RESEARCH PAPER

On the Suitability of Longobardi's Model for Pashto Determiner Phrases

Talat Masood *1   Sadia Zahir Ali ² Muneeba Sharafat ³

1. Assistant Professor, Department of English, University of Swabi, KP, Pakistan
2. Lecturer, Department of English, University of Swabi, KP, Pakistan
3. Lecturer, Department of English, University of Swabi, KP, Pakistan

DOI	http://doi.org/10.47205/plhr.2022(6-II)38

PAPER INFO	ABSTRACT
	Due to their predominantly overt nature, noun phrases have always remained a source of attraction for grammarians. In fact, the study of noun phrases is as old as grammar itself. The introduction of the generative approach to grammar did not diminish the interest in noun phrases. A paradigm shift in the study of noun phrases occurred when 'D' as the head of the noun phrase was introduced. A large number of language-specific and cross-linguistic studies were carried out to describe the determiner phrase. Among these, Longobardi (2001) is considered very influential account. On the other hand, during all these years of intense activity, determiner phrases in Pashto remained unexplored from any theoretical perspective. The goal of the current paper is to look at the varied forms of determiner phrases in Pashto and see whether Longobardi's model can adequately explain determiner phrases in Pashto or the model needs adjustments to cater to the needs of Pashto determiner phrases.

Introduction

Due to their ubiquitous presence in different clausal and sentential constructions, noun phrases have always attracted grammarians; as such, they have remained a productive arena for research during the last one hundred years. The introduction of the generative approach to grammar did not diminish the ever-increasing interest of the grammarians in noun phrases. A paradigm shift occurred in the study of the noun phrase when a functional head 'D' was introduced for the noun phrase to serve as its head. Since the introduction of the determiner phrase, a lot has been written on the nature of the determiner phrases. Among them, Longobardi (2001) is considered as one of the most influential accounts of determiner phrases (DPs) on cross-linguistic basis. DPs in Pashto, on the other hand, remained unexplored from any standard point of view (both traditionally and generatively). The goal of this paper is to see whether Longobardi's model can adequately explain the structure of Pashto DPs or not.

Literature Review

A paradigm shift occurred in the study of noun phrase when Reuland (1986), Hellan (1986), Abney (1987), and Bowers (1987) introduced a functional head, called determiner (D), for the noun phrase, to serve as its head. Subsequently, Szabolsci (1987, 1994, 2018), Giorgi and Longobardi (1991), Ritter (1988, 1991),Valois (1991), Cinque (1994,1999,2006, 2010), Longobardi (1994, 2001), Giusti (1997, 2002), Lyons (1997), Chierchia (1998, 2005), Borer (2005), Burgè (2002), Carstens (2000, 2017), Alexiadou (2001, 2014), Shlonsky (2004, 2020), Alexiadou, Haegeman and Stavrou (2007), Gebhardt (2009), Ticio (2010), Longobardi and Silvestri (2013), Krapova and Cinque (2018) to name only a few, have discussed different aspects of determiner phrases. However, because of the varied nature of DPs cross-linguistically, no account has so far been able to explain adequately the nature of DPs belonging to different languages. In the context of these facts, Longobardi model DP is considered to see if it explains the facts of Pashto DPs or not, as it is considered one of the most influential accounts given above.

Longobardi (2001) is concerned with proposing principles and parameters for the structure of DPs cross-linguistically. He starts by pointing out the similarities and differences between nominals in a clause and nominals inside a DP. He divides the genitives inside the DP into two groups – prepositional genitives and non-prepositional genitives. The non-prepositional genitives, which are infact five different types of heterogeneous genitives, are grouped under possessive genitives. The possessive genitives, according to him, tend to occupy higher positions than the 'prepositional genitives'. Possessive or possessivized genitive "may surface relatively high in a DP structure, i.e. they can precede attributive adjectives under a normal intonation, a possibility excluded for prepositional genitives" (p. 567). He gives the following structure for the different possible arguments inside a nominal phrase:

