Annie Montaut

On the Non-Lexical Categories of *avyay* 'Invariables' and Their Grammaticalization in Pahari Languages, with a Comparison to Standard Hindi

आनी मोंतो

पहाड़ी भाषाओं में सहायक कोटियों के रूप में अव्ययों का व्याकरणीकरण और मानक हिंदी के साथ उनकी तुलना

Abstract Non-lexical categories of uninflected elements are usually only listed in Pahari grammars without much explanation. In such lists, conjunctions, coordinators and discourse particles (*to, hī*) are packed together with lexical elements such as adverbs (*ab, kal*) and interjections (*are, hāy*) under the Sanskrit umbrella term *avyay*. Similarly, adpositions are also barely listed after the well-developed sections on nouns. Grammatical elements are however most of the time connected to other functional or lexical words in the language, and the story of their grammaticalization itself is of great significance for understanding the relations between the given language and cognate or neighbouring languages. As a matter of fact, the grammaticalization process is all the more interesting in so-called dialects, as standardization has been less variation-suppressive than in the so-called major languages: dialects, particularly those close to the regional major language they 'belong' to, are then the best standpoint for looking at the grammaticalization in major languages, since they are a kind of language sanctuary, where variation is preserved.

This article bears on this understudied aspect, with special reference to the so-called Central Pahari (Garhwali and Kumaoni) in relation to Standard Hindi, showing that the very diversity of forms can help to understand the nature and evolution of the equivalent material in Standard Hindi. Our theoretical framework combines historical grammar, theories of grammaticalization, functionalist typology, and occasionally contact linguistics.

Keywords case markers, diachrony of postpositions, Garhwali and Hindi dialects, quotative.

सारांश आम तौर पर पहाड़ी भाषाओं के व्याकरणों में अव्यय या *uninflected elements* बिना किसी व्याख्या के केवल एक सूची के रूप में प्रस्तुत किए जाते हैं। इन सूचियों में समुच्चय बोधक (*तो, ही*), क्रिया-विशेषण (*अब, कल*), विस्मयबोधक (*अरे, हाय*) आदि को संस्कृत के पारिभाषिक शब्द "अव्यय" के अंतर्गत ही प्रस्तुत किया जाता है। इसी प्रकार से, परसर्ग भी संज्ञाओं की विस्तृत व्याख्या के बाद एक सूची भर के रूप में ही दिए जाते हैं। व्याकरणिक तत्व अकसर भाषा के अन्य क्रियात्मक या कोश-विषयक शब्दों से संबंधित होते हैं और किसी भाषा के सजाति या भौगोलिक रूप से नज़दीकी दूसरी भाषाओं से संबंध को समझने के लिए उनके व्याकरणीकरण का इतिहास बहुत महत्व रखता है। असल में बोलियों में व्याकरणीकरण की प्रक्रिया और भी रुचिकर होती है क्योंकि बोलियों का मानकीकरण मुख्य कही जाने वाली भाषाओं की तुलना में कम विविधता निषेधात्मक होता है। बोलियाँ, विशेष रूप से जो क्षेत्रीय संबद्ध भाषा के समीप होती हैं मुख्य भाषाओं में व्याक-रणीकरण को समझने का सर्वश्रेष्ठ दृष्टिकोण प्रदान करती क्योंकि वे एक ऐसा भाषा अभ्यारण्य हैं जिनमें विविधता संरक्षित होती है।

यह लेख इस अल्पअध्यायित (अध्ययनाधीन) पहलू के बारे में है। मध्य पहाड़ी भाषाओं (गढ़वाली और कुमाऊँनी) और मानक हिंदी के विशेष संदर्भ में, यह दर्शाता है कि रूपों की विविधता हमें मानक हिंदी में समकक्ष सामग्री की प्रकृति और उद्भव को समझने में मदद दे सकती है। इस लेख में प्रस्तुत सैद्धांतिक संरचना ऐतिहासिक व्याकरण, व्याकरणिककरण के सिद्धांत, क्रियात्मक वर्गीकरण और संपर्क भाषाविज्ञान को संघटित करता है।

मुख्य शब्द – कारक सूचक चिह्न, परसर्गों का ऐतिहासिक उद्गम, व्याकरणिककरण, गढ़वाली की हिंदी से तुलना, क्वोटेटिव।

1 Introduction: scope and goal of the paper

1.1 Garhwali language in its linguistic and cultural environment

Garhwali is an Indian living language with twofold gender distinction, spoken by about 3 million people in the Western part of Uttarakhand (including important speaking communities in Himachal Pradesh, Haryana and Punjab).[1] Although it is noncontroversially considered an Indo-Aryan language, naturally incorporating non-Indo-Aryan words, as do all other IA languages including Sanskrit, another opinion exists outside of the milieu of linguists. In some non-professional essays in the social media platforms of Uttarakhand, Garhwali is deemed not related to Sanskrit or Vedic, and having no more relation to them than a reciprocal one: Old Garhwali or Kumaoni, the Khas languages, had, as stated in the essay, been the

---

1 It is, however, difficult to correctly estimate the number of speakers (whether of L1 or L2), as mentioned in Ethnologue: linguistic activists tend to overestimate the numbers while the UNESCO report on endangered languages gives hardly more than 500 000 speakers, see *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger* by Moseley (2010).

instrument of lexical creation in Sanskrit.[2] That may, of course, appear an exaggerated vision for any IA language, whose syntax and lexicon share more with OIA than with any substrate. But the reasons given by the author are quite interesting since his wish to dissociate non-standardized languages, such as Garhwali, from a codified language fixed by literary or religious canons (hence unchangeable and as such unable to give birth to any language) points to a reality: standardized modern languages represent in his terms a "cauterization" of the living proliferation of spontaneous continuous creativity which is typical of "dialects" of all times.

Garhwali is deemed vigorous and developing by Ethnologue, with a positive attitude among its speakers, although many might object that the turn to Hindi in the younger generation suggests a not so positive attitude. The UNESCO *Atlas of World Languages in Danger* (Moseley 2010) mentions it, on the contrary, as rapidly shrinking and classifies it in the "unsafe" category, and the UNESCO Silk Road Programme estimates the number of speakers at 279 500.[3] My own field observations lead me to the same conclusion (apart from language activists who obviously exhibit strong linguistic pride, most speakers grant the topmost status to English, followed by Hindi).

A non-written language until recently, Garhwali is now enjoying a number of publications, including creative writing (fiction and poetry) and cultural publications such as the magazine *Dhād*, founded in 1971 by linguistic activists.

The many similarities of Garhwali and Rajasthani are consistent with Garhwal's political history since the influence of migrated Rajputs has deeply impacted the local (Khasa) culture and language; "a somewhat corrupted form of Rajasthani", says Grierson (1916: 279).

As any minor language considered a dialect, Garhwali offers interesting interactions with the local material culture, which can also be considered endangered, and with it the precious knowledge of the local environment and biodiversity.[4]

---

2   "Vedic Sanskrit or Sanskrit Are not Mother of Garhwali and Kumaoni Languages", reversely Old Garhwali and Khas languages can be regarded as mothers of Vedic and Sanskrit (Kukreti s.d.).

3   UNESCO Silk Road Program.

4   The same is of course true for lexical elements, particularly those related to traditional labor, tools and natural environment, and many scholars have dealt with this aspect of "eco-linguistic" conservation (starting with David Harmond's "Losing Species, Losing Languages: Connections between Biological and Linguistic Diversity" (1996) and Peter Mühlhäusler's "The Interdependence of Linguistic and Biological Diversity" (1995). It is necessary to mention the great works of Anupam Miśra (1993; 1998) on the cultures and languages related to water conservation: *Rājasthān kī rajat bū̃dẽ* (The Radiant Raindrops of Rajasthan) and *Āj bhī khaṛe haĩ tālāb* (The Lakes are Still Alive). Nettle and Romaine (2000: 166) write, "Delicate tropical environments in particular must be managed with care and skill. It is indigenous peoples who have the relevant practical knowledge, since they have been successfully making a living in them for

The corpus used for this study includes notes from four sessions of fieldwork carried out between 1997 and 2016 in Srinagar, Pauri, Dehradun, and Western Kumaon (the examples from the field research are not referenced), as well as the available collections of Garhwali epics (*lokgāthāẽ*) and folksongs (*lokgīt*), such as Bābulkar 1996, Nauṭiyāl 1996 and Cātak 2000. Section 2 analyses the main case markers in core functions, other case markers are considered in section 3, and the less discussed marker *bal* in section 4.

1.2 Grammatical words within the wider category *avyay* ('invariables') or uninflected items

Why should we focus on grammatical elements rather than adverbs or interjections, and, among grammatical items, why on adpositions and the quotative marker rather than on other conjunctions, coordinating or subordinating?

The main reason why interjections have been excluded from this study is that they convey also, maybe mainly, onomatopoeic features, and thus would require a different methodology, including tools for dealing with sound symbolism and expressivity (Dingemanse 2012). Furthermore, they differ not so much from Hindi, whose properties are contrasted with the Garhwali facts in this study. Also most particles are the same as those used in Hindi, the reason why they will be only briefly alluded to below: Hindi *to* for instance is conveyed by its Garhwali cognate *ta* in most of its uses, both as a conjunction ('then', 'so'), a resumptive in the correlative system and as a discourse particle with a contrastive and topicalizing meaning… < Skt. *tavat*, commented in Montaut (2016 b). An exception has to be made for *bal*, unknown in Hindi, which is sometimes classified as a discourse particle (*vācak avyay* Cātak 1966: 139–141) and sometimes as a case marker (Jośī 2011: 13), but is closer to the meaning and behaviour of evidential markers in languages that have them. It will be studied in the last section.

Adverbs are a more interesting category for they sometimes radically differ from Hindi; as a class, however, they offer fewer opportunities for studying the various paths of grammaticalization, which is the main goal of this paper. An example of such striking difference is the creation of time adverbials: the well-known use of the same word in Hindi for referring to 'tomorrow' and 'yesterday'

hundreds of generations. Much of this detailed knowledge about local ecosystems is encoded in indigenous languages and rapidly being lost". Mühlhäusler (2003: 60) describes how "[t]he rapid decline in the world's linguistic diversity thus must be regarded with apprehension by those who perceive the interconnection between linguistic and biological diversity".

is not attested in Garhwali; it is also unknown in many Indian languages including Indo-Aryan languages,[5] such as Dakkhini Hindi/Urdu or Bengali. The fact that Garhwali displays the two distinct words *byāle/byālī* 'yesterday' and *bhoḷ/bhow* 'tomorrow'[6] points to the originality of Hindi and closely related languages (Urdu, Punjabi), which use the same word *kal* (< Skt. *kalyam* 'at daybreak').

Conjunctions introducing subordinate clauses, such as *ki* 'that' and complex conjunctions including it (*kyõki* 'because', *tāki* 'in order to') are common in modern Garhwali, as in modern Hindi, but quite rare in traditional Garhwali where the correlative system prevails as in Old Indo-Aryan (OIA). Even the hypothetic system (*jũ ... ta ...*, equivalent to the Skt. basic correlative structure *ya-... ta-*)[7] is less frequent in Modern Garhwali than the all-purpose *cā/jā* (< *cāhe*) 'if, whether'. Correlation, according to Minard (1936), was the only device in Old Indo-Aryan equivalent to the modern subordinating system, with the basis *ya-* (> MIA and NIA *j-*) in the first member of the diptych and the resumptive pronominal basis *ta-* in the second one, with various endings depending on the meaning of the relation. This system is still echoed in Modern Hindi's correlative devices with a renewal of resumptive *ta-* as *va-* (*jab ... tab* 'when', *jahã ... tahã / vahã* 'where', *jo ... vah* 'who', *jaise ... vaise* 'such as', *jitnā -...- utnā* 'as big/numerous as', while properly strictly subordinating devices are borrowed from Persian; they all include the all-purpose complementizer *ki* 'that' (*cũki* 'since', *tāki* 'so that', *hālã̃ki* 'even if, although').

Coordinating conjunctions are the same in Garhwali and Hindi (*ar/aur* 'and' < Skt. *aparam*, *avaram*), except *dī* 'and', possibly derived from *ādi* 'etc., and others',[8] which is occasionally substituted with *ar* in Garhwali.

---

5   The fact that Dakkhini uses *sabã̃* for 'tomorrow' as distinct from *kal* for 'yesterday' has often been interpreted as a calque from Dravidian neighboring languages, which all have two different words.

