

was taken from Burma to Ceylon in A.D. 1170–71, when the Mahāthēra Uttarājīva went there. But the date put forward in the Myazedi inscription seems insufficient to upset what appears to be so clear from the Ceylon records; namely, that the reckoning with the initial point in B.C. 544 was devised there, and was put together in its complete form just after A.D. 1165.

J. F. FLEET.

THE CONSTRUCTION OF GENITIVE-ACCUSATIVE IN MARATHI

A serious study of Indian Vernaculars is very interesting and useful, not only for a Sanskrit scholar, but, I am glad to be able to show, for a comparative philologist too.

In Old Slavonic, as in Indian Vernaculars, the accusative termination of *i*- and *u*-stems and of masculine *o*-stems being dropped, the form for the accusative case was the same as for the nominative, and thus the sentence “synъ viditъ oтца = filius videt patrem” was ambiguous, and could mean also “filium videt pater”, the position of the subject being free. Therefore the language, for the sake of avoiding ambiguity, used the genitive instead of accusative in the case of living beings: “synъ viditъ oтца.”

The same process is to be seen in Indian Vernaculars, and is especially clear in Marāṭhī, grammatically the most important and most interesting dialect of all Indian Vernaculars. In so far as I have read Hindi, I find that the same construction exists there also, though rather complicated; this being so, it must be treated in a separate way, which I hope to do later on.

The Marāṭhī verb पाहणे, “to see,” governs the accusative case, when the object is a thing, e.g.: **हे पाहून ती हरणीही सबकतगिनाच्या मागून जाऊं लागली** = “having seen *that* (= acc.), the doe began to go after Sabaktagin”; but it

governs the genitive, when the object is a human or other living being, e.g. : इतक्कांत त्याचा मुलगा शिवा जेवण घेऊन आला. त्यास पाहून रामजी म्हणाला = "meantime his son Śivā came with the food. Having seen *him* (= gen.) Rāmji said".

The verb घेणे (= pr. gēṇhai, s. grṇhāti), "to take," governs in the last sentence the accusative : जेवण घेऊन = "the food having taken"; but by living beings it governs the genitive case : तेव्हां हरणी पोरस घेऊन आनंदानें उड्या मारीत रानांत निघून गेली = "Then the doe, having taken the fawn, ran away with joy into the forest".

Now the questions are: (a) Why is this genitive construction used only in respect of human and other living beings? (b) why is the genitive only used and not, for instance, the dative,¹ and what is the *syntactic explanation* of it?

The first question is not difficult. So far as I am aware, all scholars are of one opinion in regard to Old Slavonic, but in regard to Marāṭhī no one seems to have as yet given a satisfactory explanation.

We know that in most cases the subject of a sentence is a human or other living being. Therefore when two names of animate objects occur in a sentence, without any distinction in case termination, the sentence could be misunderstood; that is to say, the sentence "synъ viditъ oтъcъ" = "filius videt patrem" could be misunderstood (= filium videt pater), but not "oтъcъ viditъ gradъ" = "pater videt arcem", because it is not possible to say "arx videt patrem".

More difficult is the second question. In the last volume of *Indg. Forschungen* (xxiv, 3-4, pp. 293-307) Professor A. Thomson treats this question as to the origin of the genitive construction in Slavonic languages. This article is, in fact, a refutation of Professor E. Berneker's theory

¹ This has no bearing on Marāṭhī.

expressed in Kuhn's *Zeitschrift*, 1904, xxxvii, p. 364,¹ that the negative sentences, in which the object must in Old Slavonic be in the genitive case, have had an influence on this construction. For example, the positive sentence runs "synъ viditъ otъcъ" (= acc.), but the negative "synъ ne viditъ otъca" (= gen.). According to Professor Berneker, the influence of the negative sentence with the genitive case brought about the use of the genitive instead of the accusative in *positive* sentences also.

But this theory cannot be applied to Marāṭhī, because in this language no such change of cases takes place. Therefore the influence of the negative sentences cannot have produced the genitive construction now existing in Marāṭhī, and in all probability the same holds good for Old Slavonic.

Professor Thomson also does not believe that the syntactic value of a genitive in negative sentences should have been the same as the accusative in positive sentences. He explains in the first part of his article² that this construction was due to a desire of repressing the psychological subject in the sentence and making it evidently into the object.

To express myself more clearly in reference to Marāṭhī, I venture to modify a little what Professor A. Thomson has so well expressed. I state that the Marāṭhī language conclusively proves that the genitive construction in question is really the outcome of nothing else than a desire to avoid ambiguity.

We see this clearly from the construction, which we call the double accusative (direct and indirect object), in Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit; for instance, in Latin "puto te amicum", in Greek "φίλον Φίλιππον ἡγούντο", in Sanskrit "ná vái hatāṃ vṛtrāṃ vidmá ná jivám".

In Marāṭhī the direct object is *always* put into the

¹ The date of the article is 1901.

² He promised two parts.

genitive, not only in the case of a living being (according to the rule mentioned above), but also in that of an inanimate object, and this is done, in my opinion, simply for the sake of distinguishing it from the indirect object.

Cf. in Marāṭhī **हिंदू लोकांत जातिभेद मानितात** = “everyone believes in difference of castes among Hindū people”; **मानितात** governs the accusative (**जातिभेद**). Here the accusative is used, because there is only one object.

But in the sentence **वैदिक धर्माचे लोक वेदांस आणि स्मृतिपुराणादि धर्मग्रंथांस प्रमाण मानितात** = “the people of the Vedic religion believe in the Vedas, Smṛtipurāṇas, etc., in these religious books, as an authority”, where the same verb (**मानितात**) with the same meaning occurs, the direct object (**धर्मग्रंथांस**, “they believe in . . .”), which in the former sentence is rendered by the accusative (**जातिभेद**), is here put in the genitive, obviously to avoid ambiguity.

All instances are taken from Marāṭhī reading-books, these two last, for example, from **मराठी पांचवे पुस्तक**, 1908, p. 20. Such instances are very many, and, as I said before, they go to confirm Professor A. Thomson's views on the subject with regard to Old Slavonic.

V. LESNÝ.

OXFORD, *January*, 1910.

THE SEVEN-HEADED DRAGON¹

When the Sufi martyr, Manṣūr Ḥallāj, was being led to execution, he cried out—

“My Friend is doing me no unkindness,
He gives me the cup that he as the host drank,
He invites me to taste stake and headsman's mat,
Like one who in summer drinks wine with the
dragon.”

¹ See JRAS., 1908, p. 552.