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Abstract

In this article the syntactic structure of those noun phrases of Urdu is explored in which there are multiple instances of genitive marked elements. The structural ambiguities in such phrases are described. It is shown that only the attributive genitive modifiers stack together at the same level to modify the head noun otherwise there is always a hierarchical structure for the genitive modifiers. The nominals which license genitive marked arguments are described and their classification is given. This classification will help building an enriched lexicon for the development of a computational grammar for Urdu.

1. Introduction

The form *kaa* in Urdu-Hindi originated from the past participle form of the Indo-Aryan verb *kar*- ‘do’. It inflects for gender, number and case and agrees with the head noun: *kau* (M.Sg.Dir), *ke* (M.Sg.Obl/M.Pl), *kii* (F) [1]. This form is traced back to a Prakrit past participle form *keraa* that is further traced back to Sanskrit past participle form *kritaan*. The evidence for it is provided by Beames [2] who has given the example, *kapi-kritam vacanam* ‘speech made by monkey’ or alternatively ‘speech of the monkey’. The inflected forms *keraa*, *kerii*, *kere* were in use in old Hindi. The possessive/genitive forms of pronouns were made by adding these forms to them. Later the first syllable of these forms was lost and only the second one was retained with some forms of the pronouns and hence Hindi-Urdu now uses *meraa*, *teraa*, etc. as possessive pronouns. But with some other forms of pronouns and all nouns the forms *kau*, *kii*, *ke* began to be used.

Based on some tests to distinguish affixes and clitics by Miller [3] and Zwicky [4], Butt and King [5] have analyzed these forms as clitics. One of the test is that these have scope over noun coordination and the other is that some other element can intervene between these endings and the nominal host. The most frequent use of these clitics is that they mark possessive nouns, that is, these generally express possession or have-a relation. Consider the following instances of genitive phrases.

(1) a. ندا کی کتاب
nidaa=kii kitaab
Nida.F.3Sg=Gen.F book.F.3Sg
‘Nida’s book’
b. کتاب کا ورق
kitaab=kA varq
book.F.3Sg=Gen.M.3Sg page.M.3Sg
‘The page of a book’

Both of instances in (1) show a have-a relation. Although the genitive markers are hosted on the modifier noun, these show agreement of number and gender with the head noun. Another requirement for a genitive phrase to be grammatical is that the host of the genitive marker should be in oblique form. If some genitive phrase hosts a genitive marker then both the head noun and the genitive marker in the host genitive phrase will be in oblique form.

(2) a. بچے کے کھلونے کی قیمت
[bace=ke kHilone=kii qiimat
‘The price of a child’s toy’
b. بچے کے کھلونے کی قیمت
[bace=kaa kHilona
child.M.3Sg.Obl=Gen.M.3Sg.Dir toy.M.3Sg.Dir
‘A child’s toy’

In (2a) the host of the genitive marker *bacaar* ‘child’ is in its oblique form. When the whole genitive phrase in (2a) hosts another genitive marker as in (2b) then both the head noun *kHilona* ‘toy’ and the genitive marker *kao* in the phrase become oblique. Such is the morpho-syntactic behavior of genitive markers in Urdu. In addition to possession there are so many other relations
that are expressed by genitive markers [6]. To explore all these relations is not in the scope of this paper. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 analyzes the structure of genitive phrases with multiple instances of genitive marked nouns. Section 3 describes the genitive marked arguments with the verbal elements and provides the classification of nouns based on genitive marked arguments. An implementation in the LFG (Lexical Functional Grammar) framework is discussed in section 4. Section 5 concludes the paper.

2. Structure of Genitive Phrases with Multiple Genitive Modifiers

Both flat and hierarchical structures of genitive phrases with multiple instances of genitive marked nouns are possible. Consider the following example.

(3) a. 

الیٰ کی کاندی کی انجو ٹھی 

ali=kii cañdii=kii añguuTHii 

Ali=Gen.F silver=Gen.F ring.F.3Sg 

‘Ali’s silver-ring’ OR 

‘The ring of Ali’s silver’ 

b. 

