Chapter II

CASE STUDY IN MARATHI:
REVIEW OF LITERATURE
A brief review of literature in Marathi is attempted here to see how cases were treated in Marathi. A similarity in the nature and function of case in Marathi and English could be observed partly because Marathi belongs to the Indo-European family of languages to which English also belongs. The treatment of cases in Marathi by various grammarians is surveyed in the chronological order and some concluding remarks are drawn in this chapter. It leads to observe that some of them follow the Sanskrit grammatical tradition and most of the others follow the Western models of either the English or the Latin grammatical tradition. As if this was not enough, some early works of Marathi grammar were written in Sanskrit, Portuguese and English. Some of them followed the Sanskrit grammatical tradition and others followed the Western models and accordingly, they can be divided into these two classes.

II.1 THE EARLY MAHANUBHAV TRADITION

The grammatical works of Marathi of the very early times belong to the Mahanubhav tradition of the thirteenth and fourteenth century. The names of grammarians and the titles of their grammatical works of this tradition are noted in the following lines of verse composed by Mahant Gopiraj Mahanubhav.

माहिमंलटी व्याकरणावरी || संस्कृत, भाषा मंजरी ||
रचिते जहाले केशव सूरी || परमार्ग हेतु ||
मूढ व्याकरणाचे अधारे || सुभाष निबंधु, बोलिता कवित्तरे ||
जो छपते भाषेस्थी होऊन उरे || महाराष्ट्रीये ||
भाषा प्रवेश, भाषा प्रदीपिका || गौड महाराष्ट्री पीठिका ||
अदी व्याकरणचा आवाका || उमचविला ||
श्री भास्करे गोपाल अज्ञापिते || ते लक्ष्मण रत्नाकर बोलिते ||
मग पंचवार्तिक निरीपिते जहाले || भीष्मपुरण ||
लिंगाचर विविधना || इरुपातीय परण न्याय प्रमाण ||
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These lines inform us about the following grammatical works of Marathi (Arjunwadkar, 1991: 2-4).

1. Damodar Pandit's *Lingatraya Vivanchana* (A.D.1278) is known only by its name as the text is not available.

2. Gopal Pandit's *Lakshan Ratna:kar or Dwa:trinshalla:kshan Ratna:kar* (A.D.1268-1340) written in Sanskrit cannot necessarily be called a grammatical work.

3. Mahindravyyas or Mahimbhat's *Vya:karan* (approximately in A.D.1300) is known only by its name for the script of it is not available.

4. Kavishwarvyyas or Bhaskar Kavishwar or Bhanubhat Borikar wrote *Subha:shanibandhu* (A.D.1308) but it was destroyed along with his other works.

5. Keshav Suri or Keshavaraj Suri or Keshiraj's *Bha:sha:manjiri* (A.D.1314) is also not available in print.

6. Bhishmacharya's *Panchawa:rtik* (the date of its composition is not found) follows Panini's tradition of Sanskrit grammar. This grammatical work of Marathi is based purely on the Sanskrit tradition.

II. 2 SOME PORTUGUESE PRIESTS AS GRAMMARIANS OF MARATHI

In the beginning there was no strong tradition of grammarians in Marathi except that of the Mahanubhavas. Their works are available only in esoteric manuscripts and most of them are known only by their names as the scripts are no more available. The first printed grammars of Marathi began appearing with the Portuguese who conquered Goa at the end of the fifteenth century, and the Portuguese missionaries studied the Marathi
language used in Goa and wrote grammatical works of it because initially they intended to produce the Christian scriptures in Marathi for the spread of Christianity.

One of the well-known grammatical works of Marathi in Portuguese was produced by Father Thomas Stephens entitled *Arte Da Língua Canarim* in 1640 (Arjunwadkar, 1991: 8) and it is obvious that Stephens’s Marathi grammar should be based on the traditional Latin grammar to which he was accustomed.

Another work written and printed in Portuguese was *Gramatica Marashtta - a mais vulgar que se pratica nos Reinos de Nizamaxa Idalxa* : Padres Missionarios, Rome 1778 (?). (Arjunwadkar, 1991: 9). Later on, Priyolkar translated it into English and it was published in the ‘Journal of the University of Bombay’ (Vol.2 XXIII, part 2 Sept., 1954). This is a grammatical work of Konkani dialect of Marathi spoken in that period.

Another grammatical work of Konkani dialect of Marathi written in Portuguese is *Arte Canarina Da Lingua Do Norte* (1858) written by an anonymous Portuguese writer. It is believed that probably it was written by a Franciscan priest in Thane in the seventeenth century (Arjunwadkar, 1991: 9).

It is interesting to note, from the references mentioned above that the grammatical works of Marathi were written in Portuguese during the early period, but they were produced out of the need of the missionaries of the time. Many other grammatical works of Marathi of the earlier tradition were also written in English. They were composed mostly by Englishmen, the missionaries and servants of East India Company and a few also by Indians, mostly Maharashtrians whose native language was Marathi.

The study of the modern Indian languages like Marathi, Bengali, Gujarathi, and Panjabi started during the British rule in India and the first printed dictionaries and grammars of these languages were produced during the British rule. So there was a rising need for grammatical works
of simplified nature. Many of them appear to be plain learning aids for students. They may not be rated high as serious works of grammar.

II.3 THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Hereafter the tradition of writing Marathi grammar in Marathi has been continually carried forward by renowned scholars such as Dadoba Pandurang, Krishnashastri Chiplunkar, Krishnashastri Godbole, Ramchandra Bhikaji Gunjikar, Rawajishastri Godbole, Moro Keshav Damle, V. K. Rajwade, Narayan Vittal Apte, Govind Krishna Modak, Mahadev Pandurang Sabnis, Arvind Mangrulkar and others.

Parallel to this tradition was the other tradition of Marathi grammars written in English which includes the grammarians like J. Stevenson, R. Burgess, Ganapatrao Navalkar, Appaji Kashinath Kher, Narayan Govind Kalelkar who have produced some remarkable works.

The third tradition of writing grammars is in the form of 'language course'. They are the works of Edward Farebank, H. M. Lambert, Naresh Kawadi, Franklin Southworth, R. M. P. Raeside and B. V. Nemade. These works are either partial or indirect forms of Marathi grammar written in English with a specific purpose of introducing the Marathi language to the foreign or non-Marathi learners.

II.3.1 William Carey (1805). It appears that a systematic study of the Marathi language was initiated in the nineteenth century by the publication of William Carey's *A Grammar of the Mahratta Language to which are added Dialogues on Familiar Subjects* in 1805 and *The English-Marathi Dictionary* in 1810. These books were produced in Bengal and not in Maharashtra. William Carey's grammatical work of Marathi introduced some basic though scanty rules of the Marathi language as it was meant for those English officers who needed to use Marathi for communication with the natives and for administrative work.

Carey's grammatical work of Marathi based on the Latin gram-
mar carries a subsection entitled ‘Of Cases’ in which he has listed the cases and the terminations used for each of them. According to him, there are seven cases in Marathi: the nominative, accusative, instrumental, dative, ablative, possessive and locative (Carey, 1805: 13) and he gives the list of terminations used for each case. But in the latter section entitled ‘Observations on the Substantive’ he includes the vocative case by commenting:

"The vocative does not terminate differently from the nominative, but is simply connected with the vocative particle. These particles differ according to the quality of the person addressed or the respect or disrespect intended to be shown to him" (Carey, 1908: 30).

II.3.2 Robert Drummond (1808)

Robert Drummond’s *Illustrations of the Grammatical parts of the Guzerattee, Mahratta and English languages* (1808) contains abridged information about the grammatical rules of Marathi in the first thirty-six pages. A list of seven cases labelled from First to Seven along with their illustrations in Marathi, English and Gujarathi in a tabular form is presented and no detailed discussion on case is found in his work.

II.3.3 Influence of Sanskrit tradition on the grammatical works of Marathi with reference to case study.

A number of grammarians of Marathi in the nineteenth and the twentieth century followed the Sanskrit tradition while forming the case categories in Marathi. The ancient linguistic tradition in India, especially that of Panini, is universally acknowledged and has deeply influenced the European linguists. It would be relevant to describe Panini’s *Kaːraka* Theory at this point as it throws considerable light on the influence of the Sanskrit tradition on that of Marathi with special reference to case.
II.3.3.1 Panini’s *Kaːraka* Theory. The idea of establishing a distinction between abstract case roles and concrete case markers is not new to the Indian grammatical tradition. Panini, the prodigious grammarian of Sanskrit, in his *Ashthaːdhyaːyī*, the grammatical work of Sanskrit in the form of Sutras written in approximately the fifth or the fourth century B.C. introduced the *Kaːraka* theory in which he distinguished between *Kaːrakas* literally meaning ‘factors of action’ and *Vibhaktis* of which the former can be correlated with the concept of case roles and the latter with that of case markers (Bhat, 1985(2)). Panini postulates primarily six different *Kaːrakas*, defined on the basis of their meanings as follows (Ananthanarayana, 1970):

*Karta*: the independent
*Karma*: that which is primarily desired by *Karta*:
*Karan*: the most effective means for the accomplishment of action.
*Sampradaːn*: one whom the *Karta* has in view in the act of giving something.
*Apaːdaːn*: a fixed point, away from which the movement occurs.
*Adhikaran*: the locus of action.

For each of these *Kaːrakas*, Panini assigns one *Vibhakti* (case suffix) as its primary representation, namely, the Nominative for *Karta*; Accusative for *Karma*, Instrumental for *Karan*, Dative for *Sampradaːn*, Ablative for *Apaːdaːn*, and locative for *Adhikaran*. Passive sentences are considered to be exceptions to this general rule in that the *Karta* is represented by the Instrumental in them and known by the Nominative.

There are also several other exceptions to this general rule in Sanskrit. For example, in the sentence ‘*asishcinati*’ (‘The sword cuts’) the *Karan* is represented by the Nominative, whereas in the sentence ‘*Sthali Pacati*’ (‘The pot cooks’), the Nominative is used for representing the *Adhikaran* (Location). However, it is the occurrence of these and other such exceptions to the above mentioned general rules of *Kaːraka*-*Vibhakti*
correlation that has made it necessary to establish the *Ka:rakas* as forming a distinct level in the grammar as compared to that of *Vibhaktis*.

Panini's phenomenal contribution to phonetics is well known. His main contribution to syntax, according to P. Kiparsky and J. F. Staal (1969), is the theory of the 'Ka:raka' relations. These relations comprise such notions as have in the West been traditionally called 'logical subject of,' 'logical object of' etc. and correspond to the 'underlying' or 'deep' syntactic relations of transformational grammar. They show that Panini's grammar is a system of rules for converting semantic representations of sentences into phonetic representations, via two intermediate levels of deep (underlying) structure and surface structure in a generative grammar. As far as Panini's *Ka:raka* theory is concerned, he interrelates four levels stated by Kiparsky and Staal (1969 : 84) : (1) The level of semantic relations, characterized in terms of concepts such as 'agent', 'goal', 'location'; (2) the level of 'Ka:raka' relations, corresponding to deep structure relations such as '(underlying) subject', '(underlying) object', 'place adverbial'; (3) the level of surface structure represented in terms of morphological categories, e.g. by nominal cases, derivational affixes, prepositions, or verbal voices; (4) the level of phonology, e.g. case endings which express voices. The derivation of a sentence starts at level (1) from its meaning. A set of rules then specifies the *Ka:raka* relations. Panini next introduces the cases or other morphological categories which correspond to these *Ka:raka* relations. Lastly, he introduces the actual phonological forms which express these morphological categories, thereby reaching the fourth level. Kiparsky and Staal discuss all these levels in detail, the way they are realized by Panini and how his *Ka:raka* theory was related to 'deep structure'.

The *Ka:rakas* are recognized by most scholars of modern linguistics as basic semantic notions that in fact pivot sentence constructions. As Franson Manjali (1997) comments:
“They are similar to the case roles/relations proposed in the case grammars. But Ka:rakas are much more than these, and their crucial role as a common substratum of ontology, cognition, and grammar can be understood only if we regard them as a manner of classifying ‘actions’ in the real world” (Franson Manjali, 1997: 79).

It may not be, however, inappropriate to suggest that the Ka:raka notions are conceived as properties of the world corresponding to, though independent of, their grammatical/morphological manifestations. Panini himself was probably merely projecting the ‘Ka:rakas’ (literally, ‘a factor of action’) from morphological occurrences in the form of cases to a set of possible actions in the world. A commentator rightly pointed out:

“If the notion of ‘Ka:rakas’ was perhaps derived from an observation of Sanskrit cases, Panini had raised them above the level of case values and made them intermediaries between reality and the grammatical categories. Their importance, often misunderstood, goes far beyond the syntax of cases; next to the roots, they are the prime moving factors of the whole grammar” (Scharfe, 1977: 95).

Panini’s six Ka:rakas correspond to six cases: nominative, accusative, dative, instrumental, locative and ablative. Possessive and vocative are conspicuous by their absence in Panini’s grammar. The direct borrowing of the Sanskrit Ka:raka-Vibhakti system, that is, the meanings and the case-markers of the cases Prathama:, Dwitiya: and so on, can be clearly noticed in most of the grammatical works of Marathi produced from the nineteenth century onwards.

