the research demonstrates the light verbs' patterns in comparison with the main verbs, it provides an example for the present research for analyzing the data. However, the current study not only focuses on the nominal and verbal inflections of Punjabi but also applies a canonical approach, unlike the previous research, in order to identify Punjabi nominal and verbal inflections.

2.2.2 A Universal Grammar (UG) Approach to Punjabi

Khan & Kausar (2019) organized a study that compares the two languages, i.e., Punjabi and English. This study focuses on the Non-finite T^{def} constructions of the two languages under the influence of the Minimalist version of Universal Grammar and Principles and Parameters as specified by Chomsky (2008). The study shows that Punjabi is a language that is filled with split ergativity. The ergative case is responsive to the perfective condition and the subject with the third person. This study concluded that in Punjabi, T^{def} constructions are usually not pronounced, whereas, in English, the non-finite clauses are established by an open tense element 'to'.

The research further explains the phenomenon that in Punjabi, 'infinitivalization' and 'participialization' are the two main functions through which the non-finite structures are accomplished. The 'infinitivalizations' are obtained by adding the *-naa* suffix to the verbal stem in Punjabi, e.g., *jau-naa*, 'going'. In this situation, the morphosyntactic features, i.e., person, number, gender, tense, and aspect features, cannot be determined. For instance, the past continuous finite form *ja riaa si* 'was going', which contains morphological evidence of number, person, gender, tense, and aspect, can be compared

with the non-finite form *jau-naa* 'going/to go', where all such features are morphologically lost. 'Participialization', however, allows different non-finite verb forms to occur, e.g., *parhdaa hoiaa/bathia hoiaa/jaaun valaa munda*, 'The studying/the seated/the going boy'. As compared to the former strategy, it is evident that the participle agrees with the following NP in number and gender (Bhatia, 1993). This account of Punjabi participles proves the fact that Punjabi and English behave quite similarly when it comes to the morphology of participle verbs. Thus, it is not possible to determine the morphosyntactic features of Punjabi non-finite participial forms.

Therefore, it is evident from empirical data that linguists try to bridge the languages by comparing two or more languages while applying different theories like Chomsky's Principles and Parameters in order to explain the differences and similarities between them. The study not only provides insight through its discussion of case markings and morphosyntactic features of Punjabi but also provides evidence of similarity between Punjabi and English. However, the present study is purely based on highlighting the Punjabi language by comparing two altogether different languages with entirely different morphological systems employing the Canonical approach.

Comparing language sounds and structures is becoming more and more important in the world, and morphemes are attracting more attention recently (Fisiak, 1985; Kazemian & Hashemi, 2014). Contrastive analysis is an essential and systematic branch of applied linguistics that deals with the linguistic description of the structure of two or more different languages (Kazemian & Hashemi, 2014). Such descriptive comparison and contrast serve to show how languages differ in their sound systems, grammatical structures and vocabulary. The differences help the learners get through the similarities and discrepancies between their mother tongue and the target language in order to enhance their knowledge. This type of analysis can be used in language teaching, translation, and designing syllabuses, among others, to point out the areas where the similarities and discrepancies between two or more languages are present. Conversely, the Canonical approach used in the current study has provided the researcher with an opportunity to analyse the data systematically.

2.3 Punjabi a Regional Language of Pakistan

There are a few studies contrasting various aspects of Punjabi with English, making efforts to compare and contrast English and Punjabi. Despite all these studies,

little is known about the inflectional morphemes of Punjabi. A review of the literature revealed minimal information about the complexities of noun and verb cases in Punjabi in comparison with English. Moreover, there is a dire need to explore the regional languages of Pakistan, as all the other languages of the world are being explored, promoted, and documented, but the regional languages of Pakistan are lagging behind in this respect. The in-depth analysis of the nouns and verbs of the Punjabi language with their English equivalents is not only going to promote this language into the world but is also beneficial for the Punjabi and English language teachers as well as learners of both languages, especially in the field of inflectional morphology.

Many scholars claim that Punjabi is a less researched language pertaining to this special area (Hussain, 2018; Bansal, Ahuja, Pal, and Sharma, 2011). Naseem (1992) also emphasized the fact that Punjabi morphology was not explored much in the linguistic circles of Pakistan. Only a few studies have been conducted, but these studies do not specifically probe into the inflectional morphemes of Punjabi nouns and verbs. For example, Akhtar (1997, 1999) worked in the domain of morphology. He holds that some of the characteristics of the Punjabi language are non-nominative subjects, split-ergativity, object agreement, rampant dropping of pronouns, investigating the nature of complex predicates, and linking. However, Punjabi inflectional morphemes were not described in this study with reference to their canonical behaviour in morphological, syntactic, and semantic structures. Hussain (2018) deals with nominal markers, which form or derive nouns from other nouns, verbs, adverbs, and adjectives. The study holds that we can bring out class maintaining morphemes by using Derivational morphology as its theoretical framework (Yule, 1996), but no attention was paid to the inflectional morphemes of Punjabi. Therefore, all the above reasons indicate that the present study should be conducted.

2.3.1 Morphosyntactic Feature Values in Punjabi

Shackle (2003) affirms that nouns in Punjabi maintain five cases, i.e., direct, oblique, ablative, vocative, and locative/instrumental. According to the catalogue of Punjabi inflectional morphemes compiled by Butt (2017), the major cases are: nominative, ergative, accusative, dative, instrumental, genitive and locative. Another study claims that verbs in Punjabi vary in gender, resulting in masculine and feminine forms (Pal, Ahuja, Bansal, Kumar & Sharma, 2011). Numbers are categorized as singular and plural. Person conjugates for the first, second, and third person. The stems or basic

forms of Punjabi verbs are divided into transitive and intransitive verbs. Moreover, the causality of the verbs is separated into none, simple, and double. The study also concludes that the auxiliaries in Punjabi are used only for two tenses i.e., present and past. For example, *hai* 'is' is employed for present tense, however, *si* 'was' is used for past tense. The auxiliaries also indicate the morphosyntactic features i.e. number, person and gender (Pal, Ahuja, Bansal, Kumar & Sharma, 2011). However, their study only develops a mechanism for tagging the parts of speech belonging to Punjabi language.

2.3.2 Punjabi: A Split Ergative Language

Another study by Khan and Kausar (2021) attempts a comparison between Punjabi and English languages while applying Chomsky's theory of government and binding in linguistics. This study makes a comparison of the inflections or case markers on the basis of two assertions, which are subjects and objects, with respect to transitive clauses in English and Punjabi. The research concludes that in split ergative languages like Pakistani regional language Punjabi, the External Argument, i.e., perfective transitive clauses possess the subjects which are named as the ergative cases because of the functional heads *v* at [Spec-*v*] while the Internal Argument, i.e., objects are termed as accusative cases by the same functional head *v* under the rule of subject verb agreement. Consequently, T holds a default agreement in Punjabi. It is conceivable only because Punjabi is a language with pronoun dropping. Pronoun dropping means that the meaning can be conveyed without a pronoun or subject in the language. Hence, the study holds that it is simple to suppose that Extended Projection Principle and Agree features of T are an option. The reason that is stated by the scholars is that Punjabi exhibits split-ergative behavior. This behavior, they opine, poses threats to the issue of structural case features of Internal Argument. Hence, this study attempts to uncover the phenomenon of ergativity seeking answers while considering the mechanism stipulated by Chomsky (2008), but it does not employ a Canonical approach in order to obtain a new perspective in the field.

2.3.3 Pronominal Suffixation or Cliticization

There are two types of bound morphemes in different languages, i.e., clitics and inflectional morphemes like affixes (Zwicky & Pullum, 1983). A study by Butt (2007) is about pronoun cases in the Punjabi language, also called pronominal suffixation or cliticization. This research also compares the data with its English counterpart under the umbrella of Lexical-Functional Grammar (LFG). This study also explains how clitics help to develop agreement features among subject and predicate (Bresnan and Mchombo

1987; Austin and Bresnan, 1996; Bresnan, 2001). The existence of pronominal suffixes is linked to pronoun dropping. The study concludes that discourse occurring after a verb and backgrounding are responsible for suffixation in pronouns. Pronouns are used when the information is repeated, and that information can easily be regained from the situation. Giv'on's (1976) is of the opinion that the discourse framework is based on the system of verb agreement. This study verifies the idea provided by Giv'on's (1976), but the present study is not concerned with clitics but tries to find out the genuine inflections of Punjabi nouns and verbs.

In another study, the researchers brought out the inflections in Punjabi and held that these inflections usually happen to be in the form of suffixes that indicate tense, person, and number (Pal, Ahuja, Bansal, Kumar & Sharma, 2011). The study clarifies various parts-of-speech of Punjabi, i.e., nouns, pronouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs, conjunctions, prepositions, interjections, particles, etc. It also describes the theoretical framework of their study as a morphological analyzer by explaining the construction and function of any language. The researchers also complain about the unavailability of literature in this particular field. They opine that in Punjabi, the nouns are derived from other nouns, adjectives and verbs. The researchers highlight the various ways in which the nouns are derived. For instance, nouns are derived from other nouns by the insertion of suffixes, and there are numerous ways to obtain nouns from adjectives. Deriving nouns from verbs, they opine, can be a complex phenomenon.

2.3.4 Complex Predicates and Linking in Punjabi

Akhtar (1997, 1999) worked on sorting out the complexity of Punjabi predicates and linking. He encountered the complex morphology of verbs, which he termed "argument-replacing morphemes". He explains that these morphemes and pronoun dropping happen to exist at the same time. The researcher opines that such verb cases are not confined to core arguments only. Besides, adjuncts or beneficiaries also fall into that domain, which is not specified by the subcategorization frame of the verb. They cannot, however, justify all of the arguments that are dropped. When the researcher processed the data with negation, he came to the conclusion that these morphemes must cliticize onto a preceding prosodic word. For instance, *su* can either occur along with the main verb or in a negative sentence before the main verb.

2.3.5 Characteristics of Punjabi Infixes

The research article by Anwar, Mangrio and Malik (2021) gives an account of various characteristics of Punjabi infixes. The researchers classify them into formational, pragmatic, phonological, and semantic characteristics. They also demonstrate their properties of pragmatic effect and phonological and semantic change. It covers the word formation process along with its syntactic structure and the discrepancy between speakers of the language. Various sequences of Punjabi infixes are discussed in the study, along with their role in the procedure of infixation. The researchers are of the opinion that infixation is a process of making new morphemes by inserting morphemes into morphemes, resulting in word formation. It has many obvious and distinctive attributes that differ from other systems of word formation. It also reiterates that the phonological attributes of infixes are a well-studied region, but emphasis on the morphological characteristics of infixation in Punjabi is required. Many scholars hold that, despite its very dominant position, very limited work is done on Punjabi.

The study is important because it provides an insight into the process of word formation through infixation in Punjabi. The researchers opine that, in contrast with English, infixes in Punjabi are the reason for the variation in grammatical category when they are inserted inside the root, as *جموری* is changed into *جمورچی* and category changes from noun to adjective. English infixes are called ‘emotive intensifiers’ as they express positive and negative emotions and their intensity as *imbleodypossible*. That is why Zwicky and Pullum (1987) associated English infixes with particular expletives with expressive morphology. Consequently, the researcher of the present study attempts to find out the pros and cons of Punjabi inflectional morphology concerning the learners and translators of both languages i.e., Punjabi and English.

In line with several previous studies, the researcher concludes that not much work has been done on the morphology of Punjabi, and the least attention has been paid to the inflectional morphemes of the Punjabi language. The present study, therefore, considers morphological, structural, and semantic features to be the most important aspects of Punjabi nominal and verbal behaviour.

2.3.6 Reduplication of Words in Punjabi

The study by Noor, Mangrio, and Iqbal (2015), on the one hand, reiterates that Punjabi is a typological language, which is an eminent and well-known language because of the huge population of its native speakers (Humayoun & Ranta, 2010); however, it is

not researched much in the linguistic circle of Pakistan. This study dives into the phenomenon of reduplication in the spoken as well as written forms of Punjabi. It stands for the morphological systems that help form new words through a total or partial reproduction of root words or bits of root words (Booij, 2007). According to the study, reduplication of various types occurs in Punjabi. There are two types of reduplication: complete reduplication and incomplete reduplication. For instance, *gali gali* is an example of complete reduplication; however, *əver səver*, is termed incomplete reduplication. The study describes vowel-based Reduplication, i.e., *hoer soer*, and consonant-based Reduplication, as in, *sətʃi mətʃi*. As a matter of fact, Punjabi is considered a language where the recurrence of various single syllabic morphemes manufactures some essential lexical items, i.e., *tʃatʃa* 'paternal uncle', *nana* 'maternal grandfather', *kaka* 'baby boy', and *mama* 'uncle', *baba* 'father', *dada* 'paternal grandfather'. These Reduplicated lexical items revolve around relationships basically.

The study shows that the semantics of reduplication is not confined to the operations that are conventional; rather, it adds to the meaning of the affiliated terms in syntax. It puts forward a number of examples to nullify the claim that the base words of reduplicated items are always meaningful. This study is relevant to the present study as it states that reduplication is an important morpho-semantic phenomenon which plays a vital role in word-formation process of any language (Novotna, 2000). The present study, however, not only fills the research gap found in previous studies with special reference to employing a canonical approach to the inflectional morphemes of Punjabi but also paves the way for future researchers to explore other aspects of Punjabi morphology. There is much disagreement and confusion between the scholars as to what the similarities and differences between Punjabi and English inflectional morphemes are. The researcher aims to clarify these confusions by determining the nominal and verbal inflections of Punjabi and English and by bringing out the morphosyntactic features using a canonical typology. Recommendations will then be provided as to which inflectional morphemes should be included in the curriculum.

2.4 Morphosyntactic Feature Values in Punjabi and Sister Languages

A comparison between Punjabi and English language structures poses many difficulties for learners and translators from both origins. Morphology, though, as a field of study, is getting considerable attention in academia. There are a number of studies conducted on the morphology of Indo-Aryan languages (Karr, 2009; Ramasamy, 2011;

Saad, 2015). Mangrio (2016), for instance, worked on the morphology of loan words in Urdu. Iqbal (2016) and Muhabat (2016) worked on the morphology of Punjabi nouns; Magier (1983) on the morphology of Marwari language; Singh and Agnihotri (1997) on Hindi; Strnad (2013) on Old Hindi; and Ramasamy (2011) on Tamil language. Schmidt (1999) and Mangrio (2016) studied plural, gender and case markings in Urdu, whereas Iqbal (2016) and Muhabat (2016) studied plural markers in Punjabi. Punjabi, despite being a relatively large language, did not receive any scholarly attention. Due to this dearth of research, the current study is being carried out to compare the morphology of Punjabi and English. The purpose of the research is to highlight the Punjabi language in the eyes of the international community.

Ijaz and Moin (2003) review peculiar rules for gender and number in Punjabi and describe their changing patterns. However, the current study provided an in-depth morphological analysis of the inflections, symbolizing gender, number, and person. A few studies give an insight into the morphosyntactic feature values of Punjabi, but they do not specifically probe into the inflectional morphemes of Punjabi nouns and verbs (Butt and Geuder, 2001; Shackle, 2003; Ijaz and Moin, 2003; Naseem, 1992). However, these studies provide a basis and pave the way for the present research to be conducted.

A few other studies give an insight by drawing certain similarities between Punjabi and its other sister Indo-Aryan languages (Khan & Kausar, 2021). The research article by Anwar, Mangrio and Malik (2021) holds that Punjabi's infixes are not much divergent from its sister Indo-Aryan languages, i.e., Urdu, Hindi, etc.

The study by Khan and Kausar (2021) attempts to uncover the phenomenon of ergativity while considering the mechanism stipulated by Chomsky (2008). This split system is determined by different factors, i.e., the semantic nature of NP, tense, mood, aspect, etc. Many of the sister languages of Punjabi are also based on split ergativity, e.g., Hindi, Kashmiri, Gujrati, Marhati, etc. Although this study draws certain similarities between Punjabi and its other sister Indo-Aryan languages, it is not devoted to the inflectional morphemes of the Punjabi language.

The study ultimately suggests certain changes in the theory that fit the Punjabi language, depending on empirical data. The study suggests the changes in Chomsky's government and binding theory that the Extended Projection Principle and Agree features of T, which are derivative from C, are not obligatory. For instance, the pro-drop would

not be possible if the functional head T had obligatory EPP features. Since the IA determines the empty morphosyntactic features of little *v*, it is presumed that agree features are default (Khan and Kausar, 2021).

Khan & Kausar (2021) hold that in the presence of evidence like pro-drop, absence of expletive, and absence of an active goal in the domain to satisfy agree features, it is assumed that in Punjabi T has default agree features, like most Indo-Aryan languages, i.e., Hindi, Urdu, Kashmiri, Gujrati, Marhati, etc. This study is relevant to the present study in terms of its discussion of morphosyntactic features of Punjabi. The present study, though, is not specifically about the Internal and External arguments of the Punjabi language.

2.4.1 Acquisition of Nominal Inflections in Punjabi and Urdu

Khanam & Hussain (2017) is a research study that evaluates the obtaining process of Urdu and Punjabi nominal inflections as the first language in children. Their acquisition of nominal inflectional morphology has been examined with the help of picture description. The children are evaluated via the identification of gender, number and case categories of Punjabi and Urdu nouns. The study concludes that the acquisition of Urdu and Punjabi noun inflectional morphology is a step-by-step practice that involves various types of overgeneralization. The study mentions that Urdu's nominal inflections change in their gender, number, and case values. The researchers examine that nouns in Urdu language inflect, as in masculine *laRka*, 'boy' and feminine *larki*, 'girl', and their gender can influence the other linguistic items in the sentence, like Lithuanian and Russian languages (Voeikova & Savickiene, 2001). The researchers hold that Urdu has a natural gender (Ranjan, 2013). They also define a noun in Urdu as not only a number feature but a grammatical feature as well (Crystal, 2008). In Urdu, a noun can be a singular *laRka*, 'boy' or plural *laRke*, 'boys'.

The study, on the one hand, explains that Urdu's morphology inflects in three cases: nominative, oblique, and vocative. The nominative case, also known as the direct case, '*laRka*' is utilized as the subject of a sentence with no ending. Oblique case (*laRke*), however, is employed when a noun is trailed by case endings like *ko*, *ke*, *ka*, *me*, *se*, or when it is used as vocative case *O laRke*, 'O boy'. The vocative case is used in proper nouns and kinship terms with "vocative interjections" like *ae*, *o*, etc. (Schmidt, 1999; David, Maxwell, Browne, & Lynn, 2009). The researchers also describe Punjabi nouns, which inflect in five cases. For instance, *ghoRA*, 'horse' can be conjugated in nominative

ghoRA, 'horse' / oblique *ghoRe*, 'horse' / vocative *ghoReA*, 'o horse' / ablative *ghoReoN*, 'from horse' and vocative/ instrumental, which is rare in use *skule*, 'to school', *ghare*, 'to home' (Humayuon & Ranta, 2010; Shackle, 2007; Kaur, 2012). This study, however, is helpful for the present research as it identifies different nominal and verbal cases and dives deep into not only Punjabi morphology but its sister language, Urdu, as well.

2.4.2 Analyzing Gender and Number Marking Processes

The loanwords in Punjabi are researched to the minimum in the realm of linguistics. Noor, Mangrio, & Anwar (2019) call attention to the characteristics of Persian loanwords in Punjabi on the pivot of investigating the marking system along with their gender and number. Masculine nouns and feminine nouns are separated, highlighting their case markings. The six masculine and five feminine inflections are concluded. Haugen (1950) states that loanwords can find their way into the receiving language if they integrate with the syntax of that language. The study is the first of its kind in the domain of morphology, applying Distributed Morphology with reference to Persian loanwords in Punjabi. However, the present study does not concern the etymology of Punjabi words but focuses on the inflectional morphemes of Punjabi nouns and verbs. Thus, the study is relevant in its description of Punjabi morphology.

Punjabis happen to be a very large number in Western countries. For instance, Shackle (2017) describes that Punjabis are the third biggest linguistic community in Canada and fourth biggest in UK. In a latest survey of the Punjabi language, Bhatia (1993) is considered to be an authentic Punjabi grammar and Akhtar (1999) happens to be a new reference. Butt (2017) also supports the researcher's claim that in spite of a large population in the West, there is not much research conducted on Punjabi and its sister languages i.e., Siraiki and Potwari.

2.4.3 Morphosyntactic Features of Urdu Language

Hardie (2004) is a study conducted on Urdu that highlights the morphosyntactic features of various parts of speech. This study provides an insight into the present study by diving into the domain of Urdu morphology. Since, Urdu is a sister language to Punjabi, the identification of Urdu nouns and verbs is helpful for the present study. The researcher conducts part-of-speech tagging in Urdu by using corpus linguistic methodology. The study also points out many derivational affixes, of which some are borrowed from Persian and Arabic (Schmidt 1999), while others are hereditary in Indo-

Aryan. For instance, the *-ā* and *-vā* suffixes manufacture base forms of transitive and causative verbs with the help of intransitive verb roots (Kachru, 1990; Schmidt, 1999).

The researcher is of the opinion that Urdu forms are established on the basis of suffixation. Nouns and adjectives are marked with gender, number, and case. Verbs are characterised by agreement in gender and number or person and number. Verbs are not labeled for tense, with the special case of the irregular auxiliary *hōnā*. In contrast, auxiliaries are blended with a non-finite form, or the subjunctive. In numerous instances, very similar forms appear within inflectional conjugations, i.e., the suffix *-ē* specifies masculine oblique case or plural number on adjectives but also implies the subjunctive form of verbs.

Urdu is known for its use of verb phrases having more than one verb called “compound verbs” (Schmidt, 1999). These compound verbs comprise a lexical verb attached to some sort of auxiliary or semiauxiliary. The study debates the concept that how much meaning an auxiliary verb adds to the sentence, whether it merely identifies the tense or lexical verb, is also affected by it. In Urdu, the researcher holds that the lexical verb is followed by the auxiliary verb. In some cases (such as the future marker *gā*, *gē* / *gī*), however, this leads to uncertainty as to whether the morpheme is an independent auxiliary verb or actually a tense-marking suffix. For example, Kachru (1990), Schmidt (1999), and Bhatia and Koul (2000) all indicate the future marker as a “suffix,” but they vary on whether this means it should be written as a single word with the verb or not.

Butt (1995) sees the so-called ergative marker not as indicating a grammatical relation but as having “been invested with semantic content... as a marker of agentivity or volitionality,” which the researcher refers to neutrally as the postposition *ne*. Urdu has postpositions rather than prepositions and uses many phrasal postpositions. In the noun phrase, demonstratives, postposition phrases, and adjectives precede their head nouns.

The study finds four characteristics of nouns: type, gender, number, and case. The researcher further explains that, in contrast with the Roman, Greek, and Cyrillic alphabets, the Urdu alphabet has no uppercase letters. He points out that there is no definite article in Urdu like ‘the’ to differentiate the proper and common noun like English (Bhatia and Koul, 2000). He is of the view that gender, number, and case are familiar linguistic attributes in Urdu that can be highlighted with the help of suffixes. To rephrase

it, the Urdu language possesses noun declensions. The study describes that Urdu has two genders: masculine and feminine. The researcher holds that it is well agreed that Urdu has two numbers, singular and plural (Schmidt 1999; Bhatia and Koul 2000; Barz 1977; Bailey et al. 1956). In the model of the language given by Schmidt, Urdu has three cases: nominative, oblique, and vocative. Therefore, this study is useful for the present research in its identification of inflections that follow the marked nouns (e.g., masculine $-ā$ changing to $-ē$, feminine $-ī$ changing to $-iyā$, and so on). The study also gives insight by bringing out the morphological and syntactic properties of words (Voutilainen, 1999).

2.4.4 Pluralization Processes of Rangri Language

Another study by Anwar and Rasool (2021) brings a regional Pakistani language, i.e., Rangri, to the attention of the international community by exploring its morphological structure along with the pluralization processes and comparison of its morphology with two of its closest sister languages, i.e., Urdu and Punjabi. The study concludes that Rangri nouns vary in their indication of morphosyntactic features, i.e., number, gender, and case. The study highlights that there are different systems of making plurals in Rangri as compared to other Indo-European languages. The study holds that masculine and feminine nouns are found to have taken variant plural markers along with adjectives. The study attempts to inspect the pluralization of masculine, feminine, case, and derogatory forms of Rangri nouns and compare them with pluralization in Urdu and Punjabi nouns.

The researchers are of the opinion that pluralization is an important morphological process that, along with gender and case marking, comprises the inflectional system of a language. The researchers opine that Rangri nouns also carry a derogatory inflection, which is inserted as an infix in certain nouns. This study is similar to the present study in analyzing Rangri morphological structure, its pluralization processes, comparison of its morphology with two of its closest sister languages, i.e., Urdu and Punjabi, and the inflectional morphemes, but the difference lies in that the present study concentrates on the morphology of the Punjabi language.