[<u>1</u> GenS <u>2</u> [S-oriented [Manner1 N [Manner2 [Argument <u>3</u> [GenO [α P[S [O…N…]] α]]]]]]] (p. 580)

"He believes that positions 1 through 3 are the possible surface positions for possessive genitives cross-linguistically. He hypothesises that the lower position of prepositional genitive may be related to the base ones of P, S, and O in phrase α. He believes that 'liner order' in phrases such as α is 'essentially undetermined'. According to him, in many cases, the principal nominal N moves to D, while adjectives remain in-situ. Similarly, in some cases, the principal nominal moves to intermediate positions between D and N." (Masood, 2014; p. 192)

Further, according to him, the generalized hierarchy for possessor, subject, and object type constructions is P>S>O, which means that in such constructions P would precede the subject and the subject would precede the object. Again, there has been the pattern that the genitive bearing nominal precedes the attributive adjectives in non-prepositional genitives and follows the attributive adjectives in prepositional genitives (Longobardi, 1994). He proposes that "attributive adjectives as a whole… crosslinguistically occur lower than a genitive position or higher than another genitive position:"(p. 580). Moreover, he proposes that cross-linguistically "there are thus two positions for non-prepositional Genitive, one higher than adjectival modifiers, the

other lower. Languages make the parametric choice of activating just one or the other or both."(p. 568).

While during the last fifty years noun phrases/ determiner phrases have remained an active arena for research, NPs/ DPs in Pashto have remained oblivious to these developments. Majority of the well-known grammarians (Raverty, 1855; Lorimer, 1902; Roos-Keppel, 1922; Penzal, 1955; Shafeev, 1964; Mackenzie, 1987; Bukhari, 1995; Tegey and Robson, 1996; Rashteen, 2001; Zayar, 2005), have in one way or another touched the issue of noun phrases/ determiner phrases, in passing, from traditional perspective. However, none of them has not exclusively discussed the noun phrase/ determiner phrase for its own sake. No detailed account either traditionally or generatively exists about Pashto DPs. Moreover, Pashto DPs have never been discussed in the context of Longobardi's structure for DPs.

Material and Methods

Although, Pashto is one of the most widely spoken Indo-Iranian languages, still it has no worthwhile corpora. This is in addition to the fact that so far no comprehensive study, be it traditional or generative, of Pashto DPs has ever been carried out. Thus, the current study is exploratory in nature and has theoretical/ qualitative implications; unlike a typical quantitative research involving questions and statistical analyses. As such, the instant methodology has two aspects. First, to point out some generative characteristics/ trends of the DPs that have been noticed in DPs cross-linguistically (especially with reference to Longobardi (2001)). Second, to point out some features of Pashto DPs (based on Masood 2014) and analyze them in the light of Longobardi's model (2001).

While carrying out analyses of different Pashto constructions, the author has not relied solely on self-knowledge; rather, opinions of other native speakers of Pashto about grammaticality/ ungrammaticality of different DP constructions/ characteristics are considered. Age, gender, and locality are given importance while soliciting their opinions.

Some Features of Pashto DPs

"When seen from a cross-linguistic perspective, determiners and DPs in Pashto have their unique features. For instance, Pashto is an article-less language. In Pashto, determiners are not necessary for grammaticality, which may be the consequence of the first feature, namely, article-less-ness. Determiners, in Pashto DPs, unlike English, can be staked together: *da* 'of' *zama* 'my' *hagha* 'that' *har* 'every' *yo* 'one' *pen* 'pen'/ '*my that every one pen'. The above example shows that that word order is acceptable in Pashto, while such arrangement is unacceptable in English. Adjectives, in Pashto, are non-gradable, thus at times making it difficult to differentiate determiners from adjectives. In Pashto DPs, determiners do not occur to the right of the nouns, as has been the case with certain languages. Nouns in Pashto inside a DP remain *in situ*, they do not move to the spec DP as is the case with Saxon genitives in English. Possessive pronouns in Pashto DPs are base generated in the region between D and NP. The constituents of a Pashto DP observe the following fixed order: Possessive Pronoun > Demonstrative > Quantifier > Adjective > Noun. Pashto possessive pronouns cannot stand on their own. They, most of the time, need a host

