9

Inflecting Postpositions in Indic and Kashmiri

John R. Payne

1. Incidence

An interesting form of Suffixaufnahme involving inflecting postpositions can be found in the majority of the modern Indic languages and dialects, including varieties of Sindhi, Lahnda, Punjabi, Gujarati, Marathi, Konkani, Rajasthani (Marwari and Jaipuri), Hindi (standard Hindi, Braj, Awadhi, Bundeli), Central Pahari (Kumauni, Garhwali), Western Pahari (Jaunsari, Sirmauri, Baghati, Kiunthali, Kului, Mandeali, Chameali, Bhadrawahi), Parya, and Romany. It is also found in Kashmiri, genetically a Dardic language but bordering on the Indic area.

The languages and dialects where Suffixaufnahme is not found are essentially those belonging to the Eastern Indic group (Bengali, Assamese, Bhojpuri, Maithili, and Oriya), but they also include Nepali and the Eastern Hindi dialect Chhattisgarhi, which borders on Oriya, as well as Sinhalese and Maldivian.

2. The Construction

The Indic Suffixaufnahme construction can be illustrated by the standard Hindi examples in (1) and (2).

(1) a. Rani kā bhāī
        Rani of=DctSgMasc brother=DctSgMasc
        'Rani's brother' (direct)
    b. Rānī ke bhāī
        Rani of=OblSgMasc brother=OblSgMasc
        'Rani's brother' (oblique)

    c. Rānī ke bhāī
       Rani of=DctPlMasc brother=DctPlMasc
       'Rani's brothers' (direct)
    d. Rani ke bhāiyõ
       Rani of=OblPlMasc brother=OblPlMasc
       'Rani's brothers' (oblique)

(2) a. Rani ki bahan
       Rani of=DctSgFem sister=DctSgFem
       'Rani's sister' (direct)
    b. Rānī ki bahan
       Rani of=OblSgFem sister=OblSgFem
       'Rani's sister' (oblique)
    c. Rānī ki bahnē
       Rani of=DctPlFem sister=DctPlFem
       'Rani's sisters' (direct)
    d. Rani ki bahnõ
       Rani of=OblPlFem sister=OblPlFem
       'Rani's sisters' (oblique)

Nouns in Hindi belong to one of two gender classes (masculine or feminine) and can show inflectional distinctions of case (direct, also known as absolute, or oblique) and number (singular or plural). Some syncretism is involved: except for masculine nouns ending in -*ā* or -*ā̃,* which have distinct forms for the oblique singular (-e and -2 respectively), the forms of the direct and oblique singular are identical. For masculine nouns, the form of the direct plural coincides with that of the oblique singular; i.e., nouns ending in -*ā* or -*ā̃* have the endings -*e* and -2 respectively, while nouns like bhdi 'brother' have the same form for direct singular, oblique singular, and absolute plural. Feminine nouns always have a distinct form for the direct plural, and all nouns, whether masculine or feminine, have a distinct form for the oblique plural.

    While a noun in the direct case may occur in isolation, for example as the subject of an intransitive sentence or as the indefinite or non-specific object of a transitive sentence, nouns in the oblique case are invariably governed by one of a basic set of postpositions that serve to differentiate the general oblique function. These are:

ne	agent in the ergative construction
ko	definite or specific object, indirect, dative subject
se	instrumental
mē	location inside
par	location on top of
tak	as far as, up to
kā	possessor and other genitive functions

These postpositions have been termed "Layer II" case markers, as opposed to the "Layer I" morphological case distinction of direct versus oblique (Zograf 1976, Masica 1991).

In possessor constructions like those in (1) and (2), the modified noun (bhdi 'brother' or bahan 'sister') inflects with the Layer I case and number appropriate to the whole construction. The modifier NP (Rdni) is governed by the genitive postposition *kā*. Unlike any of the other Layer II postpositions, however, *kā* itself inflects for case, number, and gender in agreement with the modified noun. The inflectional forms are *kā* (direct singular masculine), ke (oblique singular/plural masculine and direct plural masculine), and *kī* (feminine). In an example like (1a), therefore, the phrase *Rānī kā* 'Rani's' simultaneously contains a genitive marker (the postposition *kā* itself), and a marker of the case of the whole construction (the *-ā* inflection of kd agreeing with the direct case of the modified masculine noun).

The crucial examples demonstrating the presence of Suffixaufnahme, insofar as Suffixaufnahme is a phenomenon of multiple case marking, are the examples with a masculine modified noun in (1), since the feminine form of the genitive postposition ki shows no case distinctions between direct and oblique. Phrases like Rdni k i in (2a) have just the genitive marking of the postposition and lack overt case agreement with the modified noun. If, however, the notion of Suffixaufnahme is extended to categories other than case, for example number and gender, the number and gender inflections of *kā* become relevant. It might be argued that a phrase like *Rānī* ke 'Rani's' in (1c) contains two manifestations of number (the singular number of the modifier Rdni and the plural number of the modified noun expressed in the inflectional ending *-e* of ke), and two manifestations of gender (the feminine gender of the modifier Rdni and the masculine gender of the modified noun expressed in the inflectional ending *-e* of ke). The modifying phrase can therefore assume the number and gender, as well as the case, of the noun it modifies.

