

17 March 2018

San Francisco State University

Marathi's Prenominal Noun-modifying Constructions: Their Protean Functions and Diverse Morphologies



खिडक्यांच्या काचा फुटलेली शाळा म्हणजे महापालिकेची शाळा ...

[[*khiḍkyāñ-čyā kāsā phuṭ-lel-i*] *šālā*] *mhanje mahāpālike-či šālā*
windows-Gen panes break-PstPrt-Fsg school = municipality-Gen school

‘A window-panes-broken school means a municipal school ...’

Peter Edwin Hook and Prashant Pardeshi

Universities of Michigan and Virginia

国立国語研究所 NINJAL

Focus of our presentation:
Marathi and Japanese PreNMCs and [K&C]+

PreNMCs = prenominal noun modifying constructions (or constituents). Cf. broken dish, swollen river, etc.

[K&C]+ = extensions (and critiques) of Ed Keenan and Bernard Comrie's NPAH [Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy] as set out in K&C 1977, critiqued [Maxwell 1977, Joseph 1983], and further refined by Comrie's collaborations with Kaoru Horie [1995], Yoshiko Matsumoto and Peter Sells [2017].

Keenan and Comrie's 1977 NPAH

NPAH = 'Noun Phrase Accessibility Hierarchy':

Subj > Obj > IndObj > Oblique > Poss > ObjComp

The NPAH is one of the three well-studied hierarchies claiming cross-linguistic validity. (The other two are Berlin and Kay's hierarchy of basic color terms [1969] and Silverstein's Animacy Hierarchy as evidenced in alignment splits [1972]).

Marathi, Japanese, and the NPAH

K&C's sample: 49 languages - of which only 10 are OV.

Neither Marathi or Japanese PreNMCs offer much to a reanalysis or testing of the first 5 segments of the NPAH:

Subj > Obj > IndObj > Oblique > Poss > ObjComp

However, neither language allows its PreNMCs to relativize on the final “**object-of-comparison**” position.

‘Those that I am younger than become fewer by the day.’

Object of comparison in Marathi

In Marathi the **relative-corerelative** can be used for this position:

(ते तापमान) सर्वात थंड व **ज्याच्यापेक्षा** अधिक नीच ...
(*te tāpmān*) *sarvāt thaṇḍ va jyā.čyā-pekṣā* *adhik nič*
(that temp) most cold and **which-than** more low

तापमान असूच शकत नाही
tāpmān as.u-ts śakat nāhi
temperature be-Emph can not

‘That temperature [absolute zero] is the coldest and lower than which a temperature cannot be.’

[<https://marathivishwakosh.maharashtra.gov.in/khandas/khand4>]

Relativization on inalienable Possessor

Marathi freely relativizes on the position of inalienable possessor:

[[*ek moṭhi bahiṇ āṇi lahān bhāu as-lel-ā*] *hā mulgā*] ...
one big sister and little brother be-PstPart-Msg this boy
‘[This boy [who has a big sister and a little brother]] ...’

[gaurangprabhu.blogspot.com]

Japanese, too, relativizes on the position of inalienable possessor:

子供がいた人は少なかった

[[*kodomo-ga i-ta*] *hito-wa*] *sukuna-katta*

children-Nom be-PstPrt person-Top be.few-Pst

‘[People [who had children]], there were not so many of them.’

(ママ(その頃クルーで子供がいた人は少なかったので恭子ママと呼ばれていました))

[<https://ameblo.jp/pico346/entry-11978308209.html>]

Relativization on alienable Possessors

PreNMCs may also relativize on alienable possessor:

kāy kar-til [bičāre [kārḍ n-as-lele] lok]?

what do-Fut poor card not-be-PstPrt people

‘What will the poor folks do who don’t have cards?’

[mbtest2.maayboli.com/node/60794]

In Japanese, too:

[[*kasa-ga at-ta*] *kata*] *ga, ī de-šou*

umbrella-Nom be-PstPrt person if good be-Fut

‘It would be good were you to have an umbrella.’

[<https://tenki.jp/indexes/umbrella>]

Relativization on Possessor of embedded subject

Marathi relativizes on possessors of embedded subjects:

[[*mulā-sāṭhi jiv tuṭ-ṇār-i*] *āi*] ...
child-for soul(Msg) break-PresPrt-Fsg mother(Fsg)
‘[a mother [(whose) soul breaks for her child]] ...

