The Morphology of Loanwords in Urdu

The Morphology of Loanwords in Urdu:

The Persian, Arabic and English Strands

By

Riaz Ahmed Mangrio

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

I dedicate this work to my late mother, who longed for my better career even in the last few moments of her life.

"Words are chameleons, which reflect the colour of their environment."
—Learned Hand

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

FOREWORD

S.J. HANNAHS
SENIOR LECTURER IN LINGUISTICS,
NEWCASTLE UNIVERSITY, UK

This study by Riaz Mangrio is novel in several different ways. In the first place, it considers the morphological adaptation of loanwords in Urdu, a language rarely examined in terms of loanword adaptation. Secondly, parallels and differences are explored between the relatively recent adaptation of English loans and the older adaptation of words from Arabic and Persian into Urdu. Thirdly, the descriptive content – covering as it does not only English loanwords but those from Arabic and Persian as well, in addition to examining native Urdu structures – is refreshingly broad.

The study itself is primarily descriptive, carefully teasing apart sometimes complex interactions between syntax, semantics and linguistic function relative to loanword adaptation. However, even beyond the question of loanword adaptation there is much to recommend itself descriptively here, simply with regard to the morphological structures of Urdu, for example with compounding, including endocentric, exocentric, copulative, postpositional and verbal compounds. In addition to such derivational processes, this study also considers various inflectional issues, e.g. gender and number morphology, the pluralisation of English nominal loans, the adaptation of English verbs through the use of Urdu dummy verbs.

This study lays the groundwork for possible future research in a number of different directions. Firstly, interesting questions arise concerning phonological adaptation: how are the differing kinds of syllable structure of English accommodated in Urdu? Are the stress patterns of English retained in English loans in Urdu, or do the loans conform to Urdu stress requirements? What segmental modifications occur in adapting these loans to Urdu? Secondly, the study builds a good foundation for a more in-depth examination of the data against current morphological theory. For example, what insights can the data give us into various morphological frameworks such as Distributed Morphology, or the application of Optimality Theory to morphology? What does the

behaviour of dummy verbs in loanword adaptation, or that of gender, number and case morphology, tell us about current theoretical positions? Finally, one could examine the extent to which the data in this study can confirm or disconfirm theoretical positions on loanword adaptation in general. For example, the data seem to reflect expectations about the differing behaviours between the older loans from Arabic and Persian compared with the newer loans from English.

Taken as a whole, this study not only presents a large quantity of interesting data in pursuing the immediate question of loanword adaptation in Urdu, it also provides a fruitful starting point for a wealth of further investigations into Urdu and into loanword adaptation more generally.

PREFACE

This work is the outcome of my efforts for a PhD, a key aim of my life, which seemed possible after a partial funding offer by Higher Education Commission Pakistan through their ELT Reforms Project. Pakistan had a dearth of PhDs until a few years back when HEC started various programs to resolve the issue.

I have the honour to be very first in my community to have won a scholarship, from a government body, for higher study abroad. It has helped me get the goal. The initial years were very hard, as I had to support my family along with paying the rest of the University fees and bearing the living cost. Fortunately, some jobs, loans by friends in the USA and then a write up fund by Newcastle University helped me finish the course. I am indebted to all the people and the institutions.

I am highly obliged particularly to my supervisors, Dr. S. J. Hannahs and Professor Maggie Tallerman, whose kind and encouraging guidance helped a lot in the completion of a linguistic research work. Earlier, I did compile some books, which were only practice oriented.

There is a scarcity of linguistic research in Pakistan except for a small amount of work done by a few individuals. Almost no research has been done on the morphology of Pakistani languages. Thus, this study is the first attempt to research in the field. It discusses in detail about Urdu morphology, which is in fact a composition of native Urdu, Persian and Arabic morphological structures. It then focuses on English loanword morphology in the light of the word structures from the three sources. The discussion as a whole focuses on loanword formations from Persian, Arabic and English. These three languages have influenced almost all languages of the Indian Subcontinent. Thus, the study is beneficial to the people in general disregarding what language they speak. The descriptive nature of the study lays the foundation for theoretical research in the morphology of the regional languages. It forms the basis for further research in various aspects of this field.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Looking at the grievous financial stress, I faced, the completion of the research work would have been an impossible task, if I had not been blessed with kind supervisors, other academic and administrative staff as well as friends and family members. Firstly, I am highly obliged to my supervisors Dr. S. J Hannahs and Professor Maggie Tallerman for their kind support even beyond academics. They have always been very compassionate, helpful, encouraging, and friendly. Their positive and insightful criticism caused the betterment in the work.

Some of other teachers who fully supported me include Prof. Anders, Prof. Noel Burton, Prof. Karen, Dr. Martha. Dr. William, Dr. Hermann, Dr Isabelle, Dr Matthew, Dr. Ghada. I feel indebted to pay my gratitude to all of them. Among the non-academic staff, I am thankful to Rowena and Kay and particularly to Brenda for her gentleness.