The Indic Suffixaufnahme construction is an interesting combination of morphological and phrasal marking. The direct and oblique case endings in Hindi can be clearly shown to be morphological; i.e., they are internal to the word that is marked. For example, when two nouns are conjoined, both must be separately marked for direct or oblique case. A single ending cannot serve as a marker of the whole phrase:

(3) a. bahnō aur bhāiyō
         sister=OblPlFem and brother=OblPlMasc
     b. *[bahan aur bhāi]-yō
         sister and brother-OblPlMasc
         'sisters and brothers' (oblique)

Also, declinable NP-internal modifiers such as adjectives bear independent inflectional endings:

(4) a. kale ghore
         black=OblSgMasc horse=OblSgMasc
     b. *[kāl ghoṛ]-e
         black horse-OblSgMasc
         'black horse' (oblique)

By contrast, the postposition *kā* is phrasal. It can attach at the end of a
conjoined phrase, and it does not independently mark NP-internal modifiers
such as adjectives:

(5) a. Ram aur Rānī ke bhāī
         Ram and Rani of=OblSgMasc brother=OblSgMasc
         'Ram and Rani's brother' (oblique)
     b. *kāle ki ghoṛe ki ā̃kh
         black of=DctSgFem horse of=DctSgFem eye=DctSgFem
         'black horse's eye' (direct)

In coordinate structures such as (5a), whether the postposition *kā* attaches to
the conjoined phrase or to the individual conjuncts can have a semantic effect:

(6) a. [Rām aur Rānī ke] bhāiyō
         Ram and Rani of=OblPlMasc brother=OblPlMasc
         'Ram and Rani's brothers' (oblique)
     b. [Rām ke] aur [Rānī ke] bhāiyō
         Ram of=OblPlMasc and Rani of=OblPlMasc brother=OblPlMasc
         'Ram's and Rani's brothers' (oblique)

Whereas the only possible interpretation of (6a) is that the individuals re-
ferred to are simultaneously brothers of Ram and Rani (i.e., Ram and Rani
are themselves brother and sister), (6b) permits either this interpretation or
an interpretation in which the referents are either brothers of Ram or brothers
of Rani (i.e., Ram and Rani are not necessarily siblings).
    One consequence of this mixture of inflectional and postpositional mark-
ing is that in iterated genitive constructions, the case of the whole phrase
cannot be carried beyond the most immediate modifier:

(7) [[Rām ke] bhāī kā] bhātījā
     Ram of=OblSgMasc brother=OblSgMasc of=DctSgMasc cousin=DctSgMasc
     'Ram's brother's cousin' (direct)

In (7), the most immediate modifier of *bhātījā* 'cousin' is the phrase *Rām* ke
bhāī kā 'Ram's brother's', in which the Layer I inflection of the final postposi-
tion *kā* marks agreement in case, number, and gender with *bhātījā*. The post-
position *kā* itself governs the oblique case of bhdi'brother'. The internal modi-
fier of bhdi, *Rām* ke 'Ram's', then agrees via the inflection of the postposition
ke with the oblique case, singular number, and masculine gender of bhdi. The

direct case of the whole phrase is not transferred to the internal modifier *Rām ke,* which agrees solely with the noun *bhāī*. Essentially, this follows from the fact that the postposition *kd* can have one and only one Layer I ending.

3. Variations

In all the Indic languages in which it occurs, the Suffixaufnahme construction follows essentially the pattern illustrated in standard Hindi: an inflected Layer II postposition linked to a modifying NP shows Layer I agreement with a modified noun. This pattern is also found in Kashmiri, though here it is not the only Suffixaufnahme pattern, some agreeing genitives being constructed by purely word-internal means. The range of variation is limited to the role and form of the postposition, the case governed by the postposition, and the categories of agreement.

3.1. Indic

All the Indic languages that have agreeing postpositions have an agreeing postposition with possessor and general genitive functions akin to Hindi *kā*. This postposition also invariably governs the oblique case. For those languages that have two genders (masculine versus feminine), the direct and oblique case forms are shown in Table 9.1.

Three-gender systems (masculine, neuter, feminine) are found in the southwest of the Indic area (Gujarati, Marathi, and Konkani), with the forms of the genitive postposition illustrated in Table 9.2.

It will be noted that the distinction between direct and oblique is invariably present in the masculine (and neuter) singular. Elsewhere there is wide-

Table 9.1. Genitive Postpositions in Languages with Two Genders.

