

Marathi Postpositions

Arvind Jadhav, M.A. & UGC-NET (English), M.A. &
UGC-NET (Linguistics), Ph.D. Scholar

=====

Abstract

Marathi Case Markers and Postpositions are most debated area of Marathi grammar for a long time. Unlike traditional Grammarians and native Pandits, Burgess (1854) treats both of the markers as Postpositions. He mentions that the “Native authors endeavour to make the declension of nouns in Marathi to confirm to that of Sanskrit. The result is unnecessary confusion in this regard to this subject” (Burgess 1854: Preface v). His radical and innovative work of that time has still not paid much attention. He points out that contemporary grammarians adopted and applied Sanskrit scheme of case terminations arbitrarily and unscientifically.

Though Shaikh (1972) reviews Case Markers and Postpositions dichotomy from the first Marathi Grammar of William Carey (1805) to Arvind Mangalulkar’s (1964) publication, his review ignores studies like Kelkar (1959) and Fillmore (1968) of the time. The present paper discusses the recent Marathi Grammars, Pandharipande (1997) and Dhongde & Wali (2009).

I argue that Marathi Postpositions should include case markers. Gajendragadkar (1969) also echoed this view. The paper reviews the topic in the light of current studies.

Keywords: Marathi Postpositions, Case Marking in Marathi, Case Markers and Postpositions Dichotomy, Grammatical and Semantic Relations, Multifunctionality of Adpositions, etc.

1. Is Adposition a Universal Category?

“An *adposition* (Adp) is an unanalysable or analysable grammatical word constituting an *adpositional phrase* (Adp-phrase) with a term that it puts in relationship, like case affixes, with another linguistic unit, by marking the grammatical and semantic links between them” (Hagege

2010: 8). It is not a universal category, but majority of the languages has it, for example, Klamath lacks this category (DeLancey 2001: 54). Adposition includes prepositions, postpositions, and circumpositions. Marathi Postpositions belong to this category.

Adps have attracted the researcher as space-time structuring devices or tools recently. Previously, they were studied as overt case marking devices in different languages. Even, the attempts have been made to undertake typological studies to reveal the *Adp* phenomenon, across languages and universally.

2. The Phenomena of Case

Blake (1994: 1) explains **Case** as “a system of marking dependent nouns for the type of relationship they bear to their heads. Traditionally the term refers to inflectional marking, and, typically, case marks the relationship of a noun to a verb at the clause level or of a noun to a preposition, postposition or another noun at the phrase level”.

2.1. Sanskrit Case System

Pāṇini in his *Aṣṭādhyāyī* (eight books) described *kāraka* theory that gives eight cases i.e. NOMINATIVE, ACCUSATIVE, INSTRUMENTAL, DATIVE, ABLATIVE, GENITIVE, LOCATIVE, and VOCATIVE and six *kārakā* i. e. *kartṛ*, *karman*, *karāṇa*, *saṃpradāna*, *apādāna*, and *adhikaraṇa*. The Sanskrit cases are numbered and they referred to their number. The vocative bears no *kāraka* because it does not mark dependent of the verb and the genitive held as adnominal so no *kāraka* is assigned to genitive-marked nouns (Blake: 1994: 65-66).

2.2. Grammatical and Semantic Relations

It is commonly said that, whereas lexical forms convey lexical meaning, grammatical forms like bound morphemes convey grammatical meaning. These, both, meanings are not qualitatively different: grammatical forms are meaningful in the very much same sense in which lexical forms are meaningful, the only difference being that the meaning of grammatical forms is more abstract (Luraghi 2009: 140).

The cases are governed mainly governed by the verb. Cases can also be governed by prepositions or postpositions (Blake: 1994: 2). Grammatical relations refer to purely syntactic relations such as subject, direct and indirect object, each of which encompasses more than one semantic roles such as source and location. Grammatical relations need not to be one-to-one correspondence with cases (Blake: 1994: 2-3).

Blake (1994: 33) expresses the complexity between grammatical and semantic cases. He points out that “if the distinction between grammatical and semantic cases were to be clear-cut, the grammatical cases would encode only purely syntactic relations and the semantic cases would encode only homogeneous semantic relations such as location and source. However, it is common for a syntactic case to encode a semantic relation or role that lies outside of whatever syntactic relation it expresses. In Latin, for example, the accusative not only expresses the direct object, it also expresses the semantic role of destination” (Blake 1994: 33).