I cannot forget my friends' extraordinary sympathies. The worth mentioning university friends are Yousef, Nadeem, Nasser, Mohana, Oudeh, Ali, Saaid, Amer, Khaled and Hamood. They deserve the most appreciation, as they stood behind me in the hard days. Then, there were Mamdouh, Miri, Omer, Abdul Muttallib, Mohammad Al-Moaily, Mufleh, Amer, Jaehyeok. Some friends from my home country deserve the same tribute. I might have gone back, in the middle, but Dr. Jawed Akhter, the closest colleague, and the childhood friends Ziauddin, Jamil Akhter made it possible to continue. Then, Waseem Alam, Dr. Imran, new pals in Newcastle Mr. Gul Nawaz, Mr. Fayyaz (late), Ali, Abdullah and Dr. Aslam fully backed. My special thanks are to Dr. Jawed, Ziauddin and Jamil who did not let me down.

I am grateful to my in-laws, Ahsan and Khalid in particular, who financially supported and took care of my family in my absence. Above all, I am highly obliged to my dear wife and my daughter who patiently faced all the sufferings for a quite long time until they joined me. It is due to their support that my determination to get the aim wasn't broken. It will be unfair not to remember my late grandparents who raised me and did their best for my higher education abroad. Parents' role is always more important. My father, a retired man, deserves the homage particularly for his hard efforts to resolve various matters. The recollections of the pain and the sufferings of my late mother are everlasting. She always thought

Symbols and Abbreviations

Symbols

Standard IPAs (International Phonetic Alphabets) have been used for phonetic interpretation of sound changes in almost all cases (for discussion on phonology).

1. * ungrammatical
2. ~ nasalized vowel
3. → changes into
4. ⇔ sounds swapping
5. & and

Abbreviations

1. **A** Adjective
2. **Adv** Adverb
3. **acc** Accusative
4. **Aux** Auxiliary Verb
5. **bse** Base verb
6. **Dem** Demonstrative Pronoun
7. **dV** Dummy Verb
8. **erg** Ergative
9. **f** Feminine
10. **gen** Genitive marker
11. **imp** Imperfective Verb
12. **Int** Interrogative
13. **lV** Light Verb
14. **m** Masculine
15. **N** Noun
16. **neg** Negative marker
17. **nom** Nominative
18. **obl** Oblique
19. **perf** Perfective
20. **pl**. Plural
21. **PP** Postposition
22 **pre** Present verb
23. **pref** Prefix
24. **Pro** Pronoun
25. **pst** Past Verb
26. **Rel** Relative Pronoun
27. **sg**. Singular
28. **suff** Suffix
29. **V** Verb
30. **voc** Vocative

CHAPTER ONE

MORPHOLOGY AND LOANWORD MORPHOLOGY

1.1. Introduction

Language contact and the influence of one language on the other are very common phenomena. Persian, Arabic and English are some of the major languages of the world. They have influenced various other languages globally. Although a major language in itself, Urdu is also one of the recipient languages. Lexical influence from various sources is a common occurrence, but it is significant to note that a recipient language shows the loan morphological and phonological features. The same can be seen in Urdu as well, but almost nothing has been studied so far on any of the linguistic aspects. A great many features are unexplored. This study attempts to bring some of these aspects to the surface. It focuses on the loanword morphology of Urdu and looks at the nature of loanwords from Persian, Arabic and English.

This study focuses equally on the morphology of loanwords from these languages. However, the loanwords from the former two are far older than English loans, and function like native Urdu words. They are far more morphologically integrated, which means that they have adopted various morphological changes. Therefore, in this perspective, the investigation into morphological adaptation of English loans is done by looking at the patterns of native Urdu morphological structures and the morphological structures of the older loans. Thus, the morphological structures of native Urdu, Persian and Arabic are treated as the model for the morphological adaptation of English loans, which is discussed in the final part of this study. As English loanwords are more recent, it is necessary to look briefly at some of the background of English loanwords in Urdu.

This is because the Urdu lexicon is basically an amalgamation of the native Urdu words and Persian and Arabic loans. Therefore, the morphological structures which are apparent as a whole are also an amalgamation of the morphological structures from these three sources.

'Native Urdu' is understood to mean a word belonging to Urdu, Hindi or even Sanskrit, provided that it is commonly used in Urdu. The reason for this is that linguists generally treat Urdu and Hindi as one and the same language, known by different names, i.e. Urdu, Hindi, Hindustani and Hindi-Urdu. According to Rai (2000: 11), "one man's Hindi is another man's Urdu". Linguists normally use the term Urdu-Hindi or Hindi-Urdu to study the common features despite the fact that some lexical, morphological and phonetic differences do exist. Sanskrit is considered to be the mother of both, but due to deep and distinct influences, Urdu is highly Persianised/Arabicised, while Hindi is highly Sanskritised.