نیدا کی سنے کا کانگ 

nidaa=kaa sone=kaa kañgan 

Nida=Gen.Sg gold=Gen.M.Sg bracelet.M 

‘Nida’s golden ring’

For (3a), the following three bracketing structures could all be assumed.

(i) [ali=kii [caañdii=kii añguuTHii]]
(ii) [ali=kii caañdii=kii añguuTHii]
(iii) [ali=kii caañdii=kii añguuTHii]

The first two are the plausible structures for the genitive phrase and are both hierarchical. In (i) the head noun añguuTHii ‘ring’ is modified by the genitive marked element caañdii=kii ‘of silver’ and then the resulting genitive phrase is modified by another genitive marked element ali=kii ‘of Ali’. In the second bracketing structure (ii), first the noun caañdii ‘silver’ is modified by ali=kii ‘of Ali’ and then the genitive marker is attached to this phrase to modify the head noun añguuTHii ‘ring’. In (iii) the

head noun añguuTHii ‘ring’ is modified by two modifiers ali=kii ‘of Ali’ and caañdii=kii ‘of silver’.

Three structures for a noun phrase with two genitive modifiers are not always possible. For example in (3b) the bracketing structure [nidaa=kaa sone]=kaa kañgan is not possible due to morpho-syntactic behavior of the genitive markers. Here, a genitive marker is supposed to be attached with another genitive phrase nidaa=kaa sone ‘Nida’s gold’ in which the genitive marker kaa does not show the agreement of case with the head noun sone ‘gold’. So the hierarchical structure like (ii) can not be assumed for (3b).

The flat structure for both instances in (3) is not plausible in that the two genitive modifiers cannot alternate their positions (4). So we cannot say that the two modifiers are modifying the head noun at the same level.

(4) a. *

الیٰ کی کاندی کی انجو ٹھی 

caañdii=kii ali=kii añguuTHii 

silver=Gen.F.Sg Ali=Gen.F.Sg ring.F.3Sg 

‘Ali’s silver-ring’

b. *

سونے کا نیدا کا کانگ 

sone=kaa nidaa=kaa kañgan 

Nida=Gen.Sg gold.Oblique=Gen.M.Sg bracelet.M 

‘Nida’s golden ring’

One can argue that (4) is ungrammatical rather due to another reason that the possessive modifier is not the most prominent (the outer most). In (5) there is no possessive modifier and still only one order (5a) of genitive marked elements is grammatical. Some more instances of genitive phrases where a flat structure of genitive modifiers is not possible are given in (6).

(5) a. 

ملتان کی مریم کے برتون 

multaan=ke maTTii=ke bartan 


‘Ceramic pots of Multan’

b. *

مریم کی ملتان کے برتون 

maTTii=ke multaan=ke bartan 


‘Ceramic pots of Multan’

(6) a. 

الیٰ کی بیوی کی انجو ٹھی 

ali=kii biivii=kii añguuTHii 

Ali=Gen.F wife=Gen.F ring.F.3Sg 

‘The ring of Ali’s wife’

b. *

الیٰ کی بھری کی قیمت 

ali=kii gHaRii=kii qiimat 

Ali=Gen.F watch=Gen.F price.F.3Sg 

‘The price of Ali’s watch’

1 In the transcription scheme, consider ‘a’, ‘i’, ‘u’ as short vowels and ‘aa’, ‘ii’, ‘uu’ as long vowels. The equal symbol ‘=’ marks a clitic boundary. Glosses used in this paper are as follows: 1st, 2nd and 3rd person, respectively; Gen=genitive, Dir=direct case, Obl=oblique case, Sg=Singular, Pl=Plural, Inf=Infinitive.
The noun that opens a position for another nominal is called the relational element [7]. The noun biivii ‘wife’ in (6a) is a relational element and the modifier alii=kii makes a constituent with this noun. In (6b) the head noun qimmat ‘price’ actually is an attribute and this attribute can only be of ghHaRii ‘watch’. So (6a) and (6b) both have hierarchical structures as illustrated below.