6   *Byālī* is generally derived from MI *viāla* < Skt. *vikāla* 'evening' (Turner 1966), or alternately derived from Skt. **vibhāne* 'shining.loc' > *vihāne* (Cātak 1966: 137); *bhol* is derived by Turner (1966) from OI * *bhōlā/bhōrā* 'daybreak', and by Cātak (1966: 137) from the attributive phrase containing the future passive participle of *bhū* 'to become, be' and the noun 'time' *bhavya velā*. See the Hindi word *bayalu* 'leftover from yesterday' referring to the breakfast which comprises of food leftover from the previous night, a possible borrowing from Garhwali, according to Anvita Abbi – whom I thank for the remark.

7   See for instance *jū tū nī kardo ta maĩ karlū* (if 2SG NEG do.PRS.2SG then 1SG do.FUT.1SG) 'If you do not do [it], I will do [it]'. In Old Hindi also and up to the 20th century, 'if' was expressed by *jo* (< Apabhramsha *jau*) and *jo* still occurs in this function in Modern Hindi.

8   *tū dī maĩ jaulā* [2SG and 1SG go.FUT.PL] 'You and me will go' (Cātak 1966: 139).

1.3 State of the art

Descriptions of the Garhwali language are not very many and are all in Hindi but some of them provide very useful comments, particularly the first fully-fledged one, *Gaṛhvālī vyākaraṇ kī rūp rekhā* by Abodh Baṃdhu Bahuguṇa published in 1960, followed by Govind Cātak's pioneering work *Madhya pahāṛī kā bhāṣāśāstrīy adhyayan* (Linguistic Study of Central Pahari) published in 1966, with many reprints up to now. Goviṃd Juyāl published in 1967 a comparative grammar of Central Pahari (Garhwali and Kumaoni) and Hindi, *Madhya pahāṛī bhāṣā (gaṛhvālī kumaonī) kā anuśīlan aur uskā hindī se saṃbaṃdh*, also quite enlightening. The latest Garhwali grammar I have been able to consult is Rajnī Kukretī's *Gaṛhvālī vyākaraṇ*, published in 2010, rich in examples and contemporary uses, yet unfortunately lacking in scholarly references and ignoring the work done by previous scholars. The closely related language Kumaoni has been magistrally described by D. D. Sharma in his two volumes *The Formation of Kumauni Language* (1987), a most useful companion for the study of Garhwali too.

Besides these specialized works, more general grammars, particularly those with a diachronic perspective, most of them provided by the best philologists of the earlier generation, also mention Garhwali forms. Prior to them, the pioneering Hindi grammar published in 1876 by Reverend Samuel Henry Kellogg covered the entire range of regional languages along with "High Hindi" and lavishly drew from early Hindi: this *Grammar of the Hindi Language*, significantly subtitled, "In which are Treated the Standard Hindí, Braj, and the Eastern Hindí of the Rámáyan of Tulsí Dás, Also the Colloquial Dialects of Marwar, Kumaon, Avadh, Baghelkhand, Bhojpur, Etc.; with Copious Philological Notes". Among the best philological works, initiated by the magistral *Origin and Development of Bengali Language* by Suniti Kumar Chatterji (1926, many times reprinted), are Udaynārāyaṇ Tivārī's historical description of Hindi grammar (*Hindī bhāṣā kā udgam aur vikās*, first published in 1955), which gives reliable information about case markers from all the languages of the Hindi belt; Baburam Saksena's description of Awadhi (1937); Hardev Bāhrī's work on the so-called "dialects" of Hindi *Grāmīṇ Hindī boliyā̃* (1966) is also a useful tool.

Many presentations of the Garhwali culture and literature also frequently provide a grammatical sketch of the language and an introduction to its history, such as 'Sailesh' Bhaṭṭ's *Gaṛhvālī bhāṣā aur uskā sāhitya* (Garhwali Language and Literature), published in 1976, or Janārdan Prasād Kālā's *Gaṛhvālī bhāṣā aur uskā lok sāhitya* (Garhwali Language and Folklore, 1959).

2 Main case markers

What will be meant by "main" in this section are the most frequent forms for marking the functional cases, that is, those conveying core grammatical functions,[9] such as ergative, dative/object/experiencer, ablative/instrumental and locative. Equivalents of Hindi *ke lie* 'for' marking beneficiaries are for instance not considered as "main" case markers for dative, nor equivalents of Hindi *par* 'on', *ke ūpar* 'above', *ke nīce* 'under', *ke bīc mẽ* 'inside', *ke pās* 'close, near' for locative, *ke sāth* 'with' for comitative. These markers will be discussed in the next section. Phonetic variations will also be left aside in the simplified presentation below and will be studied in the subsection dealing with etymology. In this way, Table 1 (from Cātak 1966: 100), with the addition of some forms present in Grierson's samples (1916: 300ff), presenting a huge proliferation of forms, can be simplified as presented in Table 2, by dispensing with the merely phonetic variants as well as the less frequent forms or forms used for non-grammatical cases. The discussion in the next subsection will be mainly based on this simplified table.

Table 1 The main case markers in Garhwali.

Function	Form
Ergative/Agent (*kartā*)	*na/la*
Accusative/Patient (*karm*)	*ka, ku, kū, kaĩ, saṇī, haṇī, gaṇī, kaṇī, khuṇī, chanaĩ, taĩ, thaĩ*
Instrument(al), cause (*karaṇ*)	*na, -n, se, sī, tī*
Dative (*sampradān*)	*kaĩ, taĩ, tāĩ̃, taĩ, thaĩ, laĩ, laii* (लैइ), *lāĩ̃, ka, saṇī, haṇī, gaṇī, kaṇī, khuṇī, kū, caĩ*
Ablative (*apādān*)	*na, tī, te, taĩ, biṭe, baṭī, se, sī, paran*[10]
Genitive (*saṃbaṃdh*)	*ko, kā, kī, rū, rā, rī, no*
Locative (*adhikaraṇ*)	*par, mā, mu, mang, māje, tanaĩ, mathe, undū*

---

9 The issue of how abstract a grammatical case is, how much 'concrete' meaning remains in dative or ablative will be deliberately ignored in this section and left open until the discussion of grammaticalization paths. Strictly speaking only the ergative could be properly regarded as a grammatical or functional (abstract) case, and it could even be argued that transitivity in Indo-Aryan languages is largely semantic. As for the accusative, it is well known that not all direct objects are marked, and that the marking is largely sensitive to discourse factors.

10 Equivalent of Hindi *par se* (periphrastic ablative).

Table 2 The most frequent forms of the main case markers in Garhwali.

Agent (*kartā*)	*na*
Patient (*karm*)	*ku, saṇī, khuṇī, taĩ*
Dative (*saṃprādān*)	*ku, saṇī, khuṇī, taĩ*
Instrument/cause (*karaṇ*)	*na, sī, tī*
Ablative (*apādān*)	*na, sī, tī, baṭī/biṭe*
Genitive *(saṃbaṃdh)*	*ko, rū, kar*
Locative (*adhikaraṇ*)	*mã*

2.1 Use of case markers

2.1.1 Ergative/instrumental

A striking difference with Hindi is the distribution of the agent (ergative) marker (1a–b), which also occurs in Garhwali as an instrumental, conveying the meaning 'cause' (2a) or 'means' (2b), and even as an ablative (3), whereas Hindi would display the instrumental *se* in the latter examples (Hindi parallels are given between square brackets for the sake of comparison):

(1a) *mi=na   ū   duī   (ū̃ duyū̃ thaĩ)   khujyāi*
1SG=ERG 3PL two   (3PL two ACC) search.AOR [11]
[H. *maĩ=ne un donõ ko khojā*]
'I looked for these two.'

(1b) *ve=na   satū saṇī ve   talau mã ḍāl   dinyā*
3SG=ERG sattu ACC that lake   in   throw give.AOR
[H. *us=ne sattū ko us jhīl mẽ ḍāl diyā*]
'He threw the sattu (ground barley or rice) in the lake.' (Grierson 1916: 287)

---

11 The ending -*i/ī* (sometimes -*e*) is an invariable tense marker for simple past (definite past or preterit or aorist) which will be glossed as AOR and not by the more usual PFV since it is not really a marker for perfectivity (Montaut 2016c). Personal endings also optionally occur in this tense (-*au* for 1st person, *ān* for plural 3rd person, etc.). Abbreviations other than the standard ones used: HONOUR for Honorific, GRD for Gerund, PRSUMP for the Presumptive mood; H. for Hindi, U. for Urdu. Postpositions are transliterated according to the way as they are written in the Devanagari texts and glossed as separate words after nouns and as clitics after pronouns (and many nouns in Garhwali). Examples indicated without source are from personal field notes.

(2a) *bhūk=an   mare*   [H. *bhūkh se mare*]
hunger=INS   die.AOR.3PL
'They died (because) of hunger.' (Cātak 1966: 101)

(2b) *dātu=n   khãda*   [H. *dãtõ se khātā hai*]
teeth=INS   eat.PRS.3SG
'He eats with (his) teeth.' (ibid)

(3) *vakh=an   āe*   [H *vahã se āyā*]
here=ABL   come.AOR
'He came from there.' (ibid)

Both functions, instrumental and agent, can occur in the same clause:

(4) *mi=na   nauno   (naunā saṇī)   bẽṭ   na   māri*
1SG=ERG   child   (child ACC)   cane   INS   strike.AOR
[H. *maĩ=ne bacce   ko   bẽṭ   se   mārā*]
'I hit the boy with a cane.'[12]

As in Hindi, ergative agents have the referential properties of subjects: they clearly control reflexivation and converb constructions; thorough research has yet to be done on the topic.

(5) *jai=na   o   apṇā   khetu   mā   bhejyo*
REL=ERG   3SG[13]   REFL   field   in   send.AOR
[H *jis=ne   use   apne   khet   mẽ   bhejā*]
'Who sent him to his field.' (Grierson 1916: 284)

A peculiarity of Garhwali (6a) and Kumaoni (6b) contrasting with Standard Hindi/ Urdu (6c) is the use of the ergative marker for obligation, which will be dealt with in a more detailed way in section 3.

(6a) *maĩ=na (maĩ-la)   ājj   barat   rakhṇa*
(6b) *maĩ=le   āj   barat   rakhṇa*
1SG=ERG   today   fast   keep.INF
'I have to fast today.'

---

12 The past form is either invariable (*-i/-e*), as in Kumaoni (*-e*), or variable, see (1b) and (5). Grierson for the same contents gives the sentence *maĩ=n nauno bẽṭ-an māre* (1916: 300).

13 Note the absence of the accusative marker, although the pronoun has a human reference, in contrast with Hindi.

(6c) *mujhe   āj   vrat   rakhnā   hai*   H/U
     1SG.DAT today fast   keep.INF is
     'I have to fast today.'

The same peculiarity has been noticed in Hindi/Urdu (H/U) of the Punjab, where the ergative marker *ne* alternates with the dative marker *ko*:

(7a) *maĩ=ne   jānā   hai*   PANJAB H/U
     1SG=ERG   go.INF   is
     'I must go.' or 'I want to go.'
(7b) *mujhe   jānā   hai*   STANDARD H/U
     1SG.DAT go.INF   is
     'I must go.'

As regards the alternation between (7a) and (7b), Butt (2006: 86) suggests that (7a) conveys a particular emphasis on future and the deliberate will to act. This hypothesis is strongly rejected for punjabized Hindi and Punjabi by Khokhlova (2013: 95), who argues that a single speaker does not use both constructions and when using the ergative postposition does not particularly emphasize deliberate will, since in his dialect it is the standard construction for obligation.

2.1.2 The dative/accusative marker

The most frequent standard postpositions for differential object marking in the modern conversational register are *taĩ* and *saṇī*, frequently alternating with *kū*, the Garhwali counterpart of Hindi *ko*:

(8a) *tū   anīl rāvat   tain/saṇī/kū   jāndi cha?*
     2SG Anil Rawat   ACC   know PRS
     '(Do) you know Anil Rawat?'
(8b) *mi=na   yī   film saṇī/taĩ   dekhi/dekhe*
     1SG=ERG this film ACC   saw
     (cf. *ī film dekhi* 'this film saw', where the object is unmarked)
     'I saw this film.'
(8c) *ī   bāt   taĩ   yād   rākhi*
     DEM thing ACC   memory place.IMP
     'Remember this thing.'

Contrary to Kumaoni, which usually rules out the co-occurrence of differential object marking and ergative marking (Stroński 2010), Garhwali like Hindi allows both marked nouns in the same clause:

(9a) *mi=na   naunā taĩ/saṇī   bẽṭ   na   māri*
      1SG=ERG   child ACC   cane   INS   strike.AOR
      'I hit the boy with a cane.'

(9b) *mi=na   ũ̃   duyũ̃   thaĩ   khujjyai* [14]
      1SG=ERG   DEM   two   ACC   search.AOR
      'I looked for both of them.'

