CHAPTER III
DEFINITION OF MALAYALAM CASES

In this Chapter, an attempt is made to define the different Cases in Malayalam. Fillmore's definition of each case is given first with illustrations. An account of how the Traditional Sanskrit Grammarian Paanini and other Traditional Malayalam Grammarians have defined and illustrated each case is given and the difference of Fillmore's case from the Traditional case are explained with illustrations. Finally, the criticisms of different grammarians regarding Fillmore's definitions are mentioned and the inadequacy, if any, of Fillmore's definition is suggested and proposed a new definition.

I. Agentive case

Fillmore (1968a) defines Agentive case as, "the typically animate perceived instigator of the action identified by the verb" (p. 24).

Following Fillmore, the subject of the following sentences in Malayalam can be taken as Agentive.
(1) ayaal ooti
    he ran
    'He ran'

(2) rema paattu paattunu
    Rema song sings
    'Rema sings the song'

(3) avan enne aticcu
    he me(Acc.) beat
    'He beat me'

Based on the above definition the subject of the following sentences cannot be taken as Agentive since they are not animate nouns.

(4) vanti ninnu
    vehicle stopped
    'The vehicle stopped'

(5) kaaRRu kataku tuRannu
    wind door opened
    'The wind opened the door'
(6) kuppi paalkontu niRannu
bottle milk-with filled

'The bottle filled with milk'

The following examples show that there are certain inanimate nouns which may function as animate. Such cases can be considered as Agentive. This is implied in the definition by the word "typically".

(7) mantrisabha tiirumaaniccu
ministry decided

'The ministry has decided'

(8) Rasya jaRmaniye toolppiccu
Russia Germany(Acc.) defeated

'Russia defeated Germany'

(9) ulsavakkammiRRi aa kaaryam carcca ceytu festival committee that matter discussion done

'The festival committee discussed that matter'

Fillmore's Agentive must be a 'Perceived instigator'. To 'perceive' means 'to become aware of by one of the senses'. 'Instigator'
is 'one who incites a person to do an action'. So by 'perceived instigator' he might have meant an actor who does an action knowingly. Therefore in the following sentences, though the subject is animate, it cannot be Agentive since no real action is done perceivably by the subject.

(10) avan niraasanaanu
    he desperate is

   'He is desperate'

(11) raaman nanaanu
    Rama is drenched

   'Rama is drenched'

(12) naan aa kaaryam arinnu
    I that matter knew

   'I knew that matter'

The Traditional Sanskrit Grammarian Paṇinī also had mentioned about Agentive. The Agentive is karta according to Paṇinī. Paṇinī (1891) says, "whatever the speaker chooses as the
Independent, principal and absolute source of action is called karta or agent" (p. 191).

Karta is independent, that is, it does not depend on any other kaaraka in accomplishing an action. The action identified by the verb is dependent on karta for its result. Karta is the most important relation. If it is expressed, it will always be in prathama and it is the subject. When karta is not available for subject, other kaarakas become the subject.

Paanini's karta and Fillmore's Agentive are different. Fillmore's Agentive should be animate, but there is no mentioning of animateness as a feature of karta in Paanini. According to him the case which has the prathama ending is karta, no matter whether it is animate or inanimate.

Other Traditional grammarians like Gundert, Mathen and Varma have followed Paanini. Examine the following sentences:

(13) kutti karayunnu
child cries

'The child cries'
(14) siita peeticcupooyi
   Sita frightened

'Sita is frightened'.

(15) kalam uṭanṇu
    pot broke

'The pot broke'.

(16) muRi vellamkōntu niRannu
    room water-with filled

'The room filled with water'.

(17) aa sabdām avale unartti
    that sound she (Acc.) awakened

'That sound awakened her'.

According to Fillmore, only the subject of (13) is Agentive, but for Paṇini and other Traditional Grammarians the subject of the sentences (13) to (17) is karta because they are in the Nominative form.

Fillmore's definition of Agentive is not fully agreeable due to several reasons. D.A. Cruse (1973) and Gruber (1967) have criticized
Fillmore's definition of Agentive. Cruse raises the question, "Why Fillmore speaks of the 'perceived instigator', perceived by whom, speaker, hearer or speech community in general?" (p. 12). He also questions the word 'instigator'. He asks, "Who is the instigator in the following sentence?" (p. 12).

Jim put Mary upto persuading Tom to make John strangle the cat.

He says, "all qualify as instigator except John, but Fillmore does not mean this" (p. 12). He tries to substitute 'performer' for 'instigator' and he argues that in the above sentence only John qualifies as the performer of the action. Cruse gives the following example also:

John marched the prisoners across the yard.

Cruse suggests that, "if the action identified by the verb is the act of marching, then this is performed by the prisoners, on the other hand, if it is the act of making
people march, then clearly John is the performer" (p. 12). According to Cruse there are two agentives in the above sentence—John and the prisoners, and he says that Fillmore's definition does not seem to allow for this. But we can clearly say that the prisoners is not Agentive, but Experiencer.

According to Gruber (1967), "an Agentive verb is one whose subject refers to an animate object which is thought of as the willful source or agent of the activity described in the sentence" (p. 943). This seems to be not acceptable. For example, see the following sentences. The subject of the first sentence will be Agentive, but not that of the second, if we accept his definition.