Therefore, in line with several previous studies, the Punjabi language bears a striking resemblance to its sister Indo-Aryan languages, i.e., Hindi, Urdu, Kashmiri, Gujrati, Marhati, etc., while comparing and contrasting the morphological entities. The current study, however, determines the nominal and verbal inflectional morphemes of Punjabi and English by bringing out the morphosyntactic features using a canonical

typology. There is much disagreement and confusion between the scholars as to what the similarities and differences between Punjabi and English inflectional morphemes are. Recommendations are also provided at the end as to which inflectional morphemes should be included in the curriculum. While considering the rationale and assumptions of the study, the researcher opted for this topic in order to highlight certain characteristics of the Punjabi language in comparison with the English language. The study also takes into account the morphological, structural, and semantic features as the most important aspects of Punjabi nominal and verbal behaviour.

2.5 Mixing up Morphological, Syntactic or Semantic Features

The morphosyntactic features and values are not identified and described with reference to their canonical behaviour in morphological, syntactic, and semantic structures. A historical perspective on agglutinating languages shows that determining the case values in language studies is quite an old business. An interesting typology of grammatical features is presented in Kibort and Corbett (2008, 2010); Corbett (2012). For example, they have mixed up morphological features with syntactic or semantic features. The morphosyntactic features were originally discussed by Bernard Comrie, and he made important contributions to the subject (1986, 1991). The present research attempts to take forward that discussion to the Punjabi language by following in the footsteps of Corbett. In determining the morphosyntactic features, special attention has been given to Punjabi, since it demonstrates a full array of challenging problems. The theories and frameworks related to morphology, syntax, and semantics face difficulty coping with the complexity of Punjabi nouns and verbs; therefore, the morphosyntactic feature values theory is employed by the current study with an amalgamation of canonical typology.

2.6 Canonical Typology: A New Phenomena

The present study is conducted using the morphological analysis method, but an appropriate approach had to be created in order to best represent the constructiveness of Punjabi morphology. For that purpose, a few studies have been examined. A range of different morphological or morphosyntactic domains has been investigated from a canonical typological perspective so far, most notably agreement (Comrie 2003, Corbett 2003, 2006, Cormier, Schembri & Woll 2013, Cysouw 2011, Luraghi 2016, Palancar 2015, Polinsky 2003, Suthar 2006), morphosyntactic features and their values (Corbett 2008, Corbett 2013, Corbett 2015, Round & Corbett 2017, Van de Velde 2013), and a wide range of topics related to inflectional and derivational morphology.

To conduct the current research on Punjabi and English nouns and verbs, the study by Baerman, Brown, and Corbett (2005) is kept in view as it represents a blend of syntax and morphology. However, the methodology employed by the study probes into the inflectional morphology of a different language. Thus, in order to emphasize the inflectional morphology of Punjabi and English, the researcher adhered to accepted practice. The above-mentioned approaches were not chosen because they only deal with one of the languages and do not use a comparative approach while comparing two or more languages. Canonical typology is distinguished from other contemporary approaches to typology by its appeal to the notion of the canon, a logically motivated archetype from which attested and unattested patterns are calibrated (Bond, 2019). While not a theory of morphology, Canonical Typology was first developed as a means to systematically analyse morphosyntactic and morphological phenomena, such as agreement and inflection (Corbett, 2015). Canonical Typology utilizes observations on a large number of empirically motivated variables to gauge the similarities and differences across languages (Audring & Masini, 2019). As the typology helps to understand linguistic similarities, differences, and patterns, it also helps facilitate translation by identifying linguistic structures common to all languages, such as linguistic processes observed in syntactic structures.

A useful typology of grammatical features is offered in Kibort and Corbett (2008, 2010); Corbett (2012), but their study is concerned with identifying morphosyntactic features of the Russian language. Although the morphosyntactic features were originally discussed by Bernard Comrie, he made important contributions to the subject (1986, 1991). Bernard Comrie is of the view that the index of fusion can be used to measure the difference between agglutination and fusion in a language, as both agglutinating and fusional languages have inflections as opposed to isolating languages (Comrie, 1989). The present research attempts to take forward that discussion to Punjabi by following in the footsteps of Corbett. In establishing the techniques, special attention is given to Punjabi, since it demonstrates a whole set of difficult problems. Canonical typology utilizes observations on a large number of empirically motivated variables to gauge the similarities and differences across languages (Audring & Masini, 2019). As the typology helps us understand linguistic similarities, differences, and patterns, it also helps facilitate translation by identifying linguistic structures common to all languages, such as linguistic processes observed in syntactic structures. The canonical approach is actually a general

approach to determining case feature values. A canonical part of speech has a perfect alignment of semantics, syntax, and morphology. For instance, a canonical noun would denote an entity, head a nominal phrase, and take the inflectional morphology appropriate in the given language (Arkadiev, 2010).

Inflectional morphology is expressed through morphosyntactic theory using the morphological analysis method. Each language has a distinctive blend of these categories to reveal grammatical information via inflection and lexical information through separate lexical items (Santos, 2008; Tallerman, 2015). Inflectional morphemes are morphological typology that is absolutely necessary for morphological theory, as typology is a testing ground for analytical models and hypotheses (Audring & Masini, 2019). Canonical typology is used to map variation encountered within a specific notional domain, typically one that is already established in linguistic description. Corbett is of the opinion that this approach has proved helpful in tackling a range of topics, particularly in morphology (Baerman et al. 2005: 27–35; Spencer 2005; Stump 2005; Corbett 2008; Thornton 2008, and others). The study conducted by Corbett is used as a model to conduct this research on Punjabi and English nouns and verbs. This analytical task is done utilizing Greville G. Corbett's model of morphosyntactic feature values presented in the work of Arkadiev (2010). However, Corbett uses this methodology to probe into the inflectional morphology of the Russian language. The researcher replicates this study in order to legitimize the current study. Therefore, the researcher followed an established practice, highlighted the inflectional morphology of the Punjabi language, and later compared it with the English language. Thus, it cultivated a new aspect of the study.

Corbett (2010) opines that the 'Canonical' approach is needed to construct a logical scheme in order to evaluate the different case values. Corbett devises a way to determine not only the number of cases but their values in the Russian language. He holds that this not only helps in describing a language but also in extracting its typology. He deals with cases partly as a feature (comparable to gender, number, and person), but mainly with the values of the feature (nominative, accusative, and so on). What is novel, though, is that the canonical approach has been employed for the first time by Corbett. This approach allows us to bring out the different properties of the case values rather than having to make black-and-white analytical decisions for each. He holds that the criteria developed for this case can be applied to other morphosyntactic values too. While referring to Comrie (1986), the researcher also considers the identity of the function.

Therefore, the researcher concludes that the research on how to establish case values in a given language has been making progress over the years.

The current study has identified similar and variant inflectional morphemes by employing the Canonical approach and bestowed special importance on the regional language Punjabi as it demonstrates a whole set of complex analytic problems with respect to case. This method has allowed the study to look at the noun and verb cases as features, considering their root, category, gender, number, and person, but mainly with the values of the feature (transitive, intransitive, nominative, accusative, etc.). The morphosyntactic features are also described with the help of the canonical approach. The present study, therefore, not only helped to describe the Punjabi language in a better manner but also has added to the domain of typology, as it is crucial for the typologist to compare "like with like" (Corbett, 2008).

Corbett concludes that there are six to eleven case values in the Russian language (Arkadiev, 2010). He is of the opinion that the 'Canonical' typology is useful to develop a logical scheme in order to analyse the various case values. The researcher concludes that the inflectional morphemes in Russian vary to a large extent. These case values, he holds, may range from the innermost to those that are outermost and those that are on the decline; even then, they keep their existence in the case system. Corbett devises a way to determine not only certain cases but also their values in the Russian language. He maintains that this not only helps in describing a language but in extracting its typology as well. The researcher puts forward that the Russian language demonstrates a full range of ambiguous and inquisitive problems as far as the case and its value are concerned. He considers the case not only in its features but in its value as well. For instance, a feature looks like gender, number, and person; however, the value of the feature appears like nominative, accusative, and so on.

What is novel, though, is that Corbett has been a pioneer in employing the canonical approach to typology. This approach is solely responsible for developing a logical scheme that examines various cases and their values. Besides, the criteria that are discussed by Corbett are not restricted to a single case but are general to all morphosyntactic features (Arkadiev, 2010). This approach deals not only with morphology but with syntax and semantics as well. This approach, Corbett holds, permits us to establish the various characteristics of the case values rather than unrealistically bringing out intelligible analytical judgments for every case. Furthermore, he is of the

opinion that the criteria developed for the case can be applied to other morphosyntactic values too. While referring to Comrie (1986: 91), the researcher also considers the identity of the function as well.

2.7 Conclusion

Therefore, debates and arguments surrounding the Punjabi nominal and verbal inflections are ongoing, partly due to the fact that the literature addressing the issue is limited and inadequate. For instance, morphology and inflectional morphemes are becoming the focus of many experts in the field of linguistics and language teaching (Kazemian & Hashemi, 2014). The present study established that no similar research studies is undertaken or published so far and that little is known regarding the topic. A review of the literature revealed that minimal information about the nominal and verbal inflections of Punjabi currently exists. This study originated in the realm of morphology with reference to the application of Canonical Typology and the inflectional morphemes of Punjabi and offers it as a foundation for further studies. This research is novel in its nature, as it not only includes Punjabi nouns and verbs in its morphological analysis but also compares them with their English equivalents, considering their form, function, and meanings.

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

The chapter presents the research methodology used in the present study. The chapter presents the theoretical framework based on the Canonical Morphosyntactic Feature Values Theory presented by Corbett, along with its three principles and ten criteria (Arkadiev, 2010) and an explanation of its relevance to the present study. The chapter also presents the research design, sample of the study, and data analysis procedure.

3.2 Morphological Analysis Method

The morphological analysis method is a standard methodology in linguistics and does not need justification. A recent study exploring similarities and differences between English and the Astori dialect of the Shina language used the morphological analysis method (Hussain, Abbas, and Bashir, 2024). Important and repeated nouns and verbs in Punjabi are chosen by the researcher and analyzed morphologically in comparison with their English counterparts. Morphology is the study of the internal construction of words. For instance, Booij (2012) is of the opinion that words can be divided into smaller pieces. Words can be categorized into many morphemes at the morphological level, which are, in Booij's view, the morphological building blocks of a word. He holds that a good division is an important analytic instrument, and it can explain the structure and formation of words in a better manner (Booij, 2012). For example, in English, the word "replacement" can be broken down into *re-*, "place," and *-ment*. The basic unit of morphology is called a morpheme. There are two types of morphemes: the free morpheme and the bound morpheme. In the word "replacement," *place* is a free morpheme, whereas *-re* and *-ment* are bound morphemes as they cannot occur independently. Morphology and syntax, however, are closely related because the words are usually inflected according to the syntactic structure of the sentence. This accounts for the fact that language users who cannot understand the formation of words might not be good at reading comprehension.

The languages of the world may vary in the way their words are analyzed into their constituent parts. Punjabi is comprised of concatenative inflectional morphology

(Humayoun & Ranta, 2010), as it mostly uses pre-fixes and suffixes for its inflections to work. English, being the West Germanic language, is different in morphology as compared to the other European languages. For instance, according to Britannica, English is less inflected in comparison with German, Latin, Russian, and Greek. If we look at the English verb 'ride' in comparison with the German 'reiten', the German 'reiten' has 13 inflected forms in comparison with the English 5 forms. On the other hand, it is still to be determined whether the Punjabi language is similar to or different from English concerning this issue.

3.3 Theoretical Framework

The Morphosyntactic Feature Values Theory by Corbett is used for this study with a blend of Canonical approach (Arkadiev, 2010). This theory not only helped the study determine what a canonical approach to typology is but also provided criteria to arrange the related data in order to induce general conclusions for broader use. This study analysed the data using the model of Greville G. Corbett, along with its three principles and ten criteria. These principles and criteria presented themselves as a framework that not only shaped the data collection method but maneuvered the data analysis procedure as well.

The examples from both Punjabi and English are taken against these principles and criteria and analysed to check if the data matches the principles and criteria presented in the theoretical framework or goes against them. When data meets these criteria, it is referred to as canonical; when it does not, it is referred to as non-canonical. The criteria empiricized the data by combining the morphology and syntax of the under-discussed linguistic items and recording the behaviour of Punjabi and English in the process. The data is collected from two sources, i.e., *Punjabi: a cognitive-descriptive grammar* produced by Bhatia (1993) and *Punjabi Grammar* by Shah (2015). This data not only proved these criteria right or wrong considering the Punjabi and English languages but also brought about certain behaviors of these languages in the process of canonicity. Those principles and criterions are presented below:

"Principle I: Features and their values are clearly distinguished by formal means (and the clearer the formal means by which a feature or value is distinguished, the more canonical that feature or value)." Arkadiev (2010, p. 6)

The first principle provided certain criteria that helped the study distinguish different morphosyntactic features and their values. The collected data is tested against the set criteria of canonicity.

Principle I consists of four particular criteria:

This principle postulates four further criteria that facilitate determining canonical and non-canonical feature values.

"Criterion 1: Canonical features and their values have a dedicated form (are 'autonomous')." Arkadiev (2010, p. 7)

The first criterion suggests that canonical features and their values are unique and easily distinguished. Zaliznjak and Melčuk (1973, pp. 69–74) both hold that if there is a unique form of a lexeme, then its feature value is autonomous. This criterion postulates that the values of the canonical nouns are autonomous. In the case of Punjabi language some nouns are simply constructed, however, there are too many deviations to understand for a common reader, hence, proper research was needed to solve this issue.

"Criterion 2: Canonical features and their values are uniquely distinguishable across other logically compatible features and their values." Arkadiev (2010, p. 8)

Corbett (2010) holds that a canonical case possesses the same features and values throughout its class. We can distinguish it by picking any combinations. For instance, he explains that in languages like German, we see many syncretisms i.e. to find out gender we have to look at the singular forms. Canonical feature values, thus, are clearly distinguishable from their other counter parts. For instance, in Punjabi, the masculine nouns are made plurals with inflection –a changing into -e, thus termed as canonical.

The second criterion, however, advocate that a canonical case possesses the same features and values throughout its class. No matter which case value we consider, it will be canonical.

"Criterion 3: Canonical features and their values are distinguished consistently across relevant word classes." Arkadiev (2010, p. 8)

The third criterion suggests that canonical feature values remain consistent throughout the class and do not change. In the agglutinative languages like Punjabi and English, however, there are a lot many inconsistencies in the use of inflections indicating case, person, number and gender. For instance, in English *woman* is given its plural in the

form of *women*. In the case of Punjabi, the nouns have a natural gender, either they are male or female. This quality, however, lacks in the English language. For instance, *kataab* (book) has no gender in English but in Punjabi it is considered a female entity. The data has been filled proving this criterion right or wrong.

"Criterion 4: Canonical features and their values are distinguished consistently across lexemes within relevant word classes." Arkadiev (2010, p. 8)

In canonical word class, nevertheless, each member behaves consistently not only in feature but in its value as well. The deviations, thus, can be in the feature or its value. Generally, in Punjabi, the feminine nouns are made plural using *-an* inflection. Consistency, however, is the part and parcel of canonicity, but we find out that Punjabi nouns are not much of the consistent ones. The data has been taken from the sources proving in the favour of this criterion or going against it.

"Principle II: The use of canonical morphosyntactic features and their values is determined by simple syntactic rules." Arkadiev (2010, p. 10)

The second principle, however, holds that the canonical parts of speech follow the simple syntactic rules. Corbett (2010) holds that the canonical nouns follow the simple syntactic rules. The examples from the sources prove the fact whether Punjabi and English nominal and verbal inflections obey the simple syntactic rules or defy them.

"Criterion 5: The use of canonical morphosyntactic features and their values is obligatory." Arkadiev (2010, p. 10)

This criterion helped the researcher determine that every Punjabi noun and verb must be in some kind of case, even if there is no clear case marker. It is still referred to as a particular case with various values. If we see the paradigm, the direct case *munda* 'boy' holds no clear case marking except *-a*, but it holds its place syntactically, thus being termed a different case.

"Criterion 6: Canonical use of morphosyntactic features and their values does not admit syntactic conditions." Arkadiev (2010, p. 12)

This criterion provided a bridge between the syntax and morphology of Punjabi nouns and verbs. It employs a possible condition of word order or topicalization. Topicalization is defined as a transformation that changes the syntactic position of a word. In other words, changing the placement of a linguistic element at the beginning of a

sentence is termed topicalization. For instance, in the vocative case of *kurie* 'girl', the case marking *ni* is moved to the front of the sentence.

"Criterion 7: Canonical use of morphosyntactic features and their values does not admit semantic conditions." Arkadiev (2010, p. 12)

This criterion can be seen as relating to lexical semantics, which is not specific to lexeme. This criterion postulates that 'mark the direct object with the accusative' instead of additional syntactic conditions. Bhatia (1993) describes that inanimate nouns may optionally take the postposition, whereas human nouns obligatorily require *nu*. This juxtaposition of form and meaning is non-canonical.

"Criterion 8: Canonical use of morphosyntactic features and their values does not admit lexical conditions from the target (governee)." Arkadiev (2010, p. 12)

This criterion poses a question: if the case is marked, are there any further lexical conditions? In canonicity, a governor needs a specific case value in order to play its role in syntax. For instance, in the following example, the postposition *nu* is used as a base by the head word 'I', which not only changes the case value of *katab* 'book', but also changes the gender value of the following verb *vekhia* 'look'. As it is changed into male from the feminine *vekhi* 'look', it hence provides an example of non-canonicity with further lexical condition.

"Criterion 9: Canonical use of morphosyntactic features and their values does not admit additional lexical conditions from the controller (governor)." Arkadiev (2010, p. 13)

Corbett (2010) holds that in the canonical situation, the additional conditions from the lexical items are mostly non-canonical. The canonical features and their values do not change with different lexical items and remain the same. Punjabi lexical features differ in their case markings and prove to be non-canonical. The idea is that in the canonical situation, the controller has a single requirement that it govern the dative verb case. Additional conditions from this source are not canonical. The accusative postposition, for instance, is always used with direct object nouns referring to humans. The change in the lexical items provides us with the variance in their feature values, which is non-canonical. As an animate noun, *aadmii* 'man' has to be in the accusative case; however, *billi* 'cat' can be in the direct case as well.

"Criterion 10: The use of canonical morphosyntactic features and their values is sufficient (they are independent)." Arkadiev (2010, p. 14)

This criterion holds that canonical features and their values are independent and can stand alone. In Punjabi, only one nominal case, such as direct, i.e., *munda* (boy), can stand alone, but none of the other cases can stand alone.

"Principle III: Canonical morphosyntactic features and their values are expressed by canonical inflectional morphology." Arkadiev (2010, p. 14)

This principle deals with such lexical items that possess a different sort of non-canonicity. For instance, the examples that show too little or too many distinctions fall under the heading of canonical inflectional morphology. This principle is concerned only with canonicity from the point of view of the lexeme.

Therefore, all the principles and criteria guide this research. They provide a basis to check the deviant and similar nominal and verbal inflectional morphemes and consider their features, which are case, number, gender, and person. The data not only proved these criteria right or wrong considering the Punjabi and English languages but also brought about certain behaviours of these languages in the process. Inflectional morphology, however, is expressed through morphosyntactic theory using the morphological analysis method. Each language has a distinctive blend of these categories to reveal grammatical information via inflection and lexical information through separate lexical items (Santos, 2008; Tallerman, 2015). Inflectional morphemes are morphological typology that is absolutely necessary for morphological theory, as typology is a testing ground for analytical models and hypotheses (Audring & Masini, 2019). Canonical typology is used to map variation encountered within a specific notional domain, typically one that is already established in linguistic description.

3.4 Relevance of the Theory to the Study

This theory is relevant in the sense that it not only helped to describe the Punjabi language but also added to the domain of typology, as it is crucial for the researcher to compare "like with like" (Arkadiev, 2010). This theoretical framework allowed the study to look at the noun and verb cases as features, considering their root, category, gender, number, and person, but mainly with the values of the feature (transitive, intransitive, nominative, accusative, etc.). The data is categorized according to certain principles and criteria, which not only provided an opportunity to sort out the similarities and differences

between Punjabi and English linguistic items but also to bring about certain morphosyntactic features.

There are two novel aspects to this theory. The first one is that it provides a logical scheme to assess the various case values. And the second is that the criteria are also relevant to morphosyntactic features instead of a particular case (Arkadiev, 2010). There may be different functions for each of the recognized case values, such as transitive, intransitive, nominative, accusative, etc. While case values are concentrated, these various case functions also deserve typological investigation, as proposed by Ferguson (1970) and continued recently through the use of semantic maps (Haspelmath, 2003).

While applying the canonical approach to typology, this study demonstrates progress in understanding a system like the Punjabi case system. Furthermore, the theoretical framework gave the study a fresh perspective on this complex phenomenon. In this way, it can be guessed what the case is or what it might be. Considering the Punjabi language as fully canonical in terms of form-function mapping would mean that its word classes can be stratified without any deviations or overlappings. This study not only investigated whether it is true or not, but the nominal and verbal classes across Punjabi and English are also defined according to simple syntactic rules. These word classes of inflectional morphemes are identical in nature or behave differently.

The structure of these case values was considered in the same fashion. For instance, if a language whose case values were all determined by simple syntactic rules were canonical, it would be difficult to stratify the numerous possible deviations from such simple syntactic rules. However, it is way more difficult to prove whether it holds a slightly different syntactic structure, a semantic condition, and so on. This theory proved helpful to construct the logically possible canonical system in mind and find out if there are any ambiguities in them. Johanna Nichols is of the opinion that "Canonical constructions are all alike; each non-canonical construction is non-canonical in its own way." This canonical approach, however, can be applied to both syntax and morphology (Corbett, 2007a). Given this general approach to determining case feature values, the present study attempts to learn canonical morphosyntactic features and their values and see how our case data fit in. There are several criteria that fall under the category of more general principles.

John Hawkins' (1986) theory of language comparison, on the other hand, is used to compare the nominal and verbal inflections of Punjabi and English. Hawkins puts forward an "attempt to consider two whole languages from a typological universal point of view," searching "for unifying generalizations that underlie the variation between the major portions of the whole languages" (Hawkins 1986). Strictly speaking, a comparison across the languages of Punjabi and English was possible due to this theory exploring the inflectional morphemes in both languages.

3.5 Research Design

This study explored the nominal and verbal inflections of Punjabi and English. The data is collected from Bhatia (1993) and Shah (2015), as Bhatia (1993) is considered to be authentic Punjabi grammar (Noor, Mangrio, and Anwar, 2019) and Shah (2015) is a new reference. Important and repeated nouns and verbs are selected against each criterion presented by the theoretical framework of the study. Enough data is incorporated in order to empiricize it with the help of the Canonical approach. Explorative and descriptive designs were used in this research, using a qualitative methodology. The data is observed using three principles and ten criteria, characterizing it as either canonical or non-canonical. The insights and conclusions are drawn keeping in view the behaviour of Punjabi and English languages. A morphological research method, however, has suited best to understand the characteristics of the sample as to whether Punjabi inflectional morphemes are different from their English counterpart. This study provided a basis for future researchers to carry out research on a major level to find out the structural similarities and differences between the inflectional morphemes of nouns and verbs in Punjabi and English. If the same design, procedures, and data analysis methods are applied across different settings, the study may be replicated. The secondary data can be utilized to replicate the study because it is useful for identifying research gaps and for data verification through analysis. In addition, the secondary data can also be utilized to address the question of what areas require additional primary research. The data is managed with the help of principles and criteria presented in the theoretical framework of the study, and it is analysed using a morphological analysis method.

3.5.1 Sample

The sample is collected from two sources, i.e., *Punjabi: a cognitive-descriptive grammar* produced by Bhatia (1993) and *Punjabi Grammar* by Shah (2015). Important and repeated nouns and verbs in Punjabi are chosen, and later the data is analysed using

the morphological analysis method. This data in the form of Punjabi nouns and verbs is used to answer new research questions, as the original study does not take up the issues highlighted in the present study.

3.5.2 Data Analysis Procedure

In this study, morphological analysis is performed with the help of the Canonical Morphosyntactic Feature Values Theory by Corbett. In addition to investigating the morphosyntactic characteristics of each language, this study compared Punjabi and English nouns and verbs in order to further build an in-depth understanding of both the languages. The theoretical framework provided the study with two goals. The first one is to introduce the criteria for canonicity, and the second is for each criteria to indicate briefly how the cases of Punjabi nouns and verbs measure up against it.

This Canonical approach is essential for determining case feature values, as it not only considers canonical morphosyntactic features and their values but also examines whether the case data fits into it or not. This approach provides the study with several criteria in the form of three principles and ten criteria. The data is analysed with the help of these criteria provided by the model of Greville G. Corbett (Arkadiev 2010). These criteria indicate whether Punjabi nominal and verbal cases measure up against them (Arkadiev, 2010). Bond (2019) postulates that the application of Canonical Typology is a newer methodology. The most important function that it performs is to comprehend all the diversity of the inflectional system in various languages and distribute those languages into different crude categories. In order to meet the goals of the research, the data is sorted into distinct portions rather than being mixed together with the help of these criteria.