(i) [alii=kii biivii]=kii aŋguTHii
(ii) [alii=kii ghHaRii]=kii qimmat

The hierarchical structure could be deep on either side depending upon the semantics of participants in genitive phrases.

2.1. Attributive Genitive Modifiers

The list of some attributes and their examples is given in Table 1. Attributive genitive modifiers here are taken to be those genitive modifiers which result after adding a genitive marker to some attribute of the head noun. More than one attributive genitive element can modify the head noun at the same level. That is, a genitive phrase with multiple attributive genitive modifiers has a flat structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nr.</th>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Example/Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Material</td>
<td>gold, clay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>10 rupees, low price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>small size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Height</td>
<td>tall height</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>red color</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Weight</td>
<td>3 kilograms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>20 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: List of Attributes

Consider the following instances of genitive phrases with multiple instances of attributive genitive modifiers.

(7) a. ﻷﻤﯽ ﻓﺪ ﻞﻣﻞ ﻤﺎ ﻪ ﻪ ﻦ ﺗ ﺞ ﻷ ﻪ ﻪ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﻪ ﻧ ﻦ ﻦ 
[lambe qad=kii] [gore raŋg=kii] laRkii tall height=Gen.F white color=Gen.F girl.F ‘The girl of tall height and white colour’

b. ﻷﻤﯽ ﻷ ﻪ ﻪ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ 
[kam qimmat=kaa] [cHoTe size=kaa] laptop low price=Gen.M small size=Gen.M laptop.M ‘A laptop of low price and small size’

In both (7a) and (7b) the order of genitive modifiers can be alternated without changing the truth-conditional meaning. My claim is that only attributive genitive modifiers can stack together in a flat structure in Urdu. Furthermore, attributive genitive modifiers show a syntactically similar distribution as adjectival modifiers. The instances in (7) can be uttered with adjectival modifiers as in (8).

(8) a. ﻷﻤﯽ ﻷ ﻪ ﻪ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻞ ﻞ ﻞ ﻞ 
[alii=kii biivii]=kii aŋguTHii
[alii=kii gHaRii]=kii qimmat

The hierarchical structure could be deep on either side depending upon the semantics of participants in genitive phrases.

Like adjectival modifiers (9), the attributive genitive modifiers also modify the head noun (10) and that these cannot modify other genitive phrases. With this argumentation it is clear why example phrases in (4) and (5b) are ungrammatical.

(9) a. ﻷﻤﯽ ﻷ ﻪ ﻪ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻞ ﻞ ﻞ ﻞ 
[alii=kii baRaa kamrah]

b. ﻷﻤﯽ ﻷ ﻪ ﻪ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻞ ﻞ ﻞ ﻞ 
*[alii=kii baRaa kamrah]

(10) a. ﻷﻤﯽ ﻷ ﻪ ﻪ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻞ ﻞ ﻞ ﻞ 
[piine=kaa saaf paanii]
drink.Inf=Gen.M clean water.M.Sg ‘Purified drinking-water’

b. ﻷﻤﯽ ﻷ ﻪ ﻪ ﻦ ﺞ ﻦ ﻞ ﻞ ﻞ ﻞ 
*[piine=kaa saaf paanii]
drink.Inf=Gen.M clean water.M.Sg ‘Purified drinking-water’

In (9b) the adjectival modifier baRaa ‘big’ is not modifying the head noun kamrah ‘room’. We cannot suppose that this adjective is modifying the possessor noun because in that case it should have been in oblique form to agree with Ali, which is oblique given that it is hosting a genitive kaa on the possessor noun phrase. As the adjective cannot modify the genitive phrase alii=kii kamrah ‘Ali’s room’, the whole phrase becomes ungrammatical. The phrase in (10b) can only be grammatical if the phrase piine=kaa paanii ‘drinking-water’ is considered as a unit. As in English the phrase every men’s room is acceptable...
because men’s room is considered as a noun-noun compound involving the possessive morpheme and every takes men’s room as a unit for its complement [8].