[cinema-canvas.blogspot.com]

Japanese, too, relativizes on possessors of embedded subject:

傘が壊れた人

kasa-ga koware-ta hito ...

umbrella-Nom break-PstPrt person

‘Someone having a broken umbrella...’

[<https://mojom.com/jpy132939x10x11.html>]

Relativization on (Possessor of) Possessor of Possessor ?

Marathi relativizes on possessor of possessors of intransitive subjects:

वादळाने (आईच्या) घराचे छत उडालेल्या महिलेस ... [*vnxpres.com*]

[[*vādaḷā-ne* (*āi-čyā*) *gharā-tse čhat uḍāl-el-yā*] *mahile-s*]

windstorm-Ins mother-Gen house-Gen roof fly-Pst-Prt woman-Dat

‘To a woman whose (mother’s) house’s roof flew off in the wind ...’

Japanese, too, relativizes on possessors of possessors of such subjects:

その夜、おなかの調子が悪くなった私は ...

sono yoru, [[*onaka-no chōši ga waruku nat-ta*] *wataši*]-*wa* ...

that night stomach-Gen state-Nom bad become-PstPrt me-Top

‘That night, as for me, the state of my stomach had gone south ...’

[<https://imidas.jp/jijikaitai/>]

What about Possessors of transitive subjects?

Eastern Shina, an Indo-Aryan language spoken in the Northern Areas of Pakistan, allows relativization on possessors of transitive subjects:

[[*bāl-i čori thāw*]-ek]-i *ripoṭ ne daw*
boy-Erg stealing did-one-Erg report not gave (elicited)

Without context ambiguity may result:

'[The person [**whose** boy stole (something)]] didn't report it.'

'[The person [**from whom** the boy stole (something)]] didn't report it.'

子どもがバッグを引ったくった女性は警察に通報しなかった
kodomo-ga baggu-o hitta.kut-ta jyosei-wa keisatsu-ni tsūhō šinakatta
boy-Nom bag-Acc snatch-PstPrt lady-Top police-Dat inform didn't

'[The woman [**whose** boy snatched a bag]] didn't report it.'

'[The woman [**from whom** the boy snatched a bag]] didn't report it.'

A “Garden-path” problem for Object of Oblique

Marathi [rarely] allows relativization on ObjObl in transitive NMCs:

चोरी केलेल्या इसमाचा गुलाम ... [ketkardnyankosh.com/]

[[*tsori ke-lel-yā*] *isamā-tsā*] *gulām* ...

theft do-PstPrt-Obl person-Gen slave

'The slave_i of [the person_j [**who**_j stole (something)]] ...'

On Subj, right? But the full context requires a different interpretation:

tsorā-lā [[*tsori ke-lel-yā*] *isamā-tsā*] *gulām ho-un rahā.veṁ lāgat ase*
thief-Dat theft do-PstPrt-Obl person-Gen slave become-Ger remain need Pst

'The thief would have to become the slave_i (for life) of [the person_j [**from whom**_j he_i stole (something)]]).' (Aztec law)

A similar problem arises with non-past NMCs relativizing on IndObj.

“Garden-paths” in Japanese?

Japanese, too, allows relativization on ObjObl in transitive NMCs. Question: Does relativization on ObjObl create ambiguity in Japanese? Is (1) ambiguous between 友人 ‘friend’ as borrower and 友人 as lender?

... お金を借りた友人がずっとついてくる

... *okane-o kari-ta yū.jin-ga zutto.tsuite kuru*

money-Acc borrow-PstPrt friend-Nom forever come

‘The friend **who** borrowed (from me?) / **from whom** (I?) borrowed money will keep on coming forever ...’

[<https://bokete.jp> > お題]

Increasing “referential density” disambiguates ...

Without an explicit non-referential subject inside such a NMC, the most likely interpretation is that the relativization is on subject:

... お金を借りた]友人]は、 ... [www.ictac14.org]
[[... *okane-o kari-ta*] *yū.jin*]-*wa* ...
... money-Acc borrowed friend-Top ...
‘... the friend (**who**) borrowed money ...’

私がお金を借りた]友人]は、 ...
[[*wataši-ga okane-o kari-ta*] *yū.jin*]-*wa* ...
I-Nom money-Acc borrowed friend-Top ...
‘The friend (**from whom**) I borrowed money ...’