	DctSg Masc	OblSg Masc	DctPl Masc	OblPl Masc	DctSg Fem	OblSg Fem	DctPl Fem	OblPl 'Fem
Punjabi	dā	de	de	de (diā̃)	di	di	dīā̃	dīā̃
Lahnda	dā; nā, nã̄	de; ne	de; ne	diā̃; neā̃, nīā̃	di; ni, ni	di; ni, ni	dīā̃; nīā̃	dīā̃; nīā̃
Sindhi	jo	jē	jā	jū	ji	ji (jia)	jē (jī)	jē, jini, juni
Marwari	ro	rā	rā	rā	ri	ri	ri	ri
Jaipuri	ko	kā	kā	kā	ki	ki	ki	ki
Parya	ko	kâ	kâ	kâ	ki	ki	ki	ki
Kumauni	ko	kà	kà	kà	ki	ki	ki	ki
Stand. Hindi	kā	ke	ke	ke	ki	ki	ki	ki
Braj	kao	kae	kae	kae	ki	ki	ki	ki
Awadhi	ker	ke(rē)	ke(rē)	ke(rē)	ki	ki	ki	ki
Bundeli	kō	kē	kē	kē	ki	ki	ki	ki
Romany (Slovak)	kero/ gero	kere/ gere	kere/ gere	kere/ gere	keri/ geri	kera/ gera	kere/ gere	kere/ gere

Table 9.2. **Genitive Postpositions in Languages with Three Genders.**

	Dct Sg Masc	Obl Sg Masc	Dct Pl Masc	Obl Pl Masc	Dct Sg Neut	Obl Sg Neut	Dct Pl Neut	Obl Pl Neut	Dct Sg Fem	Obl Sg Fem	Dct Pl Fem	Obl Pl Fem
Gujarati	no	nā	nā	nā	nũ	nā	nā	nā	ni	ni	ni	ni
Marathi	cā	cyā	ce	cyā	cẽ	cyā	ci	cyā	ci	cyā	cya	cyā
Konkani	lo, gelo	lyā	le, gele	lyā	l	lyā	li	lyā	li	lyā	lyo	lyā

spread syncretism: the direct-oblique distinction is rarer in the plural and feminine paradigms, but it is nevertheless preserved to some extent in the languages in the west of the Indic area (Marathi, Konkani, Lahnda, Sindhi, and marginally in the masculine plural in Punjabi).

The distinction between direct and oblique is also preserved in the feminine singular in a limited number of Romany dialects. According to Ventcel' and Čerenkov (1976: 308), these are the dialects of the Slovak and Hungarian Gypsies, the dialect of the Vlakh Gypsies of Moldavia and Rumania, the Kelderari dialect (originally spoken on the Rumanian-Hungarian language border in the Austro-Hungarian Empire) and the Lowari dialect. The latter two dialects have spread throughout Eastern and Western Europe.

Romany dialects are unusual in that the genitive postposition not only agrees with the case, number, and gender of the modified noun, but also has two allomorphs depending on the singularity or plurality of the modifier. In most dialects, including the dialect of the Slovak Gypsies shown in Table 9.1, the forms have initial k- and g- respectively. An illustrative paradigm of the direct forms (Ventcel' and Čerenkov 1976: 305) is given in (8).

(8)   a. [romés kero] chắvo
          Gypsy=OblSgMasc of=Sg=DctSgMasc son=DctSgMasc
          '(male) Gypsy's son' (direct)
      b. [romés kere] chắve
          Gypsy= OblSgMasc of=Sg=DctPlMasc child=DctPlMasc
          '(male) Gypsy's children' (direct)
      c. [romes keri] chai
          Gypsy= OblSgMasc of=Sg= DctSgFem daughter=DctSgFem
          '(male) Gypsy's daughter' (direct)
      d. [romn'h kero] chắvo
          Gypsy=OblSgFem of=Sg=DctSgMasc son=DctSgMasc
          '(female) Gypsy's son' (direct)
      e. [romn'h kere] chắve
          Gypsy=OblSgFem of=Sg=DctPlMasc child= DctPlMasc
          '(female) Gypsy's children' (direct)

f. [romn'á **keri**] **chai**
   Gypsy= OblSgFem of=Sg=DctSgFem daughter=DctSgFem
   '(female) Gypsy's son' **(direct)**

g. [romén **gero**] chávo
   Gypsy=OblPlMasc **of**=Pl=DctSgMasc **son**=DctSgMasc
   'Gypsies' son' (direct)

h. [romén **gere**] cháve
   Gypsy= OblPlMasc **of**=Pl=DctPlMasc **son**=DctPlMasc
   'Gypsies' sons' (direct)

i. [romé∅ **geri**] **chai**
   Gypsy= OblPlMasc **of**=Pl=DctSgFem **daughter**=DctSgFem
   'Gypsies' daughter[7] **(direct)**

Variants in other Romany dialects are kir-lgir-, kar-lgar-, kor-lgor-, *kr-/gr-* and t'ir-ld'ir-. Contrasting forms corresponding to the singular and plural of the governed noun are in general a feature of Romany Layer II postpositions, for example *ke/ge* (dative), telde (locative), tarldar (ablative), and *ha/ća* (instru-mental) in the Slovak dialect. This can be treated as an interesting formal confirmation of the status of the genitive as a Layer II postposition in Romany.