Studying loanwords and loanword integration, the distinction and combination of two criteria of conformity, i.e. conformity of loanwords to the source language form and conformity to the target language system, help us better understand the diachronic processes of progressive integration of loanwords (Winter 2008: 156). By invoking conformity in both, one of two alternative possibilities must be addressed. (1) The properties of a loanword are unchanged in a borrowing language and they match those of the source language. (2) The properties of a loanword have changed, and they now match those of the target language system in that the loanword seems to be part of the borrowing language vocabulary. Analysing conformity to the (SLF) Source Language Form and conformity to the (TLS) Target Language System, the main goal of this study is to establish first the relation between the Source Languages (Persian and Arabic) and the Target Language (Native Urdu), with relevance to the morphology of loanwords. Then, treating the morphological structures of native Urdu, Persian and Arabic as the three faces of Urdu morphology as a whole, it is interesting to look at English loanword morphology. The hypothesis is that the affixation, whether inflectional or derivational, may be on native Urdu patterns but that the compounding of English loans is more with the older loans (Persian and Arabic), which form a bigger part of the Urdu lexicon. This is one of the factors which need to be established. Moreover, it is equally important to know whether Urdu also borrows any derivations, of an English loan, as it borrowed Persian and Arabic derivations with or without any morphological changes. The study generally observes the extent of the English loanword adaptation, in the light of Persian and Arabic loanword adaptation, and establishes if it is as complete as that of the two older loan influences. There are other related questions, e.g. what are the structural patterns after the loanword integration; how are the loanwords modified, and which of the elements are affected? It is also of interest to note whether Urdu borrows English affixes in the same way as it has borrowed Persian and Arabic affixes.

Two points in particular need to be considered. Firstly, regarding Persian and Arabic influence, there is extremely little written on Urdu linguistics in general and its morphology in particular. Secondly, there is nothing written on English loanword influence on Urdu either. Therefore, the lack of any related literature is an obstacle. Moreover, there is no theory of loanwords dealing specifically with morphological adaptation of loans. In this context, the present work does not fit clearly into any specific theoretical framework. Therefore, there is need for good, careful descriptive work before serious theoretical analysis can be carried out. So, much of the current work is descriptive and deals with the characteristics of the morphological structures from the three prominent sources i.e. native Urdu, Persian and Arabic. Following this, the discussion on the morphological adaptation of English loans describes the processes involving English in the light of the three sources of morphological structures already shown.

Morphological adaptation includes all aspects of derivational and inflectional integration. However, due to space restrictions, the primary focus is on some major points, including gender/number and case morphology, the derivation of nouns, adjectives and verbs by affixation and by compounding. The proposed study is divided into six chapters. The examination starts in the first chapter with an introduction to English loanwords in Urdu, and more generally morphology and loanword morphology of the South Asian languages. A general picture is sketched regarding the status of English loanwords and how nouns and verbs in particular are adapted in some South Asian/ Indo Aryan languages. In the subsequent chapters, the focus is on the morphology of the Urdu noun itself (Chapter 2), derivation by means of affixation (Chapter 3) and by compounding (Chapter 4). Chapter 5 takes a close look at the adaptation of English loans. The final chapter (Chapter 6) concludes the discussion summarising Urdu morphological features and those of English loans. The key point is to have a look at the general implications of the study.

In order to discuss these points, the first factor required is to understand morphology or word structure, particularly inflection and derivation. Beyond that, it is equally important to understand the issues involved in loanword morphology.

1.2. Morphology

Morphology means the study of structures, and it is a branch of Biology, Geology and some other fields of knowledge. Lingustic morphology is the study of words and their internal structures mainly

through the analysis of morphemes, affixation, reduplication (partial or full) and various sorts of compounding. Morphemes are various types of word parts, e.g. prefix, stem, infix and suffix. Thus, a single Urdu word, e.g. *laɪlmi* 'unawareness' can be broken into three morphemes, i.e. the Arabic prefix *la* 'un', Arabic stem *ɪlm* 'knowledge/awareness' and native Urdu suffix *-i*. The prefix *la* converts the noun *ɪlm* into an adjective *laɪlm* which is then converted into another noun **laɪlmi** by the suffix *-i*. Sometimes, independently occurring words in a compound can also participate in morphological processes. For example, the Urdu word *kəmra-e-dʒəmaəʈ* 'classroom' is a compound word and both the constituents *kəmra* 'room' and *dʒəmaəʈ* 'class' are two independently occurring words. The function of the infix *-e-* is to link both the constituents and give possessive meaning. It gives the semantics of genitive *ka*/ *ki*/*ke*, which cannot occur in compounds.

A distinction between inflection and derivation is often associated with affixation (the attachment of a morpheme). Inflection does not change the category but rather the form of the same word, e.g. *plæt* 'plate', *plætæ̃* 'plates', *plætõ* (plural oblique) *plæto* (plural vocative). In the given Urdu examples, *plæt* is the singular noun, *-æ̃* is the plural marker, while *-õ* and **-o** show the oblique and vocative plural forms respectively. Inflected forms are variants of one and the same word. Derivation, on the other hand, means new word formation from a base word. This may change the category of the base, but a derivation may also be in the same category as the base word. A noun, for instance *ʊsul* 'principle', can be converted into the adjective *ʊsuli* 'in principle', the noun and adjective **be**ʊsul '(someone) unprincipled' and an adverb *ʊsulən* 'in principle'.