(noun) to attach to. Possession in Pashto DP is realized via the possessive marker *da*. The functional category D in Pashto is empty." (Masood 2014; pp. 189-190)

Analyses and Discussion

In the analyses and discussion section, different aspects of Longobardi's (2001) proposal are taken and they are applied to Pashto DPs to see whether they explain Pashto DPs or not.

First, we take the case of possessive marker. A major divide that exists between genitive case bearing nominals is that either the genitive case is realized via preposition or through other means (Longobardi, 2001). The literature review shows that no one has tried to deal with the exact nature of possessive marker in Pashto. For the realization of genitive case in Pashto, it is proposed that they are not prepositions; rather, they are possessive markers showing possession. Our proposal is supported by the facts that, firstly, while in case of prepositional genitives, the prepositional phrase part of the DP is located below the other nominal (as for instance in English, pen [of Peter], ball [of Maria]), in Pashto DPs, it is not the case. Here the prepositional phrase - if we hypothetically suppose that it is a prepositional phrase - lies above the other nominal: *[da Saleem] pen*, *[da Maria] ball*. Secondly, prepositions are thought to be independent units. They can stand on their own. Possessive markers, on the other hand, cannot stand on their own; they need a host/root to attach to. It is the case with the possessive marker *da* in Pashto DPs. Unlike the well-established prepositions in Pashto, it cannot stand on its own. Based on this, it can be concluded that possessive marker in Pashto is not a preposition.

Second, we take the case of realization of possessives. Longobardi (2001) believes that the realization of possessives - when the possessive marker is not a preposition (as for instance, in English through 's, in German through s, in Arabic through I, etc.) - may surface prenominally of the possessive noun. This is not the case with prepositional genitives where in majority of cases preposition comes after the possessive (as for instance, [father of] Maria, [ball of] Maria, etc.). In Pashto DPs, interestingly, contrary to Longobardi, though the genitive marker is not a preposition, still it precedes the possive and possessive noun: *[da Peter] pen*, *[da Maria] ball*. Thus, Longobardi does not cater to this aspect of Pashto DPs.

Third, Longobardi (2001) is of the view that possessive or possessivized genitive "may surface relatively high in a DP structure, i.e. they can precede attributive adjectives under a normal intonation, a possibility excluded for prepositional genitives" (p. 567). For Pashto genitives, it can be observed that one of the genitives is always located at the left periphery. And they precede attributive adjectives under a normal intonation, as for instance, *[da tha][khkulay] pen*, *[da] [Saleem]thora topai.* Hence, in this attribute Pashto DPs act according to Longobardi's proposal.

Fourth, Longobardi's (2001) generalized hierarchy for possessor, subject, and object type constructions is P>S>O, which means that in such constructions P would precede the subject and the subject would precede the object. He considers it workable cross-linguistically. However, when it comes to Pashto, possessors that precede the

subject nominals cannot be found. Whenever, there are possessors to the left periphery, they serve as subjects as well:

(1) *da   Peter   pen   mathavəl.*
    Poss   Peter   pen   breaking
    'Peter's breaking of a pen'
(2) *da   Erika   pesho   ledəl.*
    Poss   Erika   cat   seeing
    'Erika's seeing of a cat'

If an effort is made to form a structure where a possessor precedes the subject and the subject precedes the object, it results in an ungrammatical construction. Thus, in Pashto, the segregation of subject and possessors in the left periphery is tantamount to duplication of the same thing.