The data is arranged by these criteria in order to induce general principles for broader use. These principles and criteria not only shaped the data collection method but also maneuvered the data analysis procedure. The examples from both Punjabi and English languages are taken against these principles and criteria and analysed to check if the data matches the principles and criteria or gone against them. The data that is provided in compliance with this criteria is termed canonical; however, the data that goes against that criteria is called non-canonical. Morphology and syntax are closely related because the words are usually inflected according to the syntactic structure of the sentence. By combining the morphology and syntax of the linguistic components and recording the behavior of Punjabi and English during the process, the criteria empirically

supported the data. The data is collected from two sources, i.e., *Punjabi: a cognitive-descriptive grammar* produced by Bhatia (1993) and *Punjabi Grammar* by Shah (2015). The data not only proved these criteria right or wrong considering the Punjabi and English languages but also brought about certain behaviours of these languages in the process of canonicity. The data is analysed with the help of two chapters. One chapter denotes Punjabi nominal inflections, while the other chapter serves the purpose of identifying Punjabi verbal inflections.

3.6 Conclusion

This study attempted to explain the ambiguities in Punjabi and English inflectional morphemes by analyzing them morphologically. This analytical task is performed employing Canonical Morphosyntactic Feature Values Theory by Corbett, thus contributing to the field of canonical typology. Typology is a testing ground for theories to be proven right or wrong (Audring & Masini, 2019). Enough data is incorporated in order to empiricize it with the help of the Canonical approach. Explorative and descriptive designs were used in this research, using a qualitative methodology. The canonical approach is actually a general approach to determining case feature values. It mixes up morphological features with syntactic or semantic features. A central position is given to Punjabi by applying the theory of Canonical Morphosyntactic Features and Their Values presented by Corbett, along with its three principles and ten criteria (Arkadiev, 2010). These principles and criteria not only shaped the data collection method but also maneuvered the data analysis procedure. For instance, the data is observed using three principles and ten criteria, characterizing it as either canonical or non-canonical. The criteria empiricized the data by combining the morphology and syntax and recording the behaviour of Punjabi and English in the process. The study focused on developing an understanding of the existing data that was taken from two sources, i.e., Bhatia (1993) and Shah (2015). The insights and conclusions are drawn keeping in view the behaviour of Punjabi and English languages.

CHAPTER 4 DATA ANALYSIS-I

NOMINAL INFLECTIONS IN PUNJABI

4.1 Introduction

The chapter presents the data analysis of nominal inflections by using the theory of Canonical Morphosyntactic Features and Their Values presented by Greville G. Corbett (Arkadiev, 2010). This chapter then goes on to discuss number, case, gender, masculine nouns, feminine nouns, declension, syntax, proverbs, morphosyntactic features, pseudo-nouns, semantics, and dative/genitive precedence. This theory is used to manoeuvre the study, along with its three principles and ten criteria. The relevant data is gathered systematically with the help of these principles and criteria. Every criterion and principle has its roots in the canonicity norm and is designed to serve as a yardstick for comparing the evidence. The data that matches the principle or criterion is acknowledged as canonical; however, the data that goes against it is categorized as non-canonical. In addition to determining case feature values in Punjabi, the canonical approach mixes up morphological features with their syntactic or semantic counterparts. Bhatia (1993, p. 165) holds that Punjabi nouns differ in number, gender and case. The number inflects for singular and plural, gender deviates in masculine and feminine and case varies in simple, oblique and vocative. The three principles and ten criteria presented in the theoretical framework of the study are as following:

"Principle I: Features and their values are clearly distinguished by formal means (and the clearer the formal means by which a feature or value is distinguished, the more canonical that feature or value)." Arkadiev (2010, p. 6)

Principle I covers four more specific criteria:

"Criterion 1: Canonical features and their values have a dedicated form (are 'autonomous')" Arkadiev (2010, p. 7)

4.2 Number

Zaliznjak (1973) and Corbett (2008) both hold that if there is a unique form of a lexeme, then its feature value is autonomous. This criterion postulates that the values of the canonical nouns are autonomous. Some nouns are simply constructed; for instance, in

the case of number, 'boy' is made plural with the help of the inflection '-s', 'boys'. In the case of Punjabi, *munda* takes *munde* as its plural form. It uses *-a* and *-e* as their interchanging inflections. *Kuri*, 'girl' has its plural *Kurian*, 'girls', and *kitaab* 'book' is pluralized in the form of *kitaaban*, 'books'. These are some instances of non-autonomous nouns. However, there are too many deviations to understand for a common reader in Punjabi.

Munda gea.

Boy.ms went.pst.sm

'(One) boy went.'

(1)

Munde gae. (unspecified number)

Boys.m.pl went.pst.m.pl

'Boys went.'

(2)

Kujh Munde gae.

Some. Adj.boys.m.pl went.pst.m.pl

'Some boys went.'

(3)

Chaar Munde gae.

Four. Adj.boys.m.pl went.pst.m.pl

'Four boys went.'

(4)

Sohni kuri.

Adj.s.f noun.s.f

'Pretty girl.'

(5)

Sohnian kurian.

Adj.pl.f noun.pl.f

'Pretty girls.'

(6)

Ohdi kitaab.

She (Pro.) book.s.f

'Her book.'

(7)

Ohdian kitaaban.

She (Pro.) book.pl.f

'Her books.'

(8)

Shah (2015, p. 55)

These nouns in Punjabi are not particularly distinctive. However, certain nouns are quite autonomous. For instance, these Punjabi nouns have the same singular and plural forms, i.e.,

Sah 'breath'

Rah 'way'

Taa 'ream'

Bharaa 'brother'

Via(h) 'marriage'

Darya 'river'

Batshah 'king'

Ooth 'camel'

Rukh 'tree'

(9)

Shah (2015, p. 56)

Instances (2), (3), (4), (6), and (8) follow the simple rule of plurality, and instances in (9) use a uniqueness-based standard to make the nouns plural. However, in English, only an *-s* inflection is required to change singular forms like *'ream'*, *'brother'*, *'marriage'*, etc. into plurals.

4.3 Case

Bhatia (1993, p. 165) is of the opinion that bound suffixes such as word-final *-a* and *-e* in *muNDaa* 'boy' and *muNDe* 'boys', respectively, mark case in Punjabi. He further explains that nouns are inflected for number, gender and case. There are three main cases in Punjabi i.e., simple, oblique and vocative. Nouns are declined according to their gender class and the phonological property of their final segments (Bhatia, 1993, p. 165). He holds that there are three main patterns of nominal declension (the variation in the form) in Majhi.

It is evident that Punjabi cases are clearly discovered on the basis of their morphosyntactic features. In the use of a noun, there are many inflections that mark the case. The changing values of these cases make them very interesting, like the Russian cases indicated by Corbett (Arkadiev, 2010). Using this criteria, it is discovered that Punjabi case values vary significantly. For instance, the vocative case in Punjabi is distinguished with the markers *-oe/ve* and *-nii* that precede a noun. This quality makes it unique, i.e.,

CASES	NOUN	POSTPOSITION
Direct	<i>munda</i>	<i>0</i>
Oblique	<i>munde</i>	<i>ne</i> (ergative)
	<i>munde</i>	<i>nu</i> (accusative/dative)
	<i>munde</i>	<i>to</i> (instrumental)
	<i>munde</i>	<i>te</i> (locative)
	<i>munde</i>	<i>daa/de/dian</i> (genitive)
Vocative	<i>O/ve muNDiaa</i>	

(10)

(Bhatia 1993, p. 165)

The behaviour of other cases is equally unique. All the other cases in the *muNDaa* 'boy' paradigm take either postposition marking, i.e., *ne*, *nu*, *to*, *te*, *daa*, *de*, *dian*, or there is a preposition marking, as in, vocative *o/ve*, except the direct case. English 'boy', however, does not involve any sort of ambiguity in its case marking except for using the -s inflection as in plural case 'boys' or an apostrophe -'s. The postpositions at the end of the accusative, ergative, instrumental, etc. make them canonical. However, inflectional suffixes are regarded as additive morphemes, which serve as variants of the same word rather than separate words, as in: boy – boys – boy's – boys' (Josiah & Udoudom, 2012).

The same inflections can be noticed in the lexeme *kuRii*, 'girl':

CASES	NOUN	POSTPOSITION
Direct	<i>kuRii</i>	0
Oblique	<i>kuRii</i>	<i>ne</i> (ergative)
		<i>nu</i> (accusative/dative)
		<i>to</i> (instrumental)
		<i>te</i> (locative)
		<i>daa/de/dii/diaa</i> (genitive)

Vocative *nii kuRie*

(11)

(Bhatia 1993, p. 165)

CASE	SINGULAR	PLURAL
Direct	<i>aadmii</i> 'man'	<i>aadmii</i>
Oblique	<i>aadmii</i>	<i>aadmiaa</i>
Vocative	<i>aadmiia</i>	<i>aadmiio</i>
Direct	<i>kar</i> 'house'	<i>kar</i>
Oblique	<i>kar</i>	<i>karaa</i>
Vocative	<i>karaa</i>	<i>karo</i>
Direct	<i>kurii</i> 'girl'	<i>kuriian</i>
Oblique	<i>kurii</i>	<i>kuriian</i>

Vocative *kurie* *kuriio*

(12)

(Bhatia 1993, p. 166)

In the case of *aadmii*, 'man', the direct, oblique, and accusative, singular forms are the same. Similarly, *kar* 'house' and *kuri* 'girl' have the same forms in different situations. The question arises in the mind: how can we term them in different cases? For that purpose, we need to consider the context in which they occur. For instance, the following sentences provide *aadmii*, 'man', as the direct case in (13a), whereas the accusative is exemplified in the context of (13b). The postposition *nu* is used as the case marker for an accusative noun. Same is the treatment for other nouns, i.e., *kar*, 'house' and *kurii*, 'girl'. For instance:

**aadmi vekho.*

(13a)

Aadmi nu vekho.

man.m.s acc. See.pst.m.s

'Look at a/the man.'

(13b)

Bhatia (1993, p. 172)

O kar gia.

He home.Dir.ms Go.pst.ms

'He went home.'

(14)

Bhatia (1993, p. 169)

KuRie, pagvaan te parosaa kar, sab thiik ho jaavegaa.

girl-voc.God on trust do-imp.all fine be go-fut.ms.

'O girl! trust God, everything will be fine.'

(15)

Bhatia (1993, p. 175)

In order to differentiate the noun *mundaa*, 'boy' in direct and oblique/accusative cases, we examine the situation where they occur. To put it differently, we provide the context to prove that they are different forms belonging to different cases. The *munda* 'boy' in the direct case does not take any postpositional case marking; however, the oblique/accusative case of *munde nu* 'boy' takes a case marking in the form of *nu*. For example:

Mai muNDe nu vekhiao.

I boy-obl. acc. see pst.ms.

'I saw a/the boy.'

(16a)

**Mai muNDaa 0 vekhiao.*

I boy 0 see-pst.ms.

'I saw a/the boy.'

(16b)

Bhatia (1993, p. 167)

Mai munde nu puchiao.

I boy.obl. acc.from ask.pst.ms

'I asked the boy.'

(16c)

Munda 'boy' takes 'to' postposition when occurring in instrumental case as *munde to* 'boy' i.e.,

Mai munde to salaa mangii.

I boy from advice demand.pst.fs

'I sought the advice of the boy.'

(16d)

Bhatia (1993, p. 175)

Bhatia (1993) also provides the example of *kataab*, 'book' in the case of direct with no case marking, whereas accusative case with a *nu* postposition. These examples

provide enough empirical evidence to put them in different nominal cases and also exemplify the canonicity of the first criterion.

Mai kataab vekhi.

I book.f.s. dir. see.pst.f.s

'I saw a book.'

(17a)

Mai kataab nu vekhiaa.

I book.f.s acc. See.pst.m.s

'I saw the book.'

(17b)

Bhatia (1993, p. 167)

Punjabi: this analysis shows that some case values are clearly non-canonical in terms of criterion 1: as the word final *-a* and *-e* in *muNDaa* 'boy' and *muNDe* 'boys' face poorly against this criterion. It is clearly not unique enough to be termed canonical, but most of the other case values are canonical. For instance, the accusative case of *kataab* 'book' measures up quite nicely against this criterion as it uses an extra feature of *nu* after it. Thus, all the other cases except the direct case prove to be canonical according to the first criterion.

"Criterion 2: Canonical features and their values are uniquely distinguishable across other logically compatible features and their values."

Arkadiev (2010, p. 8)

4.4 Gender

4.4.1 Masculine Nouns

Corbett holds that a canonical case has the same features and values throughout its class (Arkadiev, 2010). We can distinguish it by picking any combination. For instance, he explains that in languages like German, we see many syncretisms, i.e., to find out gender, we have to look at the singular forms. Canonical feature values are clearly distinguishable from their other counterparts (Arkadiev, 2010). In Punjabi, the masculine nouns are made plurals by changing the inflection *-a* into *-e*, and they are termed canonical, i.e.,

Singular Plural

munda 'boy' *munde* 'boys'

ghora 'horse' *ghore* 'horses'

kamra 'room' *kamre* 'rooms'

keera 'insect' *keere* 'insects'

danda 'rod' *dande* 'rods'

(18)

Shah (2015, p. 56)

These nouns in Punjabi, however, have the same singular and plural forms, and deviate from the set rule of canonicity. For instance:

Sah 'breath'

Rah 'way'

Taa 'ream'

Bharaa 'brother'

Via(h) 'marriage'

Darya 'river'

(19a)

Shah (2015, p. 56)

These nouns in Punjabi are always used in the plural, thus deviating from the set rule of canonicity. For instance:

maape 'parents'

peke 'married girl's parental home'

sohre 'in laws'

naanke 'place of maternal family home'

daadke 'place of paternal family home'

(19b)

Shah (2015, p. 58)

The nominal direct case and singular *hatth* 'hand' has the same plural as *hatth* 'hands' which provides an example of non-canonicity.

Case	Singular	Plural
Direct:	<i>hatth</i>	<i>hatth</i> 'hand'
Oblique:	<i>hatth</i>	<i>hatthaa</i>
Vocative:	<i>hattho</i>	<i>hatthaa</i>

(20)

(Bhatia 1993, p. 166)

These above examples deviate from the established canonical rule that plural nouns are formed with the inflection -s. They are also non-canonical in nature and are not clearly distinguishable.

Punjabi: while case is expressed together with number and gender in nouns, different values are normally distinguishable in various combinations. The main seven case values are largely non-canonical in this sense, but there are also some instances of canonicity. Thus, nouns normally take their subject in the oblique, ergative, accusative, instrumental, locative, genitive, and vocative forms, along with additional lexical conditions. The oblique case, however, proves to be canonical only as shown in the paradigm of *munda* (boy).

"Criterion 3: Canonical features and their values are distinguished consistently across relevant word classes. The morphosyntactic features behave consistently throughout and do not deviate from the set criteria of canonicity."

Arkadiev (2010, p. 8)

4.4.2 Feminine Nouns

The languages of the world also differ in the way they cipher natural gender. English represents natural gender majorly through lexical items and via pronouns, i.e., boy takes 'he', whereas girl chooses 'she', and so on. However, there are languages that represent grammatical gender features with the help of inflectional morphemes, i.e., Spanish (Sera, Elieff, Forbes, Burch, Rodríguez, & Dubois, 2002). Punjabi can also be described as a "gender-loaded" language, as its gender feature is not only represented by

nouns but verbs and adjectives as well (Shafiq & Iqbal, 2023). In agglutinative languages like Punjabi and English, there are a lot of inconsistencies in the use of inflections indicating gender. In the case of Punjabi, the nouns have a grammatical gender; either they are male or female. This quality, however, is lacking in the English language.

In English, the plural is made using the -s inflection at the end of the nouns, with some exceptions. The noun *girl* is pluralized as *girls*, but *woman* is given its plural in the form of *women*. In the case of Punjabi, however, the nouns have a grammatical gender, either male or female. This quality is lacking in the English language. For instance, *xabar* 'news' has no gender in English, but in Punjabi it is considered a female entity, i.e.,

O xabar axbaar to milii.

this news newspaper from. get-pst.fs.

'(I) got this news from the newspaper.'

(21)

Bhatia (1993, p. 180)

Consider the point that the feminine quality of *xabar* 'news' forces us to take a feminine verb after it, i.e., *milii* 'got'. This attribute makes the Punjabi noun *xabar* 'news' non-canonical. The following sentence (22) also comes bearing a similar example, i.e., *kaka*, 'child'. The noun *kaka* 'child' in Punjabi is termed a masculine thing; however, in English, 'child' is neither masculine nor feminine.

O ne kurii nu kaka ditte.

He erg. girl dat. child.ms give.pst.ms

'He gave the child to the girl.'

(22)

Bhatia (1993, p. 174)

This criterion states that a nominal case is canonical if its features and values remain the same throughout and it does not deviate from the set criteria of canonicity.

Mai kataab vekhi.

I book.fs look.pst.s.f

'I saw a book.'

(23a)

Bhatia (1993, p. 167)

In the example (23a), the direct case *kataab* 'book' is quite canonical. The conjunct verbs, however, project instances of non-canonicity, i.e.,

foto khichna (to photograph)*jhooth bolna* (to tell a lie)

(23b)

Shah (2015, p. 100)

In the examples (23b), a noun and a verb are combined to form a verb case, which is not conventional and proves to be non-canonical. There are only two genders in Punjabi: masculine and feminine. (Shah, 2015, p. 58) Masculine singular nouns mostly end in /a/ or /h/ and feminine in /i/. We can identify them as canonical gender features, i.e., masculine *ghora* (horse) is made feminine with *ghori* 'mare' (Shah, 2015, p. 60); their English equivalents, though, do not imply the simple rule of making feminine.

Masculine	Feminine
<i>ghora</i> (horse)	<i>ghori</i> (mare)
<i>kutta</i> (dog)	<i>billi</i> (cat)
<i>mela</i> (fair)	<i>hatti</i> (shop)

(24) Shah (2015, p. 60)

However, these pairs are non-canonical against this criterion, where morphosyntactic features and their values do not behave consistently throughout and deviate from the set criteria of canonicity. The Punjabi language holds attributes that make it non-canonical, as few examples of nouns defy the set pattern or rule of canonicity. For example, *mochi* (shoemaker) is considered masculine, and *dua* (prayer) is denoted as feminine (Shah, 2015, p. 60). However, their English versions neither belong to the masculine nor feminine categories.

Masculine	Feminine
<i>mali</i> (gardener)	<i>aashaa</i> (hope)
<i>mochi</i> (shoemaker)	<i>dua</i> (prayer)

(25)

Shah (2015, p. 60)

In a similar vein, the objects in Punjabi are traditionally separated into male and female, i.e.,

Masculine	Feminine
<i>haar</i> 'necklace'	<i>wali</i> 'earring'
<i>mez</i> 'table'	<i>kursi</i> 'chair'
<i>taj</i> 'crown'	<i>hakoomat</i> 'reign'
<i>aasmaan</i> 'sky'	<i>zameen</i> 'earth'

(26)

Shah (2015, p. 59)

The examples in (26) demonstrate how tradition rather than logic prevails in categorizing the nouns into masculine and feminine in Punjabi. Such nouns deviate from the set pattern and, are confirmed to be non-canonical.

Punjabi: the main seven case values are largely non-canonical against this criterion, but some instances of canonicity are also found. The feminine case *kataab* 'book', however, proves to be canonical considering its gender and its relationship with the verb.

"Criterion 4: Canonical features and their values are distinguished consistently across lexemes within relevant word classes." Arkadiev (2010, p. 8)

Generally, in Punjabi, the feminine nouns are made plural using the inflection *-an*. For instance:

Singular	Plural
<i>kuri</i> 'girl'	<i>kurian</i> 'girls'
<i>kitaab</i> 'book'	<i>kitaabaan</i> 'books'
<i>pinsal</i> 'pencil'	<i>pinsalaan</i> 'pencils'
<i>keeri</i> 'ant'	<i>keerian</i> 'ants'

(27)

Shah (2015, p. 57)

Consistency is part and parcel of canonicity. However, there is not much consistency observed in these Punjabi nouns. Consider the following examples, where inflection *-waan* is used to make the plurals:

Singular	Plural
<i>dua</i> 'prayer'	<i>duawaan</i> 'prayer'
<i>dwa</i> 'medicine'	<i>dwawaan</i> 'medicines'
<i>saza</i> 'punishment'	<i>sazawaan</i> 'punishments'

(28)

Shah (2015, p. 57)

In canonical word class, each member behaves consistently not only in feature but in its value as well. When they do not behave in the same way, they deviate in two different ways. The deviations can be in the feature or its value (Arkadiev, 2010). It is evident that some of the features and their values are canonical against criterion 4, but most of the cases are non-canonical.

4.5 Declension

Declension is the changing of the form of a word, generally to express its syntactic function in the sentence, through some inflections. Declensions may apply to nouns, pronouns, adjectives, adverbs, and articles to indicate case, number, gender, and other grammatical categories. Nouns are declined according to their gender, class, and the phonological properties of their final segments. Bhatia (1993, p. 166) holds that there are three main patterns of nominal declension in Majhi: one is ending with *-aa* as in *mundaa* 'boy', the other is ending with non-*aa* as in *kar* 'house', and the last is a feminine noun, i.e., *kuri* 'girl'. The declension of these cases demonstrates non-canonicity as they change their inflections against each category. However, in English, the nouns 'boy', 'house', and 'girl' are made plural quite canonically with the simple inflection *-s*, i.e., 'boys', 'houses', and 'girls'.

CASE	SINGULAR	PLURAL
Direct	<i>mundaa</i> 'boy'	<i>munde</i>
Oblique	<i>munde</i>	<i>mundiaa</i>

Vocative	mundiaa	mundio
Direct	<i>kar</i> 'house'	<i>kar</i>
Oblique	<i>kar</i>	<i>karaa</i>
Vocative	<i>karaa</i>	<i>karo</i>
Direct	<i>kurii</i> 'girl'	<i>kuriian</i>
Oblique	<i>kurii</i>	<i>kuriian</i>
Vocative	<i>kurie</i>	<i>kuriio</i>

(Bhatia 1993: 166)

(29)

Punjabi: the nominal case values are not anywhere close to canonical against this criterion, as they are unable to inflect sometimes for number and other times for gender. Some other times, however, they do not possess any inflections at all, thus called indeclinables, but they still occupy their syntactic place. Conversely, canonicity does occur occasionally. Nouns normally take their plural form with the inflection *-an*, as in *kurian* 'girls', but other instances like pluralization with the inflection *-waan*, as in *duawaan* 'prayer', provide us with instances of non-canonicity against this criterion.

"Principle II: The use of canonical morphosyntactic features and their values is determined by simple syntactic rules." Arkadiev (2010, p. 10)

4.6 Syntax

Corbett holds that the canonical nouns follow simple syntactic rules (Arkadiev, 2010). Bhatia (1993), on the other hand, is of the opinion that the function of indicating case relationships in postpositions, i.e., *nu*, performs a wide variety of other syntactic and semantic functions.

**Mai muNDaa 0 vekhiala.*

I boy 0 see-pst.ms.

'I saw a/the boy.'

(30)

Mai muNDa nu vekhiala.

I boy-obl. acc. see pst.ms.

'I saw a/the boy.'

(31)

Bhatia (1993, p. 167)

In the example (30), *muNDaa* 'boy' holds an example of following a simple syntactic rule, but this structure is deemed ungrammatical because an animate subject consistently requires the postposition *nu*. In the sentence (31), the accusative case *muNDe nu*, makes the sentence grammatically correct while taking into account the additional case of *nu*. Hence, demonstrating non-canonicity in relation to this criterion.

**Aadmi vekho.*

(32a)

Aadmi nu vekho.

man.m.s acc. See.pst.m.s

'Look at the man.'

(32b)

Billi nu vekho.

Cat.ms (acc.) see.pst.ms

'Look at the cat.'

(32c)

Bhatia (1993, p. 172)

A single inflection in Punjabi may show more than one function in a single constructions but English nouns show only one function. This accusative postposition is always used with direct object nouns referring to humans. Inanimate nouns may optionally take the postposition, whereas human nouns obligatorily require *nu*. The use of the *nu* postposition with inanimates is motivated by their definite reference. The use of the postposition *nu*, however, is optional with non-human animate nouns. The *nu* postposition also provides the extra meaning of the determinant 'the' with the human subjects. The Punjabi language is designated non-canonical due to this unusual syntactical feature, as exemplified in (32a–32c).

Bhatia is of the view that instrumentality in Punjabi nouns is marked by the two postpositions *to* and *de*. For instance, the following sentences describe the noun *Daak* 'mail' and, *caakuu* 'knife' followed by the postpositions *to* and *de* respectively.

Mai saneaa Daak to pijvaaiiaa.

I message mail inst. send-pst.ms.

'I sent the message by mail.'

(33a)

Mai kelaa caakuu (de) naal kaTiaa.

I banana knife gen-ms.obl. with/in the company of cut-pst.fs.

