sees of Sanskrit MSS. the more one hesitates to create linguistic atrocities out of variant readings.

I may add that in a note in the October number of the *Journal* will be found some criticisms on Dr. Michelson's linguistic archaisms in the *Rāmāyaṇa*, which, though written before, answer some of the remarks in his note.

A. BERRIEDALE KEITH.

October, 1910.

FURTHER NOTE ON THE GENITIVE-ACCUSATIVE CONSTRUCTION IN MARATHI

Mr. T. K. Laddu, in reply (pp. 870-3 of the *Journal* for July) to my article on genitive-accusative construction in Marāṭhī (pp. 481-4 of the *Journal* for April), seems to represent a peculiar point of view of philology in general and of comparative philology in particular. May I be allowed to add a few remarks to it?

Mr. Laddu's derivations are doubtful. As regards his etymology of the Marāṭhī termination स (p. 872: "and so स also might have come from another postposition साठों"), Mr. Laddu does not know that Dr. Hoernle showed many years ago (*JASB.* xlii, p. 61) that the postposition साठों is really a compound of the old genitive termination स and the postposition आठों (Ap. Pr. अट्टहिं, Skt. अर्थे = for the sake of). Dr. Hoernle's derivation, repeated in his still very useful *Grammar* (*A Comparative Grammar of the Gaudian Languages, with special reference to the Eastern Hindī*, London, 1880), § 365, has been accepted by other scholars (cf. Beames, *A Comparative Grammar of the Modern Aryan Languages of India*, ii, § 57).

Dr. Hoernle further (Gr., § 375) warns us against confusion of two postpositions in Indo-Aryan languages: N. लाई, S. लाइ, M. ला (Skt. लाभे = for the benefit of) and the

postposition N. लागी, S. लगे, M. लागीं (Skt. लभे = in contact with). This notwithstanding, Mr. Laddu, deriving the Marāṭhī termination ला from the postposition लागीं (p. 872: "The termination ला has come from the postposition लागीं"), confuses them.

Mr. Laddu seems to be astonished (cf. p. 871: "regarding the use of what he (Dr. Lesný) calls the genitive," or further below: "inflected accusative (which Dr. Lesný calls genitive)") that I call the Marāṭhī form in स a genitive. He could, however, very easily have ascertained that that is nothing new. See, for instance, Dr. Grierson's L.S. vii, p. 24, where Dr. Sten Konow says: "bāpās is derived from Prākṛit bappassa, the genitive of bappō, a father, the genitive having replaced the dative in all Prākṛits." Mr. Laddu assumes that I have followed in my grammatical studies only Navalkar's *Student's Marāṭhī Grammar* (cf. especially p. 872: "The terminations of the inflected accusative, स, ना, are derived by the Rev. G. R. Navalkar (whom Dr. Lesný has followed) from the Sanskrit ख"), but the case is, it seems, entirely the reverse. J. Beames (Gr. ii, § 59) derives the Marāṭhī termination चा from Skt. त्व (also Dr. Bhandarkar), Dr. Hoernle (JASB. xli, p. 139, and Gr., § 374) from Skt. कृतः, Dr. Grierson (K.Z. xxxviii, p. 473) again from Skt. त्या (+ ka). But Mr. Laddu, disregarding these leading authorities, says (p. 872): "As regards the genitive proper in Marāṭhī, we have the termination चा . . . , which is most probably derived from the Sanskrit ख." So far as I am aware, only the Rev. G. R. Navalkar derives चा from Skt. ख, an impossible derivation; cf. Navalkar's Grammar, § 81, note: "The genitive चा is the modification of the Sanskrit genitive inflection ख." But on p. 873 Mr. Laddu proposes a new etymology: "Perhaps this स has nothing to do with the Sanskrit ख, from which we have झ and च through Mahārāṣṭrī. There is also another and better derivation

possible. . . . the accusative plural termination, which was originally *aṃs* अंस in Sanskrit, was probably modified and taken into Marāṭhī as अंस (*aṃsa*) or स with a nasal on the preceding syllable." I suppose it is not necessary to refute such an etymology, which would have been more natural a hundred years ago than to-day. On the Indo-Aryan phonology we have to-day Dr. Grierson's excellent essays, "On the Phonology of the Modern Indo-Aryan Vernaculars," ZDMG. xlix, pp. 393-421, and l, pp. 1-42. L. Gray's *Indo-Iranian Phonology* and Dr. Hoernle's *Grammar* can also be recommended.

As to the whole question, I must repeat the views of Dr. Sten Konow (L.S. vii, p. 25), Dr. Grierson (K.Z. p. 490), and other scholars (from the Indian grammarians for instance, Yoshi, Gr. iii, p. 376) that the Marāṭhī form in चा is originally an adjective and no case. Thus when I compared the genitive-accusative construction in Old Slavonic with a construction in modern Marāṭhī everyone sees I must have meant not an adjective but a case, the original old genitive (L.S. vii, p. 24): Skt. *devasya*, Pkt. *devassa*, Mar. *devās*. And in that sense I have used the term genitive. Most of the Marāṭhī grammars call that case according to the Sanskrit syntax dative or inflected accusative, and European scholars have followed this use. In my opinion it would be better to call an accusative only that form of a noun which is equal to the nominative, and which is called now "uninflected accusative", but the form in स (originally an old genitive) and the new equivalents a genitive; the form चा is a pure adjective, a possessive adjective. As in Prākritis there will be no dative. If less practical such nomenclature would be more philological.

As to the animate and inanimate object of a transitive verb in modern Marāṭhī (in prose), the position is as I have stated in the *Journal* of April, pp. 481-4. In *Marāṭhī English Primer*, by Ganesh Hari Bhide, Bombay, 1889,

we read on p. 17: "When a noun denoting a person is the object of a transitive verb, it is always put in the dative case (ending **स**, etc.); but when a noun denotes an irrational animal, it is optionally put either in the accusative or dative case. In all other notions the accusative case is generally used." Exactly the same is said in the 2nd edition, 1901, p. 30. Navalkar (*Student's Marāṭhī Grammar*, p. 43) says the same. Now Mr. Laddu writes that I have misunderstood the Marāṭhī construction (p. 871), that the rule is erroneous and inaccurate, and quotes a few verses from Dnyānēśvarī from the thirteenth century. On the contrary, it is due to the development of the language that it does not remain the same. His statement concerns the language of Dnyānēśvarī, but not the Marāṭhī of to-day; to-day the Marāṭhās speak otherwise than in the thirteenth century. Secondly, Mr. Laddu ought not to quote poetry, which differs in all languages from prose. I did not conceal the fact that my instances on pp. 781-2 of this Journal were taken from the reading-books (Mr. Laddu says in the very beginning of his paper (p. 870) a little ironically: "Dr. Lesný has quoted a few sentences from Marāṭhī reading-books and shown . . ."). I think the Marāṭhī reading-books prepared by the Vernacular Text Books Revision Committee, bearing the dates 1906-8, illustrate very well the Marāṭhī as spoken to-day, and I observe that the use in these books agrees with the rule as stated by Bhide and Navalkar. Of course, the use in old Marāṭhī poetry and also in Marāṭhī proverbs differs considerably from the use in Marāṭhī prose.

Nevertheless, I am glad to learn Mr. Laddu's opinion, because Marāṭhī is his own language.

V. LESNÝ.

PRAG.

September 5, 1910.