Fifth, there has been the pattern that the genitive bearing nominal precedes the attributive adjectives in non-prepositional genitives and follows the attributive adjectives in prepositional genitives (Longobardi, 2001). Pashto genitives, being non-prepositional in nature, precede attributive adjectives:

(3) *da   tha   khkulay   pen*
    Poss   you   beautiful   pen
    'Your beautiful pen'
(4) *da   Peter   thora   topai*
    Poss   Peter   black   cap
    'Peter's black cap'

However, at the same time, attributive adjectives can be found preceding the non-prepositional genitive nominals:

(5) *da   khkuli   Peter   pen*
    Poss   beautiful   Peter   pen
    'the pen of handsome Peter'
    (Lit. handsome Peter's pen)
(6) *da   khkuli   Peter   khkulay   pen*
    Poss   beautiful   Peter   beautiful   pen
    'the beautiful pen of handsome Peter'
    (Lit. handsome Peter's beautiful pen)

Alongside this feature, another feature can also be observed in such genitive constructions: attributive adjectives prefer not to be used with genitive case bearing pronouns:

(7) * *da   khkulay   tha   pen*
      Poss beautiful   you   pen
(8) * *da   khkulay   zma   khkulay   pen*
      Poss beautiful   my   beautiful   pen

Thus, in both the above-sketched scenarios, namely, the use of attributive adjectives as preceding the non-prepositional genitive bearing nominals, and the use

of attributive adjectives with respect to nouns and pronouns, Pashto is somewhat different from the other languages studied so far. Hence, here again, Pashto DPs do not confirm to Longobardi's proposal.

Sixth, Longobardi (2001) proposes that "attributive adjectives as a whole… crosslinguistically occur lower than a genitive position or higher than another genitive position:" Again, we can partially agree with him when he says that adjectives could occur lower than a genitive position and higher than another genitive position, on the condition if we agree with him that genitive head preceded the attributive adjectives. However, in our opinion attributive adjectives precede the genitive nomianls, so a situation (Gen Attributive Adjective Gen) cannot arise, if the attributive adjectives belong to the left most genitive. It could arise if the attributive adjective belong to the second genitive, a situation which Longobardi certainly did not meant to. Again, if there is a situation where the two genitives host attributive adjectives, then in our opinion in Pashto it would have (Attributive Adjective Gen Attributive Adjective Gen) structure, which again does not confirm to Longobardi's proposal. Similarly, in Pashto, pronouns when showing genitive case cannot be preceded by adjectives, while nominals bearing genitive case can be preceded by adjectives:

(9) *da*   *haghə*   *pen.*
    Poss   he.ACC   pen
    'His pen'

(10)   **da*   *khkuli*   *haghə*   *pen.*
        Poss   beautiful   he.ACC   pen
        '*beautiful his pen'

(11)   *da*   *khkuli*   *koor*   *wər.*
        Poss   beautiful   house   door
        'The door of a/the beautiful house'

Thus, while nominals with genitive case partially substantiate Longobardi's proposal, pronouns with a genitive case do not.

Seventh, Longobardi (2001) proposes that cross-linguistically "there are thus two positions for non-prepositional Genitive, one higher than adjectival modifiers, the other lower. Languages make the parametric choice of activating just one or the other or both."(p. 568). Again, Pashto is unique that it not only has more than two non-prepositional genitives but also can activate all of them:

(12)   *da*   *Peter*   *da*   *plar*   *da*   *khor*   *thor*   *spai.*
        Poss   Peter   Poss   father   Poss   sister   black   dog
        '?Peter's father's sister's black dog'

(13)   *da*   *khulay*   *Peter*   *da*   *zooɻ*   *plar*   *da*
        meranai   *khor*   *speen*   *thor*   *spai*
        Poss   beautiful   Peter   Poss   old   father   Poss
        step   sister   white   black   dog
        '??handsome Peter's old father's step-sister's white-black dog'

In the first example, only genitives are given to show that there can be more than two genitives in Pashto DPs and that genitives can be activated simultaneously. In the second example, the genitives are shown to be preceded by adjectival modifiers.