'I cut the banana with a knife.'

(33b) Bhatia (1993, p. 180)

An additional example of non-canonicity against this criterion comes from the instrumental noun *kuRii*, which is followed by two postpositions *de naal*.

Mai O nu kuRii de naal vekhiaa... ranjiit nu.

I he to girl of company see-pst.ms... Ranjit to

'I saw him with a girl. . . Ranjit.'

(33c) Bhatia (1993: 155)

4.7 Proverbs

Subjects in Punjabi are canonical if they appear before their verbal counterparts, but several Punjabi proverbs turn out to be quite non-canonical by this criterion, for instance:

Kare koi; te bhare koi.

Someone does, another pays. (Proverb)

(34)

Shah (2015: 107)

O ne kamm kiitaa.

She erg. work.ms do.pst.ms

'She did the work.'

(35)

Bhatia (1993, p. 169)

In the first example, the verb *kare* 'does' non-canonically precedes the subject *koi* 'someone'; however, in the second example, the verb *kiita* 'did' canonically follows the subject *O ne* 'he'. Thus, it complies with the simple syntactic rule.

Punjabi: here the primary nominal case values are mostly non-canonical in this respect, but some instances of canonicity are also found. Thus, nouns normally do not follow the simple syntactic rules except for the direct case. The case of *muNDaa* 'boy' shows canonicity; all the other nominal cases, however, are non-canonical.

"Criterion 5: The use of canonical morphosyntactic features and their values is obligatory." Arkadiev (2010, p. 10)

Every Punjabi noun must be in some kind of case, even if there is no clear case marking. It is still going to be referred to as a particular case with various values. This specific value depends on the paradigm. If we see the below paradigm (36a), the direct case *raat* 'night' has no clear case marking, but it holds its place syntactically, thus being termed a different case. The bare stem is not considered outside the case system considering the paradigm of *raat* 'night' (fs) in order to find out the various cases of Punjabi *raat* 'night', which is a proof of Punjabi non-canonical nominal inflections:

CASES	NOUN	POSTPOSITION
Direct	<i>raat</i>	0
Oblique	<i>raat</i>	<i>ne</i> (ergative)
	<i>raat</i>	<i>nu</i> (accusative/dative)
	<i>raat</i>	<i>to</i> (instrumental)
	<i>raat</i>	<i>te</i> (locative)
	<i>raat</i>	<i>daa/de/dii/dian</i> (genitive)
Vocative	<i>nii</i>	<i>raate</i>

(36a)

(Bhatia 1993, p. 165)

No clear case marking is there in vocative case *raate* 'night' except -e, as shown by Bhatia (1993), but preposition *-nii* is used before a noun to make it vocative case. The rationale behind this is that the canonical morphosyntactic features and their values are obligatory.

KuRie, pagvaan te parosaa kar, sab thiik ho jaavegaa.

girl-voc.God on trust do-imp.all fine be go-fut.ms.

'O girl! trust God, everything will be fine.'

(36b)

Bhatia (1993, p. 175)

The above sentence (36b) exhibits an example of a vocative case, *kuRie*, 'O girl'. The point to note is that it does not retain prepositions like *-oe/ve* and *-nii*; nonetheless, it instantiates a case without clear marking. Bhatia (1993) is of the opinion that postpositions in Punjabi nominal inflections are perfectly capable of expressing semantic functions. For instance, a number of postpositions, i.e., *nu*, *ne*, *to*, *te*, etc., indicate a variety of different meanings. These postpositions are employed after a noun or a noun phrase, and they cannot stand alone.

In canonicity, a governor needs a specific case value in order to play its role in syntax. For instance, in the following example (37a), the postposition *nu* is obligatory for the head word *munda*, 'boy', without which the sentence is ungrammatical.

Munde nu kataab paRnii pavegii.

boy.ms.obl to(daL) book.fs read-inf.fs compel-fut.fs

"The boy will have to read the book.'

(37a)

**Mundaa kataab paRnii pavegii.*

boy book.fs read-inf.fs compel-fut.fs

"The boy will have to read the book.'

(37b)

(Bhatia 1993, p. 167)

Postpositions are capable of expressing semantic functions ranging from agency to beneficiary, volitionality to stativity. A number of particles, expressing a variety of meanings—inclusion, exclusion, contrast, and others—are employed after either a noun or a noun phrase. However, they cannot be used exclusively to express the grammatical relationship of a noun phrase with other constituents in a sentence.

Considering the Punjabi nominal cases, most of the cases are canonical (having explicit case marking), but a few cases do not possess any clear case marking. For instance, the following sentence (38) has a nominal case *bol* 'word', which is exactly like the verbal case *bol* 'say', thus providing us with 0 case marking. Despite this fact, this nominal case occupies its syntactic place.

Change bol bol. (Intransitive)

'Say good words/things.'

(38) Shah (1993, p. 98)

In Majhi, nouns ending with non-*aa*, i.e., *aadmii* 'man' and *hatth* 'hand', are represented with the same forms in different cases. Hence, they belong to particular cases, even if there is no clear case marker. They are still considered particular cases with various values. This can be verified by taking into account the situation in which they occur.

CASE	SINGULAR	PLURAL
Direct	<i>aadmii</i> 'man'	<i>aadmii</i>
Oblique	<i>aadmii</i>	<i>aadmiiaa</i>
Vocative	<i>aadmiia</i>	<i>aadmiio</i>
Direct:	<i>hatth</i>	<i>hatth</i> 'hand'
Oblique:	<i>hatth</i>	<i>hatthaa</i>
Vocative:	<i>hattho</i>	<i>hatthaa</i>

(39) (Bhatia 1993, p. 166)

Punjabi: it is obvious that all the main case values are obligatory against this criterion.

"Criterion 6: Canonical use of morphosyntactic features and their values does not admit syntactic conditions." Arkadiev (2010, p. 12)

4.8 Morphosyntactic Features

This criterion employs a possible condition of word order or topicalization (Arkadiev, 2010). Topicalization is defined as a transformation that changes the syntactic position of a word. In other words, changing the placement of a linguistic element at the beginning of a sentence is termed topicalization. For instance, in the vocative case of *aadmii* 'man', the case marking *oe/ve* is moved to the front of the sentence. Corbett holds that the canonical nouns do not necessarily follow syntactic rules (Arkadiev, 2010). Bhatia (1993) is of the opinion that the function of indicating case relationships in postpositions, i.e., *nu*, performs a wide variety of other syntactic and semantic functions. *Kataab* (book) as a direct case, demonstrating a simple syntactic rule as represented in English: 'I saw a book.' The accusative case of *kataab nu* (book), however, provides a clear example of non-canonicity against this criterion. For instance, the paradigm of *aadmii* (man) (40) shows postpositions like *ne*, *to*, *te*, *daa*, *de*, *dian*, etc. that do not follow the simple syntactic rules and demonstrate examples of split ergativity.

CASES	NOUN	POSTPOSITION
Direct	<i>aadmii</i>	0
Oblique	<i>aadmii</i>	<i>ne</i> (ergative)
		<i>nu</i> (accusative/dative)
		<i>to</i> (instrumental)
		<i>te</i> (locative)
		<i>daa/de/dii/diaa</i> (genitive)
Vocative	<i>oe/ve</i>	<i>aadmiaa</i>

(40) (Bhatia 1993, p. 165)

This principle is vital for the interface between syntax and morphology, as it indicates that syntax is free of morphology. Zwicky (1996) holds that the rules of syntax have nothing to do with morphological features, i.e., inflectional class. Zaliznjak (1973) is of the opinion that the rule of government is complex, but we do not need simpler rules of government. Corbett, on the other hand, suggests that the cases can be semantically

defined, but the rule of the government cannot refer to inflectional classes (Arkadiev, 2010).

4.8.1 Case

This criterion implies that the values of canonical morphosyntactic features go beyond syntactic norms (Arkadiev, 2010). In the Punjabi language, the ergatives or case markers do not admit to the syntactic rules. In the succeeding example, *Hakiim* is followed by a *ne* postposition. In the case of *mariiz*, the subsequent *nu* does not admit to the syntactic conditions. However, in the passive sentence, *mariiz* is not followed by the *nu* postposition, proving to be canonical against this criterion. The point to note is that the *nu* postposition is not grammatically correct in the passive sentence.

Hakiim ne mariiz nu vekhiala.

doctor erg. patient ace. see-pst.ppl.

The doctor examined the patient.'

(Active)

(41)

Hakiim to mariiz vekhiala gila.

doctor by patient see-pst.ppl. go-pst.ms

(Passive)

(42)

The patient was examined by the doctor.'

**Hakiim to mariiz nu vekhiala gila.*

(43)

(Bhatia 1993, p. 173)

4.8.2 Number

The second principle (this criterion) also further checks the determined identical word classes of nouns for their features, which are case, number, and gender. This criterion also helps to evaluate the different values of those features. In Punjabi, the masculine nouns are usually made plurals with inflection, *-a* changing into *-e*, i.e.,

Singular Plural

munda (boy) *munde*(boys)

(44)

Shah (2015, p. 56)

But, looking at the syntax, we come to know that they are quite non-canonical and do admit to the syntactic rules, for instance:

Munda gea.

Boy.ms went.pst.sm

'(One) boy went.'

(45a)

Munde gae. (unspecified number)

Boys.m.pl went.pst.m.pl

'Boys went.'

(45b)

Kujh Munde gae.

Some. Adj.boys.m.pl went.pst.m.pl

'Some boys went.'

(45c)

Chaar Munde gae.

Four. Adj.boys.m.pl went.pst.m.pl

'Four boys went.'

(45d) Shah (2015, p. 55)

Singular Plural

kuri (girl) *kurian* (girls)

kitaab (book) *kitaabaan* (books)

(46)

Shah (2015, p. 57)

Nouns like *kuri* (girl) and *kitaab* (book) do not deviate from the simple syntactic rules while changing into their plural counterparts, i.e., *kurian* (girls) and *kitaabaan* (books). For instance:

Sohni kuri.

Adj.s.f noun.s.f

'Pretty girl.'

(47a)

Sohnian kurian.

Adj.pl.f noun.pl.f

'Pretty girls.'

(47b)

Ohdi kitaab.

She (Pro.) book.s.f

'Her book.'

(47c)

Ohdian kitaaban.

She (Pro.) book.pl.f

'Her books.'

(47d)

Shah (2015, p. 55)

Some Punjabi nouns make their plurals unconventionally; nonetheless, they follow a simple syntactic rule. This criterion classifies them as non-canonical. For example:

Sah 'breath'

Rah 'way'

Taa 'ream'

Darya 'river'

(48) Shah (2015, p. 56)

4.8.3 Gender

There are only two genders in Punjabi: masculine and feminine (Shah, 2015; 58).

Masculine singular nouns mostly end in /a/ or /h/ and feminine in /i/, i.e.,

Masculine	Feminine
<i>munda</i> (boy)	<i>kuri</i> (girl)

Bhatia (1993: 166)

Masculine	Feminine
<i>kutta</i> (dog)	<i>billi</i> (cat)

(49a)

Shah (2015: 60)

Munda sakool gea e.

The boy has gone to school.

(49b)

Kuri ghar e.

The girl is at home.

(49c)

Shah (2015, p. 62)

Kutta wafadaar janwar e.

Dog is a faithful animal.

(49d)

Shah (2015; 59)

Billi nu vekho.

Cat.ms (acc.) see.pst.ms

'Look at the cat.'

(50)

Bhatia (1993, p. 172)

Some pairs make their feminine in an unorthodox way, but their morphosyntactic features and their values do not transcend the simple syntactic rules. For instance:

Masculine	Feminine
<i>mali</i> (gardener)	<i>aashaa</i> (hope)
<i>mochi</i> (shoemaker)	<i>dua</i> (prayer)

(51) Shah (2015, p. 60)

The Punjabi language holds a few examples of nouns that defy the set pattern or rule of gender. *Tobii* 'washerman' is a masculine noun, whereas *bhaen* 'sister' is denoted as a feminine value, but we cannot identify them as canonical gender features because they do not defy the simple syntactic rule. For example:

O aadmii tobii ai.

That man washerman is.

'That man is a washerman.'

(52a)

Bhatia (1993: 176)

Bhaen noon khat likh.

Write a letter to your sister.

(52b) Shah (2015, p. 64)

In Punjabi we have evidence for case and gender features in nouns. However, in English, the gender feature is restricted to Pronouns only (Arkadiev, 2010). Criterion 3, on the other hand, draws the distinction between the two systems, in which English is mostly canonical here and Punjabi obviously not.

4.9 Pseudo-Nouns

Bhatia (1993) is of the opinion that, other than performing the function of indicating case relationships, postpositions perform a wide variety of other syntactic and semantic functions. Their functions may range from those of adverbs and adverbial conjunctions to those of pseudo-nouns, as shown in the given examples:

O de kol kataab ai.

He gen.ms.obl. near book is.

'He has a book.'

(53a)

O de kolo kataab ai.

He gen.ms.obl near.inst. book is.

'He has a book.'

Lit. The book is in his proximity.

(53b)

(Bhatia 1993, p. 168)

In the above example, Bhatia (1993) opines that *kol* 'near/proximity of' is used as a compound postposition with a pseudo-head *kol* of a noun phrase with *O de* as a modifying postpositional phrase. The pseudo-head *kol* is followed by either the locative postposition *vice* 'in' or the instrumental postposition *to* 'from'. Compound postpositions take the following postpositions as their argument: (i) genitive *de*: *de vice* 'inside', *de saamNe* 'in front of'; (ii) instrumental/ablative *to*: *to piccho* 'after'.

Punjabi: almost all the morphosyntactic features are non-canonical except for the case. Thus, nouns normally take their subject in the oblique, ergative, accusative, instrumental, locative, genitive, and vocative forms with deviant syntactic conditions. For instance, the ergatives or case markers with *munda* 'boy' or *kataab* 'book', etc., along with the rare example of pseudo-nouns, do not admit to the syntactic rules and prove to be canonical only.

"Criterion 7: Canonical use of morphosyntactic features and their values does not admit semantic conditions." Arkadiev (2010, p. 12)

4.10 Semantic Functions

This criterion also helps to determine different inflections of nominal cases. Corbett is of the opinion that canonical morphosyntactic features and their values have nothing to do with semantics and morphosemantic features, but genuine morphosyntactic

features and their values are of more interest (Arkadiev, 2010). This criterion can be seen as relating to lexical semantics, which is not specific to lexeme.

This criterion postulates that 'mark the direct object with the accusative' instead of additional syntactic conditions. Bhatia (1993) describes that the direct object postposition is homophonous with the dative postposition in Punjabi. The accusative postposition is always used with direct object nouns referring to humans. Inanimate nouns, however, may optionally take the postposition, whereas human nouns obligatorily require *nu*. The use of the *nu* postposition with inanimates is motivated by their definite reference and also provides the extra meaning of the determinant 'the' with the human subjects. The use of the postposition *nu* is optional with non-human animate nouns. This juxtaposition of the form and meaning is non-canonical as shown in (54a-54c).

**Aadmi vekho.*

(54a)

Aadmi nu vekho.

man.m.s acc. See.pst.m.s

'Look at the man.'

(54b)

Billi nu vekho.

Cat.ms (acc.) see.pst.ms

'Look at the cat.'

(54c)

Bhatia (1993, p. 172)

4.11 Dative/Genitive Precedence

Bhatia (1993) postulates that direct object marking is sensitive to the presence of a subject. With dative verbs, postpositional marking with the subject takes precedence over accusative marking. Dominance and precedence are interrelated. This means that if something comes first, it dominates as well. In this case, dative case marking *nu* comes before the verb; thus, it occupies the space of accusative marking, e.g.,

Mai nu kurii pasand aaii.

I dat. girl.fs. choice come-pst.fs.

'I liked the girl.'

(55a)

**Mai nu kuRii nu pasand aaii.*

I dat. girl.fs. acc. choice come-pst.fs.

'I like the girl.'

(55b)

Bhatia (1993, p. 173)

With a few exceptions, other oblique subjects, like genitive, passive and dative subjects, exclude the marking of direct objects. For instance:

Surjiit de do muNDe ne.

Surjit gen.mp. two boys are

'Surjit has two boys.'

(56a)

**Surjiit de do muNDe nu ne.*

(56b)

Bhatia (1993, p. 173)

Thus, these examples cumulatively indicate that Punjabi nominal cases do admit to semantic conditions, hence, are non-canonical.

Bhatia (1993: 167) is of the view that case suffixes bring forth some morphophonemic changes in the stem of a noun. However, morphophonemic change alone cannot denote a case relationship. He further explains that the semantic content of postpositions is essentially similar to that of traditional case markers. They are not affixed to nouns. For instance, in transitive perfective sentences, the postposition *ne* occurs with the subject. With the exception of the genitive postposition *daa*, which is inflected for number, gender and case, the postpositions do not change. The content of instrumental/ablative and locative postpositions such as *to* 'from', *te* 'on/at', *nu*, 'to', and *vice* 'in' can be optionally conveyed by the case suffix *-ii*. This process is restricted to

nouns ending in a consonant, e.g., *hatth + ii = hatthii* 'by hand' *caakuu + ii = caakuuii* 'by knife' *kar + ii = kari* 'in the house'.

Postpositions are capable of expressing semantic functions i.e., beneficiary, volitionality, stativity, quality, etc. For instance, Bhatia holds that quality is expressed either by an adjective or by an adjective derived from a noun.

...xush aadmii...

happy man.ms.

'...a happy man...'

(57)

...sharam-iilii kuRii...

shame-with suf.fs. girl.fs.

'...a bashful girl...'

(58)

Bhatia (1993, p. 182)

The noun *sharm* 'shame' is changed semantically with *-iilii* inflection, providing a perfect example of non-canonically admitting to a semantic condition.

Punjabi: the choice of accusative case values with direct objects referring to humans and dative/genitive precedence cases are examples here. The instrumental/ablative and locative postpositions such as *to* 'from', *te* 'on/at', *nu*, 'to', and *vice* 'in' can be optionally conveyed by the case suffix *-ii*. This process is restricted to nouns ending in a consonant, e.g., *hatth + ii = hatthii*, 'by hand'.

"Criterion 8: Canonical use of morphosyntactic features and their values does not admit lexical conditions from the target (governee)." Arkadiev (2010, p. 12)

This criterion explores if there are any further lexical conditions once the case is marked. In canonicity, a governor needs a specific case value in order to play its role in syntax. For instance, in the following example (59b), the postposition *nu* is used as a base by the head word 'I', which not only changes the case value of *kataab* 'book' but also changes the gender value of the following verb *vekhia* 'look'. As it is changed into masculine from the feminine *vekhi* 'look'. In the same vein, *kuRii* is a feminine noun, but

it takes the masculine verb *vekhia* because of the postposition *nu*, providing an example of non-canonicity with further lexical conditions.

Mai kataab vekhi.

I book.f.s see.pst.f.s

'I saw a book.'

(59a)

Mai kataab nu vekhia.

I book.fs acc. see.pst.ms

'I saw the book.'

(59b)

(Bhatia 1993; 167)

Mai kuRii nu vekhiala.

I girl acc. see-pst.ms

'I saw a/the girl.'

(59c)

(Bhatia 1993, p. 88)

The instrumental/ablative case markings combined with nominal lexemes provide an excellent example against this criterion and prove to be non-canonical. According to Bhatia (1993, p. 167), case suffixes bring forth some morphophonemic changes in the stem of a noun. However, morphophonemic change alone cannot denote a case relationship. He further explains that the semantic content of postpositions is essentially similar to that of traditional case markers. They are not affixed to nouns. For instance, in transitive perfective sentences, the postposition *ne* occurs with the subject. With the exception of the genitive postposition *daa*, which is inflected for number, gender, and case, the postpositions are invariant. The content of instrumental/ablative and locative postpositions such as *to* 'from', *te* 'on/at', *nu*, 'to', and *vice* 'in' can be optionally conveyed by the case suffix *ii*. This process is restricted to nouns ending in a consonant, e.g., *hatth* + *ii* = *hatthii* 'by hand' *caakuu* + *ii* = *caakuuii* 'by knife' *kar* + *ii* = *karii* 'in the house'.

This criterion postulates that one can combine the lexical meaning of the lexeme with the grammatical meaning of the feature value in a compositional fashion. Bhatia (1993) describes that the direct object postposition is homophonous with the dative postposition in Punjabi. The accusative postposition is always used with direct object nouns referring to humans. Inanimate nouns may optionally take the postposition, whereas human nouns obligatorily require *nu*. The use of the *nu* postposition with inanimates is motivated by their definite reference and also provides extra meaning of the determinant 'the' with the human subjects. The use of the postposition *nu* is optional with non-human animate nouns. This juxtaposition of form and meaning is non-canonical.

**aadmi vekho.*

(60)

Aadmi nu vekho.

man.m.s acc. See.pst.m.s

'Look at the man.'

(61)

Billi nu vekho.

Cat.ms (acc.) see.pst.ms

'Look at the cat.'

(62) Bhatia (1993, p. 172)

Punjabi: under this latter interpretation, there are some case values that have many fully canonical uses. However, there are also several instances which are non-canonical in this respect. The main seven case values are largely non-canonical in this respect. Thus nouns normally take their subject in the oblique, ergative, accusative, instrumental, locative, genitive, and vocative forms with additional lexical conditions.

"Criterion 9: Canonical use of morphosyntactic features and their values does not admit additional lexical conditions from the controller (governor)."

Arkadiev (2010, p. 13)

Corbett holds that in the canonical situation, the additional conditions from the lexical items are mostly non-canonical (Arkadiev, 2010). This criterion considers the issue of lexical conditions while using canonical feature values. The canonical features

and their values do not change with different lexical items and remain the same. Punjabi lexical features, however, differ in their case markings, proving to be non-canonical. The idea is that in the canonical situation, the controller holds a single requirement that it governs the dative verb case. Additional conditions from this source are not canonical. The accusative postposition, for instance, is always used with direct object nouns referring to humans. Inanimate nouns may optionally take the postposition, whereas human nouns obligatorily require *nu*. The use of the *nu* postposition with inanimates is motivated by their definite reference. The use of the postposition *nu* is optional with non-human animate nouns. The *nu* postposition also provides the extra meaning of the determinant 'the' with the human subjects. Thus, the change in the lexical items also provides the variance in their feature values, which is non-canonical. Animate noun, i.e., *aadmii* 'man', must be in the accusative case; however, *billi* 'cat' can be in the direct case as well.

**Aadmi vekho.*

(63)

Aadmi nu vekho.

man.m.s acc. See.pst.m.s

'Look at the man.'

(64)

Billi nu vekho.

Cat.ms (acc.) see.pst.ms

'Look at the cat.'

(65)

Bhatia (1993, p. 172)

Thus, the above examples (63-65) prove this criterion wrong and demonstrate that Punjabi feature values do admit to additional lexical conditions from the controller (governor). When we change the lexical item *aadmii* 'man' with its counterpart *billi* 'cat', its case value changes.

Bhatia (1993) postulates that direct object marking is sensitive to the presence of a subject. With dative verbs, the postpositional marking with the subject takes precedence

over the accusative marking. Dominance and precedence are interrelated. This means that if something comes first, it dominates as well. In this case, dative case marking *nu* comes before the verb, occupying the space of accusative marking, e.g.,

Mai nu kurii pasand aaii.

I dat. girl.fs. choice come-pst.fs.

'I liked the girl.'

(66)

**Mai nu kuRii nu pasand aaii.*

I dat. girl.fs. acc. choice come-pst.fs.

'I like the girl.'

(67)

Bhatia (1993, p. 173)

Postpositions are capable of expressing semantic functions, i.e., beneficiary, volitionality, stativity, quality, etc. For instance, Bhatia holds that quality is expressed either by an adjective or by an adjective derived from a noun. A noun manipulates the adjective to be masculine or feminine depending on the gender of the noun and does admit to the additional lexical conditions from the controller (governor), i.e.,

...xush aadmii...

happy man.ms.

'...a happy man...'

(68)

...sharam-iilii kuRii...

shame-with, suf.fs. girl.fs.

'...a bashful girl...'

(69)

Bhatia (1993, p. 182)

The noun *sharm* 'shame' is changed semantically with the inflection *-iilii*, providing a perfect example of non-canonically admitting to a semantic condition. Bhatia

(1993) is of the opinion that the copular construction does not formally distinguish between defining, identity, and role types of complements, and the complement noun in each receives a nominative (simple) case with zero or no postposition, as exemplified below. The copular verb *ai* 'is' provides an excellent example of canonically not admitting to further lexical conditions. Hence, three different lexical items are represented canonically with the same verbal case, *ai* 'is':

Identity

O aadmii tobii ai.

That man washerman is.

'That man is a washerman.'

(70)

Role

O granthi ai.

He Granthi is.

'He is a Granthi.'

(71)

Defining

O janwar ai.

He animal is

'He is an animal.'