II.3.4 Muhamad Ebrahim Mukbah Moonshi (1825). A Grammar of the Mahra:tha: Language (1825) is written by Muhamad Ebraheem Mukbah Moonshi, Interpreter to the Hon’ble Supreme court of Judicature at Bombay (now Mumbai) was revised by Lieut-col. Vans Kennedy and published
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under the sanction of the Government in Bombay. It was a grammatical work of Marathi written in English after William Carey published his *Marathi Grammar*. Mukbah Moonshi commented that the only grammar hitherto published was that of Carey. But Mukbah’s grammatical work indicates his inadequate knowledge of Marathi language, and what he studied was purely bookish Marathi. However, some relevant observations regarding cases in Mukbah Moonshi’s grammatical work may be considered here.

Mukbah introduced six cases in Marathi: *Prathama*, *Dwitiya*, *Chaturthi*, *Panchami*, *Shasthi*, *Sambodhan* and the remaining two the *Tritiya* and *Saptami*, in the traditional grammar are merged in *Panchami*. His classification of cases is based on the Sanskrit traditional grammar.

**II.3.5 Jagannath Kramavant, Gangadharsastri Phadke and Balshastri Ghagave (approximately 1825).** The earlier grammars of Marathi like those of Father Stephens, William Carey, Vyenkatmadhav and others have failed to create any tradition in Marathi grammar. But *Maha:ra:shtra Bha:sheche Vya:karan* (1825) by the three pandits Jagannath Kramavant, Gangadharsastri Phadke and Balshastri Ghagave, is the first major grammatical work of Marathi written in Marathi. It was published by A. K. Priyolkar in 1954 and in the introduction of this book Priyolkar mentions that the script of this book was written perhaps in 1825. The microfilm of it was borrowed from India Office, London by University of Mumbai, the original hand-written script having 153 pages (Priyolkar, ed., 1954 : Intro.12).

Kramavant, Phadke and Ghagave list seven cases in Marathi from *Prathama* to *Saptami* (Priyolkar, ed., 1954 : 15). A detailed discussion on different meanings of these cases by adding terminations and postpositions is done in the Chapter ‘Vibhaktyarth Vicha:r’ and it is totally descriptive based on the early Sanskrit tradition.

**II.3.6 Vyenkatmadhav (approximately 1827).** Vyenkatmadhav’s
Maha:ra:shtra Prayog Chandrika: (approximately in 1827) is a grammatical work of Marathi written in Sanskrit perhaps because, during his time, many grammatical works of Dravidian languages were written in Sanskrit. Being originally written in Madras, it is edited in a book form in Marathi by K. S. Arjunwadkar for the convenience of its circulation for Marathi readers. The details of grammar are presented by Vyenkatmadhav in the form of Sutras totalling 227 like that of Panini. In this work the discussion of cases and case-markers is found in the two parts entitled 'Na:mvibhakti' and 'Sarvana:mvibhakti'. He introduces eight cases in Marathi from Prathama: to Sambodhan, and in the next chapter he discusses 'Vibhaktyartha', that is, case-meanings. Arjunwadkar’s comments on his grammar and case system are as follows:

“व्यक्तमाध्यवाने आपले व्याकरण मुख्यत संस्कृत भाषेत लिहिले आहे. त्याला पाणिनीच्या द्वारे त्याला आणि बांधवाच असते त्यावर संस्कृत तत्कालीन दृष्टी महणासे ठीक आहे. तिष्ठा लगेच खाळी तिचे मराठी आणि त्याने विवरण (हे संस्कृत दृष्टीचे शब्द शास्त्रतत्त्वात नाही) कसे ते कसे अद्वितीयीयाचे आहे. दाखल करून पडू उदाहरणे आणि त्यांचे विवरण (हे अन्तर्दशी फक्त मराठी आहेत.) ही दिली आहे. सार्वाती आध्यात्मिक मराठी शब्द आलेला आहेत … … एकून सूत्रे २२७ असून ती साता राजत स्वतंत्रतपणे एकपासून क्रमांक देऊन विभागाची आहेत … … “

(Arjunwadkar, ed., 1972 : 5).

“गट ५ : नामविभक्तिरूपे (सूत्रे १ - २५); सर्वनाम विभक्तिरूपे (सूत्रे २६ - ५२), विभक्तवर्ध (सूत्रे ५३-५६) “(Arjunwadkar, ed., 1972 : 6).

“व्यक्तमाध्यवाने संस्कृततत्त्वात्याद्वैतकाल विभक्तिधिव्या आहेत, पण विभक्तवर्धिपाणिनीयातिसिद्ध शब्दरूपीजी भाषणातून ठेवतेरी नाही. 'सी' हा तुतीयेच आणि 'स' हा ष्टीचा प्रत्यय मानला आहे. 'पॉटा आला' याचे 'पोटा' ही ष्टीचा आणि त्याच 'आ' हा ष्टीचा प्रत्यय आहे. अत्याच राहील पाणिनीय पद्धतीनुसार विभक्तिसंस्कृत आणि प्रत्ययलोप सांगितला आहे.” (Arjunwadkar, ed., 1972 : 7).

II.3.7 Dadoba Pandurang Tarkhadkar (1836). A grammatical work of Marathi, produced by Dadoba Pandurang Tarkhadkar entitled Maha:ra:shtra Bha:sche Vya:karan (1836), gave him the reputation of being called 'the Panini of the Marathi language'. He defines grammar as
a science which helps to understand the philosophy, rules and the pure and impure aspects of a language. His Marathi grammar, based on the Sanskrit grammatical tradition appears to be prescriptive. He points out much confusion about the study of the case system in Marathi, but neither does he provide nor suggest any solution for it. For him, the relationship of verbs with nouns and pronouns in a sentence are Ka: raka and the terminations and postpositions used to indicate them are called Pratyayas. He introduces eight cases in Marathi from Pratham: a to Sambodhan based on those in Sanskrit grammar.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;Cases</th>
<th>Terminations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pratham:</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwitiya:</td>
<td>ला, स, तः</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tritiya:</td>
<td>नें, दी, शी,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaturthi</td>
<td>ला, स, ते अर्थ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panchami</td>
<td>ऊन, हून, तून</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shasthi</td>
<td>चा, ची, चे</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saptami</td>
<td>त, इ, आँ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambodhan</td>
<td>हो</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Tarkhadkar, 1836: 61).

In the fifth chapter entitled 'Ka: rakvichar,' Tarkhadkar discusses different meanings of cases which, as he remarks, are six: Karta:, Karma, Karan, Samprada:n, Apa:da:n and Adhikaran (Tarkhadkar, 1836: 291) and every case carries different meanings.

1. Pratham:  - Karta: and Karma
2. Dwitiya:  - Karma
3. Tritiya:  - Karta:, Karan, hetu, Angavika:r, and Sa:hitya
4. Chaturthi - Samprada:n, Adhikaran
5. Panchami – Apa:da:n. Here Tarkhadkar defines Apa:da:n as follows “एकादश क्रिय्यशी विभाजना संबंध असता जेणेकरून अवधीशी अथवा वियोगाचा अथवा न्यूनाधिक्याचा बोध होतो त्याच्या अङ्गानाच महणावे” (Tarkhadkar, 1836 : 297). For Tarkhadkar Apa:da:n indicates the time or departure from or the meaning of more or less.

6. Shasthi – Tarkhadkar outlines Shasthi as follows: “संगीत वैयक्तिक अर्थ जो बंध तो कारकांत लेखित नाहीत हे सप्तक्षिक आहें; करण श्रेणी काही साक्षर क्रियेशी संबंध ठेवित नाही; श्रेणी संबंध इतर शब्दांशी होऊन त्या शब्दांश संबंध क्रियेशी राहतो. जसे - ‘गोपालाच्या भांती एक दुकान पालते,’ यात पालते’ या क्रियेशी जो करताना संबंध तो ‘बाप’ या शब्दांशी होय; ‘गोपाल’ या शब्दांशी ‘पालते’ याचा काही संबंध नाही; म्हणून श्रेणी कारकांत नाही.

आता हा श्रेणी संबंध अनेक प्रकार असतो. त्याचा विस्तार केला असता ग्रंथ वाढते, म्हणून व्यापक वेशक मुख्य प्रकार येथे संगते.

अंगांगिभाव संबंध - जसे - हाताचे बोट
स्वस्थामिभाव संबंध - जसे - बाजीरावाचा वाहा
सेव्येसेवकभाव संबंध - जसे - राजाचा दूत
आधाराधेयभाव संबंध - जसे - नटीचा मासा, रात्रीचा अंधार
जन्यजनकभाव संबंध - जसे - या बाईंने अपघात“

(Tarkhadkar, 1836 : 298-299).

According to Tarkhadkar a single case carries different meanings and one of them which suits the situation is to be accepted (Tarkhadkar, 1836 : 300). He appears to be confused sometimes, as for example, although he claims that the cases in Marathi should be classified by the terminations and postpositions used by them, he distinguishes the Dwitiya: and Chaturthi cases on the basis of meaning for both these cases have the terminations, ‘sa, la; te’ (sing.) and ‘sa, la; na; te’ (plu.). With all the shortcomings, Dadoba Pandurang Tarkhadkar's grammar is undoubtedly an important landmark in the evolution of the thinking on case in Marathi.
II.3.8 James E. Ballantyne (1839). James E. Ballantyne's *A grammar of the Mahrratta Language* (1839) contains a chapter on the Noun in which he states:

“There are seven cases, viz., Nominative, Accusative, Dative, Instrumental, Ablative, Genitive and Locative.” (Ballantyne, 1839: 14).

But in the eighth chapter entitled ‘Of the Syntax’ he refers to the Vocative case not being included in the earlier list of cases and justifies it as follows:

“The Vocative case is the same as the Nominative preceded or followed by a vocative particle.” (Ballantyne, 1839: 37).

Ballantyne takes account of the terminations used for every case and exemplifies by adding them to some nouns. He points out the phonological changes that occur in a noun after adding each termination which perhaps may be with the intention to help the British learners to learn Marathi. There is no discussion on the syntactic or semantic aspect of cases and his classification of cases is naturally Latin-based.

II.3.9 J. Stevenson (1843). Stevenson’s *The Principles of Marathi Grammar* (1843) written in English is based on the model of the Latin grammar, and as far as the classification of the cases in Marathi is concerned, he follows two different methods, the old and the new method of his own. According to him:

“The Natives generally reckon the cases to be seven in number, without the vocative, as is done by Sanskrit grammarians; some of these cases, however, are made up by means of particles affixed to the root. We shall give an example of a noun so declined, but afterwards reduce the number of cases, including the vocative to five.” (Stevenson, 1843: 17).
In accordance with the old traditional system, he introduces eight cases in Marathi, that is, from Prathama: to Sambodhan, and terminations used for them are those that we find in Tarkhadkar. According to his new system, he enumerates five cases based on the typical affixes used for nouns in Marathi, and gives a detailed note on the inflections used for cases in Marathi. To those learning Marathi he points out:

"Let the student commit to memory these affixes, which remain always the same, and then the whole of the inflections of a noun will become apparent from an abridged scheme of the form of the one that follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nom. and Obj.</td>
<td>1st and 2nd घर   a house घेरे  houses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>3rd घेरे by a house घेरही by houses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>4th घर to a house घरही to houses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>7th घरी at a house घरी at houses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocative</td>
<td>8th घर o house घरो नो o houses&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we see that in the first case category, Stevenson merges two cases, namely, Nominative and Objective (1st and 2nd) into one only because both of them have no terminations and it is apparent that his classification of cases in Marathi is form-based. Naturally there is no account of the meanings of the cases in Stevenson’s grammar and his supposition on case appears to be insufficient and illogical.

II.3.10 Gangadhar Shastri Phadke (1849). Gangadhar Shastri Phadke’s Maha:ra:shtra Bha:sheche Vya:karan (1849) is based on the model of the traditional grammar of Sanskrit and eight cases in Marathi from Prathama: to Sambodhan are introduced by him.

Usually in many traditional Marathi grammars the terminations used for Dwitiya: and Chaturthi cases are ‘स, ला, ते’ (singular) and ‘स, ला, ना,
(plural), but in Phadke's list these terminations are used only for the Dwitiya: case and the postpositions 'सादी, करिता, स्तव' for Chaturthi. He clearly states that he borrows the case names Prathama: to Sambodhan only for the sake of convenience of their sequence.

II.3.11 E. Burgess (1854). E. Burgess's Grammar of the Marathi Language (1854), written in English, was regarded to be a comprehensive grammar of the Marathi language. He points out that the way Greek and Latin are related to English, Sanskrit is related to Marathi, but he criticizes Dadoba Tarkhadkar for writing the grammar of Marathi based on that of Sanskrit. In his estimate, Stevenson's The Principles of Marathi Grammar was the best among the available ones.

What Dadoba called 'sa:ma:nyarup' (सामान्यरुप) was an oblique case (विकृत विभागी) for Burgess. He agrees to have only three cases in Marathi, Prathama:, Dwitiya:, and Sambodhan, and claims this classification to be meaning-based, whereas the form-based classification of cases in Marathi, according to him, would be into two categories which are 1. Inflected case: This may include all postpositions and terminations to nouns and pronouns, and 2. Uninflected case: this may include Prathama: and Direct Object of active verbs. He refers this case as 'uninflected Objective'.

Burgess claims his classification to be totally different from the earlier ones, but it does not provide a valid classification of cases in Marathi as we find two different systems of classification of cases in his work.