A loanword typically follows the morphological rules of a borrowing language. It may be helpful to know how languages influence each other and what morphological results occur.

1.2.1. Loanword Morphology

When speakers of a language want to identify with each other, they may find themselves adjusting their speech to eliminate the more obvious differences in pronunciation or vocabulary. But when multilingual speakers interact with each other, it involves language contact. This can be seen in Kupwar, India, where multilingualism has led to the convergence between the local dialects of two Indic languages, Marathi and Urdu, and two Dravidian languages, Kannada and Telugu (Thomason 2001: 45). Kupwar is a small town of 3000 inhabitants, who speak the four different languages. Due to centuries of contact, the varieties of the four languages

are similar to each other syntactically and are distinct from the varieties spoken in other parts of India. Gumperz and Wilson (1971) note that, historically, grammar is thought to be the most persistent, while lexicon is the most changeable component of a linguistic system, but in Kupwar the grammar is adaptable and the lexicon is the most persistent. The words of each language have been retained and coupled with a common syntax. They observe that the adaptations are far-reaching and multilateral, and each language has adopted some features from the others.

Bilingualism and education are two important factors. Presently, electronic media is also an important factor. Note the following two examples. The first is Greece, where most people are educated and monolingual (Tatsioka 2008: 129), and the other is the Indian Subcontinent where most people are bilingual and uneducated. In both these regions, only a small number of people know English, but most people frequently use English words and phrases. Expressions like *Oh God!* are very common. This is mainly due to media influence.

The consistent use of such borrowings makes them a part of the borrowing language. However, loanwords and simple borrowings are two different terms, which distinguish them from each other. Haugen (1950: 212) uses the term "borrowing" for *the attempted reproduction* of some patterns of one language into the other, and the term "loanwords" for *one type of borrowing*. Loanwords are single words or compounds, but borrowings may be stems or full phrases. Loanwords are also different from code-switching, as Poplack et al. (1989: 390) state that the former follows the rules of the recipient language, while code-switching is a linguistic term denoting the concurrent use of more than one language, or language variety, in conversation.

The study of how a language reacts to the presence of foreign words – whether it rejects, translates or freely accepts them – may give us insight into its formal tendencies. The adaptation of a loanword depends both on its word class (verb, noun, adjective) and on its similarity to native words and to loanwords from other languages already existing in the borrowing language.

The native Urdu affixes are productive and form new words in combination with the words from a different source. But some of the loan affixes e.g. Persian *-ana* → *zalɪmana* 'tyrant' also derive a good number of words with roots from other sources e.g. Arabic in this case. The productivity of these affixes in general, although systematic, shows some irregularity as well. Seidenberg and Gonnerman (2000: 354) state, "Morphological systems are quasi regular. They are productive and systematic but also show many seemingly irregular forms". They note that

the inconsistencies in word structures reflect the uncertainty about the nature of morphological units and greatly complicate the task of interpreting empirical results; for example, *bakery* is related to *bake* and *cannery* to *can* but what is *groce* in *grocery*? While looking at similar inconsistencies, Ahmed (2008: 2) states, "(Urdu) lexical items, prefixes, and suffixes are difficult to study on the spoken level since their occurrence is quite unpredictable". Although Urdu morphology follows some patterns and rules, the rules may be complex and may cut across linguistic components e.g. morphology and phonology. It cannot be termed 'unpredictable', as Ahmed claims. Nevertheless, there are certain deviations from the rules of each pattern.

The patterns of words used as nouns differ from those used as verbs or adjectives, in relation to both morphological marking and words' incorporation into the borrowing language structure. The incorporation of loans also indicates both alterations in the phonology of the loanwords and subsequent adjustments in the phonology of the recipient language. For example, with respect to regions, phonetically, there are two alternations in the English noun *street*. Punjabi people say *sətrit*, but others pronounce it as *ıstrit*. The loan also has two plural variants, *sətritẽ/ıstritẽ*. The subsequent adjustments in the phonology of the recipient language can be observed in Urdu also due to Arabic loan velar fricatives /x/ and /ɣ/.

However, as the focus of this thesis is on the morphological integration of loanwords, rather than loanword phonology, only some phonological aspects of relevance to morphology are discussed**.** Before discussing morphological adaptation, it is helpful to look at the sociolinguistic status of Urdu as compared with other languages of the Indian Subcontinent.