Sometimes ambiguity is generated as to whether the genitive attributive modifier before the material genitive modifier is for the material of the head noun or the head noun itself (11a). If the material genitive modifier is placed before any other genitive attributive modifier (11b) then no such ambiguity is generated.

\[(11)\]
\[
a. \text{ ﻣﻴﺰ} \text{ ﻗﻠﮏ} \text{ ﺑﺎ} \text{ ﺛﺎ} \text{ ﻣﻴﺰ} \\
\text{ mez =Gen.F red color=Gen.F wood=Gen.F table.F.Sg} \\
\text{ ‘The table made of red wood’ OR} \\
\text{ ‘The red table made of wood’}
\]
\[
b. \text{ ﻣﻴﺰ} \text{ ﻗﻠﮏ} \text{ ﻣﻴﺰ} \text{ ﺑﺎ} \text{ ﺛﺎ} \text{ ﻣﻴﺰ} \\
\text{ mez =Gen.F red color=Gen.F wood=Gen.F table.F.Sg} \\
\text{ ‘The red table made of wood’}
\]

When both adjectives and attributive genitive modifiers are present in noun phrases then attributive genitive modifiers are placed near the head noun after the adjectives (12).

\[(12)\]
\[
\text{ ندا} \text{ ﻷ} \text{ لﺰﮓ} \text{ ﺗﺎ} \text{ خﻮﺑﺼﻮﺮ} \text{ ﻟﻴﺒﺎس} \\
\text{ nidaa=gen red color=Gen beautiful suit} \\
\text{ ‘Nida’s beautiful red suit’}
\]

(13) a. ﻣﻤﻤﮏ ﺗﺎ ﻛﻠﺐ ﺛﺎ ﻣﻴﺰ \\
\text{ kam qiimat=kaa laptop} \\
\text{ low price=Gen laptop} \\
\text{ ‘A laptop of low price’}

b. ﻣﻴﺰ ﻛﻠﺐ ﺛﺎ ﻣﻴﺰ \\
\text{ mez=Gen.F red color=Gen.F wood=Gen.F table.F.Sg} \\
\text{ ‘The red table made of wood’}

(14) a. ﻓﻴﻤﺎ ﺗﺎ ﻋﻠﻢ \\
\text{ qiimat=kaa ilm} \\
\text{ price=Gen knowledge} \\
\text{ ‘Knowledge of the price’}

b. ﺘﻮ ﺗﺎ ﻣﻴﺰ \\
\text{ sao ropai=kii qiimat} \\
\text{ hundred rupee=Gen price} \\
\text{ ‘Price of one hundred rupees’}

If a genitive marker is added to some specified attribute (13a) or some value of attribute (13b), in both cases it will be considered as an attributive genitive modifier, provided the modified noun is not an abstract one. In (14a) and (14b) the modified nouns are abstract and therefore modifiers in such cases are not attributive genitive modifiers. The is-a relation is expressed in (14b).

The part-whole relation with a genitive construction is expressed by marking the whole with the genitive marker but the other way round is also possible in Urdu. In the later case the part before hosting the genitive marker is modified by some adjective/quantifier and it acts like attributive genitive modifiers (15a-b).

\[(15)\]
\[
a. \text{ ﺟﺎ} \text{ ﻣﻴﺰ} \text{ ﺗﺎ} \text{ رﻮ} \text{ ﺟﺎ} \text{ ﺟﺎ} \\
\text{ ek rañg=kii murQaa} \\
\text{ one leg=Gen.M rooster.M} \\
\text{ ‘The rooster of one leg’}
\]
\[
b. \text{ ﺟﺎ} \text{ ﻣﻴﺰ} \text{ ﺗﺎ} \text{ ﺟﺎ} \text{ ﺟﺎ} \\
\text{ piile rañg=kii do paroñ=kaa yih pañkHaa} \\
\text{ yellow colour=Gen two wing=Gen this fan} \\
\text{ ‘This fan of yellow colour and of two wings’}
\]

So far, in this section, multiple instances of genitive modifiers have been explored and the analogy of attributive genitive modifiers with adjectives was described. Multiple genitive arguments of nouns are discussed in the next section.