II.3.12 Krishna Shastri Godbole (1849). Krishna Shastri Godbole's Marathi Bha:sheche Navin Vya:karan (1867) is based on the tradition of Sanskrit grammar. In the chapter on 'Vibhakti', he introduces six cases and six meanings or Ka:rakas of these cases - Karta:, Karma, Karan, Samprada:n, Apa:da:n and Adhikaran. Every case has one or more Ka:raka or meanings as revealed by Godbole.
cases | Meaning or Ka:raka of cases
--- | ---
1. Prathama: | Karta; Dwitiya:-Karma.
2. Tritiya: | Karta; Karan
3. Chaturthi | Karta; Karma, Sampradana: Adhikaran
4. Panchami | Apada:n (to depart)
5. Saptami | Adhikaran (place)
6. Sambodhan | Vocative (the way a speaker addresses somebody) (Godbole, 1867: 55)

The terminations for these cases are the same as those used by other grammarians. The postpositions which are used for different cases are also given by Godbole as follows:

“विभावी(case) शब्दयोगी अवयये (postpositions)

तुलीया कस्तु, मूले, कद्रू, सह, वरीय, कर्मी, हारे, कून, सर्व.
चतुर्थी करिता, सांति, स्तव, अर्ध (अर्थार्थ), कवितेल -करणे, लागी, लागोनि,

व्रत, व्रतां, निमित्त (तो)
पंचमी पेक्षा, वातून, विना, खरोज, शिवाय, पासून, (कवितेल)-पासाव, विणे,
दीप, परीस.
सप्तमी मध्ये, आंत, विषयी, (कवितेल) मधे, मधी, माजी, माजारी, भीतरी, विसी,

यां, ए ि” (Godbole, 1867: 55.)

Although Godbole introduces different meanings of the six cases stated above, he argues that there are only five cases in Marathi: Prathama:, Tritiya:, Chaturthi, Panchami and Sambodhan. (Godbole, 1867: 45). He omits Dwitiya: because, according to him, the function of Dwitiya: is carried out generally by Prathama: and sometimes by Chaturthi. He omits Shassthi because its form changes in accordance with the gender and number of its noun (Godbole, 1867: 46).

II.3.13 Bellairs and Askhedkar (1868). Bellairs and Askhedkar’s A
Grammar of the Marathi Language (1868) follows both English and Sanskrit traditions in respect to the classification of case categories in Marathi. Their English or Latin-based classification of cases in Marathi is described by them as follows:

"By inflection the Marathi language indicates eight general relations, and accordingly has eight cases, viz., Nominative, Accusative, Instrumental, Dative, Ablative, Genitive, Locative and Vocative, which are distinguished by terminations or postpositions" (Bellairs and Askhedkar, 1868 : 4-5).

They show by illustrations that most of these cases denote more than one meaning. (Bellairs and Askhedkar, 1868 : 68-73).

1. The Nominative case is the case which ‘names’ the subject or a proposition, that is, the person or thing of which anything is predicted but, for them, the subject in Marathi may be either in the nominative or the instrumental case. In Marathi the use of the Nominative for the Accusative case is common, e.g. ‘तीन तोळ्यांना सोने’ : ‘three tolahs of gold’.

2. The Accusative case denotes the object of transitive verbs. Verbs and adjectives denoting extent of time or space govern the Accusative of the noun describing that extent.

3. The Instrumental case denotes the agent, implement or the means by which anything is done. It also expresses the manner or degree in which any object is effected and also the characteristics by which any object is marked. ‘तो पौढवा बोललो.’ : ‘He talks loudly.’ ‘तो बॅडीने बाह्यस दिसलो.’ : ‘He seems to be a Brahmin by his lock of hair.’

4. The Dative case generally expresses the person or thing to or for which, or in regard to which, something is, or is done: it may therefore be termed the case of the remoter object. In Marathi the Dative sometimes stands for the Locative case, e.g. ‘डीक्यास व्याच्या पाऊडते होते.’ ‘A puggree was on his head’. ‘तो बेखळावास मेगला.’ : ‘He went to Belgaum’.

The Dative is optionally used with the gerundive for the Instrumental
case. e.g. ‘ते मळा करूत घेवो’ : ‘I have to do that’.

5. The Ablative case, according to Bellairs and Askhedkar, expresses a variety of relations defining and modifying the predicate, that is, all those relations which in English are expressed by the preposition ‘from.’

6. The Genitive case serves principally to denote that relation between two substantives by which the two conjointly express only one idea, the genitive supplying the place of or qualifying adjective. In Marathi, the Genitive is sometimes used for the Locative case. e.g., ‘तो रात्रिचा बाचितो’ : ‘He reads at night’ and also for the Instrumental., e.g. ‘माझ्या बोलण्याचा त्याला रापण्ये’ : ‘He becomes angry at my words’ and also for the Ablative., e.g. ‘भी कलचा त्यास संगती’ : ‘I have been telling him since yesterday’. The subjective genitive is common in Marathi e.g. ‘तीकाचा जुलूम’ : ‘tyranny of the people’ The objective genitive is uncommon, e.g., ‘ईश्वराची भक्ति’ : ‘God’s worship’.

7. The Locative case denotes the place where, and the time at which anything is or is done. In Marathi the Locative case is sometimes used for the Instrumental case, e.g. ‘रिकाम्या हाती बाजारात जात नये’ : ‘One should not go to the market empty-handed’. This case is also used sometimes where the preposition ‘बर’ ‘on’ might be expected to govern its noun, e.g. ‘पायात जोडा’ : ‘a shoe on a foot’, ‘बोटात आंगली’ : ‘a ring on a finger’.

8. The Vocative case is used to address a person or thing, and is inserted in clauses without affecting their construction’. (Bellairs and Askhedkar, 1868 : 68-73).

A list of the Marathi equivalents for the grammatical terms in English used by them in their book is provided in Appendix 1 (Bellairs and Askhedkar, 1868 : 82). In this list the term ‘case’ is ‘Vibhakti’ in Marathi. The eight case-names in English from Nominative to Vocative respectively are also indicated in the brackets as ‘first’ to ‘eighth’. Accordingly
their equivalents in Marathi are given and are respectively labelled from *Prathama:* to *Sambodhan.*

It appears that Bellairs and Askhedkar intended to help the non-Marathi learners to learn Marathi through their grammatical work because the terminology used to label the cases is selected from both English and Marathi languages and different meanings of each case are discussed elaborately.

**II.3.14 Krishnashastri Chiplunkar (1893). In *Marathi Vya:karana:var Nibandh* (1893)** Krishnashastri Chiplunkar discusses elaborately the cases in Marathi. About case in Marathi he comments:

“प्रातिपदिक्षण व्या:प्रमाणे दिवंगत्वम् हि लागतात्, त्या:प्रमाणे त्याः विभिन्नतेः हि
लागतात्. प्रातिपदिक्षण अभेदाने दुसः श्रवण हि प्रातिपदिक्षणी अन्य विभिन्नत: असता
त्याः विकर होता नाही, परंतु दुसः संबंधाने त्याः अन्य विभिन्नत: असत्याः किवा चिथ्यापदाः
त्याः मृणेः प्रातिपदिक्षण अन्य कर्त्याः असत्याः त्याः जो विकर होतो त्याः
‘विभिन्नते’ अश्री व्याकरणात पारिभाषिक संज्ञा केली आहे.” (Chiplunkar, 1893 : 40).

He discusses the case system in the early grammatical works of Marathi composed by Dadoba and Burgess, and comes to the conclusion that there should be only five cases in Marathi formed on the basis of the terminations used for them. The five cases introduced by him are: *Prathama;*, *Tritiya;*, *Chaturthi, Panchami, Saptami* (Chiplunkar, 1893 : 43).

His observation regarding the terminations used for these cases is:

“हेसर्वः प्रत्यय सर्वः प्रातिपदिक्षण सर्वः प्रसंगी लागतात्ः असे नाही,
चारीकाही व्यापक मृणेः सर्व प्रातिपदिक्षण सर्व प्रसंगी लागानारे आहेत, व काही,
काही प्रातिपदिक्षण मात्र लागतात व काहीचा प्रयोग मराठी कथितेत मात्र
होतो.”(Chiplunkar, 1893 : 45).

Many other grammarians agree that the *Prathama:* case does not have any termination, whereas Chiplunkar introduces the terminations ‘ओ, ऊ’ (Singular) and ‘ए, आ, एः, इः’ (Plural) for *Prathama;*. He argues that the *Dwitiya:*
and Chaturthi cases take similar terminations ‘स, ला, ते’ (singular) ‘स, ला, ना, ते’ (plural) but the meaning expressed by them for Chaturthi is more extensive than that of Dwitiya: so he omits Dwitiya: and retains Chaturthi in his list. The Shashthi case functions as an adjective so it is also omitted, and as the Sambodhan case does not have any terminations, it is excluded from the list of cases.

II.3.15 Ganpatrao R. Navalkar (1894). Ganpatrao R. Navalkar’s The Student’s Marathi Grammar (1894) is meant for learners of Marathi. Eight cases from Pratham: to Sambodhan based on the Sanskrit grammar and the English names from Nominative to Vocative along with the Ka: rakas : Karta:ka: rak, Karmaka: rak and the rest are given by him. The uses of the seven cases from Pratham: to Saptami are discussed by giving illustrations (Navalkar, 1894 : 324). It should be of good help for the foreign learners of Marathi.

II. 3.16 Appaji Kashinath Kher (1899). Appaji Kashinath Kher in A Higher Marathi Grammar (1899) describes in considerable length the cases in Marathi as one of the controversial issues in Marathi grammar. In the Introduction to his book, Kher discusses elaborately his views regarding the doubtful and controversial points in Marathi grammar. Referring to the case system in the early languages like Sanskrit and Prakrit, Kher logically comes to an important conclusion as follows:

“If then in both the languages above referred to [English and Marathi] the sense plays the most important part, we should be guided by the sense especially in determining the cases in Marathi. We have seven chief Ka: rakas or relations, and if we have seven cases the arrangement will be satisfactory. The vocative case alone will have to be omitted. But the vocative may be called the nominative of address (संबोधनार्थी प्रथम), and although it has a distinct form in the plural it may be left out of consideration as it serves no syntactical purpose in a sentence. ... The cases
are to be determined and named by their Ka: rakas and not by their particular terminations. The terminations may vary but the Ka: raka is 'invariable'. The terminations of cases only assist us in distinguishing one Ka: raka from another, and where they fail the sense alone will determine the relation; in other words, they are for convenience." (Kher, 1899. Intro : xxxix-xi)

He considers the case in Marathi as "the inflection of the noun (or pronoun) to express its relation to other words in a sentence. The relation of the noun or pronoun with the verb or the other words in a sentence is called Ka: raka." (Kher, 1899 : 130).

Kher categorizes seven chief Ka: rakas as follows:

1. Karta: - the Agent
2. Karma - the Object
3. Karan - the Instrument
4. Samprada:n - giving or donation
5. Apa:da:n - ablation or taking away
6. Swa:mitwa or Sambandh - possession
7. Adhikaran - location or place.

Accordingly he forms seven cases which express the above Ka: raka or meanings respectively from Prathama: to Saptami —

1. Prathama: or Karta:ka: rak - Nominative
2. Dwitaya: or Karmaka: rak - Accusative
3. Tritiya: or Karanka: rak - Instrumental
4. Chaturthi or Saprada:nka: rak - Dative
5. Panchami or Apa:da:nka: rak - Ablative
6. Shashthi or Swamitwaka: rak - Genitive
7. Saptami or Adhikaranka: rak - Locative
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(Kher, 1899 : 130).

He further comments that there is one more case commonly enumerated, viz., *Sambodhan* the Vocative which may be included in the list of cases, but it does not bear any relation to the words in a sentence. (Kher, 1899 : 131).

Kher believes that *Ka:rakas* and cases in Marathi are derived from the Sanskrit grammatical tradition and some aspects are also derived from that of Prakrit. He discusses the derivation of the terminations and postpositions of all the cases in Marathi and in the final part of his chapter on cases, points out how every case enumerates more than one meaning.

1. The Nominative case - nominative or agent is its principal meaning.

2. The Accusative case - 'Object' of the verb. It is also used to express the adverbial relations of time, distance, measure, weight, circumference etc.

3. The Instrumental case - chiefly shows the agent and the Instrument. The Instrumental has several other significations like the operating cause, occasion, the accompanying circumstances, direction, authority, time, intercourse, opposition, purpose, comparison, manner, the contents of a thing, the measure of excess or inferiority, rate of measurement and quantity, the state of the body, space, proximity, close to. The following postpositions are used to denote the relation of Instrumentality:

   a. ‘क्रृत’, ‘क्षत्री’ express 'simple instrumentality.'

   b. ‘व्यवस्थान’ indicates instrumentality, it also denote 'indirect agency' and 'channel' or 'medium'; sometimes it signifies 'source' and has the force of the 'ablative.'

   c. ‘जवळन’ (though generally used with an ablative force) is used to denote 'indirect agency' as an instrumental postposition.
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d. ‘ढारा’ or ‘ढारे’ is also used to express ‘instrumentality’ or ‘medium’.

The Dative case – a. principally denotes the ‘agent’ and ‘giving whether real or imaginary.’ It has also several other significations. It denotes b. Space i. Place ‘in’, ii. motion ‘to’. He also states here that the ‘Dative thus used is sometimes called ‘अधिकरणार्थिः चतुर्थी’ c. Time i. Point of time, ii. Extent or limit, d. Compensation or substitution. e. The indirect object. f. Reference: i. person or thing benefited or injured, ii. Possession, iii. sympathy for the person, iv. the thing in which a person suffers, v. the person supplicated, vi. purpose, effect or consequence, vii. comparison, proportion, viii. utility, office, ix. definiteness.

