Nominal Modification in Hindi-Urdu

Kinza Mahoon   *University of Toronto*

KA-marking in Hindi-Urdu (HU) has previously been analysed as genitive case marking (Butt & King 2004) and compared to Izafat (Bögel & Butt 2010), the HU borrowing of Persian ezafe. In this paper I will show that neither KA-marking nor izafat are case marking in HU, and although they are both used for nominal modification, they appear in distinct contexts different from DP-internal nominal modification (such as adjectives etc.). I argue that izafat is a method of compounding in HU, and that KA-marking is in fact a type of LINKER (cf. den Dikken 2006). I posit that KA-marking is necessary when merging another maximal projection to a DP as a modifier in order to resolve issues of labelling raised by Chomsky (2013).

It is crucial to note that despite previous literature, which claim that the distribution of izafat are a subset of KA-marking (Butt & King 2004; Bögel, Butt & Sulger 2008; Bögel & Butt 2010), the distributions of KA-marking, izafat, and other modification are quite different; in (1a) below we can see that izafat may only appear with bare nouns as even the inclusion of plural number, which is the first shell dominating a bare noun in HU (Dayal, 2011) is ungrammatical; meanwhile, in (1b) we can see that using KA-marking is fine. Likewise, in (2a) we can see that using KA-marking when an adjective modifies a noun is ungrammatical, but in (2b) it is possible to use izafat to join a bare noun and adjective.

1) a. Munsanif e kitab-(*on)   2) a. am   (*ki) divan
       Author.M IZ book-PL   common   KA   room
       'the/an author of books'   'public hall'

   b. Kitab-on ka munsanif   b. divan-e   am
       book-PL KA author.M   room-EZ common
       'the/an author of books'   'public audience hall' (Butt & King, 2004)

Following tests from Barrie & Mathieu (2015), I propose that izafat in HU is a word formation process, specifically compounding as among other properties, it is not possible to make backward reference to a noun within an ezafe construction. I follow Harley (2009) and posit that the root noun selects for and internal argument and merges with it before undergoing head movement to merge with the category defining head triggering the inversion we see in izafat constructions in HU; compare the default order in (2a) where the adjective precedes the noun with (b) where the noun prosodically bound to the ezafe and precedes the adjective.

I show that KA-marking is not genitive case but, a LINKER for two maximal projections. It is possible to link a number of different types of constituents to a DP using KA-marking; in (3) it is used to link a PP – in other cases it can be used to link a non-nominalized VP to a DP as a modifier; this is inconsistent with genitive case. Following this, I show that KA-marking joins two DPs; in (4) we can see that KA-marking links two NPs with demonstrative determiners and numerals; however, this is not grammatical with adjective or izafat modifiers.

3) Karachi tak   *(ki) sarhak   4) in   do   kitab-on ka ye ek   munsanif
   Karachi until   KA road.M.NOM   these two book-PL KA this one author.M
   'the road that goes to Karachi'   'the single author of these two books'

In conclusion, I propose that there are three levels of nominal modification in HUthat have separate sets of requirements and structures. Novelly, I suggest that KA-marking does not correspond to genitive case, and is used to combine maximal projections; and izafat, unlike

Persian ezafe, is a compounding process. Ultimately, I propose that KA-marking, like other LINKERS, has a functional motivation – in this case resolving problems of labelling.

References

Barrie, Michael. 2015. Two Kinds of Structural Noun Incorporation. *Studia Linguistica* 69(3). 237–271.

Bögel, Tina & Miriam Jessica Butt. 2010. Possessive Clitics and Ezafe in Urdu. In K Börjas & D Denison (eds.), *Morpho-syntactic categories and the expression of possession*,. John Benjamins.

Bögel, Tina, Miriam Butt & Sebastian Sulger. 2008. Urdu Ezafe and the Morphology-Syntax Interface. In *Proceedings of LFG08*,. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Butt, Miriam Jessica & Tracy King. 2004. The status of case. In Veneeta Dayal & Anoop Mahajan (eds.), *Clause Structure in South Asian Languages*, 153–198. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Chomsky, Noam. 2013. Problems of projection. *Lingua* 130. 33–49.

den Dikken, Marcel. 2006. *Relators and Linkers*. MIT Press.

Harley, Heidi. 2009. Compounding in Distributed Morphology. In Rochelle Lieber & Pavel Stekauer (eds.), *Oxford Handbook of Compounding*, 129–144. Oxford: Oxford University Press.