(18) goopi avalute kaalil cavitti
    Gopi she-of leg-in kicked

    'Gopi kicked her leg'

(19) goopi aRiyaate avalute kaalil cavitti
    Gopi accidently she-of leg-in kicked

    'Gopi accidently stepped on her leg'
Gruber also mentions that, "an Agentive verb is substitutable in all circumstances by the phrase 'do something'" (p. 943). This seems to be an acceptable proposition.

Cruse (1973) suggests that inanimate objects like wind, rain etc. and some machines can acquire a temporary Agentivity by virtue of their kinetic (or other) energy. He says, "the feature of Agentivity is present in any sentence referring to an action performed by an object which is regarded as using its own energy in carrying out the action. Including amongst these objects are living things, certain types of machines and natural agents" (p. 21).

To illustrate his points Cruse gives the following examples:

(20a) The wind blew the tree down.
(20b) The computer calculates the correlation coefficient.

But we can't agree to his suggestions. It
It is true that the wind in (20a) uses its own energy rather than the energy provided by someone else to open the door. But, the wind cannot open the door like an animal. It is because of the force of the wind that the door opened, and so it is only an external force. So also, in (20b) the computer cannot calculate the correlation coefficient by itself. Man has to start the machine, otherwise it will not work.

Taking all these into consideration, we have to reformulate Fillmore's definition of Agentive. We shall agree with Fillmore in saying that Agentive should be animate but we cannot agree to the phrase 'perceived instigator'. Instigator can mean 'causer'. Then 'perceived instigator' can be 'one who knowingly causes somebody to act'. Whether Fillmore means both self-instigation and external causing by the word 'instigator' is not clear.
Now examine the following sentences:

(21) patti ootunnu
dog runs

"The dog runs"

(22) ayaal pattiyu ootikkunnu
he dog(Acc.) run makes

"He drives the dog to run"

If we accept Fillmore's definition, patti 'the dog' in (21) cannot be taken as Agentive since patti is not an instigator. But patti performs the act of running and so it is the performer. In (22) ayaal 'he' acts as the instigator and patti is Experiencer. (21) is a noncausative sentence. So in a noncausative sentence Agentive will be the instigator. This is the case with other noncausative and causative sentences also. Therefore, we shall accept Fillmore's term 'instigator' and Cruse's term 'performer' in specifying causative and noncausative sentences in Malayalam.
Consequently, Fillmore's definition of Agentive can be modified as follows:

-Agentive is the case of the typically animate performer or instigator of the action identified by the verb'.

II. Comitative case

Fillmore (1968a) has described Comitative case but has not given any definition for it.

According to Fillmore (1968a) conjunctive sentences are derived from Comitative phrases and it is a case which occurs in association with or in opposition with the Agentive. Comitative case also will be animate like Agentive.

In the following examples, ayaalootu 'with him', vimalayootu 'with Vimala', raajanRe kuute 'with Rajan' are Comitatives.

(23) ŋaan ayaalootu etirttu
    I he-with quarrelled
    'I quarrelled with him'

(24) kutti vimalayootottu kaliikkunnu
    child Vimala - with plays
    'The child plays with Vimala'
Fillmore's Comitative case can be equated with Traditionalist's Sociative case.

Paññini (1891) includes the Sociative case under the third case, that is, along with Instrumental, and he argues that the meaning of the Sociative case is accompaniment of the Agentive (Karta).

"When the word 'with' is coined to a word, the latter takes the third case when the sense is that the word in the third case is not the principal but the accompaniment of the principal thing" (p. 185).

He gives the following examples:

The father has come with the son

Among Malayalam Grammarians the author of Liilaatilakam ((1955) 1962) includes Sociative case under the Third Case and the suffix noted
by him is -otu (p. 84). Gundert ((1851) 1962) also includes the Social case (saahityam) with the suffixes _ootu and -otu under tritiya but later on he treats it separately (pp. 142-152). For Mathen ((1863) 1969) tritiya is Social Case and he says that it occurs in association with or in opposition with the subject. Mathen gives -ootu and -kuute as suffixes of tritiya (p. 82). Varma ((1895) 1978) calls the third case as samyoojika vibhakti (that which joins with another) the suffixes of which is -ootu (p. 175).

The kaaraka which represents samyoojika vibhakti is saaksi (counterpart). It is defined as, "the person whom the karta or agent needs in doing something who acts as a counterpart or co-operator" (p. 183).

The Traditional Sociative case can be animate or inanimate, but for Fillmore the Comitative case must be animate. Examine the following sentences:

(26) ayaal simanRinootu manal ceerttu he cement - with sand mixed

"He mixed sand with cement"
(27) avar meyyootu mey urummi ninnu
they body-with body by touching stood

'They stood close together'

(28) avar mukhatoottu mukham nookki
they face-with face looked

'They looked face to face'

simanRinootu 'with cement' in (26), meyyootu
'with body' in (27) and mukhatoottu 'with face'
in (28) are Sociatives according to Traditional grammarians but these are all included under Objective by Fillmore.

Fillmore (1968a) argues that the Comitative and conjunction of NPs are related, that is, sentences with Comitative case can be converted into conjunctive sentences.