The following postpositions are used for the Dative – a. ‘जवल’ denotes the indirect object b. ‘लाशी’ denotes ground or reason; utility or fitness. c. ‘पाशी’ is used like ‘जवल’ to express the indirect object. ‘कड’ is used in the same way. d. The postpositions ‘करिता, करणे, साठी, स्तव, अर्थी’ denote ‘purpose’ or ‘reason’.

5. The Ablative case expresses the relation of ablation or taking away.

a. Sometimes denotes the source of an action.

b. The beginning of an action.

c. Nouns denoting ‘fear, danger’ etc. are in the ablative as ‘घोरापासून भय.’

d. Some adjectives of ‘quality’ as ‘मऊँ, कठीण, वहील’ etc. require the nouns expressing these qualities in the ablative as ‘लोण्यातून मऊँ’ ‘दगडाहून कठीण.’

e. Nouns that precede the adjectives ‘अन्य, दुसरा, वेगला, वाहून, घेरे,’ अधिक, कमी’ etc. are in the ablative.

The terminations ‘हून’ and ‘उन’ are also appended to nouns governed by postpositions as ‘पुलाच्या खालून रस्ता केल्या आहे.’
they are added on to adverbs in the sense of ‘from’ as ‘आलून’ from inside, ‘वर्न’ from above, ‘खून’ from here, ‘लेखून’ from there, ‘बाहेऊन’ from outside etc.

i. ‘पासून’ is sometimes used for ‘हून’ in the sense of ‘from’.

ii. ‘हून’ is joined to nouns denoting place when ‘motion from a place’ is expressed.

iii. ‘हून’ expressed comparison also.

iv. Sometimes post-positions and adverbs express sense of passage or channel.

The following postpositions are used for the ablative-

i. ‘क्रून’ denotes ‘source’.

ii. ‘जव्हून’ denotes a. the source or motion from, b. agency, c. proximity.

iii. ‘पासून’ denotes a. origin, b. privation, c. since, d. ‘distance from’ in space

iv. ‘पेशा’ denotes a. comparison, b. reason.

v. ‘वर्न’ expresses a. source, b. locality, c. approximation, d. ground or reason.

vi. The postpositons ‘वाचून, विना, खेरीज, शिवाय’ are used in the sense of ‘without’.

6. The Genitive case is used to denote ‘the connection of two nouns’ generally, or the relation of ‘genus’ and ‘species’ between two objects as ‘रामाचा अपराध काय असेल तो असो.’

A note is given by Kher, that is, the adjective that limits the signification of the noun or, in other words, shows the relation of ‘species’ and ‘genus’ exactly agrees with the ‘Genitive’ case. Hence, the Genitive is adjectival in form. In the above instance the meaning of
the word 'अपराध' is limited by 'रामाचा'

The chief relations of the Genitive case are:

a. Possession of an object.

b. Effect or action

c. Family relations, origin, descent, which includes "भातुसंबंध, सेव्यसंबंध, जन्यजनकसंबंध", that is, the relation of brothers, of masters, or descents, of the creator and the created etc. Sometimes the governing noun is understood in the sense of 'descent'.

d. Members or partition (अंगायिभावसंबंध) Here the Genitive denotes the 'whole' while the word it governs denotes the 'part'.

e. Quality of objects (धर्माच्यसंबंध)

f. Material (प्रकृतिच्यसंबंध)

g. Place of residence, contents.

h. Completion, abundance.

i. Emotion with reference to person.

j. Adaption or use.

k. Change of state.

Besides governing nouns the Genitive governs adjectives, adverbs also.

Adjective- 'तो ब्रह्महत्येचा दोषी आहे.' The nouns governed by such adjectives as 'आवद्धता, प्रिय, देशी' etc take the Genitive; as 'तो माझा आवद्धता आहे.'

Adverb - the partitive Genitive is generally joined to adverbs 'दाराचे बाहेर हलू नकोस.' Here the postpositions may be added to the inflected form of the noun or its Genitive case as 'दाराचे बाहेर' or 'दाराचे बाहेर.'

a. The Genitive is used adverbially to denote 'time'. This is sometimes called 'अधिकरणांनी संदृशी.'
b. The 'time' expressed thus by the Genitive is more 'emphatic' than that expressed by the Dative in 'स' as 'तो रात्रीचा येईल.'

c. The Genitive sometimes expresses the 'instrument' or 'cause of action' when it is called 'करणार्थी' or 'हेत्तवर्णी षड़ी' as 'मला तुझ्या बोलण्याचा राग आला.' 'हाथाचा मऊ, जातीचा शूर'.

d. Sometimes the Genitive has the relation of ablation, and it is called 'अपादनार्थी षड़ी' as 'मी येथे केवळा बसलो आहे.'

7. The Locative case generally expresses the time or place of an action.

a. The Locative is sometimes used for the 'Instrumental'.

b. The Locative sometimes takes the genitive termination.

c. The nouns that govern the adjectives which signify power, skill etc. are in the Locative as 'शास्त्रात चतूर.'

d. The Locative is also used of these nouns which collectively are compared with single individual as 'मुलांत उत्तम कोण?'

When several nouns take the same case-terminations or postpositions the latter are applied to all the nouns separately or all the nouns are put in the nominative and these terminations are appended to the relative 'हा'.

When two compounded nouns are used, the form is exception to the above rule as 'तो हातापायणी मजबूत आहे'.

When two nouns are coupled by a conjunction they should not be inflected in different ways or by the different case-terminations of the same case, as 'सुला आणि त्वाला' and not 'तूस' and 'त्वाला'. In poetry, this rule is not kept up.

The chief locative postpositions are 'आत', 'मध्ये' 'वर' as प्रवात जोडा, अंगात अंगरखा, धरार मध्ये तंता, होक्यावर टोपी.' (Kher, 1899 : 136-147).

Thus Kher has made valuable contribution to various aspects of case in Marathi. However, Kher's arguments sometimes appear to be
confusing: for instance, he states that the relation of the noun or pronoun with the verb or the other words in a sentence is called Ka:raka. Accordingly, he introduces seven cases from Prathama to Saptami which express Ka:rakas or relations of nouns with the verb respectively – Karta:ka:rak, Karmaka:rak, Karanka:rak, Samprada:nka:rak, Apa:da:nka:rak, Swamitwaka:rak, Adhikaranka:rak and the English names for them are Nominative, Accusative, Instrumental, Dative, Ablative, Genitive and Locative. But his remark about Sambodhan is rather inconsistent to his early comments on cases because he gives a note that Sambodhan, the Vocative may be included in the list of cases, but it does not bear any relation to the words in a sentence. Thus, there is a kind of inconsistency in his arguments.

Another point to note is that a number of meanings expressed by the terminations and postpositions used for each case are discussed by him at length where he tries to show how one case expresses several relations (Kher, 1899: 136–147). It is discussed by many other grammarians too. But in Kher’s discussion, most of the time, there is overlapping of case relations. For example, as he states Locative has the meaning of Instrument, Genitive indicates the relation of Instrument or time or relation of ablation, and Accusative expresses adverbial relation of time, distance, measure and so on, and Instrumental denotes time, manner, purpose. All this appears obviously confusing and very difficult to accept as a disciplined argument.

II.4 THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

II.4.1 Alfred Darby (1905). Alfred Darby, an Englishman produced A Primer of the Marathi Language (1905) for the use of adults in the form of a text book of Marathi for non-Marathi learners. Based on the model of Latin grammar he gives eight cases of Marathi from Nominative to Vocative, illustrating the shades of the meaning of each case.
II.4.2 G. A. Grierson (1908). G. A. Grierson in his historical *Linguistic survey of India Vol VII Indo-Aryan family: Southern Group (Marathi)* (1908) includes Marathi skeleton grammar that consists of the formation of cases in Marathi, wherein an observation is made as follows:

"The oblique base is used as a Vocative ... and other cases are formed by adding postpositions to the oblique forms"

(Grierson, 1908: 30-31)

A list of the terminations or postpositions for different cases in Marathi is given by enumerating six cases: Agent (Nominative), Instrument, Dative, Ablative, Genitive, Vocative. Being an Englishman his grammar of Marathi is based on the traditional grammar of English, and is rather scanty without detailed discussion or arguments.

II.4.3 V. K. Rajwade (1909). *Dya:neshwaritil Marathi Bha:sheche Vya:karan or Grammar of the Marathi Language of the Dnya:neshvari* (1909) by Vishwanath Kashinath Rajwade is claimed to be the first historical grammar of Marathi. As a work of a great scholar, it is considered to be the beginning of serious historical study of Marathi. His work is based on the tradition of the Sanskrit grammar. According to him, the cases in Marathi are derived from the earlier languages Sanskrit, Maharashtri and Apabhransha.

He introduces eight cases in Marathi, from Prathama: to Sambodhan without any discussion on the meanings or the semantic base of these cases. However, an elaborate note on the terminations and postpositions used to realise them is in another grammatical work of his *Subanthvicha:r* (1912).

II.4.4 M. K. Damle (1911). With Moro Keshav Damle Marathi grammatical enters a mature phase, especially, in case study. His monumental *Sha:striya Marathi Vya:karan* (1911) has its remarkable place in the history of Marathi grammatical works, and is the most comprehensive...
work written so far on Marathi. This work cites in discussions the account of the earlier important grammatical works of Marathi discussing elaborately the problematic areas in the study of Marathi like cases. It is the most remarkable feature of Damle’s work which we do not find in any other Marathi grammatical works written so far. However, he cannot be regarded as a linguist whose analysis originates in some linguistic theory or presents theoretical aspects of language in his otherwise original work. Nevertheless his book still remains the most important reference work for those who study any grammatical aspect of Marathi language and his treatment of the subject is quite logical and it is original in parts.

Damle’s Shastrya Marathi Vyaskar contains an elaborate chapter on vibhakti or cases and according to him, the terminations and postpositions added to nouns and pronouns indicate their relationship with other words in a sentence and are called vibhakti (cases) and, the terminations and postpositions or suffixes are called pratyaya and the form of nouns and pronouns by adding them are vibhakti or vibhaktyant as Damle states after providing several illustrations.

He takes account of the treatment of case system, cases, case-markers given by all the major grammarians of Marathi before him such as Dadoba Tarkhadkar, Godbole, Joshi, Kher, Chiplunkar and others, making critical comments on each of them. His objection to nearly all of them is that their cases are based on Karaka or meanings. Then Damle strongly argues that cases in Marathi should be realised by the terminations (pratyayas) added to nouns and pronouns in a sentence. He also disagrees with the earlier names of cases like Kartravibhakti, Karmavibhakti, Karanvibhakti and so on. He comments that these names are derived from the conventions in the English grammatical tradition. From his own point of view he shows how these case names give rise to confusion and disturb the earlier Sanskrit-based case system in Marathi. However, he uses the symbolic labels like Pratham:, Dwitiya: and so on for the cases derived by him.

CASE STUDY IN MARATHI : A REVIEW OF LITERATURE
Then Damle proceeds to evaluate the number of cases given in the earlier grammatical works of Marathi as well as those of Sanskrit. According to Damle all of the cases in Sanskrit cannot be retained in Marathi. For example if the cases in Marathi are meaning-based, Dwitiya: and Chaturthi cases take the terminations “स, ला, ते” and (sign) “स, ला, ना, ते” (plural), whereas Damle’s cases are form-based so both Dwitiya: and Chaturthi are fused together and labelled as Chaturthi. He further justifies the retention of Chaturthi and gives some reasons for retaining it and omitting Dwitiya: case. First, terminations “स, ना” are used more frequently with the sense of Samprada: as than that of Karma. Second, the way Chaturthi does not appear to be a separate case in Prakrit, Dwitiya: does not appear an independent case in Marathi for its function is fulfilled partly by Chaturthi and partly by Prathama:. Third, neither Dwitiya: in Marathi does take its own terminations nor the terminations for it are derived form Sanskrit as they generally are derived for the other cases in Marathi. Damle claims his merging of Dwitiya: into Chaturthi to be historically as well as etymologically logical (Damle, 1911 : 287).

Then he poses a comprehensive argument for the retention of Shashti case. The early grammarians like Gunjikar, Chipulkar, Bhandarkar, discussed the postpositions and terminations of the Shashti case and their origin in Sanskrit grammar for most of them claimed its termination ‘चा’ to be that of an adjective, whereas Damle enumerates fifteen points to establish Shashti as one of the cases and ‘चा, ची, दे’ to be its terminations (Damle, 1911 : 287 – 289). Since his argument is seminal to the whole debate on case in Marathi, it would be appropriate to reproduce his argument in the original as follows:

आक्षेप परिहार : उल्लट पक्षी असे प्रतिपादन करितां येतें की,

1. तद्धित्त्र प्रत्यायांनी नामाचे सामान्यरूप होत नाही. ‘चा’ यांचे इतर विभिन्नप्रत्ययांप्रमाणे त्यांचे सामान्यरूप होते आणि जरी ‘घरचा, नागपुरचा’ इत्यादी कांडी तिकणां ‘चा-वे’ पर्यंत सामान्यरूप झालेली दिसते नाही तरी ही उदाहरणां अपवादक असून असे अपवाद ‘नागपुरचा, इंद्रदूहुन’ इत्यादी स्थानी अन्य प्रत्ययांसंबंधाने ही आढळतात. महणून विभिन्नप्रत्ययांप्रमाणे ‘चा’ ह्याचूळी
नामांचे सामान्यरूप होते असे महणण्यास हरकत नाही. परंतु तदित्त धारणांपूर्वी नामांचे सामान्यरूप कर्यत नाही.