(72)

Bhatia (1993, p. 176)

Punjabi: the main case values are largely non-canonical in this respect, but there are also some instances of canonicity. The noun *kurii* 'girl' non-canonically manipulates the adjective *sharmiilii* 'shameful' to be feminine according to the gender of the noun, and does admit to the additional lexical conditions from the controller (governor). The copular construction, however, does not formally distinguish between the lexical nouns; each receives a nominative (simple) case with zero or no postposition, i.e., *tobii* 'washer man',

and *janwar* 'animal' do not change their value, thus canonically do not admit to the additional lexical conditions from the controller.

"Criterion 10: The use of canonical morphosyntactic features and their values is sufficient (they are independent)." Arkadiev (2010, p. 14)

This criterion holds that canonical features and their values are independent and can stand alone. In Punjabi, only one nominal case, such as direct, i.e., *munda* (boy), can stand alone, but none of the other cases can stand alone. For example:

CASES	NOUN	POSTPOSITION
Direct	<i>munda</i>	0
Oblique	<i>munde</i>	<i>ne</i> (ergative)
	<i>munde</i>	<i>nu</i> (accusative/dative)
	<i>munde</i>	<i>to</i> (instrumental)
	<i>munde</i>	<i>te</i> (locative)
	<i>munde</i>	<i>daa/de/dian</i> (genitive)
Vocative	<i>O/ve muNDiaa</i> (73)	

(Bhatia 1993, p. 165)

Bhatia (1993) postulates that direct object marking is sensitive to the presence of a subject. With dative verbs, the postpositional marking with the subject takes precedence over the accusative marking. Dominance and precedence are interrelated. This means that if something comes first, it dominates as well. In this case, dative case marking *nu* comes before the verb; thus, it occupies the space of accusative marking. Hence, it provides an excellent example of non-canonicity against the current criteria, e.g.,

Mai nu kurii pasand aaii.

I dat. girl.fs. choice come-pst.fs.

'I liked the girl.'

(74)

**Mai nu kuRii nu pasand aaii.*

I dat. girl.fs. acc. choice come-pst.fs.

'I like the girl.'

(75)

Bhatia (1993, p. 173)

Punjabi: all six of the main case values are non-canonical in this respect except the direct case, which can stand alone. The dative case can signal an indirect object. The dative verbal case, thus, is non-canonical in this respect since it can occur only together with a preposition.

"Principle III: Canonical morphosyntactic features and their values are expressed by canonical inflectional morphology." Arkadiev (2010, p. 14)

This principle deals with such lexical items that possess a different sort of non-canonicity. This principle, however, does not concern grammatical morphemes. For instance, the examples that show too little or too many distinctions fall under the heading of canonical inflectional morphology. This principle is concerned only with canonicity from the point of view of the lexeme. Here we take the perspective of the feature and its values, suggesting that a canonical feature will not be subject to the restrictions that we are considering. For instance:

Change bol bol. (Intransitive)

'Say good words/things.'

(76) Shah (1993, p. 98)

The above example provides an example of too many deviations, as the first *bol* 'words/things' is a noun and the second *bol* 'say' is a verb, but they both are the exact same lexemes, making it difficult for the foreign language learners to differentiate.

Punjabi: the expression of case is non-canonical morphology in many instances. However, they are not equally canonical. The canonical view, thus, gives a new view on the given data and focuses upon the differences between the main case values of Punjabi.

4.12 Conclusion

Therefore, the canonical approach for determining case feature values is essential since it not only considers canonical morphosyntactic features and their values but also verifies whether or not our case data fits into it. However, examination of data in Punjabi noun cases has exhibited that the inflectional morphemes of Punjabi are quite distinct

from those in English. This uniqueness not only lies in different forms of nouns but also in the concept of split ergativity and distinctive gender systems as well. The same forms in different situations and the changing values of Punjabi nominal cases make them very interesting. As a result, the dilemma of how to categorize them as distinct cases then emerges. For that purpose, the context in which where they occur must be considered. It is also interesting to know the behaviour of the Punjabi language while considering the gender value of nouns. The analysis of the data demonstrates how tradition rather than logic prevails in categorizing the nouns into masculine and feminine in the Punjabi language. The accusative postposition *nu*, for instance, in *Aadmi nu vekho*, 'Look at the man', makes the behaviour of the Punjabi language unusual. The nominal case values are not anywhere close to canonical against the criteria presented in the theoretical framework, as they are unable to inflect sometimes for number and other times for gender. Some other times, however, they do not have any inflections at all, thus called indeclinables, but they still occupy their syntactic place. Punjabi gender value is spread to the nominal case along with its pronominal counterpart. The study revealed that the Punjabi nominal inflections are quite non-canonical, not only in terms of gender but also in number and case indication. Punjabi nominal inflections also challenged the set pattern of canonicity by certain inflections, keeping in view their variety, which makes the attributes of the language more interesting. In addition, nominal inflections of Punjabi do not line up perfectly in terms of their morphological, syntactic and semantic functions and deviate from the set rule of canonicity.

CHAPTER 5 DATA ANALYSIS-II

VERBAL INFLECTIONS IN PUNJABI

5.1 Introduction

The chapter goes on to discuss case, tense, number, gender, compound verbs, double verbs, proverbs, topicalization, semantic functions, copular verbs, and objects governed by verbs. Agreeably to the previous chapter, this chapter presents a data analysis of Punjabi verbal inflections by using the theory of Canonical Morphosyntactic Features and Their Values presented by Greville G. Corbett (Arkadiev, 2010). This theory is used to manoeuvre the study, along with its three principles and ten criteria. Each principle and criterion originated from the set rule of canonicity and presented itself as a yardstick to measure the data against. The question of different cases is tackled by looking at the situation in which they occur. The data that matches the principle or criterion is acknowledged as canonical; however, the data that goes against it is categorized as non-canonical. In addition to determining case feature values in Punjabi, the canonical approach mixes up morphological features with their syntactic or semantic counterparts. Discernments have been drawn at the end depending on the behaviour of Punjabi and English.

Bhatia (1993:85) holds that Punjabi verbs have three categories: simple, conjunct, and compound verbs. The first category selects only one verbal root, as exemplified by examples (1) in this chapter, such as *aanda* 'comes'. The second category forms verbs predominantly by means of noun/adjective/pronoun/adverb plus *karnaa* 'to do' or *hoNaa* 'to be', e.g., *kamm* 'job/task'+ *karnaa* 'to do'- *kamm karnaa* 'to work'; *cangaa* 'good' *hoNaa* 'to be' - *cangaa hoNaa* 'to be recovered'. The third category uses a sequence of verbs.

The three principles and ten criteria presented in the theoretical framework of the study are as following:

"Principle I: Features and their values are clearly distinguished by formal means (and the clearer the formal means by which a feature or value is distinguished, the more canonical that feature or value)." Arkadiev (2010, p. 6)

Principle I covers four more specific criteria.

"**Criterion 1: Canonical features and their values have a dedicated form (are 'autonomous').**" Arkadiev (2010, p. 7)

5.2 Case

Zaliznjak (1973) and Corbett (2008) both hold that if there is a unique form of a lexeme, then its feature value is autonomous. This criterion postulates that the values of the canonical verbs are autonomous. Punjabi is loaded with autonomous forms.

5.2.1 Intransitive or Transitive Verbs

In general, subjects of simple intransitive or transitive verbs are not marked by any postposition. In such instances, subjects control the verb agreement; they are quite simple, providing an example of non-canonicity. For instance:

O aanda ai.

He come.prst.ms is (aux.)

'He comes.'

(1)

O kam kar rai ai.

She work doing.fs is (aux.)

'She is doing work/She is working.'

(2)

(Bhatia 1993, p. 168)

In addition to verb agreement, subjects demonstrate a number of other properties. Most simple transitive verbs require their subjects to be marked with the ergative/agentive postposition *ne* in the perfective tenses, which are quite canonical. The subjects of most intransitive verbs, on the other hand, lack any kind of postposition. In English, however, transitive is followed by an object, and intransitive does not require it. The following sentences can be provided as examples:

O ne kamm kiitaa. (Transitive Verb)

She erg. work.ms do.pst.ms

'She did the work.'

(3)

**O kamm kiita.*

He work.ms do.pst.ms

(4)

O kar gia. (Intransitive Verb)

He home.Dir.ms Go.pst.ms

'He went home.'

(5)

**O ne kar gia.*

(6)

Bhatia (1993, p. 169)

5.3 Tense

The canonical verbal morphosyntactic features and their values are easily distinguished. In their indication of person, number, gender, tense, and case, the canonical verbs like the nouns are easy to recognize and are autonomous. For instance, a clear indication of verb tense is presented in the following example (7).

Mai gariib aan. (Present Tense)

I poor am

'I am poor.'

(7)

(Shah 2015: 149)

Maen ghar saan/si. (Past Tense)

I was at home.

(8)

(Shah 2015: 96)

Raaje de chaar puttār sii. (Past Tense)

king gen.mp.pp four sons were.

'A king had four sons.'

(9)

(Shah 2015, p. 140)

MuNDaa te kuRii jaa rae san.

boy and girl go ing-mp were

'A boy and a girl were going.'

(9a)

(Shah 2015, p. 107)

O de karii naukar hunde sii.

he gen.mp several servant.mp be-prst.mp were

'He used to have several servants.'

(9b)

(Shah 2015, p. 147)

In example (7), *aan* (am) clearly indicates the present tense, whereas *saan/si* (was) is also easily recognizable as past tense verbs. *Saan* in example (8) is particular for plural subject indication, whereas *si* is confined to the singular subject. However, both are applicable here, one at a time. In the same vein, plural subject is indicated by the verb *si* in the example (9). This attribute makes it special and canonical. The tense indication is done here using auxiliaries as main verbs. The causative verbs, on the other hand, are difficult to understand for language learners.

O ne sach bolya. (Transitive)

'He spoke the truth.'

(10)

Maen ohde kolon sach bulwaya. (Causative)

I made him speak the truth.

(11)

(Shah 2015, p. 99)

In the examples (10–11), the causative verb *bulwaya* (made him speak) against the past intransitive verb *bolya* (spoke) is a canonical verb tense that is quite unique and

difficult to understand for a foreign speaker. They are canonical in these cases owing to their uniqueness.

5.4 Number

The first criterion states that the canonical verbs do pose some sort of ambiguity and are easily distinguished. However, the following verbs (12–13) from Shah (2015) are non-canonical according to their number.

O (munda) daftar si.

'That boy was at office.' (Singular)

(12)

O mazdoor san.

They were labourers. (Plural)

(13)

Shah (2015, p. 97)

In the examples (12–13), *si* 'was' is a singular past tense, whereas *san* 'were' is a plural past tense. The examples 13a–13b, however, do not adhere to the same plurality criterion.

Maen ghar saan/si.

I was at home. (Singular)

(13a)

Asi school wich saan/si.

I was at home. (Plural)

(13b)

(Shah 2015, p. 96)

The above examples (13a–13b) use the same *saan/si* for the past singular and plural case. This quality makes them canonical. The singular past tense is indicated by both *saan* plural and *si* singular, used one at a time.

5.5 Person

The verbs "am" and "are" are substituted with the same *aan* in the subsequent cases. These examples establish the canonical and distinctive person characteristic of the Punjabi verb *aan*, i.e.,

Maen daktar aan. (Present Tense)

I'm a doctor.

(14a)

Asi Pakistani aan.

We are Pakistanis.

(14b)

Toon kithe sein? (Past Tense)

Where were you?

(14c)

Tusi lok kithe sau?

Where were you guys?

(14d)

Shah (2015, p. 96)

The same 'were' is substituted by two different verbs in Punjabi: *sein* and *sau*. Here, second person singular form *sein* and plural form *sau* are substituted by the same 'were' in English. This unique 'person' feature makes the behaviour of Punjabi distinct from English.

Punjabi: some case values are clearly non-canonical in terms of criterion 1: as in *O anda ai*, (He comes.) while indicating verb tense. Other features, such as 'person' in Punjabi, are linked to uniqueness. Most simple transitive verbs are marked with an ergative preposition, which makes them canonical. Causative verbs are also examples of canonicity.

"Criterion 2: Canonical features and their values are uniquely distinguishable across other logically compatible features and their values."

Arkadiev (2010, p. 8)

Corbett holds that a canonical case possesses the same features and values throughout its class (Arkadiev, 2010). We can distinguish it by picking any combination. For instance, he explains that in languages like German, we see many syncretisms, i.e., to find out gender, we have to look at the singular forms. Canonical feature values are clearly distinguishable from their other counterparts.

5.6 Gender

This criterion states that a canonical case remains the same throughout while considering its features and their values. We can recognize it by selecting any of it. For instance, in Punjabi, there is a clear verb gender that is denoted after the subject, thus termed canonical, i.e.,

Kabootar der tak udya. (Masculine)

The pigeon flew for long.

(15)

Ohne gudi udai. (Feminine)

He flew the kite.

(16)

Shah (2015, p. 99)

In the above examples (15–16), a clear difference in verbal forms is shown in *udya* 'flew' and *udai* 'flew'. The preceding lexeme is masculine, whereas the subsequent is feminine. Note that in English, there is the same 'flew' verbal case against two different (gender-wise) Punjabi forms.

In Punjabi, there is a case of major variation where the verb *udya* 'flew' not only indicates the number feature but gender characteristic as well, i.e., *Kabootar der tak udya*, 'The pigeon flew for long.' *Ohne gudi udai*, 'He flew the kite' (Shah, 2015, p. 99). In the above examples (15–16), a clear difference in verbal forms is shown in *udya* 'flew' and *udai* 'flew'. The preceding lexeme is singular masculine, whereas the subsequent is singular feminine. Note that in English, there is the same 'flew' verbal case against two different (gender-wise) Punjabi forms. However, there are other examples that not only indicate number variation but gender divergence as well. For instance, the verb case, *gea* 'went', in *Munda gea* '(One) boy went', has singular and male features. However, *gae* in

Munde gae, 'Boys went', has not only male but plural characteristics. There are other examples that do not differentiate between masculine and feminine verbal forms, for instance:

Oh (kuri) kaun si?

'Who was that girl?'

(17)

Oh (munda) daftar si.

'That boy was at office.'

(18)

Shah (2015, pp. 96-97)

In the above examples (17–18), therefore, the same *si* 'was' is used to denote a feminine noun *kuri* 'girl' and a masculine noun *munda* 'boy'. This is non-canonical.

Punjabi: major case values are clearly non-canonical in terms of criterion 2: For instance, *udya* 'flew' and *udai* 'flew' are the same verb cases with different gender values. Likewise, a feminine noun *kuri* 'girl' as well as a masculine noun *munda* 'boy' have taken the same verb *si* 'was'. These examples have clearly distinguished them as non-canonical because they do not possess the same features and values.

"Criterion 3: Canonical features and their values are distinguished consistently across relevant word classes. The morphosyntactic features behave consistently throughout and do not deviate from the set criteria of canonicity."

Arkadiev (2010, p. 8)

5.6.1 Grammatical Gender

The languages of the world also differ in the way they cipher natural gender. English represents natural gender majorly through lexical items and via pronouns, i.e., boy takes 'he', whereas girl chooses 'she', and so on. However, there are languages that represent grammatical gender features with the help of inflectional morphemes, i.e., Spanish (Sera, Elieff, Forbes, Burch, Rodríguez, & Dubois, 2002). Punjabi can also be described as a "gender-loaded" language, as its gender feature is not only represented by nouns but verbs and adjectives as well (Shafiq & Iqbal, 2023). In agglutinative languages like Punjabi and English, there are a lot of inconsistencies in the use of inflections

indicating gender. In the case of Punjabi, the verbs have a grammatical gender; either they are male or female. This quality, however, is lacking in the English language. For instance, *madad* 'help' has no gender in English, but in Punjabi it is considered a female entity. *Intzaar* 'wait', on the other hand, is indicated by the masculine verb *kiitaa* 'do'. The point to note is that verbs such as *madad karnaa* 'to help' and *intzaar karnaa* 'to wait' select genitive objects, e.g.,

Mai o di madad kiitii.

I he gen.fs. help.fs. do-pst.fs.

'I helped him.' (Lit I did his help.)

(19a)

Mai o da intzaar kiitaa.

I he gen.ms. wait.ms.do-pst-ms.

'I waited for him.' (Lit. I did his waiting.)

(19b)

Bhatia (1993, p.175)

Consider the point that the feminine quality of *madad* 'help' forces us to take a feminine verb after it, i.e., *kiitii* 'do'. This attribute makes the Punjabi noun *madad* 'help' non-canonical.

5.7 Conjunct Verbs

This criterion states that a verbal case is canonical if its features and values remain the same throughout and it does not deviate from the set criteria of canonicity. The conjunct verbs, however, differentiate from the canonical verbs.

O jaanda ai.

He go.prst.ms is

'He goes.'

(20)

Bhatia (1993, p. 167)

In the above example (20), *jaanda* 'go' is a simple verb consisting of a base form and auxiliary *ai* 'is', which is quite canonical. In the examples (21a–21b), however, a noun and a verb are combined to form a verb case, which is not normal. It proves to be non-canonical.

foto khichna (to photograph)

(21a)

jhooth bolna (to tell a lie)

(21b)

Shah (2015, p. 100)

Bhatia (1993, p. 85) asserts that conjunct verbs consist of a noun/adjective/pronoun/adverb and *karnaa* 'to do' or *hoNaa* 'to be'. For instance, *kamm* 'job/task'+ *karnaa* 'to do' = *kamm karnaa* 'to work'; *cangaa* 'good' *hoNaa* 'to be' = *cangaa hoNaa* 'to be recovered'.

Punjabi: major case values are clearly non-canonical in terms of criterion 3. For instance, Punjabi verbs modify their gender according to their subject, which is not the case in English. The conjunct verbs are excellent examples of non-canonicity against this criterion. Some verb cases, however, prove to be canonical, i.e., *vekhi* 'saw'.

"Criterion 4: Canonical features and their values are distinguished consistently across lexemes within relevant word classes." Arkadiev (2010, p. 8)

5.8 Person

In canonical word class, each member behaves consistently not only in feature but in value as well. When they do not behave in the same way, they deviate in two different ways. The deviations can be in the feature or its value. It is evident that some of the features and their values are canonical against criterion 4, but most of the cases are non-canonical.

Maen daktar aan. (Present Tense)

I'm a doctor.

(22a)

Asi Pakistani aan.

We are Pakistanis.

(22b)

Toon kithe sein? (Past Tense)

Where were you?

(22c)

Tusi lok kithe sau?

Where were you guys?

(22d)

Shah (2015, p. 96)

The aforementioned instances in (22a) demonstrate that Punjabi verb cases adhere to the established canonical pattern, falling in line according to number and gender. The example (22b) exhibits that the same verb *aan* represents 1st person singular as well as plural values in Punjabi. Note that English has the singular form 'am' and the plural form 'are', respectively. In the example (22c-22d), there are two verb cases in Punjabi representing 2nd person singular and 2nd person plural. Keep in mind that the English language uses the same 'were' for both the 2nd person singular and the 2nd person plural. These are examples of non-canonicity against criterion 4, as all the other attributes are canonical except the person.

5.9 Tense

Corbett provides the example of Macedonian adjectives, in which 'number' is termed to be more canonical than the gender, as the restriction is found on gender only and not on the number (Arkadiev, 2010). Punjabi also contains this kind of variation. For instance:

Maen daktar aan.

I'm a doctor. (Present Tense)

(23a)

Maen ghar saan/si.

I was at home. (Past Tense)

(23b)

(Shah 2015, p. 96)

In the example (23a), *aan* (am) clearly indicates the present tense, whereas *saan/si* (were/was) are also easily recognizable as past tense verbs. However, *saan* is particular for plural subject indication, whereas *si* is confined to the singular subject. But here both can be used, one at a time. This attribute makes it non-canonical. This is a perfect example of non-canonicity against criterion 4, as all the other attributes are canonical except number. The behaviour of Punjabi can be quite similar to that of English; therefore, it proves to be quite canonical against this criterion. For instance:

Oh parhda ai.

He studies.

(24a)

Oh parhda si.

He studied.

(24b)

(Shah 2015, p. 106)

5.10 Compound Verbs

This criterion states that canonical features and their values remain consistent throughout their sub-classes. There are many canonical verbs that do not deviate from the simple syntactic rules, for instance:

Maen sochna. (Present Tense)

I think.

(25)

Shah (2015, p. 100)

In the above example, the verb is canonical as it provides an example of a simple verb comprising a base form. However, there are other verb cases that clearly deviate from the set canonical rules, such as compound verbs.

maar (kill) *sut(na)* (throw) kill

le (take) *le(na)* (take), take possession of

(26)

Shah (2015, p.101)

Bhatia (1993, p. 326) argues that compound verbs incorporate a sequence of two verbs essentially. The first verb in the sequence is called the 'main verb'. The second verb is variously referred to as an operator, auxiliary, reinforcer, vector, and explicator. The explicator verbs add specific abstract meanings to the meaning of the main verb. The primary meaning of the sentence is determined by the lexical meaning of the main verb. The explicator receives tense-aspectual marking. The example (27a) denotes a simple verb; however, the example (27b) is an illustration of a compound verb:

O aa giaa.

he come go-pst.m.s.

'He has already come.'

(27a)

gurjiit kaur bol baiThii.

Gurjit Kaur speak sit-pst.fs.

'Gurjit Kaur spoke inappropriately.'

(27b)

Bhatia (1993, p. 326)

The examples given above are only confined to the Punjabi language; English, on the other hand, does not have the combination of two verbs occurring simultaneously. Thus, they provide a perfect example of non-canonicity. This is a perfect example of non-canonicity against criterion 4, as all other attributes are canonical except the case.

Punjabi: the verbal case values are not anywhere close to canonical against this criterion, as they are unable to inflect sometimes for number and other times for gender. Some other times, however, they do not have any inflections, thus called indeclinables, but they do occupy their syntactic place. For instance, a subject with the attribute of singularity can take a singular as well as a plural verb, i.e., *saan/si*. However, compound verbs give us some striking examples of non-canonicity, i.e., *maar* (kill) *sut(na)* (throw) kill.

"Principle II: The use of canonical morphosyntactic features and their values is determined by simple syntactic rules." Arkadiev (2010, p. 10)

Corbett holds that the canonical verbs follow simple syntactic rules (Arkadiev, 2010). For instance, in the following examples (15–16), the verbal forms *udya* 'flew' and *udai* 'flew' follow the simple syntactic rules, taking their gender after the head nouns. The preceding lexeme is masculine, whereas the subsequent is feminine. Note that in English, there is the same 'flew' verbal case against two different (gender-wise) Punjabi forms.

Kabootar der tak udya. (Masculine)

The pigeon flew for long.

(28a)

Ohne gudi udai. (Feminine)

He flew the kite.

(28b)

Shah (2015, p. 99)

5.11 Proverbs

Punjabi verbs are quite canonical against this criteria, except the proverbs, for instance:

Kare koi; te bhare koi.

Someone does, another pays. (Proverb)

(29)

Shah (2015: 107)

O ne kamm kiitaa.

She erg. work.ms do.pst.ms

'She did the work.'

(30)

Bhatia (1993, p. 169)

In the first example (28), the verb *kare* 'does' non-canonically precedes the subject; however, in the second example (29), the verb *kiita* 'did' canonically follows the

subject *O ne* 'he'. Bhatia (1993) is of the opinion that the function of indicating case relationships, the postposition *nu*, performs a wide variety of other syntactic and semantic functions.

Mai pind giaa.

I village go-pst.ms

'I went to the village.'

(30a)

Bhatia (1993, p. 148)

However, in the above example (30a), *giaa* 'went' holds an example of following a simple syntactic rule. It provides an example of canonicity against this criterion. *Kardaa*, on the other hand, is not an example of canonicity considering its extra features of *piaa* 'lay down' and *sii* 'was'. One of the functions of the compound verb construction is to mark emphasis. The operator *paiNaa* 'to lie down' functions as an emphasis marker. Sentence (32) without the operator *piaa* is well formed but conveys a non-emphatic reading.

O kamm kardaa piaa sii.

he work do-prst.ms lay down-pst.ms was

'Indeed, he was working.'

Bhatia (1993: 148)

(31)

O kamm kardaa sii.

he work do-prst.ms was

'He was working/used to work.'

(32)

Bhatia (1993, p. 156)

Punjabi: here all the main verbal case values are found largely canonical, though again with these surprising divergences, as in the proverbial instance *Kare koi; te bhare koi*, 'Someone does, another pays', and compound verb constructions.

"Criterion 5: The use of canonical morphosyntactic features and their values is obligatory." Arkadiev (2010, p. 10)

Every Punjabi verb must be in some kind of case, even if there is no clear case marker. It is still referred to as a particular case with various values. In the process of causativization, for instance, the stem of the verb changes morphophonemically, and the stress is shifted to the second syllable, i.e.,

Stem	Causative
<i>vad</i> 'be increased'	<i>vadaa</i> 'increase'
<i>haT</i> 'be removed'	<i>hataa</i> 'remove'
<i>paR</i> 'study'	<i>paRaa</i> 'teach'

(33)

Bhatia (1993, p. 238)

The above examples (33) demonstrate that there is only a minor difference between the stem verb case *par* 'study' and the causative verb case *paraa* 'teach', but still they belong to two different cases with different values. The reason behind this is that the canonical morphosyntactic features and their values are obligatory. In the following example (34a), *aan* 'am' is used as an auxiliary, while *ai* 'is' is utilized as the helping verb in the example (34b). There is only a minor difference between *aan* 'am' and *ai* 'is', but they still hold their syntactic place.