"There may be a relationship between the ways in which languages deal with 'Comitative' constructions and the phenomenon of co-ordinate conjunction of NPs and what one might wish to refer to as a Comitative case" (p. 81).
According to Fillmore 'Comitative' means accompaniment. He says that in sentences containing Comitative case and with Agentive subject, the Comitative case can function as Agentive also, because it always occurs attached to the Agentive. For example, see the following sentences:

(29) siita liilayootu yoojiccu
    Sita Leela-with agreed
    'Sita agreed with Leela'

For Fillmore, sentence (29) is semantically similar to sentence (30).

(30) siitayum liilayum yoojiccu
    Sita-and Leela-and agreed
    'Sita and Leela agreed'

He suggests that, "the case category C has a very special status since the selectional constraints on nouns under C are those of the superordinate NP. What is needed, in other words, is a rule which imposes on any N under C the same
redundant feature which are associated with the dominating Non-C case" (p. 82).

The Comitative case cannot occur independently in the deep structure. It always occurs as a sub-constituent of a dominating NP. It can become subject in the surface structure along with the NP to which it is attached. For example, in the sentence (31) sati is Agentive and raamannotu 'with Rama' is Comitative. Sentence (31) is semantically similar to (32).

(31) sati raamannotu vaadikkunnu
Sati Rama-with argues
'Sati argues with Rama'

(32) satiyum raamanum vaadikkunnu
Sati-and Rama-and argues
'Sati and Rama argues'

If the Comitative case remains inside the dominating NP, as in (32) the entire Agentive (satiyum raamanum 'Sati and Rama') becomes the subject and if the Comitative case is separated as in sentence (31) the dominating NP (sati) becomes the subject.
The following examples show that Comitative phrases cannot always be derived from NP conjunctions.

(33) usa vimalayootu aa kaaryam paranñu
Usha Vimala—with that matter said
'Usha said that matter to Vimala'

(34) aval raajanoottu atu coodiccu
she Rajan—with that asked
'She asked that to Rajan'

(35) naan goopiyoottu panam aavasyappettu
I Gopi—with money demanded
'I demanded money from Gopi'

(36) raajaavu ayaalootu atu aañnaapiccu
king he—with that commanded
'The King commanded that to him'

The above sentences are transitive with Agentive subject. In sentence (33) Usha said the matter to Vimala and Vimala heard it. Even though both Usha and Vimala are present at the time when the action of parayuka 'to say' takes place, only one of them (Usha) is the
actor. So there is no possibility of NP conjunction. In other words sentence (37) is not a paraphrase of sentence (33).

(37) usayum vimalayum aa kaaryam parāṇṇu
Usha-and Vimala-and that matter said

'Usha and Vimala said that matter'

Similar is the case with the sentences (34), (35) and (36). In all these sentences the suffix -ootu has the meaning 'to', unlike in sentences (23) to (25) where -ootu has the meaning 'with'.

The Comitative case occurs not only with Agentive but with Experiencer also. Examine the following instances:

(38) acchan remayooth koopikkunnu
father Rema-with angry

'Father is angry with Rema'

(39) raamanu siitayooth preemamaanu
Rama-to Sita-with love - is

'Rama is in love with Sita'

(40) moolikku vinuvinootu paribhavam unto
Moli-to Vinu - with displeasure is

'Moli is displeased with Vinu'
The above sentences are intransitive with Experiencer subject. Just like sentences (33) to (36) the above sentences also cannot be derived from NP conjunctions. For example, take the sentence (38) in which acchan 'father' is angry with Rema. The sentence doesn't mean that Rema also is angry with acchan 'father' and so both acchan 'father' and Rema are not taking part in the action, only acchan is the actor.

In sentences with Agentive subject and with Comitative, the Comitative case cannot always function as Agentive. It is possible only in sentences in which Comitative phrases can be derived from NP conjunctions. For example, in sentences (23) to (25) Comitative can function as Agentive also, but it is not possible in sentences (33) to (36). That is, we can have (42) from (41) but we cannot have (44) from (43).
Considering all the above facts we shall try to define Comitative case as follows:

'Comitative is the case of the animate being which acts as a co-operator of Agentive or Experiencer and which sometimes occurs in association with or in opposition with the Agentive'.
The Dative case is defined by Fillmore (1968a) as, "the case of the animate being affected by the state or action identified by the verb" (p. 24). For example, see the following sentences:

(45) ayaal enikkku oru peena tannu
  he me-to one pen gave
  'He gave me a pen'

(46) naan satikkku oru pustakam kotuttu
  I Sati-to one book gave
  'I gave a book to Sati'

enikkku in (45) and satikkku in (46) are Datives according to the above definition. Based on the above definition Dative case must be animate and it must be affected by the action of the verb.

Paanini (1891) defines Dative case as, "the person whom one wishes to connect with the object of giving is called sampradaana or recipient" (p. 180).
According to Panini animate as well as inanimate nouns can come under Dative case.

All the traditional Grammarians identified Dative case as the Fourth Case. The suffixes of the Fourth Case are -kku, -annu, -innu for the author of Liilaatilakam (pp. 84-85). According to Gundert ((1851) 1962) and Mathen ((1863) 1969) the Dative case is Caturthi, the suffixes of which are -kku and -nu. For Mathen "Dative case is affected by the action of the verb" (p. 83). Varma ((1895) 1978) names this particular case as uddeśika.