2. आतां ‘चा’ हा चरम प्रत्यय नाही आणि त्याजवळन अन्य विभक्तिप्रत्यय होतात हे खरें. तत्थापि अशी गोष्ट सत्यांची च्या प्रत्ययांसंबंधी ही आहात. “प्रांतीचा, किध्या वाळू नाही राजा देखील चीरी.” तुकाराम, “अंतरीया ज्ञानित्वा मालूम नको रे.”

3. आणि ‘येथचा, तेथचा, पररांचा’ इत्यादी स्थलावाचक व कालवाचक अव्ययांपासून जलेल्या विशेषणातील ‘चा’ प्रत्यय हा असे सर्वसाधन एकाच होत असे समजूनेच काही करण नाही आणि तसे समजून अव्ययांची नाही. शिवाय ‘चा’ याप्रथम, ‘ला’ प्रत्ययाने ही ‘येथला, तेथला, आंतरा’ इत्यादी विशेषण होतात. पण या प्रत्ययाचा निवृत्तीप्रत्यय नही. एवढा च दिखावणा ‘ला’ आणि चर्चितचा ‘ला हे’ असे हिंदी समजतात. त्याप्रथम ‘येथचा, तेथचा, पररांचा’ इत्यादी विशेषणातील ‘चा’ आणि फक्त ‘चा’ प्रत्यय हे भिन्न होत असे समजून हरकत नाही.

4. तसेच कोणताही तदित्त प्रत्ययाचे वचनाचा बोध होत नाही. परंतु ‘घरांचा’ हे एकवचन आणि ‘घरांचा’ हे अनेकवचन, असा ‘चा’-प्रत्यय दोळ्य वचनांचा लागू ‘चा’-प्रत्ययानं शब्दपासून वचनाचा बोध होते हे निवृत्त आहे.

5. एवढा विभक्तीचे अभावी ‘केळपुर’, ‘देवदर’ इत्यादी जे झण्डी तपुस्तप्रथम हवासंग काय महणण्याचे कर्मीयकरण जर मानते तर त्यांचा तदनुसार विश्राम कसा करावायचा? ‘केळीवर पूर्वज’ , ‘देवदरे पूर्व’ असा विश्राम करण त्यांस जिथे तपुस्तप्रथम जगाची कर्मीयकरण महत्त्वाचे भाग होते असे वाचणाऱ्या संबंध आहे. पण इतकेच केलेल्या वास्तविक अद्वय दर न होतां दुपारांपूर्व वाद आहे. ‘केळीवर, देवदर’ सह निवृत्त होत, तर सामान्यवाच त्यांची ‘केळ, देव’ ही संख्येत रुप्यें किती मूल नागरीच करावी? नामावर नादलेल्या कोणताही विशेषणाचा समासकाळात असा संकेत होऊन फक्त मूल नामच त्या विशेषणाचा जगाची आलेले अनेक दिसतात. शिवाय उलट पक्षी, ‘चा’-प्रत्ययानं नाम विशेषण हवासंग त्या प्रत्ययांचे संबंध नामांच नेमीही कर्मीयकरण समास होऊन असत्या कर्मीयकरण समासांती गर्दर होऊन जाईल. वर्षा केल्या मराठी आहवणी बाजूस देखील तयाल जे निवृत्त संस्त्रुत जिथे तपुस्तप्रथम समास मराठीत वेळजात, त्यांच्या योग्य विश्राम मराठीत केळ अश्यक होऊन जाईल.
8. पण तेंदुळे असे, ‘हाताचे, घराचे, मूलाचा’ ही जर विशेषणांनी होत तर त्यांच्या सून भाववाचक नाम कोणते व कसे साध्यते? करणी की सर्व विशेषणांपासून मराठीत व इतर भाषातील भाववाचक नामेच साध्यते.

9. चतुर्थीत्वाचा विभक्ती प्रत्ययांचा लोप होऊन त्या विभक्तीमुळे ज्या प्रमाणे सामान्य रूप धोक्तरत, त्यांच्यात ‘चा’ प्रत्ययांचा लोप होऊन नुसते सामान्य रूप ‘चा’ प्रत्ययांत नामाचे जागी येते. ‘पलमी’ बसवलेया राणी, माते हाते आणणी पाणी’ याच्याकडे ‘माते’ म्हणजे ‘मातेचा’ हे उच्च आहे. असा प्रत्यय रहीत विशेषणाचा उपयोग मराठीत कोठे कोणत आहे नाहीत.

10. ‘पांढरा घराचे दार’ याच्याकडे घराचे हे जर दाराचे विशेषण तर ‘पांढरा’ हे घराचे हा विशेषणाचे विशेषण म्हणजे क्रियाविशेषण होईल. होईला परंतु - असे वापराचा संभव आहे. परंतु या ठिकाणी आणणीएक अद्वित उद्देश्य होते. ‘पांढरा’ हे मूळ विशेषण व त्यांचे ‘पांढरा’ हे सामान्य रूप होय. विशेषणाच्या घटावांचा संबंधितम किंवा साहित्यसाध्य शब्देचे व्यय, तज्ज्ञ त्या विशेषणाचे सामान्यरूप होते. परंतु विशेषणाचे विशेषण आचरणाचे माहित्यांत सामान्यरूप होते. असते कोठे ठकालेत नाही. म्हणून ज्या अर्थी पुढील संबंधितम किंवा साहित्यसाध्य शब्दानेच माहित्याचे विशेषणाचे सामान्यरूप होते. आणि ‘पांढरा घराचे दार’ या ठिकाणी ‘पांढरा’ हे सामान्यरूप ज्या अर्थी ‘घराचे’ या शब्दाचे व्ययात आहे आणि ज्या अर्थी ‘घराचे’ या शब्द साहित्यसाध्य शब्द असेल म्हणणारे अध्ययन कोणी तयार नाही, त्या अर्थी ‘घराचे’ हा संबंधितम शब्द नव्हे काय? त्याचा विशेषण मूळ प्रस्तुत स्थानी व्यक्तिकरणाचा कार्य निर्देश करत आहे आंमाह होती समजत नाही.

11. सर्व विशेषणांचा नामाविशेषण उपयोग होते. ‘अध्ययन महत्व म्हणाला’ हाळवे जाणी ‘महत्व’ हे विशेषण मूळ नुसते ‘अध्ययन म्हणाला’ असे म्हणता येते. परंतु ‘चा’-प्रत्ययाने नामाचा असा नामाविशेषण उपयोग होते सोचत नाही.

12. ‘हा सोन्याचा दागिना’ आहे वा ठिकाणी ‘सोन्याचा’ ह्या विशेषण म्हटले असता एकावर चालेत. परंतु ‘सोन्याचा दागिने करितल’ या ठिकाणी ‘सोन्याचे’ हे ‘दागिने’ ह्या शब्दाचे विशेषण होय असे म्हणणे संपूर्ण दिसत नाही त्याच्या बादात तर ते केवळ कोठे कोणत आहे.

13. ‘ती दिवसाचा निजलो, रात्रीचा चालो’ हे या ठिकाणी ‘दिवसाचा’, ‘रात्रीचा’ ही ‘चा’-प्रत्ययाने विशेषण होते, अर्थात तर समजले तर त्यांस विधिविशेषण कोणत अथवा अधिकरणी विधिविशेषणांचा अर्थरूप प्रमाणण कर्याचा उपयोग होत नाही, म्हणून त्या ही ‘चा’-प्रत्ययाने विशेषणाचा नेम्नी विधिविशेषणांमध्ये किंवा विधिविशेषणांमध्ये उपयोग होतो असे म्हणणे भाग आहे.

14. ‘त्याच्या बोल्याचा मला फार राग आला’, या वाक्यात ‘बोल्याचा’ हे ‘राग’ या नामाचे
विशेषणाच होय असे महणण्यास मराठी वर्तक विभागे हायदरी तरी घाटावतील की नाही, ह्याची शंकाच आहे।

13. ‘हा घोडयाचा लगाम घटता आहे’ या वाक्यांत ‘घोडयाचा’ हे जर ‘लगामाचे’ विशेषण असेल तर ह्या शब्दाचे व्याकरण कसे करावे? ‘हा’ हे ‘घोडयाचे’ विशेषण होय असे निम्नतपणे शेढक म्हटले मूळजी होत नाही. कारण ही हे व्याकरण ‘घोडयाचे’ हा शब्द विभेदकांक मानिला तर शक्य आहे. एक तर ह्या अथवा सामान्यप्राप्तवर्तन ‘घोडयाचा’ हा सविभाषित किंवा संवाददायी शब्द घडतो आणि ‘चा’ ह्या अथवा कोणी केवळ शब्दाची अथवा महणणत नसल्यामुळे तेथे वर सांगितव्यप्रमाणे सविभाषित शब्द घडतो. आणि दुसरे, कोणतेही सार्वजनिक विशेषण विशेषणाचे विशेषण होऊ शकत नाही.

14. ‘दोन घोडयाची गाडी’ या विभागी ‘दोन’ हे गाडीचे विशेषण खास नाही. ते अर्थात ‘घोडयाची’ या शब्दाचे विशेषण होय. परंतु ‘घोडयाची’ हे जर विशेषण आणि ‘दोन’ हे ‘घोडयाची’ ह्या विशेषणाचे विशेषण तर त्यास किंवा विशेषण म्हटले पाहिजे. पण ‘दोन’ हा शब्द किंवा विशेषणाचे मराठीत कथीच उपयोगात येत नाही. ‘दोन’ ह्यानसून ‘दोनवाच’ हे किंवा विशेषण होते. कोणी असे महणणले की ‘दोन घोडे’ असा प्रथम एक शब्द पंजीकृत आहे, तर त्यास ‘दोन घोडे’ हा एक चमकावणे दिगम्बराचा मानावा लागेल. परंतु ह्या कोणी सार्वजनिक तरी महणण त्यास होऊ नाही ह्याची शंका करत आहे.

15. शिवाय ‘एका घोडयाची गाडी’ या विभागी तर ‘एका’ हे सामान्यरूप असत्यामुळे समासांतर्गत होऊ शकत नाही. त्यास शक्ती विभागीचे प्रतिष्ठांतीची घोडयाची हाचयोग विशेषण मानिले पाहिजे. परंतु ‘घोडयाची’ या विशेषणाचे संवाददायी विशेषण होऊ शकत नाही. नामानुसार घोडयाची संवाददायी विशेषण येते. नामानुसार वस्तुतः ते संवाददायी होत असा नाही ह्याची विशेषण केवळ अर्थव्यवस्था होय इत्यादी आहे. कोणी महणणले की ‘एका’ हे ‘घोडयाची’ ह्याची विशेषण अर्थ ‘घोडा’ या नामानुसार साध्यता आहे, त्या कसे ते विशेषण करावे. परंतु नामानुसार एकदा विशेषण साध्यते म्हणजे तदविशेषणांतर्गत किंवा तदविशेषणांतर्गत ती तदविशेषणांतर्गत नम त्यास त्या ‘एका’ स्वरूप असतात नसत्यामुळे वाक्यांत ते अन्य कोणताही स्वरूप विशेषणाचे विशेषण होऊ शकत नाही. ‘लाज’ या नामानुसार ‘लाजाक’ हे तदविशेषणांतर्गत असतो असे लाज यास त्या ‘लाजाक’ या विशेषणातल ‘लाज’ या नामांतर्गत असतात. असतात नसत्यामुळे ते कोणताही स्वरूप विशेषणाचे विशेषण होऊ शकत नाही. म्हणजे ‘मोठी लाज’, ‘मोठी लाजाक’ असे ज्ञानाने म्हणत येते त्यामुळे ‘मोठी किंवा मोठी लाजाक’ असे स्वरूपात फलते येत नाही. ‘मोठा लाजाक मनुष्य’, ‘मोठी लाजाक मनुष्य’ असे प्रयोग होतात. परंतु या विभागी ‘मोठा मोठी’ ही ‘लाजाक’ शब्दातील.
‘ताज’ या नामाची विशेषणे नसून ‘लाजाथू’ वा सर्वदा विशेषणाची विशेषणे होत. तस्री काही एका ‘गोडाचायी गाडी’ या उदाहरणात सर्व दिसत नाही. खूपच ‘गोडाचायी’ ह्या जर विशेषण मानिले तर या एका शब्दाचे योग्य व्यक्त करतील येत नाही. ते ‘गाडी’ या विशेषण सख्त नसे. त्यास ‘गोडाचायी’ ह्या विशेषणाचे विशेषणही महत्ता येत नाही : किवा ‘गोडाचायी’ ह्या विशेषणाने तिची ‘गोडा’ ह्या नामाची विशेषण महत्ता येत नाही. कारण की त्याच्या संगतित्वाचे नामाच्या विशेषणमध्ये असलेल्या नामाच्या वाक्याचे कोणताही स्तंबन्ध अनधिकार नसते. त्यास ‘एका गोडाचायी गाडी’ ह्या तिकाऊ ‘गोडाचायी’ या विशेषण नाही. तर ‘गोडा’ या नामाची यस्ती विभीतीच मानिली पाहिजे हे उदाहरण आहे. ‘चा’ प्रत्ययांत नामाचे एकजात विशेषण महत्त्यांचे व्यक्त करते. त्या कस्तक्या अद्वि उपन वरुण होतात हे कारण त्याच्या नामाच्या वाक्यावर अंधकार नसते. याची वाचककर्त्य एका व्यक्तीवर अस्तित्वाचा आरोप करणे असे कारण असे. तरी ‘चा’ प्रत्ययांत नामाचे निवड विशेषण महत्त्याच्या विकृतीवर अप्रविष्कारण करते. त्या ह्या पूर्ण विवरण केलेला आहे असे दिसत नाही.