Mai chaa banaa rai aan.

I tea make ing.fs am

'I am making tea.'

(34a)

(Bhatia 1993: 30)

O kamm kar rai ai.

she work do ing.fs is (aux.)

'She is working.'

(34b)

(Bhatia 1993, p. 168)

Considering the Punjabi verbal cases, however, most of the cases are canonical (having explicit case marking), but a few cases do not have any clear case marking. For instance, the following sentence comprises a verb case *bol* 'say', which is exactly like the nominal case *bol* 'word', thus providing 0 case marking. Despite this fact, this verbal intransitive case occupies its syntactic place.

Change bol bol. (Intransitive)

'Say good words/things.'

(34c)

Shah (1993, p. 98)

Punjabi: it is obvious that all the main case values are obligatory.

"Criterion 6: Canonical use of morphosyntactic features and their values does not admit syntactic conditions." Arkadiev (2010, p. 12)

5.12 Topicalization

This criterion employs a possible condition of word order or topicalization. Topicalization is defined as a transformation that changes the syntactic position of a word. In other words, changing the placement of a linguistic element at the beginning of a sentence is termed topicalization. Some Punjabi verbs are canonical and some are not against this criteria, but the proverbs surely are canonical in this respect, for instance:

Kare koi; te bhare koi.

Someone does, another pays. (Proverb)

(35a)

Shah (2015: 107)

O ne kamm kiitaa.

She erg. work.ms do.pst.ms

'She did the work.'

(35b)

Bhatia (1993, p. 169)

In the example (35a), the verb *kare* 'does' canonically precedes the subject; however, in the example (35b), the verb *kiita* 'did' follows the subject *O ne* 'he', thus complying with the rule of topicalization.

Corbett suggests that the cases can be semantically defined, but the rule of the government cannot refer to inflectional classes (Arkadiev, 2010). This criterion projects the idea that canonical morphosyntactic features and their values transcend syntactic rules. In Punjabi, the ergatives or case markers do not admit to the syntactic rules. The causative verbs do not follow the simple syntactic rules and therefore pose a threat to the language learners, i.e.,

One sach bolya.

'He spoke the truth.' (Intransitive)

(36)

Maen ohde kolon sach bulwaya.

I made him speak the truth. (Causative)

(37)

(Shah 2015, p. 99)

In these examples (36-37), the causative verb *bulwaya* (made him speak) against the past intransitive verb *bolya* (spoke) is a canonical verb tense as it does not admit to the simple syntactic rules. This phenomenon, therefore, is difficult to understand for a foreign speaker. Corbett holds that the canonical verbs do not necessarily follow syntactic rules (Arkadiev, 2010). Bhatia (1993) is of the opinion that other than performing the function of indicating case relationships, postpositions perform a wide variety of other syntactic and semantic functions, ranging from those of adverbs and adverbial conjunctions to pseudo-nouns.

For instance, Bhatia (1993) holds that the postposition, in addition to indicating case relationships, performs a wide variety of other syntactic and semantic functions. The following examples (38a-38b) project nominal case *kataab* 'book', taking a feminine verb case *vekhi* 'saw'. *Kataab nu*, on the other hand, takes the masculine verb case *vekhiia*; hence, the same noun takes a verb case with a different gender value, i.e.,

Mai kataab vekhi.

I book.f.s see.pst.f.s

'I saw a book.'

(38a)

Main kataab nu vekhiaa.

I book.f.s acc. See.pst.m.s

'I saw the book.'

(38b)

Bhatia (1993, p. 167)

Bhatia (1993) is of the opinion that subjects of simple intransitive or transitive verbs are not generally marked by any postposition. Other than verb agreement, subjects also exhibit a number of other properties. For instance, the simplest transitive verbs require their subjects to be marked with the ergative or agentive postposition *ne* in the perfective tenses. The subjects of most intransitive verbs do not require a *ne* postposition (Bhatia, 1993). In the Punjabi language, transitive verbs are normally canonical and present an excellent example of canonicity. On the contrary, intransitive verbs do admit to the syntactic rules. For instance, the verb *kiitaa* 'did' is proved to be a clear example of canonicity; *gia* 'went', on the other hand, is non-canonical.

O ne kamm kiitaa.

She erg. work.ms do.pst.ms

'She did the work.'

(39a)

**O kamm kiitaa.*

(39b)

O kar giaa.

He. home. go-pst.ms.

'He went home.'

(39c)

**O ne kar giaa.*

(39d)

Bhatia (1993, p. 169)

On the contrary, sometimes transitive verbs in Punjabi are non-canonical and intransitive verbs are canonical. For instance, transitive verbs, i.e., *bolnaa* 'to speak', and *launaa* 'to bring', do not require the postposition *ne* in the perfective tenses. However, intransitive verbs, i.e., *nicchnaa*, 'to sneeze', necessarily require it (Bhatia, 1993).

O ai bolii.

She. this speak-pst.ms.

'She spoke this.'

(40)

**O ne ai boliaa.*

(41)

O ne nicchiaa.

She. erg. sneeze-pst.ms.

'She sneezed.'

(42)

Bhatia (1993, p. 169)

5.13 Syntactic Functions

Postpositions are capable of expressing semantic functions ranging from agency to beneficiary, volitionality to stativity. Bhatia (1993: 175) opines that there are numerous particles, expressing a variety of meanings—inclusion, exclusion, contrast, and others—placed after either a noun or a noun phrase. However, they cannot be used exclusively to express the grammatical relationship of a noun phrase with other constituents in a sentence. He explains that verbs of communication take the regular *nu* postposition with their objects, whereas some verbs such as 'to demand', 'to seek', and 'to learn' require instrumental/ablative objects, e.g.,

Mai munde nu puchiaa.

I boy.obl. from ask.pst.ms

'I asked the boy.'

(43)

Mai munde to salaa mangii.

I boy from advice demand.pst.fs

'I sought the advice of the boy.'

(44)

Bhatia (1993, p. 175)

Hence, the above examples demonstrate the different verbal case markings, i.e., *nu/to*, and prove to be quite canonical against the given criteria.

Punjabi: the majority of cases are canonical in this respect, but some instances of non-canonicity are also found. Thus, the verb cases with postpositions *nu/to* provide examples of non-canonicity, i.e., *nu puchya* 'asked from' and *to sala mangi* 'sought the advice from'.

"Criterion 7: Canonical use of morphosyntactic features and their values does not admit semantic conditions." Arkadiev (2010, p. 12)

This criterion also helps to determine the different inflections of nominal and verbal cases. According to Corbett, genuine morphosyntactic features and their values are of more interest, while canonical morphosyntactic features and their values are irrelevant to semantics and morphosemantic features (Arkadiev, 2010). However, this criterion can be seen as relating to lexical semantics, which is not specific to lexeme.

This criterion postulates that 'mark the direct object with the accusative' instead of additional syntactic conditions. Bhatia (1993) describes that the direct object postposition is homophonous with the dative postposition in Punjabi. The accusative postposition is always used with direct object nouns referring to humans. Inanimate nouns may optionally take the postposition, whereas human nouns obligatorily require *nu*. The use of the *nu* postposition with inanimates is motivated by their definite reference. The use of the postposition *nu* is optional with non-human animate nouns. The *nu* postposition also provides the extra meaning of the determinant 'the' with the human subjects. This juxtaposition of form and meaning is non-canonical.

**Aadmi vekho.*

(45)

Aadmi nu vekho.

man.m.s acc. See.pst.m.s

'Look at the man.'

(46)

Billi nu vekho.

Cat.ms (acc.) see.pst.ms

'Look at the cat.'

(47)

Bhatia (1993, p. 172)

5.14 Dative/Genitive Precedence

Bhatia (1993) postulates that direct object marking is sensitive to the presence of a subject. With dative verbs, the postpositional marking with the subject takes precedence over the accusative marking. As dominance and precedence are interrelated, this means that if something comes first, it dominates as well. In this case, dative case marking *nu* comes before the verb; thus, it occupies the space of accusative marking, e.g.,

Mai nu kurii pasand aai.

I dat. girl.fs. choice come-pst.fs.

'I liked the girl.'

(48)

**Mai nu kuRii nu pasand aai.*

I dat. girl.fs. acc. choice come-pst.fs.

'I like the girl.'

(49)

Bhatia (1993, p. 173)

With a few exceptions, other oblique subjects, like genitive, passive, and dative subjects, exclude the marking of direct objects. For instance:

Surjiit de do muNDe ne.

Surjit gen.mp. two boys are

'Surjit has two boys.'

(50)

**Surjiit de do muNDe nu ne.*

(51)

Bhatia (1993, p. 173)

All these examples prove the fact that Punjabi nominal cases do admit to semantic conditions and, hence, are non-canonical.

According to Bhatia (1993, p. 167), case suffixes bring forward some morphophonemic changes in the stem of a noun. However, morphophonemic change alone cannot denote a case relationship. He further explains that the semantic content of postpositions is essentially similar to that of traditional case markers. They are not affixed to nouns. For instance, in transitive perfective sentences, the postposition *ne* occurs with the subject. With the exception of the genitive postposition *daa*, which is inflected for number, gender, and case, the postpositions do not change. The content of instrumental/ablative and locative postpositions such as *to* 'from', *te* 'on/at', *nu*, 'to', *and vice* 'in' can be optionally conveyed by the case suffix *-ii*. This process is restricted to nouns ending in a consonant, e.g., *hatth + ii = hatthii* 'by hand' *caakuu + ii = caakuuuii* 'by knife' *kar + ii = kariii* 'in the house'.

5.15 Semantic Function

Postpositions are capable of expressing semantic functions, i.e., beneficiary, volitionality, stativity, quality, etc. For instance, Bhatia believes that quality is expressed either by an adjective or by an adjective derived from a noun.

...xush aadmii...

happy man.ms.

'...a happy man...'

(52)

...sharam-iilii kuRii...

shame-with, suf.fs. girl.fs.

'...a bashful girl...'

(53)

Bhatia (1993, p. 182)

The noun *sharm* 'shame' is changed semantically with *-iili* inflection; thus, it provides a perfect example of non-canonically admitting to a semantic condition.

Punjabi: the choice of accusative case values with direct objects referring to humans and dative/genitive precedence cases are examples here. Similarly, instrumental/ablative and locative postpositions such as *to* 'from', *te* 'on/at', *nu*, 'to, and vice 'in' can be optionally conveyed by the case suffix *-ii*. This process is restricted to nouns ending in a consonant, e.g., *hatth + ii = hatthii*, 'by hand'.

"Criterion 8: Canonical use of morphosyntactic features and their values does not admit lexical conditions from the target (governee)." Arkadiev (2010, p. 12)

This criterion poses a question: if the case is marked, are there any further lexical conditions? In canonicity, a governor needs a specific case value in order to play its role in syntax. For instance, in the following example, the postposition *nu* is used as a base for the head word I, which not only changes the case value of *kataab* 'book' but also changes the gender value of the following verb *vekhia* 'look'. As it is changed into male from the feminine *vekhi* 'look'. Hence, provide an example of non-canonicity with further lexical conditions.

Mai kataab nu vekhia.

I book.fs acc. see.pst.ms

'I saw the book.'

(54)

(Bhatia 1993, p. 167)

The instrumental/ablative case markings combined with nominal lexemes provide an excellent example against this criterion and prove to be non-canonical. Bhatia (1993: 167) believes that case suffixes bring forth some morphophonemic changes in the stem of a noun. However, morphophonemic change alone cannot denote a case relationship. He further explains that the semantic content of postpositions is essentially similar to that of

traditional case markers. They are not affixed to nouns. For instance, in transitive perfective sentences, the postposition *ne* occurs with the subject. With the exception of the genitive postposition *daa*, which is inflected for number, gender, and case, the postpositions are invariant. The content of instrumental/ablative and locative postpositions such as *to* 'from', *te* 'on/at', *nu*, 'to, and vice 'in' can be optionally conveyed by the case suffix *ii*. This process is restricted to nouns ending in a consonant, e.g., *hatth* + *ii* = *hatthii* 'by hand' *caakuu* + *ii* = *caakuuuii* 'by knife' *kar* + *ii* = *karii* 'in the house'.

5.16 Copular Verbs

The complement of copular verbs appears in the nominative case (with 0 postposition). The unmarked position of the complement immediately precedes the copular verb. Bhatia (1993) is of the opinion that the copular construction does not formally distinguish between defining, identity, and role types of complements, and the complement noun in each receives a nominative (simple) case with zero or no postposition, as exemplified below. The copular verb *ai* 'is' provides an excellent example of canonically not admitting to further lexical conditions. Hence, three different lexical items are represented canonically with the same verbal case, *ai*, 'is'.

Identity

O aadmii tobii ai.

That man washerman is.

'That man is a washerman.'

(55)

Role

O granthi ai.

He Granthi is.

'He is a Granthi.'

(56)

Defining

O janwar ai.

He animal is

'He is an animal.'

(57)

Bhatia (1993, p. 176)

The complement of the three realizations of the copular verbs *hoNaa* 'to be', *ho jaauNaa* 'to become', and *baNnaa* 'to be made/to become' also appear in the nominative form at the preverbal position. Hence, three different lexical items are capable of appearing in the same syntactic situation without any further lexical conditions.

O raajaa hoiaa /ho giaa /baNiaa.

he king happen-pst.ms /be go-pst.ms/be made-pst.ms

'He became a king.'

(58)

Bhatia (1993, p. 176)

Compound verbs select the *ne* postposition with the perfective tenses only in the last of the following four conditions, i.e., the postposition is employed if both the main verb and the explicator verb select the *ne* postposition.

O ne xat likhkaa.

He erg. Letter write.pst.ms

'He wrote a letter.'

(59)

O ne xat likh littaa.

He erg. letter write. Take.pst.ms.

'He wrote the letter (for his own benefit).'

(60)

**O xat likh littaa.*

(61)

O xat likh baithkaa.

He letter write sit.pst.ms

'He wrote a letter (inadvertently).'

(62)

**O ne xat likh baithiaa.*

(63)

Bhatia (1993, p. 170)

The copular verbs, however, do provide an example of further lexical condition after marking the case with a *ne* postposition. The verb case *likh littā* 'has written' provides a meaning of perfective tense, which the simple past verb *likhiaa* 'wrote' does not.

This criterion postulates that one can combine the lexical meaning of the lexeme with the grammatical meaning of the feature value in a compositional fashion. Bhatia (1993) describes that the direct object postposition is homophonous with the dative postposition in Punjabi. The accusative postposition is always used with direct object nouns referring to humans. Inanimate nouns may optionally take the postposition, whereas human nouns obligatorily require *nu*. The use of the *nu* postposition with inanimates is motivated by their definite reference. The use of the postposition *nu* is optional with non-human animate nouns. The *nu* post position also provides the extra meaning of the determinant 'the' with the human subjects. This juxtaposition of form and meaning is non-canonical.

**Aadmi vekho.*

(64)

Aadmi nu vekho.

man.m.s acc. See.past.m.s

'Look at the man.'

(65)

Billi nu vekho.

Cat.ms (acc.) see.pst.ms

'Look at the cat.'

(66)

Bhatia (1993, p. 172)

Punjabi: under this latter interpretation, there are some case values that have many fully canonical uses. However, there are also several instances that are non-canonical in this respect.

"Criterion 9: Canonical use of morphosyntactic features and their values does not admit additional lexical conditions from the controller (governor)."

Arkadiev (2010, p. 13)

The idea is that in the canonical situation, the controller holds a single requirement. For instance, it governs the dative verb case. Additional conditions from this source are not canonical. Bhatia (1993) postulates that direct object marking is sensitive to the presence of a subject. With dative verbs, the postpositional marking with the subject takes precedence over the accusative marking. As dominance and precedence are interrelated, this means that if something comes first, it dominates as well. In this case, dative case marking *nu* comes before the verb; thus, it occupies the space of accusative marking, e.g.,

Mai nu kurii pasand aaii.

I dat. girl.fs. choice come-pst.fs.

'I liked the girl.'

(67)

**Mai nu kuRii nu pasand aaii.*

I dat. girl.fs. acc. choice come-pst.fs.

'I like the girl.'

(68)

Bhatia (1993, p. 173)

Corbett, however, holds that in the canonical situation, the additional conditions from the lexical items are mostly non-canonical (Arkadiev, 2010). This criterion considers the issue of lexical conditions while using canonical feature values. The canonical features and their values do not change with different lexical items and remain the same. Punjabi lexical features, however, differ in their case markings, thus proving to

be non-canonical. For instance, in the process of causativization, the stem of the verb changes morphophonemically, and the stress is shifted to the second syllable, i.e.,

Stem	Causative
<i>vad</i> 'be increased'	<i>vadaa</i> 'increase'
<i>haT</i> 'be removed'	<i>hataa</i> 'remove'
<i>paR</i> 'study'	<i>paRaa</i> 'teach'

(69)

Bhatia (1993, p. 238)

In the above example, thus, *vad* 'be increased' is a non-canonically different case with different case marking from its causative counterpart *vadaa* 'increase'.

5.17 Objects Governed by Verbs

While verbs of communication use the regular *nu* postposition with their objects, some verbs, such as 'to demand', 'to seek', and 'to learn', require instrumental or ablative objects, e.g.,

Mai munde nu puchiaa.

I boy.obl. from ask.pst.ms

'I asked the boy.'

(70)

Mai munde to salaa mangii.

I boy from advice demand.pst.fs

'I sought the advice of the boy.'

(71)

Bhatia (1993, p. 175)

The canonical features and their values do not change with different lexical items and remain the same. However, the above sentences exemplify different lexical items demonstrating various feature values, as when the verb *puchia* 'ask' is replaced with another lexical item *sala mangi*'seek advice', their gender value changes from masculine to feminine. Hence, prove it to be non-canonical.

However, verbs such as *madad karnaa* 'to help' and *intzaar karnaa* 'to wait' select genitive objects, but their values change with different lexical items. As *madad kiitii* 'to help' is a feminine verb, however, *intizar kiitaa* 'to wait' takes a masculine attribute, i.e.,

Mai O dii madad kiitii.

I he gen.fs help.fs do.pst.fs

'I helped him.'

(72)

Mai O da intizar kiitaa.

I he gen.ms wait.ms do.pst.ms

'I waited for him.' (Lit. I did his waiting.)

(73)

Bhatia (1993, p. 175)

There is a class of verbs in Punjabi that require their subjects to be marked with the dative postposition *nu*. This class includes psychological predicates such as *gussaa hoNaa*, 'to be angry'; *pukkh lagNaa*, 'to feel hungry'; and non-volitional verbs such as *suNaaii deuNaa*, 'to hear'.

Saa nu gussaa aiaa.

We.obl. dat. anger.ms come.pst.ms

'We became angry.'

(74)

Tuaa nu shor sunaaii ditaa.

you.obl. dat. noise.ms. hear give.pst.ms

'You heard the noise.'

(75)

Bhatia (1993, p. 170)

Punjabi: some case values are majorly non-canonical in this respect, but a few examples of canonicity are also found. The canonical verb features and their values do not change with different lexical items and remain the same. The verb case *vad* 'be

increased' changes its values when replaced with its lexical counterpart and causative verb *vadaa* 'increase', hence proving to be non-canonical. The verbs normally take their subject in the nominative, irrespective of polarity. Some verbs, however, can have a genitive subject, i.e., the verb *pasand* 'like' takes the dative preceding case marking.

"Criterion 10: The use of canonical morphosyntactic features and their values is sufficient (they are independent)." Arkadiev (2010, p. 14)

This criterion holds that canonical features and their values are independent and can stand alone. In general, subjects of simple intransitive or transitive verbs are not marked by any postposition. In such instances, subjects control the verb agreement; they can stand alone, providing an example of canonicity. For instance:

O aanda ai.

He come.prst.ms is (aux.)

'He comes.'

(76)

O kam kar raii ai.

She work doing.fs is (aux.)

'She is doing work/She is working.'

(77)

(Bhatia 1993, p. 168)

In addition to verb agreement, subjects demonstrate a number of other properties. Most simple transitive verbs require their subjects to be marked with the ergative/agentive postposition *ne* in the perfective tenses, which are quite non-canonical. The subjects of most intransitive verbs, on the other hand, lack any kind of postposition. In English, however, transitive is followed by an object, and intransitive does not require it. The following sentences can be provided as examples:

O ne kamm kiitaa.

She erg. work.ms do.pst.ms

'She did the work.'

(78)

**O kamm kiita.*

He work.ms do.pst.ms

(79)

Bhatia (1993, p. 169)

Bhatia (1993) postulates that direct object marking is sensitive to the presence of a subject. With dative verbs, the postpositional marking with the subject takes precedence over the accusative marking. Dominance and precedence are interrelated. This means that if something comes first, it dominates as well. In this case, dative case marking *nu* comes before the verb; thus, it occupies the space of accusative marking, hence providing an excellent example of non-canonicity against the current criteria, e.g.,

Mai nu kurii pasand aaii.

I dat. girl.fs. choice come-pst.fs.

'I liked the girl.'

(80)

**Mai nu kuRii nu pasand aaii.*

I dat. girl.fs. acc. choice come-pst.fs.

'I like the girl.'

(81)

Bhatia (1993, p. 173)

Punjabi: the main case values are largely non-canonical in this respect, but there are also some instances of canonicity. The dative verbal case, thus, is non-canonical in this respect, since it can occur only together with a preposition.

"Principle III: Canonical morphosyntactic features and their values are expressed by canonical inflectional morphology." Arkadiev (2010, p. 14)

This principle deals with such lexical items that possess a different sort of non-canonicity. This principle, however, does not concern grammatical morphemes. For instance, the examples that show too little or too many distinctions fall under the heading of canonical inflectional morphology. This principle is concerned with canonicity from the point of view of the lexeme. Here, the perspective of the feature and its values is

taken, suggesting that a canonical feature is not subject to the restrictions that are being considered. For instance:

Change bol bol. (Intransitive)

'Say good words/things.'

(82)

Shah (1993, p. 98)

The above example provides an example of too many deviations, as the first *bol* 'words/things' is a noun and the second *bol* 'say' is a verb, but they both are the exact same lexemes, making it difficult for the foreign language learners to distinguish the two. This principle, however, covers too little deviations in the lexical items. Corbett mentions the Macedonian adjectives that distinguish the number non-canonically but leave out the gender (Arkadiev, 2010). Such a deviation is termed too little deviation.

Maen daktar aan.

I'm a doctor. (Present Tense)

(83)

Maen ghar saan/si.

I was at home. (Past Tense)

(84)

(Shah 2015, p. 96)

In this example, *aan* (am) clearly indicates the present tense, whereas *saan/si* (were/was) are also easily recognizable as past tense verbs. However, *saan* is particular for plural subject indication, whereas *si* is confined to the singular subject. But here both can be used, one at a time. This attribute makes it non-canonical. This is a perfect example of too little deviation, as all other attributes are canonical except number.

The complement of copular verbs, however, also provides an example of too little deviation when it appears in the nominative case (with 0 postposition). The unmarked position of the complement immediately precedes the copular verb. The copular construction does not formally distinguish between defining, identity, and role types of

complements, and the complement noun in each receives a nominative (simple) case with zero or no postposition, as exemplified below.

O aadmii tobii ai.

That man washerman is.

'That man is a washerman.'

(85)

O granthi ai.

He Granthi is.

'He is a Granthi.'

(86)

O janwar ai.

He animal is

'He is an animal.'

(87)

Bhatia (1993, p. 176)

The compound verbs select the *ne* postposition with the perfective tenses only in conditions like the following, i.e., the postposition is employed if both the main verb and the explicator verb select the *ne* postposition.

O ne xat likhkaa.

He erg. Letter write.pst.ms

'He wrote a letter.'

(88)

O ne xat likh littaa.

He erg. letter write. Take.pst.ms.

'He wrote the letter (for his own benefit).'

(89)

**O xat likh littaa.*

(90)

O xat likh baithiaa.

He letter write sit.pst.ms

'He wrote a letter (inadvertently).'

(91)

**O ne xat likh baithiaa.*

(92)

Bhatia (1993, p. 170)

In the above examples, the past perfective tense takes the *-ne* postposition only if both the main verb and helping verb allow it; otherwise, it is ungrammatical. Hence, provide an excellent example of too much of the non-canonical distinction.

Punjabi: the expression of case is non-canonical morphology in many instances. However, they are not equally canonical. The canonical view, thus, gives a new view on the given data, and focuses upon the differences between the main case values of Punjabi.