The optionality of object marking, which is usually attributed to discourse prominence, as in Dalrymple & Nikolaeva's (2011) theory of secondary topic, is observable in Garhwali (see examples (1) and (4) for the modern colloquial language), even in the same discourse patterns: both marked and unmarked objects occur in the same sequence of a traditional song, where the choice of one or the other seems conditioned by rhythmic factors:

(10) *chorie, mu   jāṇ na   deule*
      girl   1SG   go   NEG   give.FUT.1SG
      'Girl, I won't let you go.'

tero bāpū		*yakhī*	*bulaulo,*	*mu*		*jāṇ*	*na*	*deule*
your father		here	call. FUT	1SG		go	NEG	give.FUT.1SG
terī amī	*ku*	*yakhī*	*bulaulo,*	*mu*	*jāṇ*	*na*	*deule*	
your mother	ACC	here	call.FUT	1SG	go	NEG	give.FUT.1SG	
tere bhāi	*ku*	*yakhī*	*bulaulo,*	*mu*	*jāṇ*	*na*	*deule*	
your brother	ACC	here	call. FUT	1SG	go	NEG	give.FUT.1SG	
terī bhābhī		*yakhī*	*bulaulū,*	*mu*		*jāṇ*	*na*	*deule*
your sister.in.law		here	call. FUT	1SG		go	NEG	give.FUT.1SG
terī dīdī		*yakhī*	*bulaula,*	*mu*		*jāṇ*	*na*	*deule*
your sister		here	call. FUT	1SG		go	NEG	give.FUT.1SG

      'I will call your father, but I won't let you go,
      I will call your mother, but I won't let you go,
      I will call your brother, but I won't let you go,
      I will call your sister-in-law, but I won't let you go,
      I will call your elder sister, but I won't let you go.' (Cātak 2000: 124)

---

14 Both *taĩ* and *thaĩ* forms occur, the latter variant in speakers from the Eastern part of Garhwal, here Reshmi, interviewed in Dehradun but coming from Bhainswara.

As is well known, differential object marking was unattested in Sanskrit and Prakrits and was still not a fully-fledged system in early Hindi, where even proper nouns could remain unmarked as objects, although they started being marked either by means of the adposition *ku/kau* or by the mere inflectional ending *-i/ĩ/hi* (Montaut 2018). In the 14th century poet Kabir, object marking seems to obey only discourse strategies or metric reasons, such as in (11) for the common nouns denoting the unique entities 'sun' and 'sea' (usually marked in Standard Hindi)[15]:

(11) *ulaṭī   gaṇga saṃmudra-hi soṣai,   sasihara sūra grāsai*
      reversed Ganga ocean-ACC   dry.PRS.3SG moon   sun swallow.PRS.3SG
      'The reversed Ganga dries up the ocean, the moon swallows the sun.'
      (Kabir, pad 185.1, in Callevaert 2000: 293)

One may consider that Garhwali is in a transitional phase, less advanced than Hindi, which requires the marking of common animate nouns and displays a rather grammaticalized behaviour in this area (although less grammaticalized for inanimates), yet more advanced than Kumaoni where differential object marking is blocked by the ergative marking of the agent.

The postpositions marking object also occur as dative markers — for standard beneficiaries (*tvai-ku nī āũn* 'I won't come for you'), as in (12–13), and experiencers (14–16), as in all Indo-Aryan languages.[16] The marker *saṇī* (12) alternates with *tai/taĩ* (14) for the beneficiary dative, as well as with *thaĩ* (15) or *kuṇi,* a variant of *kaṇī,* for the experiencer dative (16):

(12) *bābā=jī   birsat   mā-n   jo   mero hisā   cha,*
      Father=HON   property   in-from REL my   part   be.PRS
      [H. *pitā jī   birāsat* ('heritage') *mẽ   jo   merā hissā hai*
      so   maĩ=saṇī de   devā
      DEM3SG 1SG=DAT give give.IMP
      vo   mujhe   de   do]
      'Father, give me that part of the property which is mine.' (Grierson 1916: 300)

(13) *tvai=taĩ* [17]   *dendū   maĩ māletho ko   gaũ*
      2SG.OBL=DAT give.PRS.1SG 1SG Maletha of   village
      [H. *tumhẽ   detā hū   maĩ mālethā kā   gāv*]
      'I give you the village [of] Maletha.' (Nauṭiyāl 2000: 148)

---

15 One finds similar alternations for proper names in the *Rāmcaritmānas* of Tulsidas (Montaut 2018).

16 Except Bengali, well known for using the genitive for most of the experiencer subjects.

17 The form *taĩ* in the original may stand for a variant of *taĩ,* may be a typing mistake, or be due to the non-standardization of the language (in the same couplet we find *tvai saṇī*

(14) *nauni   taĩ   pata   bi   nī   chau*
     girl   DAT   knowedge.M.SG   even   NEG   be.PRS.3SG
     [H. *laṛkī   ko   patā   bhī   nahĩ   hai*]
     'The girl does not even know.'

(15) *yu sabbi   mī=thaĩ   sadani   yād   rālu*
     these all   1SG=DAT   always   memory   stay.FUT
     [H. *ye sab   mujhe   hameśā   yād   rahegā*]
     'I will always remember this all.'

(16a) *tvī=kuṇi   sūraj   kanī   unĩdā paṛī ca*
     2SG=DAT   Suraj   what.kind   sleep fall PRF
     [H. *tujhe   sūraj   kaisī   nĩd paṛī hai*]
     'How asleep you have gone, Suraj?' (Nauṭiyāl 1997: 111)

(16b) *maĩ=kuṇi   jiyā   bvai   āj   supīno   hvege*
     1SG=DAT   mother   mum   today   dream   be.go.AOR
     [H. *mujhe   mã̄   āj   svapn   ho gae*]
     'I have dreamed of mother today.' (Nauṭiyāl 1997: 111)

The unaspirated form *kuṇi* alternates with the aspirated *khuṇi* in a quite usual way in Garhwali, in the same way as *taĩ* with *thaĩ*, and one finds frequent alternate forms for occlusive consonants (*tābakhū/tambāku* 'tobacco', *par/phar* 'on', etc.).

2.1.3 Instrumental/ablative

The Hindi marker *se* is used in Garhwali as well as its parallels *sũ, sī*. Besides, one finds the marker *na/an*, same as in the agentive use (2a, 2b), and the postposition *te/tī*. As a marker for non-canonical agent (incapacitive passive for instance) one finds both the Hindi *se* or its Garhwali counterparts and the instrumental/ergative marker *na* (see below 3.2). But, unlike Hindi, Garhwali has also a specifically ablative marker *baṭi* and its alternative forms *baṭe, baṭī, biṭe*.

(17a) *tū   sab=tī   syālī   chai*
     2SG   all=ABL   beautiful   be.PRS.2SG
     'You are the most beautiful of (from) all.'

---

    in two words for the same meaning 'to you') or the metric constraints. Similarly, *naunī* 'girl' is alternately written with long or short *i*.

(17b) *kakh   baṭī   hvā   tyār byoh?*
      where   ABL   be.AOR   your marriage?
      'Where from did you marry (was your marriage)?'

(17c) *mi   byaḷī   dehraḏũ   baṭĩ aũ*
      1SG   yesterday   Dehradun   ABL come.AOR
      [H. *maĩ   kal   Dehradun   se āyā*]
      'I came from Dehradun yesterday.'

2.1.4 Genitive and locative

Both cases only deserve a brief mention because they present less variation and are formed on the same base as their Standard Hindi equivalents and can only be considered as core cases in possessive clauses.

The genitive, or relator (*saṃbaṃdh*), has only two forms, either the *k-* postposition like Hindi, which may be considered (Kukreti 2010) as a Hindi borrowing, or its enlarged form *ker/kar-*, or the *r-* postposition as in Rajasthani, mentioned by Cātak (1966: 103) as dominant in the region of Rawalti.[18] Both inflect for gender and number as in Hindi (hence not a real *avyay*, yet a grammatical item), with different endings, same for *k-*, *r-*, and *kar-*: *kau/ko/kū* for masculine singular direct case, *kā* for masculine plural and oblique, *kī* for feminine:

(18a) *cācā   karaũ/kū   ḍero*
      uncle   GEN.M.SG   house.M.SG
      'The house of uncle/uncle's house.' (Cātak 1966: 103)

(18b) *anīl   rau   nauno*
      Anil   GEN.M.SG   boy.M.SG
      'Anil's boy'

The most frequent locative marker is *mā* (cf. examples (1b) and (5) above).

---

18 Cf. *Gaṛhvālī lokgīt* (Cātak 2000: 112–27). The *kera* form is found in many other languages, such as Awadhi, Eastern Hindi; see also in Kabir, for instance, *pānī kerā budbudā* 'the sound of water'.

2.2   Origin and scope of the core case markers

2.2.1 Case marking: a recent evolution

During the earliest stage of Hindi as well as of other New Indo-Aryan languages, the inflexional endings of Sanskrit are in the process of being replaced by adpositions (nominal category) and auxiliaries (verbal category). Yet this process is far from being completed in 14ᵗʰ c. Hindi, and the ordinary situation in the discourse is the absence of clear relators, the few oblique cases maintained in the language being used for various syntactic purposes: the *-i* locative for the agent in past transitive processes, and a fused oblique *-hi* (*ehi, eĩ, aĩ*) derived from the fusion of the old dative/instrumental (already achieved in Middle Indo-Aryan) for all kinds of obliques including agents of transitive verbs:

(19a) *guri   dīyā   palītā*   (SANT BHASHA)
　　　guru.OBL/LOC   give.AOR.M.SG   stick.M.SG
　　　'The guru gave the stick.' (Kabir, pad 8, in Callewaert 2000: 126)
(19b) *virrsĩh joysĩyã   bhāṣ   pāi*   (OLD KUMAONI)
　　　Virsingh Joshi.OBL   proclamation/bond.F.SG   get.F.SG
　　　'Virsingh Joshi (the king) received the bond.' (from Pant 2009 in Stroński
　　　2014: 281)

Most of the time nouns are unmarked, the syntactic and semantic sequences being simple enough for the meaning to be clear. The *-hi* ending was the most frequent marker for differentially marked objects in Kabir, while the postpositional marking (*ku/kau*) just starts appearing (Strnad 2013: 325); the markers are used similarly for experiencers:

(20a) *kāmĩ   amī   na   bhāvai*
　　　lascivious.OBL   nectar   NEG   please.PRS.3SG
　　　'Lascivious men do not like nectar.' (Kabir, pad 20, in Vaudeville 1957: 38)
(20b) *so   bhakta   merai   mani   bhāvai*
　　　DEM   devotee   POSS.1SG.OBL   heart.OBL   please.PRS.3SG
　　　'That bhakta (devotee) is dear to my heart.' (Kabir, pad 65, in: Strnad
　　　2012: 50)
(20c) *premĩ   kaũ   premĩ   milai,*
　　　lover   DAT   lover   meet/find.PRS.3SG
　　　tab   sab   biṣ   amrit   hoi
　　　then   all   poison   nectar   be.PRS.3SG
　　　'[When] the lover finds the lover, all poison becomes nectar.'
　　　(Kabir, pad 43, in: Vaudeville 1957: 64)

In Garhwali, unlike Modern Hindi and like in Kabir, inflectional case markers are still in use in certain dialects, and Cātak (1966: 102) mentions an -*a* ending dative (21a), an -*ā* ending locative (21b), an -*u* ablative (21c), and an -*ai* instrumental/ablative (21d):

(21a) *naunā-a   miṭhāī   lāyū̃*
      boy-DAT   sweets   bring.AOR.1SG
      [H. *laṛke ke lie   miṭhāī   lāyā hū̃*]
      'I brought sweets to the boy.'

(21b) *ghaṛ-ā   pāṇī   nā,   cull-ā   āg   nī*
      house-LOC   water   NEG   fireplace-LOC   fire   NEG
      [H. *ghar mẽ   pānī   nahī̃,   cūlhe mẽ   āg   nahī̃*]
      'No water in the house, no fire in the fireplace.'

(21c) *vaṇa-u (vaṇau-u)   āye   vo   ghar*   [H. *vah van se ghar āyā*]
      forest-ABL   come.AOR   he   home
      'He came home from the forest.'

(21d) *ḍaṃḍ-aĩ   māre*   [H *ḍaṃḍe se mārā*][19]
      stick-INS   strike.AOR
      'He struck with a stick.'

Pronouns in the beneficiary (22a–b) and experiencer (22c) functions are often in the oblique case, such as *maĩ* or *mu* for the first person singular. In folk songs these pronominal forms may appear without case markers.