The traditional Genitive case is included under Dative by Fillmore (1968a). -nnu, -ite, etc, and Re are noted as suffixes of the Dative case by the author of Liilaatilakam. Gundert ((1851) 1962) and Mathen ((1863) 1969) named the Genitive case as sasti and it is the relation of one noun with another. For Gundert the suffixes of the Genitive case are -ute and atu (pp. 162-163) and for Mathen the suffix is -te. Varma ((1895) 1978) named this case as sambandhika, the suffix of which is -ute.
Varma names the Dative case as swaami kaaraka and "it is the person or thing to whom the result of the action is intended to pass for its benefit" (p. 184).

The Traditionalists described the Dative case based on the form of the case suffixes. Meaning is not at all important for them. When we take meaning into consideration a lot of confusion arise because the Dative case suffixes *ku and -nu can come as Objective and Locative case suffixes. For example, see the following sentences:

(47) "naan ii saarikku uuuRu ruupa kotuttu
I this sari-to hyndred rupees gave
'I gave hundred rupees for this sari.'

(48) ii puuvinu nalla bhaamiyuntu
this flower-to good beauty is
'This flower is very beautiful.'

(49) aval can'taykku pooyi
she market-to went
'She went to the market.'
(50) avan kāṭtinu tatti
    he door-to knocked

*He knocked at the door*

saarikku in (47), puuvinu in (48), cantaykku in (49) are all Datives for Traditionalists but when we analyse semantically we can see that the first two are Locative cases. Similarly examine the following sentences also:

(51) raaman viRaku kootaalikku vetti
    Rama wood axe - with cut

*Rama cut the wood with the axe*

(52) avan pattu manikku varum
    he ten time-to come-will

*He will come at 10 o'clock*

kootaalikku in (51) and pattu manikku in (52) are Datives for Traditionalists. But actually the first one is Instrumental and the second one Time. So the Traditionalists' analysis seems not acceptable.
Platt (1971) argues that Fillmore's definition of Dative is unacceptable. He says that it is necessary to add 'usually' or 'typically' before animate and to modify 'animate being' to 'animate being or human institution'. He gives the following example in support of this (p. 24):

He endowed his school with a scholarship

Tom gave the hospital fund a cheque for $1,000

Platt says, "We know that the scholarship was endowed through some human recipient and that the school is an institution of human beings. We know, too, that the hospital fund is a human institution and that the money was probably handed or sent to a secretary" (p. 24).

The author claims that Fillmore's choice of the term Dative seems unfortunate as it cannot help but have connotations of indirect object. So he proposes another name - Participative.

Platt (1971) defines participative as follows:
"The grammatical meaning of the tag-meme indicating the animate being or human institution, not itself an agent which emotionally, mentally or sensually involved in the state or action identified by the verb" (p. 61).

He gives the following examples:

Fred likes hamburgers
George imitated Claude
Mary pointed out the cultural centre to Doris
Bloggs murdered a warder
Jack saw the film
Hentry knows the answer

The author says, "What is common to all these examples is that the person concerned is emotionally (as with Doris) involved in the state or action identified by the verb without being an agent. Whatever a person's religious beliefs, he will probably feel that a person who is murdered is mentally or sensually involved in the action" (p. 59).
In 1969 Fillmore used the term Experiencer instead of Dative. The Experiencer case is defined by Fillmore as:

"the entity which receives or accepts or experiences or undergoes the effect of the action" (p. 116).

According to the above definition 'Rama(Dat.)' and 'he' are Experiencers in the following sentences:

(53) raamanu pattu ruupa kitti
Rama-to ten rupees got

'Rama got ten rupees'

(54) ayaal nananūnud drenched
he

'He is drenched'

In 1971 Fillmore modified the above definition as follows:

"Where there is a genuine psychological event or mental state verb we have the Exper-
That means, Experiencer is the case of the NP that experiences a psychological event or mental state.

(55) siita peeticcupooyi
Sita became afraid
'Sita became afraid'

(56) avan niraasanaanu
he desperate is
'He is desperate'

Fillmore (1968a) mentions about another case called Benefactive also in connection with Dative (p. 32). Benefactive is concerned with the perceived beneficiary of an action or state. Fillmore (1968a) has suggested that both relations, that is, Experiencer and Benefactive can be subsumed under a heading such as Dative.

(57) acchan raamanu nnuku ruupa kotuttu
father Rama-to hundred rupees gave
'Father gave hundred rupees to Rama'
Here raamanu 'Rama(Dat.)' would be Benefactive as the money is given for the benefit of Rama.

Platt (1971) defines Benefactive as follows:

"If any physical item is given to any animate being or human institution with the intention of its becoming the alienable possession of that animate being or human institution then we can consider the animate being or human institution to whom it is given as having the grammatical meaning Benefactive" (p. 59).

Chafe (1971) suggests that Benefactive and Experiencer are different relations. He gives the following examples to prove his argument.

Tom is (or Tom's got) the tickets
Tom has (or Tom's got) a convertible
Tom owns a convertible

The author says, "...... Tom is not an Experiencer. No mental experience or dispo-
sition on Tom's part is involved in these sentences. Instead, there is a kind of "benefactive" situation in which Tom can be said (in a broad sense) to be the one who benefits from whatever is communicated by the rest of the sentence.