2.3. Fillmore’s (1968) DEEP CASES

Fillmore initially proposes a universal set of six deep cases that he calls these as “syntactic-semantic relations” i.e. agentive, instrumental, dative, factitive, locative, and objective, but later modifies in eight cases as; agent, experiencer, instrument, object, source, goal, place, and time. These are called deep cases in Fillmorean case grammar, thematatic roles in Lexical Functional Grammar, and theta roles in Government and Binding. Blake evaluates Fillmorean case system as, “Fillmore’s case grammar and similar attempts by others to establish a small list of universal roles have fallen somewhat into dispute largely because no one has been able to produce a definitive list. However, a number of major theories such as Government and Binding and Lexical and Functional Grammar embrace the notion of semantic roles, but they remain uncommitted about the universal inventory” (Blake 1994: 64, 67-75).

2.4. Talmy’s (2003a.) FIGURE and GROUND

The FIGURE and GROUND notions are adopted from Gestalt psychology. In language, they have given the following characterization;

The FIGURE is moving or conceptually movable entity whose site, path, or orientation is conceived as a variable the particular value of which the relevant issue and the GROUND is a reference entity, one that has a stationary setting relative to a reference frame, with respect to which the figure's site, path, or orientation is characterized (Talmy 2000a: 184).

Talmy clarifies that “in a linguistic context, the FIGURE and GROUND notions amount to SEMANTIC ROLES or CASES, in the sense of Fillmore's Case Grammar” (Talmy 2003a: 184, 185). He compares Fillmore's (1968) case system to that of his own system and shows the difficulties of the former has overcome by the later (Talmy 2003a: 185, 339-341). The remarks are as follows:

(1) Fillmore's cases are ranged together on the single level without subgrouping: his SOURCE, GOAL, PATH, LOCATIVE, PATIENT, and INSTRUMENT have in common the property of pertaining to objects moving or located with respect to one another that AGENT does not possess. Talmy's system abstracts out the motion/ location event in which there appear only those case roles that together are equivalent to the above set of six.

(2) Fillmorean system does not show the common property of SOURCE, GOAL, PATH, and LOCATIVE that they function as –a reference point that PATIENT, INSTRUMENT, and AGENT do not possess. Talmy's system has GROUND notion for that purpose.

(3) Fillmore's three cases SOURCE, GOAL, and PATH have common moving property, and LOCATIVE has stationariness. (*cf.* Talmy's STATIONARINESS vs. MOVING, SITE or PATH notions).

(4) Fillmorean system incorporates spatiotemporal notions into its case notions. Fillmorean system has no provision to capture 'surface' and 'interior' respectively in two following sets; (a.) *on the box/ onto the box/ off of the box*, and (b.) *in the box/ into the box/ out of the box*.

(5) Fillmore's SOURCE, GOAL, and PATH could not capture spatiotemporal relations in the constructions like; *the ball rolled across the crack/ past the T.V./ around the lamp*.

(6) Talmy questions Fillmorean case system for not having distinct cases for *into N*, *onto N*, and *up to N*, all captured in GOAL in Fillmorean system.

Having explained, Talmy (2003a.: 341) points out that his PATH is flexible concept and has many advantages as MOVE vs. BE_{Loc} notions. He declares Gruber's (1965) THEME as his FIGURE, but mentions Gruber and Fillmore not having notion like GROUND. Lastly, he admits Langacker's (1987) TRAJECTOR and LANDMARK are highly comparable to his FIGURE and GROUND notions.

2.5. DeLancey's Views

DeLancey (2001: 59) proposes that “the all of the underlying semantics of core arguments that have overt linguistic expression can be explained in terms of a simple inventory of three thematic relations: THEME, LOCATION, and AGENT”. According to him (DeLancey 2001: 60), case paid more attention after the works of Gruber (1965), Fillmore (1966, 1968), Chafe (1970), and Anderson (1968, 1971), all having the same in common the conception of a universal syntactic-semantic theory of case roles, of which morphological case marking found in some languages is only one reflection. DeLancey further records the fact that “since then case theory has occupied a rather unsettled place in linguistic theory”. Besides AGENT, DeLancey's THEME and LOCATION very directly correspond to Talmy's FIGURE and GROUND (DeLancey 2001: 68).

3. Treatment the Case Markers and Postpositions in Marathi

Traditional grammarians faced the problem as to whether they should treat cases on the basis of form or meaning. Most of them took the view that cases be described based on the forms. “The case marking in Marathi is not cued to any particular grammatical role such as SUBJECT or OBJECT” (Dhongde 2009: 43). Though some of the grammarians observed equivalence between case markers and postpositions, they adopted the traditional system of eight cases.