In some Indic languages, agreeing Layer I case forms of the genitive postposition other than the basic direct and oblique are cited. Punjabi used to have an ablative (db or deb), but this is clearly archaic in modern Punjabi (Smirnov 1976: 380). Gujarati, Marwari, and Jaipuri appear to have an agentive (ne, *kai,* and re respectively), and Sindhi has a distinct vocative in hte masculine singular $(j\bar{a})$ and feminine plural $(jy\tilde{\bar{a}})$ in addition to the direct form $(j\tilde{u})$. The rarity of such additional case forms follows simply from the fact that the main functional load of case marking in the Indic languages that have Suffixaufnahme is carried by Layer II postpositions rather than by Layer I cases.

Even rarer in the Indic languages is an agreeing Layer II postposition with a function other than genitive. Smirnov (1976: 383–385) cites the possible existence in Punjabi of agreeing forms of locative postpositions such as *viclā* 'in' and *əndərlā* 'inside' in examples like (9).

(9)   **a.** [pəñjāb **vicli**] hālət
        Punjab=Obl in=DctSgFem situation=DctSgFem
        'situation in the Punjab'

      b. [**des andarle**] səmājək **sambandh**
        country=**Obl inside**=DctPlMasc **social** relationship=DctPlMasc
        'social relationships inside the country'

In addition to these agreeing forms, Punjabi possesses ordinary invariant postpositions such as *vicc* 'in' and *əndər* 'inside'. What is more, the agreeing forms can themselves act as simple adjectives with a meaning corresponding to 'central' or 'internal' in examples like *viclā morcā* 'central front' and *əndərlā ghol* 'internal conflict'. It is possible therefore that examples such as (9a) and

(9b) should be translated as 'situation internal to the Punjab' and 'social rela-
tionships internal to the country', with *viclā* and * əndərlā* treated as normal
adjectives governing the oblique case of the preceding noun. In this case, Indic
would have no examples of agreeing postpositions other than the genitive.

3.2. *Kashmiri*

Kashmiri is unusual in that the form and type of genitive marker depends not
only on the case, gender, and number of the modified noun, but also on
inherent distinctions of the head noun of the modifying phrase, viz. common
versus proper, masculine versus feminine, animate versus inanimate, and sin-
gular versus plural. The form *un* occurs with animate masculine singular
proper nouns, *uk* occurs with inanimate masculine singular common nouns,
und occurs with animate masculine singular common nouns, and *hund* occurs
with feminine and plural masculine nouns.

Of these four forms, *hund* and *und* behave in all respects like agreeing
Layer II postpositions. There are four Layer I cases in Kashmiri, traditionally
termed direct (or absolute), agentive, dative, and ablative. Given their func-
tional diversity, dative and ablative are perhaps more appropriately desig-
nated oblique I and oblique II (Zaxar'in and Edel'man 1971). The paradigm
of *hund* is then as in Table 9.3 (Zaxar'in and Edel'man 1971: 113). An exam-
ple of *hund* attached to a conjoined phrase is given in (10):

(10)   [məl'is ti məji hund] kār
        father=OblI and mother=OblI of=DctSgMasc case=DctSgMasc
        'father and mother's case'

The postposition *hund* governs the oblique I case of the modifying nouns *məl'*
'father' and *məj* 'mother' and itself agrees with the absolute case, masculine
gender, and singular number of the modified noun *kār* 'case, affair'. It should
be noted that the choice of the form *hund* (as opposed to *und)* is determined
by the final noun in the conjoined NP. As an animate masculine singular
common noun, *məl'* 'father' in isolation requires the postposition *und* (*məl'is*

Table 9.3. **Inflection of Kashmiri
Genitive Postposition** *hund.*

		Singular	Plural
Masculine	**Direct**	hund	hind'
	Oblique I	hind'is	hind'an
	Oblique II	hind'i	hind'aw
	Agentive	hind'	hind'aw
Feminine	**Direct**	hinz	hinzi
	Oblique I	hinz'i	hinzan
	Oblique II	hinz'i	hinzaw
	Agentive	hinz'i	hinzaw

+ *und* 'father's'), whereas the feminine noun *mǝj* 'mother' in isolation takes
hund (*mǝji* + hund 'mother's').