Aside from the apparent meaning difference between Experiencer and Beneficiary, the hypothesis that the two relations are distinct is supported by the fact that some languages represent them in different ways in surface structure" (pp. 147-48).

Taking all these facts into consideration, we shall check Fillmore's definition of Dative. Fillmore's definition has to be changed. Instead of several names like Dative, Experiencer, Benefactive etc., it is better to use a single name.

Just like in Dative, in Experiencer also there is a kind of affectedness that is mentally, emotionally, sentually or perceptually manifested. Similarly, Benefactive also is a kind of affectedness. When an action takes
place towards another person, the affected person may be benefited or not; in the former case it is Benefactive and in the latter it is considered to be Dative. So there is no need to use several names. We shall use a single name instead of the above three names. In all the three cases the person is affected in some way. Therefore we shall use a new name - Affective.

Affective can be defined as follows:

Affective case is the case of the typically animate being (or human institution noun) which is physically, mentally, sentimentally or emotionally affected by the action identified by the verb.

The Affective case can be of the following types:

1) Affected (may or may not be benefited) by the action.

(58) amma kuttiiye pathippikkunnu
    mother child(Acc.) teaches

'Mother teaches the child.'
(59) acchan raamane aticcu
father Rama(Acc.) beat

'Father beat Rama'

(2) Involved in the action unknowingly or caused to
involve in the action.

(60) aval avanRe valayil kutuññi
she he-of net-in trapped

'She fell into his net'

(61) ayaal avane aa kuuttattil akappetutti
he he(Acc.) that group-in got involved

'He got him involved in that group'

(3) Mentally affected due to some reason.

(62) avanRe samsaaram enne amparappiccu
he-of speech me(Acc.) suprised

'His way of talking surprised me'

(63) aa kaalcca kantu ṇaan andhaaliccupooyi
that sight by seeing I amazed

'I was amazed at that sight'

(4) Mentally, sensually, emotionally or perce-
ceptually involved in the action.
(64) siitaykku usnikkunnu
Sita - to feels hot
'Sita Feels hot'

(65) enikku visakkunnu
me - to hungry
'I feel hungry'

(66) avan ayaale kantu
he he (Acc.) saw
'He saw him'

(67) liila paattu keelkkunnu
Leela song hears
'Leela hears the song'

(5) Experiences the effect of an action.

(68) aval valare ksiiniccupooyi
she very became weak
'She became very weak'

(69) remaykku dukkham untu
Rema - to worry is
'Rema is worried'
(70) raaju marattilninnu viinu
Raju tree - from fell
'Raju fell from the tree'

(6) For psychological verbs like expect, remember, understand, forget, think etc. we use Affective.

(71) enikku atu manassilaayi
me - to that understood
'I understood that'

(72) vimala remaye marannuppooyi
Vimala Rema(Acc.) forgot
'Vimala forgot Rema'

(73) amma aloocikkunnu
mother thinks
'Mother thinks'

(74) enikku aa kaaryam oorma untu
me - to that matter rememberance is
'I remember that matter'

(7) For likes, dislikes, desires etc. Affective is used.
enikku avane istamaanu me - to he(Acc.) likeness is
'I like him'

(76) raadha sinima kaanaan aagra- hikkunnu
Radha film to see desires
'Radha desires to see the film'

siita ayaale veRukkunnu
Sita he(Acc.) hates
'Sita hates him'

(8) For knowledge, need etc. and for losing something Affective is used.

(78) revikku atu aRiyaam
Revi-to it knows
'Revi knows it'

(79) enikku aa saari veenam me - to that sari want
'I want that sari'

(80) raajuvinu aa pustakam nastappettu
Raju - to that book lost
'Raju lost that book'
(9) Receives or accepts something.

(81) raadhaykku pañam kitti
Radha-to money got
'

Radha got the money'

(82) acchanu ninRe kattu kitti
father-to you-of letter got
'

Father got your letter'

(10) Possession of something.

(83) avanu oru viiṭu untu
he-to one house is
'

He has a house'

(84) avalkku rantu kuttikal untu
she-to two children is
'

She has two children'

IV. Instrumental case

The Instrumental case is defined by Fillmore (1968a) as, "the case of the inanimate force or object causally involved in the state
or action identified by the verb" (p. 24).

See the following examples:

(85) revi cetti kattikontu vettil

Revi plant knife-with cut

'Revi cut the plant with the knife.'

(86) kutti sabdamkontu unarnnu

child sound - with awakened

'The child awakened due to the sound.'

(87) kottuBkaarrRu viitu takarttu

storm house destroyed

'The storm destroyed the house.'

Fillmore (1971, p. 251) identifies five kinds of Instrumental cases:

(a) A thing which the animal manipulates.

(88) raaman taakkoolkonto tuRannu

Rama key - with door opened

'Rama opened the door with the key.'

(b) A physical object which is the cause of an action.
The wind opened the door.

(c) Natural events which bring about some consequences.

The rain destroyed the crops.

(d) For psychological verbs the Instrumental identifies the stimulus.

His laughter frightened me.

(e) An Instrumental case can be an event itself.

Her arrival surprised me.

Paanini (1891) defines Instrumental case as follows:

"That which is especially auxilliary in the accomplishment of the action is called karana."
or Instrument" (p. 184).