These genitives are more than two in number and activated. Thus, this points to the rich nature of Pashto DPs. So here again, Longobardi's proposal is unable to explain Pashto DPs adequately.

Conclusion

Based on the discussion above, it can be concluded that though Longobardi (2001) is an influential account of the structure of the determiner phrase, however, it is unable to adequately deal with the structure of DPs/NPs in Pashto. Some of the areas where it failed to account for Pashto DPs are: 1) in Pashto, the genitive marker is not a preposition still it precedes the possessive and the possessive noun; 2) in Pashto, if the possessor precedes the subject and the subject precedes the object, then it results in an ungrammatical construction; 3) in Pashto DPs, the non-prepositional genitives not only precede the attributive adjectives but the attributive adjectives could also be found preceding the non-prepositional genitives; 4) in Pashto the situation (Gen Attributive Adjective Gen) cannot arise; rather, the structure (Attributive Adjective Gen Attributive Adjective Gen) is more appropriate for Pashto; 5) in Pashto there could be more than two genitives in a DP and they could all be activated simultaneously. These are some of the weaker aspects of Longobardi (2001) vis-à-vis Pashto DPs. Therefore, another research/ proposal would be needed to explain Pashto DPs adequately.

References

Abney, S. (1987). *The English noun phrases in its sentential aspect* (Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Alexiadou, A. (2001). *Functional structures in nominals: Nominalization and ergativity*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Alexiadou, A. (2014). *Multiple determiners and the structure of DPs*. John Benjamins.

Alexiadou, A. L. Haegeman & M. Stavrou. (2007).*Noun phrase in the generative perspective*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Borer, H. (2005). *In name only*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. 73-90.

Bowers, J. (1987). Extended X'-theory, the ECP, and the left branch condition. In *Proceedings of WCCFL* 6, 47-63.

Bukhari, S. K. (1984). *Ataliq-e-Pashto*. Peshawar, Pakistan: De Chapzai.

Burgè, L. (2002). The positions of demonstratives in the extended nominal projection. In G. Cinque (ed.), *Functional structure in DP and IP: The cartography of syntactic structures* (Vol. 1). New York, NY: Oxford University Press. 15-53.

Carstens, V. (2000). Concord in the minimalist theory. *Linguistic Inquiry, 31*(2), 319-355.

Carstens, V. (2017). Noun-to-Determiner Movement. In M. Everaert & H. van Riemsdijk (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*. 2nd edition. Hoboken: Wiley-Blackwell.

Chierchia, G. (1998). Plurality of mass nouns and the notion of 'semantic parameter'. In S. Rothstein (ed.), *Events and grammar*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer. 53-104.

Chierchia, G. (2005). *Mass nouns, number marking and semantic variation*. Amherst, MS: University of Massachusetts Amherst Linguistics Colloquium.

Cinque, G. (1994). On the evidence for partial N-movement in the Romance DP. In G. Cinque, J. Koster, J. Y. Pollock, L. Rizzi, & R. Zanuttini (eds.), *Paths towards universal grammar: Studies in honor of Richard S. Kayne*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press. 85-110.

Cinque, G. (1999). *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Cinque, G. (2002). Mapping functional structure: A project. In G. Cinque (ed.), *Functional structure in DP and IP: The cartography of syntactic structures* (Vol. 1). New York, NY. Oxford University Press

Cinque, G. (2010). *The syntax of adjectives*. Cambridge, MS: MIT Press.

Gebhardt, L. (2009). *Numeral classifiers and the structure of DP* (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University).

Giorgi, A. & Longobardi, G. (1991). *The syntax of noun phrases*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Giusti, G. (1997). The categorial status of determiners. In L. Haegeman (ed.), *The new comparative syntax* (pp. 95-123). London, UK: Longman.

Giusti, G. (2002). The functional structure of noun phrases: A bare phrase structure approach. In G. Cinque (ed.), *Functional structure in DP and IP: The cartography of syntactic structures* (Vol. 1). New York, NY: Oxford University Press

Hellan, L. (1986). The headedness of NPs in Norwegian. In P. Muysken & H. v. Riemsdijk (eds.), *Features and Projections* (pp. 89-123). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Foris.