Diachronically, und derives from the attachment of hund to the oblique I
ending of masculine nouns, e.g. *mǝl'is* + hund > *mǝl's* + und 'father's', *cūras*
+ hund > *cūrīs* + und 'thief's'. Synchronically, und might be considered as a
morphologically conditioned allomorph of hund in the immediate environ-
ment of animate masculine singular common nouns. However, because of the
sandhi phenomena that have taken place, und itself must be analysed as
governing a morphologically conditioned variant of the original oblique I
ending of the adjacent modifying noun (-s instead of -*is*, -*is* instead of -as). It
should be noted that Zaxar'in and Edel'man (1971: 114) treat the final -*s* of
the oblique I ending as belonging to the postposition (this then taking the
form sund rather than und). This seems perverse and unnecessary, given that
the oblique I always ends in -*s* for singular masculine nouns.

The paradigm of und is identical to that of hund, giving examples such as
(11).

(11)   [m'ōn'is mǝl's ind'i] gari
       my=OblISgMasc father=OblISgMasc of =OblIISgMasc house=OblIISgMasc
       'my father's house' (oblique II)

In (11), und is selected rather than hund because *mǝl'* is an animate masculine
singular common noun. It takes the form *ind'i* in agreement with the modified
noun *gari* 'house'. *Und* governs the oblique I case of *mǝl'* 'father'. That the -*s*
case ending of *mǝl'* is a conditioned variant of the usual -*is* of the oblique I is
shown by the agreement of the possessive *m'ōn'is* 'my'.

While hund and und seem to be phrasal markers of the genitive, the two
remaining genitive markers *un* and uk appear to have more of the characteris-
tics of agglutinative suffixes than of genuine postpositions. The clearest mani-
festation of this is the fact that they obligatorily attach to all the conjunct
nouns in a coordinate NP, and cannot be postposed just to the last conjunct
(Zaxar'in and Edel'man 1971: 116):

(12)   a.   **šahr-ik'** ti **gām-ik' šur'**
            town-Gen=DctPlMasc and village-Gen=DctPlMasc children=DctPlMasc
            'children of the twon and the village'
       b.   **Rām-un** ti **Narānun** gari
            Rama-Gen=DctSgMasc and Narayana-Gen=DctSgMasc
              house=DctSgMasc
            'Rama and Narayana's house'

Un and uk are traditionally regarded as governing the oblique II case of the
modifying nouns. However, because this analysis requires the postulation of
complex sandhi phenomena, it may be preferable to treat *un* and uk as simple
genitive suffixes, adding a new genitive case to the four etymologically ancient
Layer I cases (Masica 1991: 243). The full paradigms are as in Table 9.4.

Table **9.4. Paradigm of Kashmiri Genitive Suffixes -un and -*uk*.**

		Singular	Plural
Masculine	**Direct**	-un	-(i)n'
	Oblique I	-(i)n'is	-(i)n'an
	Oblique II	-(i)n'i	-(i)n'aw
	Agentive	-in'	-(i)n'aw
Feminine	**Direct**	-(i)n'	-(i)n'i
	Oblique I	-(i)n'i	-(i)n'an
	Oblique II	-(i)n'i	-(i)n'aw
	Agentive	-(i)n'i	-(i)n'aw
Masculine	**Direct**	-uk	-(i)k'
	Oblique I	-(i)k'is	-(i)k'an
	Oblique II	-(i)k'i	-(i)k'aw
	Agentive	-ik'	-(i)k'aw
Feminine	**Direct**	-ič	**-(i)č**
	Oblique I	-(i)či	-(i)čan
	Oblique II	-(i)či	-(i)čaw
	Agentive	-(i)či	-(i)čaw

Unlike the etymologically ancient Layer I endings, the genitive suffixes are restricted to nouns (of the appropriate classes) and do not form part of the paradigm of agreeing adjectives and genitive phrases. These assume case endings that might be treated as agreeing genitives, but that are syncretic with the endings of the oblique II:

(13) məl's ind'i gar-uk brōr
      father of=GenSgMasc **house**=SgMasc-Gen=DctSgMasc **cat**=DctSgMasc
      'the cat of father's house'

In (13), the genitive noun gar-uk 'of the house' agrees with the direct case, singular number, and masculine gender of *brōr* 'cat'. The possessive phrase *məl's ind'i* 'father's', which contains the agreeing postposition *ind'i,* agrees with the genitive case, singular number, and masculine gender of gar-uk (the ending being identical to that of the oblique II singular masculine).

To summarize, the form of the genitive in Kashmiri is determined by the class of the final noun in any NP. The genitive marker may be an agreeing postposition (hund with feminine nouns and masculine plural nouns, or und with animate masculine singular common nouns). These govern the oblique I case of the preceding noun and its immediate modifiers; they agree in case, number, and gender with the modified noun; and as phrasal markers they can govern an entire coordinate NP. The genitive marker may also be a genitive suffix (-un with animate masculine singular proper nouns, or -uk with inanimate masculine singular common nouns). Like the postpositions, these agree in case, number, and gender with the modified noun. However, as suffixes, they must attach to every noun in a coordinate NP

Table 9.5. Inflection of the Kashmiri Postposition *k'ut* 'for'.