(22a) *mu   dayā   putaro ko   var*
      1SG   give.IMP   son   GEN   boon
      'Give me the (divine) gift of a son.' (Cātak 2000: 116)

(22b) *sabi bainiyõ   gainī   dinī   maĩ dine   nāk nathūlī*
      all   sister.F.PL   jewels   give.AOR   1SG give.AOR   nose ring
      'To all [my] sisters you gave jewels, to me you gave a nose ring.'
      (Cātak 2000: 121)

(22c) *mu   lage   bāpū   kī   būr   mu   lage   amī   kī   būr*
      1SG   touch   dad   of   memory   1SG   touch   mum   of   memory
      'I remember (miss) dad, I remember mum.' (Cātak 2000: 124)

Yet the agentive (ergative) marker in modern Garhwali is never a mere inflection but the adposition *na*, nor is it an inflection in the traditional songs, sometimes

---

19 Other examples mentioned by Cātak contain forms still in use in some dialectal varieties: *ām ḍālai.i* (डलैइ) *bhvī̃ paṛe* (mangoes tree.ABL ground fall.AOR) 'The mangoes fell on the ground from the tree' [H. *ām peṛ se zamīn par gire*] (*ḍālo* also means 'tree' in Garhwali).

deemed more conservative, while we frequently find -*i* oblique marking for agents in the Sant Bhasha and -*ã̃* in Old Pahari (ex. 19).

2.2.2 Etymologies

The ergative marker *na*

Indeed, today the most wide-spread form of the ergative case markers is *ne* (*ni, nai, nẽ, ṇe*), found in Hindi/Urdu, Punjabi, Marathi, Gujarati, and it is derived from the reconstructed locative form of the noun *karṇa* 'ear', with the pronominal ending: * *karṇasmin* (classical Sanskrit locative *karṇe*) (Tessitori 1914: 65ff; for more details and examples see Montaut 2016a; 2017). Then this form underwent reduction along the following lines: *karṇasmin* > *kaṇṇahĩ* > *haĩ* or *kaṇṇaĩ* > *naĩ* > *nai* > *nẽ* > *ne*. Tessitori was the first scholar who identified the correct origin of *ne*, but already Trumpp (1872: 401) had traced *kane* ('near, at the edge', then 'to') to the Sanskrit noun *karṇa* 'ear'. The origin of the ergative marker has later on been accepted by all traditional grammarians (Tivārī 1961; 1966; Saksena 1937; Chatterji 1926; Cātak 1966). Tessitori (1914: 68–70) gives examples of Old Rajasthani such as (23a),[20] with a clearly locative meaning, (23b) with an allative meaning, (23c) with a dative meaning and (23d) with an agentive meaning:

(23a) *cārāï   naï   nirmala   nīra*
      road   LOC   pure   water
      'A limpid lake close by the road.'

(23b) *ã̃vyā   rā   kaṇṇhai*
      come.M.PL   king   LOC/ALL
      '[They] came to the Raja.'

(23c) *te   savihũ   naï   karaũ   paranām*
      3PL   all.OBL   LOC/ALL   do.PRS.1SG   salutation
      'I bow to all of them (in front of/ for).'

(23d) *adiśvara   naï   dikṣā   lidhi*
      Adishwara   LOC/ERG   consecration.F.SG   take.F.SG
      'The Adishvara took the consecration.'

---

20 With the longer form closer to the etymoloy: *mithyādṛṣṭī loka kaṇhai sravai vasiraunahĩ* (false.look people LOC hermit.M.SG dwell.PRS.3SG NEG) 'A shravaka (hermit) should [does] not live near heretics' (Tessitori 1914, loc.cit.).

The dative/accusative postposition *tāĩ̃, ta.ĩ̃* or *taĩ* (ताई, तईं, तैं) is usually derived from Skt. *tāvati* 'so far' > *tāmahĩ* > *tã̃vahĩ* > *tāaĩ (Cātak 1966: 102[21], quoting Tessitori 1914: 251), rather than from Skt. *tarite*, which conveys the verbal notion of going through, or *prati* 'against, toward' also suggested by Cātak. One still finds in certain contemporary dialects of Garhwali the originally directional meaning of 'till' ('the limit up to which'): *āj tāĩ̃* 'till today'.[22] Saksena (1937: 224) derives the Awadhi ablative *taĩ/tẽ* from the instrumental *tatena of the deictic *tan*. As for *thaĩ* (थैं) or *tha.ĩ* (थइं), more frequent in Kumaoni, it has also been derived from different sources, mainly from Skt. *tasmai* or *tasmin*, locative forms of the third person or deictic pronoun, and from *tahĩ*, a "periphrastic locative", as Sharma (1987: 50) calls it, meaning probably a lexical item used as a locative marker. Furthermore, it is also associated by some scholars with the Sanskrit verbal root *sthā* 'stand', 'stay', or *sthāne* (place.LOC) in the sense 'near by' when used as an adverb (Sharma 1987: 136). Interestingly, the same form behaves as an instrumental/ablative in Old Rajasthani (*nakṣatra thaï* 'from the constellation') and its "extended form" *thānnu* exists in Konkani; Khatre (1966: 124) derives it from *sthā*. The diversity of opinions regarding etymological sources is itself interesting, since it shows the weak semantic link between source and target, and at the same time the important phonetic erosion makes different sources plausible.

The widely used *saṇī*, which also occurs for both accusative and dative in Kumaoni as well as in Garhwali, is usually derived from the Sanskrit noun *saṃga* 'company' in the oblique case (Apabhramsha *saṃge*). Tivārī mentions this etymology (1961: 343), whereas Sharma (1987: 50) suggests a possible derivation (which he seems to favour) from Sanskrit *samāna* 'equal', with an "analogical extension after the style of *huṇi*", another dative-accusative marker derived from the present participle of verb *bhū* 'be', *hunte* 'being' (Apabhramsha *hunto/hunte*, cf. 3.1.2). Both grammaticalization paths (from *saṃg* or *saman*), equally plausible, suggest that a same base can result in quite opposite grammatical meanings, since they both are also considered in connection to the derivation of *se*, an instrumental/ablative marker.

Interestingly, the more typical Garhwali marker *khuṇī* (DAT), mentioned by Sharma (1987: 50) as the "Garhwali correlate" of Kumaoni *saṇi*, is derived by Cātak (1966: 102) from the Sanskrit noun *karṇe* 'ear' (*karṇasmin> Apabhramsha *kaṇṇahi*).[23] The same grammaticalization path is also attested for the agentive marker *ne*, and again, points to opposite grammaticalized meanings (source *vs*

---

21 तावति > तामहिं > *तावंहिं > *ताअइं > ताईं.

22 Similar meaning in Rajasthani.

23 Cātak mentions that the form *kana.ī* is used as a directional marker (*diśābodhak śabd*): *bhaijī, kanaĩ̃ chā jāṇā* [H. *bhāī jī, kidhar ko jā rahe ho*] 'brother HON where to be go] 'Brother, where are you going?'.

target). Cognates such as *kane/kaṇe* are also found in Gujarati as dative/accusative markers, *kanai* in Mewati and *kaṇi* in Kumaoni (Cātak 1966: 102) or Eastern Garhwali.

The marker *ku/kũ/kū*, a reflex of Standard Hindi *ko*, is consensually (Chatterji 1986; Tivārī 1951; Cātak 1966; Sharma 1987) derived from the Sanskrit word *kakṣa-* 'armpit', a word also considered as the origin of the spatial interrogative *kakh* 'where' in Garhwali, supported by a fusion with the interrogative/indefinite base *k-* common to all Indo-Aryan languages.[24]

The instrumental/ablative postposition *se*, common to Hindi and Garhwali, or its variant *sī* (INS/ABL) is sometimes derived from *śakyate* 'is able', as specially used to convey the force causing action: *karaṇ kārak mẽ viśeṣ prayog, śakti ke sūcak* (Cātak 1966: 100). The fact that languages from Rajasthan and Gujarat display a palatal reflex *śũ*, along with other alternate forms such as *sũ, siũ*, provides evidence for accepting the derivation from *sākam* suggested by Pischel (1900: 206). Although some have traced its origin to *santo/sunto* 'existing' from the active participle of Skt. *as* 'to be', this opinion is discarded in Tivārī (1961: 342), as well as a derivation from *saṃga* (Kellogg 1876: 132). The most convincing origin according to Cātak (1966), Tivārī (1951), Kellogg (1972/1876) and Chatterji (1986/1926) is from the instrumental form of *sama* 'equal, on par' (> *samena* > *samẽ* > *saẽ*).[25]

The instrumental or ablative *te, tī* (also found in Marathi and Konkani as attested by Khatre 1966, para 218: 123) is sometimes derived from the present participle of the verb *bhū* 'be', a semantically even more empty basis (Apabhramsha *hunti/ hunte* < *hontai*). But most of scholars follow Hoernle (1880: 226), who derives it from the locative of the Skt. past participle *tarite* (> *ta:ie* > *te, taĩ*) 'passed to', hence meaning 'up to', 'upon' and 'from upon' (accordingly, 'from').

The ablative case marker *baṭi* is specific of Pahari languages and also occurs in Kumaoni, with its cognates *biṭe, bāṭ, baṭe, bai*, and Garhwali *baṭikh, biṭa, bai*, always with the same meaning of origin or point of departure. Standard Hindi has the noun *bāṭ* 'way', 'road', mainly used in expressions such as *bāṭ johnā* 'wait', 'look for' but it is never grammaticalized into a directional marker. The noun has remained widely used in Garhwali and it occurs in the meaning of 'way, road':

(25a) *bīc   bāṭ   mā   kani   hoye*   (Nauṭiyāl 1997: 208)
     middle way LOC how happen.AOR
     'How did it happen in the middle of the way?'

---

24 And more generally IE indefinite/interrogative markers (*k^wo-, *k^we-, $k^wā$-).
25 The Old Bengali (15ᵗʰ c.) suggests a derivation from *sama*, a word distinct from the one used for 'company' (*saṃga*) in the same verse: *toe sama kariba maï saṃga* (2.OBL with do.*ba* (M.SG) ɪSG.OBL company.M.SG) 'I shall have union (do company) with you' (Chatterji 1926: 966).

The meaning of the source noun evokes allative rather than ablative (and so the Hindi expression 'wait' < ('look towards/at the road')), whereas Garhwali as well as Kumaoni use it in a specifically ablative meaning. However, its cognate *bai* is used in Nagari (spoken in Naggar, a small town in Himachal, Kullu district) as an equivalent of Hindi *ko*, for experiencers:

(25b) *mu=bai*   *pār*   *śobhle*   *lāge*
     1SG=DAT   mountains   nice   touch.AOR
     'I liked mountains.'

Both apparently opposed grammatical meanings are plausible in relation to the etymological origin of the marker, since it comes from the verbal root *vr̥t* 'turn', 'be', 'happen': *varte* < *vartate* (Sharma 1987: 53 derives it from the participial form *vartmani*). As in the case of *te*, or *se* (see above), or in the grammaticalization path of Kumaoni *huni* suggested in Kellogg (1876: 131) from noun of action of 'be' verb, the etymon has a very abstract and vague meaning and grammaticalized into a more precise one. Yet the original meaning of the point of departure (*baṭi* 'from') may also convey extended meanings, such as the way through which one comes (*ched baṭi* 'through the hole').

The locative *mā* is, like the Hindi *mẽ*, from the Sanskrit word *madhyam* 'middle', which is particularly clear in its Garhwali reflexes *māje*, *mãhe*. As for the two genitive markers, *kau (kī) /kerau (kerī)* and *rau (rī)*, they are consensually all derived from the participle of the verb *kr̥/kar* 'do' (< *kia* or *kera* < *kr̥ta* 'done'), implying the genitive of agent. This explains why they agree in gender and number with the head noun.

2.3 Conclusion

Two striking facts can be emphasized: first, the locational origin of most markers, which further specialized into allative or ablative functions. Their specialization is weaker in Garhwali than in Standard Hindi, and we find many markers for the same function as well as various derivations from 'be' verb grammaticalized into mutually opposite functions. Secondly, the very abstract, semantically empty origin of many markers may account for the surprisingly diverging grammaticalization paths (*se* an instrumental in Hindi, *saṇi* a dative/accusative in Garhwali/Kumaoni, *thaĩ* a dative/ accusative in Garhwali and Kumaoni, an ablative in Old Rajasthani). The same result obtains with extremely precise and concrete source terms such as 'ear', which grammaticalized into ergative/instrumental (Garhwali *na*) and dative (Garhwali *khuṇi*, Gujarati *ne*, Punjabi *nũ̃*), a grammaticalization path unattested in Heine and Kuteva (2002). As for the variety of derivations suggested by reliable scholars, it can be explained by the phonetic erosion, particularly intense in words most frequently

used. As mentioned by Bloch (1935: 179), "[t]he effect of this deterioration is that the etymological interpretation of the postpositions is often difficult or impossible".