Kelkar (1959) mixed both traditional case markers and traditional postpositions together and made separate three types of markers. His X and Y markers do not correspond to case markers and postpositions respectively. His X markers consists of some case markers and

postpositions and Y markers also consist of some case markers and postpositions. We found no satisfactory solution of the treatment of case markers and postpositions in Kelkar also.

Gajendragadkar places Postpositions as intermediate category between lexical and functional words. Postpositions, he believes, represent category of uninflected stems which have a grammatical or local function. Prepositions and postpositions, for him are similar and the terminological distinction between them is based purely on their positions (Gajendragadkar 1969: 93). He argues that “the category of case should be extended beyond its traditional scope and made to include pre/postpositions because both perform the same structural function. The difference between the two can be said to belong to surface structure”, though he accepts the fact he did not study case markers.

According to Burgess (1854: *Introduction v*), Native authors endeavour to make the declension of nouns in Marathi confirm to that of Sanskrit. It resulted in unnecessary confusion in this subject. He gives the example of Dadoba Pandurang Tarkhadkar who describes eight cases assigning certain postpositions to each, gives another class of postposition as having the same meaning as these case terminations, and still another class to which he calls postpositions. Burgess says, further, all these three classes belong to one word class postpositions, and if properly describe, there is no occasion of eight cases. Kelkar (1959: 136) mentions that “all this has no apparent motive except that of showing that Marathi, like a good daughter, has the same eight cases as Sanskrit has!”

Burgess (1854: 15) states, according to meaning, there are three cases Nominative, Objective, and Vocative. There are only two cases according to form, i. e. “uninflected” and “inflected”. In such classification, he says, the inflected case would comprise the object of postpositions, and the vocative. The uninflected would comprise the nominative, and, for the most part, the direct object of active verbs. He says that such classification would be simple, and, for exhibiting the inflection of noun, the best that could be made.

Burgess (1854: 18) criticizes the contemporary case system as incomplete. He mentions that “no classification on such principle can be complete, without assigning its proper place to every affix or postposition in the language”.

He describes three cases as; Nominative, Objective (uninflected objective and inflected objective or oblique), and Vocative. He then gives five types of oblique making or declension rules (Burgess 1854: 20-31).

4. Origin and Development of the Postpositions

Blake explains the developments within case systems as follows.

When a verb or noun becomes an adposition, it does not necessarily lose its lexical character, though it becomes a member of a relatively small closed class of a score or two of members. When a postposition becomes a case suffix, two significant changes occur. First up all it is liable to develop variant forms according to phonological properties of its host, and secondly it becomes a member of a much smaller set of forms, usually no more than ten or so. Since all noun phrases, no matter what semantic role they bear in relation to their governor, must be marked by one member of small set, it is inevitable that at least some case suffixes will cover a broad semantic range (Blake 1994: 169).

Ahmed argues that case markers were originally locative postpositions that extended semantics of cases in an abstract way (Ahmed 2007: 1) and following him, hence, the case markers are the grammaticalized forms of postpositions. Over the period of time, in the process of grammaticalization, it may be said that these case markers in Marathi have fully grammaticalized. The postposition like *-āt* 'in' is in the continuum of the process of grammaticalization, and not yet fully grammaticalized as both forms are in use *-t* and *-āt*. And most of the postpositions are not grammaticalized. The postposition *-war* 'on' has the result of grammaticalization and its origin is Sanskrit *-upari* Bloch ([1914], 1970: 174, 203). Ahmed (2008: 1-13) also discusses the spatial origin of case markers. Hagege (2010: 8) points out that "in many languages, a number of Adps, most of them or all of them, are derived from verbs or nouns".

Bloch notes that "in classical Sanskrit, the number of old indeclinable prepositions gets restricted, but on the other hand, an ever increasing number of nouns fixed in one of their cases and the gerundives shed off, little by little, their original meaning and are used to explain

periphrastically the usual relationships (Speyer, Ved.u.Sanskrit Syntax \$ 89, 91, 93). This then is the origin of the words or particles fixed to Marathi nouns, which give to modern declension what is incorrectly known as its terminations” (Bloch 1970: 203). He further also admits that “some of these affixes like; *-war* ‘on’, *-āt* ‘inside’ are clear, ... while others like; *-shi/ -lā* ‘to, towards’ are obscure” (Bloch 1970: 203).

Bloch also generalizes the fact about postpositions as follows: “There is no prohibition against supposing that other postpositions might have had a similar evaluation; but notably those which express grammatical relationships are often so changed that it becomes almost impossible to reconstruct their history” (Bloch 1970: 204).