1.3. Sociolinguistic Status of Urdu Compared with other Languages

Urdu is an Indo-Aryan language from the Indo-Iranian sub branch of Indo European language family. Abbas (2002) traces its origin to the armies of Afghan emperor Mehmood Gaznavi in the 12th Century. However, as generally known, the term *Ordu* was first used for the language spoken by the soldiers of Mughal emperor Shahjehan (17th century) when he built the Red Fort in Delhi, and the surrounding town called *Ordu-e-Mu'alla*. Urdu abridged several languages spoken by the soldiers in the Indian army and absorbed loanwords from them. That's why it is often called *ləʃkəri* (army) *zəban* (language) or the language of the army. There have been four major dialects of Urdu i.e. 1) Dakhani or now called Daccani 2) Pinjari 3) Rekhta and 4) Modern Vernacular Urdu.

The modern vernacular language is based on the *Khaṛi Boli* dialect, of the Delhi region, spoken in 12th century. Urdu is most closely related to Assamese, Gujarati, Hindi, Marathi, Punjabi, Sindhi, Singhalese and Romany. It is one of the largest languages of the Indian Subcontinent with native speakers of approximately over sixty million and an official language in Pakistan and the Indian states of Uttar Pradesh, Kashmir and Delhi (Martindale (2009). It is one of the three most important languages in the modern Indian Subcontinent alongside Hindi and Bengali, while languages spoken throughout various regions are provincial languages. It is also widely spoken in Bangladesh, Afghanistan and Nepal and the Indian states of Bihar, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka. It is spoken as a medium of communication by a large number of communities in the Gulf, UK and many other countries of Europe, as well as Afghanistan, Thailand, Nepal, Turkey, USA, Australia, Fiji, South Africa, Zambia, Mauritius and Malawi (Junior, 2005). The eloquent Urdu poetry and Indian movies have given rapid popularity to this language. Then, the immigrant workers have spread it in all four corners of the world, and it is now one of the largest languages of the world. Rahman (2004) and Grimes (2000) consider Urdu-Hindi the second most spoken language of the world.

Urdu, Hindi, Hindustani and Hindi-Urdu are various terms used for the same language. Linguists normally use the term Urdu-Hindi to study common features in both the languages. There are some morphological and phonological differences, but Urdu differs from Hindi mainly in its extensive Persian-Arabic borrowings along with Perso-Arabic script, while Hindi is written in Devanagri script. Urdu has been a victim of cultural genocide at different periods of time (Azim, 1975: 259) and was ruthlessly ignored by various governments. Perhaps, this is why Urdu borrows English loans more heavily than Hindi. A background of the lexical influence of English can help to understand loanword morphology.

1.3.1. Background and the Status of English Loanwords in Urdu

Lexical borrowing brings with it cultural implications, because it is not restricted to words alone, it includes cultural and social values (Hoffer 1980: 2). Borrowing normally involves conquest, cultural domination, disparity in social development, technological advancement and media etc. Lee (2004: 1) states:

"Armed with technological, political, economic and cultural machines, the English language has made, and is making, a profound influence and impact on the enrichment or demise of world languages".

All these factors have caused English to influence Urdu, which has borrowed a large number of its lexical items.

English is the language of science, technology, business and academic information. It is, therefore, globally thought to be a key to success. With the growth of English as an international language, there has been a rapid increase in the demand for teaching and learning English in Pakistan. It is the medium of instruction in all private schools and a compulsory subject from grade one in all public schools. It is also a popular subject of study in the universities. It is now an empowering language, and considered to have a high status and prestige as a foreign language. Rahman (2005: 998) considers, "English is a language of power and status symbol". The use of English loanwords in daily Urdu is not just a status symbol, it has become a social habit. Code-switching is the most frequent use of English loans in the media and by the elite. The reason for this is possibly the same as suggested by Takashi (1990) about Japanese that English borrowings are common because "they seem to convey a modernity and sophistication about the subject matter under discussion". The appearance of thousands of English loanwords is also due to new ideas and technologies. The borrowing of scientific and technical lexical items has increased the enrichment of Urdu also. The perspective in which these lexical items were borrowed can be understood by Baugh and Cable's (1978: 84) explanation of the power of English words that they were "so intimately associated with an object or a concept that the acceptance of the thing [involved] was the acceptance also of the word". Scientific and technical lexical items are just an aspect of English loanwords being used in Urdu. Baumgardner (1990: 60, 1998) discusses word formation in the Pakistani variety of English. He hightlights some forms of English usage eg. compounding *half pants* 'shorts', affixation *de-notify* and conversion *affectee* 'someone affected by something' etc. However, as Baumgardner states, the use of such words is restricted to English newspapers.

In sum, like other world languages, Urdu is heavily influenced by English. It borrows a large number of English words, which is similar to the one noted by Carstensen (1986: 827) in some European languages. For these languages and for Urdu, English is a reservoir from which words can be taken at random. Loanwords related to almost every part of life are in common use, but crucially they are used under the morphological influence of Urdu. Morphological changes also occur both at the inflectional and derivational level. At the inflectional level, the changes

are substantial and are based on the native Urdu patterns rather than those of Persian and Arabic loanwords. At the derivational level, there is an adaptation of a large number of loans, but the adaptability is limited in the derivation of words irrespective of the native Urdu or Persian and Arabic patterns. However, there is a difference of frequency in the derivation by affixation and by compounding. It seems more frequent by affixation when English loans correlate with native Urdu affixes. But the formation of compounds is more frequent with Persian and Arabic loan constituents.