3   Other adpositions and other functions of core markers

3.1   Forms and origin of other adpositions

3.1.1 Ergative *la*

Besides the ergative marker *na*, the postposition *la*, echoing the Kumaoni ergative marker *le*, is also used in the same function in some parts of Garhwal, including in Pauri, although the city is not very close to the eastern limit of the district next to Kumaon:

(26) *mi=la   ī   film   dekhi*
      1SG=ERG   this   film   see.AOR
      'I saw this film.'

This alternative agentive marker *la* (as also its Kumaoni cognate *le*) is generally assumed to derive from the Skt. verbal root *lag*, meaning 'touch, be stuck to, placed'. Some scholars, like Tivārī (1961), have suggested the Skt. verb *labh* 'to get, obtain' as an alternative derivation. The regular path runs as follows: *lagya* 'having come in touch with' > *lage* > *laï, lai (le)*. Interestingly, this base, glossed by Juyāl (1967: 117) as 'for the sake of', 'with the object of' is widely used as a dative marker in Indo-Aryan (e.g. Marathi *lā*, Old Hindi *lāi, lagi, lāgi*), and it also occurs in that function in Garhwali, which illustrates once more the apparently contradictory grammaticalization paths for lexical units of the same origin.

3.1.2 Target markers *tak, bānā*

The postposition *bānā* is mentioned by Cātak (1966: 102) as a causal or instrumental marker (*kāraṇ*), but it is used as a synonym of *khātar* (Hindi/Urdu *khātir*, from Arabic) 'for the sake of', hence in many contexts 'because of'.

(27a) *terā   bānā   choṛe   maĩ=na   bhainā!*
       your   sake   give.up.AOR 1SG=ERG   brother-in-law
       'What did I (not) give up for your sake (because of you) brother-in-law!'
       (Nauṭiyāl 1997: 209)

(27b) *terī   khātar   choṛe   syālī   bã̄kī bagūṛī*
      your   sake   give.up.AOR sister.in.law Banki Baguri
      'I have given up Banki Baguri for you, sister-in-law.' (Bhaṭṭ 1976: 186)

No etymology is suggested for *bānā*, but one may relate it to the Awadhi beneficiary marker *bādi* (*raurā bādi* 'for your lordship', 'for You'), derived by Saksena (1937: 230) from the Sanskrit verb *vand-* 'praise'.

As for *tak*, the postposition expressing the limit to reach or point of arrival – 'up to, till', it is common to many if not all Indo-Aryan languages, sometimes with the alternate form *talak*. Its grammaticalization from the verbal root *tāk* 'see, look at' – according to Sharma (1987: 57), who mentions Turner's etymological dictionary of Nepali as his source,— presents an interesting grammaticalization path: 'look at' > 'up to' for allatives, but lacks solidity.[26]

3.1.3 Dative/accusative markers

The postposition *chaĩ, cha.ĩ* (ਛੈਂ, ਛਇਂ), which occurs both in Garhwali and Kumaoni as an accusative marker, "[i]s the palatalized version of *thaĩ* " (Sharma 1987: 50), and most probably *ce* and *te* display a similar connection.

The postposition *huṇi*, which also occurs in Kumaoni and alternates with *haṇī*, is derived (Sharma 1987: 50) from the present participle of the Skt. verb *bhū* 'be' (Apabhramsha *hunto, hunte*), one more example of a very abstract meaning of an etymon grammaticalizing into an abstract case marker, yet with a definitely allative meaning when used in Garhwali and Kumaoni in such expressions: *ghar huṇi* 'to home', *itha huṇi* 'to this side'.

However, other Indo-Aryan languages present strong counter-examples to the allative grammaticalization path, since they grammaticalized the same word into an ablative marker, such as Old Marathi: *gharhuni* 'from house', further transformed into *gharauni*, where the marker is close to a mere case affix.[27]

As for *kaṇī* and its variant *gaṇī*, they are derived by Sharma (1987: 49) from the Sanskrit word *karṇa* 'ear' (**karṇebhi > kaṇṇahi*), which is also the basis from which the Garhwali and Hindi ergative/instrumental marker is derived, as well as the dative/accusative *khuṇi*. This raises a problem for cognitive interpretations

---

26 Heine & Kuteva (2002) do not list verbs of vision as a source for grammatical words. However, one finds it as a source for the presentative in French (*voici* 'here is', *voilà* 'there is', from the verb *voir* 'see'). It can also be observed in Hindi *cāh-* 'want' derived from the Skt. verbal root *cakṣ* 'see/look' at the origin of the modal auxiliary *cāhie* 'should'.

27 Cf. *ethuni* 'hence' (lit. 'that.from').

of grammaticalization paths, since the most commonly attested derivations tend to group target markers including dative and often differential accusative markers together as opposed to source markers, e.g. instrumental/ergative/ablative (Malchukov & Narrog 2009). The aspirated form *haṇi*, an alternate form of *saṇi*,[28] is accordingly derived from either Skt. *saṃga* 'company' or Skt. *sama* 'equal'.

Grierson (1916: 312ff.) acknowledges the problem of the contradictory behaviour of a given case marker (source *vs* target) when he observes that *gaṇī* like *khuṇi* is an equivalent of Hindi *ko* and therefore behaves as a dative but, "curiously enough", also as an ablative. However, the examples he gives for the ablative meaning suggest a translation from Hindi where the multi-purpose *se* would translate *gaṇī*: *ek banyā gaṇī* 'from a shopkeeper' [H. *ek banie se*], *kāi gaṇī* 'from whom' [H. *kis-se*] (Grierson 1916: 314), which one can interpret as 'at a shopkeeper', 'at whom', a locative meaning. Whenever the meaning of ablative (source) is non-ambiguous, Grierson gives examples with other case markers, for instance *mākoi*, which is given by Cātak (1966: 104) as an ablative: *cullā māko khānā* 'food from the oven', equivalent of Hindi *cūlhe mẽ se/ cūlhe kā khānā*, or *umḍe* 'from': *kuwā-umḍe pānī* 'water from the well'.

(28) *ve=mākoi   vo   rupyā   le le*
       3SG=ABL   these   rupies   take take.IMP
       'Take the rupees from him!' (Grierson 1916: 314)

Interestingly, Grierson also gives an example of *gaṇī* as a locative marker, which confirms the originally locative meaning (consistent with its origin) of its more frequent function of dative/allative marker:

(29) *nānā kuṛā=gaṇi   ran*
       small house=LOC   stay.PRS.3SG
       'He lives in a small house.' (Grierson 1916: 313)

The use of *gaṇī* as an allative like *saṇi* (in such expressions as "to turn to", "throw at"), apart from being a DAT/ACC marker, and initially as locative echoes the grammaticalization path of Skt. *kakṣa* 'side', which also served initially as a locative marker and further grammaticalized into allative. It also echoes the grammaticalization path of its etymon *karṇa* 'ear' from the initial locative form, acquiring subsequently the function of allative or dative (as Gujarati *ne*), and later grammaticalized into agent (Garhwali, Hindi). It also suggests that the seemingly paradoxical grammaticalization of Skt. *karṇe* into both an agent marker (*ne*) and at the same time and in the same language as a dative/allative marker (*khuṇī*) is not an isolated

28 Although some scholars relate it to *gaṇī*.

case. Whatever the origin of *saṇi* and its variant *haṇi,* it similarly illustrates symmetrically opposed paths, since it is used in Garhwali Kumaoni as a dative marker (as well as the dialectical form *hnĩ* in the region of Ramoli[29]), while the cognate forms *san, saũ* are used in Braj and Awadhi as instrumental markers. This confirms our first conclusions reached regarding core case markers (see 2.3).

3.1.4 The comitative and relator equivalents of Hindi *se*

The same form as Garhwali and Kumaoni comitative — *dagaṛ, dagaṛī, dagāṛā, dagaṛe, digar* — is found in Awadhi as a postposition too but with the meaning 'through', 'by means of'[30] and as an independent noun meaning 'way' (Saksena 1937: 128). In the latter meaning it is registered also in Chattisgarhi (*ḍagr.e* 'on the way'). No etymology is given for the Garhwali comitative *dagaṛe* and its cognates, derived from the "deśi" word with retroflex *ḍagar* (Sharma 1987: 54), but the Garhwali noun *dagūṛī* 'society, company' (30c) and the Kumaoni noun *dagaṛiyāna* 'companions' suggests the shift from the meaning 'way' to the comitative meaning. Again, one may notice the diverging paths borrowed by the synonymic words *bāṭ* and *dagaṛ* 'way', the former grammaticalized into an ablative (source), the latter into a comitative marker.

(30a) *tyār   dagaṛ ar   kū   kū   rahandan*
        2SG.GEN with   and   who   who   stay.PRS.3PL
        'Who else are living with you?'

(30b) *maĩ dagaṛā   kar   devā   guru jī   rājulā saukyān*
        1SG with   make   give.IMP   guru HON   Rajula Saukyan
        'Join Rajula Saukyan with me Guru ji!' (Nauṭiyāl 1997: 29)

(30c) *choṛe   rāṇiyõ   kī   dagūṛī*
        abandon.AOR   queen.OBL.PL   GEN   society
        'I left the society of queens.' (Bhaṭṭ 1976: 186)

The word *dagaṛ* is also used as a mere relator in verbal locutions involving reciprocity in the same way as the relator *se*:

(31a) *meru   ū   dagaṛ kvī   ristā /   āṇu-jāṇu uṭhan-baiṭhan nī   ca*
        1SG.GEN 3SG   with   any   relation /   come-go rise-sit   NEG   is
        [H. *merā us=se koī riśtā / āna-jānā uṭhnā-baiṭhnā nahĩ hai*]
        'I have no relation, no frequenting with him.'

---

29 See for instance *tve hnĩ dine* [2SG DAT gave] 'he gave you' (Cātak 1966: 102).
30 Standard Hindi has *dvārā* (< Sanskrit *dvāra* 'door') in the meaning of 'by (means of)'.

(31b) *merū*   *ḍakṭār dagaṛ bāt*   *hoge*
 1SG.GEN doctor with   speech be.go.AOR
 [H. *merī ḍākṭar se bāt ho gaī*]
 'I spoke to the doctor.'

Besides, the words *neṛe* and *nal*, also used as adverbs (32a), indicate vicinity, as does Hindi *pās* (< Skt. *pārśva* 'side'), the *-l* inflection for locative in (32b) and (36) below being possibly derived from *nal*.

(32a) *aurū̃*   *neṛū aige*
 ECHO.WORD close come.go.AOR
 'He came in the vicinity.' (Nauṭiyāl 1997: 209)

(32b) *tarā̃dā*   *ghām mā jītū chai-l*   *baiṭhīge*
 scorching sun   LOC Jitu shadow-LOC sit.go.AOR
 'In the scorching sun Jitu sat in/at the shade.' (Nauṭiyāl 1997: 209)

A number of other postpositions also differ from Hindi, such as *ũḍo* or *udo* 'below' from Sanskrit *adhaḥ*, according to Cātak (1966: 138), *bhuĩ* 'down, under' from Sanskrit *bhūmi* (see example in footnote 19), *mathe* 'above, on' from Skt. *masta-* 'scull, head' (> Pkr *mattha*, the final *-e* resulting from a later development), *aic* 'above' from Sanskrit *uccais* 'high', *ubbo* 'on top of/above', from Skt. *ūrdhva* 'upright'. This adds to the sufficient evidence that the language is deeply related to Indo-Aryan, having evolved, as all New Indo-Aryan languages, from Sanskrit through the Middle Indo-Aryan (Prakrits) stage.

Quite a few postpositions are common in Garhwali, Hindi and some other NIA, such as *par* < Skt. **uppari* (and its variant *phar*) as well as the related locutional postposition *paran* 'from above' (H. *par se*).

To sum up, this brief review of non-core case markers confirms the preceding findings: some markers are derived from very concrete words, such as parts of the body or landmarks, a common path for forging directionals by an abstraction process ('ear', 'head', 'armpit', 'earth'), others on the contrary derive from very abstract, almost lexically empty words, such as the various participial forms of the verb 'be'.

3.2   Other functions of core markers

3.2.1 *na* as a marker for subjects of obligation or modal future

We saw above in passing that in Garhwali, the so-called ergative marker can mark the subject in obligative clauses, as in (6a), in contrast with Standard Hindi, which uses the dative marker for this purpose. I am therefore maintaining the gloss

ERG for the Garhwali examples with -*na*, a case marker only used for agents and instruments. Ergative-marked subjects are the standard obligative constructions in Garhwali, they occur with both transitive (33b) and intransitive verbs (33a) and they control coreference with the converb, as in (33b).