The similar observation cited R. B. Joshi by Shaikh (1972: 284) is, “he points out that all the case terminations were initially independent words (free morphemes). But during the course of time they were changed and abridged and lost their independent occurrence in the language and thus developed into bound morphemes. Similarly, postpositions, which function as case terminations are fossilized forms of nouns and have become bound morphemes”. The examples provided by him are *-staw* ‘for’, *-saṭhi* ‘for’, *-pekṣhā* ‘than’, *-kaḍūn* ‘from/ with’, *-karwī* ‘with’.

5. Distinguishing Case Markers and Postpositions

Major three arguments have been made by the grammarians to distinguish Case Markers from Postpositions in Marathi (Damle 1911; Pandharipande 1997; Dhongde & Wali 2009; among others). They are:

- (1) Case Markers are bound and Postpositions are free morphemes,
- (2) Clitic or clitic-like element can intervene between the Nominal and the Postposition, but can’t between the Nominal and the Case Marker, and
- (3) the Postpositions have wider semantic range than Case Markers.

For the first argument, Pandhriapnde (1997: 270, 273) remarks both as bound morphemes. The Postpositions in Marathi do never occur independently, they always depend on

their nominal host. We observe the postposition *-war* and the adverb *war*, with similar phonetic shape respectively in examples (1a. & 1b.);

(1) MARATHI, SHAIKH (1972: 288).

a. *hāt-ā-war*

hand.M3SG-OBL-PP

‘on the hand’

b. *tyā-ne* *hāt* *war* *kelā.*

he.M3SG.OBL-PP hand.M3SG ADV do.PST

‘He lifted his hand up.’

Dealing with second argument, we found Pandharipande’s statement that “there are no clitics in Marathi” (Pandharipande 1997: 283). The third argument is baseless as Case Markers also have wider semantic range as postpositions. They also have local functions.

6. Comparison of Case Markers and Postpositions in Marathi

The equivalence between Case Markers and Postpositions is underlined by Zwicky’s statement that “Everything you can do with adpositions you can do with case inflections, and vice versa” (Zwicky 1992: 370).

Zwicky (1992: 369) states that the inflectional affixes and separate words can serve equally as markers of syntactic constructions. He points out that the prototypical case of adpositions is **local**, each adposition providing semantic content of its own and combining with NP to yield a PP functioning as an adverbial modifier, and prototypical use of case marker is **grammatical**, where each case marker yield syntactic function with its NP. However, the adpositions can be used grammatically, and the case markers can be used locally, and case both can be used ideosyncratically (Zwicky 1992: 370-371).

Following Burgess (1854), I argue CMs and PPs belong to the same adpositional category in Marathi language. Gajendragadkar (1969) is also of the view that these both should be grouped together. Why should we treat them in same category? Let's examine.

7. Common Properties of Case Markers and Postpositions

- 1) Marathi Case Markers as well as Postpositions show relation between the governed nominal and other word/s in the sentence.
- 2) Both follow nominal, hence they are postpositional. There are no circumpositions in Marathi.
- 3) As some Case Markers, some Postpositions take oblique before they attach to the nominal.
- 4) Like Case Markers, some Postpositions attach directly to the nominal root.
- 5) Both assign case, hence they are both Case Assigner.
- 6) They are substitutable in the same paradigm. The alterations between Case Markers and Postpositions are also found in Ahmed (2007: 10-11).
- 7) They both have grammatical and semantic functions. Marathi Case Markers and Postpositions encode space and time. The Postpositions spatial and temporal function is well known. For Case Markers encoding space; see Lestrade 2010; Ahmed 2007, 2008; Creissels 2009; among others.
- 8) Both Marathi Case Markers and Postpositions are bound morphemes.

8. Case Markers and Postpositions' Attachment to Their Nominal

The Case Markers and Postpositions can alternatively be used alike as shown in the following table (*see Table 1.1*);

<i>wāt.3FSG</i> 'way'			<i>māṅṣā.3MSG</i> 'a man'		
K/PP	Oblique	Marker	K/PP	Oblique	Marker
K1	<i>wāte</i>	<i>-ne</i>	K1	<i>māṅṣā</i>	<i>-ne</i>
K2	<i>wāte</i>	<i>-sa/ -lā</i>	K2	<i>māṅṣā</i>	<i>-sa/ -lā</i>
K3	<i>wāte</i>	<i>-shī</i>	K3	<i>māṅṣā</i>	<i>-shī</i>