तेव्हा करीत विवरणाचा इतरहर असा: ‘चा’-प्रत्ययांत नामाचे तिकाऊ ‘पुढील’ नामाचे लिंगावर्णाने बदलणे ह्या विशेषणाचा गुण आहे ह्यांनी संगती नाही. त्यातून तेव्हा निवड विशेषण असे म्हणून तर त्याकर्त्यात अनेक अमृतसवर अधिक अर्थरूप अर्थात असून अनेक उपवन होतात. त्या इतक्या की अनेक अर्थरूपांचा, त्या चा-प्रत्ययांत नामाचे एक आधी उपवन होतात. त्या इतक्या की लिंगावर्णाच्या विकृतीवर अप्रविष्कारण करणे असे म्हणून, अनंत व्यक्तीचे वाक्यावर शक्त आहे असे जसे जोडले चारले तरी ती व्यक्तांनी ते असे म्हणून तर त्याकर्त्यात आहे तर विशेषणाचे आसाधारण विकृती स्वतः म्हणून कस्तक्या अद्वितीय उपवन होतात. त्या ‘चा’-प्रत्ययांत नामाचे विभाजन महत्त्यांचे बरोबर असे अनूठे वाक्याचे आहेत नाही. तसे केल्यांना ते सर्वांना आहे अद्वितीय उपवन होत नाही.

मुंजीकरक शृंखला विवरण : मुंजीकर महत्ता. उदा सुपाळेची शृंखला महत्ता. ह्या विशेषणाचे लक्षणांकू युक्त असते. आणि विशेषणाचे अनुमोदन त्याचे उपवन होते. म्हणून त्याचा विभाजन गणने योग्य नसे असे एक कोटी शब्दकूट, गोडाचाच आणि जोडी यांची पैसे आणि तिकाऊ आहे. परंतु या रूपमध्ये जर विभाजनीय वस्तुविशेष धर्म हे आहे तर विशेषणाचे धर्मही त्याच्या आपल्याच असले म्हणून काय झाले. शृंखला शुभा विभाजनाच्याच्या भागावर विशेषणाच्या प्रयोगासून आहेत. तरी दररोप रूपाचा विभाजन महत्त्याची असाधारण विकृती होते. त्याच्या ते विभाजन काढून टाकून असे कोणती महत्त्याची असे. आणि तसे म्हणणाऱ्याच्या योग्य काय आहे. असे असाधारण अंधकार अर्थात नामाच्या विशेषणाच्या काढून टाकावे असे कोणी महत्त्याची असे. म्हणून त्याच्या विशेषण स्थांतरवर विभाजन काढून विशेषणाच्या प्रयोगासून करते. तरी ते अंधकार अर्थात नामाच्या विशेषणाच्या काढून टाकावे असे कोणी महत्त्याची असे.
असणे, म्हणजे विशेषाय्या लिंग वचनानुसारोद्घाने विकार पावणायाचा धर्म असणे, यातच अयोग्य ते काय आहे, काही नाही.

कसीत विशेषण धर्म का आढळतात? एवढेच ‘चा’-प्रत्ययान्त नामास कसी विभक्ती म्हणजेचू गैर नाही, तर अवश्य आहे. आता त्याचे ठीक विशेषणाचा विशेष निहितता हा एक धर्म आहे हे खरे: तरी तो त्याच्या विभक्तीतल्या आड येत नाही: इतकेच नक्षे तर त्याचे ठीक विभक्तीतील सर्व धर्म असल्यावरून त्याच म्हणजेच ठीक विशेषणाच्या विभक्ती हेच नव अधिक योग्य आहे. त्याचे ठीक अंशाचे: विशेषणाच्या असणे हे ही साहजिक आहे. हों भांडारकर यांनी सुविदेशी ‘चा’ प्रत्ययाची व्युत्पत्ती लक्षात घेतली म्हणजे त्याचे ठीक विभक्तिविविधवाचणी आणखी अंशाचे: विशेषणाच्या का आहे हा योग्य योग्य खुलासा होतो. त्याचे मते ‘चा’ हा मुळ ‘स्व’ हा विभक्तिविविधवाचणीचे त्याच ठीक विशेषणप्रत्ययाचे द्वारा आतला आहे: तेव्हा ‘चा’ या म्हणून प्रत्ययाचे अंगी विभक्तिविविधवाचये तर ठीक विशेषणाची दोनीही धर्म असणे स्वभाविक आहे त्याप्रमाणे मुळ ‘स्व’ विभक्तिविविधवाचणी असल्यावरून त्याचे ठीक विभक्तिविविधवाचणीच धर्म प्राधान्यकरून वस्तु असणे व त्यामुळे तत्त्व नामास विभक्तिविविधवै म्हणणे हेच इष्ट, योग्य व अवश्य आहे.”
(Damle,1911 : 287-289).

Damle for no logical reason claims that terminations of cases should be single-lettered. The postpositions of two letters like ‘साही’ cannot be used for any case. Gunjikar’s Chaturthi was proved to be dissatisfactory by Damle because of its “साही” postposition (Damle, 1911: 289).

Damle’s seven cases in Marathi are stated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Terminations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prathama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tritiya</td>
<td>ने, शी, (ध)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaturthi</td>
<td>स, ला, (ते)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panchami</td>
<td>हून,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shassthi</td>
<td>चा</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saptami</td>
<td>त, इ, (आ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambodhan</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Damle,1911 : 289).
While Damle himself says “दुर्योधनं प्रत्यय नसलात” and discards ‘साठी’ as a postposition, he gives his own justifications for the terminations of Panchami ‘हून’ (sing. and plural). This justification does not appear to be logical and substantial.

The detailed discussion of the realization of these cases by adding terminations and postpositions is mostly a morphological analysis of different case-markers, but his form-based classification of cases cannot be treated to be faultless although it paved a new way for classification of cases in Marathi. Unfortunately, no further substantial investigation and exploration is done so far in this field by any other grammarian after him.

II.4.5 Jules Bloch (1914). Jules Bloch’s grammatical work on Marathi, originally written in French, is entitled La Formation de la Langue Marathe (1914). It was translated into English by Dev Raj Chanana as The Formation of the Marathi Language and into Marathi by V. G. Panranjape as Marathi Bha:shecha: Vikas (1941). In this grammatical work we come across the detailed discussion on the terminations and postpositions of nouns and pronouns in Marathi used to posit different cases. While discussing them in detail with reference to the earlier languages like Sanskrit, Prakrit and Pali, Bloch refers to the terminations and postpositions used in Indian languages other than Marathi as well. He proposes only two cases, the ‘direct’ and the ‘oblique’ case and concentrates his discussion on the phonological aspect of different cases in the traditional Marathi grammar more elaborately than on the syntactic or semantic aspect of them.

B. V. Devadhar’s Resume of Marathi Grammar (1920) is called by him a supplement to start in Marathi through the direct method. Eight cases from Prathama: to Sambodhan based on Sanskrit grammar and their names in English from Nominative to Vocative along with their meanings, namely, Kartari, Karmani, Karani, Sampreda:ni, Apa:da:ni, Sambadhi and Adhikarani are listed with terminations and postpositions in a table.
by Devadhar (Devadhar, 1920: 30). The systematic presentation of cases as well as their different shades of meanings is helpful for the sake of the learners of Marathi; but it does not include any innovative ideas regarding cases in Marathi.

II.4.6 R. B. Joshi (1923). Ramchandra Bihkaji Joshi’s Marathi Bha: shech Ghatana: (1923) contains a chapter on Vibhakti giving a detailed account of the number of cases and the changes in their use from the earlier languages such as Sanskrit, Prakrit, Apabhransh and Old Marathi, to the then contemporary Marathi (Joshi, 1923: 86-110). His eight cases in Marathi from Prathama: to Sambodhan are based on the tradition of the Sanskrit grammar. He does not discuss the meanings or the semantic base of cases in Marathi although phonological changes after adding terminations and postpositions to nouns are discussed in detail.

II.4.7 G. N. Kelkar (1933). In the discussion on cases in his grammatical work Marathi Vya:karana:chi Mulatatwe (1933) G. N. Kelkar raises some crucial questions like, which and how many cases should there be in Marathi? What should be given the priority while forming case categories in Marathi? Why do we come across similar suffixes or postpositions (pratyaya in Marathi) to posit different cases? Kelkar himself answers these questions in his own way. He criticizes Moro Keshav Damle for omitting the Dwitiya: case and justifies its retention as a case for two reasons. He clearly states that Damle takes into consideration only the surface level terminations, and not their meanings which made him to omit Dwitiya: and allot its function to Chaturthi. Kelkar’s two reasons for retention of Dwitiya: as a case are

1. It is a coincidence that when Dwitiya: has no Ka:raka, it appears to be Prathama: and when it is posited by some Ka:raka, it appears to be Chaturthi so Dwitiya: cannot be discarded on this basis.

2. Instead of omitting Dwitiya:, Damle should have introduced some
generalised case like the ‘Objective’ case in English so that he would have been able to reduce the number of case categories to three or four. G. N. Kelkar tries to give a few suggestions for formulating case categories in Marathi. But finally we find that his case categories are directly derived from the Sanskrit tradition and he accepts to have eight cases from Prathama: to Sambodhan and gives their Ka: rakas or meanings similar to those given by Appaji Kher (1899) except Shashti which for Kelkar has Ka: raka of Sambodhan and for Kher it has Swa: mitwaka: rak.

G. N. Kelkar finds it convenient to form the cases in Marathi based on their meanings as many early grammarians did. He comments that in Marathi Sambodhan (Vocative) is the only case which necessarily indicates only one meaning and the very name of this case is suggestive of its meaning. In the same way, the rest of the cases should be labelled newly instead of giving them the traditional Sanskrit labels. He appears to evaluate the element of case in Marathi critically, and in his opinion, the fusion of all other cases into one except the Agent and the Object (Karta: and Karma) in Marathi as well as in English would be convenient. Of course, it is only a suggestion given by Kelkar for further study by other scholars.

Krishnajji Pandurang Kulkarni’s Marathi Bha: shecha: Udagam Wa Vika:s (1933) was Sanskrit-based, and his etymological account of cases from those in Sanskrit to cases in Marathi is remarkable. About the cases in Marathi he states:

“संस्कृतमध्ये एकदर सात विभिन्न होते, मध्यव्यक्त भाष्यात चतुर्थी विभिन्नता लोप झाली आहे. संस्कृतप्रामाणे मराठीत (संवौधन वाक्यानु) विभिन्नता सात आहेत असे मानितात, द्वितीया आधी चतुर्थीयया या दोन्ही विभिन्नता प्रत्यय सारख्याच जरी असले तर स्वयंचे ‘कारकार्य’—विभिन्नता प्रत्ययांत शब्दांवा क्रियापदांची संबंध—निराहे आहेत” (Kulkarni, 1933 : 371).

He agrees to retain seven cases in Marathi Prathama: to Saptami. He provides the list of terminations used for these cases similar to those
given by G. N. Kelkar and others but the Ka:raka of Saptami is not clearly stated, and the Ka:raka of Shasththi given by him is Visheshanrupee, and later on, the Upapada:rth and the postpositions used for each case are comprised:

1. Prathama: -  १. उदेश  न. विणान,  ३. परिमाण  ४. अवधि
2. Dwitiya: -
3. Tritiya: -  हेतू, सामिष्य, सहार, मूल्य, तुलना
4. Chaturthi -  प्रयोजन, मूल्य, जन्यजनक भाव, अवघवायबी, वियोग, मयादा,
             प्रमाण
5. Panchami -  ताजतप, भैद
6. Shasththi -  प्रयोजन, परिणाम, मूल्य, जन्यजनक, स्वस्वभाव, अंगांगी भाव, अनेक, सर्व या अर्थी, आधाराधेय
7. Saptami -  हेतू, पृथक्करण” (Kulkarni, 1933 : 380).

The morphophonemic account of the Sa:ma:nyaroope or the oblique forms of the cases and Sarvana:m Vibhakti in the later part of the ninth chapter entitled Mara:thiche Vya:karan. Nothing innovative is found in K. P. Kulkarni’s discussion on case-categories in Marathi.

II.4.8 M. S. Mone (1935). In Moreshwar Sakharam Mone’s Marathi Vya:karan (1935 first edn.) the case or vibhakti is defined as follows:

“नामांचा क्रियापदार्थी किंवा वाक्यातील इतर शब्दांची असतेला संबंध दाखविण्यासाठी त्यांची जी निरनिरकी रुपे होतात, त्यास विभक्ती असे म्हणतात. . . .
. . . (विभक्ती = वि + भज + ति = वेगांची केलेली असा अर्थ आहे.)” (Mone, 1935 : 60).