In each sentence in (33) a different ending of the same infinitive form occurs: -*ā* in (a), -*a* in (b), and -Ø in (c):

(33a) *mī=na   jāṇā   ijā   bvai   tātā lūhāgaṛh*
      1SG=ERG   go.INF   today   mother   Tata Luhagarh
      [H. *maĩ jāū̃gā /mujhe jānā hogā tātā lūhāgaṛh*]
      'I will/must go today, mother, to Tata in Luhagarh.' (Nauṭiyāl 1997: 111)

(33b) *maĩ=na   tū   biyā-ik   rãgīlī   vairāṭ   lāṇa*
      1SG=ERG   2SG   marry-CVB   Rangili   Vairat   bring.INF
      'I will/must bring you, Rangili, to Vairat (after) marrying you.' (Nauṭiyāl 1997: 28)[31]

(33c) *maĩ=na   jiūṇ   marūṇ   jiyā   saukyānī des   jāṇ*
      1SG=ERG   live.SBJV.1SG   die.SBJV.1SG   mother   Saukyani country   go.INF
      'Whether I live or die, mother, I have to go to the Saukyan's country'. (Nauṭiyāl 1997: 29)

The most frequent obligative patterns involve the subjunctive (from the syncretic Sanskrit present with personal endings),[32] a finite mood form which in Modern Garhwali expresses both obligation and wish with a nominative subject: *āgyārthak aur icchārthak rūp bhinn nahī̃ haĩ* "the forms conveying obligation and wish do not differ" (Cātak 1966: 131). Significantly in the non-nominative pattern as illustrated in (33), the verb has no personal ending, and such constructions are particularly frequent in the traditional folk songs and epics but they also occur in colloquial Garhwali, cf. (6a). The ending in -*aṇ* is analyzed by Cātak (1966: 130–132) as a shortening of the future [passive] participle (*bhaviṣya kāl kā kṛdant*) in -*ṇya*,[33] which agreed with the object, if any, in gender and number and used to convey, along with a future meaning, a stronger obligative meaning (*kartavya-akartavya kā vicār viśeṣ mahatva kā hotā hai*).[34] I have no explanation

31 Similarly, also with a pronominal human object 3rd person singular, oblique form unmarked (of 3SG.F : *vī/vī̃*), in the same context: *maĩ.na vā vivāik lauṇa, ḍolā ḍhasakaik* (Nauṭiyāl 1997: 28), in the meaning of a strong will: 'I will bring her after marrying, installed on a palanquin.'

32 First two verbs of (33c), conveying also eventuality, as in Hindi.

33 Obviously derived from Skt. -*anīya*.

34 With the following example: *hamārī bāt kai=na nī jāṇ* (our speech INDF=ERG NEG know) [H. *hamārī bāt kisī=ko nahī̃ jānnī hai/koī nahī̃ jānegā*] 'Nobody should/will/ could know our conversation.'

for the *-ā* ending in (33a) except that it is from a separate piece in short verses and might be due to metrical factors.

Almost all occurrences of this latter pattern involve a 1ˢᵗ-person subject and convey a strong involvement of the speaker — personal intention and will of doing what (s)he considers a personal obligation, whereas the bare subjunctive pattern (see above) conveys a simple obligation or otherwise the future, which can also be translated by the Hindi obligative construction <S *ko* (DAT)... *hai* (is)>, for instance in the mother's reply to the daughter's requirement to go (34) in the same context as (33b–c). The speaker, far from agreeing, since she does not want her daughter to go, shows of course no personal involvement, hence the future:

(34) *tū*   *jālī*   *merī*   *pothlī huṇiyõ kā des*!
      2SG go.FUT.2SG.F my   girl Hunyas of country
      [H. *tū jāegī merī beṭī huṇiyõ ke deś*]
      'You will go my daughter to the country of the Hunyas!' (Nauṭiyāl 1997: 29)

These facts, far from being a bizarre peculiarity of the language, are strongly reminiscent of the history of the future and perfect in Indo-Aryan. The origin of the ergative pattern is well-known and stems from a nominal sentence with past participle and instrumental agent, a case to be replaced later on by various postpositional markers, generally locative in their origin. Lesser known is the fact that the *-b-/-v-* future of Eastern New Indo-Aryan languages also comes from a nominal sentence with oblique agent and a future passive participle (or gerundive) and has long conveyed its initial obligative meaning, until it shifted to potential and future. With the shift to a purely temporal meaning, the syntactic pattern with oblique agent shifted towards a nominative pattern, but languages maintaining the modal meaning also tended to hold on to the oblique agent, such as Marathi, the only language in the West of the Aryandom, which retained the original syntactic pattern — with the verbal form continuing the Sanskrit gerundive —for potential, and Garhwali for obligation/will (more details in Montaut 2016a; Montaut 2017).[35]

---

35 More generally, the Romance branch of Indo-European languages also displays the same evolution from nominal sentence with participle and non-canonical agent, but the shift towards a nominative pattern was associated to the use of the 'have' auxiliary, in the future as well as in the perfect. Latin and Sanskrit patterned similarly (oblique agent—past participle or gerundive) for both the periphrastic past and the obligative construction, except that the case used for marking the agent was the dative, the case also used in possessive constructions (hence the notion of possessive meaning in Benveniste's (1966) pioneering paper on the possessive meaning of the construction with the perfect participle of a transitive verb).

3.2.2 Other modal meanings merging volitional future and inability: *se/na/baṭi*

Other non-finite verbal forms occur with the same case marker *na*, presenting again clearly not a canonical ergative. The verb ending in (35a) is the same as in (33) above, the meaning more akin to incapacitive. However, in (35b), very close in meaning and similarly displaying a non-canonical subject, the verb has the future participle form (*-ṇya*) and the subject (incapacited agent) is in the genitive under the postposition *karī*:

(35a) *maĩ=na   tvai=ku   nī   auṇ*
      1SG=ERG/INS 2SG=DAT   NEG   come
      'I won't/can't/am not to come for (the sake of) you.' (Nauṭiyāl 1997: 149)

(35b) *terā karī   nī   hoṇya*
      your GEN   NEG   be.GRD
      'You won't be able/willing to do/you are not to do.' ('It is not to be done by/ of you'.) (Cātak 1966: 101)

It is noticeable that Hindi uses in such cases infinitive with the genitive *kā* (*maĩ tere lie nahĩ āne kī* ISG 2SG for NEG come.INF GEN.F.SG), a relatively semantically bleached case marker, whereas the instrumental is also used for more clearly incapacitive meaning with intransitives both in Hindi and Garhwali, the latter employing the marker borrowed from Hindi:[36]

(36) *saberī   uṭhīk   pāṇī ko bāṭhā mũḍ mā   tharī   ganga-ḷ*
      morning   get.up.CVB   water of pot   head on   set.CVB   Ganga-LOC
      jaik   lauṇū   maĩ=se   nī   hoṇu (Nauṭiyāl 1997: 148)
      go.CVB   bring.INF   1SG=INS NEG   be.INF
      [H. ... *pāṇī kā ghaṛā ... lānā mujh=se nahĩ hogā* (lit. *honā*)]
      'I won't be able (refuse) to get up in the morning and bring the pot of water on my head from the Ganga.'

---

36 This instrumental marking of the non-canonical agent in modal passive constructions or with intransitive verbs is also atttested in medieval Hindi, for instance, in Kabir:
   sāĩ   sũ   sab hota hai,   bande thaĩ kuch   nāhĩ (pada 38, Vaudeville 1957: 58)
   Lord INS all   be   PRS.3.SG slave INS something NEG
   'The Lord can [do] everything, the slave is not able of [doing] anything.'

The ablative *baṭi*, which is used as the reference or starting point in comparative patterns (as Hindi *se*),[37] and also used as an instrumental for a secondary agent with causative verbs (as Hindi *se*), is also used as a non-canonical agent of medio-passive intransitive verbs (as Hindi *se*) to mark an agent devoid of deliberate will. The path seems to be the following: from a more or less spatial origin with the word 'hand' (by/from hand) in (37a) to the straightforward meaning of non-volitional, non-intentional agent in (37b):

(37a) *merā   hāth   bāṭ   tamro   gilās   phoṭyau*
       my   hand   ABL/INS your   glass   be.broken.AOR
       'I broke your glass by mistake / your glass was broken by / through my hand.'

(37b) *mā   bāṭ   bhūl   gayo*
       1SG   ABL/INS forget went
       [Punjabi Hindi *mujhse bhūl gayā*]
       'I forgot.' (unwillingly)

Both Kumaoni (38) and Garhwali may also use the dative marker *huṇi* in alternation with *thaĩ* before *baṭi/bai* to mark the secondary agent, as if the dative marker such as 'to be' were a simple oblique form with no special directional meaning (like Hindi *us* before the ablative marker *se*). This is consistent with the high poly-functionality of such case markers and with their non-directional origin ('being', 'existing', 'way'):

(38) *tum vi   thaĩ   baṭi / huṇi   bai   ituk   kām   iai*
       2SG   3SG.OBL ACC/DAT ABL   ACC/DAT INS   this.much work even
       ni   karnai   śaka
       NEG   do   can.AOR
       'You could not get even this much work from him.' (Sharma 1987: 54)

3.3 Conclusions

Summarizing evidence gathered in section 3, we observe in Garhwali a consistent tendency to use adpositional markers for non-canonical agents: ERG/INS for obligation+will, ABL for non-volitional/non-deliberate agents, and various dative

---

37 As well as in Kumaoni: *maĩ bai/baṭi thul chi* [1SG ABL tall be.PRS.3SG] 'He is taller than me' (Sharma 1987: 54). The form *tẽ/tī* is naturally also used for comparative and superlative: *nauniyõ mãje=n tū sab=tī syāṇī chai* (girls among=INS/ABL 2SG all=ABL be.PRS.2SG) 'You are the most beaufiful of (from among) all the girls.' (Cātak 1966: 104).

postpositions for the non-canonical subjects such as dative experiencers (see section 2). The most noticeable contrast with Hindi is the ERG/INST marking of subjects of obligation patterns, yet the modal future meaning associated with the construction echoes the original pseudo-ergative modal constructions in the earlier phase of Indo-Aryan (Montaut 1997).

Another striking fact, confirming the conclusions in 2.3, is the diverging grammaticalization paths from a given lexical item, across dialects or across languages (*lag*, for instance, grammaticalizes into a dative / beneficiary / target in Marathi and many Hindi dialects, but as an ergative and source in Kumaoni Garhwali). It may to a large extent be accounted for by the semantic content of the etymological source terms, in many cases very vague or even abstract, but concrete in case of the locative postpositions stemming from the nouns 'ear'and 'armpit', initially grammaticalized into locative markers. When Hindi and its "dialects" started emerging from of an early New-Indo-Aryan phase where the basic marking of non-nominative nouns was a syncretic oblique, the sentence was a predication either with unmarked nouns for functional cases (nominative and accusative) or with loosely related obliques, that is, with the nominal entities which were not canonical subject or canonical object. Any marker derived from any locative or abstract base, such as 'to be', or from 'equal', could do the job, until it took on more specific roles as the language evolved. One still finds remnants of this transitional state (before role specialization) in Bangaru, a non-written language spoken in Haryana, related to Punjabi more than to Hindi. In the northern variety of this language the same marker *nae* (cognate of Hindi *ne*) works as accusative, instrumental, or ergative marker, and expresses target roles as well as source roles, whereas in the southern variety *tī* (ablative in Garhwali) also expresses both source and target roles (yet not ergative agent):

(42a) *kutte   nae   ḍaṃḍe   nae   mārya*
　　　dog   ACC   stick   INS   strike.INS
　　　'He struck the dog with a stick.' (Singh 1970: 69)

(42b) *balkā   nae   toṛiyā   honge*
　　　child.M.PL   ERG   break   PRSUMP.3M.PL
　　　'The children have probably broken [it].' (Ibid.)

(42c) *rupay   tī   us=tī   le   lo*
　　　money   ACC   3SG=ABL   take   take.IMP
　　　'Take the money from him.' (Tivārī 1961: 177)

4 The "evidential" *bal*

The marker *bal* has in Garhwali a wide range of functions, although not much commented in most grammars and never labelled a quotative nor an evidential. However, since all the functions I could trace ultimately belong to the well-known array of meanings conveyed by most of the evidential markers in cross-linguistic studies, I suggest to identify it as an evidential marker, rather than a quotative (a category well known in Dravidian languages), since most Indian languages which have so-called quotative markers use them primarily to report speech, thought, and introduce conditionals.