K4	<i>wāte</i>	<i>-lā</i>	K4	<i>māṅsā</i>	<i>-lā</i>
K5	<i>wāte</i>	<i>-tūn/ -hūn</i>	K5	<i>māṅsā</i>	<i>-tūn/ -hūn</i>
K6	<i>wāte</i>	<i>-tsā</i>	K6	<i>māṅsā</i>	<i>-tsā</i>
K7	<i>wāte</i>	-	K7	<i>māṅsā</i>	-
PP 1	<i>wāte</i>	<i>-t</i>	PP 1	<i>māṅsā</i>	<i>-t</i>
PP 2	<i>wāte</i>	<i>-war</i>	PP 2	<i>māṅsā</i>	<i>-war</i>
PP 3	<i>wāte</i>	<i>-dzawaḷ</i>	PP 3	<i>māṅsā</i>	<i>-dzawaḷ</i>
PP 4	<i>wāte</i>	<i>-warūn</i>	PP 4	<i>māṅsā</i>	<i>-warūn</i>
PP 5	<i>wāte</i>	<i>-dzawaḷūn</i>	PP 5	<i>māṅsā</i>	<i>-dzawaḷūn</i>
PP 6	<i>wāte</i>	<i>-pāshī</i>	PP 6	<i>māṅsā</i>	<i>-pāshī</i>
PP 7	<i>wāte</i>	<i>-kaḍe</i>	PP 7	<i>māṅsā</i>	<i>-kaḍe</i>

The table (1.1) describes two nominal roots *wāt* ‘way’ and *māṅūs* ‘a man’ respectively. The column 1 refers to seven cases (K1 to K7) and different postpositions (PP1 to PP7). In Column 2, the nouns are in oblique forms, and the Column 3 comprised of case markers; i. e. Nominative/ Ergative, Accusative, Instrumental, Dative, Ablative, Genitive, Locative, and Vocative and postpositions like; *-āt* ‘in’, *-war* ‘on’, *-dzawaḷ* ‘near/ possessive’, *-warūn* ‘from above’, *-dzawaḷūn* ‘from near’, *-pāshī* ‘near/ possessive’, and *-kaḍe* ‘to’.

The point to be noted is case markers and postpositions attach their nominal host alike. They came in same paradigm. So, they are substitutable or complementary. There are more such postpositions can be listed above, but I have limited them up to seven. The purpose is only to compare case markers and postpositions.

9. The Analysis the postposition *-tSā*

Bloch (1970: 214) calls postpositions *-tsā*, *-tsī*, *-tse* as adjectives of belonging and then ‘genitive’. Dhongde mentions that the adpostion *-tsa* denotes a possessive relation. It is akin to a case marker but takes the gender and number of possessed noun (Dhongde 2009: 114). The marker *-tsa* has its variant forms like; *-tsā* (MASCULINE), *-tsī* (FEMNINE), *-tse* (NUETER), *-tSā* (mostly OBLIQUE). Though they change according to gender, they all have not been analysed at

mental level to reach at its basic form *-tsa*. All these markers *-tsa* and its variants have fossilized now. So, any native speaker of Marathi can easily percept them as they are.

Marathi has homophonous marker *-tsa* having focus marking-function. It can occur with any word category without changing shape or meaning, and hence it is a particle. It need not be confused with possessive marker *-tsa*, which is a postposition. If both markers occur in the same construction or phrase, their functions remains different as possessive (former) and focus marker (later) as in *ram-tsa-tsa mat barobar āhe* ‘only Ram’s statement is true’. The focus marking particle *-tsa* does not show such relation, like postposition, between two words. In pronominal constructions, this postposition has different shapes as *-tsā*, *-tsī*, *-tse*, and *-tSā*, but in other constructions, they occur as *-tSā* (see. 3a.-d.).

(2)

- | | | | |
|----|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| a. | <i>rām-tSā</i> | <i>bhāw-ā-ne</i> | <i>sāngitle.</i> |
| | ram.M3SG-PP | brother.M3SG-OBL-PP | tell.PST |
| | ‘Ram’s bother told’ | | |
| b. | <i>rām-tSā</i> | <i>bhahin-ī-ne</i> | <i>sāngitle.</i> |
| | ram.M3SG-PP | sister.F3SG-OBL-PP | tell.PST |
| | ‘Ram’s sister told’ | | |
| c. | <i>sonu-tSā</i> | <i>bhāw-ā-ne</i> | <i>sāngitle.</i> |
| | sonu.F3SG-PP | brother.M3SG-OBL-PP | tell.PST |
| | ‘Sonu’s bother told’ | | |
| d. | <i>sonu-tSā</i> | <i>bhahin-ī-ne</i> | <i>sāngitle.</i> |
| | sonu.F3SG-PP | sister.F3SG-OBL-PP | tell.PST |
| | ‘Sonu’s sister told.’ | | |

10. Is it a Clitic?

Pandharipande (1997: 459) states that there are no clitics in Marathi. However, distinguishing case markers and postpositions, she gives example (1997: 283) and states that “some of the clitic particles can optionally intervene between the noun and the postposition (e.g., *dewātSā-tsa-sāṭhi* ‘for the sake of god alone’). However, a clitic particle *-tsa* cannot occur before the case suffix (e.g., *dewātSā-tsa-lā* ‘for god alone’). Here, the *-tsa* is either emphatic/focus particle or possessive postposition. No clitic is there.