This is a general trend that is not just restricted to Urdu, but that is also noteworthy in many South Asian languages. A brief comparison of the morphological structures of some languages is given in the next section.

1.4. English Loanword Morphology in South Asian Languages

This section presents common and contrasting features of English loanword morphology in some of the South Asian languages. However, due to space restriction, the aim is to show only a sketch of the loanwords. Therefore, the focus is on just two aspects, the pluralisation of nouns and hybrid compound verbs of the constituents from two different languages.

It seems very probable that the psychological attitude of the speakers of a borrowing language towards linguistic material has much to do with its receptivity to foreign words. Some languages require structural changes in the loanwords. Sapir (1921: 2) argues that the nature and extent of borrowing depends entirely on the historical facts of cultural relation. On this basis, he compares the structural changes and contrast between German and English in their loanwords from Latin and French. A similar contrast with regard to the treatment of foreign English material can be seen in South Asia, where the Indo Aryan languages sometimes allow loans to be only phonetically restructured. At other times, inflectional or derivational changes are made by affixation (or by compounding). One element specific to their word structure is gender/number marking, e.g. in Urdu /a/ (m), /i/ (f) and /e/ (pl), in verbs and adjectives, not only nouns. It is vital in loanword morphology as well. The following subsections show some patterns of English loan nouns in five languages: Urdu, Marwaɽɪ, Sindhi, Punjabi and Pashto.

1.4.1. Pluralisation of English Loan Nouns

Of the five Indian Subcontinent languages compared in this section, the morphology of four i.e. Urdu, Marwaɽɪ, Sindhi and Punjabi is similar.

Therefore, English loan nouns of one or two syllables may be phonetically different, but morphologically they are mostly the same as their original forms. For example, many loan nouns e.g. *plate*, *glass*, and *jug* are unchanged in Urdu, Punjabi, Sindhi, and Marwaṛi. However, the morphology of Pashto differs from that of the rest. It exhibits no additional variations. This difference is also clearly visible in the English loan nouns, e.g. *pleɪt* is used with structural changes as *palæt*.

There are not many cases of three or more syllable loan nouns, as for example, *manager*. If and when such words are borrowed, they mostly have to be changed structurally. Table 1 below displays the comparison of the loan base forms in the five languages.

Table. 1.1. English Root Nouns in South Asian Languages

English	Pashto	Punjabi	Sindhi	Marwaṛɪ	Urdu
1-pleɪt	p*a*læt	plæt	plæt	plæt	plæt
2-gl*a*s	gil*a*s	gəl*a*s	gl*a*s	gl*a*s	gl*a*s
3-bɪldɪŋ	bɪlding	bɪldɪŋ	bɪldɪŋ	bɪldɪŋ	bɪldɪŋ
4- bʊk	bʊk	bʊk	bʊk	bʊk	bʊk
5- məʃiːn	məʃiːn	məʃiːn	məʃiːn	məʃiːn	məʃiːn
6- kɪtʃin	kɪtʃən	kɪtʃin	kɪtʃin	kɪtʃin	kɪtʃin
7- kəmɪʃn	kəmæʃən	kəmɪʃən	kəmɪʃən	kəmɪʃən	kəmɪʃən
8- dʒəg	dʒəg	dʒəg	dʒəg	dʒəg	dʒəg
9- peɪpə	pæpə-ər	pæpər	pæpər	pæpər	pæpər
10-hospɪtəl	əspəṯ*a*l	əspəṯ*a*l	əspəṯ*a*l	əspəṯ*a*l	əspəṯ*a*l

Note that Pashto shows both phonological and morphological changes, and so it is a good example of structural contrast with the other regional languages. For example, in pluralisation, it shows no gender marking and takes the same suffix *-una* in both masculine and feminine plurals. As the illustrations of this are given in the table below, Pashto is the only singled out here. In the other four languages, the pluralisation of the loan nouns is based on the alternation of vowels at the suffix position, and the loan stems are affixed with the native plural morphemes. Therefore, no morphological difference remains between the English loan nouns and the native nouns.

Table 1.2a. Mas: Plurals of English Loans in South Asian Languages

English	Pashto	Punjabi	Sindhi	Marwaɽɪ	Urdu
1. kɪtʃɪn	kɪtʃɪnun*a*	kɪtʃɪn	kɪtʃɪn	kɪtʃɪn	kɪtʃɪn
2. kəmɪʃn	kəmæʃən*un*a	kəmɪʃən	kəmɪʃən	kəmɪʃən	kəmɪʃən
3. dʒɔg	dʒɔgun*a*	dʒɔg	dʒɔg	dʒɔg	dʒɔg
4. peɪpə	pæpərun*a*	pæpər	pæpər	pæpər	pæpər
5. mænɪdʒər	menædʒəra:n	mənɪdʒər	mənedʒər	menedʒər	menedʒər
6. *a*m 'mango'	*a*mun*a*	*a*m	*a*m	*a*m	*a*m