3. Nominals and Genitive Arguments

Some nouns like brother, child, enemy, edge, etc., are supposed inherently relational [9], taking the genitive arguments in English and many other languages but the clearest cases of arguments in noun phrases are found in some nominalization. The relationship between nouns and verbs was established first by Chomsky in 1970 [10], when he showed that verbs and nouns seem to share complement-taking properties (16).

\[(16)\]
\[
a. \text{ The enemy destroyed the city.} \\
\text{ b. The enemy’s destruction of the city.}
\]

One basic difference between the argument structure of verbs and nouns is that verbs can take bare NPs as their arguments but the nouns cannot take bare NPs as their arguments. First it was believed that nouns take arguments only optionally [11], [12]. Later it was shown [13] by Grimshaw that many nouns have two senses or interpretations. In one sense they denote complex events and take arguments obligatorily and in another sense they denote simple events and do not necessarily take arguments. In the first sense they are called process nominals or derived nominals [14] and in the later sense they are called result nominals. Later
in this section, it will be examined whether this distinction also exists in Urdu or not.

In Urdu, infinitives are used to construct clauses and are also used as nominals. Butt [15] has debated whether infinitive clauses in Urdu are equivalent to finite clauses or whether they are nominalizations or gerunds. Bhatt [16] proposed that infinitives can be projected without a subject but Davison [17] recommended only full clause structure for Urdu infinitives. She provided evidence for the presence of projected syntactic subject in infinitive clauses, even if it is not pronounced.

In this paper Urdu infinitives as nominals will be explored as to what types of genitive arguments they can take. Consider the example phrases of infinitival nominals in (17).

(17) a. iiñdHan=kaa jalnaa
fuel=Gen.M burn.Inf 'burning of fuel'

b. marisz=kaa kHaañsnaa
patient=Gen.M cough.Inf 'Coughing of the patient'

c. nidaa=kaa dekHnaa
Nida=Gen.M see.Inf 'Seeing of Nida/ Seeing by Nida'

d. alii=kaa nidaa=ko dekHnaa
Ali=Gen.M Nida=Acc see.Inf 'Seeing of Nida by Ali'

For both unaccusative intransitive verbs (17a) and unergative intransitive verbs (17b), the subject argument (the theme in the first case and the agent in the later case) of the nominal is marked genitive. The question is which argument of the transitive verb dekHnaa 'see' is marked by genitive marker in (17c). Is it subject or object? It is assumed that it can be either in Urdu. If only one argument of the infinitival nominal of a transitive verb is mentioned in Urdu then it can be either its internal argument or its external argument.

Lebaux [18], however, explained that if the subject of nominal derived from transitive verb is present then object must obligatorily be there for the noun phrase to be grammatical. Grimshaw showed that obligatory arguments are taken by nominals only when these are action nominals and it could also be the case that the same nominal behaves in both senses. With this explanation the nominal in (17c) will be considered as a result nominal. It is observed that with infinitives only one argument is marked genitive. In case full argument structure is realized, the subject is marked genitive and the object is marked nominative or accusative. This is illustrated in (18)-(19).

(18) a. nidaa=kaa becnaa
Nida=Gen.M sell.Inf 'Selling by Nida/ Selling of Nida'

b. kHilonoñ=kaa becnaa
toy.Pl=Gen.M sell.Inf 'Selling of toys'

c. nidaa=kaa kHilonoñ=ko becnaa
Nida=Gen.M toy.Pl/Obl=Acc sell.Inf 'Selling of toys by Nida'

d. nidaa=kaa bacoñ=ko kHilone becnaa
Nida=Gen.M child.Pl/Obl=Acc sell.Inf 'Selling of toys by Nida to the children'

In (18) the infinitive of a transitive verb becnaa 'sell' is given with its arguments. The subject reading of genitive modifier in (18a) and object reading in (18b) both are okay. In (18c-d) both object and subject are mentioned and only the subject is marked genitive. The instances in (19) are frequent expressions in Urdu web corpora where only the object reading is construed. In case of only single genitive argument of the infinitive, most of the times object reading is meaningful.