		Singular	Plural
Masculine	**Direct**	k'ut	k'it'
	Oblique I	k'it'is	k'it'an
	Oblique II	k'it'i	k'it'aw
	Agentive	k'it'	k'it'aw
Feminine	**Direct**	k'ic	k'ici
	Oblique I	k'ic'i	k'ican
	Oblique II	k'ic'i	k'icaw
	Agentive	k'ic'i	k'icaw

From this it follows that the structure of a genitive coordinate NP consisting of nouns belonging to different classes depends on the class of the final noun. If the final noun requires a postposition, then any preceding conjunct nouns may simply occur in the oblique I case, even though in isolation they might require one of the genitive suffixes -*uk* or -*un*. This is illustrated in (14), where the postposition hund, selected because of the plurality of *gām* 'village', governs the oblique I case of *šahr* 'town'.

(14)   [šahri ti gāman **hind']** lūk
         town= OblI and villages=OblI of=DctPlMasc people=DctPlMasc
         'people of the town and villages'

On the other hand, if the final noun is one that requires a genitive suffix, as in examples (12a) and (12b), the preceding conjuncts must be separately and appropriately marked.

Kashmiri also possesses a further agreeing postposition ***k'ut*** 'for', occurring in examples such as (15), whose paradigm is given in Table 9.5 (Zaxar'in and Edel'man 1971: 114–115).

(15) a. [paranas **k'ut**] gari
          reading=OblI for=DctSgMasc house=DctSgMasc
          'house for reading' (direct)
      b. [ciir'an **k'it'aw**] gur'aw
          thieves= OblI for=OblIIPlFem horse=OblIIPlFem
          'horses for thieves' (oblique II)

This appears to be the best case in the Indian subcontinent of an agreeing postposition with a function other than that of genitive.

4. Postpositional or Adjectival?

One of the perennial disputes about the Indic genitive postpositions is whether they are genuine postpositions which (apart from the fact that they

Table **9.6. Adjective and Genitive Postposition Paradigms in Hindi and Sindhi.**

	Hindi		Sindi	
	Adjective	**Postposition**	**Adjective**	**Postposition**
DctSgMasc	acch-ā	k-ā	vaḍ-o	**j-o**
OblSgMasc	**acch-e**	**k-e**	vaḍ-ē	j-ē
DctPlMasc	**acch-e**	**k-e**	**vad-a**	**j-a**
OblPlMasc	**acch-e**	**k-e**	vaḍ-ane	j-ē (**j-i**)
DctSgFem	acch-i	k-i	vaḍ-ī	**j-ī**
OblSgFem	acch-i	k-i	vaḍ-ia	j-ī (j-īa)
DctPlFem	acch-i	k-i	vaḍ-iū	j-ū
OblPlFem	acch-i	k-i	vaḍ-iane	j-ē, j-ini, j-uni
	'good'	**'of'**	**'big'**	**'of'**

have agreement paradigms) parallel other case formants in the language concerned, or whether they have the function of deriving attributive adjective phrases (a view taken for example by Bloch 1965: 180–181).

The most obvious argument in favor of the adjectival hypothesis is the fact that the agreement paradigms of the postpositions typically coincide with one of the adjectival agreement paradigms in the language concerned. The formal correspondence is, however, not always exact. For example, the Sindhi postposition *jo* has a paradigm which, although similar to that of adjectives, is nevertheless different (Egorova 1966: 37). In Table 9.6, compare the Hindi adjective and genitive postposition paradigms, which are formally identical, with the corresponding Sindhi paradigms, which are similar but distinct.

Distributional arguments also speak against the adjectival hypothesis.

First, in a full description of NP structure, the position of genitive phrases may differ from that of standard adjective phrases. In Hindi, for example, the basic order of elements in Possessor–Determiner–Numeral Adjective–Noun (Kachru 1980: 41):

(16)   [Sharmilā **ki**] **ve do** lāl kitābē
       Sharmila of those two red books
       'those two red books of Sharmila's'

It can be seen that genitive phrases precede the determiner, while standard adjective phrases follow the determiner.

Second, the genitive phrase may function in Hindi as the subject or locative in a participial construction (Kachru 1980: 71–72):

(17)   a. **[Ram ki likhi hui]** kitāb
           Ram of written book
           'book written by Ram'
       b. ye [banāras ke paṛhe hue] hai
           he Banaras of studied is
           'he was educated in Banaras'

In (17a) the participial is attributive, and in (17b) it is predicative. The predicative example is particularly interesting, since there is no possibility here of arguing that the genitive phrase is modifying a noun rather than acting as a locative within the participial construction. The role of subject or locative is a typical case function, which an arbitrary adjective phrase could not fulfil. The construction can also be illustrated from Punjabi (Smirnov 1976: 379):