Table 1.2b: Fem: Plurals of English Loans in South Asian Languages

English	Pashto	Punjabi	Sindhi	Marwaɽɪ	Urdu
1. pleɪt	p*a*lætun*a*	plæt*ã*	plæt*ũ*	plæt*ã*	plæt*æ̃*
2. gl*a*s	gɪl*a*sun*a*	glas*ã*	glas/glas*ũ*	glas*ã*	glas*æ̃*
3. bɪldɪŋ	bɪldɪŋgun*a*	bɪldɪŋg*ã*	bɪldɪŋg*ũ*	bɪldɪŋg*ã*	bɪldɪŋg*æ̃*
4. bʊk	bʊkun*a*	bʊk*ã*	bʊks/bʊk*ũ*	bʊk*ã*	bʊk*æ̃*
5. məʃi:n	məʃinun*a*	məʃin*ã*	məʃin*ũ*	məʃin*ã*	məʃin*æ̃*
6. mæz 'table'	mæzun*a*	mæz*ã*	mæz*ũ*	mæz*ã*	mæz*æ̃*

The two tables exhibit some common and contrasting features in the plural morphology of some of the most commonly used English loan nouns in comparison with one native plural in the five languages. The nouns in (2a) are treated as masculine and those in (2b) are feminine. There may be morphological changes in masculine nouns as well, but the changes mainly occur in the feminine nouns. Pashto shows no gender distinction. In four of the languages, the pluralisation of the English loans is by suffixation, but the suffixation itself is no more than an alternation of vowels, which is the main element in their gender/number morphology. Phonological alternations come in many shapes and sizes, and the processes behind them are equally varied as are the kinds of factors which condition them (Davenport & Hannahs, 2005). Masculine loan nouns generally remain unchanged in their plurals, nevertheless a plural is sometimes formed by the alternation of vowels. For example, *det*a 'datum' is treated as masculine singular, and is pluralised as *det*e. In Marwaɽɪ and Sindhi, *det*o is singular and *det*a is plural.

A feminine plural is based on the suffxal alternation of vowels with nasalisation. For example, a feminine nominative plural in Marwaɽɪ and

Punjabi is *plætā̃*, but it is *plætæ̃* in Urdu and *plætũ* in Sindhi. Note that there is just an insertion of a nasalised vowel in the loan base noun. A feminine plural for oblique and vocative forms is suffixal with the insertion of nasalised vowel i.e. *õ* and non nasalised vowel o respectively.

Thus, the case morphology is also similar in these languages. Sindhi sometimes tends to use original plural patterns borrowed from English. Unlike the rest of the five languages, Pashto however discards gender distinction. Its pluralisation is also based on the consonant-vowel suffix -*una*, for both genders, rather than merely the alternation of vowels.

Generally, the pluralisation of a noun in the five languages is based on either alternation of vowels or suffixation. This is in sharp contrast to verb formation with English loans, which is done only by compounding.

1.4.2. English Loan Verb Morphology

The verbs in these languages are very complex as compared to other syntactic categories. They inflect for tense, mood, gender and number. The verbal structure is in two forms. There are a large number of verbs already present in the basic lexical form. For example, a lexical verb *pi* 'drink' requires the suffix -*na* to form the infinitive *pina* 'to drink'. It takes other suffixes according to tense and aspect needs, e.g. *pija* 'drank' and *pirəha* 'is drinking'. In the absence of lexical verbs, nouns and adjectives (particularly loans) combine with some dummy verbs to form compound verbs. A dummy verb is a kind of tool for the verb formation in the absence of base verbs in south Asian languages. In Urdu, it is generally a redesigned form of a Persian auxiliary. Schmidt (1999: 101) explains that Urdu verbs demonstrate a very regular conjugation with the exception of five verbs *ho* 'be', *kər* 'do', *ɖe* 'give', *le* 'take', and *dʒa* 'go'. These five verbs primarily function as main verbs and secondarily as dummy verbs (Versteegh, 2001: 488) and light verbs (Butt, 1995) in complex predicates. The difference between a dummy verb and a light verb is not the issue here but, in respect of Urdu, it is explained in Chapter 4. For the present purpose, it is sufficient to note that a dummy verb is used as a kind of tool to form a verbal compound in combination with a noun, e.g. N (*sãs* 'breath') + dV (*le* 'take') = V (*sãs le* 'breathe') or with an adjective, e.g. A (*xøʃ* 'happy') + dV (*ho* 'be') = V (*xøʃ ho* 'be happy'). It is needed when a lexical (base) verb does not exist. Versteegh (2001: 497) considers that the extensive use of dummy verbs in compound verbs is typical of Hindi-Urdu (Indo Aryan languages) generally.