[[*私から*お金を借りた]友人]は、 ...
‘The friend (**who**) borrowed money **from** me ...’

Does the NPAH have a place for relativization on adjuncts?

While PreNMCs relativizing on times or places do correspond to fully spelled-out relative-corerelative counterparts, it is not clear that the times or places they modify have been “extracted” in order to satisfy a PAS:

आम्ही गेलेल्या दिवशी बहुदा त्यांना काहीच मिळाले नाही

[[*āmhi ge-lelyā*] *divaś-i*] *bahu.dā tyān-nā kāhi-ts miḷā-le nāhi.*

we went-PstPrt day-Loc likely them-Dat any-Emph get-Pst not

‘The day we went (on safari) they probably did not get anything at all.’

[*mr.upakram.org*]

ज्या दिवशी आम्ही गेलो त्या दिवशी दिवसभर चांगले ऊन होते

[[*jyā divaś-i āmhi gelo*] *tyā divaś-i*] *divas-bhar tsāᅅgle un hote*

which day-Loc we went that day-Loc day-full good sun was

‘On the day we went (on the tour) there was bright sun all day long.’

[*misalpav.com/node/39850*]

Relativizing on adjuncts Or when is a phrase not a phrase?

Marathi often features NMCs that modify adjuncts of time or place:

तो खेळ घरी आणलेल्या दिवशी मूल तासन्तास खेळत बसतं.

to kheḷ ghar.i āṅ-lelyā divaś-i mul tāsan-tās kheḷ-at bas.ta

that game home bring-PstPrt day-Loc child hours-hour play-ing sits

‘The day (you) brought the game home (your) child sits playing it for hours.’

[<https://www.loksatta.com>]

दाभोलकर यांची हत्या झालेल्या ठिकाणी सर्वजण जमतात.

dābholkar yāñ.či hatyā dzhā-lelyā thikāṅ-i sarvadzaṅ djam.tāt

Dabholkar his murder occur-PstPrt place-Loc everybody gather

‘Everybody gathers at the spot where Dabholkar’s murder happened.’

[maharashtratimes.indiatimes.com]

Relativizing on “such that” (van Riemsdijk 2003)

The semantic relation of a PreNMC to its head noun may be indirect to such an extent that it cannot be easily identified.

पोटावर हात असलेल्या लोकांपेक्षा हातावर पोट असलेले लोक

poṭā-var hāt as-lelyā lokān-pekṣā hātā-var poṭ as-lele lok
tummy-on hand be-PstPrt folks-than hand-on tummy be-PstPrt folks

अधिक तडफडीनं समस्या मांडतात.

adhik taḍ.phaḍi-na samasyā māṇḍ.tāt

[*ashishchandorkar.blogspot*]

more vehemence-Ins problems present

'Those who live **by labor of their hands** articulate (these) problems more vehemently than those who (sit) **patting their (full) stomachs**.'

To take *hātā-var poṭ as-lele lok* as relativization on possessor would be too literal an interpretation of an idiom meaning 'physical laborer'.

“Towards an explanation of the Hierarchy constraints”

In their explanation of the Accessibility Hierarchy (AH) Keenan and Comrie speculate that "*The AH directly reflects the psychological ease of comprehension*" [K&C 1977: 88]. From this it should follow that since the thematic relation of the noun-modifying construction to its head noun is more clearly spelled out by the relative-corerelative [जो - तो] strategy one should then expect the जो - तो strategy to be preferred over the participial construction for the "less accessible" positions lower down on the AH. (See slides #5 and #14 for examples of the जो - तो strategy.)