5.18 Conclusion

Therefore, the data analysis of Punjabi verbs exhibited that the inflectional morphemes of Punjabi are quite unique as compared to their English counterparts. This uniqueness not only lies in different forms of verbs but also in the concept of split ergativity and distinctive gender systems as well. Unlike English, Punjabi gender value is spread to verbal forms. The transitive verbs, for instance, require their subjects to be marked with the ergative/agentive postposition *ne* to fall in the category of transitive verb, and vice versa, i.e., *O ne kamm kiitaa*, 'She did the work'. In English, however, transitive is followed by an object, and intransitive does not require it. The analysis of the data determined that the Punjabi verbal inflections not only defied the set pattern of canonicity keeping in view not only the number, gender, and person, but the conjunct, compound, and causative verbs have demonstrated further variety, which made the attributes of the language more fascinating. The data analysis manifests some interesting facts about the behaviour of the Punjabi language. The conjunct verbs, on the one hand, employ another part of speech to make the verb, i.e., *kamm karnaa* 'to work', *cangaa hoNaa* 'to be recovered', etc. The compound verbs, on the other hand, essentially incorporate a

sequence of two verbs. The first verb in the sequence is the 'main verb'. The second verb is referred to as an auxiliary or explicator, which adds specific abstract meaning to the meaning of the main verb. The primary meaning of the sentence is determined by the lexical meaning of the main verb, i.e., *O aa gaaa*. 'He has already come'. In addition, verbal inflections do not line up perfectly in terms of their morphological, syntactic, and semantic functions.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

This study conducted a comparative study of inflectional morphemes in Punjabi and English. This chapter concludes the dissertation by answering the research questions of the study. Recommendations are also provided at the end as to which inflectional morphemes should be included in the curriculum.

6.1 Findings: What are the similar and variant nominal and verbal inflections in Punjabi and English languages?

By using the sample and data analysis procedure, the study comes to the conclusion that nominal and verbal inflections in Punjabi are largely different from their English equivalents. The canonical principles and criteria (Arkadiev, 2010) demonstrate loads of differences between the two languages, along with a few similarities.

6.1.1 Noun

It can be concluded that nouns in Punjabi have more inflections than English nouns, and that a single inflection in Punjabi may show more than one function in a single construction, whereas English nouns show only one function. The postposition *nu* performs multiple functions in Punjabi.

6.1.1.1 Number

The Punjabi nominal inflections are quite unique, with some exceptions. For instance, some nouns make their plurals in a unique fashion, i.e., they have the same singular and plural forms. However, their English counterparts are simply made plurals by adding the *-s/es* inflection at the end, with some exceptions, hence not being very autonomous. A few Punjabi nouns are always used in plural, thus deviating from the set rule of canonicity. It is important to remember that there are no equivalents available in this regard in the English language. Nonetheless, there are certain commonalities between the nominal instances of the two languages. Some nouns, for instance, imply the simple rule of plurality.

6.1.1.2 Case

The study explores that Punjabi is a split ergative language except for the direct case with no case marking. All the other cases in the Punjabi noun paradigm take either

postposition marking, i.e., *ne, nu, to, te, daa, de, dian*, or there is a preposition marking, as in, vocative *o/ve*, except the direct case. English 'boy', however, does not involve any sort of ambiguity in its case marking except for using the -s inflection as in plural case 'boys' or an apostrophe -'s.

6.1.1.3 Gender

The study describes that there are only two genders in Punjabi: masculine and feminine. Masculine singular nouns mostly end in /a/ or /h/ and feminine in /i/. We can identify them as canonical gender features. However, their English equivalents do not always imply the simple rule of making feminine. But the Punjabi language holds attributes that make it non-canonical, as few examples of nouns defy the set pattern of canonicity, representing feminine with /a/ and masculine with /i/. Their English versions, however, neither belong to the masculine nor feminine categories. In Punjabi, there is evidence for case and gender features in nouns. Punjabi nouns have a grammatical gender; either they are male or female. This quality, however, is lacking in the English language, where grammatical gender is restricted to pronouns only.

6.1.2 Noun

The study concludes that the verbs in Punjabi differentiate from the verbs in English. The conjunct verbs in Punjabi employ another part of speech to make the verb, i.e., *kamm karnaa* 'to work', etc. The compound verbs, however, essentially incorporate a sequence of two verbs.

6.1.2.1 Case

a) Transitive/Intransitive

In addition to verb agreement, the study realizes that subjects demonstrate a number of other properties. Most simple transitive verbs require their subjects to be marked with the ergative/agentive postposition *ne* in the perfective tenses, which are examples of uniqueness. The subjects of most intransitive verbs have no *ne* postposition. In English, transitive is followed by an object, and intransitive does not require it.

b) Conjunct / Compound Verbs

The study describes that the conjunct verbs in Punjabi differ from the verbs in English. When a noun and a verb are combined to form a verb, this is not normal and proves to be non-canonical and different from its English counterpart. English verbs do not possess this quality. The compound verbs essentially incorporate a sequence of two

verbs. The first verb in the sequence is called the 'main verb'. The second verb is termed an auxiliary or explicator verb, which adds specific abstract meaning to the meaning of the main verb. English verbs, however, do not possess this quality.

6.1.2.2 Tense

The study reveals that in terms of tense indication, Punjabi verbs behave rather similarly to English verbs. In Punjabi, tense indication is done using auxiliaries as main verbs. The present tense is indicated with *aan* (am). The verbal instances in Punjabi do not follow the same rule of plurality as both *si* 'was' and *saan* 'were' can be used interchangeably as past verbs. The causative verbs, on the other hand, are difficult to understand for language learners. The causative verbs are quite different from its English equivalents and are difficult to understand for a foreign speaker.

6.1.2.3 Number

The study uncovers that the canonical verbs do pose ambiguity and are not easily distinguished. The verbal instances in Punjabi do not follow the same rule of plurality as both *si* 'was' and *saan* 'were' can be used interchangeably as past verbs. This attribute makes them different from their English equivalents.

6.1.2.4 Gender

The study finds a clear difference in verbal forms as shown in *udya* 'flew' and *udai* 'flew'. The preceding lexeme is masculine, whereas the subsequent is feminine. Note that in English, there is the same 'flew' verbal case against two different (gender-wise) Punjabi forms. In the case of Punjabi, the verbs have a natural gender; either they are male or female. This quality, however, is lacking in the English language. There are other examples that do not differentiate between masculine and feminine verbal forms; for instance, the past verb *si* 'was' can be used with both masculine and feminine subjects. The same *si* 'was' denotes a feminine noun *kuri* 'girl' and a masculine noun *munda* 'boy'. Their English substitute 'was' can also be used for these subjects.

6.2 Findings: How does morphology of Punjabi and English behave while considering the nominal and verbal morphosyntactic features?

While using this sample and data analysis procedure, the study comes to the conclusion that the morphological behaviour of Punjabi and English nominal and verbal morphosyntactic features bears a lot of dissimilarities.

6.2.1 Noun

The Punjabi morphosyntactic features and their values transcend the simple syntactic and semantic rules. The ergatives or case markers do not admit to the syntactic rules, i.e., inanimate nouns in Punjabi usually do not take the accusative postposition *nu*, whereas animate objects require it. Therefore, allowing the inflection *nu* to play a dual role in Punjabi morphology.

6.2.1.1 Number

The Punjabi nominal inflections are quite unique, with some exceptions. Some nouns in Punjabi are simply constructed in terms of their plural forms, whereas others take a distinctive approach to making their plurals. The study describes that the Punjabi language uses declension. Nouns are declined according to their gender, class, and the phonological properties of their final segments. Three primary patterns of nominal declension in Majhi are identified by the analysis: the first ends with *-aa*; the second ends with *non-aa*; and the third is a feminine noun. The declension of these cases demonstrates non-canonicity as they change their inflections against each category. However, in English, their equivalents are made plural quite canonically with the simple inflection *-s*.

Considering the Punjabi nominal cases, most of the cases have explicit endings, but a few cases do not have any clear case marking. Despite this fact, these nominal cases occupy their syntactic place. In Majhi, some nouns ending with *non-aa*, have the same singular and plural forms. Hence, they belong to particular cases, even if there is no clear case marking. However, sometimes the morphology of both languages behaves in the same manner by employing the simple rule of plurality.

6.2.1.2 Case

Punjabi cases are highly interesting due to their dynamic behavior. Using the criteria, it is discovered that Punjabi case values vary significantly. The vocative case in Punjabi is distinguished by the markers *-oe/ve* and *-nii* that precede a noun. The postpositions, i.e., *nu*, *ne*, *to*, *te*, etc., at the end of the other cases, like accusative, ergative, instrumental, etc., make their behaviour equally unique. Inanimate nouns may optionally take the postposition *nu*, whereas human nouns obligatorily require it. The use of the *nu* postposition with inanimates is motivated by their definite reference. In this way, a single inflection in Punjabi may show more than one function in a single constructions but English nouns mostly show only one function. This juxtaposition of form and meaning is irregular. The ergatives or other case markers along with the rare

example of pseudo-nouns, do not admit to the syntactic rules and illustrate a dissimilar behaviour. These characteristics distinguish between the morphology of Punjabi and English.

6.2.1.3 Gender

In the case of Punjabi, the nouns have a natural gender; either they are male or female. This quality is lacking in the English language. The point to consider is that the masculine/feminine quality of Punjabi nouns forces us to take a masculine/feminine verbs after it. This attribute makes the behaviour of Punjabi morphology quite dissimilar from English. Moreover, the objects in Punjabi are traditionally separated into male and female. These examples demonstrate how tradition rather than logic prevails in categorizing the nouns into masculine and feminine in the Punjabi language. Such nouns show the divergent behaviour of two altogether different languages.

6.2.2 Verb

The examination of verb data in Punjabi demonstrates that the morphology of Punjabi verbs behaves considerably different from that of English. This uniqueness not only lies in different forms of verbs but also in the concept of split ergativity and distinctive gender systems as well.

6.2.2.1 Case

It is evident from the analysis of data that some of the features and their values in Punjabi are similar to those in English, but most of the cases are dissimilar. Consequently, the Punjabi language's behavior differs from that of English. Both major and little variations are possible. In Punjabi, there is a case of major variation where the verb *udya* 'flew' not only indicates the number feature but gender characteristic as well. In this example, a clear difference in verbal forms is shown in *udya* 'flew' and *udai* 'flew'. The preceding lexeme is singular masculine, whereas the subsequent is singular feminine. The study provides the Punjabi verbs, in which the number is termed to be more canonical than the gender, as the restriction is found on gender only and not on the number. In the example, *aan* (am) clearly indicates the present tense, whereas *saan/si* (were/was) are also easily recognizable as past tense verbs. However, *saan* is particular for plural subject indication, whereas *si* is confined to the singular subject. But here both can be used, one at a time. This is a perfect example of non-canonicity against English, as all other attributes are canonical except number.

The Punjabi verbs have three categories: simple, conjunct, and compound verbs. The first category selects only one verbal root. Most simple transitive verbs require their subjects to be marked with the ergative/agentive postposition *ne* in the perfective tenses, which are examples of uniqueness. The subjects of most intransitive verbs have no *ne* postposition. In English, however, transitive is followed by an object, and intransitive does not require it. Considering the Punjabi verbal cases, most of the cases have explicit case markings, but a few cases, i.e., direct case do not have any clear case marking.

The causative verbs are difficult to understand for language learners. Their uniqueness in such cases makes them different from their English counterparts.

6.2.2.2 Person

The morphology of Punjabi verbs behaves differently while considering the person feature. The same *aan* stands for the first person singular "am" and first person plural "are". Similarly, two different second-person singular and plural forms *sein* and *sau* are substituted with the same 'were'. These examples establish the distinctive person characteristics of the Punjabi verbs *aan*, *sein*, and *sau*. This unique person feature makes the behaviour of Punjabi distinct from English.

6.2.2.3 Tense

The study reveals that in terms of tense indication, Punjabi verbs behave rather similarly to English verbs. As *aan* (am) clearly indicates the present tense, whereas *saan/si* (were, was) is also easily recognizable as past tense verbs. *Saan* is particular for plural subject indication, whereas *si* is confined to the singular subject. But both can be used, one at a time. This attribute makes it special. The tense indication is done using auxiliaries as main verbs. Note that where English uses simple verbs to indicate the meaning, Punjabi utilizes two verbs (the main verb and auxiliary verb), i.e., *Oh parhda ai*, 'He studies', and *Oh parhda si*, 'He studied'.

6.2.2.4 Number

The study uncovers that the Punjabi morphology behaves differently when considering verbs, as they do pose some sort of ambiguity. The verbs *si* and *saan* are canonical according to their number. *Si* 'was' is a singular past tense, whereas *saan* 'were' is a plural past tense. However, instances like *Maen ghar saan/si*, 'I was at home', do not follow the same rule of plurality as both *si* 'was' and *saan* 'were' can be used

interchangeably as past verbs. The morphology of Punjabi is significantly different from that of English due to this feature.

6.2.2.5 Gender

In Punjabi, there is a clear verb gender that is denoted after the subject. Note that in English, verbs have no connection with gender features. However, there are other examples that do not differentiate between masculine and feminine verbal forms. The past verb *si* 'was' can be used with both masculine and feminine subjects. However, the same *si* 'was' is used to denote a feminine and masculine noun. This is non-canonical. The study describes that, when considering gender features, the morphology of Punjabi does not react in the same manner. Some nominal cases follow a simple syntactic rule, along with their verbal counterparts which is perfectly aligned with their subjects. However, other cases along with their verbal counterparts are not an example of canonicity considering the extra feature of case *nu*. Note that, because of this extra feature, the gender value is changed from feminine to masculine or vice versa. The nouns and verbs in Punjabi have a natural gender, either male or female. This quality, however, is nowhere to be found in the morphology of the English language.

6.3 Findings: How do the behaviours of canonical nouns and verbs in Punjabi and English line up perfectly in their morphological, syntactic, and semantic structures?

The study comes to the conclusion that the behaviours of canonical nouns and verbs in Punjabi do not line up perfectly in their semantic, syntactic, and morphological structures.

6.3.1 Morphology

The study realizes that Punjabi deviates from the set rule of canonicity as compared to English. While considering the Punjabi nominal and verbal cases, most of the cases are canonical (having explicit case marking), but a few cases do not have any clear case marking. The bare stem, however, is not considered outside the case system. The simplest of the Punjabi nominal cases proved to be not so simple. The reason behind this is that the canonical morphosyntactic features and their values, in Punjabi, do not line up perfectly with respect to morphology. This is proven when the situation in which they occur is considered. In a canonical word class, each member behaves consistently not only in feature but in value as well. When they do not behave in the same way, they

deviate in two different ways. The deviations can be in the feature or its value. It is evident that, in Punjabi, some of the features and their values are canonical against the set criteria, but most of the cases are non-canonical. This research explores the different values of features. Punjabi morphology exhibits unique behavior when taking into account its number, gender, and person features and their values.

However, in English, the number, gender, and person features and their values are canonical. This study draws the distinction between the two systems, in which English is mostly canonical here and Punjabi obviously not.

6.3.2 Syntax

The study finds that canonical morphosyntactic features and their values in Punjabi transcend simple syntactic rules. The syntax is detected to be irregular. The nouns and verbs normally do not follow the simple syntactic rules except in the direct case. Punjabi nouns are inflected for number, gender, and case, however, verbs show variation in number, gender, person and case. In Punjabi, the ergatives or case markers do not admit to the syntactic rules. Inanimate nouns usually do not use the accusative postposition *nu*, whereas animate objects require it. The function of *nu* with inanimate nouns is that of a definitizer. The example *Main kataab nu vekhiala*, 'I saw the book.' denotes an accusative case of the *kataab* (book), thus providing a clear example of non-canonicity with the help of its inflection *nu*. The study explores that a possible condition of word order or topicalization is at play in Punjabi. The placement of a linguistic element at the beginning of a sentence is termed topicalization, i.e., *ni kurie* 'O girl'. The study explores if the case is marked, and if so, are there any further lexical conditions? In canonicity, a governor needs a specific case value in order to play its role in syntax. The postposition *nu* is used as a base by the head word 'I', which not only changes the case value of *kataab* 'book' but also changes the gender value of the following verb *vekhiala* 'look'. As it is changed into male from the feminine *vekhi* 'look'. Hence, provide an example of non-canonicity with further lexical conditions. In addition, subjects in Punjabi are canonical if they appear before their verbal counterparts, but Punjabi proverbs prove to be quite non-canonical against this criteria. Postpositions are capable of expressing syntactic and semantic functions. A number of particles, expressing a variety of meanings—inclusion, exclusion, contrast, and others—are employed after either a noun or a noun phrase. However, they cannot be used exclusively to express the grammatical

relationship of a noun phrase with other constituents in a sentence. However, English nouns and verbs follow the simple syntactic rule.

6.3.3 Semantics

This study probes into lexical semantics that is not specific to lexeme. The direct object marking is semantically sensitive to the presence of a subject. With dative verbs, the postpositional marking with the subject takes precedence over the accusative marking. As dominance and precedence are interrelated, therefore, if something comes first, it dominates as well. In this case, dative case marking *nu* comes before the verb; thus, it occupies the space of accusative marking, i.e., *Mai nu kurii pasand aaii*, 'I liked the girl', is grammatical; however, **Mai nu kuRii nu pasand aaii*, 'I like the girl', is grammatically incorrect. This proves the fact that canonical nouns do not perfectly line up semantically as well.

The study describes that case suffixes bring forth some morphophonemic changes in the stem of a noun. However, morphophonemic change alone cannot denote a case relationship. The semantic content of postpositions is essentially similar to that of traditional case markers. They are not affixed to nouns. In transitive perfective sentences, the postposition *ne* occurs with the subject. With the exception of the genitive postposition *daa*, which is inflected for number, gender, and case, the postpositions do not change. The postpositions are capable of expressing semantic functions. The quality is expressed either by an adjective or by an adjective derived from a noun. The noun *sharm* 'shame' is changed semantically with *-iilii* inflection in the phrase *sharam-iilii kuRii* 'a bashful girl', thus providing a perfect example of non-canonically admitting to semantic condition. The choice of accusative case values with direct objects referring to humans and dative/genitive precedence cases are examples here. The instrumental/ablative and locative postpositions such as *to* 'from', *te* 'on/at', *nu*, 'to', and *vice* 'in' can be optionally conveyed by the case suffix *-ii*. This process is restricted to nouns ending in a consonant, e.g., *hatth + ii = hatthii*, 'by hand'. The majority of case values in Punjabi are largely non-canonical in this respect, but some instances of canonicity are also found. Thus, nouns normally take their subject in the oblique, ergative, accusative, instrumental, locative, genitive, and vocative forms with additional lexical conditions. The postpositions in Punjabi nominal inflections are perfectly capable of expressing semantic functions. For instance, a number of postpositions, i.e., *nu*, *ne*, *to*, *te*, etc., indicate a variety of different meanings. These postpositions are employed after a noun or a noun

phrase, and they cannot stand alone. Hence, Punjabi nominal inflections do not perfectly line up morphologically, syntactically, and semantically.

6.4 Recommendations

The Punjabi lexemes that do not have any clear inflections and deviate from the set pattern of canonicity should be included in the curriculum in order to solve the issue of ambiguity in Punjabi and English, i.e., *Rukh* 'tree', *Rah* 'way', *Peke*, 'married girl's parental home', etc. The text book writers should allocate more teaching and learning time to the differently constructed morphemes of Punjabi, i.e., *ne*, *nu*, *to*, *te*, *daa*, *de*, *dian*, *o*, or *ve*, in comparison with their English equivalents. They should also take into account complex, compound, and causative verbs that pose threat to language learners. Language learners, translators, teachers, and course designers should allocate more time to the different behaviour of the Punjabi language that is nowhere to be found in English. In addition, future researchers can explore other aspects of Punjabi morphology. They should also take into account the morphological, structural, and semantic features as the most important aspects of Punjabi morphological behaviour.

6.5 Conclusion

This dissertation describes that inflectional classes are a basic notion in morphology, though occasionally their existence is challenged. The canonical approach provides a touch of novelty in the indication of inflectional morphemes. This approach not only allows the study to conduct a morphological analysis but also to further evaluate the terms by considering their context as well. And, finally, certain rules can be deduced with the help of the found data. This approach proves to be helpful in tackling a range of topics, particularly morphology, syntax, and semantics, thus specifying canonical and non-canonical inflectional classes with the help of empirical data. The research on how to establish case values in Punjabi and English made progress in this study. Though Punjabi is an agglutinative language that is rich in its inflections, it also possesses a large number of complex case system.

By analysing the data, the study comes to the conclusion that inflectional morphemes in Punjabi are quite unique as compared to their English counterparts. This uniqueness not only lies in different forms of nouns and verbs but also in the concept of split ergativity and distinctive gender systems as well. The analysis of the data determines that the Punjabi nominal inflections prove to be quite non-canonical not only in terms of

gender but number and case indication as well. The study concludes that nouns in Punjabi have more inflections than English nouns; and that a single inflection in Punjabi may show more than one function in a single constructions but English nouns mostly show only one function. Punjabi verbal inflections also defy the set pattern of canonicity with certain inflections, keeping in view the number, gender, and person. The complex, compound, and causative verbs demonstrate further variety, which makes the attributes of the Punjabi language more interesting. The study also comes to the conclusion that the morphological behaviour of Punjabi and English nominal and verbal features bears a lot of dissimilarities. The Punjabi morphosyntactic features and their values transcend the simple syntactic and semantic rules. The ergatives or case markers do not admit to the syntactic rules, i.e., inanimate nouns in Punjabi usually do not take the accusative postposition *nu*, whereas animate objects require it. The inflectional morphemes of Punjabi and English are explicitly explained, incorporating the ambiguities in the two very differently constructed languages. The analysis of the study concludes that Punjabi is very rich in inflections like French, Italian, and Spanish in comparison with English. In addition, this study draws the distinction between the two systems, in which English is mostly canonical here and Punjabi obviously not.

