

accurate we must substitute “generally” in the place of “always”; otherwise the examples given by me in my last note (such as **पोर घेऊन, मूलजापाज**, etc.), though quite correct and common in the prose of to-day, will not be covered by the rule given by Bhide.

I am well aware of the difference between prose and poetry and between old and modern Marāthī. If Dr. Lesný desires to make a more critical study of the Marāthī construction, it would be advisable for him to compare old prose as is found in books like the **मराठ्यांच्या इतिहासांचो साधनें, ज्ञानेश्वरी, एकनाथी भागवत**, etc., with the standard Marāthī of to-day in works like the **निबंधमाला** of Chiplonkar and other modern writers.

T. K. LADDU.

CAMBRIDGE.

January 25, 1911.

THE GENITIVE—ACCUSATIVE CONSTRUCTION IN MARATHI

Dr. Lesný's remarks on this subject, both in his first note in JRAS., 1910, p. 481, and in his reply to Mr. Laddu in JRAS., 1911, p. 179, call for one or two remarks.

1. Dr. Lesný has used the term “genitive” for the Marathi inflexion in **०स** on the strength of the origin of the termination. But there is no evidence that I know of to show that the termination in question ever bore a genitive signification in any period of Marathi. For the purposes of Dr. Lesný's argument we must consider the inflexion in the signification which it bears, and has always borne, in the minds of persons who use Marathi as a mother tongue.

2. It is true that the poetical language of all nations differs from the prose language. But in Marathi we have no early prose, and the old poetical grammatical forms which have been perpetuated to some extent in modern verse probably represent fairly accurately the spoken language of the early Mogul period.

3. Dr. Lesný justifies his use of the expression "genitive-accusative" on the ground that the termination is derived originally from the Sanskrit genitive. But this is only one out of the many dative terminations in Marathi, all of which are or have been used in the objective sense, e.g. *mod.* **ला** and **ना**, *old* **ते**, **सी** (the earlier form of **स**), and the crude form in the long vowel, and *coll.* **सनि**. I suppose none of these forms except **सी** can be referred to Sanskrit or Prakrit genitives.

That the advantage of what I (obstinately) prefer to call the dative-accusative or dative-objective in Marathi is to prevent ambiguity is undoubtedly true, as all who have been compelled habitually to use that elaborate and difficult language know by experience. And as a matter of fact in the modern colloquial language, wherever it is possible to use the accusative of a noun (not of a pronoun) without danger of ambiguity, the latter is preferred. For instance, **त्याला इकडे पाठवा**, "send him here," but **कुलकर्णी इकडे पाठवा**, "send the accountant here," in which latter case the dative would have been the literary form. As regards the origin of the use, there seems some reason to suppose that the crude form in the long vowel, e.g. **पुरवा**, **वधू**, **पृथ्वी**, which, as I have said above, is normally used both as the dative-objective and as the true dative in poetry, was originally not a dative but an objective, and when it dropped out of use its place was naturally taken by the dative, which had always been somewhat interchangeable with it, and which in all languages is nearer in sense to the objective than the genitive is.

L. J. SEDGWICK.

POONA.

March, 1911.

[This discussion is now closed.]

THE DALAI LAMA'S SEAL

In the January number of the Journal (p. 204) I had occasion to suggest a different reading of the legend on