(18)   [griarsan dīā dəssiā] 854 bolīā
        Grierson of described 854 languages
        '854 languages described by Grierson'

Third, in some languages (e.g., Hindi and Punjabi), the genitive can occur in the position of the subject NP in existential expressions denoting part-whole relationships, non-temporary possession, and kinship (Masica 1991: 359–360). What is more, in Hindi (and possibly other languages), when the relationship is one of kinship, an invariant form of the genitive can be used:

(19)   a. [kamre ki] tin hi dīvārē hai
            room of=DctPlFem three only wall=DctPlFem are
            'The room has only three walls'
        b. [Mātādīn ke] do gāē haī
            Matadin of=DctPlMasc two steer=DctPlMasc are
            'Matadin has two steers'
        c. [us ke] sirf ek bahan hai
            he of only one sister=DctSgFem is
            'He only has one sister'

In the Hindi examples (19a) and (19b), which denote a part-whole relationship and a non-temporary possession relationship respectively, the genitive postposition shows agreement with the possessed noun. In (19c), on the other hand, the genitive postposition assumes an invariant form *ke* (the same as the masculine oblique), rather than the expected feminine *ki*. Standard adjective phrases do not have these functions.

Fourth, genitive phrases can be governed by a further set of postpositions which typically have more specialized meanings than the basic Layer II postpositions. Zograf (1976: 117–122) calls these Layer III postpositions. Layer III postpositions are a widespread phenomenon throughout the Indic languages, and their construction with the genitive reflects the origin of such postpositions as nouns. The derivation is often totally transparent. In Gujarati, for example, *puṭhe* 'behind' derives from the locative of *puṭh* 'back' (Cardona 1965: 147). *Puṭhe* then governs a genitive phrase with the postposition **ni** (reflecting the feminine gender of *puṭh*); i.e., 'behind' derives from 'at the back of'. In many cases, however, there is synchronically no noun to which the Layer III postposition is related, and the form of the genitive postposition is subject to considerable variation. Written Gujarati, for example, uses diachronically

based ni (feminine), na (neuter oblique), and *ne* (historically locative); how-
ever, many speakers always select the invariant form na, reflecting the transi-
tion from noun to postposition. In Punjabi, Layer III postpositions that govern
the genitive always select an invariant form of the genitive postposition (the
masculine oblique form de):

(20)   **[paiijab de] vicc**
       Punjab **of in**
       'in the Punjab'

The force of such examples is that the analysis of *vicc* 'in' as a postposition
forces the analysis of *pənjāb* de as a genitive phrase, since postpositions do not
govern adjectives.

Fifth, genitive phrases can themselves be governed by adjectives. Exam-
ples can be cited from Gujarati in which the adjectives *samū* 'in front of', *jewū*
'like', *sərkhū* 'like', and pharthzi 'around' govern the genitive. For no obvious
synchronic reason, the forms of the genitive postposition are invariably ni
with *samū,* na with jewii and *sərkhū,* and ne with pharthii (Cardona 1965:
146). The adjectives themselves agree with the noun which they modify or of
which they are predicated:

(21)   **[bag ne] pharthu** kuṇḍaḷū che
       garden of around=DctSgNeut **circle**=DctSgNeut **is**
       'There is a circle around the garden'

As in the previous examples in which a postposition governs a phrase in the
genitive, here it can be argued that an adjective is governing a phrase in the
genitive. One would not expect an adjective to govern another adjective
phrase.

All the arguments presented above appear to demonstrate that the geni-
tive postpositions in Indic and Kashmiri create phrases with functions typical
of case-marked NPs rather than attributive adjective phrases. In other words,
the formal identification of the genitive postpositions as Layer II case markers
is correct, and the Suffixaufnahme phenomenon in Indic and Kashmiri genu-
inely involves the superposition of two cases.

5. Historical Origins

What are the historical origins of the agreeing postpositions in Indic and
Kashmiri? They appear to derive principally from the participles of Indo-
Aryan verbs such as √*kṛ-* 'do', √*as-* 'be', and √*dā-* 'give' (Chatterji 1970:
751–759). These participles agreed with the nouns they modified, and in many
languages they preserved the Layer I case, number, and gender distinctions as
their relationship with the original verb paradigms became eroded.

The present participle of √*as-* 'be' in the form *santa(+ka)* is found in the

Nasik inscriptions of the first and second centuries BCE in expressions such as *pitu-santaka* 'of the father' (literally 'father-being') . As *satka* in inscriptional Sanskrit of the Second Modern Indo-Aryan period, this participle is found all over Northern India, attaching to the base of singular nouns and the genitive of plural nouns. It survived in early Assamese in the form *-sākå,* as in *āmā-sākå* 'our', but it does not survive into modern Assamese. Its principal modern survival is in fact the agreeing postposition **hund** of Kashmiri.