REFERENCES

- Abbi, A. (1985). Reduplicative Structures: A Phenomenon of the South Asian Linguistic Area. *Oceanic Linguistics Special Publications*, 20, 159–171. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20006719>
- Akhtar, R. Nasim, 1999. *Aspectual Complex Predicates in Punjabi*. Department of Language and Linguistics, University of Essex. https://books.google.com.pk/books/about/Aspectual_Complex_Predicates_in_Punjabi.html?id=43FQNwAACAAJ&redir_esc=y
- Akhtar, R. N. (1997). Affix-s (uu) constructions in Punjabi. *Essex Graduate Student Papers in Language and Linguistics*, 1.
- Akhtar, R. N. (2000). *Aspectual complex predicates in Punjabi* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Essex).
- ‘Alī Shāh, Ş. (2015). *Punjabi Grammar*. National University of Sciences and Technology. <https://opac.nust.edu.pk/cgi-bin/koha/opac-detail.pl?biblionumber=26919>
- Arkadiev, P. M. (2010). Case and grammatical relations: Studies in honor of Bernard Comrie. *Language*, 86(2), 416-428. <https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.0.0204>.
- Anwar, B., & Rasool, S. (2021). A Word-and-Paradigm Analysis of Pluralization of Nouns in Rangri. *Kashmir Journal of Language Research*, 24(1). <http://kjlr.pk/index.php/kjlr/article/view/148/86>
- Anwar, N. ., Mangrio, R. A. ., & Malik, M. A. (2021). Exploring the infixation in the Punjabi language: Insights into derivational and inflectional morphology. *Competitive Linguistic Research Journal*, 3(1). Retrieved from <https://clrjournal.com/ojs/index.php/clrjournal/article/view/17>
- Aronoff, M., & Fudeman, K. (2022). *What is morphology?*. John Wiley & Sons. <https://www.wiley.com/en-be/What+is+Morphology%3F%2C+3rd+Edition-p-9781119715221>
- Audring, J., & Masini, F. (Eds.). (2019). *The Oxford handbook of morphological theory*. Oxford University Press. DOI:[10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199668984.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199668984.001.0001)

- Austin, P., & Bresnan, J. (1996). Non-configurationality in Australian Aboriginal languages. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 215-268. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00133684>
- Baerman, M., Brown, D., & Corbett, G. G. (2005). *The syntax-morphology interface: A study of syncretism* (No. 109). Cambridge University Press. DOI:[10.1017/CBO9780511486234](https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511486234)
- Bailey, T. G. (1956). *Teach Yourself Urdu*. New York: David McKay Company. <https://archive.org/details/teachyourselfurd0000thom/page/n5/mode/2up>
- Barz, R. K. (1977). *An introduction to Hindī and Urdū*. Faculty of Asian Studies, Australian National University. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2054339>
- Bauer, L. (2003). The phonotactics of some English morphology. *Take Danish for Instance. Linguistic studies in honour of Hans Basbøll presented on the occasion of his 60th birthday*, 12. <https://www.wgtn.ac.nz/lals/about/staff/Publications/Bauer-Phonotactics.pdf>
- Bickel, B., & Nichols, J. (2001, February). Syntactic ergativity in light verb complements. In *Proceedings of the annual meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (Vol. 27, pp. 39-52). Berkeley Linguistics Society. <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-76605>
- Brown, D., Chumakina, M., & Corbett, G. G. (Eds.). (2013). *Canonical morphology and syntax*. Oxford University Press. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Dunstan-Brown/publication/265236325_Canonical_Morphology_and_Syntax/links/561ebb6e08aecd0552/Canonical-Morphology-and-Syntax.pdf
- Brown, D., Corbett, G., & Kibort, A. (2007) Canonical Typology: a prerequisite to substantive interoperability. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Anna-Kibort/publication/237282202_Canonical_Typology_a_prerequisite_to_substantive_interoperability/links/546f3f580cf2d67fc03103db/Canonical-Typology-a-prerequisite-to-substantive-interoperability.pdf
- Brown, K., & Ogilvie, S. (2010). *Concise encyclopedia of languages of the world*. Elsevier. <file:///E:/ACADEMICS/Thesis/Concise%20Encyclopedia%20of%20Languages%20of%20the%20World.pdf>

- Bhatia, Tej K., 1993. *Punjabi: a cognitive-descriptive grammar*. Routledge, ISBN 9780415003209. https://books.google.com.pk/books/about/Punjabi.html?id=WzkOAAAAQAAJ&redir_esc=y
- Bhatia, T. K., & Koul, A. (2000). *Colloquial Urdu: the complete course for beginners*. Psychology Press. https://books.google.com.pk/books/about/Colloquial_Urdu.html?id=HkPwaXWipVcC&redir_esc=y
- Booij, G. (2007). Construction morphology and the lexicon. *Selected proceedings of the 5th Décebrettes: Morphology in Toulouse*, 34-44. <http://www.lingref.com/cpp/decemb/5/paper1613.pdf>
- Booij, G. (2012). *The grammar of words: An introduction to linguistic morphology*. Oxford University Press. <https://research.vu.nl/en/publications/the-grammar-of-words-an-introduction-to-linguistic-morphology>
- Brown, K., & Ogilvie, S. (2010). *Concise encyclopedia of languages of the world*. Elsevier. https://books.google.com.pk/books/about/Concise_Encyclopedia_of_Languages_of_the.html?id=F2SRqDzB50wC&redir_esc=y
- Bhardwaj, M., & Bhardwaj, M. R. (1995). *Colloquial Panjabi: a complete language course*. Psychology Press. https://books.google.com.pk/books/about/Colloquial_Panjabi.html?id=8XRWjwEACAAJ&redir_esc=y
- Bansal, G., Ahuja, S. P., & Sharma, S. K. (2011). Improving existing punjabi morphological analyzer. *Research Cell: An International Journal of Engineering Sciences*, 5. <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=c2a36ee4a9666b97af7703883e9b202828a568af>
- Butt, M., & Geuder, W. (2001). On the (semi) lexical status of light verbs. *Semilexical Categories: On the content of function words and the function of content words*, 323-370. DOI:[10.1515/9783110874006.323](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110874006.323)
- Butt, M. (2017). 'Hindi/Urdu and related languages', *The Oxford Handbook of Ergativity*, OxfordHandbooks, <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198739371.013.33>, accessed 24 Apr. 2024.
- Butt, M. (1995). *The structure of complex predicates in Urdu*. Center for the Study of Language (CSLI). <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Miriam-Butt/publication>

- [/35519351 The Structure of Complex Predicates in Urdu/links/00b7d51821ca2efbcc000000/The-Structure-of-Complex-Predicates-in-Urdu.pdf](#)
- Bond, O. (2019). Canonical typology. *The Oxford handbook of morphological theory*, 409-431. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-031120-115118>
- Bresnan, J., & Mchombo, S. A. (1987). Topic, pronoun, and agreement in Chicheŵa. *Language*, 741-782. <https://doi.org/10.2307/415717>
- Bresnan, J. (2001). Explaining morphosyntactic competition. *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*, 10-44. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/book/10.1002/9780470756416#page=20>
- Bukhari, N. (2009). A Comparative Study of Gojri Double Verb Constructions. *Language in India*, 9(1). <http://www.languageinindia.com/jan2009/doubleverbgojri.pdf>
- Butt, M. (2007). The role of pronominal suffixes in Punjabi. *Architecture, rules, and preferences*, 341-368. <https://ling.sprachwiss.uni-konstanz.de/pages/home/butt/main/papers/final-punjabi.pdf>
- Chomsky, N., & Lasnik, H. (2008). The theory of principles and parameters. In *I. Halbband* (pp. 506-569). De Gruyter Mouton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110095869.1.9.506>
- Clark, A. (2001, July). Learning morphology with pair hidden markov models. In *ACL (Companion Volume)* (pp. 55-60). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/2531635_Learning_Morphology_with_Pair_Hidden_Markov_Models
- Corbett, G. G. (2009). Canonical inflectional classes. In *Selected proceedings of the 6th Décebrettes: Morphology in Bordeaux* (pp. 1-11). <http://www.lingref.com/cpp/decemb/6/paper2231.pdf>
- Corbett, G. G. (2013). *The expression of gender* (p. 230). De Gruyter. <https://library.oapen.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.12657/24641/1005470.pdf#page=93>
- Cormier, K., Schembri, A., & Woll, B. (2013). Pronouns and pointing in sign languages. *Lingua*, 137, 230-247. 10.1016/j.lingua.2013.09.010. DOI:[10.1016/j.lingua.2013.09.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2013.09.010)
- Campbell, G. L. (1991). *Compendium of the World's Languages*. London: Routledge. <https://archive.org/details/concisecompendiu0000camp>

- Comrie, B., Traugott, E. C., Meulen, A. T., Reilly, J. S., & Ferguson, C. A. (1986). CONDITIONALS: A TYPOLOGY. In *On Conditionals* (pp. 77–100). chapter, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://books.google.com.pk/books/about/Conditionals.html?id=hnYNngEACAAJ&redir_esc=y
- Comrie, B. (1989). *Language universals and linguistic typology: Syntax and morphology*. University of Chicago press. https://books.google.com.pk/books/about/Language_Universals_and_Linguistic_Typol.html?id=kf-shTfcaPEC&redir_esc=y
- Comrie, B. (1991). On the importance of Arabic for general linguistic theory. *Perspectives on Arabic linguistics*, 3, 3-30. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.80.04com>
- Comrie, B. (2003). 14 Reconstruction, typology and reality. *Motives for language change*, 243. <https://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/samples/cam033/2002067362.pdf>
- Corbett, Greville. 1995. Agreement. In *Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, ed. Joachim Jacobs, Arnim von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld, and Theo Vennemann. 1235–1244. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Corbett, G., & Comrie, B. (2003). *The Slavonic Languages*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781136861376>
- Corbett, Greville G. 2005. The canonical approach in typology. In: Zygmunt Frajzyngier, Adam Hodges and David S. Rood (eds) *Linguistic Diversity and Language Theories*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 25-49. https://www.academia.edu/746875/The_canonical_approach_in_typology
- Corbett, Greville G. 2006. Agreement. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://www.academia.edu/1395482/Agreement>
- Corbett, G. G. (2006). Gender, grammatical. *Encyclopedia of language & linguistics*, 749-756. https://www.academia.edu/7955345/Grammatical_gender
- Corbett, G. G. (2007). Canonical typology, suppletion, and possible words. *Language*, 8-42. DOI: [10.1353/lan.2007.0006](https://doi.org/10.1353/lan.2007.0006)
- Corbett, G. G. (2008). Determining morphosyntactic feature values. *Case and grammatical relations: Studies in honor of Bernard Comrie*, 1-34. <https://www.torrossa.com/en/resources/an/5002213#page=12>

- Corbett, G. (2012). Canonical morphosyntactic features. *Canonical morphology and syntax*, 48-65. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199604326.003.0003>
- Corbett, G. G. (2015). Morphosyntactic complexity: A typology of lexical splits. *Language*, 145-193. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24672223>
- Cormier, K., Schembri, A., & Woll, B. (2013). Pronouns and pointing in sign languages. *Lingua*, 137, 230-247. DOI:[10.1016/j.lingua.2013.09.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2013.09.010)
- Crystal, D. (Ed.). (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (6th ed.). USA, UK, Australia: Blackwell Publishing. https://www.academia.edu/12585111/A_Dictionary_of_Linguistics_and_Phonetics_6th_Edition_David_Crystal_2008
- Cysouw, M. (2011). The expression of person and number: A typologist's perspective. *Morphology*, 21, 419-443. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11525-010-9170-5>
- David, A., Maxwell, M., Browne, E., & Lynn, N. (2009). Urdu morphology. *Maryland: Centre for Advanced Study of Language, University of Maryland*. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/153776959.pdf>
- Fedden, S., & Corbett, G. G. (2017). Gender and classifiers in concurrent systems: Refining the typology of nominal classification. *Glossa*, 2(1), 1-47. <https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.177>
- Ferguson, C. A. (1970). The Ethiopian language area. *Journal of Ethiopian Studies*, 8(2), 67-80. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41965809>
- Gast, V. (2013). Contrastive analysis. *línea*. <http://www.personal.uni-jena.de/~mu65qev/papdf/CA.pdf>. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.48181/jelts.v3i2.9628>
- Givón, T., & Li, C. (1976). Topic, pronoun and grammatical agreement in subject and topic. *Subject and topic*, 1551-188. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283429797_Topic_pronoun_and_grammatical_agreement
- Hardie, A. (2004). *The computational analysis of morphosyntactic categories in Urdu* (Doctoral dissertation, Lancaster University). <https://eprints.lancs.ac.uk/id/eprint/106/>

- Haspelmath, M. (2003). The geometry of grammatical meaning: Semantic maps and cross-linguistic comparison. In *The new psychology of language* (pp. 217-248). Psychology Press. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/27266359-The-geometry-of-grammatical-meaning-Semantic-maps-and-cross-linguistic-comparison>
- Hawkins, J. (1986). *A Comparative Typology of English and German: Unifying the Contrasts*. London: Croom Helm. <https://archive.org/details/comparativetypol0000hawk/page/n7/mode/2up>
- Hawkins, J. (1992). A performance approach to English/German contrasts. In Mair and Markus, 115—136.
- Hawkins, J. (1994). *A Performance Theory of Order and Constituency*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://lib-cat.trin.cam.ac.uk/Record/8c3afc4b-57b2-4000-bd35-1155d187043e>
- Hawkins, J. (2004). *Efficiency and Complexity in Grammars*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://academic.oup.com/book/2598>
- Haugen, E. (1950). The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing. *Language*, 26(2), 210–231. <https://doi.org/10.2307/410058>
- Hussain, K. G. (2018). Nominal Markers in Punjabi. *Hayatian Journal of Linguistics and Literature*, 2(1), 46-57. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Arshad-Mahmood-31/publication/371990077_Hayatian_Journal_of_Linguistics_and_Literature_UO_G/links/64a27029b9ed6874a5f23951/Hayatian-Journal-of-Linguistics-and-Literature-UOG.pdf#page=48
- Hussain, A., Abbas, G., & Bashir, M. (2024). Comparative Study of Noun Inflections and Their Functions in English and Astori Dialect of Shina Language: A Morphological Analysis. *Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review*, 8(1), 261-267. [https://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2024\(8-1\)23](https://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2024(8-1)23)
- Humayoun, M., & Ranta, A. (2010, November). Developing Punjabi morphology, corpus and lexicon. In *Proceedings of the 24th Pacific Asia conference on language, information and computation* (pp. 163-172). <https://aclanthology.org/Y10-1020.pdf>

- Iqbal, M. (2016). The Morphology of Punjabi Noun: An OT Analysis. A thesis submitted to University of Gujrat, Gujrat.
- Javed, S. T., Hussain, S., Maqbool, A., Asloob, S., Jamil, S., & Moin, H. (2010). Segmentation free nastalique urdu ocr. *World Academy of Science, Engineering and Technology*, 46, 456-461. <https://cle.org.pk/Publication/papers/2010/segmentation%20free%20nastalique%20Urdu%20OCR.pdf>
- Jamshaid, S., & Akhtar, R. N. (2021). Exocentric Compounds in English and Punjabi: A Morpho-Semantic Analysis of NN Formations. *Journal of Communication and Cultural Trends*, 3(1), 87-106. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/353159594_Exocentric_Compounds_in_English_and_Punjabi_A_MorphoSemantic_Analysis_of_NN_Formations
- James, C. (2005). Eric Hawkins: A tribute on your ninetieth birthday. *Language Awareness*, 14(2-3), 80-81. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09658410508668824>
- Josiah, U. E., & Udoudom, J. C. (2012). Morphophonemic Analysis of Inflectional Morphemes in English and Ibibio Nouns: Implications for Linguistic Studies. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 1(2), 72-81. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/jel.v1n2p72>
- Kachru, Y. (1990). Experiencer and other oblique subjects in Hindi. *Experiencer subjects in South Asian languages*, 59-75. https://books.google.com.pk/books/about/Experiencer_Subjects_in_South_Asian_Lang.html?id=XCarNNGmOMYC&redir_esc=y
- Kar, S. (2009). The syllable structure of Bangla in Optimality Theory and its application to the analysis of verbal inflectional paradigms in Distributed Morphology (Doctoral dissertation, Universität Tübingen). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/242690986_The_syllable_structure_of_Bangla_in_Optimality_Theory_and_its_application_to_the_analysis_of_verbal_inflectional_paradigms_in_Distributed_Morphology
- Kaur, M., GNE, L., Kaur, N., & SLIET, L. (2012). Development and Analysis of Hindi-Urdu Parallel Corpus. *International Journal of Computing and Corporate Research*, 2. <http://www.ijccr.com>

- Kazemian, B., & Hashemi, S. (2014). A Contrastive Linguistic Analysis of Inflectional Bound Morphemes of English, Azerbaijani and Persian Languages: A Comparative Study. *Journal of Education & Human Development*, 3(1), 593-614. Website: www.aripd.org/jehd
- Khanam, T., & Hussain, S. (2017). Development of Noun Inflectional Morphology in Children Acquiring Urdu and Punjabi. *Journal of Research (Urdu)*, 32. <https://www.cle.org.pk/Publication/papers/2018/Development%20of%20Noun%20Inflectional%20Morphology%20in%20Children%20Acquiring%20Urdu%20and%20Punjabi.pdf>
- Khan, A.R., Kausar, G. (2017). A gender based study of request speech act realization patterns of Punjabi speakers. *Journal of Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Research*, vol. 6(2) <https://tehqeeqat.org/english/articleDetails/25761>
- Kibort, A., & Corbett, G. G. (2008). Grammatical Features Inventory: Number. University of Surrey. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15126/SMG.18/1.02>
- Kibort, A., & Corbett, G. G. (Eds.). (2010). *Features: Perspectives on a key notion in linguistics*. Oxford University Press. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/263334574_Kibort_Anna_Greville_G_Corbett_eds_2010_Features_Perspectives_on_a_key_notion_in_linguistics
- König, E., & Gast, V. (2009). *Understanding English-German Contrasts* (Vol. 29). Erich Schmidt. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/325796110_Understanding_English-german_Contrasts_4th_edition
- Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers*. Univ of Michigan Pr. <https://archive.org/details/linguisticsacros0000lado>
- Lamberts, J. J. (1972). *A Short Introduction to English Usage*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Lewis, M. Paul, Gary F. Simons & Charles D. Fennig (eds.). 2016. *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*, 19th edn. Dallas, Texas: SIL International.
- Leech, G. (2006). *Glossary of English grammar*. Edinburgh University Press. <https://anekawarnapendidikan.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/a-glossary-of-english-grammar-by-geoffrey-leech.pdf>

- Lieber, R., & Štekauer, P. (Eds.). (2014). *The Oxford handbook of derivational morphology*. Oxford University Press, USA. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/319875020_The_Oxford_handbook_of_derivational_morphology_ed_by_Rochelle_Lieber_Pavol_Stekauer
- Luraghi, S. (2016). The dative of agent in Indo-European languages. *STUF - Language Typology and Universals*, 69(1), 15-47. <https://doi.org/10.1515/stuf-2016-0002>
- Magier, D. S. (1983). Topics in the Grammar of Marwari. A thesis submitted to University of California, Berkeley. <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/91q8z6pt>
- Mair, C. (2005). Book review: A handbook of varieties of English: A multimedia reference tool. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 33(4), 381-389. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/249700227_Book_Review_A_Handbook_of_Varieties_of_English_A_Multimedia_Reference_Tool
- Mangrio, R. A. (2016). *The Morphology of Loanwords in Urdu: The Persian, Arabic and English Strands*. New Castle: Cambridge Scholars Publishers. <https://www.cambridgescholars.com/resources/pdfs/978-1-4438-7162-4-sample.pdf>
- McGregor, RS (1972) *Outline of Hindi grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. <https://dn790006.ca.archive.org/0/items/OutlineOfHindiGrammar/12.outlineOfHindiGrammarWithExercises.pdf>
- Mcgregor, R S, *Outline of Hindi Grammar* (Oxford, 1995; online edn, Oxford Academic, 31 Oct. 2023), <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198700074.001.0001>, accessed 21 Apr. 2024.
- Muhabat, F. (2016). Exocentric Compounds in Punjabi: An OT Analysis. A thesis submitted to University of Gujrat. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/353159594_Exocentric_Compounds_in_English_and_Punjabi_A_MorphoSemantic_Analysis_of_NN_Formations
- Nasim R. A. (1992). *Punjabi Compounds: A Structural and Semantic Study*. Unpublished M. Litt. Dissertation. University of Strathclyde.
- Noor, M., Mangrio, R. A., & Anwar, B. (2019) Morphology of Persian Loan Nouns in Punjabi. <https://uog.edu.pk/downloads/journal/X/15.pdf>

- Noor, D. M., Mangrio, R. A., & Iqbal, M. (2015). Reduplication in Punjabi: A Morpho-Semantic Phenomenon. *Journal for Studies in Management and Planning*, 1(3). https://www.researchgate.net/publication/274837267_Reduplication_in_Punjabi_a_Morpho-Semantic_Phenomenon
- Novotna, J. (2000). Reduplication in Swahili. *Afrikanische Arbeitspapiere*, 64, 57-73. <https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/document?repid=rep1&type=pdf&doi=80aefbbdd8b87aee6e8e783d8d8e7cb98fbd55e>
- Palancar, E. L. (2015). A mixed system of agreement in the suffix classes of Lealao Chinantec. *Morphology*, 25, 29-62. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11525-014-9252-x>
- Pink, M. A., & Thomas, S. E. (1970). *English Grammar Composition and Correspondence*. London: Cassel and Company Ltd.
- Plag, I. (2002). The role of selectional restrictions, phonotactics and parsing in constraining suffix ordering in English. *Yearbook of morphology 2001*, 285-314. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-017-3726-5_11
- Polinsky, M. (2003). Non-canonical agreement is canonical. *Transactions of the philological society*, 101(2), 279-312. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-968X.00120>
- Rahman, G. (2016). A Comparative Study of Pashto and English Consonants. *Pashto*, 45, 11-27. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/312609250_A_Comparative_Study_of_Pashto_and_English_Consonants
- Ranjan, R. (2013). Teaching strategies of grammatical gender in L2 Hindi/Urdu. *Journal of Second Language Acquisition and Teaching*, 20, 1-19. <https://journals.uair.arizona.edu/index.php/AZSLAT/article/view/21219/20800>
- Ramasamy, M. D. (2011). Topics in the morphophonology of standard spoken Tamil (SST): an optimality theoretic study. <http://hdl.handle.net/10443/1221>
- Roach, P. (2009). *English phonetics and phonology paperback with audio CDs (2): A practical course*. Cambridge university press. https://www.uoanbar.edu.iq/HumanitarianEducationCollege/catalog/English%20Phonetics%20and%20Phonology_Peter%20Roach.pdf

- Round, E. R., & Corbett, G. G. (2017). The theory of feature systems: One feature versus two for Kayardild tense-aspect-mood. *Morphology*, 27, 21-75. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11525-016-9294-3>
- Saad, M. (2015). *Mining Documents and Sentiments in Cross-lingual Context* (Doctoral dissertation, Université de Lorraine). https://inria.hal.science/tel-01751251/file/saad_phd.pdf
- Santos, H. S. (2008). *The Interval Constructor on classes of ML-algebras* (Master's thesis, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte). <https://repositorio.ufrn.br/handle/123456789/17974>
- Sera, M. D., Elieff, C., Forbes, J., Burch, M. C., Rodríguez, W., & Dubois, D. P. (2002). When language affects cognition and when it does not: An analysis of grammatical gender and classification. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 131(3), 377–397. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.131.3.377>
- Schmidt, R. L. (1999). *Urdu: An Essential Grammar*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203979280>
- Shafiq, Z., & Iqbal, S. (2023). A Cross-linguistic Analysis of Punjabi Versus English Gender-System. *Global Sociological Review*, VIII, 8, 1-8. URL: [http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gsr.2023\(VIII-II\).01](http://dx.doi.org/10.31703/gsr.2023(VIII-II).01)
- Sheikh, A. M., & Jan, S. (2018). Noun Morphology of Pashtu Spoken in Kashmiri. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Linguistics*, 11, 97-105. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/372824368_Noun_Morphology_of_Pashtu_Spoken_in_Kashmiri
- Shackle, Christopher. 2003. Punjabi. In George Cardona & Dhanesh Jain (eds.), *The Indo-Aryan languages*, 581-621. London: Routledge. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/342103276_George_Cardona_and_Dhanesh_Jain_eds_The_Indo-Aryan_languages
- Shackle, C. (2007). Munir Shikohabadi on his imprisonment. *Writings in Hindu and Urdu on Indian Nationalism*, New Delhi, Permanent Black.
- Shackle, C. (2017). Punjabi language. In *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Punjabi-language>.

- Singh, R. and Agnihotri, R.K. (1997). *Morphology of Hindi: A Word-based Description*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers. <https://archive.org/details/hindimorphologyw0000sing>
- Spencer, A. (2005, January). Case in Hindi. In *Proceedings of the LFG05 Conference* (pp. 429-446). Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.
- Stump, G. T. (2005). Word-formation and inflectional morphology. *Handbook of word-formation*, 49-71. https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-3596-9_3
- Strnad, J. (2013). *Morphology and Syntax of Old Hindi*. Boston: Brill. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004254893_001
- Suthar, Babubhai Kohyabhai. 2006. *Agreement in Gujarati*. PhD Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Palancar, E. L. (2015). A mixed system of agreement in the suffix classes of Lealao Chinantec. *Morphology*, 25, 29-62. DOI:[10.1007/s11525-014-9252-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11525-014-9252-x)
- Tallerman, M. (2015). *Understanding Syntax* (4th ed.). London, UK: Taylor & Francis Ltd. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315758084>
- Temple, R. C. (1883). *Punjabi notes and queries* (ms.).
- Temple, R. C. (1883). *A Dissertation on the Proper Names of Panjâbîs: With Special Reference to the Proper Names of Villagers in the Eastern Panjâb*. Education society's Press. <https://ia801308.us.archive.org/10/items/dissertationonpr00temp/dissertationonpr00temp.pdf>
- Thornton, A. M. (2008). A non-canonical phenomenon in Italian verb morphology: double forms realizing the same cell. *Poster presented at OxMorph1–Oxford*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/238041587_A_non-canonical_phenomenon_in_Italian_verb_morphology_double_forms_realizing_the_same_cell
- Tomori, S. H. O. (1997). *The Morphology and Syntax of Present-Day English: An Introduction*. London: Heimann Educational Books, Inc. <https://lib.ugent.be/catalog/rug01:001834724>
- Van de Velde, F., & Van der Horst, J. (2013). Homoplasmy in diachronic grammar. *Language Sciences*, 36, 66-77. DOI:[10.1016/j.langsci.2012.03.020](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2012.03.020)

- Voeikova, M., & Savickienė, I. (2001). The acquisition of the first case oppositions by a Lithuanian and a Russian child. In *Wiener Linguistische Gazette* (No. 67, pp. 165-188). DOI:[10.1080/01629778.2012.674794](https://doi.org/10.1080/01629778.2012.674794)
- Yarmohammadi, Lotfolah. "A contrastive analysis of Persian and English." *Tehran: Payame Noor* (2002). Website: www.aripd.org/jehd
- Yule, G. (1997). *Pragmatics*. (1996). Yule, G. (2010). *The study of language*. Cambridge University Press. https://www.cambridge.org/my/files/5913/6689/9826/8769/Study_Guide_updated_170610.pdf
- Zaliznjak, A. A. (1973). O ponimanii termina 'padež'v lingvističeskix opisanijax. *Problemy grammatičeskogo modelirovanija. Moscow: Nauka*, 53-87.
- Ziahosseiny, S. M. (1999). A contrastive analysis of Persian and English and error analysis. *Tehran: Nashr-e Vira*.
- Zwicky, A. M., & Pullum, G. K. (1983). Cliticization vs. inflection: English n't. *Language*, 502-513. <https://doi.org/10.2307/413900>
- Zwicky, A. M., & Pullum, G. K. (1987, September). Plain morphology and expressive morphology. In *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* (Vol. 13, pp. 330-340). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3765/bls.v13i0.1817>
- Zwicky, A. (1996). Syntax and phonology. *Concise encyclopedia of syntactic theories*, 300-305. <https://shop.elsevier.com/books/concise-encyclopedia-of-syntactic-theories/brown/978-0-08-042711-9>