The use of dummy verbs is particularly ubiquitous with loanwords for verb formation. Even if a loan verb enters Urdu, or other Indo Aryan

languages in general, it ceases to function as a verb, and it has to combine with a dummy verb, which carries the inflectional information. The morphological functions of a dummy verb are the same. Not a loan lexical verb, but only a dummy verb shows any gender and number or tense and aspect changes. Thus, all the loans, whether they are nouns, adjectives or even verbs, must be integrated with dummy verbs to form compound verbs. For example, the English loan verb *provaid* 'provide' cannot function as a base verb in Urdu. Although borrowing verbs is frequent and convenient, the borrowed verbs cannot function as verbs unless they integrate with the dummy verbs. Therefore, to perform the function of a verb, the loan verb *provaid* is combined with a dummy verb *kər**na** 'to do' (base form *kər*) to form a compound verb, i.e. *provaid kər**na** 'to provide'. *provaid* is only used as a dysfunctional verb (used in the status of a noun). A loan verb does not function as a verb in Urdu. Its verbal capacity is taken by the dummy verbs probably due to the morphologically complex verbal systems of the Indo Aryan languages.

In light of this discussion, it can be claimed that verb construction with a loanword is in the form of a compound. More specifically, it is a hybrid compound. Various linguists have interpreted the term *hybrid* in different words. For example, Capuz (1997: 8) terms it *hybrid* or *loan blend*. The same terms are defined by Haugen (1950: 215) as those instances of lexical borrowing in which both "'importation' and 'substitution'" can be found. Kent (1999) interprets the term "hybrid" differently as a *pseudo loanword*. A hybrid combination of a native and a loan constituent is a general phenomenon in compounding. But as the Indo Aryan languages are heavily influenced by Persian-Arabic loanwords, it is also noteworthy that some dummy verbs themselves, e.g. *kərna,* are morphologically redesigned forms of Persian auxiliaries. It means that the verbal formations by them with English bases deviate from the morphological rules of both the source language and the target language. The detailed discussion in Chapter 5 shows the situation in Urdu. Table 3 illustrates some compounds formed by dummy verbs in the five languages:

Table 1.3: The Formation of Verbs with Eng Bases in South Asian Languages

English Root	Pashto	Punjabi	Sindhi	Marwaṛɪ	Urdu
1. provaid	kʌvəl	kərna	kərɔ̃ɽ	kərno	kərna
2. pruv	kʌvəl	kərna	kərɔ̃ɽ	kərno	kərna
3. əgri	kʌvəl	kərna	kərɔ̃ɽ	kərno	kərna
4. ərændʒ	kʌvəl	kərna	kərɔ̃ɽ	kərno	kərna
5. eksɛpt	kʌvəl	kərna	kərɔ̃ɽ	kərno	kərna

6. kritisaize	kavəl	kərna	kərə̃ʈ	kərno	kərna
7. rısponsəbıləti:	haɣəʃʈəl	lẽʈã	wəʈʰə̃ʈ	lẽʈõ	lena
8. rıspons	vərkavəl	ḓẽʈã	ḓejə̃ʈ	ḓẽʈõ	ḓena
9. hæpi	ʃo	hõʈã	tʰ̪ıjə̃ʈ	hõʈõ	hona
10. æŋgri	ʃo	hõʈã	tʰ̪ıjə̃ʈ	hõʈõ	hona

The patterns of verb formations are the same in all the five languages. The Indo Aryan languages require every English loan to be attached with a device for allowing verbal marking. This device is a dummy verb which forms a verbal structure. The dummy verbs, e.g. Urdu *kərna* 'do' (1-6), for transitive and *hona* 'to be' for intransitives and passive (9-10), construct infinitives e.g. *provaid* **kərna** 'to provide' (1) and *æŋgri* **hona** 'to be angry' (10). Similarly, for gender/number marking or tense/aspect morphology, it is only the dummy verb that undergoes morphological changes. The loan constituent, whatever the category, does not undergo any morphological changes. The only difference between the dummy verbs with regard to their sources is their (morpho) phonological structures. The dummy verbs used in the four languages are similar to each other and take a nasalised syllable or an alveolar nasal + a vowel. On the other hand, Pashto differs again and mostly takes a lateral ending (1-8). There is no other significant difference, and therefore no further discussion is necessary at this point.

1.4.3. Loanword Morphology in South Asian Languages in General

The relevance of the foregoing discussion has been to show briefly two important aspects of loanword morphology in the five important Indo Aryan languages, i.e. the pluralisation of English loan nouns and the compound verbal structures formed by the English loanwords and the native dummy verbs. Generally (with the exception of Pashto), their gender/number morphology is based on the alternation of vowels. However, only the loan nouns treated as feminine are generally affected by the morphological changes. Their plural morphology is formed by the alternation of vowels. The vowels are nasalised. The nouns treated as masculine remain mostly unchanged. The gender marking of English loans is only seen in four of the languages discussed; there is no gender distinction in loanwords in Pashto. Also, for pluralisation all loans undergo a change by suffixation and the loan nouns take the native plural marker -*una* e.g. gl*as***una** 'glasses'.