Normally, the emphatic particle *-tsa* occurs at the end of each word. Pandharipande’s example: *dewātSā-tsa-sāṭhi* ‘for the sake of god alone’ seems somewhat awkward usage than *dewā-sāṭhi-tsa* ‘for the sake of god alone’ or *dewāt-lā-tsa* ‘for the sake of god alone’ which seems more natural.

11. Is it a Particle?

Pandharipande (1997: 272) writes the particles are attached freely to any constituent of the sentence or to the sentence (as a whole unit). They are not inflected. Further she gives some examples of particles. We take example (3); here the *-tSā* cannot be attached (as particle can attach freely to any constituent) to the adverb *bharbhar* ‘speedily or rapidly’ in (3a.) and to the adjective *sundar* ‘beautiful’ in (3b.), but the particle *-tsa* can be attached as in (3c & 3d).

- (3) a. **bharbhar-tSā*
b. **sundar-tSā*
c. *bharbhar-tsa* ‘only quickly’
d. *sundar-tsa* ‘only beautiful’

Additionally, the particles do not show relation between two elements in the sentence. The *-tSā* shows possessive relation between such elements.

12. The Function of the Postposition *-tSā*

In the following example (4), the *-tSā* optionally intervened between nominal and the postposition *-ne*.

- (4) a. *māḍḍhā-ne* *he* *kām* *dzamnār* *nāhi*.
 I.POSS.OBL-PP this work.N3SG able.IPFV be.PRS.NEG
 ‘I am not able to do this work.’
- b. *māḍḍhā-tSā-ne* *he* *kām* *dzamnār* *nāhi*.
 I.POSS.OBL-PP-PP this work.N3SG able.IPFV be.PRS.NEG
 ‘I am not able to do this work.’
- c. *māḍḍhā-tSā-ne* *he* *bhraṣṭa* *kām* *dzamnār*
 I.POSS.OBL-PP-PP this corrupt work.N3SG able.IPFV
nāhi.
 be.PRS.NEG
 ‘I am not able to do this corrupt/ illegal/ immoral work.’

In example (4b), why there is need of possessive postposition when there is already possessive pronoun that directly can accommodate instrumental PP *-ne* as in (4a)? Pragmatically, (4a) ‘I am not able to do this work’ has limited sense that suggests a person’s physical or intellectual ability. But (4b) suggests wide range that ‘I am not able to do this work’ may be because of physical ability, mental/ intellectual ability, potential/ skill, or because of any other external reason (e.g. social, moral, external force, terror, etc.). It (4b) also suggests that someone else may do this but I cannot. The example (4c.) is given only to represent overt meaning extension of (4b.).

It normally shows possessive relation between two elements. Additionally, when it is optionally used, it is used to denote specificity purpose. In the following example, the (5b.) is used to specify that nowhere else, but in the house.

- (5) a. *ghar-ā-t*
house.N3SG -OBL-PP
‘in the house’
- b. *ghar-ā-tSā-āt*
house.N3SG-OBL-PP-PP
‘in the house’

There are constraints on the use of the postposition *-tSā*. In following example explains the fact that we cannot attach *-tSā + -āt* to abstract nouns.

- (6) a. *māḍḥā man-ā-t don witSār āle.*
I.POSS.OBL mind.N3SG-OBL-PP two thought.M3PL come.PL.PST
‘The two thoughts came in my mind.’
- *b. *māḍḥā man-ā-tSā-āt don witSār āle.*
I.POSS.OBL mind.N3SG-OBL-PP-PP two thought.M3PL come.PL.PST
‘The two thoughts came into my mind.’
- c. *to tāp-ā-t baḍbaḍlā.*
he fever.M3SG-OBL-PP babble.PST
‘He babbled in fever.’ or
‘He uttered nonsensical sounds, mostly unconsciously, in fever.’
- *d. *to tāp-ā-tSā-āt baḍbaḍlā.*
he fever.M3SG-OBL-PP-PP babble.PST
‘He babbled into fever.’