Krapova, I. & Cinque, G. (2018). Genitive/Dative Case puzzles in the Bulgarian DP. In Katerino Mome (ed.) *Studies in Bulgarian Morphosyntax in Honor of Catherine Rudin*., Bloomington, Indiana, Slavica Publishers. 131-163

Longobardi, G. (1994). Reference and proper names: A theory of N-movement in syntax and logical form. *Linguistic Inquiry, 25* (4), 609-665.

Longobardi, G. (2001). The structure of DPs: Some principles, parameters and problems. In M. Baltin & C. Collins (eds.) *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*. Malden, MS: Blackwell

Longobardi, G. & Silvestri, G., (2013). The structure of noun phrases. *The Bloomsbury Companion to Syntax*. Bloomsbury

Lorimer, J. G. (1902). *Grammar and vocabulary of Waziri Pashto.* Calcutta, India: Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing.

Lyons, C. (1999). *Definiteness*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Mackenzie, D. N. (1987). *Pashto. In the world's major languages*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Masood, T. (2014). Structural case licensing in Pashto: A minimalist perspective. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis. University of Peshawar, Pakistan.

Penzl, H. (1955). *A grammar of Pashto: A descriptive study of the dialect of Kandahar, Afghanistan*. Washington, D.C: American Council of Learned Societies.

Rashtheen, S. A. (1994). *Pashto grammar*. Peshawar, Pakistan: University Book Agency.

Raverty, H. G. (1855). *A grammar of Pukhto, Pushto, or language of the Afghans*. Peshawar, Pakistan: De Chapzai.

Reuland, E. (1986). A feature system for the set of categorial heads. In P. Muysken & H. v. Riemsdijk (eds.), *Features and Projections*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Foris. 41-89.

Ritter, E. (1988). A head-movement approach to construct-state noun phrases. *Linguistics, 26*(6), 909-929.

Ritter, E. (1991). Two functional categories in noun phrases: Evidence from Modern Hebrew. In S. D. Rothstein (ed.), *Syntax and semantics: Perspectives on phrase structure: Heads and licensing* (Vol. 25). New York, NY: Academic Press. 37-62.

Roos-Keppel, G. (1922). *Manual of Pushtu*. London, UK: Crosby Lockwood and Son.

Shafeev, D. A. (1964). *A short grammatical outline of Pashto.* (H. H. Paper , Ed. & Trans.). *International Journal of American Linguistics, pt. III, 30*(3), ix-89. (Original work published 1955).

Shlonsky, U. (2004). The form of Semitic noun phrases. *Lingua, 114*(12), 1465-1526.

Shlonsky U. (2020). A note on the order of constituents in the Mehri Noun Phrase. *Brill's Journal of Afroasiatic Languages and Linguistics* 2020;12(2).

Szabolsci, A. (1987). Functional categories in the noun phrase. In I. Kenesei (ed.), *Approaches to Hungarian* (Vol. 2, pp. 167-190). Szeged, Hungary: JATE.

Szabolsci, A. (1994). The noun phrase. In F. Kiefer & K. E. Kiss (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*: *The Syntactic Structure of Hungarian* (Vol. 27). New York, NY: Academic Press. 179-274.

Szabolsci, A. (2018). Two types of quantifier particles: Quantifier-internal vs. heads on the clausal spine. *Glossa: A Journal of Linguistics. Vol. 3*(1), 69.

Tegey, H., & Robson, B. (1996). *A reference grammar of Pashto.* Washington, DC: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Ticio, M. E. (2010). Locality domains in the Spanish determiner phrase. *Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 79*. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.

Valois, D. (1991). *The internal syntax of DP* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of California, Los Angeles, CA.

Zayar, M. A. (2005). *Pashto grammar*. Peshawar, Pakistan: Danish Publishing Association.