Among Traditional Grammarians, the author of Liilaatilakam calls the Instrumental case as the Third Case. The suffixes noted by him are -otu, -aal and kontu (p. 84). For Gundert ((1851) 1962) Instrumental is triitiya and the suffixes are -aal and -kontu (pp. 142-148). Mathen ((1863) 1969) names Instrumental as pañcam and the suffix is -aal. According to Varma ((1895) 1978) Instrumental is prayojika and the suffix is -aal.

The Instrumental case is karaṇa kaaraka for Traditionalists. Varma gives two divisions for Instrumental - karaṇam (Instrument) and kaaraṇam (cause). Karaṇam is the cause of the action. The author thinks that it is better to use -aal to denote Instrument and -kontu to denote cause.

Fillmore's definition of Instrumental has several subdivisions. We shall combine all these divisions and try to propose a revised
definition as follows:

'Instrumental is the case of the animate being which acts as the causer or mediator of an action, or an instrument used as a tool for the action, or the stimulus of a psychological verb or the inanimate force or object causally involved in the state or action identified by the verb'.

(93) avalekontu naan matuttu
     she(Acc.)-with I fed up

'I am fed up with her'

(94) raajan kattikontu palam muRiccu
     Rajan knife-with fruit cut

'Rama cut the fruit with the knife'

(95) goopi reviyekontu aa kaaryam neeti
     Gopi Revi(Acc.)-with that matter obtained

'Gopi got that thing done through Revi'

(96) avalute oottam enne atisayippiccu
     she-of running me(Acc.) astonished

'Her running astonished me'
Fillmore (1968a) defines Objective case as, "the semantically most neutral case, the case of anything representable by a noun, whose role in the action or state identified by the verb is identified by the semantic interpretation of the verb itself, conceivably the concept should be limited to things which are affected by the action or state identified by the verb. The term is not to be confused with direct object or with the name of the surface case synonymous with Accusative" (p. 25).

In 1969, Fillmore defines it as, "the entity that moves or changes or whose position or existence is in consideration" (p. 116).

In 1971, he defines it as, "the object case is that of the entity which moves or
which undergoes changes and I will use it as a waste basket. Sentences embedded to objects can serve to identify, for example, the content of a psychological event as with the verbs of judging or imagining" (p. 251).

In the following examples, paatham 'lesson', maavu 'mango tree' and saarikal 'sarees' etc. are Objectives.

(98) usa paatham vaayikkunnu
Usha lesson reads

'Usha reads the lesson'

(99) maavu puuttu
mango tree flowered

'The mango tree flowered'

(100) amma saarikal nanakkunnu
mother saris washes

'Mother washes the saris'

Paanini's karma kaaraka can be compared with Fillmore's Objective case. Paanini defines karma kaaraka as, "that which it is
intended should be most affected by the act of the agent is called karma or object" (p. 186).

There are some differences between Paanini’s karma kaaraka and Fillmore’s Objective case. Fillmore’s Objective case should be limited to things which are affected by the action and if the affected is an animate being, then it should be Experiencer. But for Paanini animate as well as inanimate can come as karma, and it is represented by Accusative case.

Fillmore’s Objective case can be correlated to Traditionalists’ karma kaaraka. Mathen ((1863) 1969) defines karma as, “one who does the action” (p. 73). Karma kaaraka is represented by dvitiiya by Gundert ((1851) 1962) and Mathen. For Varma ((1895) 1978) "the result (phala) of the verb pertain to karma" and it is representable by pratigraaha-hika vibhakti (Accusative case) (p. 183).
For Traditional grammarians there is no animate-inanimate distinction in the case of karma kaaraka whereas for Fillmore inanimate things only can come as Objective case.

Fillmore (1968a) mentions about another case called Factitive in connection with objective. The Factitive case is defined as follows:

"The case of the object or being resulting from the action or state identified by the verb" (p. 25).

(101) vinu uttaram kantupiticcu
      Vinu answer found out

'Vinu found out the answer'

(102) liila paattu paati
      Leela song sang

'Leela sang the song'

In (1969) Factitive is replaced with Resultative and it is defined as,
"the entity that comes into existence as a result of the action" (p.116).

But in 1971 the elimination of Factitive/Resultative as a distinct case category has been proposed.

"Since the Goal case is used to indicate the later stage or the end result of some action or change it can absorb what I used to call 'Resultative' or 'Factitive', that is, it specifies the end result of the action identified by the predicator as in 'I wrote a poem' or 'I constructed a bridge'" (PP.251-252).

Actually there is no need to propose separate cases like Factitive/Resultative. All these can be included in Objective.

Now we shall examine Fillmore's definition of Objective. There seems to be a bit of confusion about it. First he says, the Objective case is semantically neutral. Then says it can be represented by any noun whose role
in the action of the verb is identified by the semantic interpretation of the verb itself. Then he says that it should be limited to things which are affected by the verb.

It is not clear from the definition whether inanimate objects alone can occur in the Objective case. Animate-inanimate distinction is not mentioned in his definition. But he pointed out that it should be limited to things which are affected by the action of the verb. From this we can guess that inanimate objects affected by the action of the verb should be Objective. He has already proposed that animate beings affected by the action should be Dative. Then, what about animate beings unaffected by the action of the verb? Nothing has been mentioned about it in the definition. They are to be included in the Objective case. Then there remains the inanimate things not affected by the action of the verb. So the affected as well as unaffected inanimate objects and the unaffected animate beings are
to be treated as Objective.