The only work devoted to *bal*, to my knowledge, a three pages presentation by Deveś Jośī in 2011, emphasizes its discourse properties: *bal* "conveys conviviality, rhythm, natural fluency, a pleasant feeling" (*chapchapī, arthāt tarāvaṭjanya sukhānubhūti*, p.11),[38] rather than the classical meanings associated with quotatives. The article is significantly entitled *Gaṛhvālī kā bal hai bal* (The strength of Garhwali is *bal*), with a play on words, since *bal* as a noun means 'strength'. Cātak (1966: 139ff), however, with only a few lines devoted to the marker scattered in the section on *sambandhvācak* (conjunctions),[39] primarily identifies it as a marker of reported speech (*kisī aparokṣ vyakti kī vāṇī ko uddhṛt karne ke lie*), a function also mentioned in Jośī (2011), yet with no particular emphasis: *bal* is "used for quoting examples" (*udāharaṇ dene ke lie*) or as a synonym of *iti* "for giving the feeling of somebody else's statement" (*vaktā dvārā anya puruṣ kathan kā bhāv prakaṭ karne ke lie*), as in (43):

(43) *mantrī=jī   tumrā   gaũmā   ayã̄   bal*
       Minister=HON POSS.2   village.LOC   come.AOR   *bal*
       '[I heared /it's said that] the minister came to your village.'

4.1 Range of uses and functions

Bal is, however, not so often used to simply introduce reported speech, as in Dravidian languages where a quotative is the standard device corresponding to complementizer *ki* 'that' of Persian origin, which is used in Indo-Aryan after speech verbs. Whenever *bal* occurs in this meaning in Garhwali, far less

---

38 Deveś Jośī (2011) wrote this paper in a deliberately non-academic way in a collection of papers intented for a wide audience for the promotion of the region, its environment, tourism and culture.

39 He gives a list of twelve items, including such words as *ar* 'and', *phir* 'then', *ta* 'then, so', *cā* 'if/whether', *ki* 'that', *kilai* 'why', *jū/ji* 'if', *par* 'but'.

frequently than the finite verb *bolṇu* (*bole* 'said', *boldi* 'says'), with or without the complementizer *ki*, it always conveys some additional meaning such as indirect knowledge of the reported information with some doubt regarding its authenticity:

(44) *tvai=na   bole   bal ki   maĩ=na   terā rupyā   deṇan*
      2SG=ERG   say.AOR   *bal* that 1SG=ERG   your rupees give.GRD.PL
      [Somebody told me that] 'You said that I should give (back) your money.'

This example, given by Cātak as an illustration of the indirect speech, is all the more interesting as it shows, on the contrary, that quoting is provided by the verb *bol* 'speak/say' followed by the complementizer *ki* introducing the content of the reported speech ('I should give back…') while *bal* adds some epistemic modality (doubt about the origin and validity of the fact that 'you said it'). This is confirmed by Jośī (2011: 12) who suggests that *bal* is used for conveying doubts about the credibility of some content (*kisī kathan kī viśvāsnīyatā par sandeh vyakt karne ke lie*), with the following example:

(45) *mantrī=jī   cha bal āyã̄   tumrā gaũmā (kyā   kyā*
      Minister=HON AUX *bal* come.PFV POSS.2 village (what what
      ghoṣṇa   kari   gayā)
      declaration do.CVB   go.AOR)
      'The Minister came (really?) to your village (left having made what announcements).'

The speaker's doubt about the reported speech he presents as a hearsay is part of the core meanings of evidentials in languages with this category (Aikhenwald 2004), as well as the use of the evidential marker to introduce tales or dreams (things which are not related with factual truth), another function of the Garhwali *bal*:

(46) *ek   cha   bal rajjā. Rajjai   chai   bal dvī rāṇī*
      one   be.PST.SG *bal* king king.OBL be.PST.PL *bal* two queens
      '(Once upon a time) there was a king. The king had two queens.' (Jośī 2011: 12)

Bal occurs quite rarely in traditional folk songs, and still more rarely with the hearsay meaning:

(47a) *tumhārī bataĩdī   bal vā   boṇ   śāvnī   ka hāth juṛe*
      your   speaking *bal* DEM sowing Shavani of hand be.tied.AOR
      'Hearing what you say, these sowings are in the hand of Shauni.'
      (Bhaṭṭ 1976: 183)

But we significantly find it four times in the few lines commenting the dialogue between the Saint Gorakhnath and the hero Malusha, who has left his kingdom and wife and travelled to the great Guru to find a way for marrying Rajula (Nauṭiyāl 1997: 31):

(47b) *bal suṇ   mālūśāĩ   ḍola   baṇaulā* [H. *sun Mālūśāhī, ḍolī banāẽge*]
     bal listen.IMP   Malushaī palkin make.FUT
     'Listen Malushahi, we will make a marriage palanquin,'
     vakh par kvī   naunī baiṭhaulo   ar naũ dharlā rājulā
     there on some girl   make.sit.FUT and name put.FUT Rajula
     'install any girl on it and name her Rajula.'
     bal gurujī   naũ   ta   dharlā   rājulā,
     [H. *gurujī,   nām   to   rakh lẽge rājulā*]
     bal guru.HON   name PTCL put.FUT   Rajula
     'Guruji, we will give the name Rajulā.'
     par nakh   sikh   kakhan   laulā   vĩ   janā?
     but toe.nails head (= features) where.from bring.FUT her like
     'But where from will you bring features like hers?'
     bal acchā tvai   triyã̄   bauḷ lagī?   bal hã̄
     bal well 2SG.DAT women   craze touch.AOR *bal* yes
     [H. *'acchā, tujhe baulapan ho gayā na?' – 'hã̄'*]
     '*Bal* well, you have got crazy about women, right? *Bal*, yes.'
     ta le   merī boksāṛī vidyā   pahle
     then take.IMP my   boksari knowledge   first …
     'Then take first my Boksari knowledge …'

The dialogue between the two starts before this exchange, without any occurrence of *bal*, and there is obviously no hearsay involved and no doubt about the validity of the speech content, so that we may consider this heavy density of the marker in this crucial section as a marker of emphasis, a function mentioned by Jośī (2011) "to emphasize a given expression" (*kisī śabd par zor dene ke lie*) with the following example, a function close to the mirative meanings, very often associated with evidentials:

(48) *maĩ=na apṇī ã̄khyũ̄   dekhī   bal*
     1SG=ERG REFL eye.OBL.PL   see.AOR *bal*
     'I have **seen** that with my own eyes, (I swear it).' (Jośī 2011)

Jośī also mentions the optional use (*anāvaśyak prayog*) for adding glow and life (*lālitya ke moh ke kāraṇ*) with an example (49) where the hearsay is conveyed not by *bal*, but by the periphrastic expression 'comes to hear', *bal* only making the narration more lively:

(49) *ṭesṭ   ta   dīlī   bal par agnaĩ   apaṇu apaṇu bhāg*
exam PTCL give.FUT *bal* but afterwards REFL   REFL   destiny
'He sure will take (lit. give) the exam *bal* but afterwards each one's one's fate.'
thoṛā bhot sifāris bhī chaĩch   par suṇan-mã̃ auṇu   ki
little much bribe   too throw.AOR but hear.INF-in come.PRES that
noṭ   chan   bal   calaṇā
note be.PAST *bal* go
'He has also done some bribing but it is heard that the money *bal* was gone.'

As a marker of conviviality in intersubjective exchange, this use of *bal* echoes the phatic function (cf. expressions such as 'you see', 'you know', 'figure it out', 'just imagine', etc.), which, although not mentioned as a common one in the literature on evidentiality, is not totally inconsistent with its emphatic or mirative meanings, and could account also for what Jośī finally calls a feeling of indifference or detachment (*taṭasthatā kā bhāv*):

(50) *sarkār   ḍām   ca   bal yakh baṇaulī.   – hã   bal.*
government dam is *bal* here make.FUT   yes *bal*
'The government say they will make a dam here. – Yes *bal* (so what/might be).'
tumāru pāṇī tumhĩ=taĩ becṇai   iskīm   ca bal baṇṇī
your   water 2PL=DAT sell.INF scheme.F.SG is *bal* be.made.INF.F.SG
'They say there is to be a scheme for selling your water to you.'
phyer tumāru hamāru bhaviṣya kyā holū? – Prabhū icchā bal!
then   your   our   future   INT be.FUT Lord   desire *bal*
'Then what will be our future? – [It is] God's will *bal*!' (Jośī 2011: 13)

Interestingly, *bal* seems to be taught in schools as a *kārak*. The definition by the school boy, asked by the school inspector is that "*bal* is such a case *bal* that it brings a change in the situation of a thing *bal* or tries to do so *bal*". This enigmatic definition may point to the subjective emphasis ("a change") added by the word in the everyday speech of Garhwali speakers.[40]

---

40 **bal** *vo kārak hai* **bal** *jo kisī vastu kī sthiti mẽ parivartan kartā hai* **bal** *yā parivartan karne kī kośiś kartā hai* **bal.** A quite surprising definition, as well as the teacher's comment: 'I had to make clear that the first *bal* in the definition of the school boy is a Tibetan (*bhautik*) *bal*, the others Garhwali *bal*.' Meaning probably that the *bal* after "is a case" suggests that one is quoting some authority, whereas the others are adding emphasis and strength to the affirmation.

4.2 Origin of *bal*

The contact with Dravidian languages is often called upon to explain the presence of quotatives in Indo-Aryan languages such as Marathi or Bengali (Meenakshi 1986). This explanation must however be ruled out for Garhwali for geographical but also for empirical reasons: no conditional form or meaning is attested; as opposed to Tamil *enṟu* and Dakhini *bolke*, *bal* does not behave as a complementizer with speech verbs, nor does it occur in final position in the complement clause before the finite main verb.[41]

Bal is derived by Cātak (1966: 141) from the Sanskrit *manye* (> Prakrit *bane/ bale*), but one cannot totally discard its relation to the verb *bol* 'speak', especially if we consider the Kumaoni evidential markers. There are two of them, clearly explained by Manohar Śyām Jośī (1995: 7) in the glossary of his Hindi novel *Kasap* (a Kumaoni untranslatable word meaning something like 'don't know'), which makes a lavish use of both forms in his Kumaoni Hindi. One is *kahā* (51a), a marker of insistence (*āgrah kā sūcak*), the other is *bal* (51b), a marker of hearsay (somebody else said so, *aisā kisī aur ne kahā*). Both examples are given with the author's Hindi gloss, (51c) is from the novel itself:

(51a) *baṛī   sundar   dikhtī hai   kahā*
      great.F beautiful seem   PRS   *kahā*
      [H. *maĩ kah rahā hū̃/, vah baṛī sundar lagtī hai*
      1SG say PROG PRS.3SG great beautiful seem.F.SG PRS]
      'I say/believe me, she really does look very beautiful.'

(51b) *baṛī sundar   dikhtī hai bal*   [H. *sunā, vah baṛī sundar lagtī hai*]
      great.F beautiful seem   PRS   *bal*   (heared 3SG great beautiful seem PRS)
      'It is said / I heared that she looks very beautiful.'

(51c) *iśq   mẽ   aisā bhī hone vālā   ṭhahrā   bal*
      love in   such too be   IMMEDIATE.FUT   stay.AOR   *bal*
      (H. *aisā bhī honā thā*)
      'One says, it is bound to happen so in love.'(Such a thing too does really happen in love.)

The neighbouring Himalayan languages display more classical forms of quotatives, used to complement a verb 'say' or 'ask', and placed at the end of the complement clause and just before the following verb of the main clause, in Nepali (52a), as well as in Tibetan (52b). In both languages the form of the quotative is clearly related to the verb 'say' (Nepali *bhanera* is a gerund of verb base *bhan-* 'say', and Tibetan *ze* is derived from verb *zer* 'say, say to oneself'.

---

41 *o sabā ātū bolke bolyā* 3SG come.1SG QUOT say.AOR 'He said he will come tomorrow.'

(52a) *ma sahar janchu   bhanera bhanyo   (... sodhyo)*
    1SG city   go.PRS.1SG QUOT   say.AOR.3SG. ask.AOR.3SG
    'He said that (he asked if) he was going (I'm going) to the city.'
    (Riccardi 2003: 577) [42]

(52b) *khong lhasa-r   'gro-gi-yin ze   lab-song*
    3SG Lhasa-to   go-FUT-1SG QUOT say-CONSTATIVE.3SG
    'S/he said that s/he will go to Lhasa.' (lit. s/he said '[I] will go to Lhasa')
    (personal communication from a Tibetan colleague in Inalco, Paris)

Darjeeling Nepali however displays mixed constructions, with both a complementizer *ki* after the 'say' verb, and final *bhanera* in the complement clause, a position also found in Garhwali, although with a different meaning:

(52c) *us=le   sodhyo   ki   ma   sahar jānchu   bhanerā*
    3SG=ERG ask.AOR that 1SG city   go.PRS.1SG QUOT
    'He asked whether he (I) should/may go to the city.'
    (personnal communication of a native speaker)

The Garhwali marker *bal* behaves more as a discourse particle with evidential meanings than as a quotative, which makes its derivation from Skt. *manye* not unplausible despite the phonetic problems it raises. More research on the topic is obviously needed before coming to a sound conclusion both about its origin and its real function in the language.