Quantitative data from Marathi indicate the opposite. It is the highest positions on the Accessibility Hierarchy that are the most likely to be rendered by the relative-corerelative construction:

Preferences for participials vs जो - तो (rel – corel)

काम केलेले लोक / काम केलेली लोक; ‘people (who) worked’:	25
लोक ज्यांनी काम केलं / ज्या लोकांनी काम केलं; ‘people who worked’:	5
लोकांनी केलेलं काम / लोकांनी केलेले काम; ‘work (that) people did’:	11
लोकांनी जे काम / जे काम लोकांनी केलं / केले; ‘work that people did’:	4
पैसे असलेले / असणारे लोक; ‘people (who have) money’:	10
लोक ज्यांच्याकडे / ज्यांचे / ज्या लोकांचे पैसे अस-; ‘people who have \$\$’:	2
मुलं / मुले असलेले / असणारे लोक; ‘people (who have) kids’:	7
लोक ज्यांची / ज्या लोकांची मुलं / मुले आहेत; ‘people who have kids’:	0
हातावर पोट असलेले / असणारे लोक; ‘people living hand to mouth’:	16
ज्या लोकांचं / लोकांचे पोट हातावर / हातावर पोट; (‘stomach on hands’)	0
लोक ज्यांचं / ज्यांचे पोट हातावर / हातावर पोट; [See slide #16.]	0

“hybrid” PreNMCs in Marathi and Japanese

This type has missing arguments (or gaps) in a subordinate clause that is itself inside what appears to be a noun-complement:

ती काळी सुरेख मामा-नी घे-ईन म्हट-लेली गाडी ... (elicited)
[*ti kāḷi surekh* [[*māmā-ni* (e) *ghe-in*] *mhaṭ-leli*] *gāḍi*]
that black beautiful Uncle-Erg (gap) take-Fut1sg said-PstPrt car...
' ... that beautiful black car that Uncle said I [= he] will buy ...'

... 買うと言った車でしたから...
[[[(*boku-ga*) (e) *kau*] *to it-ta*] *kuruma*] *dešita kara*...
(I-Nom) (gap) buy Quot say-PstPrt car was because
' ... because it was the car that I said that I would buy.'

[<https://blogs.yahoo.co.jp/tokyuokucyan/14912412.htm>]

quotative PreNMCs in Nepali and Sanskrit

Head nouns in this type are coreferential with an implicit addressee:

अस्ट्रिच, ऊट र चौरी ल्याउनको लागि भनिएको व्यक्ति ... [Nepali]

[[*asṭriča, ūṭa ra čaurī lyā-un-ko lāgi*] *bhan-i-e-ko*] *vyakti*

ostrich, camel and yak bring-Inf-Gen for say-Pass-Pst-Gen person

'The person who was told to bring an ostrich, camel, and yak ...'

ज्ञात्वा तस्य बलं बुद्धिं पुनरेहि त्वरान्विता । इत्युक्ता सा ययौ ...[Sanskrit]

[[*jñā-tvā tasya balaṃ buddhiṃ punar ehi tvarānvitā*] *ity uk-tā*] *sā yayau* ...

know-Ger his strength wit again come quickly so say-PstPrt she went

"Find out his strength and wits and hurry back!" so told she left ...'

[*Rāmāyaṇa, sundarakāṇḍa, verse 12*]

Does this type exist in Marathi?

“false” constituents

The participle in hybrid PreNMCs shows agreement in gender, case, and number with a head noun with which it has no semantic relation. *mhaṭleli* in *mhaṭleli gāḍi* is feminine, direct (or nominative), singular.

[*ti surekh* [[*māmā-ni* (e) *ghe-in*] *mhaṭ-leli*] *gāḍi*] ...
that beautiful Uncle-Erg (gap) take-Fut1sg said-PstPrt.Fsg car.Fsg
' ... that beautiful black car that Uncle said I [= he] will buy (it) ...'

Similarly (?) PreNMCs exhibit false constituencies with image nouns:

donhi mulān-tsā dāt dākhava-ṇār-ā photo kāḍh-to ātā
both children-Gen tooth show-PresPrt-Msg photo draw-Pres1sg now

a: 'Now I'll take a [photo [showing both kids' tooth]] (one they found).'

b: 'Now I'll take [both kids' [< tooth showing (= smiling) > photo]].'

Parataxis as an alternative to use of PreNMCs?

It has been observed that Japanese lacks alternatives to the PreNMC. However, in some cases parataxis may dismantle complex constituents:

おなかの調子が悪くなった私は3回もトイレに起きました。

[[*onaka-no chōši-ga waruku nat-ta*] *wataši*]-*wa* 3-*kai mo toire.ni okimašita*.

tummy-Gen state-Nom bad turn-PstPrt I-Top 3-times even toilet-to got.up

'I (**whose**) stomach went bad got up 3 times (to go) to the toilet.'