(103) enikku avane aRiyaam
me-to he(Acc.) know

'I know him'

(104) naan avale oorttu
I she(Acc.) thought

'I thought of her'

(105) siita paalu kaaccunnu
Sita milk boils

'Sita boils the milk'

(106) raaman maram muRikkunnu
Rama tree cuts

'Rama cuts the tree'

(107) raaju sinima kantu
Raju film saw

'Raju saw the film'

(108) avan oru sabdam keettu
he one sound heard

'He heard a sound'
In the above sentences, avane 'he (Acc.)' in (103) and avale 'she (Acc.)' in (104) are unaffected animate beings and paalu 'milk' in (105) and maram 'tree' in (106) are affected inanimate objects and sinima 'film' in (107) and oru sabdam 'one sound' in (108) are unaffected inanimate objects.

Considering all these we shall modify the definition of Objective as follows:

'The Objective case is the case of the inanimate thing affected or unaffected by the action or the animate being unaffected by the action or state identified by the verb.'

VI. Locative case

Fillmore (1968a) defines the Locative case as, "the case which identifies the location or spatial orientation of the state or action identified by the verb" (p. 25). In the following sentences skuulil 'in the school', kuppiyil 'in the bottle', patițṇṇaaRu 'in the west' are Locatives.
The play began in the school.

Rema poured water into the bottle.

The sun sets in the west.

Pāṇini (1891), the Traditional Sanskrit Grammarian, defines Locative case as, "that which is related to the action as the site where the action is performed by reason by the agent or the object being in that place is called adhikaraṇa or Locative" (p. 185).

The conception of adhikaraṇa in Pāṇini has a wider scope than Fillmore's Locative. There are differences between Fillmore's Locative and that of Pāṇini. Pāṇini considers Ablative as a separate case whereas Fillmore includes...
Ablative in Locative. Fillmore's Locative does not include Time which is also included in adhikarama of Sañini.

The Traditional Grammarians like Gundert Mathen and Varma consider Locative case as the Seventh case. Gundert and Mathen call it as saptami whereas Varma names it as aadhaarika.

Gundert ((1851) 1962) says that saptami indicates Location and he has given the case markers as -il, -kal, -attu, -ite, -uute etc and akam, meel, kiilu etc. as Locative clitics (pp. 165-176).

Mathen ((1863) 1969) defines Locative case as the place where the action or the result of the action takes place (p. 86). According to him Locative case indicates location, time and comparison and -il is the marker. He says that besides -il there are forms like -attu, -kal etc. He states that the sentences which usually occur with a place of action need a Locative marker in their nouns.
Varma ((1895) 1978) names the seventh case as aadharaika. He has given two markers—-il and -kal, but says that these two differ slightly in their meaning. He derives -il from illam and -kal from -kan of Tamil. According to him Locative case indicates time and place of the verb. He states that Locative case + -e will indicate the meaning that which is in it.

kaattile aana 'elephant of the forest'

ii maasatte sambalam 'The salary of this month'

taaloottu 'downwards' and vellattileeeykku 'to the water' can be considered as Locative + Sociative and vellattileeykku 'to the water' as Locative + Dative.

Cases combined with gatis or particles are called by the name misravibhaktis (mixed cases) by Varma.

atiluute 'through it'

Varma mentions about vibhaktyaabhaasas
(quasicases) in Locative case. For example, the Locative case suffix -kal is not used in plural nouns; even in singular, it is not added to all nouns. Such forms are called khilas.

aaRRinnal (a place name)

In nouns denoting Time and place the actual aadhaarika (-il) may be omitted and the mere stems used instead after making the necessary changes like converting the augment -am to -attu, doubling the terminal -t- etc. The mere stem also is used if no other change is necessary.

duuram (distance) > duurattu (at a distance)

In koolikkottu vannu 'came to Calicut' the terminal -t- of koolikkottu is duplicated and -il suffix is omitted. anneeram 'at that time' does not contain any suffix at all, though it is aadhaarika in meaning. All these forms are called by the name luptas by Varma.

Sometimes the Locative suffix -il and the Dative suffix -ku are combined to form a compound
case. Such forms are termed as doubling by Varma (p. 180).

\[ \text{vellattileeykku} \quad \text{'into the water'} \]

'e' is added for euphony.

Fillmore's definition of Locative is generally acceptable, but it seems, a more clear-cut definition is required. So we can modify the definition as follows:

'The Locative case indicates the place where an action takes place, the place where an inanimate object or an animate being present or the location or direction at which an action is performed'.

(112) avan skuulil baalu kalikkunnu
      he school-in ball plays

'He plays football in the school'

(113) pustakam meesappuRattu irikkunnu
      book table-over sit

'The book is on the table'
raaman kollattu untu
Rama Quilon-in is
'Ram is in Quilon'

kappal nadikku kilakku etti
ship river-to east reached
'The ship reached on the eastern part of the river'

pakshi mukalileeykku parannu
bird up - towards flew
'The bird flew upwards'

The Traditional Grammarians consider the directive suffix -ileeykku as compound case of Locative and Dative but Fillmore includes directive in Locative.