Persian infinitives are also used as nominals and they too can take either subject or object, but not both with the ezafe construction [19]. In Urdu, however, not only some arguments of infinitive nominals are marked with the genitive, but also arguments of participial adjectives and some subordinate clauses are marked genitive.

(19) a. ek xudaa=kaa maan-naa
one God=Gen believe.Inf 'Believing in one God'

b. quran=kaa paRhnaa
Quran=Gen read.Inf 'Reading of Quran'

In (18) the infinitive of a transitive verb becnaa 'sell' is given with its arguments. The subject reading of genitive modifier in (18a) and object reading in (18b) both are okay. In (18c-d) both object and subject are mentioned and only the subject is marked genitive. The instances in (19) are frequent expressions in Urdu web corpora where only the object reading is construed. In case of only single genitive argument of the infinitive, most of the times object reading is meaningful.

Persian infinitives are also used as nominals and they too can take either subject or object, but not both with the ezafe construction [19]. In Urdu, however, not only some arguments of infinitive nominals are marked with the genitive, but also arguments of participial adjectives and some subordinate clauses are marked genitive.

(20) a. duudH=kaa jalaa huaa
milk=Gen.M burn.Perf.M be.PerfM 'One, who has been burnt of milk'
In (20) the subjects of participle adjectives are marked with the genitive. In (21) the subjects of participles are marked genitive and here these participles are acting like clauses. In (22) genitive marked elements give adverbial meanings with derived adjectival participles.

3.1. Nominals other than Infinitives with Genitive Marked Arguments

In Urdu many nouns other than infinitives are derived from verbal roots and take genitive arguments. Some nouns are derived from verbal roots of Urdu itself and some are derived from verbal roots of other languages like Arabic and Persian. These nouns can be divided into two classes. The nouns in one class take only one genitive marked argument and the nouns in other class can take two genitive marked arguments. Some instances of nouns from the former class are given in (23)-(24).

(23) a. ترین کی روانگی
Train=Gen departure
‘departure of train’

b. ترین کی استیشن میں روانگی
Train=Gen station=se ravaangii
‘departure of train from the station’

(24) a. سیالاب کی تباہی
flood=Gen.F destruction.F
‘Destruction due to flood’

b. فصول کی تباہی
crop.Pl=Gen.F destruction.F
‘Destruction of crops’

c. انسان کی تباہی
man=Gen.F destruction.F
‘Destruction of man’ OR
‘Destruction by man’

d. انسان کی فصول کی تباہی
* ‘Destruction of crops by man’ OR
* ‘Destruction of crops of a man’

e. * سیالاب کی فصول کی تباہی
‘Destruction of crops due to flood’

f. سیالاب سے فصول کی تباہی
flood=se fasloñ=kii tabaahii
‘Destruction of crops due to flood’

In (23) ravaangii ‘departure’ is a noun derived from the intransitive verb and has two alternate subcategorization frames. In both cases it takes genitive marked subject. All nouns of intransitive nature have their subject as genitive marked. The noun tabaahii ‘destruction’ is of transitive nature and can take either a genitive marked subject or a genitive marked object (24a-c) but not both of them (24d-e) are marked for genitive case. In (24f) the subject of the nominal is marked by the ablative marker se. Other nominals in Urdu which fall in this class are for example pitaaii ‘beating’, dHulaaii ‘washing’, pisaaaii ‘crushing’, muaina ‘examination’.

There are some nouns that can take only a genitive marked object, for example, the nominal bacaao ‘safety’ derived from the verb bacaanaa ‘save’. The noun intixaab ‘selection’ usually takes a genitive object. However, it can also act as result nominal where it refers to the result of the selection process as in English.