[<https://imidas.jp/jijikaitai/l-40-184-14-05-g511>]

お肌の調子が悪くなりました。

私には合わなかったみたいです。

[*ohada-no chōši*]-*ga waruku nari.maši-ta*. *Ataši-ni-wa awa-na-katta mitai.desu*.

skin-Gen state-Nom bad become-Pst. me-Dat-Top suit-Neg-Pst seems

'My skin reacted badly. It seems that (the lotion) did not suit me.'

[<https://elegant-tips.com> › スキンケア]

Insubordination [Evans and Watanabe 2016; Horie 2017: 48]

“The phenomenon of insubordination can be defined diachronically as the recruitment of main clause structures from subordinate structures, or synchronically as the independent use of constructions exhibiting characteristics of subordinate clauses.” [E&W]

'मी गावी गेलेलो (मी गावी गेलो होतो) ...

mi gāv-i ge-l-el-o = (mi gāvi ge-l-o hot-o) ...

I.Nom village-Loc go-PstPrt-**M1sg** ... go-Pst-**M1sg** was-M1sg

'I home.town gone was = (I had gone back home.)' [= 故郷]

The blogger ascribes this use of participials as finite forms to an innovation characteristic of the Marathi spoken in and near Mumbai:

'मी गावी गेलो होतो' चे मुंबईकडच्या बोलीतील प्रचलित रूप असावे, असा अंदाज आहे. [aisiakshare.com/node/1492]

Geotypology of Pre- and Post-NMC forms and functions

	Hindi-Urdu, Kashmiri	Marathi, Konkani	Nepali	Japanese, Dravidian
RelPhrases:	rel-corel	participials & rel-corel	nominals & rel-corel	participials
NounComps:	<i>ki</i> -clauses & nominals	nominals <i>ki</i> -clauses	nominals <i>ki</i> -clauses?	participials
Hybrids:	<i>ki</i> -clauses	<i>ki</i> -clauses	nominals	participials
Quotatives:	parataxis?	parataxis?	nominals	??

Except for Nepali all these languages and language families allow participials to relativize on (Intrans) Subj and on DirObj. Nepali's reliance on nominalization may reflect a Tibeto-Burman substrate. Marathi rarely allows participials in noun-complements and in hybrids.

References - 1

- Comrie, Bernard. 1998. Attributive clauses in Asian languages: Towards an areal typology. In W. Boeder, C. Schroeder, K. H. Wagner, & W. Wildgen, Eds. *Sprache in Raum und Zeit*, vol 2. Tübingen: Gunter Narr. Pp. 51-60.
- Comrie, Bernard & Kaoru Horie. 1995. Complement clauses versus relative clauses: Some Khmer evidence. In W. Abraham, T. Givón, & S. A. Thompson, Eds. *Discourse grammar and typology*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins. Pp. 65-75.
- Evans, N., & H. Watanabe, Eds. 2016. *Insubordination*. J. Benjamins.
- Hook, Peter, & Prashant Pardeshi. 2017. Noun-modifying constructions in Marathi. In Matsumoto et al. Eds. Pp. 293-329.
- Horie, Kaoru. 2017. The attributive vs. final distinction ... In Matsumoto et al., Eds. Pp. 45-58.
- Joseph, Brian D. 1983. Relativization In Modern Greek: Another Look at the Accessibility Hierarchy Constraints. *Lingua* 60:1-24.

References - 2

- Keenan, Edward L., and Bernard Comrie. 1979. Data on the noun phrase accessibility hierarchy. *Language* 55:333-351.
- Keenan, Edward L., and Bernard Comrie. 1977. Noun phrase accessibility & universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8:63-99.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The structure of the Japanese language*. MIT.
- Matsumoto, Yoshiko. 2017. General noun-modifying clause constructions in Japanese. In Matsumoto et al, Eds. Pp. 24-43.
- Matsumoto, Yoshiko, Bernard Comrie, and Peter Sells, Eds. 2017. *Noun-modifying clause constructions in languages of Eurasia. Rethinking theoretical and geographical boundaries*. Benjamins.
- Maxwell, Daniel N. 1979. Strategies of relativization and NP accessibility. *Language* 55: 352-371.
- Van Riemsdijk, Henk. 2003. East meets West: Aboutness relatives in Swiss German. <odur.let.rug.nl/~koster/DenBesten/contents/htm>