It needs more attention, though, it has been concluded that the $-tS\bar{a}$ is nothing but a postposition. So, the polysemous postposition $-tS\bar{a}$, along with its possessive relation, always denotes some kind of specific function/ purpose in the given context. I also found it analogous to Hindi postposition *-Ke*.

13. Conclusion

The treatment of Case Markers and Postpositions even in the current grammars like Pandharipande (1997) and Dhongde & Wali (2009) is debatable and it is obvious that the very nature of the concept **CASE** is unsettled. The definition and terminology of case (*see*; Haspelmath 2009), the number of cases, the number of semantic roles are uncertain.

Schlesinger cites Chomsky in this regard, “I never know how people are able to pick out thematic relations with such security, I can’t” (Chomsky 1982: 89 in Schlesinger 1995: 28).

DeLancey (2001: 64) states that “the fundamental requirement for a theory of case is an inventory of underlying case roles. And a basic reason for the failure of case grammar has been the inability of different researchers to agree on such an inventory” and he quotes Blake as:

To establish a universal set of semantic roles is a formidable task. Although some roles are demarcated by case or by adpositions in some languages, in many instances they have to be isolated by semantic tests. There are no agreed criteria and there is certainly no consensus on the universal inventory. To a great extent establishing roles and ascribing particular arguments to roles involves an extra-linguistic classification of relationships between entities in the world. There tends to be agreement on salient manifestations of roles like agent, patient, source and instrument, but problems arise with the classification of relationships that fall between the salient ones. There are also problems with determining how fine the classification should be (Blake 1994: 67-68 in DeLancey 2001: 64).

The different grammarians adopted different treatment in this regard like; the traditional aspiration of assigning universally eight cases, Verbs and their Arguments (THETA-ROLES), Fillmore’s (1968) DEEP CASES, Dowty’s (1991) PROTO-AGENT and PROTO-PATIENT, Talmy’s

(2003) FIGURE/ GROUND, DeLancey's (2001) THEME, LOCATION, and Langacker's TRAJECTOR/ LANDMARK.

So, the present study suggests that Case markers and Postpositions in Marathi belong to the same category, i. e. Marathi Postpositions. The postpositions like *-tsā* (*-tsī*, *-tse*, *-tSā*) in Marathi need to be studied further.

14. Some Additional Remarks

Does Marathi have prepositional entities? The words like, for example, *vinā* seems to be ambivalent (used as preposition and as postposition, See Hagege 2010: 14 among others) as it occurs before and after the nominal. The *vinā*/-*vinā* has the same meaning at both instances.

(7) a. *vinā-tikīṭ*

PP-ticket.N3SG

'without ticket'

b. *tikīṭ-ā-vinā*

ticket.N3SG-OBL-PP

'without ticket'

It is not the lone example. There are several uses of it like; *vinā-aṭ* 'without condition', *vinā-sāyās* 'without courage'. The similar views are also found in Burgess (1854); Joshi (1925); Varhadpande (1972); etc. Burgess (1854: 115) mentions that some particles from the Persian, having the force of postpositions, are prefixed to nouns; as, *bin-aprādh* 'without fault or crime', *bin-tsuk* 'without mistake', *bar-hukum* 'according to order', etc. Joshi (1925: 282) states that the postpositions sometimes are used before the words/ nominal (as prepositions). He gives examples like; *vinā-rakshashi*, *pari-satyatsiye*, *āḍ-drushti*, and *dekhil-Tānāji*, etc.

Varhadpande (1972: 259) mentions that rarely, the postpositions are prefixed in *Nagpuri Marathi* (Nagpuri Dialect of Marathi) as in; *binā-pānyāna* 'without water' and *binā-pāyāsāna* 'without money'. Many of such words used as prepositional entity seems to Arabic/ Persian in

Language in India www.languageinindia.com ISSN 1930-2940 14:9 September 2014

Arvind Jadhav, M.A. & UGC-NET (English), M.A. & UGC-NET (Linguistics), Ph.D. Scholar
Marathi Postpositions

origin. But now days they are completely routinized/ accomodated in Marathi. The words like; *bar-hukum* ‘as per order/ quikly’, *bin-bobhāt* ‘without propoganda/ secretly’, *bin-dhāst* ‘without fear’ are frequently used.

They seems to be used even as preverbs as in; *to bin(ā)-boltā/ bin(ā)-jewtā gelā* ‘he went without speaking/ without eating (having meal)’.

Conventions Used

The Unified style sheet for linguistics (2007), Leipzig Glossing Rules deveoped by Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics for interlinear morpheme-by-morpheme glosses, and Pandharipande (1997) for Marathi phonological transcription have been followed.