(25) a. صدر کا انتخاب
sadr=Gen intixaab
‘Selection of the president’

b. علي کا انتخاب
ali=Gen intixaab
Ali=Gen selection
‘Selection made by Ali’
c. This beautiful verse is selection of Ali

In (25b) the noun intixaab ‘selection’ refers to some result of the process which is evidenced in (25c). Because event or process nominal cannot be used predicatively as showed by Grimshaw [13], the instance of noun intixaab ‘selection’ in (25c) is a result nominal which is modified by a genitive modifier.

The second class of nominals in Urdu is typical in that both subject and object/theme are marked by genitive markers. In Persian there is not a single nominal in which both subject and object are licensed by ezafe construction. In English too, both subject and object of any noun can not be prenominal genitives. It is a special characteristics of Urdu and some other Indo-Aryan languages that these have some nominals in which both subject and object/theme both are marked genitive at the same time. The noun gHeraao ‘circumventing’ derived from the verb gHernaa ‘circumvent’ is one example of such nouns.

For each head noun in noun phrases of (26), there are two arguments and these are both marked genitive.

4. LFG Implementation

LFG’s modular framework represents the syntax with two basic representations. The c-(onstituent) structure encodes the basic constituency structure and linear hierarchy of the elements and the f-(unctional) structure models grammatical relations, functional information and other dependencies. In Urdu grammar development [20] genitive markers are dealt in syntax. These clitics have their own terminal node to represent the head of a case phrase.

The genitive marker agrees in gender, number and case with the head noun. This agreement is dealt with at f-structure via feature unification. The genitive phrases with a single instance of genitive marked element work well. With multiple instances of genitive elements the complexity increases. Consider (27):

(27) a.

abrahaa=kaa haiHaatHiyoñ=kaa laSkar
Abraha=Gen.Sg elephant.Pl=Gen army.M
‘Abrah’s army of elephants’

b.

abrahaa=ke haiHaatHiyoñ=kaa laSkar
‘The army of Abraha’s elephants’

c.

abrahaa=ke haiHaatHiyoñ=ke laSkar
Abraha=Gen elephant.Pl=Gen army.Pl
‘The armies of Abraha’s elephants’ OR ‘Abraha’s armies of elephants’

With out any restriction the following three bracketing structures for (27a) can be assumed.

(i)  [abrahaa=kaa [haiHaatHiyoñ=kaa laSkar]]
(ii) [abrahaa=kaa haiHaatHiyoñ=kaa laSkar]
(iii) [[abrahaa=kaa haiHaatHiyoñ]=kaa laSkar]

Due to non-agreement of number with the head noun the bracketing structure in (iii) is ruled out via feature unification. Structural ambiguity increases when a genitive phrase with multiple instances of genitive elements hosts a case marker, say for example an ergative marker. When a case marker is added to any instance of (27a-b) both result into the similar surface structure as in (27c).

To rule out the bracketing structure (ii) above, it is proposed to typify different genitive case phrases in the grammar, like attributive genitive case phrase, relational genitive case phrase, and so. When the two case phrases in (ii) will not be recognized as attributive case phrase, then it will be rejected and only the first one will be recognized for (27a) that seems plausible.

Likewise different nominals taking genitive arguments are proposed to be categorized according to the number and type of genitive arguments they take. The lexicon with full subcategorization information of nouns will help to correctly parse the noun phrases in Urdu and the coverage of the parser will be increased.

5. Conclusion

In this article noun phrases of Urdu with multiple instances of genitive elements have been analyzed. The flat and hierachical structures of such phrases are explored. It is shown that attributive genitive modifiers
behave like adjective modifiers in the syntax and can stack together at the same level and it is proposed to deal such elements separate to other genitive elements. The hierarchical structure of noun phrases with genitive modifiers, however, needs to be worked out further as to disambiguate depth of hierarchy in either direction based on features of the participants. It will help making grammar robust and increasing the coverage. The classification of nominals based on their number and type of genitive arguments is proposed to provide an enriched lexicon to the parser of the grammar.
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