Then about the terminations used to realise cases Mone says:

“नामांचा वाक्यातील दुसर्या शब्दांची संबंध दाखविण्यासाठी एकत्र काच प्रकारचा अर्थ दर्शविण्याची आकर्षण त्या नामांच जोडून त्यांचा एक गट करून होतो. ह्या अकारांस ‘विभक्ती’ प्रत्यय असे म्हणतात. हे गट पुढील प्रमाणे आहेत- त्यास पहिला गट, दुसरा गट

CASE STUDY IN MARATHI : A REVIEW OF LITERATURE
Mone considers eight cases respectively from Prathama: to Sambodhan in Marathi but claims that he has borrowed only the names Prathama: to Sambodhan from the old tradition of the Sanskrit grammar and later on, discusses different meanings of these cases realised by the terminations and postpositions. He divides cases into two groups: 1. Ka:rakvibhakti, is the case that is related to the verb, and 2. Upapadavibhakti, is the case that is related to the words other than the verb in a sentence. According to Mone all the cases from Prathama: to Saptami are Ka:rakvibhakti as well as upapadavibhakti and he remarks:

“विभवविध्या योगाने नामांचा किंवा नामाप्रमाणे योजितलेल्या शब्दांचा क्रियापदाधी किंवा इतर शब्दांशी संबंध जोडीला जातो. तो ज्या प्रकारचा संबंध असतो त्यास त्या विभवविध्या अर्थ असे म्हणतात. नामाचा क्रियापदाधी संबंध असत्यास त्याला कारकार्थ्य व इतर शब्दांशी संबंध असत्यास त्यास उपपदार्थ असे म्हणतात. क्रियापदाधाचा कर्म, कर्म, करण (साधन), संप्रवाद (देणे या धातुप्रमाणे अप्रत्यक्ष दुसरे करण), अपग्राह (एक गोष्टी पासून दुसरी दूर जाणे) आणि अधिकरण (ठिकाण) ही दशविषयासाठी कारकार्थ्यचे प्रयोजन आहे. तसेच उद्देश, हेतू, कारण, परिमाण, प्रमाण, मूल्य, अंतर, अवधि, आधिक्य, स्थळ, पुल्लिना, विषय, भेद, सहित्य, संबंध इत्यादी अनेक प्रकारचा एका शब्दाचा दुसरा शब्दांशी संबंध दशविषयासाठी उपपदार्थचे प्रयोजन व्याकरणात मानिलेले आहे” (Mone, 1935 : 95).

Mone classifies the Ka:raka:th and upapada:th for each case as follows:
1. Prathama: Ka:raka:th - कर्ता (Agent), कर्म (Object), अधिकरण (indicates both Time and Place)
   Upapada:th - ‘उदेश (Purpose), विधान (Statement), परिमाण (Measure), मूल्य (Price), अंतर (Distance), अवधि (Duration).’

2. Dwitiya: Ka:raka:th is only one – कर्म (Object).

3. Tritiya: Ka:raka:th - कर्ता (Agent), करण (Instrument), अधिकरण (Place)
4. Chaturthi

Ka:rka:rth- ‘कर्ता (Agent), करण (Instrument), संप्रदान (Donation or giving away), अपादान (Taking away), अधिकरण (Location)

Upapada:rth - ‘उदेश (Purpose), हेतु (Intention), परिमाण (Measure), प्रमाण (Quantity), मूल्य (Price), विनिमय (Exchange), विषय (Subject)

5. Panchami

Ka:raka:rth- अपादान (Ablation), करण (Instrument).

Upapada:rth - ‘अंतर (Distance), तुलनामेत (Distinction)’

6. Shashthi

Ka:rka:rth- ‘अपादान (Ablation), अधिकरण (Location)’

Upapada:rth - ‘हेतु (Intention), स्थिरत्यंतर (Change of place), मूल्य (Price), विनिमय (Exchange), योग्यता (Capability), प्रकार (Type), विषय (Subject matter), अधिकार (Authority), संबंध (Relation)’

7. Saptami

Ka:rka:rth - अधिकरण (Place)

Upapada:rth - करण (Reason), विषय (Subject matter)

8. Sambodhan only Ka:rka:rth कर्ता (Agent), कर्म (Object), करण (Instrument), संप्रदान (Donation or giving away), अपादान (Ablation or taking away), अधिकरण (Location)

(Mone, 1935 : 96-97).

Thus, Mone in his Marathi grammar appears to give deeper thought to the meanings of cases and the case system itself. However his assigning to a single case a number of meanings causes complication.

Mahadev Pandurang Sabnis in a:dhunik Mara:thiche Uchchatthar Vya:karan (1951) omitted Prathama: and Shashthi in his classification of case categories because Prathama: takes no termination and Shashthi functions as an adjective. Although he rightly observes: “आम्ही व्याकरणासंबंधी
II.4.9 Ashok R. Kelkar (1959). Ashok R. Kelkar’s article entitled ‘The Category of Case in Marathi - ‘A study in Method’ (1959) which contains an elaborate discussion on the morphophonemic aspect of case system in Marathi. However, it does not deal with the syntactic or semantic aspect of it.

Ashok Kelkar’s article introduces a broad division of the technical terms used in the description of a language into three groups:

Group A  BASIC TERMS

Group B  VARIABLE TERMS

Group C  SUBSTANTIAL TERMS.

These terms are described in his article as follows:

BASIC TERMS: Once we agree with these terms, we must rigorously apply them to any language that we care to describe.

VARIABLE TERMS: have to be defined afresh for each language ...... Given the theoretical model, a variable term will still have not ‘one’ definition but a set of definitions - a series of definitions for these languages in describing which we have use for the term concerned rounded off by a tentative inductively arrived at general definition. The general definition will then on merely inform the linguist what are the sort of things for which the term is available, so that he does not have to hunt for a new term for each new language. A clear distinction between basic terms and variable terms will help us to avoid many a fruitless controversy on a terminological issue.

SUBSTANTIAL TERMS : are labelled “as against the first two groups both of which are essentially formal in character — When a formal category is specifically and obviously related to some real-world fact, the linguist will find it convenient to label it after that semantic context” (Kelkar,
Kelkar does not define substantial terms in a clear way. After defining these three groups of technical terms in language, Kelkar treats 'case' as a VARIABLE TERM, and gives a tentative general definition of 'case' before turning to case in Marathi:

"If a language happens to have nouns (another variable term!) and if these nouns enter into regular paradigms (a basic term) such that the place occupied by a form in the paradigm marks the constructional relations the form enters into with other forms in the sentence in which it occurs, then the class of such mutually exclusive markers may be called case markers." (Kelkar, Ashok, 1959 : 132).

"When we try to make use of this term in describing Marathi, three classes of markers offer themselves as suitable candidates to be called case. Although in defining (Marathi) case, I have denied the name to two of them, the situation is worth examining as a whole. Apparently closely analogous question can be raised about another Indian languages and a clarification of this kind will be helpful in avoiding the pitfalls created by discrepant terminologies standing in the way of an intelligent comparison between these languages" (Kelkar, Ashok, 1959 :133).

In part II of his paper he introduces a diagram for indicating the regular paradigm in which a noun stem enters. With its help he discusses the phonological changes that take place in Marathi nouns after adding other markers.

He introduces three classes of endings satisfying the tentative definition of case given earlier.

"a. The class constituted by {direct}, {oblique}, and {vocative};

b. Class X markers; and

According to Ashok Kelkar, "A noun stem takes either (a) alone, or (a) followed by (b), or (c) alone. It is clear that (a) and (b) cannot both be case-endings, since they occur together. It is also clear that we have to decide for the classes as wholes, unless we can find some acceptable criterion to accord the status of case to some members of a class and withhold it from other members of the same class. The procedure of traditional Marathi grammars whereby an arbitrary list cutting across our three classes is drawn up can be hardly justified. The list runs as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional case</th>
<th>from (a)</th>
<th>from (b)</th>
<th>from (c)</th>
<th>other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. (nominative)</td>
<td>{direct}</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii. (accusative)</td>
<td>{direct}</td>
<td>-s,-la,*-te</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii. (instrumental)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-ni,-si,*-hi</td>
<td>-e,-iô</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv. (dative)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-s,-la,,-te</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. (ablative)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-hun</td>
<td>-un</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. (genitive)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-ca, etc.</td>
<td>-ca, etc.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vii. (locative)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>-i1,-a</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocative</td>
<td>{vocative}</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two endings marked with an asterisk are now obsolete. Note that the distinction between the two /-ne:/ (alternants to /-ni/ and to /-un/ respectively), and between the two /-ca/ series is ignored; that the endings {direct}, /-s/, and /-la/ are artificially split into a pair of homonyms each; and that the particle /-ol/ (commonly cited as /-no/!) is treated as a case-ending though it is an alternant of /ho/ (as in /mitrô + ho /'friends!', /cô la +ho/ /'do come along!/'). The several endings put under the same case are by no means freely substitutable for one another, nor are they in complementary distribution. All this has no apparent motive except that
of showing that Marathi, like a good daughter, has the same eight cases as Sanskrit has!" (Kelkar, Ashok, 1959: 136).

Kelkar further states," Nothing has turned up in this discussion that will show that the tentative definitions of case forces any particular choice on us. We clearly need an additional criterion. That is provided by another variable term-INFLECTION. A tentative general definition of inflection may be offered as follows:

When the respective paradigms into which all the members of a (tentatively proposed) stem-class enter are matched to each other in respect of form and distribution, the following things (arranged roughly in order of their importance) may be observed:

i. all or nearly all stems agree in being combinable with a set of markers;

ii. the distribution of the stem-plus-marker formation does not match that of some other simple stem (of the same class or different) so much as tie in with some syntactical relation;

iii. the presence of the marker closes the word;

iv. the set is small, compact, well-ordered, and not open-ended;

v. the markers are bound and determined by the stem.” (Ashok Kelkar, 1959: 137).

According to Kelkar,

“When the paradigm or some specifiable subset of it fulfills most or all of these conditions, the paradigm or the subset concerned is the inflectional set for the stem-class in question (and may enter the definition of the proposed stem-class)... Let us apply these to the three classes of markers. Class Y disqualifies on the very first count. Class X fails on the fourth count, and is surpassed by the other two on the third and the fifth counts. The set constituted by {direct}, {oblique}, and {vocative} comes
nearest to fulfilling all the conditions. Case in Marathi is, there-
fore the set of mutually contrasting and exclusive morphemes
{direct}, {oblique} and {vocative}, Classes X and Y we group to-
gether as POSTPOSITIONS - which is not a form-class so much
as the second position in the axis-and-postposition, which can
be occupied by any out of a large heterogeneous group” (Kelkar,

Then Kelkar presents the formal details of some noun declen-
sions of gender, number and case. He also points out that in the verbal
paradigm case-morphemes show up in two places and discusses them in
detail (Kelkar, Ashok, 1959:138). And finally he remarks:

“In most ‘word-using’ languages the word is ‘the’ most
important stopping point between the smallest units in grammar—
the morpheme—and, the largest—the sentence. But in Marathi
this distinction apparently goes to the PHRASE. Once we bear in
mind that ‘word’ is a variable term, this need not be a disturbing
conclusion.” (Kelkar, Ashok, 1959:139).

(1983) he makes some statements regarding cases in Marathi and dis-
cusses how the earlier tradition is faulty in classifying the case categories
in Marathi.

G. M. Patil wrote an artile entitled ‘Mara:thiche Vibhaktiparakaran’
in Maha:ra:shtra Sa:hiya Patrika: Jan.1961 in which he discussed cer-
tain issues related to cases in Marathi.

While discussing the concept of case he rightly points out that
the meaning of a sentence is indicated by all the words in totality. Natu-
rally there must be some relationship among them. The concept of case
was formulated to express the relationship of words in a sentence with
each other. Different terminations and postpositions are added to the words
in a sentence to indicate their relationships with each other. It clarifies the
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meaning of a sentence; so cases should be formed by the meanings they express and not by the suffixes added to the words in a sentence as is done by Moro Keshav Damle.

He emphasises the importance of the relationships of the words in a sentence and the meanings of cases. He points out,

“मराठी ही एक स्वतंत्र व प्रगत भाषा असून तिची घडण, मोडणी आणि ठेवण इतर कोणत्याही भाषेवर अवलंबून नाही. ह संस्कृत भाषेत इतक्या विभक्ती आहेत अगर प्राकृतात इतक्या विभक्ती होत्या म्हणून मराठीत ल्याग्ला तंत्रात असलेले पाहिजे हा हट्टाग्रह प्रथम सर्व सुझावी मनातून काढून टाकला पाहिजे.”

Most of the earlier Marathi grammatical works are based on Sanskrit tradition. But G. M. Patil indicates that Sanskrit is a language based on Panini’s strictly governed rules while Marathi is a language used by a living community for communication. Naturally, the language in use tends to be fluid, changing. The Kaːraka in the Sanskrit grammar cannot be directly or rightly applied to Marathi which go on changing. For instance, if we observe closely, the Marathi case categories based on the Sanskrit tradition create many problems. Many cases can express the meaning of one Kaːraka. ‘Karta: Kaːrak’ can be expressed by ‘Prathamaː, Tritiyaː, Shasththi cases’. On the other hand, one case in Marathi expresses many meanings (Kaːraka). So G. M. Patil, like most others, expresses the absolute need to reconstruct the grammar of Marathi, but we do not find him innovating something new for it.

II.4.10 Arvind Mangarulkar (1964). Arvind Mangarulkar’s ‘Marathichya: Vyaːkaranacha: Punarvichaːr (1964) is a compilation of his six lectures on Marathi grammar and we come across a full-length discussion on cases in Marathi in the last two of them. After evaluating elaborately the traditional Marathi case categories, Mangarulkar comes to the conclusion that there are only four cases in Marathi and the terminations used for them are as follow:
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"Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Terminations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prathama:</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwitiya:</td>
<td>अ, ला, स</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tritiya:</td>
<td>ने, शी, एं</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sambodhan</td>
<td>0, आ, या, ई, ए</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Mangarulkar, 1964: 144).

After introducing these four cases he mentions the special features of his own new case system in Marathi. He claims that

1. it is based on the Marathi used for live communication.