=====

References

1. Ahemed Tafseer. 2007. Spatial, Temporal, and Structural Uses of Urdu *Ko*. 1-12.
(http://ling.sprachwiss.uni-konstanz.de/pages/home/tafseer/stuttgart_ahmed.pdf .
Accessed on 5th June, 2014 at 11.58 A.M.)
2. Ahemed Tafsser. 2008. Spatial Sources of Case. A Paper presented in a workshop on “A Non-Canonical Prespectives on Case”. 1-13.
(http://ling.sprachwiss.uni_konstanz.de/pages/home/tafseer/workshop/ahmed_case_2008.pdf . Accessed on 5th June, 2014 at 11.59 A.M.)
3. Blake, Barry. 1994. *Case*. (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics). UK: Cambridge University Press.
4. Bloch, Jules. [1914], 1970. *The Formation of Marathi Language*. Translated by Dr. Dev Raj Chanana. Delhi/ Patna/ Varanasi: Motilal Banarasidas.
5. Burgess, E. 1854. *Grammar of the Marathi Language*. Bombay: American Mission Press.
6. Creissels, Denis. 2009. Spatial Cases. In Andrej Malchukov & Andrew Spencer (eds.). *The Handbook of Case*. 609-625. New York: Oxford University Press.

7. Damle. M. K. 1911. Śāstrīya Marathi Vyākaraṇ. Pune: Damodar Sawaḷārāma āṇi Maṇḍaḷi.
8. DeLancey, Scott. 2001. *Lectures on Functional Syntax*. LSA Summer Institute, UC Santa Barbara. (<http://pages.uoregon.edu/delancey/sb/fs.html>. Accessed on 6th May, 2014 at 08.55.23 A.M.)
9. Dhongde, Ramesh and Kashi Wali. 2009. *Marathi*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
10. Dowty, David. 1991. Thematic Proto-Roles and Argument Selection. *Language*. 67(3). 547-619.
11. Fillmore, C. J. 1968. The case for case. In E. Bach & R. T. Harms (eds). *Universals in Linguistic Theory*. 1-88. New York/ London: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
12. Gajendragadkar, S. N. 1969. Postpositions in Marathi : A Controlled Study. *Indian Linguistics*. 30. 93-103
13. Haspelmath, Martin. 2009. Terminology of Case. In Andrej Malchukov & Andrew Spencer (eds.). *The Handbook of Case*. 505-517. New York: Oxford University Press.
14. Joshi, R. B. 1925. Prauḍhbodh Marāthī Vyākraṇ [A Higher Marathi Grammar]. 7th Edition. Pune: Ganesh Printing Works.
15. Kelkar, Ashok. 1959. The Category of Case in Marathi: A Study in Method. *Indian Linguistics*. 20. 131-139.
16. Lestrade, Sander. 2010. *The Space of Case*. Nijmegen: Ipskamp drukkers.
17. Luraghi, Silvia. 2009. Case in Cognitive Grammar. In Andrej Malchukov & Andrew Spencer (eds.). *The Handbook of Case*. 136-150. New York: Oxford University Press.
18. Manglurkar, Arvind. 1964. *MarāthītSyā Vyākraṇātsā PunrwitSār* [Rethinking Marathi Grammar]. Pune: Pune Vidyapith.
19. Pandharipande, Rajeshwari. 1997. *Marathi*. London and New York: Routledge.
20. Schlesinger, Izchak. 1995. *Cognitive Space and Linguistic Case*. UK: Cambridge University Press.
21. Shaikh, Yasmin. 1972. A Comparative Study of Case Terminations and Postpositions in Marathi: With Reference to the Interpretations of Different Marathi Grammarians. *Jornal of University of Bombay*. Vol. 41. 281-288.

22. Talmy, L. [2000] 2003a. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics: Concept Structuring Systems*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT.
23. Varhadpande, V. K. 1972. *Nāgpuri Boli: Bhāṣāśāstriya abhyāsa* [Nagpuri Dialect: A Linguistic Study]. Nagpur: Indira Press.
24. Zwicky, Arnold. 1992. Jotting on Adpositions, Case Inflections, Government, and Agreement. In Diane Brentari, Gary Larson, and Lynn McLeod (Eds). *The Joy of Grammar*. 369-383. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
-

Arvind Jadhav

M.A. & UGC-NET (English), M.A. & UGC-NET (Linguistics), Ph.D. Scholar
Assistant Professor of English
Yashwantrao Chavan College of Science
Karad 415124
Maharashtra
India
arvind.linguistics@gmail.com