"The list of cases includes L but nothing corresponding to what might be called directional. There is a certain amount of evidence, as was mentioned above, that locational and directional elements do not contrast but are superficial differences determined either
by the constituent structure or the character of the associated verb" (1968a, p. 25).

Fillmore (1971) mentions about two cases like Source and Goal which are defined as follows:

"Source is the starting point of the movement of an object in the case of verbs of movement and it is the starting state of the object which undergoes the change in the case of the verbs which show change of state" (p. 259).

(117) raaman viittilninnu varunnu
Rama house-from comes
'Rama comes from home'

"Goal is the endpoint of the movement of an object in the case of the movement verbs and it identifies the final stage into which an object develops in the case of verbs which show the physical transformation of an object" (p. 259).

(118) ayaal kallu kulattileeykku eRinnu
he stone pond - towards threw
'He threw the stone towards the pond'
That is, Source is the place from which something moves and Goal is the place to which something moves, or in other words, Source is the starting point and Goal is the end point.

Fillmore has taken Source and Goal as subdivisions of Locative. We shall try to answer the following questions:

i. Is there any need to take separate cases like Source and Goal?

ii. Can we include both of these in Locative as subdivisions of it?

iii. Can we consider both Source and Goal as Locative?

(119) pantu tarayilinnu mukalileeykku
ball floor - from up - towards
kuticcu jumped

'The ball bounded upwards from the ground'

(120) raaman marattilinnu taaleeykku caati
Rama tree - from down - towards jumped

'Rama jumped downwards from the tree'
These examples show that both Source and Goal comes in the same sentence and also in separate sentences. Only one of them or both of them can occur in a sentence. So if we consider these two as Locative there will be confusion because a case category can occur only once in a simple sentence. So in avan marattinRe mukalilninnu taaleeykku caati 'he jumped from
the top of the tree towards water there will be two Locatives. This is impossible. Also, there is no need to take them as separate cases. It is better if we can reduce the number of cases. Therefore we can consider Source and Goal as subdivisions of Locative. In the above sentence marattinRe mukalilninnu 'from the top of the tree' is Source and vellattileeykku 'towards the water' is Goal.

VII. Time

It is a case which identifies the time at which an action takes place.

Fillmore (1968a) has mentioned about Time (p. 32). In 1971 he takes Time as a separate case.

(124) avar aARu manikku viittilninnu tiriccu they six time-to house-from started

'SAt 6 0' clock they started from the house'

(125) siita vaikittu viittil etti Sita in the evening house-in reached

'Sita reached house in the evening'
(226) samayam kalinnu
    time over
' The time is over'

(127) avan innale vannu
    he yesterday came
' He came yesterday'

In the above sentences aaRu manikku 'at 6 o'clock', vaikattu 'in the evening', samayam 'time' and innale 'yesterday' are Time.

The Traditional Grammarians included Time under Locative. It is also included under other cases also based on the form of the suffixes. See the following examples:

(128) aval raatriyil uRaññiyilla
    she night-in sleep - not
'She didn't sleep in the night'

(129) raaman ñcu manikku varum
    Rama five time-to come-will
'Rama will come at 5 o'clock'
(130) aval uccaykku pooyi
she noon-to went

'She went at noon'

(131) siita neerattotu neeram aahaaram
Sita time-with time food
kalikkum
eat-will

'Sita will eat the food at the correct time'

(132) malakkaalam vannu
rainy season came

'The rainy season came'

(133) ii teñnu ancu varsam konto kaaykkum
this cocunut five year-with bear will tree
fruit

'This cocunut tree will bear fruit within five years'

Time cannot be included under Locative because Time can occur in sentences in which Locative occurs. So we have to take Time as a separate case.
FOOTNOTES

1. Fillmore (1968a) says, "Since I know no way of dealing with inanimate nouns, occurring as agents, I shall just assume for all agents that they are animate" (p. 24).

2. Varrier (1970) argues that Directive should be taken as a separate case. He gives the following arguments in support of this:

i. The distributions of the Dative marker in its 'non-directive' sense are different from its distributions in the 'directive' meaning.

ii. The Locative marker appears in the directive sense only with motion verbs.

    He gives the following examples:

    avar viittil pooyi
    they house-in went

    'They went to the house'

    iviteninnu kooleegileeykku etra duuram untu?
    here-from college-towards how much distance

    'How much is the distance from here to the college?'

iii. '-oottu' can never be included either with Locative or with Dative as it has only directional meaning.

    Now consider the first argument. The
following examples prove that the Dative marker in the non-directive sense and in the directive sense, sometimes, comes in the same context.

avan enRe talayileeykku oru eeRu
he me-of head-towards one throw

"He threw towards my head"

avan enRe talaykku oru eeRu
he me-of head-to one throw

"He threw on my head"

miin karaykku kayaRi
fish shore-to

"The fish came to the shore"

miin karayileeykku kayaRi
fish shore-towards

"The fish came towards the shore"

The following examples show that with non-action verbs also the Locative marker appears in the directive sense.

ayaal enRe mukhattu oru noottam
he me-of face-at one look

"He looked at my face"

ayaal enRe mukhatteeykku oru noottam
he me-of face-towards one look

"He looked towards my face"

The present work attempts to reduce the number of cases. It seems, there is no need to consider directive as a separate case. It can be included in Locative (Directional Locative).