Participial forms of the verb √*kṛ-* 'do' are the main source of the present Indic agreeing postpositions. The most popular genitive postposition in Modern Indo-Aryan literature is *kēra* (or its variant form *kēla*), which derives from the participle *kārya.* It survives most obviously in the Romany dialects and Awadhi, but, in a vernacular form *kajja,* also results in the Sindhi postposition *jo.* As a form which has lost all agreement, it survives in Eastern Indic, for example as the Bengali genitive suffix *-er.*

The source of the Hindi postposition *kā* is the past participle *kṛta* of the verb √*kṛ-,* which straight forwardly gives Modern Indo-Aryan *kā.* The use of the participle *kṛta* in what can easily be interpreted as reinforcing a genitive function is apparent in the Transitional Modern Indo-Aryan period from Sanskrit expressions such as **tasya kṛtē dattam** 'gift to him, his gift' (literally 'gift done of him'). Sanskrit expressions of this form, in place of **tasmai dattam** 'gift to him' with the dative of the pronoun, are evidently based on a Prakrit or vernacular use.

The past participle **dita* of the verb √*dā-* 'give' (in place of the Sanskrit form **ditta** with reduplication) is probably the source of the Punjabi and Lahnda postposition *dā.*

The failure of genitive postpositions to agree in Indic languages such as Sinhalese and Maldivian is not due to the loss of agreement but to the origin of these postpositions in nouns rather than agreeing participles, with the Sinhalese animate genitive *gē* and the Maldivian general genitive *ge* deriving from the locative singular **gehi** 'in the house' (Geiger 1938: 110; de Silva 1970: 147).

6. Typological Correlates

6.1. Word Order

All the Indic languages have basic word order Subject−Object−Verb, and the correlation that Suffixaufnahme implies this order is therefore satisfied. Kashmiri is more problematic: it has Suffixaufnahme, but its word order is far from simple. According to Zaxar'in and Edel'man (1971: 125), word order is relatively free, but the standard order is Subject−Finite Verb−Object. There is a prima facie case, therefore, that Kashmiri constitutes a counterexample to the correlation between Suffixaufnahme and SOV order. The position is complicated by the behavior of analytic verb forms, where the non-finite section may either directly follow the finite form or follow other post-verbal sentence constituents, including the object. **A** marked word order may also have the

finite verb in initial position. The problem of basic word order in Kashmiri is therefore similar to that in German.

6.2. Ergativity

Some degree of ergativity is a feature of all the Indic languages that display Suffixaufnahme, and of Kashmiri. For the agent of transitive sentences either a Layer II postposition may be used, or a Layer I non-direct case. Indeed, the correlation almost holds in the reverse direction: the languages that lack ergativity (basically the East Indic languages, and Sinhalese and Maldivian) also lack Suffixaufnahme. The exceptions are Assamese and Nepali, which lack Suffixaufnahme but do preserve some ergativity. Nepali does however possess a genitive postposition that (marginally) maintains number and gender agreement.

The historical reasons for these correlations are complex, but it is in the Eastern languages that we see a greater tendency to lose the original Indic Layer I cases. These Layer I distinctions were the basis for the ergative-absolutive distinction in the case marking of subjects (with subsequent further differentiation by Layer II markers in some languages), and their preservation is simultaneously a prerequisite for the origin of the Indic and the Kashmiri Suffixaufnahme construction.

References

Bloch, Jules. 1965. *Indo-Aryan from the Vedas to Modern Times.* (Translated by Alfred Master.) Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.

Cardona, George. 1965. *A Gujarati Reference Grammar.* Philadephia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Chatterji, Suniti Kumar. 1970. *The Origin and Development of the Bengali Language.* Volume 2. Woking and London: George Allen and Unwin (first published 1926, Calcutta University Press).

de Silva, M. W. Sugathapala. 1970. Some observations on the history of Maldivian. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 1970, 137–162.

Egorova, Raisa P. 1966. *Jazyk sindxi.* Moscow: Nauka.

Geiger, Wilhelm. 1938. *A Grammar of the Sinhalese Language.* Colombo: Royal Asiatic Society.

Kachru, Yamuna. 1980. *Aspects of Hindi Grammar.* New Delhi: Manohar.

Masica, Colin, 1991. *The Indo-Aryan Languages.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smirnov, Jurij A. 1976. *Grammatika jazyka pandžabi.* Moscow: Nauka.

Ventcel', Tat'jana V., and L. N. Čerenkov. 1976. Dialekty cyganskogo *Jazyka. In Jazyki Azii i Afriki,* vol. 1, *Zndoevropejskie jazyki,* ed. by Nikolaj I. Konrad, 283–332. Moscow: Glavnaja Redakcija Vostočnoj Literatury.

Zaxar'in, Boris A., and Džoj I. Edel'man. 1971. *Jazyk kašmiri. Moscow: Nauka.*

Zograf, Georgij A. 1976. *Morfologičeskij stroj novyx indoarijskix jazykov.* Mocow: Nauka.