5 Conclusion

The study of the proliferating Garhwali case markers, only part of which are related to Hindi markers, has shown that various etymological bases can grammaticalize into practically any case function, the most spectacular being the word 'ear', grammaticalized into an ergative/instrumental (*na*), and a dative (*khuṇi*). The large number of markers derived from participial forms of the verb 'be' is on the other hand a striking example of an etymological source so vague and abstract that one expects widely diverging results of the grammaticalization process. These facts, curious in appearance, are however confirmed by a wider comparison with other Indo-Aryan languages, where a common set of basic markers

---

42 The form *bhanne* occurs as complementing a noun of speech:
    pradhān mantri nepāl pharkanubhayo bhanne samācār āyo
    prime minister Nepal return.3SG say.INF/QUOT news come.3SG.AOR news hear.1SG.AOR
    'The news came that the Prime Minister had returned to Nepal.'

ends up conveying very different and often opposed semantic roles, a situation unknown in other Indo-European languages. Whereas the study of case markers tells us a story similar in Garhwali, in Hindi and in other Indo-Aryan languages, the study of the evidential *bal* suggests an altogether unique evolution, since no equivalent of its major functions is found in Standard Hindi nor in any Indo-Aryan language, even those with quotatives, whatever the apparent analogy of forms may be (if we accept a *bol > bal* etymology). The attempt made here to disintricate the complexity of *avyay* words is a first step, in the hope of further research by other scholars.

Bibliography

Aikhenwald, Alexandra 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bābulkar, Mohanlāl 1996. *Gaṛhvālī lok-sāhitya kā vivecnātmak adhyayan* (A critical Study of the Garhwali folklore). Prayāg: Hindī Sāhitya Sammelan.

Bāhrī, Hardev 1966. *Hindī grāmīṇ boliyã̄* (Rural Dialects of Hindi). Ilāhābād: Kitāb Mahal.

Bahuguṇa, Abodh Baṃdhu 1960. *Gaṛhvālī vyākaraṇ kī rūprekhā* (An Outline of Garhwali Grammar). New Delhi: Garhwali Prakashan.

Benveniste, Emile 1966. "La construction passive du parfait transitif", in: *Problèmes de linguistique générale*. T.1. Paris: Gallimard, 176–186.

Bhaṭṭ, Haridatt 'Śaileś' 1976. *Gaṛhvālī bhāṣā aur uskā sāhitya* (The Garhwali Language and its Literature). Lucknow: Uttar Pradeś śāsan.

Bloch, Jules 1935. *Indo-Aryan from the Vedas to Modern Times*. Paris: Adrien-Maisonneuve.

Butt, Myriam 2006. "The Dative-Ergative Connexion", in: Bonami, Olivier & Patricia Cabredo Hofherr (eds): *Empirical Issues in Syntax and Semantics* 6, 69–92 (<http://www.cssp.cnrs.fr/eiss6/index_en.html>, accessed: March 2, 2019).

Callewaert, Winand (in collaboration with Swapna Sharma & Dieter Taillieu) 2000. *The Millenium Kabīr Vānī. A Collection of pad-s*. Delhi: Manohar.

Cātak, Goviṃd 1966. *Madhya pahāṛī kā bhāṣāśāstrīy adhyayan* (Linguistic Study of Central Pahari). Delhi: Radhakrishna Prakashan.

Cātak, Goviṃd 2000. *Gaṛhvālī lokgīt* (Garhwali folk songs). (Ādivāsī bhāṣā sāhitya prakalpa/Indian Literature in Tribal Languages.) Delhi: Sāhitya Akādamī.

Chatterji, Suniti Kumar 1986 [1926]. *The Origin and Development of the Bengali Language*. Delhi: Rupa.

Dalrymple, Mary & Irina Nikolaeva 2011. *Objects and Information Structure*. (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 131.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dingemanse, Mark 2012. "Advances in the Cross-Linguistic Study of Ideophones", *Language and Linguistic Compass* 6 (10): 654–672.

Grierson, George Abraham 1967 [1916]. *Specimens of the Pahāṛī Languages and Gujurī. Linguistic Survey of India*, vol. 9, part IV. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Harmond, David 1996. "Losing Species, Losing Languages: Connections Between Biological and Linguistic Diversity", *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 15: 89–108.

Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hoernle, August F. Rudolf 1991 [1880]. *A Comparative Grammar of the Gaudian Languages with Special Reference to the Eastern Hindi*. Delhi: Asian Educational Services.

Jośī, Deveś 2011. "Gaṛhvālī kā bal hai bal (The strength of Garhwali is the [functional word] bal)", in: *Ghughutī na bās*, *Uttarākhaṃḍ kī bhāṣā, saṃskṛti, paryaṭan evaṃ paryāvaraṇ viṣayak lekh* (Turtle Dove. Papers on the Topic of the Language, Culture, Tourism and Environment of Uttarakhand). Dehradun: Winsar Publishing Company, 11–13.

Jośī, Manohar Śyām 1995 [1982]. *Kasap*. Naī Dillī: Rājkamal Prakāśan.

Juyāl, Goviṃd Guṇānand 1967. *Madhya Pahāṛī bhāṣā (Gaṛhvālī Kumāūnī) kā anuśīlan aur uskā hindī se saṃbaṃdh* (Analysis of the Central Pahari Language (Garhwali and Kumaoni) and its Relation with Hindi). Lucknow: Navyug Graṃthāgār.

Kālā, Janārdan Prasād 1959. *Gaṛhvālī bhāṣā aur uskā lok sāhitya* (The Garhwali Language and Folk Literature). Dehradun: Samadaya Sakshaya.

Kellogg, Samuel Henry 1972 [1876]. *A Grammar of the Hindi Language: in Which Are Treated the High Hindī, Braj, and the Eastern Hindī of the Rāmāyan of Tulsī Dās, also The Colloquial Dialects of Rājputānā, Kumāon, Avadh, Rīwā, Bhojpūr, Magadha, Maithila, etc.; with Copious Philological Notes*. Delhi: Oriental Book Reprints.

Khatre, Sumitra M. 1966. *The Formation of Konkani*. Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute.

Khokhlova, Liudmila 2013. "Obligational Constructions in New Indo-Aryan Languages of Western India", *Lingua Posnaniensis* LV (2), 91–107.

Kukreti, Bhisham s.d. "Vedic Sanskrit or Sanskrit is not the mother of Garhwali and Kumaoni languages" (<https://groups.google.com/forum/#!topic/uttranchalkalasangam/bVK3VghrdUk>, accessed: January 10, 2021).

Kukreti, Rajni 2010. *Gaṛhvālī bhāṣā kā vyākaraṇ* (A Grammar of the Garhwali Language). Dehradun: Winsar Publications.

Malchukov, Andrej & Heiko Narrog 2009. "Case polysemy", in: Malchukov, Andrej & Andrew Spencer (eds): *The Handbook of Case*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 518–534.

Meenakshi, K. 1986. "The Quotative in Indo-Aryan", in: Krishnamurthi Bh. et al. (eds): *South Asian Languages: Structure, Convergence and Diglossia*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 209–218.

Minard, Armand 1936. *La subordination dans la prose védique*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Montaut, Annie 2016a. "Why Ergative Case Marker in Modal Clauses? The Historical Evolution of Aspect, Modality, Ergative and Locative in Indo-Aryan", in: Dahl, Eystein & Krzysztof Stronski (eds): *Ergativity in Indo-Aryan and Beyond*. (Typological Studies in Language 112.) Amsterdam: Benjamins, 135–165.

Montaut, Annie 2016b. "The Discourse Particle *to* and Word Ordering in Hindi", in: Fernandez-Vest, Jocelyne & Robert Van Valin, Jr. (eds): *Information Structuring of Spoken Language from a Cross-linguistic Perspective*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 263–282.

Montaut, Annie 2016c. "The Verbal Form V-ā in Hindi-Urdu: An Aorist with Aoristic Meanings", in: Guentcheva, Zlatka (ed.): *Aspectuality and Temporality*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 313–344.

Montaut, Annie 2017. "Grammaticalization of Participles and Gerunds in Preterit, Future and Infinitives", in: Bisang, Walter & Andrej Malchukov (eds): *Unity and Diversity in Grammaticalization Scenarios*. (Studies in Diversity Linguistics 16.) Berlin: Language Science Press, 97–136 (<https://langsci-press.org/catalog/book/152>, accessed: December 15, 2019).

Montaut, Annie 2018. "The Rise of Differential Object Marking in Hindi and Related Languages", in: Seržant, Ilja & Alena Witzlack-Makarevich (eds): *Diachrony of Differential Argument Marking Patterns of Variation*. (Studies in Diversity Linguistics 19.) Berlin: Language Science Press, 281–313. (<https://langsci-press.org/catalog/book/173>, accessed: October 27, 2019).

Moseley, Christopher (ed.) 2010. *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger*, 3rd edn. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

Mühlhäusler, Peter 1995. "The Interdependence of Linguistic and Biological Diversity", in: Myers, David (ed) *The Politics of Multiculturalism in Oceania and Polynesia*. Darwin: University of the Northern Territory Press, 154–161.

Mühlhäusler, Peter 2003. *Language of Environment, Environment of Language: A Course in Ecolinguistics*. London: Battlebridge.

Nauṭiyāl, Śivānaṃd 1997. *Uttarākhaṃḍ kī lokgāthāẽ* (Folk ballads of Uttarakhand). Almora: Book Depot.

Nettle, Daniel & Suzanne Romaine 2000. *Vanishing Voices: The Extinction of the World's Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Pischel, Richard 1999 [1900]. *A Grammar of the Prakrit Languages*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

Riccardi, Theodore 2003. "Nepali", in: Cardona, George & Dhanesh Jain (eds): *Indo-Aryan Languages*. London; New York: Routledge, 538–580.

Saksena, Baburam 1937. *Evolution of Awadhi: A Branch of Hindi*. Allahabad: Indian Press.

Sen, Sukumar 1960. *A Comparative Grammar of Middle Indo-Aryan*. Poona: Linguistic Society of India.

Sharma, D.D. 1987. *The Formation of Kumauni Language*. New Delhi: Bahri Publications.

Singh, Jag Dev 1970. *A Descriptive Grammar of Bangaru*. Kurukshetra: Kurukshetra Universty Press.

Strnad, Jaroslav 2012. "A Note on the Locative/Instrumental/Ergative Case in Old Hindī", *Oriental Archive* 80: 41–64.

Strnad, Jaroslav 2013. *Morphology and Syntax of Old Hindī*. Amsterdam: Brill.

Stroński, Krzysztof 2010. "Variations of Ergativity Patterns in Indo-Aryan", *Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* 46 (2)*: 237–253*.

Stroński, Krzysztof 2014. "On the Syntax and Semantics of the Past Participle and Gerundive in Early New-Aryan. Evidence from Pahari", *Folia Linguistica Historica* 35: 275–305.

Tagare, Ganesh Vasudev 1948. *Historical Grammar of Apabhramsha*. Poona: Deccan College.

Tessitori, Luigi Pio 1914. "Notes on the Grammar of the Old Western Rajasthani, With Special Reference to Apabhramsha and to Gujarati and Marwari", *The Indian Antiquary* XLIII*: 55–63, 84–91 (discontinuous pagination).

Tivārī, Udaynārāyaṇ 1961. *Hindī bhāṣā kā udgam aur uskā vikās* (The Origin and Development of the Hindi Language). Prayāg: Lok Bhārati Prakāśan.

Tiwari, Udai Narain 1966. *The Origin and Development of Bhojpuri*. (The Asiatic Society Monograph Series, vol. X.) Calcutta: The Asiatic Society.

Trumpp, Ernest 1872. *Grammar of the Sindhi language*. London: Trubner and Co.; Leipzig: Brockhaus.

Turner, Ralph 1966. *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*. London; New York; Toronto: Oxford University Press.

UNESCO Silk Road Program (<https://en.unesco.org/silkroad/silk-road-themes/languages-and-endanger-languages/garhwali>, accessed: January 10, 2021).

Vaudeville, Charlotte 1957. *Kabīr Granthāvalī*. (Publications de l'Institut Français 12.) Pondichéry: Institut Français d'Indologie.