2. 'Sambodhan' is considered as a case. The terminations of 'Prathama:' are given by him whereas there are no terminations given for this case in any earlier grammars of Marathi.

3. By omission of 'Chaturthi' the chronological sequence of cases is kept intact. as he uses the traditional names for cases for convenience.

4. As the termination of 'Dwitiya:' ते is not found in day-to-day Marathi, he omits it in his system.

5. Terminations commonly used on large scale are given firstly.

6. All the functions of all cases are taken into consideration.

7. The cases 'Chaturthi, Panchami, Shashtti, Saptami' are omitted but their functions are properly analysed in the group of ‘साधीते’. असे केल्याचे विभक्तीचे सर्वसाधारण स्वरूप संकल्प न होता एकविध आणि निकोप राहिले आहेत. (P.144-145).

8. Thus, he felt that his classification was less confusing. (Mangalurkar, 1964: 144-145).

Mangularkar tries to be more scientific and logical than the earlier grammarians in lessening the confusion regarding cases in Marathi.
II.4.11 Vijaya Chitnis (1979). Vijaya Chitnis's ... An Intensive Course in Marathi (1979), being a course of Marathi for non-Marathi learners, concentrates on giving ample drills and grammatical terms are avoided in this book as far as possible. We do not find any discussion or mention of case categories in Marathi here. The forms of nouns are labelled Straight Forms (SF) and Oblique Forms (OF) which are shown to be marked for gender, number and relations. It appears to be partially sketched on the model of the structural grammar of English.

II.4.12 Krishna S. Arjunwadkar (1987). Krishna S. Arjunwadkar in his Marathi Vya:karan-Wa:d a:ni Prawa:d (1987) discussed the case-system in Marathi by raising up a question: are cases identified either by case-markers or by meanings? While discussing this issue, he refers to the case-system in early Panditi Marathi grammar (Arjunwadkar, 1987: 139-148). He lists the number of cases in Marathi given by many earlier grammarians and takes account of the controversial arguments on 'Shashti' case in Marathi. Chiplunkar omitted 'Shashti' in Marathi case-system and as we know it was retained in the case-system by the other grammarians like Gunjikar, Damle and Mungarulkar.

He also points out the arguments of Burgess and Rajwade that there should be only two case categories in Marathi. He shows how Rajwade's opinions are far-fetched and impracticable, and are not substantiated properly. There is much controversy regarding Vocative case in Marathi in the earlier grammatical works. Arjunwadkar finally gives his own opinion about its omission from the case system of Marathi and after evaluating the case-categories in the earlier grammatical works, he states that there are only five cases in Marathi Pratama:, Tritiya:, Chaturthi, Shashti, and Saptami. (Arjunwadkar, 1987: 148).

He classifies these case-names which are derived from Sanskrit grammar for the sake of convenience and suggests to retain the same terminations and postpositions used in early case system for all these five cases.
One of the important thought expressed by him is:

“त्याकरणातील तक्षण केशावरून करावी? रुपावरून की अर्थावरून? ... ... ... रुप हे त्याकरणातल प्रथम प्रमाण होय. अर्थ हे दुर्योग. ही भूमिका स्वीकारल्यावर विभविक्षक्षणाचा निर्णय होतो. शिष्यांचा लागणारे वस्त्रभार बाजूला काहीतरंग उततात ते विभविक्षक्षण. त्याचा पत्र करता येतात, ते शोधे आहेत. या प्रत्ययाचा अर्थ सांगणे हा पदान्वयनाचा भाग होय. हे अर्थ करक या स्वरूपाचे अपस्तील किंवा नस्तील क्षकारकर्ण म्हणजे विभविक्षक्षणाचा क्रियापदार्थाची संबंध, विशेषतः पून अन्य पदार्थांची संबंध तो उपप्राघार्थ. त्याकरणात सुद्ध पदतीने पदस्थिती आधी संगठनत, पदान्वयन नंतर, पदान्वयनाचा आधारांना पद सिद्धांतातील तक्षण तर्कील आहे. ही गोष्ट दामक्यानी एक्षणी आणली आहे. पाण्डित्याचा शब्द वापरणारा तर पदान्वयन हा पदस्थितीला ‘असिद्ध’ आहे.” (Arjunwadkar, 1987: 145-146).

II.4.13 R. V. Kulkarni (1988). R. V. Kulkarni in his Ph. D. Dissertation entitled Case in English and Marathi (1988, CIEFL, Hyderabad) attempts to examine case assignment in English and Marathi within the framework of Noam Chomsky’s theory of Government and Binding (1981). He also deals with a few issues in the context of these two languages.

II.4.14 I. M. P. Raeside and B. V. Nemade(1991). In I. M. P. Raeside and B. V. Nemade’s Marathi Reading Course (1991) we come across the following comment on case-names in Marathi:

“The Latin case names (Dative, Locative etc) are largely meaningless for Marathi but are used here in case they might give some help to those familiar with Latin or German grammar and because they are used freely in old-fashioned Marathi grammars.” (Raeside and Nemade, 1991: 14).

It suggests that the case names given here as those found in the traditional grammar are for the sake of convenience for the foreign learners of Marathi. But neither some new names nor the justification for the Latin case names to be regarded as meaningless is elaborated here as perhaps it cannot have the scope in this work. But it leads to the need for redefining and relabelling of case categories in Marathi.
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II.5 CONCLUDING REMARKS

The review of literature in the preceding pages shows how the grammarians and linguists of Marathi dealt with the element of case (Vibhakti) in many different ways. There does not appear to be a properly defined concept of case or case-endings or a logical method of classification of case-markers, or case-specific relations in the entire tradition of Marathi grammarians. However, certain observations and streams of conceptualization about case can be attempted here.

It appears that nearly all the grammarians of Marathi attempted their interpretation of case being based either on Sanskrit or English, i.e., Latin grammar. For instance, Vyenkatmadhav (1827), Appaji Kashinath Kher (1899), Krishna Shastri Godbole (1863), Muhmad Mukbah Moonshi (1825), Dadoba Pandurang Tarkhadkar (1836), M. K. Damle (1911) and Ramchandra Bhikaji Joshi (1923) and others classify cases in Marathi based on the tradition of the Sanskrit grammar. But most of the Marathi grammarians include Sambodhan as one of the cases in Marathi which Sanskrit does not have; and they justify it in their own way. For instance, Vyenkatmadhav's Marathi grammar written in Sanskrit is based on the tradition of Panini's grammar of Sanskrit and it denotes eight cases. The other grammarians like Dadoba Tarkhadkar, Gangadhar Shastri Phadke, V. K. Rajwade, Ramchandra Bhikaji Joshi, G. N. Kelkar, M. S. Mone, Ashok Kelkar and others also introduce eight cases in Marathi. But it is worth noting that some of the grammarians who follow the same Sanskrit tradition do not necessarily introduce eight cases in Marathi, for example, Mukbah Moonshi, Krishna Shastri Godbole, Madhav Pandurang Sabnis introduce six cases omitting the Shashti case in Marathi, whereas Godbole fuses Prathama: and Dwitiya: in one case category; and Sabnis clearly omits the Prathama: case from his list. Appaji Kashinath Kher, M. K. Damle, K. P. Kulkarni agree to have seven cases but we observe that although Kher does not include Sambhodhan initially, he can not avoid giving the terminations for it at later stage. Damle omits Dwitiya: for the...
reasons already discussed in detail, and K. P. Kulkarni omits *Sambodhan*.

The grammarians whose interpretation of case in Marathi is based on English, i.e. Latin grammar are William Carey (1805), Robert Drummond (1808), James Ballantyne (1839), Bellairs and Askhedkar (1868), G. A. Grierson (1908), G. R. Navalkar (1894) and B. V. Devadhar (1920). William Carey enumerates seven cases with their English names: Nominative, Accusative, Instrumental, Dative, Ablative, Possessive and Locative. He omits the Vocative case from his list as it does not terminate differently from the Nominative. Drummand and Ballantyne also omit the Vocative but like *Prathama* to *Saptami* in Sanskrit grammar Drummond labels seven cases as First, Second, Third and so on. Bellairs and Askhedkar denote eight cases in Marathi including the Vocative with the terminations used for it. Grierson’s six cases do not include Accusative and Possessive; and he labels the Nominative case as the Agent. Navalkar’s Marathi grammar written in English introduces eight cases in Marathi, which are from Nominative to Vocative to help the non-Marathi learners. Similarly, B. V. Devadhar’s Marathi grammar too is a kind of Marathi language course for non-Marathi students and is submitted by the author as ‘a supplement to start in Marathi.’ We come across the Latin-based names of his eight case categories, respectively from Nominative to Vocative along with their Sanskrit-based names from *Prathama* to *Sambodhan*.

Some grammarians of Marathi form the classification of cases logically developed on their own, but retain the labels of cases in early Marathi grammars. They are Stevenson (1843), Chiplunkar (1893), E. Burgess (1854), Jules Bloch (1914), Arvind Mangarulkar (1964) and K. S. Arjunwadkar (1987). Stevenson introduces two kinds of classification of cases in Marathi, the old method introducing eight cases from *Prathama* to *Sambodhan* based on the early Sanskrit tradition, and the other ‘new’ method, introducing only three cases, *Prathama* and *Dwitiya*: in one category, *Chaturthi*, and *Sambodhan*. Chiplunkar’s five case categories of
Marathi are based on the terminations used for them, and they are Prathama:, Triiya:, Chaturthi, Panchami and Saptami. E. Burgess (1854) presents two types of classification of cases in Marathi, the meaning-based and the form-based. His meaning-based classification consists of three cases, Prathama:, Dwitiya: and Sambodhan; and his form-based classification has two cases, ‘the Inflected case’ and ‘the Uninflected case’. This appears rather an over-simplification of so many cases in Marathi based on their multifarious overt forms. Jules Bloch (1814) wrote in French his treatise on the formation of Marathi in which he introduced two cases: the ‘Direct case’ and the ‘Oblique case’. This classification is superficially based on the terminations used for nouns in Marathi. Arvind Mangarulkar (1964) seems to give a deeper thought to the concept of case in Marathi. After evaluating the confusion regarding case in the earlier grammatical works of Marathi, Mangarulkar insists on the special features of his case-system and accordingly admits to have only four cases in Marathi Prathama:, Dwitiya:, Triiya:, and Sambodhan. K. S. Arjunwadkar, a scholar of eminence with profound insights in the grammar of Marathi, is aware of the different strong influences of Sanskrit and English grammars on that of Marathi. He is deeply concerned about the fact that no independent method of forming cases has been followed in earlier grammatical works. Having realised that the tradition of Marathi grammar always remained dependent either on English or on Sanskrit and, so could not stand on its own, Arjunwadkar proposes form-based case categories as he strongly believes that meaning-based classification creates a good deal of confusion. The controversies regarding cases like Shashti, Sambodhan, Dwitiya: and Chaturthi are particularly discussed by Arjunwadkar. He approves of five cases in Marathi – Prathama:, Triiya:, Chaturthi, Shashti, and Saptami emphasising that the Sanskrit names for cases are borrowed only for the sake of convenience.

A few grammarians seem to be aware of the autonomous development of Marathi case system in the evolutionary process from Indo-Aryan through Sanskrit, Prakrit and Apabhransh to Old Marathi. For ex-
ample, Godbole (1867), Tarkhadkar (1836), V. K. Rajwade (1909), K. P. Kulkarni (1933), Krishna Shastri Chiplunkar (1893), Gunjikar and Jules Bloch (1914) and others. Godbole (1867) discusses the origin of the case-names and the terminations used for them in the ancestral languages like Sanskrit, Prakrit, Apabhransh and Old Marathi. Chiplunkar refers to the early languages like Sanskrit, Prakrit and others, while discussing the etymology of the terminations used for cases in Marathi and R. B. Joshi (1923) pointed out:

"मराठी भाषा म्हणजे प्राचीन आर्य भाषेचे परंपरेने गणलेले आधुनिक स्वरूप … त्याप्रमाणे सांप्रदायिक मराठीचे व्याकरण म्हणजे संस्कृत व्याकरणाचे गणलेले स्वरूप होय." (Joshi, 1923 : 86).

Joshi presents the eight case categories in Pali, and seven in Prakrit, and the different oblique forms of some nouns in Apabhransh and the Old Marathi of Dnyaneshwari (Joshi, 1923 : 89-92).

The controversy regarding form-based and meaning-based cases in Marathi has been going on right from the beginning among grammarians and linguists of Marathi. Accordingly, they try to justify their own classifications of cases in Marathi. The earlier grammarian E. Burgess (1854) follows two methods of classifications of cases in Marathi, that is, the form-based and the meaning-based. Other grammarians like Bellairs and Askhedkar, Chiplunkar, M. K. Damle and K. S. Arjunwadkar strongly preferred the form-based classification of cases in Marathi as it raises less confusion and appears to be logical according to them. But A. K. Kher, G. N. Kelkar, M. S. Mone and Mangarulkar prefer to classify cases based on their functions or meanings and consider it to be convenient and substantial. The linguists like G. N. Patil (1961) and, Raeside and Nemade (1991) strongly feel the need to rebuild the existing case system in Marathi with a new approach. It is an encouraging trend that almost all of them appear to be dissatisfied with the existing notions of case. However, nobody so far has even attempted a new approach to the entire case system. Thus the detailed survey of the notions of the case system.
in Marathi indicates that it is possible to interpret and restructure the case semantics by means of a comparative principle, for which discussions on case in Marathi offer interesting evolution of ideas on case, apart from providing ample data for the application of Fillmore’s case grammar model — which is semantic-based — to Marathi.